

Third-harmonic exponent in three-dimensional N -vector models

Martino De Prato,^a Andrea Pelissetto,^b Ettore Vicari^c

^a *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma Tre, and INFN, I-00146 Roma, Italy*

^b *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma La Sapienza, and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy*

^c *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy*

e-mail: deprato@fis.uniroma3.it, Andrea.Pelissetto@roma1.infn.it,
vicari@df.unipi.it.

Abstract

We compute the crossover exponent associated with the spin-3 operator in three-dimensional $O(N)$ models. A six-loop field-theoretical calculation in the fixed-dimension approach gives $\phi_3 = 0.601(10)$ for the experimentally relevant case $N = 2$ (XY model). The corresponding exponent $\beta_3 = 1.413(10)$ is compared with the experimental estimates obtained in materials undergoing a normal-incommensurate structural transition and in liquid crystals at the smectic-A–hexatic-B phase transition, finding good agreement.

PACS Numbers: 05.70.Jk, 64.60.Fr, 75.40.Cx, 61.30.-v

In nature many physical systems undergo phase transitions belonging to the universality classes of the $O(N)$ vector models. In particular, the XY model, corresponding to $N = 2$, describes the λ -transition in ^4He , (anti)ferromagnets with easy-plane anisotropy, density-wave systems, etc.; see Ref. [1] for a review. The critical exponents associated with the order parameter have been accurately measured both experimentally and theoretically [1]. Moreover, in some XY systems it is also possible to measure experimentally the critical exponents associated with secondary order parameters. This is the case of liquid crystals [2–4], of normal-incommensurate transitions [5–7], and of graphite-intercalation compounds [8].

The most relevant exponent is the second-harmonic one that has been recently computed to high-precision using field-theoretical methods in Refs. [9,10]. The ϵ -expansion gives $\phi_2 = 1.174(12)$, while the fixed-dimension expansion gives $\phi_2 = 1.184(12)$. The fourth-harmonic crossover exponent was reported in Refs. [11,10]: $\phi_4 = -0.077(3)$ (ϵ expansion) and $\phi_4 = -0.069(5)$ (fixed-dimension expansion). Here, we wish to determine the third-harmonic exponent by means of a six-loop perturbative calculation in the fixed-dimension approach, extending previous three-loop determinations [12,13,3]. Such a calculation is also relevant for some crossover phenomena, in which the XY symmetry is reduced to that of the three-state Potts model, as it happens in cubic magnets in the presence of stress or of appropriate magnetic fields [14,15].

In the field-theoretical approach one starts from the usual ϕ^4 Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \int d^d x \left[\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} r \phi^2 + \frac{1}{4!} u (\phi^2)^2 \right], \quad (1)$$

where $\phi_a(x)$ is an N -component real field. The XY model corresponds to $N = 2$, but here we will keep N generic. Secondary order parameters are associated with operators $\mathcal{O}^{(l)}$ that are polynomials of order l in the fields and that transform irreducibly under the spin- l representation of the $O(N)$ group. In particular, the third-harmonic operator is

$$\mathcal{O}_{abc}^{(3)} = \phi_a \phi_b \phi_c - \frac{\phi^2}{N+2} (\phi_a \delta_{bc} + \phi_b \delta_{ac} + \phi_c \delta_{ab}). \quad (2)$$

We wish now to compute the crossover exponent ϕ_3 associated to $\mathcal{O}_{abc}^{(3)}$ and the corresponding exponents β_3 and γ_3 given by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_3 &= 2 - \alpha - \phi_3, \\ \gamma_3 &= -2 + \alpha + 2\phi_3. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The exponents β_3 and γ_3 describe respectively the critical (singular) behavior of the average $\langle \mathcal{O}^{(3)}(x) \rangle \sim |t|^{\beta_3}$ and of the susceptibility $\chi_{\mathcal{O}} \equiv \sum_x \langle \mathcal{O}^{(3)}(0) \mathcal{O}^{(3)}(x) \rangle_c \sim |t|^{-\gamma_3}$.

