The spin glass transition of the three dimensional Heisenberg spin glass.
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It is shown, by means of Monte Carlo simulation and Finite Size Scaling analysis, that the Heisenberg spin glass undergoes a finite-temperature phase transition in three dimensions. There is a single critical temperature, at which both a spin glass and a chiral glass order. The Monte Carlo algorithm, adapted from lattice gauge theory simulations, makes possible to thermalize lattices of size $L = 32$, larger than in any previous spin glass simulation in three dimensions. High accuracy is reached thanks to the use of the Marenostrum supercomputer. The large range of system sizes studied allow us to consider scaling corrections.

PACS numbers: 75.50.Lk 75.40.Mg. 64.60.Fr. 05.50.+q.

Recently, decisive evidence for a spin glass transition in three dimensional Ising spin glasses was found by us2 and by Palassini and Caracciolo3. These works demonstrated the applicability to spin-glasses of our approach4,5 to Finite Size Scaling (FSS) at the critical temperature, as well as that of Caracciolo and coworkers6,7 for the paramagnetic state (see also8,9).

However, the situation is still confusing for Heisenberg spin glasses10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17, which is the important case of Heisenberg spin glasses, their results, like ordering due to the handedness of the non-collinear spin structures (see definitions below). The simulations of Kawamura and coworkers13,14 gave ample support of a low temperature chiral glass phase, with an Ising like ordering due to the handedness of the non-collinear spin structures (see definitions below). The simulations of Kawamura and coworkers13,14 gave ample support to this spin-chirality decoupling scenario (i.e. $T_c = 0$ for the spin glass, but $T_c > 0$ for the chiral glass ordering).

In order to clarify the situation for Heisenberg and XY spin glasses in $D = 3$, Young and Lee17 have recently tried our FSS methods at $T_c$.2,3. Although parallel tempering only allowed them15 to thermalize systems of size up to $L = 12$, very clear results were reached for the XY spin glasses. The finite-lattice correlation length $\xi_L$, was analyzed for several system sizes $L$. As expected2,4,5, the dimensionless ratio $\xi_L/L$ crosses neatly at the same $T_c$, for the chiral glass and the spin glass ordering, for XY spin glasses. In the more important case of Heisenberg spin glasses, their results, although inconclusive, were interpreted also as lack of spin-chirality decoupling. This conclusion has been criticized by Kawamura and Hukushima14, that studied somehow larger systems on very few samples.

Here we show that a finite-temperature spin glass transition occurs for the Heisenberg spin glass in $D = 3$. The critical temperature for the spin glass transition coincides with that of the chiral glass. Our results rely on Monte Carlo simulation and FSS analysis at $T_c$.2,3,4,5. We adapt a lattice gauge theory algorithm21 to our problem. Our algorithm thermalizes $L = 32$ systems, well beyond any previous spin glass simulation in $D = 3$. The use of Marenostrum, one of the World largest computing facilities, during (the equivalent of) $2.6 \times 10^4$ Pentium IV computing days allowed us to simulate 4000 samples. The phase transition seems to be of Kosterlitz-Thouless type22, although we may not exclude a lower critical dimension barely smaller than three.

We consider the Edwards-Anderson model. The Heisenberg spins $\vec{S}_i = (S_{i,x}, S_{i,y}, S_{i,z})$, $\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j = 1$, live on the nodes a cubic lattice of size $L$, with periodic boundary conditions. Spins interact via the Hamiltonian $(ij)$ indicates sum over all pairs of lattice nearest neighbors):

$$H = -\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The $J_{ij}$ are Gaussian distributed quenched random couplings1. Their mean value is zero, while their variance sets the energy unit. For any quantity, $O$, we first calculate the thermal average for the given couplings, $\langle O \rangle_J$. The average over the $J_{ij}$, $\langle O \rangle_J$, is only taken afterward.

In order to detect non-planar spin structures, one forms the chiral (pseudovector) density field12:

$$\zeta_{\mu \nu} = \vec{S}_i + \epsilon_\mu \cdot (\vec{S}_i \times \vec{S}_{i-\epsilon_\nu}) \hspace{1cm} (\mu = x, y, z),$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\epsilon_\mu$ is the unit lattice vector along the $\mu$ axis.

