Dynamics of packed swarms: time-displaced correlators of two dimensional incompressible flocks

Leiming Chen,[1,*] Chiu Fan Lee,[2,†] Ananyo Maitra,[3,4,‡] and John Toner[5,6,§]

[1] *School of Material Science and Physics, China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou Jiangsu, 221116, P. R. China*
[2] *Department of Bioengineering, Imperial College London, South Kensington Campus, London SW7 2AZ, U.K.*
[3] *Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Modélisation, CNRS UMR 8089, CY Cergy Paris Université, F-95032 Cergy-Pontoise Cedex, France*
[4] *Sorbonne Université and CNRS, Laboratoire Jean Perrin, F-75005, Paris, France*
[5] *Department of Physics and Institute of Theoretical Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR* 97403[1]
[6] *Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems, Nöthnitzer Str. 38, 01187 Dresden, Germany*

We analytically calculate the scaling exponents of a two-dimensional KPZ-like system: coherently moving incompressible polar active fluids. Using three different renormalization group approximation schemes, we obtain values for the "roughness" exponent χ and anisotropy exponent ζ that are extremely near the known exact results. This implies our prediction for the previously completely unknown dynamic exponent z is likely to be quantitatively accurate.

The Mermin-Wagner theorem [1] states that in equilibrium, two-dimensional systems with finite-range interactions cannot spontaneously break a continuous symmetry at any finite temperature. One of the earliest and most surprising results in the field of active matter was that there is no analogue of the Mermin-Wagner theorem in nonequilibrium matter. In particular, it was *explicitly* demonstrated that active polar units moving on a two-dimensional frictional substrate and with *purely* short-range interactions *can* spontaneously break continuous rotation symmetry in two dimensions and form long-range ordered flocks [2–6]. Such flocks have a *nonzero* mean speed $\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle$ even at finite noise strengths.

Despite the fact that the *existence* of long-range-ordered two-dimensional flocks has been demonstrated analytically, determining their scaling behavior analytically has proved much more challenging. One class of systems that *has* proved amenable to analytical treatment is *incompressible* flocks [7–13].

Incompressibility can arise in many ways. One way is to make the density extremely high. In this limit the effective compressibility of the flockers vanishes, with any departure from the mean density being severely penalized [8, 10]. More accurately, as the compressibility goes to 0, the length scale up to which the system is effectively incompressible diverges. A flock formed by a suspension of motile swimmers in an incompressible fluid on a substrate also inherits the incompressibility of the fluid and is therefore incompressible [10]. This is distinct from the model we will consider here due to the presence of an extra conserved quantity: the number of swimmers. However, if the number of active units is *not* conserved, for instance, due to birth and death [14–16], the dynamics of such a system belongs to the "incompressible flock" universality class we consider here [10]. Such a system has non-conserved dynamical quantities, like ours; therefore, the only hydrodynamic field is the center of mass (of background fluid plus active particles) velocity field. Furthermore, that velocity must also obey the incompressibility condition $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$. The system also has the same symmetry (rotation invariance) as ours, and breaks that symmetry spontaneously in the same way (by picking out a preferred direction of motion). Therefore, it *must* be described by the same hydrodynamic equation as ours.

Our understanding of the *equal-time* behavior of incompressible two dimensional flocks is quite complete. Although they are non-equilibrium systems, their hydrodynamic equations prove to be equivalent, once terms that are "irrelevant" in the renormalization group sense are dropped, to those of an equilibrium magnetic system [8, 17] with long-ranged interactions. Because of those long-ranged interactions, the Mermin-Wagner theorem does not apply to these magnetic systems. The partition function for this equilibrium system can then be further mapped [8] onto that for a two-dimensional smectic, whose equal-time scaling laws are known *exactly* via a further mapping [18] onto the $1+1$-dimensional KPZ equation [19]. This analysis [8] gives the scaling law for the equal time fluctuations $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ of the local active fluid velocity $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ about its mean value $\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle \equiv v_0 \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, where we've defined our coordinate system so that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is along the mean velocity spontaneously chosen by the system. Specifically

$$\langle \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) \cdot \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{0}, t) \rangle = |x|^{2\chi} \mathcal{G}_{ET}\left(\frac{|y|}{|x|^{\zeta}}\right), \tag{1}$$

where "ET" stands for "equal-time". The exponents χ and ζ were determined *exactly* by the aforementioned mappings [8] to be $\chi = -1/2$ and $\zeta = 3/2$.

