T-AFS 81-6 9

ISSN 0365-2459

22 JUIN 1981

Arkiv for Det Fysiske Seminar i Trondheim

No 6 1981

Two- and three-spin triangular Ising model:
Variational approximations

by

A. Malakis[†]

[†] On leave of absence from University of Athens, Division of Mechanics,
Athens 621.

Abstract:

The implications of the known hard-hexagon lattice gas results for the triangular Ising model with both pair and triplet interactions are pointed out. Employing an appropriate generalization of the variational method of Baxter we determine, using the lowest-order approximation, the phase boundaries for this model when the pair interactions are ferromagnetic. Higher approximations are presented for the case of pure triplet interactions and the resulting phase diagrams are in excellent agreement with all exactly known results.

1. Introduction

The study of two-dimensional Ising spin models has been one of the most successful attempts to understand the nature of phase transitions. Given a model Hamiltonian, for some lattice spin system, one would like to be able to answer some interesting questions. Such questions concern the existence and extent of phase transitions between different phases of the system, the number and the order of phase transitions for a given "external field", the behaviour of the magnetization along the phase boundaries. In this paper we shall try to answer some of these questions for the triangular lattice model specified by the Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{(i,j,k)} h(\sigma_i, \sigma_j, \sigma_k) = \sum_{(i,j,k)} \left\{ -\frac{H}{6} (\sigma_i + \sigma_j + \sigma_k) - \frac{J_2}{2} (\sigma_i \sigma_j + \sigma_i \sigma_k + \sigma_j \sigma_k) - J_3 \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k \right\} \quad (1)$$

Here $\sigma_i, \sigma_j, \sigma_k$ have values $+1$ and -1 ; each triplet (i,j,k) surrounds an elementary triangle; $h(a,b,c)$ is the contribution to the Hamiltonian of an elementary triangle; and the summation is over all $2N$ triangles (N being the number of sites of the triangular lattice). The partition function is

$$Z_N = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K_B T} \mathcal{H} \right\} = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \prod_{(i,j,k)} w(\sigma_i, \sigma_j, \sigma_k) \quad (2)$$

where $w(a,b,c) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K_B T} h(a,b,c) \right\}$ is the Boltzmann weight of any interacting triplet (a,b,c) and the summation is over all 2^N spin configurations of the Ising system. We will have to deal with the partition function per site, in the thermodynamic limit,

$$k = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \ln Z_N \quad (3)$$

The model described by the Hamiltonian (1) is particularly interesting as an example of spin-systems without the usual up-down spin reversal symmetry¹⁻⁵). ((1) is invariant under the transformation $H \rightarrow -H$, $J_3 \rightarrow -J_3$ and $\sigma_i \rightarrow -\sigma_i$, therefore, without loss of generality, we will consider $J_3 \leq 0$). This model incorporates two exactly solvable cases; the Onsager solution ($J_3=H=0$) and the Baxter-Wu solution ($J_2=H=0$). Furthermore, the hard-hexagons problem, recently solved by Baxter⁶), is obtained from (1) as a "limit" case. The usual way to obtain this equivalence is to consider $J_3=0$, $J_2 < 0$ and let $-J_2/K_B T$ and $H/K_B T$ both tend to infinity, keeping

$$z = \exp\{(-12J_2 - 2H)/K_B T\} \quad (4)$$

fixed, then the antiferromagnetic triangular Ising model becomes the hard-hexagons lattice gas with activity z , and the critical activity z_c determines the slope of the phase boundary at critical field ($H_c = \pm 6J_2$). However, similar arguments apply when $J_3 \neq 0$ and there are several cases where the slope of the corresponding phase diagrams are determined by z_c . These cases together with the ground state properties of model (1) constitute the subject of the next section.

