

## FINITE SIZE SCALING IN THREE-DIMENSIONAL BOOTSTRAP PERCOLATION<sup>1</sup>

BY RAPHAËL CERF AND EMILIO N. M. CIRILLO

*Université Paris Sud*

We consider the problem of bootstrap percolation on a three-dimensional lattice and we study its finite size scaling behavior. Bootstrap percolation is an example of cellular automata defined on the  $d$ -dimensional lattice  $\{1, 2, \dots, L\}^d$  in which each site can be empty or occupied by a single particle; in the starting configuration each site is occupied with probability  $p$ , occupied sites remain occupied forever, while empty sites are occupied by a particle if at least  $\ell$  among their  $2d$  nearest neighbor sites are occupied. When  $d$  is fixed, the most interesting case is the one  $\ell = d$ : this is a sort of threshold, in the sense that the critical probability  $p_c$  for the dynamics on the infinite lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  switches from zero to one when this limit is crossed. Finite size effects in the three-dimensional case are already known in the cases  $\ell \leq 2$ ; in this paper we discuss the case  $\ell = 3$  and we show that the finite size scaling function for this problem is of the form  $f(L) = \text{const}/\ln \ln L$ . We prove a conjecture proposed by A. C. D. van Enter.

**1. Introduction.** Cellular automata are dynamical systems defined on the  $d$ -dimensional lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  in which each site of the lattice is occupied by one of finitely many *types* at each time  $t$ . An update rule is defined, which is *homogeneous* (all the sites follow the same rule) and *local* (transitions are determined by the configuration of types on a finite set of neighboring sites) [19, 14].

These models can be thought of as interacting particle systems and their connections with statistical mechanics models have been widely studied in past years (see, e.g., [6, 13, 18, 20]). A particular example of cellular automata, known as *bootstrap percolation*, has been introduced in [5] to model some magnetic systems. More information on the physical relevance of this model is given in [4, 7].

In bootstrap percolation only two different types are associated to each site: each site can be either occupied by a particle or empty. In the starting configuration each site is independently occupied with probability  $p$ . Occupied sites remain occupied forever, while empty sites become occupied by a particle if at least  $\ell$  among their  $2d$  nearest neighbor sites are occupied. The object of primary interest is the probability  $p_{\text{full}}(\ell)$  that at the end of the dynamics, that is, in the infinite time configuration, all the sites are occupied. The basic

---

Received December 1998; revised June 1999.

<sup>1</sup>Supported in part by the European network “Stochastic Analysis and Its Applications” ERB-FMRX-CT96-0075.

AMS 1991 subject classifications. Primary 60K35; secondary 82B43.

Key words and phrases. Cellular automata, bootstrap percolation, finite size scaling, critical length.

question that has been addressed in physics literature is whether by changing the value of the parameter  $p$  the system exhibits a sort of phase transition, that is, whether there exists a critical value  $p_c(\ell) \in [0, 1]$  such that  $p_{\text{full}}(\ell) = 1$  if  $p > p_c(\ell)$  and  $p_{\text{full}}(\ell) < 1$  if  $p < p_c(\ell)$ .

For a fixed dimension  $d$ , any site occupied in the dynamics associated to  $\ell$  is also occupied in the dynamics associated to  $\ell - 1$ . Hence  $p_c(\ell)$  is an increasing function of  $\ell$ . The first rigorous result on the value of  $p_c(\ell)$  is due to van Enter, who used the idea of Straley's argument [7] to prove that in the case  $d = 2$  and  $\ell = 2$  the critical probability is equal to zero [15]. In [10, 12], Schonmann has proved that  $p_c(\ell) \in \{0, 1\}$ , more precisely  $p_c(\ell) = 0$  if  $\ell \leq d$ , otherwise  $p_c(\ell) = 1$ ; these results suggest that the most peculiar case is  $\ell = d$ .

Before these rigorous results the phase transition scenario in bootstrap percolation models was not clear. The technique that had been used to measure the critical probability  $p_c(\ell)$  was the finite size scaling: a finite volume estimate of the critical probability was found by means of Monte Carlo simulations on a finite lattice  $\Lambda_L = \{1, 2, \dots, L\}^d$ , for instance, the probability  $p_L^{0.5}$  that one half of the samples were completely filled at the end of the dynamics, and the critical value  $p_c(\ell)$  was extrapolated by means of a suitable scaling function  $f(L)$ . That is, the expression

$$(1.1) \quad p_L^{0.5} - p_c(\ell) \stackrel{L \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} f(L)$$

was supposed to be valid and Monte Carlo data were properly fitted by means of the function  $f(L)$  (see [1] and references therein).

It is rather clear that the estimate of  $p_c$  strongly depends on the choice of the scaling function  $f(L)$ ; the typical choice, when critical effects in second-order phase transition are studied, is  $f(L) = \text{const} \times L^{-1/\nu}$  where  $\nu$  is a suitable exponent. In fact this choice with  $1/\nu = d$  is correct in the case  $\ell = 1$ , while estimations of  $p_c(\ell)$  in the cases  $\ell = 2$  and  $d \geq 2$  obtained by means of Monte Carlo data analyzed through this function  $f(L)$  did not fit in the rigorous scenario depicted by Schonmann's results [1]. The problem is that the power law  $L^{-1/\nu}$  approaches zero too quickly and must be replaced by a slower function  $f(L) = \text{const} \times (\ln L)^{-(d-1)}$  as suggested by the finite volume results of Aizenman and Lebowitz [3, 8]. Indeed the analysis of old and new data performed with the correct scaling function yields the correct estimate of the critical probability [2, 16, 17].

