The dynamic critical exponent $z$ of the three-dimensional Ising universality class: Monte Carlo simulations of the improved Blume-Capel model
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Abstract

We study purely dissipative relaxational dynamics in the three-dimensional Ising universality class. To this end, we simulate the improved Blume-Capel model on the simple cubic lattice by using local algorithms. We perform a finite size scaling analysis of the integrated autocorrelation time of the magnetic susceptibility in equilibrium at the critical point. As a complement we perform non-equilibrium simulations. Completely ordered configurations are suddenly quenched to the critical temperature. As our final result for the dynamic critical exponent we obtain $z = 2.024(2)$. 
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I. INTRODUCTION

In the neighborhood of a second order phase transition, thermodynamic quantities diverge, following power laws. For example, the correlation length $\xi$ diverges as

$$\xi = f_{\pm} |t|^{-\nu} \times \left(1 + a_{\pm} t^{\theta} + bt + \ldots\right),$$

where $t = (T - T_c)/T_c$ is the reduced temperature and $\nu$ the critical exponent of the correlation length. The subscript $\pm$ of the amplitudes $a_{\pm}$ and $b_{\pm}$ indicates the high (+) and the low (−) temperature phase, respectively. Second order phase transitions are grouped into universality classes. For all transitions within such a class, critical exponents like $\nu$ assume the identical value. These power laws are affected by corrections. There are non-analytic or confluent and analytic ones. Also correction exponents such as $\theta = \omega \nu$ are universal. For the system discussed here, $\theta \approx 0.5$. Amplitudes such as $f_{\pm}$, $a_{\pm}$ and $b$ depend on the microscopic details of the system. However certain combinations, so called amplitude ratios, assume universal values. Universality classes are characterized by the symmetry properties of the order parameter at criticality, the range of the interaction and the spacial dimension of the system. For reviews on critical phenomena see for example [1 –4].

The concepts of critical phenomena can be extended to dynamic processes. For a seminal review see [5]. In addition to the fundamental characteristics of the universality class in equilibrium, a dynamic universality class is characterized by the type of the dynamics and whether the energy or the order parameter are conserved. For a detailed discussion of the classification scheme see refs. [5, 6]. Here we study purely dissipative relaxational dynamics without conservation of the order parameter or the energy, which is denoted as model A in ref. [5].

The dynamics of a model can be studied in various settings. We might consider autocorrelation times $\tau$ of systems in equilibrium or various off equilibrium situations. For example, the system can be prepared in a low or high temperature state and then it is, for example, subject to a sudden quench to the critical temperature. The system might also be subject to a slowly varying external field. Here, we consider equilibrium dynamics at the critical point and a sudden quench from an ordered configuration, corresponding to zero temperature, to the critical one.

Roughly speaking, the autocorrelation time $\tau$ is the time needed to generate a statistically independent configuration in a stochastic process at equilibrium. More precise definitions
will be given below in section IV. In the neighbourhood of a critical point the autocorrelation times of the dynamics increase with increasing correlation length $\xi$. This phenomenon is called critical slowing down. The increase is governed by a power law

$$\tau \simeq \xi^z,$$

where $z$ is the dynamic critical exponent. It can not be related to the static exponents. Similar to eq. (1), the power law is subject to corrections. Below we simulate directly at the critical point. Here, the linear lattice size $L$ takes over the role of the characteristic length scale: $\tau \simeq L^z$. The exponent $z$ also governs non-equilibrium dynamics. For a detailed discussion see for example refs. [7–9].

In table I we summarize theoretical results for the exponent $z$ given in the literature. These were obtained by field theoretic methods and by Monte Carlo (MC) simulations using many different settings. Concerning the field theoretic results we essentially follow the review [6]. Results related to the problem studied here are discussed in section 9. Model A (relaxational dynamics) of ref. [6].

