

SUM RULES FOR FOUR-SPINON DYNAMIC STRUCTURE FACTOR IN XXX MODEL

B. Si Lakhali

Département de Physique, Université de Blida, BP 270 Blida 09000, Algérie

A. Abada^y

Physics Department, Faculty of Science, United Arab Emirates University,

P.O.B. 17551 Al-Ain, United Arab Emirates^z

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

Abstract

In the context of the antiferromagnetic spin $1/2$ Heisenberg quantum spin chain (XXX model), we estimate the contribution of the exact four-spinon dynamic structure factor S_4 by calculating a number of sum rules the total dynamic structure factor S is known to satisfy exactly. These sum rules are: the static susceptibility, the integrated intensity, the total integrated intensity, the first frequency moment and the nearest-neighbor correlation function. We find that the contribution of S_4 is between 1% and 2.5%, depending on the sum rule, whereas the contribution of the exact two-spinon dynamic structure factor S_2 is between 70% and 75%. This is consistent with the expected scattering weight of states from outside the spin-wave continuum. The calculations are numerical and Monte Carlo based. Good statistics are obtained.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm 75.10.Pq 71.45.Gm 28.20.Cz 02.20.Uw

Keywords: antiferromagnetic Heisenberg spin chain, exact dynamic structure function, sum rules.

^Electronic address: silakhali@wissal.dz

^yElectronic address: a.abada@uaeu.ac.ae

^zOn leave from : Département de Physique, École Normale Supérieure, BP 92 Vieux-Kouba, 16050 Alger, Algérie

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum spin chains are in fact three-dimensional magnetic compounds in which the magnetic interaction in one direction dominates over the two others. They are not mere academic curiosities since many real-world compounds do have this property. One such compound is KCuF_3 , a satisfactory realization of the one-dimensional spin 1/2 antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model [1]. Early description of its crystallographic properties [2] confirms that it comes in two types, (a) and (d) [3, 4], both with similar spin structures. The (antiferromagnetic) coupling constant along the chain direction is roughly 100 times stronger than the (ferromagnetic) interchain coupling constant, a feature confirmed by electron-spin resonance measurements. This justifies amply a dominant one-dimensional behavior, and additional specific heat measurements are consistent with this interpretation. Also, an ideal strict one-dimensional magnetic chain will not exhibit long-range order at any finite temperature T [5], but realistic quasi-one-dimensional systems have a characteristic temperature below which there is long-range order. For example, in KCuF_3 long-range order is manifest below 38K for type (a) and 20K for type (d) [2].

Though presumably simpler than higher-dimensional systems, quantum spin chains show strong and rich quantum behavior. If for example we consider antiferromagnetic systems, we would classically anticipate a Neel state traversed by spin-waves, and (linear) spin-wave theory is traditionally the usual framework for such a description. In this context, the excitation spectrum for the one-dimensional antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model is predicted to be [6]:

$$\omega_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{k}) = 2J \sin k_j; \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathbf{k} is the momentum transfer along the chain direction and here, the magnetic coupling constant is normalized to unity for convenience. But the true ground state is actually different from the Neel state [7], and the lowest-lying excited states satisfy the so-called desCloizeaux-Pearson (dCP) dispersion relation [8]:

$$\omega_{\text{dCP}}(\mathbf{k}) = J \sin k_j; \quad (1.2)$$

At first, these excitations were understood as spin-wave-like states with spin one and early experiments on CPC [9, 10] and KCuF_3 [11, 12] were interpreted as a confirmation of this. But it was later shown [13, 14] that the natural excitations of the model have spin 1/2 and

hence are fermions. These elementary excitations are called spinons [15] and come always in pair. Furthermore, if the spin of the system is an integer, the spinons are bound and lead to well-defined spin-wave-like modes exhibiting a Haldane gap [16], a feature not seen in the (linear) spin-wave theory. If the spin is a half-integer, the spinons are unbound and there is no Haldane gap. Spin 1/2 compounds are even more interesting in that the spectrum is not simply given by a definite dispersion relation and indeed, analytic [17] and finite chain [18] calculations showed that it is actually a continuum of excitations confined to first approximation, for a given k , between a lower bound $\omega_l(k)$ and an upper bound $\omega_u(k)$ such that:

$$\omega_l(k) = \omega_{\text{dCP}}(k); \quad \omega_u(k) = 2 \sum_j \sin k=2j; \quad (1.3)$$

The ground state properties and more particularly the excitation spectrum of a magnetic system are analyzed using inelastic neutron scattering, the cross-section of which is a function of the energy and momentum transfers ω and k respectively [19, 20]. All the above mentioned features regarding the Heisenberg model are confirmed by experiments. For example, inelastic neutron scattering on KCuF_3 shows significant contribution to the scattering from regions consistent with the spin-wave continuum (1.3) and not with linear spin-wave theory, most particularly at high frequencies [21]. This implies the inadequacy of spin-wave theory [22] at such high energies in the quantum limit $s = 1/2$, this even if the two-magnon interactions are taken into account beyond the linear approximation [23, 24]. But there is consistency at low-energies, and one must mention that spin-wave theory works fine for compounds with high spins (classical limit) like KFeS_2 with $s = 5/2$ where it gives accurate peak positions, line shapes and relative intensities [21]. One should also note that inelastic neutron scattering on KCuF_3 showed consistency of the old theory approach [25], valid only at long wavelengths, particularly the temperature dependence of the scattering [26, 27]. This is important because it is an additional confirmation of the fermionic nature of the elementary excitations, the spinons.

