# C lassical criticalbehavior of $s p$ in $m$ odels $w$ ith long-range interactions 

E rik Luifen'ı' and H enk W . J. B lote<br>D epartm ent of $P$ hysics, D elft U niversity of Technology, Lorentzw eg 1, 2628 CJ D elft, $T$ he $N$ etherlands<br>(January 11, 2022)


#### Abstract

W e present the results of extensive $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations of Ising $m$ odels $w$ ith algebraically decaying ferrom agnetic interactions in the regim e where classical critical behavior is expected for these system s . W e corroborate the values for the exponents predicted by renorm alization theory for system $s$ in one, two, and three dim ensions and accurately observe the predicted logarithm ic corrections at the upper critical dim ension. W e give both theoretical and num erical evidence that above the upper critical dim ension the decay of the critical spin \{spin correlation function in nite system $s$ consists of tw o di erent regim es. For one-dim ensional system s our estim ates for the critical couplings are $m$ ore than tw o orders ofm agnitude $m$ ore accurate than existing estim ates. In tw o and three dim ensions we give, to our know ledge, the rst results for the critical couplings.
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## I. IN TRODUCTION

The critical behavior of Ising $m$ odels $w$ ith long-range interactions has attracted $m$ uff abtantiont-during the last three decades. For the one-dim ensional case, som e analytical results have been obtained ${ }^{2}-2$
 gebraically decapinginteractionstin
 developed a renorm alization-like approach to the one-dim ensionalinverse-squarem odell ${ }^{3}$ i ${ }^{3} 11$. Further renorm alizationgroup studies of this particular case are presented in $R$ efs. 1 M a, and N icke ${ }^{3} 5$ and Sak ${ }^{3611}$ who obtained renom alization predictions for the criticalexponents ofm odels of general dim ensionality $d<4 \mathrm{w}$ ith algebraically decaying interactions (obtained independently by Suzuki et alliz). O ther w orks conceming $d>1$ are tw o con jectures on, respectively, the boundary betw een long-range and short-range behavior and the bqundary betw een classical ( $m$ ean-eld) and nonclassicalbehavior, both by Stelli, ${ }^{38 \mathrm{~A}}$ a (nefiuted) con jecture by $G$ ri ths, ${ }^{39}{ }^{39}$ a rigorous con $m$ ation of the upper criticaldim ension by $A$ izenm an and Femandez ${ }^{n}$, 10 and a variational approach to the Ising $m$ odelw ith long-range interactions ${ }^{401}$ Furtherm ore, $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations have been carried out for one particular choice of the spin \{spin interaction in a tw o-dim ensionalm odel ${ }^{1411} \mathrm{H}$ ow ever, to our know ledge, neither any further veri cations of the renorm alization predictions nor any other results are available for higherdim ensional ( $\alpha>1$ ) models. To conclude this sum $m$ ary,-we, $m$ ention that the one-dim ensional $q$-state $P$ otts $m$ odel
 the Bethe lattice $4^{4}{ }^{4!}$

W hy are these m odels 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 criticalbehavior. E.g., in one-dim ensional system s 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 m odel displays a rem arkable behavior: At the critical tem perature the order param eter exhibits a nite jum $p$ (see Sec.'III), but the free energy has an essential singularity such that all them alproperties are sm ooth. In-this sense, the phase transition can be regarded as the one-dim ensional analog of a K osterlitz $\{T$ houless transition 14,1461 although the jum $p$ in the $m$ agnetization is not present there, as follow $s$ from the $M$ erm in $\{W$ agner theorem 4.] Just as $d=2$ is the lower critical dim ension for the two-dim ensionalX $Y$ model w ith short-range interactions, $=1$ is a critical decay rate in a one-dim ensional system $w$ ith interactions decaying as $r^{(1+}$ ), see Ref. ${ }^{3} 2 \overline{2} \underline{I}^{\prime}$. W ith respect to higher-dim ensional system $s$, we note that the decay rate of van der $W$ aals forces in realistic three-dim ensional system $s$ is only slightly faster than at the boundary betw een short-range (Ising-like) and long-range criticalbehavior. $T$ he question of criticality in ionic system $s$, where the (screeperd), foulomb interactions $m$ ight lead to e ectively algebraically decaying interactions, appears still open to debate 4 long-range universality class have been observed experim entally in a ferrom agnetic phase transition 511 R ecently, it has
been derived that critical uctuations $m$ ay give rise to long-range $C$ asim ir forces (decaying $m$ uch $m$ ore slow ly than van der $W$ aals interactions) betw een uncharged particles im $m$ ersed in a critical uid ${ }^{521}$ Furtherm ore, it was shown by A nderson and Yuva ${ }^{28129}$ ? that the K ondo problem corresponds to a one-dim ensional Ising $m$ odelw th a com bination of inverse-square and nearest-neighbor interactions. Y et another application follow $s$ from $R$ ef.! $22_{1}^{\prime}$, where it was show $n$ that random exchange (Levy- ight) processes can generate e ective interactionswhich decay algebraically. H ence, the universal criticalproperties of the nonequilibrium steady state of these system s are those of the long-range equilibrium Ising $m$ odels studied in this paper. Finally, the realization that the upper critical dim ension can be varied by tuning the decay rate of the interaction led to a special application of these models in Ref. 153.1 . Here, they were used to analyze a long-standing controversy on the universality of the renom alized coupling constant above the upper critical dim ension.

In this article, we present accurate num erical results for Ising system $s$ w ith algebraically decaying interactions in one, two, and three dim ensions. Until now, the long-range character of the spin \{spin interactions has been the m ain bottleneck for the exam ination of these system s by m eans of num erical m ethods (and, in fact, also for their analytical solution). A ll previously published num erical results therefore rely on, various extrapolations based on data for sm all system s . H ow ever, the advent of a novel $M$ onte $C$ arlo algorithm ${ }^{541}$ for the rst tim e enabled us to e ciently sim ulate these system s . 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 dim ension; iii) rst estim ates of the critical tem peratures of tw o-and three-dim ensional system s w ith longrange interactions; iv) veri cation of previously obtained estim ates of the critical tem peratures of one-dim ensional system $s$, which in addition im plies a check on the various extrapolation m ethods that have been developed; v) veri cation of predicted bounds on the critical tem peratures; vi) veri cation of a con jecture on the behavior of the critical tem perature as a function of the decay param eter. A nother problem one encounters in the sim ulations is the large param eter space: $T$ he sim ulations 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 $d=1 ; 2 ; 3$. T he total com puting tim e dedicated to the results presented in this paper am ounts to approxim ately two CPU years on a m odem workstation.

The outline of this paper is as follow s. In Sec. ${ }^{[I I}$, we sum up the known rigorous results for the Ising chain w ith long-range interactions. In Sec.' 'ITI, we review the renorm alization scenario of these m odels and derive the nite-size scaling behavior of several quantities. These include the corrections to scaling, both at and above the upper critical dim ension. O ur num erical results are presented and analyzed in Sec. 'ITV' and com pared w ith previously obtained results. F inally, we sum $m$ arize our conclusions in Sec. ${ }^{V} \mathrm{~V}$. T The A ppendix contains technical details conceming the application of the long-range $M$ onte $C$ arlo algorithm to the $m$ odels studied in this paper.

