

Cooling dynamics of pure and random Ising chains

Sei Suzuki*

Department of Physics and Mathematics, Aoyama Gakuin University, Fuchinobe, Sagami-hara 229-8558, Japan
(Dated: June 13, 2019)

Dynamics of quenching temperature is studied for pure and random Ising chains. Using the Kibble-Zurek argument, we obtain for the pure Ising model that density of kinks, i.e. residual energy, after quenching decays as fast as $1/\sqrt{\tau}$ with the quench rate of temperature $1/\tau$. For the random Ising model, we show that decay rate of density of kinks and residual energy are $1/\ln \tau$ and $1/(\ln \tau)^2$ respectively. The analytic results of the random Ising model are confirmed by the Monte-Carlo simulation. Our results reveal that density of kinks after simulated annealing decays slower than that after quantum annealing at least in the random Ising model in one dimension. This is an analytic evidence for the advantage of quantum annealing over simulated annealing which arises only in the presence of randomness.

PACS numbers: 75.40.Gb, 75.10.Pq, 05.70.Ln, 03.67.Ac

Introduction. Solving combinatorial optimization problems is one of the most important tasks in science. In the language of physics, the task is translated into finding the ground energy and corresponding ground state of a Hamiltonian with classical variables. The achievement of this task is nontrivial when the Hamiltonian contains the randomness. Statistical physics has offered several algorithms to such optimization problems. The most popular is probably simulated annealing [1]. Simulated annealing utilizes the thermal fluctuation. Starting from the equilibrium of high temperature, the system is driven by quenching temperature with time according to a certain schedule. If the quench speed is slow enough, the system keeps its equilibrium at each temperature and reaches its ground state in the end.

Quantum annealing is another algorithm proposed on the analogy of simulated annealing [2, 3, 4]. Quantum annealing adds kinetic terms to the Hamiltonian of the problem. Kinetic terms do not commute with the original Hamiltonian and thereby induce tunneling effects. Assume that the kinetic terms are overwhelming in the total Hamiltonian initially and the initial state is the ground state of the kinetic terms. The kinetic terms are then dropped with time. If the change in the Hamiltonian is slow enough, the state evolves adiabatically according to the Schrödinger equation and reaches the ground state of the original Hamiltonian when the kinetic terms vanish.

It is natural now to ask which protocol is better. A number of studies have compared simulated annealing and quantum annealing numerically [3, 5, 6, 7] and experimentally [8]. Most of them give results in favor of quantum annealing. However analytic evidences and/or proofs that guarantees the advantage of quantum annealing are absent.

When we discuss quench dynamics, we cannot ignore the existence of the phase transition. Since the initial state is a disordered state, one has to pass through the phase transition before arriving the target state as far as it is an ordered ground state. The Kibble-Zurek (KZ)

argument [9, 10] helps us to understand quench dynamics across the phase transition.

Dynamics across the quantum phase transition was first studied by Zurek *et al.* by means of the KZ argument [11] for pure Ising ferromagnet in the transverse field in one dimension. They showed that the density ρ of kinks between ferromagnetic domains behaves as

$$\rho(\tau) \sim 1/\sqrt{\tau} \quad (1)$$

with the quench rate $1/\tau$ of the transverse field. This result is confirmed by the analytic solution of the Schrödinger equation by Dziarmaga [12]. As for random systems, Dziarmaga applied the Kibble-Zurek argument to the quantum phase transition of the random Ising chain in the transverse field and obtained density of kinks decaying approximately as [13]

$$\rho^{\text{QA}}(\tau) \sim 1/(\ln \tau)^2. \quad (2)$$

Caneva *et al.* also derived the same decay rate [14], using the Landau-Zener formula and distribution of excitation gaps at the critical point. In ref.[14], the decay rate of residual energy is also estimated numerically. Its result is written as

$$E_{\text{res}}^{\text{QA}}(\tau) \sim 1/(\ln \tau)^\zeta, \quad \zeta \approx 3.4. \quad (3)$$

The study of quenching dynamics across thermodynamic phase transition is not necessarily sufficient. Laguna and Zurek have studied the Langevin dynamics of the order-parameter field in one spatial dimension [15]. However the model they studied does not correspond to the true Ising model in one dimension, because it involves an unphysical phase transition. Huse and Fisher have made a theory on residual energy after quenching temperature in classical random systems [16]. They regarded the system with disorder as a collection of independent two-level systems, and derived residual energy which decays as

$$E_{\text{res}}^{\text{SA}}(\tau) \sim 1/(\ln \tau)^2. \quad (4)$$

Despite of Huse-Fisher's general theory on classical quenching in random systems, one cannot tell anything about comparison between simulated annealing and quantum annealing. Comparison of eqs. (3) and (4) is obscure because of a lack of analytical support on eq. (3). Density of kinks tells nothing since it is not available in simulated annealing.

