

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

Shunsuke Furukawa,<sup>1,\*</sup> Vincent Pasquier,<sup>2</sup> and Jun'ichi Shiraishi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Condensed Matter Theory Laboratory, RIKEN, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

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

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

(Dated: June 1, 2018)

We investigate the generic scaling properties of the mutual information between two disjoint intervals, in a class of one-dimensional quantum critical systems described by a  $c = 1$  bosonic field theory. A numerical analysis of a spin-chain model reveals that the mutual information is scale-invariant and depends directly on the compactification radius of the bosonic field. We interpret the results in terms of correlation functions of branch-point twist fields. The present study provides a new way to determine the compactification radius, and furthermore demonstrates the power of the mutual information to extract information of conformal field theory besides the central charge.

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

The scalings of entanglement estimators have been studied actively in extended quantum systems since they provide new ways to characterize quantum phases and phase transitions. A particularly useful estimator for a many-body state  $|\Psi\rangle$  is the entanglement entropy  $S_A$  between a subregion  $A$  of the system and the exterior  $\bar{A}$ . It is defined as the von Neumann entropy  $S_A = -\text{Tr} \rho_A \log \rho_A$  of the reduced density matrix  $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_{\bar{A}} |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ . In a critical regime, this estimator can display a universal scaling reflecting the nature of the underlying field theory. Illuminating examples are one-dimensional (1D) quantum critical systems. For an interval  $A = [x_1, x_2]$  in an infinite chain, the entanglement entropy obeys a scaling [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]:

$$S_A = \frac{c}{3} \log(x_2 - x_1) + s_1, \quad (1)$$

where  $c$  is the central charge of the conformal field theory (CFT) and  $s_1$  is a non-universal constant related to the ultra-violet (UV) cutoff. This scaling allows to determine the universal number  $c$  as a representative of the ground state structure, without having recourse to spectral properties.

As is well known, the central charge is not the only important number specifying a CFT. A natural question is how we can access further information of the CFT hidden in the ground state. In this Letter, we demonstrate that the entanglement entropy can do this task if we consider two disjoint intervals,  $A = [x_1, x_2]$  and  $B = [x_3, x_4]$ , in a chain. We measure the amount of correlations between the intervals, using the mutual information [9, 10] defined as

$$I_{A:B} := S_A + S_B - S_{A \cup B}. \quad (2)$$

We focus on a class of systems described by a  $c = 1$  bosonic field theory. This class is known as Tomonaga-Luttinger liquids (TLL) and dominates a large variety of 1D critical fluids of both bosonic and fermionic kinds [7,

8]. The compactification radius  $R$  of the bosonic field (or the TLL parameter  $K = 1/(4\pi R^2)$ ) changes continuously in the critical phase, and controls the power-law behavior of physical quantities. Our numerical analysis of a spin-chain model reveals a robust relation between  $I_{A:B}$  and  $R$ . Agreement with the general prediction of Calabrese and Cardy (CC) [5] (shown in Eq. (4) below) can be seen only in the vicinity of the  $SU(2)$ -symmetric point.

Roughly speaking, the mutual information (2) may be regarded as a *region-region* correlator. It is known that  $I_{A:B}$  is non-negative, and becomes zero iff  $\rho_{A \cup B} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ , i.e., in a situation of no correlation [11]. A motivation to consider  $I_{A:B}$  comes from that microscopic details at short-range scales, which are often obstacles when analyzing *point-point* correlators, can be smoothed out over regions. As we enlarge the region sizes, we expect that  $I_{A:B}$  detects essential features of the correlations emerging in the coarse-grained limit. When there is a long-range order in local operators, we have  $I_{A:B} \neq 0$  for finite local regions  $A$  and  $B$ , even in the limit of large separation [12]. In a critical system with power-law decaying correlations,  $I_{A:B}$  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,  $I_{A:B}$  can remain finite, which is the situation we examine here.

First, suppose we treat the mutual information (2) following the prediction of Calabrese and Cardy [5], which focused on the dependence on the central charge  $c$ . For an infinite chain, the entanglement entropy on double intervals  $A \cup B = [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_3, x_4]$  was predicted to be [5]

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

with  $x_{ij} = x_i - x_j$ . Here the constant term  $2s_1$  is determined so that  $S_{A \cup B} \rightarrow S_A + S_B$  in the limit  $x_{21}, x_{43} \ll x_{31}, x_{42}$ . For a finite chain of length  $L$ , one replaces  $x_{ij}$  by the cord distance  $\frac{L}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x_{ij}}{L}$  in Eqs. (1) and (3) [13]. We




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 (4).

now consider a division  $(r_A, r_C, r_B, r_D)$  of a finite chain as depicted in the inset of Fig. 1. Then the CC formula for the mutual information reads

$$I_{A:B}^{\text{CC}} = \frac{c}{3} \log \left[ \frac{\sin \frac{\pi(r_A+r_C)}{L} \sin \frac{\pi(r_B+r_C)}{L}}{\sin \frac{\pi r_C}{L} \sin \frac{\pi r_D}{L}} \right]. \quad (4)$$

Note that the UV-divergent constant  $s_1$  has been cancelled out in the mutual information, and the resultant (4) is invariant under global scale transformations. Similar ideas of eliminating the UV-divergence have been suggested by Casini and Huerta [14] and have also been exploited in the context of topological entropy [15] 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,

$$H := \sum_{j=1}^L (S_j^x S_{j+1}^x + S_j^y S_{j+1}^y + \Delta S_j^z S_{j+1}^z) - h \sum_{j=1}^L S_j^z. \quad (5)$$

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  $\Delta > -1$  [8]. The compactification 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  $\langle S_j^z S_{j'}^z \rangle - M^2$ , are given by  $\eta := 2\pi R^2$  and




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.

