

My encounters with Alex Müller and the perovskites

Amnon Aharony^{1, *}

¹ *School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 6997801, Israel*

(Dated: August 2, 2023)

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Professor K. Alex Müller. After describing our personal and scientific encounters since 1974, I concentrate on the many puzzles which appeared in our discussions and collaborations, involving the interplay between theory and experiments on the critical behavior of cubic perovskites which undergo (second or first) order transitions to a lower symmetry phases (trigonal or tetragonal). The conclusion, reached only very recently, is that (although beginning with the same cubic symmetry) the two types of transitions belong to two distinct universality classes: under [100] stress, the cubic to trigonal transition exhibits a tetracritical phase diagram, with ‘cubic’ exponents, while the cubic to tetragonal transition exhibit an ‘intermediate’ bicritical phase diagram, but asymptotically the bicritical point turns into a triple point, with three first order lines. To test these conclusions, it is suggested to measure the effective critical exponents as the temperature approaches criticality.

I. Personal

My discussions and collaborations with Karl Alexander Müller (Alex), which started in 1974 and continued into the 1990’s, all concerned the critical phenomena near the displacive phase transitions of the perovskites (from a cubic to lower-symmetry structures). This paper concentrates on these encounters. Alex started his work on the perovskites in his Ph. D. thesis, published in 1958 [1]. In this thesis he measured EPR (electron paramagnetic resonance) spectra of Fe^{3+} impurities in the perovskite SrTiO_3 , a tool which he continued to use for many important later discoveries, concerning these critical phenomena. Due to his work on the perovskites, Alex quickly became one of the leaders in the fields of structural transitions and ferroelectricity, and participated in many international conferences and schools on these topics [2]. Much of the work on these topics is described in the 1991 two volume collection of papers, which he edited together with Harry Thomas [3]. Fifty of Alex’s papers were reprinted in Ref. [4]. Based on these contributions, Alex became an IBM Fellow in 1982. This gave him the right to choose his own research, eventually discovering high temperature superconductivity.

Personally, I first met Alex when he visited Cornell, in 1974. At the time, I was a postdoc in Michael Fisher’s group, working on applications of the (then) new renormalization group (RG), and I had just published a paper on the critical behavior of cubic systems [5]. During his visit, Alex described his experimental results [6], and we immediately started discussions on the interplay between the theory for the cubic perovskites and the experiments, which raised several puzzles. Many of these discussions were joint with Alastair Bruce (ADB), a former student of Roger Cowley in Edinburgh (who was also an expert on structural phase transitions) who was also a postdoc at Cornell. This ‘ping pong’ exchange between Alex and me continued for more than 20 years (into his superconductivity years), during which Alex and I met many times,

and became good friends [7].

After Alex’s visit to Cornell, I visited him many times at the IBM Zürich Laboratory in Rüschlikon, where he usually took me for long hikes in the mountains, during which we discussed physics and many other topics (see Fig. 1). One freezing night he also drove me (with Tony Schneider) to an ice hockey match, in his self maintained nice car. The same car also took us to the 4th European Meeting on ferroelectricity in 1980 on the beach of Portorož, Yugoslavia (now Croatia), where we both presented talks [8]. Alex’s 60th birthday was celebrated in a conference in Zürich, in which my talk’s title was “My life with Alex Müller and the perovskites”. Unfortunately, I cannot find the old-fashioned transparencies used in that talk.

Alex also visited Tel Aviv many times. In particular, during one of his visits in the 1980’s he discussed superconductivity in granular aluminium with my colleagues Ora Entin-Wohlman and Guy Deutcher [9]. He later ‘blamed’ these discussions as one of the reasons for his research on the high-temperature superconductors. I tried to tell him that his work on the perovskites is great, and that he should continue it, but obviously he knew better (I had a similar experience with Heini Rohrer, of the same IBM laboratory, with whom I collaborated on dilute antiferromagnets before he switched to tunneling electron microscopes and the Nobel prize; work on critical phenomena seems to be a good preparation for this prize...). However, Alex told me about the superconductivity in the cuprates before his paper with Bednorz was published, and this enabled some of us to publish the first magnetic model for pairing and the first phase diagram of the cuprates, including a spin glass phase between the antiferromagnet and the superconductor [10, 11].

In 1987 I had dinner with knowledgeable Swedes in Oslo, and I concluded that the Swedish academy will call Alex and Bednorz the next day, to inform them about their Nobel prize. I immediately called Alex, told him to stay near the phone the next day, and got his permission



FIG. 1: Alex and the author: Photo taken on Alex's camera during a hike in the mountains near Zürich, circa 1976.




FIG. 2: A new year card from Alex in 1992, just before visiting Tel Aviv with his daughter Sylvia.

to nominate him as an honorary doctor of Tel Aviv University. Indeed, he received this honorary degree in 1988, joining 10 other honorary degrees all over the world (his official letterhead said “Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. mult. K. A. Müller.”). When I told him that this degree entitles him to participate in the board of governors of the university, he took this seriously, and even expressed an opinion on who should be elected as the university's next president. In 1988 I also attended the ceremony in which Boston University gave him the same honor.

