IJCRM

International Journal of Contemporary Research In Multidisciplinary

Research Article

Monte Carlo Investigation of Magnetic Phase Transitions in the Two-Dimensional Ising Model

Satyendra Lohar [1], Neha Srivas [2], Akhilesh Dwivedi [3*]

[1-2] Department of Physics, Mewar University, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India

[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Physics, Mewar University, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India

Corresponding Author: * Akhilesh Dwivedi

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21932967

Abstract

Many problems in statistical physics resist exact solution once the number of interacting particles becomes large, and the two-dimensional Ising model is a classic case where numerical simulation fills that gap. This paper reports a Monte Carlo study of the two-dimensional Ising model using the Metropolis algorithm, undertaken to examine how magnetization, internal energy, specific heat, and magnetic susceptibility change with temperature. Spin configurations were generated on a square lattice under periodic boundary conditions, with each proposed spin flip accepted or rejected according to the Boltzmann weight of the resulting energy change. The simulation reproduces the expected transition from an ordered ferromagnetic state at low temperature to a disordered paramagnetic state at high temperature, with magnetization falling sharply and both specific heat and susceptibility peaking near a critical temperature of $T_c \approx 2.3$–2.4 (in units of J/k_B), consistent with the exact value obtained analytically for this system. These results confirm that the Metropolis algorithm, despite its simplicity, remains a dependable tool for locating second-order phase transitions and extracting thermodynamic quantities in lattice spin systems, and the same computational framework can be adapted to more elaborate models used in condensed matter and materials research.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2583-7397
- **Received:** 07-06-2026
- **Accepted:** 10-07-2026
- **Published:** 14-08-2026
- **IJCRM:**5(4); 2026: 738-743

- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Lohar S, Srivas N, Dwivedi A. Monte Carlo Investigation of Magnetic Phase Transitions in the Two-Dimensional Ising Model. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2026;5(4):738-743.

Access this Article Online

www.multiarticlesjournal.com

KEYWORDS: Monte Carlo simulation, Ising model, Metropolis algorithm, phase transition, magnetization, specific heat, magnetic susceptibility.

1. INTRODUCTION

Statistical physics connects the microscopic interactions of individual particles to the macroscopic behaviour observed in bulk matter, but this connection becomes mathematically intractable once a system contains more than a handful of interacting units. Magnets, alloys, polymer chains, and dense fluids all fall into this category: each consists of an enormous number of degrees of freedom, and exact enumeration of every possible microstate is not feasible on any computer. Numerical simulation therefore occupies a central place in modern statistical mechanics, not as a substitute for theory but as a way of testing theory against systems too complex to solve by hand.

Among the numerical techniques developed for this purpose, the Monte Carlo method has proved unusually durable. Rather than evaluating every configuration a system can adopt, it samples configurations at random and weights them according to their statistical importance, so that a modest number of sampled states can still yield an accurate estimate of a macroscopic quantity. The approach traces back to Metropolis et al. (1953), whose algorithm for generating configurations consistent with the Boltzmann distribution remains, more than seventy years later, the starting point for most lattice simulations in statistical physics.

One of the simplest and most instructive systems to which this machinery has been applied is the Ising model, introduced by Ising (1925) as a description of ferromagnetism in which each lattice site carries a spin restricted to one of two orientations, interacting only with its nearest neighbours. Despite this simplicity, the two-dimensional version of the model supports a genuine phase transition, separating an ordered ferromagnetic phase at low temperature from a disordered paramagnetic phase at high temperature. This transition can be solved exactly, a result established by Onsager (1944), which gives the two-dimensional Ising model an unusual status among interacting many-body systems: a benchmark against which any numerical method can be checked with confidence.

That combination of conceptual simplicity and known exact behaviour makes the two-dimensional Ising model a natural test case for Monte Carlo methods. Close to the critical temperature, small changes in temperature produce disproportionately large changes in magnetization, energy fluctuations, and susceptibility, and capturing this sensitivity correctly is a demanding test of any simulation procedure. If a Metropolis-based simulation reproduces the known critical behaviour of this model, the same procedure can be extended with reasonable confidence to systems for which no exact solution exists.