In cases where no exact information is available one has to resort to approximations. Approximate treatments have a long and rather successful record in the theory of phase transitions. A recent development in this direction is the variational method of Baxter⁷). The method has been applied to some models⁸⁻¹²) and yielded very accurate results. The main idea of the method is to derive a set of matrix equations from which k may be determined. If the matrices involved have infinite size the equations are exact (corner transfer matrix equations), restricting the matrices to be finite a sequence of approximations converging to the exact results is obtained. For "ferromagnetic" triangular models the matrix equations were given

by Baxter and Tsang¹¹⁾. However, in order to study the critical properties of the general Hamiltonian (1) one has to distinguish between the three sublattices of the triangular lattice. The necessity for distinction between the sublattices can be seen from the ground state properties; for certain values of H , J_2 and J_3 the system admits a ground state in which spins on one sublattice are down (-1), whereas spins on the other two are up (+1). Such models for which the lattice symmetry may be broken at low temperatures and one of the three sublattices "preferentially occupied" may be referred as "antiferromagnetic" (the model may be "antiferromagnetic" even with ferromagnetic pair interactions $J_2 > 0$). The appropriate generalization of the variational method for "antiferromagnetic" triangular models has been obtained in a previous paper¹³⁾ (hereafter referred as I) and will be stated in section 3. The variational method is utilized in section 4, where we restrict ourselves to $J_2 > 0$ and obtain phase diagrams for several values of $r = |J_3|/|J_2|$. Higher approximations are presented for the case of pure triplet interactions ($J_2 = 0$).

2. Exact properties

In order to examine the ground state configurations it is convenient to define

$$r = |J_3|/|J_2| \quad (5)$$

$$H^* = H/(|J_3|+|J_2|) \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{and } h^*(a,b,c) = h(a,b,c)/(|J_3|+|J_2|) \quad (6b)$$

From the definition of the Hamiltonian (1) it is seen that there are four configurations on an elementary triangle with different energies, i.e.,

$$h_1^* = h^*(+,+,+) = -\frac{1}{2} H^* + (r - \frac{3}{2}a)/(r+1) \quad (7a)$$

$$h_2^* = h^*(+,+,-) = h^*(+,-,+) = h^*(-,+,+) = -\frac{1}{6} H^* + (-r + \frac{1}{2}a)/(r+1) \quad (7b)$$

$$h_3^* = h^*(+,-,-) = h^*(-,+,-) = h^*(-,-,+) = \frac{1}{6} H^* + (r + \frac{1}{2}a)/(r+1) \quad (7c)$$

$$h_4^* = h^*(-,-,-) = \frac{1}{2} H^* + (-r - \frac{3}{2}a)/(r+1) \quad (7d)$$

Here $a=+1$ for ferromagnetic pair interactions ($J_2 > 0$) and $a=-1$ for antiferromagnetic pair interactions ($J_2 < 0$). For $a=+1$, a little calculation (i.e. find the $\min\{h_i^*\}$) shows that one has to distinguish three cases:

Case F1 : $r > \frac{3}{2}$. The ground states ($T=0$) are: (i) the (+++) state (all spins up) for $H^* > (6r-6)/(r+1)$; (ii) the three ordered (++-) states (spins on one sublattice down, spins on the other two up) when $(6r-6)/(r+1) > H^* > 3/(r+1)$; and (iii) the (---) state (all spins down) when $H^* < 3/(r+1)$. Thus the ground state undergoes two transitions, one at $H^* = (6r-6)/(r+1)$ and the (++-)→(---) transition at $H^* = 3/(r+1)$. In the former, precisely at $H^* = (6r-6)/(r+1)$, there is an infinite degeneracy of states, so we shall use the notation (+++)^{I,D}→(++) for this transition. This infinite degeneracy has some important implications and it will be shown that these states are in one-to-one correspondence with those of the hard-hexagon model.

Case F2 : $r < \frac{3}{2}$. The ground state undergoes only the $(+++)\rightarrow(---)$ transition at $H^* = 2r/(r+1)$.

Case F3 : $r = 3/2$. Here again we have only one transition at $H^* = 6/5$. When $H^* > 6/5$ we have only the $(+++)$ ground state, whereas when $H^* < 6/5$ we have only the $(---)$ ground state. Precisely at $H^* = 6/5$, however, there is an infinite degeneracy of states and to make this explicit we shall use the notation $(+++)^{I \rightarrow D}(---)$ for this transition. The states are not in one-to-one correspondence with the configurations of the hard-hexagon model, but the infinite degeneracy distinguishes the present transition from the $(+++)\rightarrow(---)$ transition, and has again, as we shall see, some interesting implications.

