## <span id="page-0-0"></span>Explosive Percolation Obeys Standard Finite-Size Scaling in an Event-Based Ensemble

Ming Li $\mathbf{0}$ ,<sup>[1,\\*](#page-4-0)</sup> Junfeng Wang,<sup>1</sup> and Youjin Deng $\mathbf{0}^{2,3,\dagger}$  $\mathbf{0}^{2,3,\dagger}$  $\mathbf{0}^{2,3,\dagger}$ 

<sup>1</sup>School of Physics, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, Anhui 230009, China<br><sup>2</sup>Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Dapartment of Modes

 $H^2$ Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics,

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China <sup>3</sup>

 ${}^{3}$ MinJiang Collaborative Center for Theoretical Physics, College of Physics and Electronic Information Engineering,

Minjiang University, Fuzhou, Fujian 350108, China

(Received 20 August 2022; accepted 17 March 2023; published 4 April 2023)

Explosive percolation in the Achlioptas process, which has attracted much research attention, is known to exhibit a rich variety of critical phenomena that are anomalous from the perspective of continuous phase transitions. Hereby, we show that, in an event-based ensemble, the critical behaviors in explosive percolation are rather clean and obey the standard finite-size scaling theory, except for the large fluctuation of pseudo-critical points. In the fluctuation window, multiple fractal structures emerge and the values can be derived from a crossover scaling theory. Further, their mixing effects account well for the previously observed anomalous phenomena. Making use of the clean scaling in the event-based ensemble, we determine with a high precision the critical points and exponents for a number of bond-insertion rules and clarify ambiguities about their universalities. Our findings hold true for any spatial dimensions.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.147101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.147101)

Percolation is one of the paradigms in statistical physics and probability theory [[1](#page-4-2)]. The standard percolation model on a lattice is defined by randomly occupying sites or bonds with some probability, and undergoes a continuous phase transition. Simple alterations of the percolation, such as lattice type, only result in different critical points, and do not change the universality class [[1](#page-4-2)]. By adopting significantly different percolation rules, such as rigidity percolation [[2](#page-4-3),[3\]](#page-4-4), new universalities can arise. Nevertheless, the continuity of the transition remains robust, and the finitesize scaling (FSS) theory is always applicable.

In recent years, there has been an ongoing discussion on the so-called Achlioptas process [[4](#page-4-5)[,5\]](#page-4-6), in which some intrinsic mechanism is introduced to suppress the growth of large clusters. A basic way is called the product rule (PR) [\[6\]](#page-4-7). At each time step, two empty bonds are randomly picked up, the size product of the two clusters containing the ending sites of each bond is calculated, and the one, leading to a smaller size product, is inserted. As a consequence, the onset of percolation is significantly delayed, but once it happens, a large cluster emerges suddenly, hence the name explosive percolation (EP). EP has been observed in a wide class of Achlioptas processes, including on regular lattices [\[7](#page-4-8)[,8](#page-4-9)] and scale-free networks [\[9](#page-4-10)[,10](#page-4-11)], and in systems with other bond-insertion rules [[11](#page-4-12)–[15](#page-4-13)]. EP was perceived as a discontinuous transition when it was introduced [\[6](#page-4-7)–[11](#page-4-12),[13](#page-4-14),[16,](#page-4-15)[17\]](#page-4-16), but later studies suggested that the sharp transition is continuous, despite displaying rich anomalous behaviors [\[12](#page-4-17)[,18](#page-4-18)–[22](#page-4-19)].

Consider the largest cluster  $C_1$ , whose relative size,  $m \equiv$  $\langle C_1 \rangle/N$  (N is the system volume), acts as an order parameter. According to the FSS theory, at the critical point  $T_c$ , *m* scales as  $N^{d_f-1}$ , where  $d_f$  is the fractal dimension with respect to the system volume  $N$  [[23](#page-4-20)]. Further, the probability distribution of  $C_1$  can be renormalized to a single-variable function as  $P(\mathcal{C}_1, N)d\mathcal{C}_1 = P(x)dx$ , with  $x \equiv C_1/N^{d_f}$ . However, as in Fig. [1\(a\)](#page-1-0) for random graphs, EP displays a bimodal distribution [[19,](#page-4-21)[24\]](#page-4-22), and, further, multiple fractal dimensions emerge; i.e., different values,  $d_f^+$ and  $d_f^-$ , are needed to collapse the data for different peaks. Actually, neither of them is the correct fractal dimension, as we shall show later.

