

# Exact Solution of a Yang-Baxter Spin-1/2 Chain Model and Quantum Entanglement

Ming-Guang Hu<sup>1,\*</sup>, Kang Xue<sup>2</sup>, and Mo-Lin Ge<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Theoretical Physics Division, Chern Institute of Mathematics,  
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, Jilin 130024, P. R. China*

(Dated: October 31, 2018)

Entanglement is believed to be crucial in macroscopic physical systems for understanding the collective quantum phenomena such as quantum phase transitions. We start from and solve exactly a novel Yang-Baxter spin-1/2 chain model with inhomogeneous and anisotropic short-range interactions. For the ground state, we show the behavior of neighboring entanglement in the parameter space. It is found that inhomogeneity of coupling strengths affects entanglement in a distinctive way from homogeneous case, and can thus blur entanglement in characterizing quantum criticality.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a 05.30.-d 03.65.Ud

## I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement was conventionally considered to be a quirk of microscopic objects and has been recognized to be ubiquitous and so robust that it promises applications in the quantum communication and quantum computing like technologies [1]. In the last few years, there was an increasing interest in entanglement in macroscopic physical systems (MPS) [2, 3]. Entanglement may lead to further insight into MPS. For example, in statistical mechanics, given that quantum phase transitions (QPT) occur at absolute zero and are driven by quantum fluctuations, entanglement may provide additional correlations for QPT [4, 5] that has no classical counterpart. In return, materials and experience built up over the years in condensed matter (MPS) are helping in finding new protocols for quantum computation and communication: a quantum computer is a many-body system where, different from traditional ones, the Hamiltonian can be controlled and manipulated.

Studying the structure of entanglement in the underlying ground states of MPS is crucial in understanding a large variety of collective quantum phenomena. For a 1D spin-1/2 XY chain [6] with short-range interactions

$$H_{XY} = - \sum_n \left( \frac{1+\gamma}{2} \sigma_n^x \sigma_{n+1}^x + \frac{1-\gamma}{2} \sigma_n^y \sigma_{n+1}^y + \lambda \sigma_n^z \right), \quad (1)$$

the entangled degree (ED) between any two nearest-neighbor particles keeps the same for the translational symmetry, and its derivative is capable to fulfill the role of an order parameter to characterize QPT at the critical point  $\lambda = 1$  [4, 5, 7]. Potential as it is, such an observation is not universal enough to assure all correspondences between entanglement and QPT, and in Ref. [8] it demonstrates a long-distance entanglement appearing for values of the microscopic parameters which do not co-

incide with known quantum critical points. In addition, if the short-range interactions are not homogeneous, e.g. a dual chain, ED between two nearest-neighbor particles would generally not keep in accordance for different sets of chains. At this case, questions arise on what ED is and whether it corresponds to critical points of QPT well.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the consequences of entanglement of local nearest-neighbor particles when extended to a macroscopic system and to check whether entanglement under inhomogeneous coupling strengths can well characterize quantum criticality. To achieve that, we use a novel Yang-Baxter spin-1/2 chain model with alternating coupling strengths. The model can be understood as a set of spin dimers, with intra-dimer exchange interaction depicted by a parameter  $\theta_1$ , and a weaker coupling between dimers by  $\theta_2$ . We can open or close the coupling between dimers by adjusting the value of  $\theta_2$ , so that the system and further entanglement of the ground state can transit between a decoupled and coupled dimer state. It resembles the strategy of quantum phase transition that varies a Hamiltonian as a function of a parameter  $g$ , and examines whether the ground state breaks a symmetry of the Hamiltonian [9].

Experimentally, such a class of coupled dimer models exist in a number of Cu compounds, such as  $\text{TiCuCl}_3$  and  $\text{BaCuSi}_2\text{O}_3$ , which have a coupled dimer antiferromagnet on a 2D plane [10]. Ultracold atoms in optical lattice also provide a potential platform to simulate these dimer models [11]. In addition, a variety of nanotechnologies under development including superconducting quantum circuits, microscopic cavity quantum electrodynamics, quantum dots or lines, nanotubes, etc., all aimed at controlling a macroscopic physical system, promise to implement any kind of coupling in the future.

This article is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce and exactly solve an inhomogeneous Yang-Baxter spin-1/2 chain model. Based on the solution, we investigate the quantum criticality by analyzing the geometric phase (GP) of the ground state, and study the effect of inhomogeneity on entanglement between different nearest-neighbor sites and next-nearest-neighbor sites in Sec. III. At last, Sec. IV is dedicated to the conclusion.