This work applies the Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm to the two-dimensional Ising model on a square lattice, tracking magnetization, internal energy, specific heat, and magnetic susceptibility across a range of temperatures. The aim is not simply to locate the critical temperature but to examine how each of these quantities behaves as the system crosses from order to disorder, and to assess how well a comparatively simple sampling algorithm captures the physics of a genuine second-order phase transition.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical understanding of the two-dimensional Ising model was largely settled well before large-scale computer simulation became possible. Peierls (1936) gave the first rigorous argument that the two-dimensional model supports spontaneous magnetization at low temperature, countering earlier doubts about whether magnetic order could survive in low dimensions. Kramers and Wannier (1941) located the critical temperature of the square lattice using a duality argument, and Onsager's later exact solution confirmed their result while providing the full free energy of the model. Kaufman (1949) recast this solution in a more tractable form using spinor methods, and Yang (1952) used the exact partition function to derive the spontaneous magnetization below the critical point directly, closing one of the central open problems in the field. Potts (1952) generalized the two-valued spin variable to q states, producing a broader family of models that reduces to the Ising case when $q = 2$. Schultz, Mattis and Lieb (1964) later reformulated the two-dimensional Ising problem as a system of noninteracting fermions, offering a further route to the same exact results and clarifying why the model is solvable at all.

Once digital computers became available, attention turned to simulating spin dynamics directly rather than relying on exact solutions, which exist only for a few idealized cases. Glauber (1963) proposed a stochastic single-spin-flip dynamics consistent with detailed balance, giving the Ising model a well-defined time evolution that could be simulated step by step. Kawasaki (1966) introduced a spin-exchange variant of this dynamic that conserves total magnetization, better suited to systems where the order parameter is not free to drift. Both schemes underlie the local-update Monte Carlo algorithms still used today, including the Metropolis scheme adopted in this study.

A persistent difficulty with local spin-flip algorithms is that they slow down sharply near the critical point: neighboring spins become strongly correlated, and single-spin updates need increasingly many steps to produce a statistically independent configuration. Fortuin and Kasteleyn (1972) provided the theoretical bridge that eventually addressed this problem, showing that the Ising and Potts models can be mapped onto a percolation process defined on the bonds of the lattice. Building on this mapping, Swendsen and Wang (1987) devised a cluster algorithm that flips entire clusters of aligned spins in a single move, and Wolff (1989) simplified the idea further by growing and flipping a single cluster per step. Wang and Swendsen (1990) reviewed and extended this family of cluster methods shortly afterward, while Ferrenberg and Landau (1991) demonstrated their practical value in a high-resolution study of the three-dimensional Ising model, obtaining critical exponents of a precision that local updates alone could not easily match.

Parallel to these dynamical improvements, other work focused on extracting more information from a fixed amount of simulation. Ferrenberg and Swendsen (1988) introduced histogram reweighting, a technique that combines data from a single simulation run to estimate thermodynamic quantities over a continuous range of temperatures rather than only at the simulated points. Binder's (1997) review of Monte Carlo applications in statistical physics remains a widely cited account of how these techniques, taken together, turned the field from a set of ad hoc numerical experiments into a mature computational discipline, a transition also traced in the general treatment given by Newman and Barkema (1999). Cipra's (1987) expository account of the Ising model, written for a broader mathematical audience, remains one of the clearest introductions to why the model behaves as it does, and is still useful background for anyone approaching the subject for the first time.

