arXiv:cond-mat/0202316v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 12 Sep 2002

Quantum M onte Carlo with D irected Loops

O lav F. Syljasen¹, and Anders W. Sandvik²,^y

¹NORDITA, Blegdam svej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen , Denmark

²Department of Physics, Abo Akademi University, Porthansgatan 3, FIN-20500 Turku, Finland

(D ated: February 5, 2022)

W e introduce the concept of directed loops in stochastic series expansion and path integral quantum Monte Carlo methods. Using the detailed balance rules for directed loops, we show that it is possible to smoothly connect generally applicable simulation schemes (in which it is necessary to include back-tracking processes in the loop construction) to more restricted loop algorithms that can be constructed only for a limited range of H am iltonians (where back-tracking can be avoided). The \algorithm ic discontinuities" between general and special points (or regions) in param eter space can hence be eliminated. As a speci c example, we consider the anisotropic S = 1=2 H eisenberg antiferrom agnet in an external magnetic eld. We show that directed bop simulations are very e cient for the full range of magnetic elds (zero to the saturation point) and anisotropies. In particular for weak elds and anisotropies, the autocorrelations are signi cantly reduced relative to those of previous approaches. The back-tracking probability vanishes continuously as the isotropic Heisenberg point is approached. For the XY-model, we show that back-tracking can be avoided for all elds extending up to the saturation eld. The method is hence particularly e cient in this case. We use directed loop simulations to study the magnetization process in the 2D Heisenberg m odel at very low tem peratures. For L L lattices with L up to 64, we utilize the step-structure in the magnetization curve to extract gaps between di erent spin sectors. Finite-size scaling of the gaps gives an accurate estimate of the transverse susceptibility in the therm odynamic limit: $_{?} = 0.0659 \quad 0.0002.$

PACS num bers: 05.10.-a, 05.30.-d, 75.10.Jm, 75.40 Mg

I. IN TRODUCTION

In recent years, signi cant advances in quantum M onte Carlo (QMC) algorithms have opened up several classes of quantum many-body models to the kind of largescale num erical studies that were previously possible only for classical systems. The progress has been along two main lines: (i) the elimination [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] of the system atic error of the Trotter decom position [6] on which most of the early nite-temperature QMC algorithms [7, 8, 9, 10, 11] were based (with the exception of H andscom b's method [12, 13, 14, 15], the utility of which was lim ited), and (ii) the developm ent of loop-cluster algorithms [16] for e cient sampling in the quantum mechanical con guration space [3, 4, 17, 18, 19]. Algorithms incorporating both (i) and (ii) have been devised starting from either the Euclidean path integral (worldline QMC methods operating in continuous imaginary time [3, 4]) or the power series expansion of the partition function (stochastic series expansion, hereafter SSE [18], which is an extension of Handscomb's method). W hile the Trotter error is a controllable one and can be elim inated in standard approaches by extrapolating results for di erent in aginary tim e discretizations to the continuum [6, 20], its absence directly at the level of the simulation can imply considerable time savings when unbiased results are needed, e.g., in nite-size scaling studies. The

loop-cluster algorithm s (world-line loops [16, 17, 19], SSE operator-loops [18], and world-line worm s [3]) have offered even more dramatic speed-ups, in many cases reducing autocorrelation times by several orders of magnitude and thus enabling studies of system sizes much larger than what was possible with local sampling algorithm s. In addition, in some special cases, ferm ionic and other sign problem s can be elim inated with the loop-cluster algorithm s [21, 22, 23].

The new QMC methods have become important tools for quantum many-body research in condensed matter physics (with applications to quantum spins [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34], bosons [35, 36, 37], and one-dimensional ferm ion systems [38, 39]) as well as in lattice gauge theory [21, 22]. An important property of som e of the loop-cluster algorithm s is that they are e cient also in the presence of external elds [18, 19, 22, 40]. In particular the SSE algorithm with the operator-loop update [18] has proven very powerful in several recent studies of quantum spin systems [33, 34] and boson system s [35, 36, 37] including, respectively, a magnetic eld and a chem ical potential. It is interesting to note that in this respect QMC algorithms now perform better than classical M onte C arlo, since in the latter case external elds still pose challenging problem s.

In this paper we present a general fram ework for constructing loop-type algorithm s both in SSE and path integralm ethods. We focus prim arily on the SSE approach, which owing to the manifestly discrete nature of its conguration space is easier to implement and, for the same reason, also is more e cient in most cases. In the SSE operator-loop update introduced in Ref. 18, a distinction

E lectronic address: sylju@ nordita.dk

^yE lectronic address: asandvik@ abo.

wasm ade between a general algorithm (where it is necessary to allow the propagating end of the operator path to back-track) and special ones applicable only for certain H am iltonians (where the paths do not back-track). For example, in the case of the S = 1=2 Heisenberg m odel with uniaxial anisotropy and external magnetic eld h (also known as the XXZ-m odel),

$$H = J \begin{bmatrix} X \\ B_{i}^{x} S_{j}^{x} + S_{i}^{y} S_{j}^{y} + S_{i}^{z} S_{j}^{z} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X \\ h \\ S_{i}^{z}; \end{pmatrix} (1)$$

particularly e cient algorithms were devised at the isotropic Heisenberg point (= 1, h = 0) and for the XY - m odel (= 0, h = 0). W hile the general algorithm can be used for any ;h, it does not perform as well in the limits ! 1;h ! 0 and ! 0;h ! 0 as the special algorithm sexactly at these points (which are the only points at which the more e cient algorithm s can be used). Hence, one has to switch algorithm swhen crossing the isotropic Heisenberg and XY points. The presence of such \algorithm ic discontinuities" is clearly bothersom e, both from a mathematical and practical point of view. Here we show how the algorithm ic discontinuities can be elim inated within a more general fram ework of satisfying detailed balance when constructing the operator-loop. For reasons that will become clear below, we call the entities involved in this type of update \directed loops". W ith these, we are able to carry out simulations as e ciently in the lim its approaching the Heisenberg and XY points as exactly at those points. W e also show that this scheme can be easily adapted to continuous-time path integrals.

The outline of the rest of the paper is the following: In Sec. II we review the SSE method and the operatorloop update on which the new directed loop algorithm is based. W e outline a proof of detailed balance and also discuss a few special cases in which back-tracking can be easily avoided in the loop construction. In Sec. III we rst discuss a more general condition for satisfying detailed balance in the SSE method, which leads us to the directed loop equations. We then show in detail how this scheme is applied to the spin-1/2 X X Z model. We present two solutions of the directed loop equations. One is identical to the previous generic operator-bop update and the other sm oothly connects to the special \determ inistic" operator-bop algorithm at the isotropic Heisenberg point. We also brie y discuss the structure of the directed loop equations for a more general class of H am iltonians. Im plementation of directed loops in the path integral form alism is discussed in Sec. IV. In Sec. V we present simulation results in various parameter regions of the XXZ-m odel. We compare autocorrelation times for simulations using the two di erent directed loop solutions. W e also extract the dynam ic exponent in sim ulations of isotropic H eisenberg m odels at critical points in one, two, and three dimensions. In Sec. VI, as a demonstration of what can be accomplished with the improved solution, we present results for the magnetization as a function of the external eld in the 2D Heisenberg m odel

at very low temperatures. We calculate the magnetic susceptibility using gaps between di erent spin sectors extracted from the step-structure in the magnetization curve. We conclude with a summary and discussion in Sec. VII. In an Appendix we outline the basic elements of a simple and e cient computer implementation of the SSE method.

II. STOCHASTIC SERIES EXPANSION

The SSE m ethod is a generalization [1, 2, 18] of H andscom b's power series expansion m ethod for the isotropic S = 1=2 H eisenberg ferrom agnet [12] and antiferrom agnet [13, 14] to a m uch w ider range of system s. The perform ance is signi cantly improved also for the H eisenberg m odel [27, 28, 41]. Early attempts of such generalizations [15] were limited by the di culties in analytically evaluating the traces of the term s of the expansion. This problem was solved [1, 2] by the development of a scheme for importance sampling also of the individual terms of the traces expressed in a conveniently chosen basis. The starting point of the SSE m ethod is hence the power series expansion of the partition function:

$$Z = Tre^{H} = \frac{X \quad X^{i}}{n=0} \frac{(f^{i})}{n!} h \quad fH^{n} j \quad i; \quad (2)$$

where the trace has been written as a sum over diagonal matrix elements in a basis fj ig. Simulation algorithm s based on this expansion can be form ulated without sign problem s for the sam em odels as those for which world-line m ethods [9] are applicable. There are no approximations causing systematic errors and very e cient loop-type updating algorithms have also recently been devised [18, 39, 42, 43]. A distinct advantage of SSE over continuous-tim e world-line m ethods [3, 4] is the discrete nature of the con guration space, which can be sam pled without oating point operations.

Here we rst review an implementation of the SSE method for the anisotropic S = 1=2 Heisenberg model. A proof of detailed balance in the operator-loop updating scheme is then outlined. Several practical issues related to the operator-loops are also discussed. Estimators for physical observables will not be discussed here. Several classes of expectation values have been derived in Ref. 2. O bservables of interest in the context of the Heisenberg model have been discussed in Ref. 41.0 -diagonal correlation functions (single-particle G reen's functions) have been studied in Ref. 44.

A. SSE con guration space

For the anisotropic Heisenberg antiferrom agnet (1) with N spins it is convenient to use the standard basis

$$j i = j S_1^z; S_2^z; ...; S_N^z i;$$
 (3)

and to write the H am iltonian in terms of bond operators H_{b} , where b refers to a pair of sites i(b); j(b),

$$H = J H_{b}; \quad (J > 0): \quad (4)$$

For a d-dimensional cubic lattice the number of bonds N $_{\rm b}$ = dN . The bond operators are further decomposed into two operators;

$$H_{b} = H_{1;b} \quad H_{2;b};$$
 (5)

where H_{1;b} is diagonal and H_{2;b} o -diagonal;

$$H_{1;b} = C \qquad S_{i(b)}^{z}S_{j(b)}^{z} + h_{b}[S_{i(b)}^{z} + S_{j(b)}^{z}];$$
 (6)

$$H_{2,b} = \frac{1}{2} [S_{i(b)}^{+} S_{j(b)} + S_{i(b)}^{+} S_{j(b)}^{+}];$$
(7)

and we have de ned the magnetic eld on a bond; h_b h=(2dJ). The constant C should be chosen such that all matrix elements of H_{1;b} are positive, i.e., C =4 + h_b . W e will henceforth use the notation

$$C = C_0 + ; \quad C_0 = = 4 + h_b;$$
 (8)

where 0. In the Ham iltonian (4) we have neglected a constant N $_{\rm b}$ C, which should be kept in m ind when calculating the energy.

The powers of H in Eq. (2) can be expressed as sum s of products of the bond operators (6) and (7). Such a product is conveniently referred to by an operator-index sequence

$$S_n = [a_1; b_1]; [a_2; b_2]; \dots; [a_n; b_n];$$
 (9)

where $a_i \ 2 \ f1;2g$ corresponds to the type of operator (1= diagonal, 2= o -diagonal) and $b_i \ 2 \ f1;:::;N_bg$ is the bond index. Hence,

$$Z = \begin{array}{cccc} X & X^{i} & X & & & & & \\ X & X^{i} & X & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ &$$

where J=T and n_{2} is the total number of spinipping operators [2;b] in S_{n} . It is useful to de ne normalized states resulting when j i is propagated by a fraction of the SSE operator string:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y^{p} \\ j (p) i & H_{a_{i};b_{i}} j i : \\ & & & \\ &$$

Note that there is no branching, i.e., all j (p)i are basis states, and j (p)i and j (p + 1)i are either the same state or di er only by a ipped pair of spins. In order for a term ($;S_n$) to contribute to the partition function the boundary condition j (n)i = j (0)i has to be satised. On a bipartite lattice n_2 must therefore be even, and the expansion is then positive de nite. The term s (con gurations) can thus be sam pled using M onte C arlo techniques without sign problem s.

To simplify the M onte C arlo sampling, it is useful [1] (although not necessary [2]) to truncate the expansion at a maximum power n = M and to insert M $n \setminus ll-in$ " unit operators H_{0;0} 1 in the operator products in all possible ways. This gives

$$Z = \frac{X \quad X}{\sum_{S_{M}}} \frac{n (M \quad n)!}{M !} \stackrel{\Upsilon}{\underset{i=1}{\longrightarrow}} H_{a_{i};b_{i}} ; \quad (12)$$

where n now is the number of operators $[a_i;b_i] \in [0;0]$. O ne can show that [1, 12] the average expansion order

$$hni = N_b \mathbf{\dot{E}}_b \mathbf{\dot{j}}$$
(13)

where E_{b} is the internal energy per bond, $E_{b} =$ hHhi [including the constant C in (6)], and that the width of the distribution is approximately ${\rm hni}^{1=2}$. M can therefore be chosen so that n never reaches the cut-o during the simulation (M N). The truncation error is then completely negligible. In practice, M is gradually adjusted during the equilibration of the simulation, so that $M = a n_{max}$, where n_{max} is the highest n reached. A practical range for the factor a is 12 1:5. The sim ulation can be started with some random state j i and an \empty" operator string $[0;0]_1; \ldots; [0;0]_M$ (we some times use the notation $[a;b]_{o}$ instead of $[a_{o};b_{o}]$. Ergodic sampling of the con gurations $(;S_n)$ is accomplished using two di erent types of updates.

B. Updating scheme

The rst update (diagonal update) is of the type $[0;0]_{p}$ \$ $[1;b]_{p}$, involving a single diagonal operator which changes the expansion order n by 1 [41]. The corresponding M etropolis acceptance probabilities are

$$P([0;0]_{p}! [1;b]_{p}) = \frac{N_{b} h(p) H_{1;b}(p)}{M n}; (14)$$

$$P ([1;b]_{p} ! [0;0]_{p}) = \frac{M n + 1}{N_{b} h (p) H_{1;b} j (p) i}; (15)$$

where P > 1 should be interpreted as probability one. The presence of N_b in these probabilities rejects the fact that there are N_b random choices for the bond b in a substitution [0;0]! [1;b] but only one way to replace [1;b]! [0;0] when b is given. These diagonal updates are attempted consecutively for all $p = 1; \dots; M$, and at the same time the state j i is propagated when spin ipping operators [2;b] are encountered (these cannot be changed in a single-operator update), so that the states j (p) i are available when needed to calculate the probabilities (14) and (15).

The purpose of the second type of update | the operator-bop [18] | is to accomplish substitutions [1;b], \$ [2;b], for a varying number of operators, thereby ipping spins also in several of the propagated states (11). The expansion order n does not change. It



FIG.1: The six di erent vertices corresponding to the m atrix elements in Eqs. (18). The horizontal bar represents the full bond operator H_b and the circles beneath (above) represent the spin state (solid and open circles for spin-" and spin-#, respectively) before (after) operation with either the diagonal or o -diagonal part of H_b .

is then convenient to disregard the [0;0] unit operator elements in S_M and instead work with the original sequences S_n of Eq. (10), which contain only elements [1;b]and [2;b]. For the discussion of the operator-loops, the propagation index p will refer to this reduced sequence. It is also convenient to introduce two-spin states

$$j_{b_p}(p)i = j_{i(b_p)}^{z}(p); S_{j(b_p)}^{z}(p)i;$$
 (16)

i.e., the spins at bond b_p in the propagated state j (p)i as de ned in (11). The weight factor corresponding to (10) can then be written as

$$W (; S_n) = \frac{n Y^n}{n!} h_{b_p} (p) H_{b_p} j_{b_p} (p 1) i; \quad (17)$$

where the non-zero two-spin m atrix elements are

$$h^{\#} H_{b} j^{\#} i = ;$$

$$h^{\#} H_{b} j^{\#} i = h^{\#} H_{b} j^{\#} i = = 2 + h_{b} + ;$$

$$h^{\#} H_{b} j^{\#} i = h^{\#} H_{b} j^{\#} i = 1 = 2;$$

$$h^{\#} H_{b} j^{\#} i = + 2h_{b}:$$

$$(18)$$

In principle the value of 0 is arbitrary but in practice a large constant is inconvenient since the average expansion order (13) has a contribution N_b . In many cases the simulation performs better with a small > 0 than with = 0, however, as will be demonstrated in Sec.V. For = 0, the number of allowed matrix elements is reduced from 6 to 4 (if h = 0) or 5 (if h > 0).