Unfortunately, since this analysis was based entirely on the partition function for the equivalent equilibrium model, no information about the *dynamics* of the system can be obtained by this exact mapping. Most of this missing information can be encoded in a single additional universal exponent, namely, the "dynamical" exponent

z. This can be defined by considering the *unequal*- time correlation function of the velocity fluctuations, which obeys the scaling law

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t)\cdot\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{0},0)\rangle \\ &= |x-v_b t|^{2\chi}\mathcal{G}_{UET}\left(\frac{|y|}{|x-v_b t|^{\zeta}},\frac{|t|}{|x-v_b t|^{z}}\right), \quad (2)\end{aligned}$$

and the subscript "UET" now means "unequal-time". The "boost" velocity v_b is a phenomenological parameter of our model.

In this Letter, we obtain the dynamical exponent z for the polar phase of two-dimensional, incompressible flocks using *four* different dynamic renormalization group (DRG) schemes: two different uncontrolled calculations exactly in two dimensions, and two $d=(d_c-\epsilon)$-expansions, in which we analytically continue our model, which is defined strictly in two dimensions, to higher dimensions. The two ϵ expansions, which we call the hard and soft continuations, have $d_c=5/2$ and $d_c=3$, respectively. We get

$$z = 1.67 \pm 0.05\ , \quad (3)$$

where the error bars correspond to the standard error of the four DRG schemes. We also calculate the roughness exponent χ and the anisotropic exponent ξ in all four schemes.

As mentioned earlier, we already know the static exponents χ and ζ exactly, so our purpose in performing this DRG is only to calculate z. However, our knowledge of the exact values of χ and ζ provides us with a useful check on the quantitative accuracy of our DRG calculations, because we can compare the approximate values of χ and ζ that we get from those schemes with the known exact values. And they prove to be very close; indeed, one of our uncontrolled approximations and the soft-continuation ϵ expansion both reproduce the known exact values $\chi=-1/2$ and $\zeta=3/2$. We therefore believe our prediction (3) is very accurate quantitatively, although this argument is obviously far from rigorous.

Inserting (3) and the exact value for χ into (2), and considering the limit $\mathbf{r}\to\mathbf{0}$, we obtain the temporal part of the velocity correlation:

$$\langle \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{0},t)\cdot\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{0},0)\rangle \sim A t^{\frac{2\chi}{z}} = A t^{-0.60\pm0.02}\ , \quad (4)$$

where A is some non-universal constant.

We'll now present the derivation of the above results. This begins with the hydrodynamic equation of motion (EOM) of incompressible polar active fluids, which can be constructed purely based on symmetry considerations, (as has been discussed in [8]) and is:

$$\partial_t\mathbf{v}+\lambda(\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v} = -\nabla\Pi-(\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\Pi_1)\mathbf{v}+U(|\mathbf{v}|)\mathbf{v}+\mu_1\nabla^2\mathbf{v}+\mu_2(\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla)^2\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{r},t)\ , \quad (5)$$

where the "pressure" Π is a Lagrange multiplier that enforces the incompressibility constraint: $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}=0$, the term involving $U(|\mathbf{v}|)$—a smooth, analytic function of $|\mathbf{v}|$—ensures that there is an "ordered" phase in which $\mathbf{v}$ has a nonzero mean magnitude v_0. That is, we assume that there is a regime in parameter space of $U(|\mathbf{v}|)$ where $U(|\mathbf{v}|)>0$ for $|\mathbf{v}|<v_0$, $U(|\mathbf{v}|)=0$ for $|\mathbf{v}|=v_0$, and $U(|\mathbf{v}|)<0$ for $|\mathbf{v}|>v_0$. The "anisotropic pressure" Π_1 is another generic function of $|\mathbf{v}|$. Finally, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{r})$ is a zero-mean, Gaussian white noise with the correlation

$$\langle f_i(\mathbf{r},t)f_j(\mathbf{r}',t')\rangle = 2D\delta_{ij}\delta^2(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')\delta(t-t')\ , \quad (6)$$

where the indices i,j enumerate the spatial coordinates.

