I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Critical exponents for the $O(n)$ model have been calculated for many years, using high-temperature series expansions [1–7], an expansion\(^1\) in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ [8–19], field theory in dimension $d = 3$ [20–22], Monte Carlo simulations [23–27], exact results in dimension $d = 2$ [28–31], or the conformal bootstrap [32–35]. Most of these methods rely on some resummation procedure [10,36,37]. The main exponents are the decay of the 2-point function at $T_c$, 
\[
\langle \phi(x)\phi(0)\rangle \sim |x|^{2-d-\eta},
\]
and the divergence of the correlation length $\xi$ as a function of $T - T_c$,
\[
\xi \sim |T - T_c|^{-\nu}.
\]
Other exponents are related to these [11], as the divergence of the specific heat
\[
c \sim |T - T_c|^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 2 - \nu d,
\]
the magnetization $M$ below $T_c$,
\[
M \sim (T_c - T)^{\beta}, \quad \beta = \frac{v}{2}(d - 2 + \eta),
\]
the susceptibility $\chi$,
\[
\chi \sim |T - T_c|^{-\gamma}, \quad \gamma = v(2 - \eta),
\]
and the magnetization at $T_c$ in presence of a magnetic field $h$,
\[
M \sim h^{1/\delta}, \quad \delta = \frac{d + 2 - \eta}{d - 2 + \eta}.
\]

\(^1\)In this paper we use $d = 4 - \epsilon$, which is more common for statistical physics, while the original 6-loop calculations [8–10] were performed in space dimension $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$, which is used in high-energy physics.

The renormalization-group treatment starts from the $\phi^4$ theory with $O(n)$ symmetry,
\[
S = \int_\mathbb{R} m_0^2 \phi_0^2(x) + \frac{1}{2}[\nabla \phi_0(x)]^2 + g_0 \frac{4\pi^2}{4!} [\phi_0(x)]^2.
\]
where $\phi_0(x) \in \mathbb{R}$. The index 0 indicates bare quantities. The renormalized action is
\[
S = \int_\mathbb{R} Z_1 m_1^2 \phi(x)^2 + Z_2 \frac{1}{2} [\nabla \phi(x)]^2 + Z_3 \frac{16\pi^2}{4!} g \mu^4 [\phi(x)]^2.
\]
The relation between bare and renormalized quantities reads
\[
\phi_0(x) = \sqrt{Z_2} \phi(x) =: Z_\phi \phi(x),
\]
\[
m_0^2 = \frac{Z_1}{Z_2} m^2 =: Z_m m^2,
\]
\[
g_0 = \frac{Z_4}{Z_2} g \mu^4 =: Z_g g \mu^4.
\]
Using perturbation theory in $g_0$, counterterms are identified to render the theory UV finite. In dimensional regularization and minimal subtraction [38], the $Z$ factors only depend on $g$ and $\epsilon$ and admit a Laurent series expansion of the form
\[
Z_i = Z_i(g, \epsilon) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{Z_{i,k}(g)}{\epsilon^k}.
\]
Each $Z_{i,k}(g)$ is a power series in the coupling $g$, starting at order $g^2$ or higher.

Three renormalization group (RG) functions can be constructed of the three $Z$ factors. The $\beta$-function, quantifying the flow of the coupling constant, reads
\[
\beta(g) := \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu}_{g_0} = \frac{-\epsilon g}{1 + g \frac{\beta \ln Z_3}{\beta g}}.
\]
The RG functions associated to the anomalous dimensions are defined as
\[ γ_1(g) := μ \frac{∂}{∂μ} \ln(Z_ε) = β(g) \frac{∂}{∂g} \ln[Z_ε(g)]. \] (14)

To leading order, the expansion of the β function is
\[ β(g) = -εg + \frac{n + 8}{3} g^2 + O(g^3). \] (15)

Thus, at least for ε small, there is a fixed point with β(αg) = 0 at
\[ g_ε = \frac{3ε}{n + 8} + O(ε^2). \] (16)

It is infrared (IR) attractive and thus governs the properties of the system at large scales. This is formally deduced from the correction-to-scaling exponent \( ω \), defined as
\[ ω := β'(g_ε) = ε + O(ε^2). \] (17)

The exponents \( ν \) and \( η \) are obtained from the remaining RG functions,
\[ ν^{-1} = 2 + γ_m(g_ε) = 2 + γ_1(g_ε) - η. \] (19)

Since \( g_ε = O(ε) \), the perturbative expansion in ε is turned into a perturbative expansion in ε. While the exponents \( ν \) and \( η \) are well defined in the critical theory, it is not clear whether \( ω \) can be obtained from the critical theory as well.

A different class of exponents concerns geometrical objects as the fractal dimension of lines. An example is the self-avoiding polymer, also known as self-avoiding walk (SAW), whose radius of gyration \( R_g \) scales with its microscopic length \( ℓ \) as
\[ R_g^{\text{SAW}} \sim ℓ^ν. \] (20)

Its fractal dimension is
\[ d_1^{\text{SAW}} = \frac{1}{ν}. \] (21)

In general, however, \( ν \) does not yield the scaling of critical curves but of the ensemble of all loops. This can be seen for the loop-erased random walk depicted in Fig. 1. It is constructed by following a random walk at time \( t \) for all \( t \leq T \). Whenever the walk comes back to a site it already visited, the ensuing loop is erased [39]. The remaining simple curve (blue on Fig. 1) is the loop-erased random walk (LERW). The trace of the underlying random walk (RW) is depicted in red (for the erased parts) and blue (for the nonerased part). Its fractal dimension is (see, e.g., Ref. [40] Theorem 8.23)
\[ d_1^{\text{RW}} = 2 \] (22) in all dimensions \( d \geq 2 \), and its radius of gyration scales as
\[ R_g^{\text{RW}} \sim T^v, \quad v = \frac{1}{2}. \] (23)

The same scaling holds (by construction) for LERWs,
\[ R_g^{\text{LERW}} \sim T^v, \quad v = \frac{1}{2}. \] (24)

but this does not tell us anything about its fractal dimension, i.e., the blue curve, which in \( d = 2 \) is [41]
\[ d_1^{\text{LERW}} = \frac{5}{4}. \] (25)

