

On the Symmetry of Universal Finite-Size Scaling Functions in Anisotropic Systems

Alfred Hucht

Theoretische Physik, Gerhard-Mercator-Universität, D-47048 Duisburg, Germany

(Dated: 14th April 2024)

In this work a symmetry of universal finite-size scaling functions under a certain anisotropic scale transformation is postulated. This transformation connects the properties of a finite two-dimensional system at criticality with generalized aspect ratio ≥ 1 to a system with ≤ 1 . The symmetry is formulated within a finite-size scaling theory, and expressions for several universal amplitude ratios are derived. The predictions are confirmed within the exactly solvable weakly anisotropic two-dimensional Ising model and are checked within the two-dimensional dipolar in-plane Ising model using Monte Carlo simulations. This model shows a strongly anisotropic phase transition with different correlation length exponents $\neq$ parallel and perpendicular to the spin axis.

The theory of universal finite-size scaling (UFSS) functions is a key concept in modern understanding of continuous phase transitions [1, 2, 3]. In particular, it is known that the UFSS functions of a rectangular two-dimensional (2D) system of size $L_{\parallel} \times L_{\perp}$ depend on the aspect ratio $L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp}$ [4]. For instance, in *isotropic* systems the scaling function at criticality U_c of the Binder cumulant $U = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \langle m^4 \rangle / \langle m^2 \rangle^2$ [5], where $\langle m^n \rangle$ is the n -th moment of the order parameter, is known to be a universal function $U_c(L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp})$ for a given boundary condition. This quantity has been investigated by several authors in the isotropic 2D Ising model with periodic boundary conditions [6, 7], while the influence of other boundary conditions on $U_c(L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp})$ has recently been studied in Refs. [8, 9].

In *weakly anisotropic* systems, where the couplings are anisotropic ($J_{\parallel} \neq J_{\perp}$ in the 2D Ising case), the correlation length of the infinite system in direction $= \parallel, \perp$ becomes anisotropic and scales like $\ell^{(\perp)}(t) \propto t^{-\nu_{\perp}}$ near criticality. ($t = (T - T_c)/T_c$ is the reduced temperature and we assume $t > 0$ without loss of generality.) This leads to a correlation length amplitude ratio $\hat{\ell}_{\parallel} = \hat{\ell}_{\perp}$ different from unity. The UFSS functions then depend on this ratio, i. e. $U_c = U_c(L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp}; \hat{\ell}_{\parallel} = \hat{\ell}_{\perp})$. However, isotropy can be restored asymptotically by an anisotropic scale transformation, where all lengths are rescaled with the corresponding correlation length amplitudes $\hat{\ell}$ [10, 11, 12]. Thus the UFSS functions depend on $L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp}$ and $\hat{\ell}_{\parallel} = \hat{\ell}_{\perp}$ only through the *reduced* aspect ratio $(L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp})_{\text{red}} = (L_{\perp}/\hat{\ell}_{\perp}) / (L_{\parallel}/\hat{\ell}_{\parallel})$.

In *strongly anisotropic* systems both the amplitudes $\hat{\ell}$ as well as the correlation length exponents ν are different and the correlation length in direction $= \parallel, \perp$ scales like

$$\ell^{(\perp)}(t) \propto t^{-\nu_{\perp}} : \quad (1)$$

Examples for strongly anisotropic phase transitions are Lifshitz points [13] as present in the anisotropic next nearest neighbor Ising (ANNI) model [14, 15, 16], or the non-equilibrium phase transition in the driven lattice gas model [17, 18]. Furthermore, in dynamical systems one can identify the $\parallel$ -direction with time and the $\perp$ -direction(s) with space [19], which in most cases give

strongly anisotropic behavior.

