Heterogeneous Mean First-Passage Time Scaling in Fractal Media
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The mean first passage time (MFPT) of random walks is a key quantity characterizing dynamic processes on disordered media. In a random fractal embedded in the Euclidean space, the MFPT is known to obey the power-law scaling with the distance between a source and a target site with a universal exponent. We find that the scaling law for the MFPT is not determined solely by the distance between a source and a target but also by their locations. The role of a site in the first passage process is quantified by the random walk centrality. It turns out that the site of highest random walk centrality, dubbed as a hub, intervenes in first passage processes. We show that the MFPT from a departure site to a target site is determined by a competition between direct paths and indirect paths detouring via the hub. Consequently, the MFPT displays a crossover scaling between a short distance regime, where direct paths are dominant, and a long distance regime, where indirect paths are dominant. The two regimes are characterized by power laws with different scaling exponents. The crossover scaling behavior is confirmed by extensive numerical calculations of the MFPTs on the critical percolation cluster in two-dimensional square lattices.
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Introduction.—Random walks are fundamental for stochastic processes, such as transport, search, and spreading. While random walks on regular lattices have long been studied [1], there has been an ever-increasing interest in the topic incorporating structural disorder of the underlying substrate [2], geometric confinement [3], stochastic resetting [4], non-Markovian dynamics [5], and many more.

An important quantity characterizing random walks (RWs) is the first passage time (FPT) distribution and the mean first passage time (MFPT) [1,6]. Scaling properties of the FPT and MFPT reflect the interplay between the RW dynamics and geometric properties of the underlying substrate. For example, on infinite lattices, the FPT distribution follows a power law with a universal exponent [1,6]. Generally, in finite scale-invariant media, the MFPT \(T(r)\) between two sites at a distance \(r\) is known to obey the scaling law [7–9]

\[
T(r) \sim \begin{cases} 
N r^{d_w - d_f}, & \text{for } d_w > d_f \\
N \ln r, & \text{for } d_w = d_f \\
N, & \text{for } d_w < d_f 
\end{cases}
\]  

where \(N\) is the total number of sites, \(d_f\) is the fractal dimension of the medium, and \(d_w\) is its walk dimension. It is remarkable that the scaling law is governed by only one universal exponent, \(\theta = d_w - d_f\). On the other hand, on a highly heterogeneous graph, the MFPT displays a more complex scaling behavior [10–13]. In a scale-free network characterized by a power-law distribution of local connectivity of each site, the FPT and the MFPT averaged over source sites display a target site dependent scaling behavior [13]. Generally, in heterogeneous media, the MFPT from site \(i\) to \(j\) could be very different from the MFPT from \(j\) to \(i\): for undirected graphs, one can assign a potential-like quantity, called the RW centrality (RWC), to each site [14]. Since the MFPT between two sites in either direction differs by the difference in their inverse RWCS (see below), a wide distribution of the RWCs could lead to a source-target specific, or heterogeneous, scaling of the MFPT, which is what we will address in this Letter.

To this purpose, we reconsider the scaling law in Eq. (1) for two-dimensional (2D) critical bond percolation clusters. We will show that despite a homogeneous local connectivity distribution, the MFPT displays a heterogeneous scaling behavior characterized by a site-dependent scaling exponent and an intriguing crossover scaling, for which the site with the highest RWC responsible. RWs on critical percolation clusters have long been studied [2,15–18], but a site-dependent or heterogeneous scaling has not been reported yet. Our Letter also sheds light on the role of the RWC for RWs in disordered media.
Random walk centrality.—We consider an undirected graph consisting of $N$ sites, whose connectivity is represented by a symmetric adjacency matrix $A = A^T$, with matrix elements $A_{ij}$ being 0 or 1 indicating the absence or presence of an edge between sites $i$ and $j$ [19], respectively. The number of edges attached to a site $i$ is its degree and is given by $k_i = \sum_j A_{ij}$. A discrete time RW on the graph is defined by the transition matrix $W = K^{-1}A$, where $K$ is a diagonal matrix with $K_{jj} = \delta_{ij} k_j$. That is, a random walker at site $i$ jumps to site $j$ with the probability $W_{ij} = A_{ij}/k_i$ in a unit time step $\Delta t = 1$. The transition matrix has the left row eigenvector $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_i, \ldots, \pi_N)$ with $\pi_i = k_i / (\sum_j k_j)$ and the right column eigenvector $|1\rangle = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$, both with eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$. The left eigenvector corresponds to the steady state probability distribution [14].