The latter appears in the scaling of the radius of gyration with the backbone length, i.e.,
\[ R_g^{\text{LERW}} \sim ℓ^{1/d_1}, \] (26)

or can be extracted by measuring the backbone length \( ℓ \) as a function of time,
\[ ℓ \sim T^φ, \quad φ = νd_1. \] (27)

While the function \( γ_m \) gives us the RG flow of the operator
\[ E(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} φ_i^2(x), \] (28)

there is a second \( O(n) \)-invariant operator bilinear in \( φ \), namely the traceless tensor operator
\[ E_{ij}(x) := φ_i(x)φ_j(x) − δ_{ij}E(x). \] (29)

By construction
\[ ∑_i E_{ii}(x) = 0. \] (30)

Now consider the insertion of operators \( E \) and \( E \) into an expectation value. More specifically, insert (we choose normalizations convenient for the calculations)
\[ E := \frac{1}{2} ∫_y ∑_i φ_i^2(y) \] (31)
into a diagram in perturbation theory of the form

\[
\left\langle \phi_1(x)\phi_1(z) \int_y \frac{1}{2} \phi_1^2(y) e^{-S} \right\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int_y \frac{1}{2} \phi_1^2(y) e^{-S} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_1} \right)^n \phi_1(z) \phi_1(x)
\]

All contributions up to 1-loop order are drawn: On the first line is the free-theory contribution. The insertion of \( \int_y \frac{1}{2} \phi_1^2(y) \) gives the length (in time) of the free propagator. On the second line are the first type of 1-loop contributions, with the insertion of \( \int_y \frac{1}{2} \phi_1^2(y) \) twice in an outer line, once in a loop. On the third and fourth line are the remaining 1-loop contributions, with the red loop counting a factor of \( n \). This stems from our graphical convention to note the \( (\phi^2 \gamma) \) vertex as

\[
(\phi^2)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \right\rangle
\]

contracting the two rightmost lines leads to a free summation \( \sum_n \), i.e., a factor of \( n \) indicated in red above.

These perturbative corrections are in one-to-one correspondence to diagrams in the high-temperature lattice expansion, where in appropriate units \( g \) is set to 1. Both expansions yield the total length of all lines, be it propagator or loop.

As the insertion of \( \int_y \frac{1}{2} \phi_1^2(y) \) can be generated by deriving the action (7) with respect to the mass, the fractal dimension of all lines is related to \( v \) as in Eq.

\[
\lambda = 2 + \gamma(\nu) - \eta.
\]

We are now in a position to evaluate the fractal dimension of the blue line, also termed the propagator line or backbone, i.e., excluding loops: This is achieved by inserting an operator proportional to \( \delta_{ij} \). To be specific, we consider the insertion of

\[
\delta := \frac{1}{2} \int_y \phi_1^2(y) - \phi_2^2(y).
\]

This is, with a normalization convenient for our calculations, the integrated form of \( \delta_{11} - \delta_{22} \) defined in Eq.

\[
\phi_+(n) := \nu d_i = \frac{d_\nu}{d_\mu} = 2 + \gamma(\nu) - \eta.
\]

The explicit result to 6-loop order is given below in Eq.

\[
\delta S = \lambda \int_y \phi_1^2 - \phi_0^2.
\]

where \( \phi_0 \) denotes the \( i \)th component of the bare field \( \phi \). As a result, the fractal dimension of the propagator (or backbone) line is given by

\[
d_\nu = 2 + \gamma(\nu) - \eta.
\]

The last relation, which is stronger than \( d_\nu > d_i \), is expected since the derivative with respect to \( n \) counts loops which are added to the fractal when increasing \( n \), which should be positive.

Let us now turn to a comparison of the fractal dimension given by Eq.

\[
\phi_+(0) = 1, \quad \phi_+(n) > 0.
\]

The last relation, which is stronger than \( d_\nu > d_i \), is expected since the derivative with respect to \( n \) counts loops which are added to the fractal when increasing \( n \), which should be positive.
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\]

The last relation, which is stronger than \( d_\nu > d_i \), is expected since the derivative with respect to \( n \) counts loops which are added to the fractal when increasing \( n \), which should be positive.

Let us now turn to a comparison of the fractal dimension given by Eq.

\[
\phi_+(0) = 1, \quad \phi_+(n) > 0.
\]

The last relation, which is stronger than \( d_\nu > d_i \), is expected since the derivative with respect to \( n \) counts loops which are added to the fractal when increasing \( n \), which should be positive.
In Sec. II we give the explicit result for the new RG function \( \gamma_\varepsilon \). The table compares our values to results from the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( d_i )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>KP17</th>
<th>simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LERW</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1.6243(10)</td>
<td>1.623(6)</td>
<td>1.62400(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7027(10)</td>
<td>1.7025(7)</td>
<td>1.701847(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7353(10)</td>
<td>1.7352(6)</td>
<td>1.7349(65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7644(10)</td>
<td>1.7642(3)</td>
<td>1.7655(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 2. Fractal dimensions of lines in dimension \( d = 3 \). Two expansions are shown: Direct (in red) and expansion for \( 1/d_i \) (blue). The table compares our values to results from the literature.

(ii) self-avoiding polymers: \( n = 0 \). Here \( d_i \equiv 1/v \).

(iii) Ising model: \( n = 1 \).

(iv) \( XY \) model: \( n = 2 \).

Simulations for the Ising and \( XY \) models are performed on the lattice [49,50] by considering the high-temperature expansion, which allows the authors to distinguish between propagator lines and loops, similarly to our discussion of the perturbative expansion (32).

In all cases, the agreement of our RG results with simulations in \( d = 3 \) is excellent, firmly establishing that the appropriate operator was identified. In dimension \( d = 2 \) (shown on Fig. 3), different resummation procedures (see below) yield different results, showing that extrapolations down to \( d = 2 \) are difficult. This can be understood from the nonanalytic behavior of the exact result close to \( n = \pm 2 \). It is even more pronounced for the exponent \( v \) (see Fig. 11), which diverges with a square-root singularity at \( n = 2 \). We will come back to this issue in Sec. VI.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows: In Sec. II we give the explicit result for the new RG function \( \gamma_\varepsilon \).

