

Finite-Size Effects in the ϕ^4 Field Theory Above the Upper Critical Dimension

X.S.Chen^{1,2} and V.Dohm¹

¹ Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Hochschule Aachen, D-52056 Aachen, Germany

² Institute of Particle Physics, Hua-Zhong Normal University, Wuhan 430070, China
(September 8, 1997)

We demonstrate that the standard $O(n)$ symmetric ϕ^4 field theory does not correctly describe the leading finite-size effects near the critical point of spin systems on a d -dimensional lattice with $d > 4$. We show that these finite-size effects require a description in terms of a lattice Hamiltonian. For $n \neq 1$ and $n = 1$ explicit results are given for the susceptibility and for the Binder cumulant. They imply that recent analyses of Monte-Carlo results for the d -dimensional Ising model are not conclusive.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Jk, 64.60.Ak, 75.40.Mg

The effect of a finite geometry on systems near phase transitions is of basic interest to statistical physics and elementary particle physics. In both areas the ϕ^4 Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_v \int d^d x \left[\frac{1}{2} (\nabla \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (5\phi')^2 + u_0 (\phi'^2)^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

for an n -component field $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ in a finite volume V plays a fundamental role [1]. For simplicity we consider a d -dimensional cube, $V = L^d$, with periodic boundary conditions, $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = L^{-d} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \phi_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}$. The summation runs over discrete \mathbf{k} vectors with components $k_j = 2\pi m_j/L$; $m_j = 0, 1, 2, \dots; j = 1, 2, \dots, d$; in the range $k_j < \pi$ with a finite cutoff.

It is generally believed that the leading finite-size effects near the critical point of d -dimensional systems can be described by H both for $d = d_u$ and for $d > d_u$ where $d_u = 4$ is the upper critical dimension. Since for $d > 4$ the bulk critical behavior is mean-field like, it is plausible that the leading finite-size effects for $d > 4$ appear to be describable in terms of a simplified Hamiltonian [2,3]

$$H_0(\phi) = L^d \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \phi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + u_0 (\phi^2)^2 \right] \quad (2)$$

involving only the homogeneous fluctuations of the lowest ($\mathbf{k} = 0$) mode $\phi_0 = L^{-d} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x})$. Based on the statistical weight $\exp[-H_0(\phi)]$, universal results have been predicted [2] for systems above d_u . For the case $n = 1$, the lowest-mode predictions have been compared with Monte-Carlo (MC) data for the d -dimensional Ising model [4-7]. Although disagreements were noted and doubts were raised in Ref.4, subsequent analyses [5-7] based on the Hamiltonian H appeared to reconcile the MC data with the lowest-mode predictions.

In this Letter we shall demonstrate that the lowest-mode approach fails for the Hamiltonian H in Eq.(1) for $d > 4$ and that the leading finite-size effects of spin systems on a d -dimensional lattice with $d > 4$ are not correctly described by H . We show that this defect of H is due to the $(5\phi')^2$ term. These unexpected findings shed new light on the role of lattice effects for $d > d_u$

and imply that recent analyses of the MC data [4-7] in terms of the continuum ϕ^4 theory are not conclusive.

We shall prove our claims first in the large- n limit where a saddle point approach [1] can be employed. Our proof is not based on the renormalization group. We have extended the saddle point approach to the finite system to derive the order-parameter correlation function

$$G(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_v \int d^d x \langle \phi(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{0}) \rangle \quad (3)$$

with the statistical weight $\exp(-H)$. In the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed $u_0 n$ we have found the exact result

$$G^1 = r_0 + 4u_0 n L^d \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{(1 + k^2)^{1/2}} \quad (4)$$

