

PITHA 94/9  
 hep-lat/9401034

# THE UNIVERSAL EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL FOR THREE-DIMENSIONAL MASSIVE SCALAR FIELD THEORY FROM THE MONTE CARLO STUDY OF THE ISING MODEL

M.M.Tsypin<sup>1</sup>

*Institute for Theoretical Physics E, RWTH Aachen, D-52056 Aachen, Germany*

and

*Department of Theoretical Physics,  
 P. N. Lebedev Physics Institute, Leninsky pr. 53, 117924 Moscow, Russia*

## Abstract

We study the low-energy effective action  $S_{eff}[\varphi]$  for the one-component real scalar field theory in three Euclidean dimensions in the symmetric phase, concentrating on its static part — effective potential  $V_{eff}(\varphi)$ . It characterizes the approach to the phase transition in all systems that belong to the 3d Ising universality class. We compute it from the probability distributions of the average magnetization in the 3d Ising model in a homogeneous external field, obtained by Monte Carlo. We find that the  $\varphi^6$  term in  $V_{eff}$  is important, while the higher terms can be neglected within our statistical errors. Thus we obtain the approximate effective action

$$S_{eff} = \int d^3x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial_\mu \varphi + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \varphi^2 + m g_4 \varphi^4 + g_6 \varphi^6 \right\},$$

with arbitrary mass  $m$  that sets the scale, and dimensionless couplings  $g_4 = 0.97 \pm 0.02$  and  $g_6 = 2.05 \pm 0.15$ . The value of  $g_4$  is consistent with the renormalization group fixed point coupling. This  $V_{eff}$ , when used instead of the traditional  $a\varphi^2 + b\varphi^4$ , turns the Ginzburg–Landau description of the long-wave properties of the 3d theory near criticality into quantitatively accurate. It is also relevant to the theory of cosmological phase transitions.

PITHA 94/9  
 January 1994

---

<sup>1</sup>Alexander von Humboldt Fellow  
 e-mail: hkf256@djukfa11.bitnet

# 1 Introduction

This work is devoted to the following problem: what is the effective potential, and the corresponding effective Ginzburg–Landau theory, that would provide not exact, but reasonably phenomenologically accurate description of the properties of the 3d Ising model near the phase transition (and other models that belong to the same universality class)?

The model from this universality class that is particularly suitable for field-theoretical treatment is the theory of one-component real scalar field in three Euclidean dimensions (“3d  $\phi^4$  theory”), defined by the (bare) action

$$S = \int d^3x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\mu \phi + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi^2 + \lambda \phi^4 \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Thus, from the field-theoretical point of view, we study the low-energy effective action of this theory.

This problem, being interesting by itself, is also relevant to the theory of cosmological phase transitions in the early Universe. The second order high-temperature phase transition in the 3+1-dimensional quantum field theory is in the universality class of the 3d Euclidean phase transition. The weak first-order high-temperature transitions can be studied in the framework of effective 3d Euclidean theory as well. The effective potential for such problems has been a subject of recent investigations [1, 2]. The use of the perturbation theory is hindered in three dimensions by infrared divergences and by the strong-coupling nature of the problem. Such issues as the existence and role of the  $|\varphi|^3$  term in the effective potential remain to be settled.

Thus the nonperturbative study of the effective action of the simplest 3d field theory (1), or that of the 3d Ising model, seems appropriate.

## 2 The model

We study the Ising model with the nearest-neighbour interaction on a simple cubic lattice. The partition function is

$$Z = \sum_{\{\phi_i\}} \exp \left\{ \beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \phi_i \phi_j + J \sum_i \phi_i \right\}, \quad \phi_i = \pm 1, \quad (2)$$

where  $J$  is the homogeneous external field (“magnetic field”). We study the symmetric (paramagnetic) phase, thus the coupling  $\beta$  is less than, but close to the critical value  $\beta_c \approx 0.22165$ .

Our main subject are the long-wave (low-momentum, low-energy) properties of the model, when it is in the scaling region, but not exactly at the critical point. Then the properties are fixed, the only free parameter is the mass (= the scale). The particles of the corresponding 2+1-dimensional field theory are massive (and thus can be nonrelativistic) and have well-defined low-energy properties, such as nonrelativistic scattering amplitudes. The effective action we are looking for is a convenient formalism to describe these properties.

### 3 The effective action

The low-energy Ginzburg-Landau-Wilson effective action can be written as

$$S_{eff} = \int d^3x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} Z_\varphi^{-1} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial_\mu \varphi + V_{eff}(\varphi) - J(x) \varphi(x) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\varphi(x)$  is the (slowly varying) average magnetization, and we keep only the lowest-order derivative term. To compute  $S_{eff}$  one needs to know the effective potential  $V_{eff}(\varphi)$  and the field renormalization factor  $Z_\varphi$ . To compute the former, it is sufficient to consider only the homogeneous external field  $J(x) = J$ ; the latter can be derived from the two-point correlation function of  $\varphi$ . Thus we never have to work with the explicitly  $x$ -dependent  $J(x)$ .