$\min(1/\eta, 2)$ , respectively. For  $-1 < \Delta \leq 1$  and  $h = 0$ , the radius  $R$  is given by  $\eta = 2\pi R^2 = 1 - (1/\pi) \arccos \Delta$ . 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  $R$  in the  $M$ - $\Delta$  and  $h$ - $\Delta$  phase diagrams can be found in e.g. Refs. 8 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  $\eta = 2\pi R^2$  for various  $(M, \Delta)$  in the critical phase. Remarkably, the data points almost form a single curve for each type of division. The collapse of a two-dimensional  $M$ - $\Delta$  plane onto these two curves strongly indicates a direct dependence of  $I_{A:B}$  on  $R$ . Agreement with the CC formula (4) can be observed 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 the 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 formula (4). For each  $\Delta$ , the results from  $L = 28$  and  $24$  obey a single curve, indicating the scale invariance of  $I_{A:B}$ . The curve for  $\Delta = 1$  agrees well with the CC formula (4). 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, we also




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

consider the Rényi entropy (or alpha entropy) defined as

$$R_A^{(n)} := \frac{-1}{n-1} \log(\text{Tr } \rho_A^n). \quad (6)$$

The von Neumann entropy  $S_A$  can be reached in the limit  $n \rightarrow 1$ . Following Calabrese and Cardy [5], one can derive the following expression (originally found in Ref. [3]) for a single interval  $A = [x_1, x_2]$  in an infinite chain:

$$R_A^{(n)} = \frac{1+n}{6n} c \log x_{21} + s_n, \quad (7)$$

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 as  $I_{A:B}^{(n)} := R_A^{(n)} + R_B^{(n)} - R_{A \cup B}^{(n)}$ .

In Fig. 3, we plot the deviation of the “Rényi” mutual information  $I_{A:B}^{(n)}$  from the CC prediction  $I_{A:B}^{CC(n)} = -\frac{1+n}{6n} c \log [\cos^2 \frac{\pi r}{L}]$ . 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 the single-interval entropy in Ref. 19. In Fig. 3, the oscillations in the  $n = 3$  and 4 cases occur around the relatively smooth curves in the von Neumann case. 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  $n \rightarrow 1$ . The former should be controlled by the continuum description.

Let us now discuss the origins of the deviation from the Calabrese-Cardy prediction and the dependence on the compactification radius. We follow the formulation based on branch-point twist fields proposed by Cardy *et al.* [20] First, we represent the moment  $\text{Tr } \rho_A^n$  as the partition function on a  $n$ -sheeted Riemann surface  $\mathcal{R}_n$  [5]. Then, we relate it to a correlation function of twist fields  $\mathcal{T}$  and




FIG. 4: (color online)  $I_{A:B} - I_{A:B}^{CC}$  versus the cross ratio  $x$  given in (12). 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.

$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  with conformal dimensions  $\Delta_n = \bar{\Delta}_n = \frac{c}{24} (n - \frac{1}{n})$  [20]. For double intervals  $A \cup B = [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_3, x_4]$  in an infinite chain, we can write it down as

$$\text{Tr } \rho_{A \cup B}^n \propto \langle \mathcal{T}(x_1) \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_2) \mathcal{T}(x_3) \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_4) \rangle. \quad (8)$$

The  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$  covariance property requires this four-point function to have the following form:

$$\left( \frac{x_{31} x_{42}}{x_{21} x_{32} x_{43} x_{41}} \right)^{2\Delta_n} \left( \frac{\bar{x}_{31} \bar{x}_{42}}{\bar{x}_{21} \bar{x}_{32} \bar{x}_{43} \bar{x}_{41}} \right)^{2\bar{\Delta}_n} F_n(x, \bar{x}; \eta), \quad (9)$$

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. (9) corresponds to the CC prediction [5], and the function  $F_n$  gives an additional contribution  $\frac{-1}{n-1} \log F_n(x, x; \eta) =: -f_n(x; \eta)$  to the Rényi entropy  $R_{A \cup B}^{(n)}$ . The mutual information detects this new part:

$$I_{A:B}^{(n)} - I_{A:B}^{CC(n)} = f_n(x; \eta), \quad (10)$$

$$I_{A:B} - I_{A:B}^{CC} = \lim_{n \rightarrow 1} f_n(x; \eta) =: f(x; \eta). \quad (11)$$

The function  $f_n(x; \eta)$  should satisfy (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. (12) below), and (iii)  $f_n(x; \eta) = f_n(x; 1/\eta)$  and  $f_n(x; 1) = 0$  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

$$x = \frac{\sin \frac{\pi r_A}{L} \sin \frac{\pi r_B}{L}}{\sin \frac{\pi(r_A+r_C)}{L} \sin \frac{\pi(r_C+r_B)}{L}} \quad (12)$$




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  $\Delta$ , 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, strongly supporting Eq. (11).