In this letter, we study the dynamics of quenching temperature of pure and random Ising chains by means of the Kibble-Zurek argument. We obtain following results. Decay rate of density of kinks after quenching of the pure system is the same as eq. (1) except for the logarithmic correction. Density of kinks of the random system behaves as

$$\rho^{\text{SA}}(\tau) \sim 1/\ln \tau. \quad (5)$$

Residual energy of the random Ising chain decays as the same as eq. (4) by Huse-Fisher. We emphasize here that it is derived in a different manner. The decay rates of density of kinks are definitely different between quantum quench and classical quench for the random case. Our results on the random system together with known results on quantum quench of the same model give the first analytic evidence that residual error of quantum annealing decays faster than that of simulated annealing.

This letter is organized as follows. At first, we briefly review the Kibble-Zurek argument in the next section. After that, we study quench dynamics of the pure Ising chain and derive the decay rate of density of kinks. We then reveal logarithmic decay rates of density of kinks and residual energy for the random Ising chain. We also show results of Monte-Carlo simulation for the random Ising chain.

Kibble-Zurek argument. Let us consider a ferromagnetic system with the critical temperature T_c . In the Kibble-Zurek argument, the correlation length and the relaxation time of the system with fixed temperature are quantities of importance. Both quantities are functions of temperature and increase with decreasing temperature toward T_c . We denote the correlation length and the relaxation time by $\xi(T)$ and $\tau_r(T)$ respectively.

Now we consider quenching temperature with time t as $T(t) = T_c(1 - t/\tau)$ where time is assumed to evolve from $-\infty$ to τ and $1/\tau$ stands for the quenching rate. We assume that the system is in its equilibrium initially. When the temperature is sufficiently high, the system almost maintains its equilibrium since the relaxation time is short. However, when the temperature is close to T_c , the temperature decreases further before the system attains the equilibrium. Thus the system cannot possess the complete ferromagnetic order and contains domain walls when the temperature goes below T_c . Once the domain structure forms, it should be preserved by the zero temperature. The size of the domain is represented by the correlation length $\hat{\xi}$ of the state when the tem-

perature passes T_c . The KZ argument described below provides an estimation of $\hat{\xi}$ for a given τ .

We introduce an equality:

$$\tau_r(T(\hat{t})) = |\hat{t}|. \quad (6)$$

This equality defines the time \hat{t} at which the relaxation time is equal to the remaining time to the critical temperature. At later time until $t = \tau$, the system cannot attain the equilibrium since the relaxation time is longer than the remaining time. Suppose here that the system stays in the equilibrium at $\hat{T} \equiv T(\hat{t})$ and does not evolve any more after t passes \hat{t} . Then the correlation length of the state at $t = \tau$ is approximated by $\hat{\xi} \approx \xi(\hat{T})$. Since one can express T in terms of ξ from the expression of $\xi(T)$, the left hand side of eq. (6) is written in terms of $\hat{\xi}$. The right hand side, on the other hand, is written as $\tau|\hat{T} - T_c|/T_c$, which is also expressed in terms of $\hat{\xi}$. Thus we obtain the equation of $\hat{\xi}$ from eq. (6). Solution of this equation yields $\hat{\xi}$ as a function of τ .