#### 3.1 The effective potential

The effective potential (free energy)  $V_{eff}(\varphi)$  [3]-[5] is defined by

$$\frac{dV_{eff}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = J, \quad \varphi = \langle \phi \rangle_J. \quad (4)$$

Thus (3), considered at the tree level, reproduces correctly the average magnetization  $\langle \phi \rangle_J$  as a function of external field  $J$ . We recall also that  $V_{eff}(\varphi)$  is a generating function for one-particle irreducible (1PI)  $n$ -point Green functions  $\Gamma_n$  at momentum zero,

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = \sum_n \frac{1}{n!} \Gamma_n(p=0) \varphi^n. \quad (5)$$

#### 3.2 How to compute $V_{eff}$ on the lattice - existing methods

Our goal is to compute  $V_{eff}$  by Monte Carlo with the best possible precision. There are at least three approaches.

- 1) Direct computation of the correlation functions  $\Gamma_n$ , such as

$$\Gamma_4(p=0) = \langle \phi^4 \rangle - 3 \langle \phi^2 \rangle^2, \quad (6)$$

and so on [6]-[8]. This approach works reasonably well for  $\Gamma_4$ , but is hardly feasible for  $\Gamma_6$  and higher  $\Gamma_n$ : after subtraction of disconnected and one-particle reducible parts the signal to noise ratio turns out to be very bad, and statistical errors are prohibitively high [8].

- 2) Compute the magnetization per spin  $\varphi = \langle \phi \rangle_J$  as a function of the external field  $J$  by Monte Carlo, invert this function to obtain  $J = J(\varphi)$  and integrate it numerically to obtain  $V_{eff}(\varphi)$  according to (4) [9, 10]. The drawback of this approach is that it requires many measurements of  $\langle \phi \rangle_J$  at different values of  $J$ .

- 3) Study the probability distribution of the order parameter  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \phi_i$  [11]. One uses the Monte Carlo algorithm to generate a Boltzmann ensemble of configurations. For

every configuration in the ensemble one computes the order parameter (magnetization per site)  $\varphi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \phi_i$ , where  $N$  is the total number of sites on the lattice. Thus the probability distribution of  $\varphi$  is obtained, which is characterized by the probability density

$$P(\varphi) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\{\phi_i\}} \delta\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \phi_i - \varphi\right) \exp\left\{\beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \phi_i \phi_j\right\}. \quad (7)$$

To prove that this is indeed the probability density, it is sufficient to observe that for any function  $f(\varphi)$

$$\int P(\varphi) f(\varphi) d\varphi = \left\langle f\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \phi_i\right) \right\rangle. \quad (8)$$

This probability is considered usually in connection with the “constrained effective potential”  $V_{con}(\varphi)$  [3],[11]-[14], which is defined by

$$P(\varphi) \propto \exp\{-\Omega V_{con}(\varphi)\}, \quad (9)$$

for a system in a box of volume  $\Omega$  (we set the lattice spacing equal to unity, so  $\Omega = N$ ). It can be shown that in the infinite volume limit the constrained effective potential coincides with the standard  $V_{eff}$  [12, 13].

One can gain additional insight into these different ways to extract  $V_{eff}$  from the Monte Carlo data by considering the actual distributions of the order parameter in a typical case (Fig. 1).

The first method studies, essentially, the deviation of the  $J = 0$  curve from the Gaussian, which is quite small and difficult to measure. The distribution is located at small values of  $\varphi$ , where the dominating term in  $V_{eff}$  is  $\varphi^2$ , while higher terms provide only small corrections.

The second method means that we use each curve to compute the expectation value of  $\varphi$ , i.e.  $\langle \phi \rangle_J$ , and discard all remaining information contained in the data. (It seems that one can obtain a good method by combining this with the reweighting technique [15, 16]. Then  $\langle \phi \rangle_J$  could be computed accurately for any  $J$  from 0 to  $\approx 0.3$  just from the data at Fig. 1 plus the data on the energy. And all the information from probability distributions is utilized. However, we do not pursue this line further here).

The third method also looks at the form of the  $J = 0$  probability distribution and thus has the similar drawbacks as the first one.

### 3.3 Our method

For the Monte Carlo computation of the effective potential we have developed a method that is close in spirit to the constrained effective potential approach, but contains two significant improvements.

First, it is obvious from the preceding discussion, that to obtain the information on the higher powers of  $\varphi$  in  $V_{eff}$ , one should study the system at  $\varphi$  far from zero. This can be achieved with the help of the external field. The definition (9) allows a straightforward generalization for nonzero external field:

$$P(\varphi) \propto \exp\{-\Omega V_{con}(\varphi) + \Omega J \varphi\}. \quad (10)$$

Thus one can check whether some ansatz, such as  $V_{con}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + u\varphi^4$ , gives a good approximation for the  $V_{con}$ , and find the values of parameters (such as  $r$  and  $u$ ), by performing a simultaneous fit of several histograms, corresponding to different values of  $J$ , by (10), using the parameters of  $V_{con}$  as fit parameters.

