

# Thermodynamic properties of a classical d-dimensional spin-S Heisenberg ferromagnet with long-range interactions via the spectral density method

A. Cavallo<sup>a,b</sup>, F. Cosenza<sup>a,b</sup>; and L. De Cesare<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica "E. R. Caianiello", Università degli Studi di Salerno,  
Via S. Allende, 84081 Baronissi (SA), Italy

<sup>b</sup>Istituto Nazionale di Fisica della Materia (INFN), Unità di Salerno, Italy

---

## Abstract

The thermodynamic properties of a classical d-dimensional spin-S Heisenberg ferromagnet, with long-range interactions decaying as  $r^{-p}$  and in the presence of an external magnetic field, is investigated by means of the spectral density method in the framework of classical statistical mechanics. We find that long-range order exists at finite temperature for  $d < p < 2d$  with  $d \geq 2$  and for  $p > d$  with  $d > 2$ , consistently with known theorems. Besides, the related critical temperature is determined and a study of the critical properties is performed.

Key words: Classical Heisenberg model, long-range interactions.

PACS: 05.20.-y, 75.10.Hk, 64.60.Fr

---



---

Email address: cosfab@sa.infn.it (F. Cosenza).

## 1 Introduction

The quantum two-time Green function technique has provided a very powerful tool in condensed matter physics for exploring the equilibrium and transport properties of a wide variety of many-body systems. Within this framework, the equation of motion method (EMM) and the spectral density method (SDM) allow to obtain reliable approximations to treat typically unperturbative problems [1,2,3]. The pioneering introduction of the two-time Green functions and the EMM in classical statistical mechanics by Bogoljubov and Sadovnikov [4], has opened the concrete possibility to describe classical and quantum systems on the same footing. Next, a classical version of the SDM (CSDM) has been also formulated in extensive [5,6,7] and nonextensive [8] classical statistical mechanics and applied to classical magnetic chains [5,6,7,8]. The last method, which seems to present many advantages with respect to the most conventional EMM [3,5,6,7,8], offers a robust instrument for systematic and well tested approximations [3] to explore the macroscopic properties of classical many-body systems as well. Unfortunately, both the mentioned methods have not received the due consideration in the classical context and further developments and applications are desirable. Along this direction, in this paper we apply the CSDM to investigate the thermodynamic properties of a highly non-trivial  $d$ -dimensional classical spin- $S$  Heisenberg ferromagnet with long-range interactions decaying as  $r^{-p}$  ( $p > d$ ) with the distance  $r$  between spins in the presence of an external magnetic field. The choice of this model, besides its intrinsic theoretical interest, is motivated also by its relevance in the description of many materials [9,10,11] of experimental and technological importance and, in particular, in the understanding of the critical behavior of magnetic systems

when long-range exchange interactions are believed to play an important role. In general, realistic microscopic magnetic models with long-range interactions are difficult to be studied in a reliable way. Since the exact solution for the spin-1/2 quantum Heisenberg chain with an inverse-square exchange ( $p = 2$ ) and without an external field was found independently by Haldane [12] and Shastry [13], only a limited lot of information has been acquired about the low-temperature properties, the existence of long-range order (LRO) and the related critical behavior for different values of the decaying exponent  $p$  and the dimensionality  $d$ .

Recently, the critical properties at finite temperature of  $d$ -dimensional quantum Heisenberg models, with interactions of the type here considered (here often named "long-range spin models") have been studied using microscopic techniques [14,15,16,17] and Monte Carlo simulations [18]. A summary of the known features sounds as follows. The one- and two-dimensional long-range quantum spin-1/2 Heisenberg ferromagnets in absence of an external magnetic field were investigated by Nakano and Takahashi using the so called modified spin-wave theory [14] and the Schwinger-boson mean-field approximation [15]. Further information were derived for the  $d$ -dimensional case by means of the EMM for the two-time Green functions using the Tyablikov decoupling procedure [16]. Monte Carlo simulations for the two-dimensional quantum spin-1/2 Heisenberg model have been also performed for  $2 < p \leq 6$  [18]. This scenario, has been recently enriched by an extension [17] of the Mermin-Wagner theorem [19] for the existence of ferromagnetic (FM) LRO at finite temperature in quantum Heisenberg and XY models in  $d (= 1; 2)$  dimensions with  $r^p$ - and oscillatory- interactions.

Classical long-range spin- $s$  Heisenberg FM models have attracted great atten-

tion, too. It has been proved that LRO exist in  $d(= 1;2)$  dimension when  $d < p < 2d$  [20,21] and is destroyed at all finite temperatures for  $p \geq 2d$  [22,23,24]. Similar results were obtained for the spherical model [25] and the present scenario of the critical properties is largely based on renormalization group calculations for the classical  $n$ -vector model [26,27]. Classical long-range antiferromagnetic (AFM) models have been studied less extensively. The available rigorous results [20,21,22] suggest orientational disorder at all finite temperatures when  $p \geq 2d$ , but no theorem exists entailing existence or absence of LRO for  $d < p < 2d$ . Monte Carlo simulations have been also performed for both  $d(= 1;2)$ -dimensional classical FM (for  $p = 2d$  [28]) and AFM (for  $p = 3/2$  and  $p = 3$  with  $d = 1$  and  $d = 2$  respectively [29]) Heisenberg long-range models. The results confirm that FM-LRO survives at finite temperature provided  $d < p < 2d$  and allow to conjecture that no AFM-LRO exists at all finite temperatures for  $p > d$ . Spin-wave studies [29] agree with last conjecture but no definitive statement can be drawn at the present stage. In a quite recent work [30] the thermodynamics and the critical properties of the classical long-range spin- $S$  Heisenberg FM chain in the presence of an external field have been systematically studied using the CSDM to lowest order of approximation. The results are in good agreement with previous available analytical and numerical investigations. As mentioned before, here we use the same method to explore a  $d$ -dimensional Heisenberg FM model. As we shall see, a rich phase diagram appears where all the above mentioned scenario is reproduced and extended.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we introduce the model and the moment equations (ME's) for the spectral density (SD) to lowest order of approximation. The main low-temperature properties are studied in Sec. 3

and the existence of LRO in different regions of the  $(d, p)$ -plane is also shown in a transparent way. Sec. 4 is devoted to the critical properties and the low-temperature paramagnetic susceptibility of the model. Finally, in Sec. 5, some concluding remarks are drawn.