The exponent $z$ has been computed up to the third order in $\epsilon$, where $4 - \epsilon$ is the dimension of the system. It turns out that the result can be conveniently represented as

$$z = 2 + c\eta,$$

where $c = 0.72609 \ (1 - 0.1885 \epsilon + ...) [10]$. At this order in the $\epsilon$-expansion, $c$ does not depend on $n$, where $n$ gives the dimension of the order parameter in the $O(N)$-invariant nonlinear $\sigma$-model [10]. Based on the fact that the coefficient of $\epsilon$ is small, one might hope that most of the difficulties in analysing the series are shuffled into $\eta$ and the series of $c$ is, in a vague sense, well behaved.

For the two-dimensional Ising model various approaches give results that are consistent with $z \approx 2.17$; See for example refs. [11–14]. Note that the two-dimensional Ising model is simpler to deal with than the three-dimensional one for various reasons. In particular note that the leading static correction in the two-dimensional Ising model is due to the breaking of the Galilean invariance by the lattice. On the square lattice we therefore have $\omega = 2$. Using $\eta = 1/4$ we arrive at $c \approx 0.68$ for the two-dimensional Ising model. In order to get an idea which range of numerical values are compatible with the $\epsilon$-expansion at $\epsilon = 1$, we consider the ansatz

$$c = 0.72609 \frac{1 - 0.1885 \epsilon}{1 + b \epsilon^2}.$$  

(4)
Requiring that \( c = 0.68 \) in two dimensions we get \( b = -0.08369 \). Taking this estimate we get \( c = 0.64304 \) in three dimensions. Together with \( \eta = 0.036296(20) \) \([15]\) we arrive at \( z = 2.0233 \) compared with \( z = 2.0214 \) obtained by using the result of the \( \epsilon \)-expansion \([10]\) directly. The latter number is quoted in table II while the first is used to estimate the error. The authors of ref. \([10]\) refrain from giving a numerical estimate for three dimensions. One might try to refine this type of argument by taking into account the result of Bausch et al. \([16]\), who studied the dynamics of an interface in \( 1 + \epsilon' \) dimensions. They arrive at \( z = 2 + \epsilon' - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon'^2 + \ldots \) for the dynamic critical exponent.

In addition to the \( \epsilon \)-expansion, the problem has been attacked by a perturbative expansion in fixed dimension. The 4-loop result for \( d = 3 \) has been analysed in two different ways \([17, 18]\), giving consistent numerical estimates.

Now let us turn to studies using Monte Carlo simulations. In most of the cases, the Ising model on the simple cubic lattice has been studied. In ref. \([25]\), the Ising model on the body centred cubic (bcc) and face centred cubic (fcc) lattice has been simulated. Finally in ref. \([26]\), similar to the present work, the improved Blume-Capel model on the simple cubic lattice is studied. In refs. \([19, 20]\) equilibrium autocorrelation times are determined. In ref. \([11]\) damage spreading is considered. In the other studies short time dynamics is studied. Mostly the simulations are started with an ordered configuration, corresponding to \( T = 0 \), and a sudden quench to \( T_c \) is performed.

The results obtained from simulations of the Ising model give results for \( z \) that are larger than the field theoretic ones. Most of these results are not compatible within errors with the field theoretic ones. One might argue that this is due to the leading correction that is not properly taken into account in the analysis of the data.

This was the motivation of ref. \([26]\) to simulate the improved Blume-Capel model on the simple cubic lattice instead of the Ising model. Indeed the estimate given in ref. \([26]\) is fully consistent with the field theoretic one.

Also here we simulated the improved Blume-Capel model, aiming at a considerably better accuracy of the estimate of \( z \).