The matrix element product in the weight (17) can be represented as a network of n vertices, with two spins S_i^z (p 1); S_j^z (p 1) \entering" the pth vertex and S_i^z (p); S_j^z (p) \exiting". The six allowed vertices, corresponding to the non-zero matrix elements (18), are illustrated in Fig. 1. The direction of propagation (here and in other illustrations) is such that moving upward corresponds to increasing the propagation index p.

In order to carry out the operator-loop update, a linked list of the vertices is rst constructed. For each of the four legs on each vertex there is a spin state and a link to the following (in the direction of increasing p) or previous (direction of decreasing p) vertex leg at the same site. The periodic boundary condition of the propagated states must be taken into account, i.e., the links can span across p = 0 and every leg then has an outgoing and incoming link (i.e., a bidirectional link). In case a spin (site) is acted upon only by a single operator in S_n , the



FIG.2: (a) An SSE con guration for a three-site system with three operators, shown along with all the propagated states. Here open and solid bars indicate diagonal and o -diagonal operators, respectively. (b) The linked vertex list corresponding to (a). The dashed lines represent bidirectional links.

(a)		(b)	(c)	(d)
•	0	<u>ф</u> о	• •	• _ð
Ę	0	<u>•</u> 0	₽₽₽	₹ <u></u>
•	0	0 0	• •	• • •
•	0	0 0	0	0 0
0	0	<u> </u>	<u>o o</u>	o 🁌
₽	0	φο	$\overline{P_{\mathbf{v}}}$	φo
0	0	• •	<u>° ° °</u>	○ ●
0	0	• •	• •	• 0

FIG. 3: All four paths through two vertices where the entrance is at the low-left leg. The arrow indicates the exit leg. The resulting updated vertices, with the spin at the entrance and exit legs ipped, are also shown. The two cases marked with an X are forbidden, since the updated vertices do not correspond to operators in the Hamiltonian considered here. We refer to the four di erent processes as (a) \bounce", (b) \continue-straight", (c) \switch-and-reverse", and (d) \switch-and-continue".

corresponding two legs of that vertex are linked together. O therw ise, for a site acted upon by two or more operators, all links are between di erent vertices. An exam ple of an SSE con guration and its corresponding linked vertex list is shown in Fig. 2. C learly, in an allowed conguration links can exist only between legs in the same spin state. Note that in the representation with the full states in (a), which is never used in the actual simulation but is included here for illustrative purposes, we distinguish between diagonal and o -diagonal operators (as is also done in the stored operator sequence S_M used in the diagonal update). In the vertex representation (b) the two-spin states are taken from the full propagated states (16) and the type of the operator (diagonal or o diagonal) is implicitly given by the four spin states. The bar is hence strictly redundant, but we include it in the gures as a rem inder that the vertices represent m atrix elem ents of the bond-operators.

To construct an operator-bop, one of the 4n vertex legs is rst selected at random as an initial entrance leg.



FIG. 4: Two di erent ways in which an operator-loop can close. The starting points of the loops in (a) and (b) are the legs from which the arrows point out. In (a) the last segment of the loop connects the initial and nalvertices, resulting in the starting spin being ipped in the nal con guration. In (b) the last loop segment is within the initial vertex and the starting spin is ipped twice, with the net e ect of no change. Both loops (a) and (b) here result in the updated vertices shown in (c).

O ne of the four legs belonging to the sam e vertex as the entrance leg is then chosen as the exit from the vertex, and both the entrance and exit spins are ipped. E xam – ples of how vertices change in the four types of process are shown in Fig. 3. The probability of exiting at a given leg, given the entrance leg and the four spin states de ning the vertex, is taken proportional to that matrix elem ent in (18) which corresponds to the vertex generated when the entrance and exit spins have been ipped. As an exam ple, de ning matrix elem ents obtained when ipping spins in a vertex as

$$W = \begin{cases} f_3 ; f_4 \\ f_1 ; f_2 \end{cases} (p) =$$
(19)

$$hf_3S_i^z(p); f_4S_j^z(p) H_b f_1S_i^z(p 1); f_2S_j^z(p 1)i;$$

where $f_i = 1$ if the spin on leg i (i = 1;2;3;4) is ipped and $f_i = +1$ if it is not ipped, the probability of exiting at leg 2 if the entrance is at leg 1 is given by

$$P_{2;1} = \frac{W^{++}}{W^{++}_{++} + W^{++}_{+} + W^{+}_{+} + W^{+}_{+}}; \quad (20)$$

where we have used for 1. The reasons for this choice for the probability will be discussed in Sec. IIC. If the entrance and exit correspond to di erent sites (the switchand-reverse and switch-and-continue processes in Fig. 3), the change in the vertex corresponds to a change of the type of the operator (diagonal\$ o -diagonal). The leg to which the exit is linked is taken as the entrance to the next vertex, from which an exit is again chosen. This procedure is repeated until the original starting point is reached (the loop closes). The mism atches (links connecting di erent spin states) existing at the original entrance and at the propagating end of the path are then \healed" and a new con guration contributing to the partition function has been created. Note that, depending on the way the loop closes, the spin at the leg from which the loop construction was started may or may not be ipped after the full loop has been com pleted. Exam ples illustrating this are given in Fig. 4.

0 ne of the two site-switching paths | the switch-andreverse in Fig. 3 (c) or switch-and-continue in 3 (d) | is always forbidden since the corresponding o -diagonal matrix element of the Heisenberg bond-operator is zero. The bounce path in Fig. 3 (a) is always allowed since the vertex is una ected (the same spin is ipped twice, resulting in no net change). The continue-straight path 3 (b) is always allowed if the constant > 0 so that all the diagonalmatrix elements in (18) are larger than zero. If = 0 at least one of the diagonalmatrix elements vanishes, and the continue-straight process is then forbidden in some cases.

If a spin in the state j i is not acted upon by any of the operators in $S_{\rm M}$, it cannot be ipped by the operator-loop update. Such \free" spins can, however, be ipped with probability 1=2 since they do not appear in the weight function. Since the average of n, the number of operators in $S_{\rm M}$, grows linearly with , free spins appear frequently only at relatively high temperatures.

It is convenient to de ne a M onte C arb step (M C S) as a sweep of diagonal updates at all positions in S_M where possible, followed by construction of the linked list in which a number N₁ of operator-bops are constructed before m apping back to a new S_M and j i and ipping free spins. Observables can be measured after every, or every few, M C S (in some cases, it may even worth-while to record measurements after every loop).

The remaining question now is how many operatorloops one should construct in each MCS. The operatorloops are typically of highly varying lengths. Each MCS should involve several loop updates, so that a signi cant fraction of the vertices are visited. In order not to bias the measurements it is important that N $_1$ is xed. One cannot, e.g., keep on constructing loops during a given MCS until the number of vertices visited exceeds a predeterm ined number. The average size of the operatorloops depends strongly on the model parameters. It is therefore useful to record the loop sizes and periodically $adjust N_1 during the equilibration of the simulation.$ Typically, we determ ine N_1 such that the average cum ulative loop length (the num ber of vertices visited) during one MCS is approximately 2hni or 2M . In recording the loop length, we do not count bounces (since no change result in the vertex o which the path bounces). Am ong the counted steps there are still som e fraction of backtracking ones, i.e., segments of the operator-loop where com pleted vertex updates are reversed. If a bounce occurs already at the rst step the loop closes in m ediately. W ith our de nition, this is a completed loop of length 0. In order not to bias the m easurem ents, such length-0 loops also have to be counted among the N $_1$ com pleted bops.

O ne could also $\times N_1$ based on a criterion involving the average number of leg-spins which are actually ipped during an MCS, but recording this number is slightly more complicated than just keeping track of the loop lengths. Since this has to be done only during equilibration the cost is not prohibitive, however. The exact de nition of N₁ and precisely what constitutes one MCS are not critical issues (as in the classical W ol cluster

algorithm [45], where the MCS can also be de ned in a way analogous to what we have discussed here).

The operator-bop construction (the operator path) is a type of random walk in a d+1-dimensional space (although the network of connected vertices does not necessarily have this dimensionality it could e ectively have a fractal dimension < d + 1). One may therefore wonder whether the closing of the loop could become problem atic, especially for large system s in three dim ensions. In som e cases, an operator-loop can indeed becom e very long before it closes. In rare cases a loop may even not close during a simulation of practical length. The loop size distribution is always very broad, how ever, and the non-closing problem can simply be circum vented by im posing a maximum length beyond which the loop construction is term inated. The way we typically in plement this term ination is by immediately initiating a new MCS (beginning with a diagonal update), hence disregarding all the loops that were constructed during the MCS of the term inated loop. This way, we do not have to save actual operator paths (needed in order to undo the changes done during construction of the term inated loop), which would become in practical for long paths. The term ination does not violate detailed balance and hence the correct distribution of con gurations contributing to Z is maintained. Term ination of incomplete loops does introduce a bias in quantities which are related to the extended con guration space, however, such as single-particle G reen's functions [44]. Typically, we use a maximum loop length

100 hni. For the XXZ-m odel (in any number of dimension) incomplete loop term ination is then extremely rare (excessively long loops can occur more frequently in other models [39]). The average loop length is typically much smaller than hni, but can in some cases be a signi cant fraction of hni (up to tens of percent).

C. Detailed balance

In the originally proposed operator-loop scheme [18], the probability of selecting an exit leg is proportional to the corresponding matrix element (18) when the entrance and exit spins have been ipped (with the factor of proportionality chosen to give probability one for the sum of the four probabilities), a speci c example of which is written in Eq. (20). One can prove that detailed balance is satis ed in this process by considering an extended con guration space which includes also the interm ediate con gurations generated during the loop construction (which do not contribute to the partition function).

The detailed balance proof is illustrated by an example for a conguration with three vertices in Fig.5(a). In 1), the leg with the arrow has been selected as the initial entrance point of the operator-loop. An exit leg is chosen according to the probabilities discussed above. Flipping both the entrance spin and the exit spin leads to a new conguration in the extended space. In Fig.5(a) the three resulting congurations which have non-zero prob-



FIG.5: Twoways to bok at the extended con guration space generated during operator-bop construction. Examples of how the con guration shown in (a)-1 is modi ed at the beginning of an update in the link-discontinuity picture (a) and ladder operator picture (b) are shown. In (a), the arrow in 1 indicates the proposed starting point of the loop. In (b), a rst step of ipping the two spins at this link has already been carried out (generating ladder operators which are indicated by vertices with sem i- lled bars), and the arrow indicates the entrance point for the following step. In both (a) and (b), con gurations that can be generated out of 1 are shown in 2-4. Link-discontinuities are indicated by sm all horizontal lines in (a). In both cases, con guration 2 corresponds to the bounce process, which results in immediate return to the original con guration.

ability are shown in 2)-4). The entrance ! exit paths are also indicated and the corresponding spins have been ipped. The probability of process 3) corresponds to the example given in Eq. (20), which when inserting the actual spin states becomes

$$P_{2;1} = \frac{h'' \# H_{b} j \#'' i}{h \# H_{b} j \#'' i + h'' \# H_{b} j \#'' i + h''' \# H_{b} j \#'' i}$$
(21)

In 2), the entrance and exit are at the same leg. This is a bounce process which closes the loop immediately with no change in the conguration. In 3) and 4) the vertex has changed and two links have appeared which connect legs with di erent spin states. We call these \link-discontinuities". Only congurations with no link-discontinuities contribute to Z. All congurations created during the loop construction contain two linkdiscontinuities, until the loop closes (which can be seen as the discontinuities annihilating each other). There are no weight changes associated with the link-discontinuities the conguration weight is still considered to be given by Eq. (17). Hence, the only weight change arises from the change in the a ected vertex when the entrance and exit spins are ipped.

The way the exit leg is chosen at the start of the operator-loop corresponds to a heat-bath algorithm . The probabilities of no change (staying in the original subspace) or transfer to a con guration with two linkdiscontinuities are proportional to the respective weights in the extended space. Once a con guration with two discontinuities has been created (i.e., the rst step was not a bounce), we do not want to create m ore discontinuities (which would take us out of the extended space considered here) and therefore the following updates can only take place at the discontinuities (the end points of the path), i.e., the discontinuities can be moved. Here the same heat-bath algorithm as in the rst step is used. The only di erence is that the entrance leg is not chosen at random but is given by a link from the previous vertex. Hence, the whole process consists of a series of heat-bath steps, which satisfy detailed balance and therefore generate con gurations according to probabilities proportional to the weight in the extended space. The subset of con qurations with zero link-discontinuities, which contribute to Z, are therefore also generated with the correct distribution. The process is ergodic because all types of vertices can be generated, and since the operator path can wind around the periodic boundaries and then change both the spatial winding number and the total magnetization. Within a sector of xed winding number and magnetization, local updates which constitute a small subset of the operator-bops su ce to ensure ergodicity [41].

Instead of thinking about the extended con guration space in terms of link-discontinuities, one can consider the vertices created when one of the spins in the original vertices of Fig. 1 is ipped. These new vertices correspond to the single-spin ipping (ladder) operators S ; and S_i. The loop construction can be formulated in term s of introducing pairs of these, which are then random ly propagated until they reach the sam e vertex and annihilate each other. The start of such a process is illustrated in Fig. 5 (b), using the same con guration and starting point as in 5(a). The dierence with respect to the previous discussion is that now there are no linkdiscontinuities. Instead, the spins at both ends of the link at the selected entrance leg are ipped simultaneously. This introduces two ladder vertices. Here one has to assign a value, v_1 , to the matrix elements of the ladder operators (i.e., the new operators are $v_1S_i^+$ and $v_1S_i^-$). The initial loop segment, an example of which is shown as 1) in Fig. 5 (b), is then generated only with a probability m in [1; v_1^2 = (W $_1$ W $_2$)], where W $_1$ and W $_2$ are the matrix elements corresponding to the two vertices that are considered for replacem ent by ladder vertices. If this rst step is accepted the next step is again to choose an exit. leg. A s before, the propagation of the path is carried out according to a heat-bath algorithm, with probabilities proportional to the matrix element when the entrance and exit spins have been ipped. In the example, paths 2) and 3) lead to closed loops (back to the space with no ladder operators), whereas in 4) the ladder operators

are m oved further away from each other. Note that both spins on the link corresponding to the exit leg are ipped in every steps, so that no link-discontinuities appear. The process continues until the two ladder operators are on the same vertex, which then becomes equal to one of the original two-spin vertices. This brings the system back into the original con guration space.

The link-discontinuity and ladder operator pictures of the loop construction are clearly completely equivalent, although the probabilities associated with starting (or closing) the loop are di erent. In actual simulations it is typically more convenient to use the linkdiscontinuities view. The ladder operator picture explicitly relates the extended con guration space to that of correlation functions involving these operators, but the link-discontinuities can be easily related to them as well. An extended con guration space analogous to the one generated in the operator-loop update was rst utilized in the context of the worm algorithm for continuous-tim e world-line simulations [3]. The issue of measuring o diagonal correlation functions using the SSE operatorloops has been considered in Ref. [44].

In Sec. III we will give a more form al and complete proof of detailed balance. W e will show that the heatbath algorithm is not the only, and also not the most e cient, way to satisfy detailed balance when constructing the operator-loop. We will introduce the concept of a directed loop to form a general fram ework for loop updating schemes, both in SSE and path integrals in ulations. In the SSE scheme, the directed loop simply leads to di erent probabilities of choosing am ong the four exits from a vertex, all other aspects of the m ethod rem aining as has been discussed in this section. Before introducing the directed loop concept, we rst consider special cases in which the bounce process can be excluded. In IIE we discuss m ore technical SSE im plem entation issues, which also are common to the heath-bath operator loops and the new directed loops.

