

Critical structure factor in Ising systems

Victor Martin-Mayor^{1,2}, Andrea Pelissetto,¹ and Ettore Vicari³¹ Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Roma La Sapienza and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy² Statistical Mechanics Center (SMC), INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy³ Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Pisa and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italye-mail: Victor.Martin@roma1.infn.it, Andrea.Pelissetto@roma1.infn.it,
Vicari@df.unipi.it

(March 22, 2024)

Abstract

We perform a large-scale Monte Carlo simulation of the three-dimensional Ising model on simple cubic lattices of size L^3 with $L = 128$ and 256 . We determine the corresponding structure factor (Fourier transform of the two-point function) and compare it with several approximations and with experimental results. We also compute the turbidity as a function of the momentum of the incoming radiation, focusing in particular on the deviations from the Ornstein-Zernike expression of Puglielli and Ford.

PACS Numbers: 05.50.+q, 05.70.Jk, 75.10.Hk, 64.60.Fr

I. INTRODUCTION

Near a phase-transition critical point, some observed quantities show a universal behavior that is common to a large class of systems, independently of the microscopic details. A very important universality class is the Ising one that is characterized by short-range interactions and a scalar order parameter. It describes the liquid-vapor transition in fluids, the mixing transition in multicomponent systems, the Curie transition in (anti)ferromagnets with axial anisotropy. The Ising critical behavior has been extensively studied both theoretically and experimentally, see Refs. [1,2]. In particular, the critical exponents, the equation of state, and several amplitude ratios have been determined with good precision. Another important quantity in the theory of critical phenomena is the static structure factor, that can be measured experimentally by determining the intensity of the light scattered by the fluid relative to the intensity of the incident light [3]. To probe larger wave numbers, neutrons are used instead of light. At the critical density of fluids near the gas-liquid critical point or at the critical concentration of binary fluids near the critical mixing point, one expects for $t = (T - T_c)/T_c \neq 0$ the general scaling behavior [4,6]

$$S(k) = \xi^3 g(k\xi); \quad (1)$$

where $\xi = C|t|^{-\nu}$, ξ is the correlation length which diverges as $|t|^{-\nu}$, k is the momentum-transfer vector, and \pm refers to the two phases, $+$ (resp. $-$) corresponding to the high- (resp. low-) temperature phase. Its absolute value is given by

$$k = \frac{4}{\lambda} \sin \frac{\theta}{2}; \quad (2)$$

where λ is the wavelength of the radiation (neutrons) in the scattering medium and θ is the scattering angle. The functions $g(Q)$, normalized so that

$$g^{-1}(Q) = 1 + Q^2 + O(Q^4) \quad (3)$$

for $Q = k\xi \ll 1$ (this defines ξ as the second-moment correlation length), are universal. Their limiting behavior is well known. For Q small, $g(Q)$ is approximated by the leading term, the so-called Ornstein-Zernike approximation

$$g_{OZ}(Q) = \frac{1}{1 + Q^2}; \quad (4)$$

Such an approximation well describes the data up to $Q \approx 1$ and is routinely used in the analysis of the data with k small and of the turbidity for the determination of the correlation length [7]. On the other hand, for large Q , $g(Q)$ shows an anomalous decay controlled by the exponent

$$g(Q) \sim \frac{C_1}{Q^2}; \quad (5)$$

Therefore, the experimental determination of the structure factor for large wavenumbers allows a direct determination of the exponent [8,20].

In this paper, we compute the structure factor in the high-temperature phase for small values of Q by means of Monte Carlo simulations on lattices L^3 , with $L = 128; 256$. We are able to determine the function $g_+(Q)$ with an error of less than 1% (resp. 2%) for $Q \leq 5$ (resp. $Q \leq 20$). These numerical results together with the most recent estimates of the critical exponents [21] are then used to determine interpolations that are valid for all values of Q and have the correct large- Q behavior. For this purpose, we use a dispersive approach [22-24], which allows us to determine an interpolating form for $g_+(Q)$ that agrees with the Monte Carlo data in the small- Q region and that well approximates (within 0.5%) the experimental results of Ref. [18].

These results are then used to compute the turbidity, i.e. the attenuation of the transmitted light intensity per unit optical path length due to the scattering with the sample. This quantity is routinely measured in experiments, since it allows the determination of the correlation length. In particular, we compute the deviations from the Puglielli-Ford expression [7], that is based on the Ornstein-Zernike approximation.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we review the theoretical results for the structure factor. In Sec. IIA we define the basic observables and report the behavior of $g_+(Q)$ for small and large values of Q . Estimates of the constants appearing in these expansions are reported in Sec. IIB. In Sec. IIC we discuss Bray's approximation. First, we discuss the high-temperature phase: we update the estimates of Ref. [23] by using the most recent results for the critical exponents. Then, we generalize the approximation to the low-temperature phase. In Sec. III we discuss our high-temperature Monte Carlo results which are compared with approximate expressions and with the experimental data of Ref. [18]. In Sec. IV we compute the turbidity, focusing on the deviations from the Puglielli-Ford expression [7] due to the anomalous decay of $g_+(Q)$. We find that the turbidity is larger than this expression by 1% (resp. 5%) for $Q_0 = 15$ (resp. 350), where $Q_0 = q_0$ and q is the momentum of the incoming radiation.

