

# Spatial Asymmetric Two dimensional Continuous Abelian Sandpile Model

N. Azimi-Tafreshi\*, H. Dashti-Naserabadi, S. Moghimi-Araghi†

Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology,

Tehran, P.O.Box: 11155-9161, Iran

## Abstract

We insert some asymmetries in the continuous Abelian sandpile models, such as directedness and ellipticity. We analyze probability distribution of different heights and also find the field theory corresponding to the models. Also we find the fields associated with some height variables.

*PACS:* 05.65+b, 89.75.Da

*Keywords:* Self-Organized Criticality, Sandpile models, Conformal Field Theory.

## 1 Introduction

After the seminal work of Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld [1], sandpile models have been found to be a very helpful framework to study Self-Organized Criticality (SOC). SOC is believed to be the underlying reason for the scaling laws seen in a number of natural phenomena [2]. Further investigations showed that BTW sandpile model has an Abelian property and was renamed Abelian Sandpile Model (ASM) [4]. The model is still the simplest, most studied model of SOC, in which many analytical results has been derived. For a good review see ref. [3].

Extensive work has been done on this model, analytical and computational. To name a few, one can list the works by Dhar [4, 5], where the probabilities of some height cluster were computed. In [4], Dhar computed the number of recurrent configurations and showed that all occur with equal probability. Later, in [5], Majumdar and Dhar calculated the probabilities of occurrence of some specific clusters, known as Weakly Allowed Clusters (WAC's). The simplest of these clusters is one-site height one cluster. The probabilities of other one-site clusters with height above 1 was computed in ref. [6]. There are many other analytical results, among them one can mention the results on boundary correlations of height variables and effect of boundary conditions [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12], on presence of dissipation in the model [9, 10, 13], on field theoretical approaches [9, 14, 15, 16, 17], on finite size corrections [5, 11] and many other results[3].

In ASM, the height variables take only integer values. However there are some other models in which the height variables can take real values [18, 19, 21, 22, 23]. In Zhang model, which is

---

\*email:azimi@physics.sharif.ir

†email: samanimi@sharif.edu

not Abelian, when a site topples all of its energy (height) is distributed among its neighbors. On the other hand the model introduced by Gabrielov, called Abelian Avalanche Model (AA Model) and the model introduced by Ghaffari et. al. have the Abelian property. In [23] a continuous version of ASM is considered on a square lattice and many of its different properties are studied. When we let the heights be real number, naturally the components of toppling matrix could be real too. In this paper we consider continuous ASM [23] and change different components of toppling matrix. We will do it in a way to add spatial asymmetries to the model. Two specific asymmetries are considered, one is to introduce a preferred direction. The second is to introduce elliptical asymmetry. The first one is related to directed sandpile model and the second, as we shall see results naturally from the original BTW model. We have derived the probability distribution of height variables and also avalanche distributions. Also the field theory associated with these models are considered. The new models are still critical and show scaling relations.

In the next section we first review the Continuous ASM. Next we consider the effects of a perturbation that introduces a preferred direction in the model. In the forth section we introduce ellipticity in the model and derive many properties of such a system.

## 2 Continuous Abelian Sandpile Model

The Continuous Abelian Sandpile Model (CASM) on a square lattice is defined in [23]. Consider a  $L \times L$  square lattice. To each site  $u = (i, j)$  a *continuous* height variable,  $h(u)$  is assigned, where without loss of generality we assume these variables are in  $[0,4)$  (in the original paper it was taken to be in  $[0,1)$ ). The evolution rules consist of the following rules:

1) At each time step, a site is selected randomly and an amount of sand is added to it and other height variables are unchanged. The amount of sand added to the site is a random real number in the interval  $[p, q] \in [0, 4)$ . The distribution function could be any function, but for simplicity we take it to be uniform on the interval  $[p, q]$ . If height remains below four, the new configuration is stable and we go to the next time step.

2) If height of the sand at that site becomes equal to or greater than four, the site becomes unstable and topples in the following way: it gives an amount of sand with height one to either of its neighbors. In other words  $h(v) \rightarrow h(u) - \Delta^C(u, v)$  for all  $v$ , where  $\Delta^C(u, v)$  is the toppling matrix of the CASM and is defined as

$$\Delta^C(u, v) \begin{cases} 4 & u = v \\ -1 & |u - v| = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

So if the height of a site is  $4 + \alpha$ , after toppling its height will be  $\alpha$  and the heights of neighbors will be added by the amount 1. As a result of this toppling, some of the neighbors may become unstable and an avalanche may occur.