## 2 The model and the moment equations for the spectral density

A classical  $d$ -dimensional spin- $S$  Heisenberg ferromagnet with long-range interactions is described by the Hamiltonian:

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j - h \sum_{i=1}^N S_i^z \quad (1)$$

Here,  $N$  is the number of sites of the hypercubic lattice with unitary spacing,  $S_i, i=1, \dots, N$  are the classical spins,  $h$  is the external magnetic field and the spin-spin interaction, in view of the thermodynamic limit as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , is assumed to be  $J_{ij} = J r_{ij}^{-p}$ , where  $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$  and  $J > 0$  measures the strength of the coupling. The extreme case  $p \rightarrow 0$  corresponds to the standard nearest-neighbor interaction while the mean field approximation is obtained when  $p = 0$  (replacing  $J$  by  $J/N$ ). For this type of interaction, the thermodynamic limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  is well defined only for  $p > d$ , while for  $p \leq d$  the ground state of the system has an infinite energy per particle as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and the conventional statistical mechanics cannot be directly applied.

The classical spins model (1) can be appropriately described by the set of  $2N$  canonical variables  $\theta_j, S_j^z$  where  $\theta_j$  is the angle between the projection of the spin vector  $S_j$  in the  $(x, y)$ -plane and the  $x$  axis. For practical calculations we find convenient to introduce the new variables  $S_j = S_j^x + i S_j^y$ , so that

$S_j^2 = (S_j^z)^2 + S_j^+ S_j^-$ . Then, the Hamiltonian (1) can be rewritten as

$$H = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_k J(k) S_k^+ S_{-k} + S_k^z S_{-k}^z - h S_0^z \quad (2)$$

involving the Fourier components of the spins and the exchange interaction defined by:

$$S_k = \sum_{j=1}^N e^{ik \cdot r_j} S_j; \quad J(k) = \sum_{j=1}^N e^{ik \cdot (r - r_j)} J_{ij}, \quad (3)$$

where  $k$  denotes a wave vector in the  $d$ -dimensional Fourier space. The sum in Eq. (2) is restricted to the first Brillouin zone (1BZ) of the lattice. The Poisson brackets for the spin Fourier components relevant for us, are:

$$\{S_k; S_{k^0}^z\} = i S_{k+k^0}; \quad \{S_k^+; S_{k^0}^-\} = 2i S_{k+k^0}^0. \quad (4)$$

In the context of the CSDM [5,6,7,8,30], all the thermodynamical properties of the model can be derived using the SD defined by:

$$\rho_k(t) = \frac{Dn}{i} S_k; S_k^+(t) \stackrel{OE}{=} = \frac{Z}{i} \int_1^1 dt e^{iL t} S_k; S_k^+(t) \stackrel{OE}{=} , \quad (5)$$

where the classical dynamical variables depend on time through the conjugate canonical coordinates  $\{S_j^-(t); S_j^z(t); j=1; \dots; N\}$ . Here  $A(t) = e^{iL t} A(0)$ ,  $L = i[H, \cdot]$  is the Liouville operator and  $h \cdot$  denotes a canonical ensemble average. According to the spirit of the CSDM, we try to determine it to the lowest order in the form [7,30]:

$$\rho_k(t) = 2 \rho_k(0) + \dots, \quad (6)$$

where the unknown parameters  $\rho_k$  and  $\rho_k^+$  are to be calculated solving the

first two moment equations (M E's):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^Z \frac{d!}{2} \chi_k(!) &= \sum_{k=0}^{Dn} S_k^+ S_k^{\circ E} = 2N m; \\ \sum_{k=0}^Z \frac{d!}{2} \chi_k(!) &= \sum_{k=0}^{Dn} S_k^+ H; S_k^{\circ \circ E} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^X (J(k^0) - J(k^0)) (S_k^+ S_{k^0}^E + 2 S_{k^0}^Z S_{k^0}^E) + 2N m h \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$(8)$$

with  $m = \sum_j^D S_j^E$  the magnetization per spin.

To close this system, we should express all the unknown quantities in terms of the SD. One can show [7,30] that the transverse correlation function  $\langle S_k^+ S_k \rangle$ , appearing on the right hand side of Eq. (8), can be exactly expressed in terms of the SD by the relation:

$$\langle S_k^+ S_k \rangle = T \sum_{k=0}^Z \frac{d!}{2} \chi_k(!): \quad (9)$$

Then, taking into account the one- ansatz (6), we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^D S_k^+ S_k^E = \frac{2N m T}{!_k}: \quad (10)$$

On the contrary, the longitudinal correlation function  $\sum_{k=0}^D S_k^Z S_k^E$  cannot be exactly related to the spectral density  $\chi_k(!)$ . So, to close the system of M E's (7),(8) we should solve another moment problem by introducing a new SD. The simplest way to avoid this difficulty is to resort to the decoupling  $\sum_{k=0}^D S_k^Z S_k^E$ .  $\sum_{k=0}^D S_k^Z \langle S_k^E \rangle = N^2 m^2_{k,0}$ , which means to neglect the correlations between the Fourier components of the  $S_j^Z$ . Of course, the approximation is appropriate to describe thermodynamic regimes with finite magnetization as under near saturation conditions. In Sec. 4 we will introduce a different procedure which allows us to describe also, in a reliable way, regimes with zero or near zero magnetization. As a first step one must express the magnetization  $m$  in terms

