Conductivity of a square-lattice bond-mixed resistor network

Uriel M. S. Costa,* Constantino Tsallis, and Georges Schwachheim
Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Technológico CNPq, rua Dr. Xavier Sigaud 150, 22290 Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
(Received 29 April 1985)

Within a real-space renormalization-group framework based on self-dual clusters, we calculate the conductivity of a square-lattice quenched bond—random resistor network, the conductance on each bond being g_1 or g_2 with probabilities $1-p$ and p, respectively. The group recovers several already known exact results (including slopes), and is consequently believed to be numerically quite reliable for almost all values of p, and all ratios g_1/g_2 (in particular, $g_1=0$ and $g_1=\infty$ with finite g_2, respectively, correspond to the insulator-resistor and superconductor-resistor mixtures).

I. INTRODUCTION

Electrical conduction in random resistor networks and the associated criticality have been the subject of a considerable amount of efforts during recent years. Theoretical approaches such as computational simulations,[1,2] renormalization groups,[3,4] and others,[5–11] as well as experimental results,[12–14] are already available. Nevertheless, the problem is far from being fully solved, even for very simple systems, such as, the square lattice with quenched binary distribution of conductances (bond conductance g_1 or g_2 with probabilities $1-p$ and p, respectively). The corresponding *exact* functional dependence of the conductivity σ on p, g_1, and g_2 is still unknown.

In this paper we introduce a real-space renormalization-group (RG) formalism which follows along the lines of those recently developed in Refs. 15 and 16 to treat the conductivity of simpler but related systems. In Sec. II we introduce the model and the RG formalism, in Sec. III we present the results, and finally we conclude in Sec. IV.

II. MODEL AND RENORMALIZATION GROUP

We consider a square lattice with the following conductance distribution associated with each bond:

$$P(g)=(1-p)\delta(g-g_1)+p\delta(g-g_2) \quad (g_1,g_2\geq 0) . \tag{1}$$

The conductance of a parallel or series array of two bonds (with conductances $\bar{g}_1$ and $\bar{g}_2$) is, respectively, given by

$$g_p=\bar{g}_1+\bar{g}_2 \quad \text{(parallel)} , \tag{2}$$

$$g_s=\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_2/(\bar{g}_1+\bar{g}_2) \quad \text{(series)} . \tag{3}$$

The latter can be written in the same form as the former, namely,

$$g_s^D=\bar{g}_1^D+\bar{g}_2^D \tag{4}$$

with

$$g_i^D\equiv g_0^2/g_i \quad (i=1,2,s) , \tag{5}$$

where D stands for *dual*[15] [see also Refs. 17–19 for a related discussion in the context of the Potts and $Z(N)$ models], and g_0 is an arbitrary reference conductance.

We now introduce the following convenient variable:[15]

$$S\equiv\frac{g}{g+g_0} , \tag{6}$$

which satisfies an interesting (probability-like) property, namely,

$$S^D(g)\equiv S(g^D)=1-S(g) , \tag{7}$$

where we have used definition (5). On the basis of this S variable it will be possible later on to construct a quite performant RG (similarly to what occurred for the bond-dilute problem[15]).

We next introduce the RG formalism which yields $\sigma(g_1,g_2,p)$, by renormalizing the self-dual Wheatstone bridge cluster [Fig. 1(b)] into a single bond [Fig. 1(a)] (the RG linear-scale factor $b=2$). The conductance g_H of a Wheatstone bridge with elementary conductances $\bar{g}_1$, $\bar{g}_2,\ldots,\bar{g}_5$ as indicated in Fig. 1(b) is given (see for instance Ref. 15) by



FIG. 1. Two-terminal self-dual arrays of conductances (○ and ●, respectively, denote terminal and internal nodes). Within the present RG cluster (b) is renormalized into cluster (a).

$$g_H=\frac{\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_2\bar{g}_3+\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_2\bar{g}_4+\bar{g}_2\bar{g}_3\bar{g}_4+\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_3\bar{g}_4+\bar{g}_5(\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_3+\bar{g}_2\bar{g}_3+\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_4+\bar{g}_2\bar{g}_4)}{\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_2+\bar{g}_1\bar{g}_3+\bar{g}_2\bar{g}_4+\bar{g}_3\bar{g}_4+\bar{g}_5(\bar{g}_1+\bar{g}_2+\bar{g}_3+\bar{g}_4)} . \tag{8}$$

