

Comment on “Quantum Monte Carlo scheme for frustrated Heisenberg antiferromagnets”

K. S. D. Beach,^{1,2} Matthieu Mambrini,³ and Fabien Alet³

¹*Institut für theoretische Physik und Astrophysik, Universität Würzburg, Am Hubland, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany*

²*Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G7, Canada*

³*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, IRSAMC, CNRS, Université Paul Sabatier, 31062 Toulouse, France*

Quantum Monte Carlo methods are sophisticated numerical techniques for simulating interacting quantum systems. In some cases, however, they suffer from the notorious “sign problem” and become too inefficient to be useful. A recent publication [J. Wojtkiewicz, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 174421 (2007)] claims to have solved the sign problem for a certain class of frustrated quantum spin systems through the use of a bipartite valence bond basis. We show in this Comment that the apparent positivity of the path integral is due to a misconception about the resolution of the identity operator in this basis, and that consequently the sign problem remains a severe obstacle for the simulation of frustrated quantum magnets.

Frustrated quantum antiferromagnets are of great interest, from both experimental and theoretical points of view. A theoretical analytical framework for understanding frustrated quantum magnets is still lacking, and numerical simulations also turn out to be very difficult. In particular, Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) methods suffer from the “sign problem,” rendering QMC simulations of frustrated magnets completely inefficient.

In a recent publication,¹ J. Wojtkiewicz claims to have solved the sign problem for a certain class of frustrated antiferromagnets, including the important cases of the J_1 - J_2 model and the pyrochlore lattice. He proposes using a valence bond (VB) basis, rather than the conventional S_z basis, to formulate the path integral used in the QMC framework. In this basis, the matrix elements involved are strictly positive, and the sign problem seems to disappear. In this Comment, we point out that the conventional route to constructing the path integral (via the Trotter-Suzuki formula) is not suited to the bipartite VB basis used by Wojtkiewicz, and that consequently the method proposed in Ref. 1 cannot work.

Let us first summarize the approach taken in Ref. 1. The starting point is to group terms in the Hamiltonian $H = \sum_P H_P$ according to the plaquette P in which they act. The Trotter-Suzuki formula [see Eq. (1) in Ref. 1], is used to decouple the potentially noncommuting terms appearing in the partition function:

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left[\prod_P e^{-\epsilon H_P} \right]^n. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\epsilon = \beta/n$ is an infinitesimal imaginary-time step. In the usual way, a representation of unity is introduced between each exponential factor, leading to

$$Z = \sum_{\{\alpha\}} \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_P \langle \alpha_{P,i} | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha_{P,i+1} \rangle, \quad (2)$$

where the notation implies $|\alpha_{P,n+1}\rangle = |\alpha_{P,1}\rangle$. This amounts to introducing a new set of states at each plaquette and at each time slice.

Implicit in Eq. (2) is the existence of a simple resolution of the identity operator,

$$\hat{1} = \sum_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|, \quad (3)$$

in the basis $\{\alpha\}$ used to perform the simulations. Taking this for granted, Ref. 1 calculates all possible matrix elements $\langle \alpha | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha' \rangle$ (with $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\alpha'\rangle$ in the *bipartite* VB basis) and shows that they are all positive. Wojtkiewicz then concludes that a QMC process without sign problem can be devised with this decomposition.

The essence of this Comment is simple: we point out that Eq. (3) does *not* hold in the bipartite VB basis considered for the calculations. The correct resolution of identity reintroduces the sign problem in the Trotter-Suzuki decomposition of the partition function and renders the scheme proposed in Ref. 1 useless.

In the bipartite valence bond (BVB) basis, the lattice is decomposed into two sets (A and B) of sites, and the two spins forming a singlet necessarily belong to different sets: $[a, b] = (|\uparrow_a \downarrow_b\rangle - |\downarrow_a \uparrow_b\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$. The bipartite VB basis is overcomplete, albeit smaller than the full valence bond (FVB) basis, where there are no restrictions on the constituent spins of the singlet. Since VB bases are nonorthogonal, the most general form of the identity operator is

$$\hat{1} = \sum_{\alpha, \alpha'} |\alpha\rangle 1_{\alpha, \alpha'} \langle \alpha'|. \quad (4)$$

This means that one should also consider the matrix elements of $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ at the QMC sampling level, and in particular ensure that they are all positive in order to avoid the sign problem.

The massive overcompleteness of the basis offers multiple different solutions for $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$. One of the possible choices in the FVB basis is particularly simple. Indeed, for a system of $2N$ spins, $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ can take the diagonal form $\frac{2^N}{(N+1)!} \delta_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ [see Eq. (27) in Ref. 2]. But, such a simple resolution is not possible if the basis consists of AB bonds only³ (BVB basis).