## II. R IG OROUSRESULTS FOR THEONE-DIMENSIONALCASE

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

$$
H=\underbrace{\Lambda}_{i j} J(i \quad j) S_{i} S_{j} ;
$$

where the sum runs over all spin pairs. W e are particularly interested in algebraically decaying interactions, is, $J(n) / n$. To ensure that the energy of the system does not diverge, it is required that $>1$. In 1968, R uella $l_{1}^{I_{1}}$ rigorously proved the absence of long-range order in a spin chain $w$ ith ferrom agnetic spin \{spin couplings $J$ (i $j$ ) such that the sum

$$
X_{n=1}^{\mathbb{N}} n J(n)
$$

does not diverge in the lim it N ! 1 . For algebraically decaying interactions, this im plies the absence of a phase transition for $>2$. Shortly later, $D$ yson ${ }^{\mathbb{R}}$ proved the existence of a phase transition if the sum $s N_{n=1}^{N} J(n)$ and $P_{N=1}^{N}(\log \log n) n^{3} J(n)^{1}$ both converge, for positive and monotonically decreasing $J(n)$. In particular, a phase transition occurs for $J(n) / n \quad w$ ith $1 \ll 2$. 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, Dyson'3 was (as were| much later| also Rogers and Thom pson ${ }^{(61)}$ ) able to replace Ruelle's condition with a stronger one, whidh however still left the case $=2$ undecided. This alsa holds for an even more stringent criterion by $T$ houless ${ }_{1} / 4$ who generalized the argum ent of Landau and Lifshit $z^{56}$. for the absence of a phase transition in an Ising chain with short-range interactions. H ow ever, $T$ houless argued on entropic grounds that if a phase transition exists for $=2$, the $m$ agnetization $m$ ust have a
discontinuity at the transition point. This, was later dubbed the $\backslash T$ houless e ect" by D yson, who proved $\#$ to occur in the closely related hierarchicalm odel $I^{1573}$ Sim on and Sokalm ade $T$ houless' argum ent partially rigorous,,$^{515}$ but later A izenm an et alla showed that, although a discontinuity in the order param eter is indeed present if there is a phase transition, his argum ent does not account for this. N am ely, T houless had assum ed that the spin $\{$ spin correlation function $h s_{0} S_{r} i \quad h s_{0}$ ihs $s_{r} i$ vanishes in the lim itr! 1 , whereas actually the critical exponent is equal to 1 in this case. M eanw hile, Frohlich and Spencer $n^{\prime \prime}$ had been able to rigorously prove the existence of a phase transition in the borderline case and thus to corroborate the K ac\{T hom 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-dim ensional $m$ odel $w$ ith inversesquare interactions, where the two-point correlation function exhibits pow er-law decay $w$ ith an exponent which varies continuously in a nite tem perature range below the critical tem perature ${ }^{1111}$

## III. FIN ITE-SIZEANALYSIS OF THECRITICALBEHAVIOR

A lready in a very early stage of the history of the "-expansion, $F$ isher, $M$ a, and $N$ ickelanalyzed the criticalbehavior
 that the upper critical dim ension is given by $d_{u}=2$, as was previously con jectured by Stelp ${ }^{8!}$ and later rigorously proven by A izenm an and Femandez ${ }_{\text {nd }}^{\text {d }}$ For m ore slow ly decaying interactions, $0 \ll d=2$, the criticalbehavior is classical, whereas the critical exponents assum e nonclassical, continuously varying values for $\mathrm{d}=2 \ll 2$. For $>2$ they take their short-range (Ising) values. Sak, how ever, found that already for $>2$ sr the criticalbehavior is Isinglike, where sr denotes the exponent in the corresponding $m$ odelw ith short-range interactions. In this article we concentrate on the classical range, for which we have perform ed extensize $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations of spin $m$ odels in $d=1 ; 2 ; 3$. The nonclassical range $w$ ill be the sub ject of a future article ${ }_{2} d_{1}^{\prime}$
$W$ e brie $y$ outline the renorm alization scenario for these $m$ odels, in order to derive the nite-size scaling relations required to analyze the num ericaldata. W e start from the follow ing Landau \{G inzburg $\{\mathrm{W}$ ilson H am iltonian in m om entum space,

$$
\begin{equation*}
H(k)=k_{B} T=\frac{1}{2} X_{k} \quad j k+j_{2} k^{2}+r_{0} \quad k \quad k+\frac{u}{4 N} \quad X \quad X \quad X \quad k_{1} \quad k_{1} \quad k_{1} \quad k_{2} \quad k_{3} \quad k_{1} k_{2} k_{3} \quad h \quad \frac{N}{2} \quad k=0 \quad: \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The jk term arises from the Fourier transform of the interactions decaying as $\mathrm{r}{ }^{(\mathrm{d}+}{ }^{\text {) } . ~ T h e ~} j_{2} \mathrm{k}^{2}$ term norm ally representing the short-range interactions, is included because it $w$ illappear anyw ay in the renorm alization process and $w$ ill com pete $w$ ith the long-range term N 36 U nder a renorm alization transform ation $w$ ith a rescaling factor $b=e^{1}$, the term $j k$ is transform ed into $j k^{0}$, with $k^{0}=k b$. To keep the coe cient of the $k$ term xed, we rescale the eld k to $\mathrm{k}^{0}=\mathrm{b}^{=2} \mathrm{k}$. Thus, the coe cient of the $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ term decreases as $\mathrm{b}^{2}$ and the coe cient of the ${ }^{4}$ changes proportional to $\mathrm{b}^{2} \mathrm{~d}$. Hence, the $G$ aussian $x e d$ point dom inates the renorm alization ow for $<d=2$, which is the situation studied in this paper.

For the sake of generality we treat here the case of an $n$-com ponent order param eter with $O(n)$ sym $m$ etry. The renorm alization equations are then given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d r_{0}}{d l}=r_{0}+a(n+2) u\left(c \quad r_{0}\right) ;  \tag{4a}\\
& \frac{d u}{d l}=" u \quad a(n+8) u^{2} ; \tag{4b}
\end{align*}
$$

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 com plete to second order, because the $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{u}^{2}\right)$ term is m issing in Eq. (A는).

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.u(1)=u e^{" 1} \frac{1}{1+u \frac{a(n+8)}{"}\left(e^{11}\right.} 1\right) ; \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $u$ denotes the value of $u$ at $l=0$. This yields, to leading order in $u$, the follow ing solution for the rst equation,

$$
r_{0}(1)=\left[r_{0}+\operatorname{ac}(n+2) u=(d \quad)\right] e^{1} \frac{1}{1+\frac{a(n+8)}{n} u\left(e^{" 1} \quad 1\right)} \#_{(n+2)=(n+8)}^{\frac{a c(n+2) u e^{" 1}=(d \quad)}{1+\frac{a(n+8)}{n} u\left(e^{" 1} \quad 1\right)} ; ~ ; ~}
$$

$w$ ith $r_{0} \quad r_{0}(l=0)$. The rst factor between square brackets is proportional to the reduced tem perature $t$ (T $\left.T_{C}\right)=T_{C}$ and the last term is the so-called shift of the criticaltem perature. $T$ he factors $\left[1+a(n+8) u\left(e^{" 1} \quad 1\right)="\right]^{1}$
 the value $u=0^{-}$and the $G$ aussian xed point $(0 ; 0)$ is thus indeed stable. T he pertinent renom alization exponents are: $y_{t}=, y_{h}=(d+\quad)=2$, and $y_{i}=2 \quad d$.


$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{u c}(1)=\frac{u}{1+a(n+8) u l} ; \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the superscript \uc" indicates that we are operating at the upper criticaldim ension. This solution can be used to solve, again to leading order in $u, E q$. (4áa), yielding

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{0}^{\mathrm{uc}}(\mathrm{l})=\left[\mathrm{r}_{0}+\mathrm{ac}(\mathrm{n}+2) \mathrm{u}=(\mathrm{d}=2)\right] \mathrm{e}^{1} \frac{1}{1+\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{n}+8) \mathrm{ul}}{ }^{(\mathrm{n}+2)=(\mathrm{n}+8)} \quad \frac{\mathrm{ac}(\mathrm{n}+2) \mathrm{u}=(\mathrm{d}=2)}{1+\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{n}+8) \mathrm{ul}} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

or, in term $s$ of the rescaling factor b ,

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{0}^{\mathrm{uc}}=\left[r_{0}+\mathrm{ac}(\mathrm{n}+2) \mathrm{u}=(\mathrm{d}=2)\right] \mathrm{b} \frac{1}{1+\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{n}+8) \mathrm{u} \ln \mathrm{~b}}{ }^{(\mathrm{n}+2)=(\mathrm{n}+8)} \quad \frac{\mathrm{ac}(\mathrm{n}+2) \mathrm{u}=(\mathrm{d}=2)}{1+\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{n}+8) \mathrm{ln} \ln \mathrm{~b}}: \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since is xed at $d=2$ the factor $d=2$ in the last term is identical to the corresponding factor ( $d$ ) in Eq. $(\overline{(G)}$ ).
 tem perature is proportional to b ", whereas this factor vanishes at the upper critical dim ension itself and the factor ( $e^{11} \quad 1$ ) $=$ " in the second-order correction tums into a $\ln b$ term, yielding a logarithm ic shift of the form $1=(A \ln b+B)$.