Section III introduces a self-consistent resummation procedure as a (fast) alternative to the elaborate scheme of Ref. [10]. In the next two sections we discuss in more detail the dimension of curves and their relation to the crossover exponent (Sec. IV) and loop-erased random walks (Sec. V). Section VI tests the \( \varepsilon \) expansion against analytic results in dimension \( d = 2 \), allowing us to identify the most suitable variables for the resummation procedure. This allows us to give in Sec. VII improved predictions for all relevant exponents in dimension \( d = 3 \). Section VIII makes the connection to known results from the large-\( n \) expansion, which serves as a nontrivial test of our results. We conclude in Sec. IX.

### II. THE RG FUNCTION \( \gamma_\varepsilon \)

The RG function \( \gamma_\varepsilon \) to 6-loop order, evaluated at the fixed point, reads (with \( d = 4 - \varepsilon \))

\[
\gamma_\varepsilon = -\frac{2\varepsilon}{n+8} + \varepsilon^2 \left[ \frac{\eta^2 - 4 \eta - 36}{(n+8)^3} \right] + \varepsilon^3 \left[ \frac{24(5n + 22)\zeta_3}{(n+8)^4} + \frac{n^4 + 45n^3 + 190n^2 - 144n - 1568}{2(n+8)^5} \right] \\
+ \varepsilon^4 \left[ -\frac{80(2n^2 + 55n + 186)\zeta_5}{(n+8)^5} + \frac{18(5n + 22)\zeta_4}{(n+8)^4} - \frac{(n^5 + 16n^4 + 808n^3 + 3624n^2 - 6240n - 30528)\zeta_5}{2(n+8)^6} \right] \\
+ \varepsilon^5 \left[ \frac{882(14n^2 + 189n + 526)\zeta_7}{(n+8)^6} - \frac{100(2n^2 + 55n + 186)\zeta_6}{(n+8)^5} - \frac{4(5n^4 + 6n^3 + 3444n^2 + 26824n + 46752)\zeta_3^2}{(n+8)^7} \right]
\]
Ref. [10] and denoted KP17. We also propose a different approach, using a self-consistent (SC) resummation: Consider an exponent or observable $\kappa(\epsilon)$, with series expansion

$$\kappa(\epsilon) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n \epsilon^n. \quad (43)$$

Suppose that $b_n$ has the asymptotic form

$$b_n = c_0 a^n n! n^\alpha. \quad (44)$$

Then

$$r_n := \frac{b_n}{b_{n-1}} \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{n}{n-1} \right)^\alpha = a + \delta a(n). \quad (45)$$

### III. A SELF-CONSISTENT RESUMMATION PROCEDURE

There are many resummation procedures [22,51]; we show results based on the Borel resummation method proposed in Ref. [10] and denoted KP17. We also propose a different approach, using a self-consistent (SC) resummation: Consider an exponent or observable $\kappa(\epsilon)$, with series expansion

$$\kappa(\epsilon) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n \epsilon^n. \quad (43)$$

Suppose that $b_n$ has the asymptotic form

$$b_n = c_0 a^n n! n^\alpha. \quad (44)$$

Then

$$r_n := \frac{b_n}{b_{n-1}} \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{n}{n-1} \right)^\alpha = a + \delta a(n). \quad (45)$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$\gamma_2(\epsilon)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-2$</td>
<td>$-0.3333333 - 0.111111i + 0.211568e + 2.43354e - 11.7939e + O(\epsilon^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>$-0.285714 - 0.090379e + 0.166245e - 0.416899e + 1.50701e - 6.60415e + O(\epsilon^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$-0.25e - 0.0703125e + 0.131027e - 0.29588e + 0.982638e - 3.94648e + O(\epsilon^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$-0.222222e - 0.0534979e + 0.106224e - 0.218192e + 0.673348e - 2.50444e + O(\epsilon^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$-0.2e - 0.04e + 0.08718e - 0.165781e + 0.481055e - 1.67071e + O(\epsilon^7)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further suppose that, with $c > 0$,

$$\delta a(n) = b e^{-cn}. \quad (46)$$

This ansatz can be used to fit the last three elements of the table of $r_i$ (at 6-loop order this is $r_2, \ldots, r_6$) to the three parameters $a$, $b$, and $c$. The value of $a$ is our best estimate for the inverse of the branch-cut location in the inverse Borel transform. Having established a fit allows us to estimate the ratios $r_i$ with $i$ larger than the order to which we calculated. It in turn fixes $b_n$ to the same order, in practice up to order 28...40 using double precision and depending on the series. An example studying the fractal dimension of LERWs is given in Figs. 4 and 5 for $\alpha = 0$. In general, the fit (46) is possible only for a certain range of $\alpha$. The fit fails if the three chosen ratios $r_n$ are not monotone, as the exponential function then grows. As a consequence, in this case the SC scheme makes no prediction, and we leave the corresponding table entries empty. Different fitting forms could be proposed and tested, e.g., to account for such a nonmonotone behavior. We restricted our tests to an algebraic decay, but no benefit could be extracted from the latter. We believe that the advantage of the ansatz (45) is its fast convergence, which is lost for an ansatz with algebraic decay.

We can still use our freedom to choose $a$, which also leads to different values of the exponential decay $c$ given in Fig. 6. Our approach is to try with all values of $a$ for which a fit of the form (46) is feasible. The result is shown on Fig. 7: Apart from error bars of the procedure, we obtain the midrange and the mean of all obtained exponents as the centered and best estimates. Note that when the allowed range of $\alpha$ is small, the estimated error bars are also small, since the estimate varies continuously with $\alpha$. Thus a small error bar may indicate a robust series and indeed a small error or a series which is delicate to resum. As a consequence, error bars of this method have to be taken with a grain of salt. The method of KP17 [10] does not suffer from this artifact.