Consequently the distribution law P_H associated with Fig. 1(b) if each one of its bonds is associated with the distribution $P(g)$ [Eq. (1)] is given by

$$\begin{aligned}P_H(g)=&[(1-p)^5+(1-p)^4p]\delta(g-g_1)+4(1-p)^4p\,\delta\left[g-\frac{3g_1^2+5g_1g_2}{5g_1+3g_2}\right]+2(1-p)^3p^2\delta\left[g-\frac{g_1^2+4g_1g_2+3g_2^2}{2g_1+6g_2}\right]\\&+2(1-p)^3p^2\delta\left[g-\frac{2g_1g_2}{g_1+g_2}\right]+4(1-p)^3p^2\delta\left[g-\frac{g_1^3+5g_1^2g_2+2g_1g_2^2}{2g_1^2+5g_1g_2+g_2^2}\right]+2(1-p)^3p^2\delta\left[g-\frac{g_1^3+4g_1^2g_2+3g_1g_2^2}{3g_1^2+4g_1g_2+g_2^2}\right]\\&+2(1-p)^2p^3\delta\left[g-\frac{g_2^3+4g_2^2g_1+3g_2g_1^2}{3g_2^2+4g_2g_1+g_1^2}\right]+4(1-p)^2p^3\delta\left[g-\frac{g_2^3+5g_2^2g_1+2g_2g_1^2}{2g_2^2+5g_2g_1+g_1^2}\right]+2(1-p)^2p^3\delta\left[g-\frac{2g_2g_1}{g_2+g_1}\right]\\&+2(1-p)^2p^3\delta\left[g-\frac{g_2^2+4g_2g_1+3g_1^2}{2g_2+6g_1}\right]+4(1-p)p^4\delta\left[g-\frac{3g_2^2+5g_2g_1}{5g_2+3g_1}\right]+[(1-p)p^4+p^5)]\delta(g-g_2) .\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We could in principle follow the evolution, under successive renormalizations, of the distribution law until it attains an invariant form. This procedure has in fact already been used[3] for random resistor problems. However, an operationally much simpler and numerically excellent procedure (which has yielded quite satisfactory results for the Potts model[19]) can be followed instead, namely, to approximate distribution $P_H(g)$ by a binary one, given by

$$P'(g)=(1-p')\delta(g-g_1')+p'\delta(g-g_2') , \tag{10}$$

where p', g_1', and g_2' will be completely determined [as functions of (p,g_1,g_2)] by imposing the invariance of the three first momenta of a function $f(g)$ to be chosen. A natural possible choice is $f(g)=g$, and we shall denote g-RG as the corresponding RG. However, a more sophisticated and convenient choice is possible,[15] namely $f(g)=S(g)$ (we denote S-RG as the corresponding RG). More precisely, we impose

$$\langle S(g)\rangle_{P'}=\langle S(g)\rangle_{P_H} , \tag{11a}$$

$$\langle [S(g)]^2\rangle_{P'}=\langle [S(g)]^2\rangle_{P_H} , \tag{11b}$$

$$\langle [S(g)]^3\rangle_{P'}=\langle [S(g)]^3\rangle_{P_H} , \tag{11c}$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned}(1-p')S_1'+p'S_2'=&[(1-p)^5+(1-p)^4p]S_1\\&+4(1-p)^4pS\left[\frac{3g_1^2+5g_1g_2}{5g_1+3g_2}\right]\\&+\cdots\equiv F(p,S_1,S_2) ,\end{aligned} \tag{12a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1-p')S_1'^2+p'S_2'^2=&[(1-p)^5+(1-p)^4p]S_1^2\\&+4(1-p)^4p\left[S\left[\frac{3g_1^2+5g_1g_2}{5g_1+3g_2}\right]\right]^2\\&+\cdots\equiv G(p,S_1,S_2) ,\end{aligned} \tag{12b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1-p')S_1'^3+p'S_2'^3=&[(1-p)^5+(1-p)^4p]S_1^3\\&+4(1-p)^4p\left[S\left[\frac{3g_1^2+5g_1g_2}{5g_1+3g_2}\right]\right]^3\\&+\cdots\equiv H(p,S_1,S_2) ,\end{aligned} \tag{12c}$$

