

A study of the Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless transition in the XY model in a honeycomb lattice

Felipe E. F. de Andrade and Claudio J. DaSilva*

Instituto Federal de Goiás, Rua 76, Centro, Goiânia - GO, Brazil

L. N. Jorge

Instituto Federal do Mato Grosso - Campus Cáceres,

Av. dos Ramires s/n, 78201-380, Cáceres, MT, Brazil

(Dated: June 19, 2024)

Abstract

In this study, we examined the Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless (BKT) phase transition in the two-dimensional XY model on a honeycomb lattice. The XY model consists of normalized vectors arranged in a plane and is used to represent two-dimensional magnetic systems. It has applications in areas such as spintronics, superconductivity, and topological quantum computing. To calculate the thermodynamic properties of the system, we used numerical Monte Carlo simulations with the Metropolis algorithm and the Simulated Annealing protocol. The transition temperature was calculated using the second and fourth-order helicity modulus as the order parameter. We also calculated the vortex density and the formation energy of vortex-antivortex pairs. Our findings suggest that the critical temperature is $T_{BKT} = 0.576 \pm 0.001$, and the vortex formation energy is $2\mu = 4.0 \pm 0.5$. When compared to the square lattice, both results support the notion of the honeycomb lattice's instability.

INTRODUCTION

In 2016, scientists David J. Thouless, F. Duncan M. Haldane and J. Michael Kosterlitz were awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics for their discoveries regarding topological phase transitions in matter[1]. They were able to demonstrate that, at sufficiently low temperatures, the magnetic moments of a two-dimensional network of atoms form vortex-antivortex pairs, due to topological defects in the network. However, there is a topological phase transition that occurs when the system temperature increases. That is, at a certain critical temperature (T_{BKT}), these pairs dissociate and begin to roam freely through the network. Because of this, it was called the KT (Kosterlitz-Thouless) transition, or BKT, including the letter B to honor Vadim Berezinskii, a deceased theoretical physicist who presented ideas similar to those presented by Kosterlitz and Thouless[2]. In this context, the BKT transition was considered, by *The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*, the most important discovery of the 20th century for Condensed Matter Physics due to its applicability in several areas, not only theoretical Physics, but also technology, such as electronic systems, superconductors and future quantum computers[3].

The main theoretical model in the study of the BKT transition is the two-dimensional XY model of spins with continuous symmetry, which contains a *almost* long-range[4, 5] ordered phase, that is, unlike the ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic, this transition does not present spontaneous symmetry breaking in two dimensions. This model has great applicability, as it is capable of describing various physical systems, such as multicomponent superconductors[6, 7] and nematic or smectic liquid crystals[8, 9]. Several characteristics of this model have been analyzed analytically and numerically for decades, one of the main ones being the precise description of the nature of the BKT[10] transition. In this sense, numerous variations and generalizations of this model have been widely studied[11–13], in addition to including competition between ferromagnetic and nematic terms, they add different interactions between the spins[14, 15]. This allows the investigation of new thermodynamic phases and different types of topological defects. Despite all the advances, this model still presents several paradigms to be solved[16].

Therefore, the objective of this work is to investigate the BKT transition in a particular case of this model in the honeycomb network using numerical Monte Carlo (MC) simulations. The motivations for such a study are twofold. Recently, Wojtkiewicz et al. analytically

analyzed the long-range order of this model in the honeycomb network and found that this order is less stable than in the case of the square network[17]. Although we are proposing a classical numerical study, it is of interest to analyze the calculation of the transition temperature T_{BKT} for comparison with the square lattice. The second motivation is that although there are limitations in the use of computer simulations, since the size of the simulated systems is finite, the use of an appropriate parameter to characterize the BKT transition is also a controversial topic. Currently, the modulus of second-order helicity, which corresponds to the system's response to a global twist of the spins in a given direction, is accepted as the appropriate parameter for describing this transition[10]. The controversy lies in the fact that the discontinuity in the helicity module does not have a strong dependence on the size of the system. Although some authors show that even using the helicity modulus, a logarithmic correction allows obtaining T_{BKT} with good precision[18], it is possible to use fourth order helicity as an order parameter that presents in fact a discontinuity at the critical temperature, facilitating the description of the BKT transition via numerical simulations.

