

Critical behavior of slider-block model

(Short title: Critical...)

S G Abaimov

Pennsylvania State University, University Park, 16802, USA

E-mail: sgabaimov@gmail.com and sua20@psu.edu.

Abstract. This paper applies the theory of continuous phase transitions of statistical mechanics to a slider-block model. The slider-block model is chosen as a representative of systems with avalanches. Similar behavior can be observed in a forest-fire model and a sand-pile model. Basing on the well-developed theory of critical phenomena for percolating systems a strong analogy for the slider-block model is investigated. It is found that the slider-block model has a critical point when the stiffness of the model is infinite. Critical exponents are found and it is shown that the behavior of the slider-block model, particularly, the occurrence of system-wide events is strongly dominated by the finite-size effects. Also the unknown before behavior of the frequency-size distributions is found for large statistics of events.

1. Introduction

Recently introduced models with avalanches exhibit complex behavior of event occurrence. A slider-block [1] has been investigated by many studies

as a model representing the recurrent earthquake occurrence [2-4]. A forest-fire model represents the occurrence of fires in forests [5, 6]. The sand-pile model [7] is the main representative of the theory of self-organized criticality. All these models exhibit complex behavior. Energy (or other driving quantity) is pumped into a system. In response the system organizes its dissipation through the complex avalanche behavior.

During the past century major breakthroughs have been achieved in the theory of phase transitions in statistical mechanics (for reviews see, *e.g.* [8-10]). The major concepts of this theory have been applied not only to the typical thermal systems like liquid-gas or magnetic systems but also to the systems without actual thermalization like percolation theory [11] or damage mechanics [12]. In this paper we apply concepts of continuous phase transitions to the slider-block model. For the forest-fire and sand-pile models the application of statistical mechanics is similar and will be investigated in future publications.

Grassberger P. [6] has shown that the critical exponents significantly depend on the model size. In this paper we investigate this effect for the slider-block model. We consider models with $L = 25, 50, 100, 500,$ and 1000 slider-blocks. Also in preliminary studies we discovered that the size of statistics also significantly influences the critical behavior. Particularly, we

found that the dependence of a correlation length on a tuning field parameter exhibits significant non-smooth deviations for statistics of 10,000 events in comparison with statistics of 1,000,000 events which we used as a reference. The frequency-size behavior also significantly depends on the size of statistics. We found unknown before behavior when we used large statistics.

We utilize the modification of the slider-block which requires integration of coupled ordinary differential equations. Therefore the sizes of statistics are limited by the time of numerical simulations. In spite of this difficulty for large model sizes of $L = 500$ and $L = 1000$ blocks we have obtained large statistics in the range from 170,000 up to 1,100,000 avalanches. Most of distributions have from 300,000 to 800,000 slip events. This let us to obtain smooth scaling dependences and accurate values of critical exponents.

In Section 2 we introduce the model. In Section 3 we investigate its frequency-size behavior. In Section 4 we consider an analogy with the percolating theory and develop preliminary expectations what a critical point and a correlation length of the model are. In Section 5 we develop a rigorous expression for the correlation length and consider its behavior. Also we investigate the finite-size scaling of the model and find that the dependences for different model sizes collapse on a single curve.

2. The model

In this paper we utilize a variation of the slider-block model (SBM) with the inertia of blocks where the differential equations of motion are coupled [2]. This is the variation of the model that is the most difficult to solve numerically but has an advantage of the absence of multiple approximations that are used in other modifications. One of the most important improvements is that the time evolution of an avalanche includes coupled motion of all participating blocks in contrast to the cellular-automata models where blocks are moving in sequences, one by one.

A linear chain of L slider blocks of mass m is pulled over a surface at a constant velocity V_L by a loader as illustrated in Fig. 1. This introduces a mechanism to pump the energy into the system. Each block is connected to the loader by a spring with stiffness k_L . Adjacent blocks are connected to each other by springs with stiffness k_C . Boundary conditions are assumed to be periodic: the last block is connected to the first block.

The blocks interact with the surface through static-dynamic friction. The static stability of each slider-block is given by

$$k_L y_i + k_C (2y_i - y_{i-1} - y_{i+1}) < F_{Si}, \quad (1)$$

where F_{Si} is the maximum static friction force on block i holding it motionless and y_i is the position of block i relative to the loader. These thresholds introduce the non-linearity of the system behavior.

