

Finite-size effects in the spherical model of finite thickness

H. Chamati ‡

Universität Duisburg–Essen (Campus Duisburg) Fachbereich Physik, Lotharstraße 1, 47048
Duisburg

E-mail: hassan.chamati@uni-due.de

Abstract. A detailed analysis of the finite-size effects on the bulk critical behaviour of the d -dimensional mean spherical model confined to a film geometry with finite thickness L is reported. Along the finite direction different boundary conditions are applied: periodic (p), antiperiodic (a) and free surfaces with Dirichlet (D), Neumann (N) and a combination of Neumann and Dirichlet (ND) on both surfaces. A systematic method for the evaluation of the finite-size corrections to the free energy for the different types of boundary conditions is proposed. The free energy density and the equation for the spherical field are computed for arbitrary d . It is found, for $2 < d < 4$, that the singular part of the free energy has the required finite-size scaling form at the bulk critical temperature only for (p) and (a). For the remaining boundary conditions the standard finite-size scaling hypothesis is not valid. At $d = 3$, the critical amplitude (related to the so called Casimir amplitude) is estimated. We obtain $\Delta^{(p)} = -2\zeta(3)/(5\pi) = -0.153051\dots$, $\Delta^{(a)} = 0.274543\dots$ and $\Delta^{(ND)} = 0.01922\dots$, implying a fluctuation-induced attraction between the surfaces for (p) and repulsion in the other two cases. For (D) and (N) we find a logarithmic dependence on L .

PACS numbers: 05.70.Fh, 05.70.Jk, 75.40.–s

Submitted to: *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*

‡ On leave from Institute of Solid State Physics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 72 Tzarigradsko Chaussée, 1784 Sofia, Bulgaria

1. Introduction

Over the last 30 years there has been an increasing interest in the critical behaviour of systems (fluids, magnets ...) confined between two infinite parallel plates i.e. films. Such systems can be regarded as d -dimensional generalization of two $(d - 1)$ -dimensional walls separated by matter of thickness L . The so called thermodynamic Casimir effect related to fluctuation induced long-ranged forces between the plates was, and still is, the central theme of these investigations both experimentally and theoretically[§]. This effect was first predicted by Fisher and de Gennes (Fisher & de Gennes 1978) in their investigation on a confined critical binary liquid at its bulk critical point. They showed that the reduced free energy per unit area contains a term of the form $\Delta^{(\tau)}L^{-d+1}$, where $\Delta^{(\tau)}$ is the so called Casimir amplitude by analogy with the Casimir effect in vacuum fluctuations of the electromagnetic field between two metallic plates (Casimir 1948). It is a universal quantity that depends on the bulk universality class and the boundary conditions (τ) imposed on the confining walls (Privman & Fisher 1984, Singh & Pathria 1985a). The different types of boundary conditions are in turn related to distinct universality classes of surface critical behaviour depending on the behaviour of the order parameter at the surfaces bounding the system and some additional surface properties (Diehl 1986).

In general, according to (Privman & Fisher 1984, Singh & Pathria 1985a) the singular part of the free-energy density of a finite (in one or more directions) d -dimensional system with linear size L , near the bulk critical point T_c , may be expressed in the form

$$f_{s,d}^{(\tau)}(t, h; L) \approx L^{-d}Y^{(\tau)}(c_1tL^{1/\nu}, c_2hL^{\Delta/\nu}), \quad (1.1)$$

where t and h are related to the temperature, T , and the external magnetic field, H , via

$$t = \frac{T - T_c}{T_c}, \quad h = \frac{H}{k_B T}. \quad (1.2)$$

The arguments of $Y^{(\tau)}(x_1, x_2)$ are appropriate scaled variables, ν and Δ are the usual critical exponents, while all the details of the system are incorporated in the non-universal quantities c_1 and c_2 . Then the function $Y^{(\tau)}(x_1, x_2)$ is a universal scaling function, whose exact expression depends upon the number of finite directions, the bulk universality class and the boundary conditions (τ) to which the system is subjected. For a system confined to a film geometry, at $T = T_c$, the Casimir amplitude coincides with the critical amplitude of the singular part of the free energy density, i.e.

$$\Delta^{(\tau)} = Y^{(\tau)}(0, 0). \quad (1.3)$$

The spherical model of Berlin and Kac (Berlin & Kac 1952) was initially designed to mimic the critical properties of the Ising model. It has been obtained by requiring the spins to be continuous variables subject to a global constraint (the sum of the squares of spins at each lattice site is equal to the total number of sites N) rather than a local one (the square of the spin at each site is exactly 1). Later it was shown that the free energy of this model can be obtained

[§] The literature on the thermodynamic Casimir effect can be found in (Grüneberg & Diehl 2008) and references therein.

as a limiting case of that of the Heisenberg model with infinite number of spin components (Stanley 1968). The equivalence between the Heisenberg model with infinite spin components and the spherical model remains valid for finite systems, as long as one considers boundary conditions that preserve the translational invariance of the lattice (Knops 1973). Lewis and Wannier (Lewis & Wannier 1952) proposed to simplify the spherical model by requiring the global constraint of Berlin and Kac to be obeyed in the sense of an ensemble average. This model is generally known as the *mean spherical model*.

Because of its exact solubility and direct relevance to real physical situations the ferromagnetic mean spherical model has been extensively used to gain insights into the critical properties of finite (in one or more directions) systems^{||}. Periodic boundary conditions, implying ferromagnetic interactions of spins belonging to both boundaries on the finite directions, have been by far the most used boundary conditions. These allow for analytic treatment of problems related to the finite-size scaling theory (Privman et al. 1991, Brankov et al. 2000). In addition to periodic boundary conditions, antiperiodic boundary conditions have also been used (Barber & Fisher 1973, Singh & Pathria 1985*b*) to investigate the finite-size scaling properties of the ferromagnetic mean spherical model. The aforementioned boundary conditions do not break the translational invariance of the model in the absence of a magnetic field. Much less has been achieved in the case of nonperiodic (free) boundary conditions. These are believed to be more relevant to real systems, especially to systems confined between parallel plates. The ferromagnetic mean spherical model of finite thickness has been investigated in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions in (Barber & Fisher 1973, Barber 1974, Danchev et al. 1997, Chen & Dohm 2003, Dantchev & Brankov 2003) and Neumann boundary conditions in (Barber et al. 1974, Danchev et al. 1997, Dantchev & Brankov 2003). The authors of (Barber & Fisher 1973, Barber 1974) using a method originally devised in (Barber & Fisher 1973) investigated the scaling properties of the mean spherical model with finite thickness. They obtained explicit forms of the equation for the spherical field at three, four and five dimensions, separately. The method was extended to the study of the finite-size effects in the case of Neumann and Neumann-Dirichlet boundary conditions in (Danchev et al. 1997). In (Chen & Dohm 2003) it was argued that the results of (Barber & Fisher 1973, Barber 1974) for Dirichlet boundary conditions were incorrect at three dimensions far from the critical point. Later, the equation for the spherical field of (Barber & Fisher 1973) was rederived in (Dantchev & Brankov 2003). It should be mentioned, however that the derivation of (Dantchev & Brankov 2003) is based on an improved method of (Barber & Fisher 1973). On the other hand, in (Barber & Fisher 1973, Danchev et al. 1997, Barber 1974, Dantchev & Brankov 2003) the free energy density for the different kinds of boundary conditions was obtained by integrating the equation for the spherical field leading to a complicated integral representations.

In the present paper we propose a different method to treat the finite size effects in the mean spherical model of finite thickness. The method is a generalization of that devised in (Singh & Pathria 1985*a*) for periodic boundary conditions. It applies to antiperiodic,

^{||} For an extensive list of literature see (Barber & Fisher 1973, Singh & Pathria 1985*a*, Privman 1990, Chamati et al. 1998, Brankov et al. 2000) and references therein.