We shall denote the bulk critical temperature by T_c . For $T > T_c$, G^1 can be interpreted as the susceptibility (per component) of the finite system. In the bulk limit the standard equation [8] for the bulk susceptibility χ_b for $T > T_c$ is recovered from Eq.(4) as

$$\chi_b^{-1} = r_0 + 4u_0 n \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{k^2 + 1} \quad (5)$$

where $\sum_{\mathbf{k}}^R$ stands for $(2\pi)^{-d} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^R d^d k$ with a finite cutoff $k_j \leq \pi$. It is convenient to rewrite Eq.(4) in terms of r_0 and $r_{0c} = a_0 t$ where $r_{0c} = 4u_0 n \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{k^2}$ is the bulk critical value of r_0 as determined from Eq.(5) (with $\chi_b^{-1} = 0$), and $t = (T - T_c)/T_c$. Furthermore it is important to separate the $\mathbf{k} = 0$ part $4u_0 n L^d$ from the sum in Eq.(4). After a simple rearrangement we obtain

$$G^1 = \frac{r_0 + \frac{P}{(r_0)^2 + 16u_0 n L^d (1+S)}}{2(1+S)}; \quad (6)$$

$$r_0 = a_0 t; \quad (7)$$

$$S = 4u_0 n L^d \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0}^X [k^2 (1 + k^2)]^{-1/2}; \quad (8)$$

$$= 4u_0 n \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^Z \frac{1}{k^2} - L^d \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0}^X \frac{1}{k^2}; \quad (9)$$

These equations are the starting point of our analysis. They are exact in the limit $n \rightarrow 1$ at fixed $u_0 n$ and are valid, at finite cutoff, for $d > 2$, for arbitrary L and for arbitrary r_0 . They are written in a form that separates the $k = 0$ contribution $16u_0 n L^d$ from the effect of the $k \neq 0$ modes. The latter is contained in S and c .

In addition to the finite-size effect of the $k = 0$ mode, the $k \neq 0$ modes cause two different finite-size effects: (i) a finite renormalization of the coupling $u_0 n$ due to S which for $d > 4$ attains the finite bulk value $S_b = 4u_0 n \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} [k^2 (\frac{1}{b} + k^2)]^{-1}$, and (ii) a shift of the temperature scale due to c which vanishes in the bulk limit. These two kinds of finite-size effects were also identified by Brezin and Zinn-Justin [2] who argued that for $d > 4$ these effects do not change the leading L dependence obtained within the lowest-mode approximation. These arguments do not depend on n and, if correct, should remain valid also in the large- n limit.

The finite-size effect (ii) comes from c which, for $d > 2$ and finite n , has the nontrivial large- L behavior

$$4u_0 n L^{d-2} \left[a_1(d) (L)^{-2} + a_2(d) (L)^{-d} \right] \quad (10)$$

apart from more rapidly vanishing terms. For the coefficients $a_i(d) > 0$ we have found

$$a_1(d) = \frac{d}{3(2)^{d-2}} \int_0^{\infty} dx x e^{-x} \int_0^{\infty} dy e^{-y} x^{d-1} y^{d-1}; \quad (11)$$

$$a_2(d) = \frac{1}{4^{d-2}} \int_0^{\infty} dy \left(\int_{m=1}^{\infty} e^{-y m^2} \right)^d \frac{1}{y^{d-2}}; \quad (12)$$

as confirmed in Fig.1 by numerical evaluation of Eq.(9) for $d = 3, 4, 5$. Thus, for $d > 4$, c vanishes as L^{-2} , and not as L^{-d} [2,5-7] or as $L^{-d/2}$ [4]. This implies that in Eq.(6) the zero-mode term proportional to L^d does no longer constitute the dominant finite-size term.

Our claims are most convincingly examined at bulk T_c . Then Eq.(6) is reduced to

$$\frac{1}{c} = \frac{16u_0 n L^d (1 + S_c)}{2(1 + S_c)} \quad (13)$$

where S_c is given by the r.h.s. of Eq.(8) with $\frac{1}{c}$ replaced by $\frac{1}{c}$. We see that the large- L behavior is significantly affected by the L^{-2} term. For large L and $d > 4$ we obtain from Eqs.(13) and (10)

$$\frac{1}{c} \sim \frac{L^d}{4u_0 n} \left[a_1(d) L^{-d} + L^{-2} \right]; \quad (14)$$

By contrast, the lowest-mode approximation with $\frac{1}{c} = 0$ and $S_c = 0$ yields $\frac{1}{c} = (4u_0 n)^{1/2} L^{d/2}$. This proves that the lowest-mode approach fails in the present case. We note that the arguments in Ref.2 regarding the finite-size effect (ii) are not compelling since they are focused on the contributions of individual terms at lowest non-zero k rather than on an analysis of the summed effect of these contributions.




