

The effect of long range interactions on the stability of classical and quantum solids

Debanjan Chowdhury*¹ and Amit Dutta†¹

¹*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur 208016, India.*

(Dated: October 31, 2018)

We generalise the celebrated Peierls' argument to study the stability of a long-range interacting classical solid. Long-range interaction implies that all the atomic oscillators are coupled to each other via a harmonic potential, though the coupling strength decays as a power-law $1/x^\alpha$, where x is the distance between the oscillators. We show that for the range parameter $\alpha < 2$, the long-range interaction dominates and the one-dimensional system retains a crystalline order even at a finite temperature whereas for $\alpha \geq 2$, the long-range crystalline order vanishes even at an infinitesimally small temperature. We also study the effect of quantum fluctuations on the melting behaviour of a one-dimensional solid at $T = 0$, extending Peierls' arguments to the case of quantum oscillators.

PACS numbers: 64.60.-i; 64.70.D-

I. INTRODUCTION

The role of the range of interactions in phase transitions and critical phenomena has been investigated for many years. For example, there are rigorous theorems which rule out the possibility of long-range ordered phases of a system with only short-range interactions [1]. It is also well known that mean-field theory becomes exact in the limit of infinite range interactions [2]. Power-law interactions, which fall as $1/x^\alpha$ with the increasing separation x between the interacting elements, can smoothly interpolate between these two extremes [3, 4]. The implications of power-law interactions have been explored for several physical systems; these include, for example, classical [5] and quantum spin glasses [6], ionic systems [7], complex networks [8], etc. Very recently, non-equilibrium phase transitions with long-range interactions have also received attention [9].

Power-law interactions can lead to non-trivial and counterintuitive results. For example, for the d -dimensional Ising model with ferromagnetic power-law interactions, the critical exponents depend on the range parameter α and the conventional short-range critical exponents are recovered for relatively large α (typically for $\alpha \rightarrow 2$) [4, 10]. The ferromagnetic to paramagnetic transition in a d -dimensional Ising model with inverse-square interaction $1/x^2$ is a special type of Kosterlitz-Thouless transition [11] driven by topological defects [12].

For many systems, heuristic reasoning, which are essentially extensions of Peierls' original arguments [13], have been remarkably successful in predicting the (im-)possibility of long-range order. Some of these results were later established using rigorous analytical and numerical methods. Examples include predictions of the lower-critical dimension of the Ising model and the impossibility of the existence of a two-dimensional crystalline order at a finite temperature.

In this work, employing Peierls'-type arguments, we examine the stability of long-range crystalline order in a d -dimensional system with power-law interactions. In other words, we consider a crystal at a finite temperature where the atomic oscillators interact via a harmonic potential with a strength that decays algebraically, i.e., as $1/x^\alpha$, with x being the separation between the oscillators. It is to be noted that, the power-law form of interaction does not have an inherent length scale associated with it. This is in sharp contrast to the case where the strength of the interaction between two oscillators separated by a distance x decays exponentially as e^{-x/L_0} . Clearly, in the latter case, L_0 sets in a length scale over which the interactions are effective and therefore the melting behaviour turns out to be identical to oscillators with only nearest neighbour interactions.

The Peierls' argument generalised to the power-law interactions suggests that the crystalline order persists for a one-dimensional solid even at a finite temperature, provided the range parameter $\alpha < 2$ whereas for $\alpha \geq 2$ the crystalline order is destroyed by infinitesimal thermal fluctuations. The case $\alpha = 2$ corresponds to a marginal situation. We also comment on the stability of the crystalline structure at zero-temperature when the oscillators are quantum mechanical so that quantum fluctuations tend to destroy the crystalline order.

* E-mail: debanjan@iitk.ac.in

† E-mail: dutta@iitk.ac.in




FIG. 1: (a) A One dimensional crystal and a (b) Two dimensional crystal.