where $S_i\equiv S(g_i)$ and $S_i'\equiv S(g_i')$ $(i=1,2)$. The solution of the set of Eqs. (12) is given by

$$p'=\frac{L^2}{1+L^2} , \tag{13a}$$

$$S_1'=F\pm L\sqrt{K} , \tag{13b}$$

$$S_2'=F\mp\frac{1}{L}\sqrt{K} , \tag{13c}$$

where

$$K\equiv G-F^2\geq 0 \tag{14}$$

and

$$L\equiv\frac{[(H-3FK-F^3)^2+4K^3]^{1/2}-(H-3FK-F^3)}{2K^{3/2}} . \tag{15}$$

The upper (lower) sign in Eqs. (13b) and (13c) is to be used in the region $S_1>S_2$ $(S_1<S_2)$, i.e., $g_1>g_2$ $(g_1<g_2)$. Equations (13) unambiguously provide p', S_1', and S_2' as functions of p, S_1 and S_2 [or equivalently p', g_1', and g_2' as functions of p, g_1, and g_2; the reference conductance g_0 is cancelled out everywhere due to the homogeneous structure of Eqs. (13)], thus formally closing the operational problem. Finally, the conductivity σ of the system, as a function of p and g_1/g_2 for say fixed g_2, renormalizes as $1/g_2$ (see Refs. 3,15,16,20, and 21).

III. RESULTS

The recursive relations (13) provide the surface indicated in Fig. 2. We note that (i) two fully stable fixed points



FIG. 2. RG flow in the (p,S_1,S_2) space. The separatrix (surface delimited by the heavy lines) between the g_1-dominated and the g_2-dominated regions is invariant under the $(p,S_1,S_2)\leftrightarrow(1-p,S_2,S_1)$ transformation; the $p=\frac{1}{2}$ line constitutes in invariant subspace corresponding to the equal concentration model. ○, ●, and ■, respectively, denote fully stable, fully unstable, and semistable fixed points.



FIG. 3. Concentration dependence of the quenched bond-mixed resistor square-lattice conductivity, for typical ratios g_1/g_2 (numbers on curves). $g_1/g_2=0$ and $g_1/g_2=\infty$, respectively, correspond to the resistor-insulator and resistor-superconductor mixtures. The dashed line indicates the $p=\frac{1}{2}$ asymptote.

exist, namely, $(p,S_1,S_2)=(0,0,0)$ and $(1,1,1)$, which enable (through the determination of the separatrix between their respective attractive basins) the numerical calculation of the surface we are interested in; (ii) the insulator-resistor (superconductor-resistor) particular case corresponds to the lines on the $S_1=0$ and $S_2=0$ ($S_1=1$ and $S_2=1$) planes; (iii) the homogeneous or pure case ($g_1=g_2$) corresponds to the twisted H-like line constituted by the $p=0$, $p=1$, and $s_1=s_2$ segments; (iv) the equal-concentration case ($p=\frac{1}{2}$, $g_1\neq g_2$) corresponds to the line $S_1+S_2=1$.

In Fig. 3 we have represented, in the (σ,p) space for fixed g_2 and typical values of $\alpha\equiv g_1/g_2>0$, the surface appearing in Fig. 2.

The present S-RG provides the following *exact* results:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma(1)}\frac{d\sigma(p)}{dp}\bigg|_{p=0}=\frac{2\alpha(1-\alpha)}{1+\alpha} \tag{16}$$

and consistently

$$\frac{1}{\sigma(1)}\frac{d\sigma(p)}{dp}\bigg|_{p=1}=\frac{2(1-\alpha)}{1+\alpha}\ , \tag{17}$$

as well as

$$\sigma(0)/\sigma(1)=\alpha \tag{18}$$

and

$$\frac{\sigma(p)}{\sigma(1)}\frac{\sigma(1-p)}{\sigma(1)}=\alpha\ \ (\forall p)\ , \tag{19}$$

