# The three-dim ensional random ly dilute Ising m odel: M onte C arlo results

Pasquale Calabrese,<sup>1</sup> Victor M art n-M ayor<sup>2;3</sup> Andrea Pelissetto,<sup>4</sup> Ettore Vicari<sup>5</sup>
<sup>1</sup> Scuola Nom ale Superiore and INFN, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, I-56126 Pisa, Italy.
<sup>2</sup> Departamento de F sica Teorica I, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, E-28040 Madrid, Spain
<sup>3</sup> Instituto de Biocom putacion y F sica de Sistem as Complejos (BIFI), Universidad de Zaragoza, E-50009 Zaragoza, Spain
<sup>4</sup> D ip. Fisica dell'Universita di Rom a \La Sapienza" and INFN, P. le Moro 2, I-00185 Rom a, Italy
<sup>5</sup> D ip. Fisica dell'Universita di Pisa and INFN, V. Buonarroti 2, I-56127 Pisa, Italy e-m ail: calabres@df.unipi.it,Victor@lattice.fis.ucm.es,

Andrea.Pelissetto@romal.infn.it,vicari@df.unipi.it

(April 14, 2024)

# Abstract

We perform a high-statistics simulation of the three-dimensional random ly dilute Ising m odel on cubic lattices L<sup>3</sup> with L 256. W e choose a particular value of the density, x = 0.3, for which the leading scaling corrections are suppressed. We determ ine the critical exponents, obtaining = 0:683(3),= 0.035(2), = 0.3535(17), and = 0.049(9), in agreem ent with previous num erical simulations. We also estimate num erically the xed-point values of the four-point zero-m om entum couplings that are used in eld-theoretical xed-dimension studies. Although these results som ewhat dier from those obtained using perturbative eld theory, the eld-theoretical estim ates of the critical exponents do not change signi cantly if the M onte C arlo result for the xed point is used. Finally, we determ ine the six-point zero-m om entum couplings, relevant for the sm all-m agnetization expansion of the equation of state, and the invariant am plitude ratio R<sup>+</sup> that expresses the universality of the free-energy density per correlation volume. We nd  $R^+ = 0.2885(15)$ .

PACS Numbers: 75.10 Nr, 75.40 Cx, 75.40 Mg, 64.60 Fr

Typeset using REV T<sub>E</sub>X

D uring the last few decades m any theoretical and experim ental studies have investigated the critical properties of statistical systems in the presence of quenched disorder. Typical examples are random ly dilute uniaxial antiferrom agnets, for instance,  $Fe_x Zn_{1,x} F_2$  and M n<sub>x</sub>Zn<sub>1 x</sub> F<sub>2</sub>, obtained by m ixing a uniaxial antiferrom agnet with short-range interactions with a nonm agnetic material. Experiments nd that, for su ciently low impurity concentration 1{x, these systems undergo a second-order phase transition at  $T_c(x) < T_c(x = 1)$ , with critical exponents independent of the in purity concentration. The experim ental results have been summarized in Ref. [1], which reports = 0:10(2), = 0:69(1), and = 0:350(9). These estimates are de nitely di erent from the values of the critical exponents of the pure Ising universality class, where, e.g., = 0.1096(5) (Ref. [2]), and thus indicate that the in purities change the nature of the transition that belongs to a new random universality class. In the presence of an external magnetic eld, dilute uniaxial antiferrom agnets show a di erent critical transition, belonging to the universality class of the random - eld Ising m odel [3[6]].

A simple model for dilute uniaxial systems is provided by the three-dimensional random Ising model ( $\mathbb{R} \mathbb{M}$ ) with Hamiltonian

$$H_{x} = J_{\substack{i \ j}}^{X} S_{i}S_{j}; \qquad (1.1)$$

where the sum is extended over all nearest-neighbor sites,  $s_i$  are Ising spin variables, and i are uncorrelated quenched random variables, which are equal to one with probability x (the spin concentration) and zero with probability 1 x (the impurity concentration). For sm all 1 x, i.e. above the percolation threshold of the spins, this model shows a critical transition analogous to that observed in experiments and whose nature has been the object of m any theoretical studies, see, e.g., Refs. [7{10}].

Numerical M onte C arb simulations [11{17] had long been inconclusive in setting the question of the critical behavior of the R M . W hile the measured critical exponents were de nitely dierent from the Ising ones, results apparently depended on the spin concentration, in disagreement with renormalization-group (RG) theory. Only recently has the question been clarified. Ref. [13] showed the presence of very strong concentration-dependent scaling corrections with exponent  $! = 0.37(6) \cdot 0$  nly if they are properly taken into account, the numerical estimates of the critical exponents become dilution independent as expected. Their nalestimates are = 0.6837(53) and = 0.0374(45), from which one also derives = 0.3546(28) and = 0.051(16) using scaling relations. These results are in good agreement with the experimental ones reported above, although the numerical estimate of is slightly dierent.

R andom ly dilute Ising systems can also be studied by using the eld-theoretical (FT) approach [9,10]. The starting point is the cubic-symmetric Hamiltonian [18]

$$H_{LGW} = \int_{i=1}^{Z} d^{d}x \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{X^{i}} (0 - i)^{2} + r \sum_{i=1}^{2^{i}} + \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{i;j=1}^{X^{i}} (u_{0} + v_{0} - ij) \sum_{i=1}^{2^{i}} o^{i}; \qquad (1.2)$$

where  $_i$  is an N-component eld. By using the standard replica trick, it can be shown that in the form all limit N ! O such a model corresponds to a system with quenched

disorder e ectively coupled to the energy density, as is the case of the R M [18]. As is well known, the lim it N ! 0 is a subtle one. In the standard perturbative approaches, the lim it is taken naively | we simply set N = 0 in the perturbative expansion | in plicitly assuming that the replica symmetry is not broken. In recent years, however, this assumption has been questioned [19] on the ground that the RG approach may not take into account other localm inimum con gurations of the random H am iltonian (12), which may cause the spontaneous breaking of the replica symmetry. However, a xed-dimension perturbative two-loop calculation [20] in a perturbative approach proposed in R ef. [19] nds that the standard replica-symmetric xed point is stable under any replica-symmetry breaking perturbation, thereby supporting the standard approach. In this paper, we do not further consider this issue and in the follow ing we always assume that the standard approach is correct. Note that the good agreement among numerical and eld-theoretical results supports this assumption, although one cannot exclude that replica-symmetry breaking e ects can only be seen very close to the critical point.

In the FT approach one books for stable xed points in the region  $u_0 < 0$  (or, equivalently u < 0). If the pure xed point at u = 0 is stable, disorder is irrelevant, while the presence of a new stable xed point with u < 0, indicates that disorder is relevant and that dilute system s belong to a new universality class. Numerical and experimental results indicate that in dilute Ising systems the correct scenario is the second one and thus a new random xed point should be present with u < 0.

The most precise FT estimates of critical quantities are presently obtained by using perturbative methods. However, in the case of random systems the perturbative approach faces new di culties: the perturbative series are not only divergent, but are also non-Borel sum m able [21,22]. This m eans that even the know ledge of the complete perturbative series does not allow the exact computation of the critical quantities. These di culties are clearly present in the -expansion and in the related m in in al-subtraction scheme without expansion [23{25]. The expansion in  $r^{-}$  is not well behaved and does not allow quantitative determ inations of the critical exponents, while in the minimal-subtraction scheme results are very sensitive to the resum m ation m ethod. If the Chisholm -B orel m ethod is used [24], no random xed point is found with the longest available series (ve loops). Apparently, four-bop series provide the most accurate results and increasing the length of the expansion does not help improving the precision of the results. On the other hand, if a double Pade-Borel resummation is used as proposed in Ref. [22], a random xed point is found also at ve loops [25]. The estimates of the critical exponents are in any case not very precise, and moreover, at variance with the xed-dimension approach described below, the stabilitymatrix eigenvalues turn out to be complex.

The xed-dimension perturbative expansion in powers of two independent zeromomentum quartic couplings u and v (directly related to  $u_0$  and  $v_0$  de ned in Eq. (1.2)) is apparently better behaved. Up to six bops, a random xed point u, v is always found, although the estimates of u and v vary signi cantly with the order and the resummation method. In spite of that, the estimates of the critical exponents are quite precise, due to a relatively large insensitivity of the results to the position of the xed point. The analysis of the six-bop series gives [26] = 0.678 (10), = 0.030 (3), = 0.349 (5), and = 0.034 (30). The agreement with the experimental and numerical results is again quite satisfactory; only the estimate of seems to be slightly larger than the experimental result. In this paper we present a new num erical study of the R M. The purpose is to extend and possibly in prove the num erical results of R ef. [13]. We estimate the critical exponents and, in particular, in order to verify if the apparent small discrepancy between experiments and num erical results is really there. Moreover, we determ ine the four-point and the sixpoint zero-momentum couplings, and the universal ratio  $R^+$ . As a byproduct we are able to check the accuracy of the FT approach by comparing Monte Carlo and FT estimates of the xed-point values u and v.

We have performed a high-precision M onte C arb simulation of the model with H am iltonian (1.1) at J = 1 and density x = 0.8. Such a value has been chosen on the basis of the results of R ef. [13], where it was shown that scaling corrections are particularly sm all for such a value of x. This is fully con meed by our analysis: We do not observe scaling corrections with exponent ! = 0.37(6), the correction-to-scaling exponent observed in R ef. [13] for generic values of the density. [27] N ote that the absence of corrections with exponent ! also implies the absence of corrections with exponents 2!, 3!, ::: Therefore, we expect corrections to scaling with next-to-leading exponent !<sub>2</sub> (!<sub>2</sub> = 0.8(2) according to eld theory [28]). Unexpectedly, also these corrections are sm all. The R M at x = 0.8 is therefore an \improved" m odel [29{32,2], i.e. a m odel in which the leading correction to scaling is (approximately) absent in the expansion of any observable near the critical point.

First of all, we determ ine the critical exponents by using two di erent methods. A rst estimate is obtained by employing the extrapolation method of Refs. [33{35] (similar methods have been discussed in Refs. [36,37]). It allows us to determ ine the critical exponents from the high-temperature behavior of the susceptibility and of the correlation length. We also use direct nite-size scaling (FSS) methods, obtaining consistent estimates. Our nal results are

$$= 0:683(3);$$
 (1.3)

from which, using scaling and hyperscaling relations, we obtain

$$= (2 ) = 1:342(6); (1.5)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}(1 + 1) = 0.3535(17); \tag{1.6}$$

$$=\frac{5}{1+}=4.30(11); \tag{1.7}$$

$$= 2 \quad 3 = 0.049(9):$$
 (1.8)

Our results are in good agreement with those of Ref. [13] and, in particular, con m the discrepancy between the experimental and theoretical estimates of  $\$ .

We also carefully check the validity of the hyperscaling relation 2 = 3. We analyze the speci c heat at the critical point obtaining = 0.115(28). U sing the estimate (1.3) for 1 = we obtain

$$\frac{2}{-}$$
 -= 3:04(3); (1.9)

which is fully consistent with 3. We also perform another check of hyperscaling, analyzing the speci c heat and the energy at the critical point. We obtain

$$\frac{2}{-} - = 2:93(6); \tag{1.10}$$

again consistent with 3.