D. Excluding back-tracking in special cases

In the general operator-loop algorithm discussed above, the probability of the bounce process is always non-zero, because the vertex remains unchanged and has a non-zero value (otherwise, it would not appear in the con guration in the rst place). In some special cases, it is possible to modify the algorithm in such a way that the bounce is completely excluded. This has very favorable e ects on the simulation dynamics, since there is then no back-tracking and all segments of the loop accomplish changes in the con guration.

The most important of the special cases is the isotropic H eisenberg model (= 1; h = 0) [18]. A very similar algorithm exists for the ferrom agnet (J < 0) [23]. For the antiferrom agnet, choosing the constant = 0 in Eqs. (18) implies that the vertices with all spins up or all spins down vanish and the remaining four matrix elements all



FIG.6: A llallow ed vertices in the determ inistic operator-loop algorithm in the case of the H eisenberg antiferrom agnet (a) and ferrom agnet (b). O perator-loop segments starting at the low er left leg are also shown.

equal 1=2. As a result, the matrix element product in (17) is $sim ply (1=2)^n$ and is not a ected by the operatorbop update. If the bounce process is excluded, the only remaining process is the switch-and-reverse shown in Fig. 6 (a) and the path is hence determ inistic. The actual loop structure is only changed by the diagonal update. The determ inistic loop process is clearly symmetric with respect to ipping or ipping back the spins at all vertex legs covered by the loop and hence it obeys detailed balance. For the ferrom agnet, the bounce can be excluded ifC =1=4 in (6) [for the isotropic ferrom agnet = 1 and there is no m inus sign in (5)], and the only remaining process is then the switch-and-continue process shown in Fig.6(b).

In the deterministic case, each vertex leg can be uniquely assigned to a loop, and the loops can be ipped independently of each other. Instead of random ly choosing starting points and constructing a xed number of loops, one can then construct all possible loops exactly once, by always picking a starting point which does not belong to a loop already constructed. The loops should then be ipped with probability 1=2. The random decision of whether or not to ip can be made before the loop is constructed, but even if the decision is not to ip one has to construct the whole loop and set ags on the vertex legs visited, so that one does not attem pt to construct the same loop again. Loops are constructed this way until all 4n vertex legs have been visited. This method of constructing all the loops is analogous to the classical Swendsen-W ang multi-cluster method [46], whereas, as was already mentioned above, the operator-loop construction in the general non-determ inistic case is more sim ilar to the W ol single-cluster algorithm [45].

It should be noted that in the determ inistic case an algorithm including only operator updates (diagonal updates and bops) is not completely ergodic. In the antiferrom agnet, spin states with all spins up or down are isolated from the other states since no operators can act on them. These two states are important only at very high temperatures and they can then be reached by also performing random ips of \free" spins. In simulations with > 0 all states can be reached even without such spin ips.

A nother special case is the XY-m odel [18, 26] (= 0, h = 0). In this case all matrix elements in (18) equal 1=2

if the constant = 1=2. The weight is then again only dependent on n and does not change in the operatorloop update. The bounce can therefore be excluded also in this case, leaving two remaining allowed exits from each vertex. A lthough these paths are not determ inistic, one can still subdivide the system into loops that can be ipped independently of each other.

The bop structure in the general operator-bop algorithm, which includes bounce processes, is similar to that in the worm algorithm for continuous-time path-integrals [3], although the twom ethods are quite di erent in other respects (the actual processes used to construct the SSE operator-bops and the worm s are di erent | see Sec. V II). In the special cases where the bounce process can be excluded, the SSE operator-bops are analogous to the world-line bops (in discrete [16] or continuous [4, 19] in aginary time). The close relationships between the Euclidean path integral in continuous time and the discrete representation on which the SSE method is based has been discussed in previous papers [2, 42, 47] and will also be further elucidated here in Sec. IV.

III. D IRECTED LOOPS

In the operator-loop update discussed in the previous section, detailed balance is satis ed using a heat-bath algorithm for propagating the path between connected vertices. In this section we will present a more general set of equations that have to be satis ed for detailed balance to hold in such a process. We will show that these equations have an in nite number of solutions, some of which can lead to a more e cient sampling than the heat bath. We construct a particular solution based on the intuitive hypothesis (for which we have no rigorous proof) that the probability of bounces (back-tracking) should be minim ized. We show that the bounces can in fact be com pletely excluded in a much wider range of parameters than at the two isolated points (isotropic XY and Heisenberg) discussed in Sec. II D.

We call the entities involved in the more general scheme \directed loops", because the detailed balance equations that we construct (the directed loop equations) explicitly take into account the fact that the construction of the path of vertices is directional, i.e., the probability of exiting at a particular leg given the entrance leg is not the same as the probability of the reverse process. The original operator-loop update with the heat-bath probabilities [18] discussed in the previous section corresponds to a particular solution of the directed loop equations. W e stress that if another solution is used, the only di erence in the actual simulation with respect to the original scheme is a dierent set of probabilities for exiting at a given vertex leg, given the entrance leg and the four spin states. Before we explicitly construct new solutions in the context of the XXZ-m odelwe begin by describing m ore generally how the directed loop equations arise.

A. Conditions for detailed balance

Let us rst recall that the detailed balance requirem ent reads

$$P(s! s^{0})W(s) = P(s^{0}! s)W(s^{0});$$
 (22)

where s denotes a con guration having weight W (s), which in the SSE m ethod is expressed as a product over vertex weights, Eq. (17), and P (s ! s⁰) is the probability of changing the con guration from s to s⁰. W hile the weights are given by the H am iltonian the probability for how to update the spin con guration depends on the actual algorithm used.

The algorithm for constructing an operator-bop to update an SSE con guration is quite general for any form of the 2-body interaction (and can be extended also to multi-particle interactions). With the con guration m apped onto a linked vertex list, an initial entrance vertex leg is rst picked at random am ong all 4n legs. Then an exit leg belonging to the same vertex is chosen in a probabilistic way and the spins on the entrance and exit legs are ipped with unit probability. More generally, the states at these legs are updated with non-zero probabilities only for changes leading to vertices corresponding to non-zero m atrix elem ents. For sim plicity, we here assume that the change at the exit leg is uniquely dictated (through conservation laws) by the change at the entrance leg. The process continues using as the new entrance leg the leg linked to the exit leg. The process stops when the initial starting leg is reached. The probability for arriving at a new con guration s⁰ can therefore be written as

 $P (s ! s^{0}) = X$ $P (e_{0})P (s;e_{0} ! s_{1};e_{1})$ $P (g;e_{1} ! s_{2};e_{2})$ $P (s_{1} ; e_{n} 1 ! s^{0};e_{0});$

where $P(e_0)$ is the probability for choosing the vertex leg e_0 as the initial starting point and P ($s_i; e_i ! s_{i+1}; e_{i+1}$) is the probability given a spin con guration s_i and the entrance leg e_i to exit the vertex at x_i which is connected to the next entrance leg e_{i+1} , resulting in a new con guration s_{i+1} . The intermediate congurations s_i belong to the extended space of con gurations with two linkdiscontinuities, as discussed in Sec. II-C. The exit legs x_i do not explicitly appear in the probabilities since we have assumed that they are uniquely linked to the follow ing entrance legs e_{i+1} (generalization to cases where the uniqueness does not hold are straight-forward). The sum is over all possible closed loops which result in the updated con guration being the particular con guration s^0 . To nd a convenient way of choosing the probabilities on the right hand side of the above one needs an expression for the inverse process where the spin con guration s⁰ is transferred into s. This can be written down quite simply by realizing that for each of the term s in Eq. (23)there is a corresponding term which describes the \time "- reversed path, which contributes to the reverse probability. Thus one can write

$$P (s^{0} ! s) = X P (e_{0})P (s^{0};e_{0} ! s_{n 1};e_{n 1})$$

$${}_{2};e_{2} (s s_{1};e_{1}) (24)$$

$$P (s_{1};e_{1} ! s;e_{0});$$

where the sum is over the same closed loops as in Eq.(23). By inserting these expressions into the detailed balance equation (22) we see that detailed balance is satisfied if

for all possible SSE con gurations and entrance legs. Because the update $(s_i;e_i ! s_{i+1};e_{i+1})$ changes only one particular vertex, all except one of the factors in the product of vertex weights in Eq. (17) factor out and cancel. Writing W $(s;e;x) = W_s P(s;e ! s^0;x)$, where we have slightly changed the notation so that W_s denotes the m atrix element corresponding to a single vertex with its four leg states coded as s, e is the entrance leg, and x is the exit leg on the same vertex, one can form ulate the detailed balance criterion Eq. (25) as

$$W (s; l_1; l_2) = W (s^0; l_2; l_1)$$
(26)

which should be valid for all possible vertex types which can be converted into each other by changing the states at the entrance and exit legs. This equation in plies many relations between the unknown probabilities of how to chose an exit leg given a particular vertex and an entrance leg. There are additional relations which must be satis ed. R equiring that the path always continues thru (23a vertex translates into into

X

P (s;e !
$$s_x;x$$
) = 1; (27)

where the sum is over all legs on the vertex. We have emphasized in the notation s_x that the resulting spin con guration depends on the exit leg. In terms of the weights W $(s;l_1;l_2)$ this requirement translates into

which must be valid for all vertices and entrance-legs. This set of equations, Eq. (28) together with the relations in Eq. (26), form the directed loop equations, the foundations of our new approach to construct valid probability tables for the operator-loop update.

B. SSE directed loops for the X X Z-m odel

For the XXZ-m odel there are just three possible exits for any given entrance leg as one choice always leads to a



FIG.7: Example of two vertices with directed loop segments that transform into each other in the ipping process.



FIG. 8: Possible assignments of directed loop segments for half of the dierent combinations of vertices and entrancelegs. The other half of the vertex con gurations can be obtained by interchanging up and down spins (solid and open circles) while keeping the arrows. The lines with arrows are the directed loop segments. The con gurations are divided into four sets (one in each quadrant). On ipping the spins connected by the loop segment and reversing the direction of the arrow, only con gurations within the same quadrant are transform ed into each other.

zero weight state when spins connected by the loop segment are ipped (due to violation of the z-m agnetization conservation of the model). Fig. 3 illustrates the possibilities for placing directed loop segments for dierent vertices. In order for our update process to satisfy detailed balance we recall that according to Eq. (26) we must relate vertices in which the two spins connected by the loop segment are ipped and the direction of the loop segment is reversed. Such related con gurations are illustrated in Fig. 7. Furtherm ore Eq. (28) relates vertices with di erent exit legs having the same spin con guration and entrance legs. W e then m ake the key observation that all possible vertex con gurations can be divided into eight subsets that do not transform into each other. Half of these subsets are shown in Fig. 8, where only con gurations within the same quadrant are transform ed into each other. These con gurations form closed sets under the ipping operation. It is therefore su cient to derive the detailed balance conditions, Eq. (26), for transitions between vertex con gurations in the same set independently of other con gurations.

A row in any of the quadrants in Fig. 8 contains all

three con gurations which can be reached by entering a certain vertex from a certain entrance leg. For instance, in the upper left quadrant the entrance leg for the rst row is the lower left one, for the second row the lower right one, and for the third row the upper right one. A c-cording to Eq. (28), sum m ing the weights of all possible con gurations that can be reached from a certain in-leg, keeping the spin con guration xed, should equal the vertex weight alone. Thus taking the upper left quadrant of F ig. 8, we have for row s 1–3 from the top:

$$W_1 = b_1 + a + b;$$

 $W_2 = a + b_2 + c;$ (29)
 $W_3 = b + c + b_3;$

where the symbols on the left hand sides are the vertex weights Eq. (18) in the spin con guration space, i.e.,

while those on the right are weights in the enlarged conguration space of spins and directed loop segments. We have assigned equal weights to the congurations which are related by ipping, in accordance with Eq. (26). The order of the symbols on the right-hand sides of Eqs. (29) follows the order in the upper left quadrant of Fig. 8, so that, e.g., the weight of the two congurations in Fig. 7 is b and the weight of the very middle conguration in the upper left quadrant of Fig. 8 is b_2 . We use b with a subscript to denote a weight of a conguration where the exit equals the entrance (bounce process).

As m entioned above there are in all eight sets of vertex con gurations which close under the ipping process. These sets are in principle independent of each other and have their own equation sets. However, one can easily convince one-self that because of sym m etry reasons there are only two di erent types of sets. One of these sym metries is that of permuting the two spins acted upon by H_b. This implies that the equations derived for the set in the upper left quadrant in Fig. 8, Eqs. (29), are the same as for the set (not shown) that can be obtained from the upper right quadrant by interchanging up-and down spins, keeping the orientation of the directed loop segments. The other symmetry is that of imaginary time inversion, which in the gures corresponds to switching the pairs of spins below and above the horizontal bar representing the operator H_b. This symmetry together with the previous one identify the rules for the upper left quadrant of Fig. 8 with those of the lower right quadrant. Thus, one only has to consider two independent sets of equations, Eqs. (29) and the corresponding equations which can be derived from the lower left quadrant in Fig.8:

$$W_1 = b_1^0 + a^0 + b^0;$$

$$W_{2} = a^{0} + b_{2}^{0} + c^{0}; \qquad (31)$$
$$W_{4} = b^{0} + c^{0} + b_{3}^{0}:$$

This latter set takes the form of the set (29) but with prim ed sym bols to denote the weights and W $_4$ instead of W $_3$. There is a further reduction in the case of zero m agnetic eld, where the two equation sets become identical.

Before discussing solutions to these sets of equations it should be stressed that the actual probabilities for selecting the exit leg is given by dividing the weight in the extended con guration space by the weight of the bare vertex, so that, e.g., the probability for choosing the \bounce" process given that the entrance leg is the lower left one on a vertex with weight W $_1$, as shown in the very upper left hand comer of F ig. 8, is $b_1 = W_1$.

It is clear that there are m any solutions w ith only positive weights to the above equation sets as they are underdeterm ined; both sets have six unknowns and there are three equations w ith the additional requirem ent of nonnegative weights. A particular sym m etric solution is the one corresponding to the heat-bath probabilities used in the original scheme [18], which we will henceforth refer to as Solution A. It is given by

$$a = W_{1}W_{2} = (W_{1} + W_{2} + W_{3});$$

$$b = W_{1}W_{3} = (W_{1} + W_{2} + W_{3});$$

$$c = W_{2}W_{3} = (W_{1} + W_{2} + W_{3});$$

$$b_{i} = W_{i}^{2} = (W_{1} + W_{2} + W_{3}):$$

(32)

For the primed weights, W_3 is replaced by W_4 . C learly the probabilities for choosing the exit leg are here proportional to the weights of the resulting bare vertices which are obtained by ipping the two spins on the loop seqment, an example of which was given in Eq. (20). This solution is valid in the full parameter space of the XXZmodel. However, it generally assigns a relatively large weight to the bounce processes where the exit leg equals the entrance leg. These are ine ective in updating the con gurations. In particular, when the eld h ! 0 and the anisotropy ! 1 the bounce probability approaches 1=2. A though the method still is reasonably e cient (we are not aw are of any m ethod that has been m ore successful for models including external elds), this is bothersome since the SSE algorithm exactly at h = 0 can be form ulated entirely without any bounce processes [18], as reviewed in Sec. IID, and is then considerably more e cient. The fact that the h = 0 scheme has no bounces and is completely determ inistic, whereas the h! 0 m ethod has bounce probabilities approaching 1=2, inspires us to look for solutions where the bounce probability instead vanishes continuously as h! 0. This will elim inate the \algorithm ic discontinuity" of the previous approach.