It has been shown in [23] that there is a (many to one) mapping from configurations in CASM to configurations in ASM, which preserves the dynamics, therefore the new model reproduce most of the interesting features of ASM. Also it is shown that the probability distribution is piecewise




Figure 1: The probability density profile of height variables

constant. The probability of finding a site with height  $h \in [k-1, k)$  with  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$  is equal with  $p(k)$ , the probability of finding a site with height  $k$  in the usual ASM. The claims were proved and were in agreement with simulations.

As the heights are continuous, we can take other integer parameters of the model to be real. This has been done to the dissipation parameter in the model[23]. The probability distribution is found when there exist dissipation with different (real) values in [23]. Yet there are some other parameters which are integer in the original model, but may be taken to be real in the new model. In this paper we consider the amount of sand transferred to the neighbors and let it take different real values and see how the properties of the model are changed.

### 3 CASM with preferred direction

One of the easiest modifications to the toppling matrix is to introduce a preferred direction, that is; sand grains are more likely to move to left rather than right. Such modification is also studied in the usual ASM [24], but as the toppling matrix components have integer values, the only possibility is to send two sand grains to left and nothing to right. The same can be done in the vertical direction. If this is the case, then the toppling matrix will be upper triangular and all the configurations will be recurrent [24]. However, in our model we are able to control the amount of directedness: when a site is toppled, then  $1 + \epsilon$  grains of sand move to left and  $1 - \epsilon$  grains of sand move to right. Clearly  $\epsilon = 0$  corresponds to the usual ASM and  $\epsilon = 1$  corresponds to the case mentioned above, provided we add both horizontal and vertical directedness.

Several properties of the model can be studied, the probability distribution, the corresponding action, the avalanche distributions etc. The probability distribution of finding different heights is sketched in Figure 1 for some different values of  $\epsilon$  when both directions are directed. As we see,

still we have the same step-like pattern as in the case of undirected CASM. Some new small steps have appeared which have the length proportional to  $\epsilon$ . As  $\epsilon$  becomes larger, these steps become longer and little by little the original pattern fades away. At  $\epsilon = 1$  probability distribution becomes uniform, as it is expected [24].

Also the avalanche distribution is studied in this model. System sizes from 64 to 1024 has been investigated. Starting with a lattice of randomly distributed heights  $h \in [1, 4)$ , the system is evolved to reach steady state. After that, we begin the measurements. The measurements are averaged over about  $10^7$  avalanches. We studied two characteristics of an avalanche (though we bring the result of one of them): the total number of toppling events is called the size  $s$  of an avalanche and the number of distinct toppled lattice sites which is denoted by  $s_d$ . Because a particular lattice site may topple several times, the number of toppling events exceeds the number of distinct toppled lattice sites, i.e.,  $s > s_d$ , except when the system is fully directed in both directions in which case we have  $s = s_d$ . In the critical steady state the corresponding probability distributions should obey power-law behavior characterized by exponents  $\tau_s$  and  $\tau_d$ :

$$P(s) \propto s^{-\tau_s}, \quad (2)$$

$$P(s_d) \propto s_d^{-\tau_d} \quad (3)$$

Figure 2 displays the obtained results for the distribution  $P(s)$  for different system sizes and three different values of  $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.4, 1.0$  when the both directions are directed. A power-law fit to the straight portion of these curves yields the exponents  $\tau_s(L)$ . Figure 3 shows a plot of the exponents  $\tau_s(L)$  vs  $1/\log L$  for  $\epsilon = 0.1$  and  $0.4$ . This allows us to extract the exponent  $\tau_s(\infty)$ . As example, for the cases shown in Figure 3, it turns out to be:  $\tau_s(\infty) = 1.31 \pm 0.08$  for  $\epsilon = 0.1$  and  $\tau_s(\infty) = 1.38 \pm 0.08$  for  $\epsilon = 0.4$ , though the error bars are quite big and we do not have reliable results at hand. It is worth to mention that for small values of  $s$ , the magnitude of slope is less comparing with the one associated with greater values of  $s$  which is due to finite size of lattice. It is seen that still the system is critical and self-organized. There is no characteristic length in the model and finite size scaling is clearly observed from Figure 2. The exponent  $\tau_s$  seems to increase as  $\epsilon$  becomes greater which could be expected from the known behavior of directed sandpile model.

