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#### Abstract

In this paper we establish a new e cient $m$ ethod for sim ulating polym er\{solvent system $s$ which combines a lattige Boltzm ann approach for the uid with a continuum molecular dynam ics (MD) $m$ odel for the polym er chain. T he two parts are coupled by a sim ple dissipative force while the system is driven by stochastic forces added to both the uid and the polym er. Extensive tests of the new $m$ ethod for the case of a single polym er chain in a solvent are perform ed. The dynam ic and static scaling properties predicted by analytical theory are validated. In this context, the in uence of the nite size of the sim ulation box is discussed. W hile usually the nite size corrections scale as $L^{1}$ ( $L$ denoting the linear dim ension of the box), the decay rate of the $R$ ouse $m$ odes is only subject to an $L^{3}$ nite size e ect. Furtherm ore, the mapping to an existing M D sim ulation of the sam e system is done so that all physical input values for the new $m$ ethod can be derived from pure M D sim ulation. B oth $m$ ethods can thus be com pared quantitatively, show ing that the new m ethod allow $s$ for $m$ uch larger tim e steps. C om parison of the results for both $m$ ethods indicates system atic deviations due to non \{perfect $m$ atch of the static chain conform ations.


PACS num bers: $02.70 \mathrm{Ns}, 05.10 . \mathrm{G} \mathrm{g}, 47.11 .+\mathrm{j}, 83.10 \mathrm{Nn}$

## I. IN TRODUCTION

$T$ he com plexity and variety of soft condensed $m$ atter is largely due to the fact that length scales of di erent orders of $m$ agnitude are present ${ }^{n+1 / 2 .}$. $W$ hen dealing $w$ ith polym ers in com puter sim ulations, one therefore often intends to analyze the scaling behavior, where the nature
 W hen constructing $m$ odels for these system $s$ it is crucial to coarse \{ grain the details and to keep the relevant length scales in order to observe the phenom ena one is interested in. Since bead \{spring $m$ odels in M D simulations are an appropriate $m$ eans to $y$ ield the right universal law S , they have been $w$ idely used to sim ulate the scaling behavior of polym ers and $m$ uch progress has been $m$ ade using these


W hile in som e system s, e. g. in highly concentrated solutions or in $m$ elts, the dynam ic properties are not affected by the solvent \| such that these can be sim ulated by conventional bead \{spring $m$ odels $w$ thout explicitly taking into account the solvent | there are $m$ any phenom ena in polym er science where the in uence of the solvent on the polym er dynam ics cannot be neglected. For exam ple, in dihute or sem i\{dihute polym er solutions, the dynam icalbehavior is changed and even dom inated by hydrodynam ic interaction between di erent parts of the polym ers. T his eventually leads to a long\{range in-
 paper, we want to provide a new e cient $m$ ethod for the sim ulation of polym er system $s$ w here hydrodynam ics plays a role. The idea is to focus on the really necessary parts only, i.e. the hydrodynam ics of the solvent and the (B rownian) m otion of the polym er chains, thereby trying to keep the com putational costs at a minimum. O ur
test case is the dynam ics of a single chain in a solvent. This problem has, continuously attracted the attention
 theories ${ }^{1012}$. 2 rely on uncontrollable assum ptions that can be tested using com puter sim ulations.

Sim ulating such system s by M D is only possible if one introduces explicit solvent particles. H ence one has to face the problem that alm ost allCPU tim e goes into the propagation of the solvent particles, while one is $m$ ainly interested in the chain properties. H ow ever, there are also other com putationalm ethods than M D available for soft condensed $m$ atter system $s$ where hydrodynam ics is im portant, not only in the eld of polym ers but for exam ple also in colloidal suspensians. These include $B$ row nian D ynam ics sim ulationg $\mathrm{g}^{13}\{1$, and $D$ issipative $P$ article D ynam ics (DPD) $1_{2}^{17423!. ~ B ~ o t h ~ o f ~ t h e m ~ h a v e ~ i n h e r e n t ~}$ strengths, but also som e disadvantages: The rst technique $m$ ust face the problem that the algorithm scales as the cube of the num ber of particles, and the latter (like M D ) sim ulates the solvent particles explicitly, leading to sim ulations of several thousand particles even for a single chain of, say, 30 m onom ers. C om pared to M D , DPD hasthe advantage ofm uch largertim esteps, $m$ ainly because of the use of very soft potentiala ${ }^{19}$. 9 . A lot of progress in the theoretical fram ew ork of the $m$ ethod has
 like the tim e step dependent tem perature and the sm all Schm idt num bertis. Recently, how ever, som e e ort has been $m$ ade to 11 this gapi ${ }^{231}$.

In this paper we use a recently proposed $m$ ethod ${ }^{2 \times 1 / 4}$ that couples a lattice Boltzm ann approach for the uid to bead\{spring_Ralym er chains. The lattioe Boltzm ann $m$ ethod (LBM ) ${ }_{2}^{251261}$ was developed to sim ulate hydrodynam ics on a grid. The LBM was show $n$ to be an e ective and fastm ethod forsim ulating uid ow s, com parable to

 loidal particles are sim ulated as hard spheres by using stick boundary conditions. This leads to a very e cient algorithm : Its CPU cost scales linearly w th the num ber of particles, and it uses a $\backslash \mathrm{m}$ inim al" model to sim ulate the uid. Besides, Ladd also showed.29. that uctuations can be inconporated into the LBM in the spirit of Landau\{Lifshitz uctuating hydrodynam ic $9^{3 a}-$, which is essential if one $w$ ants to investigate $B$ row nian $m$ otion.

N ow one m ight think of a direct application of Ladd's $m$ ethod to polym er\{solvent system s. H ow ever, using hard spheres to m odel the m onom ers is not necessary here, as rotational degrees of freedom as well as stick boundary conditions are not relevant: On the large length and tim e scales we are interested in, like the radius of gyration and the Zimm time of the polymer, it is su cient that hydrodynam ic interaction has evolved. The $\backslash m$ icroscopic details" of the coupling should then not play a role. In this spirit, we couple the LBM to bead \{spring polym er chains by a sim ple friction ansatz, thereby treating the $m$ onom ers as point particles for the uid. W e will show that this ansatz is su cient to sim ulate both the static and dynam ic scaling behavior of the polym er. The sim ulation of the uid by LBM rather than explicit particles and the sim ple friction ansatz lead to a large speedup in com puter tim e of about a factor of 20 when com pared to pure M D, or even more if one is w illing to be satis ed w ith less accurate data.

A dditionally, wem ap ourm ethod to a pure M D sim ulation, i.e. we show how to determ ine all physical input values from the results ofM D, allow ing us to com pare our results to, an existing M D sim ulation w ith explicit solvent particles ${ }^{{ }^{1}}$. In other words, the uid in the new m ethod can be viewed as a coarse\{grained MD uid, and there exists a well\{de ned procedure for how to do the coarse\{ graining. O fcourse, in using such a m esoscopic approach it is no longer possible to include detailed chem istry like in atom istic MD sim ulations. This is, how ever, a quite com $m$ on feature ofm esoscopic sim ulation $m$ ethods; D P D sim ulations do not include atom istic details either.
$T$ he rem ainder of this article is organized as follow s: W e outline the $m$ ethod in Section 'TII, and present the nu$m$ erical results in Section 'ITIT, which are com pared to pure M D in Section 'IVI'. In Section N' we conclude w ith some nal rem arks and an outlook to further studies.

## II. THESIM ULATION METHOD

## A. The Lattice B oltzm ann M ethod for the Solvent

The lattice Boltzm ann $m$ ethod is a discrete formulation of the Boltzm ann equation on a lattice, leading to the $N$ avier\{Stokes equations in the incom pressible lim it by m eans of a Chapm an $\left\{E\right.$ nskog expansion ${ }^{251426}$. It has
been successfully applied to a variety of uid ow problem s , and it is especially well\{suited for complex uids because of the possibility of straightforw ard im plem entation of com plex boundaries. T he centralquantity of the algorithm is $n_{i}(r ; t)$, the num ber of particles in a volum $e$ $a^{3}$ at the grid point $r$ at time $t$, which have the velocty $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{\text {a }}(\mathrm{i}=1 ;:: ; \mathrm{b})$, where $a$ is the lattioe spacing, the tim e step and $c_{i}$ a vector leading to the ith neighbor on a grid with unit lattice constant. T he evolution equation for $n_{i}(r ; t)$ is the lattice Boltzm ann equation

$$
\begin{align*}
n_{i}\left(r+c_{i} a ; t+\right)= & n_{i}(r ; t)  \tag{1}\\
& +X_{j=1}^{X^{b}} L_{i j} n_{j}(r ; t) \quad n_{j}^{e q}(; u):
\end{align*}
$$

$T$ he last term expresses the relaxation of $n_{i}$ tow ards a localpseudo \{equilibrium, which resem blas a B hatnagar\{ G ross $\left\{\mathrm{K}\right.$ rook ( BG K) collision operato $1^{111}$ in in the continuum Boltzm ann equation. The constant $m$ atrix $L_{i j}$ can be interpreted as the scattering betw een particle population $i$ and $j$. Its eigenvalues can be determ ined from physical and num erical argum ents, such that its explicit form is not necessary for the sim ulation algorithm 2!.. The local pseudo \{equilibrium distribution $n_{i}^{e q}(; u)$ depends on the density $p^{(r ; t)}={ }_{i} n_{i}(r ; t)=a^{3}$ and uid current $j(r ; t) \quad u={ }_{i} n_{i}(r ; t) c_{i}=\left(a^{2}\right)$ only. Here, is the $m$ ass of a uid particle. The usual functional form for $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{eq}}(; \mathrm{u})$ is assum edta:

$$
\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}}^{e q}(; \mathrm{u})=\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{q}}+\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{q}}\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}} \quad \mathrm{u}\right)+q \mathrm{u}^{2}+\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{q}}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}} & u^{2} \tag{2}
\end{array}\right):
$$

The coe cients $A_{q}, B_{q}, C_{q}$ and $D_{q}$ (which depend on the sublattice $q$, $i$. $e$. the $m$ agnitude of $c_{i}$ ) are deter$m$ ined to reproduce the correct $m$ acroscopic hydrodynam ic behavior. N ote that this is contrary to continuum kinetic theory, where the M axw ell\{B oltzm ann distribution is determ ined by entropy considerations and the $N$ avier\{Stokes equations, follow naturally by the
 pseudo \{equilibrium. Explicit values for the coe_qients $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{q}}, \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{q}}, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}}$ and $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{q}}$ are known for di erent lattioes ${ }^{34}$.

