

The effective potential in three-dimensional $O(N)$ models.

Andrea Pelissetto and Ettore Vicari

Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and I.N.F.N., I-56126 Pisa, Italy

(March 22, 2022)

Abstract

We consider the effective potential in three-dimensional models with $O(N)$ symmetry. For generic values of N , and in particular for the physically interesting cases $N = 0, 1, 2, 3$, we determine the six-point and eight-point renormalized coupling constants which parametrize its small-field expansion. These estimates are obtained from the analysis of their ϵ -expansion, taking into account the exact results in one and zero dimensions, and, for the Ising model (i.e. $N = 1$), the accurate high-temperature estimates in two dimensions. They are compared with the available results from other approaches. We also obtain corresponding estimates for the two-dimensional $O(N)$ models.

Keywords: Field theory, Critical phenomena, $O(N)$ models, Ising model, Effective potential, n -point renormalized coupling constants, ϵ -expansion, $1/N$ expansion.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Jk, 64.60.Fr, 05.50.+q, 75.10.Hk, 11.10.Kk, 11.15.Tk.

I. INTRODUCTION

The effective potential is widely used in the field-theoretic description of fundamental interactions and phase transitions. In field theory the effective potential is the generating functional of the one-particle irreducible correlation functions at zero external momenta. In statistical physics it represents the free-energy density \mathcal{F} as a function of the order parameter, which, for spin models, is the magnetization M . Its global minimum determines the value of the order parameter, which characterizes the phase of the system. In the high-temperature or symmetric phase the minimum is unique with $M = 0$. As the temperature decreases below the critical value, the effective potential takes a double-well shape: the order parameter does not vanish anymore and the system is in the low-temperature or broken phase¹. The equation of state is closely related to the effective potential. It relates the magnetization M (i.e. the order parameter), the magnetic field H and the reduced temperature $t \propto T - T_c$. It is simply given by

$$H = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial M}. \quad (1)$$

In this paper we study the effective potential of $O(N)$ models. We recall that $O(N)$ models describe many important critical phenomena in nature: liquid-vapour transitions in classical fluids, the helium superfluid transition, the critical properties of isotropic ferromagnetic materials and long polymers. We will focus mainly on the small-renormalized-field expansion of the effective potential in the symmetric phase. Its coefficients are directly related to the zero-momentum n -point renormalized coupling constants g_n . The four-point coupling $g \equiv g_4$ plays an important role in the field-theoretic perturbative expansion at fixed dimension [3], which provides accurate estimates of critical indices and universal ratios in the symmetric phase. In this approach any universal quantity is obtained from a series in powers of g (g -expansion) which is then resummed and evaluated at the fixed-point value of g , g^* . Accurate estimates of g^* have been obtained by calculating the zero of the Callan-Symanzik β -function associated with g (see e.g. Refs. [4–9]). These results have been substantially confirmed by computations using different approaches, such as ϵ -expansion [10], high-temperature expansion (see, e.g., Refs. [11–14,10]), Monte Carlo simulations (see, e.g., Refs. [15–17]), $1/N$ expansion [11,10].

Recently there has been a lot of interest in the problem of computing the higher-order coupling constants g_6, g_8, \dots , for the Ising model (see e.g. Refs. [18,15,19,13,20,9,14,21,17,22]). Here we will study the issue for generic values of N . We will obtain satisfactory estimates of g_6 and g_8 , or, equivalently, of the ratios $r_{2j} \equiv g_{2j}/g^{j-1}$, from their ϵ -expansion [23] ($\epsilon \equiv 4 - d$) within the ϕ^4 theory defined by the action

$$S = \int d^d x \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi(x) \partial_\mu \phi(x) + \frac{1}{2} m_0^2 \phi^2 + \frac{1}{4!} g_0 (\phi^2)^2 \right]. \quad (2)$$

¹Actually in the broken phase the double-well shape is not correct because the effective potential must always be convex. In this phase it should present a flat region around the origin. For a discussion see e.g. Refs. [1,2].

The ϵ -expansion of the fixed-point value of r_{2j} can be derived from the ϵ -expansion of the equation of state, which is known to $O(\epsilon^3)$ for the Ising model [24,25], i.e. $N = 1$, and to $O(\epsilon^2)$ for generic values of N [26], thus leading to series of the same length for r_{2j} . Since the available series are short and have large coefficients increasing with j , their straightforward analysis does not provide reliable estimates, but gives only an indication of the order of magnitude. A considerable improvement can be achieved if one uses the results for $d = 0, 1, 2$, whenever they are available. This idea was employed in Ref. [27] to improve the estimates of the critical exponents of the Ising and self-avoiding walk models, and in Ref. [28] it was used to the study of the two-point function. In Ref. [10] it was generalized and successfully applied to the determination of the zero-momentum four-point renormalized coupling. In the present case the basic assumption is that the zero-momentum n -point renormalized couplings g_{2j} , and therefore the ratios r_{2j} , are analytic and quite smooth in the domain $4 > d > 0$ (thus $0 < \epsilon < 4$). This can be verified in the large- N limit. One may then perform a polynomial interpolation among the values of d where the constants r_{2j} are known ($d = 0, 1$) or for which good estimates are available ($d = 2$ for $N = 1$, obtained from a high-temperature analysis), and then analyze the series of the difference. This procedure leads to more accurate estimates, which are consistent with those obtained by the direct analysis of the original ϵ -series, but have a much smaller uncertainty. As a by-product of our analysis we also obtain relatively good estimates of r_6 and r_8 for two-dimensional $O(N)$ models.

For $N \neq 1$, most of the published results concern the renormalized four-point coupling constant g . As far as we know, estimates of g_6 and g_8 have only been obtained from approximate solutions of the renormalization group equation [18], and from the analysis of high-temperature series [12]. The latter results present a large uncertainty. The former are reported without errors — which, in any case, are very difficult to estimate — and their reliability is unclear. For instance, the estimates of g that are obtained using this method are in disagreement with the results of other computations. Therefore our new independent estimates of r_6 and r_8 for $N \neq 1$ represent our main results, and provide an important check of the above-mentioned calculations.

For the Ising model we can compare our results with the estimates obtained using different approaches: the g -expansion at fixed dimension $d = 3$ [20,9] that apparently provides the most precise results; a different analysis of the ϵ -expansion based on the parametric representation of the equation of state [9]; approximate solutions of the exact renormalization group equation [18,21]; high-temperature expansions [14,12,13]; dimensional expansion around $d = 0$ [29,19]; Monte Carlo simulations [15,17]. Our final results are in good agreement with these estimates and their precision is comparable with that of the analysis of the g -expansion.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce our notation and give some general formulae for the small-field expansion of the effective potential. In Sec. III we compute the effective potential in the large- N limit, the ratios r_{2j} to $O(1/N)$, and give the exact values of r_6 and r_8 for $d = 1, 0$. Furthermore we present a high-temperature analysis of the two-dimensional Ising model, which provides accurate estimates of the first few r_{2j} . In Sec. IV we present our analysis of the ϵ -expansion of r_{2j} . In Sec. V we compare our results with other approaches. In App. A we give some useful formulae relating the ratios r_{2j} to the connected Green's functions. In App. B we report the ϵ -expansion of r_{2j} derived from

the ϵ -expansion of the equation of state. In App. C some details of the calculations in one dimension are given.

