

Construction of density operator for a general mean-field Hamiltonian and its application to the models of correlated fermions

Jakub Jędrak, Jozef Spałek

Marian Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University,
Reymonta 4, 30-059 Kraków, Poland

Abstract

We analyze a class of the mean-field lattice-fermion Hamiltonians and construct the corresponding grand-canonical density operator for such a model system. New terms are introduced, which may be interpreted as local fugacities, molecular fields, etc. The presence of such terms is an unavoidable consequence of the consistent statistical description. Although in some cases (e.g. the Hartree or the Hartree-Fock type of approximations) the presented formalism is redundant, in general (e.g. for a renormalized t-J model) it leads to nontrivial modifications. The case of zero temperature is also briefly analyzed.

PACS: 05.30.-d, 71.10.Fd, 75.10.Jm.

1 Introduction

For most of realistic models of quantum many-particle systems an exact solution cannot be obtained. This is a typical situation in the condensed matter or nuclear physics. As a consequence, a number of approximate methods have been developed. Among them, widely used are various types of the so-called mean-field approaches.

By mean-field (MF) description of the problem we understand making use of the Hamiltonian which depends on some extra parameters, having the meaning of expectation values of well-defined operators. Those parameters are not *a priori* known and are to be determined. The Hartree-Fock method is a good example of such approach.

Mean field methods often provide us with a valuable insight into the physical properties of the system under consideration. They are capable of describing many interesting phenomena, especially those involving phase transitions, such as that from a normal metal to superconductor (in the form of the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer theory), or those from a paramagnet to either antiferromagnet or ferromagnet.

In implementing this procedure, it is the physics of the problem, not the mathematics, that tells us when the application of MF approach is justified. Nonetheless, we may be also faced with the problem of considering the internal mathematical consistency of the method, as well as its underlying physical principles. The aim of this paper is to clarify this issue, in a simple, even didactic manner.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains formulation of the problem. In Section 3 we invoke certain facts from the statistical mechanics. In Section 4 we show how to construct MF density operator, and discuss briefly the applicability of the method. In Section 5 two specific examples of mean-field Hamiltonians, for which our approach is applicable, are described. Section 6 contains a summary. In Appendix 7.1 we dwell on the case of zero temperature. In Appendix 7.2 variational bounds for grand-canonical potential Ω are elaborated, whereas in Appendix 7.3 we provide some technical details of our analysis.

2 Statement of the problem

We assume that Hilbert-Fock state space is of finite dimension D , as we/are interested/ our principal interest is of... deal with fermion models on a finite lattice. The MF Hamiltonians are denoted as \hat{H} , whereas those which are not of MF type, will be called *exact* and labelled with the subscript 'e'.

As already mentioned in the introduction, by *mean-field* we understand the situation in which Hamiltonian depends on certain complex parameters, that are to be determined when solving the problem at hand. Such Hamiltonian is usually derived from a parent Hamiltonian, labeled as \hat{H}_e^P , in which we replace some of its operators by \mathbb{C} -numbers, i.e.

$$\hat{A}_s \rightarrow A_s \in \mathbb{C}, \quad s = 1, \dots, M; \quad \hat{H}_e^P \rightarrow \hat{H}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_M). \quad (1)$$

The numbers A_s have then a natural interpretation of mean values of the corresponding operators. In general, we may propose any form of functional dependence of \hat{H} on $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_M) \equiv \vec{A}$, there may be even no obvious \hat{H}_e^P to start with. Our principal task is then to construct thus a Hamiltonian, which is tractable; this typically means that the resulting \hat{H} is bilinear in creation and annihilation operators. The question then arises, how to determine the values of parameters A_s appearing in \hat{H} .

We assume that our system is in thermal equilibrium characterized by the temperature $k_B T = \beta^{-1}$ and the chemical potential μ . In principle, one can have Q different species of fermions, then we have obviously Q corresponding chemical potentials. If the Hamiltonian of the system were exact,

i.e. not expectation-value dependent, then the treatment of such situation is straightforward, in a sense, that grand canonical (GC) ensemble is well defined, and all information about the system is contained in the following density operator¹ [1],

$$\hat{\rho}_e = Z_e^{-1} \exp(-\beta(\hat{H}_e - \mu\hat{N})), \quad (2)$$

where $Z_e = \text{Tr}[\exp(-\beta(\hat{H}_e - \mu\hat{N}))]$ is the grand-canonical partition function. The expectation value of any observable \hat{A} is then given by

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle_e \equiv \text{Tr}[\hat{A}\hat{\rho}_e]. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, we presume, that in the mean-field case this basic definition still holds, i.e.

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \text{Tr}[\hat{A}\hat{\rho}]. \quad (4)$$

Regardless the form of MF density operator $\hat{\rho}$, we should be able to obtain any expectation value through (4). The last definition allows us to determine, in particular, the values of A_1, A_2, \dots, A_M appearing in $\hat{\rho}$, by solving a system of M implicit equations of M variables (the self-consistency equations), which takes the form

$$\forall_s \langle \hat{A}_s \rangle = A_s = \text{Tr}[\hat{A}_s\hat{\rho}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_M)]. \quad (5)$$

We may hope that this system should have at least one solution.

One would expect, that MF grand-canonical density operator should be given by (2) with \hat{H}_e replaced with \hat{H} , so

$$\hat{\rho} = \tilde{Z}^{-1} \exp(-\beta(\hat{H} - \mu\hat{N})), \quad \tilde{Z} = \text{Tr}[\exp(-\beta(\hat{H} - \mu\hat{N}))]. \quad (6)$$

This is, however, not necessarily the case, as is shown in the next Section.