In the continuum limit, we may assign an action to the theory. As in the steady state, only recurrent configurations appear, and they appear with equal probability, the partition function is




Figure 2: Avalanche size distribution for  $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.4, 1.0$  and for lattice sizes  $L = 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024$ .




Figure 3: The exponents  $\tau_s(L)$  is a linear function of  $1/\log L$ . The intersection with vertical axis gives  $\tau_s(\infty)$

simply equal with the total number of recurrent configurations, that is, the determinant of toppling matrix. Such determinants could be written in terms of integration over grassman variables:

$$\det \Delta = \int d\theta_i d\bar{\theta}_i \exp(\theta_i \Delta_{ij} \bar{\theta}_j). \quad (4)$$

In this way the action of the theory may be obtained. If lattice spacing is small, one can go to continuum limit and find a field theoretic action for the theory. In the case of usual ASM the action turns out to be the  $c = -2$  logarithmic conformal theory action [25, 14]:

$$S_{c=-2} \propto \int \bar{\partial}\theta\partial\bar{\theta} \quad (5)$$

For the theory defined above, the action is more or less the same, but there are some added terms due to directedness:

$$S_{\text{dir.}} \propto \int (\bar{\partial}\theta\partial\bar{\theta} + \theta(a\partial + \bar{a}\bar{\partial})\bar{\theta}), \quad (6)$$

where  $a$  is a constant proportional to  $\epsilon$  with dimension of length. This new term grows under renormalization group, therefore the large scale properties of the model is given by the fully directed model.

## 4 Elliptical asymmetry

In the previous section, it was supposed that the lattice has a preferred direction. The field associated with this deformation was a relevant one and hence we expected the theory show different characteristics on large scales. Also the toppling matrix was not symmetric: the amount of sand transferred from site  $i$  to the site  $j$  is not necessarily equal with the amount of sand transferred from  $j$  to  $i$ . Therefore one can not apply the burning test to the model. However it is possible to modify the toppling matrix in the following way so that it remains symmetric and, as we shall see, the added term to the action would not be relevant.

We assume that the vertical links can carry an amount of sand equal to  $1 - \epsilon$  and the horizontal links can carry an amount of sand equal with  $1 + \epsilon$  ( $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$ ). In this way the total amount of sand removed from a toppled site is 4 and the mass of sand is conserved. As we see the new toppling matrix is symmetric, but in real space,  $x$  direction is quite different from  $y$  direction, in fact; we have added some ellipticity to the system and therefore it does not have full rotational symmetry, however this deformation preserves the scale symmetry.




Figure 4: The probability density profile of height variables in elliptical asymmetry

If we go back to the original BTW paper [1], we observe that elliptical asymmetry naturally could arise in their model. In their paper, BTW first define a one dimensional model and using a specific transformation, express it in some other parameters. The same is done to a two dimensional version of the model to arrive at BTW model, however it could easily be observed that if we apply the same transformation to the two dimensional model, we will not arrive at the BTW model, instead we arrive at a model with elliptical asymmetry. Let's explain it in more details. In the one dimensional model, an ordered array of heights  $z_i$  is considered. Sand grains enter from left and leave from right. If the difference of the heights of two neighbors become more than two a sand grain moves to right. The slope parameters  $h_i$  are defined as  $h_i = z_i - z_{i+1}$ . Then as result of "toppling" at site  $i$  we will have  $h_i \rightarrow h_i - 2$  and  $h_{i\pm 1} \rightarrow h_{i\pm 1} + 1$ . The generalization to two dimensions would be to define the slope parameters as  $h_i = 2z_i - z_{i,R} - z_{i,D}$ , where  $z_{i,R}$  and  $z_{i,D}$  are the height variables right and down to the site  $i$  respectively. The dynamics would be if the slope parameter of a cite (mean value of the slope there) is more than a threshold, one sand grain moves to right and one sand grain moves downward. The dynamics in terms of  $h$  variables would be  $h_i \rightarrow h_i - 4$ ,  $h_{i,L;R;D;U} \rightarrow h_{i,L;R;D;U} + 2$  and  $h_{i,RU;LD} \rightarrow h_{i,RU;LD} - 1$ , where  $h_{i,RU;LD}$  are the slope parameters of right-up and left-down next nearest neighbors of the site  $i$ . As we see there is an asymmetry in the two diagonal directions and the system does not have full rotational symmetry.