The FSS theory also tells us that  $C_1 = N^{d_f} \tilde{m} (\delta T N^{1/\nu})$ , where  $\delta T = T - T_c$ ,  $\nu$  is the correlation-length exponent with respect to the system volume N, and  $\tilde{m}(\cdot)$  is a universal function. However, a wide range of  $\nu$  values, inconsistent within the quoted errors, has been reported for EP [[18](#page-4-18),[19](#page-4-21)[,26](#page-4-23)–[28](#page-4-24)]. It was further observed [\[19](#page-4-21)[,25\]](#page-4-25) that there simultaneously exists a pair of exponents,  $\nu_1 < \nu_2$ , but neither of them is sufficient to describe the scaling of  $C_1$ data near  $T_c$ ; see Figs. [1\(b\)](#page-1-0) and [1\(c\)](#page-1-0). Other anomalous phenomena include the powder-keg mechanism [\[11\]](#page-4-12), nonself-averaging property [\[15\]](#page-4-13), and hysteresis [\[29\]](#page-4-26). It seems that, despite being continuous, EP does not obey the standard FSS theory, and extracting correct exponents becomes difficult. This leads to controversies about how the universality of EP depends on bond-insertion rules.

By dynamically recording  $C_1(t)$ , where time step t is also the number of inserted bonds, the event,  $T_N \equiv t_{\text{max}}/N$ , can be located by the maximum point  $t_{\text{max}}$  of the incremental size,  $C_1(t) - C_1(t - 1)$  [\[14,](#page-4-27)[18](#page-4-18)[,30](#page-4-28)[,31\]](#page-4-29). Major progress was recently achieved [[25](#page-4-25)], in which the pseudo-critical point

<span id="page-1-0"></span>

FIG. 1. Anomalous scaling behaviors in the conventional ensemble. (a) The bimodal distribution  $P(x)$  of the largest cluster size  $C_1$  at  $T_c$ . Data collapse around the right peak is achieved by defining  $x = C_1/N^{d_f^+}$  with  $d_f^+ = 0.956$ , while for the left peak, one has to use a smaller value  $d_f^- = 0.657$  and a rescaled exponent  $\eta = 0.08$ . (b),(c) The scaling of  $C_1$  near  $T_c$ , with the exponents  $1/\nu_1 = 0.740$  and  $1/\nu_2 = 0.500$  (the correct fractal dimension  $d_f = 0.935$  is used here), The data collapse is somewhat better for  $\nu_2$ , which was incorrectly regarded as the correlation-length exponent [[19](#page-4-21),[25](#page-4-25)].

 $T_N \equiv \langle T_N \rangle$  and the variance  $\sigma_T^2 \equiv \langle T_N^2 \rangle - \langle T_N \rangle^2$  are calculated. The correct fractal dimension for random graphs,  $d_f = 0.935$ , was obtained at  $T_N$ . It was further observed that the deviation decays as  $T_N - T_c \sim N^{-1/\nu_1} = N^{-0.75}$ , but the fluctuation vanishes more slowly as  $\sigma_T \sim N^{-1/\nu_2} = N^{-0.50}$ . The authors concluded that  $\nu_2$  serves as the correlationlength exponent of EP.

In this Letter, we study EP in a similar way as in Refs. [[14](#page-4-27),[18](#page-4-18)[,25,](#page-4-25)[30\]](#page-4-28). A simple but important difference is that, after locating  $T_N$ , the process was repeated according to the recorded sequence of inserted bonds. This allows us to sample any quantity at any time step. Here, we focus on two basic quantities—the order parameter  $m$  and the susceptibility  $\chi = \langle \sum_{i \neq 1} C_i^2 \rangle / N$ . From the total number of clusters with size in  $[s, s + \Delta s]$ , we also calculate the cluster-number density  $n(s, N)$ . By definition, one has  $\chi = \sum_{s} s^{2} n(s, N)$ . We explore the scaling behaviors of these quantities and their dependence on the dynamic deviation  $\delta T \equiv T - T_N$ . To distinguish from the conventional ensemble of fixed bond density, we call such dynamic sampling to be in the event-based ensemble.