3 Exact approach: a brief summary

Before discussing the mean-field case, it is desirable to describe briefly the canonical situation. For any exact Hamiltonian \hat{H}_e , the GC density operator is given by (2). This particular form may be derived from the the following variational principle: we require that GC density operator maximizes the Von Neumann entropy, with the conditions that expectation values of Hamiltonian ($\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_e\hat{H}_e]$) and the particle number operator ($\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_e\hat{N}]$) are fixed, (see [1, 2]), i.e.

$$\mathcal{S}_e = \text{Tr}(-\hat{\rho}_e \ln \hat{\rho}_e - \beta\hat{\rho}_e\hat{H}_e + \nu\hat{\rho}_e\hat{N} - \omega\hat{\rho}_e). \quad (7)$$

¹For simplicity we assume for now, that only one kind of particles is present.

Those two conditions are enforced with the help of the Lagrange multipliers β and $\nu \equiv \mu\beta$, whereas the parameter ω is introduced to ensure $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_e] = 1$. We want $\hat{\rho}_e$ to be a constant of motion, so from the quantum Liouville equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{\rho}_e(t) = [\hat{H}_e, \hat{\rho}_e(t)], \quad (8)$$

it follows, that $[\hat{H}_e, \hat{\rho}_e] = 0$. If, additionally, $[\hat{H}_e, \hat{N}] = 0$, which is usually the case in non-relativistic quantum mechanics, we may simultaneously diagonalize all the operators appearing in (7). The minimization procedure² is most conveniently carried out in the basis in which $\hat{\rho}_e$ is diagonal, $\hat{\rho}_e = \sum_i^D p_i |i\rangle\langle i|$. One can easily convince oneself, that the resulting $\hat{\rho}_e$ is indeed of the form given by (2). Density operators for canonical and microcanonical ensembles may be obtained in the very similar manner. The fact, that the canonical density operators maximize the entropy functional (7) or analogous expressions, may be considered as their basic property (*Jaynes principle*), [3, 2].

4 Entropy functional in the mean-field description

We turn to the construction of the proper form of MF density operator. We are interested in a situation in which the entire description of the system is based solely on MF Hamiltonian. In the previous Section it was stated, that maximum entropy condition is the basic one for canonical density operators. Consequently, it should be applied also to the mean-field description. Under this circumstance, the difference with the canonical situation above is that now the Hamiltonian depends on M variables $\{A_s\} \equiv \vec{A}$, interpreted as the expectation values of corresponding operators $\{\hat{A}_s\}$. Those M expectation values, together with D diagonal matrix elements of $\hat{\rho}$, are now the variational parameters, with respect to which the entropy functional

$$\mathcal{S} = \text{Tr}(-\hat{\rho} \ln \hat{\rho} - \beta \hat{\rho} \hat{H} + \nu \hat{\rho} \hat{N} - \omega \hat{\rho}), \quad (9)$$

is maximized. However, if the $M+D$ parameters were treated as independent, there is no certainty that $\{A_s\}$ obtained in this manner coincide with those resulting from the self-consistency conditions (5). Obviously, one may use (5) to eliminate the A_s variables from \hat{H} . Nonetheless, the resulting dependence of \mathcal{S} on D diagonal elements of $\hat{\rho}$ is usually quite complicated, and the explicit

²Formally, (7) is a functional, and the derivatives should be in principle understood as the functional ones. However, for finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and with no dependence of $\hat{\rho}_e$ on time, practically it means an ordinary differentiation.

form of MF density operator cannot be, in general, obtained with the latter method (e.g. we may not be able to find the eigenbasis of $\hat{\rho}$ explicitly).

The natural choice is to use Lagrange multiplier method. The M constraints (5) are enforced with the help of M Lagrange multipliers $\{\tilde{\lambda}_s\} \equiv \vec{\tilde{\lambda}}$. To account for that, the terms of the form $\tilde{\lambda}_s(\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}\hat{A}_s] - A_s)$ must be added to (9). Then, we have in total $D + 2M$ variables, treated as *independent*. In effect, the entropy functional reads

$$\mathcal{S}_\lambda = \text{Tr}\left(-\hat{\rho}_\lambda \ln \hat{\rho}_\lambda - \beta \hat{\rho}_\lambda \hat{H} + \nu \hat{\rho}_\lambda \hat{N} - \omega \hat{\rho}_\lambda + \sum_{s=1}^M \tilde{\lambda}_s \hat{\rho}_\lambda (\hat{A}_s - A_s)\right). \quad (10)$$

Taking this step is equivalent to the following redefinition of the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} \rightarrow \hat{H}_\lambda = \hat{H} - \sum_{s=1}^M \lambda_s (\hat{A}_s - A_s), \quad \lambda_s = \beta^{-1} \tilde{\lambda}_s. \quad (11)$$

Incorporation of this additional term is a basic new ingredient in this paper and will be discussed in detail in what follows. Also, few remarks are in place here. First, each operator \hat{A}_s should be bilinear in creation and/or annihilation operators, in order to preserve a single-particle character of \hat{H} . Second, some of the combinations of the operators $\{\hat{A}_s\}$ appearing in (11) may be proportional to the number operator \hat{N} . Nonetheless, the presence of chemical potential μ determines the average number of particles. This is the reason for using the MF approach combined with grand canonical ensemble formalism, otherwise; we will not be able to specify N .

Third, the operators \hat{H} and \hat{N} in (10) have a different status than the operators $\{\hat{A}_s\}$. The expectation values of the former are assumed to be fixed *a priori*, enforced by the values of temperature and chemical potential. In contrast, the expectation values of the latter are obtained from variational procedure, and are not previously given. Consequently, the same distinction holds for parameters β , ν and λ_s , although all of them are called the Lagrange multipliers. Nonetheless, some of $\{\lambda_s\}$ may have a physical interpretation. Depending on corresponding operator \hat{A}_s they may be termed as local fugacities, molecular fields, etc. (Note, that for $\hat{A}_s = \hat{A}_s^\dagger$, λ_s is real.)

