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#### Abstract

Finite-size scaling (FSS) of the ve-dim ensional ( $\mathrm{d}=5$ ) Ising m odel is investigated num erically. Because of the hyperscaling violation in $d>4$, FSS of the $d=5$ Ising model no longer obeys the conventional scaling relation. R ather, it is expected that the FSS behavior depends on the geom etry of the em bedding space (boundary condition). In this paper, we consider the cylindrical geom etry, and explore its in uence on the correlation length $=\mathrm{L} f\left(\mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}}} ; \mathrm{H} \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$ with system size $L$, reduced tem perature , and $m$ agnetic eld $H$; the indiges, $Y_{t ; h}$, and , characterize $F$ SS. For that punpose, we em ployed the transfer-m atrix m ethod w th N ovotny's technique, which enables us to treat an arbitrary (integral) num ber of spins $N=8 ; 10 ;:: ; 28$; note that conventionally, N is restricted in $\mathrm{N}\left(=\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{d}}{ }^{1}\right)=16 ; 81 ; 256 ;::$. A s a result, we estim ate the scaling indices as $=1: 40(15), y_{t}=2: 8(2)$, and $y_{h}=4: 3(1)$. A dditionally, under postulating $=4=3$, we arrive at $y_{t}=2: 67(10)$ and $y_{h}=4: 0(2)$. These indioes di er from the naively expected ones, $=1, y_{t}=2$ and $y_{h}=3$. R ather, our data support the generic form ulas, $=\left(\begin{array}{ll}d & 1\end{array}\right)=3, y_{t}=2(d \quad 1)=3$, and $y_{h}=d \quad 1$, advocated for the cylindrical geom etry in $d \quad 4$.


## I. INTRODUCTION

The criticality of the Ising $m$ odelabove the upper criticaldim ension ( $d>4$ ) belongs to the mean- eld universality class. H ow ever, the nite-size e ect, nam ely, the nite-size-scaling behavior, is not quite universalbecause of the violation of the hyperscaling in $d>4$. (From a renorm alization-group view point, this peculiarity is attributed to the presence of $\backslash$ dangerous irrelevant variable" [1, 2, 3].) A ctually, it is expected that the em bedding geom etry of the system (boundary condition) would a ect the nite-size-scaling behavior for $d>4$ [4, $5,6,4,8,9,10,11]$.

Recently, Jones and Y oung perform ed an extensive $M$ onte C arlo sim ulation for the $d=5$ Ising model em bedded in the (periodic) hypercubic geom etry [12]. They calculated the correlation length with Kin 's technique [13]. (Because the calculation of requires a com putationale ort, B inder's cum ulant ratio rather than has been studied extensively so far [1, 8, 9].) They found that the correlation length obeys the scaling relation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\mathrm{L} f\left(\mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}}}\right) ; \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ ith the linear dim ension $L$ and the reduced tem perature. They found that the scaling indiges are in good agreem ent w ith the theoretical prediction [4, 5, 6],

$$
\begin{equation*}
=5=4 \text { and } y_{t}=5=2: \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

N otably enough, their indioes exclude the naively expected values, $=1$ and $y_{t}=2$. That is, the correlation length $L$ exceeds the system size $L$ at the criticalpoint $=0$ as L! 1. (In other words, the spin wave excitation costs very little energy for large L.) Such a peculiarity should be attributed to the violation of the conventional scaling relation (hyperscaling) in $d>4$. It would be intriguing that the above form ula is cast into the expression [7],

$$
\begin{equation*}
=l f\left(I^{2}\right) ; \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ ith the replacem ents $l=L$ and $y_{t}=2$. The expression is now rem iniscent of the conventional scaling relation expected for the $m$ ean- eld universality class. N am ely, the violation of hyperscaling is reconciled (absorbed) by the replacem ents, and the scaling indioes, and $y_{t}$, characterize the anom aly quantitatively. So far, num erous considerations have been $m$ ade $[7,8,[1,12]$ for the hypercubic geom etry, where the $M$ onte $C$ arlo $m$ ethod works very e ciently.

In this paper, we investigate the $d=5$ Ising $m$ odelem bedded in the cylindrical geom etry; nam ely, we consider a system with in nite system size along a particular direction. C learly, the transferm atrix $m$ ethod well suits exploiting such a geom etry. H ow ever, practically, the transferm atrix $m$ ethod does not apply very well in large dim ensions $d \quad 3$ because of its severe lim itation as to the available system sizes.