\*Electronic address: huphys@hotmail.com

†Electronic address: geml@nankai.edu.cn

## II. THE YANG-BAXTER SPIN-1/2 CHAIN MODEL AND EXACT DIAGONALIZATION

The Yang-Baxter equation (YBE) was originated in solving the  $\delta$ -function interaction model by Yang [12] and the statistical models by Baxter [13], and was then introduced to solve many quantum integrable models by Faddeev and Leningrad Scholars [14]. It plays a fundamental role in the theories of  $1+1$  and  $2+1$  dimensional integrable quantum systems, including lattice statistical models and nonlinear field theory. For example, Yang's  $\check{R}$ -matrix in YBE for the  $n$ th and  $(n+1)$ th particles is  $\check{R}(u)_{n,n+1} = 1 + u\hat{P}_{n,n+1}$  ( $u$  is spectral parameter, i.e., 1D momentum and  $\hat{P}$  is permutation satisfying  $\hat{P}^2 = 1$ ); it yields the  $XXX$  chain model through  $H_{n,n+1} \sim \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \check{R}(u)|_{u=0}$ , when  $\hat{P}$  takes its 4D representation of  $\hat{P}_{n,n+1} = \frac{1}{2}(I + \sigma_n \cdot \sigma_{n+1})$  ( $I$  is a 4D unit matrix and  $\sigma$  is the Pauli matrix). Now, for two "spins" in  $\check{R}(\theta_n) = I + \tan(\theta_n)\hat{M}$  ( $\hat{M}^2 = -I$ ), it analogously leads to the two-body interaction [15] we concern here:

$$H_{n,n+1} = -\hbar\omega \cos \theta_n [\cos \theta_n (S_n^z + S_{n+1}^z) + \sin \theta_n (e^{i\phi} S_n^+ S_{n+1}^+ + e^{-i\phi} S_n^- S_{n+1}^-)], \quad (2)$$

where  $S^\pm = S^x \pm iS^y$  with  $S^{x,y,z} = \sigma^{x,y,z}/2$ , and  $\phi$  is the flux dependent of time  $t$  and it takes  $\phi(t) = \omega t$ , denoting procession angle of spins around the  $z$  direction in a rotating magnetic field. For a number of particles, we should sum all of these nearest-neighbor interaction as  $H = \sum_n H_{n,n+1}$ . If we take all  $\theta_n$  to be the same, it would correspond to an homogeneous chain, otherwise it would correspond to inhomogeneous cases.

From the Eq. (2), the family of Hamiltonians that is parameterized by  $\phi$  is clearly isospectral, and, therefore, the critical behavior is independent of  $\phi$ . In fact, we can see that the spin raising-raising or lowering-lowering structure in Eq. (2) allows a rotation for each spin around  $z$ -axis and such a rotation transformation can be employed to adjust the value of the phase factors in Eq. (2), e.g.,  $H' = g(\phi/2)Hg^\dagger(\phi/2)$  and  $g(\phi) = \prod_{i=1}^N e^{-i\sigma_i^z \phi/2}$  giving  $g(\phi/2)S_n^+ g^\dagger(\phi/2) = e^{-i\phi/2} S_n^+$  and  $g(\phi/2)S_n^- g^\dagger(\phi/2) = e^{i\phi/2} S_n^-$ . Then the Hamiltonian is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} H' &= -\hbar\omega \sum_n \cos \theta_n [\sin \theta_n (S_n^+ S_{n+1}^+ + S_n^- S_{n+1}^-) \\ &\quad + \cos \theta_n (S_n^3 + S_{n+1}^3)] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega \sum_n \cos \theta_n [\sin \theta_n (\sigma_n^x \sigma_{n+1}^x - \sigma_n^y \sigma_{n+1}^y) \\ &\quad + \cos \theta_n (\sigma_n^z + \sigma_{n+1}^z)]. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing  $H'$  with the  $XY$  chain in Eq. (1), one sees that the form of dominant two-body interaction in  $H'$  is exactly that in  $H_{XY}$  yet under  $\gamma, \lambda \gg 1$  limit. Like  $H_{XY}$ , there is a global  $Z_2$  symmetry for  $H$  which keeps invariant under a unitary transformation  $\prod_n \sigma_n^z$ . In the following,




FIG. 1: The coupled dimer chain, described by the Hamiltonian Eq. (4) with  $\theta_1$  on the solid dark lines and  $\theta_2$  on the dashed red lines. Each ellipse represents a superposed triplet valence bond,  $\cos \frac{\theta_n}{2} |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + \sin \frac{\theta_n}{2} e^{-i\phi} |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ .

we will see that the ground state does not break such a symmetry.