For this purpose we determine the renormalization function $Z_3(g)$ from the one-particle irreducible three-point function $\Gamma_3^{(3)}(0)$ with an insertion of the operator $\mathcal{O}_{abc}^{(3)}$ at zero external momenta, i.e. we set

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{abc}^{(3)} \phi_a \phi_b \phi_c \rangle^{1PI} = A Z_3^{-1}(g), \quad (4)$$

where A is a numerical coefficient that ensures that $Z_3(0) = 1$, and g is the four-point renormalized coupling. Then, we compute the renormalization-group function

$$\eta_3(g) \equiv \left. \frac{\partial \ln Z_3}{\partial \ln m} \right|_u = \beta(g) \frac{d \ln Z_3}{dg}, \quad (5)$$

and $\eta_3 = \eta_3(g^*)$, where g^* is the fixed-point value of g . Finally, the renormalization-group scaling relation (valid in three dimensions)

$$\phi_3 = \left(\eta_3 + \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \eta \right) \nu \quad (6)$$

allows us to determine ϕ_3 .

We computed $\Gamma_3^{(3)}(0)$ to six loops. The calculation is rather cumbersome since it requires the evaluation of a few thousand Feynman diagrams. We handled it with a symbolic manipulation program, which generates the diagrams and computes the symmetry and group factors of each of them. We used the numerical results compiled in Ref. [16] for the integrals associated with each diagram. We obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_3(\bar{g}) = & -\frac{6}{N+8} \bar{g} + \frac{2(N+10)}{(N+8)^2} \bar{g}^2 - \frac{128.736 + 15.4900 N - 0.650238 N^2}{(N+8)^3} \bar{g}^3 \\ & + \frac{1148.68 + 191.005 N + 1.82163 N^2 + 0.283028 N^3}{(N+8)^4} \bar{g}^4 \\ & - \frac{12606.9 + 2550.46 N + 64.4818 N^2 - 2.34060 N^3 - 0.152501 N^4}{(N+8)^5} \bar{g}^5 \\ & + \frac{161373. + 38736.8 N + 1874.23 N^2 - 5.98451 N^3 + 1.88168 N^4 + 0.094179 N^5}{(N+8)^6} \bar{g}^6 \\ & + O(\bar{g}^7), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where, as usual, we have introduced the rescaled coupling \bar{g} defined by

$$g = \frac{48\pi}{8+N} \bar{g}. \quad (8)$$

Here g is the usual four-point renormalized coupling normalized so that $g = u/m$ (m is the renormalized mass) at tree level.

Field-theoretical perturbative expansions are divergent, and thus, in order to obtain accurate results, an appropriate resummation is required. We use the method of Ref. [17] that takes into account the large-order behavior of the perturbative expansion, see, e.g., Ref. [18]. Mean values and error bars are computed using the algorithm of Ref. [11].

Given the expansion of $\eta_3(\bar{g})$, we determine the perturbative expansion of $\phi_3(\bar{g})$, $\beta_3(\bar{g})$, and $\gamma_3(\bar{g})$ using relations (3) and (6). Then, we resum the perturbative series and compute them at $\bar{g} = \bar{g}^*$ [19]. For $N = 2$ we obtain $\phi_3 = 0.5963(21)$, $0.5968(2)$, $\beta_3 = 1.398(8)$, $1.405(3)$, $\gamma_3 = -0.800(7)$, $-0.808(13)$, where for each exponent we report the estimate obtained from the direct analysis and from the analysis of the series of the inverse. The two estimates obtained for each exponent agree within error bars, but, with the quoted errors, the scaling relations (3) are not well satisfied. For instance, using $\nu = 0.67155(27)$ (Ref. [20]) and $\beta_3 = 1.403(8)$ we obtain $\phi_3 = 0.611(8)$, while using the same value of ν and $\gamma_3 = -0.803(13)$ we have $\phi_3 = 0.606(6)$. These two estimates are slightly higher than