Dirichlet, Neumann boundary conditions imposed on both surfaces bounding the system and a combination of Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions on each surface. The method is quite general and is used for arbitrary dimension. Furthermore, the finite-size contributions to the free energy density are obtained directly from the corresponding general expression rather than through integration of the equation for the spherical field. We anticipate here that from our results we recover the particular cases of (Barber & Fisher 1973, Barber 1974, Danchev et al. 1997, Dantchev & Brankov 2003) but not the results of (Chen & Dohm 2003). We will return to these points later in the paper.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 we define the model and present the expressions for the free energy density and the equation for the spherical field for the different kinds of boundary conditions. In Section 3 we present in details how the method applies to the case of periodic boundary conditions and compare our results with those available in the literature. In Sections 4 through 7 we extend the method for arbitrary dimensions to the other boundary conditions and compare with the results obtained by other authors using different methods. Finally in Section 8 we summarize our results.

2. The model

We consider the mean spherical model on a d -dimensional lattice confined to a film geometry i.e. infinite in $d - 1$ dimensions and of finite thickness L in the remaining dimension with volume $V = L \times \infty^{d-1}$. The linear size of the lattice is measured in units of the lattice constant, which will be taken equal to 1. The model is defined through

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} s_i s_j - H \sum_i s_i + \frac{1}{2} \mu \sum_i s_i^2 \quad (2.1)$$

where $s_i \equiv s_i(\mathbf{r}, z)$, the spin at site i , is a continuous real variable ($-\infty \leq s_i \leq \infty$) with coordinates \mathbf{r} in the $d - 1$ infinite “parallel” planes and z in the finite lateral direction. J_{ij} is the interaction matrix between spins at sites i and j , and H is an ordering external magnetic field. Finally the field μ is introduced so as to ensure the spherical constraint

$$\sum_i \langle s_i^2 \rangle = N, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\langle \cdot \cdot \rangle$ denotes standard thermodynamic averages computed with the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} and N the total number of spins on the lattice.

Along the finite z direction we impose different kinds of boundary conditions which we will denote collectively by τ . For a lattice system this means:

- (p) periodic: $s(\mathbf{r}, 1) = s(\mathbf{r}, L + 1)$;
- (a) antiperiodic: $s(\mathbf{r}, 1) = -s(\mathbf{r}, L + 1)$;
- (D) Dirichlet: $s(\mathbf{r}, 0) = s(\mathbf{r}, L + 1) = 0$;
- (N) Neumann: $s(\mathbf{r}, 0) = s(\mathbf{r}, 1)$ and $s(\mathbf{r}, L) = s(\mathbf{r}, L + 1)$;
- (ND) Neumann–Dirichlet: $s(\mathbf{r}, 0) = s(\mathbf{r}, 1)$ and $s(\mathbf{r}, L + 1) = 0$.

For nearest neighbour interactions and under the above boundary conditions the Hamiltonian (2.1) may be diagonalized by plane waves parallel to the confining plates and appropriate eigenfunctions $\varphi_n^{(\tau)}(z)$ using the representation

$$s_i(\mathbf{r}, z) = \sum_n \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{dq_1}{2\pi} \cdots \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{dq_{d-1}}{2\pi} s_{\mathbf{q},n} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \varphi_n^{(\tau)}(z), \quad (2.3)$$

where the integrals over q_i s, the components of \mathbf{q} , are restricted to the first Brillouin zone of the hypercubic lattice of dimension $d - 1$. The orthogonal eigenfunctions read

$$\varphi_n^{(p)}(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \exp \left[i \frac{2\pi}{L} n z \right], \quad n = 0, \dots, L - 1; \quad (2.4a)$$

$$\varphi_n^{(a)}(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \exp \left[i \frac{2\pi}{L} \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) z \right], \quad n = 0, \dots, L - 1; \quad (2.4b)$$

$$\varphi_n^{(D)}(z) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L+1}} \sin \left[\frac{\pi}{L+1} (n+1) z \right], \quad n = 0, \dots, L - 1; \quad (2.4c)$$

$$\varphi_n^{(N)}(z) = \begin{cases} L^{-1/2}, & n = 0, \\ \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}} \cos \left[\frac{\pi}{L} n z \right], & n = 1, \dots, L - 1 \end{cases}; \quad (2.4d)$$

$$\varphi_n^{(ND)}(z) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2L+1}} \cos \left[\frac{2\pi}{2L+1} \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) z \right]; \quad n = 0, \dots, L - 1. \quad (2.4e)$$

The eigenmodes associated with the above eigenfunctions are given by

$$\omega_n^{(p)} = -2 + 2 \cos \left[\frac{2\pi}{L} n \right]; \quad (2.5a)$$

$$\omega_n^{(a)} = -2 + 2 \cos \left[\frac{2\pi}{L} \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right]; \quad (2.5b)$$

$$\omega_n^{(D)} = -2 + 2 \cos \left[\frac{\pi}{L+1} (n+1) \right]; \quad (2.5c)$$

$$\omega_n^{(N)} = -2 + 2 \cos \left[\frac{\pi}{L} n \right]; \quad (2.5d)$$

$$\omega_n^{(DN)} = -2 + 2 \cos \left[\frac{2\pi}{2L+1} \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (2.5e)$$

Those corresponding to the diagonalised interaction matrix are $\lambda_n^{(\tau)} = 2 + \omega_0^{(\tau)}$.

At zero field, the free energy density of the mean spherical model under the above boundary conditions imposed along the finite lateral size has the general expression (obtained via the Legendre transformation)

$$\beta F_d^{(\tau)}(T, L; \phi) = \frac{1}{2} \ln K + \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} U_{d-1}(\phi + \omega_0^{(\tau)} - \omega_n^{(\tau)}) - \frac{1}{2} K(\phi + \omega_0^{(\tau)}) - K, \quad (2.6)$$

where $K = \beta J = J/k_B T$ and

$$U_d(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_1}{2\pi} \cdots \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_d}{2\pi} \ln \left[z + 2 \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \cos \theta_i) \right]. \quad (2.7)$$

In (2.6), the shifted spherical field, defined by

$$\phi = \mu/J - \lambda_0^{(\tau)},$$

is the solution of the spherical constraint

$$K = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} W_{d-1}(\phi + \omega_0^{(\tau)} - \omega_n^{(\tau)}). \quad (2.8)$$

with

$$W_d(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_1}{2\pi} \cdots \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_d}{2\pi} \frac{1}{z + 2 \sum_{i=1}^d (1 - \cos \theta_i)}. \quad (2.9)$$

The bulk limit is obtained by letting the lateral size L go to infinity. This allows us to investigate the thermodynamics of the ferromagnetic mean spherical model in the thermodynamic limit. Here we shall not enter into the investigation of the thermodynamic properties (the interested reader may refer to (Pathria 1996)). It is worth mentioning that the present model undergoes a continuous phase transition at a bulk critical point determined by

$$K_{c,d} = W_d(0), \quad (2.10)$$

for $d > 2$. On the other hand for $d > 4$ the model exhibits mean-field-like critical behaviour. In the following we will consider only dimensions in the interval $2 < d < 4$. Recently an efficient method to estimate the Watson integral $W_d(0)$ and the associated logarithmic integral for d -dimensional hypercubic lattice has been proposed in (Joyce & Zucker 2001).

Before embarking into the investigation of the finite-size effects for the different boundary conditions a few comments are in order:

(1) For the evaluation of the finite-size contributions to the bulk expressions of the free energy and the equation for the spherical field the case of periodic boundary conditions is the simplest. A powerful method to treat these sums was proposed in (Singh & Pathria 1985a). It was found that in this case the correlation length ξ_L of the finite system is given by $\xi_L = \phi^{-1/2}$ (Singh & Pathria 1987).

