

# Comment on “Quenches in quantum many-body systems: One-dimensional Bose-Hubbard model reexamined”

Marcos Rigol

Department of Physics, Georgetown University, Washington, DC 20057, USA

(Dated: November 20, 2018)

In a recent paper Roux [Phys. Rev. A 79, 021608(R) (2009)] argued that thermalization in a Bose-Hubbard system, after a quantum quench, follows from the approximate Boltzmann distribution of the overlap between the initial state and the eigenstates of the final Hamiltonian. We show here that the distribution of the overlaps is in general not related to the canonical (or microcanonical) distribution and, hence, it cannot explain why thermalization occurs in quantum systems.

PACS numbers: 67.85.Hj; 05.70.Ln; 75.40.Mg

In Ref. [1], Roux argued that thermalization in quantum systems, after a quench, follows from the approximate Boltzmann distribution of the overlap between the initial state and the eigenstates of the final Hamiltonian. Roux studied quantum quenches in the Bose-Hubbard model and concluded that, for small quenches,  $|C_\alpha|^2 = |\langle \Psi_\alpha | \psi_{ini} \rangle|^2$  exhibits an exponential decay typical of a canonical ensemble. The distribution of  $|C_\alpha|^2$  (or  $p_n$ , as denoted in [1]) enters into the computation the infinite-time average  $\bar{O}$  of any observable  $O$ , where  $\bar{O} = \sum_\alpha |C_\alpha|^2 O_{\alpha\alpha}$ ,  $O_{\alpha\alpha} = \langle \Psi_\alpha | \hat{O} | \Psi_\alpha \rangle$ ,  $|\Psi_\alpha\rangle$  are the eigenstates of the final Hamiltonian, and  $|\psi_{ini}\rangle$  is the initial state. This would explain why thermalization was observed in Ref. [2] for small quenches. Here, we show that the distribution of  $|C_\alpha|^2$  is not related to the canonical (or microcanonical) distribution and, hence, it cannot explain why thermalization occurs in quantum systems.

We study a nonintegrable model of hardcore bosons (HCBs) in a linear chain with nearest-neighbor hopping  $t$  and interaction  $V$ , and next-nearest-neighbor hopping  $t'$  and interaction  $V'$ . We perform a quantum quench from two different initial states that have the same energy  $E_0 = \langle \Psi_{ini} | \hat{H}_{fin} | \Psi_{ini} \rangle$ , and hence the same effective temperature  $T$  [3], in the final Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{fin}$ . We utilize full diagonalization to study eight HCBs in a 24-site lattice with periodic boundary conditions. Translational symmetry is used and the initial state is selected from the eigenstates of the initial Hamiltonian with total  $k = 0$ . Further details about the equilibrium properties and nonequilibrium dynamics of closely related HCB systems can be found in Ref. [4] and for spinless fermion systems in Ref. [5].

In Figs. 1(a) and 1(b), we show the distribution of  $|C_\alpha|^2$  for the two initial states selected for our quenches. They are compared with the canonical weights corresponding to the effective temperature  $T$ . Two salient features can be seen in those figures. (i) The distribution of  $|C_\alpha|^2$  exhibits a maximum around the energy  $E_0 = -4.62$ , while in the canonical distribution the ground state is always the state with maximal weight. (ii) The exponent of the exponential decay of  $|C_\alpha|^2$  is different for the two initial states, i.e., it depends on the initial conditions and cannot be predicted by the effective




FIG. 1: (Color online) Results for a quantum quench from:  $t_{ini} = 0.5$ ,  $V_{ini} = 2.0$  (State 1), and  $t_{ini} = 2.0$ ,  $V_{ini} = 0.5$  (State 2), to  $t_{fin} = 1.0$  (sets the energy scale),  $V_{fin} = 1.0$ . In both cases  $t'_{ini} = t'_{fin} = 0.32$ ,  $V'_{ini} = V'_{fin} = 0.32$ ,  $E_0 = -4.62$ , and  $T = 3.0$ . (a),(b)  $|C_\alpha|^2$  (points) and canonical (straight line) distributions. (c) Energy distributions (d)  $n(k)$  of the two initial states. (e)  $n(k)$  of the infinite-time average for both initial states and  $n(k)$  of the standard statistical ensembles. Inset in (d),  $n(k=0)_{\alpha\alpha}$  vs  $E$  for all the eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_{fin}$ .

temperature of the system. From these results we conclude that, in general, the distribution of  $|C_\alpha|^2$  is not related to standard statistical ensembles and cannot explain thermalization.

The energy distributions  $\rho(E)$ , where  $\rho(E) = (\text{probability distribution}) \times (\text{density of states})$ , corresponding to both initial states, as well as the one corresponding to the canonical ensemble, are shown in Fig. 1(c). They provide guidance to identify from which region of the many-body spectrum are the eigenstates that contribute to  $\bar{O}$ , given the two initial states, and to the canonical ensemble result. As expected, all the energy distributions peak around  $E_0 = -4.62$  but they are all different from each other. We note that, as discussed in Ref. [6], the width of the energy distributions for both initial states

is expected to vanish in the thermodynamic limit, as the width of the canonical distribution does.

Figure 1(d) depicts the momentum distribution function  $[n(k)]$  of both initial states, which are clearly different from each other. In Fig. 1(e), we present the results of the infinite-time average of  $n(k)$  for the two initial states, and compare them with the predictions of the microcanonical and canonical ensembles. The time averages are virtually indistinguishable from each other (independence of the initial conditions) and agree with the microcanonical prediction, i.e., thermalization takes place. The canonical prediction is slightly different due to finite size effects [4, 5]. Considering that  $|C_\alpha|^2$  versus  $E$  is different for both initial states and from the microcanonical weights, one can understand thermalization in terms of the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis

(ETH) [6, 7]. ETH states that the eigenstate expectation value of generic few-body observables are very similar between eigenstates that are close in energy. From ETH it follows that no matter the weights one uses in the average over a narrow window of energies, the result will always be the same. The validity of ETH for  $n(k)_{\alpha\alpha}$  around  $E_0 = -4.62$  is corroborated by the behavior of  $n(k=0)_{\alpha\alpha}$  versus  $E$  in the inset in Fig. 1(d).

### Acknowledgments

We acknowledge support from the Office of Naval Research and from Georgetown University.

- 
- [1] G. Roux, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 021608(R) (2009).  
 [2] C. Kollath, A. M. Läuchli, and E. Altman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 180601 (2007).  
 [3] Computed from  $E_0 = Z^{-1} \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{H}_{fin} e^{(-\hat{H}_{fin}/k_B T)} \right\}$ , where  $Z = \text{Tr} \left\{ e^{(-\hat{H}_{fin}/k_B T)} \right\}$  and  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant.  
 [4] M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 100403 (2009); M. Rigol

- and L. F. Santos, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 011604(R) (2010).  
 [5] M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 053607 (2009).  
 [6] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, M. Olshanii, Nature (London) **452**, 854 (2008).  
 [7] J. M. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991); M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 888 (1994).