In the following section we define the model that is simulated and the observables that are measured. Next we define the algorithms that are used. Then we discuss how the autocorrelation time is defined and how it is determined in the simulation. In section V we discuss our simulations and the analysis of the numerical results. Finally we summarize and
TABLE I. We summarize results for the dynamic critical exponent $z$ for model A and the three-dimensional Ising universality class given in the literature. These were obtained by using field theoretic methods such as the $\epsilon$-expansion and perturbation theory in a fixed dimension and by Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of lattice models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ref.</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>method</th>
<th>$z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Three-loop $\epsilon$-expansion</td>
<td>2.0214(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4-loop in $d = 3$, Padé-Borel summed</td>
<td>2.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4-loop in $d = 3$, Padé summed</td>
<td>2.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>MC, equilibrium dynamic critical behaviour</td>
<td>2.03(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20]</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>MC, equilibrium dynamic critical behaviour</td>
<td>2.03(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>MC, ordered, sudden quench to $T_c$</td>
<td>2.08(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[22]</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>MC, ordered, sudden quench to $T_c$</td>
<td>2.073(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>MC, short time dynamics, various settings</td>
<td>2.042(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MC, ordered, sudden quench to $T_c$</td>
<td>2.055(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>MC, BCC, ordered, sudden quench to $T_c$</td>
<td>2.064(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>MC, improved BC, $T = \infty$, sudden quench to $T_c$</td>
<td>2.020(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

give our conclusions.

II. THE MODEL

The Blume-Capel model is characterized by the reduced Hamiltonian

$$H = -\beta \sum_{<xy>} s_x s_y + D \sum_x s_x^2 - h \sum_x s_x,$$

(5)

where the spin might assume the values $s_x \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2)$ denotes a site of the simple cubic lattice, where $x_i \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., L_i - 1\}$. We employ periodic boundary conditions in all directions of the lattice. Throughout we shall consider $L_0 = L_1 = L_2 = L$ and a vanishing external field $h = 0$. In the limit $D \to -\infty$ the “state” $s = 0$ is completely
suppressed, compared with \( s = \pm 1 \), and therefore the spin-1/2 Ising model is recovered. In \( d \geq 2 \) dimensions the model undergoes a continuous phase transition for \(-\infty \leq D \leq D_{tri}\) at a \( \beta_c(D) \). For \( D > D_{tri} \) the model undergoes a first order phase transition. Refs. [27,29] give for the three-dimensional simple cubic lattice \( D_{tri} \approx 2.006, D_{tri} \approx 2.05 \) and \( D_{tri} = 2.0313(4) \), respectively. It has been demonstrated numerically that on the line of second order phase transitions, there is a point where the amplitude of the leading correction to scaling vanishes, see ref. [30] and references therein. Following ref. [30]

\[
D^* = 0.656(20)
\]

and

\[
\beta_c(D = 0.655) = 0.387721735(25) .
\]

Here we simulated at \((D, \beta) = (0.655, 0.387721735)\). At \( D = 0.655 \) leading corrections to scaling should be at least by a factor of 30 smaller than in the spin-1/2 Ising model on the simple cubic lattice.

A. The observables

We focus on the magnetisation

\[
m = \frac{1}{L^3} \sum_x s_x
\]

and the estimator of the magnetic susceptibility

\[
\chi \equiv \frac{1}{L^3} \left( \sum_x s_x \right)^2
\]

for a vanishing expectation of the magnetisation. Furthermore we measured

\[
E = \frac{1}{L^3} \sum_{<xy>} s_x s_y ,
\]

which is proportional to the energy density.

III. THE ALGORITHMS

We perform two different types of simulations. First we studied the equilibrium behaviour at the critical point for finite lattices. In this case we used a hybrid of the single cluster
algorithm [31] and local updates to efficiently equilibrate the system. In the hybrid update, sweeps using the local algorithm alternate with a certain number of single cluster updates. Our measurements are organized in bins. These bins are separated by hybrid updates. While measuring only local updates are performed. In a second set of simulations we started from completely ordered configurations corresponding to zero temperature. In a sudden quench, the temperature is set to the critical value. This means that in the update probabilities our estimate of the inverse critical temperature is inserted. The lattice size is chosen sufficiently large to approximate the thermodynamic limit at high precision.