The probability distribution of finding different heights is sketched in Figure 4 for  $\epsilon \in \{0.1, 0.4, 1.0\}$ . The simulation is done on a  $1024 \times 1024$  lattice averaging over  $10^7$  samples. We still have major and minor steps when  $\epsilon$  is small. As  $\epsilon$  becomes greater, the minor steps become larger and at  $\epsilon = 1$  we have a two-step graph, which indicates that the model is now effectively a one dimensional one.

Also the avalanche distribution is studied in this model. Just as the case of directed CASM, system sizes from 64 to 1024 has been investigated. Again, starting with a lattice of randomly distributed heights  $h \in [1, 4]$ , the system is evolved to reach steady state. After that, the measurements are begun. The measurements are averaged over about  $10^7$  avalanches. Probability distribution of avalanche size is sketched in Figure 5 for  $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.4$ . The case of  $\epsilon = 1.0$  is totally different, as it corresponds to one dimensional ASM.

Using The same tools, the slope  $\tau_s(\infty)$  for different values of  $\epsilon$  could be obtained, for example we have  $\tau_s(\infty)_{\epsilon=0.1} = 1.25 \pm 0.06$  and  $\tau_s(\infty)_{\epsilon=0.4} = 1.24 \pm 0.06$ . Again system shows finite size scaling and is critical, but there is not a remarkable variations in the exponents like  $\tau_s$  as  $\epsilon$  is changed. Possibly they belong to identical universality class.




Figure 5: The avalanche size distribution in a system with elliptical asymmetry.

#### 4.1 One-site height probability

In CASM with no asymmetries, one is able to find the probability of having any height in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . This is done using the burning algorithm[5]: consider the recurrent configurations with the property that the height of the site  $i$  is in  $[0, 1]$ . As this site burns after all of its neighbors, it should be a leaf in the corresponding spanning tree. Therefore, the total number of such configurations could be obtained by counting the number of spanning trees in which site  $i$  is a leaf. In the modified model the same arguments holds for  $h \in [0, 1 - \epsilon)$ , because the burning test still works and any site with  $h \in [0, 1 - \epsilon)$  has to be a leaf in the corresponding spanning tree. Note that as we have links with weight  $1 + \epsilon$ , the sites with  $h \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$  may not be a leaf.

Similar to the way we find the probability of one in ASM, we modify the the weights of the toppling matrix to ensure that the site  $i$  is a leaf. This modification of weights is only done on a finite number of lattice bonds, therefore the probabilities corresponding to these local restrictions can be calculated in terms of finite dimensional determinant.

We modify the original model by removing the bonds to three neighbors of site  $i$  such that only one bond connects site  $i$  to the system. All four possible choices to cut the bonds are not equivalent, there are two different modifications:  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  shown in Figure 6. In the case  $A_1$ , we delete all neighbor bonds of site  $i$  except a left or a right one which has weight  $1 + \epsilon$ , and change the weight of this remaining bond to  $1 - \epsilon$  to ensure the height of site  $i$  won't be more than  $1 - \epsilon$ . In the case  $A_2$ , one of the vertical bonds with the weight  $1 - \epsilon$  remains unchanged and connects site  $i$  to system.

