Testing the Universality of Self-Organized Criticality in Galactic, Extra-Galactic, and Black-Hole Systems

MARKUS J. ASCHWANDEN¹ AND ERSIN GÖĞÜŞ²

¹Lockheed Martin, Solar and Astrophysics Laboratory (LMSAL), Advanced Technology Center (ATC), A021S, Bldg.252, 3251 Hanover St., Palo Alto, CA 94304, USA; e-mail: markus.josef.aschwanden@gmail.com

²SabancıUniversity, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Tuzla, İstanbul 34956, Türkiye; e-mail: ersing@sabanciuniv.edu

ABSTRACT

In this study we are testing whether the power law slopes (α_F, α_E) of fluxes (F), fluences or energies (E) are universal in their size distributions, $N(F) \propto F^{-\alpha_F}$ and $N(E) \propto E^{-\alpha_E}$, in astrophysical observations of galactic, extragalactic, and black-hole systems. This is a test of fundamental importance for self-organized criticality (SOC) systems. The test decides whether (i) power laws are a natural consequence of the scale-freeness and inherent universality of SOC systems, or (ii) if they depend on more complex physical scaling laws. The former criterion allows quantitative predictions of the power law-like size distributions, while the later criterion requires individual physical modeling for each SOC variable and data set. Our statistical test, carried out with 61 published data sets, yields strong support for the former option, which implies that observed power laws can simply be derived from the scale-freeness and on not require specific physical models to understand their statistical distributions. The observations show a mean and standard deviation of $\alpha_F = 1.78 \pm 0.29$ for SOC fluxes, and $\alpha_E = 1.66 \pm 0.22$ for SOC fluences, and thus are consistent with the prediction of the fractal-diffusive SOC model, with $\alpha_F = 1.80$ and $\alpha_E = 1.67$.

Keywords: methods: statistical — fractal dimension — self-organized criticality —

1. INTRODUCTION

This study addresses aspects of nonlinear physics and complexity physics applied to astrophysical phenomena. This new field of research started with the notion of fractal geometry (see textbooks of Mandelbrot 1977 and Feder 1988). This new focus developed into the concept of *self-organized criticality (SOC)* (Katz 1986; Bak et al. 1987; 1988; Bak 1996), which mostly deals with the statistics of nonlinear events, also called avalanches or catastrophes. On the observational side, it was found that power law size distributions (or occurrence frequency distributions) represent reliable hallmarks of SOC avalanche processes, while on the theoretical side, cellular automaton models appear to mimic SOC processes adequately on a microscopic level (see textbooks by Pruessner 2012; Charbonneau 2017; Jensen 2023). Early applications of the SOC model to solar physics observations and simulations were presented in Lu and Hamilton (1991). Extensive applications to other astrophysical phenomena were pursued thereafter (Aschwanden et al. 2016).

The main motivation of this endeavour is the aim to obtain a deeper physical understanding of SOC models, which requires theoretical models that are sufficiently detailed to produce quantitative theoretical predictions. At this point we observe many phenomena with power law-like size distributions in nature (in astrophysics, magnetospheric physics, geophysics, biophysics, sociophysics, etc.), but we do not understand why power laws exist, why they have specific values for the power law slopes, which parameters have universality, and what is the role of waiting time distributions. While older SOC studies adhere to the original Bak-Tang-Wiesenfeld (BTW) model, based on microscopic next-neighbor interactions in lattice grids, the newer SOC studies are quantified in terms of macroscopic physical scaling laws, derived from the scale-free probability distribution function. The latter model is formulated in terms of the so-called standard fractal-diffusive self-organized criticality model (FD-SOC). The previously published textbook "Self-Organized Criticality in Astrophysics. The Statistics of Nonlinear Processes in the Universe" (Aschwanden 2011a)

contains many complementary aspects of SOC models, but does not contain any treatment of the FD-SOC model, which has been published later on (Aschwanden 2012a; 2014; Aschwanden et al. 2016).

The contents of this Paper are organized in observations and data analysis of galactic, extra-galactic, and black hole systems (Section 2), consisting of data selection (Section 2.1), observational instruments (Section 2.2), observed physical phenomena (Section 2.3), a description of the standard FD-SOC model (Section 2.4), the fluence model (Section 2.5), alternative SOC energy models (Section 2.6), and cellular automaton simulations (Section 2.7). The subsequent discussion of results (Section 3) includes the main results of size distributions (Section 3.1), the nonuniversality of waiting time distributions (Section 3.2), the effects of small-number statistics (Section 3.3), the choice of inertial ranges (Section 3.4), and a comparison of cosmological and solar data (Section 3.5). Conclusions are drawn in Section 4.

2. OBSERVATIONS AND DATA ANALYSIS

2.1. Data Selection

In this study we extract size distributions for the flux, $N(F) \propto F^{-\alpha_F}$, and for the energy, $N(E) \propto E^{-\alpha_E}$, from a comprehensive sample of 61 published data sets, obtained from galactic, extra-galactic, and black-hole system data. The acquisition of relevant data sets has been accomplished by specific searches of the term "Self-organized criticality (SOC)", extracted from the abstracts of the Astrophysics Data System (ADS) (funded by NASA). The references of these selected studies are tabulated in column 6 of Table 1 (for the SOC variable of the flux), and in column 6 of Table 2 (for the SOC variable of energy or fluence), both organized in chronological order. The diversity of various data sets and the wide-spread and interdisciplinary scope is intended to emphasize the aspect of SOC universality.

2.2. Observational Instruments

Most of the observational instruments used in the selected studies are spacecraft with detectors operating in soft X-ray and hard X-ray wavelengths, while a few ground-based instruments operate in radio wavelengths. Comparing different wavelength ranges is relevant because all radiation processes and physical emission mechanisms are wavelength-dependent. Thus, we list the covered instruments and wavelength or energy ranges as follows.

The European X-Ray Observatory SATellite (EXOSAT) provided data from the medium energy (ME) instrument, which operates in the energy range of 1-50 keV.

The German-built imaging X-Ray Telescope (XRT) on board ROSAT is sensitive to X-rays and Extreme Ultraviolet in the energy range of (0.1-2.4 keV), providing light curves from the High Resolution Imager (HRI).

The INTErnational Gamma-Ray Astrophysics Laboratory (INTEGRAL) is a medium-sized ESA mission and is optimized to surveying the hard X-ray sky in the energy range from 15 keV to 10 MeV.

The spacecraft Chandra with the ACIS-S/HETGS instrument provides 2-8 keV light curves of Sgr A^{*} in the center of the Milky Way during the Chandra X-Ray Visionary Project (XVP).

The Neil Gehrels Swift Observatory, previously called Swift Gamma-Ray Burst Explorer, is a space observatory designed to study Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRB) and to monitor the afterglow in X-rays, and UV/Visible light at the location of a burst, covering an energy range of 0.2-10 keV in soft X-rays, and in a wavelength range of 170-650 nm in UV/V. The all-sky hard X-ray survey detector on board Swift, Burst Alet Telescope (BAT) detects photons in the energy range of 15-150 keV.

The Kepler Space Telescope is a space telescope launched by NASA in 2009 and lasted until 2018, designed to discover (occulting) Earth-sized planets orbiting other stars, operating in the wavelength range of 430-890 nm.

XMM-Newton, also known as the High Throughput X-Ray Spectroscopy Mission and the X-Ray Multi-Mirror Mission (XMM), is an X-ray observatory lauched by the European Space Emission (ESA), is tasked with investigating interstellar X-Ray sources and performs joint spectroscopy in both X-rays and visible/ultraviolet, sensitive in the energy range of 0.1-12 keV (12-0.1 nm).

The Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope (FGST) performs all-sky gamma-ray observations and detects cosmological phenomena such as Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN), pulsars, and conducts searches for dark matter from a low Earth orbit, with the instrument Large Area Telescope (LAT), within an energy range of 20 MeV-300 GeV. Fermi also contains the Gamma-Ray Burst Monitor (GBM) which is sensitive to photon energies between 8 keV and 30 MeV.

The Hubble Space Telescope (HST) is one of the most versatile telescopes in space, with 2.4 meter aperture, launched in 1990, and is still functional after 35 years. Hubble is imaging in near-infrared (>750 nm), visible light (380-750 nm), and ultraviolet (<380 nm).

The Compton Gamma Ray Observatory (CGRO) was a space gamma-ray observatory detecting photons with energies from 20 keV to 30 GeV.

The Interplanetary Cometary Explorer (ICE), also called ISEE-3, recorded hard X-rays at energies of >30 keV.

The Rossi X-ray Timing Explorer (XTE) was designed to study temporal and spectral phenomena associated with galactic and extragalactic systems, containing compact objects in the energy range of 2-250 keV.

Besides the previously enumerated space-based instruments, ground-based radio interferometers have also been used to study SOC:

The Australian Square Kilometre Array Pathfinder (ASKAP) is a radio interferometer that is sensitive to celestial sources, such as galaxy formation or evolution of magnetic fields in galaxies, at wavelengths of 712-1000 MHz.

Arecibo radio interferometer observed Fast Radio Bursts (FRB) at 1.4 and 4.5 GHz.

The Very Large Array (VLA) recorded radio data at 3 GHz.

The Green Bank Telescope (GBT) is imaging in the wavelength range of 4-8 GHz.

Obviously, size distributions of SOC variables (e.g., fluxes or energies) can only be compared from different instruments if they are tuned to identical wavelength ranges. However, if SOC universality holds over some wavelength range, the size distributions are expected to be proportional to each other in the same wavelength range.

