Transfer-M atrix M onte C arlo E stim ates of C ritical Points in the Sim ple C ubic Ising, P lanar and H eisenberg M odels

M.P.Nightingale,

Departm ent of Physics, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881

HW J.Blote,

Faculty of Applied Physics, Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 5046, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands

The principle and the e ciency of the M onte C arb transferm atrix algorithm are discussed. Enhancements of this algorithm are illustrated by applications to several phase transitions in lattice spin m odels. We demonstrate how the statistical noise can be reduced considerably by a similarity transformation of the transferm atrix using a variational estimate of its leading eigenvector, in analogy with a common practice in various quantum M onte C arb techniques. Here we take the two-dimensional coupled X Y -Ising m odel as an example. Furthermore, we calculate interface free energies of nite three-dimensional O (n) m odels, for the three cases n = 1, 2 and 3. Application of nite-size scaling to the numerical results yields estimates of the critical points of these three m odels. The statistical precision of the estimates is satisfactory for the m odest amount of computer time spent.

I. IN TRODUCTION

M any important problems in computational physics and chem istry can be reduced to the computation of dom inant eigenvalues of matrices of high or in nite order. Among the numerous examples of such matrices are quantum mechanical H am iltonians and transferm atrices. The latter were introduced in statistical mechanics by K ramers and W annier in 1941 to study the two-dimensional Ising model¹, and ever since, important work on lattice models in classical statistical mechanic has been done with transferm atrices, producing both exact and numerical results.

The analogy of the time-evolution operator in quantum mechanics and the transferm atrix in statistical mechanics allows the two elds to share numerous techniques. Speci cally, a transferm atrix T of a statistical mechanical lattice system in d dimensions offen can be interpreted as the evolution operator in discrete, imaginary time t of a quantum mechanical analog, as is well known. That is, T exp(tH); where H is the ham iltonian of a system in d 1 dimensions, the quantum mechanical analog of the statistical mechanical system. From this point of view, the computation of the partition function and of the ground-state energy are essentially the same problem s: nding the largest eigenvalue of T and of exp(tH), respectively.

The transferm atrix M onte C arb m ethod used in this paper employs an algorithm as simple as the di usion M onte C arb algorithm, which was developed to compute the dom inant eigenvalue of the evolution operator exp(tH). In contrast to di usion M onte C arb, transferm atrix M onte C arb provides exact eigenvalues, subject only to statistical noise and as quali ed below in Section II. M ore speci cally, unlike transferm atrix M onte C arb, di usion M onte C arb su ers from a system atic error, the time-step error, because of the necessity to employ an approximate, short-time evolution operator. Sim ilar errors are also found in path-integralM onte C arb and, in general, in all approaches based on the Trotter form ula². An alternative, related approach, viz. G reen function M onte C arb, used to compute the dom inant eigenvalue of (H E)¹, where E is close to the ground state energy, does not su er from a time-step error, and, from that point of view, G reen function M onte C arb is m ore elegant than di usion M onte C arb. H ow ever, the G reen function M onte C arb algorithm is considerably m ore complicated, and enhancem ent of that algorithm by the variance reduction techniques discussed below, has its limitations.

From an orthodox com plexity theory point of view, exact num erical transferm atrix com putations for lattices in more than one dimension are intractable, since the order of transferm atrices grows exponentially with the num ber of lattice sites in a transfer slice. Standard M onte C arlo methods in statistical mechanics, on the other hand, statistically sample the Boltzm ann distribution, typically employing some variant of the M etropolis algorithm. One can argue that M onte C arlo methods are of polynomial complexity in the system size, at least for certain important physical observables. This raises the question of the ultim ate utility of the transferm atrix for computational purposes.

In many cases, one is interested in the behavior of systems in the thermodynamic limit. For critical systems in particular, one has to rely on nite-size scaling and extrapolation methods to extract the relevant information from the computations. The transferm atrix method has advantages in both respects. Firstly, one can compute the

spectrum of the transferm atrix m ethod virtually to m achine precision, which perm its extrapolation w ithout serious loss of num erical accuracy. Secondly, a large body of num erical evidence suggests that the transferm atrix spectrum has weaker corrections-to-scaling than quantities commonly computed by standard M onte C arb. C learly, also the transferm atrix M onte C arb m ethod takes advantage of the weakness of the corrections-to-scaling. Unfortunately, statistical noise is introduced, but this can be substantially reduced by the use of optim ized trial eigenvectors, by virtue of which the M onte C arb process is in e ect only used to compute corrections to an already sophisticated approximation.

If one could neglect the correlations introduced by the re-weighting step of the transfer-m atrix M onte C arlo algorithm [see the split/join steps (2a) and (2b) in the algorithm given in Section II] and if one could ignore the resulting loss of e ciency of the transfer-m atrix M onte C arlo algorithm, this m ethod would be a solution to the exponential growth problem m entioned above³. In addition, transfer-m atrix M onte C arlo would be completely free of critical slowing down, since the correlation time of the algorithm is equal to the correlation length of the slices used in the de nition of the transfer m atrix. A gain, the use of optim ized trial eigenvectors can serve to reduce the detrim ental e ect of the multiplicative re-weighting.

