

# Universal Amplitude Ratios in the Critical Two-Dimensional Ising Model on a Torus

Jesús Salas

*Departamento de Física de la Materia Condensada and  
Departamento de Física Teórica  
Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Zaragoza  
Zaragoza 50009, SPAIN  
JESUS@MELKWE.G. UNIZAR. ES*

Alan D. Sokal

*Department of Physics  
New York University  
4 Washington Place  
New York, NY 10003 USA  
SOKAL@NYU.EDU*

March 31, 1999

## Abstract

Using results from conformal field theory, we compute several universal amplitude ratios for the two-dimensional Ising model at criticality on a symmetric torus. These include the correlation-length ratio  $x^* = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \xi(L)/L$  and the first four magnetization moment ratios  $V_{2n} = \langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle / \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n$ . As a corollary we get the renormalized four-point coupling constant for the massless theory on a symmetric torus,  $G^* = (3 - V_4)/x^{*2}$ . We confirm these predictions by a high-precision Monte Carlo simulation. The finite-size-scaling behavior of our data is consistent with the prediction that the leading correction to finite-size scaling in the susceptibility is the regular background. As a by-product, we also analyze the dynamic critical behavior of the Swendsen-Wang algorithm for this model: we find that the ratio  $\tau_{\text{int}, \varepsilon}/C_H$  tends to infinity either as a logarithm  $A \log L + B$  or as a power-law  $AL^p$  with a small power  $p \approx 0.06$ .

**Key Words:** Ising model; universal amplitude ratios; conformal field theory; torus; finite-size scaling; corrections to scaling; Monte Carlo; Swendsen–Wang algorithm; cluster algorithm; dynamic critical exponent.

**PACS Numbers:** 05.10.Cc, 05.50.+q, 05.70.Jk, 11.10.Kk, 11.25.Hf, 64.60.Cn.

# 1 Introduction

A central concept in the theory of critical phenomena is the idea of *universality*, which states that phase-transition systems can be divided into a relatively small number of “universality classes” (determined primarily by the system’s spatial dimensionality and the symmetries of its order parameter) within which certain features of critical behavior are universal. In the 1950s and 1960s it came to be understood that critical exponents are universal in this sense [1]. Later, in the 1970s, it was learned that certain dimensionless ratios of critical amplitudes are also universal [2].

The past quarter-century has seen enormous progress in the determination of critical exponents for a wide variety of universality classes, including exact analytical results for two-dimensional (2D) models [3, 4, 5, 6] and increasingly precise numerical determinations for three-dimensional models by a variety of techniques (field-theoretic renormalization group [7, 8], series extrapolation [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16], Monte Carlo [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]). As a result, attention has turned quite naturally to universal amplitude ratios: these include amplitude ratios in infinite volume and those in finite-size scaling (FSS). Though much numerical work has been done, few exact results are known.<sup>1</sup>

The critical behavior of many 2D models can be studied analytically using conformal field theory (CFT) [4, 5, 6]. Many critical exponents have been determined exactly, along with a few universal amplitude ratios [40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49]. The main goal of the present paper is to compute, using CFT, a few more universal amplitude ratios for the 2D Ising model and to test these predictions by a high-precision Monte Carlo study. The amplitude ratios considered here arise in finite-size scaling; they can be computed starting from the correlation functions of the critical 2D Ising model on a torus.

The first class of quantities we study concern the shape of the magnetization distribution  $\rho(\mathcal{M})$  at criticality on a symmetric torus ( $L_x = L_y$ ). We study the rescaled shape of this distribution (i.e. normalizing by its width  $\langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^{1/2}$ ) as well as the dimensionless ratios of its moments,

$$V_{2n} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n}. \quad (1.1)$$

We can also define the dimensionless cumulants

$$U_{2n} \equiv \frac{\langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle_{\text{conn}}}{\langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n}. \quad (1.2)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Among the models studied are 2D nonlinear  $\sigma$ -models [24, 25, 26, 27, 28], two- and three-dimensional self-avoiding walks [19], the three-dimensional Ising model [29, 30, 20, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35], three-dimensional  $O(N)$  spin models [18, 36, 37, 38, 16], and the 2D 4-state Potts model [39].

For any symmetric distribution  $\rho(\mathcal{M}) = \rho(-\mathcal{M})$  these satisfy<sup>2</sup>

$$U_4 = V_4 - 3 \quad (1.3a)$$

$$U_6 = V_6 - 15V_4 + 30 \quad (1.3b)$$

$$U_8 = V_8 - 28V_6 - 35V_4^2 + 420V_4 - 630 \quad (1.3c)$$

$$U_{10} = V_{10} - 45V_8 - 210V_4V_6 + 1260V_6 + 3150V_4^2 - 18900V_4 + 22680 \quad (1.3d)$$

$\vdots$

Note that  $V_4$  and  $U_4$  are closely related to the so-called Binder cumulant [50]

$$U_{4,\text{Binder}} \equiv 1 - \frac{\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle}{3\langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^2} = 1 - \frac{V_4}{3} = -\frac{U_4}{3}. \quad (1.4)$$

For  $\beta < \beta_c$  the ratios  $V_{2n}$  tend in the infinite-volume limit to those characteristic of a Gaussian distribution,

$$V_{2n}(\text{Gaussian}) = (2n-1)!! \quad (1.5a)$$

$$U_{2n}(\text{Gaussian}) = 0 \quad (1.5b)$$

while for  $\beta > \beta_c$  they tend to those characteristic of a sum of two delta functions,

$$V_{2n}(\text{two deltas}) = 1 \quad (1.6a)$$

$$U_{2n}(\text{two deltas}) = \frac{2^{2n-1}(2^{2n}-1)}{n} B_{2n} \quad (1.6b)$$

where  $B_{2n} = (-1)^{n-1}(2n)! \zeta(2n)/2^{2n-1}\pi^{2n}$  is a Bernoulli number. At  $\beta = \beta_c$ , however, these ratios acquire non-trivial values in-between (1.5a) and (1.6a).<sup>3</sup> These values, which are universal, can in principle be computed by integrating the spin correlators for the critical 2D Ising model on a torus, which were determined by Di Francesco *et al.* [41, 42] using CFT. In practice, however, the formula for  $V_{2n}$  rapidly gets more complicated as  $n$  grows. Di Francesco *et al.* [41, 42] computed  $V_4$  to roughly three decimal places by Monte Carlo integration. Here we shall improve this result by three orders of magnitude, and shall also compute  $V_6$  to five decimal places,  $V_8$  to almost four decimal places, and  $V_{10}$  to three decimal places:

$$V_4 = 1.1679229 \pm 0.0000047 \quad (1.7)$$

$$V_6 = 1.4556491 \pm 0.0000072 \quad (1.8)$$

$$V_8 = 1.89252 \pm 0.00018 \quad (1.9)$$

$$V_{10} = 2.53956 \pm 0.00034 \quad (1.10)$$

---

<sup>2</sup> These relations can be computed from the generating functions

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{U_{2n}}{(2n)!} z^{2n} = \log \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{V_{2n}}{(2n)!} z^{2n} \right)$$

with  $V_0 = V_2 = 1$  and  $V_{2n+1} = 0$ .

<sup>3</sup> The Schwarz inequality implies that  $V_{2n} \geq 1$  for any model, and the Gaussian inequality [51, 52] implies that  $V_{2n} \leq (2n-1)!!$  for ferromagnetic Ising models. In particular, we have  $-2 \leq U_4 \leq 0$ . Moreover, Newman [53] and Shlosman [54] have proven, for ferromagnetic Ising models, that  $(-1)^{n-1}U_{2n} \geq 0$  for all  $n$ ; and Newman [53] has proven some additional inequalities on the  $U_{2n}$ .

Finally, we shall measure the ratios  $V_{2n}$  for  $2 \leq n \leq 10$  by Monte Carlo simulation, with an accuracy that gradually deteriorates as  $n$  grows. For  $n = 2, 3, 4, 5$  our Monte Carlo estimates agree well with the theoretical predictions (but are of course less precise).

Another interesting quantity is the second-moment correlation length  $\xi$ . It has a sensible definition in finite volume (see Sections 2.1 and 4.2 for details), and its expected FSS behavior is

$$\xi \sim L \left[ x^* + AL^{-\Delta} + \dots \right], \quad (1.11)$$

where the leading coefficient

$$x^* = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \xi/L \quad (1.12)$$

is universal.<sup>4,5</sup> Here we shall compute  $x^*$  for the 2D Ising model at criticality by numerically integrating the known spin correlators [41, 42]; we find

$$x^* = 0.9050488292 \pm 0.0000000004. \quad (1.13)$$

Our Monte Carlo data confirm this prediction. To our knowledge, this is the first exact determination of  $x^*$  for any universality class. Monte Carlo estimates of  $x^*$  are available for many other 2D models — including the 3-state Potts model [61], the 4-state Potts model [62, 63], the 3-state square-lattice Potts antiferromagnet [64, 65], the XY model [66], and several points on the self-dual curve of the symmetric Ashkin–Teller model [62] — and it would be very interesting to compute  $x^*$  analytically for some of these models. Numerical estimates of  $x^*$  are also available for some three-dimensional spin models [18, 30, 36].

Consider, finally, the dimensionless renormalized four-point coupling constant

$$g = -\frac{\bar{u}_4}{\chi^2 \xi^d} = -\frac{U_4}{(\xi/L)^d}. \quad (1.14)$$

In the FSS limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\beta \rightarrow \beta_c$  with  $\xi/L$  fixed,  $g$  is a nontrivial function of the FSS variable  $\xi/L$ :

$$g = F_g(\xi/L). \quad (1.15)$$

Therefore, the function  $g(\beta, L)$  fails to be jointly continuous at  $(\beta, L) = (\beta_c, \infty)$ ; many limiting values are possible depending on the mode of approach, and the massive and massless scaling limits

$$g^* = \lim_{\beta \uparrow \beta_c} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} g(\beta, L) \quad (1.16)$$

$$G^* = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\beta \uparrow \beta_c} g(\beta, L) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} g(\beta_c, L) \quad (1.17)$$

---

<sup>4</sup> The quantity  $x^*$  also plays an important role in a recently developed method for extrapolating finite-volume Monte Carlo data to infinite volume [55, 56, 57, 26, 58].

<sup>5</sup> An analogous situation holds in a cylindrical ( $L \times \infty$ ) geometry for the exponential correlation length in the longitudinal direction,  $\xi_{exp}(L)$  [which can be defined in terms of the logarithm of the ratio of the two largest eigenvalues of the transfer matrix]. Privman and Fisher [59] showed that  $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \xi_{exp}(L)/L$  at criticality is universal, and Cardy [60] showed that for 2D conformal-invariant systems it is equal to  $1/(\pi\eta)$ .

correspond to the two extreme cases  $g^* = F_g(0)$ ,  $G^* = F_g(x^*)$ . As a corollary of our computation of  $V_4$  and  $x^*$ , we obtain the value of  $g$  at criticality on a symmetric torus:

$$G^* = \frac{3 - V_4}{x^{*2}} = 2.2366587 \pm 0.0000057. \quad (1.18)$$

We have also employed our Monte Carlo data to obtain information on the leading correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta$ , which has been the object of some discussion in the literature [67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72]. Unfortunately, for most observables we find that the corrections to FSS are extremely weak, which makes it very difficult to estimate the exponent  $\Delta$  with any accuracy. For the susceptibility, our data are consistent with the prediction of the simplest theoretical scenario — in which irrelevant operators are absent, and the nonlinear scaling fields are independent of  $L$  — that the leading correction to FSS is the regular background term ( $\Delta = 7/4$ ); however, the error bars on  $\Delta$  are so large that many other possible values (e.g. 1,  $4/3$ ) are equally compatible with the data. For the correlation length, the corrections to FSS are so weak that no reliable conclusions can be drawn. For the cumulants  $\bar{u}_4$  and  $\bar{u}_6$ , our data are consistent with the prediction  $\Delta = 11/4$  of the simplest theoretical scenario, but the error bars are again large. For the observables  $V_4$ ,  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$ , we can exploit our exact knowledge of the leading amplitude to obtain improved estimates of  $\Delta$ ; these indicate rather strongly that  $\Delta \approx 7/4$ , in agreement with the simplest theoretical scenario. Only for the Fortuin-Kasteleyn bond observables  $S_4$  and  $S_2^{(2)}$  are the corrections to scaling reasonably strong; naive analysis of these data suggests that  $\Delta \approx 1$ , but they are also consistent with a dominant  $\Delta = 4/3$  correction coming from the vacancy operator [67, 71] combined with a subdominant  $\Delta' = 7/4$  correction coming from the regular background.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we review the main exact results available for the 2D Ising model, and we compute (by numerical integration) the CFT prediction for the quantities  $x^*$ ,  $V_4$ ,  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$ . In Section 3 we use renormalization-group theory to discuss various scenarios for the corrections to scaling, both in infinite volume and in FSS. In Section 4 we explain the Monte Carlo algorithm we have used to simulate this model. In Section 5 we analyze our numerical results for the static observables and compare them against the available exact results; we also try to extract information concerning the corrections to scaling. In Section 6 we analyze our numerical results for the Swendsen–Wang dynamics. Finally, in Section 7 we present our final conclusions and discuss prospects for future work. In Appendix A we summarize the definitions and principal properties of the Jacobi theta functions, and in Appendix B we explain how we carried out the numerical integrations involved in computing  $x^*$ .

## 2 Exact Results

### 2.1 Definitions and notation

In this section we summarize some of the known exact results for the 2D nearest-neighbor ferromagnetic Ising model on the square lattice. We use the non-standard

normalization of  $\beta$  defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Ising}} = -\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j \quad (2.1a)$$

$$= -\beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} + \text{const} , \quad (2.1b)$$

which is of course motivated by considering the Ising model as a special case of the  $q$ -state Potts model; it differs by a factor of 2 from the usual Ising normalization. In our normalization, the critical point is at

$$\beta_c = \log(1 + \sqrt{2}) \approx 0.881373587 . \quad (2.2)$$

We shall study the Ising model on an  $L \times L$  square lattice with periodic boundary conditions. We define energy density  $E$  by<sup>6</sup>

$$E = \frac{1}{V} \left\langle \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (1 - \delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j}) \right\rangle , \quad (2.3)$$

where  $V = L^2$  is the number of lattice sites. We define the specific heat by<sup>7</sup>

$$C_H = -\frac{\partial E}{\partial \beta} . \quad (2.4)$$

The correlation length on a periodic lattice of size  $L$  is defined to be

$$\xi = \frac{1}{2 \sin(\pi/L)} \left( \frac{\chi}{F} - 1 \right)^{1/2} , \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\chi$  is the susceptibility (i.e., the Fourier-transformed two-point correlation function at zero momentum) and  $F$  is the corresponding quantity at the smallest nonzero momentum  $(2\pi/L, 0)$  [see (4.10)/(4.12) and (4.19)/(4.23) below for details]. This is a finite-lattice generalization of the second-moment correlation length.

## 2.2 Critical exponents

The infinite-volume limits of the energy, specific heat, magnetization and exponential correlation length as a function of  $\beta$  are exactly known [73, 74, 75]. In addition, the first few terms in the asymptotic expansion of the infinite-volume susceptibility near criticality are known [40, 76, 70]. From these results one obtains the critical exponents

$$\alpha = 0 \times \log \quad (2.6a)$$

$$\beta = 1/8 \quad (2.6b)$$

$$\nu = 1 \quad (2.6c)$$

$$\gamma = 7/4 \quad (2.6d)$$

where  $0 \times \log$  means that the specific heat displays a logarithmic divergence at  $\beta = \beta_c$ .

---

<sup>6</sup> Our definition of the energy differs slightly from the literature: see also eqs. (4.6)/(4.15) below. When quoting other authors' results we have modified their formulae to agree with our notation.

<sup>7</sup> This definition is somewhat nonstandard in that it omits a prefactor  $\beta^2$ .

## 2.3 Energy and specific heat

In infinite volume, the value of the energy at criticality is

$$E_c(\infty) = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 0.2928932188. \quad (2.7)$$

Ferdinand and Fisher [77] have computed exactly the energy and specific heat as a function of  $\beta$  for the 2D Ising model on a finite torus of size  $L_x \times L_y$ . In particular, they gave explicit expressions for the energy and specific heat at criticality on a symmetric torus of size  $L = L_x = L_y$ , and when  $L \rightarrow \infty$  they obtained the following asymptotic expansions<sup>8</sup>

$$E_c(L) = E_c(\infty) - \frac{\theta_2(0)\theta_3(0)\theta_4(0)}{\theta_2(0) + \theta_3(0) + \theta_4(0)} \frac{1}{L} + \mathcal{O}(L^{-2}) \quad (2.8a)$$

$$\approx 0.2928932188 - 0.3112197304 \frac{1}{L} + \mathcal{O}(L^{-2}) \quad (2.8b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_H(L) = & \frac{2}{\pi} \log L + \frac{2}{\pi} \left( \frac{5}{2} \log 2 - \log \pi + \gamma_E - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{\theta_2(0) + \theta_3(0) + \theta_4(0)} \left[ \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{\nu=2}^4 \theta_\nu(0) \log \theta_\nu(0) + \frac{\theta_2(0)^2 \theta_3(0)^2 \theta_4(0)^2}{\theta_2(0) + \theta_3(0) + \theta_4(0)} \right] \\ & - \frac{\theta_2(0)\theta_3(0)\theta_4(0)}{\theta_2(0) + \theta_3(0) + \theta_4(0)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}L} + \mathcal{O}(\log^3 L/L^2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.9a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \approx & 0.6366197724 \log L + 0.1778399331 - 0.2200655818 \frac{1}{L} \\ & + \mathcal{O}(\log^3 L/L^2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.9b)$$

Here  $\theta_\nu(0)$  ( $\nu = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) denote the usual Jacobi  $\theta$ -functions  $\theta_\nu(z, \tau)$  [see Appendix A] evaluated at  $z = 0$  and  $\tau = i$ , and  $\gamma_E$  is the Euler constant  $\gamma_E \approx 0.5772156649$ . These expansions give not only the leading term, but also some of the corrections to scaling.

To our knowledge, nothing is known analytically about the subsequent terms in the asymptotic expansions (2.8) and (2.9). However, we can investigate this question numerically by computing the exact  $E_c(L)$  and  $C_H(L)$  using the Ferdinand–Fisher formulae and then subtracting off the known terms of the asymptotic expansion. For  $E_c(L)$  we find, surprisingly, that the next term is apparently *not*  $L^{-2}$ , as would normally be expected, but rather  $L^{-3}$ . Moreover, the term  $L^{-4}$  seems to be missing as well, and the deviations can be fitted well by  $AL^{-3} + BL^{-5}$  with  $A \approx 0.1033415669$  and  $B \approx 0.365347$ : see Figure 1, where  $L^3[E_c(L) - (2.8a)]$  is plotted versus  $L^{-2}$  for

---

<sup>8</sup> The exact expression for the finite- $L$  energy (resp. specific heat) as a function of  $\beta$  is given in eq. (2.6) [resp. eq. (2.7)] of ref. [77]; the asymptotic expression at large  $L$  of the energy (resp. specific heat) as a function of  $\beta$  is given in eq. (4.13) [resp. eq. (4.16)]; and the specializations of the latter formulae to  $\beta = \beta_c$  are given in eq. (4.15) [resp. eq. (4.21)].

$16 \leq L \leq 4096$ .<sup>9</sup> We have also checked that the next correction to the energy beyond (2.8a) behaves as  $\sim L^{-3}$  also for *asymmetric* tori of size  $2L \times L$  and  $3L \times L$ . For  $C_H(L)$ , we find that the difference  $C_H(L) - (2.9a)$  behaves approximately as  $L^{-2}$ , with *no* multiplicative logarithm. Moreover, the next term seems likely to be of order  $L^{-3}$ , again without a multiplicative logarithm. Indeed, the deviations from (2.9a) can be fitted well by  $AL^{-2} + BL^{-3}$  with  $A \approx 0.02427997036$  and  $B \approx 0.07308169$ : see Figure 2, where  $L^2[C_H(L) - (2.9a)]$  is plotted versus  $L^{-1}$ .<sup>10</sup> The nature of the subsequent terms in (2.8) and (2.9) is relevant to theoretical issues associated with corrections to scaling (see Sections 3.3 and 3.4), so it would be useful to resolve it analytically.

## 2.4 Spin correlators

Spin correlators for the critical 2D Ising continuum field theory on a torus were obtained by Di Francesco *et al.* [41, 42] using an approach based on CFT. The result is<sup>11</sup>

$$\langle \sigma_{z_1} \cdots \sigma_{z_{2n}} \rangle = \frac{\sum_{\nu=1}^4 Z_\nu \langle \sigma_{z_1} \cdots \sigma_{z_{2n}} \rangle_\nu}{\sum_{\nu=1}^4 Z_\nu} \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$Z_\nu = \frac{|\theta_\nu(0)|}{2|\eta|} \quad (2.11)$$

and

$$Z_\nu^2 \langle \sigma_{z_1} \cdots \sigma_{z_{2n}} \rangle_\nu^2 = \frac{1}{2^{n+2} |\eta|^2} \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_j = \pm 1 \\ \sum_j \epsilon_j = 0}} \left| \theta_\nu \left( \frac{\sum_j \epsilon_j z_j}{2} \right) \right|^2 \prod_{i < j} \left| \frac{\theta_1(z_i - z_j)}{\theta_1'(0)} \right|^{\epsilon_i \epsilon_j / 2} \quad (2.12a)$$

---

<sup>9</sup> We have considered all values of  $L$  between 16 and 100, all multiples of two between 100 and 1000, and all multiples of four between 1000 and 4096 (1309 different values in total). If we arbitrarily assign error bars of size  $10^{-15}$  to each data point, we get a good fit to the Ansatz  $E_c(L) - (2.8a) = AL^{-3} + BL^{-5}$  for  $L_{min} = 112$ . The coefficients are  $A = 0.1033415669 \pm 0.0000000014$  and  $B = 0.365347 \pm 0.000024$ , and  $\chi^2 = 4.59$  (1217 DF, level = 100%). Of course, the  $\chi^2$  value and the error bars on  $A$  and  $B$  cannot be taken seriously, as the deviations from the Ansatz are not random.

<sup>10</sup> Using the same set of values of  $L$  (see footnote 9) and again arbitrarily assigning error bars of size  $10^{-15}$  to each data point, we get a good fit to the Ansatz  $C_H(L) - (2.9a) = AL^{-2} + BL^{-3}$  for  $L_{min} = 700$ . The coefficients are  $A = 0.02427997036 \pm 0.00000000024$  and  $B = 0.07308169 \pm 0.000000021$ , and  $\chi^2 = 163.40$  (923 DF, level = 100%). Again, the  $\chi^2$  value and the error bars on  $A$  and  $B$  cannot be taken seriously, as the deviations from the Ansatz are not random. If we allow in the fit an additional term  $CL^{-3} \log L$ , we obtain a very small coefficient  $C \approx -2 \times 10^{-5}$ . Thus, we conclude that this term is absent.

<sup>11</sup> There is a misprint in the normalization of the 4-spin correlator in equation (9) of [42], and in the normalization of the  $2n$ -spin correlator in equation (6.6) of [41]. We have rederived both correlators using the chiral bosonization prescription presented in [41]. With the correct normalization, shown in (2.10)–(2.12) below, we are able to reproduce the numerical value of  $V_4$  reported in [42], as well as the numerical estimates of  $V_4$ ,  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$  obtained in our simulation.



$$= \frac{\theta'_1(0)^{n/2}}{2^{n+2}|\eta|^2} \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_j=\pm 1 \\ \sum_j \epsilon_j=0}} \left| \theta_\nu \left( \frac{\sum_j \epsilon_j z_j}{2} \right) \right|^2 \prod_{i < j} |\theta_1(z_i - z_j)|^{\epsilon_i \epsilon_j / 2} \quad (2.12b)$$

Here we have used the complex-number notation  $z = x_1 + ix_2$ ;  $\theta'_1(0) \approx 2.8486946040$  is the derivative of  $\theta_1(z, \tau)$  with respect to  $z$  evaluated at  $z = 0$  and  $\tau = i$ ; and  $\eta \approx 0.7682254223$  is the usual Dedekind function  $\eta(\tau)$  evaluated at  $\tau = i$ . Please note that  $\theta'_1(0) = 2\pi\eta^3$  [cf. (A.13)]. Note also that the contribution of  $\{\epsilon_j\}$  to (2.12) is equal to that of  $\{-\epsilon_j\}$ , so in the numerical evaluation of this expression we need only take half the terms. The expression (2.10) gives the FSS limit for the Ising-model correlation functions at criticality: here  $z_i$  denotes the position in lattice units divided by the lattice linear size  $L$ .

**Remark.** Although the sector  $\nu = 1$  does not contribute to the partition function [since  $Z_1 \sim \theta_1(0) = 0$ ], it does contribute to the correlation functions [since  $Z_1 \langle \sigma_{z_1} \cdots \sigma_{z_{2n}} \rangle_1 \neq 0$ ]. So this sector cannot simply be discarded. See ref. [41] for details.

The two correlators that are needed in the evaluation of the Binder cumulant are

$$Z_\nu \langle \sigma_{z_1} \sigma_{z_2} \rangle_\nu = \frac{|\theta'_1(0)|^{1/4}}{2|\eta|} \frac{|\theta_\nu(\frac{z_1 - z_2}{2})|}{|\theta_1(z_1 - z_2)|^{1/4}} \quad (2.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\nu \langle \sigma_{z_1} \sigma_{z_2} \sigma_{z_3} \sigma_{z_4} \rangle_\nu &= \frac{|\theta'_1(0)|^{1/2}}{2\sqrt{2}|\eta|} \left\{ \left| \theta_\nu \left( \frac{z_1 + z_2 - z_3 - z_4}{2} \right) \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \times \left| \frac{\theta_1(z_1 - z_2) \theta_1(z_3 - z_4)}{\theta_1(z_1 - z_3) \theta_1(z_1 - z_4) \theta_1(z_2 - z_3) \theta_1(z_2 - z_4)} \right|^{1/2} \\ &\quad \left. + (2 \leftrightarrow 3) + (2 \leftrightarrow 4) \right\}^{1/2} \quad (2.14) \end{aligned}$$

We also need the 6-point correlator to compute  $V_6$ . Its exact expression can be deduced easily from the general equation (2.12):

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\nu \langle \sigma_{z_1} \sigma_{z_2} \sigma_{z_3} \sigma_{z_4} \sigma_{z_5} \sigma_{z_6} \rangle_\nu &= \frac{|\theta'_1(0)|^{3/4}}{4|\eta|} \left\{ \left| \theta_\nu \left( \frac{z_1 + z_2 + z_3 - z_4 - z_5 - z_6}{2} \right) \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \times \Psi(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, z_5, z_6) + (2 \leftrightarrow 4) + (2 \leftrightarrow 5) + (2 \leftrightarrow 6) \\ &\quad + (3 \leftrightarrow 4) + (3 \leftrightarrow 5) + (3 \leftrightarrow 6) + (2 \leftrightarrow 4; 3 \leftrightarrow 5) \\ &\quad \left. + (2 \leftrightarrow 4; 3 \leftrightarrow 6) + (2 \leftrightarrow 5; 3 \leftrightarrow 6) \right\}^{1/2} \quad (2.15) \end{aligned}$$

where the function  $\Psi$  is defined as

$$\Psi(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, z_5, z_6) = \left( \frac{\theta_1(z_{12}) \theta_1(z_{13}) \theta_1(z_{23}) \theta_1(z_{45}) \theta_1(z_{46}) \theta_1(z_{56})}{\prod_{i=1,2,3; j=4,5,6} \theta_1(z_{ij})} \right)^{1/2} \quad (2.16)$$

and we have used the shorthand notation  $z_{ij} \equiv z_i - z_j$ .

From these equations we can obtain the values of  $x^* = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \xi/L$  and  $V_{2n}$  by numerical integration. In particular,

$$x^* = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \frac{\chi}{F} - 1 \right)^{1/2} \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$\chi \sim \int d^2 z \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_z \rangle \quad (2.18)$$

$$F \sim \int d^2 z \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_z \rangle \cos(2\pi x_1) \quad (2.19)$$

and  $\int d^2 z = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dx_1 dx_2$ . The details of this computation are given in Appendix B. We obtain

$$\int d^2 z \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_z \rangle = 1.55243295465 \pm 0.000000000004 \quad (2.20)$$

$$\int d^2 z \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_z \rangle \cos(2\pi x_1) = 0.04656744682 \pm 0.000000000004 \quad (2.21)$$

As a result, we obtain  $x^*$  with 10 digits of precision:

$$x^* = 0.9050488292 \pm 0.00000000004 . \quad (2.22)$$

We repeated the computation requiring 11 digits of precision in the integrals, and the result was the same.

