New method for the extrapolation of finite-size data to infinite volume

Sergio Caracciolo^a, Robert G. Edwards^b, Sabino J. Ferreira^c, Andrea Pelissetto^d and Alan D. Sokal^{e*}

^aDipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università degli Studi di Lecce, Lecce 73100, ITALIA

^bSCRI, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA

^cDepartamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG 30161, BRASIL

^dDipartimento di Fisica and INFN – Sezione di Pisa, Università degli Studi di Pisa, Pisa 56100, ITALIA

^eDepartment of Physics, New York University, 4 Washington Place, New York, NY 10003, USA

We present a simple and powerful method for extrapolating finite-volume Monte Carlo data to infinite volume, based on finite-size-scaling theory. We discuss carefully its systematic and statistical errors, and we illustrate it using three examples: the two-dimensional three-state Potts antiferromagnet on the square lattice, and the twodimensional O(3) and $O(\infty)$ σ -models. In favorable cases it is possible to obtain reliable extrapolations (errors of a few percent) even when the correlation length is 1000 times larger than the lattice.

Quantum field theorists are interested primarily in infinite systems; but Monte Carlo simulations must perforce be carried out on lattices of finite linear size L, limited by computer memory and speed. This raises the problem of extrapolating finite-volume data to $L = \infty$. We present here a simple and powerful method for performing this extrapolation, based on finite-size-scaling theory [1]; and we discuss carefully its systematic and statistical errors. We illustrate the method using three examples: the two-dimensional threestate Potts antiferromagnet on the square lattice [2], and the two-dimensional O(3) and $O(\infty) \sigma$ models [3,4]. We have found — much to our surprise — that in favorable cases it is possible to obtain reliable extrapolations (errors of a few percent) at ξ/L as large as 10–1000. More details can be found in [5].

Consider, for starters, a model controlled by a renormalization-group (RG) fixed point having *one* relevant operator. Let us work on a periodic lattice of linear size L. Let $\xi(\beta, L)$ be a suitably defined finite-volume correlation length (we use the second-moment correlation length defined by equations (4.11)-(4.13) of [6]), and let \mathcal{O} be any long-distance observable (e.g. the correlation length or the susceptibility). Then finitesize-scaling theory [1] predicts that

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)}{\mathcal{O}(\beta, \infty)} = f_{\mathcal{O}}\Big(\xi(\beta, \infty)/L\Big) + O\Big(\xi^{-\omega}, L^{-\omega}\Big)$$
(1)

where $f_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a universal function and ω is a correction-to-scaling exponent. Hence, if s is any fixed scale factor (usually we take s = 2),

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(\beta, sL)}{\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)} = F_{\mathcal{O}}\Big(\xi(\beta, L)/L\Big) + O\Big(\xi^{-\omega}, L^{-\omega}\Big)$$
(2)

where $F_{\mathcal{O}}$ can be expressed in terms of $f_{\mathcal{O}}, f_{\xi}$.

Our method proceeds as follows [7]: Make Monte Carlo runs at numerous pairs (β, L) and (β, sL) . Plot $\mathcal{O}(\beta, sL)/\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)$ versus $\xi(\beta, L)/L$, using those points satisfying both $\xi(\beta, L) \geq$ some value ξ_{min} and $L \geq$ some value L_{min} . If all these points fall with good accuracy on a single curve — thus verifying the Ansatz (2) for $\xi \geq \xi_{min}, L \geq L_{min}$ — choose a smooth fitting function $F_{\mathcal{O}}$. Then, using the functions F_{ξ} and $F_{\mathcal{O}}$, extrapolate the pair (ξ, \mathcal{O}) successively from $L \rightarrow sL \rightarrow s^2L \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \infty$.

We have chosen to use functions $F_{\mathcal{O}}$ of the form

$$F_{\mathcal{O}}(x) = 1 + a_1 e^{-1/x} + \ldots + a_n e^{-n/x}$$
(3)

This form is partially motivated by theory, which tells us that $F(x) \rightarrow 1$ exponentially fast as $x \rightarrow -$

^{*}Speaker at the conference.

0 [10]. Typically a fit of order $3 \le n \le 12$ is sufficient; we increase *n* until the χ^2 of the fit

becomes essentially constant. The resulting χ^2 value provides a check on the systematic errors arising from corrections to scaling and/or from the inadequacies of the form (3).