Here, we im plem ent the 18 \{velocity $m$ odel of $R$ ef. 2 d, which corresponds to the D 3218 m odel in the nom enclature ofR ef. 134. . The set of $C_{i}$ consists of the 6 nearest and 12 next\{nearest neighbors on a sim ple cubic lattice. $V$ ia a Chapm an $\{E n s k o g$ expansion one can show that this m odel leads to the N avier\{Stokes equations in the lim it of sm all K nudsen and M ach num ber $\mathbf{2}^{55}$, and derive a relation between the kinem atic viscosity and the non $\{$ trivial eigenvalue of $L_{i j}$ belpnging to the eigenvector $C_{i} C_{i} ;(;=x ; y ; z ; 母) \underline{13} 4$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{1}{6} \frac{2}{-}+1 \frac{\mathrm{a}^{2}}{}: \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this paper, we alw ays dealw ith low Reynolds num ber ow, hence the linearized N avier\{Stokes equations
are su cient. For this reason, we neglect the nonlinear term in the equilibrium distribution (i), i. e. we e ectively set $C_{q}=-D_{q}=0$, thus obtaining a simpler and faster algorithm 29.

F luctuations can be incorporated into the lattice B oltzm ann m ethod ${ }^{2} 9$. The central idea is to add uctuations to the uxes of the conserved variables, i. e. the stress tensor, and not to the hydrodynam ic elds and j. In th is way, localm ass and $m$ om entum conservation can be guaranteed 3 . The uctuating lattice Boltzm ann equation reads

$$
\begin{align*}
& n_{i}\left(r+c_{i} a ; t+\quad\right)=n_{i}(r ; t)  \tag{4}\\
& \quad+X_{j=1}^{X^{b}} L_{i j} n_{j}(r ; t) \quad n_{j}^{e q}(; u)+n_{i}^{0}(r ; t)
\end{align*}
$$

w ith the stochastic term

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{i}^{0}(r ; t)=D_{q}^{X} \quad 0 c_{i} c_{i}: \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The random stress uctuations ${ }^{0}$ are assum ed to have white noise behavior
$0(r ; t)^{0}\left(r^{0} ; t^{0}\right)=A r r^{0} t t^{0}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
+\quad \frac{2}{3} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

By solving the resulting discrete Langevin equation for the- qurrent one nds the uctuation\{dissipation relation ${ }^{29}$ for this system; the noise strength $A$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{2 k_{B} T^{2}}{a^{3}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where is the dynam ic viscosity.
The LBM was tested extensively, com pared to other N avier\{Stokes solvers and found to have com parable speed and accuracy (see for exam ple Refs. 25

## B. The Bead $\{$ Spring $M$ odel for the $P$ olym er $C$ hain

The polym er model consists of repulsive Lennard\{ Jones $m$ onom ers.connected via non \{harm onic springs (FENE potential) ${ }^{1 / 9}$ :

$$
\begin{array}{rlrlr}
\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{LJ}} & =4 \bar{r}^{12} \quad \bar{r}^{6}+\frac{1}{4} & & \left(r<2^{1=6}\right)  \tag{8}\\
\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FENE}} & =\frac{\mathrm{kR}_{0}^{2}}{2} \ln 1 \frac{r^{2}}{R_{0}} & & \left(r<R_{0}\right):
\end{array}
$$

In order to $m$ odel the excluded volume e ect the Lennard \{Jones potential acts betw een allm onom ers. A s usual, the param eters , and the $m$ ass $m$ of the m onom er de ne our unit system. Therefore we w rote
the LBM in dim ensional form in the last section, rather than using the usual dim ensionless lattioe units. The equations of $m$ otion resulting from these potentials are integrated using the velocity Verlet algorithm ${ }^{351 .}$ w ith a tim e step $t$. N ote that there is a priori no need to set $t=$ and wewill explo进 this fact below .
The polym er m odel has been applied successfully to the simulation of $m$ any, system sat including a single chain in explicit solvent ${ }^{\frac{7}{1}}$, so that we can com pare chain properties in using these potentials.

$$
\text { C. C oupling of } F l u \text { id and } M \text { onom er }
$$

A smentioned above, for the length and tim e scales of the polym er chain, the \m icroscopic" details of the coupling should not play a role, as long as one assures that hydrodynam ics evolves in the uid on tim e scales faster than the di usion tim e scale of the $m$ onom ers. It is not necessary to resolve the shape of the $m$ onom er for the uid. Thus, we can treat one $m$ onom er as a point particle. In analogy to the Stokes form ula for a sphere in a viscous uid, we assum e the force on the $m$ onom er exerted by the uid to be proportional to the di erence of the velocity of the $m$ onom er $V$ and the uid velocity $u$ at the $m$ onom er's position,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.F_{f 1}=\quad \mathbb{V} \quad u(R ; t)\right]: \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, is a proportionality coe cient which wew ill refer to as the \bare" friction coe cient. This ansatz has also been used in the sim ulation of sedim entation ${ }^{361}$.


FIG.1. Illustration of the quantities used for the coupling ofm onom er and uid (in two dim ensions). The gure shows a sketch of a m onom er surrounded by the elem entary cell of the four nearest neighb or grid points. $a$ is the lattice constant.

Because the uid velocity is only calculated at the discrete lattice sites in the sim ulation, one has to intenpolate to get $u(R ; t)$ at the $m$ onom er's position. W e im plem ent a sim ple linear interpolation using the grid points on the elem entary lattice cell containing the $m$ onom er: D enoting the relative position of the $m$ onom er in this cell by ( $x ; y ; z$ ), with the origin being at the low er left front edge (see Fig. (111) , we can de ne

$$
\begin{align*}
& (0 ; 0 ; 0)=(1 \quad x=a)(1 \quad y=a)(1 \quad r=a) ;  \tag{10}\\
& (1 ; 0 ; 0)=x=a \quad(1 \quad y=a)(1 \quad z=a) ;
\end{align*}
$$

etc. The form ula for the linear interpolation then reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(R ; t)={ }_{r 2 n g}^{X} r u(r ; t) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ng denotes the grid points on the considered elem entary lattioe cell.

In order to conserve the totalm om entum of uid and $m$ onom erwe have to assign the opposite force to the uid in that cell. $N$ ote that then the interaction is purely local. In particular, the force density $\quad F_{f l}=a^{3}$ which is to be given to the uid leads to a $m$ om entum density transfer per MD time step tof

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{f 1}=a^{3}=\frac{j}{t}=X_{i ; r 2 n g}^{x} n_{i}(r ; t) c_{i} \frac{}{a^{2} \quad t}: \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last equation has to be satis ed for the change in the num ber ofparticles $n_{i}$ of the grid points on the ele$m$ entary lattioe cell in order to exchange the $m$ om entum density j. Besides, one must also ensure $m$ ass conservation in the uid,

$$
{ }_{i ; r 2 n g}^{x} n_{i}(r ; t)=0:
$$

The way how to calculate the corresponding $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}}$ at the nearest grid points is not unique; one possibility w as presented in Ref.i2. H ere, we follow a di erent approach which seem s slightly m ore natural: For given hydrodynam ic elds $(r ; t)$ and $j(r ; t)$ at a certain grid point $r$, the equilibrium distribution can be calculated according to Eq. the points $r 2 \mathrm{ng}$ due to the presence of the $m$ onom er can therefore be determ ined: stays constant ( $m$ ass conservation), while $j$ ! $j+r$ j. Here $r$ is the fraction (1 ${ }^{(1)}$ ) of the total jwhich is given to the speci c grid point $r$. $T$ herefore, by requiring that $n_{i} \quad n_{i}^{\text {eq }}$ rem ains unchanged, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{r})=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{r} j \quad \mathbb{j} ; \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where again the nonlinear part of Eq. glected, consistent w ith our overall procedure. M ore accurate algorithm s (which would how ever be com putationally $m$ ore expensive) could be constructed, using the
$m$ ethod proposed in Ref. ${ }^{3} 7_{1}$; how ever, this is not necessary for our purposes: O ur sim ple approach is consistent with locality of the interaction, plus $m$ om entum conservation, and should therefore su ce to build up hydrodynam ic interactions in the correct $m$ anner.

