

Mutual Information and Compactification Radius in a $c = 1$ Critical Phase in One Dimension

Shunsuke Furukawa,^{1,*} Vincent Pasquier,² and Jun'ichi Shiraishi³

¹*Condensed Matter Theory Laboratory, RIKEN, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

²*Institut de Physique Théorique, CEA Saclay, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France*

³*Graduate School of Mathematical Science, University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan*

(Dated: May 29, 2019)

The scaling of the mutual information defined between two intervals is studied numerically in the critical phase of a spin-1/2 XXZ chain in a magnetic field, whose effective theory is a free bosonic field theory compactified on a circle. The numerical results show a deviation from the field-theoretical prediction of Calabrese and Cardy when the system is away from the $SU(2)$ point, and exhibit a dependence on the compactification radius of the bosonic field. The origin of this deviation is discussed, and a connection with the twist field correlation functions is given. The present result demonstrates that the entanglement entropy on double intervals does contain more information on the critical properties besides the central charge.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 05.70.Jk, 75.10.Pq

The concept of quantum entanglement has provided new ways to study strongly correlated systems. The main novelty is to characterize quantum phases and phase transitions by studying various entanglement estimators in the ground states without having recourse to the excited states. One useful estimator for a many-body state $|\Psi\rangle$ is the entanglement entropy S_A between a part A of the system and the rest \bar{A} . It is defined as the von Neumann entropy of the reduced density matrix ρ_A obtained by tracing out the degrees of freedom on \bar{A} :

$$S_A = -\text{Tr} \rho_A \log \rho_A, \quad \rho_A = \text{Tr}_{\bar{A}} |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|. \quad (1)$$

The region-dependence of S_A encodes some relevant correlation properties of $|\Psi\rangle$. An illuminative example is a one-dimensional quantum critical system described by a conformal field theory (CFT). One observes the appearance of the central charge c - a universal number specifying the CFT - in the scaling law of the entanglement entropy [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. For an interval $A = [x_1, x_2]$ in an infinite chain, the scaling law reads

$$S_A = \frac{c}{3} \log(x_2 - x_1) + s_1, \quad (2)$$

where s_1 is a non-universal constant related to the ultraviolet (UV) cutoff.

In this Letter, we demonstrate that the entanglement entropy defined on double intervals, $A \cup B = [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_3, x_4]$, contains richer information on the critical properties than the single-interval case in Eq. (2). To eliminate the dependence on the UV cutoff, we consider the mutual information defined by

$$I_{A:B} \equiv S_A + S_B - S_{A \cup B}. \quad (3)$$

We numerically evaluate this quantity in a critical spin chain effectively described by a free bosonic field theory compactified on a circle. In the $SU(2)$ -symmetric case,

the numerical result agrees with the field-theoretical prediction of Calabrese and Cardy (CC) [4] shown in Eq. (5) below. In other cases, the numerical result deviates from the CC prediction and reveals a new scaling determined by the compactification radius of the bosonic field.

The mutual information defined by Eq. (3) was introduced in the context of quantum information [11, 12]. It measures the amount of correlations intervening two subsystems. Indeed, $I_{A \cup B}$ is non-negative, and becomes zero if and only if $\rho_{A \cup B} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$, i.e., in a situation of no correlation [13]. When there is a long-range order in local operators, we have $I_{A \cup B} \neq 0$ for finite local regions A and B , even in the limit of large separation [20]. In a critical system with power-law decaying correlations, $I_{A \cup B}$ goes to zero if A and B are far apart in comparison with their lengths, r_A and r_B . However, if r_A and r_B are of the order of the separation, $I_{A \cup B}$ can remain finite, which is the situation we examine here.

First, suppose we treat the mutual information (3) following the field-theoretical predictions of Calabrese and Cardy [4]. For an infinite chain, the entanglement entropy on double intervals $A \cup B = [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_3, x_4]$ is predicted to be [4]

$$S_{A \cup B} = \frac{c}{3} \log \left(\frac{x_{21} x_{32} x_{43} x_{41}}{x_{31} x_{42}} \right) + 2s_1, \quad (4)$$

