

New critical exponents for percolation and the random-cluster model

Youjin Deng,¹ Wei Zhang,² Timothy M. Garoni,³ Alan D. Sokal,^{4,5} and Andrea Sportiello⁶

¹*Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

²*Department of Physics, Jinan University, Guangzhou 510632, China*

³*ARC Centre of Excellence for Mathematics and Statistics of Complex Systems, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Melbourne, 139 Barry St., Melbourne, Vic. 3010, Australia*

⁴*Department of Physics, New York University, 4 Washington Place, New York, NY 10003, USA*

⁵*Department of Mathematics, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom*

⁶*Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università degli Studi di Milano, via Celoria 16, I-20133 Milano, Italy*

(Dated: April 20, 2009)

We introduce several infinite families of new critical exponents for the random-cluster model, and give heuristic scaling arguments determining all but one of these exponents as a function of q in the two-dimensional case. We then give Monte Carlo simulations confirming these predictions. For the shortest-path fractal dimension we give the conjectured exact formula $d_{\min} \stackrel{?}{=} (g+2)(g+18)/(32g)$ where g is the Coulomb-gas coupling. Finally, we apply these exponents to provide a radically improved implementation of the Sweeny Monte Carlo algorithm.

PACS numbers: 05.50.+q, 05.10.Ln, 64.60.ah, 64.60.De

The random-cluster model with parameter $q \geq 0$ [1] is a correlated bond-percolation model that plays a major role in the theory of critical phenomena, especially in two dimensions where it arises in recent developments of conformal field theory [2] via its connection with stochastic Loewner evolution (SLE) [3, 4]. For $q = 1$ it reduces to independent bond percolation [5], while for integer $q \geq 2$ it provides a graphical representation of the q -state ferromagnetic Potts model [6]. The random-cluster model thus provides an extension of both percolation and the Potts model that allows all positive values of q , integer or noninteger, to be studied within a unified framework.

In this Letter we shall define and study several infinite families of new critical exponents for the random-cluster model; some of these exponents have been studied previously for spanning trees ($q = 0$) or percolation ($q = 1$) only, while others appear to be entirely new. We give heuristic scaling arguments determining all but one of these exponents as a function of q in the two-dimensional (2D) case, and Monte Carlo simulations confirming these predictions. For the remaining undetermined exponent, which is the shortest-path fractal dimension $d_{\min}$ [7], we give the conjectured exact formula $d_{\min} \stackrel{?}{=} (g+2)(g+18)/(32g)$ where g is the Coulomb-gas coupling [8]. We conclude by applying these exponents to provide a radically improved implementation of the Sweeny Monte Carlo algorithm [9].

Definition of exponents. We shall define a variety of positive-integer-valued observables $\mathcal{O}$; for each one we expect that its probability distribution obeys a scaling law $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O} = s) \sim s^{-\psi_{\mathcal{O}}}$ (with $\psi_{\mathcal{O}} > 1$) for large s at criticality in infinite volume, or more generally $\sim s^{-\psi_{\mathcal{O}}} F_{\mathcal{O}}(s/\xi^{d_{\mathcal{O}}}, s/L^{d_{\mathcal{O}}})$ near criticality in large finite volume, where $F_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a scaling function. Our goal is to determine, for each $\mathcal{O}$, the decay exponent $\psi_{\mathcal{O}}$ and the fractal

dimension $d_{\mathcal{O}}$. Note that at criticality in finite volume, $\langle \mathcal{O}^n \rangle \sim L^{(n+1-\psi_{\mathcal{O}})d_{\mathcal{O}}} + \text{const} + \text{corrections to scaling as } L \rightarrow \infty$ (or $\sim \log L$ if $n+1-\psi_{\mathcal{O}} = 0$); we shall use this fact in our Monte Carlo determinations of $\psi_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $d_{\mathcal{O}}$.

Given a lattice site $\mathbf{x}$, we write $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}$ for the cluster containing $\mathbf{x}$, $|\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}|$ for the number of sites in it, $T_{\mathbf{x}}$ for the maximum graph-theoretic distance (“chemical distance”) from $\mathbf{x}$ to any site in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}$, and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ for the subset of sites in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}$ whose graph-theoretic distance from $\mathbf{x}$ is at most t . For 2D lattices, if $\mathbf{x}$ is a site and e is a bond incident on $\mathbf{x}$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x},e}$ the Baxter–Kelland–Wu (BKW) [10] loop on the medial lattice that winds around $\mathbf{x}$ through e , and by $|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x},e}|$ its length, when the bond e is unoccupied; otherwise we set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x},e} = \emptyset$ and $|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x},e}| = 0$.

