Scaling theory of continuous symmetry breaking under advection

Harukuni Ikeda*

Department of Physics, Gakushuin University, 1-5-1 Mejiro, Toshima-ku, Tokyo 171-8588, Japan

(Dated: January 23, 2024)

In this work, we discuss how the linear and non-linear advection terms modify the scaling behavior of the continuous symmetry breaking and stabilize the long-range order, even in d = 2 far from equilibrium, by means of simple scaling arguments. For an example of the liner advection, we consider the O(n) model in the steady shear. Our scaling analysis reveals that the model can undergo the continuous symmetry breaking even in d = 2 and, moreover, predicts the upper critical dimension $d_{up} = 2$. These results are fully consistent with a recent numerical simulation of the O(2) model, where the mean-field critical exponents are observed even in d = 2. For an example of the non-linear advection, we consider the Toner-Tu hydrodynamic theory, which was introduced to explain polar-ordered flocks, such as the Vicsek model. Our simple scaling argument reproduces the previous results by the dynamical renormalization theory. Furthermore, we discuss the effects of the additional non-linear terms discovered by the recent re-analysis of the hydrodynamic equation. Our scaling argument predicts that the additional non-linear terms modify the scaling exponents and, in particular, recover the isotropic scaling reported in a previous numerical simulation of the Vicsek model. We discuss that the critical exponents predicted by the naive scaling theory become exact in d = 2 by using a symmetry consideration and similar argument proposed by Toner and Tu.

Introduction.— One of the most famous no-go theorems in equilibrium statistical mechanics is the Mermin-Wagner theorem [1], which prohibits continuous symmetry breaking in d = 2 dimensions. However, the Mermin-Wagner theorem does not hold far from equilibrium, and indeed, there are several out-of-equilibrium systems showing continuous symmetry breaking even in d = 2 [2–10]. A famous prototypical numerical model that breaks the Mermin-Wagner theorem is the so-called Vicsek model [2]. The model consists of XY spins flaying with a constant speed along their magnetic direction, which mimics the flocking behavior among living things such as birds and bacteria [2, 11]. Interestingly, the numerical simulation of the model in d = 2 showed that the model undergoes continuous symmetry breaking from the disordered phase, where the mean velocity of the spins vanishes $\langle \boldsymbol{v} \rangle = 0$, to the ordered phase, where $\langle \boldsymbol{v} \rangle \neq 0$ [2].

In 1995, Toner and Tu proposed a hydrodynamic theory to explain the long-range order of the Vicsek model in d = 2 [12]. The Toner-Tu theory in 1995 (TT95) successfully explained the existence of the order phase of the Vicsek model in d = 2. However, subsequent re-analysis of the hydrodynamic theory by J. Toner reported several additional terms that were not considered in the original theory TT95 [12]. These terms hinder the exact calculations of the critical exponents for compressible fluid [13]. Recently, an extensive numerical simulation of the Vicsek model has been performed. The numerical results of the critical exponents are indeed inconsistent with those of TT95. In particular, the numerical results suggest almost isotropic scaling behavior [14], while TT95 predicts anisotropic scaling [12]. One of the purposes of this work is to reconcile this discrepancy by taking into account the effects of the additional non-linear terms.

In the hydrodynamic theory TT95, the key ingredient to stabilize the long-range order in d = 2 is the non-linear advection $(\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla) \boldsymbol{v}$, which leads to the super-diffusion and facilitates the relaxation of the Goldstone mode [12, 15]. Interestingly, a recent numerical simulation of the O(n)model with steady shear revealed that the linear advection $(\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla) \boldsymbol{\phi}$, where $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ denotes the order parameter, can also stabilize the long-range order and allows the continuous symmetry breaking in d = 2 [16]. The numerical result also reported that the critical exponents of the model agree with the mean-field theory (linear analysis) even in d = 2. Our other goal is to explain this surprising result.

To tackle the above two problems, we perform simple scaling arguments for the continuous symmetry breaking with advection. Our theory for the linear advection of the O(n) model predicts that the upper critical dimension below which the Gaussian fixed point gets unstable is $d_{\rm up} = 2$. This explains the mean-field behavior observed in the numerical simulation in d = 2 [16]. For the non-linear advection, our scaling analysis can reproduce the previous theoretical results reported in TT95 [12]. Furthermore, the simplicity of the scaling argument allows us to take into account the additional non-linear terms, which have not been taken into account in the original theory TT95 [12]. The new critical exponents obtained by this work indeed support the isotropic scaling reported in the previous numerical simulation of the Vicsek model [14]. We also argue that the exponents predicted by the native scaling argument actually become exact in d = 2.