Using the same arguments as above we conclude that UFSS functions of strongly anisotropic systems depend on the *generalized* reduced aspect ratio (cf. [6])

$$= L_{\parallel} L_{\perp}^{-\nu_{\perp}} / \ell_{\perp}^{\nu_{\perp}} ; \quad \text{with} \quad r = \hat{\ell}_{\parallel} / \hat{\ell}_{\perp} \quad (2)$$

being the *generalized* correlation length amplitude ratio, and with the anisotropy exponent $\nu_{\perp} = \nu_{\parallel} / r$ [19]. Up to now no attempts have been made to describe the dependency of UFSS functions like $U_c(\cdot)$ on the shape of strongly anisotropic systems. In particular, it is not known if the anisotropy exponent $\nu_{\perp}$ can be determined from $U_c(\cdot)$. This problem is addressed in this work.

Consider a 2D strongly anisotropic finite system with periodic boundary conditions. When the critical point of the infinite system is approached from temperatures $t > 0$, the correlation lengths ℓ in the different directions

are limited by the direction in which $\ell^{(\perp)}$ from Eq. (1) reaches the system boundary first [4]. For a given volume $N = L_{\parallel} L_{\perp}$ we define an “optimal” shape $L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}} \times L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}}$ at which both correlation lengths $\ell^{(\perp)}$ reaches the system boundary simultaneously, i. e.

$$L^{\text{opt}} = \ell^{(\perp)}(t) \quad (3)$$

for some temperature $t > 0$ (Fig. 1a). We immediately find using Eqs. (1, 2) that the optimal shape obeys $\ell_{\text{opt}} = 1$ for all N , giving $L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}} = r (L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}})$. A system of optimal shape should show the strongest critical fluctuations for a given volume N as the critical correlation volume ℓ_{c}^3 spans the whole system.

At the optimal aspect ratio $= 1$ the correlations are limited by both directions $\parallel$ and $\perp$ (Fig. 1a). If the system is enlarged by a factor $b > 1$ in the $\parallel$ -direction (Fig. 1b), the correlation volume may relax into this direction but does not fill the whole system due to the limitation in $\perp$ -direction. A similar situation with exchanged roles occurs if the system is enlarged by a factor $b > 1$ in the $\perp$ -direction (Fig. 1c). We now *assume* that systems (b) and (c) are similar in the scaling region $L^{\text{opt}} \gg 1$, i. e. that their correlation volumes are asymptotically equal.




Figure 1: Three systems with different aspect ratio (Eq. (2)) at criticality. In (a) the critical correlation volume $\xi_{\parallel,c} \times \xi_{\perp,c}$ (shaded area) spans the whole system, while in (b) and (c) correlations are limited by symmetric finite-size effects.

Hence we can formulate a *symmetry hypothesis*: Consider a system with periodic boundary conditions and optimal aspect ratio $\rho = 1$ at the critical point. If this system is enlarged by a factor $b > 1$ in $\parallel$ -direction, it behaves asymptotically the same as if enlarged by *the same factor* b in $\perp$ -direction.

To formulate this hypothesis within a finite-size scaling theory, we consider a 2D strongly anisotropic system of size $L_{\parallel} \times L_{\perp}$ which fulfills the generalized hyperscaling relation $2 - \beta/\nu = d_{\parallel} + d_{\perp}$ [6]. For our purpose it is sufficient to focus on the critical point. The universal finite-size scaling *ansatz* [1, 2, 3, 4, 6] for the singular part of the free energy density $f_c = F_{\text{sing}}/(N k_B T_c)$ reads [20]

$$f_c(L_{\parallel}; L_{\perp}) = \frac{b_{\parallel} b_{\perp}}{N} Y_c(b_{\parallel}; b_{\perp}) \quad (4)$$

with the scaling variables $b_{\parallel} = L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp}^{\theta}$, where θ is a free scaling parameter. The scaling function Y_c is universal for a given boundary condition, all non-universal properties are contained in the metric factors $L_{\parallel}^{\theta}$. These metric factors occur due to the usual requirement that the relevant lengths are $L = L_{\parallel}^{\theta}(\tau)$ near criticality, and cannot be absorbed into τ in contrast to isotropic systems. For the three systems in Fig. 1 we set $b_{\parallel} = (L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}})^{-1}$ to get

$$f_c(L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}}; L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}}) = \frac{1}{N} Y_c(1; 1) \quad (5a)$$

$$f_c(b L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}}; L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}}) = \frac{b}{N} Y_c(b; 1) \quad (5b)$$

$$f_c(L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}}; b L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}}) = \frac{b}{N} Y_c(1; b) \quad (5c)$$

