

Asymptotic Freedom in Antiferromagnetic Chains of Large Spin

Samuel Gozel,¹ Frédéric Mila,¹ and Ian Affleck²

¹*Institute of Physics, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy and Stewart Blusson Quantum Matter Institute, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, V6T1Z1*

Although quarks are bound by a linear potential to form hadrons, they appear as nearly free particles in certain high-energy experiments, due to the fact that the Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) effective coupling constant becomes small at high energies. We extend this idea to antiferromagnetic chains of large spin (S), which can be mapped onto the $O(3)$ non-linear σ model whose effective coupling constant is also small at sufficiently high energies. This allows us to make predictions for the equal-time and dynamical spin-spin correlations, measurable in neutron scattering experiments. Our predictions for static correlations are compared to quantum Monte-Carlo for $S = 5/2$.

Asymptotic freedom is a term used to describe the fact that although the strong interactions confine quarks into hadrons they nonetheless appear as nearly free particles in deep inelastic scattering experiments [1–3]. Nearly free quark behavior is also observed in high-energy $e^+ - e^-$ annihilation into hadrons, but the theoretical description of such a process is complicated by the fact that the momentum transfer $Q^\mu = (E/c, \mathbf{q})$ is now timelike rather than spacelike. In both cases however $|Q^2|$ must be large compared to Λ_{QCD}^2 , where Λ_{QCD} is the characteristic energy scale ≈ 217 MeV at which the renormalized QCD coupling constant starts to become small.

While non-abelian gauge theories, such as QCD, are the only possible theories exhibiting asymptotic freedom in four space-time dimensions [4], the two-dimensional case is different. The Gross-Neveu model, the CP^{N-1} model and the $O(N)$ non-linear σ model with $N > 2$ are examples of asymptotically free theories in (1+1) dimensions. The latter was used as a toy model for QCD as it is considerably simpler. It is also well known by the condensed matter community because of its strong connection to spin chains.

Indeed the low-energy (compared to JS) degrees of freedom of the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain of spin S , with Hamiltonian

$$H = J \sum_j \mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j+1}, \quad (1)$$

can be mapped into those of the $O(3)$ non-linear σ model (NL σ M) with Lagrangian density [5, 6]

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2g} \left[\frac{1}{v} (\partial_t \phi)^2 - v (\partial_x \phi)^2 \right] + \frac{\theta}{4\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} \phi \cdot (\partial_\mu \phi \times \partial_\nu \phi). \quad (2)$$

Here the field ϕ is a 3-component unit vector, $|\phi(t, x)|^2 = 1$. The last term is topological, for imaginary time with space-time mapped to the surface of a sphere; it has no effect in perturbation theory. The parameters

take the approximate values

$$g = \frac{2}{S}, \quad v = 2JS, \quad \theta = 2\pi S. \quad (3)$$

This approximate mapping is obtained using

$$\mathbf{S}_j \approx (-1)^j S \phi + \mathbf{l}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathbf{l} = \frac{1}{vg} \phi \times \partial_t \phi \quad (5)$$

is the conserved spin density of the σ model. Thus we see that $\sum_j \mathbf{S}_j \approx \int dx \mathbf{l}$; the conserved total spin operators correspond in both models. The field ϕ is the antiferromagnetic order parameter. A perturbative treatment of the σ model assumes spontaneous breaking of the $O(3)$ symmetry with, for example, $\phi \approx (0, 0, 1)$. We then introduce a pair of Goldstone boson fields, φ_1, φ_2 and write

$$\phi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \sqrt{1 - \varphi^2}). \quad (6)$$

Rescaling $\varphi \rightarrow \sqrt{g} \varphi$, and setting the velocity to 1, the non-topological part of the Lagrangian density becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\partial^\mu \varphi \cdot \partial_\mu \varphi + \frac{g(\varphi \cdot \partial^\mu \varphi)(\varphi \cdot \partial_\mu \varphi)}{1 - g\varphi^2} \right]. \quad (7)$$