Pure Ising chain. We consider the simple pure Ising model in one dimension: $H = -\sum_i \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1}$. Although this model does not exhibit the phase transition at any finite temperature, the ground state possesses the complete ferromagnetic order. Hence one can regard the critical temperature as $T_c = 0$. Denoting the inverse of temperature by β , an expression of the correlation length is given by

$$\xi(T) = 1/\ln \coth \beta \approx \frac{1}{2}e^{2\beta}, \quad (7)$$

where the lattice constant is assumed to be the unit of length. We note that the right hand side is the expression valid at low temperature, i.e. $T \ll 1$. In order to discuss dynamics of the present system, we assume the Glauber model[17]. Then, the relaxation time for fixed temperature is given by

$$\tau_r(T) = 1/(1 - \tanh 2\beta) \approx \frac{1}{2}e^{4\beta} \approx \frac{1}{2}\xi(T)^2, \quad (8)$$

where the approximation signs are valid at low temperature. Thus the correlation length and the relaxation time grow with decreasing temperature toward $T_c = 0$.

From now we discuss dynamics of quenching temperature according to the KZ argument. We assume the quench schedule:

$$T(t) = -t/\tau \quad (9)$$

instead of the one in the previous section because of $T_c = 0$. We also assume that time t evolves from $-\infty$ to 0 and the inversed quench rate τ is large, i.e. $\tau \gg 1$. Equation (6) defines the approximate time \hat{t} at which the evolution of the system stops. Using eqs. (7) and (9), the time \hat{t} is written as $\hat{t} = -2\tau/\ln 2\hat{\xi}$, where $\hat{\xi}$ is the correlation length at $\hat{T} = T(\hat{t})$. We remark that the low

temperature expression of ξ is allowed as far as τ is large enough because \hat{T} is small. Equations (6) and (8) yield an equation of $\hat{\xi}$ as $\hat{\xi}^2 = 4\tau/|\ln 2\hat{\xi}|$. This equation cannot be solved analytically. However $\ln \hat{\xi}$ is a gentle function of $\hat{\xi}$ compared to $\hat{\xi}^2$. Hence $\hat{\xi}$ is almost proportional to $\sqrt{\tau}$. The inverse of correlation length corresponds to density of kinks approximately. It follows that density of kinks in the final state is estimated as

$$\rho \approx \frac{1}{\hat{\xi}} = \frac{(|\ln 2\hat{\xi}|)^{1/2}}{2\sqrt{\tau}}. \quad (10)$$

Thus one finds that density of kinks of the final state is proportional to $1/\sqrt{\tau}$ as far as the logarithmic correction is ignored.

Random Ising chain. The random Ising chain is represented by

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_i J_i \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1}. \quad (11)$$

In our study, the coupling constant $\{J_i\}$ is drawn randomly from the uniform distribution between 0 and 1, namely $P(J_i) = 1$ for $J_i \in [0, 1]$ and $P(J_i) = 0$ otherwise. This model is the same as the one studied in refs.[13, 14].

The correlation function between sites i and $i+k$ with fixed $\{J_i\}$ in the equilibrium at fixed temperature is given by $\langle \sigma_i \sigma_{i+k} \rangle = \prod_{j=i}^{i+k-1} \tanh \beta J_j$. Taking the average over randomness, the correlation function in the thermodynamic limit is obtained as $[\langle \sigma_i \sigma_{i+k} \rangle]_{\text{av}} = (\ln \cosh \beta / \beta)^k$. From this formula of the correlation function, one can obtain an explicit expression of the correlation length:

$$\xi(T) = [\ln(\beta / \ln \cosh \beta)]^{-1} \approx \beta / \ln 2. \quad (12)$$

Note that the right hand side is the low temperature expression.

The energy of the system with fixed $\{J_i\}$ is written as $\langle \mathcal{H} \rangle = - \sum_i J_i \tanh \beta J_i$. The average over randomness yields an expression of the energy per spin at low temperature in the thermodynamic limit:

$$\varepsilon = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{[\langle \mathcal{H} \rangle]_{\text{av}}}{N} \approx -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\beta^2} \frac{\pi^2}{24}. \quad (13)$$

We remark that the ground state energy is $-\frac{1}{2}$.

The relaxation time is available in ref.[18] by Dhar and Barma. It is given by $\tau_R = 1/(1 - \tanh 2\beta)$. The low temperature expression is

$$\tau_R(T) \approx e^{4\beta}/2 \approx e^{(4 \ln 2)\xi(T)}/2. \quad (14)$$

As is the case with the pure Ising chain, there is no phase transition at any finite temperature in this model.