Apart from \hat{H} and \hat{N} , there may be more observables which expectation values are previously given. In such a situation the terms $-\xi_s \hat{A}_s$, analogous to $-\mu \hat{N}$ term, should be present, to ensure that the $\langle \hat{A}_s \rangle$ is consistent with experimental output. This is nothing else but the observation that the model description one uses is inseparable from details of the experiments being described. If we ignore some available information about the physical system

under consideration, we obtain more biased density operator (or probability distribution).

Fourth, the operators appearing in (11) do not necessarily commute with each other, and thus cannot be, in the general, simultaneously diagonalized. However, in analogy with the canonical case, it is natural to require that $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$ thus obtained is stationary, $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\hat{\rho}_\lambda(t) = 0$, from which $[\hat{H}_\lambda, \hat{\rho}_\lambda] = 0$ follows. It may happen though, that $[\hat{N}, \hat{H}_\lambda] \neq 0$ (e.g. in the BCS theory of superconductivity). In such case, we may once more formally redefine the Hamiltonian according to $\hat{H}_\lambda \rightarrow \hat{K}_\lambda = \hat{H}_\lambda - \mu\hat{N}$, and then demand, that $[\hat{K}_\lambda, \hat{\rho}_\lambda] = 0$. In result, diagonalization of \hat{K}_λ provides us with the set of \vec{A} and $\vec{\lambda}$ -dependent eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the density operator $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$. Formula (10) written in this eigenbasis reads now

$$\mathcal{S}_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^D \left(-q_i \ln q_i - \beta(\hat{H})_{ii}q_i + \nu(\hat{N})_{ii}q_i - \omega q_i + \sum_{s=1}^M \tilde{\lambda}_s ((\hat{A}_s)_{ii} - A_s)q_i \right), \quad (12)$$

(with $(\hat{N})_{ii} = \langle i|\hat{N}|i\rangle$ etc..)

4.1 Maximization of the entropy functional

The necessary conditions for \mathcal{S}_λ given by (12) to have a stationary solution are

$$\forall_j : \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_\lambda}{\partial q_j} = -(1+\omega) + \ln q_j - \beta(\hat{H})_{jj} + \nu(\hat{N})_{jj} + \sum_{s=1}^M \tilde{\lambda}_s ((\hat{A}_s)_{jj} - A_s) = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$\forall_w : \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_\lambda}{\partial A_w} = -\beta \sum_{i=1}^D q_i \left(\frac{\partial \hat{H}_{ii}}{\partial A_w} + \lambda_w \right) = 0, \quad (14)$$

and

$$\forall_w : \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_\lambda}{\partial \lambda_w} = \sum_{i=1}^D q_i ((\hat{A}_w)_{ii} - A_w) = 0. \quad (15)$$

When deriving (14) and (15), we ignored the possible explicit dependence of eigenvectors $|i\rangle$ on \vec{A} and $\vec{\lambda}$. This is justified with the help of Hellmann-Feynman theorem, Appendix C. From (13) solely, we then obtain the explicit, basis-independent form of density operator $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$,

$$\hat{\rho}_\lambda = \mathcal{Z}_\lambda^{-1} \exp \left(-\beta(\hat{H}_\lambda - \mu\hat{N}) \right), \quad \mathcal{Z}_\lambda = \text{Tr}[\exp \left(-\beta(\hat{H}_\lambda - \mu\hat{N}) \right)]. \quad (16)$$

We see that (16) differs from (6) by the presence of additional terms in the Hamiltonian, in accordance with (11). Additionally, Eqs. (14) and (15) may be rewritten respectively as

$$-\frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_\lambda}{\partial A_w} = \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_\lambda \left(\frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial A_w} + \lambda_w \right)] = \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial A_w} + \lambda_w \right\rangle_\lambda = \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{H}_\lambda}{\partial A_w} \right\rangle_\lambda = 0, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_\lambda}{\partial \lambda_w} = \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_\lambda (\hat{A}_w - A_w)] = \langle \hat{A}_w \rangle_\lambda - A_w = \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{H}_\lambda}{\partial \lambda_w} \right\rangle_\lambda = 0. \quad (18)$$

Now define the functional

$$\mathcal{F} \equiv -\beta^{-1} \ln \mathcal{Z}_\lambda, \quad (19)$$

with \mathcal{Z}_λ given by (16). Then Eqs. (17) and (18) may acquire the form

$$\nabla_A \mathcal{F} = 0, \quad \nabla_\lambda \mathcal{F} = 0, \quad (20)$$

where $\nabla_A \equiv \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial A_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_M} \right)$, and analogously for ∇_λ . When deriving the last condition we made use of the identity (c.f. [2])

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} e^{C(x)} = \int_0^1 d\tau e^{\tau C(x)} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} C(x) \right) e^{(1-\tau)C(x)}, \quad (21)$$

the linearity of the trace operation, as well as its invariance with respect to cyclic permutation of the operators. The system of equations (20) is equivalent to that given by (13-15). Its form allows for an interpretation in the spirit of Landau theory of phase transitions, as \mathcal{F} is a generalized thermodynamic-potential functional. This interpretation becomes even more direct for expectation values that have a meaning of order parameters. Such situation reflects a capability of the mean-field theories to describe the symmetry-broken phases. It is quite remarkable, that it is possible within our method of approach to relate self-consistent equations (5) to the variational method expressed via (20), for any MF Hamiltonian. Also, the detailed analytical form of \mathcal{F} or even its series expansion in the powers of order parameter(s) may not be obtainable. Moreover, even if we manage to find such an expansion, it may occur, that it differs considerably from what one could expect from the standard Landau approach. However, in a general situation, an insight into this problem may be obtained with the help of numerical analysis only.