Taylor expanding the denominator in the second term gives a series of interaction terms. The Goldstone boson fields φ correspond to the bosonic operators introduced in the usual Holstein-Primakoff (HP) treatment of the spin chain, also based on large S . But perturbation theory, both in the σ model and in the HP treatment, is plagued with infrared divergences in (1+1) dimensions. This is related to the Mermin-Wagner-Coleman theorem, which states that continuous symmetries cannot be spontaneously broken in (1+1) dimensional quantum field theories or equivalently in antiferromagnetic chains [7]. This failure of perturbation theory can be understood using the renormalization group, just as in QCD. The renormalized coupling constant at scale E is determined by [8]

$$\frac{dg}{d \ln E} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} g^2. \quad (8)$$

S	1	3/2	2	5/2	3
Λ/J	0.410	~ 0.1	0.0892	~ 0.02	0.0100
v/Λ	6.02	~ 14	49.5	~ 160	637

Table I. Values of the energy scale Λ and associated length-scale v/Λ for the relevant values of the spin S .

Solving this equation, the renormalized coupling constant at scale E is given approximately by

$$g(E) = \frac{g_0}{1 - g_0 \ln(D/E)/(2\pi)} \quad (9)$$

where D is of the order of the ultraviolet cut-off, $D \approx JS$. This implies that the effective coupling constant becomes $\mathcal{O}(1)$ at the scale $\Lambda \approx De^{-2\pi/g_0} = De^{-\pi S}$. For integer spin, corresponding to $\theta = 0$, there is a ‘‘Haldane gap’’ of order Λ . For half-integer spin, corresponding to $\theta = \pi$, the model is gapless but Λ is nonetheless a crossover scale. At energy scales $\gg \Lambda$, or correspondingly length scales $\ll v/\Lambda$, we might expect perturbative behavior to hold, corresponding to asymptotic freedom. This behavior will be the same for both integer and half-integer spin. The field theory approximation only holds at energy scales small compared to the band-width, JS . But, for large S , $\Lambda \ll JS$ so there is an intermediate energy window, $\Lambda \ll E \ll JS$, in which a perturbative treatment of the σ model applies. As we go to larger S this energy window extends almost to zero. Table I summarizes the values of Λ and v/Λ obtained from numerical measurement of the gap for integer spin $S = 1, 2, 3$, as well as the expected values for $S = 3/2$ and $5/2$ obtained by interpolation [9].

HP perturbation theory also fails at capturing the low-energy behavior of the spin chain. In particular it fails at differentiating between integer and half-integer spin. The advantage of this perturbative approach on the lattice is that the energy window of the perturbative regime extends to arbitrary high energies, $E \gg \Lambda$. For this reason we expect HP perturbation theory to provide a more accurate description of the spin chain at very short distances.

In this paper we will study two quantities using a combination of σ model perturbation theory, HP perturbation theory and quantum Monte-Carlo (QMC) - the equal time correlation function and the dynamical structure factor:

$$G(|j|) \equiv \langle \mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_0 \rangle, \\ S(k, \omega) \equiv \sum_j e^{-ikj} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t} \langle \mathbf{S}_j(t) \cdot \mathbf{S}_0(0) \rangle. \quad (10)$$

The σ model approximation keeps only wave vectors

near π and 0 and gives

$$\langle S_j^a(t) S_0^b(0) \rangle \approx S^2 (-1)^j \langle \phi^a(t, j) \phi^b(0, 0) \rangle + \langle l^a(t, j) l^b(0, 0) \rangle. \quad (11)$$

From Eq. (11) we see that, in perturbation theory, these Green’s functions are very different for $a = b = 3$ and $a = b = 1$ or 2. In fact, we only expect perturbation theory to be valid if we average over directions, using

$$\langle S_j^a(t) S_0^b(0) \rangle = \frac{\delta^{ab}}{3} \langle \mathbf{S}_j(t) \cdot \mathbf{S}_0(0) \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Equivalently, perturbation theory works at high energies in the σ model for rotationally invariant quantities only. In particular, such angular averaging leads, as we will see, to cancellations of infrared divergences, resulting in infrared-finite perturbative results. This is known as ‘‘Elitzur’s conjecture’’ [10, 11].