In [3] bootstrap percolation on finite lattices  $\Lambda_L$  is considered in the case  $\ell = 2$  and  $d \geq 2$  and it is observed that if  $p$  is kept fixed, then in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  the probability  $p_{\text{full}}^{L,p}$  to fill  $\{1, \dots, L\}^d$  tends to one whatever the value of  $p$  is. But if  $p \rightarrow 0$  together with  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , then it is possible to find a particular regime in which the probability to fill everything tends to zero. Indeed it is proved in [3] that there exist two constants  $c_+ > c_- > 0$  such that if  $p \geq c_+ / (\ln L)^{d-1}$  then  $p_{\text{full}}^{L,p} \rightarrow 1$  when  $p \rightarrow 0$  and  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , while if  $p \leq c_- / (\ln L)^{d-1}$ , then in the same limit  $p_{\text{full}}^{L,p} \rightarrow 0$ .

Let us focus on the case  $d = 3$ . The choice  $\ell = 2$  is not the most delicate one; indeed, according to [12] in the case  $\ell = 3$ , that is, even in a situation

in which it is more difficult to fill empty sites, the critical probability  $p_{\text{full}}$  is still zero. Hence one can guess that in the case  $d = 3$ ,  $\ell = 3$ , the correct finite scaling function is not the Aizenman–Lebowitz one, but perhaps a function approaching zero more slowly. Our aim is to study this case and to show that results similar to those in [3], and conjectured by A. C. D. van Enter, hold with the scaling function  $f(L) = \text{const}/\ln \ln L$ . This problem has been proposed in [12] as Problem 3.1; we notice also that related questions have been discussed in [9, 11].

An interesting follow up would be the generalization of our results to the  $d$ -dimensional case with  $\ell = d$ . In this case one expects  $f(L) = \text{const}/(\ln \ln \cdots \ln L)$  with the logarithm applied  $d - 1$  times.

In Section 2 we introduce the notations and we state the main result. Theorem 2.1 is proved in Section 3.

**2. Notation and results.** We first describe the model of bootstrap percolation that we are going to study. Let us consider the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  and the discrete time variable  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . The status of the site  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^3$  at time  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  is described by a random variable  $X_t(x)$  with values in  $\{0, 1\}$ . The site  $x$  is occupied at time  $t$  if  $X_t(x) = 1$  and empty if  $X_t(x) = 0$ . We denote by  $\Omega := \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^3}$  the space of the configurations and by  $X_t \in \Omega$  the configuration of the system at time  $t$ . The initial configuration  $X_0$  is chosen by occupying independently each site of the lattice with probability  $p$  (initial density). Then the system evolves according to the following deterministic rules:

1. If  $X_t(x) = 1$ , then  $X_{t+1}(x) = 1$  (1's are stable).
2. If  $X_t(x) = 0$  and  $x$  has at least three occupied sites among its six nearest neighbors, then  $X_{t+1}(x) = 1$ .
3.  $X_{t+1}(x) = 0$  otherwise.

We omit in our notations the dependence of the process  $X_t$  on the initial density  $p$ . When the initial density will be different from  $p$  it will be clearly stated. We denote by  $X$  the final configuration attained by the system when the dynamics stops, that is,

$$(2.1) \quad X := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t.$$

By Schonmann's result [10, 12], we know that  $X(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^3$  whenever  $p > 0$ .

Let us consider a subset  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$ . We denote by  $X_{\Lambda, t}$  the process restricted to  $\Lambda$  with free boundary conditions; that is, the dynamics runs without taking into account sites outside  $\Lambda$ . Thus  $X_{\Lambda, t}$ ,  $X_{\Lambda, t}(x)$  and  $X_{\Lambda}$  will, respectively, denote the configuration at time  $t$ , the value of the random variable at time  $t$  and site  $x$  and the final configuration for the process restricted to  $\Lambda$ .

Given two arbitrary sets  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$ , we denote by  $X_{\Lambda_1, t}^{\Lambda_2}$  the process restricted to  $\Lambda_1$  and with sites in  $\Lambda_2$  occupied. The sites in  $\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus (\Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2)$  are not taken into account to run the dynamics of  $X_{\Lambda_1, t}^{\Lambda_2}$ . We omit  $\Lambda_1$  in the notation if  $\Lambda_1 = \mathbb{Z}^3$  and we omit  $\Lambda_2$  if  $\Lambda_2 = \emptyset$ .

DEFINITION 2.1. Following [3] we say that a set  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$  is *internally spanned* if it is entirely covered in the final configuration of the dynamics restricted to  $\Lambda$ , that is, if

$$(2.2) \quad \forall x \in \Lambda, \quad X_\Lambda(x) = 1.$$

We have now introduced the bootstrap percolation model in dimension  $d = 3$  and with parameter  $\ell = 3$ . As we have already remarked, this is the most delicate three-dimensional bootstrap percolation model. Indeed,  $\ell = 3$  is the highest value of the parameter  $\ell$  such that the critical probability in infinite volume is equal to zero: for each positive initial density  $p$ , the probability that the whole lattice is completely occupied by particles at the end of the dynamics is equal to 1.