The statistical error on the extrapolated value of $\mathcal{O}_{\infty}(\beta) \equiv \mathcal{O}(\beta, \infty)$ comes from three sources: (i) error on $\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)$, which gets multiplicatively propagated to \mathcal{O}_{∞} ; (ii) error on $\xi(\beta, L)$, which affects the argument $x \equiv \xi(\beta, L)/L$ of the scaling functions F_{ξ} and $F_{\mathcal{O}}$; and (iii) statistical error in our estimate of the coefficients a_1, \ldots, a_n in F_{ξ} and $F_{\mathcal{O}}$. The errors of type (i) and (ii) depend on the statistics available at the single point (β, L) , while the error of type (iii) depends on the statistics in the whole set of runs. Errors (i)+(ii) [resp. (i)+(ii)+(iii) can be quantified by performing a Monte Carlo experiment in which the input data at (β, L) [resp. the whole set of input data] are varied randomly within their error bars and then extrapolated.

The discrepancies between the extrapolated values from different lattice sizes at the same β — to the extent that these exceed the estimated statistical errors — indicate the presence of systematic errors and thus the necessity of increasing L_{min} and/or ξ_{min} and/or n.

A figure of (de)merit of the method is the relative variance on the extrapolated value $\mathcal{O}_{\infty}(\beta)$, multiplied by the computer time needed to obtain it. We expect this *relative variance-time product* [for errors (i)+(ii) only] to scale as

$$\operatorname{RVTP}(\beta, L) \approx \xi_{\infty}(\beta)^{d+z_{int,\mathcal{O}}} G_{\mathcal{O}}(\xi_{\infty}(\beta)/L)$$
 (4)

where d is the spatial dimension and $z_{int,\mathcal{O}}$ is the dynamic critical exponent of the Monte Carlo algorithm being used; here $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a combination of several static and dynamic finite-size-scaling functions, and depends both on the observable \mathcal{O} and on the algorithm but not on the scale factor s. As ξ_{∞}/L tends to zero, we expect $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ to diverge as $(\xi_{\infty}/L)^{-d}$ (it is wasteful to use a lattice $L \gg \xi_{\infty}$). As ξ_{∞}/L tends to infinity, we expect $G_{\mathcal{O}} \sim (\xi_{\infty}/L)^p$ [5], but the power p can be either positive or negative. If p > 0, there is an optimum value of ξ_{∞}/L ; this determines the best lattice size at which to perform runs for a given β . If p < 0, it is most efficient to use the *smallest* lattice size for which the corrections to scaling are negligible compared to the statistical errors.

Our first example [2] is the two-dimensional three-state Potts antiferromagnet on the square lattice, which is believed to have a critical point at $\beta = \infty$ [11]. We used the Wang-Swendsen-Kotecký cluster algorithm [12], which appears to have no critical slowing-down ($\tau_{int_{\perp}\mathcal{M}^2_{stagg}} < 5$ uniformly in β and L) [2]. We ran on lattices L = 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 1536 at 153 different pairs (β, L) in the range $5 \leq \xi_{\infty} \leq 20000$. Each run was between 2×10^5 and 2.2×10^7 iterations, and the total CPU time was modest by our standards (about 2 years on an IBM RS-6000/370). We took $\xi_{min} = 10$ and $L_{min} = 128$ and used a quintic fit in (3); the result for F_{ξ} is shown in [2,5] ($\chi^2 = 75.41$, 66 DF, level = 20%). The extrapolated values from different lattice sizes at the same β agree within the estimated statistical errors ($\chi^2 = 43.03, 75$ DF, level > 99%). The result for G_{ξ} is shown in [5]: the errors are roughly constant for $\xi_{\infty}/L \gtrsim 0.4$ but rise sharply for smaller ξ_{∞}/L . In practice we were able to obtain ξ_{∞} to an accuracy of about 1% (resp. 2%, 3%, 5%) at $\xi_{\infty} \approx 1000$ (resp. 2000, 5000, 10000).

Next let us consider [3,4] the two-dimensional O(3) σ -model (see Caracciolo's talk for more details). We used the Wolff embedding algorithm with standard Swendsen-Wang updates; again critical slowing-down appears to be completely eliminated. We ran on lattices L =32, 48, 64, 96, 128, 192, 256, 384, 512 at 180 different pairs (β, L) in the range $20 \lesssim \xi_{\infty} \lesssim 10^5$. Each run was between 10^5 and 5×10^6 iterations, and the total CPU time was 7 years on an IBM RS-6000/370. We took $\xi_{min} = 20$ and used a tenth-order fit. There appear to be weak corrections to scaling (of order $\leq 1.5\%$) in the region $0.3 \lesssim \xi_L/L \lesssim 0.7$ for lattices with $L \lesssim 64-96$. We therefore chose $L_{min} = 128$ for $\xi_L/L \leq 0.7$, and $L_{min} = 64$ for $\xi_L/L > 0.7$. The result for F_{ξ} is shown in [4,5] ($\chi^2 = 72.91, 73$ DF, level = 48%). The result for G_{ℓ} is shown in [5]; at large ξ_{∞}/L it decreases sharply, with a power $p \approx -2$ in agreement with theory [5]. In practice we obtained ξ_{∞} to an accuracy of about 0.2% (resp. 0.7%, 1.1%, 1.6%) at $\xi_{\infty} \approx 10^2$ (resp. 10³, 10⁴, 10⁵).