The staggered part of the equal-time Green’s function is given by the ϕ^a Green’s function. Up to $\mathcal{O}(g)$ this gives

$$\langle \phi^a(x) \phi^b(0) \rangle \approx g \langle \varphi^a(x) \varphi^b(0) \rangle, \quad (a, b \in \{1, 2\}) \\ \langle \phi^3(x) \phi^3(0) \rangle \approx 1 - g \langle \varphi(0) \cdot \varphi(0) \rangle. \quad (13)$$

The free massless boson Green’s function is

$$\langle \varphi^a(x) \varphi^b(0) \rangle = \delta^{ab} \int \frac{dk}{4\pi|k|} e^{ikx}. \quad (14)$$

We may insert an ultraviolet cut-off, $|k| < D/v$. However, there is also a logarithmic infrared divergence at $k \approx 0$. Thus $\langle \phi^a(x) \phi^b(0) \rangle$ is infrared divergent. Averaging over directions leads to

$$\langle \phi(x) \cdot \phi(0) \rangle \approx 1 + g \int \frac{dk}{4\pi|k|} (e^{ikx} - 1), \quad (15)$$

which is an infrared-finite result at all energy scales. However perturbation theory is only expected to be valid for $|x| \ll v/\Lambda$ where the $\mathcal{O}(g)$ correction makes a small correction to the two-point function. Performing the integral, we obtain the well-known result

$$\langle \phi(x) \cdot \phi(0) \rangle \approx 1 - \frac{g}{\pi} \ln(|x|D/v). \quad (16)$$

This expression is valid both for integer and half-integer spin S at intermediate distances $1 \ll |x| \ll v/\Lambda$. At $|x| \gg v/\Lambda$, $\langle \phi(x) \cdot \phi(0) \rangle$ decays exponentially for integer S or as $1/|x|$ for half-integer S . The crossover behavior for $|x| \approx v/\Lambda$ is much more difficult to calculate. To calculate $\langle l^a(x) l^b(0) \rangle$ we use

$$\mathbf{l} \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}v} (-\partial_t \varphi^2, \partial_t \varphi^1, 0), \quad (17)$$

giving

$$\langle \mathbf{l}(x) \cdot \mathbf{l}(0) \rangle \approx -\frac{1}{\pi g x^2}. \quad (18)$$

(In this case, averaging is not necessary to get an infrared-finite result.) Again we only trust this result for $|x| \ll v/\Lambda$. For $|x| \gg v/\Lambda$ we expect exponential decay for integer S . For half-integer S , $1/x^2$ decay is expected; merely the coefficient changes in going from short to long distances. Thus, in the σ model approximation we predict

$$\langle \mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_0 \rangle \approx (-1)^j S^2 \left[1 - \frac{2}{\pi S} \ln \left(\frac{|j|D}{v} \right) \right] - \frac{S}{2\pi j^2} \quad (19)$$

for $1 \ll |j| \ll v/\Lambda$ and S integer or half-integer. This expression explicitly breaks down at distance $v e^{\pi S/2}/D \approx v/\Lambda$. The correct expression for this crossover lengthscale can be obtained from Eq. (19) by adding second order corrections.

Now we apply non-linear spin-wave theory (NLSWT) to the spin chain. We rotate the spins on one of the two sublattices and introduce lattice HP boson operators for these rotated spins as

$$\begin{aligned} S_j^z &= S - a_j^\dagger a_j \\ S_j^+ &= \sqrt{2S} f_j(S) a_j \\ S_j^- &= \sqrt{2S} a_j^\dagger f_j(S) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $f_j(S) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{a_j^\dagger a_j}{2S}}$. The quadratic Hamiltonian can be diagonalized with a Bogoliubov transformation and gives the dispersion relation

$$\epsilon_k = 2JS |\sin k|, \quad (21)$$

which agrees with the σ model velocity $v = 2JS$ for k near 0 or π .

