C lassical critical behavior of spin m odels with long-range interactions

Erik Luiten and Henk W . J. Blote

Department of Physics, Delft University of Technology, Lorentzweg 1, 2628 CJDelft, The Netherlands

(January 11, 2022)

We present the results of extensive M onte C arlo simulations of Ising models with algebraically decaying ferrom agnetic interactions in the regine where classical critical behavior is expected for these systems. We corroborate the values for the exponents predicted by renormalization theory for systems in one, two, and three dimensions and accurately observe the predicted logarithm is corrections at the upper critical dimension. We give both theoretical and numerical evidence that above the upper critical dimension the decay of the critical spin (spin correlation function in nite systems consists of two dimensions of the critical systems our estimates for the critical couplings are more than two orders of magnitude more accurate than existing estimates. In two and three dimensions we give, to our know ledge, the mathematical couplings.

64.60 Fr, 64.60 A k, 05.70 Jk

I. IN TRODUCTION

The critical behavior of Ising m odels with long-range interactions has attracted m uch attention during the last three decades. For the one-dimensional case, some analytical results have been obtained, 1;2;3;4;5;6;7;8;9;10;11 as well as a num ber of num erical results. The num erical results apply to both inverse-square interaction $s^{12;13;14;15}$ and general algebraically decaying interactions.^{16;17;18;19;20;21;22;23;24;25;26;27} Specialm ention deserves the work by Anderson, Yuval, and Hamann,^{28;29;30;31} which greatly stimulated the interest in spin chains with long-range interactions. They also developed a renorm alization-like approach to the one-dim ensional inverse-square m odel." Further renorm alizationgroup studies of this particular case are presented in Refs. 12, 32, 33, 34. A major contribution was made by Fisher, M a, and Nickel³⁵ and Sak,³⁶ who obtained renorm alization predictions for the critical exponents of m odels of general dimensionality d < 4 with algebraically decaying interactions (obtained independently by Suzuki et al.³⁷). Other works concerning d > 1 are two conjectures on, respectively, the boundary between long-range and short-range behavior and the boundary between classical (mean-eld) and nonclassical behavior, both by Stell,³⁸ a (refuted) conjecture by G ri ths, ³⁹ a rigorous con m ation of the upper critical dimension by A izenm an and Fernandez,¹⁰ and a variational approach to the Ising m odel with long-range interactions.⁴⁰ Furtherm ore, M onte C arlo simulations have been carried out for one particular choice of the spin (spin interaction in a two-dimensionalmodel.41 However, to our knowledge, neither any further veri cations of the renorm alization predictions nor any other results are available for higherdimensional (d > 1) models. To conclude this summary, we mention that the one-dimensional q-state Potts model with long-range interactions has been studied analytically,^{9;11} num erically,^{42;43} and in a mean-eld approximation on the Bethe lattice.44

W hy are these models interesting? In the rst place from a fundam entalpoint of view : They enable us to study the in uence of the interaction range on the critical behavior. E g., in one-dimensional systems long-range order is only possible in the presence of spin (spin interactions which decay su ciently slow ly. In the borderline (inverse-square) case, the 1D model displays a remarkable behavior: At the critical temperature the order parameter exhibits a nite jump (see Sec. II), but the free energy has an essential singularity such that all them alproperties are smooth. In this sense, the phase transition can be regarded as the one-dimensional analog of a K osterlitz (Thouless transition, $^{45;46}$ although the jump in the magnetization is not present there, as follows from the M emmin (W agner theorem 47 Just as d = 2 is the lower critical dimensional for the two-dimensional X Y model with short-range interactions, = 1 is a critical decay rate in a one-dimensional system with interactions decaying as r $^{(1+)}$, see Ref. 32. W ith respect to higher-dimensional system s, we note that the decay rate of van der W aals forces in realistic three-dimensional system s is only slightly faster than at the boundary between short-range (Ising-like) and long-range critical behavior. The question of criticality in ionic system s, where the (screened) C oulom b interactions might lead to e ectively algebraically decaying interactions, appears still open to debate. $^{48;49;50}$ It has also been claim ed that exponents in the long-range universality class have been observed experimentally in a ferrom agnetic phase transition. 51 R ecently, it has

E lectronic address: erik@tntnhb3.tn.tudelft.nl

been derived that critical uctuations may give rise to long-range C asim ir forces (decaying much more slow ly than van der W aals interactions) between uncharged particles immersed in a critical uid.⁵² Furtherm ore, it was shown by A nderson and Yuval^{28,29} that the K ondo problem corresponds to a one-dimensional Ising model with a combination of inverse-square and nearest-neighbor interactions. Yet another application follows from R ef. 22, where it was shown that random exchange (Levy- ight) processes can generate elective interactions which decay algebraically. Hence, the universal critical properties of the nonequilibrium steady state of these systems are those of the long-range equilibrium Ising models studied in this paper. Finally, the realization that the upper critical dimension can be varied by tuning the decay rate of the interaction led to a special application of these models in R ef. 53. Here, they were used to analyze a long-standing controversy on the universality of the renormalized coupling constant above the upper critical dimension.

In this article, we present accurate numerical results for Ising systems with algebraically decaying interactions in one, two, and three dimensions. Until now, the long-range character of the spin (spin interactions has been the main bottleneck for the exam ination of these systems by means of numerical methods (and, in fact, also for their analytical solution). All previously published numerical results therefore rely on various extrapolations based on data for small systems. However, the advent of a novel M onte C arb algorithm ⁵⁴ for the rst time enabled us to e ciently simulate these systems. The high accuracy of the results opens several perspectives: i) veri cation of the renorm alization predictions for the critical exponents; ii) accurate observation of logarithm ic corrections at the upper critical dimension; iii) rst estimates of the critical tem peratures of two- and three-dimensional systems s with long-range interactions; iv) veri cation of previously obtained estimates of the critical tem peratures of one-dimensional system s, which in addition implies a check on the various extrapolation of a conjecture on the behavior of the critical tem peratures; vi) veri cation of a conjecture on the behavior of the critical tem peratures as a function of the decay param eter. A nother problem one encounters in the simulations is the large param eter space: The simulations for a set of di erent tem peratures and system sizes have to be repeated for a range of values of the decay param eter and for d = 1;2;3. The total com puting time etericated to the results presented in this paper am ounts to approximately two CPU-years on a modem workstation.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Sec. II, we sum up the known rigorous results for the Ising chain with long-range interactions. In Sec. III, we review the renorm alization scenario of these models and derive the nite-size scaling behavior of several quantities. These include the corrections to scaling, both at and above the upper critical dimension. Our numerical results are presented and analyzed in Sec. IV and compared with previously obtained results. Finally, we sum marize our conclusions in Sec. V. The Appendix contains technical details concerning the application of the long-range M onte C arb algorithm to the models studied in this paper.

II. R IG OROUS RESULTS FOR THE ONE-D IM ENSIONAL CASE

For the one-dim ensional case, the H am iltonian is given by

$$H = \int_{ij}^{X} J(i j) s_i s_j; \qquad (1)$$

where the sum runs over all spin pairs. We are particularly interested in algebraically decaying interactions, i.e. J(n) / n. To ensure that the energy of the system does not diverge, it is required that > 1. In 1968, Ruelle¹ rigorously proved the absence of long-range order in a spin chain with ferrom agnetic spin (spin couplings J (i j) such that the sum

$$X^{N}$$
 nJ (n) (2)

does not diverge in the limit N ! 1. For algebraically decaying interactions, this implies the absence of a phase transition for > 2. Shortly later, Dyson² proved the existence of a phase transition if the sum s $\prod_{n=1}^{N} J(n)$ and $\prod_{n=1}^{P} (\log \log n) n^{3} J(n)^{-1}$ both converge, for positive and monotonically decreasing J(n). In particular, a phase transition occurs for J(n) / n with 1 < < 2. This partly corroborated the conjecture of K ac and T hom pson,⁵⁵ viz. that there is a phase transition for 1 < 2. Furtherm ore, D yson³ was (as were | much later | also R ogers and Thom pson⁶) able to replace Ruelle's condition with a stronger one, which how ever still left the case = 2 undecided. This also holds for an even more stringent criterion by Thouless,⁴ who generalized the argument of Landau and Lifshitz⁵⁶ for the absence of a phase transition in an Ising chain with short-range interactions. How ever, Thouless argued on entropic grounds that if a phase transition exists for = 2, the magnetization must have a

discontinuity at the transition point. This was later dubbed the \T houless e ect" by Dyson, who proved it to occur in the closely related hierarchicalm odel.⁵⁷ Sim on and Sokalm ade Thouless' argument partially rigorous,⁵ but later A izenm an et al.⁹ showed that, although a discontinuity in the order parameter is indeed present if there is a phase transition, his argument does not account for this. Namely, Thouless had assumed that the spin{spin correlation function hs₀s_ri hs₀ihs_ri vanishes in the lim it r ! 1, whereas actually the critical exponent is equal to 1 in this case. Meanwhile, Frohlich and Spencer⁷ had been able to rigorously prove the existence of a phase transition in the borderline case and thus to corroborate the K ac{Thom pson conjecture for = 2 as well. A nother interesting point is the rigorous proof for the existence of an interm ediate ordered phase in the one-dimensionalm odel with inversesquare interactions, where the two-point correlation function exhibits power-law decay with an exponent which varies continuously in a nite temperature range below the critical temperature.¹¹

