

# Scaling of fidelity susceptibility in the ground state of Kitaev honeycomb model

Shuo Yang,<sup>1,2</sup> Shi-Jian Gu,<sup>1</sup> Chang-Pu Sun,<sup>2</sup> and Hai-Qing Lin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and ITP, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100080, China*

We study exactly the ground state fidelity in the Kitaev honeycomb model. Our results show that the fidelity susceptibility can be used to identify the topological phase transition from a disordered phase with Abelian anyon excitations to a disordered phase with non-Abelian anyon excitations.

PACS numbers: 64.60.-i, 05.30.Pr, 75.10.Jm

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quite recently, a great deal of effort [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] has been devoted to the role of fidelity, a concept borrowed from quantum information theory [15], in quantum phase transitions (QPTs) [16]. The motivation is quite obvious. Since the fidelity is a measure of similarity between two states, the change of the ground state structure around the quantum critical point should result in a dramatic change in the fidelity across the critical point. Such a fascinating prospect has been demonstrated in many correlated systems. For example, in one-dimensional XY model, fidelity shows a narrow trough at phase transition point [2]. Similar properties were also found in fermionic [3] and bosonic systems [4]. The advantage of fidelity lies that, since the fidelity is a space geometrical quantity, no priori knowledge of order parameter and symmetry-breaking is required in the studies of QPTs.

Nevertheless, the properties of the fidelity is mainly determined by its leading term [7, 8], i.e., its second derivative with respect to the driving parameter (or so-called fidelity susceptibility [8]). According to the standard perturbation method, it has been shown that the fidelity susceptibility actually is equivalent to the structure factor (fluctuation) of driving term in the Hamiltonian [8]. For example, if we focus on the thermal phase transitions and choose the temperature as driving parameter, the fidelity susceptibility, extracted from the mixed state fidelity between two thermal states [6], is simply the specific heat [7, 8]. From this point of view, the fidelity approach to QPTs seems still under the framework of the correlation functions approach, which is intrinsically related to the local order parameter.

However, some systems cannot be described in the framework build on the local order parameter. This might due to the absence of preexisting symmetry in the Hamiltonian, such as topological phase transition [17] and Kosterlitz-Thouless phase transition [18]. For the latter, since the transition is of infinite-order, it has already been pointed out that the fidelity might fail to identify the phase transition point [8, 11]. Therefore, it is an interesting issue to address the role of fidelity in study the topological phase transition.

In this paper, we study the critical behavior of the fidelity susceptibility in a topological QPT described by

the Kitaev honeycomb model. We find that the fidelity susceptibility can be used to identify the topological phase transition from a disordered phase with Abelian anyon excitations to another disordered phase with non-Abelian anyon excitations. We organize our work as follows. In section II, we brief the honeycomb Kitaev model and the definition of the fidelity susceptibility in the Hamiltonian's parameter space. In section III, we diagonalize the Hamiltonian based on Kitaev's approaches and obtain the explicit forms of the Riemann metric tensor, from which the fidelity susceptibility along any direction can be obtained. In section IV, we study the scaling behavior of the fidelity susceptibility numerically. Section V includes a brief summary.

## II. THE MODEL AND SOME FORMULA

The Hamiltonian of Kitaev honeycomb model [19] is

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -J_x \sum_{x\text{-links}} \sigma_j^x \sigma_k^x - J_y \sum_{y\text{-links}} \sigma_j^y \sigma_k^y - J_z \sum_{z\text{-links}} \sigma_j^z \sigma_k^z, \\ &= -J_x H_x - J_y H_y - J_z H_z. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $j, k$  denote two ends of the corresponding bond, and  $J_a$  ( $a = x, y, z$ ) are coupling constants. Though such a model is rather artificial, its potential application in the topological quantum computation have attracted much attention in recent years [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. It has been shown that there exists a non-trivial topological quantum phase transition from a gapped A phase with Abelian anyon excitations to a gapless B phase with non-Abelian anyon excitations. Moreover, the spin-spin correlation functions decay exponentially in both phases, so there is no long-range order in the real space. However, it has also been shown that a kind of long range order might exist in the dual space [24], so basic concepts of Landau theory of continuous phase transitions can still be applied.