The universal moment ratio  $V_4$  is given by

$$V_4 = \frac{\int d^2 z_2 d^2 z_3 d^2 z_4 \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_{z_2} \sigma_{z_3} \sigma_{z_4} \rangle}{[\int d^2 z \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_z \rangle]^2} . \quad (2.23)$$

Di Francesco *et al.* [41, 42] performed the integrals in numerator and denominator by Monte Carlo and obtained

$$V_4 = 1.168 \pm 0.005 . \quad (2.24)$$

We have improved this value, as follows: For the denominator of (2.23), we use the very precise estimate (2.20) coming from deterministic numerical integration. For the numerator, we performed a Monte Carlo integration using  $10^9$  measurements. Our result is

$$V_4 = 1.1679229 \pm 0.0000047 , \quad (2.25)$$

which is compatible with (2.24) but three orders of magnitude more precise. This value also agrees closely with the estimate of Kamieniarz and Blöte [78] based on extrapolation of the exact results (computed by transfer-matrix methods) for  $L \leq 17$ :

$$V_4 = 1.1679296 \pm 0.0000014 , \quad (2.26)$$

where the error bar is of course somewhat subjective.<sup>12</sup>

More generally, the universal moment ratio  $V_{2n}$  is given by

$$V_{2n} = \frac{\int d^2 z_2 \cdots d^2 z_{2n} \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_{z_2} \cdots \sigma_{z_{2n}} \rangle}{[\int d^2 z \langle \sigma_0 \sigma_z \rangle]^n}. \quad (2.27)$$

We have been able to compute the (exact except for the numerical integration) values of the ratios  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$ . We performed the integrals in the numerator by Monte Carlo, using  $10^9$  measurements for  $V_6$ ,  $4 \times 10^6$  measurements for  $V_8$  and  $2.5 \times 10^6$  measurements for  $V_{10}$ . We obtain

$$V_6 = 1.4556491 \pm 0.0000072 \quad (2.28)$$

$$V_8 = 1.89252 \pm 0.00018 \quad (2.29)$$

$$V_{10} = 2.53956 \pm 0.00034 \quad (2.30)$$

In general, the formula for the  $2n$ -point function contains  $(2n)!/[2(n!)^2]$  terms [this takes into account the  $\{\epsilon_j\} \leftrightarrow \{-\epsilon_j\}$  symmetry], and this grows asymptotically like  $4^n$ . Thus, in computing  $V_4$  (resp.  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$ ,  $V_{10}$ ) we had to include 3 (resp. 10, 35, 126) terms, and the computation of  $V_{12}$  would require handling 462 terms. Moreover, the numerator has to be integrated over a  $(4n-2)$ -dimensional torus. These facts make the high-precision numerical integration of  $V_{2n}$  extremely time-consuming as soon as  $n$  becomes moderately large.

Let us consider, finally, the dimensionless renormalized four-point coupling constant  $g$  defined by

$$g = -\frac{\bar{u}_4}{\chi^2 \xi^d} = -\frac{U_4}{(\xi/L)^d}. \quad (2.31)$$

In the FSS limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\beta \rightarrow \beta_c$  with  $\xi/L$  fixed,  $g$  becomes a nontrivial function of the FSS variable  $\xi/L$ ,

$$g = F_g(\xi/L). \quad (2.32)$$

(There is some evidence that it is a *decreasing* function of  $\xi/L$ .<sup>13</sup>) In particular, the

<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately, Kamieniarz and Blöte [78] reported only meagre details of the fits that led to this extraordinarily precise estimate. That is a shame, as information on the presence or absence of particular correction-to-scaling terms could be of considerable theoretical interest (see Section 3 below). It is remarkable that, even though their Ansätze (9)/(10) for the second and fourth field derivatives of  $F^{(s)} \equiv L^d f_{\text{sing}}$  differ from ours (3.34e)/(3.34f), their final Ansatz for  $Q_L \equiv 1/V_4$  coincides with ours. The differences between their Ansätze (9)/(10) and ours (3.34e)/(3.34f) are threefold: 1) Their amplitude  $A^{(1)}$  in (9) should in fact vanish at criticality, according to us [cf. (3.35) and footnote 22 below]. 2) They assume from the beginning that the scaling function  $A$  in (7) [what we call  $\widetilde{W}$ ] does not depend on  $L^{y_h} g_h$ , while we initially allow for this dependence in the Ansatz (3.33). This dependence adds extra subleading logarithmic terms to the FSS behavior of  $\bar{u}_4$  (and in fact all of the  $\bar{u}_{2n}$ ), in particular the second term in (3.34f). On the other hand, they are probably right that such terms are in fact absent [see our Remark after (3.35)]. 3) They miss a term proportional to  $L^{2y_h+y_t}$  in (10), which arises from the mixing of  $h^2$  in the thermal field  $g_t$ . This term corresponds to the third term in our (3.34f).

<sup>13</sup> Baker and Kawashima [79] conjecture that  $g(\beta, L)$  [resp.  $\xi(\beta, L)$ ] is a decreasing [resp. increasing] function of  $\beta$  for each fixed  $L < \infty$ ; these two facts, if true, would immediately imply that  $F_g(\xi/L)$  is a decreasing function of its argument  $\xi/L$ . Numerical data for the 2D [30, 80] and three-dimensional [30, 79] Ising models clearly support the Baker–Kawashima conjecture.

massive and massless scaling limits

$$g^* = \lim_{\beta \uparrow \beta_c} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} g(\beta, L) \quad (2.33)$$

$$G^* = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\beta \uparrow \beta_c} g(\beta, L) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} g(\beta_c, L) \quad (2.34)$$

correspond to the two extreme cases  $g^* = F_g(0)$ ,  $G^* = F_g(x^*)$ . The best currently available estimates for the 2D Ising model are

$$g^* = \begin{cases} 14.694 \pm 0.002 & \text{by high-temperature expansion [81, 82]} \\ 14.66 \pm 0.06 & \text{by expansion around } d = 0 \text{ [83, 84]} \\ 14.2 \pm 0.7 & \text{by Monte Carlo [30]} \end{cases} \quad (2.35)$$

$$G^* = 2.24 \pm 0.01 \quad \text{by Monte Carlo [30]} \quad (2.36)$$

Our own Monte Carlo data, reported in Sections 5.5 [cf. (5.35a)] and 5.8 [cf. (5.58a)], improve (2.36) to  $G^* = 2.2345 \pm 0.0014$ . From (2.22) and (2.25) we obtain the theoretical prediction

$$G^* = \frac{3 - V_4}{x^{*2}} = 2.2366587 \pm 0.0000057. \quad (2.37)$$

### 3 Corrections to Scaling

In the renormalization-group (RG) approach to critical phenomena, corrections to scaling arise from two sources: 1) irrelevant operators [85, 86], and 2) the smooth but in general nonlinear connection between the conventional thermodynamic parameters and the RG nonlinear scaling fields [85, 86, 68, 70]. These corrections to scaling are conventionally designated as “non-analytic” and “analytic”, respectively (we emphasize, however, that the “non-analytic” corrections can have either non-integer or integer exponents). In each case, the correction amplitudes are non-universal but satisfy certain universal relations. However, these relations are *different* for the two types of corrections, so they can in principle be distinguished even if the exponents are integers.

#### 3.1 Corrections to scaling in infinite volume

Consider, first, a  $d$ -dimensional system in infinite volume. We shall assume, for concreteness, that there are exactly two relevant operators — corresponding roughly to a thermal field  $t$  and a magnetic field  $h$  — and that the free energy is invariant under  $h \rightarrow -h$ . Then RG theory entails that the free energy per unit volume  $f$  can generically be written (in the absence of marginal operators) as the sum of a singular part  $f_{\text{sing}}$  and a regular part  $f_{\text{reg}}$ , where the singular part satisfies the scaling relation

$$f_{\text{sing}}(g_t, g_h, \{g_{u_j}\}) = b^{-d} f_{\text{sing}}(b^{y_t} g_t, b^{y_h} g_h, \{b^{y_j} g_{u_j}\}) \quad (3.1)$$

for all  $b > 0$ , where  $y_t, y_h > 0$  are the thermal and magnetic exponents, and  $y_j < 0$  are the irrelevant exponents. Here  $g_t, g_h, g_{u_j}$  are the nonlinear scaling fields associated with the thermal field  $t \equiv \beta_c(\{u_j\}) - \beta$ , the magnetic field  $h$  and the irrelevant fields  $u_j$ :

$$g_t = a_0(t, u) + a_2(t, u)h^2 + a_4(t, u)h^4 + \dots \quad (3.2a)$$

$$g_h = b_1(t, u)h + b_3(t, u)h^3 + b_5(t, u)h^5 + \dots \quad (3.2b)$$

$$g_{u_j} = c_{j0}(t, u) + c_{j2}(t, u)h^2 + c_{j4}(t, u)h^4 + \dots \quad (3.2c)$$

where the  $a_k, b_k$ , and  $c_{jk}$  are smooth functions of  $t$  and  $u \equiv \{u_j\}$  having small- $t$  asymptotic expansions

$$a_k(t, u) \simeq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} a_{kl}(u)t^l \quad (3.3a)$$

$$b_k(t, u) \simeq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_{kl}(u)t^l \quad (3.3b)$$

$$c_{jk}(t, u) \simeq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} c_{jkl}(u)t^l \quad (3.3c)$$

with  $a_{00}(u) = 0$ ,  $a_{01}(u) > 0$  and  $b_{10}(u) > 0$ . [That is,  $a_0 \sim t$  and  $b_1 \sim 1$  for small  $t$ .]

It follows that the susceptibility, specific heat, magnetization and other observables pick up both analytic and non-analytic corrections to scaling. To see this in detail, let us first choose  $b = |g_t|^{-1/y_t}$  in (3.1): this gives the scaling formula

$$f_{\text{sing}}(g_t, g_h, \{g_{u_j}\}) = |g_t|^{d/y_t} f_{\text{sing}}(\pm 1, g_h/|g_t|^{y_h/y_t}, \{g_{u_j}|g_t|^{-y_j/y_t}\}) \quad (3.4a)$$

$$\equiv |g_t|^{d/y_t} Y_{\pm}(g_h/|g_t|^{y_h/y_t}, \{g_{u_j}|g_t|^{-y_j/y_t}\}) \quad (3.4b)$$

where the  $\pm$  refers to  $\text{sgn } g_t = \text{sgn } t$ , and the  $Y_{\pm}$  are smooth functions when their arguments are near zero. In terms of the ordinary critical exponents, we have  $y_t \equiv 1/\nu$ ,  $d/y_t \equiv d\nu = 2 - \alpha$ ,  $y_h/y_t \equiv \beta + \gamma$  and  $-y_j/y_t \equiv \theta_j$ .<sup>14</sup> Let us now differentiate (3.4) with respect to  $h$  either 0, 1 or 2 times and then restrict to  $h = 0$ . In the absence of irrelevant operators we would have [68, 87, 70]<sup>15</sup>

$$f(t, h = 0) = A_{f\pm}|t|^{2-\alpha}f_0(t) + A_0(t) \quad (3.5a)$$

$$M(t, h = 0) = B_{0\pm}|t|^{\beta}m_0(t) \quad (3.5b)$$

$$\chi(t, h = 0) = C_{0\pm}|t|^{-\gamma}p_0(t) + E_{0\pm}|t|^{1-\alpha}e_0(t) + D_0(t) \quad (3.5c)$$

where

$$A_{f\pm} = a_{01}^{2-\alpha}Y_{\pm}(0) \quad (3.6a)$$

---

<sup>14</sup> We trust that there is no danger of confusion between the critical exponent  $\beta$  and the inverse temperature  $\beta$ .

<sup>15</sup> Here we are defining  $M = \partial f / \partial h$  and  $\chi = \partial^2 f / \partial h^2$ .

$$B_{0\pm} = a_{01}^\beta b_{10} Y'_\pm(0) \quad (3.6b)$$

$$C_{0\pm} = a_{01}^{-\gamma} b_{10}^2 Y''_\pm(0) \quad (3.6c)$$

$$E_{0\pm} = \pm 2(2 - \alpha) a_{01}^{1-\alpha} a_{20} Y_\pm(0) \quad (3.6d)$$

and  $f_0, m_0, p_0, e_0$  are smooth functions normalized to unity at  $t = 0$ ,

$$f_0(t) = \left( \frac{a_0(t)}{a_{01}t} \right)^{2-\alpha} \quad (3.7a)$$

$$m_0(t) = \left( \frac{a_0(t)}{a_{01}t} \right)^\beta \frac{b_1(t)}{b_{10}} \quad (3.7b)$$

$$p_0(t) = \left( \frac{a_0(t)}{a_{01}t} \right)^{-\gamma} \left( \frac{b_1(t)}{b_{10}} \right)^2 \quad (3.7c)$$

$$e_0(t) = \left( \frac{a_0(t)}{a_{01}t} \right)^{1-\alpha} \frac{a_2(t)}{a_{20}} \quad (3.7d)$$

(here we used the relation  $\alpha + 2\beta + \gamma = 2$ ), while  $A_0$  and  $D_0$  come from the regular background:

$$A_0(t) = f_{\text{reg}}(t, h = 0) \quad (3.8a)$$

$$D_0(t) = \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{reg}}}{\partial h^2}(t, h = 0) \quad (3.8b)$$

(There is no regular background in the spontaneous magnetization:  $f_{\text{reg}}$  is a smooth and even function of  $h$ , so  $\partial f_{\text{reg}}/\partial h$  vanishes at  $h = 0$ .) Of course, we must have  $B_{0+} = 0$  [hence  $Y'_+(0) = 0$ ] in order that the spontaneous magnetization vanish for  $t > 0$ . It follows from (3.7) that the analytic corrections to scaling in  $f, M$  and  $\chi$  are connected at all orders in  $t$  by the relation [87, 70]

$$p_0(t) = \frac{m_0(t)^2}{f_0(t)}. \quad (3.9)$$

**Remark.** Privman and collaborators [88, p. 12] [2, pp. 6–7] have asserted that  $f_{\text{reg}}$  can be chosen to be independent of  $h$ . But this seems *a priori* implausible to us, as  $t$  and  $h$  play qualitatively similar roles (the only difference is the symmetry  $h \rightarrow -h$ ). Moreover, if it were true, it would imply that the regular background contribution  $D_0(t)$  to the susceptibility is absent, contrary to the rigorously established asymptotic expansion (3.31) in the 2D Ising model, in which  $D_0 \neq 0$  [76, 70].

Let us now include the effects of irrelevant variables. The results are as follows:

$$f(t, h = 0, u) = A_{f\pm}(u) |t|^{2-\alpha} f_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j A'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] + A_0(t, u) \quad (3.10a)$$

$$M(t, h = 0, u) = B_{0\pm}(u) |t|^\beta m_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j B'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] \quad (3.10b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(t, h = 0, u) = & C_{0\pm}(u) |t|^{-\gamma} p_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j C'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] \\ & + E_{0\pm}(u) |t|^{1-\alpha} e_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j E'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] \\ & + D_0(t, u) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10c)$$

where the dots denote higher-order corrections to scaling (of orders  $|t|^{\theta_j+1}, |t|^{\theta_j+2}, \dots, |t|^{\theta_j+\theta_k}, |t|^{\theta_j+\theta_k+1}, \dots$ ). Here

$$A_{f\pm}(u) = a_{01}(u)^{2-\alpha} Y_{\pm}^{(0,0)} \quad (3.11a)$$

$$A'_{\pm,j}(u) = c_{j00}(u) a_{01}(u)^{\theta_j} \frac{Y_{\pm}^{(0,1)}}{Y_{\pm}^{(0,0)}} \quad (3.11b)$$

$$B_{0\pm}(u) = a_{01}(u)^\beta b_{10}(u) Y_{\pm}^{(1,0)} \quad (3.11c)$$

$$B'_{\pm,j}(u) = c_{j00}(u) a_{01}(u)^{\theta_j} \frac{Y_{\pm}^{(1,1)}}{Y_{\pm}^{(1,0)}} \quad (3.11d)$$

$$C_{0\pm}(u) = a_{01}(u)^{-\gamma} b_{10}(u)^2 Y_{\pm}^{(2,0)} \quad (3.11e)$$

$$C'_{\pm,j}(u) = c_{j00}(u) a_{01}(u)^{\theta_j} \frac{Y_{\pm}^{(2,1)}}{Y_{\pm}^{(2,0)}} \quad (3.11f)$$

$$E_{0\pm}(u) = \pm 2(2 - \alpha) a_{01}(u)^{1-\alpha} a_{20}(u) Y_{\pm}^{(0,0)} \quad (3.11g)$$

$$E'_{\pm,j}(u) = \left( 1 + \frac{\theta_j}{2 - \alpha} \right) A'_{\pm,j}(u) \quad (3.11h)$$

where we have used the shorthand  $Y_{\pm}^{(k,l)} \equiv \partial^{k+l} Y_{\pm}(x, z) / \partial x^k \partial z_j^l \big|_{x=z=0}$ , and  $f_0, m_0, p_0, e_0, A_0$  and  $D_0$  are smooth functions defined exactly as in (3.7)/(3.8) but restoring the  $u$ -dependence. In particular, the functions  $f_0, m_0$  and  $p_0$  satisfy the same relation (3.9) as when the irrelevant variables are neglected. It follows that the correction-to-scaling amplitudes corresponding to integer powers  $t, t^2, \dots, t^k$  are related by this equation, *provided that* none of the quantities  $\sum_j n_j \theta_j, \gamma + 1 - \alpha + \sum_j n_j \theta_j, \alpha - 2$  or  $\gamma$  equals an integer  $\leq k$ , where the  $n_j$  are integers  $\geq 0$ . The first two conditions ensure that the non-analytic corrections to scaling do not have integer exponents  $\leq k$ , while the last two conditions ensure that the regular background term does not make such a contribution.

Let us note that the limiting ratio of  $f\chi/M^2$  is *universal* (i.e. independent of  $u$ ):

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^\pm} \frac{f\chi}{M^2}(t, h = 0, u) = \frac{Y_{\pm}^{(0,0)} Y_{\pm}^{(2,0)}}{[Y_{\pm}^{(1,0)}]^2}. \quad (3.12)$$

Indeed, this equation would hold identically in  $t$  were it not for (a) irrelevant variables and (b) the regular background contribution. And let us note, finally, that the ratios of correction-to-scaling amplitudes  $B'_{\pm,j}(u)/A'_{\pm,j}(u)$ ,  $C'_{\pm,j}(u)/A'_{\pm,j}(u)$  and  $E'_{\pm,j}(u)/A'_{\pm,j}(u)$  are universal: they are again given by ratios of derivatives of  $Y_{\pm}$  evaluated at  $(0,0)$  and/or of critical exponents.

### 3.2 Corrections to finite-size scaling

Let us now extend this framework to study finite-size scaling (FSS) in a system of size  $L^d$  with periodic boundary conditions. To do this, it suffices to introduce a scaling field  $g_L = L^{-1}$  with (relevant) exponent  $y_L = 1$ ,<sup>16</sup>

$$f_{\text{sing}}(g_t, g_h, \{g_{u_j}\}, L^{-1}) = b^{-d} f_{\text{sing}}(b^{y_t} g_t, b^{y_h} g_h, \{b^{y_j} g_{u_j}\}, bL^{-1}), \quad (3.13)$$

and to generalize (3.2) to allow a possible smooth dependence on  $L^{-1}$  in the coefficients  $a_k$ ,  $b_k$  and  $c_{jk}$  (but see below). Choosing  $b = L$  in (3.13), we obtain

$$f_{\text{sing}}(g_t, g_h, \{g_{u_j}\}, L^{-1}) = L^{-d} f_{\text{sing}}(L^{y_t} g_t, L^{y_h} g_h, \{L^{y_j} g_{u_j}\}, 1) \quad (3.14a)$$

$$\equiv L^{-d} W(L^{y_t} g_t, L^{y_h} g_h, \{L^{y_j} g_{u_j}\}) \quad (3.14b)$$

where  $W$  is a smooth function. Then, if we neglect the irrelevant scaling fields, the observables at criticality ( $t = h = 0$ ) are given by<sup>17</sup>

$$f(0, 0, L^{-1}) = L^{-d} \mathcal{A} + A_0(0, L^{-1}) \quad (3.15a)$$

$$E(0, 0, L^{-1}) = L^{(\alpha-1)/\nu} \mathcal{F}(L^{-1}) + F_0(0, L^{-1}) \quad (3.15b)$$

$$C_H(0, 0, L^{-1}) = L^{\alpha/\nu} \mathcal{G}(L^{-1}) + L^{(\alpha-1)/\nu} \mathcal{H}(L^{-1}) + G_0(0, L^{-1}) \quad (3.15c)$$

$$M(0, 0, L^{-1}) = 0 \quad (3.15d)$$

$$\chi(0, 0, L^{-1}) = L^{\gamma/\nu} \mathcal{C}(L^{-1}) + L^{(\alpha-1)/\nu} \mathcal{E}(L^{-1}) + D_0(0, L^{-1}) \quad (3.15e)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_4(0, 0, L^{-1}) &= L^{2\gamma/\nu+d} \mathcal{C}_4(L^{-1}) + L^{(\gamma+1)/\nu} \mathcal{E}_4(L^{-1}) \\ &\quad + L^{\gamma/\nu} \mathcal{J}_4(L^{-1}) + L^{\alpha/\nu} \mathcal{K}_4(L^{-1}) \\ &\quad + L^{(\alpha-1)/\nu} \mathcal{L}_4(L^{-1}) + D_{0,4}(0, L^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.15f)$$

$$\bar{u}_{2n}(0, 0, L^{-1}) = L^{n\gamma/\nu+(n-1)d} \mathcal{C}_{2n}(L^{-1})$$

---

<sup>16</sup> One might imagine, by analogy with  $g_t$  and  $g_h$ , that  $g_L$  should be given by a power series  $\alpha_1/L + \alpha_2/L^2 + \dots$ . However, in periodic boundary conditions, it is reasonable to expect that  $g_L$  is *exactly* equal to  $1/L$ , without higher-order corrections. This is because, in any reasonable renormalization transformation with block size  $b$  (and periodic boundary conditions), the renormalized system size should be  $L' = L/b$  *exactly* (at least when  $L$  is a multiple of  $b$ ). If we are wrong, and the scaling field  $g_L$  is a nontrivial power series in  $1/L$ , this dependence would generate new corrections to FSS given by integer powers of  $1/L$ . Indeed, each  $L$  appearing in (3.14) and subsequent equations would have to be replaced by  $1/g_L$ .

<sup>17</sup> Here we are defining  $E = -\partial f/\partial\beta = \partial f/\partial t$ ,  $C_H = -\partial E/\partial\beta = \partial^2 f/\partial t^2$ ,  $M = \partial f/\partial h$ ,  $\chi = \partial^2 f/\partial h^2$  and  $\bar{u}_m \equiv \partial^m f/\partial h^m = L^{-d} \langle \mathcal{M}^m \rangle_{\text{conn}}$ .



$$\begin{aligned}
& + L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu+(n-2)d+1/\nu} \mathcal{E}_{2n}(L^{-1}) \\
& + \cdots + D_{0,2n}(0, L^{-1})
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15g}$$

$$\bar{u}_{2n+1}(0, 0, L^{-1}) = 0 \tag{3.15h}$$

where  $\alpha = 2 - d\nu$  and

$$\mathcal{A} = W^{(0,0)} \tag{3.16a}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(L^{-1}) = a_{01}(L^{-1}) W^{(1,0)} \tag{3.16b}$$

$$\mathcal{G}(L^{-1}) = a_{01}^2(L^{-1}) W^{(2,0)} \tag{3.16c}$$

$$\mathcal{H}(L^{-1}) = 2 a_{02}(L^{-1}) W^{(1,0)} \tag{3.16d}$$

$$\mathcal{C}(L^{-1}) = b_{10}(L^{-1})^2 W^{(0,2)} \tag{3.16e}$$

$$\mathcal{E}(L^{-1}) = 2 a_{20}(L^{-1}) W^{(1,0)} \tag{3.16f}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{2n}(L^{-1}) = b_{10}(L^{-1})^{2n} W^{(0,2n)} \tag{3.16g}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{2n}(L^{-1}) = 2n(2n-1) b_{10}(L^{-1})^{2n-2} a_{20}(L^{-1}) W^{(1,2n-2)} \tag{3.16h}$$

$$\mathcal{J}_4(L^{-1}) = 24 b_{10}(L^{-1}) b_{30}(L^{-1}) W^{(0,2)} \tag{3.16i}$$

$$\mathcal{K}_4(L^{-1}) = 12 a_{20}(L^{-1})^2 W^{(2,0)} \tag{3.16j}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_4(L^{-1}) = 24 a_{40}(L^{-1}) W^{(1,0)} \tag{3.16k}$$

where we have used the shorthand  $W^{(k,l)} \equiv \partial^{k+l} W(x, y) / \partial x^k \partial y^l \big|_{x=y=0}$ , and  $A_0$ ,  $F_0$ ,  $G_0$ ,  $D_0$  and  $D_{0,2n}$  come from the regular background in the obvious way [cf. (3.8)]. The dots in the expression for the cumulant  $\bar{u}_{2n}$  correspond to contributions that are suppressed by further powers of  $L^{-(\gamma-1)/\nu-d}$  or  $L^{-1/\nu}$  or both. Please note that analytic corrections  $L^{-1}$ ,  $L^{-2}$ ,  $\dots$  arise (except in the leading term of the free energy) in case the coefficient functions  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  have a dependence on  $L^{-1}$ . In fact, Guo and Jasnow [89] have argued, using the field-theoretic RG, that such mixing does *not* occur; if they are right, then all such analytic corrections should be absent, i.e. the functions  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \dots$  should be constants. Similarly, Privman and collaborators [88, p. 12] [2, p. 101] have argued that the regular background term  $f_{\text{reg}}$  should be independent of  $L^{-1}$ ; if they are right, then analytic corrections to  $A_0, F_0, \dots$  should likewise be absent. However, we shall refrain from *assuming* these behaviors, and shall instead attempt to analyze our Monte Carlo data so as to *check* these assertions.

If there are irrelevant scaling fields the above equations generalize to

$$f(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) = L^{-d} \left[ \mathcal{A} + \sum_j \mathcal{A}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \cdots \right] + A_0(0, u, L^{-1}) \tag{3.17a}$$

$$E(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) = L^{(\alpha-1)/\nu} \left[ \mathcal{F}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{F}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \cdots \right]$$

$$+ F_0(0, u, L^{-1}) + \dots \quad (3.17b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_H(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= L^{\alpha/\nu} \left[ \mathcal{G}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{G}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &+ L^{(\alpha-1)/\nu} \left[ \mathcal{H}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{H}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &+ G_0(0, u, L^{-1}) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.17c)$$

$$M(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) = 0 \quad (3.17d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= L^{\gamma/\nu} \left[ \mathcal{C}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{C}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &+ L^{-d+1/\nu} \left[ \mathcal{E}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{E}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &+ D_0(0, u, L^{-1}) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.17e)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_{2n}(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= L^{n\gamma/\nu+(n-1)d} \left[ \mathcal{C}_{2n}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{C}'_{2n,j}(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &+ L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu+(n-2)d+1/\nu} \\ &\quad \times \left[ \mathcal{E}_{2n}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{E}'_{2n,j}(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &+ \dots + D_{0,2n}(0, u, L^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.17f)$$

$$\bar{u}_{2n+1}(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) = 0 \quad (3.17g)$$

where the dots inside the brackets stand for higher-order corrections  $L^{-(\theta_j+\theta_k)/\nu}, \dots$ , while the final dots in the energy, specific heat and susceptibility stand for terms of order  $L^{-d-\theta_j/\nu}, L^{-d-(\theta_j+\theta_k)/\nu}, \dots$  [and analogously for  $\bar{u}_{2n}$ ]. The coefficients  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}_{2n}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{2n}$  are given by (3.16) if we evaluate them with all the irrelevant scaling fields set to zero. The remaining coefficients are given by

$$\mathcal{A}'_j(u, L^{-1}) = c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) W_j^{(0,0,1)} \quad (3.18a)$$

$$\mathcal{F}'_j(u, L^{-1}) = a_{01}(u, L^{-1}) c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) W_j^{(1,0,1)} \quad (3.18b)$$

$$\mathcal{G}'_j(u, L^{-1}) = a_{01}^2(u, L^{-1}) c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) W_j^{(2,0,1)} \quad (3.18c)$$

$$\mathcal{H}'_j(u, L^{-1}) = 2[a_{02}(u, L^{-1}) c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) + a_{01}(u, L^{-1}) c_{j01}(u)] W_j^{(1,0,1)} \quad (3.18d)$$

$$\mathcal{C}'_j(u, L^{-1}) = b_{10}(u, L^{-1})^2 c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) W_j^{(0,2,1)} \quad (3.18e)$$

$$\mathcal{E}'_j(u, L^{-1}) = 2a_{20}(u, L^{-1}) c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) W_j^{(1,0,1)} \quad (3.18f)$$

$$\mathcal{C}'_{2n,j}(u, L^{-1}) = b_{10}(u, L^{-1})^{2n} c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) W_j^{(0,2n,1)} \quad (3.18g)$$

$$\mathcal{E}'_{2n,j}(u, L^{-1}) = 2n(2n-1)b_{10}(u, L^{-1})^{2n-2} a_{20}(u, L^{-1}) c_{j00}(u, L^{-1}) W_j^{(1,2n-2,1)} \quad (3.18h)$$

where we have used the shorthand  $W_j^{(k,l,1)} \equiv \partial^{k+l+1} W(x, y, z) / \partial x^k \partial y^l \partial z_j \big|_{x=y=z=0}$ .