III. FIN ITE-SIZE ANALYSIS OF THE CRITICAL BEHAVIOR

A lready in a very early stage of the history of the "-expansion, F isher, M a, and N ickel analyzed the critical behavior of d-dimensional systems (d < 4) with long-range interactions decaying as $r^{(d+)}$, with > 0.35 T hey concluded that the upper critical dimension is given by $d_u = 2$, as was previously conjectured by $Stell^{28}$ and later rigorously proven by A izenm an and Fernandez.¹⁰ For m one slow ly decaying interactions, 0 < d=2, the critical behavior is classical, whereas the critical exponents assume nonclassical, continuously varying values for d=2 < 2. For > 2 they take their short-range (Ising) values. Sak,³⁶ however, found that already for > 2 are the critical behavior is Isinglike, where sr denotes the exponent in the corresponding m odel with short-range interactions. In this article we concentrate on the classical range, for which we have perform ed extensive M onte C and simulations of spin m odels in d = 1;2;3. The nonclassical range will be the subject of a future article.⁵⁸

We brie y outline the renorm alization scenario for these models, in order to derive the nite-size scaling relations required to analyze the num erical data. We start from the following Landau {Ginzburg{Wilson Hamiltonian in momentum space,

$$H(_{k})=k_{B}T = \frac{1}{2} X_{k} j k + j_{2}k^{2} + r_{0} k k + \frac{u}{4N} X_{k_{1}} X_{k_{2}} X_{k_{3}} k_{1} k_{2} k_{3} h \frac{1}{2} \frac{N}{2} k_{k=0} :$$
(3)

The j k term arises from the Fourier transform of the interactions decaying as r ^(d+). The j_2k^2 term normally representing the short-range interactions is included because it will appear anyway in the renormalization process and will compete with the long-range term $.^{36}$ Under a renormalization transformation with a rescaling factor $b = e^1$, the term j k is transformed into j k⁰, with $k^0 = kb$. To keep the coe cient of the k term xed, we rescale the eld k to $_{k^0}^{0} = b = _{k}^{2}$. Thus, the coe cient of the k² term decreases as b ² and the coe cient of the ⁴ changes proportional to $b^2 = d$. Hence, the G aussian xed point dominates the renormalization ow for < d=2, which is the situation studied in this paper.

For the sake of generality we treat here the case of an n-component order parameter with 0 (n) symmetry. The renormalization equations are then given by

$$\frac{dr_0}{dl} = r_0 + a(n+2)u(c r_0);$$
(4a)

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\mathrm{d}l} = \mathbf{u} \quad \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{8})\mathbf{u}^2; \tag{4b}$$

where (n + 2) and (n + 8) are the usual factors arising from the tensorial structure of the interaction part of the H am iltonian and " = 2 d. These equations are not complete to second order, because the O (u^2) term is missing in Eq. (4a).

We rst consider the case " < 0. The solution of the second equation is given by

$$u(l) = ue^{l} \frac{1}{1 + u^{\frac{\alpha(n+8)}{n}}(e^{l} - 1)};$$
(5)

where u denotes the value of u at l = 0. This yields, to leading order in u, the following solution for the st equation,

$$r_{0}(l) = [r_{0} + ac(n+2)u = (d \quad)]e^{l} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{a(n+8)}{n}u(e^{n} \mid 1)} \frac{ac(n+2)ue^{n} = (d \quad)}{1 + \frac{a(n+8)}{n}u(e^{n} \mid 1)};$$
(6)

with r_0 r_0 (l = 0). The rst factor between square brackets is proportional to the reduced temperature t (T T_c)=T_c and the last term is the so-called shift of the critical temperature. The factors [l + a (n + 8)u (e^{"1} 1)="]¹ in Eqs. (5) and (6) are higher-order corrections in u. Under successive renorm alization transform ations, u approaches the value u = 0 and the Gaussian xed point (0;0) is thus indeed stable. The pertinent renorm alization exponents are: $y_t = , y_h = (d +)=2$, and $y_i = 2$ d.

At " = 0, the Gaussian xed point becomes marginally stable. Solving Eq. (4b) leads to

$$u^{uc}(l) = \frac{u}{1 + a(n+8)ul};$$
(7)

where the superscript \uc" indicates that we are operating at the upper critical dimension. This solution can be used to solve, again to leading order in u, Eq. (4a), yielding

$$r_{0}^{uc}(l) = [r_{0} + ac(n + 2)u = (d=2)]e^{l} \frac{1}{1 + a(n + 8)ul} \frac{(n+2) = (n+8)}{1 + a(n + 8)ul} \frac{ac(n + 2)u = (d=2)}{1 + a(n + 8)ul}$$
(8)

or, in term s of the rescaling factor b,

$$\mathbf{r}_{0}^{uc} = [\mathbf{r}_{0} + \operatorname{ac}(\mathbf{n} + 2)\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{d} = 2)]\mathbf{b} \quad \frac{1}{1 + a(\mathbf{n} + 8)\mathbf{u}\ln\mathbf{b}} \qquad \frac{\operatorname{ac}(\mathbf{n} + 2)\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{d} = 2)}{1 + a(\mathbf{n} + 8)\mathbf{u}\ln\mathbf{b}} : \tag{9}$$

Since is xed at d=2 the factor d=2 in the last term is identical to the corresponding factor (d) in Eq. (6). Further comparison of Eqs. (6) and (8) shows that above the upper critical dimension the leading shift of the critical temperature is proportional to b["], whereas this factor vanishes at the upper critical dimension itself and the factor (e^{1} 1)=" in the second-order correction turns into a lnb term, yielding a logarithm is shift of the form 1=(A lnb+B).

From the solutions of the renorm alization equations we can derive the scaling behavior of the free energy and of (combinations of) its derivatives. For the case " < 0 the free energy density f scales, to leading order, as

$$f(t;h;u;1=L) = b^{d} f b^{y_{t}} t + \sim ub^{y_{i}} y^{t} ; b^{y_{h}}h;b^{y_{i}}u;b=L + g;$$
(10)

where $\sim = ac(n + 2)=(d)$ and we have included a nite-size eld L¹. g denotes the analytic part of the transform ation. We abbreviate the rst term on the right-hand side as b^d f (t⁰;h⁰;u⁰;b=L). However, we must take into account the fact that, for T T_c, the free energy is singular at u = 0. This makes u a so-called dangerous irrelevant variable; see, e.g., R ef. 59. As discussed in Ref. 53, the correct nite-size scaling properties are obtained by setting b = L and making the substitution $^{0} = -u^{01-4}$. This leads to a new universal function, f, with

$$f(t^{0};h^{0};u^{0};1) + g = f'(t;h); \qquad (11)$$

where $t = t^{0} = u^{01-2}$ and $\tilde{h} = h^{0} = u^{01-4}$. The analytic part of the transformation also contributes to the singular dependence of the free energy on t (see, e.g., R ef. 60, C h. V I, x 3): D espite the regularity of this term in each single renormalization step, the in nite number of steps still leads to the build-up of a singularity. This contribution, denoted by g, is absorbed in f as well. Setting b = L and combining Eqs. (10) and (11) yields

$$f t;h;u;\frac{1}{L} = L^{d} f' L^{y_{t} y_{i}=2} \frac{1}{u^{1=2}} t + \sim uL^{y_{i} y_{t}} ;L^{y_{h} y_{i}=4} \frac{h}{u^{1=4}}$$
(12a)

$$= L^{d} f^{*} L^{y_{t}} \frac{1}{u^{1=2}} t + \sim u L^{y_{i} y_{t}} ; L^{y_{h}} \frac{h}{u^{1=4}} :$$
 (12b)

Here, we have introduced the exponents y_t y_t $y_{i}=2 = d=2$ and y_h y_h $y_{i}=4 = 3d=4$. The corresponding critical exponents indeed assume their xed, classical values; = 0, = 1=2, = 1, = 3. The exponent is singled out here as a special case; even without taking into account the modi cation of y_t and y_h due to the dangerous irrelevant variable one obtains the classical value = 1. Since the correlation length exponent $= 1=y_t$ (it is not a ected by the singular dependence of the free energy on u), we see that hyperscaling is violated, which is a well-know n result for system s above their upper critical dimension.⁵⁹ The rescaling of the pair-correlation function g (decaying proportional to $1=r^{d-2+}$) relates the exponent to the rescaling factor of the edd, yielding = 2. Note that this contrasts with the short-range case (= 2), where assumes its mean-eld value for all dimensionalities d 4. This im plies that direct experimental measurement of either or o ers a way to discern whether the interactions in a system are mean-eld-like (= 1=2, = 0) or have the form of a slow by decaying power-law. Below the upper critical dimension, how ever, the nite-size scaling behavior of the spin (spin correlation function is (apart from a volume factor) identical

to that of the magnetic susceptibility . This relation yields a contradiction above the upper critical dimension, since depends on the scaled combination tL^yt, instead of tL^{yt}. Indeed, the susceptibility diverges as t and the nite-size behavior of is thus L / L ^{yt} = L^{d=2}, corresponding to g / L ^{d=2}. On the other hand, if one assumes that the nite-size behavior of the correlation function is identical to the large-distance behavior, one expects that g / L ^(d 2+) = L ^(d). Only at the upper critical dimension, d_u = 2, these two predictions coincide. We will return to this point at the end of this section. Furtherm ore, we will exam the behavior of the spin (spin correlation function in Sec. IV.