We perform extensive simulations on random graphs and on hypercubic lattices in dimensions from two to six and observe the following. First, we find that, at  $T_N$  and in terms of  $\delta T$ , the standard FSS theory applies well to any quantity as  $Q(T, N) = N^Y \tilde{Q}(\delta T N^{1/\nu_1})$ , with Y the associated exponent. Note that the correlation-length exponent is unique, which is  $\nu_1$  instead of  $\nu_2$ . Second, we reveal that

the previously observed exponents  $d_f^{\pm}$  correspond to the fractal dimensions in the fluctuation window  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_2})$  at the supercritical and subcritical sides of  $T_N$ , respectively. Moreover, we propose a crossover scaling theory and derive the values of  $d_f^{\pm}$ . All these findings hold true for any dimension and a number of bond-insertion rules. Finally, we determine with a high precision the percolation threshold and the critical exponents for a number of bondinsertion rules and identify their universalities. For clarity, herein we only present the numerical results for the basic EP (with the product rule) on random graphs and will publish other results elsewhere [\[32\]](#page-4-30).

Standard finite-size scaling in the event-based ensemble.—The probability distribution of  $C_1$  at  $T_N$  is displayed in Fig. [2\(a\)](#page-1-1). In contrast to Fig. [1\(a\),](#page-1-0) the distribution is smooth and has a single peak, and, more importantly, it can be expressed as a single-variable function as  $P(x = C_1/N^{d_f})$ . Note that the correct fractal dimension,  $d_f = 0.935$ , equals neither to  $d_f^+$  nor to  $d_f^-$ . In standard percolation, the cluster-number density at criticality follows a power-law behavior up to a cutoff size  $s_N \sim N^{d_f}$ , i.e.,  $n(s, N) = s^{-\tau} \tilde{n}(s/s_N)$ , and the Fisher exponent  $\tau$  satisfies the hyperscaling relation  $\tau = 1 + 1/d_f$ . For EP, this gives  $\tau = 2.07$  from  $d_f = 0.935$ , and the nice data collapse in the inset of Fig. [2\(a\)](#page-1-1) clearly demonstrates that  $n(s, N)$  for EP obeys the standard FSS form.

Following the standard FSS ansatz, we plot, respectively, in Figs. [2\(b\)](#page-1-1) and [2\(c\)](#page-1-1), the largest cluster  $C_1$  and the susceptibility  $\chi$  versus the renormalized dynamic deviation

<span id="page-1-1"></span>

FIG. 2. Standard FSS behaviors in the event-based ensemble. (a) At  $T_N$ ,  $C_1$  has a uniform distribution  $P(x = C_1/N^{d_f})$ , where the correct fractal dimension is  $d_f = 0.935$  instead of  $d_f^+$  or  $d_f^-$ . The inset shows that the cluster-number density obeys  $n(s, N) = s^{-\tau} \tilde{n}(s/N^{d_f})$ , with  $\tau = 1 + 1/d_f \approx 2.07$ . (b),(c) Over a wide range at both sides of  $T_N$ , the standard FSS form holds well for  $C_1$  and susceptibility  $\chi$ , where the jump arises from the event-based definition of  $T_N$ . The correct correlation-length exponent is  $1/\nu_1 = 0.740$ , instead of  $1/\nu_2 = 0.500$  [\[19](#page-4-21)[,25\]](#page-4-25).

 $z \equiv \delta T N^{1/\nu_1}$ , where  $d_f = 0.935$  and  $1/\nu_1 = 0.740$ . Excellent data collapse is achieved over a wide range of  $z$ , which strongly supports that, despite of being sharp, EP is a continuous transition and obeys the standard FSS theory.

To determine the percolation threshold  $T_c$  and the critical exponents,  $d_f$  and  $1/\nu_1$ , we fit data to the standard FSS ansatz,

<span id="page-2-1"></span>
$$
T_N = T_c + N^{-1/\nu_1} (b_0 + b_1 N^{-\omega_1} + b_2 N^{-\omega_2}), \tag{1}
$$

$$
C_1 = N^{d_f}(a_0 + a_1 N^{-\omega_1} + a_2 N^{-\omega_2}), \quad (T = \mathcal{T}_N), \quad (2)
$$

where the terms with  $\omega_i$  (i = 1, 2) are for finite-size corrections. We obtain  $T_c = 0.8884491(2)$ ,  $d_f = 0.935(1)$ , and  $1/\nu_1 = 0.740(2)$ , where systematic errors have been taken into account.