O(n) model in shear. — We first discuss the effects of the linear advection. We consider the O(n) model in the steady shear [16]:

$$\frac{\partial \phi_a}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla \phi_a = \nabla^2 \phi_a - \frac{\delta F[\boldsymbol{\phi}]}{\delta \phi_a} + \xi_a, \qquad (1)$$

where the *n*-component vector $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \{\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_n\}$ denotes the order parameter,

$$F[\phi] = \int d\boldsymbol{x} \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(\boldsymbol{\phi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \right) + \frac{g}{4} \left(\boldsymbol{\phi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi} \right)^2 \right]$$
(2)

denotes the standard ϕ^4 free-energy, and ξ_a denotes the thermal nosie of zero mean and variance:

$$\langle \xi_a(\boldsymbol{x},t)\xi_b(\boldsymbol{x}',t')\rangle = 2T\delta_{ab}\delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}')\delta(t-t'). \quad (3)$$

The advection term in Eq. (1), $\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla \phi_a$, is a linear function of the order parameter. For the velocity field \boldsymbol{v} , we consider the simple shear along the x_1 direction:

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \dot{\gamma} x_2 \boldsymbol{e}_1, \tag{4}$$

where e_1 denotes the unit vector along the x_1 axis. Recently, an extensive numerical simulation of the model has been performed [16]. The numerical result showed that the model undergoes the continuous symmetry breaking even in d = 2. Furthermore, the critical exponents of the transition agree with the mean-field prediction. Here, we explain this result through a simple scaling argument.

To investigate the large spatio-temporal behavior of the model, we consider the following scaling transformations [17, 18] [19]:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &\to b^{\zeta_1} x_1, \ x_2 \to b^{\zeta_2} x_2, \ x_i \to b x_i \ i = 3, \cdots, d, \\ t &\to b^z t, \ \phi_a \to b^{\chi} \phi_a, \ \varepsilon \to b^{y_{\varepsilon}} \varepsilon, \ g \to b^{y_g} g. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

For the noise ξ_a , Eq. (3) implies $\xi_a - b^{-\frac{z+\zeta_1+\zeta_2+d-2}{2}}\xi_a$ [20]. Then, Eq. (1) reduces to

$$b^{\chi-z} \frac{\partial \phi_a}{\partial t} + b^{\chi+\zeta_2-\zeta_1} \dot{\gamma} x_2 \frac{\partial \phi_a}{\partial x_1}$$

= $b^{\chi-2\zeta_1} \frac{\partial^2 \phi_a}{\partial x_1^2} + b^{\chi-2\zeta_2} \frac{\partial^2 \phi_a}{\partial x_2^2} + b^{\chi-2} \sum_{i=3}^d \frac{\partial^2 \phi_a}{\partial x_i^2}$
- $b^{\chi+y_{\varepsilon}} \varepsilon \phi_a - b^{y_g+3\chi} g |\phi|^2 \phi_a + b^{-\frac{z+\zeta_1+\zeta_2+d-2}{2}} \xi_a$ (6)

We first discuss the model without shear $\dot{\gamma} = 0$. In this case, assuming that each term in Eq. (6) has the same scaling dimension, we get

$$\chi - z = \chi - 2\zeta_1 = \chi - 2\zeta_2 = \chi - 2$$

= $\chi + y_\varepsilon = y_g + 3\chi = -(z + \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + d - 2)/2$, (7)

leading to

$$z = 2, \zeta_1 = \zeta_2 = 1, \chi = \frac{2-d}{2}, y_\varepsilon = -2, y_g = d - 4.$$
 (8)

To see the stability of the ordered phase, one can observe the fluctuation of the order parameter $\langle \delta \phi_a^2 \rangle \sim b^{2\chi}$. For $d \leq 2, \chi \geq 0$, and thus, the fluctuation diverges in the thermodynamic limit $b \to \infty$, which destroys the longrange order [12], as expected from the Mermin-Wagner theorem [1]. Eq. (5) implies that the coefficient of the non-linear term g scales as $g' = b^{-y_g}g$ after the scale transformation $\mathbf{x}' \to b^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ [17]. When $y_g > 0$, the non-linear term is irrelevant, and the critical exponents of the Gaussian fixed point Eq. (8) become exact. The upper critical dimension $d_{\rm up}$ above which the Gaussian fixed point stabilizes is obtained by setting $y_g = 0$, leading to $d_{\rm up} = 4$ [17]. The results are fully consistent with the scaling analysis of the equilibrium model [17].

