

Susceptibility of the one-dimensional Ising model: is the singularity at $T = 0$ an essential one?

James H. Taylor
School of Geoscience, Physics, and Safety
University of Central Missouri
Warrensburg, MO 64093
jtaylor@ucmo.edu

Jan. 3, 2020

Abstract

The zero-field, isothermal susceptibility of the one-dimensional Ising model is shown to have a relatively simple singularity as the temperature approaches zero, proportional only to the inverse temperature. This is in contrast to what is seen throughout the literature: an essential singularity involving an exponential dependence on the inverse temperature. The analysis involves nothing beyond straightforward series expansions, starting either with the partition function for a closed chain in a magnetic field, obtained using the transfer-matrix approach; or from the expression for the zero-field susceptibility found via the fluctuation-dissipation theorem. In both cases, the exponential singularity is cancelled by part of a term that is usually considered ignorable in the thermodynamic limit.

Spin chains, ladders and planes; rigorous results in statistical mechanics
PhySH: one-dimensional spin chains, magnetic susceptibility, transfer matrix calculations

I. INTRODUCTION

The tractability of the one-dimensional (1D) Ising model with only nearest-neighbor interactions [1] and in zero magnetic field has made it of value not only for pedagogical purposes, but for shedding light on formally corresponding properties of other systems that can be mapped onto it (such as the the folding-unfolding behaviour of protein helices [2], or the hydrogen-bond order of single-file water in nanopores [3]). The inclusion of a "field" complicates the problem mathematically, but allows for even broader applicability beyond the Ising model itself: the chemical potential can be substituted for the magnetic field in treatment of the 1D lattice gas [4]; and allowing the field to represent a "background"—for example, the effect of a disease gene on allele sharing in siblings, or the existence of dynamical equilibrium between fitness and mutations—has led to a simpler yet effective alternative to standard approaches in genetic statistical analysis [5]. The Ising model has also been employed as a benchmark for testing methods of broader applicability: among more recent examples are a Padé approximant method for expressing the entropy as a function of energy (and thus leading to the Helmholtz free energy) [6]; a combinatorial approach that emphasizes the role of nearest-neighbor spin-pairs rather than individual spins [7]; approximating the free energy using a cluster-expansion algorithm that discards clusters whose contributions are below a specified threshold, rather than using a predetermined limit on cluster size [8]; an experimentally realizable technique for finding Lee-Yang zeroes of a system by monitoring the quantum coherence of a probe spin [9]; and an extended scaling approach designed specifically for spin systems with critical temperature $T_c = 0$ [10].

When explicitly referenced, the general consensus is that the isothermal susceptibility in zero magnetic field has an essential singularity as the absolute temperature T approaches zero, being proportional to the product of the inverse temperature and an exponential whose argument is proportional to $1/T$. In the following, the susceptibility is evaluated at low T , both for an open-ended chain and for a chain with periodic boundary conditions (closed chain). Terms in the exact expressions that are usually ignored in the thermodynamic limit are retained. As a result, it is found that the essential singularity as $T \rightarrow 0$ is eliminated, leaving a much weaker dependence on the inverse temperature, although at the same time displaying a stronger dependence on the number of spins than is quoted elsewhere.

II. OPEN-ENDED CHAIN

As is well-known, the 1D Ising model can be described as a chain of spins which can take on two values: $s = +1$ ("up") and $s = -1$ ("down"). For a chain of N

spins with uniform, nearest-neighbor-only interaction in zero magnetic field, the Hamiltonian is commonly written in the form

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} J(s_i s_{i+1}), \quad (1)$$

where the interaction strength $J > 0$ for a ferromagnetic system. The partition function is then

$$Z_N = \sum_{\{s_i\}} e^{-H\beta}, \quad (2)$$

where $\beta = 1/kT$ (k being Boltzmann's constant), and the sum is over all possible states of the system (i.e, the set of all possible strings of values for the s_i). For an open-ended chain, the sum can be worked out fairly easily by a combination of direct enumeration and induction (see, for example, [11] for details):

$$Z_N = 2^N \cosh^{(N-1)}(J\beta). \quad (3)$$

Once the partition function has been obtained, the spin-spin correlations, $\langle s_i s_{i+j} \rangle$, can be determined. These may in turn be used to find the susceptibility via a standard result from the fluctuation-dissipation theorem:

$$\chi_T(B = 0, T) = \frac{\mu^2}{kT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \langle s_i s_j \rangle, \quad (4)$$

with $\mu = g\mu_B$, where μ_B is the Bohr magneton and g the Landé g factor. (Since the magnetization M is 0, the factor of $-M^2/kT$, which would otherwise appear on the right-hand side of this equation, is absent [11].)