Fluctuation window and multiple fractal dimensions.— For standard percolation, the deviation and the fluctuation of  $T_N$  are in the same order,  $T_N - T_c \sim \sigma_T \sim N^{-1/\nu_1}$ , where exponent  $\nu_1$  is unique. For EP, however,  $\sigma_T$  vanishes with a much slower speed and is governed by another exponent as  $\sigma_T \sim N^{-1/\nu_2}$  [[25](#page-4-25)]. The fit of the  $\sigma_T$  data gives  $1/\nu_2 = 0.503 \approx 1/2$ , and the inequality,  $\nu_1 < \nu_2$ , is clearly shown in Fig. [3\(a\)](#page-2-0). Thus, beyond the standard scaling window  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_1})$ , a fluctuation window  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_2})$  is well defined.

<span id="page-2-0"></span>

FIG. 3. Multiple critical exponents as determined by the standard FSS ansatz. (a) The deviation is  $T_N - T_c \sim N^{-1/\nu_1}$  with  $1/\nu_1=0.740(2)$ , but the fluctuation is  $\sigma_T \sim N^{-1/\nu_2}$  with  $1/\nu_2 = 0.503(3)$ . The fluctuation window  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_2})$  is larger than the standard scaling window  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_1})$ , implying a nonself-averaging effect in the conventional ensemble. (b) The largest clusters,  $C_1$  at  $T_N$ ,  $C_1^{\pm}$  in the fluctuation window  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_2})$  for  $T > T_N$  and  $T < T_N$ , respectively. It is shown that, while  $C_1$  has the fractal dimension  $d_f = 0.935(1)$ ,  $C_1^{\pm}$  have  $d_f^+ = 0.956(2)$  and  $d_f^- = 0.657(3)$ , respectively.

We sample observables at  $\mathcal{T}_N^{\pm} \equiv \mathcal{T}_N \pm a N^{-1/\nu_2}$  and set  $a = 1$  for simplicity. The largest cluster sizes  $C_1^{\pm}$  are also well described by a power-law scaling [Fig. [3\(b\)\]](#page-2-0). The fits by Eq. [\(2\)](#page-2-1) give  $d_f^+ = 0.956(3)$  for  $T_N^+$  and  $d_f^- = 0.657(3)$ for  $\mathcal{T}_{N}^-$ , which agree well with those in Fig. [1\(a\)](#page-1-0). This means that the two peaks in Fig. [1\(a\)](#page-1-0) actually correspond to the scaling behaviors in the fluctuation window, respectively at the supercritical and subcritical sides. It is thus revealed that the critical behaviors in the conventional ensemble are effectively a mixture of those in the fluctuation window.

The pseudo-critical points  $T<sub>N</sub>$  typically deviate away from the thermodynamic point  $T_c$  by an amount of  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_2})$ , while the correct critical behaviors are around  $T_N$  within a narrow window  $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/\nu_1})$ . In terms of  $z = \delta T N^{1/\nu_1}$ , the fluctuation window is infinitely large as  $|z| \sim N^{1/\nu_1-1/\nu_2} \to \infty$ . This suggests that the mixing effect is over an infinite range and cannot be averaged out by taking more samples. It is thus not surprising that anomalous critical phenomena arise at  $T_c$ .

Relation between multiple fractal dimensions.—From the scaling behaviors in Fig. [2,](#page-1-1) we expect that  $d_f = 0.935$  is the only correct fractal dimension and  $d_f^{\pm}$  can be derived. According to the FSS theory, the correlated size behaves as  $\xi_s \sim |\delta T|^{-\nu_1}$ , so that  $|z| = |\delta T| N^{1/\nu_1} \sim (N/\xi_s)^{1/\nu_1}$ . In the fluctuation window, which has  $N \gg \xi_s$  from  $z \to \infty$ , the thermodynamic scaling should be recovered.

