

# Revisiting the Theory of Finite Size Scaling in Disordered Systems: Can Be Less Than $2/d$

Ferenc Pazmandi, Richard T. Scalettar and Gergely T. Zimanyi  
Physics Department, University of California, Davis, CA 95616

For phase transitions in disordered systems, an exact theorem provides a bound on the finite size correlation length exponent:  $\nu_{FS} \geq 2/d$ . It is believed that the true critical exponent of a disorder induced phase transition satisfies the same bound. We argue that in disordered systems the standard averaging introduces a noise, and a corresponding new diverging length scale, characterized by  $\nu_{FS} = 2/d$ . This length scale, however, is independent of the system's own correlation length. Therefore  $\nu_{FS}$  can be less than  $2/d$ . We illustrate these ideas on two exact examples, with  $\nu_{FS} < 2/d$ . We propose a new method of disorder averaging, which achieves a remarkable noise reduction, and thus is able to capture the true exponents.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Nr, 75.40.Mg, 05.70.Fh, 72.15.Rn

Using a very general formulation, Ref. [1] presented an exact theorem, which puts constraints on the finite size correlation length exponent  $\nu_{FS}$  of a large class of disordered systems:  $\nu_{FS} \geq 2/d$ , where  $d$  is the dimension. This relation is often referred to as the quantum Harris criterion [2]. While many investigations found exponents in accordance with this bound, there is an increasing number of results in contradiction with it. In particular, in a model for charge density waves exact calculations yielded  $\nu_{FS} = 1/2$  below four dimensions [3], and numerical studies on 2d disordered Bose-Hubbard models found  $\nu_{FS} \approx 0.7$  [4]. Experimentally the Bose glass transition of helium in aerogel [5], and the localization transition in doped semiconductors [6] seem to violate this bound. In this paper we argue that the  $\nu_{FS} \geq 2/d$  constraint is characteristic only to the method used to carry out the disorder average, and the true exponent is independent of this bound.

To start our considerations of random systems, we chose the same type of disorder used by Ref. [1]: a binary distribution for, say, a disordered site energy. Typically, physical quantities are calculated by averaging over different disorder realizations. For calculational convenience, the standard method is analogous to the "grand canonical" approach: impurities are put on each site with a given probability,  $p$ , and the averaging is carried out for all possible concentration of impurities and their configurations. An alternative method, which could be termed the "canonical" approach, keeps the number of impurities fixed, and the average is taken only over the possible configurations of these impurities. For finite systems the two methods are equivalent. The density fluctuations in the grand canonical method, however, introduce an extra noise. This noise vanishes in the infinite system, but it may alter the results of the finite size scaling. The "canonical averaging" strongly reduces this noise by excluding density fluctuations.

We now argue that the bound obtained in Ref. [1] is only generated by the noise introduced by the "grand

canonical averaging". Different choices, such as using "canonical averaging", produce different bounds. The theorem of Ref. [1] considers a random system where a phase transition is induced by changing the concentration  $K$  of site (or bond) impurities. Let  $Y$  be any event depending on disorder realizations in a finite volume, with probability  $P(K)$ . This  $P(K)$  is calculated by averaging over all disordered configurations, and selecting those compatible with  $Y$ . Averaging is performed in the "grand canonical" way, since fluctuations in the density of impurities are allowed. From these premises the exact statement  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log P(K) = -\nu_{FS} K$  follows, where  $N$  is the system size. A closer look at the proof reveals that this result is derived solely from the concentration fluctuations of the impurities, which were externally introduced in the averaging process (see the last equation of the proof in Ref. [1]). Thus the bound on  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log P(K) = -\nu_{FS} K$  does not relate to the intrinsic properties of the system under investigation. It only reflects the "resolution" of the "grand-canonical averaging". In other words, because of the presence of the density fluctuations, the minimal resolvable change in  $K$  is  $dK/1 = 1/N$ . The probability  $P$  can change at most  $O(1)$ , immediately explaining the above bound.