A nother feature of the M onte C arb transfer m atrix, which can contribute to a reduction of the correlation time of the stochastic process, is that m oves are e ectively m ade at surface sites. This m akes it m uch easier to overcom e the barriers som e system s present to standard M onte C arb algorithm s. An example of such a system is the X Y -Ising m odel discussed in R ef. 4.

The layout of this paper is as follows. In Section II we review the basic M onte C and algorithm to determ ine transferm atrix eigenvalues by means of a statistical in plementation of the power method. A part from relatively m inor details, the algorithm given in Section II is the same as the one discussed in Refs. 5, 6, 7. Section III describes the sim ilarity transformation of the transferm atrix, which leads to a pronounced decrease of the statistical errors of the M onte C and process. Section III in particular describes in detail the construction of a variational approximation of the eigenstate associated with the largest eigenvalue. This approximate eigenstate yields the similarity transformation used to reduce the statistical errors of the algorithm. D etails of the speed-up of the algorithm are presented at the end of Section III a coupled X Y -Ising model in two dimensions. Finally, Section IV contains applications of the transfermatrix M onte C arb method to three-dimensional O (n) models for n = 1, 2 and 3. Preliminary discussions of the the work discussed in Sections III and IV were published elsewhere^{6;4}.

II. M ONTE CARLO IM PLEMENTATION OF THE POWER METHOD

Consider an operator T of which we want to compute the dom inant eigenvalue. Let T be represented by matrix elements hR JT $Ji = T_{RS}$, where Ri and Ji are basis states of the physical system under consideration. These states will be treated here as discrete. For M onte C arb calculations, the distinction between continuous and discrete states is a m inor technicality; in the discussion below, generalization to the continuous case follows im mediately by replacing the appropriate sum s by integrals and replacing K ronecker by D irac -functions.

Perhaps the simplest way to calculate the dom inant eigenvalue of a matrix or integral kernel is the power method. That is, choose an arbitrary initial state $ju^{(0)}i$ and compute iteratively:

$$ju^{(t+1)}i = \frac{1}{c_{t+1}}T ju^{(t)}i;$$
(1)

where c_{t+1} is a constant chosen so that $j_{1}^{(t+1)}i$ is norm alized or in some other convenient standard form. For t ! 1, the constants c_t approximate the dominant eigenvalue $_0$ of T and the vectors $j_{1}^{(t)}i$ converge to the corresponding eigenvector.

To implement Eq. (1) by M onte C arb, $ju^{(t)}i$ is represented by a sequence of N_t walkers. Each of these walkers is a pair (R ;w); = 1;:::;N_t. The variable R of a walker represents a possible con guration of the system described by T, and w represents its statistical weight. The latter quantity is subject to the condition $w_1 < w < w_u$, where w_1 and w_u are bounds introduced so as to keep all weights w of the same order of m agnitude, which improves the e ciency of the algorithm. This sequence of walkers represents a (sparse) vector with components

$$\underline{u}_{R}^{(t)} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{N_{t}} \\ W_{R} ; R \end{bmatrix};$$
(2)

where is the usual K ronecker -function. The underscore is used to indicate that the $\underline{u}_{R}^{(t)}$ represent a stochastic vector $\underline{i}_{L}^{(t)}$ i. A stochastic process will be de ned presently with transition probabilities such that $c_{t+1} \underline{i}_{L}^{(t+1)}$ i has a

conditional expectation value equal to T $\underline{j}_{2}^{(t)}$ i for any given sequence of walkers representing $\underline{j}_{2}^{(t)}$ i. In practice, one has to average over the stationary state of a stochastic process in which the constants c_{t} are determined on the y, so that c_{t+1} and $\underline{j}_{2}^{(t+1)}$ i are correlated. As a consequence, there is no guarantee that the stationary state expectation value of $\underline{j}_{2}^{(t)}$ i is precisely an eigenstate of T, at least not for nite N_t. The same mathematical problem occurs if one takes the time-average of Eq. (1) in the presence of noise correlated to the c_{t} . The resulting bias^{8;9} has also been discussed in the context of di usion M onte C arb⁷.

To de ne the stochastic process, Eq. (1) is rewritten as

$$u_{R}^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{c_{t+1}} \sum_{S}^{X} P_{RS} D_{S} u^{(t)} S;$$
(3)

where

$$D_{S} = \sum_{R}^{X} T_{RS} \text{ and } P_{RS} = T_{RS} = D_{S}:$$
 (4)

Eq. (3) describes a process represented by a M onte C arb run which, in addition to a few initial equilibration sweeps, consists of a time series of a little over M₀ sweeps over all walkers at times labeled by $t = :::;0;1;:::;M_0$. The sweep at time t consists of two steps designed to perform stochastically the matrix multiplications in Eq. (3). Following N ightingale and B lote⁹, the process is de ned by the following steps, which transform the generation of walkers at time t into the the generation at time t+ 1. Variables pertaining to times t and t+ 1 will be denoted respectively by unprimed and primed symbols.