II. SMALL-FIELD EXPANSION OF THE EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL

The free energy per unit volume can be expanded in powers of the renormalized magnetization φ (i.e. the expectation value of the renormalized field $\phi_r = \phi/\sqrt{Z}$):

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi) = \frac{\Gamma(\varphi)}{V} = \mathcal{F}(0) + \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{4!}m^{4-d}g\varphi^4 + \sum_{j=3} m^{2j+(1-j)d} \frac{1}{(2j)!}g_{2j}\varphi^{2j}, \quad (3)$$

where $\Gamma(\varphi)$ is the generating functional of one-particle irreducible correlation functions at zero external momenta, i.e. the effective potential of the renormalized theory. The mass scale m is the inverse of the second-moment correlation length, i.e. $m = \xi^{-1}$ and

$$\xi^2 = \frac{1}{2d} \frac{\int dx x^2 G(x)}{\int dx G(x)}, \quad (4)$$

where the function $G(x)$ is defined by

$$\langle \phi_\alpha(0)\phi_\beta(x) \rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}G(x). \quad (5)$$

By rescaling φ as

$$\varphi = \frac{m^{(d-2)/2}}{\sqrt{g}}z \quad (6)$$

in Eq. (3), the free energy can be written as

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi) - \mathcal{F}(0) = \frac{m^d}{g}A(z), \quad (7)$$

where

$$A(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2 + \frac{1}{4!}z^4 + \sum_{j=3} \frac{1}{(2j)!}r_{2j}z^{2j}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$r_{2j} = \frac{g_{2j}}{g^{j-1}}. \quad (9)$$

In App. A we give some useful formulae to derive the constants r_{2j} from the connected Green's functions.

One can show that $z \propto t^{-\beta}M$, and that the equation of state can be written in the form

$$H \propto t^{\beta\delta} \frac{\partial A(z)}{\partial z}. \quad (10)$$

This relation can be exploited in order to derive $A(z)$ from the equation of state, which is usually written in the form (see e.g. Ref. [4])

$$H = M^\delta f(x) \quad (11)$$

where $x = tM^{-1/\beta}$. The function $A(z)$ is thus given by

$$\frac{\partial A(z)}{\partial z} = h_0 z^\delta f(x_0 z^{-1/\beta}), \quad (12)$$

where the normalization constants h_0 and x_0 are fixed by the requirement that

$$A(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2 + \frac{1}{4!}z^4 + O(z^6). \quad (13)$$

The ratios r_{2j} are obtained by expanding $A(z)$ in powers of z . Notice that, since the function $f(x)$ in Eq. (11) is regular at $x = 0$ and nonzero, Eq. (12) implies $A(z) \sim z^{\delta+1}$ for $z \rightarrow \infty$.

In the following we will be interested in the rescaled effective potential $A(z)$ and we will calculate the fixed-point values of the first few coefficients r_{2j} of its small- z expansion.

III. EXACT AND HIGH-TEMPERATURE RESULTS

In order to get a qualitative idea of the properties of the effective potential, we consider its large- N limit. It is easy to derive the large- N limit of the rescaled effective potential $A(z)$ from the corresponding equation of state [30]:

$$H = M^\delta (1 + x)^{2/(d-2)}, \quad (14)$$

where $\delta = (d+2)/(d-2)$, $x = tM^{-1/\beta}$ and $\beta = 1/2$. One finds

$$A(z) = \frac{6}{d} \left[\left(1 + \frac{d-2}{12} z^2 \right)^{d/(d-2)} - 1 \right], \quad (15)$$

from which

$$r_{2j} = \frac{(2j)!}{2^{2j-2} 3^{j-1} j(j-1)} \prod_{i=1}^{j-2} \left(\epsilon - 2 \frac{i-1}{i} \right). \quad (16)$$

The constants r_{2j} are $(j-2)$ th-order polynomials in $\epsilon \equiv 4-d$ that have $j-2$ real zeros at $\epsilon = 2(i-1)/i$ with $i = 1, \dots, j-2$. Notice that in the limit $j \rightarrow \infty$ the zeros have $\epsilon = 2$ (i.e. $d = 2$) as an accumulation point. It is interesting to note the form of the large- N limit of $A(z)$ for integer d :

$$A(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2 + \frac{1}{24}z^4 \quad \text{for } d = 4, \quad (17)$$

$$A(z) = \frac{1}{2}z^2 + \frac{1}{24}z^4 + \frac{1}{864}z^6 \quad \text{for } d = 3, \quad (18)$$

$$A(z) = 3 \left(e^{z^2/6} - 1 \right) \quad \text{for } d = 2, \quad (19)$$

$$A(z) = 6z^2 (12 - z^2)^{-1} \quad \text{for } d = 1. \quad (20)$$

Notice that in the large- N limit, for $d = 3, 4$ (and in general for $d = 2n/(n - 1)$ with integer $n \geq 2$) the effective potential is a polynomial in z , or equivalently in φ . In four dimensions only the first two terms are present so that the effective potential (in the variable z) coincides with the phenomenological expression of Ginzburg and Landau. Notice however that the rescaling (6) is not strictly defined in four dimensions since $g \rightarrow 0$ in the critical limit. Therefore this simple expression is not valid in the original variable φ and indeed logarithms of the magnetization appear in the four-dimensional effective potential [31]. In three dimensions also the φ^6 term is present so that $\delta = 5$. As $d \rightarrow 2$ all terms become relevant. Of course this simple behaviour is peculiar of the large- N limit. For finite values of N all terms are present in the small-field expansion, and δ can only be determined after resumming the series.

One can also derive the $O(1/N)$ correction to Eq. (16) from the corresponding $O(1/N)$ correction to the equation of state calculated² in Ref. [30]. In $d = 3$ one obtains

$$r_6 = \frac{5}{6} \left[1 + \frac{12.2556}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right) \right], \quad (21)$$

$$r_8 = -\frac{67.3140}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right), \quad (22)$$

$$r_{10} = \frac{1406.83}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right), \quad (23)$$

etc.... For large values of j the coefficients of the $O(1/N)$ term in the $1/N$ expansion of r_{2j} behave approximately as $\sim (2j)!(-c)^j$, where c is a constant: $c \simeq 0.40$. The large coefficient of the $O(1/N)$ correction in r_6 indicates that the region where Eq. (21) may be a good approximation corresponds to very large values of N , say $N \gtrsim 100$. This is expected to be true also for r_{2j} with larger values of j .

The constants r_{2j} can be computed exactly in one and zero dimensions. These results will be useful in our analysis of the ϵ -expansion of r_{2j} as explained in the introduction.

