

Reduced fidelity approach for quantum phase transitions in spin-1/2 dimerized Heisenberg chains

Heng-Na Xiong,¹ Jian Ma,¹ Zhe Sun,² and Xiaoguang Wang^{1,*}

¹*Zhejiang Institute of Modern Physics, Department of Physics,
Zhejiang University, HangZhou 310027, P.R. China.*

²*Department of Physics, HangZhou Normal University, HangZhou 310036, P.R. China.*

(Dated: November 26, 2018)

We use reduced fidelity susceptibility to characterize quantum phase transitions in the one-dimensional spin-1/2 antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain with dimerization, and the intradimer and interdimer reduced fidelity susceptibilities are considered. It is found that they are closely related to the square of the second-order derivative of the ground-state energy of the global system, and thus we may conclude that the reduced fidelity susceptibility can well or more effectively reflect the second-order critical behaviors of the system. Moreover, explicit analytical and numerical results are given for both finite-size and infinite-size cases of the system. In the thermodynamic limit, critical exponents are computed for the reduced fidelity susceptibilities near the critical point.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Pq, 75.10.Jm, 75.40.Cx

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum phase transitions (QPTs) [1] driven purely by quantum fluctuations is an essential phenomenon in quantum many-body correlated systems. It is induced by the change of external parameters at zero temperature. How to characterize QPTs has attracted widespread attention in many fields. In the field of quantum-information theory, entanglement plays an important role in characterizing QPTs [2] due to its nature of purely quantum correlation. Fidelity is another indicator of QPTs since it describes the stability of a quantum system to external perturbations [3]. There are some kinds fidelity used for measuring QPTs, such as ground-state fidelity [4], the fidelity of first excited state [5], fidelity susceptibility [6] and operator fidelity susceptibility [7] etc. Among these concepts, ground-state fidelity is a successful measure of QPTs in several explicit systems since it reflects the quantum property of the whole system at zero temperature, and fidelity susceptibility is another effective tool to detect QPTs for its independence of the concrete values of the small perturbations. Besides, reduced fidelity [8] or partial fidelity [9] has also aroused much interest, because it concentrates on the description of the stability of the subsystem, which has more practical meaning in experiments. Therefore, to avoid the artificial small perturbations, the reduced fidelity susceptibility (RFS) for the ground state (GS) of the system can be naturally introduced.

The QPTs of many quantum correlated systems have been investigated both for the finite-size and infinite-size situations. For example, the transverse-field Ising model [10], the Heisenberg XXZ model [11] and the frustrated Heisenberg chain [5, 12] are the popular mod-

els widely studied, because their critical behaviors are relatively easier to be revealed using the concepts mentioned above. In fact, there is another fundamental spin-correlated model, the dimerized Heisenberg chain. It is of special interest both in theory and experiment, since it gives a reasonably accurate description of many dimerized quasi-one-dimensional (quasi-1D) antiferromagnets which have two important but structurally inequivalent superexchange paths that are spatially linked, such as the materials of $\text{Cu}(\text{NO}_3)_2 \cdot 2.5\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $(\text{VO})_2\text{P}_2\text{O}_7$ and various aromatic free-radical compounds [13]. Therefore, many efforts have been devoted to study its quantum critical behaviors of the dimerized Heisenberg model using various methods, e.g., continuous unitary transformations [14], density matrix renormalization group [15], concurrence [16] and block entanglement [17]. However, using the concept of fidelity to characterize its QPTs phenomena has not been performed up to now.

We will use the RFS to study critical behaviors of the 1D spin-1/2 dimerized Heisenberg model in the antiferromagnetic case and will focus on the RFSs between two nearest-neighbor spins of the system. Interestingly, it is shown that the RFSs are connected closely to the square of the second-order derivative of the GS energy of the global system, which indicates that RFS approach might be a more effective tool to identify the second-order QPTs.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we derive a general expression of RFS for two Hermitian and semi-positive definite matrices, which are commuted with each other, and give direct connections between RFSs and second-order QPTs in the dimerized model. In Sec. III, the critical behaviors of the system is studied for both finite-size and infinite-size situations. Finally, a summary is presented in Sec. IV.