The second point concerns the correspondence between the probability distribution and the effective potential. When we use the relation (10), we get the finite-volume constrained effective potential. However, the quantity that enters the low-energy effective action is the *infinite*-volume  $V_{eff}$ , i.e., the free energy per unit volume in the usual thermodynamical sense. As in the infinite-volume limit ( $\Omega \rightarrow \infty$ ) both potentials are known to coincide, one is tempted to use the formula [17]

$$P(\varphi) \propto \exp \{ -\Omega V_{eff}(\varphi) + \Omega J\varphi \}. \quad (11)$$

and to hope that for the reasonably large volume  $\Omega$  the finite volume effects are reasonably small. It turns out that *this is actually not the case*. The situation is illustrated by the lower graph at the Fig. 2. The finite volume corrections (which manifest themselves by the volume dependence of parameters of  $V_{eff}$ ) are unacceptably large, in spite of going to zero in the infinite volume limit. This behaviour shows that (11) is not a very good approximation. It turns out that while (11) reproduces correctly the exponential dependence on  $\Omega$  at  $\Omega \rightarrow \infty$ , it misses the important preexponential factor.

The improved formula for the probability distribution of the order parameter of the system in a finite box of volume  $\Omega$  with the periodic boundary conditions is

$$P(\varphi) \propto \sqrt{\frac{d^2 V_{eff}(\varphi)}{d\varphi^2}} \exp \{ -\Omega V_{eff}(\varphi) + \Omega J\varphi \}, \quad (12)$$

where  $V_{eff}(\varphi)$  is the infinite-volume effective potential. This relation can be found (in somewhat implicit form or for special cases) in the literature (see [18]; [19],(5.54); [14],(4.27)). The upper graph at Fig. 2 confirms that this is indeed a good approximation: no finite volume corrections are visible for  $L/\xi \geq 4$ .

We outline here briefly the derivation of the preexponential factor in (12). On the one-loop level one can write the effective potential as a bare potential plus one-loop correction. For a theory with a bare Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\mu \phi + V_0(\phi) \quad (13)$$

we have

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = V_0(\varphi) + \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \ln \left( p^2 + \frac{d^2 V_0}{d\varphi^2} \right). \quad (14)$$

At the same time for the constrained effective potential in the box of volume  $\Omega$  the integral is substituted by a sum over momenta allowed by the boundary conditions, with the  $p = 0$  mode excluded:

$$V_{con}(\varphi)|_\Omega = V_0(\varphi) + \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_p' \ln \left( p^2 + \frac{d^2 V_0}{d\varphi^2} \right). \quad (15)$$

Thus the difference between  $V_{con}$  and  $V_{eff}$  reduces to the difference between the sum and the integral. This difference has been computed in [18], sect. 3.3. The leading large volume term takes a simple form:

$$V_{con}(\varphi)|_{\Omega} - V_{eff} = -\frac{1}{2\Omega} \ln \frac{d^2 V_0}{d\varphi^2}. \quad (16)$$

This provides the preexponential factor in (12). The last step is to substitute  $V_0$  by  $V_{eff}$ , which means essentially the use of selfconsistent values for the masses.

### 3.4 The preexponent in the probability distribution and the equal weight versus equal height problem for asymmetric first order phase transitions

We deviate a little from our problem to make an additional comment on the formula (12).

This formula seems quite universal and useful for the various problems connected with the order parameter probability distribution. In our problem we use it in the symmetric phase for a range of  $J$ . A very different and in some sense complementary application is the equal weight versus equal height problem for asymmetric first order transitions [17],[19]-[23]. Consider a model with a first order phase transition between two phases characterized by the order parameters  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ , exactly at the transition point. This means that the free energies for both phases are the same, i.e.,  $V_{eff}(\varphi_1) = V_{eff}(\varphi_2)$ . Put the system in a finite box much larger than the correlation lengths in both phases. Consider the probability distribution  $P(\varphi)$  of the order parameter. Then this distribution can be approximated by the two narrow Gaussian peaks around  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  [20, 17]. The question is, do they have equal height or equal weight? The formula (11) predicts equal height, while it can be shown that equal weight is the correct answer [21]-[23],[19]. But this it just what follows from (12).

## 4 Monte Carlo computation of the effective action

Now we turn to our computation of the effective action. We study the 3d Ising model (2) on a simple cubic lattice with periodic boundary conditions, on lattices from  $14^3$  to  $58^3$ . The Swendsen-Wang cluster Monte Carlo algorithm in the external magnetic field [24]-[26] is used to generate the Boltzmann ensemble of configurations. (We use the version of this algorithm without the ghost spin). For every configuration we measure magnetization per site  $\varphi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \phi_i$  and compute the histograms for the probability density  $P(\varphi)$ , for several values of  $J$ . Then we do the simultaneous fit of all the histograms with the formula (12). (We minimize the sum of  $\chi^2$  from the individual histograms). The first ansatz to try is

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + u\varphi^4, \quad (17)$$

inspired by the standard Ginzburg-Landau theory (or the tree-level  $\phi^4$  theory). The result is shown at Fig. 3. One can see the discrepancy between the data and the fit — not very large, but statistically significant at our level of precision. This means that (17) does not provide a good quantitative description of the effective potential. So we consider a three-parameter expression

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + u\varphi^4 + w\varphi^6. \quad (18)$$

This form is motivated by several intuitive considerations that are discussed below. We have found that it provides the ideal fit (Fig. 1): there is no systematic discrepancy between the data and the fit, just statistical noise. We have found no other reasonable ansatz that works so well (we have also tried three-parameter expressions  $V_{eff}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + u|\varphi|^w$  and  $V_{eff}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + w|\varphi|^3 + u\varphi^4$  — they work poorly).