A s we discussed in Ref. 24 , one has to take care when adding stochastic term $s$ to the system. D ue to the dissipative nature of the coupling, it is necessary to incorporate uctuations to both the uid and the $m$ onom ers, i. e. to the LBM like in Eq. ${ }^{2}$ ', and to the $m$ onom ens by extending Eq. $\overline{1}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{f 1}=\quad[V \quad u(R ; t)]+f: \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $f$ is a stochastic force of zero $m$ ean and

$$
h f \quad(t) f\left(t^{0}\right) i=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
t & \left.t^{0}\right) 2 \quad k_{B} T: \tag{16}
\end{array}\right.
$$

$T$ he $m$ om entum transfer to the uid for the uctuating case is calculated in the same way as described above w ithout the uctuations. For this reason, the totalm o$m$ entum of uid and polym er is conserved locally also in the uctuating case. O ne can show analytically that w ith thism ethod the uctuation \{dissipation relation holds for the continuum lim it of the $m$ odel, where the coupling to the LBM uid is replaced by the analogous coupling to a N avier\{Stokes uid w ith them al uctuations of the ow eld. For the velocities of the $m$ onom ers and the uid ow velocity, the equilibrium distribution is then given by the $M$ axwell\{Boltzm ann distribution, while the confor$m$ ationalstatistics of the chain is given by the B oltzm ann distribution, i. e. govemed by the intra\{chain potentials $V_{\text {LJ }}$ and $V_{\text {FEne }}$, see Eq. . $\overline{10}_{10}^{1 .}$. This should be contrasted w ith the M D case, where the potential due to the solvent particles has an additional in uence. For the discrete case, one can check the uctuation\{dissipation relation by investigating the velocity relaxation of one (initially kicked) $m$ onom er in the uid on the one hand, and the velocity autocorrelation, if uctuations are added, on the other hand. $T$ he tw o quantities coincide for ourm ode $\underline{2}^{2}{ }^{4}-$, which is expected from linear response theory. It is also interesting to note that in the overdam ped lim it for the $m$ onom erm otion, and the continuum lim it for the uid, our approach is identical to the $O$ ono \{F reed equations of $m$ otion_'s, which are com $m$ only used in polym er solution theory.

The main justi cation of our approach relies on the fact that a hydrodynam ic $(\mathbb{N}$ avier\{Stokes) description of the uid works down to very short (actually, surprisingly short) length and tim e scales. T herefore, one should expect that the ow around a m onom er should be describable by the solution of the N avier\{Stokes equation as soon as the distance is larger than a few lattioe spacings. The sam e argum ent holds for the analogousM D system, where one expects N avier\{Stokes behavior beyond a few particle diam eters. $T$ herefore, we $m$ ay say that any two localcouplings (for exam ple, our LBM friction ansatz vs. MD) are equivalent as soon as they produce the same long\{range ow eld. If this is the case, then the hydrodynam ic interaction betw een tw 0 m onom ers (as long as
they are not too close) will be identical, and the single\{ m onom erm obilities w ill also m atch (note that for a particle which is pulled through the uid at constant velocity by a constant force, the friction coe cient is determ ined by the energy dissipated in the surrounding ow eld).
$T$ his latter property actually allow s for an easy deter$m$ ination of the sim ulation param eter, which we will now, for the sake of clarity, denote by the sym bol bare. A heuristic procedure, which was followed in Ref. ${ }^{2} 4_{1}^{1}$, is to vary this param eter in a set of sim ulations of a single m onom er in solvent (which can be done very easily), and to $m$ easure the $m$ om om er di usion coe cient $D$ or until the latter has the desired value. If viscosity and uid density $m$ atch as well, then the long \{range parts of the ow elds (beyond a few lattice spacings) m ust look the sam $e$. It should be noted that the E instein relation $D_{0}=k_{B} T=e$ thus de nes an e ective or renorm alized friction coe cient, which di ers from the original bare one, as it contains all the back ow e ects. Since these tend to increase the mobility, one has e bare. M ore quantitatively, one can argue as follow s: Let us consider a particle which is pulled through the solvent at constant velocity $V$ by an extemal force $F$. Then, rew riting Eq. i, we nd

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{bare}} \mathrm{~F}+\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{av}} ; \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here $u_{a v}$ is the ow velocity averaged over the nearest lattice sites of the particle, as im plem ented by our interpolation procedure. H ow ever, to a good approxim ation, the ow eld should be given by the $O$ seen tensor:

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\frac{1}{8 r}(1+\hat{r} \quad \hat{r}) F ; \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here $r$ is the distance from the particle. H ence the averaged ow eld should | in our case of averaging roughly at a distance a from the particle | have the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{a v}=\frac{1}{g a} F ; \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here $g$ is an unknow n num eric constant describing the details of the lattice geom etry and of the averaging procedure. For exam ple, doing the average over a sphere of radius $d$, one would directly obtain $u_{a v}=F=\binom{6}{d}$, from which one easily derives Stokes' law. C ombining these results and using e V $=F$ one obtains

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{e}=\frac{1}{\text { bare }}+\frac{1}{g a} ; \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

i. e. the overall mobility is sim ply the sum of the bare m obility and a hydrodynam ic, Stokes\{type contribution, where the lattice discretization serves to provide an effective Stokes radius of the $m$ onom ers. This relation has been tested by running several sim ulations at di erent bare couplings and di erent lattioe constants; the agree$m$ ent is rem arkable, as seen from Fig. ${ }_{2}^{2}, \mathbf{1}$, w here we plot
$a=e$ asa function of $a=$ bare. The param eter $g$ is thus found to have the value $g \quad 25$ for our $m$ ethod.


F IG . 2. Test of the predicted relation betw een bare and effective friction coe cient, Eq. 401 G rids of di erent lattice spacings were used as indicated in the gure.

The lattice constant a hence appears not only as a param eterw hich controls how accurately the N avier\{Stokes equation is solved (this is the usualcase for N avier\{Stokes equation solvers), but it is being assigned an additional $m$ eaning as an e ective Stokes radius. For that reason, it cannot be varied arbitrarily, but only w ithin lim its: A too sm all lattice constant w ould result in an unphysically large particle $m$ obility, even if bare is very large. This is quite di erent from conventionalN avier\{Stokes equation solving, where one obtains system atically better results when a is decreased, and can be view ed as the prioe w hich has to be paid for introducing the sim ple and com putationally fast concept of a point particle, w hich is how ever, strictly spoken, unphysical. It should be noted that bare controls the degree ofcoupling to the ow eld: Forsm all bare, one has e bare, while for large bare the Stokes contribution prevails, e $\quad \mathrm{a}$. It should have becom e clear that hence bare has no realphysicalm eaning whatsoever; it is really the e ective friction which $m$ atters for the coupling.
III. SINGLE CHAIN SIMULATION

## A. Input P aram eters

$T$ he present $m$ odel is intended to represent the sam.e physical situation as an existing pure MD sim ulation ${ }^{n_{1}^{\prime}}$. W e therefore choose the physicalinput values for the new $m$ ethod as obtained by the form er (all values are given in the unit system speci ed in Sec. (III). The uid is characterized by the the tem perature $\overline{\mathrm{k}}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{T}=1: 2$, the density
$=0: 864$, and the kinem atic viscosity $=2: 8$. The param eter (the uid particle $m$ ass) is unim portant; its value can be absorbed in a re\{de nition of the $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}}$. The lattice constant a of the grid is set to unity; this is roughly the sam e as the bond length of the polym er chain, and the interparticle distance of the M D uid. A s in the pure M D sim ulation, we study chains of length $N_{c h}=30 ; 40$ and 60. The corresponding grid sizes (which are im portant param eters, since they determ ine the hydrodynam ic interaction of the chain $w$ ith its periodic im ages, see Ref. $\left.{ }_{1}^{17} \overline{1}_{1}\right)$ are $\mathrm{L}=18,18$, and 22 , respectively, which is roughly identical to the corresponding M D box sizes.
$T$ he param eters for the FENE potentialare taken from the MD sim ulation as $R_{0}=2: 0$ and $k=7: 0$. A s already discussed in Sec. TIIC the static conform ations are identical: In the M D case, there is also the in uence of the solvent, which is absent in the present $m$ ethod. A ctually, the data show a system atic deviation, which is how ever not very large (see


Them áss of the $m$ onom ers was set to unity. This actually di ens from the M D case where the m onom erm ass had been set to two. H ow ever, we also used a m onom er ofm ass one in order to determ ine the \bare" friction coe cient, bare, using the procedure outlined at the end of Sec. 'IIIC1, such that we found bare $=20: 8$ from the requirem ent that the $m$ onom er di usion coe cient has the value known from $M D, D_{0}=0: 076$. H ad we used a m onom er of di erent m ass, we would also have obtained a slightly di erent value for bare (these are very sm all e ects, beyond what the sim ple picture which underlies Eq. ', ${ }^{2} \mathbf{O}_{1}^{\prime}$ can capture). Since how ever on the tim e scale of $B$ rownian $m$ otion it is only the param eter $e=k_{B} T=D_{0}$ which $m$ atters, w e expect an in uence of the $m$ ass param eter only for short tim es, where the dynam ics di ens from M D behavior anyways.