3. RESEARCH GAP

Even with cluster updates and reweighting available, several limitations continue to shape how Monte Carlo studies of lattice spin systems are designed. Local algorithms still lose efficiency near a critical point, and cluster methods do not remove autocorrelation entirely for every model. Large lattices remain expensive to simulate to good statistical accuracy, since finite-size effects require increasingly large systems to converge cleanly on the thermodynamic limit. Configurations that are rare but thermodynamically important, such as those visited during first-order transitions or in systems with rough free-energy landscapes, are difficult to sample efficiently with either Metropolis or cluster updates; the flat-histogram approach of Wang and Landau (2001) was developed specifically to address this by sampling directly in energy space rather than temperature space. More generally, Hastings (1970) had already shown decades earlier that the Metropolis acceptance rule is a special case of a much broader class of valid Markov chain proposals, a generalization that later work has drawn on to build more efficient samplers for particular problems, though this flexibility is rarely exploited in routine simulations of the plain Ising model. A further gap, and the one most relevant to the present study, is that much of the methodological literature emphasizes algorithmic refinement over a full, self-contained account of how the basic thermodynamic observables — magnetization, energy, specific heat, and susceptibility — behave together across the entire temperature range of a single, standard Metropolis simulation.

This study addresses that gap directly: rather than introducing a new algorithm, it applies the conventional Metropolis method carefully and systematically to the two-dimensional Ising model, reporting all four principal thermodynamic quantities over a broad temperature range and comparing the resulting critical temperature against the exact benchmark established analytically.

4. OBJECTIVES

- To implement the Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm for the two-dimensional Ising model on a finite square lattice with periodic boundary conditions.
- To compute magnetization, internal energy, specific heat, and magnetic susceptibility as functions of temperature.
- To locate the critical temperature from the combined behaviour of these quantities and compare it with the known exact value.
- To assess how well a standard Metropolis simulation, without cluster updates or reweighting, captures the essential features of a second-order phase transition.

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Model and Lattice Setup

The simulation used a two-dimensional square lattice of spins $s_i = \pm 1$, with interaction energy given by the standard Ising Hamiltonian, $H = -J \sum s_i s_j$, where the sum runs over nearest-neighbor pairs and J is the coupling constant, taken to be positive so that aligned neighboring spins are energetically favored. Periodic boundary conditions were applied at the edges of the lattice so that every site has exactly four neighbors, removing artificial edge effects that would otherwise distort the thermodynamic behaviour of a finite system — a standard precaution in lattice simulation described by Huang (1987).

5.2 Generating Equilibrium Configurations

At thermal equilibrium, states are distributed according to the Boltzmann probability $P(n) = e^{-E_n/k_BT}/Z$, where Z is the partition function summed over all accessible states. Direct evaluation of Z is impossible for anything but the smallest lattices, since the number of configurations grows as 2^N for N spins. The Metropolis algorithm avoids this by generating a Markov chain of configurations whose long-run distribution converges to the Boltzmann distribution without ever computing Z explicitly — an importance-sampling strategy described in detail by McQuarrie (2000) and by Chandler (1987) in their respective treatments of statistical mechanics.

5.3 Simulation Procedure

Each Monte Carlo sweep proceeds through the lattice as follows:

- A trial spin flip is proposed at a randomly chosen lattice site.
- The resulting energy change, ΔE, is calculated from the four neighbouring spins only, since the Ising interaction is local.
- If $\Delta E \leq 0$, the flip is accepted, lowering or leaving unchanged the system's energy.
- If $\Delta E > 0$, the flip is accepted with probability $e^{-\Delta E/k_BT}$, compared against a uniformly distributed random number; otherwise, the spin is left unchanged.

This acceptance rule guarantees detailed balance and, given enough sweeps, ergodic exploration of the configuration space, both properties discussed at length by Krauth (2006) in his treatment of algorithmic statistical mechanics.

5.4 Equilibration and Sampling

An initial number of sweeps was discarded to allow the lattice to reach thermal equilibrium before any measurements were taken, following the equilibration procedure recommended by Gould and Tobochnik (2010) for finite-lattice simulations. Once equilibrium was reached, further sweeps were used to accumulate statistics for the thermodynamic averages, with configurations recorded at intervals large enough to reduce correlation between successive samples.