with $x_{ij} = x_i - x_j$. Here the constant term $2s_1$ is determined so that $S_{A \cup B} \approx S_A + S_B$ in the limit $x_{21}, x_{43} \ll x_{31}, x_{42}$. For a finite chain of length L , one replaces x_{ij} by a chord distance $\frac{L}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x_{ij}}{L}$ in Eqs. (2) and (4) [21]. We now consider a division (r_A, r_C, r_B, r_D) of a finite chain as depicted in the inset of Fig. 1. The CC formula for the mutual information is obtained as

$$I_{A:B}^{\text{CC}} = \frac{c}{3} \log \left[\frac{\sin \frac{\pi(r_A+r_C)}{L} \sin \frac{\pi(r_B+r_C)}{L}}{\sin \frac{\pi r_C}{L} \sin \frac{\pi r_D}{L}} \right]. \quad (5)$$




FIG. 1: (color online) The mutual information for fixed divisions $r_A:r_C:r_B:r_D=1:1:1:1$ and $1:2:1:2$, versus $\eta = 2\pi R^2$. We set the magnetization at $M = \frac{k}{L}$ with $k = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{L}{2} - 3$ for $-1 < \Delta \leq 1$ and with $k = 1, \dots, \frac{L}{2} - 3$ for $1 < \Delta$, so that the system is inside the critical phase. Black and green points correspond to the larger ($L = 28, 30$) and smaller ($L = 24$) systems, respectively. Horizontal red lines indicate the Calabrese-Cardy result (5).

Note that the UV-divergent constant s_1 has been cancelled out in the mutual information, and the resultant (5) is invariant under global scale transformations. Similar ideas of eliminating the UV-divergence have been suggested in Ref. 5 and have also been exploited in the context of topological entropy [14] in higher dimensions. Henceforth, lengths of (sub)systems are measured in units of the lattice spacing.

Now we turn to numerical analyses of the mutual information in a spin chain, based on Lanczos diagonalization of finite systems up to $L = 30$. We consider a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ XXZ chain in a magnetic field,

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^L (S_j^x S_{j+1}^x + S_j^y S_{j+1}^y + \Delta S_j^z S_{j+1}^z) - h \sum_{j=1}^L S_j^z. \quad (6)$$

Since the magnetization per site, $M = \frac{1}{L} \sum_j S_j^z$, is a conserved quantity, we can label the ground-states using M . A $c = 1$ critical phase extends over a wide region in $\Delta > -1$. The low-energy effective theory for this critical phase is a free bosonic field theory compactified on a circle of radius R , known as a Tomonaga-Luttinger (TL) liquid [15]. The radius R controls the nature of critical correlations. Indeed, the exponents for the leading algebraic decay of magnetic correlations, $\langle S_j^x S_{j'}^x \rangle$ and $\langle S_j^z S_{j'}^z \rangle \sim M^2$, are given by $\eta \equiv 2\pi R^2$ and $\min(1/\eta, 2)$, respectively. For $-1 < \Delta \leq 1$ and $h = 0$, the radius R is given by

$$\eta = 2\pi R^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \arccos \Delta. \quad (7)$$




FIG. 2: (color online) Mutual information $I_{A:B}$ as a function of $\frac{r}{L}$ for divisions $(r_A, r_C, r_B, r_D) = (r, \frac{L}{2} - r, r, \frac{L}{2} - r)$. We set $h = 0$, and symbols with different shapes correspond to different $\Delta = -0.8, -0.6, 0, 1$. Filled and empty symbols correspond to $L = 28$ and 24 , respectively.

For $\Delta > 1$, the system is in a gapped Néel phase at $h = 0$ and enters the critical phase at a critical field with $\eta = 2$. For general $h \neq 0$, the radius R can be determined by numerically solving the integral equations obtained from the Bethe ansatz [16, 17, 18]. When increasing h , $\eta = 2\pi R^2$ monotonically increases ($-1 < \Delta < 0$) or decreases ($0 < \Delta$) to $\frac{1}{2}$ at the saturation. Summaries of the value of R (or TL parameter $K = 1/(2\eta)$) in the M - Δ and h - Δ phase diagrams can be found in e.g. Refs. 15 and 18.