During strain accumulation due to the loader motion all blocks are motionless relative to the surface and have the same increase of their coordinates relative to the loader plate

$$\frac{dy_i}{dt} = V_L. \quad (2)$$

When the cumulative force of the springs connecting to block i exceeds the maximum static friction F_{Si} , the block begins to slide. The dynamic slip of block i is controlled by its inertia

$$m \frac{d^2 y_i}{dt^2} + k_L y_i + k_C (2y_i - y_{i-1} - y_{i+1}) = F_{Di}, \quad (3)$$

where F_{Di} is the dynamic (sliding) frictional force on block i . The loader velocity is assumed to be much smaller than the slip velocity, so the movement of the loader is neglected during a slip event. This is consistent with the concept that the interval of earthquake slip duration is negligible in comparison with the interval of slow tectonic stress accumulation between earthquakes.

The sliding of one block can trigger instability of other blocks forming a many-block event. When the velocity of a block becomes equal to zero it sticks and switches from the dynamic to static friction.

It is convenient to introduce the non-dimensional variables and parameters: $\tau_f = t\sqrt{\frac{k_L}{m}}$ for the time of avalanche evolution, $Y_i = \frac{k_L y_i}{F_S^{ref}}$ for the

coordinates of blocks. The ratio of static to dynamic friction $\phi = \frac{F_{Si}}{F_{Di}}$ is

assumed to be the same for all blocks $\phi = 1.5$ but the values themselves

$\beta_i = \frac{F_{Si}}{F_S^{ref}}$ vary from block to block with F_S^{ref} as a reference value of the static

frictional force (F_S^{ref} is the minimum value of all F_{Si}). Particularly, the

values of frictional parameters β_i are assigned to blocks by the uniform

random distribution from the range $1 < \beta_i < 3.5$. This random variability in

the system is a “noise” required to generate event variability in stiff systems.

Parameter $\alpha = \frac{k_C}{k_L}$ is the stiffness of the system relative to the stiffness of its

connection to the loader. Later we will see that α plays an important role as a

tuning field parameter. For all model sizes as values of α we will use 1, 2, 3,

4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 50, 60, 75, 100, 200,

500, 1000, 2000, 5000, 10000, and some others, specific for each particular

model size..

Stress accumulation occurs when all blocks are stable, and slip of blocks occurs during the fast time τ_f when the loader is assumed to be approximately motionless. In terms of these non-dimensional variables the static stability condition (1) becomes

$$Y_i + \alpha(2Y_i - Y_{i-1} - Y_{i+1}) < \beta_i, \quad (4)$$

strain accumulation Eq. (2) becomes

$$\frac{dY_i}{d\tau_s} = 1, \quad (5)$$

and dynamical slip Eq. (3) becomes

$$\frac{d^2Y_i}{d\tau_f^2} + Y_i + \alpha(2Y_i - Y_{i-1} - Y_{i+1}) = \frac{\beta_i}{\phi}. \quad (6)$$

To perform simulations a velocity-verlet scheme is used which is a typical scheme for molecular-dynamics simulations [13].

3. Frequency-size behavior

Figs. 2(a-b) illustrate behavior of the SBMs consisting of $L = 500$ and 1000 blocks. The probability density function of the frequency-size distribution is plotted on log-log axes for different values of the system stiffness α . As a size S of an event the number of different blocks participated in this event is used. During an avalanche a block can lose and gain its stability many times but is counted only once in the size of this event. This makes the size of an event equal to its elongation. If the size of an event is equal to the size of the

model we will refer to these events as system-wide (SW) events. For large sizes in Figs. 2(a-b) the sliding average over 9 blocks has been used to remove fluctuations.