Thus for every value of the bare coupling  $\beta$  we obtain the low-energy effective Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{2}Z_\varphi^{-1}\partial_\mu\varphi\partial_\mu\varphi + r\varphi^2 + u\varphi^4 + w\varphi^6. \quad (19)$$

The three parameters  $r, u, w$  are determined by the fitting procedure described above. The field renormalization factor  $Z_\varphi$  is obtained from the propagator

$$G_2(\mathbf{p}) = \langle\phi(\mathbf{p})\phi^*(\mathbf{p})\rangle, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\phi(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \phi_{\mathbf{x}} e^{i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}}. \quad (21)$$

Then at small momentum  $p$

$$G_2(\mathbf{p})^{-1} = Z_\varphi^{-1}p^2 + 2r. \quad (22)$$

We use the lattice version of this,

$$G_2(\mathbf{p})^{-1} = Z_\varphi^{-1} \sum_{\mu=1}^3 2(1 - \cos p_\mu) + 2r, \quad (23)$$

and use typically three values of momentum,

$$p_\mu = (p, 0, 0), \quad p = \frac{2\pi n}{L}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \quad (24)$$

to find  $Z_\varphi^{-1}$  as the slope of  $G_2(\mathbf{p})^{-1}$  as a function of  $\sum_\mu 2(1 - \cos p_\mu)$ .

After the renormalization of  $\varphi$ ,

$$\varphi = \sqrt{Z_\varphi}\varphi_R, \quad (25)$$

we obtain the effective Lagrangian in the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\varphi_R\partial_\mu\varphi_R + \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi_R^2 + mg_4\varphi_R^4 + g_6\varphi_R^6, \quad (26)$$

where

$$m = \sqrt{2Z_\varphi r}, \quad g_4 = \frac{Z_\varphi^2 u}{\sqrt{2Z_\varphi r}}, \quad g_6 = Z_\varphi^3 w. \quad (27)$$

In the continuum limit ( $m \rightarrow 0$ ) this effective Lagrangian should be universal. Thus the only free parameter is  $m$ , that determines the scale, while the dimensionless four- and six-point couplings  $g_4$  and  $g_6$  take definite values that are the same for the whole 3d Ising universality class. Our numerical results are collected in Table 1 and represented at Figs. 4–7.

## 5 Data analysis and extrapolation to the continuum limit

Apart from statistical errors, there are two sources of systematic errors: finite volume and finite UV cutoff. To check for the finite volume effects, we increase the lattice size  $L$ , keeping  $m$  fixed. One can see from Fig. 2 that for  $L/\xi \geq 4$  finite volume effects are negligible. To check for the effect of the finite UV cutoff, we keep  $L/\xi$  fixed at  $\approx 4.1$ , increase  $\xi$  and scale  $J$  according to

$$J \propto \xi^{-\beta\delta/\nu} \quad (\beta\delta \approx 1.57, \nu \approx 0.63) \quad (28)$$

The scaling limit is characterized by stabilization of  $g_4$  and  $g_6$  as the functions of  $\xi$ , for large enough  $\xi$ . We observe a smooth approach to scaling (Figs. 4 and 5), but note that the shift of  $g_6$  caused by the finiteness of the cutoff is still visible on our largest lattices. The correlation length in zero field is  $\xi = m^{-1} \approx 14$  for the  $58^3$  lattice, but one should keep in mind that it is smaller for nonzero  $J$ , and for the largest  $J$  used in the fit it is approximately twice as small. The presence of finite cutoff effects in our data makes it necessary to extrapolate the results to continuum limit  $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ . As we keep  $L/\xi$  fixed, we work in terms of  $L$ . The reasonable extrapolation is

$$g_6(L) = g_6(\infty) + aL^{-\kappa}. \quad (29)$$

The statistical errors in the data for  $g_6$  are still too high to allow the determination of the exponent  $\kappa$  with reasonable accuracy, while different values of  $\kappa$  (such as  $\kappa = 1$  or  $\kappa = 2$ ) lead to considerably different extrapolated values  $g_6(\infty)$ . The situation can be alleviated if we take into account that the statistical errors of  $g_4$  and  $g_6$  are not independent (Fig. 6), and so there is a linear combination of  $g_4$  and  $g_6$  that has much smaller error than  $g_4$  and  $g_6$  separately (Fig. 7). For this combination one can find the corresponding exponent  $\kappa = 1.5 \pm 0.2$ . The plausible assumption is that  $g_6$  should be extrapolated with the same exponent ( $g_4$  shows little dependence on  $L$  for  $L \geq 17$ , so one does not really have to extrapolate it). That is why we plot the couplings at Figs. 4 and 5 as functions of  $L^{-1.5}$ .