Some details of the calculations for $d = 1$ can be found in App. C. Here we only give the results for r_6 and r_8 . For $N \geq 1$ we have

$$r_6 = 5 - \frac{5N(N-1)^2(8N+7)}{(N+1)(N+4)(4N-1)^2}, \quad (24)$$

$$r_8 = \frac{175}{3} - \frac{35N(N-1)^2(256N^3 + 3037N^2 + 1705N - 588)}{3(N+1)(N+4)(N+6)(4N-1)^3}. \quad (25)$$

For $N \leq 1$ instead

$$r_6 = 5, \quad (26)$$

$$r_8 = \frac{175}{3}. \quad (27)$$

² We mention the presence of a misprint in the final expression of the $O(1/N)$ equation of state given in Eq. (29) of Ref. [30]: in the third term of the first line $(2\pi)^{2-\epsilon/2}$ should be replaced by $2\pi^{2-\epsilon/2}$.

For $N = 1$ these expressions agree with the results of Ref. [19]. For $N = \infty$ they reproduce Eq. (16). For the Ising model we will also need the value of r_{10} , which has been computed in Ref. [19]: $r_{10} = 1225$.

For $d = 0$ and $N \geq 1$, using the formulae reported in App. A, it is easy to obtain³

$$r_6 = \frac{10(N + 8)}{3(N + 4)}, \quad (28)$$

$$r_8 = \frac{70(N^2 + 14N + 120)}{3(N + 4)(N + 6)}, \quad (29)$$

$$r_{10} = \frac{280(10752 + 3136N + 256N^2 + 30N^3 + N^4)}{(N + 4)^2(N + 6)(N + 8)}. \quad (30)$$

For $N = 1$ these results agree with those of Ref. [19]. It is not clear how to determine the value of r_{2j} for $N = 0$. Unlike the case $d = 1$, we cannot prove that setting $N = 0$ in the formulae obtained for $N \geq 1$ provides the correct answer.

For the two-dimensional Ising model reliable estimates of the first few r_{2j} can be obtained from the analysis of their high-temperature expansion on the lattice. The basic reason is that the leading correction to scaling is analytic, since the subleading exponent Δ is expected to be larger than one [32,33]. Therefore the traditional methods of analysis of high-temperature series should work well. The series published in Refs. [34,35] for the lattice Ising model with nearest-neighbor interactions allow us to calculate r_{2j} (more precisely, a high-temperature series whose value at the critical point is r_{2j}) to 17th-order on the square lattice (for which $\beta_c = \text{ArcTanh}(\sqrt{2} - 1)$) and to 14th-order on the triangular lattice (for which $\beta_c = \text{ArcTanh}(2 - \sqrt{3})$). In the analysis of these series we followed Ref. [10], using several types of approximants, Padè, Dlog-Padè and first-order integral approximants. Table I reports the results obtained on the square and on the triangular lattice. They are consistent with each other. Assuming universality, as final estimates for the two-dimensional Ising model we take

$$r_6 = 3.678(2), \quad (31)$$

$$r_8 = 26.0(2), \quad (32)$$

$$r_{10} = 275(15). \quad (33)$$

The error on the estimate of r_{2j} increases with j and thus the analysis of the higher-order coefficients does not lead to reliable estimates. We mention that the high-temperature analysis of Ref. [13] led⁴ to $r_6 = 3.679(8)$, which is perfectly consistent with our estimate.

³The calculation is easily done for the N -vector model: in this case one has a single field \vec{s} with $\vec{s} \cdot \vec{s} = 1$ and the Gibbs measure is simply $d\vec{s} \delta(\vec{s} \cdot \vec{s} - 1)$.

⁴ Actually Ref. [13] gives an estimate of $R_0 \equiv \chi_4^2 / (\chi_2 \chi_6) = (10 - r_6)^{-1}$.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE ϵ -EXPANSION

In this Section we will compute r_{2j} for $j = 3, 4, 5$ using the ϵ -expansion. The series in ϵ of r_6 , r_8 and r_{10} are reported in App. B. They were obtained from the ϵ -expansion of the equation of state [26,24,25]. Since the ϵ -expansion is asymptotic, it requires a resummation to get estimates for $d = 3$, i.e. $\epsilon = 1$, which is usually performed assuming its Borel summability.

The main point of our analysis is the use of the exact values of r_{2j} for $d = 0, 1$ we have reported in the previous Section, and, for $N = 1$, of the precise two-dimensional estimates which have been obtained from the analysis of high-temperature series, see Eqs. (31), (32), (33). Indeed the constants r_{2j} are expected to be analytic in the domain $4 > d > 0$. This can be explicitly verified in the large- N limit where the constants r_{2j} are polynomials in ϵ , cf. Eq. (16). Moreover it was implicitly assumed in the dimensional expansion around $d = 0$ done in Refs. [29,19].

The idea of the method is the following: consider a generic observable and let $R(\epsilon)$ be its expansion in ϵ . Moreover suppose that the values of R are known for a set of dimensions $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k$. In this case one may use as zeroth order approximation the value for $\epsilon = 1$ of the polynomial interpolation through $\epsilon = 0, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k$ and then use the series in ϵ to compute the deviations. More precisely, let us suppose that exact values $R_{\text{ex}}(\epsilon_1), \dots, R_{\text{ex}}(\epsilon_k)$ are known for the set of dimensions $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k$, $k \geq 2$. Then define

$$Q(\epsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^k \left[\frac{R_{\text{ex}}(\epsilon_i)}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_i)} \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^k (\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)^{-1} \right] \quad (34)$$

and

$$S(\epsilon) = \frac{R(\epsilon)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (\epsilon - \epsilon_i)} - Q(\epsilon), \quad (35)$$

and finally

$$R_{\text{imp}}(\epsilon) = [Q(\epsilon) + S(\epsilon)] \prod_{i=1}^k (\epsilon - \epsilon_i). \quad (36)$$

One can easily verify that the expression

$$[Q(\epsilon) + S(0)] \prod_{i=1}^k (\epsilon - \epsilon_i) \quad (37)$$

is the k -order polynomial interpolation through the points $\epsilon = 0, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k$. The resummation procedure is applied to $S(\epsilon)$ and the final estimate is obtained by computing $R_{\text{imp}}(\epsilon = 1)$.

Since the series of r_{2j} begins with a term of order ϵ , we analyze the quantity r_{2j}/ϵ . Notice that, as a consequence, the interpolation formula (37) actually uses the value of the derivative of r_{2j} in four dimensions. If the interpolation is a good approximation one should find that the series which gives the deviations has smaller coefficients than the original one. Consequently one expects that also the errors in the resummation are reduced. We find

that, as expected, the coefficients of the corresponding series $S(\epsilon)$ decrease in size with k , the number of exact values that are used to constrain the series. This fact was also shown in Ref. [10] for the case of the four-point renormalized coupling.