For the discussion of other solutions to the directed loop equations (29) and (31) it is convenient to express these equations in terms of the bounce weights b_1 ;:::; b_3^0 :

$$a = \frac{1+}{4} + \frac{h_b}{2} + \frac{b_2 + b_3}{2};$$



FIG.9: \A lgorithm ic phasediagram " showing regions where various bounce weights must be non-zero. The actual values of these weights are given in Table I. In the shaded region all bounce weights can be set to zero. O ther bounce weights are listed in Table I.

$$b = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{b_{1} + b_{2} + b_{3}}{2};$$

$$c = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{b_{1} + b_{2} + b_{3}}{2};$$

$$a^{0} = \frac{1 + b_{2} + b_{2} + b_{3} +$$

where we have explicitly inserted the expressions for the vertex weights, Eq. (30). We seek positive solutions to these equations. Being under-determ ined there are many solutions, so we will try to nd the solutions that yield the most e ective algorithm s. As a general principle for nding e cient rules, we will attempt to minim ize the bounce weights $b_1; :::; b_3^0$. The solution so obtained will be term ed Solution B. Inspecting the equations, it is clear that there is one region in parameter space where one can avoid bounces altogether. This region is shown as the shaded region in Fig. 9. From the requirement of non-negative vertex weights we already have the restriction

0. In the shaded region, the requirement of nonnegative weights also in the enlarged conguration space when all the bounce weights are zero imposes an additional constraint on : (1)=4 $_{\rm H}$ =2. We have no rigorous principle of noting the optimal value of in general, but as can be inferred from our simulation tests (presented in Sec.V) it is often advantageous to choose a sm all but non-zero value in cases where m in = 0.

For the Heisenberg antiferrom agnet at zero m agnetic eld (= 1;h = 0) the determ inistic algorithm constructed in Ref. 18 is recovered for the choice = 0. The non-zero weights are then $a = a^0 = 1=2$, while the non-zero m atrix elements are W₁ = W₂ = 1=2, which correspond to the switch-and-reverse process illustrated in Fig. 6(a). This is a determ inistic algorithm as the only probabilities di erent from zero are unity. There

TABLE I: Non-zero bounce weights and m inimum values of for the di erent parameter regions of Solution B of the directed loop equations. The Roman numerals correspond to those in Fig. 9. We have de ned = (1)=2.

	bounce weights			m in	
I				(h _b)=2
II	$b_2 = h_b$	$b_2^0 = h_b$		0	
III	$b_2 = h_b$			0	
IV	$b_2 = h_b$	$b_3^0 = h_b$	+	0	
V		$b_3^0 = h_b$	+	(h _b)=2
VI	$b_3 = h_b$ +	$b_3^0 = h_b$	+	h_{b}	=2

is a subtlety here as the ratio $c\!=\!\!W_3$ is undeterm ined for

= 0. However, the value of this probability can be left undeterm ined as the vertex with all spins down will not be generated as a consequence of the vanishing of the weight W₃. This is actually more general whenever a probability cannot be de ned because of a zero denom inator it can be left undeterm ined because the probability of reaching such a vertex is zero in the rst place. For the XY-model (= 0) at zero magnetic eld the choice = 1=4 gives a di erent set of zero-bounce rules than the one proposed in R ef. 18, which, how ever also is a solution of our equations (but with = 1=2). It is quite rem arkable that for the XY-model one can in fact nd rules with no bounces for all magnetic eld strengths up to the saturation eld. We expect this to be very useful.

O utside the shaded region in Fig. 9 one orm ore bounce weights must be non-zero. In these regions we will again choose the sm allest possible values for the bounce weights. Table I shows these values for the di erent regions in Fig. 9, along with the minimum value of allowed. Selecting a value for , the remaining weights can be obtained using Eqs. (33).

At the boundary between regions in Fig. 9, one of the bounce weights vanishes continuously. In particular this m eans that the rules for the H eisenberg antiferrom agnet in a magnetic eld approaches the rules in zero eld continuously as h_b ! 0. This is to be contrasted to the sym metric Solution A, Eqs. (32), where the bounce probabilities approach 1=2 as h_b ! 0. Hence, the algorithm ic discontinuity is indeed rem oved as the special determ inistic solution at the isotropic point is recovered autom atically with Solution B (when = 0).

In Sec. V, the perform ance of simulations using Solutions A and B will be quantiled in terms of calculated autocorrelation functions. It will be shown that the new Solution B can lead to autocorrelation times more than an order of magnitude shorter than with Solution A. The improvements are most dramatic for weak but non-zero elds and weak Ising anisotropies (>1). In Sec. IV we will describe how the directed bops also can be adapted to simulations in the path integral form alism. Below we rst brie y discuss the form of the detailed balance equa-

tions for m ore general H am iltonians.

C. General form of the directed loop equations

The directed loop approach can be easily applied to a much wider class of models than the $S = 1=2 \times X \times Z$ -model discussed in the preceding section. The SSE operator-loop update with the heat-bath probabilities [18] has already been applied to several di erent system s, including spin system s with S > 1=2 [43], various boson models [35, 36, 37], as well as the 1D extended Hubbard model [39]. We here brie y outline the general form of the directed loop equations and their solutions for a general 2-body interaction.

W hen the operator-loop update is applied to models with higher spins, boson or ferm ion models, it is clear that the simple notion of ipping a spin in the S = 1=2XXZ-m odelm ust be extended to a change in the state at a vertex leg where the nal state is to one out of several possible ones. Consider as an example a spin-1 model where a loop can change the state on a leg by one or two units of spin. This is simplied when the total S^z is conserved as then these di erent changes can be considered as two independent loop-updates. This is because changing the state on the exit leg by two units of spin when the state on the entrance leg is changed by one unit, or vice-versa, violates the S^z conservation law. Thus, with such a conservation law the state change of the exit leg is uniquely determ ined given the state change at the entrance leg. For simplicity we will here consider only those cases where this uniqueness holds, although this is by no means a necessary condition.

In order to describe the general form of the directed loop equations for this type of general two-site interaction it is convenient to change labeling som ewhat from that used in the previous section. To de ne this new labeling, we start by selecting a reference vertex (which can be any of the allow ed vertices) and label its weight W_1 . W e then choose an entrance leg and label this leg as leg 1, and then number the rest of the legs on this vertex 2;3 and 4. D istributing the weight over all possible exit legs according to Eq. (28) gives

$$W_1 = a_{11} + a_{12} + a_{13} + a_{14};$$
 (34)

where we have labeled the weights a_{ij} in the extended space by their entrance (i) and exit (j) legs. On changing the states at both the entrance and exit legs one arrives at a new vertex. If the entrance and exit legs are the same the vertex stays the same. Now label the weight of the vertex reached by exiting at leg i as W_i. Thus if the exit was on leg 2 we would label that vertex W₂. W₂ has a sim ilar decom position as W₁,

$$W_2 = a_{21} + a_{22} + a_{23} + a_{24};$$
 (35)

where now the entrance is on leg two on the vertex which di ers from vertex 1 by having changed the states at leg 1 and 2. The weight a_{21} corresponds to the process where the path enters at leg 2 and exits at leg 1. The states are changed in the opposite way to that when arriving at W₂

from W $_1$, and hence the process is undoing the changes and we arrive back at W_1 . From Eq. (26) it follows that $a_{21} = a_{12}$. Now one can ask the question if exiting at leg 3 or 4 yields the sam e vertex type when starting from W $_2$ as it does starting from W_1 . The answer to this is yes, because starting from W_1 one would change the state at leg 1 and 3 while starting from W_2 one would change the states at legs 2 and 3. But W $_2$ di ers from W $_1$ only by having di erent states at legs 1 and 2 and thus the state at leg 2 is changed twice in opposite directions resulting in the same con guration W_3 . The weights are hence uniquely de ned by this procedure, and one is guaranteed that the only vertices which are related by the detailed balance equations are those which can be reached by changing the state on the entrance leg together with the state on any exit leg of the reference vertex. The directed loop equations can therefore be written as

where the matrix on the left hand side is a real symmetric 4 4 m atrix with all entries non-negative for a useful algorithm. The magnitudes of the diagonal elements determine the bounce probabilities. This is the general structure of the directed loop equations for 2-site interactions. There are in general several such sets of equations, which can be generated one-by-one by changing the reference vertex and the type of change at the entrance leg. The reference vertex should then of course be chosen am ong vertices that have not yet been generated starting from another reference vertex, in order not to generate the sam e equation sets several times. Som e of the di erent sets are typically identical to each other by symmetry, as in the case of the S = 1=2 X X Z model where there are eight sets falling into two classes. In that case the structure of the equations changes into 3 3 form s because there are only three allowed exit possibilities for each entrance leg. To explain this with an example in the scheme used here, we can consider the vertex with all spins down as the reference vertex. Then $W_2 = 0$ as this con guration corresponds to the case where the lower legs (1 and 2) are ipped, resulting in a vertex with weight zero. This immediately implies that all a's (being all non-negative) with an index 2 must be zero and so the result is that row 2 and colum n 2 is taken out resulting in a 3 3-m atrix. In general, there can be a large num bers of 4 4 equation sets, som e or all of which reduce into 3 3 and 2 2 sets (e.g., for Hubbard-type electron m odels there are both 2 2 and 3 3 sets, but no 4 4 sets).

Let us consider the 3 3 case in greater detail and ask when one can dow ithout bounces, as we saw was possible in a region in parameter space of the S = $1=2 \times X \times Z - M$ model discussed in the previous section. To do this, it is convenient to rst label the equations so that $W_3 = W_2$ W₁. We then set all the diagonal entries (the bounce weights) to zero and nd the region of di erent W's for which the equation set has strictly positive solutions. In this case the solution is unique as there are 3 equations and 3 unknowns and it is easy to see that the a's are positive only when W₃ $W_1 + W_2$, and hence one nd a directed loop solution without bounces only when this condition is satis ed.

A llowing bounces, it is also easy to see that one can always do with only one bounce, the one which bounces o of the vertex with the largest weight. If W₃ is the largest weight one can set $a_{11} = a_{22} = 0$ and $a_{33} = W_3$ W_1 W_2 , which gives $a_{12} = 0$, $a_{13} = W_1$ and $a_{23} = W_2$. Thism eans that the probability form oving between the con gurations with sm allest weight is zero while that of moving from the largest weight con guration to the sm aller ones is the ratio of the sm aller weight to the larger weight and unity for the reverse process. The bounce probability is unity m inus the probability form oving to the sm aller weight con gurations. A similar analysis can be carried out for the 4 4 equation sets appearing for S > 1=2 m odels and boson m odels.

The equation sets involving largerm atrices, as encountered when dealing with interactions involving more than two sites, can also be studied in a similar manner. It should be pointed out that there is nothing that guarantees a priori that the operator-loop update is ergodic (in com bination with the diagonal updates), for any solution of the directed loop equations. Ergodicity requires that all allowed vertices can be generated through a series of loop updates, and this is typically the case with 2particle terms (although one could in principle construct models where it is not the case). However, simple onedim ensional loops such as those discussed here cannot always accomplish this alone when the interaction includes more than two particles, even in the case of relatively simple models. The SSE method has recently been applied to an X Y -m odel with a standard 2-spin interaction J and a 4-spin term K [48]. In that particular case, an operator-loop update can be used, and is ergodic, for JJ > 0, but for J = 0 another cluster-type update had to be carried out. In practice, a combination of the two updates had to be used for large K = J.

IV. PATH INTEGRAL FORMULATION

In this section we will discuss how the directed loops can be applied to the path integral M onte C arlo m ethod (P IM) form ulated in imaginary time. Such m ethods are known as world-line m ethods in discrete [9] or continuous [3, 4] imaginary time. The close relationships between the SSE and P IM representations of quantum statistical m echanics have been explored in previous works [42, 47]. Here we will show that also the directed loop ideas can be almost directly translated from SSE into the P IM form alism.

A. Construction of the path integral

W e start by writing the partition function as

$$Z = Trfe^{H} g = Tr e^{H}; \quad (37)$$

$$t = 1$$

where = =L and L is a large integer. The Ham iltonian is generally a sum of non-commuting pieces, and in order to dealwith the exponential it is convenient to em ploy the Suzuki-Trotter trick [6]. This involves dividing the Ham iltonian into several sets of term s, where all term s within a set are commuting while the sets them selves are non-commuting. Because the Hamiltonian is multiplied by the small quantity it is possible to split the exponential into a product of exponentials, each having one set in the exponent. The errors arising from this approximation vanishes as ! 0 [6, 20]. Consider as an example the X X Z chain. Then the H am iltonian can be divided into two sets, one involving the operators which act on sites 2n and 2n + 1 while the other set involves the operators acting on sites 2n + 1 and 2n + 2. It is then possible to insert complete sets of states, which can be chosen to be written in term s of S^z-com ponents, between all the exponentials and the partition function can bewritten [7, 8, 9, 10]

$$Z = \int_{f g t=1}^{X \quad Y^{L}} h_{t+1} j e^{-H_{2}} j_{t+1=2} i h_{t+1=2} j e^{-H_{1}} j_{t} i;$$
(38)

where is a shorthand for a spin con guration in the S^{z} -basis of all sites in the chain. The sum is over all possible sets of spin con gurations, two complete sets of states for each time step t, and the trace in plies $_{L+1} = _1$. This is called the checkerboard breakup as one can visualize it as a checkerboard pattern (see Fig. 10) where all the matrix elements are pictured as shaded plaquettes. This breakup is completely general and can also be used for higher-dimensional lattices. Because each set H₁ and H₂ consists of individually commuting terms it su ces to consider the interaction on one shaded plaquette only and the matrix elements can easily be written down. Keeping only terms to rst order in one nds

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{W}_{1} = h^{"} \# j e^{-H} j \# " i = h \# " j e^{-H} j " \# i = = 2; \\ & \mathbb{W}_{2} = h^{"} \# j e^{-H} j " \# i = h \# " j e^{-H} j \# " i \\ & = 1 + (C + = 4) ; \\ & \mathbb{W}_{3} = h \# \# j e^{-H} j \# \# i = 1 + (C = 4 h_{b}) ; \\ & \mathbb{W}_{4} = h^{""} j e^{-H} j " " i = 1 + (C = 4 + h_{b}) : \end{split}$$

These matrix elements di er from the matrix elements (18) in the SSE method only in that the Hamiltonian is multiplied by the factor and the diagonal matrix elements also come with the zeroth-order term of the exponential. The weight W_1 comes with a minus sign which here is om itted by in plicitly performing a rotation about the S^z-axis for spins on one sub-lattice.



FIG.10: The checkerboard breakup of the space-time for a spin chain with four sites with open boundary conditions. H $_1$ have term s acting on the links between site 0 and 1 and the link between site 2 and 3. H $_2$ acts on the link between site 1 and 2. The shaded plaquettes show where the Ham iltonian acts.



FIG.11: Loop and spin con gurations which should have the same weight when allowing the loops to be ipped independently.

This can be done whenever the lattice is bipartite. One can of course also calculate the matrix elements (39) exactly, but since we will here take the continuum limit it is su cient to go to linear order in , where the similarity to the SSE expressions are most evident.

In the ordinary world-line loop algorithm (for a review see R ef. [49]), two loop segments are assigned to each and every shaded plaquette in a stochastic way. The shaded plaquettes are corner-sharing so that when all shaded plaquettes have been assigned segments one can identify closed loops. Given that the probabilistic rules for the assignment of loop segments for each shaded plaquette follows the analogy of Eq. (26) and Eq. (28), one can ip a loop with any probability. In particular one can pick a random site and a random imaginary time and ip the loop which includes this point with probability unity. One can also turn this around and rst, before any loop is constructed, pick a random point in spacetime and then construct the loop starting at this point and ipping spins with probability unity as the loop is being constructed.

W hen assigning bop segments to each shaded plaquette one needs two loop segments for each plaquette in order to ll the lattice completely. Then many con gurations can be reached, as one should be able to independently ip spins along one or both the loop segments.

Thus one gets relatively many constraints of the type (26). This is illustrated in Fig. 11. In fact, in zero eld there are just as m any equations as unknowns, and this set has only non-negative solutions in the XY-like case 1. In a magnetic eld there is one additional 1 equation and the set does not have any solutions. Within the standard loop algorithm this is repaired by introducing additional processes which \freeze" loops together, i.e., if spins on one loop is ipped, spins on any loops frozen together with the rst one will also be ipped. This increases the number of unknowns in the equation set, making a solution possible. W hile we are not aware of any system atic studies of the e ects of the freezing process, it tends to freeze all loops together resulting in the trivial spin update where all spins are ipped. It is therefore not very e ective. However, in the extreme Ising limit the freezing is responsible for the fact that the loop algorithm becomes equivalent to the Swendsen-W ang algorithm, and hence the freezing of loops has some merits.