In order to resolve this lim itation, we im plem ented $N$ ovotny's technique $114,15,16$, 17, 18], which enables us to treat an arbitrary number of system sizes $N=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28$; here, the system size N denotes the number of constituent spins within a unit of the transfer matrix ( $F$ ig. (1). N ote that conventionally, the system size is restricted in $N\left(=L^{d}{ }^{1}\right)=16 ; 81 ; 256 ;:::$, which soon exceeds the lim it of available com puter resources. Such an arbitrariness allows us to treat a variety of system sizes, and manage system atic nite-size-scaling analysis. A ctually, w ith the scaling analysis, we obtained the indioes
$=1: 40(15), y_{t}=2: 8(2)$, and $y_{h}=4: 3(1) . \mathrm{M}$ oreover, postulating $=4=3$, we obtained $y_{t}=2: 67(10)$ and $y_{h}=4: 0(2)$. (Here, the exponent $y_{h}$ denotes the scaling dim ension of the $m$ agnetic eld. O ur scaling relation, Eq. (13), inconporates the magnetic eld $H$ and the corresponding scaling index $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{h}}$.) O bviously, our results exclude the naively expected ones, $=1, y_{t}=2$, and $y_{h}=3$. R ather, our data seem to support the generic form ulas [4, [5, 6],

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{d \quad 1}{3} ; y_{t}=2 \frac{d \quad 1}{3} ; \text { and } y_{h}=d \quad 1 ; \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

advocated for the cylindrical geom etry in d 4. A ctually, our data deviate from the above $m$ entioned values for the hypercubic geom etry, Eq. (2), indicating that the embedding geom etry is indeed in uential upon the nite-size scaling.

In faimess, its has to be mentioned that $N$ ovotny obtained $+y_{t} d \quad$ [14, 17]. He postulated $=(\mathrm{d} 1)=3$ in order to x the location of the criticalpoint. In this paper, we do not rely on any propositions, and estim ate the indioes independently. For that purpose, we calculated the cum ulant ratio to get inform ation on the critical point. M oreover, we treated the system sizes up to $N=28$, which is substantially larger than that ofR ef. [17], $N 13$. Here, we made use of an equivalence between the $d=5$ Ising $m$ odeland the quantum $d=4$ Ising $m$ odel; the latter is com putationally less dem anding. W e also elim inated insystem atic nite-size corrections by tuning extended coupling constants; see our Ham iltonian (G). In this respect, the m otivation of the present research is well directed to $m$ ethodology.

The rest of this paper is organized as follow s. In Sec.
schem e in detail. In Sec. ITI, we m anage the nite-size-scaling analyses of the sim ulation data. In the last section, we present the sum $m$ ary and discussions.

## II. NUMERICALMETHOD

In this section, we explain the num erical m ethod. First, we argue the reduction of the $d=5$ Ising $m$ odelto the $d=4$ quantum transverse- eld Ising $m$ odel. The reduced (quantum $m$ echanical) model is much easier to treat num erically. Second, we explicate Novotny's transferm atrix $m$ ethod. W e place an em phasis how we extended his form alism to adopt the quantum $m$ echanical interaction.
A. Reduction of the classical $d=5$ Ising $m$ odel to the $d=4$ quantum counterpart

The d-dim ensional Ising $m$ odel reduces to the (d 1)-dim ensional transverse- eld Ising m odel; in general, the d-dim ensional classical system has its (d 1)-dim ensional quantum counterpart [19]. Such a reduction is based on the observation that the transfer-m atrix direction and the (quantum ) im aginary-tim e evolution have a close relationship. A ctually, the quantum $H$ am ittonian is an in nitesim al generator of the transfer $m$ atrix. Because the quantum H am ittonian contains few non-zero elem ents, its diagonalization requires reduced com putationale ort. The signi cant point is that the universality class (criticality) is m aintained through the $m$ apping.

To be speci $c$, we consider the follow ing $d=4$ transverse- eld Ising $m$ odel $w$ ith the extended interactions. T he H am ittonian is given by,


Here, the operators $f{ }_{i} g$ denote the Paulim atrices placed at the $d=4$ hypercubic lattice points i. The param eters and H stand for the transverse and longitudinalm agnetic elds,
 neighbor pains, the next-nearest-neighbor (plaquette diagonal) pairs, the third-neighbor pairs, and the fourth-neighbor pairs, respectively. T he param eters $f J_{i} g(i=1 ; 2 ; 3 ; 4)$ are the corresponding coupling constants. H ereafter, we regard $J_{1}$ as a unit of energy $\left(J_{1}=1\right)$, and
tune the rem aining coupling constants $J_{2 ; 3 ; 4} s o$ as to elim inate the insystem atic nite-size errors; see Sec.III.
$W$ e sim ulate the above $d=4$ quantum Ising $m$ odel $w$ th the num erical diagonalization $m$ ethod. The diagonalization of such a high-dim ensional system requires huge com puter$m$ em ory space. In fact, the num ber of spins constituting the $d=4$ chuster increases very rapidly as $N=16 ; 81 ; 256 ;:::$, overw helm ing the available com puter resources. In the next section, we resolve this di culty through resorting to $N$ ovotny's transfer-m atrix form alism .

