9-226



Объединенный институт ядерных исследований дубна

B 39

E17-89-226

1989

U.Behn*, V.B.Priezzhev, V.A.Zagrebnov

ONE DIMENSIONAL RANDOM FIELD ISING MODEL: RESIDUAL ENTROPY, MAGNETIZATION, AND THE "PERESTROYKA" OF THE GROUND STATE

Submitted to "Journal of Statistical Physics"

*Sektion Physik, Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, DDR-7010 Leipzig, German Democratic Republic

Be laconic

Platon, Protagoras, 343 BC

1. INTRODUCTION

The ferromagnetic one-dimensional Ising model in a discrete stochastic field,

where $\sigma_n = \pm 1$ is an i.i.d. random sequence, shows for zero temperature a discontinuous behaviour of magnetization m and residual entropy s_{res} as functions of h_0/h and J. This was observed in [1, 2] using a finite Markov chain approach, and alternatively by energy balance arguments which explained the discontinuities by flips of microscopic spin clusters. There an understanding of the dependence on h_0/h has been obtained in *both languages*.

In the present paper we work out the energy balance arguments to explain the dependence of m and s_{res} as function of J including the continuous degeneracy of the ground state. Furthermore, we show that formula (2.14) exploited in [2] gives only an upper bound for the residual entropy.



ENERGY BALANCE ARGUMENTS

2.1. Outline of the idea

2.

The discontinuous behaviour of magnetization and entropy for zero temperature can be understood as the consequence of flips of microscopic spin clusters.

There exist well defined clusters, which -in an appropriate environment- become unstable at certain threshold values of the system parameters J, h_0 , and h. Unstable means that no direction of the cluster is preferred energetically . *Above the threshold* one direction is preferred. Changing the parameters of the system we will observe a successive *perestroyka* (reconstruction) of the ground state.

At the threshold there is a macroscopic degeneracy of the ground state reflected by spikes of the residual entropy. Except $h_0 = 0$ (in this case we have zero magnetization) one observes in addition jumps in the magnetization. The above arguments are only true if the cluster lives in an appropriate environment, i.e. the adjacent spins should have definite directions. The minimal configuration surviving the previous steps of perestroyka and guaranteeing in this way a definite direction (up, down) of the (right, left) adjacent spin to a given cluster is called in the following stable (up, down; right, left) boundary cluster $B \stackrel{r}{\to} \frac{1}{2}$

If more than one type of clusters become instable at the same threshold (this is possible for rational h_0/h , see example below) we have an additional mechanism for degeneracy: All possible combinations of those clusters contribute to the spikes.

Above threshold we then possibly face with a new phenomena: If at least two of these clusters are antiparallel below the threshold then above the threshold in an antiparallel environment they form an aligned pair, but no direction is preferred. This degeneracy survives at least up to the next threshold and is responsible for a plateau in the residual entropy as a function of the exchange.

The jump in magnetization passing the threshold due to flips of the corresponding clusters of only one type C in the appropriate environment build by the corresponding stable boundary clusters B^1 and B^r is

 $\Delta m = 2 (\Delta n_{\uparrow} - \Delta n_{\downarrow}) \operatorname{Prob} \{ B^{1} C B^{r} \}$

where Δn_{σ} is the difference in the number of spins in direction σ before and after the perestroyka.

(2.1)

The corresponding spike of the residual entropy can be obtained by $s_{res} = k_B \ln W$, where $W = 2^{Prob} \{ B^1 C B^r \}$ is the specific statistical weight of the degeneracy of the ground state, so that

 $s_{res} = k_B \operatorname{Prob}\{B^1 C B^r\} \ln 2$. (2.2)

The Prob($B^{1} C B^{r}$) is the Bernoulli measure of the cylindrical set corresponding to infinite (±) configurations with the base $B^{1}C B^{r}$.

2. 2. Zoology of clusters for $h_0/h = 1/4$

To explain the energy balance arguments it is convenient to start with the example considered in [2]. There we studied magnetization and residual entropy as functions of J for fixed ratio $h_0/h = 1/4$.

