

Counting-Based Effective Dimension and Discrete Regularizations

Ivan Horváth,^{1,2,*} Peter Markoš,^{3,†} and Robert Mendris^{4,‡}

¹*Nuclear Physics Institute CAS, 25068 Řež (Prague), Czech Republic*

²*University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506, USA*

³*Dept. of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Comenius University in Bratislava, Mlynská Dolina 2, 842 28 Bratislava, Slovakia*

⁴*Shawnee State University, Portsmouth, OH 45662, USA*

(Dated: May 21, 2022)

Effective number theory determines all additive ways to assign counts to collections of objects with probabilities or other additive weights. Here we construct all counting-based schemes to select effective supports on such collections, and show that it leads to a unique notion of effective dimension. This *effective counting dimension* (ECD) specifies how the number of objects in a support scales with their total number, and its uniqueness means that all schemes yield the same value. Hence, ECD is well defined and can be used to characterize targets of discrete regularizations in physics and other quantitative sciences. Given its generality, ECD may help to connect and interpret results from widely distinct areas. Our analysis makes recent studies of effective spatial dimensions in lattice quantum chromodynamics and Anderson localization models well founded. We address the reliability of regularization removals in practice and perform the respective numerical analysis in the context of 3d Anderson criticality. Our arguments suggest that measure-based dimensions (Minkowski, Hausdorff) of fixed sets have good probabilistic extensions.

Keywords: dimension, effective counting dimension, effective number theory, effective support, effective description, minimal effective description, regularization, Anderson localization, lattice QCD, discrete models

1. Introduction & Summary. In the study of physical and various model situations we frequently need to describe or analyze some collection $O = \{o_1, o_2, \dots\}$ of objects. The most basic quantitative analysis of O is to count its objects, namely to label it by a natural number N . However, descriptive value of an ordinary count becomes limited when objects in a collection differ substantially. Indeed, consider O_\bullet containing the Sun, the Proxima Centauri and 10^{10} individual grains of sand from Earth's beaches. The ordinary count $N = 2 + 10^{10}$ is clearly a poor characteristic of O_\bullet if the individual importance of its objects is judged by their masses.

The recent works [1–3] revisited counting with the aim of making it more informative in such situations. In particular, the effective number theory (ENT) studies possible ways to assign counts to collections involving objects distinguished by an additive importance weight such as probability or mass. For example, ENT associates with O_\bullet an *intrinsic (minimal) effective count* by mass $N_\star = 2 + 2.0 \times 10^{-16}$, leading to useful quantitative insight. [The textbook masses for the stars and the average mass of 4.5 mg for a grain of sand went into this calculation.]

The utility of ordinary counting in analyzing the natural world stems mainly from its *additivity* which guarantees consistent bookkeeping for stable objects and leads to predictability: given disjoint collections O_1 and O_2 with labels N_1 and N_2 we can predict what the label of the combined collection $O_1 \cup O_2$ would be ($N_1 + N_2$) without actually performing the merger. Since merging and partitioning are at the heart of dealing with objects, counting became a theoretical tool: it is usually easier and faster to handle numbers than physical objects.

ENT requires any extension of counting to its effective form to be additive in order to preserve the above features [1]. Generalized additivity arises naturally if one views ordinary counting as a process carried out by a machine. Its “ready state” includes an empty list $I = ()$ and its operation entails receiving objects from O sequentially. Each input causes I to update via $I \rightarrow I \sqcup (1)$, where \sqcup denotes concatenation, resulting in a certain $I = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ upon exhausting all objects. The machine then calls its number function $N = N[I]$ (length of a list) and outputs the label. This representation of ordinary counting makes it plain that the scheme is encoded by function $N[I]$ and its additivity is expressed by the functional equation