*Electronic address: xgwang@zimp.zju.edu.cn

II. REDUCED FIDELITY SUSCEPTIBILITY AND ITS CONNECTION TO QUANTUM PHASE TRANSITIONS

The Hamiltonian for antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain (AHC) with dimerization reads

$$H_D = J \sum_{i=1}^{N/2} (\mathbf{S}_{2i-1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2i} + \alpha \mathbf{S}_{2i} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2i+1}), \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{S}_i denotes the i -th half-spin operator, J and αJ are the intradimer and interdimer couplings respectively with $\alpha > 0$ the ratio between them. In the following, we set $J = 1$ for convenience. The total number of spins N is required to be even and the periodic boundary conditions $\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_{N+1}$ is assumed.

A. Reduced density matrix

To study the RFS, we need to know the reduced density matrix between two spins, and for the whole discussions we restrict us to the case of two nearest spins. The Hamiltonian has the SU(2) symmetry, i.e., $[H, \sum_{i=1}^N S_{i\gamma}] = 0$ ($\gamma = x, y, z$), which guarantees the reduced density matrix between two nearest-neighbor spins has the form [18]

$$\rho_{ij} = \text{diag}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2), \quad (2)$$

with

$$\varrho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} u^+ & \\ & u^+ \end{pmatrix}, \quad \varrho_2 = \begin{pmatrix} u^- & w \\ w & u^- \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

in the basis $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle\}$, where $\sigma_z|0\rangle = -|0\rangle$ and $\sigma_z|1\rangle = |1\rangle$. In order to have block-diagonal form of the reduced density matrix, we do not use standard basis here. The matrix elements are given by [18]

$$\begin{aligned} u^\pm &= \frac{1}{4} (1 \pm \langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle), \\ w &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This implies that the reduced density matrix ρ_{ij} is only related to the spin correlator $\langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle$. It is noticed that both ϱ_1 and ϱ_2 are Hermitian, and they can be rewritten in terms of Pauli operators as $\varrho_1 = u\mathbf{I}$, $\varrho_2 = w\mathbf{I} + z\sigma_x$, where \mathbf{I} denotes a 2×2 identical matrix. Therefore, it is found that $\varrho_i \equiv \varrho_i(\alpha)$ ($i = 1, 2$) commutes with $\tilde{\varrho}_i \equiv \varrho_i(\alpha + \delta)$ with δ a small perturbation of the control parameter α , i.e., $[\varrho_i, \tilde{\varrho}_i] = 0$. This commuting property will greatly facilitate our study of RFS below.

In addition, there is a translational invariance in the Hamiltonian due to the periodic boundary condition, which leads to the fact that, for any index i , $\langle \mathbf{S}_{2i-1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2i} \rangle$ equals to each other, so does $\langle \mathbf{S}_{2i} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2i+1} \rangle$. Applying the

Feynman-Hellman theorem to the GS, the two kinds spin correlators with the nearest coupling can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_{1z} \sigma_{2z} \rangle &= \frac{8}{3} (e_0 - \alpha \partial_\alpha e_0), \\ \langle \sigma_{2z} \sigma_{3z} \rangle &= \frac{8}{3} \partial_\alpha e_0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $e_0 \equiv E_0/N$ represents the GS energy (denoted by E_0) per spin. The above equation gives a direct relation between the two correlators and the ground-state energy and its first-order derivative. In other words, the two types of reduced density matrix for two nearest spins are completely determined by e_0 and $\partial_\alpha e_0$.

B. Reduced fidelity susceptibility

First, we will generally calculate the fidelity between two Hermitian and semi-positive definite matrices $\varrho \equiv \varrho(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\varrho} \equiv \varrho(\alpha + \delta)$, which are commuted with each other, i.e., $[\varrho, \tilde{\varrho}] = 0$, so that they can be diagonalized simultaneously. With the definition of fidelity, we get

$$F_\varrho = \text{tr} \sqrt{\varrho^{1/2} \tilde{\varrho} \varrho^{1/2}} = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i \tilde{\lambda}_i}, \quad (6)$$

where λ_i s and $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ s are the eigenvalues of ϱ and $\tilde{\varrho}$, respectively. Since zero eigenvalues have no contribution to F_ϱ , we only need to consider the nonzero ones. In the following, the subscript i in \sum_i only denotes the nonzero eigenvalues of ϱ .

