

Theory of ground states for classical Heisenberg spin systems VI

Heinz-Jürgen Schmidt¹ and Wojciech Florek²

¹ *Universität Osnabrück, Fachbereich Physik, D - 49069 Osnabrück, Germany*

² *Adam Mickiewicz University, Faculty of Physics,
ul. Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego 2, 61-614 Poznań, Poland*

We formulate part VI of a rigorous theory of ground states for classical, finite, Heisenberg spin systems. After recapitulating the central results of the parts I - V previously published we consider a magnetic field and analytically calculate the susceptibility at the saturation point. To this end we have to distinguish between parabolic and non-parabolic systems, and for the latter ones between two- and three-dimensional ground states. These results are checked for a couple of examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

The ground state of a spin system and its energy represent valuable information, e. g., about its low temperature behaviour. Most research approaches deal with quantum systems, but also the classical limit has found some interest and applications, see, e. g., [1] - [16]. For classical Heisenberg systems, including Hamiltonians with a Zeeman term due to an external magnetic field, a rigorous theory has been recently established [17] - [22] that yields, in principle, all ground states. However, two restrictions must be made: (1) the dimension m of the ground states found by the theory is *per se* not confined to the physical case of $m \leq 3$, and (2) analytical solutions will only be possible for special couplings or small numbers N of spins. A first application of this theory to frustrated systems with wheel geometry has been given in [23] and [24].

The purpose of the present paper is to give a concise review of the central results of [17] - [22] and to apply the methods outlined there to describe the magnetic behaviour of a spin system subject to a magnetic field close to the saturation point. For each field larger than the saturation field B_{sat} all spins will point into the direction of the field (or opposite the direction, depending on the sign of the Zeeman term), but for values of B slightly below B_{sat} the spins will form an “umbrella” with infinitesimal spread, see, e. g., Figure 9. It is an obvious goal to calculate that umbrella in lowest order w. r. t. some sensible expansion parameter t . Another physically interesting property in this connection would be the *saturation susceptibility* χ_0 , that is the limit of the susceptibility for $B \uparrow B_{sat}$. Note that numerical calculations close to the saturation point are difficult and do not yield precise estimates for the spin system’s behaviour in lowest order.

In order to investigate the reaction of the spin system to magnetic fields near the saturation point, some case distinctions prove to be necessary. According to the general theory outlined in [17] - [22] the various ground states can be obtained by means of linear combinations of eigenvectors of a so-called *dressed J -matrix* corresponding to its minimal eigenvalue. The first case distinction refers to whether the ground state at the saturation point is essentially unique (non-parabolic case) or not (parabolic case). In the parabolic case the minimal energy E will be a quadratic function of the magnetization M (hence the name) and consequently the susceptibility will be constant for a certain domain. In the non-parabolic case the magnetic behaviour in the vicinity of the saturation point can be calculated by means of a perturbation series up to order four in the parameter t proportional to the spread of the infinitesimal spin umbrella. This series expansion is easier for coplanar states than for three-dimensional ones, hence the second case distinction. The form of the infinitesimal spin umbrella close to the saturation point depends on the eigenvectors of the dressed J -matrix in a way to be made more precise below. In the coplanar case there is only one eigenvector that determines the spin umbrella up to a proportionality factor that can be determined in a straight forward manner. However, in the three-dimensional case there are two orthogonal eigenvectors and the proportionality factor has to be replaced by a 2×2 -matrix that can only be determined by solving a non-linear system of equations. These remarks may suffice to illustrate the difference between the coplanar and the three-dimensional case at this point.

After recapitulating, in Section II, the general theory including the aspects relevant for the present problem, we will, in Section III, explain in more details the above-sketched alternative between parabolic and non-parabolic systems and treat the first ones in Section IV. After some preliminaries the series expansion for the non-parabolic case is presented for coplanar ground states, Section V A, and three-dimensional ground states, Section V B. In both cases, the final equation for saturation susceptibility can be put into a relatively simple common form. In Section VI we will present four examples. The first one in Section VI A is a parabolic irregular tetrahedron that interestingly deviates from the parabolic behaviour for values of the magnetization M from the interval $0 < M_0 \leq M < M_1 < N = 4$. The next three examples are non-parabolic ones. The isosceles triangle, Section VI A, has coplanar ground states for all values of B that can be analytically calculated and hence directly compared with the corresponding perturbation series results. The almost regular cube, Section VI C, also considered in [22] for other reasons, has coplanar ground states close to the saturation field. Its saturation susceptibility can be determined as the root of a third order equation and checked

with numerical results. Finally, in Section VID, we present an irregular octahedron ($N = 6$) that is non-parabolic and admits three-dimensional ground states. We close with a Summary and Outlook in Section VII.

II. GENERAL THEORY

We will shortly recapitulate the essential results of [18]-[21] in a form adapted to the present purposes.

A. Pure Heisenberg systems

Let \mathbf{s}_μ , $\mu = 1, \dots, N$, denote N classical spin vectors of unit length, written as the rows of an $N \times m$ -matrix \mathbf{s} where $m = 1, 2, 3$ is the dimension of the spin vectors. The energy of this system will be written in the form

$$H(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu, \nu=1}^N J_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_\mu \cdot \mathbf{s}_\nu, \quad (1)$$

where the $J_{\mu\nu}$ are the entries of a symmetric, real $N \times N$ -matrix \mathbb{J} with vanishing diagonal elements. In contrast to [18]-[21] the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is introduced for convenience. A *ground state* is a spin configuration \mathbf{s} minimizing the energy $H(\mathbf{s})$. If we fix all vectors \mathbf{s}_ν of a ground state except a particular one \mathbf{s}_μ , the latter has to minimize the term

$$H_\mu \equiv \mathbf{s}_\mu \cdot \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^N J_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_\nu \right). \quad (2)$$

Hence \mathbf{s}_μ must be a unit vector opposite to the bracket in (2) and thus has to satisfy

$$-\kappa_\mu \mathbf{s}_\mu = \sum_{\nu=1}^N J_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_\nu, \quad (3)$$

with Lagrange parameters $\kappa_\mu \geq 0$. Upon defining

$$\bar{\kappa} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N \kappa_\mu, \quad \text{and } \lambda_\mu \equiv \kappa_\mu - \bar{\kappa}, \quad (4)$$

such that

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^N \lambda_\mu = 0, \quad (5)$$

we may rewrite (3) in the form of an eigenvalue equation

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^N \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \mathbf{s}_\nu \equiv \sum_{\nu=1}^N (J_{\mu\nu} + \delta_{\mu\nu} \lambda_\nu) \mathbf{s}_\nu = -\bar{\kappa} \mathbf{s}_\mu. \quad (6)$$

Here we have introduced the *dressed J -matrix* $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ with vanishing trace considered as a function of the vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$ of “gauge parameters”.

We denote by $j_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ the lowest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ and by $\mathcal{W}_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ the corresponding eigenspace. It can be shown [18] that the graph of the function $j_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, the “eigenvalue variety”, has a maximum, denoted by \hat{j} , that is assumed at a uniquely determined point $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ such that

$$E_{\min} = \frac{1}{2} N \hat{j} \quad (7)$$

is the ground state energy and that the ground state configuration \mathbf{s} can be obtained as a linear combination of the corresponding eigenvectors of $\mathbb{J}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$. Strictly speaking, the latter statement has to be restricted to the case where the dimension of $\mathcal{W}_{\min}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ is less or equal three, which will be satisfied for all examples considered in this paper. In the

case of one-dimensional $\mathcal{W}_{min}(\hat{\lambda})$ (collinear ground state) we have a smooth maximum of $j_{min}(\lambda)$, whereas in the cases of a two- or higher-dimensional $\mathcal{W}_{min}(\hat{\lambda})$ we have a singular maximum with a conical structure of $j_{min}(\lambda)$, at least for some directions in the λ -space.

Besides the “ground state gauge” $\mathbb{J}(\hat{\lambda})$ there will be another gauge of the J -matrix that will be used, namely the “homogeneous gauge” denoted by $J^{(h)}$. It is obtained by subtraction of the corresponding row sums from the diagonal elements and final addition of the mean row sum j :

$$J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \equiv J_{\mu\nu} + \left(j - \sum_{\lambda} J_{\mu\lambda} \right) \delta_{\mu\nu} , \quad (8)$$

where

$$j \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu} . \quad (9)$$

It follows that j will be an eigenvalue of $J^{(h)}$ corresponding to the eigenvector $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^\top$. For later use let $j_{min}^{(h)}$ denote the minimal eigenvalue of $J^{(h)}$.

According to the above remarks the ground state configuration \mathbf{s} can be written in the form

$$\mathbf{s} = W \Gamma , \quad (10)$$

where W is an $N \times m$ -matrix the columns of which span $\mathcal{W}_{min}(\hat{\lambda})$, and Γ is a real $m \times m$ -matrix. For the $N \times N$ Gram matrix

$$G \equiv \mathbf{s} \mathbf{s}^\top \quad (11)$$

we obtain the following representation:

$$G \stackrel{(10,11)}{=} (W \Gamma) (W \Gamma)^\top = W \Gamma \Gamma^\top W^\top \equiv W \Delta W^\top . \quad (12)$$

Here $\Delta = \Gamma \Gamma^\top$ is a positive semi-definite real $m \times m$ -matrix that can be obtained as a solution of the inhomogenous system of linear equations

$$1 = \mathbf{s}_\mu \cdot \mathbf{s}_\mu = G_{\mu\mu} \stackrel{(12)}{=} (W \Delta W^\top)_{\mu\mu} , \quad \mu = 1, \dots, m , \quad (13)$$

called “additionally degeneracy equation” (ADE) in [18].

Let $\Gamma = \sqrt{\Delta} R$ be the polar decomposition of Γ with $R \in O(m)$, then (10) assumes the form

$$\mathbf{s} = W \sqrt{\Delta} R . \quad (14)$$

The rotational/reflectional matrix R in (14) can be chosen quite generally due to the invariance of $H(\mathbf{s})$ under rotations/reflections. If for each pair of ground states $(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}')$ there exists an $R \in O(m)$ such that $\mathbf{s}' = \mathbf{s} R$ then \mathbf{s} will be called *essentially unique*.

B. Heisenberg-Zeeman systems

In the case of a magnetic field \mathbf{B} that leads to an additional Zeeman term $-\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{S}$ (the sign is chosen as negative without loss of generality) in the Hamiltonian the ground state problem can be reduced to that of a spin system with a pure Heisenberg Hamiltonian, see [21]. In the first step it is shown that the ground states of the Heisenberg-Zeeman system are among the *relative ground states* of the pure Heisenberg system. These are defined as the ground states under the constraint $\|\mathbf{S}\|^2 = M^2$. The minimal energy $E(M)$ can be extended to an even function defined for $-N \leq M \leq N$ and, in the smooth case, the corresponding magnetic field can be obtained as $B(M) = \frac{\partial E}{\partial M}$. The maximal magnetization $M = N$ thus corresponds to the *saturation field* $B_{sat} = B(N)$. It can be shown that

$$B_{sat} = j - j_{min}^{(h)} , \quad (15)$$

see eq. (164) in [21], where the missing factor 2 is due to our modified definition of the energy (1). Recall that spin systems satisfying $j > j_{min}^{(h)}$ and hence $B_{sat} > 0$ have been called “anti-ferromagnetic” (AF) in [21]. For the present paper this will be generally assumed. Further we may assume $N \geq 3$, since the case $N = 2$ is completely understood.

