# NUCLEAR PHYSICS B PROCEEDINGS SUPPLEMENTS

# Are defects important for 3D phase transitions?

C. Holm<sup>a</sup> and W. Janke<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institut für Theoretische Physik, Freie Universität Berlin Arnimallee 14, D-14195 Berlin, Germany

<sup>b</sup>Institut für Physik, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz Staudinger Weg 7, D-55099 Mainz, Germany

We use single-cluster Monte Carlo simulations to study the role of topological defects in the three-dimensional classical Heisenberg model on simple cubic lattices of size up to  $80^3$ . By applying reweighting techniques to time series generated in the vicinity of the approximate infinite volume transition point  $K_c$ , we obtain clear evidence that the temperature derivative of the average defect density  $d\langle n \rangle/dT$  behaves qualitatively like the specific heat, i.e., both observables are finite in the infinite volume limit.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that topological defects can play an important role in phase transitions [1,2]. Recently Lau and Dasgupta (LD) [3] have used Monte Carlo (MC) simulations to study the role of topological defects in the three-dimensional (3D) classical Heisenberg model, where the defects are point-like objects. Motivated by the importance of vortex points in the 2D XY model [4], LD tried to set up a similar pictorial description of the phase transition in the 3D Heisenberg model. Analyzing their simulations on simple cubic (sc) lattices of size  $V = L^3$  with L = 8, 12and 16, LD claimed that the temperature derivative of the average defect density,  $\langle n \rangle$ , diverges at the critical temperature  $T_c$  like  $d\langle n \rangle/dT \sim t^{-\psi}$ ,  $t = |T - T_c|/T_c$ , with an exponent  $\psi \approx 0.65$ . They further speculated that  $\psi = 1 - \beta$ , where  $\beta \approx 0.36$ is the critical exponent of the magnetization, and then argued that  $\langle n \rangle$  should behave like a "disorder" parameter.

The existence of such a strong divergence of  $d\langle n \rangle/dT$  seems unlikely, because the definition of defects is quasi-local. It is therefore more likely [5] that  $\langle n \rangle$  should qualitatively behave like the energy and  $d\langle n \rangle/dT$  like the specific heat, which is a finite quantity for the 3D Heisenberg model.

Using standard finite-size scaling (FSS) arguments we hence expect to see on finite lattices either

$$d\langle n \rangle / dT = L^{\psi/\nu} f(x) \tag{1}$$

or, if the second argument holds true,

$$d\langle n \rangle / dT = const + L^{\alpha/\nu} g(x), \qquad (2)$$

where  $\nu \approx 0.7$  and  $\alpha \approx -0.1$  are the correlation length and specific heat exponents for the 3D Heisenberg model [6,7],  $x = tL^{1/\nu}$ , and f(x), g(x)are scaling functions.

# 2. SIMULATION

Using the single-cluster update algorithm [8] we ran simulations for sc lattices of size  $V = L^3$ with L=8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64, 72, 80and periodic boundary conditions [9]. Our main emphasis was on the defect density  $n = \sum q^2 n_{|q|}$ , where  $n_1, n_2, \ldots$  are defect densities of charge  $q = \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$  To locate these charges we followed the definition of Berg and Lüscher [10] according to which the charge  $q_i$  at the dual lattice site  $i^*$ is given by

$$q_{i^*} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{12} A_i.$$
 (3)

The 12  $A_i$  refer to the directed areas of the spherical triangles that can be formed from the spins located at the vertices of the cube enclosing  $q_i$ .

All runs were performed at  $K_0 = 0.6929$  with a statistics of approximately 20000 measurements taken every  $\tau_n$  sweep, where  $\tau_n$  is the (integrated) autocorrelation time of the charge density. For each run we recorded the time series of the energy density e = E/V, the magnetization density m = $|\sum_i \vec{s_i}|/V$ , and the charge densities  $n_{|q|}$ . From this data we computed the specific heat

$$C = d\langle e \rangle / dT = V K^2 (\langle e^2 \rangle - \langle e \rangle^2), \qquad (4)$$

the thermal expansion coefficient

$$C_q = T d\langle n \rangle / dT = V K(\langle en \rangle - \langle e \rangle \langle n \rangle), \tag{5}$$

and the topological susceptibility

$$\chi_{\mathfrak{g}} = d\langle n \rangle / d\mu = V(\langle n^2 \rangle - \langle n \rangle^2), \tag{6}$$

where  $\mu$  is the "field" in a fugacity term  $\mu Vn$ , which one can imagine adding to the energy.