## B. C onstructions of the $H$ am iltonian $m$ atrix elem ents

In this section, we present an explicit representation for the H am iltonian (5). W em ake use ofN ovotny'sm ethod [14], which enables us to treat an arbitrary num ber ofspins constituting a unit of the transfer $m$ atrix. N ovotny form ulated the idea for the classical Ising $m$ odel. In this paper, we show that his idea is applicable to the quantum Ising m odel, Eq. (5), as well.

B efore we com $m$ ence a detailed discussion, we explain the basic idea of $N$ ovotny'sm ethod. In F ig. 目, we presented a schem atic draw ing of a unit of the transfer $m$ atrix for the Ising $m$ odel in $d=3$ (rather than $d=5$ for the sake of sm plicity). Because the cross-section of the $d=3$-dim ensional bar is $d=2$-dim ensional, the transferm atrix unit should have a $d=2$-dim ensional structure. H ow ever, in Fig. 1 , the spins f ${ }_{i} G(i=1, i=1 ; 2 ;::: ; N)$ constitute a $d=1$-dim ensional (zig-zag) structure. This feature is essential for us to construct the transferm atrix unit with an arbitrary (integral) num ber of spins. T he dim ensionality is lifted to $d=2 e$ ectively by the long-range interactions over the ${ }^{p} \bar{N}$ th-neighbor pairs; ow ing to the long-range interaction, the $N$ spins constitute a $\mathrm{P}_{\bar{N}}^{\mathrm{N}} \overline{\mathrm{N}}$ rectangular netw ork. (T he signi cant point is that the num ber ${ }^{\mathrm{p}} \overline{\mathrm{N}}$ is not necessarily an integral nor rational num ber.) Sim ilarly, the bridge over $(\bar{N} \quad 1)$ th neighbor pairs introduces the next-nearest-neighbor (plaquette diagonal) couping with respect to the $\frac{p}{\mathrm{~N}} \quad \mathrm{P} \overline{\mathrm{N}}$ netw ork.

We apply this idea to the case of the $d=4$ quantum system. To begin $w$ ith, we set
 1;2;:::;N ). These bases diagonalize the operator ${ }_{j}^{z}$; nam ely,

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{j}^{\mathrm{z}} \text { 我 }{ }_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{gi}={ }_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{Jf}}{ }_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{gi} \mathrm{i} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds.

W e consider the one- and two-body interactions separately. N am ely, we decom pose the H am iltonian (5) into two sectors,

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=H^{(2)}\left(\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{~g}\right)+\mathrm{H}^{(1)}(\quad ; \mathrm{H}): \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The com ponent $H^{(2)}$ originates from the spin-spin interaction, which depends on the exchange couplings $f_{i} g$. On the other hand, the contribution $H^{(1)}$ com es from the single-spin term s , depending on the m agnetic elds, and H .

First, we consider $H^{(2)}$. This com ponent concems the mutual connectivity am ong the N spins, and we apply N ovotny's idea to represent the m atrix elem ents. W e propose the follow ing expression,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{J_{3}}{2} X^{2 A} X \quad X^{2 A} X^{; 2 A \sim} \sim{ }^{2 A}(\sim+\sim \sim \sim)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, the set $A$ consists of the elem ents, $A=f 1 ; N^{1=4} ; \mathrm{N}^{1=2} ; \mathrm{N}^{3=4} \mathrm{~g}$. The com ponent $\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{v})$ denotes the vth-neighbor interaction for the N -spin alignm ent,
$w$ th the exchange-interaction $m$ atrix,

$$
\text { hf }{ }_{i} G \mathfrak{J} \mathfrak{f} \mathcal{F}_{i} g i=\underbrace{X^{N}}_{k=1}{ }_{k k} ;
$$

and the translational operator $P$ satisfying,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{f}}{ }_{\mathrm{i} g \mathrm{~g}}=\mathrm{f} \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}+1 \mathrm{~g}} \mathrm{i} ; \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

under the periodic boundary condition. The insertion of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{v}}$ beside the T operation is a key elem ent to introduce the coupling over the vth-neighbor pairs. The denom inator 2 in Eq. (8)) com pensates the duplicated sum .