hence,

$$\sigma(\tfrac{1}{2})/\sigma(1)=\sqrt{\alpha}\ . \tag{19'}$$

Equation (16) recovers the $d=2$ Eq. (9) of Ref. 4; Eq. (19) recovers Eq. (5) of Ref. 9. The g-RG is numerically less performant: for instance, instead of the *exact* Eq. (16), it yields

$$\frac{1}{\sigma(1)}\frac{d\sigma(p)}{dp}\bigg|_{p=0}=\frac{8\alpha(1-\alpha)}{3\alpha+5}\ , \tag{20}$$

which coincides with the (approximate) $(d,n)=(2,1)$ Eq. (8) of Ref. 4.

The critical exponents t and s [defined, in the $p\to p_c=\frac{1}{2}$ bond percolation limit, through $\sigma(p;\alpha=0)\propto(p-p_c)^t$ and $\sigma(p;\alpha=\infty)\propto(p-p_c)^{-s}$] coincide[19] for the square lattice, but their exact numerical value is still unknown. To treat them within the present S-RG we calculate the Jacobian $J\equiv\partial(p',\alpha',S_2')/\partial(p,\alpha,S_2)$ at the percolation point $(p,\alpha,S_2)=(\frac{1}{2},0,1)$, and obtain

$$J=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{13}{8} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \frac{23}{12} & 0\\ \frac{13}{8} & 0 & \frac{23}{12}\end{bmatrix}\ , \tag{21}$$

whose eigenvalues are $\lambda_1=\frac{13}{8}$ and $\lambda_2=\lambda_3=\frac{23}{12}$. The thermal critical exponent $\nu=\ln b/\ln\lambda_1$ as well as the exponent $t=s=\ln\lambda_3/\ln_1$ we obtain are indicated in Table I.

Before closing this section, we add that the heuristic arguments proposed in Refs. 27–30 suggest the following approximate *analytic* expression for $\sigma(p)/\sigma(1)$:

$$\langle S\rangle_p=\tfrac{1}{2}\ , \tag{22}$$

TABLE I. Present RG and other available values for the critical exponents ν and $t=s$.

	g-RG	S-RG	Others
ν	1.428	1.428	$\frac{4}{3}$ (exact[a])
t	1.235	1.340	1.26[b]
			1.28±0.03[c]
			1.30[d]
			1.268[e]
			1.237[f]
			1.34[g]

[a]Reference 22.
[b]Reference 23.
[c]Reference 24.
[d]Reference 25.
[e]Reference 26.
[f]Reference 15.
[g]Reference 33.

hence,

$$(1-p)S_1+pS_2=\tfrac{1}{2}\ , \tag{23}$$

therefore,

$$\frac{(1-p)\alpha}{\alpha+\sigma(p)/\sigma(1)}+\frac{p}{1+\sigma(p)/\sigma(1)}=\frac{1}{2}\ , \tag{24}$$

and consequently,

$$\frac{\sigma(p)}{\sigma(1)}=\tfrac{1}{2}\{[(1-\alpha)^2(1-2p)^2+4\alpha]^{1/2}-(1-\alpha)(1-2p)\}\ . \tag{25}$$

It can be readily verified that this equation coincides with the $Z=4$ particular case of Eq. (5.7) of Ref. 6 obtained by Kirkpatrick through an effective medium approximation (EMA).

