

Temperature-dependent logarithmic corrections in the spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain.

Victor Barzykin

*National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Florida State University,
1800 E. Paul Dirac Dr., Tallahassee, Florida 32310*

We obtain the logarithmic corrections to the dynamic response function and NMR T_1 and T_{2G} rates in the spin-1/2 antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain using perturbative renormalization group in the leading irrelevant operator. The result is compared with NMR experiments in Sr_2CuO_3 .

Quantum spin chains have attracted considerable interest for a long time, due to both unconventional physics of the 1D materials and sophisticated theoretical methods used in the analysis of the problem. In particular, it is well known [1] that the antiferromagnetic spin-1/2 XXZ chain is critical for $J_x > J_z$ (the two exchange constants), and the spin correlators at $T = 0$ decay as a power law with distance. The critical theory can be mapped on a theory of free bosons. For $J_x < J_z$ the system acquires a spin gap. At the quantum critical point, the Heisenberg XXX chain, the spin correlation function has logarithmic corrections to the free theory coming from the leading irrelevant operator, which becomes marginal. Thus, the asymptotic power law behavior of the correlator at long distances is modified [2,3]. The staggered component of the spin-spin correlator has the following form:

$$\langle S^z(r)S^z(0) \rangle = (-1)^r \frac{\sqrt{\ln(r/r_0)}}{(2\pi)^{3/2}r}, \quad (1)$$

where the non-universal coefficient $D = 1/(2\pi)^{3/2}$ has been determined from the Bethe Ansatz [4,5].

Although this logarithmic behavior has been known for some time [2,3], numerical [6,7,8,9,10] and experimental [11,12] tests of it have appeared only recently. To fit the numerical data, various ansatzes were used [6,9,10,13]. A consistent field-theoretical derivation of the logarithmic factor for the equal-time correlator in a finite-size chain at $T = 0$ has been recently done in Ref. [4,14]. In what follows we use a similar approach to obtain staggered dynamic spin correlator, up to two-loop order in the perturbative renormalization group scheme. The imaginary part of the staggered dynamic spin susceptibility is observed in the inelastic neutron scattering experiments, and determines NMR T_1 . NMR T_{2G} is found from the real part of the spin susceptibility.

Let us now show how the logarithms appear in the time-dependent staggered spin correlation function. For this purpose it is more convenient to work in real space and imaginary time, so that one can easily apply bosonization and conformal invariance. One should then Fourier transform and analytically continue the result to real frequencies. At low temperatures and large distances we can use the continuum approximation. The

theory can be written in terms of free bosons defined on a circle. In case of $SU(2)$ - symmetric Heisenberg model it is more convenient to use the non-Abelian bosonization [2], which respects the symmetry. The action for the $SU(2)$ -symmetric matrix field \mathbf{g}_β^α includes the Wess-Zumino term with coefficient $k = 1$. The Hamiltonian density takes the following form:

$$H = H_0 - 8\pi^2/\sqrt{3}\lambda \mathbf{J}_L \cdot \mathbf{J}_R, \quad (2)$$

where H_0 is the Hamiltonian density for a free boson, $\mathbf{J}_{L,R}$ are left and right $SU(2)$ currents:

$$\mathbf{J}_L \equiv \frac{-i}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \text{tr}[\mathbf{g}^\dagger \partial_- \mathbf{g} \boldsymbol{\sigma}], \quad \mathbf{J}_R \equiv \frac{i}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \text{tr}[\partial_+ \mathbf{g} \mathbf{g}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}] \quad (3)$$

The spin operators can be written in non-abelian bosonization notation as:

$$\mathbf{S}_j = (\mathbf{J}_L + \mathbf{J}_R) + \text{const } i(-1)^j \text{tr}[\mathbf{g} \boldsymbol{\sigma}], \quad (4)$$

so that the correlation function has uniform and staggered terms,

$$\chi(r, \tau) = \langle S_0^z S_r^z \rangle \rightarrow \chi_u(r, \tau) + (-1)^r \chi_s(r, \tau), \quad (5)$$

where τ is imaginary time. Both terms vary slowly on the scale of the lattice spacing, and correspond to different Green's functions in the continuum theory. The staggered susceptibility, which is enhanced near $q = \pi$ wave vector, is observed by inelastic neutron scattering and NMR,

$$\chi_s(r, \tau) \propto \langle \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^z \mathbf{g})(r, \tau) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^z \mathbf{g})(0) \rangle. \quad (6)$$