TABLE I. Critical exponents associated with the spin-3 operator $O_{abc}^{(3)}$

| N | ϕ_3 | β_3 | γ_3 |
|----------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| 0 | 0.445(11) | 1.331(11) | -0.89(2) |
| 2 | 0.601(10) | 1.413(10) | -0.81(2) |
| 3 | 0.678(18) | 1.455(18) | -0.78(4) |
| 4 | 0.760(23) | 1.487(23) | -0.73(4) |
| 5 | 0.814(14) | 1.484(14) | -0.67(3) |
| 8 | 0.971(33) | 1.519(33) | -0.55(7) |
| 16 | 1.193(12) | 1.540(12) | -0.35(2) |
| ∞ | $\frac{3}{2}$ | $\frac{3}{2}$ | 0 |

those obtained from the analysis of $\phi_3(g)$ and $1/\phi_3(g)$. Clearly, the errors are somewhat underestimated, a phenomenon that is probably connected with the nonanalyticity [21–23] of the renormalization-group functions at the fixed point \bar{g}^* .

In order to obtain a conservative estimate, we have thus decided to take as estimate of ϕ_3 the weighted average of the direct estimates and of the estimates obtained using β_3 and γ_3 together with the scaling relations (3). The error is such to include all estimates. The other exponents are dealt with analogously [24]. The final results for several values of N are reported in Table I.

Let us compare these results with previous ones for $N = 2$. Ref. [3] reports $\beta_3 = 3\beta + 3\nu x_3$, where $x_3 \approx 0.174$ from the ϵ -expansion and $x_3 \approx 0.276$ from the fixed-dimension expansion. It follows $\beta_3 \approx 1.397$ and $\beta_3 \approx 1.602$ in the two cases. These results are reasonably close to ours. The exponent β_3 has been determined at the smectic-A–hexatic-B phase transition in liquid crystals, obtaining [2,3] $\beta_3 \approx 4.8\beta \approx 1.66$, using $\beta = 0.3485(4)$ (Ref. [20]). Such an exponent has also been measured in some materials exhibiting a structural normal-incommensurate phase transition. From the analysis of x-ray scattering data in erbium Ref. [6] obtains $\beta_3 = 1.8(3)$, while two different experiments in Rb_2ZnCl_4 give respectively $\beta_3 = 1.80(5)$ (Ref. [5]) and $\beta_3 = 1.50(4)$ (Ref. [7]). Keeping into account that the experimental errors seems to be underestimated, there is reasonable agreement with our results. The exponent $\delta^* \equiv \beta/\phi_3$ was measured at the trigonal-to-pseudotetragonal transition in [111]-stressed SrTiO_3 obtaining [14] $\delta^* = 0.62(10)$. Such an estimate is in good agreement with our prediction $\delta^* = 0.58(1)$. Finally, we should mention that our results are also relevant for polymer physics. Indeed, we can derive from the estimates obtained for $N = 0$ the partition-function exponent p for nonuniform [25] star polymers with three arms: $p = 3(\gamma + \nu)/2 + \phi_3 = 3.06(1)$, where we used $\gamma = 1.1575(6)$ (Ref. [26]).