It rem ains to specify the tim e steps tapd. A choice of $t=0: 01$ is optim al for the MD part' 6 the LBM time step it is desirable to $m$ ake it as large as possible because the uid calculation is the CPU intensive part of the $m$ ethod. Test sim ulations show ed the lim iting factor to be that $n_{i}$ is getting negative for too large tim e steps due to increasing uctuations, in particular near the $m$ onom ers. This situation, how ever, can alw ays happen, although $w$ ith decreasing probability for sm aller tim e steps. W e found that using a tim e step of
$=0: 05$ only approxim ately each $10^{4}$ th random num ber one $n_{i}$ becam e negative, while for $=0: 01$ such a case never occurred during the observation time. We decided to generate new random numbers in such rare cases, which of course slightly changes the distribution of the sim ulated noise, but is justi ed if the probability for negative $n_{i}$ 's is low enough. W e ran the sim ulations at $=0: 05$ and also did a simulation for the sm allest system $\left(\mathbb{N}_{c h}=30, \mathrm{~L}=18\right)$ using $=0: 01$ in order to check the results.

Furtherm ore, we should com $m$ ent in som em ore detail on the lattice constant $a$. T he choice $a=1$ seem $s$ intuitively reasonable, since thism atches the bond length and the interparticle distance in the M D system. H ow ever, one would in principle like to $m$ ake the lattioe spacing as large as possible, since, for constant overall volum $e$, the com putationale ort scales as a ${ }^{3}$. For this reason, we also did a test run w th $\mathrm{a}=2$ for the $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=30$ system, where we of course had re\{adjusted the bare friction, see end of Sec. "IIIC'. It tumed out that the decay of the dynam ic structure factor looks quite sim ilar. H ow ever, there are system atic discrepancies (see Sec. 'IV B'), such that the gain in speed is paid for by a certain loss in accuracy. In what follow s we w ill alw ays refer to the case $a=1$, unless explicitly stated otherw ise.

| Chain length | 30 | 30 | 40 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LB tim e step | 0:05 | 0:01 | 0:05 | 0:05 |
| exponent | 0:621 0:004 | 0:620 0:002 | 0:637 0:002 | 0:637 0:002 |
| $\mathrm{Re}_{\mathrm{e}}$ | $94 \quad 5$ | $90 \quad 4$ | $134 \quad 4$ | 21710 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{g}}^{2}$ | 14:3 0:5 | 13:9 0:4 | 20:6 0:3 | 33:5 0:9 |
| $\frac{1}{\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{H}}}$ | 0:299 0:005 | 0:300 0:005 | 0:261 0:005 | 0:215 0:004 |
| $\frac{1}{R_{\mathrm{H}}}{ }_{\mathrm{L}}^{1}{ }_{\mathrm{a}}$ | 0:1512 | 0:1525 | 0:1179 | 0:0986 |
| $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{T}$ | 1:139 0:003 | 1:2056 0:003 | 1:139 0:003 | 1:139 0:003 |
| $\mathrm{g}_{3}$-exp. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0:9951 0:0004 | 1:009 0:0002 | 1:0001 0:0001 | 1:006 0:003 |
| $g_{1}-\exp$. | 0:6415 0:001 | 0:6747 0:001 | 0:6630 0:0006 | 0:6704 0:002 |
| D cm | 6:533 $10^{3} 1110{ }^{5}$ | 6:102 $10{ }^{3} 110^{5}$ | 4:860 $10{ }^{3} \quad 2 \quad 10{ }^{5}$ | 3:387 $100^{3} 110$ |
| D $0^{\text {c }}$ | 0:081 | 0:062 | 0:076 | 0:054 |
| z (estim ate) | 365 | 380 | 705 | 1650 |

TABLE I. Single chain properties
${ }^{a}$ no error due to com plicated calculation
${ }^{\text {b }}$ exponent obtained by, tting a power law in the sub-di usive scaling regim et 2 [20:80]
c calculated using Eq. 13 II'

An im portant point conceming the com parison with analytical theory should be m entioned here. It is usually assum ed in these theories that the tim e scale for the evolution of the hydrodynam ic interaction is $m$ uch sm aller than the di usion time scale of a monomer, i. e. the Schm idt num ber $\mathrm{Sc}=\overline{\mathrm{D}_{0}} \quad$ 1. This param eter can be set arbitrarily in our $m$ ethod: is an input param eter and $D_{0}$ can be tuned by choosing bare. In our case, we have Sc 32.

## B. C hain Statics

$T$ he results for the chain lengths of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=30,40$ and 60 are listed in Table tem perature provides a rst consistency check of the algorithm. The values for $k_{B} T_{m}$ easured $\frac{2}{3 N_{c h}} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k} \text { in }}$ show a discretization errorof5\% for the large tim e step $=0: 05$. For the sm all tim e step $=0: 01$ the error decreases signi cantly.
$T$ he radius of gyration

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{G}^{2}={\frac{1}{2 N_{c h}^{2}}}_{i j}^{X} r_{i j}^{2} ; \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

w th $r_{i j}=\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{i}} \quad r_{j} j$ and the end $\{$ to $\{$ end distance

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{e}}^{2}={ }^{\mathrm{D}}\left(\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{N} \mathrm{ch}} \quad \mathrm{r}_{)^{2}}\right)^{\mathrm{E}} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

are related to the num ber of $m$ onom ers by the static exponent ,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{g}^{2} / R_{e}^{2} / N_{c h}^{2} ; \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a self\{avoiding walk 0:588 from renorm alization group theory $m$ ethods and $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulation ${ }^{39}$. In principle, can be obtained from the scaling law (2-3); ; how ever, this would require sim ulations covering a w ide range of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}$. H ence, it is advantageous to use the static structure factor

$$
\begin{align*}
S(k) & =N_{c h}{ }^{1}{ }^{X} \text { hexp (ik }{ }^{i j} \text { if)i }  \tag{24}\\
& =N_{c h}{ }^{1}{ }^{1}{ }^{1 j} \frac{\sin \left(k r_{i j}\right)}{k r_{i j}} ;
\end{align*}
$$

which probes di erent length scales even for a single polym er. In the scaling regim $\mathrm{eR}_{\mathrm{g}}{ }^{1} \quad \mathrm{k} \quad \mathrm{a}_{0}{ }^{1}$ ( $\mathrm{a}_{0}$ being a $m$ icroscopic length of the order of the bond length) the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(k) / k^{1=} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

 get the values for of Table 焉which are about 6\% higher than the asym ptotically correct value, resulting from the nite chain length. In $F$ ig. $\bar{W}_{1}^{1}$, we also include data which have been generated from à sim ulation of a single chain
without surrounding LBM uid. The conform ationsm ust be the sam e, i.e. the structure factorsm ust coincide (up to discretization errors, which $m$ ay look som ew hat di erent for the chain coupled to the LBM uid). A s is seen from the gure, the agreem ent is very good, i. e. the $m$ ethod is validated to produce correct static conform ations.


FIG .3. The static structure factor of the chains.
The hydrodynam ic radius

$$
\begin{equation*}
{\frac{1}{R_{H}}}_{1}={\frac{1}{N_{c h}^{2}}}_{i \in j}^{X} \frac{1}{r_{i j}} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

is an interesting quantity because the K irkw ood prad,iction for the di usion of the chain's center ofm assitil

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{C M}=\frac{D_{0}}{N_{c h}}+\frac{k_{B} T}{6} \quad \frac{1}{R_{H}} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

depends on it. This form ula, how ever, is only correct for a single chain in an in nite $m$ edium. In a nite box one has to take into account the hydrodynam ic interaction w ith the periodic im ages. This w ill eventually lead to a nite\{size corrected hydrodynam ic radius. Q uite generally, one $m$ ust expect a nite size e ect of order $L^{1}$ for every dynam ic quantity, corresponding to the slow $r^{1}$ decay of hydrodynam ic interactions. A detailed description can be found in Refs. 7,140 , so that we can restrict ourselves to the essential points. W ithin the O seen approxim ation, the di usion tensor is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{i j} D\left(r_{i j}\right)={\frac{k_{B} T}{L^{3}}}_{k \notin 0}^{X} \frac{1 \hat{k} \hat{k}}{k^{2}} \exp (i k \quad i \neq \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $i$; j where $k=2 n=L$ ( $n$ being a vector of integers) runs over the reciprocal lattice vectors and $\hat{k}$ is a unit vector in the direction of $k$. For $i=j$, one has the
$m$ onom eric di usion coe cient D orplus the contribution due to the hydrodynam ic interaction of that bead with its ow $n$ periodic im ages,

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{i i}=D_{0} 1+\lim _{r!} D(r) \quad \frac{k_{B} T}{8 r}(1+\hat{r} \quad \hat{r}): \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last tw o expressions can be calculated e ciently using the Ewald sum $m$ ation technique. T he center ofm ass di usion constant is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{C M}={\frac{1}{N_{c h}^{2}}}^{X} \frac{1}{3} T_{i j} \operatorname{TrhD}_{i j} i: \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$


which de nes, by com parison w ith the $K$ inkwood form ula (271), a nite size corrected hydrodynam ic radius:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{CM} ; \mathrm{L}} \quad \frac{\mathrm{D}_{0}}{\mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{ch}}}+\frac{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T}}{6} \quad \frac{1}{\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{H}}} \quad: \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

$R_{H}$ is thus e ectively increased by the periodic in ages. For our box sizes, the discrepancy betw een $R_{H}{ }^{1}{ }_{L}$ and $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{H}}{ }^{1}$, am ounts to approxim ately a factor of two (cf. Table(1). I h is is in agreem ent w ith the corrections found in Ref. $\tilde{I}_{1}$.