It is clear from (3.17f) that the background contribution to  $\bar{u}_{2n}$  is strongly suppressed (i.e., by a factor  $L^{-n\gamma/\nu - (n-1)d}$ ). However, this is no longer true for the analogous non-connected observables  $\chi_{2n} = V^{-n} \langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle$ , which are related to the connected observables  $\bar{u}_{2n}$  by expressions similar to (1.3a). In particular, the expression for  $\chi_{2n}$  contains a piece proportional to  $\chi^n$ . Thus, we should expect in  $\chi_{2n}$  a correction term  $L^{-\gamma/\nu}$  coming from the regular background contribution to  $\chi = V^{-1} \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle$ .

Assuming that the functions  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{2n}$  are independent of  $L^{-1}$ , it follows that the FSS of the cumulant ratios  $U_{2n} = L^{(1-n)d} \bar{u}_{2n} / \chi^n$  is given by

$$U_{2n} = U_{2n}^\infty \left[ 1 + \sum_j U'_{2n,j} L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + U''_{2n} L^{-\gamma/\nu} + \dots \right], \quad (3.19)$$

where the coefficient  $U''_{2n}$  comes entirely from the regular background term in the susceptibility:

$$U''_{2n} = -2n D_0(0, u, L^{-1}) / \mathcal{C}(u, L^{-1}). \quad (3.20)$$

Similar expressions of course hold for the magnetization moment ratios  $V_{2n}$ . On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{C}$  or  $\mathcal{C}_{2n}$  do depend on  $L^{-1}$ , then we should expect additional corrections of order  $L^{-1}, L^{-2}, \dots$ .

### 3.3 Models with logarithmic specific heat

The basic Ansätze (3.1)/(3.13) have to be modified in models where the specific heat has a logarithmic singularity (like the 2D Ising model).<sup>18</sup> The scaling Ansatz (3.4b) should be replaced by [90, 68]

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{sing}}(g_t, g_h, \{g_{u_j}\}) &= -g_t^2 \log |g_t| \tilde{Y}_\pm(g_h/|g_t|^{y_h/y_t}, \{g_{u_j}|g_t|^{-y_j/y_t}\}) \\ &\quad + g_t^2 Y_\pm(g_h/|g_t|^{y_h/y_t}, \{g_{u_j}|g_t|^{-y_j/y_t}\}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

where we have assumed  $\alpha = 0$  and hence  $d\nu = d/y_t = 2$ . The scaling functions  $\tilde{Y}_\pm(x, \{z_j\})$  and  $Y_\pm(x, \{z_j\})$  must match appropriately when  $x \rightarrow \infty$  [68]. If we neglect the irrelevant fields and follow the same steps as in the pure power-law case, we arrive at similar formulae for the basic observables:

$$f(t, h=0) = -\tilde{A}_{f\pm} t^2 \log |t| f_0(t) + A_0(t) \quad (3.22a)$$

$$E(t, h=0) = -2t \log |t| \tilde{A}_{f\pm} f_1(t) + B_0(t) \quad (3.22b)$$

---

<sup>18</sup> The *mechanism* that causes the appearance of such logarithmic singularities can be described alternatively as a resonance between the thermal operator and the identity operator ( $y_I \equiv d = 2y_t$ ) [86, pp. 94–96], or as an interplay between the singular and regular parts of the free energy [90, 91, 92, 93].

$$C_H(t, h = 0) = -2 \log |t| \tilde{A}_{f\pm} f_2(t) + G_0(t) \quad (3.22c)$$

$$M(t, h = 0) = B_{0\pm} |t|^\beta m_0(t) \quad (3.22d)$$

$$\chi(t, h = 0) = C_{0\pm} |t|^{-\gamma} p_0(t) - \tilde{E}_{0\pm} |t| \log |t| e_0(t) + D_0(t) \quad (3.22e)$$

where

$$f_1(t) = f_0(t) + \frac{t}{2} \frac{df_0}{dt} \quad (3.23a)$$

$$f_2(t) = f_0(t) + 2t \frac{df_0}{dt} + \frac{t^2}{2} \frac{d^2 f_0}{dt^2} \quad (3.23b)$$

Here the coefficients  $B_{0\pm}$  and  $C_{0\pm}$  are exactly the same as in the pure-power-law case; the coefficients  $\tilde{A}_{f\pm}$  and  $\tilde{E}_{0\pm}$  are given by formulae similar to (3.11), except that  $\alpha$  should be set equal to zero and  $Y_\pm$  should be replaced by  $\tilde{Y}_\pm$ ; and the functions  $f_0$ ,  $m_0$ ,  $p_0$ , and  $e_0$  are the same as before. In deriving (3.22), we have assumed that

$$\left. \frac{\partial \tilde{Y}(x)}{\partial x} \right|_{(0)} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{Y}(x)}{\partial x^2} \right|_{(0)} = 0 \quad (3.24)$$

to ensure that there are no terms with multiplicative logarithms in the spontaneous magnetization, as the exact solution of the 2D Ising model shows [74], and to ensure there is no  $|t|^{-\gamma} \log |t|$  term in the susceptibility, as is also known [40, 76, 70]. Indeed, Aharony and Fisher [68] conjecture that, in the 2D Ising model, the functions  $\tilde{Y}_\pm(x)$  are in fact *constants*. If so, it follows from the analyticity of the free energy in  $t$  when  $h \neq 0$  that  $\tilde{Y}_+ = \tilde{Y}_-$ , and hence that  $\tilde{E}_{0+} = \tilde{E}_{0-}$  [68].

If we allow irrelevant fields, the above formulae generalize to

$$\begin{aligned} f(t, h = 0, u) = & -\tilde{A}_{f\pm}(u) t^2 \log |t| f_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j \tilde{A}'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] \\ & + t^2 \sum_j \hat{A}_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + A_0(t, u) \end{aligned} \quad (3.25a)$$

$$M(t, h = 0, u) = B_{0\pm}(u) |t|^\beta m_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j B'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] \quad (3.25b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(t, h = 0, u) = & C_{0\pm}(u) |t|^{-\gamma} p_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j \hat{C}'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] \\ & - \tilde{C}_{0\pm} |t|^{-\gamma} \log |t| \sum_j \tilde{C}'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} \\ & - \tilde{E}_{0\pm}(u) |t| \log |t| e_0(t, u) \left[ 1 + \sum_j \tilde{E}'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{\theta_j} + \dots \right] \\ & + E_{0\pm}(u) \sum_j E'_{\pm,j}(u) |t|^{1+\theta_j} \\ & + D_0(t, u) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.25c)$$

Here we also have assumed

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{Y}(x, \{z_k\})}{\partial x \partial z_i} \right|_{(0,0)} = \left. \frac{\partial^3 \tilde{Y}(x, \{z_k\})}{\partial x \partial z_i \partial z_j} \right|_{(0,0)} = \dots = 0 \quad (3.26)$$

to ensure that there are no additional terms with multiplicative logarithms in the spontaneous magnetization, as the exact solution shows [74]. Again the coefficients  $B'_{\pm,j}$  and  $E'_{\pm,j}$  are exactly the same as in the power-law-scaling case; and the coefficients  $\tilde{A}'_{\pm,j}$  and  $\tilde{E}'_{f\pm,j}$  are obtained from (3.11) by replacing  $Y_{\pm}$  by  $\tilde{Y}_{\pm}$ .

Let us now compare these expressions with the known results for the square-lattice spin-1/2 nearest-neighbor Ising model. The exact expressions for the free energy [73] and the spontaneous magnetization [74] can of course be Taylor-expanded in  $t$ ; only integer powers of  $t$  arise (along with multiplicative logarithms in the case of the free energy). The results for the internal energy and spontaneous magnetization are<sup>19</sup>

$$E(t, h = 0) = -\frac{2t}{\pi} \log |t| \left[ 1 + \frac{3}{2\sqrt{2}}t + \frac{17}{12}t^2 + \frac{5}{2\sqrt{2}}t^3 + \mathcal{O}(t^4) \right] + B_0(t) \quad (3.27a)$$

$$M(t < 0, h = 0) = 2^{5/16}(-t)^{1/8} \left[ 1 + \frac{9}{16\sqrt{2}}t + \frac{1243}{3072}t^2 + \frac{9259}{16348\sqrt{2}}t^3 + \mathcal{O}(t^4) \right] \quad (3.27b)$$

$$M(t \geq 0, h = 0) = 0 \quad (3.27c)$$

where  $B_0(t)$  is an analytic function near  $t = 0$ :

$$B_0(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \left( -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3 \log 2}{\pi} \right) t + \left( -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi} + \frac{9 \log 2}{2\sqrt{2}\pi} \right) t^2 + \mathcal{O}(t^3) \quad (3.28)$$

By comparing the expansions (3.27) with the RG formulae (3.22b,d)/(3.23), we can extract the first few terms of the functions  $f_0(t)$  and  $m_0(t)$ , and thus of  $a_0(t)$  and  $b_1(t)$ . Assuming the normalization  $a_{01} = b_{10} = 1$ , the results are

$$a_0(t) = t + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}t^2 + \frac{7}{24}t^3 + \frac{17}{48\sqrt{2}}t^4 + \mathcal{O}(t^5) \quad (3.29a)$$

$$b_1(t) = 1 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}t + \frac{23}{64}t^2 + \frac{191}{384\sqrt{2}}t^3 + \mathcal{O}(t^4) \quad (3.29b)$$

---

<sup>19</sup> The expansion for the internal energy is most easily obtained starting from its exact expression [73] in terms of a complete elliptic integral of the first kind,  $K(k)$ , and then using the expansion of  $K(k)$  near  $k = 1$ :

$$K(k) = A(1 - k^2) \log(1 - k^2) + B(1 - k^2)$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are analytic functions with explicitly known Taylor series at zero [94, eqs. 8.113.3 and 8.111.1] [95, pp. 46–55].

Using (3.7c) [or equivalently (3.9)] one can obtain the prediction for the smooth function  $p_0(t)$  appearing in the susceptibility<sup>20</sup>:

$$p_0(t) = 1 + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}}t + \frac{151}{768}t^2 + \frac{615}{2048\sqrt{2}}t^3 + \mathcal{O}(t^4) \quad (3.30)$$

For the zero-field susceptibility, no exact solution is known, but the first three coefficients of the asymptotic expansion

$$\chi = C_{0\pm}|t|^{-7/4} + C_{1\pm}|t|^{-3/4} + D_0 + \mathcal{O}(|t|^{1/4} \log |t|, |t|^{1/4}) \quad (3.31)$$

are known analytically [40, 76, 70], and several further terms of the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_0 = & C_{0\pm}|t|^{-7/4} + C_{1\pm}|t|^{-3/4} + D_0 + C_{2\pm}|t|^{1/4} + \tilde{E}_0 t \log |t| + D_1 t \\ & + C_{3\pm}|t|^{5/4} + \mathcal{O}(|t|^2 \log |t|, |t|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

have been inferred from high-temperature and low-temperature series [70].<sup>21</sup> (In particular, the terms  $|t|^{1/4} \log |t|$  and  $|t|^{5/4} \log |t|$  are found to be absent or at least to have very small coefficients.) Comparing the series for  $f$ ,  $M$  and  $\chi$ , Gartenhaus and McCullough [70] found that the ratios  $C_{n\pm}/C_{0\pm}$  for  $n = 1, 2, 3$  are in perfect agreement with the relation (3.30) based on the assumed absence of non-analytic corrections to scaling. For some reason, the irrelevant operators seem to have *zero* amplitude in the spin-1/2 nearest-neighbor 2D Ising model, at least up to  $\theta_j \approx 3$ .

Let us now consider FSS. For a system with a logarithmic specific heat, the Ansatz (3.14b) has to be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{sing}}(g_t, g_h, \{g_{u_j}\}, L^{-1}) = & L^{-2}(\log L) \widetilde{W}(L^{y_t} g_t, L^{y_h} g_h, \{L^{y_j} g_{u_j}\}) \\ & + L^{-2} W(L^{y_t} g_t, L^{y_h} g_h, \{L^{y_j} g_{u_j}\}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

(see also [93]), where  $\widetilde{W}$  and  $W$  are smooth functions, and we are assuming  $d = 2$  and  $\alpha = 0$ . If we neglect the irrelevant fields, the observables at criticality ( $t = h = 0$ ) are given by

$$f(0, 0, L^{-1}) = A_0(0, L^{-1}) + L^{-2}(\log L) \tilde{\mathcal{A}} + L^{-2} \mathcal{A} \quad (3.34a)$$

$$E(0, 0, L^{-1}) = B_0(0, L^{-1}) + L^{-1} \mathcal{F}(L^{-1}) \quad (3.34b)$$

$$C_H(0, 0, L^{-1}) = (\log L) \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(L^{-1}) + G_0(0, L^{-1}) + L^{-1} \mathcal{H}(L^{-1}) \quad (3.34c)$$

$$M(0, 0, L^{-1}) = 0 \quad (3.34d)$$

$$\chi(0, 0, L^{-1}) = L^{\gamma/\nu} \mathcal{C}(L^{-1}) + D_0(u, L^{-1}) + L^{-1} \mathcal{E}(L^{-1}) \quad (3.34e)$$

$$\bar{u}_4(0, 0, L^{-1}) = L^{2\gamma/\nu+d} \mathcal{C}_4(L^{-1})$$

---

<sup>20</sup> These results agree with those of Gartenhaus and McCullough [70, eq. (12)] once one notes that  $t = \beta_c t_{GM} = \log(1 + \sqrt{2}) t_{GM}$ , where  $t_{GM}$  is the parameter  $t$  appearing in [70].

<sup>21</sup> In particular, we have  $\tilde{E}_{0+} = \tilde{E}_{0-} \equiv \tilde{E}_0$ , in agreement with the prediction of Aharony and Fisher [68].

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\log L) L^{(\gamma+1)/\nu} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_4(L^{-1}) + L^{(\gamma+1)/\nu} \mathcal{E}_4(L^{-1}) \\
& + L^{\gamma/\nu} \mathcal{J}_4(L^{-1}) + (\log L) \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_4(L^{-1}) + \mathcal{K}_4(L^{-1}) \\
& + D_{0,4}(0, L^{-1}) + L^{-1} \mathcal{L}_4(L^{-1})
\end{aligned} \tag{3.34f}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{u}_{2n}(0, 0, L^{-1}) &= L^{n\gamma/\nu+2(n-1)} \mathcal{C}_{2n}(L^{-1}) + (\log L) L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu+2(n-2)+1} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2n}(L^{-1}) \\
&+ L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu+2(n-2)+1} \mathcal{E}_{2n}(L^{-1}) + \dots + D_{0,2n}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.34g}$$

$$\bar{u}_{2n+1}(0, 0, L^{-1}) = 0 \tag{3.34h}$$

where the coefficients  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{C}_{2n}, \mathcal{E}_{2n}, \mathcal{J}_4, \mathcal{K}_4$  and  $\mathcal{L}_4$  are the same as in (3.16), and the coefficients with a tilde are given by the same formulae with  $W$  replaced by  $\tilde{W}$ . We have also assumed that

$$\left. \frac{\partial \tilde{W}}{\partial x} \right|_{(0,0)} = \left. \frac{\partial^{2n} \tilde{W}}{\partial y^{2n}} \right|_{(0,0)} = 0 \tag{3.35}$$

The vanishing of  $\partial \tilde{W} / \partial x|_{(0,0)}$  is needed in order to suppress the terms proportional to  $L^{-1} \log L$  in the energy and specific heat, which do not appear in the exact asymptotic expansions (2.8a) and (2.9a) due to Ferdinand and Fisher [77].<sup>22</sup> The vanishing of  $\partial^{2n} \tilde{W} / \partial y^{2n}|_{(0,0)}$  with  $n = 1$  is needed in order to suppress the leading  $L^{\gamma/\nu} \log L$  term in the susceptibility, and the analogous vanishing for  $n \geq 2$  is needed to suppress the leading term  $L^{n\gamma/\nu+2(n-1)} \log L$  in the cumulants  $\bar{u}_{2n}$  (the numerical data for  $\chi$  and  $\bar{u}_{2n}$  fit nicely to a simple power law with no multiplicative logarithmic corrections: see Sections 5.3 and 5.7 below).<sup>23</sup>

**Remark.** Since we have assumed in (3.35) that *all* the derivatives of the function  $\tilde{W}$  with respect to its second argument  $y$  vanish at  $x = y = 0$ , it is natural to go slightly farther and assume that  $\tilde{W}$  is in fact independent of  $y$ . (This is the FSS analogue of the Aharony-Fisher conjecture that the functions  $\tilde{Y}_{\pm}$  are constants.) If this is the case, then  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2n}$  vanish as well, so that the sub-leading term in  $\bar{u}_{2n}$  will not be of order  $(\log L) L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu+2(n-2)+1}$  but rather  $L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu+2(n-2)+1}$ .

The equations (3.34b,c) for the energy and specific heat can be compared directly with the exact asymptotic expansions (2.8a)/(2.9a) obtained by Ferdinand and Fisher [77]. In particular, the ratio of their  $L^{-1}$  coefficients is predicted to be

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}(0)}{\mathcal{H}(0)} = \frac{a_{01}(L = \infty)}{2a_{02}(L = \infty)} = \sqrt{2} \tag{3.36}$$

from (3.29a). This is the same value we obtain from (2.8a)/(2.9a). This means either that (a) there is no  $L^{-1}$  term in the background contributions  $B_0$  and  $G_0$ , or (b) the

---

<sup>22</sup> The FSS expressions (3.34e)/(3.34f) for the susceptibility and  $\bar{u}_4$  also contain terms of order  $L^{-1} \log L$ . However, their amplitude is proportional to  $\partial \tilde{W} / \partial x|_{(0,0)}$ , so they vanish in the 2D nearest-neighbor Ising model.

<sup>23</sup> The FSS expression (3.34f) for  $\bar{u}_4$  also contain a term of order  $L^{\gamma/\nu} \log L$ . However, its amplitude is proportional to  $\partial^2 \tilde{W} / \partial y^2|_{(0,0)}$ , so it vanishes in the 2D nearest-neighbor Ising model.

$L^{-1}$  contributions of the background are exactly in the ratio (3.36), or (c) there is a miraculous conspiracy involving an irrelevant exponent  $\theta_j = 1$  (or  $\theta_j + \theta_k + \dots = 1$ ). The most plausible explanation, of course, is that  $L^{-1}$  terms in the background are absent, as are contributions of irrelevant operators at least through order  $L^{-1}$ .

If we consider also the irrelevant fields, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= L^{-2}(\log L) \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_j \tilde{\mathcal{A}}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + L^{-2} \left[ \mathcal{A} + \sum_j \mathcal{A}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + A_0(0, u, L^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.37a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} E(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= L^{-1} \left[ \mathcal{F}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{F}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + L^{-1}(\log L) \sum_j \tilde{\mathcal{F}}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \\ &\quad + B_0(0, u, L^{-1}) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.37b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_H(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= (\log L) \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + L^{-1} \left[ \mathcal{H}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{H}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + G_0(0, u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{G}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \\ &\quad + L^{-1}(\log L) \sum_j \tilde{\mathcal{H}}'_j L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.37c)$$

$$M(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) = 0 \quad (3.37d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= L^{\gamma/\nu} \left[ \mathcal{C}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{C}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + L^{-1} \left[ \mathcal{E}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{E}'_j(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + D_0(0, u, L^{-1}) + L^{\gamma/\nu}(\log L) \sum_j \tilde{\mathcal{C}}'_j L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \\ &\quad + L^{-1}(\log L) \sum_j \tilde{\mathcal{E}}'_j L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.37e)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_{2n}(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) &= L^{n\gamma/\nu + (n-1)d} \left[ \mathcal{C}_{2n}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{C}'_{2n,j}(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\ &\quad + (\log L) L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu + (n-2)d + 1/\nu} \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{2n}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \tilde{\mathcal{E}}'_{2n,j}(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\
& + L^{(n-1)\gamma/\nu + (n-2)d+1/\nu} \\
& \times \left[ \mathcal{E}_{2n}(u, L^{-1}) + \sum_j \mathcal{E}'_{2n,j}(u, L^{-1}) L^{-\theta_j/\nu} + \dots \right] \\
& + \dots + D_{0,2n}(0, u, L^{-1})
\end{aligned} \tag{3.37f}$$

$$\bar{u}_{2n+1}(0, 0, u, L^{-1}) = 0 \tag{3.37g}$$

where the coefficients  $\mathcal{A}'_j, \dots$  are the same as in (3.18), and the coefficients  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}'_j, \dots$  are obtained by replacing  $W$  by  $\tilde{W}$ . The final dots represent higher-order terms of order  $L^{-2-\theta_j/\nu} \log L$ ,  $L^{-2-\theta_j/\nu}$ ,  $L^{-2-\theta_j/\nu-\theta_k/\nu} \log L$ ,  $L^{-2-\theta_j/\nu-\theta_k/\nu}, \dots$

By comparing the above results for the energy and the specific heat to the exact asymptotic expansions (2.8a)/(2.9a), we can obtain lower bounds on the irrelevant exponents  $\theta_j/\nu$  that contribute to these observables in the spin-1/2 nearest-neighbor 2D Ising model. Since the correction term for the energy (2.8a) is of order  $L^{-2}$  or smaller, it follows that

$$\theta_j/\nu \geq 1 \tag{3.38}$$

unless

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x \partial z_j} \right|_{(0,0,0)} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{W}}{\partial x \partial z_j} \right|_{(0,0,0)} = 0 \tag{3.39}$$

so that the amplitudes  $\mathcal{F}'_j$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}'_j$  vanish; moreover, the strict equality  $\theta_j/\nu = 1$  can only occur if  $\mathcal{F}'_j = 0$  (i.e.,  $\partial^2 W / \partial x \partial z_j|_{(0,0,0)} = 0$ ). Likewise, since the correction term for the specific heat (2.9a) is of order  $\log^3 L / L^2$  or smaller, it follows that

$$\theta_j/\nu \geq 2 \tag{3.40}$$

unless

$$\left. \frac{\partial^3 W}{\partial x^2 \partial z_j} \right|_{(0,0,0)} = \left. \frac{\partial^3 \tilde{W}}{\partial x^2 \partial z_j} \right|_{(0,0,0)} = 0 \tag{3.41}$$

so that the amplitudes  $\mathcal{G}'_j$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}'_j$  vanish.

**Remarks.** 1. By taking into account our numerical results on the next correction terms for the energy and the specific heat (Section 2.3), the above bounds on  $\theta_j/\nu$  can be strengthened. If the correction term for the energy (2.8a) is indeed of order  $L^{-3}$ , as our fit suggests, then the above reasoning implies that

$$\theta_j/\nu \geq 2 \tag{3.42}$$

unless  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}'_j$  and  $\mathcal{F}'_j$  vanish. The same bound is obtained from the specific heat if the next term in (2.9a) is of order  $L^{-2}$ .

2. Nienhuis [67] has derived exact formulae for the critical and tricritical exponents of the 2D  $q$ -state Potts model ( $q \leq 4$ ) by mapping the dilute Potts model onto a

Gaussian-like model (see also ref. [96]). This procedure gives also the next-to-leading exponents, and it predicts for the 2D Ising model that

$$\theta_j/\nu = \frac{4}{3}. \quad (3.43)$$

However, Nienhuis argues that this exponent does *not* appear as a correction to scaling in the free energy itself, but only in its derivative with respect to  $q$ . Furthermore, Blöte and den Nijs [71] studied the random-cluster-model representation of the Potts model with  $q = 2 + \epsilon$  states. They found evidence for an irrelevant operator with  $\theta_j/\nu = 4/3$  associated to vacancy excitations, as predicted by Nienhuis. Moreover, the amplitude of this correction-to-scaling term was found to be of order  $\epsilon$ , so that it vanishes at the Ising model  $q = 2$ . On the other hand, they also considered other models in the Ising universality class that are expected to have enhanced vacancy excitations — the antiferromagnetic Ising model in a magnetic field and the Blume-Capel model — and in both cases they found, somewhat surprisingly, that the leading correction to scaling has  $\theta_j/\nu = 2$ . To make matters even more confusing, Barma and Fisher [69] found evidence for a  $\theta_j/\nu = 4/3$  correction in the double-Gaussian and Klauder models.

In the Ising model  $q = 2$ , one might expect to see  $\theta_j/\nu = 4/3$  corrections in the Fortuin-Kasteleyn bond observables  $S_2^{(2)}$  and  $S_4$  [defined in (4.13)/(4.14) and (4.27)/(4.28) below], which are connected to the fourth-order magnetization invariants  $\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{M}'^4 \rangle$  of the  $q$ -state Potts model by  $q$ -dependent formulae [see (4.33)/(4.34)].

### 3.4 Summary of scenarios for the two-dimensional Ising model

Let us summarize the above discussion by sketching the possible scenarios that could occur in the 2D spin-1/2 nearest-neighbor Ising model. We define the exponent  $\Delta$  to be the leading correction-to-scaling exponent in each quantity, whether it arises from non-analytic or analytic corrections or from the regular background.

First of all, the exact solutions (3.27) for the infinite-volume free energy and spontaneous magnetization tell us that if there are irrelevant operators contributing to these quantities with nonzero amplitude, then the corresponding exponents  $\theta_j$  must be integers. Moreover, if there are such corrections, then — barring miraculous relations among the correction amplitudes — the relation (3.9) between the correction terms in the free energy, spontaneous magnetization and susceptibility ought to fail at order  $t^{\theta_j}$ . But Gartenhaus and McCullough [70] have verified numerically that this relation holds at least through order  $t^3$ , suggesting that irrelevant operators are absent.

Let us now consider corrections to finite-size scaling. In FSS theory for systems with periodic boundary conditions, three simplifying assumptions have frequently been made:

- (a) The regular part of the free energy,  $f_{\text{reg}}$ , is independent of  $L$  [88] (except possibly for terms that are exponentially small in  $L$ ).

(b) The coefficients  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  (which arise in the scaling fields  $g_t$  and  $g_h$ ) are independent of  $L$  [89].

(c)  $g_L$  equals  $L^{-1}$  exactly, with no corrections  $L^{-2}, L^{-3}, \dots$  [88].

Moreover, in the 2D spin-1/2 nearest-neighbor Ising model, there is evidence that

(d) There are no irrelevant operators [68, 70].

We then have the following possible scenarios:

- (i) The simplest scenario is the one in which assumptions (a)–(d) all hold. Then we expect  $\Delta = 7/4$  for the susceptibility, higher magnetization moments  $\langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle$  and magnetization ratios  $V_{2n}$ ; and we expect  $\Delta = 11/4$  for the cumulants  $\bar{u}_{2n}$ . In this scenario, there would be *no* additional terms in the energy and specific heat expansions beyond those shown explicitly in (2.8a)/(2.9a) [except perhaps for terms that are *exponentially* small in  $L$ ]. Unfortunately, our numerical computations of  $L$ -dependence of the energy and specific-heat (Section 2.3) contradict this latter prediction.
- (ii) If there are no irrelevant fields and no  $L$ -dependence in the regular background, but we allow a smooth  $L$ -dependence in the coefficients  $a_k$  and  $b_k$ , then we expect  $\Delta = 1$  corrections in all observables. (The same happens if the scaling field  $g_L$  has corrections of order  $L^{-2}, L^{-3}, \dots$ .) The asymptotic expansion (2.8a) for the energy would contain additional terms  $L^{-2}, L^{-3}, \dots$ , and the expansion (2.9a) for the specific heat would contain additional terms  $L^{-2} \log L, L^{-2}, \dots$ . Note, however, that the  $L$ -dependence of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  is constrained by our knowledge that no term  $L^{-1} \log L$  appears in (2.9a); this suggests that further logarithmic terms  $L^{-2} \log L, L^{-3} \log L, \dots$  might be absent as well, in agreement with our numerical results (Section 2.3).
- (iii) If there are irrelevant fields, but there is no  $L$ -dependence in either the coefficients  $a_k, b_k$  or the regular background, then

$$\Delta = \min_j \frac{\theta_j}{\nu} . \quad (3.44)$$

Consistency with the Ferdinand-Fisher expansions (2.8a)/(2.9a) implies that  $\Delta \geq 2$  unless certain derivatives of the functions  $W$  and  $\bar{W}$  vanish at  $x = y = z = 0$  [cf. (3.39)/(3.41)].