At this stage we face the problem of solving Eqs. (20). In practice, the most convenient way would probably be to work in the eigenbasis of $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$, as then the explicit form of \mathcal{F} as a function of \vec{A} and $\vec{\lambda}$ could be obtained.

Obviously, Eqs. (20) may have many solutions, each of them representing different physical state, which depends on values of β, μ and parameters appearing in the Hamiltonian. The ground state is the one minimizing \mathcal{F} .

Let us note, that the formalism presented here may also be applied to the spin systems, with the only difference, that in that situation the canonical rather than the grand-canonical ensemble should be used instead. In particular, this formalism can be used to build up a mean-field description for the case of the classical spin models. In such a situation we deal with a probability distribution, which may obviously be represented by the density matrix, that can be diagonalized simultaneously with all observables appearing in the problem at hand.

The problem related to that discussed in the present paper, namely the construction of variational principles suited for optimization of physical quantities of interest, is examined in an interesting article by R. Balian and M. Veneroni [4]. This paper contains a detailed analysis of the problem, as well as covers a large area of the subject (for example the authors discuss time-dependent formalism).

Very recently we became aware of the papers [5], which focus on the same problem. The authors make also use of the Jaynes principle, or, more generally, of information theory techniques. However, their findings and presented point of view differ essentially from those discussed above, see also Appendix 7.2.

4.2 Redundancy conditions

The question arises, when the presence of Lagrange multipliers in the Hamiltonian (11) becomes unnecessary. We will not provide general answer, but instead present an example. Suppose that the parent Hamiltonian is of the following form

$$\hat{H}_e^P = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{\{s,t\}} V_{st} \hat{A}_s \hat{A}_t, \quad (22)$$

where each \hat{A}_s is assumed to be bilinear in the creation and/or annihilation operators, and the summation is performed over a subset of all possible pairs $\{s, t\}$ of indices. If the interaction term in (22) is decoupled according to

$$\hat{A}_s \hat{A}_t \rightarrow \hat{A}_s A_t + A_s \hat{A}_t - A_s A_t, \quad (23)$$

then the standard Hartree or the Hartree-Fock type mean-field Hamiltonian is obtained. With the presence of λ -terms it reads

$$\hat{H}_\lambda = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{\{s,t\}} V_{st} (\hat{A}_s A_t + A_s \hat{A}_t - A_s A_t) - \sum_s \lambda_s (\hat{A}_s - A_s), \quad (24)$$

and where \hat{H}_0 does not depend on \vec{A} . Then, one can find that in a general case

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial A_w} \right\rangle_\lambda = 0, \quad (25)$$

which together with (17) implies that $\lambda_s = 0$. Also, for Hamiltonian of such form, the solution of the self-consistent equations (5) and of the variational equations $\nabla_A \mathcal{F} = 0$, coincide. A related discussion of this problem may be found in [6].

Summarizing, for any MF Hamiltonian with the interaction treated according to (23), application of our method is not necessary. However, this is not always the case and in the next Section we present two such nontrivial examples.

5 Two nontrivial examples

We now discuss briefly two examples for which the proposed method leads to nontrivial corrections. To achieve this goal, we make use of Eq. (17), and show that the condition $\vec{\lambda} = 0$ cannot be, in general, satisfied.

5.1 Renormalized t-J model

The first example we analyze is the MF Hamiltonian of the so-called renormalized t-J model ([7]-[12]). It originates from the standard t-J model [13], believed to describe correctly the essential physics of the cuprate high-temperature superconductors, that is expressed by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_e = \sum_{i,j(i),\sigma} t_{ij} \tilde{c}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \tilde{c}_{j\sigma} + J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j - \frac{1}{4} \nu_i \nu_j) - \mu \sum_{i,\sigma} \nu_{i\sigma}. \quad (26)$$

Here $\tilde{c}_{i\sigma} = (1 - n_{i-\sigma}) c_{i\sigma}$ and $\nu_i = \sum_\sigma \tilde{c}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \tilde{c}_{i\sigma}$ are the operators with double occupancies on site i projected out. The corresponding renormalized MF Hamiltonian has the form [9]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} \left((t_{ij} g_{ij}^t c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) - \frac{3J}{4} g_{ij}^J (\chi_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.} - |\chi_{ij}|^2) \right) \\ &- \frac{3J}{4} g_{ij}^J (\Delta_{ij} c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i-\sigma}^\dagger + \text{H.c.} - |\Delta_{ij}|^2) - \mu \sum_{i\sigma} n_{i\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

with $x_i = 1 - \sum_\sigma \langle c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} \rangle \equiv 1 - y_i$, $y_i = \sum_\sigma \langle c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} \rangle$, $\chi_{ij} = \langle c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \rangle$, and $\Delta_{ij} = \langle c_{i-\sigma} c_{j\sigma} \rangle = \langle c_{j-\sigma} c_{i\sigma} \rangle$. In this form the projections have been abolished

at the price of introducing the expectation-value dependent renormalization factors g_{ij}^t and g_{ij}^J resulting from the Gutzwiller approximation [14]. Assume first, that the renormalization factors depend solely on $\{x_i\}$, i.e.

$$g_{ij}^t = \sqrt{\frac{4x_i x_j}{(x_i + 1)(x_j + 1)}} \quad \text{and} \quad g_{ij}^J = \frac{4}{(x_i + 1)(x_j + 1)}. \quad (28)$$

In general case, we have to determine the values of parameters χ_{ij} , Δ_{ij} and x_i . This could be achieved, in a standard manner, with the help of self-consistent Eqs. (5) (cf. [7]- [11]).