For Eq. (2), we can define these operators  $J_n^z = S_n^z + S_{n+1}^z$ ,  $J_n^+ = S_n^+ S_{n+1}^+$  and  $J_n^- = S_n^- S_{n+1}^-$ , which still satisfy the angular momentum commutation relation. It indicates that the set of angular momentum  $\{J_n^\pm, J_n^z\}$  only occupy a subspace spanned by  $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{n,n+1}$  and  $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle_{n,n+1}$ , which belong to the  $j = 1/2$  angular momentum representation. Actually, Eq. (2) describes a dimer with two spin interaction and if it is isolated without coupling between dimers, its eigenvalues are readily given by  $E_{n,n+1}^\pm = \pm \hbar\omega \cos \theta_n$  and the corresponding ground state is  $|E^-\rangle = \cos \frac{\theta_n}{2} |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + \sin \frac{\theta_n}{2} e^{-i\phi} |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ . Albeit  $|E^-\rangle$  is the most entangled Bell state at  $\theta_n = \pi/2$ ,  $H_{n,n+1}$  vanishes and so  $\pi/2$  is a prohibited value for the existence of an entangled dimer.

To describe entanglement, we use the concurrence [16] of a two-particle state, related to the "entanglement of formation" [17], to define the entanglement degree of states. The concurrence for the state of the  $i$ th and  $j$ th particles is defined as

$$C(i, j) = \max\{r_1 - r_2 - r_3 - r_4, 0\} \quad (3)$$

where  $r_{1,2,3,4}$  are the square roots of the eigenvalues of the product matrix  $R = \rho(i, j)\tilde{\rho}(i, j)$  in descending order;  $\rho(i, j)$  is the density matrix of the  $i$ th and  $j$ th spin-1/2 particles and the spin flipped matrix is defined as  $\tilde{\rho}(i, j) = \sigma^y \otimes \sigma^y \rho^*(i, j) \sigma^y \otimes \sigma^y$ . If it is a pure state, e.g.  $|E^-\rangle$ , the density matrix  $\rho(n, n+1) = |E^-\rangle\langle E^-|$  and the concurrence quantifying entanglement is  $C(n, n+1) = |\sin \theta_n|$ . If it is a two-particle state in a many-particle system,  $\rho(i, j)$  would represent a two-particle mixed state reduced from the many-particle density matrix  $\rho$ .

Now, let us focus on a simplest inhomogeneous chain model with the bonds between any odd-even numbered nearest-neighboring sites characterized by  $\theta_1$  and between any even-odd numbered nearest-neighboring sites characterized by  $\theta_2$  (see Fig. 1). For such a chain, there are totally  $2N$  sites and the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -\hbar\omega \sum_{m,j} [\cos^2 \theta_{\frac{j+3}{2}} (S_{2m-1}^z + S_{2m}^z) + \sin \theta_{\frac{j+3}{2}} \\ &\quad \cos \theta_{\frac{j+3}{2}} (e^{i\phi} S_{2m+j}^+ S_{2m}^+ + e^{-i\phi} S_{2m+j}^- S_{2m}^-)], \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where  $m = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $j = \pm 1$ . It can be seen that when  $\theta_1 \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$  and  $\theta_2 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ , the Eq. (4) becomes to describe  $N$  isolated

dimers, which have the obvious exact ground state,  $\prod_m (\cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{2m-1,2m} + \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} e^{-i\phi} |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle_{2m-1,2m})$ .

To solve this model, let us first introduce the following Jordan-Wigner transformation to represent spin operators at sites with spinless fermion operators:  $a_n = (\prod_{l < n} \sigma_l^z) S_n^+$  or  $S_n^+ = a_n e^{-i\pi \sum_{l < n} a_l^\dagger a_l}$ . Then, note that the summation in Eq. (4) is either on all even or on all odd indices, and so we should distinguish even and odd to define their corresponding forms in momentum space, respectively, as

$$a_k^e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{m=1}^N e^{-i\frac{2\pi k}{N}m} a_{2m}, \quad a_k^o = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{m=1}^N e^{-i\frac{2\pi k}{N}m} a_{2m-1}, \quad (5)$$

where the reduced momentum  $k = -M, \dots, M$  with  $M = (N-1)/2$  for  $N$  odd and fermion operators  $(a_k^{e(\dagger)}, a_k^{o(\dagger)})$  anticommute with each other. Thus the Eq. (4) can be written into

$$H = -\frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega \sum_{k=-M}^M [(\xi_k e^{i\phi} a_k^o a_{-k}^e + h.c.) - \Delta (a_k^{o\dagger} a_k^o + a_k^{e\dagger} a_k^e - 1)], \quad (6)$$

with  $\xi_k = \sin 2\theta_2 e^{2i\pi k/N} - \sin 2\theta_1$  and  $\Delta = \cos 2\theta_1 + \cos 2\theta_2 + 2$ . The Hamiltonian  $H$  can be diagonalized by using the Bogoliubov transformation and the result is