A general theoretical framework for studying discrete time random walks has been formulated some time ago [14,19,20]. There the MFPT from site $i$ to $j$ is given by [14]

$$T_{ij} = \frac{R_{ij} - R_{ji} + \delta_{ij}}{\pi_j},$$

where the matrix $R$ is called the group generalized inverse of $(1 - W)$ [21,22] and given by $R \equiv \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (W - |1\rangle \langle 1|)^t$. Condamin et al. [7] noticed that $R_{ij}$ is dominated by the term $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} W(j, t|i)$, where $W(j, t|i) \equiv (W^t)_{ij}$ is the probability to find the walker at site $j$ in $t$ steps when it started at site $i$. Assuming the scaling form $W(j, t|i) = r^{-d_j/d_w} \Pi(r_{ij})^{1/d_w}$ with $r_{ij}$ being the Euclidean distance between $i$ and $j$ [2], they derived the scaling law in Eq. (1) [7].

The formal expression in Eq. (2) has a deeper implication when the transition probabilities satisfy the detailed balance condition, $\pi_i W_{ij} = \pi_j W_{ji}$ for all $i$ and $j$, which holds for RWs on undirected graphs. Then, one can assign an RWC $C_i \equiv \pi_i/R_{ii}$ to each site $i$, relating the MFPTs $T_{ij}$ and $T_{ji}$ by [14]

$$T_{ij} - T_{ji} = C_j^{-1} - C_i^{-1}.$$

The RWC is an indicator of the attractiveness of a site in the random walk process: a first passage to a higher RWC site from a lower RWC site takes less time than the first passage in the opposite direction. The RWC has also been used to identify influential nodes in complex networks [24–28]. The inverse of the RWC $\alpha_i \equiv 1/C_i = R_{ii}/\pi_i$ is equal to the average MFPT to site $i$ from a random departure site $j$ sampled with the steady state probability distribution, $\alpha_i = \sum_{j\neq i} \pi_j T_{ji}$. It is also called the global mean first passage time [10,29], or the accessibility index [30]. Similarly, Kemeny’s constant is defined as $K_i = \sum_{j\neq i} T_{ij} \pi_j = \sum_{i} R_{ij}$, which is independent of $i$ and a characteristic of an underlying graph [20,30,31].

MFPT from hub and marginal site.—In a disordered medium site-to-site fluctuations of the RWC may affect the scaling of the MFPT with the distance. We address this issue for the RW on the critical bond percolation cluster of 2D square lattices [2,3,15–17], which we generate by occupying bonds of a 2D $L \times L$ square lattice with periodic boundary conditions with the critical occupation probability $p_c = 1/2$ and identifying the largest cluster. The 2D critical percolation cluster is a random fractal with the fractal dimension $d_f = 91/48$ [32]. The walk dimension is known to be $d_w \approx 2.87 > d_f$ [33].

It is computationally demanding to evaluate the RWC and the MFPT for it requires to find the group generalized inverse of $1 - W$ [26]. We will adapt the numerical algorithm developed in Ref. [34], which turns out to be extremely efficient. It takes only a few minutes in an ordinary desktop computer to compute the RWC distribution for the critical percolation cluster of lattices of size $1024 \times 1024$. All numerical data for 2D percolation clusters are obtained on a 2D lattice with $L = 1024$, if not stated otherwise, and averaged over at least 2000 independent realizations of the critical percolation cluster.

Figure 1 illustrates an RWC configuration on a critical bond percolation cluster. The RWC distribution is highly heterogeneous (see Appendix A in the Supplemental Material [35]). High RWC sites are clustered and spread out in a filamentous pattern, which is analogous to the backbone structure [2]. This heterogeneity raises questions about the simple scaling of the MFPT with a single scaling exponent as in Eq. (1).

![Figure 1. RWC configuration on a 2D critical percolating cluster in a lattice of size $1024 \times 1024$. The highest and lowest RWC sites are marked with blue and red circles, respectively. Red line segments denote bridges between them (see the main text). The black area represents sites that do not belong to the percolating cluster.](image)
The exponent \( \theta \) fitting the data within the range indicated by the dashed lines.

The dimension 1 for the site independence of Kemeny's constant evaluated at a site \( i \) is given by \( K_i = \sum_{j \neq i} T_{ij} \pi_j \). Since \( \pi_j = a_j/N \) with \( O(1) \) constant \( a_j \), Kemeny’s constant is approximated as the arithmetic average of outbound MFPTs to all the other sites. The scaling form in Eq. (4) leads to \( K \sim L^{\Delta + \theta} \). Thus, \( \Delta + \theta \) should be the same at the sites obeying Eq. (4). We also note that the inbound and outbound MFPTs differ by a constant factor. From now on, we focus our Letter on the outbound MFPT.