In the next step it can be shown that the relative ground states are among the absolute ground states of the pure Heisenberg system if an auxiliary uniform coupling of strength γ is added that leads to a Hamiltonian $H(\gamma)$. Especially, the phenomenon of saturation can be recovered by varying the uniform coupling. There exists a certain value $\gamma_0 < 0$ called the “critical uniform coupling” such that the following holds: For $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ the ground state of the system with Hamiltonian $H(\gamma)$ will be the ferromagnetic ground state corresponding to the eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$ of the homogeneously gauged J -matrix $J^{(h)}(\gamma)$ and that for $\gamma > \gamma_0$ the ground state will be different from the ferromagnetic one.

In general, the relation between γ and B can be complicated. For example, it may happen that the ADE (13) for $H(\gamma)$ has an d -dimensional convex set of solutions such that the corresponding ground states have different magnetization M and different energy $E(M)$, calculated without uniform coupling. In this way a single value of γ may correspond to a whole family of ground states of the corresponding Heisenberg-Zeeman system. This will happen in the *parabolic case* considered in Section IV and $\gamma = \gamma_0$.

On the other hand, it is possible that the ADE (13) for $H(\gamma)$ has only one solution for a certain interval $\gamma_0 < \gamma < \gamma_1$ and that there will be a 1 : 1-correspondence between uniform coupling strength γ and magnetic field B for this interval. This will happen for the non-parabolic case, see Section V.

In both cases there holds a simple relation between the saturation field B_{sat} and the critical uniform coupling γ_0 , namely

$$\gamma_0 = -\frac{B_{sat}}{N}, \quad (16)$$

following from (28) and (15).

III. THE SATURATION ALTERNATIVE

As explained in Section IIB the ground states in the presence of a magnetic field \mathbf{B} are among the ground states assumed by the pure Heisenberg spin system with an auxiliary uniform coupling of strength γ . If γ is negative and arbitrarily large in absolute value all spins will be aligned into the direction of the field and the maximal magnetization $M = N$ is reached. Let γ_0 be the maximal value where this happens such that for $\gamma > \gamma_0$ the ground state will not be fully aligned and $M < N$. The corresponding critical field is called the *saturation field* B_{sat} , see (15) and (23), (120) and (181) below.

We consider a matrix \mathbb{J} of coupling coefficients that depends on the gauge parameters $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and an auxiliary uniform coupling coefficient γ . This dependence will be written as

$$\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \gamma) = \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) + \delta_{\mu\nu} \lambda_\nu + \gamma \Xi_{\mu\nu} \quad \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, N, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\Xi_{\mu\nu} \equiv 1 - \delta_{\mu\nu} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu \neq \nu, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu = \nu. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

It follows from the above remarks that for $\gamma < \gamma_0$ the vector $\mathbf{1} \equiv (1, 1, \dots, 1)^\top$ will be the ground state of the spin system characterized by (17) and the corresponding ground state gauge will be given by

$$\kappa_\mu^{(0)} = -\sum_\nu \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0), \quad \lambda_\mu^{(0)} = \kappa_\mu^{(0)} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_\nu \kappa_\nu^{(0)} \equiv \kappa_\mu^{(0)} + j, \quad (19)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$ and j denoting the mean row sum of $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0)$. It follows that $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, 0)$ is homogeneously gauged, i. e.,

$$\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, 0) = J^{(h)}, \quad (20)$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, 0) \mathbf{1} = j \mathbf{1}. \quad (21)$$

By definition the matrix $J^{(h)}$ has constant row (column) sums and hence commutes with Ξ . Since Ξ has also constant row sums, equal to $N - 1$, it follows that $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma)$ is also homogeneously gauged and satisfies

$$\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma) \mathbf{1} = (j + (N - 1)\gamma) \mathbf{1} \equiv j(\gamma) \mathbf{1}. \quad (22)$$

For sufficiently large negative γ the eigenvalue $j(\gamma)$ will be the lowest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma)$ and $\mathbf{1}$ will be the ground state. This property is lost if another eigenvalue assumes the role of the lowest one. Hence the critical value γ_0 can be characterized as the lowest value of γ such that $j(\gamma_0)$ becomes degenerate. To determine γ_0 let us consider the (possibly degenerate) lowest eigenvalue $j_{min}^{(h)}$ of $J^{(h)} = \mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, 0)$ and an arbitrary normalized corresponding eigenvector $\boldsymbol{\xi}$:

$$J^{(h)} \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, 0) \boldsymbol{\xi} = j_{min}^{(h)} \boldsymbol{\xi}. \quad (23)$$

Due to the general assumption $j > j_{min}^{(h)}$ we conclude that $\boldsymbol{\xi} \perp \mathbf{1}$, i. e.,

$$\sum_{\mu} \xi_{\mu} = 0. \quad (24)$$

Due to

$$\Xi = |\mathbf{1}\rangle\langle\mathbf{1}| - \mathbb{1}, \quad (25)$$

$\boldsymbol{\xi}$ will also be an eigenvector of Ξ with eigenvalue -1 :

$$\Xi \boldsymbol{\xi} = |\mathbf{1}\rangle \underbrace{\langle\mathbf{1}|\boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle}_0 - \boldsymbol{\xi} = -\boldsymbol{\xi}. \quad (26)$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma) \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, 0) \boldsymbol{\xi} + \gamma \Xi \boldsymbol{\xi} \stackrel{(23,26)}{=} \left(j_{min}^{(h)} - \gamma \right) \boldsymbol{\xi} \equiv j_0(\gamma) \boldsymbol{\xi}. \quad (27)$$

This means that, for $\gamma < 0$, the two eigenvalues $j(\gamma)$ and $j_0(\gamma)$ of $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma)$ behave differently, the first one decreases with growing $|\gamma|$ and the second one increases, see Figure 1. The two lines in Figure 1 representing $j(\gamma)$ and $j_0(\gamma)$ intersect at the critical value γ_0 defined by $j(\gamma_0) = j_0(\gamma_0)$ according to

$$j + (N - 1) \gamma_0 = j_{min}^{(h)} - \gamma_0 \equiv x_0 \quad (28)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \gamma_0 = \frac{1}{N} \left(j_{min}^{(h)} - j \right) < 0. \quad (29)$$

Actually, the γ -dependence of $j_{\alpha}(\gamma) = j_{\alpha} - \gamma$ holds for every eigenvalue j_{α} of $J^{(h)}$ different from j and leads to corresponding intersections with $j(\gamma)$ at $\gamma_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{N} (j_{\alpha} - j)$. The critical value γ_0 will be given by the lowest one of these γ_{α} and hence by the lowest eigenvalue $j_0 = j_{min}^{(h)}$ of $J^{(h)}$. Moreover, the value x_0 in (28) will be the lowest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma)$ for $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$.

To summarize: For $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ the state $\mathbf{1}$ will be the ground state of the spin system characterized by the dressed J -matrix $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma)$ and hence all spins are aligned parallel to the magnetic field. For $\gamma > \gamma_0$ this is no longer the case and hence γ_0 is the critical uniform coupling defining what we will call the saturation point.

Further, the following alternative occurs: Either at $\gamma = \gamma_0$ the ground state $\mathbf{1}$ is essentially unique, i. e., the corresponding ADE (13) has exactly one solution, or, there exists at least one other ground state at $\gamma = \gamma_0$ and hence the convex set \mathcal{S}_{ADE} of solutions of (13) contains more than one, and hence infinitely many points. We conjecture that this alternative is identical to the distinction between “continuous reduction” and “discontinuous reduction” made in [21].

In the first case we have a smooth family $\mathbf{s}(\gamma)$ of unique ground states for some interval $\gamma_0 < \gamma < \gamma_0 + \varepsilon$ satisfying $\mathbf{s}(\gamma_0) = \mathbf{1}$ and may investigate the magnetic behaviour of the spin system in the vicinity of the saturation point by means of a perturbational series, see Section V. The susceptibility at the saturation point assumes the form

$$\chi_0 = \frac{N}{B_{sat} + N k^2}, \quad (30)$$

see (126), (187) and Figure 2.

In the second case we have another smooth family $\mathbf{s}(t)$ of ground states such that $\mathbf{s}(0) = \mathbf{1}$ but this family can be constructed solely from states given by \mathcal{S}_{ADE} at $\gamma = \gamma_0$, see Section IV. The family $\mathbf{s}(t)$ may include the absolute ground state or not. Moreover, for this family of ground states the energy (without uniform coupling) will be a simple




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of the linear γ -dependence of the two eigenvalues $j(\gamma) = j + (N - 1)\gamma$ (blue line) and $j_0(\gamma) = j_{min}^{(h)} - \gamma$ (dark yellow line). The two lines meet at $\gamma = \gamma_0$ given by (29) thereby defining the critical value of the saturation point.

quadratic function $E(M)$ of the magnetization M , a property that has been called “parabolicity” in [21]. Consequently, near the saturation point the susceptibility will be constant assuming the value

$$\chi = \frac{N}{B_{sat}}, \quad (31)$$

see (24).

It is not clear whether the above “saturation alternative” covers all possibilities. In the parabolic case it may happen that the family $\mathbf{s}(t)$ contains un-physical ground states of dimension greater than three, and that the physical ground states do not give rise to a quadratic function $E(M)$. The AF icosahedron is an example, see [3].

IV. PARABOLIC CASE

According to Section III, at the saturation point the dressed J -matrix $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ has a degenerate minimal eigenvalue x_0 and a corresponding eigenspace $\mathcal{E}_0 \equiv \mathcal{W}_{min}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)})$ containing the vector $\mathbf{1}$ that represents the ferromagnetic ground state. We now consider the case where it is possible to obtain another m -dimensional ground state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ by means of linear combinations of vectors of \mathcal{E}_0 . Recall from the general theory that these linear combinations are encoded in some positively semi-definite $m \times m$ -matrix Δ that solves the ADE (13). We hence consider the case where the compact convex solution set \mathcal{S}_{ADE} of (13) contains more than one point.

Since the vectors $\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu^{(i)}\right)_{\mu=1,\dots,N}$ lie in \mathcal{E}_0 for $i = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$\sum_\nu \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\nu^{(i)} = x_0 \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu^{(i)}, \quad (32)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\mu = 1, \dots, N$.

