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## Conclusion

## The Mermin-Wagner Theorem

In one and two dimensions, continuous symmetries cannot be spontaneously broken at finite temperature in systems with sufficiently short-range interactions.
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4 Discussion

For systems in statistical equilibrium the expectation value of an operator A is given by

$$
\langle A\rangle=\lim _{V \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{tr}\left(e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}} A\right)
$$

If some operator is not invariant under the transformations of $\mathcal{S}$,

For systems in statistical equilibrium the expectation value of an operator A is given by

$$
\langle A\rangle=\lim _{V \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{tr}\left(e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}} A\right)
$$

If the Hamiltonian displays a continuous symmetry $\mathcal{S}$ it commutes with the generators $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}^{i}$ of the corresponding symmetry group

$$
\left[\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}^{i}\right]_{-}=0
$$

If some operator is not invariant under the transformations of $\mathcal{S}$,

$$
\left[B, \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}^{i}\right]_{-}=C^{i} \neq 0
$$

the average of the commutator $C^{i}$ vanishes:

$$
\left\langle C^{i}\right\rangle=0
$$

It turns out that such averages may be unstable under an infinitesimal perturbation of the Hamiltonian

$$
\mathcal{H}_{\nu}=H+\nu H^{\prime}-\mu \hat{N}
$$

one can define the quasi-average:

$$
\langle A\rangle_{q}=\lim _{\nu \rightarrow 0} \lim _{V \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{tr}\left(e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_{\nu}} A\right)
$$

The quasi-average does not need to coincide with the normal average

$$
\left\langle C^{i}\right\rangle_{q}=\lim _{\nu \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{tr}\left(e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_{\nu}}\left[\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}^{i}\right]_{-}\right) \neq 0
$$

An Example:

$$
H=-\sum_{i j} J_{i j} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{i}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{j}}
$$

it is invariant under rotations in spin-space

$$
[H, \mathbf{S}]_{-}=0
$$

from

$$
\left\langle\left[S^{\alpha}, S^{\beta}\right]_{-}\right\rangle=0 \quad \text { and } \quad\left[S^{x}, S^{y}\right]_{-}=i \hbar S^{z}
$$

we find that the conventional average of the magnetization vansihes.
Adding a symmetry breaking field

$$
\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{0}}=B_{0} \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{z}}
$$

we may study quasi-averages and find spontaneous symmetry breaking.
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For the proof of the Mermin-Wagner Theorem we will use the Bogoliubov inequality

$$
\frac{1}{2} \beta\left\langle\left[A, A^{\dagger}\right]_{+}\right\rangle\left\langle\left[[C, H]_{-}, C^{\dagger}\right]_{-}\right\rangle \geq\left|\left\langle[C, A]_{-}\right\rangle\right|^{2}
$$

The idea for proofing the Bogoliubov inequality is to define an appropriate scalar product and then exploit the Schwarz inequality:

$$
(A, B)=\sum_{n \neq m}\langle n| A^{\dagger}|m\rangle\langle m| B|n\rangle \frac{W_{m}-W_{n}}{E_{n}-E_{m}}
$$

with

$$
W_{n}=\frac{e^{-\beta E_{n}}}{\operatorname{Tr}\left(e^{-\beta H}\right)}
$$

A scalar product has four defining axioms:
(1)

$$
(A, B)=(B, A)^{*}
$$

This is valid since

$$
\left(\langle n| B^{\dagger}|m\rangle\langle m| A|n\rangle\right)^{*}=\langle n| A^{\dagger}|m\rangle\langle m| B|n\rangle
$$

(2) The linearity follows directly from the linearity of the matrix element
(3) It is also obvious that

$$
(A, A) \geq 0
$$

(9) From $A=0$ it naturally follows that $(A, A)=0$. The converse is not necessarily true

In conclusion this shows that we have constructed a semidefinite scalar product.

To exploit the Schwarz inequality, we calculate the terms occurring in it:

$$
|(A, B)|^{2} \leq(A, A)(B, B)
$$

We now choose

$$
B=\left[C^{\dagger}, H\right]_{-}
$$

First we calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A, B) & =\sum_{n \neq m}\langle n| A^{\dagger}|m\rangle\langle m|\left[C^{\dagger}, H\right]_{-}|n\rangle \frac{W_{m}-W_{n}}{E_{n}-E_{m}} \\
& =\sum_{n, m}\langle n| A^{\dagger}|m\rangle\langle m| C^{\dagger}|n\rangle\left(W_{m}-W_{n}\right) \\
& =\sum_{m} W_{m}\langle m| C^{\dagger} A^{\dagger}|m\rangle-\sum_{n} W_{n}\langle n| A^{\dagger} C^{\dagger}|n\rangle \\
& =\left\langle C^{\dagger} A^{\dagger}-A^{\dagger} C^{\dagger}\right\rangle=\left\langle\left[C^{\dagger}, A^{\dagger}\right]_{-}\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting $B=\left[C^{\dagger}, H\right]_{-}$, we find

$$
(B, B)=\left\langle\left[C^{\dagger},[H, C]_{-}\right]_{-}\right\rangle \geq 0
$$