The first order interaction, which is $\mathcal{O}(S^0)$, is made of four HP bosons. Since the classical ground state is collinear the Bogoliubov transformed interaction does not contain anomalous terms with two bosons. Thus the effect of the first order interaction is to renormalize the ground state energy and the velocity,

$$v = 2JS \rightarrow 2JS \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{S} \right), \quad (22)$$

where $\kappa = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\pi} \simeq 0.18169$.

The calculation of the equal-time spin-spin correlation function follows from the expansion of $\mathbf{S}_0 \cdot \mathbf{S}_r$ in powers of $1/S$ using the HP transformation. A standard Rayleigh-Schrödinger approach applied separately to even and odd distances gives the following result,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{S}_0 \cdot \mathbf{S}_r \rangle &= (-1)^r S^2 \left[1 + \frac{1}{S} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} J_\alpha(r) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4S^2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} J_\alpha(r) - \delta_{r,0} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(S^{-3}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$




Figure 1. Static spin-spin correlation function obtained in NLSWT for $S = 5/2$ at zero and finite-temperature and comparison to QMC [9]. The errorbars are smaller than visible.

where $\alpha = r \pmod{2}$ and where $J_{0,1}(r)$ are the two following infrared-finite integrals

$$\begin{aligned} J_0(r) &= \int_0^{\pi/2} dk \frac{1 - \cos(kr)}{\sin(k)}, \\ J_1(r) &= \int_0^{\pi/2} dk \left[\frac{1}{\sin(k)} - \frac{\cos(kr)}{\tan(k)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

This formula is thus in agreement with Elitzur's conjecture in the $O(3)$ NL σ M. The $O(3)$ invariant two-point function of spin operators in spin-wave theory is infrared-finite to second order. The divergences occurring in $\langle S_0^z S_r^z \rangle$ are exactly canceled by the divergences of $2 \langle S_0^x S_r^x \rangle$ [12]. Fig. 1 compares Eq. (23), as well as its finite-temperature generalization (see below), to QMC simulations for spin $S = 5/2$ in the regime $|r| < v/\Lambda \approx 160$ where it is expected to be valid.

Taking now the limit of large distance $|r| \gg 1$ but always keeping $|r| \ll v/\Lambda$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{S}_0 \cdot \mathbf{S}_r \rangle &\simeq (-1)^r S^2 \left[1 - \frac{2}{\pi S} \ln \left(\frac{|r|}{r_0} \right) + \frac{1}{2\pi S} \frac{1}{r^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\pi^2 S^2} \ln^2 \left(\frac{|r|}{r_0} \right) \right] - \frac{S}{2\pi r^2} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $r_0 = e^{\pi/2 - \gamma}/2 \simeq 1.35$. This is in agreement with the NL σ M. The $1/r^2$ term at order $1/S$ in the staggered part comes from the non-linearity of the dispersion relation within spin-wave theory, and is subdominant at large distance compared to the logarithmic decay.

The dynamical structure factor can be obtained from the time-ordered Green's function of HP bosons,

$$i G(k, t) = \langle T \left[\begin{matrix} a_k(t) \\ a_{-k}^\dagger(t) \end{matrix} \right] \left[\begin{matrix} a_k^\dagger(0) & a_{-k}(0) \end{matrix} \right] \rangle \quad (26)$$

and its Fourier transform $G(k, \omega)$ as [13]

$$S^{\mu\nu}(k, \omega) = -2 \text{Im} [F^{\mu\nu}(k, \omega)] \quad (27)$$

where $F^{\mu\nu}(k, \omega)$ is the time-ordered Green's function of spin operators,

$$i F^{\mu\nu}(k, \omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t} \langle T S_k^\mu(t) S_{-k}^\nu(0) \rangle. \quad (28)$$