Our result for the continuum limit is

$$\begin{aligned} g_4 &= 0.97 \pm 0.02, \\ g_6 &= 2.05 \pm 0.15, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where the errors are the standard deviations.



## 6 Discussion

Here we compare our results with the data available in the literature, and give some semiintuitive arguments in favour of the effective Lagrangian (26) as a good approximate theory.

### 6.1 Four-point coupling

The four-point coupling of the 3d scalar field theory has been a subject of many studies. It is not the main subject of our investigation (our main point is the role of  $g_6$ ), but the comparison of our  $g_4$  with the available data provides a useful consistency check of our computation. Here we list some data for  $g_4$  obtained by different methods.

From the 3d renormalization group fixed point:

$$\begin{array}{ll} 0.989 \pm 0.004 & [27]\text{--}[30] \\ 0.981 & [31], \text{ revised estimate} \end{array}$$

From the high-temperature series [32]–[34]:

$$\begin{array}{ll} 0.99 \pm 0.03 & (\text{simple cubic lattice}) \\ 0.991 \pm 0.003 & (\text{BCC lattice}) \\ 0.99 \pm 0.01 & (\text{FCC lattice}) \end{array}$$

From the Monte Carlo studies of the  $\langle \phi^4 \rangle - 3\langle \phi^2 \rangle^2$ :

$$\begin{array}{ll} 1.00 \pm 0.04 & [6], \xi = 3.3 \\ 1.00 \pm 0.03 & [7], \xi = 6.6 \\ 0.80 \pm 0.02 & [7], \xi = 16 \\ 0.95 \pm 0.08 & [8], \xi = 3.2 \\ 0.90 \pm 0.04 & [35], \text{ extrapolation to the continuum limit} \\ 1.00 \pm 0.08 & [36], \xi = 14.5 \end{array}$$

We observe that our result  $g_4 = 0.97 \pm 0.02$  fits well into this picture.

### 6.2 Six-point coupling

The information about  $g_6$  is more scarce. The only Monte Carlo study we are aware of is [8]. However, large statistical errors made it impossible to reach a definite conclusion about the value of  $g_6$  in the continuum limit and whether it is different from zero.

Another source of information is provided by the study of the “Ising equation of state” in the framework of the  $\varepsilon$ -expansion [37]–[41]. The equation of state describes magnetization as a function of the homogeneous external field, thus providing information on the effective potential. As the gradient term in  $\mathcal{L}_{eff}$ , that determines the normalization of the renormalized field, is not considered, one can extract parameters that do not depend on this normalization. The ratio  $g_6/g_4^2$  is such a parameter invariant under the change of the scale of the field. The convenient representation of the equation of state is given by Avdeeva and Migdal [37]. In original notation,

$$H = \chi^{-(\beta+\gamma)/\gamma} \phi(M\chi^{\beta/\gamma}), \quad (31)$$

where  $M$  is magnetization,  $H$  is the external field,  $\chi = \partial M / \partial H$  is the susceptibility in the finite field, and the function  $\phi$  is found to be

$$\phi(m) = m - m^3 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}m^5 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3). \quad (32)$$

for the dimension of space  $d = 4 - \varepsilon$ . From this equation it is straightforward to compute

$$\frac{g_6}{(g_4)^2} = 2\varepsilon - \frac{20}{27}\varepsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3). \quad (33)$$

The next order in  $\varepsilon$  can be derived from the parametric representation of the equation of state described in [41], sect. 25.1.3. One finds

$$\frac{g_6}{(g_4)^2} = 2\varepsilon - \frac{20}{27}\varepsilon^2 + 1.2759\varepsilon^3 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4). \quad (34)$$

The series is obviously divergent, and the only straightforward conclusion for  $\varepsilon = 1$  that one can make without some resummation is

$$\frac{g_6}{(g_4)^2} = 2.0 \pm 0.7. \quad (35)$$

This agrees well with our result (30).

The effective potential of the  $\phi^4$  model can be also computed in the framework of perturbation theory directly in  $d = 3$ . The result including up to five loops can be found in [42], eq.(3.3). It turns out, however, that the two-loop contribution to  $g_6$  is four times as large as the one-loop, the three-loop even larger, etc. This makes it impossible to derive any number for  $g_6$  without some resummation of the series.

Yet another approach to the computation of the effective Lagrangian is provided by the Wegner-Houghton equation in the local-potential approximation [43, 44]. The fixed point for the potential corresponds to  $g_6 = 2.40$  [44].

One more approach is the strong-coupling expansion [45]-[47] and the dimensional expansion [48] for the field theory in the Ising limit, i.e., in the limit of infinitely strong bare coupling. The results obtained for  $d = 3$  disagree with ours, as the strong-coupling expansion favours  $g_6 = 0$  [47], while the dimensional expansion leads to conjecture that  $g_6 = \infty$  [48].