For $(A, A)$ we use the following approximation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & <\frac{W_{m}-W_{n}}{E_{n}-E_{m}} \\
& =\left(\operatorname{Tr}\left(e^{-\beta H}\right)\right)^{-1} \frac{e^{-\beta E_{m}}+e^{-\beta E_{n}}}{E_{n}-E_{m}} \frac{e^{-\beta E_{m}}-e^{-\beta E_{n}}}{e^{-\beta E_{m}}+e^{-\beta E_{n}}} \\
& =\frac{W_{m}+W_{n}}{E_{n}-E_{m}} \tanh \left(\frac{\beta}{2}\left(E_{n}-E_{m}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\tanh x<x$ for $x>0$, we find that

$$
0<\frac{W_{m}-W_{n}}{E_{n}-E_{m}}<\frac{\beta}{2}\left(W_{n}+W_{m}\right)
$$

We can now estimate the scalar product:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A, A) & <\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{n \neq m}\langle n| A^{\dagger}|m\rangle\langle m| A|n\rangle\left(W_{n}+W_{m}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{n, m}\langle n| A^{\dagger}|m\rangle\langle m| A|n\rangle\left(W_{n}+W_{m}\right) \\
& =\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{n} W_{n}\left(\langle n| A^{\dagger} A|n\rangle+\langle n| A A^{\dagger}|n\rangle\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This finally leads to

$$
(A, A) \leq \frac{\beta}{2}\left\langle\left[A, A^{\dagger}\right]_{+}\right\rangle
$$

Putting what we found in the Schwarz inequality, we find that we proofed the Bogoliubov inequality

$$
\frac{1}{2} \beta\left\langle\left[A, A^{+}\right]_{+}\right\rangle\left\langle\left[[C, H]_{-}, C^{+}\right]_{-}\right\rangle \geq\left|\left\langle[C, A]_{-}\right\rangle\right|^{2}
$$

We now want to find out whether the isotropic Heisenberg model gives a spontaneous magnetization. The starting point is the Hamiltonian

$$
H=-\sum_{i, j} J_{i j} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{i}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{j}}-b \sum_{i} S_{i}^{z} e^{-i \mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}}}
$$

We are interested in the magnetization

$$
M_{s}(T)=\lim _{B_{0} \rightarrow 0} g_{J} \frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar} \sum_{i} e^{-i \mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}}}\left\langle S_{i}^{Z}\right\rangle_{T, B_{0}}
$$

For the following analysis, we assume that the exchange integrals $J_{i j}$ decrease sufficiently fast with increasing distance $\left|\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{j}}\right|$ so that the quantity

$$
Q=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i, j}\left|\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{j}}\right|^{2}\left|J_{i j}\right|
$$

remains finite.

We will now prove the Mermin-Wagner Theorem by using the Bogoliubov inequality for the operators

$$
\begin{aligned}
A=S^{-}(-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{K}) & \Rightarrow A^{\dagger}=S^{+}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{K}) \\
C=S^{+}(\mathbf{k}) & \Rightarrow C^{\dagger}=S^{-}(-\mathbf{k})
\end{aligned}
$$

Where the spin operators in $\mathbf{k}$-space are defined by

$$
S^{\alpha}(\mathbf{k})=\sum_{i} S_{i}^{\alpha} e^{-i \mathbf{k} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}}}
$$

