

CLASSICAL TWO-DIMENSIONAL XY MODEL  
WITH IN-PLANE MAGNETIC FIELD

M.E.Gouvêa,\* F.G.Mertens,\*\* A.R.Bishop and G.M.Wysin.\*\*\*

Theoretical Division

Los Alamos National Laboratory

Los Alamos, NM, 87545 USA

ABSTRACT

We present analytical and numerical simulation studies on the two dimensional-XY classical ferromagnetic model with weak in-plane magnetic field (the reduced field is  $h = 0.05$  and it is applied along the x-axis). The structure and dynamics of vortex spin configurations are considered. The simulation data show a strong crossover at  $T_c = 1.0JS^2$ ; the data for  $T < T_c$  are well interpreted by one- and two- spin wave processes with an additional anomalous central peak at  $S_{xx}(\vec{q}, \omega)$  structure function which is suggested as a contribution from domain walls. The data for  $T \geq T_c$  can be interpreted by vortex gas theory. The in-plane data can be compared to recent experiments performed on  $\text{CoCl}_2$ -intercalated into graphite. The  $S_{zz}(\vec{q}, \omega)$  shows unusual behaviour as  $T$  is increased to  $T \geq 1.2JS^2$  indicating that another phase transition or crossover, related to the out-of-plane spin component, can occur.

\* permanent address: Dep. Física, ICEx, UFMG, Belo Horizonte, MG, 30161, Brazil

\*\* permanent address: Phys. Inst., Univ. Bayreuth, D-8580, Bayreuth, Fed. Rep. Germany

\*\*\* permanent address: Physics Dept., Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA

## I - INTRODUCTION

Classical two dimensional (2D) easy plane (XY) magnetism has attracted a great deal of attention in recent years. As for other low dimensional systems, the interplay between extended fluctuations and large amplitude, localized excitations has been found to be quite rich. Easy plane symmetry in 2D spin systems is particularly appealing because it admits vortex-like spin configurations and the possibility of a topological vortex-antivortex unbinding transition, as proposed by Kosterlitz and Thouless [1973]. Improvements in materials preparation have made available a considerable number of quasi-2D ferro and antiferromagnetic materials and, consequently, the amount of experimental information on spin dynamics has also increased considerably, making possible a comparison with detailed theoretical predictions existing for both the fluctuations and excitations in this model. Many of the materials that have been classified as quasi-2D easy plane include anisotropies that can break the rotational symmetry of the XY plane. José et al. [1977], using a renormalization group technique, have studied the phase diagram of the 2D-planar mode (i.e., spins restricted to the XY-plane) with in-plane symmetry breaking of degree  $p$ . Their conclusion is that the Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) phase is suppressed if  $p < 4$ . We emphasize, however, that a dynamical description of 2D-XY models must include the out-of-plane spin component  $S_z$ . The inclusion of  $S_z$  can lead to additional features beyond by those predicted by José et al. [1977] including anomalies in  $S_z$  correlations (Kawabata and Bishop [1982]).

In this work, we will concentrate on 2D-XY ferromagnets with an external magnetic field applied along one of the in-plane axes. A magnetic field corresponds to a symmetry breaking of degree  $p = 1$ . At low temperatures, the spins are almost completely aligned along the field and a standard spin wave treatment to two spin waves processes can be used (Section II) to explain the main features concerning the dynamical behaviour in this low temperature range. As the temperature is raised, nonlinear excitations such as vortices and domain walls have to be incorporated in the description. In Section III, we study, analytically and numerically, the effects due to the applied field on the shape and dynamics of vortices; formation of

domain walls is also discussed there. Combined Monte Carlo (MC)-Molecular Dynamics (MD) numerical simulation studies covering a wide temperature range are presented in Section IV. A transition is observed at  $T_c \approx 1.0JS^2$  and we discuss separately data obtained at temperatures lower than  $T_c$  (Section IV.A) and above  $T_c$  (Section IV.B). A comparison between our results and some recent inelastic neutron experiments performed on intercalated graphite compounds ( $\text{CoCl}_2$  - GIC) with an in-plane magnetic field is also included in Section IV. The final conclusions are given in Section V.

