

Ralph Kenna's scaling relations in critical phenomena

Leïla Moueddene ^{1,2}, Arnaldo Donoso ³ and Bertrand Berche ^{1*} 

¹ Laboratoire de Physique et Chimie Théoriques, CNRS - Université de Lorraine, UMR 7019, Nancy, France and L4 collaboration, Leipzig-Lorraine-Lviv-Coventry, Europe

² Centre for Fluid and Complex Systems, Coventry University, Coventry CV1 5FB, United Kingdom

³ Department of Experimental Physics, Maynooth University, Maynooth Co. Kildare, Ireland
February 15, 2024

Abstract: In this note, we revisit the scaling relations among “hatted critical exponents” which were first derived by Ralph Kenna, Des Johnston and Wolfhard Janke, and we propose an alternative derivation for some of them. For the scaling relation involving the behavior of the correlation function, we will propose an alternative form since we believe that the expression is erroneous in the work of Ralph and his collaborators.

Keyword: Critical exponents; Logarithmic corrections; Scaling and renormalization; Scaling laws; Tricritical point; Finite-Size Scaling

In memory of our friend Ralph Kenna

This paper is dedicated to our friend Ralph Kenna who passed away on Oct. 26th 2023. Ralph was a close collaborator and a very good friend, he was the PhD co-advisor of one of the authors of the present paper (LM). Renowned specialist in the study of phase transitions through the partition function zeros, he developed this formalism in the difficult cases where critical behaviours are controlled beyond the dominant singularities, by logarithmic corrections.

The present work was initiated on the occasion of the ComPhys23 workshop¹ organized by W. Janke in Leipzig, and dedicated to the memory of Ralph. The opening talk was intended to highlight some of Ralph's most important contributions to statistical physics, notably the derivation of scaling laws between the exponents associated with logarithmic singularities in the vicinity of second-order phase transitions. Ralph was a well-known physicist in the statistical physics community and these new scaling laws were very successful in the field of critical phenomena. It was by revisiting these scaling laws and their derivation that we noted that one of these relations was incomplete and that the work undertaken by Ralph and his co-authors around twenty years ago merited to be completed.

*Correspondence: bertrand.berche@univ-lorraine.fr

¹<http://www.physik.uni-leipzig.de/~janke/CompPhys23/>

This paper could have been written by Des Johnston or by Wolffhard Janke, the co-authors of Ralph in this topic (and in many more works).

1 Scaling relations and universal combinations of amplitudes, a short primer

We assume that the reader is familiar with the notion of critical exponents that describe the singularities of various thermodynamic functions at the approach of a second-order phase transition. Otherwise, we can suggest to refer e.g. to the textbook of Kardar [1].

Standard scaling relations among the universal critical exponents are the following,

$$2\beta + \gamma = 2 - \alpha, \quad (1)$$

$$\beta(\delta - 1) = \gamma, \quad (2)$$

$$\nu(2 - \eta) = \gamma, \quad (3)$$

$$2 - \alpha = \nu d. \quad (4)$$

They are very useful, not only to obtain the values of all 6 fundamental critical exponents within a universality class from the knowledge of 2 of them but also because they allow for the definition of other universal quantities, written as specific combinations of critical amplitudes. Let us show how this works. For that purpose, we first define the amplitudes as they enter the expressions of the leading singular behaviours of thermodynamic quantities in the vicinity of a second-order phase transition:

$$\text{Specific heat: } C_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq A_{\pm}|t|^{-\alpha}, \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Low temperature magnetization: } m_{-}(t, 0) \simeq B_{-}(-t)^{\beta}, \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Susceptibility: } \chi_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq \Gamma_{\pm}|t|^{-\gamma}, \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Critical temperature magnetization: } m_c(0, h) \simeq B_c|h|^{1/\delta}, \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Correlation length: } \xi_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq \xi_{0\pm}|t|^{-\nu}. \quad (9)$$

Here, the two arguments of the functions at the l.h.s. are respectively $t = (T - T_c)/T_c$ and $h = H/T_c$, and the indices \pm specify the high ($t > 0$) and low ($t < 0$) temperature phases, meaning that the field is zero, and the index c on the contrary implies the field behaviour at the critical temperature. The symbol \simeq stands for the leading singularity (i.e. the most singular part, since there could be regular contributions to the thermodynamic quantities, power law corrections to scaling, and multiplicative logarithmic corrections, all these being omitted in Eqs. (5)-(9)).

We can also define the singular part of the free energy density in zero field:

$$f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t, 0) \simeq F_{\pm}|t|^{2-\alpha}, \quad (10)$$

and, since the specific heat is the second derivative of f^{sing} w.r.t t , F_{\pm} is not independent, since this requires $A_{\pm} = (1 - \alpha)(2 - \alpha)F_{\pm}$. The Lee-Yang edge is another quantity of interest in critical phenomena and we define

$$h_{\pm}^{\text{LY}}(t) \simeq h_{0\pm}|t|^{\Delta} \quad (11)$$

with the so-called gap exponent $\Delta = \beta + \gamma = \beta\delta$.

Universality is the observation that some quantities only depend on very general properties, like space dimensionality. The critical exponents are such universal quantities, but the amplitudes are not, although some combinations among them have the property of universality. To make it clear, let us write Widom's scaling assumption, i.e. the fact that the singular part of the free energy density is a homogeneous function of the scaling fields,

$$f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t, h) = b^{-d} \mathcal{F}_{\pm}(\kappa_t b^{y_t} t, \kappa_h b^{y_h} h), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\pm}(x(b), y(b))$ is a universal scaling function of its arguments, y_t and y_h are the RG dimensions of the relevant fields t and h , and κ_t and κ_h are non universal metric factors which would differ, say on the square lattice and the triangular lattice in $2d$. The amplitudes defined above depend on these metric factors, and this is why they are not universal. E.g. from $C_{\pm}(t, 0) = \frac{\partial^2 f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t, 0)}{\partial t^2}$, setting $b = |t|^{-1/y_t}$ in the scaling form (12), one obtains

$$C_{\pm}(t, 0) = \kappa_t^{2+(d-2y_t)/y_t} |t|^{(d-2y_t)/y_t} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{F}_{\pm}(x, 0)}{\partial x^2} \right)_{x=1}. \quad (13)$$

This identifies the exponent

$$\alpha = (2y_t - d)/y_t \quad (14)$$

and the amplitude

$$A_{\pm} = \kappa_t^{2-\alpha} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{F}_{\pm}(x, 0)}{\partial x^2} \right)_{x=1}. \quad (15)$$

The other exponents are similarly defined in terms of y_t and y_h by very famous relations that we do not repeat here and the other amplitudes depend on the metric factors as $B_- \sim \kappa_h \kappa_t^{\beta}$, $\Gamma_{\pm} \sim \kappa_h^2 \kappa_t^{-\gamma}$, $B_c \sim \kappa_h^{1+1/\delta}$.