It is not difficult to determine the contribution of the free boson with radius $R = 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ [15] - the conformally invariant WZW model on a circle of length $\beta = 1/T$ in the imaginary time direction. Indeed, \mathbf{g} has scaling dimension 1/2, so for an infinite system one writes:

$$\langle \text{tr}[\mathbf{g}(z, \bar{z}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}^z] \text{tr}[\mathbf{g}(0) \boldsymbol{\sigma}^z] \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{z\bar{z}}}. \quad (7)$$

, where $z = \tau + ix$, $\bar{z} = \tau - ix$. Here we have chosen a convenient normalization for the operator \mathbf{g} . Here and below we use the units $c = k_B = \hbar = 1$. Making a

conformal transformation from the infinite plane to the cylinder, one easily finds:

$$< tr[\mathbf{g}(z, \bar{z})\boldsymbol{\sigma}^z] tr[\mathbf{g}(0)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^z] > = \frac{\pi T}{\sqrt{\sin(\pi T z) \sin(\pi T \bar{z})}}. \quad (8)$$

The result for real time is given by a straightforward analytic continuation, $\tau = it$. To obtain $\chi''(q, \omega)$, one simply performs a Fourier transform. Integration over q in the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$ gives NMR T_1 [16]. These results are, of course, well known.

$$\delta < tr[\mathbf{g}(z, \bar{z})\boldsymbol{\sigma}^z] tr[\mathbf{g}(0)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^z] > = \frac{\pi^2 \lambda_0 T}{\sqrt{3 \sin[\pi T z] \sin[\pi T \bar{z}]}} \left\{ \ln \left[\frac{\sin[\pi T z] \sin[\pi T \bar{z}]}{(\pi T/T_0)^2} \right] + \text{const} \right\} \quad (9)$$

Here λ_0 is the “bare” coupling constant for a theory defined with a cutoff at $T = T_0$.

We can now sum the leading logarithmic contributions using the standard Callan-Symanzik RG equations for the staggered spin correlation function $\chi_s(r, \tau, T, \lambda)$:

$$[-\partial/\partial \ln T + \beta(\lambda)\partial/\partial \lambda + 2\gamma(\lambda)]\chi_s(r, \tau T, \tau T, \lambda) = 0, \quad (10)$$

where $\beta(\lambda)$ is the beta function for the coupling constant

$$\chi_s(r, \tau, T, \lambda_0) = \exp \left(-2 \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda(T)} \frac{\gamma[\lambda']}{\beta(\lambda')} d\lambda' \right) F[\lambda(T), rT, \tau T], \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda_0 \equiv \lambda(T_0)$ is the “bare” coupling - a coupling at the energy cutoff scale T_0 , $F[\lambda(T), rT, \tau T]$ is an arbitrary function of the effective coupling constant at scale T , $\lambda(T)$.

Since the coupling constant flows to zero as T is decreased, one can use perturbative expressions for $\gamma(\lambda)$ and $\beta(\lambda)$ to determine the long-distance asymptotics for the staggered spin susceptibility. The universal terms in the perturbative expansion for the β -function [17] and the anomalous dimension [2,3] are known,

$$\beta(\lambda) = -(4\pi/\sqrt{3})\lambda^2 - (1/2)(4\pi/\sqrt{3})^2\lambda^3 \quad (13)$$

$$\gamma(\lambda) = 1/2 - (\pi/\sqrt{3})\lambda. \quad (14)$$

Thus the effective coupling is given by:

$$\chi_s(r, \tau, T, \lambda) = \frac{1}{r} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_0}{\lambda(T)}} e^{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n [\lambda(T)^n - \lambda_0^n]} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} F_m(rT, \tau T) \lambda(T)^m \quad (18)$$

The coefficients, a_n and the functions $F_m(rT, \tau T)$ can be determined from the perturbative expansion in the leading irrelevant operator.