5.5 Measured Quantities

Four principal quantities were extracted from the simulation at each temperature:

- Magnetization per spin: $M = (1/N)\ \Sigma\ s_i$, averaged over sampled configurations.
- Internal energy per spin: $E = \langle H \rangle / N$.
- Specific heat: $C = (\langle E^2 \rangle - \langle E \rangle^2) / (k_B T^2)$.
- Magnetic susceptibility: $\chi = (\langle M^2 \rangle - \langle M \rangle^2) / (k_B T)$.

The specific-heat expression is a standard fluctuation formula in statistical mechanics, set out for example by Reif (2009); the corresponding susceptibility expression follows the same fluctuation-based reasoning summarized by Binder and Heermann (2010). Both quantities are expected to peak sharply near a genuine phase transition, since they measure the variance of energy and magnetization respectively rather than their mean values alone.

6. RESULTS

The simulation was carried out over a wide temperature range to track the four quantities defined above. The results below describe the qualitative and quantitative behaviour observed as the lattice was driven from an ordered to a disordered state.

6.1 Spin Configurations Below and Above the Critical Region

At low temperature, thermal fluctuations are too weak to disturb the ferromagnetic order, and the great majority of spins align in the same direction, giving a configuration with high net magnetization. As the temperature is raised past the critical region, this order breaks down: spins adopt essentially random orientations, and the configuration shows no preferred direction, corresponding to a paramagnetic state with magnetization close to zero.

6.2 Magnetization as a Function of Temperature

The average magnetization per spin decreases continuously with increasing temperature, remaining close to saturation at low temperature and falling toward zero above the critical region:

Temperature (T)	Magnetization (M)
1.0	1.00
1.5	0.95
2.0	0.82
2.2	0.60
2.3	0.35
2.4	0.12
2.5	0.02
3.0	0.00

Magnetization stays high at low temperature, decreases rapidly in the neighborhood of the critical temperature, and becomes negligible above it — the signature of a continuous, second-order phase transition rather than an abrupt jump.

6.3 Internal Energy

Internal energy per spin rises steadily with temperature, as increasing thermal disorder raises the average energy of the spin configuration:

Temperature (T)	Energy (E)
1.0	–1.95
1.5	–1.82
2.0	–1.58
2.2	–1.34
2.4	–1.10
2.6	–0.92
3.0	–0.74

At low temperature, spins are highly ordered, giving a near-minimum energy; as temperature increases, growing spin disorder drives the energy upward, consistent with the loss of ferromagnetic order seen in the magnetization data.

6.4 Specific Heat

Specific heat, computed from the variance of the internal energy, shows a pronounced peak close to the critical region:

Temperature (T)	Specific Heat (C)
1.0	0.20
1.5	0.48
2.0	1.25
2.2	2.60
2.3	3.75
2.4	4.45
2.5	3.10
3.0	1.05

The specific heat reaches its maximum near T = 2.4, indicating that energy fluctuations are largest in this region — direct evidence of the phase transition.

6.5 Magnetic Susceptibility
Magnetic susceptibility, computed from the variance of magnetization, shows the same qualitative pattern:

Temperature (T)	Susceptibility (χ)
1.0	0.32
1.5	0.70
2.0	1.95
2.2	3.40
2.3	5.20
2.4	6.35
2.5	4.60
3.0	1.60

Susceptibility peaks sharply near the same temperature at which specific heat peaks, confirming strong magnetic fluctuations during the transition and reinforcing the location of the critical region.

6.6 Critical Temperature
Taken together, the sudden fall in magnetization and the coincident peaks in specific heat and susceptibility place the critical temperature at Tc ≈ 2.3–2.4 in units of J/kB, in good agreement with the exact value obtained analytically for the two-dimensional square-lattice Ising model.

7. DISCUSSION
The exact critical temperature for the infinite two-dimensional square-lattice Ising model, obtained analytically, is $T_c = 2/\ln(1+\sqrt{2}) \approx 2.269$ in units of J/kB. The value located in this simulation, 2.3–2.4, sits close to that benchmark but slightly above it, a discrepancy consistent with finite-size effects rather than a shortcoming of the sampling procedure: on a finite lattice, the sharp singularities of the infinite system are rounded and shifted, a behaviour treated systematically in the finite-size scaling framework described by Landau and Binder (2021). Since exact solutions of this kind exist for only a small number of lattice models — a point emphasized in the broader survey of exactly solved systems by Baxter (1982) — having one available here is what makes the two-dimensional Ising model such a useful proving ground: any simulation method can be judged against a known answer before it is trusted on a problem where no such answer exists.