We introduce real replicas1: pairs of spin configurations, $\vec{S}_i^{(1)}$ and $\vec{S}_i^{(2)}$ independently evolving with the same set of couplings, $\{J_{ij}\}$, and at the same temperature, $T$. We have as well a replicated field for the chiral densities, $\vec{S}_i$. From the real replicas we form the tensor field...
\[ q_{\mu,\nu}(\vec{r}_i) \] and the chiral vector field \( \kappa_{i,\mu} : (\mu, \nu = x, y, z) \)

\[ q_{\mu,\nu}(\vec{r}_i) = s^{(1)}(\mu, \nu), \quad \kappa_{i,\mu} = s^{(2)}(\mu, \nu). \quad (3) \]

Their Fourier transforms,

\[ \hat{q}_{\mu,\nu}(\vec{k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_{\mu,\nu}(\vec{r}_i)e^{i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r}_i}/L^3, \quad \hat{\kappa}_{\mu}(\vec{k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \kappa_{i,\mu}e^{i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r}_i}/L^3, \quad (4) \]

yield the spin glass (SG) wave vector dependent susceptibility and the chiral glass (CG) one:

\[ \frac{\chi_{SG}(\vec{k})}{L^3} = \sum_{\mu,\nu} |\langle \hat{q}_{\mu,\nu}(\vec{k}) \rangle|^2J, \quad \frac{\chi_{CG}(\vec{k})}{L^3} = \langle |\hat{\kappa}_{\mu}(\vec{k})|^2 \rangle. \quad (5) \]

Both for the SG and the CG case, we have:

\[ \xi_L = \frac{1}{2 \sin(\xi_{min}/2)} \left( \frac{\chi(\vec{k}_{min})}{\chi(\xi_{min})} - 1 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (6) \]

where \( \vec{k}_{min} = (2\pi/L, 0, 0) \) or permutations. One has \( \xi_{CG}^L \) or \( \xi_{CG}^L \) for \( \hat{\kappa}_{\mu} \cdot \vec{k}_{min} = 0 \) or \( 2\pi/L \), respectively. Rotational invariance at \( T_c \) implies \( \xi_{CG}^L = \xi_{CG}^L \) for large \( L \).

Model \( 1 \) was simulated with a mixture of heat bath and (microcanonical) overrelaxation taken from lattice QCD \( 21 \), but also effective for frustrated spin models \( 23 \). We straightforwardly modified the implementation for \( J_{ij} = 1 \) in \( 21 \). The Elementary Monte Carlo Step (EMCS) consists of a sequential heat bath sweep, followed by (the integer part of) \( 5L/4 \) sequential overrelaxation sweeps, to let the microcanonical wave run over the system. Overrelaxation fastly evolves chirality (in \( D = 1 \) it inverts the local chirality). One heat bath update is roughly as CPU time consuming as 7 overrelaxations. The merits of the mixed algorithm can be assessed from Fig. 1 (standard Parallel Tempering reached only \( L = 12 \) for the same model \( 14 \)). Overrelaxation may be combined with Parallel Tempering, but this is unnecessary at \( T_c \). Lattices \( L = 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 24 \) and 32 were simulated close to \( T_c \approx 0.16(2) \) \( 16 \) (see table \( 1 \)). We extrapolate to nearby temperatures using bias-corrected \( 22 \) data reweighting \( 24 \).

Thermalization is a major issue in SG simulations. Our thermalization tests included the by now standard log\(_2\) data binning (i.e., average over all samples the second half of the generated data, and compare this average with that of the second fourth of the Monte Carlo history, the average over the second eighth, and so on), finding compatibility for the last three bins. Another strong thermalization test is the consistency of the reweighting extrapolation \( 24 \). As Fig. 3 shows, the reweighting extrapolation is satisfactory for our data. It is a nice check, because simulations at different \( T \) are completely independent.

