

Natural Measures on Polyominoes Induced by the Abelian Sandpile Model

Andrea Sportiello

CNRS, and LIPN, Université Sorbonne Paris Nord*
Villetaneuse, France

andrea.sportiello@univ-paris13.fr

We introduce a natural Boltzmann measure over polyominoes induced by boundary avalanches in the Abelian Sandpile Model. Through the study of a suitable associated process, we give an argument suggesting that the probability distribution of the avalanche sizes has a power-law decay with exponent $\frac{3}{2}$, in contrast with the present understanding of bulk avalanches in the model (which has some exponent between 1 and $\frac{5}{4}$), and to the ordinary generating function of polyominoes (which is conjectured to have a logarithmic singularity, i.e. exponent 1). We provide some numerical evidence for our claims, and evaluate some other statistical observables on our process, most notably the density of triple points.

1 Non-uniform measures on polyominoes from Statistical Mechanics

Given a periodic tiling of the plane, a (general) *polyomino* is a finite connected geometric structure formed by joining one or more cells of the tiling edge to edge. The name polyomino is typically associated to the square grid, while for the triangular and hexagonal grids the names polyiamonds and polyhexes (respectively) are sometimes used [30, 37, 38].

The history in the study of polyominoes started within recreational mathematics more than one century ago [15, 16, 18]. In a modern vision, they form a challenging problem in Combinatorics and Statistical Mechanics (see e.g. [19, sec. 10.8] or [17]), somewhat in analogy with the study of Self-Avoiding Walks: despite allowing for an elementary and natural definition, very little is known rigorously from a mathematical perspective, although mathematicians and physicists have provided numerous conjectures that are believed to be true and are strongly supported by numerical simulations. A reason for this difficulty is that, within the field of exactly-solvable models in Statistical Mechanics, we know more about locally-homogeneous random systems, than about finite compact random structures embedded in Euclidean space.

Given a polyomino P , define $n(P)$, the *size* of P , as the number of faces contained in P . The exhaustive generation of polyominoes, or their enumeration, at any finite size n , is a finite problem, and the problem of decreasing the computational cost of the associated algorithms has been studied by several authors [4, 5, 9, 14, 22, 23, 39]. That is, calling $A_n^{\mathcal{L}}$ the number of polyominoes of size n on a given lattice \mathcal{L} , the problem of determining the first N values $\{A_1^{\mathcal{L}}, \dots, A_N^{\mathcal{L}}\}$, with the smallest possible asymptotic growth of the complexity as a function of N (and the largest possible value of N given the present technology), is an interesting problem in the theory of algorithms, and also a topic appropriated for GASCom, but it is not our subject today.

*The work of A. Sportiello is supported by the French ANR projects DIMERS (ANR-18-CE40-0033) and COMBINE (ANR-19-CE48-0011).

Determining the asymptotic of $A_n^{\mathcal{L}}$ as a function of n is a very interesting subject. Padé approximants can be used on the list of the first few values, so that the previous question is important also for this goal, but also other insights can give access to this information, mostly coming from Statistical Physics. It is believed that $A_n^{\mathcal{L}} \sim c_{\mathcal{L}} \lambda_{\mathcal{L}}^n / n$, [22], where the overall constant $c_{\mathcal{L}}$ and the *growth rate* $\lambda_{\mathcal{L}}$ are expected to depend on the lattice (for the square lattice it is known that $4.00253 \leq \lambda_{\square} \leq 4.5252$ and the best estimates are $c_{\square} \simeq 0.3169$ and $\lambda_{\square} \simeq 4.0626$ [23]), while, crucially, the exponent -1 of the algebraic correction is an exact rational, and it is expected to be *universal* (in the sense of universality for Critical Phenomena [41]), and is a *critical exponent*, i.e., among its various properties of robustness, it shall be the same for all two-dimensional lattices.

Finally, it is of interest to determine the asymptotics for large n of statistical observables of large random polyominoes, taken with the uniform measure. Some examples of interesting observables are the perimeter, that is, the number of edges on the boundary, and the gyration radius, that is, the radius of the smallest disk that contains the polyomino. The average of both these quantities is expected to scale algebraically with n , again with some *critical exponents* expected to be the same for all lattices.

An interesting subclass of polyominoes consists of *simply-connected* polyominoes, that is, polyominoes such that the boundary consists of a single cycle (or, in simple words, “polyominoes with no holes”), see for example [17]. The same questions as above (determination of the A_n ’s, asymptotics, critical exponents for observables like the perimeter and the radius of gyration, . . .) apply to this subfamily, and involve in principle a different set of critical exponents.

The point of this paper is that one can consider some measure of interest $\mu_n(P)$ over polyominoes P of size n , instead that the uniform one. Of course, for such a measure to be interesting, it shall relate to some relevant probabilistic process. Again, this connects to the notion of universality of critical phenomena, where modifying the measure in such a way would correspond to “couple” the first model to a second one, and tune again the parameters such that the system becomes critical (of which a signal would be the fact that the natural “Boltzmann” series, i.e., the grand-canonical partition function, has an algebraic singularity at $z = 1$). An example of such a philosophy comes from random planar maps. On one side, there is an overwhelming evidence that critical exponents associated to maps (asymptotics in the enumeration, scaling of distances, etc.) are universal, that is do not depend on the precise local structure of the map (for example, are the same for random triangulations, or for quadrangulations, or for all maps altogether). Furthermore, if one consider maps “with matter” (that is, coupled with a critical Statistical Mechanics model, such as the Ising Model, the Potts Model, the $O(n)$ Loop Model, etc.), the critical exponents change, again in a universal way, that depends only on the type of matter introduced, and not on the local structure of the map. In some rare cases, the introduction of matter may even simplify the problem (for example, the enumeration of maps is much simpler if they are equipped with a spanning tree, which is the limit $q \rightarrow 0$ of the q -colour Potts Model).