2.3. Observed Phenomena

Let us summarize the nomenclature of astrophysical phenomena used in our study of 35 flux and 26 energy cases. This list (enumerated in column 5 of Tables 1 and 2), includes about 10 different phenomena associated with galactic, extragalactic, and black-hole systems:

Gamma-ray bursts (GRB) afterglow are extremely energetic events occurring at cosmological distances, exhibiting light curves with highly variable pulses, detected at photon energies of $E_{phot} \leq 5$ keV to ≥ 300 GeV. Prompt gamma-ray emission is believed to be generated by internal dissipation processes from the collapse of massive stars (for long-duration pulses), while the later afterglow is produced through the shock wave interaction with the surrounding interstellar medium. Short-duration GRBs are thought to originate from mergers of two compact objects such as binary neutron stars or black hole-neutron star binaries (Meszaros and Rees 1992), once the jet has reached a sufficiently large distance from the central engine. Recent statistical SOC studies of GRBs can be found in Wang and Dai (2013), Yi et al. (2016), Lyu et al. (2020), Wei et al. (2023), Peng et al. (2023b), Li and Yang (2023), and Maccary et al. (2024), see also Tables 1 and 2.

X-ray flares are common phenomena detected in the early afterglow phase of GRBs, most prominently in the era of the Swift satellite. About one third of Swift GRBs show X-ray flares, observed both in short and long GRBs, typically $\Delta t \approx 10^2 - 10^5$ s after the prompt emission. Theoretical interpretations (Yi et al. 2016) of X-ray flare events range from fragmentation of a collapsing star (King et al. 2005), fragmentation of an accretion disk (Perna et al. 2006), intermittent accretion behavior caused by a time-variable magnetic barrier (Proga and Zhang 2006), magnetic reconnection from a post-merger millisecond pulsar (Dai et al. 2006), to magnetic dissipation in a decelerating shell (Giannios 2006). X-ray flares observed in Mrk 421 might be driven by a magnetic reconnection mechanism (Yan et al. 2018; Giannios 2013). Recent statistical SOC studies of galactic and extragalactic X-ray flare phenomena are studied in Li et al. (2016), Wang et al. (2017), Yang et al. 2019), Yan et al. (2018), Yuan et al. (2018), Zhang et al. (2022), and Wei et al. (2023).

Pulsar glitches: A pulsar is a highly magnetized, rapidly-rotating neutron star that emits a beam of electromagnetic radiation. Since the beamed emission is aligned with the magnetic axis, we observe rotationally modulated pulses whenever the beam axis points to the Earth (line-of-sight direction) during each period of its rapid rotation. Besides these regular periodic pulses on time scales of milliseconds, which are measured with high accuracy, there occur sudden changes in rotational frequency, aka. glitches. These anomalies are probably caused by sporadic unpinning of vortices that transfer momentum to the crust (Alpar 1977). Conservation of angular momentum produces then a tiny increase of the angular rotation rate, called "positive spin-ups" of the neutron star. Recent statistical and theoretical SOC studies of pulsar glitches are given in Morley and Schmidt (1996), Cairns (2004), Cairns et al. (2004), Melatos et al. (2008), Warszawski and Melatos (2008), Melatos et al. (2015, 2018), Yu and Liu (2017), Kennedy et al. (2018); and Gao and Wei (2024). Giant pulses as well as micropulses are mentioned in studies of pulsar glitches, which may represent two different physical mechanisms.

Soft gammay-ray repeaters (Magnetars): Unlike GRBs, which are extra-galactic and singular events, a group of short duration bursts were distinct as they were spectrally soft and multiple bursts originated from the same regions of the sky. Based on these properties, Soft Gamma-Ray Repeaters (SGRs) were introduced (Laros et al. 1987). The first members of the family of SGRs were two galactic sources (SGR 1806-20 and SGR 1900+14) and the source of the exceptional March 5th event (Mazetz et al. 1979), namely SGR 0526-66 in the Large Magellanic Cloud. Duncan and Thompson (1992) proposed that a neutron star with ultrastrong magnetic field (in the order of $B \gtrsim 10^{14}$ G) could explain extraordinatry characteristics of the March 5^{th} event and dubbed magnetars for isolated neutron stars with extremely strong magnetic fields. According to the magnetar model, repeated short duration bursts of hard X-rays/soft gamma-rays are expected from fracturing of the solid neutron star crust, driven by the stress of an evolving, strong magnetic field (Thompson and Duncan 1995). Observational confirmation SGRs being magnetars was achieved with the discovery of the spin period and period derivative of SGR 1806-20 as 7.47 s and 7.6×10^{-11} s s⁻¹, respectively (Kouveliotou et al. 1998), therefore, yielding an inferred dipolar field strength of $B = 8 \times 10^{14}$ [G]. Soon after this discovery, spin parameters of SGR 1900+14 were measured and its magnetar nature was established (Kouveliotou et al. 1999). There are nearly 30 magnetars identified to date. For a compensive review of the physics behind magnetars, see Turolla et al. (2015). The recent discovery of a galactic fast radio burst (FRB) associated with a hard X-ray burst from a SGR J1935+2154 has established the magnetar origin of at least some FRBs (Wei et al. 2021). Recent statistical SOC studies in magnetars include Chang et al. (1996), Gogus et al. (1999, 2000, 2017), Prieskorn and Kaaret (2012), Wang and Dai (2013), Huppenkothen et al. (2015), Enoto et al. (2017), Cheng et al. (2020), Wang et al. (2021), Wei et al. (2021), Zhang et al. (2023), Peng et al. (2023a), Xiao et al. (2024), Xie et al. (2024), and Gao and Wei (2024).

Blazars are a rather extreme class of radio-loud active galactic nuclei (AGNs), consisting of *BL Lac objects* (Ciprini et al. 2003), Taveccio et al. 2020a, 2020c) and *flat spectrum radio quasars* (FSQR). Due to relativistic Doppler boosting, blazar emission is dominated by the nonthermal emission produced by its jet (Yan et al. 2018). Recent statistical SOC studies on blazars, mostly focussing on the 3C 454.3 and Mrk 421, are described in Zhang et al. (2018a), Yan et al. (2018), and Peng et al. (2023a).

An active galactic nuclei (AGN) is a compact region at the center of a galaxy that emits a significant amount of energy across the electromagnetic spectrum, with characteristics indicating that this luminosity is not produced by the stars. The non-stellar radiation from an AGN is believed to result from the accretion of matter by a supermassive black hole at the center of its host galaxy. Recent SOC studies on AGNs can be found in Lawrence and Papadakis (1993), Leighly and O'Brien (1997), Xiong et al. (2000), Gaskell (2004), Uttley et al. (2005), and Kunjaya et al. (2011).

X-ray Binaries are stellar systems of a compact object (white dwarf, neutron star, black hole) and an evolving star, which have been further subdivided into low-mass X-Ray binaries (LMXB), high-mass X-Ray binaries (HMXB), supergiant fast X-ray transients (SFXT), and super-massive black holes (SMBH), and cataclysmic binaries. Recent SOC studies on binaries can be found in Uttley et al. (2005), Bachev et al. (2011), Paizis and Sidoli (2014), Moreira et al. (2015), Wang et al. (2017), Kennedy et al. (2018), or Zhang et al. (2022).

Super Massive Black-Hole systems (SMBH) are found in centers of galaxies, either in our galaxy (Sgr A^{*}), or other galaxies (for instance in M87; Wang et al. 2015). Recent SOC studies on Sgr A^{*} include Mocanu and Grumiller (2012), Li et al. (2015), Wang et al. (2015), and Yuan et al. (2018).

Fast radio bursts (FRBs) are millisecond mysterious radio transients with anomalous high dispersion measure (Cheng et al. 2020). FRBs are observed mostly from cosmological distances, which is supported by the direct localization of FRB 121102. Events from FRBs have similar statistical properties as magnetar bursts. Recent SOC studies on FRBs can be found in Spitler et al. (2016), Chatterjee et al. (2017), Zhang et al. (2018), Zhang et al. (2018b), Scholz et al. (2016; 2017), Michilli et al. (2018), Lu and Piro (2019), Wang and Zhang (2019), Gourdji et al. (2019), Cheng et al. (2020), Lin and Sang (2020), Wei et al. (2021), Zhang et al. (2021), Wang et al. (2021), and Wang et al. (2023).

Cosmic rays are high-energetic particles (protons, helium nuclei, or electrons) that originate from within our Milky Way, as well as from extragalactic space, and are detected when they hit the Earth's atmosphere and produce a shower of high-energy (muon) particles. The energy spectrum of cosmic rays extends over a large range of 10⁹ eV $\leq E \leq 10^{21}$ eV, with an approximate power law slope of $\alpha_E \approx 3.0$. A closer inspection reveals a broken power law with a "knee" at $E_{knee} \approx 10^{16}$ eV, which separates the cosmic rays accelerated inside our Milky Way (with a spectral slope of $\alpha_{E1} \approx 2.7$) and in extragalactic space (with a slope of $\alpha_{E2} \approx 3.3$). The sources of cosmic rays are believed to be supernova remnants, pulsars, pulsar-wind nebulae, active galactic nuclei, and gamma-ray burst sources. The

GALACTIC SOC TESTING

5

particles with higher energies $(E \gtrsim E_{knee})$ have a uniform and isotropic distribution over the sky and are believed to originate mostly from active galactic nuclei).

2.4. The Standard FD-SOC Model

The fluxes F_i , i = 0, ..., n are basic SOC variables (or SOC observables), for which we can derive the power law slope α_F by using a simple theoretical model that is called the *fractal-diffusive SOC (FD-SOC)* model, which is derived from first principles in Aschwanden (2012a, 2014, 2015).

