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#### Abstract

W e introduce the concept of directed loops in stochastic series expansion and path integral quantum $M$ onte $C$ arlo $m$ ethods. U sing the detailed balance rules for directed loops, we show that it is possible to sm oothly connect generally applicable sim ulation schem es (in which it is necessary to include back-tracking processes in the loop construction) to m ore restricted loop algorithm $s$ that can be constructed only for a lim ited range of $H$ am iltonians (w here back-tracking can be avoided). The \algorithm ic discontinu ities" betw een generaland specialpoints (or regions) in param eter space can hence be elim inated. As a speci c exam ple, we consider the anisotropic $S=1=2$ H eisenberg antiferrom agnet in an extemalm agnetic eld. W e show that directed loop sim ulations are very $e$ cient for the full range of $m$ agnetic 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. T he back-tracking probability vanishes continuously as the isotropic H eisenberg point is approached. For the $X Y \mathrm{~m}$ odel, we show that back-tracking can be avoided for all elds extending up to the saturation eld. Them ethod is hence particularly e cient in this case. W e use directed loop sim ulations to study the magnetization process in the 2 D Heisenberg m odel at very low tem peratures. For L L lattices w ith L up to 64, we utilize the step-structure in the $m$ agnetization curve to extract gaps between di erent spin sectors. Finite-size scaling of the gaps gives an accurate estim ate of the transverse susceptibility in the therm odynam ic lim it: $?=0: 0659$ 0:0002.


PACS num bers: $05.10 .-\mathrm{a}, 05.30 .-\mathrm{d}, 75.10 \mathrm{Jm}, 75.40 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{g}$

## I. IN TRODUCTION

In recent years, signi cant advances in quantum $M$ onte C arlo (Q M C ) algorithm s have opened up several classes of quantum $m$ any-body $m$ odels to the kind of largescale num erical studies that w ere previously possible only for classical system $s$. The progress has been along two m ain lines: (i) the elim ination $\left[\begin{array}{lll}1 \\ \hline\end{array}\right.$ tem atic error of the $T$ rotter decom position $[1]$ on which most of the early nite-tem perature QMC algorithm s $\bar{T}, 1,1,1]$
 lim ited), and (ii) the developm ent of loop-cluster algorithm $s$ [1G] for e cient sampling in the quantum $m e-$
 rithm s incorporating both (i) and (ii) have been devised starting from either the Euclidean path integral (w orldline QM C m ethods operating in continuous im aginary tim e $\left[\underline{L}_{1}^{\prime}, ~, ~\left(\underline{I}_{1}^{\prime}\right]\right)$ or the pow er series expansion of the partition function (stochastic series expansion, hereafter SSE [1] $\left.\bar{i}_{1}^{\prime}\right]$, which is an extension of $H$ andscom b's $m$ ethod). W hile the Trotter error is a controllable one and can be elim inated in standard approaches by extrapolating results for di erent im aginary tim e discretizations to the continuum $[6,1,201]$, its absence directly at the level of the sim ulation can im ply considerable tim e savings when unbiased results are needed, e.g., in nite-size scaling studies. T he

[^0]loop-cluster algorithm $s$ (w orld-line loops operator-loops [1] ${ }^{-1}$ ], and world-line worm S (3, fered even $m$ ore dram atic speed-ups, in $m$ any cases reducing autocorrelation tim es by several orders of $m$ agnitude and thus enabling studies of system sizes much larger than what was possible w th local sam pling algorithm s. In addition, in som e special cases, ferm ionic and other sign problem scan be elim inated w ith the loop-


The new QM C m ethods have becom e im portant tools for quantum $m$ any-body research in condensed matter physics (w ith applications to quantum spins 24,12 , 2 ,

 lattice gauge theory $\left[\overline{2}_{2}^{2} \overline{1}_{1}^{\prime},{ }^{\prime \prime} \overline{2}_{1}^{\prime}\right]$. An im portant property of som e of the loop-cluster algorithm $s$ is that they are e_-
 In particular the SSE algorithm w ith the operator-loop update $[1 \overline{1} 1]$ has proven very powerful in several recent studies of quantum spin system $s$ [ 3 tem $s$, $\left.35_{1}, 136,13\right]_{1}$ including, respectively, a m agnetic eld and a chem icalpotential. It is interesting to note that in this respect $Q$ M C algorithm s now perform better than classical M onte C arlo, since in the latter case extemal elds still pose challenging problem s.

In this paper we present a general fram ew ork for constructing loop-type algorithm sboth in SSE and path integralm ethods. W e focusprim arily on the SSE approach, which ow ing to the $m$ anifestly discrete nature of its conguration space is easier to im plem ent and, for the sam e reason, also is $m$ ore e cient in $m$ ost cases. In the SSE operator-loop update introduced in $R$ ef. $1 \overline{1}_{1}^{1}$, a distinction
wasm ade betw een a generalalgorithm (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 (w here the paths do not back-track). For exam ple, in the case of the $S=1=2 \mathrm{H}$ eisenberg m odel w ith uniaxialanisotropy and extemalm agnetic eld h (also known as the XXZ-m odel),

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=J_{\text {hi;ji }}^{X}\left[S_{i}^{\mathrm{X}} S_{j}^{\mathrm{X}}+S_{i}^{\mathrm{y}} S_{j}^{\mathrm{Y}}+S_{i}^{z} S_{j}^{z}\right] \quad h_{i}^{X} S_{i}^{z} ; \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

particularly e cient algorithm s were devised at the isotropic Heisenberg point ( $=1, h=0$ ) and for the $X Y$ m odel $(=0, h=0)$. W hile the general algorithm can be used for any ; h, 迷 does not perform as well in the lim its ! $1 ; \mathrm{h}!0$ and ! $0 ; \mathrm{h}!0$ as the special algorithm s exactly at these points (w hich are the only points at which the $m$ ore e cient algorithm $s$ can be used). H ence, one has to sw itch algorithm sw hen crossing the isotropic $H$ eisenberg and X Y points. The presence of such \algorithm ic discontinuities" is clearly bothersom e, both from a $m$ athem atical and practical point of view . H ere we show how the algorithm ic discontinuities can be elim inated $w$ thin a $m$ ore general fram ew ork of satisfying detailed balance when constructing the operator-loop. For reasons that will becom e clear below, we call the entities involved in this type of update \directed loops". W ith these, we are able to carry out sim ulations as e ciently in the lim its approaching the H eisenberg and XY points as exactly at those points. W e also show that this schem e can be easily adapted to continuous-tim e path integrals.

The outline of the rest of the paper is the follow ing: In Sec. II we review the SSE m ethod 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 m ore general condition for satisfying detailed balance in the SSE m ethod, which leads us to the directed loop equations. W e then show in detail how this schem e is applied to the spin $-1 / 2 \mathrm{XXZ} \mathrm{m}$ odel. W e present tw o solutions of the directed loop equations. O ne is identical to the previous generic operator-loop update and the other sm oothly connects to the special \determ in istic" operator-loop algorithm at the isotropic H eisenberg point. W e also brie y discuss the structure of the directed loop equations for a m ore general class of H am irtonians. Im plem entation of directed loops in the path integral form alism is discussed in Sec. IV. In Sec. V we present sim ulation results in various param eter regions of the XXZ-m odel. We com pare autocorrelation tim es for sim ulations using the tw o 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, tw o, and three dim ensions. In Sec. V I, as a dem onstration of what can be accom plished w ith the im proved solution, we present results for the $m$ agnetization as a function of the extemal eld in the 2D H eisenberg $m$ odel
at very low tem peratures. $W$ e calculate the $m$ agnetic susceptibility using gaps between di erent spin sectors extracted from the step-structure in the $m$ agnetization curve. W e conclude w ith a sum $m$ ary and discussion in Sec. V II. In an A ppendix we outline the basic elem ents of a sim ple and e cient com puter im plem entation of the SSE m ethod.

## II. STOCHASTIC SERIESEXPANSION

 scom b's pow er series expansion $m$ ethod for the isotropic $S=1=2$ H eisenberg ferrom agnet [12'] and antiferrom agnet $[1], 1]$, 1 , to a $m$ uch $w$ ider range ofsystem $s$. T heperform anc is signi cantly im proved also for the $H$ eisenberg m odel $\overline{2} \overline{-1}, \overline{2} \overline{2}, \overline{1}, \overline{1} 11]$. E arly attem pts of such generalizations [151] were lim ited by the di culties in analytically evaluating the traces of the term s of the expansion. This problem was solved $[1,1,1]$ by the developm ent of a schem e for im portance sam pling also of the individual term $s$ of the traces expressed in a conveniently chosen basis. The starting point of the SSE $m$ ethod is hence the pow er series expansion of the partition function:

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z=\operatorname{Tr} e^{H}=X_{n=0}^{X} \frac{\left(f^{H}\right.}{n!} h H^{n} j i ; \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the trace has been w ritten as a sum over diagonal $m$ atrix elem ents in a basis $f j$ ig. Sim ulation algorithm s based on this expansion can be form ulated w thout sign problem $s$ for the sam em odels as those for which w orld-line $m$ ethods $\left[\frac{1}{d}\right]$ are applicable. There are no approxim ations causing system atic errors and very e cient loop-type updating algorithm s have also recently been
 continuoustim e w orld-line $m$ ethods $\left[\begin{array}{c}3,1 \\ , 1 \\ \prime 2\end{array}\right]$ is the discrete nature of the con guration space, which can be sam pled w thout oating point operations.

Here we rst review an im plem entation of the SSE $m$ ethod for the anisotropic $S=1=2 \mathrm{H}$ eisenberg m odel. A proof of detailed balance in the operator-loop updating schem e is then outlined. Several practical issues related to the operator-loops are also discussed. Estim ators for physical observables will not be discussed here. Several classes of expectation values have been derived in Ref. O bservables of interest in the context of the $H$ eisenberg m odelhave been discussed in Ref. 4141.0 -diagonalcorrelation functions (single-particle G reen's functions) have been studied in Ref. 414.

## A. SSE con guration space

For the anisotropic Heisenberg antiferrom agnet [1]) w ith N spins it is convenient to use the standard basis

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=W_{1}^{z} ; S_{2}^{z} ;::: ; S_{N}^{z} i ; \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and to w rite the H am iltonian in term s ofbond operators $H_{b}$, where $b$ refers to a pair of sites $i(b) ; j$ (b),

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=\int_{b=1}^{X_{b}} H_{b} ; \quad(J>0): \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a d-dim ensional cubic lattice the num ber of bonds $N_{b}=d N$. The bond operators are further decom posed into two operators;

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{H}_{1 ; \mathrm{b}} \quad \mathrm{H}_{2 ; \mathrm{b}} ; \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{H}_{1 ; \mathrm{b}}$ is diagonal and $\mathrm{H}_{2 ; \mathrm{b}} \circ$-diagonal;

$$
\begin{align*}
& H_{1 ; b}=C \quad S_{i(b)}^{z} S_{j(b)}^{z}+h_{b}\left[S_{i(b)}^{z}+S_{j(b)}^{z}\right] ;  \tag{6}\\
& H_{2 ; b}=\frac{1}{2}\left[S_{i(b)}^{+} S_{j(b)}+S_{i(b)} S_{j(b)}^{+}\right] ; \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

and we have de ned the $m$ agnetic eld on $a$ bond; $h_{b}$ $h=(2 d J)$. The constant $C$ should be chosen such that all m atrix elem ents of $\mathrm{H}_{1 ; b}$ are positive, i.e., $\mathrm{C} \quad=4+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$. W ew ill henceforth use the notation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}_{0}+; \quad \mathrm{C}_{0}==4+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}} ; \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\quad 0$. In the H am iltonian ( ${ }^{(4)}$ (4) we have neglected a constant $N_{b} C$, which should be kept in $m$ ind when calculating the energy.

The powers of $H$ in Eq. $\overline{(\underline{1})}$ ) can be expressed as sum s of products of the bond operators ( (G) and (T). . Such a product is conveniently referred to by an operator-index sequence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}=\left[\mathrm{a}_{1} ; \mathrm{b}_{1}\right] ;\left[\mathrm{a}_{2} ; \mathrm{b}_{2}\right] ;::: ;\left[\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{n}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{n}}\right] ; \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{i} 2 f 1 ; 2 g$ corresponds to the type of operator ( $1=$ diagonal, $2=0$-diagonal) and $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}} 2 \mathrm{f1;}::: ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{g}$ is the bond index. H ence,
where $\quad J=T$ and $n_{2}$ is the total number of spinipping operators $[2 ; b]$ in $S_{n}$. It is useful to de ne norm alized states resulting when $j i$ is propagated by a fraction of the SSE operator string:

$$
j(p) i \sum_{i=1}^{Y^{p}} H_{a_{i} ; b_{i}} j i:
$$

$N$ ote that there is no branching, i.e., all $j$ (p)i are basis states, and $j(p) i$ and $j(p+1) i$ are ether the sam e state or di er only by a ipped pair of spins. In order for a term $\left(; S_{n}\right)$ to contribute to the partition function the boundary condition $j(n) i=j(0) i$ has to be satised. On a bipartite lattice $n_{2} \mathrm{~m}$ ust 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 $w$ thout sign problem $s$.

To sim plify the $M$ onte_C arlo sam pling, it is useful [1] (although not necessary ${ }_{2}{ }_{2}$ ]) to truncate the expansion at a $m$ axim um power $n=M$ and to insert $M \quad n \backslash 11-$ in" unit operators $\mathrm{H}_{0 ; 0} \quad 1$ in the operator products in all possible ways. This gives

$$
Z=\begin{array}{llll}
X & X & { }^{n}(M \quad n)! & Y^{*}  \tag{12}\\
S_{M} & H_{a_{i} ; b_{i}} & + \\
i=1
\end{array}
$$

where $n$ now is the number of operators $\left[a_{i} ; b_{i}\right] \in[0 ; 0]$. O ne can show that [1", 12 [1] the average expansion order

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln i=N_{b} \Psi_{b} \dot{j} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{b}}$ is the intemal energy per bond, $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{hH} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{i}$ [including the constant $C$ in (G)], and that the width of the distribution is approxim ately $\mathrm{hni}^{1=2}$. M can therefore be chosen so that $n$ never reaches the cut-o during the sim ulation ( $M \quad N$ ). The truncation error is then com pletely negligible. In practice, M is gradually adjusted during the equilibration of the sim ulation, so that $M=a \quad n_{n a x}, w h e r e n_{m}$ ax is the highest $n$ reached. A practical range for the factor $a$ is $1: 2 \quad 1: 5$. The $\operatorname{sim}-$ ulation can be started $w$ th som e random state $j i$ and an \em pty" operator string $[0 ; 0]_{1} ;::: ;[0 ; 0]_{M}$ (we som e tim es use the notation $\left[\mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{p}}\right.$ instead of $\left[\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{p}} ; \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{p}}\right]$ ). E rgodic sam pling of the con gurations ( $; \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ) is accom plished using two di erent types of updates.

> B. Updating schem e

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 [ $[4-1]$. The corresponding $M$ etropolis acceptance probabilities are

$$
\begin{align*}
& P\left([0 ; 0]_{p}![1 ; b]_{p}\right)=\frac{N_{b} h(p) j H_{1 ; b} j(p) i}{M} ;  \tag{14}\\
& P\left([1 ; b]_{p}![0 ; 0]_{p}\right)=\frac{M(\mathrm{n}+1}{N_{b} h(p) j H_{1 ; b} j(p) i} ; \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathrm{P}>1$ should be interpreted as probability one. $T$ he presence of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{b}}$ in these probabilities re ects the fact that there are $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{b}}$ random choiges for the bond b in a substitution $[0 ; 0]$ ! $[1 ; b]$ but only one way to replace $[1 ; \mathrm{b}]$ ! $[0 ; 0]$ when b is given. T hese diagonalupdates are attem pted consecutively for all $p=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{M}$, and at the sam e tim e 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)iare available when needed to calculate the probabilities (14) and (15).