Using a similar notation we find for antiferromagnetic pair interactions ($a = -1$) , the following cases:

Case A1 : $r > \frac{1}{2}$. We have two ground state transitions; the $(+++)^{I \rightarrow D}(++-)$ at $H^* = 6$ and the $(++-)\rightarrow(---)$ transition at $H^* = -3/(r+1)$.

Case A2 : $r < \frac{1}{2}$. There are now three transitions. The $(+++)^{I \rightarrow D}(++-)$ transition at $H^* = 6$; the $(++-)^{I \rightarrow D}(--+)$ transition at $H^* = -6r/(r+1)$; and the $(--+)^{I \rightarrow D}(---)$ transition at $H^* = (6r-6)/(r+1)$.

Case A3 : $r = \frac{1}{2}$. We have again the $(+++)^{I \rightarrow D}(++-)$ transition at $H^* = 6$ and the $(++-)^{I \rightarrow D}(---)$ transition at a field $H^* = -2$.

These ground state properties are helpful in understanding the topology of the phase boundaries (since they determine some of their "end-points"). Some of the above transitions are expected to extend to finite temperatures (in finite temperatures we drop the notation I.D and replace the term "state" by the term "phase"). However, the mean-field approximation⁵⁾ predicts that in case F3($r = 3/2$) and also in case F2(for some r) both the $(+++)\rightarrow(++-)$ and the $(++-)\rightarrow(---)$

transitions occur at finite temperatures, but our results (section 4) do not confirm this. Other questions concern the order of these transitions and the slopes of the phase boundaries at their "end-points". Some of these questions can be definitely answered. In particular, the $(+++)\rightarrow(++-)$ transitions in cases F1, A1, A2, A3 and the $(--+)\rightarrow(---)$ transition in case A2 are of second order and the slope of their phase boundaries at the corresponding critical fields is determined by the critical activity of the hard-hexagon model.

To prove this statement let us define:

$$T^* = K_B T / (|J_2| + |J_3|) \quad (8a)$$

$$\mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H} / (|J_2| + |J_3|) \quad (8b)$$

and transform to lattice gas variables ($\epsilon_i = 0, 1$) by

$$\sigma_i = s(1 - 2\epsilon_i) \quad (s = \pm 1) \quad (9)$$

Then from (1) and (9) we find:

$$\mathcal{H}^* = \sum_{(i,j,k)} \frac{2}{a(r+1)} \left[(2ras-1)(\epsilon_i\epsilon_j + \epsilon_i\epsilon_k + \epsilon_j\epsilon_k) - 4ras \epsilon_i\epsilon_j\epsilon_k \right] \quad (10)$$

$$- 2 \sum_i \left[\frac{6(ras-1)}{a(r+1)} - sH^* \right] \epsilon_i - N(sH^* + (3a-2rs)/(r+1))$$

where the first summation is over all $2N$ triangles; the second summation is over all N sites; and as before $a=+1$ for ferromagnetic pair interactions and $a=-1$ for antiferromagnetic. In order to obtain the hard-hexagon lattice gas one must introduce infinite nearest-neighbour repulsions. From (2) and (10) we find that this can be achieved by taking the zero temperature limit as follows:

$$\frac{sH^*}{T} \rightarrow \infty \quad (11a)$$

$$\frac{(rsa-1)}{a(r+1)T^*} \rightarrow \infty \quad (11b)$$

$$\frac{(2ras-1)}{a(r+1)T^*} \rightarrow \infty \quad (11c)$$

$$\frac{(2ras-3)}{a(r+1)T^*} \rightarrow \infty \quad (11d)$$

and keeping

$$z = \exp \left[2 \left\{ \frac{6(ras-1)}{a(r+1)T^*} - \frac{sH^*}{T^*} \right\} \right] \quad (12)$$