There are three most general assumptions in the FD-SOC model: (i) the multi-fractality in Euclidean space, (ii) classical diffusion transport, and (iii) incoherent emission mechanisms. First we have to define the Euclidean space, which has 3 different dimensionalities, d = 1, 2, 3, while the corresponding fractal dimensions D_d are defined by the fractal (Hausdorff) dimension. The Hausdorff dimension (in 3-D space, d = 3,) is then defined with the fractal volume V, the fractal dimension $D_V = D_3$, and a length scale L (Mandelbrot 1977, 1983, 1985),

$$V = L^{D_V} (1)$$

For sake of simplicity we deal in the following with the third dimension only, d = 3, which is most relevant in our 3-D real world. For each fractal dimension D_V , there is a range of fractal dimensions, $[D_{V,min}, D_{V,max}] = [d - 1, d]$, which covers the range of [2,3] for the dimensionality d = 3. A representative fractal dimension is the arithmetic mean of the minimum and maximum value,

$$D_V = \frac{(D_{V,min} + D_{V,max})}{2} = d - \frac{1}{2} = 2.50 .$$
⁽²⁾

Since we defined a fractal dimension by a non-singular range, $(D_{V,min} < D_V < D_{V,max})$, our range is consistent with the concept of multi-fractals, but can also be expressed by a single value, which is consistent with mono-fractals also.

Secondly, we have to define a relationship between the length scale L and the time scale T for a transport mechanism operating in SOC avalanches. While the original SOC model was expressed in terms of a cellular automaton, driven by next-neighbor interactions in the original BTW model (Bak et al. 1987), the FD-SOC model is found to provide a suitable approximation that avoids the use of complex cellular automatons, and uses the simple physical scaling law of Brownian motion instead,

$$T = L^{2/\beta} aga{3}$$

where $\beta = 1$ corresponds to the transport process by classical diffusion, while the propagation distance L of a SOC avalanche scales with the square-root of the time, $L \propto T^{1/2}$, also called Brownian motion.

Thirdly, for incoherent emission mechanisms the flux of a SOC avalanche is proportional to the (fractal) volume (Eq. 1),

$$V \propto \left(L^{D_V}\right)^{\gamma}$$
 . (4)

where γ is the volume-flux coefficient, being $\gamma = 1$ for incoherent emission mechanisms, (e.g., bremsstrahlung, free-free emission, gyro-resonance emission, gyro-synchrotron emission), and values of $\gamma \gtrsim 2$ are typical for coherent emission mechanisms (e.g., plasma emission in electron beams, loss-cone plasma emission, or *Microwave Amplification by Stimulated Emission (MASER)*. The incoherent emission then implies a proportionality of the flux F to the emitting fractal volume V^{γ} , i.e., $F \propto V^{\gamma}$.

Given these 3 relationships of the FD-SOC model, we can derive the predicted power law slopes for SOC fluxes straightforwardly. The scale-freeness yields the size distribution of SOC avalanche length scales L, only depending on the dimensionality (d = 3 in most real-world data)

$$N(L)dL \propto L^{-d}dL . (5)$$

Mathematically, we perform a variable substitution from the length size distribution N(L) to the volume size distribution N(V), by inversion of Eq. (4), $L(V) = V^{1/(D_V \gamma)}$, calculating the derivative, $(dL/dV) = V^{(1/D_V \gamma)-1}$, and inserting these two terms into Eq. (5) yields,

$$N(V)dV = N[L(V)] \left| \frac{dL}{dV} \right| dL,$$
(6)

$$N(V)dV = L(V)^{-d/(D_V\gamma)} V^{1/(D_V\gamma)-1} dV,$$
(7)

$$N(V)dV = V^{-d/(D_V\gamma) + 1/(D_V\gamma) - 1}dV$$
(8)

$$N(V)dV = V^{-[(d-1)/(D_V\gamma)]-1}dV$$
(9)

$$N(V)dV = V^{-\alpha_V}dV \tag{10}$$

which then yields the power law slope α_V ,

$$\alpha_V = 1 + \frac{(d-1)}{D_V \gamma} = \frac{9}{5} = 1.80 .$$
(11)

Inserting the dimensionality d = 3, the mean fractal dimension $D_V = 2.50$, and the incoherence coefficient $\gamma = 1$, the FD-SOC model provides a prediction of the power law slope of fluxes α_F without any free parameters. Since the fractal volume V is proportional to the flux for incoherent emission ($\gamma = 1$), it follows that the power law slopes for fluxes and volumes, α_F and α_V , are identical,

$$\alpha_F = \alpha_V . \tag{12}$$

Consequently, the FD-SOC model predicts different slopes for incoherent and coherent emission mechanisms, which implies that there is no universality in the wavelength-dependent energy scaling laws, while the scale-freeness predicts a universally valid power law slope for the SOC volumes and fluxes for the cases with incoherent emission, i.e., $\alpha_V = \alpha_F = 1.80$.

2.5. Fluence Modeling

The detection of SOC events is generally done from light curves of fluxes, f(t), obtained by an automated structure detection algorithm, or manually in form of an event catalog. Light curves can be observed in a large number of wavelengths in astrophysics, such as in gamma rays, hard X-rays, soft X-rays, EUV, UV, visible light, radio, etc. The central question of this study is whether the power law-like size distributions, (also called occurrence frequency distributions), have an identical power law slope α_{F,λ_i} at different wavelengths λ_i , which would fulfill the criterion of universality,

$$\alpha_{F\lambda_1} = \alpha_{F\lambda_2} = \dots, \alpha_{F\lambda_i} = const . \tag{13}$$

If the criterion of universality is fulfilled, this would imply two possible interpretations: (i) the same physical emission mechanism is operational at different wavelengths λ_i , or (ii) the power law slope is not a property of the wavelength-dependent emission mechanism, but rather is caused by the scale-free property of the SOC statistics. We will see in the following that the second interpretation is more likely than the first interpretation.

The fluence is defined as the time-integrated flux during the duration T of an observed event,

$$E = \int_{t_1}^{t_1+T} f(t) \, dt \,, \tag{14}$$

where $T = t_2 - t_1$ is the duration of an event, f(t) is the time series of fluxes, and E is the fluence or energy during the time interval $[t_1, t_2]$, so that the physical unit of a flux F is [energy/time], and the physical unit of a fluence Eis [energy]. The source area needs to be included in the observed distance when the sources are located at different distances from the observer, such as stellar or galactic objects. Since all used datasets are selected from publications produced by other authors, we cannot bring all variables into self-consistent physical units. However, since PL slopes are scale-free in SOC datasets, we can inter-compare the size distribution of various SOC parameters, independent of their numerical value or physical unit, and this way test their universality.

It should be noted that flux F and fluence or energy E have different power law slopes. In slight variance to previous versions of the FD-SOC model, we modify the definition of the fluence or energy E as a function of the Euclidean dimension d, i.e., $E \propto V_{peak} \propto L^{(d)}$, which is a function of the Euclidean dimension d. The prediction for the fluence is then $a_E = a_V = 1 + (d-1)/d = 5/3 \sim 1.67$. This definition is consistent with the fractal structure of a SOC avalanche, because the Euclidean volume V (with dimension d) is essentially the envelope to the fractal volume (with fractal dimension D_V), in the spatio-temporal integration scheme of SOC events. Consequently, the flux scales with the fractal volume V, while the fluence or energy scales with the space and time-integrated volume V_{max} .

We perform, similarly to above, a variable substitution from the length size distribution N(L) to the volume size distribution N(V), by inversion of Eq. (7), $L(V) = V^{1/(d\gamma)}$, calculating the derivative, $(dL/dV) = V^{(1/d\gamma)-1}$, and inserting these two terms into Eq. (5) yields,

$$N(V)dV = N[L(V)] \left| \frac{dL}{dV} \right| dL,$$
(15)

$$N(V)dV = L(V)^{-d}V^{1/(d\gamma)-1}dV,$$
(16)

$$N(V)dV = V^{-d/(d\gamma) + 1/(d\gamma) - 1}dV$$
(17)

$$N(V)dV = V^{-[(d-1)/(d\gamma)]-1}dV$$
(18)

$$N(V)dV = V^{-\alpha_E}dV \tag{19}$$

which then yields the power law slope α_E ,

$$\alpha_E = 1 + \frac{(d-1)}{d\gamma} \approx \left(2 - \frac{1}{d}\right) \approx \left(\frac{5}{3}\right) \approx 1.67 .$$
⁽²⁰⁾

where the approximative values originate from the Standard Fractal-Diffusive SOC (FD-SOC) model by assuming dimensionality (d = 3), classical diffusion $(\beta = 1)$, and incoherent (random) emission $(\gamma = 1)$. Application of the FD-SOC model can be found in Wang and Dai (2013).

2.6. Alternative SOC Energy Models

2.6.1. Isotropic Luminosity Model

In astrophysical observations, the distances of the observed objects vary from stellar distances to extragalactic distances, and thus need to be corrected to a common reference distance, in order to compare distance-related brightness (or intensity) variations. **Energy units quoted in this Section are given in arbitrary units** $(E_{iso}, E_{rel}, E_{syn}, E_B)$. The uncorrected burst energy in radio bursts is generally defined in terms of an isotropic radiation pattern,

$$E_{iso} \propto 4\pi D_L^2 F \Delta \nu , \qquad (21)$$

where D_L is the luminosity distance, F is the burst fluence, and $\Delta \nu$ is the bandwidth of the observation (e.g., Wang and Zhang 2019; Chatterjee et al. 2017; Gourdji et al. 2019; Lyu et al. 2020).