Every year my wife and I got a new year card from him and from his wife Inge, Fig. 2. I met Inge many times in their home in Hedigen and in Tel Aviv. After his retirement, Alex shifted interests to philosophy and psychology (as before, maybe he knew better?), and our communications became more rare. Sadly, I missed the chance to communicate to him our very recent results on the puzzles of the perovskites, which are described at the end of this paper. I like to think that he would enjoy seeing that - even fifty years after our first meeting - his discussions with me are still alive and fruitful.




FIG. 3: (color online) The cubic (left) and tetragonal (right) unit cells in SrTiO_3 (the latter shows only half the cell: neighboring cells rotate in opposite directions). Large, intermediate and small spheres correspond to Sr, O and Ti ions, respectively. The dashed lines represent the octahedra, which rotate around the vector \mathbf{Q} , lying along the vertical axis (the O ions in the central horizontal plane move as indicated by the arrow). When \mathbf{Q} is along a diagonal of the cube, the octahedra rotate around that diagonal, and the unit cell is stretched along \mathbf{Q} , causing a cubic to trigonal transition (as in LaAlO_3).

II. The phase transitions in the perovskites

Perovskite materials exhibit intriguing physical properties, and have been extensively explored for both practical applications and theoretical modeling [12]. In particular, perovskites like SrTiO_3 and LaAlO_3 play important roles in modern solid state applications [13]. Indeed, these materials continue to be in the center of much current research [14]. At high temperatures, perovskites usually have a cubic structure (left panel, Fig. 3). As the temperature T decreases, some perovskites undergo an antiferrodistortive structural transition from the cubic to a lower-symmetry structure, via a rotation of the oxygen (or fluorine) octahedra: SrTiO_3 , KMnF_3 , RbCaF_3 and others undergo a cubic to tetragonal transition, see Fig. 3. In contrast, LaAlO_3 , PrAlO_3 , and NdAlO_3 , undergo a cubic to trigonal transition. As first found by Alex, the order parameter of these transitions is related to the rotations of the oxygen octahedra in the unit cell [15]. For the cubic to tetragonal transition, the octahedra rotate around a cubic axis and the order-parameter vector \mathbf{Q} (a.k.a. the rotation vector) is along that axis (with a length proportional to the rotation angle, which is deduced from the EPR spectra). For the cubic to trigonal transition, \mathbf{Q} is along a cubic diagonal. Similar rotations (around a tetragonal axis) occur in double perovskites, e.g., the tetragonal to orthorhombic transition in the Bednorz-Müller parent high-temperature superconductor La_2CuO_4 [16]. Honoring Alex, Ora Entin-Wohlman and I placed the unit cell of this material on the cover of our solid state book [17].

The behavior of a system at the vicinity of its transition temperature T_c can be expressed by critical ex-

ponents. When the transition at T_c is continuous, the correlation length diverges as $\xi \propto |t|^{-\nu}$ and the order-parameter approaches zero (for temperatures $T < T_c$) as $|\langle \mathbf{Q} \rangle| \propto |t|^\beta$, where $t = T/T_c - 1$. The critical exponents ν and β are expected to be universal, i.e., having the same values for many physical systems which share the same symmetry. The exponents describing other physical properties, e.g., α and γ for the specific heat and for the order parameter susceptibility, are obtained via scaling relations, $d\nu = 2 - \alpha = 2\beta + \gamma$, where d is the dimensionality.

As described in the next section, the experiments of Alex and others raised several puzzles:

(1) What is the critical behavior of the cubic to tetragonal and of the cubic to trigonal phase transitions? One had to distinguish between three possibilities: (a) Both belong to the same universality class, of the isotropic Heisenberg model. (b) One (or both) belong to the universality class associated with the cubic fixed point of the renormalization group. (c) One (or both) turn first order.

(2) Some of the transitions from cubic to tetragonal seem to be first order, or to be close to a tricritical point [18]. This does not seem to happen for the cubic to trigonal transitions. Why?

(3) Applying uniaxial stress reduces the number of components of the critical order parameter, from 3 to 1 or from 3 to 2. The 3-component critical point mentioned above then becomes a multicritical point [29]. Is this multicritical point bicritical, tetracritical or triple?

III. Theory versus experiments

1958: Alex develops the EPR measurements in SrTiO₃ [1].

1968: Alex, Berlinger and Waldner use EPR to measure the rotation angles of the octahedra in both SrTiO₃ and LaAlO₃, and identify similarities between their temperature dependences [15]. All of Alex's EPR experiments were done together with his long-time technician, Walter Berlinger.

1970: Alex, Berlinger and Slonczewski measure the structural transition in SrTiO₃ under [111] uniaxial stress, and observe a cubic to trigonal phase transition (in contrast to the cubic to tetragonal transition at zero stress) [30]. Following Ref. [31], the Landau theory free energy for this transition is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U} = & \frac{1}{2}K(T)Q^2 + A'Q^4 + A'_n \sum_{i<j} Q_i^2 Q_j^2 \\ & - b_e \sum_i T_{ii}(3Q_i^2 - Q^2) - b_t \sum_{i<j} T_{ij}Q_i Q_j, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $Q^2 = |\mathbf{Q}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 Q_i^2$, $K(T) \propto (T - T_c^{(0)})$, with $T_c^{(0)}$ being the transition temperature at zero stress, A'

reflects the cubic symmetry quartic term, T_{ij} are the components of the stress tensor and the coefficients b_e and b_t represent the couplings of the stress tensor to the order parameter components Q_i . The stress p along [111], for which $T_{ij} \equiv -p/3$ for all i, j , 'prefers' ordering of \mathbf{Q} along [111], hence the trigonal structure. In this Landau theory, the transition temperature increases linearly with the stress, $T_c(p) - T_c^{(0)} \propto p$.