- 1. Update the old walker (S ;w) to yield a temporary walker (S⁰;w⁰) according to the transition probability P_{S^0S} , where $w^0 = D_S w = c^0$, for $= 1; :::; N_t$. The next step can change the num ber of walkers. To maintain their num ber close to a target num ber, say N_0 , choose $c^0 = {}^{\circ}_0 (N_t = N_0)^{1=s}$, where ${}^{\circ}_0$ is a running estimate of the eigenvalue $_0$ to be calculated, where s 1 (see below).
- 2. From the tem porary walkers construct the new generation of walkers as follows:
 - (a) Split each walker $(S^{0}; w^{0})$ for which $w^{0} > b_{u}$ into two walkers $(S^{0}; \frac{1}{2}w^{0})$. The choice $b_{u} = 2$ is a reasonable one.
 - (b) Join pairs $(\mathbb{R}^0; \mathbb{w}^0)$ and $(\mathbb{R}^0; \mathbb{w}^0)$ with $\mathbb{w}^0 < b_1$ and $\mathbb{w}^0 < b_1$ to produce a single walker $(\mathbb{R}^0; \mathbb{w}^0 + \mathbb{w}^0)$, where $\mathbb{R}^0 = \mathbb{R}^0$ or $\mathbb{R}^0 = \mathbb{S}^0$ with relative probabilities \mathbb{w}^0 and \mathbb{w}^0 . We chose $b_1 = 1=2$.
 - (c) A ny tem porary walker left single in step (2b), or for which $b_1 < w^0 < b_1$, becomes a permanent member of the new generation of walkers.

The algorithm described above was constructed so that for any given realization of $\underline{j} u^{(t)}$ i, the expectation value of $c_{t+1} \underline{j} u^{(t+1)}$ i, in accordance with Eq. (1), satisfies

$$E c_{t+1} \underline{\mu}^{(t+1)} i = T \underline{\mu}^{(t)} i;$$
 (5)

where E () denotes the conditional average over the transitions dened by the above stochastic process. More generally by p-fold iteration one nds^5 :

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{Y}^{p}} & \# & ! \\ \mathbf{E} & \mathbf{C}_{t+b} & \underline{\mathbf{u}}^{(t+p)}\mathbf{i} & = \mathbf{T}^{p}\underline{\mathbf{u}}^{(t)}\mathbf{i} \mathbf{j} \\ & & & & \\ \mathbf{b}=1 \end{array}$$
 (6)

The stationary state average of $j_{t}^{(t)}$ is close to the dom inant eigenvector of T, but, as m entioned above, it has a system atic bias when the num ber N_t of walkers is nite. For increasing p, components of non-dom inant eigenvectors can be projected out and thus the bias is reduced, in principle. Unfortunately, the variance of the corresponding estimators increases as their bias decreases. The reader is referred to R efs. 8, 5, 6, 3 for a more detailed discussions of this problem. Su ce it to mention here, rstly, that s is the expected number of time steps it takes to restore the number of walkers to its target value N₀ and, secondly, that strong population control (s = 1) tends to introduce a stronger bias than weaker control (s > 1)¹⁰.

W ith Eq. (6) one constructs an estim $ator^5$ of the dom inant eigenvector $ju^{(1)}i$ of the matrix T:

$$j\hat{\mu}^{(p)}i = \frac{1}{M_0} \frac{\overset{X}{K} \circ \overset{R}{Y}^{1}}{\underset{t=1}{\overset{t=0}{\longrightarrow}} c_{t,b}} \frac{\underline{\mu}^{(t)}}{\underline{\mu}^{(t)}}i;$$
(7)

M ore practically, suppose that h_T j is an approximate leading eigenbra h_T j of T, and that 0 is an arbitrary operator. The mixed expectation value of 0 can be approximated as

$$\frac{h_{T} \mathfrak{y} \mathfrak{y}^{(1)} \mathfrak{i}}{h_{T} \mathfrak{y}^{(1)} \mathfrak{i}} \quad \frac{h_{T} \mathfrak{y} \mathfrak{y}^{(p)} \mathfrak{i}}{h_{T} \mathfrak{y}^{(p)} \mathfrak{i}} : \tag{8}$$

An important special case is obtained by choosing in this expression 0 = T and $h_T R i = 1$ for all R. The latter corresponds to the in nite-tem perature approximation for the trial state and in that case, Eq. (8) reduces to an estimator for the dom inant eigenvalue of T:

$$0 \qquad \frac{P_{M_{0}}}{P_{M_{0}}} \left(\begin{array}{c} p \\ p \\ b=0 \end{array} \right) W^{(t)}}{P_{M_{0}}} \left(\begin{array}{c} p \\ p \\ p \\ t=1 \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} p \\ b=0 \end{array} \right) C_{t,b}} W^{(t,1)} \right) ; \qquad (9)$$

where

$$W_{t} = h_{T} \underline{\mu}^{(t)} \underline{i} = \int_{-1}^{X^{t}} w^{(t)}$$
 (10)

For the above special choice of the trial bra h $_{\rm T}$ j Eq. (8) becomes the expression for the surface expectation value of 0 in the geometry shown on the right in Fig. 1. A lthough we have used the transferm atrix algorithm only for the computation of the dom inant eigenvalue of the transferm atrix for the applications discussed in this paper, it should be mentioned for completeness that one can also compute bulk expectation values, at least asymptotically, as follows.