- (iv) If we allow irrelevant fields and a smooth  $L$ -dependence in all the coefficients, then we have

$$\Delta = \min \left( 1, \min_j \frac{\theta_j}{\nu} \right) . \quad (3.45)$$

Finally, if we allow a smooth  $L$ -dependence in the regular background, then in all four scenarios the value of  $\Delta$  would be unchanged; the alterations affect only the subleading correction-to-scaling exponents. Note, however, that such a smooth  $L$ -dependence of the regular background is possible only if the terms of order  $L^{-1}$  come exactly in the ratio (3.36).

## 4 Description of the Simulations

### 4.1 Swendsen–Wang algorithm for the Potts model

The Swendsen–Wang algorithm [97] is defined for the ferromagnetic  $q$ -state Potts model; the special case  $q = 2$  corresponds to the Ising model.

The  $q$ -state Potts model assigns to each lattice site  $i$  a spin variable  $\sigma_i$  taking values in the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ ; these spins interact through the reduced Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Potts}} = -\beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} - 1) , \quad (4.1)$$

where the sum runs over all the nearest-neighbor pairs  $\langle ij \rangle$ . The partition function is defined as

$$Z = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} e^{-\mathcal{H}_{\text{Potts}}} = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \exp \left[ \beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} - 1) \right] . \quad (4.2)$$

Finally, the Boltzmann weight of a configuration  $\{\sigma\}$  is given by

$$W_{\text{Potts}}(\{\sigma\}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} e^{\beta(\delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} - 1)} = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} (1 - p + p\delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j}) \quad (4.3)$$

where  $p = 1 - e^{-\beta}$ .

The idea behind the Swendsen–Wang algorithm [97, 98, 99] is to decompose the Boltzmann weight by introducing new dynamical variables  $n_{ij} = 0, 1$  (living on the bonds of the lattice), and to simulate the joint model of old and new variables by alternately updating one set of variables conditional on the other set. The Boltzmann weight of the joint model is

$$W_{\text{joint}}(\{\sigma\}, \{n\}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} [(1 - p)\delta_{n_{ij}, 0} + p\delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j}\delta_{n_{ij}, 1}] . \quad (4.4)$$

The marginal distribution of (4.4) with respect to the spin variables reproduces the Potts-model Boltzmann weight (4.3). The marginal distribution of (4.4) with respect to the bond variables is the Fortuin–Kasteleyn [100, 101, 102] random-cluster model with parameter  $q$ :

$$W_{\text{RC}}(\{n\}) = \frac{1}{Z} \left[ \prod_{\langle ij \rangle: n_{ij}=1} p \right] \left[ \prod_{\langle ij \rangle: n_{ij}=0} (1 - p) \right] q^{\mathcal{C}(\{n\})} , \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}(\{n\})$  is the number of connected components (including one-site components) in the graph whose edges are the bonds with  $n_{ij} = 1$ .

We can also consider the conditional probabilities of the joint distribution (4.4). The conditional distribution of the  $\{n\}$  given the  $\{\sigma\}$  is as follows: Independently for each bond  $\langle ij \rangle$ , one sets  $n_{ij} = 0$  when  $\sigma_i \neq \sigma_j$ , and sets  $n_{ij} = 0$  and 1 with probabilities  $1 - p$  and  $p$  when  $\sigma_i = \sigma_j$ . Finally, the conditional distribution of the  $\{\sigma\}$  given the  $\{n\}$  is as follows: Independently for each connected cluster, one sets all

the spins  $\sigma_i$  in that cluster equal to the same value, chosen with uniform probability from the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ .

The Swendsen–Wang algorithm simulates the joint probability distribution (4.4) by alternately applying the two conditional distributions just described. That is, we first erase the current  $\{n\}$  configuration, and generate a new  $\{n\}$  configuration from the conditional distribution given  $\{\sigma\}$ ; we then erase the current  $\{\sigma\}$  configuration, and generate a new  $\{\sigma\}$  configuration from the conditional distribution given  $\{n\}$ .

## 4.2 Observables to be measured

We have performed simulations of the 2D Ising model at criticality on a periodic square lattice of linear size  $L$ . As it is convenient to view the Ising model as the  $q = 2$  case of the Potts model, we have used the Potts normalization throughout this paper.

We have measured the following basic observables:

- the energy density (i.e., the number of unsatisfied bonds)

$$\mathcal{E} \equiv \sum_{\langle xy \rangle} (1 - \delta_{\sigma_x, \sigma_y}) \quad (4.6)$$

- the bond occupation

$$\mathcal{N} \equiv \sum_{\langle xy \rangle} n_{xy} \quad (4.7)$$

- the nearest-neighbor connectivity (which is an energy-like observable [61])

$$\mathcal{E}' \equiv \sum_{\langle xy \rangle} \gamma_{xy} , \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\gamma_{xy}$  equals 1 if both ends of the bond  $\langle xy \rangle$  belong to the same cluster, and 0 otherwise. More generally, the connectivity  $\gamma_{ij}$  can be defined for an arbitrary pair  $i, j$  of sites:

$$\gamma_{ij}(\{n\}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \text{ is connected to } j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \text{ is not connected to } j \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

- the squared magnetization

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \left( \sum_x \boldsymbol{\sigma}_x \right)^2 \quad (4.10a)$$

$$= \frac{q}{q-1} \sum_{\alpha=1}^q \left( \sum_x \delta_{\sigma_x, \alpha} \right)^2 - \frac{V^2}{q-1} \quad (4.10b)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x \equiv \mathbf{e}^{(\sigma_x)} \in \mathbf{R}^{q-1}$  is the Potts spin in the hypertetrahedral representation<sup>24</sup> and  $V = L^2$  is the number of lattice sites

---

<sup>24</sup> Let  $\{\mathbf{e}^{(\alpha)}\}_{\alpha=1}^q$  be unit vectors in  $\mathbf{R}^{q-1}$  satisfying  $\mathbf{e}^{(\alpha)} \cdot \mathbf{e}^{(\beta)} = (q\delta^{\alpha\beta} - 1)/(q-1)$ , and let  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x \equiv \mathbf{e}^{(\sigma_x)}$ . For  $q = 2$  this means  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x = \cos(\pi\sigma_x) = \pm 1$ .

- powers of the squared magnetization

$$\mathcal{M}^{2n} = (\mathcal{M}^2)^n \quad (4.11)$$

- the square of the Fourier transform of the spin variable at the smallest allowed non-zero momentum

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \left| \sum_x \sigma_x e^{2\pi i x_1/L} \right|^2 + \left| \sum_x \sigma_x e^{2\pi i x_2/L} \right|^2 \right) \quad (4.12a)$$

$$= \frac{q}{q-1} \times \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^q \left( \left| \sum_x \delta_{\sigma_x, \alpha} e^{2\pi i x_1/L} \right|^2 + \left| \sum_x \delta_{\sigma_x, \alpha} e^{2\pi i x_2/L} \right|^2 \right) \quad (4.12b)$$

where  $(x_1, x_2)$  are the Cartesian coordinates of point  $x$ . Note that  $\mathcal{F}$  is normalized to be comparable to its zero-momentum analogue  $\mathcal{M}^2$ .

- the mean-square and mean-fourth-power size of the clusters

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \#(\mathcal{C})^2 \quad (4.13)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_4 = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \#(\mathcal{C})^4 \quad (4.14)$$

where the sum is over all the clusters  $\mathcal{C}$  of activated bonds and  $\#(\mathcal{C})$  is the number of sites in the cluster  $\mathcal{C}$ .

From these observables we compute the following expectation values:

- the energy density  $E$  per spin

$$E = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathcal{E} \rangle \quad (4.15)$$

- the specific heat

$$C_H = \frac{1}{V} \text{var}(\mathcal{E}) \equiv \frac{1}{V} [\langle \mathcal{E}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{E} \rangle^2] \quad (4.16)$$

- the bond density

$$N = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (4.17)$$

- the nearest-neighbor connectivity density

$$E' = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathcal{E}' \rangle \quad (4.18)$$

- the magnetic susceptibility

$$\chi = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle \quad (4.19)$$

- the higher magnetization moments

$$\chi_{2n} = \frac{1}{V^n} \langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle \quad (4.20)$$

- the higher magnetization cumulants

$$\bar{u}_{2n} = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle_{\text{conn}} \quad (4.21)$$

- the magnetization moment ratios

$$V_{2n} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n} \quad (4.22)$$

- the correlation function at momentum  $(2\pi/L, 0)$

$$F = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathcal{F} \rangle \quad (4.23)$$

- the second-moment correlation length

$$\xi = \frac{1}{2 \sin(\pi/L)} \left( \frac{\chi}{F} - 1 \right)^{1/2} \quad (4.24)$$

- the variant second-moment correlation length

$$\xi' = \frac{L}{2\pi} \left( \frac{\chi}{F} - 1 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (4.25)$$

which differs from  $\xi$  only by correction-to-scaling terms of order  $L^{-2}$

- the normalized cluster-size moments

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{V} \langle \mathcal{S}_2 \rangle \quad (4.26)$$

$$S_2^{(2)} = \frac{1}{V^2} \langle \mathcal{S}_2^2 \rangle \quad (4.27)$$

$$S_4 = \frac{1}{V^2} \langle \mathcal{S}_4 \rangle \quad (4.28)$$

**Remarks.** 1. In the general  $q$ -state Potts model, there is, in addition to  $\mathcal{M}^4 \equiv (\mathcal{M}^2)^2$ , a second fourth-order invariant of the magnetization:

$$\mathcal{M}'^4 = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{\alpha=1}^q \left( \mathbf{e}^{(\alpha)} \cdot \sum_x \boldsymbol{\sigma}_x \right)^4, \quad (4.29)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}^{(\alpha)}$  are the hypertetrahedral unit vectors. However, in the Ising model  $q = 2$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}^4 = \mathcal{M}'^4$ .

2. Using the Fortuin–Kasteleyn identities [100, 101, 102, 99], it is not difficult to show that

$$\langle \mathcal{N} \rangle = p(B - \langle \mathcal{E} \rangle) \quad (4.30)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{E} \rangle = \frac{q}{q-1}(B - \langle \mathcal{E}' \rangle) \quad (4.31)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle = \langle \mathcal{S}_2 \rangle \quad (4.32)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle = \frac{q+1}{q-1} \langle \mathcal{S}_2^2 \rangle - \frac{2}{q-1} \langle \mathcal{S}_4 \rangle \quad (4.33)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{M}'^4 \rangle = \frac{3}{(q-1)^2} \langle \mathcal{S}_2^2 \rangle + \frac{q^2 - 6q + 6}{(q-1)^3} \langle \mathcal{S}_4 \rangle \quad (4.34)$$

where  $p = 1 - e^{-\beta}$  and  $B = 2V$  is the number of bonds in the lattice. (Note that the coefficients in the formulae for  $\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{M}'^4 \rangle$  coincide at  $q = 2$ , but their first derivatives with respect to  $q$  differ.) As a check on the correctness of our simulations, we have tested these identities to high precision, in the following way: Instead of comparing directly the left and right sides of each equation, which are strongly positively correlated in the Monte Carlo simulation, a more sensitive test is to define new observables corresponding to the differences (i.e.,  $\mathcal{N} - p(B - \mathcal{E})$  and so forth). Each such observable should have mean zero, and the error bars on the sample mean can be estimated using the standard error analysis outlined below. The comparison to zero yields the following  $\chi^2$  values:

$$\text{For (4.30): } \chi^2 = 10.23 \text{ (14 DF, level} = 75\%) \quad (4.35)$$

$$\text{For (4.31): } \chi^2 = 17.00 \text{ (14 DF, level} = 26\%) \quad (4.36)$$

$$\text{For (4.32): } \chi^2 = 9.93 \text{ (14 DF, level} = 77\%) \quad (4.37)$$

$$\text{For (4.33)/(4.34): } \chi^2 = 9.05 \text{ (14 DF, level} = 83\%) \quad (4.38)$$

Here DF means the number of degrees of freedom, and “level” means the confidence level of the fit (defined at the beginning of Section 5 below). The agreement is excellent.

3. We also compared our data for  $V_4$  for  $L = 4, 6, 8, 12, 16$  with the exact values computed by Kamieniarz and Blöte [78] using transfer-matrix methods. We get  $\chi^2 = 5.14$  (5 DF, level = 40%), indicating good agreement.

For each observable  $\mathcal{O}$  discussed above we have measured its autocorrelation functions in the Swendsen-Wang dynamics,

$$C_{\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}}(t) = \langle \mathcal{O}_s \mathcal{O}_{s+t} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle^2 \quad (4.39)$$

$$\rho_{\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}}(t) = \frac{C_{\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}}(t)}{C_{\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}}(0)} \quad (4.40)$$

where the expectations are taken in equilibrium. From these functions we have estimated the corresponding integrated autocorrelation time

$$\tau_{\text{int}, \mathcal{O}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} \rho_{\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}}(t) \quad (4.41a)$$



$$= \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \rho_{\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}}(t) \quad (4.41b)$$

by the methods of Ref. [103, Appendix C], using a self-consistent truncation window of width  $6\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}$ . This autocorrelation time is needed to compute the correct error bar on the sample mean  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ . The integrated autocorrelation times for the observables  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$  satisfy the rigorous inequalities [61]

$$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{N}} \leq \tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}} \leq \tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}'} . \quad (4.42)$$

These inequalities are of course satisfied by our numerical data (see Table 4).

**Remarks.** 1. The estimation of the error bar for the specific heat is a little bit more involved. The specific heat equals  $V^{-1}$  times the mean value of the observable  $\mathcal{O} = (\mathcal{E} - \mu_{\mathcal{E}})^2$ , where  $\mu_{\mathcal{E}} \equiv \langle \mathcal{E} \rangle$  is the *true* mean value of the energy. If one knows  $\mu_{\mathcal{E}}$ , then the error bar on  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$  can be computed by the standard method. Unfortunately, we do not know (in general) the value of  $\mu_{\mathcal{E}}$ , so we use instead the sample mean  $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$  (which should be computed first). More details on the statistical theory can be found in [61].

2. The error bar of the second-moment correlation length is computed by considering the random variable

$$\mathcal{O}' = \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}} - \frac{\mathcal{F}}{\mu_{\mathcal{F}}} , \quad (4.43)$$

which automatically has zero mean. Then,

$$\text{var}(\hat{\xi})^{1/2} = \frac{1}{4 \sin(\pi/L)} \frac{\chi}{F} \left( \frac{\chi}{F} - 1 \right)^{-1/2} \text{var}(\mathcal{O}')^{1/2} , \quad (4.44)$$

where  $\hat{\xi}$  denotes our Monte Carlo estimate of  $\xi$ . In practice, the values of  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}$  and  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$  are replaced by their corresponding sample means (which should be computed first).

3. The error bar on the ratio  $V_{2n}$  is computed in a similar fashion:

$$\text{var}(\hat{V}_{2n})^{1/2} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n} \text{var}(\mathcal{O}_{2n}'')^{1/2} , \quad (4.45)$$

where  $\hat{V}_{2n}$  denotes our Monte Carlo estimate of  $V_{2n}$ , and the observable  $\mathcal{O}_{2n}''$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_{2n}'' = \frac{\mathcal{M}^{2n}}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^{2n}}} - n \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}} + n - 1 \quad (4.46)$$

and has mean zero. Again, the mean values  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}^{2n}}$  and  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}$  are replaced in practice by their sample means.

4. The error bar on the Monte Carlo estimates of the connected cumulants

$$\bar{u}_4 = L^{-d} \left( \langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle - 3 \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^2 \right) \quad (4.47a)$$

$$\bar{u}_6 = L^{-d} \left( \langle \mathcal{M}^6 \rangle - 15 \langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle + 30 \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^3 \right) \quad (4.47b)$$

are given by the following expression

$$\text{var}(\widehat{u_{2n}})^{1/2} = L^{-d} \mu_{\mathcal{M}^{2n}} \text{var}(\mathcal{O}_{2n}''')^{1/2} \quad (4.48)$$

where the auxiliary observables for  $n = 2, 3$  are defined as follows

$$\mathcal{O}_4''' = \frac{\mathcal{M}^4}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^4}} - \frac{6}{V_4} \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}} - \left(1 - \frac{6}{V_4}\right) \quad (4.49a)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_6''' = \frac{\mathcal{M}^6}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^6}} - \frac{15V_4}{V_6} \left[ \frac{\mathcal{M}^4}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^4}} + \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}} \right] + \frac{90}{V_6} \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}} - \left(1 - \frac{30V_4}{V_6} + \frac{90}{V_6}\right) \quad (4.49b)$$

and the mean values  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}^{2n}}$  and the ratios  $V_{2n} = \mu_{\mathcal{M}^{2n}}/\mu_{\mathcal{M}^2}^n$  are replaced in practice by their sample means.

5. As a further check on the correctness of our simulations, we have computed both sides of the identity

$$\rho_{\mathcal{NN}}(1) = 1 - \frac{(1-p)(2-E)}{pC_H + (1-p)(2-E)} \quad (4.50)$$

proven in [104, equation 7] (see also [61]).<sup>25</sup> This is a highly nontrivial test, as it relates static quantities (energy and specific heat) to a dynamic quantity (autocorrelation function of the bond occupation at time lag 1). We have also checked with great accuracy the identities [61]

$$C_{\mathcal{EE}}(t) = \frac{1}{p^2} C_{\mathcal{NN}}(t+1) \quad (4.51)$$

$$\rho_{\mathcal{EE}}(t) = \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{NN}}(t+1)}{\rho_{\mathcal{NN}}(1)} \quad (4.52)$$

$$C_{\mathcal{E}'\mathcal{E}'}(t) = \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right)^2 C_{\mathcal{EE}}(t+1) \quad (4.53)$$

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}'\mathcal{E}'}(t) = \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{EE}}(t+1)}{\rho_{\mathcal{EE}}(1)} \quad (4.54)$$

### 4.3 Summary of the simulations

We have run our Monte Carlo program on lattices with  $L$  ranging from 4 to 512 (see Table 1). In all cases the initial configuration was random, and for  $L \leq 64$  (resp.  $L \geq 96$ ) we discarded the first  $5 \times 10^4$  (resp.  $10^5$ ) iterations to allow the system to reach equilibrium; this discard interval is in all cases greater than  $10^4 \tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$ .<sup>26</sup> The

<sup>25</sup> Please note that [104] used a definition of energy that is slightly different from the one used here:  $E(\text{Ref. [104]}) = (1/V) \langle \sum_{\langle xy \rangle} \delta_{\sigma_x, \sigma_y} \rangle = 2 - E$ .

<sup>26</sup> Such a discard interval might seem to be much larger than necessary:  $10^2 \tau_{\text{int}}$  would usually be more than enough. However, there is always the danger that the longest autocorrelation time in the system may be much larger than the longest autocorrelation time that one has *measured*, because one has failed to measure an observable having sufficiently strong overlap with the slowest mode. As an undoubtedly overly conservative precaution against the possible (but unlikely) existence of such a (vastly) slower mode, we decided to discard up to 2% of the entire run. This discard amounts to reducing the accuracy on our final estimates by a mere 1%.

total number of iterations ranges from  $2.15 \times 10^6$  ( $L = 4$ ) to  $8.2 \times 10^6$  ( $L = 512$ ), and is selected to be approximately  $10^6 \tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$ . These statistics allow us to obtain a high accuracy in our estimates of the static and dynamic quantities (error  $\lesssim 0.17\%$  and  $\lesssim 0.51\%$ , respectively). The static data are displayed in Table 1 ( $E$ ,  $C_H$ ,  $\chi$ ,  $F$  and  $\xi$ ), Table 2 ( $S_2^{(2)}$  and  $S_4$ ) and Table 3 (the ratios  $V_{2n}$ ), while the dynamic data (autocorrelation times) are displayed in Table 4.

The CPU time required by our program is approximately  $6.3 L^2 \mu\text{s}$  per iteration on a Linux Pentium machine running at 166 MHz. The total CPU time used in the project was approximately 7.5 months on this machine.

We have improved the precision of our analysis by supplementing our own Monte Carlo data with comparable data from other authors:

1) We have used measurements of the susceptibility  $\chi$  and the energy autocorrelation time  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$  due to Baillie and Coddington [105, 106], who made extensive simulations using the Swendsen–Wang algorithm on lattice sizes from  $L = 8$  to  $L = 512$  (see Table 5). They performed between  $10^7$  and  $2 \times 10^7$  iterations on each lattice: this corresponds to an effort ranging from  $\approx 7$  times ours ( $L = 8$ ) to  $\approx 1.5$  times ours ( $L = 128, 256, 512$ ). Since they used exactly the same algorithm as we did, the correct ratio of their error bar  $\sigma'(\mathcal{O})$  to ours  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  must be

$$\frac{\sigma'(\mathcal{O})}{\sigma(\mathcal{O})} = \sqrt{\frac{N}{N'}} , \quad (4.55)$$

where  $N$  (resp  $N'$ ) is our (resp. their) number of Swendsen-Wang iterations after the discard interval. This relation applies to each lattice size  $L$  and each of the two observables  $\mathcal{O} = \chi, \tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$ . In Table 5, the first error bar shown for each observable is the “corrected” error bar  $\sigma'(\mathcal{O})$  determined by using (4.55) together with our own error bar  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  from Table 1 or 4; the error bar in parentheses is the one reported in Ref. [105, 106]. For  $L = 50$  and  $100$ , for which we have no data, we obtained the “corrected” error bar by using our runs at the nearby values  $L = 48$  and  $96$ . For the susceptibility, the agreement between the two error bars is good. The small discrepancies ( $\lesssim 20\%$ ) are understandable as statistical fluctuations arising from the way the error bars were computed in Ref. [105, 106]: they split the whole data sample into  $n = 16$ – $20$  independent batches and estimated the error bars from the dispersion among the batch means, a technique that leads to statistical errors in the estimated error bar of order  $1/\sqrt{n}$ . (By contrast, our windowing method is roughly equivalent to taking batches of size equal to the window width  $6\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}$ ; as a result, the equivalent number of batches is vastly larger, and the statistical fluctuations are much smaller. We therefore believe that our “corrected” error bars are more accurate.) For  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$ , by contrast, there are large discrepancies (up to a factor of  $\approx 2.5$ ) between the two error bars. We do not know the reason for these discrepancies, but we believe that our own error bars are more reliable: they have  $\sigma(\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}})/\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$  roughly proportional to  $(\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/N)^{1/2}$ , which is not the case for the error bars reported in Ref. [105, 106].

Comparison of the Baillie–Coddington raw data (with the “corrected” error bars) to ours at the seven overlapping  $L$  values yields  $\chi^2 = 4.07$  (7 DF, level = 77%) for the susceptibility, and  $\chi^2 = 6.81$  (7 DF, level = 45%) for the energy autocorrelation time.

The two data sets are therefore compatible; the estimates resulting from merging their data with ours (using the “corrected” error bars) are displayed in Table 6. Let us emphasize that irrespective of whose *absolute* error bars (theirs or ours) are more accurate, the correct way to merge the data is to use relative weights  $N : N'$ , as we have done.

2) We have also used measurements of the correlation length  $\xi$  obtained by Ballesteros *et al.* [107], who performed single-cluster [108] simulations of the 2D site-diluted Ising model at various concentrations  $\mathbf{p}$ . Their data for  $\mathbf{p} = 1$  (i.e., the usual Ising model) correspond to anywhere from  $4 \times 10^5$  to  $7 \times 10^5$  statistically independent measurements at each lattice size from  $L = 12$  to  $L = 512$  (see Table 7). The statistical independence of two consecutive measurements was achieved by allowing 100 single-cluster moves between them. Their error bars are slightly larger than ours. As a matter of fact, their error bars  $\sigma'(\xi)$  and our error bars  $\sigma(\xi)$  satisfy approximately the relation

$$\frac{\sigma(\xi)}{\sigma'(\xi)} = \sqrt{\frac{2\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}'}N'}{N}}, \quad (4.56)$$

where  $N$  (resp.  $N'$ ) is the number of measurements of our (resp. their) work, and  $\mathcal{O}'$  is the observable (4.43) we used to compute the correct correlation-length error bar. This supports the belief that their measurements are indeed essentially independent and that their error bars are correctly computed. Comparison of their raw data to ours at the eleven overlapping  $L$  values yields  $\chi^2 = 10.28$  (11 DF, level = 51%). The two data sets are therefore compatible. The corresponding merged data are shown in Table 8.

## 5 Data Analysis: Static Quantities

For each quantity  $\mathcal{O}$ , we carry out a variety of fits using the standard weighted least-squares method. As a precaution against corrections to scaling, we impose a lower cutoff  $L \geq L_{\min}$  on the data points admitted in the fit, and we study systematically the effects of varying  $L_{\min}$  on the estimated parameters and on the  $\chi^2$  value. In general, our preferred fit corresponds to the smallest  $L_{\min}$  for which the goodness of fit is reasonable (e.g., the confidence level<sup>27</sup> is  $\gtrsim 10$ –20%) and for which subsequent increases in  $L_{\min}$  do not cause the  $\chi^2$  to drop vastly more than one unit per degree of freedom (DF).

Let us note in advance a curious fact: Many (though not all) of our fits have an unusually high confidence level, frequently well over 95%. The simplest explanation for such behavior is that we have somehow overestimated our raw-data error bars. But the good agreement between our error bars for  $\chi$  and  $\xi$  and those of Baillie and Coddington [105, 106] and Ballesteros *et al.* [107], respectively — who used different

---

<sup>27</sup> “Confidence level” is the probability that  $\chi^2$  would exceed the observed value, assuming that the underlying statistical model is correct. An unusually low confidence level (e.g., less than 5%) thus suggests that the underlying statistical model is *incorrect* — the most likely cause of which would be corrections to scaling.

statistical methods — suggests that any such overestimation, if it exists, is small (less than 10–20%). So we really do not understand the reason for these unusually high confidence levels.

## 5.1 Internal energy

Let us begin with the energy. We first compare our results against the exact finite-volume solution due to Ferdinand and Fisher [77, eq. 2.6]. We obtain a good agreement  $\chi^2 = 6.77$  (14 DF, level = 94%).

We can also try to fit our data to the expected FSS behavior

$$E = E(\infty) + A_1 L^{-\Delta_1} + A_2 L^{-\Delta_2} + \dots, \quad (5.1)$$

truncating the series at various places. If we fit the results to a constant  $E(\infty)$ , ignoring any correction term, we are unable to obtain any reasonable fit, as the differences among the energies  $E(L)$  are much larger than the statistical error bars. If we keep the first correction term but ignore higher-order terms, we can try to simultaneously estimate the three parameters  $E(\infty)$ ,  $A_1$  and  $\Delta_1$  using a nonlinear weighted-least-squares fit. Our preferred result corresponds to  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$E(\infty) = 0.292893 \pm 0.000011 \quad (5.2a)$$

$$A_1 = -0.3081 \pm 0.0030 \quad (5.2b)$$

$$\Delta_1 = 0.9972 \pm 0.0032 \quad (5.2c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 4.00$  (9 DF, level = 91%). This is in perfect agreement with the theoretical prediction (2.8b). If we impose  $\Delta_1 = 1$ , then we can estimate simultaneously the parameters  $E(\infty)$  and  $A_1$ . The fit is already good for  $L_{min} = 8$ , yielding

$$E(\infty) = 0.2928860 \pm 0.0000056 \quad (5.3a)$$

$$A_1 = -0.31045 \pm 0.00077 \quad (5.3b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 4.65$  (10 DF, level = 91%). Motivated by the fits of  $E_c(L)$  – (2.8a) in Section 2.3, we can impose  $\Delta_1 = 1$  and  $\Delta_2 = 3$ , and estimate simultaneously the parameters  $E(\infty)$ ,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . The fit is already good for  $L_{min} = 4$ , yielding

$$E(\infty) = 0.2928880 \pm 0.0000057 \quad (5.4a)$$

$$A_1 = -0.31099 \pm 0.00083 \quad (5.4b)$$

$$A_2 = 0.135 \pm 0.027 \quad (5.4c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 5.36$  (11 DF, level = 91%). The second correction-to-scaling coefficient is compatible within errors with the amplitude we obtained in Section 2.3:  $A_2 \approx 0.1033415669$ .