Expanding (5) about an ordered state using $\mathbf{v}=v_0\hat{\mathbf{x}}+\mathbf{u}$ and retaining only relevant terms (i.e., the terms that are important in the limit of large time and length scales), we obtain the EOM governing $\mathbf{u}$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u_i &= -\partial_i\Pi+\mu_\perp\partial_y^2u_i+\mu\partial_x^2u_i \\ &\quad -\alpha\left(u_x+\frac{u_y^2}{2v_0}\right)(\delta_{ix}+\frac{u_y}{v_0}\delta_{iy})+f_i\ , \quad (7)\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha\equiv-v_0\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}U}{\mathrm{d}|\mathbf{v}|}\right)_{|\mathbf{v}|=v_0}$, $\mu_\perp\equiv\mu_1$, and $\mu\equiv\mu_1+\mu_2v_0^2$. As discussed in [8, 14], we have performed a Galilean transformation to a reference frame $\mathbf{r}'$ which moves with respect to our original reference frame in the direction of mean flock motion at a speed $v_b=\lambda v_0$; that is, $\mathbf{r}'\equiv\mathbf{r}-\lambda v_0t\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, or, equivalently, $x'=x-v_bt$. For simplicity, in (7) we have dropped the prime in x. Note that $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t)$ is also subject to the incompressibility constraint $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}=0$ inherited from $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}=0$. The somewhat non-trivial power-counting that leads to (7) is detailed in [8].

We now perform a DRG analysis to obtain the dynamic exponent for the incompressible flock. Fourier transforming (7) and acting on the projection operator $P_{yi}(\mathbf{q})$ to eliminate the pressure term [20], we obtain

$$-\mathrm{i}\omega u_y = P_{yx}\left(\mathbf{q}\right)\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}\left[-\alpha\left(u_x+\frac{u_y^2}{2}\right)\right]+P_{yy}(\mathbf{q})\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}\left[-\alpha\left(u_x+\frac{u_y^2}{2}\right)u_y+\mu\partial_x^2 u_y+f_y\right], \tag{8}$$

where we have eliminated v_0 by absorbing it into $\mathbf{u}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{u}\to v_0\mathbf{u}$), and the symbol $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}$ represents the $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$th Fourier component.

Now we implement the standard DRG procedure [21] on EOM (8). First we decompose the field $\mathbf{u}$ into "slow" and "fast" parts $\mathbf{u}^<(\mathbf{q})$ and $\mathbf{u}^>(\mathbf{q})$, which are supported at small $\mathbf{q}$'s and large $\mathbf{q}$'s, respectively. (We will eventually take the large $\mathbf{q}$'s to lie in an infinitesimally thin shell along the outer edge of the Brillouin zone).

Next we average out $\mathbf{u}^>(\mathbf{q})$ to get the effective EOM for $\mathbf{u}^<(\mathbf{q})$. In this step the various coefficients in (8) are renormalized; we call these changes "graphical corrections". Finally we rescale time, lengths, and fields as

$$t\to te^{z\mathrm{d}\ell},\quad x\to xe^{\mathrm{d}\ell},\quad y\to ye^{\zeta\mathrm{d}\ell}, \tag{9a}$$

$$u_y\to u_y e^{\chi\mathrm{d}\ell},\quad u_x\to u_x e^{(\chi+1-\zeta)\mathrm{d}\ell}, \tag{9b}$$

to restore the Brillouin zone to its original size. Note that the form of the rescaling in u_x is imposed by the incompressibility condition. This whole process is then repeated iteratively, which leads to recursion relations for the three coefficients α, μ, and D in (8) [Note that D is hidden in the correlations of the noise $\mathbf{f}$ (6)].