The inelastic neutron scattering is theoretically analyzed with the help of the two-point dynamic structure factor (DSF) S , for, in the Born approximation which is amply sufficient for the present purposes, the differential cross-section per scattering solid angle and outgoing neutron energy E_f is [19, 20]:

$$\frac{d^2}{d\omega dE_f} = N \sum_{ij} \frac{k_f}{k_i} \frac{g}{2} F(k) \sum_{ij} \hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j S^{ij}(\omega; k); \quad (1.4)$$

N is the number of scatterers, $g_0 = 0.2896$ a unit for magnetic scattering, g the Lande factor, $F(k)$ the magnetic form factor, k_f the outgoing and k_i the incoming neutron momenta respectively, i and j the cartesian coordinates. The D SF S is the Fourier transform of the two-point spin correlation function:

$$S^{ij}(\omega; k) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{l=1}^Z \sum_{m=1}^X \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i[k \cdot (r_{lm} - r_l) - \omega t]} S_l^i(0) S_m^j(t); \quad (1.5)$$

where r_{lm} is the position of the spin S_{lm} on the chain. The Hamiltonian corresponding to the antiferromagnetic isotropic Heisenberg model commutes with the total spin operator, which implies that $S^{ij}(\omega; k)$ is diagonal in i and j and $S^{ii}(\omega; k)$ is the same for $i = x, y$ and z . The averaging in (1.5) is generally done at finite temperature, but at low temperatures, only the ground state is retained. Also, for a quasi-one-dimensional system, the cross-section for neutron scattering with momentum transfer k depends only on the component k_{\parallel} of k parallel to the chain.

Historically, the first attempts to calculate the D SF for the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model were made in the context of spin-wave theory which, for the chain lying in the z -direction, gives the transverse response as [6]:

$$S_{SWT}^{xx}(\omega; k) = S_{SWT}^{yy}(\omega; k) = \frac{1}{2} \tan k/2 \cdot \theta(\omega - \omega_{cl}(k)); \quad (1.6)$$

and the longitudinal component $S_{SWT}^{zz}(\omega; k)$ with a logarithmic singularity at $\omega_{cl}(k)$. Non-isotropy here is a consequence of the assumption of a Neel ground state with long-range order. Now the true quantum ground state does not have long-range order, which means isotropy must apply. The inadequacy of (1.6) triggered further efforts. First those of [28], where, guided by exact results of the one-dimensional XY model, numerical calculations on finite chains and known sum rules, it is constructed an ansatz for the D SF of the spin 1=2 chain at zero temperature, the so-called Muller ansatz:

$$S_{Mull}^{ii}(\omega; k) = \frac{\theta(\omega - \omega_{cl}(k)) \cdot \theta(\omega - \omega_u(k))}{\omega^2 - \omega_{cl}^2(k)}; \quad (1.7)$$

where θ is the Heaviside step function. This form for the D SF has two main features. (i) A square-root singularity at the lower boundary of the spin-wave continuum. (ii) A built-in strict restriction to the spin-wave continuum itself, which is not physical at the high-frequency end if the Muller ansatz is to represent the total D SF. Indeed, the Muller ansatz predicts an abrupt high-energy cutoff while computer calculations [28] suggest there is

contribution of states outside the continuum, particularly from above, but with a scattering weight two orders of magnitude lower than that of neighboring states inside the continuum. Within the spinon picture, the small contributions outside the continuum are identified with processes in which more than two spinons are created. There is also a relatively small but systematic underestimation of the relative spectral weight near $k = \pi$ [21]. But in overall, the Muller ansatz gives reasonable results (to order unity) for known sum rules, is consistent with quantum Monte Carlo calculations [29] and supported by [30]. More importantly, it is in good agreement with the inelastic neutron scattering experiments done on KCuF_3 [21, 26, 27].

The second set of efforts was to map the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model in the long wavelength limit onto a relativistic quantum field theory and exploit the bosonization method of Luther and Peschel [31] to obtain an analytic expression of the D SF at finite temperature [25]. For integer spins, one finds that the D SF has a single mode with a gap as predicted in [16]. For half-integer spins, the expression of the D SF at zero temperature agrees with the low-momentum limit of the Muller ansatz and at finite temperature, there is good agreement with the measurements on KCuF_3 [26, 27].

But all the above results regarding the dynamic structure function, though useful in their own right, are only approximate. This is important to note because over the decades, a number of quantum spin chains, most notably the Heisenberg model, have been amenable to exact solutions. As to the methods used, first there was the Bethe ansatz [7] which, as already mentioned, gives the exact ground state for the model with characteristics different from the classical Neel antiferromagnetic ordering. Then techniques were developed in successful attempts to calculate exactly a number of thermodynamic quantities, techniques like the method of (commuting) transfer matrices and the Yang-Baxter equation [5]. These methods culminated in the so-called Quantum Inverse Scattering Method [32], a milestone towards the recognition of the quantum group symmetry present in the model. But up to here, all the exact results were for the most part concerned with only the static (thermodynamic) properties of the quantum spin chains; correlation functions that encode the dynamics remained elusive to exact treatment. One had to wait for advances in two-dimensional conformal field theory to see how the infinite two-dimensional conformal symmetry allows the computation of correlation functions of the so-called vertex operators, using bosonization techniques [33]. The same strategy was then applied to quantum spin chains once it

became clear how to adapt the bosonization method to deformed commutation relations between creation and annihilation operators [34, 35, 36, 37]. For the Heisenberg model, actual formal manipulations are made in the context of the equivalent six-vertex model where vertex operators are defined in the framework of the infinite-dimensional representation of the quantum group. Correlation functions are then defined and, when mapped back to local spin operators, compact expressions of form factors are obtained [38].