Let us consider the crossover scaling from finite  $N$  to infinite N. For susceptibility, as |z| increases,  $\chi = N^{2d_f-1}\tilde{\chi}(z)$ should gradually evolve to  $\chi \sim |\delta T|^{-\gamma}$ . To eliminate finite-N dependence, it is requested that  $\tilde{\chi}(|z| \to \infty) \sim |z|^{-\gamma}$ , with  $\gamma/\nu=2d_f-1$ . The thermodynamic correspondence of  $C_1$  is the order parameter  $m = N^{d_f-1}\tilde{m}(z)$ . For a continuous phase transition and for infinite N, m remains zero for  $\delta T < 0$  and the long-range order is continuously developed as  $(\delta T)^{\beta}$  for  $\delta T > 0$ . In the supercritical phase, the crossover scaling of  $\tilde{m}(z)$  can be extracted as  $\tilde{m}(z\rightarrow\infty)\sim z^{\beta}$ , with  $\beta/\nu=1-d_{f}$ . These are well supported by Fig. [4.](#page-3-0)

From  $C_1 = N^{d_f} \tilde{m}(z)$ ,  $\tilde{m}(z) \sim z^{\beta}$ , and  $z \sim N^{1/\nu_1 - 1/\nu_2}$ , the  $d_f^+$ value is readily calculated as  $d_f^+ = 1 - (1 - d_f)(\nu_1/\nu_2) \approx$ 0.956, in excellent agreement with those in Figs. [1\(a\)](#page-1-0) and [3\(b\).](#page-2-0) At the subcritical side, from the correlated size,  $\xi_s \sim |\delta T|^{-\nu_1} \sim N^{\nu_1/\nu_2}$ , we expect  $C_1^- \sim \xi_s^{d_f} \sim N^{d_f(\nu_1/\nu_2)}$ , giving  $d_f^- = d_f(\nu_1/\nu_2) \approx 0.632$ . This is somewhat smaller than  $d_f^-$  = 0.657 in Figs. [1\(a\)](#page-1-0) and [3\(b\)](#page-2-0), and it can be explained by an alternative way based on  $\chi$  and  $n(s, N)$ .

Consider a subcritical window  $O(N^{-1/\lambda})$  centered around  $T_N$ , with  $\lambda > \nu_1$ , we have  $\chi \sim N^{(2d_f-1)(\nu_1/\lambda)}$  from the crossover scaling of  $\chi$ , and expect  $n(s, N) = s^{-\tau} \tilde{n}(s/s_\lambda)$ , with the cutoff size  $s_{\lambda} \sim N^{d_{\lambda}} < N^{d_f}$ . The number of clusters of size  $s_{\lambda}$  is diverging, which is  $N_{\lambda} \sim N s_{\lambda}^{1-\tau} \sim N^{1-(d_{\lambda}/d_{f})}$ , with  $s^{1-\tau}$  for the cumulative cluster-number density. With this, the leading term of  $\chi$  can be expressed as

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

FIG. 4. Crossover scaling behaviors in terms of the renormalized dynamic distance  $z = \delta T N^{1/\nu_1}$ . (a) The universal function  $\tilde{m}(z)$  in the FSS of the order parameter,  $m = N^{d_f-1}\tilde{m}(z)$ , scales as  $\tilde{m}(z \to \infty) \sim z^{\beta}$  in the supercritical side, with  $\beta = (1 - d_f)\nu_1 \approx$ 0.088. (b),(c) The universal function  $\tilde{\gamma}(z)$  in the FSS of the susceptibility,  $\chi = N^{2d_f-1}\tilde{\chi}(z)$ , scales as  $\tilde{\chi}(|z| \to \infty) \sim |z|^{-\gamma}$ , with  $\gamma = (2d_f - 1)\nu_1 \approx 1.18$ , which holds true at both the subcritical  $(z < 0)$  and the supercritical  $(z > 0)$  sides of  $T<sub>N</sub>$ .

 $s_{\lambda}^2 N_{\lambda}/N \sim N^{2d_{\lambda}-d_{\lambda}/d_f}$ . Thus, by setting  $(2d_f-1)(\nu_1/\lambda)$  =  $2d_{\lambda} - d_{\lambda}/d_f$ , the relation between  $d_{\lambda}$  and  $d_f$  is established,  $d_{\lambda} = d_f(\nu_1/\lambda)$ , and  $d_f^- = d_f(\nu_1/\nu_2)$  is recovered for  $\lambda = \nu_2$ . Note that  $d_{\lambda}$  is to characterize the typical size of a diverging number of clusters, while  $C_1$  is the largest one. From the extreme-value theory, one expects  $C_1 \sim N^{d_\lambda}(\ln N)^{\kappa}$ , where exponent  $\kappa$  depends on the distribution of cutoff clusters. This explains why the fitting result ( $d_f^-$  = 0.657) is slightly larger than the predicted value ( $d_f^-$  = 0.632).

