

**Background** Many models studied in statistical physics have critical points, where correlations diverge and things become complex and interesting in many ways. For the standard Ising model (in two or higher dimensions) this is the Curie point,  $T_C$ ; as one approaches this point the typical size of domains (among other observables) diverges as a power law,  $l \propto (T - T_C)^{-\alpha}$ .

With this background it is natural that physicists find the observations of power laws in nature to be very exciting. We have seen some examples of degree distributions following power laws in the networks lectures, but many other quantities, including word frequencies, severities of terrorist attacks, the populations of cities, individual wealth, and book sales have been claimed to do so as well.

While there are several mechanisms that give rise to power laws (including combinations of exponentials and random extremal processes), criticality is the most interesting one. However, most systems have to be carefully tuned to show criticality; in the Ising model we have to fix the temperature at  $T_C$  to see this behavior. This makes the critical scheme a less than convincing explanation for the common occurrence of power laws in nature.

A proposed solution is something called *self-organized criticality* (SOC). The idea is that something about the system drives it towards a critical point, regardless of the initial conditions. In the forest fire model [2] which we will study here, trees grow and fires burn down connected clusters of trees. Thus, when there are few trees, fires have little effect and the forest grows. However, when the density increases the fires tend to have more effect, burning down large swats of forest. There is thus a balancing act between the growing and burning effects, and the model is held by its own dynamics close to a critical point.

**Simulation model** The model consist of a square  $N \times N$ -lattice on which the trees grow. Each site either has a tree or is empty. At each time step each empty site has a probability  $p$  to turn into an occupied one. Each time step also has a probability  $f$  of an lightning strike, occuring at a random site. The strike ignites the tree, if any, at that site. The tree ignites its von Neumann neighbors<sup>1</sup> (using periodic boundary conditions), they ignite their neighbors etc., and all ignited trees are removed from the lattice. In other words, the lightning strike starts a forest fire which burns down a connected cluster of trees (see Fig. 1). One can either have the fire to spread one step

---

<sup>1</sup>The nearest von Neumann neighbors of a cell is the four cells to its immediate right, left, top, and bottom.

each time step or let the fire burn down the whole cluster during a single time step (corresponding to taking  $p \rightarrow 0$  with  $p/f$  finite, separating the timescales for growth and burning completely). Use the latter!

The number of trees burnt down in a single strike is the size of the fire. We will study the distribution of these sizes.




Figure 1: (Left) A snapshot of a forest where a cluster of 2605 trees is burning down, yielding a relative fire size of 0.16. Green patches are occupied by trees, orange are burning. (Right) Rank-frequency plot of the fire sizes on a 128-by-128 lattice with a power law fitted to the bulk of the distribution.

**Rank-frequency plots** Plotting power law distributions can be problematic as the tail gets very noisy and binning introduces artifacts. A solution is the rank-frequency plot. It effectively plots the complementary cumulative distribution<sup>2</sup> of the data, allowing easy comparison to the cCDF of the hypothetical distribution. To do such a plot given some data, we sort the data, giving a series  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$  with  $y_i \geq y_{i+1}$ , and assign to each value its (normalized) rank, giving a new data set  $\{(y_i, i/n)\}_{i=1}^n$ . This is the empirical cCDF, ready to be plotted in a log-log graph. See Fig. 1 for an example.

**Generating power law data** There are several methods for generating random numbers with a given distribution  $P(x)$ . The most general is **re-**

<sup>2</sup>If a quantity has probability distribution  $P(x)$ , its complementary cumulative distribution is  $cCDF(y) = \int_y^\infty P(x)dx$ , that is, the probability of observing a value greater than or equal to  $y$ .

jection sampling, but if one knows the CDF and can invert it, the more direct method of generating uniform numbers  $r_i \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$  and picking  $X_i = CDF^{-1}(r_i)$  is much more efficient, giving data with the desired distribution  $X_i \sim P(X_i)$ . This approach is known as **inverse transform sampling**. For a power law distribution  $P(x) \propto (x/x_{min})^{-\tau}$  the formula for the cCDF becomes  $X_i = x_{min}(1 - r_i)^{-\frac{1}{\tau-1}}$ .

