lsing model

Alexander Tsirlin

Experimentalphysik VI, Zentrum für elektronische Korrelationen und Magnetismus





Theory of Magnetism, SS18



lsing model

History of the Ising model





Wilhelm Lenz 1888–1957

First theory professor in Hamburg

Ernst lsing 1900–1998

Did teaching for most of his life Germany till 1938, US since 1947

lsing model

Origin of the Ising model

In a quantum treatment certain angles α will be distinguished, among them in any case $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = \pi$. If the potential energy W has large values in the intermediate positions, as one must assume taking account of the crystal, then these positions will be very seldom occupied, Umklapp processes will therefore occur very rarely, and the magnet will find itself in the two distinguished positions.

If one assumes that in the ferromagnetic bodies the potential energy of an atom (elementary magnet) with respect to its neighbors is different in the null position and in the π position, then there arises a natural directedness of the atom corresponding to the crystal state, and hence a spontaneous magnetization.

Wilhelm Lenz, Physikalische Zeitschrift 21, 613 (1920)

Origin of the Ising model

In a quantum treatment certain angles α will be distinguished, among them in any case $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = \pi$. If the potential energy W has large values in the intermediate positions, as one must assume taking account of the crystal, then these positions will be very seldom occupied, Umklapp processes will therefore occur very rarely, and the magnet will find itself in the two distinguished positions.

If one assumes that in the ferromagnetic bodies the potential energy of an atom (elementary magnet) with respect to its neighbors is different in the null position and in the π position, then there arises a natural directedness of the atom corresponding to the crystal state, and hence a spontaneous magnetization.

Wilhelm Lenz, Physikalische Zeitschrift 21, 613 (1920)

Beitrag zur Theorie des Ferromagnetismus¹).

Von Ernst Ising in Hamburg.

(Eingegangen am 9. Dezember 1924.)

Es wird im wesentlichen das thermische Verhalten eines linearen, aus Elementarmagneten bestehenden Körpers untersucht, wobei im Gegensatz zur Weissschen Theorie des Ferromagnetismus kein molekulares Feld, sondern nur eine (nicht magnetische) Wechselwirkung benachbarter Elementarmagnete angenommen wird. Es wird gezeigt, daß ein solches Modell noch keine ferromagnetischen Eigenschaften besitzt und diese Aussage auch auf das dreidimensionale Modell ausgedehnt.

E. Ising, Z. Phys. 31, 253 (1925)

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Exchange interactions
- 3. Finite systems
- 4. Ising model
 - 4.1. 1D model in zero field
 - 4.2 1D model in the magnetic field
 - 4.3. Mean-field solution
 - 4.4. Exact solution in 2D and its implications
 - 4.5 Beyond magnetism
 - 4.6 Monte-Carlo simulations
- 5. Heisenberg model
- 6. Hubbard model
- 7. Kondo model
- 8. Neutron scattering

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Exchange interactions
- 3. Finite systems
- 4. Ising model
 - 4.1. 1D model in zero field
 - 4.2. 1D model in the magnetic field
 - 4.3 Mean-field solution
 - 4.4. Exact solution in 2D and its implications
 - 4.5 Beyond magnetism
 - 4.6 Monte-Carlo simulations
- 5. Heisenberg model
- 6. Hubbard model
- 7. Kondo model
- 8. Neutron scattering

1925, Ising: no magnetic transition in 1D; could not solve the model in higher dimensions, but conjectured that the result should remain the same

- 1925, Ising: no magnetic transition in 1D; could not solve the model in higher dimensions, but conjectured that the result should remain the same
- 1928, Heisenberg: proposed a different type of magnetic interaction, acknowledged Ising's efforts and conjectured that the larger number of nearest neighbors (at least eight) will lead to a magnetic transition, should proper form of the interaction be considered

1925, Ising: no magnetic transition in 1D; could not solve the model in higher dimensions, but conjectured that the result should remain the same

1928, Heisenberg: proposed a different type of magnetic interaction, acknowledged Ising's efforts and conjectured that the larger number of nearest neighbors (at least eight) will lead to a magnetic transition, should proper form of the interaction be considered

1932, Van Vleck:

In a certain sense the Lenz-Ising model is a purely mathematical fiction, as it neglects the interactions $-2J(s_i^x s_j^x + s_j^y s_j^y)$ between the components of spin perpendicular to the direction of the magnetic field, which are often important physically. The result should not be identified too closely with the actual magnetic behavior of the material simply because of the inadequacy and arbitrariness of the model.