As local update we used either the heat bath algorithm or the particular Metropolis algorithm discussed in section IV of ref. [30]. In the case of the heat bath algorithm, we use a more or less straight forward implementation. The spins are stored by using char variables. In the case of the Metropolis algorithm, we are using multispin coding and 64 systems are simulated in parallel. Here 64 is the number of bits contained in a long integer variable. As discussed in ref. [30], we were not able to take advantage of the multispin coding when using the cluster algorithm. Hence we update the 64 systems one by one when performing the cluster update. As random number generator, we have used the SIMD-oriented Fast Mersenne Twister algorithm [32].

Let us briefly comment on the CPU time needed for the local updates. Our simulations were performed on various PCs and servers. As a typical example let us quote the times needed on a single core of an Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E3-1225 v3 running at 3.20GHz. In the case of the heat bath algorithm we need about 5 ns for the update of a single site. The time needed for the measurement of the energy and the magnetisation is 1.8 ns for one site. In the case of the Metropolis algorithm, implemented by using multispin coding, 0.9 ns are needed for the update of a single site. The measurement of the energy and the magnetisation, implemented by using multispin coding, takes about 0.3 ns per site.

Since the implementation of the Metropolis algorithm is more efficient than that of the heat bath algorithm, the major simulations are performed by using the Metropolis algorithm. In these simulations, we divide the lattice in checkerboard fashion and update the sub-lattices alternately.
IV. THE AUTOCORRELATION TIME

In the simulations at equilibrium we determined the integrated autocorrelation time. Let us briefly recall the basic definitions. Let us consider a generic estimator $A$. The autocorrelation function of $A$ is defined by

$$\rho_A(t) = \frac{\langle A_i A_{i+t} \rangle - \langle A \rangle^2}{\langle A^2 \rangle - \langle A \rangle^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where we average over the times $i$.

If the Markov process fulfills detailed balance, the Markov matrix is symmetric and therefore the eigenvalues are real. Then

$$\rho_A(t) = \sum_{\alpha} a_{A,\alpha} \exp(-t/\tau_{\exp,\alpha}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Note that even if the local update fulfills detailed balance, as it is the case for the heat bath and Metropolis algorithm used here, the composite update, consisting of an ordered sweep over the lattice, does not. However, often one still finds that eq. (12) is a good approximation of the behaviour of $\rho_A$. For a discussion see for example \cite{33,35}.

Our goal is to find a quantity that is proportional to the largest $\tau_{\exp,0}$ and that can be determined in the simulation with small statistical and systematical errors.

Our starting point is the integrated autocorrelation time

$$\tau_{\text{int},A} = \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \rho_A(t).$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

In a numerical study the summation has to be truncated. In practice the upper bound is taken, selfconsistently, as a few times $\tau_{\text{int},A}$. See for example \cite{33,35}. Since we intend to reduce effects of the truncation, we continued the sum, assuming a single exponential decay:

$$\tau_{\text{int},A} = \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{t_{\text{max}}} \rho(t) + \sum_{t=t_{\text{max}}+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\rho}(t),$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

with

$$\tilde{\rho}(t) = a(t_{\text{max}}) \exp(-t/\tau_{\text{eff}}(t_{\text{max}})).$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where

$$\tau_{\text{eff}}(t) = -1/\ln[\rho_A(t+1)/\rho_A(t)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

and

$$a(t) = \rho(t) \exp(-1/\tau_{\text{eff}}(t)).$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)
We determined the auto-correlation function of the energy density, the magnetisation and the magnetic susceptibility. Preliminary studies have shown that the scaling of the integrated autocorrelation time of these three quantities with the linear lattice size $L$ is consistent. Also plotting $\tau_{eff}(t)/\tau_{int}$ as a function of $(t + 1/2)/\tau_{int}$ we find a collapse of the data for different lattice sizes.

To keep the study tractable, we focus on the integrated autocorrelation time $\tau_{int,\chi}$ of the magnetic susceptibility in the following. Throughout we take $t_{max} \approx 3\tau_{int,\chi}$.