FIG. 1. L -dependence of $\frac{1}{c} = (4u_0 n L^d)^{-1}$ with from Eq.(9) for $d = 3, 4, 5$ (solid curves). The dashed lines represent Eq.(10) with $a_1(3) = 0.27706$, $a_1(4) = 0.08333$, $a_1(5) = 0.02443$, and $a_2(3) = 0.22578$, $a_2(4) = 0.14046$, $a_2(5) = 0.10712$. The arrows indicate the large- L limits.

Furthermore we see that the $L^{d/2}$ power law in Eq.(14) differs from the $L^{d/2}$ power law obtained from the exact solution of the n -vector model on a lattice for $n \rightarrow 1$ [9] and of the mean spherical model on a lattice [10]. This proves that the field-theoretic Hamiltonian \hat{H} in Eq.(1) does not correctly describe the leading finite-size effects of spin models on a d -dimensional lattice with $d > 4$, at least in the large- n limit.

In the following we show that this defect is due to the $(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{r})^2$ or $k^2 \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r}$ term of

$$\hat{H} = L^d \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{2} (r_0 + k^2) \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{-\mathbf{k}} + u_0 L^{3d} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{k}''} (\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}'})(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}''} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'}) \quad (15)$$

with $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} d^d x e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x})$. Instead we consider a lattice Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(\mathbf{r}_i)$ for n -component vectors \mathbf{r}_i with components r_i^a , $1 \leq i \leq n$, $a = 1, \dots, n$, on lattice points \mathbf{x}_i of a simple cubic lattice with volume $V = L^d$ and with periodic boundary conditions. We assume

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{r}_i) = \sum_i \left[\frac{r_{i0}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} J_{ij} (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)^2 \right]; \quad (16)$$

where J_{ij} is a pair interaction and a is the lattice spacing. In terms of $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{j}} d^d x e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}_j} \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{j}}$ the Hamiltonian \hat{H} has the same form as Eq.(15) but with $r_0 + k^2$ replaced by $\epsilon_0 + 2 \sum_{\mathbf{j}} J(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{j})$ where $J(\mathbf{k}) = J(0) - J(\mathbf{k})$ and

$$J(k) = (a=L)^d \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} e^{ik(x_i - x_j)}; \quad (17)$$

The k values are restricted by $-a \leq k_j \leq a$. In the large- n limit at fixed $\hat{u}_0 n$ the susceptibility $\hat{\chi} = \frac{1}{n} (a=L)^d \sum_{i,j} \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle$ is determined by Eqs.(6)-(9) with k^2 replaced by $2 \sum_{k \neq 0} J(k)$. The large- L behavior of the crucial quantity $\hat{\chi}$ is for $d > 2$

$$\hat{\chi} = 2\hat{u}_0 n \sum_k [J(k)]^1 L^d \sum_{k \neq 0} [J(k)]^1 \quad (18)$$

$$4\hat{u}_0 n J_0^{-1} a_2(d) L^{2-d} \quad (19)$$

which for $d > 4$ differs from that of the continuum version, Eq.(10), where $2 \sum_k J(k)$ was approximated by k^2 . This approximation turns out to be the unjustified for $d > 4$. Eq.(19) is valid for short-range interactions where

$$J_0 = \frac{1}{d} (a=L)^d \sum_{i,j} (J_{ij} = a^2) (x_i - x_j)^2 \quad (20)$$

is finite. As a consequence of Eq.(19), the leading L dependence of $\hat{\chi}$ at T_c is for $d > 4$

$$\hat{\chi}_c = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{u}_0 n)^{1=2} (1 + S_c^b)^{1=2} L^{d=2}; \quad (21)$$