Crossover scaling of MFPT.—The site-dependent scaling behavior is not limited to an exceptional outlier site: We consider the outbound MFPTs from a set of source sites \( \{M_1, M_2, \cdots\} \) selected hierarchically as follows. We select the local minimum RWC site \( M_n \) among all sites within a circle of radius \( R_n = 2^{n-1} \) centered at the hub. The outbound MFPT \( T_n(r) \) from \( M_n \) as a function of the distance \( r \) to target sites is shown in Fig. 3(a). We find an interesting crossover of \( T_n(r) \). It grows algebraically with \( r \) with the exponent \( \theta_m \) for \( r \ll R_n \) and with the exponent \( \theta_h \) for \( r \gg R_n \). The crossover scaling behavior is summarized by the scaling form

\[
T_n(r) = N R_n^{\theta_h} F(r/R_n), \tag{6}
\]

where the scaling function \( F(x) \) behaves as \( F(x \ll 1) \sim x^{\theta_h} \) and \( F(x \gg 1) \sim x^{\theta_h} \). The crossover scaling is confirmed by the scaling plot shown in Fig. 3(b). The crossover scaling persists when one chooses a source site at random among the sites at given distance from the hub (see Appendix C in the Supplemental Material [35]).

Our numerical results highlight the role of the highest RWC site in the random walk dynamics. Imagine an ensemble of the first passage events from a source site \( s \) to a target site \( t \) at a distance \( r_{s-t} \). Let \( r_{s-b} \) be the distance from \( s \) to the hub. When the target is farther than the hub \( (r_{s-t} \gg r_{b-h}) \), the ensemble is dominated by the paths detouring via the hub. Consequently the MFPT follows the scaling \( T \sim r^{\theta_h} \) with the scaling exponent \( \theta_h = d_w - d_f \) irrespective of \( s \). On the other hand, when the target is closer than the hub \( (r_{s-t} \ll r_{b-h}) \), the ensemble is dominated by direct paths and the MFPT scaling law depends on the choice of \( s \) (see Appendix D in the Supplemental Material [35]). The crossover may be overlooked when one...
measures the MFPT averaged over all pairs of source and target sites at a given distance.

One can understand the origin (and potential complications) of the scaling law for $T(r)$ in Eq. (1) [7] by the following consideration: Given a source-target pair at a distance $r$, one partitions the entire graph into blocks of linear size $\xi \sim r$, putting the source and target into the same block denoted as starting block. Each block has $N_r \sim r^d$ sites and the total number of blocks is $N_r \sim N/N_r \sim N r^{-d_f}$. If all blocks were statistically equivalent, the RW would always spend $\tau_r \sim r^{d_f}$ time steps in a single block until it hops to a neighboring block. With Eq. (2) the return time to the starting block is $T_{ret} \sim \tau_r \cdot (1/N_r)$, with the probability to be in one block $p_b \sim 1/N_r \sim r^d/N$, thus $T_{ret} \sim N r^{d_f-d_f}$. The MFPT can then be estimated as $T_{ret}/P_s$ with $P_s$ the probability to find the target site before leaving the starting block, which is $P_s = (1/2)$ for $d_f > d_j$ and $P_s \sim \tau_r/N_r \sim r^{d_f-d_f}$ for $d_f < d_j$. This argument reproduces the scaling law Eq. (1), except for the marginal case $d_f = d_j$. It clearly reveals that the simple scaling, $T(r) \sim r^d$ with a unique scaling exponent $\theta$, is based on the assumption that the entire fractal lattice can be partitioned into homogeneous blocks. Similar arguments may also lead to scaling laws for the higher moments of the FPT distribution, cf. Ref. [36]. Our results presented in Fig. 3, however, indicate that blocks are heterogeneous on all length scales.

This heterogeneity is further evidenced by the scaling behavior of the chemical distance (number of edges in the shortest path) $l(r)$ with respect to the Euclidean distance between two sites. The average chemical distance is known to scale as $l(r) \sim r^{d_{min}}$, with $d_{min} \approx 1.14$ for the 2D critical percolation cluster (Sec. 6.6 of [37]). We discriminate again between the hub (h) and the marginal site (m) as starting sites and found

$$ l(r) \sim \begin{cases} L^h r^{d_{min},h}, & \delta_h \approx 0.0, \quad d_{min},h \approx 1.11, \\ L^m r^{d_{min},m}, & \delta_m \approx 0.52, \quad d_{min},m \approx 0.58. \end{cases} \tag{7} $$

The chemical distance $l_m(r)$ from the local minimum RWC site $M_n$ shows again a crossover $l_m(r) = L^m r^{d_{min},m} G(1/R_n)$ for $1 \ll R_n \ll L$. We also looked at the MFPT as a function of the chemical distance and observed a similar crossover behavior (see Appendix E in the Supplemental Material [35] for the detailed analysis for the chemical distance scaling).