In our simulations, the autocorrelation functions are computed in the following way. We consider distances $t$ up to $t_{MAX} > t_{max}$. The simulations are organized in bins of the size $(n_t + 1) t_{MAX}$, where $t_{MAX} = 2L^2$ throughout. Here we make use of the fact that $z \approx 2$. Then

$$\overline{A} = \frac{1}{n_t t_{MAX}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t t_{MAX}} A_i ,$$

$$\overline{A^2} = \frac{1}{n_t t_{MAX}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t t_{MAX}} A_i^2 ,$$

and

$$\overline{A_i A_{i+t}} = \frac{1}{n_t t_{MAX}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_t t_{MAX}} A_i A_{i+t} .$$

For each bin, these averages are stored in a file for the subsequent analysis. Statistical errors are computed by using the jackknife method.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

First we performed simulations at the critical point, studying the equilibrium behaviour on finite lattices. To this end we simulated the model by using the Metropolis algorithm along with a checkerboard decomposition for the linear lattice sizes $L = 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 48, \text{ and } 56$. For comparison, we performed simulations using the heat bath algorithm using three different orders to run through the lattice. Here we studied linear lattice sizes up to $L = 28$. 


TABLE II. We give the results for the comparison of different local update algorithms $A_1$ and $A_2$. $r$ and $a$ are the free parameters of the ansatz (21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/d.o.f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(HB, R)$</td>
<td>$(HB, C)$</td>
<td>1.98990(43)</td>
<td>-0.282(29)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(HB, T)$</td>
<td>$(HB, C)$</td>
<td>0.99985(20)</td>
<td>-0.106(21)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(M, C)$</td>
<td>$(HB, C)$</td>
<td>1.33136(19)</td>
<td>-2.100(12)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Comparing various local update scheme at the critical point

As a comparison of the performance, and check whether different local updates result in the same exponent $z$, we did run simulations for lattice sizes $L = 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 20, 24, 28$ at $D = 0.655$ and $\beta = 0.387721735$. We performed local heat bath (HB) updates, visiting the sites of the lattice in different order. In the first case, denoted by $C$, we divide the lattice in checkerboard fashion. The two sub-lattices are updated alternately. Running through the lattice in typewriter fashion is denoted by $T$. Finally, the site that is updated is selected randomly. This is denoted by $R$. A unit of time has passed, when $L_0 L_1 L_2$ sites have been updated. We also compare with the Metropolis (M) algorithm, discussed in more detail in the section below.

We fitted ratios of integrated autocorrelation times of the magnetic susceptibility with the ansatz

$$\frac{\tau_{A_1}(L)}{\tau_{A_2}(L)} = r \times (1 + aL^{-\epsilon}) ,$$

where $r$ and $a$ are free parameters. Here, $A_1$ and $A_2$ denote the two different algorithms that have been used. We fix the correction exponent $\epsilon = 2$. This choice is motivated by the fact that the breaking of the rotational invariance by the simple cubic lattice is associated with the correction exponent $\omega_R = 2.022665(28)$ [15]. Furthermore, the analytic background of the magnetic susceptibility can be viewed as a correction with the exponent $2 - \eta = 1.9637022(20)$. In table [II] we summarize our results. In these fits, all lattice sizes that we have simulated are taken into account.

We conclude that the different local update schemes are indeed characterized by the same dynamic critical exponent $z$. Corrections in the ratios of autocorrelation times vanish
TABLE III. Simulations using the Metropolis algorithm at $\beta_c$. We give the statistics in terms of the number of bins $N_{\text{bin}}$ and our estimates of the integrated autocorrelation time $\tau_{\text{int,}\chi}$ of the magnetic susceptibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L$</th>
<th>$N_{\text{bin}}/64$</th>
<th>$\tau_{\text{int,}\chi}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23766</td>
<td>18.6742(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7244</td>
<td>29.4079(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4323</td>
<td>42.5921(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>58.2400(66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>76.3353(95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>96.886(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>119.953(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>145.471(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>173.578(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>237.030(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>310.833(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>394.31(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>488.28(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>706.14(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>964.44(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

quickly, consistent with a behaviour $\propto L^{-2}$.