(2) The same method was successfully extended to the case of antiperiodic boundary conditions (Singh & Pathria 1985b). However, the calculation were done in the absence of the lowest mode $\omega_0^{(\tau)}$ in (2.6) and (2.8). Later (Allen & Pathria 1993), it was found that the correlation length ξ_L and the spherical field are no more connected by a simple relation as it is the case for periodic boundary conditions. It was suggested that the correlation length is in fact related to the solution of the equation for spherical field shifted by the asymptotic behaviour of $\omega_0^{(\tau)}$ i.e. $\frac{\pi^2}{L^2}$.

(3) The remaining boundary conditions have attracted less attention (Barber & Fisher 1973, Barber 1974, Barber et al. 1974, Danchev et al. 1997, Brankov et al. 2000, Chen & Dohm 2003, Dantchev & Brankov 2003). Apart from the paper by (Chen & Dohm 2003), all

investigations were specialized to $d = 3$ using an approach based on (Barber & Fisher 1973). For arbitrary d and Dirichlet boundary conditions, a recent work (Chen & Dohm 2003) proposed a different method and claimed that the results of (Barber & Fisher 1973), obtained at $d = 3$, were incorrect.

Here we generalize the method of (Singh & Pathria 1985a) for periodic boundary conditions to the other boundary conditions. We investigate the finite-size effects of the free energy density (2.6) and the equation for the spherical field (2.8) in each case for arbitrary dimension d and comment on the results of the aforementioned papers.

3. Periodic boundary conditions

For the sake of completeness we will derive here the relevant expressions for the mean spherical model of finite thickness under periodic boundary conditions. The derivation is adapted from (Singh & Pathria 1985a) (see also (Chamati et al. 1998)). The explicit expressions for the free energy density and the equation for the spherical field are given by

$$\beta F_d^{(p)}(T, L) = \frac{1}{2} \ln K + \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} U_{d-1} \left(\phi + 2 \left[1 - \cos \left(\frac{2\pi}{L} n \right) \right] \right) - \frac{1}{2} K \phi - K, \quad (3.1a)$$

and

$$K = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} W_{d-1} \left(\phi + 2 \left[1 - \cos \left(\frac{2\pi}{L} n \right) \right] \right), \quad (3.1b)$$

respectively. In this case $\omega_0^{(p)} = 0$.

Using the integral representations

$$z^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-zt} \quad (3.2a)$$

and

$$\ln z = \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} [e^{-t} - e^{-zt}]. \quad (3.2b)$$

we can separate the expressions for the free energy density (3.1a) and the equation for the spherical field (3.1b) into the corresponding bulk expressions and the associated finite-size contributions. Let us illustrate how this works for the equation for the spherical field. With the aid of (3.2a) the sum entering this equation can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(p)}(\phi) &= \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \left(1 - \cos \frac{2\pi}{L} n \right) \right] \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_1}{2\pi} \cdots \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_{d-1}}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty dz \exp \left\{ -z \left[\phi + 2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (1 - \cos \theta_i) \right] \right\} Q_L^{(p)}(2z) \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

with

$$Q_L^{(p)}(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} \exp \left[z \cos \frac{2\pi}{L} n \right]. \quad (3.4)$$

Notice that $Q_L^{(p)}(z)$ is a periodic function of period 2π . Further we use (a generalization of) the Poisson summation formula, namely

$$\sum_a^b f(n) = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_a^b e^{2\pi i l n} f(n) dn + \frac{1}{2}f(a) + \frac{1}{2}f(b). \quad (3.5)$$

to get the identity

$$Q_L^{(p)}(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} \exp \left[z \cos \frac{2\pi}{L} n \right] = L \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} I_{Ll}(z), \quad (3.6)$$

where $I_\nu(x)$ stands for the modified Bessel function of the first kind (Abramowitz & Stegun 1972).

Substituting (3.6) into (3.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(p)}(\phi) &= L \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} dz e^{-z\phi} [e^{-2z} I_0(2z)]^{d-1} e^{-2z} I_{Ll}(2z) \\ &= LW_d(\phi) + 2L \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} dz e^{-z\phi} [e^{-2z} I_0(2z)]^{d-1} e^{-2z} I_{Ll}(2z), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where we have used the integral representation

$$W_d(\phi) = \int_0^{\infty} dz e^{-z\phi} [e^{-2z} I_0(2z)]^d \quad (3.8)$$

and the relation $I_{-2p}(x) = I_{2p}(x)$ (Abramowitz & Stegun 1972).

For large L , using the asymptotic expansion (Singh & Pathria 1985a)

$$I_\nu(x) = \frac{e^{x-\nu^2/2x}}{\sqrt{2\pi x}} \left[1 + \frac{1}{8x} + \frac{9-32\nu^2}{2!(8x)^2} + \dots \right], \quad (3.9)$$

after some straightforward steps, keeping only leading terms in L^{-1} , we get

$$\mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(p)}(\phi) = LW_d(\phi) + L \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \phi^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1}(lL\sqrt{\phi})}{(\frac{1}{2}lL\sqrt{\phi})^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}, \quad (3.10)$$

where $K_\nu(x)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind (Abramowitz & Stegun 1972).

Collecting the above results the equation for the spherical field reads

$$K = W_d(\phi) + \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \phi^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1}(lL\sqrt{\phi})}{(\frac{1}{2}lL\sqrt{\phi})^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}. \quad (3.11)$$

The finite-size behaviour of this equation has been studied in detail in (Chamati et al. 1998) for arbitrary d . For $2 < d < 4$, using the asymptotic behaviour

$$W_d(z) = W_d(0) + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] z^{(d-2)/2} + O(z^{(d-1)/2}), \quad (3.12)$$

equation (3.11) takes the scaling form

$$\varkappa = \frac{y^{d-2}}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left[\left| \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] \right| - 4 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1}(ly)}{(\frac{1}{2}ly)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} \right], \quad (3.13)$$

where we have introduced the scaling variable $y = L\sqrt{\phi}$ and $\varkappa = L^{1/\nu}(K_{c,d} - K)$ with $\nu = (d - 2)^{-1}$ – the critical exponent measuring the divergence of the correlation length. Consequently we have a solution of the form $\xi_L = \phi^{-1/2} = Lf_p(\varkappa)$, where f_p is a universal scaling function. For the particular case $d = 3$, equation (3.13) takes a simple form

$$2\pi\varkappa = \ln 2 \sinh \frac{y}{2}, \quad (3.14)$$

whose solution at the critical point, $\varkappa = 0$, is

$$y_0 = 2 \ln \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}. \quad (3.15)$$

The finite-size contributions to the free energy can be accounted for by using the integral representation (3.2b). The aim here is to transform the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{d,L}^{(p)}(\phi) &= \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \left(1 - \cos \frac{2\pi n}{L} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_1}{2\pi} \cdots \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta_{d-1}}{2\pi} \ln \left[\phi + 2 \left(1 - \cos \frac{2\pi n}{L} \right) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (1 - \cos \theta_i) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

into a more tractable form. After some straightforward algebra along the lines explained above, including the use of the identity (3.6), we arrive at

$$\mathcal{P}_{d,L}^{(p)}(\phi) = LU_d(\phi) - L \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \phi^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}}(lL\sqrt{\phi})}{\left(\frac{1}{2}lL\sqrt{\phi}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}}, \quad (3.17)$$

Using (3.17) for the large L asymptotic behaviour of the free energy density we get

$$\beta F_d^{(p)}(T, L; \phi) = \beta F_d(T; \phi) - \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \phi^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}}(lL\sqrt{\phi})}{\left(\frac{1}{2}lL\sqrt{\phi}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}}, \quad (3.18)$$

where $F_d(T; \phi) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} F_d^{(\tau)}(T, L; \phi)$ is the bulk free energy density.