fixed. One can verify that the above are satisfied precisely under the conditions the $(+++)^I \rightarrow^D(+-)$ ($s=+1$) and the $(--+)^I \rightarrow^D(---)$ ($s=-1$) transitions occur; and that proves the statement that the corresponding infinite degenerate states are in one-to-one correspondence with the configurations of the hard-hexagon model. The critical fields for these transitions ($a=s=1$, $s=-a=1$ and $s=a=-1$ respectively) can be written

$$H_c^* = \frac{6(ras-1)}{as(r+1)} \quad (13)$$

Now, since, as $T^* \rightarrow 0$ and $H^* \rightarrow H_c^* - (\frac{s}{2} \ln z) T^*$, the partition function (2) transforms to the partition function of the hard-hexagon model with activity z , it follows that the slope of the phase boundaries $H^*(T^*)$ at $T=0$:

$$\lambda = \left. \frac{dH^*(T^*)}{dT^*} \right|_{T^*=0} \quad (14)$$

is related to the critical activity of the hard-hexagon model⁶⁾ by

$$\lambda = -\frac{s}{2} \ln z_c = -\frac{s}{2} \ln \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (11 + 5\sqrt{5}) \right\} \quad (15)$$

Furthermore, the critical magnetization is related to the critical density of hard-hexagons by⁶⁾

$$|M_c| = 1 - 2\rho_c = .447... \quad (16)$$

Precisely at $r = \frac{3}{2}$ ($r = \frac{1}{2}$) in case F3(A3), the limits 11d(11c) cannot be satisfied and the one-to-one correspondence with the hard-hexagons configurations does not hold. However, the implications of the infinite degeneracy of states will be discussed in section 4 where we present the results of the variational method.

3. Variational Approximations

The matrix equations for "antiferromagnetic" triangular models are given in Eqs.(6) and (7) of I. Using a representation in which the corner transfer matrices $B(a)$ and $\tilde{A}(a)$ are diagonal we can write these equations as

$$\sum_b F(a,b)\tilde{A}(b)F(b,a) = \xi_1 \tilde{A}^2(a) \quad (17a)$$

$$\sum_b \tilde{G}^T(b,a)\tilde{G}(b,a) = \xi_2 B^4(a) \quad (17b)$$

$$\sum_b \tilde{G}(a,b)B^2(b)\tilde{G}^T(a,b) = \xi_3 \tilde{A}^3(a) \quad (17c)$$

$$\sum_c w(a,b,c)F(a,c)\tilde{G}(c,b) = \eta_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{G}(a,b)B(b) \quad (17d)$$

$$\sum_c w(a,b,c)\tilde{G}(a,c)B(c)\tilde{G}^T(b,c) = \eta_3^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{A}(a)F(a,b)\tilde{A}(b) \quad (17e)$$

$$F(a,b) = F^T(b,a) \quad (17f)$$

Here a, b and c have values ± 1 ; and $w(a,b,c)$ is the Boltzmann weight of the interacting spins a, b and c surrounding an elementary triangle. The partition function per site is

$$k = \{(\eta_1^2 \eta_3)/(\xi_1 \xi_2 \xi_3)\}^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (18)$$

Furthermore, the magnetizations can be expressed in terms of the corner transfer matrices (they have been obtained from a variational expression for k in I):

$$M = \frac{2}{3}m + \frac{1}{3}m' \quad (19a)$$

$$m = \frac{\sum_a a \operatorname{Tr}\{\tilde{A}^3(a)\}}{\sum_a \operatorname{Tr}\{\tilde{A}^3(a)\}} \quad (19b)$$

$$m' = \frac{\sum_a a \operatorname{Tr}\{B^6(a)\}}{\sum_a \operatorname{Tr}\{B^6(a)\}} \quad (19c)$$

Here m' is the magnetization for the sublattice distinguished from the other two.