Finally, we compare our  $g_6$  with results of Tetradis and Wetterich, obtained within the “effective average action” approach [49]-[51]. They use the symbol  $u_3$  for the six-point coupling, the correspondence is  $g_6 = u_3/48$ . The fixed-point value is  $u_{3*} = 87.4$  ([50], Table 2), while the asymptotic value of the low-energy coupling, as the phase transition is approached from the symmetric phase (which is more appropriate to compare with our  $g_6$ ), is  $u_{3S} = 107$  [52]. This corresponds, respectively, to  $g_6 = 1.82$  and  $g_6 = 2.23$ .

### 6.3 Philosophy

A widespread point of view on the effective potential in 3d is as follows. The problem should be considered in the framework of the  $\phi^4$  theory. Then either you work on the tree level, and have a standard Landau theory with

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = a\varphi^2 + b\varphi^4, \quad (36)$$

or you include loop corrections, and then you must retain all powers of  $\varphi$  in  $V_{eff}$ . The  $\varphi^6$  term should be considered on equal footing with other higher terms.

Our study corroborates an alternative point of view advocated by Tetradis and Wetterich [50, 51]: that while (36) is a rather rough approximation, the ansatz

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 + mg_4\varphi^4 + g_6\varphi^6 \quad (37)$$

gives a very good approximation, and the higher powers of  $\varphi$  can be considered as small corrections. Additional arguments in favour of this point of view can be drawn from the smallness of the critical index  $\eta$  in the 3d theory.

Consider the asymptotic behaviour of magnetization  $\varphi = \langle\phi\rangle_J$  in the external field as a function of  $J$  at large  $\varphi$  ( $=$  large  $J$ ). This is the same limit as if we keep  $J$  fixed and let  $m \rightarrow 0$ . The equation  $dV_{eff}/d\varphi = J$  gives

$$6g_6\varphi^5 = J, \quad \langle\phi\rangle_J \propto J^{1/5}. \quad (38)$$

The Landau theory (36) at the critical point ( $a = 0$ ) would give

$$\varphi^3 \propto J, \quad \langle\phi\rangle_J \propto J^{1/3}. \quad (39)$$

However, this is exactly the definition of the critical index  $\delta$ :

$$\langle\phi\rangle_J \propto J^{1/\delta}. \quad (40)$$

Thus the Landau theory (36) corresponds to  $\delta = 3$ , and (37) corresponds to  $\delta = 5$ , while the correct value is

$$\delta = \frac{d+2-\eta}{d-2+\eta} \approx 4.8. \quad (41)$$

We see that while  $\delta \neq 5$  means that (37) is, strictly speaking, inapplicable for very large  $\varphi$  (such that  $V_{eff}''(\varphi) \gg V_{eff}''(0) = m^2$ ), 5 is still a much better approximation to  $\delta$  than 3, due to the smallness of  $\eta$ . In the large  $N$  limit of the  $O(N)$  Heisenberg model in 3d  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ , and the  $N$ -component analog of (37) becomes exact [49, 53].

The form (37) is inapplicable for  $m = 0$ , i.e. exactly at the transition point. In this case every nonzero  $\varphi$  is ‘very large’, and the correct form is

$$V_{eff} \propto \varphi^{\delta+1} \quad (m = 0). \quad (42)$$

However, the whole idea of the low-energy effective action is no more applicable in this case, because ‘low energy’ means  $p \ll m$ . So we always work at nonzero  $m$ .

Notice that  $\varphi^6$  is renormalizable in 3d, while higher terms are nonrenormalizable. Thus (37) amounts to the idea to keep just all renormalizable terms in the effective action. The same phenomenon — that this is a good approximation — is observed for the 3d 3-state Potts model [54], and seems to be rather general.

## 7 Conclusions

We have studied the low-energy effective action for the scalar field theory in three dimensions. We considered the 3d Ising model in the symmetric phase in the scaling region. We have found that a very good approximation is provided by

$$S_{eff} = \int d^3x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial_\mu \varphi + V_{eff}(\varphi) \right\}, \quad (43)$$

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} m^2 \varphi^2 + m g_4 \varphi^4 + g_6 \varphi^6, \quad (44)$$

and estimated the values of dimensionless couplings:

$$g_4 = 0.97 \pm 0.02, \quad g_6 = 2.05 \pm 0.15. \quad (45)$$

(The errors are standard deviations). This effective action is universal for the whole 3d Ising universality class, in the sense that the only free parameter is the mass  $m$ . Its applicability region is bounded by the requirement that  $\varphi$  is not too large. It works well at least for  $\varphi$  such that  $m_{eff}(\varphi) = [V''_{eff}(\varphi)]^{1/2} \leq 3m$ , and maybe further.

We observe a smooth approach to scaling in the 3d Ising model. Our results for  $g_4$  and  $g_6$  are in good agreement with the values available in the literature, but disagree with [45]-[48]. While, to our knowledge, our result for  $g_4$  is the most precise among the available Monte Carlo estimates, and this is the first Monte Carlo study to provide the definite result on  $g_6$ , we consider the direct Monte Carlo check that the approximation (44) works perfectly as our main result.