Let us explain the $m$ eaning of the above form ula, Eq. (8), $m$ ore in detail. As shown in $F$ ig. [1, in the case of $d=2$, we made bridges over $N^{1=2}$ th-neighbor pairs to lift up the
dim ensionality to $d=2 e$ ectively. In the case of $d=4$, by analogy, we introduce the interaction distances such as $\mathrm{v}=1 ; \mathrm{N}^{1=4} ; \mathrm{N}^{1=2}$ and $\mathrm{N}^{3=4}$. The rst term in Eq. (8) thus represents the nearest-neighbor interactions (w th respect to the $d=4$-dim ensional cluster) . Sim ilarly, the rem aining term s introduce the long-range interactions. For exam ple, the com ponent H $\left(1+\mathrm{N}^{1=4}\right)$ introduces the next-nearest-neighbor (plaquette diagonal) interaction. W e em phasize that the idea of N ovotny is readily applicable to the quantum model. [In short, our (quantum mechanical) form ulation is additive. On the contrary, N ovotny's original form ulation is $m$ ultiplicative, because his original form ulation concems the Boltzm ann weight rather than the H am iltonian itself.]

Lastly, we consider the one-body part $H^{(1)}$. Them atrix elem ent is given by the form ula,

The expression is quite standard, because the com ponent $H^{(1)}$ sim ply concems the individual spins, and has nothing to do with the connectivity am ong them .

The above form ulas com plete our basis to sim ulate the quantum $H$ am iltonian (5) num erically. In the next section, we perform the num erical $\operatorname{sim}$ ulation for $\mathrm{N}=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28$.
III. NUMERICALRESULTS

In Sec. [五, we set up an explicit expression for the H am iltonian (5); see Eqs. (8) and (12). In this section, we diagonalize the H am iltonian for $\mathrm{N}=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28 \mathrm{w}$ th the Lanczos algorithm. We calculated the rst-excitation energy gap $E$ (rather than ). The scaling relation for E is given by,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{L} \quad g\left(\mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{t}}} ; \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{h}}}\right) ; \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

because E 1= holds. (A s com pared to Eq. [1), our scaling relation is extended to include the $m$ agnetic eld $H$ as well as the corresponding scaling index y .) The reduced tem perature is given by $=\quad \mathrm{c}$ with the criticalpoint c . N ote that the lineardim ension L satis es $\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{N}^{1=4}$, because the N spins constitute the $\mathrm{d}=4$-dim ensional cluster.

We x the interaction param eters to,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{J}_{1} ; \mathrm{J}_{2} ; \mathrm{J}_{3} ; \mathrm{J}_{4}\right)=(1 ; 0: 15 ; 0: 05 ; 0: 05) ; \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

and scan the transverse $m$ agnetic eld . (W e will also provide data for $\left(\mathbb{I} ; J_{2} ; J_{3} ; J_{4}\right)=$ $(1 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0)$ and $(1 ; 0: 1 ; 0: 1 ; 0: 05)$ as a reference.) The interaction param eters, Eq. (14), are optim al in the sense that the insystem atic nite-size errors are suppressed satisfactorily.
A. Scaling behavior of B inder's cum ulant ratio and the transition point

Because the scaling relation, Eq. (13), contains a num ber of free param eters, it is am biguous to determ ine these param eters sim ultaneously. A ctually, in Ref. [14,17], the author $x e d=4=3$, to determ ine the index $¥$.

In this paper, we estim ate the scaling indices independently $w$ thout resorting to any postulations. For that punpose, we calculated an additional quantity, nam ely, B inder's cum ulant ratio [20],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{U}=1 \quad \frac{\mathrm{hM}{ }^{4} \mathrm{i}}{3 \mathrm{~h} \mathrm{M}^{2} \mathrm{i}^{2}} ; \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

to determ ine the location of $c$. Here, the brackets $h$ : : :i denote the expectation value at the ground state. The $m$ agnetic $m$ om ent $M$ is given by $M=\underset{i=1}{\mathrm{~N}} \underset{i}{z}$. Because the cum ulant ratio is dim ensionless ( $=0$ ), 迆 obeys a sim pli ed scaling relation;

$$
\begin{equation*}
U=\sigma\left(L^{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{t}}} ; H L^{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{h}}}\right): \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ence, the intersection point of the cum ulant-ratio curves indicates a location of the critical point. The scaling relation for the cum ulant ratio, Eq. (16), has been studied extensively for the $\mathrm{d}=5$ hypercubic geom etry w th the M onte C arlo m ethod $[1,8,1,12]$.