## II - Spin-Wave Theory

The 2D-XY model in a magnetic field can be described by the classical Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{J}{2} \sum_{m,n} (S_{m,n}^x g_{m,n}^x + S_{m,n}^y g_{m,n}^y) - g\mu_B H \sum_{m,n} S_{m,n}^x \quad (\text{II.1})$$

where the summation is taken over the sites  $(m,n)$  of a 2D-square lattice,  $J$  is the exchange parameter,  $S_{m,n}^\alpha$  are the components of the classical spin vector  $\vec{S}_{m,n} = (S_{m,n}^x, S_{m,n}^y, S_{m,n}^z)$  and

$$g_{m,n}^\alpha = S_{m,n+1}^\alpha + S_{m,n-1}^\alpha + S_{m+1,n}^\alpha + S_{m-1,n}^\alpha \quad (\text{II.2})$$

is the sum over the nearest neighbors of each site  $(m,n)$ .

For the pure XY model (in the absence of a field), it is well known that, besides spin-waves, one should consider vortices as essential excitations leading to a topological phase transition at  $T_c$  [Kosterlitz and Thouless, 1973].

It has been shown [Nelson and Fisher (1977), Côté and Griffin (1986)] that, for temperatures below  $T_c$ , the effect of (bound) vortices can be described as a renormalization of the spin-wave excitations. In the presence of a magnetic field, the possibility of  $2\pi$ -domain walls being formed represents an additional complication. However, the energy of a domain wall is proportional to its length (and, also, to the field strength) and it is not very probable that many domain walls will be created at low temperature. If the applied field is sufficiently strong, and at low temperatures (above the 3D ordering temperature but below  $T_c$ ), we can assume that the spins will be aligned nearly parallel to the field so that a spin-wave theory can be used. In this section, we will ignore both vortices and domain walls, and their interactions with spin-waves, assuming that for this temperature range such effects will result in a renormalization of the spin-wave energy. We will find that the principal features concerning dynamical spin-correlations may be understood within the spin-wave approximation provided that one includes two-spin-waves processes.

We choose  $x$  as the quantization direction and use the Holstein-Primakoff transformation to express the spin operators as boson operators:

$$S_{m,n}^x = S - a_{m,n}^+ a_{m,n} \quad ; \quad S_{m,n}^+ = S_{m,n}^z + i S_{m,n}^y = \sqrt{2S} a_{m,n}^+ .$$

After a straightforward calculation [for details, see e.g. Heilmann et al. (1981)], spin-correlation functions can be obtained in the harmonic approximation context. For the spatial Fourier transform of  $yy$ - and  $zz$ -correlation functions, we obtain

$$\langle S_{\vec{q}}^y(t) S_{-\vec{q}}^y \rangle = \frac{S}{2} (\rho_{\vec{q}}^+ + \rho_{\vec{q}}^-)^2 [n_{\vec{q}} e^{i\omega_{\vec{q}} t} + (n_{\vec{q}} + 1) e^{-i\omega_{\vec{q}} t}] , \quad (\text{II.3a})$$

$$\langle S_{\vec{q}}^z(t) S_{-\vec{q}}^z \rangle = \frac{S}{2} (\rho_{\vec{q}}^+ - \rho_{\vec{q}}^-)^2 [n_{\vec{q}} e^{i\omega_{\vec{q}} t} + (n_{\vec{q}} + 1) e^{-i\omega_{\vec{q}} t}] \quad (\text{II.3b})$$

where  $n_{\vec{q}} = (e^{\hbar\omega_{\vec{q}}/k_B T} - 1)^{-1}$  is the usual boson occupation number,  $\omega_{\vec{q}}$  is the spin-wave energy

$$\omega_{\vec{q}} = JS (4 + h)^{1/2} [4 + h - \cos(q_x) - \cos(q_y)]^{1/2}, \quad (\text{II.4})$$