On the other hand, if one uses "canonical averaging", then the above inequality does not apply. For, in contrast to the previous case, the number of impurities is now well defined. In the present binary example, the resolvable change of  $K$  is bounded only by its minimum allowed increment,  $1/N$ . Hence,  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log P(K) = -\nu_{FS} K$ . Along the lines of Ref. [1], the inequality  $\nu_{FS} \geq 1/d$  now follows. As before, this inequality is characteristic of the "canonical averaging" only, and does not impose any restriction on the true exponent of the physical system. The physical reason behind this is that both averaging procedures introduce a new characteristic length scale, which has the potential to obscure the true correlation length of the physical system.

It is also important to note that the assumption of a

binary disorder plays a crucial role in deriving the above bounds. For continuous distributions they do not necessarily apply. To see this, consider the following simple example, motivated by the quantum phase transition between the so called Mott-Insulator and Bose-Glass phases, which takes place in interacting bose systems with site disorder. At this transition the renormalization group flows are controlled by a fixed point with zero hopping strength [7], thus the system reduces to a collection of independent sites with random energies. Let the distribution of the site energy  $\epsilon \in [0; K]$  be

$$P(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{K} \left( \frac{\epsilon}{K} \right)^{\gamma-1} ; \quad (1)$$

with  $\gamma > 1$ . We generate  $N$  independent  $\epsilon_i$  ( $i = 1; \dots; N$ ) from the above distribution. We define the finite-size event  $Y$  to occur, when all  $\epsilon_i$ 's are smaller than a given value  $\epsilon \in [0; K]$ . We fix the value of  $\epsilon$ , and drive the transition by changing  $K$ . As required by the theorem of [1], the probability  $P$  of  $Y$  happening is finite at the critical value of the disorder,  $K_c = \epsilon$ . It goes to zero exponentially with the system size  $N$  for  $K > K_c$ . Close to the transition, for  $\epsilon = (K - K_c) = K_c - 1$ , this probability is

$$P(N; \epsilon) \sim e^{-N^{\gamma-1}} ; \quad (2)$$

A characteristic length scale  $\xi$  can be now defined as a function of  $\epsilon$ . It is determined from the system size as  $N_\xi = \xi^d$ , where  $P(N_\xi; \epsilon) = P(N_\xi; 0) - 1 = e$ . Defining a critical exponent as  $\xi \sim (K - K_c)^{-\nu}$  one arrives at  $\nu = (\gamma + 1)/d$ . For  $\gamma < 1$ ,  $\nu$  is less than  $2/d$ . While we considered a concrete example, we emphasize that this result can be relevant for any transition driven by local singularities in the action.

Motivated by the above observations, we now attempt to construct a modified finite size scaling procedure, which does have the potential to access the true exponents of the system. The centerpiece of our argument is the following observation. If the distribution of the disorder is given in an analytic form, that uniquely determines  $K_c$ , the critical value of the control parameter for the infinite system. However, any given disorder realization in a finite system could have been generated from disorder distributions with a range of parameters, corresponding to a range of  $K_c$  values. In other words, it is unclear which infinite system's finite size realization did one simulate. A distribution is characterized completely by its moments. Typically,  $K_c$  is linked to some of these moments, for instance the dispersion. For a finite system of size  $N$ , this dispersion is determined only with a relative uncertainty of  $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ . Therefore there is a range of distribution parameters which are compatible with the specific realization, and thus could have generated it. This raises the problem, which  $K_c$  to use in a finite size scaling analysis.