For $2 < d < 4$, in the vicinity of the bulk critical point, we have the expansion

$$U_d(z) = U_d(0) + K_{c,d}z + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \frac{2}{d} \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] z^{d/2} + O(z^{(d+1)/2}). \quad (3.19)$$

Thus the singular part of the free energy takes the scaling form

$$\beta f_{s,d}^{(p)}(y, \varkappa) = \frac{1}{2} L^{-d} \left[\varkappa y^2 + \frac{2y^d}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\frac{1}{d} \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] - 2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}}(ly)}{\left(\frac{1}{2}ly\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \right) \right], \quad (3.20)$$

in consistency with the finite-size scaling hypothesis (1.1). The Casimir amplitude for $d = 3$ i.e. the critical amplitude of the singular part of the free energy density can be computed analytically using polylogarithm identities (Sachdev 1993). The result is (Sachdev 1993, Danchev 1998):

$$\Delta^{(p)} = -\frac{2\zeta(3)}{5\pi} = -0.153051 \dots \quad (3.21)$$

This value is compatible with estimations obtained for more realistic $O(n)$ models using different approaches. For more details we refer the reader to (Grüneberg & Diehl 2008).

As one would expect from previous studies on the mean spherical model, the results obtained for periodic boundary conditions are in conformity with the finite-size scaling hypothesis. In the following we will extend the method described here to the other boundary conditions. The generalization is somehow straightforward, however we will see the appearance of some subtleties that need careful consideration.

4. Antiperiodic boundary conditions

The explicit expressions for the free energy density and the equation for the spherical field read

$$\beta F_d^{(a)}(T, L; \phi) = \frac{1}{2} \ln K + \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + \omega_0^{(a)} - \omega_n^{(a)} \right] - \frac{1}{2} K \left(\phi + \omega_0^{(a)} \right) - K, \quad (4.1a)$$

and

$$K = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + \omega_0^{(a)} - \omega_n^{(a)} \right]. \quad (4.1b)$$

respectively. Here the lowest eigenmode $\omega_0^{(a)} \neq 0$, in contrast to the case of periodic boundary conditions.

Unlike the analysis of (Singh & Pathria 1985*b*) we shall not omit $\omega_0^{(\tau)} = -2 + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L}$ from our equations, rather we will use the combination $\sigma^{(a)} = \phi + \omega_0^{(a)}$ as a variable in our consideration of the sums entering (4.1a) and (4.1b). We will see that this is crucial to our further treatment. Indeed, in our notations, ϕ is expected to define the correlation length and no other definition for this quantity is necessary as it has been suggested in (Allen & Pathria 1993).

The analysis of Section 3 for periodic boundary conditions can be applied to the sums

$$\mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(a)}[\sigma^{(a)}] = \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} W_{d-1} \left[\sigma^{(a)} - \omega_n^{(a)} \right] \quad (4.2a)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{d,L}^{(a)}[\sigma^{(a)}] = \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} U_{d-1} \left[\sigma^{(a)} - \omega_n^{(a)} \right] \quad (4.2b)$$

appearing in the left hand side of (4.1a) and (4.1b), respectively. Now instead of the identity (3.6) we use (Singh & Pathria 1985*b*)

$$Q_L^{(a)}(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} \exp \left[z \cos \frac{2\pi}{L} \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] = L \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \cos(\pi l) I_{Ll}(z), \quad (4.3)$$

to end up with the final expressions

$$\beta F_d^{(a)}(T, L; \phi) = \beta F_d \left(T; \phi + \omega_0^{(a)} \right) - \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\phi + \omega_0^{(a)} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}} \left(lL \sqrt{\phi + \omega_0^{(a)}} \right)}{\left(\frac{1}{2} lL \sqrt{\phi + \omega_0^{(a)}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \quad (4.4a)$$

and

$$K = W_d \left(\phi + \omega_0^{(a)} \right) + \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\phi + \omega_0^{(a)} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left(lL\sqrt{\phi + \omega_0^{(a)}} \right)}{\left(\frac{1}{2}lL\sqrt{\phi + \omega_0^{(a)}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} \quad (4.4b)$$

For $2 < d < 4$, making use of the asymptotic behaviour (3.12), for large L and in the vicinity of the bulk critical point, with $\phi + \omega_0^{(a)} < 1$, we have the scaling behaviour

$$\varkappa = \frac{(y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{d-2}{2}}}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left[\left| \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] \right| - 4 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left(l\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right)}{\left(\frac{1}{2}l\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} \right], \quad (4.5)$$

where we have used $\omega_0^{(a)} \approx -\frac{\pi^2}{L^2}$. The solution of (4.5) may be written as $\xi_L = Lf_{(a)}(\varkappa)$, where $f_{(a)}$ a universal scaling function.

For $d = 3$, equation (4.5) reads

$$2\pi\varkappa = \ln 2 \cosh \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2}, \quad (4.6)$$

whose positive solution is

$$y_0 = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{3} \pi. \quad (4.7)$$

This is the critical amplitude of the correlation length. This result has been obtained also in (Allen & Pathria 1993) using a different definition for the correlation length imposed by the choice of a different initial equation for the spherical field.

Using the asymptotic behaviour (3.19), valid for $2 < d < 4$, the singular part of the free energy density may be written in a scaling form as

$$f_{s,d}^{(a)}(y, \varkappa) L^d = \frac{1}{2} \varkappa (y^2 - \pi^2) + \frac{(y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\frac{1}{d} \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] - 2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}} \left(l\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right)}{\left(\frac{1}{2}l\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \right). \quad (4.8)$$

In accordance with the finite-size scaling hypothesis (1.1). For the important case $d = 3$, its critical amplitude at T_c and consequently the corresponding Casimir amplitude for antiperiodic boundary conditions is ¶

$$\Delta^{(a)} = 0.274543 \dots \quad (4.9)$$

Notice that the Casimir amplitude here is positive in contrast to the case of periodic boundary conditions, see e.g. (3.21), but approximately twice higher in magnitude. This result is compatible with that of (Krech & Dietrich 1992) obtained using renormalization group.

Before closing this section let us mention that the expressions for periodic boundary conditions and those corresponding to antiperiodic boundary conditions may be written in unified general forms with a parameter characteristic of twisted boundary conditions. In the remainder of the paper we will use these methods to analyse the finite-size effects of the mean spherical model with a film geometry subject to more realistic boundary conditions.

¶ This result was obtained independently by (Dantchev et al. 2008)

5. Dirichlet boundary conditions

5.1. Equation for the spherical field

Here we will evaluate the finite-size contributions to the sum appearing in (2.8) in the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions. We start with

$$\mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(D)}(\phi) = \sum_{n=1}^L W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{\pi n}{L+1} \right], \quad (5.1)$$

which upon extending the sum to $n = 2L + 1$ may be written

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(D)}(\phi) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2L+1} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{\pi n}{L+1} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} + 2 \right] - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} - 2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The last two terms correspond to $n = L + 1$ and $n = 0$, respectively. Comparing with (3.3) we find that the sum in the right hand side is exactly $\mathcal{S}_{d,2L+2}^{(p)}(\phi + \omega_0^{(D)})$ corresponding to periodic boundary conditions with a film of thickness $2L + 2$. This suggests that the analysis of the sum appearing in (5.2) can be performed following the method outlined in Section 3 (see e.g. (3.10)).