Universalities.—Unlike in standard percolation, it is suggested that, for EP, small alteration of bond-insertion rule can lead to different critical exponents [\[4](#page-4-5)]. For instance, the basic product rule can be modified into the sum rule (SUM) [[6\]](#page-4-7), which calculates the total size of the two clusters associated with each candidate bond. Further, an additional rule (AD) can be adopted by preferentially inserting the intracluster bond  $[17]$  $[17]$  $[17]$ . One can also apply the best of m rule [\[11\]](#page-4-12), i.e., choose three candidate bonds  $(m3)$  or even more. On random graphs, the rule of [[12\]](#page-4-17), we call it CDGM by combining the initials of the authors' surnames, is applied: choose a pair of random sites and reserve the site in the smaller cluster, repeat the procedure for the second pair, and finally, insert a bond between the two reserved sites. Controversies remain about how the EP universality depends on bond-insertion rules. As an exemplified case, debate still exists whether the AD rule would change the universality of EP [[17](#page-4-16)]; the fractal dimension was even estimated to be larger than the system dimension, which is clearly unphysical [\[33](#page-4-31)].

<span id="page-3-1"></span>TABLE I. Percolation thresholds  $T_c$  and critical exponents for various bond-insertion rules, including the product rule (PR), the sum rule (SUM), the CDGM rule, the best of m rule for  $m = 3$  $(m3)$ , and the additional rule (AD). EP has two basic exponents, the correlation-length exponent  $\nu_1$  and the fractal dimension  $d_f$ , and, in addition, it has the fluctuation exponent  $\nu_2$ . It is argued that the fluctuation obeys the central-limit theorem and, thus,  $\nu_2 = 2$  holds exactly.

Rules	$T_c$	$1/\nu_1$	$d_f$	$1/\nu_2$
<b>PR</b>	0.8884491(2)	0.740(2)	0.935(1)	0.503(3)
$PR + AD$	0.8884490(4)	0.740(3)	0.935(1)	0.504(3)
<b>SUM</b>	0.860207(1)	0.80(3)	0.957(5)	0.503(2)
$SUM + AD$	0.860206(1)	0.80(3)	0.953(5)	0.500(3)
<b>CDGM</b>	0.9232074(3)	0.8181(1)	0.9545(1)	0.500(2)
m <sub>3</sub>	0.9647899(1)	0.875(1)	0.979(1)	0.501(1)

In the event-based ensemble, we study EP for a list of bond-insertion rules, and the results for random graphs are given in Table [I.](#page-3-1) We obtain the following. (1) The AD rule does not change the universality, or even the percolation threshold. (2) Universalities are different for the PR, the SUM, and the m3 rule; the phase transition seems to be sharpest for the  $m3$  rule. (3) The CDGM rule seems to be in the same universality as the SUM rule, within the estimated errors. But its finite-size corrections are significantly smaller and the estimated exponents have much higher precision, which are in excellent agreement with the result of the numerical method [[21](#page-4-32)].

Discussions.—By an event-based method, we find that EP obeys the standard FSS theory. As standard percolation, EP has two basic exponents, the fractal dimension  $d_f$  and the correlation-length exponent  $\nu_1$ , which can describe well the critical behaviors of any quantities near the pseudocritical points  $T_N$ . Nevertheless, EP has a large fluctuation of  $T_N$ , which is governed by another exponent  $\nu_2 > \nu_1$ . This scenario holds true for different bond-insertion rules, and for any dimension [\[32\]](#page-4-30). The high-precision estimate of critical exponents enables us to establish the EP universalities for various bond-insertion rules.

The obtained  $\nu_2$  values agree well with 2, except for two dimensions where  $1/\nu_2 = 0.484(4)$  is slightly smaller than 0.5 [\[32\]](#page-4-30). In units of the renormalized dynamic deviation  $z$ , the fluctuation of  $T_N$  is infinitely large  $N^{1/\nu_1-1/\nu_2}$ , implying that the central-limit theorem is satisfied. Thus, the fluctuation may asymptotically be of Gaussian type and  $\nu_2 = 2$ holds exactly. On this basis, we argue that  $\nu_2$  is merely a fluctuation exponent and cannot act as a correlation-length exponent.

