Criticality versus q in the $2+1$-dimensional Z_q clock model

J. Hove* and A. Sudbø†
Department of Physics
Norwegian University of Science and Technology,
N-7491 Trondheim, Norway

(Dated: February 7, 2020)

Using Monte Carlo simulations we have studied the $d=3$ Z_q clock model in two different representations, the phase-representation and the loop/dumbbell-gas (LDG) representation. We find that for $q \geq 5$ the critical exponents α and ν for the specific heat and the correlation length, respectively, take on values corresponding to the case $q \to \infty$, where $\lim_{q\to\infty} Z_q = 3DXY$ model. The remaining exponents, which depend on the particular degrees of freedom used to describe the system, vary continuously with q. In particular, we demonstrate this fact for the anomalous scaling exponent η in the phase representation.

PACS numbers: 05.50.+q,11.15.Ha,64.60.Cn,71.10.Hf

Matter coupled-gauge field theories in $2+1$ dimensions have come under renewed scrutiny in the context of condensed matter physics in the past decade, as effective theories of strongly correlated systems [1]. Concepts such as confinement-deconfinement transitions associated with the proliferation and recombination of topological defects of gauge fields, enter for instance in attempts at providing a theoretical foundation for breakdown of Fermi-liquid theory in more than one dimension. The variety of such gauge-field theories that have been proposed, even limiting focus to the abelian case, is considerable. They range from Ising Z_2 lattice gauge theories [2] to the compact abelian Higgs model [1, 3]. The latter may be viewed as the $q \to \infty$-limit of a Z_q lattice gauge theory. The abelian Higgs model has recently been demonstrated to have a phase transition of the Kosterlitz-Thouless type in $d = 2+1$ when the matter field is in the fundamental representation [3], which is the relevant case for studying strongly correlated fermion systems [1]. Strong hints at a recombination of monopole configurations of topological defects of compact $U(1)$ gauge fields into dipole configurations, and hence destruction of Polyakov permanant confinement due to matter-field coupling, has recently been seen in numerics [4].

Thus, the critical properties of Z_q lattice spin/gauge models is of considerable current interest. In this paper, we will therefore compute various critical exponents for this model as a function of q. It is of some interest to see how the exponents of this model interpolate between the Z_2 values and the $3DXY$ values obtained when $q \to \infty$.

The Z_q model is a simple planar-spin model, where the direction of the spin is parametrized by a phase. This phase is restricted to the values $2\pi n/q$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and is defined by the following action

$$S = -\beta \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{q}\left(n_i - n_j\right)\right). \qquad (1)$$

The state is specified by the integer variables $n_i \in [0, 2, \cdots, q-1]$. Special cases include $q = 2$ which is the Ising model, $q = 3$ which is the three state Potts model, and the limit $q \to \infty$ which corresponds to the XY model. In addition, $q = 4$ corresponds to two *independent* Ising models. For reasons of computational efficiency the Z_q model with q "large enough" is often used in numerical simulations of the XY model. Moreover, the Z_q spin model with $q \geq 2$ in $d = 3$ is dual to a Z_q lattice gauge theory which corresponds to a certain limit of an important matter-coupled gauge theory, namely the compact Higgs model model with gauge charge q [5].

In $d = 2$, the model shows a quite peculiar phase structure, with an intermediate *incompletely ordered phase* (IOP), where the system shows behavior similar to the critical Kosterlitz Thouless phase. Upon further cooling, the system will order completely into one of the q completely ordered states[6, 7]. In $d = 3$ the Z_q model does not have an IOP, but various generalizations of the model do [7, 8, 9]. However, our focus has been on the high temperature phase transition which goes into the conventional Ising and XY phase transitions for $q = 2$ and $q \to \infty$.