In the case of polyominoes, a simple example in this direction is the measure induced by critical site percolation (that is, the q -state Potts model in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$), e.g. on the triangular lattice (which is the simplest case, as, by simple symmetry arguments, it is known that the critical parameter is $q_c = \frac{1}{2}$). Interestingly, this measure is much simpler to study than the original problem, and is quite explicit: calling $b(P)$ the number of faces not in P , and adjacent to P , we have $\mu_n^{\text{perc}}(P) = 2^{-n-b(P)+1}/n$ for polyominoes P of size n . Also, in this case, exact sampling in polynomial time can be performed quite easily: one should just explore the percolation cluster containing the origin, repeating the algorithm up to have the desired size, and perform anticipated rejection on small clusters. The peculiar factor $1/n$ has a trivial explanation in this case: when the underlying lattice is face-transitive (as is the case for the square, hexagonal and triangular lattices, for example), without loss of generality we can consider polyominoes rooted at one face, as there is a 1-to- n correspondence between unrooted and rooted objects. In particular

the corresponding enumeration series is just $nA_n^{\mathcal{L}}$, and all statistical averages remain the same.

The measure induced by percolation is a simple illustration of how modifications of the uniform measure induced by a Statistical Mechanics model on the whole plane, although apparently more complicated, may be more accessible than the uniform measure. Exploring one certain class of examples within this framework, namely the ones induced by the Abelian Sandpile Model (ASM) of Statistical Mechanics [12] (which is related to Uniform Spanning Trees, that is, the q -state Potts model in the limit $q \rightarrow 0$), is the topic of this paper. Contrarily to the model of percolation (and, more generally, of critical q -colour Potts Model), this model induces measures on polyominoes supported on the simply-connected ones, that is, our (grand canonical) measures $\mu(P)$ will be non-zero if and only if the polyomino P has no holes.

Other natural measures on lattice animals, with a large literature, that we do not mention at length in this paper are for example the *Diffusion-Limited Aggregation* model (DLA) or the *Eden Model* [3, 13, 29, 40]. These models are, yet again, simpler versions of the uniform measure over polyominoes, but, contrarily to the point stressed here, the simplification does not come from the fact that the measure is defined in terms of a Statistical Mechanics model, but rather from the fact that the configurations can be generated by iteratively adding the unit elements one by one, with some growth rule.

2 Avalanches in the Abelian Sandpile Model and polyominoes

The *Abelian Sandpile Model* [1] is a lattice automaton in the class of out-of-equilibrium models in Statistical Mechanics. Pictorially, it is a model in which some “sand” arrives in the system, according to some protocol, and then the local instabilities are relaxed through some “sand avalanches”, which are possibly large, so that the sand can ultimately leave the system through its boundary. When a single grain of sand is added, provided that an avalanche occurs, every site has performed either a positive number of topplings, or none, and the set of sites which have performed at least one toppling is connected, and thus constitutes a non-empty polyomino. Here we shall give a short introduction to the formalism, following in part the notations of [6, 12].

By the celebrated work of Dhar and collaborators [11, 12, 26, 27], it is known that, under the protocol in which the sand is added randomly and uniformly, the steady-state probability distribution of the sand configurations is supported on the so-called “recurrent configurations”, and is uniform. Also, the uniform measure is stable under addition of any given configuration, followed by relaxation. These configurations are characterised by the avoidance of an infinite list of “forbidden subconfigurations” (FSC), and are in bijection with the spanning trees of the lattice, rooted at the boundary, through a (slightly non-canonical¹) algorithm called “burning test”. The relation between configurations and spanning trees is valid if we consider the boundary as a single site. If instead we prefer to keep a visual notation induced by the lattice, and do not connect the boundary edges among themselves, it is more precise to say that the relation is with rooted spanning forests, where each component of the forest is rooted at a boundary edge. Yet another characterisation of recurrent configurations is that, by adding a “frame identity” to the configuration and performing the resulting avalanches, the system goes back to the original configuration, and the avalanche consists in exactly one toppling per site (the frame identity Id_f is the configuration such that $\text{Id}_f(v)$ is the number of boundary edges incident on v).

It is useful to recall the main ideas of the Propp and Wilson LERW algorithm [33] for the exact sampling of rooted spanning trees, or more generally rooted spanning forests. The algorithm, for a

¹The bijection is described in terms of an auxiliary data structure: for each site, one shall choose a total ordering of the incident edges.

generic graph with boundary edges, goes as follows. Choose any ordering of the sites of the domain (excluding the boundary). Initialise the *absorbing set* to the boundary. Then, for every site, if it is not already in the absorbing set, start a random walk from the site (with rates associated to the Laplacian matrix of the graph), up to reaching the absorbing set, and add to the absorbing set the loop-erasure of this walk (performed in the time ordering of the walk). At the end of the algorithm we have a rooted spanning forest, with roots on the initial absorbing set, uniformly sampled, and in bijection with recurrent configurations through the burning test.

From the point of view of Statistical Mechanics, the most natural measure on sand configurations is the uniform measure on recurrent configurations. From this point onward, our constructions will be tacitly assumed to be performed over sand configurations sampled with this measure.