Simple ratios are immediately defined from the fact that the approach to criticality from above and from below is described by the same exponent for a given quantity (except for the magnetization, obviously). For example in the case of the specific heat $C_+(|t|) \simeq A_+ |t|^{-\alpha}$ and $C_-(-|t|) \simeq A_- |t|^{-\alpha'}$, where $\alpha' = \alpha$. It follows that the metric factors cancel in the ratio and

$$R_C(|t|) = \frac{C_+(|t|)}{C_-(-|t|)} = \frac{A_+ |t|^{-\alpha}}{A_- |t|^{-\alpha'}} \rightarrow R_C = \frac{A_+}{A_-} \quad (16)$$

is thus universal. The limit corresponds to the approach to criticality ($|t| \rightarrow 0$ here) since the combination $R_C(|t|)$ can be temperature-dependent due to the possible presence of different values for the amplitudes of the corrections to scaling which has not been taken into account in Eq. (5) to (9). In the same manner, one defines the universal ratios

$$R_{\chi} = \frac{\Gamma_+}{\Gamma_-}, \quad R_{\xi} = \frac{\xi_{0+}}{\xi_{0-}}. \quad (17)$$

The scaling relations are other examples of relations that allow the definition of new combinations. For example the ratio m_-^2/χ_{\pm} eliminates κ_h , and κ_t is then eliminated, thanks to Eq. (1) if we further divide by C_{\pm} . There is still an

unwanted $|t|^2$ dependence that needs to be simplified and for that purpose we consider the quantity

$$R_{\pm}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{m_{\pm}^2(-|t|)}{C_{\pm}(t)\chi_{\pm}(t)|t|^2} = \frac{B_{\pm}^2}{C_{\pm}\Gamma_{\pm}}|t|^{2\beta+\gamma+\alpha-2} \rightarrow \frac{B_{\pm}^2}{C_{\pm}\Gamma_{\pm}}. \quad (18)$$

Thanks to Eq. (1), the fact that all metric factors cancel out in this latter quantity makes the combination $B_{\pm}^2/C_{\pm}\Gamma_{\pm}$ universal. Proceeding the same way, Eq. (2) and Eq. (3) suggest to contemplate the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\pm}^{(2)}(t) &= \chi_{\pm}(t)m_{\pm}^{\delta-1}(-|t|)m_c^{-\delta}(h)h|_{h=h_{\pm}^{\text{LY}}(|t|)} \\ &= \Gamma_{\pm}B_{\pm}^{\delta-1}B_c^{-\delta}|t|^{-\gamma+\beta(\delta-1)} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\pm}B_{\pm}^{\delta-1}B_c^{-\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$R_{\pm}^{(3)}(t) = \frac{\chi_{\pm}(t)}{\xi_{\pm}^{2-\eta}(t)} = \frac{\Gamma_{\pm}}{\xi_{0\pm}^{2-\eta}}|t|^{-\gamma+\nu(2-\eta)} \rightarrow \frac{\Gamma_{\pm}}{\xi_{0\pm}^{2-\eta}}, \quad (20)$$

that reach their respective universal values. Eventually, Eq. (4) leads to consider the following combination

$$R_{\pm}^{(4)}(t) = \xi_{\pm}^d(t)f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t) = \xi_{0\pm}^d F_{\pm}|t|^{-d\nu+2-\alpha} \rightarrow \xi_{0\pm}^d F_{\pm} \quad (21)$$

as universal also.

2 From the universal combinations of amplitudes to scaling laws among hatted exponents

Having the universal combinations of amplitudes at hand, we consider now the case where the critical behaviour is described, besides the leading singularities, by multiplicative logarithmic corrections. This may happen for example for a system at its upper critical dimension d_{uc} , or in the case of the $2d$ 4-states Potts model, or the $2d$ disordered Ising model as well. Many examples can be found in Ref. [3, 4, 2].

Let us first remind the standard definitions of some exponent combinations which will occur below: $\alpha_c = \alpha/\beta\delta$, $\gamma_c = \gamma/\beta\delta$, $\nu_c = \nu/\beta\delta$, $\epsilon_c = (1-\alpha)/\beta\delta$. The logarithmic corrections can appear either in the approach to the critical temperature when the magnetic field is fixed at zero, or on the other hand right at T_c , when the magnetic field approaches zero:

$$h = 0, t \rightarrow 0^{\pm}, \quad (22)$$

$$f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t, 0) \simeq F_{\pm}|t|^{2-\alpha}(-\ln|t|)^{\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (23)$$

$$m_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq B_{\pm}|t|^{\beta}(-\ln|t|)^{\hat{\beta}}, \quad (24)$$

$$e_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq \frac{A_{\pm}}{(1-\alpha)}|t|^{1-\alpha}(-\ln|t|)^{\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (25)$$

$$\chi_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq \Gamma_{\pm}|t|^{-\gamma}(-\ln|t|)^{\hat{\gamma}}, \quad (26)$$

$$C_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq A_{\pm}|t|^{-\alpha}(-\ln|t|)^{\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (27)$$

$$\xi_{\pm}(t, 0) \simeq \xi_{0\pm}|t|^{-\nu}(-\ln|t|)^{\hat{\nu}}, \quad (28)$$

$$t = 0, h \rightarrow 0^\pm, \quad (29)$$

$$f_c^{\text{sing}}(0, h) \simeq F_c |h|^{1+1/\delta} (-\ln |h|)^{\hat{\delta}_c}, \quad (30)$$

$$m_c(0, h) \simeq B_c |h|^{1/\delta} (-\ln |h|)^{\hat{\delta}_c}, \quad (31)$$

$$e_c(0, h) \simeq E_c |h|^{\epsilon_c} (-\ln |h|)^{\hat{\epsilon}_c}, \quad (32)$$

$$\chi_c(0, h) \simeq \Gamma_c |h|^{-\gamma_c} (-\ln |h|)^{\hat{\delta}_c}, \quad (33)$$

$$C_c(0, h) \simeq \frac{A_c}{\alpha_c} |h|^{-\alpha_c} (-\ln |h|)^{\hat{\alpha}_c}, \quad (34)$$

$$\xi_c(0, h) \simeq \xi_c |h|^{-\nu_c} (-\ln |h|)^{\hat{\nu}_c}. \quad (35)$$

We can also define at criticality $t = h = 0$ the logarithmic correction of the correlation function, defining the exponents $\hat{\eta}$ that will play an essential role in the following of this paper:

$$G(0, 0, |\mathbf{r}|) \simeq g_0 |\mathbf{r}|^{-(d-2+\eta)} (\ln |\mathbf{r}|)^{\hat{\eta}}. \quad (36)$$

We mostly use the notations of Refs. [5, 2], with quantities (amplitudes and exponents) at the critical temperature defined with the subscript c , except for δ in (31) which is standard according to the terminology fixed by Fisher long ago [6].

Ralph Kenna and his co-workers, Des Johnston and Wolfhard Janke, have established a series of scaling relations [3, 4, 2] among “hatted exponents”, as Ralph was used to call them. Their approach was based on the zeros of the partition function, either the Lee-Yang zeros (in complex magnetic field) or the Fisher zeros (in complex temperature).