2.6.2. Relativistic Isotropic Model

Extra-galactic distances can be obtained from the cosmological redshift. In the study of Yi et al. (2016), the prompt emission of gamma-ray bursts (GRB) detected by Swift in the 0.3-10 keV energy range has been modeled with the isotropically radiated energy E_{iso} ,

$$E_{rel} \propto \frac{4\pi D_L^2 F}{(1+z)} , \qquad (22)$$

where D_L is the luminosity distance, F is the fluence of the flare, and z is the relativistic redshift correction. Similar applications of the relativistic distance normalization up to $z \approx 15$ have been reported by Zhang (2018b) for the most sensitive telescopes, such as the 500-m Aperture Spherical radio Telescope (FAST). Such a model was also called isotropic-equivalent released energy (Maccary et al. 2024). General-relativistic effects are incorporated in Xiong et al. (2000).

2.6.3. Dispersion Measure Model

The dispersion measure (DM) is one of the key attributes of radio pulsars and Fast Radio Bursts (FRB), which is an approximate measure of the column density of electrons between the observer and source. The observed large spread of fluences E has motivated SOC modelers to consider the power law volumetric rate of FRB events per unit (isotropic) energy (Lu and Piro 2019). The differential size distribution is defined as,

$$\frac{dN}{dE} = AE^{-\alpha_E} \qquad E \le E_{max} , \qquad (23)$$

with a maximum energy of E_{max} above which there no FRBs occur. Combining the total number of events N_{tot} with the dispersion measure DM_{max} and the threshold flux F_{th} , leads to the estimate of the volumetric rate of FRBs (Lu and Piro 2019). The cumulative size disribution function is defined as,

$$N(>E) \approx \frac{AE^{1-\alpha_E}}{\alpha_E - 1} . \tag{24}$$

Further Bayesian analysis of the full parameter space yields a Schechter-like model (Lu and Piro 2019), which consists of a power law part with an exponential drop-off,

$$\frac{dN}{dE} = \frac{\Phi_0}{E_{max}} (1+z)^{\gamma_{Lorentz}} \left(\frac{E}{E_{max}}\right)^{-\alpha_E} \exp\left(\frac{-E}{E_{max}}\right) , \qquad (25)$$

where Φ_0 is the volumetric rate normalization, at a redshift z = 0, while $(1 + z)^{\gamma_{Lorentz}}$ is the relativistic correction. These distance corrections are most important for galactic and extragalactic phenomena, such as pulsars or FRBs.

2.6.4. Synchrotron Model

The variability of synchrotron emission can be used to constrain the magnetic field strength in the emission region by the X-ray variability time scale (e.g., Tavecchio et al. 1998; Yan et al. (2018),

$$t_{\rm cool} = \frac{6\pi m_e c}{\sigma_T \gamma_{\rm Lorentz} B^2} , \qquad (26)$$

where t_{cool} is the cooling time, *B* is magnetic field in the comoving frame, m_e is the electron rest mass, σ_T is the cross section of Thomson scattering, and γ_{Lorentz} is the relativistic Lorentz factor of the electrons. The observational synchrotron photon energy is

$$E_{syn} \approx 1.5 \times 10^{-11} \gamma_{\text{Lorentz}} \frac{B}{(1\ G)} \frac{\delta_D}{(1+z)} \quad [\text{keV}] , \qquad (27)$$

where δ_D is the Doppler factor.

2.6.5. Magnetic Reconnection Model

In solar and stellar flares, the magnetic reconnection process is often invoked, where the average magnetic energy density $B^2/8\pi$ is used as a measure of the SOC energy parameter (Shibata and Magara 2011),

$$E_B = L^3 \left(\frac{B^2}{8\pi}\right) \approx 3 \times 10^{30} \left(\frac{B}{10^2 \ G}\right)^2 \left(\frac{L}{2 \times 10^9 cm}\right)^3 \ [\text{erg}] \ . \tag{28}$$

which is the typical energy for a solar flares (Yi et al. 2016; Peng et al. 2023). In order to enable tests of magnetic reconnection processes, measurements of the spatial scale L and the magnetic field density B are necessary, which yield the magnetic energy E_B . The parameters L and B are more difficult to measure than other SOC variables, and thus are seldom available. Other applications can be found in Cheng et al. (2020).

2.6.6. Hydrodynamic Energy Model

There is a large number of physical model ideas that have been sketched in the SOC literature, but have not yet matured to a level that they could be applied to SOC data. A hydrodynamic model has been proposed from advection-dominated accretion disks (Takeuchi and Mineshige 1997).

2.7. Cellular Automaton Simulations

Cellular automaton models have been designed and simulated for a variety of physical scenarios, such as for black hole accretion disks (Mineshige et al. 1994a), for 1/f fluctuations in hard X-rays from black hole objects (Mineshige et al. 1994b; Takeuchi e al. 1995), for flickering of cataclysmic variables (Yonehara et al. 1997), for pulsar glitches (Warszawski and Melatos 2008), for spherical geometries in soft gamma repeater bursts driven by magnetic reconnection (Nakazato 2014), for 1-D magnetized grids in the afterglow of gamma-ray burst X-rays (Harko et al. 2015), for magnetar variability with Bayesian hierarchical models (Huppenkothen et al. 2015), for gamma-ray blazars (Tavecchio et al. 2020b), for extragalactic gamma-ray fluxes (Lipari 2021), for avalanches of magnetic flux ropes (Wang et al. 2022), or for soft gamma-ray repeaters (Xiao et al. 2024).

One arbitrary choice in simulations with cellular automatons is the propagation scheme of the employed nextneighbor interactions. The original realization in the Bak-Tang-Wiesenfeld (BTW) model employs 4 next neighbors in a 2-D Euclidean space only, while subsequent applications use 3 and 5 next neighbors (Mineshige et al. 1994a; Negoro et al. 1995; Takeuchi et al. 1995; Yonehara et al. 1997); Mineshige and Negoro 1999), 2 next neighbors (Mineshige et al. 1994b; Harko et al. 2015), 3 next neighbors (Nakazato 2014), or 6 next neighbors (Wang et al. 2022). Since

GALACTIC SOC TESTING

9

the power law slope of size distributions strongly depends on the dimensionality (d = 1, 2, 3) and the number of next neighbors, the arbitrary choice of these pameters has no predictive power.

Another incapability of size distributions derived from cellular automaton algorithms is the choice of the fitted or apparent size distribution, which includes ideal power laws (Bak et al. 1987; Warszawski and Melatos et al. 2008; Lipari 2021; Wang et al. 2022; Xiao et al. 2024), power law with exponential cutoff (Mineshige et al. 1994a,b; Takeuchi et al. 1995; Mineshige and Negoro 1999; Nakazato 2014), and power law with flattening (Tavecchio et al. 2020a, 2020b, 2020c; Xie et al. 2024). Single and double power law models (α_1, α_2) have been suggested in Xie et al. (2024), however without a physical model.

Most of the simulated cellular automatons are consistent with the three-part structure of size distributions, which includes (i) the flattening part due to incomple sampling for the smallest events near the detection threshold, (ii) the (ideal) power law part in the inertial range, and (iii) the exponential drop-off due to finite system size effects for the largest events.

3. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In this section we discuss the observed statistical results of the size distributions (Section 3.1), the non-universality of waiting time distributions (Section 3.2), the uncertainties due to small-number statistics (Section 3.3), the choice of (power law) inertial ranges (Section 3.4), and comparisons of cosmological with solar data (Setion 3.5).

3.1. Size Distribution Results

We identified 35 data sets that contain information on the size distribution N(F) and power law slopes α_F of peak fluxes F (Table 1), drawn from galactic, extragalactic, and black-hole systems published in literature. The mean and standard deviation of these values is

$$\alpha_F = 1.78 \pm 0.29 \ . \tag{29}$$

Likewise, we identified 25 data sets that contain information on the size distribution N(E) and power law slopes α_E of peak energies E (Table 2). The mean and standard deviation of these values is,

$$\alpha_E = 1.66 \pm 0.22 \ . \tag{30}$$

Within the statistical uncertainties, the observed power law slopes (α_F and α_E) agree with the theoretial prediction of the FD-SOC model, i.e., $\alpha_F = 1.80$ (Eq. 11) and $\alpha_E = 1.67$ (Eq. 20), which is the main result of this study and this way confirms the universality of the power law slopes α_F and α_E .

The implication of this result is that the statistics of SOC avalanches can be understood in terms of the standard FD-SOC model that is solely based on the three assumptions of (i) multi-fractality, (ii) transport by classical diffusion, and (iii) incoherent emission mechanisms. We can now answer the fundamental questions posed in the Introduction: The FD-SOC model is able to predict the existence of power laws (because power laws can be fitted within the statistical uncertainties); to predict the specific values of the power law slopes (Eqs. 11, 20), and to predict which parameters have universality (i.e., $\alpha_F = 1.80$ for the peak flux, $\alpha_E = 1.67$ for the dissipated energy.) In principle, the standard FD-SOC model can be generalized for various dimensionalities (d = 1, 2, 3), non-classical diffusion ($\beta \neq 1$), and coherent emission mechanisms ($\gamma > 1$), while the standard values are (d = 3, $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = 1$). Ultimately, the original automaton concept of the BTW model is not a necessary condition for SOC model, because the microscopic next-neighbour interactions can be replaced by the macroscopic scale-freeness probability distribution function (Eq. 5), from which the power law slopes can be directly derived. Using the FD-SOC model (Section 2.4) predicts then universality of the theoretically predicted power law slopes, without invoking detailed physical models for SOC processes. This transformation of microscopic BTW models to macroscopic scale-free size distributions can be considered as a major paradigm shift of SOC models.

3.2. Waiting Time Statistics

The common wisdom is that waiting time distributions have an exponential fall-off for stationary (random) distribution functions, while they have a power law size distribution for non-stationary distributions. A non-stationary distribution requires at least one more free parameter than a stationary distribution, which can be defined in terms of a flare rate function. A waiting time distribution function thus cannot have universal validity for non-stationary probability distribution functions, because of its dependence of the flaring rate variability. Every waiting time distribution function model can only make predictions if there is a way to measure the flare rate, which generally is not constant.