The anomalous phenomena in the conventional ensemble are revealed to be a mixture of critical behaviors over the fluctuation window. Since it is infinitely wide in units of the renormalized deviation, the self-averaging effect is lacking, and this leads to the inequivalence of different ensembles. Moreover, the multiple fractal dimensions are derived based on the crossover scaling from finite N to infinite N.

The effective event-based method can find broad applications, since large sample-to-sample fluctuations can widely exist in systems like disordered ones [[34](#page-4-33)]. Moreover, the proposed crossover scaling theory may provide important insights for connecting critical behaviors in different ensembles.

The authors acknowledge helpful discussions with Peter Grassberger, Jingfang Fan, and Sheng Fang. The research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12275263 and the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2018YFA0306501).

<span id="page-4-2"></span><span id="page-4-1"></span><span id="page-4-0"></span>[\\*](#page-0-0) lim@hfut.edu.cn

[†](#page-0-0) yjdeng@ustc.edu.cn

- <span id="page-4-3"></span>[1] D. Stauffer and A. Aharony, *Introduction to Percolation* Theory, 2nd ed. (Taylor & Francis, London, 1991).
- <span id="page-4-4"></span>[2] D. J. Jacobs and M. F. Thorpe, Generic Rigidity Percolation: The Pebble Game, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.4051) 75, 4051 (1995).
- <span id="page-4-5"></span>[3] D. J. Jacobs and M. F. Thorpe, Generic rigidity percolation in two dimensions, Phys. Rev. E 53[, 3682 \(1996\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.53.3682)
- [4] S. Boccaletti, J. A. Almendral, S. Guan, I. Leyva, Z. Liu, I. Sendiña-Nadal, Z. Wang, and Y. Zou, Explosive transitions in complex networks' structure and dynamics: Percolation and synchronization, [Phys. Rep.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2016.10.004) 660, 1 (2016).
- <span id="page-4-7"></span><span id="page-4-6"></span>[5] A. A. Saberi, Recent advances in percolation theory and its applications, [Phys. Rep.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2015.03.003) 578, 1 (2015).
- <span id="page-4-8"></span>[6] Dimitris Achlioptas, Raissa M. D'Souza, and Joel Spencer, Explosive percolation in random networks, [Science](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167782) 323, [1453 \(2009\)](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167782).
- <span id="page-4-9"></span>[7] Robert M. Ziff, Explosive Growth in Biased Dynamic Percolation on Two-Dimensional Regular Lattice Networks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103[, 045701 \(2009\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.045701)
- <span id="page-4-10"></span>[8] Robert M. Ziff, Scaling behavior of explosive percolation on the square lattice, Phys. Rev. E 82[, 051105 \(2010\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.82.051105)
- <span id="page-4-11"></span>[9] Y. S. Cho, J. S. Kim, J. Park, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, Percolation Transitions in Scale-Free Networks Under the Achlioptas Process, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103[, 135702 \(2009\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.135702).
- <span id="page-4-12"></span>[10] Filippo Radicchi and Santo Fortunato, Explosive Percolation in Scale-Free Networks, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.168701) 103, 168701 [\(2009\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.168701)
- <span id="page-4-17"></span>[11] Eric J. Friedman and Adam S. Landsberg, Construction and Analysis of Random Networks with Explosive Percolation, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103[, 255701 \(2009\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.255701)
- <span id="page-4-14"></span>[12] R. A. da Costa, S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, Explosive Percolation Transition is Actually Continuous, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105[, 255701 \(2010\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.255701).
- <span id="page-4-27"></span>[13] Raissa M. D'Souza and Michael Mitzenmacher, Local Cluster Aggregation Models of Explosive Percolation, [Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.195702) Rev. Lett. 104[, 195702 \(2010\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.195702)
- <span id="page-4-13"></span>[14] Jan Nagler, Anna Levina, and Marc Timme, Impact of single links in competitive percolation, [Nat. Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys1860) 7, 265 [\(2011\).](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys1860)
- [15] Oliver Riordan and Lutz Warnke, Achlioptas processes are not always self-averaging, Phys. Rev. E 86[, 011129 \(2012\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.86.011129)
- <span id="page-4-15"></span>[16] Filippo Radicchi and Santo Fortunato, Explosive percolation: A numerical analysis, [Phys. Rev. E](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.81.036110) 81, 036110 [\(2010\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.81.036110)