**IV. DIMENSION OF CURVES AND CROSSOVER EXponent**

Following the classic book by Amit [11] (for more references see Refs. [45,47,52]), the crossover exponent arises for the following question: Consider the anisotropic $O(n)$ model, where the first $k < n$ components have a mass $m_1^2$ and the remaining $n - k$ components have a mass $m_2^2$ (we suppressed the index 0 for the bare objects for convenience of notation),

$$S = \int k \frac{m_1^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \phi_i(x)^2 + \frac{m_2^2}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \phi_i(x)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \tilde{\phi}(x))^2 + \frac{16\pi^2}{4!} g(\tilde{\phi}(x))^2. \quad (47)$$

This form arises in mean-field theory, when coarse graining an $n$-component model with anisotropy. Consider $m_1^2 < m_2^2$, i.e., $\lambda := m_2^2 - m_1^2 > 0$. The corresponding phase diagram is shown in Fig. 8. When lowering the temperature, the $k$ first modes will become massless before the remaining ones, and one arrives at an effective $O(k)$ model. In the opposite case, $m_1^2 > m_2^2$, the remaining $n - k$ modes become massless first, resulting in a critical $O(n - k)$ model, while for $m_1^2 = m_2^2$ all modes becomes massless at the same temperature.
FIG. 7. (a) In blue the fractal dimension $d_f$ of LERWs as a function of $\alpha$. The latter yields bounds for $d_f$, i.e., $d_f \approx [1.62378, 1.6254]$, and as a best estimate the mean of the obtained values, $d_f \approx 1.62426$ (blue dashed line). The numerical result is $d_f = 1.62400 \pm 0.00005$ (orange with error bars in dashes) [48]. (b) Same for $d = 2$. We find $d_f \approx [1.238, 1.259]$, with a mean estimate $d_f \approx 1.244$, to be compared to the exact result $d_f = 5/4$. Using only the 5-loop series gives $d_f (d = 3) \approx 1.621$ and $d_f (d = 2) = 1.11$.

Let us rewrite the quadratic (derivative free) terms in Eq. (47) as

$$S_{m^2} = \frac{m^2}{2} \tilde{\phi}(x)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \tilde{\mathcal{E}},$$

(48)

where

$$m^2 := \frac{km^2_1 + (n-k)m^2_2}{n},$$

(49)

$$\lambda := m^2_2 - m^2_1,$$

(50)

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{n} \left[ (n-k) \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i(x)^2 - k \sum_{i=k+1}^n \phi_i(x)^2 \right].$$

(51)

Further denote the distance to the critical point by

$$t := \frac{T - T_{c,n}}{T_{c,n}}.$$  

(52)

Then any thermodynamic observable, as, e.g., the longitudinal susceptibility, will assume a scaling form with $t$ as

$$\chi^{-1}_L(t, g) = t^\gamma f \left( \frac{\lambda}{t^{\phi_c}} \right).$$

(53)

The function $f$ is the crossover function, while $\phi_c$ is the crossover exponent. It is the ratio of dimensions between $\lambda$ and $m^2$, namely

$$\phi_c = \frac{\text{dim}_\mu(\lambda)}{\text{dim}_\mu(m^2)} = \frac{2 + \gamma_2(\gamma_1(g_2) - \eta)}{2 + \gamma_1(\gamma_1(g_2) - \eta)}.$$  

(54)

In the numerator is the renormalization of $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ as given by Eq. (51) and which sits in the same representation as $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{i,j}$ defined in Eq. (29) or $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ defined in Eq. (35) (thus the same notation for all these objects) and which is the fractal dimension

FIG. 8. The crossover phase diagram as given in Ref. [11], with $\lambda = m^2_2 - m^2_1$. The thick black line is a line of first-order phase transitions.

FIG. 9. Slope of the crossover exponent at $n = 0$ for dimensions $0 \leq d \leq 4$. The black cross is the analytic result from Eq. (102) in $d = 2$.  
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Its series expansion reads

\[ \phi_\epsilon = \frac{d_\epsilon}{d_{\epsilon}^{\text{tot}}} = \nu d_\epsilon. \]  

(55)

This agrees with Ref. [45], see Eq. (14) in that paper, for \( \phi_\epsilon \) (noted \( \phi \) there), except for a misprint for the order \( \epsilon^3 \) term: The coefficient 682 in the second line of Eq. (14) of Ref. [45] should read 628.
We have in all dimensions d Table III and Fig. 9. Integrals of the inverse Borel transform do not converge well for the procedure suggested in Ref. [10] (KP17) are presented in SC KP17 Exact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>$d_i(e)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-2$</td>
<td>$2 - 0.333333e - 0.111111e^2 + 0.211568e^3 - 0.611186e^4 + 2.43354e^5 - 11.7939e^6 + O(e^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>$2 - 0.285714e - 0.100583e^2 + 0.155051e^3 - 0.410163e^4 + 1.48492e^5 - 6.52249e^6 + O(e^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$2 - 0.25e - 0.0859375e^2 + 0.114425e^3 - 0.287513e^4 + 0.956133e^5 - 3.85575e^6 + O(e^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$2 - 0.222222e - 0.0720165e^2 + 0.0875336e^3 - 0.209864e^4 + 0.647691e^5 - 2.42316e^6 + O(e^7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$2 - 0.2e - 0.06e^2 + 0.069718e^3 - 0.157887e^4 + 0.457846e^5 - 1.60209e^6 + O(e^7)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curve $\phi_c(n)$, at least in higher dimensions, is rather straight, and thus the most important quantity to give is

$$\phi_c'(0)_{d=0} = 0.70(18),$$

(57)

$$\phi_c'(0)_{d=1} = 0.44(6),$$

(58)

$$\phi_c'(0)_{d=2} = 0.239(10),$$

(59)

$$\phi_c'(0)_{d=3} = 0.0912(7).$$

(60)

We have in all dimensions $d$

$$\phi_c'(0) = v[Y_c'(0) - y_c'(0)].$$

(61)

Estimates for $\phi_c'(0)$ obtained by SC resummation and the procedure suggested in Ref. [10] (KP17) are presented in Table III and Fig. 9. Integrals of the inverse Borel transform do not converge well for $d = 0$ in the KP17 resummation scheme, which prevents us from obtaining an estimate there.