3.3. Small-Number Statistics

One of the prime criteria whether the observed values of power law slopes are accurate strongly depends on the statistical size of the sample, especially in the case of small-number statistics. As a test we select only events with large-number statistics, i.e., $n \ge 100$, and find $\alpha_F = 1.88$ and $\alpha_E = 1.68$, which is however not significantly different from the statistics of all data sets.

3.4. Inertial Range

The flux range or energy range that is fitted with a power law distribution function, also called *inertial range* is often chosen empirically by eye, which can affect the fitted power law slope considerably, especially if the inertial range is relatively small. As a test we select those subsets that have a large inertial range of more 3 decades (which is a factor of $q_E = E_{max}/E_{min} > 10^3$. Such a selection should be most reliable, granted that the extracted sample is statistically representative. The inertial range is tabulated in column 3 of Tables 1 and 2. These 13 values with large energy ranges have a mean value of $\alpha_E = 1.69$, which follows the trend of the FD-SOC predicted value of $\alpha_E = 1.67$.

3.5. Comparison with Solar Data

So far we obtained information on the size distributions and their power law slopes entirely from galactic, extragalactic, and black-hole systems. However, if some universality of the power law slopes is claimed, it is most useful to compare with alternative data, such as solar flares. The mean and standard deviation of flux power law slopes of solar data, as extracted from 21 cases in Table 2 of Aschwanden et al. (2016), is found to be,

$$\alpha_F^{solar} = 1.74 \pm 0.11 \ . \tag{31}$$

Likewise, we identified 10 cases of fluence (or energy) power law slopes of solar data, as extracted from 10 cases in Table 2 of Aschwanden et al. (2016), with a mean and standard deviation of,

$$\alpha_E^{solar} = 1.56 \pm 0.11 \ . \tag{32}$$

This comparison demonstrates that the power law slopes of observed solar data agrees even better with the theoretial predictions of the FD-SOC model, i.e., $\alpha_F = 1.80$ (Eq. 11) and $\alpha_E = 1.67$ (Eq. 20), by using solar data rather than by using galactic data. Moreover, the statistial uncertainties reduce from $\sigma_F = 0.29$ and $\sigma_E = 0.22$ to $\sigma_F = 0.11 = \sigma_E = 0.11$, which represents a significant reduction of the statistical uncertainty of the FD-SOC model. This statistical behavior is expected since solar data can be more accurately measured at the much shorter solar distance than at cosmological scales (of galactic, extragalactic, and black-hole systems).

4. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of this study can be summarized as follows:

- 1. The *fractal-diffusive self-organized criticality (FD-SOC)* model is able to predict some fundamental questions of SOC models, such as the existence of power law-like size distribution functions, the specific values of the power law slopes, which SOC parameters have universality, and the role of waiting time distribution functions.
- 2. The observed medians of size distribution functions are reported to be $\alpha_F = 1.78 \pm 0.29$ for the SOC peak fluxes F, and $\alpha_E = 1.66 \pm 0.22$ for the SOC energies E, which are consistent with the theoretically predicted values of $\alpha_F = 9/5 = 1.80$ and $\alpha_E = 1.67$. This statistical sample indlucdes 35 cases for the flux and 26 cases for the fluence or energy. In addition, we sort the observed PL slopes also by SOC phenomena in Table 3, which further corroborates the universality claimed here.
- 3. In order to understand SOC size distributions we advocate a paradigm shift from the microscopic next-neighbour interaction BTW model to macroscopic scale-free probability distribution functions. It appears that cellular automaton algorithms are not a necessary condition for SOC behavior, but add unnecessary complexity. It can be simplified with Monte-Carlo-type simulations of suitable physical scaling laws.
- 4. The observed power law distribution functions can be fitted by a three-part model that includes (i) the flattening due to incomplete samling of small events, (ii) the initial range that can be fitted with a pure power law function,

and (iii) the steepening due to finite-system size effects for the largest events. Such a generalized three-part size distribution function (Aschwanden 2021),

$$N(x)dx = N_0(x_0 + x)^{-\alpha_x} \exp\left(-\frac{x}{x_e}\right) \, dx \,\,, \tag{33}$$

that can be fitted to an observed size distribution, thus should include a threshold value x_0 and a finite-system size limit x_e . This is a Pareto-type distribution function, which converges to $N \mapsto N_0$ for $x \ll x_0$. Suitable fits require a minimum initial range of $E_{max}/E_{min} \approx 10^2 - 10^3$ decades, and a minimum-number statistics of $N_{min} \gtrsim 10^2 - 10^3$.

5. Physical scaling law models of SOC processes (e.g., fluence, isotropic luminosity model, relativistic isotropic model, dispersion measure model, synchrotron model, magnetic reconnection, hydrodynamic model, see Section 2.6) require measurements of additional physical parameters, but are not a necessary condition to understand the statistics of SOC size distributions, which is entirely defined by the scale-freeness of the data in Euclidean space.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge constructive and stimulating discussions (in alphabetical order) with Sandra Chapman, Paul Charbonneau, Henrik Jeldtoft Jensen, Adam Kowalski, Alexander Milovanov, Leonty Miroshnichenko, Jens Juul Rasmussen, Karel Schrijver, Vadim Uritsky, Loukas Vlahos, and Nick Watkins. This work was partially supported by NASA contract NNX11A099G "Self-organized criticality in solar physics" and NASA contract NNG04EA00C of the SDO/AIA instrument to LMSAL.

REFERENCES

- Alpar, M.A. 1977, Pinning and Threading of Quantized Vortices in the Pulsar Crust Superfluid, ApJ 213, 527.
- Aschwanden, M.J. 2011a, Self-Organized Criticality in Astrophysics. The Statistics of Nonlinear Processes in the Universe, Springer-Praxis: New York, 416p.
- Aschwanden, M.J. 2012a, A statistical fractal-diffusive avalanche model of a slowly-driven self-organized criticality system, AA 539, A2 (15 p).
- Aschwanden, M.J. 2014, A macroscopic description of a generalized self-organized criticality systems. Astrophysical applications, ApJ 782, 54.
- Aschwanden, M.J. 2015, Thresholded powerlaw size distributions of instabilities in astrophysics, ApJ 814, 19 (25pp).
- Aschwanden, M.J., Crosby, N., Dimitropoulou, M., Georgoulis, M.K., Hergarten, S., McAteer, J., Milovanov, A., Mineshige, S., Morales, L., Nishizuka, N., Pruessner, G., Sanchez, R., Sharma, S., Strugarek, A., and Uritsky, V. 2016, 25 Years of Self-Organized Criticality: Solar and Astrophysics, Space Science Reviews 198, 47-166.
- Aschwanden, M.J. 2021, Finite system-size effects in self-organized criticality systems, ApJ 909:69, (12 pp).
- Atteia, J.L., Barat, C., Hurley, K., Niel, M., Vedrenne, G. et al. 1987, A second catalog of gamma-ray bursts: 1978-1980 localizations from the interplanetary network. ApJSS 64, 305-382.
- Bachev, R., Boeva, S., Stoyanov K., and Semkov, E. 2011, Intranight variability to the huge gamma-ray outburst of KS 1510-089, The Astronomers Telegram, No. 3479.
- Bak, P., Tang, C., and Wiesenfeld, K. 1987, Self-organized criticality An explanation of 1/f noise, Physical Review Lett. 59/27, 381-384.
- Bak, P., Tang, C., and Wiesenfeld, K. 1988, Self-organized criticality, Physical Rev. A 38/1, 364-374.
- Bak, P. 1996, How nature works, Copernicus, Springer Verlag: New York.
- Beckmann, V., Borkowski, J., Courvoisier, T.J.L., Goetz, D., Hudec, R., Hroch, F., Lund, N., Mereghetti, S., Shaw, S. E., von Kienlin, A., and Wigger, C. 2003, *Time resolved spectroscopy of GRB 030501 using INTEGRAL*, AA 411, L327.
- Beloborodov, A.M. and Thompson, C. 2007, Corona of magnetars, ApJ 657/2, 967-993.
- Cairns, I.H. 2004, Properties and interpretations of giant micropulses and giant pulses from pulsars, ApJ 610, 948-955.
- Cairns, I.H., Johnston, S., and Das, P. 2004, Intrinsic variability and field statistics for pulsars B1641-45 and B0950+08, MNRAS 353, 270.
- Chang, H.K., Chen, K., Fenimore, E.E., and Ho, C. 1996, Spectral studies of magnetic photon splitting in the March 5 event and SGR 1806-20, AIP Conf. Proc. 384, 921-925.
- Chatterjee, S., Law, C.J., Wharton, R.S., Burke-Spolaor, S., Hessels, J.W.T. et al. 2017, A direct localization of a fast radio bursts and its host, Nature 541/7636, pp.58-61.
- Charbonneau, P. 2017, Natural complexity: A modeling handbook, Princeton Press: Princeton.
- Cheng, Y., Zhang, G.Q., and Wang, F.Y. 2020, Statistical properties of magnetar bursts and FRB 121102, MNRAS 491, 1498-1505.
- Ciprini, S., Fiorucci, M., Tosti, G., and Marchili, N. 2003, The optical variability of the blazar GV 0109+224. Hints of self-organized criticality, in High energy blazar astronomy, ASP Conf. Proc. 229, (eds. L.O. Takalo and E. Valtaoja), ASP: San Francisco, p.265.
- Dai, Z.G., Wang, X.Y., Wu X.F., and Zhang B. 2006, X-flares from postmerger millisecond pulsars, Science 311, Issue 5764, 1127-1129.
- Duncan, R. and Thompson, C. 1992, Formation of Very Strongly Magnetized Neutron Stars: Implications for Gamma-Ray Bursts, ApJ, 392, L9
- Enoto, T., Shibata, S., Kitaguchi, T., Suwa, Y., Uchida, T. et al. 2017, Magnetar broadband X-ray spectra correlated with magnetic fields: Suzaku Archive of SGRs and AXP combned with NuSTAR, Swift, and RXTE, ApJSS 231/1, id. 8, 21pp.
- Feder, J. 1988, Fractals, Plenum Press: New York, 283 p.
- Gao, C.Y. and Wei, J.J. 2024, A comparative analysis of scale-invariant phenomena in repeating fast radio bursts and glitching pulsars, ApJ 968/1, id.40, 8pp
- Gaskell, C.M. 2004, Lognormal X-ray flux variations in an extreme narrow-line Seyfert 1 galaxy, ApJ 612, L21.-L24.
- Giannios, D. 2013, Reconnection-driven plasmoids in blazars: fast flares on a slow envelope, MNRAS 431/1, p.355-363.
- Gogus, E., Woods, P.M., Kouveliotou, C., van Paradijs, J., Briggs, M.S., Duncan, R.C., and Thompson, C. 1999, Statistical properties of SGR 1900+14 bursts, ApJ 526, L93-L96.