In cases where the lattice symmetry is not broken the infinite-dimensional solution of Eqs. (17) is expected to have the properties:

$$\tilde{A}(a) = B^2(a) = A^2(a) \quad (20a)$$

$$\tilde{G}(a,b) = A(a)F(a,b) \quad (20b)$$

$$\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi_3 = \xi, \quad \eta_1 = \eta_3 = \eta \quad (20c)$$

and our equations reduce to those given by Baxter and Tsang¹¹⁾:

$$\sum_b F(a,b)A^2(b)F(b,a) = \xi A^4(a) \quad (21a)$$

$$\sum_c w(a,b,c)F(a,c)A(c)F(c,b) = \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} A(a)F(a,b)A(b) \quad (21b)$$

$$F(a,b) = F^T(b,a) \quad (21c)$$

$$k = \eta/\xi \quad (21d)$$

$$M=m=m' = \frac{\sum_a \text{Tr}\{A^6(a)\}}{\sum_a \text{Tr}\{A^6(a)\}} \quad (21e)$$

In the following section we utilize these equations to study the phase diagrams for the model (1) with ferromagnetic pair interactions ($J_2 > 0$) for several values of $r (= |J_3|/|J_2|)$. The $n_1 \times n_2$ approximation truncates $\tilde{A}(+)$, $B(+)$, $F(+,+)$ and $\tilde{G}(+,+)$ to be $n_1 \times n_1$; $F(+,-)$ and $\tilde{G}(+,-)$ ($F(-,+)$ and $\tilde{G}(-,+)$) to be $n_1 \times n_2$ ($n_2 \times n_1$); and $\tilde{A}(-)$ and $B(-)$ to be $n_2 \times n_2$ matrices. The resulting non-linear algebraic equations are solved by the Newton-Raphson method. Initial guesses are obtained using the "eigenvalue iterative procedure" of Baxter⁷⁾ as generalized in I.

4. Phase diagrams

We consider first the 1×1 approximation (all matrices 1×1) and derive phase diagrams for several values of r . These phase diagrams (Figs 1a-e) are obtained as follows. In the general case, $r > \frac{3}{2}$, we find three physically interesting solutions (the solution of Eqs.(17) is not unique and one has to select the solution that maximizes k). Using a notation reflecting the low temperature properties of these solutions we shall refer to them as the (+++), (---) and (++-) solutions. The (+++) and the (---) solutions satisfy the symmetry properties (20), the (++-) solution does not. Let the partition function per site k , corresponding to these solutions, be denoted by $k(+++)$, $k(---)$, and $k(++-)$ respectively. The phase boundaries are determined by comparing these partition functions in the (H^*, T^*) plane. The critical lines $(P_1 P_3)$, $(P_2 P_3)$ and $(P_3 P_4)$ are determined by the conditions $k(+++) = k(++-)$, $k(++-) = k(---)$ and $k(+++) = k(---)$ respectively. For $r > \frac{3}{2}$ the three solutions satisfy at P_3 : $k(+++) = k(++-) = k(---)$. The solution that maximizes k in each region is indicated in Fig.1b.

In figures 1a-e the mean-field approximation⁵⁾ is also shown by dotted lines. The 1×1 approximation yields the exact "end-points" given by the ground state considerations:

$$H_C^* = H_{P_1}^* = (6r-6)/(r+1) \quad \text{for } r > \frac{3}{2} \quad (22a)$$

$$H_{P_2}^* = 3/(r+1) \quad \text{for } r > \frac{3}{2} \quad (22b)$$

$$H_{P_3}^* = 2r/(r+1) \quad \text{for } r \leq \frac{3}{2} \quad (22c)$$

From figures 1a-e, one can see that the quantitative predictions of the mean-field approximation are very poor. Qualitatively the

mean-field has some drawbacks not shared with the 1×1 approximation. It predicts a positive value for the slope λ and thus two transitions for certain values of H^* (above $H_{P_1}^*$), one transition from the $(+++)$ to the $(++-)$ phase and another, in some higher temperature, from the $(++-)$ to the $(+++)$ phase. It also predicts⁵⁾ that the $(+++) \rightarrow (++-)$ and the $(++-) \rightarrow (---)$ transitions occur even for some $r < \frac{3}{2}$. The 1×1 approximation rules out these possibilities as it can be seen from figures 1a-e. The slope of the line $(P_1 P_3)$ at the critical field, $H_{P_1}^*$, is independent of the value of r (as it should be) and is a reasonable approximation ($\lambda_{1 \times 1} = -1.02..$) to the exact result ($\lambda = -1.203...$).