Another method to make the loop algorithm work in a magnetic eld is to apply the eld in the x-direction, thereby changing the matrix elements and introducing a m inus sign. Using the concept of m erons the resulting sign problem can be solved [21, 22], but the simulation algorithm is not very e cient for large system s. If one relaxes the condition that the loops should be ipped with probability one and instead chooses weights such that the ipping probability is maxim ized, it is possible to nd rules that work very well at extrem e elds [19]. How ever, this success at extrem e elds must be regarded as a lucky circum stance and is not generally valid for lower elds. Yet another and perhaps the sim plest loop m ethod in the presence of a magnetic eld is to construct the loops as if the eld was absent and then include a M etropolis decision whenever attempting to ip a loop that changes the magnetization. This method is, however, very ine ective [44] (except at extrem ely weak elds; h=J < 1=(N)[25]) as is to be expected as it does not take into account the actual physics of the model which is the competition between the magnetic eld and the exchange energy.

N one of the above m ethods for treating external elds has proven as useful in practice as the SSE operator-loop algorithm [18]. The worm algorithm for path integral simulations in continuous in aginary time [3] shares some important features with the SSE operator-loops (speci – cally, there is an analogue to the back-tracking) and has also been used successfully. However, its autocorrelation times appear to be longer (as can be seen in comparing our results in Sec.V with those presented in R ef. 40). We will discuss di erences between the procedures used to construct directed loops and worms in Sec.V II. Because the directed loops is a further in provement of the SSE approach, it is natural to investigate if these concepts can also be in plemented in the path integral form ulation.

${\tt B}$. D irected loops in the P ${\tt I\!M}$

To implement the notion of directed loops in the path integral form ulation we note the sim ilarities of the vertices in the SSE and the shaded plaquettes in the PIM . We can identify a corner of a shaded plaquette with a vertex leg in the SSE.Both have a spin attached, and each corner (leg) is connected to another corner (leg) on another shaded plaquette (vertex). To construct a directed loop, we ist choose a random entrance corner at a random shaded plaquette. Then, depending on the spin con guration, we choose an exit corner and place a directed loop segment between the entrance corner and the exit corner. The spins connected by the loop seqment are ipped with probability one. The spin on the exit corner is then the entrance spin of the next shaded plaquette and the process continues until the loop closes. In contrast to the usual loop algorithm there is no notion of freezing loops, but there is the necessary (at least in som e regim es) process of bouncing where the \loop head" backtracks som e distance along its path and reverses spin jps.

Because of the relation between the SSE vertices and the shaded plaquettes, and the sim ilarity of the matrix elements (30) and (39), one can immediately write down the the detailed balance equations for the PIM using Fig.8 and interpreting the vertices as shaded plaquettes. As in the SSE, there are eight sets of directed loop equations which are reduced to two by symmetries. Substituting the plaquette weights and expressing the extended con guration weights in terms of the bounce weights we get

$$a = \frac{1+}{4} + \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{h_{b}}{2};$$

$$b = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{h_{b} + h_{b}}{2};$$

$$c = 1 + C - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{h_{b} - h_{b}}{2};$$

$$a^{0} = -\frac{1+}{4} - \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{h_{b} - h_{b}}{2};$$

$$b^{0} = -\frac{1}{4} + \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{h_{b} - h_{b}}{2};$$

$$c^{0} = -\frac{1}{4} + C - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{h_{b}}{2} + \frac{h_{b} - h_{b}}{2};$$

$$(40)$$

Non-negative weights are required to avoid sign problem s. This im plies that there are regions where bounces must be non-zero. In fact the sam e \algorithm ic phasediagram " as shown in Fig. 9 applies here, with the exception that in this case there are no restrictions on C h) as it always occurs multiplied (or = C =4 in a combination where there also is the zerothbv order term of the exponential. In fact, in the construction of the loops in continuous im aginary time, where only quantities to order m atters, the value of C drops out com pletely as we will consider ratios where it turns out



FIG. 12: Left: Continuous in aginary time construction of a loop. This gure can be understood as the limit ! 0 of Fig. 10, dotted (solid) lines correspond to spin down (up). Starting at an arbitrary site and time (indicated by the arrow) a probability of \decay" dependent on the spin states of the neighbors is calculated, and the loop head is moved to the point of decay. Right: A resulting a^0 decay at a time $_d$ where the segment up to the decay has changed orientation and a new arrow is placed.

that C does not occur to order . Thus in contrast to the SSE, there is nothing gained by adjusting C in the path integral representation. W henever in a region of param eter space where bounces are needed, one can choose them to be the minimum values as summarized in Table I, with the only modi cation that the bounce weights should be multiplied by . As in the SSE method the actual probability for choosing an exit corner, given an entrance corner and a spin con guration on a shaded plaquette, is obtained by dividing one of the weights above by the appropriate matrix element from Eqs. (39).

In the lim it ! 0 this method might seem very slow as one needs to make a choice for every plaquette of which there are in nitely many in this lim it. However, one can use the method employed in the continuous time implementation of the standard world-line loop algorithm [4], which is based on the fact that the $c_{c}c^{0}$ weights are of order unity. The $c_{c}c^{0}$ weights describe the process of continuing the loop construction in the imaginary time direction on the same site. Being of order unity means that this will be the dom inating process. The other processes are multiplied by and will therefore occurm uch less frequently.

To illustrate in detail how a loop is constructed in the ! 0, consider as an example the situation show n lim it in Fig. 12. This gure shows the full in aginary-time spin con gurations for four sites. The dotted (solid) lines correspond to spin down (up). The gure can be understood as the lim it ! 0 of Fig. 10. The loop construction consists of moving the loop head. This motion begins at a random site and time in a random direction. In Fig. 12 the starting point and direction is marked by an arrow. From the arrow at time $_0$ to the time $_1$ the spin con guration on site 1 and its neighbors 0 and 2 stay unchanged. At time $_1$ there is a spin-ip process exchanging the spins on sites 1 and 2. This means that half of the 2 = , = 10, shaded plaquettes (the factor 2 is from the fact that there are two neighbors) between the starting point $_0$ and $_1$ are of the type W $_2$, while the other half is of the type W_3 . The loop head

will therefore enter alternately the lower left corner on shaded plaquettes having weight W $_2$ and the lower right corner on shaded W 3 plaquettes. On exiting the shaded W ₂ plaquette, one of the three processes a^0 , b_2^0 or c^0 can happen, while for each of the W $_3$ plaquettes one of the processes b,c or b_3 can happen. The c and c^0 processes are by far the most probable as they are of order unity while the others are of order . Therefore until one of the other processes of order occurs, the loop head will just continue its motion in the upward direction on site 1. The probability for the rst occurrence of one of the within an interval processes of order after time ⁰ is given by

P (⁰) =
$$\frac{c^0}{W_2} \frac{c}{W_3}$$
 = $\frac{c^0}{W_2} + 1 \frac{c}{W_3}$
= $e^{(-0^+ - 2)^0} (-0^+ - 2)$; (41)

where in the last equality we have taken the limit ! 0, and the quantities _i are nite as ! 0;

$$_{0} = \frac{b + b_{3}^{0}}{W_{3}}; \qquad (42)$$

$$_{2} = \frac{a^{0} + b_{2}^{0}}{W_{2}}; \qquad (43)$$

where the subscript on indicates which neighbor is considered. Recall that by de nition $W_3 = b + c + b_3^0$ and $W_2 = a + b_2 + c$. Thus, with a random num ber generator one can generate \decay" times according to the distribution (41) and take the random decay tim e generated as the point where one of the processes a^0 , b_2^0 , b or b_3 occurs. If the decay time so generated is bigger than $_1$ 0 the loop head can be moved directly all the way to time $_{1}$, while ipping all the spins on site 1 up to time 1. There it enters a shaded plaquette from the lower left corner. This plaquette has weight W $_1$, and the possible choices for exit comers are determ ined by the ratio of the weights $b_1^0 a^0$ and b^0 to W 1 which all are nite as ! 0.0ne can hence just use the random num bergenerator to select the exit corner. G iven that the outcom e of this choice is, for instance, a⁰ the loop head would move to site 2 while ipping spins which changes the shaded plaquette of type W₁ to be of type W₂. The process would then continue in the downward direction on site 2. If the decay happens before 1 the loop head moves to the decay point while ipping spins and then a choice between the possible decay types is made. G iven that a decay occurs, the choice

of di erent types of decays is again independent of as only the ratios matter. As an example, the probability of selecting a^0 is $a^0=(a^0 + b_2^0 + b + b_3)$. This type of process is illustrated in Fig. 12. Having m ade the choice the process continues, and the loop closes when the loop head reaches the original starting point.

In practice it is convenient to store the spin- ip events in a doubly-linked list for each lattice site so that spinips can be added and removed e ciently. The main computational cost is then to search the site of the loop head and its neighbors for spin transitions.

In zero magnetic eld the directed PIM loop algorithm proposed here corresponds exactly to the singlecluster formulation of the ordinary loop algorithm for 1 1 [4, 16]. This can be seen by setting all bounce w eights to zero and C ==4, and then com paring our weights to Eq. (39) in Ref. [49]. In the language of the usual loop algorithm, our weight a corresponds to horizontal breakups, b to diagonal breakups, and c to verticalbreakups. The general algorithm with bounces is more similar to the worm algorithm [3], but the processes by which the worm is propagated through space-time are di erent and do not correspond to a solution of our directed loop equations. This will be further discussed in Sec.VII. In Sec.V we will dem onstrate that the directed loop processes, especially with Solution B (in both SSE and PIM implementations) lead to much more e cient simulation algorithms.

V. AUTOCORRELATIONS

A utocorrelation functions provide quantitative measures of the e ciency of a M onte C arlo sam pling scheme e in generating statistically independent con gurations. For a quantity Q, the norm alized autocorrelation function is de ned as

$$A_{Q}(t) = \frac{hQ(i+t)Q(i)i}{hQ(i)^{2}i} \frac{hQ(i)i}{hQ(i)^{2}}; \quad (44)$$

where i and t are M onte C arlo times, for which we will use the unit of 1 M CS (as de ned in Sec. II-D in the case of SSE, and with an analogous de nition for the P M). The brackets indicate the average over the time i. A symptotically, the autocorrelation function decays exponentially as $e^{t=0}$, where the asymptotic autocorrelation time $_{Q}$ is given by the slowest mode of the simulation (the transition m atrix of the M arkov chain) to which the observable Q couples. For short times, the behavior is typically dierent for dierent quantities, even if $_{Q}$ is the same. The integrated autocorrelation time is de ned according to

$$_{int} [Q] = \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{X^{1}} A_{Q} (t)$$
 (45)

and is the autocorrelation m easure of greatest practical utility [49].

In this section we will present integrated autocorrelation times for some important quantities in several regions of the parameter space of the anisotropic Heisenberg model (1). We cannot present a completely exhaustive study, however, since in addition to the eld h and the anisotropy , the autocorrelations also depend on temperature T=J=1 and the lattice size. In addition, in SSE simulations the autocorrelations depend on the constant in the matrix elements (18). One of our aim s here is to not the optimum value if . We compare simulations with the original general (non-determ inistic) SSE

operator-loop update [18] (Solution A) and the new solution of the directed loop equations discussed in Sec. III B (Solution B).We also present some results obtained with Solution B in continuous-time PIM simulations.

The physical quantities that we will focus on here are the magnetization,

$$M = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} hS_{i}^{z}i;$$
 (46)

the uniform magnetic susceptibility

$$_{u} = \frac{*}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} S_{i}^{z}; \qquad (47)$$

the staggered susceptibility,

$$s = \frac{1}{N} X (1)^{X_{k} \times 1^{+} Y_{k} \times 1^{+}} d hS_{k}^{z} (1)S_{1}^{z} (0)i; (48)$$

and the spin sti ness,

$$_{\rm s} = \frac{{\rm e}^2 {\rm E} ()}{{\rm e}^2}; \qquad (49)$$

where E () is the internal energy per spin in the presence of a twist in the boundary condition. These quantities and their SSE estimators have been discussed in detail in Ref. [41].

We note again that the de nition of an MCS in the generic SSE operator-loop schem e involves som e degree of arbitrariness, as was discussed in Sec. IID. There is also a statistical uncertainty due to the statistical determ ination of the num ber N₁ of operator-bops constructed per MCS. In all the SSE simulations discussed here, N $_1$ was adjusted during the equilibration of the simulation so that on average 2M vertex legs (excluding bounces) were visited in each MCS. The maximum expansion power M was increased if needed after each equilibration MCS, so that M = 125 n_{max} , where n_{max} is the highest power n generated so far in the simulation. The statistical uncertainties in N $_{\rm l}$ and $n_{\rm m\,\,ax}$ im ply some uctuations in the de nition of an MCS. This, in turn, results in uctuations in the results for the integrated autocorrelation tim es that can be larger than their statistical errors. Typically, these uctuations are only a few percent, how ever, and are hence not problem atic.

In the P M simulations, we adjusted N₁ so that on average the total length (again excluding bounces) of all N₁ bops in a MCS is equal to N; the space-time volume. The de nitions of an MCS in SSE and P M sim - ulations are hence similar but not identical. One reason why it is di cult to construct exactly comparable MCS de nitions in the SSE and the P M is that the diagonal single-operator updates carried out separately in SSE are in e ect accomplished during the loop construction in the P M. Another di erence is that there is no



FIG.13: Integrated autocorrelation times vs external eld for the m agnetization of an N = 64 H eisenberg chain at = 16. The upper and low er panels show results of simulations using Solutions A and B, respectively. Several values of the constant were used, as indicated by the legends in the low er panel.

The inset shows the magnetization itself.

adjustable constant in the PIM. In Ref. [44] an alternative approach of norm alizing the autocorrelation times by the actual number of operations performed was used. However, also this de nition may be ambiguous since it depends on the details of the implementation, and there are also dierences in the actual CPU time consumed depending on the mix of operations (integer, oating point, boolean, etc.). These issues are not of major signicance in the calculations we present below, but should nevertheless be kept in mind when comparing autocorrelations for the two methods.

The rem inder of this section is organized as follows: In A we rst discuss SSE simulations of the 1D Heisenberg model in an external eld. In B we consider SSE simulations of 2D systems in elds and with an isotropies. P IM results for both 1D and 2D systems are presented in C. We have also studied several isotropic systems at critical points and extracted the dynamic exponent of the simulations. We discuss these results in D.

A. SSE sim ulations in 1D

W hen the constant = 0, the vertices with all spins up or all spins down are excluded from the SSE con guration space when h = 0, since the corresponding matrix elements (18) then vanish. W hen h > 0, the all-up ver-



FIG.14: Integrated autocorrelation times vs external eld for the staggered susceptibility of an N = 64 H eisenberg chain at = 16. The inset shows the staggered susceptibility.

tex is again allowed. W ith > 0 all vertices are allowed and the propagation of the loop is then more random. We here begin by studying how the simulation e ciency depends on in the case of the 1D Heisenberg model (= 1) in a eld.

Figs. 13 and 14 show the eld dependence of the integrated autocorrelation tim e of the m agnetization and the staggered susceptibility in simulations of chains with 64 sites at inverse tem perature = 16. As shown in the inset of Fig. 13, at the T = 0 saturation eld $(h_{sat}=J=2 in)$ 1D) the magnetization is about 10% from saturation at this tem perature. The staggered susceptibility is peaked at h = 0, rejecting the fact that the staggered spin-spin correlation function for spin components parallel to the external eld is dominant only in the absence of a eld. In the case of Solution A simulations, the e ect of increasing from 0 is an initial small drop in int [M] for eldsh < 0:8 and a small increase at higher elds. There is a substantial increase in int [s] for weak elds. As is further increased there is a small increase in $_{int} M$] also for weak elds. In contrast, with Solution B increasing

has favorable e ects on both autocorrelation times up to the highest studied here. The e ects are very small for high elds, how ever, since there the autocorrelation time is already close to its lower bound 0.5 when = 0. For all -values, the autocorrelation times are considerably shorter with Solution B than with Solution A. This shows that the strategy of decreasing the probability of the bounce processes in the operator-loop construction is working. The e ects are particularly pronounced at



FIG.15: Bounce probabilities in Solution A and B simulations of an N = 64 H eisenberg chains at = 16, using di erent values of .

and close to h = 0, where the shortest autocorrelation times with Solution B are only about 10% of those with Solution A.