We also carried out a "simulated Monte Carlo" experiment for the O(N) σ -model at $N = \infty$, by generating data from the exact finite-volume solution plus random noise of 0.1% for L =64, 96, 128, 0.2% for L = 192, 256 and 0.5% for L = 384,512 [which is the order of magnitude] we attain in practice for O(3)]. We considered 35 values of β in the range 20 $\lesssim \xi_{\infty} \lesssim 10^6$. We used $\xi_{min} = 20$ and $L_{min} = 64$ (in fact much smaller values could have been used, as corrections to scaling are here very small) and a ninth-order fit; for two different data sets we get $\chi^2 = 114$ (resp. 118) with 166 DF. In practice we obtain ξ_{∞} with an accuracy of 0.6% (resp. 1.2%, 2%, 3%) at $\xi_{\infty} \approx 10^3$ (resp. 10⁴, 10⁵, 10⁶). Here we can also compare the extrapolated values $\xi_{\infty}^{extr}(\beta)$ with the exact values $\xi_{\infty}^{exact}(\beta)$. Defining $\mathcal{R} = \sum_{\beta} [\xi_{\infty}^{extr}(\beta) - \xi_{\infty}^{exact}(\beta)]^2 / \sigma^2(\beta)$, we find for the two data sets $\mathcal{R} = 17.19$ (resp. 25.81) with 35 DF. Only 6 (resp. 9) points differ from the exact value more than one standard deviation, and none by more than two.

Details on all of these models will be reported separately [2,4].

The method is easily generalized to a model controlled by an RG fixed point having k relevant operators. It suffices to choose k-1 dimensionless ratios of long-distance observables, call them $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_{k-1})$; then the function $F_{\mathcal{O}}$ will depend parametrically on $R(\beta, L)$. In practice one can divide R-space into "slices" within which $F_{\mathcal{O}}$ is empirically constant within error bars, and perform the fit (3) within each slice. We have used this approach to study the mixed isovector/isotensor σ -model, taking R to be the ratio of isovector to isotensor correlation length [3,4].

The method can also be applied to extrapolate the exponential correlation length (inverse mass gap). For this purpose one must work in a system of size $L^{d-1} \times T$ with $T \gg \xi_{exp}(\beta, L)$ (cf. [8]).

We wish to thank Martin Hasenbusch and especially Jae-Kwon Kim for sharing their data with us, and for challenging us to push to ever larger values of ξ/L . This research was supported by CNR, INFN, CNPq, FAPEMIG,

DOE contracts DE-FG05-85ER250000 and DE-FG05-92ER40742, NSF grant DMS-9200719, and NATO CRG 910251.

REFERENCES

- V. Privman, ed., Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).
- S.J. Ferreira and A.D. Sokal, hep-lat/ 9405015; and in preparation.
- S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3906 (1993).
- 4. S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, hep-lat/9411009; and in preparation.
- S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, S.J. Ferreira, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, hep-lat/9409004.
- S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Nucl. Phys. B403, 475 (1993).
- 7. Our method has many features in common with those of Lüscher, Weisz and Wolff [8] and Kim [9]. In particular, all these methods share the property of working only with observable quantities (ξ, O and L) and not with bare quantities (β). Therefore, they rely only on "scaling" and not on "asymptotic scaling"; and they differ from other FSS-based methods such as phenomenological renormalization.
- M. Lüscher, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. B359, 221 (1991).
- J.-K. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1735 (1993); Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **34**, 702 (1994); University of Arizona preprints AZPH-TH/93-49 and AZPH-TH/94-15.
- H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. **B233**, 183 (1989);
 S. Caracciolo and A. Pelissetto, in preparation.
- R.J. Baxter, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A383, 43 (1982).
- J.-S. Wang, R.H. Swendsen and R. Kotecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 109 (1989) and Phys. Rev. **B42**, 2465 (1990); M. Lubin and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1778 (1993).