At the upper critical dim ension itself, i.e. at " = 0, the free energy density scales as

$$f t;h;u;\frac{1}{L} = b^{d} f \frac{b^{y_{t}}}{(\ln b)^{(n+2)=(n+8)}} t + b^{y_{t}} \frac{u}{1+u \ln b}; b^{y_{h}}h;\frac{u}{1+u \ln b};\frac{b}{L} + g$$
(13a)

$$= L^{d} \mathbf{f}^{\prime} \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{(n+2)=(n+8)}} \frac{1}{u^{1-2}} t + \sim L^{y_{t}} \frac{u}{1 + \sim u \ln L} ; L^{y_{h}} \frac{h}{u^{1-4}} ;$$
(13b)

where $\sim = a(n + 8)$ and we have set b = L in the second line. u is now a marginal variable and although we again have to perform the substitution ! ⁰ (the Gaussian xed point is marginally stable), the exponents y_t and y_h now coincide with y_t and y_h , respectively, because y_i vanishes. Thus, the scaling relations (12b) and (13b) di er only in the logarithm ic factors in the rst argument of f and in other higher-order corrections.

A susual, the nite-size scaling relations are now found by taking derivatives of the free energy density with respect to the appropriate scaling elds. In the M onte C arb simulations we have sam pled the second and the fourth m om ent of the m agnetization density, the dimensionless amplitude ratio $Q = \operatorname{Im}^2 i^2 = \operatorname{Im}^4 i$ (which is directly related to the B inder cumulant⁶¹), and the spin (spin correlation function over half the system size (for even system sizes). The second m om ent of the m agnetization density is (apart from a volum e factor) equal to the second derivative of the free energy density with respect to h,

$$hm^{2}i = L^{d} \frac{\theta^{2}f}{\theta h^{2}} (t;h;u;l=L) = L^{2y_{h} 2d} f^{(2)} L^{Y_{t}} \frac{\hat{t}}{u^{1=2}}; L^{Y_{h}} \frac{h}{u^{1=4}} ;$$
(14)

where $f^{(2)}$ stands for the second derivative of f with respect to its second argum ent and t^{\pm} + $\ull^{y_1} y_1$. At " = 0, logarithm ic factors do not only arise in the argum ents of $f^{(2)}$, but also in a som ew hat unexpected way in the prefactor. Namely, if we include the lnL dependence of u in the second argum ent of Eq. (13b), i.e. if we replace L^{y_h} hu¹⁼⁴ by

$$L^{Y_h}h = \frac{u}{1 + u \ln L}$$
; (15)

and then take the second derivative of f with respect to its second argum ent, we obtain

$$m^{2}i = L^{2y_{h} 2d} \frac{u}{1 + u \ln L} f^{(2)} \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{(n+2)=(n+8)}} \frac{1}{u^{1-2}} t + u^{y_{t}} \frac{u}{1 + u \ln L} ; L^{y_{h}} \frac{u}{1 + u \ln L}$$
(16)

For the fourth m agnetization m om ent a similar expression holds and in the amplitude ratio Q all prefactors divide out, both for " < 0 and " = 0. Thus we nd that the ratio Q is given by a universal function Q',

$$Q_{\rm L}$$
 (T) = $Q'_{\rm L} L^{\rm y_{\rm t}} \frac{\hat{t}}{u^{1=2}} + q_{\rm L} L^{\rm d 2y_{\rm h}} + ;$ (17)

where we have om itted the h dependence of \mathcal{Q} , since we are only interested in the case h = 0. The additional term proportional to q_1 arises from the h dependence of the analytic part of the free energy⁶² and the ellipsis stands for higher powers of L^{d-2y_h} (faster-decaying terms). At " = 0, fm ust be replaced by the argument within square brackets in Eq. (13b), multiplied by the factor (ln L) (n+2)=(n+8). Finally, we may derive the nite-size scaling behavior of the spin {spin correlation function g (r) by di erentiating the free energy density to two boal magnetic elds, which couple to the spins at positions 0 and r, respectively, and assuming that the nite-size behavior is identical to the r dependence of g. If we do not take into account the dangerous irrelevant variable mechanism, we nd g / $L^{2y_h 2d} = L^{(d-)}$, just as we found before from = 2 . However, replacing y_h by y_h yields g / L d=2, in agreement with the L dependence of the magnetic susceptibility. This clari es the di erence between the two predictions: At short distances (large wave vectors), the j k $_{k}$ $_{k}$ term will be the dom inant term in the Landau {G inzburg{W ilson H am iltonian and there is no \dangerous" dependence on u. Hence, the nite-size behavior of the spin {spin correlation function will be given by L $^{(d 2+)}$. For k = 0, the coe cient of the ² term vanishes and thus the u ⁴ term is required to act as a bound on the magnetization. To account for this singular dependence on u, we rescale the eld, which in plies that y_h is replaced by y_h and g scales as L^{2y_h ^{2d}}. In a nite system, the wave vectors assume discrete values, $k = (n_x; n_y; n_z)^2 = L$, and thus it is easily seen that even for the lowest nonzero wave vectors j k $_k$ constitutes the dom inant bounding term on the magnetization. N am ely, the coe cient of the ⁴ term contains a volum e factor L ^d [cf. Eq. (3)] and this term is thus (above the upper critical dimension) a higher-order contribution decaying as L² ^d.

IV.NUMERICAL RESULTS AND COMPARISON W ITH EARLIER RESULTS

A . Sim ulations

W e have carried out M onte C arlo simulations for system s described by the H am iltonian

$$H = k_{\rm B} T = \int (jr_i r_j j) s_i s_j; \qquad (18)$$

where the sum runs over all spin pairs and periodic boundaries were employed. The precise form of the (long-range) spin (spin interaction J (r) as used in the simulations was chosen dependent on the dimensionality. For d = 1 we have followed the conventional choice J (r) = $K = r^{d+}$ (with discrete values for r), as this allows us to compare all our results (including nonuniversal quantities) to previous estimates. However, as explained in Ref. 54 and the Appendix, this discrete form requires the construction of a look-up table, which becomes ine cient for higher dimensionalities. For d = 2 we have thus applied an interaction which is the integral of a continuously decaying function,

$$J(jr) = K \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & Z_{r_{x}+\frac{1}{2}} & Z_{r_{y}+\frac{1}{2}} \\ & dx & dy r^{(d+)} \end{array};$$
(19)

where $r = (r_x; r_y)$ and r = jrj. In d = 3 the corresponding volume integral was used for J (r). This modi cation of the interaction does only change nonuniversal quantities like the critical temperature, but should not in uence the universal critical properties like the critical exponents and dimensionless amplitude ratios, since the di erence between the continuous and the discrete interaction consists of faster decaying terms that are irrelevant according to renorm alization theory. Details concerning the simulations can be found in the Appendix.

The following system sizes have been examined: chains of length 10 L 150000, square systems of linear size 4 L 240, and cubic systems of linear size 4 L 64. At the upper critical dimension simulations for even larger system shave been carried out in order to obtain accurate results from the analyses: L = 300000 in d = 1 and L = 400 in d = 2. (I.e., in terms of numbers of particles the largest system size for d = 2 is considerably smaller than for d = 1 and d = 3.) For the simulations we used a new cluster algorithm for long-range interactions.⁵⁴ This algorithm is 0 (L^{d+z}) times faster than a conventional M etropolis algorithm, where z is the dynam ical critical exponent. For systems displaying mean-eld-like critical behavior, we expect z = d=2 and the e ciency gain in our simulations is thus of the order of 10^8 for the largest system sizes. For each data point we have generated between 10^6 and 4 10^6 W ol clusters.

B.D eterm ination of the critical tem peratures, the am plitude ratio Q, and the therm al exponent

The critical couplings K $_{\rm c}$ of these system s have been determ ined using an analysis of the amplitude ratio Q. The nite-size scaling analysis was based on the Taylor expansion of Eq. (17), which for " < 0 reads:

$$Q_{L}(T) = Q + p_{1} \pounds U^{y_{t}} + p_{2} \pounds L^{2y_{t}} + p_{3} \pounds^{3} L^{3y_{t}} + \# L \pounds^{2y_{h}} + \# L \pounds^{2y_{h}} + \# L \pounds^{2y_{h}} + (20)$$

The term proportional to ~ in f yields a contribution $q_2 L^{y_1=2} = q_2 L^{-d=2}$ and the term $q_3 L^{y_1}$ comes from the denominator in Eq. (5). The coe cients p_i and q_i are nonuniversal. In addition to the corrections to scaling in Eq. (20) we have also included higher powers of $q_3 L^{y_1}$, which become particularly important when y_i is small (i.e. when is close to d=2), higher powers of $q_1 L^{d-2y_h} = q_1 L^{-d-2}$, and the crossterm proportional to $L^{y_t + y_1}$.