Beside the critical exponents we also measure the four-point couplings  $G_4$  and  $G_{22}$  dened in Eqs. (A12) and (A14), which can be directly related to the xed-point values u and v :  $G_4 = v$  and  $G_{22} = u = 3$ . We obtain:

$$G_4 = 43:3(2);$$
  
 $G_{22} = 6:2(1):$  (1.11)

These estimates di er signi cantly from those reported in Ref. [26], which were obtained from the analysis of perturbative six-loop series:  $G_4 = 38.0(1:5)$  and  $G_{22} = 4:5(6)$ . C learly, the non-Borel sum mability of the perturbative expansions gives rise to a large systematic error. It is also possible that the nonanalyticity of the RG functions [38{41}] near the random xed point plays an important role.

These discrepancies on the estimates of u and v call for a reanalysis of the perturbative expansions of the critical exponents. By using the M onte C arb estimate of u and v we nd = 0.686(4), = 0.026(3), and = 1.355(8). These estimates do not dier signicantly from those obtained in Ref. [26] and are also in satisfactory agreement with the M onte C arb results. Clearly exponents are quite insensitive to the exact location of the xed point. We also try a dierent method for estimating critical quantities. It is based on an expansion around the Ising xed point. Results are similar: = 0.690(8), = 0.0345(20), and = 1.355(10). Note that the estimate of is now in perfect agreement with the M onte C arb result.

In this paper we also determ ine some other universal amplitude ratios that involve hightem perature quantities. First, we determ ine the six-point universal ratios  $r_6$ ,  $C_{42}$ , and  $C_{222}$ , de ned in Eq. (A13). The coe cient  $r_6$  is particularly in portant since it parametrizes the sm all-m agnetization expansion of the critical equation of state in the high-tem perature phase [42]. We nd

$$r_6 = 0.90(15)$$
: (1.12)

F inally, we compute the universal ratio  $R^+$  dened by

$$R^{+}$$
 ( $A^{+}$ )<sup>1=3</sup> $f^{+}$ ; (1.13)

where  $A^+$  and  $f^+$  are dened in terms of the singular behavior of the specic heat C and of the correlation length ,  $C_{sing} \quad A^+t$ ,  $f^+t$  for  $t_c \quad ! \quad 0^+ \cdot W = obtain$ 

$$R^{+} = 0.2885(15); \qquad (1.14)$$

in good agreem ent with other theoretical results [42]:  $R^+ = 0.290(10)$ , obtained from the analysis of the corresponding six-loop perturbative series, and  $R^+ = 0.282(3)$ , derived from a quite precise approximation of the equation of state.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we present the M onte Carlo results. In Sec. IIB we determ ine the critical tem perature by perform ing a careful analysis of the nitesize behavior of som e RG invariant ratios near the critical point. In Sec. IIC we determ ine the four-point and six-point couplings by using the extrapolation m ethod of R efs. [33{35]. In Sec. IID and IIE we determ ine and by using again the extrapolation m ethod and by also perform ing a more direct FSS analysis. Then, in Sec. IIF we study the nite-size behavior of the energy and of the speci c heat near the critical point. We obtain an independent estimate of , that allows us to check the validity of the hyperscaling relation 2 = 3. Finally, in Sec. IIG we compute the universal ratio  $R^+$ . For this purpose, we generalize the extrapolation m ethod of R efs. [33{35} to the energy. In spite of the necessary subtractions, the m ethod works quite well, providing a rather precise estimate. In Sec. III we reanalyze the six-loop perturbative series of R ef. [26], using the new M onte C arb estimate of the xed point. We employ the di erent resumm ation m ethods discussed in R ef. [26] and also a new m ethod based on an expansion around the Ising xed point. Finally, in the appendix we report the de nitions of the quantities that are used throughout the paper.

### II.NUMERICAL RESULTS

#### A. The M onte Carlo sim ulation

We have performed a high-precision Monte Carlo simulation of the model with Hamiltonian (1.1) with J = 1 at density x = 0.8. Such a value has been chosen on the basis of the results of Ref. [13], who showed that for such a value of x scaling corrections are particularly sm all. In the simulations we have considered cubic lattices of size  $L^3$ , L = 16, 32, 64, 128, and 256, with periodic boundary conditions. Simulations have been performed for several values of between 0.275 and 0.28578. Two thirds of the simulations refer to the interval 0:275 0.2856 (we will call the corresponding data the high-tem perature results), while one third of the CPU time was used in simulations in a narrow interval around the critical point, 0:28572 0:28578. The average number of samples for each and L has been 10 (L = 16), 36 10 (L = 32), 27 10 (L = 64), 12 10 (L = 128),approximately 7 and 3 10 (L = 256). The runs were performed on a cluster with D ual A th lon M P 12M H z processors. The total CPU time is approximately 17.4 CPU-years of a single processor. As random number generator we have used a combination of the Parisi-Rapuano generator [43] and of a congruential generator [44]. Results for each sample have been obtained as follows. Starting from a random spin con quration, we perform 2000 iterations, each of them consisting alternatively of a Metropolis sweep and of a full Swendsen-W and update. We use both a local and a nonlocal dynamics to guarantee equilibration of short-distance and long-distance modes. Then, we perform 2000 full Swendsen-W and updates, measuring all quantities (see appendix for de nitions) every 10 iterations. To estim ate correlation functions we use improved estimators that signi cantly reduce the statistical errors. Note that we have been much more conservative than Ref. [13]: There, only 200 Swendsen-W ang iterations were performed for equilibration. For quantities that involve the noise average of products of sample averages, there is a bias due to the nite length of the run for each sample. In order to take this bias into account we have perform ed a bias correction following Ref. [45].

L <sub>m in</sub>	<sup>2</sup> /DOF	R	С	
		U <sub>4</sub>		
16	115.2/25	1.6337(4)	0,2857520(7)	0.804 (44)
32	17.5/20	1.6385(6)	0 2857477 (6)	0.727 (43)
64	7.4/12	1.6407(11)	0,2857462 (9)	0.726 (60)
		U 6		
16	134.4/25	3,2348 (22)	0,2857530 (8)	0.817 (46)
32	18.8/20	3,2597 (28)	0,2857480 (6)	0.727 (43)
64	7.4/12	3,2710 (54)	0 2857463 (9)	0.726 (60)
		U <sub>22</sub>		
16	35.0/25	0.1500(8)	0 2857266 (141)	1,23 (51)
32	25.0/20	0.1484 (6)	0 2857425 (68)	1.06(54)
64	21.2/12	0.1480(10)	0 2857454 (83)	0.93 (66)
		=L		
16	22.6/25	0,5921(2)	0 2857414 (6)	0.733 (34)
32	17.4/20	0.5926(3)	0 2857423 (6)	0.708 (37)
64	11.8/12	0,5934 (6)	0,2857432 (9)	0.722 (54)

TABLE I. Results of the tR(;L) = R + a(  $_{\rm c}$ )L<sup>1=</sup> . DOF is the number of degrees of freedom of the t.

#### B.D eterm ination of the critical tem perature

As a rst step in our analysis we have determ ined the critical temperature  $_{\rm c}$ . For this purpose we consider the results of the simulations for 0.28572 0.28578, which is a small interval around  $_{\rm c}$ . We consider four invariant ratios, U<sub>4</sub>, U<sub>6</sub>, U<sub>22</sub>, and =L, see appendix for de nitions. Standard FSS predicts that, in the FSS limit !  $_{\rm c}$ , L ! 1 at ( $_{\rm c}$ )L<sup>1=</sup> xed, each quantity R (;L) behaves as

$$R(;L) = \hat{R}[(_{c})L^{1=}]; \qquad (2.1)$$

where  $\hat{R}(z)$  is a universal function. Since  $_{c}$  is particularly sm all for the data, we can expand  $\hat{R}(z)$  in powers of z, keeping only the rst term (we checked that the addition of the term of order  $z^{2}$  does not change the results). Thus, we t each quantity R (;L) by using

$$R(;L) = R + a(_{c})L^{1=};$$
 (2.2)

with R ,  $_{\rm c}$ , and free parameters. In each twe include all data with L  $L_{\rm m \ in}$  and, in order to detect corrections to scaling, we use  $L_{\rm m \ in} = 16, 32$ , and 64. The results are reported in Table I.

There is a slight evidence of corrections to scaling, but it is interesting to note that they have opposite sign in  $U_4$ ,  $U_6$ , and =L.Conservatively, we would obtain

$$_{\rm c} = 0.2857447(24);$$
 (2.3)

where the central value is the average of the estim ates obtained for  $U_4$  and =L ( $L_{m in} = 64$ ), and the error is such to include one error bar for both  $U_4$  and =L.

These is are not particularly sensitive to the exponent , which is quite poorly determined. We obtain = 0.72 (6). One could imagine of improving the results by xing . However, the dependence of  $_{\rm c}$  on is very small and no signi cant change is observed.

In order to include scaling corrections we also perform ts of the form

$$R(;L) = R + a(_{c})L^{1=} + bL^{!};$$
 (2.4)

where we include the leading scaling correction. These ts are not sensitive to the value of

and thus we x it, taking = 0:69. We keep ! as a free parameter, since we do not know which is the most in portant correction to scaling for our data. Indeed, the leading correction has exponent ! = 0:37 (6), but there is evidence that for p = 0.8 leading corrections have a very small amplitude [13]. In order to be able to keep ! as a free parameter, we analyzed at the same time two dimensions observables. We restrict our attention to U<sub>4</sub>, U<sub>6</sub>, and =L, since U<sub>22</sub> is too noisy. Using all data with L = 16 (if the data with L = 16 are discarded the t is unstable) and taking properly into account the covariance between the two observables, we obtain:

- (a) analysis of =L and  $U_4$ : ! = 0:70(11),  $_{c}$  = 0:2857435(8), (=L) = 0:5943(8),  $U_4$  = 1:6502(24), b(=L) = 0:017(7), b( $U_4$ ) = 0:13(3); <sup>2</sup> = 47:5, DOF = 50.
- (b) analysis of =L and  $U_6$ : ! = 0:71(11),  $_c = 0.2857435(8)$ , (=L) = 0.5942(8),  $U_6 = 3:318(11)$ , b(=L) = 0.017(7), b( $U_4$ ) = 0:67(16);  $^2 = 46:7$ , DOF = 50.

Here DOF is the number of degrees of freedom. The results are quite stable, indicating the presence of corrections with exponent ! = 0.7(1), in agreement with the idea that scaling corrections with exponent ! = 0.4 are very small. The elective exponent ! = 0.7(1) is quite close to the next-to-leading exponent predicted by perturbative eld theory [28], i.e.  $!_2 = 0.8(2)$ . Thus, we mainly observe next-to-leading corrections, which in any case are quite small. In particular, they are of little relevance for =L. The coe cient b, cf. Eq. (2.4), is very small and the estimates of  $_c$  obtained from the combined ts are fully compatible with those obtained for =L without scaling corrections.

These analyses that keep into account scaling corrections hint at values of  $_{\rm c}$  lower than the estimate (2.3). We are thus led to consider

$$_{\rm c} = 0.285744$$
 (2) (2.5)

as our nalestimate.