FIG.4. Them ean square displacem ent of the chain's center ofm ass.

## C. Chain Dynam ics

 starts from the prediction $D_{C M} / R_{g}{ }^{1}$ (cf. Eq. $\left.{ }^{1} \overline{2}_{1}\right)$.

The Zimm timez,i.e. the longest relaxation tim e of the chain, is given by the condition that the chain has $m$ oved its ow $n$ size during $z$, or $D_{C M} z / R_{g}^{2}$, implying $z / R_{g}^{3}$, which de nes the dynam ic exponent $z=3$. $T$ his exponent then quite generally relates tim es to corresponding lengths, such that, for exam ple, the $m$ ean square displacem ent of a $m$ onom er on tim e scales below $z$, but above the $m$ icroscopic time scales 0 , should be proportional to $t^{2=z}=t^{2=3}$. For a chain $w$ thout hydrodynam ic interaction (R ouse m odel), where D $\mathrm{Cm} / \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}{ }^{1}$, one nds $\underline{z}=2+1=$ from analogous considerations.
$F$ igure $\sqrt{4}$ show $s$ the $m$ ean square displacem ent of the chain's center ofm ass

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{3}(t)=\left(_{C M}\left(t_{0}+t\right) \quad R_{C M}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)^{2}: \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

By tting a power law we obtain the exponents and the di usion constants shown in Table i. . O bviously, the exponents support the prediction of sim ple di usive behavior ( $t^{1}$ ). O ne would expect theoretically that two di usive regim es exist, both exhibiting $t^{1}$ behavior but different prefactors, w ith a sm ooth crossover around the Zimm time. The accuracy of the data does not allow to support this crossover, which is not surprising as the short \{ tim e and long \{tim e di usion-gonstant are expected to be rather close to each other $1_{1}^{1} 41,42$. In principle, the scaling behavior ofD см provides a test of the Zim m prediction $D_{C M} / N_{c h}$. But there are large correctionstp scaling due to nite chain length and bead size e ects ${ }^{10} 4^{4}-3$. $T$ herefore it ism ore usefulto analyze the non \{asym ptotic relation (311) by com paring the values for $D_{0}$ that can be obtained from Eq. ${ }^{3} \overline{1}_{1}^{\prime}$, w here nite chain length and nite box size are taken into account, w ith the input value of $\mathrm{D}_{0}=0: 076$. The values are also listed in Table it show ing quite reasonable agreem ent. W thout the nite size corrections, the agreem ent is unacceptable, such that a negative value for $D_{0}$ would be obtained.


FIG.5. The mean square displacem ent of the central m onom er.

The $m$ ean square displacem ent of a single $m$ onom er i (which should only be evaluated for $m$ onom ens near the center of the chain to elim inate end e ects)

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{1}(t)={ }^{D}\left(r_{i}\left(t+t_{0}\right) \quad r_{i}\left(t_{0}\right)\right)^{2} \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

is plotted in F ig. $\overline{\mathrm{F}}_{1} 1$. In the tim e regim e below the Z im m tim $e$ and above the ballistic regim $e$, the scaling behavior $g_{1}(t) / t^{2=3}$ is predicted. The corresponding $t$ to our data yields the exponents of $T$ able 袋. T he values obviously favor the Zimm model com pared to the R ouse m odel, which predicts $g_{1}(t) / t^{2=z}=t^{0: 54}$.

The $Z i m m$ tim ecan be estim ated from them ean square displacem ent of a $m$ onom er in the center ofm ass system,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
g_{2}(t)=h\left(\left[\begin{array}{ll}
{\left[r_{i}\left(t+t_{0}\right)\right.} & R_{C M}\left(t+t_{0}\right)
\end{array}\right]\right.  \tag{35}\\
{\left[\begin{array}{ll}
{\left[_{i}\left(t_{0}\right)\right.} & \left.\left.R_{C M}\left(t_{0}\right)\right]\right)^{2} ;
\end{array}\right.}
\end{array}
$$

which is depicted in Fig. $\frac{\text { ig. Theoretically, a crossover }}{\text {. }}$ to a plateau should evolve at the Zimm time. H ow ever, the crossover is quite extended in our sim ulation, $m$ aking it di cult to extract a speci $c$ time for it. $W$ e therefore estim ate the Z im m tim from

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=\frac{R_{g}^{2}}{6 D_{C M}} ; \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

which yields the values shown in Table in.


FIG. 6. The $m$ ean square displacem ent of the central $m$ onom er in the chain's center of $m$ ass system.

It is interesting to perform a R ousem ode analysis. For this purpose one de nes the R ouse $m$ odes $a^{4}{ }^{4}{ }^{4}$

$$
X_{p}=N_{c h}{ }^{1}{ }_{n=1}^{\text {N }_{\mathrm{ch}}} \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{n}} \cos \frac{\mathrm{p}}{\mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{ch}}}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{n} & \frac{1}{2} \tag{37}
\end{array}\right):
$$

It is $w$ ell know $n$ that these $m$ odes are the (independent) eigenm odes of the random walk R ouse m ode $3^{3}$.


FIG.7. N orm alized autocorrelation function of the R ouse $m$ ode $X_{p}$ for di erent $p$, for the longest sim ulated chain $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=60$. The upper part of the gure uses $\mathrm{p} t$ as scaling argum ent, where $p$ was calculated directly from the chain conform ations. The $m$ iddle part uses $p^{z} t$, where naive dynam ic scaling has been applied, while the low er part also takes the correction factor $r(p)$ (see A ppendix 'A!) into account. T he $m$ eaning of sym bols is the sam e for all three parts (see $m$ iddle part).

H ow ever, for reasons of translational sym m etry along the chain, one must expect that the cross correlation $h X_{p}\left(t+t_{0}\right) X_{q}\left(t_{0}\right) i(p \in q)$ is at any rate quite weak, regardless of chain statistics and dynam ics, such that the $m$ odes can be view ed as independent $m$ odes even beyond the random walk R ouse case. For a ring polym er, this can be show $n$ rigorously, since in this case there is strict invariance under the transform ation $n!n+1$,
such that the R ouse m odes (w hich are then de ned with an $\exp$ (ip $n=\mathrm{N} \mathrm{ch}$ ) factor) are eigenfunctions under this transform ation. H ence, if end e ects are not too strong, one should also expect for our case an independence of the R ouse modes. Indeed, w thin the accuracy of our data, the cross correlation term s are zero.

Furtherm ore, w ithin the approxim ations of the Z im m m odel, the autocomplation fiunction of the $m$ odes should decay exponentially $3^{3}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{h X_{p}\left(t+t_{0}\right) X_{p}\left(t_{0}\right) i}{X_{p}^{2}}=\exp \left(t={ }_{p}\right): \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

In Fig. $\overline{1}_{1}$, , we therefore plot, for $\mathrm{p} \quad 1$, the nom alized autocorrelation function sem i\{logarithm ically as a function of properly scaled tim e. Firstly, we estim ate $p$ via the in itial decay rate

$$
\begin{equation*}
p^{1}=p=\frac{d}{d t} \frac{h X_{p}(t) X_{p}(0) i}{X_{p}^{2}} \quad ; \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

which can, w ithin the fram ew ork of K irkw ood $\{\mathrm{Z}$ im m theory, be calculated in term $s$ of purely static averages, i. e. from the chain conform ations in combination $w$ ith a m odel di usion tensor, for which we use Eqs. ${ }_{2}^{2} \overline{8}_{1}^{1}$ and 2d. The, details of this approach are described in Appendix 'A. Interestingly, it tums out that this quantity is only sub ject to an $L^{3}$ nite size e ect (which we neglect), in contrast to the usual $L^{1}$ behavior. This result holds beyond the various approxim ations of Appendix ' A '; ; our interpretation is that any contribution of global center $\{$ of $\{m$ ass $m$ otion of the chain is being subtracted, such that the leading\{order hydrodynam ic interaction $w$ ith the periodic im ages cancels out, and only a dipole\{type interaction rem ains. In the upper part of Fig. $\bar{I}_{1}$, we thus plot the autocorrelation as a function of pt , where p was calculated directly from the sim ulated chain conform ations, in com bination $w$ ith the $O$ seen tensor. It is seen that the $O$ seen form ula describes the decay quite well; how ever, the data collapse is not particularly good. There is also som e curvature, indicating a non $\{$ exponential decay. The $m$ iddle part of the gure then uses the scaling argum ent $p^{z} t$. This $p$ \{dependence results from the calculation of $p$, where instead of the actual chain conform ations asym ptotic self\{avoiding walk statistics is em ployed (see A ppendix 'A'), as the leading power law. This corresponds to sim ple dynam ic scaling, which views the pth mode as equivalent to a chain of length $N_{c h}=p$, such that $p /\left(N_{c h}=p\right)^{z}$. H ow ever, the $m$ ore detailed calculation of A ppendix 'A yields an additionalweak p\{dependence, i. e. a correction factor r(p), whose presence indicates, in our opinion, that the sim ple picture of subchains of length $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=\mathrm{p}$ is not fiully justi ed. Taking this correction into account, we obtain a very nice data collapse (see low er part ofF ig. ${ }^{\prime} \bar{T}_{1}$ ). . This is quite rem arkable; one w ould of course expect the best data collapse for the upperm ost part which involves the sm allest num ber of approxim ations. It seem $s$ that there are various errors involved which som ehow happen to cancelout.


