

Non-Markovian Persistence at the PC point of a 1d non-equilibrium kinetic Ising model

Nora Menyhard

Research Institute for Solid State Physics, H-1525 Budapest, P.O. Box 49, Hungary

Geza Odor

Research Institute for Materials Science, H-1525 Budapest, P.O. Box 49, Hungary

One-dimensional non-equilibrium kinetic Ising models evolving under the competing effect of spin flips at zero temperature and nearest neighbour spin exchanges exhibiting a parity-conserving (PC) phase transition on the level of kinks are investigated here numerically from the point of view of the underlying spin system. The dynamical persistency exponent and the exponent characterising the two-time autocorrelation function of the total magnetization under nonequilibrium conditions are reported. It is found that the PC transition has strong effect: the process becomes non-Markovian and the above exponents exhibit drastic changes as compared to the Glauber-Ising case.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 05.50.+q, 64.60.Ht

In recent years, two nonequilibrium dynamical critical exponents have been discovered, which arise under non-equilibrium conditions. The non-equilibrium (short-time) exponent characterizes two-time correlations in systems relaxing to their critical state in the process of quenching from infinitely high temperatures to T_c [1,2]. Recently, one more critical exponent was proposed [3], the persistence exponent ν , associated with the probability $p(t)/t$, that the global order parameter has not changed sign up to time t after a quench to the critical point [4]. For some known examples, cited in ref. [4], the scaling law

$$Z = d + 1 - \frac{\nu}{2} \quad (1)$$

is satisfied (here d is the dimensionality and ν is the static critical exponent of the order parameter correlation function), which has been derived assuming that the dynamics of the order parameter is a Markovian process. In general, however, ν and Z have been proposed [4] to be independent, new critical dynamical exponents.

One of the soluble examples is the $d = 1$ Ising model with Glauber kinetics. In this case the critical temperature is at $T = 0$, and as shown in ref. [4], the persistence exponent is $\nu = 1/4$ for the global order parameter which is the total magnetisation $M(t)$. Moreover, Z is known to be $Z = 1$ in this model. The aim of the present note is to study these new dynamical critical exponents in a simple non-equilibrium Ising system (NEKIM) introduced in [5]. The phase diagram of NEKIM consists essentially of a line of (first order) Ising-type transitions, which line ends at a special point. At this endpoint, on the level of kinks (phase boundaries) a second order phase transition takes place from an absorbing to an active state which, however, belongs to the parity conserving (PC) universality class [6,7,5,8-10]. The critical fluctuations of this PC transition exert a pronounced effect on the underlying spin system as found earlier [11] thus e.g. the classical dynamical exponent Z , defined as usual through $\chi \sim \omega^{-Z}$ with χ/ρ was found to be $Z = 1.75(1)$ instead of the Glauber-Ising value of $Z = 2$. (We note here that $p = e^{-\frac{4J}{kT}}$ plays the role of $\frac{T-T_c}{T_c}$ in 1d with $T_c = 0$ and the static exponents are defined as powers of p for $T \neq 0$).

The question arises how the critical fluctuations of the PC transition affect the other two critical dynamical exponents ν and Z . Before entering into the details of our results for ν and Z , the model will be described in some detail.

In NEKIM the system evolves under a combined effect of spin-flips and spin-exchanges. The spin-flip transition rate in one-dimension for spin s_i ($s_i = \pm 1$) sitting at site i is [12]:

$$w_i = \frac{1}{2} (1 + s_{i-1} s_{i+1}) - \frac{1}{2} s_i (s_{i-1} + s_{i+1}) \quad (2)$$

where $\tanh 2J/kT$ (J denoting the coupling constant in the Ising Hamiltonian), and $\tanh 2J/kT$ are further parameters. At $T = 0$ $\tanh 2J/kT = 1$ and there are two independent non-zero rates $\frac{1}{2} (1 - \tanh 2J/kT)$ and $\frac{1}{2} (1 + \tanh 2J/kT)$, responsible for random walk, and pairwise annihilation of kinks, respectively.

The spin-exchange transition rate of nearest neighbour spins (the Kawasaki [13] rate at $T = 1$) is

$w_{ii+1} = \frac{1}{2}p_{ex} [1 - s_i s_{i+1}]$; where p_{ex} is the probability of spin exchange. Spin-flip and spin-exchange have been applied alternatingly.