As usual in DRG calculations [21], we need to make approximations to perform the averaging step. We use four distinct DRG approximation schemes. Two of these are one-loop order DRG calculations in exactly two dimensions, which are uncontrolled approximations since there is no limit in which they become exact. The third scheme is an $\epsilon_h = 5/2-d$ expansion to $O(\epsilon_h)$, in which we analytically continue our calculation to $d>2$ by treating the y direction as $d-1$ dimensional, and the fourth scheme is an $\epsilon_s = 3-d$ expansion to $O(\epsilon_s)$ in which we analytically continue our theory to higher dimensions by treating the x direction to be $d-1$ dimensional. We call the former the "hard" continuation, and the latter the "soft" continuation. These last two are controlled approximations, since they formally become exact in the limit $\epsilon_{h,s}\to 0$. Obviously, they are also only approximate in $d=2$. The first of the two uncontrolled approximations uses a Brillouin zone (BZ) $-\infty<q_y<\infty$, $-\Lambda<q_x<\Lambda$, where Λ is the ultraviolet cut-off, and the second uses the BZ $-\infty<q_x<\infty$, $-\Lambda<q_y<\Lambda$. The ϵ-expansion results are independent of the shape of the Brillouin zone as we explicitly demonstrate in the supplement [22]. All four approaches yield values of the dynamical exponent that are fairly close to each other. Furthermore, all four obtain values of the already exactly known exponents χ and ζ which prove to be very close to those known exact values; indeed, the first uncontrolled approximation and the soft-continuation ϵ expansion yield the exact values of the χ and ζ.

Crucially, in all four DRG calculations, we use the symmetry properties of the EOM for $\mathbf{u}$ to make two important simplifications. First, the rotation invariance of our hydrodynamic EOM is ensured by choosing the values of χ and ζ to keep all four "α"s appearing in (8) (i.e., the coefficients of u_x, u_y^2, u_xu_y, and u_y^3) the same under rescaling, i.e.,

$$\chi = 1-\zeta\,. \tag{10}$$

This simplification reduces the total number of recursion relations to three. These are quite generally

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln\alpha}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = z-2\zeta+2+\eta_\alpha\,, \tag{11}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln\mu}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = z-2+\eta_\mu\,, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln D}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = z-\zeta-2\chi-1+\eta_D \tag{13}$$

for the uncontrolled approximations (which are done in $d=2$), or

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln D}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = z+(1-d)\zeta-2\chi-1+\eta_D \tag{14}$$

for the hard-continuation ϵ expansion, or

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln D}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = z-\zeta-2\chi-(d-1)+\eta_D \tag{15}$$

for the soft-continuation ϵ expansion. In all of these equations (12-15), $\eta_{\alpha,\,u,D}$ denote graphical corrections.

Note that these recursion relations imply that the fixed point values of $\eta_{\alpha,\,u,D}$ are determined entirely by z, ζ, and χ (and visa-versa). Indeed, setting all ℓ derivatives equal to zero in (11), (12), and (13) implies that

$$\eta_\mu = 2-z\,,\ \eta_\alpha = 2\zeta-z-2\,,\ \text{and}\ \eta_D = 2\chi-\zeta-z+1\,. \tag{16}$$

Next, the fact that the dynamics of $\mathbf{u}$ obeys detailed balance introduces another simplification. This becomes clear if we formally introduce a friction coefficient in the dynamics for $\mathbf{u}$; $\Gamma\partial_t u_i = -\delta H/\delta u_i + f_i$, which is just the time-dependent-Ginzberg-Landau model, or model A [23, 24], with $H(\mathbf{M})$ the Hamiltonian for a ordered divergence-free two-dimensional magnet expanded around its minimum at nonzero magnetization, where $\mathbf{M} = (v_0+u_x)\hat{x}+u_y\hat{y}$. $\Gamma=1$ in (8) but it doesn't retain

that value under renormalization. This would appear as a renormalization of the coefficient of $-i\omega u_y$; in general, this is an independent quantity. However, here detailed balance implies that the ratio D/Γ *cannot* change under renormalization i.e., Γ and D must renormalize in the same way. This implies that the correction to $\ln\Gamma$ is the same as the correction to $\ln D$. If we denote the direct graphical correction to the annealed noise η_D^{dir} and the direct graphical correction to Γ as η_ω, the argument just given implies $\eta_\omega = \eta_D^{dir}$. To avoid retaining the friction coefficient as another extra parameter, we divide both sides of the renormalized EOM by the coefficient of $-i\omega u_y$ to fix the coefficient of $-i\omega u_y$ at 1. This effectively introduces an additional correction $-\eta_D^{dir}$ to both α and μ, and $-2\eta_D^{dir}$ to D. (The factor of 2 arises because D is proportional to the correlation of *two* noises). Therefore, the overall graphical corrections to α, μ, and D are given by