- 1925, Ising: no magnetic transition in 1D; could not solve the model in higher dimensions, but conjectured that the result should remain the same
- 1928, Heisenberg: proposed a different type of magnetic interaction, acknowledged Ising's efforts and conjectured that the larger number of nearest neighbors (at least eight) will lead to a magnetic transition, should proper form of the interaction be considered

1932, Van Vleck:

In a certain sense the Lenz-Ising model is a purely mathematical fiction, as it neglects the interactions $-2J(s_i^x s_j^x + s_j^y s_j^y)$ between the components of spin perpendicular to the direction of the magnetic field, which are often important physically. The result should not be identified too closely with the actual magnetic behavior of the material simply because of the inadequacy and arbitrariness of the model.

- Till 1950's: Ising model is a purely mathematical game
- Since 1960's: limited applications to rare-earth compounds
- Since ~ 2000: deliberate search for Ising magnets

Spinon (kink) excitations



Bound (confined) spinons



• Excitation continuum splits into narrow excitations at low temperatures

R. Coldea et al. Science 327, 177 (2010)

Bound spinons



- Interchain interactions create an effective field
- Domains walls are bound in this effective potential and form a sequence of **bound states**

R. Coldea et al. Science 327, 177 (2010)

Confinement in particle physics



Confinement in particle physics



- 1. Introduction
- 2. Exchange interactions
- 3. Finite systems

• 4. Ising model

- 4.1. 1D model in zero field
- 4.2. 1D model in the magnetic field
- 4.3. Mean-field solution
- 4.4. Exact solution in 2D and its implications
- 4 5 Beyond magnetism
- 4.6 Monte-Carlo simulations
- 5. Heisenberg model
- 6. Hubbard model
- 7. Kondo model
- 8. Neutron scattering

Mean-field vs. exact



- 1. Introduction
- 2. Exchange interactions
- 3. Finite systems

• 4. Ising model

- 4.1. 1D model in zero field
- 4.2 1D model in the magnetic field
- 4.3 Mean-field solution
- 4.4. Exact solution in 2D and its implications
- 4 5 Beyond magnetism
- 4.6 Monte-Carlo simulations
- 5. Heisenberg model
- 6. Hubbard model
- 7. Kondo model
- 8. Neutron scattering

Attempts to solve the model in 2D

1936, Rudolf Peierls:

Did not manage (and did not try) to solve the model, but demonstrated non-zero magnetization at low temperatures, i.e., the formation of an ordered state in 2D

▶ 1936, Rudolf Peierls:

Did not manage (and did not try) to solve the model, but demonstrated non-zero magnetization at low temperatures, i.e., the formation of an ordered state in 2D

▶ 1940-41, Hendrik Kramers and Gregory Wannier:

Exact transition temperature $k_B T_c/J = 2/\ln(1 + \sqrt{2}) \simeq 2.269$ derived by constructing the dual lattice (Kramers-Wannier duality)

Approximate calculation of the partition function beyond mean field

▶ 1936, Rudolf Peierls:

Did not manage (and did not try) to solve the model, but demonstrated non-zero magnetization at low temperatures, i.e., the formation of an ordered state in 2D

1940-41, Hendrik Kramers and Gregory Wannier:

Exact transition temperature $k_B T_c/J = 2/\ln(1 + \sqrt{2}) \simeq 2.269$ derived by constructing the dual lattice (Kramers-Wannier duality)