This is in agreement with the results of Tetradis and Wetterich, obtained within the effective average action approach [50, 51], that  $\phi^6$  is important, while the higher terms in  $V_{eff}$  provide only small corrections.

Our main tool was the study of the probability distribution of the order parameter in the finite system with the periodic boundary conditions, in the external field. We find that the simple asymptotic formula (12) that connects the probability distribution in a large, but finite system with the infinite-volume effective potential works perfectly in our case, when  $L/\xi \geq 4$ . The formula seems to be rather general and useful also for other problems in the theory of the order parameter distribution.

The Ising model in the symmetric phase is just the simplest three-dimensional model. It would be interesting to extend the approach developed here to its broken phase, to weak first order transitions and to models that serve as effective 3d theories for high-temperature phase transitions in QCD and in the Higgs sector of the standard model.

## Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank V. Dohm, M. E. Fisher, M. Göckeler, J. Jersák, E. Focht, C. Frick, G. Münster, S. K. Nechaev, M. A. Stephanov, N. Tetradis, J. F. Wheeler and F. Zimmerman for valuable discussions and correspondence. I am deeply grateful to Prof. H. A. Kastrup, Prof. J. Jersák and the Institute of Theoretical Physics E of RWTH

Aachen for their kind hospitality, and to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for the fellowship and other support. This work was partially supported by the Russian Fund for Fundamental Research Grant 93-02-3815.

## References

- [1] K. Kajantie, K. Rummukainen and M. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. B407 (1993) 356
- [2] M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. 316B (1993) 112
- [3] J. Goldstone, Nuovo Cim. 19 (1961) 154
- [4] G. Jona-Lasinio, Nuovo Cim. 34 (1964) 1790
- [5] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D7 (1973) 1888
- [6] B. Freedman, P. Smolensky and D. Weingarten, Phys. Lett. 113B (1982) 481
- [7] B. A. Freedman and G. A. Baker, J. Phys. A15 (1982) L715
- [8] J. F. Wheeler, Phys. Lett. 136B (1984) 402
- [9] D. J. E. Callaway and D. J. Maloof, Phys. Rev. D27 (1983) 406
- [10] D. J. E. Callaway, Phys. Rev. D27 (1983) 2974
- [11] K. Binder, Z. Phys. B43 (1981) 119
- [12] P. Ginsparg and H. Levine, Phys. Lett. 131B (1983) 127
- [13] L. O’Raighfeartaigh, A. Wipf and H. Yoneyama, Nucl. Phys. B271 (1986) 653
- [14] M. Göckeler and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. B350 (1991) 228
- [15] A. M. Ferrenberg and R. H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (1988) 2635, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 1658 (E)
- [16] A. M. Ferrenberg and R. H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 1195
- [17] M. S. S. Challa, D. P. Landau and K. Binder, Phys. Rev. B34 (1986) 1841
- [18] E. Brézin and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B257[FS14] (1985) 867
- [19] V. Privman, in: “Finite size scaling and numerical simulation of statistical systems”, ed. V. Privman, World Scientific, Singapore, 1990, pp. 1-98.
- [20] K. Binder and D. P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B30 (1984) 1477
- [21] C. Borgs and R. Kotecký, J. Stat. Phys. 61 (1990) 79

- [22] C. Borgs and R. Kotecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68 (1992) 1734
- [23] V. Privman and J. Rudnik, J. Stat. Phys. 60 (1990) 551
- [24] R. H. Swendsen and J.-S. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58 (1987) 86
- [25] J.-S. Wang and R. H. Swendsen, Physica A167 (1990) 565
- [26] J.-S. Wang, Physica A161 (1989) 249
- [27] G. A. Baker, B. G. Nickel, M. S. Green and D. I. Meiron, Phys. Rev. Lett. 36 (1976) 1351
- [28] G. A. Baker, B. G. Nickel, and D. I. Meiron, Phys. Rev. B17 (1978) 1365
- [29] J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39 (1977) 95
- [30] J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. B21 (1980) 3976
- [31] B. G. Nickel, Physica A177 (1991) 189
- [32] G. A. Baker and J. M. Kincaid, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 1431
- [33] G. A. Baker and J. M. Kincaid, J. Stat. Phys. 24 (1981) 469
- [34] G. A. Baker, in: Phase transitions and critical phenomena, vol. 9, ed. C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz, AP, London, 1984, pp. 233-311.
- [35] R. A. Weston, Phys. Lett. 219B (1989) 315
- [36] J.-K. Kim and A. Patrascioiu, Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 2588
- [37] G. M. Avdeeva and A. A. Migdal, Sov. Phys. – JETP Lett. 16 (1972) 178
- [38] E. Brézin, D. J. Wallace and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 29 (1972) 591
- [39] D. J. Wallace and R.K.P. Zia, J. Phys. C7 (1974) 3480
- [40] D. J. Wallace, in: Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, vol. 6, ed. C. Domb and M. S. Green, Academic Press, London, 1976, pp. 293–356.
- [41] J. Zinn-Justin, Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989.
- [42] F. J. Halfkann and V. Dohm, Z. Phys. B89 (1992) 79
- [43] A. Hasenfratz and P. Hasenfratz, Nucl. Phys. B270 (1986) 687
- [44] C. Bagnuls and C. Bervillier, Phys. Rev. B41 (1990) 402
- [45] C. M. Bender, F. Cooper, G. S. Guralnik, H. Moreno, R. Roskies, D. H. Sharp, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45 (1980) 501