The purpose of the second type of update | the operator-loop $\left[18_{1}^{\prime}\right]$ is to accom plish substitutions $\left.[1 ; b]_{p} \$ 2 ; b\right]_{p}$ for a varying number of operators, thereby _ipping spins also in several of the propagated states (111). The expansion order $n$ does not change. It

F IG . 1: T he six di erent vertices corresponding to the $m$ atrix elem ents in Eqs. (18). T he horizontal bar represents the full bond operator $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}}^{-}$and the circles beneath (above) represent the spin state (solid and open circles for spin-" and spin-\#, respectively) before (after) operation $w$ th either the diagonal or o -diagonal part of $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}}$.
is then convenient to disregard the $[0 ; 0]$ unit operator elem ents in $S_{M}$ and instead work w ith the original sequences $S_{n}$ of q q. (101), which contain only elem ents [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 tw o-spin states

$$
\begin{equation*}
j b_{p}(p) i=j j_{i\left(b_{p}\right)}^{z}(p) ; S_{j\left(b_{p}\right)}^{z}(p) i \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e., the spins at bond $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{p}}$ in the propagated state $j(\mathrm{p})$ i as de ned in (11). The weight factor corresponding to (1 $1 \mathbf{1}_{1}^{(1)}$ ) can then be w ritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
W \quad\left(; S_{n}\right)=\frac{n}{n!}_{p=1}^{Y^{n}} h b_{p}(p) H_{b_{p}} j b_{p}(p \quad 1) i ; \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here the non-zero two-spin $m$ atrix elem ents are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { h\#\# } H_{b} j \# \# i=\quad ; \\
& \text { h\#" } H_{b} j \# " i=h " \# H_{b} j " \# i==2+h_{b}+\text {; } \\
& \text { h"\# } H_{b} j \# " i=h \# " \not H_{b} j " \# i=1=2 ;  \tag{18}\\
& \text { h"" } H_{b} j " " i=+2 h_{b}:
\end{align*}
$$

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 $m$ any cases the sim ulation perform sbetter with a sm all $>0$ than w ith $=0$, how ever, as w ill be dem onstrated in Sec. V . For $=0$, the num ber of allow ed $m$ atrix elem ents is reduced from 6 to 4 (if $h=0$ ) or 5 (if $h>0$ ).
$T$ he $m$ atrix elem ent product in the weight [ $\left[1 \overline{1}_{1}\right.$ ) can be represented as a netw ork of $n$ vertices, w ith two spins $S_{i}^{z}(p 1) ; S_{j}^{z}(p 1)$ lentering" the $p$ th vertex and $S_{i}^{z}(p) ; S_{j}^{z}(p)$ lexiting". The six allowed vertiges, corresponding to the non-zero $m$ atrix elem ents (118), are illustrated in $F$ ig. $\frac{11}{11}$. T he 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 follow ing (in the direction of increasing p) or previous (direction of decreasing $p$ ) vertex leg at the sam e site. The periodic boundary condition of the propagated statesm ust be taken into account, i.e., the links can span across $p=0$ and every leg then has an outgoing and incom ing 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 w ith all the propagated states. H ere open and solid bars indicate diagonal and o -diagonal operators, respectively. (b) The linked vertex list corresponding to (a). T he dashed lines represent bidirectional links.


FIG. 3: All four paths through two vertices where the entrance is at the low-left leg. The arrow indicates the exit leg. T he resulting updated vertices, $w$ th the spin at the entrance and exit legs ipped, are also shown. The two cases $m$ arked $w$ ith an $X$ are forbidden, since the updated vertices do not correspond to operators in the H am iltonian considered here. W e refer to the four di erent processes as (a) \bounce", (b) \continue-straight", (c) \sw itch-and-reverse", and (d) \sw itch-and-continue".
corresponding tw o legs of that vertex are linked together. O therw ise, for a site acted upon by two or m ore operators, all links are betw een di erent vertioes. A n exam ple of an SSE con guration and its corresponding linked vertex list is show $n$ in $F$ ig. $\overline{1} \overline{1}$. . C learly, in an allow ed conguration links can exist only between legs in the sam e spin state. $N$ ote that in the representation $w$ ith the fill states in (a), which is never used in the actual sim ulation but is included here for ilhustrative punposes, we distinguish betw een diagonal and o-diagonaloperators (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 (1]) and the type of the operator (diagonalor o diagonal) is im plicitly 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 vertioes represent $m$ atrix elem ents of the bond-operators.

To construct an operator-loop, one of the $4 n$ 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. T he starting points of the loops in (a) and (b) are the legs from which the arrow s point out. In (a) the last segm ent of the loop connects the initial and nal vertices, resulting in the starting spin being ipped in the nal con guration. In (b) the last loop segm ent is $w$ ithin the in itial vertex and the starting spin is ipped tw ice, w ith the net e ect of no change. B oth loops (a) and (b) here result in the updated vertioes show $n$ 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. Exam ples ofhow vertices change in the four types of process are show $n$ in F ig. given the entrance leg and the four spin states de ning the vertex, is taken proportional to that $m$ atrix elem ent in (1-1)) which corresponds to the vertex generated when the entrance and exit spins have been ipped. As an example, de ning $m$ atrix elem ents obtained when ipping spins in a vertex as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{W} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{f}_{3} ; \mathrm{f}_{4} \\
\mathrm{f}_{1} ; \mathrm{f}_{2}
\end{array} \quad(\mathrm{p})=  \tag{19}\\
& \mathrm{hf}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{p}) ; \mathrm{f}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{p}) \not \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}} \dot{\mathrm{f}}_{1} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{p} \\
& 1) ; \mathrm{f}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{z}}(\mathrm{p}
\end{align*}
$$

where $f_{i}=1$ ifthe 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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}_{2 ; 1}=\frac{\mathrm{W}^{++}}{\mathrm{W}_{\substack{++++}}^{++} \mathrm{W}^{++}+\mathrm{W}_{+}^{+}+\mathrm{W}^{+}} ; \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have used for 1. The reasons for this choice for the probability w illbe discussed in Sec. II C . If the entrance and exit correspond to di erent sites (the sw itch-and-reverse and sw itch-and-continue processes in $F$ ig. ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ (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 $m$ ism 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. N ote that, depending on the way the loop closes, the spin at the leg from which the loop construction was started $m$ ay or $m$ ay not be ipped after the fiull loop has been com pleted. E xam ples illustrating this are given in $F$ ig. 'I'l.

O ne of the tw o site-sw itching paths | the sw itch-and-

is alw ays forbidden since the corresponding o -diagonal $m$ atrix elem ent of the $H$ eisenberg bond-operator is zero. The bounce path in $F$ ig. vertex is una ected (the same spin is ipped tw ice, resulting in no net change). The continue-straight path ind (b) is alw ays allowed if the constant $>0$ so that all the diagonalm atrix elem ents in (18) are larger than zero. If $=0$ at least one of the diagonālm atrix elem ents vanishes, and the continue-straight process is then forbidden in som e cases.

If a spin in the state $j i$ is not acted upon by any of the operators in $S_{M}$, it cannot be ipped by the operatorloop update. Such \free" spins can, how ever, be ipped $w$ ith probability $1=2$ since they do not appear in the weight function. Since the average of $n$, the num ber of operators in $S_{M}$, grow s linearly w ith , free spins appear frequently only at relatively high tem peratures.

It is convenient to de ne a M onte C arlo step (MCS) as a sweep of diagonal updates at all positions in $S_{M}$ where possible, follow ed by construction of the linked list in which a num ber $N_{1}$ of operator-loops are constructed before $m$ apping back to a new $S_{M}$ and $j i$ and ipping free spins. O bservables can be $m$ easured after every, or every few, MCS (in som e cases, it may even worth-w hile to record $m$ easurem ents after every loop).

The rem aining question now is how many operatorloops one should construct in each M CS. The operatorloops are typically of highly varying lengths. E ach M C S should involve several loop updates, so that a signi cant fraction of the vertioes are visited. In order not to bias the $m$ easurem ents it is im portant that $N_{1}$ is xed. O ne cannot, e.g., keep on constructing loops during a given M C S until the num ber of vertices visited exceeds a predeterm ined num ber. T he average size of the operatorloops depends strongly on the m odel param eters. It is therefore useful to record the loop sizes and periodically adjust $N_{1}$ during the equilibration of the sim ulation. Typically, we determ ine $N_{1}$ such that the average cum $u$ lative loop length (the num ber of vertices visited) during one M C S is approxim ately 2 hni or 2 M . 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., segm ents of the operator-loop where com pleted vertex updates are reversed. If a bounce occurs already at the rst step the loop closes im $m$ ediately. $W$ th our de nition, this is a com pleted loop of length 0 . In order not to bias the $m$ easurem ents, such length-0 loops also have to be counted am ong the $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ com pleted loops.

O ne could also $\times N_{1}$ based on a criterion involving the average num ber of leg-spins which are actually ipped during an MCS, but recording this number is slightly $m$ ore complicated than just keeping track of the loop length. Since this has to be done only during equilibration the cost is not prohibitive, how ever. T he exact de nition of $N_{1}$ and precisely what constitutes one M CS are not critical issues (as in the classical W ol cluster
algorithm [45둔], where the M CS can also be de ned in a way analogous to what we have discussed here).

The operator-loop construction (the operator path) is a type of random walk in a d+1-dim ensional space (although the netw ork of connected vertices does not necessarily have this dim ensionality| it could e ectively have a fractal dim ension $<d+1$ ). O ne $m$ ay therefore $w$ onder whether the closing of the loop could becom e 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 $m$ ay even not close during a sim ulation of practical length. T he loop size distribution is alw ays very broad, how ever, and the non-closing problem can sim ply be circum vented by im posing a maxim um length beyond which the loop construction is term inated. The w ay we typically im plem ent this term ination is by im m ediately initiating a new MCS (beginning w ith a diagonal update), hence disregarding all the loops that w ere constructed during the M C S of the term inated loop. T his w ay, we do not have to save actual operatorpaths (needed in order to undo the changes done during construction of the term inated loop), which w ould becom e im practical for long paths. The term ination does not violate detailed balance and hence the correct distribution of con gurations contributing to $Z$ is $m$ aintained. Term ination of incom plete loops does introduce a bias in quantities which are related to the extended con $g$ uration space, how ever, such as single-particle G reen's functions [444]. Typically, we use a m axim um loop length

100 hni . For the XXZ-m odel (in any num ber of di$m$ ension) incom plete loop term ination is then extrem ely rare (excessively long loops can occur m ore frequently in other $m$ odels [3d]). The average loop length is typically much sm aller than hni, but can in som e cases be a signi cant fraction of hni (up to tens of percent).

> C. D etailed balance

In the originally proposed operator-loop schem e $\left[1 \overline{1}_{1}^{\prime}\right]$, the probability of selecting an exit leg is proportional to the corresponding $m$ atrix elem ent (1-18) when the entrance and exit spins have been ipped ( w ith the factor of proportionality chosen to give probability one for the sum of the four probabilities), a speci c exam ple of which is w rilten in Eq. (201). O ne 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 exam ple for a con guration w ith three vertioes in $F$ ig. ${ }^{-1} 1(a)$. In 1), the leg w th 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. F lipping both the entrance spin and the exit spin leads to a new con guration in the extended space. In $F$ ig. '्ָरl' (a) the three resulting con gurations which have non-zero prob-


FIG.5: Twow ways to look at the extended con guration space generated during operator-loop construction. Exam ples 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 tw o spins at th is link has already been carried out (generating ladder operators which are indicated by vertices w ith sem i- lled bars), and the arrow indicates the entrance point for the follow ing 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 im m ediate retum to the original con guration.
ability are show $n$ in 2)-4). The entrance! exit paths are also indicated and the corresponding spins have been ipped. T he probability ofprocess 3) corresponds to the exam ple given in Eq. (2G), which when inserting the actualspin states becom es

In 2), the entrance and exit are at the sam e leg. This is a bounce process which closes the loop im m ediately w ith no change in the con guration. In 3) and 4) the vertex has changed and two links have appeared which connect legs with di erent spin states. W e call these \link-discontinuities". Only con gurationsw ith no link-discontinuities contribute to Z. All con gurations created during the loop construction contain two linkdiscontinuities, untilthe loop closes (w hich can be seen as the discontinuities annihilating each other). T here are no w eight changes associated w ith the link-discontinuities the con guration weight is still considered to be given by Eq. $\left(\overline{1}_{1} \overline{7}_{1}\right)$. H ence, the only w eight 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. T he 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. O nce 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 follow ing updates can only take place at the discontinuities (the end points of the path), i.e., the discontinuities can be m oved. H ere the sam e heat-bath algorithm as in the rst step is used. $T$ he only di erence is that the entrance leg is not chosen at random but is given by a link from the previous vertex. H ence, 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 w eight in the extended space. T he subset of con $g-$ urations $w$ th zero link-discontinuities, which contribute to $Z$, are therefore also generated $w$ ith the correct distribution. The process is ergodic because all types of vertices can be generated, and since the operator path can w ind around the periodic boundaries and then change both the spatialw inding num ber and the totalm agnetization. W thin a sector of xed winding number and $m$ agnetization, local updates which constitute a sm all subset of the operator-loops su ce to ensure ergodicity [411].

Instead of thinking about the extended con guration space in tem s of link-discontinuities, one can consider the vertices created when one of the spins in the original vertices of $F$ ig. ${ }_{1}^{11}$ is ipped. These new vertices correspond to the single-spin ipping (ladder) operators $S_{i}^{+}$ and $S_{i}$. The loop construction can be form ulated 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. . $\mathrm{K}_{1}^{1}$ (b) , using the sam e con guration and starting point as in 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 sim ultaneously. This introduces tw o ladder vertices. H ere one has to assign a value, $\mathrm{v}_{1}$, to the m atrix elem ents of the ladder operators (i.e., the new operators are $\mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{~S}_{i}^{+}$and $\mathrm{v}_{1} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ). The initial loop segm ent, an exam ple of which is show $n$ as 1) in Fig. $\overline{\text { I }}$ (b) , is then generated only $w$ ith a probabirity m in $\left[1 ; \mathrm{v}_{1}^{2}=\left(\mathrm{W}_{1} \mathrm{~W}_{2}\right)\right]$, where $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{W}_{2}$ are the m atrix elem ents corresponding to the tw o vertices that are considered for replacem ent by ladder vertioes. 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 $m$ atrix elem ent when the entrance and exit spins have been ipped. In the exam ple, paths 2) and 3) lead to closed loops (back to the space w ith no ladder operators), whereas in 4) the ladder operators
arem oved further aw ay from each other. $N$ ote 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 sam e vertex, which then becom es equal to one of the original two-spin vertioes. This brings the system back into the original con guration space.

The link-discontinuity and ladder operator pictures of the loop construction are clearly com pletely equivalent, although the probabilities associated w ith starting (or closing) the loop are di erent. In actual sim $u$ lations it is typically $m$ ore convenient to use the linkdiscontinuities view. T he 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 w orld-line sim ulations [3] $\left.{ }^{1}\right]$. The issue of $m$ easuring $\circ$ diagonal correlation functions using the SSE operatorloops has been considered in Ref. [44].

In Sec. III we will give a m ore form al and com plete proof of detailed balance. We 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. W e will introduce the concept of a directed loop to form a general fram ew ork for loop updating schem es, both in SSE and path integralsim ulations. In the SSE schem e, the directed loop sim ply 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. B efore introducing the directed loop concept, we rst consider special cases in which the bounce process can be excluded. In IIE we discussm ore technicalSSE im plem entation issues, which also are com $m$ on 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 alw ays non-zero, because the vertex rem ains unchanged and has a non-zero value (otherw ise, it would not appear in the con guration in the rst place). In som e special cases, it is possible to m odify the algorithm in such a way that the bounce is com pletely excluded. T his has very favorable $e$ ects on the sim ulation dynam ics, since there is then no back-tracking and all segm ents of the loop accom plish changes in the con guration.

Them ost im portant of the special cases is the isotropic H eisenberg m odel $(=1 ; \mathrm{h}=0)$ [ 18 B$]$. A very sim ilar al gorithm exists for the ferrom agnet ( $J<0$ ) [23]. For the antiferrom agnet, choosing the constant $=0$ in Eqs. "(1) implies that the vertioes $w$ ith all spins up or all spins dow $n$ vanish and the rem aining four $m$ atrix elem ents all


FIG . 6: A llallow ed vertices in the determ in istic operator-loop algorithm in the case of the $H$ eisenberg antiferrom agnet (a) and ferrom agnet (b). O perator-loop segm ents starting at the low er left leg are also shown.
equal $1=2$. A s a result, the $m$ atrix elem ent product in ( $1 T_{1}$ ) is sim ply $(1=2)^{\mathrm{n}}$ and is not a ected by the operatorloop update. If the bounce process is excluded, the only rem aining process is the sw itch-and-reverse show $n$ in F ig. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{I}_{1}(\mathrm{a})$ and the path is hence determ in istic. The actual loop structure is only changed by the diagonal update. $T$ he determ in istic loop process is clearly sym $m$ etric $w$ ith 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 if $\mathrm{C}=1=4$ in ${ }_{1}^{(1 /(\$)}$ [for the isotropic ferrom agnet $=1$ and there is no $m$ inus sign in $\left.\left(\bar{F}_{1}\right)^{\prime}\right)$, and the only rem aining process is then the sw itch-and-continue process show $n$ in Fig. ${ }^{\prime}$ 'G (b) .