1971: Alex and Berlinger fit the data for the rotation angles of the oxygen octahedra in both SrTiO₃ and LaAlO₃ to a crossover from the mean-field exponent $\beta_{MF} = 1/2$ (far from T_c) to the critical $|\mathbf{Q}| \sim |t|^\beta$, with $\beta = 0.33 \pm 0.02$ [6].

1973: The author (AA) uses the renormalization group to analyze the critical behavior of cubic systems in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions [5]. Basically, one turns the Landau free energy (1) into a Ginzburg-Landau-Wilson (GLW) free energy density, by adding a gradient term, $|\nabla \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{r})|^2/2$, whose coefficient is normalized to 1 (and kept equal to 1 under renormalization). This term represents the interactions, capturing the long range correlations [32–35]. In the analysis, the terms with A' and A'_n in Eq. (1) were replaced by $uQ^4 + v \sum_i Q_i^4$. This analysis yielded four competing fixed points: Gaussian (G), Decoupled Ising (D), Isotropic Heisenberg (I) and Cubic (C), see Fig. 4 (adapted from Ref. [32]). This figure has been reproduced by other authors, e.g., Refs. 37–39, and included in textbooks [40]. As the figure shows, the relative stability of the fixed points depends on a dimensionality dependent number of order parameter components, $n_c(d)$. Up to third order in ϵ , it was then concluded that $n_c(3) > 3$, and therefore the stable fixed point is the isotropic one. Assuming the initial values of the parameters, S and L, both materials are within the (shaded) region of attraction of the isotropic fixed point (on the left hand side of the figure), and therefore both the cubic to tetragonal and cubic to trigonal phase transitions should be continuous, exhibiting the Heisenberg critical exponent $\beta_I \simeq 0.377$. Although this scenario supports the apparent universality seen by Alex *et al.* in 1971, the measured common exponent β disagrees with this isotropic value.

1974: Alex visits Cornell, and discusses with AA and ADB the discrepancy between the theoretical and experimental exponents. Noting that the experiments were done on single crystals which were polished along one axial direction, they concluded that the polishing introduced internal stresses, like T_{11} in Eq. (1). This implied a crossover from the isotropic critical behavior to that of the Ising model, with only one critical component of the order parameter.

1974: AA and ADB publish a theoretical paper, presenting the bicritical phase diagram expected for SrTiO₃ under (positive and negative) uniaxial stress. The 1971 fits by Alex and Berlinger are conjectured to result from a crossover between the isotropic and the Ising behav-




FIG. 5: Possible phase-diagrams for the perovskites under [100] uniaxial stress. (a) Bicritical phase diagram. (b) Tetracritical phase diagram. (c) Diagram with a triple point (see text). Thick lines - first-order transitions. Thin lines - second-order transitions. The first-order transition lines between the ordered phases and the disordered paramagnetic phase end at tricritical points (small empty circles). After Refs. 29, 57.




FIG. 4: (color online) Schematic flow diagram and FPs for the cubic model, adapted from Ref. 32. G =Gaussian, I =isotropic, D =Decoupled (Ising) and C =Cubic FP's. S =initial point for SrTiO_3 . L =initial point for LaAlO_3 (these locations were estimated by Alex *et al.* [36]). The dashed lines represent the stability edges, $u + v = 0$ (for $v < 0$) and $u + v/n = 0$ (for $v > 0$), below which the free energy in Eq. (2) is stabilized by the terms of order $|\mathbf{Q}|^6$, and the transitions are first-order. The shaded areas are the regions of attraction of the stable FP's (I on left and C on right).

ior [41]. This implied that the polished sample experiments were done at a point on the lower critical line in Fig. 5(a).

1976: AA shows that when $v \neq 0$ (either at the cubic fixed point or for effective exponents, which are measured during the renormalization group flow), the crossover exponent due to the uniaxial pressure has different values for stress along [100] or along [111] [43]. These predictions have not yet been tested experimentally (but see below).

1977: AA visits IBM Zürich, and joins Alex and Berlinger in a detailed study of SrTiO_3 under [111] stress [44], continuing the 1970 work by Alex, Berlinger and Slonczewski [30]. Below the transition from cubic to

1975: Alex and Berlinger apply uniaxial stress along [100] and [110] (the latter is equivalent to negative stress along [100]), and confirm the above AA+ADB conjectures (including the first measurement of the bicritical phase diagram for uniaxially stressed SrTiO_3). They also fit the 1971 data to $\phi = \phi_0 |t|^{\beta(1)} [1 + b_1 |t|^x]$, with the Ising exponent $\beta(1) = 0.315$ and with the correction exponent $x = 0.50 \pm 0.05$ [42]. The correction term was needed, because the data were not taken very close to T_c and were in the middle of the crossover from the bicritical point to the Ising behavior. They also showed that the shift of T_c due to the stress is not straight, as in the Landau theory, but rather described by the crossover exponent $\phi \simeq 1.25$, as predicted by the renormalization group.