On the other hand, following our method, we apply the formalism of the preceding Sections. This step requires the following redefinition of the Hamiltonian (27)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\lambda = \hat{H} & - \sum_i \lambda_i^x \left(\sum_\sigma c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} - y_i \right) - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} \left(\lambda_{ij}^x (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} - \chi_{ij}) + \text{H.c.} \right) \\ & - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} \left(\lambda_{ij}^\Delta (c_{i-\sigma} c_{j\sigma} - \Delta_{ij}) + \text{H.c.} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

If we restrict ourselves to non-superconducting solutions, ($\Delta_{ij} = 0$), then Eq. (17), for $A_w \equiv y_i$, takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i^x & = \left\langle \sum_{j(i),\sigma} t_{ij} \frac{\partial g_{ij}^t}{\partial x_i} (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) - \frac{3J}{4} \sum_{j(i),\sigma} \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial x_i} (\chi_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.} - |\chi_{ij}|^2) \right\rangle_\lambda \\ & = \sum_{j(i)} \left(4t_{ij} \frac{\partial g_{ij}^t}{\partial x_i} \text{Re} \chi_{ij} - \frac{3}{2} J \sum_{j(i),\sigma} \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial x_i} |\chi_{ij}|^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

In what follows it will be shown that in this particular case, $\lambda_{ij}^x = \lambda_{ij}^\Delta = 0$ for every bond $\langle ij \rangle$. Consequently, if for all i , we put $\lambda_i^x = 0$, then the density operator, and all averages coincide with those of the standard treatment. However, in such situation equation (30) cannot, in general, be satisfied, as its solutions do not necessarily coincide with those of self-consistent equations (5). For example, if one sets $J = 0$ and $x_i \in (0, 1)$, then from (30) it follows that

$$\left\langle \sum_{j(i),\sigma} (\tilde{t}_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) \right\rangle = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{t}_{ij} = t_{ij} \frac{\partial g_{ij}^t}{\partial x_i} \quad (31)$$

This, however, is a senseless result, as in such case our Hamiltonian reduces essentially to that of free fermions, at least for the case of homogeneous solution, $x_i \equiv x$. Similarly, for $t_{ij} = 0$, one obtains $|\chi_{ij}|^2 = 0$ for each bond

ij , as $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} g_{ij}^t < 0$, for all $\langle ij \rangle$ pairs. This is in contradiction with the numerical results of Raczkowski *et al.*, [10]. Consequently, it follows that $\lambda_i^x \neq 0$, for every i .

From the point of view of our findings, a related situation can be found in the article by C. Li *et al.* [12]. Namely, the Authors study inhomogeneous solutions of the model (27) (with slightly different definitions of χ_{ij} and Δ_{ij}), but with the additional term of the form $\sum_i \epsilon_i (\sum_\sigma c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} + x_i - 1)$, where ϵ_i is the local fugacity, included. The quantity ϵ_i plays a role analogous to λ_i^x in our method. Inclusion of that additional constraint allows the authors to treat each x_i as a variational parameter, and leads to the equations analogous to (30). This step should be clear in the light of the discussion in the preceding Sections. However, the constraints were introduced on the technical level, and no deeper justification of the formalism was given by the Authors.

Next, we pose the question of redundancy of the Lagrange multipliers λ_{ij}^X and λ_{ij}^Δ . We may expect that, according to discussion carried out in Section 4.2, these quantities vanish, as Hamiltonian (27) with g_{ij}^t and g_{ij}^J , as given by (28), is of the Hartree-Fock type with respect to both χ_{ij} and Δ_{ij} . This is indeed the case, as we may use once more Eq. (17) with $A_w = \chi_{ij}$ and $A_w = \Delta_{ij}$, respectively, to obtain

$$\lambda_{ij}^X = \left\langle \frac{3}{4} J \sum_\sigma g_{ij}^J (c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} - \chi_{ij}^*) \right\rangle_\lambda \equiv 0, \quad (32)$$

$$\lambda_{ij}^\Delta = \left\langle \frac{3}{4} J \sum_\sigma g_{ij}^J (c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i-\sigma}^\dagger - \Delta_{ij}^*) \right\rangle_\lambda \equiv 0. \quad (33)$$

However, for the renormalization factors of the more complicated form (compare [8], [11]), i.e.

$$g_{ij}^t = \sqrt{\frac{4x_i x_j (1-x_i)(1-x_j)}{(1-x_i)^2(1-x_j)^2 + 8(1-x_i x_j)|\chi_{ij}|^2 + 16|\chi_{ij}|^4}}, \quad (34)$$

$$g_{ij}^J = \frac{4(1-x_i)(1-x_j)}{(1-x_i)^2(1-x_j)^2 + 8x_i x_j (|\Delta_{ij}|^2 - |\chi_{ij}|^2) + 16(|\Delta_{ij}|^4 + |\chi_{ij}|^4)}, \quad (35)$$