In the determ inistic case, each vertex leg can be uniquely assigned to a loop, and the loops can be ipped independently ofeach other. Instead of random ly choosing starting points and constructing a xed num ber of loops, one can then construct all possible loops exactly once, by alw ays picking a starting point which does not belong to a loop already constructed. The loops should then be ipped $w$ ith probability $1=2$. The random decision ofw hether or not to ip can bem ade 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 sam e loop again. Loops are constructed this way until all $4 n$ vertex legs have been visited. This method of constructing all the loops is analogous to the classical Sw endsen $-W$ ang $m$ ulti-cluster $m$ ethod [ [4G], w hereas, as w as already m entioned above, the operator-loop construction in the general non-determ in istic case is $m$ ore sim ilar to the $W$ ol single-chuster algorithm [

It should be noted that in the determ inistic case an algorithm including only operator updates (diagonalupdates and loops) is not com pletely ergodic. In the antiferrom agnet, spin states $w$ th all spins up or dow $n$ are isolated from the other states since no operators can act on them. These two states are im portant only at very high tem peratures and they can then be reached by also perform ing random ips of $\backslash f r e e "$ spins. In sim ulations w th >0 all states can be reached even w thout such spin ips.
 $h=0$ ). In this case allm atrix elem ents in (18) equal1=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 rem aining allowed exits from each vertex. A though these paths are not determ inistic, one can still subdivide the system into loops that can be ipped independently ofeach other.
The loop structure in the general operator-loop algorithm, which includes bounce processes, is sim ilar to that in the worm algorithm for continuous-tim e pathintegrals $\left[\frac{1}{3}\right]$, although the tw o $m$ ethods are quite di erent in other respects (the actual processes used to construct the SSE operator-loops 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-loops are analogousto the w orld-line loops (in discrete [1] ] or continuous [ $[\underline{1}, 1]$ im aginary time). The close relationships between the Euclidean path integral in continuous tim e and the discrete representation on which the SSE m ethod is based
 also be further elucidated here in Sec. IV ${ }^{2}$.

## 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 betw een connected vertices. In this section we will present a m ore general set of equations that have to be satis ed for detailed balance to hold in such a process. W e will show that these equations have an in nite num ber of solutions, som e of which can lead to a $m$ ore cient sam pling than the heat bath. W e 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 $m$ inim ized. $W$ e show that the bounces can in fact be com pletely excluded in a much wider range of param eters than at the two isolated points (isotropic XY and H eisenberg) discussed in Sec. II D.

We call the entities involved in the more general schem e \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 vertioes is directional, i.e., the probability ofexiting at a particular leg given the entrance leg is not the sam e as the probability of the reverse process. T he original operator-loop update $w$ ith the heat-bath probabilities [1] 11 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 actualsim ulation $w$ ith respect to the original schem $e$ is a di erent set of probabilities for exiting at a given vertex leg, given the entrance leg and the four spin states. B efore 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. C onditions for detailed balance

Let us rst recall that the detailed balance requirem ent reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left(s!s^{0}\right) W \quad(s)=P\left(s^{0}!s\right) W \quad\left(s^{0}\right) ; \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

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. ( $1 \vec{l}_{1}$ ), and P ( $s!s^{0}$ ) is the probability of changing the con guration from $s$ to $s^{0}$. W hile the w eights are given by the H am iltonian the probability for how to update the spin con guration depends on the actualalgorithm used.

The algorithm for constructing an operator-loop 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). W ith the con guration m apped onto a linked vertex list, an initialentrance vertex leg is rst picked at random am ong all 4n legs. Then an exit leg belonging to the sam e vertex is chosen in a probabilistic $w$ ay and the spins on the entrance and exit legs are ipped with unit probability. M ore generally, the states at these legs are updated w ith non-zero probabilities only for changes leading to vertioes corresponding to non-zero $m$ atrix elem ents. For sim plicity, we here assum e that the change at the exit leg is uniquely dictated (through conservation law s) 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. T he probability for arriving at a new con guration $s^{0}$ can therefore be w ritten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
P\left(s!s^{0}\right)= & P\left(e_{0}\right) P\left(s ; e_{0}!s_{1} ; e_{1}\right) \\
& P\left(s ; e_{1}!s_{2} ; e_{2}\right) \\
& P\left(s_{1} 1 ; e_{n} 1!s^{0} ; e_{0}\right) ;
\end{aligned}
$$

where $P\left(e_{0}\right)$ is the probability for choosing the vertex leg $e_{0}$ as the initial starting point and $P\left(s_{i} ; e_{i}!S_{i+1} ; e_{i+1}\right)$ 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 $g$ uration $s_{i+1}$. The interm ediate con gurations $s_{i}$ belong to the extended space of con gurations w th two linkdiscontinuities, as discussed in Sec. II-C. The exit legs $x_{i}$ do not explicitly appear in the probabilities since we have assum ed 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-forw ard). T he 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 w ay 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 $s^{0}$ is transferred into $s$. This can be w ritten down quite sim ply by realizing that for each of the term s in Eq. (23) there is a corresponding term which describes the \tim e"-
reversed path, which contributes to the reverse probability. Thus one can w rite

$$
\begin{gather*}
P\left(s^{0}!s\right)=\begin{array}{r}
X \\
P\left(e_{0}\right) P\left(s^{0} ; e_{0}!s_{n} ; e_{n}\right) \\
2 ; e_{2}\left(s s_{1} ; e_{1}\right)
\end{array} \\
P\left(s ; e_{1}!s ; e_{0}\right) ; \tag{24}
\end{gather*}
$$

where the sum is over the same closed loops as in Eq. ( $\mathbf{2}^{2} \overline{3}_{1}$ ) . B y inserting these expressions into the detailed balance equation (22 $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ ) we see that detailed balance is satis ed if

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
W & \left(s_{i}\right) P\left(s_{i} ; e_{i}!s_{i+1} ; e_{i+1}\right)= \\
W & \left(s_{i+1}\right) P\left(s_{i+1} ; e_{i+1}!\quad s_{i} ; e_{i}\right) \tag{25}
\end{array}
$$

for allpossible SSE con gurations and entrance legs. Because the update ( $s_{i} ; e_{i}!s_{i+1} ; e_{i+1}$ ) changes only one particular vertex, allexcept one ofthe factors in the product of vertex weights in Eq. $\left(1 \bar{T}_{1}\right)$ factor out and cancel. $W$ riting $W(s ; e ; x)=W{ }_{s} P\left(s ; e^{-}!s^{0} ; x\right)$, where we have slightly changed the notation so that $W{ }_{s}$ denotes the $m$ atrix elem ent corresponding to a single vertex $w$ th its four leg states coded as $s$, $e$ is the entrance leg, and $x$ is the exit leg on the sam e vertex, one can form ulate the detailed balance criterion Eq. ( $2 \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}$ ) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{W}\left(s ; l_{1} ; l_{2}\right)=W \quad\left(s^{0} ; l_{2} ; l_{1}\right) \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

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 im plies $m$ any relations betw een the unknown probabilities of how to chose an exit leg given a particular vertex and an entrance leg. T here are additional relations $w$ hich $m$ ust be satis ed. Requiring that the path alw ays continues thru (239 vertex translates into into

```
X
    P(s;e! Sx;x)=1;
    x
```

where the sum is over all legs on the vertex. W e have em phasized in the notation $s_{x}$ that the resulting spin con guration depends on the exit leg. In term $s$ of the weights $W\left(s ; l_{1} ; l_{2}\right)$ th is requirem ent translates into

$$
{ }_{x}^{X} W(s ; e ; x)=W_{s} ;
$$

which $m$ ust be valid for all vertices and entrance-legs. This set of equations, Eq. (28; ${ }^{\prime}$ ) together $w$ th the relations in Eq. (2a), 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 XX Z-m odel

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


F IG . 7: E xam ple of two vertices w ith directed loop segm ents that transform into each other in the ipping process.


FIG. 8: Possible assignm ents of directed loop segm ents for half of the di erent com binations 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 arrow $s$. The lines w ith arrow $s$ are the directed loop segm ents. The con gurations are divided into four sets (one in each quadrant). On ipping the spins connected by the loop segm ent and reversing the direction of the arrow, only con gurations w ith in the sam e quadrant are transform ed into each other.
zero w eight state w hen spins connected by the loop seg$m$ ent are ipped (due to violation of the $z-m$ agnetization conservation of the model ). F ig. $\bar{N}_{1}^{2}$ illustrates the pos sibilities for placing directed loop segm ents for di erent vertices. In order for our update process to satisfy detailed balance we recall that according to Eq. (2G) we $m$ ust relate vertices in which the two spins connected by the loop segm ent are ipped and the direction of the loop segm ent is reversed. Such related con gurations are illustrated in F ig. $\mathrm{I}_{1} 71$. Furtherm ore E q. (28) relates vertiges w ith di erent exit legs having the sam e spin con guration and entrance legs. W e then $m$ ake the key observation that allpossible vertex con gurations can be divided into eight subsets that do not transform into each other. H alf of these subsets are show $n$ in $F$ ig. $, \bar{\prime}, \bar{\prime}$, w here only con $g-$ urations w ithin the sam e 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. (2-1), for transitions betw een vertex con gurations in the sam e set independently of other con gurations.

A row in any of the quadrants in Fig. 'ig 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 ccording to Eq. (281), sum m ing the w eights of all possible con gurations thàt can be reached from a certain in-leg, keeping the spin con guration xed, should equalthe vertex weight alone. T hus taking the upper left quadrant of Fig. '" q , we have for row s 1-3 from the top:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{W}_{1}=\mathrm{b}_{1}+\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b} \\
& \mathrm{~W}_{2}=\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}_{2}+\mathrm{c}  \tag{29}\\
& \mathrm{~W}_{3}=\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{b}_{3}
\end{align*}
$$

where the sym bols on the left hand sides are the vertex weights E q. (1) in the spin con guration space, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
& W_{1}=h " \# H_{b} j \# " i=h \# " H_{b} j " \# i=1=2 ; \\
& \mathrm{W}_{2}=\mathrm{h} \# \text { " } \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{j}^{2} \text { "i=h"\# } \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{j} \text { "\#i }=2+\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}+\text {; } \\
& W_{3}=h \# \# H_{b} j \# \# i=\text {; }  \tag{30}\\
& \mathrm{W}_{4}=\mathrm{h} " \| \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{j} \text { ""i=} \quad+2 h_{b} \text {; }
\end{align*}
$$

while those on the right are weights in the enlarged conguration space of spins and directed loop segm ents. W e have assigned equal weights to the con gurations which are related by ipping, in accordance w ith Eq. (26). The order of the sym bols on the right-hand sides of Eqs. (2"q) follow $s$ the order in the upper left quadrant of F ig. Iq, so that, e.g., the weight of the two con gurations in Fig. is b and the weight of the very $m$ iddle con guration in the upper left quadrant of $F$ ig. . subscript to denote a weight of a con guration where the exit equals the entrance (bounce process).

A smentioned above there are in all eight sets of vertex con gurationswhich close under the ipping process. These sets are in principle independent ofeach other and have their own equation sets. H ow ever, one can easily convince one-self that because of sym $m$ etry reasons there are only two di erent types of sets. O ne of these sym $m$ etries is that of perm uting the two spins acted upon by $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}}$. This im plies that the equations derived for the set in the upper left quadrant in F ig. ' $\mathrm{g}_{1}$, Eqs. (29), are the sam e 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 segm ents. The other sym $m$ etry is that of in aginary tim e inversion, which in the gures corresponds to sw itching the pairs of spins below and above the horizontal bar representing the operator $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}}$. This sym $m$ etry together w th the previous one identify the rules for the upper left quadrant of F ig. I , w ith 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 $F$ ig.

$$
\mathrm{w}_{1}=\mathrm{b}_{1}^{0}+\mathrm{a}^{0}+\mathrm{b}^{0} ;
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{W}_{2}=a^{0}+b_{2}^{0}+c^{0} ;  \tag{31}\\
& \mathrm{W}_{4}=b^{0}+c^{0}+b_{3}^{0}:
\end{align*}
$$

This latter set takes the form of the set (29) but $w$ th prim ed sym bols to denote the weights and ${ }^{-}{ }^{-}{ }_{4}$ instead of $\mathrm{W}_{3}$. There is a further reduction in the case of zero m agnetic eld, where the tw o equation sets becom e 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 low er left one on a vertex $w$ th weight $\underline{W}_{1}$, as show $n$ in the very upper left hand comer off ig. $\bar{i} \mathbf{q}$, is $\mathrm{b}_{1}=\mathrm{W}_{1}$.

It is clear that there arem any solutions w ith only positive w eights to the above equation sets as they are underdeterm ined; both sets have six unknow ns 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 schem e [18], which we will henceforth refer to as Solution A. It is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{a} & =\mathrm{W}_{1} \mathrm{~W}_{2}=\left(\mathrm{W}_{1}+\mathrm{W}_{2}+\mathrm{W}_{3}\right) ; \\
\mathrm{b} & =\mathrm{W}_{1} \mathrm{~W}_{3}=\left(\mathrm{W}_{1}+\mathrm{W}_{2}+\mathrm{W}_{3}\right) ; \\
\mathrm{c} & =\mathrm{W}_{2} \mathrm{~W}_{3}=\left(\mathrm{W}_{1}+\mathrm{W}_{2}+\mathrm{W}_{3}\right) ;  \tag{32}\\
\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}} & =\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}=\left(\mathrm{W}_{1}+\mathrm{W}_{2}+\mathrm{W}_{3}\right):
\end{align*}
$$

For the prim ed 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 vertioes which are obtained by ipping the tw o spins on the loop seg$m$ ent, an exam ple of which was given in Eq. (2d). This solution is valid in the fiull param eter space of the XXZmodel. H ow ever, it generally assigns a relatively large w eight to the bounce processes where the exit leg equals the entrance leg. T hese 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 them ethod still is reasonably e cient (we are not aw are of any $m$ ethod that has been $m$ ore successful for $m$ odels including extemal elds), this is bothersom e since the SSE algorithm exactly at $h=0$ can be form ulated entirely w thout any bounce processes [ [1] 1$]$, as review ed in Sec. IID, and is then considerably $m$ ore e cient. $T$ he fact that the $h=0$ schem e has no bounces and is com pletely determ in istic, 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 elm inate the \algorithm ic discontinuity" of the previous approach.

For the discussion of other solutions to the directed loop equations (2 $\overline{2}$ ) and ( $\left.\overline{3}_{1}^{1} \overline{1}\right)$ it is convenient to express these equations in term sof the bounce weights $\mathrm{b}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}$ :

$$
\mathrm{a}=\frac{1+}{4}+\frac{\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}}{2}+\frac{\mathrm{b} \mathrm{l}_{2}+\mathrm{b}_{3}}{2} ;
$$



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

$$
\begin{align*}
& b=\frac{1}{4} \quad \frac{h_{b}}{2}+\frac{\underline{q}+b_{2} b_{g}}{2} ; \\
& c=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{h_{b}}{2}++\frac{b_{1} \mathrm{~b}_{2} \mathrm{~b}_{9}}{2} ;  \tag{33}\\
& a^{0}=\frac{1+}{4} \quad \frac{h_{b}}{2}+\frac{\mathrm{L}_{1} \mathrm{~h}_{2}+\mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}}{2} ; \\
& b^{0}=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{h_{b}}{2}+\frac{\underline{Q}+b_{2}^{0} \mathfrak{b}_{2}}{2} ; \\
& c^{0}=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{3 h_{b}}{2}++\frac{\mathrm{b}_{1}^{0} \mathrm{~K}_{2}^{0} \mathrm{H}_{3}^{0}}{2} ;
\end{align*}
$$

where we have explicitly inserted the expressions for the vertex weights, Eq. (30). W e seek positive solutions to these equations. Being under-determ ined there are $m$ any solutions, so we will try to nd the solutions that yield the $m$ ost e ective algorithm $s$. A s a general principle for nding e cient rules, we will attem pt to m inim ize the bounce weights $\mathrm{b}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}$. The solution so obtained w ill be term ed Solution B. Inspecting the equations, it is clear that there is one region in param eter space where one can avoid bounces altogether. This region is shown as the shaded region in Fig. 1 negative vertex weights we already have the restriction

0 . In the shaded region, the requirem ent of nonnegative weights also in the en larged con guration space when all the bounce weights are zero im poses an additional constraint on : (1 )=4 $\quad \mathrm{b}=2$. W e have no rigorous principle of nding the optim al value of in general, but as can be inferred from our sim ulation tests (presented in Sec. V) it is often advantageous to choose a sm allbut non-zero value in cases where m in $=0$.