In Fig. 15 we show the probability of bounces in the simulations (P_{bounce} is the fraction of bounces, including length-0 bops). The behavior releases that of the autocorrelation times. With Solution B, P_{bounce} decreases monotonically with for all edds, whereas with Solution A the behavior is non-monotonic. In Solution B, the vanishing of P_{bounce} both in the limitsh! 0 and h! $h_{sat}=J$ (at T = 0) follows by construction, as discussed in Sec. II. With Solution A the bounce rate is large in these limits.

For weak elds, a small > 0 has favorable e ects on the magnetization autocorrelations both with solution A and B. In the case of Solution B, both int M and int [s]continue to decrease also when 1, as seen in Figs. 13 and 14. Nevertheless, it is not practical to use a very large since the average expansion order hni (and hence the operator sequence size M) has a contribution N_b, and there is a similar increase in the number of operations needed to carry out one MCS. However, Figs. 13 and 14 indicate that even a small value, (1=4), givesa signi cant im provem ent of the magnetization autocorrelations relative to = 0 simulations. We nd that this behavior persists also for larger system sizes and lower tem peratures. Fig. 16 shows int M] for dierent system sizes N at inverse tem perature = N = 4, using both

= 0 and 1=4. The advantage of = 1=4 becomes more pronounced with increasing system size. For N = 128 the maximum $_{int} M$] is reduced by about 50% for both Solution A and B. The relative advantage of Solution B



FIG.16: Integrated autocorrelation times for the magnetization in simulations of chains of di erent lengths N at inverse temperature = N = 4. The inset shows the magnetization.

over A is again the most dram atic in the lim it h ! 0. In both solutions, the autocorrelation time is rather strongly peaked, with the peak position for the largest systems at slightly higher elds for Solution B. The reason for this type of eld dependence is not clear and deserves further study. It cannot be ruled out that a still more e cient directed loop solution could be found at interm ediate eld strengths (which would im ply that m inim izing the bounce probability does not necessarily lead to the m ost e cient algorithm).

W hen the tem perature becom es sm all com pared to the nite-size gaps in the system, a step structure in the magnetization versus eld curve can be clearly resolved, as is shown in Fig. 17(a). These steps are also re ected in the autocorrelation time, as shown in Fig. 17(b). There are sharp maxim as in the regions where the magnetization switches between two values. Exactly at T = 0, the autocorrelation function (44) for the magnetization is ill-de ned, since there are then no uctuations in M on the magnetization plateaus. However, we nd that the limit T ! 0 is well-behaved in the simulations. Exactly at the switching elds, int [M] appears to diverge, how ever, show ing that tunneling between the two equal-probability magnetization sectors becomes rare. Fig. 17 (c) shows the average size of the operator-loops. There are maxim a at the switching elds, with the peak heights growing as the tem perature is lowered. On the plateaus, the loop size does not change much with . A divergence of the average loop size with at the switching



FIG.17: M agnetization vs eld of an N = 64 chain (a), the corresponding integrated autocorrelation time (b), and the average size of the operator-loops (c). Solid and open circles show results at = 64 and 128, respectively. The simulations were carried out with Solution B of the directed loop equation with = 1=4.

elds can be expected, since in order for the magnetization to change, the loop has to wrap around the system in the SSE propagation (or imaginary time) direction, which is of length . The convergence of the average loop size on the plateaus can be understood on the sam e grounds. A part from the oscillations, there is also a signi cant increase in the loop size as the eld increases.

D istributions of loop sizes at = 128 are shown in Fig. 18 for eld strengths corresponding to magnetization plateaus (h=J = 0 and 0:14) and switching elds (h=J = 0:07 and 0:21). At h = 0, there are no bounce processes and this appears to be re ected as a qualitatively di erent loop size distribution than for h > 0, with no very large loops and a larger probability of sizes in the range 2^8 2^{11} . For all elds, there is a quite sharp crossover beyond which the probability becomes very small. Problem s with loops that do not close [39, 44] are therefore absent in this case. We did not have to impose any maximum size during the loop construction in any of the simulations discussed in this paper.

In the studies of the 1D H eisenberg model in a eld that we have presented here, the new Solution B is clearly better than Solution A, although the di erence is very large only for h close to 0 (but signi cant also for h !



FIG.18: Loops size distribution for N = 64 chains at = 128 and di erent eld strengths (Solution B simulations with = 1=4). P (m) is the cumulative probability of loop sizes between 2^m (0 for m = 0) and 2^{m+1} 1.

 h_{sat}). A lready with solution A the autocorrelation time for the magnetization is very short compared to other approaches. W ith the continuous-time worm algorithm int M] is close to 100 even for system sizes as small as N = 10 and N = 20 [40].

B. SSE sim ulations in 2D

For the 2D XXZ-m odel (on periodic L \perp L lattices), we have calculated autocorrelation times versus the eld strength in system s with isotropic couplings (= 1,0

h $h_{\text{sat}} = 4J$, Ising-anisotropic systems in zero eld (1, h = 0), and the XY-model in zero and nite eld (= 0, h=J = 0;1=2).

Fig. 19 shows the eld dependence of the autocorrelation time for the magnetization of L = 16 and L = 32system s at inverse tem perature = 8. W ith Solution A at = 0, a sharp drop in the autocorrelation time can be noted im m ediately when h becom es non-zero. It is not surprising that the algorithm at h = 0 is inefcient, since the only processes occurring here are the switch-and-reverse and the bounce (see Fig. 3). The bounce probability is high if it is not excluded \by hand", which would yield the much more e cient determ inistic loop rules. W ith the bounce included, the actual closed loop is still determ inistic but during its construction the propagating open end oscillates random ly back and forth along the defacto determ inistic trajectory until the loop closes or is annihilated via back-tracking all the way to the starting point. Once h is non-zero, the loops becom e m anifestly non-determ inistic (since an additional vertex path becom es allowed) and apparently, as seen in Fig. 19, even for a very small h the simulation is much more e cient. This is in contrast to the 1D case (see



FIG.19: Integrated autocorrelation times for the magnetization in simulations of the 2D Heisenberg model in a magnetic eld, using Solution A (circles) and B (squares) and constants = 0 (lled symbols) and 1=4 (open symbols). The inset shows the magnetization (the di erences in M between L = 16 and L = 32 are very sm all at the inverse temperature = 8 used here).

Fig. 16), where Solution A with = 0 is reasonably efcient even for h = 0 and int M] increases when h is turned on. This di erence between the 1D and 2D sim ulations may be related to the loop sizes (although the full explanation probably is more complex and related to the di erent physical properties of the system s, which are rejected in the loop structures). In 1D, the loops are relatively sm all, and for a sm all h a large fraction of the constructed loops are then identical to the determ inistic ones at h = 0. In 2D the bops are much larger, and then even a small h can allow most paths to \escape" from the h = 0 determ inistic loop trajectories so that there are not as m any propagations back and forth along the same path as at h = 0. Using a non-zero also m akes the path non-determ inistic, and Fig. 19 shows very favorable e ect of using = 1=4 in Solution A at h = 0. For higher elds, there are only very m inor advantages of a non-zero, which is also in contrast to the 1D case. A s in the 1D case, Solution B reduces the autocorrelation tim es very signi cantly at weak elds, and substantially also at higher elds. The di erences between = 0 and 1=4 in Solution B are smallat all elds, how ever.

Fig. 20 shows autocorrelation times for the staggered susceptibility of Ising-anisotropic systems in zero eld at = 8. Solution B performs signi cantly better than Solution A for < 1:5, but only marginally better at



FIG. 20: Integrated autocorrelation times for the staggered susceptibility in simulations of the 2D anisotropic Heisenberg model at = 8. The symbols indicate Solutions A, B, and = 0;1=4 in the same way as in Fig. 19.



FIG. 21: Upper panel: Bounce probabilities in simulations of a 32 32 anisotropic Heisenberg model at = 8. Lower panel: The average loop size in the same simulations.

higher . In this system = 0 implies that the closed loops are defacto determ inistic for all anisotropies (the only allow ed = 0 vertex processes are again the bounce and the switch-and-reverse). How ever, the symmetry of

ipping and ipping back loops is broken when > 1 and the defacto xed structure of the closed loops is not taken into account during their construction, neither with Solution A nor B (doing this would correspond to neglecting the bounces, constructing a determ inistic loop and then taking into account in a M etropolis acceptance probability for actually ipping the loop, in a way analogous to what has been done with the standard world-line loop method for weak magnetic elds [25]). Solution B minim izes the bounce probability and hence leads to m ore directed paths and, therefore, closing of the loops in fewer steps (and hence a larger num ber of com pleted loop in an MCS as de ned here). Bounce probabilities are shown in the upper panel of Fig. 21. W hen > 0 the bops become manifestly non-determ inistic, leading to signi cantly reduced autocorrelation times. The bounce probabilities are also reduced, but for both solutions P_{bounce} still becom es large as is increased. N evertheless, the autocorrelation times continue to decrease. We do not expect this to be the case as ! 1, where the model at xed

reduces to the classical Ising antiferrom agnet at tem perature T ! 0. In that lim it, a classical single-spin ip would correspond to ipping spins on all SSE vertices on a given site (the number of which scales as), which would be a slow process since the bounce probability is high. The lower panel of Fig. 21 shows that the average loop size becom es very small for large . The algorithm clearly does not reduce to a classical Swendsen-W ang or Wol cluster algorithm as ! 1 (in the classical algorithm s the cluster size ! N as T ! 0). However, at higher tem peratures the algorithm could easily be supplem ented with a cluster update which corresponds exactly to the classical one (a multi-spin generalization of the ips of \free" spins, where clusters of spins connected to each other by operators in S_M can be ipped simultaneously without changing the weight if = 0 and h = 0). As in the standard world-line loop algorithm [49], it is also possible to include loop-freezing in the determ inistic operator-loop algorithm .

Note that there is essentially no structure in the Solution B autocorrelation time for = 1=4 in Fig.20, in spite of the fact that the scan over anisotropies should cross an Ising-type transition to an ordered state. At = 3 the antiferrom agnetic order is already at 97% of the maximum (classical T = 0) value, as can be inferred from the insets of Fig.20 by using Eq. (48).

For the XY-model (= 0), the directed loop equations have a solution without bounces for all elds up to the saturation eld. We not that the resulting algorithm is very e cient, with autocorrelation times smaller than one for all system sizes and temperatures that we have studied. Fig. 22 shows results for the spin sti ness as a function of temperature for zero eld as well as at h=J = 0.5. The corresponding autocorrelation times are



FIG.22: Spin sti ness of the X Y -m odel at zero external eld (upper panel) and at h=J = 0.5 (lower panel). The insets show the corresponding integrated autocorrelation times. Solution B with $= _{m in}$ (see Table I) was used in all cases.

peaked around the K osterlitz-T houless (K T) transition temperature but do not grow with the system size. The K T transition in the h = 0 system has been studied to high accuracy using a continuous-time world-line loop algorithm, with the result $T_{K\,T}$ =J 0.342 [24]. Our h = 0 data are in complete agreement with the previous results. W e nd that the data for h = 0.5 shown in Fig. 22 can be collapsed onto the h = 0 data if T and s are both scaled by the same factor (1.05 for h=J = 0.5), in accord with the universality of the transition. M ore extensive results for this model will be presented elsewhere.

C. PIM simulations

Next we will show some results for autocorrelation times obtained using the PIM in plementation of the directed loop algorithm. To make a reasonable comparison with the autocorrelation times for the SSE, we will also in the PIM de ne a MCS so that it includes N₁ loops, where N₁ is determined such that on average the total path length, excluding the rst path segment im mediately following each bounce, of all N₁ loops in an MCS is equal to N; the space-time volume (in the PIM, each path segment has a length in imaginary time, in contrast to the SSE where the steps are just counted). This de nition is chosen so that it corresponds reasonably closely to the de nition used in the SSE. However, it could be argued that a better de nition of the total path length would be to add all the path segments but



FIG. 23: Upper panel: Integrated autocorrelation times vs external eld for the magnetization (solid circles) and staggered susceptibility (open circles) in PIM simulations of an N = 64 Heisenberg chain at = 16. Lower panel: Bounce probability vs external eld in the same simulation.

instead of excluding the segment immediately following a bounce one would subtract the part of the path immediately following a bounce that overlaps with the path segment preceding the bounce (with special care taken for consecutive bounces). This would more accurately take into account the fraction of spins actually ipped. We have here used the rst de nition of the MCS as it corresponds more closely to how we de ne an MCS in the SSE method (where a di erent treatment of the bounces could of course also be implemented see Sec. HD).

Generally speaking the computer in plementation of the PIM is more complex than SSE, as it is always necessary to keep track of the spin states on neighboring sites in the PIM. This is not required in the SSE formulation, where the vertices contain all the information needed. Therefore our computer code for the PIM is not as e cient as the SSE code in generating a single MCS, and so we will be content in this section to show just a few PIM autocorrelation results. As Solution A of the directed loop equations was already shown above to be much less e ective than Solution B, we will in this section just show results for Solution B.

Fig. 23 shows the integrated autocorrelation times $\inf M$]and $\inf [s]$ for a 64-site H eisenberg chain (= 1) at inverse temperature = 16 as functions of the m agnetic eld. Comparing with the SSE results in Figs. 13 and 14, it is seen that $\inf M$] is comparable to the = 1 case while $\inf [s]$ is more similar to the = 0 curve, except close to h = 0 where it also behaves more like the



FIG.24: Field dependence of the integrated autocorrelation times for the magnetization in PIM simulations of chains of di erent lengths N at inverse temperature = N = 4.

= 1 case. The lower panel of Fig. 23 shows the eld dependence of the bounce probability. P_{bounce} is here dened as the num ber of bounces divided by the totalnum ber of times the path building changes, either by moving to a neighbor size or by back-tracking. This measure is not directly comparable to the de nition in the SSE case, as the moves c and c⁰, where the path continues on the same size, are not counted in the denom inator of P_{bounce} (they are in nitely many in the PIM). Nevertheless, the general behavior of P_{bounce} versus h is the same for the two m ethods.

In Fig. 24 we have plotted int M] as a function of magnetic eld for di erent chain sizes N. In all cases = N = 4. As in the SSE case (Fig. 16) we see an increase in int M] with system size for small to intermediate elds. However, the maximum P M autocorrelation times are about 50% smaller than in the SSE = 1=4 case.

We have also carried out simulations of the 2D H eisenberg model using the PIM. In Fig. 25 we show results for int M] for a 16 16 lattice at = 8. Here the behavior is almost identical to the SSE results shown in Fig. 19, where there is only a small dependence on .

From these examples it can be seen that the PIM generally has shorter autocorrelation times than SSE in cases where the SSE results show a signi cant dependence on the constant $\$. In some sense the PIM corresponds to ! 1 lim it of SSE, as in this lim it the continuethe straight processes also dom inate the loop construction in SSE. In cases where the SSE autocorrelations converge slowly to their = 1 lim it the PIM approach may hence be more e cient (since in SSE the computation time for one MCS grows linearly with in this lim it). However, in assessing a method's e ciency one should also take into account the cost of perform ing a single MCS. This of course depends heavily on the actual com puter in plem entation of the directed loop algorithm. That is, what



FIG.25: Integrated autocorrelation times (PIM) vs external eld for the magnetization of an 16 16 H eisenberg square lattice at = 8.

kind of data structures are used to represent the spin and vertex con gurations, what kind of search algorithm s are used for nding spin states at a given time in the P M, e.t.c. W hile we do not attempt to compare the P M and SSE in this respect here, it is quite clear that it is often easier to nd a fast and e ective in plementation for the SSE than for the P M. We also note that the convergence to the ! 1 limit in the SSE is relatively fast in all cases we have studied so far. The convergence appears to be slowest in 1D, but even there the reduction of the autocorrelation times become s small beyond = 1, where they are similar to the P M autocorrelations.