this is not necessarily the case. In such more general situation, the Eqs. (32) and (33) acquire the form, respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ij}^x &= - \sum_{\sigma} \left\langle t_{ij} \frac{\partial g_{ij}^t}{\partial \chi_{ij}} (c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) - \frac{3}{4} J \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial \chi_{ij}} (\chi_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.} - |\chi_{ij}|^2) \right. \\
&+ \left. - \frac{3}{4} J g_{ij}^J (c_{j\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{i\sigma} - \chi_{ij}^*) - \frac{3}{4} J \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial \chi_{ij}} (\Delta_{ij} c_{j\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{i-\sigma}^{\dagger} + \text{H.c.} - |\Delta_{ij}|^2) \right\rangle_{\lambda} \\
&= -4t_{ij} \frac{\partial g_{ij}^t}{\partial \chi_{ij}} \text{Re} \chi_{ij} + \frac{3}{2} J \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial \chi_{ij}} (|\Delta_{ij}|^2 + |\chi_{ij}|^2), \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{ij}^{\Delta} &= \sum_{\sigma} \left\langle \frac{3}{4} J \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial \Delta_{ij}} (\chi_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.} - |\chi_{ij}|^2) + \frac{3}{4} J g_{ij}^J (c_{i-\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma}^{\dagger} - \Delta_{ij}^*) \right. \\
&+ \left. \frac{3}{4} J \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial \Delta_{ij}} (\Delta_{ij} c_{j\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{i-\sigma}^{\dagger} + \text{H.c.} - |\Delta_{ij}|^2) \right\rangle_{\lambda} \\
&= \frac{3}{2} J \frac{\partial g_{ij}^J}{\partial \Delta_{ij}} (|\Delta_{ij}|^2 + |\chi_{ij}|^2). \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

Once again, if we put $\vec{\lambda} = 0$ in order to reduce our approach to the standard treatment, we see that Eqs. (36) and (37) cannot be satisfied. For Eq. (36) this can be easily shown for the case $t_{ij} = -t$ by adding it to its complex conjugate part. Then, for $\text{Re} \chi_{ij} > 0$ one can convince oneself by explicitly computing respective derivatives of g_{ij}^t and g_{ij}^J , that the resulting expression has nonzero value, for a wide range of values x_i . For Eq. (37) or (36) in the case of $t_{ij} = 0$, no additional explanation is required.

Similar arguments apply to the case when, instead of $\vec{\lambda} = 0$, a weaker conditions $\lambda_{ij}^x = 0$ or $\lambda_{ij}^{\Delta} = 0$, are imposed. In such situation we cannot make use of the numerical or analytical results obtained with the help of the self-consistent equations. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that such conditions do not lead to contradictions. For example from Eqs. (36) (with $t_{ij} = 0$) or (37) we infer, that $\chi_{ij} = \Delta_{ij} = 0$.

In that slightly hand-waving manner we argued, that for the Hamiltonian (27) our approach does not in general reduce to that based solely on the self-consistency equations. The interesting question then arises, which method provides us with a lower value of the free energy functional (19)? The answer to this question requires a detailed numerical investigation and will be given elsewhere [15]. However, this point is not crucial for this discussion to hold.

5.2 Electrons with spin-dependent effective masses

Some time ago, J. Spałek and P. Gopalan introduced a description of certain heavy-fermion system, based on the assumption, that the effective masses

of quasiparticles are spin-dependent [16]. They used the MF Hamiltonian, which depends on $A_1 = N$ and $A_2 = M$, where

$$\hat{N} = \hat{A}_1 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \quad \hat{M} = \hat{A}_2 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} \sigma c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \quad (38)$$

and L denotes the number of lattice sites. With additional λ -terms, this Hamiltonian reads

$$\hat{H} = \left(\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} (\Phi_{\sigma}(N, M) \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} - \sigma h - \mu) \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \right) - \lambda_1 (\hat{N} - N) - \lambda_2 (\hat{M} - M), \quad (39)$$

with $(-\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sigma h \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma})$ being the Zeeman term. The present case is, in fact, quite similar to the previous one, the band-narrowing factors $\Phi_{\sigma}(N, M)$ are also derived from the Gutzwiller approach. Then analogously, by making use of Eq. (17), either with $A_w = N$ or $A_w = M$, we obtain respectively

$$\lambda_1 = - \left\langle \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} \frac{\partial \Phi_{\sigma}(N, M)}{\partial N} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \right\rangle_{\lambda}, \quad (40)$$

$$\lambda_2 = - \left\langle \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} \frac{\partial \Phi_{\sigma}(N, M)}{\partial M} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \right\rangle_{\lambda}. \quad (41)$$

Regardless of the detailed analytical form of $\Phi_{\sigma}(N, M)$, we may multiply (41) by $-\frac{\partial}{\partial N} \Phi_{\downarrow}(N, M) (\frac{\partial}{\partial M} \Phi_{\downarrow}(N, M))^{-1}$ and add it to (40). The resulting r.h.s is then proportional to $\langle E_{kin, \uparrow} \rangle_{\lambda} = \langle \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} \rangle_{\lambda}$, the average band energy of particles with z -spin component $\sigma = \uparrow$. If we put $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$, all the averages become identical to those of the standard treatment. Consequently, for (40) and (41) to hold in such a case we have to require that $\langle E_{kin, \uparrow} \rangle = 0$, for any admissible value of N, M , which is a trivial and inconsistent result. The same holds for $\sigma = \downarrow$.

The numerical studies of this model and its extensions are carried out recently, [17].

6 Summary and conclusions

In this paper we have presented the method of constructing the grand-canonical density operator for a wide class of mean-field Hamiltonians that is based on the entropy functional maximization. We have shown, that such a density operator is not, in general, obtained by replacing the exact Hamiltonian by its mean-field counterpart. Usually, some extra terms, which may

be interpreted as a kind of source terms or molecular fields, must be added to the mean-field Hamiltonian.

It is also shown, that although for the Hartree and the Hartree-Fock type of mean-field Hamiltonians our method is not necessary, there are also some important examples (like the Gutzwiller-projected t-J Hamiltonian), for which the method does not reduce to the standard one.

If there is M expectation values appearing in a mean-field Hamiltonian that are to be determined, the method presented here results in a system of $2M$ equations. This is in contrast to the standard treatment, where only M such equations appear. A detailed numerical analysis is required to validate our results on concrete applications.