$h = g\mu_B H/(JS)$  is the reduced magnetic field, and  $\rho_{\vec{q}}^+$ ,  $\rho_{\vec{q}}^-$  are given by

$$\rho_{\vec{q}}^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{4 + h - \cos(q_x) - \cos(q_y)}{\omega_{\vec{q}}/JS} \pm 1 \right]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{II.5})$$

It is easily seen from (II.3), that a sharp one-spin wave peak at  $\omega = \pm \omega_{\vec{q}}$  is expected in  $S^{\alpha\alpha}(\vec{q}, \omega)$ , [ $\alpha = y, z$ ]. We can also compute the integrated intensities  $I^{\alpha}(\vec{q}) = \int d\omega S^{\alpha\alpha}(\vec{q}, \omega)$  and obtain the ratio

$$R(\vec{q}) = \frac{I^y(\vec{q})}{I^z(\vec{q})} = \frac{(\rho_{\vec{q}}^+ + \rho_{\vec{q}}^-)^2}{(\rho_{\vec{q}}^+ - \rho_{\vec{q}}^-)^2} (>1). \quad (\text{II.6})$$

In obtaining (II.6), we took the classical limit of (II.3). We will show in section IV that these predictions for  $S^{\alpha\alpha}(\vec{q}, \omega)$  [ $\alpha = y, z$ ] agree well with our numerical simulation data.

For the  $S^{xx}(\vec{q}, t)$  function we have

$$\langle S_{\vec{q}}^x(t) S_{-\vec{q}}^x \rangle = \delta_{\vec{q}, 0} \langle (S - \langle a_{m,n}^+ a_{m,n} \rangle) \rangle^2 \langle \delta S_{\vec{q}}^x(t) \delta S_{\vec{q}}^x \rangle \quad (\text{II.7})$$

where

$$\langle \delta S_{\vec{q}}^x(t) \delta S_{-\vec{q}}^x \rangle = N^2 \sum_{\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2} \delta_{\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}, 0} \{ (\rho_{\vec{q}_1}^+ \rho_{\vec{q}_2}^+ + \rho_{\vec{q}_1}^- \rho_{\vec{q}_2}^-) \}^2 n_{\vec{q}_1} (1 + n_{\vec{q}_2})^x$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times e^{i(\omega_{\vec{q}_1} - \omega_{\vec{q}_2})t} + \frac{1}{2}(\rho_{\vec{q}_1}^+ \rho_{\vec{q}_2}^- + \rho_{\vec{q}_2}^+ \rho_{\vec{q}_1}^-)^2 \left[ n_{\vec{q}_1} n_{\vec{q}_2} e^{i(\omega_{\vec{q}_1} + \omega_{\vec{q}_2})t} + \right. \\
& \left. + (1 + n_{\vec{q}_1})(1 + n_{\vec{q}_2}) e^{-i(\omega_{\vec{q}_1} + \omega_{\vec{q}_2})t} \right] \quad (II.8)
\end{aligned}$$

is due to the spin fluctuations. The first term in (II.7) gives a Bragg peak while the second term, defined by (II.8), is the contribution due to two-spin wave processes: the first term in (II.8) corresponds to the simultaneous creation and annihilation of spin waves while the second term represents the two-spin wave annihilation ( $n_{\vec{q}_1} n_{\vec{q}_2}$ ) and creation  $[(1 + n_{\vec{q}_1})(1 + n_{\vec{q}_2})]$  processes—we shall focus only on the creation process. Taking the classical limit and the temporal Fourier transform of each term in (II.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
G_D^{xx}(\vec{q}, \omega_D) &= \frac{1}{4\pi N} \sum_{\vec{q}_1} \frac{T^2}{\omega_{\vec{q}_1} \omega_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_2}} (\rho_{\vec{q}_1}^+ \rho_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_1}^+ + \\
& + \rho_{\vec{q}_1}^- \rho_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_1}^-)^2 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{q}_1} (\omega_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_1} - \omega_{\vec{q}_1}) \right|^{-1} \quad (II.9)
\end{aligned}$$