The above treatment, though technically involved, opened the way for a systematic exact treatment of the dynamic structure factor. In an expansion in the (even) number of spinons [39], it was first obtained an exact expression for the two-spinon contribution S_2 [40], and a comparison with the Muller ansatz showed that it gives a better account of the phenomenology [41, 42]. Next an exact expression of the four-spinon contribution S_4 to the D SF was derived in [43] and its behavior as a function of the neutron energy and momentum transfers ω and k respectively was studied in [44].

The present work aims at furthering the investigation of the properties of the four-spinon D SF S_4 . Through an estimation of a number of sum rules, we address the issue of the spectral weight within S_4 in the total S . The sum rules we use are: the static susceptibility, the integrated intensity, the total integrated intensity, the first frequency moment and the nearest-neighbor correlation function. We reach the conclusion that S_4 contributes a weight between 1% and 25%, depending on the sum rule used, whereas S_2 contributes a weight between 70% and 75%. This is consistent with the finite chain calculations of [28] where it is observed that states just up the spin-wave continuum contribute with a scattering weight two orders of magnitude smaller than states within the continuum. The sum rules we investigate involve multi-dimensional integrations and these are performed using Monte Carlo algorithms. The statistical errors are reasonable.

This article is organized as follows. After this introduction, we describe briefly in the next section the $s = 1/2$ antiferromagnetic Heisenberg quantum spin chain in the framework of [38], give the definition of the dynamic structure factor S and decompose it into n -spinon contributions S_n with n even. Then we write the expressions of S_2 and S_4 and give a brief account of their respective features and behaviors. In section three we describe the five sum rules we use to estimate the scattering weight of the four-spinon contribution and the results obtained. As already mentioned, the calculations use Monte Carlo integration methods and a discussion of the errors is given. Section four includes concluding remarks and indicates

few directions in which one can carry forward.

II. HEISENBERG CHAIN AND DYNAMIC STRUCTURE FACTOR

The antiferromagnetic $s = 1/2$ XXX Heisenberg chain is defined as the isotropic limit of the XXZ anisotropic Heisenberg model with the following Hamiltonian:

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\sigma_n^x \sigma_{n+1}^x + \sigma_n^y \sigma_{n+1}^y + \sigma_n^z \sigma_{n+1}^z \right) \quad (2.1)$$

$(q + q^{-1})/2$ is the anisotropy parameter and the isotropic antiferromagnetic limit is obtained as $q \rightarrow 1$, or equivalently $q \rightarrow -1$. Here $\sigma_n^{x/y/z}$ are the usual Pauli matrices acting at the site n of the chain. Note that the definition (2.1) and its isotropic limit are totally equivalent to the usual one if we consider [45] the transformation $U = \exp \left(i J \sum_{j=1}^{P+1} \sigma_j^z \right)$, which transforms the Hamiltonian $H(J; \hbar) = J \sum_{n=1}^{P+1} \left(\sigma_n^x \sigma_{n+1}^x + \sigma_n^y \sigma_{n+1}^y + \sigma_n^z \sigma_{n+1}^z \right) + \hbar \sum_n \sigma_n^z$ into $H(J; \hbar)$, i.e., $U H(J; \hbar) U^{-1} = H(J; \hbar)$. As mentioned already in the introductory section, we take the coupling constant $J = 1$ as well as $\hbar = 1$ and the external magnetic field $\hbar = 0$. Lattice spacing is also taken equal to one. All this is consistent with the notation and conventions used in [38] which we follow closely.

The full exploitation of the quantum algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry of the model requires an exact diagonalization of the Hamiltonian directly in the thermodynamic limit. Because of two different boundary conditions on the infinite chain, there are two equivalent vacuum states $|i\rangle$, $i = 0, 1$. The Hilbert space \mathcal{F} consists of n -spinon energy eigenstates $|j_1; \dots; j_n; i\rangle$ such that:

$$H |j_1; \dots; j_n; i\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n e(j) |j_1; \dots; j_n; i\rangle \quad (2.2)$$

where $e(j)$ is the energy of spinon j and j is a spectral parameter living on the unit circle. In the above relation, $j = 1$. The translation operator T which shifts the spin chain by one site acts on the energy eigenstates as follows:

$$T |j_1; \dots; j_n; i\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n p(j_i) |j_1; \dots; j_n; i+1\rangle \quad (2.3)$$

where $p(j) = e^{ip(j)}$ and $p(j)$ is the lattice momentum of spinon j . The exact expressions of $e(j)$ and $p(j)$ are known [13, 38, 43] and their isotropic limits are given in eq (2.12)

below. The completeness relation in F reads:

$$I = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{d_j}{2^{i_j}} j_1 \cdots j_n i_1 \cdots i_n h_1 \cdots h_n j \quad (2.4)$$