Eq. 1 is straightforwardly reformulated as a model of an interacting ensemble of links which either form closed loops or originate/terminate at point charges. In $d = 2$ Elitzur *et al.* [6], showed using RG that the model has a Kosterlitz Thouless transition for $q \geq 5$. We start with the partition function

$$Z(\beta, q) = \sum_{\{n_i\}} \exp\left[\beta \sum_i \left(\sum_{\hat{\mu}} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{q}\Delta_{\hat{\mu}} n_i\right)\right)\right]. \qquad (2)$$

The first step is to replace the cosine with a quadratic potential, this is the Villain approximation[10]. Next, we lift the integers n_i to real-valued phase variables θ_i, at the expense of introducing an auxiliary integer field Q, which through the Poisson summation formula[11] restrict the θ_i variables to the discrete values allowed by original theory. The resulting partition function is then given by

$$Z_V(\beta,q) = \Xi[\beta] \int D\theta \sum_{\{\mathbf{k},Q\}} \exp\left[-\sum_i \left(\frac{\beta_V}{2} \left(\Delta\theta_i - 2\pi\mathbf{k}\right)^2 + iq\theta Q \right) \right]. \tag{3}$$

In Eq. 3, the $\mathbf{k}$ field is an integer *link field* living on the links of the *original* lattice, and the Q field is scalar field living on the *sites* of the same lattice. The prefactor[11] $\Xi[\beta]$ and effective coupling $\beta_V = \beta_V(\beta)$ must be retained to get *quantitatively* correct results compared to Eq. (2), however they do *not* affect the critical properties and from now on we will assume $\beta_V = \beta$, $\Xi[\beta] = 1$, and omit the V index on the partition function.

In Eq. 3, the Q-field explicitly accounts for the discrete nature of the Z_q model. Setting $Q \equiv 0$, we recover the Villain representation of the XY model. Due to this similarity, the remaining analysis follows well known steps [12], which we briefly include for completeness. A Hubbard-Stratonovich decoupling of the quadratic expression in Eq. 3 is performed by introducing an auxiliary field $\mathbf{v}$, thus bringing the parition function onto the form

$$Z(\beta,q) = \int D\mathbf{v} D\theta \sum_{\{\mathbf{k},Q\}} \exp\left[-\sum_i \left(\frac{1}{2\beta}\mathbf{v}^2 + i\mathbf{v}\cdot\left(\Delta\theta_i - 2\pi\mathbf{k}\right) + iq\theta Q \right) \right]. \tag{4}$$

In Eq. 4, the $\mathbf{k}$-summation can be performed, thus restricting the velocity field $\mathbf{v}$ to integer values, denoted by $\mathbf{l}$. In the term coupling $\Delta\theta$ and $\mathbf{l}$, a partial integration can be performed, such that θ only appears in the combination $i\theta\left(\Delta\mathbf{l} - qQ\right)$, whereupon the θ integrations can be performed to produce the constraint

$$\left(\Delta\mathbf{l} - qQ\right) = 0. \tag{5}$$

At this stage the transformation to a loop gas is complete, and the partition function is given by

$$Z(\beta,q) = \sum_{\{\mathbf{l},Q\}} \delta_{\nabla\mathbf{l},qQ} \exp\left[\frac{-1}{2\beta} \sum_i \mathbf{l}^2 \right]. \tag{6}$$

Observe how the discrete nature of the problem, i.e. finite q, only appears in the constraint in Eq. 6. With $Q \equiv 0$, Eq. 6 reduces to a loop-gas with steric repulsion, this is a well known model with an *inverted XY* transition[13]. When there are Q excitations present, we see from the constraint Eq. 5 that these appear as *sources* and *sinks* for the $\mathbf{l}$ field [14]. Note that the special case $q = 1$ effectively represents no constraint. In this case, the theory Eq. 6 is noninteracting, and sustains no phase transition. For all $q \geq 2$, Eq. 6 has a phase transition, since large loops consisting of vortex segments of unit strength are left unaffected by the monopole configurations. Fig. 1 shows a typical configuration for $q = 2$ model.

Since we know that the $Q \equiv 0$ case is an equivalent representation of the $U(1)$ universality class, we can view the Q excitations, as representing the discrete nature of the theory, and then check whether they are relevant or not.



FIG. 1: A typical loop gas configuration for $q = 2$ model, multiply connected links, like the vertical along the left edge have much lower entropy than loop/dumbbell combinations, and hence give a small contribution to the partition function.