For the $H$ eisenberg antiferrom agnet at zero $m$ agnetic eld ( $=1 ; \mathrm{h}=0$ ) the determ in istic algorithm constructed in Ref. '18' is recovered for the choige $=0$. The non-zero weights are then $a=a^{0}=1=2$, while the non-zero m atrix elem ents are $\mathrm{W}_{1}=\mathrm{W}_{2}=1=2$, which correspond to the sw itch-and-reverse process illustrated in $F$ ig. ${ }^{\prime} \bar{G}(a)$. This is a determ in istic algorithm as the only probabilities di erent from zero are unity. There

TABLE I: $N$ on-zero bounce $w$ eights and $m$ inim values of for the di erent param eter regions of Solution B of the directed loop equations. T he R om an num erals correspond to those in F ig. $\mathrm{TH}_{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{N}}$. W e have de ned $\quad=(1 \quad)=2$.

|  | bounce w eights |  |  |  | m in |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |  |  | ( | $\left.\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}\right)=2$ |
| II | $\mathrm{b}_{2}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ |  | $\mathrm{b}_{2}^{0}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ |  | 0 |  |
| III | $\mathrm{b}_{2}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| IV | $\mathrm{b}_{2}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ |  | $\mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | + | 0 |  |
| V |  |  | $\mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | + | ( | $\left.\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}\right)=2$ |
| V I | $\mathrm{b}_{3}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | + | $\mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}=\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | + | $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | =2 |

is a subtlety here as the ratio $\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{W}_{3}$ is undeterm ined for
$=0$. H ow ever, the value of this probability can be left undeterm ined as the vertex w ith all spins dow n w ill not be generated as a consequence of the vanishing of the weight $W_{3}$. This is actually m ore 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 m odel $(=0)$ at zero $m$ agnetic eld the choice
$=1=4$ gives a di erent set of zeroboounce nules than the one proposed in Ref. $\underline{1}_{1} \bar{B}_{1}^{\prime \prime}$, which, how ever also is a solution of our equations (but with $=1=2$ ). It is quite rem arkable that for the $X Y m$ odel one can in fact nd rules w ith no bounces for allm agnetic eld strengths up to the saturation eld. W e expect this to be very useful.

O utside the shaded region in $F$ ig..$_{1}^{-1}$ 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 if show s these values for the di erent regions in F ig. 1 , 1 , along w ith the m in um value of al low ed. Selecting a value for , the rem aining w eights can be obtained using Eqs. (323) .

At the boundary betw een regions in F ig. " $_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}$, 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 $m$ etric Solution $A, E$ qs. ( 3 2li), w here the bounce probabilities approach $1=2 \mathrm{as}_{\mathrm{h}}$ ! 0 . H ence, the algorithm ic discontinuity is indeed rem oved as the special determ inistic solution at the isotropic point is recovered autom atically w ith Solution B (when $=0$ ).

In Sec. V , the perform ance of sim ulations using Solutions A and B w ill be quanti ed in term s of calculated autocorrelation fiunctions. It $w$ ill be shown that the new Solution B can lead to autocorrelation tim es $m$ ore than an order ofm agnitude shorter than w ith Solution A. T he im provem ents are $m$ ost dram atic for weak but non-zero elds and weak Ising anisotropies ( > 1). In Sec. IV we w ill describe how the directed loops also can be adapted to sim ulations in the path integral form alism. Below we rst brie $y$ discuss the form of the detailed balance equations for $m$ ore general H am iltonians.
C. General form of the directed loop equations

T he directed loop approach can be easily applied to a m uch w ider class ofm odels than the $\mathrm{S}=1=2 \times \mathrm{XX} \mathrm{m}$ odel discussed in the preceding section. T he SSE operatorloop update w ith the heat-bath probabilities [1d] has already been applied to severaldi erent system S , including Spin system $s$ w th $S>1=2$ [43], various boson $m$ odels [25 [3-1]. W e here brie $y$ outline the general form of the directed loop equations and their solutions for a general 2 Hoody interaction.

W hen the operator-loop update is applied to m odels $w$ ith higher spins, boson or ferm ion models, it is clear that the simple notion of ipping a spin in the $S=1=2$ XXZ 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. C onsider as an exam ple a spin-1 m odel where a loop can change the state on a leg by one or tw o units of spin. This is sim pli ed when the totals ${ }^{z}$ is conserved as then these di erent changes can be considered as tw o 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 vige-versa, violates the $S^{z}$ conservation law. T hus, w ith such a conservation law the state change of the exit leg is uniquely determ ined given the state change at the entrance leg. For sim plicity we w ill here consider only those cases w here this uniqueness holds, although this is by no $m$ eans a necessary condition.

In order to describe the general form of the directed loop equations for this type ofgeneraltw o-site interaction it is convenient to change labeling som ew hat 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 vertioes) and label its weight $W_{1}$. W e then choose an entrance leg and label this leg as leg 1, and then num ber the rest of the legs on this vertex $2 ; 3$ and 4. D istributing the w eight over allpossible exit legs according to Eq. (2G) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{w}_{1}=\mathrm{a}_{11}+\mathrm{a}_{12}+\mathrm{a}_{13}+\mathrm{a}_{14} \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have labeled the weights $a_{i j}$ in the extended space by their entrance (i) and exit (j) legs. O n changing the states at both the entrance and exit legs one arrives at a new vertex. If the entrance and exit legs are the sam e the vertex stays the sam $e$. $N$ ow label the weight of the vertex reached by exiting at leg i as $W_{i} . T$ hus if the exit was on leg 2 we would label that vertex $\mathrm{W}_{2}$. W 2 has a sim ilar decom position as $\mathrm{W}_{1}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{W}_{2}=\mathrm{a}_{21}+\mathrm{a}_{22}+\mathrm{a}_{23}+\mathrm{a}_{24} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

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. T he weight $a_{21}$ corresponds to the process w here the path enters at leg 2 and exits at leg 1. T he states are changed in the opposite $w$ ay to that $w$ hen arriving at $W_{2}$
from $\mathrm{W}_{1}$, and hence the process is undoing the changes and we arrive back at $W_{1}$. From Eq. (2G) it follow s that $a_{21}=a_{12} . N$ ow one can ask the question if exiting at leg 3 or 4 yields the sam e vertex type $w$ hen starting from $\mathrm{W}_{2}$ as it does starting from $\mathrm{W}_{1}$. The answer to this is yes, because starting from $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ one would change the state at leg 1 and 3 while starting from $\mathrm{W}_{2}$ one would change the states at legs 2 and 3 . But $W_{2}$ di ens 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 sam e con guration $\mathrm{W}_{3}$. The weights are hence uniquely de ned by this procedure, and one is guaranteed that the only vertioes 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. T he directed loop equations can therefore be w ritten as
$w$ here the $m$ atrix on the left hand side is a real sym $m$ etric $4 \quad 4 \mathrm{~m}$ atrix w th all entries non-negative for a usefiul algorithm. The $m$ agnitudes of the diagonal ele$m$ ents determ ine the bounce probabilities. $T$ his is the generalstructure 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 tim es. Som e of the di erent sets are typically identical to each other by symm etry, as in the case of the $S=1=2 \times X Z \mathrm{~m}$ odel where there are eight sets falling into two classes. In that case the structure of the equations changes into 3 form s because there are only three allowed exit possibilities for each entrance leg. To explain this with an exam ple in the schem e used here, we can consider the vertex $w$ th all spins dow $n$ as the reference vertex. T hen $W_{2}=0$ as this con guration corresponds to the case where the low er legs ( 1 and 2) are ipped, resulting in a vertex with weight zero. This im m ediately im plies that alla's (being all non-negative) w ith an index 2 m ust 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 44 equation sets, som e or all of w hich reduce into 3 and 2 sets (e.g., for $H$ ubbard-type electron m odels there are both $2 \quad 2$ and 3 sets, but no 44 sets).

Let us consider the $3 \quad 3$ case in greater detail and ask when one can do w thout bounces, as we saw waspossible in a region in param eter space of the $S=1=2 \times \mathrm{XZ}$ m odel discussed in the previous section. To do this, it is convenient to rst label the equationsso that $W{ }_{3} \quad W_{2}$
$W_{1}$. W e 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 $W_{3} \quad W_{1}+W_{2}$, and hence one nd a directed loop solution w ithout bounces only when this condition is satis ed.

A llow ing bounces, it is also easy to see that one can alw ays do w ith only one bounce, the one which bounces o of the vertex $w$ ith the largest $w$ eight. If $W_{3}$ is the largest weight one can set $a_{11}=a_{22}=0$ and $a_{33}=$ $\mathrm{W}_{3} \quad \mathrm{~W}_{1} \quad \mathrm{~W}_{2}$, which gives $\mathrm{a}_{12}=0, \mathrm{a}_{13}=\mathrm{W}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{a}_{23}=$ $\mathrm{W}_{2}$. This $m$ eans that the probability form oving betw een the con gurationsw ith sm allest w eight is zero while that of $m$ oving from the largest weight con guration to the sm aller ones is the ratio of the sm allerw eight to the larger weight and unity for the reverse process. The bounce probability is unity $m$ inus the probability for $m$ oving to the sm aller weight con gurations. A sim ilar analysis can be carried out for the 44 equation sets appearing for $\mathrm{S}>1=2 \mathrm{~m}$ odels and boson m odels.
$T$ he equation sets involving largerm atrioes, as encountered when dealing $w$ th interactions involving $m$ ore than two sites, can also be studied in a sim ilar $m$ anner. It should be pointed out that there is nothing that guarantees a priori that the operator-loop update is ergodic (in com bination w ith the diagonalupdates), for any solution of the directed loop equations. E rgodicity requires that all allow ed vertioes can be generated through a series of loop updates, and this is typically the case with 2particle term $s$ (although one could in principle construct m odels where it is not the case). H ow ever, sim ple onedim ensional loops such as those discussed here cannot alw ays accom plish this alone when the interaction includes $m$ ore than two particles, even in the case of relatively sim ple $m$ odels. The SSE $m$ ethod has recently been applied to an X Y m odelw ith a standard 2-spin interaction $J$ and a 4 -spin term $K$ [4d]. In that particular case, an operator-loop update can be used, and is ergodic, for jं j> 0, but for $J=0$ another chister-type update had to be carried out. In practige, a com bination of the two updates had to be used for large $K=J$.

## IV . PATH INTEGRALFORMULATION

In this section we w ill discuss how the directed loops can be applied to the path integralM onte C arlo $m$ ethod ( P IM ) form ulated in im aginary tim $e$. Such $m$ ethods are know $n$ as w orld-linem ethods in discrete $\left[\frac{9}{1}\right]$ or continuous
 the SSE and $P \mathbb{I M}$ representations of quantum statistical $m$ echan ics have been explored in previous w orks [42, $\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \mathbf{4}_{2} 7_{1}\right]$. H ere we w ill show that also the directed loop ideas can be alm ost directly translated from SSE into the $P \mathbb{I M}$ form alism .
A. C onstruction of the path integral

W e start by w riting the partition function as

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z=\operatorname{Trfe} e^{H} g=\operatorname{Tr} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{t}=1}^{\left(\mathrm{Y}^{Z}\right.} e^{H} \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $==\mathrm{L}$ and L is a large integer. The H am iltonian is generally a sum of non-com muting pieces, and in order to dealw ith the exponential it is convenient to em ploy the Suzuki-T rotter trick [ib]. This involves dividing the H am iltonian into several sets of term s , w here all term s w ithin a set are com m uting while the sets them selves are non-com muting. Because the H am iltonian is m ultiplied by the sm allquantity it is possible to split the exponentialinto a product ofexponentials, each having one set in the exponent. T he errors arising from this approxim ation vanishes as ! 0 勧. C onsider as an exam ple the XXZ chain. T hen the $\bar{H}$ am iltonian can be divided into two sets, one involving the operators which act on sites $2 n$ and $2 n+1$ while the other set involves the operators acting on sites $2 n+1$ and $2 n+2$. It is then possible to insert com plete sets of states, which can be chosen to be w ritten in term $s$ of $S^{z}$-com ponents, betw een all the exponentials and the partition function can be w ritten
where is a shorthand for a spin con guration in the $S^{z}-$ basis ofallsites in the chain. T he sum is over allpossible sets of spin con gurations, tw o com plete sets of states for each tim e step $t$, and the trace implies $L+1=1 \cdot T h i s$ is called the checkerboard breakup as one can visualize it as a checkerboard pattem (see Fig. 112) where all the $m$ atrix elem ents are pictured as shaded plaquettes. T his breakup is com pletely general and can also be used for higher-dim ensional lattioes. B ecause each set $H_{1}$ and $H_{2}$ consists of individually commuting terms it su ces to consider the interaction on one shaded plaquette only and the $m$ atrix elem ents can easily be w ritten dow $n$. K eeping only term $s$ to nst order in one nds

$$
\begin{align*}
& =1+(C+=4) \text {; }  \tag{39}\\
& W_{3}=h \# \# j \quad{ }^{H} j \# \# i=1+\left(C \quad=4 \quad h_{b}\right) \text {; }
\end{align*}
$$

These $m$ atrix elem ents di er from the $m$ atrix elem ents (18) in the SSE m ethod only in that the Ham ittonian is multiplied by the factor and the diagonal matrix elem ents also com e w ith the zeroth-order term of the exponential. The weight $W_{1}$ com es $w$ ith $a m$ inus sign which here is om itted by im plicitly perform ing a rotation about the $S^{z}$-axis for spins on one sub-lattige.


FIG. 10: The checkerboard breakup of the space-time for a spin chain w ith four sites w ith open boundary conditions. $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ have term $s$ acting on the links betw een site 0 and 1 and the link betw een site 2 and 3. $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ acts on the link between site 1 and 2. The shaded plaquettes show where the H am ilton ian acts.


FIG.11: Loop and spin con gurationswhich should have the sam e weight when allow ing the loops to be ipped independently.
$T$ his can be done whenever the lattice is bipartite. O ne can of course also calculate the $m$ atrix elem ents (301) exactly, but since wew illhere take the continuum lim it it is su cient to go to linear order in , where the sim ilarity to the SSE expressions are $m$ ost evident.

In the ordinary w orld-line loop algorithm (for a review see R ef. [4][]), tw o loop segm ents are assigned to each and every shaded plaquette in a stochastic way. The shaded plaquettes are comer-sharing so that when all shaded plaquettes have been assigned segm ents one can identify closed loops. G iven that the probabilistic rules for the assignm ent of loop segm ents for each shaded plaquette

ip a loop w ith any probability. In particular one can pick a random site and a random im aginary time and
ip the loop which includes this point with probability unity. O ne can also tum this around and nst, before any loop is constructed, pick a random point in spacetim $e$ and then construct the loop starting at this point and ipping spins w th probability unity as the loop is being constructed.

W hen assigning loop segm ents to each shaded plaquette one needs two loop segm ents for each plaquette in order to $l l$ the lattice com pletely. Then $m$ any con $g-$ urations can be reached, as one should be able to independently ip spins along one or both the loop segm ents.

Thus one gets relatively m any gonstraints of the type (26). This is illustrated in Fig. 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
$1 \quad 1$. In a magnetic eld there is one additional equation and the set does not have any solutions. W ithin 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. $T$ his increases the num ber of unknow ns in the equation set, $m$ aking a solution possible. W hile we are not aw are 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. H ow ever, in the extrem e Ising lim it the freezing is responsible for the fact that the loop algorithm becom es equivalent to the Sw endsenW ang algorithm, and hence the freezing of loops has som e $m$ erits.