In the case of the pair $(M,C)$ and $(HB,C)$, where the amplitude of the correction is relatively large we also performed a fit with the exponent $\epsilon$ of the correction as free parameter. We obtain $\epsilon = 2.08(5)$, when fitting all available data.

B. The local Metropolis algorithm at the critical point

Our numerical results for $\tau_{\text{int,}\chi^2}$ are summarized in table III. Throughout we use $n_t = 1000$ here. In total these simulations took the equivalent of about two years of CPU time on one core of a Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E3-1225 v3 CPU.
We have fitted our results with the ansätze
\[ \tau = aL^z, \quad (22) \]
where \(a\) and \(z\) are the free parameter. We also used
\[ \tau = aL^z \times (1 + cL^{-\epsilon}), \quad (23) \]
where \(c\) is an additional free parameter. We have fixed the correction exponent \(\epsilon = 2\). Note that the amplitude of the leading correction is small in the improved model. At the level of the present accuracy it should be negligible.

Fitting with the ansatz (22) we get \(z = 2.0236(6)\) and \(\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 0.74\), taking into account all data with \(L \geq 32\). Fitting with the ansatz (23) we get \(z = 2.0244(4)\), \(c = -0.19(10)\) and \(\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 1.31\), taking into account all data with \(L \geq 14\). As preliminary result of this section we take \(z = 2.024(1)\).

C. Non-equilibrium method

Finally we performed non-equilibrium simulations. We have simulated the Blume-Capel model by using our Metropolis algorithm discussed above in section II at \(D = 0.655\) and \(\beta = 0.387721735\). At \(t = 0\), we start with a completely ordered configuration. For simplicity we focus on the magnetisation.

Most of our simulations were performed using lattices of the linear size \(L = 300\). As a check of finite size effects, we performed simulation with \(L = 50\) and 100 in addition. In the case of \(L = 50\) and 100 we performed \(2000 \times 64\) runs and for \(L = 300\) we performed \(4000 \times 64\) runs. For \(L = 50\) we did run up to \(t = 1000\) and for \(L = 100\) and 300 up to \(t = 4000\). Statistical errors are computed by using the jackknife method. In figure 1 we plot ratios of the magnetisation as a function of the Monte Carlo time \(t\). We find that for \(L = 50\) the deviation from \(L = 300\) reaches a \(3\sigma\) level for \(t \gtrsim 840\). For \(L = 100\) this is the case for \(t \gtrsim 3500\). In both cases we regard the magnetisation for \(L = 300\) as approximation of the thermodynamic limit. From scaling we expect that the point of deviation from the thermodynamic limit by a certain fraction behaves as \(t \propto L^z\). Therefore we conclude that for \(L = 300\) up to \(t = 4000\) deviations from the thermodynamic limit can be safely ignored at the level of our statistics. In the following only data obtained for \(L = 300\) are considered.
FIG. 1. We plot the ratios \( m_{L_1}(t)/m_{L_2}(t) \) for \( L_1 = 50 \) and 100 and \( L_2 = 300 \) as a function of \( t \). For the readability of the figure we only give a fraction of the \( t \) values.

In total, the simulations for \( L = 300 \) took the equivalent of about 440 days on a single core of an Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E3-1225 v3 CPU.

In the thermodynamic limit, the magnetisation behaves as

\[
m(t) = a(t - t_0)^{-\lambda_m},
\]

where \( \lambda_m = \beta/\nu z \). See eq. (2) of ref. [22] and references therein. Note that \( \beta/\nu = \Delta\sigma = 0.5181489(10) \) in three dimensions [15]. Eq. (24) is subject to leading corrections of the equilibrium universality class. Since we simulate an improved model, we ignore these corrections in our analysis. We only take explicitly into account analytic corrections that are expressed by \( t_0 \).