A . The dynamic structure factor

The dynamic structure factor we calculate is the zero-temperature limit of (1.5) up to 2^{-} , namely the Fourier transform of the transverse vacuum-to-vacuum two-point function defined by:

$$S^{i+}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k}) = \int_0^1 dt \int_{\mathbb{Z}} d\mathbf{m} e^{i(\mathbf{l} \cdot \mathbf{t} + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{m})} h_0 j_m^+(t) \rho_i(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k}); \quad (2.5)$$

where ϵ is the neutron energy, always positive, and k the neutron momentum component along the chain. δ_{ij} denotes $(\delta_{ij})_{ij=1}^2$. The DSE satisfies the following relations:

$$S(j; k) = S(j; k) = S(j; k + 2); \quad (2.6)$$

expressing reflection symmetry and periodicity. Inserting the completeness relation (2.4) and using the Heisenberg relation:

$${}^{\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y};\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{t}) = e^{i\mathbf{H}\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{T}^{-\mathbf{m}} {}^{\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y};\mathbf{z}}_0(0) \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{m}} e^{-i\mathbf{H}\mathbf{t}}; \quad (2.7)$$

we can write the transverse D SF (2.5) as the sum of n -spinon contributions, with n even:

$$S^{i+} (!; k) = \sum_{n \text{ even}}^X S_n^{i+} (!; k); \quad (2.8)$$

where the n-spinon D SF S_n is given by:

$$S_n^{i+}(\mathbf{!}; \mathbf{k}) = \frac{2}{n!} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{d_j}{2^{i_j}} e^{im(\mathbf{k} + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{p}_j)} \prod_{j=1}^n e_j^{i_j} X_{\mathbf{Z}_1}^{i_1+m}(\mathbf{!}_{n-1}) \cdots X_{\mathbf{Z}_n}^{i_n+1}(\mathbf{!}_1, \dots, \mathbf{!}_n); \quad (2.9)$$

a relation in which X^i denotes the form factor:

$$X_{1, \dots, n}^i(1, \dots, n) = h_0^+(0) j_{1, \dots, n} i_{1, \dots, n} i \quad (2.10)$$

and $i+m$ is to be read modulo 2. Note that each S_n satisfies the symmetry relations (2.6).

The form factor X^i is known [38, 46]. It is expressed as a trace of vertex operators in the context of the infinite-dimensional representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. The trace is performed

using q -deformed commutation relations of annihilation and creation operators the vertex operators are expressed with. From the form factor X^i one can get a compact expression for the D SF S_n [43] in the general anisotropic case, an expression involving intricate complex contour integrals. The isotropic limit, the one of interest in this work, is obtained via the replacement [38, 43]:

$$= ie^{2i\theta} ; \quad q = e^{-\theta} ; \quad \theta \rightarrow 0^+ ; \quad (2.11)$$

where θ is the new spectral parameter suited for this case. The expressions of the energy e and momentum p in terms of θ are:

$$e(\theta) = \frac{1}{\cosh(2\theta)} = \sin p ; \quad \cot p = \sinh(2\theta) ; \quad p \in [0, \pi] : \quad (2.12)$$

B. The two-spinon contribution

The transverse two-spinon D SF S_2 is the less involved expression to derive from (2.9). It has been obtained in [40] and reads:

$$S_2(\theta; k) = \frac{e^{i\theta}}{4} \frac{(\theta - \theta_{21}(k)) (\theta - \theta_{2u}(k))}{\theta^2} : \quad (2.13)$$

The notation of the dynamic structure factor has been eased since we will deal only with the transverse D SF and the final results are independent of the vacuum state chosen. The function $I(\theta)$ is given by:

$$I(\theta) = \int_0^{\theta+1} \frac{dt \cosh(2t) \cos(4t)}{t \sinh(2t) \cosh(t)} e^t ; \quad (2.14)$$

and $\theta_{2u}(k)$ and $\theta_{2l}(k)$ are the familiar upper and lower bounds of the spin-wave continuum of excitation energies given in (1.3). The spectral parameter θ is related to θ and k by the relation:

$$\cosh \theta = \frac{\sinh \theta_{2u} \sinh \theta_{2l}}{\sinh \theta_{2l} \sinh \theta_{2u}} ; \quad (2.15)$$

which is obtained using eq (2.12) and the energy-momentum conservation laws:

$$\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2 ; \quad k = p_1 - p_2 : \quad (2.16)$$

The properties of S_2 have been discussed in [41, 42] where a thorough comparison with the Muller ansatz (1.7) is carried. We will simply note that: (i) The content of S_2 in (2.13)

to the spin-wave continuum means that the Muller ansatz (1.7) was in fact a description of the scattering weight from two-spinon processes only, and the spin-wave continuum is actually a two-spinon continuum'. (ii) The exact two-spinon DSF S_2 exhibits a manifest square-root singularity at the upper boundary of the two-spinon continuum whereas the Muller ansatz exhibits a square-root singularity at the lower boundary.

C. The four-spinon contribution

The expression of the four-spinon DSF S_4 is given in [43]. For $0 < k < \pi$ it reads:

$$S_4(\omega; k) = C_4 \int_{-p_3}^{Z^0} \int_{-p_4}^{Z^0} F(\omega_1; \omega_2; \omega_3; \omega_4) : \quad (2.17)$$

For other values of k , it extends by symmetry using (2.6). The notation is as follows. C_4 is a numerical constant equal to:

$$C_4 = \frac{2^{21} \Gamma(14)}{3^{1/4} \Gamma(8) \Gamma(1/2)} = 2.130627 \dots \times 10^{-7}; \quad (2.18)$$

an expression in which Γ is Euler's gamma function and:

$$A(z) = \exp \int_0^z dt \frac{\sinh^2 t - 1 - \frac{z}{i} \exp t}{t \sinh(2t) \cosh t} : \quad (2.19)$$

The integrand F in (2.17) has a rather complicated expression. It writes:

$$F(\omega_1; \omega_2; \omega_3; \omega_4) = \sum_{(p_1, p_2)} \frac{\exp[h(\omega_1; \omega_2; \omega_3; \omega_4)]}{W_u^2 W^2} \mathcal{G}(\omega_1; \omega_2; \omega_3; \omega_4) : \quad (2.20)$$