II. LONG RANGE INTERACTIONS

Let us consider a one dimensional crystalline arrangement of harmonic oscillators with long-range interactions in the absence of any thermal or quantum fluctuations. The potential energy for this system(Fig.1) in the harmonic

approximation can be expressed as [14],

$$U = \sum_n \sum_m \frac{K_m}{2} [q(na) - q([n+m]a)]^2 \quad (1)$$

where K_m is the effective spring constant, a is the interatomic separation and n is the index representing the discrete sites on the crystal. The equation of motion for the atom at the position ' na ' is given by

$$M\ddot{q}(na) = \sum_{m>0} K_m [q([n+m]a) + q([n-m]a) - 2q(na)], \quad (2)$$

where M is the mass of an oscillator. We assume the usual plane wave solutions of the type $q(na) \propto e^{i(kna - \omega t)}$, to obtain the dispersion relation of the many-oscillator system given as

$$\omega = 2\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{m>0} K_m \sin^2(mka/2)}{M}} \quad (3)$$

In the long wavelength limit, i.e. $k \rightarrow 0$, which is relevant in determining the phase transition behaviour, Eqn.(3) reduces to,

$$\omega = a\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{m>0} K_m m^2}{M}} |k|, \quad (4)$$

provided $\sum_{m>0} m^2 K_m$ converges. Now in the special case of nearest neighbour short range interactions, we recover the standard phononic [15] dispersion relation, $\omega = ck$, where c is the speed of sound. In the case of long range interactions, on the other hand, the interaction strength decays with distance as $K_m = \frac{1}{m^\alpha}$ ($\alpha > 0$), then $\omega \sim |k|$ holds for $\alpha \geq 4$ since the sum in Eqn.(4) converges. For $1 < \alpha < 3$, we get (see Appendix I)

$$\omega \sim k^{(\alpha-1)/2}. \quad (5)$$

It can be shown that the above dispersion relation holds for higher dimensional cases. We shall restrict our discussion to the range $1 < \alpha \leq 3$ to estimate the marginal dimension or the range of the stability of a crystalline structure.

We shall now examine the effect of thermal fluctuations on the stability of the above solid using the formalism developed by Peierls' [13]. In the real space, the displacement of the atom at the position ' na ' can be written as a superposition of the different Fourier modes as,

$$q(na) = \sum_k q_k e^{ikna}, \quad (6)$$

$0 < k < 2\pi/a$, where the time dependence has been ignored. Making use of the classical equipartition theorem, we get

$$\langle |q_k|^2 \rangle = \langle q_k q_{-k} \rangle = \frac{k_B T}{M \omega_k^2}, \quad (7)$$

The real space displacement, $q(na)$ is immediately found to be,

$$\langle q^2(na) \rangle = \int \langle q_k q_{-k} \rangle e^{ikna} d^d k = \frac{k_B T}{M} \int \frac{e^{ikna}}{\omega_k^2} d^d k, \quad (8)$$

where d denotes the dimensionality of space. Then $\langle \delta^2 \rangle = \langle q^2(na) \rangle$ gives a measure of the fluctuation in the position of the atom at ' na '. To probe the marginality in the melting behaviour, we shall focus on the fluctuations in the displacement of the atom at the origin ($na=0$).

Let us first enlist the form of $\langle \delta^2 \rangle$ for solids with short range interactions in different spatial dimensions

$$\langle \delta^2 \rangle \begin{cases} \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k^2} & \text{for } d = 1, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{k dk}{k^2} & \text{for } d = 2, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{k^2 dk}{k^2} & \text{for } d = 3, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

From the above Eqn.(9), we see that $\langle \delta^2 \rangle$ diverges for a one and two dimensional solid in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, the 2-d solid shows a log divergence, which means that the divergence is extremely slow. This log-divergence immediately establishes the spatial dimension $d = 2$ as the marginal dimension. For $d = 3$, on the other hand, $\langle \delta^2 \rangle$ is finite in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$, pointing to the existence of the crystalline order even at a finite temperature in a three-dimensional solid.