Regarding the nature of phase transitions the 1×1 approximation gives, in general, first order transitions with jumps in magnetization; P_4 being a "classical" critical point within the approximation. The jumps are small only for the critical line $(P_1 P_3)$. From the magnitude of the jumps one could conclude that the $(+++)$ $\rightarrow$ $(---)$ and the $(++-) \rightarrow (---)$ transitions are of first order, whereas the $(++-) \rightarrow (+++)$ transition is of second order. As $T^* \rightarrow 0$, the $(---) \rightarrow (++)$ transition takes place between magnetizations -1 and $+\frac{1}{3}$; the slope of the phase boundary at P_2 is independent of r and it is zero $\left(\frac{dH^*}{dT^*} \Big|_{T^*=0} = 0 \right)$. For $r < \frac{3}{2}$ the "ferromagnetic" $(+++)$ $\rightarrow$ $(---)$ transition takes place, as $T^* \rightarrow 0$, between magnetizations $+1$ and -1 ; again the slope is independent of r and it is zero.

However, precisely at $r = 3/2$ the ferromagnetic $(+++)$ $\rightarrow$ $(---)$ transition takes place, as $T^* \rightarrow 0$, between magnetizations $.6447...$ and -1 and the slope of the phase boundary is non-zero: $\frac{dH^*}{dT^*} \Big|_{T^*=0} = -.2$.

We suppose that this rather surprising result is not an artifact of the 1×1 approximation. It seems reasonable to speculate that

this different behaviour is due to the infinite degeneracy of ground states pointed out in section 2 (case F3). For $r > \frac{3}{2}$ the ferromagnetic $(+++)\rightarrow(---)$ transition at P_3 takes place between a positive and a negative magnetization, both varying with r .

It should be pointed out that the "length" of the line (P_3P_4) for $r=\infty$ ($J_2=0$) is of the order of the error of the 1×1 approximation. It is therefore possible that P_3 and P_4 coincide in the exact solution. Indeed, this seems to be the case since in the 2×2 approximation (P_3P_4) becomes "shorter" and is again of the order of the error of the 2×2 approximation. However, for $\frac{3}{2} < r < \infty$ the line (P_3P_4) does not seem to be merely an artifact of the approximation (figure 1b), this can also be seen from table I, where we give the points P_3 and P_4 for several values of r . It is therefore possible that in the exact solution $H_{P_4}^* \geq 0$ for any r ; note that mean-field yields $H_{P_4}^* \leq 0$ for any r .

We restrict now the treatment to pure triplet interactions ($J_2=0$) and present two higher approximations to the critical line (P_1P_3) . These are the 2×2 and 3×2 approximations shown in Figure 2 together with the 1×1 approximation. The numerical results are given in table II. They converge to the exact values, as can be seen by comparing with the exactly solvable zero-field case and also with the hard-hexagon result (15). The 2×2 approximation yields: $\lambda_{2\times 2} = -1.16\dots$ and the 3×2 : $\lambda_{3\times 2} = -1.206\dots$ in good agreement with the exact result ($\lambda = -1.203\dots$). The jumps in magnetization are, in general, small in magnitude and tend to zero as the size of the matrices tends to infinity, so the $\infty\times\infty$ solution would yield, as expected, second-order transitions for (P_1P_3) . The jump is maximal at $H^* = 0$, but, even in this apparently least accurate case for the magnetization, the trend of the results is correct (the 1×1

results for $H^* = 0$ are $M(++-) = .281$ and $M(+++) = 0$). The jump is zero at $H^* \simeq 1.5$, where it also changes sign. Comparing the values of the magnetizations in table II one can see that $M(++-)$ is more accurate than $M(+++)$ (away from zero-field). The limiting values of $M(++-)$ as we approach the critical field ($H^* = 6$) are .44 and .43 for the 2×2 and 3×2 approximations respectively, in very good agreement with the exact result (16). Apparently, away from zero field, the 2×2 approximation for $M(++-)$ is accurate to the second decimal place.