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Phys. Rep. **368**, 549 (2002).
- [2] J. D. Brock, A. Aharony, R. J. Birgeneau, K. W. Evans-Lutterodt, J. D. Litster, P. M. Horn, G. B. Stephenson, and A. R. Tajbakhsh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 98 (1985).
- [3] A. Aharony, R. J. Birgeneau, J. D. Brock, and J. D. Litster, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1012 (1986).
- [4] A. Aharony, R. J. Birgeneau, C. W. Garland, Y.-J. Kim, V. V. Lebedev, R. R. Netz, and M. J. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 5064 (1995).
- [5] S. R. Andrews and H. Mashiyama, J. Phys. C **16**, 4985 (1983).
- [6] G. Helgesen, J. P. Hill, T. R. Thurston, and D. Gibbs, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 9446 (1995).
- [7] M. P. Zinkin, D. F. McMorrow, J. P. Hill, R. A. Cowley, J.-G. Lussier, A. Gibaud, G. Grübel, and C. Sutter, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 3115 (1996).
- [8] P. Bak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 889 (1980).
- [9] P. Calabrese, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 046115 (2002).
- [10] P. Calabrese, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, *Multicritical Phenomena in $O(n_1) \oplus O(n_2)$ Symmetric Theories*, to appear in Phys. Rev. B **67** (2003).
- [11] J. M. Carmona, A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 15136 (2000).
- [12] F. J. Wegner and A. Houghton, Phys. Rev. A **10**, 435 (1974).
- [13] D. J. Wallace, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, Vol. 6, edited by C. Domb and M. S. Green (Academic, New York, 1976).
- [14] A. Aharony, K. A. Müller, and W. Berlinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 33 (1977).
- [15] D. Mukamel, M. E. Fisher, and E. Domany, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 565 (1976).
- [16] B. G. Nickel, D. I. Meiron, and G. A. Baker, Jr., “Compilation of 2-pt and 4-pt graphs for continuum spin models,” Guelph University Report, 1977, unpublished.
- [17] J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 95 (1977); Phys. Rev. B **21**, 3976 (1980).
- [18] J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, fourth edition (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2001).
- [19] In the analyses we used the following estimates of \bar{g}^* : $\bar{g}^* = 1.395(15)$ for $N = 0$ (Ref. [26]), $\bar{g}^* = 1.402(4)$ for $N = 2$ (Ref. [20]), $\bar{g}^* = 1.395(7)$ for $N = 3$ (Ref. [27]), $\bar{g}^* = 1.385(15)$, $1.360(15)$, $1.310(15)$, $1.205(15)$ for $N = 4, 5, 8, 16$ respectively [R. Guida and J. Zinn-Justin, J. Phys. A **31**, 8103 (1998); P. Butera and M. Comi, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 11552 (1998); A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. B **575**, 579 (2000)]. Other numerical estimates can be found in Ref. [1].
- [20] M. Campostrini, M. Hasenbusch, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 214503 (2001).
- [21] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. B **519**, 626 (1998).
- [22] P. Calabrese, M. Caselle, A. Celi, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, J. Phys. A **33**, 8155 (2000).
- [23] M. Caselle, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, in *Fluctuating Paths and Fields*, edited by W. Janke, A. Pelster, H.-J. Schmidt, and M. Bachmann, (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001); hep-th/0010228.
- [24] For the exponent ν we have taken the following numerical results: $\nu = 0.5874(2)$ for $N = 0$ [T. Prellberg, J. Phys. A **34**, L599 (2001)], $\nu = 0.67155(27)$ for $N = 2$ (Ref.

- [20]), $\nu = 0.7112(5)$ for $N = 3$ (Ref. [27]), $\nu = 0.749(2)$ for $N = 4$ [M. Hasenbusch, J. Phys. A **34**, 8221 (2001)] $\nu = 0.766, 0.830, 0.911$ for $N = 5, 8, 16$ [S. A. Antonenko and A. I. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. E **51**, 1894 (1995)]. Other numerical estimates can be found in Ref. [1].
- [25] In nonuniform star polymers the length of each arm is arbitrary. One can also consider *uniform* star polymers, in which case each arm has the same length. The partition function exponent p is different and it has been computed for several lattices and dimensions in, e.g., J. E. G. Lipson, S. G. Whittington, M. K. Wilkinson, J. L. Martin, and D. S. Gaunt, J. Phys. A **18**, L469 (1985) and in D. S. Gaunt and T. C. Yu, J. Phys. A **33**, 1333 (2000).
- [26] M. S. Causo, S. Caracciolo, and A. Pelissetto, Phys. Rev. E **57**, R1215 (1998).
- [27] M. Campostrini, M. Hasenbusch, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 144520 (2002).