All analyses were carried out on the same data set as used in Ref. 53, to which several data points have been added for most values of \cdot . First, we have only kept \cdot xed the exponents in the correction term s, y_i and y_b. The corresponding estimates for Q and y_t are shown in the third and fourth column of Table I. One observes that the M onte Carlo results for both Q and y_t are in quite good agreem ent with the renorm alization predictions^{63;53} $Q = 8^{2} = 4(\frac{1}{4}) = 0.456947:$: and $y_t = d=2$. However, the uncertainties in the estimates increase considerably with increasing , because the leading irrelevant exponent becom es very sm all. An exception is the relatively large uncertainty in y_t (d = 1; = 0.2), which originates from the fact that the M onte C arlo data were taken in a rather narrow temperature region around the critical point. Furtherm ore, an accurate simultaneous determination of Q and y_t is very di cult, because of the correlation between the two quantities. Therefore we have repeated the same analysis with Q xed at its theoretical prediction as appears justified by the values for Q in Table I in order to obtain m ore accurate estimates for y. The results, shown in the fifth column of Table I, are indeed in good agreement with the theoretically expected values (last column). Thus, we have kept the therm alexponent xed at its theoretical value in the further analysis, just as in Ref. 53. The corresponding results for Q and K_c are shown in Table II. As discussed in Ref. 53, over the full range of and d the M onte C arlo results for Q show good agreem ent with the renorm alization prediction, thus con m ing the universality of this quantity above the upper critical dimension. In com parison with the estimates presented in Table I of Ref. 53, two minor remarks apply. First, for Q (d = 3; = 0.4) one decim alplace too much was quoted, suggesting a too high accuracy. Secondly we note that the newest result for K_{c} (d = 3; = 1:2) deviates two standard deviations from the earlier estimate.

The universality of Q is illustrated graphically in Figs. 1 (a) {1 (c), where the increasing importance of corrections to scaling upon approaching the upper critical dimension clearly follows from the size of the error bars. At the upper critical dimension itself (" = 0) this culm inates in the appearance of logarithm ic corrections, where the nite-size scaling form of Q_L is given by

$$Q_{L}(T) = Q + p_{1} \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{1-3}} t + v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L} + p_{2} \frac{L^{2y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{2-3}} t + v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L}^{2} + q_{1} L^{d-2y_{h}} + \frac{q_{3}}{\ln L} + c_{2} L^{d-2y_{h}} + c_{2} L^{d-2y_{h}} + c_{2} L^{d-2y_{h}} + c_{3} L^{d-2y_{h}} + c_{4} L^{d-2y_{h}} + c_$$

The ellipses denote terms containing higher powers of $L^{d 2y_h}$ and $1=\ln L$. A lthough the resulting estimates for Q at the upper critical dimension lie within two standard deviations from the renormalization prediction, one observes that the estimates are systematically too high, suggesting the imperfection of the quoted scaling formula. Only more accurate data, spanning an even larger range of system sizes, and an analysis including further corrections to scaling will allow a more precise determination of Q. To illustrate the dependence of the nite-size corrections on " more directly, Fig. 2 (a) displays (for various values of) the nite-size scaling functions as they follow from a least-squares t of the data for d = 1 to Eqs. (20) and (21), respectively. A lthough one clearly observes the increase of nite-size corrections when ! d=2, the true nature of the logarithm is corrections in (21) cannot be appreciated from this graph. To emphasize the di erence between "= 0 and " < 0, we therefore also show [Fig. 2 (b)] the same e plot for the enorm ous range 0 < L < 10¹⁰. Now it is evident how strongly the case "= 0 di ers even from a case with strong power-law corrections, such as = 0.4 ("= 0.2).

We have used the universality of Q to considerably narrow the error margins on K_c by xing Q at its theoretical value in the least-squares t. The corresponding couplings are shown in Table II as well. The relative accuracy of the critical couplings lies between 1:5 10^{5} and 4:0 10^{5} . For the one-dimensional case, we can compare these results to earlier estimates, see Table III. One notes that the new est estimates are more than two orders of magnitude more accurate than previous estimates. The rst estimates¹⁸ were obtained by carrying out exact calculations for chains of 1 to 20 spins and subsequently extrapolating these results using Pade approximants. Note that the estimates for T_c in Ref. 18 are expressed in units of the inverse of the Riemann zeta function and thus must be multiplied by (1 +). All couplings are somewhat too high, but still in fair agreement with our estimates. The results of D om an¹⁹ have no error bars. Still, his results are worrying, since he carries out a cluster approach, obtaining critical couplings which start at the mean-eld value for cluster size zero and increase monotonically with increasing cluster size, as they should, since mean-eld theory yields a lower bound on the critical couplings (see below). Thus, he argues that the true couplings will lie higher than his best estim ates (obtained for cluster size 10). How ever, all these best estimates lie already above our estimates, which seem s to indicate a problem inherent in his approach. Ref. 20 presents results of an approximation coined $\$ nite-range scaling" with error margins of 1%. For = 0.1 the error is considerably underestim ated, but for the other values of the decay param eter the couplings agree with our results well within the quoted errors. The same technique was applied in Ref. 42, but now the uncertainty in the couplings was estimated to be less than 10%, for small a few times larger. This is clearly a too conservative estimate, as the di erence with our results is only a few percent for = 0.1 and considerably less for larger . In Ref. 21, the coherent-anom aly method was used to obtain two di erent estimates without error margins. We have quoted the average of the two results, with their di erence as a crude measure for the uncertainty. The agreem ent is quite good, although all results lie system atically above our values. Yet another approach has been form ulated in Ref. 27, where

the Onsager reaction - eld theory was applied to obtain a general expression for the critical coupling,

$$K_{c}() = \frac{(1+)\sin((-2))}{(1-)^{1+}} :$$
(22)

Unfortunately, no estimate for the accuracy of this expression is given, but it seems to generally underestimate the critical coupling by a few percent. Finally, some estimates have been obtained recently by means of the real-space renormalization-group technique.⁴³

In addition, M onroe has calculated various bounds on the critical couplings as shown in Table IV. The Bethe lattice approximation²⁴ was used to obtain both upper and lower bounds, to which our results indeed conform, although it must be said that the upper bounds do not constitute a very stringent criterion. Furthermore, the application of V igfusson's method²⁵ has yielded even closer lower bounds for = 0:1 and = 0:2.

A part from these approximations, one may also use mean-eld theory to make some predictions concerning the critical coupling in the limit # 0. It was shown by Brankov⁶⁴ that in this limit the d-dimensional system with an interaction potential / $=r^{d+}$ is equivalent to the Husim i(Tem perley mean spherical model. More speci cally, it was conjectured by Cannas²⁶ that for the one-dimensional case lim $!_{0} K_{c} = 2$, which is also the rst term in the Taylor expansion of Eq. (22). Indeed, in mean-eld theory one has $zK_{c}^{MF} = 1$, where z is the coordination number. For d = 1 this corresponds to the requirement

$$2K_{c}^{MF}()_{n=1}^{X^{I}}\frac{1}{n^{1+}} = 2K_{c}^{MF}()(1+) = 1;$$
(23)

where (x) denotes the R iem ann zeta function. The expansion of (x) around x = 1 yields the conjectured relation $\lim_{\#0} K_c^{MF} = =2$. Figure 3 (a) shows the critical coupling as a function of the decay parameter along with K_c^{MF} () and the asymptotic behavior for # 0. One observes that K_c () indeed approaches K_c^{MF} () when approaches zero. Furtherm ore, K_c^{MF} () is smaller than K_c () for all , as one expects from the fact that mean-eld theory overestim ates the critical tem perature. It is interesting to note that for = 0:1 ($K_c^{MF} = 0:047239$) this lower bound already excludes the estimates given in R efs. 42 and 27 (cf. Table III). Replacing zK_c^{MF} by the integrated interaction, we can generalize such estimates to higher dimensionalities,

$$K_{c}^{MF}() \frac{2}{\frac{d}{2}} \int_{m_{0}}^{2} dr \frac{1}{r^{1+}} = 1:$$
 (24)

For d > 1, the lower distance cuto m_0 of the integral, i.e. the minimal interaction distance with the nearest neighbors, does not have an isotropic value, since there is no interaction within an elementary cube around the origin. Nevertheless, a constant value m_0 , e.g. $m_0 = 1=2$, is a good approximation. Furthermore, for d = 1 the integral is only a rst-order approximation of Eq. (23), but for d = 2 and d = 3 it precisely corresponds to the interaction (19) and its generalization to d = 3, respectively. As a rst estimate one thus obtains

$$\lim_{\#0} K_{c}^{MF}() = \frac{\frac{a}{2}}{2^{d=2}} m_{0} :$$
 (25)

An expansion in terms of shows that the rst term is independent of m_0 . For d = 1;2;3 one nds, respectively, $K_c^{M,F} = 2$, $K_c^{M,F} = (2)$, $K_c^{M,F} = (4)$. Figures 3 (b) and 3 (c) show K_c () for d = 2 and d = 3, the corresponding asymptotes and Eq. (25) with $m_0 = 1=2$.