For pure triplet interactions, Baxter, Sykes and Watts⁴⁾ have conjectured an expression for the magnetization along (P_2, P_3) , with a critical exponent $\beta_M = \frac{1}{12}$. The magnetizations of the $(---)$ and $(++-)$ phases along this line are related by $M(---) = -3M(++-)$ as we can show from Eqs.(17). Indeed, at $H^* = 0$ we have $w(a,b,c) = w(-a,-b,c)$ and if Eqs.(17) have a solution $\tilde{A}, B, F, \tilde{G}$ they also permit a solution $\tilde{A}^*, B^*, F^*, \tilde{G}^*$ where

$$A^*(a) = \tilde{A}(-a) \quad ; \quad B^*(a) = B(a) \quad (23a)$$

$$F^*(a,b) = F(-a,-b) \quad ; \quad \tilde{G}^*(a,b) = \tilde{G}(-a,b) \quad (23b)$$

$$k^* = k \quad (23c)$$

Considering $\tilde{A}, B, F, \tilde{G}$ to describe the $(---)$ phase, the $\tilde{A}^*, B^*, F^*, \tilde{G}^*$ solution describes the $(++-)$ phase. It is reasonable to assume that the $\infty \times \infty$ solution that maximizes k for the $(---)$ phase will satisfy the symmetry properties (20) so that $m = m'$ and from (23) and (19) we find $M(---) = -3M(++-)$.

5. Computational remarks

In general each of the solutions((+++), (---) and (++-) solutions), used to obtain the phase boundaries in the previous section, exists in the region where it maximizes k but also a little outside this region. A similar situation was found by Baxter, Enting and Tsang¹²⁾ in their study of the hard-square lattice gas. It is expected¹²⁾ that this interpenetration of the solutions will disappear as the size of the matrices increases. It may be speculated that the line (P_3P_4) , in the case of pure triplet interactions, is a consequence of this interpenetration of the "finite" solutions and will shrink to a single point (P_3) as the size of the matrices increases.

The $\infty \times \infty$ solution of the matrix equations defining the variational approximations (in our case Eqs.(17)), that maximizes k , is expected, in some cases, to satisfy certain symmetry properties (such as (20)). However, it should be pointed out that this need not be true in all finite-order approximations not even for the "square" ($n_1=n_2$) approximations. A striking example is the 2×2 approximation for $H^* = J_2 = 0$. In this case we found two solutions for the (---) phase, one symmetric (i.e. satisfying (20)) and an asymmetric (not satisfying (20)); the asymmetric solution maximizes k . The difference between these solutions is small and presumably will diminish as one goes to higher approximations. From the symmetric (---) solution we then obtained using (23) a "symmetric" (++-) solution (with $m=-m'$ at $H^*=0$) which then becomes asymmetric as H^* increases. It is therefore, possible to obtain a 2×2 approximation to the critical line (P_3P_1) starting from the "symmetric" (++-) solution; the results are then slightly different from those in table II. For instance, this yields $T^*(H^*=0)=2.2828...$ whereas the asymmetric yields $T^*(H^*=0)=2.2840...$; the asymmetric solution gives slightly smaller jumps in magnetization. In the 1×1

approximation the (---) solution that maximizes k satisfies also the symmetry properties (20).

6. Concluding remarks

We have explored the implications of the known hard-hexagon lattice gas results for the triangular Ising model with both pair and triplet interactions. The model has been studied by the variational method when the pair interactions are ferromagnetic and the nature of phase diagrams has been clarified. The numerical results of the approximations are in good agreement with the known exact results and higher approximations converge to the exact values as indicated by the 2×2 and 3×2 approximations for the case of pure triplet interactions. The lowest-order 1×1 approximation yields successful qualitative predictions. It predicted that the slope of the $(+++)\rightarrow(++-)$ phase boundary at the critical field and the critical magnetization are independent of r (the ratio of the interaction strengths). It points out that the $T^*=0$ slope of the phase boundaries for the $(+++)\rightarrow(---)$ ($r < \frac{3}{2}$) and the $(++-)\rightarrow(---)$ ($r > \frac{3}{2}$) transitions is also independent of r and it is zero. We conjecture this to be an exact result. Finally, for the special ratio $r = \frac{3}{2}$ it predicts that the $(+++)\rightarrow(---)$ transition takes place, as $T^* \rightarrow 0$, between magnetizations $.6447\dots$ and $-.1$ and the slope of the phase boundary has a non-zero value, i.e. $-.2$. It is reasonable to assume that the numerical values $.64$ and $-.2$ are only approximate, however, we expect the qualitative prediction, that the $(+++)\rightarrow(---)$ transition at $r = \frac{3}{2}$ is different (at low temperatures) from the $(+++)\rightarrow(---)$ transition for $r < \frac{3}{2}$, to be correct.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Professor P.C.Hemmer for helpful discussions and NTNF for a fellowship.