II. THEORETICAL RESULTS

A. Definitions

Several theoretical results are available for the structure factor. For Q small, one can compute the corrections to the Ornstein-Zernike behavior, by writing

$$g_+(Q) = 1 + Q^2 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} c_n Q^{2n} ; \quad (6)$$

For large Q , the structure factor behaves as

$$g_+(Q) \sim \frac{C_1}{Q^2} + 1 + \frac{C_2}{Q^{(1-\eta)_+}} + \frac{C_3}{Q^{1-\eta_-}} ; \quad (7)$$

a behavior predicted theoretically by Fisher and Langer [25] and proved in the field-theoretical framework in Refs. [26,27].

Beside the constants c_n , the constants S_M and S_Z defined by

TABLE I. Estimates of c_n , S_M , and S_Z . IHT denotes the results obtained from the analysis of high-temperature expansions for improved models, HT,LT results obtained from the analysis of high- and low-temperature expansions for the Ising model, while "-exp." and "d = 3 g-exp." label the field-theoretical results. (sc) and (bcc) denote the simple cubic and the body-centered cubic lattice respectively. Unless stated otherwise, field-theoretical results are taken from Ref. [29], while the IHT estimates are taken from Ref. [21]. For S_M we should also report the Monte Carlo estimate of Ref. [30], $S_M = 0.941(11)$.

	IHT	HT,LT	-exp.	d = 3 g-exp.
c_2^+	$3.90(6) \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.0(2) \cdot 10^{-4}$ [28] $5.5(1.5) \cdot 10^{-4}$ (sc) [31] $7.1(1.5) \cdot 10^{-4}$ (bcc) [31]	$3.3(2) \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.0(5) \cdot 10^{-4}$
c_3^+	$0.88(1) \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.0(1) \cdot 10^{-5}$ [28] $0.5(2) \cdot 10^{-5}$ (sc) [31] $0.9(3) \cdot 10^{-5}$ (bcc) [31]	$0.7(1) \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.3(3) \cdot 10^{-5}$
c_4^+	$0.4(1) \cdot 10^{-6}$		$0.3(1) \cdot 10^{-6}$	$0.6(2) \cdot 10^{-6}$
S_M^+	$0.999601(6)$	$0.99975(10)$ [28]	$0.99968(4)$	$0.99959(6)$
S_Z^+	$1.000810(13)$			
c_2		$1.2(6) \cdot 10^{-2}$ [31]	$2.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$ [32]	
c_3		$7(3) \cdot 10^{-3}$ [31]	$3.9 \cdot 10^{-3}$ [32]	
S_M		$0.938(8)$ [29] $0.930(6)$ [33]		

$$S_M = M_{\text{gap}}^2; \quad (8)$$

$$S_Z = (Z_{\text{gap}})^2; \quad (9)$$

are of theoretical interest. Here M_{gap} (the mass gap of the theory) and Z_{gap} determine the long-distance behavior of the two-point function in x-space:

$$G(x) = \frac{Z_{\text{gap}}}{4} \frac{e^{-M_{\text{gap}} |x|}}{|x|}. \quad (10)$$

The critical limits of S_M and S_Z are related to the imaginary zeroes $-iq_0$ of $g^{-1}(Q)$ closest to the origin by

$$S_M = Q_0^2; \quad (11)$$

$$S_Z = \frac{dg^{-1}(Q)}{dQ^2} \Big|_{Q = -iq_0}; \quad (12)$$

B. Numerical results

The coefficients c_n^+ turn out to be very small [6], $c_2^+ \sim 10^{-4}$, and this explains the success of the Ornstein-Zernicke approximation up to $Q \sim 1$. The constants c_n^+ have been calculated

by field-theoretic methods. They have been computed to $O(g^3)$ in the framework of the ϵ -expansion [23], and to $O(g^4)$ in the framework of the $d=3$ g -expansion [28]. The perturbative series have been resummed in Ref. [29] obtaining the results reported in Table I. The most precise estimates have been obtained from the analysis of their high-temperature expansions in improved models [21], see the results labelled by IHT in Table I.

As already observed in Ref. [28], the coefficients show the pattern

$$c_n^+ \approx c_{n-1}^+ \approx \dots \approx c_2^+ \approx 1 \quad \text{for } n \geq 3: \quad (13)$$

Therefore, a few terms of the expansion of $g_+(Q)$ in powers of Q^2 provide a good approximation of $g_+(Q)$ in a relatively large region around $Q = 0$: as we shall see, deviations are less than 1% up to $Q \approx 3$. This is in agreement with the theoretical expectation that the singularity of $g_+(Q)$ nearest to the origin is the three-particle cut [22,23]. If this is the case, the convergence radius r_+ of the Taylor expansion of $g_+^{-1}(Q)$ is $r_+ = 3^2 S_M^+$. Since, see Table I, $S_M^+ \approx 1$, at least asymptotically we should have

$$c_{n+1}^+ \approx \frac{1}{9} c_n^+ : \quad (14)$$

This behavior can be checked explicitly in the large- N limit of the N -vector model [28].