Now, we discuss how the finite shear rate $\dot{\gamma} \neq 0$ changes the above scaling behavior. If we require all terms in Eq. (6) to have the same scaling dimension, we obtain seven equations, while there are only six unknown variables, ζ_1 , ζ_2 , z, χ , y_{ε} , and y_g , which are overdetermined and do not have solutions. So, we here assume that the advection $\dot{\gamma}x_2\partial_{x_1}\phi_a \sim b^{\chi+\zeta_2-\zeta_1}$ plays a more dominant role than the diffusion $\partial_{x_1}^2\phi_a \sim b^{\chi-2\zeta_1}$, which is tantamount to assuming $\chi + \zeta_2 - \zeta_1 > \chi - 2\zeta_1 \rightarrow \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 > 0$ and neglect the term $b^{\chi-2\zeta_1}$ in Eq. (6). Requiring that all the remaining terms in Eq. (6) have the same scaling dimension, we get

$$\chi - z = \chi + \zeta_2 - \zeta_1 = \chi - 2\zeta_2 = \chi - 2$$

= $\chi + y_{\varepsilon} = y_g + 3\chi = -(z + \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + d - 2)/2,$ (9)

leading to

$$z = 2, \zeta_1 = 3, \zeta_2 = 1, \chi = -\frac{d}{2}, y_{\varepsilon} = -2, \ y_g = d - 2.$$
(10)

The assumption $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 > 0$ is satisfied self-consistently. The anisotropic exponent $\zeta_1 = 3$ is consistent with the linear analysis [16]. Since $\chi < 0$, the fluctuation of the order parameter $\langle \delta \phi_a^2 \rangle \sim b^{2\chi}$ vanishes in the large scale $b \gg 1$, which allows the long-range order even in d = 2. This is in sharp contrast with the equilibrium system without shear $\dot{\gamma} = 0$, where the long-range order can exist only for d > 2 [1]. The upper critical dimension is obtained by setting $y_g = 0$ [17], leading to $d_{\rm up} = 2$, meaning that Eqs. (10) are exact even in d = 2. The exponents ζ_1 , ζ_2 , and y_{ε} are indeed consistent with a recent numerical simulation in d = 2 [16]. However, strictly speaking, the logarithmic corrections are expected at the upper critical dimension $d = d_{\rm up} = 2$ [17]. Further numerical studies would be beneficial to elucidate this point.

Hydrodynamic theory for the Vicsek model.— Now we discuss the effects of the non-linear advection of the hydrodynamic theory of the Vicsek model [2]. We first investigate the *minimal* hydrodynamic theory for the polar ordered flocks investigated in Ref. [21]:

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}}{\partial t} + (\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla) \boldsymbol{v} = \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{v} - \frac{\delta F[\boldsymbol{v}]}{\delta \boldsymbol{v}} + \boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (11)$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ represents the local velocity of the flocks, and the functional form of the free-energy F is given by Eq. (2). Compared to the original model proposed by Toner and Tu [12], the model Eq. (11) assumes that the fluid is *incompressible* and neglects the terms related to the pressure-gradient forces, such as ∇p and $\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\nabla)p$. Some irrelevant terms, such as $(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\nabla)^2\boldsymbol{v}$, are also neglected [21]. Since the velocity field \boldsymbol{v} itself plays the role of the order parameter, Eq. (11) has the non-linear advection term $(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{v}$ [22]. In the ordered phase $\varepsilon < 0$, the mean value of the velocity field has a finite value $\langle \boldsymbol{v} \rangle = v_0 \boldsymbol{e}_{\parallel}$, where $\boldsymbol{e}_{\parallel}$ denotes the unit vector along the mean velocity $v_0 = |\langle \boldsymbol{v} \rangle|$. Now we decompose the velocity field as $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel} + \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}$. We consider the following scaling transformations [12]:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\parallel} \to b^{\zeta} x_{\parallel}, \ \boldsymbol{x}_{\perp} \to b \boldsymbol{x}_{\perp}, \ t \to b^{z} t, \\ \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \to b^{\chi} \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}, \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel} \to b^{\chi'} \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel}, \varepsilon \to b^{y_{\varepsilon}} \varepsilon, \ g \to b^{y_{g}} g. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Then, Eq. (11) in the space perpendicular to e_{\parallel} reduces to