The standard procedure answers this question by assuming that one can use a single  $K_c$  for all samples generated from the same distribution. However, the above argument suggests that the very same sample may be the realization of distributions with different parameters, leading to an inherent noise in the procedure, similar to the above considered binary examples. In order to avoid such a built-in noise, we now propose a modified finite size scaling procedure for disordered systems. We suggest that for each disorder realization one should identify the distribution, and in particular the critical parameter  $K_c^r$ , which it most likely corresponds to. In practice this might be difficult, and we return to this question later. For the moment, we only assume that it is possible to identify  $K_c^r$ . We propose that the natural control parameter of the critical behaviour is  $\epsilon = (K - K_c^r) = K_c^r - 1$ . The act of averaging should then be performed for the samples with the same  $\epsilon$ . We propose to adopt the finite size scaling hypothesis for the critical behaviour of a generic physical quantity  $Q$ ,

$$Q(L; \epsilon) = L^{-\gamma} q(L^{-1/\nu}) ; \quad (3)$$

where  $q(z)$  is a universal scaling function, and  $\gamma, \nu$  are the critical exponents for  $Q$ , and the true correlation length  $\xi \sim 1/\nu$ . Note that some aspects of this proposition are already practiced in numerical studies: sizeable noise-reduction is customarily reached by adjusting the random variables after they are generated, e.g. in order to keep their mean value constant.

Next we assume the validity of Eq.3 and perform the standard finite size scaling, to demonstrate how that procedure's inherent noise can mask the true critical behaviour. Some of the key results of the analysis are: i) we find that the exponent of the intrinsic correlation length might be different from  $\nu$  appearing in the standard finite size scaling. Therefore the theorem of Ref. [1] does not provide constraints on the true exponent  $\nu$ . ii) In particular,  $\nu$  can be less than  $2/d$ . In this case typically  $\nu = 2/d$ .

The standard finite size scaling procedure [8] in disordered systems calls for calculating a physical quantity,  $Q$ , such as the critical susceptibility, for different values of  $N$  and  $K$ , the system size and control parameter, each time performing the calculations for a number of disorder realizations. Averaging over the disorder yields  $\langle Q(K) \rangle$ , and the critical coupling  $K_c$  is then identified for instance from a crossing pattern [9]. Requiring the collapse of the data, when plotted as a function of  $L^{1/\nu}$ , where  $\epsilon = (K - K_c) = K_c - 1$ , determines the exponents.

To make contact between the standard scaling procedure and Eq.3, a relation between the unique  $K_c$  and the fluctuating  $K_c^r$  has to be constructed. A simple representation of the inherent noise, or uncertainty, is to assume the validity of the central limit theorem for  $K_c^r$

$$K_c^r = K_c + \frac{D}{L^{d/2}} x ; \quad (4)$$

where  $x$  is a random variable with a distribution width of  $O(1)$ . Here  $D$  measures the scatter in  $K_c^r$ , and  $\ell$  is the distance from the average critical point  $K_c$ . As we have seen, this is not necessarily true for all systems, and we will return to the case when the fluctuations scale with a different power.

The standard procedure neglects the fluctuations of  $K_c^r$ , which is equivalent to averaging  $Q$  over the random variable  $x$  of Eq.4:

$$\langle Q \rangle = L^{-\gamma} q(D L^{1-\frac{d}{2}} x) + \frac{L^{d=2}}{D} : \quad (5)$$

Here the  $x$  average is denoted by  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ , corresponding to the standard averaging procedure, as opposed to  $Q$ , the correlated averaging of the new procedure in Eq.3.

First we analyze the critical point itself, then we shall proceed to extract the critical behaviour of the correlation length. At  $\ell = 0$  the scaling form for  $Q$  is

$$\langle Q \rangle = L^{-\gamma} q(D x L^{1-\frac{d}{2}}) : \quad (6)$$

For  $d > 2$  the argument of the scaling function approaches zero with increasing system size, and the  $L$  dependence of the averaged quantity  $\langle Q \rangle(L)$  is characterized by the intrinsic exponent  $\gamma$ . Here we use the customary assumption that the universal scaling function  $q(z)$  approaches a finite value as  $z \rightarrow 0$ .

In the  $d < 2$  case, however, the argument of  $q(z)$  goes to large values, probing deeply non-critical regions, even though the system is assumed to be at criticality. To highlight the consequences of this, we proceed with a generic form for the asymptotic behaviour of the scaling function, adopting  $q(z) \sim z^{-\beta}$ . From Eq.6  $\langle Q \rangle \sim L^{-\gamma-\beta}$ , where  $\beta = \gamma + 1 - d/2$ . Clearly the  $L$  dependence of the averaged  $\langle Q \rangle$  is different from the intrinsic value  $\gamma$ .