of the  $\mathbf{k}^0$ . This is not a simple problem for a classical spin system, also when  $S = 1/2$  (for which the exact relation  $S_j^z = 1/2 - S_j^+ S_j^-$  exists in the quantum counterpart). However, as shown in Refs. [7,30] within the spirit of the SDM, one can use the expression:

$$m^2 = \frac{S^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{3}{2N^2} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^D S_{\mathbf{k}}^+ S_{\mathbf{k}}^E}{1 - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{2S^2 N^2} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^D S_{\mathbf{k}}^+ S_{\mathbf{k}}^E}, \quad (11)$$

which is appropriate for all thermodynamic regimes and reduces, correctly, to the near saturation relation  $m \approx S \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^D S_{\mathbf{k}}^+ S_{\mathbf{k}}^E = (2S) = S \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^D S_{\mathbf{k}}^+ S_{\mathbf{k}}^E = (2SN^2)$  arising from the identity  $S^2 = S_j^z{}^2 + S_j^+ S_j^-$  with  $S_j^+ S_j^- = S^2 - 1$ . Then, from Eq. (10), as a consequence of Eq. (9) and the ansatz (6), Eq. (11) yields:

$$m^2 = \frac{S^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{3T_m}{N} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^D \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^0}}{1 - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{T_m}{N S^2} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^D \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^0}}. \quad (12)$$

With the above ingredients, Eqs. (7)-(8) become a closed system to be solved self-consistently. By introducing conveniently the dimensionless variables  $\bar{m} = m/S$ ,  $\bar{T} = T/JS^2$ ,  $\bar{h} = h/JS$  and  $\bar{T}_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{k}^0/JS$ , the ME's reduce to:

$$\bar{T}_{\mathbf{k}} = \bar{h} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}^0} \langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{\bar{T}}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}^0} \frac{\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\mathbf{k}} \langle \mathbf{k}^0 \rangle}{\bar{T}_{\mathbf{k}^0}}; \quad (13)$$

$$\bar{m}^2 = \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{3}{N} \bar{T} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^D \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^0}}; \quad (14)$$

with

$$\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_r \frac{1}{r} \frac{\cos k_r}{\mathbf{k}^0}; \quad (15)$$

In the thermodynamic limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  one must replace the sum  $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\mathbf{k}} = N$  by an integral  $\int_{\text{BZ}}^R \langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\mathbf{k}} d^d \mathbf{k} = (2\pi)^d$  in the  $d$ -dimensional  $\mathbf{k}$ -space and hence Eqs.(13)



and (14) can be rewritten as:

$$T_k = \bar{h} + \langle \epsilon \rangle(k) R(k), \quad (16)$$

$$2 = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{3\bar{T}^R}{T} \frac{1}{1BZ} \frac{d^d k}{(2)^d} \frac{1}{T_k}}. \quad (17)$$

with

$$R(k) = 1 + \frac{\bar{T}^Z}{1BZ} \frac{d^d k^0}{(2)^d} \frac{\langle \epsilon \rangle(k - k^0)}{T_{k^0} - \langle \epsilon \rangle(k)}. \quad (18)$$

The solution of the problem is complicated and one must consider asymptotic regimes for obtaining explicit results or use numerical calculations. Moreover, we can note that these equations have physical meaning only if  $\epsilon \neq 0$  [30]. Hence, they cannot describe the critical behavior of the system or a paramagnetic phase in zero external field. As we will see, in Sec. 3 this problem can be simply overcome with an appropriate modification of Eq. (18).

### 3 Low temperature properties

We first examine analytically the low temperature solution of Eqs. (16)–(18). The expressions of  $\epsilon$  and  $T_k$  to the first order in the reduced temperature  $\bar{T}$ , which allow us to capture some relevant aspects of the low-temperature physics of the model (1), are given by:

$$T_k = \bar{h} + \langle \epsilon \rangle(k) - \bar{T}^n I_d^{(p)}(\bar{h}) - \langle \epsilon \rangle(k) + I_d^{(p)}(\bar{h}; k)^0; \quad (19)$$

$$1 = \bar{T} I_d^{(p)}(\bar{h}); \quad (20)$$

where

$$I_d^{(p)}(\bar{h}) = \frac{1}{1BZ} \frac{d^d k}{(2)^d} \frac{1}{\bar{h} + \langle \epsilon \rangle(k)}; \quad (21)$$

$$I_d^{(p)}(\bar{h}; k) = \frac{1}{1BZ} \frac{d^d k^0}{(2)^d} \frac{\langle \epsilon \rangle(k^0) - \langle \epsilon \rangle(k - k^0)}{\bar{h} + \langle \epsilon \rangle(k^0)}; \quad (22)$$

At first, we assume  $\bar{h} \neq 0$  so that no convergency problem for the above integrals in the  $k$ -space occurs. To calculate analytically these integrals, one needs an explicit expression of the function  $\chi^{(p)}(k)$  which, unfortunately, cannot be obtained in terms of elementary functions in the whole 1BZ, for arbitrary values of the parameter  $p > d$ . Nevertheless, for sufficiently small values of the external magnetic field, the dominant contribution to the integrals in Eqs. (19) and (20) arises from the low wave-vector excitations as close to the critical temperature (see Sec. 4). Then, we can obtain an explicit estimate of  $\chi$  and  $T_k$  assuming the dominant behavior of  $\chi^{(p)}(k)$  in the 1BZ as  $k \rightarrow 0$ , provided that the coefficients of  $\bar{T}$  in Eqs. (19) and (20) remain finite. Keeping this in mind, one can show [16,17,28,29] that for  $p > d$  we have for  $\chi^{(p)}(k)$  the low- $k$  expansions:

$$\chi^{(p)}(k) \sim \begin{cases} A_d k^{p-d} + B_d k^2 + O(k^4); & p \neq d+2 \\ C_d k^2 \ln(-k) + O(k^4); & p = d+2: \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

The explicit expressions of the coefficients  $A_d$ ,  $B_d$  and  $C_d$ , which depend in a cumbersome way on the dimensionality  $d$ , the exponent  $p$  and a wave-vector cut-off related to the geometrical definition of 1BZ, are inessential at this stage and will be omitted. However, for case  $d = 2$ , they will be explicitly given in Sec. 4 where a comparison with some analytical and Monte Carlo predictions is performed.