This agrees with the $L^{d=2}$ power law of the exact solution of the lattice models of Refs. 9 and 10 for $d > 4$ and with the lowest-mode result $\hat{\chi}_{0c} = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{u}_0 n)^{1=2} L^{d=2}$. We see that at T_c for $d > 4$ the $k \neq 0$ modes of \hat{H} do not change the leading exponent $d=2$ of the lowest-mode approximation. Nevertheless they produce a finite change of the amplitude of $\hat{\chi}_c$ through $S_c^b = \hat{u}_0 n \sum_k [J(k)]^2$. Furthermore we conclude from Eqs.(14) and (21) that for $d > 4$ the lattice Hamiltonian \hat{H} yields significantly different finite-size effects compared to those of H .

An analysis of the temperature dependence of $\langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle(t; L)$, Eq.(6), and of $\hat{\chi}(t; L)$ shows that for $d > 4$ finite-size scaling in its usual form is not valid, as expected [9], but we find that it remains valid in a generalized form with two reference lengths. The asymptotic scaling structure of $\hat{\chi}$ is

$$\hat{\chi}(t; L) = L^{-\hat{\chi}} \hat{P}(\hat{t}(L = \hat{l}_0)^{1=}; (L = \hat{l}_0)^{4-d}) \quad (22)$$

where \hat{l}_0 is the bulk correlation-length amplitude and $\hat{l}_0 = [4\hat{u}_0 n J_0^2 (1 + \hat{S}_c^b)^{-1}]^{1=(d-4)}$ is a second reference length. The d -dependent scaling function reads

$$\hat{P}(\hat{x}; y) = 2J_0^{-1} \sum^n (\hat{x}; y) + \sum^p \frac{1}{[(\hat{x}; y)^2 + 4y]^{O_1}} \quad (23)$$

where $(\hat{x}; y) = x - a_2(d)y$. In the lowest-mode approximation the term $a_2(d)y$ is dropped which implies that the leading finite-size term for $t > 0$ becomes incorrect. Thus, for $t > 0$, the lowest-mode approach fails for the

lattice model (and also for the continuum model whose scaling function P turns out to be non-universal).

In the following we extend our analysis to the case $n = 1$ which is of relevance to the interpretation of MC data of the d -dimensional Ising model [4-7]. We shall examine the susceptibility and the Binder cumulant U ,

$$Z = \sum_v \langle \sigma^d x \rangle' (x)' (0) = L^d \langle \sigma^2 \rangle; \quad (24)$$

$$U = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \langle \sigma^4 \rangle = \langle \sigma^2 \rangle^2; \quad (25)$$

within the ϕ^4 model, Eq.(1), including the effect of the $k \neq 0$ modes in one-loop order. For $d > 4$ at finite cut-off, the perturbative finite-size field theory [11,12] is applicable near T_c without a renormalization-group treatment. The averages are defined as $\langle \sigma^m \rangle = \frac{1}{R} \int d\sigma \sigma^m P(\sigma)$ where $P(\sigma) = Z^{-1} \int d\mathbf{H} e^{\mathbf{H} \cdot \sigma}$ is the order-parameter distribution function with $(\sigma) = (\mathbf{x})'$ representing the inhomogeneous fluctuations [12]. From Refs. 11 and 12 we derive the L dependence at T_c in one-loop order

$$\chi_c = L^{d=2} u_0^{\text{eff } 1=2} \#_2 (y_0^{\text{eff}}); \quad (26)$$

$$U_c = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \#_4 (y_0^{\text{eff}}) = \#_2 (y_0^{\text{eff}})^2; \quad (27)$$

where

$$y_0^{\text{eff}} = r_0^{\text{eff}} L^{d=2} u_0^{\text{eff } 1=2}; \quad (28)$$