Here, we offer an alternative derivation of most of these scaling laws, probably simpler in its approach. Universality assumes that the previous ratios of amplitudes are still universal when multiplicative logarithmic corrections are present, i.e.

$$R_\pm^{(1)}(t) = \frac{m_-^2(-|t|)}{C_\pm(|t|)\chi_\pm(|t|)|t|^2} = \frac{B_-^2}{C_\pm\Gamma_\pm} (-\ln |t|)^{2\hat{\beta}-\hat{\alpha}-\hat{\gamma}}. \quad (37)$$

The fact that this quantity *must* tend to $B_-^2/C_\pm\Gamma_\pm$ now demands that

$$2\hat{\beta} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\gamma}. \quad (38)$$

This is the first of Ralph and coworkers’ scaling relations. Using the same method, the second ratio easily leads to a second relation,

$$\hat{\gamma} + \hat{\beta}(\delta - 1) - \delta\hat{\delta} = 0. \quad (39)$$

The amplitude of the Lee-Yang edge, $h_{0\pm}$, has a non trivial dependence with the metric factors, $h_{0\pm} \sim \kappa_t^{\beta\delta} \kappa_h^{-1}$. This can be retrieved from the scaling relation $\Delta = \beta\delta$, and the universality of the ratio

$$R^{(5)}(t) = \frac{m_c(h_\pm^{\text{LY}}(t))}{m_-(t)} = \frac{B_c h_{0\pm}^{1/\delta}}{B_-} |t|^{\Delta/\delta-\beta} (-\ln |t|)^{\hat{\Delta}/\delta+\hat{\delta}-\hat{\beta}} \rightarrow \frac{B_c h_{0\pm}^{1/\delta}}{B_-} \quad (40)$$

requires that

$$\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{\beta} - \hat{\delta})\delta. \quad (41)$$

The scaling relations (38) and (39) were first derived in Ref. [3]. Instead of (41), Ralph and his co-workers had $\hat{\Delta} = \hat{\beta} - \hat{\gamma}$ which is recovered here using (39) and (41).

In the same paper, they also derived

$$\hat{\varphi} = \hat{\nu} + \nu\hat{\alpha}/(2 - \alpha). \quad (42)$$

This is an analogue of the hyperscaling relation for logarithmic relations. A new *pseudo-critical exponent* [3, 4, 11] appears there, $\hat{\varphi}$, that describes the finite-size scaling (FSS) of the correlation length,

$$\xi_L \simeq L(\ln L)^{\hat{\varphi}}. \quad (43)$$

This behaviour is encoded in the scaling hypothesis for the correlation length, appropriately extended to account for the logarithmic correction:

$$\xi_{\pm}(t, h, L^{-1}) = b(\ln b)^{\hat{\varphi}} \mathcal{X}(\kappa_t b^{y_t} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_t} t, \kappa_h b^{y_h} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_h} h, bL^{-1}). \quad (44)$$

Like y_t (resp. y_h) is the RG eigenvalue associated with the scaling field t (resp. h), we denote \hat{y}_t (resp. \hat{y}_h) the corresponding exponent of the logarithmic correction. For the sake of clarity, we will later denote the rescaled variables as $x(b) = \kappa_t b^{y_t} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_t} t$, $y(b) = \kappa_h b^{y_h} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_h} h$, and $z(b) = bL^{-1}$. Eq. (43) follows from the choice $b = L$ at criticality $t = h = 0$ in (44). The same scaling form is used in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, setting $x = 1$. This requires iterations

$$\begin{aligned} b &= (\kappa_t |t|)^{-1/y_t} (\ln b)^{-\hat{y}_t/y_t} \\ &\simeq (\kappa_t |t|)^{-1/y_t} (-\ln |t|)^{-\hat{y}_t/y_t} \left(1 + \frac{\ln(-\ln |t|)}{(-\ln |t|)} + \text{higher order correction} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Inserted in the expression of the correlation length leads to leading order to

$$\xi_{\pm}(t, 0, 0) \simeq |t|^{-1/y_t} (-\ln |t|)^{\hat{\varphi} - \hat{y}_t/y_t} \mathcal{X}(1, 0, 0) \quad (46)$$

and requires the usual relation $\nu = 1/y_t$, but also, to conform to (28),

$$\hat{\varphi} = \hat{\nu} + \nu\hat{y}_t. \quad (47)$$

We now show that this agrees with Ralph's scaling relation (42). For that purpose, we use the compatibility with the extension of the phenomenological Widom scaling assumption for the free energy density (12) to the presence of logarithmic corrections, written as far as we know for the first time by Ralph Kenna in Ref. [15],

$$f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t, h, L^{-1}) = b^{-d} \mathcal{F}_{\pm}(\kappa_t b^{y_t} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_t} t, \kappa_h b^{y_h} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_h} h, bL^{-1}). \quad (48)$$

The second derivative w.r.t. t is the specific heat, and the choice $x = 1$ at $h = L^{-1} = 0$ then leads (using $\alpha = (2y_t - d)/y_t$) to

$$C_{\pm}(t, 0, 0) \simeq |t|^{-\alpha} (-\ln |t|)^{2\hat{y}_t - \alpha\hat{y}_t} \mathcal{C}_{\pm}(1, 0, 0), \quad (49)$$

(from now on, we always limit (45) to leading logarithmic order), hence, from (27),

$$\hat{\alpha} = (2 - \alpha)\hat{y}_t \quad (50)$$

which completes the proof.

3 Solving a disagreement with our friends

In Ref. [2], Ralph Kenna has given a complete account of these, and many more scaling relations among hatted exponents. This is not our purpose here to be exhaustive, but rather to show alternative derivations, or to complete what Ralph and coworkers didn't do. With this perspective in mind, Eqs. (44), (48) and an analogous homogeneity form for the correlation function (discussed later) offers an option to proceed as we show now.

In Ref. [4], two other scaling relations between hatted exponents were derived:

$$\hat{\alpha} = d(\hat{\varphi} - \hat{\nu}) \quad \text{or} \quad \hat{\alpha} = 1 + d(\hat{\varphi} - \hat{\nu}), \quad (51)$$

$$\hat{\eta} = \hat{\gamma} - \hat{\nu}(2 - \eta). \quad (52)$$

Concerning the first relation (51), the second formula is valid in such circumstances where the model has $\alpha = 0$ and an impact angle $\phi \neq \pi/4$ for the Fisher zeros in the complex plane (this is the case for the pure two-dimensional Ising model). We will not consider this case, but rather the more general case of the first formula. It can be rederived by careful use of the ratio 4 (Eq. (21)) in section 1, and even requires to use of FSS of the correlation length. From $\xi_{\pm}(t) \simeq |t|^{-\nu}(-\ln|t|)^{\hat{\nu}}$, we first reverse to $|t| \simeq \xi_{\pm}^{-1/\nu}(t)(\ln \xi_{\pm}(t))^{\hat{\nu}/\nu}$. This expression is then incorporated into (23) to get

$$f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t) \simeq \xi_{\pm}^{-d}(t)(\ln \xi_{\pm}(t))^{d\hat{\nu} + \hat{\alpha}} \quad (53)$$

i.e. a modified version of (21):

$$R_{\pm}^{(4bis)}(t) = \frac{\xi_{\pm}^d(t) f_{\pm}^{\text{sing}}(t)}{(\ln \xi_{\pm}(t))^{d\hat{\nu} + \hat{\alpha}}} \rightarrow \xi_{0\pm}^d F_{\pm}. \quad (54)$$

Now, inserting (43) into (53) leads to the FSS behaviour of the free energy density at criticality,

$$f_L^{\text{sing}}(0) \simeq L^{-d}(\ln L)^{-d\hat{\varphi}}(\ln L)^{\hat{\alpha} + d\hat{\nu}}, \quad (55)$$

and compatibility with (48) at $t = h = 0$, $b = L$ then demands

$$\hat{\alpha} = d\hat{\varphi} - d\hat{\nu}. \quad (56)$$

which is Kenna and coworkers' relation.