The coefficients c_n are also quite small, although not as much as in the high-temperature case. Indeed, $c_2 \approx 10^{-2}$, see Table I. They have been computed using field-theoretical methods [32] and from the analysis of low-temperature series [31]. In the low-temperature phase, one also observes the pattern (13), although the coefficients decrease slower. This is related to the fact that in the low-temperature phase the nearest singularity is the two-particle cut, so that convergence radius r_- of the Taylor expansion of $g_-^{-1}(Q)$ is $r_- = 2^2 S_M^-$, and therefore,

$$c_{n+1} \approx \frac{1}{4S_M^-} c_n \approx 0.27 c_n : \quad (15)$$

The large-order coefficients C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 have been computed theoretically within the ϵ -expansion to order ϵ^3 [23] in the high-temperature phase and to order ϵ^2 in the low-temperature phase [32]. Using the ϵ -expansion results, we obtain

$$C_1^+ \approx 0.92; \quad C_2^+ \approx 1.8; \quad C_3^+ \approx 2.7: \quad (16)$$

The corresponding low-temperature parameters C_n can be derived from the high-temperature C_n by using a set of relations derived in Ref. [27]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_1^+}{C_1} &= U_2^{-1} U^2 \\ \frac{C_2^+}{C_2} &= U_0 U^{(1)} = \\ \frac{C_3^+}{C_3} &= U^{1=}; \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_0 &= \frac{A^+}{A}; \\ U_2 &= \frac{C^+}{C}; \\ U &= \frac{f^+}{f}; \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here, C and f are the amplitudes of the susceptibility and of the second-moment correlation length defined above, while A are defined from the critical behavior of the specific heat, $C_H \sim A|t|^{-\alpha}$. Using the estimates of Ref. [21], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= 1.275(10) C_1^+ \quad 1.17; \\ C_2 &= 0.728(5) C_2^+ \quad 1.3; \\ C_3 &= 0.345(2) C_3^+ \quad 0.9; \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The large-momentum behavior of the structure factor has also been studied experimentally and the behavior (7) has been explicitly verified in the high-temperature phase. In particular, the exponent α and the constant C_1^+ have been determined. A analysis of the large- k behavior of the structure factor $S_+(k)$ gives: $\alpha = 0.017(15)$, $C_1^+ = 0.96(4)$ and $0.030(25)$, $C_1^+ = 0.95(4)$ (two different parametrizations of the structure factor are used) [9]; $\alpha = 0.0300(15)$, $C_1^+ = 0.92(1)$ [11]; $\alpha = 0.042(6)$, $C_1^+ = 0.915(21)$ [18]. No unbiased determination of C_2^+ and C_3^+ is available. Fixing $C_2^+ + C_3^+ = 0.9$ (the ϵ -expansion result of Ref. [23]), Ref. [18] obtains $C_2^+ = 2.05(80)$ and $C_3^+ = 2.95(80)$, in reasonable agreement with the ϵ -expansion predictions.

C. Bray's approximation

In order to compare with the experimental data it is important to know the function $g(Q)$ for all values of Q . For the high-temperature $g_+(Q)$, several interpolations have been proposed with the correct large- and small- Q behavior [5,31,22,24,8]. The most successful one is due to Bray [23], which incorporates the expected singularity structure of $g_+(Q)$. Here, we present Bray's interpolation together with its generalization to the low-temperature phase.

In this approach, one assumes $g^{-1}(Q)$ to be well defined in the complex Q^2 plane, with a cut on the negative real Q^2 axis, starting at $Q^2 = -r^2$, where, as discussed above, $r_+^2 = 9S_M^+$, $r_-^2 = 4S_M^-$. Then

$$g^{-1}(Q) = \frac{2 \sin \frac{\pi}{2} \int_r^\infty du u^{-1} F(u)}{C_1} + \frac{S_M}{u^2 - S_M} + \frac{Q^2}{u^2 + Q^2}; \quad (20)$$

where $F(u)$ is the spectral function, which must satisfy $F(+1) = 1$, $F(u) = 0$ for $u < r$, and $F(u) = 0$ for $u \rightarrow \infty$. Notice the appearance of the constant C_1 , which is determined, once $F(u)$ is given, by requiring $g^{-1}(0) = 1$.