For J = 0 the ground state configuration follows the direction of the field. The first cluster C_{4}^{-} which

becomes unstable increasing J is shown in Fig. 1a. The threshold condition is that the energy difference between initial and final configuration (binding energy of the flipping spin) becomes zero , $h_{\perp} + 2J = 0$, which defines $J_{\alpha}^{(1)} = -h_{\perp}/2$.

Fig. 1. Clusters $C_{\downarrow}^{-} =$ (a) and $C_{\uparrow}^{+} =$ (b) are responsible for the 1st and the .2nd spike, respectively. The stable boundaries are $B_{\uparrow} =$ (a), and $B_{\downarrow} =$ (b). (c) illustrates the necessity to introduce the stable boundary cluster: The number of single up-spins is reduced due to the first step of the perestroyka.

For $J > J_C^{(1)}$ all C_{\downarrow}^- disappeared (first step of the perestroyka of the ground state). The jump in the magnetization is $\Delta m^{(1)} = 2 \cdot 1 \cdot (1/2)^3 = 1/4$ (see (2.1)). At the threshold the C_{\downarrow}^- don't prefer any direction, the ground state is macroscopically degenerated and the residual entropy has a spike $s_{res}^{(1)} = k_B^- (1/2)^3 \ln 2$ (see (2.2)), the magnetization is in the middle between the steps.

The thus obtained ground state is stable until reaching $J_{C}^{(2)} = h_{+}/2$ where the C_{t}^{+} become unstable (see Fig. 1b). The jump in magnetization and the residual entropy are calculated as above, $\Delta m^{(2)} = 2 \cdot (-1) \cdot (1/2)^{5} = -1/2^{4}$, and $s_{res} = k_{B} (1/5)^{5} \ln 2$. --- Β, Θ Θ Β,---↓ ↓ α)

 $B_{4} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{array} \right\}$

Fig. 2. The two down spin cluster $C_{\downarrow}^{-} =$ in an up spin environment is responsible for the 3rd threshold (a). (b) shows the set of up-spin boundary clusters which are stable for $J < J_{c}^{(4)} =$ 7/8 h.

The third threshold $J_c^{(3)} = -h_{-}$ originates from cluster C_{+}^{-} (see Fig. 2), correspondingly $\Delta m^{(3)} = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot ((1/2)^2 + (1/2)^3) \cdot (1/2)^2 \cdot ((1/2)^2 + (1/2)^3) = 9/2^6$, and $s_{res} = k_B (9/2^8) \ln 2$. The next threshold $J_c^{(4)} = 7/8$ h results (in contrast to the previous one) from an infinite class of clusters generated by C_{+}^{++} and C_{+}^{-+--} (cf. Fig. 3) with respective





Fig. 3. Generators for composed clusters responsible for the 4th threshold (a). The 3-cluster and the 5-cluster surrounded by down (up) spins become instable at $J_c^{(4)}$ (b).

b) Fig. 4. The sets of down (a), respectively up (b) right boundary clusters which are stable for $J < J_c^{(5)}$. The left boundary clusters are $B_{\uparrow \downarrow}^{1} = (B_{\uparrow \downarrow}^{r})^{M}$ where M denotes mirror reflection to the left. Obviously, Pr (B_{\downarrow}^{r}) = 2^{-2} + 2^{-4} + 2^{-5} = $37/2^{8}$, and Pr (B_{\uparrow}^{r}) = 2⁻²+ 2⁻⁴+ 2⁻⁵ + 2⁻⁷ + 2⁻⁸ $91/2^8$.

a)

binding energies $-2h_+-h_+2J$ and $4h_++h_++2J$. Obviously the coincidence of the thresholds is due to our choice of h_0/h . In Fig. 4 we show how to organize the environment such that it survives the previous steps of the perestroyka and remains stable at least up to the next threshold. Figs. 5 and 6 show the infinite hierarchy of composed clusters which have all the same threshold $J_{2}^{(4)}$.