The same derivation can be done for the magnetic sector, considering the approach to criticality at T_c for $h \rightarrow 0$ and yields the scaling relation

$$\hat{\delta} = d\hat{\varphi} - d\hat{\nu}_c. \quad (57)$$

Concerning the last Eq. (52), we believe that this relation is incomplete. Applied to the 4-state Potts model in two dimensions [7, 8, 9, 10], which has $\hat{\eta} = -\frac{1}{8}$, $\hat{\gamma} = \frac{3}{4}$, $\hat{\nu} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\eta = \frac{1}{4}$, Eq. (52) is fulfilled. We believe that this is because there $\hat{\varphi} = 0$, and that an additional term $\hat{\varphi}\gamma/\nu$ is missing in the general case. A test is provided in the case of the Ising model in 4 dimensions which has $\hat{\varphi} = \frac{1}{4}$ (models at their upper critical dimensions have $\hat{\varphi} = 1/d_{\text{uc}}$ [11, 13, 12, 14]). There, Ralph and his co-authors had anticipated that $\hat{\eta} = 0$ for Eq. (52) to work

($\hat{\gamma} = \frac{1}{3}$, $\hat{\nu} = \frac{1}{6}$ and $\eta = 0$ for the Ising model in 4 dimensions), but according to Luijten [16], $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}$ instead, a result that is in contradiction with Eq. (52).

Let us examine the problem in more detail. In Ref. [4], the authors have questioned the relation between the correlation function and the square of the magnetization when the system decorrelates, i.e. for $|\mathbf{r}| \rightarrow \infty$:

$$G(t, h, L^{-1} \rightarrow \infty, |\mathbf{r}| \rightarrow \infty) \rightarrow m^2(t, h, L^{-1} \rightarrow \infty). \quad (58)$$

On the contrary, we assume that there is no reason why this would not be valid, so we start from the homogeneity of the (spin-spin) correlation function with logarithmic corrections as

$$G(t, h, L^{-1}, |\mathbf{r}|) = b^{-(d-2+\eta)} (\ln b)^{\hat{\eta}} G(x(b), y(b), z(b), |\mathbf{r}|/b), \quad (59)$$

Setting $x = 1$, $y = 0$ and the thermodynamic limit $z = 0$ leads to the following temperature behaviour when $|\mathbf{r}| \rightarrow \infty$

$$G(t, 0, 0, \infty) \simeq |t|^{\frac{d-2+\eta}{\nu t}} (-\ln |t|)^{\frac{d-2+\eta}{\nu t} \hat{y}_t + \hat{\eta}} G(1, 0, 0, \infty) = m^2(t, 0, 0). \quad (60)$$

This requires the usual relation $2\beta = \frac{d-2+\eta}{\nu t}$ and

$$\hat{\eta} = 2(\hat{\beta} - \beta \hat{y}_t). \quad (61)$$

The two examples given above are test grounds. For the 4-state Potts model in two dimensions, we extract immediately $\hat{\eta} = -\frac{1}{8}$ which is correct. For the $4d$ Ising model on the other hand, we obtain $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}$, in agreement with Luijten's result [16], later verified numerically in Ref. [17], but we are here in contradiction with the prediction of Refs. [4, 2].

Since the question is of importance, we want to consider it from other perspectives also. The correlation function is linked to the susceptibility via the fluctuation-dissipation relation:

$$\chi(0, 0, L^{-1}) = \int_0^L d^d r |\mathbf{r}|^{-(d-2+\eta)} (\ln |\mathbf{r}|)^{\hat{\eta}} G(0, 0, |\mathbf{r}|L^{-1}, 1). \quad (62)$$

Setting $\rho = |\mathbf{r}|/L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(0, 0, L^{-1}) &= L^{2-\eta} (\ln L)^{\hat{\eta}} \int_0^1 d^d \rho \rho^{-(d-2+\eta)} \left(1 + \frac{\ln \rho}{\ln L}\right)^{\hat{\eta}} G(0, 0, \rho, 1) \\ &\simeq L^{2-\eta} (\ln L)^{\hat{\eta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

and, since the susceptibility obeys, via the second derivative of (48), to

$$\chi(t, h, L^{-1}) = \kappa_h^2 b^{-d+2y_h} (\ln b)^{2\hat{y}_h} \mathcal{D}(x(b), y(b), z(b)), \quad (64)$$

its FSS compared to (63) demands that $2 - \eta = 2y_d - d = \gamma/\nu$ and

$$\hat{\eta} = 2\hat{y}_h. \quad (65)$$

Again, this confirms $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}$ for the $4d$ Ising model.

The fluctuation-dissipation theorem has also been used in Refs. [4, 2] in the form

$$\chi_\infty(t) \sim \xi_\infty^{2-\eta}(t) (\ln \xi_\infty(t))^{\hat{\eta}}, \quad (66)$$

from where Eq. (52) follows, so there is still some difficulty hidden to solve our disagreement. Let us set $b = \xi_\infty(t)$ in (64):

$$\chi_\infty(t) = \xi_\infty^{-d+2y_h}(t)(\ln \xi_\infty(t))^{\hat{\eta}} \mathcal{Y}(x(\xi_\infty(t)), 0) \quad (67)$$

where the variable x in the scaling function \mathcal{Y} is evaluated at $\xi_\infty(t)$ to give

$$x(\xi_\infty(t)) = \xi_\infty(t)^{y_t} (\ln \xi_\infty(t))^{\hat{y}_t} |t| = (-\ln |t|)^{\hat{\delta}/\nu}. \quad (68)$$

The scaling function must have the behaviour $\mathcal{Y}(x, 0) \sim x^{-\gamma}$ when $|t| \rightarrow 0$ to recover the temperature singularity of the susceptibility $\chi_\infty(t, 0) \sim |t|^{-\gamma} (-\ln |t|)^{\hat{\gamma}}$. It follows that instead of (66), one has

$$\chi_\infty(t) \sim \xi_\infty^{2-\eta}(t)(\ln \xi_\infty(t))^{\hat{\eta}-\gamma\hat{\delta}/\nu} \quad (69)$$

and instead of Eq. (52), one has a third form for the exponent $\hat{\eta}$:

$$\hat{\eta} = \hat{\gamma} - \hat{\nu}(2 - \eta) + \gamma \frac{\hat{\delta}}{\nu}, \quad (70)$$

again compatible with $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}$ for the $4d$ Ising model. This suggests to use, instead of the ratio $R_\pm^{(3)}(t)$, the modified version

$$\begin{aligned} R_\pm^{(3\text{bis})}(t) &= \frac{\chi_\pm(t)}{\xi_\pm^{2-\eta}(t)(\ln \xi_\pm(t))^{\hat{\eta}-\gamma\hat{\delta}/\nu}} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma_\pm}{\xi_{0\pm}^{2-\eta}} (-\ln |t|)^{\hat{\gamma}-\hat{\eta}-\gamma\hat{\delta}/\nu-\hat{\nu}(2-\eta)} \rightarrow \frac{\Gamma_\pm}{\xi_{0\pm}^{2-\eta}} \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

which, again, is universal. The 4 standard scaling laws and the corresponding 4 hatted scaling laws are listed in table 1.