From the above reported analyses, we also obtain estimates of the invariant ratios R  $\,$  at the critical point. We obtain

$$\frac{1}{L} = 0:5943(9);$$

$$U_{4} = 1:650(9);$$

$$U_{6} = 3:32(5);$$

$$U_{22} = 0:1480(10):$$

$$(2.6)$$

We quote the results obtained in the ts (2.4), while the error is such to include also the result of the twithout scaling corrections and  $L_{min} = 64$ . For  $U_{22}$  we only consider the ts without scaling corrections. Note that  $U_{22} \in 0$ , indicating the absence of self-averaging at the critical point, in agreement with the theoretical arguments of Ref. [46].

We can compare our results with those of Ref. [13]. They found  $_{c} = 0.2857421(52)$ ,  $U_{4} = 1.653(20)$ ,  $U_{22} = 0.145(7)$ , (=L) = 0.598(7), which are in full agreement with our nalresults.

#### C.D eterm ination of the four-point and six-point couplings

In this Section we wish to determ ine the four-point couplings  $G_4$  and  $G_{22}$ , and the six-point universal ratios  $r_6$ ,  $C_{42}$ , and  $C_{222}$ , see appendix for de nitions. Note that these quantities are de ned in the high-tem perature phase and one should take rst the in nite-volume limit and then the limit ! \_\_\_\_, cf. Eq. (A14). In order to perform this task we have applied the extrapolation method of Refs. [33{35}] to our high-tem perature data, i.e. to the results with 0.2856 (corresponding to  $_1$  () < 89). This method is extremely powerful in order to compute the in nite-volume behavior of critical quantities and it has been applied to severalm odels, including spin glasses [47].

The idea is the following. Given a long-distance quantity S ( ;L), in the FSS lim it we can write

$$\frac{S(; sL)}{S(; L)} = F_{S}[(; L)=L] + O(L'; '); \qquad (2.7)$$

where s is an arbitrary (rational) number (here we always consider s = 2). Here  $F_s(z)$  is a universal function de ned for 0 z z (=L) = 0.5943(9) such that  $F_s(0) = 1$  and  $F_s(z) = s$ , where is the exponent characterizing the critical behavior of S (;L) at the critical point, i.e., S ( $_c$ ;L) L . Eq. (2.7) is the basis of the extrapolation technique since, in the absence of scaling corrections, it allows us to compute S (;sL) on a lattice of size sL in term s of quantities de ned on a lattice of size L and of the function  $F_s(z)$ . In practice, one works as follows. First, one performs several runs, determining S (;sL), S (;L), (;sL), and (;L). By means of a suitable interpolation, this provides the function F (z) for S and . Then, S<sub>1</sub> () and 1 () are obtained from S (;L) and (;L) by iterating Eq. (2.7) and

the corresponding equation for (;L). Of course, one must be very careful about scaling corrections, discarding system atically lattices with sm all values of L till the results become independent of L within error bars.

Let us not discuss the four-point couplings for which we will obtain quite precise estimates. In Figs. 1, 2, and 3 we report the data for S (;2L)=S (;L) for G<sub>4</sub>, G<sub>22</sub>, and , together with a t of the data with L 64. As discussed in Refs. [33,34], we parametrize  $F_s$  (z) with a polynom ial [48] in e<sup>1=z</sup> of order n, increasing n until the <sup>2</sup> of the t changes by less than one by going from n to n + 1. In these analyses we have taken n = 7. The parametrization of  $F_s$  (z) as a polynom ial in e<sup>1=z</sup> is theoretically motivated: indeed, for zeromomentum quantities,  $F_s$  (z) approaches 1 with corrections of order e<sup>a=z</sup>, a 1, as z ! 0. This choice is not strictly correct for since in this case [49] F (z) = 1 + O (z<sup>2</sup>). However,



FIG.1. Ratios  $G_4$  (;2L)= $G_4$  (;L) vs (;L)=L. The solid curve is a tusing all data with L 64.

these power corrections are expected to be very small for our de nition of nite-volum e correlation length [50], and therefore the system atic error due to our choice of param etrization should be small.

Looking at the gures, it is quite di cult to distinguish any correction to scaling, i.e. system atic deviations from the tted curve. However, at a closer look one may see that some points with L = 16 are out of the curve (in all cases by less than three error bars, so that these di erences are barely signi cant). Conservatively, we have decided to discard all L = 16 data. In order to check further for corrections to scaling we have computed in nite-volum e estimates  $S_1$  (L) using only data with  $L = L_{min}$ ,  $L_{min} = 32$ , 64. Additionally, we have also system atically discarded points that are far from the critical point by including only data with min for several values of min.

Using the extrapolation procedure we have outlined above, for each  $L_{min}$  and  $_{min}$  we obtain in nite-volume estimates  $_1$  (),  $G_{4;1}$  (), and  $G_{22;1}$  (). To obtain the estimate at the critical point, the extrapolated values for the coupling constants have been tted by using

$$S_1() = S + a(_c);$$
 (2.8)

with  $_{c} = 0.285744$  (2). The results are reported in Tables II and III for 0.275 m in 0.284 (corresponding to  $4.45 < _{1} < 15.86$ ).

To check for corrections to scaling, we have also perform ed a di erent analysis. First we tS(;2L)=S(;L) taking into account a scaling correction with exponent!, i.e. assuming

$$\frac{S(;2L)}{S(;L)} = F_{S}((;L)=L) + \frac{1}{L!}G_{S}((;L)=L);$$
(2.9)

and use both functions  $F_s$  (z) and  $G_s$  (z) to perform the in nite-volum e extrapolation. Then, the in nite-volum e results for the coupling constants are tted by using

TABLE II. Results for the renorm alization constant  $G_4$ . On the left we report the results for  $L_{min} = 32$ , on the right those for  $L_{min} = 64$ . We report two dierent <sup>2</sup>. The rst one ( $\frac{2}{estr}$ ) refers to the t that allows the determination of the curve  $F_{G_4}(z)$ , cf. Eq. (2.7), the second one ( $\frac{2}{t}$ ) to the t (2.8). Beside the <sup>2</sup> we also report the number of degrees of freedom (DOF). The results have two errors: the rst one is the statistical error, the second one gives the variation of the estimate as <sub>c</sub> is varied within one error bar, cf. Eq. (2.5).

m in	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	G <sub>4</sub>	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	G <sub>4</sub>
0.2750	14.9/22	17.3/16	43.65 (6+ 0)			
0.2780	14.9/22	16.8/15	43.63 (6+ 0)	9.0/11	15.9/15	43.56(9+2)
0.2800	14.9/21	13.4/14	43.59(7+0)	9.0/11	13.1/14	43.51 (10+ 0)
0,2810	14.9/20	11.9/13	43.60 (8+ 1)	9.0/11	12.7/13	43.52 (10+ 1)
0.2820	14.8/19	92/12	43.55 (8+ 1)	9.0/11	11.8/12	43.47 (11+ 0)
0.2830	12.1/17	9.1/11	43.41 (11+ 1)	7.4/10	12.7/11	43.45(12+0)
0.2835	12.0/15	7.6/10	43.34 (12+ 1)	7.4/9	10.8/10	43.40 (15+ 1)
0.2840	9.1/13	93/9	43.34 (17+ 2)	7.1/8	9.7/9	43.32 (18+1)

TABLE III. Results for the renorm alization constant G  $_{\rm 22}$  . De nitions are as in Table II.

m in	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	G <sub>22</sub>	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	G <sub>22</sub>
0.2750	19.5/22	13.6/16	6.18(3+0)			
0.2780	19.5/22	142/15	6.18(3+0)	12.0/11	11.3/15	6,25(4+0)
0.2800	19.1/21	13.1/14	6.18(3+0)	12.0/11	11.5/14	6,25(4+0)
0,2810	17.4/20	10.9/13	6,22 (3+ 0)	12.0/11	11.3/13	6,25 (5+ 1)
0.2820	17.4/19	62/12	6.19(3+0)	12.0/11	8.9/12	6,23 (5+ 0)
0.2830	16.9/17	5.7/11	6.18(4+0)	11.7/10	8.4/11	6,23(6+0)
0.2835	16.8/15	4.9/10	6.19(5+1)	11.3/9	82/10	6,25 (6+ 1)
0.2840	12.1/13	2.5/9	6.12(7+0)	10.4/8	1.5/9	6.11(8+1)



FIG.2. Ratios  $G_{22}$  (;2L)= $G_{22}$  (;L) vs (;L)=L. The solid curve is a tusing all data with L 64.

$$S_1() = S + a(_c)^{!}$$
: (2.10)

In order to perform the analysis we should x the exponents ! and . We use = 0:69, and repeat the analysis using ! = 0.8 (the next-to-leading exponent predicted by eld theory [28]) and ! = 0:4, which is the leading exponent determ ined in Ref. [13]. The results corresponding to ! = 0.8 are reported in Table IV. It is essential to include the results with L = 16 in the analysis, otherwise the data do not show FSS corrections and the t is unstable. Therefore, we cannot check the goodness of the Ansatz by discarding data with small L, i.e. present results for di erent values of  $L_{min}$  as done before.

Let us not discuss the results for  $G_4$ . The tsw ithout corrections to scaling show a signi cant (at the level of the reported errors) decrease as min is increased and also a slight dependence on  $L_{min}$ . Corrections to scaling are positive and the estimate decreases with increasing min, so that one only obtains an upper bound  $G_4 < 43.4$ . On the other hand, the twith ! = 0.80 gives results independent of min within error bars; moreover the  $^2$  of the t (2.10) is systematically lower than that of the t (2.8). Clearly the data are very well tted by assuming a correction-to-scaling exponent ! = 0.80. For ! = 0.40 the results strongly depend on min, varying from  $G_4 = 42.49(14)$  for min = 0.275 to  $G_4 = 43.47(40)$  for min = 0.2835. Also, the  $^2$  is larger than the  $^2$  obtained using ! = 0.8. There is therefore little evidence for such a small correction-to-scaling exponent, con ming again that for density x=0.8 the leading scaling corrections are very small. As nall estimate we take

$$G_4 = 43:3(2);$$
 (2.11)

which is consistent with all results.

Let us now consider the results for  $G_{22}$ . The results of Table III show no dependence on  $m_{in}$  and a tiny dependence on  $L_{min}$  which could be of purely statistical origin. With the



FIG.3. Ratios (;2L)=(;L)vs (;L)=L. The solid curve is a tusing all data with L 64.

present error bars there is no evidence for nonanalytic scaling corrections and indeed the results obtained using ! = 0.80 (see Table IV) are perfectly consistent with those of the ts with purely analytic corrections. Our nalestimate is

$$G_{22} = 62(1)$$
: (2.12)

The error is rather conservative and is such to include all estimates.

We should note that our results are compatible with the FT predictions of Ref. [28], where it is shown that in in nite volum e G<sub>22;1</sub> () and G<sub>4;1</sub> () have scaling corrections with nextto-leading exponent ! = 0.8 (2) of sim ilar relative size. In particular, the results of Ref. [28] give  $a_{G_{22}} = 0.23 (10) a_{G_4}$  where a is the coe cient de ned in Eq. (2.10). From the ts we obtain instead  $a_{G_4} = 20 (5)$  and  $a_{G_{22}} = 1.5 (1.0)$ . The errors should be taken with caution: They simply give the variation of the parameter a with min for 0.275 min 0.281 (for larger values the statistical error becomes larger than jaj) and do not include any possible system atic elect. A ssuming these values with their errors, we estimate  $a_{G_{22}} = 0.08 (5) a_{G_4}$ , which is in reasonable agreement with the FT result.