$$b^{\chi-z} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}}{\partial t} + b^{2\chi-1} (\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \cdot \nabla_{\perp}) \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} + b^{\chi+\chi'-\zeta} (\boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel} \cdot \nabla_{\parallel}) \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}$$

$$= b^{\chi-2} \nabla_{\perp}^{2} \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} + b^{\chi-2\zeta} \nabla_{\parallel}^{2} \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}$$

$$- b^{\chi+y_{\varepsilon}} \varepsilon \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} - b^{y_{g}+\chi+2\chi'} g \left| \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel} \right|^{2} \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}$$

$$- b^{y_{g}+3\chi} g \left| \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \right|^{2} \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} + b^{-\frac{z+\zeta+d-1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\perp}.$$
(13)

As before, we assume that the advection $(\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \cdot \nabla_{\perp}) \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \sim b^{2\chi-1}$ plays the dominant role than the diffusion $\nabla_{\perp}^2 \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \sim b^{\chi-2}$, which is tantamount to assuming $2\chi - 1 > \chi - 2 \rightarrow \chi > -1$. Then, we obtain the following scaling relations:

$$\chi - z = \chi + \chi' - \zeta = 2\chi - 1 = \chi - 2\zeta = y_{\varepsilon} + \chi = y_g + 3\chi = -(z + \zeta + d - 1)/2,$$
(14)

leading to

$$z = \frac{2(1+d)}{5}, \ \zeta = \frac{d+1}{5}, \ \chi = \frac{3-2d}{5},$$
$$\chi' = -\frac{d+1}{5}, \ y_{\varepsilon} = -\frac{2(1+d)}{5},$$
(15)

and

$$y_g = \chi - z - \max[\chi + 2\chi', 3\chi] = \frac{2(d-4)}{5}.$$
 (16)

The assumption $\chi > -1$ is satisfied self-consistently for d < 4. The resultant z, ζ , and χ are consistent with the previous study by Toner and Tu (TT95) [12]. The exponents χ and χ' both become negative, $\chi < 0$ and $\chi' < 0$, for d > 3/2, which allows the long-range order even in d = 2 [12]. Note that they satisfy the scaling relation $\chi' = \chi - 1 + \zeta$, which is expected from the condition of the incompressible flow $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{v} = \nabla_{\parallel} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel} + \nabla_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} = 0$ [23]. By setting $y_g = 0$, we get the upper critical dimension $d_{\rm up} = 4$. The previous renormalization group analysis revealed that there are no corrections for the exponents z, ζ , and χ for incompressible fluid [12, 24, 25].

TABLE I. Critical exponents. Data are taken from Ref [14].

	d=2			d = 3		
	TT95	Vicsek	This world	x TT95	Vicsek	This work
χ	-1/5	-0.31(2)	-1/3	3 - 3/5	-0.62	-2/3
ζ	3/5	0.95(2)		4/5	1	1
z	6/5	1.33(2)	4/3	8 8/5	1.77	5/3

Recently, an extensive numerical simulation of the Vicsek model reported that the critical exponents χ , ζ , and z are inconsistent with TT95, Eqs. (15), see TA-BLE I [14, 26]. In particular, the numerical results suggest the almost isotropic scaling $\zeta \approx 1$ [14, 26]. This discrepancy would be reconciled by considering the hydrodynamic theory for *compressible* fluid [13]. For the compressible fluid, the density fluctuations $\delta\rho$ are coupled with \boldsymbol{v} , leading to some additional non-linear coupling terms between \boldsymbol{v} and $\delta\rho$ in Eq. (13) [12, 13]. These non-linear terms were not taken into account in the previous theory (TT95) [12, 13].