In this system, at $T = 0$, a PC type phase transition takes place. In [5] we have started from a random initial state and determined the phase boundary in the $(\beta; p_{ex})$ plane. In the following we will choose a typical point on this phase diagram and make simulations at this point. The parameters chosen are: $\beta = .35$; $p_{ex} = .3$; $c = .395(2)$. In the simulations the spin-flip part has been applied using two-sublattice updating. After that we have stored the states of the spins and made L (L is the size of the system) random attempts of exchange using always the stored situation for the states of the spins before updating. All these together has been counted as one time-step of updating. (Usual MC update in this last step enhances the effect of p_{ex} and leads to $c = .362(1)$).

In [4] it has been argued that for studying non-equilibrium critical dynamics, the global, rather than the local order parameter should be considered. The non-equilibrium nature of the problem under consideration is partly due to the model itself and partly due to the conditions of a quench from $T = 1$ to $T = 0$. This latter means that we will restrict ourselves to completely random initial states and follow the behaviour of the system using the rules described above. The persistency exponent is defined via the probability $p(t)$ that the global order parameter, which in our case is the total magnetization: $\langle M_{k=0}(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{L} \langle \sum_i s_i(t) \rangle$, has not changed sign up to time t :

$$p(t) = \langle \text{sign}(M_{k=0}(t)) \text{sign}(M_{k=0}(0)) \rangle \quad (3)$$

Finite size scaling (FSS) applied to the persistence problem [4] leads to the form:

$$p(t) = L^{-Z} g(t/L^Z) \quad (4)$$




FIG. 1. $p(t)L^a$, $a = Z$, plotted against t/L^Z with $Z = 1.75$ and $\beta = .65; .67; .69$. For clarity the $.65$ and $.69$ data have been multiplied and divided by a factor of 2, respectively. The simulational data exhibited here have been obtained for $L = 100; 200; 400; 800$ sized systems labeled by different symbols, for statistical averages between $3 \cdot 10^6$ - 10^5 samples.

Simulations have been carried out in the range $50 \leq L \leq 2000$ with periodic as well as antiperiodic boundary conditions and at least for 10^5 independent runs. Fig.1 shows those of our results which have the best statistics with averages over up to 10^6 independent random initial configurations (those configurations, however, for which $M(0) = 0$ exactly, were discarded) with periodic boundary conditions for $L = 100; 200; 400$ and 800 . Using $Z = 1.75(1)$ [11] the best fit corresponds to $\beta = .67(1)$. The fact that periodic boundary conditions allow only an even number of kinks leads eventually to perfect ordering of spins seen as levelling off of curves on Fig.1. Our simulations with antiperiodic boundary conditions have led to the same value of β as above though the form of the scaling function $g(t/L^Z)$ in this case is different, of course. For comparison we have also simulated the exactly soluble Glauber-Ising case and found the expected value of $\beta = .25$ within the accuracy of the simulations.

The local autocorrelation function defines the new exponent [1,2]:

$$A(t; 0) = \frac{1}{L} \langle \sum_i s_i(0) s_i(t) \rangle / t^{-\frac{Z}{2}} \quad (5)$$

We have made simulations for this quantity after starting with a random initial configuration, and allowing the system to evolve according to the rule of NEKIM as described above. Averaging has been taken over random initial configurations in a chain of length $L = 1000$. The result is shown on Fig.2. The best fit has been obtained with $\beta = 1.49(3)$, using $Z = 1.75(1)$. For comparison, numerical results for the corresponding quantity in the Glauber-Ising limiting case are also displayed on Fig.2. It is worth mentioning, that data for $t \leq 10$ had to be discarded in both cases; power law behaviour is seen only for later times and this fact does not change if the number of averages taken is increased even by an order of magnitude.




FIG. 2. Time dependence of the local autocorrelation function $A(t;0)$. $L = 1000$ and the number of averages over independent random initial states was 1.5×10^5 also for the Glauber-Ising case which is shown for comparison.