The equation for the spherical field follows from (2.8), (5.2) and (3.10). This is (to the leading order in L^{-1})

$$\begin{aligned} K &= W_d \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right) + \frac{1}{L} \left[W_d \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} + 4 \right) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left(2lL \sqrt{\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2}} \right)}{\left(lL \sqrt{\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where we have used the large asymptotic behaviour $\omega_0^{(D)} \approx -\frac{\pi^2}{L^2}$. Equation (5.3) is the general form of the equation for the spherical field for arbitrary dimension d . Notice that the right hand side is composed of a bulk term, a size dependent surface term

$$W_d \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} + 4 \right) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right) \quad (5.4)$$

and finite-size corrections. Here, all the quantities are function of the combination $\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2}$. Thus, the critical properties of the mean spherical model of finite thickness under Dirichlet boundary conditions should be investigated using $\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2}$ as a small parameter keeping in mind that $\phi \ll 1$ and $L \gg 1$.

The scaling behaviour of (5.3) depends strongly upon d , indeed the asymptotic expansion of $W_{d-1}(z)$ for small argument takes different expressions for different values of d . We first start with the important three dimensional case that has been extensively studied in the literature. Later we will extend our analysis to the interval $3 < d < 4$. This constraint for d

ensures the validity of the asymptotic expansion (3.12) for $W_d(z)$ and $W_{d-1}(z)$ at the same time. This means that the lower critical dimension in this case is $d = 3$.

For $d = 3$, using (3.12) with $d = 3$ and

$$W_2(z) = \frac{1}{4\pi} (5 \ln 2 - \ln z) + O(z \ln z), \quad (5.5)$$

form (5.3) we have

$$K - K_{c,3} = \frac{1}{L} \left[K_{c,3} - \frac{1}{2} W_2(4) - \frac{5 \ln 2}{8\pi} \right] - \frac{1}{4\pi L} \ln L - \frac{1}{4\pi L} \ln \frac{\sinh 2\sqrt{L^2\phi - \pi^2}}{\sqrt{L^2\phi - \pi^2}}, \quad (5.6)$$

which, apart from an unimportant numerical factor that enters in the definition of K , coincides with equation (4.69) of (Barber & Fisher 1973) obtained at $d = 3$ via a different method. Consequently our result disagrees with that of (Chen & Dohm 2003), where it has been argued that equation (4.69) of (Barber & Fisher 1973) was incorrect far from $K_{c,3}^+$. At the bulk critical point, solving (5.6), with the assumption $L\sqrt{\phi} \ll 1$, we find $\phi \sim L^{-3}$ in agreement with (Chen & Dohm 2003, Dantchev & Brankov 2003). It is worth mentioning that (5.6) cannot be put in a scaling form because of the logarithmic dependence on L . However, if one considers a shifted critical point that absorbs the term proportional to $\ln L$ and the surface contributions according to (Barber & Fisher 1973)

$$K_{s,3}^{(D)} = K_{c,3} + \frac{1}{L} \left[K_{c,3} - \frac{1}{2} W_2(4) - \frac{7 \ln 2}{8\pi} \right] - \frac{1}{4\pi L} \ln L, \quad (5.7)$$

it is possible to recover the scaling behaviour. However, the shifted critical temperature (5.7) has no physical meaning, although at first sight one would hope to write L^{-1} as $L^{-1/\nu}$ with ($\nu = (d-2)^{-1}$), which is actually not correct as we will see later for $3 < d < 4$. A quantity that has such a meaning is the critical temperature of the film given by

$$K_{c,3}^{(D)} = K_{c,3} + \frac{1}{L} \left[K_{c,3} - \frac{1}{2} W_2(4) - \frac{5 \ln 2}{8\pi} \right]. \quad (5.8)$$

Here one would expect that the standard finite-size scaling is violated since $d = 3$ is the lower critical dimension.

In the case $3 < d < 4$, the equation for the spherical field (5.3) may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} -\varkappa &= L^{d-3} \left[W_d(0) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1}(0) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1}(4) \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} (y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left[\Gamma\left(\frac{2-d}{2}\right) - \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{3-d}{2}\right) (y^2 - \pi^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} (y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left(2l\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right)}{\left(l\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

The first term in right hand side shows that the standard finite-size scaling hypothesis breaks down in the vicinity of the bulk critical temperature. It is likely that the introduction of a scaling function depending on \varkappa and an additional variable proportional to L^{d-3} aiming at

⁺ The origin of this discrepancy is discussed in (Chen & Dohm 2003).

the modification of the finite-size scaling would cure this deficiency. Notice that at the film critical temperature defined via

$$K_{c,d}^{(D)} = K_{c,d} + \frac{1}{L} \left[W_d(0) - \frac{1}{2}W_{d-1}(0) - \frac{1}{2}W_{d-1}(4) \right], \quad (5.10)$$

it is possible to rewrite (5.9) in a scaling form.

5.2. Free energy density

Let us now turn to the evaluation of the free energy density. We need the asymptotic behaviour of the sum

$$\mathcal{P}_{d,L}^{(D)}(\phi) = \sum_{n=1}^L U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{\pi n}{L+1} \right], \quad (5.11)$$

entering the expression (2.6) of the free energy. Here again we extend the sum to $n = 2L + 1$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{d,L}^{(D)}(\phi) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2L+1} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{\pi n}{L+1} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} + 2 \right] - \frac{1}{2} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{L+1} - 2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

The sum in the right hand side of (5.12) corresponds to $P_{d,2L+2}^{(p)}(\phi + \omega_0^{(D)})$ from (3.16). Then from (3.17) and (5.12) we get the free energy density

$$\begin{aligned} \beta F_d^{(D)}(T, L; \phi) &= \beta F_d \left(T; \phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right) + \frac{1}{L} \beta F_{d,\text{surf.}}^{(D)} \left(T; \phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}} \left(2lL \sqrt{\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2}} \right)}{\left(lL \sqrt{\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{L^2}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where

$$\beta F_{d,\text{surf.}}^{(D)}(T; \sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \left[U_d(\sigma) - \frac{1}{2}U_{d-1}(\sigma + 4) - \frac{1}{2}U_{d-1}(\sigma) \right]$$

accounts for contributions stemming from the surfaces.

For $d = 3$, we use the expansions (3.19) and

$$U_2(z) = U_2(0) - \frac{1}{4\pi} z \ln z + \frac{1}{4\pi} (1 + 5 \ln 2) z + O(z^2 \ln z) \quad (5.14)$$

to obtain the singular part of the free energy density

$$\begin{aligned} \beta f_{s,3}^{(D)} L^3 &= \frac{1}{2} z (y^2 - \pi^2) - \frac{1}{12\pi} (y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} \left[K_{c,3} - \frac{1}{2}W_2(4) - \frac{1 + 5 \ln 2}{8\pi} \right] (y^2 - \pi^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{16\pi} (y^2 - \pi^2) \ln (y^2 - \pi^2) - \frac{1}{8\pi} (y^2 - \pi^2) \ln L \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{8\pi} \sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \text{Li}_2 \left(\exp \left[-2\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{16\pi} \text{Li}_3 \left(\exp \left[-2\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

At the shifted critical point $K_{s,3}^{(D)}$ (See (5.7)), $f_{s,3}^{(D)}$ takes a scaling form. Notice that at the bulk critical temperature $f_{s,3}^{(D)}$ is proportional to $L^{-3} \ln L$ implying that the finite size scaling hypothesis (1.1) breaks down for the mean spherical model with Dirichlet boundary conditions at $d = 3$, while in more realistic models the finite-size scaling is valid and the critical Casimir amplitude can be estimated (Krech & Dietrich 1992).