Some reflection shows that, for an avalanche to produce a non-simply-connected polyomino, it shall surround a FSC, thus the measure on polyominoes induced by avalanches on uniform random recurrent configurations is supported on the simply-connected subfamily. This remark is implicit in the work of Dhar, and appears explicitly for example in [34].

In general, avalanches may involve more than one toppling on certain sites, a well-known fact which has led to the definition of “waves of avalanches”, in [21]. The characterisation of recurrent configurations has an implication on the wave decomposition. Indeed, for any recurrent configuration z , the relaxation of $z + \text{Id}_f$ gives again z , through an avalanche that makes each site topple exactly once. As a result, for every portion of the frame identity, $0 \prec u \prec \text{Id}_f$, the relaxation of $z + u$ must produce an avalanche that makes each site topple either one or zero times, and the support of sites which have not toppled must remain accessible from the boundary, as they will be toppling if we now add $\text{Id}_f - u$ to the configuration and relax. In other words, if we add the amount of sand described by $0 \prec u \prec \text{Id}_f$, the resulting avalanche will contain no more than a single wave. We shall call *boundary avalanche* an avalanche induced by a u of this form.

The study of the probability distribution of avalanches, and possibly of the single waves, has been performed since the early days of the model, but has proven difficult and controversial, and also complicated to analyse on numerical experiments, because of strong finite-size corrections [2, 21, 24, 28, 31, 32]. Part of the complicity is due to the interplay among the different waves (cf. in particular [31]). It is thus conceivable that the study of boundary avalanches does not suffer of the same pathologies as for generic avalanches.

For definiteness, let us describe a process consisting of single-site boundary avalanches, that we shall call the *permutation boundary avalanche process*. Let us call V the number of sites in the domain (i.e. its “volume”), $\mathcal{B} \subset E$ the set of boundary edges, and $B = |\mathcal{B}| = |\text{Id}_f|$ the number of boundary edges (which is also the number of sand grains in the frame identity). Let $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_B$ be a random permutation of the boundary edges. We can add the grains of sand constituting Id_f one by one, in the order given by σ , and register the B (possibly empty) avalanches. By the abelianity properties of the ASM, the collection of all the B supports of the avalanches (i.e., the B polyominoes) coincides with the avalanche due to the addition of the whole frame identity, and thus constitutes a partition of the domain. By the stability of the uniform measure on recurrent configuration under addition of deterministic configurations, for every $1 \leq k \leq B$, the probability distribution over the polyomino associated to b_k , the k -th boundary edge in the order of σ , is only a function of the boundary edge itself, and not of the position it occupies in the ordering σ . In particular, if v_b is the average size of the polyomino associated to a boundary avalanche due to the boundary edge b , we must have $\sum_b v_b = V$ (again, regardless of the choice of σ). In particular, on a lattice in which the boundary edges are all equivalent (i.e., on “boundary-edge-transitive graphs”²),

²That is, graphs G with an outer boundary \mathcal{B} s.t., for all $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists $g \in \text{Aut}(G)$ s.t. $g(b_1) = b_2$.

we must have $v_b = V/B$ for all b .

A strongly related process, that we shall call the *BT boundary avalanche process*, is more directly related to the burning test, and the Propp and Wilson algorithm for generating uniform rooted spanning trees [33]. In this case, for each site v we shall choose, once and for all, a total ordering \mathcal{O} of the set of incident edges. We shall now add the whole Id_f , and perform the relaxation in parallel. The sand grains of Id_f are “coloured” in B different colours. Each site v will become unstable at some moment of the avalanche, that is, it will have a height $h + c$, where k is the maximal allowed stable height, and $1 \leq c \leq d(v)$. The colour of the site v is inherited from the colour of the site u which has donated the c -th grain of sand among those which have been donated to v at the present stage of the avalanche, where “the c -th” neighbour is defined according to the given ordering \mathcal{O} . We can visualise the process of colour inheritance by drawing an oriented edge (uv) in this case. The overall set of oriented edges added in this way describes the rooted spanning forest which, through the burning test, is in bijection with the given recurrent configuration. And, as we have mentioned, the partition of the domain into polyominoes can be studied in terms of the components of the forest obtained through the Propp and Wilson algorithm.

We must have some values v'_b (in principle different from the v_b 's) for the average size of the polyomino associated to the tree rooted on the boundary edge b , with $\sum_b v'_b = V$. The independence of the set of spanning forests from the choice of ordering \mathcal{O} implies that the v_b 's do not depend on \mathcal{O} , and thus, in particular, on a boundary-edge-transitive graph, we have $v'_b = V/B$ for all b .

A crucial non-trivial fact is that the permutation boundary avalanche process and the BT boundary avalanche process are in fact *the same probabilistic process*. A way of seeing this is to realise that in the permutation boundary avalanche process, for any given σ , we can construct some trees on the various avalanches, following the rules of the burning test. Conditioning the sand configuration z to have some avalanche support $P = P_{b_1}$ for the boundary avalanche associated to the boundary edge b_1 corresponds to say that $z|_P$ is recurrent for an ASM model defined on a suitable restriction of the domain to $G \setminus P$, with appropriate boundary conditions, and that the heights in the sites adjacent to P are such that, after the topplings on P have been performed, no site has reached its critical height value (this condition can be rephrased by a shift of both the height values and the critical height values at these sites). We can use this argument repeatedly, for all b in \mathcal{B} in the order given by σ , to deduce that the spanning forests constructed from the permutation boundary avalanche process for the given σ , applied to the list of all recurrent configurations, produce the list of all spanning forests on the domain, with no repetitions. In particular, $v'_b = v_b$ for all b , and more generally we can calculate any observable for one process using the defining properties of the other process (we will use this argument several times in the following sections). See Figure 1 for an illustration.