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t ; h ; u ; 1=L)=b^{d} f b^{y_{t}} t+\sim u b^{y_{i} y_{t}} ; b^{y_{h}} h ; b^{y_{i}} u ; b=L+g ; \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sim=\operatorname{ac}(n+2)=(d \quad)$ and we have included a nite-size eld $L^{1} . g$ denotes the analytic part of the transform ation. We abbreviate the rst term on the right-hand side as $b^{d} f\left(t^{0} ; \mathrm{h}^{0} ; \mathrm{u}^{0} ; \mathrm{b}=\mathrm{L}\right)$. H ow ever, we $m$ ust take into account the fact that, for $T, ~ T_{c}$, the free energy is singular at $u=0$. This $m$ akes $u$ a so-called dangerous irrelevant variable; see, e.g., R ef. 15 . A s discussed in Ref. $5 \mathbf{T}$, the correct nite-size scaling properties are obtained by setting $b=L$ and $m$ aking the substitution ${ }^{0}=u^{01=4}$. This leads to a new universal fiunction, $f^{n}$, with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{t}^{0} ; \mathrm{h}^{0} ; \mathrm{u}^{0} ; 1\right)+\mathrm{g}=\mathrm{f}^{\sim}(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{K}) ; \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $t=t^{0}=u^{\mathbb{1}=2}$ and $\check{K}=h^{0}=u^{\mathbb{1}=4}$. The analytic part of the transform ation also contributes to the singular dependence of the free energy on $t$ (see, e.g., $\mathrm{Ref}. \mathrm{i}^{6} \mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{Ch} . \mathrm{VI,x} 3$ ): D espite the regularity of this term in each single renorm alization step, the in nite num ber of steps still leads to the build-up of a singularity. T his contribution, denoted


$$
\begin{align*}
f \quad t ; h ; u ; \frac{1}{L} & =L^{d} f^{y^{y_{t}} y_{i}=2} \frac{1}{u^{1=2}} t+\sim u L^{y_{i} y_{t}} ; L^{y_{h} y_{i}=4} \frac{h}{u^{1=4}}  \tag{12a}\\
& =L^{d} \tilde{f} L^{y_{t}} \frac{1}{u^{1=2}} t+\sim u L^{y_{i} y_{t}} ; L^{y_{h}} \frac{h}{u^{1=4}}: \tag{12b}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, we have introduced the exponents $y_{t} \quad y_{t} \quad y_{i}=2=d=2$ and $y_{h} \quad y_{h} \quad y_{i}=4=3 d=4$. The corresponding critical exponents indeed assum e their xed, classical values; $=0,=1=2,=1,=3$. The exponent is singled out here as a special case; even $w$ ithout taking into account the $m$ odi cation of $y_{t}$ and $y_{h}$ due to the dangerous irrelevant variable one obtains the classical value $=1$. Since the correlation length exponent $=1=y$ (it is not a ected by the singular dependence of the free energy on-u), we see that hyperscaling is violated, which is a w ell-know n result for system s above their upper critical dim ension '59.'T he rescaling of the pair-correlation function $g$ (decay ing proportional to $1=r^{d}{ }^{2+}$ ) relates the exponent to the rescaling factor of the eld, yielding $=2 \quad . \mathrm{N}$ ote that this contrasts with the short-range case ( $=2$ ), where assum es its $m$ ean-eld value for all dim ensionalties d 4. This implies that direct experim entalm easurem ent of either or o ers a way to discem whether the interactions in a system are $m$ ean-eld-like $(=1=2,=0)$ or have the form of a slow ly decaying pow er-law. Below the upper criticaldim ension, how ever, the nite-size scaling behavior of the spin \{spin correlation fiunction is (apart from a volum e factor) identical
to that of the $m$ agnetic susceptibility. This relation yields a contradiction above the upper critical dim ension, since depends on the scaled combination $t^{y_{t}}$, instead of $\mathrm{L}^{{ }^{\mathrm{yt}}}$. Indeed, the susceptibility diverges as $t$ and the nite-size behavior of is thus $L / L^{y_{t}}=L^{d=2}$, corresponding to $g / L^{d=2}$. On the other hand, if one assum es that the nite-size behavior of the correlation function is identical to the large-distance behavior, one expects that $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}(\mathrm{d} 2+)=\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{d})$. Only at the upper critical dimension, $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{u}}=2$, these twopredictions coincide. W e w ill retum to this point at the end of this section. Furtherm ore, we willexam ine the behavior of the spin \{spin correlation function in Sec. 'I $\bar{I} \overline{1}{ }^{\prime}$.

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

$$
\begin{align*}
f \quad t ; h ; u ; \frac{1}{L} & =b^{d} f \frac{b^{y_{t}}}{(\ln b)^{(n+2)=(n+8)}} t+\sim b^{y t} \frac{u}{1+\sim^{\sim} u \ln b} ; b^{y_{h} h} ; \frac{u}{1+\sim_{u l n} b} ; \frac{b}{L}+g  \tag{13a}\\
& =L^{d} f^{\frac{L^{y t}}{(\ln L)^{(n+2)=(n+8)}}} \frac{1}{u^{1=2}} t+\sim L L^{y t} \frac{u}{1+\sim_{u \ln L}} ; L^{y_{h}} \frac{h}{u^{1=4}} \quad ; \tag{13b}
\end{align*}
$$

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 $G$ aussian $x e d$ point is $m$ arginally stable), the exponents $y_{t}$ and $y_{h}$ now coincide $w$ ith $y_{t}$ 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 argum ent 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 w ith respect to the appropriate scaling elds. In the $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations we have sam pled the second and the fourth $m$ om ent of the $m$ agnetization density, the dim ensionless amplitude ratio $Q \quad \mathrm{hm}^{2} i^{2}=\mathrm{hm}{ }^{4} i$ (which is directly related to the $B$ inder cum ulant ${ }^{611}$ ), 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 w ith respect to $h$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{lm}^{2} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{L} \text { d } \frac{@^{2} f}{@ \mathrm{~h}^{2}}(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{h} ; \mathrm{u} ; 1=\mathrm{L})=\mathrm{L}^{2 \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{h}}} 2 \mathrm{~d} \mathrm{f}^{(2)} \quad \mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}}} \frac{\hat{\mathrm{E}}}{\mathrm{u}^{1=2}} ; \mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{h}}} \frac{\mathrm{~h}}{\mathrm{u}^{1=4}} ; \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{f}^{(2)}$ stands for the second derivative of $\tilde{f} w$ ith respect to its second argum ent and $\hat{t} \quad t+\sim u L^{y_{i}} y_{t}$. 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.


$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{h}}} \mathrm{~h}{\frac{\mathrm{u}}{1+{ }^{\sim} \mathrm{u} \ln \mathrm{~L}}}^{1=4} ; \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{lm}^{2} i=L^{2 y_{h}} 2 \mathrm{~d} \frac{u}{1+{ }^{\sim} u \ln L} \overbrace{}^{1=2} f^{(2)} \frac{L^{y t}}{(\ln L)^{(n+2)=(n+8)}} \frac{1}{u^{1=2}} t+\sim L{ }^{y t} \frac{u}{1+\sim^{\sim} u \ln L} \quad ; L^{y_{h}} \frac{u}{1+\sim^{\sim} u \ln L} \quad l^{1=4}! \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the fourth $m$ agnetization $m$ om ent a sim ilar expression holds and in the am plitude ratio $Q$ all prefactors divide out, both for $"<0$ and $"=0$. Thus we nd that the ratio $Q$ is given by a universal function $\mathbb{Q}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{L}(T)=Q L^{y_{t}} \frac{\hat{\epsilon}}{u^{1=2}}+q_{i} L^{d 2 y_{h}}+ \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have om itted the $h$ dependence of $\widetilde{Q}$, 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 energy ${ }^{621}$ and the ellipsis stands for higher pow ens ofL ${ }^{d}{ }^{2 y_{h}}$ (faster-decaying term $s$ ). At " $=0$, tm ust be replaced by the argum ent with in square brackets in Eq. (13 $\bar{b}_{1}^{\prime}$ ), m ultiplied by the factor ( $\left.\ln L\right)^{(n+2)=(n+8)}$. Finally, wem ay derive the nite-size scaling behavior of the spin \{spin correlation function $g(r)$ by di erentiating the free energy density to tw o localm agnetic elds, which couple to the spins at positions 0 and $r$, respectively, and assum ing that the nite-size behavior is identical to the $r$ dependence of $g$. If $w e$ do not take into account the dangerous irrelevant variable $m$ echanism, we nd $g / L^{2 y_{h}} 2 d=L$ (d), just as we found before from $=2$. H ow ever, replacing yr by $y_{h} y$ ields $g / L d=2$, in agreem ent $w$ ith the $L$ dependence of the $m$ agnetic susceptibility. This clari es the di erence betw een the tw o predictions: A t short distances
 and there is no \dangerous" dependence on $u$. Hence, the nite-size behavior of the spin \{spin correlation function w ill 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 $m$ agnetization. To account for this singular dependence on $u$, we rescale the eld, which im plies that $y_{h}$ is replaced by $y_{h}$ and $g$ scales as $L^{2 y_{h}} 2 d$. In a nite system, the $w$ ave vectors assum e discrete values, $k=\left(n_{x} ; n_{y} ; n_{z}\right) 2=L$, and thus it is easily seen that even for the lowest nonzero $w$ ave vectors $j k \quad k \quad k$ constitutes the dom inant bounding term on the $m$ agnetization. $N a m$ ely, the coe cient of the ${ }^{4}$ term contains a volum efactor $L^{d}[c f$. Eq. $(\underline{3})]$ and this term is thus (above the upper critical dim ension) a higher-order contribution decaying as $L^{2} \mathrm{~d}$ 。
IV. NUMERICALRESULTSAND COMPARISON W ITHEARLIER RESULTS
A. S im ulations