- <span id="page-4-16"></span>[17] Y. S. Cho and B. Kahng, Suppression Effect on Explosive Percolation, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107[, 275703 \(2011\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.275703).
- <span id="page-4-18"></span>[18] Hyun Keun Lee, Beom Jun Kim, and Hyunggyu Park, Continuity of the explosive percolation transition, [Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.84.020101) Rev. E 84[, 020101\(R\) \(2011\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.84.020101)
- <span id="page-4-21"></span>[19] Peter Grassberger, Claire Christensen, Golnoosh Bizhani, Seung-Woo Son, and Maya Paczuski, Explosive Percolation is Continuous, but with Unusual Finite Size Behavior, [Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.225701) Rev. Lett. 106[, 225701 \(2011\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.225701)
- [20] Oliver Riordan and Lutz Warnke, Explosive percolation is continuous, Science 333[, 322 \(2011\)](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1206241).
- <span id="page-4-32"></span>[21] R. A. da Costa, S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, Critical exponents of the explosive percolation transition, Phys. Rev. E 89[, 042148 \(2014\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.89.042148)
- <span id="page-4-19"></span>[22] Raissa M. D'Souza and Jan Nagler, Anomalous critical and supercritical phenomena in explosive percolation, [Nat.](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys3378) Phys. 11[, 531 \(2015\).](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys3378)
- <span id="page-4-20"></span>[23] The standard definition of the fractal dimension  $d_f^*$  is as  $C_1 \sim L^{d_f^*}$ , where L is the length of hypercubic lattices. Because of the absence of system length in random graphs, we define the fractal dimension as  $C_1 \sim N^{d_f}$ . For a hypercubic lattice, we have  $N = L^d$ , and thus  $d_f = d_f^*/d$ , where d is the system dimension.
- <span id="page-4-22"></span>[24] Liang Tian and Da-Ning Shi, The nature of explosive percolation phase transition, [Phys. Lett. A](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physleta.2011.11.039) 376, 286 [\(2012\).](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physleta.2011.11.039)
- <span id="page-4-25"></span>[25] Jingfang Fan, Jun Meng, Yang Liu, Abbas Ali Saberi, Jürgen Kurths, and Jan Nagler, Universal gap scaling in percolation, Nat. Phys. 16[, 455 \(2020\)](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-019-0783-2).
- <span id="page-4-23"></span>[26] Y. S. Cho, S.-W. Kim, J. D. Noh, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, Finite-size scaling theory for explosive percolation transitions, Phys. Rev. E 82[, 042102 \(2010\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.82.042102).
- [27] Jiantong Li and Mikael Östling, Corrected finite-size scaling in percolation, [Phys. Rev. E](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.86.040105)  $86$ , 040105(R) [\(2012\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.86.040105)
- <span id="page-4-24"></span>[28] Jingfang Fan, Maoxin Liu, Liangsheng Li, and Xiaosong Chen, Continuous percolation phase transitions of random networks under a generalized achlioptas process, [Phys. Rev.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.85.061110) E 85[, 061110 \(2012\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.85.061110).
- <span id="page-4-26"></span>[29] Nikolaos Bastas, Kosmas Kosmidis, and Panos Argyrakis, Explosive site percolation and finite-size hysteresis, [Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.84.066112) Rev. E 84[, 066112 \(2011\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.84.066112).
- <span id="page-4-28"></span>[30] S. S. Manna and Arnab Chatterjee, A new route to explosive percolation, [Physica \(Amsterdam\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2010.10.009) 390A, 177 [\(2011\).](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2010.10.009)
- <span id="page-4-29"></span>[31] M. Feshanjerdi and A. A. Saberi, Universality class of epidemic percolation transitions driven by random walks, Phys. Rev. E 104[, 064125 \(2021\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.104.064125).
- <span id="page-4-30"></span>[32] Detailed simulations and data analyses for different bondinsertion rules and different spatial dimensions are in progress.
- <span id="page-4-31"></span>[33] Qianqian Wu and Junfeng Wang, Thresholds and critical exponents of explosive bond percolation on the square lattice, [Int. J. Mod. Phys. C](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129183122500966) 33, 2250096 (2022).
- <span id="page-4-33"></span>[34] Karim Bernardet, Ferenc Pázmándi, and G. G. Batrouni, Disorder Averaging and Finite-Size Scaling, [Phys. Rev.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.4477) Lett. 84[, 4477 \(2000\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.4477).