Taking into account Eq. (23), the integral  $I_d^{(p)}(\bar{h})$  can be explicitly estimated and we have the following low-temperature representation for the reduced

magnetization

$$\chi' = \frac{1}{T} \left[ \frac{1}{h} {}_2F_1 \left( 1; \frac{d}{p-d}; \frac{p}{p-d}; \frac{A_d}{h} \frac{p-d}{h} \right); \quad d < p < d+2 \right. \\ \left. K_d^R \int_0^{\infty} dk k^{d-1} \frac{h}{h} + C_d k^2 \ln(-k) \right]^{i-1}; p = d+2 \quad (24) \\ \frac{1}{h} {}_2F_1 \left( 1; \frac{d}{2}; 1 + \frac{d}{2}; \frac{B_d}{h} \frac{2}{h} \right); \quad p > d+2$$

where  ${}_2F_1(a; b; c; z)$  is the hypergeometric function,  $K_d = 2^{1-d} \Gamma(d-2) \Gamma(d)$  and  $\Gamma(z)$  is the gamma function. An analogous calculation of  $\Gamma_d^{(p)}(\bar{h}; k)$  in the expression (19) for  $T_k$  is rather complicated. However, an explicit estimate of  $T_k$  based on the expansions (23) is irrelevant for next developments. The low temperature susceptibility can be now easily obtained from Eq. (24) by derivation with respect to the reduced magnetic field  $\bar{h}$ . For the reduced susceptibility  $\chi = \chi/J$  we have:

$$\chi = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{h}} \left[ \frac{1}{h} {}_2F_1 \left( 2; \frac{d}{p-d}; \frac{p}{p-d}; \frac{A_d}{h} \frac{p-d}{h} \right); \quad d < p < d+2 \right. \\ \left. K_d^R \int_0^{\infty} dk k^{d-1} \frac{h}{h} + C_d k^2 \ln(-k) \right]^{i-2}; p = d+2 \quad (25) \\ \frac{1}{h^2} {}_2F_1 \left( 2; \frac{d}{2}; 1 + \frac{d}{2}; \frac{B_d}{h} \frac{2}{h} \right); \quad p > d+2:$$

The above low- $T$  expressions have a physical meaning for  $\bar{T}$  and  $\bar{h}$  in the near saturation regime ( $\chi' \rightarrow 1$ ) and also for  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$  when long-range order occurs. As mentioned before, the integrals in Eqs. (19) and (20), and hence the functions in Eqs. (24)–(25), could diverge in the limit  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$  for particular values of the exponent and the dimensionality  $d$  of the lattice. When this is not the case, from Eq. (20) a spontaneous magnetization at a finite temperature should arise signaling the occurrence of LRO. Of course, the low- $k$  behaviors (23) determine the constraints for convergency of the integrals involved in the low-

T expressions when  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$ . It is easy to see that, in the limit  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$ , the integral (21) converges only for  $d < p < 2d$  with  $d \leq 2$  and for  $p > d$  with  $d > 2$ . Then, for these values of  $p$  and  $d$ , a spontaneous magnetization  $m_0(T) = m_0(T)S$  exists and hence LRO occurs at a finite temperature, with the result:

$$m_0(T) = (T; 0)^{1/2} \bar{T} I_d^{(p)}(0) \quad (26)$$

where  $I_d^{(p)}(0)$  is a finite quantity whose estimate can be immediately obtained from Eq. (24). On the contrary, for  $d > 2d$  with  $d < 2$ , the integral (21) diverges as  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$  and no finite solution for  $m_0$  exists at  $\bar{T} \neq 0$ . This means that, for these values of  $p$  and  $d$ , no LRO occurs at finite temperature. The global situation is schematically shown in Fig. 1. Here we also distinguished the domains where, as we will show in the next Sec. 4, the system exhibits a critical behavior like for a Heisenberg model with a nearest-neighbor exchange coupling (short-range interaction (SRI) regime) and the long-range nature of interactions (LRI) becomes effective.

In conclusion, our explicit low-temperature results suggest that a transition to a FM phase at finite temperature occurs in the domains of the  $(p, d)$ -plane where LRO exists. In the remaining domains a different scenario takes place with absence of a phase transition. These predictions are quite consistent with the recent extension [17] of the known Mermin-Wagner theorem [19] to quantum spin models with LRI's of the type here considered. Other thermodynamic properties can be also obtained within the framework of CSDM when the solutions of the ME's are known. Indeed, for our spin model, one can easily show that the internal energy  $u$  and free energy  $f$  per spin are given

by [30]:

$$\begin{aligned} u(T;h) &= \frac{\langle H \rangle}{N} \\ &= \frac{\hbar}{N} \langle S_0^z \rangle - \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_k J(k) \langle S_k^+ S_k^E + S_k^D S_k^z \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(T;h) &= f_0 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_0 \frac{dJ^0}{J^0} \langle H_I \rangle(J^0) \\ &= f_0 + \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_k \frac{J(k)}{J} \sum_0 \frac{dJ^0}{J^0} \langle S_k^+ S_k^E + S_k^D S_k^z \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Here,  $H_I$  is the interaction part of the spin Hamiltonian,  $f_0$  is the free energy per spin for a magnetic model without interactions and  $\langle \dots \rangle_{J^0}$  denotes a canonical average as a function of the interaction strength  $J^0$ . As we see, within our approximations all the quantities in Eqs. (27) and (28) can be expressed in terms of the transverse  $SD(k)$  and hence all the relevant thermodynamic quantities of our classical spin model can be evaluated. In particular, for the reduced internal energy  $\bar{u} = u/JS^2$  we have:

$$\bar{u} = -\frac{\hbar}{J} \sum_{1BZ} \frac{\overline{T}}{J} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{J(k)}{T_k} - \frac{J(0)}{2J}. \quad (29)$$