More specifically, we will use the MC method in conjunction with the Simulated Annealing protocol to calculate the second order helicity and also the fourth order helicity for estimate the critical temperature of the BKT transition. Furthermore, we will make use of the finite-size scaling (FSS) technique with logarithmic correction proposed by Y.D. Hsieh et al.[18], for extrapolation in the thermodynamic limit. In a complementary way, we will calculate the vortex density and the energy of formation of vortex pairs. This value can give clues about the stability of the honeycomb network compared to the square network.

First, we will review the thermodynamics of the XY model and the BKT transition. Then, we will detail the numerical protocol used and the calculation of thermodynamic properties. Next, we will discuss the results obtained. Finally, we will draw some conclusions.

THE MODEL

The XY model is a model of normalized vectors, ordered at the sites of a flat lattice[19]. This model is successful in representing magnetic systems in two dimensions, such as two-dimensional magnetic crystals[20] and two-dimensional van der Waals heterostructures[21]. These have great technological potential, more precisely in the area of spintronics, with the development of magnetic sensors, information storage devices and topological quantum

computing components[3].

The Hamiltonian of the XY model can be written as

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j), \quad (1)$$

where $J > 0$ is the ferromagnetic coupling (exchange interaction) constant, $\mathbf{S}_i = (S_i^x, S_i^y) = (\cos \theta_i, \sin \theta_i)$ represents the spin vector i , $\theta_i - \theta_j$ is the angle between each pair of spins located in the lattice sites and the notation $\langle i, j \rangle$ indicates that the sum is made only between neighboring sites closer.

The study of the phenomenon of phase transitions in models like this has stood out in the academic community for decades, due to the existence of a topological order[4]. Phase transitions are physical phenomena that cause a change of state from an ordered phase to a disordered one and vice versa. Generally, to characterize a phase transition, the behavior of an order parameter is described, a non-zero property during the ordered phase that equals zero in the disordered phase[22], for example, the magnetization in ferromagnetic materials, density in fluids, etc. If the first derivatives of the system's free energy are discontinuous at the transition temperature T_{BKT} , then this will be of first order and there will be spontaneous symmetry breaking of the system[23].

Close to T_{BKT} , the thermodynamic properties present a critical behavior, and can be described by power laws governed by critical exponents[24]. For example, in a simple ferromagnetic system, magnetization M , magnetic susceptibility χ , specific heat C behave as follows:

$$M \sim (-\epsilon)^\beta, \quad (2)$$

$$\chi \sim \epsilon^{-\gamma}, \quad (3)$$

$$C \sim \epsilon^{-\alpha}, \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon = \text{mod } 1 - T/T_{BKT}$ is the reduced temperature and the exponents α , β and γ are the critical exponents that describe the behavior of physical quantities of interest close to T_{BKT} . Note that these equations have asymptotic behavior, therefore, they are only valid when ϵ tends to zero, that is, at temperatures close to the critical temperature of the system.

However, in the XY model, there is no discontinuity in the first derivatives of the free energy at the transition temperature T_{BKT} , but rather in the second derivatives. Furthermore,

there is no spontaneous symmetry breaking of the system, but rather the change in the nature of quasi-long-range fluctuations of the order parameter, i.e., there are no abrupt changes of the system during the transition. This configures a phase transition of continuous (infinite) order[2, 4, 5]. For sufficiently low temperatures, there is the creation of vortex-antivortex pairs in the network, representing a state with almost long-range order, as predicted by Kosterlitz and Thouless[4]. Vortices can be characterized as topological defects[1] where the spins form a kind of whirlpool, that is, when adding the phase differences between the spins in a closed path proportional to the lattice, a value multiple of $\pm 2\pi$ [25].