The large- N results of Eqs. (21-23) provide further support to our constrained analysis. Indeed one may consider the simple polynomial interpolation (which uses the values of r_{2j} in $d = 0, 1$ and the value of its derivative in $d = 4$) evaluated at $d = 3$, r_{2j}^{int} , and compare its large- N expansion with the exact one. One finds (for $N \geq 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} r_6^{\text{int}} &= \frac{5(16N^5 + 402N^4 + 1734N^3 + 539N^2 - 669N + 84)}{6(N+1)(N+4)(N+8)(4N-1)^2} \\ &= \frac{5}{6} \left[1 + \frac{101}{8N} - \frac{87}{N^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^3}\right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and

$$r_8^{\text{int}} = -\frac{75.65}{N} + \frac{988.4}{N^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^3}\right). \quad (39)$$

Comparing Eq. (38) with Eq. (21), one sees that r_6^{int} gives the exact result for $N = \infty$. Moreover, also the $O(1/N)$ correction is closely reproduced: indeed the coefficient of the $O(1/N)$ term in r_6^{int} is 10.52 to be compared with the exact value 10.21 of Eq. (21). Therefore in the large- N limit r_6^{int} provides an estimate of r_6 with a relative error which behaves as $0.37/N$: r_6^{int} becomes increasingly accurate as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The same discussion applies to r_8 : the coefficient of the $1/N$ term in Eq. (39) is very close to the exact one -67.31 , cf. Eq. (22). Therefore also in this case the interpolation r_8^{int} provides good estimates of r_8 : for $N \rightarrow \infty$ the relative error is 12%.

The analysis of the series $S(\epsilon)$, cf. Eq. (35), can be performed by using the method proposed in Ref. [6], which is based on the knowledge of the large-order behaviour of the series. It is indeed known that the n -th coefficient of the series behave as $\sim (-a)^n \Gamma(n+b_0+1)$ for large n . The constant a , which characterizes the singularity of the Borel transform does not depend on the specific observable; it is given by [36,37] $a = 3/(N+8)$. The coefficient b_0 depends instead on the series one considers. Given a quantity R with series

$$R(\epsilon) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} R_k \epsilon^k, \quad (40)$$

we have generated new series $R_p(\alpha, b; \epsilon)$ according to

$$R_p(\alpha, b; \epsilon) = \sum_{k=0}^p B_k(\alpha, b) \int_0^{\infty} dt t^b e^{-t} \frac{u(\epsilon t)^k}{[1 - u(\epsilon t)]^\alpha} \quad (41)$$

where

$$u(x) = \frac{\sqrt{1+ax} - 1}{\sqrt{1+ax} + 1}. \quad (42)$$

The coefficients $B_k(\alpha, b)$ are determined by the requirement that the expansion in ϵ of $R_p(\alpha, b; \epsilon)$ coincides with the original series. For each α, b and p an estimate of R is simply given by $R_p(\alpha, b; \epsilon = 1)$.

For the Ising model, where the available series are of order $O(\epsilon^3)$, we followed Ref. [10] in order to derive the estimates and their uncertainty. We determine an integer value of b , b_{opt} , such that

$$R_3(\alpha, b_{\text{opt}}; \epsilon = 1) \approx R_2(\alpha, b_{\text{opt}}; \epsilon = 1) \quad (43)$$

for $\alpha < 1$. b_{opt} is the value of b such that the estimate from the series to order $O(\epsilon^3)$ is essentially identical to the estimate from the series to order $O(\epsilon^2)$. In a somewhat arbitrary way we have then considered as our final estimate the average of $R_p(\alpha, b; \epsilon = 1)$ with $-1 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $-2 + b_{\text{opt}} \leq b \leq 2 + b_{\text{opt}}$. The error we report is the variance of the values of $R_3(\alpha, b; \epsilon = 1)$ with $-1 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $[b_{\text{opt}}/3 - 1] \leq b \leq [4b_{\text{opt}}/3 + 1]$. This procedure is *ad hoc*, but provides estimates that are all consistent among each other. In order to test the method, in Ref. [10], the procedure was applied to the determination of the critical indices and it provided estimates and error bars in substantial agreement with the results of other authors. Therefore we believe that our error bars are reasonable, although one should be cautious in giving them the standard statistical meaning.

The results of our analysis for the Ising model, corresponding to $N = 1$, are presented in Table II. We report various estimates of r_6 , r_8 and r_{10} obtained from an unconstrained analysis and constrained analyses in various dimensions. They are all consistent. As expected, the error decreases when additional lower dimensional values are used to constrain the analysis: the error of the unconstrained analysis is approximately an order of magnitude larger than the error of our best result that uses the known values at $d = 0, 1, 2$. In Figs. 1 and 2 we show respectively r_6 and r_8 as a function of d . There we plot the polynomial interpolations through the known values of r_6/ϵ at $d = 4, 2, 1, 0$, and the results of our constrained ($d = 2, 1, 0$) ϵ -expansion analysis. Their comparison shows how well the polynomial interpolation works.

We have also repeated the analysis in two dimensions. In this case, of course, it is more difficult to get precise estimates: the unconstrained expansion gives results with large errors and it is therefore practically useless. Better estimates are obtained constraining the expansion in one and zero dimensions. The results for these two cases are reported in Table I. The final estimates for r_6 and r_8 are in very good agreement with the much more precise results obtained from the high-temperature analysis. The result for r_{10} is instead significantly lower than the high-temperature estimate. It should be noted however that the series in ϵ for r_{10} has very large coefficients and the estimates show large fluctuations with the parameters b and α . Therefore it is not clear if our algorithm to determine the error bars is working properly here. For this reason, in this case we believe the high-temperature estimate to be more reliable than the ϵ -expansion result.

For generic values of N , the series is one order shorter and we have only two non-trivial terms. The procedure we presented above cannot be applied and we used a different method. For each value of b , averaging over $-1 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, we obtain three estimates: the first one is the result of the analysis of the unconstrained series, the second and the third one the results from the series constrained respectively in $d = 1$ and in $d = 1, 0$. We then compute the weighted average and the corresponding χ^2 . The optimal value b_{opt} is chosen as the value of b with the smallest χ^2 . Once b_{opt} has been chosen, we calculated mean values and relative spreads varying b and α according to the algorithm we presented above. Again, we

must stress that the procedure is completely arbitrary, and, since the series has only two terms, one should be very cautious in interpreting the spread of the approximants as an error bar. Our three-dimensional results for r_6 and r_8 are reported in Table III. There we report the values of the simple polynomial interpolation r_{2j}^{int} (see Eq. (38) for r_6^{int}), and the results from an unconstrained analysis and constrained analyses in various dimensions (the errors reported are the spreads of the approximants varying b and α). The corresponding results for $d = 2$ are presented in Table IV.

