

Flory Exponents from a Self-Consistent Renormalization Group

Randall D. Kamien¹

School of Natural Sciences
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, N J 08540

The wandering exponent for an isotropic polymer is predicted remarkably well by a simple argument due to Flory. By considering oriented polymers living in a one-parameter family of background tangent fields, we are able to relate the wandering exponent to the exponent in the background field through an ϵ -expansion. We then choose the background field to have the same correlations as the individual polymer, thus self-consistently solving for ν . We find $\nu = 3/(d+2)$ for $d < 4$ and $\nu = 1/2$ for $d \geq 4$, which is exactly the Flory result.

2 April 1993; Revised 2 June 1993

¹ email: kamien@guinness.ias.edu

1. Introduction

The theory of polymer conformations is at once elegant and confounding. Flory theory, which is based on dimensional analysis, does a remarkable job in predicting the wandering exponent defined by $\langle [r(L) - r(0)]^2 \rangle \propto L^2$ [1]. Nonetheless, controlled approximations which attempt to improve on Flory theory for polymers are not nearly as good. Flory theory predicts $\nu_F = 1/2$ for $d \leq 4$ and $\nu_F = 3/(d+2)$ for $d > 4$, which is exact in and above the critical dimension $d_c = 4$, where the polymer acts as a random walk [2]. It has been shown [3] that ν_F is exact in $d = 2$ dimensions as well. In three-dimensions the resummed ϵ -expansion gives $\nu = 0.5880 \pm 0.0010$ [4], Flory theory gives $\nu_F = 0.6$, and the most recent numerical simulations cannot distinguish between the two [5].

In this note we rederive the Flory exponent. We do this by considering oriented polymers interacting with a background directing field. Flory theory would predict the same value of ν for oriented or non-oriented polymers. For a family of directing fields, parameterized by ϵ , we can derive an exact result for ν in terms of ϵ . Unlike other self-consistent analyses, we find the self-consistent exponent by matching exponents, not correlation function prefactors [6]. We then choose ϵ so that the tangent-tangent correlation function of the polymer scales with the same exponent as the background field correlation, thus self-consistently choosing ν . We find the Flory value, namely $\nu = 1/z = 3/(d+2)$, where z is the dynamical exponent, as we discuss below. It is amusing that the Flory result comes from an ϵ -expansion which happens to be, in this case, exact. This may suggest why Flory theory is so good. Additionally, it suggests how one might study tethered surfaces, where Flory theory is not so good and ϵ -expansions are not so easy.

2. Formulation

We consider a d -dimensional system with a background tangent field u ,

$$Z_u[r;s] = N \int_{r(0)=0}^{r(s)=r} [dr] \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4D} \int_0^s ds^0 \left(\frac{dr(s^0)}{ds^0} \right)^2 \right] u(r(s^0); s^0); \quad (2.1)$$

where s labels the monomer along the polymer. Then the annealed partition function is

$$Z_{\text{an}}(r;s) = \int [du] Z_u(r;s) P[u]; \quad (2.2)$$

A factor of ℓ has been introduced to help to organize the perturbation expansion, and will, in the end, be set to unity. In addition, it is needed to make the units correct, i.e. $[\ell] = L S^{-1}$.

The vector field $u(x;s)$ is a function of both space and the monomer label s , as if each monomer interacts with a different vector field, even though they could be near each other in space. Note that in mean field theory $dr(s) = ds = \ell u(r(s);s)$. Consider the tangent correlations of two monomers at two nearby points in space, A and B. If the polymer takes a short route from A to B, then the tangent vectors along that length will be strongly correlated, since they must mostly lie along the line connecting the two points. On the other hand, if the polymer takes a long circuitous path while getting from A to B, the two tangent vectors will not be very correlated. Since $u(x;s)$ is the self-consistent tangent field, it must reflect this simple geometric argument. If u did not depend on s , the tangent-tangent correlations along the polymer would only depend on their distance in space, and would not respect the constraint relating the path to the tangent vectors.

We now view the functional integral over $r(s)$ as a quantum mechanical propagator in imaginary time. That is, Z_u will satisfy a Fokker-Planck equation with the initial condition $r(0) = 0$. In this case the Euclidean Lagrangian is just our Hamiltonian. The Euclidean Hamiltonian is the Legendre transform of the Lagrangian. However, as with the theory of a point particle in an electromagnetic field, there is an ordering ambiguity. The functional integral produces the symmetric Hamiltonian. Because, in statistical mechanics, the Hamiltonian comes from a transfer matrix, we must take the symmetric ordering of the momentum and the velocity field, as is done in electrodynamics of a quantum mechanical particle [7].