Then, in the low temperature limit, from (24) we find:

$$\bar{u} \approx -\frac{\hbar}{J} \frac{1}{2} \frac{J(0)}{J} + O(T^2 g \hbar) \quad (30)$$

where the explicit expression of the term  $O(T^2 g \hbar)$  can be obtained in a straightforward but tedious way. Hence, for the reduced specific heat  $\bar{C}_h = \partial \bar{u} / \partial T_h = C_h / S$ , as expected for a classical spin model [30], we have:

$$\bar{C}_h \approx 1 + O(T^2 g \hbar). \quad (31)$$

#### 4 Near zero-magnetization regimes

As we mentioned before, the decoupling  $\langle S_k^z S_k^z \rangle \approx \langle S_k^z \rangle \langle S_k^z \rangle$  is suitable for regimes with nonzero magnetization ( $\neq 0$ ). Hence, the basic equations used in the previous section do not allow us to explore near-zero magnetization domains in the phase diagram as the critical region. To overcome this difficulty, one is forced to find a more appropriate decoupling procedure for the longitudinal correlation function which allows us to obtain self-consistent ME's appropriate for describing regimes when  $\rightarrow 0$  and preserves also the simplicity of the one-function ansatz for the transverse  $\langle S_k^\pm \rangle$ . A possible and successful solution to this problem was suggested several years ago for spin models with short-range interactions [7,31]. These studies showed that a suitable decoupling procedure when the magnetization approaches to zero (see also Ref. [3] for the quantum counterpart) consists in writing (see Eq. (8)):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k^0} [J(k^0) - J(k - k^0)] \langle S_{k^0}^z S_{k^0}^z \rangle \\ = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k^0} [J(k^0) - J(k - k^0)] \langle S_{k^0}^z \rangle \langle S_{k^0}^z \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\langle S_{k^0}^z \rangle^2}{N^2 S^2} \right) \langle S_{k^0}^+ S_{k^0}^- \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

As we see, with Eq. (32) only the  $\langle S_k^\pm \rangle$  is involved and, inserting in the ME (8), one finds for the reduced dispersion relation  $\bar{T}_k$  the same formal expression (16) but with  $R(k)$  replaced by:

$$R(k) = 1 + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k^0} \frac{\langle S_{k^0}^z \rangle^2}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\langle S_{k-k^0}^\pm \rangle \langle S_{k^0}^\pm \rangle}{\bar{T}_{k^0} \langle S_{k^0}^\pm \rangle}. \quad (33)$$

Notice that, the effect of the decoupling (32) corresponds essentially to achieve in Eq. (18) the transformation  $1 = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k^0} \langle S_{k^0}^z \rangle^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k^0} \langle S_{k^0}^z \rangle^2 \right)^{-1/2}$  [7,30,31]. Now, the new ME's can be properly used for an estimate of the main critical

properties of our classical spin model when it exhibits LRO and of the low temperature paramagnetic susceptibility in the remaining domains of the  $(p, d)$ -plane when no LRO exists.

#### 4.1 Critical temperature and critical behavior

In the limit  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$  with  $\beta \rightarrow 0$ , the system of Eqs. (16)–(17) with  $R(\mathbf{k})$  given by Eq. (33), become

$$T_{\mathbf{k}} = \langle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) R(\mathbf{k}) \rangle, \quad (34)$$

$$R(\mathbf{k}) = 1 + \frac{\overline{T}}{\langle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \rangle} \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{z})} \frac{d^d k^0}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\langle \epsilon(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}^0) \rangle \langle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}^0) \rangle}{\langle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}^0) R(\mathbf{k}^0) \rangle}, \quad (35)$$

$$\overline{T} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{3\overline{T}Q(\overline{T})}{TQ(\overline{T})}} \quad (36)$$

where

$$Q(\overline{T}) = \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{z})} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\langle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) R(\mathbf{k}) \rangle}. \quad (37)$$

The reduced critical temperature  $\overline{T}_c$  (with  $T_c = JS^2\overline{T}_c$ ) can be determined by imposing the condition  $\overline{T}(\overline{T}_c) = 0$  and hence by solving the self-consistent equation:

$$1 - 3\overline{T}_c Q(\overline{T}_c) = 0. \quad (38)$$

For an explicit estimate of  $\overline{T}_c$ , one can again calculate the integrals in Eqs. (34)–(37) assuming for  $\langle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \rangle$  the dominant contribution as  $k \rightarrow 0$  and solving our self-consistent equations by iteration. To first level of iteration we find

$$Q(\overline{T}_c) = \frac{I_d^{(p)}(0)}{1 + \overline{T}_c I_d^{(p)}(0)}. \quad (39)$$

Then, Eq. (38) yields:

$$\overline{T}_c = \frac{1}{2I_d^{(p)}(0)} \quad (40)$$

where  $I_d^{(p)}(0)$  is given by Eq. (24). Thus, a critical temperature exists when  $I_d^{(p)}(0)$  is finite and hence in the domains of the  $(p, d)$ -plane where LRO takes place (see Fig. 1), as expected. Of course the estimate for the critical temperature can be systematically improved by calculating the integral  $I_d^{(p)}(0)$  using next  $k$ -powers in the expansions (23).