As the temperature of the system increases, therefore, a transition from this state to a disordered state occurs, breaking the vortex-antivortex pairs, which begin to move freely through the system.

This transition is known as Berezinskii–Kosterlitz–Thouless (BKT) and occurs mainly in superconductors. In summary, the BKT phase transition is unconventional, as there is neither a change in the symmetry of the system nor a singularity in the free energy of the system. As there is a topological change in the order parameter, leading to a change in the behavior of the system, it is characterized as a topological phase transition and quasi-long-range order is a unique feature of these transitions.

NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

The Monte Carlo (MC) method uses random numbers to construct the phase space of a given physical system, which can be studied by sampling its microstates. This method had its advent in the study of physical problems during the Manhattan project and was used precisely to calculate probabilistic data linked to random phenomena. This capability of the MC method is convenient when you want to faithfully represent complex and random systems [22].

In this sense, to calculate the average value of a quantity of interest in a system in thermal equilibrium, we could use the MC method to generate several states to measure that quantity in each of them [26]. However, we know that the probability of a system in thermal equilibrium occupying a state i with energy E_i can be obtained through the

Boltzmann distribution

$$\mathcal{P}(E_i) = \frac{\exp(-\beta E_i)}{Z}, \quad (5)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$, with k_B being the Boltzmann constant, T the temperature, and Z the system partition function.

However, generating completely random and independent states is not a coherent representation of natural physical processes. Therefore, we use the Markov chain method to generate new states. In this method, a state i can only evolve into a state j if a transition probability is satisfied[19], that is, a new configuration cannot be chosen randomly among all possible ones, but rather from the configuration in which the system is located.

Thus, we can represent this transition probability as the ratio between the probabilities of existence of states i and j , that is,

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}(E_j)}{\mathcal{P}(E_i)} = \frac{\exp(-\beta E_j)/Z}{\exp(-\beta E_i)/Z} = \exp(-\beta \Delta E), \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta E = E_j - E_i$ is the energy difference between these states.

In the system studied in this work, each new configuration consists of assigning a new orientation to a single spin of the network, if this new orientation contributes to the reduction of the system's energy or does not change it, that is, $\Delta E \leq 0$, the movement is accepted. However, if there is an increase in the system's energy ($\Delta E > 0$), there is a chance that the new generated state will be accepted according to Equation 6. This protocol is known as the Metropolis algorithm, and can be implemented in MC simulations to generate configurations through a probability of acceptance of the new spin orientation (P_a) as follows[26]

$$P_a = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{se } \Delta E \leq 0, \\ \exp(-\beta \Delta E) & \text{se } \Delta E > 0. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

By scanning the entire network, that is, all N sites, where $N = L^2$, assigning a new orientation to the spin at each site and using the Metropolis algorithm to accept or not the new orientation, we perform which is known as the Monte Carlo step (m_s).

Due to the complexity of the phase space of the XY model, the Metropolis algorithm may encounter difficulties in sampling the low temperature region. A technique used to overcome this type of problem is called *Simulated Annealing* (SA)[22]. This process consists of initializing the system at an infinite temperature and cooling it uniformly and slowly

until $T \approx 0$. This protocol is efficient, as it allows the system not to get stuck in local energy minima when you want to minimize a function dependent on a very large number of parameters, since functions with this characteristic present difficulties in locating the global minimum due to the high number of local minima. Therefore, the SA procedure allows the system to pass through local minima without getting stuck in them, as long as the increase in β is small in each interval.

In practice, we start with $\beta = 0$ and increase it uniformly until we reach a desired temperature value. Each simulation consists of n temperature intervals, where within each interval m_s Monte Carlo steps are executed, resulting in a total of nm_s simulation steps. After each Monte Carlo step, the increments in β are given by $\beta = 1/k_B T = \beta_0 + i\Delta\beta_n$ ($i = 1, \dots, nm_s$), where $\Delta\beta_n = (\beta_n - \beta_0)/nm_s$.

