Analytically solving the Ising model in $2 + \epsilon$ dimensions





Wenliang Li

Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, Japan

Sun Yat-Sen University, China



Bootstat 2021, 3-28 May

Last Friday

2<d<4 Ising from $\langle \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \rangle$ numerical bootstrap Cappelli, Maffi, Okuda '18



"the conformal states rearrange themselves around d=2.2"

ϵ - expansion

 Slightly below 4d weakly coupled Wilson-Fisher fixed point

$$G_{\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma}^{\text{Free}}(u,v) = 1 + u^{\Delta_{\sigma}} + \frac{u^2}{v^2}$$



• 2d Ising model is exactly solvable

see Vichi's note

$$G_{\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma}^{(d=2)}(u,v) = \frac{(1+u^{1/2}+v^{1/2})^{1/2}}{\sqrt{2}v^{1/8}}$$

It is tempting to deform the strongly coupled solution to $2 + \epsilon$ d using the analytic conformal bootstrap (Weakly coupled in fermionic representation, but nonlocal?)

ϵ - expansion

- Consider $\epsilon = d 2$ is small
- To first order

$$G^{(d=2+\epsilon)}_{\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma}(u,v) = G^{(0)}_{\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma}(u,v) + \epsilon G^{(1)}_{\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma}(u,v) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$$

- Assume
 - 1. conformal symmetry
 - 2. leading corrections are linear in ϵ

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{scaling dimension} & \Delta_i = \Delta_i^{(0)} + \epsilon \, \Delta_i^{(1)} + O(\epsilon^2) \\ \\ \text{OPE coefficient} & \lambda_i = \lambda_i^{(0)} + \epsilon \, \lambda_i^{(1)} + O(\epsilon^2) \end{array}$$

Conformal bootstrap

• Crossing equation

• To first order,

$$\begin{split} D &= \sum \lambda_i^2 F_{\Delta_i,\ell_i} \\ &= \epsilon \sum \left(2\lambda_i^{(0)} \lambda_i^{(1)} + (\lambda_i^{(0)})^2 \Delta_i^{(1)} \partial_{\Delta} \right) F_{\Delta,\ell} \Big|_{d \to 2, \Delta \to \Delta_i^{(0)}} \implies \text{ sum of 2d blocks} \\ &+ \epsilon \sum (\lambda_i^{(0)})^2 \left(\Delta_{\sigma}^{(1)} \partial_{\Delta_{\sigma}} + \partial_d \right) F_{\Delta,\ell} \Big|_{d \to 2, \Delta \to \Delta_i^{(0)}} \implies \text{ fixed by 2d data} \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \end{split}$$

the intermediate states are the same as 2d

 In small u,v expansion, the crossing solution is symmetric in u,v (convergent series?)

See Henriksson's talk for more advanced analytical methods

 In s-channel OPE, the power laws in v are associated with twist accumulation points with large-spin asymptotics

$$u^{\tau/2} v^p \qquad \longleftrightarrow \qquad \lambda_i^2 \sim \ell^{-2p-1} \frac{\Gamma(\ell)^2}{\Gamma(2\ell)} + \dots$$

• In 3d, the vacuum contribution is dual to $u^{\Delta_{\sigma}}v^{0-\Delta_{\sigma}}$ At large spin, mean fields $\tau_{[\sigma\sigma]_n} \sim 2\Delta_{\sigma} + 2n$ dominate

vacuum state double-twist trajectories

But 2d has no twist gap.
 LHS involves infinitely many states: I, T, T², ... (self-dual)

• ϵ -expansion + lightcone expansion

- $u = z\bar{z}$ $v = (1-z)(1-\bar{z})$
- $$\begin{split} \epsilon \sum \left(2\lambda_i^{(0)}\lambda_i^{(1)} + (\lambda_i^{(0)})^2 \Delta_i^{(1)}\partial_{\Delta} \right) F_{\Delta,\ell} \Big|_{d \to 2, \Delta \to \Delta_i^{(0)}} & \text{sum of 2d blocks} \\ = -\epsilon \sum (\lambda_i^{(0)})^2 \left(\Delta_{\sigma}^{(1)}\partial_{\Delta_{\sigma}} + \partial_d \right) F_{\Delta,\ell} \Big|_{d \to 2, \Delta \to \Delta_i^{(0)}} & \text{fixed by 2d data} \end{split}$$
- 2d global conformal blocks also factorize