Approximate calculation of the partition function beyond mean field

₹ =	$ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{-2} \\ 2k^{-2} \\ 2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{-2} \\ 2k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 2k^{-2} \\ 2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{-2} \\ 2k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2k^{-2} \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{array}{c} -2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-2} \\ 2 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-2} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -2k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 2 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \\ -2 \\ 0 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -2k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^2 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^2 \\ 0 \\ 2k^2 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^2 \\ 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\\ -2\\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}}\\ 0\\ 0\\ 2\\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}}\\ 0\\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}}\\ 0\\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -2k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -2k^{2} \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}} \\ 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}}\\ 0\\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}}\\ 0\\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}}\\ -2\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 2\\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}}\end{array}$	$-2k^{-2}$ $-2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{-2}$ 0 $2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{-2}$ 0 $2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{2}$ 0 0 0 $2k^{2}$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ -2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}} \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}} \\ 0 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ -2k^2 \\ 0 \\ -2k^2 \\ 2k^2 \\ 0 \\ -2k^2 \\ 0 \\ -2k^2 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^2 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^2 \\ \cdot 2k^2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ -2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2} \\ 2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2} \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2} \\ -2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -2k^{-2}\\ -2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{-2}\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ -2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{2}\\ 0\\ 2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{-2}\\ 0\\ 2^{\frac{3}{2}}k^{2}\\ -2k^{2}\\ 0\\ 0\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ -2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{2} \\ 2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -2k^{-2} \\ -2^{\frac{4}{3}}k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \\ 2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	(69)
	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 2k^{-2} \\ 0 \\ 2k^{-2} \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \end{array} $	$0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k-2} \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k-2} \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k-2} \\ 0$	$2k^2$ $2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 0 $2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}}$	0 -2 0 0 0 0	$2k^2$ $2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 0 0 0	$2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 $2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 -2	$\begin{array}{c} -2k^2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^2 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^2 \\ 0 \\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-2} \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-2} \\ -2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} $	$2k^2$ 0 $2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 0	$2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 $-2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 $2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ -2	$ \begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}}\\ \cdot 2k^{2}\\ 2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}}\\ -2k^{2}\\ 0 \end{array} $	$-2^{\frac{1}{2}k^2}$ 0 0 0 0 0	$-2k^2$ 0 0 0 0 0	$-2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}}$ 0 0 $2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}}$ -2	$2k^{2}$ 0 $-2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{2}$ 0 $2^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-2}$	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \\ -2^{\frac{1}{2}k^{-2}} \\ 0 \end{array} $	



Lars Onsager 1903–1976

1968 Nobel prize in chemistry

However, those who know him will witness the fact that he is clarity itself, and often responds at great length if the questions presented to him refer to *Norse mythology, gardening,* the more subtle aspects of *Kriegspiel* (a form of blindfold chess involving two opponents and a referee), and even encyclopedic facts of organic chemistry

Elliott Montroll



Lars Onsager 1903–1976

1968 Nobel prize in chemistry

However, those who know him will witness the fact that he is clarity itself, and often responds at great length if the questions presented to him refer to *Norse mythology, gardening,* the more subtle aspects of *Kriegspiel* (a form of blindfold chess involving two opponents and a referee), and even encyclopedic facts of organic chemistry

Elliott Montroll

- 1942: exact partition function announced on a conference
- 1944: first publication
- 1947: human-readable publication (thanks to Onsager's PhD student)

$$\log \lambda_{\infty} = \frac{1}{2} \log(2 \sinh 2H) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} \gamma(\omega) d\omega \quad (106)$$

where

 $\cosh \gamma(\omega) = \cosh 2H' \cosh 2H^*$

 $-\sinh 2H' \sinh 2H^* \cos \omega$.



Lars Onsager 1903–1976

1968 Nobel prize in chemistry

However, those who know him will witness the fact that he is clarity itself, and often responds at great length if the questions presented to him refer to *Norse mythology, gardening,* the more subtle aspects of *Kriegspiel* (a form of blindfold chess involving two opponents and a referee), and even encyclopedic facts of organic chemistry

Elliott Montroll

- 1942: exact partition function announced on a conference
- 1944: first publication
- 1947: human-readable publication (thanks to Onsager's PhD student)

Solution for the magnetization

- 1948: announced on a conference, never published
- 1952: published by C.N. Yang (following Onsager's advice)



Lars Onsager 1903–1976

1968 Nobel prize in chemistry

After Onsager

In the days of Kepler and Galileo it was fashionable to announce a new scientific result through the circulation of a cryptogram which gave the author priority and his colleagues headaches. Onsager is one of the few moderns who operates in this tradition.

Elliott Montroll

After Onsager

In the days of Kepler and Galileo it was fashionable to announce a new scientific result through the circulation of a cryptogram which gave the author priority and his colleagues headaches. Onsager is one of the few moderns who operates in this tradition.

Elliott Montroll

Hendrik Casimir (stayed in Netherlands throughout WWII): What are the news in theoretical physics since 1940?

Wolfgang Pauli (worked in the US) Nothing special, really, but Onsager's solution was an interesting piece of work

per Elliott Montroll

After Onsager

In the days of Kepler and Galileo it was fashionable to announce a new scientific result through the circulation of a cryptogram which gave the author priority and his colleagues headaches. Onsager is one of the few moderns who operates in this tradition.

Elliott Montroll

Hendrik Casimir (stayed in Netherlands throughout WWII): What are the news in theoretical physics since 1940?