The different quantities involved in this expression are defined as follows:

$$W = 1 + (\sin p_3 + \sin p_4); \quad W_u = 2 \sqrt{\sin K/2}; \quad K = k + p_3 + p_4;$$

$$\cot p_j = \sinh 2 \theta_j; \quad p_j \in [0; \pi/2]; \quad (2.21)$$

the function h in relation (2.20) reads:

$$h(\omega_1; \omega_2; \omega_3; \omega_4) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} I_{ij}; \quad (2.22)$$

where $\delta_{ij} = \delta_{ji}$ and the function $I(\cdot)$ is given in (2.14). The function g reads:

$$g_{\alpha} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{j+1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^4 X^4 \cosh 2 \quad j$$

$$X^4 \frac{Q}{i\epsilon} \frac{m}{2} \frac{1}{2} (\gamma - i) + i \quad j_i \quad Y^4 \frac{m}{2} \frac{1}{2} + i \quad j_i : \quad (2.23)$$

$$m = (j - \gamma) \quad i\epsilon \quad j_i \quad \sinh \quad j_i \quad i = 1 \quad m + 1 + i \quad j_i$$

In relation (2.20), the sum is over the two pairs $(p_1; p_2)$ and $(p_2; p_1)$ solutions of the following energy-momentum conservation laws:

$$W = (\sin p_1 + \sin p_2); \quad K = p_1 - p_2; \quad (2.24)$$

They read:

$$(p_1; p_2) = (K=2 + \arccos(W = 2 \sin(K=2))) ; K=2 \arccos(W = 2 \sin(K=2))) : \quad (2.25)$$

Note that the solution in (2.25) is allowed as long as $W_1 = W = W_u$ where W_u is given in (2.21) and:

$$W_1 = \sin K : \quad (2.26)$$

The (analytic) behavior of the function F in (2.20) was investigated in [43]. In particular, it was shown that the series g_i is convergent for all values of its arguments and stays finite when two spectral parameters or more get equal. Since the function h goes to $+1$ in these regions [41], the integrand F of S_4 is regular there. Furthermore, it was shown that F is exponentially convergent when one of the spectral parameters gets large, which means the double integration over p_3 and p_4 in (2.17) is finite. All these analytic results pave the way for safe numerical manipulations.

The behavior of S_4 as a function of the energy and momentum transfers $!$ and k respectively is studied numerically in [44]. First is determined the extent in the $(k; !)$ -plane outside which S_4 vanishes identically, i.e., the four-spinon continuum', by analogy with the two-spinon continuum. Then shapes of S_4 as a function of $!$ for different fixed values of k and vice versa are obtained. Consistency of S_4 in three areas is obtained: (i) Concomitant to the independently determined four-spinon continuum. (ii) Expected overall shape: sharp rise at the lower boundary of the continuum followed by a longer tail at the upper boundary. (iii) Similarity with the overall shape of the two-spinon contribution S_2 .

III. SUM RULES FOR THE DYNAMIC STRUCTURE FUNCTION

Once the expression of the four-spinon contribution to the total dynamic structure factor is found and its behavior acquainted with, it is interesting to have an estimate of its contribution. One way is to consider sum rules, which are physical quantities related to the total dynamic structure factor, generally via specific integrals, the values of which we know exactly. This procedure is a reasonable good indicator of the weight of each contribution since each S_n is positive, and so is their total sum S .

For the present case, namely the one-dimensional nearest-neighbor Heisenberg antiferromagnet, a number of these sum rules has been derived in [47], see also [48, 49]. The ones we consider in this work are: the static susceptibility, the integrated intensity, the total integrated intensity, the first frequency moment and the nearest-neighbor correlation function. In the sequel, for each of these five sum rules, we calculate the corresponding contribution from the two-spinon DSF S_2 and then the corresponding contribution from the four-spinon DSF S_4 . Then we make a weight comparison, with the corresponding exact result when possible, or simply between the two results.

All the forthcoming calculations are numerical. The two-spinon calculations are fairly straightforward and standard quadratures are sufficient. But those related to S_4 are quite more involved and we use a Monte Carlo algorithm for that. The χ^2 factor and the standard deviation χ_4 corresponding to each calculation are displayed. Finally, note that all the exact results we refer to are known in the literature [47, 48].

A. Static susceptibility

The first sum rule we consider is the one giving the static susceptibility $\chi(k)$ for two local spin operators. It is related to the dynamic structure factor via the relation [19]:

$$\chi(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \frac{d}{d\omega} S(\mathbf{r}; k) : \quad (3.1)$$

The static susceptibility is known exactly in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$. It is found to be:

$$\chi(0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \chi(k) = \frac{1}{2} : \quad (3.2)$$

We therefore calculate the static susceptibility for both S_2 and S_4 using (3.1) for all values of k , which we denote $\chi_2(k)$ and $\chi_4(k)$ respectively. Our results are displayed in Table 1.

Of course, $\chi_2(k)$ and $\chi_4(k)$ for the chosen values of sm all k will not compare directly to $\chi(0)$. Note also that it is not possible to take k directly equal to zero before integration because we would get zero identically. Finally, the behaviors of $\chi_2(k)$ and $\chi_4(k)$ themselves as functions of sm all k are not of interest in this study.

