

# Order parameters in quasi-1D spin systems

Garry Goldstein<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*garrygoldsteinwinnipeg@gmail.com*

In this work we extend the idea of the meanfield. Meanfields approximately map - through some self consistency relation - a complex, usually manybody, problem to a simpler more readily solvable problem. Prototypical examples of simpler meanfield problem (meanfield systems) are the single site and free particle problems - which are solvable. Here we propose a new class of simple meanfield systems where the simple problem to be solved is a 1D spin chain. These meanfields are particularly useful for studying quasi-1D models. We illustrate this idea by considering meanfields for the Ising and ferromagnetic Heisenberg models with one direction coupled much more strongly than the other directions (quasi-1D systems) which map at meanfield level onto the 1D Ising and 1D ferromagnetic Heisenberg models. Magnetic phase transition temperatures and are obtained for both models.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Meanfields have been very successfully used as a first step towards the solution of many complex manybody problems [1–5]. In a meanfield like solution we map a difficult manybody problem into a simpler one (a simpler system which can be efficiently solved) solve the problem and solve for self consistency to relate the parameters of the solution of the simpler problem to the more complex many body problem to be solved. The prototypical meanfield simple system is the single site problem or the single particle problem. In the single particle case the complex system is mapped onto a quadratic Hamiltonian, through say Hartree-Fock [5], in a self consistent manner. In the single site problem a spin model is mapped onto a single spin problem which can be efficiently solved and self consistency is imposed through equating the parameters of the single site problem to those of the neighboring spins [1]. The single site problem may be extended, as in Dynamical Meanfield Theory (DMFT), to a single site and a bath whereby the frequency dependence of the Green's functions of the manybody system may be modeled self consistently through the dissipative effects of the bath [6]. Another important simple system which may be efficiently analyzed is the 1D system. Indeed many 1D models are solvable through transfer matrix [1], Density matrix Renormalization Group (DMRG) [7], Jordan-Wigner fermionization [3] and the Bethe Ansatz (BA) [8, 9] techniques. In this work we consider 3D systems where the coupling in one direction is much stronger than the coupling in the other two (quasi-1D systems). For these systems mapping the system to a 1D meanfield system and solving for self consistency is more efficient than regular meanfield (we verify this in Appendix A). We illustrate this idea through the 3D (quasi-1D) Ising model whose meanfield is the 1D Ising model in an external field (which is solvable by transfer matrix techniques) and the 3D (quasi-1D) ferromagnetic Heisenberg model whose meanfield is the 1D ferromagnetic Heisenberg model in an external field (which is solvable by BA techniques). We choose these two examples because of their simplicity clarity and because in both 3D and 1D these models are prototypical examples of models with

magnetic phase transitions.

## II. ISING EXAMPLE

Consider a 3D quasi-1D Ising model in an external field with the following Hamiltonian:

$$H_I = -\Gamma \sum_i \sigma^z(i) \sigma^z(i + \hat{z}) - J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, j \neq i \pm \hat{z}} \sigma^z(i) \sigma^z(j) + B \sum_i \sigma_i^z \quad (1)$$

at a temperature  $\beta$  and  $\langle i, j \rangle$  are nearest neighbors, here we will be interested in  $\Gamma \gg J$  so that the 1D chains along the z-axis are more strongly coupled than the transverse plane. Now consider the following meanfield Hamiltonian at unit temperature:

$$H_{MF} = \gamma \sum_i^N \sigma^z(i) \sigma^z(i + 1) + h \sum_i \sigma^z(i) \quad (2)$$