In Fig. 2, we plotted the cum ulant ratio for various and $N=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28$ with $H=0$ xed; asm entioned above, we xed the exchange-ooupling constants $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{q}} 9$ to Eq. (14). From the scale-invariant (intersection) point of the curves in Fig. 2 , we observe a clear indication of criticality at c 12:5. In the subsequent analysis of Sec. IIB, we m ake use of this inform ation to determ ine the scaling indioes.

This is a good position to address why we xed the exchange couplings to Eq. 14) . A s a com parison, we presented the cum ulant ratio for various and $\mathrm{N}=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28 \mathrm{in} \mathrm{F}$ ig. 3, where we tentatively tum 0 the extended couplings $J_{i ; 3 ; 4}=0$. C learly, the data are scattered as com pared to those off ig. 2]. Such data scatter obscures the onset of the phasetransition point, and prohibits detailed data analysis of criticality. In order to im prove the nite-size behavior, we surveyed the param eter space f $\ddagger 9$, and found that the choige (14) is
an optim alone. Such elim ination of nite-size errors has been utilized successfully in recent num erical studies $\mathbb{2 1}, 22]$.

B . C ritical exponent

P rovided by the inform ation on c (F ig. (2) , we are able to determ ine the scaling indioes from the scaling relation (13). In this section, we consider the index .

In $F$ ig. 4, we plotted the approxim ate index,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)=\frac{\ln \left(\mathrm{E}\left(\mathbb{N}_{1}\right)=\mathrm{E}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2}\right)\right) \mathrm{j}={ }_{\mathrm{c}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)}}{\ln \left(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)} ; \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\left[2=\left(\mathrm{L}_{1}+\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)\right]^{3} \mathrm{w}$ ith $8 \quad \mathrm{~N}_{1}<\mathrm{N}_{2} \quad 28$; note that $\mathrm{L}_{1 ; 2}=\mathrm{N}_{1 ; 2}^{1=4}$ holds. The param eters are the sam e as those off ig. 2. The approxim ate transition point ${ }_{c}\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)$ is given by the intersection point of the cum ulant ratio for a pair of $\left(\mathbb{N}_{1} ; \mathrm{N}_{2}\right)$; nam ely, it satis es

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{U}\left(\mathbb{N}_{1} ;{ }_{c}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)\right)=\mathrm{U}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} ;{ }_{c}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)\right): \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

The least-squares $t$ to these data yields $=1: 403$ (46) in the them odynam ic lim it. W e carried out sim ilar data analysis for $\left(J_{2} ; J_{3} ; J_{4}\right)=(0: 1 ; 0: 1 ; 0: 05)$, and obtained $=1: 494(21)$. A s an error indicator, we accept the di erence betw een them. A s a consequence we estim ate the index as

$$
\begin{equation*}
=1: 40(15): \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us $m$ ention a num ber of rem anks. First, our result excludes the naively expected one $=1$. Actually, the result $>1$ indicates that the correlation length $L$ develops $m$ ore rapidly than the system size $L$ enlarges. This feature $m$ ay re ect the fact that the spin waves cost very little energy large L. Second, our result supports the generic form ula
$=4=3$, Eq. (4) , advocated for the cylindrical geom etry in d $4[4,5,6]$. O $n$ the contrary, it deviates from that of the hypercubic geom etry (2); we con $m$ this observation in the follow ing sections. Lastly, the validity of the abscissa scale (extrapolation schem e), $1=\mathrm{L}^{3}$, in F ig. 4 is not clear. In Sec IIID, we inquire into the validity of the extrapolation schem e.

```
C . C ritical exponents }\mp@subsup{y}{t}{}\mathrm{ and }\mp@subsup{y}{h}{
```