## 5.2 Specific heat

Our specific-heat data also agree well with the exact finite-volume solution due to Ferdinand and Fisher [77, eq. 2.7]:  $\chi^2 = 13.48$  (14 DF, level = 49%).

Since we expect a logarithmic  $L$ -dependence for the specific heat, we first fit our data to  $C_H = A \log L + B$ . Our preferred fit corresponds to  $L_{min} = 32$ :

$$A = 0.6384 \pm 0.0017 \quad (5.5a)$$

$$B = 0.1675 \pm 0.0078 \quad (5.5b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 4.92$  (6 DF, level = 55%). The agreement with the asymptotic expansion (2.9b) is quite good. If we try to simultaneously estimate the first three terms in (2.9) (i.e.,  $C_H = A \log L + B + C/L$ ), we obtain a reasonable fit for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$A = 0.6359 \pm 0.0018 \quad (5.6a)$$

$$B = 0.1820 \pm 0.0087 \quad (5.6b)$$

$$C = -0.229 \pm 0.048 \quad (5.6c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 6.58$  (9 DF, level = 68%). These estimates agree within errors with the exact result (2.9b).

### 5.3 Susceptibility

The expected FSS behavior for the susceptibility is

$$\chi = L^{\gamma/\nu} [A + BL^{-\Delta} + CL^{-\Delta'} + \dots] \quad (5.7)$$

with  $\gamma/\nu = 7/4$ . If we fit to a pure power law  $\chi = AL^{\gamma/\nu}$ , a good fit is obtained for  $L_{min} = 16$ :

$$\frac{\gamma}{\nu} = 1.75043 \pm 0.00016 \quad (5.8)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 3.98$  (8 DF, level = 86%). This result is 2.7 standard deviations away from the theoretical value  $7/4$ . If we impose  $\gamma/\nu = 7/4$  and fit  $\chi/L^{7/4}$  to a constant  $A$ , a good fit is obtained for  $L_{min} = 48$ :

$$A = 1.09212 \pm 0.00021 \quad (5.9)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 3.35$  (6 DF, level = 76%).

An estimate of  $\Delta$  can be obtained by fixing  $\gamma/\nu$  to its theoretical value  $7/4$  and fitting  $\chi/L^{7/4}$  to  $A + BL^{-\Delta}$ , ignoring higher-order corrections to scaling. A good fit is obtained for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$A = 1.09238 \pm 0.00037 \quad (5.10a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.04 \pm 0.41 \quad (5.10b)$$

$$B = -0.033 \pm 0.029 \quad (5.10c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 2.64$  (9 DF, level = 98%). This estimate of  $\Delta$  is clearly consistent with  $\Delta = 1$ , but it is also consistent within one standard deviation with Nienhuis' [67] value  $\Delta = 4/3$ , and consistent within two standard deviations with  $\Delta = 7/4$ . The main fact to be noted is that the coefficient of the correction-to-scaling term  $B$  is

very small; indeed, it is compatible with zero within approximately one standard deviation. This explains why the estimate of  $\Delta$  is so uncertain.

Let us see now the results of fitting the data to the Ansatz  $\chi/L^{7/4} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed to the three most natural candidates (1, 4/3, 7/4):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 1.09241 \pm 0.00022 \quad B = -0.0305 \pm 0.0046 \\ (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 &= 2.66, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 99\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.11a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 1.09221 \pm 0.00020 \quad B = -0.0613 \pm 0.0093 \\ (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 &= 3.07, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 98\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.11b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= 1.09215 \pm 0.00017 \quad B = -0.1726 \pm 0.0063 \\ (L_{min} = 4, \chi^2 &= 6.13, 12 \text{ DF, level} = 91\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.11c)$$

These fits suggest that the exponent  $\Delta = 7/4$  is slightly favored as it achieves a similar confidence level with a smaller  $L_{min}$ . This is in agreement with the simplest scenario: no irrelevant variables (at least with  $\theta/\nu < 7/4$ ), and no  $L$ -dependence of the RG coefficients  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  (at least through order  $L^{-1}$ ).

Let us now redo the foregoing fits using the merged data of Table 6 (our data plus that of Baillie and Coddington [105, 106]). A simple power-law fit gives

$$\frac{\gamma}{\nu} = 1.75013 \pm 0.00017 \quad (5.12)$$

for  $L_{min} = 64$  with  $\chi^2 = 1.92$  (5 DF, level = 86%). A fit of  $\chi/L^{7/4}$  to a constant gives

$$A = 1.09215 \pm 0.00014 \quad (5.13)$$

for the same  $L_{min}$  with  $\chi^2 = 2.38$  (6 DF, level = 88%). The three-parameter fit gives for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$A = 1.09223 \pm 0.00019 \quad (5.14a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.35 \pm 0.26 \quad (5.14b)$$

$$B = -0.073 \pm 0.038 \quad (5.14c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 5.35$  (11 DF, level = 91%). These values are compatible within errors with the previous determination using only our own data. Once again, the estimate of the correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta$  is compatible within errors both with all three possible values 1, 4/3 and 7/4; and the coefficient  $B$  is again quite small (this time it is two standard deviations away from  $B = 0$ ). Finally, if we perform the 2-parameter fit  $\chi/L^{7/4} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed to 1, 4/3 and 7/4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 1.09236 \pm 0.00015 \quad B = -0.0288 \pm 0.0021 \\ (L_{min} = 12, \chi^2 &= 4.73, 11 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.15a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 1.09224 \pm 0.00012 \quad B = -0.0708 \pm 0.0040 \\ (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 &= 5.35, 12 \text{ DF, level} = 95\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.15b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= 1.09210 \pm 0.00011 \quad B = -0.1708 \pm 0.0054 \\ (L_{min} = 4, \chi^2 &= 8.00, 14 \text{ DF, level} = 89\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.15c)$$

Again, the above fits slightly favor  $\Delta = 7/4$  over the other two candidates.

In conclusion, we are able to extract very accurately the values of the critical exponent  $\gamma/\nu$  and the leading amplitude  $A$ . However, it is very hard to determine, from the available Monte Carlo data, the correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta$ . This is due primarily to the smallness of the correction-to-scaling amplitude  $B$ .

## 5.4 Fourier-transformed two-point correlator at momentum $(2\pi/L, 0)$

This observable is expected to have a FSS behavior similar to the susceptibility:

$$F = L^{\gamma/\nu} [A + BL^{-\Delta} + CL^{-\Delta'} + \dots] . \quad (5.16)$$

With a simple power-law Ansatz  $F = AL^{\gamma/\nu}$ , we get a good fit for  $L_{min} = 32$ :

$$\frac{\gamma}{\nu} = 1.74998 \pm 0.00050 \quad (5.17)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.00$  (6 DF, level = 99%). Note that a good fit is obtained here with a much smaller  $L_{min}$  than was the case for the susceptibility; this suggests that the corrections to scaling are even smaller in  $F$  than in  $\chi$ . Indeed, if we fit  $F/L^{7/4}$  to a constant  $A$ , we obtain a good fit already for  $L_{min} = 12$ :

$$A = 0.032718 \pm 0.000012 \quad (5.18)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 5.34$  (9 DF, level = 87%). There is a large drop in the  $\chi^2$  (by 3.4 units) at  $L_{min} = 32$ :

$$A = 0.032727 \pm 0.000014 \quad (5.19)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.00$  (7 DF, level = 99%). However, the two estimates agree perfectly.

If we fix  $\Delta = 1, 4/3, 7/4$  and perform the fit  $F/L^{7/4} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$ , we get in all cases values of the amplitude  $B$  compatible with zero within 1.5 standard deviations:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 0.03274 \pm 0.000018 \quad B = -0.00112 \pm 0.00076 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 16, \chi^2 = 2.95, 8 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.20a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 0.032732 \pm 0.000016 \quad B = -0.0029 \pm 0.0019 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 16, \chi^2 = 2.86, 8 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.20b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= 0.032729 \pm 0.000015 \quad B = -0.0093 \pm 0.0062 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 16, \chi^2 = 2.87, 8 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.20c)$$

We conclude that the corrections to scaling in the observable  $F$  are undetectably small.



## 5.5 Second-moment correlation length

The second-moment correlation length  $\xi$  and its variant  $\xi'$  [cf. (4.24)/(4.25)] are expected to behave as

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \xi \\ \xi' \end{Bmatrix} = L^p [x^* + AL^{-\Delta} + \dots] \quad (5.21)$$

with  $p = 1$ . We can estimate  $p$  by ignoring correction-to-scaling terms and performing a simple power-law fit. We get

$$\text{For } \xi: \quad p = 0.99974 \pm 0.00036 \quad (L_{min} = 32, \chi^2 = 1.48, 6 \text{ DF, level} = 96\%) \quad (5.22)$$

$$\text{For } \xi': \quad p = 1.00018 \pm 0.00036 \quad (L_{min} = 32, \chi^2 = 1.37, 6 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \quad (5.23)$$

The agreement with the theoretical prediction is excellent.

The value of the constant  $x^*$  can be estimated most simply by fitting the ratio  $\xi/L$  or  $\xi'/L$  to a constant, ignoring corrections to scaling. We get

$$\text{For } \xi: \quad x^* = 0.90577 \pm 0.00028 \quad (L_{min} = 32, \chi^2 = 2.02, 7 \text{ DF, level} = 96\%) \quad (5.24)$$

$$\text{For } \xi': \quad x^* = 0.90557 \pm 0.00026 \quad (L_{min} = 16, \chi^2 = 2.73, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \quad (5.25)$$

The estimate based on  $\xi$  lies 2.6 standard deviations away from the value  $x^* \approx 0.90505$  predicted by CFT [cf. (2.22)]. The estimate based on  $\xi'$  is slightly better: it lies two standard deviations away from the theoretical prediction, and works also for smaller  $L_{min}$ . Indeed, the corrections to scaling in  $\xi'/L$  are negligible (compared to our statistical error) already for  $L \geq 16$  (see the last column of Table 8).<sup>28</sup> This fact makes it almost hopeless to study corrections to FSS in  $\xi'$ .

If we fit  $\xi$  to (5.21), keeping the first correction-to-scaling term and trying to estimate simultaneously the three parameters  $x^*$ ,  $A$  and  $\Delta$ , a good fit is obtained for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$x^* = 0.90546 \pm 0.00033 \quad (5.26a)$$

$$A = 0.75 \pm 0.30 \quad (5.26b)$$

$$\Delta = 1.76 \pm 0.18 \quad (5.26c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 2.97$  (9 DF, level = 97%). The value of  $x^*$  is again two standard deviations away from the theoretical prediction (2.22). The estimate of  $\Delta$  is very close to  $7/4$ , is only 1.4 standard deviations away from 2, and is incompatible with 1; but perhaps this estimate ought not be taken too seriously, as the correction-to-scaling amplitude

---

<sup>28</sup> Table 8 is based on merging our data with that of Ballesteros *et al.* [107]; but virtually identical results are obtained using our data alone.

is only 2.5 standard deviations away from zero (a deviation that is, moreover, comparable to the discrepancy in  $x^*$ ). The analogous fit for  $\xi'$  is even more hopeless (the amplitude  $A$  is compatible with zero within 0.7 standard deviations), so we omit the details. This correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta \approx 2$  can be understood as arising simply from the ratio  $\xi/\xi' \equiv [(L/\pi) \sin(\pi/L)]^{-1} = 1 + (\pi^2/6)L^{-2} + \dots$ . Indeed, if we fit the data to the Ansatz  $\xi/L = x^* + AL^{-2}$  we get for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$x^* = 0.90569 \pm 0.00027 \quad (5.27a)$$

$$A = 1.269 \pm 0.064 \quad (5.27b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 4.56$  (10 DF, level = 92%). Then,  $A/x^* \approx 1.40$ , which is not far from  $\pi^2/6 \approx 1.64$ .

Since the estimates (5.24)–(5.27) of  $x^*$  are manifestly compatible with the theoretical prediction (2.22), it makes sense to *impose* the theoretical value for  $x^*$  and try to estimate the correction-to-scaling exponent and amplitude by performing a standard two-parameter fit  $\xi/L - x^* = AL^{-\Delta}$ . It goes without saying that the results are unlikely to be definitive, since the “signal”  $\xi/L - x^*$  is comparable in magnitude to its error bar (the statistical “noise”): indeed,  $\xi/L - x^*$  is less than two standard deviations away from zero for  $L \geq 32$ . There is an additional difficulty with such fits: when  $\Delta$  is unknown, one actually performs the above fit by doing the linear fit  $\log(\xi/L - x^*) = \log A - \Delta \log L$ , using a linear approximation to compute the error bar of the left-hand side:  $\sigma(\log(\xi/L - x^*)) \approx \sigma(\xi)/(\xi - Lx^*)$ . But if the error bar on  $\xi/L - x^*$  is *not* much smaller than its central magnitude, the linear approximation gives an incorrect result, and thus the fit is also incorrect. (Indeed, when the noise dominates, even the *sign* of  $\xi/L - x^*$  may vary from point to point, so that the logarithm is ill-defined.) There is a way to (partly) overcome this difficulty: we can consider the theoretical prediction for  $x^*$  (together with its corresponding error bar coming from the numerical integration, which in this case is essentially zero) to be an additional point at  $L = \infty$ . Then we perform the nonlinear 3-parameter fit  $\xi/L = x^* + AL^{-\Delta}$  by minimizing the  $\chi^2$ ; there are no logarithms involved, so the statistical theory of the fit is sound. However, the *error bars* on the fit are based on a linear approximation around the minimum, and thus are unreliable if the raw-data error bars are large.

Using the first method we get estimates around  $\Delta \approx 1.36$  at  $L_{min} \leq 8$  with  $\chi^2 \approx 11$  (10–12 DF, level = 38%–50%). At  $L_{min} = 12$  there is a large drop in the  $\chi^2$ , giving

$$A = 0.137 \pm 0.060 \quad (5.28a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.08 \pm 0.16 \quad (5.28b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 5.17$  (9 DF, level = 82%). There is another noticeable drop in the  $\chi^2$  at  $L_{min} = 32$ , and at this  $L_{min}$  the estimates for  $A$  and  $\Delta$  are both compatible with zero within errors. (This is unsurprising, as the constant fit  $\xi/L = A$  was good at the same value of  $L_{min}$ .) With the second method the fit is already good for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$x^* = 0.9050488292 \pm 0.0000000004 \quad (5.29a)$$

$$A = 0.58 \pm 0.18 \quad (5.29b)$$

$$\Delta = 1.63 \pm 0.14 \quad (5.29c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 4.46$  (10 DF, level = 92%). These results are quite similar to those obtained by the standard 3-parameter fit (5.26), but rather different from those obtained with the first method (5.28). The discrepancy is presumably due to the problems discussed above. For the reasons already discussed, we consider (5.29) more reliable than (5.28).

The analogous fits for  $\xi'$  give an amplitude  $A$  that is consistent with zero whenever the  $\chi^2$  is reasonable ( $L_{min} \geq 6$ ), so we omit them.

Finally, let us fix  $\Delta = 1, 4/3, 7/4, 2$  and fit to  $\xi/L - x^* = AL^{-\Delta}$ .<sup>29</sup> The results are:

$$\Delta = 1: \quad A = 0.050 \pm 0.020 \quad (L_{min} = 32, \chi^2 = 2.32, 7 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \quad (5.30a)$$

$$\Delta = 4/3: \quad A = 0.259 \pm 0.020 \quad (L_{min} = 12, \chi^2 = 4.86, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 90\%) \quad (5.30b)$$

$$\Delta = 7/4: \quad A = 0.769 \pm 0.033 \quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 5.21, 11 \text{ DF, level} = 92\%) \quad (5.30c)$$

$$\Delta = 2: \quad A = 1.765 \pm 0.214 \quad (L_{min} = 16, \chi^2 = 5.22, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 81\%) \quad (5.30d)$$

As in the susceptibility, the value  $\Delta = 7/4$  is slightly favored over the other candidates, as it needs a somewhat smaller value of  $L_{min}$  with similar values of the confidence level. On the other hand,  $\Delta = 2$  also gives a reasonable fit, and  $A/x^* \approx 1.95$  is not terribly far from  $\pi^2/6 \approx 1.64$ .

We can improve the precision of our numerical estimates by using the merged data of Table 8 (our data plus that of Ballesteros *et al.* [107]). The simple power-law fit yields

$$\text{For } \xi: \quad p = 1.00047 \pm 0.00033 \quad (L_{min} = 48, \chi^2 = 0.86, 5 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \quad (5.31)$$

$$\text{For } \xi': \quad p = 1.00074 \pm 0.00033 \quad (L_{min} = 48, \chi^2 = 0.82, 5 \text{ DF, level} = 98\%) \quad (5.32)$$

The fits to a constant give

$$\text{For } \xi: \quad x^* = 0.90565 \pm 0.00023 \quad (L_{min} = 48, \chi^2 = 2.92, 6 \text{ DF, level} = 82\%) \quad (5.33)$$

$$\text{For } \xi': \quad x^* = 0.90555 \pm 0.00020 \quad (L_{min} = 16, \chi^2 = 6.99, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 64\%) \quad (5.34)$$

---

<sup>29</sup> In this case we can safely perform the fits with any method (i.e., the 2-parameter fit  $\xi/L - x^* = AL^{-\Delta}$  or the 3-parameter fit  $\xi/L = x^* + AL^{-\Delta}$  with the theoretical prediction for  $x^*$  added as an additional point at  $L = \infty$ ). Both methods give identical results, as there are no logarithms involved in the computation.

The three-parameter fit  $\xi/L = x^* + AL^{-\Delta}$  is good for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$x^* = 0.90552 \pm 0.00026 \quad (5.35a)$$

$$A = 0.86 \pm 0.29 \quad (5.35b)$$

$$\Delta = 1.82 \pm 0.15 \quad (5.35c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 7.57$  (9 DF, level = 58%). The analogous fit with  $\xi'$  yields a correction-to-scaling amplitude compatible with zero within errors.

If we fix  $x^*$  to its theoretical value (by adding its theoretical prediction as an additional data point at  $L = \infty$ ) and perform the 3-parameter fit  $\xi/L = x^* + AL^{-\Delta}$  we obtain for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$x^* = 0.9050488292 \pm 0.0000000004 \quad (5.36a)$$

$$A = 0.63 \pm 0.17 \quad (5.36b)$$

$$\Delta = 1.67 \pm 0.12 \quad (5.36c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 10.66$  (10 DF, level = 38%). The analogous fit with  $\xi'$  yields a correction-to-scaling amplitude compatible with zero within errors.

Finally, if we perform the 2-parameter fits  $\xi/L - x^* = AL^{-\Delta}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed, and likewise for  $\xi'$ , we obtain for  $\xi$ :

$$\Delta = 1: \quad A = 0.029 \pm 0.020 \quad (L_{min} = 48, \chi^2 = 7.62, 6 \text{ DF, level} = 17\%) \quad (5.37a)$$

$$\Delta = 4/3: \quad A = 0.096 \pm 0.081 \quad (L_{min} = 48, \chi^2 = 8.26, 6 \text{ DF, level} = 22\%) \quad (5.37b)$$

$$\Delta = 7/4: \quad A = 0.767 \pm 0.031 \quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 11.16, 11 \text{ DF, level} = 43\%) \quad (5.37c)$$

$$\Delta = 2: \quad A = 2.067 \pm 0.333 \quad (L_{min} = 24, \chi^2 = 9.94, 8 \text{ DF, level} = 27\%) \quad (5.37d)$$

Again, the above fits favor the value  $\Delta = 7/4$  over the rest: the value of  $L_{min}$  is three times smaller than for the other candidates, and the confidence level is the best one.

In conclusion, one can extract accurate estimates of the critical exponent  $p$  and the amplitude  $x^*$  using our Monte Carlo data; the results agree with the theoretical prediction (2.22) within two standard deviations. However, it is very difficult to estimate from our numerical data the correction-to-scaling exponent (or the corresponding amplitude), even if we exploit our knowledge of the exact  $x^*$ . Indeed, for  $\xi'$  the corrections to scaling are negligible (compared to our statistical error) for  $L \geq 16$ .

## 5.6 The bond observables $S_4$ and $S_2^{(2)}$

The Fortuin-Kasteleyn bond observables  $S_4$  and  $S_2^{(2)}$  are expected to behave as  $L^{2\gamma/\nu}$  plus corrections to scaling. Their  $q$ -dependent connection with the magnetization moments  $\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{M}'^4 \rangle$  in the  $q$ -state Potts model [cf. (4.33)/(4.34)] suggests

that they might “feel” the vacancy operator  $\Delta = 4/3$  that is predicted [67, 71] to appear in the Potts model with  $q = 2 + \epsilon$ . As explained in Section 3.2, we also expect a correction term  $\Delta = 7/4$  coming from the regular background contribution to  $\chi = V^{-1}\langle\mathcal{M}^2\rangle$  and hence also to  $\langle\mathcal{M}^4\rangle \equiv \langle\mathcal{M}^4\rangle_{\text{conn}} + 3\langle\mathcal{M}^2\rangle^2$ .

Let us consider first  $S_4$ . If we fit our numerical data (Table 2) to the Ansatz  $AL^p$ , we get a good fit for  $L_{\min} = 128$ :

$$p = 3.49999 \pm 0.00078 \quad (5.38)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.16$  (2 DF, level = 92%). This value agrees perfectly with the theoretical prediction  $2\gamma/\nu = 7/2$ . We can estimate the correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta$  by fitting  $S_4/L^{7/2}$  to the Ansatz  $A + BL^{-\Delta}$ . The fit is reasonably good for  $L_{\min} = 8$ :

$$A = 1.31776 \pm 0.00069 \quad (5.39a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.023 \pm 0.068 \quad (5.39b)$$

$$B = -0.330 \pm 0.047 \quad (5.39c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 2.87$  (9 DF, level = 97%). The estimate for  $\Delta$  agrees very precisely with  $\Delta = 1$  and it is many standard deviations away from the other conjectured values (e.g.,  $4/3$  and  $7/4$ ). Moreover, the correction amplitude  $B$  is reasonably large in absolute magnitude, and is seven standard deviations away from zero. This contrasts strongly with the weakness of the corrections to scaling in the other observables we have examined.

Let us see now the results of fitting the data to the Ansatz  $S_4/L^{7/2} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed to 1,  $4/3$  and  $7/4$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 1.31796 \pm 0.00041 \quad B = -0.3140 \pm 0.0080 \\ &\quad (L_{\min} = 8, \chi^2 = 2.99, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 98\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.40a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 1.31688 \pm 0.00048 \quad B = -0.859 \pm 0.076 \\ &\quad (L_{\min} = 24, \chi^2 = 4.18, 7 \text{ DF, level} = 76\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.40b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= 1.31684 \pm 0.00054 \quad B = -5.13 \pm 1.03 \\ &\quad (L_{\min} = 48, \chi^2 = 2.98, 5 \text{ DF, level} = 70\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.40c)$$

These results give strong apparent support to the conclusion that  $\Delta \approx 1$  for this observable, which conflicts with our theoretical prediction that the leading corrections should be  $\Delta = 4/3$  and  $\Delta = 7/4$ . On the other hand, the exponent  $\Delta \approx 1$  could be merely an effective exponent that imitates the sum of two correction-to-scaling terms  $L^{-4/3}$  and  $L^{-7/4}$  with coefficients of opposite signs. To test this, let us try fitting to the Ansatz  $S_4/L^{7/2} = A + BL^{-\Delta} + CL^{-7/4}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed to 1 or  $4/3$ . We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 1.31782 \pm 0.00055 \quad B = -0.301 \pm 0.035 \quad C = -0.063 \pm 0.169 \\ &\quad (L_{\min} = 8, \chi^2 = 2.85, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.41a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 1.31704 \pm 0.00049 \quad B = -1.18 \pm 0.14 \quad C = 1.34 \pm 0.33 \\ &\quad (L_{\min} = 8, \chi^2 = 3.88, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 92\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.41b)$$

The data are thus *consistent* with the theoretical prediction, although they are also consistent with other scenarios.

A similar analysis can be carried out for the observable  $S_2^{(2)}$ . For a pure power law, the first good fit is attained at  $L_{min} = 128$ :

$$p = 3.49980 \pm 0.00075 \quad (5.42)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.18$  (2 DF, level = 91%). The fit  $S_2^{(2)}/L^{7/4} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  yields, for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$A = 1.34282 \pm 0.00063 \quad (5.43a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.097 \pm 0.084 \quad (5.43b)$$

$$B = -0.315 \pm 0.056 \quad (5.43c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 3.01$  (9 DF, level = 96%). Again, the estimate for  $\Delta$  is compatible within one standard deviation with the value  $\Delta = 1$ ; it is almost three standard deviations away from  $\Delta = 4/3$ , and more than six standard deviations away from  $7/4$ .

Let us see now the results of fitting the data to the Ansatz  $S_2^{(2)}/L^{7/2}$  to  $A + BL^{-\Delta}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed to 1,  $4/3$  and  $7/4$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 1.34322 \pm 0.00044 \quad B = -0.246 \pm 0.012 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 12, \chi^2 = 2.83, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.44a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 1.34214 \pm 0.00043 \quad B = -0.600 \pm 0.044 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 16, \chi^2 = 4.69, 7 \text{ DF, level} = 79\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.44b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= 1.34208 \pm 0.00047 \quad B = -3.08 \pm 0.50 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 32, \chi^2 = 3.76, 6 \text{ DF, level} = 71\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.44c)$$

Again, the above results give strong apparent support to the conclusion that  $\Delta \approx 1$  for this observable. But if we fit  $S_2^{(2)}/L^{7/2} = A + BL^{-\Delta} + CL^{-7/4}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed to 1 or  $4/3$ , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 1.34299 \pm 0.00054 \quad B = -0.217 \pm 0.034 \quad C = 0.20 \pm 0.16 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 2.88, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.45a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 1.34242 \pm 0.00048 \quad B = -0.84 \pm 0.13 \quad C = 0.80 \pm 0.32 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 3.62, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 93\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.45b)$$

The data are again consistent with the theoretical prediction, although they are also consistent with other scenarios.

In summary, the most favored scenarios are: a) there is a dominant  $\Delta = 1$  correction (and little or no subdominant  $\Delta' = 7/4$  correction); or b) there is a dominant  $\Delta = 4/3$  correction plus a subdominant  $\Delta' = 7/4$  correction with amplitudes of opposite signs. Scenario (b) is more plausible from a theoretical point of view, but we admit that our numerical evidence in no way favors it over scenario (a).

It is curious to note that, in the fits with a single correction term of fixed  $\Delta$ , the  $L^{-\Delta}$  correction amplitudes  $B$  in  $S_4$  and  $S_2^{(2)}$  are in all cases (i.e.,  $\Delta = 1, 4/3, 7/4$ ) in a ratio not far from  $3/2$  (i.e., 1.28, 1.43, 1.67, respectively). The same occurs in the fits with three correction terms and  $\Delta = 1, 4/3$  (1.39 and 1.40, respectively). As a result, these correction terms nearly cancel when we form the combination  $\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle = 3\langle \mathcal{S}_2^2 \rangle - 2\langle \mathcal{S}_4 \rangle$ .

Let us now test this idea by analyzing directly the observable  $\chi_4 = \langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle / V^2 = 3S_2^{(2)} - 2S_4$ .<sup>30</sup> A simple power-law fit  $\chi_4 = AL^p$  yields a good result for  $L_{min} = 128$ :

$$p = 3.49930 \pm 0.00080 \quad (5.46)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.40$  (2 DF, level = 82%). The 3-parameter fit  $\chi_4/L^{7/2} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  is good for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$A = 1.39319 \pm 0.00055 \quad (5.47a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.46 \pm 0.21 \quad (5.47b)$$

$$B = -0.38 \pm 0.17 \quad (5.47c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 3.74$  (9 DF, level = 93%). The estimate for  $\Delta$  is close to  $\Delta = 4/3$ , is less than 1.5 standard deviations away from  $\Delta = 7/4$ , and is 2.2 standard deviations away from  $\Delta = 1$ . If we fix  $\Delta$  to any of these three values and perform the subsequent fits, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 1.39388 \pm 0.00048 \quad B = -0.117 \pm 0.013 \\ (L_{min} = 12, \chi^2 &= 3.50, 9 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.48a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 1.39343 \pm 0.00040 \quad B = -0.289 \pm 0.018 \\ (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 &= 4.11, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.48b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= 1.39271 \pm 0.00034 \quad B = -0.699 \pm 0.011 \\ (L_{min} = 4, \chi^2 &= 6.58, 12 \text{ DF, level} = 88\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.48c)$$

The above results suggest that  $\Delta = 7/4$  is somewhat favored, as we can achieve comparable values of the confidence levels with a smaller  $L_{min}$ . This is consistent with our theoretical expectation that the  $L^{-4/3}$  corrections in  $S_2^{(2)}$  and  $S_4$  cancel out *exactly* in the linear combination  $3S_2^{(2)} - 2S_4 = \chi_4$ .