for the first term, and

$$\begin{aligned}
G_S^{xx}(\vec{q}, \omega_S) &= \frac{1}{4\pi N} \sum_{\vec{q}_2} \frac{T^2}{\omega_{\vec{q}_2} \omega_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_2}} (\rho_{\vec{q}_2}^+ \rho_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_2}^- + \\
& + \rho_{\vec{q}_2}^- \rho_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_2}^+)^2 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{q}_2} (\omega_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_2} + \omega_{\vec{q}_2}) \right|^{-1} \quad (II.10)
\end{aligned}$$

for the two-spin wave creation where  $\vec{q}_1$  and  $\vec{q}_2$  are restricted by the conditions

$$\omega_D = \omega_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_1} - \omega_{\vec{q}_1}, \quad \omega_S = \omega_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}_2} + \omega_{\vec{q}_2} \quad (II.11)$$

The D and S subscripts stand for difference and sum processes as suggested by (II.11). We can expect a very complicated spectrum because there is a singularity in  $G_{\alpha}^{XX}(\vec{q}, \omega_{\alpha})$  ( $\alpha = D, S$ ) for each critical point of  $\omega_{\vec{q} + \vec{q}'} \pm \omega_{\vec{q}'}$  as a function of  $\vec{q}'$ . In order to obtain some information about the spectrum, we consider small values for the wavevector  $\vec{q}$  so that an expansion can be made: and we obtain, approximately,

$$\omega_D \approx \omega_{\vec{q}_1} \frac{q \sin q_{1x}}{4 + h - 2[\cos q_{1x} + \cos q_{1y}]}, \quad (II.12)$$

$$\omega_S = \omega_{\vec{q}_2} \left[ 2 + \frac{q \sin q_{2x}}{4 + h - 2(\cos q_{2x} + \cos q_{2y})} \right]. \quad (II.13)$$

(In order to obtain (II.12) and (II.13), we restricted the  $\vec{q}$  vector to lie along the x-axis). Even with all these approximations, it is not an easy task to perform the sums indicated in (II.9) and (II.10) but for  $\vec{q} = 0$  we can say that the difference and sum peaks will occur at  $\omega_D = 0$  and  $\omega_S = 2JS[h^2 + 6h + 4]^{1/2}$ ; for  $\vec{q} \neq 0$ , we expect these frequency peaks to change (approximately) linearly with  $|\vec{q}|$ . These predictions will be checked by the numerical simulation data (Section IV).

### III - Vortices in a Magnetic Field

The spin vector  $\vec{S}$  can be described by two continuously varying fields,  $\theta(\vec{r}, t)$  and  $\phi(\vec{r}, t)$ , as

$$\vec{S}(\vec{r}, t) = S\{\cos \theta(\vec{r}, t) \cos \phi(\vec{r}, t), \cos \theta(\vec{r}, t) \sin \phi(\vec{r}, t), \sin \theta(\vec{r}, t)\} \quad (III.1)$$

and, then, the continuum equations of motion corresponding to Hamiltonian (II.1) can be obtained. A general solution to these equations of motion is not available. A nontrivial static ( $\theta = 0$ ) solution can be obtained by solving the sine-Gordon equation

$$\nabla^2 \phi = h \sin \phi. \quad (\text{III.2})$$

In the absence of field, this equation gives the well known planar vortices of the XY model

$$\theta_0 = 0, \quad \phi_0 = \phi + c \quad (h = 0) \quad (\text{III.3})$$

where  $\phi$  is a polar coordinate, and  $c$  is an arbitrary constant. An analytic solution to (III.2), for  $h \neq 0$ , was given by Hudák [1982] but it corresponds to a vortex with vorticity 4 which is not expected to play an important role in dynamics [Amit et al. (1980)]. In order to study the modifications to the static vortex shape [specified by (III.3)] due to a weak applied field, we will adopt an approximate perturbative treatment inserting

$$\phi = \phi_0 + \phi_1, \quad \theta = \theta_0 + \theta_1 \quad (\text{III.4})$$

and

$$\dot{\phi} = -\vec{v} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \phi, \quad \dot{\theta} = -\vec{v} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \theta \quad (\text{III.5})$$

into the equations of motion. Here,  $\phi_0$  and  $\theta_0$  are given by (III.3) and  $\vec{v}$  is the vortex velocity.