To understand the reliability of our procedure we applied the above analysis to the case $N = 1$, i.e. to its $O(\epsilon^2)$ series of r_{2j} constrained at $d = 0, 1$, and compared the results⁵ (see Table III) with the previous ones reported in Table II. In three dimensions the estimates of r_6 and r_8 that have been obtained using this method are respectively lower (higher) by half an error bar (resp. one error bar) than the corresponding estimates obtained from the longer series. So we expect the three-dimensional results for r_8 to be somewhat higher than the true result, at least for small values of N . In two dimensions there is good agreement for r_6 while r_8 differs by one error bar. Therefore, for $N = 1$, it seems that our procedure gives reasonable estimates and error bars.

A rigorous check of the error bars can be done in the large- N limit. In the case of r_6 , consider the analysis which provides the best estimates, the constrained one in $d = 1, 0$. Here r_6 is estimated from the expansion

$$\frac{r_6}{\epsilon} = \frac{5}{6} \left[1 + \frac{10.63 + 0.37\epsilon}{N} + O(\epsilon^2, 1/N^2) \right]. \quad (44)$$

This equation shows that inclusion of the $O(\epsilon)$ term gives an estimate of r_6 which is larger than r_6^{int} , in contrast with what we expect on the basis of the exact result (21). Clearly the deviation $r_6 - r_6^{\text{int}}$ is positive for small values of ϵ and negative for $\epsilon = 1$. Such a behaviour cannot be reproduced by a single term in ϵ and thus, at least for large values of N , the inclusion of the $O(\epsilon)$ in Eq. (44) worsens the final estimate. As a consequence the spread of the approximants largely underestimates the correct error. The previous discussion shows that this is not the case for $N = 1$ and thus we expect the problem to appear for some intermediate value of N that is unfortunately unknown. We have decided to be conservative and we have simply assumed that for all values of N the spread of the approximants is an unreliable estimate of the error. Thus, in Table V that summarizes our final results, the error we report for r_6 is the difference between the final result and the value of the interpolation. This method provides a reasonable estimate of the uncertainty in the large- N limit, but, for the reasons we mentioned above, we believe it overestimates the errors in the small- N region (this is evident in the $N = 1$ case). Of course, the two-dimensional estimates of r_6 may have the same problem. In this case however the spread of the approximants is larger and includes $r_6 - r_6^{\text{int}}$. Therefore, whatever method we use, we get essentially the same error bars.

⁵ For $N = 1$ we have also applied this method using the two-dimensional results. In this case we consider six estimates, from the analyses of the series quoted in Table II. From the series to order $O(\epsilon^2)$ (resp. $O(\epsilon^3)$) we get $r_6 = 2.048(22)$ (resp. $r_6 = 2.061(14)$) and $r_8 = 2.9(7)$ (resp. $r_8 = 2.3(5)$).

The same analysis can be repeated for r_8 , which is estimated from

$$\frac{-75.65 + 6.35\epsilon}{N} + O(\epsilon^2, 1/N^2) \quad (45)$$

In this case the $O(\epsilon)$ term has the correct sign. For $\epsilon = 1$ it provides estimates that differ from the correct result, Eq. (22), by 2%, which is indeed the size of the error bar of our final estimates. Therefore the error bars obtained for r_8 are correct for large values of N . Since they are also reasonable for $N = 1$ we believe them to be reliable for all values of N .

V. CONCLUSIONS AND COMPARISON WITH OTHER CALCULATIONS

We have studied the small-renormalized-field expansion of the fixed-point effective potential in the symmetric phase of three-dimensional $O(N)$ models. The coefficients of this expansion are related to the zero-momentum n -point renormalized couplings g_n . By properly rescaling the effective potential one may re-express the small-field expansion in terms of the ratios $r_{2j} \equiv g_{2j}/g^{j-1}$ with $j \geq 3$, cf. Eq. (8). We have derived the ϵ -expansion of r_{2j} from the ϵ -expansion of the equation of state which has been computed to order $O(\epsilon^3)$ for the Ising model [24], and to $O(\epsilon^2)$ for $N \neq 1$ [26]. When, as in the case of the ratios r_{2j} , the quantity at hand is expected to be analytic and smooth as a function of d , one may use exact results (or precise estimates) for lower-dimensional $O(N)$ models in order to constrain the analysis of the corresponding ϵ -expansion. For this reason we have computed the first few r_{2j} exactly in one and zero dimensions for all values of N and we have estimated the same quantities in two dimensions for $N = 1$ from the high-temperature series of Refs. [34,35]. The constrained analyses of the available ϵ -series of r_{2j} , according to the procedure outlined in Sec. IV, allowed us to achieve a considerable improvement with respect to their standard resummation, and led to satisfactory estimates of the first few r_{2j} . Using the accurate estimates of the fixed-point value of $g \equiv g_4$ which can be found in the literature (see Sec. I), one can extract the fixed-point value of the zero-momentum $2j$ -point renormalized couplings g_{2j} from the relation $g_{2j} = g^{j-1}r_{2j}$.

Let us compare our results with the available estimates from other approaches. For $N \neq 1$ there are not many published results: we are only aware of the estimates of g_4 , g_6 and g_8 presented in Refs. [18,12]. Table V presents a summary of all the available (as far as we know) estimates of r_6 and r_8 for several values of $N \neq 1$. Ref. [18] uses a renormalization-group approach in which the exact RG equation is approximately solved (no estimates of the errors are presented there). Ref. [12] instead derives g_4 and g_6 from their high-temperature expansion in the lattice N -vector model. These estimates are in reasonable agreement with our results. One can also compare the results of our analysis for large values of N with the $1/N$ expansion to $O(1/N)$. This comparison shows a substantial consistency, although the region where the $O(1/N)$ approximation of r_{2j} is effective corresponds to very large values of N , say $N \gtrsim 100$.

We have also computed r_6 and r_8 in two dimensions. We recall that the two-dimensional N -vector model is asymptotically free for $N \geq 3$, and has a Kosterlitz-Thouless transition for $N = 2$.

For $N = 1$, the Ising model, many works have been devoted to the study of the effective potential, exploiting various approaches. Table VI presents a summary of all the available