Origin of crossover scaling.—A fractal may comprise a subset of sites or bonds which is itself a fractal. For instance, 2D percolation clusters contain red bonds (or cutting bonds) which themselves form a fractal with fractal dimension $d_{red} = 3/4$ [38]. More generally, a percolation cluster has a mesoscale structure consisting of a backbone, red bonds, and dangling ends [2,39]. This structural heterogeneity is the origin of the site-dependent scaling and the crossover scaling.

To support this claim, we study the distribution of bridges [40] between the hub and the marginal site in 2D percolation clusters. A bond is defined to be a bridge if the marginal site would be disconnected from the hub without it, represented by red lines in Fig. 1 [41]. We find that the total number of bridges obeys the power law scaling $N_b \sim L^{0.75}$ (see Appendix F in the Supplemental Material [35]), which indicates that the marginal site is located deep within a dangling end. Moreover, as Fig. 1 illustrates, bridges are predominantly distributed near the marginal site. Consequently, random walks from the marginal site are quasi-one-dimensional along a path consisting mainly of the bridges. The MFPT from a marginal site to another separated by a chemical distance $l$ then scales like the 1D random walk MFPT $T(l) \sim N l^\theta$. Since the chemical distance $l$ scales with the Euclidean distance $r$ as given in Eq. (7), we obtain

$$ T(r) \sim L^{d_f+\delta_m r^{d_{min},m}}. \tag{8} $$

Note that $d_f + \delta_m \approx 2.42$ and $d_{min,m} \approx 0.58$, which are close to $\Delta_m \approx 2.36$ and $\theta_m \approx 0.49$ [cf. Eq. (5)]. Our argument reveals that the quasi-one-dimensional structure of bridges near the marginal site is responsible for the crossover scaling. It also predicts, at least approximately, the scaling exponents $\Delta_m$ and $\theta_m$ in terms of the geometric quantities $\delta_m$ and $d_{min,m}$.

We performed similar studies for 3D percolation clusters [42], random walk trails [43], and the Sierpinski gasket. We observe the described crossover scaling for the random fractals as shown in Fig. 4. We point out that for the deterministic fractal shown here (Sierpinski gasket), the scaling exponents are site independent (see Appendix G in the Supplemental Material [35] for further discussion).

Conclusion.—We report in this Letter, for the first time, heterogeneous scaling behavior of the MFPT of RWs on a random fractal, the critical percolation cluster in 2D. MFPTs measured from the hub and measured from the marginal site as a function of the distance of the target site obey power law scaling with distinctively different exponents and the distance dependence of MFPTs from general starting sites shows a striking crossover.
Heterogeneous behavior of various observables in disordered systems is expected, as, for instance, dynamical heterogeneities in glassy systems [44] or in the context of Griffiths singularities in strongly disordered systems [45] like the transverse Ising chain [46] or the Sinai walk [47]. A lack of self-averaging is a prominent consequence of this spatial heterogeneity [48], and it manifests itself in the quantities we looked at. But different power laws for different regions in the system, as we find them for regions close to the hub and close to the marginal site, have, to our knowledge, not been reported before. An important consequence of our results is that scaling theories for the MFPT that are based on an explicit or hidden spatial homogeneity assumption should be considered more carefully.

The origin of the strong heterogeneity in the MFPT can be traced back to the broad distribution of the RWC. Our results could be generalized to, and are relevant for, a larger class of heterogeneous media embedded in real space, like diffusion-limited aggregation, random resistor networks, lattice animals, and so on. We also speculate that heterogeneous scaling could occur in multifractal systems characterized by a continuous spectrum of fractal dimension. Our results also suggest that the RWC distribution is important to understand information spreading dynamics on complex networks.
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[19] The formalism in the Letter is also valid in a weighted graph with nonbinary adjacency matrix elements.
[23] The matrix (1−W) is not invertible because one of the eigenvalues of W equals to 1. The group generalized inverse is defined as \(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1-\lambda_n)} |\lambda_n\rangle\langle\lambda_n|\), where \(\lambda_n, |\lambda_n\rangle, \langle\lambda_n|\) are the nth eigenvalue, right eigenvector, and left eigenvector of W, respectively. The sum excludes the eigenstate with \(\lambda = 1\).
[27] S. Oldham, B. Fulcher, L. Parkes, A. Arnatkevičiūtė, C. Suo, and A. Fornito, Consistency and differences between...


[41] The bridges correspond to red bonds between the hub and the marginal site. Imagine that all bonds are identical resistors and a voltage drop is applied between the hub and the marginal site. The bridge bonds carry all current in such an electric circuit, and the current stops flowing when any of them are removed.