It is noticed that, for a small change δ , $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ can be expanded as $\tilde{\lambda}_i \equiv \lambda(\alpha + \delta) \simeq \lambda_i + (\partial_\alpha \lambda_i) \delta + (\partial_\alpha^2 \lambda_i) \delta^2/2 + O(\delta^3)$. Then the fidelity for matrix ϱ is

$$F_\varrho = \sum_i \left\{ \lambda_i + \frac{\delta}{2} \partial_\alpha \lambda_i + \frac{\delta^2}{4} \left(\partial_\alpha^2 \lambda_i - \frac{(\partial_\alpha \lambda_i)^2}{2\lambda_i} \right) \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Here we have neglected small terms higher than second order. Since $\sum_i \lambda_i \equiv 1$, we have $\sum_i \partial_\alpha \lambda_i = \sum_i \partial_\alpha^2 \lambda_i = 0$. Thus the fidelity is further reduced to

$$F_\varrho = 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \sum_i \frac{(\partial_\alpha \lambda_i)^2}{4\lambda_i}. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, according to the relation between fidelity and susceptibility $F = 1 - \chi \delta^2/2$ [6], the fidelity susceptibility χ_ϱ corresponding to the matrix ϱ is obtained as

$$\chi_\varrho = \sum_i \frac{(\partial_\alpha \lambda_i)^2}{4\lambda_i}. \quad (9)$$

This expression of fidelity susceptibility is valid for any commuting density matrices.

C. Connections to quantum phase transitions

In the dimerized model, as the two-spin reduced density matrices with different parameters commute, Eq. (9) is applicable. By using the expression of the reduced density matrix, after some calculations, the RFS for the density matrix ρ_{ij} can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_{ij} &= \frac{4(\partial_\alpha \langle \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \rangle)^2}{(3 + 4\langle \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \rangle)(1 - 4\langle \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \rangle)} \\ &= \frac{3(\partial_\alpha \langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle)^2}{4(1 + \langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle)(1 - 3\langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle)}.\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

which depends on both the spin correlator $\langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle$ itself and its derivative. The required condition for Eq. (10) is

$$\langle \sigma_{iz} \sigma_{jz} \rangle \in \left(-1, \frac{1}{3}\right), \quad (11)$$

which ensures the eigenvalues of ρ_1 and ρ_2 positive.

Now, substituting Eq. (5) into Eq. (10), one can get another forms for the RFSs χ_{12} and χ_{23} as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_{12} &= \frac{16\alpha^2 (\partial_\alpha^2 e_0)^2}{(3 + 8e_0 - 8\alpha \partial_\alpha e_0)(1 - 8e_0 + 8\alpha \partial_\alpha e_0)}, \\ \chi_{23} &= \frac{16 (\partial_\alpha^2 e_0)^2}{(3 + 8\partial_\alpha e_0)(1 - 8\partial_\alpha e_0)}\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

in terms of ground-state energy and its first-order and second-order derivatives. Thus, the ground-state energy as a function of α is sufficient to determine the RFSs.

One key observation is that the numerators of the above two expressions happen to be proportional to the square of the second-order derivative of GS energy. Since Eq. (11) ensures the denominators be positive and finite, the singularities of the RFSs are determined only by the numerators. That is, if the second-order derivative of GS energy is singular at the critical point, the RFSs is singular too. On the other hand, it is known that the divergence of the second-order derivative of GS energy reflects the second-order QPTs of the system, which is shown in Ref. [4] explicitly as

$$\partial_\alpha^2 e_0 = \sum_{n \neq 0}^N \frac{2 |\langle \Psi_n | H_1 | \Psi_0 \rangle|^2}{N(E_0 - E_n)}, \quad (13)$$

where $H_1 = \partial_\alpha H$ is the driving term of the Hamiltonian H , and $|\Psi_n\rangle$ is the eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue E_n of H . Eq. (13) show that the vanishing energy gap in the thermodynamic limit can lead to the singularity of the the second-order derivative of GS energy. Therefore, both the two-spin RFSs can exactly reflects the second-order QPTs of the global system in this model. In addition, the second power in the numerators of the expressions indicates that the two-spin RFSs may be more effective in measuring QPTs. Furthermore, by the fidelity approach, it will be shown in Sec. III that the dimerized AHC has a second-order critical point at $\alpha = 1$.