7 Appendices

7.1 Appendix A: Zero-temperature limit

We present briefly some remarks on the the treatment for the $T = 0$ case. In principle, the situation in question could be obtained as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the finite temperature case, but we consider it separately, to avoid unnecessary mathematical difficulties.

It is well known, that for the ground state of Hamiltonian \hat{H}_e the following functional

$$E(|\Psi\rangle) = \langle \Psi | \hat{H}_e | \Psi \rangle \quad (42)$$

reaches its minimum, with the additional requirement that $\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle = 1$. Among the trial states, depending on a set of parameters, the best state is that minimizing (42). Assume now that all of the M variational parameters, $A_1, \dots, A_M \equiv \vec{A}$, are regarded as expectation values of the operators $\hat{A}_1, \dots, \hat{A}_M$. Moreover, instead of \hat{H}_e we may also consider some MF Hamiltonian \hat{H} . In that situation, the state, the Hamiltonian or both may be \vec{A} -dependent. Thus, when minimizing (42) in that case, we must remember that the conditions

$$A_s = \langle \Psi(\vec{A}) | \hat{A}_s | \Psi(\vec{A}) \rangle = \text{Tr}(|\Psi(\vec{A})\rangle \langle \Psi(\vec{A}) | \hat{A}_s) \quad (43)$$

must hold. The special situation is encountered for the case $\hat{A}_s = \hat{N}$ for some s . Then, the trial state cannot be an eigenstate of \hat{N} , in contrast to what is usually assumed in the non-relativistic quantum mechanics (in the opposite case N cannot be, obviously, used as a variational parameter). $|\Psi(\vec{A})\rangle$ may be a coherent superposition of eigenstates of \hat{N} with different N , as is the BCS wave function, even the problem at hand may have nothing to do with

superconductivity. Another possibility is to use a mixed state as the trial state. In any case, to control the average number of particles, a $(-\mu\hat{N})$ term should be added to the Hamiltonian. It is then a standard exercise on the Lagrange multiplier method that we are forced to employ in to determine minimum of the following functional,

$$\langle \Psi(\vec{A}) | \hat{H} - \vec{\lambda} \cdot (\vec{\hat{A}} - \vec{A}) - \mu\hat{N} - \omega | \Psi(\vec{A}) \rangle, \quad (44)$$

with $\langle \Psi(\vec{A}) | \Psi(\vec{A}) \rangle = 1$ accounted for with the help of the parameter ω . For an \vec{A} -dependent Hamiltonian, this may be once again understood as a redefinition of the Hamiltonian (11).

7.2 Appendix B: Relation of the method to other variational principles

Up to this point we considered the situation, when our description of the system had been based on the MF Hamiltonian \hat{H} . In other words, we assumed that there is no exact reference Hamiltonian \hat{H}_e , for which \hat{H} plays the role of a simplified (linearized) counterpart. Such a treatment may seem questionable because one can argue, that without the exact Hamiltonian, we have no real basis for the analysis. On the other hand, resulting MF Hamiltonian may be not much more unrealistic than \hat{H}_e , which by itself is simplified and covers only a part of the real-system complexity.

There are also situations when we want to use a MF density operator as a trial state in order to determine the bounds on the grand-canonical potential Ω of the system described by \hat{H}_e . Such bounds are provided by the well-known inequality due to Bogolyubov and Feynman [18]

$$\Omega_e \leq \langle \hat{H}_e - \hat{H} \rangle + \Omega = \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}(\hat{H}_e - \hat{H})] + \Omega. \quad (45)$$

There are several ways to prove this; probably the shortest of them is that of making use of the Klein inequality, [19]

$$\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho} \ln \hat{\rho}] \geq \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho} \ln \hat{\sigma}], \quad (46)$$

which holds for any normalized density operators $\hat{\rho}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$. Inserting

$$\hat{\rho} = Z^{-1} \exp(-\beta(\hat{H} - \mu\hat{N})), \quad \hat{\sigma} = \hat{\rho}_e = Z_e^{-1} \exp(-\beta(\hat{H}_e - \mu\hat{N})), \quad (47)$$

we obtain (45). Bogolyubov inequality is the basis of variational principle, the best of the trial states $\hat{\rho}$ is the one which minimizes r.h.s. of (45). The density operators (16) may serve as such trial states, in contrast to those

given by (6), which have no variational parameters (the expectation values are completely determined by solving (5)). In such case, the r.h.s. of (45) should be varied with respect to \vec{A} , but not $\vec{\lambda}$, which in turn ensures that \vec{A} is obtained in a consistent way. Consequently, instead of (20) we have to solve the following system of $2M$ equations

$$\nabla_A \mathcal{B}(\vec{A}, \vec{\lambda}) = 0, \quad \forall_s \langle \hat{A}_s \rangle_\lambda = A_s = \text{Tr}[\hat{A}_s \hat{\rho}_\lambda(\vec{A}, \vec{\lambda})], \quad (48)$$

where by $\mathcal{B}(\vec{A}, \vec{\lambda})$ we denote the r.h.s of (45). Under these circumstances, solution of (48) would generally lead to different values of A_s and λ_s , than those obtained from (20). Obviously, $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$ is then no longer a true grand-canonical density operator, with this respect it is not even better than (6). The same holds true for other inequalities (i.e. various generalizations of (45)), and the corresponding variational principles built on them. One may use the $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$ (16) as useful trial states in such cases as well. However, the entropy functional (10) with the corresponding variational principle play a special role, and determines the shape of such density operator.