Ratio	scaling relation	hatted scaling relation
$\frac{m^2(- t)}{C_\pm(t)\chi_\pm(t) t ^2}$	$2\beta + \gamma = 2 - \alpha$	$2\hat{\beta} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\gamma}$
$\left. \frac{\chi_\pm(t)m^{\delta-1}(- t h)}{m_\pm^\delta(h)} \right _{h=h_\pm^{\text{LY}}(t)}$	$\beta(\delta - 1) = \gamma$	$\hat{\gamma} + \hat{\beta}(\delta - 1) - \delta\hat{\delta} = 0$
$\frac{\chi_\pm(t)}{\xi_\pm^{2-\eta}(t)(\ln \xi_\pm(t))^{\hat{\eta}-\gamma\hat{\delta}/\nu}}$	$\nu(2 - \eta) = \gamma$	$\hat{\gamma} - \hat{\nu}(2 - \eta) + \gamma \frac{\hat{\delta}}{\nu} = \hat{\eta}$
$\xi_\pm^d(t) f_\pm^{\text{sing}}(t)$	$2 - \alpha = \nu d$	$\hat{\alpha} = d\hat{\delta} - d\hat{\nu}$

Table 1: The main scaling laws and hatted scaling laws and the associated universal combinations of amplitudes.

So far so good, but the situation is not yet clear, since the case of percolation in 6 dimensions (its upper critical dimension) is maybe a counterexample. With $\gamma = 1$, $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$, $\eta = 0$, and the values of the logarithmic correction exponents $\hat{\gamma} = \frac{2}{7}$, $\hat{\nu} = \frac{5}{42}$ and of the pseudo-critical exponent $\hat{\delta} = \frac{1}{d_{\text{uc}}} = \frac{1}{6}$, using Eq. (70) we predict $\hat{\eta} = \frac{8}{21}$, while Kenna and coworkers predict $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{21}$ from Eq. (52).

This latter result conforms to an analytic prediction from Ref. [18], but on the other hand, our value is supported by an FSS prediction by Ruiz-Lorenzo [19], $\chi_L L^{-2} \sim (\ln L)^{8/21}$. This disagreement demands further analysis.

In Ref. [2], Kenna has listed the values of the known hatted critical exponents for a series of models, and when $\hat{\eta}$ was not known, he has proposed the expected value from the use of Eq. (52). An interesting model is missing from the list, the tricritical Ising model, which has logarithmic corrections at its upper critical dimension $d_{\text{uc}} = 3$ and has non-zero $\hat{\phi} = 1/3$. We will now analyse this universality class in more detail.

4 The tricritical Ising universality class in the Blume-Capel model at the upper critical dimension

The spin-1 Blume-Capel model [20, 21] is a lattice model defined by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j + \Delta \sum_i \sigma_i^2 - H \sum_i \sigma_i, \quad (72)$$

where the spin variables $\sigma_i = -1, 0, +1$, $J > 0$ denotes the ferromagnetic exchange interaction among nearest-neighbour sites ($\langle i, j \rangle$ indicates summation over nearest neighbours), and Δ is the crystal-field strength that controls the density of vacancies (the $\sigma_i = 0$ states can be viewed as vacancies in an ordinary $\sigma_i = \pm 1$ Ising model) [22]. For $\Delta = -\infty$, vacancies are suppressed from the partition function and the Hamiltonian reduces to that of the Ising ferromagnet. At $\Delta = 0$ the second-order transition is in the pure Ising model universality class. When Δ increases from 0, a perturbation theory shows that the transition temperature decreases along a line which remains of Ising-like second-order phase transition. On the other hand, in the vicinity of $T = 0$ the transition is first-order and persists first-order at small values of T until it reaches the second-order line. Right at the limit, there is a tricritical point characterized by specific values of T_t , Δ_t . Tricriticality corresponds to the ϕ^6 Landau expansion [23] and the upper critical dimension is thus $d_{\text{uc}} = 3$, the case that we consider now.

Using appropriate linear combinations of the physical parameters, determined by the geometry of the phase diagram and the fact that they have to vanish at the tricritical point, the even scaling fields are $\tau = (T - T_t)/T_t$, $g = (\Delta - \Delta_t)/T_t + a\tau$, and the odd scaling field is the usual magnetic field $h = H/T_t$. Lawrie and Sarbach [24] have shown that the free energy density at the tricritical point in $3d$ reads, in terms of these scaling fields, as

$$f_{\text{tri}}^{\text{sing}}(\tau, g, h) = b^{-3} \mathcal{F}_{\pm}(b^1 (\ln b)^{\frac{4}{15}} \tau, b^2 (\ln b)^{\frac{1}{3}} g (1 - a^{-1} b^{-1} (\ln b)^{-\frac{1}{15}} \tau g), b^{\frac{5}{2}} (\ln b)^{\frac{1}{6}} h), \quad (73)$$

where the non universal metric factors κ_i have been omitted. Here, the subscript ‘tri’ indicates that the expression is valid in the vicinity of the tricritical point where $\tau = g = h = 0$. The logarithmic corrections are explicitly given in this expression.

The notations in Ref. [24] necessitate to be adapted to be consistent with those that we have used until now. Leaving aside the logarithmic corrections




Figure 1: Typical phase diagram of the Blume-Capel model in the (T, Δ) plane. The λ line is a line of second-order phase transition in the Ising model universality class that ends at a tricritical point of coordinates (T_t, Δ_t) . The dashed line is a first-order transition line. The most singular even scaling field at the tricritical point is g , a linear combination of τ and of $\Delta - \Delta_t$.

for a while, let us write

$$f_{\text{tri}}^{\text{sing}}(\tau, g, h) = b^{-d} \mathcal{F}_{\pm}(b^{y_{\tau}} \tau, b^{y_g} g, b^{y_h} h). \quad (74)$$

The dominant even scaling field is g , the usual singularities and critical exponents are therefore defined by their behaviours w.r.t. g instead of τ which brings corrections to scaling due to crossover. This means that the t and y_t of the three previous sections of this paper will now be replaced by g and y_g . At $h = 0$ and $\tau = 0$, setting $b = |g|^{-1/y_g}$ leads to $f_{\text{tri}}^{\text{sing}}(0, g, 0) \sim |g|^{d/y_g}$. This is compatible with $\nu = 1/y_g$. The specific heat measures the total energy fluctuations. Its most singular part is defined by

$$C(\tau, g, h) = \frac{\partial^2 f_{\text{tri}}^{\text{sing}}}{\partial g^2} = b^{-d+2y_g} \mathcal{C}_{\pm}(b^{y_{\tau}} \tau, b^{y_g} g, b^{y_h} h) \sim |g|^{-\alpha} \quad \text{when } \tau, h = 0 \quad (75)$$

with $\alpha = \frac{2y_g - d}{y_g}$. This shows that the exponent d/y_g of $f_{\text{tri}}^{\text{sing}}(0, g, 0)$ is thus equal to the usual value $2 - \alpha$ and the hyperscaling relation holds.