$$N[I_1 \sqcup I_2] = N[I_1] + N[I_2] \quad , \quad \forall I_1, I_2 \quad (1)$$

In effective counting, each object o comes with a label specifying its own weight w . The associated machine initializes the weight list $W = ()$ and then sequentially inputs the objects. Upon each input, it scans the weight w and updates W via $W \rightarrow W \sqcup (w)$. After finishing the input, it calls its number function $N = N[W]$ to get the ordinary count, and uses it to rescale W into a canonical counting form $W \rightarrow C = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_N)$ satisfying $\sum_i c_i = N$. This rescaling is allowed since, like its ordinary prototype, effective counting is scale invariant. The machine then calls its effective number function $N = N[C]$ and outputs the result. Additivity of the procedure is then expressed by the functional equation [1]

$$N[C_1 \sqcup C_2] = N[C_1] + N[C_2] \quad , \quad \forall C_1, C_2 \quad (A)$$

It ensures that effective counts of disjoint collections with equal average weight per object add up upon merging.

Hence, in the same way that $N = N[I]$ encodes ordinary counting, each $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}[C]$ obeying (A) and other necessary conditions [1] specifies a valid effective counting scheme. When used consistently in all situations, each offers book-keeping and predictability features analogous to those of ordinary counting. ENT identifies all such effective schemes \mathcal{N} . A key property of the resulting concept is that the scheme specified by [1]

$$\mathcal{N}_*[C] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{n}_*(c_i) \quad , \quad \mathbf{n}_*(c) = \min\{c, 1\} \quad (2)$$

satisfies $\mathcal{N}_*[C] \leq \mathcal{N}[C] \leq N[C]$ for all C and all \mathcal{N} . Since it cannot be lowered by a change of counting scheme, the effective total prescribed by \mathcal{N}_* is intrinsic to a collection. In fact, each collection of objects with additive weights is characterized by two key counting characteristics: the ordinary count N and the intrinsic effective count \mathcal{N}_* .

In this work we show that effective counting entails a unique notion of dimension. The basic setting involves an infinite sequence of collections O_k with N_k objects, and an associated sequence $C_k = (c_{k,1}, c_{k,2}, \dots, c_{k,N_k})$ of counting weights. Here N_k is strictly increasing and hence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_k = \infty$. The pair O_k, C_k can represent e.g. an increasingly refined description of a complex composite object or of a physical system with infinitely many parts. Following the standard physics language, we refer to it as ‘‘regularization’’ of the target $k \rightarrow \infty$ situation.

The *effective counting dimension* (ECD) aims to convey how the abundance of objects needed for effective description of the target scales with their abundance in full description. If a collection O weighted by C can be effectively described by its restriction O_s containing $\mathcal{N}[C]$ highest-weighted objects, then ECD corresponds to Δ in

$$\mathcal{N}[C_k] \propto N[C_k]^\Delta \quad \text{for } k \rightarrow \infty \quad , \quad 0 \leq \Delta \leq 1 \quad (3)$$

However, it turns out that the above notion of effective description (effective support) O_s is only consistent for certain schemes \mathcal{N} . Indeed, for \mathcal{N} to delineate the support properly, a separation property formulated in Sec. 3 has to be imposed. Formally, if \mathfrak{N} is the set of all schemes \mathcal{N} , then only elements of its subset $\mathfrak{N}_s \subset \mathfrak{N}$ assign effective supports. We will show in Sec. 3 that \mathfrak{N}_s is spanned by

$$\mathcal{N}_{(u)}[C] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c_i) \quad , \quad \mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) = \min\{c/u, 1\} \quad (4)$$

where $u \in (0, 1]$. Note that $\mathcal{N}_{(1)} = \mathcal{N}_* \in \mathfrak{N}_s$.

The above leads us to consider $\Delta = \Delta[\{C\}, \mathcal{N}]$ with $\{C\}$ a shorthand for regularization sequence and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{N}_s$. The minimal nature of \mathcal{N}_* implies that $\Delta_*[\{C\}] \equiv \Delta[\{C\}, \mathcal{N}_*]$ is the smallest possible ECD. However, ECD is in fact fully robust and doesn’t depend on \mathcal{N} at all. Indeed, in

Sec. 4 we will show that

$$\Delta_*[\{C\}] = \Delta[\{C\}, \mathcal{N}] \quad , \quad \forall \mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{N}_s \quad (5)$$

Hence, ECD is a well-defined property of the target specified by regularization pair $\{O\}, \{C\}$. The use of additive counting makes it the measure-based effective dimension.