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega \sum_k \varepsilon_k^\pm (\alpha_k^\dagger \alpha_k + \beta_k^\dagger \beta_k - 1). \quad (7)$$

The eigenspectra contain two bands of quasiparticle excitations:  $\varepsilon_k^\pm = \pm \sqrt{|\xi_k|^2 + \Delta^2}$ . The transformed fermion operators  $\alpha_k = u_k e^{i\phi/2} a_k^o + v_k e^{-i\phi/2} a_{-k}^{e\dagger}$  and  $\beta_k = \bar{u}_k e^{i\phi/2} a_k^e + \bar{v}_k e^{-i\phi/2} a_{-k}^{o\dagger}$ , where  $\bar{u}_k = -u_k = (\Delta + \varepsilon_k^\pm) / [2\varepsilon_k^\pm (\Delta + \varepsilon_k^\pm)^{1/2}]$  and  $\bar{v}_k = v_k^* = -\xi_k / [2\varepsilon_k^\pm (\Delta + \varepsilon_k^\pm)^{1/2}]$  for different bands  $\varepsilon_k^\pm$ . For these coefficients, there is  $\bar{u}_k u_k^* + \bar{v}_k v_k^* = 0$ .

The ground state  $|g\rangle$  of  $H$  is the vacuum of the fermionic modes, satisfying  $\alpha_k |g\rangle = 0$  and  $\beta_k |g\rangle = 0$  for all  $k$ . Generally it is hard to write the ground state obviously into a spin superposed state, but for our model there is a fact that the *Néel state*—  $|\Psi^1\rangle = |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle^{\otimes N}$  or  $|\Psi^2\rangle = |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle^{\otimes N}$ — just corresponds to the zero energy eigenstate of  $H$ . Take  $|\Psi^1\rangle$  for example: it has  $\alpha_k |\Psi^1\rangle = 0$  and therefore it is identical to  $|\Psi^1\rangle = \prod_k \beta_k^\dagger |g\rangle$ , which inversely gives an expression for the ground state  $|g\rangle = \prod_k \beta_k |\Psi^1\rangle$ , i.e.,

$$|g\rangle = \prod_k \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^N \frac{e^{-i\frac{2\pi k}{N}m}}{\sqrt{N}} \left[ \bar{v}_k e^{-i\phi/2} \left( \prod_{l < 2m-1} \sigma_l^z \right) S_{2m-1}^- + \bar{u}_k e^{i\phi/2} \left( \prod_{l < 2m} \sigma_l^z \right) S_{2m}^+ \right] \right\} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle^{\otimes N}, \quad (8)$$

which would return to the single isolated dimer case (i.e.,  $|E^-\rangle$ ) if one takes  $N = 1$  and  $\theta_2 = \pi/2$ . From Eq. (8), it

can be seen the ground state is invariant under the global  $Z_2$  transformation and so it keeps the same symmetry as the Hamiltonian. Alternatively, the ground state can also be expressed by

$$|g\rangle = \prod_k \left( \bar{u}_k e^{i\phi/2} |0\rangle_{-k}^o |0\rangle_k^e + \bar{v}_k e^{-i\phi/2} |1\rangle_{-k}^o |1\rangle_k^e \right), \quad (9)$$

where  $|0\rangle_k^{o,e}$  and  $|1\rangle_k^{o,e}$  are the vacuum and single excitation of the  $k$ th mode,  $a_k^{o,e}$ , respectively. The ground state is a tensor product of states, each lying in the two-dimensional Hilbert space spanned by  $|0\rangle_{-k}^o |0\rangle_k^e$  and  $|1\rangle_{-k}^o |1\rangle_k^e$ . Such a form provides us a convenient way to discuss its dynamical property such as GP of the ground state.

### III. QUANTUM CRITICALITY AND ENTANGLEMENT

QPT occurs at a point in the external parameter space, where there can be a level-crossing and excited levels become the ground state, creating a point of nonanalyticity of the ground state energy as a function of external parameters [9]. With the Hamiltonian Eq. (7) in consideration, we take  $\theta_{1,2}$  as those external parameters. Obviously, at the point of  $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi/2$  all energy levels cross and hence it is a trivial quantum critical point with vanishing Hamiltonian. Recently, GP of the ground state [18, 19] and entanglement between nearest-neighbor particles [4, 5] for a homogeneous Heisenberg  $XY$  chain were proposed to characterize the criticality of QPT. Here we should investigate their behaviors for our novel inhomogeneous chain, especially the varying entanglement as the different  $\theta_{1,2}$ .

