

# Improved actions for the two-dimensional $\sigma$ -model

Sergio Caracciolo<sup>a</sup>, Andrea Montanari<sup>a</sup>, and Andrea Pelissetto<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, Sezione di Pisa, I-56100 Pisa, ITALIA

<sup>b</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università degli Studi di Pisa, I-56100 Pisa, ITALIA

For the  $O(N)$   $\sigma$ -model we studied the improvement program for actions with two- and four-spin interactions. An interesting example is an action which is reflection-positive, on-shell improved, and has all the coupling defined on an elementary plaquette. We show the large  $N$  solution and preliminary Monte Carlo results for  $N = 3$ .

In recent years there has been much work in improving lattice actions (see e.g. M. Lüscher's and P. Hasenfratz' talks at this conference). The idea behind all these attempts is to modify the lattice action with the addition of irrelevant operators in order to reduce lattice artifacts: the aim is to have scaling and finite-size-scaling at small values of the correlation length.

Two different approaches have been used. The original idea of Symanzik [1] consisted in adding, on the basis of power counting, new operators to the action with coefficients such as to cancel corrections of order  $O(g^{2n}a^2)$  in the correlation functions. It was later realized that it is possible to change the action so as to improve only on-shell quantities [2]. In this case the number of necessary operators is in general reduced. This approach can be applied order by order in perturbation theory in a straightforward (although computationally difficult) way. Recently the idea has been successfully implemented at a non-perturbative level [3] for the fermionic actions (here the corrections are of order  $a$ ), obtaining actions which are full improved at order  $O(a)$ .

A different approach is the perfect action program of Ref. [4]: here the starting point is an action which is the fixed point of a renormalization-group transformation. The relation between the Symanzik approach and the fixed-point actions has been recently clarified in Ref. [5]. Fixed-point actions are *on-shell*, *tree-level* improved to *all orders in  $a^2$*  (this last condition should not be very relevant — at least for the scaling of stan-

dard observables — as quantum corrections will introduce again terms of order  $a^2$ ). Therefore these actions are particular Symanzik theories. Of course the main question is if this particular procedure chooses among all Symanzik-improved theories those which have a “better” behaviour. We do not know the answer to this question, but we can try to understand it by comparing the behaviour of fixed-point actions and other theories which are improved à la Symanzik using different criteria (for instance simplicity, locality .....). Here we will study this problem in the context of the two-dimensional  $\sigma$ -model focusing on the behaviour of the mass gap in a strip.

Let us begin by discussing tree-level improvement and in particular the relation between on-shell and off-shell improvement. In this case one can show that for generic actions which have only two-spin couplings on-shell and off-shell improvement at tree level are identical. More precisely, consider an action of the form

$$S = \sum_{x,y} J(x-y) \sigma_x \cdot \sigma_y \quad , \quad (1)$$

such that:

1. the Fourier transform  $\hat{J}(p)$  of  $J(x)$  is continuous (locality);
2.  $\hat{J}(p) - \hat{J}(0) = 0$  only for  $p = (0,0)$  in the Brillouin zone (correct continuum limit);
3.  $\hat{J}(p) - \hat{J}(0) = -\alpha p^2 + O(p^4)$  for  $p \rightarrow 0$  with  $\alpha > 0$  (ferromagnetic).

Then tree-level improvement (both on-shell and off-shell) requires that, for  $p \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\hat{J}(p) - \hat{J}(0) = -\alpha p^2 + O(p^6). \quad (2)$$

The classical example is the action proposed originally by Symanzik [1]

$$S^{Sym} = \sum_{x\mu} \left( \frac{4}{3} \sigma_x \cdot \sigma_{x+\mu} - \frac{1}{12} \sigma_x \cdot \sigma_{x+2\mu} \right). \quad (3)$$

It is possible to obtain actions which are on-shell, but not off-shell, improved if one adds also four-spin couplings. Indeed, if  $S^{cl}$  is the classical continuum action

$$S^{cl} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2x (\sigma \cdot \square \sigma), \quad (4)$$

( $\square = \sum_{\mu} \partial_{\mu}^2$ ), then it is easy to check that

$$\square \pi \cdot \frac{\delta S^{cl}}{\delta \pi} - (\sigma \cdot \square \sigma) \pi \cdot \frac{\delta S^{cl}}{\delta \pi} = \square \sigma \cdot \square \sigma - (\sigma \cdot \square \sigma)^2 \quad (5)$$

Thus a lattice action whose continuum limit is

$$S = \int d^2x \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\sigma \cdot \square \sigma) + \frac{Aa^2}{2} (\sigma \cdot \square^2 \sigma - (\sigma \cdot \square \sigma)^2) + O(a^4) \right] \quad (6)$$

is on-shell improved for any  $A$  since the added term vanishes when one uses the classical equations of motion. In a more rigorous way one can show that, up to terms of order  $O(a^4)$ , a change of variables allows to get rid of the term proportional to  $A$  in (6). It is enough to reexpress the action in terms of

$$\pi' = \pi + \frac{Aa^2}{2} (\square \pi - \pi (\sigma \cdot \square \sigma)). \quad (7)$$

