Comment on "Scaling Hypothesis for the Spectral Densities in the O(3) Nonlinear Sigma Model"

In a recent paper [1], we reported the results of a Monte Carlo study which show that for p/m < 100 the continuum limit of the lattice O(3) σ model agrees as well with the *S*-matrix prediction [2] as with the continuum limit of the dodecahedron spin model. In the latter model the massive high temperature phase must terminate at some finite inverse temperature β . It is well known that asymptotic freedom requires the current two-point function to diverge for $p/m \rightarrow \infty$ [3]. However, in another recent paper, we proved that the current two-point function is bounded at finite β , due to reflection positivity and a Ward identity.

Consequently, unless the observed agreement between the O(3) and dodecahedron spin model is accidental and disappears at larger values of p/m, the Balog and Niedermaier scaling hypothesis [4] for the spectral densities in the O(3) nonlinear σ model, predicting a logarithmic increase of the current two-point function with p/m, cannot be correct. Moreover, since the spin two-point function should behave as $(p/m)^{\eta-2}$ for large p/m, the behavior of the odd- and even-particle number spectral densities $\rho^{(n)}(\mu)$ must be quite different.

This different behavior is shown both by our Monte Carlo data and by the Balog-Niedermaier prediction itself,



FIG. 1. Monte Carlo data and the Balog-Niedermaier prediction (solid line) for the spin two-point function.



FIG. 2. Monte Carlo data and the Balog-Niedermaier prediction (solid line) for the current two-point function.

if one looks at it on a logarithmic scale (see Figs. 1 and 2): While for the odd case (spin) the data start growing faster than logarithmically, they grow more slowly than $\ln(p/m)$ for the even case (current). This behavior gives support to our scenario of a powerlike increase in the odd and boundedness in the even sector. Incidentally, for the odd case, the logarithmic slope of the *S*-matrix result [2] at p/m = 100 is already 0.143 and growing; this is larger than the prediction $4/3\pi^2$ in [2] (the long version of their Letter [4]) for the asymptotic slope.

Adrian Patrascioiu

Physics Department, University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona 85721

Erhard Seiler

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 Munich, Germany

Received 1 July 1997 [S0031-9007(97)05058-8] PACS numbers: 11.10.Jj, 11.10.Kk, 11.10.Lm, 11.15.Ha

- [1] A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, hep-lat/9706011.
- [2] J. Balog and M. Niedermaier, Nucl. Phys. **B500**, 421 (1997).
- [3] J. Balog, Phys. Lett. B 300, 145 (1993).
- [4] J. Balog and M. Niedermaier, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 4151 (1997).