## Exercises

1. Implement the basic model and visualize it for  $N = 128$ , see Fig. 1. What are reasonable values for the parameters  $p$  and  $f$ ? Note the shapes of the clusters removed by a lightning strike. **To report:** Figures similar to the left plot in Figure 1 for different parameters. Describe and explain the characteristic behaviour for each choice of parameters. Restrict yourself to four figures. **(6p)**
2. Study the size distribution of the fires for  $N = 128$ . For each fire do the following: 1) record its size; 2) compute the density of the forest just before the fire; 3) generate a random forest (grown without fires) with similar density; and 4) start a fire in it (pick random site with three) and record size. Generate and compare the rank-frequency plots of the distributions of fire sizes for the two types of forests. **To report:** The distributions shown in a single plot. Discuss how and why they differ. **(7p)**
3. It is generally claimed that the self-organized fire distribution follows a power law with exponent  $\tau = 1.15$  [3],  $P(s) \propto s^{-1.15}$ , in the limit of large systems. Try to evaluate this claim. Normally we should use maximum likelihood (MLE) to estimate the exponent [4] but in this case it works badly due to the cut-off of the distribution. An alternative would be to model the cut-off as an exponential and derive the MLE for the resulting distribution, but that is outside of the scope of this exercise. Instead, to get a rough approximation, use the heretical method of drawing straight lines in your plot and calculate the slope (which is  $1 - \tau$  in a rank-frequency plot). Check that this works acceptably by generating a synthetic data set (see above) from the power law and compare. **To report:** 1) A rank-frequency plot with the fire data and the linear fit used to find the exponent  $\tau$ ; 2) A rank-frequency plot comparing the fire data and the synthetic power law data. 3) A

discussion of your results. E.g.: Is the result sensitive to the choice of parameters  $p$  and  $f$ ? What factors might impact the result? **(7p)**

4. The value for the exponent depends on the size of the lattice  $N$ , so do a finite size analysis. Repeat the above exercise 3 for the different values of  $N \in \{8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512\}$ . Plot the resulting exponents as a function of  $1/N$  and extrapolate (using some suitable function) to zero (i.e.  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) to obtain the limiting exponent in the case of an infinite lattice. **To report:** The resulting plot with the extrapolation and a discussion of your result. **(5p)**

For most models, studies such as the one in this homework is enough (provided you did it on reasonably large lattices); increasing system size merely leads to more significant digits in the critical parameters. This model is different though. Grassberger [5] did extensive simulations up to  $N = 65536$  (by representing each tree with a single bit, you can fit such a lattice into a 1 GB memory) and found new behavior for extremely large systems, with e.g.  $\tau = 1.19 \pm 0.01$ , noting that nothing prevents still new behavior at even larger scales. Looking at the density of trees, he also found that the previous result of  $\rho \approx 0.408$  is an underestimate: the density continues to increase for ever larger systems, albeit very slowly. As the density cannot exceed the percolation density  $\rho_c = 0.592\dots$ , Grassberger conjectured that it will end up there. A simple extrapolation of his data gives that this point is reached somewhere around  $N = 10^{20}\dots$

## References

- [1] BD Malamud, G Morein, and DL Turcotte. Forest fires: An example of self-organized critical behavior. *Science*, 281(5384):1840–1842, September 1998.
- [2] B. Drossel and F. Schwabl. Self-organized critical forest-fire model. *Physical Review Letters*, 69(11):1629–1632, 1992.
- [3] P Grassberger. On a self-organized critical forest-fire model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 26(9):2081–2089, May 1993.

- [4] Aaron Clauset, Cosma Rohilla Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman. Power-Law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM Review*, 51(4):661–703, January 2009.
- [5] Peter Grassberger. Critical behaviour of the Drossel-Schwabl forest fire model. *New Journal of Physics*, 4(1):17, 2002.