In order to obtain an approximation one must specify $F_{+B}(u)$. Bray [23] proposed to use a spectral function that gives exactly the Fisher-Langer asymptotic behavior, i.e.

$$F_{+B}(u) = \frac{P(u) - Q(u) \cot \frac{1}{2}}{P(u)^2 + Q(u)^2}; \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P(u) &= 1 + \frac{C_2}{u^p} \cos \frac{p}{2} + \frac{C_3}{u^{1=}} \cos \frac{1}{2}; \\ Q(u) &= \frac{C_2}{u^p} \sin \frac{p}{2} + \frac{C_3}{u^{1=}} \sin \frac{1}{2}; \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with $p(1) = 1$. These definitions do not specify the spectral functions completely since several quantities are still unknown. First of all, we should fix the critical exponents. We will use the estimates of Ref. [21], obtained from the analysis of high-temperature expansions for improved models:

$$\begin{aligned} &= 1.2373(2); \\ &= 0.63012(16); \\ &= 0.03639(15); \\ &= 0.1096(5); \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Several other determinations are reported in Refs. [2,29]. For S_M^+ we use the estimate labelled by IHT reported in Table I, while for S_M we employ the low-temperature prediction of Ref. [29], see Table I. We must also fix C_2 and C_3 . In the high-temperature phase, Bray proposes to fix $C_2^+ + C_3^+$ to its ϵ -expansion value $C_2^+ + C_3^+ = 0.9$ and then to determine these constants by requiring $F_{+B}(r_+) = 0$. These conditions completely fix the spectral function and thus the structure factor. As a check, we can compare the estimates of c_n^+ and C_i^+ obtained by using Bray's approximation $g_{+B}(Q)$ with the previously quoted results. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^+ &= 0.918; & C_2^+ &= 2.56; & C_3^+ &= 3.46; \\ c_2^+ &= 4.2 & 10^4; & c_3^+ &= 1.0 & 10^5; \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The constants C_1^+ , C_2^+ , and C_3^+ are in reasonable agreement with the ϵ -expansion results (16), while c_2^+ and c_3^+ are close to the estimates reported in Table I.

In the low-temperature phase, we have tried to follow again Bray's strategy. We have first set $C_2 + C_3 = 0.4$ and required $F_{+B}(r_-) = 0$. However, the resulting estimates of C_n and c_n are not in agreement with the previous results: we find $C_1 = 0.87$, $c_2 = 1 \cdot 10^3$. Little changes if we fix $C_2^+ + C_3^+ = 0.4$ and use the relations (17). For this reason, we have given up requiring $F_{+B}(r_-) = 0$ and we have simply set $C_2 = 1.3$, $C_3 = 0.9$, as obtained in the previous section. Then, Bray's approximation gives

$$C_1 = 1.0; \quad c_2 = 1.1 \cdot 10^2; \quad c_3 = 1.7 \cdot 10^3; \quad (25)$$

which are close to previous estimates. A plot of Bray's approximations is given in Fig. 1. Note that the structure factors in the high- and low-temperature phases are very similar.




FIG. 1. Scaling functions $g_B(Q)$ versus Q in Bray's approximation. We report the high- (HT) and low- (LT) temperature scaling functions.

III. MONTE CARLO RESULTS

We determine the structure factor in the region of small k as we shall see, we are able to reach $k \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ by means of a large-scale Monte Carlo simulation. We consider the Ising model on a cubic lattice, i.e. the Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j \quad (26)$$

where $\sigma_i = \pm 1$ and the summation is over nearest-neighbor pairs $\langle i,j \rangle$. We measure the structure factor

$$S(\mathbf{q}; L) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{x,y,z} e^{iq_x x} + e^{iq_y y} + e^{iq_z z} h_{(0,0,0) \rightarrow (x,y,z)} \quad (27)$$

for three different values of L : (a) $L = 128$, $\beta = 0.2204$; (b) $L = 128$, $\beta = 0.2210$; (c) $L = 256$, $\beta = 0.22145$. Of course, in Eq. (27) $q = 2\pi n/L$, where n is an integer. In the simulation we used the Swendsen-Wang algorithm, starting from random configurations and discarding $(2-4) \cdot 10^4$ iterations. The results of the simulations are reported in Table II. We report the number of iterations N_{\pm} , the susceptibility χ , the second-moment correlation length ξ and $h(\mathbf{q}; L)$,

$$h(\mathbf{q}; L) = \ln \frac{(1 + q^2 \xi^2) S(\mathbf{q}; L)}{S(0,0,0)}; \quad (28)$$

which directly measures the deviations from a purely Ornstein-Zernike behavior.

In Fig. 2 we plot $S(\mathbf{q}; L) = \chi / (2\pi)^3$ for the three lattices considered | errors are smaller than the size of the points | together with the experimental results of Ref. [18] for CO_2 and Bray's approximation. We observe good agreement, the numerical data for lattice (c) being close to the experimental ones.

TABLE II. For the three lattices considered, (a), (b), and (c), we report the number of iterations N_{it} , the susceptibility χ , the second-moment correlation length ξ and $h(\mathbf{q}; \beta; L)$ for $n = \mathbf{q}L = (2, 1, 1)$.