In this particular situation we examine the question of finite size scaling, that is, following [3], we consider the process  $X_{\Lambda_L, t}$  on the finite cube  $\Lambda_L = \{1, \dots, L\}^3$  of size  $L$  and we perform the simultaneous limits  $L \rightarrow \infty$  and  $p \rightarrow 0$ . We prove that there exists a cutoff between regimes in which the asymptotic probability that the cube  $\Lambda_L$  is internally spanned is zero or one.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let us consider the cube  $\Lambda_L$  of side length  $L$  and the process  $X_t$  with initial density  $p$  and let us denote by  $R(L, p)$  the probability that the cube  $\Lambda_L$  is internally spanned. There exist two constants  $c_+ > c_- > 0$  such that:*

- (i)  $R(L, p) \rightarrow 1$  if  $(L, p) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$  in the regime  $p > c_+ / \ln \ln L$ ;
- (ii)  $R(L, p) \rightarrow 0$  if  $(L, p) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$  in the regime  $p < c_- / \ln \ln L$ .

We start to prove the first part of Theorem 2.1; this is the easy part of the theorem and its proof has already been sketched in [16]. The idea of the proof relies on the notion of *critical length*. However small  $p$  is, if a fully occupied cube has size large enough, then the probability of finding on its faces two-dimensional occupied square droplets large enough to grow and cover all the faces of the cube (two-dimensional supercritical droplets) is close to 1. As  $p$  goes to 0, the size of such a cube must diverge to  $\infty$  and this must happen quickly enough; the critical length of the occupied cubes is of order  $\exp(\text{const}/p)$ . In order to have a probability close to 1 of finding such cubes, the size  $L$  of the region  $\Lambda_L$  must be of order  $\exp \exp(\text{const}/p)$ .

We now make this a little more precise. From results in [12] one easily obtains that there exists a constant  $c_1 > 0$  such that, given a cube  $\Lambda_l$ , if  $p \geq c_1 / \ln l$  then there exists a constant  $a_1 > 0$  such that

$$(2.3) \quad P(\Lambda_l \text{ covers } \mathbb{Z}^3 \mid \Lambda_l \text{ occupied at } t = 0) \geq \prod_{k=l}^{\infty} (1 - \exp(-a_1 k)).$$

We consider a large cube  $\Lambda_L$  and we estimate  $R(L, p)$  from below:

$$(2.4) \quad R(L, p) \geq P(\text{in } \Lambda_L \exists \Lambda_l \text{ occupied at } t = 0, \Lambda_l \text{ covers } \mathbb{Z}^3) = P(\Lambda_l \text{ covers } \mathbb{Z}^3 \mid \text{in } \Lambda_L \exists \Lambda_l \text{ occupied at } t = 0) P(\text{in } \Lambda_L \exists \Lambda_l \text{ occupied at } t = 0).$$

Now, from (2.3) it follows that if  $l \geq \exp(c_1/p)$  then the first factor in (2.4) tends to 1 when  $p$  goes to 0. It remains to adjust the value of  $L$  so that the second factor of (2.4) tends to 1, too. By partitioning the cube  $\Lambda_L$  in disjoint cubes of size  $l$  one has

$$(2.5) \quad P(\text{in } \Lambda_L \exists \Lambda_l \text{ occupied at } t = 0) \geq 1 - (1 - p^{l^3})^{(L/l)^3}.$$

By choosing  $c_+ > c_1 > 0$ ,  $l = \exp(c_1/p)$  and  $L > \exp \exp(c_+/p)$ , the right-hand term in the equation above tends to 1 when  $p$  goes to 0. This completes the proof of the first part of Theorem 2.1.  $\square$

**3. Proof of Theorem 2.1.** We prove here the second part of Theorem 2.1. Let us sketch briefly the strategy of our proof. Our goal is to find a suitable upper bound to the probability that a cube  $\Lambda_L$  is internally spanned. We say that a cube is crossed if, in the final configuration of the dynamics restricted to the cube itself, there is an occupied connected set joining two opposite faces of the cube. We compute an upper bound to the probability of the simple event that a cube is crossed by building several processes which dominate the original bootstrap percolation process. The last process is simply a juxtaposition of several independent two-dimensional bootstrap percolation processes with an additional increasing step. We then rely on the known estimates [3] for the bootstrap percolation model in the case  $d = 2$ ,  $l = 2$  to bound from above the probability that a cube is crossed. If the region  $\Lambda_L$  is internally spanned, then it must contain cubes of every intermediate size which are crossed. The best upper bound is obtained for cubes of size of order  $\exp(\text{const}/p)$ , which is likely to be the size of a “critical droplet,” yielding an upper bound of the correct order.

First, we give some additional definitions. Given a site  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^3$  we denote by  $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$  its three coordinates and given a set  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$  we define its diameter

$$(3.1) \quad d(\Lambda) := \sup\{|x_i - y_i| : x \in \Lambda, y \in \Lambda, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\},$$

that is,  $d(\Lambda)$  is the side length of the minimal cube surrounding the set  $\Lambda$ . We say that  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$  is a region of  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  if and only if it is nearest-neighbors connected. If  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$  are two regions of  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  and  $\Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$  is a region as well, then  $d(\Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2) \leq d(\Lambda_1) + d(\Lambda_2)$ .

We adapt to our situation a key lemma of [3] describing what happens at a smaller scale inside an internally spanned region.

**LEMMA 3.1.** *Let  $\Lambda_1$  be a region of  $\mathbb{Z}^3$ . If  $\Lambda_1$  is internally spanned, then for all  $\kappa$  such that  $1 \leq \kappa$  and  $2\kappa + 1 \leq d(\Lambda_1)$  there exists some region  $\Lambda_2$  included in  $\Lambda_1$  which is internally spanned and such that  $\kappa \leq d(\Lambda_2) < 2\kappa + 1$ .*

**PROOF.** We build the final configuration  $X_{\Lambda_1}$  through the following algorithmic procedure. Let  $\mathcal{C}_0$  be the collection of the sites occupied at time zero. Suppose we have built a collection of internally spanned regions  $\mathcal{C}_n$ ; we define a rule to build the collection  $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}$ :

(i) If there exist two regions  $A, B$  of  $\mathcal{C}_n$  such that  $A \cup B$  is still a region, then we set

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{C}_{n+1} := \mathcal{C}_n \cup \{A \cup B\} \setminus \{A, B\},$$

that is,  $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}$  is obtained by replacing in  $\mathcal{C}_n$  the two elements  $A$  and  $B$  by  $A \cup B$ .