Now fix nearby sites $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$, and let $C_{\min,k} = \min(|\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}_1}|, \dots, |\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}_k}|)$ if these clusters are all distinct, and 0 otherwise. We expect that all these observables have fractal dimension $d_{C_{\min,k}}$ equal to the cluster fractal dimension $d_F = d - \beta/\nu$. Moreover, standard hyperscaling arguments give $\psi_{C_{\min,1}} = d/d_F$ (the usual notation is $\tau = \psi_{C_{\min,1}} + 1$). Our goal is to determine $\psi_{C_{\min,k}}$ for $k \geq 2$. To our knowledge these exponents are new, except $\psi_{C_{\min,2}} = \frac{11}{8}$ for 2D spanning trees [11].

Likewise, let $T_{\min,k} = \min(T_{\mathbf{x}_1}, \dots, T_{\mathbf{x}_k})$ if the clusters $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}_i}$ are all distinct, and 0 otherwise. As a slight variant, let $T'_{\min,k}$ be the largest t such that the partial clusters $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}_i}(t)$ are all disjoint and contain at least one site at graph-theoretic distance t from $\mathbf{x}_i$. Also, for $k \geq 2$, let $S_{\min,k}$ be the length of the shortest path connecting some pair of sites $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_j$ if one exists, and 0 otherwise. We expect that all these observables have fractal dimension $d_{T_{\min,k}} = d_{T'_{\min,k}} = d_{S_{\min,k}}$ equal to the shortest-path fractal dimension $d_{\min}$ [7], and that $\psi_{T_{\min,k}} = \psi_{T'_{\min,k}} = \psi_{S_{\min,k}}$. We aim to determine $d_{\min}$ as well as $\psi_{T_{\min,k}}$ for $k \geq 1$. To our knowledge, the shortest-path exponents

have not previously been studied for $q \neq 0, 1$.

Consider also a pair of sites separated by a distance $\sim L$, say $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{x} = \alpha L$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $S_{\alpha L}$ be the length of the shortest path connecting these sites if one exists, and 0 otherwise. We expect that $\langle (S_{\alpha L})^n \rangle \sim L^{nd_{\min} - 2\beta/\nu}$.

Finally, for two-dimensional lattices, choose for each site $\mathbf{x}_i$ a bond e_i incident on it, and let $M_{\min,k} = \min(|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x}_1, e_1}|, \dots, |\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x}_k, e_k}|)$ if these loops are all distinct, and 0 otherwise. We expect that all these observables have fractal dimension $d_{M_{\min,k}}$ equal to the hull fractal dimension d_H ; and standard hyperscaling arguments give $\psi_{M_{\min,1}} = d/d_H$. We aim to determine $\psi_{M_{\min,k}}$ for $k \geq 2$.

Scaling arguments. Let $p_k(R)$ be the probability that, in an annulus of inner radius $r \sim O(1)$ and outer radius R , the inner circle is connected to the outer one by at least k distinct clusters. We expect that $p_k(R) \sim R^{-x_k}$ when $R \rightarrow \infty$ at criticality, for exponents $x_1 = \beta/\nu < x_2 < \dots$. In two dimensions it is known [8, 12] that

$$x_1 = (g-2)(6-g)/(8g) \quad (1a)$$

$$x_k = (g/8)k^2 - (g-4)^2/(8g) \quad \text{for } k \geq 2 \quad (1b)$$

where $q = 2 + 2\cos(g\pi/2)$ with $2 \leq g \leq 4$.

Fix nearby sites $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$, and let $C_k(s)$ be the probability that $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ belong to k distinct clusters, each of which contains at least s sites. The correspondence $s \sim R^{d_F}$ suggests that $C_k(s) \sim p_k(s^{1/d_F})$. Since $C_k(s) = \mathbb{P}(C_{\min,k} \geq s)$, we predict $\psi_{C_{\min,k}} = x_k/d_F + 1$ and hence $\langle (C_{\min,k})^n \rangle \sim L^{nd_F - x_k + \text{const.}}$. This agrees with standard hyperscaling for $k = 1$; we will test it for $k \geq 2$.