The deviation of K_c () from K_c^{MF} () is also expressed by the last term in the renormalization expression (6). However, in order to assess the dependence of this term one has to calculate the dependence of the coe cients a and c, arising from the integrals over the -dependent propagators.

C.Determ ination of critical exponents

1. Magnetic susceptibility

The magnetic susceptibility is directly proportional to the average square magnetization density,

$$= L^{d} lm^{2} i; \qquad (26)$$

and thus we can use Eq. (14) to analyze the nite-size data. Expanding this equation in t and u we obtain for " < 0

$$= L^{2y_{h} d} a_{0} + a_{1} t L^{y_{t}} + a_{2} t^{2} L^{2y_{t}} + t t L^{y_{t}} + a_{1} t L^{y_{t}} + t L^{y_{$$

#

and for " = 0

$$= L^{2y_{h} d} \frac{p}{\ln L} a_{0} + a_{1} t \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{1=3}} t + v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L} + a_{2} \frac{L^{2y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{2=3}} t + v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L}^{2} + \frac{b_{1}}{\ln L} +$$
(28)

The analytic part of the free energy m ight give rise to an additional constant, but this could not be observed in our simulations, because it is dominated by the corrections to scaling. In Table V we list the results of an analysis of the numerical data. For all examined systems we have determined the exponent y_h and the critical coupling. The estimates for the latter are in good agreement with those obtained from the analysis of the universal amplitude ratio Q. Furthermore, the exponents agree nicely, for all dimensionalities, with the renormalization prediction $y_h = 3d=4$. Just as before, the uncertainties increase with increasing a lathough the analyses at the upper critical dimension itself seem to yield better results than those just above it. Compare in particular the results for = 1.4 ($y_i = -0.2$) and

= 1:5. The logarithm ic prefactor in Eq. (28) can be clearly observed in the sense that the quality of the least-squares t decreases considerably when this factor is om itted. To reduce the uncertainty in the exponents we have repeated the analysis with K_c xed at the best values in Table II, i.e. those obtained with xed Q. The corresponding estimates of y_h are also shown in Table V and are indeed in good agreement with the renormalization predictions.

Now we can calculate the critical exponents and compare them to earlier estimates for d = 1. We do this for the correlation length exponent $= 1 = (y_t + y_i = 2)$ and the magnetization exponent $= (d \ y_h) = y_t$. The results are shown in Tables VI and VII. Since all our estimates for y_t and y_h agree with the renormalization values, also and are in agreement with the classical critical exponents. Unfortunately, the accuracy in both exponents is seriously ham pered by the uncertainty in y_t , which has only been determined from the temperature-dependent term in Q. In particular the results for from Ref. 42 are, for small , in better agreement with the theoretically predicted values than our estimates. However, all previous results, both for and for , deviate seriously from the predicted values when approaches 1=2, which is not the case for our values. This can probably be attributed to the fact that corrections to scaling have been taken into account m ore adequately.

2. Spin { spin correlation function

In Sec. III two di erent decay modes for the spin $\{spin correlation function were derived. The relative magnitude of r and L determ ines which of the modes applies. In the bulk of our simulations we have restricted r in g(r) to r = L=2. Since this quantity relations to k = 0 mode of the correlation function, we write for " < 0 an expression analogous to that for the magnetic susceptibility,$

$$g(L=2) = L^{2y_{h} 2d} c_{0} + c_{1} t^{2} L^{y_{t}} + c_{2} t^{2} L^{2y_{t}} + t^{2} t^{2} d^{i} + t^{2$$

and for " = 0

"

$$g(L=2) = L^{2y_{h} 2d} \frac{p_{hL}}{\ln L} c_{0} + c_{1} t \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{1=3}} t + v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L} + c_{2} \frac{L^{2y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{2=3}} t + v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L}^{2} + \frac{d_{1}}{\ln L} + (30)$$

For values of r such that g (r) does not correspond to this mode of the correlation function, the -dependent exponent y_h will appear in (29) instead of y_h . Furtherm ore, the logarithm ic prefactor in (30) will be absent, as it arises from the dangerous irrelevant variable [cf. Eq. (16)]. The results of our analysis are shown in Table V III. The results evidently corroborate that the exponent y_h coincides with that appearing in the susceptibility. A loo the factor $\frac{P}{\ln L}$ in (30) was clearly visible in the least-squares analysis. The critical couplings agree with the estimates from Q and

and we have again tried to increase the accuracy in y_h by repeating the analysis with K_c xed at their best values in Table II. The accuracy of the results is somewhat less than of those obtained from the magnetic susceptibility, because we have now only used numerical data for even system sizes. The fact that the L dependence of (L=2) is determined by the k = 0 mode raises the question whether one can also observe the power-law decay described by

in nite systems. To this end, we have sampled g(r) as a function of r in the one-dimensional model. In order to clearly distinguish the two predictions for the decay of g(r) we have examined a system far from the upper critical dimension, viz. with = 0.1. It turned out to be necessary to sample very large system sizes to observe the regime where $g(r) / r^{(d)}$. Figure 4 displays the spin (spin correlation function scaled with $L^{d=2}$ versus r=L. The scaling makes the results collapse for r of the order of the system size. Here, the correlation function levels o . This is the

m ean-eld like contribution to the correlation function, which dom inates in the spatial integral yielding the m agnetic susceptibility. For small r the data do not collapse at all, which shows that g(r) exhibits di erent scaling behavior in this regime. Indeed, the correlation function decays here as $r^{(d)} = r^{0.9}$ and not as $r^{d=2}$. Note, however, that this regime is restricted to a small region of r and can only be observed for very large system sizes.

It is interesting to note that already Nagle and Bonner¹⁸ have tried to calculate in a spin chain with longrange interactions from nite-size data for the susceptibility. Because this calculation relied on the assumption that (L;K_c) (L 1;K_c) g(L) L ^(d 2+), they called the corresponding exponent ~. The results for ~ turned out to assume a constant value approximately equal to 1.50 for 0 < 0.5. Thus, the identication of ~ with was assumed to be invalid in Ref. 35. Now we see that ~ is in excellent agreement with d+2 $2y_h = 2$ d=2.

V.CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have studied systems with long-range interactions decaying as $r^{(d+)}$ in one, two, and three dimensions in the regime where these interactions exhibit classical critical behavior, i.e., for 0 < d=2. From the renorm alization equations we have derived the scaling behavior, including the corrections to scaling, for various quantities. These predictions, in particular the critical exponents and the scaling behavior of the amplitude ratio $m^2 i^2 = hm^4 i$, have been veriled by accurate M onte C arbo results. At the upper critical dimension, the logarithm is factors appearing in the nite-size scaling functions could be accurately observed. The M onte C arbo results have been obtained with a dedicated algorithm. This algorithm is many orders of magnitude faster (up to the order of 10^8 for the largest examined system) than a conventional M onte C arbo algorithm for these systems. O ur analysis has also yielded estimates for the critical couplings. For d = 1 these values have an accuracy which is more than two orders of m agnitude better than previous estimates and could thus serve as a check for half a dozen di erent approximations. For d = 2 and d = 3 we have, to our best know ledge, obtained the rst estimates for the critical couplings. Finally, we have given both theoretical and numerical arguments that above the upper critical dimension the decay of the critical spin (spin correlation function in nite system s consists of two regimes: 0 ne where it decays as $r^{(d + 1)}$ and one where it is independent of the distance.

As an outlook we note that m any interesting results m ay be expected below the upper critical dimension, where neither any rigorous results nor any accurate num erical results are available. This regime will be the subject of a future investigation.⁵⁸

APPENDIX A: DETAILS OF THE MONTE CARLO ALGORITHM FOR LONG RANGE INTERACTIONS

The cluster algorithm applied in this study has been described for the rst time in Ref. 54. A somewhat more elaborate treatment of the mathematical aspects was given in Ref. 65. A lthough conceptually no new aspects arise in the application to algebraically decaying interactions in more than one dimension, several important practical issues must be taken care of in actual simulations. It is the purpose of this Appendix to discuss these issues and their solutions in some more detail. We do not repeat the full cluster algorithm here, but only describe how the cluster form ation process proceeds from a given spin s_i which has already been added to the cluster (the so-called current spin).

