

In a recent Letter [1], Cuccoli *et al* presented a new theoretical approach to the understanding of the two dimensional (2D) quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnet (QHA). The approach is characterized by the feasibility of the separation of the quantum fluctuation from the thermal one. One of their main predictions is that  $\xi$  for the QHA is given by that of the classical counterpart, i.e.,

$$\xi(t) = \xi_{cl}(t_{cl}), \quad t_{cl} = t/\theta^4(t), \quad (1)$$

where  $t = kT/J$  for  $S = 1/2$  and  $\theta(t)$  can be determined from their theory using their Eqs.(6)-(8), at least numerically.

The authors concluded that their theory “appears to explain all the experimental data for different values of  $S$  without any fitting parameters”. Consequently, they questioned the validity of the key assumption of the conventional theoretical approach [2]. This conclusion, however, is surprising because the Gaussian approximation they used to handle the quantum fluctuation is supposed to be accurate only when the effect of the fluctuation is weak, i.e., for sufficiently large value of  $S$  and high temperature. Since the experimental data have rather large statistical fluctuation and previously available MC data limited to  $\xi < 30$  are not completely free of systematic errors, much more accurate data including larger  $\xi$  appear to be crucial to check the validity of their theory.

In this Comment we present high precision MC data of the second moment correlation length for  $S = 1/2$  QHA on  $L \times L$  lattices, up to  $\xi = 95.7(3)$ . Our data are obtained using a powerful new quantum MC method [3] which completely eliminates the systematic error coming from finite Suzuki-Trotter number. We carefully monitored the finite size effect in our data by repeating measurements on varying lattice size from  $L = 20$  to 1000 and found that it becomes smaller than the typical statistical error of 0.3 percent or better under the condition  $L/\xi \gtrsim 7$ .

The classical correlation length  $\xi_{cl}(t_{cl})$  can be determined from extensive MC data already available for the 2D classical Heisenberg ferromagnet [4] much more precisely than using the data given by Cuccoli *et al.* [1], because an extrapolation of  $\xi_{cl}(t_{cl})$  for smaller  $t_{cl}$  is necessary. Considering  $\xi_{cl}$  over the range  $34 \lesssim \xi_{cl} \lesssim 788$  [4] (corresponding to  $0.20 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.29$ ), we find a good fit assuming the functional form from the two-loop order of the perturbation theory for the classical model, i.e.,  $\xi_{cl}(t_{cl}) = C_\xi t_{cl} e^{a/t_{cl}} [1 + c_1 t_{cl} + \dots]$ , with  $C_\xi \simeq 2.300 \times 10^{-3}$ ,  $a \simeq 6.378$ ,  $c_1 \simeq -0.855$ , and  $\chi^2/N_{DF}$  (the  $\chi^2$  value per degree of freedom)  $\simeq 0.4$ . For the  $\xi_{cl}$  over  $2 \lesssim \xi_{cl} \lesssim 34$  (corresponding to  $0.29 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.65$ ), on the other hand, it turns out that an additional correction of the type  $c_2 t_{cl}^2$  is necessary for a good fit. The estimated fitting parameters in this case are:  $C_\xi \simeq 8.129 \times 10^{-3}$ ,  $a \simeq 6.050$ ,  $c_1 \simeq -2.862$ , and  $c_2 \simeq 2.393$ . Given  $\xi_{cl}(t_{cl})$ ,

we obtain  $\xi(t)$  directly from Eq.(1) for all the values of  $t$  where our quantum Monte Carlo data are available.

In Fig. (1) we present our results. We see a good agreement with the theory for  $\xi(t) \lesssim 6$ . However, our data clearly deviate from the theory for larger values of  $\xi$ . In fact the theory overestimates the actual numerical data more than 500 percent at  $t \simeq 0.21$ . We thus conclude that the validity of the new approach is limited to very high temperature regime, i.e.,  $T/J \gtrsim 0.4$  for the 2D  $S = 1/2$  QHA.

We would like to thank A. Cuccoli, V. Tognetti, R. Vaia and P. Verrucchi for helpful comments and for sending us their numerical estimates for the function  $\theta^4$ .

Jae-Kwon Kim<sup>a</sup>, D. P. Landau<sup>a</sup>, and Matthias Troyer<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Center for Simulational Physics  
The University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602

<sup>b</sup>Institute for Solid State Physics  
University of Tokyo, Tokyo 106, Japan

**Figure Caption:** Comparison of the Monte Carlo data with the theoretical prediction Eq.(1) for the 2D  $S = 1/2$  QHA. The statistical errors of our data are much smaller than the size of the symbol.

- 
- [1] A. Cuccoli, V. Tognetti, R. Vaia, and P. Verrucchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3439 (1996)
  - [2] S. Chakravarty *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 2344 (1989)
  - [3] B. B. Beard and U.-J. Wiese, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 5130 (1996)
  - [4] J. Apostolakis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2687 (1991); J.-K. Kim, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 4663 (1994); S. Caracciolo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1891 (1995)
  - [5] M. S. Makivić and H.-Q. Ding, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 3562 (1991)