Next we develop an understanding of the region in the proximity of the critical point, i.e. the case of finite  $\ell$ . Let us first focus on  $d < 2$ . From Eq.5 one identifies two scaling regions, governed by two different characteristic diverging length scales.

For large system sizes inevitably  $D L^{1-d/2} \gg 1$ , so the argument of  $q(z)$  again extends to large values. Utilizing the previous asymptotic model form,

$$\langle Q \rangle = L^{-\gamma} q(D L^{1-d/2}) : \quad (7)$$

from which a length scale can be identified, characterizing the finite size scaling of  $\langle Q \rangle$ , averaged in the standard way. It diverges with an exponent  $\nu_{FS} = 2/d$  even though the true exponent  $\nu$  is less than  $2/d$ . This result now demonstrates in general, what has been observed earlier for the binary example: the standard, or "grand canonical" averaging introduces a noise, which in turn generates a new length scale and a corresponding new exponent into the analysis.

The other scaling region is reached when  $D L^{1-d/2} \approx 1$ . In this limit

$$\langle Q \rangle = L^{-\gamma} q(1) : \quad (8)$$

As is known, for large values of  $L$ , the exponent is not accessible by finite size scaling [8], hence  $L$  should be kept around unity. Therefore the determination of  $\nu$  requires the study of the region away from the asymptotics: large and small system sizes. For weak disorder ( $D \ll 1$ ) this window in fact might be wide enough for practical purposes. To reiterate, however, studies concentrating on the asymptotic region are bound to see  $\nu_{FS} = 2/d$ .

In the case of  $d > 2$  the standard procedure is capable of accessing the true  $\nu$ : it can be obtained from  $\langle Q \rangle$  by increasing the system size to the extent of  $D L^{d=2} \approx 1$ , but keeping  $L \gg O(1)$ . This again implies avoiding the "non-scaling" region around  $\ell = 0$ . For strong disorder and small available system sizes, one can end up again with large arguments of  $q(z)$ , and consequently in the scaling regime described by  $\nu_{FS}$  and (Eq.7). There are several additional crossover regimes in the parameter space, which can be studied based on Eq.5.

What happens if instead of the central-limit-theorem form,  $L^{d=2}$ , the fluctuations of  $K_c^r$  are described by some other power law? For instance, on physical grounds, the fluctuations may scale with the correlation length exponent

$$= \gamma + \frac{D}{L^{1-\nu}} x : \quad (9)$$

Substituting this expression into Eq.3 and averaging over  $x$  shows that the standard procedure and our proposition give the same result for the exponents, although the scaling function changes due to the difference in averaging.

Equation 9 can help incorporate the idea of  $K_c^r$  in the scaling. One can appreciate that from looking at a finite sample, it is far from trivial to identify  $K_c^r$ , belonging to the infinite system. A solution might be suggested by recalling that for ordered classical magnets, the maximum of the susceptibility of a finite size sample is shifted as:  $T_c(L) = T_c(\infty) / L^{1-\nu}$ , just as in Eq.9. Scaling then can be performed in terms of  $T_c(L)$ , resulting in the correct exponents. Even in the absence of knowledge of the  $K_c^r$  of the corresponding infinite system, one can still extract a  $K_c^r$  from a specific feature of a critical quantity of the finite size system. Using this  $K_c^r$  in our new scaling approach should provide the correct exponent  $\nu$ , provided that  $K_c^r \sim K_c^r / L^{1-\nu}$ , a reasonable assumption.

We are thus left with the task of identifying  $K_c^r$  of a finite system. For many quantum systems at  $T = 0$  a reasonable proposition for  $K_c^r$  might be the value of  $K$ , where the gap to the first excitation vanishes or has a minimum. For classical systems  $K_c^r$  may be identified where some critical susceptibility exhibits a maximum.