The Fokker-Planck (Euclidean Schrodinger) equation obtained is:

$$\frac{\partial Z_u(r;s)}{\partial s} = D r^2 Z_u(r;s) - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} [u(r;s) \nabla_u(r;s)] + u(r;s) \cdot r \nabla_u(r;s) g : \quad (2:3)$$

If we write $\psi(r;s) = (s) Z_u(r;s)$ and Fourier transform in space and time, we get:

$$(-i! + D k^2) \psi(k;!) = \psi_0(k) - \frac{1}{2} (i) \int \frac{d^d q}{(2)^d} u_i(k-q) (\mathbf{k}^i + \mathbf{q}^i) \psi(q;) \quad (2:4)$$

where $!$ is the Fourier variable conjugate to s , k is the Fourier variable conjugate to x and ψ_0 is the Fourier transform of the initial conditions. The boundary condition $r(0) = 0$ corresponds to $\psi_0 = 1$. Equation (2.4) can be solved recursively in powers of ℓ .

Now we must consider the random field u . If u is to describe the self-consistent background, then, if the polymers have no ends (by either being cyclic or spanning the system), $r_u = 0$. With this constraint, we take

$$hu_i(k;!)u_j(k^0;!^0)_i = \frac{ij}{A!^2 + Bk^2} \frac{k_i k_j = k^2}{(! + !^0)^d (k + k^0)} \quad (2.5)$$

We will self-consistently choose $!$ at the end of the calculation. We have chosen the $!^2$ dependence in the denominator for simplicity. If we had chosen a dependence other than quadratic we could always capture the same relative scaling of $!$ and k by an appropriate choice of β in (2.5).

We note an important simplification due to the constraint $r_u = 0$, [8] namely that there is no difference between taking u to be quenched or annealed. The quenched probability distribution for r is just:

$$P_{qu}(r;s) = \int [du] \mathbb{R} \frac{Z_u(r;s)}{d^d r Z_u(r;s)} P[u] \quad (2.6)$$

However, by integrating (2.3) over space, we find that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \int d^d r Z_u(r;s) = \int d^d r r \cdot \left[\mathbb{D} r \cdot \mathbb{Z}_u(r;s) - u(r) Z_u(r;s) \right] : \quad (2.7)$$

where we have used the fact that $r_u = 0$. By Gauss's law, the integral on the right hand side will vanish since $Z_u(r;s)$ will fall to 0 at infinity. Thus the normalization of Z_u is s -independent. Since $\int d^d r Z_u(r;0)$ is a constant, independent of u , so is $\int d^d r Z_u(r;s)$, and it factors out of the functional integrand in (2.6). But then we see that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{an}(r;s) &= \mathbb{R} \frac{\int [du] Z_u(r;s) P[u]}{\int d^d r \int [du] Z_u(r;s) P[u]} \\ &= \mathbb{R} \frac{\int [du] Z_u(r;s) P[u]}{\int d^d r Z_u(r;s) \int [du] P[u]} \\ &= P_{qu}(r;s) : \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Because of the directed nature of the propagator, it is possible to argue that $z = 2$ to all orders. Since this problem can be viewed as quenched disorder, u will not suffer any nontrivial rescalings, and so A and B will only rescale trivially. In addition, as we will argue in Appendix A, β does not get renormalized at any order of perturbation theory.

3. Perturbation Theory and the Renormalization Group

We analyze this model within the context of the dynamical renormalization group, along the lines of [9]. For a renormalization group with parameter λ , we rescale lengths according to $k^0 = e^\lambda k$ and $!^0 = e^{(\lambda)}!$, where (λ) is an arbitrary function of λ to be determined later. When integrating out high-momentum modes in a momentum shell $e^{-\lambda} < k < e^\lambda$, we integrate over all values of $!$. We can choose the field u to have dimension 0. We find differential recursion relations:

$$\frac{dD(\lambda)}{d\lambda} = D(\lambda) \left[2 + z + \frac{2}{2BD} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d} \right) A_d \right] \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\frac{d(\lambda)}{d\lambda} = (\lambda) \left[1 + z \right] \quad (3.1b)$$