To see this explicitly, consider the four-site ($N = 2$) system, which admits three VB states—two bipartite, $[1, 2][3, 4]$ and $[1, 4][3, 2]$, and one nonbipartite, $[1, 3][2, 4]$. The representation of the identity operator has only positive, diagonal elements in the full VB basis but negative, offdiagonal ones in the bipartite basis:

$$(1_{\alpha, \alpha'})_{\text{FVB}} = \frac{2}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

$$(1_{\alpha, \alpha'})_{\text{BVB}} = \frac{2}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

Let us comment on the general N case: the matrix $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ is the pseudo-inverse of the positive semidefinite overlap matrix $O_{\alpha, \alpha'} = \langle \alpha | \alpha' \rangle$ (when only AB bonds are allowed). Since $O_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ has only positive elements, the positivity of all off-diagonal elements of $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ would require that all diagonal elements be strictly negative. This is in contradiction with the positivity of the traces of both $O_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ and $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$. Therefore, in the basis of bipartite bonds, $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ must contain at least one strictly negative, off-diagonal element. Indeed, one can establish that $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ is dense in such elements.

Alternatively, one could imagine formulating the QMC using the full VB basis, which has a simpler resolution of identity. Unfortunately, the sign problem then appears in the Hamiltonian matrix elements. In short, we are left with two ways to organize the path integral, one involving a sum over a VB basis restricted to AB bonds only,

$$Z = \sum_{\{\alpha\}}^{\text{BVB}} \cdots \underbrace{\langle \alpha | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha' \rangle}_{\text{positive}} \underbrace{1_{\alpha', \alpha''}}_{\text{signed}} \underbrace{\langle \alpha'' | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha''' \rangle}_{\text{positive}} \cdots, \quad (7)$$

and one involving an unrestricted sum,

$$Z = \sum_{\{\alpha\}}^{\text{FVB}} \cdots \underbrace{\langle \alpha | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha' \rangle}_{\text{signed}} \underbrace{\langle \alpha' | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha'' \rangle}_{\text{signed}} \cdots \quad (8)$$

In neither case is the sign eliminated. In the bipartite VB basis, the matrix elements $\langle \alpha | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha' \rangle$ are strictly positive, but the identity matrix elements $1_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ are not. In the full VB basis, the situation is reversed: $1_{\alpha, \alpha'} \sim \delta_{\alpha, \alpha'} > 0$, but $\langle \alpha | e^{-\epsilon H_P} | \alpha' \rangle$ is no longer strictly positive. Thus, the choice of basis amounts to nothing more than shuffling the sign problem from one location to another. With these considerations in mind, it is clear that the Trotter-Suzuki decomposition cannot be performed as envisioned in Ref. 1, and the QMC scheme proposed therein breaks down.

In conclusion, the VB basis can be very useful in QMC simulations, but a workable algorithm cannot be organized around inserting an overcomplete set of states between time slices in a Trotter-Suzuki scheme. A better approach is to project down from a trial state using the power method, relying on the property that Heisenberg spin interactions induce simple rearrangements of valence bond configurations.⁴ In this way, spin models with non-frustrating interactions of arbitrary order can be treated. Grouping of terms (along the lines of the plaquette decomposition of Ref. 1) combined with a fixed-node approximation⁵ might partially alleviate the sign problem in models with frustrating interactions and lead to more efficient QMC sampling,⁶ but we do not expect a simple full solution to the sign problem (such as the one claimed in Ref. 1) to emerge from this approach.

Finally, it is worth noting that the *overlap calculations* reported in Ref. 1 are certainly correct and may yet prove useful in the evaluation of variational valence bond wavefunctions, following the method of Liang, Douçot, and Anderson⁷ and its refinements.^{8,9}

We thank Sylvain Capponi and Anders Sandvik for fruitful discussions and J. Wojtkiewicz for helpful correspondence. This research is supported by the French ANR program (MM and FA), the Alexander von Humboldt foundation (KB), and the French-German Procope exchange program.

¹ J. Wojtkiewicz, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 174421 (2007).

² K. S. D. Beach and A. W. Sandvik, Nucl. Phys. B **750**, 142 (2006).

³ This can be traced back to the minus sign existing in the overcompleteness relation $[a_1, a_2][b_1, b_2] = [a_1, b_1][a_2, b_2] - [a_1, b_2][a_2, b_1]$ that allows one to systematically eliminate all AA/BB bonds when going from the FVB basis to the BVB one.

⁴ A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 207203 (2005).

⁵ H. J. M. van Bommel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2442 (1994).

⁶ K. S. D. Beach, unpublished.

⁷ S. Liang, B. Douçot, and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 365 (1988).

⁸ J. Lou and A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 104432 (2007).

⁹ K. S. D. Beach, arXiv:0709.3297.