FIG.8. Scaling plot of the dynam ic structure factor for $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=60$, for R ouse scaling ( $z=3: 7$ ), asym ptotic Z im m scaling $(z=3)$, and $z=2: 8$, which produces the best collapse.

As far as the absolute value of the decay rate is concemed we nd reasonable agreem ent: $W$ hile the lower part of Fig . $3 \quad 10^{4} \mathrm{p}^{3} \mathrm{r}(\mathrm{p})$, Eq. $\mathrm{A}^{2} \overline{1} 1$ predicts a decay rate of order 5:4 $10{ }^{4} p^{3} r(p)$ where we have for sim plicity used the random $w a l k$ value for the constant $A$, and $b^{3}=2: 0$ (extracted from the results for $R_{e}^{2}$ via $R_{e}^{2}=b^{2} N^{2}$ ).
$T$ he dynam ic structure factor

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(k ; t)={\frac{1}{N_{c h}}}^{X} \quad \operatorname{hexp}\left(i k \quad\left[i(t) \quad r_{j}(0)\right]\right) i \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

is predicted ${ }^{3 \prime \prime}$ to exhibit the scaling behavior

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(k ; t)=S(k ; 0) f\left(k^{z} t\right) \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

if both $w$ avenum ber and tim $e$ are in the scaling regin $e$, i. e. $R_{g}{ }^{1} \mathrm{k} \quad a_{0}^{1}$ and $0 \quad t \quad z$. It is even possible to calculate explicit form ulas (rigorously for the random walk Rouse model and unsing the linearization
 that there is an exponential dependency on $\left(k^{z} t\right)^{2=z}$ for
${ }_{k} t$ 1, where $k$ is the $(k$ \{dependent) decay rate. Hence a plot of $S(k ; t) k^{1=}$ against $\left(k^{z} t\right)^{2=z}$ should | for the correct $m$ odel | collapse to a straight line in a $\log \left\{\right.$ linear representation. For $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=60$, the results are shown in F ig. ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ (the plots for the other chain lengths look quite sim ilar). T he data were restricted to the scaling regim e $20 \quad t \quad 80$ and $0: 7 \quad \mathrm{k} \quad 2$. T hese ranges w ere obtained from the single\{m onom erm ean square displace-
 respectively. Values of $S(k ; t)$ below $0: 01$ were discarded, for reasons of statistical accuracy. It is clearly visible that the simulation shows Z im m rather than R ouse behavior. A dynam ic exponent of $z=2: 8$ yields the best data collapse. Such an e ective value, which is, due to corrections to scaling, som ew hat sm aller than the correct asym ptotic one, is quite usually observed, not only in sim ulations $\mathbf{S}^{1_{1}^{1}}$, but also in experim entsit.

C onceming nite size e ects, one has for a nite box size $S=S(k ; t ; L)$, and scaling is cormupted by the second length $L$ in the problem. T he in uence can be estim ated, in close analogy to the procedure presented in A ppendix 'A', by studying the-A, kgasu form ula for the k \{ dependent di usion coe cienti49, i47,
which is $L$ \{dependent because of the nite size form (2) of $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ij}} . \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{L})$ is related to the initial slope of the $\mathrm{dy}-$ nam ic structure factor via

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(k ; L)=\lim _{t!0} \frac{1}{k^{2} t} \ln \frac{S(k ; t ; L)}{S(k ; 0 ; L)} \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e do not present the details of our sem i\{quantitative analysis here since they have been outlined in Ref. ${ }^{17}$ I already. The result is a $k\{$ independent correction term of order $L^{1}$ (note that $S(k ; t)$ does contain the overall chain motion, for every w avenum ber). As the leading\{ order ( $L=1$ ) term is proportional to $k$ in the scaling regim e, the conclusion is that scaling is cormupted, but the relative contribution of the nite size correction gets $w$ eaker $w$ ith increasing $k$. For the $k$ ! 0 lim it nite size corrections am ount to roughly $100 \%$, as has been show $n$ by the calculations for the hydrodynam ic radius in Sec. 'IIIB'. In the scaling regim e the corrections are much sm aller, because it is closer to the kL ! 1 lim it. This is, in our opinion, the $m$ ain reason $w$ hy the data collapse w orks so nigely.
IV. COM PARISON TO THE CORRESPONDING M D SYSTEM

## A.E cien Cy

Since the system is highly dihute, the CP U cost for the M D part for the polym er chain is negligible, and the lattice B oltzm ann part uses up practically allcom putational resources. It should be noted that this part can be optim ized by choosing appropriate sim ulation param eters; our choice $(\mathrm{a}=1,=0: 05)$ is probably not the m ost e cient one. Firstly, it is possible to increase the lattioe spacing som ew hat, w ithout substantial loss in accuracy. For exam ple, going from $a=1$ to $a=2$ reduces the com putationale ort by a factor ofeight. T his increase seem s how ever to be slightly too large already; as outlined in Sec. IIV B1, a = 2 produces less accurate data. Secondly, one can try to exploit Eq. ing $=2: 8$, such that the sim ulation runs at $=1$, forwhich the LBM algorithm takes a particularly sim ple form $i_{1}$ which a substantial num ber of operations can be saved ${ }^{91}$. Further speedup can be expected if the require$m$ ent $=2: 8$ and $D_{0}=0: 076$ (form apping to M D ) were released. H ow ever, we have not checked these questions in a system atic fashion; in particular, our discussion has not taken into account that the lim it of stable tim e steps
depends on both a and in a non\{trivial way. We hence $w$ ant to sim ply state that our present choice ofparam eters is not yet a fully optim ized one; therefore the num bers given below (for $\mathrm{a}=1$ and $=0: 05$ ) should be view ed as a lower bound of the e ciency which the $m$ ethod can attain.

On one EV 5.6 processor of a 433 M HzDEC A lpha server 8400 (for a typical box size of $L=40$ ) our code obtains 3:1 $10^{5}$ grid point updates per second. In order to com pare this num ber w ith the m olecular dynam ics system, we note that one grid point corresponds to 0:86 solvent particles for $=0: 86$ and $a=1: 0$. Therefore, the e ciency of the code in MD units is 3:1 $10^{5} \quad 0: 86 \quad 2: 7 \quad 150$ particle updates per second. $T$ his num ber should be contrasted $w$ ith the e ciency of, optim ized M D codes for short\{range LJ uids, which is_ ${ }^{481}$ (on the sam em achine) $2: 1 \quad 10^{\circ}$ particle updates per second, using the code described in R ef., $49_{1 .}$ T hus, the LBM would run by a factor of $1: 3$ faster than MD if the sam e tim e step were used. H ow ever, the lattice B oltzm ann tim e step $=0: 05$ is $m$ ore than an order of $m$ agnitude larger than for the pure M D system : T he latter m ust be run $w$ ithout friction and noise, i.e. in the microcanonical ensem ble, in order to strictly conservem om entum (otherw ise the hydrodynam ic interaction w ould be screened ${ }^{\frac{1}{5}}=$ ) . Such a sim ulation can only be stable on long tim e scales if the tim e-step is su ciently sm all; according to our experiences $4^{4}-1$, one needs $t=0: 003$. Taking these factors into account, we obtain a net speedup of a factor of

22, which, as outlined above, can be increased further by choosing a coarser lattice, i. e. by trading in accuracy for speed, A detailed com parison w ith the \com petitor" D P D 17.123 .1 is highly desirable, but not done here, last not least becausethe $m$ atch of the viscosity is $m$ uch less trivial in D P D $1_{1}^{211222.2}$. From what we know from the literature, we expect that the tw o m ethods would be roughly com parable in speed, at least by order ofm agnitude.


FIG.9. The dynam ic structure factor $S(k ; t)$ for the new m ethod w ith $=0: 05$ (circles) and $=0: 01$ (line) com pared to pure MD simulation (crosses) for three di erent $k$ values $\left(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=30\right)$.
B. Static and D ynam ic B ehavior

In order to check how well the new m ethod produces the sam e physics as the originalM D m odeli', from which all sim ulation param eters were derived, we focus on the
com parison of the structure factor $S(k ; t)$ forboth $m$ ethods, as show $n$ in $F$ ig. '191 (tim e dependence at constant k),
 (tim e dependence for the norm alized structure factor).