## 5.7 The cumulants $\bar{u}_4$ and $\bar{u}_6$

Before dealing with the ratios  $V_{2n}$ , let us consider first the cumulants  $\bar{u}_{2n}$  with  $n = 2$  and 3 in order to directly estimate their correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta$  and

---

<sup>30</sup> As pointed out previously in Section 4.2, there is no statistically significant difference between  $\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle$  and  $\langle 3S_2^2 - 2S_4 \rangle$ . In this section we shall deal only with the former; almost identical estimates are obtained with the latter.

compare the numerical results to the possible theoretical scenarios. The expected FSS behavior of these observables is

$$\bar{u}_{2n} = L^{n\gamma/\nu+(n-1)d} [A + BL^{-\Delta} + \dots] \quad (5.49)$$

Let us begin with  $\bar{u}_4$ . The simple power-law fit  $\bar{u}_4 = AL^p$  gives for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$p = 5.50076 \pm 0.00028 \quad (5.50)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 2.93$  (10 DF, level = 98%). This estimate agrees well with the expected value  $2\gamma/\nu+2 = 11/2$ . If we fix  $p$  to its theoretical value and perform the 3-parameter fit  $\bar{u}_4/L^{11/2} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  we get for  $L_{min} = 4$ :

$$A = -2.18512 \pm 0.00092 \quad (5.51a)$$

$$\Delta = 2.04 \pm 0.33 \quad (5.51b)$$

$$B = 0.65 \pm 0.31 \quad (5.51c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 5.95$  (11 DF, level = 88%). There is a noticeable drop in the  $\chi^2$  at  $L_{min} = 8$ , from 5.86 to 2.28; but the estimates for  $B$  and  $\Delta$  are then both compatible with zero within errors. Indeed, this is expected from the fact that at  $L_{min} = 8$  the  $\bar{u}_4$  data are compatible with a pure power-law behavior. The estimate (5.51b) for  $\Delta$  is two standard deviations away from the theoretically predicted value  $\Delta = \gamma/\nu + d - 1/\nu = 11/4$  [cf. (3.34g)]; it is one (resp. two, three) standard deviations away from the other candidates  $\Delta = 7/4, 4/3, 1$ . As the error bar in the amplitude  $B$  is quite large ( $\sim 50\%$ ), let us fix  $\Delta$  to the expected candidates and perform the two-parameter fits  $\bar{u}_4/L^{11/2} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= -2.18576 \pm 0.00102 \quad B = 0.058 \pm 0.022 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 2.88, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 98\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.52a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= -2.18532 \pm 0.00094 \quad B = 0.113 \pm 0.044 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 3.49, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.52b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= -2.18501 \pm 0.00088 \quad B = 0.260 \pm 0.106 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 4.22, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.52c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 2: \quad A &= -2.18517 \pm 0.00079 \quad B = 0.610 \pm 0.043 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 4, \chi^2 = 5.96, 12 \text{ DF, level} = 92\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.52d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 11/4: \quad A &= -2.18478 \pm 0.00081 \quad B = 2.396 \pm 0.367 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 6, \chi^2 = 5.89, 11 \text{ DF, level} = 88\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.52e)$$

The larger values of  $\Delta$  (2, 11/4) are weakly favored as they achieve a similar confidence level with smaller  $L_{min}$ .

The simple power law-fit to  $\bar{u}_6$  gives for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$p = 9.25116 \pm 0.00043 \quad (5.53)$$



with  $\chi^2 = 2.91$  (10 DF, level = 98%). This value agrees well with the expected value  $3\gamma/\nu + 4 = 37/4$ . The 3-parameter fit  $\bar{u}_6/L^{37/4} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  gives for  $L_{min} = 4$ :

$$A = 18.153 \pm 0.012 \quad (5.54a)$$

$$\Delta = 2.03 \pm 0.33 \quad (5.54b)$$

$$B = -7.97 \pm 3.83 \quad (5.54c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 5.94$  (11 DF, level = 87%). As for  $\bar{u}_4$ , there is a sharp drop in the  $\chi^2$  at  $L_{min} = 8$ ; but the estimates for  $B$  and  $\Delta$  are then both compatible with zero within errors. The estimate (5.54b) for  $\Delta$  is almost exactly equal to the estimate (5.51b) obtained from analysis of  $\bar{u}_4$ . If we perform the two-parameter fits  $\bar{u}_6/L^{37/4} = A + BL^{-\Delta}$  with  $\Delta$  fixed, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 1: \quad A &= 18.161 \pm 0.013 \quad B = -0.73 \pm 0.27 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 2.86, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 98\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.55a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 4/3: \quad A &= 18.156 \pm 0.012 \quad B = -1.42 \pm 0.55 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 3.47, 10 \text{ DF, level} = 97\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.55b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 7/4: \quad A &= 18.152 \pm 0.011 \quad B = -3.26 \pm 1.33 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 8, \chi^2 = 4.22, 12 \text{ DF, level} = 94\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.55c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 2: \quad A &= 18.154 \pm 0.010 \quad B = -7.63 \pm 0.54 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 4, \chi^2 = 5.95, 12 \text{ DF, level} = 92\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.55d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = 11/4: \quad A &= 18.149 \pm 0.011 \quad B = -30.06 \pm 4.60 \\ &\quad (L_{min} = 6, \chi^2 = 5.90, 11 \text{ DF, level} = 88\%) \end{aligned} \quad (5.55e)$$

Once again, the larger values of  $\Delta$  (2, 11/4) are weakly favored.

In conclusion, the value  $\Delta = 2$  seems to be preferred by the numerical data for both  $\bar{u}_4$  and  $\bar{u}_6$ , as it achieves a similar confidence level with a smaller value of  $L_{min}$ . This could be interpreted as a purely analytic contribution to  $\mathcal{C}_{2n}(L^{-1})$ , that is, to  $b_{10}$ :

$$b_{10}(L^{-1}) = b_{100} + L^{-2}b_{102} + \dots, \quad (5.56)$$

or else as a contribution of an irrelevant operator with  $\theta_j/\nu \approx 2$ . On the other hand, if there are no irrelevant operators and no  $L$ -dependence in the coefficients  $a_k$  and  $b_k$ , then we would expect  $\Delta = \gamma/\nu + d - 1/\nu = 11/4$ , which is certainly consistent with our data.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> In (3.34g) there are *two* terms with  $\Delta = 11/4$ : the normal one, and another one with a multiplicative  $\log L$ . On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that the logarithmic term has a vanishing amplitude: see the Remark after (3.35). If we fit the data to the 3-parameter Ansatz  $\bar{u}_{2n}/L^{n\gamma/\nu+(n-1)d} = A_{2n} + B_{2n}L^{-11/4} \log L + C_{2n}L^{-11/4}$ , we get estimates of the amplitudes  $A_{2n}$  and  $B_{2n}$  with error bars so large that no reliable conclusions can be drawn.

## 5.8 Magnetization moment ratios

If we study the magnetization distribution  $\rho(\mathcal{M})$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$  at fixed  $\beta$ , we expect three distinct behaviors depending on the value of  $\beta$ :

- (a) At  $\beta < \beta_c$ , we are in the high-temperature regime, where correlations decay exponentially. A variant of the central limit theorem [109] guarantees that the finite- $L$  distributions will converge, after rescaling by the factor  $\sqrt{V\chi}$ , to a Gaussian distribution of mean zero and unit variance.<sup>32</sup>
- (b) At  $\beta > \beta_c$  we are in the low-temperature regime, and the finite- $L$  distributions should converge, after rescaling by the factor  $VM_0$  (where  $M_0$  is the spontaneous magnetization), to the sum of two delta functions. There are Gaussian fluctuations around these two delta functions, but their width is much smaller, namely  $\sqrt{V\chi_0}$ , where  $\chi_0$  is the susceptibility in a pure phase.
- (c) At  $\beta = \beta_c$  [or more generally, at fixed value of the FSS variable  $L^{1/\nu}(\beta - \beta_c)$ ], the finite- $L$  distributions will converge, after rescaling by the factor  $\sqrt{V\chi}$ , to some non-Gaussian distribution characteristic of the critical Ising model in a finite box. This distribution is not, to our knowledge, known exactly.

We have computed the magnetization histograms at  $\beta = \beta_c$  for  $L = 4, \dots, 512$ . The sequence of histograms is expected to converge to a limiting distribution when we normalize the magnetization by  $\sqrt{V\chi}$  and normalize the height of the bins so that the area enclosed by the histogram is 1. For  $L \gtrsim 64$  the histograms converge well to a limiting histogram (Figure 3). For  $L \lesssim 48$  small corrections to scaling are observed: the peaks of the histogram are slightly taller than in the limiting histogram (see Figure 4). The limiting distribution is symmetric and very strongly two-peaked (with maxima at  $\mathcal{M}/\sqrt{V\chi} \approx \pm 1.11$ ); clearly the 2D Ising model at criticality in a finite symmetric torus is very far from Gaussian (e.g., we will find  $V_4$  much closer to 1 than to 3).

In order to characterize quantitatively this limiting distribution, we have measured its moments  $\langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle$  for  $n = 1, \dots, 10$  and have computed the corresponding ratios  $V_{2n} \equiv \langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle / \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n$ . We expect a behavior

$$V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty + B_{2n}L^{-\Delta} + C_{2n}L^{-\Delta'} + \dots \quad (5.57)$$

For each  $n$ , we have fitted our numerical data (Table 3) in two ways: a one-parameter fit to a constant  $V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty$  (fits marked with a C on the second column of Table 9) and a three-parameter fit to  $V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty + B_{2n}L^{-\Delta}$  (fits marked P in Table 9). In addition, for  $2n = 4, 6, 8, 10$  we have carried out fits  $V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty + B_{2n}L^{-\Delta}$  in which the theoretical prediction (2.25)/(2.28)/(2.29)/(2.30) for  $V_{2n}^\infty$  is imposed (fits marked P' in

---

<sup>32</sup> Previously this had been proven for finite subvolumes of an infinite system [110, 111], by a technique using the FKG inequalities. It has recently been proven by Newman [109] also for finite systems with periodic or free boundary conditions, by a different (but simple and elegant) method using the GKS, GHS and Simon-Lieb inequalities. We thank Professor Newman for communicating to us this unpublished result, which we hope he will someday publish.

Table 9). Since these theoretical values are themselves Monte Carlo estimates arising from the numerical integration, we have implemented this fit simply by considering the theoretical prediction to be an additional data point, with its corresponding error bar, at  $L = \infty$ . For  $2n = 4, 6$  the error bar on this  $L = \infty$  point is vastly smaller than the error bars on the other points, so this procedure is tantamount to imposing the limiting value  $V_{2n}^\infty$ . (However, as noted in Section 5.5, it is not equivalent to a standard two-parameter fit  $V_{2n} - V_{2n}^\infty = B_{2n}L^{-\Delta}$ , as no logarithm is involved.) For  $2n = 8, 10$ , by contrast, the precision on the theoretical prediction is not much better than that on our Monte Carlo data, so this procedure is really needed. In any case, the “signal”  $V_{2n} - V_{2n}^\infty$  is less than two standard deviations away from zero for  $L \geq 32$  for  $n = 2, \dots, 5$ . Thus, we should make the same observations about the reliability of the fits as in the correlation-length case (cf. Section 5.5).

As expected, the estimates of  $V_{2n}^\infty$  lie in-between the values associated to a Gaussian distribution (1.5) and those associated to a two-delta-function distribution (1.6). However, they are much closer to the latter values, reflecting the strongly two-peaked shape of the magnetization distribution.

The fits to a constant are excellent for  $L_{min} \gtrsim 32$ –64; for  $2n = 4, 6, 8, 10$  the estimates of  $V_{2n}^\infty$  agree with the theoretical predictions within about 2.5 standard deviations. The three-parameter fits are excellent already for  $L_{min} = 8$ : the correction-to-scaling amplitude  $B_{2n}$  grows in magnitude with  $n$ , while the values of the correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta$  are quite stable and are consistent with the theoretical prediction  $\Delta = \gamma/\nu = 7/4$  [cf. (3.19)] within two standard deviations.

Let us now look more closely at  $V_4$ . With the three-parameter fit, we obtain for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$V_4^\infty = 1.16777 \pm 0.00013 \quad (5.58a)$$

$$\Delta = 2.01 \pm 0.22 \quad (5.58b)$$

$$B_4 = -0.48 \pm 0.23 \quad (5.58c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.53$  (9 DF, level = 100%). The estimate of  $V_4^\infty$  is about one standard deviation away from the theoretical prediction  $V_4^\infty \approx 1.16792$  [cf. (2.25)]. The estimate of  $\Delta$  is reasonably close to  $\Delta = 7/4$ ; but since the estimated correction amplitude  $B_4$  is only 2 standard deviations away from zero, this estimate of  $\Delta$  should perhaps not be taken too seriously.

Better estimates of  $\Delta$  and  $B_4$  can be obtained by *imposing* the theoretical value of  $V_4^\infty$  (see row P' in Table 9). The result is good for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$V_4 = 1.1679227 \pm 0.0000047 \quad (5.59a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.87 \pm 0.17 \quad (5.59b)$$

$$B_4 = -0.36 \pm 0.14 \quad (5.59c)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 2.91$  (10 DF, level = 98%). These estimates are qualitatively similar to (5.58). The estimate for  $\Delta$  is compatible with  $\Delta = 7/4$  within one standard deviation.

Let us now look quickly at the analogous fits for  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$ . The three-parameter fits are all good for  $L_{min} = 8$ :

$$V_6^\infty = 1.45517 \pm 0.00037 \quad (5.60a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.90 \pm 0.16 \quad (5.60b)$$

$$B_6 = -1.39 \pm 0.48 \quad (5.60c)$$

$$\chi^2 = 1.66 \text{ (9 DF, level = 100\%)} \quad (5.60d)$$

$$V_8^\infty = 1.89163 \pm 0.00079 \quad (5.61a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.83 \pm 0.13 \quad (5.61b)$$

$$B_8 = -3.04 \pm 0.83 \quad (5.61c)$$

$$\chi^2 = 1.86 \text{ (9 DF, level = 99\%)} \quad (5.61d)$$

$$V_{10}^\infty = 2.5377 \pm 0.0015 \quad (5.62a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.78 \pm 0.11 \quad (5.62b)$$

$$B_{10} = -5.9 \pm 1.3 \quad (5.62c)$$

$$\chi^2 = 2.06 \text{ (9 DF, level = 99\%)} \quad (5.62d)$$

The estimates of  $V_6^\infty$ ,  $V_8^\infty$  and  $V_{10}^\infty$  are compatible with the predicted exact values (2.28)/(2.29)/(2.30) within 1.5, 1.3 and 1.2 standard deviations, respectively. The estimates of the exponent  $\Delta$  are compatible with  $7/4$ .

Better determinations of the parameters  $\Delta$  and  $B_{2n}$  ( $n = 3, 4, 5$ ) can be obtained if we fix the value of  $V_{2n}^\infty$  to its theoretical prediction (2.28)/(2.29)/(2.30) in the way discussed at the beginning of this section. The three fits are again good for  $L_{min} = 8$  (see rows P' in Table 9):

$$V_6^\infty = 1.4556489 \pm 0.0000072 \quad (5.63a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.79 \pm 0.12 \quad (5.63b)$$

$$B_6 = -1.11 \pm 0.31 \quad (5.63c)$$

$$\chi^2 = 3.24 \text{ (10 DF, level = 98\%)} \quad (5.63d)$$

$$V_8^\infty = 1.89248 \pm 0.00018 \quad (5.64a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.76 \pm 0.10 \quad (5.64b)$$

$$B_8 = -2.61 \pm 0.59 \quad (5.64c)$$

$$\chi^2 = 3.03 \text{ (10 DF, level = 98\%)} \quad (5.64d)$$

$$V_{10}^\infty = 2.53947 \pm 0.00033 \quad (5.65a)$$

$$\Delta = 1.712 \pm 0.083 \quad (5.65b)$$

$$B_{10} = -5.14 \pm 0.96 \quad (5.65c)$$

$$\chi^2 = 3.49 \text{ (10 DF, level = 97\%)} \quad (5.65d)$$

These estimates agree fully with those coming from the standard 3-parameter fits (5.60)–(5.62). In all three cases, the estimates for the correction-to-scaling exponent support the conjecture  $\Delta = 7/4$ . And, as  $n$  grows, the estimate for  $\Delta$  is farther away from  $\Delta = 2$  (0.8 standard deviations for  $n = 2$ , 1.7 for  $n = 3$ , 2.4 for  $n = 4$ , and 3.5 for  $n = 5$ ).

In summary, we have been able to estimate the limiting values  $V_{2n}^\infty$  with great accuracy; and in the cases where the exact values are known, our numerical estimates agree with the theoretical predictions within less than two standard deviations. Our numerical estimates for  $\Delta$  are compatible (within less than two standard deviations) with  $\Delta = 7/4$ . With the knowledge of the exact value of  $V_{2n}^\infty$ , the estimates for  $\Delta$  come closer to  $7/4$ , with a smaller error bar. The numerical data thus support the FSS behavior

$$V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty + B_{2n}L^{-7/4} + \dots, \quad (5.66)$$

which is compatible with the simplest scenario (no irrelevant fields and no  $L$ -dependence of the RG coefficients  $a_k$  and  $b_k$ ). However, it is also compatible with the other scenarios provided that the irrelevant exponents satisfy  $\theta_j/\nu > 7/4$  and the  $L$ -dependence in  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  starts at order  $L^{-2}$  or higher.

## 6 Data Analysis: Dynamic Quantities

The dynamic critical exponent associated to the observable  $\mathcal{O}$  in the Swendsen-Wang algorithm can be estimated by a simple power-law fit  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}} = A_{\mathcal{O}}L^{z_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}}$ . The results are quite similar for the three “energy-like” observables  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$ . The estimates for  $L_{\min} = 192$  are

$$z_{\text{int},\mathcal{N}} = 0.2259 \pm 0.0064 \quad (\chi^2 = 0.35, 1 \text{ DF, level} = 56\%) \quad (6.1a)$$

$$z_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}} = 0.2186 \pm 0.0068 \quad (\chi^2 = 0.11, 1 \text{ DF, level} = 74\%) \quad (6.1b)$$

$$z_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}'} = 0.2216 \pm 0.0069 \quad (\chi^2 = 0.16, 1 \text{ DF, level} = 69\%) \quad (6.1c)$$

These values of  $z_{\text{int}}$  are compatible within errors. Thus, we expect the corresponding autocorrelation times to be proportional for large  $L$ , and this is indeed the case:

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}}{\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}} = 0.8739 \pm 0.0029 \quad (L_{\min} = 32, \chi^2 = 2.23, 7 \text{ DF, level} = 95\%) \quad (6.2a)$$

$$\frac{\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}'}}{\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}} = 1.0218 \pm 0.0033 \quad (L_{\min} = 24, \chi^2 = 1.58, 8 \text{ DF, level} = 99\%) \quad (6.2b)$$

Here the error bars were computed using the triangle inequality, and so are expected to be overestimated; this explains the unusually high confidence levels. These three observables are the slowest modes (of those we have studied) in the Swendsen-Wang dynamics for this system. The autocorrelation times of the “susceptibility-like” observables  $\mathcal{M}^2$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  grow more slowly than those of  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$ , and a power-law fit yields

$$z_{\text{int},\mathcal{M}^2} = 0.1417 \pm 0.0060 \quad (L_{\min} = 192, \chi^2 = 0.052, 1 \text{ DF, level} = 82\%) \quad (6.3a)$$

$$z_{\text{int},\mathcal{F}} = 0.0650 \pm 0.0023 \quad (L_{\min} = 96, \chi^2 = 2.999, 3 \text{ DF, level} = 39\%) \quad (6.3b)$$

On the other hand, the data for  $\tau_{\text{int}}$  of the “energy-like” observables are also compatible with various forms of logarithmic growth. Indeed, the Li-Sokal bound [104, 61] shows rigorously that  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}/C_H \geq \text{const}$  for  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}'$ , and it is of interest to ask whether this bound is sharp. We will therefore investigate three types of fits in addition to the pure power-law fit already considered: one in which the Li-Sokal bound is sharp,

$$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}/C_H = A + \dots \quad (6.4a)$$

$$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}} = A' \log L + B' + \dots \quad (6.4b)$$

one in which it is sharp modulo a logarithm,

$$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}/C_H = A \log L + B + \dots \quad (6.5a)$$

$$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}} = A' \log^2 L + B' \log L + \dots \quad (6.5b)$$

and one in which it is not sharp,

$$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}/C_H = AL^p [1 + \dots] \quad (6.6a)$$

$$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}} = A' L^p \log L [1 + \dots] \quad (6.6b)$$

We shall focus on  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$ , as the other two observables give similar results. In Table 10 we show the values of the ratio  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}/C_H$  obtained by merging our data with that of Baillie and Coddington [105, 106]. We emphasize that we use the *exact* expression for  $C_H(L)$  from [77, eq. (2.7)], *not* the asymptotic expansion (2.9a)/(2.9b). We observe that the behavior of  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{O}}/C_H$  as a function of  $L$  is strongly non-monotonic: it decreases for  $4 \lesssim L \lesssim 16$ , and grows for  $L \gtrsim 16$ .

1) *Fits to sharp Li-Sokal bound.* If we fit  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$  to the Ansatz  $A' \log L + B'$ , we obtain a good fit for  $L_{\min} = 96$ :

$$A' = 1.551 \pm 0.025 \quad (6.7a)$$

$$B' = -1.65 \pm 0.13 \quad (6.7b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.99$  (3 DF, level = 80%). Alternatively, we can try to fit  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H$  to a constant  $A$ , using here the *exact* value of the specific heat  $C_H$  at lattice size  $L$ . In all cases we obtain horrible fits ( $\chi^2/\text{DF} \gtrsim 28$ ). This is unsurprising as  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H$  is clearly non-constant (see Table 10). The result (6.7) suggests the existence of an additive logarithmic correction:  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H = A + B/\log L$ . The fit to this Ansatz is good for  $L_{\min} = 96$ :

$$A = 2.403 \pm 0.038 \quad (6.8a)$$

$$B = -2.93 \pm 0.19 \quad (6.8b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.17$  (3 DF, level = 76%). Note, however, that the correction amplitude  $B$  is quite large; in particular, the correction  $B/(A \log L)$  is  $\approx 20\%$  even for  $L = 512$ . One could also try the Ansatz  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H = A + BL^{-\Delta}$ . In this case we obtain the first good fit for  $L_{\min} = 32$  yielding  $\Delta = -0.164 \pm 0.081$  with  $\chi^2 = 3.33$  (5 DF, level =

65%). This result is inconsistent, as it means that the ratio  $\tau_{\text{int},\varepsilon}/C_H$  actually grows like  $\sim L^{0.164}$ , instead of remaining bounded by a constant. There is a large drop in the  $\chi^2$  at  $L_{\min} = 64$ , but this time the three estimates are compatible with zero within errors. So we conclude that our data is not compatible with a bounded ratio  $\tau_{\text{int},\varepsilon}/C_H$  plus power-like corrections to scaling.

2) *Fits to Li-Sokal bound sharp modulo a logarithm.* If we fit  $\tau_{\text{int},\varepsilon}$  to the Ansatz  $A' \log^2 L + B' \log L$ , we obtain a good fit for  $L_{\min} = 64$ :

$$A' = 0.0584 \pm 0.0036 \quad (6.9a)$$

$$B' = 0.926 \pm 0.019 \quad (6.9b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.24$  (4 DF, level = 99%). Alternatively, we can try to fit  $\tau_{\text{int},\varepsilon}/C_H$  to the Ansatz  $A \log L + B$ ; we get a reasonable fit already for  $L_{\min} = 64$ :

$$A = 0.1047 \pm 0.0054 \quad (6.10a)$$

$$B = 1.289 \pm 0.028 \quad (6.10b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.38$  (4 DF, level = 98%). Note the smallness of the leading coefficient  $A'$  or  $A$ .

3) *Fits to non-sharp Li-Sokal bound.* If we fit  $\tau_{\text{int},\varepsilon}/C_H$  to the Ansatz (6.6a), the first good fit corresponds to  $L_{\min} = 64$ :

$$A = 1.361 \pm 0.021 \quad (6.11a)$$

$$p = 0.0571 \pm 0.0029 \quad (6.11b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.81$  (4 DF, level = 94%). A fit to the Ansatz (6.6b) yields similar results:

$$A' = 0.960 \pm 0.015 \quad (6.12a)$$

$$p = 0.0475 \pm 0.0030 \quad (6.12b)$$

with  $L_{\min} = 64$  and  $\chi^2 = 0.38$  (4 DF, level = 98%). As in previous works [62, 61, 63], we find that the Li-Sokal bound might be non-sharp by a small power  $p$ .

The  $\chi^2$  values for the three fits are excellent: in all cases they are  $< 1$  for 3–4 degrees of freedom. However, the  $L_{\min}$  needed to achieve our preferred fit differs from one Ansatz to another. The non-sharp Ansätze (6.5) and (6.6) work with a slightly smaller value of  $L_{\min}$  than the sharp Ansatz (6.4) or the pure power-law fit (6.1b):  $L_{\min} = 64$  for the former versus  $L_{\min} = 96, 192$  for the latter ones. The  $\chi^2$  value associated to the non-sharp-by-a-logarithm Ansatz (6.5) is slightly better than that associated to the non-sharp-by-a-power Ansatz (6.6), but the difference is probably not significant. Thus, our data favor slightly the non-sharp-by-a-logarithm Ansatz over the non-sharp-by-a-power Ansatz, while the sharp Ansatz and the pure power-law Ansatz are least favored; but no definitive conclusion can be drawn.

This is in agreement with our previous findings in the Ashkin–Teller [62], 3-state Potts [61] and 4-state Potts [63] models, where we concluded that the Li-Sokal bound was either violated by a logarithm or by a small power  $p \approx 0.060$  [62]. However, we were unable to distinguish between them.

We can perform similar fits with the merged data (Table 6). A simple power-law fit is good for  $L_{min} = 192$ , yielding

$$z_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}} = 0.2265 \pm 0.0050 \quad (6.13)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.017$  (1 DF, level = 97%). The other fits are as follows:

1) *Fits to sharp Li-Sokal bound.* The fit  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}} = A' \log L + B'$  is good only when  $L_{min}$  as high as 192:

$$A' = 1.665 \pm 0.037 \quad (6.14a)$$

$$B' = -2.28 \pm 0.21 \quad (6.14b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.44$  (1 DF, level = 23%). If try to fit the ratio  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H$  to a constant  $A$ , we obtain horrible fits for all  $L_{min}$ . If we include an additive logarithmic correction  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H = A + B/\log L$ , we obtain a good fit for  $L_{min} = 192$ :

$$A = 2.580 \pm 0.056 \quad (6.15a)$$

$$B = -3.92 \pm 0.32 \quad (6.15b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.50$  (1 DF, level = 22%).

2) *Fits to Li-Sokal bound sharp modulo a logarithm.* For the Ansätze (6.5a) and (6.5b), a good fit is obtained already for  $L_{min} = 96$ :

$$A = 0.1101 \pm 0.0042 \quad (6.16a)$$

$$B = 1.264 \pm 0.022 \quad (6.16b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.47$  (4 DF, level = 83%), and

$$A' = 0.0627 \pm 0.0028 \quad (6.17a)$$

$$B' = 0.906 \pm 0.015 \quad (6.17b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.83$  (4 DF, level = 77%), respectively.

3) *Fits to non-sharp Li-Sokal bound.* Likewise, for the Ansätze (6.6a) and (6.6b),  $L_{min} = 96$  suffices:

$$A = 1.348 \pm 0.0016 \quad (6.18a)$$

$$p = 0.0593 \pm 0.0023 \quad (6.18b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 0.97$  (4 DF, level = 91%), and

$$A' = 0.947 \pm 0.0011 \quad (6.19a)$$

$$p = 0.0504 \pm 0.0023 \quad (6.19b)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 1.35$  (4 DF, level = 85%), respectively.