We define a family of $(m + 1)$ -dimensional ground states $\mathbf{s}(t)$ that interpolates between $\mathbf{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$:

$$\mathbf{s}_\mu(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1-t^2} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu t \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \text{ and } \mu = 1, \dots, N. \quad (33)$$

It is clear that the $\mathbf{s}_\mu(t)$ are unit vectors. The total spin is obtained as

$$\mathbf{S}(t) = \sum_{\mu} \mathbf{s}_\mu(t) = \begin{pmatrix} N \sqrt{1-t^2} \\ \sum_{\mu} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu t \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} N \sqrt{1-t^2} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma} t \end{pmatrix}, \quad (34)$$

and yields the squared magnetization

$$M(t)^2 = \mathbf{S}(t) \cdot \mathbf{S}(t) = N^2 (1-t^2) + \Sigma^2 t^2. \quad (35)$$

Using

$$\mathbf{s}_\mu(t) \cdot \mathbf{s}_\nu(t) = 1 - t^2 + \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\nu t^2 \quad (36)$$

for all $\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, N$ we calculate the energy (without the uniform coupling):

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \mathbf{s}_\mu(t) \cdot \mathbf{s}_\nu(t) \quad (37)$$

$$\stackrel{(36)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} (1-t^2) + \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\nu t^2 \right) \quad (38)$$

$$\stackrel{(20,21)}{=} \frac{1}{2} N j (1-t^2) + \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{\mu\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} + \gamma_0 \Xi_{\mu\nu} \right) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\nu - \gamma_0 \sum_{\mu\nu} \Xi_{\mu\nu} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\nu \right] t^2 \quad (39)$$

$$\stackrel{(17,18)}{=} \frac{1}{2} N j (1-t^2) + \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu} \left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0 \right) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\nu - \gamma_0 \sum_{\mu\nu} (1 - \delta_{\mu\nu}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mu \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\nu \right] t^2 \quad (40)$$

$$\stackrel{(32)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left(N j (1-t^2) + N x_0 t^2 - \gamma_0 \Sigma^2 t^2 + \gamma_0 N t^2 \right) \quad (41)$$

$$\stackrel{(28)}{=} \frac{1}{2} N j + \frac{\gamma_0}{2} (N^2 - \Sigma^2) t^2 \quad (42)$$

$$\stackrel{(35)}{=} \frac{1}{2} N j + \frac{\gamma_0}{2} (N^2 - M(t)^2) \quad (43)$$

$$\stackrel{(29)}{=} \frac{1}{2} N j_{min}^{(h)} + \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{2 N} M(t)^2. \quad (44)$$

Recall that the a spin system satisfying the last equation has been called “parabolic” in [21], eq. (164). The missing factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is due to our modified definition of the energy in (1). Another difference is that in [21] the validity of (44) was required for the interval $\tilde{\mu} \leq M \leq N$, $\tilde{\mu}$ denoting the magnetization corresponding to the “threshold field” B_{thr} , see [21], whereas we have only proven (44) for $M(1) \leq M(t) \leq M(0)$. We will provide an example in Section VI A showing that the condition of parabolicity may be only satisfied for a smaller interval than required in [21] and hence the definition of “parabolicity” should be accordingly weakened.

As an immediate consequence of (44) we note that for the considered one-parameter family the magnetic field obeys

$$B(t) = \frac{\partial E}{\partial M} = \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{N} M(t), \quad (45)$$

which yields the saturation field

$$B_{sat} = B(0) = \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{N} M(0) = j - j_{min}^{(h)} \quad (46)$$

in accordance with (15).

For the susceptibility we obtain the constant value

$$\chi = \frac{\partial M}{\partial B} = \frac{N}{j - j_{min}^{(h)}} \stackrel{(46)}{=} \frac{N}{B_{sat}} \stackrel{(29)}{=} -\frac{1}{\gamma_0}. \quad (47)$$




FIG. 2: Schematic representation of the magnetization M as a function of the magnetic field B in the vicinity of the saturation point (B_{sat}, N) in the non-parabolic case. The saturation susceptibility χ_0 is the slope of the function $M(B)$ at the saturation point. According to (126) and (187) it assumes the form $\chi_0 = \frac{N}{B_{sat} + Nk^2}$ and hence the tangent to $M(B)$ at the saturation point intersects the B -axis at $-Nk^2$.

V. NON-PARABOLIC CASE

According to Section III, at the saturation point the dressed J -matrix $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ has a degenerate eigenvalue x_0 and a corresponding eigenspace \mathcal{E}_0 containing the vector $\mathbf{1}$ that represents the ferromagnetic ground state. We now consider the case where it is not possible to obtain another m -dimensional ground state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ by means of linear combinations of vectors of \mathcal{E}_0 . Recall from the general theory that these linear combinations are encoded in some positively semi-definite $m \times m$ -matrix Δ that solves the ADE (13). We hence consider the case where the compact convex solution set \mathcal{S}_{ADE} of (13) contains exactly one point.

Generally, we denote the subspace of \mathcal{E}_0 orthogonal to $\mathbf{1}$ by \mathcal{E}_1 such that

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}_1 \oplus \mathbb{R} \mathbf{1}. \quad (48)$$

In this section we will assume local analyticity, i. e., that for some interval $\gamma_0 < \gamma < \gamma + \varepsilon$ the physically relevant quantities can be expanded into power series w. r. t. a certain parameter t . However, t cannot be chosen as $\gamma - \gamma_0$ but rather as $t = \sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_0}$. This can be made plausible by the square root in the representation of the ground state as $\mathbf{s} = W \sqrt{\Delta} R$, see (14). Even if the matrix Δ could be expanded into a power series w. r. t. $\gamma - \gamma_0$, the ground state itself can only be represented by a t -series with $t = \sqrt{\gamma - \gamma_0}$. This also explains why we need the fourth order expansion to calculate the saturation susceptibility χ_0 . Due to $B = \frac{\partial E}{\partial M}$ and $\chi = \frac{\partial M}{\partial B}$ the second order would suffice, but this is the second order of the expansion of E and M w. r. t. the variable $\gamma - \gamma_0 = t^2$. The fact that the ground state varies with t whereas the minimal energy varies with t^2 also explains the poor quality of numerical ground state determination close to the saturation point.

For the critical value $\gamma = \gamma_0$ the vector $\mathbf{1} \equiv (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ will still be an eigenvector of the dressed J -matrix $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$. The gauge parameters $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$ and the corresponding eigenvalue x_0 have already been calculated, see (19) and (28).

We will make the case distinction according to whether the ground states for $\gamma_0 < \gamma < \gamma + \varepsilon$ are two- or three-dimensional. This is sufficient to cover the physical cases but higher-dimensional ground states could be calculated by analogous methods.

A. Coplanar ground states

We assume that the eigenspace \mathcal{E}_0 of $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ corresponding to the lowest eigenvalue x_0 is two-dimensional and hence the subspace \mathcal{E}_1 according to (48) will be one-dimensional. Let $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ be a fixed normalized basis vector in \mathcal{E}_1 .

1. Notations and first results

Recall that the J -matrix depending on the gauge parameters $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and the uniform coupling strength γ assumes the form

$$\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \gamma) = \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) + \delta_{\mu\nu} \lambda_\nu + \gamma \Xi_{\mu\nu} \quad \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, N, \quad (49)$$

where

$$\Xi_{\mu\nu} \equiv 1 - \delta_{\mu\nu} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu \neq \nu, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu = \nu. \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

We set

$$J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \equiv \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, \gamma_0), \quad (51)$$

and consider the one-parameter families

$$J_{\mu\nu}(t) = J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + t^2 \Xi_{\mu\nu}, \quad (52)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_\mu(t) = \sum_{n=0,1,2,\dots} t^n \mathbf{s}_\mu^{(n)}, \quad (53)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_\mu^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} + t^2 \begin{pmatrix} x_\mu^{(2)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t^3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_\mu^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} + t^4 \begin{pmatrix} x_\mu^{(4)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \dots, \quad (54)$$

$$\kappa_\mu(t) = \sum_{n=0,2,4,\dots} t^n \kappa_\mu^{(n)}, \quad (55)$$

$$x(t) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_\mu \kappa_\mu(t) = \sum_{n=0,2,4,\dots} t^n x_n, \quad (56)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. The condition $\|\mathbf{s}_\mu(t)\| = 1$ for all $\mu = 1, \dots, N$ entails an infinite number of identities for the $x_\mu^{(n)}$, the first two of which read

$$x_\mu^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} y_\mu^{(1)2}, \quad (57)$$

$$x_\mu^{(4)} = -\left(y_\mu^{(1)} y_\mu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_\mu^{(1)4} \right). \quad (58)$$

In the ground state configuration the total spin $\mathbf{S}(t)$ will point into the direction $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ of the field and hence

$$\mathbf{S}(t) = \sum_\mu \mathbf{s}_\mu(t) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} M(t) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

which yields the series representation of the magnetization

$$M(t) = N + t^2 M^{(2)} + t^4 M^{(4)} + \dots \stackrel{(59,54)}{=} \sum_{n=0,2,4,\dots} t^n \sum_\mu x_\mu^{(n)}. \quad (60)$$

We note that Eqs. (59) and (54) imply

$$\sum_\mu y_\mu^{(n)} = 0 \quad \text{for all odd } n. \quad (61)$$

Further we consider the energy (without the auxiliary uniform coupling)

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \mathbf{s}_\mu(t) \cdot \mathbf{s}_\nu(t) = E^{(0)} + t^2 E^{(2)} + t^4 E^{(4)} + \dots \quad (62)$$

The t -series for $M(t)$ and $E(t)$ contain only even terms since the scalar product of two terms of different parity in (53) vanishes.

2. Perturbation series

We rewrite Eq. (3) in the form

$$\sum_{\nu} J_{\mu\nu}(t) \mathbf{s}_{\nu}(t) = -\kappa_{\mu}(t) \mathbf{s}_{\mu}(t) , \quad (63)$$

expand both sides into powers of t and equate identical powers. The following subsections are devoted to the evaluation of (63) for orders t^0, \dots, t^4 . This method is closely analogous to the usual Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory of eigenvalue equations in quantum mechanics.

3. Terms $O(t^0)$:

By evaluating (63) for $t = 0$ we recover the results of Section III concerning the ground state problem at the saturation point. Especially,

$$E^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \stackrel{(9)}{=} \frac{Nj}{2} , \quad (64)$$

in accordance with (7).

4. Terms $O(t^1)$:

The t -linear terms of (63) read:

$$\sum_{\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(1)} = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)} . \quad (65)$$

Using (54) this means

$$\sum_{\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} y_{\nu}^{(1)} = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} y_{\mu}^{(1)} , \quad (66)$$

or, due to (4) and (28),

$$\sum_{\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) y_{\nu}^{(1)} = x_0 y_{\mu}^{(1)} . \quad (67)$$

Hence $y^{(1)}$ is an eigenvector of $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ corresponding to its lowest eigenvalue x_0 . According to (61) this eigenvector $y^{(1)}$ is orthogonal to $\mathbf{1}$ and hence proportional to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$:

$$y_{\mu}^{(1)} = X \xi_{\mu}, \quad \text{for some constant } X > 0 , \quad (68)$$

and all $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. X may be chosen positive since $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is only unique up to a sign. The value of X will be determined later. For the sake of convenience we introduce the abbreviation

$$K_{\mu\nu} \equiv J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + \delta_{\mu\nu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} = \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) - \delta_{\mu\nu} x_0 , \quad (69)$$

for all $\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, N$. The matrix (69) defines a positively semi-definite operator K with a two-dimensional kernel $\ker(K) = \mathcal{E}_0$ spanned by $\mathbf{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Its $(N-2)$ -dimensional range will be denoted by $\text{ran}(K) = \ker(K)^{\perp}$.