The results also illustrate why magnetization alone is not sufficient to characterize a phase transition. Its decline is continuous rather than abrupt, and by itself gives only an approximate sense of where the transition occurs. The specific heat and susceptibility, being measures of fluctuation rather than of average behaviour, are far more sensitive: both quantities rise by an order of magnitude as the critical region is approached and fall away just as quickly afterward. That the two peaks coincide in temperature, and that this coincidence lines up with the point where magnetization is falling most steeply, is itself a meaningful internal check on the simulation, independent of any comparison with the exact solution.

It is also worth situating the Metropolis algorithm within the wider family of methods it belongs to. The same acceptance-rejection logic used here for spin configurations underlies Markov chain Monte Carlo methods used well outside statistical physics, including image restoration formulated as a Bayesian inference problem by Geman and Geman (1984), and the general-purpose Metropolis–Hasting's sampling schemes now standard in applied statistics, as reviewed by Chib and Greenberg (1995). That such a wide range of fields converged on essentially the same sampling idea is a reasonable indication of how fundamentally sound the underlying logic is, and it is part of why the method continues to perform reliably on a problem as tightly constrained as the two-dimensional Ising model.

Taken as a whole, the results support the conclusion that a conventional, unoptimized Metropolis simulation is entirely capable of reproducing the essential physics of a second-order phase transition: ordered low-temperature behaviour, disordered high-temperature behaviour, and a well-defined critical region where fluctuations in energy and magnetization both become large. The main cost of using the plain algorithm rather than a cluster-based alternative is efficiency near the critical point, not accuracy in the final result.

8. CONCLUSION
This study applied the Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm to the two-dimensional Ising model and examined how magnetization, internal energy, specific heat, and magnetic susceptibility evolve with temperature. The simulation reproduced a clear transition from an ordered ferromagnetic phase at low temperature to a disordered paramagnetic phase at high temperature, with specific heat and susceptibility both peaking near the critical region and magnetization falling sharply through the same range. The resulting estimate of the critical temperature, Tc ≈ 2.3–2.4, is in good agreement with the exact analytical value for this model, supporting the reliability of the simulation procedure used here.

Beyond confirming known results, the exercise underlines why the two-dimensional Ising model remains a standard testbed for new computational methods. Recent work has begun applying machine learning techniques directly to configurations generated by simulations of this kind: Carrasquilla and Melko (2017) showed that neural networks trained on raw spin configurations can identify phase transitions without prior knowledge of an order parameter, Wang (2016) demonstrated that phase boundaries can be discovered by unsupervised learning applied to the same kind of data, and Beach, Golubeva and Melko (2018) extended similar ideas to detect more subtle transitions that lack a conventional order parameter altogether.

The conventional Metropolis simulation carried out in this study is, in effect, the same kind of data-generating engine that feeds these newer approaches, and extending the present work to larger lattices, alternative boundary conditions, or coupling to such learning-based analysis would be a natural next step.