As a check we have repeated the analysis for H $_4$  G $_4$  + 3G $_{22}$ . Since the procedure is nonlinear, this represents an important consistency check. We obtain

$$H_{4} = 24:7(2); (2.13)$$

which is in full agreem ent with the estimates reported above.

Finally, we consider the six-point couplings  $r_6$ ,  $C_{42}$ , and  $C_{222}$ . We apply again the extrapolation procedure we have used for  $G_4$  and  $G_{22}$ . However, in this case there are larger system atic errors. The extrapolation curve F (z), cf. Eq. (2.7), is poorly determined for z < 0.3, since the six-point couplings have large statistical errors when (;L)=L is small. A large error on the curve gives a large system atic error on the extrapolations and induces correlations among the results for di erent (such correlations are instead small for  $G_4$ 

TABLE IV. Results for  $G_4$  and  $G_{22}$  for ts with a correction-to-scaling exponent ! = 0.8. We report two di erent <sup>2</sup>. The rst one ( $_{estr}^2$ ) refers to the t that allows the determ ination of the curve F (z), cf. Eq. (2.9), the second one ( $_{t}^2$ ) to the t (2.10). Beside the <sup>2</sup> we also report the num ber of degrees of freedom (DOF). We only report the statistical error; the error due to <sub>c</sub> is negligible.

m in	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	G <sub>4</sub>	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /DOF	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	G <sub>22</sub>
0.2750	30.0/29	12.6/16	43,28 (8)	31.8/29	12.1/16	6.15(3)
0.2780	29.9/28	10.9/15	43.31 (9)	31.6/28	11.1/15	6.16(4)
0.2800	29.5/26	10.8/14	43.30 (10)	31.1/26	9.9/14	6.16(4)
0.2810	25.4/24	9.0/13	43.43(11)	22.1/24	8.8/13	6,26 (5)
0.2820	24.3/22	9.0/12	43.30 (13)	22.0/22	5.8/12	6,21 (6)
0.2830	21.3/19	6.4/11	43.37 (17)	21.1/19	3.6/11	6,25(7)
0.2835	13.4/16	7.1/10	43.53 (22)	18.1/16	32/10	6,33 (9)
0.2840	10.6/13	7.9/9	43,26 (29)	12.3/13	2.7/9	6.00 (13)

and  $G_{22}$ ). Because of them, it is di cult to set correct error bars and to determ ine the nal results. For these reasons we have taken a conservative attitude. We have generated di erent sets of extrapolated data by changing the degree n of the interpolation polynom ial and min (in all cases we set  $L_{min} = 16$  in order to have a su ciently large number of points in the small-z region). Then, we determ ine the range that includes most (approximately 2/3) of the extrapolated data with their error bars. The central value of such an interval gives the nal result, while its half width gives the error. We obtain

$$r_6 = 0.90(15);$$
  
 $C_{42} = 0.12(5);$   
 $C_{222} = 0.45(15):$  (2.14)

In Fig. 4 we report the nal results together with the results for a single extrapolation, so that the reader can see the quality of our num erical results and how much conservative our nal error bars are. Note that in this analysis we have not made any attempt to evaluate corrections to scaling. In any case, we expect them to be small compared with the large errors we quote.

The numerical estimates can be compared with the FT results. We shall discuss the four-point couplings in Sec. III. For what concerns the six-point couplings, the analysis of the available four-loop series in the xed-dimension scheme [51] is not very precise. We only mention the estimate  $r_6 = 1:1^{+0:1}_{0:5}$  reported in Ref. [42], which agrees with the more precise result (2.14).

#### D. The exponent

In order to determ ine the exponent we have followed two di erent strategies: (a) we have determ ined extrapolated values  $_1$  () using our extrapolation method and then we



FIG.4. In nite-volume results for the six-point ratios  $r_6()$ ,  $C_{42}()$ , and  $C_{222}()$  from the extrapolation with  $L_{min} = 16$ ,  $_{min} = 0.275$ , and degree of the interpolation polynom ial n = 7. On the horizontal axis we report  $_1()$ . We also report the nal results  $r_6 = 0.90(15)$ ,  $C_{42} = 0.12(5)$ , and  $C_{222} = 0.45(15)$ .

have perform ed a t  $_1$  () ( $_c$ ); (b) we have perform ed a purely FSS analysis without extrapolations. The advantage of method (b) is that we can keep both  $_c$  and ! as free parameters, and thus check the previously determ ined value for  $_c$  and our claim that scaling corrections with small values of ! are tiny.

In the rst case we proceed as before. If we neglect scaling corrections, we can generate in nite-volum elestimates  $_1$  () by using the extrapolation precedure based on Eq. (2.7) and then we can determine from ts of the form

$$\ln_1() = \ln(c) + a + b(c)$$
: (2.15)

As a second possibility we can include corrections with exponent ! in the extrapolation, see Eq. (2.9), and t the extrapolated data with

$$\ln_1() = \ln(_c) + a + b(_c)^{!}$$
: (2.16)

We report in Fig. 5 the results for the analytic t with  $L_{min} = 32$  and  $L_{min} = 64$  and for the nonanalytic twith ! = 0.80 and  $L_{min} = 16$  for several values of min. We observe that results with and without nonanalytic corrections di er signi cantly, much more than the statistical errors. How ever, corrections have opposite trends. A nalytic ts give results that decrease as min is increased while nonanalytic ts have the opposite behavior. Compatible results are obtained for min 0:283. For = 0:283 we obtain = 0:6847(15) from the rst analysis with  $L_{min} = 64$  and = 0:6818(24) from the second analysis. A reasonable estimate would be 0:683(3) which includes all results. It should be noted that the results depend strongly on  $_{\rm c}$  that has been xed to  $_{\rm c}$  = 0.285744(2). By varying  $_{\rm c}$  within one varies approximately by 0.003. Thus, collecting everything together, this error bar, method gives the nal result



FIG.5. Results for the exponent vs  $_{min}$ . We report the results obtained by thing the extrapolated high-temperature data without scaling corrections (they are labelled  $L_{min} = 32$  and  $L_{min} = 64$ ) and with scaling corrections with exponent != 0.8 (labelled != 0.80), and the results obtained by using all data and the parametrization (2.20) (labelled \FSS"). The horizontal lines correspond to the nalresult = 0.683(3).

$$= 0:683(3+3):$$
 (2.17)

The estimate (2.17) has been obtained by using only the high-tem perature data, i.e. those with 0.2856. A more precise estimate can be obtained by performing a direct FSS analysis that allows us to use both the high-tem perature and the critical-point results for the correlation length. In this way, we do not need to  $x_c$  and we can also keep ! as a free parameter. We start from the general FSS expression

$$\frac{1}{L} = F [u_1 (t) L^{1=}; u_2 (t) L^{!}]; \qquad (2.18)$$

where only one correction-to-scaling operator has been taken into account. Here t ( $_{c}$ ), and  $u_{1}$  (t) and  $u_{2}$  (t) are nonlinear scaling elds satisfying  $u_{1}$  (0) = 0 and  $u_{2}$  (0)  $\notin$  0. Equation (2.18) can be rewritten in the scaling lim it as

$$\frac{1}{L_{1}} = f_{1} (tL^{1=}) + L^{1=} f_{2} (tL^{1=}) + L^{!} f_{3} (tL^{1=});$$
(2.19)

with  $f_1(0) \notin 0$  and  $f_3(0) \notin 0$ . The three scaling functions represent the three types of contributions we expect:  $f_1(x)$  is the leading FSS curve,  $f_2(x)$  corresponds to the analytic corrections, and  $f_3(x)$  is the nonanalytic FSS correction. The function  $f_2(x)$  is related to  $f_1(x)$  by  $f_2(x) = x^2 f_1^0(x)$ , a relation that follows from the fact that this correction is due to the expansion of the scaling eld  $u_1(t) = t + at^2 + 0$  ( $t^3$ ). The existence of the in nite-volume limit xes the behavior of these functions for  $x ! 1 : f_1(x) = x$ ,  $f_2(x) = x^1$  and  $f_3(x) = x^{(! 1)}$ .

m in	<sup>2</sup> /D O F		!	с
0.2750	51/62	0.6851(15)	1.71 (18)	0,2857434(7)
0.2780	50/60	0.6842 (22)	1.60 (28)	0,2857434 (7)
0.2800	45/57	0.6823 (36)	1.32 (35)	0,2857433(7)
0.2810	43/54	0.6803 (52)	1.10(34)	0,2857435(8)
0.2820	41/51	0.6827 (36)	1.51 (66)	0,2857433(7)
0.2830	39/47	0.6836(28)	2.1(1.3)	0,2857430(7)
0.2835	30/43	0.6836(23)	3.6(2.5)	0 2857428 (8)

TABLE V. Results of the FSS analysis using the parametrization (2.20) with n = 12 as a function of  $m_{in}$ . Here DOF is the number of degrees of freedom of the t.

Now, we wish to determ ine  $_{c}$ , and ! by thing the numerical data for =L with Eq. (2.19). For this purpose, we must parametrize the scaling functions reported above with expressions containing a nite number of parameters. Thus, we consider an even integer n and parametrize:

$$\frac{1}{L} = {}^{h} P_{n} (tL^{1=}) + L^{!} (1 + ptL^{1=})^{!} Q_{n} (tL^{1=})^{i} =^{n};$$

$$P_{n} (x) = {}^{X^{n}} a_{i}x^{i}; \qquad Q_{n} (x) = {}^{X^{2}} b_{i}x^{2i}; \qquad (2.20)$$

where t (  $_{\rm c}$  ). This param etrization has the correct behavior both for sm all and large x for any n. Note that our choice of writing Q<sub>n</sub>(x) as a polynom ial in x<sup>2</sup> is due only to practical considerations: since corrections are sm all, Q<sub>n</sub>(x) cannot be param etrized with as m any param eters as P<sub>n</sub>(x); on the other hand, to guarantee the correct large-x behavior Q<sub>n</sub>(x) and P<sub>n</sub>(x) must have the same degree. We also made some analyses writing Q<sub>n</sub>(x) as a polynom ial in x<sup>3</sup> in this case n must be a multiple of 3 without noting signi cant di erences. The value of n has been chosen on the basis of the <sup>2</sup> of the t: n has been increased until the <sup>2</sup> does not change signi cantly as n is increased by 2. The results of the analyses we present correspond to n = 12.

In the analyses we have kept , !, p, c, faig, and fbig as free parameters. The t is stable only if we include the data with L = 16, otherwise there are no scaling corrections at the level of our error bars and therefore it is in possible to determ ine !. To check for corrections, we have system atically discarded points far from c, including in the analysis only data with min for several values of min. In order to have a mostly linear t, we have tted  $(\frac{1}{7})^{n=}$ . The results are reported in Table V.