III. FINITE-SIZE AND CRITICAL BEHAVIORS

In this section, we consider the critical behaviors of the 1D spin-1/2 dimerized AHC. It is known that, for $0 < \alpha \ll 1$, the interdimer coupling is so weak that all the spins are locked into singlet states, while for $\alpha = 1$, the system is reduced to the uniform AHC. Hence, it has already been proved that the dimerized AHC has a critical point at $\alpha = 1$ [14, 15, 16, 17], which exactly exists in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.

A. Finite-size behaviors

1. Analytical results for $N = 4$ case

For the case that the total spins $N = 4$, the analytical results can be obtained. In this case, the GS energy per spin of the system can be analytically given by [16, 19]

$$e_0 = -\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} + \sqrt{1-\alpha+\alpha^2} \right), \quad (14)$$

with its first and second-order derivatives being

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\alpha e_0 &= \frac{1}{8} \left(-1 + \frac{1-2\alpha}{\sqrt{1-\alpha+\alpha^2}} \right), \\ \partial_\alpha^2 e_0 &= -\frac{3}{16(1-\alpha+\alpha^2)^{3/2}}.\end{aligned}\quad (15)$$

Then the susceptibilities of the reduced density matrices ρ_{12} and ρ_{23} can be derived from Eq. (12) as

$$\chi_{12} = \chi_{23} = \frac{3}{16(1-\alpha+\alpha^2)^2}. \quad (16)$$

Since ρ_{12} and ρ_{23} correspond to the intradimer and interdimer subsystems, respectively, χ_{12} and χ_{23} can be called intradimer and interdimer fidelity susceptibilities accordingly.

From Eq. (16) we see that χ_{12} and χ_{23} have the same expressions, and there is no singularity over parameter α . However, take derivation of the expression with respect to α , one will find that there is a maximum of χ_{12} (or χ_{23}) at $\alpha = 0.5$, which is also the maximum position of $\partial_\alpha^2 e_0$ as shown in Eq. (15). However, the maximum position $\alpha = 0.5$ deviates from the real critical point $\alpha = 1$ and can be called pseudo-critical point due to the finite size of the system. In addition, the different powers in the expressions of χ_{12} (or χ_{23}) and $\partial_\alpha^2 e_0$ shows that the former is more sensitive around the critical point.

Besides, the exact equivalence between χ_{12} and χ_{23} is in contract with concurrences as shown in Ref. [16]. There, the concurrences for the reduced system, i.e., C_{12} and C_{23} are unequal to each other and have a crossing point at $\alpha = 1$, which leads to the mean concurrence takes its maximum at the critical point $\alpha = 1$. This is because the concurrences C_{12} and C_{23} are only related to the zero and first-order derivative of GS energy over




FIG. 1: Reduced fidelity susceptibilities (a) χ_{12} and (b) χ_{23} versus α for $N = 6, 8, 10, 12$.

α , respectively. However, the RFSs shown in Eq. (12) are also determined by the second-order derivative of GS energy, which leads to the identical behaviors between χ_{12} and χ_{23} .

2. Numerical results for $N = 6, 8, 10, 12$

For the case that the total spins $N > 4$, we use exact diagonalization method to examine the critical behaviors of the system in terms of the RFSs. The results for $N = 6, 8, 10, 12$ are shown in Fig. 1.

It is seen that both the RFSs χ_{12} and χ_{23} can well reflect the critical behaviors of the system. With increasing system size, the pseudo-critical point exhibited by χ_{12} (or χ_{23}) approaches to the real critical point $\alpha = 1$. Besides, the larger N becomes, the higher and shaper the peak of χ_{12} (or χ_{23}) is.

It should be noticed that there is a slight difference between χ_{12} and χ_{23} for a given α and N , which results from the difference between the spin correlators shown in Eq. (5). In fact, the two spin correlators are equivalent, if we exchange the intradimer and interdimer couplings. Thus χ_{12} and χ_{23} are also equivalent in identifying QPTs.