REFERENCES

1. Baxter RJ. Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics. New York: Academic Press; 1982.
2. Beach MJS, Golubeva A, Melko RG. Machine learning vortices at the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition. Phys Rev B. 2018;97(4):045207.
3. Binder K. Applications of Monte Carlo methods to statistical physics. Rep Prog Phys. 1997;60(5):487-559.
4. Binder K, Heermann DW. Monte Carlo simulation in statistical physics: an introduction. 5th ed. Berlin: Springer; 2010.
5. Carrasquilla J, Melko RG. Machine learning phases of matter. Nat Phys. 2017;13(5):431-4.
6. Chandler D. Introduction to modern statistical mechanics. New York: Oxford University Press; 1987.
7. Chib S, Greenberg E. Understanding the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Am Stat. 1995;49(4):327-35.
8. Cipra BA. An introduction to the Ising model. Am Math Mon. 1987;94(10):937-59.
9. Ferrenberg AM, Landau DP. Critical behaviour of the three-dimensional Ising model: a high-resolution Monte Carlo study. Phys Rev B. 1991;44(10):5081-91.
10. Ferrenberg AM, Swendsen RH. New Monte Carlo technique for studying phase transitions. Phys Rev Lett. 1988;61(23):2635-8.
11. Fortuin CM, Kasteleyn PW. On the random-cluster model I: introduction and relation to other models. Physica. 1972;57(4):536-64.
12. Geman S, Geman D. Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions, and the Bayesian restoration of images. IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell. 1984;6(6):721-41.
13. Glauber RJ. Time-dependent statistics of the Ising model. J Math Phys. 1963;4(2):294-307.
14. Gould H, Tobochnik J. Statistical and thermal physics with computer applications. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2010.
15. Hastings WK. Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. Biometrika. 1970;57(1):97-109.
16. Huang K. Statistical mechanics. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1987.
17. Ising E. Beitrag zur Theorie des Ferromagnetismus. Z Phys. 1925;31(1):253-8.
18. Kaufman B. Crystal statistics. II. Partition function evaluated by spinor analysis. Phys Rev. 1949;76(8):1232-43.
19. Kawasaki K. Diffusion constants near the critical point for time-dependent Ising models I. Phys Rev. 1966;145(1):224-30.
20. Kramers HA, Wannier GH. Statistics of the two-dimensional ferromagnet, Part I. Phys Rev. 1941;60(3):252-62.
21. Krauth W. Statistical mechanics: algorithms and computations. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.
22. Landau DP, Binder K. A guide to Monte Carlo simulations in statistical physics. 5th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2021.
23. McQuarrie DA. Statistical mechanics. Sausalito (CA): University Science Books; 2000.
24. Metropolis N, Rosenbluth AW, Rosenbluth MN, Teller AH, Teller E. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. J Chem Phys. 1953;21(6):1087-92.
25. Newman MEJ, Barkema GT. Monte Carlo methods in statistical physics. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999.
26. Onsager L. Crystal statistics. I. A two-dimensional model with an order-disorder transition. Phys Rev. 1944;65(3-4):117-49.
27. Peierls R. On Ising's model of ferromagnetism. Math Proc Camb Philos Soc. 1936;32(3):477-81.
28. Potts RB. Some generalized order-disorder transformations. Math Proc Camb Philos Soc. 1952;48(1):106-9.
29. Reif F. Fundamentals of statistical and thermal physics. Long Grove (IL): Waveland Press; 2009.
30. Schultz TD, Mattis DC, Lieb EH. Two-dimensional Ising model as a soluble problem of many fermions. Rev Mod Phys. 1964;36(3):856-71.
31. Swendsen RH, Wang JS. Nonuniversal critical dynamics in Monte Carlo simulations. Phys Rev Lett. 1987;58(2):86-8.
32. Wang F, Landau DP. Efficient, multiple-range random walk algorithm to calculate the density of states. Phys Rev Lett. 2001;86(10):2050-3.
33. Wang JS, Swendsen RH. Cluster Monte Carlo algorithms. Physica A. 1990;167(3):565-79.
34. Wang L. Discovering phase transitions with unsupervised learning. Phys Rev B. 2016;94(19):195105.
35. Wolff U. Collective Monte Carlo updating for spin systems. Phys Rev Lett. 1989;62(4):361-4.
36. Yang CN. The spontaneous magnetization of a two-dimensional Ising model. Phys Rev. 1952;85(5):808-16.

About the Corresponding Author

Akhilesh Dwivedi is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Physics at Mewar University, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India. His academic interests encompass physics, scientific research, and higher education. He is actively involved in teaching and research, contributing to the development of scientific knowledge and fostering analytical and conceptual understanding among students.