References

- 1) D. Merlini, A.Hintermann and Ch.Gruber, Lett.Nuov.Cim.7(1973)815
- 2) D.W.Wood and H.P.Griffiths, J.Phys. C7(1974)1417
- 3) R.J.Baxter and F.Y.Wu, Phys.Rev.Lett. 31(1973)1294 ;
Aust.J.Phys. 27(1974)357.
- 4) R.J.Baxter, M.F.Sykes and M.G.Watts, J.Phys.A8(1975)245
- 5) S.Frøyen, Aa.S.Sudbø and P.C.Hemmer, Physica 85A(1976)399
- 6) R.J.Baxter, J.Phys. A13(1980)L61
- 7) R.J.Baxter, J.Statist.Phys.,19(1978)461
- 8) R.J.Baxter, J.Math.Phys.,9(1968)650
- 9) S.B.Kelland, Can.J.Phys. 54(1976)1621
- 10) R.J.Baxter and I.G.Enting, J.Stat.Phys., 21(1979)103
- 11) R.J.Baxter and S.K.Tsang, J.Phys.A (1980)1023
- 12) R.J.Baxter, I.G.Enting and S.K.Tsang, J.Stat.Phys.,22(1980)465
- 13) A.Malakias, Arkiv for Det Fysiske Seminar i Trondheim No.13(1980).

TABLE I

$r = J_3 / J_2 $	$T_{P_3}^*$	$H_{P_3}^*$	$T_{P_4}^*$	$H_{P_4}^*$
∞	2.347... ¹	0	2.524...	-.072...
20	2.229...	.135...	2.492...	.027...
3	1.528...	.712...	2.408...	.38...
2	.92...	.966...	2.408...	.481...
1.5	0 ³	1.2 ³	2.435...	.532...
1	0 ³	1 ³	2.524...	.555...
.5	0 ³	2/3 ³	2.83...	.454...
.2	0 ³	1/3 ³	3.312...	.245...
0	0 ³	0 ³	3.915... ²	0

Results of the 1×1 approximation for the "end-points" of the phase diagrams P_3 and P_4 for several values of r . ¹Exact result: $2/\ln(1+\sqrt{2})=2.269...$ ²Exact result: $4/\ln 3=3.640...$ ³Exact results given in eq.22c.

TABLE II

H *	2x2 Approximation			3x2 Approximation		
	T *	M(++-)	M(+++)	T *	M(++-)	M(+++)
0	2.284 [†]	.251	0	2.278 [†]	.260	.107
.5	2.336	.297	.268	2.321	.302	.278
1	2.298	.319	.307	2.280	.321	.312
1.5	2.223	.335	.334	2.203	.336	.335
2	2.120	.350	.357	2.099	.350	.356
2.5	1.993	.365	.378	1.970	.363	.374
3	1.839	.379	.399	1.815	.375	.391
3.5	1.656	.395	.420	1.631	.388	.409
4	1.438	.410	.442	1.412	.402	.427
4.5	1.171	.426	.463	1.145	.415	.443
5.	.836	.444	.481	.812	.425	.456
5.5	.428	.444	.487	.414	.428	.460

Variational approximations for the critical line (P_1P_3) in the case of pure triplet interactions.[†]Exact result: $2/\ln(1+\sqrt{2})=2.2691\dots$

Fig.1

Fig. 2