1975: ADB and AA publish a detailed analysis of the bicritical versus the tetracritical phase diagrams for perovskites under stress, based on the renormalized stress-dependent terms in Eq. (1) [29]. They also show that the multicritical point should be bicritical [with a first order ‘flop’ transition between the two ordered phases, Fig. 5(a)] for $v < 0$, i.e., for the cubic to tetragonal transition under [100] stress, but it should turn tetracritical [with an intermediate ‘mixed’ phase between the above phases, Fig. 5(b)] for $v > 0$, i.e., for the cubic to trigonal transition under [100] stress.

trigonal, one encounters a first order transition in which the order parameter components in the (111) plane order. Following Ref. [45], they show that the three-fold rotational symmetry of these order parameters yields a three-state Potts model, and they measured (and compared with theory) the exponent describing the growth of the order parameter discontinuity, as a power of the distance from the multicritical point.

1979: AA and ADB visit IBM Zürich. This visit resulted in two back-to-back papers [46, 47]. Several perovskites undergoing a cubic to tetragonal transitions had

been shown to undergo a first order transition, or a vicinity to a tricritical points (see references in [18, 46]). The theoretical paper interpreted this fact as coming from the strong cubic anisotropy of the interactions: due to the weak coupling between octahedra along the axis of their tetrahedral (alternating) rotation, the coefficient of the quadratic terms in the GLW free energy density in Fourier space, $U_{2,i}(\mathbf{q})Q_i(\mathbf{q})Q_i(-\mathbf{q})$, have the flat Lifshitz form, $U_{2,i}(\mathbf{q}) = r_i + q_{\perp,i}^2 + aq_i^{2L}$ (with $q_{i,\perp}^2 = q^2 - q_i^2$). This yields a critical and a tricritical behaviors with the exponents of the uniaxial Lifshitz exponents. The experimental paper [47] confirmed these predictions for uniaxially stressed RbCaF_3 . Note that such cubic terms in the dispersion relation, $U_{2,i} = r + q^2 + f_0(q_i)^2$, were already discussed in Refs. [19, 20]. Although f_0 is weakly irrelevant near the isotropic value $f_0 = 0$, one expects a crossover to the Lifshitz behavior when $f_0 \rightarrow -1$. Increasing $-f_0$ pushes v to more negative values, towards the stability line.

1981-3: AA and Daniel Blankschtein find more options for tricritical points on the bicritical phase diagram, resulting from sixth order terms like Q^6 [48]. Experimental realizations of these predictions for the perovskites were reviewed by Fossheim [49].

1983: Alex and collaborators [36] measured the tetracritical phase diagram of LaAlO_3 under [100] stress, confirming the predictions of [29]. Also, based on the mean-field region of the experiments, they estimated the ‘initial’ Landau parameters to be $\{u, v\}_S \cong \{1.91, -0.068\}$ for SrTiO_3 and $\{u, v\}_L \cong \{0.06 \pm 0.06, 0.68 \pm 0.06\}$ for LaAlO_3 , all in cgs units divided by 10^{43} . These rough values (which should be improved!) are shown in Fig. 4 by S and L. As discussed below, they fit beautifully with our expectations: SrTiO_3 has a small initial negative v , and we predict that it will flow quickly parallel to the horizontal axis towards the universal asymptotic line and the isotropic fixed point before turning downwards.

IV. Developments after 2000

The value of $n_c(3)$ has been a topic of very much activity, ever since [5]. Some of the results up to 2002 were summarized in the review paper [39]. Practically all the calculational methods yield $n_c(3) \cong 2.9 \pm 0.1 < 3$. Very recent results confirm this conclusion even more accurately, see e.g. [50, 51]. This has far reaching consequences. In particular, the correct renormalization group flow diagram is the one on the right hand side of Fig. 4. The stable fixed point is the cubic one, and the phase diagram of LaAlO_3 under [100] uniaxial stress is the tetracritical one, with cubic exponents. Similar conclusions follow for the multicritical point with $5 = 2 + 3$ components, which was thought to be described by the decoupled fixed point (for that case) [52], but see below.

In contrast, SrTiO_3 has $v < 0$ (the point S in Fig.

4), and therefore it cannot reach the cubic fixed point. Therefore, the cubic to trigonal and the cubic to tetragonal transitions *cannot belong to the same universality class!* As discussed below, the apparently similar exponents observed for these two transitions result from the slow renormalization group flows, which leave the point S close to the isotropic fixed point, while L flows to the cubic fixed point - whose exponents are very close to the isotropic ones. These conclusions created a new puzzle, for SrTiO_3 under [100] stress [53]: Practically all the experiments (e.g., [6]) exhibited bicritical phase diagrams. However, as seen in Fig. 4, the point S is at a small $v < 0$. Therefore, for $n_c(3) < 3$ it *cannot* flow to the cubic fixed point. As this schematic flow diagram shows, this point must flow to more negative values of v , eventually crossing the mean field stability line $u + v = 0$. The renormalization group iterations can be stopped after ℓ iterations, when the renormalized correlation length $\xi(\ell) = \xi(0)/e^\ell$ becomes of the order of the lattice constant. At that point, most of the fluctuations have been eliminated, and one can use the Landau theory, with the renormalized parameters $u(\ell)$ and $v(\ell)$. If these values are below the stability line, this theory yields a first order transition. By continuity, the two transition lines leaving this multicritical point also become first order, turning second order only at a finite distance from this point [57]. The multicritical point thus becomes a triple point, as in Fig. 5(c). However, the experiments on SrTiO_3 do *not* show a triple point! Instead, they show a bicritical point, with an apparent second order. This puzzle remained open until 2022. The same issue also arose for many other apparent bicritical points (e.g., [52]).