Let us consider that the temperature is lowered according to the schedule given by eq. (9). We impose eq. (6) to define the time \hat{t} at which the evolution keeping

equilibrium breaks. From eq. (12), time relates with the correlation length by $|\hat{t}| = \tau/(\xi \ln 2)$. Applying this relation and eq. (14) to eq. (6), we obtain an equation of $\hat{\xi}$:

$$\hat{\xi} = \frac{1}{4 \ln 2} \left(\ln \tau - \ln \frac{\hat{\xi} \ln 2}{2} \right). \quad (15)$$

This equation cannot be solved analytically. However, since $(\ln \hat{\xi})/\hat{\xi} \rightarrow 0$ for $\hat{\xi} \rightarrow 0$, we find that $\hat{\xi}$ is almost proportional to $\ln \tau$ when $\tau \gg 1$. Equation (15) leads to an estimation of density of kinks,

$$\rho \approx \frac{1}{\hat{\xi}} \approx \frac{4 \ln 2}{\ln \tau - \ln \frac{\hat{\xi} \ln 2}{2}}. \quad (16)$$

The second term in the denominator is negligible for sufficiently long τ as mentioned above. Hence eq. (5) is derived.

Residual energy is also estimated from the energy at $T = \hat{T}$. Using eqs. (14) and (9), eq. (6) is rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2} e^{4\hat{\beta}} = \tau / \hat{\beta}, \quad (17)$$

where we defined $\hat{\beta} \equiv 1/\hat{T}$. This equation is followed by $\hat{\beta} = \frac{1}{4} \ln \tau - \frac{1}{4} \ln(\hat{\beta}/2)$. Substituting this for β in eq. (13), we obtain residual energy per spin as

$$\varepsilon_{\text{res}} = \frac{2\pi^2}{3} \frac{1}{(\ln \tau - \ln(\hat{\beta}/2))^2}. \quad (18)$$

Since the second term in the denominator is negligible for large τ , hence we obtain eq. (4).

We next consider a logarithmic schedule:

$$T(t) = \frac{T_0}{1 + a \ln(-\frac{T_0 \tau}{t})}, \quad (19)$$

where T_0 and a are positive numbers. In this schedule, the temperature is reduced from T_0 at $t = -T_0\tau$ to 0 at $t = 0$. Using eq. (19) with eqs. (6) and (14), one obtains the equation of $\hat{\beta}$ as $\frac{1}{2} e^{4\hat{\beta}} = T_0\tau \exp\{1/a - (T_0/a)\hat{\beta}\}$. This equation can be solved analytically and yield $\hat{\beta} = \ln(2e^{1/a}T_0\tau)/(4 + T_0/a)$. From eq. (12), one obtains the expression for density of kinks as

$$\rho \approx \frac{1}{\hat{\xi}} \approx \frac{(4 + \frac{T_0}{a}) \ln 2}{\ln \tau + \ln(2T_0) + \frac{1}{a}}. \quad (20)$$

This expression is reduced to eq. (5) for $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. The expression of residual energy per spin is obtained as

$$\varepsilon_{\text{res}} \approx \frac{\pi^2}{24} \frac{(4 + \frac{T_0}{a})^2}{(\ln \tau + \ln(2T_0) + \frac{1}{a})^2}, \quad (21)$$

which yields eq. (4) for $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. These results implies that the asymptotic behaviors of density of kinks and




FIG. 1: Density of kinks and residual energy after simulated annealing with the linear schedule. Square symbols are obtained by the Monte-Carlo simulation. The fitting curve of density of kinks is given by $\rho = q/\hat{\xi}$ with the correlation length $\hat{\xi}$ determined by eq. (15) with $\tau = p\tau^{\text{mc}}$. Residual energy is fitted by $\varepsilon_{\text{res}} = (\pi^2/24)/(r\hat{\beta})^2$ with $\hat{\beta}$ determined by eq. (17) with $\tau = p\tau^{\text{mc}}$. Parameters p , q , and r are adjusted so as to fit results of the Monte-Carlo simulation.

residual energy for $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ are insensitive to the schedule of quenching temperature.

We confirm results of the random Ising chain by the Monte-Carlo simulation for systems with 500 spins. The temperature is lowered according to the linear schedule. We choose the initial condition of the temperature as $T = 5$ at $t = -5\tau$. In order to take an average with respect to randomness of the system, we generated 100 configurations of coupling constants $\{J_i\}$. For each configuration, simulated annealing are carried out 500 times.