A nother $m$ ethod to $m$ ake the loop algorithm work in a magnetic eld is to apply the eld in the x-direction, thereby changing the $m$ atrix elem ents and introducing a $m$ inus sign. U sing the concept of $m$ erons the resulting sign problem can be solved $\left[21,1,2_{2}^{1} 2_{1}^{\prime}\right]$, but the sim ulation algorithm is not very e cient for large system $s$. If one relaxes the condition that the loops should be ipped w ith probability one and instead chooses weights such that the ipping probability ism axim ized, it is possible to nd rules that work very well at extrem e elds [1] $\overline{9}_{1}^{\prime}$. H ow ever, this success at extrem e eldsm ust be regarded as a lucky circum stance and is not generally valid for low er elds. Yet another and perhaps the sim plest loop $m$ ethod in the presence of a $m$ agnetic eld is to construct the loops as if the eld was absent and then include a M etropolis decision whenever attem pting to ip a loop that changes the $m$ agnetization. This $m$ ethod is, how ever, very ine ective [44] (except at extrem ely weak elds; h=J < 1=( N ) [2]-1]) as is to be expected as it does not take into account the actual physics of the $m$ odel which is the com petition betw een the $m$ agnetic eld and the exchange energy.
$N$ one of the above $m$ ethods for treating extemal elds has proven as usefulin practice as the SSE operator-loop algorithm [18] $\left.{ }^{1} 1\right]$. The worm algorithm for path integral sim ulations in continuous im aginary tim e [3], shares som e im portant features w ith the SSE operator-loops (speci cally, there is an analogue to the back-tracking) and has also been used successfully. H ow ever, its autocorrelation tim es appear to be longer (as can be seen in com paring our results in Sec. $V$ w th those presented in R ef., (10.') . W e will discuss di erences betw een the procedures used to construct directed loops and w orm s in Sec. V II. B ecause the directed loops is a further im provem ent of the SSE approach, it is natural to investigate if these concepts can also be im plem ented in the path integral form ulation.

B . D irected loops in the P IM
To im plem ent 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 P $\mathbb{I M}$. W e can identify a comer of a shaded plaquette with a vertex leg in the SSE. Both have a spin attached, and each comer (leg) is connected to another comer (leg) on another shaded plaquette (vertex). To construct a directed loop, we rst choose a random entrance comer at a random shaded plaquette. Then, depending on the spin con guration, we choose an exit comer and place a directed loop segm ent between the entrance comer and the exit comer. The spins connected by the loop seg$m$ ent are ipped with probability one. The spin on the exit comer is then the entrance spin of the next shaded plaquette and the process continues until the loop closes. In contrast to the usualloop algorithm there is no notion of freezing loops, but there is the necessary (at least in som e regim es) process ofbouncing w here the \loop head" backtracks som e distance along its path and reverses spin ips.
Because of the relation betw een the SSE vertioes and the shaded plaquettes, and the sim ilarity of the $m$ atrix elem ents $\left[3{ }^{3} \overline{0} 1\right)$ and ( 3 " 3 ), one can im $m$ ediately w rite dow $n$ the the detailed balance equations for the P IM using Fig. ${ }_{1} \underline{\theta}_{1}$ and interpreting the vertices as shaded plaquettes. A $s$ in the SSE, there are eight sets of directed loop equations which are reduced to two by symm etries. Substituting the plaquette weights and expressing the extended con guration weights in term s of the bounce weights we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& a=\frac{1+}{4}+\frac{h_{b}}{2}+\frac{\mathrm{b} \mathrm{l}_{2}+\mathrm{b}_{3}}{2} ; \\
& \mathrm{b}=\frac{1}{4} \frac{\mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{b}}}{2}+\frac{\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{b}_{2} \mathrm{~b}}{2} ; \\
& \mathrm{c}=1+\mathrm{C} \frac{1}{4} \frac{\mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{b}}}{2}+\frac{\mathrm{b}_{1} \mathrm{~b}_{2} \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{g}}}{2} ; \\
& a^{0}=\frac{1+}{4} \frac{h_{b}}{2}+\frac{\mathrm{b}_{1} \mathrm{~h}_{2}+\mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}}{2} ;  \tag{40}\\
& b^{0}=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{h_{b}}{2}+\frac{\mathfrak{l}_{1}+\mathrm{b}_{2}^{0} \mathrm{~b}_{3}^{0}}{2} ; \\
& c^{0}=1+c \frac{1}{4}+\frac{h_{b}}{2}+\frac{b_{1}^{0} h_{2}^{0} h_{3}^{0}}{2}:
\end{align*}
$$

N on-negative weights are required to avoid sign problem s. This im plies that there are regions where bounces $m$ ust be non-zero. In fact the sam e \algorithm ic phasediagram " as shown in Fig. 'd applies here, with the exception that in this case there are no restrictions on $C$ (or $=C \quad=4 \quad \mathrm{~B}$ ) as it alw ays occurs $m$ ultiplied by in a combination where there also is the zerothorderterm of the exponential. In fact, in the construction of the loops in continuous im aginary tim e, where only quantities to order $m$ atters, the value of $C$ drops out com pletely as we will consider ratios where it tums out


FIG. 12: Left: C ontinuous im aginary tim e construction of a loop. This gure can be understood as the lim it ! 0 of Fig.110, dotted (solid) lines correspond to spin down (up). Starting at an arbitrary site and tim e (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. $R$ ight: A resulting $a^{0}$ decay at a tim $e d$ where the segm ent 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 integralrepresentation. W henever in a region ofparam eter space w here bounces are needed, one can choose them to be the $m$ inim um values as sum $m$ arized in Tableit + , w ith the only m odi cation that the bounce w eights should be m ultiplied by . A s in the SSE m ethod the actual probability for choosing an exit comer, given an entrance comer and a spin con guration on a shaded plaquette, is obtained by dividing one of the weights above by the appropriate $m$ atrix elem ent from Eqs. (3d).

In the lim it ! 0 this method $m$ ight seem very slow as one needs to $m$ ake a choide for every plaquette of which there are in nitely $m$ any in this lim it. H ow ever, one can use the $m$ ethod em ployed in the continuous tim e im plem entation of the standard w orld-line loop algorithm [4] $\left.4_{1}^{1}\right]$, which is based on the fact that the $c_{r} c^{0}$ w eights are of order unity. T he $c_{r} c^{0}$ weights describe the process of continuing the loop construction in the im aginary tim e direction on the sam e site. Being of order unity m eans that this w illbe the dom inating process. T he other processes arem ultiplied by and w illtherefore occurm uch less frequently.

To ilhustrate in detail how a loop is constructed in the lim it ! 0, consider as an exam ple the situation show $n$ in $F$ ig. ."른. This gure show sthe fullim aginary-tim e spin con gurations for four sites. T he dotted (solid) lines correspond to spin down (up). The gure can be understood as the lim it ! 0 of Fig. $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}}^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{-}$. The lop construction consists of $m$ oving the loop head. This m otion begins at a random site and time in a random direction. In Fig. 12 the starting point and direction is $m$ arked 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 m eans that half of the $2=, \quad=10$, shaded plaquettes (the factor 2 is from the fact that there are two neighbors) betw een the starting point 0 and 1 are of the type $W_{2}$, while the other half is of the type $\mathrm{W}_{3}$. T he loop head
will therefore enter altemately the lower left comer on shaded plaquettes having weight $W_{2}$ and the low er right comer on shaded $W_{3}$ plaquettes. On exiting the shaded $W_{2}$ plaquette, one of the three processes $\mathrm{a}^{0}, \mathrm{~b}_{2}^{0}$ or $\mathrm{c}^{0}$ can happen, while for each of the $\mathrm{W}_{3}$ plaquettes one of the processes b,c or $b_{3}$ can happen. The $c$ and $c^{0}$ processes are by far the m ost 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 w ill just continue its $m$ otion in the upw ard direction on site 1. T he probability for the rst occurrence of one of the processes of order within an interval aftertime 0 is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
P\left({ }^{0}\right) & \frac{C^{0}}{W_{2}} \frac{c}{W_{3}}{ }^{0} \quad \frac{c^{0}}{W_{2}}+1 \frac{C}{W_{3}} \\
& =e^{\left(0^{+}\right)^{0}(0+2)} ; \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

where in the last equality we have taken the lim it ! 0 , and the quantities $i$ are nite as ! 0;

$$
\begin{align*}
& 0=\frac{\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}}{\mathrm{~W}_{3}}  \tag{42}\\
& 2=\frac{\mathrm{a}^{0}+\mathrm{b}_{2}^{0}}{\mathrm{~W}_{2}} \tag{43}
\end{align*}
$$

where the subscript on indicates which neighbor is considered. Recall that by de nition $\mathrm{W}_{3}=\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{b}_{3}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{W}_{2}=\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}_{2}+\mathrm{c}$. Thus, w ith a random num ber generator one can generate \decay" tim es according to the distribution ( 41 11) and take the random decay tim e generated as the point $w$ here one of the processes $a^{0}, b_{2}^{0}, b$ or $b_{3}$ occurs. If the decay tim e so generated is bigger than 10 the loop head can be m oved directly all the way to time 1 , while ipping all the spins on site 1 up to tim e 1 . There it enters a shaded plaquette from the low er left comer. This plaquette has weight $W_{1}$, and the possible choiges for exit comers are determ ined by the ratio of the w eights $\mathrm{b}_{1}^{0}, \mathrm{a}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{b}^{0}$ to $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ which all are nite as ! 0. O ne can hence just use the random num ber generator to select the exit comer. G iven that the outcom e of this choice is, for instance, $a^{0}$ the loop head w ould $m$ ove to site 2 while ipping spins w hich changes the shaded plaquette of type $W_{1}$ to be oftype $W_{2}$. Theprocess would then continue in the dow nw ard direction on site 2 . If the decay happens before 1 the loop head m oves to the decay point while
ipping spins and then a choice betw een the possible decay types is m ade. G iven that a decay occurs, the choige of di erent types of decays is again independent of as only the ratios $m$ atter. As an exam ple, the probability of selecting $a^{0}$ is $a^{0}=\left(a^{0}+b_{2}^{0}+b+b_{3}\right)$. This type of process is illustrated in F ig. 112.12 . H aving $m$ ade the choige the process continues, and the loop closes w hen the loop head reaches the originalstarting point.

In practioe it is convenient to store the spin- ip events in a doubly-linked list for each lattioe site so that spinips can be added and rem oved e ciently. T he m ain com putational cost is then to search the site of the loop head and its neighbors for spin transitions.

In zero magnetic eld the directed P $\mathbb{I M}$ loop algorithm proposed here corresponds exactly to the singlecluster form ulation of the ordinary loop algorithm for
 bounce w eights to zero and $C=\quad=4$, 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 horizontalbreakups, b to diagonalbreakups, and c to verticalbreakups. T he generalalgorithm w ith bounces is $m$ ore sim ilar to the w orm algorithm [\$] $]$, but the processes by which the worm is propagated through space-tim e are di erent and do not correspond to a solution of our directed loop equations. This will be further discussed in Sec. V II. In Sec. V we w ill dem onstrate that the directed loop processes, especially w ith Solution B (in both SSE and $P$ IM im plem entations) lead to $m u c h ~ m o r e ~ c i e n t ~$ sim ulation algorithm s.

## V.AUTOCORRELATIONS

Autocorrelation functions provide quantitative m easures of the e ciency of a M onte C arlo sam pling schem e in generating statistically independent con gurations. For a quantity $Q$, the norm alized autocorrelation function is de ned as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{Q}(t)=\frac{h Q(i+t) Q(i) i \quad h Q(i) P}{h_{Q}(i)^{2} i \quad h Q(i) \underline{P}} ; \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $i$ and $t$ are $M$ onte $C$ arlo tim es, for which we will use the unit of 1 MCS (as de ned in Sec. II-D in the case of SSE, and w ith an analogous de nition for the P $\mathbb{I M}$ ). The brackets indicate the average over the time i. A sym ptotically, the autocorrelation function decays exponentially as $\quad e^{\mathrm{t}=}{ }^{e}$, where the asym ptotic autocorrelation time $e$ is given by the slow est $m$ ode of the sim ulation (the transition $m$ atrix of the $M$ arkov chain) to which the observable Q couples. For short tim es, the behavior is typically di erent for di erent quantities, even if $Q$ is the sam e . The integrated autocorrelation tim e is de ned according to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{int}[Q]=\frac{1}{2}+{ }_{t=1}^{X^{\geq}} A_{Q}(t) \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

and is the autocorrelation $m$ easure of greatest practical utility [ ${ }^{4} \mathbf{4}_{1}^{7}$ ].

In this section we w ill present integrated autocorrelation tim es for som e im portant quantities in several regions of the param eter space of the anisotropic H eisenberg model ( $\underline{1}_{1}^{1}$ ). W e cannot present a com pletely exhaustive study, how ever, since in addition to the eld $h$ and the anisotropy , the autocorrelations also depend on tem perature $\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{J}=1$ and the lattioe size. In addition, in SSE sim ulations the autocorrelations depend on the constant in the $m$ atrix elem ents $(1,1 \phi)$. O ne of our aim $s$ here is to nd the optim um value if ${ }^{2}$. W e com pare sim ulations w ith the originalgeneral (non-determ inistic) SSE
operator-loop update [1] (Solution A) and the new solution of the directed loop equations discussed in Sec. III B (Solution B ).W e also present som e results obtained w ith Solution B in continuous-tim e P $\mathbb{M}$ simulations.
$T$ he physical quantities that wew ill focus on here are the $m$ agnetization,

$$
\begin{equation*}
M=\frac{1}{N}_{i=1}^{X_{i}^{N}} \mathrm{hS}_{i}^{z} i \tag{46}
\end{equation*}
$$

the uniform magnetic susceptibility

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\star} \frac{N^{N}}{X^{\mathrm{N}} S_{i=1}^{\mathrm{z}}} \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

the staggered susceptibility,

$$
\begin{equation*}
s=\frac{1}{N}_{k ; 1}^{X}(1)^{x_{k} x_{1}+y_{k} y_{1}}{ }_{0}^{Z} d h S_{k}^{Z}(1) S_{1}^{Z}(0) i ; \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the spin sti ness,

$$
\begin{equation*}
s=\frac{@^{2} E()}{@} \text {; } \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $E()$ is the intemalenergy per spin in the presence of a tw ist in the boundary condition. These quantities and their SSE estim ators have been discussed in detail in $R$ ef. $\left.{ }^{\left[411_{1}^{\prime}\right.}\right]$.

W e note again that the de nition of an M CS in the generic SSE operator-loop schem e involves som e degree of arbitrariness, as was discussed in Sec. II D. There is also a statistical uncertainty due to the statistical deter$m$ ination of the num ber $N_{1}$ of operator-loops constructed per MCS. In all the SSE sim ulations discussed here, $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ w as adjusted during the equilibration of the sim ulation so that on average 2 M vertex legs (excluding bounces) were visited in each M CS.T hem axim um expansion power M w as increased if needed after each equilibration M CS, so that $M=1: 25 \quad n_{n a x}$, where $n_{m a x}$ is the highest power n generated so far in the sim ulation. The statistical uncertainties in $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{m}}$ ax imply some uctuations in the de nition of an MCS. This, in tum, results in uctuations in the results for the integrated autocorrelation tim es that can be larger than their statisticalerrors. T ypically, these uctuations are only a few percent, how ever, and are hence not problem atic.