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{G}_{\Delta, \boldsymbol{\ell}} (\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\bar{z}}) &= \mathsf{K}_{\Delta, \boldsymbol{\ell}} (\boldsymbol{z}) \mathsf{K}_{\Delta, \boldsymbol{\ell}} (\boldsymbol{\bar{z}}) + (\boldsymbol{z} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\bar{z}}) & \text{from Vichi's note} \\ & \mathsf{K}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} (\boldsymbol{x}) &= \mathsf{X}^{\boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\ell}} \, {}_{\boldsymbol{z}} \mathsf{F}_{\boldsymbol{z}} (\boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\ell}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{j}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{j}, \boldsymbol{x}) & \text{small } \boldsymbol{z}, 1 - \boldsymbol{\bar{z}} \\ & \mathsf{small } \boldsymbol{z}, 1 - \boldsymbol{\bar{z}} \\ & \mathsf{Ist line} \quad \epsilon \sum_{\tau} u^{-\Delta_{\sigma}^{(0)}} (f_{1,\tau} (1 - \boldsymbol{\bar{z}}) + f_{2,\tau} (1 - \boldsymbol{\bar{z}}) \partial_{\tau}) k_{\tau} (\boldsymbol{z}) - (\boldsymbol{z} \leftrightarrow 1 - \boldsymbol{\bar{z}}) \\ & \mathsf{Crossing involves} \quad \log(\boldsymbol{z}), \ \log(1 - \boldsymbol{\bar{z}}) \end{split}$$

- $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left| \sum_{d \to 2, \Delta \to \Delta_i^{(0)}} \right|_{d \to 2, \Delta \to \Delta_i^{(0)}}$ is more technical 1. derive the large spin expansion of 2d OPE coefficients
 - 2. use general d conformal blocks to derive the lightcone expansion of resummed results
 - 3. take the d derivative and set d to 2

• 2012.09710
$$g_{\Delta,\ell}^{(d,a,b)}(z,\bar{z}) \sim \sum_{k,p,q} \frac{D_k^{p,q}}{J^{2p}} \left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2}+p} k_{\gamma+2q}(z) k_{\beta}(\bar{z})$$

$$\gamma = \tau - d + 2 \qquad \sum_{\ell} \lambda_{\Delta,\ell}^2 g_{\Delta,\ell}(z,\bar{z}) \sim \left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} k_{\gamma}(z) (1-\bar{z})^p \\ \beta = \tau + 2\ell \qquad \qquad + \left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2}+1} \frac{(D_0^{1,0} + D_1^{1,0}) k_{\gamma}(z) + D_0^{1,1} k_{\gamma+2}(z)}{(p+1)(p+1-a+b)} (1-\bar{z})^{p+1} + \dots$$

Results

- NO solution beyond 1st order in $z, 1 \bar{z}$
- d=2 is a singularity !
- At least one assumption is wrong

Relax the assumptions

• 1. Conformal symmetry

scale vs conformal invariance?

strong evidence for conformal invariance in d = 2, 3, 4- ϵ

• 2. CFT data corrections are linear in ϵ

Otherwise, the leading corrections should be e^a with a < 1

To match the d-derivative terms, a=1/k, k=2,3,4,5,...

• Other branch cut possibility $(-\epsilon)^a$

Relax the assumptions

- The simplest possibility is $\,\epsilon^{1/2}$

- Infinite higher-spin towers to generate lightcone singularities
- a) deform the 2d data $\tau_I = 4n$, $\tau_{\epsilon} = 4n + 1$ $\Delta_i = \Delta_i^{(0)} + \epsilon^{1/2} \Delta_i^{(1)} + \dots \quad \lambda_i = \lambda_i^{(0)} + \epsilon^{1/2} \lambda_i^{(1)} + \dots$

b) add new states/trajectories to reduce twist spacing

$$\lambda_i = 0 + \epsilon^{1/2} \lambda_i^{(1)} + \dots$$

$$\tau_{I'} = 4n + 2, \quad \tau_{\epsilon'} = 4n + 3$$

2d twist spacing

• Global conformal blocks are special in 2d

invariant under the "spin shadow" transform

$$\ell\leftrightarrow 2-d-\ell$$

• So the 2d data should be invariant under

Do

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{twist} & \Delta - \ell \leftrightarrow \Delta + \ell \\ & \tau \leftrightarrow \tau + 2\ell \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{conformal spin} \end{array}$$

identical correlator: cs spacing is 4, so twist spacing is also 4 (decompose Virasoro blocks into global blocks)

$$\sigma \times \sigma = I + \epsilon$$
 $\tau_I = 4n$, $\tau_\epsilon = 4n + 1$
some quasi-primary states decouple from $\langle \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \rangle$?