Let us rst consider the static case $t=0$. The corresponding plot ( F ig. $\mathrm{i}_{1} \overline{\mathrm{O}}_{1}^{\prime}$, upperm ost part) for $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=30$ show $s$ system atic deviations. $T$ hese $m$ anifest for exam ple in the discrepancies of the static scaling exponent ( = 0:59 for the pure M D sim ulation, $=0: 62:: 0: 0: 64$ for the new $m$ ethod); the chain is $m$ ore stretched using the new m ethod. The absolute values for the static structure factor di er up to about 25\%. Sim ilar results hold if one com pares other static quantities like the radius of gyration or the end\{to \{end distance. It can be veri ed that the discrepancies show no signi cant dependency on the chain length for the range investigated here ( 30 \{ 60). M oreover, they are not due to a discretization error in time, as the plots for $=0: 05$ and $=0: 01$ show . $T$ he reason is rather sim ply the fact that the M D chain is sub ject to a di erent potential (intra\{chain plus solvent) than the LBM chain (intra\{chain only). For that reason, there is a system atic di erence in the static conform ations, which then, in tum, w ill also a ect the dynam ic properties som ew hat. For exam ple, the $N_{c h}=60$ chain has a gyration radius $R_{g}^{2}{ }^{1=2}=5: 79$, while the corresponding M D chain ${ }^{\frac{1}{1}}$ has a gyration radius of only $4: 78$. It is hence not surprising that the larger chain is also som ew hat slow er, as the com parison of the di usion constants con $\mathrm{ms}\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{CM}}=3: 39 \quad 10^{3}\right.$ for the larger LBM chain, and $D_{C M}=4: 25 \quad 10^{3}$ for the $s m$ aller M D chain). Therefore, in order to achieve a better $m$ atch of static and dynam ic properties, it would be necessary to re\{adjust the potential for the LBM chain such that the conform ations are $m$ ore sim ilar. This is possible, but not com pletely trivial, and has not been attem pted in this work. On the other hand, for the dynam ics param eters (i. e. the viscosity and the friction coe cient), it is quite easy, to achieve $m$ atching, as has been described in Sec. MAI.

Tuming to the decay of $S(k ; t)$, we rst note that the
 ilar discrepancies of up to $25 \%$ as for the static case. The overall agreem ent is how ever quite reasonable. In order to divide out the trivial am plitude e ect, we also plot $S(k ; t)=S(k ; 0)$ for three di erent $k$ values in $F$ ig. $\mathbf{1}_{2} 1$ $k$ in the scaling regim $e$, the agreem ent is $m$ uch better, $w$ ith di erences of a few percent only. This is not too surprising, since in this regim e the decay rate should in essence be given by $\mathrm{k}^{3} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{T}=$ tim es a num ericalprefactor which deppends only weakly on the details of the chain statistics $d^{4} \theta^{i d} 47$ I. In the long\{wavelength regim e (inset of Fig. (1211) the decay is given by $\exp \quad D_{C M} k^{2} t$, which is nicely con $m$ ed by the data, and thus the ratio of the decay rates is just the ratio of the di usion constants, i. e. there is again a discrepancy of roughly $20 \%$ (this is hardly visible in Fig. $111_{1}^{\prime}$, due to noise in the M D data).


FIG.10. The dynam ic structure factor $S(k ; t)$ for the new m ethod w th $=0: 05$ (circles) and $=0: 01$ (line) com pared to pure MD simulation (crosses) for three di erent tim es $\left(\mathbb{N}_{c h}=30\right)$.

To sum $m$ arize, we nd that both m ethods are well\{ suited for quantitatively reproducing the dynam ics of polym er chains in solvent, and both revealZim m behavior very nicely. T he discrepancies which we nd in the dynam ic properties can be directly traced back to the non $\{$ perfect $m$ atch of the static conform ations. If those had been $m$ atched by an adjustm ent of the potential, then the agreem ent w ould probably be close to perfect.

Finally, let us discuss in m ore quantitative term $s$ the in uence of the lattice spacing. To this end, Fig. 1 com pares the decay of the nom alized dynam ic structure factor of an $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ch}}=30$ chain for three k values, obtained by running the same system w ith two di erent lattice
spacings $a=1$ (as discussed previously) and $a=2$. A $l l$ other sim ulation param eters (in particular the box volum e, and the $m$ onom eric di usion coe cient $D 0_{0} \mid$ not the bare coupling bare) were left identical. A s one sees from the gure, the larger lattioe spacing induces decays which are system atically slow er, by roughly $20 \%$ to $25 \%$. It is thus a question of desired accuracy if one $w$ ants to consider these results as still acceptable or not. T he observed e ect goes in the direction which one expects, for the follow ing reasons: As soon as the lattice spacing exceeds the size of the chain, there w illbe no hydrodynam ics left and one w ill observe pure R ouse dynam ics, which is slow er. O f course, this m ust be a system atic crossover as a function of lattice spacing. Thus one expects a decrease of the hydrodynam ic correlations $w$ ith increasing a (also consistent w ith the reasoning at the end of Sec. (IIIĆ́ㄴ), and hence a system atic slow dow $n$ of the dynam ics.


FIG.11. $S(k ; t)=S(k ; 0)$ for $N_{c h}=60$ using the new $m$ ethod (solid lines) w ith $=0: 05$ com pared to pure M D simulation (dashed lines) for three di erent $k$ values.

## V.CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

$W$ th this paper we have established a new m ethod to sim ulate polym er\{solvent system s . T he solvent is modeled by the lattiae B oltzm ann m ethod and the polym er by a continuum bead\{spring model. The two parts are coupled using a sim ple dissipative friction ansatz which locally conservesm ass and $m$ om entum. T he driving force of the system are them al uctuations which are added to both the uid and the polym er. T he $m$ ain advantage of the new m ethod com pared to M D is its com putational e ciency, which am ounts to a factor of 20 , or even m ore, if one is $w$ illing to be satis ed $w$ ith less accurate results.

A s described in Sec. 'IIIA', it is possible to obtain the physical input param eters for the new method from results ofexisting M D sim ulations. T herefore, one can view
the present $m$ ethod as a coarse\{graining procedure where one goes in a wellicontrolled way from sm all length and tim e scales to larger ones. As the results show, this is possible $w$ thout substantial loss of in form ation about the statics and dynam ics on the $m$ esoscopic scale.

The input which is needed from a m orem icroscopic approach consists of: (i) E ective potentials for the coarse\{ grained $m$ onom ers such that the static chain conform ations are roughly reproduced (this was the part to which we did not pay m uch attention, w the result that this is the largest souroe for the observed deviations); (ii) the solvent tem perature, density and viscosity, and (iii) the $m$ onom eric di usion coe cient, from which one adjusts the coupling.

It seem $s$ that a lattioe spacing which roughly $m$ atches the chain's bond length and the interparticle distance of the solvent is optim al. A lattice constant which is chosen too large w ill result in underestim ated hydrodynam ic interactions, as seen from the data $w$ ith $a=2$, while a too sm all lattice spacing $w$ ill result in a large com putational e ort, plus (if it becom es very sm all) a m onom eric di usion coe cient which will exceed any realistic value, due to an e ective Stokes radius which is too sm all.

W e have chosen the param eters ofR ef. I', for our sim ulation and perform ed a detailed quantitative com parison of the results. Them ain deviations result from insu cient $m$ atch of the static conform ations. The current $m$ odel is therefore as appropriate as the originalM D m odel for veri cation of $Z \mathrm{imm}$ dynam ics in dilute polym er solutions. The dynam ic scaling laws (in particular the $k^{3} t$ decay of the dynam ic structure factor) could be observed, and there is good agreem ent w ith the decay rates predicted by the Zimm model, if the nite box size e ects are taken into account. Interestingly enough, the decay of the R ouse $m$ odes is only sub ject to an $L^{3}$ nite size e ect, while m ost other decay rates have a large $L^{1}$ nite size correction, due to the $r{ }^{1}$ behavior of the $O$ seen tensor.

A fter having tested the $m$ ethod successfully future work can now deal w th $m$ ore controversial problem s, like the in uence of hydrodynam ics on the motion of a sem i\{ exible chain or the hydrodynam ic screening in sem idliute solutions. It should how ever be kept in $m$ ind that the algorithm in its current version is only suitable for problem s where the polym er concentration is low. The coupling only takes into account the m om entum transfer betw een $m$ onom ers and solvent. Excluded $\{$ volum e e ects betw een solvent particles and $m$ onom ers, which are very im portant for processes like, e. g., the penetration of solvent into a dense polym er $m$ atrix, are not properly m odeled. A study of such topics w ould require a generalization of the algorithm which would assign a nite volum e to the $m$ onom ers.

It is a pleasure to thank $R$ alf $E$ veraers and $A$ lexander K olb for helpfuldiscussions, and the latter for a critical reading of the $m$ anuscript.


FIG. 12. Com parison of $S(k ; t)=S(k ; 0)$ for $N_{c h}=30$, $t w o$ di erent lattice spacings, and three $k$ values as indicated.