5. Terms $O(t^2)$:

We obtain the second order terms of (63):

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(2)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(0)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(2)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)} , \quad (70)$$

or, by means of (54),

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} x_{\nu}^{(2)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} x_{\mu}^{(2)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)}, \quad (71)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. Since the $x_{\mu}^{(2)}$ are already determined by (57), we may view these equations as giving explicit expressions for the $\kappa_{\mu}^{(2)}$ for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$:

$$\kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} = - \sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + \delta_{\mu\nu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \right) y_{\nu}^{(2)} - (N-1) \quad (72)$$

$$\stackrel{(57,69)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} + (1-N). \quad (73)$$

It follows that the vector $\kappa^{(2)}$ lies in the subspace spanned by $\text{ran}(K)$ and $\mathbf{1}$ and hence is orthogonal to ξ or, equivalently, to $y^{(1)}$:

$$\sum_{\mu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} y_{\mu}^{(1)} = 0. \quad (74)$$

From (73) we may calculate the second order correction to the eigenvalue x_0 according to (56):

$$x_2 = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2N} \left(\sum_{\mu\nu} K_{\mu\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \right) + N-1 = N-1, \quad (75)$$

since $\mathbf{1} \in \ker(K)$.

The second order correction to the magnetization reads

$$M^{(2)} = \sum_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{(2)} \stackrel{(57)}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \stackrel{(68)}{=} -\frac{1}{2} X^2. \quad (76)$$

The analogous correction to the energy is obtained as

$$E^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(2\mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(2)} + \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) \quad (77)$$

$$\stackrel{(54,57)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(-y_{\nu}^{(1)2} + y_{\mu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) \quad (78)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \left(-y_{\nu}^{(1)2} + y_{\mu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) \quad (79)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} y_{\mu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(1)} \quad (80)$$

$$\stackrel{(20,21,23)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left(-j + j_{min}^{(h)} \right) \sum_{\mu} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \quad (81)$$

$$\stackrel{(68)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left(-j + j_{min}^{(h)} \right) X^2. \quad (82)$$

In Eq. (79) we have used that the bracket in (78) vanishes for $\mu = \nu$ and hence the total expression is independent of the diagonal elements of $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0)$. Especially, we may choose the diagonal elements corresponding to the homogeneous gauge.

6. Terms $O(t^3)$:

The third order terms of (63) are:

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(3)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(3)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)}, \quad (83)$$

or, using (54),

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} y_{\mu}^{(3)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(1)}, \quad (84)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. By means of (69) this can be brought into the form of an (in general) inhomogeneous linear system of equations for the unknown $y_{\nu}^{(3)}$:

$$\sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} y_{\nu}^{(3)} = \left(1 - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \right) y_{\mu}^{(1)} \equiv u_{\mu}. \quad (85)$$

This system is only solvable if the r. h. s. lies in the range of K , i.e., $u \in \text{ran}(K) = \ker(K)^{\perp}$. We thus obtain the solvability conditions $u \perp \mathbf{1}$ and $u \perp y^{(1)}$. The first condition follows from (61) and (74). The second condition reads

$$\sum_{\mu} \left(1 - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \right) y_{\mu}^{(1)2} = 0. \quad (86)$$

Obviously its validity depends of the value of X that has not yet been determined. So we may kill two birds with one stone by using (86) to determine X :

$$0 = \sum_{\mu} \left(1 - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \right) y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \quad (87)$$

$$\stackrel{(73)}{=} \sum_{\mu} \left(N - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \right) y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \quad (88)$$

$$\stackrel{(68)}{=} N X^2 - \frac{1}{2} X^4 \sum_{\mu\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \xi_{\nu}^2 \xi_{\mu}^2 \quad (89)$$

$$= X^2 \left(N - \frac{1}{2} X^2 k^2 \right), \quad (90)$$

with

$$k^2 \equiv \sum_{\mu\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \xi_{\nu}^2 \xi_{\mu}^2. \quad (91)$$

$k^2 \geq 0$ since it is defined as the expectation value of a positively semi-definite operator and hence $k \equiv \sqrt{k^2} \geq 0$ is well-defined. Then the second solvability condition equivalent to (90) yields

$$X = \frac{\sqrt{2N}}{k}. \quad (92)$$

For the last equation it is required that $k^2 > 0$. This can be proven as follows: $k^2 = \sum_{\mu\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \xi_{\nu}^2 \xi_{\mu}^2 = 0$ is only possible if the vector with components $(\xi_{\mu}^2)_{\mu=1,\dots,N}$ lies in the linear span of $\mathbf{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, that is

$$\xi_{\mu}^2 = \alpha \xi_{\mu} + \beta \quad (93)$$

for two real numbers α and β and all $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. Due to $\sum_{\mu} \xi_{\mu}^2 = 1$ and $\sum_{\mu} \xi_{\mu} = 0$ we have $\beta = 1$. Further, $\alpha \neq 0$ since $\alpha = 0$ would imply that all $\xi_{\mu}^2 = 1$ in contradiction to $\sum_{\mu} \xi_{\mu}^2 = 1$ and the general condition $N \geq 3$. Then the quadratic equation (93) has the solutions

$$\xi_{\mu} = \frac{\alpha}{2} + \delta_{\mu} \sqrt{1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{4}}, \quad (94)$$

where $\delta_{\mu} = \pm 1$. Let $\alpha > 0$. According to $\sum_{\mu} \xi_{\mu} = 0$ not all δ_{μ} can have the same sign. Hence there exists at least one $\mu = 1, \dots, N$ with $\delta_{\mu} = +1$ such that

$$|\xi_{\mu}| = \left| \frac{\alpha}{2} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{4}} \right| > 1, \quad (95)$$

in contradiction to $\sum_{\mu} \xi_{\mu}^2 = 1$. If $\alpha < 0$ we can argue analogously by choosing a $\delta_{\mu} = -1$. \square

For later purpose we consider

$$\sum_{\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \stackrel{(69)}{=} \sum_{\nu} (K_{\mu\nu} + \delta_{\mu\nu} x_0) y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \quad (96)$$

$$\stackrel{(73)}{=} 2 \left(N - 1 + \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \right) + x_0 y_{\mu}^{(1)2}, \quad (97)$$

and further

$$\sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) y_{\nu}^{(1)2} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \stackrel{(97)}{=} 2 \sum_{\mu} \left(N - 1 + \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \right) y_{\mu}^{(1)2} + x_0 \sum_{\mu} y_{\mu}^{(1)4} \quad (98)$$

$$\stackrel{(86,68)}{=} 2 N X^2 + x_0 \sum_{\mu} y_{\mu}^{(1)4}. \quad (99)$$

7. Terms $O(t^4)$:

The fourth order terms of (63) are:

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(4)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(2)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(4)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(2)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(4)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)}, \quad (100)$$

or, using (54),

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} x_{\nu}^{(4)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} x_{\nu}^{(2)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} x_{\mu}^{(4)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} x_{\mu}^{(2)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(4)}, \quad (101)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. These equations can be used to calculate $\kappa_{\mu}^{(4)}$ for all $\mu = 1, \dots, N$:

$$\kappa_{\mu}^{(4)} \stackrel{(69,101)}{=} - \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} x_{\nu}^{(4)} - \sum_{\nu} \left(\Xi_{\mu\nu} + \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \delta_{\mu\nu} \right) x_{\nu}^{(2)} \quad (102)$$

$$\stackrel{(57,58)}{=} \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \left(y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} \left(\Xi_{\mu\nu} + \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \delta_{\mu\nu} \right) y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \quad (103)$$

$$\stackrel{(18)}{=} \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \left(y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} \left((1 - \delta_{\mu\nu}) y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \quad (104)$$

$$\stackrel{(68)}{=} \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \left(y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(X^2 - y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \quad (105)$$

$$= \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \left(y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(X^2 + \left(\kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} - 1 \right) y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \right). \quad (106)$$

From (106) we may calculate the fourth order correction to the eigenvalue x_0 according to (56):

$$x_4 = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(4)} = -\frac{1}{2} X^2, \quad (107)$$

using (86) and $\mathbf{1} \in \ker(K)$.

The fourth order correction to the magnetization reads:

$$M^{(4)} = \sum_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{(4)} \stackrel{(58)}{=} - \sum_{\mu} \left(y_{\mu}^{(1)} y_{\mu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\mu}^{(1)4} \right). \quad (108)$$

For the analogous correction to the energy we obtain:

$$E^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(2 \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(4)} + 2 \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(3)} + \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(2)} \right) \quad (109)$$

$$\stackrel{(57,58)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(-2 y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} - \frac{1}{4} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} + 2 y_{\mu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{4} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \right). \quad (110)$$

Since the bracket in the last equation vanishes for $\mu = \nu$ we may add arbitrary diagonal elements to $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0)$ without changing the total value of $E^{(4)}$. In particular, we may choose the homogeneous gauge of the J-matrix thus obtaining:

$$E^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \left(-2 y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} - \frac{1}{4} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} + 2 y_{\mu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{4} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \right) \quad (111)$$

$$\stackrel{(20,21,17)}{=} -j \sum_{\nu} \left(y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} \right) + \sum_{\mu\nu} \left(\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) - \gamma_0 \Xi_{\mu\nu} \right) \left(y_{\mu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \right) \quad (112)$$

$$\stackrel{(108,67,20,18)}{=} j M^{(4)} + x_0 \sum_{\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \gamma_0 \sum_{\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) y_{\mu}^{(1)2} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \\ - \frac{\gamma_0}{8} \left[\left(\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu}^{(1)2} \right) \left(\sum_{\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} \right) - \sum_{\mu} y_{\mu}^{(1)4} \right] \quad (113)$$

$$\stackrel{(68)}{=} j M^{(4)} + x_0 \sum_{\nu} y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \gamma_0 \sum_{\nu} \left(y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} \right) + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) y_{\mu}^{(1)2} y_{\nu}^{(1)2} - \frac{\gamma_0}{8} X^4 \quad (114)$$

$$\stackrel{(99,28)}{=} j M^{(4)} + (x_0 + \gamma_0) \sum_{\nu} \left(y_{\nu}^{(1)} y_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} y_{\nu}^{(1)4} \right) + \frac{N}{4} X^2 + \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{8N} X^4 \quad (115)$$

$$\stackrel{(108,28)}{=} \left(j - j_{min}^{(h)} \right) M^{(4)} + \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{8N} X^4 + \frac{N}{4} X^2. \quad (116)$$

8. Saturation susceptibility

We will use the series coefficients of $M(t)$ and $E(t)$ calculated in the preceding subsections to determine the leading coefficient of the susceptibility. To this end we first consider the series expansion of the magnetic field

$$B(t) = \frac{\partial E / \partial t}{\partial M / \partial t} \quad (117)$$

$$= \frac{2 E^{(2)} t + 4 E^{(4)} t^3 + \dots}{2 M^{(2)} t + 4 M^{(4)} t^3 + \dots} \quad (118)$$

$$= \frac{E^{(2)}}{M^{(2)}} + \frac{2 (E^{(4)} M^{(2)} - E^{(2)} M^{(4)})}{M^{(2)2}} t^2 + \dots \quad (119)$$

This yields the saturation field

$$B_{sat} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} B(t) = \frac{E^{(2)}}{M^{(2)}} \stackrel{(82,76)}{=} \frac{\frac{1}{2} (-j + j_{min}^{(h)}) X^2}{-\frac{1}{2} X^2} = j - j_{min}^{(h)}. \quad (120)$$

This result is in accordance with (15).