A typical example of boundary-edge-transitive domain is a $L_x \times L_y$ cylinder, in which (say) L_x is the periodicity and L_y is the distance between the two portions of the boundary. In this case $V/B = L_y/2$, and thus is a divergent quantity if we perform the thermodynamic limit $V \rightarrow \infty$ by keeping the aspect ratio fixed. We shall call this case the *cylinder geometry*. A variant of this geometry is again a $L_x \times L_y$ cylinder, but now, instead of having two open boundaries, we have an open boundary and a “folded” boundary, that is, a toppling at (i, j) on this boundary leaves one particle at (i, j) , and gives out three particles, in the directions W,S,E. We shall call this case the *folded cylinder geometry*. Note that the folded geometry can be interpreted as an ordinary geometry $L_x \times 2L_y$, where we restrict to configurations which are symmetric under horizontal reflection (and add the sand to the system accordingly).

Some examples of realisations of this process are given in Figure 4 at the end of this paper.




Figure 1: An example of the correspondence between the BT boundary avalanche process and the permutation boundary avalanche processes for the possible choices of σ , for the small graph with $V = 3$ and $B = 2$ depicted on the top-left corner. Top: the list of the 7 spanning forests, and the corresponding list of $(|T_1|, |T_2|)$. Bottom: the 7 recurrent configurations, and the associated lists of $(|P_1|, |P_2|)$ for the 2 permutations of the boundary edges. The three unordered lists are the same (namely, $(3, 0)$, $(2, 1)$, $(1, 2)$ and $(0, 3)$ are repeated 2, 2, 1, 2 times, respectively), this being the consequence, for this graph, of the statement that the permutation boundary avalanche process and the BT boundary avalanche process on the uniform measure over recurrent configurations are the same probabilistic process.

3 Some accessible observables in the Boundary Avalanche Process

In this section we want to evaluate some statistical observables in the Boundary Avalanche Process. The key idea is that we can use the bijection between the implementation of the burning test and the construction of spanning forests rooted at the boundary edges. Then, we can use either the implications of the Propp and Wilson LERW algorithm [33], or also, more directly, the Kirchhoff Matrix-Tree Theorem, by evaluating determinants of suitable Laplacian matrices. Not surprisingly, these probabilities will turn out to be ratios of determinants of very similar matrices, so that in fact, by the Jacobi's theorem on complementary minors, through "small" determinants involving the inverse of the Laplacian matrix (that is, the Green's function).

Note however that not all the potentially useful observables can be calculated directly by this method. For reasons reminiscent of the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot lemma, or the Kasteleyn solution of the Dimer Model on bipartite planar graphs, probabilities of events are accessible only if some topological property of the event guarantees that the signs appearing in the determinant are controlled.

A useful formalism goes through Grassmann calculus, that is, a representation of determinants (and determinants of minors) as formal Gaussian integrals over complex scalar non-commuting variables, as described in detail in [8, 20]. In this case, the roots $R = \{r_i\}$ of the forests are described by factors $\bar{\psi}_{r_i} \psi_{r_i}$ in the integrand, while the factor $\bar{\psi}_{u_1} \psi_{v_1} \cdots \bar{\psi}_{u_k} \psi_{v_k}$ implements the fact that the vertices in some ordered list $U = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ are connected pairwise to the vertices in the list $V = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ (according to some permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k$, that is, u_j is in the same component than $v_{\sigma(j)}$, and is not in the same component of any other u_i , or v_i , or r_i). However, such an event comes with a sign equal to the signature of σ . That is, for the three lists $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_h\}$, $U = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ and $V = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$, we will consider Grassmann integrals of the form

$$Z_{R,U,V} = \int \mathcal{D}(\psi, \bar{\psi}) \left(\prod_{r \in R} \bar{\psi}_r \psi_r \right) \bar{\psi}_{u_1} \psi_{v_1} \cdots \bar{\psi}_{u_k} \psi_{v_k} e^{\bar{\psi} L \psi}. \quad (1)$$

The consequence of the Kirchhoff Theorem is that these expressions count (with signs) certain $h + k$ -component spanning forests of the graph,

$$Z_{R,U,V} = \sum_{\substack{F=\{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{h+k}\} \subseteq G \\ r_i \in T_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k \\ u_i, v_{\sigma(i)} \in T_{k+i} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h}} \varepsilon(\sigma). \tag{2}$$

The explicit calculations on a generic weighted digraph \mathcal{G} (with a boundary), such that the sum of the weights of the outgoing edges of a vertex is the same for all vertices, involve the graph Green’s functions $G(u, v)$, identified by the defining equation $L_u G(u, v) = \delta_{u,v}$, where $L_u f(u) = \sum_{(uu')} w_{(uu')} (f(u') - f(u))$ is the graph (weighted) Laplacian (w.r.t. position u). The collection of the “boundary Green’s functions” $G(u, v)$, for v on the boundary of \mathcal{G} , corresponds to the probabilities that a random walk, starting at u , diffusing with the weights w_e and absorbed at the boundary, terminates in v . Thus, in particular,

$$\sum_{v \in \partial \mathcal{G}} G(u, v) = 1 \quad \forall u. \tag{3}$$

These remarks are of interest here because, as we will see, most of the interesting choices of (R, U, V) in (2) are such that (say) $U \cup R = \partial \mathcal{G}$, so that the relevant Green’s functions in the evaluation of $Z_{R,U,V}$ are indeed boundary Green’s functions in the sense above.