B. Infinite-size critical behaviors

Now, we consider the thermodynamic limit. For the system size $N \rightarrow \infty$, the critical behavior of the system is usually described by a new alternative parameter $\eta \equiv (1 - \alpha)/(1 + \alpha)$. When the system approaches to the uniform chain limit, i.e., $\eta \rightarrow 0$, analytical studies obtained by renormalization group [20] had predicted that the GS energy per spin e_0 should diverge as a power law times a logarithmic correction, i.e., $\eta^{4/3}/|\ln \eta|$. However, it is restricted to an extremely small range $\eta < 0.02$

[15]. Thereafter, some numerical results pointed out that a pure power-law behavior is reasonably simple and accurate for larger η as well [15, 21].

For generality, we assume a power law of e_0 as the form $c\eta^p$ with c an overall constant. The exponent p are given differently over different η ranges. Hitherto, almost all the works [15, 21] show that $1 < p < 2$ over the range $0 < \eta < 1$. Thus we will restrict $1 < p < 2$ in the following. The GS energy per spin in the thermodynamic limit can be written accordingly as [15]

$$e_0(\eta) = \frac{1}{1 + \eta}(e_0(0) - c\eta^p), \quad (17)$$

where $e_0(0) = 1/4 - \ln 2$ is the GS energy per spin for $\eta = 0$.

The above expression shows that the GS energy follows the power law behavior η^p . This can give a prediction of the critical point of the RFSs. From Eq. (17), we can easily get the first and second-order derivatives of GS state energy per spin in the thermodynamic limit as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha e_0 &= \frac{c}{2}(2p + \alpha - 1)(1 + \alpha)^{-1}(1 - \alpha)^{p-1}, \\ \partial_\alpha^2 e_0 &= -2c(p - 1)p(1 + \alpha)^{-(p+1)}(1 - \alpha)^{p-2}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It is seen that, as $\alpha > 0$ and $1 < p < 2$, the first-order derivative of e_0 does not diverge for any allowed α value, while the second-order derivative of \tilde{e}_0 has a singular point $\alpha = 1$. That is, the dimerized AHC has a second-order QPT point $\alpha = 1$. As it is demonstrated in Sec. III, it is no doubt that the RFSs also diverges at $\alpha = 1$, i.e., $\eta = 0$.

Next we discuss the critical behaviors of the RFSs around the critical point. Insert Eq. (18) into Eq. (12), we obtain the RFSs as

$$\chi_{12} = -\frac{c^2 p^2 (p-1)^2 \eta^{-2+2p} (\eta-1)^2 (\eta+1)^4}{16 \left[c^2 (p+\eta-p\eta)^2 \eta^{2p} + c(2\ln 2 - 1)(p+\eta-p\eta)\eta^{1+p} + \ln 2 (\ln 2 - 1)\eta^2 \right]},$$

$$\chi_{23} = -\frac{c^2 p^2 (p-1)^2 \eta^{-2+2p} (\eta+1)^6}{16 \left[c^2 (p-\eta+p\eta)^2 \eta^{2p} - c(2\ln 2 - 1)(p-\eta+p\eta)\eta^{1+p} + \ln 2 (\ln 2 - 1)\eta^2 \right]}.$$
(19)




FIG. 2: Reduced fidelity susceptibilities versus α in the thermodynamic limit, with $c = 0.39$ and the exponent $p = 1.45$ over the range of $0.008 \lesssim \eta \lesssim 0.1$ [15], i.e., $0.818 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 0.984$.

When $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, i.e., $\eta \rightarrow 0$, we only consider the leading terms in the expressions and get the critical behaviors of the RFSs as