Count quasi-primary

Based on (4.9) and (4.10) in Cappelli, Maffi, Okuda '18

```
 \{ \{ \Delta \to 0, \ 1[0] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 1, \ 1[0] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 2, \ 1[2] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 3, \ 0 \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 4, \ 1[0] + 1[4] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 5, \ 1[4] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 6, \ 1[2] + 1[6] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 7, \ 1[6] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 8, \ 1[0] + 1[4] + 1[7] + 2 \ 1[8] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 9, \ 1[0] + 1[8] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 10, \ 1[2] + 2 \ 1[6] + 1[9] + 2 \ 1[10] \}, \ \{ \Delta \to 11, \ 1[2] + 2 \ 1[10] + 1[11] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 12, \ 1[0] + 1[3] + 2 \ 1[4] + 2 \ 1[8] + 1[11] + 3 \ 1[12] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 13, \ 1[0] + 1[4] + 1[9] + 3 \ 1[12] + 1[13] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 13, \ 1[0] + 1[4] + 1[9] + 3 \ 1[12] + 1[13] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 14, \ 1[1] + 2 \ 1[2] + 1[5] + 2 \ 1[6] + 3 \ 1[10] + 2 \ 1[13] + 4 \ 1[14] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 14, \ 1[1] + 2 \ 1[2] + 1[5] + 2 \ 1[6] + 3 \ 1[10] + 2 \ 1[13] + 4 \ 1[14] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 15, \ 1[0] + 1[2] + 2 \ 1[6] + 1[7] + 1[11] + 3 \ 1[14] + 2 \ 1[15] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 16, \ 4 \ 1[0] + 1[1] + 1[3] + 2 \ 1[4] + 1[7] + 3 \ 1[8] + 4 \ 1[12] + 3 \ 1[15] + 5 \ 1[16] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 17, \ 1[0] + 1[2] + 2 \ 1[4] + 1[5] + 3 \ 1[8] + 1[9] + 2 \ 1[13] + 5 \ 1[16] + 3 \ 1[17] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 18, \ 1[1] + 4 \ 1[2] + 2 \ 1[3] + 1[5] + 3 \ 1[6] + 2 \ 1[9] + 4 \ 1[10] + 5 \ 1[14] + 4 \ 1[17] + 7 \ 1[18] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 19, \ 1[0] + 2 \ 1[2] + 2 \ 1[3] + 1[4] + 3 \ 1[6] + 1[7] + 3 \ 1[10] + 2 \ 1[11] + 3 \ 1[15] + 6 \ 1[18] + 4 \ 1[19] \}, \\ \{ \Delta \to 20, \ 4 \ 1[0] + 2 \ 1[1] + 1[3] + 6 \ 1[4] + 3 \ 1[5] + 2 \ 1[7] + 4 \ 1[8] + 3 \ 1[11] + 5 \ 1[12] + \\ 7 \ 1[16] + 6 \ 1[19] + 9 \ 1[20] \} \}
```

$$\mathcal{N}_{m}(q,\bar{q}) = |\widehat{\chi}_{11}(q)|^{2} + |q^{h_{13}}\widehat{\chi}_{13}(q)|^{2}$$

= $\sum_{\Delta=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\ell| \le \Delta} d^{QP}(\Delta,\ell) x^{\Delta} y^{\ell}, \qquad q = xy, \quad \bar{q} = xy^{-1}.$ m=3