Here we consider explicitly the two-dimensional case for  $2 < p < 4$  also for a comparison with recent analytical and Monte Carlo results. In this case, the coefficients in the expansions (23) are given by [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= \frac{2^2 p^2}{(p) \sin[(p-2)\pi/2]} \\ B_2 &= 2^{p-2} \left[ \frac{p}{2} - 1 \right] \Gamma\left(\frac{p}{2}; \frac{1}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{p}{2}; \frac{3}{4}\right), \quad 2 < p < 4 \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where  $(z; a) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (n + a)^{-z}$  is the generalized Riemann zeta function and  $(z)$   $(z; 0)$  is the ordinary Riemann zeta function. Then, for the integral  $I_2^{(p)}(0)$ , in the case of interest  $2 < p < 4$ , we have:

$$I_2^{(p)}(0) \sim \frac{2^p}{4} \frac{2^{(p)}}{p 2^{1-p/2}} \sin \frac{(p-2)}{2} \pi; \quad (42)$$

and hence:

$$\overline{T}_c (d=2) = \frac{(4-p)^2 p^2}{2^{p-2} (p) \sin \frac{(p-2)}{2}}; \quad (43)$$

The critical temperature as a function of  $p$  ( $2 < p < 4$ ) for  $d = 2$  and  $S = 1/2$  is plotted in Fig. 2 and compared with the corresponding results recently obtained for the quantum Heisenberg model by Nakano and Takahashi, using a modified spin-wave (SW) theory [14] and the two-time Green function EMM within the Tyablikov decoupling [16], and by Vassiliev et al. with a Monte Carlo simulation [18]. Our result appears to be consistent with the ones obtained for the quantum counterpart in view of the known feature that a quantum spin model can be reasonably approximated by a classical one only



in the large- $S$  limit [32].

From Eqs. (34)-(37) it is easy to obtain also the behavior of  $\bar{\chi}(\bar{T})$  as  $\bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{T}_c^+$ . With  $m = S$  and  $T = JS^2\bar{T}$ , we get (for all values of  $p$  and  $d$  in the domains where a phase transition is allowed):

$$m = \frac{(T - T_c)}{T_c} \quad (44)$$

with

$$= \frac{1}{2} : \quad (45)$$

Next, for the reduced paramagnetic susceptibility, defined as  $\bar{\chi} = \bar{\chi}_h = \chi/J$  in the limit  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$  with  $\beta \rightarrow 0$ , Eqs. (16)-(17) with the new expression (33) for  $R(k)$  reduce to

$$1 = 3\bar{T} \int_{1BZ} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{1 + \bar{T} X(k)} \quad (46)$$

$$X(k) = \chi^{(p)}(k) + \bar{T} \int_{1BZ} \frac{d^d k^0}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\chi^{(p)}(k) \chi^{(p)}(k^0)}{1 + \bar{T} X(k^0)} \quad (47)$$

with  $X(k) = \chi^{(p)}(k)R(k)$ . As usual, an estimate of  $\bar{\chi}(\bar{T})$  as  $\bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{T}_c^+$  can be obtained assuming the low- $k$  behavior (23) for  $\chi^{(p)}(k)$  with the aim to find a solution of Eqs. (46) and (47) such that  $\bar{\chi}(\bar{T}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $\bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{T}_c^+$ . Then, we find:

$$= J \frac{T - T_c}{T_c} \quad (48)$$

[illegible]
$$\text{and} \quad \begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \text{xxxxxx} \\ \frac{2}{d-2}; \quad 2 < d < 4 \\ \text{xxxxxx} \end{array} \\ & = \begin{array}{c} \text{xxxxxx} \\ 1; \quad d = 4 \quad ; p = d + 2: \\ \text{xxxxxx} \\ \vdots \\ 1; \quad d > 4 \end{array} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The symbol  $x_{\text{in}}$ , here and below, denotes the main ( $T - T_c$ )-dependence with a logarithmic correction (for instance,  $\overline{T} - \overline{T}_c^{-1} \ln 1 = \overline{T} - \overline{T}_c^{-1}$ ).

We now determine the behavior of the reduced magnetization along the critical isotherm as  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$ . Starting from the basic ME's (16) & (17) it is immediate to see that, for small values of  $\bar{h}$  and  $\beta$ , the equation for the critical isotherm has the form :

$$1 - \frac{2}{3} \quad {}^2 \quad {}^3 \overline{T}_c Q_c(\overline{h}) = 0 \quad (51)$$

$$Q_c(\bar{h}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{B}^d} \frac{d^d k}{1 + (\bar{h} \cdot \mathbf{k}) X_c(\mathbf{k})} \quad (52)$$

$$Q_c(\vec{h}) = \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{1 + (\vec{h} - \vec{k})^2} \quad (52)$$

and  $X_c(k)$  is determined by Eq. (47) with  $\bar{\omega}$  replaced by  $-\bar{\omega}$  and  $\bar{T} = \bar{T}_c$ .

Eq. (51) can be solved numerically but an reliable estimate of the reduced magnetization as  $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$  can be simply obtained, as usual, assuming in Eqs. (51) and (52) the dominant contribution of  $\langle \epsilon \rangle(k)$  as  $k \rightarrow 0$ . With this

assumption and the definition  $\bar{h}^{-1}$  for the isotherm critical exponent, Eqs. (51) and (52) yield:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{p}{2d-p}; \quad \frac{3}{2}d < p < \frac{2d}{d-2} \\ \dots d+2, d > 2 \end{array} \right\} \\
 = & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 3_{\ln}; \quad p = \frac{3}{2}d, \quad d < 4 \\ 3; \quad d < p < \frac{3}{2}d, \quad d < 4 \\ \dots d+2, d > 4, \end{array} \right\} \quad (53)
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{d+2}{d-2}; \quad 2 < d < 4 \\ 3_{\ln}; \quad d = 4 \quad ; p = d+2 \\ 3; \quad d > 4 \end{array} \right\} \quad (54)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $3_{\ln}$  characterizes the behaviour  $\bar{h}^{-1=3} \sim \ln \bar{h}^{-1=3}$ .