We can also define less singular exponents w.r.t. the scaling field τ (with tilde notation), e.g. $C(\tau, 0, 0) \sim |\tau|^{-\tilde{\alpha}}$. A similar analysis as above shows that $f_{\text{tri}}^{\text{sing}}(\tau, 0, 0) \sim |\tau|^{d/y_{\tau}}$ with $d/y_{\tau} = (d/y_g)\phi = (2 - \alpha)\phi$ with $\phi = y_g/y_{\tau}$ the crossover exponent. There is a caveat here since d/y_{τ} is not equal to $2 - \tilde{\alpha}$ as one can find in the literature [24]. Indeed, $\tilde{\alpha} = (2y_g - d)/y_{\tau} = \alpha\phi$, hence $2 - \tilde{\alpha} = 2 - \alpha\phi \neq (2 - \alpha)\phi$. This is important to collect correct expressions, and this is done in table 2.

This being said, we can now incorporate the logarithmic corrections in Eq. (74) to get

$$f_{\text{tri}}^{\text{sing}}(\tau, g, h) = b^{-d} \mathcal{F}_{\pm}(b^{y_{\tau}} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_{\tau}} \tau, b^{y_g} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_g} g, b^{y_h} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_h} h), \quad (76)$$

leading even field, g		subleading even field, τ		leading odd field, h	
$C(0, g, 0) \sim g ^{-\alpha}$	$\alpha = \frac{2y_g - d}{y_g}$	$C(\tau, 0, 0) \sim \tau ^{-\tilde{\alpha}}$	$\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha\phi$	$m(0, 0, h) \sim h ^{1/\delta}$	$\delta = \frac{y_h}{d - y_h}$
$m(0, g, 0) \sim g ^\beta$	$\beta = \frac{d - y_h}{y_g}$	$m(\tau, 0, 0) \sim \tau ^{\tilde{\beta}}$	$\tilde{\beta} = \beta\phi$		
$\chi(0, g, 0) \sim g ^{-\gamma}$	$\gamma = \frac{2y_h - d}{y_g}$	$\chi(\tau, 0, 0) \sim \tau ^{-\tilde{\gamma}}$	$\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma\phi$		

Table 2: Leading and subleading singularities for the most common physical quantities and the definitions of the associated exponents. Here the crossover exponent is $\phi = y_g/y_\tau$.

and the comparison with Eq. (73) simply leads to

$$y_g = 2, \quad y_h = \frac{5}{2}, \quad y_\tau = 1, \quad (77)$$

$$\hat{y}_g = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \hat{y}_h = \frac{1}{6}, \quad \hat{y}_\tau = \frac{4}{15}, \quad \hat{\nu} = \frac{1}{3}. \quad (78)$$

Quantity	leading exponent			logarithmic correction exponent				
	IM4D	Tri. IM	Perco.	IM4D	Tri. IM	Perco.		
$C(t, 0)$	$\alpha = \frac{2y_t - d}{y_t}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	-1	$\hat{\alpha} = (2 - \alpha)\hat{y}_t$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{7}$
$m_-(t, 0)$	$\beta = \frac{d - y_h}{y_t}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	1	$\hat{\beta} = \beta\hat{y}_t + \hat{y}_h$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{2}{7}$
$\chi(t, 0)$	$\gamma = \frac{2y_h - d}{y_t}$	1	1	1	$\hat{\gamma} = 2\hat{y}_h - \gamma\hat{y}_t$	$\frac{1}{3}$	0	$\frac{2}{7}$
$m_c(0, h)$	$\frac{1}{\delta} = \frac{d - y_h}{y_h}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\hat{\delta} = \frac{1}{\delta}\hat{y}_h + \hat{y}_h$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{2}{7}$
$h_{LY}(t, 0)$	$\Delta = \frac{y_h}{y_t}$	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{5}{4}$	2	$\hat{\Delta} = \Delta\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_h$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	0
$\xi(t, 0)$	$\nu = \frac{1}{y_t}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\hat{\nu} = \hat{\nu} - \nu\hat{y}_t$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{5}{42}$
$G(0, 0, \mathbf{r})$	$\eta = d - 2y_h + 2$	0	0	0	$\hat{\eta} = 2\hat{y}_h$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{8}{21}$

Table 3: Leading and logarithmic correction exponents for the most common physical quantities.

We can now deduce the values of the standard critical exponents and the associated logarithmic corrections exponents. They are listed in Table 3 for three universality classes which all have non-zero values of the pseudo-critical exponent $\hat{\nu}$, the Ising model in four dimensions, the tricritical Ising model in three dimensions, and the problem of percolation in six dimensions.

In this table, the first six lines are not controversial. The seventh line presents the correlation function correction exponent $\hat{\eta}$ which follows from our scaling law, in any of the forms given in Eqs. (61), (65) or (70). These three expressions are mutually consistent, but they differ from Eq. (52) used by Kenna and his co-authors. This latter formula would respectively predict for the three universality

classes the values 0 , $-\frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{21}$. We have seen that the first value, 0 , is falsified in the $4d$ IM case by Refs. [16, 17], but the results of Ref. [18] invalidates our third value $\frac{8}{21}$, the last entry of in table 3 while Ref. [19] on the contrary supports this value.

The case of the tricritical Ising model in three dimensions appears crucial and we have to provide numerical results in support of our result. The numerical computation of the correlation function is known to be a very delicate problem and we will approach the value of the exponent $\hat{\eta}$ differently, using FSS. Another delicate aspect is the also well-known fact that extracting logarithmic corrections in the vicinity of a critical point can be extremely difficult [25]. Recently, it was found that very accurate results can be obtained numerically in the Blume-Capel model with relatively small system sizes [26] via the analysis of the zeros of the partition function, and in particular the Lee-Yang zeros [27, 28]. The Lee-Yang zeros are connected to the susceptibility [29] via

$$\chi(g, 0, L^{-1}) \simeq L^{-d} \sum_{j=1}^{L^d} h_j^{-2}(g, 0, L^{-1}), \quad (79)$$

where j labels the zeros in the upper half complex plane are indexed in order of increasing distance from the critical point. The sum is dominated by the lowest zero, the Lee-Yang edge h^{LY} , and at the tricritical point, the FSS of the susceptibility is thus linked to that of h^{LY} :

$$\chi(0, 0, L^{-1}) \simeq L^{-d} h^{\text{LY}}(0, 0, L^{-1})^{-2} \simeq L^{2-\eta} (\ln L)^{\hat{\eta}}. \quad (80)$$

In the presence of logarithmic corrections to the scaling form of the Lee-Yang edge obeys

$$h^{\text{LY}}(g, h) = b^{-y_h} (\ln b)^{-\hat{y}_h} \mathcal{H}_{\pm}(b^{y_{\tau}} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_{\tau}} \tau, b^{y_g} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_g} g, b^{y_h} (\ln b)^{\hat{y}_h} h) \quad (81)$$

compatible with the behaviour in terms of the thermal scaling field g , as it can be shown using the scaling laws of Table 3, $h^{\text{LY}}(g, 0) \sim |g|^{\Delta} (-\ln |g|)^{\hat{\Delta}}$. If one sits exactly at the tricritical point, $\tau = g = h = 0$, we can extract the FSS behaviour of the zeros by setting $b = L$,

$$h^{\text{LY}}(0, 0, L^{-1}) \simeq L^{-y_h} (\ln L)^{-\hat{y}_h} \quad (82)$$

and it follows that we expect

$$h^{\text{LY}}(0, 0, L^{-1}) \simeq L^{(\eta-2-d)/2} (\ln L)^{-\hat{\eta}/2} \quad (83)$$

which agrees with Eq. (80).