The proposed symmetry hypothesis states that for $b > 1$ Eqs. (5b) and (5c) are asymptotically equal in the scaling region where L^{opt} is large,

$$f_c(b L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}}; L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}}) \stackrel{b \gg 1}{\sim} f_c(L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}}; b L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}}) \quad (6)$$

Hence the scaling function Y_c has the simple symmetry

$$Y_c(b; 1) \stackrel{b \gg 1}{\sim} Y_c(1; b) \quad (7)$$

To rewrite Y_c as function of the generalized aspect ratio (Eq. (2)) instead of the quantities b , we set $b_{\perp} = 1$ in system (c) and get, as then $b = (b L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}})^{-1} = L_{\parallel}^{\theta}$,

$$f_c(L_{\parallel}^{\text{opt}}; b L_{\perp}^{\text{opt}}) = \frac{b}{N} Y_c(b_{\parallel}; 1) \quad (8)$$

Eqs. (5c) and (8) are identical and we conclude that $b Y_c(1; b) = b Y_c(b_{\parallel}; 1)$. At this point it is convenient to define the scaling function $Y_c(b) = b Y_c(b_{\parallel}; 1)$ which fulfills

$$f_c(L_{\parallel}; L_{\perp}) = \frac{1}{N} Y_c(\rho) \quad (9)$$

For this scaling function the symmetry reads

$$Y_c(\rho) \stackrel{\rho \gg 1}{\sim} Y_c(\rho^{-1}) \quad (10)$$

We see from Eq. (9) that the critical free energy density f_c is a universal function of the reduced aspect ratio $\rho = L_{\parallel} L_{\perp}^{-\theta} = r$ without any non-universal prefactor, and that at criticality *all* system specific properties are contained in the non-universal ratio r from Eq. (2).

Ansatz Eq. (4) can also be made for the inverse spin-spin correlation length at criticality [20]

$$\chi_{\parallel,c}^{-1}(L_{\parallel}; L_{\perp}) = \frac{b}{L} X_{\parallel,c}(b_{\parallel}; b_{\perp}) \quad (11)$$

The proposed symmetry gives $X_{\parallel,c}(b_{\parallel}; 1) \stackrel{b \gg 1}{\sim} X_{\parallel,c}(1; b)$, where $\perp$ denotes the direction perpendicular to $\parallel$. Hence the correlation volumes $\xi_{\parallel,c} \times \xi_{\perp,c}$ of system (b) and (c) in Fig. 1 are indeed equal as assumed above and become $\xi_{\parallel,c} \times \xi_{\perp,c} = \frac{N}{b} X_{\parallel,c}^{-1}(b; 1) X_{\parallel,c}^{-1}(b_{\parallel}; 1)$.

The correlation length amplitudes A in cylindrical geometry ($b \neq 1$, $b = 1$), which can be calculated exactly for many isotropic two-dimensional models within the theory of conformal invariance [21] generalize to the strongly anisotropic form [3]

$$A = \lim_{L \rightarrow 1} L^{\theta} = \lim_{L \rightarrow 1} \chi_{\parallel,c}^{-1}(L_{\parallel}; L_{\perp}) \quad (12)$$

Inserting Eq. (11) they become

$$A^{\parallel} = r X_{\parallel,c}^{-1}(1; 1); \quad A^{\perp} = r^{-1} X_{\perp,c}^{-1}(1; 1) \quad (13)$$

which shows that in general A is not universal. The symmetry hypothesis states that both limits of the scaling function $X_{\parallel,c}$ are equal. Denoting this universal limit $A = X_{\parallel,c}^{-1}(1; 1) = X_{\perp,c}^{-1}(1; 1)$ we obtain $A^{\parallel} = r A$ and $A^{\perp} = r^{-1} A$ as well as the amplitude relations

$$A^{1+\theta} = A^{\parallel}(A^{\perp}) ; \quad \frac{A^{\parallel}}{A^{\perp}} = r^{1+\theta} \quad (14)$$