Explicit values for the crossover exponent in $d = 3$ to be compared with experiments, high-temperature series expansion, and numerics are

$$\phi_c^{sc}(d = 3, n = 1) = 1.089(1),$$

(62)

$$\phi_c^{sc}(d = 3, n = 2) = 1.180(4),$$

(63)

$$\phi_c^{sc}(d = 3, n = 3) = 1.265(5),$$

(64)

$$\phi_c^{sc}(d = 3, n = 4) = 1.329(8),$$

(65)

$$\phi_c^{sc}(d = 3, n = 5) = 1.391(2).$$

(66)

There are experiments for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$. For $n = 2$:

$$\phi_c^{exp}(d = 3, n = 2) = 1.17(2)$$

[53],

(67)

$$\phi_c^{exp}(d = 3, n = 2) = 1.18(5)$$

[54],

(68)

$$\phi_c^{exp}(d = 3, n = 2) = 1.23(4)$$

[55]

(69)

The first two figures are for two different samples of the very nearly isotropic antiferromagnet RbMnF$_3$ [58], and the last one [59] is for the bicritical point in MnF$_2$.

In Ref. [60] a theory based on SO(5), i.e., $n = 5$, has been proposed to explain superconductivity and antiferromagnetism in a unified model. While MC simulations support this scenario [61,62], it has been argued in Ref. [63] that the isotropic fixed point is unstable and breaks down into SO(2) $\times$ SO(3).

Recent Monte Carlo simulations [26] provide very precise estimates for the crossover exponent for $n = 2, 3, 4$ (in terms of Ref. [26] $\phi_c = Y_2$):

$$\phi_c^{MC}(d = 3, n = 2) = 1.1848(8),$$

(75)

$$\phi_c^{MC}(d = 3, n = 3) = 1.2735(9),$$

(76)

$$\phi_c^{MC}(d = 3, n = 4) = 1.3567(15).$$

(77)

The high-temperature series expansion of Ref. [64] yields

$$\phi_c^{HT}(d = 3, n = 2) = 1.175(15),$$

(78)

$$\phi_c^{HT}(d = 3, n = 3) = 1.250(15).$$

(79)

References:

[53] This is the only experiment where the value of the crossover exponent is significantly higher than our (and other) estimates, but its lower bound is close to the theoretical values. The notation used in the experiments is $\phi_c = 2 - \sigma - \bar{\sigma}$.

TABLE III. Numerical values for the 6-loop $\phi_c'(0)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>KP17</th>
<th>Exact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.70(18)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Exact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44(6)</td>
<td>0.58(12)</td>
<td>0.34/z 0.238732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.239(10)</td>
<td>0.262(10)</td>
<td>3/4π ≈ 0.238732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0912(7)</td>
<td>0.0925(4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An alternative to the ε expansion is to work directly in dimension \(d = 3\) (renormalization group in fixed space dimension \(d = 3\), denoted RG3), as was done in Ref. [65]:

\[
\phi_c^{\text{RG3}}(n = 2) = 1.184(12), \\
\phi_c^{\text{RG3}}(n = 3) = 1.271(21), \\
\phi_c^{\text{RG3}}(n = 4) = 1.35(4), \\
\phi_c^{\text{RG3}}(n = 5) = 1.40(4), \\
\phi_c^{\text{RG3}}(n = 8) = 1.55(4), \\
\phi_c^{\text{RG3}}(n = 16) = 1.75(6).
\]

Another approach is the nonperturbative renormalization group (NPRG). With this method the following estimates were obtained [66] (in terms of Ref. [66] \(\phi_c = \theta_1/\theta_2 = y_{2,1}\nu\)):

\[
\phi_c^{\text{NPRG}}(n = 2) = 1.209, \\
\phi_c^{\text{NPRG}}(n = 3) = 1.314, \\
\phi_c^{\text{NPRG}}(n = 4) = 1.407, \\
\phi_c^{\text{NPRG}}(n = 5) = 1.485, \\
\phi_c^{\text{NPRG}}(n = 10) = 1.710.
\]

Values provided by NPRG are systematically higher than those provided by other methods, but it is not clear how precise these values are. Their deviation from all other values is on the level of several percentages, and we believe this to be an appropriate error estimate. The most precise 6-loop estimates are obtained by a resummation of the \(\phi_c^{-13/4}\) expansion: They have lower error estimates (in both the SC and KP17 methods) and better agree with the most precise values from Monte Carlo simulations. See also the discussion in Sec. VI B.

A summary is provided in Table IV.

V. LOOP-ERASED RANDOM WALKS

The connection between the \(O(n)\)-symmetric \(\phi^4\) theory at \(n = -2\) and loop-erased random walks has only recently been established for all dimensions \(d\) [43], even though in \(d = 2\) this was known from integrability [68,69]. As we discussed above [see after Eq. (21)], this is a random walk where loops are erased as soon as they are formed. As such it is a non-Markovian process. On the other hand, its trace is equivalent to that of the Laplacian random walk \([70,71]\), which is Markovian if one considers the whole trace as state variable. It is constructed on the lattice by solving the Laplace equation \(\nabla^2 \Phi(x) = 0\) with boundary conditions \(\Phi(x) = 0\) on the already-constructed curve, while \(\Phi(x) = 1\) at the destination of the walk, either a chosen point or infinity. The walk then advances from its tip \(x\) to a neighboring point \(y\), with probability proportional to \(\Phi(y)\). In dimension \(d = 2\), it is known via the relation to stochastic Löwner evolution \([41,72]\) that the fractal dimension of LERWs is

\[
d_f^{\text{LERW}}(d = 2) = \frac{5}{4}.
\]

In three dimensions, there is no analytic prediction for the fractal dimension of LERWs, only the bound [67]

\[
1 \leq d_f^{\text{LERW}} \leq 5.
\]

We conjecture that it can be generalized to arbitrary dimension \(d\) as

\[
1 \leq d_f^{\text{LERW}} \leq \frac{5}{6 - d}.
\]