For small values of α the SBM has no SW events. The frequency-size statistics for small events has a tendency to be similar to the Gutenberg-Richter power-law distribution (straight line on the log-log axes) but for larger events it has a roll-down. When α increases, the roll-down moves to the right and finally goes beyond the system size L . Also the behavior of the system changes. SW events are still absent but we see the appearance of a peak of events whose sizes are about a half of the model size. For the further increase of α , when α exceeds some critical value, the first SW events appear. The peak of the half-model-size events becomes narrower and disappears on some statistics ($\alpha = 2000$ for $L = 500$ blocks and $\alpha = 5000$ for $L = 1000$ blocks). Instead, another peak appears which is adjacent to the SW limit. We believe that this effect is observed for the first time in this study due to the large statistics.

Further increase of α is assumed to cause all complexities of the curve to disappear and the frequency-size dependence to become a perfect power-law plus a discrete peak of SW events. However, we have not been able to observe this effect for the large systems with $L = 500$ and $L = 1000$ blocks

because this clean power-law dependence is supposed to appear at very high values of α , where the differential equations become difficult to solve numerically. Therefore we illustrate this dependence for the model with $L = 100$ blocks in Fig. 2(c). The maximum likelihood fit gives the value of the exponent of the power-law dependence -2.08 ± 0.09 which is very close to 2. Therefore we can suggest that in the limit of the infinite stiffness the model exhibits the power-law dependence of non-SW events with the meanfield (rational) value of the exponent 2. However, further investigations with the aid of alternative models are required to confirm this power-law dependence for the large system sizes and high values of α .

The dependence of α , at which the first SW events appear, on the size of the model is shown in Fig. 3. We see that the appearance of the first SW events depends on the system size and is a result of the finite-size effect. Therefore, contrary to the erroneous suggestion in [3], the value of α , at which the first SW events appear, does not represent the critical point of the model. What is the meaning of this α and what is the critical point of the model we will discuss in the next Section.

4. An analogy with the percolation theory

As a possible analogy we consider a percolating system. In the case of site percolation [11] a field parameter p is the probability for a lattice site to be

occupied. If N_{\bullet} is the number of occupied sites on the lattice and N_{total} is the total number of sites on the lattice then $p = N_{\bullet} / N_{\text{total}}$. For the rectangular (square) two-dimensional lattice with the linear size of L sites the total number of sites is $N_{\text{total}} = L^2$.

For the given value of p we define a microstate as a particular realized configuration of occupied sites on the lattice. For example, for $N_{\bullet} = 1$ there are N_{total} microstates when there is only one occupied site at any of N_{total} possible locations on the lattice. For $N_{\bullet} = N_{\text{total}}$ there is only one microstate when all sites are occupied.

Let's assume that p increases from 0 to 1. Then initially for p below the percolation threshold p_C there is no percolating cluster on the infinite lattice. For the finite lattice with size L for $p < L / N_{\text{total}}$ (for $N_{\bullet} < L$) there is also no percolating cluster. However, when p is greater than L / N_{total} (when $N_{\bullet} \geq L$) the appearance of the percolating cluster among all microstates is possible. Particularly, percolating is any microstate that contains one row of the lattice completely occupied. For p significantly below the percolating threshold p_C the number of these percolating microstates is much smaller than the total number of microstates for the given p . Therefore if an observer were looking at an ensemble of all possible system realizations for the given p (an ensemble of all possible microstates) s/he would count percolating

microstates as highly improbable and their fraction among all microstates in the ensemble as negligible. A correlation length ξ for this value of p is much smaller than the system size.

Even when, for the further increase of p , the fraction of percolating microstates becomes finite for a finite system, this does not guarantee that the infinite system percolates. In the finite system the fraction of percolating microstates becomes finite earlier than in the infinite system because of the finite-size effect [11]. The finite system begins to percolate when its correlation length ξ reaches the size of the system L . But percolation of the infinite system requires the infinite correlation length, which requires higher values of p . Visually, the infinite system can be imagined as composed by an ensemble of finite systems combined together (an ensemble of all microstates of a finite system). If only the negligible fraction of these microstates percolate the finite lattice then the infinite system does not have a percolating cluster.

For the case of SBM the field parameter is the stiffness of the system α . For small values of α there are no SW events in the system. If α increases and exceeds some threshold the first SW events appear in the system. However, the fraction of these events (*e.g.*, 3 of 290,000 for the system size $L = 1000$ and $\alpha = 14$) is very small. For the field parameter

above some threshold the appearance of SW events becomes possible. However, the correlation length ξ is still finite and, in fact, is even much smaller than the size of the system L . For the further increase of the field parameter the correlation length reaches the size of the finite system, but is still much smaller than the infinite correlation length, required for the infinite system to reach its critical point. Therefore, the first appearance of SW events in the finite system must not be confused with the case of an infinite system at the critical point α_C .