The calculations are more explicit on portions of regular lattices, and involve lattice sums on certain lattice Green functions on the domain, which, when the domain allows for the use of the “method of images”, can be constructed in terms of the lattice Green function of the infinite lattice under investigation (most notably, the square, triangular or hexagonal lattice). The theoretical investigation of lattice Green function has a long history, of which a breakthrough result is due to Lüscher and Weisz [25] (where an important ingredient is an observation of Vohwinkel unpublished elsewhere), which, for the square and triangular lattice, has been implemented in [35, 36] and in [10], respectively (recall that, as polyominoes are defined on the faces of the lattice, the Green function of the triangular lattice in fact relates to polyhexes). See also [7] for further details.

In order to calculate the algebraic asymptotic decay of probabilities of events, however, it is enough to use the asymptotic Green function, which for all lattices, once that the lattice spacing is rescaled in order to have unit density, is universally $G(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \ln |\vec{x}_1 - \vec{x}_2|^2$. However, in the special case of a straight boundary, the method of images implies that (say, for the square lattice) we have to consider the combination $G(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) - G(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2 - 2\hat{e}_y)$, that scales as $G_{\text{bd}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2}$ for $x^2 + y^2 \gg 1$ (for the triangular lattice with unit density, we have a correction factor $\alpha = 2^{\frac{1}{2}} 3^{-\frac{1}{4}}$).

A first warm-up example of observable can be the explicit check of the simple fact that any site must be in some tree of the forest. So we must have the identity

$$Z_{\mathcal{B}, \emptyset, \emptyset} = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} Z_{\mathcal{B} \setminus b, (b), (s)} \quad \forall s. \tag{4}$$

On a generic graph \mathcal{G} , and using the Kirchhoff Matrix-Tree Theorem and Jacobi minor formula, this is rephrased into the statement (3) above (and indeed the random walk defining the boundary Green’s function can be interpreted as the support for the first LERW in Propp and Wilson’s algorithm, when s is chosen to be the first vertex in the ordering).

It is instructive to check that, for the specific case of the square lattice and in a limit of $y \gg 1$,

$L_x, L_y \gg y$,³ the combinatorial statement above is in agreement with the identity

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2} \simeq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2} = 1 \quad \forall y, \quad (5)$$

(for the triangular lattice, a factor α^{-1} for the density of sites along a row cancels out with the scaling factor α in the Green's function).

A more interesting calculation consists (for example, in the case of hexagonal cells) in determining the probability that the vertex in (x, y) is a triple point of the process, that is, its three adjacent hexagonal faces are in three different polyominoes. The fact that 3 is an odd number, that the set U is on the outer boundary and the set V consists of adjacent faces implies that the annoying signs are in fact protected, that is, of the six possible permutations, only the three connectivity patterns with equal signature are allowed. For $y \gg 1$ the probability that (x, y) is a triple point, and the three adjacent polyominoes are rooted on the points (x_1, x_2, x_3) , is given (up to a simple scaling factor for the lattice spacings, and in a limit $L_x, L_y \gg x, y, x_1, x_2, x_3$) by the determinant of the matrix

$$M[x, y, (x_1, x_2, x_3)] = \left(\frac{y}{(x_i - x)^2 + y^2}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{y}{(x_i - x)^2 + y^2}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \frac{y}{(x_i - x)^2 + y^2} \right)_{i=1,2,3} \quad (6)$$

Integrating over x and y gives the overall probability that the polyominoes rooted on the real axis at coordinates (x_1, x_2, x_3) share a triple point. A calculation shows that this probability is proportional to the inverse of the Vandermonde factor,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \int_0^{\infty} dy \det M[x, y, (x_1, x_2, x_3)] \propto \frac{1}{(x_3 - x_2)(x_3 - x_1)(x_2 - x_1)}. \quad (7)$$

Integrating over the x_i 's, at $x = 0$, gives the overall probability that $(0, y)$ is a triple point, which is, for y large enough,

$$\int_{-\infty \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq x_3 \leq \infty} dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \det M[0, y, (x_1, x_2, x_3)] = \frac{1}{2\pi y^2}. \quad (8)$$

Indeed, the algebraic decay $1/y^2$ is integrable at infinity, a fact in agreement with the deterministic information that there are exactly $L_x - 2$ triple points in a configuration on a folded cylinder, that is, asymptotically on average one triple point per column.

Now we calculate an observable in which the role of the signs is more subtle. Consider a realisation of the boundary avalanche process, in a limit $L_x, L_y \rightarrow \infty$, so that the boundary vertices can be totally ordered along \mathbb{Z} . For $i < j$, if the polyominoes P_i and P_j share a boundary, then they have exactly two triple points, with some polyominoes $P_{k_{\text{int}}(i,j)}$ and $P_{k_{\text{ext}}(i,j)}$. A peculiar fact is that, of these two vertices, only one will be in the range $\{i + 1, \dots, j - 1\}$ (we will set it to be $k_{\text{int}}(i, j)$). So we can define unambiguously the vector $\vec{v}_{ij} = t_{i,j,k_{\text{ext}}(i,j)} - t_{i,j,k_{\text{int}}(i,j)}$, where $t_{i,j,l}$ is the triple point between the polyominoes P_i , P_j and P_l , and set $\vec{v}_{ij} = 0$ if P_i and P_j do not share a boundary. Now, given two adjacent faces v_1, v_2 , consider $Z_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{u_i, u_j\}, \{u_i, u_j\}, \{v_1, v_2\}}$. This quantity gives the probability that $v_1 \in P_i$ and $v_2 \in P_j$, minus the probability that $v_1 \in P_j$ and $v_2 \in P_i$. Call $e'_{v_1, v_2} = (v'_1, v'_2)$ the oriented dual edge associated to the oriented edge (v_1, v_2) . Remark that

$$\sum_{(v_1, v_2)} e'_{v_1, v_2} Z_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{u_i, u_j\}, \{u_i, u_j\}, \{v_1, v_2\}} = \mathbb{E} \vec{v}_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

³In this limit we can use the asymptotic form of the boundary Green's function given above, and, as it will be useful only later on, trade lattice derivatives with ordinary derivatives.