The two new toppling matrices are of the form  $\Delta^{(1)} = \Delta - B^{(1)}$  and  $\Delta^{(2)} = \Delta - B^{(2)}$  respectively where  $B^{(1)}$  and  $B^{(2)}$  are defect matrices:



Figure 6: Two types of bond modification

$$B^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 3 + \epsilon & -1 + \epsilon & -1 - \epsilon & -1 + \epsilon & -2\epsilon \\ -1 + \epsilon & 1 - \epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 - \epsilon & 0 & 1 + \epsilon & 0 & 0 \\ -1 + \epsilon & 0 & 0 & 1 - \epsilon & 0 \\ -2\epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

$$B^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 3 + \epsilon & -1 - \epsilon & -1 + \epsilon & -1 - \epsilon \\ -1 - \epsilon & 1 + \epsilon & 0 & 0 \\ -1 + \epsilon & 0 & 1 - \epsilon & 0 \\ -1 - \epsilon & 0 & 0 & 1 + \epsilon \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

As we have left-right and up-down symmetries, the number configurations where  $h_i \in [0, 1 - \epsilon)$  is proportional to  $N = 2(\det \Delta^{(1)} + \det \Delta^{(2)})$ . So the probability of finding at most  $1 - \epsilon$  amount sand at a site is given by:

$$P(1 - \epsilon) = \frac{N}{4 \det \Delta} = \frac{1}{2} \det(I - B^{(1)}G) + \det(I - B^{(2)}G), \quad (9)$$

where  $G = \Delta^{-1}$ , is Green function matrix with the following integral form:

$$G_{ij} - G_{00} = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dp_i}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dp_j}{2\pi} \frac{\cos(ip_i) \cos(j p_j) - 1}{4 - 2(1 + \epsilon) \cos p_i - 2(1 - \epsilon) \cos p_j}. \quad (10)$$

The new toppling rules with elliptic asymmetry in CASM make the values of Green function to depend on the orientation of two sites an addition to their distances. Hence their calculation is a bit more tricky. For example, in the symmetric case it is enough to calculate  $G_{ii}$ , all other components of  $G$  could be obtained easily thereafter. We have computed the Green functions analytically and a few of them which were necessary to derive  $P(1 - \epsilon)$  are listed in Appendix. Using these Green functions, the determinants can be computed and  $P(1 - \epsilon)$  is derived. The formula is very long expression and we do not bring it here, we have sketched it in Figure 7. The result is very good in agreement with the simulations done. As we see, for  $\epsilon = 0$  we arrive at the well-known result  $P(1)$  in BTW model. The probability gradually comes down till it vanishes at  $\epsilon = 1$  which could be expected. It is also possible to calculate other one site probabilities such as the probability  $h \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)$ . In these cases, you have some non-local constraints, just like higher-than-one one site probabilities in usual ASM.




Figure 7: The probability  $P(1 - \epsilon)$  as a function of  $\epsilon$






Figure 8: The amount of rotational asymmetry of two point functions for  $\epsilon = 0.1$  and  $0.2$ .

## 4.2 Two-point correlation function

Again, using the same scheme introduced by [5], one is able to find correlation functions of finding sites with height less than  $1 - \epsilon$ . Making the modifications according to configurations  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  in the vicinity of any two sites, it is possible to find the probability that both sites have heights less than  $1 - \epsilon$ . In order to compute this joint probability, we consider one site at the origin and another at  $i = (r, \theta)$ . There are four different cases depending on how we modify the toppling rules: the defect matrices associated with either of the site could be  $B^{(1)}$  or  $B^{(2)}$ . Collecting all the four possible configurations, one finds:

$$P(1 - \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \sum_{n, \acute{n}=1}^2 \det \left( I - \begin{pmatrix} G_{00} & G_{0i} \\ G_{i0} & G_{ii} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B^{(n)} & 0 \\ 0 & B^{(\acute{n})} \end{pmatrix} \right) \right). \quad (11)$$

The  $G$  blocks denote green function matrixes at two sites and  $G_{0i} = (G_{i0})^t$ . The short distance Green functions are given in Appendix, therefore to compute the above determinants at the scaling limit we have to know the expansion of Green function at far distances. This could be obtained by solving the deformed continuum Laplace equation:

$$G(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \epsilon^2}} \left( -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln r - \frac{1}{4\pi} \ln \left( \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{1 + \epsilon} + \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{1 - \epsilon} \right) - \frac{\gamma}{2\pi} - \frac{\ln 8}{4\pi} + \frac{1}{24\pi r^2} \left( \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{1 + \epsilon} + \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{1 - \epsilon} \right) + \dots \right) \quad (12)$$

where  $\gamma = 0.577\dots$  is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. Using all these together, we are ready to find the two point probability:

$$P(h_0 < 1 - \epsilon, h_r < 1 - \epsilon) = (P(1 - \epsilon))^2 + \frac{f(\epsilon, \theta)}{r^4} + \dots \quad (13)$$

where  $f$  is derived as an analytic functions in terms of  $\epsilon$  and  $\theta$ . Again it is a very long expression and we do not bring it here. We have sketched the function  $f$  in polar coordinate for two different values of  $\epsilon = 0.1$  and  $0.2$  in Figure 8. The result shows that the correlations are long ranged and have scaling property, though there is no rotational symmetry, and the amount of this anisotropy depends on  $\epsilon$ .