We first evaluate $I_{A:B}$ for fixed divisions $(r_A, r_C, r_B, r_D) = \frac{L}{4}(1, 1, 1, 1)$ and $\frac{L}{6}(1, 2, 1, 2)$. Figure 1 shows a plot of $I_{A:B}$ against $\eta = 2\pi R^2$. Remarkably, the data points form an almost single curve for each type of division. The collapse of a two-dimensional M - Δ plane onto these two curves strongly indicates a direct connection between $I_{A:B}$ and R . The agreement with the CC prediction (5) can be seen only around $\eta = 1$ ($SU(2)$ -symmetric case). One can also observe that $I_{A:B}$ is symmetric under $\eta \rightarrow 1/\eta$, which might reflect a duality in the effective theory.

In Fig. 2, we plot $I_{A:B}$ as a function of $\frac{r}{L}$ for divisions $(r_A, r_C, r_B, r_D) = (r, \frac{L}{2} - r, r, \frac{L}{2} - r)$, in comparison with CC prediction $I_{A:B}^{CC}$ in Eq. (5). The result for $\Delta = 1$ agrees relatively well with the CC formula (5). In other cases, the curves run above the CC formula. We can confirm that $I_{A:B}$ approaches zero in the limit $\frac{r}{L} \rightarrow 0$, as expected for systems without long-range order. If we subtract the CC formula (see black circles in Fig. 3), we find that the curves are symmetric under $\frac{r}{L} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} - \frac{r}{L}$ and have maxima at $\frac{r}{L} = \frac{1}{4}$.

As an extension of the von Neumann entropy (= entanglement entropy), we also consider the Rényi entropy




FIG. 3: (color online) The deviation of the “Rényi” mutual information $I_{A:B}^{(n)}$ from the CC result $I_{A:B}^{CC(n)}$ in Eq. (10), for divisions $(r, \frac{L}{2} - r, r, \frac{L}{2} - r)$. Different symbols correspond to $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

(or alpha entropy) defined by

$$R_A^{(n)} = \frac{-1}{n-1} \log(\text{Tr } \rho_A^n). \quad (8)$$

The von Neumann entropy S_A can be reached in the limit $n \rightarrow 1$. Following Calabrese and Cardy [4], one can derive the following expression for a single interval $A = [x_1, x_2]$ in an infinite chain:

$$R_A^{(n)} = \frac{1+n}{6n} c \log x_{21} + s_n, \quad (9)$$

where s_n is again a UV-divergent constant. Likewise, within CC argument, the translation from von Neumann to Rényi can be done via a replacement $\frac{c}{3} \rightarrow \frac{1+n}{6n} c$. We define the “Rényi” mutual information by $I_{A:B}^{(n)} = R_A^{(n)} + R_B^{(n)} - R_{A \cup B}^{(n)}$.

In Fig. 3, we plot the deviation of the “Rényi” mutual information $I_{A:B}^{(n)}$ from the CC result

$$I_{A:B}^{CC(n)} = -\frac{1+n}{6n} c \log \left[\cos^2 \frac{\pi r}{L} \right]. \quad (10)$$

In contrast to the von Neumann case $n \rightarrow 1$, we observe some oscillating dependence on $\frac{r}{L}$ for $n > 1$. Similar oscillations have also been reported for a single-interval entropy in Ref. 9. In Fig. 3, the oscillations in the $n = 3$ and 4 cases occur around the smooth curves in the von Neumann case $n \rightarrow 1$. From this, it is expected that $I_{A:B}^{(n)} - I_{A:B}^{CC(n)}$ consists of a smooth component, which depends little on n , and an oscillating component, which shrinks in the limit $n \rightarrow 1$.

Let us now discuss the origin of the deviation from the Calabrese-Cardy result. We follow the formulation based on branch-point twist fields proposed in Ref. 8. First, we represent the moment $\text{Tr } \rho_A^n$ as the partition function on a n -sheeted Riemann surface \mathcal{R}_n [4]. Then, we relate it




FIG. 4: (color online) $I_{A:B} - I_{A:B}^{CC}$ versus the cross ratio x given in (15). All the divisions (r_A, r_C, r_B, r_D) with $3 \leq r_A \leq r_B$ and $3 \leq r_C \leq r_D$ are examined. For $L = 28$ (24), there are totally 305 (152) possibilities of such divisions. Black and Green symbols correspond to $L = 28$ and 24, respectively.

to a correlation function of twist fields \mathcal{T} and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ with conformal dimensions $\Delta_n = \bar{\Delta}_n = \frac{c}{24} (n - \frac{1}{n})$ [8]. For double intervals $A \cup B = [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_3, x_4]$ embedded in an infinite chain, we can write it down as

$$\text{Tr } \rho_{A \cup B}^n \propto \langle \mathcal{T}(x_1) \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_2) \mathcal{T}(x_3) \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_4) \rangle. \quad (11)$$