In the P $\mathbb{I M}$ sim ulations, we adjusted $N_{1}$ so that on average the total length (again excluding bounces) of all $N_{1}$ loops in a M CS is equal to $N$; the space-time volume. The de nitions of an MCS in SSE and PIM sim ulations are hence sim ilar but not identical. O ne reason why it is di cult to construct exactly com parable M CS de nitions in the SSE and the P $\mathbb{M}$ is that the diagonal single-operator updates carried out separately in SSE are in e ect accom plished during the loop construction in the $P \mathbb{M}$. A nother di erence is that there is no


F IG .13: Integrated autocorrelation tim es vs extemal eld for the $m$ agnetization of an $N=64 \mathrm{H}$ eisenberg chain at $=16$. $T$ he upper and low er panels show results of sim ulations using SolutionsA and B, respectively. Severalvalues of the constant were used, as indicated by the legends in the lower panel. $T$ he inset show $s$ the $m$ agnetization itself.
adjustable constant in the P IM. In Ref. [4] [4] an alternative approach of norm alizing the autocorrelation tim es by the actual num ber of operations perform ed w as used. H ow ever, also this de nition $m$ ay be am biguous since it depends on the details of the im plem entation, and there are also di erences in the actualCP $U$ tim e consum ed depending on the $m$ ix ofoperations (integer, oating point, boolean, etc.). These issues are not ofm a jor signi cance in the calculations we present below, but should nevertheless be kept in $m$ ind when com paring autocorrelations for the tw om ethods.
$T$ he rem inder of this section is organized as follow s: In A we rst discuss SSE sim ulations of the 1D Heisenberg m odelin an extemal eld. In B we consider SSE sim ulations of 2D system $s$ in elds and $w$ th anisotropies. $P \mathbb{I M}$ results for both 1 D and 2D system S are presented in C. W e have also studied several isotropic system $s$ at critical points and extracted the dynam ic exponent of the sim ulations. W e discuss these results in D.
A. SSE sim ulations in 1D

W hen the constant $=0$, the vertioes w th all spins up or all spins down are excluded from the SSE con guration space $w$ hen $h=0$, since the corresponding $m$ atrix elem ents ( $1 \mathbf{1} \overline{1}$ ) then vanish. W hen $h>0$, the all-up ver-


F IG . 14: Integrated autocorrelation tim es vs extemal eld for the staggered susceptibility of an $\mathrm{N}=64 \mathrm{H}$ eisenberg chain at
$=16$. The inset show s the staggered susceptibility.
tex is again allowed. W ith > 0 all vertices are allow ed and the propagation of the loop is then $m$ ore random. W e here begin by studying how the sim ulation e ciency depends on in the case of the 1D $H$ eisenberg $m$ odel ( $=1$ ) in a eld.

Figs. 1 grated autocorrelation tim e of the $m$ agnetization and the staggered susceptibility in sim ulations of chains w ith 64 sites at inverse tem perature $=16$. A s show n in the inset of $F$ ig. '1] 1D) the $m$ agnetization is about $10 \%$ from saturation at this tem perature. T he staggered susceptibility is peaked at $h=0$, re ecting the fact that the staggered spin-spin correlation function for spin com ponents parallel to the extemal eld is dom inant only in the absence of a eld. In the case of Solution $A$ sim ulations, the e ect of increasing from 0 is an initial sm all drop in int $M$ ] for elds h < 0:8 and a sm all increase at higher elds. T here is a substantialincrease in int [s] forw eak elds. As is further increased there is a sm all increase in int $M$ ] also for weak elds. In contrast, w ith Solution B increasing
has favorable e ects on both autocorrelation tim es up to the highest studied here. The e ects are very sm all for high elds, how ever, since there the autocorrelation tim e is already close to tis low er bound $0: 5 \mathrm{when}=0$. For all -values, the autocorrelation tim es are considerably shorter w ith Solution B than with Solution A. This show s 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


F IG .15: B ounce probabilities in Solution A and B sim ulations of an $\mathrm{N}=64 \mathrm{H}$ eisenberg chains at $=16$, using di erent values of .
and close to $h=0$, where the shortest autocorrelation tim es w ith Solution B are only about 10\% of those with Solution A.

In Fig. 1 sim ulations ( $P_{\text {bounce }}$ is the fraction ofbounces, including length-0 loops). The behavior re ects that of the autocorrelation tim es. $W$ ith Solution B, $P_{\text {bounce }}$ decreases $m$ onotonically $w$ th for all elds, whereas w th Solution A the behavior is non-m onotonic. In Solution B, the vanishing of $P_{\text {bounce }}$ both in the lim itsh ! 0 and $h!h_{\text {sat }}=J$ (at $\mathrm{T}=0$ ) follow sby construction, as discussed in Sec. II. W ith Solution A the bounce rate is large in these lim its.

For weak elds, a sm all > 0 has favorable e ects on the $m$ agnetization autocorrelations both $w$ th 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 $F$ igsi ${\underset{N}{2}}_{13}^{3}$ and "14. N evertheless, 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 sim ilar increase in the num ber of operations needed to carry out one M CS. H ow ever, Figs. ind and '114' indicate that even a sm all value, ( $1=4$ ), gives a signi cant im provem ent of the $m$ agnetization autocorrelations relative to $=0$ sim ulations. $W$ e nd that this behavior persists also for larger system sizes and low er tem peratures. Fig. [1] shows int $M$ ] for di erent system sizes N at inverse tem perature $=\mathrm{N}=4$, using both
$=0$ and $1=4$. The advantage of $=1=4$ becom es $m$ ore pronounced with increasing system size. For $N=128$ the $m$ axim um int $M$ ] is reduced by about $50 \%$ for both Solution A and B. The relative advantage of Solution B


F IG . 16: Integrated autocorrelation tim es for the $m$ agnetization in sim ulations of chains of di erent lengths $N$ at inverse tem perature $=\mathrm{N}=4$. The inset show s the m agnetization.
over $A$ is again the $m$ ost dram atic in the $\lim$ ith! 0 . In both solutions, the autocorrelation tim e is rather strongly peaked, w ith the peak position for the largest system s 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 $m$ ore 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 allcom pared to the nite-size gaps in the system, a step structure in them agnetization versus eld curve can be clearly resolved, as is show $n$ in $F$ ig. $\overline{1}_{1}^{1}(a)$. These steps are also re ected in the autocorrelation tim e, as shown in Fig. '1 긴 (b). There are shanp $m$ axim as in the regions where the $m$ agnetization Sw itches betw een two values. Exactly at $T=0$, the autocorrelation function ( $44_{1}^{\prime}$ ') for the $m$ agnetization is ill-de ned, since there are then no uctuations in $M$ on the $m$ agnetization plateaus. H ow ever, we nd that the lim it T ! 0 is well-behaved in the simulations. Exactly at the switching elds, int M ] appears to diverge, how ever, show ing that tunneling betw een the two equal-probability $m$ agnetization sectors becom es rare. Fig. $\left.]_{1}^{1}\right]_{1}^{\prime}(c)$ show s the average size of the operator-loops. There are $m$ axim a at the sw itching elds, w ith the peak heights grow ing as the tem perature is low ered. On the plateaus, the loop size does not change much w ith . A divergence of the average loop size w ith at the sw itching


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 sim ulations w ere carried out w ith Solution B of the directed loop equation w ith $=1=4$.
elds can be expected, since in order for the $m$ agnetization to change, the loop has to w rap around the system in the SSE propagation (or im aginary tim e) direction, which is of length . The convergence of the average loop size on the plateaus can be understood on the sam egrounds. 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.ing for eld strengths corresponding to m agnetization plateaus ( $h=J=0$ and $0: 14$ ) and sw itching elds ( $\mathrm{h}=\mathrm{J}=0: 07$ and $0: 21$ ). At $\mathrm{h}=0$, there are no bounce processes and this appears to be re ected as a qualitatively di erent loop size distribution than for $h>0$, w ith no very large loops and a larger probability of sizes in the range $2^{8} \quad 2^{11}$. For all elds, there is a quite shanp cross over beyond which the probability becom es very sm all P roblem S w ith loops that do not close [39, i44] are therefore absent in this case. $W$ e did not have to im pose any $m$ axim um size during the loop construction in any of the sim ulations discussed in this paper.

In the studies of the 1D $H$ eisenberg $m$ odel in a eld that w e 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 $\mathrm{N}=64$ chains at $=$ 128 and di erent eld strengths (Solution B sim ulations w ith
$=1=4) . P(m)$ is the cum ulative probability of loop sizes betw een $2^{m} \quad(0$ for $m=0)$ and $2^{m+1} 1$.
$h_{\text {sat }}$ ). A lready $w$ ith solution A the autocorrelation tim e for the $m$ agnetization is very short com pared to other approaches. W ith the continuous-time worm algorithm
int $M$ ] is close to 100 even for system sizes as sm all as $N=10$ and $N=20$ [40
B. SSE sim ulations in 2D

For the 2D XXZ-m odel (on periodic $L \quad L$ lattices), we have calculated autocorrelation tim es versus the eld strength in system s w ith isotropic couplings ( $=1,0$
$\mathrm{h} \quad \mathrm{h}_{\text {sat }}=4 \mathrm{~J}$ ), Ising-anisotropic system s in zero eld ( $1, \mathrm{~h}=0$ ), and the XY m odel in zero and nite eld ( $=0, \mathrm{~h}=\mathrm{J}=0 ; 1=2$ ).
Fig.1] 1 dhow s the eld dependence of the autocorrelation tim e for the m agnetization of $\mathrm{L}=16$ and $\mathrm{L}=32$ system $s$ 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
 bounce probability is high ifit is not excluded \by hand", which would yield the $\mathrm{m} u \mathrm{ch}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{m}$ ore e cient determ in istic loop rules. $W$ ith the bounce included, the actual closed loop is still determ in istic but during its construction the propagating open end oscillates random ly back and forth along the defacto determ in istic tra jectory until the loop closes or is annihilated via back-tracking all the way to the starting point. O nce $h$ is non-zero, the loops becom emanifestly non-determ inistic (since an additional vertex path becom es allow ed) and apparently, as seen in $F$ ig. 1 m ore $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ cient. This is in contrast to the 1D case (see


FIG. 19: Integrated autocorrelation tim es for the $m$ agnetization in sim ulations of the 2D H eisenberg m odel in a m agnetic eld, using Solution A (circles) and B (squares) and constants $=0$ (lled sym bols) and $1=4$ (open sym bols). The inset show $s$ the $m$ agnetization (the di erences in $M$ between $L=16$ and $L=32$ are very $s m$ all at the inverse tem perature
$=8$ used here).
 cient even for $h=0$ and int $M$ ] increases when $h$ is tumed on. This di erence betw een the 1D and 2D sim ulations $m$ ay be related to the loop sizes (although the full explanation probably is $m$ ore com plex and related to the di erent physical properties of the system s , which are re ected 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 in istic ones at $h=0$. In 2D the loops are $m$ uch larger, and then even a small h can allow m ost paths to \escape" from the $\mathrm{h}=0$ determ inistic loop tra jectories so that there are not as $m$ any propagations back and forth along the sam e path as at $h=0$. U sing a non-zero also makes the path non-determ inistic, and $F$ ig. ild show s 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 betw een $=0$ and $1=4$ in Solution B are sm all at all elds, how ever.

Fig. 2 susceptibility of Ising-an isotropic system $s$ in zero eld at $=8$. Solution $B$ perform s signi cantly better than Solution A for < 1:5, but only marginally better at


FIG. 20: Integrated autocorrelation tim es for the staggered susceptibility in sim ulations of the 2D anisotropic H eisenberg m odel at $=8$. The symbols indicate Solutions A, B, and $=0 ; 1=4$ in the sam e way as in $F i g 119$.


FIG. 21: U pper panel: Bounce probabilities in sim ulations of a 3232 an isotropic H eisenberg model at $=8$. Lower panel: The average loop size in the sam e sim ulations.
higher. In this system $=0$ im plies that the closed loops are defacto determ inistic for all anisotropies (the only allow ed $=0$ vertex processes are again the bounce and the sw itch-and-reverse). H ow ever, the sym $m$ etry 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, nether w ith 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 w hat has been done w ith the standard w orld-line loop
 $m$ izes the bounce probability and hence leads to $m$ ore directed paths and, therefore, closing of the loops in few er steps (and hence a larger num ber of com pleted loop in an M CS as de ned here). Bounce probabilities are show $n$ in the upper paneloff ig. $2 \overline{1} \overline{1}^{\prime}$. W hen $>0$ the loops becom e m anifestly non-determ inistic, leading to signi cantly reduced autocorrelation tim es. The bounce probabilities are also reduced, but for both solutions $P_{\text {bounce }}$ still becom es large as is increased. N evertheless, the autocorrelation tim es continue to decrease. W e 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 allSSE vertices on a given site (the num ber of which scales as ), which would be a slow process since the bounce probability is high. The low er panel of $F$ ig. $21_{1}^{1}$, show $s$ that the average loop size becom es very sm all for large. T he algorithm clearly does not reduce to a classicalSw endsen $-W$ ang or $W$ ol cluster algorithm as ! 1 (in the classical algorithm s the cluster size! N as T ! 0). H ow ever, at higher tem peratures the algorithm could easily be supple$m$ ented $w$ ith a cluster update which corresponds exactly to the classical one (a multi-spin generalization of the
ips of \free" spins, where chusters of spins connected to each other by operators in $S_{M}$ can be ipped sim ultaneously w thout changing the weight if $=0$ and $h=0$ ). As in the standard world-line loop algorithm [491], it is also possible to include loop-freezing in the determ in istic operator-loop algorithm .
$N$ ote that there is essentially no structure in the Solution $B$ autocorrelation tim e for $=1=4$ in $F$ ig 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 m axim um (classicalt $=0$ ) value, as can be inferred from


For the XY m odel $(=0)$, the directed loop equations have a solution w thout bounces for all elds up to the saturation eld. W e nd that the resulting algorithm is very e cient, w ith autocorrelation tim es sm aller than one for all system sizes and tem peratures that we have studied. Fig. ${ }^{2} 2 \overline{2}$, show s results for the spin sti ness as a function of tem perature for zero eld as well as at $\mathrm{h}=\mathrm{J}=0: 5$. The corresponding autocorrelation tim es are


FIG. 22: Spin sti ness of the X Y m odel at zero extemal eld (upper panel) and at $h=J=0: 5$ (lower panel). T he insets show the corresponding integrated autocorrelation tim es. Solution B w ith $=\mathrm{m}$ in (see Table I) was used in all cases.
peaked around the K osterlitz-T houless (K T ) transition tem perature but do not grow w th the system size. The KT transition in the $h=0$ system has been studied to high accuracy using a continuous-tim e w orld-line loop algorithm, $w$ ith the result $T_{K ~}=J \quad 0: 342$ [ [24]. O ur $h=0$ data are in com plete agreem ent w ith the previous results. $W$ e nd that the data for $h=0: 5$ show $n$ in $F$ ig. $2 \overline{2} \overline{2}_{1}^{\prime}$ can be collapsed onto the $h=0$ data if $T$ and $s$ are both scaled by the sam e factor ( $1: 05$ for $h=J=0: 5$ ), in accord w ith the universality of the transition. M ore extensive results for this $m$ odel $w$ illbe presented elsew here.
C. P IM simulations

Next we will show some results for autocorrelation tim es obtained using the $P \mathbb{I M}$ im plem entation of the directed loop algorithm. To m ake a reasonable com parison w th the autocorrelation tim es for the SSE, we will also in the PIM de ne a MCS so that it includes $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ loops, where $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ is determ ined such that on average the total path length, excluding the rst path segm ent im $m$ ediately follow ing each bounce, of all $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ loops in an MCS is equalto $N$; the space-tim evolume (in the $P \mathbb{I M}$, each path segm ent has a length in im aginary tim $e$, 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. H ow ever, it could be argued that a better de nition of the total path length would be to add all the path segm ents but


F IG . 23: U pper panel: Integrated autocorrelation tim es vs extemal eld for the $m$ agnetization (solid circles) and staggered susceptibility (open circles) in P IM sim ulations of an $\mathrm{N}=64 \mathrm{H}$ eisenberg chain at $=16$. Lower panel: B ounce probability vs extemal eld in the sam e sim ulation.
instead of exchuding the segm ent im $m$ ediately follow ing a bounce one would subtract the part of the path im $\mathrm{me} \mathrm{e}^{-}$ diately follow ing a bounce that overlaps w th the path segm ent preceding the bounce (w ith special care taken for consecutive bounces). This would $m$ ore accurately take into account the fraction of spins actually ipped. W e have here used the rst de nition of the M CS as it correspondsm ore closely to how we de ne an M CS in the SSE $m$ ethod (w here a di erent treatm ent of the bounces could of course also be im plem ented (see Sec. II D ).

Generally speaking the com puter im plem entation of the $P \mathbb{I M}$ is $m$ ore com plex than SSE, as it is alw ays necessary to keep track of the spin states on neighboring sites in the $P \mathbb{I M}$. $T$ his is not required in the SSE for$m$ ulation, where the vertices contain all the inform ation needed. Therefore our com puter code for the $P \mathbb{I M}$ is not as e cient as the SSE code in generating a single M CS, 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 lesse ective than Solution B, wew illin this section just show results for Solution B.