V. The 2022 solution to the puzzle (with Entin-Wohlman and Kudlis)

To solve this puzzle, Ora Entin-Wohlman and I developed a new approach, also with Andrey Kudlis (who is a expert on the resummation techniques) [53–56]. Most of the accurate calculations, mentioned above, concentrated on calculating the critical exponents, at the fixed points, and not the renormalization group flow diagrams away from these fixed points. For example, the high-order ϵ -expansions do not converge, and the fixed points and the critical exponents required a resummation of their series [38]. To derive the renormalization group recursion relations (a.k.a. the flow equations in parameter space), one would need to derive long expansions of the flow equations in $u(\ell)$ and $v(\ell)$, and resum them for each pair of these parameters. Instead, we noticed that the cubic fixed point is very close to the isotropic fixed point (for the same reason, $n_c(3)$ is very close to 3), and therefore we decided to expand the flow equations around the isotropic fixed point. The small deviations from this point allowed us to stop at quadratic order in these devi-

ations, $\delta u(\ell) = u(\ell) - u_I^*$ and $v(\ell)$. Group theory shows that the isotropic fixed point has only three independent stability exponents for the quartic spin terms, and one of them breaks the permutation symmetry in favor of the two ordered phases in the bicritical diagram. Therefore, along the ‘symmetric line $g = 0$, all the bicritical and tetracritical flow diagrams (including those involving the biconical fixed point instead of the cubic one, for the case of $n = n_1 + n_2$ components) require only two independent variables, like u (for the isotropic Q^4) and v (for the appropriate combination of the nine quartic terms associated with the spherical harmonics $Y_{4,m}$). The coefficients in the new recursion relations were derived by resummations of the corresponding ϵ -expansions of derivatives (with respect to δu and v) at the isotropic fixed point.

At quadratic order, the flow equations can be solved analytically, and the details are included in Refs. [53–56]. These calculations yielded two main results. First, while the stability exponent for the isotropic u is negative and large, $\lambda_u^I = -0.7967(15)$, that for the symmetry breaking term v is negative but very small, $\lambda_v^I = 0.0083(15)$. Therefore, the non-linear variable associated with δu decays quickly to zero, as $e^{\lambda_u^I \ell}$, and one is left with a (novel) universal line which describes the flow in the $u - v$ plane. Since λ_v^I is so small, the flow away from the isotropic fixed point (in both directions) is very slow, and the point $S[u(\ell), v(\ell)]$ stays close to the isotropic fixed point for many iterations. If the initial correlation length is not very large (i.e., T is not very close to T_c), the above point remains above the stability line, and one observes an *apparent* bicritical point, with apparent isotropic exponents. However, very accurate experiments, or initial points which happen to be very close to the stability lines, may cross this line, and exhibit the triple point of Fig. 5(c). Indeed, KMnF_3 and RbCaF_3 do show first order transitions at some finite t , implying that they start at larger values of $|v(0)|$. This offers an alternative explanation of their behavior, competing with that of Ref. [46]. Only an accurate dedicated experiment may distinguish between these two scenarios. Theoretically, one should repeat our recent analysis including the renormalization group flow of f_0 .

Second, once we have the transient $u(\ell)$ and $v(\ell)$, we can put them into the flow equations for the other variables (e.g., the temperature difference t and the uniaxial pressure p , and derive the local effective exponents $\beta(\ell)$ and $\phi(\ell)$, with ℓ coming from $\xi(\ell) = 1$. Away from the critical point, these exponents remain close to their isotropic values. However, as ℓ increases (moving away from the isotropic fixed point), the negative $v(\ell)$ changes quickly towards the stability line, and the effective exponents change significantly. In particular, the effective $\beta(\ell)$ decreases for $v < 0$, Fig. 6, possibly explaining its low values observed for KMnF_3 and RbCaF_3 [18]!

In particular, it is interesting to note that the crossover exponents which characterize the non-straight lines in the




FIG. 6: Dependence of the effective critical exponent β on the RG flow parameter ℓ . Different lines correspond to different initial values $v(0)$, for a fixed $u(0)$. In this plot, the trajectories are shown only at $v(\ell) > -0.8$, where our quadratic approximation is reasonable. From Ref. [53].

multicritical phase diagrams for [100] and [111] pressure [43] deviate from their isotropic value in opposite directions, Fig. 7. It would be interesting to test these new predictions.




FIG. 7: (color online) The effective exponents $\varphi_{diag}(\ell)$ and $\varphi_{axis}(\ell)$ for several initial values of u and v , as functions of ℓ . The horizontal axes (green lines) are at the asymptotic values of the isotropic fixed point, $\varphi^I = 1.263$ (which is the same for both panels). The black horizontal lines show the cubic asymptotic values, $\varphi_{axis}^C = 1.255$ and $\varphi_{diag}^C = 1.268$. The exponents corresponding to trajectories with $v(0) > 0$ (III and IV, dashed lines) approach the asymptotic values of the cubic fixed point, visibly different from the isotropic counterparts. In contrast, those with $v(0) < 0$ (I and II, full lines) initially come close to these values, but then turn downward to smaller values, towards the fluctuation-driven first-order transition. From Ref. [54].