Conformal invariance requires this four-point function to have the following form:

$$\left(\frac{x_{31} x_{42}}{x_{21} x_{32} x_{43} x_{41}} \right)^{2\Delta_n} \left(\frac{\bar{x}_{31} \bar{x}_{42}}{\bar{x}_{21} \bar{x}_{32} \bar{x}_{43} \bar{x}_{41}} \right)^{2\bar{\Delta}_n} F_n(x, \bar{x}; \eta), \quad (12)$$

with $x_i = \bar{x}_i$. Here, $F_n(x, \bar{x}; \eta)$ is a function of the cross ratios $x = \frac{x_{21} x_{43}}{x_{31} x_{42}}$ and $\bar{x} = \frac{\bar{x}_{21} \bar{x}_{43}}{\bar{x}_{31} \bar{x}_{42}}$ normalized as $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} F_n(x, x; \eta) = 1$, and should be determined by $\eta = 2\pi R^2$ as suggested by Fig. 1. The power function part $(\dots)^{2\Delta_n} (\dots)^{2\bar{\Delta}_n}$ in Eq. (12) corresponds to the Calabrese-Cardy result [4], and the function F_n gives an additional contribution $\frac{-1}{n-1} \log F_n(x, x; \eta) \equiv -f_n(x; \eta)$ to the Rényi entropy $R_{A \cup B}^{(n)}$. The mutual information detects this new part:

$$I_{A:B}^{(n)} - I_{A:B}^{CC(n)} = f_n(x; \eta), \quad (13)$$

$$I_{A:B} - I_{A:B}^{CC} = \lim_{n \rightarrow 1} f_n(x; \eta) \equiv f(x; \eta). \quad (14)$$

The function $f_n(x; \eta)$ satisfies (i) $f_n(x; \eta) \rightarrow 0$ ($x \rightarrow 0$), (ii) the crossing invariance $f_n(x; \eta) = f_n(1-x; \eta)$ required from $R_{A \cup B}^{(n)} = R_{C \cup D}^{(n)}$ for a finite chain (see Eq. (15) below), and (iii) a duality $f_n(x; \eta) = f_n(x; 1/\eta)$ suggested by Fig. 1.

As a check of this result, we plot $I_{A:B} - I_{A:B}^{CC}$ as a function of the cross ratio x in Fig. 4. For a finite chain, the cross ratio is given by

$$x = \frac{\sin \frac{\pi r_A}{L} \sin \frac{\pi r_B}{L}}{\sin \frac{\pi(r_A+r_C)}{L} \sin \frac{\pi(r_C+r_B)}{L}} \quad (15)$$




FIG. 5: (color online) $n = 2$ “Rényi” mutual information for the 1:1:1:1 division versus $\eta = 2\pi R^2$. The same symbols as in Fig. 1 are used.

We can confirm that for a given Δ , and for various divisions (r_A, r_C, r_B, r_D), the additional contribution to the CC result can be fit by a single curve with good accuracy, supporting Eq. (14).

For $n = 2$, two twist fields, \mathcal{T} and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ are identical [10], and have the conformal dimensions $\Delta_2 = \bar{\Delta}_2 = \frac{1}{16}$. The correlation of four twist fields (Ramond fields) (12) was obtained by Al.B. Zamolodchikov [19]. For four identical fields of dimensions $\frac{1}{16}$, the crossing-symmetric solution reads

$$F_2^Z(x, x; \eta) = \frac{\theta_3(q^{1/\eta})\theta_3(q^\eta)}{[\theta_3(q)]^2} \quad \text{with } \theta_3(q) \equiv \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{m^2}, \quad (16)$$

where $q \equiv e^{i\pi\tau}$ is related to x as

$$x = 16q \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} [(1 + q^{2m}) / (1 + q^{2m-1})]^8. \quad (17)$$

From the identity $\theta_3(e^{-i\pi/\tau}) = e^{-i\pi/4} \tau^{1/2} \theta_3(e^{i\pi\tau})$, it is obvious that F_2^Z is invariant under $\tau \rightarrow -1/\tau$, which corresponds to $x \rightarrow 1 - x$. When two intervals of small lengths $r \equiv x_{21} = x_{43}$ are separated far apart by a distance $d \equiv x_{31} = x_{42} (\gg r)$, Eq. (16) reduces to $F_2^Z \approx 1 + 2 \left(\frac{r}{4d}\right)^{2 \min(1/\eta, \eta)}$. The second part scales as the dominant magnetic correlation *squared*.

