

Non-analyticity of the Callan-Symanzik β -function of $O(N)$ models.

Andrea Pelissetto^a and Ettore Vicari^a

^aDipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Pisa, Italy.

In the framework of the $1/N$ expansion we show that the Callan-Symanzik β -function associated with the four-point coupling g is non-analytic at its zero, i.e. at the fixed-point value g^* of g . This singular behavior can be interpreted by renormalization group arguments, and written in terms of scaling correction exponents.

We obtain accurate determinations of g^* in $3-d$ and $2-d$ by exploiting two alternative approaches: the ϵ -expansion in the ϕ^4 formulation of the $O(N)$ model, and the high-temperature expansion of the lattice N -vector ($O(N)$ nonlinear σ) model. These results are compared with the available estimates by other approaches, such as the fixed-dimension perturbative expansion, Monte Carlo simulations, etc..

We also present results for the n -point renormalized coupling constants that parameterize the behavior of the effective potential in the high- and low-temperature phases.

The renormalization-group theory of critical phenomena provides a description of statistical models in the neighbourhood of the critical point. For $O(N)$ models calculations are based on the ϕ^4 -field theory. A strategy, which has been largely employed in the study of the symmetric phase, relies on a perturbative expansion in powers of the zero-momentum four-point coupling g performed at fixed dimension. The theory is renormalized at zero momentum by requiring

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(p)_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} Z_G^{-1} [m^2 + p^2 + O(p^4)] \quad (1)$$

$$\Gamma^{(4)}(0, 0, 0, 0)_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = Z_G^{-2} m g \delta_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} / 3 \quad (2)$$

where $\delta_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\gamma\delta} + \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\delta} + \delta_{\alpha\delta}\delta_{\beta\gamma}$. When $m \rightarrow 0$ the coupling g is driven toward an infrared stable zero g^* of the Callan-Symanzik β -function

$$\beta(g) \equiv m \partial g / \partial m|_{g_0, \Lambda}. \quad (3)$$

g^* is also obtained as the critical limit of

$$g_\sigma = -\frac{3N}{N+2} \frac{\chi_4}{\chi^2 \xi^d} \longrightarrow g^* \quad (4)$$

where χ is the magnetic susceptibility, ξ the second-moment correlation length, and $\chi_4 = \sum_{i,j,k} \langle \phi(0) \cdot \phi(x_i) \phi(x_j) \cdot \phi(x_k) \rangle_c$. We recall that N -vector (nonlinear $O(N)$ σ) and ϕ^4 models describe the same critical behavior.

In the framework of the $1/N$ expansion the analysis of the next-to-leading order shows that

the Callan-Symanzik β -function is non-analytic at its zero, i.e. at the fixed-point value g^* of g [1]. The large- N result agrees with the singular behavior

$$\beta(g) = -\omega(g^* - g) + \text{analytic terms} \\ + c_1 (g^* - g)^{1+\frac{1}{\Delta}} + \dots + d_1 (g^* - g)^{\frac{\Delta_2}{\Delta}} + \dots \quad (5)$$

($\Delta = \omega\nu$ and Δ_2 are scaling correction exponents) that can be derived using renormalization group arguments [2].

A precise determination of g^* is crucial in the field-theoretic approach based on the g -expansion, where the critical exponents are obtained by evaluating appropriate (resummed) anomalous dimensions at g^* . In this approach the resummation of the g -expansion is usually performed following the Le Guillou Zinn-Justin (LZ) procedure [3], which assumes the analyticity of the β -function. The presence of confluent singularities may then cause a slow convergence to the correct fixed-point value, leading to an underestimation of the uncertainty. A more general analysis explicitly allowing for the presence of confluent singularities would slightly change the value of g^* for small values of N and consequently the values of the critical exponents [4]. It is therefore important to exploit other approaches to the study of $O(N)$ models, which can provide a check of the estimates of g^* from the resummations of the g -expansion. We considered two al-

Table 1

Three-dimensional estimates of $\bar{g}^* \equiv g^*(N+8)/(48\pi)$. For the Ising model we also mention the recent Monte Carlo estimate [7] $\bar{g}^* = 1.397(14)$ (actually derived by us using the data kindly made available by the authors). A more complete list of the available estimates of g^* can be found in Ref. [1].