Critical exponents naturally fall into two classes, those that can be obtained from scaling of the free energy, and those that cannot. The two exponents α and ν belong to the former category. In particular this means that α and ν must be the same for any model and its dual counterpart, since the partition function and therefore the free energy are identical for any two systems that are con-

nected by a duality transformation. The remaining exponents can be grouped into the following combinations

$$\frac{\gamma}{2-\eta} \quad , 2\beta+\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(\delta+1), \tag{7}$$

which follow from the standard scaling laws, but do however not involve an assumption of hyperscaling. These particular combinations of exponents are invariant under any transformation amounting to describing *the same phase transition* in terms of different fields.

The main focus of this paper has been how the critical properties of the Z_q model changes when q increases. We will see that the operator *independent* combination $(1+\alpha)/\nu$ jumps from the Ising value to XY value when q increases from four to five, whereas η only gradually approaches the XY value, for $q \gg 5$.

We have performed Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of the Z_q model, both using a phase-representation, Eq. 1, as well as a loopgas/dumbbell gas (LDG) representation, Eq. 6. The phase representation is simulated as a conventional spin simulation. In the LDG representation, the fundamental Monte Carlo moves are represented by alternating attempts of inserting a closed loop excitation of the $\mathbf{l}$ field and a dumbbell configuration consisting of a $+Q/-Q$ pair connected with an occupied q-valued link. For $q=2$ the (vacuum) excitations of a loop or a $+Q/-Q$ pair have the same energy, while for $q>2$ the elementary dumbbell excitations are more expensive than the elementary loop excitations, and their relative importance diminishes with increasing q.

The main goal has been to determine how the critical properties change with q. The central quantity we have considered is the connected third order moment of the action [5]

$$\langle (S-\langle S\rangle)^3\rangle \propto |\beta-\beta_c|^{1+\alpha}\,, \tag{8}$$

which recently has been demonstrated to yield surprisingly good scaling results compared to second moments [5]. When approaching the critical point, the correlation length ξ diverges as $\xi \propto |\beta-\beta_c|^{-\nu}$. Therefore, in a finite system of linear extent L we find that the third order moment in Eq. 8 scales with L as

$$\langle (S-\langle S\rangle)^3\rangle \propto L^{\frac{1+\alpha}{\nu}}. \tag{9}$$

The main advantages of the third order moment in Eq. 8 are that (1) good quality scaling is achieved for practical system sizes even for models with $\alpha<0$, e.g. the 3DXY model, and (2) one set of measurements gives *both* the combination $(1+\alpha)/\nu$ and $-1/\nu$ *independently* [5]. A schematic figure showing how $\langle (S-\langle S\rangle)^3\rangle$ scales is shown in Fig. 2, and figures 3 and 4 show representative finite-size scaling (FSS) results.

We have considered systems of size $L\times L\times L$ with $L=8,10,12,16,20,24,32,40,48$, and up to $2\cdot 10^7$ sweeps over



FIG. 2: Generic figure showing third moment of action, and how data are extracted for FSS analysis. For further details of this method see [5].



FIG. 3: This figure shows the scaling of $\langle (S\rangle S\langle)\rangle S\rangle$ for $q=4(\blacksquare)$ and $q=5(\bullet)$. The $q=4$ results show Z_2 scaling with $(1+\alpha)/\nu = 1.76\pm 0.05$, and the $q=5$ curve shows XY scaling with $(1+\alpha)/\nu = 1.46\pm 0.03$.



FIG. 4: This figure shows the scaling of $\langle (S-\langle S\rangle)^3\rangle$ for $q=4(\blacksquare)$ and $q=5(\bullet)$. The $q=4$ results show Z_2 scaling with $(1+\alpha)/\nu = 1.76\pm 0.05$ - i.e. qualitatively similar to Fig. 3

the lattice. In addition to the $q = 4$ and $q = 5$ presented in figures 3 and 4, we have also studied the q values $q = 6, 8, 12, 16$ and 24. We find that the combination $(1+\alpha)/\nu$ changes abruptly from the Z_2 value of 1.763 [15] to the XY value of 1.467 [16] when q is increased from four to five. A further increase of q beyond $q = 5$ does not affect the value of $(1 + \alpha)/\nu$, as shown in Fig. 5.