From this we find the commutation relations

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[S^{+}\left(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{1}}\right), S^{-}\left(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)\right]_{-} } & =2 \hbar S^{z}\left(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{1}}+\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{2}}\right) \\
{\left[S^{z}\left(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{1}}\right), S^{ \pm}\left(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)\right]_{-} } & = \pm \hbar S^{ \pm}\left(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{1}}+\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We now evaluate the three individual terms of the Bogoliubov inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle[C, A]_{-}\right\rangle & =\left\langle\left[S^{+}(\mathbf{k}), S^{-}(-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{K})\right]_{-}\right\rangle \\
& =2 \hbar\left\langle S^{z}(\mathbf{K})\right\rangle \\
& =2 \hbar \sum_{i} e^{-i \mathbf{K R _ { i }}}\left\langle S_{i}^{z}\right\rangle \\
& =\frac{2 \hbar^{2} N}{g_{J} \mu_{B}} M\left(T, B_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\left\langle\left[A, A^{\dagger}\right]_{+}\right\rangle & =\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\left\langle\left[S^{-}(-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{K}), S^{+}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{K})\right]_{+}\right\rangle \\
& =\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{i, j} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{K})\left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{i}}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{j}}\right)}\left\langle S_{i}^{-} S_{j}^{+}+S_{j}^{+} S_{i}^{-}\right\rangle \\
& =2 N \sum_{i}\left\langle\left(S_{i}^{x}\right)^{2}+\left(S_{i}^{y}\right)^{2}\right\rangle \\
& \leq 2 N \sum_{i}\left\langle\mathbf{S}_{i}^{2}\right\rangle \\
& =2 \hbar^{2} N^{2} S(S+1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we calculate the double commutator

$$
\left\langle\left[[C, H], C^{\dagger}\right]_{-}\right\rangle
$$

First we will evaluate

$$
\left[S_{m}^{+}, H\right]_{-}=-\hbar \sum_{i} J_{i m}\left(2 S_{i}^{+} S_{m}^{z}-S_{i}^{z} S_{m}^{+}-S_{m}^{+} S_{i}^{z}\right)+\hbar b S_{m}^{+} e^{-i K R_{\mathrm{m}}}
$$

Using this, we evaluate the double commutator

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[\left[S_{m}^{+}, H\right]_{-}, S_{p}^{-}\right]_{-} } & =2 \hbar^{2} \sum_{i} J_{i p} \delta_{m p}\left(S_{i}^{+} S_{p}^{-}+2 S_{i}^{z} S_{p}^{z}\right) \\
& -2 \hbar^{2} J_{m p}\left(S_{m}^{+} S_{p}^{-}+2 S_{m}^{z} S_{p}^{z}\right)+2 \hbar^{2} b \delta_{m p} S_{p}^{z} e^{-i \mathbf{K R}_{p}}
\end{aligned}
$$

This leads to the following intermediate result for the expectation value we are looking for

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left[[C, H], C^{\dagger}\right]_{-}\right\rangle & =\sum_{m, p} e^{i \mathbf{k}\left(\mathbf{R}_{m}-\mathbf{R}_{p}\right)}\left\langle\left[\left[S_{m}^{+}, H\right]_{-}, S_{p}^{-}\right]_{-}\right\rangle \\
& =2 \hbar^{2} b \sum_{p}\left\langle S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle e^{-i \mathbf{K} \mathbf{R}_{p}} \\
& +2 \hbar^{2} \sum_{m, p} J_{m p}\left(1-e^{-i \mathbf{k}\left(\mathbf{R}_{m}-\mathbf{R}_{p}\right)}\right)\left\langle S_{m}^{+} S_{p}^{-}+2 S_{m}^{z} S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

To find a simple upper bound we may add to the right-hand side the same expression with $\mathbf{k}$ replaced by $-\mathbf{k}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle\left[[C, H], C^{\dagger}\right]_{-}\right\rangle \\
\leq & 4 \hbar^{2} b \sum_{p}\left\langle S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle e^{-i \mathbf{K \mathbf { R } _ { p }}} \\
+ & 4 \hbar^{2} \sum_{m, p} J_{m p}\left(1-\cos \left(\mathbf{k}\left(\mathbf{R}_{m}-\mathbf{R}_{p}\right)\right)\right)\left\langle\mathbf{S}_{m} \mathbf{S}_{p}+S_{m}^{z} S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

We can simplify the right hand side using the triangle inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle\left[[C, H], C^{\dagger}\right]_{-}\right\rangle \\
\leq & 4 \hbar^{2} b N\left|\left\langle S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle\right| \\
+ & 4 \hbar^{2} \sum_{m, p}\left|J_{m p}\right|\left|\left(1-\cos \left(\mathbf{k}\left(\mathbf{R}_{m}-\mathbf{R}_{p}\right)\right)\right)\right|\left(\left|\left\langle\mathbf{S}_{m} \mathbf{S}_{p}\right\rangle\right|+\left|\left\langle S_{m}^{z} S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle\right|\right) \\
\leq & 4 \hbar^{2} b N\left|\left\langle S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle\right| \\
+ & 4 \hbar^{2} \sum_{m, p}\left|J_{m p}\right|\left|1-\cos \left(\mathbf{k}\left(\mathbf{R}_{m}-\mathbf{R}_{p}\right)\right)\right|\left(\hbar^{2} S(S+1)+\hbar^{2} S^{2}\right) \\
\leq & 4 \hbar^{2} b N\left|\left\langle S_{p}^{z}\right\rangle\right| \\
+ & 8 \hbar^{2} S(S+1) \sum_{m, p}\left|J_{m p}\right|\left|1-\cos \left(\mathbf{k}\left(\mathbf{R}_{m}-\mathbf{R}_{p}\right)\right)\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