One notes that the 2 factor stays around one but $\chi_4 = \chi_4$ is relatively high with respect to the coming sum rules, around 13% on average. This can easily be traced to the sensitivity of the integration to the low-energy region as there is the factor $1/\omega$. Indeed, better precision is obtained when ω appears in the numerator and not in the denominator. For this sum rule, χ_4 is only compared to χ_2 and on average, the ratio χ_4/χ_2 is around 0.6%. We note that the estimated contribution of S_4 with respect to this sum rule is smaller than the forthcoming ones.

k	$\chi_2(k)$	$\chi_4(k)$	χ_4	χ_4/χ_2	2	$\chi(0)$	χ_4/χ_2
0.1	$4.17340 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$0.36927 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$0.6344 \cdot 10^{-5}$	17.1%	0.813	$5.06606 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.1%
0.2	$4.11826 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.91744 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.2114 \cdot 10^{-5}$	7.5%	0.573	$5.06606 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.7%
0.3	$4.00307 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.85373 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.8943 \cdot 10^{-5}$	10.2%	1.36	$5.06606 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.5%
0.4	$4.48920 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.99597 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.2076 \cdot 10^{-5}$	18.0%	0.897	$5.06606 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.9%

Table 1: Static susceptibility for S_2 and S_4

B. Integrated intensity

The next sum rule we consider is the one that defines the integrated intensity with respect to the neutron energy transfer, namely:

$$I(k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\omega S(\omega; k) : \quad (3.3)$$

The behavior of the integrated intensity is not exactly known for all values of k , but for small k , we know it is linear:

$$I(k) = \frac{1}{4} k^2 \quad (k \text{ small}) : \quad (3.4)$$

We will then use (3.3) to calculate, for small k , the integrated intensity $I_2(k)$ coming from the two-spinon D SF S_2 and the integrated intensity $I_4(k)$ coming from the four-spinon D SF S_4 . The results are displayed in Table 2 and plotted in FIG 1.

We notice a clear linear behavior for $I_2(k)$, with a slope roughly 75% of that of $I(k)$. The four-spinon integrated intensity presents a somewhat linear behavior too, with a slope roughly 1% of that of $I(k)$. The χ^2 factor is still of order one and the standard deviation σ_4 is here too about 13%, as for the static susceptibility. The explanation lies also in the small k -region.

k	$I_2(k)$	$I_4(k)$	χ^2_4	$\sigma_4=I_4$	χ^2	$I(k)$	$I_2=I$	$I_4=I$
0.1	$0.640435 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$0.26462 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$0.3656 \cdot 10^{-5}$	13.8%	1.16	$0.875535 \cdot 10^{-2}$	73.1%	0.3%
0.2	$1.27924 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.72237 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.7739 \cdot 10^{-5}$	10.2%	1.30	$1.750704 \cdot 10^{-2}$	80.2%	1.1%
0.3	$1.911885 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.98517 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.9236 \cdot 10^{-5}$	16.3%	0.607	$2.62606 \cdot 10^{-2}$	72.5%	1.1%
0.4	$2.643305 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.11577 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.0768 \cdot 10^{-5}$	13.1%	0.951	$3.501409 \cdot 10^{-2}$	75.0%	0.9%

Table 2: Integrated intensity for S_2 and S_4




FIG .1: Integrated intensity for S_2 and S_4 for small k .

C . Total integrated intensity

The total integrated intensity with respect to both energy and momentum is defined by:

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z dk I(k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z dk \sum_{\mathbf{l}} S(\mathbf{l}; k). \quad (3.5)$$

It is known to be exactly equal to [47]:

$$I = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (3.6)$$

Table 3 displays our results for this sum rule. We note a better standard deviation: a relative value of 8% only, compared to the previous 13%. The 2 factor is of order one. The two-spinon contribution stays at around 74% whereas the four-spinon contribution is now at about 2.5%. This trend, namely a better precision and a 2.% contribution, is going to continue in the remaining sum rules.

I_2	I_4	$_4$	$_4=I_4$	2	I	$I_2=I$	$I_4=I$
0.1845412	0.00629916	0.0004973	7.9%	0.430	0.25	73.8%	2.5%

Table 3: Total integrated intensity for S_2 and S_4

D . First frequency moment

The next sum rule we look at is related to the first frequency moment, defined by:

$$K(k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z d\omega \omega S(\omega; k). \quad (3.7)$$

It is also known exactly, but for all k this time. It reads:

$$K(k) = \frac{8}{3} \ln 2 - \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \frac{k}{2} : \quad (3.8)$$

We have carried out the runs for all values of the momentum transfer and our results for the two-spinon contribution $K_2(k)$ and the four-spinon contribution $K_4(k)$ are displayed in Table 4 below. They are also plotted in FIG 2.

One sees that $K_2(k)$ has the right quadratic behavior from (3.8) with a relative coefficient of roughly 69%. But what is remarkable is the fact that also $K_4(k)$ has the same quadratic

behavior, with a stable coefficient of about 2.5% . The σ^2 factor is of order one and the standard deviation is better, around 6.7% . The better statistics comes partly from the fact that the neutron energy ϵ is present in the numerator and not in the denominator in the integral (3.7), which makes the numerical integration more stable close to $\epsilon = 0$. One may then expect the higher frequency moments $K_i(k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^R d\epsilon \epsilon^i S(\epsilon; k)$ with $i > 1$ to give even more stable results.

k	$K_2(k)$	$K_4(k)$	σ_4	$\sigma_4 = K_4$	σ^2	$K(k)$	$K_2 = K$	$K_4 = K$
0.1	$0.2053042 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$0.80744 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$0.6305 \cdot 10^{-5}$	7.8%	1.196	$0.2951853 \cdot 10^{-2}$	69.5%	2.7%
0.2	$0.813574 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.08253 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.1058 \cdot 10^{-5}$	6.8%	1.549	$1.177792 \cdot 10^{-2}$	69.1%	2.6%
0.3	$1.799619 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.42950 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.8636 \cdot 10^{-5}$	5.3%	0.208	$2.639001 \cdot 10^{-2}$	68.2%	2.1%
0.4	$3.294491 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$12.70855 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$8.8941 \cdot 10^{-5}$	7.0%	0.524	$4.664213 \cdot 10^{-2}$	70.6%	2.7%

Table 4: First frequency moment for S_2 and S_4




FIG. 2: First frequency moment for S_2 and S_4 for small values of k .