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T}={\underset{\text { hiji }}{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{~J}\left(\dot{j}_{i} \quad r_{j} \boldsymbol{\jmath}\right) \mathrm{s}_{i} \mathrm{~S}_{j} ; ~ ; ~}_{\text {; }} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the sum runs over all spin pairs and periodic boundaries were em ployed. The precise form of the (long-range) spin $\{$ spin interaction $J(r)$ as used in the sim ulations was chosen dependent on the dim ensionality. For $d=1$ we have follow ed the conventional choice $J(r)=K=r^{d+}$ ( $w$ ith discrete values for $r$ ), as this allows us to com pare all our results (including nonuniversalquantities) to previous estim ates. H ow ever, as explained in Ref. 5 this discrete form requires the construction of a look-up table, which becom es ine cient for higher dim ensionalities. For $d=2$ we have thus applied an interaction which is the integral of a continuously decaying function,
where $r=\left(r_{x} ; r_{y}\right)$ and $r=j r j$. In $d=3$ the corresponding volume integral was used for $J(r)$. This m odi cation of the interaction does only change nonuniversal quantities like the critical tem perature, but should not in uence the universal critical properties like the critical exponents and dim ensionless am plitude ratios, since the di erence betw een the continuous and the discrete interaction consists of faster decaying term $s$ that are irrelevant according to renorm alization theory. D etails conceming the sim ulations can be found in the A ppendix.

The follow ing system sizes have been exam ined: chains of length 10 L 150000, square system s of linear size 4 L 240, and cubic system s of linear size $4 \mathrm{~L} \quad 64$. At the upper critical dim ension sim ulations for even larger system s have 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 term $s$ of num bers of particles the largest system size for $d=2$ is considerably sm aller than for $d=1$ and $d=3$.) For the sim ulations we used a new chuster algorithm for long-range interactions.54.4 T his algorithm is $O\left(L^{d+z}\right)$ tim es faster than a conventionalM etropolis algorithm, where $z$ is the dynam ical critical exponent. For system $s$ displaying $m$ ean- eld-like critical behavior, we expect $z=d=2$ and the $e$ ciency gain in our sim ulations is thus of the order of $10^{8}$ for the largest system sizes. For each data point we have generated betw een $10^{6}$ and $4 \quad 10^{6}$ W ol clusters.
B. D eterm ination of the critical tem peratures, the am plitude ratio $Q$, and the therm al exponent
$T$ he critical couplings $K_{c}$ of these system s have been determ ined using an analysis of the am plitude ratio $Q$. T he nite-size scaling analysis was based on the Taylor expansion of E q. (17-1), which for " < 0 reads:

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{L}(T)=Q+p_{1} E^{y_{t}}+p_{2} t^{2} L^{2 y_{t}}+p_{3} \epsilon^{3} L^{3 y_{t}}+\quad+L q^{2 y_{n}}+\quad \nLeftarrow L \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{i}}+\quad: \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

The term proportional to $\sim$ in $\hat{E}$ yields a contribution $q_{2} L^{y_{i}=2}=q_{2} L{ }^{d=2}$ and the term $q_{3} L^{y_{i}}$ com es from the denom inator in Eq. (5). The coe cients $p_{i}$ and $q_{i}$ are nonuniversal. In addition to the corrections to scaling in Eq. (2O1) we have also included higher powers of $q_{3} L^{Y_{i}}$, which becom e particularly im portant when $y_{i}$ is sm all (i.e. when is close to $d=2$ ), higher powers of $q_{I} L^{d} 2 y_{h}=q_{1} L^{d=2}$, and the crossterm proportional to $L^{y_{t}+y_{i}}$.

All analyses were carried out on the sam e data set as used in Ref. " $5 \mathbf{2} \mathbf{2} \mathbf{3}$, to which several data points have been added form ost values of. First, we have only kept xed the exponents in the correction term $s, y_{i}$ and $y_{h}$. The corresponding estim ates for $Q$ and $y_{t}$ are show $n$ in the third and fourth colum $n$ of $T a b l e ~ i d$.
 $Q=8^{2}={ }^{4}\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)=0: 456947:::$ and $y_{t}=d=2$. H ow ever, the uncertainties in the estim ates increase considerably $w$ ith 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 tem perature region around the critical point. Furtherm ore, an accurate sim ultaneous determ ination of $Q$ and $y_{t}$ is very di cult, because of the correlation betw een the two quantities. Therefore we have repeated the sam $e$ analysis w ith Q xed at its theoretical prediction| as appears justi ed by the values for $Q$ in $T a b l e \frac{11}{\mathbb{I}}$ in order to obtain $m$ ore accurate estim ates for $y_{t}$. The results, show $n$ in the fth colum $n$ of $T$ ablein are indeed in good agreem ent w th the theoretically expected values (last column). Thus, we have kept the them alexponent xed at its theoretical
 discussed in Ref. $15-3$, 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 dim ension. In
 one decim alplace too $m$ uch was quoted, suggesting a too high accuracy. Secondly we note that the new est result for $K_{c}(d=3 ;=1: 2)$ deviates two standard deviations from the earlier estim ate.
 to scaling upon approaching the upper critical dim ension clearly follow sfrom the size of the error bars. At the upper critical dim ension itself $("=0)$ this culm inates in the appearance of logarithm ic corrections, where the nite-size scaling form of $Q_{L}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{L}(T)=Q+p_{1} \frac{L^{y t}}{(\ln L)^{1=3}} t+v \frac{L^{y t}}{\ln L}+p_{2} \frac{L^{2 y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{2=3}} t+v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L}+q_{1} L^{d 2 y_{h}}+\quad \frac{q_{3}}{\ln L}+\quad: \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