#### A. Quantum Criticality Characterized by geometric phase

GP of the ground state, accumulated by varying the angle  $\phi$  from 0 to  $2\pi$ , is described by  $\beta_g = \frac{1}{N} \int_0^{2\pi} \langle g | i \partial_\phi | g \rangle d\phi$ , and by utilizing Eq. (9) it is

$$\beta_g^\pm = -\frac{\pi}{N} \sum_k (|\bar{u}_k|^2 - |\bar{v}_k|^2) = -\frac{\pi}{N} \sum_k \Delta / \varepsilon_k^\pm, \quad (10)$$

with  $\beta_g^+ = -\beta_g^-$ . The term  $\beta_k = -\pi \Delta / \varepsilon_k^\pm$  is a geometric phase for the  $k$ th mode, and represents the area in the parameter space enclosed by the loop determined by  $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \phi)$ . One can see that when we turn off the coupling between dimers by setting  $\theta_2 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ , the GP would return to the two-particle dimer case with  $\beta_g = \pi(1 - \cos \theta_1)$ . To study quantum criticality, we are interested in the thermodynamic limit when the spin lattice number  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . In this case the summation  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=-M}^M$  can be replaced by the integral  $\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi d\varphi$  with




FIG. 2: (Color online) The diagram for the Berry phase of the ground state of the spin-1/2 chain model: (a) the Berry phase  $\beta_g^+$  corresponding to the ground state; (b) its derivative  $\partial\beta_g^+/\partial\theta_2$  as a function of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ ; (c) its derivative  $\partial^2\beta_g^+/\partial\theta_1\partial\theta_2$  as a function of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ .

$\varphi = 2\pi k/N$ ; the GP in the thermodynamic limit is given by

$$\beta_g^\pm = - \int_0^\pi d\varphi \Delta / \varepsilon_\varphi^\pm, \quad (11)$$

with the energy spectra  $\varepsilon_\varphi^\pm = \pm \sqrt{|\xi_\varphi|^2 + \Delta^2}$  with  $|\xi_\varphi|^2 = \sin^2 2\theta_1 + \sin^2 2\theta_2 - 2 \sin 2\theta_1 \sin 2\theta_2 \cos \varphi$ .

To see the quantum criticality obviously, we plot GP  $\beta_g$  and its derivatives  $\partial\beta/\partial\theta_2$ ,  $\partial^2\beta/\partial\theta_1\partial\theta_2$  in the parameter  $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$  space, shown in Fig. 2. It can be seen, from Fig. 2(a), that there is a conical intersection at the point  $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi/2$ , which indicates a critical point there. The non-analytical property at the critical point can be seen obviously from the diagram of GP derivative [see Fig. 2(c)]. However, as we pointed above, such a QPT point is trivial, since at the point the whole Hamiltonian vanishes and hence it appears to be exotic there. If fixing one parameter, say  $\theta_1$ , it would correspond to the isolated dimer case and we should check whether there are other critical phenomena as varying  $\theta_2$ . The derivative of GP with  $\theta_2$  is plotted in Fig. 2(b), from which we can see, except for the above critical point and its vicinity, it is analytic everywhere. So there is no additional critical point.

## B. Entanglement of the ground state

In this section, we confine our interest at entanglement between two nearest-neighbor sites and two next-nearest-neighbor sites in the chain, given long-distance

entanglement decays rapidly with the distance (see below). Translation invariance of dual lattices implies that  $C(2m, 2m+1) = C_e(1)$ ,  $C(2m-1, 2m) = C_o(1)$  and  $C(2m-1, 2m+1) = C(2)$  for all  $m$ . The concurrence will be evaluated as a function of the relative position  $|i-j|$  between the  $i$ th and  $j$ th spins and parameters  $\theta_{1,2}$ . All information needed is contained in the reduced density matrix  $\rho(i, j)$  obtained from the ground-state wavefunction after all the spins except those at positions  $i$  and  $j$  have been traced out. The resulting  $\rho(i, j)$  represents a mixed state of a two-particle system. The structure of the reduced density matrix is obtained by exploiting symmetries of the model. The nonzero entries of  $\rho(i, j)$  can then be related to the various correlation functions, and concurrence of the ground state is evaluated exactly starting from the results in Refs. [20, 21, 22].