$$r_0^{\text{eff}} = r_{0c} + 12u_0 S_1(r_{0L}) + 144u_0^2 M_0^2 S_2(r_{0L}); \quad (29)$$

$$u_0^{\text{eff}} = u_0 - 36u_0^2 S_2(r_{0L}); \quad (30)$$

$$r_{0L} = r_{0c} + 12u_0 M_0^2; \quad (31)$$

$$M_0^2 = (L^d u_0)^{1=2} \#_2 (r_{0c} L^{d=2} u_0^{1=2}); \quad (32)$$

$$\#_m(y) = \frac{\int_0^1 dy \exp(-\frac{1}{2} y s^2) s^4}{\int_0^1 dy \exp(-\frac{1}{2} y s^2) s^4}; \quad (33)$$

In this order the critical value $r_{0c} < 0$ is determined implicitly by the bulk limit ($r_0^{\text{eff}} = 0$) of Eq.(29),

$$r_{0c} = 12u_0 I_1(-2r_{0c}) + 36u_0 r_{0c} I_2(-2r_{0c}); \quad (34)$$

where $I_m(r) = \int_k (r + k^2)^{-m}$. The finite-size effect of the $k \neq 0$ modes enters through

$$S_m(r) = L^{-d} \sum_{k \neq 0} (r + k^2)^{-m}; \quad (35)$$

For large L we have $r_{0L} = -2r_{0c} + O(L^{-d})$ and

$$r_0^{\text{eff}} = 12u_0 [I_1(-2r_{0c}) - S_1(-2r_{0c})] + 36u_0 r_{0c} [I_2(-2r_{0c}) - S_2(-2r_{0c})] + O(L^{-d}); \quad (36)$$

Similar to in Eqs.(9) and (10), the parameter $r_0^{\text{eff}} < 0$ vanishes as L^{-2} (rather than as L^{2-d}) for $d > 4$, thus $y_0^{\text{eff}} < 0$ diverges as $L^{(d-4)=2}$ (rather than vanishes as $L^{(d-4)=2}$) for $d > 4$. Since $\#_2(y) \sim y=4$ and $\#_4(y) \sim y^2=16$ for large negative y [11] this implies that χ_c diverges as $L^{d=2}$ and U_c attains the large- L limit $2=3$. We

conclude that the $L^{d=2}$ power law for ν_{0c} and the value $\nu_{0c} = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \#_4(0) = \#_2(0)^2 = 0.2705$ predicted [2] for $n = 1$ within the lowest-mode approach are incorrect. From Refs. 2 and 12 we infer that analogous conclusions hold for general $n > 1$.

These unexpected results show that the widely accepted arguments in support of the asymptotic correctness of the lowest-mode approximation above the upper critical dimension in statics [1,2,5-7,13-19] and dynamics [1,20-23] are not valid and that recent interpretations [4-7] of the Monte-Carlo data of the d -dimensional Ising model in terms of predictions based on the Hamiltonian H , Eq.(1), are not conclusive, in spite of the apparent agreement found in Refs. 5-7.

Guided by our exact results in the large- n limit, we propose a solution to this puzzle by replacing the field-theoretic ϕ^4 Hamiltonian H , Eq.(1), by the lattice ϕ^4 Hamiltonian \hat{H} , Eq.(16), with $n = 1$ for the comparison with the d -dimensional Ising model. This involves a reexamination of ν_0^{eff} , Eq.(36), with k^2 replaced by $2[J(0) - J(k)]$. We anticipate that the resulting value for the Binder cumulant \hat{U}_c of the lattice model will be close to (or possibly identical with) that of the lowest-mode approach. This expectation is based on our result (for $n \neq 1$) that at T_c the lowest-mode approach yields the correct leading finite-size exponent of ν_c . In addition, however, a detailed analysis of non-asymptotic (finite- L) correction terms is required which, for the Hamiltonian \hat{H} , are expected to be different from those employed in a recent analysis based on H [5].