(ii) If no such regions exist then we choose a site  $x$  not belonging to any set in  $\mathcal{C}_n$  and having three neighbors in the set  $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{C}_n} A$ . We denote by  $A_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , the  $r$  regions of  $\mathcal{C}_n$  containing a neighbor of  $x$ , and we set

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{C}_{n+1} := \mathcal{C}_n \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^r A_i \cup \{x\} \right\} \setminus \{A_1, \dots, A_r\}.$$

(iii) If no such site  $x$  exists, the algorithm stops.

Notice that for each  $n$ , the regions of  $\mathcal{C}_n$  are internally spanned. Since by hypothesis  $\Lambda_1$  is internally spanned, the procedure ends for some  $m$  such that  $\mathcal{C}_m = \{\Lambda_1\}$ . Moreover, we have that  $\max\{d(A) : A \in \mathcal{C}_0\} = 1$ ,  $\max\{d(A) : A \in \mathcal{C}_m\} = d(\Lambda_1)$  and for any  $n \leq m - 1$ ,

$$(3.4) \quad \max\{d(A) : A \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}\} \leq 2 \max\{d(A) : A \in \mathcal{C}_n\} + 1.$$

Hence there exists  $n$  such that

$$(3.5) \quad \kappa \leq \max\{d(A) : A \in \mathcal{C}_n\} < 2\kappa + 1,$$

which means that in  $\mathcal{C}_n$  there is an internally spanned region  $\Lambda_2$  such that  $\kappa \leq d(\Lambda_2) < 2\kappa + 1$ .  $\square$

DEFINITION 3.1. Let us consider a cube  $\Lambda$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^3$ . We say that  $\Lambda$  is crossed, or that there is a crossing in  $\Lambda$ , if and only if in the final configuration  $X_\Lambda$  of the dynamics restricted to  $\Lambda$  there is an occupied region joining two opposite faces of the cube  $\Lambda$ .

We note that for any region  $A$  the following inclusion holds:

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &\{A \text{ is internally spanned}\} \\ &\subset \{\text{the smallest cube surrounding } A \text{ is crossed}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by using Lemma 3.1, for any  $L$  and any  $\kappa$  such that  $2\kappa + 1 < L$ , we have

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} R(L, p) &\leq P(\exists l, \kappa \leq l < 2\kappa + 1, \exists \Lambda_l \subset \Lambda_L, \Lambda_l \text{ is crossed}) \\ &\leq (\kappa + 1) L^3 \max_{\kappa \leq l < 2\kappa + 1} P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(3.8) \quad R(L, p) \leq L^3 \min_{1 \leq \kappa < (L-1)/2} (\kappa + 1) \max_{\kappa \leq l < 2\kappa + 1} P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed}).$$

We have reduced the estimate of  $R(L, p)$  to the estimate of the probability that a cube  $\Lambda_l$  is crossed and by symmetry we can consider the case of a crossing along the first coordinate direction (denoted by  $e_1$  in the sequel),

$$(3.9) \quad P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed}) \leq 3 P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed along } e_1).$$

In order to estimate the right-hand term of (3.9) we reduce the problem to a two-dimensional situation by properly cutting the cube  $\Lambda_l$  in slices of thickness two-perpendicular to the  $x_1$ -direction. For the sake of definiteness we suppose that  $\Lambda_l := \{1, 2, \dots, l\}^3$  where  $l$  is an even integer and we define the slices

$$(3.10) \quad T_k := \{x \in \Lambda_l : x_1 = 2k - 1 \text{ or } x_1 = 2k\}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \frac{l}{2}.$$

We define a map  $s$  associating to each site in a slice the only nearest neighbor along the first coordinate direction belonging to the same slice,

$$(3.11) \quad \forall x \in \Lambda_l, \quad s(x) := \begin{cases} (x_1 + 1, x_2, x_3), & \text{if } x_1 \text{ is odd,} \\ (x_1 - 1, x_2, x_3), & \text{if } x_1 \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

The process  $X_{T_k, t}^{\Lambda_l \setminus T_k}$ , obtained by restricting the original process  $X_t$  to the slice  $T_k$  and by occupying all the sites in  $\Lambda_l \setminus T_k$ , dominates the original process in the same slice,

$$(3.12) \quad \forall k \in \left\{1, \dots, \frac{l}{2}\right\} \quad \forall x \in T_k, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad X_t(x) \leq X_{T_k, t}^{\Lambda_l \setminus T_k}(x).$$

In each slice  $T_k$ , for  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, l/2\}$ , we define a new process  $Y_t^k$ .