These predictions can be checked within the exactly solved weakly anisotropic 2D Ising model with different couplings $J_{\parallel}$ and $J_{\perp}$, where the paramagnetic correlation length reads $\xi^{-1}(\tau) = (\log \coth(J_{\parallel}/2J_{\perp}))^{-1}$ with $\beta = 1/k_B T$ [22]. The amplitude ratio r at the critical point $\sinh(2\beta J_{\parallel}) \sinh(2\beta J_{\perp}) = 1$ [22] becomes $r = \sinh(2\beta J_{\parallel})$ [23]. On the other hand, the inverse correlation length amplitudes in cylinder geometry Eq. (12) has been calculated [24] to give $A_U = \frac{4}{3} \sinh(2\beta J_{\parallel})$; which immediately yields Eqs. (13) if we insert the well known universal value $A_U = 4$ [21, 25]. The left relation of Eqs. (14) has already been derived for several weakly anisotropic models, where it simplifies to $A_U^2 = A_U^{\parallel} A_U^{\perp}$ [24, Eq. (7)].

To check the symmetry numerically in strongly anisotropic systems, we now focus on the Binder cumulant U . The scaling *ansatz* at criticality Eq. (4) becomes

$$U_c(L_{\parallel}; L_{\perp}) = \frac{1}{b_{\parallel} b_{\perp}} U_c(b_{\parallel} L_{\parallel}; b_{\perp} L_{\perp}) = U_c(\rho) \quad (15)$$

with the scaling function $U_c(\rho) = U_c(b_{\perp}; 1) b_{\parallel}$ and the calculation is completely analogous to the free energy case. The symmetry hypothesis for the cumulant scaling functions $\bar{U}_c$ and U_c thus reads (cf. Eqs. (7,10))

$$\bar{U}_c(\rho; 1) \stackrel{b_{\perp} > 1}{=} \bar{U}_c(1; \rho); \quad U_c(\rho) \stackrel{\rho > 1}{=} U_c(\rho^{-1}): \quad (16)$$

The generalization of the cumulant amplitude A_U [5, 26] to strongly anisotropic systems is similar to Eq. (12) and gives

$$A_U = \lim_{L_{\perp} \rightarrow 1} L_{\parallel}^{-1} = \lim_{L_{\parallel} \rightarrow 1} L_{\perp} U_c(L_{\parallel}; L_{\perp}): \quad (17)$$

Inserting the scaling *ansatz* Eq. (15) we now find

$$A_U^{\parallel} = r U_c(1; 1); \quad A_U^{\perp} = r^{-1} U_c(1; 1); \quad (18)$$

which again are in general not universal. Using the symmetry hypothesis we can define $A_U = U_c(1; 1) = \bar{U}_c(1; 1)$ and get $A_U^{\parallel} = r A_U$, $A_U^{\perp} = r^{-1} A_U$ as well as the identities (cf. Eqs. (14))

$$A_U^{1+} = A_U^{\parallel} (A_U^{\perp}); \quad \frac{A_U^{\parallel}}{A_U^{\perp}} = r^{1+1}: \quad (19)$$

The cumulant scaling function $U_c(\rho)$ must be extremal at $\rho = 1$ due to symmetry. Furthermore, as a deviation from the optimal aspect ratio $\rho = 1$ reduces the cumulant, it has a maximum at this point [6]. A sketch of $U_c(\rho)$ for an assumed anisotropy exponent $\nu = 2$ is depicted in Fig. 2. For $\nu > 1$ both $U_c(\rho)$ and $U_c(\rho^{-1})$ collapse onto a single curve, reflecting the proposed symmetry. It is obvious from Fig. 2 that $U_c(\rho)$ (and thus also $Y_c(\rho)$ from Eq. (10)) can not be analytic at $\rho = 1$ in strongly anisotropic systems, as the two branches $U_c(\rho)$ and $U_c(\rho^{-1})$ identical for $\nu > 1$ fork at $\rho = 1$ [20]. On