$$\frac{dB(\lambda)}{d\lambda} = B(\lambda) \left[d - 2 + z \right] \quad (3.1c)$$

where $z(\lambda) = (\lambda)$ and $A_d = 2(4)^{d-2} = (d=2)$ is a geometrical factor. Putting these together, we can get a recursion relation for $g = \frac{2}{d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d} \right) A_d = 2BD$:

$$\frac{dg}{d\lambda} = g \left(-g \right) \quad (3.2)$$

where $= 2 - d$. Thus in $d = 2$ dimensions there is a stable fixed point at $g = 0$, whereas if $d < 2$ then there is a stable fixed point at $g = \frac{1}{d-2}$. In the details of the calculation, it is essential that < 2 . Succinctly put, this is because the pole in $!$ which is used to evaluate the self-energy correction ($! = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{(B - A)k^2}$) must dominate the dispersive part of the propagator ($D(k^2)$) at small k . We will check that this constraint holds when finding the self-consistent value of $!$.

4. Self-Consistent Value of

Choosing D to be fixed simplifies calculations (though $!$ does not change the results), so we choose $z(\lambda) = 2 - g(\lambda)$. As we show in Appendix A, at the nontrivial fixed point, $z = 2 - \frac{1}{d-2}$ exactly. Using this we find the following two scaling relations for the position and velocity correlations:

$$\langle [r(L) - r(0)]^2 \rangle = 2dD L^{2-z} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\langle \frac{dr(L)}{ds} \frac{dr(0)}{ds} \rangle = \frac{4dD(2-z)}{z^2} L^{(2-z)-2} \quad (4.2)$$

Now we would like to look at the tangent field correlations, corresponding to (4.1) and (4.2). We would like to evaluate

$$\langle u_i(r(s);s)u_i(0;0) \rangle = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{d!}{2} \frac{e^{ik \cdot r(s)} e^{-i!s} (d-1)}{A!^2 + Bk^2} \quad (4.3)$$

Since $\langle r(s) \rangle = 0$, we take $r(s) = 0$ in (4.3) and then check that the corrections are themselves consistent. We find

$$\langle u_i(r(s);s)u_i(0;0) \rangle = \frac{(d-1)A_d (1) A^{(d-2)/2}}{2B^{d/2}} L^{(d-2)/2} \quad (4.4)$$

Matching the scaling exponents, we have

$$\frac{d}{z} = \frac{2-2z}{z} = \frac{4-2d-2}{2-2+d} \quad (4.5)$$

Solving for z , we find $z = d/2$ or $z = (d+2)/3$. The former gives $z = 2$ ($d=2$) $d=0$, and hence $z = 2$. In this case (4.2) is incorrect, since the second derivative of (4.1) vanishes. Thus, we must choose $z = (d+2)/3$. We note that this solution satisfies both $z > 2$ and $z < d$ for $d > 4$, and so we can say that the critical dimension of this model is $d_c = 4$. Above this, z is negative, and we return to the simple random walk fixed point, $z = 2$. Finally, we compute $z = 2 - 2 + d = (d+2)/3$, in complete agreement with Flory theory. We point out that the matching of exponents breaks down when $d = 4$, for if (4.1) is described solely by an exponent, without logarithms, there is no matching to do (that is, the exponent in (4.2) would be 0). Thus, we do not expect, and in fact do not, reproduce the correct logarithmic corrections to scaling.

If we expand the complex exponent in the integrand of (4.3) in powers of $r(s)$ we would find an expansion of the form

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1)^j (k)^{2j} [r(s)]^{2j}}{(2j)!} \quad (4.6)$$

where we have suppressed the indices. This sum only contains even powers since the integration over k will eliminate odd powers of k by rotational invariance. Since $\langle r(s)^2 \rangle = s^{2j=z}$ and each power of k^2 will produce a factor of s^{-2} , we find that the higher order corrections scale the same way as the leading term if $z = 2$, which, in fact, it does. Thus the approximation is truly self-consistent.