O ne can represent the K ram ers-W annier transferm atrix by the graph shown in Fig.2.a. This matrix transfers from an old slice to a new one, with slices represented respectively by small full and large open circles. The process adds only one new site: the open circle labeled 1. O ne site, the small closed circle labeled L, is about to disappear into the bulk. C oincidences of both types of circles represent K ronecker- functions in the transferm atrix [see Eq. (13)]. The solid lines stand for interactions added in one transfer operation. O ne can de ne a transferm atrix with extended slices consisting of m of the original, m inim al slices. The dom inant eigenvector of this extended transferm atrix is sim ply the original eigenvector multiplied by the Boltzm ann weight associated with the portion of the lattice containing variables that have not yet been summed over. Eq. (8), used with any operator in which occur only variables of slice m, becomes a bulk expectation value form ! 1. The implementation of this concept is called forward walking in the context of quantum M onte C arb^{11,12}, and this only requires extending the walkers so that their states correspond to the extended slices introduced above. This increases the mem ory requirements and the cost of splitting a walker, but otherw ise the e ciency of the algorithm is not a ected.

III. VARIANCE REDUCTION (IM PORTANCE SAM PLING) AND TRIAL VECTORS

In principle, if h_T j equals an exact eigenbra of the operator 0 in equation Eq. (8), the right-hand side of the expression is a zero-variance estimator. In general, no exact eigenvectors are known, but even an approximation may yield a substantial reduction of statistical noise. A more e cient well-known¹³ way to exploit an approximate left eigenbra h_T j to reduce variance works by application of the method described above to a similarity transform of the original operator T. This transform ation is de ned by:

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \mathbf{I}\mathbf{T} \mathbf{I}^{1}; \tag{11}$$

where I is diagonal in the con guration presentation, and is de ned as

$$I = \mathop{\operatorname{R}}_{B} \operatorname{ih}_{T} \mathop{\operatorname{R}}_{T} \operatorname{ih} \mathop{\operatorname{R}}_{T} \operatorname{j} \operatorname{ih} \operatorname{R}_{T} \operatorname{ih} \operatorname{R}_{T} \operatorname{j} \operatorname{ih} \operatorname{R}_{T} \operatorname{j} \operatorname{ih} \operatorname{R}_{T} \operatorname{j} \operatorname{ih} \operatorname{R}_{T} \operatorname{i$$

Ideally, h_T jwould equal the exact dom inant eigenbra of T. In that case, the stochastic process de ned as above, but with T replaced by T, would become optimally e cient and in fact would lack critical slowing down. For such an ideal process D, de ned as in Eq. (4) as a function of T, would be a constant times the unit matrix. The walker weights would no longer uctuate so that birth and death process would no longer occur. The walkers would evolve into a statistically independent ensemble. The estimator given in Eq. (8), appropriately transformed, would have zero variance. The transform ed bra $h_T^- j = h_T j I^-$ would have all elements equal to unity in the con guration

representation. In other words, T would be represented by a stochastic matrix, which would eliminate re-weighting of walkers and the concomitant split/join step in the algorithm.

In the absence of exact eigenbras, approximations may be obtained by variational methods. The variational expression for the leading eigenbra h_T j can conveniently be cast in the form of an elective surface H am illonian with pair interactions between nearest neighbors, next-nearest neighbors, and so on. These interactions are treated as variational parameters and can be determined from an analysis of the walker population¹⁴.

Since generalization to higher dimensions and models with dimensions of a consider the Kramers-W annier transfer matrix for the two-dimensional Ising model to explain the construction of trial vectors used in the applications discussed in Section IV.

For a simple quadratic lattice of M sites, wrapped on a cylinder with a circum ference of L spins and helical boundary conditions, the transferm atrix for the Ising m odel is

$$T_{S;R} = e^{K (s_1 r_1 + s_1 r_L)} \sum_{\substack{s_1; r_{1+1} \\ i=1}}^{\frac{1}{2}} (13)$$

with $S = (s_1; s_2; \ldots; s_L)$ and $R = (r_1; r_2; \ldots; r_L)$, where the $s_i = 1$ and $r_i = 1$. The conditional partition function of the lattice of M sites, subject to the restriction that the spins on the left-hand edge are in state R, as illustrated in Figure 1, is denoted Z_M (R). One has

$$Z_{M+1}(S) = \prod_{R}^{X} T_{S,R} Z_{M}(R):$$
(14)

O bviously, for M ! 1 the restricted sum s Z_M (R) are proportional to the components $u_R^{(1)}$ of the dominant right eigenvector of the transfer matrix. The eigenvector is represented by the graph on the right in Figure 1. Full circles indicate spins that have been sum med over, while the xed surface spins are represented by the open circles; each bond represents a factor exp (K s_is_j). The left eigenvector, which is the one that has to be approximated by an optimized trial vector, is represented by the graph on the left. In passing, we mention the following relation between left and right eigenvectors, which follows by inspection of the graphs:

$$hu^{(1)} \mathfrak{F} \mathfrak{i} = \mathop{e^{K}}_{i=1}^{i_{Y} 1} hU(S) \mathfrak{j}^{(1)} \mathfrak{i}; \qquad (15)$$

where U is the relection operator: U (S) = $(s_L; s_{L-1}; ...; s_1)$.