Before demonstrating results (4) and (5) we wish to make a few remarks. (i) The fact that ECD doesn’t require metric enlarges the scope of its applications. Indeed, models in some areas (e.g. ecosystems or social sciences) often do not involve distances. (ii) Setups with metric frequently entail UV cutoff a (\propto shortest distance) and IR cutoff L (\propto longest distance). Sequence $\{C\}$ can facilitate their removals: C_k may be associated e.g. with $a_k \rightarrow 0$ at fixed L , or with $L_k \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed a . Defining the nominal dimensions via $N[C_k] \propto a_k^{-D_{UV}(L)}$ and $N[C_k] \propto L_k^{D_{IR}(a)}$ for UV and IR cases, their effective counterparts are [4]

$$\mathcal{N}_*[C_k] \propto a_k^{-d_{UV}(L)} \quad , \quad \mathcal{N}_*[C_k] \propto L_k^{d_{IR}(a)} \quad (6)$$

If Δ_{UV}, Δ_{IR} denote their associated ECDs then

$$d_{UV} = \Delta_{UV} D_{UV} \quad , \quad d_{IR} = \Delta_{IR} D_{IR} \quad (7)$$

Dimension d_{IR} was recently calculated in QCD [4] and in Anderson models [5]. (iii) The meaning of d_{UV} and d_{IR} is analogous to Minkowski (box-counting) dimensions [6] of fixed sets. In fact, for $\{O\}$ that UV-regularizes a region in \mathbb{R}^D , d_{UV} is exactly the Minkowski dimension of $\{O_s\}$ treated as a fixed set. The demonstrated uniqueness of ECD suggests that measure-based dimensions are meaningful even for geometric figures emerging effectively, e.g. from probabilities. (iv) We refer to $O_s = O_s[O, C, \mathcal{N}]$, $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{N}_s$, both as the support and the description of O . The latter is well fitting in situations involving complexity and information. Our analysis entails the existence of well-defined *minimal effective description* $O_*[O, C]$, namely $O_s[O, C, \mathcal{N}_*]$, which may find uses in these contexts.

2. Effective Counting Schemes. We start from ENT [1] which determines the set \mathfrak{N} of all effective counting schemes $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}[C] = \mathcal{N}(c_1, \dots, c_N)$. Apart from additivity (A), symmetry, continuity and boundary conditions, the axiomatic definition of \mathfrak{N} also ensures that increasing the cumulation of weights in C doesn’t increase the effective number. This monotonicity is expressed by

$$\mathcal{N}(\dots c_i + \epsilon \dots c_j - \epsilon \dots) \leq \mathcal{N}(\dots c_i \dots c_j \dots) \quad (M)$$

for each $c_i \geq c_j$ and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq c_j$. The resulting \mathfrak{N} consists of additively separable functions $\mathcal{N}(c_1, \dots, c_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{n}(c_i)$, such that the *counting function* $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}(c)$, $c \in [0, \infty)$, is

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \text{ continuous} & & (iii) \mathbf{n}(0) = 0 \\ (ii) \text{ concave} & & (iv) \mathbf{n}(c) = 1 \text{ for } c \geq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Representation of each $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{N}$ by \mathbf{n} satisfying (8) is unique.