5. Conclusions

One might imagine adding to this model in a number of ways. One possibility is to add an explicit self-avoiding term to (2.1). This would only cause the same complications present in Flory theory. Another possibility would be to add a small divergence to the field u , corresponding to polymer heads and tails [10]. We would then have

$$hu_i(k; \epsilon)u_j(k^0; \epsilon^0) = \frac{\epsilon_j k_i k_j = k^2}{A \epsilon^2 + B k^2} (\epsilon + \epsilon^0)^{-d} (k + k^0) \quad (5.1)$$

where ϵ is close to, but not equal to 1. In this case we find that new graphs arise which spoil the exact argument in Appendix A. Moreover, some of these new graphs will diverge logarithmically when $\epsilon = \epsilon_F = (d+2)/3$. One might add a small correction to ϵ_F and do a ϵ expansion around $\epsilon = 0$. Unfortunately, now, there is a new fixed point, and the self-consistent correction ϵ is not small.

It would have been more natural to consider a walk in a random potential and then self-consistently choose the two-point correlation of the potential to match the density-density correlation. It is, unfortunately, notoriously difficult to study polymers in a random potential in an arbitrary dimension [11]. Here we have exploited the solubility of a random-walker in a random velocity field.

It is perhaps a curiosity that self-avoidance was not involved in this calculation. In fact, by mapping the system to quantum mechanics, we have actually mapped the system to a directed walk in an external vector field, ignoring the energy cost of self-intersections entirely. The self-consistent vector field is a strange object, as it depends not only on the polymer position $r(s)$, but also the point along the polymer s . This is necessary from a geometric point of view, and suppresses tangent vector correlations between two monomers far apart along the polymer sequence. In (2.2) we can imagine integrating out the velocity field u . The details of this are in Appendix B, and the resulting free energy looks similar to that for a self-avoiding walk, with an energy cost for self-intersections. Reproducing the Flory exponent then, suggests that the Flory theory may be more robust, and that the model studied here is in the same universality class. The quality of the Flory prediction may lie in the fact that the self-consistent analysis here incorporated an exact result, within the epsilon expansion.

6. Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to acknowledge stimulating discussions with L. Balents, M. E. Fisher, M. Goulian, P. Le Doussal, T. Lubensky and D. Nelson as well as a critical review by P. Fendley. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation, through Grant No. PHY 92-45317, and through the Ambrose Monell Foundation.

Appendix A. Exact Value of z

In the above discussion we used the result that $z = 2$ at the fixed point, to all orders in ϵ [12]. This result is similar to that in [9] where Galilean invariance assured that the scaling field of the interaction would only rescale by its naive dimension. Our argument will be perturbative. The first requirement is that u only rescales by its naive dimension. Since the quenched and annealed problems are the same, we can regard u as a quenched random field. While it is typical to absorb the coupling into u , we will not do so here, and hence it will not be non-trivially renormalized. We also note that (2.3) is linear in so any nontrivial rescaling of u will not affect it.

We consider a general graph with an incoming line, carrying momentum p , and outgoing line, carrying momentum p^0 , and an outgoing u line, carrying momentum $p - p^0$. The incoming line must first meet a vertex with u . At this vertex, let u carry away momentum k_1 . The contribution to the graph from this vertex is then proportional to:

$$p - (k_1)^2 - k_1 k_1 = p - (k_1)^2 - k_1 k_1 \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

Thus the graph will be explicitly proportional to p . Similarly, the outgoing line will emerge from such a vertex. If the u line carries momentum k_2 , then it will contribute a term proportional to:

$$(p^0 - k_2) - (k_2)^2 - k_2 k_2 = (p^0) - (k_2)^2 - k_2 k_2 \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

due to the transverse nature of the u propagator. Thus the graph will generate a term with at least two powers of the external momentum. This will not then renormalize since it is the coefficient of a term with only one power of momentum. Indeed, this graph will generate terms, which by power counting, are irrelevant operators. Hence, the recursion relation for χ will simply be

$$\frac{d \chi}{d \epsilon} = - (1 + z) \chi \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

to all orders.

Now,

$$\frac{dB(\gamma)}{d\gamma} = B(d-2+z) \quad (A.4)$$

and if D has the recursion relation:

$$\frac{dD(\gamma)}{d\gamma} = D(d-2+z+f(g)) \quad (A.5)$$

where $f(g)$ represents the perturbation expansion renormalizing D , then g must have the recursion relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dg(\gamma)}{d\gamma} &= g[2f-1+zg-f(d-2+zf-2+z+f(g)g)] \\ &= g[2-d-f(g)] \\ &= g[-f(g)] \end{aligned} \quad (A.6)$$

since the dimension of g $= B-D$ will include a contribution from B and D . Thus, if there is a fixed point, then $f(g) = 0$ to all orders in g . Hence, we see that at the fixed point $z = 2$ to all orders.