(as far as we know) estimates⁶ of r_6 , r_8 and r_{10} . Apparently the most precise results are those obtained in Ref. [9]. They have been derived from the analysis of the g -expansion at fixed dimension of the effective potential calculated to five loops [38,39] (in Table VI we refer to this approach by $d = 3$ g -exp.). Ref. [9] presents also an analysis of the $O(\epsilon^3)$ expansion using the parametric representation of the equation of state (in Table VI we refer to this approach by ϵ -exp. PREQ). In this case the ϵ -expansion is used to estimate the coefficients of the expansion of the function⁷ $h(\theta)$ characterizing the parametric representation of the equation of state (see e.g. Ref. [4]). Then the constants $F_{2j-1} \equiv r_{2j}/(2j-1)!$ are obtained using their relation to the expansion of $h(\theta)$. Precise estimates of r_{2j} have also been obtained in Ref. [21] (see also Ref. [18]) by approximately solving the exact renormalization group equation (ERG), although the estimate of g by the same method is not equally good. Additional results have been obtained from high-temperature expansions [14,12,13] and Monte Carlo simulations [15,17] of the lattice Ising model. The high-temperature results are in substantial agreement with the field-theoretic estimates. The apparent small discrepancy of the estimates of r_6 of Refs. [13,22], which were obtained by using different lattice formulations of the Ising model, is probably due to the presence of confluent singularities which are not properly handled by standard approximants. The results of Ref. [14] come from an analysis of $O(\beta^{17})$ series on the cubic lattice, and they have been obtained by using the Roskies transform [40] and suitably biased integral approximants [41] which take into account the leading confluent singularity. High-temperature techniques have also been used to obtain a dimensional expansion around $d = 0$ (d -exp.) of the Green's functions. The analysis of these series provides estimates of g_4 and g_6 [19]. The corresponding value of r_6 is however smaller than the field-theoretic estimates, although the value found for g_4 is in substantial agreement⁸. The Monte Carlo results do not agree with the results of other approaches, especially those of Ref. [17]. But one should consider the difficulty of such calculations on the lattice due to the subtractions that must be performed to compute the irreducible correlation functions. In Ref. [15] estimates of g_4 and g_6 are obtained by looking at the probability distribution of the average magnetization. The discrepancy in this case may come from the $O(\phi^6)$ polynomial approximation of the potential used to fit the data, or from possible finite-size effects.

Our results for the Ising model are much more precise than those obtained for $N \neq 1$. This is due essentially due to two reasons: one additional order is known in the ϵ -series

⁶ When the original reference reports only estimates of g_{2j} (see Refs. [12,19,15,17]), the errors we quote for r_{2j} have been calculated by considering the estimates of g_{2j} as uncorrelated.

⁷ The coefficients of the expansion of $h(\theta)$ were estimated by setting $\epsilon = 1$ in their ϵ -series. The reported errors take into account the uncertainty on the critical exponents γ and β , and the error on the normalization parameter ρ that relates r_{2j} and the low- θ expansion of $h(\theta)$. Other sources of error are neglected and therefore the final error may be underestimated.

⁸ From the values of g_4 and g_6 reported for the two dimensional model one derives $r_6 = 3.12(12)$, to be compared with our strong-coupling result $r_6 = 3.678(2)$.

of r_{2j} ; beside exact results for $d = 0, 1$, good estimates have been obtained in $d = 2$ by an analysis of the available high-temperature series, which can be used in the constrained analysis of the ϵ -expansion. The precision of our results is comparable with that obtained from the analysis of the g -expansion. Moreover there is a substantial consistency among the various approaches whose results are reported in Table VI.

APPENDIX A:

In this appendix we give some useful formulas relating r_{2j} to the connected Green's functions evaluated at zero momentum. The coefficients of the expansion of $A(z)$ around $z = 0$ can be written in terms of one-particle irreducible correlation functions

$$\Gamma_{2j} \equiv \Gamma_{\alpha_1 \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_j \alpha_j}^{(2j)}(0, \dots, 0), \quad (\text{A1})$$

as

$$r_{2j} \equiv \frac{g_{2j}}{g^{j-1}} = \frac{(2j)!}{2^j 3^{j-1} j!} \frac{(N+2)^{j-2}}{\prod_{i=2}^{j-1} (N+2i)} \frac{\Gamma_{2j} \Gamma_2^{j-2}}{\Gamma_4^{j-1}}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

In terms of the zero-momentum connected Green's functions

$$\chi_{2j} = \sum_{x_2, \dots, x_{2j}} \langle s_{\alpha_1}(0) s_{\alpha_1}(x_2) \dots s_{\alpha_j}(x_{2j-1}) s_{\alpha_j}(x_{2j}) \rangle_c, \quad (\text{A3})$$

one then has

$$r_6 = 10 - \frac{5(N+2)}{3(N+4)} \frac{\chi_6 \chi_2}{\chi_4^2}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$r_8 = 280 - \frac{280(N+2)}{3(N+4)} \frac{\chi_6 \chi_2}{\chi_4^2} + \frac{35(N+2)^2}{9(N+4)(N+6)} \frac{\chi_8 \chi_2^2}{\chi_4^3}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$r_{10} = 15400 - \frac{7700(N+2)}{(N+4)} \frac{\chi_6 \chi_2}{\chi_4^2} + \frac{350(N+2)^2}{(N+4)^2} \frac{\chi_6^2 \chi_2^2}{\chi_4^4} + \frac{1400(N+2)^2}{3(N+4)(N+6)} \frac{\chi_8 \chi_2^2}{\chi_4^3} - \frac{35(N+2)^3}{3(N+4)(N+6)(N+8)} \frac{\chi_{10} \chi_2^3}{\chi_4^4}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

APPENDIX B:

Here we present the ϵ -series of r_{2j} we used in our analysis. The ϵ -expansion of r_{2j} can be obtained from the equation of state which is known to $O(\epsilon^3)$ for the Ising model [24,25,9], and to $O(\epsilon^2)$ for generic values of N [26].

For generic values of N one finds

$$r_6 = \frac{5(N+26)}{6(N+8)} \epsilon - \frac{4.37395N^2 + 55.6177N + 615.008}{(N+8)^3} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3), \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$r_8 = -\frac{35(N+80)}{18(N+8)} \epsilon + \frac{35(N^3 + 67.6582N^2 + 1661.61N + 11634.7)}{18(N+8)^3} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3), \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$r_{10} = \frac{35(N+242)}{3(N+8)} \epsilon - \frac{245(N^3 + 108.389N^2 + 4780.44N + 35830.0)}{12(N+8)^3} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3). \quad (\text{B3})$$

For the Ising model, where one additional order is known, we have

$$r_6 = \frac{5}{2}\epsilon - \frac{25}{27}\epsilon^2 + \left(\frac{20\zeta(3)}{9} - \frac{5\lambda}{9} - \frac{310}{729} \right) \epsilon^3 + O(\epsilon^4), \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$r_8 = -\frac{35}{2}\epsilon + \frac{1925}{54}\epsilon^2 - \left(\frac{350\zeta(3)}{9} - \frac{35\lambda}{3} + \frac{18655}{1458} \right) \epsilon^3 + O(\epsilon^4), \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$r_{10} = 315\epsilon - \frac{13685}{12}\epsilon^2 + \left(1260\zeta(3) - 420\lambda + \frac{406945}{324} \right) \epsilon^3 + O(\epsilon^4), \quad (\text{B6})$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{3}\psi' \left(\frac{1}{3} \right) - \frac{2\pi^2}{9} \approx 1.17195 \quad (\text{B7})$$

and $\zeta(3) \approx 1.20206$.