Another expression for the scaling behaviour of the singular part of free energy was obtained in (Barber 1974). In our notations it reads

$$\beta f_{s,3}^B L^3 = \frac{1}{2} \varkappa y^2 - \frac{y^2}{8\pi} \ln L + \frac{y^2}{2} \left[K_{c,3} - \frac{1}{2} W_2(4) - \frac{7 \ln 2}{8\pi} \right] + Q_0(y), \quad (5.16)$$

where

$$Q_0(x) = \frac{\pi}{8} \left[R(-1) - R\left(\frac{x^2}{\pi^2} - 1\right) \right] \quad (5.17)$$

with

$$R(z) = \int_0^z \ln \frac{\sinh \pi \sqrt{w}}{\pi \sqrt{w}} dw.$$

By comparing (5.15) and (5.16) we see that the first three terms in the right hand side of (5.16) have their counterparts in (5.15) obtained through the replacement $y^2 \rightarrow y^2 - \pi^2$. It seems that the terms linear in π^2 and the term proportional to $L^{-3} \ln L$ were neglected in (5.16). It remains to see what is the situation for the rest of the terms. Unfortunately no direct analytic comparison can be made, despite the fact that the integral representation (5.17) can be expressed in terms of polylogarithms. To achieve the comparison recourse must be sought in numerical methods, so we plot the function $Q_0(y)$ and

$$D(y) = \frac{1}{16\pi} (2 \ln 2 - 1) (y^2 - \pi^2) - \frac{1}{12\pi} (y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{1}{16\pi} (y^2 - \pi^2) \ln (y^2 - \pi^2) - \frac{1}{8\pi} \sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \text{Li}_2 \left(\exp \left[-2\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{16\pi} \text{Li}_3 \left(\exp \left[-2\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2} \right] \right) \quad (5.18)$$

from (5.15) which contains terms that are not present in (5.16) and those that were apparently neglected. The result is shown in Figure 1. We see clearly that both functions have similar behaviours and are shifted one from the other by a constant. This has been checked by computing the derivatives of both functions which gives us the same result. The difference between the two functions is estimated to be

$$Q_0(y) - D(y) = \frac{\pi}{16} \left[-1 + \ln(4\pi^2) + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \zeta(3) \right]. \quad (5.19)$$

Thus, the scaling functions (5.15) and (5.16) are equal up to an irrelevant constant that does not become singular at the bulk critical point.

For $3 < d < 4$ the scaling form of the singular part of the free energy reads

$$2f_{s,d}^{(D)} L^d = \varkappa (y^2 - \pi^2) + L^{d-3} \left[W_d(0) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1}(0) - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1}(4) \right] (y^2 - \pi^2) + \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} (y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{d}{2}} \left[\frac{1}{d} \Gamma\left(\frac{2-d}{2}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{d-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{3-d}{2}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2}} \right]$$




Figure 1. Behaviours of the functions $Q_0(y)$ (5.16) and $D(y)$ (5.18) against y .

$$-\frac{2}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}}(y^2 - \pi^2)^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}}(2l\sqrt{y - \pi^2})}{(l\sqrt{y^2 - \pi^2})^{\frac{d}{2}}}. \quad (5.20)$$

Just like the equation for the spherical field we find that the surface contributions to the singular part of the free energy violates the standard finite-size scaling hypothesis (1.1). A reformulation of the scaling behaviour would require the introduction of a function with two arguments: the scaling variable \varkappa and a scaling variable that incorporates the size dependent term L^{d-3} . It is easy to see that the scaling is recovered if one considers the difference with respect to the critical temperature of the film (5.10) rather than the bulk critical temperature.

6. Neumann boundary conditions

6.1. Equation for the spherical field

To investigate the finite-size effects in the spherical model of finite thickness subject to Neumann boundary conditions we need to estimate the large asymptotic behaviour of the sum

$$\mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(N)}(\phi) = \sum_{n=1}^L W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 - 2 \cos \frac{\pi(n-1)}{L} \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2L-1} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 - 2 \cos \frac{\pi n}{L} \right] - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} [\phi + 4] + \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} [\phi]. \quad (6.1)$$

The sum in the last line is exactly $\mathcal{S}_{d,2L}^{(N)}(\phi)$ (see (3.3)). Consequently, from (6.1) and (3.10), the equation for the spherical field is given by

$$K = W_d(\phi) - \frac{1}{2L} [W_{d-1}(\phi + 4) - W_{d-1}(\phi)] + \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \phi^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1}(2lL\sqrt{\phi})}{(lL\sqrt{\phi})^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}, \quad (6.2)$$

to the leading order in L^{-1} .

The presence of $W_{d-1}(\phi)$ in (6.2) raises the lower critical dimension of the film to $d = 3$. At $d = 3$, equation (6.2) takes the simple form

$$K - K_{c,3} = -\frac{1}{2L} \left[W_2(4) - \frac{5}{4\pi} \ln 2 \right] + \frac{1}{4\pi L} \ln L - \frac{1}{4\pi L} \ln \left[2L\sqrt{\phi} \sinh(L\sqrt{\phi}) \right]. \quad (6.3)$$

This equation was derived in (Dantchev & Brankov 2003) using a method based on (Barber & Fisher 1973). At the bulk critical temperature $K_{c,3}$ the spherical field behaves as $\phi \sim L^{-1}$ to the leading order assuming $L\sqrt{\phi} \ll 1$. In the limit $L\sqrt{\phi} \gg 1$ one would expect a logarithmic behaviour as pointed out by (Dantchev & Brankov 2003). At the shifted critical temperature, defined through (Dantchev & Brankov 2003)

$$K_{s,3}^{(N)} = K_{c,3} - \frac{1}{2L} \left[W_2(4) - \frac{3}{4\pi} \ln 2 \right] + \frac{1}{4\pi L} \ln L, \quad (6.4)$$

equation (6.3) may be written in a scaling form. However, this temperature has no physical meaning and it is more appropriate to use the critical temperature of the film given by

$$K_{c,3}^{(N)} = K_{c,3} - \frac{1}{2L} \left[W_2(4) - \frac{5}{4\pi} \ln 2 \right]. \quad (6.5)$$

We see that the finite-size scaling is not fulfilled due to the fact that $d = 3$ is the lower critical dimension.

For $3 < d < 4$ the scaling form of the equation for the spherical field is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa = & \frac{1}{2} L^{d-3} [W_{d-1}(4) - W_{d-1}(0)] - \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left[\Gamma \left(\frac{2-d}{2} \right) - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{y} \Gamma \left(\frac{3-d}{2} \right) \right] y^{d-2} \\ & - \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} y^{d-2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1}(2ly)}{(ly)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

As above for the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions the standard finite-size scaling hypothesis is violated here as well and would need a reformulation in order to take into account the term proportional to L^{d-3} . We remark also that if one defines the critical temperature of the film via

$$K_{c,d}^{(N)} = K_{c,d} + \frac{1}{2} [W_{d-1}(0) - W_{d-1}(4)], \quad (6.7)$$

then (6.6) may be written in a scaling form by considering the difference in temperature relative to (6.7).

6.2. Free energy density

The free energy density is obtained by analysing the sum

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{d,L}^{(N)}(\phi) &= \sum_{n=1}^L U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 - 2 \cos \frac{\pi(n-1)}{L} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2L-1} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 - 2 \cos \frac{\pi n}{L} \right] - \frac{1}{2} U_{d-1} [\phi + 4] + \frac{1}{2} U_{d-1} [\phi].\end{aligned}\quad (6.8)$$

which contains the term $\mathcal{P}_{d,2L}^{(p)}(\phi)$, equivalent to (3.16). Using (6.8) and (3.17) we obtain explicitly

$$\beta F_d^{(N)}(T, L; \phi) = \beta F_d(T; \phi) + \frac{1}{L} \beta F_{d,\text{surf.}}^{(N)}(\phi) - \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \phi^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}}(2lL\sqrt{\phi})}{(lL\sqrt{\phi})^{\frac{d}{2}}}, \quad (6.9)$$

where

$$\beta F_{d,\text{surf.}}^{(N)}(\phi) = \frac{1}{4} U_{d-1} [\phi] - \frac{1}{4} U_{d-1} [\phi + 4] \quad (6.10)$$

is the surfaces contribution.