Following [4], we will study now the two-time autocorrelation function for the global order parameter: $A^{global}(t_1; t_2) = L \langle M_{k=0}(t_1) M_{k=0}(t_2) \rangle$ or rather its normalized form, namely

$$a(t_1; t_2) = A^{global}(t_1; t_2) / \sqrt{S(0; t_1) S(0; t_2)} = f\left(\frac{t_1}{t_2}\right) \quad (6)$$

Here $S(0; t) = L \langle \frac{1}{L} \sum_i s_i(t)^2 \rangle$ is the structure factor at the ferromagnetic peak and the second equality follows from scaling assumption (see later in more detail). Moreover, for $y \neq 1$, $f(y) \sim y^{-(d+1-\beta)/2} = y^{-Z}$ is the expected power law behaviour. Nevertheless, if the process is Markovian, the power law behaviour of $f(\frac{t_1}{t_2})$ has to hold for all $t_1 > t_2$ as shown in [4].

The second moment of the global magnetization (structure factor) should behave as [15]

$$S(0; t) \sim t^{-(d-2)/2} = t^{-Z} \quad (7)$$

We have found earlier, in [11] that $\beta = 50(2)$, i.e. even at the PC point the Ising phase transition is of first order and thus $S(0; t) \sim t^{-1/2}$. Moreover, via the above applied scaling law $d-2+\beta = 2$, $\beta = 1.0(1)$ follows at the PC point, too.

Fig.3. shows $a(t_1=t_2)$ as a function of $t_1=t_2$ for six different values of t , $t = 3; 5; 10; 32; 50; 100$. We have simulated $A^{global}(t_1; t_2)$ while for the denominator we have used the power law behaviour as indicated above with $1-Z = 57$. Unfortunately, it is very hard to get $A^{global}(t_1; t_2)$ to a satisfactory accuracy.




FIG. 3. The normalized autocorrelation function $a(t_1=t_2)$ at the PC point for six different values of t_2 increasing in the downward direction in the range 3-100. The Glauber case is exhibited again for comparison. $L = 1000$ and the number of averages over independent initial states: 10^5 .

The reason is probably the fact that in the scaling form of $A^{\text{global}}(t_1; t_2)$ the leading order term is $\propto (t_1/t_2)^{\frac{d}{2}}$ which is non-singular in the present model (it is marginal with $d = 1$ for the 1d Glauber model while it is singular for the 2d Ising case). This means that the $k = 0$ mode is not special for the two-time structure factor (while it is for the equal-time structure factor) and thus a power law behaviour is correction to scaling [18]. In more detail: the scaling form for the two-time structure factor can be written as

$$\langle M_k(t_1) M_k(t_2) \rangle = t_2^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \frac{L(t_1)}{L(t_2)}^d f_1(kL(t_1)) + t_2^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \frac{L(t_1)}{L(t_2)}^{1-d} f_2(kL(t_1)); t_1, t_2 \gg 1; d > 1 \quad (8)$$

where $L(t) \propto t^{1/2}$ and for $k \neq 0$ $f_1(kL(t)) \neq \text{const.}$ Moreover since the second term is correction to scaling, $1 < d$. For $t_1 = t_2$ we get the usual structure factor and for $k \neq 0$ without the correction term this is the form cited in [4] below their eq.(16). In the present case, knowing that the singular term is missing we can say $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} f_1(kL(t)) = 0$, scaling can still be present and 1 plays the role of d (and we will use d for 1 in the following even for $d > 1$).

Now turning back to our Fig.3, apart from the first three decades in time, fluctuations hinder drawing any conclusion concerning the (correction to scaling) behaviour of $A^{\text{global}}(t_1; t_2)$ even for averages of order 10^5 . For the quantity $t_1=t_2$ this fact narrows down the interval of analyzable data even more. Nevertheless, it is clearly seen that the dynamic scaling assumption expressed in eq.(6) (and which eventually can be expected to hold only for $t_1 \gg 1; t_2 \gg 1$) starts to be fulfilled to an accuracy below 1% only for values $t_1 > t_2 > 50$. Actually this is not typical: it has been proposed [14] that in case of systems quenched to their critical temperature (and here $T_c = 0$) universality and scaling may appear in a quite early stage of time evolution, far from equilibrium, where $(t) \propto t^{1/2}$ is still small. Based on the scaling relation for such early time intervals, a new way for measuring static and dynamic exponents has been proposed [15,16] and applied also for the local autocorrelation function [17]. Some of our earlier results also show that, indeed, power law behaviour sets in for quite early times already. Thus e.g. in [11] concerning the structure factor $S(0; t) \propto t^x$, the power law behaviour was apparent already for very early times and for such low values of L as $L = 128$, provided the number of averages in the simulation was high enough (above 10^5). The obtained result, $x = 1/2 = 1/2$ was made use of above.