Therewith we have found

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle\left[[C, H], C^{\dagger}\right]_{-}\right\rangle \\
\leq & 4 \hbar^{2}\left|B_{0} M\left(T, B_{0}\right)\right| \\
+ & 8 \hbar^{2} S(S+1) \sum_{m, p} \frac{\left|J_{m p}\right|}{2} k^{2}\left|\mathbf{R}_{m}-\mathbf{R}_{p}\right|^{2} \\
\leq & 4 \hbar^{2}\left|B_{0} M\left(T, B_{0}\right)\right|+4 N k^{2} \hbar^{4} Q S(S+1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting what we have found in the Bogoliubov inequality and summing over all the wavevectors of the first Brillouin zone we get:

$$
\beta S(S+1) \geq \frac{M^{2}}{N^{2} g_{j}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\left|B_{0} M\right|+k^{2} \hbar^{2} N Q S(S+1)}
$$

We are finally ready to prove the Mermin-Wagner Theorem. In the thermodynamic limit we find:

$$
S(S+1) \geq \frac{m^{2} v_{d} \Omega_{d}}{\beta(2 \pi)^{d} g_{j}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2}} \int_{0}^{k_{0}} \frac{k^{d-1} d k}{\left|B_{0} M\right|+k^{2} \hbar^{2} Q S(S+1)}
$$

All that is left to do is to evaluate the integrals. This can be done exactly; in one dimension we find:

$$
S(S+1) \geq \frac{m^{2} v_{1}}{\beta 2 \pi g_{j}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2}} \frac{\arctan \left(k_{0} \sqrt{\frac{Q \hbar^{2} S(S+1)}{\left|B_{0} m\right|}}\right)}{\sqrt{Q \hbar^{2} S(S+1)\left|B_{0} m\right|}}
$$

We are specifically interested in the behaviour of the magnetization for small fields $B_{0}$ :

$$
\left|m\left(T, B_{0}\right)\right| \leq \text { const. } \frac{B_{0}^{1 / 3}}{T^{2 / 3}}, \quad \text { as } B_{0} \rightarrow 0
$$

For a two-dimensional lattice we find:

$$
S(S+1) \geq \frac{m^{2} v_{2}}{\beta 2 \pi g_{j}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2}} \frac{\ln \left(\sqrt{\frac{Q \hbar^{2} S(S+1) k_{0}^{2}+\left|B_{0} m\right|}{\left|B_{0} m\right|}}\right)}{2 Q \hbar^{2} S(S+1)}
$$

from which for small fields we get

$$
\left|m\left(T, B_{0}\right)\right| \leq \text { const. }\left(T \ln \left(\frac{\text { const. } .^{\prime}+\left|B_{0} m\right|}{\left|B_{0} m\right|}\right)\right)^{-1 / 2}
$$

From the previous two expressions we conclude that there is no spontaneous magnetization in one and two dimensions:

$$
m_{s p}=\lim _{B_{0} \rightarrow 0} m\left(T, B_{0}\right)=0 \text { for } T \neq 0
$$

Thus, the Mermin-Wagner Theorem is proved.
(1) The proof is valid only for $T>0$. For $T=0$ our inequalities make no predictions.
(2) Via the factor $e^{-i K R_{i}}$ the proof also forbids long-range order in antiferromagnets.
(3) We cannot make any predictions for $d>2$, but Roepstroff strengthened the proof to find an upper bound for the magnetization in $d \geq 3$.
(9) The theorem is valid for arbitrary spin S .
(6) The theorem is valid only for the isotropic Heisenberg model. The proof is not valid even for a weak anisotropy. This explains the existence of a number of two-dimensional Heisenberg ferromagnets and antiferromagnets like $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CuF}_{4}$.
(0) The theorem is restricted only to the non-existence of spontaneous magnetization. It does not necessarily exclude other types of phase transitions. For example the magnetic susceptibility may diverge.

# This is the end of my presentation 

Thank you for your attention.
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