Note that this conjecture becomes exact in dimensions \(d = 1\) and \(d = 2\). The best numerical estimation in \(d = 3\) is from D. Wilson [48],

\[
d_f^{\text{LERW}}(d = 3) = 1.62400 \pm 0.00005 = 1.62400(5).
\]

Our resummations from the field theory are (see Fig. 10)

\[
d_f^{\text{LERW}}(d = 3) = 1.6243(10), \\
d_f^{\text{LERW}}(d = 3) = 1.623(6).
\]

VI. THE LIMIT OF \(d = 2\) CHECKED AGAINST CONFORMAL FIELD THEORY

A. Relations from conformal field theory

In \(d = 2\), all critical exponents should be accessible via conformal field theory (CFT). The latter is based on ideas proposed in the 1980s by Belavin, Polyakov, and Zamolodchikov [73]. They constructed a series of minimal models, indexed by an integer \(m \geq 3\), starting with the Ising model at \(m = 3\). These models are conformally invariant and unitary, equivalent to reflection positive in Euclidean theories. For details, see one of the many excellent textbooks on CFT \([2,29,30,74]\). Their conformal charge is given by

\[
c = 1 - \frac{6}{m(m + 1)}.
\]

The list of conformal dimensions allowed for a given \(m\) is given by the Kac formula with integers \(r, s\) (Eq. (7.112) of

\[
d_f^{\text{LERW}}(d = 2) = \frac{5}{4}.
\]
FIG. 11. The exponent \( \nu \) for \( d = 2 \) (a) and its inverse (b). The different colors come from resummations of \( \nu \) (blue), \( 1/\nu \) (red), \( 1/\nu^2 \) (green), \( 1/\nu^3 \) (cyan), and \( \alpha = 2 - \nu d \) (dark green). The dashed black line is from CFT as given by Eq. (100). The shaded errors are (minimal) errors estimated from the uncertainty in the extrapolation, see Sec. III.

Ref. [30],

\[
    h_{r,s} = \left[ \frac{r(m+1) - sm}{4m(m+1)} \right]^2 - 1, \quad 1 \leq r < m, \quad 1 \leq s \leq m.
\]  

(97)

It was later realized that other values of \( m \) also correspond to physical systems, in particular \( m = 1 \) (loop-erased random walks) and \( m = 2 \) (self-avoiding walks). These values can further be extended to the \( O(n) \) model with noninteger \( n \) and \( m \), using the identification

\[
    n = 2 \cos \left( \frac{\pi}{m} \right).
\]  

(98)

More strikingly, the table of dimensions allowed by Eq. (97) has to be extended to half-integer values, including 0. It is instructive to read [75], where all operators were identified. This yields the fractal dimension of the propagator line [75–77],

\[
    d_1 = 2 - 2h_{1,0} = 1 + \frac{\pi}{2(\arccos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right) + \pi)}.
\]  

(99)

This is compared to the \( \epsilon \) expansion on Fig. 3.

For \( \nu \), i.e., the inverse fractal dimension of all lines, be it propagator or loops, we get

\[
    \nu = \frac{1}{2 - 2h_{1,3}} = \frac{1}{4} \left[ 1 + \frac{\pi}{\arccos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)} \right].
\]  

(100)

This agrees with Ref. [75], inline after Eq. (2). (Note that the choice \( h_{2,1} \) coinciding with \( h_{1,3} \) for Ising does nor work for general \( n \).) A comparison to the \( \epsilon \) expansion is given in Fig. 11.

For \( \eta \), there are two suggestive candidates from the Ising model, \( \eta = 4h_{1,2} = 4h_{2,2} \). This does not work for other values of \( n \).

We propose, in agreement with Refs. [75–77],

\[
    \eta = 4h_{2,0} = \frac{5}{4} - \frac{3 \arccos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)}{4\pi} - \frac{\pi}{\arccos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right) + \pi}.
\]  

(101)

It has a square-root singularity for both \( n = -2 \) and \( n = 2 \). A comparison to field theory is given in Fig. 12.

As we discuss in the next section, we have no clear candidate for the exponent \( \omega \). This is apparent in Fig. 13, where our estimates from the resummation are confronted to some guesses from CFT.

Finally, the crossover exponent \( \phi_c \) defined in Eqs. (39) and (54) becomes

\[
    \phi_c = v d_t = \frac{1 - h_{1,0}}{1 - h_{1,3}} = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{3\pi}{8 \arccos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)}.
\]  

(102)

This is compared to the \( \epsilon \) expansion in Fig. 14.

B. Resummation

Note that there are singularities at \( n = \pm 2 \), the most severe one being at \( n = 2 \) for the exponent \( \nu \). For this reason, resummation is difficult for \( n \approx 2 \). We found that the singu-
larity in \( d = 2 \) is much better reproduced when resumming \( 1/\nu^3 \) instead of \( \nu \), see Fig. 11. This expansion catches the divergence at \( n = 2 \) in \( d = 2 \), even though the singularity thus constructed is not proportional to \( 1/\sqrt{2 - n} \) but proportional to \( 1/\sqrt{2 - n} \). As we will see, reproducing this singularity at least approximately renders expansions also more precise in \( d = 3 \), even for \( n = 0, 1 \).

The same situation appears for \( \phi_c \), where \( 1/\phi_c^{13/4} \) provides the most precise fit of the \( n = 2 \) singularity (see Fig. 14). This leads to smaller error bars for both resummation methods (see Table IV) and supports our statement about the necessity of a proper choice of the object for resummation, based on the knowledge of the \( d = 2 \) singularities.

For \( d_l \) (Fig. 3) and \( \eta \) (Fig. 12), the \( \epsilon \) expansion is approximately correct. But there are square-root singularities when approaching \( n = \pm 2 \) in \( d = 2 \), which are not visible in the \( \epsilon \) expansion. It is suggestive that these singularities in \( d = 2 \) influence the convergence in \( d = 3 \). Building in these exact results in \( d = 2 \), including the type of singularity in the \((d, n)\) plane would increase significantly the precision in \( d = 3 \).