**DEFINITION 3.2.** We consider all the sites in  $\Lambda_l \setminus T_k$  occupied and we define the process  $Y_t^k$  on  $\{0, 1\}^{T_k}$  as follows. For any  $x$  in  $T_k$ :

- (i)  $Y_0^k(x) = \max(X_{T_k, 0}^{\Lambda_l \setminus T_k}(x), X_{T_k, 0}^{\Lambda_l \setminus T_k}(s(x))) = \max(X_0(x), X_0(s(x)))$ .
- (ii) If  $Y_t^k(x) = 1$  then  $Y_{t+1}^k(x) = 1$ .
- (iii) If  $Y_t^k(x) = 0$  and  $x$  has at least three occupied sites among its six nearest neighbors in the configuration  $Y_t^k$ , then  $Y_{t+1}^k(x) = 1$  and  $Y_{t+1}^k(s(x)) = 1$ .
- (iv)  $Y_{t+1}^k(x) = 0$  otherwise.

The mechanism to build  $Y_{t+1}^k(x)$  is the one used for  $X_{T_k, t+1}^{\Lambda_l \setminus T_k}$  followed by an additional step increasing the configuration. This mechanism ensures that for all  $t$  and any  $x$  in  $T_k$  one has  $Y_t^k(x) = Y_t^k(s(x))$ .

We next introduce a family of two-dimensional processes.

**DEFINITION 3.3.** To each slice  $T_k$ , for  $k$  in  $\{1, \dots, l/2\}$ , we associate a two-dimensional  $l \times l$  square  $Q_l^k := \{1, 2, \dots, l\}^2$ . On each square  $Q_l^k$  we define a process  $Z_{Q_l^k, t}$  by

$$(3.13) \quad Z_{Q_l^k, t}(x_2, x_3) := Y_t^k(2k - 1, x_2, x_3) = Y_t^k(2k, x_2, x_3)$$

for any  $(x_2, x_3) \in Q_l^k$ .

The processes  $Z_{Q_i^k, t}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq l/2$ , are independent and they are two-dimensional bootstrap percolation processes with parameter  $\ell = 2$  and initial density  $q = 1 - (1 - p)^2 = 2p - p^2$ . Furthermore, these processes dominate the original process in the slices, that is, for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, l/2\}$ ,  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in T_k$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$(3.14) \quad X_{T_k, t}(x) \leq Z_{Q_i^k, t}(x_2, x_3).$$

We use these two-dimensional processes to estimate the probability that a cubic region is crossed. We consider the  $(l/2) \times l \times l$  parallelepiped  $\mathcal{A}$  obtained by collecting all the  $l/2$  squares  $Q_i^k$  introduced in Definition 3.3 (the  $k$ th slice along  $e_1$  corresponds to  $Q_l^k$ ) and we denote by  $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$  the configuration on  $\mathcal{A}$  defined as follows:  $\forall x_1 \in \{1, \dots, l/2\}, \forall x_2, x_3 \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ ,

$$(3.15) \quad Z_{\mathcal{A}}(x_1, x_2, x_3) := Z_{Q_l^{x_1}}(x_2, x_3),$$

where  $Z_{Q_i^k}$ ,  $k \in \{1, \dots, l/2\}$ , is the final configuration of the process  $Z_{Q_i^k, t}$ . We bound (3.9) by

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed along } e_1) \\ &\leq P(\text{in } Z_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ there is a crossing along } e_1). \end{aligned}$$

We consider next the two-dimensional bootstrap percolation model with parameter  $\ell = 2$  and initial density  $q$ . We define as well the concept of “being internally spanned” and we denote by  $S(l)$  a square of side length  $l$ . We recall that for such a process, the final configuration is a union of separated occupied rectangular regions; that is, the distance between two occupied rectangles is strictly larger than 1. We restate a few results for this model.

LEMMA 3.2 (Aizenman–Lebowitz [3]). *For all  $\kappa \geq 1$ , a necessary condition for  $S(l)$  to be internally spanned, where  $\kappa \leq l$ , is that it contains at least one rectangular region whose maximal side length is in the interval  $[\kappa, 2\kappa + 1]$  which is also internally spanned.*

The proof of Lemma 3.2 can be found in [3].

LEMMA 3.3. *Let  $A$  be a rectangular region of side lengths  $l_1$  and  $l_2$ , where  $l_1 \leq l_2$ . For  $q$  small enough one has*

$$(3.17) \quad P(A \text{ is internally spanned}) \leq (4l_2q)^{l_2/2}.$$

PROOF. If  $A$  is partitioned in  $l_2/2$  disjoint slabs of width 2, a necessary condition for  $A$  to be internally spanned is that each slab contains initially an



occupied site. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(A \text{ is internally spanned}) &\leq (1 - (1 - q)^{2l_1})^{l_2/2} \\
 &\leq \exp\left(\frac{l_2}{2} \ln(1 - \exp(2l_2 \ln(1 - q)))\right) \\
 &\leq \exp\left(\frac{l_2}{2} \ln(-2l_2 \ln(1 - q))\right).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.18}$$

For  $q$  small enough,  $\ln(1 - q) \geq -2q$ , whence

$$P(A \text{ is internally spanned}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{l_2}{2} \ln(4l_2q)\right) = (4l_2q)^{l_2/2}. \quad \square
 \tag{3.19}$$

LEMMA 3.4. *For any  $l$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  and any  $\kappa \leq (l - 1)/2$  let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the event:  $S(l)$  contains a rectangular region internally spanned whose maximal side length belongs to the interval  $[\kappa, 2\kappa + 1]$ . For  $q$  small enough one has*

$$P(\mathcal{E}) \leq l^2 (2\kappa + 1)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\kappa}{2} \exp(-4(2\kappa + 1)q)\right).
 \tag{3.20}$$