In F igs. 5 and 6, we plotted the approxim ate indices,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)+\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{t}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)=\frac{\left.\ln \left(@ E\left(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\right)=@ \quad E\left(\mathrm{~N}_{2}\right)\right) \mathrm{j}_{={ }_{c}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)}^{\ln \left(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)} ; ;\right)}{} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)+2 \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)=\frac{\ln \left(@_{\mathrm{H}}^{2} \quad \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\right)=@_{\mathrm{H}}^{2} \quad \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{~N}_{2}\right)\right) \dot{\mathrm{q}}_{\mathrm{i}}=0 ;={ }_{\mathrm{c}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)}{\ln \left(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)} ; \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively, for $\left[2=\left(L_{1}+L_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ w th $8 \quad N_{1}<N_{2}$ 28; the param eters are the sam e as those of $F i g$. 2. The least-squares $t$ to these data yields the estim ates, $\quad+\geq=$ $1: 396(21)$ and $\quad+2 y_{h}=7: 198(39)$, in the therm odynam ic lim it. Sim ilarly for $\left(J_{2} ; J_{3} ; J_{4}\right)=$ $(0: 1 ; 0: 1 ; 0: 05)$, we obtained $+y_{t}=1: 359(12)$ and $+2 y_{h}=7: 211(24)$. C onsequently, we estim ate the scaling indioes as $\quad+y_{t}=1: 4(1)$ and $\quad+2 y_{h}=7: 2(1)$. Combining them w ith $=1: 40(15)$, Eq. (19), we arrive at,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{t}=2: 8(2) \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{h}=4: 3(1): \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

A gain, our data exclude the naively expected values, $y_{t}=2$ and $y_{h}=3$. $R$ ather, our estim ates are com parable w ith the generic form ula, Eq. (4); actually, the estim ate $y_{t}=2: 8(2)$ is quite consistent $w$ ith the prediction $y_{t}=8=3$, Eq. (4), whereas the result $y_{h}=4: 3(1)$ and the formula $y_{h}=4, \mathrm{Eq}$. (4) , are rather out of the error margin. W e attain $m$ ore satisfactory agreem ent betw een the num erical result and the form ula by the data analysis under the assum ption $=4=3$ in the next section. O $n$ the contrary, our data con ict w ith the values, Eq. [2), anticipated for the hypercubic geom etry. H ence, the data suggest that the em bedding geom etry is in uential on the nite-size scaling above the upper critical dim ension. W e con $m$ this issue $m$ ore in detail in the next section.
D. Scaling indices $y_{t}$ and $y_{h}$ under the assum ption $=4=3$

In Sec. IIIB, we obtained an estim ate $=1: 40$ (15) being in good agreem ent w ith the formula $=4=3$, Eq. (4). In this section, we assume $=4=3$ (4] , and estim ate the rem aining indioes $y_{t}$ and $y_{h}$ under this hypothesis.

In Fig. 7, we plotted the approxim ate index,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{t}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)=\frac{\ln \left(@ \mathrm{U}\left(\mathbb{N}_{1}\right)=@ \mathrm{U}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2}\right)\right) j=\sim_{c}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)}{\ln \left(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)} ; \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the abscissa scale $\left[2=\left(L_{1}+L_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ with $8 \quad N_{1}<N_{2} \quad 28$; the param eters are the sam e as those of F igs. 44. Because we assum ed $=4=3$ [ ], we are able to determ ine the approxim ate critical point ${ }_{c}{ }_{c}\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)$ from the xed point of $L^{4=3} E(L)$; nam ely,

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{1}^{4=3} E\left(\mathbb{N}_{1} ; \sim_{c}\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)\right)=L_{2}^{4=3} \quad E\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} ; \sim_{c}\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)\right): \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e notice that the data exhibit im proved convergence to the therm odynam ic lim it. The least-squares $t$ to these data yields $¥=2: 671$ (49) in the them odynam ic lim it. Sim ilarly, we obtained $y_{t}=2: 697(42)$ for $\left(J_{2} ; J_{3} ; J_{4}\right)=(0: 1 ; 0: 1 ; 0: 05)$. C onsequently, we estim ate,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{t}=2: 67(10): \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

This result is consistent $w$ ith the above estim ate $y_{t}=2: 8(2)$, Eq. (22), con $m$ ing the reliability of our analyses in Figs. 4t-6. It is also in good agreem ent with the prediction $y_{t}=8=3$, Eq. (4). On the contrary, our estim ate excludes the exponent $y_{t}=5=2$, Eq. (2), advocated for the hypercubic geom etry.

Sim ilarly, in F ig. 8 , we plotted the approxim ate index,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln \left(@_{\mathrm{H}}^{2} \mathrm{U}\left(\mathbb{N}_{1}\right)=@_{\mathrm{H}}^{2} \mathrm{U}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2}\right)\right) \dot{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}=0 ; \tilde{c}_{\mathrm{c}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)}}{\ln \left(\mathrm{L}_{1}=\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)} ; \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the abscissa scale $\left[2=\left(L_{1}+L_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ with $8 \quad N_{1}<N_{2} \quad 28$; the param eters are the sam e as those of F igs. 4/6. The data exhibit an appreciable system atic nite-size deviation. The least-squares $t$ to these data yields $y_{h}=4: 021$ (60). Sim ilarly, we obtained $y_{h}=4: 148$ (36) for $\left(J_{2} ; J_{3} ; J_{4}\right)=(0: 1 ; 0: 1 ; 0: 05)$. C onsequently, we estim ate,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{h}=4: 0(2): \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

A gain, the result is quite consistent $w$ th the prediction $y_{h}=4, E q$. (4) . In other worlds, this agreem ent indicates that the extrapolation schem e (abscissa scale) $1=L^{3}$ is sensible.