By definition,

$$\langle s_i s_{i+l} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_N} \sum_{\{s_i\}} (s_i s_{i+l}) e^{-H\beta}, \quad (5)$$

and is found in this situation to be equal to $\tanh^l(J\beta)$ [11]. Inserting this result in Eq. (4) yields [11], [12]

$$\chi_T(B = 0, T) = \frac{\mu^2}{kT} \left\{ N \left[1 + \frac{2 \tanh(J\beta)}{1 - \tanh(J\beta)} \right] - \frac{2 \tanh(J\beta) [1 - \tanh^N(J\beta)]}{[1 - \tanh(J\beta)]^2} \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Since the last term inside the braces is not proportional to N , and since $\tanh(J\beta)$ is less than one, that term is normally ignored, on the grounds that in the thermodynamic limit it will be negligible in comparison to the term preceding it. However,

assuming a finite (though otherwise unspecified) value for N , this last part can be approximated via a simple series expansion. First, note that

$$\frac{[1 - \tanh^N(J\beta)]}{[1 - \tanh(J\beta)]} = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \tanh^m(J\beta); \quad (7)$$

also,

$$\tanh(J\beta) = \frac{\sinh(J\beta)}{\cosh(J\beta)} = \frac{(e^{J\beta} - e^{-J\beta})}{(e^{J\beta} + e^{-J\beta})} = \frac{(1 - e^{-2J\beta})}{(1 + e^{-2J\beta})}, \quad (8)$$

and thus

$$\frac{2 \tanh(J\beta)}{[1 - \tanh(J\beta)]} = e^{2J\beta} - 1. \quad (9)$$

Assuming $e^{-2J\beta}$ is small compared to 1, the factor of $(1 + e^{-2J\beta})^{-1}$ in the last part of Eqs. (8) can be approximated in the usual way, leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{[1 - \tanh^N(J\beta)]}{[1 - \tanh(J\beta)]} &= \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} [1 - e^{-2J\beta}]^m [1 - e^{-2J\beta} + e^{-4J\beta} - e^{-6J\beta} + \dots]^m \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \left[1 - 2me^{-2J\beta} + 2m^2e^{-4J\beta} - \frac{2}{3}m(2m^2 + 1)e^{-6J\beta} + \dots \right] \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Using standard results for the sums over different powers of m [13], the right-hand side becomes

$$N \left[1 - (N-1)e^{-2J\beta} + \frac{(N-1)(2N-1)}{3}e^{-4J\beta} - \frac{(N-1)(N^2 - N + 1)}{3}e^{-6J\beta} + \dots \right] \quad (11)$$

The first term inside the braces in Eq. (6)—the one directly proportional to N —turns out to be simply $Ne^{2J\beta}$. Multiplying expression (11) by $(e^{2J\beta} - 1)$ while retaining only terms up to order $e^{-4J\beta}$, then using that result in Eq. (6), leads to

$$\chi_T(B=0, T) \simeq \frac{(N\mu)^2}{kT} \left\{ 1 - \frac{2(N^2 - 1)}{3N}e^{-2J\beta} + \frac{(N^2 - 1)}{3}e^{-4J\beta} \right\}. \quad (12)$$

The first term in Eq. (6) for the susceptibility, which is normally assumed to be the dominant one, has been exactly eliminated.

III. CLOSED CHAIN

It will be assumed initially that the system is in a uniform, nonzero, longitudinal magnetic field B . For a chain with periodic boundary conditions ($s_{N+1} \equiv s_1$), the transfer-matrix technique leads in a particularly simple fashion to Z_N ; the partition function thus obtained will be used to find the susceptibility via differentiation with respect to B , after which the field will be set to zero.