We summarize our findings for the continuum and lattice versions of the ϕ^4 model for $d > 4$ as follows: Lattice effects manifest themselves not only in changes of nonuniversal amplitudes but also in changes of the exponents of the leading finite-size terms as compared to the exponents of the continuum ϕ^4 model. The lowest-mode approach fails for the continuum ϕ^4 model, and also for the lattice model for $t > 0$. Therefore the values for the amplitude ratios derived previously [2] cannot be justified on the basis of the ϕ^4 continuum theory. For the lattice Hamiltonian, however, the lowest-mode approach is qualitatively justified at T_c for $n \neq 1$, at least for ν_c . We conjecture that this is the reason for a fortuitous (approximate) agreement found between MC (lattice) data [4-7] and the lowest-mode predictions [2]. Further work is necessary in terms of the ϕ^4 lattice model, Eq.(16), to fully establish our conjecture.

We also anticipate lattice and cutoff effects on leading finite-size terms at $d = d_u$. This is relevant to future studies of tricritical phenomena at $d = 3$, e.g., in $^3\text{He}-^4\text{He}$ mixtures [24] and to MC simulations for lattice models of elementary particle physics at $d = 4$.

Support by Sonderforschungsbereich 341 der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft is acknowledged.

-
- [1] J. Zinn-Justin, Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996).
 - [2] E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B 257, 867 (1985).
 - [3] J. Rudnick, H. Guo, and D. Jasnow, J. Stat. Phys. 41, 353 (1985).
 - [4] Ch. Rickwardt, P. Nielaba, and K. Binder, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) 3, 483 (1994); K. Binder, M. Nauenberg, V. Privman, and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. B 31, 1498 (1985); K. Binder, Z. Phys. B 61, 3 (1985).
 - [5] E. Luijten and H.W. J. Blöte, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 1557 (1996); H.W. J. Blöte and E. Luijten, Europhys. Lett. 38, 565 (1997).
 - [6] K.K. Mon, Europhys. Lett. 34, 399 (1996).
 - [7] G. Parisi and J.J. Ruiz-Lorenz, Phys. Rev. B 54, R 3698 (1996); B 55, 6082 (1997).
 - [8] D.J. Amit, Field Theory, the Renormalization Group and Critical Phenomena (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1978).
 - [9] E. Brezin, J. Phys. (Paris) 43, 15 (1982).
 - [10] J. Shapiro and J. Rudnick, J. Stat. Phys. 43, 51 (1986); J. Rudnick, in Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems, edited by V. Privman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), p.142.
 - [11] A. Esser, V. Dohm, and X.S. Chen, Physica A 222, 355 (1995).
 - [12] X.S. Chen, V. Dohm, and N. Schultka, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3641 (1996).
 - [13] K. Binder and J.S. Wang, J. Stat. Phys. 55, 87 (1989); K. Binder, in Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems, edited by V. Privman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), p.173.
 - [14] V. Privman, in Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems, edited by V. Privman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), p.1.
 - [15] V. Privman, P.C. Hohenberg, and A. Aharony, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic, New York, 1991), Vol. 14, p.1.
 - [16] H.W. Diehl, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic, London, 1986), Vol. 10, p.76.
 - [17] S. Singh and R.K. Pathria, Phys. Rev. B 38, 2740 (1988).
 - [18] M. Krech, The Casimir Effect in Critical Systems (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).
 - [19] H.K. Janssen and W. Koch, Physica A 227, 66 (1996).
 - [20] Y.Y. Goldschmidt, Nucl. Phys. B 280, 340 (1987); B 285, 519 (1987).
 - [21] J.C. Niel and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B 280, 355 (1987).
 - [22] H.W. Diehl, Z. Phys. B 66, 211 (1987); U. Ritschel and H.W. Diehl, Nucl. Phys. B 464, 512 (1996).
 - [23] H.K. Janssen, B. Schaub, and B. Schmittmann, Z. Phys. B 71, 377 (1988); J. Phys. A 21, L427 (1988).
 - [24] M. Larson, NAsA Proposal EXACT (1997).