

University of Groningen

Comment on the paper by Y.Komura and Y.Okabe [arXiv:1011.3321]

Enter, Aernout C. D. van; Romano, Silvano; Zagrebnov, Valentin A.

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Early version, also known as pre-print

Publication date:

2011

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Enter, A. C. D. V., Romano, S., & Zagrebnov, V. A. (2011). *Comment on the paper by Y.Komura and Y.Okabe [arXiv:1011.3321]*.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Comment on the paper by
Y. Komura and Y. Okabe, *J.Phys. A* **44**,
015002, 2011

Aernout C.D. van Enter ^{*}, Silvano Romano [†]
and Valentin A. Zagrebnov [‡]

November 8, 2021

Abstract

We point out that the claim of strong universality of [1] is incorrect, as it contradicts known rigorous results.

AMS 2000 subject classification: 82B20, 82B26, 60K35.

Keywords: Generalised XY-model, Kosterlitz-Thouless versus first-order transition, nonuniversality.

^{*}University of Groningen, Johann Bernoulli Institute of Mathematics and Computing Science,
Postbus 407, 9700 AK Groningen, The Netherlands,

A.C.D.v.Enter@math.rug.nl,
<http://www.math.rug.nl/~aenter/>

[†]University of Pavia, Dept of Physics, via A. Bassi 6, Pavia, Italy,
Silvano.Romano@pv.infn.it,

<http://www.pv.infn.it/~romano/>

[‡]Université de la Méditerranée and Centre de Physique Théorique - UMR 6207 Luminy Case
977, 13288 Marseille, Cedex09, France

zagrebnov@cpt.univ-mrs.fr,
<http://www.cpt.univ-mrs.fr/~zagrebno/zagrebnov.htm>

The generalised lattice ferromagnetic XY -model was introduced by two of us in [2]. Its simplest version involves 3-component unit spins on a D -dimensional lattice, parameterized by standard angles in the spherical coordinates and interacting according to the ferromagnetic nearest-neighbour Hamiltonian

$$H = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (\sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j)^q \cos(\varphi_i - \varphi_j) , \quad J > 0 .$$

When $D = 2$, the model yields orientational disorder at all finite temperatures, and produces a transition to a low-temperature Berezinskiĭ–Kosterlitz–Thouless (BKT) phase, possessing slow decay of magnetic correlations and infinite susceptibility [2]. In turn, the transition is expected, and was found by simulation [3], to exhibit the usual BKT scenario, at least for small values of q . On the other hand, this scenario does not hold for *all* values of q , i.e. the BKT transitions are *not universal*.

Indeed, we *proved* in [4] that the named transition turns first-order for sufficiently large q . Recall that a hint of this behaviour was already suggested by numerical analysis [3].

Notice that the above *rigorous* results entail that both existence and the type of transition *depend* on the parameter q , i.e. they exclude universality.

The above-mentioned generalized XY -model was recently addressed by simulation for various values of q in Ref. [1]. Although the authors found only a certain evidence of the BKT criticality, they claim that this behaviour holds for *all values* of q . This claim can not be correct since it contradicts to our rigorous results [4], which seem to have been unknown to the authors of the Ref. [1].

References

- [1] Y. Komura and Y. Okabe, *J.Phys. A* **44**, 015002, 2011.
- [2] S. Romano and V. A. Zagrebnov, *Phys. Lett. A* **301**, 201, 2002.
- [3] L. A. S. Mol, A. R. Pereira, H. Chamati and S. Romano, *Eur.Phys. J. B* **50**, 541, 2006.
- [4] A. C. D. van Enter, S. Romano and V. A. Zagrebnov, *J. Phys. . A* **39**, L439, 2006.