Count quasi-primary

```
\{\Delta \rightarrow 21, 4 + 2 \lfloor [1] + \lfloor [2] + 3 \lfloor [4] + 2 \lfloor [5] + 2 \lfloor [6] + 3 \lfloor [8] + 2 \lfloor [9] + 5 \lfloor [12] + 2 \lfloor [6] + 3 \lfloor [8] + 2 \lfloor [9] + 5 \lfloor [12] + 2 \lfloor [9] + 5 \lfloor [12] + 2 \lfloor [9] + 
                                              3 [13] + 4 [17] + 8 [20] + 6 [21]
\{\Delta \rightarrow 22, \, \lfloor [0] + 2 \, \lfloor [1] + 6 \, \lfloor [2] + 3 \, \lfloor [3] + 2 \, \lfloor [5] + 8 \, \lfloor [6] + 3 \, \lfloor [7] + 3 \, \lfloor [9] + 3 \, \lfloor [9]
                                                 5l[10] + 4l[13] + 7l[14] + 9l[18] + 8l[21] + 11l[22]
   \{\Delta \rightarrow 23, l[0] + 3l[1] + 6l[2] + 2l[3] + 2l[4] + 3l[6] + 4l[7] + 3l[8] +
                                                 5l[10] + 3l[11] + 6l[14] + 4l[15] + 6l[19] + 11l[22] + 9l[23]
\{\Delta \rightarrow 24, 9 \mid [0] + 3 \mid [1] + \mid [2] + 4 \mid [3] + 8 \mid [4] + 3 \mid [5] + 3 \mid [7] + 10 \mid [8] + 3 \mid [7] + 10 \mid [8] + 3 \mid [7] + 10 \mid [8] + 3 \mid [8] \mid 
                                                 5l[9] + 4l[11] + 7l[12] + 6l[15] + 9l[16] + 11l[20] + 10l[23] + 15l[24]
\{\Delta \rightarrow 25, 9 \mid [0] + 3 \mid [1] + 2 \mid [2] + 4 \mid [3] + 6 \mid [4] + 4 \mid [5] + 3 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [8] + 6 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [8] + 6 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [8] + 6 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [8] + 6 \mid [6] + 5 \mid [6] \mid [
                                              6 \lfloor 9 \rfloor + 4 \lfloor 10 \rfloor + 6 \lfloor 12 \rfloor + 4 \lfloor 13 \rfloor + 8 \lfloor 16 \rfloor + 6 \lfloor 17 \rfloor + 9 \lfloor 21 \rfloor + 15 \lfloor 24 \rfloor + 11 \lfloor 25 \rfloor
 \{\Delta \rightarrow 26, l[0] + 6l[1] + 12l[2] + 3l[3] + 2l[4] + 6l[5] + 10l[6] + 5l[7] + 10l[6] + 10l[6] + 5l[7] + 10l[6] + 10l
                                              4 \lfloor 9 \rfloor + 14 \lfloor 10 \rfloor + 6 \lfloor 11 \rfloor + 6 \lfloor 13 \rfloor + 9 \lfloor 14 \rfloor + 8 \lfloor 17 \rfloor + 11 \lfloor 18 \rfloor + 15 \lfloor 22 \rfloor + 15 \lfloor 14 \rfloor + 15 \lfloor 15 \rfloor + 15 \rfloor + 15 \lfloor 15 \rfloor + 
                                                 14 | [25] + 19 | [26] \},
```

1<d<2

Double kinks

Golden, Paulos '15



More constraints

Introduce new intermediate trajectories with $\tau = 4n + 2, 4n + 3$

Then there are many solutions.

 $\lambda_i = 0 + \epsilon^{1/2} \lambda_i^{(1)} + \dots$

- s-t crossing is just the 1st constraint
- s-u crossing can't be studied using the above lightcone expansion (Mellin space?)
- Ising decoupling In 2d, [twist-1, spin-2] and [twist-5, all spin] decouple at the Ising point

Do they persist in $2 + \epsilon$ dimensions ? [twist-1, spin-2] seems to persist, [twist-5, spin=0] partly does. (Cappelli, Maffi, Okuda '18)

Consistency in Lorentzian signature, such as the Regge limit

Open questions

- If 2d data is deformed by fractional power of *€*, do we still need new states?
- Numerically solving the crossing equation based on a tentative spectrum with new states?
- More no-go results due to 2d peculiarity? Other models?
- Other analytic methods? Analytic functional, dispersive sum rules, Tauberian theorems, ...

Thank you!