Appendix B. Effective Self-Avoidance Interaction

Starting with (2.2), the coupling of the polymer to the random field can be written

$$F_{\text{int}} = \frac{Z}{2D} \int d^d x ds \int^d (r(s) - x) u(x; s) \frac{dr(s)}{ds} \quad (B.1)$$

Upon integrating out u , we end to order ϵ^2 (note that this will not include the $O(\epsilon^2)$ term in (2.1))

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{int}} &= \frac{Z}{2} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} ds ds^0 \\ &\quad \frac{e^{i \int_0^s (B-A)k_j \dot{r}_j(s^0) ds^0}}{16D \sqrt{AB} k^2 + 2} k^2_{ij} k_i k_j e^{ik \cdot [r(s) - r(s^0)]} \frac{dr_i(s)}{ds} \frac{dr_j(s^0)}{ds^0} \end{aligned} \quad (B.2)$$

Because of phase oscillations, the integral over k is small if $r(s) - r(s^0)$ is large. If $r(s) - r(s^0) = 0$ we can replace k^2_{ij} by $k_i k_j$ in the k integration, through rotational invariance.

Making this substitution then is a good approximation, and the corrections are suppressed due to the oscillations. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\text{int}} &= \frac{2(d-1)}{16D} \frac{1}{A^B} \int^Z \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} ds ds^0 e^{i \frac{p}{(B=A)k} \cdot \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{s}^0} \frac{d}{ds} \frac{d}{ds^0} e^{ik \cdot [\mathbf{r}(s) - \mathbf{r}(s^0)]} \\
&= \frac{2(d-1)}{16D} \frac{1}{A^B} \int^Z \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} ds ds^0 e^{ik \cdot [\mathbf{r}(s) - \mathbf{r}(s^0)]} \frac{d}{ds} \frac{d}{ds^0} e^{i \frac{p}{(B=A)k} \cdot \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{s}^0} \\
&= \frac{2(d-1)}{16D} \frac{1}{A^3} \int^Z \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} ds ds^0 k^2 e^{ik \cdot [\mathbf{r}(s) - \mathbf{r}(s^0)]} e^{i \frac{p}{(B=A)k} \cdot \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{s}^0} \\
&\quad + \text{constant}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

Within the self-consistent approximation we found $\beta = (d+2)=3$, so $\beta^2 = d^2 = 9$.

We now expand in powers of $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{s}^0$, since by self-avoidance large values of $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{s}^0$ will typically be accompanied by large values of $\mathbf{r}(s) - \mathbf{r}(s^0)$ which will suppress the integral. In addition we can expand in powers of β assuming that away from the critical dimension $d = 4$ we only have a slightly modified potential, corresponding to a renormalized interaction. The first term in a double expansion in powers of β and $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{s}^0$ is

$$F_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2} \int^Z ds ds^0 \beta^2 (\mathbf{r}(s) - \mathbf{r}(s^0))^2; \tag{B.4}$$

looking very similar indeed to a self-avoidance term. We can also see that the repulsion is proportional to β^2 , which itself is proportional to the expansion parameter of the model discussed in this paper.

References

- [1] P. Flory, Principles of Polymer Chemistry, Chap. XII, (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1971).
- [2] For another way of interpreting the Flory exponent, see J. P. Bouchaud and A. Georges, Physics Reports 195 (1990) 127, and references therein.
- [3] B. Nienhuis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49 (1982) 1062.
- [4] P. G. de Gennes, Phys. Lett. A 44 (1973) 271; J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39 (1977) 95.
- [5] G. Grest, private communication.
- [6] J. P. Bouchaud and M. E. Cates, Phys. Rev. E 47 (1993) 1455; J. Doherty, M. A. Moore and A. Bray (unpublished).
- [7] R. P. Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. 20 (1948) 367.
- [8] We would like to thank P. Le Doussal for pointing this out. See also P. Le Doussal and R. D. Kamien, in preparation (1993).
- [9] D. Forster, D. R. Nelson, and M. J. Stephen, Phys. Rev. A 16 (1977) 732.
- [10] R. D. Kamien, P. Le Doussal and D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. A 45 (1992) 8727.
- [11] M. Kardar and Y. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58 (1987) 2087.
- [12] After submission of this manuscript, J. Bouchaud informed us of a similar result in J. Honkonen and E. Karjalainen, Phys. Lett. A 129 (1988) 333.