As we said, this form can be checked with good accuracy at the price of relatively light Monte Carlo simulations. The coordinates of the tricritical point of the Blume-Capel model in $3d$ are found in the literature [30], $T_t \simeq 1.4182$, $\Delta_t \simeq 2.84479(30)$, but the value of Δ_t does not seem to be as accurate as that of the temperature and for example Zierenberg et al [31] report instead $\Delta_t \simeq 2.8446(3)$. Let us first analyse this problem ourselves. In Figure 2, we report the FSS of the magnetization at $T_t \simeq 1.4182$ for several values of Δ ranging from 2.8440 to 2.8448. The magnetization is expected to follow the FSS behaviour

$$m(0, 0, L^{-1}) \sim L^{-d+y_h} (\ln L)^{\hat{y}_h} \quad (84)$$

with $d - y_h = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\hat{y}_h = \frac{1}{6}$. The data points are fitted as $m(0, 0, L^{-1})L^{\frac{1}{2}} = a(\ln L)^b$ with a, b free parameters. The closest to the expected result (the black dashed line) is at $\Delta = 2.8442$ where we get $b = 0.155 \pm 0.007$. We will thus consider this value of Δ as our estimate for the coordinate of the tricritical point Δ_t .




Figure 2: FSS of the magnetization for the tricritical Ising model (Blume-Capel model at its tricritical temperature) in $3d$ at $T_t = 1.4182$ and various values of the crystal field parameter Δ for sizes ranging from $L = 12$ to 22 . The best fit is for $\Delta = 2.8442$ ($\chi^2/\text{dof} = 30.40/4 = 7.6$ at $\Delta = 2.8440$, $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 5.39/4 = 1.35$ at $\Delta = 2.8442$, $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 28.36/4 = 7.09$ at $\Delta = 2.8446$ and $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 76.74/4 = 19.18$ at $\Delta = 2.8448$).




Figure 3: FSS of the Lee-Yang edge for the tricritical Ising model (Blume-Capel model at its tricritical temperature) in $3d$ at $T_t = 1.4182$ and various values of Δ for sizes ranging from $L = 12$ to 22 .

The analysis of the Lee-Yang edge is presented in figure 3 with a larger choice of values of Δ and, again, the best fit is at $\Delta_t = 2.8442$ where the estimate of \hat{y}_h is now slightly larger at 0.172 ± 0.008 .

The reader could still question the sensitivity of the value of \hat{y}_h with the choice of tricritical temperature T_t . Indeed, when one looks at the FSS of the tricritical magnetization, for example, the effective exponent of the log term is either positive and close to the expected value or can differ from the expectation and even be negative, depending on the values of the crystal field Δ (see Figure 2). It makes sense to ask whether the role of T_t may also have a significative influence. We believe that the results presented in this work are reliable and to support the consistency of the numerical data, we show in figure 4 that slight variations of T change the regime from the pure 3d Ising model at $T = 1.4197$, for which $y_h = 2.4815(15)$ [32] is expected, to first-order at $T = 1.4070$ where an effective FSS $y_h = d$ is expected [33]. $T = 1.4182$ safely recovers $y_h^{\text{Tri}} = 2.5$ to a very good accuracy and confirms the tricritical value of $T_t \simeq 1.4182$. Note that the transition line in the phase diagram in the vicinity of the tricritical point is almost at a fixed value of Δ , this is why the three regimes are found at the same crystal field value of $\Delta = 2.8442$.




Figure 4: FSS of the Lee-Yang edge in the vicinity of the tricritical point of the Blume-Capel model in $3d$, at $T_t = 1.4070, 1.4182$ and 1.4197 and $\Delta = 2.8442$ to show the first-order, the tricritical, and the ordinary second-order regimes from the values of the corresponding RG dimensions y_h .

5 Conclusions

The numerical results obtained for the tricritical Ising model universality class in $3d$ confirm the prediction that $\hat{y}_h = \frac{1}{6}$, hence the prediction $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{3}$, while the scaling law of Kenna and co-workers would have given $-\frac{1}{3}$ instead.

In Ref. [2], Ralph Kenna concluded his review with a table collecting the sets of critical exponents and hatted critical exponents for various models and predicting those which were still unknown from the use of the newly discovered

scaling laws, and in particular Eq. (52) that we scrutinize and propose to replace by Eq. (70) or any of the equivalent forms that we have derived.

In the list, the $O(n)$ model with long-range interactions [34, 35] was predicted to have $\hat{\eta} = 0$. We propose instead $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}$, following from $\hat{y}_t = (4 - n)/[2(n + 8)]$, $\hat{y}_h = \frac{1}{4}$.

The Lee-Yang edge in $6d$ [19] was predicted to have $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{9}$. We rather have $\hat{y}_t = -\frac{2}{9}$ and $\hat{y}_h = \frac{2}{9}$, hence $\hat{\eta} = \frac{4}{9}$.

For lattice animals in $8d$ [19], Kenna predicted $\hat{\eta} = \frac{1}{9}$ and we have $\hat{y}_t = \hat{y}_h = \frac{2}{9}$ and $\hat{\eta} = \frac{4}{9}$.

The case of scale-free networks [36, 37, 38] is particular in the sense that Ralph Kenna did not make any prediction for $\hat{\eta}$, because some exponents were missing. From those which are known, we can deduce that $\hat{y}_t = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $\hat{y}_h = -\frac{1}{4}$ and we deduce thus $\hat{\eta} = -\frac{1}{2}$ which is a new prediction.

Eventually, we believe that the n -colour Ashkin-Teller model in $2d$ is still under question since the exponents collected by Shalaev and Jug [39] do not satisfy the “standard” scaling laws, e.g. the values reported do not obey $\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\gamma} = 2\hat{\beta}$.

To finish this paper, we would like to say that the scaling laws discovered by Ralph Kenna and his co-workers are invaluable because they make it possible to establish (or falsify) the consistency of the results obtained for various models. The case of the n -colour Ashkin-Teller model in $2d$ is such an example where it seems that there are still some inconsistencies to solve. Although we happened to contradict one of these scaling laws, we admire the piece of work done in Refs. [2, 3, 4] where we recognize Ralph’s footprint.

Acknowledgements: We are thankful to Wolfhard Janke for very interesting discussions. We thank the Collège Doctoral 02-07 Statistical Physics of Complex Systems (University of Leipzig-Université de Lorraine) and the L⁴ collaboration Leipzig - Lviv - Lorraine - Coventry. LM thanks Coventry University and the Collège Doctoral for financial support.

References

- [1] M. Kardar, Statistical Physics of Fields, Cambridge University Press, 2007,
doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511815881
- [2] R. Kenna, Universal scaling relations for logarithmic-correction exponents, Order, Disorder and Criticality: Advanced Problems of Phase Transition Theory Volume 3, arXiv/1205.4252.
- [3] R. Kenna, D. A. Johnston and W. Janke, Scaling Relations for Logarithmic Corrections, Phys. Rev. Lett. , **96**, 115701, (2006),
doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.115701.