To study the fidelity susceptibility, we should know the structure of the parameter space of the Hamiltonian (1) which is three dimensional. In this space, we can always introduce a certain path in the parameter space along which the ground state of the Hamiltonian evolves, i.e.,

$$J_a = J_a(\lambda), \quad (2)$$

where  $\lambda$  plays a kind of driving parameter along the evolution line. We then extend the definition of fidelity to this arbitrary line in high-dimensional space. Following Ref. [2], the fidelity is defined as the overlap between two ground state

$$F = |\langle \Psi_0(\lambda) | \Psi_0(\lambda + \delta\lambda) \rangle|, \quad (3)$$

where  $\delta\lambda$  is the magnitude of a small displacement along the tangent direction at  $\lambda$ . Then the fidelity susceptibility along this line can be calculated as

$$\chi_F = \lim_{\delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{-2 \ln F_i}{\delta\lambda^2} = \sum_{ab} g_{ab} n^a n^b, \quad (4)$$

where  $n^a = \partial J_a / \partial \lambda$  denotes the tangent unit vector at the given point,  $g_{ab}$  is the Riemann metric tensor introduced by Zanardi, Giorda, and Cozzini[7]. For the present model, we have

$$g_{ab} = \sum_n \frac{\langle \Psi_n(\lambda) | H_a | \Psi_0(\lambda) \rangle \langle \Psi_0(\lambda) | H_b | \Psi_n(\lambda) \rangle}{(E_n - E_0)^2}, \quad (5)$$

where  $|\Psi_n(\lambda)\rangle$  is the eigenstate of the Hamiltonian with energy  $E_n$ .

Clearly,  $g_{ab}$  does not depend on a specific path along which the system evolves. However, once  $g_{ab}$  are obtained, the fidelity susceptibility is just a simple combination of  $g_{ab}$  together with a unit vector which defines the direction of system evolution in the parameter space.

### III. FIDELITY SUSCEPTIBILITY IN THE GROUND STATE

According to Kitaev [19], the Hamiltonian (1) can be diagonalized exactly by introducing Majorana fermion operators to represent Pauli operators as

$$\sigma^x = ib^x c, \quad \sigma^y = ib^y c, \quad \sigma^z = ib^z c, \quad (6)$$

where Majorana operators satisfy  $A^2 = 1$ ,  $AB = -BA$  for  $A, B \in \{b^x, b^y, b^z, c\}$  and  $A \neq B$ , and also  $b^x b^y b^z c |\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$  to ensure the commutation relations of spin operators. Then the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{j,k} \hat{u}_{jk} J_{a_{jk}} c_j c_k. \quad (7)$$

Since the operators  $\hat{u}_{jk} = ib_j^{a_{jk}} b_k^{a_{jk}}$  satisfy  $[\hat{u}_{jk}, H] = 0$ ,  $[\hat{u}_{jk}, \hat{u}_{ml}] = 0$ , and  $\hat{u}_{jk}^2 = 1$ , they can be regarded as the generators of  $Z_2$  symmetry group. Therefore, the whole Hilbert space can be decomposed into common eigenspaces of  $\hat{u}_{jk}$ , each subspace is characterized by a group of  $u_{jk} = \pm 1$ . The spin model is transformed to a quadratic Majorana fermionic Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{j,k} u_{jk} J_{a_{jk}} c_j c_k. \quad (8)$$

Here we only restrict ourselves to the vortex free subspace with translational invariant, i.e., all  $u_{jk} = 1$ . After Fourier transformation, we get the Hamiltonian of a unit cell in the momentum representation [19]

$$H = \sum_q \begin{pmatrix} a_{-q,1} \\ a_{-q,2} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & if(q) \\ -if(q)^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{q,1} \\ a_{q,2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where the Majorana operators

$$a_{q,\gamma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2L^2}} \sum_s e^{-i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}_s} c_{s,\gamma}, \quad (10)$$