	(a)	(b)	(c)
N_{it}	$4.35 \cdot 10^6$	$3.2 \cdot 10^6$	$2.14 \cdot 10^6$
	669.9 (4)	1501 (2)	6339 (10)
	13.050 (7)	19.739 (14)	41.16 (5)
n		$h(\mathbf{q}; \beta; L)$	
1	0.0009 (9)	0.0015 (11)	0.0002 (17)
2	0.0002 (11)	0.0003 (14)	0.0001 (25)
3	0.0017 (12)	0.0027 (16)	0.0019 (27)
4	0.0039 (13)	0.0065 (17)	0.0042 (27)
5	0.0063 (13)	0.0096 (18)	0.0067 (28)
6	0.0093 (13)	0.0135 (18)	0.0095 (28)
7	0.0128 (13)	0.0179 (18)	0.0123 (28)
8	0.0178 (13)	0.0232 (19)	0.0141 (28)
9	0.0222 (14)	0.0281 (18)	0.0179 (28)
10	0.0270 (13)	0.0335 (19)	0.0204 (28)
11	0.0326 (14)	0.0398 (18)	0.0234 (29)
12	0.0383 (13)	0.0459 (17)	0.0263 (28)
13	0.0438 (13)	0.0521 (17)	0.0290 (29)
14	0.0510 (13)	0.0593 (18)	0.0324 (29)
15	0.0579 (13)	0.0666 (18)	0.0353 (28)
16	0.0647 (14)	0.0736 (18)	0.0380 (28)
17	0.0722 (13)	0.0815 (18)	0.0409 (29)
18	0.0806 (13)	0.0896 (18)	0.0437 (28)
19	0.0887 (14)	0.0986 (17)	0.0478 (28)
20	0.0975 (13)	0.1078 (18)	0.0506 (29)
21	0.1072 (14)	0.1168 (18)	0.0538 (29)
22	0.1158 (14)	0.1271 (18)	0.0576 (28)
23	0.1258 (14)	0.1366 (18)	0.0616 (28)
24	0.1367 (14)	0.1473 (18)	0.0642 (29)
25	0.1472 (14)	0.1583 (18)	0.0676 (28)

However, at a closer look one observes tiny deviations of order 1-2%. In order to observe better the differences among the different approximations and data, it is useful to plot the function $h(\mathbf{q}; \beta; L)$ which converges to $\ln[(1 + Q^2)g_+(Q)]$ in the scaling limit. We have been able to observe accurately (i.e. at the level of one error bar, approximately 0.3% on $g_+(Q)$) this convergence only up to $Q \leq 4$, as it can be seen in Fig. 3. Indeed, only in this region we observe a good overlap of the results for the two lattices (b) and (c), which have the largest values of β . As a further check, we can compare the numerical results with the small- Q expansion (6) which is expected to converge rapidly up to $Q \leq 3$. Using Eq. (6) to order Q^6 (resp. Q^8) we obtain the curve labelled "\series3" (resp. "\series4") in Fig. 3. The data (c), that correspond to $L = 256$, are in perfect agreement, confirming that in this region we are




FIG. 2. Function $S(q; \beta; L) = \gamma$ versus $Q = q$ for the three cases (a), (b), (c). We also report the experimental results of Ref. [18], "expt," and Bray's approximation, "Bray."




FIG. 3. Function $h(q; \beta; L)$ versus $Q = q$ for the three cases (a), (b), (c). We also report the experimental results of Ref. [18], "expt," and the small- Q approximations, "series3" and "series4."

seeing the correct asymptotic behavior. In Fig. 3 we also report the experimental results of Ref. [18]. They are systematically higher than the Monte Carlo results and indicate that, at least in this region, the experimental error on the structure factor is approximately of order 0.5-1%.

For larger values of Q , we are not able to observe scaling, as it can be seen in Fig. 4. According to standard renormalization-group theory

$$h(q; \beta; L) = h_1(Q; L=) + L^{-1} h_2(Q; L=) + \dots \quad (29)$$

where $[21] = 0.83(5)$. Thus, we could try to extrapolate in L at $L =$ fixed and then take the limit $L = \infty$. Lattices (b) and (c) have approximately the same $L =$, $L = 6$ and thus, in principle one should be able to extrapolate in L . In practice, corrections increase




FIG. 4. Function $h(q; \beta, L)$ versus $Q = q$ for the three cases (a), (b), (c). We also report the experimental results of Ref. [18], "expt," a phenomenological interpolation, "fit," and Bray's approximation, "Bray."

quickly with Q , see Fig. 4, and no reliable extrapolation can be done. In any case, we believe we can still use the numerical data presented in Fig. 4 to conclude conservatively that, for $Q \in 15-20$, $h(q; \beta, L)$ for lattice (c) is a good approximation to the limiting function with an error at most of 0.02, i.e. that we can use our data (c) to compute $g_+(Q)$ with a 2% precision up to $Q \in 15-20$.