Figure 9: Three different configurations to modify the toppling matrix near a boundary

### 4.3 Boundary effects on height $1 - \epsilon$ probability

As boundary sites play important role in sandpile models, it would be interesting to consider the model in presence of different boundary conditions (BCs). We consider two types of boundary conditions, open and closed [26], according to toppling rules in our model. In the case of open BC, we set  $\Delta_{ii} = 4$  for boundary sites. This means that the amount of sand leaving the system when a boundary site topples is  $1 - \epsilon$  or  $1 + \epsilon$  depending on whether the site is on a horizontal or vertical edge. For closed BC we set  $\Delta_{ii} = 3 + \epsilon$  on horizontal edge and  $\Delta_{ii} = 3 - \epsilon$  for vertical edge so that there would be no dissipation on the boundary. It maybe hard to keep track of vertical and horizontal edges, an easier way is to consider  $\epsilon \in (-1, 1)$ , so the transformation  $\epsilon \rightarrow -\epsilon$  would interchange vertical an horizontal edges.

For simplicity, we consider that the model is defined on the upper half plane and the open/closed boundary is located at  $y = 1$ . Let's compute the probability of having an amount of sand less than  $1 - \epsilon$  at site  $i = (0, y)$  in the upper half plane. To this end we have to compute the open and closed Green functions for two sites  $i_1 = (x_1, y_1)$  and  $i_2 = (x_2, y_2)$ . This could be done using the image method:

$$G^{op}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) = G(x_1 - x_2, y_1 - y_2) - G(x_1 - x_2, y_1 + y_2) \quad (14)$$

$$G^{cl}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) = G(x_1 - x_2, y_1 - y_2) + G(x_1 - x_2, y_1 + y_2 - 1) \quad (15)$$

The calculations of height  $1 - \epsilon$  probability in the presence of the boundary are similar to that on the plane. There are three different configurations as shown in Figure 9, therefore<sup>1</sup>

$$P^{op,cl}(1 - \epsilon, y) = \frac{1}{4} \left( 2 \det \left( I - B^{(1)} G_{h,A}^{op,cl} \right) + \det \left( I - B^{(2)} G_{h,B}^{op,cl} \right) + \det \left( I - B^{(2)} G_{h,C}^{op,cl} \right) \right). \quad (16)$$

Using Eq. (12) we are able to compute the determinants for distances far from boundary, then we find that the probability for height  $1 - \epsilon$  at a distance  $y$  from boundary is:

$$P^{op,cl}(1 - \epsilon, y) = P(1 - \epsilon) \pm \frac{S(\epsilon)}{y^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{y^4}\right), \quad (17)$$

where the constant term  $P(1 - \epsilon)$  is bulk probability for a site to have height at most  $1 - \epsilon$  and is given by Eq. (9). The leading term that depends on the distance from boundary falls off as  $1/y^2$

<sup>1</sup>It turns out that the configurations  $B$  and  $C$  have the same contribution at large distances.




Figure 10:  $S(\epsilon)$  as a function of  $\epsilon$

with coefficient  $S(\epsilon)$  which is a complicated analytic function of  $\epsilon$  and is sketched in Figure 10. Plus sign corresponds to open boundary condition and minus sign to closed ones. It can be shown that this probability at distance  $x$  from a vertical open or closed boundary has a similar behavior.