$$\eta_\alpha = \eta_\alpha^{dir} - \eta_D^{dir}\,, \quad \eta_\mu = \eta_\mu^{dir} - \eta_D^{dir}\,, \tag{17}$$

$$\eta_D = \eta_D^{dir} - 2\eta_D^{dir} = -\eta_D^{dir}\,. \tag{18}$$

Using these considerations, and explicitly evaluating the graphical corrections to one-loop order [22], we find the following graphical corrections for the first uncontrolled approximation, i.e., using the BZ $-\infty < q_y < \infty$, $-\Lambda < q_x < \Lambda$ in exactly $d = 2$:

$$\eta_\alpha = -\frac{3g^{U1}}{4}\,,\ \eta_\mu = \frac{g^{U1}}{4}\,,\ \eta_D = -\frac{g^{U1}}{4}\,, \tag{19}$$

where

$$g^{U1} = \frac{\alpha^{1/2}D}{4\mu^{3/2}\pi\Lambda}\,. \tag{20}$$

Using the recursion relations (11), (12), (13), and the definition of g^{U1}, implies the following recursion relation for g^{U1}:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln g^{U1}}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = \frac{2 + 2\eta_D + \eta_\alpha - 3\eta_\mu}{2} \approx 1 - g^{U1}, \tag{21}$$

where we have used the identity (10). The first equality is exact, and the second, approximate, equality is valid only to one-loop order, and is obtained from combining (11), (12), (13), (19) with (20). This implies that there is a stable fixed point at $(g^{U1})^* = 1$. While this fixed point is only valid to one-loop order, since g^{U1} *does* have a non-zero fixed point value at *all* orders, and since the first equality in (21) is valid to *all* orders, setting the L.H.S. of (21) to 0 leads to an *exact* identity between the values of $\eta_{\alpha,\mu,D}$ at the fixed point :

$$2 + 2\eta_D + \eta_\alpha - 3\eta_\mu = 0\,. \tag{22}$$

Using our relations (16) in $d = 2$, we can see that this expression (22) implies (10), which we already required to keep all α's the same.

An exactly analogous calculation for the second uncontrolled approximation, using the BZ $-\infty < q_x < \infty$, $-\Lambda < q_y < \Lambda$, yields the following graphical corrections [22] to one-loop order in exactly $d = 2$:

$$\eta_\alpha = -\frac{7g^{U2}}{8}\,,\ \eta_\mu = \frac{5g^{U2}}{8}\,,\ \eta_D = -\frac{3g^{U2}}{8}\,, \tag{23}$$

where

$$g^{U2} = \frac{\zeta\alpha^{1/4}D}{8\sqrt{2}\mu^{5/4}\pi\sqrt{\Lambda}}\,. \tag{24}$$

This definition of g^{U2} implies the recursion relation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln g^{U2}}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = \frac{2\zeta + 4\eta_D + \eta_\alpha - 5\eta_\mu}{4} \approx \frac{4\zeta - 11g^{U2}}{8}, \tag{25}$$

where, again, the first equality is formally valid to all orders, but the second, approximate equality, to only one-loop order. Since $\zeta > 0$, the approximate equality implies a stable fixed point at $(g^{U2})^* = 4\zeta/11$ to one-loop order.

The first, exact, relation implies another exact scaling law at the fixed point:

$$2\zeta + 4\eta_D + \eta_\alpha - 5\eta_\mu = 0\,. \tag{26}$$

However, this relation again proves to be exactly equivalent to (10), as can be seen by again using our relations (16) in $d = 2$.

