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#### Abstract

Knowing only the zero-field magnetization (e.g., Yang's result) of the Ising model in any number of dimensions, one can construct a lower bound on $m(h)$, the magnetization in finite field. Knowledge of $u$, the internal energy per bond, enables a more efficient lower bound to be constructed. Both are applications of the Griffiths inequality, as recently generalized by Kelly and Sherman, and should prove useful in the lattice gas problem where it is essential to know $m(h)$.


We present nontrivial lower bounds on the magnetization in finite magnetic field $|m(h)|$ of the Ising model. An "upper upper" bound is $|m(h)|=1$. Subsequently we hope to derive an improved upper bound which, together with the present result, should help constrain the true $m(h)$ fairly well.
Consider an isotropic $M \times N$ lattice, with a spin at every site and periodic boundary conditions, and a Hamiltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
H(h)=-J \sum_{(i j)} \sigma_{i} \sigma_{j}-h \sum_{i} \sigma_{i} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The partition function $Z(M, N, h, \beta)$ is:

$$
\begin{align*}
Z(M, N, h, \beta) & \equiv \operatorname{Tr}\left\{e^{-\beta I I}\right\} \\
& =Z\left(M, N, h^{\prime}, \beta\right)\left\langle e^{\beta\left(h-h^{\prime}\right) \Sigma_{i} \sigma_{i}}\right\rangle_{h^{\prime}} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left\rangle_{h}\right.$, indicates "thermodynamic average w.r.t. $H\left(h^{\prime}\right)$. .' Expanding:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle e^{\left.\beta\left(h-h^{\prime}\right) \Sigma_{i} \sigma_{\rangle}\right\rangle} h_{h^{\prime}}=\cosh ^{M N} \beta\left(h-h^{\prime}\right)\left\langle\prod_{1}^{M N}\left(1+\sigma_{i} t\right)\right\rangle\right. \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which $t \equiv \tanh \beta\left(h-h^{\prime}\right)$.
We factor the product into pairs and apply the generalized Griffiths inequality ${ }^{1}$ due to Kelly and Sherman. ${ }^{2}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\langle\prod_{1}^{M N}\left(1+\sigma_{i} t\right)\right\rangle h_{h^{\prime}} \\
& \quad \geq \prod_{1}^{\frac{1}{2} M N}\left\langle\left[1+t\left(\sigma_{i}+\sigma_{i+1}\right)+t^{2} \sigma_{i} \sigma_{i+1}\right]\right\rangle \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

By translational invariance, all factors are equal, and the rhs of (4) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1+2 t m\left(h^{\prime}\right)+\left.t^{2}\left|u\left(h^{\prime}\right)\right|\right|^{\frac{1}{2} M N} .\right. \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]In the limit $M N \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $h^{\prime} \rightarrow 0$, Griffiths has shown that $m$ is positive and obeys

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{h^{\prime} \rightarrow 0} \lim _{M N \rightarrow \infty} m\left(h^{\prime}\right) \geq m_{Y} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $m_{Y}$ is the (positive) magnetization calculated by Yang. ${ }^{3}$ Similarly, the limit:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{h^{\prime} \rightarrow 0} \lim _{M N \rightarrow \infty}\left|u\left(h^{\prime}\right)\right|=|u| \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

is the zero-field short-range correlation function-i.e., the absolute value of the internal energy per bond. Thus,

$$
\begin{align*}
& Z(M, N, h, \beta) \geq Z(M, N, 0, \beta)\left(\cosh ^{M N} \beta h\right) \\
& \times\left(1+2 t m_{Y}+t^{2}|u|\right)^{\frac{1}{M N}} . \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

On the lhs, we have
$Z(M, N, h, \beta) \equiv \exp \left[M N \beta \int_{0}^{h} d h^{\prime \prime} m\left(h^{\prime \prime}\right)\right] Z(M, N, 0, \beta)$.
Because $m\left(h^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is a nondecreasing function of its argument,

$$
\begin{equation*}
h m(h) \geq \int_{0}^{\hbar} d h^{\prime \prime} m\left(h^{\prime \prime}\right) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combine (10) and (8) to obtain
$m(h) \geq(h \beta)^{-1}\{\log \cosh \beta h$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.+\frac{1}{2} \log \left(1+2 t m_{Y}+t^{2}|u|\right)\right\} . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

We illustrate this result in Fig. 1, plotting the rhs of (11) for one temperature above $T_{c}$ (curve A), one at $T_{c}(\mathrm{~B})$, and two below $T_{c}(\mathrm{C}$ and D$)$.
A lower bound, which is somewhat less efficient above $T_{c}$ but almost as good as (11) below it, can be obtained with far less numerical work; according to Refs. (1) and (2), $|u| \geq m_{Y}^{2}$, therefore using this on the rhs of (11) we find

$$
\begin{equation*}
m(h) \geq(\beta h)^{-1} \log \left(\cosh \beta h+m_{Y} \sinh \beta h\right) . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Above or at $T_{c}, m_{Y}=0$, and the resultant lower bound is shown as the dotted curve in Fig. 1. Below

[^1]

Fig. 1. Lower bounds to the magnetization at finite field $m(h)$ plotted vs $x=\tan \beta h$ at various temperatures. For $\mathrm{A}, T / T_{c}=1.83$; for $\mathrm{B}, T=T_{0}$; for $\mathrm{C}, T / T_{c}=0.927$; and for $\mathrm{D}, T / T_{c}=$ 0.61 ; all using inequality (11). Dotted curve is inequality (12) at all $T \geq T_{0}$.
$T_{c}$, the lower bound (12) rapidly approaches (11) and would be indistinguishable from curves $C$ and $D$ at the temperatures we have chosen, on the scale of our graph.

It is hoped that the present results might be useful
in lattice gas theory as well as in magnetism. It should be noted that they are not at all restricted to two dimensions; once a variational estimate of $m$ in zero field is known for three dimensions, it can be used forthwith in Eq. (12).
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