Correlation functions under the ground state can be evaluated by using the fermionic representation and the simple identity  $1 - 2a_n^\dagger a_n = (a_n^\dagger + a_n)(a_n^\dagger - a_n)$ . For each pair of fermion operators  $(a, a^\dagger)$ , we can further define two Majorana fermion operators  $(A, B)$ :  $A_n = a_n^\dagger + a_n$  and  $B_n = i(a_n^\dagger - a_n)$  with  $A^\dagger = A$  and  $B^\dagger = B$ . Exploring then, we can write the Pauli matrices as:  $\sigma_n^x = \prod_{l<n} [(-i)A_l B_l] A_n$ ,  $\sigma_n^y = \prod_{l<n} [(-i)A_l B_l] B_n$ , and  $\sigma_n^z = (-i)A_n B_n$ . A two-body correlation function, say  $\langle \sigma_m^x \sigma_n^x \rangle_{|m<n}$ , under the ground state, is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_m^x \sigma_n^x \rangle &= -i \left\langle B_m \prod_{l=m+1}^{n-1} (-iA_l B_l) A_n \right\rangle \\ &= \langle (-iB_m) A_{m+1} (-iB_{m+1}) \cdots A_{n-1} (-iB_{n-1}) A_n \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Since the expectation values are with respect to a free Fermi theory, the expression on the right-hand side can be evaluated by the Wick's theorem [9, 23], which relates it to a sum over products of expectation values of pairs of operators, i.e.,  $\langle A_l A_m \rangle$ ,  $\langle B_l B_m \rangle$ , and  $\langle B_l A_m \rangle$ . The evaluation of average values of these pairs is displayed in Append. A. In order to see the macroscopic property of entanglement, we define two  $k$ -independent functions:

$$\begin{aligned} F(|n-m|) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k e^{i\frac{2\pi k}{N}(n-m)} (|\bar{u}_k|^2 - |\bar{v}_k|^2), \\ G(m-n) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k e^{-i\frac{2\pi k}{N}(n-m)} 2u_k v_k, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which have summed all frequencies in the momentum space to be the form in the position space. We can see,  $F(0)$  is nothing but the one proportional to GP in Eq. (10). In this respect, we may well say  $F, G$  are macroscopical quantities, which under the thermodynamical limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  can be calculated still by making the replacement  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_k \rightarrow \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi d\varphi$ .

The reduced density matrix  $\rho(i, j)$  can be expressed by these correlation functions as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(i, j) &= \frac{1}{4} \left( I + \langle \sigma_i^z \rangle \sigma_i^z \otimes 1 + \langle \sigma_j^z \rangle 1 \otimes \sigma_j^z \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{X, Y=x, y, z} \langle \sigma_i^X \sigma_j^Y \rangle \sigma_i^X \otimes \sigma_j^Y \right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$




FIG. 3: (Color online) The diagram for concurrence: (a) two independent entangled degrees, in the form of concurrence, are shown, and  $C_e(1)$  denotes entanglement between even-odd numbered two nearest-neighbor sites while  $C_o(1)$  denotes entanglement between odd-even numbered two nearest-neighbor sites; their corresponding contours are also shown in (b); (c) at fixed values of  $\theta_1 = 0$ ,  $\theta_1 = \pi/4$  and  $\theta_1 = 9\pi/19$ , we show how  $C_o(1)$  and  $C_e(1)$  vary with  $\theta_2$ .

where the vanishing expectation values of the  $x, y$ -component of a single sigma matrix have been considered. Next, we would focus on entanglements between the nearest-neighbor and the next-nearest-neighbor sites. In principle, the numerical results on the concurrence of such two-site density state can be performed readily according to its definition introduced in Sec. II, but before that, we find the concurrence depends only on the above two  $k$ -independent functions  $F(|n-m|)$  and  $G(m-n)$ . Further, as an illustration, we give out the expression of entanglement, in the form of concurrence defined above, between nearest-neighbor sites by

$$C_o(1) = \max\{0, |G(0)| - \frac{1}{2}|F(0)^2 + G(0)^2 - 1|\},$$

$$C_e(1) = \max\{0, |G(1)| - \frac{1}{2}|F(0)^2 + G(1)^2 - 1|\} \quad (15)$$

Their varying trends in  $\theta_{1,2}$  parameter space are displayed in Fig. 3, where Fig. 3(b) is the corresponding contours of Fig. 3(a), and Fig. 3(c) is the cross-section of Fig. 3(a) at fixed values of  $\theta_1$ .