Wolfgang Pauli (worked in the US) Nothing special, really, but Onsager's solution was an interesting piece of work

per Elliott Montroll

Young physicists today may find it surprising, even unbelievable, that in the 1950's the Lenz-Ising model and similar problems were not deemed important by most physicists. They were considered arcane exercises, narrowly interesting, mathematically seducing, but of little real consequence.

C.N. Yang

In the best mathematical tradition, not being able to solve the original problem, I looked around for a similar problem which I could solve

Mark Kac about his attempted work on the Ising model in 3D

Ehrenfest theory of phase transitions



Paul Ehrenfest 1880–1933

first theory of phase transitions



Superfluid transition of helium (λ -transition) first example of a second-order transition

W.H. Keesom and K. Clusius, KNAW Proceedings 35, 307 (1932)

- First order: latent heat, discontinuity in dF/dα
- Second order: no latent heat, discontinuity only in $d^2F/d\alpha^2$

Logarithmic divergence



Logarithmic divergence



 λ -type anomaly at the magnetic transition

J.C. Wright et al. Phys. Rev. B 3, 843 (1971)



G. Jaeger, Arch. Hist. Exact. Sci. 53, 51 (1998)

Continuous transitions (former "second-order")

- First derivatives of the free energy $(dF/d\alpha)$ change continuously
- Second derivatives $(d^2F/d\alpha^2)$ may or may not have discontinuities
- No latent heat, no hysteresis
- Order parameter can be defined
- Constrained by symmetry (the transition follows one of the irreducible representations of the symmetry group)
- Examples:

Continuous transitions (former "second-order")

- First derivatives of the free energy $(dF/d\alpha)$ change continuously
- Second derivatives $(d^2F/d\alpha^2)$ may or may not have discontinuities
- No latent heat, no hysteresis
- Order parameter can be defined
- Constrained by symmetry (the transition follows one of the irreducible representations of the symmetry group)
- Examples: magnetic ordering, superconducting transition (in zero field)

Continuous transitions (former "second-order")

- First derivatives of the free energy $(dF/d\alpha)$ change continuously
- Second derivatives $(d^2F/d\alpha^2)$ may or may not have discontinuities
- No latent heat, no hysteresis
- Order parameter can be defined
- Constrained by symmetry (the transition follows one of the irreducible representations of the symmetry group)
- Examples: magnetic ordering, superconducting transition (in zero field)

Discontinuous transitions (former "first-order")

- First derivatives of the free energy $(dF/d\alpha)$ show discontinuities
- Latent heat, hysteresis
- Examples:

Continuous transitions (former "second-order")

- First derivatives of the free energy $(dF/d\alpha)$ change continuously
- Second derivatives $(d^2F/d\alpha^2)$ may or may not have discontinuities
- No latent heat, no hysteresis
- Order parameter can be defined
- Constrained by symmetry (the transition follows one of the irreducible representations of the symmetry group)
- Examples: magnetic ordering, superconducting transition (in zero field)

Discontinuous transitions (former "first-order")

- First derivatives of the free energy $(dF/d\alpha)$ show discontinuities
- Latent heat, hysteresis
- Examples: boiling/crystallization, magnetic ordering with a structural component

Residual entropy







G. Wannier, Phys. Rev. 79, 357 (1950)

Antiferromagnetic Ising model on the triangular lattice

- Infinite number of configurations with the same energy (extensive ground-state degeneracy)
- Large residual entropy of 0.3383R (entropy at T = 0) nearly 50% of the total entropy of $R \ln 2$
- Violates the third law of thermodynamics

Spin ice





2-in-2-out states infinite number of configurations possible

Residual entropy (same as in water ice)

M.J.P. Gingras and P.A. McClarty, Rep. Prog. Phys. 77, 056501 (2014) R. Moessner and A.P. Ramirez, Physics Today (2) 24 (2006)

Magnetic monopoles





3-in-1-out + 1-in-3-out (excitation)

• The tetrahedra with excited configurations (3-in-1-out and 1-in-3-out) can be viewed as magnetic monopoles

```
L. Balents, Nature 464, 199 (2010)
per C. Castelnovo et al. Nature 451, 42 (2008)
```

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Exchange interactions
- 3. Finite systems

• 4. Ising model

- 4.1. 1D model in zero field
- 4.2 1D model in the magnetic field
- 4.3 Mean-field solution
- 4.4. Exact solution in 2D and its implications
- 4.5. Beyond magnetism
- 4.6 Monte-Carlo simulations
- 5. Heisenberg model
- 6. Hubbard model
- 7. Kondo model
- 8. Neutron scattering

Lattice gas models and absorption

(a) T=798K (b) T=1007K

- Adsorbates form different phases (liquid or crystalline with different periodicity) depending on temperature and "field" (surface coverage)
- Relevant to catalysis, environmental research, etc.