To describe the thermodynamic behavior of the XY model, we calculate the average energy per site, the magnetization and the corresponding thermal fluctuations, that is, specific heat and susceptibility. The average energy in this case is given by:

$$\langle E \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle_T, \quad (8)$$

where N is the total number of spins in the network, \mathcal{H} is the Hamiltonian of the system given by Equation 1 and its average is taken at a certain temperature.

Although magnetization is not the appropriate order parameter for obtaining the BKT transition temperature, obtaining it is important for a qualitative understanding of the phase transition. Thus, based on the alignment of the spins in the ground state, we can write the magnetization of the XY model in a finite lattice as:

$$m = \langle |\mathbf{M}| \rangle_T = \frac{1}{N} \langle \sqrt{M_x^2 + M_y^2} \rangle_T, \quad (9)$$

where

$$M_x = \sum_{i=1}^N \cos \theta_i, \quad (10)$$

$$M_y = \sum_{i=1}^N \sin \theta_i. \quad (11)$$

With this definition, $m = 1$ in the ground state and should decrease as the temperature increases. For the specific heat and susceptibility we have,

$$C_v = \frac{\langle E^2 \rangle - \langle E \rangle^2}{k_B T^2}. \quad (12)$$

$$\chi = \frac{\langle M^2 \rangle - \langle M \rangle^2}{k_B T}. \quad (13)$$

In turn, the appropriate order parameter to study the BKT transition is the second-order helicity module[10, 18], which corresponds to the system's response to a global twist of the spins in a certain direction. To better understand helicity, let's imagine a square network of spins at a temperature $T = 0$ in the ferromagnetic phase with width L , and a magnetic field parallel to one of its edges is applied. The spins present on the edge that is under the action of the magnetic field must undergo a Φ variation in their orientation in relation to the original state. To minimize the energy of the system, each spin of neighboring rows parallel to the edge will undergo a rotation equivalent to an angle of $\phi = \Phi/(L - 1)$. Thus, the energy of this system in the presence of this spin is given by

$$E(\phi) = -J(L - 1)L \cos(\phi) = E(0) + J(L - 1)L[1 - \cos(\phi)]. \quad (14)$$

According to [27], for a small ϕ , we have $E(\phi) - E(0) = (J/2)(L - 1)L\phi^2$ by series expansion by Taylor. Using this result, we understand that the variation in the system's energy for a small twist corresponds to a function of ϕ^2 , thus, the helicity for $T = 0$ is defined as

$$\langle \Upsilon \rangle_{T=0} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 E(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2}, \quad (15)$$

For non-zero temperatures, the system is described by the free energy $F(\phi)$, whose global minimum (most stable state) corresponds to $\phi = 0$. If we expand $F(\phi)$ in a Taylor series around $\phi = 0$ we will have:

$$F(\phi) = \frac{\phi^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 F(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2} + \frac{\phi^4}{4!} \frac{\partial^4 F(\phi)}{\partial \phi^4}, \quad (16)$$

because the odd terms of the expansion are null. Thus, we define helicity and fourth-order helicity as follows:

$$\langle \Upsilon \rangle \equiv \frac{\partial^2 F(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2}, \quad (17)$$

$$\langle \Upsilon_4 \rangle \equiv \frac{\partial^4 F(\phi)}{\partial \phi^4}. \quad (18)$$

Knowing this, according to [10], for a potential that depends only on the difference in the angle between the spins, the helicity is given by:

$$\langle \Upsilon \rangle = \langle e \rangle - N\beta \langle s^2 \rangle, \quad (19)$$

being

$$e = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle_x} \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j), \quad (20)$$

$$s = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle_x} \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j) \quad (21)$$

and fourth order helicity can be written as:

$$\langle \Upsilon_4 \rangle = -\frac{1}{N} \langle e \rangle + 4\beta \langle s^2 \rangle - 3\beta [\langle \Upsilon^2 \rangle - \langle \Upsilon \rangle^2] + 2\beta^3 N^2 \langle s^4 \rangle. \quad (22)$$