Likewise, let $N_k(t)$ be the probability that the partial clusters $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}_i}(t)$ are all disjoint and contain at least one site at graph-theoretic distance t from $\mathbf{x}_i$. The correspondence $t \sim R^{d_{\min}}$ suggests that $N_k(t) \sim p_k(t^{1/d_{\min}})$. Since $N_k(t) = \mathbb{P}(T'_{\min,k} \geq t)$, we predict $\psi_{T'_{\min,k}} = x_k/d_{\min} + 1$. For $q = 1$ this argument is due to Ziff [13].

Analogous reasoning for the medial observables predicts $\psi_{M_{\min,k}} = x_k/d_H + 1$. In two dimensions it is known [12] that $d_H = 1 + 2/g$.

Monte Carlo simulations. We simulated the two-dimensional random-cluster model at criticality for $q = 0, 0.01, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 3, 3.5$ [14] and $4 \leq L \leq 1024$ (periodic boundary conditions) by the Sweeny algorithm [9] when $0 < q < 1$ and the Chayes–Machta algorithm [15] when $q > 1$. For $0.25 \leq q \leq 2$ we also have data at $L = 2048$. For $q = 1$ we used cluster-growth algorithms to handle $4 \leq L \leq 4096$. For $q = 0$ we used Wilson’s algorithm [16] to generate spanning trees from loop-erased random walk [17]. The total CPU time used in these simulations was approximately 66 yr.

For each observable $\mathcal{O}$, we fit $\langle \mathcal{O}^n \rangle$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$ to the Ansätze aL^p , $aL^p + bL^{p-\Delta}$ and $aL^p + c$, varying $L_{\min}$ (the smallest L value included in the fit) until the χ^2 was reasonable. The error bar is a subjective 68% confidence limit that includes both statistical error and systematic




Figure 1: Finite-size-scaling plot showing $s^{x_2/d_F} \mathbb{P}(C_{\min,2} \geq s)$ versus s/L^{d_F} for $q = 1$ and $64 \leq L \leq 4096$.

error due to unincluded corrections to scaling. Exponents $p < 0$ always come from a fit to $aL^p + c$.

Our results for $C_{\min,2}$ and $C_{\min,3}$ are reported in Table I. The agreement with the predicted exponents is excellent, except where the exponent is very negative and hence possibly overshadowed by correction-to-scaling terms. A finite-size-scaling plot for $C_{\min,2}$ and $q = 1$ is shown in Fig. 1 and exhibits excellent collapse. For $\langle C_{\min,3} \rangle$ at $q = 0$ (see [17]), where the predicted exponent is zero, we observe a clear $a \log L + b$ behavior.

Our results for $M_{\min,2}$ are reported in Table II. The predicted values are again confirmed. A similar agreement is found for $M_{\min,3}$ and will be reported elsewhere.

We also studied $M_{\min,2}$ and $M_{\min,3}$ for the “dense” Fortuin–Kasteleyn (FK) clusters in which all bonds between sites in the same cluster are inserted. This modification leaves connectivities (hence x_k and d_F) unchanged but is conjectured [18] to change the hull and shortest-path dimensions to those of FK clusters with coupling $g' = 16/g$. The results for $M_{\min,2}$ are shown in the bottom half of Table II; they are consistent with our prediction over the entire range $4 \leq g' \leq 8$. We remark that $4 \leq g' \leq 6$ corresponds to the tricritical Potts model for $4 \geq q \geq 0$, but no interpretation of $6 \leq g' \leq 8$ in terms of a spin model with positive weights is known [19].


Next we studied $S_{\alpha L}$ for $\alpha = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ in order to estimate the shortest-path exponent $d_{\min}$: see Table III. Our result for $q = 1$ is compatible with Grassberger’s [7] estimate $d_{\min} = 1.1306(3)$. The corrections to scaling are very strong for these observables, and our error bars are dominated by our assessment of the likely systematic error from such corrections. It would be very useful (but also very expensive) to obtain data at larger values of L .