Figure 2: Sketch of critical cumulant scaling functions $U_c(\rho)$ and $U_c(\rho^{-1})$ with $\nu = 2$ for assumed anisotropy exponent $\nu = 2$. We have $U_c(1) = A_U$ and $U_c(1) = A_U^{-1}$. For $\nu > 1$ $U_c(\rho)$ fulfills $U_c(\rho) = U_c(\rho^{-1})$.

the other hand, $Y_c(\rho)$ and $U_c(\rho)$ can be analytic at $\rho = 1$ if the anisotropy exponent $\nu = 1$, as in the case of the isotropic 2D Ising model [27, Eq. 3.37].

To check the symmetry hypothesis in a strongly anisotropic system, I performed Monte Carlo simulations of the two-dimensional dipolar in-plane Ising model [20]

$$H = \frac{J}{2} \sum_{i,j} \sigma_i \sigma_j + \frac{!}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{(\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\parallel})^2 - 2(\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\perp})^2}{\mathbf{r}_{ij}^5} \sigma_i \sigma_j \quad (20)$$

with spin variables $\sigma_i = \pm 1$, ferromagnetic nearest neighbor exchange interaction $J > 0$, and dipole interaction $! > 0$. The distance $\mathbf{r}_{ij} = (\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\parallel}; \mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\perp})$ between spin i and j is decomposed into contributions parallel and perpendicular to the spin axis. In the simulations the Wolff cluster algorithm [28] for long range systems proposed by Luijten and Blöte [29] was used, modified to anisotropic interactions. In contrast to earlier work [30, 31] using renormalization group technics it is found that this model shows a strongly anisotropic phase transition. The details of the simulations will be published elsewhere [20].

After T_c was determined, systems with constant volume $N = L_{\parallel} L_{\perp}$ were simulated, which was chosen to have a large number of divisors in order to get many different aspect ratios (e.g. $N = 2^6 3^3 5^2 = 43200$ has 84 divisors). The resulting critical cumulant $U_c(L_{\parallel}; L_{\perp})$ for two different volumes $N = 4320; 43200$ is depicted in the inset of Fig. 3. As expected, both curves have the same maximum value $U_c(1) = 0.555(5)$ at criticality. With variation of $L_{\perp}$ the curves are shifted horizontally and collapse for $\nu = 2.1(3)$, with maximum at $r = 0.415(40)$. To check the proposed symmetry we fold the left branch with $\rho < 1$ (open symbols) to the right and rescale the ρ -axis with ρ^{-1} . The resulting data collapse for $\nu > 1$ is shown in Fig. 3. This collapse and the additional condition that both curves must go to zero as $A_U = 0$ allows a




Figure 3: Cumulant $U_c(L_{\parallel}, L_{\perp})$ of the dipolar in-plane Ising model (Eq. (20)) for dipole strength $\mu = J = 0.1$ and system size $N = 43200$ at the critical point $k_B T_c = J = 2.764(1)$. The data points collapse for $\rho > 1$ if we set $\rho = 2.1(3)$ and $r = 0.415(40)$, giving the universal amplitudes $U_c(1) = 0.555(5)$ and $A_U = 3.5(2)$. The inset shows U_c as function of the un-reduced generalized aspect ratio $L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp}$ for system size $N = 43200$ (circles) and $N = 4320$ (triangles).

precise determination of ρ and r as well as of the universal amplitude $A_U = 3.5(2)$.