Next we consider the series representation of the susceptibility

$$\chi(t) = \frac{\partial M / \partial t}{\partial B / \partial t} \quad (121)$$

$$\stackrel{(119)}{=} \frac{2 M^{(2)} t + 4 M^{(4)} t^3 + \dots}{\frac{4t}{M^{(2)2}} (E^{(4)} M^{(2)} - E^{(2)} M^{(4)}) + \dots}. \quad (122)$$

This yields the saturation susceptibility

$$\chi_0 \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \chi(t) = \frac{M^{(2)3}}{2(E^{(4)}M^{(2)} - E^{(2)}M^{(4)})} \quad (123)$$

$$= \frac{\left(-\frac{1}{2}X^2\right)^3}{2\left(B_{sat}M^{(4)} + \frac{B_{sat}X^4}{8N} + \frac{N}{4}X^4\right)\left(-\frac{1}{2}X^2\right) - 2\left(-\frac{1}{2}B_{sat}X^2\right)\left(M^{(4)}\right)} \quad (124)$$

$$= \frac{NX^2}{B_{sat}X^2 + 2N^2} \quad (125)$$

$$\stackrel{(92)}{=} \frac{N}{B_{sat} + Nk^2}, \quad (126)$$

which represents a central result of the present paper. In Eq. (124) we have inserted the previous results for $M^{(2)}$, $E^{(2)}$, and $E^{(4)}$, see (76), (79), and (116), together with (120).

B. Three-dimensional ground states

We assume that the eigenspace \mathcal{E}_0 of $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\lambda^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ corresponding to the lowest eigenvalue x_0 is three-dimensional and hence the subspace \mathcal{E}_1 according to (48) will be two-dimensional. Let $(\xi^{(1)}, \xi^{(2)})$ be a fixed orthonormal basis in \mathcal{E}_1 .

1. Notations and first results

Similarly as in Section V A 1 we consider the one-parameter families

$$J_{\mu\nu}(t) = J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + t^2 \Xi_{\mu\nu}, \quad (127)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_\mu(t) = \sum_{n=0,1,2,\dots} t^n \mathbf{s}_\mu^{(n)}, \quad (128)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} + t^2 \begin{pmatrix} x_\mu^{(2)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t^3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} + t^4 \begin{pmatrix} x_\mu^{(4)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \dots, \quad (129)$$

$$\kappa_\mu(t) = \sum_{n=0,2,4,\dots} t^n \kappa_\mu^{(n)}, \quad (130)$$

$$x(t) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_\mu \kappa_\mu(t) = \sum_{n=0,2,4,\dots} t^n x_n, \quad (131)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. However, in this section the vectors $\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(n)}$ for odd n are assumed to be two-dimensional, $\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and their components are designated $y_\mu^{(n,a)}$ for $a = 1, 2$. For fixed n we may view the $y_\mu^{(n,a)}$ as the entries of an $N \times 2$ -matrix $\mathbf{y}^{(n)}$ with N rows $\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(n)}$ and two columns $\mathbf{y}^{(n,a)}$.

The condition $\|\mathbf{s}_\mu(t)\| = 1$ for all $\mu = 1, \dots, N$ entails an infinite number of identities for the $x_\mu^{(n)}$, the first two of which read

$$x_\mu^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)}, \quad (132)$$

$$x_\mu^{(4)} = -\left(\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} \left(\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)}\right)^2\right). \quad (133)$$

In the ground state configuration the total spin $\mathbf{S}(t)$ will point into the direction $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ of the field and hence

$$\mathbf{S}(t) = \sum_\mu \mathbf{s}_\mu(t) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} M(t) \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (134)$$

such that

$$M(t) = N + t^2 M^{(2)} + t^4 M^{(4)} + \dots \stackrel{(129,134)}{=} \sum_{n=0,2,4,\dots} t^n \sum_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{(n)}. \quad (135)$$

We note that Eqs. (134) and (129) imply

$$\sum_{\mu} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(n)} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for all odd } n. \quad (136)$$

Further we consider the energy (without the auxiliary uniform coupling)

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \mathbf{s}_{\mu}(t) \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}(t) = E^{(0)} + t^2 E^{(2)} + t^4 E^{(4)} + \dots \quad (137)$$

The t -series for $M(t)$ and $E(t)$ contain only even terms since the scalar product of two terms of different parity in (128) vanishes.

2. Perturbation series

The procedure is analogous to that of section V A and hence we will only mention those equations and results that are essentially different. Especially the terms of 0^{th} order in t are identical to those of section III.

3. Terms $O(t^1)$:

The t -linear terms of (63) read:

$$\sum_{\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(1)} = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)}. \quad (138)$$

Using (129) this means that

$$\sum_{\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)}, \quad (139)$$

or, due to (4) and (28),

$$\sum_{\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} = x_0 \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)}. \quad (140)$$

Hence the columns $\mathbf{y}^{(1,a)}$, $a = 1, 2$, of the matrix $\mathbf{y}^{(1)}$ are eigenvectors of $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ corresponding to its lowest eigenvalue x_0 . According to (136) these eigenvectors $\mathbf{y}^{(1,a)}$ are orthogonal to $\mathbf{1}$ and hence lie in \mathcal{E}_1 . They can hence be expanded into the orthonormal basis $(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(2)})$:

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1,1)} = \alpha_{11} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(1)} + \alpha_{12} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(2)}, \quad (141)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1,2)} = \alpha_{21} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(1)} + \alpha_{22} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(2)}, \quad (142)$$

for all $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. The α_{ij} can be viewed as the coefficients of a 2×2 -matrix $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. It is only unique up to an arbitrary rotation/reflection in the two-dimensional space \mathcal{E}_1 . This freedom can be used to additionally require that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is symmetric and positively definite, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} > 0$. In fact, let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\top})^{1/2} R$ be the polar decomposition of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ with $R \in O(2)$, then $\boldsymbol{\alpha} R^{-1} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\top})^{1/2}$ will be positively semi-definite. The stronger requirement $\boldsymbol{\alpha} > 0$ follows from the condition of a proper two-dimensional vector $\mathbf{y}^{(1)}$.

We will determine $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ below.

4. Terms $O(t^2)$:

We obtain the second order terms of (63):

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(2)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(0)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(2)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)} , \quad (143)$$

or, by means of (129),

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} x_{\nu}^{(2)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} x_{\mu}^{(2)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} , \quad (144)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. Since the $x_{\mu}^{(2)}$ are already determined by (132), we may view these equations as explicit expressions for the $\kappa_{\mu}^{(2)}$ for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$:

$$\kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} = - \sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + \delta_{\mu\nu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \right) x_{\nu}^{(2)} - (N-1) \quad (145)$$

$$\stackrel{(132,69)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} + (1-N) . \quad (146)$$

It follows that the vector $\kappa^{(2)}$ lies in the subspace spanned by $\text{ran}(\mathbf{K})$ and $\mathbf{1}$ and hence is orthogonal to \mathcal{E}_1 or, equivalently, to $\xi^{(1)}$ and $\xi^{(2)}$:

$$\sum_{\mu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \xi_{\mu}^{(1)} = \sum_{\mu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \xi_{\mu}^{(2)} = 0 . \quad (147)$$

From (146) we may calculate the second order correction to the eigenvalue x_0 according to (56):

$$x_2 = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu} \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2N} \left(\sum_{\mu\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \right) + N-1 = N-1 , \quad (148)$$

since $\mathbf{1} \in \ker(K)$.

The second order correction to the magnetization reads

$$M^{(2)} = \sum_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{(2)} \stackrel{(132)}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} . \quad (149)$$

The analogous correction to the energy is obtained as

$$E^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(2\mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(2)} + \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) \quad (150)$$

$$\stackrel{(129,132)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(-\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} + \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) \quad (151)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \left(-\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} + \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) \quad (152)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \quad (153)$$

$$\stackrel{(20,21,23)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \left(-j + j_{min}^{(h)} \right) \sum_{\mu} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \quad (154)$$

$$\stackrel{(149)}{=} \left(j - j_{min}^{(h)} \right) M^{(2)} . \quad (155)$$

In Eq. (152) we have used that the bracket in (151) vanishes for $\mu = \nu$ and hence the total expression is independent of the matrix' diagonal.