Therefore, by Eq.(16), $\langle \Upsilon \rangle \geq 0$, because for small variations of ϕ , the free energy is dominated by the smallest non-zero derivative of F , which is positive. However, $\langle \Upsilon_4 \rangle$ must also be positive for any temperature T where $\langle \Upsilon \rangle$ is equal to zero. This implies that $\langle \Upsilon \rangle$ cannot continually go to zero at the transition temperature T_{BKT} if $\langle \Upsilon_4 \rangle$ at the same time approaches a minimum at T_{BKT} . Therefore, if $\langle \Upsilon_4 \rangle$ approaches a minimum in T_{BKT} , then the change in $\langle \Upsilon \rangle$ has to be discontinuous [10].

Thus, as demonstrated by Minnhagen, both orders of helicity can be used as an order parameter in the BKT[10] transition.

In order to estimate the critical BKT transition temperature, we use a second-order helicity property called the Nelson-Kosterlitz criterion[28], which predicts the following:

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Upsilon(T_{BKT}) = \frac{2T_{BKT}}{\pi}, \quad (23)$$

where L is the width of the network, that is, when the number of spins in the network tends to infinity, this equality is satisfied. Thus, the procedure is to calculate the helicity (we will just call second-order helicity helicity, since odd orders are null) for each temperature at different lattice sizes and compare with the straight line $r = 2T/\pi$. The intersection of these values gives us the critical temperature value for each network size.

To estimate the BKT transition temperature using fourth-order helicity (Equation 22), we simply need to identify the temperature that minimizes the function.

To overcome the limitation of the simulation to the size of the system, we will use the technique known as Finite-Size Scaling (FSS), developed by K. Binder[29]. For temperatures below the critical value, some physical quantities of interest, such as helicity Υ , can be described by a power law[14], as

$$\Upsilon \propto L^{-x}, \quad (24)$$




FIG. 1. Schematic representation of the honeycomb network, the spin vectors \mathbf{S}_i , the first neighbors and the transposition to a square network.

where x is an exponent dependent on the system temperature.

When the order parameter has a strong dependence on the size of the system and it is possible to find a singularity in the phase transition, a linear extrapolation ($x = 1$) is appropriate to find the critical temperature in the thermodynamic limit ($L \rightarrow \infty$). Otherwise, it cannot be guaranteed that the order parameter is discontinuous in this limit. This appears to be the case for second-order helicity. However, to try to get around this problem, some authors use a logarithmic dependency given by[14, 22, 30]:

$$T_c = \frac{B}{(\ln L)^2} + T_{BKT}, \quad (25)$$

where T_c corresponds to the values of the critical transition temperature obtained by the simulations, B is a dimensionless constant, L is the size of the system and T_{BKT} is the critical transition temperature in the thermodynamic limit.

RESULTS

As previously stated, in this work we study the case of XY spins located at the sites of a honeycomb lattice. Figure 1 schematically illustrates this network, the spin orientation at each site, its first neighbors and the transposition to the equivalent square network, used in the simulations. This transposition greatly facilitates the implementation of the Metropolis algorithm in Monte Carlo simulations, without any loss of generality.

To validate our computational procedure and statistical treatment of the data, we tested our code, first, on the square network. Some results are shown in the attached supplementary




FIG. 2. (a) Average energy, (b) specific heat, (c) average magnetization and (d) magnetic susceptibility as a function of temperature for various lattice sizes.

material. All of them are in excellent agreement with those recorded in the literature[18], highlighting the value of the critical temperature obtained via fourth-order helicity, resulting in $T_{BKT} = 0.897 \pm 0.004$. It is worth noting that all physical quantities presented in this section are in reduced units, for example, energy is in units of J and temperature is J/k_B .