A sexplained in Ref. 54, the key element of the algorithm lies in splitting up the so-called bond-activation probability $p(s_i;s_j) = s_{is_j}p_{ij} = s_{is_j}[1] \exp(2J_{ij})$ into two parts, namely the K ronecker delta testing whether the spins s_i and s_j are parallel and the provisional" bond-activation probability p_{ij} . This enables us to de ne a cum ulative bond probability C (k), from which we can read o which bond is the next one to be provisionally activated,

C (j)
$$P(n)$$
 (A1)

with

$$P(n) = (1 p_1)(1 p_2) \qquad (1 p_1)p_n :$$
 (A2)

 $p_j = 1 = \exp(2J_j)$ is an abbreviation for p_{0j} , i.e., we de ne the origin at the position of the current spin. When comparing the expressions to those in R ef. 54 one must take into account that we now are working with Ising instead of Potts couplings. P (n) is the probability that in the rst step n = 1 bonds are skipped and the nth bond is provisionally

activated. Now the next bond j that is provisionally activated is determ ined by a random number g 2 [0;1i: j 1 bonds are skipped if C (j 1) g < C (j). The number j can be easily determ ined from g once we have tabulated the quantity C (j) in a look-up table. If the jth bond is placed to a spin s_j that is indeed parallel to the current spin s_i then s_j is added to the cluster (i.e., the jth bond is activated). Subsequently we skip again a number of bonds before another bond at a distance k > j is provisionally activated. The appropriate cumulative probability is now given by a generalization of Eq. (A1) (see Ref. 54),

In principle we need now for each value of j another look-up table containing the $C_j(k)$. This is hardly feasible and fortunately not necessary, as follows from a comparison of Eqs. (A1) and (A3). Namely,

$$\begin{array}{c} & \text{"} & \text{"} & \text{"} \\ Y^{j} & \text{"} & \text{"} \\ C (k) = C_{0} (k) = C (j) + & (1 \quad p_{i}) \quad C_{j} (k) = C (j) + [1 \quad C (j)]C_{j} (k) \end{array}$$
 (A 4)

or $C_j(k) = [C(k) - C(j)] = [1 - C(j)]$. So we can calculate $C_j(k)$ directly from C(k). In practice one realizes this by using the bond distance j of the previous bond that was provisionally activated to rescale the (new) random number g to $g^0 2$ [C(j);1i; $g^0 = C(j) + [1 - C(j)]g$. Since we consider only ferrom agnetic interactions, $\lim_{j \ge 1} C(j)$ exists and is smaller than 1, cf. Eq. (A 3). Still we can accome modate only a limited number of bond distances in our look-up table and must therefore devise some approximation scheme to handle the tail of the long-range interaction, which is essential for the critical behavior. This issue is addressed below. Furtherm ore, this description only takes into account the bonds placed in one direction. The actual implementation of the algorithm must of course allow for bonds in both directions (assuming that d = 1).

An alternative for the look-up table exists for interactions which can be explicitly sum m ed. In those cases, Eq. (A 3) can be solved for k, yielding an expression for the bond distance in terms of $C_j(k)$, i.e., in terms of the random num ber g. For the interaction de ned in Sec. II the sum appearing in the right-hand side of (A 3) is (for j = 0) the truncated R iem ann zeta function,

$$X^{k} \qquad J_{n} = K \qquad X^{k} \frac{1}{n^{d+}};$$
 (A 5)

which cannot be expressed in closed form. In more than one dimension, a look-up table is very impractical and an interaction which can be sum med explicitly becomes very desirable. Therefore we have taken an isotropic, continuous interaction of the form $J = K = r^{d+}$. The interaction with a spin at lattice site n is then given by the integral of J over the elementary square (cube) centered around n [cf. Eq. (19)] and the cum ulative bond probability yields the (not necessarily integer-valued) distance k at which the rst provisional bond is placed. To this end, the sum in (A3) is replaced by a d-dimensional integral over the coupling J. As J is isotropic, only an integral over the radius remains, which runs from the minim albond distance up to k. Thus for d = 2 Eq. (A3) reduces to

$$C_{j}(k) = 1 \exp 2\frac{2 K}{j} \frac{1}{j} \frac{1}{r}$$
 (A 6)

and in d = 3 the factor 2 is simply replaced by 4. Equating $C_{i}(k)$ to the random number g we nd

Rescaling of the random number is no longer required: The lowest value, g = 0, leads to a provisional bond at the same distance as the previous one, k = j. If $g = C_j(1) = 1 \exp[(4 \text{ K} =)j]$ the next provisional bond lies at in nity and thus $g \ge [C_j(1);1i$ yields no bond at all. Once the distance k has been obtained, d = 1 further random numbers $g_1;g_2;:::$ are required to determ ine the direction of the bond. In d = 2, we set $= g_1 = (2)$. The coordinates of the next provisional bond (relative to the current spin) are then $(r_x;r_y) = (k \cos ;k \sin)$, which are rounded to the nearest integer coordinates. Finally, the periodic boundary conditions are applied to m ap these coordinates onto a lattice site. For the next provisional bond, j is set equal to k (not to the rounded distance!) and a new k is determ ined. If no bond has been placed yet, j is set to 1=2, the lowest possible bond distance. Hence it is possible to nd a 1=2 k < $\frac{1}{2}=2$ and an angle such that the corresponding lattice site is the origin. This does not a ect

the bond probabilities, but it is of course a \wasted" M onte C arlo step. For d = 3 the process is sim ilar, except that we need another random number g_2 to determ ine a second angle =2 < =2, such that sin is distributed uniform by; $\sin = 1 2g_2$. The bond coordinates are given by (k cos cos ; k cos sin ; k sin).

This approach can also be applied in the one-dimensional case, where the geometrical factor 2 in (A 6) must be replaced by 2, which rejects the fact that bonds can be put to the left and to the right of the origin. The direction of the bond is then simply determ ined by another random number. As has already been mentioned in Ref. 54, this can be used to cope with the limited size M of the look-up table. Beyond the bond distance M the sum in (A 3) is approximated by an integral. I.e., if the random number g lies in the interval [C (M); C (1) i, the bond distance k is determ ined from the one-dimensional version of (A7), where the lower part of the integral is replaced by an explicit sum

$$k = M + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2K} \ln (1 - g) + \frac{X^{H}}{n^{-1}} \frac{1}{n^{1+}} :$$
 (A8)

. ..

Here, the geom etrical factor is absent, as we have opted to treat \left" and \right" separately in our simulations (no additional random number is required in that case). The approximation (A8) e ectively introduces a modi cation of the spin (spin interaction, which however can be made arbitrarily small by increasing M. Note that the o set 1=2 in the rst term ensures a precise matching of the discrete sum and the integral approximation: the random number g = C(M) = 1 exp $\left[2K \prod_{n=1}^{P} n^{(1+n)}\right]$ yields k = M + 1 = 2 which is precisely the lowest k that is rounded to the integer bond distance M + 1.

The accuracy of this procedure is further limited by the nite resolution of random numbers. Eq., in our simulations the original random numbers are integers in the range $[0; 2^{32} 1]$. Thus, for bond distances l such that C (1) C (1 1) is of the order 2 32 , the discreteness of the random numbers is no longer negligible. For d = 2 and d = 3, the discreteness of the angles also limits the lattice sites that can be selected for a provisional bond, but this generally occurs at distances larger than 1. Once the value of 1 has been determ ined, with a safe margin, there are various approaches to this limitation. One may, eg., draw another random number to determ ine the precise bond distance. A simpler approach is to distribute all bonds beyond luniform ly over the lattice, in order to prevent that certain lattice sites are never selected. However, one should take care that such simple approaches do not essentially modify the critical behavior. If I is relatively sm all, the error introduced by a random distribution of the bond distances m ight be larger than the e ect of an interaction which decreases slightly nonm onotonically at large distances. Furtherm ore, in order to preserve the symmetry of the lattice, such a uniform distribution of the bonds should occur outside a square (cube) instead of a circle (sphere) with radius 1.

⁷ J.Frohlich and T.Spencer, Comm.Math.Phys.84,87 (1982).

¹ D.Ruelle, Comm.Math.Phys. 9, 267 (1968).

² F.J.Dyson, Comm.Math.Phys.12, 91 (1969).

³ F.J.Dyson, Comm.Math.Phys.12, 212 (1969).

⁴ D.J.Thouless, Phys. Rev. 187, 732 (1969).

⁵ B.Sim on and A.D.Sokal, J.Stat. Phys. 25, 679 (1980).

⁶ J.B.R ogers and C.J.Thom pson, J.Stat. Phys. 25, 669 (1981).

⁸ J.Z. Imbrie, Comm. Math. Phys. 85, 491 (1982).

⁹ M.Aizenman, J.T.Chayes, L.Chayes, and C.M.Newman, J.Stat.Phys. 50, 1 (1988).

¹⁰ M.A izenm an and R.Femandez, Lett.M ath.Phys.16, 39 (1988).

¹¹ J.Z.Im brie and C.M.Newman, Comm.Math.Phys.118, 303 (1988).

¹² J. Bhattacharjee, S. Chakravarty, J. L. Richardson, and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B 24, 3862 (1981).

¹³ G.V.M atvienko, Teor.M at.Fiz. 63, 465 (1985) [Theor.M ath.Phys. 63, 635 (1985)].

¹⁴ B.Siu, J.Stat. Phys. 38, 519 (1985).

¹⁵ J.O.Vigfusson, Phys. Rev. B 34, 3466 (1986).

¹⁶ D.Rapaport and N.E.Frankel, Phys.Lett.A 28, 405 (1968).

¹⁷ J.F.Dobson, J.M ath. Phys. 10, 40 (1969).

¹⁸ J.F.Nagle and J.C.Bonner, J.Phys.C 3, 352 (1970).