PROOF. We suppose  $q$  small enough to have  $\ln(1 - q) \geq -2q$  and we bound the probability of the event  $\mathcal{E}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(\mathcal{E}) &\leq l^2 (2\kappa + 1)^2 \max_{\kappa \leq l_2 \leq 2\kappa + 1} \exp\left(\frac{l_2}{2} \ln(1 - \exp(2l_2 \ln(1 - q)))\right) \\
 &\leq l^2 (2\kappa + 1)^2 \exp\left(\frac{\kappa}{2} \ln(1 - \exp(2(2\kappa + 1) \ln(1 - q)))\right) \\
 &\leq l^2 (2\kappa + 1)^2 \exp\left(\frac{\kappa}{2} \ln(1 - \exp(-4(2\kappa + 1)q))\right) \\
 &\leq l^2 (2\kappa + 1)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\kappa}{2} \exp(-4(2\kappa + 1)q)\right). \quad \square
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.21}$$

Now we come back to the proof of the upper bound. Let  $\alpha$  be positive. Notice that  $p \leq q \leq 2p$ . We denote by  $\underline{1}$  the configuration in a square  $Q_l^k$  with all the sites occupied. We still increase the configuration  $Z_{Q_l^k}$  by setting  $Z_{Q_l^k} = \underline{1}$  in case  $Z_{Q_l^k}$  contains at least one occupied rectangular region of maximal side length larger than  $\alpha/q$ . Suppose that  $l \geq \alpha/q$  and  $\alpha/q > 3$ . By applying Lemma 3.4 with  $\kappa = \alpha/3q$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(Z_{Q_l^k} = \underline{1}) &\leq l^2 \left(\frac{2\alpha}{3q} + 1\right)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{6q} \exp\left(-4\left(\frac{2\alpha}{3q} + 1\right)q\right)\right) \\
 &\leq \frac{l^2 \alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{6q} \exp(-4\alpha)\right).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.22}$$

We suppose that  $\alpha$  is small enough to have  $\exp(-4\alpha) \geq 1/2$ . Then

$$P(Z_{Q_l^k} = \underline{1}) \leq \frac{l^2 \alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{12q}\right).
 \tag{3.23}$$

Let  $M$  be the (random) number of indices  $k$  such that  $Z_{Q_l^k} = \underline{1}$  and let  $k(1), \dots, k(M)$  be these indices arranged in increasing order. Let  $\mathcal{E}_1$  be the event

$$\mathcal{E}_1 := \{\text{there is a crossing along } e_1 \text{ in } Z_{\mathcal{A}}\}.$$

We decompose this event as follows:

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{E}_1) &= P(\mathcal{E}_1, M = 0) \\ &+ \sum_{m=1}^{l/2} \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_m} P(\mathcal{E}_1, M = m, k(1) = i_1, \dots, k(m) = i_m). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $i < j$  be two indices in  $\{1, \dots, l/2\}$ . By  $\mathcal{E}(i, j)$  we denote the following event: there exists a sequence of  $H$  disjoint occupied rectangular regions  $(R_h, 1 \leq h \leq H)$  in  $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$  such that:

- (i)  $R_1$  is included in  $Q_l^i$ ,  $R_H$  is included in  $Q_l^j$ .
- (ii) The regions  $R_h, 2 \leq h \leq H - 1$ , are included in  $\cup_{i < h < j} Q_l^h$ .
- (iii) For each  $h, 1 \leq h \leq H$ , if  $R_h$  belongs to  $Q_l^k$ , then  $R_h$  is separated from the other occupied rectangular regions of  $Z_{Q_l^k}$ .
- (iv) The maximal side length of all these regions is strictly less than  $\alpha/q$ ; we denote by  $r_h$  the maximal side length of  $R_h$ .
- (v) For each  $h, 1 \leq h \leq H - 1$ , a site of  $R_h$  is the neighbor of a site of  $R_{h+1}$ .
- (vi) All the sites of these regions are occupied in  $Z_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

We remark that  $H$  is free; however, it has to be larger than  $j - i + 1$ . Moreover, the sequence of rectangles  $(R_h, 2 \leq h \leq H - 1)$  can go back and forth between the squares  $Q_l^{i+1}$  and  $Q_l^{j-1}$ . We make the convention that for any  $i, \mathcal{E}(i, i) = \mathcal{E}(i, i - 1)$  is the full event of probability 1. Using (3.23), we have

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} &P(\mathcal{E}_1, M = m, k(1) = i_1, \dots, k(m) = i_m) \\ &\leq P\left(M = m, k(1) = i_1, \dots, k(m) = i_m, \mathcal{E}(1, i_1 - 1), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathcal{E}(i_1 + 1, i_2 - 1), \dots, \mathcal{E}(i_{m-1} + 1, i_m - 1), \mathcal{E}\left(i_m + 1, \frac{l}{2}\right)\right) \\ &= \prod_{h=1}^{m+1} P(\mathcal{E}(i_{h-1} + 1, i_h - 1)) P(Z_{Q_l^{i_1}} = \underline{1}) \cdots P(Z_{Q_l^{i_m}} = \underline{1}) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{l^2 \alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{12q}\right)\right)^m \prod_{h=1}^{m+1} P(\mathcal{E}(i_{h-1} + 1, i_h - 1)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have set  $i_0 = 0$  and  $i_{m+1} = l/2 + 1$ .