Finally, we calculate the critical exponent for the specific heat in the domains of  $p$  and  $d$  where the transition to a FM phase occurs. It is important to note that we cannot use the expression (29) for the reduced internal energy per spin which has been obtained assuming the decoupling  $S_k^D S_k^E \rightarrow h S_k^D S_k^E$ . Rather, we must use the general relation (27) with the decoupling procedure (32) appropriate near the critical point. Bearing this in mind, the reduced internal energy per spin near the critical point assumes the form :

$$\bar{u} = \bar{h} \left[ \frac{J(0)}{2J} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{T} + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{J(\mathbf{k})}{(2J)^d T_k} \right]; \quad (55)$$

where now  $T_k$  involves the quantity  $R(\mathbf{k})$  given by Eq. (33). Working for

$\bar{h} \neq 0$ ,  $\bar{h} \neq 0$  with  $\bar{h} = \bar{h}(\bar{T})$  as  $\bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{T}_c^+$ , setting  $\bar{h} = \bar{h}(\bar{T})$  in Eq. (55) and taking into account Eq. (46) for  $\bar{h}(\bar{T})$  with  $X(k)$  evaluated as  $k \rightarrow 0$ , we have for the reduced zero-field specific heat  $\bar{C}_{h=0}(\bar{T}) = C_{h=0}(\bar{T})/S$ :

$$\bar{C}_{h=0}(\bar{T}) = \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial \bar{T}} \Big|_{\bar{h}=0}, \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} \bar{T}^{-2} \frac{\partial \bar{h}}{\partial \bar{T}}; \quad (\bar{T} \rightarrow \bar{T}_c^+). \quad (56)$$

This interesting expression allows us to determine the specific heat critical exponent. Indeed, with  $\bar{h} = A \bar{T}^{-\frac{d}{2}} \bar{T}_c^{\frac{d}{2}}$  or  $\bar{h} = A \bar{T}^{-\frac{d}{2}} \ln^{-1} \bar{T} = (\bar{T} - \bar{T}_c)^{-\frac{d}{2}}$ , Eq. (56) yields:

$$\bar{C}_{h=0}(\bar{T}) \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} A^2 \bar{T}^{-d} \bar{T}_c^{\frac{d}{2}}; & d < 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} A^2 \bar{T}^{-d} \bar{T}_c^{\frac{d}{2}} \ln^{-1} \bar{T} \sim \frac{1}{\bar{T} - \bar{T}_c}; & d = 0 \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

With these definitions and the values of the exponent determined before one can immediately obtain the desired values of  $\alpha$ . We find:

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \frac{3d-2p}{2d-p}; & \frac{3}{2}d < p < \frac{d}{2}d+2, d > 2 \\ 0_{\ln}; & p = \frac{3}{2}d, \quad d < 4 \\ 0; & d < p < \frac{3}{2}d, \quad d < 4 \\ 0; & d > 4, \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

in the domain where LRITs are active, and

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \frac{d-4}{d-2}; & 2 < d < 4 \\ 0_{\ln}; & d = 4; \quad p = d+2 \\ 0; & d > 4 \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

in the SRI regime. One can easily check that the critical exponents  $\nu$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\alpha$  calculated above satisfy the well known scaling laws  $\nu = (\gamma - 1)/2$ ,  $\beta + 2 + \gamma = 2$  and  $\gamma + (1 + \nu) = 2$  for all values of  $p$  and  $d$  which allow a transition to the FM phase. Besides, they coincide with those obtained by Nakano and Takahashi [16] for the quantum counterpart, consistently with the universality hypothesis [32].

## 4.2 Low temperature paramagnetic susceptibility for $p \geq 2d$ and $d \geq 2$

The low temperature behavior of the susceptibility in absence of LRO, i.e. for  $p \geq 2d$  and  $d \geq 2$  (see Fig. 1), is given by Eqs. (46) and (47) but bearing in mind that now  $T_c = 0$ . Following a procedure similar to the one used in the preceding section for obtaining the behavior of the paramagnetic susceptibility as  $T \rightarrow T_c^+$ , in the low temperature limit, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \chi \sim \exp \left[ \frac{h A_d}{3T} \right]^{\frac{1}{d}}; & p = 2d \\
 & \chi \sim T^{-\frac{p-d}{p-2d}}; & 2d < p < 2+d \\
 & \chi \sim T^{-\frac{2}{2-d}} \ln \left[ \frac{1}{T} \right]^{\frac{1}{2-d}} & p = 2+d \\
 & \chi \sim T^{-\frac{2}{2-d}}; & p > 2+d:
 \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

The previous behaviors generalize those obtained in Ref. [30] for  $d = 1$ . It is worth noting that for case  $p = 2d$  one finds a pure exponential divergence as  $T \rightarrow 0$  as for one-dimensional model [30]. This result, although consistent with that one obtained within the modified spin-wave theory [14] and the EMM for the two-time Green functions [16] for the quantum counterpart, does not reduce, for  $d = 1$ , to the expression derived by Haldane [12] which contains

a factor proportional to  $\bar{T}^{-1=2}$ . So, one must expect a  $d$ -dependent power law factor in  $\bar{T}$  in Eq. (60), which corrects the pure low-temperature exponential divergence. The simple lowest-order approximation in the CSDM, here used, is not able to capture this important physical aspect. However, within the spirit of the SDM [3], one can hope to improve systematically this result working to higher order approximations.

## 5 Concluding remarks

In this work we have applied the SDM, within the framework of the classical statistical mechanics (CSDM), to study the thermodynamic properties of a classical  $d$ -dimensional Heisenberg FM model with LRI's decaying as  $r^{-p}$  ( $p > d$ ) in the presence of an external magnetic field. To lowest order in the CSDM, the most relevant magnetic quantities have been obtained analytically in the low-temperature regime under near saturation conditions as a functions of  $d$  and  $p$ . The FM LRO at finite temperature has been shown to occurs in a wide region of the  $(p-d)$ -plane (see Fig. 1) where a transition to a FM phase takes place decreasing the temperature.