- Gogus, E., Woods, P.M., Kouveliotou, C., and van Paradijs, J. 2000, Statistical properties of SGR 1806-20 bursts, ApJ 532, L121-L124.
- Gogus, E., Lin, L., Roberts, O.J., Chakraborty, M., Kaneko, Y., Gill, R. et al. 2017, Burst and outburst characteristics of magnetar 4U 0142+61, ApJ 835;68 (8 pp).
- Gourdji, K., Michilli, D., Spitler, L.G. et al. 2019, A sample of low-energy bursts from FRB 121102, ApJL 877, L19.
- Harko, T., Mocanu, G., and Stroia, N. 2015, Self-organized criticality in an one dimensional magnetized grid. Application to GRB X-ray afterglows, Astropys.Space.Science 357/1, id.84, 9pp.
- Huppenkothen, D., Brewer, B.J., Hogg, D.W., Murray, I., Frean, M. et al. 2015, Dissecting magnetar variability with Bayesian hierarchical models, ApJ 10/1, id. 66, 21pp.
- Jensen, H.J. 2023, Complexity Science. A study of emergence, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Katz, J. 1986, A model of propagating brittle failure in heterogeneous media, JGR 91, 10412.
- Kennedy, M.R., Clark, C.J., Voisin, G., and Breton, R.P. 2018, Kepler K2 observations of the transitional millisecond pulsar PSR J1023+0038, MNRAS 477, 1120-1132.
- King, A., O'Brien, P.T., Goad, M.R., Osborne, J., Olsson, E., and Page, K. 2005, Gamma-ray bursts: Restarting the engine, ApJ 630/2, pp.L113-L115.
- Klebesadel, R.W., Strong, I.B., and Olson, R.A. 1973, Observations of gamma-ray bursts of cosmic origin, ApJ 182, p.L85.
- Kouveliotou, C., Dieters, S., Strohmayer, T., van Paradijs, J., Fishman, G.J., Meegan, C.A., Hurley, K., Kommers, J., Smith, I., Frail, D., Muakami, T. 1998, An X-ray pulsar with a superstrong magnetic field in the soft γ-ray repeater SGR 1806-20, Nature 393, 235-237.
- Kouveliotou, C., Strohmayer, T., Hurley, K., van Paradijs, J., Finger, M.H., Dieters, S., Woods, P., Thomson, C., and Duncan, R.C. 1999, Discovery of a magnetar associated with the soft gamma ray repeater SGR 1900+14, ApJ 510, L115-L118.
- Kunjaya, C., Mahasena, P., Vierdayanti, K., and Herlie, S. 2011, Can self-organized critical accretion disks generate a log-normal emission variability in AGN?, Astrophys.Space.Science 336/2, pp.455-460.
- Laros, J.G., Fenimore, E.E., Klebesadel, R.W., Ateia, J.L., Boar, M., Hurley, K., Niel, M., Vedrenne, G., Kane, S.R. 1987, A new type of repretitive behavior in a high-energy transient, ApJ 320/1, p.L111.
- Lawrence, A. and Papadakis, I. 1993, X-ray variability of active galactic nuclei: A universal power spectrum with lumninosity-dependent amplitude, ApJ 414, L85.
- Leighly, K.M., and O'Brien, P.T. 1997, Evidence for Nonlinear X-Ray Variability from the Broad-Line Radio Galaxy 3C 390.3, Astrophys. J. 481, L15.
- Li, Y.P., Yuan, F., Yuan, Q. et al. 2015, Statistics of X-ray flares of Sagittarius A*: Evidence for solar-like self-organized criticality phenomena, ApJ 810/2, article id. 19, 8 pp.
- Li, J., Torres, D.F., Rea, N., de Ona Wilhelmi, E. et al. 2016, Search for gamma-ray emission fromm AE Aquarii with seven years of Fermi-LAT observations, ApJ 832/1, article id.35, 6 pp.
- Li, X.J. and Yang, Y.P. 2023, Signatures of the self-organized criticality phenomenon in precursors of gamma-ray bursts, ApJ 955, Issue 2, id. L34, 7 pp.
- Lin, H.N. and Sang, Y. 2020, Scale-invariance in the repeating fast radio burst 121102, MNRAS 491, 2156-2161.
- Lipari, P. 2021, The origin of the power-law form of the extragalactic gamma-ray flux, Astroparticle Physics 125, id. 102507.
- Lu, E.T. and Hamilton, R.J. 1991, Avalanches and the distribution of solar flares, Astrophys. J. 380, L89-L92.
- Lu, W. and Piro, A.L. 2019, Implications from ASKAP fast radio burst statistics, ApJ 883/1, id.40, 8pp.
- Lyu, F., Li, Y.P., Hou, S.J., Wei, J.J., Geng, J.J., and Wu X.F. 2020, Self-organized criticality in multi-pulse gammaray bursts, Frontiers Phys. 16/1, article id 14501.
- Mandelbrot, B.B. 1977, Fractals: form, chance, and dimension, Translation of Les objects fractals, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco.
- Mandelbrot, B.B. 1983, The fractal geometry of nature, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco.
- Mandelbrot, B.B. 1985, Self-affine fractals and fractal dimension, Physica Scripta 32, 257-260.
- Maccary, R., Guidorzi, C., Amati, L., Bassznini, L., Bulla, M., et al. 2024, Distributions of energy, luminosity, duration and waiting times of gamma-ray burst pulses with known redshift detected by Fermi/GBM, ApJ 965, Issue 1, id. 92, 17pp.
- Melatos, A., Peralta, C., and Wyithe, J.S.B. 2008, Avalanche Dynamics of radio pulsar glitches, ApJ 672, 1103-1118.

- Melatos, A., Douglass, J.A., and Simula, T.P. 2015, Persistent gravitational radiation from glitching pulsars, ApJ 807:123, 12pp.
- Melatos, A., Howitt, G., and Fulgenzi, W. 2018, Size-waiting-time correlations in pulsar glitches, ApJ 863, 196.
- Meszaros, P. and Rees, M.J. 1992, Tidal heating and mass loss in neutron star binaries: Implications for gamma-ray burst models, ApJ 397, 570.
- Michilli, D., Seymour, A., Hessels, J.W.T. et al. 2018, An extreme magneto-ionic environment associated with the fast radio burst source FRB 121102, Nature 553, issue 7687, pp.182-185.
- Mineshige, S., Takeuchi, M., and Nishimori, H. 1994a, Is a black hole accretion disk in a self-organized critical state?, ApJ 435, L125-L128.
- Mineshige, S., Ouchi, B., and and Nishimori, H. 1994b, On the generation of 1/f fluctuations in X-rays from black-hole objects, PASJ 46, 97-105.
- Mineshige, S. and Negoro, H. 1999, Accretion disks in the context of self-organized criticality: How to produce 1/f fluctuations ?, in High energy processes in accreting black holes, ASP Conf. Ser. 161, 113-128.
- Mocanu, G. and Grumiller, D. 2012, Self-organized criticality in boson clouds around black holes, Phys.Rev. D 85, Issue 10, is.105022.
- Moreira, C.A., Schneider, A.M., de Aguiar Marcus, A.M. 2015, Binary dynamics on star networks under external perturbations, Phys.Rev.E Vol. 92/4, id.042812.
- Morley, P.D. and Schmidt, I. 1996, Platelet collapse model of pulsar glitches, Europhys.Lett. 33/2, pp.105-110.
- Nakazato, K. 2014, Self-organized criticality in a spherically closed cellular automaton: Modeling soft gamma repaeter bursts driven by magnetic reconnection, Phys.Rev.D 90/4, id.043010.
- Negoro, H., Kitamoto, S., Takeuchi, M., and Mineshige, S. 1995, Statistics of X-ray fluctuations from Cygnus X-1: Reservoirs in the disk?, ApJ 452, L49-L52.
- Paizis, A. and Sidoli, L. 2014, Cumulative luminosity distributions of supergiant fast X-ray transients in hard X-rays, MNRAS 439/4, 3439-3452.
- Peng, F.K., Wang, F.Y. Shu, X.W et al. 2023, Self-organized criticality in solar GeV flares, MNRAS 518/3, 3959-3965.
- Peng, F.K., Wei, J.J., and Wang, H.Q. 2023a, Scale invariance in gamma-ray flares of the Sun and 3C 454.3, ApJ 959/2, id.108, 8 pp.
- Peng, F.K., Wang, F.Y., Shy X.W., Hou, S.J. 2023b, self-organized criticality in solar GeV flares, MNRAS 518/3, pp.3959-3965.
- Perna, R., Bozzo, E., Stella, L. 2006, On the spin-up/spin-down transitions in accreting X-ray binaries, ApJ 639, 363-376.
- Prieskorn, Z. and Kaaret, P. 2012, Furst fluence distributions of soft gamma repeaters 1806-20 and 1900+14 in the Rossi X-ray timing explorer PCA era, ApJ 755:1 (6pp).
- Proga, D. and Zhang, B. 2006, The late time evolution of gamma-ray bursts: ending hyperaccretion and producing flares, MNRAS 370/1, pp.L61-L65.
- Pruessner, G. 2012, Self-organised criticality. Theory, models and characterisation, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Scholz, P., Spitler, L.,G., Hessels, J.W.T. 2016, The repeating fast radio burst FRB 121102: Multi-wavelength observations of additional bursts, ApJ 833, 177.
- Scholz, P., Bogdanov, S., Hessels, J.W.T. et al. 2017, Simultaneous X-ray, gamma-ray, and radio observations of the repeating fast radio burst FRB 121102, ApJ 846, 80.
- Shibata K. and Magara T. 2011, Solar Flares: Magnetohydrodynamic Processes, 2011, LRSP, 8, 6.
- Spitler, L.G., Scholz, P., Hessels, J.W.T. et al. 2016, A repeating fast radio burst, Nature 531, 202.
- Takeuchi, M., Mineshige, S., and Negoro, H. 1995, X-ray fluctuations from black-hole objects and self organization of accretion disks, Publ. Astron. Soc. Japan 47, 617-627.
- Takeuchi, M., Mineshige, S., and Negoro, H. 1997, X-ray fluctuations from advection-dominated accretion disks with a critical behavior, ApJ 486, 160-168.
- Tavecchio, F., Maraschi, L., Ghisellini, G. 1998, Constraints on the physical parameters of TeV blazars, ApJ 509/2, pp.608-619.
- Tavecchio, F., Landoni, M., and Sironi, L. 2020a, Probing shock acceleration in BL Lac jets through X-ray polarimetry: the time-dependent view, MNRAS 498/1, pp.599-608.