In order to estimate  $P(\mathcal{E}(i, j))$  for  $i < j$ , we consider a fixed sequence  $r_1, \dots, r_H$  in  $\{1, \dots, \alpha/q - 1\}$ . The number of sequences  $R_1, \dots, R_H$  of rectangles with maximal sides  $r_1, \dots, r_H$  and satisfying the above requirements

is smaller than

$$(3.26) \quad l^2 r_1 \times r_1^2 r_2 \times r_2^2 r_3 \times \dots \times r_{H-1}^2 r_H \leq l^2 (r_1 r_2 \dots r_H)^3.$$

Notice that several rectangles of the sequence  $R_1, \dots, R_H$  might belong to the same slice. However the rectangles belonging to the same slice are separated and the events that these rectangles are internally spanned depend only on the dynamics restricted to the rectangles. Hence these events are independent, so that

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} &P(R_1, \dots, R_H \text{ are occupied in } Z_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &\leq P(R_1, \dots, R_H \text{ internally spanned}) \\ &= P(R_1 \text{ internally spanned}) \dots P(R_H \text{ internally spanned}) \\ &\leq (4r_1 q)^{r_1/2} \dots (4r_H q)^{r_H/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used Lemma 3.3. Thus

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{E}(i, j)) &= \sum_{H \geq j-i+1} P(\exists R_1, \dots, R_H \text{ realizing } \mathcal{E}(i, j)) \\ &\leq \sum_{H \geq j-i+1} \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_H < \alpha/q} l^2 (r_1 \dots r_H)^3 (4r_1 q)^{r_1/2} \dots (4r_H q)^{r_H/2} \\ &= \sum_{H \geq j-i+1} l^2 \left( \sum_{1 \leq r < \alpha/q} r^3 (4rq)^{r/2} \right)^H. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the sum  $\sum_{1 \leq r < \alpha/q} r^3 (4rq)^{r/2}$  as follows:

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq r < \alpha/q} r^3 (4rq)^{r/2} &= \sum_{1 \leq r \leq 8} r^3 (4rq)^{r/2} + \sum_{9 \leq r < \alpha/q} r^3 (4rq)^{r/2} \\ &\leq 8^3 (32q)^{1/2} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{q}\right)^4 \max_{9 \leq r < \alpha/q} (4rq)^{r/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $f(r) = (4rq)^{r/2}$ . For  $\alpha$  small enough,  $f(r)$  is decreasing on  $[9, \alpha/q]$ , whence

$$(3.30) \quad \sum_{1 \leq r < \alpha/q} r^3 (4rq)^{r/2} \leq 8^3 (32q)^{1/2} + \alpha^4 36^{9/2} q^{1/2} \leq b_0 q^{1/2},$$

where  $b_0$  is a constant not depending on  $\alpha$ . Thus,

$$(3.31) \quad P(\mathcal{E}(i, j)) \leq \sum_{H \geq j-i+1} l^2 (b_0 \sqrt{q})^H.$$

Finally, for  $q$  small enough, so that  $b_0 \sqrt{q} < 1/2$  and  $\ln b_0 \leq (-1/4) \ln q$ , we have

$$(3.32) \quad P(\mathcal{E}(i, j)) \leq 2l^2 (b_0 \sqrt{q})^{j-i+1} = 2l^2 \exp\left(\frac{1}{4}(j-i+1) \ln q\right).$$

Coming back to inequality (3.25),

$$\begin{aligned}
 &P(\mathcal{E}_1, M = m, k(1) = i_1, \dots, k(m) = i_m) \\
 (3.33) \quad &\leq \left( \frac{l^2 \alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{12q}\right) \right)^m (2l^2)^{m+1} \exp\left[\left(\frac{l}{2} - m\right)\left(\frac{1}{4} \ln q\right)\right]
 \end{aligned}$$

and putting this estimate in (3.24),

$$\begin{aligned}
 &P(\mathcal{E}_1) = P(\mathcal{E}_1, M = 0) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^{l/2} \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_m} P(\mathcal{E}_1, M = m, k(1) = i_1, \dots, k(m) = i_m) \\
 (3.34) \quad &\leq \sum_{m=0}^{l/2} \left(\frac{l}{2}\right)^m \left(\frac{l^2 \alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{12q}\right)\right)^m (2l^2)^{m+1} \exp\left[\left(\frac{l}{2} - m\right)\left(\frac{1}{4} \ln q\right)\right] \\
 &\leq 2l^2 \exp\left[\frac{l}{8} \ln q\right] \sum_{m=0}^{l/2} \left[\frac{l^5 \alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{12q}\right) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4} \ln q\right]\right]^m.
 \end{aligned}$$

This is our estimate of the probability of a crossing along  $e_1$  in the case  $l \geq \alpha/q$ . On the other hand, in the case  $l < \alpha/q$  we estimate the probability of a crossing along  $e_1$  by considering directly the event  $\mathcal{E}(1, l/2)$ ,

$$(3.35) \quad P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed along } e_1) \leq P\left(\mathcal{E}\left(1, \frac{l}{2}\right)\right) \leq 2l^2 \exp\left[\frac{l}{8} \ln q\right].$$

We note that it would not have been possible to use the same strategy in the case  $l \geq \alpha/q$  because the probability of having a very large internally spanned rectangle in some slice does not vanish.