The thermodynamic regimes with near zero and zero magnetization have been explored on the basis of a proper modification in the ME's of the transverse SD. So we have estimated the critical temperature and the main critical properties of the model, beyond the mean field approximation, in the domains of the  $(p-d)$ -plane where a FM ordered phase is expected. The critical exponents, here determined as a function of  $p$  and  $d$ , coincide with those ones for the corresponding quantum model. This constitutes a microscopic check of the irrelevance of quantum fluctuations, consistent with the universality hypothesis

in the theory of critical phenomena. In contrast, as expected, our calculations show that the nonuniversal parameters, such as the critical temperature, depends on the classical or quantum nature of the model under study, especially for small values of the spin  $S$  as explicitly shown by a comparison of our critical temperature estimates with analytical studies and Monte Carlo simulations previously achieved for the quantum counterpart. Finally, we have determined the low-temperature behavior of the paramagnetic susceptibility for  $p = 2d$  with  $d < 2$  when no LRO occurs.

The rich scenario here obtained in a unified and consistent way for a non-trivial spin model, shows clearly the potentiality and the effectiveness of the SDM also in treating classical many-body systems. It is indeed relevant feature that, already to the lowest-order approximation, the CSDM is able to capture the essential physics of the model, consistent with Monte Carlo simulations [18,28,29] and exact results [20,21,22,23,24], and to obtain results beyond the Tyablikov-like approximation for arbitrary values of dimensionality  $d$  and the decaying exponent  $p > d$ . Besides, it offers the possibility to achieve systematically higher-order approximations with the aim to improve the results here obtained and to study also the damping of the oscillations on the same footing [6].

In conclusion, due to the great experience acquired in the quantum many-body theory, we believe that the CSDM [5,6,7,8,30] and the formalism of the two-time Green functions in classical statistical mechanics [4] constitute a promising tool to explore equilibrium and transport properties of a wide variety classical many-body (not only magnetic) systems. Further developments and applications along this directions are desirable.

## References

- [1] D.N. Zubarev, *Usp. Fiz. Nauk.* 71, 71 (1960) (*Sov. Phys. Usp.* 3, 320 (1960))
- [2] S.V. Tyablikov, *Methods in the Quantum Theory of Magnetism* (Plenum Press, New York 1967); see also: N.M. Ajlis, *The Quantum Theory of Magnetism* (World Scientific Singapore 2000).
- [3] O.K. Kalashnikov and E.S. Fradkin, *Phys. Stat. Sol. B* 59, 9 (1973) and references therein.
- [4] N.N. Bogoljubov and B.I. Sadovnikov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 43, 677 (1981) (*Sov. Phys. JETP* 16, 482 (1963)).
- [5] A. Caramico D'Auria, L. De Cesare and U. Esposito, *Phys. Lett.* 85A, 197 (1981).
- [6] L.S. Campana, A. Caramico D'Auria, M. D'Ambrosio, L. De Cesare and U. Esposito, *J. Phys. C* 16, L549 (1983).
- [7] L.S. Campana, A. Caramico D'Auria, M. D'Ambrosio, L. De Cesare, G. Kamieniarz and U. Esposito, *Phys. Rev. B* 30, 2769 (1984).
- [8] A. Cavallo, F. Cosenza, and L. De Cesare, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 240602 (2001); 88, 099901(E) (2002).
- [9] M. Steiner, J. Wilkin and C.G. Windsor, *Adv. Phys.* 25, 87 (1976).
- [10] G. Reither and A. Splander, *J. Phys. C* 13, 32027 (1980).
- [11] M. Sepiarky et al., *Phys. Rev. B* 64, 060101(R) (2001).
- [12] F.D.M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60, 635 (1988); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 66, 1529 (1991).
- [13] B.S. Shastry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60, 639 (1988).



- [14] H. Nakano and M. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. B 50 10331 (1994).
- [15] H. Nakano and M. Takahashi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 63, 4256 (1994).
- [16] H. Nakano and M. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. B 52, 6606 (1995).
- [17] P. Bruno, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 137203 (2001).
- [18] O. N. Vassiliev, M. G. Cottam, and I. V. Rojdestvenski, J. Appl. Phys. 89, 7329 (2001) and references therein.
- [19] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 17, 1133 (1966).
- [20] H. Kunz and C. E. Porter, Commun. Math. Phys. 46, 245 (1976).
- [21] J. Fröhlich, R. Israel, H. Lieb, and B. Simon, Commun. Math. Phys. 62, 1 (1978).
- [22] J. B. Rogers and C. J. Thompson, J. Stat. Phys. 25, 669 (1981).
- [23] B. Simon, J. Stat. Phys. 26, 307 (1981).
- [24] C. E. Porter, Commun. Math. Phys. 79, 181 (1981).
- [25] G. S. Joyce, Phys. Rev. 146, 349 (1966).
- [26] M. E. Fisher, S.-K. Ma and B. G. Nickel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 917 (1972).
- [27] J. M. Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 1577 (1976).
- [28] S. Romano, Phys. Rev. B 40, 4970 (1989); *ibid.* 46, 5420 (1992).
- [29] S. Romano, Phys. Rev. B 42, 6739 (1990); *ibid.* 44, 7066 (1991).
- [30] A. Cavallo, F. Cosenza, and L. De Cesare, Phys. Rev. B 66, 174439 (2002).
- [31] G. Kamienart, Acta Phys. Pol. A 52, 243 (1977); J. Phys. C 16, 3763 (1983).
- [32] H. E. Stanley, Introduction to Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1971).




Fig. 1. Domains of the  $(p, d)$ -plane when a ferromagnetic long-range order (LRO) exists and is absent (NO LRO). The dashed line  $p = d + 2$  separates the domains where long-range interaction (LRI)- and short-range interaction (SRI)-regimes occur. The dashed region ( $p < d$ ) corresponds to a nonextensive thermodynamics.




Fig. 2. The estimated critical temperature  $T_c=J$  as a function of the decaying exponent  $p$  for a two-dimensional spin-1=2 Heisenberg ferromagnet. The full line ( $T_c$  CSDM) represents the estimate here obtained. The dashed ( $T_c$  GF) and ( $T_c$  SW) lines refer to Green function (GF) method [16] and modified spin-wave (SW) theory [14] results. The dots depict the quantum Monte Carlo ( $T_c$  QMC) predictions [18].