Indeed, the boundary between P_i and P_j is a polygonal curve resulting from the concatenation of dual edges (in either orientation), going from $t_{i,j,k_{\text{int}}(i,j)}$ to $t_{i,j,k_{\text{ext}}(i,j)}$.

Similar arguments give, for a region Ω ,

$$\sum_{(v_1, v_2): v'_1 \in \Omega, v'_2 \notin \Omega} Z_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{u_i, u_j\}, \{u_i, u_j\}, \{v_1, v_2\}} = \mathbb{P}(t_{i,j,k_{\text{int}}(i,j)} \in \Omega, t_{i,j,k_{\text{ext}}(i,j)} \notin \Omega) - \mathbb{P}(t_{i,j,k_{\text{ext}}(i,j)} \in \Omega, t_{i,j,k_{\text{int}}(i,j)} \notin \Omega). \quad (10)$$

Calculations of the asymptotic behaviour of observables of this form rely on the evaluation of the quantities $Z_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{u_i, u_j\}, \{u_i, u_j\}, \{v_1, v_2\}}$, which are related to the evaluation of the determinant of a matrix of the form

$$M'[x, y, (x_1, x_2)] = \left(\frac{y}{(x_i - x)^2 + y^2}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{y}{(x_i - x)^2 + y^2} \right)_{i=1,2}. \quad (11)$$

In particular, taking as Ω the half-plane above height y , and summing over all pairs $i < j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L_x} \sum_{i < j} (\mathbb{P}(t_{i,j,k_{\text{int}}(i,j)} \in \Omega, t_{i,j,k_{\text{ext}}(i,j)} \notin \Omega) - \mathbb{P}(t_{i,j,k_{\text{ext}}(i,j)} \in \Omega, t_{i,j,k_{\text{int}}(i,j)} \notin \Omega)) \\ = \int_{-\infty \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \infty} dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \det M'[0, y, (x_1, x_2)] = \frac{1}{\pi y}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now the algebraic decay $1/y$ is not integrable at infinity, and gives a sensible information on the fractal properties of the process. We discuss the implications of this calculation in the next section.

4 A scaling argument

We shall try to give a prediction for the asymptotic behaviour of the tail of the probability distribution for the boundary avalanches. Say that we are in a cylinder with aspect ratio of order 1. Let us suppose that, on some length scales much larger than the lattice spacing, and much smaller than the size of the domain, the process of boundary avalanches is approximatively scale invariant. Then, the distribution of the sizes of the avalanches must be a power law for the range $1 \ll n \ll L^2$, and then must be truncated by the finiteness of the domain, i.e.

$$p_L(n) \sim \begin{cases} n^{-\gamma} & n \ll L^2 \\ 0 & n \gg L^2 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

The value of γ , unknown up to this point, can now be determined: indeed we know that $\sum_n n p_L(n) \sim L$, and such a behaviour is compatible with a single value of γ , namely $\gamma = \frac{3}{2}$. In other words, we expect that $\mathbb{P}_L(n(P) > n) \sim n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for $1 \ll n \ll L^2$.

This sketchy prediction seems numerically verified, but somewhat “for the wrong reasons”. A more detailed description of the truly scale-invariant process of boundary avalanches should be given in a regime in which the geometry of the cylinder does not introduce a new finite parameter in the model, that is, in a regime $L_y \gg L \gg 1$ (in this section it is convenient to adopt the notation $L_x = L$). In this case we do not see anymore the effect of the top boundary of the cylinder, or a difference between the cylinder and the folded-cylinder geometries, and we shall expect that there exists almost surely one “giant avalanche”, occupying a fraction $1 - \mathcal{O}(L/L_y)$ of the volume, so that the probability distribution may take the form




Figure 2: Averages of the k -th largest polyomino in a process (except the giant one), multiplied by k^2 , and rescaled so that the first value is 1, on the data presented in Figure 3. A far-fetching conjecture based on the formula (12) would suggest that this function is 1, up to values of $k \ll L_x$.

(calling $V = LL_y$, the volume)

$$p_L(n) \sim \begin{cases} n^{-\gamma} & n \ll L^2 \\ o(n^{-\gamma}) & L^2 \ll n \ll V \\ p'_L(n) & n = V - \mathcal{O}(L^2) \\ 0 & n > V \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where $\sum_n p'_L(n) = 1/L$, and again we must have $\gamma > 1$. This implies for the average

$$\frac{V}{L} = \mathbb{E}(|P|) = \frac{V - \Theta(L^2)}{L} + \int^{L^2} dx x^{1-\gamma} = \frac{V}{L} - \Theta(L) + \Theta((L^2)^{2-\gamma}) \quad (15)$$

which requires

$$1 = 2(2 - \gamma) \quad (16)$$

that is, again $\gamma = 3/2$.