APPENDIX A: IN ITIALDECAYRATEOF ROUSE M ODES

In this appendix we outline the details of the calculation of p, i.e. the initial decay rate of the autocorrelation function of the $R$ ouse $m$ odes for $p$ 1, where we treat the general case of a chain whose statistics is described by an exponent (i. e. $=0: 5$ for a random walk (RW), and = 0:6 for a self\{ avoiding walk (SAW) ) $)_{1}$. W e start by stating the result of linear resp onse theorylin

$$
\begin{align*}
p & =\frac{d}{d t} \frac{h X_{p}(t) X_{p}(0) i^{!}}{X_{p}^{2}}  \tag{A1}\\
& =\frac{1}{X_{p}^{2}} X_{i ; j ; ;} \quad \frac{@ X_{p}}{@ r_{i}} D_{i j} \frac{@ X_{p}}{@ r_{j}} ;
\end{align*}
$$

where Greek indiges again denote C artesian coordinates. Evaluating the derivatives of the $R$ ouse $m$ odes, one $o b-$ tains

$$
\begin{array}{r}
p=\frac{1}{X_{p}^{2} N_{c h}^{2}}{ }_{i ; j}^{X} \cos \frac{p}{N_{c h}}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
i & 1=2
\end{array}\right)  \tag{A2}\\
\cos \frac{p}{N_{c h}}(j \quad 1=2) \operatorname{TrhD} \\
i j
\end{array} \quad . \quad .
$$

From the de nition of the Rouse m odes, Eq. nds

$$
\begin{align*}
& X_{p}^{2}={\frac{1}{N_{c h}^{2}}}_{i j}^{X}{ }_{i j} \quad \text { jícos } \frac{p}{N_{c h}}(i \quad 1=2)  \tag{A3}\\
& \cos \frac{\mathrm{p}}{\mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{ch}}}(\mathrm{j} \quad 1=2) ;
\end{align*}
$$

which is evaluated via (b is the bond length)

$$
\begin{align*}
& r_{i} \quad j r=\frac{1}{2}{ }^{h} r_{i}^{2}+r_{j}^{2} \quad\left(r_{i} \quad r_{j}\right)^{2^{i}}  \tag{A4}\\
& 0={ }_{i=1}^{X^{c h}} \cos \frac{p}{N_{c h}}(i \quad 1=2) \tag{A5}
\end{align*}
$$

(note that the last relation holds only asym ptotically for large ii $\quad j$. Approxim ation by an integralyields

$$
\begin{array}{r}
x_{p}^{2}=\frac{b^{2}}{2 N_{c h}^{2}}{ }^{Z_{N_{c h}}} 0_{0}^{Z_{N_{c h}}} d x x^{j} y_{j}^{2}  \tag{A7}\\
\cos \frac{p}{N_{c h}} x \cos \frac{p}{N_{c h}} y:
\end{array}
$$

Furtherm ore, we use the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\cos \cos =\frac{1}{2}[\cos (\quad)+\cos (+)] \tag{A8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and transform to the variables

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\frac{p}{N_{c h}}(x \quad y) ; \quad v=\frac{p}{N_{c h}}(x+y): \tag{A9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Exploiting the sym $m$ etry of the integrand $w$ ith respect to $u$, and perform ing the integration over $v$, we nd

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{p}^{2}=\frac{b^{2} N_{c h}^{2}}{2(p)^{1+2}} f(p) \tag{A10}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(p)=\frac{1}{p}_{0}^{Z} d u u^{2}[\sin u \quad(p \quad u) \cos u]: \tag{A11}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the RW case, $f(\mathrm{p})$ is exactly unity, while for the SAW case a weak dependence on p rem ains; how ever, also in this case $f(p)$ is close to one. U sing the M AP LE softw are package, we have num erically evaluated this function; for the rst 20 R ouse $m$ odes it is tabulated in Table int.

The calculation of the num erator of Eq. AR is perform ed using precisgly the same procedure, the only difference being that $\left(\begin{array}{ll}r_{i} & r_{j}\end{array}\right)^{2}$ is replaced by $\operatorname{TrhD}{ }_{i j} i$, which we calculate using the nite box size form, Eq. $\mathrm{L}^{2}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{TrhD}_{i j} i=\frac{k_{B} T^{2}}{Z_{1}}{ }_{k_{0}}^{1} d k \operatorname{hexp}(i k \quad i f) i ; \tag{A12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have replaced the sum $m$ ation over wavenum bers by an integral

$$
\begin{equation*}
{\frac{1}{L^{3}}}_{k \notin 0}^{\mathrm{X}}!{\frac{1}{(2)^{3}}}_{\mathrm{k}_{0}}^{\mathrm{Z}} 4 \mathrm{k}^{2} \mathrm{dk} \tag{A13}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\mathrm{k}_{0}=2=\mathrm{L}$ denoting the cuto w avenumber due to the nite box size.

The factor hexp ( $\mathrm{ik} \quad \mathrm{if}$ ) i describes the structure of the chain, and $m$ ust, for reasons of scaling ${ }^{112}$, asym ptotically have the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{hexp}(i k \quad i f) i=g k^{2} b^{2} \ddot{j} \quad j \jmath \quad: \tag{A14}
\end{equation*}
$$

It should be noted that, for reasons of in ection sym $m e-$ try, $g \mathrm{~m}$ ust depend on $\mathrm{k}^{2}$, and that $\mathrm{g}(0)=1$. W e further introduce the constants

$$
\begin{align*}
& A=Z_{1}^{Z_{1}} d w g\left(w^{2}\right) \\
& B={\frac{d g\left(w^{2}\right)}{d w^{2}}}_{w=0}: \tag{A15}
\end{align*}
$$

For example, for a random walk one has $g=$ $\exp \quad\left(b^{2}=6\right) k^{2}$ ï jj, i. e. $g\left(w^{2}\right)=\exp \left(w^{2}=6\right), A=$ $\overline{3=2}, \mathrm{~B}=1=6 . W$ e now calculate $\mathrm{TrhD}_{\mathrm{ij}} \mathrm{i}$ by perform ing a Taylorexpansion w ith respect to $\mathrm{k}_{0}=\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{L}^{1}\right)$; the result is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{TrhD}_{i j} i= & \frac{k_{B} T}{2} \frac{A}{b \ddot{j} \quad j j} \text { ke } \frac{B}{3} b^{2} \ddot{\eta} \quad j j k_{0}^{3} \\
& +O\left(k_{0}^{5}\right):
\end{aligned}
$$

(A 17)
Interestingly, the linear term does not depend on the m onom er indiges at all. From this, we conclude that the linear $L^{1}$ contribution to the decay rate exactly vanishes, due to Eq. 'AA"', and that the leading order nite size e ect is actually of order $L{ }^{3}$, i. e. quite sm all. In what follow s we w ill therefore only concentrate on the leading\{order term for an in nite box. U sing the sam e procedure as for $X_{p}^{2}$, one nds

|  | RW <br> p | $\mathrm{h}(\mathrm{p})=\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{p})$ | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{p})$ | SAW <br> $\mathrm{h}(\mathrm{p})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1.040901 | 1.229939 | 1.531335 | 1.245049 |
| 2 | 1.155368 | 1.096321 | 1.671897 | 1.525007 |
| 3 | 1.186325 | 1.099453 | 1.711021 | 1.556248 |
| 4 | 1.203640 | 1.075431 | 1.732468 | 1.610952 |
| 5 | 1.213328 | 1.077224 | 1.744639 | 1.619569 |
| 6 | 1.220118 | 1.067140 | 1.753074 | 1.642778 |
| 7 | 1.224789 | 1.068286 | 1.758929 | 1.646496 |
| 8 | 1.228399 | 1.062691 | 1.763420 | 1.659391 |
| 9 | 1.231138 | 1.063494 | 1.766850 | 1.661363 |
| 10 | 1.233376 | 1.059915 | 1.769636 | 1.669601 |
| 11 | 1.235174 | 1.060514 | 1.771886 | 1.670781 |
| 12 | 1236696 | 1.058018 | 1.773782 | 1.676515 |
| 13 | 1.237967 | 1.058484 | 1.775371 | 1.677278 |
| 14 | 1.239069 | 1.056638 | 1.776745 | 1.681508 |
| 15 | 1.240014 | 1.057013 | 1.777926 | 1.682029 |
| 16 | 1240849 | 1.055589 | 1.778967 | 1.685283 |
| 17 | 1.241579 | 1.055899 | 1.779880 | 1.685654 |
| 18 | 1.242234 | 1.054765 | 1.780696 | 1.688239 |
| 19 | 1.242815 | 1.055026 | 1.781422 | 1.688510 |
| 20 | 1.243341 | 1.054101 | 1.782079 | 1.690615 |

TABLE II. The functions $f(p)$, $h(p)$, and $r(p)$, as de ned in the text, for both the RW and the SAW case.

$$
\begin{array}{r}
Z_{N_{c h}}^{d x} \int_{0}^{Z_{c h}} d y \frac{1}{\dot{j x} y j} \cos \frac{p}{N_{c h}} x \text { cos } \frac{p}{N_{c h}} y= \\
=\frac{N_{c h}^{2}}{(p)^{1}} h(p) \tag{A18}
\end{array}
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(p)=\frac{1}{p}_{0}^{Z} d u \frac{1}{u}[(p \quad u) \cos u \quad \sin u]: \tag{A19}
\end{equation*}
$$

This function also exhibits a weak p\{dependence, see Table', TII, even for a RW. Finally, introducing

$$
\begin{equation*}
r(p)=h(p)=f(p) ; \tag{A20}
\end{equation*}
$$

also tabulated in Table, as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{p}=\mathrm{A} \frac{2}{2} \frac{k_{B} T}{\mathrm{~b}^{3}}{\frac{\mathrm{p}}{\mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{ch}}}}^{3} \mathrm{r}(\mathrm{p}): \tag{A21}
\end{equation*}
$$

The leading power\{ law dependence on p and N ch is exactly what one expects from dynam ic scaling. The function $r(p)$ is a correction to scaling. As far as the num erical prefactor is concemed, we get (in the RW case) a relaxation which is roughly the sam er as that calculated in the textbook by D oi and Edw ards ${ }^{\text {. }}$.
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