Returning again to the percolating system, below the percolating threshold $p < p_C$ the behavior of the system is significantly different at different spatial scales. For the scales smaller than the correlation length ξ the distribution of clusters is fractal and scale-invariant. The frequency-size distribution of cluster sizes in this case is a power-law and again there is an analogy here with the frequency-size distribution of small events in the SBM (straight line of the Gutenberg-Richter power-law distribution for small events on log-log axes). For the scales similar or greater than the correlation length ξ the frequency-size distribution of clusters deviates from the power-law and has an exponential roll-down. Again there is an analogous roll-down for the SBM for larger events. Therefore, preliminary, for the SBM the correlation length ξ can visually be found as being in the range where the

frequency-size distribution changes its behavior from the power-law to the roll-down. However, the frequency-size behavior of the SBM is more complex than the behavior of a percolating system. Therefore later we will provide a more rigorous statement.

For a finite percolating system, when the correlation length becomes greater than the system size $\xi \geq L$ the distribution of all non-percolating clusters is fractal and scale-invariant. The same we can see for the SBM for the range of high values of α when the roll-down has moved completely beyond the system size L and the frequency-size distribution for non-SW events becomes a power-law distribution $\text{pdf}(S) \propto S^{-2}$ ($\alpha = 1000$ in Fig. 2(c)). When the correlation length approaches the system size for a finite system, the fraction of percolating clusters becomes finite because of the finite-size effect. Therefore for the SBM we can conclude that the appearance of the significant fraction of SW events is also a result of the finite-size effect and is an indication that the correlation length ξ is reaching the system size L .

5. Correlation length ξ

First we will consider the definition of a correlation length in the theory of percolation. For the infinite system the correlation length ξ may be defined as the averages root mean square distance between two arbitrary occupied

sites on the lattice under the condition that these two sites must belong to the same cluster [11]

$$\xi \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{the same cluster}} r_{i,j}^2}{\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{the same cluster}} 1}}, \quad (7)$$

where indexes i and j enumerate occupied sites on the lattice, $r_{i,j}$ is the distance between occupied sites i and j , and sum $\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{the same cluster}}$ goes over all pairs of occupied sites $\langle i,j \rangle$ under the condition that both sites in each pair must belong to the same cluster. This definition can be written as the averaging over all clusters on the lattice

$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_k \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k} r_{i,j}^2}{\sum_k \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k} 1}}, \quad (8)$$

where index k enumerates all clusters on the lattice. The sum over all clusters \sum_k can be transformed into the sums over different cluster sizes s

(s is the number of occupied sites in a cluster)

$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_s \sum_{k_s=1}^{N_s} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} r_{i,j}^2}{\sum_s \sum_{k_s=1}^{N_s} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} 1}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_s \sum_{k_s=1}^{N_s} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} r_{i,j}^2}{\sum_s \sum_{k_s=1}^{N_s} \frac{1}{2} s(s-1)}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_s \sum_{k_s=1}^{N_s} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} r_{i,j}^2}{\sum_s N_s \frac{1}{2} s(s-1)}}, \quad (9)$$

where index k_s enumerates N_s clusters of size s . The radius of gyration of a given cluster k_s is

$$R_{k_s} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} r_{i,j}^2}{\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} 1}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} r_{i,j}^2}{\frac{1}{2}s(s-1)}}, \quad (10)$$

and the averaged root mean square radius of gyration for clusters of size s on the lattice is

$$R_s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{k_s=1}^{N_s} R_{k_s}^2}{N_s}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{k_s=1}^{N_s} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{cluster } k_s} r_{i,j}^2}{N_s \frac{1}{2}s(s-1)}}. \quad (11)$$

Therefore Eq. (9) can be written as

$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_s N_s \frac{1}{2}s(s-1)R_s^2}{\sum_s N_s \frac{1}{2}s(s-1)}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_s n_s s(s-1)R_s^2}{\sum_s n_s s(s-1)}}, \quad (12)$$

where n_s is the number of clusters of size s per lattice site for the given p . So the correlation length is the root mean square of radii of all clusters averaged over all clusters in the lattice not directly but with the weight coefficients $s(s-1)$.