The ellipses denote term $s$ containing higher powers of $L^{d 2 y h}$ and $1=\ln L$. A though the resulting estim ates for $Q$ at the upper criticaldim ension lie within tw o standard deviations from the renorm alization prediction, one observes that the estim ates are system atically too high, suggesting the im perfection of the quoted scaling form ula. O nly m ore accurate data, spanning an even larger range of system sizes, and an analysis including further corrections to scaling will allow a more precise determ ination of $Q$. To illustrate the dependence of the nite-size corrections on " m ore directly, $F$ ig. t of the data for $d=1$ to Eqs. ( $\overline{2} \overline{0})$ and $(\overline{2} \overline{1})$, respectively. A though one clearly observes the increase of nite-size corrections when ! $d=2$, the true nature of the logarithm ic corrections in ( $2 \underset{1}{1}]_{1}$ ) cannot be appreciated from this graph. To em phasize the di erence betw een " = 0 and " < 0, we therefore also show $\mathbb{F}$ ig. ${ }^{2}(\mathrm{Z})$ )] the sam e plot for the enom ous range $0<\mathrm{L}<10^{10}$. N ow it is evident how strongly the case " $=0$ di ers even from a case with strong power-law corrections, such as $=0: 4("=0: 2)$.
$W$ e have used the universality of $Q$ to considerably narrow the errorm argins on $K_{c}$ by xing $Q$ at its theoretical value in the least-squares $t$. The corresponding couplings are show $n$ in $T$ able $\operatorname{lil}$ as $w$. The relative accuracy of the critical couplings lies betw een 1:5 $100^{5}$ and 4:0 $10^{5}$. For the one-dim ensional case, we can com pare these results to earlier estim ates, see T ableiIIT. O ne notes that the new est estim ates are $m$ ore than tw o orders ofm agnitude $m$ ore accurate than previous estim ates. The rst estim ates ${ }^{18}$ were obtained by carrying out exact calculations for chains of 1 to 20 spins and subsequently extrapolating these results using $P$ ade approxim ants. N ote that the estim ates for $T_{c}$ in $R$ ef. $1 \overline{1}$, are expressed in units of the inverse of the $R$ iem ann zeta function and thus $m$ ust be $m$ ultiplied by ( $1,+_{1}$ ). All couplings are som ew hat too high, but still in fair agreem ent $w$ ith our estim ates. The results of D om anill have no error bars. Still, his results are w orrying, since he carries out a cluster approach, obtaining critical couplings which start at the $m$ ean- eld value for cluster size zero and increase $m$ onotonically with increasing cluster size, as they should, since m ean- eld theory yields a lower bound on the critical couplings (see below). Thus, he argues that the true couplings w ill lie higher than his best estim ates (obtained for cluster size 10). H ow ever, all these best estim ates lie already above our estim ates, which seem $s$ to indicate a problem inherent in his approach. Ref. 2 presents results of an approxim ation 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 w ith our results well w ith in the quoted errors. The sam e technique was applied in Ref. $4 \overline{2} 1$, but now the uncertainty in the couplings was estim ated to be less than $10 \%$, for $s m$ all a few tim es larger. This is clearly a too conservative estim ate, as the di erence w ith our results is only a few percent for $=0: 1$ and considerably less for larger. In Ref. $12 \overline{1} \overline{1}$, , the coherent-anom aly $m$ ethod was used to obtain two di erent estim ates w thout error margins. W e have quoted the average of the tw o results, $w$ ith their di erence as a crude $m$ easure for the uncertainty. $T$ he agreem ent is quite good, although all results lie system atically above our values. Yet another approach has been form ulated in Ref. $\mathbf{n}_{2}^{\prime} \overline{1}_{1}^{\prime \prime}$, where
the O nsager reaction- eld theory was applied to obtain a general expression for the critical coupling,

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{c}()=\frac{(1+) \sin (=2)}{(1)^{1+}}: \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

U nfortunately, no estim ate for the accuracy of this expression is given, but it seem $s$ to generally underestim ate the critical coupling by a few percent, F inally, som e estim ates have been obtained recently by $m$ eans of the real-space renorm alization-group technique $4^{33^{1}}$
 approxim ation ${ }^{24}$ was used to obtain both upper and lower bounds, to which our results indeed conform, although it $m$ ust be said that the upper bounds do not constitute a very stringent criterion. Furtherm ore, the application of V igfusson's m ethod $\mathbf{2}^{251}$ has yielded even closer low er bounds for $=0: 1$ and $=0.2$.

A part from these approxim ations, one $m$ ay also use $m$ ean= eld theory to $m$ ake som e predictions conceming the critical coupling in the lim it \# 0 . It was shown by B rankov ${ }^{64}$ that in this lim it the d-dim ensional system with an interaction potential / $=r^{d+}$ is equivalent to the $H$ usim i\{Tem perley m ean sphericalm odel. M ore speci cally, it w as con jectured by C annas that for the one-dim ensional case lim ! o $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{c}} \quad=2$, which is also the rst term in the Taylor expansion of Eq. (22'). Indeed, in $m$ ean- eld theory one has $z{\underset{C}{c}}_{\mathrm{M}}^{\mathrm{F}}=1$, where z is the coordination num ber. For $d=1$ this corresponds to the requirem ent

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{C}}^{\mathrm{MF}}()_{\mathrm{n}=1}^{\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{X}}} \frac{1}{\mathrm{n}^{1+}}=2 \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{C}}^{\mathrm{MF}}() \quad(1+\quad)=1 ; \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

where (x) denotes the $R$ iem ann zeta function. The expansion of $(x)$ around $x=1$ yields the con jectured relation $\lim \# 0 K_{c}^{M F}==2$. Figurelt (a) show $s$ the criticalcoupling as a function of the decay param eter along with $K_{c}^{M F}$ ( ) and the asym ptotic behavior for \# 0 . O ne observes that $K_{C}()$ indeed approaches $K_{c}^{M}{ }^{\mathrm{F}}()$ when approaches zero. Furthem ore, $K_{c}^{M F}()$ is smaller than $K_{C}()$ for all , as one expects from the fact that $m$ ean- eld theory overestim ates the critical tem perature. It is interesting to note that for $=0: 1\left(\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{C}}^{\mathrm{MF}} \quad 0: 047239\right)$ this low er bound
 we can generalize such estim ates to higher dim ensionalities,

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{c}^{M F}() \frac{2}{\frac{d=2}{2}}_{Z_{0}}^{1} d r \frac{1}{r^{1+}}=1: \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $d>1$, the low er distance cuto $m_{0}$ of the integral, i.e. the $m$ in im al interaction distance $w$ ith the nearest neighbors, does not have an isotropic value, since there is no interaction within an elem entary cube around the origin. N evertheless, a constant value $\mathrm{m}_{0}$, e.g. $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{o}}=1=2$, is a good approxim ation. Furthem ore, for $\mathrm{d}=1$ the integral is only a rst-order approxim ation of Eq. (231), but for $d=2$ and $d=3$ it precisely corresponds to the interaction (191) and its generalization to $d=3$, respectively. A s a rst estim ate one thus obtains

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\# 0} K_{c}^{M F}()=\frac{\frac{d}{2}}{2^{d=2}} m_{0}: \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

An expansion in term sof shows that the rst term is independent of $m_{0}$. For $d=1 ; 2 ; 3$ one nds, respectively, $K_{C}^{M F}=2, K_{C}^{M F}=(2), K_{C}^{M F}=(4)$. Figured 3 (b) and ${ }_{C}^{-3}(c)$ show $K_{C}()$ ford $=2$ and $d=3$, the corresponding asym ptotes and Eq. (2515) w ith $\mathrm{m}_{0}=1=2$.

The deviation of $K_{C}^{-}()$from $K_{c}^{M F}()$ is also expressed by the last term in the renorm alization expression $\overline{(Q)}(\underline{)})$. H ow ever, in order to assess the dependence of th is term one has to calculate the dependence of the coe cients a and $c$, arising from the integrals over the -dependent propagators.

## C.D eterm ination of critical exponents

## 1. M agnetic susceptibility

The m agnetic susceptibility is directly proportional to the average square $m$ agnetization density,

$$
\begin{equation*}
=L^{d} \mathrm{~lm}^{2} i ; \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

and thus we can use Eq. (1) to analyze the nite-size data. Expanding this equation in $t$ and $u$ we obtain for " $<0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=L^{2 y_{n}} d a_{0}+a_{1} \epsilon^{y_{t}}+a_{2} t^{2} L^{2 y_{t}}+\quad+L b^{i}+ \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for " $=0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=L^{2 y_{h}} d^{p} \frac{" 1}{\ln L} a_{0}+a_{1} t \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{1=3}} t+v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L}+a_{2} \frac{L^{2 y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{2=3}} t+v \frac{L^{y_{t}}}{\ln L}+\frac{b_{1}}{\ln L}+\quad \text { \# }: \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