Next, we turn to the ϵ expansion calculations. Analytically continuing our calculation to $d > 2$ by treating the y direction as $d-1$ dimensional (hard continuation) and using the BZ $-\infty < q_x < \infty$, $0 < |q_y| < \Lambda$, we obtain the following graphical corrections [22] in the recursion relations (11), (12), (14) to one-loop order:

$$\eta_\alpha = -\frac{7g_h}{8}\,,\ \eta_\mu = \frac{5g_h}{8}\,,\ \eta_D = -\frac{3g_h}{8}\,, \tag{27}$$

where

$$g_h = \frac{\zeta\alpha^{1/4}DS_{d-1}\Lambda^{d-5/2}}{8\sqrt{2}(2\pi)^{d-1}\mu^{5/4}}\,. \tag{28}$$

Combining this definition of g_h with the recursion relations for α, μ, and D implies

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln g_h}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = \frac{(10-4d)\zeta + 4\eta_D + \eta_\alpha - 5\eta_\mu}{4} \approx \frac{5-2d}{2}\zeta - \frac{11}{8}g_h. \tag{29}$$

This second, approximate, equality implies that the critical dimension is 5/2: for $d < 5/2$, g_h flows to a nonzero stable fixed point $(g_h)^* = \frac{8\epsilon_h}{11}\zeta$ to $O(\epsilon_h)$, where $\epsilon_h = 5/2 - d$; while for $d > 5/2$, g_h is attracted to $(g_h)^* = 0$ (i.e., the Gaussian fixed point). Note once again that the first exact equality implies an exact scaling relation between the anisotropy exponent ζ and the η's for $d < 5/2$:

$$(10-4d)\zeta + 4\eta_D + \eta_\alpha - 5\eta_\mu = 0\,. \tag{30}$$

Note that this relation reduces to (26) in $d = 2$, as it must.

Finally, we analytically continue our calculation to $d > 2$ by treating the x direction as $d-1$ dimensional (soft continuation) and use the BZ $0 < |q_x| < \Lambda$, $-\infty < q_y < \infty$. We obtain the following graphical corrections in the recursion relations (11), (12) and (15) to one-loop order [22]:

$$\eta_\alpha = -\frac{3g_s}{4}\,,\ \eta_\mu = \frac{g_s}{4}\,,\ \eta_D = -\frac{g_s}{4}\,, \tag{31}$$

where

$$g_s = \frac{D\alpha^{1/2} S_{d-1}\Lambda^{d-3}}{4\mu^{3/2}(2\pi)^{d-1}}\,. \tag{32}$$

The closed recursion relation for g_s is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln g_s}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = \frac{6-2d+2\eta_D+\eta_\alpha-3\eta_\mu}{2} \approx 3-d-g_s\,. \tag{33}$$

Here the critical dimension is 3. For $d < 3$, the second approximate equality implies a stable fixed point $(g_s)^* = \epsilon_s$ to $O(\epsilon_s)$, where $\epsilon_s = 3-d$. Note that again the first exact equality implies an exact scaling relation between η's for $d < 3$

$$6-2d+2\eta_D+\eta_\alpha-3\eta_\mu = 0 \tag{34}$$

which reduces to (22) in $d = 2$.

We now use the trajectory integral-matching formalism [25] to calculate $C(\mathbf{r},t) = \langle \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t)\cdot\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{0},0)\rangle$, by relating the correlators in the original system to those of the rescaled system, via

$$\begin{aligned} &C(\alpha_0,\mu_{x0},D_0,\mathbf{r},t) \\ &= e^{2\chi\ell} C\left[\alpha(\ell),\mu(\ell),D(\ell),\frac{|y|}{e^{\zeta\ell}},\frac{|x-v_bt|}{e^{\ell}},\frac{|t|}{e^{z\ell}}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

with α, μ and D controlling the magnitude of $C(\mathbf{r},t)$, and the subscript "0" denotes the bare values of the parameters. Note the argument $x-v_bt$ appears in these expressions because we have undone the aforementioned Galilean boost to return to the laboratory coordinate system.

We will illustrate this calculation in detail for the first uncontrolled approximation; for the other approximations the calculation is very similar. We choose ζ and z to fix α, μ, and D (of course, due to the exact relation (10), fixing ζ also fixes χ). This gives

$$z^{U1} = \frac{7}{4}\,,\quad \zeta^{U1} = \frac{3}{2}\,,\quad \chi^{U1} = -\frac{1}{2}\,. \tag{36}$$