Above the threshold, in the composed clusters shown in Figs. 6 a,b , all 3- and 5- clusters point in the direction preferred by the surrounding. The pairs of 3-

and 5- clusters living in antiparallel surrounding become aligned (cf. Fig. 5) but no direction is preferred. The same mechanism works for the composed clusters of Fig. 6c and leads to a hierarchy of kink-type configurations, see Fig. 7. The jump in magnetization has contributions from the clusters shown in Fig. 6,

$$\Delta m_{a}^{(4)} = 2 \operatorname{Pr}(B_{\psi}^{1}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-3n) 2^{-3n-5}(n-1) \operatorname{Pr}(B_{\psi}^{r})$$

$$= -\frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{37}{2 \cdot 5 \cdot 17} \right)^{2},$$

$$\Delta m_{b}^{(4)} = 2 \operatorname{Pr}(B_{\uparrow}^{1}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (5n) 2^{-5n-3}(n-1) \operatorname{Pr}(B_{\uparrow}^{r})$$

$$= \frac{1}{5} \left(\frac{91}{2^{2} \cdot 3 \cdot 17} \right)^{2},$$

$$\Delta m_{c}^{(4)} = 2 \operatorname{Pr}(B_{\uparrow}^{1}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2n 2^{-8n} \operatorname{Pr}(B_{\psi}^{r}) = \frac{37 \cdot 91}{(2^{3} \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 17)^{2}}$$

Summing up all jumps we obtain the magnetization m = 6/17for $J_c^{(4)} < J < J_c^{(5)}$ in accordance with [2]. To calculate the residual entropy we first consider the contribution to the



a)

Fig. 5. Simplest composed cluster constructed from the 3and 5-generators (see Fig. 3) which become unstable at $J_c^{(4)}$. At the threshold either the 3-cluster (a) or the 5-cluster (b) can be flipped producing three possible configurations. Also the reflected image of these configurations has to be taken into account.



Fig. 6. Hierarchy of composed clusters which become unstable at $J_C^{(4)}$. The possible configurations at the threshold have to be constructed according to the rule described in Fig. 5. The last remark of Fig. 5 also applies. No other possibilities appear.



Fig. 7. For $J_C^{(4)} < J < J_C^{(5)}$ the 3- and 5-clusters build up rigid pairs (8-clusters) which try to align. As in Fig. 5 we have to spend the energy for one unsatisfied bond (kink) denoted by the arrow. Thus n pairs produce n+1 equivalent configurations. The energy to flip one pair in an antiparallel environment (shift of the kink) $3h_+ + 5h_-$ vanishes due to our specific choice $h_0/h=1/4$.

8

specific statistical weight W from all the clusters C^{n} of n pairs shown in Fig. 7 which is $W_{n} = (n+1)^{p_{n}}$ where $p_{n} = 2$ Prob ($B_{\downarrow}^{1} C^{n} B_{\downarrow}^{r}$) = $2 \cdot \frac{37}{2^{8}} \cdot 2^{-8n} \cdot \frac{91}{2^{8}} = 37 \cdot 91 \cdot 2^{-8} (n+2)+1$. Thus we obtain $W = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} W_{n}$ and the residual entropy

 $s_{res} = k_B \frac{37 \cdot 91}{2^{15}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-8n} \cdot \ln(n+1) = k_B 0.00041...\cdot \ln 2.$

At the fourth threshold, we face with a new quality: We have two types of instable clusters, which correspond to the situation that a spike in the residual entropy touches with a plateau. Combinatorical calculations similar to the one above show a discrepance with [2]. Therefore, situation of this type call for further investigations of the formula for magnetization exploited there. The next threshold will be $J_c^{(5)} = h$. To find the responsible clusters is a nontrivial exercise, the simplest one is shown in Fig. 8.

Fig. 8. The simplest cluster responsible for the 5th threshold.