FIG. 5: The exponent-combination $(1 + \alpha)/\nu$ versus q. Note how it changes value abruptly as q is increased from $q = 4$ to $q = 5$. The dashed lines are the Ising (Z_2) and XY (Z_∞) values of 1.763 and 1.467, respectively.

The third order moment in Eq. 8 has been computed for both the phase- and the loop-gas representations of the model. For the phase representation, we have also calculated the second moment of the the magnetization, i.e. susceptibilty. Close to the critical point this behaves as

$$\langle M^2 \rangle \propto |\beta - \beta_c|^{-\gamma}\,, \tag{10}$$

and by using standard FSS Ansätze along with the scaling relation $\gamma = \nu(2 - \eta)$ we find $\gamma/\nu = 2 - \eta$. Although the combination $(1 + \alpha)/\nu$ is essentially *independent* of q for $q \geq 5$ within the precision of our computations, we find that the exponent η varies smoothly with q.

We have not computed the exponents γ and β explicitly, as it turns out that it is difficult to obtain sufficient quality scaling of the relevant quantities. However, we can still conclude something about the variation of exponents with q. α and ν are obtained from scaling of the free energy. We may obtain combinations $(n - 2 + \alpha)/\nu$ from scaling of the n-th moment of the action. When this combination has an abrupt variation with q, it follows from invoking hyperscaling $\alpha = 2 - d\nu$ that α and ν separately have an abrupt variation with q. From the relation $\gamma = \nu(2 - \eta)$ it then follows that also γ varies abruptly with q, since η has been shown to vary smoothly. Moreover, from the relation $\alpha + \beta(\delta + 1) = 2$ we may conclude that the combination $\beta(\delta + 1)$ must also vary abruptly with q.



FIG. 6: The critical exponent η as a function of q, as computed from Eq. 6. This exponent is *operator dependent*, and the value varies continuously with q. The dashed line is the XY value $\eta_{\rm DXY} \approx 0.038$[16], which is only reached in the limit $q \to \infty$. This variation should be contrasted with that for $(1 + \alpha)/\nu$ in Fig. 5.

In the LDG representation we have only computed the exponent combination, $(1 + \alpha)/\nu$. As required by duality, we have found the same behavior for this combination in LDG representation as in the phase representation. There is *a priori* no reason why the remaining exponents should agree in the two representations, as long as the combinations Eq. 7 are satisfied. We have not computed any of the remaining exponents in the LDG representation, but our impression is that the $q \to \infty$ limit is reached much faster than in the phase-representation. Measurements of $\langle |Q| \rangle$ at the critical point give $\langle |Q| \rangle \approx 0.07, 5.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $2.75 \cdot 10^{-6}$ for $q = 2, 4$ and 5 respectively. For $q = 2$ and 4, the phase transition should be in the Ising universality class, but already at $q = 5$ the excitations representing the discrete structure of the problem are very much frozen out at the critical point, indicating that the discrete structure is irrelevant at the critical point.

That the Z_q model is in the XY universality class for $q \geq 5$ must mean that the discrete structure is rendered irrelevant for these q values. To investigate this point further, we have implemented a simple real-space RG procedure, which attempts to probe for what values of q the discrete nature of Z_q model is relevant at the critical point. If we denote the untransformed phases and fields as θ_0, then the renormalized phase at level $n+1$ is given by the *block spin* construction

$$\theta_{n+1} = \mathrm{atan}\left(\frac{\sum_k \sin\theta_n(k)}{\sum_k \sin\theta_n(k)}\right), \tag{11}$$

where the sum over k in Eq. 11 is over the eight spins in a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ cube. For $q = 2$, this transformation is clearly trivial, since adding a number of phases 0 and π

will still give 0 or π. However, for $q > 2$ the effective q^* will increase with n, and for $n \to \infty$ the resulting block spins can take *any* direction.