For  $n = 2$ , two twist fields,  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ , are identical, and have conformal dimensions  $\Delta_2 = \bar{\Delta}_2 = \frac{1}{16}$ . The correlation function (8) of four twist fields with these dimensions (Ramond fields) was obtained by A.I.B. Zamolodchikov [21] and by Dixon *et al.* [22]. The crossing-invariant solution for four identical fields gives

$$f_2^R(x; \eta) = \log \frac{\theta_3(\eta\tau)\theta_3(\eta^{-1}\tau)}{[\theta_3(\tau)]^2}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\tau$  is pure-imaginary, and is related to  $x$  via  $x = [\theta_2(\tau)/\theta_3(\tau)]^4$ . Here  $\theta_2$  and  $\theta_3$  are Jacobi theta functions:

$$\theta_2(\tau) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{i\pi\tau(m+1/2)^2}, \quad \theta_3(\tau) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{i\pi\tau m^2}. \quad (14)$$

At a special point  $\eta = 1/2$ , Eq. (13) can be simplified as  $f_2^R(x; 1/2) = \log \sqrt{(1+x^{1/2})(1+(1-x)^{1/2})/2}$ . One can check that  $f_2^R(x; \eta)$  satisfies all the aforementioned properties (i)-(iii). When two intervals of small lengths  $x_{21} = x_{43} =: r$  are separated far apart by a distance  $x_{31} = x_{42} =: d (\gg r)$ , Eq. (13) reduces to  $f_2^R \approx 2 \left(\frac{r}{4d}\right)^{2 \min(1/\eta, \eta)}$ . This scales as the dominant magnetic correlation *squared*.

In Fig. 3, the formula  $f_2^R(x; \eta)$  is drawn as smooth blue lines. The formula agrees relatively well with the data of  $I_{A:B}^{(2)} - I_{A:B}^{CC(2)}$  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  $f_2^R + I_{A:B}^{CC(2)}$ . 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 Eq. (13).

In summary, we have shown that the mutual information  $I_{A:B}$  obeys a scaling determined by the compactification radius  $R$ . This result can be used as a new method for determining  $R$  from the ground state, which is complementary to the standard spectroscopic method [8] based on the Drude weight and the compressibility. 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. In general, we expect that every CFT has its characteristic function  $f(x)$  in the mutual information. This can be used as a fingerprint for distinguishing different CFTs, as originally suggested in Ref. 14.

The authors 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. The collaboration of the authors was initiated in the Workshop of “Topological Aspects of Solid State Physics” at ISSP, Univ. of Tokyo.

*Note added.* After the preprint of this paper was posted on arXiv, Calabrese and Cardy have added a note to their paper [5]. Another analysis of the double-interval entropy has been done in parallel by Caraglio and Gliozzi [23].

\* 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] B.-Q. Jin and V.E. Korepin, J. Stat. Phys. **116**, 79 (2004).
- [4] V.E. Korepin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 096402 (2004).
- [5] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp. 2004, P06002; See also arXiv:hep-th/0405152 for a note added on the multiple-interval entropy.
- [6] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 181602 (2006); S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, JHEP 08 (2006) 045.
- [7] F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1840 (1981).
- [8] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension*, Oxford Science Publications, 2004.
- [9] C. Adami and N.J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3470 (1997);
- [10] V. Vedral, M.B. Plenio, M.A. Rippin, and P.L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
- [11]  $\rho_{A \cup B} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$  is used as an indicator of correlations in S.-A. Cheong and C.L. Henley, arXiv:0809.0075.
- [12] Furthermore,  $I_{A:B}$  gives the ground-state degeneracy, reflecting the superposition of macroscopically distinct states (S. Furukawa and G. Misguich, unpublished).
- [13] 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 ( $z$ ).
- [14] H. Casini and M. Huerta, Phys. Lett. B **600**, 142 (2004).
- [15] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110404 (2006); M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110405 (2006).

- [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] B. Nienhuis, M. Campostrini, and P. Calabrese, arXiv:0808.2741.
- [20] J.L. Cardy, O.A. Castro-Alvaredo, B. Doyon, J. Stat. Phys. **130**, 129 (2007).
- [21] Al.B. Zamolodchikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **63**, 1061 (1986); Nucl.Phys.B **285**, 481 (1987).
- [22] L. Dixon, D. Friedan, E. Martinec, and S. Shenker, Nucl. Phys. B **282**, 13 (1987).
- [23] M. Caraglio and F. Gliozzi, JHEP 11 (2008) 076.