Where for self consistency:

$$\gamma = \beta\Gamma, \quad h = \beta J \mathcal{N} m - \beta B \quad (3)$$

here  $\mathcal{N} \sim 2(d-1)$  is the number of nearest neighbors in the weakly coupled directions and  $d = 3$  is the dimension of the system. Then we know that the magnetization  $m$  in the thermodynamic limit for the Hamiltonian in Eq. (2) at unit temperature is given by 1 [1]:

$$m = \frac{\sinh(h)}{[\exp(-4\gamma) + (\sinh(h))^2]^{1/2}} \quad (4)$$

This is an exact result (using the transfer matrix formalism) [1]. Now we substitute the meanfield relations in Eq. (3) and obtain:

$$m = \frac{\sinh(\beta J \mathcal{N} m - \beta B)}{[\exp(-4\beta\Gamma) + (\sinh(\beta J \mathcal{N} m - \beta B))^2]^{1/2}} \quad (5)$$

Setting  $B = 0$  and linearizing to find the phase transition temperature we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \exp(2\beta\Gamma) \beta J \mathcal{N} m, \\ 1 &= \exp(2\beta\Gamma) \beta J \mathcal{N} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

leads to magnetism. Taking the logarithm of both sides we see that:

$$2\beta\Gamma = -\log(\beta J \mathcal{N}) \quad (7)$$

Introducing

$$\lambda = \frac{\Gamma}{J \mathcal{N}} \gg 1 \quad (8)$$

We get that:

$$2\lambda = -\frac{\log(\beta J \mathcal{N})}{\beta J \mathcal{N}} \quad (9)$$

We now write:

$$\beta_0 J \mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \quad (10)$$

Then:

$$-\frac{\log(\beta J \mathcal{N})}{\beta J \mathcal{N}} \cong \frac{\log(2\lambda)}{\beta J \mathcal{N}} \quad (11)$$

This means that:

$$\beta_1 J \mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{2\lambda \log(2\lambda)} \quad (12)$$

In general we can iterate the solution through the relation (though Eq. (12) is often enough):

$$\beta_{n+1} J \mathcal{N} = -\frac{1}{2\lambda \log(\beta_n J \mathcal{N})} \quad (13)$$

We note that the usual meanfield equations the phase transition temperature can be found through the following relationship:

$$2\beta\Gamma + \beta J \mathcal{N} = 1 \quad (14)$$

Which are much worse as it predicts:

$$\beta J \mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{2\lambda + 1} \quad (15)$$

which is significantly different, for large  $\lambda$ , then Eq. (12), see Appendix A.

### III. FERROMAGNETIC HEISENBERG MODEL EXAMPLE

We consider the anisotropic 3D (quasi-1D) ferromagnetic Heisenberg model with the following Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -\mathcal{J} \sum_i \vec{\sigma}(i) \cdot \vec{\sigma}(i + \hat{z}) \\ &\quad - J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, j \neq i \pm \hat{z}} \vec{\sigma}(i) \cdot \vec{\sigma}(j) + B \sum_i \sigma_i^z \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

with  $\mathcal{J} \gg J$ . Now we consider the following meanfield Hamiltonian (which happens to be the Heisenberg model in an external field and as such solvable by BA techniques [8, 9]):

$$H_{MF} = -\mathcal{J} \sum_i \vec{\sigma}(i) \cdot \vec{\sigma}(i+1) + h \sum_i \sigma^z(i) \quad (17)$$

with

$$h = \mathcal{N} J \mathcal{M} + B \quad (18)$$

Where  $\mathcal{M}$  will be chosen self consistently that is:

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle \sigma^z(i) \rangle_{H_{MF}} \quad (19)$$

We will now solve Eqs. (17) and (19) and find the critical transition temperature where  $\mathcal{M}$  vanishes. This will be an extended meanfield treatment of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (16). Indeed the magnetic susceptibility  $\chi$  can be used to determine phase boundaries. We have that for the ferromagnetic Heisenberg model at temperature  $T$  the susceptibility is given by [8, 9]:

$$\chi = \mathcal{J}^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^2 + 0.581 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^{3/2} + 0.68 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right) \right) + \dots \quad (20)$$

Now to determine the phase transition temperature between magnetic and non-magnetic phase we use the relationship:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi h &= \mathcal{M} \\ \chi \mathcal{N} J \mathcal{M} &= \mathcal{M} \\ \chi \mathcal{N} J &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Where we have set  $B = 0$  to find the phase transition. As such for the phase transition between magnetic and non-magnetic we write:

$$\frac{\mathcal{N} J}{\mathcal{J}} \left( \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^2 + 0.581 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^{3/2} + 0.68 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right) \right) = 1 \quad (22)$$