The conclusions are similar to those obtained using our data alone, but distinguish the Ansätze a bit more cleanly. In particular, the sharp Ansatz (6.4) is clearly disfavored: it requires a much larger  $L_{min}$  than the Ansätze (6.5) and (6.6) [192



versus 96], and even so achieves a poorer confidence level [22–23% versus 77–91%]. The pure power-law fit (6.13) is also disfavored, as it requires  $L_{\min} = 192$  (though it then achieves an excellent  $\chi^2$ ). Finally, the non-sharp-by-a-power Ansatz (6.6) is now slightly favored over the non-sharp-by-a-logarithm Ansatz (6.5), but the difference is again probably not significant. We conclude that the Li-Sokal bound is likely non-sharp, either by a small power  $p \approx 0.06$  or by a logarithm.

**Remark.** The integrated autocorrelation times for the “susceptibility-like” observables ( $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{M}^2, \mathcal{F}$ ) behave in a rather different way: the ratio  $\tau_{\text{int}, \mathcal{O}}/C_H$  decreases as  $L$  is increased.

## 7 Conclusions and Open Questions

### 7.1 Summary of our results

We have computed, using results from conformal field theory (CFT), the exact (except for numerical integration) values of five universal amplitude ratios characterizing the 2D Ising model at criticality on a symmetric torus: the correlation-length ratio  $x^*$  and the magnetization moment ratios  $V_4$ ,  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$ . All except for  $V_4$  are new, and we have improved previous CFT determinations of  $V_4$  by three orders of magnitude (reaching precision similar to that obtained by transfer-matrix approaches). As a corollary, we have computed the exact value  $G^*$  of the dimensionless renormalized four-point coupling constant at criticality on a symmetric torus.

We have checked all these theoretical predictions by means of a high-precision Monte Carlo simulation. Using finite-size-scaling (FSS) techniques, we have tried to determine the leading term as well as the correction-to-scaling terms. We confirm to very high precision the theoretically predicted critical exponents associated to the susceptibility, the observable  $F$ , the correlation length, the cumulants  $\bar{u}_4$  and  $\bar{u}_6$ , and the bond observables  $S_4$  and  $S_2^{(2)}$  (error bars  $\lesssim 0.04\%$ ); we also measure to very high precision the corresponding nonuniversal amplitudes (error bars  $\lesssim 0.04\%$ ). Finally, we confirm to high precision the theoretically predicted universal amplitude ratios  $x^*$ ,  $V_4$ ,  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$  (error bars  $\lesssim 0.06\%$ ).

The determination of the leading correction-to-scaling exponent  $\Delta$  has proved to be very difficult. For nearly all observables, the correction-to-scaling amplitude is extremely small, which makes it very difficult to estimate the exponent  $\Delta$  with any accuracy.

The energy and the specific heat have been the easiest observables to analyze, as the first two or three terms of their FSS expansions are exactly known [77]. Our data are fully compatible with these exact asymptotic expansions, and in particular with the  $L^{-1}$  correction in both observables. Moreover, our numerical calculations using the exact Ferdinand–Fisher formulae (Section 2.3) have suggested what the next terms in these expansions may be. The existence of such additional correction-to-scaling terms implies that there is an  $L$ -dependence in the regular background  $f_{\text{reg}}$  and/or that there is an  $L$ -dependence in the nonlinear scaling fields  $g_t$  and  $g_h$  and/or that  $g_L$  is not exactly  $1/L$ .

For the susceptibility, our data are consistent with the prediction of the simplest theoretical scenario — in which irrelevant operators are absent, and there is no  $L$ -dependence in the nonlinear scaling fields — that the leading correction to FSS is the regular background term ( $\Delta = 7/4$ ). But the error bars on  $\Delta$  are so large that many other possible values (e.g. 1,  $4/3$ ) are equally compatible with the data. The correction-to-scaling amplitude is only 2 standard deviations away from zero.

For the modified correlation length  $\xi'$ , the corrections to FSS are so weak that they are essentially invisible for  $L \geq 16$ ; and no reliable conclusions can be obtained from our data for  $L = 4, 6, 8, 12$ . For the standard correlation length  $\xi$ , the leading correction to scaling might be  $\Delta = 7/4$ , or it might be  $\Delta = 2$  arising from  $\xi/\xi' \equiv [(L/\pi) \sin(\pi/L)]^{-1} = 1 + (\pi^2/6)L^{-2} + \dots$ . Our knowledge of the exact leading amplitude  $x^*$  does not, unfortunately, help much in determining the leading correction-to-scaling exponent. However, we expect that the knowledge of  $x^*$  could be very helpful for determining the correction-to-scaling exponent in *other* models in the Ising universality class where the leading correction-to-scaling amplitude is not so small.

For the cumulants  $\bar{u}_4$  and  $\bar{u}_6$ , our data are consistent with the prediction  $\Delta = 11/4$  of the simplest theoretical scenario, but the error bars are again large.

For the observables  $V_4$ ,  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$ , we are in a somewhat better position, as we can exploit our exact knowledge of the leading amplitude to obtain improved estimates of  $\Delta$ . These estimates indicate rather strongly that  $\Delta \approx 7/4$ , once again in agreement with the simplest theoretical scenario.

Only for the Fortuin-Kasteleyn bond observables  $S_4$  and  $S_2^{(2)}$  are the corrections to scaling reasonably strong: the amplitudes differ from zero by more than six standard deviations. Naive analysis of these data suggests that  $\Delta \approx 1$  with an error bar less than 0.1; but the data are also consistent with a dominant  $\Delta = 4/3$  correction combined with a subdominant  $\Delta' = 7/4$  correction, with amplitudes of opposite signs. The  $\Delta = 4/3$  correction would arise [67, 71] from a vacancy operator in the  $q$ -state Potts model with  $q = 2 + \epsilon$  that couples with an amplitude of order  $\epsilon$ , and which would be seen in  $S_4$  and  $S_2^{(2)}$  because of their  $q$ -dependent connection with the fourth-order magnetization invariants  $\langle \mathcal{M}^4 \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{M}'^4 \rangle$  of the  $q$ -state Potts model. The  $\Delta' = 7/4$  correction would come from the regular background contribution to the susceptibility.

## 7.2 Prospects for future work

Our work suggests some questions for future study:

1) It would be useful to understand analytically the terms beyond (2.8)/(2.9) in the asymptotic expansions [77, 112] for the finite-volume energy and specific heat at criticality (or more generally, at fixed values of the FSS variable  $x = Lt$ ). In particular, this could shed light on theoretical issues associated with corrections to scaling (see Sections 3.3 and 3.4). Our numerical fits (Section 2.3) suggest strongly that the next terms in the energy are  $L^{-3}$  and  $L^{-5}$  — surprisingly, the terms  $L^{-2}$  and  $L^{-4}$  appear to be absent — and that the next terms in the specific heat are  $L^{-2}$  and  $L^{-3}$ , without multiplicative logarithms. The  $L^{-2}$  correction in the energy seems to

be absent also in asymmetric tori.

2) In finite-size-scaling theory [88] for systems with periodic boundary conditions, three simplifying assumptions have frequently been made:

- (a) The regular part of the free energy,  $f_{\text{reg}}$ , is independent of  $L$  [88] (except possibly for terms that are exponentially small in  $L$ ).
- (b) The scaling fields  $g_t$  and  $g_h$  are independent of  $L$  [89].
- (c)  $g_L$  equals  $L^{-1}$  exactly, with no corrections  $L^{-2}$ ,  $L^{-3}$ ,  $\dots$  [88].

Moreover, in the nearest-neighbor spin-1/2 2D Ising model, it has further been assumed that

- (d) There are no irrelevant operators [68, 70].

Unfortunately, the combination of these four assumptions implies that the asymptotic expansions for the energy and specific heat at criticality terminate at order  $1/L$  [cf. (3.34b)/(3.34c)]; and our numerical computations (as well as elementary intuition) show this to be false. The problem, therefore, is to determine which one(s) of these assumptions are invalid, and why. Assumption (c) is extremely plausible from RG considerations, at least for periodic boundary conditions (see footnote 16 above); and assumption (d) has been confirmed numerically through order  $t^3$  at least as regards the bulk behavior of the susceptibility [70]. So we suspect that the difficulty is in (a) and/or (b).

3) By applying reweighting methods [113, 114, 115, 116] to our Monte Carlo data *at* the critical temperature, we can obtain information *away from* the critical temperature, throughout the FSS regime.<sup>33</sup> In particular, we expect to be able to determine the universal FSS functions to reasonably high accuracy. This work is currently in progress [117].

4) The weakness of the corrections to FSS in the nearest-neighbor spin-1/2 2D Ising model has made it very difficult to obtain information about them using Monte Carlo. Two alternative approaches should be considered:

- (a) Study other models in the Ising universality class, for which the corrections to scaling might be stronger [69, 71].
- (b) Use exact solutions for moderately-sized volumes, computed using transfer matrices [78], instead of Monte Carlo.

---

<sup>33</sup> The reweighting is of course always valid, in principle, no matter how large  $\Delta\beta$  is; but the statistical error bars on the reweighted data grow rapidly as  $|\Delta\beta|$  grows, and the maximum  $|\Delta\beta|$  for which one can obtain a not-too-large error bar gets smaller for larger  $L$ :

$$|\Delta\beta| \lesssim \begin{cases} L^{-d/2} & \text{near a non-phase-transition point} \\ L^{-1/\nu} & \text{near a critical point} \\ L^{-d} & \text{near a first-order phase-transition point} \end{cases}$$

In particular, near a critical point this corresponds exactly to the FSS regime.

Indeed, the incredibly accurate estimate of  $V_4$  obtained by Kamieniarz and Blöte [78], based on extrapolation of the exact results for  $L \leq 17$ , suggests that it would be useful to examine systematically, by the same methods, *all* the observables studied in this paper, in order to extract the leading terms as well as the correction-to-scaling terms. All the needed observables except the correlation length can be deduced from the partition function  $Z_{L \times L}$  written as a polynomial in  $e^{-2J}$  and  $e^{-2h}$ . Moreover, from this polynomial one can also study the thermal properties of the second-order transition curve in the Ising antiferromagnet in a uniform magnetic field, and its zero-temperature limit, the hard-square lattice gas<sup>34</sup>; these models are believed [71, 118] to lie in the Ising universality class, but may well have stronger corrections to scaling than the standard nearest-neighbor ferromagnet.

5) It would be interesting to extend the analytic computation of  $x^*$  to other two-dimensional models, in particular those that can be mapped onto Gaussian models via height representations (see e.g. [119, 120, 64]). This work is currently in progress [121].

Let us conclude by observing that, a mere decade ago, the state of the art in Monte Carlo investigations of critical phenomena was to obtain the leading critical exponent to two decimal places; moreover, many of these studies were unreliable due to poor statistics, sloppy statistical analysis, and inadequate consideration of finite-size effects and corrections to scaling. Today, thanks to improved algorithms, more powerful computers and increasing care in data analysis, it has become possible (in many cases) to obtain the leading critical exponent to three decimal places and to begin to extract information on universal amplitude ratios and on subleading exponents. Indeed, our Monte Carlo work is now on the verge of pushing up against the limits of our theoretical understanding of corrections to scaling, even in such well-studied models as the nearest-neighbor spin-1/2 2D Ising model!

## A Theta Functions

We use the following definitions for the Jacobi  $\theta$ -functions [122, 94]:

$$\theta_1(z, \tau) \equiv -i \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^n y^{n+\frac{1}{2}} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n+\frac{1}{2})^2} \quad (\text{A.1a})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n q^{\frac{1}{2}(n+\frac{1}{2})^2} \sin \left( 2\pi \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right) z \right) \quad (\text{A.1b})$$

$$\theta_2(z, \tau) \equiv \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} y^{n+\frac{1}{2}} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n+\frac{1}{2})^2} \quad (\text{A.2a})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n+\frac{1}{2})^2} \cos \left( 2\pi \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right) z \right) \quad (\text{A.2b})$$

---

<sup>34</sup> To study the magnetic properties of this model, it would be necessary to include in the Hamiltonian also a staggered magnetic field.

$$\theta_3(z, \tau) \equiv \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} y^n q^{\frac{1}{2}n^2} \quad (\text{A.3a})$$

$$= 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{\frac{1}{2}n^2} \cos(2\pi n z) \quad (\text{A.3b})$$

$$\theta_4(z, \tau) \equiv \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^n y^n q^{\frac{1}{2}n^2} \quad (\text{A.4a})$$

$$= 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n q^{\frac{1}{2}n^2} \cos(2\pi n z) \quad (\text{A.4b})$$

where

$$q = e^{2\pi i \tau} \quad \text{with } |q| < 1 \quad (\text{A.5a})$$

$$y = e^{2\pi i z} \quad (\text{A.5b})$$

We sometimes omit the argument  $\tau$  when its value is clear from the context; in particular, in the present paper we have usually  $\tau = i$ . A prime on  $\theta_\nu$  indicates the derivative with respect to  $z$ .

The  $\theta$ -functions satisfy certain symmetry properties

$$\theta_1(z \pm 1) = -\theta_1(z) \quad (\text{A.6a})$$

$$\theta_2(z \pm 1) = -\theta_2(z) \quad (\text{A.6b})$$

$$\theta_3(z \pm 1) = \theta_3(z) \quad (\text{A.6c})$$

$$\theta_4(z \pm 1) = \theta_4(z) \quad (\text{A.6d})$$

$$\theta_1\left(z \pm \frac{1}{2}\right) = \pm \theta_2(z) \quad (\text{A.7a})$$

$$\theta_2\left(z \pm \frac{1}{2}\right) = \mp \theta_1(z) \quad (\text{A.7b})$$

$$\theta_3\left(z \pm \frac{1}{2}\right) = \theta_4(z) \quad (\text{A.7c})$$

$$\theta_4\left(z \pm \frac{1}{2}\right) = \theta_3(z) \quad (\text{A.7d})$$

$$\theta_1(z \pm \tau, \tau) = -y^{\mp 1} q^{-1/2} \theta_1(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.8a})$$

$$\theta_2(z \pm \tau, \tau) = y^{\mp 1} q^{-1/2} \theta_2(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.8b})$$

$$\theta_3(z \pm \tau, \tau) = y^{\mp 1} q^{-1/2} \theta_3(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.8c})$$

$$\theta_4(z \pm \tau, \tau) = -y^{\mp 1} q^{-1/2} \theta_4(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.8d})$$

$$\theta_1\left(z \pm \frac{\tau}{2}, \tau\right) = \pm i y^{\mp 1/2} q^{-1/8} \theta_4(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.9a})$$

$$\theta_2\left(z \pm \frac{\tau}{2}, \tau\right) = y^{\mp 1/2} q^{-1/8} \theta_3(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.9b})$$

$$\theta_3\left(z \pm \frac{\tau}{2}, \tau\right) = y^{\mp 1/2} q^{-1/8} \theta_2(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.9c})$$

$$\theta_4\left(z \pm \frac{\tau}{2}, \tau\right) = \pm i y^{\mp 1/2} q^{-1/8} \theta_1(z, \tau) \quad (\text{A.9d})$$

Finally, it is worth noticing that the modulus of a  $\theta$ -function satisfies the relation

$$|\theta_\nu(\pm x_1 \pm i x_2)| = |\theta_\nu(x_1 + i x_2)| \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for  $x_1, x_2$  real and  $0 \leq q < 1$ .

The Dedekind  $\eta$ -function is defined as

$$\eta(\tau) = q^{1/24} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and it satisfies the relations

$$\theta_2(0, \tau) \theta_3(0, \tau) \theta_4(0, \tau) = 2\eta(\tau)^3 \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\theta'_1(0, \tau) = 2\pi\eta(\tau)^3 \quad (\text{A.13})$$

## B Computation of spin-correlator integrals

The computation of  $x^* = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \xi/L$  involves computing numerically the integrals

$$I_1 = \int d^2 z \frac{\sum_{\nu=1}^4 |\theta_\nu(z/2)|}{|\theta_1(z)|^{1/4}} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$I_2 = \int d^2 z \frac{\sum_{\nu=1}^4 |\theta_\nu(z/2)|}{|\theta_1(z)|^{1/4}} \cos(2\pi x_1) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where  $z = x_1 + i x_2$  and  $\int d^2 z = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dx_1 dx_2$ .

Let us consider here  $I_1$ , as  $I_2$  can be done in a similar fashion. Using the symmetry properties of the  $\theta$ -functions and their absolute values (see Appendix A), we reduce the integral to

$$I_1 = 4 \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^{1/2} dx_1 dx_2 \frac{\sum_{\nu=1}^4 |\theta_\nu(z/2)|}{|\theta_1(z)|^{1/4}}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The integrand contains two pieces: One (coming from  $\nu = 1$ ) is finite at  $z = 0$  and its integral can be performed safely by standard deterministic numerical-integration techniques (e.g. MATHEMATICA's `NIntegrate`), yielding

$$I_{1,1} \equiv 4 \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^{1/2} dx_1 dx_2 \frac{|\theta_1(z/2)|}{|\theta_1(z)|^{1/4}} = 0.5234826517 \pm 0.0000000001 \quad (\text{B.4})$$

The other piece (coming from  $\nu = 2, 3, 4$ ) diverges at  $z = 0$  like  $|\theta_1(z)|^{-1/4} \sim |z|^{-1/4}$ . This singularity makes numerical integration a bit tricky. Since  $\theta'_1(0) = 2\pi\eta^3$  [see (A.13)], the simple function

$$H(z) = 4 \frac{\sum_{\nu=2}^4 |\theta_\nu(0)|}{|2\pi\eta^3 z|^{1/4}} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

has exactly the same divergent behavior at  $z = 0$ . The integral of this function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} 4 \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^{1/2} dx_1 dx_2 H(z) &= 4 \frac{\sum_{\nu=2}^4 |\theta_\nu(0)|}{(2\pi\eta^3)^{1/4}} \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^{1/2} dx_1 dx_2 \frac{1}{(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1/8}} \\ &= 8 \frac{\sum_{\nu=2}^4 |\theta_\nu(0)|}{(2\pi\eta^3)^{1/4}} \int_0^{\pi/4} d\psi \int_0^{1/(2\cos\psi)} dr r^{3/4} \\ &= \frac{8}{7} \frac{2^{1/4} \sum_{\nu=2}^4 |\theta_\nu(0)|}{(2\pi\eta^3)^{1/4}} \int_0^{\pi/4} (\cos\psi)^{-7/4} d\psi \\ &\approx 2.95015472419465 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Though we were unable to perform exactly the final angular integral, the integrand  $\cos^{-7/4}\psi$  is regular on the interval  $[0, \pi/4]$  and so the integral can be performed by standard numerical-integration techniques.

Finally, we have to integrate the function

$$4 \frac{\sum_{\nu=2}^4 |\theta_\nu(z/2)|}{|\theta_1(z)|^{1/4}} - H(z) . \quad (\text{B.7})$$

This function does not diverge at  $z = 0$  (or at any other point in the integration domain), so its integral can again be performed using standard techniques. This last integral is  $0.007973883019 \pm 0.000000000001$ , so the final result is

$$I_1 = 3.4816112589 \pm 0.00000000001 . \quad (\text{B.8})$$

The second integral  $I_2$  can be performed in the same way [and using the same auxiliary function  $H(z)$ ]. The final result is

$$I_2 = 0.1044359092 \pm 0.00000000001 . \quad (\text{B.9})$$

## Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Paul Coddington and Juan Jesús Ruiz-Lorenzo for communicating to us their unpublished data; Chuck Newman for communicating to us his unpublished proof of a central limit theorem for periodic boxes; Sergio Caracciolo, Michael Fisher and Andrea Pelissetto for discussions; and Vladimir Privman and Hubert Saleur for correspondence.

The authors' research was supported in part by U.S. National Science Foundation grant PHY-9520978 (A.D.S.) and CICYT (Spain) grants PB95-0797 and AEN97-1680 (J.S.).



## References

- [1] C. Domb, *The Critical Point: A Historical Introduction to the Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena* (Taylor & Francis, London, 1996).
- [2] V. Privman, P.C. Hohenberg and A. Aharony, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, Vol. 14, ed. C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, London–San Diego, 1991).
- [3] B. Nienhuis, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, vol. 11, edited by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, London, 1987).
- [4] J.L. Cardy, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, vol. 11, edited by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, London, 1987).
- [5] C. Itzykson, H. Saleur and J.-B. Zuber, eds., *Conformal Invariance and Applications to Statistical Mechanics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988).
- [6] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu and D. Sénéchal, *Conformal Field Theory* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997).
- [7] J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, 2nd edition (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993).
- [8] R. Guida and J. Zinn-Justin, J. Phys. A **31**, 8103 (1998), cond-mat/9803240.
- [9] G. Bhanot, M. Creutz and J. Lacki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1841 (1992), hep-lat/9206020.
- [10] J. Adler, C. Holm and W. Janke, Physica A **201**, 581 (1993), hep-lat/9305005.
- [11] A.J. Guttmann and I.G. Enting, J. Phys. A **26**, 807 (1993), hep-lat/9212032.
- [12] A.J. Guttmann and I.G. Enting, J. Phys. A **27**, 5801 (1994), hep-lat/9312083.
- [13] H. Arisue and K. Tabata, Nucl. Phys. B **435**, 555 (1995), hep-lat/9407023.
- [14] P. Butera and M. Comi, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 6391 (1997), hep-lat/9703017.
- [15] P. Butera and M. Comi, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 8212 (1997), hep-lat/9703018.
- [16] P. Butera and M. Comi, Critical specific heats of the  $N$ -vector spin models on the sc and the bcc lattices. Preprint, hep-lat/9903010.
- [17] C. Holm and W. Janke, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 936 (1993), hep-lat/9301002.
- [18] A.P. Gottlob and M. Hasenbusch, Physica A **201**, 593 (1993), cond-mat/9305020.
- [19] B. Li, N. Madras and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **80**, 661 (1995), hep-lat/9409003.

- [20] H.W.J. Blöte, E. Luijten and J.R. Heringa, J. Phys. A **28**, 6289 (1995), cond-mat/9509016.
- [21] M.P. Nightingale and H.W.J. Blöte, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 1001 (1996), cond-mat/9602089.
- [22] H.W.J. Blöte, J.R. Heringa, A. Hoogland, E.W. Meyer and T.S. Smit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2613 (1996), cond-mat/9602020.
- [23] S. Caracciolo, M.S. Causo and A. Pelissetto, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 1215 (1998), cond-mat/9703250.
- [24] S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1891 (1995), hep-lat/9411009.
- [25] S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, T. Mendes, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **47**, 763 (1996), hep-lat/9509033.
- [26] G. Mana, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 3674 (1997), hep-lat/9610021.
- [27] J. Balog and M. Niedermaier, Nucl. Phys. B **500**, 421 (1997), hep-th/9612039.
- [28] J. Balog, M. Niedermaier, F. Niedermayer, A. Patrascioiu, E. Seiler and P. Weisz, Comparison of the  $O(3)$  bootstrap  $\sigma$ -model with the lattice regularization at low energies. Preprint, hep-lat/9903036.
- [29] A.J. Liu and M.E. Fisher, Physica A **156**, 35 (1989).
- [30] J.-K. Kim and A. Patrascioiu, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 2588 (1993).
- [31] C. Gutfeld, J. Küster and G. Münster, Nucl. Phys. B **479**, 654 (1996), cond-mat/9606091.
- [32] S.-Y. Zinn and M.E. Fisher, Physica A **226**, 168 (1996).
- [33] R. Guida and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B **489**, 626 (1997), hep-th/9610223.
- [34] M. Caselle and M. Hasenbusch, J. Phys. A **30**, 4963 (1997), hep-lat/9701007.
- [35] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Low-temperature effective potential of the Ising model. Preprint, cond-mat/9805317.
- [36] M. Weigel and W. Janke, Universal amplitudes in the FSS of three-dimensional spin models. Preprint, cond-mat/9809253.
- [37] P. Butera and M. Comi, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 11552 (1998), hep-lat/9805025.
- [38] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. B **522**, 605 (1998), cond-mat/9801098.

- [39] M. Caselle, R. Tateo and S. Vinti, Universal amplitudes in the 2D four state Potts model. Preprint, cond-mat/9902146.
- [40] T.T. Wu, B.M. McCoy, C.A. Tracy and E. Barouch, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 316 (1976).
- [41] P. Di Francesco, H. Saleur and J.-B. Zuber, Nucl. Phys. B **290** [FS20] (1987) 527.
- [42] P. Di Francesco, H. Saleur and J.-B. Zuber, Europhys. Lett. **5** (1988) 95.
- [43] J.L. Cardy, J. Phys. A **21**, L797 (1988).
- [44] J.L. Cardy and H. Saleur, J. Phys. A **22**, L601 (1989).
- [45] S. Caracciolo, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, J. Phys. A **23**, L969 (1990).
- [46] J.L. Cardy and G. Mussardo, Nucl. Phys. B **410**, 451 (1993), hep-th/9306028.
- [47] J.L. Cardy and A.J. Guttmann, J. Phys. A **26**, 2485 (1993), cond-mat/9303035.
- [48] G. Delfino, Phys. Lett. B **419**, 291 (1998), hep-th/9710019.
- [49] G. Delfino and J.L. Cardy, Nucl. Phys. B **519**, 551 (1998), hep-th/9712111.
- [50] K. Binder, Z. Phys. B **43**, 119 (1981).
- [51] C.M. Newman, Z. Wahr. verw. Geb. **33**, 75 (1975).
- [52] J. Bricmont, J. Stat. Phys. **17**, 289 (1977).
- [53] C.M. Newman, Commun. Math. Phys. **41**, 1 (1975).
- [54] S.B. Shlosman, Commun. Math. Phys. **102**, 679 (1986).
- [55] M. Lüscher, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 221 (1991).
- [56] J.-K. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1735 (1993).
- [57] S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, S.J. Ferreira, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2969 (1995), hep-lat/9409004.
- [58] S. Caracciolo, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, in preparation.
- [59] V. Privman and M.E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 322 (1984).
- [60] J.L. Cardy, J. Phys. A **17**, L385 (1984).
- [61] J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **87**, 1 (1997), hep-lat/9605018.
- [62] J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **85**, 297 (1996), hep-lat/9511022.
- [63] J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **88**, 567 (1997), hep-lat/9607030.

- [64] J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **92**, 729 (1998), cond-mat/9801079.
- [65] S.J. Ferreira and A.D. Sokal, Antiferromagnetic Potts models on the square lattice: A high-precision Monte Carlo study. Preprint, cond-mat/9811345.
- [66] J.-K. Kim, private communication.
- [67] B. Nienhuis, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **15**, 199 (1982).
- [68] A. Aharony and M.E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 4394 (1983).
- [69] M. Barma and M.E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 5954 (1985).
- [70] S. Gartenhaus and W.S. McCullough, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 11688 (1988).
- [71] H.W.J. Blöte and M.P.M. den Nijs, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 1766 (1988).
- [72] I.G. Enting, A.J. Guttmann and I. Jensen J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **27**, 6987 (1994).
- [73] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **65**, 117 (1944).
- [74] C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **85**, 808 (1952).
- [75] R.J. Baxter, *Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics* (Academic Press, New York, 1982).
- [76] X.-P. Kong, H. Au-Yang and J.H.H. Perk, Phys. Lett. A **116**, 54 (1986); **118**, 336 (1986).
- [77] A.E. Ferdinand and M.E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. **185**, 832 (1969).
- [78] G. Kamieniarz and H.W.J. Blöte, J. Phys. A **26**, 201 (1993).
- [79] G.A. Baker Jr. and N. Kawashima, J. Phys. A **29**, 7183 (1996).
- [80] G.A. Baker Jr., J. Stat. Phys. **77**, 955 (1994).
- [81] P. Butera and N. Comi, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 15828 (1996), hep-lat/9710092.
- [82] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. B **519**, 626 (1998), cond-mat/9711078.
- [83] C.M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4919 (1993), hep-th/9311060.
- [84] C.M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1875 (1995), hep-th/9405043.
- [85] F.J. Wegner, Phys. Rev. B **5**, 4529 (1972).
- [86] F.J. Wegner, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, vol. 6, edited by C. Domb and M.S. Green (Academic Press, London, 1976).
- [87] S. Gartenhaus and W.S. McCullough, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 3299 (1987).