Then setting $\ell = \ln(\Lambda|x-v_bt|)$ casts the R.H.S. of (35) in the form (2) where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{G}_{UET}\left(\frac{|t|}{|x-v_bt|^z},\frac{|y|}{|x-v_bt|^\zeta}\right) \\ &\equiv \Lambda^{2\chi} C\left[\alpha_0,\mu_0,D_0,\frac{|y|}{(|x-v_bt|\Lambda)^\zeta},\frac{1}{\Lambda},\frac{|t|}{(|x-v_bt|\Lambda)^z}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Since the static limit of the correlator $C(\mathbf{r},t=0)$ has been obtained in [8], we focus here on the dynamic limit $C(\mathbf{0},t)$. In this limit we expect the correlator to be a power law of t only. As a result, the scaling function $\mathcal{G}_{UET}$ must behave as $(t/|x-v_bt|^z)^{\frac{\chi}{z}}$ to cancel out the prefactor $|x-v_bt|^{2\chi}$ in (2). Thus we obtain (4). We remind the reader that the static exponents ζ^{U1} and χ^{U1} in this approximation, coincidentally, coincide with the exact static exponents obtained in [8]. We however note that as these are one-loop calculations, the static exponents have no reason to coincide with their exact values and, indeed, they do not in two of the three other approximations.

Likewise, the second uncontrolled approximation yields

$$z^{U2} = \frac{23}{14}\,,\quad \zeta^{U2} = \frac{11}{7}\,,\quad \chi^{U2} = -\frac{4}{7}\,, \tag{38}$$

the hard continuation

$$z^h = 2-\frac{10}{11}\epsilon_h = \frac{17}{11}\,, \tag{39}$$

$$\zeta^h = 2-\frac{12}{11}\epsilon_h = \frac{16}{11}\,, \tag{40}$$

$$\chi^h = -1+\frac{12}{11}\epsilon_h = -\frac{5}{11}\,, \tag{41}$$

where $\epsilon_h = 5/2-d$ and in the second equality $d = 2$ is taken, and the soft continuation

$$z^s = 2-\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_s = \frac{7}{4}\,, \tag{42}$$

$$\zeta^s = 2-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_s = \frac{3}{2}\,, \tag{43}$$

$$\chi^s = -1+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_s = -\frac{1}{2}\,, \tag{44}$$

where $\epsilon_s = 3-d$ and in the second equality $d = 2$ is taken.

Taking an average over the four sets of values of the exponents leads to the value $z = 1.67\pm0.05$ quoted in the introduction, $\zeta = 1.51\pm0.02$, and $\chi = -0.507\pm0.024$. Note that the predictions for ζ and χ are extremely close to their exact values $\zeta = 3/2$ and $\chi = -1/2$, which implies our prediction for z is almost certainly also very accurate. This also implies that though the linear theory suggested that velocity fluctuations in incompressible flocks are diffusive, nonlinearities *lower* the dynamical exponent, which makes the dynamics *super*diffusive: that is, distance scales like $t^{1/z}$ with $z < 2$, which means distance grows faster with time than the $t^{1/2}$ diffusive law.

In summary, we have calculated the dynamical exponent z characterizing the scaling of velocity fluctuations with time in incompressible two-dimensional flocks. We did so using *four* different approximation schemes, and demonstrated that the dynamics is significantly modified; specifically, the value of z is substantially changed by

nonlinearities, which turn the fluctuations superdiffusive. Interestingly, due to the mapping [8] between this system and the model-A dynamics of a divergence-free magnet [17], this also implies that magnetisation fluctuations of a divergence-free magnet or a two-dimensional magnet with two-dimensional dipolar interactions are also superdiffusive.

L.C. acknowledges support by the National Science Foundation of China (under Grant No. 12274452), and thanks the MPI-PKS, where the early stage of this work was performed, for their support. J. T. thanks the Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems, Dresden, Germany, for their support through a Martin Gutzwiller Fellowship during this period. AM was supported by a TALENT fellowship from CY Cergy Paris Université.

* leiming@cumt.edu.cn
† c.lee@imperial.ac.uk
‡ nyomaitra07@gmail.com
§ jjt@uoregon.edu

[1] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, "Absence of ferromagnetism or antiferromagnetism in one- or two-dimensional isotropic Heisenberg Models," Physical Review Letters **17,** 1133 (1966); P.C. Hohenberg, "Existence of long-range order in one and two dimensions," Physical Review **158,** 383 (1967).