N	ϵ -exp.[1]	g -exp.[6]	g -exp.[4]	H.T.[1]	H.T. cubic[5]	H.T. bcc[5]
0	1.390(17)	1.413(6)	1.39	1.393(20)	1.388(5)	1.387(5)
1	1.397(8)	1.411(4)	1.40	1.406(9)	1.408(7)	1.407(6)
2	1.413(13)	1.403(3)	1.40	1.415(11)	1.411(8)	1.406(8)
3	1.387(7)	1.391(4)	1.39	1.411(12)	1.409(10)	1.406(8)
4	1.366(15)	1.377(5)		1.396(16)	1.392(10)	1.394(10)

Table 2

Two-dimensional estimates of $\bar{g}^* \equiv g^*(N+8)/(24\pi)$. We recall that $O(N)$ σ models with $N \geq 3$ are asymptotically free, thus $\beta_c = \infty$.

N	ϵ -exp.[1]	g -exp.	H.T.	M.C.	$1/N$ -exp.
0	1.69(7)		1.679(3) [9]		
1	1.75(5)	1.85(10) [3]	1.7540(2) [9]	1.71(12) [10]	
2	1.79(3)		1.810(10) [9]	1.76(3) [11]	
3	1.72(2)	1.749(16) [8]	1.724(9) [1]	1.73(3) [11]	1.758
4	1.64(2)		1.655(16) [9]		1.698

ternative approaches: the ϵ -expansion in the continuum ϕ^4 formulation and the high-temperature (HT) expansion of the N -vector (lattice $O(N)$ σ) model. We extended the ϵ -expansion of g^* to $O(\epsilon^4)$. Accurate estimates of g^* in 3- d and 2- d were obtained by a constrained analysis of the ϵ -series using its known values at lower dimensions. Moreover we reanalyzed the available HT expansion of g_σ in the N -vector models, by a method able to handle the leading confluent singularity (for a more recent analysis using longer series see Ref. [5]). In Table 1 and 2 we present our 3- d and 2- d results respectively. For comparison we also report some of the available estimates from other approaches. The agreement among the various estimates of g^* is globally good.

The results in Table 1 indicate that the systematic error in the LZ resummation due to the non-analytic terms in Eq. (5) should be small. This may be explained by the fact that, for small values of N , the exponents in Eq. (5) are close to integer numbers, indeed $\Delta_2/\Delta \simeq 2$, $\Delta_3/\Delta \simeq 3$, and $1 + 1/\Delta \simeq 3$. However, the results for $N = 0, 1$ are slightly lower than the estimates given by the LZ resummation of the $O(g^7)$ series of $\beta(g)$, thus favouring the more general analysis of Ref. [4].

This would lead to a small change in the estimates of the critical exponents. For instance, in the case $N = 0$ (self avoiding walks) the resummation of the $O(g^7)$ series of $\gamma(g)$ evaluated at $\bar{g}^* = 1.413(6)$ gives $\gamma(\bar{g}^*) \simeq 1.160$. A lower value $\bar{g}^* \simeq 1.39$, as indicated by our calculations, would lead to $\gamma(\bar{g}^* = 1.39) \simeq 1.158$, in substantial agreement with the recent result of Monte Carlo simulations $\gamma = 1.1575(6)$ [12] and with the analysis of the ϵ -expansion: $\gamma \simeq 1.158$.

The effective potential is widely used in the field-theoretic description of fundamental interactions and phase transitions. In statistical physics it represents the free-energy density \mathcal{F} as a function of the order parameter. \mathcal{F} can be expanded in powers of the renormalized magnetization φ

$$\Delta\mathcal{F} = \sum_{j=1} m^{2j+(1-j)d} \frac{1}{(2j)!} g_{2j} \varphi^{2j} \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\varphi) - \mathcal{F}(0)$, and g_{2j} are the zero-momentum $2j$ -point renormalized coupling. By definition $g_2 = 1$ and $g_4 = g$. Setting $\varphi = m^{(d-2)/2} z / \sqrt{g}$ and $r_{2j} = g_{2j} / g^{j-1}$ we write

$$\Delta\mathcal{F} = \frac{m^d}{g} \left(\frac{1}{2} z^2 + \frac{1}{4!} z^4 + \sum_{j=3} \frac{1}{(2j)!} r_{2j} z^{2j} \right) \quad (7)$$

Table 3

Three-dimensional estimates of r_6 and r_8 . A more complete list of the estimates of r_{2j} is reported in [13].