Let us mention a few rem arks. First, the data in Figs. 7 and 8 exhibit suppressed nite-size corrections ow ing to the assum ption $=4=3$. This feature was observed in Refs. [14, 17], where the author estim ated $y_{t}$ reliably under $=\left(\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{d} & 1\end{array}\right)=3$; see the Introduction. O uranalysis show sthat the assum ption yields a reliable estim ate for $y_{h}$ as wellas $y_{t}$. Second,
our data con $m$ the self-consistency of our analyses perform ed in $F$ igs. 4f-8. P articularly, the data justify the extrapolation schem e w ith the abscissa scale $1=\mathrm{L}^{3}$. A s a m atter of fact, in Ref. [23], the authors observed notable nite-size corrections to the cum ulant ratio $U$ obeying $L^{d} 2 y_{h}$. In our case ( $d=5$ cylindricalgeom etry), the power should read d $2 y_{h}=3$. H ence, our num erical data support their claim. Lastly, as to the convergence of $U$ to the them odynam ic lim it, there arose controversies [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32]; it has been reported that there appear unclari ed nite-size corrections to $U$, which prohibit us to take reliable extrapolation to the them odynam ic lim it. In this paper, we avoided the subtlety by elim inating nite-size errons w the ( nitely-tuned) extended interactions; see Figs 2 and 3. We consider that such a technique would be signi cant for the study of high-dim ensional system S, where the available system size is restricted.

IV . SUM M ARYAND D ISCUSSIONS

W e studied the nite-size-scaling behavior of the $d=5$ Ising model em bedded in the cylindrical geom etry. O ur aim is to see an in uence of the em bedding geom etry (boundary condition) on the scaling relation, Eq. (13) ; the em bedding geom etry should alter the scaling indices and $y_{t ; h} a b o v e d>4[4,5,6]$. For that punpose, we em ployed the transferm atrix $m$ ethod (Sec. II), and im plem ented $N$ ovotny's technique [14] to treat a variety ofsystem sizes $\mathrm{N}=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28$. M oreover, we m ade use of an equivalence betw een the $\mathrm{d}=5$ (classical) Ising $m$ odel and its $d=4$ quantum countenpant; the latter version is com putationally less dem anding $w$ ith the universality class retained.

We analyzed the sim ulation data w th the nite-size scaling relation, Eq. (13), and obtained the scaling indices as $=1: 40(15), y_{t}=2: 8(2)$, and $y_{h}=4: 3(1)$. A dditionally, under $=4=3$, we estim ate $y_{t}=2: 67(10)$ and $y_{h}=4: 0(2)$. T he indices exclude the naively expected ones, $=1, y_{t}=2$, and $y_{h}=3$, re ecting the violation of hyperscaling in large dim ensions. C learly, our data support the generic form ulas, Eq. (4), advocated for the cylindrical geom etry in d $4[4,5,6]$. On the contrary, our data con ict $w$ ith the values for the hypercubic geom etry, Eq. (2). O ur result dem onstrates that the em bedding geom etry is indeed in uential on the scaling indiges.