5. Terms $O(t^3)$:

The third order terms of (63) are:

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(3)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(3)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)} , \quad (156)$$

or, using (129),

$$\sum_{\nu} \left(J_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(3)} + \Xi_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \right) = -\kappa_{\mu}^{(0)} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(3)} - \kappa_{\mu}^{(1)} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} , \quad (157)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. By means of (69) this can be brought into the form of an (in general) inhomogeneous linear system of equations for the unknown $\mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(3)}$:

$$\sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(3)} = \left(1 - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \right) \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \equiv \mathbf{u}_{\mu} . \quad (158)$$

This system is only solvable if the r. h. s. lies in the range of K , i.e., $\mathbf{u}^{(a)} \in \text{ran}(K) = \ker(K)^{\perp}$ for $a = 1, 2$. Especially, the solvability condition implies

$$\sum_{\mu} \left(1 - \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)} \right) \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} = 0 . \quad (159)$$

More generally, we obtain the solvability conditions $\mathbf{u}^{(a)} \perp \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{u}^{(a)} \perp \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(b)}$ for all $a, b = 1, 2$. The first conditions follow from (136) and (147). Using (146), the second group of conditions is equivalent to

$$0 = \sum_{\mu} \left(2N \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1,a)} - \sum_{\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1,a)} \right) \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(b)} , \quad (160)$$

for all $a, b = 1, 2$. Upon expanding the $\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1,a)}$ in terms of the $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(b)}$ via (141) and (142) we thus obtain four polynomial equations of third order for the four unknown α_{ab} . In order to write these equations in concise form we introduce the three vectors $\mathbf{q}^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, with components

$$\mathbf{q}_{\mu}^{(1)} \equiv \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(1)2}, \quad \mathbf{q}_{\mu}^{(2)} \equiv \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(1)} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(2)}, \quad \mathbf{q}_{\mu}^{(3)} \equiv \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mu}^{(2)2}, \quad (161)$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, N$ and define

$$k_{ij} \equiv \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{q}_{\mu}^{(i)} K_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{q}_{\nu}^{(j)} , \quad (162)$$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, where $k_{ij} = k_{ji}$ follows from the symmetry of K . Then the four polynomial equations assume the form

$$2N\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{11} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{11} + \alpha_{12} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{12} + \alpha_{11} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{13} + \alpha_{12} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{23} \\ + 2\alpha_{11} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{12} + 2\alpha_{12} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{22} , \quad (163)$$

$$2N\alpha_{12} = \alpha_{11} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{12} + \alpha_{12} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{13} + \alpha_{11} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{23} + \alpha_{12} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{33} \\ + 2\alpha_{11} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{22} + 2\alpha_{12} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{23} , \quad (164)$$

$$2N\alpha_{21} = \alpha_{21} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{11} + \alpha_{22} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{12} + \alpha_{21} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{13} + \alpha_{22} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{23} \\ + 2\alpha_{21} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{12} + 2\alpha_{22} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{22} , \quad (165)$$

$$2N\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{21} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{12} + \alpha_{22} (\alpha_{11}^2 + \alpha_{21}^2) k_{13} + \alpha_{21} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{23} + \alpha_{22} (\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) k_{33} \\ + 2\alpha_{21} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{22} + 2\alpha_{22} (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}\alpha_{22}) k_{23} . \quad (166)$$

These equations could be further simplified, but this appears superfluous as they surprisingly can be directly solved using computer-algebraic means, if we add the equation $\alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21}$ considered above and use concrete numbers for the k_{ij} calculated for the particular spin system under consideration. This will be demonstrated below for the example in Section VI D. Note, that the above system (163) - (166) is independent of N , only the calculation of the k_{ij} may

become more cumbersome for large N . Typically, a computer-algebraic system would yield a finite number of solutions that can, however, be boiled down to a single solution by using the condition $\alpha > 0$ considered above.

Hence we will proceed by assuming that a unique solution of (163) - (166) together with $\alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21}$ exists and leave it to the particular case how to concretely calculate α . We observe that the quadratic correction to the magnetization can be expressed in terms of the α_{ij} :

$$M^{(2)} \stackrel{(149)}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu} \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \stackrel{(141,142)}{=} -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\alpha \alpha^{\top}) = -\frac{1}{2} (\alpha_{11}^2 + 2\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) . \quad (167)$$

For later purpose we consider

$$\sum_{\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\lambda^{(0)}, \gamma_0) \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \stackrel{(69)}{=} \sum_{\nu} (K_{\mu\nu} + \delta_{\mu\nu} x_0) \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \quad (168)$$

$$\stackrel{(146)}{=} 2(N-1 + \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)}) + x_0 \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} , \quad (169)$$

and further

$$\sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\lambda^{(0)}, \gamma_0) (\mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)}) (\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)}) \stackrel{(169)}{=} 2 \sum_{\mu} (N-1 + \kappa_{\mu}^{(2)}) \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} + x_0 \sum_{\mu} (\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)})^2 \quad (170)$$

$$\stackrel{(159,149)}{=} -4N M^{(2)} + x_0 \sum_{\mu} (\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)})^2 . \quad (171)$$

6. Terms $O(t^4)$:

As in Section V A 7 the fourth order terms of (63) can be used to determine $\kappa_{\mu}^{(4)}$ for all $\mu = 1, \dots, N$. We will not dwell upon the details but rather consider the fourth order part of the magnetization:

$$M^{(4)} = \sum_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{(4)} \stackrel{(133)}{=} - \sum_{\mu} \left(\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} (\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)})^2 \right) . \quad (172)$$

For the fourth order correction to the energy we obtain:

$$E^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(2 \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(0)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(4)} + 2 \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(3)} + \mathbf{s}_{\mu}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{\nu}^{(2)} \right) \quad (173)$$

$$\stackrel{(132,133)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0) \left(-2 \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(3)} - \frac{1}{4} (\mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)})^2 + 2 \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{4} (\mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\mu}^{(1)}) (\mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\nu}^{(1)}) \right) \quad (174)$$

Since the bracket in the last equation vanishes for $\mu = \nu$ we may add arbitrary diagonal elements to $\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{0}, 0)$ without

changing the total value of $E^{(4)}$. In particular, we may choose the homogeneous gauge of the J-matrix thus obtaining:

$$E^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} J_{\mu\nu}^{(h)} \left(-2\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} - \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right)^2 + 2\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \right) \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right) \right) \quad (175)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{(20,21,17)}{=} -j \sum_\nu \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right)^2 \right) \\ & + \sum_{\mu\nu} \left(\mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) - \gamma_0 \Xi_{\mu\nu} \right) \left(\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} \left(\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \right) \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (176)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{(108,67,29,18)}{=} j M^{(4)} + x_0 \sum_\nu \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \gamma_0 \sum_\nu \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) \left(\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \right) \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right) \\ & - \frac{\gamma_0}{8} \left[\left(\sum_\mu \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \right) \left(\sum_\nu \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right) - \sum_\nu \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (177)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{(68)}{=} j M^{(4)} + x_0 \sum_\nu \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \gamma_0 \sum_\nu \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right)^2 \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\mu\nu} \mathbb{J}_{\mu\nu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) \left(\mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\mu^{(1)} \right) \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right) - \frac{\gamma_0}{2} M^{(2)2} \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

$$\stackrel{(171,28)}{=} j M^{(4)} + (x_0 + \gamma_0) \sum_\nu \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(3)} + \frac{1}{8} \left(\mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{y}_\nu^{(1)} \right)^2 \right) - \frac{N}{2} M^{(2)} + \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{2N} M^{(2)2} \quad (179)$$

$$\stackrel{(172,28)}{=} \left(j - j_{min}^{(h)} \right) M^{(4)} - \frac{N}{2} M^{(2)} + \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{2N} M^{(2)2}. \quad (180)$$

7. Saturation susceptibility

Analogously to the results of Section V A 8 we obtain for the leading coefficient of the t -series for the magnetic field

$$B_{sat} \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} B(t) = \frac{E^{(2)}}{M^{(2)}} \stackrel{(155)}{=} \frac{\left(j - j_{min}^{(h)} \right) M^{(2)}}{M^{(2)}} = j - j_{min}^{(h)}. \quad (181)$$

This result is in accordance with (15).

Similarly, we reconsider the series representation of the susceptibility

$$\chi(t) = \frac{\partial M / \partial t}{\partial B / \partial t} \quad (182)$$

$$\stackrel{(119)}{=} \frac{2 M^{(2)} t + 4 M^{(4)} t^3 + \dots}{\frac{4t}{M^{(2)2}} (E^{(4)} M^{(2)} - E^{(2)} M^{(4)})}. \quad (183)$$

and the corresponding saturation susceptibility

$$\chi_0 \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \chi(t) = \frac{M^{(2)3}}{2 (E^{(4)} M^{(2)} - E^{(2)} M^{(4)})} \quad (184)$$

$$= \frac{M^{(2)3}}{2 \left(B_{sat} M^{(4)} + \frac{B_{sat} M^{(2)2}}{2N} - \frac{N}{2} M^{(2)} \right) M^{(2)} - 2 B_{sat} M^{(2)} M^{(4)}} \quad (185)$$

$$= \frac{N}{B_{sat} - \frac{N^2}{M^{(2)}}} \quad (186)$$

$$\stackrel{(167)}{=} \frac{N}{B_{sat} + \frac{2N^2}{\alpha_{11}^2 + 2\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2}} \equiv \frac{N}{B_{sat} + N k^2}. \quad (187)$$

In Eq. (185) we have inserted the previous results for $E^{(2)}$ and $E^{(4)}$, see (155) and (180), as well as (181). In the last equation (187) we have written the saturation susceptibility in a form analogous to the coplanar case (126).




FIG. 3: The convex domain \mathcal{G} of u, v -values such that the Gram matrix $G(u, v)$ according to (191) will be positively semi-definite. The (black) point corresponding to the ferromagnetic ground state $\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow$ is marked by “1”, analogously the (red) point corresponding to the coplanar ground state with minimal magnetization (or energy) by “ g ”. The tangent at g (black dotted line) has been calculated by means of (192) or (193).

VI. EXAMPLES

Examples for parabolic systems including the odd regular polygons can also be found in [21]. We will add an example in Section VIA that is only “locally parabolic”, i. e., for a certain interval of magnetization $M_1 \leq M \leq N$ in order to support our proposal to weaken the pertinent definition.

A. Irregular tetrahedron

As an example of a parabolic system we consider a tetrahedron ($N = 4$) with six coupling coefficients which are chosen so that the example fulfils its purpose mentioned above. The homogeneously gauged J-matrix is taken as

$$J^{(h)} = \frac{1}{262} \begin{pmatrix} 235 & -141 & -291 & 459 \\ -141 & -125 & 489 & 39 \\ -291 & 489 & 95 & -31 \\ 459 & 39 & -31 & -205 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (188)$$

Its eigenvalues are

$$j_1 = 3, \quad j_{min}^{(h)} = -2 \text{ (twofold degenerate) and } j = 1, \quad (189)$$

which entails

$$B_{sat} = j - j_{min}^{(h)} = 3, \quad \gamma_0 = \frac{j_{min}^{(h)} - j}{N} = -\frac{3}{4}. \quad (190)$$

The ADE (13) of the corresponding J-matrix with uniform coupling $\mathbb{J}(\lambda^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ has solutions depending on two parameters u, v such that the corresponding Gram matrix reads

$$G(u, v) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{135}(91u + 44) & \frac{1}{65}(21v + 44) & \frac{1}{15}(13u + 9v - 7) \\ \frac{1}{135}(91u + 44) & 1 & \frac{1}{117}(91u + 63v - 37) & v \\ \frac{1}{65}(21v + 44) & \frac{1}{117}(91u + 63v - 37) & 1 & u \\ \frac{1}{15}(13u + 9v - 7) & v & u & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (191)$$




FIG. 4: The absolute coplanar ground state \mathbf{h} of the irregular tetrahedron determined numerically and the total spin \mathbf{S} of length $M_0 = 0.22834$.




FIG. 5: The minimal energy E as a function of magnetization M for relative ground states of the irregular tetrahedron and $M_0 \leq M \leq 1$. The solid red parabola represents a subset of ground states given by the points of \mathcal{G} and satisfying the equation (194). The ground state of \mathcal{G} with minimal magnetization is marked by “ g ” as in Figure 3. The dashed red parabola represents the continuation of (194) to lower values of M . The blue curve is a fit of $E(M)$ for 75 numerically determined coplanar ground states including the absolute ground state marked by “ h ”. Obviously the numerically determined ground states have an energy above the parabola (194).