- Tavecchio, F., Bonnoli, G., and Galanti, G. 2020b, On the distribution of fluxes of gamma-ray blazars: hints for a stochastic process?, MNRAS 497/1, pp.1294-1300.
- Tavecchio, F. and Sobacchi, E. 2020c, Anisotropic electron populations in BL Lac jets: Consequences for the observed mission, MNRAS 491/2, p.2198-2204.
- Thompson, C. and Duncan, R.C. 1995, The soft gamma repeaters as very strongly magnetized neutron stars. I. Radiative mechanism for outbursts MNRAS 275, 255-300.
- Thompson, C. and Duncan, R.C. 1996, The soft gamma repeaters as very strongly magnetized neutron stars. II. Quiescent neutrino, X-ray, and Alfvén wave emission ApJ 473, 322-342.
- Turolla, R., Zane, S., and Watts, A.L. 2015, Magnetars: the physics behind observations. A review, RPPh 78/11, id. 116901.
- Uttley, P., McHardy, I.M., and Baughan, S. 2005, Non-linear X-ray variability in X-ray binaries and active galaxies, MNRAS 359/1, pp.345-362.
- Wang, F.Y. and Dai, Z.G. 2013, Solar flare-like origin of X-ray flares in gamma-ray burst afterglows, Nature Physics 9(8), 465-467.
- Wang, F.Y., Dai, Z.G., Yi, S.X., and Xi, S.Q. 2015, Universal behavior of X-ray flares from black hole systems, ApJSS 216/1, id.8, 8pp.
- Wang, J.S., Wang, F.Y., and Dai, Z.G. 2017, Self-organized criticality in type I X-ray bursts, MNRAS 471/3, 2517-2522.
- Wang, F.Y., and Zhang, G.Q. 2019, A universal energy distribution for FRB 121102, ApJ 882/2, id.108, 10pp.
- Wang, F.Y., Zhang, G.Q., and Dai, Z.G. 2021, Galactic and cosmological fast ratio bursts as scaled-up solar radio bursts, MNRAS 501/3, 3155-3161.
- Wang, W.B., Li, C., Tu, Z.L., Guo, J.H., Chen, P.F., and Wang, F.Y. 2022, Avalanches of magnetic flux rope in the state of self-organized criticality, MNRAS 512/2, 1567-1573.
- Wang, F.Y., Wu, Q., and Dai, Z.G. 2023, Repeating fast radio bursts reveal memory from minutes to an hour, ApJL 949/2, id.L33, 9pp.
- Warszawski, L, and Melatos, A. 2008, A cellular automaton model of pulsar glitches, MNRAS 390/1, 175-191.
- Wei, Y., Zhang, B.T., and Murase, K. 2023, Multiwavelength afterglow emission from bursts associated with magnetar flares and fast radio bursts, MNRAS 524/4, pp.6004-6015.
- Wei, J.J., Wu, X.F., Dai, Z.G., Wang, F.Y., Wang, P., Li, D., Zhang, B. 2021, Similar scale-invariant behaviors between soft gamma-ray repeaters and an extreme epoch from FRB 121102, ApJ 920/2, id. 153, 7 pp.
- Xiao, S., Zhang, S.N., Xiong, S.L., Wang, P., Li, X.J., Dong, A.J., Zhi, Q.J., and Li, D. 2024, The self-organized criticality behaviours of two new parameters inn SGR J1935+2154, MNRAS 528/2, pp.1388-1392.
- Xie,S.L., Yu, U.W., Xiong, S.L., Lin, L., Wang, P., Zhao, Y., Wang, Y., han, W.L. 2024, Finding the particularity of the active episode of SGR J1935+2154 during which FRB 20200428 occurred: Implications from statistics of Fermi/GBM X-Ray bursts, ApJ 967/2, id.108, 9pp.
- Xiong, Y., Witta, P.J., and Bao, G. 2000, Models for accretion-disk fluctuations through self-organized criticality including relativistic effects, PASJ 52, L1097-L1107.
- Yan, D., Yang, S., Zhang, P., Dai, B., Wang, J. and Zhang, L. 2018, Statistical analysis of XMM-Newton X-ray flares of Mrk 421: Distributions of peak flux and flaring time duration, ApJ 864, 164 (16pp).
- Yang, H., Yuan, W., Yao, S., Li, Y., Zhang, J., Zhou, H., Komossa, S., Liu, H.Y., Jin, C. 2018, SDSSJ211852.96-073227.5: a new gamma-ray flaring narrow-line Seyfert 1 galaxy, MNRAS 477/4, p.5127-5138.
- Yang, S., Yan, D., Dai, B., Zhang, P. and Zhu, Q. 2019, Statistical analysis of X-ray flares from the nucleus and HST-1 knot in the M87 jet, MNRAS 489/2, p.2685-2693.
- Yi, S., Xi, S.Q., Yu, H., Wang, F.Y., Mu, H.J., Lu, L.Z., and Liang, E.W. 2016, Comprehensive study of the X-ray flares from gamma-ray bursts observed by Swift, ApJSS 224:20 (13pp).
- Yonehara, A., Mineshige, S., and Welsh, W.F. 1997, Cellular-automaton model for flickering of cataclysmic variables, ApJ 486, 388-396.
- Yu, M. and Liu, Q.J. 2017, On the detection probability of neutron star glitches, MNRAS 468/3, p.3031-3041.
- Yuan, Q., Wang, Q.D., Liu, S., and Wu, K. 2018, A systematic Chandra study of Sgr A*: II. X-ray flare statistis, MNRAS 473, 306-316.
- Zhang, J.M., Zhang, J., Yi, T.F., Huang, X.L., and Liang, E.W. 2018, Flux and spectral variation characteristics of 3C 454.3 at the GeV band, Research in Astron. Astrophys. 18/4, id. 040.

- Zhang, J., Zhang, H.M., Yao, S., Guo, S.C., Lu, R.J. and Liang, E.W. 2018a, Jet radiation properties of 4C+49.22: from the core to large-scale knots, ApJ 865/2, id.100. 11 pp.
- Zhang, Y.G., Gaijar, V., Foster, G., Sienion, A., Cordes, J., Law C. et al. 2018b, Fast radio burst 121102 pulse detection and periodicity: A machine learning approach, ApJ/2, id.149, 18 pp.
- Zhang, G.Q., Wang, P., Wu, Q., Wang, F.Y., Li, D., Dai, Z.B., Zhang, B. 2021, Energy and waiting time distributions of FRB 121102 observed by FAST, ApJ 920L, 23.
- Zhang, W.L., Yi, S.X., Yang, U.P., and Qin, Y. 2022, Statistical Properties of X-Ray Flares from the Supergiant Fast X-Ray Transients, Research Astron. Astrophys. 22/6, id.065012, 8pp.
- Zhang, B. 2023, The physics of fast radio bursts, Rev.Modern.Phys. 95/3, id.035005.

Table 1. The power law slope of the size distributions of the flux α_F (column 1), number of events N_{ev} (column 2), power law range in units of decades (column 3), the instrument (column 4), objects (column 5), and references (column 6) are tabulated from different published studies.