![Fig. 13. The exponent \( \omega \) in \( d = 2 \). Dots represent values reported in the literature, mostly based on CFT. The value \( \omega = 7/4 \) for \( n = 1 \) is consistent with the \( O(1) \) term in Ref. [78], while the reanalysis of Ref. [79] concludes on \( \omega = 2 \). In Ref. [79] it is also argued that \( \omega = 2 \) for \( n \gg 2 \). The black dashed line is the guess (103) resulting from the operator generating an intersection between two lines.](image1)

![Fig. 14. The exponent \( \phi_c \) in \( d = 2 \). The dashed black line is the analytic result from Eq. (102). The colored lines are resummations of \( \phi_c \) (blue), \( 1/\phi_c \) (red), \( 1/\phi_c^2 \) (green), \( 1/\phi_c^3 \) (cyan), \( 1/\phi_c^{13/4} \) (magenta), and \( 1/\phi_c^2 \) (gray). Resumming \( 1/\phi_c^{13/4} \) considerably improves the precision. As for \( \omega \) presented in Fig. 13, the situation is rather unclear, as there is no choice of \( h_{2,0} \), which is a good candidate for all \( n \) in the range of \(-2 \leq n \leq 2 \). Intersections in high-temperature graphs are given by \( h_{2,0} \), and this operator is the closest in spirit to the \((\phi^3)^2\) interaction of our field theory, resulting in

\[
\omega_{\text{guess}} = 2h_{2,0} - 2. \tag{103}
\]

This contradicts the results from the \( \epsilon \) expansion presented in Fig. 13. It is not even clear whether this is a question which can be answered via CFT: As all observables depend on the coupling \( g \), the exponent \( \omega \) quantifies how far this coupling has flown to the IR fixed point. On the other hand, in a CFT the ratio of size \( L \) over lattice cutoff \( a \) has gone to infinity, and the theory by construction is at \( g = g_c \). Our results are consistent with \( \omega = 2 \) for all \( n \), in which case the associated operator might simply be the determinant of the stress-energy tensor, sometimes (abusively) referred to as \( T\bar{T} \), see, e.g., Ref. [80].

### VII. IMPROVED ESTIMATES IN \( d = 3 \) FOR ALL EXPONENTS

With the knowledge gained in \( d = 2 \), we are now in a position to give our best estimates for all critical exponents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SC from ( \phi_c^{13/4} )</th>
<th>KP17</th>
<th>KP17 ( \phi_c^{13/4} )</th>
<th>RG3 [65]</th>
<th>NPRG [66]</th>
<th>HT [64]</th>
<th>MC [26]</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.180(4)</td>
<td>1.183(1)</td>
<td>1.183(3)</td>
<td>1.1843(6)</td>
<td>1.184(12)</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>1.175(15)</td>
<td>1.1848(8)</td>
<td>1.17(2) [53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18(5) [54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19(3) [56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.23(4) [55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17(10) [57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.278(26) [58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.274(45) [58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.279(31) [59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.265(5)</td>
<td>1.273(1)</td>
<td>1.263(13)</td>
<td>1.2742(10)</td>
<td>1.271(21)</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>1.250(15)</td>
<td>1.2735(9)</td>
<td>1.2(5) [53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27(1) [54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29(1) [56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33(4) [55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.37(10) [57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.287(26) [58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.287(45) [58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.289(31) [59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.329(5)</td>
<td>1.361(1)</td>
<td>1.33(3)</td>
<td>1.3610(7)</td>
<td>1.35(4)</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>1.356(7)</td>
<td>1.3567(15)</td>
<td>1.35(2) [53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.391(2)</td>
<td>1.442(2)</td>
<td>1.42(4)</td>
<td>1.444(5)</td>
<td>1.40(4)</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>1.485(7)</td>
<td>1.485(15)</td>
<td>1.485(2) [54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.534(2)</td>
<td>1.64(1)</td>
<td>1.59(7)</td>
<td>1.625(17)</td>
<td>1.55(4)</td>
<td>1.55(4)</td>
<td>1.55(4)</td>
<td>1.55(4)</td>
<td>1.55(4) [55]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V. Numerical values for the exponent $\eta$ in $d = 3$. SC combines expansion for $\eta$ and $\sqrt{\eta}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>KP17</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>0.0198(3)</td>
<td>0.0203(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0304(2)</td>
<td>0.0310(7)</td>
<td>0.031043(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0355(3)</td>
<td>0.0362(6)</td>
<td>0.036298(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0374(3)</td>
<td>0.0380(6)</td>
<td>0.0381(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0373(3)</td>
<td>0.0378(5)</td>
<td>0.0378(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0363(2)</td>
<td>0.0366(4)</td>
<td>0.0360(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the exponent $\nu$, we use the expansion of $1/\nu^3$, while for $\eta$ and $\omega$ we use the standard direct expansions. For $d_f$, we both use the direct expansion, as the expansion of $1/d_f$, to get an idea about the errors induced by changing the quantity to be extrapolated.

Our findings are given on Tables IV to VII, as well as Fig. 2 and Figs. 15 to 18. Let us summarize them.

The exponent $\eta$ is shown in Table V and Fig. 15. For SAWs, the agreement of KP17 with the Monte Carlo results of Refs. [23, 24] is better than $10^{-3}$ (relative). For the Ising model ($n = 1$), the agreement with the conformal bootstrap [33] is of the same order.

Our predictions for $\nu$ are given in Table VI and Fig. 16. Using the expansion of $1/\nu^3$, the relative deviation to the conformal bootstrap is about $3 \times 10^{-4}$ instead of $10^{-3}$ for the direct expansion, validating both schemes. The same deviation of $3 \times 10^{-4}$ appears in the comparison to Monte Carlo simulations of SAWs.

The exponent $c_0$ has already been discussed in Sec. IV. Table IV summarizes our findings. In general, there is a very good agreement between the diverse theoretical predictions and experiments. We find it quite amazing that experiments were able to measure this exponent with such precision.