$s$  refers to a unit cell while  $\gamma$  to a position type inside the cell, and

$$\begin{aligned} f(q) &= \epsilon_q + i\Delta_q, \\ \epsilon_q &= J_x \cos q_x + J_y \cos q_y + J_z, \\ \Delta_q &= J_x \sin q_x + J_y \sin q_y. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here, we set  $L$  to be an odd integer, then the system size is  $N = 2L^2$ . The momenta take

$$q_{x(y)} = \frac{2n\pi}{L}, n = -\frac{L-1}{2}, \dots, \frac{L-1}{2}. \quad (12)$$

The above Hamiltonian can be rewritten by some fermionic operators as

$$H = \sum_q \sqrt{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2} \left( C_{q,1}^\dagger C_{q,1} - C_{q,2}^\dagger C_{q,2} \right). \quad (13)$$

Therefore, we have the ground state

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_0\rangle &= \prod_q C_{q,2}^\dagger |0\rangle \\ &= \prod_q \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2}}{\Delta_q + i\epsilon_q} a_{-q,1} + a_{-q,2} \right) |0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

with the ground state energy

$$E_0 = - \sum_q \sqrt{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2}. \quad (15)$$

The fidelity of the two ground states at  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda'$  can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} F^2 &= \prod_q \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta_q \Delta'_q + \epsilon_q \epsilon'_q}{E_q E'_q} \right), \\ &= \prod_q \cos^2 (\theta_q - \theta'_q). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(2\theta_q) &= \frac{\epsilon_q}{E_q}, \quad \sin(2\theta_q) = \frac{\Delta_q}{E_q}, \\ \cos(2\theta'_q) &= \frac{\epsilon'_q}{E'_q}, \quad \sin(2\theta'_q) = \frac{\Delta'_q}{E'_q}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$




FIG. 1: (color online) The fidelity susceptibility as a function of  $J_z$  along the dashed line shown in the triangle for various system sizes  $L = 101, 303, 909$ . Both up insets correspond to enlarged picture of two small portions.

The Riemann metric tensor can be expressed as

$$g^{ab} = \sum_q \left( \frac{\partial \theta_q}{\partial J_a} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \theta_q}{\partial J_b} \right), \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial (2\theta_q)}{\partial J_x} &= \frac{J_z \sin q_x + J_y \sin(q_x - q_y)}{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2} \cdot \frac{\Delta_q}{|\Delta_q|}, \\ \frac{\partial (2\theta_q)}{\partial J_y} &= -\frac{J_x \sin(q_x - q_y) - J_z \sin q_y}{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2} \cdot \frac{\Delta_q}{|\Delta_q|}, \\ \frac{\partial (2\theta_q)}{\partial J_z} &= -\frac{J_x \sin q_x + J_y \sin q_y}{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2} \cdot \frac{\Delta_q}{|\Delta_q|}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Clearly, with these equations, we can in principle calculate the fidelity susceptibility along any direction in the parameter space according to Eq. (4).

#### IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Following Kitaev [19], we restrict our studies on the plane  $J_x + J_y + J_z = 1$  (see the large triangle in Fig. 1). According to his results, the plane consists of two phases, i.e., a gapped A phase with Abelian anyon excitations and a gapless B phase with non-Abelian excitations. The two phases are separated by three transition lines, i.e.  $J_x = 1/2$ ,  $J_y = 1/2$ , and  $J_z = 1/2$  which form a small triangle of the B phase.

Generally, we can define an arbitrary evolution line on the plane. Without loss of generality, we first choose the line as  $J_x = J_y$  (see the dashed line in the triangle of Fig. 1). Then the fidelity susceptibility along this line can be




FIG. 2: (color online) The finite size scaling analysis is performed for the case of power-law divergence for systems sizes  $L = 201, 301, \dots, 901$ . The fidelity susceptibility, considered as a function of system size and driving parameter is a function of  $L^\nu (J_z - J_z^{\max})$  only, has the critical exponent  $\nu = 0.96$ .

simplified as

$$\chi_F = \frac{1}{16} \sum_q \left[ \frac{\sin q_x + \sin q_y}{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2} \right]^2. \quad (20)$$

The numerical results of different system sizes are shown in Fig. 1. The results are very impressive. First of all, the fidelity susceptibility per two sites, i.e.  $\chi_F/L^2$  diverges quickly with increasing system size around the critical point  $J_z = 1/2$ . This property is similar to the fidelity susceptibility in other systems, such as the one-dimensional Ising chain [2] and the asymmetric Hubbard model[12]. Secondly,  $\chi_F/L^2$  is almost an intensive quantity in the A phase ( $J_z > 1/2$ ), while in the B phase, the fidelity susceptibility also diverges with increasing system size. Thirdly, the fidelity susceptibility shows many peaks in the A phase, the number of peak linearly increases with the system size  $L$  (see the left-up inset of Fig. 1).

