arXiv:cond-mat/0305213v1 9 May 2003

Comment on "Dynamic behavior of anisotropic non-equilibrium driving lattice gases"

In a recent Letter Albano and Saracco (AS) [1] study the dynamic behavior of some anisotropic driven lattice gases by Monte Carlo (MC) simulations [2]. They check the scaling of the order parameter OP defined in their Eq. (4) and, by data collapse, determine the relevant scaling exponents. Then, they formulate scaling Ansätze (see Eqs. (5) and (8) of AS) in order to relate the measured scaling exponents with the critical exponents analytically computed within different field-theoretical approaches (see Refs. [3, 4]). Comparing MC results and theoretical predictions they conclude that the universality class of the phase transition in the driven lattice gases considered in the paper is well-described by the field theory proposed in Ref. [4], ruling out that of Ref. [3]. In this Comment we point out that the Ansätze (5) and (8) do not take properly into account the strongly anisotropic nature of the phase transition, by implicitly assuming $z = z_\perp = z_\parallel$. As a consequence, at variance with AS's claims, MC data are not conclusive on the issue of the universality class.

Let us outline the argument. During the relaxation of a spin system from an initial uncorrelated state with small magnetization m_0, the k-th moment of the magnetization is expected to scale according to [2] $M^{(k)}(t,\tau,L,m_0) = b^{-k\beta/\nu} f_k(b^{-z}t, b^{1/\nu}, b^{1/\nu}\tau, b^{-1}L, b^{x_0}m_0)$, where x_0 is related to the initial-slip exponent. The generalization of this expression to a system that is strongly anisotropic and has a conserved order parameter requires some care. Using the notations of Ref. [5], one expects $M^{(k)}(t,\tau,L_\parallel,L_\perp,m_0) = b^{-k\beta/\nu_\parallel} f_k(b^{-z_\parallel}t, b^{1/\nu_\parallel}\tau, b^{-1}L_\parallel, b^{-\nu_\perp/\nu_\parallel}L_\perp, b^{x_0}m_0)$, where M can be naturally identified with some suitable order parameter, for instance with the excess density as in AS. Since m_0 is approximately zero for the initial configurations, taking into account that the OP defined by AS is expected to scale as $\sqrt{M^{(2)}}$ [1], one obtains Eq. (5) of AS with the identification $z = z_\parallel$. Correctly, in Table I, AS report the predictions $z = 4/3$ and $z \approx 1.998$ for the two models they consider (see Eqs. (1) and (2) of AS), which refer indeed to $z_\parallel$. Formulae (6) and (7) follow from Eq. (5) and therefore they are correct only if we identify $z = z_\parallel$. In Eq. (8), AS generalize the scaling behavior of OP to the case of the relaxation from the ground state configuration. Without attemping a derivation of their equation, we simply note that, as it stands, it is not compatible with Eq. (5) of AS: The exponent z appearing in Eq. (8) must be identified with $z_\perp = \nu_\parallel z_\parallel/\nu_\perp$ and not with $z_\parallel$. Indeed, whatever the initial condition is, we expect that after a time interval long enough to allow the relaxation of the initial condition, OP will display a characteristic long-time behavior, that should be captured by any reasonable scaling form. Now, from Eq. (5) (rewritten as before) it is easy to derive that, in the thermodynamic limit, $OP(t,\tau) = t^{-\beta/\nu_\parallel z_\parallel} f_{\rm FD}(t^{1/\nu_\parallel z_\parallel}\tau)$, while from Eq. (8) $OP(t,\tau) = t^{-\beta/\nu_\perp z} f_{\rm GS}(t^{1/\nu_\perp z}\tau)$. These two equations give the same long-time limit only if in the second case we identify z with $z_\perp$, i.e. $OP(t,\tau,L_\parallel,L_\perp) = b^{-\beta/\nu_\perp} OP(b^{-z_\perp}t, b^{1/\nu_\perp}\tau, b^{-\nu_\parallel/\nu_\perp}L_\parallel, b^{-1}L_\perp)$. Equations (9) and (10) follow from Eq. (8) and therefore here z must be interpreted as $z_\perp$. As a consequence, some of the theoretical predictions for the quantities measured by AS and reported in Tab. I of Ref. [1], change according to the following table

Model	$\beta/\nu_\perp z(+)$	$c_\perp(+)$
Eq. (1) in Ref. [1]	1/4	1/4
Eq. (2) in Ref. [1]	≈ 0.13	≈ 0.27

Comparing these corrected predictions with the numerical results reported in Tab. I of AS, we conclude that the value of $\beta/\nu_\perp z$ is in agreement with Eq. (1), which is exactly the opposite conclusion with respect to AS, while the numerical estimate of $c_\perp$ differs from the predictions of both field-theoretical models considered in AS's paper.

Sergio Caracciolo,[1] Andrea Gambassi,[2] Massimiliano Gubinelli,[3] and Andrea Pelissetto[4]

[1] Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Milano, and INFM-NEST, I-20133 Milano, Italy

[2] Max-Planck-Institut für Metallforschung and Institut für Theoretische und Angewandte Physik der Universität Stuttgart, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany

[3] Dipartimento di Matematica Applicata and INFN, Università di Pisa, I-56100 Pisa, Italy

[4] Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", I-00185 Roma, Italy

[1] E. V. Albano and G. Saracco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 145701 (2002).

[2] Z. B. Li, L. Schülke, and B. Zheng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 3396 (1995); K. Okano, L. Schülke, K. Yamagishi, and B. Zheng, Nucl. Phys. B **485**, 727 (1997); B. Zheng, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **12**, 1419 (1998); Physica A **283**, 80 (2000).

[3] H. K. Janssen and B. Schmittmann, Z. Phys. B **64**, 503 (1986). K. -t. Leung and J. L. Cardy, J. Stat. Phys. **44**, 567 (1986); Erratum J. Stat. Phys. **45**, 1087 (1986).

[4] P. L. Garrido, F. de los Santos, and M. A. Muñoz, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 752 (1998); P. L. Garrido, M. A. Muñoz, and F. de los Santos, and M. A. Muñoz, Phys. Rev. E **61**, R4683 (2000).

[5] B. Schmittmann and R. K. P. Zia, *Statistical mechanics of driven diffusive systems*, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz, vol. 17 (Academic Press, London, 1995).