We next investigate whether the system flows towards an infinite value of q^* or not under such a RG transformation. This is tantamount to asking whether the discrete structure is rendered irrelevant or not on long length scales. To this end, at each iteration step n, we have recorded *histograms* $h_n(\theta)$ of the phase distributions on the lattice, and monitored the manner in which this histogram flows under rescaling. To do this at a *quantitative* level, the distribution $P_n(\theta_n)$ can be written as a sum of harmonic functions

$$P_n(\theta_n) = a_{n,0} + \sum_k \left(a_{n,k} \cos\left(\frac{k2\pi}{q}\right) + b_{n,k} \sin\left(\frac{k2\pi}{q}\right) \right). \tag{12}$$

Here, the coefficient $a_{n,k}$ in Eq. 12 denotes the k-th Fourier-cosine component at RG level n. Clearly, the coefficient $a_{n,q}$ is the interesting component, we have studied how this coefficient flows under repeated rescaling.



FIG. 7: Histograms of θ after four rescalings for $q = 4$, and $q = 5$. For $q = 4$, the distribution shows clear signs of a discrete background, whereas for $q = 5$ this is not the case.

In summary, we have studied the critical exponents α, ν and η in the three-dimensional Z_q spin model for $q \geq 5$, where formally the limit $q \to \infty$ corresponds to the $3DXY$ model. The first two exponents have been obtained both using a phase-representation of the model, as well as a dual counterpart to this. These should yield identical results, something which is borne out in our simulations to high precision. We have found that for $q \geq 5$, α and ν take values which essentially are consistent with the values they take in the $3DXY$ model. In contrast to this, the value η varies smoothly as q is increased, from its Ising value at $q = 4$ ($Z_4 = Z_2 \otimes Z_2$) to its $3DXY$ value at $q = \infty$. From the exact equalities Eqs. (7) it follows that also the other operator dependent exponents β, γ, and δ will vary smoothly as a function of q.



FIG. 8: The flow of the coefficient $a_{n,q}$ for $q = 4$ and $q = 5$. For $q = 4$, we see that there is a fixed point at the critical point, whereas for $q = 5$ we see that $a_{n,q}$ flows to zero for all T close to T_c.

We acknowledge support from the Norwegian Research Council through the Norwegian High Performance Computing Centre (NOTUR). All computations were carried out on an Origin SGI3800.

* Electronic address: Joakim.Hove@phys.ntnu.no
† Electronic address: Asle.Sudbo@phys.ntnu.no

[1] G. Baskaran, Z. Zou and P.W. Anderson, Solid State Commun. **63**, 973 (1987); G. Kotliar and J. Liu, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 5142 (1988); G. Baskaran and P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 580 (1988); L. B. Ioffe and A.I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 8988 (1989); N. Nagaosa and P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett **64**, 2450 (1990); P.A. Lee and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B **46** 5621 (1990).

[2] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1773 (1991); N. Read and S. Sachdev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **5**, 219 (1991); T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 7850 (2000); N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1773 (1991). N. Read and S. Sachdev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **5**, 219 (1991); T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 7850 (2000).

[3] H. Kleinert, F. S. Nogueira and A. Sudbø, Phys. Rev. Lett **88**, 232001 (2002); `hep-th/0209132`.

[4] M. N. Chernodub, E.-M. Ilgenfritz, and A. Schiller, Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 231601 (2002); Phys. Lett. **567**, 269 (2002); `hep-th/0212005`.

[5] A. Sudbø, E. Smørgrav, J. Smiseth, F. S. Nogueira and J. Hove, Phys. Rev. Lett **89**, 226403 (2002).

[6] S. Elitzur, R. B. Pearson and J. Shigemitsu, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 3698 (1979).

[7] N. Todoroki, Y. Ueno and S. Miyashita, cond-

mat/0207665 (2002).
[8] Y. Ueno and K. Mitsubo, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 8654 (1991).
[9] Y. Ueno and K. Kasono, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 16471 (1993).
[10] J. Villain, J. Phys. (Paris) **36**, 581 (1977).
[11] H. Kleinert, *Gauge Fields in Condensed Matter*, World Scientific Publishing, (1989).
[12] P. R. Thomas and M. Stone, Nucl. Phys. B **144**, 513 (1978).
[13] C. Dasgupta and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1556 (1981).
[14] M. B. Einhorn and R. Savit, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 2583 (1979).
[15] M. Hasenbusch, K. Pinn and S. Vinti, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 11471 (1999).
[16] M. Campostrini, M. Hasenbusch, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 214503 (2001).