At $d = 3$, using (3.19) and (5.14) the singular part of the free energy density reads

$$\begin{aligned}\beta f_{d,3}^{(N)} L^3 &= \frac{1}{2} \varkappa y^2 - \frac{1}{12\pi} y^3 - \frac{1}{4} \left[W_2(4) - \frac{1 + 5 \ln 2}{4\pi} \right] y^2 - \frac{1}{8\pi} y^2 \ln y + \frac{1}{8\pi} y^2 \ln L \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{8\pi} y \text{Li}_2(e^{-2y}) - \frac{1}{16\pi} y \text{Li}_3(e^{-2y}).\end{aligned}\quad (6.11)$$

Here again we have a logarithmic dependence on L and surface contributions leading to the violation of the finite-size scaling hypothesis (1.1). At the non-physical critical point (6.4) the scaling is recovered. As one would expect the finite-size scaling breaks down even at the critical point of the film (6.5). This makes the spherical model unsuitable for the evaluation of the Casimir amplitude for $O(n)$ systems with Neumann boundary conditions. The value of this quantity is known from renormalization group (Grüneberg & Diehl 2008).

For $3 < d < 4$, the singular part of the free energy reads

$$\begin{aligned}\beta f_{s,d}^{(N)} L^d &= \frac{1}{2} \varkappa y^2 + \frac{1}{4} L^{d-3} [W_{d-1}(0) - W_{d-1}(4)] y^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left[\frac{1}{d} \Gamma \left(\frac{2-d}{2} \right) + \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{d-1} \Gamma \left(\frac{3-d}{2} \right) \right] - \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} y^d \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}}(2ly)}{(ly)^{\frac{d}{2}}}.\end{aligned}\quad (6.12)$$

This suggests that standard finite-size scaling hypothesis (1.1) is not valid for the mean spherical model confined to a film geometry with Neumann boundary conditions. If the term proportional to L^{d-3} is absorbed in the definition of the distance to the critical point of the film (6.7), then the scaling behaviour is obtained. Similar to the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions a modified finite-size scaling hypothesis is necessary to get the appropriate scaling behaviour.

7. Neumann–Dirichlet boundary conditions

7.1. Equation for the spherical field

To extract the finite-size effects from (2.8) in the case of mixed boundary conditions i.e. Neumann and Dirichlet on the bounding surfaces, the sum to be considered is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{d,L}^{(DN)}(\phi) &= \sum_{n=1}^L W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{2\pi(n-\frac{1}{2})}{2L+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2L} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{2\pi(n+\frac{1}{2})}{2L+1} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} W_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2L+1} + 2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

By inspection of the sum in the second line we see that the analysis of this case is tightly related to that of antiperiodic boundary conditions. In other words this sum is exactly $S_{d,2L+1}^{(a)}(\phi + \omega_0^{(ND)})$ with $S_{d,2L+1}^{(a)}(\sigma)$ defined in (4.2a) meaning that in this case the finite-size corrections correspond to a film of thickness $2L+1$ subject to antiperiodic boundary conditions. Then, along lines similar to the analysis of Section 4, for the equation for the spherical field we get

$$\begin{aligned} K &= W_d \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{4L^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2L} \left[W_d \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{4L^2} \right) - W_{d-1} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{4L^2} + 4 \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{4L^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left(2lL \sqrt{\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{4L^2}} \right)}{\left(lL \sqrt{\phi - \frac{\pi^2}{4L^2}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

to the leading order in L^{-1} . Notice that here the lower critical dimension of the film is not altered i.e. it coincides with that of the bulk system. For $2 < d < 4$, using (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa &= \frac{\left(y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \right)^{\frac{d-2}{2}}}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left[\left| \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] \right| - 4 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}-1} \left(l \sqrt{y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4}} \right)}{\left(\frac{1}{2} l \sqrt{y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} L^{d-3} [K_{c,d} - W_{d-1}(4)]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

The solution of this equation depends on L which leads us to the conclusion that the standard finite-size scaling is violated here as well. To resolve this issue one would need a modified finite-size scaling assumption. Let us introduce the critical temperature of the film via

$$K_{c,d}^{(ND)} = K_{c,d} - \frac{1}{2L} [K_{c,d} - W_{d-1}(4)]. \quad (7.4)$$

In this case it is possible to write (7.3) in a scaling form. Remark however that for $d = 3$ the term L^{d-3} vanishes and the finite-size scaling is expected to hold. Indeed, at $d = 3$, (7.3)

turns into the simple form

$$4\pi\kappa = \ln 2 \cosh \sqrt{y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4}} - 2\pi [K_{c,3} - W_2(4)], \quad (7.5)$$

This equation is identical to equation (4.31) of (Dantchev & Brankov 2003) obtained by a method adapted after (Barber & Fisher 1973). At the bulk critical temperature, $\kappa = 0$, solving (7.5) numerically we find the critical amplitude

$$y_0 = 1.45684\dots \quad (7.6)$$

7.2. Free energy density

The free energy is obtained as a result of the analysis of the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{d,L}^{(DN)}(\phi) &= \sum_{n=1}^L U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{2\pi(n-\frac{1}{2})}{2L+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2L} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2L+1} - 2 \cos \frac{2\pi(n+\frac{1}{2})}{2L+1} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} U_{d-1} \left[\phi + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2L+1} + 2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

So apart from a surface term (the last term) the asymptotic form of the free energy has a similar expression to (4.4a) in the case of the antiperiodic boundary conditions with the replacements $\omega_0^{(a)} \rightarrow \omega_0^{(ND)}$ and $L \rightarrow 2L$ i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \beta F_d^{(ND)}(T, L; \phi) &= \beta F_d(T; \phi + \omega_0^{(ND)}) + \frac{1}{L} \beta F_{d,\text{surf.}}^{(ND)}(\phi + \omega_0^{(ND)}) \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} (\phi + \omega_0^{(ND)})^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}} \left(2lL \sqrt{\phi + \omega_0^{(ND)}} \right)}{\left(lL \sqrt{\phi + \omega_0^{(ND)}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

with the surface contribution

$$F_{d,\text{surf.}}^{(ND)}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{4} [U_d(\sigma) - U_{d-1}(\sigma + 4)]. \quad (7.9)$$

For $2 < d < 4$, the singular part of the free energy density follows also from that for antiperiodic boundary conditions (4.8) and the corrections originating from the surfaces. In this case we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta f_{s,d}^{(ND)}(y, \kappa) &= \frac{1}{2} L^{-d} \kappa \left(y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{4} L^{-3} [K_{c,d} - W_{d-1}(4)] \left(y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4} \right) \\ &\quad + L^{-d} \frac{(y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4})^{\frac{d}{2}}}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\frac{1}{d} \Gamma \left[\frac{2-d}{2} \right] - 2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \frac{K_{\frac{d}{2}} \left(2l \sqrt{y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4}} \right)}{\left(l \sqrt{y^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{4}} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

Here again there is a term proportional to L^{d-3} that violates the standard finite-size scaling hypothesis (1.1) in the vicinity of $K_{c,d}$ and its modification is necessary to get the correct scaling. At the film critical point $K_{c,d}^{(ND)}$ from (7.4) we may write the free energy in a scaling form. At $d = 3$ there is no explicit dependence in L . In this case, the critical amplitude of the singular part of the free energy density is obtained from (7.10). Thus the Casimir amplitude for the three dimensional mean spherical film subject to Neumann-Dirichlet boundary conditions is

$$\Delta^{(ND)} = 0.01922\dots \quad (7.11)$$

This exact result is in conformity with that of (Krech & Dietrich 1992) obtained using renormalization group. Similar to the case of antiperiodic boundary conditions the Casimir amplitude is positive but smaller in magnitude indicating a weaker repulsing force between the surfaces bounding the system.