This procedure is straightforward and was previously used by us [Gouvêa et al. (1989a)] to study the distortion suffered by a vortex due to the movement induced by interactions with other vortices in the system. After linearizing in  $\theta_1$ ,  $\phi_1$  and  $v$ , we obtain

$$\theta_1 = \frac{v}{4JS} \frac{\sin(\phi - \alpha)}{r} \quad (r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (\text{III.6a})$$

where  $\alpha$  is the angle between  $\vec{v}$  and the x-axis, and

$$\phi_1 = -\frac{hr^2}{3} \sin(\phi + c) \quad (\text{III.6b})$$

where  $h$  is considered as a small parameter (in our numerical simulations, Section IV, we used  $h = 0.05$ ). The asymptotic solution for  $\theta_1$ , eq. (III.6a) is asymmetric about  $\vec{v}$  — the out-of-plane component has different signs on each side of the line along which the vortex moves. This result is identical to the one found for 2D-XY systems [Gouvêa et al. (1989a)]. The deformation of the in-plane field,  $\phi_1$ , forces the spins into the direction of the magnetic field, i.e., the effect of the magnetic field is to create a region (domain) where all spins lie along the  $+x$  direction; as the size of this region increases, the vortex is pushed to one of the system's boundaries. It should be noted that  $\phi_1$  and, also, the direction of motion depend on the constant  $c$ . In the pure XY-model, this constant has no role and is often ignored. However, when a certain in-plane magnetic field is applied, the value of  $c$  directly influences the static force  $\vec{F}_H$  due to interactions with the field and, consequently, the direction of motion  $\alpha$ . These conclusions can also be drawn from Huber's [1982] expression for  $\vec{F}_H$ .

At low temperature, we are concerned with vortex-antivortex pairs [Kosterlitz and Thouless (1973)]. In the absence of a field, the energy of a pair does not depend on the value of the constant  $c$  (III.3) of each one of the pair's components. A field breaks the rotational symmetry of the XY-plane and then different pairs (corresponding to different  $c$ 's) will have

different energies; one can easily estimate which combinations correspond to low or high energy simply by trying to put together different vortices and antivortices (neglecting any distortions) and by counting the number of spins (in fact, spin components) aligned parallel or antiparallel to the field. The interesting conclusion is that the configurations that lead to minimal energy have lower energy for  $h \neq 0$  than for  $h = 0$ . This means that these energetically favoured pairs will be more tightly bound and will require more energy to unbind.

Consequently, we can expect that, for  $h \neq 0$ , vortex-antivortex pairs will unbind at a temperature higher than  $T_{KT}$  ( $\approx 0.8JS^2$ ).

In order to check the approximate analytical results given by (III.6) and to get information on how the discreteness of the lattice affects the vortex motion, simulation studies were performed on a  $40 \times 40$  square lattice. The discrete equations of motion used in the numerical simulations are

$$\dot{\vec{S}}_i = \vec{S}_i \times \vec{F}_i - \epsilon \vec{S}_i \times (\vec{S}_i \times \vec{F}_i), \quad (\text{III.7})$$

$$\vec{F}_i = J \sum_j [(S_j^x + h) \vec{e}_x + S_j^y \vec{e}_y + S_j^z \vec{e}_z]. \quad (\text{III.8})$$

The sum on  $j$  only runs over the nearest neighbors of  $i$ . The parameter  $\epsilon$  is the strength of a Landau-Gilbert damping, which was included to damp out spin waves generated from non-ideal initial conditions. A single planar ( $\theta = 0$ ) vortex (with  $c = -\pi/2$ ) centered in a unit cell of the lattice was used as the initial condition. The equations for the xyz-spin components were integrated using a fourth order Runge-Kutta scheme with time step 0.04 (in time units  $h/JS$ ). Neumann boundary conditions and a damping strength  $\epsilon = 0.1$  were used.