In conclusion, I postulate a symmetry of universal finite-size scaling functions under a certain anisotropic scale transformation and generalize the Privman-Fisher equations [1] to strongly anisotropic phase transitions on rectangular lattices at criticality. It turns out that for a given boundary condition the only relevant variable is the generalized reduced aspect ratio $\rho = L_{\parallel}/L_{\perp} = r$ and that e. g. the free energy scaling function Eq. (9) obeys the symmetry $Y_c(\rho) \stackrel{!}{=} Y_c(1/\rho)$. At criticality, the free energy density f_c , the inverse correlation lengths $\xi_{\parallel}, \xi_{\perp}$, and the Binder cumulant U_c are universal functions of ρ , without a non-universal prefactor. All system specific properties are contained in the non-universal correlation length amplitude ratio r (Eq. (2)).

The generalization to higher dimensions is straightforward [20], an interesting application would be the precise determination of the exponent ν at the Lifshitz point of the three-dimensional ANNNI model [15, 16]. An open question is the validity of the proposed symmetry in non-equilibrium systems with appropriate boundary conditions, which recently have been shown to exhibit Privman-Fisher universality [3].

I thank Sven Lübeck and Erik Luijten for valuable discussions and Malte Henkel for a critical reading of the manuscript. This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through SFB 491.

- [1] V. Privman and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 322 (1984).
- [2] V. Privman, in *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems*, edited by V. Privman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), chap. 1.
- [3] M. Henkel and U. Schollwöck, J. Phys A: Math. Gen. **34**, 3333 (2001).
- [4] K. Binder, in *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems*, edited by V. Privman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), chap. 4.
- [5] K. Binder, Z. Phys. B **43**, 119 (1981).
- [6] K. Binder and J.-S. Wang, J. Stat. Phys. **55**, 87 (1989).
- [7] G. Kamieniarz and H. W. J. Blöte, J. Phys A: Math. Gen. **26**, 201 (1993).
- [8] Y. Okabe, K. Kaneda, M. Kikuchi, and C.-K. Hu, Phys. Rev. E **59**, 1585 (1999).
- [9] K. Kaneda and Y. Okabe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2134 (2001).
- [10] D. P. Landau and R. H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 2787 (1984).
- [11] J. O. Indekeu, M. P. Nightingale, and W. V. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 330 (1986).
- [12] M. A. Yurishchev, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 3915 (1997).
- [13] R. M. Hornreich, M. Luban, and S. Shtrikman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 1678 (1975).
- [14] W. Selke, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, edited by C. Domb and M. S. Green (Academic Press, London, 1992), vol. 15.
- [15] H. W. Diehl and M. Shpot, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 12338 (2000).
- [16] M. Pleimling and M. Henkel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 125702 (2001).
- [17] S. Katz, J. L. Lebowitz, and H. Spohn, Phys. Rev. B **28**, 1655 (1983).
- [18] B. Schmittmann and R. K. P. Zia, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, edited by C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, London, 1995), vol. 17.
- [19] M. Henkel, *Conformal Invariance and Critical Phenomena*, Texts and Monographs in Physics (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1999).
- [20] A. Hucht (2002), to be published.
- [21] J. Cardy, J. Phys A: Math. Gen. **17**, L385 (1984).
- [22] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **65**, 117 (1944).
- [23] R. K. P. Zia and J. E. Avron, Phys. Rev. B **25**, 2042 (1982).
- [24] P. Nightingale and H. Blöte, J. Phys A: Math. Gen. **16**, L657 (1983).
- [25] J. M. Luck, J. Phys A: Math. Gen. **15**, L169 (1982).
- [26] T. W. Burkhardt and B. Derrida, Phys. Rev. B **32**, 7273 (1985).
- [27] A. E. Ferdinand and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. **185**, 832 (1969).
- [28] U. Wolff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 361 (1989).
- [29] E. Luijten and H. W. J. Blöte, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **6**, 359 (1995).
- [30] K. De'Bell and D. J. W. Geldart, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 743 (1989).
- [31] M. Bulenda, U. C. Täuber, and F. Schwabl, J. Phys A: Math. Gen. **33**, 1 (2000).