The results for  $_{\rm c}$  are quite stable, in full agreement with the analyses reported in Sec. IIB for =L and with the nalestimate (2.5). The estimates of ! vary significantly and have a quite large error. There is however very little evidence of scaling corrections with ! < 1, as already discussed in Sec. IIB. Finally, let us consider . As it can be seen from Fig. 5 the results are in rough agreement with those found before and apparently become independent of  $_{\rm min}$  for  $> 0.282.0 \, {\rm ur}$  nalestimate is



FIG.6.Ratios (;2L)= (;L)vs (;L)=L.The solid curve is a tusing all data with L 64.

which is compatible with the results of all analyses. The estimate (2.21) is in very good agreement with the result = 0:6837(53) of Ref. [13].

#### E. The exponent

In order to compute the exponent and correspondingly = (2 ), one can analyze the critical behavior of the susceptibility . However, we have found much more convenient to analyze  $=^{2}$ . Indeed, because of statistical correlations between and , the relative error on is significantly smaller than that on . Moreover, the FT analysis of Ref. [28] indicates that has much smaller scaling corrections than .

In order to determ ine we perform two di erent analyses. The rst one uses the high-temperature data and follows closely the analysis of the correlation length presented in Sec. IID. Given (;L) we determ ine the curve F (z), cf. Eq. (2.7). The ratios (;2L)= (;L) are reported in Fig. 6, together with a t of the points with L 64. There are clear scaling corrections, especially when (;L)=L<sup>></sup> 0:3: the data with L = 16, and also some points with L = 32, are system atically above the curve. As before, we discard all points with L = 16 and perform the extrapolation using data with L  $L_{min}$ , with  $L_{min} = 32;64$ , in order to detect scaling corrections. The extrapolated values are tted by using

$$\ln_1() = \ln_{(c)} + a + b_{(c)}$$
 (2.22)

and xing  $_{c} = 0.285744$  (2). The results are reported in Table VI. They show a system atic dependence on  $L_{min}$  and  $_{min}$  and seem to indicate 0.0240, but it is di cult to set an error bar. Conservatively, we write

$$= 0:0240(15);$$
 (2.23)

TABLE VI. Results for the critical exponent . On the left we report the results for  $I_{\text{m in}} = 32$ , on the right those for  $L_{\text{m in}} = 64$ . We report two di errent <sup>2</sup>. The rst one ( $\frac{2}{\text{estr}}$ ) refers to the t that allows the determ ination of the curve F (z), cf. Eq. (2.7), the second one ( $\frac{2}{t}$ ) to the t (2.22). Beside the <sup>2</sup> we also report the number of degrees of freedom (DOF). The results have two errors: the rst one is the statistical error, the second one gives the variation of the estim ate as <sub>c</sub> is varied within one error bar, cf. Eq. (2.5).

m in	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF		<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	
0.2750	37.1/22	16,2/15	0.0249(1+1)			
0.2780	37.1/22	16.1/14	0.0249(2+1)	15.7/11	12.4/14	0.0253(2+1)
0.2800	36.7/21	11.0/13	0.0246(2+1)	15.7/11	11.6/13	0.0252(2+1)
0,2810	36.7/20	5.9/12	0.0243(2+1)	15.7/11	10.6/12	0.0251(3+1)
0.2820	36.3/19	5.5/11	0.0242(3+1)	15.7/11	11.0/11	0.0250 (3+ 1)
0.2830	35.1/17	4.0/10	0.0241(4+1)	15.5/10	9.9/10	0.0248 (4+ 2)
0.2835	33.2/15	1.5/9	0.0236(5+2)	15.5/9	4.9/9	0.0243(6+2)
0.2840	22.6/13	4.7/8	0.0236(7+2)	12.0/8	2.7/8	0.0245(8+1)

that includes the estim ates with  $m_{in} = 0.284$  with their error bars. U sing the estim ate of reported in Sec. IID, = 0.683(3), we obtain

$$= 0:035(2):$$
 (2.24)

We have also repeated the analysis including scaling corrections with ! = 0.3. In the extrapolation procedure we use Eq. (2.9), and then we t the extrapolated data by using

$$\ln_1() = \ln(_c) + a + b(_c)^{!}$$
: (2.25)

The results are reported in Table V II. They show a system atic upward trend, indicating that scaling corrections with ! = 0.8 do not correctly describe the data. This is also evident from the  $^2$  of the t (2.25) which is quite large for small  $_{min}$ . A lower value of !, say ! = 0.4, gives even worse results, con m ing that corrections with ! < 1 are very small, in agreem ent with the FT analysis of Ref. [28]. In any case the results of Table V II indicate that  $^{>}$  0.0220, in agreem ent with Eq. (2.23).

The second analysis we consider uses the data at the critical point. For  $_{\rm c}$  we have

$$(;L) = L f_1(tL^{1=}) + L ! f_2(tL^{1=});$$
 (2.26)

where t  $_{\rm c}$  . If we expand for t 0 we can write

$$\ln (;L) = \ln L + a + btL^{1} + cL^{!}: \qquad (2.27)$$

We rest perform an analysis neglecting scaling corrections (c = 0) for several values of  $L_{min}$ . If we x <sub>c</sub> = 0.285744(2) and = 0.683(3) we obtain:

$$L_{m in} = 16$$
: = 0:0331(2 + 6), <sup>2</sup>/DOF = 76/26;

TABLE VII. Results for the critical exponent using scaling corrections with exponent ! = 0.8. We report two di erent <sup>2</sup>. The rst one  $\binom{2}{estr}$  refers to the t that allows the determ ination of the curve F (z), cf. Eq. (2.9), the second one  $\binom{2}{t}$  to the t (2.25). Beside the <sup>2</sup> we also report the number of degrees of freedom (DOF). We only report two errors: the rst one is the statistical error, the second one gives the variation of the estimate as  $_{c}$  is varied within one error bar, cf. Eq. (2.5).

m in	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /DOF	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	
0.2750	24.5/29	174/15	0.0179(2+1)
0.2780	24.5/28	55.8/14	0.0193(2+1)
0.2800	24.1/26	29.0/13	0.0203(3+1)
0.2810	22.5/24	19.3/12	0.0210(4+2)
0.2820	20.0/22	11.0/11	0.0217(5+2)
0.2830	19.4/19	6.1/10	0.0228(7+2)
0.2835	192/16	4.8/9	0.0226(8+2)
0.2840	14.2/13	5.3/8	0.0230 (12+ 3)

 $L_{min} = 32$ : = 0:0347(3 + 8), <sup>2</sup>/DOF = 27/21;

$$L_{min} = 64$$
: = 0:0354(6 + 14), <sup>2</sup>/DOF = 22/13.

The rst error is statistical, while the second one is due to the error on  $_{\rm c}$ . The error due to the error on  $_{\rm c}$ . The error due to the error on  $_{\rm c}$  and be neglected. There are apparently some scaling corrections, but it should be noted that the di erence between the results with  $L_{\rm min} = 32$  and 64 is not signile cant given the statistical error bars. We also perform an analysis with scaling corrections with exponent ! = 0.80. U sing all data, i.e. taking  $L_{\rm min} = 16$ , we obtain = 0.0382(8 + 16), c = 0.111(16 + 23),  $^2/\text{DOF} = 29/25$ . This result is higher than the estimates obtained before, but still compatible with the quoted errors.

The analysis at the critical point gives therefore results that are in full agreement with those obtained before, con m ing the correctness of the estimate (2.24), and with the result of Ref. [13], = 0.0374(45).

#### F.The exponent and hyperscaling

In this Section we wish to determ ine the exponent and check the hyperscaling relation 2 = d . Unfortunately, we have measured the speci c heat C (;L) only near the critical point and thus we can determ ine only from the behavior for  $_{c}$ .

RG predicts that, in the FSS lim it, the energy scales as

E (;L) 
$$E_{bulk}$$
 () + L<sup>(1)=</sup>  $g_1$  (tL<sup>1=</sup>) + L<sup>(1)=</sup>  $g_2$  (tL<sup>1=</sup>); (2.28)

where t  $_{\rm c}$  and we have included one scaling correction. Note that  $E_{\rm bulk}$  () is expected to have an exponentially small dependence on L which can be neglected for all

practical purposes. Near the critical point we can expand this expression in powers of tL<sup>1=</sup> obtaining for the energy and the speci c heat the expressions

$$E(;L) = a_{E} + b_{E}t + c_{E}L^{(1)} + d_{E}tL^{=} + e_{E}L^{(1)};$$
 (2.29)

C(;L) 
$$a_c + b_c t + c_c L^{=} + d_c t L^{(+1)=} + e_c L^{=};$$
 (2.30)

with  $a_c = b_E$  and  $c_c = d_E$ .

We wish now to determ ine = . We consider the speci c heat, since in this case the singular behavior is stronger. In Eq. (2.30) we have not used hyperscaling, so that the expression depends on two independent exponents and , or more precisely = and 1=. In order to simplify the analysis, we now analyze the speci c heat using hyperscaling to rew rite the correction term. Thus, Eq. (2.30) becomes

$$C(;L) = a_{c} + b_{c}t + c_{c}L^{=} + d_{c}tL^{3=2(=+1)} + e_{c}L^{=}; \qquad (2.31)$$

that depends only on = . We begin by neglecting the correction-to-scaling term, i.e. we set  $e_c = 0.F$  ixing  $_c = 0.285744$  (2), a ve-parameter t of the data with L  $L_{min}$  gives:

$$L_{min} = 16$$
,  $= = 0.119(7 + 6)$ ,  $^{2}/DOF = 12.0/24$ ;  
 $L_{min} = 32$ ,  $= = 0.115(17 + 11)$ ,  $^{2}/DOF = 11.6/19$ .

The rst error is the statistical one, while the second one gives the variation of the estim ate as  $_{c}$  is varied by one error bar. Two things should be noticed: the analytic term proportional to t is very small compared with the statistical errors. Indeed,  $b_{c} = 23(83 + 8)$  and  $b_{c} =$ 

30(167 + 24) in the two ts. M oreover, corrections to scaling are apparently small, since the results do not depend on  $L_{min}$ . As a check, we have also performed an analysis with a correction term ( $e_c \in 0$ ). We nd = = 0:109(50 + 6),  $e_c = 0:3(1:4)$ , and  $^2/DOF = 11.9/23$ , for ! = 0:3 and  $L_{min} = 16$ . The coe cient  $e_c$  is compatible with zero, while the  $^2$  of the t changes only by 0.1 in spite of the fact that we have added an additional parameter. There is no evidence of scaling corrections. As nalestimate of = we take the result with  $L_{min} = 32$  and  $e_c = 0$ ,

$$- = 0:115(28):$$
 (2.32)

If we use hyperscaling and the estimate of of Sec. IID, = 0.683(3), we obtain = 0.072(13). This estimate is in reasonable agreement with (2.32) con ming the validity of hyperscaling. Using Eq. (2.32) and = 0.683(3) we obtain = 0.079(19), which is in reasonable agreement with the estimate obtained using hyperscaling = 0.049(9).