The convex set \mathcal{G} in the (u, v) -plane corresponding to those points where $G(u, v) \geq 0$ and hence to physical ground states is shown in Figure 3. Its boundary corresponds to coplanar ground states except the point **1** representing the ferromagnetic ground state $\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow$. The points in the interior of \mathcal{G} correspond to three-dimensional states of the form (33).

It will be instructive to calculate the energy (without uniform coupling) $E(u, v)$ and the squared magnetization

$M^2(u, v)$ for the ground states corresponding to the points of \mathcal{G} . The result is

$$E(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(G(u, v) J^{(h)} \right) = \frac{2}{585} (728u + 540v - 683), \quad (192)$$

$$M^2(u, v) = \sum_{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu}(u, v) = \frac{16(728u + 540v + 487)}{1755}. \quad (193)$$

These two functions satisfy the linear relation

$$E(u, v) = -4 + \frac{3}{8} M^2(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} N j_{min}^{(h)} + \frac{j - j_{min}^{(h)}}{2N} M^2(u, v), \quad (194)$$

showing that the present example of the irregular tetrahedron is parabolic in the sense of Section IV and, in particular, has a constant susceptibility $\chi = \frac{4}{3}$ in the domain \mathcal{G} .

The state g with the lowest magnetization $M_1 = 0.619623$ (or lowest energy $E_1 = -3.85603$) among the states corresponding to \mathcal{G} is not the absolute ground state. We have numerically determined the absolute ground state with $M_0 = 0.22834$ and $E_0 = -3.93768$, see Figure 4, and the relative (coplanar) ground states for $M_0 < M < M_1$, see Figure 5. Obviously, the energies of these relative ground states are above the parabola (194) and hence the irregular tetrahedron is an example of a parabolic system in the sense of Section IV that is not parabolic for all physical possible values of the magnetization.

B. Isosceles triangle

For the non-parabolic case we first we consider a relatively simple example where all quantities can be analytically calculated. This will be the AF triangle ($N = 3$) with coupling coefficients $J_{12} = J_{13} = 1$ and $J_{23} = 2$. The corresponding homogeneously gauged J -matrix has the form

$$J^{(h)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -\frac{1}{3} & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & -\frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (195)$$

and its eigenvalues are

$$j = \frac{8}{3}, \quad j_{min}^{(h)} = -\frac{7}{3}, \quad j_3 = -\frac{1}{3}, \quad (196)$$

with (normalized) eigenvectors

$$\mathbf{e}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{e}_2 = \boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{e}_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (197)$$

From this we calculate the saturation field

$$B_{sat} \stackrel{(120)}{=} j - j_{min}^{(h)} = 5 \quad (198)$$

and the critical uniform coupling parameter

$$\gamma_0 \stackrel{(29)}{=} \frac{j_{min}^{(h)} - j}{N} = -\frac{5}{3}. \quad (199)$$

Since the ground state problem for the general triangle has been completely solved in [20] it will suffice to give the following results without detailed derivation:

$$\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t), \gamma_0 + t^2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3t^2+1} - \frac{4}{3} & t^2 - \frac{2}{3} & t^2 - \frac{2}{3} \\ t^2 - \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{1}{3t^2-1} + \frac{2}{3} & t^2 + \frac{1}{3} \\ t^2 - \frac{2}{3} & t^2 + \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3t^2-1} + \frac{2}{3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (200)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_1(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (201)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_2(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2-3t^2}{6t^2+2} \\ \frac{3t\sqrt{3t^2+4}}{6t^2+2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix} + t^2 \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{9}{2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t^3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -\frac{63}{8} \end{pmatrix} + t^4 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{27}{2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \dots \quad (202)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_3(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2-3t^2}{6t^2+2} \\ -\frac{3t\sqrt{3t^2+4}}{6t^2+2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -3 \end{pmatrix} + t^2 \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{9}{2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + t^3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{63}{8} \end{pmatrix} + t^4 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{27}{2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \dots \quad (203)$$

For $t = t_0 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}$ the absolute ground state

$$\mathbf{s}_1(t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{s}_2(t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{\sqrt{15}}{4} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{s}_3(t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{4} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{15}}{4} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (204)$$

with a residual magnetization of $M = 1/2$ will be assumed. Further,

$$M(t) = \frac{3}{3t^2+1} = 3 - 9t^2 + 27t^4 + \dots, \quad (205)$$

$$\kappa_1(t) = \frac{(2-3t^2)^2}{9t^2+3} = \frac{4}{3} - 8t^2 + 27t^4 + \dots, \quad (206)$$

$$\kappa_2(t) = \kappa_3(t) = \frac{1}{3} + t^2. \quad (207)$$

The latter yields the minimal eigenvalue $x(t)$ of $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t), \gamma_0 + t^2)$ by summation over $\mu = 1, 2, 3$:

$$x(t) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu} \kappa_{\mu}(t) = -\frac{9t^4+2}{9t^2+3} = -\frac{2}{3} + 2t^2 - 9t^4 + \dots \quad (208)$$

For the total energy (without uniform coupling) we obtain

$$E(t) = \frac{-18t^4 - 21t^2 + 4}{(3t^2+1)^2} = 4 - 45t^2 + 216t^4 + \dots, \quad (209)$$

further

$$B(t) = \frac{\partial E(t)/\partial t}{\partial M(t)/\partial t} = \frac{5-3t^2}{1+3t^2} = 5 - 18t^2 + 54t^4 + \dots, \quad (210)$$

and finally

$$\chi(t) = \frac{\partial M(t)/\partial t}{\partial B(t)/\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (211)$$

that turns out to be constant for $0 < t < \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}$, see Figure 6. Although the minimal energy is a quadratic function of the magnetization, $E(t) = -2 - M(t) + M^2(t)$, the system is not parabolic in the sense of Section IV since its susceptibility is not given by $\frac{N}{B_{sat}} = \frac{3}{5}$ as it should be for parabolic systems according to (47).

Thus the physical quantities and their expansions into t -series are completely known for the considered isosceles triangle and one may directly check the results of Section V A. We will confine ourselves to a few significant cases. First we compare the eigenvector $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0, 1, -1)^{\top}$ of $J^{(h)}$ with the vector $x^{(1)} = (0, 3, -3)^{\top}$ of linear ground state corrections and conclude

$$X = 3\sqrt{2}, \quad (212)$$

by means of (68). Let $\boldsymbol{\xi}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(0, 1, 1)^{\top}$ be the vector of squared components ξ_{μ}^2 , $\mu = 1, 2, 3$. To check (92) we note that the operator K defined in (69) will be of the form $K = |\mathbf{k}\rangle\langle\mathbf{k}|$ with $\mathbf{k} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(-2, 1, 1)^{\top} = \sqrt{2}\mathbf{e}_3$. It follows that

$$k^2 = \sum_{\mu\nu} K_{\mu\nu} \xi_{\nu}^2 \xi_{\mu}^2 = |\langle\mathbf{k}|\boldsymbol{\xi}^2\rangle|^2 = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{3}. \quad (213)$$




FIG. 6: The magnetization M as a function of the magnetic field B for the isosceles spin triangle considered in this section. We have extended the domain of B to include also negative values and plotted $M(B)$ as an odd function. The magnetization $M(B)$ is the linear function $M(B) = 1/2 + B/2$ in the interval $0 < B < B_{sat} = 5$ in accordance with the result $\chi = 1/2$ obtained for the analytical domain $0 < B < B_{sat}$, see (211).

Hence

$$X \stackrel{(212)}{=} 3\sqrt{2} = \frac{\sqrt{2 \times 3}}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}} \stackrel{(213)}{=} \frac{\sqrt{2N}}{k}, \quad (214)$$

thereby confirming (92). Finally, we will check Eq. (126):

$$\chi \stackrel{(211)}{=} \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{5 + 3 \times \frac{1}{3}} \stackrel{(198,213)}{=} \frac{N}{B_{sat} + N k^2}. \quad (215)$$

C. Almost regular Cube

We consider a cube ($N = 8$) with AF coupling $J_{\mu\nu} = +1$ except two ferromagnetic bonds $J_{24} = J_{13} = -1$, see Figure 7. We will analytically calculate the saturation susceptibility and check it by numerical calculations. This example has also been considered in [22] with a general ferromagnetic bond strength. Its homogeneously gauged J -matrix has the form

$$J^{(h)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (216)$$

The corresponding characteristic polynomial reads

$$p(x) = (x-2)x(x+2)(x^2-2x-2)(x^3+2x^2-6x-8), \quad (217)$$

which leads to the two prominent eigenvalues

$$j = 2, \quad j_{min}^{(h)} = \text{Root}[x^3 + 2x^2 - 6x - 8, 1] = -3.10278 \dots \quad (218)$$




FIG. 7: The almost regular cube with ten AF coupling parameters $J_{\mu\nu} = +1$ (blue lines) and two ferromagnetic bonds $J_{24} = J_{13} = -1$ (red lines).

with corresponding (not normalized) eigenvectors $\mathbf{1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\xi} = & \left(\text{Root}[4x^3 - 7x - 1, 2], -\text{Root}[4x^3 - 7x - 1, 2], \text{Root}[2x^3 + 4x^2 - x - 1, 3], \right. \\ & \left. -\text{Root}[2x^3 + 4x^2 - x - 1, 3], \text{Root}[4x^3 + 4x^2 - 3x - 1, 1], -\text{Root}[4x^3 + 4x^2 - 3x - 1, 1], -1, 1 \right)^\top \end{aligned} \quad (219)$$

$$\approx (-0.144584, 0.144584, 0.551388, -0.551388, -1.4068, 1.4068, -1, 1)^\top. \quad (220)$$

Here we have adopted the notation $\text{Root}[p(x), n]$ for the n th root of the polynomial $p(x)$ analogous to the similar MATHEMATICA[®] command. In passing we note the special form of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ with alternating components due to the reflectional symmetry of the almost regular cube, see [22] for details. We conclude

$$B_{sat} \stackrel{(120)}{=} j - j_{min}^{(h)} = 5.10278\dots, \quad (221)$$

and

$$\gamma_0 \stackrel{(29)}{=} \frac{j_{min}^{(h)} - j}{N} = -0.637847\dots \quad (222)$$

From this we will obtain the matrix K , see (69), and its expectation value k^2 according to (91), taking into account that (219) was not normalized. The exact result reads

$$k^2 = \text{Root}[199712x^3 - 46136x^2 - 14439x + 3113, 3] = 0.298158\dots, \quad (223)$$

and yields the saturation susceptibility

$$\chi_0 \stackrel{(126)}{=} \frac{N}{B_{sat} + Nk^2} = 632 \text{Root}[41295512x^3 + 40484x^2 - 778x + 1, 2] = 1.06837\dots \quad (224)$$

To check this exact result we have numerically calculated 137 ground states for $\gamma_0 < \gamma < -1/2$ and fitted the function $E(M)$ by an even polynomial of degree 12. This yields a numerical approximation of $M(B)$, see Figure 8, with a slope 1.037 at the saturation point in approximate accordance with (224).