Supposing that  $l \leq \exp(\alpha/120q)$ , one has

$$(3.36) \quad \frac{l^5 \alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{12q}\right) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4} \ln q\right] \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{q^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{24q} - \frac{1}{4} \ln q\right).$$

If  $q$  is sufficiently small so that the right hand term is smaller than 1, under the hypothesis  $2 \leq l \leq \exp(\alpha/120q)$ , from (3.9), (3.34), (3.35) and (3.36), one has

$$(3.37) \quad P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed}) \leq 6l^2 \exp\left[\frac{l}{8} \ln q\right] \left(\frac{l}{2} + 1\right) \leq 6l^3 \exp\left(\frac{l}{8} \ln q\right).$$

Hence, there exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that for  $p$  sufficiently small and  $2 \leq l \leq \exp(\alpha/240p)$ ,

$$(3.38) \quad P(\Lambda_l \text{ is crossed}) \leq 6l^3 \exp\left(\frac{l}{8} \ln(2p)\right).$$

Finally, we use equations (3.8) and (3.38) to estimate the probability  $R(L, p)$  and to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. First we consider the case

$L \leq \exp(\alpha_0/p)$  with  $\alpha_0 = \alpha/240$  and we write

$$(3.39) \quad \begin{aligned} R(L, p) &\leq L^3 \min_{1 \leq \kappa < (L-1)/2} (\kappa + 1) \times 6(2\kappa + 1)^3 \exp\left(\frac{\kappa}{8} \ln(2p)\right) \\ &\leq 6L^7 \exp\left(\frac{L}{24} \ln(2p)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We remark that the right-hand term goes to zero in the limit  $p \rightarrow 0$  and  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, in the case  $L > \exp(\alpha_0/p)$ , we restrict the minimum in (3.8) to the range  $2\kappa + 1 \leq \exp(\alpha_0/p)$  and we get

$$(3.40) \quad R(L, p) \leq 6L^3 \exp\left(\frac{4\alpha_0}{p}\right) \exp\left[\frac{1}{24} \exp\left(\frac{\alpha_0}{p}\right) \ln(2p)\right].$$

From the estimate above we see that there exists a positive constant  $c_-$  such that if  $L$  is less than  $\exp \exp(c_-/p)$  then  $R(L, p)$  goes to 0 in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  and  $p \rightarrow 0$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** The authors express their thanks to A. C. D. van Enter who suggested the topic of this paper and to R. H. Schonmann for useful suggestions and comments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ADLER, J. and AHARONY, A. (1988). Diffusion percolation I. Infinite time limit and bootstrap percolation. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **21** 1387–1404.
- [2] ADLER, J., STAUFFER, D. and AHARONY, A. (1989). Comparison of bootstrap percolation models. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **22** L297–L301.
- [3] AIZENMAN, M. and LEBOWITZ, J. L. (1988). Metastability effects in bootstrap percolation. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **21** 3801–3813.
- [4] BRANCO, N. S., DOS SANTOS, R. R. and DE QUEIROZ, S. L. A. (1984). Bootstrap percolation: a renormalization group approach. *J. Phys. C* **17** L373–L377; Khan, M. A., Gould, H. and Chalupa, J. (1985). Monte Carlo renormalization group study of bootstrap percolation. *J. Phys. C* **18** L223–L228; Branco, N. S., de Queiroz, S. L. A. and Dos Santos, R. R. (1986). Critical exponents for high density and bootstrap percolation. *J. Phys. C* **19** 1909–1921.
- [5] CHALUPA, J., LEATH, P. L. and REICH, G. R. (1979). Bootstrap percolation on a Bethe lattice. *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **12** L31–L37.
- [6] GRIFFEATH, D. (1988). Cyclic random competition: a case history in experimental mathematics. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* **35** 1472–1480.
- [7] KOGUT, P. M. and LEATH, P. L. (1981). *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **14** 3187–3194.
- [8] LE NORMAND, R. and ZARCONE, C. (1984). *Kinetics of Aggregation and Gelation* (F. Family and D. P. Landau, eds.) North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [9] MOUNTFORD, T. S. (1995). Critical length for semi-oriented bootstrap percolation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **56** 185–205.
- [10] SCHONMANN, R. H. (1990). Critical Points of two-dimensional bootstrap percolation-like cellular automata. *J. Statist. Phys.* **58** 1239–1244.
- [11] SCHONMANN, R. H. (1990). Finite size scaling behavior of a biased majority rule cellular automaton. *Phys. A* **167** 619–627.
- [12] SCHONMANN, R. H. (1992). On the behavior of some cellular automata related to bootstrap percolation. *Ann. Probab.* **20** 174–193.
- [13] TOFFOLI, T. and MARGOLUS, N. (1987). *Cellular Automata Machines. A New Environment for Modeling*. MIT Press.

- [14] ULAM, S. (1950). Random processes and transformations. *Proc. Internat. Congr. Math.* 264–275.
- [15] VAN ENTER, A. C. D. (1987). Proof of Straley’s argument for bootstrap percolation. *J. Statist. Phys.* **48** 943–945.
- [16] VAN ENTER, A. C. D., ADLER, J. and DUARTE, J. A. M. S. (1990). Finite-size effects for some bootstrap percolation models. *J. Statist. Phys.* **60** 323–332.
- [17] VAN ENTER, A. C. D., ADLER, J. and DUARTE, J. A. M. S. (1991). Addendum: Finite-size effects for some bootstrap percolation models. *J. Statist. Phys.* **62** 505–506.
- [18] VICHNIAC, G. Y. (1984). Simulating physics with cellular automata. *Phys. D* **10** 96–116.
- [19] VON NEUMANN, J. (1966). *Theory of Self-Reproducing Automata*. Univ. Illinois Press, Urbana.
- [20] WOLFRAM, S. (1983). Statistical mechanics of cellular automata. *Rev. Modern Phys.* **55**, 601–644; WOLFRAM, S. (1986). *Theory and Applications of Cellular Automata*. World Scientific, Singapore.

MATHÉMATIQUE, BÂTIMENT 425  
UNIVERSITÉ PARIS SUD  
ORSAY  
FRANCE 91405  
E-MAIL: Raphael.Cerf@math.u-psud.fr  
cirillo@gyptis.univ-mrs.fr