We can now RG-improve the perturbative result

$$\chi_s(r, \tau, T, \lambda) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \frac{\pi T \sqrt{\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} \right)}}{\sqrt{\sin(\pi T z) \sin(\pi T \bar{z})}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{4 \ln(\Lambda/T)} \ln[\sin(\pi T z) \sin(\pi T \bar{z})] \right). \quad (19)$$

In order to obtain the logarithm, one has to go further [2,3] and do a perturbative expansion in the leading irrelevant operator in Eq.(2), and then collect the diverging terms in a Renormalization Group (RG) scheme [4,14]. To the first order in the leading irrelevant operator the correction can be easily calculated. The details of a similar calculation of this diagram in a finite-size chain at $T = 0$ can be found in Ref. [14]. The first-order correction has the following form:

λ in Eq.(2):

$$\frac{d\lambda}{d \ln T} = -\beta(\lambda) \quad (11)$$

and $\gamma(\lambda)$ is the anomalous dimension. In Eq. (10) the T -derivative acts only on the first argument of χ_s ; rT and τT are held fixed. The solution of Eq.(10) can be written as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda(T)} = \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \left\{ \ln(\Lambda/T) + \frac{1}{2} \ln[\ln(\Lambda/T)] \right\} + O(1), \quad (15)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \text{const} \cdot \sqrt{\lambda_0} e^{\sqrt{3}/(4\pi\lambda_0) T_0}. \quad (16)$$

Thus, we can rewrite the integral in Eq.(12):

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda(T)} \frac{\gamma(\lambda)}{\beta(\lambda)} d\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{T_0}{T} + \frac{1}{4} \ln \frac{\lambda(T)}{\lambda_0} + \dots \quad (17)$$

In general, one can expand the staggered spin susceptibility Eq.(12) in powers of $\lambda(T)$:

Eq.(7), Eq.(9). This can be done by expanding Eq.(18) to first order in the bare coupling constant, λ_0 , and comparing it with the perturbative calculations. We find:

This expression is our final perturbative result, which has to be Fourier-transformed and continued analytically to real frequencies. For this purpose it is more convenient

to work with temperature-dependent anomalous dimension $\eta(T)$ instead of the form Eq.(19) with the logarithms. To the same order we can write:

$$\chi_s(r, \tau, T, \lambda) = \frac{\pi T}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} \right)} (\sin(\pi T z) \sin(\pi T \bar{z}))^{\frac{-\eta(T)}{2}}, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\eta(T) = 1 - \frac{1}{2 \ln \frac{\Lambda}{T}} \quad (21)$$

The analytic continuation of Eq.(20) is then analogous

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im} \chi(q, \omega) &= \frac{2^{\eta(T)-2}}{(2\pi)^{3/2} \pi T} \sin(\pi \eta(T)/2) \sqrt{\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} \right)} \times \\ &\times \text{Im} \left\{ B \left(\frac{i(\omega - q)}{4\pi T} + \frac{\eta(T)}{4}, 1 - \frac{\eta(T)}{2} \right) B \left(\frac{i(\omega + q)}{4\pi T} + \frac{\eta(T)}{4}, 1 - \frac{\eta(T)}{2} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $B(x, y) \equiv \Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)/\Gamma(x+y)$ is the beta-function. An immediate consequence of the temperature-dependent anomalous dimension is that the correlation length acquires additional logarithmic temperature dependence, which can be observed in the inelastic neutron scattering experiments:

$$\xi^{-1} = \pi T \left(1 - \frac{1}{2 \ln \frac{\Lambda}{T}} \right). \quad (23)$$