To study the scaling behavior of the fidelity susceptibility around the critical point, we perform finite scaling analysis. Since the fidelity susceptibility in the A phase is an intensive quantity, the fidelity susceptibility in the thermodynamic limit, scales like [12]

$$\frac{\chi_F}{L^2} \propto \frac{1}{|J_z - J_z^c|^\alpha}. \quad (21)$$

around  $J_z^c = 1/2$ . Meanwhile, the maximum point of  $\chi_F$  at  $J_z = J_z^{\max}$  for a finite sample behavior like

$$\frac{\chi_F}{L^2} \propto L^\mu, \quad (22)$$

with  $\mu = 0.507 \pm 0.0001$  (see the inset of Fig. 2). According to the scaling ansatz, the rescaled fidelity susceptibility around its maximum point at  $J_z^{\max}$  is just a simple




FIG. 3: (color online) The fidelity susceptibility and a few low-lying excitations as a function of  $J_z$  in a small portion of the evolution line for system size  $L = 51$ .




FIG. 4: (color online) The fidelity susceptibility as a function of  $J_x = 2/3 - J_y$  along the dashed shown in the triangle for various system sizes  $L = 101, 303, 909$ .

function of the rescaled driving parameter, i.e.,

$$\frac{\chi_F^{\max} - \chi_F}{\chi_F} = f[L^\nu (J_z - J_z^{\max})]. \quad (23)$$

where  $f(x)$  is a universal scaling function and does not depend on the system size, and  $\nu$  is the critical exponent. The function  $f(x)$  is shown in Fig. 2. Clearly, the rescaled fidelity susceptibility of various system sizes fall onto a single line for a specific  $\nu = 0.96 \pm 0.005$ . Then the critical exponent  $\alpha$  can be obtained as

$$\alpha = \frac{\mu}{\nu} = 0.528 \pm 0.001. \quad (24)$$

One of the most interesting observations is that huge number of peaks appear in the B phase. Scaling anal-

ysis manifests that the number of peaks is proportional to the system size. Physically, the peak means that the ground state can not adiabatically evolve from one side of the peak to the other side easily because the two ground states have distinct features. From this point of view, the ground state in the B phase might be stable to the adiabatic perturbation. Moreover, the existence of many peaks can also be reflected from the reconstruction of the energy spectra. For this purpose, we choose a small portion of evolution line and plot both the fidelity susceptibility and a few low-lying excitations in Fig. 3. Since the fidelity is inversely proportional to the energy gap [Eq. (5)], the location of each peak corresponds to a gap minimum.

Similarly, we can also choose the system evolution line as  $J_z = 1/3$ , the fidelity susceptibility then takes the form

$$\chi_F = \frac{1}{36} \sum_q \left[ \frac{(\sin q_x - \sin q_y) + 2 \sin(q_x - q_y)}{\epsilon_q^2 + \Delta_q^2} \right]^2. \quad (25)$$

The numerical results for this case are shown in Fig. 4. The results are similar to previous cases qualitatively. In the B phase, there still exist many peaks. Both the number and the magnitude of the peaks increase with the system size. While in the A phase, the fidelity susceptibility becomes an intensive quantity. Fig. 4 looks like a “crown” on the head of a king and with many decorations on the top. The crown separates the region into two different phases.

## V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In summary, we have studied the critical behavior of the fidelity susceptibility where a topological phase transition occurred in the honeycomb Kitaev model. Though no symmetry breaking exists and no local order parameter in real space can be used to describe the transition, the fidelity susceptibility definitely can witness the transition point. We found that the fidelity susceptibility per two sites is almost an intensive quantity in the gapped phase, while in the gapless phase, the huge number of peaks reflects frequent spectra reconstruction along the evolution line. We also studied various scaling and critical exponents of the fidelity susceptibility around the critical points.