We can also check hyperscaling directly by comparing the results for the energy and the specic heat. If we de ne  $_1 = , _2 (2) = ,$  we can rewrite Eqs. (2.29) and (2.30) as

$$E (;L) = a_{E} + b_{E} t + c_{E} L^{(1-2)=2} + d_{E} t L^{1};$$
  

$$C (;L) = b_{E} + d_{E} L^{1} + d_{C} t L^{(3-1+2)=2};$$
(2.33)

where we have neglected scaling corrections and we have set  $b_c = 0$  in agreem ent with the previous analysis. If hyperscaling is satisfied we should nd  $_2 = 3.$  A combined analysis of E (;L) and C (;L) xing  $_c$  gives



FIG.7. Ratios R (;2L)=R (;L) vs (;L)=L. The solid curve is a tusing all data with L 64.

$$L_{m in} = 16$$
: = = 0:119(6 + 6),  $_2 = 2:952(17 + 8)$ ,  $^2/DOF = 33.4/51$ ;  
 $L_{m in} = 32$ : = = 0:112(16 + 9),  $_2 = 2:930(43 + 12)$ ,  $^2/DOF = 29.3/41$ .

Here, as before, the rst error is the statistical one, while the second gives the error due to  $_{c}$ . The estimates of = are compatible with Eq. (2.32), while  $_{2}$  is in reasonable agreement with 3, con rm ing again the validity of hyperscaling.

# G . The universal ratio ${\rm R}^+$

W e now wish to compute the universal ratio  $R^+$  that is related to the universality of the singular part of the free energy per correlation volume. More precisely, let us consider the in nite-volume free energy density F $_1$  ( )

$$F_1 = \frac{1}{V} \frac{\ln Z}{\ln Z};$$
 (2.34)

and the in nite-volume specic heat C  $_1$  ( ) =  $0^2 F_1$  ( )=0  $^2.$  In the critical limit t  $_c$   $\,$  ! O we can write

$$F_{1}() = F_{bulk}() + F^{+}t^{2} + \text{connections;}$$

$$C_{1}() = C_{bulk}() + A^{+}t + \text{connections;}$$

$$(2.35)$$

where  $A^+ = (2)(1)F^+$ . If  $_1() f^+t$  in the same limit  $t! 0^+$ , RG predicts the universality of  $F^+ (f^+)^3$ , or equivalently of

$$R^+$$
  $A^+$   $L^{=3}f^+$ : (2.36)

m in	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	R <sup>+</sup>	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /D O F	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	R <sup>+</sup>
0.2750	14.7/19	40.2/16	0,28674 (13)			
0.2780	14.7/19	31.3/15	0,28688 (14)	10.4/8	20.1/15	0,28677 (16)
0.2800	14.6/18	23.9/14	0,28703 (15)	10.4/8	16.5/14	0,28689 (17)
0.2810	14.6/17	20.9/13	0,28712(17)	10.4/8	15.8/13	0,28698 (19)
0.2820	13.8/16	20.4/12	0,28718(18)	10.4/8	13.2/12	0,28709 (20)
0.2830	13.6/14	15.4/11	0,28744 (22)	10.3/7	10.8/11	0,28726 (23)
0.2835	12.9/12	12.8/10	0,28749(26)	10.3/6	9.45/10	0,28736(27)
0.2840	12.9/10	11.5/9	0,28737 (32)	10.2/5	8.63/9	0,28730 (33)

TABLE VIII. Results for the universal ratio  $R^+$ . De nitions are as in Table II. The error due to  $_c$  is negligible.

We now compute  $R^+$  using our high-tem perature results for the energy E (;L) and for the correlation length (;L). We de ne a quantity R (;L),

R(;L) 
$$\frac{1}{1}$$
 (E(;L)  $a_{\rm E} b_{\rm E}$ t)t (;L); (2.37)

where  $a_E$  and  $b_E$  are de ned in terms of the expansion of  $F_{bulk}$  ( ) for t! 0:

$$\frac{dF_{buk}()}{d} = a_{E} + b_{E} t + O(t^{2}):$$
(2.38)

It is easy to check that

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \lim_{L \to 1} R(;L) = R^{+}:$$
(2.39)

In order to compute R (;L), we must specify the values of the two constants  $a_E$  and  $b_E$  in Eq. (2.37). For this purpose we exploit the fact that  $E_{\rm bulk}$  () is the same function in Eq. (2.28) and in Eq. (2.38), so that  $a_E$  and  $b_E$  coincide with the constants de ned in Eq. (2.29). Thus,  $a_E$  and  $b_E$  can be determined independently by using the critical-point data for the energy and the speci c heat. We thus proceed as follows. We consider Eq. (2.33),  $x_c = 0.285744$  (2),  $_2 = 3$ , = 2 = 3, = 0.683 (3), and compute  $a_E$  and  $b_E$  by analyzing E (;L) and C (;L) near the critical point. Then, we determ ine R (;L). The error on R (;L) takes into account the error on E (;L), (;L),  $a_E$ , and  $b_E$ , and also the variation of the estimates as and  $_c$  vary within one error bar. In order to be conservative, we use a worst-error estim ate sum m ing all errors together. Once R (;L) has been computed we use the extrapolation m ethod presented in Sec. IIC.

In Fig. 7 we report the ratios R (;2L)=R (;L) together with a t of the data with L 64 (a good t is obtained by using a polynom ial with n = 10). Apparently, there are no scaling corrections, but at a closer look one nds system atic deviations for L = 16. As before, these points will be discarded in the analytic ts.

The results of the tswith analytic corrections are reported in Table V III for  $L_{min} = 32$  and  $L_{min} = 64$ . For small min they show an upward trend and then apparently stabilize

m in	<sup>2</sup> <sub>estr</sub> /DOF	² <sub>t</sub> ∕DOF	R <sup>+</sup>
0.2750	32.0/25	10.5/16	0,28908 (19)
0.2780	30.8/24	9,5/15	0,28897 (21)
0.2800	30.5/22	8.6/14	0,28895 (24)
0.2810	29.7/20	7.6/13	0,28897 (26)
0.2820	28.5/18	8.5/12	0,28898 (30)
0.2830	27.9/15	8,5/11	0,28905 (36)
0.2835	17.8/12	52/10	0,28951 (45)
0.2840	15.7/9	6.4/9	0 28967 (56)

TABLE IX. Results for the universal ratio  $R^+$  using scaling corrections with exponent ! = 0.8. Denitions are as in Table IV. The error related to <sub>c</sub> is negligible.

around 0.2874(3). In order to check the role of the corrections to scaling, we have repeated the analysis by adding scaling corrections with exponent ! = 0.80. The results are presented in Table IX. They are now substantially independent of  $_{m in}$  con rm ing that the data are very well tted by assuming such an exponent. The nalestimate is somewhat higher than that obtained in the analytic ts, indicating that in this case nonanalytic scaling correction may play an important role. We do not know which of the two ts is the most reliable one and thus we have taken as nalestimate

$$R^{+} = 0.2885(15); \qquad (2.40)$$

which is compatible with the results of both analyses.

The estimate (2.40) is in good agreement with the results of other methods. A sixloop computation in the xed-dimension FT approach gives [42]  $R^+ = 0.290(10)$ , while, by using approximate parametric representations of the equation of state, one obtains [42]  $R^+ = 0.282(3)$ .

### III.COM PARISON W ITH FIELD-THEORY RESULTS

The critical behavior of the R IM has been extensively studied using the FT approach. Quantitative predictions can be obtained by using di erent techniques: perturbative m ethods in the four-point renormalized couplings in xed dimension  $d = 3 \text{ or in}^{-1}$ , 4 d, or nonperturbative m ethods based on approximate RG equations, see Refs. [23{26,28,51{56}} The most accurate results have been obtained in the rst approach: six-loop expansions for the -functions and the critical exponents have been derived and analyzed in Refs. [57,26]. The corresponding estimates of the critical exponents, e.g., = 0.678(10) and = 0.030(3), are in satisfactory agreement with the M onte C arb results presented before.

The main problem of the perturbative approach is the non-B orelsum mability of the series [21,22]. This fact makes the analysism ore subtle and less precise than in the case of the pure Ising model. The discutties of the perturbative approach appear in the determinations of the xed-point values u and v of the renormalized couplings (they are normalized so that at

tree level  $u = u_0 = m$ ,  $v = v_0 = m$ , m being the renorm alized m ass), which are directly related to the quantities we have measured in the M onte C arlo simulation (see R ef. [42] for a derivation of these relations):  $G_4 = v$ ,  $G_{22} = u = 3$ , and  $H_4$ ,  $G_4 + 3G_{22} = u + v$ . The analysis of the six-loop series provided results somewhat dependent on the resummation method [58]. Indeed, we found [26]:  $G_4 = 37.7$  (2),  $G_{22} = 4.3$  (6),  $H_4 = 24.8$  (1.8) (double P ade-B orelm ethod);  $G_4 = 36.8$  (3),  $G_{22} = 4.0$  (1),  $H_4 = 24.8$  (6) (conform all P ade-B orelm ethod);  $G_4 = 38.6$  (7),  $G_{22} = 4.8$  (2),  $H_4 = 24.2$  (9) (direct conform alm ethod). The estimates of  $H_4$  are in good agreement with the M onte C arlo result (2.13),  $H_4 = 24.7$  (2). On the other hand, the estimates of  $G_4$  and  $G_{22}$  (combining the results we would have guessed  $G_4 = 38.0$  (1.5) and  $G_{22} = 4.5$  (6) with errors that are, at rst sight, quite conservative directive direction and  $G_{21}$  from the M onte C arlo estimates (2.11) and (2.12).

These discrepancies call for a reanalysis of the perturbative series of the exponents, verifying if the use of the M onte C arb results for  $G_4$  and  $G_{22}$  leads to signi cantly di erent estim ates. We have thus repeated the analysis, using the di erent resummation m ethods outlined in Refs. [26,55]. We nd

$$= 0:686(4); = 0:026(3); = 1:355(8); \qquad (3.1)$$

where the errors include the results of the di erent resum m ation m ethods. It is reassuring that these estimates are close to those found in Ref. [26], = 0:678(10), = 0:030(3), and = 1:330(17), and also reasonably close to the M onte Carlo estimates. The small variation of the estimates of the critical exponents is due to the particular structure of the perturbative series: if they are rewritten in terms of y u + v and u, the resum m ations depend m ostly on y = H<sub>4</sub>, which is correctly determined by FT m ethods, and only slightly on u that is instead poorly known. We should also observe that the new estimate of is closer to the M onte Carlo result, while the estimate of is slightly worse. Therefore, the FT estimates do not become m ore accurate if m ore precise results for u and v are used. This is an indication that, at least for the critical exponents, the location of the xed point is not the main source of error on the results.