N	r_6				r_8			
	ϵ -exp.	g -exp.	ERG	H.T.	ϵ -exp.	g -exp.	ERG	H.T.
1	2.058(11)	2.053(8)	2.064(36)	1.99(6)	2.48(28)	2.47(25)	2.47(5)	2.7(4)
2	1.94(11)	1.967	1.83	2.2(6)	3.5(1.3)		1.4	
3	1.84(9)	1.880	1.74	2.1(6)	2.1(1.0)		0.84	
4	1.75(7)	1.803	1.65	1.9(6)	1.2(1.0)		0.33	

In order to evaluate the first few r_{2j} we performed a constrained analysis of the ϵ -expansion of r_{2j} . In Table 3 we report our 3- d results for r_6 and r_8 . We compare them with some of the available estimates from other approaches, such as $d = 3$ g -expansion [6,14], approximate solution of the exact renormalization group equation (ERG) [15,16], high-temperature expansion [17, 18]. In the case of the Ising model also r_{10} has been roughly estimated: $r_{10} = -20(15)$.

In two dimensions an analysis of the HT expansion of the free-energy of the Ising model in the presence of an external field gave $r_6 = 3.678(2)$, $r_8 = 26.0(2)$ and $r_{10} = 275(15)$. These numbers compare well with the estimates $r_6 = 3.69(4)$ and $r_8 = 26.4(1.0)$ obtained from our constrained analysis of the ϵ -expansion. Moreover we obtained $r_6 = 3.54(7)$ and $r_8 = 25.1(2.0)$ for $N = 2$ (2- d XY model), and $r_6 = 3.33(6)$ and $r_8 = 20.3(1.7)$ for $N = 3$.

In the broken phase of the 3- d Ising model the effective potential at the coexistence curve can be expanded as

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi) - \mathcal{F}(\varphi_0) = \sum_{j=2} m^{d-j(d-2)/2} \frac{1}{j!} g_j^- (\varphi - \varphi_0)^j \quad (8)$$

where g_j^- are the zero-momentum j -point renormalized coupling in the broken phase ($g_2^- = 1$ by definition). A constrained analysis of the ϵ -expansion [19] gave the estimates $g_3^- = 13.06(12)$ and $g_4^- = 75(7)$. The parametrization (8) does not apply to the case $N \neq 1$, due to the presence of Goldstone bosons. One indeed finds

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi) - \mathcal{F}(\varphi_0) \approx c (\varphi^2 - \varphi_0^2)^{d/(d-2)} \quad (9)$$

In 3- d , where $d/(d-2) = 3$, logarithms appear in the corrections to the leading behavior.

REFERENCES

1. A. Pelissetto, E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. **B519** (1998) 626.
2. B. G. Nickel, in *Phase Transitions*, M. Lévy, J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin eds., (Plenum, New York and London, 1982).
3. J. C. Le Guillou, J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. **B21** (1980) 3976.
4. D.B. Murray, B.G. Nickel, Guelph University report (1991).
5. P. Butera, M. Comi, hep-lat/9805025.
6. R. Guida, J. Zinn-Justin, cond-mat/9803240.
7. H.G. Ballesteros, et al, hep-lat/9805022; private communications.
8. M. Falcioni, et al, Nucl. Phys. **B225** (1983) 313.
9. P. Butera, N. Comi, Phys. Rev. **B54** (1996) 15828.
10. J. K. Kim, A. Patrascioiu, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 2588.
11. J. Kim, Phys. Lett. **B345** (1995) 469.
12. S. Caracciolo, M. S. Causo, A. Pelissetto, Phys. Rev. **E57** (1998) R1215.
13. A. Pelissetto, E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. **B522** (1998) 605.
14. A. I. Sokolov, et al, hep-th/9808011.
15. T. Morris, Nucl. Phys. **B495** (1997) 477.
16. N. Tetradis, C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B422** (1994) 541.
17. P. Butera, N. Comi, Phys. Rev. **E55** (1997) 6391.
18. T. Reisz, Phys. Lett. **B360** (1995) 77.
19. A. Pelissetto, E. Vicari, cond-mat/9805317.