8. Discussion

We investigated the finite-size effects in the d dimensional ferromagnetic mean spherical model of finite thickness L subject to different kind of boundary conditions: periodic (p), antiperiodic (a), Dirichlet (D) and Neumann (N) on both surfaces bounding the model, and a combination of Neumann and Dirichlet on each surface (ND). We proposed a method for the computation of the finite-size corrections of the free energy for arbitrary dimension. Our analysis showed that for Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions the finite-size effects are essentially equivalent to the case of periodic boundary conditions for a film of thickness $2L$ and additional surface terms. Similarly, the case of Neumann-Dirichlet was found to be related to the case of antiperiodic boundary conditions with thickness $2L$.

The free energy density and the equation for the spherical field were computed for a film with arbitrary dimension d subject to the different boundary conditions. In the particular case $d = 3$, our general expressions for (D), (N) and (ND) reduce to those obtained by (Barber & Fisher 1973) and (Danchev et al. 1997, Danchev & Brankov 2003). It is found that the singular part of the free energy density has the standard finite-size scaling form for $2 < d < 4$ only in the cases (p) and (a) i.e. for those boundary conditions which do not break the translation invariance of the model. In these cases we estimated the critical amplitude of the singular part of the free energy and obtained the values: $\Delta^{(p)} = -2\zeta(3)/(5\pi) = -0.153051\dots$ and $\Delta^{(a)} = 0.274543\dots$ for (p) and (a), respectively. Interpreted in terms of the Casimir effect this imply that in the case (p) we have fluctuation-induced attraction between the surfaces bounding the model and a repulsion in the case (a).

For a film subject to (D) or (N) the lower critical dimension is raised to 3 with a critical point shifted from the bulk one by surface terms. In the vicinity of the bulk critical point the standard finite-size scaling is not valid in general. At $d = 3$, the solution of the equation for the spherical field is proportional to L^{-3} for (D) and to L^{-1} for (N), while the singular part of the free energy exhibits a logarithmic dependence on L . For $3 < d < 4$, the standard

finite-size scaling for the singular part of the free energy needs to be modified according to

$$f_{s,d}^{(\tau)}(t; L) \approx L^{-d} Y^{(\tau)}(b_1 t L^{1/\nu}, b_2 L^{d-3}), \quad (8.1)$$

with b_1 and b_2 some non-universal quantities depending on the details of the model. The function $Y^{(\tau)}$ is expected to be a universal function of its arguments.

In the case (ND), the lower critical dimension is the same as that of the bulk model. Nonetheless, the film has its own critical point shifted from the bulk one by surface terms. For $2 < d < 4$, the standard finite-size scaling has to be modified in neighbourhood of the bulk critical temperature using (8.1). A surprising fact is that the finite-size scaling hypothesis is again valid at $d = 3$. At T_c , the square root of the equation for the spherical field is equal to $1.45684 \dots L^{-1}$ and the Casimir amplitude is found to be $\Delta^{(ND)} = 0.01922 \dots$ i.e. a weaker than the case (a) fluctuation-induced repulsion.

It well known that the mean spherical model is not able to capture the gross features of $O(n)$ models when it is subject to boundary conditions that break the translational invariance of the model. To solve this problem remaining in the framework of the spherical model one would introduce additional spherical fields to ensure the proper behaviour of the surface spins (Singh et al. 1975). Otherwise one can try recovering the equivalence between the spherical model and $O(n)$ spin models by imposing spherical constraints ensuring the same mean square value for all spins of the system (Knops 1973). In the case of a film geometry this is equivalent to having a spherical constraint on each layer of the system with a space dependent spherical field along the finite direction (Hikami & Abe 1976, Bray & Moore 1977, Ohno & Okabe 1983) whose relaxed version reduce to the model under consideration. Even in this case an accurate study of the problems related to finite-size scaling remains rather untractable analytically (Hikami & Abe 1976).

Acknowledgments

The author expresses his gratitude to Prof. Diehl for many illuminating discussions and in addition to Prof. Tonchev for a critical reading of the manuscript.

References

- Abramowitz M & Stegun I A 1972 *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables* US Govt Printing Office Washington, DC.
- Allen S & Pathria R K 1993 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **26**(23), 6797–6806.
- Barber M N 1974 *J. Stat. Phys.* **10**, 59–88.
- Barber M N & Fisher M E 1973 *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **77**, 1–78.
- Barber M N, Jasnow D, Singh S & Weiner R A 1974 *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **7**(19), 3491–3504.
- Berlin T H & Kac M 1952 *Phys. Rev.* **86**(6), 821–835.
- Brankov J G, Danchev D M & Tonchev N S 2000 *The Theory of Critical Phenomena in Finite-Size Systems—Scaling and Quantum Effects* World Scientific Singapore.
- Bray A J & Moore M A 1977 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **10**, 1927–1962.
- Casimir H B G 1948 *Proc. K. Ned. Akad. Wetensch.* **51**, 793–795.
- Chamati H, Pisanova E S & Tonchev N S 1998 *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 5798–5811.
- Chen X S & Dohm V 2003 *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 056127.

- Danchev D M 1998 *Phys. Rev. E* **58**(2), 1455–1462.
- Danchev D M, Brankov J G & Amin M E 1997 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **30**, 1387–1402.
- Danchev D, Grüneberg D & Diehl H W 2008. in preparation.
- Danchev D M & Brankov J G 2003 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **36**, 8915–8933.
- Diehl H W 1986 in C Domb & J. L Lebowitz, eds, 'Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena' Vol. 10 Academic Press New York chapter 2, pp. 76–267.
- Fisher M E & de Gennes P G 1978 *C. R. Seances Acad. Sci., Ser. B* **287**.
- Grüneberg D & Diehl H W 2008 *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 115409.
- Hikami S & Abe R 1976 *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **55**, 1412–1418.
- Joyce G S & Zucker I J 2001 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34**(36), 7349–7354.
- Knops H J F 1973 *J. Math. Phys.* **14**(12), 1918–1920.
- Krech M & Dietrich S 1992 *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 1886–1921.
- Lewis H W & Wannier G H 1952 *Phys. Rev.* **88**(3), 682–683. [Errata: *Phys. Rev.* 90, 1131–1131 (1953)].
- Ohno K & Okabe Y 1983 *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **70**, 1226–1239.
- Pathria R K 1996 *Statistical mechanics* second edn Butterworth–Heinemann Oxford.
- Privman V, ed. 1990 *Finite-size scaling and numerical simulations of statistical systems* World Scientific Singapore.
- Privman V & Fisher M E 1984 *Phys. Rev. B* **30**(1), 322–327.
- Privman V, Hohenberg P C & Aharony A 1991 in C Domb & J. L Lebowitz, eds, 'Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena' Vol. 10 Academic Press New York chapter 1, pp. 4–134.
- Sachdev S 1993 *Phys. Lett. B* **309**, 285–288.
- Singh S, Jasnow D & Barber M N 1975 *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **8**(20), 3408–3414.
- Singh S & Pathria R K 1985a *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 4483–4490.
- Singh S & Pathria R K 1985b *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 4618–4627.
- Singh S & Pathria R K 1987 *Phys. Rev. B* **36**(7), 3769–3781.
- Stanley H E 1968 *Phys. Rev.* **176**(2), 718–722.