T he analytic part of the free energy $m$ ight give rise to an additional constant, but this could not be observed in our sim ulations, because it is dom inated by the corrections to scaling. In Table iVi we list the results of an analysis of the num erical data. For all exam ined system s we have determ ined the exponent $y_{h}$ and the critical coupling. T he estim ates for the latter are in good agreem ent w th those obtained from the analysis ofthe universalam plitude ratio Q . Furthem ore, the exponents agree nicely, for alldim ensionalities, $w$ ith the renorm alization prediction $y_{h}=3 d=4$. Just as before, the uncertainties increase $w$ ith increasing, although the analyses at the upper critical dim ension itself seem to yield better results than those just_above it. C om pare in particular the results for $=1: 4\left(y_{i}=0: 2\right)$ and
$=1: 5$. The logarithm ic prefactor in Eq. (2d) can be clearly observed in the sense that the qually 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 $w$ ith $K_{c}$ xed at the best values in $T a b l e$ IT, i.e. those obtained $w$ ith xed $Q$. The corresponding estim ates of $y_{h}$ are also show in Table
$N$ ow we can calculate the critical exponents and com pare them to earlier estim ates for $d=1 . W$ e do this for the correlation length exponent $=1=\left(y_{t}+y_{i}=2\right)$ and the $m$ agnetization exponent $=\left(d \quad y_{h}\right)=y_{t}$. The results are show $n$
 agreem ent w ith the classical critical exponents. U nfortunately, the accuracy in both exponents is seriously ham pered by the uncertainty in $y_{t}$, which has only been determ ined from the tem perature-dependent term in $Q$. In particular the results for from Ref. 14 are, for sm all, in better agreem ent $w$ th the theoretically predicted values than our estim ates. H ow ever, 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. ${ }^{\text {III }}$ tw o di erent decay $m$ odes for the spin $\{$ spin correlation function were derived. $T$ he relative $m$ agnitude of $r$ and $L$ determ ines which of the $m$ odes applies. In the bulk of our sim ulations we have restricted $r$ in $g(r)$ to $r=L=2$. Since this quantity re ects the $\mathrm{k}=0 \mathrm{~m}$ ode of the correlation function, we write for " < 0 an expression analogous to that for the $m$ agnetic susceptibility,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(L=2)=L^{2 y_{h}} 2 d^{h} c_{0}+c_{1} \epsilon^{y_{t}}+c_{2} t^{2} L^{2 y_{t}}+\quad \pm L d^{d^{i}}+ \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for " $=0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(L=2)=L^{2 y_{h}} 2 d p \frac{"}{\ln L} c_{0}+c_{1} t \frac{L^{y t}}{(\ln L)^{1=3}} t+v \frac{L^{y t}}{\ln L}+c_{2} \frac{L^{2 y_{t}}}{(\ln L)^{2=3}} t+v \frac{L^{y t}}{\ln L}+\frac{d_{1}}{\ln L}+\quad \text { \# }: \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

For values of $r$ such that $g(r)$ does not correspond to this $m$ ode of the correlation function, the -dependent exponent Yh w ill appear in (2 $\overline{2}_{1}$ ) instead of $y_{h}$. Furtherm ore, the logarithm ic prefactor in ( $30_{1}^{\prime}$ ) w ill be absent, as it arises from the dangerous irrelevant variable [cf. Eq. (1-G)]. The results of our analysis are shown in Table ílin. The results evidently corroborate that the exponent $y_{h}$ coincides $w$ ith that appearing in the susceptibility. A lso the factor $\overline{\ln L}$ in (30 ${ }_{1}^{\prime}$ ) was clearly visible in the least-squares analysis. T he critical couplings agree $w$ ith the estim ates from $Q$ and
and we have again tried to increase the accuracy in $y_{h}$ by repeating the analysis $w$ ith $K_{c}$ xed at their best values in Table 'ITI. The accuracy of the results is som ew hat less than of those obtained from the m agnetic susceptibility, because we have now only used num erical data for even system sizes. The fact that the $L$ dependence of $g(L=2)$ is determ ined by the $\mathrm{k}=0 \mathrm{~m}$ ode raises the question whether one can also observe the power-law decay described by
in nite system $s$. To this end, we have sam pled $g(r)$ as a function of $r$ in the one-dim ensionalm odel. In order to clearly distinguish the two predictions for the decay of $g(r)$ we have exam ined a system far from the upper critical dim ension, viz. w ith $=0: 1$. It tumed out to be necessary to sam ple very large system sizes to observe the regim e where $g(r) / r^{(d)}$. Figure ${ }^{1 / 4}$ displays the spin \{spin correlation function scaled $w$ ith $L^{d=2}$ versus $r=L$. The scaling $m$ akes the results collapse for $r$ r of the order of the system size. H ere, the correlation function levels o. This is the
$m$ ean- eld like contribution to the correlation function, which dom inates in the spatial integralyielding the $m$ agnetic susceptibility. For sm all $r$ the data do not collapse at all, which show s that $g(r)$ exhibits di erent scaling behavior in this regim e. Indeed, the correlation fiunction decays here as $r^{(d)}=r^{0: 9}$ and not as $r^{d=2}$. N ote, how ever, that th is regim $e$ is restricted to a sm all region of $r$ and can only be observed for very large system sizes.

It is interesting to note that already N agle and Bonner ${ }^{18}$ have tried to calculate in a spin chain with longrange interactions from nite-size data for the susceptibility. Because this calculation relied on the assum ption that
$\left(L ; K_{c}\right) \quad\left(L 1 ; K_{c}\right) \quad g(L) \quad L$ (d 2+ ), they called the corresponding exponent $\sim$. The results for ~ tumed out to assum e a constant value approxim ately equal to 1.50 for $0<0: 5$. Thus, the identi cation of $\sim w$ ith was assum ed to be invalid in Ref. 3 3in. N ow we see that $\sim$ is in excellent agreem ent with $d+2 \quad 2 y_{h}=2 \quad d=2$.

## V.CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have studied system $s$ with long-range interactions decaying as $r^{(d+}$ ) in one, two, and three dim ensions in the regim e 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 am plitude ratio $m^{2} i^{2}=l m^{4} i$, have been veri ed by accurate $M$ onte $C$ arlo results. At the upper critical dim ension, the logarithm ic factors appearing in the nite-size scaling functions could be accurately observed. The M onte C arlo results have been obtained $w$ th a dedicated algorithm. This algorithm is $m$ any orders ofm agnitude faster (up to the order of $10^{8}$ for the largest exam ined system ) than a conventional M onte C arlo algorithm for these system s . O ur analysis has also $y$ ielded estim ates for the critical couplings. For $d=1$ these values have an accuracy which is $m$ ore than tw o orders of m agnitude better than previous estim ates and could thus serve as a check for half a dozen di erent approxim ations. For $d=2$ and $d=3$ we have, to our best know ledge, obtained the rst estim ates for the critical couplings. Finally, we have given both theoretical and num erical argum ents that above the upper critical dim ension the decay of the critical spin \{spin correlation function in nite system sconsists of tw o regim es: O newhere it decays as r (d ${ }^{2+}$ ) 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 dim ension, where neither any rigorous fesults nor any accurate num erical results are available. This regim e w ill be the sub ject of a future investigation ${ }^{2}{ }^{8!}$

APPENDIX A: DETAILS OF THEMONTECARLOALGORITHM FOR LONG-RANGE IN TERACTIONS

The cluster algorithm applied in this study has been described for the rst tim e in Ref. 1
 the application to algebraically decaying interactions in $m$ ore than one dim ension, several im portant practical issues $m$ ust be taken care of in actual sim ulations. It is the purpose of this A ppendix to discuss these issues and their solutions in som e m ore detail. W e do not repeat the full cluster algorithm here, but only describe how the chuster form ation process proceeds from a given spin $s_{i}$ which has already been added to the chister (the so-called current spin).

A s explained in Ref. 5 $p\left(s_{i} ; s_{j}\right)=s_{i} s_{j} p_{i j}=s_{i} s_{j}\left[1 \quad \exp \left(2 J_{i j}\right)\right]$ into two parts, nam ely the $K$ ronecker delta testing whether the spins $s_{i}$ and $s_{j}$ are paralleland the \provisional" bond-activation probability $p_{i j}$. 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,

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(j){ }_{n=1}^{X^{j}} P(n) \tag{A1}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith

$$
P(n)=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
1 & p_{1}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & p_{2} \tag{A2}
\end{array}\right) \quad\left(1_{n} p\right) p_{n}:
$$

$p_{j} 1 \exp \left(2 J_{j}\right)$ is an abbreviation for $p_{0 j}$, i.e., we de ne the origin at the position of the current spin. W hen com paring the expressions to those in Ref. 15 in m ust take into account that we now are working w ith Ising instead of Potts couplings. $P(n)$ is the probability that in the rst step $n \quad 1$ bonds are skipped and the $n$th bond is provisionally
activated. N ow the next bond $j$ that is provisionally activated is determ ined by a random num ber $92[0 ; 1 i: j 1$ bonds are skipped if $C(j 1) \quad g<C(j)$. The num ber $j$ 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 num ber ofbonds before another bond at a distance $k>j$ is provisionally activated. The appropriate cum ulative probability is now given by


$$
C_{j}(k)=\begin{array}{lll}
X^{k} & { }^{2} & Y^{1}  \tag{A3}\\
4^{1} & (1 & \left.p_{m}\right)^{5} p_{n}=1
\end{array} \quad \begin{gathered}
0 \\
\exp ^{@}
\end{gathered} 2^{X^{k}} \begin{gathered}
1 \\
J_{n} A
\end{gathered}:
$$