Let us now extend the above analysis to solids with long range interactions. The form of the fluctuation $\langle \delta^2 \rangle$ is enlisted below:

$$\langle \delta^2 \rangle \begin{cases} \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k^{\alpha-1}} \sim \frac{1}{k^{\alpha-2}} & \text{for } d = 1, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k^{\alpha-2}} \sim \frac{1}{k^{\alpha-3}} & \text{for } d = 2, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k^{\alpha-3}} \sim \frac{1}{k^{\alpha-4}} & \text{for } d = 3, \\ 1 < \alpha < 3 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The case with $d = 1$ turns out to be the most interesting as we observe that for all values $\alpha < 2$, the crystal remains stable even at a finite temperature. At $\alpha = 2$, we observe the first signature of a divergence. Therefore, we conclude that $\alpha = 2$ happens to be the marginal case, with fluctuations diverging logarithmically with the system size. This settles $\alpha = 2$ as the marginal case for a one-dimensional solid. If the long range interaction decays faster than $1/x^2$, the interaction is feeble and the solid fails to retain the crystal structure even at an infinitesimally small temperature.

III. T=0 : EFFECTS OF QUANTUM FLUCTUATIONS

In Eqn.(8), if we put temperature $T = 0$, the average fluctuation $\langle \delta^2 \rangle$ vanishes. We now have to take care of the quantum fluctuations if the harmonic oscillators are quantum mechanical. In that case, we should now set the average energy of a mode to be the zero-point energy $\hbar\omega_k$ of the corresponding oscillator. We obtain

$$\langle q_k q_{-k} \rangle = \frac{\hbar\omega_k}{Mw_k^2} = \frac{\hbar}{Mw_k}, \quad (11)$$

$$\langle q^2(na) \rangle = \int \langle q_k q_{-k} \rangle e^{ikna} d^d k = \frac{\hbar}{M} \int \frac{e^{ikna}}{w_k} d^d k. \quad (12)$$

The above relations lead to a non-trivial modification in the marginal dimension of a solid with quantum mechanical oscillators, as illustrated below. In a spirit similar to that of the previous section, let us now examine the $\langle \delta^2 \rangle$ for a quantum solid with short range interactions,

$$\langle \delta^2 \rangle \begin{cases} \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k} & \text{for } d = 1, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{kdk}{k} & \text{for } d = 2, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{k^2 dk}{k} & \text{for } d = 3, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Interestingly, under the effect of quantum fluctuations, both two and three dimensional crystals sustain the long range crystalline order, whereas the one dimensional solid shows a logarithmic divergence in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$. Hence in the case of quantum oscillators at $T = 0$, $d = 1$ is the marginal dimension whereas in higher dimensions a perfect crystalline order exists at absolute zero. The above finding when contrasted with the melting behaviour of a classical solid with short-range interacting oscillators, an interesting $d_{quantum} \rightarrow (d + 1)_{classical}$ correspondence, with respect to the marginal dimensionality arises.

TABLE I: Stability of Solids

Spatial dimension	Short range interactions		Long Range Interactions	
	Classical (T≠0)	Quantum (T=0)	Classical (T≠0)	Quantum (T=0)
d=1	Unstable	Unstable (ln)	Stable(1<α<2) Unstable(α≥2)	Stable(1<α<3) Unstable(ln) for (α≥3)
d=2	Unstable (ln)	Stable	Stable(1<α<3) Unstable(ln) for α≥3	Stable
d=3	Stable	stable	Stable	Stable

Let us now assume that the quantum oscillators are also long-range interacting as the classical oscillators of the previous section. A similar line of arguments leads to

$$\langle \delta^2 \rangle \begin{cases} \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k^{(\alpha-1)/2}} \sim \frac{1}{k^{(\alpha-3)/2}} & \text{for } d = 1, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k^{(\alpha-3)/2}} \sim \frac{1}{k^{(\alpha-5)/2}} & \text{for } d = 2, \\ \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k^{(\alpha-5)/2}} \sim \frac{1}{k^{(\alpha-7)/2}} & \text{for } d = 3, \\ 1 < \alpha < 3 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