In Fig. 4 we also report Bray's approximation. Such an approximation agrees nicely with the Monte Carlo results (c) up to $Q \approx 10$ and, as expected, it is lower in the region $Q \gtrsim 10$ where we expect the results (c) to be higher than the scaling limiting curve. Bray's function looks therefore a reasonable approximation to the universal scaling function, although it is somewhat lower than the experimental data by 1-2%.

For the computations of the next Section, it is important to have an estimate of the structure factor with a reasonable error bar. For this purpose, we have determined a second interpolation that is in better agreement with the experimental data. We will obtain an error by comparing the results obtained using this interpolation and Bray's approximation. This interpolation may be obtained by considering expressions that agree with the numerical data for lattice (c) in the region $Q < Q_{\max} = 15$. We shall use again the spectral representation (20), since such an expression gives automatically the behavior (14) and ensures the correct small- Q behavior. In order to obtain the correct large- Q behavior, we use a generalization of the spectral function proposed by Bray, i.e.

$$F_t(u) = F_B(u) \left[1 - u^2 \right] + \sum_{n=2}^{Q_{\max}} a_n u^n : \quad (30)$$

Such an expression is purely phenomenological. The first term has been introduced to guarantee that $F_t(1) = 0$ as generally expected, while corrections of order $1-u$ have been avoided, since they would give rise to terms of order $1-Q^{-2}$ for $Q \gg 1$ that are stronger than those appearing in the Fisher-Langer behavior (7). In Eqs. (20) and (22) we use




FIG. 5. Ratio τ/τ_{PF} versus Q_0 using Bray's approximation, "Bray," and the phenomenological approximation, "fit." We also report the corresponding asymptotic expression $\tau_{as} = \tau_{PF}$, ("as1" and "as2") where τ_{as} is defined in Eq. (34), and the phenomenological approximation (36), "phen," valid for $Q_0 \gg 100$. In "as1" we use $C_1^+ = 0.91797$, $K = 0.128735$, in "as2" we use $C_1^+ = 0.92$, $K = 0.160734$.

the ϵ -expansion estimates (16) and the values of the exponents reported in Eq. (23). The constants a_n are fixed by requiring $g_+^{-1}(0) = 1$ and $g_+(Q)$ to fit the numerical data (c) up to $Q \approx 15$. A good fit is obtained by taking $n_{max} = 6$ and $a_2 = 574.128$, $a_3 = 7588.59$, $a_4 = 29558.9$, $a_5 = 43740.7$, $a_6 = 21715.6$. The corresponding curve labelled "fit" is reported in Fig. 4. The results depend on Q_{max} used in the fit, and tend to give a lower curve if smaller values of Q_{max} are used. However, it is interesting to remark that, with the choice $Q_{max} = 15$, the interpolation is in excellent agreement with the experimental data for all $Q > 15$, see Fig. 4.

Finally, it is interesting to remark that the Ornstein-Zernicke approximation differs at most 1% from the correct expression for $Q \lesssim 5$, while for $Q \gtrsim 5$ the Fisher-Langer formula can be applied, as already observed in many experimental works, see, e.g., Refs. [15,17,19,20].

IV. TURBIDITY

The turbidity τ is defined as the attenuation of the transmitted light intensity per unit optical path length due to the scattering with the sample. Explicitly, it is given by

$$\tau = \int \frac{dS(k)}{4\pi} \approx \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi \sin^2 \theta \, d\theta \, \sin^2 \theta \, \sin \theta \, d\theta \quad ; \quad (31)$$

where $k = 2k_0 \sin(\theta/2)$, $k_0 = 2\pi/\lambda$ is the momentum of the incoming radiation in the medium, λ the corresponding wavelength in vacuum, n the refractive index, and $\theta = (\theta; \phi)$ the solid angle. By using Eq. (1), in the high-temperature phase we can write the turbidity in the form

$$= \frac{2 \cdot 0 \cdot t}{Q_0^2} \int_0^{Z_{2Q_0}} Q dQ g_+(Q) - 1 - \frac{Q^2}{2Q_0^2} + \frac{Q^4}{8Q_0^4} ; \quad (32)$$

where $Q_0 = k_0$ and 0 is a constant that can be assumed temperature-independent in a neighborhood of the critical point.

For small values of Q_0 , the Ornstein-Zernicke approximation can be used obtaining the Puglielli-Ford expression [7]

$$\chi_{PF} = 0 \cdot t \frac{2a^2 + 2a + 1}{a^3} \log(2a + 1) - \frac{2(a + 1)}{a^2} ; \quad (33)$$

where $a = 2Q_0^2$.