APPENDIX C:

In this appendix we present some details of the computation of r_6 and r_8 in $d = 1$. We use the formalism of Ref. [42] which is based on the expansion of the Boltzmann weight in hyperspherical harmonics. Explicitly, given a generic nearest-neighbour Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_x V(\vec{s}_x \cdot \vec{s}_{x+1}) \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $\vec{s}_x \cdot \vec{s}_x = 1$, we expand the Boltzmann weight as

$$e^{\beta V(\vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{s}_2)} = F_N(\beta) \left[1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} v_{N,k}(\beta) Y_{N,k}(\vec{s}_1) \cdot Y_{N,k}(\vec{s}_2) \right] \quad (\text{C2})$$

where $Y_{N,k}(\vec{s})$ are the $O(N)$ hyperspherical harmonics. The coefficients $v_{N,k}(\beta)$ depend on β and on the explicit form of the interaction $V(x)$. For the standard nearest-neighbour interaction, $V(x) = x$ and

$$v_{N,k}(\beta) = \frac{I_{N/2+k-1}(\beta)}{I_{N/2-1}(\beta)} \quad (\text{C3})$$

where $I_n(\beta)$ is a modified Bessel function.

A rather lengthy computation gives the following results:

$$g_4 = 6 - \frac{12(N-1)}{(N+2)} R_2, \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$g_6 = 180 + 180 \frac{(N-1)}{(N+2)^2} \left[-5(N+2)R_2 - \frac{3N^2}{N+4} R_2^2 R_3 + (7N-4)R_2^2 \right], \quad (\text{C5})$$

$$g_8 = 12600 + 2520 \frac{(N-1)}{(N+2)^3} \left[-44(N+2)^2 R_2 - 54 \frac{N^2(N+2)}{N+4} R_2^2 R_3 \right. \\ \left. - 24 \frac{N^3(N+1)(N+2)}{(N+4)^2(N+6)} R_2^2 R_3^2 R_4 + 6 \frac{N^2(N+2)}{N+4} R_2^2 R_3^2 + 8(N+2)(17N-11)R_2^2 \right. \\ \left. + 12 \frac{N^2(11N-8)}{N+4} R_2^3 R_3 - 18 \frac{N^4}{(N+4)^2} R_2^3 R_3^2 - 2(71N^2 - 82N + 20)R_2^3 \right]. \quad (\text{C6})$$

Here R_j is the critical value of the ratio m_1/m_j where m_j is the mass in the spin- j channel defined by the large- x behaviour of the spin- j correlation function,

$$\langle Y_{N,j}(\vec{s}_0) \cdot Y_{N,j}(\vec{s}_x) \rangle \sim e^{-m_j|x|} \quad (\text{C7})$$

for $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. For the standard nearest-neighbour interaction we have

$$R_j = \begin{cases} \frac{N-1}{j(N+j-2)} & \text{for } N \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{for } N \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{C8})$$

Substituting in the previous formulae, we get the results reported in Sec. III.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. O’Raifeartaigh, A. Wipf, and H. Yoneyama, Nucl. Phys. **B271** (1986) 653.
- [2] H. Mukaida and Y. Shimada, Nucl. Phys. **B479** (1996) 663.
- [3] G. Parisi, Cargèse Lectures (1973), unpublished; J. Stat. Phys. **23** (1980) 49.
- [4] J. Zinn-Justin, “Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena”, Clarendon Press, Oxford, third edition with corrections, 1997.
- [5] G. A. Baker, Jr., B. G. Nickel, M. S. Green and D. I. Meiron, Phys. Rev. Lett. **36** (1977) 1351; G. A. Baker, Jr., B. G. Nickel, and D. I. Meiron, Phys. Rev. **B17** (1978) 1365.
- [6] J. C. Le Guillou, and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39** (1977) 95; Phys. Rev. **B21** (1980) 3976.
- [7] B. G. Nickel, Physica **A117** (1991) 189; D. B. Murray and B. G. Nickel, *Revised estimates for critical exponents for the continuum n-vector model in 3 dimensions*, unpublished Guelph University report (1991).
- [8] S. A. Antonenko and A. I. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. **E51** (1995) 1894.
- [9] R. Guida and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. **B489** (1997) 626.
- [10] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, *Four-point renormalized coupling constant and Callan-Symanzik β -function in $O(N)$ models*, cond-mat/9711078, submitted to Nucl. Phys. **B**.
- [11] M. Campostrini, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi and E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 207.
- [12] T. Reisz, Phys. Lett. **360B** (1995) 77.
- [13] S. Zinn, S.-N. Lai, and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. **E54** (1996) 1176.
- [14] P. Butera and N. Comi, Phys. Rev. **E55** (1997) 6391.
- [15] M. M. Tsy-pin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 2015.
- [16] G. A. Baker Jr. and N. Kawashima, J. Phys. **A29** (1996) 7183.
- [17] J.-K. Kim and D. P. Landau, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **53** (1997) 706.
- [18] N. Tetradis and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B422** (1994) 541.
- [19] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1992) 4919; Phys. Rev. **D51** (1995) 1875.
- [20] A. I. Sokolov, V. A. Ul’kov and E. V. Orlov, to appear in “RG96”, and J. Phys. Studies; A. I. Sokolov, Phys. Solid State **38** (1996) 354.
- [21] T. Morris, Nucl. Phys. **B495** (1997) 477.
- [22] S.-H. Lai and M. E. Fisher, Molec. Phys. **88** (1996) 1373.
- [23] K. G. Wilson and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28** (1972) 240.
- [24] D. J. Wallace and R. P. K. Zia, J. Phys. **C7** (1974) 3480.
- [25] J. F. Nicoll and P. C. Albright, Phys. Rev. **B31** (1985) 4576.
- [26] E. Brézin, D. J. Wallace, and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29** (1972) 591; Phys. Rev. **B7** (1973) 232.
- [27] J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, J. Physique **48** (1987) 19.
- [28] M. Campostrini, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi and E. Vicari, Europhys. Lett. **38** (1997) 577; cond-mat/9705086, to appear in Phys. Rev. **E**.
- [29] C. M. Bender, S. Boettcher, and L. Lipatov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992) 3674.
- [30] E. Brézin and D. J. Wallace, Phys. Rev. **B7** (1973) 1967.
- [31] E. Brézin, J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. **D8** (1973) 2418.
- [32] T. T. Wu, B. M. McCoy, C. A. Tracy, and E. Barouch, Phys. Rev. **B13** (1976) 316.

- [33] M. Barma, and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. **B31** (1985) 5954.
- [34] S. Katsura, N. Yazaki, and M. Takaishi, Can. J. Phys. **55** (1977) 1648.
- [35] S. McKenzie, Can. J. Phys. **57** (1979) 1239.
- [36] L. N. Lipatov, Sov. Phys. JETP **72** (1977) 411.
- [37] E. Brézin, J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 1544, 1588.
- [38] C. Bagnuls, C. Bervillier, D. I. Meiron and B. G. Nickel, Phys. Rev. **B35** (1987) 3585.
- [39] F. J. Halfkann and V. Dohm, Z. Phys. **B89** (1992) 79.
- [40] R. Z. Roskies, Phys. Rev. **B24** (1981) 5305.
- [41] P. Butera and N. Comi, Phys. Rev. **B56** (1997) 8212.
- [42] A. Cucchieri, T. Mendes, A. Pelissetto and A. D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **86** (1997) 581

TABLES

TABLE I. Two-dimensional Ising model. We report the estimates of r_6 , r_8 and r_{10} obtained from the analysis of the 17th order strong-coupling series on the square lattice and 14th order series on the triangular lattice (HT), and from the analyses of the ϵ -expansion constrained at $d = 1$ and at $d = 0, 1$ (ϵ -exp.).