A similarity transformation of the transfer matrix T can be introduced by dividing up the interaction energies between the columns dimension. That is, h is introduced by writing

$$T_{S,R} = e^{h(S;R)}$$
: (16)

A transform ation h ! h is de ned by

$$f(S;R) = g(S) + h(S;R) g(R);$$
(17)

 $T_{S,R} = {}^{\prime}_{T} (S) T_{S,R} = {}^{\prime}_{T} (R);$ (18)

$$\hat{T}(S) = e^{g(S)}$$
: (19)

For purposes of variance reduction, versatile trial vectors that capture som e of the essential physics without seriously slowing down computations, can be chosen of the following form

$$\hat{T}_{T}(S) = e^{i_{j} K_{ij} s_{i} s_{j}}; \qquad (20)$$

a form rem iniscent of the Jastrow functions used for quantum many-body systems. The asterisk in the sum over pairs indicates that the K_{ij} are truncated for distances greater than a couple of lattice spacings.

The couplings K_{ij} in Eq. (20) are variational parameters. They can be determined e ciently with the M onte C arlo scheme introduced by Um rigar, W ilson and W ilkins¹⁴, i.e., by minimization of the variance of D[°] (S), where the variance is approximated by a weighted sum over the states of the walkers of one generation, during the initial stage of the M onte C arlo run. This procedure is e cient and stable as long as the K_{ij} are truncated with care, in which case it is perfectly feasible to use as many as 50 to 100 di erent parameters.



 $F\ \mbox{IG}\ .\ 1.$ Illustration of left and right eigenvectors of the transfer $\mbox{m}\ \mbox{atrix}\ .$



FIG.2. Illustration of the calculation of correlation functions involving spins in the bulk below the surface layer. Site labels before the addition of the new spin (open circle) appear to the right, and the new labels to the left of a lattice point.

The magnitude of the K_{ij} is expected to increase with the strength of the correlations between surface spins. Since all correlations between surface spins for the left eigenvector have to be propagated through the lattice on the left, as illustrated in Figure 1, one expects that for high tem peratures, i.e., sm all K,

$$K_{ij} / K^{d_{ij}};$$
 (21)

where d_{ij} is the length of the shortest path along edges connected by bonds between sites i and j. By inspection of the graph in Figure 1, we therefore expect the following partial ordering in decreasing strength of interaction and increasing d_{ij}

It is important to note that if K_{ij} = K_{i+1;j+1} the corresponding factors cancel in the transform ed transferm atrix T for 2 i L 2, since $s_i = t_{i+1}$ for non-vanishing transferm atrix elements. For reasons of e ciency it is therefore advantageous to have this equality satis ed as often as possible. Unfortunately, helical boundary conditions introduce a step which destroys translation symmetry on the surface and renders the partial ordering in Eq. (22) insu cient. For example, sites 1 and 2 are more strongly correlated than 2 and 3, and correlations keep decreasing through pair (L 1;L). Consequently, K₁₂ > K₂₃ > :::> K_{L 1;L}.

In practice, the di erences between the K_{ij} with $d_{ij} = 3$ are frequently greater than the higher-order K_{ij}. Then, it is necessary to treat K₁₂ and K₂₃ as di erent parameters of the trial vector. An elicient compromise is to treat K_{ij} in which site 1 or L participate as di erent. The same applies to all K_{ij} for which the shortest path between i and j straddles the step on the surface. To summarize, we distinguish di erent types of pairs of sites (i; j) both on the basis of the distance d_{ij} and to some extent on the location of the pair, enforcing as much translation invariance as possible.

C learly, none of the above depends only on lattice geom etry or the Ising nature of the variables. In general, only a m ethod is required to generate lists of lattice sites separated by various distances d_{ij} . These can be constructed with simple graph theoretic tools such as incidence m atrices, which m akes it possible to dealw ith di erent dimensions and lattice types in an identical fashion once the pertinent incidence m atrix has been de ned.

To illustrate the e-ciency and exibility of this technique for constructing trial vectors, we use the X Y-Ising model. It consists of coupled Ising and planar rotator degrees of freedom on a simple quadratic lattice. On each lattice site there are two variables: $s_i = 1$ and n_i , a two-component unit vector. The reduced H am iltonian | divided by $k_B T |$ is given by

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} X \\ A \\ n_i \\ g + B \\ n_i \\ g + S_i \\ s_j + C \\ s_i \\ s_j \end{pmatrix};$$
(23)

We consider the special case A = B and only from the point of view of the performance of transfer-matrix M onte C arb algorithm. For a discussion of the physics of this model the reader is referred to R ef. 4. The trial vectors discussed above for the Ising model have an immediate generalization:

$${}_{T} = \exp \left[{\overset{0}{\overset{X}{\underset{i;j}{}}} {}_{X} {}_{i;j} n_{i} {}_{B} + {}_{B} {}_{i;j} n_{i} {}_{B} s_{i} s_{j} + {}_{C} {}_{i;j} s_{i} s_{j} \right]^{A} :$$
 (24)

The truncation scheme introduced above for the Ising model is purely geometrical, and therefore carries over without changes to the X Y -Ising model. It should, however, be noted that there are models and choices of transfer matrices to which the above scheme is not applicable. Ref. 15 contains a discussion and an example of such a case.