We also computed the eigenvalues of the  $2 \times 2$ covariance matrix formed by e and n, which gives two uncorrelated quantities  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ . To obtain results for the various observables  $\mathcal{O}$  at K values in an interval around the simulation point  $K_0$ , we applied the reweighting method [11]. To obtain errors we devided each run into 20 blocks and used the standard Jackknife technique.

#### 3. RESULTS

We focussed first on the scaling behavior of  $C_q$ at our previous estimate [7] of the critical coupling  $K_c = 0.6930$ , and checked a scaling Ansatz for  $C_q$  of the form

$$C_q = C_q^{\text{reg}} - a_0 L^{\alpha'/\nu}.$$
 (7)

Note that this Ansatz covers both scaling hypotheses (1) and (2). The resulting fit yields  $\alpha'/\nu =$ -0.401(61),  $C_q^{\text{reg}} = 1.50(8)$ , and  $a_0 = 1.82(6)$ , with a quality factor Q = 0.30. The good quality of the fit basically rules out the divergence predicted by the Ansatz (1) of LD, and strongly favours (2), which predicts a finite asymptotic value for  $C_q$ . We also tried to reproduce the exponent  $\psi \approx 0.65$  of LD, by selecting only their lattice sizes, and fitting a straight line to our first 3 data points. But even then we obtain a much smaller value of  $\psi/\nu \approx 0.36(3)$ , leading to  $\psi \approx 0.25(3)$ . One can ask, if  $\alpha'$  is equal to the specific-heat exponent  $\alpha$ . Using our earlier MC result [7] of  $\nu = 0.704(6)$ , we get a value of  $\alpha' = -0.282(46)$ , which does, on the first glance, not strongly support this conjecture. The best field theoretical estimates are  $\nu = 0.705(3)$ ,  $\alpha = -0.115(9)$ , and  $\alpha/\nu = -0.163(12)$  (resummed perturbation series [12]), while our earlier MC study [7] yielded  $\nu = 0.704(6)$ ,  $\alpha = -0.112(18)$ , and  $\alpha/\nu =$ -0.159(24). However, the accuracy of the values of  $\alpha$  is somewhat misleading, because they were obtained from hyperscaling,  $\alpha = 2 - 3\nu$ . The directly measured values have much larger error bars, for example  $\alpha/\nu = -0.30(6)$  [6] and  $\alpha/\nu = -0.33(22)$  [7].

To compare  $\alpha'$  directly with the measured specific-heat exponent of the present MC simulation, we fitted C to

$$C = C^{\text{reg}} - b_0 L^{\alpha/\nu}.$$
 (8)

The resulting fit yields  $\alpha/\nu = -0.225(80)$ ,  $C^{\text{reg}} = 4.8(7)$ , and  $b_0 = 4.1(5)$  with Q = 0.55, leading to  $\alpha = -0.158(59)$ . These values are in very good agreement with the hyperscaling prediction, but noteworthy is also the tendency for the values to come out too large.

Other estimates for  $\alpha'$  and  $\alpha$  can be obtained [9] by means of analogous fits of  $\langle n \rangle$  and  $\langle e \rangle$  at  $K_c = 0.6930$ , which yield  $(\alpha' - 1)/\nu = -1.547(15)$ ,  $\langle n \rangle^{\text{reg}} = 0.1074(1)$ , and  $c_0 = 0.42(2)$ , with Q = 0.30, and  $(\alpha - 1)/\nu = -1.586(19)$ ,  $\langle e \rangle^{\text{reg}} = 2.0106(1)$ , and  $d_0 = 1.68(8)$ , with Q = 0.25. This results in  $\alpha'/\nu = -0.127(27)$ ,  $\alpha' = -0.089(20)$ , and  $\alpha/\nu = -0.166(31)$ ,  $\alpha = -0.117(23)$ . The results for  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha/\nu$  are in excellent agreement with the hyperscaling prediction, and have not been directly measured before with such a high precision. The results for  $\alpha'$  and  $\alpha'/\nu$  are lower than those obtained from (7), but now they are almost consistent with the values for  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha/\nu$ .

We further looked at the scaling behavior of  $\chi_q$ , defined in eq.(6), which looked similar to  $C_q$ . Therefore we tried again a scaling Ansatz of the form

$$\chi_q = \chi_q^{\text{reg}} - e_0 L^{\alpha''/\nu}.$$
(9)

A three-parameter fit yields  $\alpha''/\nu = -0.554(57)$ ,  $\chi_q^{\text{reg}} = 0.67(2)$ , and  $e_0 = 0.95(6)$  with Q = 0.41, leading to  $\alpha'' = -0.390(44)$ . If one discards the two lowest *L* values from the fit, one observes a clear trend towards a lower  $\alpha''$ -value, but with the drawback of increased error bars and no improvement in  $\chi^2/\text{dof}$  (per degree of freedom).