Fig. "23", shows the integrated autocorrelation tim es int $\mathbb{M}$ ] and int $[\mathrm{s}$ ] fora 64 -site $H$ eisenberg chain ( $=1$ ) at inverse tem perature $=16$ as functions of the m aqnetic _eld. C om paring w ith the SSE results in Figs. '13' and "14, it is seen that int $M$ ] is com parable to the $=1$ case while int $[\mathrm{s}]$ is m ore sim ilar to the $=0$ curve, exapt close to $h=0$ where it also behaves $m$ ore like the


FIG. 24: F ield dependence of the integrated autocorrelation tim es for the $m$ agnetization in $P \mathbb{M}$ sim ulations of chains of di erent lengths N at inverse tem perature $=\mathrm{N}=4$.
$=1$ case. The lower panel of $F$ ig. 2 dependence of the bounce probability. ${ }_{\text {b bounce }}$ is here dened as the num ber ofbounces divided by the totalnum ber of tim es the path building changes, either by $m$ oving to a neighbor site or by back-tracking. This $m$ easure is not directly com parable to the de nition in the SSE case, as the $m$ oves $c$ and $c^{0}$, where the path continues on the sam e site, are not counted in the denom inator of $P_{\text {bounce }}$ (they are in nitely $m$ any in the $P \mathbb{M}$ ). N evertheless, the generalbehavior of $P_{\text {bounce }}$ versus $h$ is the sam $e$ for the two $m$ ethods.

In Fig. ${ }^{2} 211$ we have plotted int $M$ ] as a function of m agnetic eld fordi erent chain sizes N . In all cases = $\mathrm{N}=4$. A s in the SSE case ( F ig. C (1) we see an increase in int $M$ ] w ith system size for sm all to interm ediate elds. H ow ever, the $m$ axim um P IM autocorrelation tim es are about 50\% sm aller than in the SSE $=1=4$ case.

W e have also carried out sim ulations of the 2D H eisenberg $m$ odelusing the $P \mathbb{I M}$. In $F$ ig. ${ }^{2} \bar{L}_{1}^{\prime}$ w we show results for int $M$ ] for a 1616 lattice at $=8$. H ere the behavior is alm ost identical to the SSE results shown in Fig. id, where there is only a sm alldependence on .

From these exam ples it can be seen that the P $\mathbb{I M}$ generally has shorter autocorrelation tim es than SSE in cases where the SSE results show a signi cant dependence on the constant. In som e sense the $P \mathbb{I} M$ corresponds to the ! 1 lim it of SSE, as in this lim it the continuestraight processes also dom inate the loop construction in SSE. In cases where the SSE autocorrelations converge slow ly to their $=1$ lim it the $P \mathbb{I M}$ approach $m$ ay hence be $m$ ore e cient (since in SSE the com putation tim e for one M CS grows linearly w ith in this lim it). H ow ever, in assessing a m ethod's e ciency one should also take into account the cost of perform ing a single M CS. This of course depends heavily on the actual com puter im ple$m$ entation of the directed loop algorithm. That is, what


F IG . 25: Integrated autocorrelation tim es (P IM) vs extemal eld for the $m$ agnetization of an $16 \quad 16 \mathrm{H}$ eisenberg square lattice at $=8$.
kind ofdata structures are used to represent the spin and vertex con gurations, what kind of search algorithm sare used for nding spin states at a given time in the $P \mathbb{M}$, e.t.c. $W$ hile we do not attem pt to com pare the $P \mathbb{M}$ and SSE in this respect here, it is quite clear that it is often easier to $n d$ a fast and $e$ ective im plem entation for the SSE than for the PIM.W ealso note that the convergence to the ! 1 lim it in the SSE is relatively fast in all cases we have studied so far. T he convergence appears to be slow est in 1D, but even there the reduction of the autocorrelation tim es becom es sm all beyond $=1$, where they are sim ilar to the $P \mathbb{I M}$ autocorrelations.

## D . D ynam ic exponent

A $n$ interesting question is how the autocorrelation tim e diverges $w$ ith the system size in sim ulations at a critical point. T he 1D H eisenberg m odelat $\mathrm{h}=0 ; \mathrm{T}=0$ exhibits power-law $(1=r)$ decay of the staggered spin-spin correlation function and is a hence a quantum critical system [ $50{ }^{-1}$ ']. W e have studied the integrated autocorrelation tim e for the staggered spin susceptibility in this m odel as the system size N is increased and the inverse tem perature
$=\mathrm{N}=4$. T he staggered susceptibility should couple to the slow est $m$ ode of the sim ulation, and its autocorrelation tim e is therefore expected to diverge asym ptotically according to a power law ;

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{int}[s] \quad{ }^{z} ; \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $z$ is the dynam ic exponent of the sim ulation. N ote that it is here essential that and $N$ are taken to in nity at a xed ratio (as the physicaldynam ic criticalexponent relating space and im aginary time is 1). It is interesting to com pare SSE sim ulationsw ith Solution B at di erent


F IG . 26: A utocorrelation tim es for the staggered susceptibility of the isotropic $H$ eisenberg chain at $=N=4$ obtained in SSE and PIM sim ulations w ith 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 com pare the two possible ways of ipping the loops when $=0$. Ath $=0 ;=0$, Solution B reduces to the determ inistic operator-loop [1d]. A s discussed in Sec. II $D$, instead of constructing a xed num ber of loops per M CS at random, all loops can then be constructed and ipped independently ofeach other w ith probability $1=2$. T h is is analogous to the Sw endsen W ang [4.] algorithm for the classical Ising $m$ odel. For the Ising $m$ odel, it is know $n$ that it is $m$ ore e cient (i.e., $z$ is sm aller) to construct the clusters one-by-one using the W ol algorithm


In Fig. $\overline{2} \overline{6}-\overline{6}$ we show results of Solution B sim ulations w th $=0$ and $1=4$ along w th results from $=0 \operatorname{sim}-$ ulations were all clusters were constructed. The autocorrelation tim es of the two $=0$ sim ulations are very sim ilar, but for large system sm arginally shorter w hen all clusters are constructed. H ence, there is here no advantage in constructing the clusters one-by-one. $T$ his ism ost likely related to the fact that in order to change the loop structure in the SSE sim ulations at $h=0 ;=0$, diagonal updates also have to be carried out. In the schem e used here, diagonal updates are only perform ed at the beginning of each M CS, and hence the sam e loop can be constructed several tim es in one MCS if they are constructed at random. It is then $m$ ore e cient to construct allloops 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 diagonalupdates, w hich certainly could be possible but w hich we have not yet attem pted. A s in the other cases w e have discussed above, there is a signi cant im provem ent when $=1=4$ is used in Solution B. H ow -


FIG.27: SSE autocorrelation tim es for the staggered and uniform susceptibility of the $H$ eisenberg bilayer close to its quantum critical point ( $~_{?}=J=2: 5225 \mathrm{was}$ used). The inverse tem perature $=\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{J}$.
ever, the dynam ic exponent appears to be the sam e in all cases; $z \quad 0: 75$. In $F$ ig ${ }_{2}^{2}$ It is clear that the autocorrelation tim es here are signi cantly shorter but $m$ ost likely the dynam ic exponent is the same as in SSE. $T$ he shorter $P \mathbb{M}$ autocorrelation tim es are consistent $w$ ith the 1D results show $n$ 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 $H$ eisenberg $m$ odel on two coupled layers (bilayer), ${ }^{W}$ ith intra-plane coupling $J$ and inter-plane coupling $J$ ? [511]. The $\mathrm{T}=0$ antiferrom agnetic long-range order in this $m$ odel vanishes at a critical inter-plane coupling $\left(J_{?}=J\right)_{c} \quad 2: 525$ " [2\$]. Som e autocorrelation results for both $S S E$ and $P \mathbb{I}$ sim ulations of this $m$ odel at $J_{?}=J=$ $2: 524$ have been presented recently [ $\left.444^{\prime}\right]$ and indicate that the dynam ic exponent $z \quad 0$ in both $m$ ethods. Our m ost recent sim ulations indicate that $\left(\mathrm{J}_{\text {? }}=\mathrm{J}\right)_{\mathrm{c}} \quad 2: 5225$, i.e., slightly lover than the previous estim ate $\overline{\underline{2}} \overline{1} 1]$. In Fig. ${ }^{2} \underline{21}_{1}$ w w show integrated autocorrelation tim es for severalquantities at this coupling, using both $=0$ and $1=4$ in Solution B sim ulations. In the $=0$ case, all clusters were constructed in each M C S.W e again note signi cant shorter autocorrelation tim es in the non-determ inistic simulation ( $=1=4$ ). H ow ever, the determ inistic sim ulation is signi cantly faster. O ne determ in istic M CS at
$=0$ typically only requires $5060 \%$ of the CPU time of a generic Solution B M CS at $=1=4$. The net gain in sim ulation e ciency $w$ ith $>0$ is therefore only $m$ arginal in this case. A llour results are consistent with $\mathrm{z}=0$, although with $=0$ the convergence to a size-independent behavior is rather slow. We have not carried out P $\mathbb{I M}$ sim ulations of this system .
$N$ ext we consider the 3D H eisenberg $m$ odel, which un-


FIG.28: A utocorrelation tim es for the staggered susceptibility and the spin sti ness of the 3D H eisenberg $m$ odel close to its critical tem perature ( $\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{J}=0: 944 \mathrm{w}$ as used). The lines correspond to scaling $\mathrm{L}^{1=4}$.
dergoes a phase transition to an antiferrom agnetic state at a non-zero tem perature [52]. A ccording to recent SSE sim ulations, using system $s w$ ith $N=L^{3}$ sites and $L_{\text {n }}$ up to 16 , the critical tem perature $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{J}=0: 946 \quad 0: 001$ [ $[5$ These sim ulations were carried out using only local updates. $W$ th the operator-loop update, $m$ uch larger system s can be studied. W e have carried out sim ulations for L up to 48 close to the critical tem perature. B ased on the results, w e believe that $T_{c}$ is at the low end ofthe previous estim ate, likely very close to 0:944. Fig. 2 id show s autocorrelation tim es for the staggered susceptibility and the spin sti ness at $T=J=0: 944$, obtained using the determ inistic SSE algorithm w ith $=0$ (constructing all clusters during each M CS) and Solution B with $=1=4$. Here the $=0$ results are initially consistent $w$ ith a dynam ic exponent z $0: 25$, but for the largest sizes there seem $s$ to be a change in behavior, possibly a convergence corresponding to $z=0$. The $=1=4$ simulation is fully consistent w ith $\mathrm{z}=0$.
VI. LOW FIELD MAGNETIZATION OFTHE 2D HEISENBERGMODEL

A san exam ple ofan application $m$ ade possiblew ith 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 tem peratures, the eld dependence of the $m$ agnetization exhibits a stepstructure due to the gaps between the lowest-energy states $w$ th $m$ agnetization $m_{z}=0 ; 1 ; 2 ;:: \quad N=2$. These gaps can be extracted from the calculated $m$ agnetization curve. For the isotropic $H$ eisenberg $m$ odel, the


FIG. 29: Total m agnetization vs extemal eld in the 2D H eisenberg m odel w ith $\mathrm{L}=64$ at two inverse tem peratures. $T$ he curves were calculated using four tted energies $E_{L}(S)$ (the sam e for both curves).
gaps are exactly the gaps between the degenerate spin m ultiplets w ith total spin $S=0 ; 1 ;:::$ in the absence of the eld.

In an antiferrom agnetically ordered system, such as the 2D $H$ eisenberg $m$ odel, the energies of the $S>0$ multiplets relative to the $S=0$ ground state should correspond to the excitations of a quantum rotor when $S \quad \bar{N}$. The over-allenergy scale can be related to the uniform (transverse) $m$ agnetic susceptibility [5] ${ }^{2}$ ]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
E(S)=\frac{S(S+1)}{2 L^{2} ?} \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L^{2}=N . T$ he asym ptotic validity of this relation has been veri ed using quantum M onte C arlo estim ates
 convergence of the spectrum fors L wasbeen pointed out for the 2D H eisenberg $m$ odel $w$ ith spin-1=2 [5]. A system atic study $\circ f E_{L}(S)$ for system $s$ larger than $L=16$ w as 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 tim es 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 ew ill present our com plete results of such calculations elsew here. H ere we will dem onstrate the pow er of the new $m$ ethod by focusing on the rst few levels for system sizes L up to 64, ie., the num ber of spins is 16 tim es larger than in the previous studies $\left[55_{1}^{1}, 15 \sigma_{1}\right]$.

In order to see the step-structure needed to extract the energy levels $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathrm{S})$ for sm all $S$, the tem perature has to
be below the $S=1$ gap, which according to Eq. ( $55_{1}^{1}$ ) and previous estim ates of the susceptibility ( ? $0: 0 \overline{65}=\mathrm{J}$ ) is approxim ately $0: 004=\mathrm{J}$ for $\mathrm{L}=64$. In practioe, we have used inverse tem peratures corresponding to roughly $1=10$ of the gap. W e have tted the num erical results to a magnetization curve $\mathrm{hm}_{\mathrm{z}}$ i calculated using energy levels of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{L}\left(S ; m_{z}\right)=E_{L}(S) \quad h m_{z} ; \quad m_{z}=0 ; \quad 1 ;::: \quad S ; \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

at the sam e tem perature as in the sim ulations. $W$ e adjust the energies $E_{L}(S)$ to give the best $m$ atch betw een the calculated and theoreticalm agnetization curves. F ig. ind shows results for $L=64$ at $=2048$ and 4096. We used the same tted levels $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathrm{S})$ at both tem peratures (clearly, the $S=1$ level com pletely dom inates the = 4096 results, which include only the rst $m$ agnetization step) . A s in R ef. $5 \mathbf{5} \underline{6}$, w e de ne a spin-and size-dependent susceptibility using the energy levels $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathrm{S})$ obtained in this tting procedure;

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2 \mathrm{~L} ; \mathrm{S}}=\frac{\mathrm{L}^{2} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathrm{~S})}{\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{~S}+1)} ; \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

and extrapolate data for $x e d S$ to in nite size in order to determ ine the them odynam ic susceptibility ? .
 ranging from $L=8$ to $L=64$. $T$ he results up to $L=16$ agree very wellw th those presented previously [5].], but our statistical errors are considerably sm aller. The collapse of the three curves onto each other for large system $s$ dem onstrate the validity of Eq. ( 5 (211) for sm all $S$. Extrapolating the three data sets to in nite size gives the susceptibility ? = 0:0659 0:0002, again in good agreem ent w ith R ef., ${ }^{\prime}$ ', ${ }^{-}$, but w ith a considerably reduced statistical error.

For the $L=64$ sim ulations at $=4096$, theCPU time needed to perform one M CS is approxim ately 40s on an IntelP entium III running at 866 M hz . T he results show n in F ig. 2d 2 are based on $3 \quad 8 \quad 10 \mathrm{MCS}$ for each data point.
VII. SUMMARYAND DISCUSSION

W e have introduced the concept of directed loops in stochastic series expansion and path integral quantum $M$ onte $C$ arlo and im plem ented them for sim ulations of the $S=1=2 \times X Z-m$ odel in an extemalmagnetic eld. $T$ he directionality of the loop re ects the asym $m$ etry between the operation of ipping the spins along the loop and the reverse operation of ipping back those spins. Such an asym $m$ etry is not present in the standard worldline loop algorithm $[4,16,142]$, which as a consequence is restricted to certain regions of param eter space. Q uite generally, there is a hierarchy of three classes of directed loops. In the m ost general case the loop can back track during construction. In som e regions of the param eter space the back tracking can be excluded, and in som e


F IG . 30: Inverse susceptibility extracted using the energies of the $S=1 ; 2$, and 3 m ultiplets. $T$ he curves are quadratic ts.
further restricted regions the loops becom e sym $m$ etric (non-directional) and reduce to the type of loops previously considered for world-line $[\overline{4}, 1], 1]$ sim ulations. H ence, the directed loop fram ew ork constitutes a natural generalization of the loop-cluster concept [1]]. W e have show $n$ that the transitions betw een the di erent levels of the hierarchy can be $m$ ade sm ooth by $m$ inim izing the probability ofback-tracking when solving the directed loop equations. W e have also dem onstrated that the algorithm based on this solution w orks very well in the full param eter space of the XXZ-m odel.