2.3. Rational vs. irrational values of h₀/h and asymptotics for large J

We consider a rigid aligned cluster living in antiparallel environment (For example take the 8-cluster of Fig. 7). A continuous degeneracy is observed if the binding energy of both orientations is the same, namely zero

 $n_{+}h_{+} + n_{-}h_{-} = (n_{+} + n_{-})h_{0} + (n_{+} - n_{-})h = 0$ (2.3)

 n_{+} and n_{-} are the numbers of the sites where the external field points up or down, respectively. Since the n_{σ} are natural numbers the zero result (2.3) is only possible if h_0/h is rational. For irrational h_0/h we have no continuous degeneracy, the residual entropy as a function of J exhibits only spikes.

Thus, for a given J, the residual entropy as a function of h_0/h feels very sensitively whether this ratio is rational or irrational. $s_{res}(h_0/h)$ behaves similar to a Dirichlet function. Modifications are due to the dependence on J , and the possibility of spikes for irrational values of h_0/h , see Fig. 9.



Fig. 9. Schematic picture of the residual entropy as a function of h_0/h and J. The two "fractal fences" are the Dirichlet type functions mentioned in the text. The case h_0/h =1 is a simple exercise, whereas h_0/h =0 can be analyzed similarly to the case h_0/h =1/4. To estimate the asymptotic behaviour of $s_{res}(J \rightarrow \infty)$ it is sufficient to restrict ourselves to the spikes since they have higher values than the plateau. Let us consider a rigid cluster which is responsible for the spike. It's binding energy is zero,

 $-2J + n_{+}h_{+} + n_{-}h_{-} = -2J + (n_{+} + n_{-})h_{0} + (n_{+} - n_{-})h = 0.$

To fulfill this equation, for large J also the $n_{+/-}$ have to be large, and n_{+} - n_{-} cancels with Prob 1 for J \rightarrow ∞ .

Therefore, asymptotically the length of the cluster $n = n_+ + n_- \sim J/h_0$. To estimate s_{res} from above we replace the probabilities of the stable boundaries by 1 and $^{-2J/h_0}_{-2J/h_0}$.

3. COMPARISON WITH FINITE MARKOV CHAIN ANALYSIS

The magnetization $m(h_0/h=1/4, J)$ obtained above reproduces the results of the finite Markov chain analysis (cf. Table 1 in [2]).

The residual entropy $s_{res}(h_0/h=1/4, J)$ however differs. To solve this puzzle we reconsider the derivation of the formula for s_{res} .

1997年1月1日日 古田田田

3. 1. Residual entropy revised

For the sake of brevity we introduce $\zeta_n^{\sigma} = \beta (\zeta_n + \sigma J)$. where ζ_n is the auxiliary random field recursively generated by $\zeta_n = h_n + A(\zeta_{n-1})$, cf. [2]. From

$$f^{N} = -(\beta N)^{-1} \ln z^{N} = -(\beta N)^{-1} \{ \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ \sigma=t}}^{N-1} (2ch \zeta_{n}^{\sigma})^{1/2} + \ln 2ch \beta \zeta_{N} \}$$



Fig. 10. Shapes of the function A(x)=(2 β)⁻¹ln[ch β (x+J)/ch β (x-J)] for β ' > β .

we obtain

$$s^{N} = - \partial f^{N} / \partial T =$$

$$= (k_{B}/2N) \sum_{\substack{n=1\\\sigma=\pm}}^{N-1} \{ \ln(2ch\xi_{n}^{\sigma}) - \xi_{n}^{\sigma} th\xi_{n}^{\sigma} - \beta^{2} \partial \xi_{n} / \partial \beta th\xi_{n}^{\sigma} \} +$$

+
$$(k_{B}^{N}) \{ \ln 2 ch \beta \xi_{N} - \xi_{N} th \beta \xi_{N} - \beta^{2} \partial \xi_{N}^{N} / \partial \beta th \beta \xi_{N} \}$$
 (3.1)