#### 4.4 Field Theory Description

As mentioned before, the number of different recurrent configurations of sandpile model (the partition function) is given by determinant of the toppling matrix  $\Delta$  which leads to the action of  $c = -2$  logarithmic conformal field theory (Eq. (5)). We rewrite the action in  $x$ - $y$  coordinates:

$$S = \int -\theta \partial_x^2 \bar{\theta} - \theta \partial_y^2 \bar{\theta}. \quad (18)$$

The lattice rotational symmetry is broken when we apply elliptic asymmetry in toppling rules. So it is expected the field theory describing our model not to be conformal invariant. The perturbed action turns out to be

$$S \sim \int -\theta \partial_x^2 \bar{\theta} - \theta \partial_y^2 \bar{\theta} - \epsilon (\theta \partial_x^2 \bar{\theta} - \theta \partial_y^2 \bar{\theta}), \quad (19)$$

which is rotationally asymmetric.

In this field theory, following the grassmanian method used in [14], it is possible to assign a scaling field to height variable being in  $[0, 1 - \epsilon)$ . The probability of height  $1 - \epsilon$  can be written as

$$P(1 - \epsilon) = \frac{\int d\theta_i \int d\bar{\theta}_j \exp(\sum \theta_i \Delta_{ij} \bar{\theta}_j) \frac{1}{2} \left( \exp(-\theta_i B_{ij}^{(1)} \bar{\theta}_j) + \exp(-\theta_i B_{ij}^{(2)} \bar{\theta}_j) \right)}{\int d\theta_i \int d\bar{\theta}_j \exp(\sum \theta_i \Delta_{ij} \bar{\theta}_j)}, \quad (20)$$

which resembles the expectation value of the field  $(1/2) \left( \exp(-\theta B^{(1)} \bar{\theta}) + \exp(-\theta B^{(2)} \bar{\theta}) \right)$ . Following [14], we can assign a field to this height variable in the following way:

$$\phi(1 - \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \langle \exp(-\theta_i B_{ij}^{(1)} \bar{\theta}_j) + \exp(-\theta_i B_{ij}^{(2)} \bar{\theta}_j) \rangle \rangle, \quad (21)$$

where  $\langle \langle \dots \rangle \rangle$  means that we have to contract all  $\theta$ 's and  $\bar{\theta}$ 's except two. In the contraction we have to use the Green functions given in appendix. Doing all this and going to continuum limit we will arrive at

$$\phi(1 - \epsilon) = - (f(\epsilon) \partial_x \theta \partial_x \bar{\theta} + g(\epsilon) \partial_y \theta \partial_y \bar{\theta}) \quad (22)$$

$f(\epsilon)$  and  $g(\epsilon)$  are complicated functions with long terms that are plotted in Figure 11.




Figure 11:  $f(\epsilon)$  and  $g(\epsilon)$  are sketched as functions of  $\epsilon$ .

As we see, setting  $\epsilon = 0$  we will arrive at the known field in ASM. As we increase  $\epsilon$  the function  $g$  gradually approaches to zero and is always positive. However the function  $f$  increases up to  $\epsilon \simeq 0.2$  and then comes down becomes zero at  $\epsilon = 1$ . This is natural, because the limit  $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$  means you want to find the field associated with the probability of height  $h$  be in the interval  $[0, 1 - \epsilon] = \emptyset$ , therefore the field should be zero.

At any case it is very interesting to investigate this new field theory. In this theory, the scale symmetry is preserved and we expect criticality. However the rotational symmetry is broken and we do not have the full conformal invariance, though the system is still solvable from field theory point of view. Possibly one can investigate this model in the context of perturbed conformal field theory [27, 28]. It can be argued that the action (19) could become symmetric if you rescale horizontal and vertical directions with suitable (and different) scale parameters [29], therefore this new theory should be identical with the previous one. This argument, if applied to the action is completely correct, and if one constructs the field theory through defining the correlation functions the two theories will be identical. But if you ask questions about the field assigned to physical properties, such as the probability of height of a site being less than  $1 - \epsilon$ , the situation becomes more complicated and it is not easy to find an easy way to relate the corresponding fields in the two theories. For example the field associated with the probability of height of a site being less than  $1 - \epsilon$  in ordinary CASM is  $(1 - \epsilon)\phi_1$  where  $\phi_1$  is the field of height one in ASM. However the same field in asymmetric case is given by equation (22) and could not be derived from  $\phi_1$  via a simple rescaling. On the other hand it has been seen that the scaling exponent  $\tau_s$  is not sensitive to the value of  $\epsilon$ . Putting all these together, it seems that the elliptical asymmetry does not change the universality class of the theory.