By construction the data for the magnetisation at different values of \( t \) are correlated. We tried to avoid fitting a large data set with correlations and keep the analysis simple. Our starting point is an effective exponent given by

\[
z_{m,\text{eff},t_0}(t) = \Delta\sigma \frac{\ln [(2t - t_0)/(t - t_0)]}{\ln [m(2t)/m(t)]},
\]

(25)
TABLE IV. We give the results of minimizing the variance of $z_{m,\text{eff},t_0}$ within the intervals $t_1 \leq t < 2t_1$, eq. (27), with respect to $t_0$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$t_1$</th>
<th>$t_0$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-1.380(5)</td>
<td>2.04089(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-1.571(9)</td>
<td>2.03315(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-1.679(13)</td>
<td>2.03006(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-1.838(25)</td>
<td>2.02677(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-1.944(38)</td>
<td>2.02524(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>-1.95(8)</td>
<td>2.02523(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>-2.01(12)</td>
<td>2.02481(65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>-2.01(24)</td>
<td>2.02470(87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where $t_0$ remains a free parameter.

In a first step of the analysis we fix $t_0$ by requiring that $z_{m,\text{eff},t_0}(t)$ has a minimal variance in the interval $t_1 \leq t < t_2$: The average of $z_{m,\text{eff},t_0}$ in the interval is denoted by

$$\bar{z}_{m,\text{eff},t_0}(t_1, t_2) = \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} z_{m,\text{eff},t_0}(t) .$$

(26)

Then we minimize

$$\text{var}(z, t_0, t_1, t_2) = \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} [z_{m,\text{eff},t_0}(t) - \bar{z}_{m,\text{eff},t_0}(t_1, t_2)]^2$$

(27)

with respect to $t_0$. The results of this analysis for $t_2 = 2t_1$ and various values of $t_1$ are given in table [IV]. With increasing $t_1$, the estimate of $t_0$ is increasing, while that of $z$ is decreasing. The corrections are compatible with $t_1^{-1}$ and $t_1^{-2}$, respectively. Fitting the results for $t_1 \geq 60$, not taking into account the statistical correlations, we arrive at $z = 2.0244(4)$ and $t_0 = -2.13(10)$. As our preliminary estimate of this section we take

$$t_0 = -2.1(2) , \quad z = 2.0245(10) ,$$

(28)

which is compatible with both our extrapolation in $t_1$ and the result obtained for $t_1 = 160$.

As a check, we plot $z_{m,\text{eff},t_0}(t)$ for $t_0 = 3.1$ for the full range of $t$ that we have simulated.
FIG. 2. The effective exponent $z$ as defined by eq. (25) for $L = 300$ and $t_0 = -2.1$ The solid line indicates the preliminary result $z = 2.0245$ of this section.

As our final result, taking into account both the estimates obtained in sections V B and V C we quote

$$z = 2.024(2),$$

where we give a some preference to section V B. The error it taken such that both estimates, including their individual errors are covered.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

We have studied a purely dissipative relaxational dynamics for the improved Blume-Capel model on the simple cubic lattice. This model shares the universality class of the three-dimensional Ising model. Improved means that the parameter $D$ of the model is chosen such that the amplitude of leading corrections to scaling is strongly suppressed. The numerical results for the dynamic critical exponent $z$ given in the literature vary considerably. In particular there is a clear discrepancy between most of the results obtained by the simulation
of the Ising model and field theoretic results. Only a previous simulation of the Blume-Capel model gives a result that is consistent with field theory. We have computed the dynamic critical exponent by using two different approaches. The results are nicely consistent. As our final estimate we quote $z = 2.024(2)$ that includes the estimates of both methods. Our result is consistent with that of ref. [26] but more precise. It is consistent with the analysis of the $\epsilon$-expansion [10], however there is a small discrepancy with the 4-loop expansion in fixed dimension [17, 18].

In particular, since we have to face critical slowing down when studying a relaxational process it is important to use an improved model, since here already from relatively small lattices reliable results can be obtained.

Since the amount of CPU time used in this study is still moderate, further progress can be achieved by increasing lattice sizes and statistics. To this end, an efficient implementation of a local algorithm applied to the Blume-Capel model that runs on a graphics processing unit (GPU) would be desirable. As an example for recent work, where the two dimensional Ising model has been simulated on a GPU, see ref. [36].
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