We get

$$S^{xx}(k, \omega) = S\pi \left(1 - \frac{n}{S}\right) \left| \tan\left(\frac{k}{2}\right) \right| \delta(\omega - \epsilon_k) \quad (29)$$

where ϵ_k is here the corrected dispersion relation given in Eq. (21) with the velocity in Eq. (22). The coefficient $n = \langle a_i^\dagger a_i \rangle$ is infrared divergent. The transverse part of the dynamical structure factor is thus divergent. First order interaction terms do not broaden the delta peak. The weight is turned from finite and positive at zeroth order to infinite and negative at first order. This is however not a major issue since perturbation theory is only expected to be valid at energies $|\omega^2 - \epsilon_k^2| > \Lambda^2$, in analogy to the NL σ M where the two-momentum must satisfy $|Q^2| > \Lambda^2$. The longitudinal component of the structure factor is given by a two-magnon continuum starting at energy ϵ_k and extending up to energies of the order of $4JS$. The spectral weight diverges quadratically in the frequency close to momentum $k \approx 0, \pi$. Again we only trust the results above the threshold where the spectral weight is finite.

As a consequence of the divergences of $S^{xx}(k, \omega)$ and $S^{zz}(k, \omega)$ the associated components of the static structure factor obtained as

$$S^{\mu\mu}(k) = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} S^{\mu\mu}(k, \omega) \quad (30)$$

are also divergent. However averaging over directions leads to an infrared-finite result, thus providing a reliable description of the isotropic quantity for $k \gg \Lambda/v$ [12]. The same result can be obtained by Fourier transforming the static spin-spin correlation function in Eq. (23).

One can perform the same calculation at finite temperature $T = 1/\beta$ [12]. The main tool is now the bosonic Matsubara Green's function $\mathbb{G}(k, i\omega_n)$ defined equivalently to Eq. (26) and the dynamical structure factor is obtained as [13]

$$S^{\mu\nu}(k, \omega; \beta) = -\frac{2}{1 - e^{-\beta\omega}} \text{Im} [F^{\mu\nu, R}(k, \omega; \beta)] \quad (31)$$

where $F^{\mu\nu, R}(k, \omega; \beta)$ is the retarded Green's function of spin operators and is obtained from the imaginary-time ordered one by analytical continuation. Since $F^{\mu\nu, R}(k, \omega; \beta)$ can be non-zero at negative energy we expect non-vanishing spectral weight at $\omega < 0$. This




Figure 2. Dynamical structure factor for $S = 5/2$ at inverse temperature $\beta = 10$ (in units of J^{-1}). The white dashed lines are the lower and upper thresholds of the continuum, $\omega_k = \pm v_\beta |\sin(k)|$, $\omega_k = 2v_\beta \sin(k/2)$ and $\omega_k = 2v_\beta |\cos(k/2)|$. Because of temperature effects there is non-zero spectral weight at $|\omega| < v_\beta |\sin(k)|$.

corresponds to transitions between single-magnon states, as shown in Fig. 2 where we averaged over directions. Along the lower thresholds $|\omega| = v_\beta |\sin(k)|$, where v_β is the NLSWT velocity and depends explicitly on temperature, the spectral weight is divergent. However the behavior along the thresholds will in reality be different for integer and half-integer spin: for integer spin, the gap Λ appears at momentum π and a two-magnon continuum starts at momentum 0 and energy 2Λ . For half-integer spin the spectrum is gapless at momentum 0 and π . As S increases the spectral weights for integer or half-integer spin well-above Λ , which is exponentially small in S , become identical and are described by the perturbative approach developed here.

The spin-5/2 case illustrated in this paper is of particular interest because the crossover lengthscale v/Λ is large enough to observe an extended perturbative regime and because several compounds with half-filled d -orbitals realize isotropic quasi one-dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnets, allowing for experimental investigation [14–18].