3. Effective Supports. We will assume from now on that the order of objects in $O = \{o_1, \dots, o_N\}$ is set by their relevance in C , i.e. that $c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots \geq c_N$. Given a counting scheme \mathcal{N} , we collect the first $\mathcal{N}[C]$ objects to form the intended effective support (effective description) O_s of O . Since \mathcal{N} is real-valued, we represent O_s as

$$O = \{o_1, \dots, o_N\} \longrightarrow O_s[O, C] = \{o_1, \dots, o_J : f\} \quad (9)$$

where J is the ceiling of $\mathcal{N}[C]$, and $\mathcal{N}[C] = J - 1 + f$. Hence, $0 < f \leq 1$ is the fraction of o_J included in O_s .

The rationale for effective support so conceived is clear: O_s is a subcollection of most relevant elements from O that behaves under the ordinary counting measure in the same way as O under the effective one. Indeed, additivity (A) translates into (dependence on \mathcal{N} , C_1 , C_2 is implicit)

$$\mathcal{N}[O_s[O_1 \sqcup O_2]] = \mathcal{N}[O_s[O_1]] + \mathcal{N}[O_s[O_2]] \quad (10)$$

where an obvious real-valued extension of $\mathcal{N}[\dots]$ to collections with fractional last element was made.

However, ENT axioms only deal with counting and their compatibility with the above notion of effective support needs to be examined. Effective numbers are crucially shaped by additivity (A) and monotonicity (M). With (A) being the basis for O_s via (10), it is (M) that requires attention. To that end, consider the operation on left-hand side of (M), involving the last object included in O_s (i.e. o_J) and first object fully left out (o_{J+1}). Since o_J gains relevance at the expense of o_{J+1} , its presence in O_s (expressed by f) cannot decrease, namely

$$\mathcal{N}(\dots c_J + \epsilon, c_{J+1} - \epsilon \dots) \geq \mathcal{N}(\dots c_J, c_{J+1} \dots) \quad (\text{SP})$$

for all C such that $c_J > c_{J+1} > 0$ and all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. This ensures meaningful separation of effective support from the rest, and is necessary for $\mathcal{N} \in \mathfrak{N}$ to define O_s consistently. We refer to it as (support) *separation property*. Note that $J = \text{ceil}(\mathcal{N}[C])$ depends on \mathcal{N} and C .

We now show that the only counting schemes \mathcal{N} compatible with (SP) are specified by Eq. (4). To start, note that in order to make the separation property compatible with monotonicity (M), we have to impose the equality sign in (SP). In terms of counting function \mathbf{n} of \mathcal{N} we have

$$\mathbf{n}(c_J + \epsilon) + \mathbf{n}(c_{J+1} - \epsilon) = \mathbf{n}(c_J) + \mathbf{n}(c_{J+1}) \quad (11)$$

for all C with $c_J > c_{J+1} > 0$ and all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.

Note next that properties (8) of \mathbf{n} imply the existence of $0 < u \leq 1$ such that $\mathbf{n}(c) = 1$ for all $c \geq u$, and $0 < \mathbf{n}(c) < 1$ for all $0 < c < u$. Given this $u = u[\mathbf{n}]$, the separation operation in (11) cannot be performed when $c_J \geq u$. Indeed, since each $\mathbf{n}(c_j)$ with $j \leq J$ contributes unity to $\mathcal{N}[C]$, we have $J = \text{ceil}(J + \sum_{i=J+1}^N c_i)$, leading to $c_{J+1} = 0$. Hence, it is sufficient to consider (11) for C with $u > c_J > c_{J+1} > 0$. In this form it is readily satisfied by $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}$ of Eq. (4) due to its linearity on $[0, u]$. Consequently, $\mathcal{N}_{(u)} \in \mathfrak{N}_s$.