Via the relation (54), which can be written as $\phi_c = \nu d_f$, the exponent $\phi_c$ is intimately related to the fractal dimension $d_f$ of curves discussed in the Introduction and summarized in Fig. 2. Again, in all cases the agreement is well within the small error bars.

The exponent $\omega$ is notoriously difficult to obtain, possibly due to a nonanalyticity of the $\beta$ function at the fixed point $g_s$ [79]. We show our predictions in Table VII and Fig. 17. The deviations from results obtained by other methods are much larger but consistent with our error bars. The only value from simulations we have doubts about is $\omega$ for SAWs in $d = 3$, which is an “outlier” in Fig. 17. As reported by Refs. [24, 81],

$$\omega = \Delta/\nu = 0.899(14) \quad [24],$$

$$\omega = \Delta/\nu = 0.904(6) \quad [81].$$

Reference [24] provides the most precise result for $\nu = 0.58759700(40)$, while the value of $\Delta = \omega \nu = 0.528(8)$ is less precise than that of Ref. [81], namely $\Delta = 0.5310(35)$. The value $\nu = 0.5875(5)$ of Ref. [81] is less precise than the one of Ref. [24], but the error is negligible compared to that of $\Delta$. Combining the most precise values gives an estimate $\omega = 0.904(5)$ as in Eq. (105) but with a slightly reduced error bar.

As already stated, proper choice of the object of resummation can significantly increase the convergence and yield estimates closer to those of CFT in $d = 2$ and conformal bootstrap in $d = 3$. While for the exponent $\nu$ this choice is obviously $\nu^{-3}$, and for $\phi_c$ it is $1/\phi_c^{13/4}$, since both catch the singularity in $d = 2$ (see Figs. 11 and 14), for the exponents $\eta$ and $\omega$ there is no evident choice. A more detailed investigation of these ideas is beyond the scope of the present paper and left for future research.

TABLE VI. Numerical values for the exponent $\nu$ in $d = 3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>SC ($\nu^{-3}$)</th>
<th>KP17 ($\nu^{-3}$)</th>
<th>KP17 ($1/\nu$)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-2$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>0.5434(2)</td>
<td>0.545(2)</td>
<td>0.5444(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5874(2)</td>
<td>0.5874(10)</td>
<td>0.5874(3) [10]</td>
<td>0.5875970(4) [24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6296(3)</td>
<td>0.6298(13)</td>
<td>0.6292(5) [10]</td>
<td>0.629971(4) [33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6706(2)</td>
<td>0.6714(16)</td>
<td>0.6690(10) [10]</td>
<td>0.6717(1) [25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7094(2)</td>
<td>0.7112(2)</td>
<td>0.7059(20) [10]</td>
<td>0.7112(5) [82]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7449(4)</td>
<td>0.748(3)</td>
<td>0.7397(35) [10]</td>
<td>0.7477(8) [27]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 15. The exponent $\eta$ in $d = 3$. The SC resummation scheme (in blue) seems to be systematically smaller than the values of KP17 (in red). SC resummation of $\sqrt{\eta}$ (in cyan) works slightly better. Black crosses represent the best values from MC and conformal bootstrap, as given in Ref. [10].
VIII. CONNECTION TO THE LARGE-\(n\) EXPANSION

One of the most effective checks of perturbative expansions is comparison of different expansions of the same quantity. For the \(O(n)\) model, the \(\epsilon\) expansion provides a series in \(\epsilon\) which is an exact function in \(n\), while the large-\(n\) expansion (or \(1/n\) expansion) provides a series in \(1/n\) with coefficients exact in \(d\). Thus setting \(d = 4 - \epsilon\) in the \(1/n\) expansion and expanding it in \(\epsilon\), while expanding the coefficients of the \(\epsilon\) expansion in \(1/n\) for the same quantity must yield identical series. As for each expansion a different method is used, this provides a very strong cross-check for both expansions.

The large-\(n\) expansion of the crossover exponent \(\phi_c\) as given in Eqs. (39) and (54) was calculated in Ref. [46] to \(1/n^2\). Expanding it in \(\epsilon\), we obtain a double (\(\epsilon, 1/n\)) expansion \(\phi_{c,\epsilon,n}\),

\[
\phi_{c,\epsilon,n} = \left[ 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} + \frac{\epsilon^3}{8} + \frac{\epsilon^4}{16} + \frac{\epsilon^5}{32} + \frac{\epsilon^6}{64} + O(\epsilon^7) \right] 
+ \frac{1}{n} \left[ -4\epsilon + \epsilon^3 + (-\zeta_3 + 1)\epsilon^4 + \frac{3}{4}(-\zeta_4 + 1)\epsilon^5 \right] 
+ O(\frac{1}{n^2}).
\]

(106)

This expansion agrees with Eq. (56) expanded in \(1/n\). Even though not all 6-loop diagrams contribute to the \(1/n^2\) term, the comparison with the large-\(n\) expansion is a very strong consistency check.

IX. CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

In this paper, we evaluated the fractal dimension of critical lines in the \(O(n)\) model, yielding the fractal dimension of loop-erased random walks (\(n = -2\)), self-avoiding walks (\(n = 0\), as well as the propagator line for the Ising model (\(n = 1\)) and the \(XY\) model (\(n = 2\)). Our predictions from the \(\epsilon\) expansion at 6-loop order are in excellent agreement with numerical simulations in \(d = 3\) for the larger values of \(n\), even exceeding the numerically obtained precision. This was possible through a combination of several resummation techniques, including a self-consistent one introduced here. Analyzing its behavior in dimension \(d = 2\) to determine the most suitable quantity to be resummed allowed us to improve
the precision for the remaining exponents, especially $\nu$, yielding now an agreement of $3 \times 10^{-4}$ for the Ising model in $d = 3$, as compared to the conformal bootstrap. We plan to extend this work in several directions as follows:

(i) Analyze the analytic structure of the critical exponents as a function of $d$ and $\epsilon$ to better catch the singularities in $d = 2$ and thus obtain more precise resummations in $d = 3$ for all exponents.

(ii) Use the 7-loop results of Ref. [19] to improve our estimates.
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