¹⁹ B.G.S.Dom an, Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) 103, K169 (1981).

²⁰ Z.G lum ac and K.Uzelac, J.Phys.A 22, 4439 (1989).

- ²¹ J.L.M onroe, R.Lucente, and J.P.Hourlland, J.Phys. A 23, 2555 (1990).
- ²² B.Bergersen and Z.Racz, Phys.Rev.Lett. 67, 3047 (1991).
- ²³ R.Manieri, Phys. Rev. A 45, 3580 (1992).
- ²⁴ J.L.M onroe, Phys. Lett. A 171, 427 (1992).
- ²⁵ J.L.M onroe, J.Stat. Phys. 76, 1505 (1994).
- ²⁶ S.A.Cannas, Phys. Rev. B 52, 3034 (1995).
- ²⁷ A.S.T.Pires, Phys.Rev.B 53, 5123 (1996).
- ²⁸ P.W. Anderson and G.Yuval, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, 89 (1969).
- ²⁹ G.Yuvaland P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B 1, 1522 (1970).
- ³⁰ P.W. Anderson, G.Yuval, and D.R.Hamann, Phys. Rev. B 1, 4464 (1970).
- ³¹ P.W .Anderson and G.Yuval, J.Phys.C 4, 607 (1971).
- ³² J.M.Kosterlitz, Phys.Rev.Lett. 37, 1577 (1976).
- ³³ J.L.Cardy, J.Phys.A 14, 1407 (1981).
- ³⁴ S.A.Bulgadaev, Phys. Lett. A 102, 260 (1984).
- ³⁵ M.E.Fisher, S.-k.Ma, and B.G.Nickel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 917 (1972).
- ³⁶ J.Sak, Phys.Rev.B 8, 281 (1973).
- ³⁷ M. Suzuki, Y. Yam azaki, and G. Igarashi, Phys. Lett. A 42, 313 (1972).
- ³⁸ G.Stell, Phys. Rev. B 1, 2265 (1970).
- ³⁹ R.B.Griths, Phys. Rev. Lett. 24, 1479 (1970).
- ⁴⁰ M.J.W ragg and G.A.Gehring, J.Phys.A 23, 2157 (1990).
- ⁴¹ H.-J.Xu, B.Bergersen, and Z.Racz, Phys. Rev. E 47, 1520 (1993).
- ⁴² Z.G lum ac and K.Uzelac, J.Phys.A 26, 5267 (1993).
- ⁴³ S.A. Cannas and A.C. N. de Magalhaes, Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas F sicas, preprint.
- ⁴⁴ L.B.Bemardes and S.Goulart Rosa, Jr., Phys. Lett. A 191, 193 (1994).
- ⁴⁵ J.M.Kosterlitz and D.J.Thouless, J.Phys.C 6, 1181 (1973).
- ⁴⁶ J.M.Kosterlitz, J.Phys.C 7, 1046 (1974).
- ⁴⁷ N.D.Merm in and H.W agner, Phys.Rev.Lett. 17, 1133 (1966).
- ⁴⁸ B.Hafskjold and G.Stell, in The Liquid State of Matter: Fluids, Simple and Complex, edited by E.W. Montroll and J.L. Lebowitz (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982), p.175.
- ⁴⁹ M.E.Fisher, J.Stat.Phys. 75, 1 (1994).
- ⁵⁰ R.Folk and G.Moser, Int.J. Therm ophys. 16, 1363 (1995).
- ⁵¹ O.Boxberg and K.W esterholt, J.M ag.M ag.M at. 140 {144, 1563 (1995).
- ⁵² T.W. Burkhardt and E.Eisenriegler, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, 3189 (1995).
- ⁵³ E.Luijten and H.W.J.Blote, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 1557 (1996); 76, 3662 (1996).
- ⁵⁴ E.Luijten and H.W.J.Blote, Int.J.M od.Phys.C 6, 359 (1995).
- ⁵⁵ M.Kac and C.J.Thom pson, J.M ath. Phys. 10, 1373 (1969).
- ⁵⁶ L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Statistical Physics (Pergam on, London, 1959).
- ⁵⁷ F.J.Dyson, Comm.Math.Phys.21, 269 (1971).
- ⁵⁸ E.Luijten and H.W.J.B lote, to be published.
- ⁵⁹ V.Privm an and M.E.Fisher, J.Stat.Phys. 33, 385 (1983).
- ⁶⁰ S.-k.Ma, Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena (Addison-Wesley, Redwood, California, 1976).
- ⁶¹ K.Binder, Z.Phys.B 43, 119 (1981).
- ⁶² H.W.J.Blote, E.Luiten, and J.R.Heringa, J.Phys. A 28, 6289 (1995).
- ⁶³ E.Brezin and J.Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B 257 [FS14], 867 (1985).
- ⁶⁴ J.G.Brankov, Physica A 168, 1035 (1990).
- ⁶⁵ E.Luijten, H.W.J.Blote, and K.Binder, Phys. Rev.E 54, 4626 (1996).



FIG.1. The amplitude ratio Q as a function of the decay parameter in (a) d = 1, (b) d = 2, and (c) d = 3 dimensions. The solid line marks the renormalization prediction.



FIG.2. The amplitude ratio Q in a one-dimensional system as a function of the system size L for various values of . Figure (a) illustrates the increase of the nite-size corrections when the upper critical dimension (= d=2) is approached. Figure (b) emphasizes the dimension between nite-size corrections above the upper critical dimension (power-law) and at the upper critical dimension itself (logarithm ic).



FIG.3. The critical coupling K_c as a function of the decay parameter for (a) d = 1, (b) d = 2, and (c) d = 3. Also shown is the asymptotic behavior for # 0 as predicted by m ean-eld theory and m ean-eld values for K_c over the full range of 0 < < d=2 (for d = 2 and d = 3 only approximately).



FIG.4. The spin spin correlation function versus r=L in the one-dimensionalm odel with = 0:1. Results for various system sizes are shown. For a discussion see the text.

TABLE I. The amplitude ratio Q and the therm all exponent y_t for systems with long-range interactions in one, two, and three dimensions, for several values of the decay parameter 0 < d=2. The values in the fth column have been obtained with Q and the theoretically predicted value (see text) and the last column lists the renormalization predictions for y_t .

| d | | Q | Уt | Уt | RG |
|---|------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 1 | 0.1 | 0.4566 (8) | 0.507 (7) | 0.507 (7) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | 0.2 | 0.455 (4) | 0.54 (4) | 0.504 (12) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | 0.25 | 0.457 (3) | 0.500 (8) | 0.500 (5) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.454 (2) | 0.519 (14) | 0.506 (12) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.457 (3) | 0.50 (2) | 0.50 (2) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0.465 (8) | 0.51 (4) | 0.501 (16) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 2 | 0.2 | 0.4574 (10) | 1.01 (2) | 1.01 (2) | 1 |
| 2 | 0.4 | 0.455 (2) | 1.02 (2) | 1.009 (15) | 1 |
| 2 | 0.6 | 0.450 (6) | 1.04 (4) | 1.008 (17) | 1 |
| 2 | 0.8 | 0.454 (6) | 1.03 (9) | 1.03 (3) | 1 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 0.468 (11) | 1.04 (8) | 1.07 (7) | 1 |
| 3 | 0.2 | 0.4581 (11) | 1.51 (3) | 1.513 (18) | <u>3</u> 2 |
| 3 | 0.4 | 0.4561 (10) | 1.521 (18) | 1.512 (15) | 3 2 |
| 3 | 0.6 | 0.453 (3) | 1.53 (4) | 1.521 (14) | 3 2 |
| 3 | 0.8 | 0.458 (2) | 1.48 (2) | 1.487 (10) | <u>3</u> 2 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 0.453 (10) | 1.52 (7) | 1.508 (9) | 3 2 |
| 3 | 12 | 0.447 (8) | 1.56 (2) | 1.519 (10) | 3 2 |
| 3 | 1.4 | 0.454 (5) | 1.48 (3) | 1.48 (3) | <u>3</u> 2 |
| 3 | 15 | 0.466 (8) | 1.65 (6) | 1.57 (4) | 3 2 |

TABLE II. The amplitude ratio Q and critical couplings K $_{\rm c}$ for system s with long-range interactions in one, two, and three dimensions, for several values of the decay parameter 0 < d=2. The therm all exponent (see Table I) was kept xed at its theoretical value in all analyses. The estimates for K $_{\rm c}$ in the last column have been obtained by xing Q at its renorm alization prediction. The num bers between parentheses represent the errors in the last decimal places.