However, the relation between the fidelity susceptibility and topological phase transition still seems unclear. Earlier thought is that the fidelity susceptibility, which is a kind of structure factor obtained by a combination of correlation functions, can hardly be related to the topological phase transition, since the latter cannot be described by the correlation functions of local operators. On the other hand, our results indicate that the fidelity susceptibility is still able to characterize the topological phase transition. This issue deserves further investigations.

### Acknowledgments

We thank Xiao-Gang Wen, Yupeng Wang, Guang-Ming Zhang, and Junpeng Cao for helpful discussions.

This work is supported by the Direct grant of CUHK (A/C 2060344) and NSFC.

- 
- [1] H. T. Quan, Z. Song, X. F. Liu, P. Zanardi, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 140604 (2006).
- [2] P. Zanardi and N. Paunkovic, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 031123 (2006).
- [3] P. Zanardi, M. Cozzini, and P. Giorda, arXiv: quant-ph/0606130; M. Cozzini, P. Giorda, and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 014439 (2007); M. Cozzini, R. Ionicioiu, and P. Zanardi, arXiv: cond-mat/0611727.
- [4] P. Buonsante and A. Vezzani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 110601 (2007).
- [5] P. Zanardi, H. T. Quan, X. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032109 (2007).
- [6] P. Zanardi, H. T. Quan, X. G. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032109 (2007).
- [7] P. Zanardi, P. Giorda, and M. Cozzini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 100603 (2007).
- [8] W. L. You, Y. W. Li, and S. J. Gu, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 022101 (2007).
- [9] H. Q. Zhou and J. P. Barjaktarevic, arXiv: cond-mat/0701608; H. Q. Zhou, J. H. Zhao, and B. Li, arXiv:0704.2940;
- [10] L. C. Venuti and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 095701 (2007).
- [11] S. Chen, L. Wang, S. J. Gu, and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. E **76** 061108 (2007); S. Chen, L. Wang, Y. Hao, and Y. Wang, arXiv:0801.0020.
- [12] S. J. Gu, H. M. Kwok, W. Q. Ning, and H. Q. Lin, arXiv:0706.2495.
- [13] M. F. Yang, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 180403 (R) (2007); Y. C. Tzeng and M. F. Yang, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012311 (2008).
- [14] N. Paunkovic, P. D. Sacramento, P. Nogueira, V. R. Vieira, and V. K. Dugaev, arXiv:0708.3494.
- [15] M. A. Nilesen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
- [16] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1999).
- [17] X. G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory of Many-Body Systems* (Oxford University, New York, 2004).
- [18] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **6**, 1181(1973).
- [19] A. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **303**, 2 (2003); Ann. Phys. **321**, 2 (2006).
- [20] X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 016803 (2003); M. A. Levin and X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 045110 (2005).
- [21] J. Preskill, *Topological quantum computation*, <http://www.theory.caltech.edu/people/preskill/ph229/> (2004).
- [22] J. K. Pachos, IJQI **4**, 947 (2006); Ann. Phys. **322**, 1254 (2007).
- [23] S. D. Sarma, M. Freedman, C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, arXiv: 0707.1889.
- [24] X. Y. Feng, G. M. Zhang, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 087204 (2007); D. H. Lee, G. M. Zhang, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 196805 (2007).
- [25] H. D. Chen and J. P. Hu, arXiv: cond-mat/0702366; H. D. Chen and Z. Nussinov, arXiv: cond-mat/0703633; Z. Nussinov, G. Ortiz, arXiv: cond-mat/0702377.
- [26] Y. Yu, arXiv: 0704.3829; Y. Yu, Z. Q. Wang, arXiv: 0708.0631; T. Y. Si and Y. Yu, arXiv:0709.1302; T. Y. Si and Y. Yu, arXiv: 0712.4231 .
- [27] S. Yang, D. L. Zhou, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 180404(R) (2007).
- [28] S. P. Kou and X. G. Wen, arXiv: 0711.0571.
- [29] S. Mandal and N. Surendran, arXiv: 0801.0229.