V. Conclusions

Our recent work answers all the questions posed in the beginning:

(1) Contrary to the common belief, that the (cubic) symmetry in the disordered phase should determine the universality class, the cubic to trigonal and the cubic to tetragonal transitions *do not* belong to the same universality class. The former belongs to the universality class of the cubic fixed point and the latter should have a fluctuation driven first order transition, with effective exponents which crossover from the mean field values to the isotropic fixed point values, and then change quickly as the system approached this first order transition. Since the cubic fixed point is very close to the isotropic one, intermediate temperature ranges could yield similar effective exponents for both types of transitions, as originally observed by Alex.

(2) The above difference also explains why (only) the cubic to tetragonal transitions approach a first order transition, either if the initial point in the $u - v$ diagram is close to the stability line, or if the initial correlation length is large enough.

(3) Asymptotically (at large initial correlation lengths) the [100] stressed cubic to trigonal phase diagram should be tetracritical, with cubic exponents (that depend on the direction of the uniaxial stress). In contrast, the [100] stressed cubic to tetragonal phase diagram should have a triple point. However, the latter may exhibit an apparent bicritical point, with varying effective exponents, at intermediate temperature ranges.

It should be emphasized that the same conclusions apply to many other phase transitions from cubic phases, e.g., in magnets, ferroelectrics, and more [55].

As shown, the main difference between the various multicritical phase diagrams concerns the initial sign of the cubic parameter v . Alex and I discussed this issue many times, and concluded that a way to vary v experimentally is to use mixed crystals, e.g. $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{TiO}_3$ [58] or a mixture of SrTiO_3 with LaAlO_3 , which is expected to be easy to grow due to their matching lattice constants [13]. Since both the isotropic and cubic FP's have $d\nu > 2$, randomness is irrelevant [59, 60] and one expects the same competition predicted above. It is interesting to note that $\text{KMn}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{F}_3$ seems to approach a second-order transition as x increases [61]. If the transition is still into the tetragonal structure, this may represent a smaller value of the initial $|v|$ in the dilute case. This may be caused by the larger dimension of the parameter space in the dilute case, which involves many transient iterations until the flow reaches the $u - v$ plane [60].

As already said, I am sure that Alex would enjoy these results. I miss our energetic discussions.

I am grateful to Alex Müller for his friendship and collaboration. I also thank Alastair Bruce for many old joint papers, and Ora Entin-Wohlman and Andrey Kudlis for a very fruitful recent collaboration.

* Electronic address: aaharonyaa@gmail.com

- [1] K. A. Müller, *Paramagnetische Resonanz von Fe^{3+} in SrTiO_3 Einkristallen*, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **31**, 173 (1958).
- [2] e.g., R. Pynn and A. Skjeltorp, eds., **Multicritical Phenomena**, Proc. NATO advanced Study Institute series B, Physics; Vol. 106, Plenum Press, NY 1984.
- [3] K. A. Müller and H. Thomas, eds., **Structural phase transitions I**, and **Structural phase transitions II** (Springer-Verlag Berlin, 1991).
- [4] K. A. Müller and T. W. Kool, **Properties of Perovskites and Other Oxides**, *World Scientific*, 2010.
- [5] A. Aharony, *Critical behavior of anisotropic cubic systems*, *Phys. Rev. B* **8**, 4270 (1973).
- [6] K. A. Müller and W. Berlinger, *Static critical exponents at structural phase transitions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 13 (1971).
- [7] The history of the interplay between theory and experiments following this exchange, and a preliminary report of the present results, were recently reviewed in three lectures by A. Aharony, at **Bootstat 2021: Conformal Bootstrap and Statistical models**, Paris, May 2021. These lectures are also available as *Multicritical behavior near the Structural phase transitions in the perovskites, I, II, III*.
- [8] **Ferroelectrics**, Vol. 24, Issue 1 (1980).
- [9] G. Deutscher, O. Entin-Wohlman, S. Fishman, and Y. Shapira, *Percolation description of granular superconductors*, *Phys. Rev. B* **21**, 5041 (1980).
- [10] A. Aharony, R. J. Birgeneau, A. Coniglio, M. A. Kastner, and H. E. Stanley, *Magnetic phases and magnetic pairing in doped La_2CuO_4* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1330 (1988).
- [11] F. C. Chou, N. R. Belk, M. A. Kastner, R. J. Birgeneau, and A. Aharony, *Spin-Glass Behavior in $\text{La}_{0.96}\text{Sr}_{0.04}\text{Cu}_4$* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 2204 (1995).
- [12] F. Dogan, H. Lin, M. Guilloux-Viry and O. Peña, *Focus on properties and applications of perovskites*, *Sci. Technol. Adv. Mater.* **16**, 020301 (2015).
- [13] e.g., A. Ohtomo and H. Hwang, *A high-mobility electron gas at the $\text{LaAlO}_3/\text{SrTiO}_3$ heterointerface*, *Nature* **427**, 423 (2004); N. Reyren *et al.*, *Superconducting Interfaces Between Insulating Oxides*, *Science* **317**, 1196 (2007).
- [14] G. Scheerer *et al.*, *Ferroelectricity, Superconductivity, and SrTiO_3 —Passions of K.A. Müller*, *Condens. Matter* **2020**, 5(4), 60 (2020).
- [15] K. A. Müller, W. Berlinger, and F. Waldner, *Characteristic Structural Phase Transition in Perovskite-Type Compounds*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 814 (1968).
- [16] J. D. Axe and M. K. Crawford, *Structural instabilities in lanthanum cuprate superconductors*, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **95**, 271 (1994).
- [17] A. Aharony and O. Entin-Wohlman, **Introduction to Solid State Physics**, in Hebrew, Open University, Israel (2018), available on line at Israel Physical Society; English translation: World Scientific, Singapore (2018).
- [18] Examples include, e.g., $\beta \sim 1/3$, ~ 0.27 , $\sim 0.17 \pm 0.02$ for KMnF_3 [21], RbCaF_3 and NaNbO_3 [22], respectively. Furthermore, some experiments hint that SrTiO_3 may be close to a tricritical point [23–25], while both RbCaF_3 and KMnF_3 have first-order transitions [26, 27]. Interestingly, some experiments exhibit intermediate regions (before the first-order transitions) with effective critical