Our results are consistent with the simple formula $d_{\min} \stackrel{?}{=} (g+2)(g+18)/(32g)$: see Table III and Fig. 2. This formula has the nice property that $d_{\min}$ is monotone decreasing for $2 \leq g \leq 6$ and reaches $d_{\min} = 1$ precisely at $g = 6$, in accordance with the idea [20] that clusters

Quantity	$q =$	0	0.01	0.25	0.5	1	1.5	2	3	3.5
$C_{\min,2}$	p (num.)	1.25002(4)	1.1800(1)	0.9273(2)	0.8071(2)	0.6458(1)	0.5226(2)	0.4163(3)	0.214(2)	0.108(3)
	p (pred.)	1.25000	1.18007	0.92707	0.80768	0.64583	0.52298	0.41667	0.21667	0.10376
$(C_{\min,2})^2$	p (num.)	3.25002(4)	3.1647(2)	2.8633(1)	2.7252(2)	2.5418(2)	2.4065(2)	2.2923(3)	2.0832(7)	1.9695(8)
	p (pred.)	3.25000	3.16489	2.86336	2.72492	2.54167	2.40621	2.29167	2.08333	1.96999
$(C_{\min,2})^3$	p (num.)	5.24998(5)	5.1496(2)	4.7997(2)	4.6424(2)	4.4377(2)	4.2896(3)	4.1668(6)	3.950(2)	3.838(2)
	p (pred.)	5.25000	5.14970	4.79965	4.64216	4.43750	4.28943	4.16667	3.95000	3.83621
$C_{\min,3}$	p (num.)	$a \log L + b$	-0.109(2)	-0.532(9)	-0.723(8)	-0.961(8)	-1.04(3)	-0.98(2)	-0.7(1)	-0.6(1)
	p (pred.)	0.00000	-0.10974	-0.52401	-0.72989	-1.02083	-1.25148	-1.45833	-1.86667	-2.10868
$(C_{\min,3})^2$	p (num.)	2.0009(5)	1.8755(12)	1.415(3)	1.184(4)	0.867(5)	0.623(5)	0.38(3)	0.01(2)	-0.29(9)
	p (pred.)	2.00000	1.87508	1.41229	1.18735	0.87500	0.63174	0.41667	0.00000	-0.24245
$(C_{\min,3})^3$	p (num.)	4.0012(9)	3.860(2)	3.352(4)	3.100(6)	2.739(18)	2.494(11)	2.33(7)	1.73(7)	1.56(5)
	p (pred.)	4.00000	3.85990	3.34857	3.10460	2.77083	2.51497	2.29167	1.86667	1.62378

Table I: Numerical estimates versus theoretical predictions for exponents associated to $C_{\min,k}$ with $k = 2, 3$.

Quantity	$q =$	0	0.01	0.25	0.5	1	1.5	2	3	3.5
$M_{\min,2}$	p (num.)	1.25002(4)	1.1639(5)	0.8527(5)	0.7036(3)	0.4994(7)	0.3444(4)	0.2087(2)	-0.0525(25)	-0.195(3)
	p (pred.)	1.25000	1.16439	0.85222	0.70341	0.50000	0.34420	0.20833	-0.05000	-0.19748
$(M_{\min,2})^2$	p (num.)	3.25002(4)	3.1333(4)	2.7141(5)	2.5164(4)	2.2498(4)	2.0488(2)	1.8749(3)	1.5485(15)	1.372(2)
	p (pred.)	3.25000	3.13353	2.71364	2.51638	2.25000	2.04864	1.87500	1.55000	1.36751
$(M_{\min,2})^3$	p (num.)	5.24998(5)	5.1023(4)	4.5756(6)	4.3293(5)	4.0000(2)	3.7531(4)	3.5415(3)	3.1484(16)	2.938(3)
	p (pred.)	5.25000	5.10267	4.57507	4.32935	4.00000	3.75308	3.54167	3.15000	2.93250
$M'_{\min,2}$	p (num.)	0.496(3)	0.4532(6)	0.2818(10)	0.1973(5)	0.085(3)	-0.006(5)	-0.099(5)	-0.24(3)	-0.46(15)
	p (pred.)	0.50000	0.45322	0.28100	0.19795	0.08333	-0.00535	-0.08333	-0.23333	-0.31998
$(M'_{\min,2})^2$	p (num.)	1.748(3)	1.7116(6)	1.5718(4)	1.5050(8)	1.4165(13)	1.351(2)	1.296(4)	1.11(4)	1.02(7)
	p (pred.)	1.75000	1.71118	1.57121	1.50546	1.41667	1.34955	1.29167	1.18333	1.12250
$(M'_{\min,2})^3$	p (num.)	2.995(4)	2.9688(10)	2.8612(20)	2.8136(8)	2.749(4)	2.709(10)	2.667(2)	2.59(4)	2.55(4)
	p (pred.)	3.00000	2.96914	2.86143	2.81297	2.75000	2.70444	2.66667	2.60000	2.56499