For the honeycomb network, MC simulations were performed at sizes $L = [8, 16, 24, 32, 48, 64, 96, 128]$. In the SA protocol, we use $\beta_0 = 0$, $\beta_n = 4$, $n = 100$ and $m_s = 10^5$, using Metropolis dynamics to change the state of the spins. This totals 10^7 Monte Carlo steps for each round. Furthermore, ten independent simulations (using different seeds to initialize the random number generator) were performed for each network size. This was done to ensure the stability of the results. For the largest network size, all configurations were saved for each temperature range in order to describe the structural order of the spins and calculate the vortex density for each T .

Figure 2 shows some thermodynamic quantities as a function of temperature for all simulated network sizes. Although the specific heat and susceptibility present a discontinuity in the region close to the phase transition, in addition to a slight scaling tendency with increasing network size, determining the critical temperature using susceptibility is quite laborious. Some authors use the Binder cumulant crossing technique together with another sophisticated numerical procedure, which demands a lot of computational resources[14].




FIG. 3. Average second-order helicity as a function of temperature for different sizes of L . The straight line $2T/\pi$ indicates the critical temperature through the intersection with the helicity curve. As L increases, the temperature of the intersection point approaches the critical temperature.




FIG. 4. *Finite-size scaling* using the critical temperature obtained by second-order helicity for $L = 16, 24, 32, 48, 64, 96, 128$.

Figure 3 presents the second-order helicity given by Equation 19 as a function of temperature for various lattice sizes. Furthermore, the theoretical line $2T/\pi$ is shown. It can be seen that the discontinuity of helicity with lattice size in the transition is not very strong. A discontinuity is expected to actually occur at the thermodynamic limit. However, we can use the intersection of the line $2T/\pi$ with the curve to estimate the critical temperature for each temperature value. Note that, as the size of the network increases, the intersection




FIG. 5. Average fourth-order helicity as a function of temperature for various lattice sizes.

converges to the left, getting closer and closer to the real value of the critical temperature in the thermodynamic limit. A difficulty encountered here is determining the intersection point, since the curve obtained is not continuous. In turn, a larger sampling of points, using MC simulations with the Metropolis algorithm, would require a lot of computational resources.

Based on this, we individually calculated the T_{BKT} values for each network and performed the FSS (Equation 25), as shown in Figure 4. The critical temperature value obtained was $T_{BKT} = 0.582 \pm 0.002$. Note that this value is smaller when compared to that of the square network. An expected result, since the honeycomb network is considered less stable than the square one, that is, it supports *almost* long-range order for a smaller temperature range[17].

The same procedure was used to obtain fourth-order helicity as a function of temperature, as shown in Figure 5 for various lattice sizes. As shown by Minnhagen[10], this quantity has a minimum in the BKT transition region. Note that in addition to the minimum of this function moving to the left with increasing system size, the absolute value of helicity at this point also increases.

Obtaining the critical temperature through $\langle \Upsilon_4 \rangle$ is more direct, since finding the minimum of the function is simpler. Thus, a value of T_c was obtained for each network size and, again, we performed the FSS to calculate the T_{BKT} , as shown in Figure 6. In this case, we obtain $T_{BKT} = 0.576 \pm 0.001$. Based on the square lattice case, we are forced to believe that this




FIG. 6. *Finite-size scaling* using the critical temperature obtained by fourth-order helicity for $L = 8, 16, 24, 32, 48, 64, 96$ e 128 .

value is closer to the correct value. This needs to be verified by more precise future studies using other numerical or theoretical techniques.