It is not completely evident that, except for the trivial giant avalanche, the process of boundary avalanches occupies a height of order L of the domain, and that the second largest avalanche is on a scale $\sim L^2$. However, this can be established through the calculation, performed in (12), of the average number of interfaces between pairs of polyominoes that reach height y , which scales as $L/(\pi y)$. So, this average goes from $\gg 1$ to $\ll 1$ when y goes from much smaller than L/π to much larger than L/π . As avalanches have possibly fractal boundaries, but their interior has Hausdorff dimension 2, we deduce that the second largest avalanche must have a volume on the scale $\sim L^2$. Then, as the appearance of each further avalanche approximately adds one to the number of interfaces, from the behaviour in L/y of our observable we may deduce that the average sizes of avalanches listed in decreasing order (and excluding the giant one) may form a sequence not too far from the series CL^2/k^2 , for some constant C , up to values of k so that the avalanches have macroscopic sizes. It is remarkable that such a far-fetching prediction is vaguely in accordance with the numerics, even at relatively small sizes (cf. Figure 2).




Figure 3: Left: plot of the ordered list of 10^4 avalanche sizes, for a folded-cylinder geometry on the square lattice, of size 101×158 . We adopt a log-log plot, with a superposed red line of slope $-1/2$, which highlights the validity of the ansatz in equation (14) in this case. Right: plot of the ordered list of $L_x \times 10^2 = 10100$ avalanche sizes, for 100 realisations of the permutation process.

Note that, as yet another consequence of the properties of the ASM, the probability distribution for the avalanche process, shown in the bottom of Figure 3, and for the single-site boundary avalanches, shown in the top of the same figure, are essentially coincident (except for the fact that the fraction of giant avalanches in the first case is exactly equal to $1/L$, while in the second case it is only approximately equal to this value, with Gaussian fluctuations on a scale compatible with an approximation of independent events). Indeed, as explained above, the coincidence of these two distributions is implied by the principles of the Abelian Sandpile Model, while the scaling ansatz only concerns the determination of the qualitative properties of this function.

Arguments of this type have been a *leitmotif* of this paper: the relation between apparently different boundary avalanche processes has allowed us to deduce fine statistical properties for each of them (and in particular for the most basic procedure, of a single-site boundary avalanche), by using each time the most convenient formulation. Without using this multiplicity of definitions, we wouldn't have been able to perform most of our calculations.

References

- [1] Per Bak, Chao Tang & Kurt Wiesenfeld (1987): *Self-organized criticality: An explanation of the $1/f$ noise*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 59, pp. 381–384, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.381.
- [2] Per Bak, Chao Tang & Kurt Wiesenfeld (1988): *Self-organized criticality*. *Phys. Rev. A* 38, pp. 364–374, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.38.364.
- [3] R. Ball, M. Nauenberg & T. A. Witten (1984): *Diffusion-controlled aggregation in the continuum approximation*. *Phys. Rev. A* 29, pp. 2017–2020, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.29.2017.
- [4] Gunnar Brinkmann, Gilles Caporossi & Pierre Hansen (2003): *A Survey and New Results on Computer Enumeration of Polyhex and Fusene Hydrocarbons*. *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences* 43(3), pp. 842–851, doi:10.1021/ci025526c.
- [5] Jon Brunvoll, Björg N. Cyvin & Sven J. Cyvin (1992): *Benzenoid chemical isomers and their enumeration*, pp. 181–221. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, doi:10.1007/BFb0018564.




Figure 4: Some examples of realisations of the permutation boundary avalanche process on the square lattice in a folded-cylinder geometry with $L_x = 101$ (only the most relevant part of the cylinder is shown). The hue value of the colour describes the position of the corresponding boundary edge in the permutation σ .

- [6] S. Caracciolo, G. Paoletti & A. Sportiello (2012): *Multiple and inverse topplings in the Abelian Sandpile Model*. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* 212(1), pp. 23–44, doi:10.1140/epjst/e2012-01652-9.
- [7] Sergio Caracciolo & Andrea Pelissetto (1998): *Corrections to finite-size scaling in the lattice N -vector model for $N = \infty$* . *Phys. Rev. D* 58, p. 105007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.58.105007.
- [8] Sergio Caracciolo, Alan D Sokal & Andrea Sportiello (2007): *Grassmann integral representation for spanning hyperforests*. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 40(46), p. 13799, doi:10.1088/1751-8113/40/46/001.
- [9] Björg N. Cyvin, Jon Brunvoll & Sven J. Cyvin (1992): *Enumeration of benzenoid systems and other polyhexes*, pp. 65–180. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, doi:10.1007/BFb0018563.
- [10] C. De Grandi (2005): *Fermionic field theory for trees and forests on the triangular lattice*. Laurea thesis, Univ. degli Studi di Milano. Available at <https://pcteserver.mi.infn.it/~caraccio/Lauree/DeGrandi.pdf>. Note.
- [11] D Dhar, P Ruelle, S Sen & D N Verma (1995): *Algebraic aspects of Abelian sandpile models*. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 28(4), p. 805, doi:10.1088/0305-4470/28/4/009.
- [12] Deepak Dhar (1999): *The Abelian sandpile and related models*. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 263(1), pp. 4–25, doi:10.1016/S0378-4371(98)00493-2. Proceedings of the 20th IUPAP International Conference on Statistical Physics.
- [13] M. Eden (1961): *A Two-Dimensional Growth Process*. In F. Neyman, editor: *Proceeding of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, IV*, University of California, p. 223.
- [14] Ian G. Enting & Iwan Jensen (2009): *Exact Enumerations*, pp. 143–179. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-9927-4.