E . Nearest-neighbor correlation

The last sum rule we consider is related to the nearest-neighbor correlation function defined by the following relations:

$$\langle S_n^z S_{n+1}^z \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} dk \exp(ik) I(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} dk \exp(ik) \langle S(k) S(k) \rangle \quad (3.9)$$

Its value is also known exactly [47]:

$$\langle S_n^z S_{n+1}^z \rangle = \frac{E_G}{3}; \quad (3.10)$$

where E_G is the ground-state energy per site which, in the thermodynamic limit, is given by:

$$E_G = -\ln 2 - \frac{1}{4} \quad (3.11)$$

Our results for the nearest-neighbor correlation function are displayed in Table 5 below. The two-spinon contribution is about 72% and the four-spinon contribution is around 2.4%. The (relative) standard deviation δ_4 is about 12% and the χ^2 factor is of order one.

$\langle S_n^z S_{n+1}^z \rangle$	$\langle S_n^z S_{n+1}^z \rangle$	δ_4	$\chi_4^2 = \frac{\langle S_n^z S_{n+1}^z \rangle}{\langle S_n^z S_{n+1}^z \rangle}$	χ^2	$\langle S_n^z S_{n+1}^z \rangle$	$hi_2 = hi$	$hi_4 = hi$
0.105594	0.0035309	0.000421	11.9%	0.580	0.1477157	71.5%	2.4%

Table 5: Nearest-neighbor correlation for S_2 and S_4

IV . CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this work, we have calculated five sum rules for the exact four-spinon dynamic structure factor S_4 in the spin 1/2 Heisenberg antiferromagnetic quantum spin chain. The calculations were all numerical using Monte Carlo integration methods. The statistics is satisfactory: the χ^2 factor is always around one and the standard deviation δ_4 range between 7% and 13% of the calculated quantity. It is better for sum rules in which the neutron momentum transfer Q appears in the numerator since this make the integration more stable when close to zero.

From this analysis, we conclude that the four-spinon D SF S_4 contributes to the total dynamic structure factor S a factor between 1% and 2.5%, depending on the sum rule used,

whereas the two-spinon contribution is between 70% and 75%. These results are consistent with the expectation from finite chain calculations [28] that the spectral weight of states outside the two-spinon continuum is roughly two orders of magnitude smaller than the spectral weight of neighboring states within the continuum.

There are five directions in which one may wish to carry forward. The first direction is to try to determine an expression for the six-spinon contribution S_6 , study its behavior as a function of $!$ and k and then determine its contribution to the total S : But one should know that, technically, matters may be more involved.

The second direction to explore is the study of the dynamic structure factor in the anisotropic case. This is also of physical interest since perfect isotropy is only an ideal limit. The model is exactly solvable and we do have generic expressions for S_n in the form of contour integrals in the spectral parameters' complex planes [39]. The difficulty here is that the integrands involve much more complicated functions which are already present in S_2 , and one should expect intricate complexities in this more general case.

The third direction to explore is to include a (small) external magnetic field. There are finite-chain calculations in this regard, [28] and more recently [50, 51]. But one has to remember that the model is not exactly solvable in this case. One will then have to try small perturbations around the zero-field limit solution.

The fourth direction is the finite-temperature case. Here too there are finite-chain [28] and field-theory results [25]. It is then certainly interesting to see the temperature effects on S_2 and perhaps on S_4 .

The fifth direction is to look into the situation of a spin-one chain. The model is still exactly solvable and, exploiting the quantum group symmetry, compact expressions for the form factors are available [52, 53, 54]. One key issue in this regard is to try to recover the Haldane gap [16] through these exact manipulations.

Acknowledgments

A substantial part of the numerical work was done at the Abdus-Salam ICTP, Trieste, through the Junior Associateship program. B.S. warmly thanks the Center for this.