However, all other \mathbf{n} featuring the same u violate (11). To show that, consider $N = 3$ vectors $C = (3 - y - x, y, x)$ with $0 < x < y < u$ and $J = 2$. Definition of J , namely $J - 1 < \mathcal{N}[C] \leq J$, demands that $\mathbf{n}(x) + \mathbf{n}(y) \leq 1$. We will specify x, y that satisfy this, as well as $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{n}(x - \epsilon) + \mathbf{n}(y + \epsilon) < \mathbf{n}(x) + \mathbf{n}(y)$ for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, thus failing (11). Since $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}$ produces equality in this relation, we can proceed using $\mathbf{g}(x) = \mathbf{n}(x) - \mathbf{n}_{(u)}(x)$ and

$$\mathbf{g}(x - \epsilon) + \mathbf{g}(y + \epsilon) < \mathbf{g}(x) + \mathbf{g}(y) \quad , \quad 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0 \quad (12)$$

From properties (8) of \mathbf{n} , $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}$ and the explicit form of $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}$ it follows that $\mathbf{g}(x)$ is a continuous function satisfying: (a) $\mathbf{g}(0) = \mathbf{g}(u) = 0$; (b) $\mathbf{g}(x) > 0$ for $0 < x < u$; (c) there are $0 < x_0 \leq y_0 < u$ such that $\mathbf{g}(x)$ is increasing on $[0, x_0]$ and decreasing on $[y_0, u]$. Hence, any $0 < x \leq x_0$, $y_0 < y < u$ and $0 < \epsilon_0 \leq \min\{x, u - y\}$ form a triple satisfying (12). Finally, for any y chosen as above, we can select sufficiently small $x > 0$ such that $\mathbf{n}(x) < 1 - \mathbf{n}(y)$ due to $\mathbf{n}(0) = 0$ and continuity. Hence, all schemes \mathcal{N} based on $\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{n}_{(u)}$ fail to satisfy (SP), and \mathfrak{N}_s is spanned by $\mathcal{N}_{(u)}$.

4. Uniqueness of ECD. We are now in a position to show (5). Consider a pair $\mathcal{N}_\star, \mathcal{N}_{(u)}$ for arbitrary but fixed $0 < u \leq 1$. We compare their counting functions $\mathbf{n}_\star(c)$ and $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c)$ on the following partition of their domain. (i) $0 \leq c \leq u$. Here $\mathbf{n}_\star(c) = c$ and $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) = c/u$ and hence $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) = \mathbf{n}_\star(c)/u$. (ii) $u < c < 1$. Here $\mathbf{n}_\star(c) = c$ and $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) = 1$ and so $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) = \mathbf{n}_\star(c)/c < \mathbf{n}_\star(c)/u$. (iii) $c \geq 1$. Here $\mathbf{n}_\star(c) = \mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) = 1$ and so $\mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) \leq \mathbf{n}_\star(c)/u$.

Taken together, this yields $\mathbf{n}_\star(c) \leq \mathbf{n}_{(u)}(c) \leq \mathbf{n}_\star(c)/u$ for any $c \geq 0$, as well as

$$\mathcal{N}_\star[C] \leq \mathcal{N}_{(u)}[C] \leq \frac{1}{u} \mathcal{N}_\star[C] \quad , \quad \forall C, \quad \forall u \in (0, 1] \quad (13)$$

Now, consider a regularization sequence $\{C\}$ such that its ECD (3) associated with \mathcal{N}_\star (i.e. Δ_\star) exists. From (13) it follows that the power governing the growth of $\mathcal{N}_{(u)}[C_k]$ with N_k also exists and is equal to Δ_\star as claimed in (5). Hence, the concept of effective counting dimension associated with $\{C\}$ is well-defined (unique).

5. Practical Points through Anderson Criticality.

Results of Ref. [1] and of the present work suggest that \mathcal{N}_\star alone is sufficient for many types of effective counting analyses. However, the knowledge of full structure involving \mathfrak{N} and \mathfrak{N}_s is also relevant in practice. For example, it can be used to assess the reliability of regularization removals. Indeed, \mathfrak{N}_s is spanned by counting schemes $\mathcal{N}_{(u)}$ and we showed that the associated $\Delta(u)$ is constant on $u \in (0, 1]$. However, ECD involves $k \rightarrow \infty$ (regularization level) limit and can be affected by large systematic errors if collections O_k used in an extrapolation are insufficient to achieve scaling. The computed $\Delta(u)$ is expected to vary significantly in that case. Conversely, the degree of non-constant behavior can be used to judge the level of systematic errors when approximate scaling is in place.