SG is grateful to Francisco Hyunkyu Kim for helpful discussions and to Synge Todo for help setting up the QMC simulations. The calculations have been performed using the facilities of the Scientific IT and Application Support Center of EPFL. This work has been supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF), by NSERC Discovery Grant 04033-2016 and by the Cana-

dian Institute for Advanced Research.

-
- [1] David J. Gross and Frank Wilczek. Ultraviolet Behavior of Non-Abelian Gauge Theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 30(26):1343–1346, June 1973.
- [2] H. David Politzer. Reliable Perturbative Results for Strong Interactions? *Physical Review Letters*, 30(26):1346–1349, June 1973.
- [3] Michael E. Peskin and Daniel V. Schroeder. *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*. Westview Press, February 1995.
- [4] Sidney Coleman and David J. Gross. Price of Asymptotic Freedom. *Physical Review Letters*, 31(13):851–854, September 1973.
- [5] F. D. M. Haldane. Nonlinear field theory of large-spin Heisenberg antiferromagnets: semiclassically quantized solitons of the one-dimensional easy-axis Néel state. *Physical Review Letters*, 50(15):1153, 1983.
- [6] F. D. M. Haldane. Continuum Dynamics of the 1-D Heisenberg Antiferromagnet: Identification with the O(3) Nonlinear Sigma Model. *Physical Letters A*, 93(9):464–468, February 1983.
- [7] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner. Absence of Ferromagnetism or Antiferromagnetism in One- or Two-Dimensional Isotropic Heisenberg Models. *Physical Review Letters*, 17(22):1133–1136, November 1966.
- [8] A.M. Polyakov. Interaction of Goldstone particles in two dimensions. Applications to ferromagnets and massive Yang-Mills fields. *Physics Letters*, 59B(1):79–81, October 1975.
- [9] Syngge Todo and Kiyoshi Kato. Cluster Algorithms for General- S Quantum Spin Systems. *Physical Review Letters*, 87(4), July 2001.
- [10] Shmuel Elitzur. The applicability of perturbation expansion to two-dimensional Goldstone systems. *Nuclear Physics B*, 212(3):501–518, 1983.
- [11] François David. Cancellations of infrared divergences in the two-dimensional non-linear σ models. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 81(2):149–170, 1981.
- [12] Samuel Gozel, Frédéric Mila, and Ian Affleck. Unpublished.
- [13] Sebastian Doniach and Ernst Helmut Sondheimer. *Green's functions for solid state physicists*. World Scientific Publishing, 1974.
- [14] R. Dingle, M. E. Lines, and S. L. Holt. Linear-Chain Antiferromagnetism in $[(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{N}][\text{MnCl}_3]$. *Physical Review*, 187(2):643–648, November 1969.
- [15] R. J. Birgeneau, R. Dingle, M. T. Hutchings, G. Shirane, and S. L. Holt. Spin Correlations in a One-Dimensional Heisenberg Antiferromagnet. *Physical Review Letters*, 26(12):718–721, March 1971.
- [16] M. T. Hutchings, G. Shirane, R. J. Birgeneau, and S. L. Holt. Spin Dynamics in the One-Dimensional Antiferromagnet $(\text{CD}_3)_4\text{NMnCl}_3$. *Physical Review B*, 5(5):1999–2014, March 1972.
- [17] Richard A Mole, John A Stride, Tobias Unruh, and Paul T Wood. Non-classical behaviour in an $S = 5/2$ chain with next nearest neighbour interactions observed from the inelastic neutron scattering of $\text{Mn}_2(\text{OD}_2)(\text{C}_4\text{O}_4)$. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 21(7):076003, February 2009.
- [18] K. S. Asha, K. M. Ranjith, Arvind Yogi, R. Nath, and Sukhendu Mandal. Magnetic properties of manganese based one-dimensional spin chains. *Dalton Transactions*, 44(46):19812–19819, 2015.