IV. CONCLUSION

Within a real-space renormalization-group framework, we have calculated, for arbitrary concentrations and values of the (two) possible conductances, the conductivity of a square-lattice quenched bond—random resistor network with a binary distribution of conductances. The results are very encouraging as our best renormalization group (namely, the S-RG) recovers several available exact information (critical percolation probability, slopes, dual relations) and a satisfactory value for the insulator-resistor and superconductor-resistor mixtures critical exponents $t=s\simeq 1.340$ (to be compared with other recent numerically reliable values such as 1.26,[23] 1.28,[24] 1.30,[25] 1.33,[26] etc.). In some sense, such a high accuracy is not normally expected for a renormalization approach using such a small cluster ($b=2$). Three reasons converge for this fact to happen: (i) both clusters of Fig. 1 are self-dual (two-rooted) graphs, a choice which since long is known[4,31,32] to be very convenient for the square lattice; (ii) the renormalization space is relatively large in the sense that it is three-dimensional (p,S_1,S_2); (iii) the averages are performed on a very convenient variable (namely, the S variable) as it transforms, under duality, as simply as a probability [see Eq. (7)]. An interesting technical point is worthy to be noted: the exact critical probability $p_c=\frac{1}{2}$ has been obtained *without* imposing *a priori* a *pure* percolation renormalization-group recursive relation as usually done (see, for instance, Ref. 15).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge useful discussions with E.M.F. Curado, P. R. Hauser, A. M. Mariz, L. R. da Silva, and A. O. Caride, as well as fruitful remarks by A. Conglio. One of us (U.M.S.C.) has benefited from partial support from the (Brazilian agency Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal do Encino Superior (CAPES).

*On leave of absence from Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Alagoas, 57000 Maceió Alagoas, Brazil.

[1]E. Guyon, J. Clerc, G. Giraud, and J. Roussenq, J. Phys. **42**, 1553 (1981).
[2]A. K. Sarichev, A. P. Vinogradoff, J. Phys. C **16**, L1073 (1983).
[3]R. B. Stinchcombe and B. P. Watson, J. Phys. C **9**, 3221 (1976); C. J. Lobb, D. J. Frank, and M. Tinkham, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 2262 (1981).
[4]J. Bernasconi, Phys. Rev. B **18**, 2185 (1978); J. M. Luck, J. Phys. A **18**, 2061 (1985).
[5]S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 1722 (1971).
[6]S. Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys. **45**, 574 (1973).
[7]S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B **15**, 1533 (1973).
[8]J. P. Straley, J. Phys. C **9**, 783 (1976).
[9]J. P. Straley, Phys. Rev. B **15**, 5733 (1977).
[10]A. B. Harris and R. Fish, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 796 (1977).
[11]L. Turban, J. Phys. C **11**, 449 (1978).
[12]B. J. Last and D. J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 1719 (1971).
[13]H. Ottavi, J. P. Clerc, G. Giraud, J. Roussenq, E. Guyon, and C. D. Mitescu, J. Phys. C **11**, 1311 (1978).
[14]J. P. Clerc, G. Giraud, S. Alexander, E. Guyon, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 2489 (1980).
[15]C. Tsallis, A. Coniglio, and S. Redner, J. Phys. C **16**, 4339 (1983).
[16]C. Tsallis and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. B **28**, 6603 (1983).
[17]C. Tsallis, J. Phys. C **14**, L85 (1981).
[18]F. C. Alcaraz and C. Tsallis, J. Phys. A **15**, 587 (1982).
[19]U. M. S. Costa and C. Tsallis, Physica **128A**, 207 (1984).
[20]C. Tsallis, A. Coniglio, and G. Schwachheim Phys. Rev. B **32**, 3322 (1985).
[21]L. R. Silva, N. S. Almeida, and C. Tsallis, Phys. Rev. B **32**, 4725 (1985).
[22]M. P. M. den Nijs, Physica **95A**, 449 (1979).
[23]S. Alexander and R. Orbach, J. Phys. Lett. **43**, L625 (1982).
[24]B. Derrida and J. Vannimenus, J. Phys. A **15**, L557 (1982).
[25]H. J. Herrmann, B. Derrida, and J. Vannimenus, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 4080 (1984).
[26]A. Coniglio and H. E. Stanley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1068 (1984).
[27]S. V. F. Levy, C. Tsallis, and E. M. F. Curado, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 2991 (1980).

[28]C. Tsallis and A. C. N. de Magalhães, J. Phys. **42**, L227 (1981).
[29]C. Tsallis, J. Phys. C **14**, L85 (1981).
[30]R. J. V. dos Santos and C. Tsallis, J. Phys. A **16**, 3601 (1983).
[31]P. J. Reynolds, W. Klein, and H. E. Stanley, J. Phys. C **10**, L167 (1977).
[32]J. P. Straley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 767 (1982).
[33]B. Shapiro, J. Phys. C **13**, 3387 (1980).