	HT		ϵ -exp.	
	square	triangular	$d = 1$	$d = 0, 1$
r_6	3.677(2)	3.678(1)	3.67(9)	3.69(4)
r_8	25.9(5)	26.0(1)	24.2(2.2)	26.4(1.0)
r_{10}	269(11)	279(11)	131(81)	171(31)

TABLE II. Three-dimensional Ising model. Estimates of r_6 , r_8 , and r_{10} from the polynomial interpolation (“int”), from an unconstrained analysis of the ϵ -expansion, “unc”, and constrained analyses in various dimensions. For the analyses which use the estimates in $d = 2$ we report two errors: the first one gives the uncertainty of the resummation of the series, the second one expresses the change in the estimate when the two-dimensional result varies within one error bar.

	int	unc	$d = 1$	$d = 0, 1$	$d = 2$	$d = 1, 2$	$d = 0, 1, 2$
r_6	2.092	2.106(79)	2.058(35)	2.063(24)	2.059(25+0)	2.060(15+1)	2.058(11+1)
r_8	1.31	0.4(2.4)	1.93(89)	2.65(63)	2.23(60+2)	2.53(39+3)	2.48(27+5)
r_{10}	35	-98(120)	-7(67)	15(38)	-7(41+2)	-8(18+5)	-20(13+7)

TABLE III. Three-dimensional estimates of r_6 and r_8 for various values of N from the polynomial interpolation (“int”), cf. Eq. (38) for r_6 , from an unconstrained analysis of the ϵ -expansion and constrained analyses in various dimensions.

N	r_6				r_8			
	int	unc	$d = 1$	$d = 0, 1$	int	unc	$d = 1$	$d = 0, 1$
0	2.42	2.08(22)	2.07(12)		-7.8	8(11)	6.4(5.0)	
1	2.17	2.03(17)	2.01(9)	2.03(6)	-0.6	5.2(8.7)	4.8 (3.6)	4.7(1.9)
2	2.05	1.94(14)	1.91(6)	1.94(5)	-0.4	3.6(7.0)	3.2 (2.8)	3.5(1.3)
3	1.93	1.86(11)	1.82(5)	1.84(4)	-1.2	2.4(5.8)	2.0 (2.2)	2.1(1.0)
4	1.82	1.76(9)	1.74(4)	1.75(3)	-1.7	1.5(4.9)	1.1 (1.9)	1.2(1.0)
8	1.500	1.525(55)	1.516(17)	1.517(8)	-2.5	-0.7(2.7)	-0.72(94)	-0.74(44)
16	1.296	1.304(26)	1.296(6)	1.291(1)	-2.3	-1.3(1.4)	-1.29(39)	-1.37(18)
32	1.104	1.115(11)	1.112(2)	1.108(1)	-1.6	-1.4(7)	-1.18(13)	-1.22(6)
48	1.025	1.036(6)	1.032(1)	1.029(1)	-1.2	-1.2(5)	-0.96(7)	-0.98(3)

TABLE IV. Two-dimensional estimates of r_6 and r_8 for various values of N from the polynomial interpolation of the known values at $d = 4, 1, 0$, from analyses constrained at $d = 1$ and at $d = 0, 1$. In the large- N limit $r_6 = 5/3$ and $r_8 = 35/9$.

N	r_6			r_8		
	int	$d = 1$	$d = 0, 1$	int	$d = 1$	$d = 0, 1$
0	3.87	3.7(9)		10.5	33(11)	
1	3.78	3.69(26)	3.70(10)	23.5	28.7(7.5)	28.6(2.6)
2	3.60	3.51(22)	3.54(7)	20.9	24.9(6.5)	25.1(2.0)
3	3.38	3.32(19)	3.33(6)	16.7	20.3(5.4)	20.3(1.7)
4	3.20	3.15(15)	3.15(5)	13.6	17.0(4.5)	16.8(1.4)
8	2.73	2.70(9)	2.71(3)	7.5	9.3(2.2)	9.3(7)
16	2.330	2.34(4)	2.325(5)	4.3	5.1(1.0)	5.2(3)
32	2.045	2.06(2)	2.049(3)	3.4	3.82(40)	3.81(12)
48	1.932	1.95(1)	1.936(2)	3.3	3.65(22)	3.60(7)

TABLE V. Summary of the available estimates of r_6 and r_8 for several values of N in three dimensions.

N	r_6				r_8		
	ϵ -exp.	ERG [18]	HT [12]	$1/N$	ϵ -exp.	ERG [18]	$1/N$
0	2.1(3)				6(5)		
2	1.94(11)	1.83	2.2(6)		3.5(1.3)	1.45	
3	1.84(9)	1.74	2.1(6)		2.1(1.0)	0.84	
4	1.75(7)	1.65	1.9(6)		1.2(1.0)	0.33	
8	1.52(2)			2.11	-0.7(5)		-8.41
16	1.291(5)			1.47	-1.4(2)		-4.21
32	1.108(4)			1.15	-1.22(6)		-2.10
48	1.029(4)			1.046	-0.98(3)		-1.40
100	0.934(3)	0.89		0.9355	-0.575(9)	-0.64	-0.67

TABLE VI. Summary of the available estimates of r_6 , r_8 and r_{10} for the three-dimensional Ising model. The error we quote for the result of our ϵ -expansion analysis has been calculated by considering the two errors reported in the last row of Table II as uncorrelated.

	r_6	r_8	r_{10}
ϵ -exp. [this paper]	2.058(11)	2.48(28)	-20(15)
ϵ -exp. PREQ [9]	2.11(5)	2.27(15)	-11.6(7)
$d = 3$ g -exp. [9]	2.054(7)	2.50(25)	-22(15)
ERG [21]	2.064(36)	2.47(5)	-18(4)
ERG [18]	1.94	2.18	
HT [14]	1.99(6)	2.7(4)	-4(2)
HT [13]	2.157(18)		
HT [22]	2.25(9)		
HT [12]	2.5(5)		
d -exp [19]	1.54(26)		
MC [15]	2.72(23)		
MC [17]	3.26(25)	12(2)	

FIGURES

FIG. 1. For the Ising model we plot r_6 as a function of d . The continuous line represents the polynomial interpolation through the known results at $d = 4, 2, 1, 0$. The bars are the results (with their uncertainty) of our constrained ($d = 2, 1, 0$) ϵ -expansion analysis.

FIG. 2. For the Ising model we plot r_8 as a function of d . The continuous line represents the polynomial interpolation through the known results at $d = 4, 2, 1, 0$. The bars are the results (with their uncertainty) of our constrained ($d = 2, 1, 0$) ϵ -expansion analysis.

Figure 1




Figure 2