We can also compute the behavior for large Q_0 by using Eq. (7). We obtain

$$\chi_{as} = \frac{2 \cdot 0 \cdot t}{Q_0^2} C_1^+(2Q_0) - \frac{2 + 2 + 8}{(+ 2)(+ 4)} - \frac{C_1^+}{C_1^+} + K + O(Q_0^{-(1)}) = ; \quad (34)$$

where

$$K = \int_0^{Z_1} Q dQ g_+(Q) + \int_1^{Z_1} Q dQ g_+(Q) - C_1^+ Q^{-2} ; \quad (35)$$

In order to obtain χ for all values of Q_0 we must use a specific form for $g_+(Q)$. We will use here Bray's approximation and the interpolation formula obtained using (30) with $n_{max} = 6$, $Q_{max} = 15$. The difference between the results obtained using these two expressions provides the error on our results. In Fig. 5 we report χ_{PF} using the two different approximations together with their asymptotic expression $\chi_{as} = \chi_{PF}$. In Bray's approximation $K = 0.128735$ while in the second one $K = 0.160734$. The deviations from the Puglielli-Ford behavior are very small and for $Q_0 \leq 100$ are well described by the asymptotic expression (34) with $C_1^+ = 0.92$ and $K = 0.145(16)$. Estimates of the turbidity for $1 \leq Q_0 \leq 100$ can be found in Table III. For $Q_0 > 100$ one can use the phenomenological formula

$$\chi_{PF} = 0.666421 + 0.242399 \cdot 1 + 0.0087936 Q_0^{2 \cdot 0.018195} + 0.0911801 \cdot 1 + 0.09 Q_0^{4 \cdot 0.0090975} ; \quad (36)$$

which is also reported in Fig. 5 ("phen").

We wish finally to compare our results with the approximate expressions given by Ferrell [34], which require $Q_0 \gg 1$ and $\log Q_0 \gg 1$, i.e. $1 \ll Q_0 \leq e^{10} \approx 9 \cdot 10^4$. By expanding Eq. (34) and setting as in Ref. [34] $L = \log(4Q_0^2)$ we obtain

$$\frac{0 \cdot t}{Q_0^2} C_1^+(L - 1) + C_1^+ - \frac{L^2}{4} - \frac{L}{2} + \frac{3}{4} + K ; \quad (37)$$

In order to compare with Ferrell's results, we must compute $\chi = (4 \cdot 0 \cdot t - g(2Q_0))$. Since, using the same approximations $g(2Q_0) = C_1^+(2Q_0)^{-2} (1 + L - 2 + O(L^{-2}))$, we obtain

$$\frac{0 \cdot t}{4 \cdot 0 \cdot t - g(2Q_0)} = L - 1 - \frac{L^2}{4} + \frac{3}{4} + \frac{K}{C_1^+} \quad (38)$$

TABLE III. Ratio τ_{PF} . We use here: (a) Bray's approximation; (b) general phenomenological interpolation based on (30) with $n_{max} = 6$ and $Q_{max} = 15$.

Q_0	(a)	(b)
5	1.004	1.004
10	1.008	1.009
15	1.011	1.014
20	1.013	1.017
25	1.015	1.020
30	1.017	1.022
35	1.019	1.024
40	1.020	1.026
45	1.022	1.028
50	1.023	1.029
60	1.025	1.031
70	1.027	1.034
80	1.029	1.036
90	1.030	1.037
100	1.032	1.039

This formula agrees with Ferrell's expression once we recognize that $K = 0$ () since $K = 0$ for a purely Ostein-Zemike behavior. Numerically, we predict $3=4 + K = (C_1^+)^{-1} \approx 5.1(5)$, which is smaller than Ferrell's numerical result 8.4. Ferrell's expression predicts a turbidity that is somewhat higher than ours. Indeed, his numerical result implies $K \approx 0.26$ in Eq. (34), and as consequence we would obtain $\tau_{PF} \approx 1.06$ (resp. 1.085) for $Q_0 = 100$ (resp. 1000), to be compared with our prediction $\tau_{PF} \approx 1.036(4)$ (resp. 1.069(3)).

Another expression for the turbidity that takes into account the anomalous decay of the structure factor is given in Ref. [35]. It assumes that [36] $g_+(Q) = (1 + cQ^2)^{-1+\alpha}$, where $c = 1/(1 - \alpha)$. It follows that

$$\tau = 4\pi \int_0^\infty \frac{(2b+1)^{-2} - 1}{b^3} \frac{[4 - 2b(4) + 2(2 + 2 + 8)]}{(2 +)(4 +)} db; \quad (39)$$

where $b = 4Q_0^2/(2 +)$. Such an expression however predicts a turbidity that is too large. For instance, for $Q_0 = 10$ it gives $\tau_{PF} \approx 1.05$, to be compared with our prediction $\tau_{PF} \approx 1.008$, cf. Table III.