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 follow from a com parison of qs . ( $\binom{-1}{-1}$ and $\left(\frac{\bar{A}}{-1} \overline{3}\right) . \mathrm{N}$ am ely,

$$
\left.C(k)=C_{0}(k)=C(j)+{ }_{i=1}^{Y^{j}} \quad l_{1}^{\#} \quad p_{i}\right) \quad C_{j}(k)=C(j)+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & C(j)
\end{array}\right] C_{j}(k)
$$

or $C_{j}(k)=\left[\begin{array}{ll}C(k) \quad C(j)\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}1 & C(j)\end{array}\right]$. So we can calculate $C_{j}(k)$ directly from $C(k)$. In practioe one realizes this by using the bond distance $j$ of the previous bond that was provisionally activated to rescale the (new) random num ber
 and is sm aller than 1, cf. Eq. (A 3li) . Still we can accom m odate only a lim ited num ber ofbond distances in our look-up table and $m$ ust therefore devise som e approxim ation schem $e$ to handle the tail of the long-range interaction, which is essential for the criticalbehavior. This issue is addressed below. Furtherm ore, this description only takes into account the bonds placed in one direction. The actualim plem entation of the algorithm m ust of course allow for bonds in both directions (assum ing that $d=1$ ).

A $n$ altemative for the look-up table exists for interactions which can be explicitly sum $m$ ed. In those cases, Eq. (Ā $\overline{3}$ ) can be solved for $k$, yielding an expression for the bond distance in term $s$ of $C_{j}(k)$, i.e., in term $s$ of the random num ber $g$. For the interaction de ned in Sec. truncated $R$ iem ann zeta function,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{n}=1}^{\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{n}}=K_{n=1}^{\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{k}}} \frac{1}{\mathrm{n}^{\mathrm{d}+}} ; ~ ; ~} \tag{A5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which cannot be expressed in closed form. In m ore than one dim ension, a look-up table is very im practical and an interaction which can be sum $m$ ed explicitly becom es very desirable. T herefore we have taken an isotropic, continuous interaction of the form $J=K=r^{d+}$. The interaction $w$ ith a spin at lattioe site $n$ is then given by the integral of $J$ over the elem entary 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 provisionalbond is placed. To this end, the sum in (A $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ ) is replaced by a d-dim ensionalintegralover the coupling $J$. A s $J$ is isotropic, only an integralover the radius rem ains, which runs from the $m$ in im albond distance up to $k$. Thus for $d=2$ Eq. ( $\bar{A} \overline{3} \overline{-})$ reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{j}(k)=1 \quad \exp \quad 2 \frac{2 k}{j} \quad \frac{1}{\mathrm{r}} \tag{A6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and in $d=3$ the factor 2 is sim ply replaced by 4 . Equating $C_{j}(k)$ to the random num ber $g$ we nd

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{k}=\mathrm{h}^{\mathrm{h}}+\frac{}{4 \mathrm{k}} \ln (1 \quad \mathrm{~g})^{\mathrm{i}^{1=}}: \tag{A7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Rescaling of the random num ber is no longer required: The low est value, $g=0$, leads to a provisionalbond at the sam e distance as the previous one, $\mathrm{k}=\mathrm{j}$. If $\mathrm{g}=\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{j}}(1)=1 \exp [(4 \mathrm{~K}=) \mathrm{j} \quad$ ] the next provisionalbond lies at in nity and thus $g 2\left[C_{j}(1) ; 1 i\right.$ yields no bond at all. O nce the distance $k$ has been obtained, $d \quad 1$ further random num bers $g_{1} ; g_{2} ;::$ : are required to determ ine the direction of the bond. In $d=2$, we set $=g_{1}=(2)$. The coordinates of the next provisionalbond (relative to the current spin) are then $\left(r_{x} ; r_{y}\right)=(k \cos ; k \sin )$, 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 provisionalbond, $j$ 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 low est possible bond distance. H ence it is possible to nd a $1=2 \mathrm{k}<\overline{2}=2$ 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 \w asted" M onte C arlo step. For $d=3$ the process is sim ilar, except that we need another random num ber $g_{2}$ to determ ine a second angle $=2<\quad=2$, such that sin is distributed uniform ly; $\sin =1 \quad 2 g_{2}$. The bond coordinates are given by (kcos cos ;kcos $\left.\sin ; k \sin \right)$.

This approach can also be applied in the one-dim ensional case, where the geom etrical factor 2 in ( $(\overline{\mathrm{A}}-\overline{\mathrm{q}}) \mathrm{m}$ ust be replaced by 2, which re ects the fact that bonds can be put to the left and to the right of the origin. The direction of the bond is then sim ply determ ined by another random num ber. A s has already been $m$ entioned in $R$ ef. $5 \overline{15} 1$, th is can be used to cope w th the lim ited size $M$ of the look-up table. Beyond the bond distance $M$ the sum in (A ( 3 ) is approxim ated by an integral. I.e., if the random num ber $g$ lies in the interval $[C M)$; $C(1) i$, the bond distance $k$ is determ ined from the one-dim ensional version of ( $(\bar{A} \overline{-} \overline{-})$ ), where the low er part of the integral is replaced by an explicit sum

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=M+\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2 K} \ln (1 \quad g)+x_{n=1}^{M^{M}} \frac{1}{n^{1+}} \quad!1= \tag{A8}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ere, the geom etrical factor is absent, as we have opted to treat \left" and \right" separately in our sim ulations (no additional random num ber is required in that case). The approxim ation ( $\bar{A} \overline{8})$ e ectively introduces a m odi cation of the spin \{spin interaction, which how ever can be m ade anbitrarily sm all by increasing $M$. N ote that the $o$ set $1=2$ in the rst term ensures a precise $m$ atching of the discrete sum and the integral approxim ation: the random num ber $g=C(M)=1 \quad \exp \left[2 K_{n=1}^{M} n^{(1+)}\right.$ ] yields $k=M+1=2$ which is precisely the low est $k$ that is rounded to the integer bond distance $\mathrm{M}+1$.

T he accuracy ofth is procedure is further lim ited by the nite resolution ofrandom num bers. E.g., in our sim ulations the original random num bers are integers in the range $\left[0 ; 2^{32} \quad 1\right]$. Thus, forbond distances lsuch that $C$ (l) $C$ (1) 1 ) is of the order $2^{32}$, the discreteness of the random num bers is no longer negligible. For $d=2$ and $d=3$, the discreteness of the angles also lim its the lattice sites that can be selected for a provisionalbond, but this generally occurs at distances larger than 1 . O nce the value of 1 has been determ ined, $w$ ith a safe $m$ argin, there are various approaches to this lim itation. O ne m ay, e.g., draw another random num ber to determ ine the precise bond distance. A sim pler approach is to distribute allbonds beyond luniform ly over the lattice, in order to prevent that certain lattice sites are never selected. H ow ever, one should take care that such simple approaches do not essentially m odify the criticalbehavior. If lis relatively $s m$ 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 sym $m$ etry of the lattice, such a uniform distribution of the bonds should occur outside a square (cube) instead of a circle (sphere) w ith radius 1.
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FIG.1. The amplitude ratio $Q$ as a fiunction of the decay param eter in (a) $d=1$, (b) $d=2$, and (c) $d=3$ dim ensions. $T$ he solid line $m$ arks the renorm alization prediction.


F IG.2. The am plitude ratio $Q$ in a one-dim ensional system as a function of the system size L for various values of . $F$ igure (a) illustrates the increase of the nite-size corrections when the upper critical dim ension ( $=d=2$ ) is approached. Figure (b) em phasizes the di erence betw een nite-size corrections above the upper critical dim ension (pow er-law) and at the upper critical dim ension itself (logarithm ic).


FIG.3. The critical coupling $K_{c}$ as a fiunction of the decay param eter for (a) $d=1$, (b) $d=2$, and (c) $d=3$. A lso show $n$ is the asym ptotic behavior for \# 0 as predicted by $m$ ean-eld theory and $m$ ean-eld values for $K$ over the full range of $0 \ll d=2$ (for $d=2$ and $d=3$ only approxim ately).