D. Dynam ic exponent

A n interesting question is how the autocorrelation time diverges with the system size in simulations at a critical point. The 1D H eisenberg model at h = 0;T = 0 exhibits power-law (1=r) decay of the staggered spin-spin correlation function and is a hence a quantum critical system [50]. We have studied the integrated autocorrelation time for the staggered spin susceptibility in this model as the system size N is increased and the inverse temperature = N = 4. The staggered susceptibility should couple to

the slowest mode of the simulation, and its autocorrelation time is therefore expected to diverge asymptotically according to a power law;

$$int[s]$$
^z; (50)

where z is the dynam ic exponent of the simulation. Note that it is here essential that and N are taken to in nity at a xed ratio (as the physical dynam ic critical exponent relating space and im aginary time is 1). It is interesting to compare SSE simulations with Solution B at di erent



FIG.26: A utocorrelation times for the staggered susceptibility of the isotropic Heisenberg chain at = N = 4 obtained in SSE and PIM simulations with Solution B. The dashed line has slope 0:75.

-values (we do not consider solution A here since it is much less e cient than Solution B). It is also interesting to compare the two possible ways of ipping the bops when = 0. At h = 0; = 0, Solution B reduces to the determ inistic operator-loop [18]. As discussed in Sec. II D, instead of constructing a xed number of bops per M CS at random, all bops can then be constructed and ipped independently of each other with probability 1=2. This is analogous to the Swendsen-W ang [46] algorithm for the classical Ising m odel. For the Ising m odel, it is known that it is more e cient (i.e., z is smaller) to construct the clusters one-by-one using the W ol algorithm [45].

In Fig. 26 we show results of Solution B simulations with = 0 and 1=4 along with results from = 0 sim ulations were all clusters were constructed. The autocorrelation times of the two $= 0 \sin u$ lations are very sim ilar, but for large system sm arginally shorter when all clusters are constructed. Hence, there is here no advantage in constructing the clusters one-by-one. This is most likely related to the fact that in order to change the loop structure in the SSE simulations at h = 0; = 0, diagonal updates also have to be carried out. In the scheme used here, diagonal updates are only performed at the beginning of each MCS, and hence the same loop can be constructed several times in one MCS if they are constructed at random. It is then more e cient to construct all bops once. In order to achieve an advantage sim ilar to the W ol algorithm, one would have to construct a new schem e for the diagonal updates, which certainly could be possible but which we have not yet attempted. As in the other cases we have discussed above, there is a signi cant improvement when = 1=4 is used in Solution B. How-



FIG. 27: SSE autocorrelation times for the staggered and uniform susceptibility of the Heisenberg bilayer close to its quantum critical point ($J_2 = J = 2.5225$ was used). The inverse temperature = L=J.

ever, the dynam ic exponent appears to be the same in all cases; z 0:75. In Fig. 26 we also show PIM results. It is clear that the autocorrelation times here are signi cantly shorter but most likely the dynam ic exponent is the same as in SSE. The shorter PIM autocorrelation times are consistent with the 1D results shown above in Secs. V A and C, and clearly we could also reduce the SSE autocorrelations by increasing further.

In 2D, a well studied quantum critical system is the Heisenberg model on two coupled layers (bilayer), with intra-plane coupling J and inter-plane coupling J_2 ? [51]. The T = 0 antiferrom agnetic long-range order in this model vanishes at a critical inter-plane coupling 2:525 [28]. Some autocorrelation results for $(J_2 = J)_c$ both SSE and P IM simulations of this model at $J_2 = J =$ 2:524 have been presented recently [44] and indicate that the dynamic exponent z 0 in both methods. Our m ost recent simulations indicate that $(J_2 = J)_c$ 2:5225, i.e., slightly lover than the previous estimate [28]. In Fig. 27 we show integrated autocorrelation times for several quantities at this coupling, using both = 0 and 1=4 in Solution B simulations. In the = 0 case, all clusters were constructed in each MCS.We again note signi cant shorter autocorrelation times in the non-determ inistic simulation (= 1=4). However, the determ inistic sim ulation is signi cantly faster. One determ inistic MCS at = 0 typically only requires 50 60% of the CPU time of a generic Solution B M C S at = 1=4. The net gain in simulation e ciency with > 0 is therefore only marginal in this case. All our results are consistent with z = 0, although with = 0 the convergence to a size-independent behavior is rather slow. We have not carried out PIM simulations of this system .

Next we consider the 3D Heisenberg model, which un-



FIG.28: A utocorrelation times for the staggered susceptibility and the spin sti ness of the 3D H eisenberg m odel close to its critical temperature (T=J = 0.944 was used). The lines correspond to scaling $L^{1=4}$.

dergoes a phase transition to an antiferrom agnetic state at a non-zero tem perature [52]. A coording to recent SSE simulations, using system s with $N = L^3$ sites and L up to 16, the critical tem perature $T_c=J = 0.946 \quad 0.001$ [53]. These simulations were carried out using only local updates. W ith the operator-loop update, much larger system s can be studied. W e have carried out simulations for L up to 48 close to the critical tem perature. Based on the results, we believe that T_c is at the low end of the previous estimate, likely very close to 0:944. Fig. 28 shows autocorrelation times for the staggered susceptibility and the spin sti ness at T = J = 0.944, obtained using the determ inistic SSE algorithm with = 0 (constructing all clusters during each MCS) and Solution B with = 1=4. Here the = 0 results are initially consistent with a dynam ic exponent z 0.25, but for the largest sizes there seems to be a change in behavior, possibly a convergence corresponding to z = 0. The = 1=4 sim ulation is fullyconsistent with z = 0.

VI. LOW -FIELD MAGNETIZATION OF THE 2D HEISENBERG MODEL

A s an example of an application m ade possible with Solution B of the directed loop equations, we here present SSE simulation results for the 2D H eisenberg m odel in a weak magnetic eld. At very low temperatures, the eld dependence of the magnetization exhibits a step-structure due to the gaps between the lowest-energy states with magnetization $m_z = 0$; 1; 2;::: N=2. These gaps can be extracted from the calculated magnetization curve. For the isotropic H eisenberg m odel, the



FIG. 29: Total magnetization vs external eld in the 2D H eisenberg model with L = 64 at two inverse temperatures. The curves were calculated using four tted energies E $_{\rm L}$ (S) (the same for both curves).

gaps are exactly the gaps between the degenerate spin m ultiplets with total spin S = 0;1;::: in the absence of the eld.

In an antiferrom agnetically ordered system, such as the 2D Heisenberg model, the energies of the S > 0 multiplets relative to the S = 0 ground state should correspond to the excitations of a quantum rotor when S N. The over-allenergy scale can be related to the uniform (transverse) m agnetic susceptibility [54]:

$$E(S) = \frac{S(S+1)}{2L^2};$$
 (51)

where L^2 = N . The asymptotic validity of this relation has been veried using quantum M onte Carlo estimates for small S and L up to 16 [55, 56]. Recently, a slow convergence of the spectrum for S $\,$ L was been pointed out for the 2D H eisenberg m odel with spin-1=2 [56]. A system atic study of E $_{\rm L}$ (S) for system s larger than L = 16 was not possible, how ever, because of the large statistical errors in the energy di erences.

W ith the directed loop algorithm we can instead extract the energy gaps using the eld dependence of the m agnetization. As we have shown in Sec. V, the new Solution B shortens the autocorrelation times very signi cantly for low elds, which is what we need in order to accurately extract the energy levels for S ranging from 0 to L. W e will present our com plete results of such calculations elsewhere. Here we will dem onstrate the power of the new method by focusing on the rst few levels for system sizes L up to 64, i.e., the num ber of spins is 16 tim es larger than in the previous studies [55, 56].

In order to see the step-structure needed to extract the energy levels E $_{\rm L}$ (S) for sm all S , the tem perature has to

be below the S = 1 gap, which according to Eq. (51) and previous estimates of the susceptibility ($_{?}$ 0:065=J) is approximately 0:004=J for L = 64. In practice, we have used inverse temperatures corresponding to roughly 1=10 of the gap. We have tted the numerical results to a magnetization curve hm_zi calculated using energy levels of the form

$$E_{L}(S;m_{z}) = E_{L}(S) \quad hm_{z}; m_{z} = 0; 1; ::: S; (52)$$

at the sam e tem perature as in the simulations. We adjust the energies E_L (S) to give the best m atch between the calculated and theoretical magnetization curves. Fig. 29 shows results for L = 64 at = 2048 and 4096. We used the same tted levels E_L (S) at both tem peratures (clearly, the S = 1 level completely dom inates the = 4096 results, which include only the rst magnetization step). As in Ref. 56, we de ne a spin-and size-dependent susceptibility using the energy levels E_L (S) obtained in this tting procedure;

$$\frac{1}{2_{\rm L,S}} = \frac{L^2 E_{\rm L} (S)}{S (S+1)};$$
(53)

and extrapolate data for xed S to in nite size in order to determ ine the therm odynam ic susceptibility $_{?}$. Fig. 30 shows our results for S = 1;2;3 and system sizes ranging from L = 8 to L = 64. The results up to L = 16 agree very well with those presented previously [56], but our statistical errors are considerably smaller. The collapse of the three curves onto each other for large system s demonstrate the validity of Eq. (51) for small S. Extrapolating the three data sets to in nite size gives the susceptibility $_{?}$ = 0:0659 0:0002, again in good agreem ent with R ef. 56 but with a considerably reduced statistical error.

For the L = 64 simulations at = 4096, the CPU time needed to perform one MCS is approximately 40s on an IntelPentium III running at 866 M hz. The results shown in Fig. 29 are based on 3 8 10 MCS for each data point.

VII. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have introduced the concept of directed loops in stochastic series expansion and path integral quantum M onte C arlo and in plemented them for simulations of the S = $1=2 \times X \times Z$ -m odel in an external magnetic edd. The directionality of the loop rejects the asymmetry between the operation of ipping the spins along the loop and the reverse operation of ipping back those spins. Such an asymmetry is not present in the standard worldline loop algorithm [4, 16, 49], which as a consequence is restricted to certain regions of parameter space. Quite generally, there is a hierarchy of three classes of directed loops. In the most general case the loop can back track during construction. In some regions of the parameter space the back tracking can be excluded, and in some



FIG. 30: Inverse susceptibility extracted using the energies of the S = 1;2, and 3 multiplets. The curves are quadratic ts.

further restricted regions the loops become symmetric (non-directional) and reduce to the type of loops previously considered for world-line [4, 16, 17] and SSE [18] simulations. Hence, the directed loop framework constitutes a natural generalization of the loop-cluster concept [16]. We have shown that the transitions between the di erent levels of the hierarchy can be made smooth by minimizing the probability of back-tracking when solving the directed loop equations. We have also demonstrated that the algorithm based on this solution works very well in the full parameter space of the X X Z-m odel.

Our scheme appears to be much more e cient than the worm algorithm for continuous-time path integral simulations $[\beta]$, which also is applicable in the full parameter space but does not exhibit the three-level hierarchy of the directed loops (at least not in its current form ulation). The con guration space involving two moving discontinuities was used rst in the worm algorithm for the purpose of measuring o -diagonal correlation functions (G recen's functions). It was also the st method that was practically useful in the presence of external elds. It is, how ever, not the presence of the discontinuities that makes the worm algorithm and SSE operator-loop [18] algorithm applicable in the presence of external elds. One can also think of the construction of the standard worldline loops [16, 49] in term s of m oving discontinuities, but they are more constrained in their motion and therefore cannot take external elds into account. Hence, it is the rules for moving the discontinuities that determ ine whether or not a loop or worm simulation is e cient. The directed loop equations constitute a fram ework for optimizing these rules. Below we will comment on the sim ilarities and di erences between worms and directed loops.

The operator-bop update previously constructed for

SSE simulations [18] corresponds to a particular solution (A) of the directed loop equations. We have here constructed a di erent solution (B), which minimizes the probability of back tracking in the loop construction and therefore is more e cient. The new solution B completely eliminates back-tracking (bounce processes) in the X X Z-m odel for z-anisotropies 1 < < 1 up to a nite external eld h (up to the saturation eld for = 0and only exactly at h = 0 for j = 1). In other interesting param eter regions the bounce probability is typically a few percent or less. Our simulation results show that the new solution can decrease the autocorrelation times by up to an order of magnitude or more in cases where Solution A is the least e cient (at weak and interm ediate magnetic elds and anisotropies). The algorithm ic discontinuity of the previous approach (which am ounted to using a very e cient determ inistic algorithm at h = 0and the much less e cient generic Solution A for h > 0) is hence avoided with Solution B, where the bounce probabilities and the autocorrelation times smoothly connect to those of the determ inistic algorithm . How ever, our results also indicate that the determ inistic loop construction at h = 0 is not always the most e cient. W ith a non-determ inistic solution (Solution B with the constant

> 0 in the bond operator) the operator paths becomes more random , which has a favorable e ect on the auto-correlations.

In addition to being more e cient in term softhe autocorrelation times measured in units of our de ned MCS, Solution B is also typically faster as the num ber of operations required to perform one MCS is smaller (because of the smaller bounce probability). In terms of ease of im plem entation, Solution A is more straight-forward as it is directly given in term s of matrix elements of bondoperators. In order to implement Solution B for a new Ham iltonian, one rst has to investigate the subclasses of vertices with their directed loop segments and then m in im ize the bounce probabilities for all non-equivalent classes. SSE with Solution A (and other special solutions for Heisenberg and XY-models) have already been used for a number of di erent lattices and Ham iltonians [26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43], but so far we have only investigated Solution B for the XXZ-m odel discussed in this paper. W e expect generalizations to a wide range of other models to be relatively straight-forward.

In the continuous-tim e path integral, Solution B of the directed loop equations for zero eld and jj = 1 results in an algorithm identical to the standard world-line loop algorithm [4, 49]. The generic algorithm, which includes a probability of back-tracking as the loop is constructed, has some features in common with the worm algorithm [3]. The extended con guration space with an open world-line segment (the worm) is the same in the two m ethods (and is analogous also in the SSE operator-loop construction, although the representation there is discrete rather than continuous). How ever, there are im – portant di erences in the actual processes used to prop-

agate the path (or worm). In the worm algorithm the \jum p" and \reconnection" procedures involve the creation or annihilation of a kink, in which one of the worm ends jum ps from one site to another and spins are ipped on nite equal-length segments of imaginary time at both the initial and nalsites [3]. The location in time of the worm end does not change in these processes, but is accomplished in separate updates. In the PIM directed loop scheme, the movement in imaginary time and the creation (or annihilation) of a kink is combined, and in each step spins are ipped on a nite segment of im aginary time at a single site only. This dynam ics follows naturally from the vertex-representation introduced for the SSE operator-loop algorithm [18], where a single spin is ipped on a link connecting two vertices and the possible sites (the same or a speci c neighbor site) and direction (forward or backward) for the next step is dictated by the four legs of the vertex. Here we have directly translated this dynam ics into the path integral simulation by borrowing ides from the continuous-time loop algorithm [4]. The simulation dynamics is hence di erent from the worm algorithm, and the worm algorithm does not correspond to a solution of the directed loop equations. Our autocorrelation results show that the directed loop scheme is much more e cient than the worms in simulations of the Heisenberg chain in a magnetic eld, for which our measured autocorrelation times for small system s are alm ost two orders of m agnitude sm aller than those reported for the worm algorithm [40]. We expect the superior perform ance of the directed loop scheme to be quite general, as the bounce minimization achieved with Solution B has no counterpart in the worm algorithm (although it may be possible to develop a generalization). There are, how ever, very interesting aspects of the worm scheme which could also perhaps be incorporated for the directed loops, e.g., the space-tim e potential introduced in order to more e ciently measure G reen's functions at long distances [3].