- [4] R. Kenna, D. A. Johnston and W. Janke, Self-Consistent Scaling Theory for Logarithmic Correction Exponents, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **97**, 155701, (2006), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.169901.
- [5] V. Privman, P.C. Hohenberg, A. Aharony, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, Vol. 14, edited by C. DOMB AND J.L. LEBOWITZ (Academic, New York, 1991).
- [6] M.E. Fisher, Notes, definitions, and formulas for critical point singularities, In *Critical phenomena. Proceedings of a conference held in Washington, DC*, ed. M.S. Green and J.V. Sengers, 1965.
- [7] M. Nauenberg and D.J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 837 (1980), doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.44.837
- [8] J.L. Cardy, M. Nauenberg and D.J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev. B* **22**, 2560 (1980), doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.22.2560
- [9] B. Berche and C. Chatelain, *Phase transitions in two-dimensional random Potts models* (ed Holovatch, Y.) (World Scientific, Singapore, 2004), <https://arxiv.org/pdf/cond-mat/0207421.pdf>
- [10] L.N. Shchur, B. Berche and P. Butera, A study of logarithmic corrections and universal amplitude ratios in the two-dimensional 4-state Potts model, *Europhysics Letters* **81** (3), 30008, (2008), doi: 10.1209/0295-5075/81/30008
- [11] R. Kenna and B. Berche, A new critical exponent ν and its logarithmic counterpart ν_{log} , *Condensed Matter Physics* **16**, 23601 (2013), doi:10.5488/CMP.16.23601
- [12] Ruiz-Lorenzo J.J., *Condens. Matter Phys.*, Revisiting (logarithmic) scaling relations using renormalization group, 2017, **20**, 13601, doi:10.5488/CMP.20.13601
- [13] R. Kenna and B. Berche, Fisher's scaling relation above the upper critical dimension, *EPL* **105**, 26005 (2014), doi:10.1209/0295-5075/105/26005
- [14] R. Kenna and B. Berche, On a previously unpublished work with Ralph Kenna, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01675 (2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.01675>
- [15] Kenna, R., Finite size scaling for $O(N)$ ϕ^4 -theory at the upper critical dimension, *Nuclear Physics B*, 2004, **691** [FS], 292–304, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.05.012
- [16] E. Luijten, Interaction Range, Universality and the Upper Critical Dimension, PhD thesis, Delft University (1997).
- [17] Lv Jian-Ping, Xu Wanwan, Sun Yanan, Chen Kun, Deng Youjin, Finite-size scaling of $O(n)$ systems at the upper critical dimensionality, *Natl Sci Rev*, 2021, **8**, nwaa212, doi:10.1093/nsr/nwaa212

- [18] O. Stenull and H.-K. Janssen, Logarithmic corrections to scaling in critical percolation and random resistor networks, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 036129 (2003), doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.68.036129
- [19] J.J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, Logarithmic corrections for spin glasses, percolation and Lee-Yang singularities in six dimensions, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **31** 8773 (1998), doi:10.1088/0305-4470/31/44/006
- [20] H.W. Capel, On the possibility of first-order phase transitions in Ising systems of triplet ions with zero-field splitting, *Physica* **32**, 966–988 (1966), doi:10.1016/0031-8914(66)90027-9.
- [21] M. Blume, Theory of the First-Order Magnetic Phase Change in UO₂, *Phys. Rev.* **141**, 517–524 (1966), doi:10.1103/PhysRev.141.517.
- [22] J.L. Cardy, *Scaling and Renormalization in Statistical Physics*, Cambridge University Press, 1996, doi:10.1017/CBO9781316036440
- [23] Berche B., Ellis T., Holovatch Yu., Kenna R., Phase transitions above the upper critical dimension, *SciPost Physics Lecture Notes*, 2022, **60**, 1-44, doi:10.21468/SciPostPhysLectNotes.60.
- [24] I.D. Lawrie and S. Sarbach, Theory of tricritical points, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* (edited by C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz, Academic Press, London, 1984).
- [25] L.N. Shchur, B. Berche and P. Butera, Numerical revision of the universal amplitude ratios for the two-dimensional 4-state Potts model, *Nuclear Physics B* **811** (3), 491-518 (2009), doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2008.10.024
- [26] L. Moueddene, N.G. Fytas, Yu. Holovatch, R. Kenna and B. Berche, Critical and tricritical singularities from small-scale Monte Carlo simulations: The Blume-Capel model in two dimensions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02720 (2024)0, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2401.02720.pdf>
- [27] C.N. Yang and T.D. Lee, Statistical Theory of Equations of State and Phase Transitions. I. Theory of Condensation, *Phys. Rev.* **87**, 404–409 (1952), doi:10.1103/PhysRev.87.404.
- [28] T.D. Lee and C.N. Yang, Statistical Theory of Equations of State and Phase Transitions. II. Lattice Gas and Ising Model, *Phys. Rev.* **87**, 410 (1952), doi:10.1103/PhysRev.87.410.
- [29] B. Berche, R. Kenna and J.-C. Walter, Hyperscaling above the upper critical dimension, *Nuclear Physics B* **865** [FS], 115–132 (2012), doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.07.021
- [30] M. Deserno, Tricriticality and the Blume-Capel model: A Monte Carlo study within the microcanonical ensemble, *Physical Review E*, **56**, 5204-5210 (1997), doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.56.5204.
- [31] J. Zierenberg, N.G. Fytas, and W. Janke, Parallel multicanonical study of the three-dimensional Blume-Capel model, *Physical Review E* **91** (2015), doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.91.032126.

- [32] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Critical phenomena and renormalization-group theory, *Physics Reports* **368**, 549-727 (2002), doi:10.1016/S0370-1573(02)00219-3
- [33] V. Privman and M.E. Fisher, Finite-size effects at first-order transitions, *J Stat Phys* **33**, 385–417 (1983), doi:10.1007/BF01009803
- [34] M.E. Fisher, S.-K. Ma and B.G. Nickel, Critical Exponents for Long-Range Interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **29**, 917 (1972), doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.29.917
- [35] E. Luijten and H.W.J.Blöte, Classical critical behavior of spin models with long-range interactions, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 8945 (1997), doi: 10.1103/PhysRevB.56.8945
- [36] Hyunsuk Hong, Hyunggyu Park, and Lei-Han Tang, Finite-size scaling of synchronized oscillation on complex networks, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 066104 (2007), doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.76.066104
- [37] V. Palchykov, C. von Ferber, R. Folk, Yu. Holovatch and R. Kenna, Critical phenomena on scale-free networks: Logarithmic corrections and scaling functions, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 011145, (2010), doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.82.011145
- [38] M. Krasnytska, B. Berche, Yu. Holovatch and R. Kenna, Partition function zeros for the Ising model on complete graphs and on annealed scale-free networks, *J. Phys. A* **49** (13), 135001 (2016), doi: 10.1088/1751-8113/49/13/135001
- [39] G. Jug and B.N. Shalaev, Critical behavior of weakly disordered anisotropic systems in two dimensions, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 3442, (1996), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.54.3442.