To set expectations for the behavior of Δ , note first that effective supports $O_s = O_s(u)$ of O contain populations of $N_{(u)}$ objects that decrease with increasing u . Hence, for given $\mathcal{O} = \{O_{k_1}, O_{k_2}, \dots, O_{k_M}\}$ used for regularization removal, function $\Delta(u, \mathcal{O})$ is expected to be decreasing in u . Moreover, u can be adjusted to make the fraction of objects in effective support arbitrarily close to one. There is thus a guaranteed over-representation of the scaling population at sufficiently small u . In fact, it is expected that $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \Delta(u, \mathcal{O}) \approx 1$ for generic \mathcal{O} , regardless of true ECD. The signature of \mathcal{O} suitable for regularization removal is the existence of a “scaling window” where $\Delta(u, \mathcal{O})$ changes slowly. The value $\Delta(u_0, \mathcal{O})$ at point u_0 of slowest change is expected to produce the most reliable estimate of ECD from \mathcal{O} . The change of $\Delta(u, \mathcal{O})$ within the window sets an approximate scale of systematic error.

We now apply this general strategy to the recent calculation [5] of spatial effective dimensions d_{IR} at Anderson transitions [7–9] in three dimensions ($d_{\text{IR}} = 3\Delta_{\text{IR}}$). We will focus on 3d Anderson model in the orthogonal class, defined on $(L/a)^3$ cubic lattice with sites labeled by $r = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ and periodic boundary conditions. The model is diagonal in spin and it is thus sufficient to consider 1-component fermionic operators c_r . Denoting by ϵ_r the on-site random energies chosen from a box distribution in the range $[-W/2, +W/2]$, the Hamiltonian is [7]

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_r \epsilon_r c_r^\dagger c_r + \sum_{r,j} c_r^\dagger c_{r-e_j} + h.c. \quad (14)$$

Here e_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) are unit lattice vectors. For energy $E = 0$, there is a critical point at $W = W_c = 16.543(2)$ [10] separating extended states at $W < W_c$ from exponentially localized ones at $W > W_c$.

Objects o_i involved in the calculation of $d_{\text{IR}} = d_{\text{IR}}(E, W)$ are elementary cubes of space at positions r_i , with weights specified by wave function ψ via $w_i = p_i = \psi^\dagger \psi(r_i)$. Collection O forms the space occupied by the system with volume $V = N[O]a^3 = L^3$. Electron in state ψ is effectively present in a subregion $O_\star[\psi]$ of volume $V_{\text{eff}} = N_\star[\psi]a^3$. Dimension d_{IR} gauges the asymptotic response of V_{eff} to increasing L . The model involves averaging over disorder $\{\epsilon_r\}$, and hence $N_\star \rightarrow \langle N_\star \rangle$ in definition (6). The critical effective dimension $d_{\text{IR}}(0, W_c) \approx 8/3$ was found for (14) and models in three other universality classes [5]. This commonality was expressed by super-universal value $d_{\text{IR}}^{\text{su}} = 2.665(3)$ with the quoted uncertainty including the spread over classes.

We have generated a new set of data for system (14) at the critical point $(0, W_c)$, producing \mathcal{O} including 26 systems with sizes in the range $22 \leq L/a \leq 160$. JADAMILU library [11] was used for matrix diagonalization. We then strictly followed the analysis procedure of Ref. [5] and obtained $d_{\text{IR}}(\mathcal{O}) = 2.6654(11)$, consistently with the original estimate. However, in the present calculation of critical eigenmodes we recorded $N_{(u)}$ for 20 equidistant values of




FIG. 1. Deviation $\delta(u, \mathcal{O}) = d_{\text{IR}}(u, \mathcal{O}) - d_{\text{IR}}(1, \mathcal{O})$ obtained via 2-power fit as described in the text. The inset shows χ^2 per degree of freedom (dof) for the fits involved.

u starting with $u = 0.05$, not just $N_\star = N_{(1)}$. This allows us to perform the stability analysis utilizing \mathfrak{N}_s .