For the 1 D Ising model with periodic boundary conditions, the transfer-matrix approach involves the construction of a matrix \mathbf{P} whose elements are the Boltzmann factors for the energy of a pair of neighboring spins, s_i and s_{i+1} , which depend on their interaction energy with each other and half their interaction with the applied field. [11], [14], [15].

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{(J+\mu B)\beta} & e^{-J\beta} \\ e^{-J\beta} & e^{(J-\mu B)\beta} \end{bmatrix}$$

Because of the boundary conditions, the partition function can be expressed as the trace of the product of N such matrices. The result is simply the sum of the eigenvalues of \mathbf{P} , each raised to the power N . The eigenvalues are easily found to be

$$\lambda_{\pm} = e^{J\beta} \cosh(\mu B\beta) \pm \sqrt{e^{2J\beta} \cosh^2(\mu B\beta) - 2 \sinh(2J\beta)}, \quad (13)$$

so

$$Z_N = \lambda_+^N + \lambda_-^N = \lambda_+^N \left[1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_-}{\lambda_+} \right)^N \right]. \quad (14)$$

At this point it is usually assumed that, in the thermodynamic limit, the second term can be ignored in comparison to the first, since the ratio (λ_-/λ_+) is always less than 1; however, this assumption is no longer true at $T = 0$, and is of questionable validity for very small T , as shown below.

The susceptibility is defined as

$$\chi_T(B, T) = \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial B} \right)_T = \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial B} \left[\frac{1}{Z_N} \left(\frac{\partial Z_N}{\partial(\mu B\beta)} \right) \right]_T, \quad (15)$$

where M is the magnetization of the chain. Starting from Eq. (14) (including both terms), and setting $B = 0$ after performing the required differentiations, one obtains

$$\chi_T(B = 0, T) = \left(\frac{N\mu^2}{kT} \right) e^{2J\beta} \left[\frac{\cosh^N(J\beta) - \sinh^N(J\beta)}{\cosh^N(J\beta) + \sinh^N(J\beta)} \right]. \quad (16)$$

Assuming that $\sinh^N(J\beta)$ can be ignored in comparison to $\cosh^N(J\beta)$ (in the limit of very large N) leads to

$$\chi_T(B = 0, T) = \left(\frac{N\mu^2}{kT} \right) e^{2J\beta}, \quad (17)$$

which is identical to the expression in Eq. (6) if the last term inside the braces is dropped. This shows explicitly the essential singularity at $T = 0$ that is commonly presented in the literature. However, it may be noted that

$$\frac{\cosh^N(J\beta) - \sinh^N(J\beta)}{\cosh^N(J\beta) + \sinh^N(J\beta)} = \frac{(e^{J\beta} + e^{-J\beta})^N - (e^{J\beta} - e^{-J\beta})^N}{(e^{J\beta} + e^{-J\beta})^N + (e^{J\beta} - e^{-J\beta})^N} = \frac{(1 + e^{-2J\beta})^N - (1 - e^{-2J\beta})^N}{(1 + e^{-2J\beta})^N + (1 - e^{-2J\beta})^N}. \quad (18)$$

Expanding the factors of $(1 \pm e^{-2J\beta})^N$ out to terms of order $e^{-6J\beta}$ yields

$$\frac{\cosh^N(J\beta) - \sinh^N(J\beta)}{\cosh^N(J\beta) + \sinh^N(J\beta)} \simeq N e^{-2J\beta} \left[1 + \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{6} e^{-4J\beta} \right] \left[1 + \frac{N(N-1)}{2} e^{-4J\beta} \right]^{-1}. \quad (19)$$

Since the last term in this expression is of the form $(1+x)^{-1}$, it may, assuming small x , be approximated accordingly. Once again multiplying and retaining only terms up to order $e^{-4J\beta}$, then inserting the result in Eq.(16), gives

$$\chi_T(B=0, T) \simeq \frac{(N\mu)^2}{kT} \left\{ 1 - \frac{(N^2-1)}{3} e^{-4J\beta} \right\}. \quad (20)$$

As for the open-ended chain, the essential singularity has been removed.

V. CONCLUSIONS

For both the open-ended and closed chains of Ising spins, the singularity as $T \rightarrow 0$ appears not to have the form that has been generally believed: instead of diverging as $N\beta e^{2J\beta}$, $\chi_T \sim N^2\beta$, to leading order. Since employing the transfer-matrix method with an open-ended chain in zero field leads to Eq. (3) for Z_N [14] (as it must), the differences between the two expressions at higher order would seem to be simply attributable to the difference in boundary conditions.