For the scaling argument, it is sufficient to estimate the order of magnitude of the new non-linear terms for $b \gg 1$. Below, we provide a rough estimation. In principle, one can express $\delta\rho$ as a function of \boldsymbol{v} by solving the equation of continuity $\partial_t \rho = -\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{J}$ [12, 13], meaning that the additional non-linear terms would also be expressed as functions of \boldsymbol{v} . The effects of the density fluctuations appear through the pressure-gradient forces, such as ∇p and $\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\nabla p)$ [13], implying that the new non-linear terms may also involve at least one spatial derivative ∇_{\parallel} or ∇_{\perp} . So, the least-order non-linear terms would be written as

$$(\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{v}) \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel \text{or}\perp}, \ (\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla) \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel \text{or}\perp}, \ \nabla_{\parallel \text{or}\perp} (\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}).$$
 (17)

The higher order terms of $\boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel \text{or}\perp}$ and $\nabla_{\parallel \text{or}\perp}$ are negligible since these terms have smaller scaling dimensions. From the scaling point of view, Eqs. (17) yield contributions proportional to $b^{2\chi-1}$, $b^{\chi+\chi'-1}$, $b^{2\chi'-1}$, $b^{2\chi-\zeta}$, $b^{\chi+\chi'-\zeta}$, and $b^{2\chi'-\zeta}$. Using Eqs. (15), one can see that most terms are irrelevant or do not change the scaling. However,

$$\nabla_{\parallel} (\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}) \sim b^{2\chi - \zeta} \tag{18}$$

diverge much faster than the terms in Eq. (13) for $b \gg 1$, which makes the scaling Eqs. (15) improper. The above discussion showed that the most relevant contribution is $b^{2\chi-\zeta}$. Note that the argument itself does not guarantee the existence of such terms. However, fortunately, the non-linear terms having the same scaling dimension have indeed been found by a more detailed analysis of the hydrodynamic theory of the compressible fluid by J. Toner [13]. He reported several non-linear terms coupled to the density fluctuations $\delta\rho$, such as $\delta\rho\partial_{\parallel}\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}\partial_{\parallel}\delta\rho$, where $\delta\rho$ and \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} have the same scaling dimension $\delta\rho \sim \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \sim b^{\chi}$, implying $\delta\rho\partial_{\parallel}\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \sim \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}\partial_{\parallel}\delta\rho \sim$ $b^{2\chi-\zeta}$ [13]. Now we discuss the additional terms indeed recover the isotropic scaling $\zeta = 1$. To get the new scaling exponents, we assume that the advection-like terms along the parallel direction, Eqs. (18), play more dominant roles than the diffusion along that direction $\nabla_{\parallel}^2 \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \sim b^{\chi-2\zeta}$, which is tantamount to assuming $2\chi - \zeta > \chi - 2\zeta \rightarrow \chi + \zeta > 0$. Then, we get the new scaling relations:

$$\chi - z = \chi + \chi' - \zeta = 2\chi - 1 = 2\chi - \zeta = y_{\varepsilon} + \chi = y_g + 3\chi = -(z + \zeta + d - 1)/2,$$
(19)

leading to the isotropic scaling exponents

$$z = \frac{d+2}{3}, \ \zeta = 1, \ \chi = \chi' = \frac{1-d}{3},$$
$$y_{\varepsilon} = -\frac{2+d}{3}, \ y_g = \frac{d-4}{3}.$$
(20)

The assumption $\chi + \zeta > 0$ is satisfied self-consistently for d < 4. By setting $y_g = 0$, we get the upper critical dimension $d_{up} = 4$. For d < 4, our theory may not give the correct result near the transition point. Furthermore, the transition of the Vicsek model is known to be discontinuous in d = 2, implying that one can not apply the scaling argument itself [27, 28]. Deep inside the ordered phase, the fluctuations are predominantly controlled by the Goldstone modes, which do not change the free-energy $F[\boldsymbol{v}]$. Therefore, the non-linear term proportional to q would be negligible. In TABLE I, we compare the Eqs. (20) with the recent numerical results of the Vicsek model in the order phase in d = 2 and 3. The agreement is reasonably good, considering the simplicity of our theory. Further theoretical [12, 23, 24, 29–32], numerical [14, 27], and, hopefully, experimental [11, 26, 33] studies would be beneficial to estimate more accurate values of the critical exponents.