Table II: Numerical estimates versus theoretical predictions for exponents associated to $M_{\min,2}$.Figure 2: Numerical estimates for $d_{\min}$ together with the conjectured exact formula $d_{\min} \stackrel{?}{=} (g+2)(g+18)/(32g)$.

become more compact as g grows. It also agrees with the known fact $d_{\min} = d_{\text{red}} = \frac{5}{4}$ at $q = 0$ [21].

Our results for $T_{\min,1}$, $T_{\min,2}$ and $S_{\min,2}$ are similar to

those shown in Table III and will be reported elsewhere.

Application. The Sweeny algorithm [9] is a local single-bond-update dynamics for the random-cluster model; for $0 < q < 1$ it is the *only* known general algorithm for this model. We have recently shown [22] that the Sweeny algorithm has rather weak critical slowing-down, fairly close to the lower bound $z \geq \alpha/\nu$ [23]; furthermore, it exhibits (especially for small q) the surprising phenomenon of “critical speeding-up” [22], in which suitable global observables exhibit significant decorrelation on time scales much *less* than one sweep (namely, L^w hits for a suitable exponent $w < d$).

The main obstacle to the use of the Sweeny algorithm is the need (when $q \neq 1$) for a nonlocal connectivity check when updating a bond xy , which potentially requires traversing an entire cluster to determine whether x is connected to y . Since the cluster attached to a given site is of mean size $\sim L^{1/\nu}$ near the critical point, this connectivity check threatens to impose a “computational critical slowing-down” that would more than outweigh the good “physical” behavior of the Sweeny dynamics.

Here we want to propose a simple method of reducing

Quantity	$q =$	0	0.01	0.25	0.5	1	1.5	2	3	3.5
$S_{L/2}$	$d_{\min}$ (num.)	1.24999(3)	1.2371(10)	1.1825(3)	1.1596(4)	1.1303(8)	1.1112(7)	1.0955(10)	1.0677(40)	1.0560(30)
$(S_{L/2})^2$	$d_{\min}$ (num.)	1.25000(3)	1.2364(10)	1.1826(3)	1.1596(4)	1.1304(10)	1.1108(6)	1.0950(9)	1.0668(30)	1.0538(25)
$(S_{L/2})^3$	$d_{\min}$ (num.)	1.24999(4)	1.2359(10)	1.1825(3)	1.1595(3)	1.1304(10)	1.1106(3)	1.0949(9)	1.0662(30)	1.0525(23)
$2 \leq g \leq 4$	$d_{\min}$ (conj.)	1.25000	1.23463	1.18211	1.15918	1.13021	1.10997	1.09375	1.06667	1.05343

Table III: Numerical estimates versus conjectured exact formula for the shortest-path exponent $d_{\min}$ as deduced from $\langle (S_{L/2})^n \rangle$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$.

this computational slowing-down: perform simultaneous breadth-first searches starting at the endpoints x and y , and stop when one of the clusters has been fully visited or the clusters merge. In the first case this takes a time $C_{\min,2}$, and in the second case a time B_s (the number of sites visited in breadth-first search until merger); both scale (in mean) as $L^{d_F - x_2} \ll L^{\gamma/\nu}$.

In two dimensions we can do even better by simultaneously following the BKW loops surrounding x and y : this takes (in mean) a time $\sim L^{d_H - x_2}$. (If the two loops are distinct and both topologically nontrivial, connectedness needs to be determined by a full simultaneous cluster traversal. Empirically this case arises with probability $\sim L^{d_{\text{red}} - d}$, which is so small [21] that it makes a negligible contribution to the total cost.) It follows that computational critical slowing-down is completely absent for $q > 4 \cos^2(\pi\sqrt{2/3}) \approx 2.811520$.