Figures [1(a,b)] show the instantaneous configuration at times  $t = 6.0$  and 15.0. From figure (1a) we see that the vortex moves along the  $-y$  direction with the out-of-plane spin components having different signs

(white and black arrows) on each side of the  $y$  axis. It can also be seen that the distortion of the in-plane spin component agrees, qualitatively, with (III.6b). Figure (1b), at a later time, shows a large domain with all spins aligned along the field; the vortex is being pushed to the opposite boundary as this domain increases. The single vortex, which, initially ( $t = 0$ ), extended itself through the whole system, is now restricted to a much smaller region. The structure seen in figure (1b) can be described as a vortex whose radius corresponds to a few lattice constants ( $\sim 4a$ ) bound to a  $2\pi$ -domain wall. This  $2\pi$ -domain wall consists of two  $\pi$ -domain walls separated by (approximately) the vortex diameter, and its length  $L$  is the distance that separates the vortex from the boundary to which it is moving. The energy of a domain wall increases linearly with  $L$ , and in an infinitely extended system, the energy of the structure shown in figure (1b) would diverge as  $L \rightarrow \infty$  so that we should not expect to find these structures at low temperatures. However, vortex-antivortex pairs bound by domain walls have finite energy and can be nucleated giving rise to a linear interaction potential between vortices.

Entropy arguments [Lee and Grinstein (1985), Einhorn et al (1980), Tang and Mahanti (1986)] can be used to determine the phase diagram. Basically, we should concentrate on two characteristic temperatures  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ . The free energy related to domain walls involves a competition between two terms with the same functional dependence since both the energy and the entropy of a domain wall depend linearly on  $L$ .  $T_1$  corresponds to the temperature at which these terms give the same contribution; for  $T \geq T_1$ , the walls connecting vortex-antivortex pairs become flexible (i.e., transverse fluctuations become soft). Similar arguments [Kosterlitz and Thouless (1973)] lead to the identification of  $T_2$  as the temperature at which vortex-antivortex pairs unbind. Then, if  $T_1 < T_2$ , we can expect two transitions. For  $T_1 < T < T_2$ , the interaction potential between vortices recovers its logarithmic dependence on  $L$  (as for the 2D-XY model) and we have a KT phase; the second transition, at  $T = T_2$ , will correspond to the KT transition. If  $T_1 \geq T_2$  we will have just one transition and both phenomena, walls becoming flexible and vortex-antivortex unbinding, will occur for  $T \geq T_1$ . For the XY-model with symmetry breaking  $p = 1$

(corresponding to an in-plane magnetic field), the work of José et al. [1987] predicts a single crossover temperature ( $T_1=T_2$ ): in a magnetic field there is no standard phase transition. However, those theoretical results were obtained for the planar-model and could be modified when out-of-plane spin components are included — for instance, an additional anomaly has been noted in the specific heat [Tobochnik and Chester (1979)] and static correlation of  $S_z$  [Kawabata and Bishop (1982)].

#### IV - Numerical Simulation and Analysis

A combined Monte-Carlo (MC)-Molecular Dynamics (MD) method [Kawabata et al (1986)] was used to determine the dynamic structure functions  $S(\vec{q}, \omega)$ . The simulations were performed on a 100 X 100 square lattice for model (II.1), with periodic boundary conditions. First, an MC algorithm of  $10^4$  steps was used to produce three equilibrium configurations at a desired temperature. These configurations are then used as initial conditions for an energy-conserving MD simulation of the equations of motion. The time integration was performed with a standard fourth order Runge-Kutta method, with a fixed time step of  $0.04 (JS)^{-1}$ . The dynamic structure function  $S_{\alpha\alpha}(\vec{q}, \omega)$  ( $\alpha = x, y, z$ ) was then determined from the Fourier transform of the space-and time-correlation functions,  $\langle S_{\alpha}(0,0) S_{\alpha}(\vec{r}, t) \rangle$ . The structure functions resulting from the three initial conditions for a given temperature were then averaged. A smoothing algorithm on  $S(\vec{q}, \omega)$ , as in Mertens et al. [1987], was also employed to reduce the effects of a finite time series and statistical fluctuations.