Exact critical exponents in d = 2.— We get almost perfect agreement in d = 2. This is surprising because (i) the full hydrodynamic equation involves far more nonlinear terms than those considered in the previous section [13], and (ii) the naive scaling argument, in general, does not give the exact critical exponents for nonlinear systems [17]. Below, we try to justify this result by using symmetry consideration [29] and argument in TT95 [12, 24]. First, note that the fluctuations in the ordered phase are dominated by the Goldstone mode v_{\perp} , which does not change the free-energy F[v]. As before, we assume that the density fluctuation $\delta\rho$ is expressed as a function of $v \approx v_{\perp}$. Then, v_{\perp} is only the relevant quantity. Let us assume that the equation of motion (EOM) of v_{\perp} is written as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}}{\partial t} = \boldsymbol{f}[\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}] + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\perp}, \qquad (21)$$

where f denotes the restoring force of v_{\perp} , and ξ_{\perp} denotes the white noise. The restoring force of the Goldstone mode f should vanish in the limit of the small wave

number in the Fourier space, implying that each term in \boldsymbol{f} should involve at least one spatial derivative $\nabla_{\perp \text{or}\parallel}$. Above the lower critical dimension, $\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \sim b^{\chi}$, $\nabla_{\perp} \sim b^{-1}$, and $\nabla_{\parallel} \sim b^{-\zeta}$ vanish in the large scale $b \to \infty$. So, $\boldsymbol{f}[\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}]$ would be expanded by \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} and $\nabla_{\perp \text{or}\parallel}$ as follows [29]:

$$\boldsymbol{f}[\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}] = (D_1 \nabla_{\perp}^2 + D_2 \nabla_{\parallel}^2) \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} + (D_3 \nabla_{\perp} + D_4 \nabla_{\parallel}) (\nabla_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}) + \lambda_1 (\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \cdot \nabla_{\perp}) \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} + \lambda_2 (\nabla_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}) \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} + \lambda_3 \nabla_{\perp} (\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}) + \nu \nabla_{\parallel} (\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}) + O(|\nabla|^4, |\boldsymbol{v}_{\perp}|^4),$$
(22)

where D_i , λ_i , and ν are some constants. The higher order terms of \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} and $\nabla_{\perp \text{or}\parallel}$ have smaller scaling dimensions and would be negligible for $b \gg 1$. In d = 2, \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp} has just one component, and the equation can be further simplified as

$$\frac{\partial v_{\perp}}{\partial t} = (d_1 \partial_{\perp}^2 + d_2 \partial_{\parallel}^2 + d_3 \partial_{\perp} \partial_{\parallel}) v_{\perp},
+ \lambda \partial_{\perp} v_{\perp}^2 + \nu \partial_{\parallel} v_{\perp}^2 + \xi_{\perp},$$
(23)

where d_i , λ , and ν are some constants. For $\nu = 0$, the critical exponents of Eq. (23) have been calculated exactly [29], leading to the same results as TT95, Eqs. (15). Below, we derive the exact critical exponents for $\nu \neq 0$. Since the non-linear terms proportional to λ and μ are written as the total derivative of \parallel or \perp , the perturbative expansion of these terms can only yield the terms $\partial_{\parallel \text{or}\perp}(\text{some function})$. This implies that the perturbative re-normalization calculation for these non-linear terms does not contribute to the terms that do not involve the spatial derivatives [12, 14, 29]. In particular, the scaling behaviors of $\partial_t v_{\perp} \sim b^{\zeta-z}$ and $\xi_{\perp} \sim b^{-(z+\zeta+d-1)/2}$ should remain unchanged. Assuming $\partial_t v_{\perp} \sim \xi_{\perp}$, we get [14]:

$$z = 2\chi + \zeta + d - 1. \tag{24}$$

A recent numerical simulation of the Vicsek model indeed confirmed the above scaling relation in d = 2 [14]. One can see that Eq. (23) is invariant under the "Pseudo-Galilean" transformation: $v_{\perp} \rightarrow v_{\perp} + V$, $x_{\perp} \rightarrow x_{\perp} + 2\lambda V t$, and $x_{\parallel} \rightarrow x_{\parallel} + 2\nu V t$, which implies the following scaling relations [12, 24]

$$1 = \chi + z, \ \zeta = \chi + z,$$

$$\rightarrow \zeta = 1, \ \chi = 1 - z.$$
(25)

Using Eqs. (24) and (25), we reproduce the exponents z, ζ , and χ in Eqs. (20). Since Eq. (23) is the most general form of EOM obtained by the symmetry consideration, we conclude that z, ζ , and χ calculated above are the exact critical exponents of the Vicsek model in d = 2. It is unclear if a similar argument can be applied to Eq. (21) in d = 3.