It is obvious from the above expressions that the question of any instability does not arise even in $d = 1$ if $\alpha < 3$. Therefore a one dimensional long-range quantum solid retains the crystalline order for a finite strength of quantum fluctuations, if the decay of the long-range interactions with the distance between the oscillators is sufficiently slow. When $\alpha = 3$,

$$\langle \delta^2 \rangle \sim \int_0^{2\pi/a} \frac{dk}{k\sqrt{\ln k}}, \quad (15)$$

$$\langle \delta^2 \rangle \sim \int \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \sim \sqrt{t} \sim \sqrt{\ln k}, \quad (16)$$

which corresponds to the first sign of a divergence as $\alpha \rightarrow 3$, and hence the situation is inferred to be marginal. The strength of the divergence keeps increasing till $\alpha = 4$, when the $\langle \delta^2 \rangle \sim \ln k$.

We have summarised the different stability criteria obtained till now in Table I.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have analyzed the stability of classical and quantum solids using Peierls' argument, with a special emphasis on the one dimensional situation. We just note in the passing that mercury chain salts, in which mercury is intercalated into linear chains in AsF_6 to give a compound $Hg_{3-\delta}AsF_6$ ($\delta \sim 0.18$ at 300K), is a system that closely resembles a one dimensional solid [16].

In the presence of short range interactions, we never expect the 1-d solid to exist at any finite temperature (Eqn.9). An infinitesimal thermal disturbance is sufficient to destroy long range order. The existence of long range interactions among the atomic oscillators, where the interaction strength falls off with distance as $1/x^\alpha$ with $\alpha < 2$, has a non-trivial effect on the stability of the one-dimensional crystal. Using a variant of Peierls' argument, we have shown that even a one-dimensional solid can sustain the crystalline order at a finite temperature if the range-parameter α is sufficiently small ($\alpha < 2$). For $\alpha = 2$, $\langle \delta^2 \rangle$ shows a logarithmic divergence and hence this is the marginal case of stability. This is similar to what is observed also in the case of a ferromagnetic power-law interacting Ising model [12]. That the inverse-square interaction is the marginal dimension even for melting of a long-range solid is an interesting observation. It should be mentioned that the situation $\alpha = 2$ turns out to be a marginal situation in

various other long range interacting systems, for example in fracture models with variable range interactions [17] or in networks with long range links [18].

We have also explored the marginal dimension in the case where the oscillators are quantum mechanical. Using a generalised version of Peierls' argument extended to the quantum case, which to our knowledge is new, we observe an interesting $d_{quantum} \rightarrow (d+1)_{classical}$ correspondence (Table I). A two-dimensional short-range classical solid is marginally stable against thermal fluctuations whereas a one-dimensional short range quantum solid happens to be marginally stable against quantum fluctuations at $T = 0$. This reminds us of the well known correspondence between the critical behaviour of a d -dimensional quantum Ising model and $(d+1)$ -dimensional classical Ising model [19]. However, at an infinitesimally small temperature a one-dimensional quantum solid can not retain a long-range order, which means that the quantum effects are irrelevant at a finite temperature as the zero-point energy is vanishingly small compared to the thermal energy $k_B T$. A unique correspondence emerges out of our study. We have shown that for a long-range one-dimensional classical solid, $\alpha = 2$ is the marginal range of interaction. In the corresponding quantum case, $\alpha = 3$ turns out to be the marginal case. There seems to exist a quantum-classical correspondence in the marginal range of interaction, just as in the case of dimension.