H. Häkkinen and M. Manninen, Phys. Rev. B 46, 1725 (1992)

Lattice gas models and absorption



- Adsorbates form different phases (liquid or crystalline with different periodicity) depending on temperature and "field" (surface coverage)
- Relevant to catalysis, environmental research, etc.

H. Häkkinen and M. Manninen, Phys. Rev. B 46, 1725 (1992)

Lattice gas models and absorption



- Adsorbates form different phases (liquid or crystalline with different periodicity) depending on temperature and "field" (surface coverage)
- Relevant to catalysis, environmental research, etc.

H. Häkkinen and M. Manninen, Phys. Rev. B 46, 1725 (1992)

Alloys



Binary alloy after quenching to temperatures below T_c

S. Majumder and S.K. Das, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 15, 13209 (2013)



F. Zhou et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 155704 (2006)

Battery materials



• Two ingredients:

- Li atoms and vacancies
- Additional electrons on Fe (2+ vs. 3+)

Both Li-Li, e – e, and Li – e interactions should be considered

F. Zhou et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 155704 (2006)



• Two ingredients:

- Li atoms and vacancies
- Additional electrons on Fe (2+ vs. 3+)
- Both Li-Li, e e, and Li e interactions should be considered

F. Zhou et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 155704 (2006)



All features of the experimental phase diagram are captured by the Ising model

F. Zhou et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 155704 (2006)

ANNNI model and Devil's staircase



White areas: commensurate order $(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{2}{11}, \text{ etc.})$

Dark areas: incommensurate order (period is not a simple rational number)

ANNNI = anisotropic next-nearest-neighbor Ising model

K. Ohwada et al. Mod. Phys. Lett. B 20, 199 (2006)

Devil's staircase (flower)



K. Ohwada et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 086402 (2001)

Applications in neurology

Projected Ising model



Neuron activity represented by an Ising variable

> T.K. Das et al. BioMed Research International 237898 (2014)

Applications in sociology

Spin-disaligned

Spin-aligned



Image credit: eoht.info

Back to magnetism



V. Daniel, Sociological Review 44, 107 (1952)

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Exchange interactions
- 3. Finite systems

• 4. Ising model

- 4.1. 1D model in zero field
- 4.2 1D model in the magnetic field
- 4.3 Mean-field solution
- 4.4. Exact solution in 2D and its implications
- 4 5 Beyond magnetism
- 4.6. Monte-Carlo simulations
- 5. Heisenberg model
- 6. Hubbard model
- 7. Kondo model
- 8. Neutron scattering

Why Monte-Carlo?

Why Monte-Carlo?



Image credit: Martinp1 (Wikimedia Commons)

Why Monte-Carlo?



Image credit: Toni Lozano (Flickr), Yamaguchi (Wikimedia Commons)

Ulam and his solitaire



Stanislaw Ulam 1909–1984

Together with Edward Teller developed the first (successful) design of the hydrogen bomb The first thoughts and attempts I made were suggested by a question which occurred to me in 1946 as I was convalescing from an illness and playing solitaires. The question was what are the chances that a Canfield solitaire laid out with 52 cards will come out successfully? After spending a lot of time trying to estimate them by pure combinatorial calculations, I wondered whether a more practical method than "abstract thinking" might not be to lay it out say one hundred times and simply observe and count the number of successful plays.





Nicholas Metropolis 1915–1999 director of the computing facility at Los Alamos

Metropolis and his algorithm

Instead of choosing configurations randomly, then weighting them with $\exp(E/kT)$, we choose configurations with a probability $\exp(E/kT)$ and weight them evenly.

N. Metropolis et al. J. Chem. Phys. 21, 1087 (1953)



J. Lee et al. Energies 8, 5538 (2015)

Monte-Carlo simulations made simple



ALPS = Algorithms and Libraries for Physics Simulations http://alps.comp-phys.org/

- Runs on different platforms (incl. Windows)
- Diagonalization: exact and sparse (Lanczos)
- Monte Carlo: classical and quantum spin models
- Density-matrix renormalization group
- Oynamic mean field theory
- Computationally not very efficient