In Fig. 3, the formula $\log F_2^Z(x, x; \eta)$ is drawn as smooth blue lines. The formula agrees relatively well with the data of $I_{A:B}^{(2)} - I_{A:B}^{\text{CC}(2)}$ for $\Delta = 0$, and runs slightly above the data for $\Delta = -0.6$. In Fig. 5, we plot $I_{A:B}^{(2)}$ for the 1:1:1:1 division, in comparison with $\log F_2^Z + I_{A:B}^{\text{CC}(2)}$. For $\eta \gtrsim 0.5$, $I_{A:B}^{(2)}$ contains strong oscillations, and the formula goes inside these oscillations. For $\eta \lesssim 0.5$, oscillations are small, but the formula goes slightly above the data. This small disagreement might be due to finite-size effects, to a subtle difference between lattice systems and

continuum descriptions, or to some missing factor in the formula (16).

In summary, we have identified a new contribution (14) to the entanglement entropy on double intervals $A \cup B$, which can be detected through the mutual information $I_{A:B}$. This new part depends on the cross ratio x of the four points and the boson compactification radius R . A direct relation between $I_{A:B}$ and R suggested in our work could be used as a new numerical method for determining R from the ground-state wave function. Analytic derivation of the function $f_n(x; \eta)$ for general n and its limit $f(x; \eta)$ is a challenging and intriguing open problem. The present result demonstrates the ability of mutual information to distinguish between different CFTs with the same central charge, as originally suggested by Casini and Huerta [5]. Extension to other classes of CFTs is left as an important future issue.

We are grateful to J. Cardy, A. Furusaki, D. Ivanov, H. Katsura, G. Misguich, B. Nienhuis, M. Oshikawa, S. Ryu, and Masahiro Sato for stimulating discussions.

* sfurukawa@riken.jp

- [1] C. Holzhey, F. Larsen, and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **424**, 443 (1994).
- [2] G. Vidal, J.I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003); J.I. Latorre, E. Rico, G. Vidal, Quant. Inf. and Comp. **4**, 048 (2004).
- [3] V.E. Korepin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 096402 (2004).
- [4] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp. 2004, P06002.
- [5] H. Casini and M. Huerta, Phys. Lett. B **600**, 142 (2004).
- [6] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 181602 (2006); S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, JHEP 08 (2006) 045.
- [7] N. Laflorencie, E.S. Sorensen, M.-S. Chang, and I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 100603 (2006).
- [8] J.L. Cardy, O.A. Castro-Alvaredo, B. Doyon, J. Stat. Phys. **130**, 129 (2007).
- [9] B. Nienhuis, M. Campostrini, and P. Calabrese, arXiv:0808.2741.
- [10] M. Caraglio and F. Gliozzi, arXiv:0808.4094.
- [11] C. Adami and N.J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3470 (1997);
- [12] V. Vedral, M.B. Plenio, M.A. Rippin, and P.L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
- [13] S.-A. Cheong and C.L. Henley, arXiv:0809.0075.
- [14] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110404 (2006); M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110405 (2006).
- [15] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension*, Oxford Science Publications, 2004.
- [16] N.M. Bogoliubov, A.G. Izergin, and V.E. Korepin, Nucl. Phys. B **56**, 687 (1986).
- [17] S. Qin, M. Fabrizio, L. Yu, M. Oshikawa, and I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 9766 (1997).
- [18] D.C. Cabra, A. Honecker, and P. Pujol, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 6241 (1998).
- [19] Al.B. Zamolodchikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **63**, 1061 (1986); Nucl.Phys.B **285**, 481 (1987).
- [20] Furthermore, this quantity gives the ground-state degen-

eracy reflecting the superposition of macroscopically distinct states (S. Furukawa and G. Misguich, unpublished).
[21] This can be obtained by the conformal transformation

$z = \tan \frac{\pi w}{L}$, which maps the cylinder (w) of circumference L to the infinite plane (z).