Because the SBM is a one-dimensional chain of blocks, each event is assumed to be continuous over the model space (all blocks, which are unstable during an avalanche, form a continuous chain). Therefore for the SBM the size s of an event (the number of blocks participated in an avalanche) is the elongation of this event. This significantly simplifies all further calculations. For any event of size s the first site makes $(s-1)$ pairs

with $(s - 1)$ other sites. Then the second site makes $(s - 2)$ pairs with $(s - 2)$ sites, and so on. Finally, the site before the last site makes one pair with the last site. For the radius of gyration of this event this provides

$$R_{k_s} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{s-1} i^2 (s-i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{s-1} i}} = \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{12}(s-1)s^2(s+1)}{\frac{1}{2}(s-1)s}}. \quad (13)$$

In one-dimensional case for the same size s there is no variability of clusters. Therefore the averaged radius of gyration R_s equals to the radius of gyration of any cluster with size s : $R_s = R_{k_s}$.

For the correlation length ξ in the similar way we obtain

$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{s=1}^L \text{pdf}(s) \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} i^2 (L-i)}{\sum_{s=1}^L \text{pdf}(s) \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} i}} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{s=1}^L \text{pdf}(s) \frac{1}{12}(s-1)s^2(s+1)}{\sum_{s=1}^L \text{pdf}(s) \frac{1}{2}(s-1)s}}, \quad (14)$$

where $\text{pdf}(s)$ is the probability density function to observe an event with the elongation s in the sequence of avalanches.

Fig. 4(a) presents the dependence of the correlation length ξ on the system stiffness α for different values of the model size L . Behavior of the correlation length suggests that the critical point is located in the infinity of the field parameter α . Therefore further we use a field parameter $t = 1 / \alpha$ instead of α . Fig. 4(b) presents on the log-log axes the dependence of the correlation length ξ on the field parameter t for different model sizes. The

correlation length ζ increases monotonically with the decrease of t . Initially this increase is influenced by non-linear effects because the system is far from the fixed point of the renormalization group. When the field parameter t reaches the vicinity of the fixed point, linearization of the renormalization group becomes possible. Starting from this value of t the dependence of the correlation length on the field parameter becomes a power-law with the exponent $\nu = 1.85 \pm 0.03$. This value was obtained by the maximum likelihood fit of the power-law parts of the curves for the SBMs with 500 and 1000 block. We use for the fit only these model sizes because they provide the dependence which is the most clean from the non-linear and crossover effects. For the infinite system we would expect the power-law divergence of the correlation length at the critical point $t = 0$ with the same value of the exponent ν .

However, our SBMs are finite. Therefore, for the further decrease of t the correlation length increases as a power-law and finally becomes of the order of the system size L . Starting from this value of the field parameter, the finite-size effect, as a crossover effect, influences the dependence of ζ on t . When the system approaches the critical point, the correlation length reaches the limit of the system size and stays constant on this limit [8]. More rigorously, the averaged cluster elongation reaches the system size while the

correlation length stays constant at lower value due to the fact that correlation length (7) is always lower than the averaged linear size of clusters.

From the theory of scaling functions [8, 10, 14] we expect that the functional dependence of the correlation length ζ on the field parameter t should have the form

$$\zeta \propto \frac{1}{t^\nu} \Xi(Lt^\nu), \text{ where } \Xi(x) = \begin{cases} \text{const}, & x \gg 1 \\ x, & x \ll 1 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

is some scaling function. In the limit $Lt^\nu \gg 1$, when $\zeta \ll L$, this function has a constant limit, which does not influence the power-law dependence $1/t^\nu$. In the limit $Lt^\nu \ll 1$, when $\zeta \gg L$, this function generates a power-law dependence t^ν , which cancels the power-law dependence $1/t^\nu$ and provides the finite limit for the correlation length. To find the scaling function $\Xi(x)$ we multiply the dependence $\zeta(t)$ by t^ν and then plot the found dependence ζt^ν as a function of the parameter $x = Lt^\nu$. The obtained scaling function $\Xi(x)$ is presented in Fig. 5. We see all curves perfectly collapsed on the scaling dependence $\Xi(x)$ except only high values of t when the system is far from the critical point and the renormalization group cannot be linearized far from its fixed point. At these high values of t the power-law divergence $1/t^\nu$ of the

correlation length has non-linear deviations, and the scaling stops to be valid.