Simulations were performed for a magnetic field corresponding to  $h = 0.05$  and for temperatures in the range  $0.7JS^2 \leq T \leq 1.3 JS^2$  (in intervals  $\Delta T = 0.1JS^2$ ). For simplicity, we will discuss separately two sets of data: A) low-temperature data ( $0.7JS^2 \leq T \leq 0.9JS^2$ ), and B) high-temperature data ( $1.0JS^2 \leq T \leq 1.3JS^2$ ).

#### A - Low Temperature Data

Here, the yy- and zz-correlation functions show a simple structure

(figure 2) consisting of a well defined finite frequency peak at  $\omega_{\vec{q}}$  which softens (i.e.,  $\omega_{\vec{q}} \rightarrow 0$ ) and becomes broader as  $T$  increases. This peak can be identified as the one-spin wave peak predicted in (II.3a) and (II.3b). Figure [3] shows the spin wave dispersion obtained from our simulation data at  $T = 0.7JS^2$ ; it compares reasonably well to theory (continuous curve) especially since renormalization effects due to temperature are not included in (II.4). Evaluating (II.6) at  $\vec{q} = 0$  for  $h = 0.05$ , we obtain  $R(\vec{q} = 0) \approx 78$ . This number corresponds to a calculation made at  $T = 0$  and shows that  $I_y(0) \gg I_z(0)$ ; the difference between  $y$  and  $z$  intensities decreases as  $\vec{q}$  increases. Using the simulation data, we can estimate  $R(\vec{q} = 0)$  at different temperatures obtaining  $R(\vec{q} = 0) \approx 51, 44,$  and  $32$  for  $T = 0.7JS^2, 0.8JS^2,$  and  $0.9JS^2$ , respectively. The value obtained for  $T = 0.7JS^2$  is comparable to the calculated one ( $T = 0$ ). The decreasing of  $R(\vec{q})$  as  $T$  increases is mainly due to the decreasing of  $I_y(\vec{q})$ , since  $I_z(\vec{q})$  remains roughly constant.

The Bragg peak predicted in (II.7) is clearly seen in  $S_{xx}(\vec{q} = 0, \omega)$ . For small  $\vec{q}$ ,  $S_{xx}(\vec{q}, \omega)$  exhibits a central peak and two finite frequency peaks [figure 4] that can be interpreted as due to the sum and difference processes discussed in Section II. Equation (II.11) assures that, for  $\vec{q} \neq 0$ , the central peak (discussed below) cannot be produced by difference processes. Figure [5] displays the data obtained for the frequencies of spin wave difference-(lower data) and sum-(upper data) peaks at  $T = 0.7JS^2$ ; they fit reasonably well to straight lines, as predicted by (II.12) and (II.13). Notice that the straight lines shown in figure [5] extrapolate to the expected point at  $\vec{q} = 0$ , namely,  $\omega_D(\vec{q} = 0) = 0$ , and  $\omega_S(\vec{q} = 0) \approx 0.72JS$  (from figure 3 we obtain a gap of  $0.36JS$  at  $T = 0.7JS^2$ ).

It is tempting to suppose that the central peak observed in  $S_{xx}(\vec{q}, \omega)$  (for small  $\vec{q}$ ) is related to the presence of domain walls (Section III). Simulation studies performed for 2D-XY models with a 4-fold in-plane symmetry breaking (implying  $\pi/2$  domain walls) also show a central peak at low temperatures [Gouvêa et al. (1989b)] and, indeed, scattering from domain walls can be established as a mechanism to produce central peaks. Unfortunately, an analysis of our simulation data — focusing on the central peak behaviour