Summary.— In summary, we have investigated the continuous symmetry breaking with linear and non-linear advections by means of simple scaling arguments. Our

theory demonstrated that the linear and non-linear advection terms can generally reduce the lower-critical dimension and stabilize the long-range order even in d = 2, where the Mermin-Wanger theorem prohibits the longrange order in equilibrium [1]. In particular, our scaling theory, for the first time, can explain the mean-field behavior of the sheared O(2) model in d = 2 [16] and the isotropic scaling behavior of the Vicesek model [14].

We thank H. Nakano, Y. Kuroda, and D. Nishiguchi for valuable discussions and comments. This work was supported by KAKENHI 23K13031.

* harukuni.ikeda@gakushuin.ac.jp

- N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 17, 1133 (1966).
- [2] T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1226 (1995).
- [3] K. E. Bassler and Z. Rácz, Phys. Rev. E 52, R9 (1995).
- [4] M. D. Reichl, C. I. Del Genio, and K. E. Bassler, Phys. Rev. E 82, 040102 (2010).
- [5] S. A. M. Loos, S. H. L. Klapp, and T. Martynec, Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 198301 (2023).
- [6] L. P. Dadhichi, J. Kethapelli, R. Chajwa, S. Ramaswamy, and A. Maitra, Phys. Rev. E 101, 052601 (2020).
- [7] L. Galliano, M. E. Cates, and L. Berthier, Phys. Rev. Lett. 131, 047101 (2023).
- [8] H. Ikeda, Phys. Rev. E **108**, 064119 (2023).
- [9] H. Ikeda and Y. Kuroda, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14235 (2023).
- [10] H. Ikeda, arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03155 (2023).
- [11] D. Nishiguchi, K. H. Nagai, H. Chaté, and M. Sano, Phys. Rev. E 95, 020601 (2017).
- [12] J. Toner and Y. Tu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 4326 (1995).
- [13] J. Toner, Phys. Rev. E 86, 031918 (2012).
- [14] B. Mahault, F. Ginelli, and H. Chaté, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 218001 (2019).
- [15] Y. Minami and H. Nakano, arXiv preprint

arXiv:2212.06390 (2022).

- [16] H. Nakano, Y. Minami, and S.-i. Sasa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 160604 (2021).
- [17] H. Nishimori and G. Ortiz, *Elements of phase transitions* and critical phenomena (Oxford university press, 2011).
- [18] A. Onuki and K. Kawasaki, Annals of Physics **121**, 456–528 (1979).
- [19] One can introduce the proportional coefficients for the advection and diffusion terms, as in $c_a \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla \phi_a$ and $c_d \nabla^2 \phi_a$, and consider their scaling dimensions. However, in such a case, the fixed point corresponds to $c_a = c_d = 0$: the model loses the spatial dependence. We are not interested in such a case. For the same reason, we also omit the proportional coefficient of $\nabla^2 \boldsymbol{v}$ and $(\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla) \boldsymbol{v}$ in the Vicsek model.
- [20] E. Medina, T. Hwa, M. Kardar, and Y.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. A 39, 3053 (1989).
- [21] M. Besse, H. Chaté, and A. Solon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 268003 (2022).
- [22] One can include two more non-linear advection terms: $(\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{v})\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\nabla(\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{v})$, which has the same scaling dimension as $(\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nabla)\boldsymbol{v}$ and do not change the results of the scaling analysis.
- [23] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, and J. Toner, Nature communications 7, 12215 (2016).
- [24] J. Toner, Y. Tu, and S. Ramaswamy, Annals of Physics **318**, 170–244 (2005).
- [25] L. Chen, C. F. Lee, and J. Toner, New Journal of Physics 20, 113035 (2018).
- [26] D. Nishiguchi, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan 92 (2023), 10
- [27] G. Grégoire and H. Chaté, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 025702 (2004).
- [28] A. P. Solon, H. Chaté, and J. Tailleur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 068101 (2015).
- [29] P. Sartori and C. F. Lee, New Journal of Physics 21, 073064 (2019).
- [30] H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 220601 (2020).
- [31] L. Di Carlo and M. Scandolo, New Journal of Physics **24**, 123032 (2022).
- [32] P. Jentsch and C. F. Lee, Phys. Rev. Res. 5, 023061 (2023).
- [33] J. Iwasawa, D. Nishiguchi, and M. Sano, Phys. Rev. Res. 3, 043104 (2021).