Now we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{N} J}{\mathcal{J}} \left( \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^2 + 0.581 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^{3/2} + 0.68 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right) \right) \\ \cong \frac{\mathcal{N} J}{6\mathcal{J}} \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

This means that:

$$T_0 \cong \mathcal{J} \left( \frac{\mathcal{N} J}{6\mathcal{J}} \right)^{1/2} \quad (24)$$

Now we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{N} J}{\mathcal{J}} \left( \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^2 + 0.581 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right)^{3/2} + 0.68 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T} \right) \right) \\ \cong \frac{\mathcal{N} J}{\mathcal{J}} \left( \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T_0} \right)^2 + 0.581 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T_0} \right)^{3/2} + 0.68 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T_0} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

As such:

$$T_1 \cong \mathcal{J} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{N}J}{6\mathcal{J}} \left[ 1 - 2.23 \left( \frac{\mathcal{N}J}{\mathcal{J}} \right)^{1/4} - 1.67 \left( \frac{\mathcal{N}J}{\mathcal{J}} \right)^{1/2} \right]} \quad (26)$$

We can continue to iteratively solve the problem more and more accurately using the formula (though Eq. (26) is often sufficient):

$$T_{n+1} \cong \mathcal{J} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{N}J}{6\mathcal{J}} \left[ 1 - \frac{\mathcal{N}J}{\mathcal{J}} \left[ 0.581 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T_n} \right)^{3/2} - 0.68 \left( \frac{\mathcal{J}}{T_n} \right) \right] \right]} \quad (27)$$

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have extended the notion of the meanfield. We have proposed a new class of meanfield models where 1D systems which combined with self consistency may be used to efficiently solve for properties of anisotropic 3D or quasi-1D systems - where one direction is much more strongly coupled than the other. In this work we have illustrated this idea with the Ising and ferromagnetic Heisenberg models which are solvable by

transfer matrix and Bethe Ansatz techniques respectively and found transition temperatures as preliminary results. In future works it would be of interest to extend these results to many other quasi-1D systems systematically.

**Acknowledgements:** The author would like to thank Natan Andrei for useful discussions.

#### Appendix A: Onsager solution

We note that the Onsager relation for  $d = 2$  ( $\mathcal{N} = 2$ ) is that the critical temperature is given by [1, 10]:

$$\begin{aligned} \sinh(2\beta J) \sinh(2\beta \Gamma) &= 1 \\ \exp(2\beta \Gamma) \cdot \beta J &\cong 1 \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

This is the exact same relationship as in Eq. (6) for  $\mathcal{N} = 1$ , which means that:

$$\beta J = \frac{1}{2\lambda \log(2\lambda)} + \dots \quad (A2)$$

This means the meanfield is accurate within a factor of two while the regular meanfield is off by  $\sim \log(2\lambda)$  for large  $\lambda$  showing significant improvement of our approach over regular meanfield in the limit of strong anisotropy or nearly 1D systems.

- 
- [1] R. K. Pathria and P. D. Beale, *Statistical Mechanics* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2011).
  - [2] M. Continentino, *Quantum Scaling in Many Body Systems: An Approach to Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017).
  - [3] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011).
  - [4] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phases of Matter* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2023).
  - [5] P. Coleman, *Introduction to Many-Body Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016).
  - [6] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth and M. J. Rosenberg, *Rev. of Mod. Phys.* **68**, 13 (1996).
  - [7] U. Schollwöck, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 259 (2005).
  - [8] M. Takahashi, *Thermodynamics of one dimensional solvable models* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
  - [9] A. A. Zvyagin, *Finite Size Effects in Correlated Models Exact Results* (Imperial College Press, London, 2005).
  - [10] L. Onsager, *Phys. Rev.* **65**, 117 (1944).