- [15] Martin Gardner (1960): *MATHEMATICAL GAMES*. *Scientific American* 203(5), pp. 186–201, doi:10.1038/scientificamerican1160-186. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24940703>.
- [16] Solomon W. Golomb (1994): *Puzzles, Patterns, Problems, and Packings*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, doi:10.1515/9780691215051.
- [17] Branko Grünbaum & Geoffrey Colin Shephard (1989): *Tilings and patterns. An introduction*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- [18] Anthony J. Guttmann (2009): *History and Introduction to Polygon Models and Polyominoes*, pp. 1–21. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-9927-4.
- [19] Frank Harary & Edgar M. Palmer (1973): *Graphical Enumeration*. Academic Press, doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-324245-7.50008. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B978012324245750008>.
- [20] Claude Itzykson & Jean-Michel Drouffe (1989): *Statistical Field Theory. Volume 1: From Brownian Motion to Renormalization and Lattice Gauge Theory*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511622786.
- [21] E.V. Ivashkevich, D.V. Ktitarov & V.B. Priezzhev (1994): *Waves of topplings in an Abelian sandpile*. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 209(3), pp. 347–360, doi:10.1016/0378-4371(94)90188-0.
- [22] Iwan Jensen (2001): *Enumerations of Lattice Animals and Trees*. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 102(3), pp. 865–881, doi:10.1023/A:1004855020556.
- [23] Iwan Jensen & Anthony J Guttmann (2000): *Statistics of lattice animals (polyominoes) and polygons*. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 33(29), pp. L257–L263, doi:10.1088/0305-4470/33/29/102.
- [24] D. V. Ktitarov & V. B. Priezzhev (1998): *Expansion and contraction of avalanches in the two-dimensional Abelian sandpile*. *Phys. Rev. E* 58, pp. 2883–2888, doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.58.2883.
- [25] Martin Lüscher & Peter Weisz (1995): *Coordinate space methods for the evaluation of Feynman diagrams in lattice field theories*. *Nuclear Physics B* 445(2), pp. 429–450, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(95)00185-U.
- [26] S N Majumdar & D Dhar (1991): *Height correlations in the Abelian sandpile model*. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 24(7), p. L357, doi:10.1088/0305-4470/24/7/008.
- [27] S.N. Majumdar & Deepak Dhar (1992): *Equivalence between the Abelian sandpile model and the $q \rightarrow 0$ limit of the Potts model*. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 185(1), pp. 129–145, doi:10.1016/0378-4371(92)90447-X.
- [28] S.S. Manna (1991): *Critical exponents of the sand pile models in two dimensions*. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 179(2), pp. 249–268, doi:10.1016/0378-4371(91)90063-L.
- [29] P Meakin (1988): *Models for Colloidal Aggregation*. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* 39(Volume 39), pp. 237–267, doi:10.1146/annurev.pc.39.100188.001321.
- [30] Wolfgang R. Müller, Klaus Szymanski, Jan von Knop & Nenad Trinajstić (1993): *On the number of square-cell configurations*. *Theoretica chimica acta* 86, pp. 269–278, doi:10.1007/BF01130823.
- [31] Maya Paczuski & Stefan Boettcher (1997): *Avalanches and waves in the Abelian sandpile model*. *Phys. Rev. E* 56, pp. R3745–R3748, doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.56.R3745.
- [32] V. B. Priezzhev, D. V. Ktitarov & E. V. Ivashkevich (1996): *Formation of Avalanches and Critical Exponents in an Abelian Sandpile Model*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 76, pp. 2093–2096, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.76.2093.
- [33] James Gary Propp & David Bruce Wilson (1998): *How to Get a Perfectly Random Sample from a Generic Markov Chain and Generate a Random Spanning Tree of a Directed Graph*. *Journal of Algorithms* 27(2), pp. 170–217, doi:10.1006/jagm.1997.0917.
- [34] Frank Redig (2006): *Mathematical Aspects of the Abelian Sandpile Model*. In Anton Bovier, François Dunlop, Aernout van Enter, Frank den Hollander & Jean Dalibard, editors: *Mathematical Statistical Physics, Les Houches* 83, Elsevier, pp. 657–729, doi:10.1016/S0924-8099(06)80051-X.
- [35] Dong-Shin Shin (1998): *Application of a coordinate-space method for the evaluation of lattice Feynman diagrams in two dimensions*. *Nuclear Physics B* 525(1), pp. 457–482, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00232-6.

- [36] Dong-Shin Shin (1999): *Correction to four-loop RG functions in the two-dimensional lattice $O(n)$ σ -model*. *Nuclear Physics B* 546(3), pp. 669–690, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00020-6.
- [37] Nenad Trinajstić (1992): *On the classification of polyhexes*. *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry* 9, pp. 373–380, doi:10.1007/BF01166101.
- [38] Nenad Trinajstić, Jan von Knop, Wolfgang R. Müller, Konrad Syzmański & Sonja Nikolić (1991): *Computational Chemical Graph Theory: Characterization, Enumeration and Generation of Chemical Structures by Computer Methods*. Ellis Horwood.
- [39] S.G. Whittington & C.E. Soteros (1990): *Lattice Animals: Rigorous Results and Wild Guesses*. In Geoffrey Grimmett & Dominic Welsh, editors: *Disorder in Physical Systems: A Volume in Honour of John M. Hammersley*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 323–335. Available at <http://www.statslab.cam.ac.uk/~grg/books/jmh.html>.
- [40] T. A. Witten & L. M. Sander (1981): *Diffusion-Limited Aggregation, a Kinetic Critical Phenomenon*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 47, pp. 1400–1403, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.47.1400.
- [41] Jean Zinn-Justin (2002): *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena; 4th ed.* International series of monographs on physics, Clarendon Press, Oxford, doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198509233.001.0001.