It is easy to write down an action with the continuum limit (6). A possible choice with all the couplings defined on a plaquette is given by [6]

$$S^{pl} = \sum_x \left( \frac{2}{3} \sum_{\mu} \sigma_x \cdot \sigma_{x+\mu} + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\hat{d}} \sigma_x \cdot \sigma_{x+\hat{d}} \right) - \frac{1}{24} \sum_x \sum_{i=1}^4 \left( \sum_{\mu_i} (\sigma_x \cdot \sigma_{x+\mu_i} - 1) \right)^2 \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{d}$  are the two diagonal vectors  $(1, \pm 1)$ ,  $\mu_1$  runs over the vectors  $(1, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$ ,  $\mu_2$  over  $(-1, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$ ,  $\mu_3$  over  $(-1, 0)$  and  $(0, -1)$  and  $\mu_4$  over  $(1, 0)$  and  $(0, -1)$  (the sum over  $i$  symmetrizes over the four plaquettes stemming from the point  $x$ ).

It is easy to verify the following properties of the action  $S^{pl}$ :

1. it is the most local action satisfying (6);
2. it is reflection positive with respect to lattice planes;
3. the ordered configuration is the unique maximum of  $S^{pl}$ ;
4. under Wolff's embedding only two-spin couplings are generated, so that one can simulate  $S^{pl}$  by a standard Wolff's algorithm.

It is easy to study the large- $N$  limit of the various actions. The large- $N$  solution of (8) can be obtained following the method used for mixed  $O(N)/RP^{N-1}$  models [7]. The two-point function is given by

$$G(x) = \frac{1}{\beta(1+\omega)} \int \frac{d^2p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{e^{ipx}}{w(p;\omega) + m^2}, \quad (9)$$

where

$$w(p;\omega) \equiv \hat{p}^2 - \frac{1}{6} \frac{\hat{p}_1^2 \hat{p}_2^2}{1+\omega}; \quad (10)$$

here  $\omega$  and  $m$  are related to  $\beta$  by the gap equations

$$\beta(1+\omega) = \int \frac{d^2p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{w(p;\omega) + m^2}, \quad (11)$$

$$6\beta\omega(1+\omega) = \int \frac{d^2p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{w(p;\omega) + m^2}, \quad (12)$$

and  $\hat{p} = 2 \sin(p/2)$ .

It is also possible to compute analytically the corrections to finite-size scaling. If one considers a strip  $L \times \infty$  and the mass-gap  $\mu(L)$ , in the FSS limit one finds

$$\frac{\mu(L)}{\mu(\infty)} = f(x) \left[ 1 + \frac{g_0(x)}{L^2} + O(1/(L^2 \log L)) \right] \quad (13)$$

where  $x \equiv \mu(L)L$ , and all functions can be analytically computed. The result is similar to what




Figure 1. Corrections to FSS for the mass gap  $\mu(L)$  for  $N = \infty$  for the four actions described in the text

has been found for general two-spin actions [8]: tree-level improvement cancels corrections of order  $\log L/L^2$ . In the large- $N$  limit we can easily compare the various actions. In Fig. 1 we report  $\mu(2L)2L$  for  $x = 1.0595$  for the Symanzik action, the plaquette action, the standard action  $S^{std}$  with nearest neighbour interactions and the diagonal action  $S^{diag}$  defined by (8) without the four-spin term. Two observations are in order: first of all, as expected, the non-improved actions show larger corrections to scaling than their improved counterparts; less expected is instead the fact that the plaquette action is clearly worse than the standard Symanzik one in spite of the “nicer” theoretical properties (more local, reflection positive ...). Moreover  $S^{Sym}$  scores much better than expected: on this scale no corrections are seen up to  $L = 5$ .

It is also interesting to perform the comparison of the various actions for  $N = 3$ . In Fig. 2 we report the same data as Fig. 1 but for  $N = 3$  together the perfect-action results of Ref. [4]. No data for the Symanzik action are yet available. The results look very similar to those for  $N = \infty$ : in particular the plaquette action shows corrections which are only half the size of the those of  $S^{std}$  and it is indeed much worse than the perfect




Figure 2.  $\mu(2L)2L$  for  $N = 3$  for fixed  $L\mu(L) = 1.0595$ . The crosses refer to the standard action (Ref. [9]), the diamonds to the perfect action (Ref. [4]) and the circle to the plaquette action.

action.

## REFERENCES

1. K. Symanzik, in “*Mathematical problems in theoretical physics*”, R. Schrader et al. eds., (Springer, Berlin, 1982); Nucl. Phys. B226 (1983) 187; *ibid.* 205.
2. Lüscher and P. Weisz, Comm. Math. Phys. 97 (1985) 59; *erratum* 98 (1985) 433.
3. M. Lüscher, S. Sint, R. Sommer, P. Weisz, H. Wittig and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 53 (1997) 905.
4. P. Hasenfratz and F. Niedermayer, Nucl. Phys. B414 (1994) 785.
5. P. Hasenfratz and F. Niedermayer, Fixed point actions in one-loop perturbation theory, hep-lat/9706002.
6. A. Caracciolo and A. Pelissetto, Phys. Lett. B402 (1997) 335.
7. N. Magnoli and F. Ravanini, Z. Phys. C31 (1986) 567.
8. S. Caracciolo and A. Pelissetto, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 53 (1997) 693.
9. M. Lüscher, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 221.