We use the quotients FSS method \( 4 \). The used scaling variable is \( \xi_L/L \) \( 4 \), better than the unknown \( L/\xi_{\infty} \) or \( (T - T_c)L^{1/\nu} \). For an observable \( O \), diverging in the large \( L \) limit as \( O_L \sim L^{\nu} \), we compare \( O_L \) in lattices \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \), at the crossing temperature \( T_{L_1,L_2} \) such that \( \xi_{L_1}(T_{L_1,L_2})/L_1 = \xi_{L_2}(T_{L_1,L_2})/L_2 \):

\[ \frac{\langle O_{L_2}(T_{L_1,L_2}) \rangle}{\langle O_{L_1}(T_{L_1,L_2}) \rangle} = \left( \frac{L_2}{L_1} \right)^{\alpha_1} + \ldots, \quad (7) \]

where \( \nu \) is the correlation length critical exponent (the dots stand for scaling corrections \( 4 \)). The advantages of Eq. \( 7 \) are many \( 2 \), \( 4 \), \( 6 \), \( 23 \). It is easy to use. Arbitrary choices on the temperature range are avoided. The statistical error estimation is crystal clear. One directly observes scaling corrections by increasing \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \).

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\multirow{2}{*}{\( T \)} & 0.15 & 0.15 & 0.15 & 0.15 & 0.150 & 0.146 & 0.145 \\
\cline{2-8}
\multirow{2}{*}{\( L \)} & 0.16 & 0.16 & 0.155 & 0.155 & 0.156 & 0.150 & 0.147 \\
\cline{2-8}
\multirow{2}{*}{\( N_{\text{samples}} \)} & 0.160 & 0.160 & 0.160 & 0.155 & 0.150 & 0.150 & 0.150 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Details of simulation. For each lattice size, we give the studied temperatures, the number of simulated samples (in the same order), and the number of elementary Monte Carlo steps per sample. In each sample we took \( 10^5 \) measurements, excepting for \( L = 32 \) (20000 measurements).}
\end{table}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig1.png}
\caption{Comparison of heat bath vs. heat bath plus overrelaxation evolution of \( \chi_{SG}(\vec{k}_{min}) \) from a hot start (EMCS: either 1 heat bath step followed by 20 overrelaxation sweeps or 4 heat bath sweeps). Points in the plot are the average over 2500 samples of 15000 successive EMCS.}
\end{figure}
we treat it here as an observable scaling as $L^\phi$. Some groups expect $\phi = 1$, while others believe that $\phi = 0$.

Several features are salient in Table I (i) Once we neglect $L = 4$, the $L$ evolution of our estimates is monotonic with increasing $L_1$ and $L_2$ (we agree with Refs. 14, 15 within their $L$ window). (ii) The $1/\nu$ from $\partial_T \xi_{CG}$ and $\partial_T \xi_{SG}$ is compatible for $L \geq 12$. (iii) When $L_1$ and $L_2$ increases, $1/\nu$ systematically decreases (in a Kosterlitz-Thouless scenario it tends to zero). (iv) Exponent $\gamma_{SG}/\nu$ stabilizes for $L \geq 12$ in a typical $D = 3$ value 4, hence:

$$\chi_{SG} \propto \xi_{CG}^{1.93 \pm 0.02}. \tag{8}$$

The scenario of Refs. 13, 14, where $\xi_{CG}$ diverges at $T_c$ while $\xi_{SG}$ (and then $\chi_{SG}$) does not, becomes untenable.

At criticality (Table II), $\xi_{SG}$ scales as $L^{0.9}$ rather than $L^1$, immediately suggesting the presence of logarithmic corrections to scaling. Without analytical guidance, the detailed numerical study of logarithmic scaling corrections in Eq. (9), the curves for the largest systems merge around $T = 0.146$, as expected for a Kosterlitz-Thouless transition (see e.g. Ref. 2).

For the sake of completeness, let us consider our data for $\xi_{SG}$ under the spin-chirality decoupling assumption. In this scenario, $\xi_{SG}$ diverges at $T = 0$, as $\xi_{SG} = A/T^\nu$ ($\nu^* = 2.2$, according to 14). FSS predicts that $\xi_{L,SG}/L$ is a smooth function of $L/\xi_{SG}$. Take now from Fig. 2 top the temperature where $\xi_{L,SG}/L$ reaches (say) 0.44 for $L = 24$ and $L = 32$, namely $T_{24} \approx 0.1508$ and $T_{32} \approx 0.1474$. In other words, $\xi_{SG}$ increases a factor $32/24 \approx 1.33$ while the temperature merely decreases by a 2%. Matching this with an algebraic divergence at $T = 0$, the nonsensical result $\nu^* \approx 12$ is obtained.