For $\beta \to \infty$ the first two terms under the sum give $\ln 2$ for each n with $\xi_n + \sigma J = 0$, and zero otherwise. Thus for $N \to \infty$ we find the contribution already obtained in [2] (cf. (2.14) there)

$$(k_{\rm B}^{\prime 2})(w_{\rm J}^{*} + w_{\rm -J}^{*})\ln 2$$
, (3.2)

where the $w_{\pm J}^{\star}$ are the weights of the invariant measure for the states $\xi_n = \pm J$, respectively. To estimate the contribution from the third term we observe that $\operatorname{sgn}_{\substack{\sigma=\pm\\ \sigma=\pm}} \operatorname{th} \xi_n^{\sigma} = \operatorname{sgn} \operatorname{sh}_2 \beta \xi_n = \operatorname{sgn} \xi_n$, and $\operatorname{sgn}_{\partial} \xi_n / \partial \beta = \operatorname{sgn}_{n-1}$, because for $\beta' > \beta$ we have $\xi_n^{\beta'} > \xi_n^{\beta}$ if $\begin{aligned} \xi_{n-1}^{\beta} &= \xi_{n-1}^{\beta} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_{n}^{\beta} < \xi_{n}^{\beta} \quad \text{if} \quad \xi_{n-1}^{\beta} = \xi_{n-1}^{\beta} < 0 \quad (\text{cf.} \\ \text{Fig. 10}). \quad \text{The sign of this contribution is nonpositive} \\ \text{since} \end{aligned}$

 $\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \operatorname{sgn} \zeta_n \operatorname{sgn} \zeta_{n-1} \ge 0 \quad \text{with Prob 1}. \quad (3.3)$

Therefore (3.2) is only an upper bound for sres.

3. 2. Explanation in the language of energy balance

Comparing the results for the spikes of $s_{res}(J)$ obtained by the energy balance arguments with those of Table 1 in [2] we observe that (3.2) corresponds to taking Prob { $B^1 C$ } instead of Prob{ $B^1 C B^r$ } in (2.2). A careful analysis of the discrete stochastic mapping $\zeta_n =$ $h_n + A(\zeta_{n-1})$ shows that the sequence of signs (characterizing the driving process h_n) corresponding to B^1 leads the driven process ζ_n to the fixed point. Then the signs corresponding to C lead in the degenerate situation the driven process ζ_n to J or -J .This two sequences contribute to (3.2) . The further history corresponding to B^r as well as the possibility of kinks is not reflected in (3.2). This is a second (and independent) argument that (3.2) is only an upper bound for s_{res} .

For the case of *continuous* degeneracy (3.2) neglects not only Prob B^r but also the additional degeneracy due to kinks (cf. Fig. 7).

It is clear that for J < h/2 $s_{res}(h_0/h)$ is correctly predicted by (3.2) because the stable boundaries are up spins which are not affected by the perestroyka. Therefore Prob B^1 = Prob B^r = 1.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have obtained a physical understanding of the discontinuous behaviour of m and s_{res} at zero temperature as a result of the perestroyka of the ground state. By energy balance arguments the (possibly infinite) class of clusters which are responsible for a given jump are selected for some examples. The thus calculated magnetization reproduces the results obtained by the finite Markov chain approach [1, 2].

The picture of flipping clusters makes the physical mechanism transparent but the selection of the relevant clusters is a rather tedious task. The finite Markov chain approach, on the other hand, does not reflect this picture in an obvious way, but gives a clear and constructive formalism which finally reduces to linear algebra.

For the calculation of the residual entropy within the Markov chain formalism some formal questions still remain open. For instance, it seems difficult to evaluate the thermodynamic formula (3.1) for zero temperature with the exception of the contribution given by (3.2). The derivation of the formula for magnetization (2.10) in [2] from the thermodynamic expression $m = -\partial f/\partial h_0$ seems similar difficult. In both cases the derivations of the driven process (or the invariant measure) with respect to the physical parameters β and h_0 are involved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of us (U. B.) would like to thank the JINR Dubna for $\frac{1}{72}$ hospitality. The support of the NTZ of the KMU-Leipzig is acknowledged by V. A. Z.