Square symbols in Fig. 1 show density of kinks and residual energy obtained by Monte-Carlo simulation. Density of kinks is defined by $\rho = [\frac{1}{2N} \sum_i (1 - \langle \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \rangle)]_{\text{av}}$, and residual energy is by $\varepsilon_{\text{res}} = [\frac{1}{N} \langle H \rangle]_{\text{av}} + \frac{1}{2}$, where $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes the expectation value with respect to the state after simulated annealing and $[\dots]_{\text{av}}$ means the average over configurations of coupling constants.

In order to obtain fitting curves of density of kinks and residual energy, we need to modify eqs. (16) and (18). First, we have to care about the difference in the unit of time between the Glauber's dynamics and Monte-Carlo dynamics. Then we bring up the relation, $\tau = p\tau^{\text{mc}}$, between the inverse of quench rate τ in the Glauber's dynamics and τ^{mc} in the Monte-Carlo dynamics, where p is an adjustable parameter. Next, we relate density of kinks ρ to the correlation length ξ by $\rho = q/\hat{\xi}$, where $\hat{\xi}$ is the solution of eq. (15). The parameter q tunes the inverse of correlation length to density of kinks. Finally, we propose an ansatz that residual energy is represented by $\varepsilon_{\text{res}} = (\pi^2/24)/(r\hat{\beta})^2$, where $\hat{\beta}$ is given from eq. (17) with $\tau = p\tau^{\text{mc}}$. Parameters p and q are determined so as to produce the Monte-Carlo results of density of kinks

with largest two τ^{mc} 's, and r is fixed to produce residual energy with largest τ^{mc} .

Figure 1 shows that results of Monte-Carlo simulation on density of kinks and residual energy are excellently fitted by the curves made from eq. (16) and eq. (18) respectively. Therefore the analytic results on the basis of the KZ argument is confirmed by the Monte-Carlo simulation.

Conclusion. We studied dynamics of quenching temperature of pure and random Ising chains. We showed for the pure Ising chain that density of kinks, i.e. residual energy, after quenching decays as $1/\sqrt{\tau}$. As for the random Ising chain, density of kinks and residual energy decay as $1/\ln \tau$ and $1/(\ln \tau)^2$ respectively. The decay rate of density of kinks for the random case is slower than that of quantum annealing for the same system. The advantage of quantum annealing arises only in the presence of randomness. This is the first analytic evidence that reveals the advantage of quantum annealing over simulated annealing.

The author thanks T. Caneva, G. E. Santoro, and H. Nishimori for fruitful discussions. The present work is partially supported by CREST, JST.

* Electronic address: sei@phys.aoyama.ac.jp

- [1] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelett, and M. P. Vecchi, *Science* **220**, 671 (1983).
- [2] A. B. Finnila, M. A. Gomez, C. Sebenik, C. Stenson, and J. D. Doll, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **219**, 343 (1994).
- [3] T. Kadowaki and H. Nishimori, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 5355 (1998).
- [4] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, J. Lapan, A. Lundgren, and D. Preda, *Science* **292**, 472 (2001).
- [5] G. Santoro, R. Martoňák, E. Tosatti, and R. Car, *Science* **295**, 2427 (2002).
- [6] R. Martoňák, G. E. Santoro, and E. Tosatti, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 057701 (2004).
- [7] D. A. Battaglia, G. E. Santoro, and E. Tosatti, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 066707 (2005).
- [8] J. Brooke, D. Bitko, T. F. Rosenbaum, and G. Aeppli, *Science* **284**, 779 (1999).
- [9] T. W. B. Kibble, *Phys. Rep.* **67**, 183 (1980).
- [10] W. H. Zurek, *Nature* **317**, 505 (1985).
- [11] W. H. Zurek, U. Dorner, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 105701 (2005).
- [12] J. Dziarmaga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 245701 (2005).
- [13] J. Dziarmaga, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 064416 (2006).
- [14] T. Caneva, R. Fazio, and G. E. Santoro, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 144427 (2007).
- [15] P. Laguna and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2519 (1997).
- [16] D. A. Huse and D. S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 2203 (1986).
- [17] R. J. Glauber, *J. Math. Phys.* **4**, 294 (1963).
- [18] D. Dhar and M. Barma, *J. Stat. Phys.* **22**, 259 (1980).