The latter is most efficiently performed by computing $\delta(u, \mathcal{O}) = d_{\text{IR}}(u, \mathcal{O}) - d_{\text{IR}}(1, \mathcal{O})$ which can be extracted directly from the raw data without any intermediate steps. Indeed, the large L behavior of $\langle N_{(u)} \rangle_L / \langle N_{(1)} \rangle_L$ is governed by power $\delta(u)$. Moreover, relation $d_{\text{IR}}(u) = d_{\text{IR}}$ is replaced by the definite $\delta(u) = 0$. While still featuring the expected decreasing behavior and slow variation in the scaling window, the size of $\delta(u, \mathcal{O})$ directly conveys the scale of systematic errors.

To extract $\delta(u, \mathcal{O})$ from the data in an unbiased way, we included it as a parameter in general 2-power fits of the above ratio in the form $c_1 L^\delta + c_2 L^{-\beta}$. The role of the second power is to absorb finite-volume effects, and its presence resulted in very stable fits. Such general 2-power fits were mainly afforded by an extensive statistics (30K–100K of disorder realizations). We proceeded by finding the smallest size L_{min} in \mathcal{O} , such that the fit in the range $L_{\text{min}}/a \leq L/a \leq 160$ yielded $\chi^2/\text{dof} < 1$ for $u = 0.95$ data. The resulting $L_{\text{min}} = 30a$ was then fixed for fits at all u , leading to $\delta(u, \mathcal{O})$ shown in Fig. 1. The respective χ^2/dof are shown in the inset.

The obtained $\delta(u, \mathcal{O})$ is indicative of \mathcal{O} suitable for regularization removal. Indeed, populations associated with the window $0.75 \leq u \leq 1$ scale essentially in sync. The slowest change occurs at $u_0 = 1$, suggesting that the quoted result for d_{IR} , which is based on N_\star , is nominally the most reliable for this \mathcal{O} . Note that, according to Eq. (13), effective support at $u = 1/2$ is up to twice as abundant as the minimal one. The associated $\delta(1/2, \mathcal{O}) \approx 0.002$ offers a convenient canonical benchmark for the level of systematic error. Given the position of the scaling window and its degree of stability, it is likely an upper bound in this case. These findings suggest that $\approx 10^{-3}$ is the scale

of statistical as well as systematic error associated with our calculation.

P.M. was supported by Slovak Grant Agency VEGA, Project n. 1/0101/20.

* ihorv2@g.uky.edu

† peter.markos@fmph.uniba.sk

‡ rmendris@shawnee.edu

- [1] I. Horváth and R. Mendris, *Entropy* **22**, 1273 (2020), [arXiv:1807.03995](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.03995) [quant-ph].
- [2] I. Horváth, *Quantum Rep.* **3**, 534 (2021), [arXiv:1809.07249](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.07249) [quant-ph].
- [3] I. Horváth and R. Mendris, *MDPI Proc.* **13**, 8 (2019), [arXiv:1907.01606](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.01606) [quant-ph].
- [4] A. Alexandru and I. Horváth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 052303 (2021), [arXiv:2103.05607](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.05607) [hep-lat].
- [5] I. Horváth and P. Markoš, (2021), [arXiv:2110.11266](https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.11266) [cond-mat.dis-nn].
- [6] K. Falconer, *Fractal geometry - mathematical foundations and applications*. (Wiley, 1990) pp. I–XXII, 1–288.
- [7] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1492 (1958).
- [8] F. Evers and A. D. Mirlin, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **80**, 1355 (2008).
- [9] A. MacKinnon and B. Kramer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 1546 (1981).
- [10] K. Slevin and T. Ohtsuki, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **87**, 094703 (2018).
- [11] M. Bollhöfer and Y. Notay, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **177**, 951 (2007).