We also tried an alternative procedure based on an expansion of the RG functions around the unstable Ising xed point u = 0,  $v = g_I$ , where [2]  $g_I = 23:56(2)$ . The analysis of the Ising-to-RIM RG ow reported in Ref. [28] and the discussion reported above show that it is convenient to introduce new variables y = u + v and z = u. In terms of y and z, the RIM xed point is located in  $y = H_4 = 24:7(2)$  and  $z = 3G_{22} = 18:6(3)$ , while the Ising xed point is at  $y_I = g_I$ , z = 0. Then, we write  $y = g_I + y$ , obtaining for any RG function f ( $y_i z$ ),

$$f(y;z) = \int_{j=1}^{X} c_{ij}(g_{I}) y^{i} z^{j}; \qquad (32)$$

$$c_{ij}(g_I) = \bigwedge_{k}^{X} f_{ijk} g_I^k :$$
(3.3)

The value of f (y;z) at the R M xed point is then obtained as follows. First, we compute the coe cients  $c_{ij}(g_I)$  at the Ising xed point, by using the conform al-m apping m ethod and exploiting the known large-order behavior of the expansion of  $c_{ij}(g_I)$  that is determined by the Ising xed point. Then, we evaluate the double series at  $y = H_4$   $g_I = 1:14$  (20)

1			1=		1=
C <sub>10</sub>	0.050 (6)	0.105(3)	0,273 (5)	0.181 (3)	0.1193(8)
C <sub>20</sub>	0.032 (8)	0.016(4)	0.00(1)	0.014(5)	0.008 (6)
C <sub>30</sub>	0.011 (6)	0.004 (5)	0.00 (3)	0.00(1)	0.00(1)
C <sub>01</sub>	0	0.0500 (4)	0.127(1)	0.0987 (6)	0.0646(1)
C <sub>02</sub>	0.0062(2)	0.0056 (9)	0.003(3)	0.015(2)	0.005(2)
C <sub>03</sub>	0.0010(2)	0.003(1)	0.017(3)	0.007(2)	0.06(1)
C <sub>04</sub>	0.0001(5)	0.00(1)	0.00(1)	0.00(2)	0.001(1)
C <sub>11</sub>	0	0.017(1)	0.003(1)	0.032(1)	0.0024(2)
C <sub>12</sub>	0.0018(4)	0.003(2)	0.018(6)	0.006(3)	0.009(3)
C <sub>13</sub>	0.0007 (4)	0.004 (3)	0.00(1)	0.009(7)	0.005(5)
C <sub>21</sub>	0	0.0033 (6)	0.0006 (6)	0.005(1)	0.0004(2)
C <sub>22</sub>	0.0009(4)	0.003(2)	0.007(1)	0.005(4)	0.003(1)

TABLE X. Estimates of the coe cients  $c_{ij} = (16 = 3)^i (6)^j c_{ij} (g_I)$ , cf. Eq. (3.3), for the expansions of , 1 = 1, and 1 = 1 around the Ising xed point.

TABLE XI. Results obtained by using the expansion (3.2) for various truncations o Max[i+j]. The rst error is due to the uncertainty on the values of the coe cients c<sub>ij</sub>( $g_I$ ), the second one is due to the uncertainty on the location of the R M xed point.

0	I	I	1= 1= I	I	1= 1= I
1	0.0033 (4+ 6)	0.056(0+2)	0.145 (0+ 5)	0.110(1+4)	0.072(1+2)
2	0.0025 (4+ 8)	0.063 (1+ 2)	0.147 (3+ 5)	0.126(2+5)	0.076(1+3)
3	0.0017(5+8)	0.060 (1+ 2)	0.135 (3+ 5)	0.120(2+4)	0.070(2+2)
4	0.0016(6+8)	0.062 (10+ 3)	0.137 (20+ 5)	0.123(20+4)	0.070(10+2)

and  $z = 3G_{22} = 18.6(3)$ . Here, we are neglecting the fact that the RG functions are nonanalytic at the Ising xed point [38{41]. Note that  $f(g_1; 0)$  is the value of the same quantity for the Ising universality class, so that the expansion (3.2) provides the di erences between  $\mathbb{R} \mathbb{M}$  and Ising critical exponents, i.e.  $f = f_{\mathbb{R} \mathbb{M}}$   $f_{\text{Ising}}$ , which are expected to be rather sm all. Of course, this expansion is, at most, asym ptotic. But one may hope that the  $R \mathbb{I}$  and Ising xed points are su ciently close, so that the rst few terms of the expansion around the Ising xed point allow us to obtain m ore accurate estim ates of the exponents of the R  ${\mathbb M}$  . In Table X we report the estimates of the  $\mbox{ rst coe cients c}_{ij}\,(g_I)$  for I/ I*1*  $_{I}$ , 1= 1=  $_{I}$ , and 1= 1=  $_{I}$ . The results for the critical exponents are reported in Table XI as a function of the order o M ax[i + j] of the expansion. We thus obtain the following estimates: I = 0.0017(13), I = 0.060(5), 1 = 1 = I = 0.135(15), $_{I} = 0.12(1), 1 = 1 = _{I} = 0.07(1)$ . The estimate we quote corresponds to o = 3, while the error is such to include the results with o = 2 and o = 4. Then, using the estimates [9]  $_{I} = 0.0364(5), _{I} = 0.6301(4), _{I} = 1.2372(5), we nally obtain$ 

 $= 0:690(5); = 0:035(2); = 1:357(10); \qquad (3.4)$ 

which are again in substantial agreem ent with the MC results.

The expansion around the Ising xed point can also be performed along the Ising-to-R M RG trajectory [28], which is obtained as the lim it  $u_0 ! 0$  of the RG trajectories in the u, v plane. At least in principle, this expansion is expected to be better behaved than the previous one, since RG functions should be analytic near the Ising xed point only along this trajectory, up to the random xed point where nonanalyticities are again present [28].

An elective parametrization of the curve is given by the set few terms of its expansion around z = 0, which is given by

$$y \quad y_{I} = T(z) = c_{2}z^{2} + c_{3}z^{3} + :::$$
 (3.5)

where  $[28] c_2 = 0.0033 (1)$  and  $c_3 = 1 (2)$  10<sup>5</sup>. The fact that y  $y_I$  is of order  $z^2$  is the main reason why we introduced the variable y and is due to the identity [28]

$$\frac{\overset{\circ}{\underline{\theta}}}{\overset{v}{\underline{\theta}}}_{u=0} + \frac{\overset{\circ}{\underline{\theta}}}{\overset{u}{\underline{\theta}}}_{u=0} \qquad \frac{\overset{\circ}{\underline{\theta}}}{\overset{v}{\underline{\theta}}}_{u=0} = 0: \qquad (3.6)$$

Substituting the expansion (3.5) into the double expansion (3.2), we obtain an expansion in powers of z

$$f(y;z) = f(g_{I} + T(z);z) = \sum_{i}^{X} e_{i}(g_{I})z^{i}; \qquad (3.7)$$

which should be then evaluated at  $g_I = g_I$  and z = z. The values of the coe cients  $e_i(g_I)$  at the Ising xed point have been computed by using a conformal mapping and a Borel transform. The results for i = 1;2;3 are reported in Table X II. The estimates of the di erence between the critical exponents of the Ising and R M universality classes are  $I = 0:0020(18), \quad I = 0:060(5), 1 = I = I = 0:136(20), \quad I = 0:119(10),$ and I = I = I = 0:070(10). These results are obtained by truncating the expansion (3.7) to third order, while the error is the sum of the uncertainty due to the resum mation, due to the truncation of the series (the di erence between the second-order and the third-order result), and due to the uncertainty on z (we used the M onte C arlo result). Then, by using

the estimates  $[9]_{T} = 0.0364(5), T = 0.6301(4), T = 1.2372(5), we nally obtain$ 

$$= 0:690(8); = 0:0345(20); = 1:355(10); \qquad (3.8)$$

that do not di er signi cantly from the estimates (3.4).

Note that the estimate of obtained by using the expansion around the Ising xed point is now in perfect agreement with the M onte Carlo result, at variance with the direct estimate (3.1). The estimate of is also in substantial agreement with the num erical estimate = 0.683(3). Therefore, the expansion around the Ising xed point appears to be a useful alternative method to compute the critical properties of the R M.

## ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

V M .M . is a Ram on y Cajal research fellow and is partly supported by M CyT (Spain), project Nos. FPA 2001-1813 and FPA 2000-0956. The num erical computations were performed at the PC C luster at the University of P isa. We thank M aurizio D avini for his indispensable technical assistance.

i			1=		1=
1	0	0.0500 (6)	0.1278(4)	0.0987 (6)	0.06462(7)
2	0.0028(4)	0.013(1)	0.022(3)	0.027(2)	0.013(2)
3	0.0008 (4)	0.002(1)	0.012(2)	0.005(2)	0.0065 (8)

TABLE XII. Estimates of the coe cients  $e_i = (6)^i e_i(g_I)$ , cf. Eq. (3.7), for the expansions of , , 1= , , and 1= around the Ising xed point.

# APPENDIX A:NOTATIONS

We consider the Hamiltonian (1.1) with J = 1 on a nite lattice  $L^3$  with periodic boundary conditions. Given a quantity O depending on the spins fsg and on the random variable f g we de ne the sample average at xed distribution f g

$$\text{boi(;fg)} \quad \frac{1}{Z(fg)} \sum_{fs_{ig}}^{X} Oe^{H[s;]}; \qquad (A1)$$

where Z (f g) is the sample partition function. Of course, we are interested in averaging over the random dilution and thus we consider disorder-averaged quantities

$$\overline{hoi}() = \begin{bmatrix} z \\ boi(; f g); \end{bmatrix}$$
(A2)

where

$$[d] = \bigvee_{i}^{Y} [x (i 1) + (1 x) (i)]:$$
(A3)

We de ne the two-point correlation function and the susceptibility (;L)

$$G(x;;L) = \frac{1}{v_0} s_0 s_x s_x i$$
 (A4)

(;L) 
$$G(x;;L)$$
 (A5)

We also consider the second-moment correlation length . In in nite volume it is de ned as

$${}^{2}_{1}() \quad \frac{1}{6} {}^{X}_{1}() \\ {}^{x}_{x} \quad \frac{1}{3} x \quad \frac{1}{3} x \quad \frac{1}{3} G_{1}(x; ):$$
 (A 6)

The nite-volum e generalization is by no means unique. We use

<sup>2</sup>(;L) 
$$\frac{\hat{G}(0;;L)}{\hat{q}_{n in}^{2}\hat{G}(q_{n in};;L)}$$
; (A7)

where  $q_{min}$  (2 =L;0;0),  $\hat{q}$  2 sin q=2, and  $\hat{G}$  (q; ;L) is the Fourier transform of G (x; ;L). This nite-volume de nition has the correct in nite-volume limit and shows a fast convergence as L ! 1 [49,50].