While the final approximations given for the susceptibility in sections II and III clearly remain valid as long as $N e^{-2J\beta} \ll 1$, it may be objected that this cannot be obviously guaranteed as $N \rightarrow \infty$. However, what this requirement amounts to is a restriction on the range of temperatures for which the assumption is correct, given the value of N . A simple way (though not the only imaginable way) to ensure that the expressions in Eqs. (12) and (20) remain usable as N increases is

to require that the temperature (in units of J/k) be less than $2/N$, making the factor in question smaller than Ne^{-N} , which is itself less than 1 for any positive integer N , and decreases rapidly as the number of spins increases (for $N = 10$, it is already less than 10^{-3}). As N grows, the allowed range of T shrinks, ultimately becoming infinitesimal, but obviously always including $T = 0$.

It can be seen from the preceding that simple and apparently reasonable arguments regarding the effects of going to the thermodynamic limit are not necessarily borne out by more careful scrutiny. In particular, a common—though not universal—assumption employed in the transfer-matrix approach is that only one eigenvalue (or at most a few with equal modulus) need be considered in the evaluation of the partition function. While this should be perfectly valid over a wide range of system parameters (such as, in the present case, the temperature or number of spins), it may not be true for all allowed values.

References

- [1] Ising E, *Beitrag zur Theorie des Ferromagnetismus*, 1925 *Z. Phys.* **31** 253
- [2] Cortajarena A L, Mochrie S G J, and Regan L, *Mapping the Energy Landscape of Repeat Proteins Using NMR-detected Hydrogen Exchange*, 2008 *J. Mol. Biol.* **379** 617
- [3] Köfinger J and Dellago C, *Single-file water as a one-dimensional Ising model* 2010 *New J. of Phys.*, **12** 093044
- [4] Tokar V and Dreyssé H, *Analytical solution of the 1D lattice gas model with infinite number of multi-atom interactions*, 2003 *Phys. Rev. E* **68** 011601
- [5] Majewski J, Li H, and Ott J, *The Ising model in physics and statistical genetics* 2001 *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **69** 853; Gao C-Y, Cecconi F, Vulpiani A, Zhou H-J, and Aurell E, *DCA for genome-wide epistasis analysis: the statistical genetics perspective* 2019 *Physical Bio.* **16** 026002
- [6] Bernu B and Lhuillier C, *Spin Susceptibility of Quantum Magnets from High to Low Temperatures*, 2015 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** 057201
- [7] Seth S, *Combinatorial approach to exactly solve the 1D Ising model*, 2017 *Eur. J. Phys.* **38** 015104
- [8] Cocco S, Croce G, and Zamponi F, *Adaptive Cluster Expansion for Ising spin models*, 2019 *Eur. Physical J.B* **92**, art. no. 259

- [9] Peng X, Zhou H, Wei B-B, Cui J, Du J, and Liu R-B, *Experimental Observation of Lee-Yang Zeros* 2015 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** 010601; Kuzmak A R and Tkachuk V M, *Detecting the Lee-Yang zeros of a high-spin system by the evolution of probe spin*, 2019 *EPL* **125** 10004
- [10] Katzgraber H G , Campbell I A, and Hartmann A K, *Extended scaling for ferromagnetic Ising models with zero-temperature transitions*, 2008 *Phys. Rev. B* **78** 184409
- [11] Stanley H E, *Introduction to Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, 1971 (Oxford University Press, New York) 115-133, 260
- [12] Derzhko O, Zaburannyi O, and Tucker J W, *Initial static susceptibilities of nonuniform and random Ising chains*, 1998 *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **186**, 188
- [13] Gradshteyn I S and Ryzhik I M, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, Corrected and Enlarged Edition 1980 (Academic Press, New York) 1
- [14] Beichert F, *Phases at Complex Temperature: Spiral Correlation Functions and Regions of Fisher Zeros for Ising Models* (thesis) 2013 URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/10023/3589>
- [15] Robertson H S, *Statistical Thermophysics*, 1993 (PTR Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ) 325-326