This also agrees with thermal Bethe ansatz calculations

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{2k_B T}{\hbar^2} \int \frac{dq}{2\pi} A_{\perp}^2(q) \frac{\text{Im} \chi(q, \omega_0)}{\omega_0} \quad (25)$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{T_{2G}} \right)^2 = \frac{p}{8\hbar^2} \left[\int \frac{dq}{2\pi} A_{\parallel}^4(q) \chi^2(q) - \left\{ \int \frac{dq}{2\pi} A_{\parallel}^2(q) \chi(q) \right\}^2 \right]. \quad (26)$$

Here $A_{\parallel}(q)$ and $A_{\perp}(q)$ are the hyperfine couplings parallel and perpendicular to the easy axis of the crystal, ω_0 is the nuclear resonance frequency, which is much smaller than any other electron energy scale. The magnetic field is directed along the c -axis. The q -dependence is smooth and arises from appropriate form factors. The susceptibility χ should, in principle, include contributions from both the uniform and staggered spin fluctuations. However, simple power counting [16] shows that the staggered component is dominant at small T . For the purpose of comparison of our theory with experiment it is convenient

to that in case of a Luttinger liquid, which is well known [15,18,19,20]. We therefore only discuss quantities which can be measured by inelastic neutron scattering and NMR. Continuing Eq.(20) to real frequencies, we get:

[21].

Let us now compute the nuclear relaxation rates. Nuclear spins are coupled to electron degrees of freedom by the magnetic hyperfine hamiltonian:

$$H_{HF} = \sum_{\alpha, i, j} A_{\alpha}^{ij} I_{i\alpha} S_{j\alpha}, \quad (24)$$

I is the nuclear spin, S is the electron spin, α enumerates spin projections for sites i and j . We will use the following expressions [22] for calculating T_1 and T_{2G} :

nient to define normalized dimensionless NMR rates [23], which should be universal functions of T/J :

$$(1/T_1)_{norm} = \frac{\hbar J}{T_1 A_{\perp}^2(\pi)} \quad (27)$$

$$(\sqrt{T}/T_{2G})_{norm} = \left(\frac{k_B T}{pJ} \right)^{1/2} \frac{\hbar J}{A_{\parallel}^2(\pi) T_{2G}} \quad (28)$$

A complete calculation of the NMR relaxation rates gives:

$$(1/T_1)_{norm} = 2D \sqrt{\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} \right)} \left(1 + \frac{\ln 2}{2 \ln \frac{\Lambda}{T}} + O \left[\frac{1}{\ln^2 \frac{\Lambda}{T}} \right] \right) \quad (29)$$

$$(\sqrt{T}/T_{2G})_{norm} = \frac{\sqrt{T_0} D}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\ln \frac{\Lambda}{T} \right)} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma + 4 \ln 2 + \frac{J}{2T_0}}{2 \ln \frac{\Lambda}{T}} + O \left[\frac{1}{\ln^2 \frac{\Lambda}{T}} \right] \right). \quad (30)$$

Here $D = 1/(2\pi)^{3/2}$ is the non-universal amplitude, $\gamma \simeq 0.5772157$ is the Euler's constant, while the integrals I_0 and I_1 are given by

$$I_0 = \int_0^\infty dx \left| \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+ix}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{3+ix}{4}\right)} \right|^4 \simeq 71.2766$$

$$I_1 = \int_0^\infty dx \left| \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+ix}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{3+ix}{4}\right)} \right|^4 \times$$

$$\times \operatorname{Re} \left[\Psi\left(\frac{1+ix}{4}\right) + \Psi\left(\frac{3+ix}{4}\right) \right] \simeq -259.94, \quad (31)$$

where $\Psi(x)$ is digamma function. The $1/\ln(\Lambda/T)$ term could be incorporated to redefine the cutoff Λ as in Ref. [4]. Thus, up to terms $O(1/\ln^2(\Lambda/T))$ the temperature dependence for $1/T_1$ or \sqrt{T}/T_{2G} is actually given by the square root of the *log* and *loglog* terms in the numerator of Eq.(31). The ratio of the relaxation rates, however, is only weakly temperature dependent. We find:

$$\left(\frac{T_{2G}}{T_1 \sqrt{T}} \right)_{\text{norm}} \simeq 1.680 \left(1 + \frac{0.7632}{\ln(\Lambda/T)} \right) \quad (32)$$




FIG. 1. NMR T_1 and $T_{2G}/T_1 T^{1/2}$ vs T/J from Takigawa *et al.* [23] fitted to our expression.