From Fig. 3, there are several points we should note: (i) under a parameter exchange ( $\theta_1 \leftrightarrow \theta_2$ ), entanglement




FIG. 4: (Color online) Entanglement between next-nearest-neighbor sites and its contour.

between the even-odd numbered nearest-neighbor sites  $C_e(1)$  is the same as that between the odd-even numbered sites  $C_o(1)$ , which is due to the invariance of the chain under different numbering ways; (ii) the coupling between dimers makes the entanglement in a dimer decreasing, and as a result, the original entangled state in certain zone become disentangled [see Fig. 3(b)]; (iii) entanglement degrees  $C_e(1)$  and  $C_o(1)$  can not increase or decrease at the same time as the parameters  $\theta_{1,2}$  change and also when both of them are nonzero, if one of them increases, the other must decrease. All these properties of entanglement for an inhomogeneous chain are different from the case of a homogeneous chain, in which entanglement between nearest-neighbor sites is the same through the whole chain.

In Fig. 4, we display entanglement  $C(2)$  between next-nearest-neighbor sites and its contour. Its maximal entanglement ( $\sim 0.03$ ) is far less than that in the nearest-neighbor case, which indicates entanglement between a pair of particles decays rapidly with the distance (generally even more rapidly than standard correlations). The contour shows that entanglement between next-nearest-neighbor sites is affected by both  $C_o(1)$  and  $C_e(1)$ . For instance,  $C(2)$  is zero at non-entangled zone of either  $C_o(1)$  or  $C_e(1)$ , while being maximal at the maximal values of sum of  $C_o(1)$  and  $C_e(1)$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

To summarize, we have discussed entanglement in a novel spin-1/2 chain model, which is inhomogeneous and anisotropic. By exactly solving the model, we diagonalize the model in a fermionic operator representation. Due to the existence of a free magnetic flux phase factor in the Hamiltonian, we analyze the GP of the ground state and its relation with the criticality of QPT. At last, by utilizing the concurrence that defines the entangled degree between two spin-1/2 particles, we uncover how entanglement between different nearest-neighbor sites evolves. We find that the coupling between dimers can decrease the entangled degree of the former isolated dimers if they are previously entangled, which as a result may lead previously entangled dimers to become disentangled after

coupling. Further, we analyze entanglement of the next-nearest-neighbor sites and find that it becomes much weak with maximum  $\sim 0.03$  and has a strong dependence on entanglement of the nearest-neighbor sites, which attributes to the two-body nearest-neighbor short-range interaction in the Hamiltonian.

As for QPT, entanglement in this model does not well characterize it. At points far from the trivial critical point, there are nonanalytic parts for concurrence  $C_{e,o}(1)$  [see Fig. 3(b)], but no QPT corresponds to them. Such nonanalytic phenomena appear in the entangled and disentangled interfaces and come mainly from the nonanalytic definition of concurrence at entangled and disentangled dividing point [see Eq. (3)]. So for any model that contains a transition from an entangled state to a disentangled state, entanglement will be inefficient at distinguishing critical phenomena.

### Acknowledgments

We thank J. L. Chen for helpful discussions. This work was supported by NSF of China (Grants No. 10575053 and No.10605013).

### APPENDIX A: CALCULATION OF EXPECTATION VALUES OF PAIRS OF OPERATORS

In determining the expectation values of pairs of Majorana operators under the ground state, we have used the representation  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$  and the definition of the ground state  $\alpha_k|g\rangle = \beta_k|g\rangle = 0$ . If we define two independent real functions, i.e., Eq. (13) by

$$\begin{aligned} F(|n-m|) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k e^{i\frac{2\pi k}{N}(n-m)} (|\bar{u}_k|^2 - |\bar{v}_k|^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \cos\left[\frac{2\pi}{N}k(n-m)\right] \Delta/\epsilon_k^\pm, \\ G(m-n) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k e^{-i\frac{2\pi k}{N}(n-m)} 2u_k v_k \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \left\{ \sin 2\theta_2 \cos\left[\frac{2\pi}{N}k(n-m+1)\right] - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sin 2\theta_1 \cos\left[\frac{2\pi}{N}k(n-m)\right] \right\} \Delta/\epsilon_k^\pm (\Delta + \epsilon_k^\pm), \end{aligned}$$

which are obtained under the thermodynamical limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  by making the replacement  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_k \rightarrow \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi d\varphi$ , then the average values of Majorana operator pairs can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_{2n} A_{2m} \rangle &= \langle A_{2n-1} A_{2m-1} \rangle = \delta_{n,m}, \\ \langle B_{2n} B_{2m} \rangle &= \langle B_{2n-1} B_{2m-1} \rangle = \delta_{n,m}, \\ \langle A_{2n} (-iB_{2m}) \rangle &= \langle A_{2n-1} (-iB_{2m-1}) \rangle = F(|n-m|), \\ \langle A_{2n} A_{2m-1} \rangle &= \langle (-iB_{2n}) (-iB_{2m-1}) \rangle = i \sin \phi G(m-n), \\ \langle A_{2n} (-iB_{2m-1}) \rangle &= \langle (-iB_{2n}) A_{2m-1} \rangle = \cos \phi G(m-n). \end{aligned}$$