- exponents, which are smaller than their isotropic values. This is consistent with our Fig. 6. The smaller values of β in NaNbO_3 have also been attributed to the inter-plane weak correlations along the rotation axis [46]. More experiments are reviewed e.g. in Refs. 2, 3, 28.
- [19] A. Aharony and M. E. Fisher, *Critical Behavior of Magnets with Dipolar Interactions. I. Renormalization Group near Four Dimensions*, *Phys. Rev. B* **8**, 3323 (1973).
- [20] T. Nattermann and S. Trimper, *Critical behaviour and cubic anisotropy*, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **8**, 2000 (1975).
- [21] F. Borsa and A. Rigamonti, *Comparison of NMR and NQR studies of phase transitions in disordered and ordered crystals*, in Ref. 3, Vol. II, p. 83.
- [22] G. O’Ariano, S. Aldrovandi, and A. Rigamonti, *Critical behavior of the order parameter at antiferrodistortive transitions with cubic fluctuations*, *Phys. Rev. B* **25**, 7044 (1982).
- [23] P. R. Garnier, *Specific heat of SrTiO_3 near the structural transition*, *Phys. Lett.* **35A**, 413 (1971).
- [24] J. O. Fossum, K. Fossheim and H. J. Scheel, *Ultrasonic investigation of the phase transition in flux-grown SrTiO_3* , *Solid State Comm.* **51**, 839 (1984).
- [25] E. K. H. Salje, M. C. Gallardo, J. Jiménez, F. J. Romero and J. del Cerro, *The cubic-tetragonal phase transition in strontium titanate: excess specific heat measurements and evidence for a near tricritical, mean field type transition mechanism*, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **10**, 5535 (1998).
- [26] M. Hikada, S. Maeda and J. S. Storey, *Structural phase transitions of RbCaF_3* , *Phase Transitions* **5**, 219 (1985).
- [27] S. Stokka and K. Fossheim, *Specific heat and phase diagrams for uniaxially stressed KMnF_3* , *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **15**, 1161 (1982).
- [28] R. A. Cowley, *The Phase Transition of Strontium Titanate*, *Phil. Trans.: Math., Phys. and Eng. Sci.* **354**, 2799 (1996).
- [29] A. D. Bruce and A. Aharony, *Coupled order parameter, symmetry breaking irrelevant scaling fields and tetracritical points*, *Phys. Rev. B* **11**, 478 (1975).
- [30] K. A. Müller, W. Berlinger, and J. C. Slonczewski, *Order parameter and phase transitions of stressed SrTiO_3* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **25**, 734 (1970).
- [31] J. C. Slonczewski and H. Thomas, *Interaction of Elastic Strain with the Structural Transition of Strontium Titanate*, *Phys. Rev. B* **1**, 3599 (1970).
- [32] A. Aharony, *Dependence of universal critical behavior on symmetry and range of interaction*, in **Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena**, C. Domb and M. S. Green, eds., Vol. 6 (Academic Press, NY, 1976), pp. 357-424.
- [33] K. G. Wilson and M. E. Fisher, *Critical Exponents in 3.99 Dimensions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28**, 240 (1972), K. G. Wilson, *Feynman-Graph Expansion for Critical Exponents*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28**, 548 (1972).
- [34] K. G. Wilson and J. Kogut, *The renormalization group and the ϵ expansion*, *Phys. Rep.* **12**, 75 (1974).
- [35] M. E. Fisher, *Renormalization group theory: Its basis and formulation in statistical physics*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 653 (1998).
- [36] K. A. Müller, W. Berlinger, J. E. Drumheller and J. G. Bednorz, *Bi- and Tetra-critical Behaviour of Uniaxially Stressed LaAlO_3* , in Ref. 2, p. 143.
- [37] J. M. Carmona, A. Pelissato and E. Vicari, *N-Component Ginzburg-Landau Hamiltonians with cubic anisotropy: A six-loop study*, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 15136 (2000).
- [38] L. T. Adzhemyan, E. V. Ivanova, M. V. Kompaniets, A. Kudlis, and A. I. Sokolov, *Six-loop ϵ expansion study of three-dimensional n-vector model with cubic anisotropy*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **940**, 332 (2019). The detailed coefficients of the ϵ expansions appear in the Ancillary files of arXiv:1901.02754.
- [39] For a review, see A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, *Critical phenomena and renormalization-group theory*, *Phys. Rep.* **368**, 542 (2002).
- [40] e.g. P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, **Principles of Condensed Matter Physics**, (Cambridge University Press, 1995); J. Cardy, **Scaling and Renormalization in Statistical Physics**, Cambridge University press, 1996); M. Kardar, **Statistical physics of fields**, (Cambridge University press 1997).
- [41] A. Aharony and A. D. Bruce, *Polycritical points and flop-like displacive transitions in Perovskites*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 427 (1974).
- [42] K. A. Müller and W. Berlinger, *Behavior of SrTiO_3 near the [100]-stress-temperature bicritical point*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 1547 (1975).
- [43] A. Aharony, *Axial and diagonal anisotropy crossover exponents for cubic systems*, *Phys. Lett. A* **59**, 163 (1976).
- [44] A. Aharony, K. A. Müller and W. Berlinger, *Trigonal-to-tetragonal transition in stressed SrTiO_3 : a realization of the three-state Potts model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 33 (1977).
- [45] D. Mukamel, M. E. Fisher, and E. Domany, *Magnetization of Cubic Ferromagnets and the Three-Component Potts Model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37**, 565 (1976).
- [46] A. Aharony and A. D. Bruce, *Lifshitz-point critical and tricritical behavior in anisotropically stressed perovskites*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 462 (1979) and references therein.
- [47] J. Y. Buzaré, J. C. Fayet, W. Berlinger and K. A. Müller, *Tricritical behavior of uniaxially stressed RbCaF_3* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 465 (1979). See also K. A. Müller, W. Berlinger, J. Y. Buzaré and J. C. Fayet, *Shift of the first-order transition in RbCaF_3 under hydrostatic pressure*, *Phys. Rev. B* **21**, 1763 (1980).
- [48] D. Blankshtein and A. Aharony, *Crossover from fluctuations driven continuous to first order transitions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 439 (1981); D. Blankshtein and A. Aharony, *Effects of spatial anisotropy on the order of the fluctuation driven transitions*, *Phys. Rev. B* **26**, 415 (1982); A. Aharony and D. Blankshtein, *Multicritical phenomena in structural phase transitions*, *Physica Scripta T1*, 53 (1982); D. Blankshtein and A. Aharony, *Fluctuation induced tricritical points*, *Phys. Rev. B* **28**, 386 (1983).
- [49] K. Fossheim, *Multicritical phenomena at structural phase transitions*, in Ref. [2], p. 129.
- [50] M. Hasenbusch and E. Vicari, *Anisotropic perturbations in three-dimensional $O(N)$ -symmetric vector models*, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 125136 (2011). These results have been improved in July 2023 (!): M. Hasenbusch, *Cubic fixed point in three dimensions: Monte Carlo simulations of the ϕ^4 model on the lattice*, arXiv: 2211.16170.
- [51] S. M. Chester, W. Landry, J. Liu, D. Poland, D. Simmons-Duffin, N. Su and A. Vichi, *Bootstrapping Heisenberg magnets and their cubic anisotropy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 105013 (2021).
- [52] A. Aharony, *Comment on “Bicritical and tetracritical phenomena and scaling properties of the $SO(5)$ theory”*,