To complement the analysis of the BKT transition, it is illustrative to show some spin configurations for different temperature values, in order to improve the understanding of the order manifested in the studied model. Figure 7 shows six different configurations for the largest simulated network, namely, $L = 128$. The color pattern indicates the individual orientation of each spin and follows the following scale: most intense red – $+\pi/2$ rad; most intense blue – $-\pi/2$ rad; white – 0 rad; black – $\pm 2\pi$ rad. For the temperature $T = 0.25$, below the critical temperature, we can see the formation of a pattern in the orientation of the spins (predominance of spins oriented vertically “up”) but which is not uniform throughout the network, this occurs due to the presence of vortex-antivortex pairs. For $T = 0.57$, exactly in the region where the transition occurs, it is easy to see how the system becomes quite heterogeneous, possibly due to the dissociation of the vortex-antivortex pairs. For temperatures higher than T_{BKT} , there is a misalignment of the spins and the disorder gradually increases until complete dissociation. The system now has a saturation in the number of vortex.

For a quantitative analysis of the dissociation of vortex-antivortex pairs, we can calculate the vortex density in the network. Each vortex occurs when the sum of $\theta_i - \theta_j$ in a closed path in the network is a multiple of $\pm 2\pi$ [25]. Based on this, we account for the vortex density for each temperature in our simulated temperature range on the $L = 128$ lattice,




FIG. 7. Network configurations $L = 128$ for various temperatures: (a) $T = 0.25$, (b) $T = 0.57$, (c) $T = 0.69$, (d) $T = 0.76$, (e) $T = 1.19$ and (f) $T = 25$. The colors indicate the orientation of the spins, with red pointing up and blue pointing down, lighter variants indicate the spin to the right and darker variants to the left.

where the vortex density is the number of vortex divided by L^2 . Figure 8 shows the variation in the vortex density of our system as a function of temperature. As expected, the density increases with increasing temperature[13]. Note also that the rate of density increase is greatest near the BKT transition temperature.

Finally, we can calculate the formation energy of a pair of vortex. Close to the transition temperature, the vortex density graph obeys the following relationship[13]

$$\rho \sim \exp(-2\mu/T), \quad (26)$$

where 2μ corresponds to the formation energy of a pair of vortex. So, with a little algebra,




FIG. 8. Vortex density as a function of temperature.

we can calculate the formation energy of a pair through the following linear relationship between $-\ln(\rho)$ and $1/T$

$$-\ln(\rho) \sim 2\mu/T, \quad (27)$$

where 2μ is the angular coefficient of the line. Based on this, we adjusted the vortex density values close to the critical temperature and obtained $2\mu = 4.0 \pm 0.5$ in units of J . This value is less than half of the value obtained for the square lattice[31]. This result reinforces the idea of the instability of the honeycomb network, where the interaction between pairs of spins is weaker.

CONCLUSIONS

We carefully analyzed the XY model in the honeycomb network through numerical Monte Carlo simulations, using the Metropolis algorithm in conjunction with the *Simulated Annealing* protocol, in order to calculate the critical transition temperature BKT. For this, we use the second-order helicity modulus and the fourth-order helicity modulus as order parameters, since these properties present a discontinuity in this phase transition. We simulate systems with sizes ranging from $L = 8$ to 128 and apply the *Finite-Size Scaling* technique to extrapolate data from the critical temperature to the thermodynamic limit. The estimated values for the transition temperature were $T_{BKT} = 0.576 \pm 0.001$ (using fourth-order helicity) and $T_{BKT} = 0.582 \pm 0.002$ (using second-order helicity). Based on the study carried out in parallel for the square lattice (see Supplementary Material attached), there is evidence

to accept the first value as the most accurate. This value is approximately 30% less than the value of the square lattice. This is consistent with the conjecture that the honeycomb network is less stable than the square one[17]. Another result obtained in this work was the calculation of the vortex density and, consequently, the estimation of the formation energy of a pair of vortices. The value obtained was $2\mu = 4.0 \pm 0.5$, in units of J . A value more than 50% less than that of the square grid. Again, corroborating the conjecture of the instability of the honeycomb network.