FIG.4. The spin \{spin correlation function versus $r=L$ in the one-dim ensionalm odelw ith $=0: 1$. Results for various system sizes are show n. For a discussion see the text.

TABLE I. The amplitude ratio $Q$ and the therm al exponent $y t$ for system $s w$ ith long-range interactions in one, tw $o$, and three dim ensions, for several values of the decay param eter $0<\quad d=2$. The values in the fth colum $n$ have been obtained $w$ ith $Q$ xed at the theoretically predicted value (see text) and the last colum $n$ lists the renorm alization predictions for $y_{t}$.

| d |  | Q | $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{t}}$ | RG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.1 | 0.4566 (8) | 0.507 (7) | 0.507 (7) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | 02 | 0.455 (4) | 0.54 (4) | 0.504 (12) | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 1 | 025 | 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 | 02 | 0.4581 (11) | 1.51 (3) | 1.513 (18) |  |
| 3 | 0.4 | 0.4561 (10) | 1.521 (18) | 1.512 (15) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 0.6 | 0.453 (3) | 1.53 (4) | 1.521 (14) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 0.8 | 0.458 (2) | 1.48 (2) | 1.487 (10) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 0.453 (10) | 1.52 (7) | 1.508 (9) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 12 | 0.447 (8) | 1.56 (2) | 1.519 (10) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 1.4 | 0.454 (5) | 1.48 (3) | 1.48 (3) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 1.5 | 0.466 (8) | 1.65 (6) | 1.57 (4) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |

TABLE II. The am plitude ratio $Q$ and critical couplings $K_{c}$ for system $s w i t h$ long-range interactions in one, two, and three dim ensions, for several values of the decay param eter $0<\quad d=2$. The them al exponent (see Table ${ }_{2}$ ) was kept xed at its theoretical value in all analyses. The estim ates for $K_{c}$ in the last colum $n$ have been obtained by xing $Q$ at its renorm alization prediction. The num bers betw een parentheses represent the errors in the last decim alplaces.

| d |  | Q | K c | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.1 | 0.4565 (8) | 0.0476162 (13) | 0.0476168 (6) |
| 1 | 02 | 0.4579 (7) | 0.092234 (2) | 0.0922314 (15) |
| 1 | 025 | 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) | 0229160 (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 | 1.2 | 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) |

TA B LE III. C om parison betw een our best estim ates of the critical couplings $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{c}}$ for the one-dim ensional system and earlier estim ates.

|  | This work | R ef.118' | R ef. ${ }^{119}{ }^{-1}$ | R ef. ${ }^{120}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | R ef. ${ }^{142}{ }^{1}$ | $\mathrm{Ref}.{ }^{12} \mathrm{I}^{1}{ }^{1}$ | R ef. ${ }^{1-271}$ | R ef. ${ }^{1-14}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | 0.0476168 (6) |  | 0.0478468 | 0.0505 (5) | 0.04635 | 0.04777 (12) | 0.0469 | 0.0481 |
| 02 | 0.0922314 (15) | 0.0926 (5) | 0.0933992 | 0.0923 (9) | 0.09155 | 0.0928 (3) | 0.0898 |  |
| 025 | 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 | 0.1825 (10) | 0.184081 | 0.1815 (18) | 0.1813 | 0.183 (2) | 0.1750 |  |
| 0.5 | 0229156 | 02307 (14) | 0230821 | 0230 (2) | 02295 | 0231 (4) | 02251 | 0250 |

TABLE IV. C om parison of our best estim ates of the critical couplings for the one-dim ensional system with som e lower and upper bounds.

|  | This work | R ef. ${ }^{124} 4^{1}$ | Ref. $\mathrm{R}^{-1} 4^{1}$ | Ref. 125 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | 0.0476168 (6) | 0.04726 | 0.09456 | 0.04753 |
| 02 | 0.0922314 (15) | 0.08947 | 0.1792 | 0.09162 |
| 0.3 | 0.136110 (2) | 0.1273 | 02558 |  |
| 0.4 | 0.181150 | 0.1615 | 0.3258 |  |
| 0.5 | 0229156 | 0.1923 | 0.3903 | \| |

TABLE V. Estim ates for the critical coupling $K_{c}$ and the exponent $y_{h}$ as obtained from the analysis of the $m$ agnetic
 error $m$ argins do not include the uncertainty in these values for $K_{c}$.

| d |  | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | R G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.1 | 0.0476161 (19) | 0.7487 (14) | 0.7493 (6) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 02 | 0.092239 (4) | 0.752 (2) | 0.7504 (10) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 025 | 0.114145 | 0.7477 (15) | 0.7468 (16) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.136110 (5) | 0.747 (3) | 0.7490 (17) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.181170 (10) | 0.749 (5) | 0.746 (3) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0229163 (8) | 0.751 (3) | 0.7492 (11) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 2 | 02 | 0.028537 (5) | 1.500 (6) | 1.495 (3) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 0.4 | 0.051830 (6) | 1.498 (9) | 1.496 (3) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 0.6 | 0.071370 | 1.497 (6) | 1.498 (2) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 0.8 | 0.088095 (10) | 1.496 (5) | 1.495 (3) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 0.102568 (3) | 1.502 (9) | 1.501 (7) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 02 | 0.0144347 (9) | 2249 (2) | 22504 (8) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 0.4 | 0.026296 (2) | 2250 (6) | 2246 (3) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 0.6 | 0.036046 (3) | 2246 (7) | 2244 (5) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 0.8 | 0.0440349 (17) | 2243 (4) | 2246 (3) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 0.050516 (3) | 2239 (2) | 2243 (7) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 12 | 0.055679 (2) | 2247 (11) | 2251 (7) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 1.4 | 0.0596636 (18) | 227 (3) | 226 (2) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 1.5 | 0.061251 (2) | 2255 (11) | 2253 (6) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |

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

|  | This w ork | R ef. 2101 | R ef. 142 | R ef. 143 | R G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | 9.3 (6) | 9.12 | 9.9 | 10.48 | 10.0 |
| 02 | 4.9 (3) | 4.90 | 4.95 |  | 5.0 |
| 025 | 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 |

TA BLE VII. Them agnetization exponent as a function of for the one-dim ensionalm odel, together w ith earlier estim ates and the renorm alization predictions.

|  | This w ork | R ef. $1 \mathbf{1 8}^{-1}$ | $\mathrm{Ref.121}{ }^{-1}$ | R G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | 0.494 (8) |  | 0.495 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 02 | 0.495 (13) | 0.5 | 0.482 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 025 | 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. Estim ates for the critical coupling $K_{c}$ and the exponent $y_{h}$ as obtained from the analysis of the spin $\left\{\right.$ spin $_{n}$
 the error $m$ argins do not include the uncertainty in these values for $K_{c}$.

| d |  | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | R G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.1 | 0.047619 (3) | 0.750 (2) | 0.7488 (9) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 02 | 0.092233 (7) | 0.749 (3) | 0.7513 (16) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 025 | 0.114148 (10) | 0.750 (5) | 0.747 (2) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.136116 (7) | 0.753 (5) | 0.752 (3) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 0.4 | 0.181158 (15) | 0.747 (7) | 0.750 (4) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0229161 | 0.753 (3) | 0.7513 (11) | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 2 | 02 | 0.028535 (7) | 1.499 (9) | 1.496 (3) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 0.4 | 0.051831 (6) | 1.505 (6) | 1.499 (4) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 0.6 | 0.071369 (6) | 1.507 (4) | 1.502 (4) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 0.8 | 0.088091 (6) | 1.495 (7) | 1.497 (3) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 2 | 1.0 | 0.102569 (3) | 1.509 (8) | 1.508 (6) | $\frac{3}{2}$ |
| 3 | 02 | 0.0144348 (16) | 2256 (6) | 2254 (4) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 0.4 | 0.026296 (3) | 2257 (8) | 2245 (5) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 0.6 | 0.036053 (4) | 2262 (10) | 2246 (4) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 0.8 | 0.044035 (4) | 2252 (11) | 2250 (5) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 1.0 | 0.050511 (5) | 2228 (15) | 2249 (9) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 12 | 0.055680 (3) | 2253 (14) | 2257 (9) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 1.4 | 0.059667 (2) | 222 (4) | 2.31 (4) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
| 3 | 1.5 | 0.061251 (3) | 2251 (15) | 2251 (8) | $\frac{9}{4}$ |
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