W e also de ne the energy E (;L) and the speci c heat C (;L):

E (;L) 3G (e;;L);  
C (;L) 
$$\frac{QE(;L)}{Q}$$
; (A8)

where e = (1;0;0). We also compute higher-order couplings. Setting

$$k \quad h \stackrel{\Lambda}{(}_{i} s_{i})^{k} i; \quad m_{k_{1}k_{2} :::k_{n}} \quad k_{1} \quad k_{2} :::k_{n}; \quad (A 9)$$

we de ne the connected n-point susceptibilities n averaged over random dilution by

$$\begin{array}{l} \nabla_{2}(;L) & \nabla_{4}(;L) = m_{2}; \\ \nabla_{4}(;L) & m_{4} & 3m_{22}; \\ \nabla_{6}(;L) & m_{6} & 15m_{42} + 30m_{222}; \end{array}$$
 (A 10)

where  $V = L^3$  is the volume. Moreover, we also de ne

Then, we de ne the four-point couplings

$$G_{4}(;L) = \frac{4}{3 \frac{2}{2}};$$

$$G_{22}(;L) = \frac{22}{3 \frac{2}{2}};$$

$$H_{4}(;L) = G_{4} + 3G_{22};$$
(A 12)

and the six-point universal ratios

$$r_{6}(;L) = 10 \quad \frac{6}{2} \frac{2}{4};$$

$$C_{42}(;L) = 4 \quad \frac{42}{4} \frac{2}{2};$$

$$C_{222}(;L) = 6 \quad \frac{222}{2} \frac{2}{22};$$
(A13)

We will be interested in the critical value of these quantities. If S (;L) is any of them, we compute its xed-point value (note that the order of the lim its cannot be interchanged)

$$S = \lim_{!} \lim_{c L! 1} S(;L):$$
 (A14)

Finally, we de ne the Binder parameters

$$U_{n}(;L) = \frac{m_{n}}{m_{2}^{n-2}};$$

$$U_{22}(;L) = \frac{m_{22}}{m_{2}^{2}};$$
(A15)

and the corresponding critical-point values

$$U = \lim_{L! \ 1} \lim_{c} U (;L):$$
(A16)

Note that the order of lim its is reversed with respect to Eq. (A14).

# REFERENCES

- [1] D.P.Belanger, Brazilian J.Phys. 30, 682 (2000) [cond-m at/0009029].
- [2] M. Campostrini, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. E 65, 066127 (2002); Phys. Rev. E 60, 3526 (1999).
- [3] S.Fishm an and A.Aharony, J.Phys.C 12, L729 (1979).
- [4] J.L.Cardy, Phys. Rev. B 29, 505 (1984).
- [5] D. P. Belanger, in Spin G lasses and Random Fields, edited by A. P. Young (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1998), p. 251 [cond-m at/9706042].
- [6] The corresponding crossover exponent has been determ ined experimentally, nding, e.g., = 1:42(3) in Fe<sub>x</sub>Zn<sub>1 x</sub> F<sub>2</sub> [I.B.Ferreira, A.R.King, and V.Jaccarino, Phys. Rev. B 43, 10797 (1991)]. The theoretical estimate [P.Calabrese, A.Pelissetto, and E.Vicari, cond-mat/0305041] = 1:42(2) is in good agreement.
- [7] A. Aharony, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C. Domb and J. Lebow itz (A cadem ic Press, New York, 1976), Vol. 6, p. 357.
- [8] R.B. Stinchcom be, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C.Dom b and J.Lebow itz (A cadem ic Press, New York, 1983), Vol. 7, p. 152.
- [9] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Phys. Rep. 368, 549 (2002) [cond-m at/0012164].
- [10] R.Folk, Yu.Holovatch, and T.Yavors'kii, UspekhiFiz.Nauk 173, 175 (2003) Physics Uspekhi 46, 175 (2003)]
- [11] W .Selke, L.N. Shchur, and A.L. Talapov, in Annual Reviews of Computational Physics, Vol. I, edited by D. Stau er (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1995).
- [12] S.W isem an and E.Dom any, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 22 (1998); Phys. Rev. E 58, 2938 (1998).
- [13] H.G. Ballesteros, L.A. Fernandez, V.M art n-M ayor, A.M unoz Sudupe, G. Parisi, and J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo, Phys. Rev. B 58, 2740 (1998).
- [14] K.Hukushima, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn. 69, 631 (2000).
- [15] M.I.Marques, J.A.Gonzalo, and J. Iniguez, Phys. Rev. E 62, 191 (2000).
- [16] W.C.Barber and D.P.Belanger, J.Magn.Magn.Mater. 226-230, 545 (2001).
- [17] P.E.Berche, C.Chatelain, B.Berche, and W. Janke, Comp. Phys. Comm. 147, 427 (2002).
- [18] G.Grinstein and A.Luther, Phys. Rev. B 13, 1329 (1976).
- [19] V.S.Dotsenko, B.Harris, D.Sherrington, and R.Stinchcombe, J.Phys. A 28, 3093 (1995); V.S.Dotsenko and D.E.Feldman, J.Phys. A 28, 5183 (1995); V.S.Dotsenko, J.Phys. A 32, 2949 (1999).
- [20] V. V. Prudnikov, P. V. Prudnikov, and A. A. Fedorenko, Phys. Rev. B 63, 184201 (2001); J. Phys. A 34, L145 (2001); A. A. Fedorenko, J. Phys. A 36, 1239 (2003).
- [21] A.J.Bray, T.McCarthy, M.A.Moore, J.D.Reger, and A.P.Young, Phys. Rev. B 36, 2212 (1987); A.J.McKane, Phys. Rev. B 49, 12003 (1994).
- [22] G.Alvarez, V.Mart n-Mayor, and J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo, J.Phys. A 33, 841 (2000).
- [23] B.N. Shalaev, S.A. Antonenko, and A.I. Sokolov, Phys. Lett. A 230, 105 (1997).
- [24] R.Folk, Yu. Holovatch, and T. Yavors'kii, Phys. Rev. B 61, 15114 (2000).
- [25] V.Blavats'ka and Yu.Holovatch, J.Mol.Liquids 105, 221 (2003).
- [26] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B 62, 6393 (2000).
- [27] Perturbative eld theory predicts ! = 0.25(10) (Ref. [26]), ! = 0.372(5) (Ref. [53]).

M oreover, it is possible to compute the next-to-leading correction exponent  $!_2$ . The analysis of the six-loop perturbative series of R ef. [26] gives  $!_2 = 0.8$  (2) (R ef. [28]).

- [28] P. Calabrese, P. Parruccini, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, cond-m at/0307699.
- [29] J.H. Chen, M. E. Fisher, and B.G. Nickel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 630 (1982).
- [30] H.G.Ballesteros, L.A. Fernandez, V.Mart n-Mayor, and A.Munoz Sudupe, Phys. Lett. B 441, 330 (1998).
- [31] M. Hasenbusch, K. Pinn, and S. Vinti, Phys. Rev. B 59, 11471 (1999); M. Hasenbusch, J. Phys. A 32, 4851 (1999); J. Phys. A 34, 1 (2001).
- [32] M. Campostrini, M. Hasenbusch, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B 63, 214503 (2001); B 65 (2002) 144520.
- [33] S. Caracciolo, R. G. Edwards, S. J. Ferreira, A. Pelissetto, and A. D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2969 (1995).
- [34] S.Caracciolo, R.G.Edwards, A.Pelissetto, and A.D.Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1891 (1995).
- [35] G.Mana, A.Pelissetto, and A.D.Sokal, Phys. Rev. D 55, 3674 (1997).
- [36] M. Luscher, P. Weisz, and U. Wol, Nucl. Phys. B 359, 221 (1991).
- [37] J.-K.Kim, Europhys. Lett. 28, 211 (1994); Phys. Rev. D 50, 4663 (1994); Nucl. Phys.
   B (Proc. Suppl.) 34, 702 (1994).
- [38] B.G.Nickel, in Phase Transitions, edited by M.Levy, J.C.LeGuillou, and J.Zinn-Justin (Plenum, New York (London, 1982).
- [39] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Nucl. Phys. B 519, 626 (1998).
- [40] P. Calabrese, M. Caselle, A. Celi, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, J. Phys. A 33, 8155 (2000).
- [41] M. Caselle, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, in Fluctuating Paths and Fields, edited by W. Janke, A. Pelster, H.-J. Schmidt, and M. Bachmann (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 2001) [hep-th/0010228].
- [42] P. Calabrese, M. De Prato, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, cond-m at/0305434.
- [43] G. Parisi and F. Rapuano, Phys. Lett. B 157, 301 (1985).
- [44] The Parisi-Rapuano generator [43] is de ned in terms of the sequence  $a_{PR,m}$  de ned by  $a_{PR,m} = m \text{ od } (a_{PR,m 24} + a_{PR,m 55}; 2^{32})$ . A random integer between 0 and  $2^{32}$  1 is obtained by taking  $r_{PR,m} = a_{PR,m} \text{ XOR } a_{PR,m 61}$ . We also consider the congruential generator  $r_{cm} = m \text{ od } (16807r_{cm 1}; 2^{31})$ . The random numbers we use are obtained from  $r_n = m \text{ od } (2r_{cm} + r_{PR,m}; 2^{32})$ .
- [45] H.G.Ballesteros, L.A.Fernandez, V.Mart n-Mayor, A.Muroz Sudupe, G.Parisi, and J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo, Nucl. Phys. B 512, 681 (1998).
- [46] A. Aharony and A. B. Harris, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3700 (1996).
- [47] M. Palassini and S. Caracciolo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 5128 (1999).
- [48] From a practical point of view, not any basis in the space spanned by the functions  $fz^kg$  is suitable to perform the t. As discussed in Ref. [35], care must be taken to choose functions which are electively orthogonal with respect to the scalar product induced by the <sup>2</sup>, otherwise the numerical solution of the minimization problem can be unstable. We used the functions  $f_k(z) = yP_{k-1}^{(0,5)}(2y=y_{max} 1)$ ; where  $y = e^{1-z}$ ,  $y_{max} = e^{1-z_{max}}$ ,  $P_n^{(a,b)}$  are Jacobipolynomials which are an orthonormal system in L<sup>2</sup> ([0;1];  $x^a (1 x)^b$ ), and  $z_{max}$  is the maximum value of (-;L)=L for the data (in our case  $z_{max} 0.542719$ ). The choice of the parameters a; b is not crucial and dimensional system of the space of the parameters as the parameters as the space of the parameters as th

analogously.

- [49] S.Caracciolo and A.Pelissetto, Phys.Rev.D 58, 105007 (1998).
- [50] W ith our de nition of (;L) the small-z behavior of F (z) is determined [49] by the small-m omentum behavior of the inverse of the two-point function of the fundamental elds. As in the Ising model without disorder (see V.M art n-M ayor, A.Pelissetto, and E.Vicari, Phys. Rev. E 66, 026112 (2002) and references therein), also in the R IM such corrections are extremely tiny [P.Calabrese, V.M art n-M ayor, A.Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, in preparation].
- [51] D. V. Pakhnin and A. I. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. B 64, 094407 (2001); D. V. Pakhnin, A. I. Sokolov, and B. N. Shalaev, Pis'm a Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 75, 459 (2002) [JETP Lett. 75, 387 (2002)].
- [52] Yu. Holovatch and T. Yavors'kii, J. Stat. Phys. 92, 785 (1998).
- [53] R.Folk, Yu.Holovatch, and T.Yavors'kii, Pis'm a v Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz.69, 698 (1999) [JETP Lett. 69, 747 (1999)].
- [54] K.B.Vamashev, Phys. Rev. B 61, 14660 (2000).
- [55] D.V.Pakhnin and A.I.Sokolov, Phys.Rev.B 61, 15130 (2000).
- [56] M. Tissier, D. Mouhanna, J. Vidal, and B. Delamotte, Phys. Rev. B 65, 140402 (2002).
- [57] J.M. Carmona, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B 61, 15136 (2000).
- [58] In R ef. [26], results are given for the rescaled couplings u and v. The relation is: u = 6 u, v = 16 v=3.