To summarize, the new effect of the higher-order corrections in the leading irrelevant operator to the dynamic spin susceptibility is, apart from the *loglog* term in the common factor $\sqrt{\ln(\Lambda/T) + 0.5 \ln[\ln(\Lambda/T)]}$, the temperature-dependent anomalous dimension and logarithmic corrections to the correlation length. These only lead to an additional weak $O(1/\ln(\Lambda/T))$ temperature dependence for the relaxation rates $1/T_1$ and

$1/T_{2G}$, which can be incorporated as a correction to the non-universal cutoff scale Λ . The relaxation rate ratio $(T_{2G}/T_1 \sqrt{T})$, however, filters out the common factor, and therefore picks up weak $1/\ln(\Lambda/T)$ temperature dependence, which we have calculated. We note that our result is similar to the ansatz used by Starykh *et al* [13]. There are, however, important differences. Starykh *et al.* [13] don't have the *loglog* term, which turns out to be the most important correction in this approximation. The $1/\ln(T_0/T)$ weak temperature dependence for the ratio of the relaxation rates was also not explicitly obtained in Ref. [13]. Our theoretical results are in excellent agreement with experimental data of Takigawa *et al.* [12,23] on Sr_2CuO_3 , as shown in Fig.1.

I would like to thank I. Affleck and L.P. Gor'kov for useful discussions and comments. This work was supported by the National High Magnetic Field Laboratory through NSF cooperative agreement No. DMR-9527035 and the State of Florida.

-
- [1] For a review see I. Affleck, *Fields, Strings and Critical Phenomena* [ed. E. Brézin and J. Zinn-Justin, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989]; 511.
 - [2] I. Affleck, D. Gepner, H.J. Schulz and T. Ziman, J. Phys. **A22**, 511 (1989).
 - [3] R.R. Singh, M.E. Fisher and R. Shankar, Phys. Rev. **B39**, 2562 (1989).
 - [4] I. Affleck, J. Phys. **A31**, 4573 (1998).
 - [5] S. Lukyanov and A. Zamalodchikov, Nucl. Phys. **B493**, 571 (1997); S. Lukyanov, Nucl. Phys. **B522**, 533 (1998).
 - [6] K. Kubo, T.A. Kaplan and J. Borysowicz, Phys. Rev. **B38**, 11550 (1988).
 - [7] S. Liang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 1597 (1990).
 - [8] A.W. Sandvik and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. **B47**, 12333 (1993).
 - [9] K. Hallberg, P. Horsch and G. Martinez, Phys. Rev. **B52**, R719 (1995).
 - [10] T. Koma and N. Mizukoshi, J. Stat. Phys. **83**, 661 (1996).
 - [11] D. A. Tennant, R. A. Cowley, S. Nagler and A. M. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 13368 (1995).
 - [12] M. Takigawa, N. Motoyama, H. Eisaki and S. Uchida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4612 (1996)
 - [13] O. A. Starykh, R. R. P. Singh, and A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 539 (1997).
 - [14] V. Barzykin, I. Affleck, J. Phys. **A**, **32**, 867 (1999).
 - [15] A. M. Tsvelik, *Quantum Field Theory in Condensed Matter Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995)
 - [16] S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 13006 (1994).
 - [17] J. Solyom, Adv. Phys. **28**, 201 (1979).
 - [18] H.J.Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 6372 (1986).
 - [19] R. Shankar, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **4**, 2371 (1990).
 - [20] S. Sachdev, T. Senthil, and R. Shankar, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 258 (1994).

- [21] K. Nomura and M. Yamada, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 8217 (1991).
- [22] C. P. Slichter, in *Strongly Correlated Electronic Systems*, ed. by K. S. Bedell *et al*, (Addison Wesley, 1994).
- [23] M. Takigawa, O. A. Starykh, A. W. Sandvik, and R. R. P. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 13681 (1997).