$$\chi_{12}, \chi_{23} \sim \eta^{2p-4} \sim (1-\alpha)^{2p-4}. \quad (20)$$

Obviously, for $1 < p < 2$, both of them diverge at $\eta = 0$, i.e., $\alpha = 1$, as displayed in Fig. 2. It is shown that the two RFSs diverge quickly when α approaches to 1. For a given α , χ_{12} and χ_{23} are remarkably larger than those in the finite-size cases. In addition, the different power between $\partial_\alpha^2 e_0$ and $\chi_{12}(\chi_{23})$ over the factor $(1-\alpha)$ indicates that these RFSs are more singular around the critical point.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have studied the critical behaviors of the 1D spin-1/2 antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain with dimerization in terms of RFS. For the GS of the system, two kinds of RFSs between two nearest-neighbor spins, i.e., the intradimer and interdimer fidelity susceptibilities are considered. It is interesting that the singularities of these RFSs are just determined by the square of the second-order derivative of the GS energy of the system, which means the RFS is effective in identifying the second-order QPTs. In addition, explicit calculations are also carried out both in finite-size and infinite-size situations analytically or numerically. It is found that, as the system size increases, the pseudo-critical points of the RFSs approach to the real critical point $\alpha = 1$. In the thermodynamic limit, we give the critical exponent of the two RFSs. These results further convince us that the critical behaviors of the system can be reflected by the fidelity of its two-spin subsystem, which is of practical meaning in experiments. Finally, it should be pointed out that the RFSs given by Eq. (10) can also be applied to other quantum many-body systems with the SU(2) symmetry, such as the frustrated Heisenberg chain with next-nearest-neighbor interactions, which is under consideration.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University (NCET), the NSFC with grant No. 90503003, the State Key Program for Basic Research of China with grant No. 2006CB921206, the Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education with grant No. 20050335087.

-
- [1] S. Sachdev, Quantum Phase Transitions (Cambridge University Press, England, 1999).
 - [2] A. Osterloh, L. Amico, G. Falci, and Rosario Fazio, Nature (London) **416**, 608 (2002); T. J. Osborne and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032110 (2002); G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003); S. J. Gu, S. S. Deng, Y. Q. Li, and H. Q. Lin, *ibid.* **93**, 086402 (2004).
 - [3] H. T. Quan, Z. Song, X. F. Liu, P. Zanardi, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 140604 (2006); P. Zanardi and N. Paunković, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 031123 (2006).
 - [4] H. Q. Zhou, R. Orús, and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 080601 (2008); S. Chen, L. Wang, Y. Hao, and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032111 (2008); J. H. Zhao and H. Q. Zhou, arXiv:0803.0814.
 - [5] S. Chen, L. Wang, S. J. Gu, and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 061108 (2007).
 - [6] W. L. You, Y. W. Li, and S. J. Gu, Phys. Rev. E **76**,

- 022101 (2007).
- [7] X. Wang, Z. Sun, and Z. D. Wang, arXiv:0803.2940.
- [8] H. Q. Zhou, arXiv:0704.2945; J. Ma, L. Xu, H. Xiong, and X. Wang, arXiv:0805.4062.
- [9] N. Paunković, P. D. Sacramento, P. Nogueira, V. R. Vieira, and V. K. Dugaev, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 052302 (2008); H. M. Kwok, C. S. Ho and S. J. Gu, arXiv:0805.3885.
- [10] S. Q. Su, J. L. Song, and S. J. Gu, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 032308 (2006); Y. C. Li and S. S. Li, *ibid.* **76**, 032117 (2007); H. Q. Zhou, J. H. Zhao, and B. Li, arXiv:0704.2940; R. Yu, H. Saleur, and S. Haas, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 140402(R) (2008).
- [11] S. J. Gu, H. Q. Lin, and Y. Q. Li, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042330 (2003); Y. C. Tzeng and M. F. Yang, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012311 (2008).
- [12] S. J. Gu, H. Li, Y. Q. Li, and H. Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 052302 (2004).
- [13] P. L. Nordio, Z. G. Soos, and H. M. McConnell, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **17**, 237 (1966).
- [14] K. P. Schmidt and G. S. Uhrig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227204 (2003).
- [15] T. Papenbrock, T. Barnes, D. J. Dean, M. V. Stoitsov, and M. R. Strayer, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 024416 (2003).
- [16] Z. Sun, X. Wang, A. Z. Hu, and Y. Q. Li, Commun. Theor. Phys. **43** 1033 (2005).
- [17] Y. Chen, P. Zanardi, Z. D. Wang, and F. C. Zhang, New J. Phys. **8** 97 (2006).
- [18] X. Wang and P. Zanardi, Phys. Lett. A **301**, 1 (2002).
- [19] X. Hao and S. Zhu, arXiv:0803.0770.
- [20] M. C. Cross and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **19**, 402 (1979); J. L. Black and V. J. Emery, *ibid.* **23**, 429 (1981).
- [21] T. Barnes, J. Riera, and D. A. Tennant, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 11384 (1999); M. Kumar, S. Ramasesha, D. Sen, and Z. G. Soos, *ibid.* **75**, 052404 (2007).