For the sake of comparison we have carried out similar simulations of $A^{\text{global}}(t_1; t_2)$ for the exactly soluble Ising-Glauber case ($p_{\text{ex}} = 0; \beta = 0$), some of these are also exhibited on Fig.3. Here dynamic scaling is fulfilled (to similar accuracy as above) already for $t_1 > t_2 > 5$ and the expected power law behaviour is seen within error. It is worth mentioning that similar value for β , i.e. $\beta = 1.0$ results from simulations in the whole absorbing region (thus e.g. for $p_{\text{ex}} = .35; \beta = 0$).




FIG. 4. The dependence of the normalized autocorrelation function on t_1/t_2 in its first decade for $t_2 = 100$. $L = 1000$ and the number of averages was 10^6 . The straight line is best power law fit with $(\beta - \frac{1}{2})/\nu = .581$.

In order to establish whether the process is Markovian or not at the PC point it will be sufficient to examine the first decade in the variable $\frac{t_1}{t_2}$ in a region where dynamic scaling holds. Fig.4 shows the result for the case $t_2 = 100$ and for averages over 10^6 independent initial states, again taking $L = 1000$. For the exponent $(\beta - \frac{1}{2})/\nu$ the value .58 results as best fit, which, according to eq.(1) should equal β . From here one arrives at $\beta = 1.51(1)$ which is in accord, within error, with the value obtained above from the local autocorrelation function. Thus, supposing the Markovian property to hold has led to contradiction because the measured value of β is .67(1).

The results together with critical exponents obtained earlier in [11] are summarized in Table I.

	β	ν	β/ν	ν	β/ν	β/ν
Glauber-Ising	0	1=2	1=2	2	1=4	1
PC	.00(1)	.444(2)	.444(2)	1.75(1)	.67(1)	1.50(2)

TABLE I. Simulation data for static and dynamic critical exponents for NEKIM

In summary, we have carried out numerical simulations to investigate the non-equilibrium dynamic critical exponents and with the aim to check the Markovian nature of the nonequilibrium Ising system in 1d at the parity conserving phase transition point of the phase diagram of NEKIM. On the basis of the present results we have been led to the conclusion that the effect of fluctuations felt by the spin system at the PC transition is such that the dynamical process becomes non-Markovian. The difference is quite pronounced, definitely beyond numerical errors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank C Sire for useful correspondence. Support from the Hungarian research fund OTKA (Nos. T 017493, 027391 and 023552) is gratefully acknowledged. The simulations were partially carried out on the Fujitsu AP 1000 parallel supercomputer.

-
- [1] H K Janssen, B Schaub and B Schmittman, Z. Phys. 43 (1989) 539
 - [2] D A Huse, Phys. Rev. E 52, 270 (1995)
 - [3] B Derrida, A J Bray and C Godreche, J Phys. A 27, L357, (1994) and A J Bray, B Derrida and C Godreche, Europhys. Lett. 27, 177 (1994)
 - [4] S N Majumdar, A J Bray, S J Comell and C Sire Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 3704
 - [5] N M Enghard, J Phys. A Math. Gen. 27 (1994) 6139
 - [6] P G rassberger F K rause and T. von der Twer J Phys. A Math. Gen. 17 (1984) L105
 - [7] P G rassberger, J Phys. A Math. Gen. 22 (1989) L1103
 - [8] Jensen I, Phys. Rev. E 50 (1994) 3623
 - [9] D Zhong, D. ben-Avraham, Phys. Lett. A 209 (1995) 333
 - [10] Kim M H., Park H., Phys. Rev. Letters 73 (1994) 2579
 - [11] N M Enghard and G Odor, J Phys. A Math. Gen. 29 (1996) 7739
 - [12] Glauber R J J Math. Phys. 4 (1963) 191
 - [13] see e.g. Kawasaki K : Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, Vol. 2, ed Domb C and Green M S (New York: Academic, 1972) p. 443
 - [14] A J Bray, Advances in Physics 43 (1994) 357
 - [15] R E Blundell, K Hamayun and A J Bray, J Phys. A Math. Gen. 25 (1992) L733
 - [16] Z B Li, L Schulke and B Zheng, Phys. Rev. Letters 74 (1995) 3396
 - [17] L Schulke and B Zheng, Phys. Lett. A 204, 295 (1995)
 - [18] S N Majumdar and D A Huse, Phys. Rev. E 52 (1995) 270