Finally, let us note yet another interesting possible way of constructing a mean-field description. Following Ref. [5], consider the problem of minimization of the quantity³

$$\Omega(\hat{\rho}) = \text{Tr} \hat{\rho} [\hat{H}_e + \beta^{-1} \ln \hat{\rho} - \mu \hat{N}], \quad (49)$$

using a trial density operator $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}_a$ of the form

$$\hat{\rho}_a = \exp \left(-\zeta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j \hat{R}_j \right). \quad (50)$$

In the last formula \hat{R}_j are some operators, chosen in a manner that makes $\hat{\rho}_a$ easy to diagonalize, e.g. once again a single-particle ones; ζ_j are the corresponding real parameters and ζ_0 ensures the normalization. In contrast to trial states (16), in such $\hat{\rho}_a$ there is no *a priori* assumed knowledge about the details of the dependence of MF density operator on corresponding expectation values, as there is no starting MF Hamiltonian. We only have a choice of a set of relevant operators \hat{R}_j , all information about microscopic model is contained in some exact Hamiltonian \hat{H}_e . Now (49) may be treated as a function(al) of m parameters ζ_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, or as a function of m yet unknown expectation values $\langle \hat{R}_j \rangle$. Both points of view lead to the same equations, resulting from minimization of (49) with respect to appropriate variables, but in contrast to Ref. [5] we choose the former interpretation.

³This step is obviously equivalent to maximization of entropy functional (7).

The stationary values of ζ_j yield a kind of an effective Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_a - \mu\hat{N} = \beta^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \zeta_j \hat{R}_j + c\hat{1}_D, \quad (51)$$

which may be regarded as the best one among single-particle Hamiltonians resulting from restricted class of density operators given by (50), i.e. being linear combination of \hat{R}_j operators.

Now we concentrate on the example of the t-J model, with \hat{H}_e given by (26) and \hat{R}_j operators being those appearing in the renormalized t-J model (27). It is interesting to compare such an approach with that of paragraph 5.1. In the present case we have, in particular, no previous knowledge about g^t and g^J -factors, but due to the minimization of (49) we may in a way estimate (or 'fit') those quantities. The numerical investigation of this subject is under way [15].

7.3 Appendix C. Hellmann-Feynman theorem

When deriving (14) and (15) we used the following identity. Suppose that some operator \hat{O} , as well as its eigenstate $|i\rangle$ (i.e. $\hat{O}|i\rangle = O_i|i\rangle$), depend on a parameter x . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial O_i}{\partial x} &= \frac{\partial \langle i(x)|\hat{O}(x)|i(x)\rangle}{\partial x} = \left\langle \frac{\partial i(x)}{\partial x} \middle| \hat{O}(x) | i(x) \right\rangle + \langle i(x) | \hat{O}(x) \middle| \frac{\partial i(x)}{\partial x} \rangle + \\ &+ \langle i(x) | \frac{\partial \hat{O}(x)}{\partial x} | i(x) \rangle = O_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \langle i(x) | i(x) \rangle + \langle i(x) | \frac{\partial \hat{O}(x)}{\partial x} | i(x) \rangle \\ &= \langle i(x) | \frac{\partial \hat{O}(x)}{\partial x} | i(x) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

for any normalized state $|i(x)\rangle$, where $\langle \frac{\partial i(x)}{\partial x} | = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\langle i(x) |)$. In Eqs. (14) and (15) we have to set $\hat{O} \equiv \hat{H}_\lambda - \mu\hat{N}$.

Acknowledgments

The authors are very grateful to Krzysztof Rościszewski for his valuable comments and insightful remarks.

The authors acknowledge the Grant from Ministry of Science and Higher Education.

*Corresponding author, e-mail: jedrak@th.if.uj.edu.pl

References

- [1] L. E. Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*, Edward Arnold Publishers, (1980).
- [2] D. Zubarev, *Statistical Mechanics of Non-equilibrium processes*. Polish edition, *Termodynamika Statystyczna*, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN (1974).
- [3] E. T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. **106**, 620-630 (1957); **108**, 171-190 (1957).
- [4] R. Balian and M. Veneroni, Annals of Physics **187**, 29-78 (1988).
- [5] R. Rossignoli and A. Plastino, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 2065 (1990); R. Rossignoli, A. Plastino, H.G. Miller, Phys. Rev. C **43**, 1599 (1991).
- [6] H. Bruus, K. Flensberg
Many-Body Quantum Theory in Condensed Matter Physics. An Introduction. Oxford University Press, (2004), chapter 4.
- [7] F. C. Zhang, C. Gros, T. M. Rice and H. Shiba, Supercond. Sci. Technol. **1** 36, (1988) also as arXiv:cond-mat/0311604v1.
- [8] M. Sigrist, T. M. Rice, F.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 12 058 (1994).
- [9] D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 060508(R), (2005).
- [10] M. Raczkowski, D. Poilblanc, R. Frésard and A. M. Oleś, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 094505 (2007).
- [11] M. Raczkowski, M. Capello, D. Poilblanc, R. Frésard and A. M. Oleś, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 140505(R) (2007).
- [12] C. Li, S. Zhou and Z. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 060501(R), (2006).
- [13] J. Spałek, A. M. Oleś, Jagiellonian University preprint SSPJU-6/76, (1976); K. A. Chao, J. Spałek, A. M. Oleś, J. Phys. C **10**, L271 (1977).
- [14] D. Vollhardt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **56**, 99, (1984).
- [15] J. Jędrak and J. Spałek, unpublished.
- [16] J. Spałek, P. Gopalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2823, (1990).
- [17] J. Kaczmarczyk and J. Spałek, unpublished.

- [18] c.f. e.g. R. P. Feynman *Statistical Mechanics. A Set of Lectures*, W. A. Benjamin, (1972), chapter 2.
- [19] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, (2000).