Comparing implementations of the directed loops within the SSE and PIM representations, one di erence is that in the form er there is an adjustable param eter (a constant added to the bond H am iltonian operators) which is not present in the latter. We have noted that a non-zero has generally favorable e ects on the autocorrelations in the SSE, but a large value is not practical since the computation time also increases with . In some sense, the PIM corresponds to SSE with ! 1, and one might therefore expect the PIM implementation to be more e cient. However, in practice the opposite is often true since already a sm all in the SSE can give autocorrelation times close to the ! 1 limit, and the com putation time for one MCS can be signi cantly shorter in SSE.PM algorithms should be more e cient in cases where the diagonal part of the Ham iltonian dom inates in the internal energy, as the PIM con gurations (which do not contain diagonal operators) then are sm aller than the corresponding SSE con gurations [47]. Another im portant aspect is the ease of im plem entation and optim ization of the simulations for various models. We have found the discrete nature of the SSE con guration space, where the vertices locally contain all information needed to construct the loops, to be a distinct advantage in this respect.

An interesting question is whether the directed-loop approach could be used to further extend the applicability of the meron concept [21] for solving sign problem s. We have shown that for the XXZ modelback-tracking in the loop construction can be avoided in a larger region of the parameter space than where the loop-algorithm spreviously used for studying merons are applicable (specifically, at non-zero external elds in XY-anisotropic system s). The possibility of generalizing the meron concept to the whole non-back-tracking region should be investigated.

A cknow ledgm ents

W e thank K.Harada and N.Kawashin a for pointing out an error in region V of Table I and Figure 9 in an earlier version of this article. AW S would like to thank P.Henelius and M. Troyer for discussions. Both authors acknow ledge support from a Nordic network project on Strongly Correlated Electrons at NORD ITA.AW S also acknow ledges support from the A cadem y of Finland (project 26175) and the V aisala Foundation.

APPENDIX A: PROGRAM IM PLEMENTATION OF THE SSE METHOD

The computer in plementation of a simulation method can of course be done in several dierent ways and is an issuemore technical in nature than them athem atical definition of the underlying algorithm. Nevertheless, for the benet of readers wishing to quickly construct a simple but e cient simulation program, we here brie y outline the basic aspects of our implementation of the SSE algorithm with the operator-loop update. Some program s are also available online [57].

We rst introduce the main data structures used to store the SSE con guration in computer memory. The state j i is stored as Spin[s] = 1 representing the up and down spins at the sites s (s = 1; :::; N). The operator-index sequence S_M can be packed into an array Sm [j] (j = 0;:::;M 1), with Sm [j] = 2b and Sm [j] = 2b+1 (b=1;:::;Nb) corresponding to diagonal and o diagonal bond-b operators, respectively, and Sm[j] = 0representing 11-in unit operators. The lattice geometry can be coded into a list of sites i(b); j(b) connected by the bonds b, i.e., Site[1;b] = i(b), Site[2;b] = j(b). The linked vertices are stored in the form of two lists, one containing the links and one the vertex types. The vertex types V tx $[p] = 1; \dots; 6$ $(p = 0; \dots; n = 1)$ correspond to the six vertices shown in Fig. 1. The links Link [j] (j = 0; :::; 4n = 1) are arranged such that Link[4p + i]

29

(p = 0; :::; n = 1, i = 0; 1; 2; 3) contains the link (which is an integer referring to another element in Link) for leg i + 1 of vertex p [the leg numbers 1; 2; 3; 4 are de ned in Eq. (19)]. The double-linked nature of the list im plies that if Link [a] = b then Link [b] = a.

The diagonal update is straight-forward: For j =0;:::;M 1, a bond b is generated at random for each Sm[j] = 0, which is changed to Sm[j] = 2b with the probability (14). If the change is made, the num ber of bond-operators present increases by 1, i.e., n ! n + 1. For each diagonal element, i.e., Sm [j] > 0 and even, the change to Sm[j] = 0 and n ! n = 1 is carried out with the probability (15), where b = Sm[j]=2. If Sm [j] is an odd integer it corresponds to an o -diagonal operator at bond b = Sm [j]=2 and the corresponding spin states should propagated, i.e., for a = 1;2,Spin [Site[a;b]]! Spin [Site[a;b]], in order for the matrix elements in Eqs. (14) and (15) to be available as needed.

To understand the implementation of the linked vertex list, it is useful to keep in m ind Fig. 2 and the num bering of the vertex legs exemplied in Eq. (19). In order to construct the lists Link and V tx, two tem porary arrays F irst[s] and Last[s] ($s = 1; \dots; N$) are needed. First[s] will contain the rst vertex leg on site s, i.e., F irst[s] = 4p + i m eans that the rst operator acting on site s is the pth bond-operator (p = 0; ...; n)1) in Sm and the vertex leg acting on the site is l = i + 1(where 1 will always be 1 or 2, as these are the legs before the operator has acted). In an analogous way, Last[s] = 4p + i refers to the last operator acting on site s (where l = i + 1 now will always be 3 or 4, since these are the legs after the operator has acted). All elements are initialized to F irst[s] = Last[s] = 1 before the construction of the linked list starts. W hereas F irst[s] will be set at most once (never if no operator acts on site s), Last[s] can be updated several times as the operator list Sm [j] is searched from j = 0 to M 1. For each Sm [j] = 0, a counterp of the number (m inus 1) of bondoperators encountered is increm ented by 1 and the bond b = Sm [j]=2 is extracted, giving also the corresponding sites $s_0 = S$ ite [1;b] and $s_1 = S$ ite [2;b]. Links can be set whenever these sites have already been encountered, i.e., for $a = 0; 1, \text{ if } \text{Last}(s_a) \in 1, \text{Link}[4p + a] = \text{Last}[s_a]$ and $Link [Last[s_a]] = 4p + a$. The last occurrence is updated to $Last[s_a] = 4p + a + 2$. If, on the other hand, $Last(s_a) = 1$, only the last and rst occurrences are recorded, i.e., $Last[s_a] = 4p + a + 2$ and $First[s_a] =$ 4p + a. The spin list Spin is propagated whenever o diagonal operators are encountered, so that the vertex types V tx [p] can be recorded (using a map from four leg states to the integers 1;:::;6). A fler the whole list Sm has been traversed the list of rst occurrences is used in order to connect the links across the propagation boundary i.e., for each s for which Last[s] & 1, Link [Last[s]] = F irst[s] and Link [F irst[s]] = Last[s].

The loop update is repeated N₁ times. Each loop starts at a random position $j_0 2 f_0; \ldots; 4n$ 1g in the list Link.

We will move in Link and the current position will be referred to as j. We hence begin at $j = j_0$ and keep j_0 in order to check at each stage whether the loop has closed or not. The current position corresponds to vertex num ber p = j=4 and the leg index is $l_i = M OD(j;4)$ (we can now for convenience number the legs 0; :::; 3). This is the entrance leg, and the vertex type is V tx [p]. The exit probabilities given the entrance leg depend on the vertex type and should be stored in a pre-generated table. It is convenient to use a list of cumulative exit probabilities instead of the individual probabilities, so that for a given entrance leg l; the exit leg can be obtained by successively comparing the cumulative probabilities $P \operatorname{rob}[l_{i}; l_{i}; V \operatorname{tx}[p]]$ for exiting at leg $l_{i} = 0; \ldots; 3$ with a random number in the range [0;1]. A corresponding list with updated vertex types is also stored, so that after the exit leg has been xed the vertex is updated as V tx (p) ! N ew V tx [[;]; V tx [p]]. A fter this, the current position in Link is changed to the one corresponding to the exit leg, i.e., $j \neq 4p + 1_{e}$. The loop closes at this stage if $j = j_{0}$. If it does not close, we move to the leg linked to j, i.e., j! Link [j]. The loop closes also at this stage if $j = j_0$. The two di erent types of closings, from within the same vertex or from a di erent vertex, are illustrated in Fig.4.

A fter all the N₁ loops have been constructed this way, the updated vertex list V tx is mapped onto the corresponding new operator list Sm. The bond-indices do not change, and therefore one can simply cycle through the positions $j = 0; \dots; M$ 1 in the old list one-byone and for each non-zero occurrence extract the bond b = Sm [j]=2 and increment an operator counterp ! p+1 (the corresponding position in the vertex list V tx). The operator-type, diagonal or o -diagonal, can be coded in a list OpType[v] = 0;1, where v = 1;...;6 is the vertex type and 0;1 correspond to diagonal and o diagonal, respectively. The updated operator element is then Sm[j] = 2b + OpType[Vtx[p]]. The spin list Spin is updated using the list of rst occurrences that was generated during the construction of the linked list. For each site s, if F irst[s] = 1 no operator acts on that site and the spin can be ipped, Spin[s]! Spin [s], with probability 1=2.0 therw ise, the updated spin state is obtained by extracting the vertex number $p = F \operatorname{irst}[s]=4$ and the leg l = M OD (First[s];4) corresponding to the site in question. The corresponding spin state can be stored as a pre-generated map, so that Spin[s] ! L egSpin [L; V tx [p]].

We have now described all the basic procedures involved in carrying out one MCS using the general operator-loop update. In the special \determ inistic" cases, where the exit leg is given uniquely by the entrance leg, a number of rather self-evident and trivial simpli cations are possible (see discussion in Sec. II-D).

The possibility of aborting loop updates that become excessively long can be simply taken into account by exiting the loop update routine without m apping the already accomplished changes in the vertex list V tx back into a new operator list Sm and state Spin. For the XXZ- m odel the bops typically do not become excessively long in practice however, as was dem onstrated in a few exam - ples in Sec.V.

The expansion cut-o M is adjusted during equilibration of the simulation by keeping it at a $n_{m ax}$ where $n_{m ax}$ is the largest n reached so far in the simulation and a suitable value for the factor is a 1.25. The number

- [1] A.W. Sandvik and J.Kurkijarvi, Phys. Rev. B 43, 5950 (1991).
- [2] A.W. Sandvik, J. Phys. A 25, 3667 (1992).
- [3] N. V. Prokofev, B. V. Svistunov, and I. S. Tupitsyn, Pism a Zh. Eks. Teor. Fiz. 64, 853 (1996) [JETP Lett. 64, 911 (1996)]; Phys. Lett. A 238, 253 (1998); JETP 87, 311 (1998).
- [4] B.B.Beard and U.-J.W ieæ, Phys.Rev.Lett. 77, 5130 (1996).
- [5] S.M.A.Rombouts, K.Heyde, and N.Jachowicz, Phys. Rev.Lett. 82, 4155 (1999).
- [6] M. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. 56, 1454 (1976).
- [7] M. Suzuki, S. M iyashita, and A. Kuroda, Prog. Theor. Phys. 58, 1377 (1977).
- [B] M. Barm a and B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. B 18, 3351 (1977).
- [9] J.E.Hirsch, R.L.Sugar, D.J.Scalapino and R.B lankenbecler, Phys. Rev. B 26, 5033 (1982).
- [10] JJ. Cullen and D. P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B 27, 297 (1983).
- [11] R.B lankenbecler, D.J.Scalapino and R.L.Sugar, Phys. Rev.D 24, 2278 (1981).
- [L2] D.C.Handscomb, Proc.Cambridge Philos. Soc. 58, 594 (1962); 60, 115 (1964).
- [13] J.W .Lyklem a, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 88 (1982).
- [14] D.H.Lee, J.D.Joannopoulos, and J.W.Negele, Phys. Rev.B 30, 1599 (1984).
- [15] S.Chakravarty and D.B.Stein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 582 (1982).
- [16] H.G.Evertz, G.Lana, and M.Marcu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 875 (1993).
- [17] N.Kawashima, J.E.Gubernatis, and H.G.Evertz, Phys. Rev.B 50, 136 (1994); N.Kawashima and J.E.Gubernatis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1295 (1994).
- [18] A.W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. B 59, R14157 (1999).
- [19] O.F. Syljasen, Phys. Rev. B 61, R 846 (2000).
- [20] J.E.Hirsch and R.M.Fye, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 2521 (1986); R.M.Fye and R.T.Scalettar, Phys. Rev. B 36, 3833 (1987).
- [21] S.Chandrasekharan and U.J.W iese, Phys. Rev. Lett 83 3116 (1999).
- [22] J.Cox, C.Gattringer, K.Holland, B.Scarlet, and U.-J. W iese, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 83, 777 (2000).
- [23] P.Henelius and A.W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. B 62, 1102 (2000).
- [24] K.Harada and N.Kawashim a Phys.Rev.B 55, R11949 (1998).
- [25] M. Troyer and S. Sachdev Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5418 (1998).
- [26] A.W Sandvik and C.J.Hamer, Phys.Rev.B 60, 6588 (1999).
- [27] A.W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3069 (1999).

of bops N₁ is also adjusted during equilibration, to keep the average total number of vertices visited in one MCS close to some reasonable number, e.g., $2\ln i$, as discussed in Sec. IIB.W e will not discuss the procedures for measuring operator expectation values here, but published form s for several types of estimators [2, 41, 44] can be easily translated into the data structures used above.

- [28] P. V. Shevchenko, A. W. Sandvik, and O. P. Sushkov, Phys. Rev. B, 61, 3475 (2000).
- [29] S. W essel, B. Norm and, M. Sigrist, and S. Haas, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1086 (2001).
- [30] K. Kato, S. Todo, K. Harada, N. Kawashima, S. Miyashita, and H. Takayama, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 4204 (2000).
- [31] S. Sachdev, M. Troyer, and M. Vojta, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 2617 (2001).
- [32] A.W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. B 66, 024418 (2002).
- [33] S.W essel, M.O Ishanii, and S.H aas, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 206407 (2001).
- [34] S.Yunoki, Phys.Rev.B 65, 092402 (2002).
- [35] F. Hebert, G. G. Batrouni, R. T. Scalettar, G. Schmid, M. Troyer, and A. Domeich, Phys. Rev. B 65, 014513 (2002).
- [36] A.Domeich, W.Hanke, E.Arrigoni, M.Troyer, and S.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 057003 (2002).
- [37] G. Schmid, S. Todo, M. Troyer, and A. Domeich, Phys. Rev.Lett. 88, 167208 (2002).
- [38] R.T.Clay, S.M azum dar, and D.K.Campbell, Phys. Rev.Lett. 86, 4084 (2001).
- [39] P.Sengupta, A.W. Sandvik, and D.K.Cam pbell, Phys. Rev B 65, 155113 (2002).
- [40] V.A.Kashumikov, N.V.Prokofev, B.V.Svistunov, and M.Troyer, Phys. Rev. B 59, 1162 (1999).
- [41] A.W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. B 56, 11678 (1997).
- [42] A.W. Sandvik, in Computer Simulation Studies in Condensed M atter Physics X IV, (Springer-Verlag, to be published).
- [43] P.Henelius, P.Frobrich, P.J.K untz, C.T im m, and P.J. Jensen, cond-m at/0204629.
- [44] A. Domeich and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. E 64, 066701 (2001).
- [45] U.Wol, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 361 (1989).
- [46] R.H.Swendsen and J.S.W ang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 86 (1987).
- [47] A.W. Sandvik, R.R.P. Singh, and D.K. Campbell, Phys. Rev. B 56 14510 (1997).
- [48] A. W. Sandvik, S. Daul, R. R. P. Singh, and D. J. Scalapino, cond-m at/0205018.
- [49] H.G.Evertz, cond-m at/9707221.
- [50] A.Luther and Peschel, Phys. Rev. B 12, 3908 (1975): I.
 A eck, D.Gepner, H.J.Schulz, and T.Ziman, J.Phys.
 A 22, 511 (1989).
- [51] K. Hida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 59, 2230 (1990); A. J. M illis and H. Monien, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 2810 (1993); A. W. Sandvik and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 2777 (1994).
- [52] G.S.Rushbrooke, G.A.Baker, and P.J.W ood in Phase Transitions and CriticalPhenomena, edited by C.Domb and M.S.Green (A cadem ic, New York, 1974), Vol.3.

- [53] A.W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 5196 (1998).
- [54] H. Neuberger and T. Zim an, Phys. Rev. B 39, 2608 (1989); D. S. Fisher, ibid. 39, 11783 (1989); P. Hasenfratz and F. Niederm ayer, Z. Phys. B 92, 91 (1993).
- [55] K.J.Runge, Phys.Rev.B 45, 12292 (1992).
- [56] C. Lavalle, S. Sorella, and A. Parola, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1746 (1998).
- [57] http://www.abo. / physcomp/