We tested in all fits if there were corrections to FSS, and observed in all quantities a trend to the value of  $\alpha/\nu$  predicted by hyperscaling, but at the price of much larger error bars. Also the  $\chi^2/dof$  did not improve. We also checked that our results did not depend strongly on the choice of  $K_c$  by repeating the fits of all quantities at  $K_c \pm 0.0002$ .

For  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  we used again the Ansatz

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_i^{\text{reg}} - a_i L^{\alpha_i/\nu},\tag{10}$$

which results in  $\alpha_1/\nu = -0.273(73)$ ,  $\lambda_1^{\text{reg}} = 5.1(5)$ , and  $a_1 = 4.7(2)$ , with Q = 0.49, and  $\alpha_2/\nu = -1.45(42)$ ,  $\lambda_2^{\text{reg}} = 0.1307(8)$ , and  $a_2 = 0.2(2)$ , with Q = 0.60, leading to  $\alpha_1 = -0.192(54)$  and  $\alpha_2 = -1.02(31)$ . This suggests  $\alpha_1 \approx \alpha$  and  $\alpha_2 \approx \alpha - 1$ . Because  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = C + \chi_q$ , this means that at least  $\chi_q$  should see something of an exponent  $\alpha_2$ . The existence of an uncorrelated observable which scales with an exponent different from  $\alpha$  suggests that we see either corrections to FSS, a new scaling field, or that  $C_q$ and  $\chi_q$  scale with some rationale multiple of  $\alpha/\nu$ . The problem is that there is no satisfactory theory of the scaling of topological quantities.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that in the 3D classical Heisenberg model the topological defect density  $\langle n \rangle$ and its temperature derivative  $C_q$  behave qualitatively like the energy  $\langle e \rangle$  and its temperature derivative C. We obtain evidence that asymptotically for large L the scaling of  $C_q$  is governed by the specific-heat critical exponent  $\alpha$ . In particular, we can reject the conjecture of LD that  $C_q$ diverges with a new critical exponent  $\psi$ , and we find no evidence for an unusual behavior of the defects near the phase transition. For the topological susceptibility  $\chi_q$  we find that it also remains finite, and that it can be fitted with an Ansatz of the form (2) as well, but that its scaling exponent deviates from  $\alpha$ . In fact, our fits of the eigenvalues  $\lambda_i$  of the covariance matrix indicate that  $C_q$ and  $\chi_q$  are a mixture of a part which scales with  $\alpha$ , and a part which scales according to  $\alpha - 1$ .

Finally, the present fits of the specific heat at  $K_c$  yielded a value of  $\alpha/\nu$  of better accuracy and in better agreement with the hyperscaling value than fits of the specific-heat maxima as used in previous works [6,7]. Moreover, by fitting the energy at  $K_c$ , we obtained an estimate for  $\alpha/\nu$  with a precision unprecedented by direct numerical MC simulations.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are indepted to A.D. Sokal for discussions that initiated this study, and to the NVV for providing the necessary computer resources. W.J. thanks the DFG for a Heisenberg fellowship.

## REFERENCES

- 1. B.I. Halperin, in *Physics of Defects*, Proceedings of the Les Houches Summer Institute, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.
- H. Kleinert, Gauge Fields in Condensed Matter, World Scientific, Singapore, 1989.
- M.-h. Lau and C. Dasgupta, Phys. Rev. B39 (1989) 7212.
- V.L. Berezinskii, JETP 34 (1972) 610; J.M. Kosterlitz and D.J. Thouless, J. Phys. C6 (1973) 1181; J.M. Kosterlitz, J. Phys. C7 (1974) 1046.
- 5. A.D. Sokal, private communication.
- P. Peczak, A.M. Ferrenberg, and D.P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B43 (1991) 6087.
- C. Holm and W. Janke, Phys. Lett. A173 (1993) 8; and Phys. Rev. B48 (1993) 936.
- 8. U. Wolff, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 (1989) 361.
- C. Holm and W. Janke, Berlin preprint FUB-HEP 10/93, HEP-LAT 9306020.
- B. Berg and M. Lüscher, Nucl. Phys. B190 [FS3] (1981) 412.
- A.M. Ferrenberg and R.H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (1988) 2635; *ibid.* 63 (1989) 1658 (E).
- 12. J.C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. **B21** (1980) 3976.