O ur schem e appears to be $m$ uch $m$ oree cient than the worm algorithm for continuous-tim e path integral sim ulations [3]1], which also is applicable in the full param eter 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 m oving discontinuities was used rst in the worm algorithm for the purpose of $m$ easuring $o$-diagonal correlation functions ( G reeen's functions). It was also the rst $m$ ethod that was practically usefiul in the presence of extemal elds. It is, how ever, not the presence of the discontinuities that $m$ akes the worm algorithm and SSE operator-loop [1\% ${ }^{-1}$ ] algorithm applicable in the presence ofextemal elds. O ne can also think of the construction of the standard worldline loops [1], ind] in term s ofm oving discontinuities, but they are $m$ ore constrained in their $m$ otion and therefore cannot take extemal elds into account. Hence, it is the rules for $m$ oving the discontinuities that determ ine whether or not a loop or worm sim ulation is e cient. The directed loop equations constitute a fram ew ork for optim izing these rules. Below we w ill com $m$ ent on the sim ilarities and di erences betw een worm s and directed loops.

The operator-loop update previously constructed for

SSE sim ulations $[\overline{1}[\underline{1} \overline{1}]$ corresponds to a particular solution (A) of the directed loop equations. W e have here constructed a di erent solution (B), which minim izes the probability of back tracking in the loop construction and therefore is $m$ ore e cient. The new solution $B$ com pletely elm inates back-tracking (bounce processes) in the XXZ-m odel for z -anisotropies $1 \ll 1$ up to a nite extemal eld $h$ (up to the saturation eld for $=0$ and only exactly at $h=0$ for $j j=1$ ). In other interesting param eter regions the bounce probability is typically a few percent or less. Our sim ulation results show that the new solution can decrease the autocorrelation tim es by up to an order of $m$ agnitude or $m$ ore in cases where Solution A is the least e cient (at w eak and interm ediate $m$ agnetic elds and anisotropies). The algorithm ic discontinuly of the previous approach (w hich am ounted to using a very e cient determ in istic algorithm at $h=0$ and the much less e cient generic Solution A for $h>0$ ) is hence avoided w ith Solution B, where the bounce probabilities and the autocorrelation tim es sm oothly connect to those of the determ inistic algorithm. H ow ever, our results also indicate that the detem inistic loop construction at $\mathrm{h}=0$ is not always the m ost e cient. W ith a non-determ inistic solution (Solution B w ith the constant
> 0 in the bond operator) the operator paths becom es $m$ ore random, which has a favorable e ect on the autocorrelations.

In addition to being $m$ oree cient in term softhe autocorrelation tim esm easured in units of our de ned M CS, Solution B is also typically faster as the num ber of operations required to perform one M CS is sm aller (because of the sm aller bounce probability). In term $s$ of ease of im plem entation, Solution A is $m$ ore straight-forw ard as it is directly given in term s of $m$ atrix elem ents of bondoperators. In order to im plem ent Solution B for a new H am iltonian, one rst has to investigate the subclasses of vertioes w ith their directed loop segm ents and then m inim ize the bounce probabilities for all non-equivalent classes. SSE w ith Solution A (and other special solutions for $H$ eisenberg and $X Y$ m odels) have already been used for a num ber of di erent lattioes and $H$ am ittonians $2 \overline{2}=\overline{2} \overline{2}-1,2$ but so far we have only investigated Solution B for the XXZ-m odel discussed in this paper. W e expect generalizations to a w ide range of other $m$ odels to be relatively straight-forw ard.

In the continuous-tim e path integral, Solution B of the directed loop equations for zero eld and $j j 1$ results in an algorithm identical to the standard w orld-line loop algorithm [4, cludes a probability of back-tracking as the loop is constructed, has som e features in com $m$ on $w$ th the worm algorithm [3]l. The extended con guration space $w$ ith an open world-line segm ent (the worm) is the sam e in the two $m$ ethods (and is analogous also in the SSE operatorloop construction, although the representation there is discrete rather than continuous). H ow 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 segm_ents ofim aginary tim e at both the in itial and nalsites [\$3 ${ }^{1}$ ]. The location in tim e of the worm end does not change in these processes, but is accom plished in separate updates. In the P $\mathbb{I M}$ directed loop schem $e$, the $m$ ovem ent in im aginary tim $e$ and the creation (or annihilation) of a kink is com bined, and in each step spins are ipped on a nite segm ent of im aginary time at a single site only. This dynam ics follow s naturally from the vertex-representation introduced for the SSE operator-loop algorithm [1] $]$, w here a single spin is ipped on a link connecting tw o vertioes and the possible sites (the sam e or a speci c neighbor site) and direction (forw ard or backw ard) for the next step is dictated by the four legs of the vertex. H ere we have directly translated this dynam ics into the path integral sim ulation by borrow ing ides from the continuous-tim e loop algorithm [ $\overline{4} 1]$. The sim ulation dynam ics is hence di erent from the worm algorithm, and the worm algorithm does not correspond to a solution of the directed loop equations. O ur autocorrelation results show that the directed
 sim ulations of the $H$ eisenberg chain in a m agnetic eld, for which our $m$ easured autocorrelation tim es for $s m$ all system s are alm ost tw o orders ofm agnitude sm aller than those reported for the worm algorithm [401]. W e expect the superior perform ance of the directed loop schem e to be quite general, as the bounce $m$ inim ization achieved w ith Solution B has no countenpart in the worm algorithm (although it $m$ ay be possible to develop a generalization). T here 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 $m$ ore_e ciently $m$ easure $G$ reen's functions at long distances [13

Comparing implem entations of the directed loops $w$ th in the SSE and P $\mathbb{I M}$ 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. W e 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 com putation tim e also increasesw ith. In som e sense, the $P \mathbb{I M}$ correspondsto SSE w ith ! 1 , and one $m$ ight therefore expect the $P \mathbb{I M}$ im plem entation to be $m$ ore e cient. H ow ever, in practice the opposite is often true since already a sm all in the SSE can give autocorrelation tim es close to the ! 1 lim it, and the computation time for one MCS can be signi cantly shorter in SSE.P IM algorithm should be m ore e cient in cases where the diagonal part of the H am iltonian dom inates in the intemal energy, as the $P \mathbb{M}$ con gurations (which do not contain diagonaloperators) then are sm aller than the corresponding SSE con gurations 4in. A nother im portant aspect is the ease of im plem entation and opti-
$m$ ization of the sim ulations for various $m$ odels. $W$ e have found the discrete nature of the SSE con guration space, where the vertioes locally contain all in form ation 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 applicabil-斗y of the $m$ eron concept [ $\left.{ }_{2} \overline{1}_{1}^{1}\right]$ for solving sign problem $s$. W e have show $n$ that for the XXZ m odelback-tracking in the loop construction can be avoided in a larger region of the param eter space than where the loop-algorithm spreviously used for studying $m$ erons are applicable (specifically, at non-zero extemal elds in XY-anisotropic system s). The possibility of generalizing the $m$ eron concept to the whole non-back-tracking region should be investigated.
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APPENDIX A: PROGRAM IM PLEMENTATION OFTHESSEMETHOD
$T$ he com puter im plem entation of a sim ulation $m$ ethod can of course be done in severaldi erent ways and is an issuem ore technicalin nature than them athem aticaldefintion of the underlying algorithm. $N$ evertheless, for the bene $t$ of readers $w$ ishing to quickly construct a sim ple but e cient sim ulation program, we here brie y outline the basic aspects of our im plem entation of the SSE algorithm w ith the operator-loop update. Som e program s are also available online $\left.{ }^{-1}\right]_{1}^{-1}$ ].

W e rst introduce the m ain data structures used to store the SSE con guration in com puter $m$ em ory. The state $j i$ is stored as $S$ pin $[s]=1$ 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] ( $j=0 ;::: ; \mathrm{M} \quad 1)$, w ith $\mathrm{Sm}[j]=2 \mathrm{~b}$ and $\mathrm{Sm}[j]=$ $2 \mathrm{~b}+1\left(\mathrm{~b}=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{b}}\right)$ corresponding to diagonaland $\circ$ diagonal bond -b operators, respectively, and $\mathrm{Sm}[j]=0$ representing 11 -in unit operators. T he lattice geom etry can be coded into a list of sites $i(b) ; j$ (b) connected by the bonds b, ie., $S$ ite $[1 ; b]=i(b), S$ ite $[2 ; b]=j(b) . T$ he linked vertices are stored in the form of two lists, one containing the links and one the vertex types. T he vertex types $V$ tx $[p]=1 ;::: ; 6(p=0 ;::: ; n \quad 1)$ correspond to the six vertices shown in $F$ ig. 111. The links $L$ ink [j] ( $j=0 ;::: ; 4 n \quad 1$ ) are arranged such that $L$ ink $[4 p+i]$
( $p=0 ;::: ; \mathrm{n} \quad 1, i=0 ; 1 ; 2 ; 3$ ) contains the link (which is an integer referring to another elem ent in $L$ ink) for leg i+ 1 of vertex $p$ the leg num bers $1 ; 2 ; 3 ; 4$ are de ned in Eq. (19) ]. The double-linked nature of the list im plies that if $L$ ink $[a]=b$ then $L$ ink $[b]=a$.

The diagonal update is straight-forward: For $j=$ $0 ;::: ; \mathrm{M} \quad 1$, a bond b is generated at random for each $S m[j]=0$, which is changed to $S m[j]=2 \mathrm{~b}$ w ith the probability (14). If the change is $m$ ade, the num ber of bond-operators present increases by 1, i.e., $n!n+1$. For each diagonal elem ent, i.e., $S m[j]>0$ and even, the change to $S m[j]=0$ and $n!n \quad 1$ is carried out $w$ ith the probability $\left.(1]_{1}^{-1}\right)$, where $b=S m[j]=2$. If $S m$ [j] is an odd integer it corresponds to an o -diagonal operator at bond $b=S m[j]=2$ and the corresponding spin states should propagated, i.e., for $a=1 ; 2$, $S$ pin [S ite $[a ; b]]!\quad S p i n[S$ ite $[a ; b]]$, in order for the $m a-$ trix elem ents in Eqs. (14) and (15) to be available as needed.

To understand the im plem entation of the linked vertex list, it is useful to keep in m ind F ig. ing of the vertex legs exem pli ed in Eq. (1919). In order to construct the lists $L$ ink and $V$ tx, tw o tem porary arrays F irst[ s ] and Last[ s$]$ ( $\mathrm{s}=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{N}$ ) are needed. F irst[s] will contain the rst vertex leg on site s, i.e., F irst $[\mathrm{s}]=4 \mathrm{p}+\mathrm{im}$ eans that the rst operator acting on site $s$ is the $p$ :th bond-operator ( $p=0 ;::: ; n \quad 1$ ) in Sm and the vertex leg acting on the site is $l=i+1$ (where l will always be 1 or 2 , as these are the legs before the operator has acted). In an analogous way, Last [s] $=4 p+i$ refers to the last operator acting on site s (where $1=i+1$ now $w$ ill alw ays be 3 or 4 , since these are the legs after the operator has acted). A ll elem ents are in itialized to F irst[s] = Last[s] = 1 before the construction of the linked list starts. W hereas F irst[s] w ill be set at m ost once (never if no operator acts on site s), Last[s] can be updated several tim es as the operator list $S m$ [j] is searched from $j=0$ to $M$ 1. For each Sm [j] 0, a counter p of the num ber ( $m$ inus 1) ofbondoperators encountered is increm ented by 1 and the bond $\mathrm{b}=\mathrm{Sm}[j]=2$ is extracted, giving also the corresponding sites $\mathrm{s}_{0}=\mathrm{S}$ ite $[1 ; \mathrm{b}]$ and $\mathrm{s}_{1}=\mathrm{S}$ ite [2;b]. Links can be set w henever these sites have already been encountered, i.e., for $a=0 ; 1$, if Last $\left(s_{a}\right) \notin \quad 1, L \operatorname{ink}[4 p+a]=\operatorname{Last}\left[s_{a}\right]$ and $L$ ink $\left[\right.$ ast $\left.\left[s_{a}\right]\right]=4 p+a . T$ he last occurrence is updated to Last $\left[s_{a}\right]=4 p+a+2$. If, on the other hand, $\operatorname{Last}\left(s_{a}\right)=1$, only the last and rst occurrences are recorded, i.e., Last $\left[s_{a}\right]=4 p+a+2$ and $F$ irst $\left[s_{a}\right]=$ $4 p+a$. The spin list $S p i n$ is propagated whenever $0-$ diagonal operators are encountered, so that the vertex types $V t x[p]$ can be recorded (using a m ap from four leg states to the integers $1 ;::: ; 6)$. A fter 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 $[s]\} 1$, L ink $[$ ast $[s]]=\mathrm{F}$ irst[ $[\mathrm{s}]$ and L ink $\mathbb{F}$ irst[ s$]]=\mathrm{L}$ ast[s].
$T$ he loop update is repeated $N_{1}$ tim es. E ach loop starts at a random position $j_{0} 2 f 0 ;::: ; 4 n \quad 1 g$ in the list Link.

W e will move in Link and the current position will be referred to as $j$. W e hence begin at $j=j o$ and keep $j_{0}$ in order to check at each stage whether the loop has closed or not. T he current position corresponds to vertex num ber $p=j=4$ and the leg index is $l_{i}=\operatorname{MOD}(j ; 4)$ (we can now for convenience num ber the legs $0 ;::: ; 3$ ). $T$ his 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 cum ulative exit probabilities instead of the individual probabilities, so that for a given entrance leg $l_{i}$ the exit leg can be obtained by successively com paring the cum ulative probabilities Prob $l_{e} ; l_{i} ; V$ tx [p]] for exiting at leg $l_{e}=0 ;::: ; 3 \mathrm{w}$ th a random num ber in the range $[0 ; 1]$. A corresponding list w ith 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 $\bigcap_{e} ; l_{i} ; \mathrm{V}$ tx $\left.[\mathrm{p}]\right]$. A fter this, the current position in Link is changed to the one corresponding to the exit leg, i.e., $j!4 p+l_{e}$. The loop closes at this stage if $j=j_{0}$. If it does not close, we $m$ ove to the leg linked to j, i.e., $j!L i n k[j]$. The loop closes also at this stage if $j=j_{0}$. $T$ he tw o di erent types of closings, from $w$ thin the sam e vertex or from a di erent vertex, are illustrated in F ig. ' $\overline{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{I}$.

A fter all the $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ loops have been constructed this w ay, the updated vertex list $V$ tx is $m$ apped onto the corresponding new operator list Sm. The bond-indices do not change, and therefore one can sim ply cycle through the positions $j=0 ;::: ; \mathrm{M} \quad 1$ in the old list one-byone and for each non-zero occurrence extract the bond $b=S m[j]=2$ and increm ent an operator counterp! p+1 (the corresponding position in the vertex list $V$ tx). T he operator-type, diagonal or o -diagonal, can be coded in a list $O p T y p e[v]=0 ; 1$, where $v=1 ;::: ; 6$ is the vertex type and 0;1 correspond to diagonal and $0-$ diagonal, respectively. T he updated operator elem ent is then $S m[j]=2 b+O p T$ ype $[V t x[p]]$. The spin list $S p i n$ is updated using the list of rst occurrences that was generated during the construction of the linked list. For each site $s$, iff irst[s] = 1 no operator acts on that site and the spin can be ipped, $S$ pin [s]! $S p i n[s]$, w ith probability $1=2$. O therw ise, the updated spin state is obtained by extracting the vertex num ber $p=F$ irst $[s]=4$ and the leg $l=\mathrm{MOD}(\mathrm{F}$ irst[s];4) corresponding to the site in question. The corresponding spin state can be stored as a pre-generated map , so that $\mathrm{Spin}[\mathrm{s}]$ ! LegS pin [; V tx [p]].

W e 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 num ber of rather selfevident and trivial sim pli cations are possible (see discussion in Sec. II-D).

The possibility of aborting loop updates that becom e excessively long can be sim ply taken into account by exiting the loop update routine $w$ thout $m$ apping the already accom plished changes in the vertex list $V$ tx back into a new operator list $S m$ and state $S p i n$. For the $X X Z-$
$m$ odel the loops typically do not becom e excessively long in practice how ever, 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 $n_{n n}$ ax where $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{m}}$ ax is the largest n reached so far in the sim ulation and a suitable value for the factor is a 1:25. The num ber
of loops $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ is also adjusted during equilibration, to keep the average total num ber of vertices visited in one M C S close to som e reasonable num ber, e.g., 2hni, as discussed in Sec. II B.W e w ill not discuss the procedures for measuring operator expectation values here, but published
 easily translated into the data structures used above.
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