- [46] C. M. Bender, F. Cooper, G. S. Guralnik, R. Roskies, D. H. Sharp, Phys. Rev. D23 (1981) 2976
- [47] C. M. Bender, F. Cooper, G. S. Guralnik, R. Roskies, D. H. Sharp, Phys. Rev. D23 (1981) 2999
- [48] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, preprint hep-th/9311060 (1993)
- [49] M. Reuter, N. Tetradis and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B401 (1993) 567
- [50] N. Tetradis and C. Wetterich, preprint DESY 93-094
- [51] N. Tetradis and C. Wetterich, preprint DESY 93-128
- [52] N. Tetradis, private communication
- [53] H.-T. Elze, preprint CERN-TH.6948/93
- [54] M. A. Stephanov and M. M. Tsypin, Nucl. Phys. B366 (1991) 420

$L^3$	$14^3$	$17^3$	$22^3$	$30^3$	$38^3$	$58^3$
$\beta$	0.2115	0.2142	0.2167	0.2186	0.2195	0.22055
$J$	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	0.0043	0.0027	0.0014	0.00066	0.00036	0.00013
	0.013	0.0081	0.0043	0.002	0.0011	0.00038
$N_{\text{conf}}$	$3 \times 700000$	$3 \times 720000$	$3 \times 700000$	$3 \times 400000$	$3 \times 500000$	$3 \times 100000$
$Z_{(J=0)}^{-1}$	0.2294(2)	0.2351(2)	0.2407(2)	0.2458(3)	0.2493(3)	0.2550(6)
$r$	0.01014(2)	0.00690(3)	0.00414(1)	0.002263(6)	0.001468(5)	0.000639(7)
$u$	0.0163(2)	0.01337(20)	0.01062(11)	0.00814(14)	0.00657(12)	0.00451(17)
$w$	0.0394(7)	0.0388(8)	0.0381(5)	0.0360(10)	0.0361(12)	0.0343(20)
$\sum \chi^2$	188	208	193	215	200	140
$N_{\text{bins}}$	165	161	161	229	160	146
$m$	0.2973(3)	0.2423(5)	0.1855(3)	0.1357(2)	0.1085(2)	0.0707(4)
$g_4$	1.041(12)	0.998(15)	0.988(10)	0.993(17)	0.974(18)	0.98(4)
$g_6$	3.26(6)	2.99(6)	2.73(4)	2.42(7)	2.33(8)	2.07(12)

Table 1: The numerical results obtained by Monte Carlo.  $N_{\text{conf}}$  is the number of configurations used.  $\sum \chi^2$  is the sum of  $\chi^2$  for all histograms (minimized by the fit);  $N_{\text{bins}}$  is the total number of bins in the histograms. The numbers in the parantheses are standard deviations of the last decimal digits.




Figure 1: A set of probability densities  $P(\varphi)$  for the magnetization per lattice site  $\varphi$ , for the Ising model (2). The solid line is the fit with (12),  $V_{\text{eff}}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + u\varphi^4 + w\varphi^6$ . Three histograms are fitted simultaneously with the same  $V_{\text{eff}}$ .






Figure 2: Finite volume dependence of the parameter  $r$ , obtained by fitting the probability distributions for  $\beta = 0.2186$ ,  $J = 0, 0.00066$  and  $0.002$  — the same values as at Fig. 1 — with (11) and (12),  $V_{eff}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + u\varphi^4 + w\varphi^6$ , for different lattice sizes:  $20^3$ ,  $24^3$ ,  $30^3$  and  $38^3$  (the correlation length  $\xi \approx 7.4$ ). Parameters  $u$  and  $w$  are less volume-sensitive.




Figure 3: The data is the same as at Fig. 1. The solid line is the best simultaneous fit with (12),  $V_{eff}(\varphi) = r\varphi^2 + u\varphi^4$ . Statistics: 400000 configurations for every histogram.




Figure 4: The dimensionless four-point coupling  $g_4$  as a function of the lattice size  $L$ . The ratio  $L/\xi$  is kept fixed at around 4.1. The errors shown are standard deviations.




Figure 5: The six-point coupling  $g_6$  as a function of lattice size  $L$ . ( $L/\xi \approx 4.1$ ).




Figure 6: The simultaneous plot of  $g_4$  and  $g_6$ . The ellipses show the statistical errors (semiaxis = standard deviation). The lattice size  $L$  is shown near the ellipses,  $L/\xi \approx 4.1$ . The broken line is for the same parameters ( $\beta$  and three values of  $J$ ) as for  $L = 30$ , but measured on a  $38^3$  lattice. This provides the additional check for the smallness of the finite volume corrections.




Figure 7: The linear combination of dimensionless couplings that is determined with the smallest statistical error.