Note the correct turbidity is larger than τ_{PF} since $g_+(Q)$ decreases slower for $Q \rightarrow 1$ than the Ostein-Zemike approximation. However, this is apparently in contrast with the experimental results for the binary liquid mixture methanol-cyclohexane presented in Ref. [37].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work of V.M.M. was supported by the European Commission contract HPMF-CT-2000-00450 and by OCYT (Spain), project No. FPA 2001-1813.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Levy, J.C. Le Guillou, and J. Zinn-Justin (Eds.) \Phase Transitions, Status of the Experimental and Theoretical Situation," Cargese 1980 (Plenum, New York, 1981).
- [2] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, \Critical Phenomena and Renormalization-Group Theory," e-print cond-mat/0012164.
- [3] The structure factor directly determines the scattered light intensity in the absence of multiple scattering. However, multiple scattering is important in experiments on fluids [38,39], and it is therefore essential to perform the appropriate corrections to the data [38{41]. Note also that we consider here only Rayleigh elastic scattering, which is the dominant contribution near the critical point, see, e.g., Ref. [39].
- [4] M. E. Fisher, J. Math. Phys. 5, 944 (1964).
- [5] M. E. Fisher and R. J. Burford, Phys. Rev. 156, 583 (1967).
- [6] M. E. Fisher and A. Aharony, Phys. Rev. B 10, 2818 (1974).
- [7] V. G. Puglielli and N. C. Ford, Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. 25, 143 (1970).
- [8] D. Beysens, A. Bourgou, and P. Calmettes, Phys. Rev. A 26, 3589 (1982).
- [9] R. F. Chang, H. Burstyn, and J. V. Sengers, Phys. Rev. A 19, 866 (1979).
- [10] R. Schneider, L. Belkoura, J. Schelten, D. Woermann, and B. Chu, Phys. Rev. B 22, 5507 (1980).
- [11] P. Damay, F. Leclercq, and P. Chieux, Phys. Rev. B 40, 4696 (1989).
- [12] Y. Izumi, Phys. Rev. A 39, 5826 (1989).
- [13] S. Janssen, D. S. Schwahn, and T. Springer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 3180 (1992).
- [14] H. Sato, N. Kuwahara, and K. Kubota, Phys. Rev. E 53, 3854 (1996).
- [15] M. Lesmann, A. Martn, L. Belkoura, D. Woermann, and E. H. Oinkis, Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem. 101, 228 (1997).
- [16] M. Bonetti, C. Bagnuls, and C. Bervillier, J. Chem. Phys. 107, 550 (1997).
- [17] M. Bonetti and P. Calmettes, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 68, 4163 (1997); Int. J. Thermophys. 19, 1555 (1998).
- [18] P. Damay, F. Leclercq, R. Magli, F. Formisano, and P. Lindner, Phys. Rev. B 58, 12038 (1998).
- [19] M. Bonetti, G. Rom et-Lem onne, P. Calmettes, and M.-C. Belissent-Funel, J. Chem. Phys. 112, 268 (2000).
- [20] M. Bonetti, P. Calmettes, and C. Bervillier, J. Chem. Phys. 115, 4660 (2001).
- [21] M. Cam postrini, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, \25th-order high-temperature expansion results for three-dimensional Ising-like systems on the simple cubic lattice," cond-mat/0201180.
- [22] R. A. Ferrell and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 200 (1975).
- [23] A. J. Bray, Phys. Rev. B 76, 1248 (1976).
- [24] R. A. Ferrell and J. K. Bhattacharjee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 1505 (1979).
- [25] M. E. Fisher and J. S. Langer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 20, 665 (1968).
- [26] E. Brezin, D. Amit, and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 151 (1974).
- [27] E. Brezin, J. C. Le Guillou, and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 473 (1974).
- [28] M. Cam postrini, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, Europhys. Lett. 38, 577 (1997); Phys. Rev. E 57, 184 (1998).
- [29] M. Cam postrini, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. E 60, 3526 (1999).

- [30] V. Agostini, C. Carlino, M. Caselle, and M. Hasenbusch, Nucl. Phys. B 484, 331 (1997);
M. Caselle, M. Hasenbusch, and P. Provero, Nucl. Phys. B 556, 575 (1999).
- [31] H. B. Tarko and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 926 (1973); Phys. Rev. B 11, 1217 (1975).
- [32] M. Combescot, M. Droz, and J. M. Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. B 11, 4661 (1975).
- [33] M. E. Fisher and S.-Y. Zinn, J. Phys. A 31, L629 (1998).
- [34] R. A. Ferrell, Physica A 177, 201 (1991).
- [35] P. Calmettes, I. Laguerre, and C. Laj, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 478 (1972).
- [36] In Ref. [35], the scaling function $g_+(Q)$ is written as $g_+(Q) = 1/(1 + Q^2)^{1-\beta}$, so that the correlation length defined there does not coincide with the usual second-moment one. In order to be consistent with our normalizations, we have introduced the correction factor c .
- [37] D. T. Jacobs, S. M. Y. Lau, A. Mukherjee, and C. A. Williams, Int. J. Thermophys. 20, 877 (1999).
- [38] J. G. Shanks and J. V. Sengers, Phys. Rev. A 38, 885 (1988).
- [39] M. A. Anisimov, Critical Phenomena in Liquids and Liquid Crystals (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1991).
- [40] A. E. Bailey and D. S. Cannell, Phys. Rev. E 50, 4853 (1994).
- [41] L. Cipolletti, Phys. Rev. E 55, 7733 (1997).