6. Conclusions

For different sizes of the slider-block model we obtain the dependence of the correlation length of the system on the stiffness of the system as a field parameter. The obtained scaling suggests that the slider-block model has a critical point when its stiffness is infinite. For the exponent of the correlation length we obtain value 1.85. Also we investigate the finite-size scaling function of the model and find that the dependence for different model sizes collapse onto a single curve.

References

- [1] Burridge R and Knopoff L, *Model and theoretical seismicity*, 1967 *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* **57** 341-371
- [2] Carlson J M and Langer J S, *Mechanical model of an earthquake fault*, 1989 *Phys. Rev. A* **40** 6470-6484
- [3] Abaimov S G, Turcotte D L, Shcherbakov R and Rundle J B, *Recurrence and interoccurrence behavior of self-organized complex phenomena*, 2007 *Nonlinear Proc. Geophys.* **14** 455-464

- [4] Abaimov S G, Turcotte D L, Shcherbakov R, Rundle J B, Yakovlev G, Goltz C and Newman W I, *Earthquakes: Recurrence and interoccurrence times*, 2008 *Pure Appl. Geophys.* **165** 777-795;
Abaimov S G, *Recurrent frequency-size distribution of characteristic events*, 2008 *ArXiv*: 0805.0450
- [5] Drossel B and Schwabl F, *Self-organized critical forest-fire model*, 1992 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** 1629-1632
- [6] Grassberger P, *Critical behaviour of the Drossel-Schwabl forest fire model*, 2002 *New J. Phys.* **4** 17
- [7] Bak P, Tang C and Wiesenfeld K, *Self-organized criticality*, 1988 *Phys. Rev. A* **38** 364-374
- [8] Goldenfeld N, *Lectures on Phase Transitions and the Renormalization Group*, 1992 (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley)
- [9] Cardy J, *Scaling and renormalization in statistical physics*, 1996 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [10] Pathria R K, *Statistical mechanics*, 1996 (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann)
- [11] Stauffer D and Aharony A, *Introduction To Percolation Theory*, 1992: Taylor&Francis)

- [12] Abaimov S G, *Applicability and non-applicability of equilibrium statistical mechanics to non-thermal damage phenomena*, 2008 *J. Stat. Mech.* P09005; Abaimov S G, *Applicability and non-applicability of equilibrium statistical mechanics to non-thermal damage phenomena: II. Spinodal behavior*, 2008 *ArXiv*: 0812.0699
- [13] Thijsen J M, *Computational physics*, 1999 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [14] Brankov J G, *Introduction to Finite-Size Scaling*, 1996, Leuven Notes in Mathematical and Theoretical Physics. Series A: Mathematical Physics vol 8 (Leuven: Leuven University Press)







Figure 1. Slider-block model.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 2. Frequency-size distribution of the model with (a) $L = 500$ blocks, (b) $L = 1000$ blocks, and (c) $L = 100$ blocks for different values of the model stiffness α . The values of α are shown in the legend and in the labels for individual curves. Starting from (a) $\alpha = 16$, (b) $\alpha = 35$, and (c) $\alpha = 8$, system-wide (SW) events are shown as markers on the right side of the plot.






Figure 3. The value of α , at which the first SW events appear. The fit shows that the dependence is close to the square root of the size of the model L .



(a)



(b)

Figure 4. Correlation length ζ as a function of (a) field parameter α and (b) field parameter $t = 1/\alpha$. Each marker represents a separate sequence of avalanches obtained in numerical simulations. The dashed line is the

maximum likelihood fit for the power-law parts of the curves for the SBMs with 500 and 1000 blocks.




Figure 5. Scaling function $\Xi(x)$. For comparison, the dependence $x = 1$ is given as a dashed line.