Table I shows the estimates of the dominant eigenvalue of X Y-Ising model for trial vector truncated at di erent values of d_{ij} : A s can be seen by comparing the rst and last lines of the table, the variance in the estimate of the eigenvalue is reduced by a factor 300 for a xed number of M onte C arlo steps. Taking into account that the computer time per step doubles, this constitutes a speed-up by a factor of 150.

TABLE I. Estimated eigenvalue and standard deviations for the XY-Ising model. These data apply to the point (A = 1.005;C = 0.2285) [cf. Eq. (23)] on the line where Ising and XY transitions coincide. Results are shown for various values of d_m, the path length of the cuto in Eq. (24). The results are for a strip of width L = 20 and were obtained with a target number of walkers N₀ = 10;000 and M₀ = 1;250L generations of which an initial 10% were discarded. The last column shows the computer time in arbitrary units needed per time step of one walker.

0		dm	s
34.17406	0.0071	0	15
34,20875	0.0052	2	15
34,21658	0.0015	3	17
34,21418	0.00083	4	19
34,21384	0.00052	5	21
34,21366	0.00049	6	23
34 21379	0.00041	7	26

IV . A P P L IC A T IO N S

As an illustration of the transferm atrix technique we apply the method to three-dimensional 0 (n) models for n = 1, 2 and 3, i.e. the Ising, planar and Heisenberg model. In particular the signi cance of the results for of the planar and Heisenberg models goes beyond mere illustrations. These results are su ciently accurate to be of some relevance for the location of the critical points.

The O (n) spins are located on the simple cubic lattice. The transferm atrix for an L L 1 system, with helical boundary conditions and layers of $N = L^2$ sites each, is a straightforward generalization of Eq. (13) and reads:

$$T_{S;R} = \sum_{\substack{s_1;r_{1+1} \\ i=1}}^{N_{T_1}} \exp [K s_1 (r + r_L + r_N)];$$
(25)

where the s_i and r_i are n-component unit vectors, $S := (s_1; s_2; \ldots; s_N)$ and $R := (r_1; r_2; \ldots; r_N)$.

As discussed above, transferm atrix M onte C and is designed to compute the dom inant eigenvalue $_0$ of the transferm atrix. The reduced free energy per site is $f = \ln_0$. From the free energy one can calculate the surface tension as the dimensions are chosen so as to force an interface in the antiferrom agnetic system. For L L 1 system s with helical boundary conditions, to which the present calculations are restricted, this means that L has to be even.

Renorm alization group theory predicts that the values of , the reduced interface free energy per lattice site, as a function of coupling K and system sizes L collapse onto a single curve, at least close to the critical point K $_{\rm c}$ and for su ciently big system s. In terms of the non-linear therm all scaling eld

$$u(K) = K K_c + a(K K_c)^2 + :::;$$
 (26)

this curve (x) is determined by

$$(u;L) = L^{1 d} (L^{Y_T} u);$$
 (27)

for a d-dimensional system with a thermal scaling exponent y_T . The function can be expanded in a series:

$$(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}^{1} \\ \mathbf{x}^{1}; \\ \mathbf{x}^{1}; \end{bmatrix}$$
 (28)

and for 0 (n) models behaves for large x as:

$$(x) = A \quad x^{[d \ 1 \ p(n)] = y};$$
(29)

where p(1) = 0 and p(2) = p(3) = 1.

Eqs. (27) to (29) are useful for the interpretation of the O (n) transferm atrix M onte C arbo results for the interface free energy. These results were obtained using nite sizes up to L = 12, and populations typically consisting of 2500 or 5000 walkers. Typical run lengths are 5000 steps, where each step m eans the addition of a surface layer of L L spins. Variance reducing trial vectors [see Eq. (20)] were constructed for path lengths up to 5. A sbefore, the variance



FIG. 3. Finite-size scaling plot for the interface free energy of the three dimensional Ising model.

of the M onte C arb process was observed to decrease considerably with increasing path length. For each system size, interface free energies were obtained for approximately 10 di erent couplings in a range of about 10% around the critical points of the Ising and planar m odels, and about 1% for the case of the H eisenberg m odel.

On the basis of these results for the Ising (n = 1) case, the function is shown in Figure 3. This data collapse is achieved by means of a least-squares t with parameters K_c; y_T; a; and 13 Taylor coe cients ₁, a generalization of a technique used in the past⁵.

To check if the system sizes were in the asymptotic nite-size scaling regime, ts were done both with and without the 6 6 1 data. The results of these ts are displayed in Table II in Appendix A. To summarize, the results are: $K_c = 0.22162$ 0.00002 and $y_T = 1.584$ 0.004 using data with L = 6 through 12; and $K_c = 0.22167$ 0.00004 and $y_T = 1.584$ 0.014 if the L = 6 are om itted. These results agree well with accurate determ inations using other m ethods (see e.g. Ref. 16, 17, 18 and references therein) which appear to cluster about $K_c = 0.221655$ (with a m argin of about 10⁶) and $y_T = 1.586$ (with a precision of a few times 10³).