Lastly, let us mention a few rem arks. First, we stress that the violation of hyperscaling above the upper criticaldim ension $đ$ is not necessarily an issue ofpure academ ic interest. For
exam ple, a class of long-range interaction 23] suppresses the upper critical dim ension to an experim entally acoessible regim e $\approx<3$. Second, there arose controversies $\mathbb{2} 4,25,26,27,28$, $29,30,31,32]$ conceming the subdom inant nite-size e ect (corrections to scaling) above a. M ore speci cally, the B inder-cum ulant data exhibit unexpectedly slow convergence to the therm odynam ic lim it. In this paper, we avoided this subtlety by extending (tuning) the exchange-coupling constants to Eq. (14), where we observed elim inated nite-size errors. A ctually, from $F$ igs. 2 and 3, we notioe that the elim ination was successful. O ur data indicate that the (dom inant) nite-size errors obey the power law $L^{3}$ as claim ed in $R$ ef. 23]. W e consider that the elim ination of nite-size errors is signi cant for the study of high-dim ensional system $s$, w here the available system size is restricted severely.
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FIG.1: C onstruction of the spin cluster for the quantum transvense- eld Ising model, Eq. (5). For sim plicity, we consider the case of $d=2$. A $s$ indicated above, the spins constitute a $d=1$ dim ensional alignm ent $f{ }_{i} g(i=1 ; 2 ;::: ; N)$, and the dimensionality is lifted to $d=2$ by introducing the bridges (long-range interactions) over the $N^{1=2}$ th and $1+N^{1=2}$ th neighbor pairs; these interactions corresp ond to the nearest-neighb or and the next-nearest-neighbor interactions, respectively, w ith respect to the $d=2$ cluster. In the case of $d=4$, we consider the $N^{1=4}$ th,$N^{1=2}$ th and $N^{3=4}$ th neighb or interactions; see Eq. (8) for detail. T his idea, nam ely, $N$ ovotny's m ethod, was rst developed for the classical Ising $m$ odel [14]. W e apply this $m$ ethod to the quantum system.


F IG . 2: Binder's cum ulant ratio U (15) is plotted for the transverse magnetic eld and the system sizes $N=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28 \mathrm{w}$ th the xed exchange couplings, Eq. 14). W e observe a clear indication of criticality at c 12:5. A pparently, the nite-size-scaling behavior is im proved as com pared to that of $F$ ig. 3 , where we tumed o the extended interactions $J_{2 ; 3 ; 4}=0$.


FIG. 3: Tentatively, we tumed $O$ the extended interactions $\left(J_{2 ; 3 ; 4}=0\right)$, and calculated the cum ulant ratio $U$ (15) for various and $N=8 ; 10 ;::: ; 28$. W e notice that the data are scattered as com pared to those in F ig. 2.


FIG.4: The approxim ate critical index $\left(\mathrm{L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)$ (17) is plotted for $\left[2=\left(\mathrm{L}_{1}+\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ with $8 \quad \mathrm{~N}_{1}<$ $N_{2} 28\left(L_{1 ; 2}=N_{1 ; 2}^{1=4}\right)$; the param etens are the sam e as those of $F i g$. 2. $T$ he least-squares $t$ to these data yields $=1: 403(46)$ in the them odynam ic $\lim$ it $L 1$.


FIG. 5: T he approxim ate critical index
$\left(\mathrm{L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)+\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}}\left(\mathrm{L}_{1} ; \mathrm{L}_{2}\right)$ (20) is plotted for $\left[2=\left(\mathrm{L}_{1}+\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ w ith $8 \quad N_{1}<N_{2} \quad 28\left(L_{1 ; 2}=N_{1 ; 2}^{1=4}\right)$; the param eters are the sam e as those of $F i g$. 2. The least-squares to these data yields $\quad+y_{t}=1: 396(21)$ in the therm odynam ic lim it $L$ ! 1 .


FIG.6: The approxim ate criticalindex $\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)+2 y_{h}\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)$ (21) is plotted for $\left[2=\left(L_{1}+L_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ w ith $8 \quad N_{1}<N_{2} 28\left(L_{1 ; 2}=N_{1 ; 2}^{1=4}\right)$; the param eters are the sam e as those of $F$ ig. 2. The least-squares $t$ to these data yields $\quad+2 \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{h}}=7: 198$ (39) in the therm odynam ic lim it L ! 1 .


F IG . 7: T he approxim ate critical index $y_{t}\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)$ (24) is plotted for $\left[2=\left(L_{1}+L_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ with $8 \quad N_{1}<$ $N_{2} 28\left(L_{1 ; 2}=N_{1 ; 2}^{1=4}\right)$; the param eters are the sam e as those of $F i g$. 2. The least-squares to these data yields $y_{t}=2: 671$ (49) in the therm odynam ic $\lim$ it $L!1 . T$ he result is consistent $w$ ith Eq. (22), con $m$ ing the reliability of our analysis.


F IG . 8: The approxim ate critical index $Y_{h}\left(L_{1} ; L_{2}\right)$ (27) is plotted for $\left[2=\left(L_{1}+L_{2}\right)\right]^{3}$ with $8 \quad N_{1}<$ $N_{2} 28\left(L_{1 ; 2}=N_{1 ; 2}^{1=4}\right)$; the param etens are the sam e as those of $F i g$. 2. The least-squares to these data yields $y_{h}=4: 021(60)$ in the therm odynam ic $\lim$ it $L!1 . T$ he result is consistent $w$ ith the prediction (4).