One may also wonder about the existence of a tunable parameter in a quantum solid which may be varied to change the strength of the quantum fluctuations. Eqn.(7), suggests that the mass of the atomic oscillator is an appropriate candidate for the above as the more massive the atom, the less are the fluctuations or uncertainty in its position.

We should conclude with the comment that in deriving the marginal dimensions or ranges in above mentioned solids, we have used the Peierls' argument and its generalisation to the quantum case. Although, Peierls argument is fairly successful in predicting the marginal dimension or range in several other situations, it fails to throw any light on the transition temperature (for dimensions above the marginal dimension), nature of transitions or role of defects in the transition. However as we have shown, it predicts interesting results even in the case of melting of classical and quantum solids.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank J.K. Bhattacharjee for fruitful discussions. AD acknowledges useful discussions and collaborations with S. M. Bhattacharjee and B. K. Chakrabarti in related fields. This work is partially supported by a KVPY fellowship to DC.

VI. APPENDIX I

When the sum in Eqn.(4) is divergent, we recast Eqn.(3) in the form of an integral as,

$$\omega = 2\sqrt{\frac{\int_0^\infty K_m \sin^2(\beta m) dm}{M}}, \quad (17)$$

where $\beta = ka/2$. Now the integral is evaluated as follows ($1 < \alpha < 3$),

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\sin^2(\beta m) dm}{m^\alpha} = \beta^{\alpha-1} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sin^2(y) dy}{y^\alpha} \quad (18)$$

Since the second integral is just a constant, we obtain Eqn.(5). For the special case $\alpha=3$, the integrand in Eqn.(18) diverges at $m = 0$. In this case, the dispersion relation turns out to be [14], $\omega = k\sqrt{|\ln k|}$.

-
- [1] N.D. Mermin, H. Wagner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17**, 1133 (1966).
 - [2] H.E. Stanley, *Phase Transition and Critical Phenomena*, Oxford University Press, (1971).
 - [3] G. Yuval and P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **1**, 1522 (1970).
 - [4] M. E. Fisher, S. K. Ma and B.G. Nickel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 917 (1972).
 - [5] G. Kotliar, P. W. Anderson and D. L. Stein, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 602 (1983).
 - [6] A. Dutta, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 224427 (2002); A. Dutta, Physica **A318**, 63 (2003); A. Dutta and R. Loganaygam, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 052405 (2007).
 - [7] K. S. Pitzer, M. C. P de Lima and D. R. Schreiber, J. Phys. Chem. **89** 1854 (1985).
 - [8] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, Nature (London) **393**, 440 (1998).

- [9] H. Hinrichsen, cond-mat/0703169; U. Divakaran and Amit Dutta, *Physica A* **384**, 39 (2007).
- [10] H.K. Janssen, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, R2673 (1998).
- [11] J. M. Kosterlitz and D.J. Thouless, *J. Phys. C* **6**, 1181 (1976).
- [12] J. M. Kosterlitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **37**, 1577 (1976); J. Bhattacharjee, S. Chakraverty, J. L. Richardson and D. J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev.* **24**, 3862 (1981); E. Luijten and H. Messingfeld, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5305 (2001).
- [13] R. Peierls, *Surprises in Theoretical Physics*, Princeton University Press (1979).
- [14] N.W. Ashcroft, N.D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics*, Holt Saunders International Editions, (1981).
- [15] C. Kittel, *Quantum Theory of Solid*, Wiley (2nd edition), (1987).
- [16] P.M. Chaikin, T.C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed matter Physics*, Cambridge University Press, (1998).
- [17] R.C. Hidalgo, Y. Moreno, F. Kun and H.J. Herrmann, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 046148 (2002).
- [18] C.F. Moukarzel and M.A. de Menezes, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 056709 (2002).
- [19] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, Cambridge University Press, (1999); B.K. Chakrabarti, A. Dutta and P. Sen, *Quantum Ising Phases and Transitions in transverse Ising models*, m41, Springer-Verlag, (Berlin, 1996).