It is rem arkable that the corrections to scaling appear to be very sm all, as appears from the data shown in Figure 3. In standard M onte C arb analyses¹⁹ of L L L system s these corrections are quite prom inent, and form an obstacle to the accurate determ ination of critical parameters.

The scaling plot shown in Figure 3, can be used to determ ine the amplitude A graphically: on a double logarithm ic plot the asymptotic slope of the curve follows from the known value of the therm al exponent y_T , cf. Eq. (29). The problem of calculating this amplitude has attracted considerable attention lately and the reader is referred to a paper by Shaw and Fisher²⁰ for details and further references to the literature. For the largest values of the scaled tem perature variable x, we nd A⁰ = A K_c^{2=y_T} = 1.8, while the trend with x is an increasing one. This value is som ewhat larger than M on's²¹ estimate A = 1.58 0.05, but still in the range 1.4 A 2.0 obtained by Shaw and Fisher. As a nalcomment we note that M on's method requires systems of linear dimensions in excess of 48 to reach the asymptotic in nite-size regime, with an increasing trend of the estimates of A with increasing x = L^{y_T} u.



FIG.4. Finite-size scaling plot for the interface free energy of the three dimensional planar model.

A similar analysis was performed for the planar model (n = 2). In comparison with the Ising case, the scaling function behaves more smoothly as a function of x, so that a satisfactory t could be obtained with fewer Taylor coe cients. The tted parameters, which are K _c; y_T ; a; and 8 Taylor coe cients _n, are shown in Table III of Appendix A . Our results for the critical point are K_c = 0.45410 0.00003 for system sizes L = 6 to 12, and K_c = 0.45413 0.00005 for L = 8 to 12. These values are close to results from series expansions^{22;23} K_c = 0.45386 and standard M onte C arlo calculations²⁴ K_c = 0.4531 (no errors quoted). Also our results for the temperature exponent, nam ely $y_T = 1.491$ 0.003 for L 6 and $y_T = 1.487$ 0.006 for L 8 are in a good agreement with existing results; we quote the coupling-constant-expansion value²⁵ $y_T = 1.495$ 0.005.

Fitted with these parameters the data collapse very well onto the function , as shown in Figure 4. Again, this scaling plot can be used to determ ine the amplitude A graphically: in this case the asymptotic power-law exponent is $1=y_T$. A t of the data at the highest available values of $x = L^{y_T} u$ leads to A = 5.9, while the trend is still increasing with x.

The calculations for the H eisenberg case n = 3 were clustered in a narrow interval around the critical tem perature, and were not aim ed at an accurate determ ination y_T . Thus, the transferm atrix M onte C arb data could be analyzed by means of a least-square twith less parameters: K c, y_T and 3 Taylor coe cients $_n$. The t is shown in Table IV in A ppendix A. The result for y_T is well within the statistical accuracy, equal to the known coupling-constant-expansion value²⁵ $y_T = 1.418$. Including the latter value as a known variable in the ts leaves our results for the critical point practically unchanged. These are: K $_c = 0.69291 - 0.00004$ for system sizes L = 6 to 12, and K $_c = 0.69294 - 0.00004$ for system sizes expansions²⁶: K $_c = 0.6916$, and m ore recently²³: K $_c = 0.69294$; and from M onte C arb calculations²⁷: K $_c = 0.693035 - 0.000037$. The difference with our result with the L = 6 data included could be interpreted as an indication of a small nite-size e ect.

The data collapse for the n = 3 case onto the function as determined by the least-squares t is shown in Figure 5. Finally we remark that, although in each of the cases n = 1, 2 and 3 the nite-size e ect appears to be small for



F IG .5. F in ite-size scaling plot for the interface free energy of the three dim ensional H eisenberg m odel.

TABLE II. Param eters, as de ned in the text, and their standard errors for the scaling function of the interfacial free energy of the three-dimensional Ising model.

	n	6	n	8
K _c	0.22162	0.00002	0,22165	0.00003
Ут	1.583	0.004	1.594	0.009
0	0.6171	0.0007	0.6194	0.0025
1	2.6111	0.0176	2,5650	0.0505
2	6.0475	0.1001	5.8047	0.2565
3	9,2362	0.3052	8.4073	0.6724
4	6.0087	0.6350	4.8601	1.0249
5	-13.6165	0.9830	-10.8331	1.7414
6	-33.2578	4.0574	-24.7108	5.6481
7	4.4790	3.3849	1,4272	4,2080
8	70.6918	11.4018	46.6641	14.0107
9	28.0314	7.9088	21.4636	8.5327
10	-69.1548	14.3387	-40.6066	15.7549
11	-43.4754	10.0932	-27.7038	10.3867
12	25,2137	6.4840	13.2245	6.4356
13	18.8658	4.8588	10.5010	4.6564
a	-2.65	0.16	-2.65	0.37

TABLE III. Param eters, as de ned in the text, and their standard errors for the scaling function of the interfacial free energy of the three-dim ensional planar m odel.

	n	6	n	8
K $_{\rm c}$	0.45410	0.00003	0.45413	0.00005
Ут	1.491	0.003	1.487	0.006
0	1,2448	0.0010	1 2469	0.0033
1	2,5592	0.0144	2 5929	0.0345
2	2.4285	0.0439	2.4738	0.0796
3	0.9881	0.0623	0.9544	0.1031
4	-0.5096	0.0664	-0.4292	0.1050
5	-0.7770	0.1579	-0.5171	0.2741
6	0.1737	0.0754	0.0793	0.1204
7	0.4346	0.1503	0.1847	0.2567
а	-0.7805	0.1159	-0.9245	0.2259

L 6, it is large for L = 4. For this reason the L = 4 data were not included in the ts.

ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the (US) National Science Foundation through G rant # DMR-9214669, by the O ce of Naval Research and by the NATO through G rant # CRG 910152. This research was conducted in part using the resources of the C omell T heory C enter, which receives m a jor funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and New York State, with additional support from the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA), the National C enter for Research Resources at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), IBM C orporation, and other members of the center's C opporate Research Institute.

APPENDIX A: SCALING PLOT PARAMETER ESTIMATES

Tables II through IV contain estimates of the parameters used in the nite-size scaling plots for the interface free energy of 0 (n) models, as discussed in Section IV.

TABLE IV. Param eters, as de ned in the text, and their standard errors for the scaling function of the interfacial free energy of the three-dimensional H eisenberg model. The M onte C arlo data were taken relatively close to K $_{\rm c}$, so that the tem perature exponent $y_{\rm T}$ is not accurately determined. The accuracy of K $_{\rm c}$ is unal ected.

	n	6	n	8
K _c	0.69291	0.00004	0.69294	0.00008
Ут	1.44	0.07	1.55	0.18
0	1.8919	0.0015	1.8933	0.0043
1	2.4563	0.3123	1.9036	0.7665
2	0.7991	0.3005	0 5097	0.4651

- ¹ H A .K ram ers and G H .W annier, Phys. Rev. 60, 252 (1941).
- ² H F. Trotter, Proc. Am . M ath. Soc. 10, 545 (1959).
- ³ For a discussion of these correlations see K J.R unge, Phys. Rev. B 45, 12 292 (1992).
- ⁴ M P.N ightingale, E.G ranato and JM.K osterlitz, Phys.Rev.B 52, 7402 (1995).
- ⁵ M P.Nightingale and H W J.Blote, Phys.Rev.Lett. 60, 1662 (1988).
- ⁶ M P.N ightingale, in Finite-size scaling and simulation of statistical mechanical systems, V.Privman, ed. (W orld Scientic, Singapore 1990), p.287-351.
- ⁷ C J. Um rigar, M P.N ightingale, and K J. Runge, J. Chem. Phys. 99, 2865 (1993).
- ⁸ J.H. Hetherington, Phys. Rev. A 30, 2713 (1984).
- ⁹ M P.Nightingale and H W J.Blote, Phys.Rev.B 33, 659 (1986).
- ¹⁰ D M .Ceperley and C J.Um rigar, private communication.
- ¹¹ M H.Kalos, J.Comp.Phys.1, 257 (1966); the original idea of "forward walking" predates this paper (M H.Kalos private communication). For further references see Ref. 11 of Ref. 12.
- ¹² K J.Runge, Phys.Rev.B 45, 7229 (1992).
- ¹³ D. M. Ceperley and M. H. Kalos, M onte Carlo M ethods in Statistical Physics, edited by K. Binder (Springer, Berlin, 1979).
- ¹⁴ C J.Um rigar, K G .W ilson and JW .W ilkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1719 (1988); C om puter Sim ulation Studies in C ondensed M atter Physics, edited by D P.Landau, K K .M on, and H .-B.Schuttler, Springer Proceedings in Physics 33 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988) p.185.
- ¹⁵ E.G ranato and M P.N ightingale, Phys. Rev. B 48, 7438 (1993).
- ¹⁶ H W J.B lote, E.Luijten and J.R.Heringa, J.Phys.A 28, 6289 (1995).
- ¹⁷ H W J.B bte, JR. Heringa, A. Hoogland, E W . Meyer and T S. Smit, preprint (1996).
- ¹⁸ R.Gupta and P.Tam ayo, preprint; to appear in Int.J.M od.Phys (1996).
- ¹⁹ A M .Ferrenberg and D P.Landau, Phys. Rev. B 44, 5081 (1991).
- ²⁰ L.Shaw and M.E.Fisher, Phys. Rev. A 39, 2189 (1989).
- ²¹ K K.M on, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 2749 (1988).
- ²² M .Ferer, M A .M oore and M .W ortis, Phys. Rev. B 8, 5205 (1973).
- ²³ K.Ohno, Y.Okabe and A.Morita, Prog. Theor. Phys. 71, 714 (1984).
- ²⁴ D.P. Landau, R. Pandey and K. Binder, Phys. Rev. B 39, 12302 (1989).
- ²⁵ J.C. Le Guillou and J.Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. B 21 3976 (1980)
- ²⁶ D S R the and M E.Fisher, Phys.Rev.B 5, 2668, 1972.
- ²⁷ K.Chen, A.M. Ferrenberg and D.P. Landau, J.Appl.Phys. 73, 5488 (1993).