Consider now $\xi_{CG}/L$, shown in Fig. 4. Although less than for $\xi_{SG}$, the crossings shift to lower $T$ for larger $L$. For $L = 8, 12$ and 16 we resolve a crossing at $T \approx 0.155$. For $L \geq 16$ the curves merge at $T \approx 0.147$, suggesting again a Kosterlitz-Thouless scaling, but with smaller scaling corrections. The $L = 32$ data at low $T$ are compatible with, but above, the $L = 24$ data. We suspect of a statistical fluctuation (the three $L = 32$ simulations are independent), but a crossing may not be discarded.

In summary, we have shown that the Heisenberg spin glass undergoes a spin glass transition in $D = 3$, by means of Monte Carlo simulation and FSS analysis. We have adapted a lattice gauge theory algorithm, that thermalizes $L = 32$ systems, well beyond any previous spin glass simulation in $D = 3$. Furthermore, a large number of samples were studied in the crossings to lower $T$ when the system sizes grow, (for $L = 24$ and $L = 32$ a crossing is not found on the simulated $T$ range). Yet, Fig. 3 bottom, dividing out the logarithmic scaling corrections in Eq. (9), the curves for the largest systems merge around $T = 0.146$, as expected for a Kosterlitz-Thouless transition (see e.g. Ref. 2).

![FIG. 2](color online) Top: For our largest systems $\xi_{SG}$ scales as $L^{0.9}$, using $\xi_{CG}/L$ as scaling variable. Bottom: The results in the upper part may be interpreted as the logarithmic corrections to scaling in Eq. (9), particularly for $L > 12$. 

| $L_1$ | $L_2$ | $\phi$ | $1/\nu_{SG}$ | $1/\nu_{CG}$ | $\gamma_{SG}/\nu_{SG}$ | $\gamma_{CG}/\nu_{CG}$ |
|------|------|------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 4    | 8    | 1.04(5) | 1.27(8) | 1.07(20) | 2.11(7) | 1.06(10) |
| 6    | 12   | 1.05(7) | 1.22(10) | 0.76(12) | 2.06(5) | 0.62(11) |
| 8    | 16   | 1.01(4) | 0.98(9) | 0.72(12) | 2.06(8) | 0.73(18) |
| 12   | 24   | 0.92(6) | 0.71(17) | 0.66(11) | 1.95(9) | 0.92(22) |
| 16   | 24   | 0.91(5) | 0.68(11) | 0.67(12) | 1.94(15) | 1.02(4) |
| 16   | 32   | 0.90(8) | 0.72(20) | 0.73(11) | 1.95(13) | 1.13(29) |
| 24   | 32   | 0.88(2) | 0.60(10) | 0.64(12) | 1.93(2) | 1.26(7) |
| 24   | 32$^a$ | 0.91(2) | 0.56(12) | 0.51(13) | 1.96(4) | 1.36(11) |

TABLE II: Critical exponents from Eq. (15) ($T^{-L_1,L_2}$ from $\xi_{CG}$). The $O$ were: $\xi_{SG}$ ($\phi$: $\xi_{SG} \sim L^\phi$), $\partial_T \xi_{CG}$ ($1/\nu$) and $\chi$ ($\gamma/\nu$). The $L_1 = 24$, $L_2 = 32$ crossing is unclear (Fig. 4), so we quote results at $T^{-L_1,L_2} = 0.146$ ($A$) and 0.145 ($B$).
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FIG. 3: (color online) **Top:** $\xi_{\text{SG}}$ in units of $L$, versus $T$, for several lattice sizes. Lines join data obtained from a single simulation [24] (all simulations independent). For the sake of clarity we only represent data for $L \geq 8$. **Bottom:** as top, correcting the suspected logarithmic corrections, Eq. (9).
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FIG. 4: (color online) Parallel chiral correlation length in units of $L$, as a function of $T$, for several lattice sizes.

**Marenostrum.** For studies in the low temperature phase, we suggest to combine our algorithm with Parallel Tempering. The large range of system sizes studied allows us to conclude that, at criticality, the spin glass susceptibility scales with the chiral correlation length, Eq. (8). Therefore, a single phase transition is present in this problem: spin-chirality decoupling is ruled out. We observe logarithmic corrections to scaling, explaining why previous investigations [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17] were inconclusive. Our results are compatible with Kosterlitz-Thouless scaling, but they are typical as well of a system with a lower critical dimension barely smaller than three.
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