It is also possible to restore the rotational symmetry statistically. If we assume the on-site asymmetries have quenched randomness; that is, on some sites  $\epsilon$  takes positive values and on some other it takes negative values, then there is no preferred direction statistically. The model should be formulated with more care, however it is very interesting to see if adding such quenched randomness will take the system to a new fixed point or not. Work in this direction is in progress.

## Acknowledgment

We would like to thank D. Dhar for his helpful comments and careful reading of the manuscript.

## 5 Appendix

We collect some values of Green function  $G$  that we have used through the paper:

$$\begin{aligned}
 G(1,1) &= -\frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}} \\
 G(0,1) &= \frac{\arcsin\left(\sqrt{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}}\right)}{\pi(\epsilon-1)} \\
 G(1,0) &= -\frac{(\pi-2\operatorname{arccotan}\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}}\right))}{2\pi(1+\epsilon)} \\
 G(0,2) &= -\frac{2(1+\epsilon)}{\pi(-1+\epsilon)\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}} - \frac{4\arcsin\left(\sqrt{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}}\right)}{\pi(-1+\epsilon)^2} \\
 G(2,0) &= \frac{2\left(\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}-\pi+2\operatorname{arccotan}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}}\right)\right)}{\pi(1+\epsilon)^2}
 \end{aligned}$$

## References

- [1] P. Bak, C. Tang, and K. Wiesenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett., **59**, 381 (1987).
- [2] H. J. Jensen, *Self-Organized Criticality* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
- [3] D. Dhar, [cond-mat/9909009].
- [4] D. Dhar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 1613 (1990); Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2837 (1990).
- [5] S. N. Majumdar and D. Dhar, Physica A **185** 129 (1992).
- [6] V. B. Priezzhev, J. Stat. Phys. **74** 955 (1994).
- [7] E. V. Ivashkevich, J. Phys. A. **27**. 3643 (1994).
- [8] M. Jeng, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 016140 (2005)[cond-mat/0407115].
- [9] M. Jeng, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 036153 (2005)[cond-mat/0405594].
- [10] M. Jeng, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 051302 (2004)[cond-mat/0312656].
- [11] P. Ruelle, Phys. Lett. B **539** 172 (2002)[hep-th/0203105].
- [12] P. Ruelle, J. Stat. Mech. (2007) P09013 [arxiv:0707.3766]
- [13] G. Piroux and P. Ruelle, J. Stat. Mech., 0410 (2004) P005, [hep-th/0407143].
- [14] S. Moghimi-Araghi, M. A. Rajabpur, S. Rouhani, Nucl. Phys. B **718** [FS](2005) 362, [cond-mat/0410434].
- [15] M. Jeng, G. Piroux, P. Ruelle, J. Stat. Mech. 0610 (2006) P015, [cond-mat/0609284].

- [16] S. Mahieu And P. Ruelle, Phys. Rev. E **64** 066130, [hep-th/0107150].
- [17] S. Moghimi-Araghi, A. Nejati, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40** ,(2007) 11277, [cond-mat/0612224]
- [18] Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 470 (1989).
- [19] A. Gabriellov, Physica A **195**, (1993) 253.
- [20] Anne Fey, Ronald Meester, Corrie Quant and Frank Redig, [math-ph/0701029].
- [21] P. Ghaffari, S. Lise and H. J. Jensen, Phys. Rev. E **56** 6702 (1997).
- [22] T. Tsuchiya and M. Katori, Phys. Rev. E **61** 1183 (2000).
- [23] N. Azimi-Tafreshi, E. Lotfi and S. Moghimi-Araghi, [arXiv:0710.3292].
- [24] D. Dhar and R. Ramaswamy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 1659.
- [25] E.V. Ivashkevich and V.B. Priezhev, Physica A **254** (1998) 97-116.
- [26] J. G. Brankov, E. V. Ivashkevich and V. B. Priezhev, J. Phys. I France **3**, 1729-1740 (1993)
- [27] A. B. Zamolodchikov, Advanced studies in pure Mathematics .19, 641(1989).
- [28] M. A. Rajabpour and S. Rouhani, Nucl. Phys. **B754** (2006) 283-292.
- [29] D. Dhar, Private communication.