[2] T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet, "Novel Type of Phase Transition in a System of Self-Driven Particles," Physical Review Letters **75**, 1226–1229 (1995).

[3] J. Toner and Y. Tu, "Long-Range Order in a Two-Dimensional Dynamical XY Model: How Birds Fly Together," Physical Review Letters **75**, 4326–4329 (1995).

[4] J. Toner and Y. Tu, "Flocks, herds, and schools: A quantitative theory of flocking," Physical Review E **58**, 4828–4858 (1998).

[5] J. Toner, "Reanalysis of the hydrodynamic theory of fluid, polar-ordered flocks," Physical Review E **86**, 031918 (1012).

[6] H. Chaté, "Dry Aligning Dilute Active Matter," Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics **11**, 189 (2020).

[7] L. Chen, J. Toner, and C. F. Lee, "Critical phenomenon of the order-disorder transition in incompressible flocks," New Journal of Physics **17**, 042002 (2015).

[8] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, and J. Toner, "Mapping two-dimensional polar active fluids to two-dimensional soap and one-dimensional sandblasting," Nature Communications **7**, 12215 (2016.)

[9] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, and J. Toner, "Incompressible polar active fluids in the moving phase in dimensions $d > 2$," New Journal of Physics **20**, 113035 (2018).

[10] A. Maitra, P. Srivastava, M. C. Marchetti, S. Ramaswamy, M. Lenz, "Swimmer suspensions on substrates: anomalous stability and long-range order," Physical Review Letters **124**, 028002 (2020).

[11] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, A. Maitra, and J. Toner, "Packed Swarms on Dirt: Two-Dimensional Incompressible Flocks with Quenched and Annealed Disorder," Physical Review Letters **129**, 188004 (2022).

[12] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, A. Maitra, and J. Toner, "Hydrodynamic theory of two-dimensional incompressible polar active fluids with quenched and annealed disorder, " Physical Review E **106**, 044608 (2022).

[13] A. Maitra "Active uniaxially ordered suspensions on disordered substrates", Physical Review E **101**, 012605 (2020).

[14] J. Toner, "Birth, Death, and Flight: A Theory of Malthusian Flocks," Physical Review Letters **108**, 088102 (2012).

[15] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, and J. Toner, "Moving, Reproducing, and Dying Beyond Flatland: Malthusian Flocks in Dimensions $d > 2$," Physical Review Letters **125**, 098003 (2020), arXiv:2001.01300.

[16] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, and J. Toner, "Universality class for a nonequilibrium state of matter: A $d = 4 - \epsilon$ expansion study of Malthusian flocks," Physical Review E **102**, 022610 (2020).

[17] A. Kashuba, "Exact scaling of spin-wave correlations in the 2D XY ferromagnet with dipolar forces," Physical Review Letters **73**, 2264 (1994).

[18] L. Golubović and Z.-G. Wang, "Anharmonic elasticity of smectics A and the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang model," Physical Review Letters **69,** 2535 (1992); "Kardar-Parisi-Zhang model and anomalous elasticity of two- and three-dimensional smectic-A liquid crystals," Physical Review E **49,** 2567 (1994).

[19] M. Kardar, G. Parisi and Y.-C. Zhang, "Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces," Physical Review Letters **56**, 889-892 (1986).

[20] Alternatatively, we could act on eqn. (7) with $P_{xi}(\mathbf{q})$ to get the EOM for $u_x(\tilde{\mathbf{q}})$. However, the resultant equation is equivalent to (8), since $u_x(\tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ and $u_y(\tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ are not independent, but rather related by the incompressibility constraint $q_x u_x(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) + q_y u_y(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) = 0$.

[21] D. Forster, D. R. Nelson, and M. J. Stephen, "Large-distance and long-time properties of a randomly stirred fluid," Physical Review A **16**, 732–749 (1977).

[22] Supplementary material that contains details of the calculations leading to the results presented here.

[23] P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995).

[24] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Halperin, "Theory of dynamic critical phenomena," Review of Modern Physics **49**, 435 (1977).

[25] D. R. Nelson, "Crossover scaling functions and renormalization-group trajectory integrals," Physical Review B**11**, 3504 (1975).