| d | | Q | K c | K c |
|---|------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1 | 0.1 | 0.4565 (8) | 0.0476162 (13) | 0.0476168 (6) |
| 1 | 0.2 | 0.4579 (7) | 0.092234 (2) | 0.0922314 (15) |
| 1 | 0.25 | 0.4579 (15) | 0.114143 (4) | 0.1141417 (19) |
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.4567 (15) | 0.136113 (4) | 0.136110 (2) |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.457 (3) | 0.181151 (8) | 0.181150 (3) |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0.466 (7) | 0.229160 (13) | 0,229156 (5) |
| 2 | 0.2 | 0.4573 (10) | 0.028533 (3) | 0.0285324 (14) |
| 2 | 0.4 | 0.4565 (17) | 0.051824 (4) | 0.0518249 (14) |
| 2 | 0.6 | 0.456 (4) | 0.071364 (7) | 0.071366 (2) |
| 2 | 0.8 | 0.458 (5) | 0.088094 (7) | 0.088094 (2) |
| 2 | 1.0 | 0.468 (7) | 0.102572 (6) | 0.102568 (6) |
| 3 | 0.2 | 0.4584 (9) | 0.0144361 (10) | 0.0144354 (6) |
| 3 | 0.4 | 0.4569 (8) | 0.0262927 (16) | 0.0262929 (7) |
| 3 | 0.6 | 0.4581 (9) | 0.036050 (2) | 0.0360469 (11) |
| 3 | 0.8 | 0.4562 (13) | 0.044034 (2) | 0.0440354 (10) |
| 3 | 1.0 | 0.4571 (14) | 0.050515 (2) | 0.0505152 (12) |
| 3 | 12 | 0.457 (3) | 0.055682 (3) | 0.0556825 (14) |
| 3 | 1.4 | 0.455 (5) | 0.059666 (2) | 0.059667 (1) |
| 3 | 1,5 | 0.467 (6) | 0.061248 (3) | 0.061250 (2) |

TABLE III. Com parison between our best estimates of the critical couplings K $_{\rm c}$ for the one-dimensional system and earlier estimates.

| | Thiswork | Ref.18 | Ref.19 | R ef. 20 | Ref. 42 | Ref.21 | R ef. 27 | Ref.43 |
|------|----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|----------|--------|
| 0.1 | 0.0476168 (6) | | 0.0478468 | 0.0505 (5) | 0.04635 | 0.04777 (12) | 0.0469 | 0.0481 |
| 0.2 | 0.0922314 (15) | 0.0926 (5) | 0.0933992 | 0.0923 (9) | 0.09155 | 0.0928 (3) | 0.0898 | |
| 0.25 | 0.1141417 (19) | | | | | | 0.1106 | |
| 0.3 | 0.136110 (2) | 0.1370 (7) | 0.138478 | 0.1362 (14) | 0.1359 | 0.1375 (10) | 0.1314 | 0.144 |
| 0.4 | 0.181150 (3) | 0.1825 (10) | 0.184081 | 0.1815 (18) | 0.1813 | 0.183 (2) | 0.1750 | |
| 0.5 | 0,229156 (5) | 0.2307 (14) | 0,230821 | 0.230 (2) | 0,2295 | 0.231 (4) | 0,2251 | 0.250 |

TABLE IV. Comparison of our best estimates of the critical couplings for the one-dimensional system with some lower and upper bounds.

| | T h is w ork | R ef. 24 | R ef. 24 | Ref.25 |
|-----|----------------|----------|----------|---------|
| 0.1 | 0.0476168 (6) | 0.04726 | 0.09456 | 0.04753 |
| 0.2 | 0.0922314 (15) | 0.08947 | 0.1792 | 0.09162 |
| 0.3 | 0.136110 (2) | 0.1273 | 0.2558 | |
| 0.4 | 0.181150 (3) | 0.1615 | 0.3258 | |
| 0.5 | 0,229156 (5) | 0.1923 | 0.3903 | |

TABLE V. Estimates for the critical coupling K $_{\rm c}$ and the exponent $y_{\rm h}$ as obtained from the analysis of the magnetic susceptibility. The values for $y_{\rm h}$ in the fth column have been obtained by xing K $_{\rm c}$ at their best estimates from Table II; the error margins do not include the uncertainty in these values for K $_{\rm c}$.

| d | | K c | Уh | Уh | RG |
|---|------|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1 | 01 | 0.0476161 (19) | 0.7487 (14) | 0.7493 (6) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 02 | 0.092239 (4) | 0.752 (2) | 0.7504 (10) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.25 | 0.114145 (4) | 0.7477 (15) | 0.7468 (16) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.136110 (5) | 0.747 (3) | 0.7490 (17) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.181170 (10) | 0.749 (5) | 0.746 (3) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0.229163 (8) | 0.751 (3) | 0.7492 (11) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 2 | 0.2 | 0.028537 (5) | 1,500 (6) | 1.495 (3) | 3 2 |
| 2 | 0.4 | 0.051830 (6) | 1.498 (9) | 1.496 (3) | 3 |
| 2 | 0.6 | 0.071370 (5) | 1.497 (6) | 1.498 (2) | 3 |
| 2 | 0.8 | 0.088095 (10) | 1.496 (5) | 1.495 (3) | 3 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 0.102568 (3) | 1,502 (9) | 1,501 (7) | 3 |
| 3 | 0.2 | 0.0144347 (9) | 2,249 (2) | 2,2504 (8) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 0.4 | 0.026296 (2) | 2,250 (6) | 2,246 (3) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 0.6 | 0.036046 (3) | 2,246 (7) | 2,244 (5) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 0.8 | 0.0440349 (17) | 2,243 (4) | 2,246 (3) | 9 4 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 0.050516 (3) | 2,239 (2) | 2,243 (7) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 12 | 0.055679 (2) | 2,247 (11) | 2,251 (7) | 9 4 |
| 3 | 1.4 | 0.0596636 (18) | 2.27 (3) | 2,26 (2) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 1.5 | 0.061251 (2) | 2,255 (11) | 2,253 (6) | <u>9</u> 4 |

TABLE VI. The correlation length exponent as a function of for the one-dimensional model, together with earlier estimates and the renorm alization predictions.

| | T his work | R ef. 20 | R ef. 42 | R ef. 43 | RG |
|------|------------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| 0.1 | 9,3 (6) | 9.12 | 9.9 | 10.48 | 10.0 |
| 0.2 | 4.9 (3) | 4.90 | 4.95 | | 5.0 |
| 0.25 | 4.00 (8) | | | | 4.0 |
| 0.3 | 3,27 (12) | 3.41 | 3.32 | 3.90 | 3.3::: |
| 0.4 | 2.50 (13) | 2.71 | 2.68 | | 2.5 |
| 0.5 | 2.00 (6) | 2.34 | 2.33 | 2.81 | 2.0 |

TABLE V II. The m agnetization exponent as a function of for the one-dimensional model, together with earlier estimates and the renorm alization predictions.

| | T h is w ork | Ref.18 | R ef. 21 | RG |
|------|--------------|--------|----------|---------------|
| 0.1 | 0.494 (8) | | 0.495 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0.2 | 0.495 (13) | 0.5 | 0.482 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0.25 | 0.506 (8) | | | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0.3 | 0.497 (15) | 0.48 | 0.460 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0.4 | 0.51 (2) | 0.45 | 0.435 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 0.5 | 0.501 (18) | 0.39 | 0.408 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

TABLE VIII. Estimates for the critical coupling K $_{\rm c}$ and the exponent $y_{\rm h}$ as obtained from the analysis of the spin (spin correlation function. The values for $y_{\rm h}$ in the ffh column have been obtained by xing K $_{\rm c}$ at their best estimates from Table II; the error margins do not include the uncertainty in these values for K $_{\rm c}$.

| d | | K _c | У _h | У _h | RG |
|---|------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1 | 0.1 | 0.047619 (3) | 0.750 (2) | 0.7488 (9) | 3 4 |
| 1 | 0.2 | 0.092233 (7) | 0.749 (3) | 0.7513 (16) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.25 | 0.114148 (10) | 0.750 (5) | 0.747 (2) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.136116 (7) | 0.753 (5) | 0.752 (3) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.181158 (15) | 0.747 (7) | 0.750 (4) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0,229161 (9) | 0.753 (3) | 0.7513 (11) | <u>3</u> 4 |
| 2 | 0.2 | 0.028535 (7) | 1.499 (9) | 1.496 (3) | 3 2 |
| 2 | 0.4 | 0.051831 (6) | 1,505 (6) | 1.499 (4) | <u>3</u> 2 |
| 2 | 0.6 | 0.071369 (6) | 1.507 (4) | 1,502 (4) | 3 2 |
| 2 | 0.8 | 0.088091 (6) | 1.495 (7) | 1.497 (3) | <u>3</u> 2 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 0.102569 (3) | 1.509 (8) | 1,508 (6) | 32 |
| 3 | 0.2 | 0.0144348 (16) | 2,256 (6) | 2,254 (4) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 0.4 | 0.026296 (3) | 2,257 (8) | 2,245 (5) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 0.6 | 0.036053 (4) | 2,262 (10) | 2,246 (4) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 0.8 | 0.044035 (4) | 2,252 (11) | 2,250 (5) | <u>9</u> 4 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 0.050511 (5) | 2,228 (15) | 2,249 (9) | 9 4 |
| 3 | 12 | 0.055680 (3) | 2,253 (14) | 2,257 (9) | 9 4 |
| 3 | 1.4 | 0.059667 (2) | 2.22 (4) | 2.31 (4) | 9 4 |
| 3 | 1,5 | 0.061251 (3) | 2,251 (15) | 2,251 (8) | 9 4 |