We are grateful to Gary Reich for a discussion that inspired this work; to Wenan Guo for participation in early stages of this project; to Russ Lyons, Robin Pemantle and David Wilson for helpful correspondence; and to NYU ITS for use of their computer cluster. This research was supported in part by NSF grant PHY-0424082, by the Science Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and by the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in Chinese Universities (UCET).

[1] P.W. Kasteleyn and C.M. Fortuin, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **26** (Suppl.), 11 (1969); C.M. Fortuin and P.W. Kasteleyn, Physica **57**, 536 (1972); G. Grimmett, *The Random-Cluster Model* (Springer, New York, 2006).
[2] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu and D. Sénéchal, *Conformal Field Theory* (Springer, New York, 1997).
[3] O. Schramm, Israel J. Math. **118**, 221 (2000), math.PR/9904022; S. Rohde and O. Schramm, Ann. Math. **161**, 883 (2005), math.PR/0106036; G.F. Lawler, *Conformally Invariant Processes in the Plane* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2005).
[4] W. Kager and B. Nienhuis, J. Stat. Phys. **115**, 1149 (2004), math-ph/0312056; J. Cardy, Ann. Phys. **318**, 81 (2005), cond-mat/0503313.
[5] D. Stauffer and A. Aharony, *Introduction to Percolation Theory*, 2nd ed. (Taylor & Francis, London, 1992); G.

Grimmett, *Percolation*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 1999).
[6] R.B. Potts, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **48**, 106 (1952); F.Y. Wu, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54**, 235 (1982); **55**, 315 (E) (1983); J. Appl. Phys. **55**, 2421 (1984).
[7] P. Grassberger, J. Phys. A **32**, 6233 (1999), cond-mat/9906309.
[8] B. Nienhuis, J. Stat. Phys. **34**, 731 (1984).
[9] M. Sweeny, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 4445 (1983).
[10] R.J. Baxter, S.B. Kelland and F.Y. Wu, J. Phys. A **9**, 397 (1976).
[11] S.S. Manna, D. Dhar and S.N. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. A **46**, R4471 (1992).
[12] H. Saleur and B. Duplantier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2325 (1987); J. Cardy, J. Phys. A **31**, L105 (1998).
[13] R.M. Ziff, J. Phys. A **32**, L457 (1999), cond-mat/9907305.
[14] We avoided $q = 4$ because the logarithmic corrections would likely make all exponent estimates unreliable [see e.g. J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **88**, 567 (1997), hep-lat/9607030].
[15] L. Chayes and J. Machta, Physica A **254**, 477 (1998); Y. Deng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 055701 (2007), arXiv:0705.2751.
[16] D.B. Wilson, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing* (ACM, New York, 1996), pp. 296–303.
[17] More precisely, we used Wilson’s algorithm to generate a random spanning tree T , and then took measurements on $T \setminus T_0$, where T_0 is a fixed short tree connecting $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$.
[18] Y. Deng, unpublished. See also Y. Deng, H.W.J. Blöte and B. Nienhuis, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 026123 (2004) for a related construction.
[19] The critical $O(n)$ loop model with $2 \geq n \geq 0$ is known to correspond to the *tricritical* Potts model with $q = n^2$ and hence $4 \leq g \leq 6$ [B. Nienhuis, Physica A **177**, 109 (1991)]. The critical $O(n)$ loop model with $0 \geq n \geq -2$ may correspond to $6 \leq g \leq 8$, but it has negative weights.
[20] Y. Deng, H.W.J. Blöte and B. Nienhuis, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 026114 (2004).
[21] The “red” bonds are the singly connected bonds, i.e. those that do not belong to any cycle. In 2D, the red-bond fractal dimension is $d_{\text{red}} = 2 - x_2 = (4 - g)(4 + 3g)/8g$. See A. Coniglio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 3054 (1989) and [8, 12].
[22] Y. Deng, T.M. Garoni and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 230602 (2007), cond-mat/0701113.
[23] X.-J. Li and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 827 (1989), see last paragraph.