- [88] V. Privman in *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems*, edited by V. Privman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).
- [89] H. Guo and D. Jasnow, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 1846 (1987); **39**, 753 (E) (1989).
- [90] M.P. Nightingale and A.H. 't Hooft, Physica **77**, 390 (1974).
- [91] D.A. Huse and M.E. Fisher, J. Phys. C **15** L585 (1982).
- [92] S.I. Chase and M. Kaufman, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 239 (1986).
- [93] V. Privman and J. Rudnick, J. Phys. A **19**, L1215 (1986).
- [94] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series and Products* (Academic Press, New York, 1965).
- [95] A. Cayley, *An Elementary Treatise on Elliptic Functions*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Dover, New York, 1961). [Originally published by George Bell and Sons, London, 1895.]
- [96] V.S. Dotsenko, Nucl. Phys. B **235** [FS11], 54 (1984).
- [97] R.H. Swendsen and J.-S. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 86 (1987).
- [98] R.G. Edwards and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 2009 (1988).
- [99] A.D. Sokal, in *Functional Integration: Basics and Applications* (1996 Cargèse summer school), ed. C. DeWitt-Morette, P. Cartier and A. Folacci (Plenum, New York, 1997).
- [100] P.W. Kasteleyn and C.M. Fortuin, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **26** (Suppl.), 11 (1969).
- [101] C.M. Fortuin and P.W. Kasteleyn, Physica **57**, 536 (1972).
- [102] C.M. Fortuin, Physica **58**, 393 (1972); **59**, 545 (1972).
- [103] N. Madras and A.D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **50**, 109 (1988).
- [104] X.-J. Li and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 827 (1989).
- [105] C.F. Baillie and P.D. Coddington, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 10617 (1991).
- [106] C.F. Baillie and P.D. Coddington, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 962 (1992); and private communication.
- [107] H.G. Ballesteros, L.A. Fernández, V. Martín-Mayor, A. Muñoz Sudupe, G. Parisi and J.J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, J. Phys. A **30**, 8379 (1998), cond-mat/9707179; and private communication.
- [108] U. Wolff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 3834 (1989).
- [109] C.M. Newman, private communication (1999).

- [110] C.M. Newman, Commun. Math. Phys. **74**, 119 (1980).
- [111] C.M. Newman, Commun. Math. Phys. **91**, 75 (1983).
- [112] M.E. Fisher and M.N. Barber, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **47**, 205 (1972).
- [113] A.M. Ferrenberg and R.H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2635 (1988).
- [114] A.M. Ferrenberg and R.H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1195 (1989).
- [115] R.H. Swendsen, Physica **A194**, 53 (1993).
- [116] A.M. Ferrenberg, D.P. Landau and R.H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. **E51**, 5092 (1995).
- [117] J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, in preparation.
- [118] G. Kamieniarz, H.W.J. Blöte and R. Dekeyser, Acta Phys. Polonica A **85**, 389 (1994).
- [119] M. den Nijs, M.P. Nightingale and M. Schick, Phys. Rev. **B26**, 2490 (1982).
- [120] J.K. Burton Jr. and C.L. Henley, J. Phys. **A30**, 8385 (1997), cond-mat/9708171.
- [121] S. Caracciolo, A. Pelissetto, J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, work in progress.
- [122] C. Itzykson and J.-M. Drouffe, *Statistical Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989), Vol. 2.

$L$	MCS	$E$	$C_H$	$\chi$	$F$	$\xi$
4	2.10	$0.217211 \pm 0.000349$	$1.0080 \pm 0.0016$	$12.1825 \pm 0.0065$	$0.4047 \pm 0.0008$	$3.8146 \pm 0.0051$
6	2.70	$0.241822 \pm 0.000249$	$1.2869 \pm 0.0017$	$24.9443 \pm 0.0130$	$0.7728 \pm 0.0013$	$5.5927 \pm 0.0063$
8	2.70	$0.254133 \pm 0.000210$	$1.4748 \pm 0.0020$	$41.4214 \pm 0.0228$	$1.2523 \pm 0.0021$	$7.3998 \pm 0.0084$
12	3.25	$0.266991 \pm 0.000148$	$1.7450 \pm 0.0022$	$84.3329 \pm 0.0454$	$2.5330 \pm 0.0038$	$10.9783 \pm 0.0114$
16	3.25	$0.273522 \pm 0.000123$	$1.9307 \pm 0.0025$	$139.5946 \pm 0.0786$	$4.1824 \pm 0.0063$	$14.5832 \pm 0.0154$
24	4.00	$0.279967 \pm 0.000084$	$2.1905 \pm 0.0028$	$284.0239 \pm 0.1525$	$8.4942 \pm 0.0118$	$21.8170 \pm 0.0212$
32	4.00	$0.283221 \pm 0.000068$	$2.3790 \pm 0.0031$	$469.7765 \pm 0.2612$	$14.0882 \pm 0.0197$	$29.0118 \pm 0.0288$
48	5.00	$0.286394 \pm 0.000046$	$2.6404 \pm 0.0033$	$955.5980 \pm 0.4966$	$28.6641 \pm 0.0365$	$43.4737 \pm 0.0395$
64	5.00	$0.288056 \pm 0.000037$	$2.8205 \pm 0.0037$	$1580.9962 \pm 0.8442$	$47.3931 \pm 0.0610$	$57.9660 \pm 0.0535$
96	6.40	$0.289657 \pm 0.000024$	$3.0783 \pm 0.0037$	$3214.3979 \pm 1.5807$	$96.3939 \pm 0.1118$	$86.9125 \pm 0.0728$
128	6.40	$0.290427 \pm 0.000019$	$3.2688 \pm 0.0041$	$5322.9013 \pm 2.6899$	$159.2797 \pm 0.1869$	$116.0034 \pm 0.0990$
192	7.10	$0.291268 \pm 0.000013$	$3.5250 \pm 0.0045$	$10817.0940 \pm 5.3669$	$324.0912 \pm 0.3656$	$173.8830 \pm 0.1434$
256	7.10	$0.291671 \pm 0.000011$	$3.7126 \pm 0.0049$	$17898.9900 \pm 9.0732$	$536.0673 \pm 0.6115$	$231.8851 \pm 0.1940$
512	8.10	$0.292283 \pm 0.000006$	$4.1430 \pm 0.0055$	$60184.2200 \pm 29.9896$	$1804.1768 \pm 1.9639$	$463.5381 \pm 0.3745$

Table 1: Values of the principal static observables for the 2D Ising model at criticality. For each lattice size  $L$  we show the number of measurements (= Swendsen-Wang iterations after the discard interval) in units of  $10^6$  (MCS), the internal energy  $E$ , the specific heat  $C_H$ , the susceptibility  $\chi$ , the Fourier-transformed correlation function  $F = \tilde{G}(2\pi/L, 0)$ , and the second-moment correlation length  $\xi$ .

$L$	$S_2^{(2)}$		$S_4$	
4	$161.64 \pm$	0.11	$157.24 \pm$	0.12
6	$685.10 \pm$	0.47	$667.47 \pm$	0.48
8	$1897.80 \pm$	1.41	$1851.35 \pm$	1.45
12	$7916.73 \pm$	5.88	$7734.28 \pm$	6.02
16	$21755.96 \pm$	17.13	$21274.37 \pm$	17.51
24	$90295.32 \pm$	69.18	$88389.85 \pm$	70.56
32	$247536.23 \pm$	198.35	$242443.78 \pm$	202.14
48	$1025353.73 \pm$	779.67	$1004854.35 \pm$	793.96
64	$2808361.37 \pm$	2211.02	$2753081.75 \pm$	2250.34
96	$11615083.32 \pm$	8508.21	$11389683.00 \pm$	8651.98
128	$31854262.68 \pm$	24172.95	$31242457.91 \pm$	24572.72
192	$131611502.59 \pm$	98784.46	$129102074.27 \pm$	100402.79
256	$360360856.78 \pm$	278200.32	$353514278.09 \pm$	282682.98
512	$4075767470.00 \pm$	3127010.50	$3998597970.00 \pm$	3175167.80

Table 2: Values of the bond observables  $S_2^{(2)}$  and  $S_4$  [cf. (4.27)/(4.28)].



$L$	$V_4$	$V_6$	$V_8$	$V_{10}$	$V_{12}$
4	$1.14827 \pm 0.00041$	$1.38285 \pm 0.00108$	$1.7100 \pm 0.0021$	$2.1505 \pm 0.0037$	$2.7358 \pm 0.0061$
6	$1.15753 \pm 0.00038$	$1.41690 \pm 0.00102$	$1.7941 \pm 0.0021$	$2.3258 \pm 0.0037$	$3.0687 \pm 0.0064$
8	$1.16042 \pm 0.00039$	$1.42853 \pm 0.00106$	$1.8247 \pm 0.0022$	$2.3930 \pm 0.0040$	$3.2026 \pm 0.0069$
12	$1.16460 \pm 0.00037$	$1.44302 \pm 0.00103$	$1.8600 \pm 0.0021$	$2.4675 \pm 0.0039$	$3.3481 \pm 0.0069$
16	$1.16586 \pm 0.00038$	$1.44774 \pm 0.00106$	$1.8721 \pm 0.0022$	$2.4942 \pm 0.0041$	$3.4020 \pm 0.0073$
24	$1.16672 \pm 0.00036$	$1.45126 \pm 0.00100$	$1.8815 \pm 0.0021$	$2.5151 \pm 0.0039$	$3.4447 \pm 0.0069$
32	$1.16756 \pm 0.00037$	$1.45400 \pm 0.00103$	$1.8880 \pm 0.0022$	$2.5288 \pm 0.0040$	$3.4717 \pm 0.0072$
48	$1.16769 \pm 0.00034$	$1.45475 \pm 0.00094$	$1.8903 \pm 0.0020$	$2.5342 \pm 0.0037$	$3.4830 \pm 0.0066$
64	$1.16777 \pm 0.00034$	$1.45494 \pm 0.00097$	$1.8907 \pm 0.0020$	$2.5353 \pm 0.0038$	$3.4854 \pm 0.0068$
96	$1.16769 \pm 0.00031$	$1.45493 \pm 0.00088$	$1.8910 \pm 0.0019$	$2.5363 \pm 0.0035$	$3.4880 \pm 0.0062$
128	$1.16763 \pm 0.00032$	$1.45469 \pm 0.00090$	$1.8904 \pm 0.0019$	$2.5351 \pm 0.0036$	$3.4857 \pm 0.0063$
192	$1.16764 \pm 0.00031$	$1.45474 \pm 0.00087$	$1.8906 \pm 0.0018$	$2.5356 \pm 0.0035$	$3.4871 \pm 0.0062$
256	$1.16777 \pm 0.00031$	$1.45514 \pm 0.00089$	$1.8914 \pm 0.0019$	$2.5371 \pm 0.0035$	$3.4895 \pm 0.0063$
512	$1.16782 \pm 0.00030$	$1.45526 \pm 0.00086$	$1.8917 \pm 0.0018$	$2.5376 \pm 0.0034$	$3.4906 \pm 0.0061$
$\infty$	$1.1679229(47)$	$1.4556491(72)$	$1.89252(18)$	$2.53956(34)$	

$L$	$V_{14}$	$V_{16}$	$V_{18}$	$V_{20}$
4	$3.509 \pm 0.010$	$4.527 \pm 0.015$	$5.866 \pm 0.022$	$7.626 \pm 0.033$
6	$4.105 \pm 0.010$	$5.551 \pm 0.017$	$7.575 \pm 0.027$	$10.414 \pm 0.042$
8	$4.356 \pm 0.012$	$6.006 \pm 0.019$	$8.374 \pm 0.031$	$11.791 \pm 0.049$
12	$4.628 \pm 0.012$	$6.496 \pm 0.020$	$9.241 \pm 0.033$	$13.300 \pm 0.054$
16	$4.731 \pm 0.012$	$6.688 \pm 0.021$	$9.589 \pm 0.035$	$13.921 \pm 0.058$
24	$4.814 \pm 0.012$	$6.843 \pm 0.020$	$9.874 \pm 0.034$	$14.436 \pm 0.057$
32	$4.864 \pm 0.012$	$6.936 \pm 0.021$	$10.040 \pm 0.036$	$14.732 \pm 0.060$
48	$4.887 \pm 0.012$	$6.979 \pm 0.020$	$10.123 \pm 0.033$	$14.883 \pm 0.056$
64	$4.892 \pm 0.012$	$6.990 \pm 0.020$	$10.143 \pm 0.034$	$14.922 \pm 0.058$
96	$4.898 \pm 0.011$	$7.001 \pm 0.019$	$10.165 \pm 0.031$	$14.965 \pm 0.053$
128	$4.894 \pm 0.011$	$6.995 \pm 0.019$	$10.154 \pm 0.032$	$14.947 \pm 0.054$
192	$4.897 \pm 0.011$	$7.001 \pm 0.018$	$10.166 \pm 0.031$	$14.970 \pm 0.053$
256	$4.901 \pm 0.011$	$7.006 \pm 0.019$	$10.175 \pm 0.032$	$14.982 \pm 0.054$
512	$4.903 \pm 0.011$	$7.011 \pm 0.018$	$10.183 \pm 0.031$	$14.997 \pm 0.052$

Table 3: Values of the ratios  $V_{2n} = \langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle / \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n$  for the 2D Ising model at criticality, as a function of the lattice size  $L$ . The row  $L = \infty$  shows the theoretical predictions (2.25)/(2.28)/(2.29)/(2.30) for  $V_4$ ,  $V_6$ ,  $V_8$  and  $V_{10}$ , respectively; they are exact except for a numerical integration, the error bars of which are given in parentheses.

$L$	$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}$	$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$	$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}'}$	$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{M}^2}$	$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{F}}$
4	$1.6193 \pm 0.0072$	$2.027 \pm 0.010$	$2.034 \pm 0.010$	$2.021 \pm 0.010$	$1.7361 \pm 0.0081$
6	$1.9372 \pm 0.0083$	$2.335 \pm 0.011$	$2.344 \pm 0.011$	$2.313 \pm 0.011$	$1.7889 \pm 0.0074$
8	$2.1887 \pm 0.0101$	$2.594 \pm 0.013$	$2.620 \pm 0.013$	$2.551 \pm 0.013$	$1.8447 \pm 0.0079$
12	$2.5171 \pm 0.0113$	$2.949 \pm 0.014$	$2.982 \pm 0.014$	$2.857 \pm 0.014$	$1.9195 \pm 0.0075$
16	$2.7757 \pm 0.0129$	$3.239 \pm 0.016$	$3.274 \pm 0.016$	$3.102 \pm 0.015$	$1.9790 \pm 0.0078$
24	$3.2050 \pm 0.0145$	$3.705 \pm 0.018$	$3.761 \pm 0.018$	$3.457 \pm 0.016$	$2.0668 \pm 0.0076$
32	$3.4700 \pm 0.0161$	$4.002 \pm 0.020$	$4.072 \pm 0.021$	$3.689 \pm 0.018$	$2.1345 \pm 0.0078$
48	$3.9282 \pm 0.0174$	$4.517 \pm 0.022$	$4.602 \pm 0.022$	$4.026 \pm 0.018$	$2.2140 \pm 0.0075$
64	$4.2417 \pm 0.0195$	$4.864 \pm 0.024$	$4.962 \pm 0.025$	$4.248 \pm 0.020$	$2.2639 \pm 0.0077$
96	$4.7463 \pm 0.0204$	$5.437 \pm 0.025$	$5.554 \pm 0.026$	$4.615 \pm 0.019$	$2.3637 \pm 0.0074$
128	$5.1330 \pm 0.0228$	$5.876 \pm 0.028$	$6.013 \pm 0.029$	$4.875 \pm 0.021$	$2.4143 \pm 0.0075$
192	$5.6835 \pm 0.0254$	$6.493 \pm 0.031$	$6.657 \pm 0.032$	$5.213 \pm 0.022$	$2.4787 \pm 0.0073$
256	$6.0871 \pm 0.0280$	$6.929 \pm 0.034$	$7.114 \pm 0.035$	$5.437 \pm 0.024$	$2.5353 \pm 0.0077$
512	$7.0988 \pm 0.0329$	$8.049 \pm 0.040$	$8.277 \pm 0.041$	$5.992 \pm 0.025$	$2.6352 \pm 0.0075$

Table 4: Values of the dynamic observables for the 2D Ising model at criticality. For each lattice size  $L$  we show the value of the integrated autocorrelation times for the energy ( $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$ ), the bond occupation ( $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{N}}$ ), the nearest-neighbor connectivity ( $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}'}$ ), the squared magnetization ( $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{M}^2}$ ), and the Fourier-transformed correlation function at the smallest nonzero momentum ( $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{F}}$ ). Note that the rigorous inequalities (4.42) hold.

$L$	MCS	$\chi$		$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$
8	20	41.3920 $\pm$	0.0084 ( 0.0080)	2.5890 $\pm$ 0.0047 (0.0050)
16	10	139.5800 $\pm$	0.0448 ( 0.0400)	3.2580 $\pm$ 0.0093 (0.0050)
32	10	470.1200 $\pm$	0.1652 ( 0.2000)	4.0160 $\pm$ 0.0128 (0.0050)
50	10	1025.9000 $\pm$	0.3511 ( 0.4000)	4.5850 $\pm$ 0.0153 (0.0050)
64	20	1581.4000 $\pm$	0.4221 ( 0.5000)	4.8990 $\pm$ 0.0120 (0.0100)
100	10	3453.7000 $\pm$	1.2646 ( 1.4000)	5.5100 $\pm$ 0.0199 (0.0170)
128	10	5319.2000 $\pm$	2.1519 ( 2.4000)	5.8740 $\pm$ 0.0224 (0.0160)
256	10	17900.0000 $\pm$	7.6452 ( 7.0000)	6.9280 $\pm$ 0.0286 (0.0300)
512	12.8	60185.0000 $\pm$	23.8566 (28.0000)	8.1440 $\pm$ 0.0317 (0.0550)

Table 5: Values of the magnetic susceptibility  $\chi$  and the energy integrated autocorrelation time  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$  for the 2D Ising model at  $\beta = \beta_c$  obtained by Baillie and Coddington [105, 106]. The first error bar for each observable is the “corrected” error bar coming from the scaling procedure outlined in Section 4.3; the error bar in parentheses is that reported in Refs. [105, 106]. For each lattice size  $L$  we show also the total number of Swendsen-Wang iterations performed, in units of  $10^6$  (MCS).

$L$	$\chi$		$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$
4	12.1825 $\pm$	0.0065	2.0267 $\pm$ 0.0103
6	24.9443 $\pm$	0.0130	2.3353 $\pm$ 0.0112
8	41.3955 $\pm$	0.0079	2.5896 $\pm$ 0.0044
12	84.3329 $\pm$	0.0454	2.9492 $\pm$ 0.0141
16	139.5836 $\pm$	0.0389	3.2533 $\pm$ 0.0081
24	284.0239 $\pm$	0.1525	3.7055 $\pm$ 0.0180
32	470.0219 $\pm$	0.1396	4.0119 $\pm$ 0.0108
48	955.5980 $\pm$	0.4966	4.5168 $\pm$ 0.0216
50	1025.9000 $\pm$	0.3511	4.5850 $\pm$ 0.0153
64	1581.3192 $\pm$	0.3775	4.8919 $\pm$ 0.0107
96	3214.3979 $\pm$	1.5807	5.4369 $\pm$ 0.0249
100	3453.7000 $\pm$	1.2646	5.5100 $\pm$ 0.0199
128	5320.6444 $\pm$	1.6804	5.8747 $\pm$ 0.0175
192	10817.0940 $\pm$	5.3669	6.4926 $\pm$ 0.0306
256	17899.5806 $\pm$	5.8464	6.9283 $\pm$ 0.0218
512	60184.6977 $\pm$	18.6698	8.1071 $\pm$ 0.0248

Table 6: Values of the magnetic susceptibility  $\chi$  and the energy integrated autocorrelation time  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}$  for the 2D Ising model at  $\beta = \beta_c$  obtained by merging our data (see Tables 1 and 4) with that of Baillie and Coddington [105, 106] (see Table 5).

$L$	EIM	$\xi$
12	0.4	$10.976 \pm 0.015$
16	0.4	$14.575 \pm 0.019$
24	0.6	$21.791 \pm 0.026$
32	0.4	$29.089 \pm 0.038$
48	0.6	$43.448 \pm 0.043$
64	0.6	$57.877 \pm 0.056$
96	0.6	$86.87 \pm 0.11$
128	0.6	$115.87 \pm 0.12$
192	0.5	$174.06 \pm 0.21$
256	0.6	$231.84 \pm 0.31$
512	0.7	$464.8 \pm 0.5$

Table 7: Values of the correlation length  $\xi$  for the 2D Ising model at  $\beta = \beta_c$  obtained by Ballesteros *et al.* [107]. For each lattice size  $L$  we also show the number of “effectively independent measurements” in units of  $10^6$  (EIM).

$L$	$\xi$	$\xi/L$	$\xi'/L$
4	$3.8146 \pm 0.0051$	$0.95365 \pm 0.00128$	$0.85859 \pm 0.00115$
6	$5.5927 \pm 0.0063$	$0.93212 \pm 0.00105$	$0.89011 \pm 0.00100$
8	$7.3998 \pm 0.0084$	$0.92497 \pm 0.00105$	$0.90138 \pm 0.00102$
12	$10.9775 \pm 0.0091$	$0.91479 \pm 0.00076$	$0.90437 \pm 0.00075$
16	$14.5799 \pm 0.0120$	$0.91125 \pm 0.00075$	$0.90540 \pm 0.00074$
24	$21.8066 \pm 0.0164$	$0.90861 \pm 0.00068$	$0.90602 \pm 0.00068$
32	$29.0400 \pm 0.0230$	$0.90750 \pm 0.00072$	$0.90604 \pm 0.00072$
48	$43.4619 \pm 0.0291$	$0.90546 \pm 0.00061$	$0.90481 \pm 0.00061$
64	$57.9235 \pm 0.0387$	$0.90506 \pm 0.00060$	$0.90469 \pm 0.00060$
96	$86.8996 \pm 0.0607$	$0.90520 \pm 0.00063$	$0.90504 \pm 0.00063$
128	$115.9494 \pm 0.0764$	$0.90585 \pm 0.00060$	$0.90576 \pm 0.00060$
192	$173.9393 \pm 0.1184$	$0.90593 \pm 0.00062$	$0.90589 \pm 0.00062$
256	$231.8724 \pm 0.1645$	$0.90575 \pm 0.00064$	$0.90573 \pm 0.00064$
512	$463.9916 \pm 0.2997$	$0.90623 \pm 0.00059$	$0.90623 \pm 0.00059$
$\infty$		0.9050488	0.9050488

Table 8: Values of the correlation length  $\xi$  for the 2D Ising model at  $\beta = \beta_c$  coming from merging our data (see Table 1) with that of Ballesteros *et al.* [107] (see Table 7). The second column shows the ratio  $\xi/L$ , and the last column shows the ratio  $\xi'/L$ . The last row ( $L = \infty$ ) shows the theoretical prediction (2.22) for the infinite-volume limit of the ratios  $\xi/L$  and  $\xi'/L$ .

$2n$	Type	$V_{2n}^\infty$	$B$	$\Delta$	$L_{min}$	$\chi^2$	$DF$	level
4	C	1.16770 $\pm$ 0.00011			32	0.48	7	100%
	P	1.16777 $\pm$ 0.00013	$-0.477 \pm 0.228$	$2.007 \pm 0.223$	8	1.53	9	100%
	P'	$1.1679227 \pm 0.0000047$	$-0.361 \pm 0.140$	$1.866 \pm 0.174$	8	2.91	10	98%
	T	$1.1679229 \pm 0.0000047$						
6	C	1.45484 $\pm$ 0.00032			32	1.09	7	99%
	P	1.45517 $\pm$ 0.00037	$-1.387 \pm 0.476$	$1.901 \pm 0.160$	8	1.66	9	100%
	P'	$1.4556489 \pm 0.0000072$	$-1.111 \pm 0.309$	$1.788 \pm 0.124$	8	3.24	10	98%
	T	$1.4556491 \pm 0.0000072$						
8	C	1.89090 $\pm$ 0.00071			48	0.48	6	100%
	P	1.89163 $\pm$ 0.00079	$-3.037 \pm 0.827$	$1.834 \pm 0.127$	8	1.86	9	99%
	P'	$1.89248 \pm 0.00018$	$-2.612 \pm 0.589$	$1.757 \pm 0.101$	8	3.03	10	98%
	T	$1.89252 \pm 0.00018$						
10	C	2.53593 $\pm$ 0.00135			48	0.69	6	99%
	P	2.53769 $\pm$ 0.00151	$-5.915 \pm 1.341$	$1.784 \pm 0.106$	8	2.06	9	99%
	P'	$2.53947 \pm 0.00033$	$-5.136 \pm 0.960$	$1.712 \pm 0.083$	8	3.49	10	97%
	T	$2.53956 \pm 0.00034$						
12	C	3.48720 $\pm$ 0.00241			48	0.99	6	99%
	P	3.49106 $\pm$ 0.00273	$-10.819 \pm 2.112$	$1.742 \pm 0.091$	8	2.29	9	99%
14	C	4.89621 $\pm$ 0.00418			48	1.37	6	97%
	P	4.90419 $\pm$ 0.00479	$-19.019 \pm 3.264$	$1.705 \pm 0.080$	8	2.56	9	98%
16	C	6.99812 $\pm$ 0.00716			48	1.83	6	93%
	P	7.01407 $\pm$ 0.00827	$-32.544 \pm 4.984$	$1.670 \pm 0.072$	8	2.86	9	97%
18	C	10.16503 $\pm$ 0.01303			64	0.97	5	97%
	P	10.19047 $\pm$ 0.01416	$-54.624 \pm 7.553$	$1.635 \pm 0.065$	8	3.23	9	95%
20	C	14.96506 $\pm$ 0.02199			64	1.16	5	95%
	P	15.01380 $\pm$ 0.02411	$-90.377 \pm 11.374$	$1.601 \pm 0.059$	8	3.69	9	93%

Table 9: Values of the infinite-volume-limit ratios  $V_{2n} = \langle \mathcal{M}^{2n} \rangle / \langle \mathcal{M}^2 \rangle^n$  for the 2D Ising model at criticality. For each  $n$  we show the results of two different types of fits: to a constant  $V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty$  (C), and to a constant plus a power-law correction-to-scaling term  $V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty + B_{2n}L^{-\Delta}$  (P). In addition, for  $2n = 4, 6, 8, 10$  we show fits  $V_{2n} = V_{2n}^\infty + B_{2n}L^{-\Delta}$  in which the theoretical prediction for  $V_{2n}^\infty$  has been imposed as explained in Section 5.8 (P'); we also show, for comparison, the theoretical prediction itself (T). The values of  $L_{min}$ ,  $\chi^2$ , the number of degrees of freedom (DF) and the confidence level are also shown.

$L$	$\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H$
4	$2.0100 \pm 0.0102$
6	$1.8203 \pm 0.0087$
8	$1.7560 \pm 0.0030$
12	$1.6933 \pm 0.0081$
16	$1.6862 \pm 0.0042$
24	$1.6905 \pm 0.0082$
32	$1.6875 \pm 0.0045$
48	$1.7124 \pm 0.0082$
50	$1.7211 \pm 0.0057$
64	$1.7335 \pm 0.0038$
96	$1.7645 \pm 0.0081$
100	$1.7732 \pm 0.0064$
128	$1.7993 \pm 0.0054$
192	$1.8425 \pm 0.0087$
256	$1.8689 \pm 0.0059$
512	$1.9541 \pm 0.0060$

Table 10: Values of the ratio  $\tau_{\text{int},\mathcal{E}}/C_H$  for the 2D Ising model at criticality coming from merging our data (see Table 4) with that of Baillie and Coddington (see Table 5). The value of the specific heat is given by the *exact* formula of Ferdinand and Fisher [77].

## 2D Ising model




Figure 1: Plot of  $L^3[E_c(L) - (2.8a)]$  versus  $L^{-2}$ , where  $E_c(L)$  is the *exact* value of the energy at criticality for a lattice of linear size  $L$ . The line represents the fit  $L^3[E_c(L) - (2.8a)] = 0.1033415669 + 0.365347L^{-2}$ . Points plotted run from  $L = 16$  to 4096.




Figure 2: Plot of  $L^2[C_H(L) - (2.9a)]$  versus  $L^{-1}$ , where  $C_H(L)$  is the *exact* value of the specific heat at criticality for a lattice of linear size  $L$ . The line represents the fit  $L^2[C_H(L) - (2.9a)] = 0.02427997036 + 0.07308169L^{-1}$ . Points plotted run from  $L = 16$  to 4096.



# Magnetization Histogram L=256




Figure 3: Magnetization histogram of the 2D Ising model at  $\beta = \beta_c$  for  $L = 256$ . The histogram is normalized such that the area enclosed is equal to unity.




Figure 4: Magnetization histogram of the 2D Ising model at  $\beta = \beta_c$  for  $L = 256$  (solid thick line) and  $L = 16$  (dotted thin line). Wide bins are employed to enhance the visibility of the corrections to scaling. The histograms are normalized such that the area enclosed is equal to unity.