- [1] W. Heisenberg, Z. Phys. 49 (1928) 619.
- [2] K. Hirakawa and Y. Kurogi, Prog. Theor. Phys. 46 (1970) 147.
- [3] A. Okazaki, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 26 (1969) 870.
- [4] A. Okazaki, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 27 (1969) 518.
- [5] R.J. Baxter, 'Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics', Academic Press, 1982.
- [6] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. 86 (1952) 694.
- [7] H.A. Bethe, Z. Phys. 71 (1931) 205.
- [8] J. des Cloizeaux and J.J. Pearson, Phys. Rev. 128 (1962) 2131.
- [9] Y. Endoh, G. Shirane, R.J. Birgeneau, P.M. Richards and S.L. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32 (1974) 170.
- [10] I.J. Heilmann, G. Shirane, Y. Endoh, R.J. Birgeneau and S.L. Holt, Phys. Rev. B 18 (1978) 3530.
- [11] M.T. Hutchings, H. Ikeda and J.M. Milne, J. Phys. C 12 (1979) L739.
- [12] S.K. Satija, J.D. Axe, G. Shirane, H. Yoshizawa and K. Hirakawa, Phys. Rev. B 21 (1980) 2001.
- [13] L.D. Faddeev and L.A. Takhtajan, Phys. Lett. A 85 (1981) 375.
- [14] M. Fowler, Phys. Rev. B 18 (1978) 421.
- [15] P.W. Anderson, Science 235 (1987) 1196.
- [16] F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50 (1983) 1153.
- [17] T. Yamada, Prog. Theor. Phys. 41 (1969) 880.
- [18] J.C. Bonner, B. Sutherland and P.M. Richards, in Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference on Magnetism and Magnetic Materials, Edited by C.D. Graham, G.H. Lander and J.J. Rhyne, AIP, New York, 1975.
- [19] S.W. Lovesey, 'Theory of neutron scattering from condensed matter', Clarendon, Oxford, 1987.
- [20] G.L. Squires, 'Introduction to the theory of thermal neutron scattering', Cambridge University

- Press, 1996.
- [21] S.E. Nagler, D.A. Tennant, R.A. Cowley, T.G. Perring and S.K. Satija, Phys. Rev. B 44 (1991) 12361.
 - [22] H.H. Kretzen, H.J. Mikeska and E. Patzak, Z. Phys. 271 (1974) 269.
 - [23] T. Holstein and H. Primako, Phys. Rev. 58 (1940) 1098.
 - [24] D.A. Tennant, S.E. Nagler, D. Weltz, G. Shirane and K. Yamada, Phys. Rev. B 52 (1995) 13381.
 - [25] H.J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. B 34 (1986) 6372.
 - [26] D.A. Tennant, T.G. Perring, R.A. Cowley and S.E. Nagler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 4003.
 - [27] D.A. Tennant, R.A. Cowley, S.E. Nagler and A.M. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B 52 (1995) 13368.
 - [28] G. Muller, H. Thomas, H. Beck and J.C. Bonner, Phys. Rev. B 24 (1981) 1429.
 - [29] J. Deisz, M. Jarrell and D.L. Cox, Phys. Rev. B 42 (1990) 4869.
 - [30] V.S. Viswanath et al., Phys. Rev. B 49 (1994) 9702.
 - [31] A. Luther and I. Peschel, Phys. Rev. B 9 (1974) 2911.
 - [32] V.E. Korepin, A.G. Izergin and N.M. Bogoliubov, The Quantum Inverse Scattering Method and Correlation Functions', Cambridge University Press, 1993.
 - [33] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu and D. Senechal, Conformal Field Theory', Springer, 1997.
 - [34] I.B. Frenkel and N.H. Jing, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 85 (1988) 9373.
 - [35] O. Davies, O. Foda, M. Jimbo, T. Miwa and A. Nakayashiki, Comm. Math. Phys. 151 (1993) 89.
 - [36] A. Abada, A.H. Bougourzi and M.A. El Gadechi, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 8 (1993) 715.
 - [37] A.H. Bougourzi, Nucl. Phys. B 404 (1993) 457.
 - [38] M. Jimbo and T. Miwa, Algebraic Analysis of Solvable Lattice Models', American Mathematical Society, 1994.
 - [39] A.H. Bougourzi, Mod. Phys. Lett. B 10 (1996) 1237.
 - [40] A.H. Bougourzi, M. Couture and M. Kacir, Phys. Rev. B 54 (1996) 12669.
 - [41] M. Karbach, G. Muller and A.H. Bougourzi, Two-spinon dynamic structure factor of the one-dimensional $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg antiferromagnet', cond-mat/9606068.
 - [42] A.H. Bougourzi, M. Karbach and G. Muller, Exact two-spinon dynamic structure factor of the one-dimensional $s = 1/2$ Heisenberg-Ising antiferromagnet', cond-mat/9712101.
 - [43] A. Abada, A.H. Bougourzi and B. Silakhal, Nucl. Phys. B 497 [FS] (1997) 733.

- [44] B. Silakhal and A. Abada, J. Phys. A : Math. Gen. 37 (2004) 497.
- [45] A. Langari, Phys. Rev. B 58 (1998) 14467.
- [46] F. A. Smirnov, Form Factors in Completely Integrable Models of Quantum Field Theory, World Scientific, Singapore, 1992.
- [47] P. C. Hohenberg and W. F. Brinkman, Phys. Rev. B 10 (1974) 128.
- [48] G. Muller, Phys. Rev. B 26 (1982) 1311.
- [49] A. Fedderphann, M. Karbach and K. H. Mutter, Phys. Rev. B 53 (1996) 11543.
- [50] M. Karbach, D. Biegand G. Muller, Quasiparticles governing the zero-temperature dynamics of the 1D spin-1/2 Heisenberg antiferromagnet in a magnetic field, cond-mat/0205142.
- [51] M. Karbach and G. Muller, Line shape predictions via Bethe ansatz for the one dimensional spin-1/2 Heisenberg antiferromagnet in a magnetic field, cond-mat/0005174.
- [52] M. Idzumi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 9 (1994) 4449; Correlation functions of the spin 1 analog of the XXZ model, hep-th/9307129.
- [53] A. H. Bougourzi and R. A. Weston, Nucl. Phys. B 417 (1994) 439.
- [54] A. H. Bougourzi, Bosonization of quantum algebras and its application to higher spin Heisenberg model, q-alg/9706015.