- [Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 059703 \(2002\)](#); *Old and new results on multicritical points*, [J. Stat. Phys. 110, 659 \(2003\)](#).
- [53] A. Aharony, O. Entin-Wohlman and A. Kudlis, *Different critical behaviors in perovskites with a structural phase transition from cubic-to-trigonal and cubic-to-tetragonal symmetry*, [Phys. Rev. B 105, 104101 \(2022\)](#).
- [54] A. Aharony, O. Entin-Wohlman and A. Kudlis, *Bi- and tetracritical phase diagrams in three dimensions*, [Low Temperature Physics 48, 483 \(2022\)](#) [Fiz. Niz. Temp. (Kharkhov) 48, 542 (2022)].
- [55] A. Aharony and O. Entin-Wohlman, *The puzzle of bicriticality in the XXZ antiferromagnet*, [Phys. Rev. B 106, 094424 \(2022\)](#).
- [56] A. Kudlis, A. Aharony, O. Entin-Wohlman, *Effective exponents near bicritical points*, To appear in Proc. FQMT, EPJ ST., [arXiv:2304.08265](#).
- [57] E. Domany, D. Mukamel, and M. E. Fisher, *Destruction of first-order transitions by symmetry-breaking fields*, [Phys. Rev. B 15, 5432 \(1974\)](#).
- [58] B. S. de Lima *et al.*, *Interplay between antiferrodistortive, ferroelectric and superconducting instabilities in $Sr_{1-x}Ca_xTiO_{3-\delta}$* , [Phys. Rev. B 91, 045108 \(2015\)](#).
- [59] A. B. Harris, *Effect of random defects on the critical behaviour of Ising models*, [J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. 7, 1671 \(1974\)](#).
- [60] A. Aharony, *Critical behavior of amorphous magnets*, [Phys. Rev. B 12, 1038 \(1982\)](#).
- [61] W. Schranz, P. Sonderegeld, A. V. Kityk, and E. K. H. Salje, *Dynamic elastic response of $KMn_{1-x}Ca_xF_3$: Elastic softening and domain freezing*, [Phys. Rev. B 80, 094110 \(2009\)](#).