Power Law	Number	Power	Instrument	Object	Reference	
Slope of	of	law				
Flux	events	range				
α_F	N_{ev}	dec				
$1.55 {\pm} 0.09$	12	1	EXOSAT	AGN	Lawrence & Papadakis (1993)	
1.70	12	1	ROSAT/HRI	3C 390.3	Leighly & O'Brien (1997)	
$2.50{\pm}1.50$	13	1	INTEGRAL	SFXT,HMXB	Paizis & Sidoli (2014)	
$1.65 {\pm} 0.17$	38	3	Chandra	Sag A*	Li et al. (2015)	
$2.40{\pm}0.60$	68	2	Chandra	J1644 + 57	Wang et al. (2015)	
$1.80{\pm}0.60$	39	2	Chandra	Sgr A^*	Wang et al. (2015)	
$1.60{\pm}0.70$	18	2	Chandra	M87	Wang et al. (2015)	
$1.77 {\pm} 0.02$	468	4	Swift	GRB	Yi et al. (2016)	
$1.50 {\pm} 0.20$	100	1	Chandra	LMXB	Wang et al. (2017)	
1.41	1198	2	Kepler K2	pulsar	Kennedy et al. (2018)	
$1.02 {\pm} 0.25$	50	1	XMM-Newton	Mrk 421	Yan et al. (2018)	
$1.54{\pm}0.02$	34	2	LAT/Fermi	blazar 3C 454.3	Zhang et al. $(2018a)$	
1.60	20	1	ASKAP	FRB	Lu and Piro (2019)	
$1.70 {\pm} 0.10$	6	2	VLA,Arecibo	FRB 121102	Wang & Zhang (2019)	
$1.63 {\pm} 0.19$	10	2	VLA, 3 GHz	FRB 121102	Chatterjee et al. (2017)	
$1.63 {\pm} 0.21$	10	2	Arecibo $1.4~\mathrm{GHz}$	FRB 121102	Spliter et al. (2016)	
$1.72 {\pm} 0.02$	10	2	Arecibo $4.5~\mathrm{GHz}$	FRB 121102	Michilli et al. (2018)	
$1.56 {\pm} 0.02$	100	2	GBT, 2 GHz	FRB 121102	Zhang et al. (2018)	
$1.67{\pm}0.07$	14	2	GBT, 1.4 $GHzi$	FRB 121102	Scholz et al. $(2016, 2017)$	
$1.83 {\pm} 0.09$	25	2	Arecibo 4-8 GHz	FRB 121102	Gourdji et al. (2019)	
$1.92{\pm}0.32$	122	1	Hubble HST-1	AGN, SMBH	Yang et al. (2019)	
$1.41 {\pm} 0.04$	100	1	GBT	FRB121102	Lin and Sang (2020)	
$2.09{\pm}0.18$	400	2	BATSE/CGRO	GRB	Lyu et al. (2020)	
$1.99{\pm}0.18$	400	2	BATSE/CGRO	GRB	Lyu et al. (2020)	
$1.66{\pm}0.06$	93	2	$GRT \ 8 \ GHz$	FRB121102	Wang et al. (2021)	
$1.82 {\pm} 0.20$	112	3	Fermi	SGR 1935 $+2154$	Wang et al. (2021)	
$1.59{\pm}0.15$	144	1	XMM-Newton	IGR J16418-4532	Zhang et al. (2022)	
$1.54{\pm}0.28$	144	1	XMM-Newton	IGR J16328-4726	Zhang et al. (2022)	
$1.50 {\pm} 0.26$	144	1	XMM-Newton	IGR J18450-0435	Zhang et al. (2022)	
$2.19{\pm}0.12$	122	2	Swift	GRB	Li and Yang (2023)	
$2.44{\pm}0.07$	243	1	BATSE/CGRO	GRB	Li and Yang (2023)	
2.05	236	2	LAT/Fermi	3C 454.3	Peng et al. (2023a)	
$1.91{\pm}0.35$	39	2	LAT/Fermi	GRB	Peng et al. $(2023b)$	
$1.88 {\pm} 0.10$	39	2	LAT/Fermi	3C 454.3	Peng et al. $(2023a)$	
$1.95{\pm}0.02$	158	4	$\mathrm{GBM}/\mathrm{Fermi}$	SGRJ1935+2154	Xie et al. (2024)	
$1.47{\pm}0.42$	974	3	GBM/Fermi	GRB	Maccary et al. (2024)	

Power Law	Number	Power	Instrument	Object	Reference	
Slope of	of	law				
Energy	events	range				
α_E	N_{ev}	dec				
$1.65 {\pm} 0.08$	22	5	BATSE	SGR 1900+14	Gogus et al. (1999)	
$1.76{\pm}0.17$	92	4	BATSE	SGR 1900+14	Gogus et al. (2000)	
$1.43 {\pm} 0.06$	266	3	RXTE	SGR 1900+14	Gogus et al. (2000)	
$1.67 {\pm} 0.15$	113	2	ICE	SGR 1900+14	Gogus et al. (2000)	
$1.77 {\pm} 0.01$	3000	3	RXTE	SGR 1806-20	Prieskorn & Kaaret (2012)	
$1.94{\pm}0.03$	2000	3	RXTE	SGR 1900+14	Prieskorn & Kaaret (2012)	
$2.06{\pm}0.15$	83	4	Swift	GRB	Wang & Dai (2013)	
1.07	1198	2	Kepler K2	pulsar	Kennedy et al. (2018)	
$1.73 {\pm} 0.25$	82	2	Chandra	Sgr A*	Yuan et al. (2018)	
$1.46 {\pm} 0.02$	34	2	LAT/Fermi	blazar 3C 454.3	Zhang et al. (2018a)	
1.70	20	1	ASKAP	FRB	Lu and Piro (2019)	
$1.84{\pm}0.03$	179	3	RXTE	SGRJI550-5418	Cheng et al. (2020)	
$1.68 {\pm} 0.01$	924	3	RXTE	SGR1806-20	Cheng et al. (2020)	
$1.65 {\pm} 0.06$	432	3	RXTE	SGR1900+14	Cheng et al. (2020)	
$1.63 {\pm} 0.06$	100	2	RXTE	FRB121102	Cheng et al. (2020)	
$1.80{\pm}0.09$	100	1	GBT	FRB121102	Lin and Sang (2020)	
$1.54{\pm}0.09$	400	2	BATSE/CGRO	GRB	Lyu et al. (2020)	
$1.44{\pm}0.09$	400	2	BATSE/CGRO	GRB	Lyu et al. (2020)	
$1.86{\pm}0.02$	1652	3	LAT/Fermi	FRB 121102	Zhang et al. (2021)	
$1.78 {\pm} 0.21$	144	1	XMM-Newton	IGR J16418-4532	Zhang et al. (2022)	
$1.22{\pm}0.21$	144	1	XMM-Newton	IGR J16328-4726	Zhang et al. (2022)	
$1.46{\pm}0.28$	144	1	XMM-Newton	IGR J18450-0435	Zhang et al. (2022)	
1.90	236	2	LAT/Fermi	3C 454.3	Peng et al. (2023a)	
$1.69{\pm}0.19$	39	3	LAT/Fermi	GRB	Peng et al. $(2023b)$	
$1.69{\pm}0.01$	158	4	$\operatorname{GBM}/\operatorname{Fermi}$	SGR J1935+2154	Xie et al. (2024)	
$1.67 {\pm} 0.20$	974	3	GBM/Fermi	GRB	Maccarv et al. (2024)	

Table 2. The power law slope of the size distributions of the energy α_E (column 1), instead of the flux α_F . Otherwise similar to Table 1.

Astrophysical	Number	Power law	Number	Power law
Phenomena	data sets	Slope	data sets	Slope
	N_F	α_F	N_E	α_E
Galactic/Extragalactic Events	35	$1.70{\pm}0.19$	26	$1.69{\pm}0.15$
Gamma Ray Bursts (GRB)	7	$1.83{\pm}0.20$	5	$1.59{\pm}0.22$
Soft Gamma Ray Repeaters (SGR)	2	$1.95{\pm}0.02$	10	$1.72{\pm}0.07$
X-Ray Binaries (XB)	5	$1.55{\pm}0.09$	3	$1.49{\pm}0.30$
Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN)	3	$1.52{\pm}0.22$		
Blazars (BL)	3	$1.56{\pm}0.12$	3	$1.47{\pm}0.10$
Fast Radio Bursts (FRB)	10	$1.62{\pm}0.11$	4	$1.84{\pm}0.08$
Black-Hole Systems (BH)	4	$1.88{\pm}0.37$	1	$1.73{\pm}0.10$
Pulsar Glitches (PLS)	1	$1.41{\pm}0.04$	1	$1.07{\pm}0.03$
Solar Flare Hard X-Rays (HXR)	20	$1.76{\pm}0.09$	9	$1.48{\pm}0.11$
Solar Flare Soft X-Rays (SXR)	11	$1.94{\pm}0.12$	5	$1.72{\pm}0.27$
Solar Flare EUV			14	$1.61{\pm}0.15$
Solar Incoherent Radio Bursts	7	$1.80{\pm}0.02$		
Solar Coronal Mass Ejections (CME)	5	$1.93{\pm}0.38$	7	$1.94{\pm}0.22$
Solar Energetic Particles (SEP)	7	$1.24{\pm}0.12$	12	$1.34{\pm}0.09$
Solar Wind (WIND)			1	$1.66{\pm}0.19$
Stellar Flares	33	$2.09{\pm}0.25$		
Stellar Flares KEPLER	49	$1.98{\pm}0.08$		
Magnetospheric Auroras	12	$1.80{\pm}0.13$	11	$1.56{\pm}0.12$
Observations Means	17	1.74 ± 0.23	12	1.64 ± 0.16
FD-SOC Prediction		1.80		1.67

Table 3. Astrophysical phenomena (column 1), number of flux data sets (column 2), power law slope of flux distributions (column 3), number of fluence data sets (column 4), and power law slope of fluence or energy (column 5) are listed.