REFERENCES

[1] U. Behn and V. A. Zagrebnov, J. Stat. Phys. 47: 939 (1987) .

[2] U. Behn and V. A. Zagrebnov, J. Phys A: Math.Gen. 21:2151 (1988).

Received by Publishing Department on March 31, 1989.

أهور ومنافع فيحتجز المؤر الكالحان

[19] "是此我们,不是不能认为我们的人,我可以说了。" 这一句话,你是你不是不要你的人,不是你不是我们的。

15

化合同 医病外裂 法法定证据的定理 经济公司

WILL YOU FILL BLANK SPACES IN YOUR LIBRARY?

You can receive by post the books listed below. Prices — in US , including the packing and registered postage.

D2-84-366	Proceedings of the VII International Conference on the Problems of Quantum Field Theory. Alushta, 1984.	11.00
D1,2-84-599	Proceedings of the VII International Seminar on High Energy Physics Problems. Dubna, 1984.	12.00
D17-84-850	Proceedings of the III International Symposium on Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics. Dubna, 1984 (2 volumes).	22.00
	Proceedings of the IX All-Union Conference on Charged Particle Accelerators. Dubna, 1984. (2 volumes)	25.00
D11-85-791	Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Algebra and Its Applications in Theoretical Physics. Dubna, 1985.	12.00
D13-85-793	Proceedings of the XII International Symposium on Nuclear Electronics, Dubna, 1985.	14.00
D4-85-851	Proceedings of the International School on Nuclear Structure Alushta, 1985.	11.00
D1,2-86-668	Proceedings of the VIII International Seminar on High Energy Physics Problems, Dubna, 1986 (2 volumes)	23.00
D3,4,17-86-747	Proceedings of the V International School on Neutron Physics. Alushta, 1986.	25.00
D9-87-105	Proceedings of the X All-Union Conference on Charged Paracle Accelerators. Dubna, 1966 (2 volumes)	25.00
D7-87-68	Proceedings of the International School-Seminar on Heavy Ion Physics. Dubna, 1986.	25.00
D2-87-123	Proceedings of the Conference "Renormalization Group-86". Dubna, 1986.	12.00
D4-87-692	Proceedings of the International Conference on the Theory of Few Body and Quark-Hadronic Systems. Dubna, 1987.	12.00
D2-87-798	Proceedings of the VIII International Conference on the Problems of Quantum Field Theory. Alushta, 1987.	10.00
D14-87-799	Proceedings of the International Symposium on Muon and Pion Interactions with Matter. Dubna, 1987.	13.00
D17-88-95	Proceedings of the IV International Symposium on Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics. Dubna, 1987.	14.00
E1,2-88-426	Proceedings of the 1987 JINR-CERN School of Physics. Varna, Bulgaria, 1987.	14.00
Orders for the above-mentioned books can be sent at the address:		
Publishing Department, JINR		

Бэн У., Приезжев В.Б., Загребнов В.А. Е17-89-226 Одномерная модель Изинга в случайном внешнем поле: остаточная энтропия, намагниченность и перестройка основного состояния

С помощью аргументов энергетического баланса исследована структура основного состояния модели и ее перестройка для различных значений параметров взаимодействия и поля.

Работа выполнена в Лаборатории теоретической физики ОИЯИ.

Препринт Объединенного института ядерных исследований. Дубна 1989

Behn U., Priezzhev V.B., Zagrebnov V.A. E17-89-226 One Dimensional Random Field Ising Model: Residual Entropy, Magnetization, and the "Perestroyka" of the Ground State

The discontinuous behaviour of magnetization and entropy for zero temperature can be understood as the consequence of flips of microscopic spin clusters. The residual entropy feels very sensitively wether the ratio of constant and random part of the magnetic field is rational or irrational, since in the former case an additional mechanism for degeneracy of the ground state appears.

The investigation has been performed at the Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR.

Preprint of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research. Dubna 1989