FIG. 8: The numerically determined magnetization curve $M(B)$ of the almost regular cube in the vicinity of the saturation point and the slope triangle with the analytically determined slope χ_0 according to (224).




FIG. 9: The ground state of the irregular octahedron for the value $\gamma = \gamma_0 + 0.0002$ of the auxiliary uniform coupling.

D. Irregular octahedron

In order to construct an example of a non-parabolic system with three-dimensional ground states we consider three vectors

$$\mathbf{a} = (1, -2, -1, 0, 1, 1)^\top, \quad \mathbf{b} = (-2, 1, -1, 1, 2, -1)^\top, \quad \mathbf{c} = (-4, -2, 3, 0, 0, 3)^\top, \quad (225)$$

orthogonal to $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)^\top$ and mutually orthogonal, the two-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^6 spanned by \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} and the projector P onto this subspace. Further consider the one-dimensional projectors $F = \frac{1}{6} |\mathbf{1}\rangle\langle\mathbf{1}|$ and




FIG. 10: The numerically determined magnetization curve $M(B)$ of the irregular octahedron for $B = 0, \dots, 4$ and the slope triangle with the analytically determined slope χ_0 of $M(B)$ at the saturation point according to (239).

$Q = \frac{1}{38}|\mathbf{c}\rangle\langle\mathbf{c}|$. and define the homogeneously gauged J -matrix of the “irregular octahedron” ($N = 6$) by

$$J^{(h)} = -2P + F + 3Q = \frac{1}{2622} \begin{pmatrix} 1697 & 3803 & -2389 & 1235 & 1577 & -3301 \\ 3803 & -1471 & -1831 & 209 & 1235 & 677 \\ -2389 & -1831 & 932 & 1007 & 2375 & 2528 \\ 1235 & 209 & 1007 & -19 & -589 & 779 \\ 1577 & 1235 & 2375 & -589 & -2527 & 551 \\ -3301 & 677 & 2528 & 779 & 551 & 1388 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (226)$$

such that its eigenvalues are

$$j_1 = 3, \quad j_{min}^{(h)} = -2 \text{ (twofold degenerate)}, \quad j = 1, \quad j_2 = 0 \text{ (twofold degenerate)}. \quad (227)$$

It follows that

$$B_{sat} \stackrel{(181)}{=} j - j_{min}^{(h)} = 3, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_0 \stackrel{(29)}{=} \frac{j_{min}^{(h)} - j}{N} = -\frac{1}{2}. \quad (228)$$

Hence the minimal eigenvalue $x_0 \stackrel{(28)}{=} j + (N-1)\gamma_0 = -\frac{3}{2}$ of $\mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0)$ is threefold degenerate and the corresponding eigenspace \mathcal{E}_0 is spanned by the vectors \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b} , $\mathbf{1}$. We choose $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\mathbf{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}\mathbf{b}$ as an orthonormal basis in \mathcal{E}_1 . The example is chosen such that the ADE for the subspace \mathcal{E}_0 has only one solution corresponding to the ferromagnetic ground state $\mathbf{1}$ and hence the present system is non-parabolic and admits three-dimensional ground states.

It is straight forward to calculate the matrix $K = \mathbb{J}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \gamma_0) - x_0 \mathbb{1}$ and the k_{ij} according to Eq. (162):

$$k_{11} = \frac{20555}{41952}, \quad (229)$$

$$k_{12} = \frac{5423}{13984\sqrt{23}}, \quad (230)$$

$$k_{13} = -\frac{143237}{964896}, \quad (231)$$

$$k_{23} = -\frac{109153}{321632\sqrt{23}}, \quad (232)$$

$$k_{33} = \frac{5812139}{22192608}. \quad (233)$$

Using computer-algebraic software the unique solution of the corresponding system of polynomial equations (163) - (166) together with $\alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21}$ and $\alpha > 0$ can be obtained as

$$\alpha_{11} = \frac{1}{48} \sqrt{\frac{9423194077641 + 451984247\sqrt{110485905}}{149703945}} \approx 6.41047, \quad (234)$$

$$\alpha_{12} = \frac{4433}{48} \sqrt{\frac{23(11649 - \sqrt{110485905})}{149703945}} \approx 1.22104, \quad (235)$$

$$\alpha_{22} = \frac{1}{48} \sqrt{\frac{23(971333547423 + 19651489\sqrt{110485905})}{149703945}} \approx 8.86256. \quad (236)$$

This yields

$$M^{(2)} \stackrel{(167)}{=} -\frac{1}{2} (\alpha_{11}^2 + 2\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2) = -\frac{11649}{190}, \quad (237)$$

$$E^{(2)} \stackrel{(181)}{=} B_{sat} M^{(2)} = -\frac{34947}{190}, \quad (238)$$

and, finally,

$$\chi_0 \stackrel{(187)}{=} \frac{N}{B_{sat} + \frac{2N^2}{\alpha_{11}^2 + 2\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{22}^2}} = \frac{7766}{4643} \approx 1.67263. \quad (239)$$

To check the latter result we have numerically calculated 20 three-dimensional ground states for $B = 0, \dots, 3$ and fitted the corresponding function $M(B)$ by a polynomial. See Figure 9 for an example of the ground state where the uniform coupling γ is slightly above the critical value γ_0 . The slope of $M(B)$ at the saturation point fits very well to the analytically determined saturation susceptibility χ_0 according to Eq. (239), see Figure 10.

VII. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

We have applied the theory of ground states published three years ago to the problem of analytically describing the behaviour of a spin system close to the saturation field where numerical calculations are difficult. In particular, we have characterized the form of the “spin umbrella” in lowest order of its spread in terms of certain eigenvectors of the dressed J -matrix at the saturation point. Moreover, we have derived simple expressions for the saturation susceptibility. This analysis has been performed for (locally) parabolic systems and for non-parabolic systems with two- or three-dimensional ground states close to the saturation field and confirmed by means of four examples using computer-algebraic software. We used the method of perturbation series up to fourth order for non-parabolic systems; for the next interesting physical quantity, the slope of the saturation susceptibility, we would have to extend the perturbation series up to the sixth order, which is possible in principle, but considerably more difficult. In view of the examples considered in this paper we conjecture that the slope of the saturation susceptibility will be negative for non-parabolic systems, as it is schematically indicated in Figure 2.

Although we think that our case distinction is complete for “standard systems” it remains an open problem to extend the present theory to those systems where the dimension m of the ground states is larger than three and hence exceeds the domain of physically possible states.

-
- [1] M. Axenovich and M. Luban, Exact ground state properties of the classical Heisenberg model for giant magnetic molecules, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 100407(R) (2003)
 - [2] A. Proykova and D. Stauffer, Classical simulations of magnetic structures for chromium clusters: size effects, *Cent. Eur. J. Phys.* **3** (2), 209 - 220 (2005)
 - [3] C. Schröder, H.-J. Schmidt, J. Schnack, and M. Luban, Metamagnetic Phase Transition of the Antiferromagnetic Heisenberg Icosahedron, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** (20), 207203 (2005)
 - [4] N. P. Konstantinidis et al, Magnetism on a Mesoscopic Scale: Molecular Nanomagnets Bridging Quantum and Classical Physics, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **303**, 012003 (2011)
 - [5] A. P. Popov, A. Rettori, and M. G. Pini, Discovery of metastable states in a finite-size classical one-dimensional planar spin chain with competing nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor exchange couplings, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 134418 (2014)

- [6] K. Ch. Mondal et al, A Strongly Spin-Frustrated Fe^{III}_7 Complex with a Canted Intermediate Spin Ground State of $S = 7/2$ or $9/2$, *Chem. Eur. J.* **21**, 10835 - 10842 (2015)
- [7] G. Kamieniarz, W. Florek, and M. Antkowiak, Universal sequence of ground states validating the classification of frustration in antiferromagnetic rings with a single bond defect, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 140411(R) (2015)
- [8] A. P. Popov, A. Rettori, and M. G. Pini, Spectrum of noncollinear metastable configurations of a finite-size discrete planar spin chain with a collinear ferromagnetic ground state, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 024414 (2015)
- [9] V. K. Henner, A. Klots, and T. Belozeroва, Simulation of Pake doublet with classical spins and correspondence between the quantum and classical approaches, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **89**, 264 (2016)
- [10] W. Florek, M. Antkowiak, and G. Kamieniarz, Sequences of ground states and classification of frustration in odd-numbered antiferromagnetic rings, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 224421 (2016)
- [11] R. J. Woolfson et al, $[CrF(O_2C^tBu)_2]_9$: Synthesis and Characterization of a Regular Homometallic Ring with an Odd Number of Metal Centers and Electrons, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **55**, 8856 - 8859 (2016)
- [12] S. Castillo-Sepúlveda et al, Magnetic Möbius stripe without frustration: Noncollinear metastable states, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 024426 (2017)
- [13] N. P. Konstantinidis, Zero-temperature magnetic response of small fullerene molecules at the classical and full quantum limit, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **449**, 55 - 62 (2018)
- [14] A. Baniodeh, N. Magnani, Y. Lan et al, High spin cycles: topping the spin record for a single molecule verging on quantum criticality, *npj Quant. Mater.* **3**, 10 (2018)
- [15] D. V. Dmitriev, V. Ya. Krivnov, J. Richter, and J. Schnack, Thermodynamics of a delta chain with ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 094410 (2019)
- [16] A. P. Singh et al, Molecular spin frustration in mixed-chelate Fe_5 and Fe_6 oxo clusters with high ground state spin values, *Polyhedron* **176**, 114182 (2020)
- [17] H.-J. Schmidt and M. Luban, Classical ground states of symmetric Heisenberg spin systems, *J. Phys. A* **36**, 6351 – 6378 (2003)
- [18] H.-J. Schmidt, Theory of ground states for classical Heisenberg spin systems I, arXiv:cond-mat1701.02489v2, (2017)
- [19] H.-J. Schmidt, Theory of ground states for classical Heisenberg spin systems II, arXiv:cond-mat1707.02859v2, (2017)
- [20] H.-J. Schmidt, Theory of ground states for classical Heisenberg spin systems III, arXiv:cond-mat1707.06512v2, (2017)
- [21] H.-J. Schmidt, Theory of ground states for classical Heisenberg spin systems IV, arXiv:1710.00318v1, (2017)
- [22] H.-J. Schmidt and W. Florek, Theory of ground states for classical Heisenberg spin systems V, arXiv:2002.12705, (2020)
- [23] W. Florek and A. Marlewski, Spectrum of some arrow-bordered circulant matrix, arXiv:math.CO1905.04807 (2019)
- [24] W. Florek, G. Kamieniarz, and A. Marlewski, Universal lowest energy configurations in a classical Heisenberg model describing frustrated systems with wheel geometry, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 054434 (2019)