Numerous improvements and advances can be made based on current results. A better technique for the statistical treatment of data can provide stronger evidence for the use of fourth-order helicity to obtain the BKT transition temperature. One suggestion is to use Wang-Landau[32] sampling to obtain a “continuous” curve of helicities, increasing the precision in estimating the critical temperature. Another suggestion is to reproduce this study of the honeycomb network in the generalized XY model[25] in order to analyze the change in the phase diagram of this model and the possible new ordered phases.

* claudio.silva@ifg.edu.br

- [1] “The nobel prize in physics 2016,” <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/physics/2016/summary/>, acessado em 15/11/2023.
- [2] V. L. Berezinskii, Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics **34**, 610 (1972).
- [3] K. S. Burch, D. Mandrus, and J.-G. Park, Nature **563**, 47 (2018).
- [4] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics **6**, 1181 (1973).
- [5] J. M. Kosterlitz, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics **7**, 1046 (1974).
- [6] E. Babaev, Nuclear Physics B **686**, 397 (2004).
- [7] R. Hlubina, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 094503 (2008).
- [8] R. Bruinsma and G. Aeppli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1625 (1982).
- [9] G. Aeppli and R. Bruinsma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 2133 (1984).
- [10] P. Minnhagen and B. J. Kim, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 172509 (2003).
- [11] Y.-B. Deng and Q. Gu, Chinese Physics Letters **31**, 020504 (2014).
- [12] M. Lach and M. Zukovic, Phys. Rev. E **104**, 024134 (2021).
- [13] Y.-Z. Sun, Q. Wu, X.-L. Yang, Y. Zhou, L.-Y. Zhu, Q. Chen, and Q. An, Frontiers in Physics

- 10** (2022), 10.3389/fphy.2022.851322.
- [14] G. A. Silva, J. A. Plascak, and D. P. Landau, *Phys. Rev. E* **106**, 044116 (2022).
- [15] Q. Cui, L. Wang, Y. Zhu, J. Liang, and H. Yang, *Frontiers of Physics* **18**, 13602 (2022).
- [16] V. Drouin-Touchette, P. P. Orth, P. Coleman, P. Chandra, and T. C. Lubensky, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 011043 (2022).
- [17] J. Wojtkiewicz, K. Wohlfeld, and A. M. Oleś, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 064409 (2023).
- [18] Y.-D. Hsieh, Y.-J. Kao, and A. W. Sandvik, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2013**, P09001 (2013).
- [19] E. Ibarra-García-Padilla, C. G. Malanche-Flores, and F. J. Poveda-Cuevas, *European Journal of Physics* **37**, 065103 (2016).
- [20] C. Gong and X. Zhang, *Science* **363**, eaav4450 (2019).
- [21] C. Gong, L. Li, Z. Li, H. Ji, A. Stern, Y. Xia, T. Cao, W. Bao, C. Wang, Y. Wang, Z. Q. Qiu, R. J. Cava, S. G. Louie, J. Xia, and X. Zhang, *Nature* **546**, 265 (2017).
- [22] D. P. Landau and K. Binder, *A Guide to Monte Carlo Simulations in Statistical Physics*, 4th ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- [23] R. K. Pathria and P. D. Beale, *Statistical mechanics* (Elsevier, 2011).
- [24] H. E. Stanley, Clarendon, Oxford, **9** (1971).
- [25] G. A. Canova, Y. Levin, and J. J. Arenzon, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 032140 (2016).
- [26] M. Newman, *Computational Physics* (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2012).
- [27] A. W. Sandvik, A. Avella, and F. Mancini, in *AIP Conference Proceedings* (AIP, 2010).
- [28] D. R. Nelson and J. M. Kosterlitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 1201 (1977).
- [29] K. Binder, *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* **43**, 119 (1981).
- [30] K. Binder, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **60**, 487 (1997).
- [31] R. Gupta and C. F. Baillie, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 2883 (1992).
- [32] F. Wang and D. Landau, *Physical review letters* **86**, 2050 (2001).