From these average values, we can calculate all correlation functions by using Wick theorem. For the nearest-neighbor case of  $\rho(2m-1, 2m)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^x \sigma_{2m}^x \rangle &= \langle (-iB_{2m-1}) A_{2m} \rangle = -\cos \phi G(0), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^y \sigma_{2m}^y \rangle &= -\langle A_{2m-1} (-iB_{2m}) \rangle = \cos \phi G(0), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^x \sigma_{2m}^y \rangle &= \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^y \sigma_{2m}^x \rangle = \sin \phi G(0), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^z \sigma_{2m}^z \rangle &= \langle A_{2m-1} (-iB_{2m-1}) A_{2m} (-iB_{2m}) \rangle \\ &= F(0)^2 + G(0)^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the nearest-neighbor case of  $\rho(2m, 2m+1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_{2m}^x \sigma_{2m+1}^x \rangle &= \langle (-iB_{2m}) A_{2m+1} \rangle = \cos \phi G(1), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m}^y \sigma_{2m+1}^y \rangle &= -\langle A_{2m} (-iB_{2m+1}) \rangle = -\cos \phi G(1), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m}^x \sigma_{2m+1}^y \rangle &= \langle \sigma_{2m}^y \sigma_{2m+1}^x \rangle = -\sin \phi G(1), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m}^z \sigma_{2m+1}^z \rangle &= \langle A_{2m} (-iB_{2m}) A_{2m+1} (-iB_{2m+1}) \rangle \\ &= F(0)^2 + G(1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

At last, for the next-nearest-neighbor case of  $\rho(2m-1, 2m+2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^x \sigma_{2m+1}^x \rangle &= \langle (-iB_{2m-1}) A_{2m} (-iB_{2m}) A_{2m+1} \rangle \\ &= -G(0)G(1) - F(0)F(1), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^y \sigma_{2m+1}^y \rangle &= -\langle A_{2m-1} A_{2m} (-iB_{2m}) (-iB_{2m+1}) \rangle \\ &= -G(0)G(1) - F(0)F(1), \\ \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^x \sigma_{2m+1}^y \rangle &= \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^y \sigma_{2m+1}^x \rangle = 0, \\ \langle \sigma_{2m-1}^z \sigma_{2m+1}^z \rangle &= \langle A_{2m-1} (-iB_{2m-1}) A_{2m+1} (-iB_{2m+1}) \rangle \\ &= F(0)^2 - F(1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

- 
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Communication* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).  
[2] V. Vedral, Nature **453**, 1004 (2008)  
[3] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).  
[4] A. Osterloh, L. Amico, G. Falci, and R. Fazio, Nature

- 416**, 608 (2002).  
[5] T. J. Osborne and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032110 (2002).  
[6] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **112**, 1900 (1958).  
[7] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).  
[8] L. Campos Venuti, C. Degli Esposti Boschi, and M.

- Roncaglia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 247206 (2006).
- [9] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1999).
- [10] S. Sachdev, Nature Phys. **4**, 173 (2008).
- [11] I. Bloch, Nature Phys. **1**, 23 (2005).
- [12] C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1312 (1967), Phys. Rev. **168**, 1920 (1968).
- [13] R. J. Baxter, *Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics* (Academic Press, London, 1982).
- [14] E. K. Sklyanim, Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov Leningradskogo Otdeleniya Matematicheskogo Instituta im. V. A. Stekiova AN SSSR, **95**, pp.55-128, 1980; L. D. Faddeev, Integrable models in 1 + 1 dimensional QFT, Les Houches Lectures, pp.536-608, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1984; P. P. Kulish and E. K. Sklyanin, Lecture Notes in Phys. **151**, pp.61-119.
- [15] J. L. Chen, K. Xue, and M. L. Ge, Phys. Rev. A **76** 042324 (2007).
- [16] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [17] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [18] A. C. M. Carollo and J. K. Pachos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 157203 (2005).
- [19] S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 077206 (2006).
- [20] P. Pfeuty, Ann. Phys. **57**, 79 (1970).
- [21] E. Barouch and B. M. McCoy, Phys. Rev. A **3**, 786 (1971).
- [22] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, Ann. Phys. **60**, 407 (1961).
- [23] X. G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory of Many-Body Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004).