

Dynamical signature of edge state in the 1D Aubry-André model

H. Z. Shen¹, X. X. Yi^{1,2}, and C. H. Oh²

¹*School of Physics and Optoelectronic Technology*

Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024 China

²*Centre for Quantum Technologies and Department of Physics,
National University of Singapore, 117543, Singapore*

(Dated: October 1, 2018)

Topological feature has become an intensively studied subject in many fields of physics. As a witness of topological phase, the edge states are topologically protected and may be helpful in quantum information processing. In this paper, we define a measure to quantify the dynamical localization of system and simulate the localization in the 1D Aubry-André model. We find an interesting connection between the edge states and the dynamical localization of the system, this connection may be used as a signature of edge state and topological phase.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.65.Vf, 71.10.Pm

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of topological insulators has attracted considerable attention in the field of topological phases of matter [1–8]. Earlier studies in this field mainly focus on three issues, (1) topological properties of the ground state phases, (2) realizations of topological quantum matter[9], and (3) possible applications of topological matter, e.g., applications of edge states for topological quantum computing and spintronics[10, 11]. Yet, explorations on the dynamical feature of topological quantum matter are scarce. This motivates the study in this paper.

Localization induced by disorder has been recently observed in ultracold bosonic gases in purely random potentials [14] and in bichromatic optical lattice[18]. In both systems, the observations have been interpreted in terms of Anderson localization[19]. Anderson localization is trivial in one-dimensional systems since the critical disorder at which the system wavefunction changes from being extended to exponentially localized is zero, i.e., all states for any finite disorder are exponentially localized in 1D systems. This makes 1D Anderson localization rather unattractive. However, by using the so-called Aubry and André(A-A) model, Aubry and André[12] predicted a sharp transition from diffusion to localization for a given value of disorder length in 1D systems in 80s last century, where the transition arises from the existence of an incommensurate potential of finite strength mimicking disorder in a 1D tight binding model.

The A-A model (also known as Harper model) can be simulated by trapped fermions on 1D quasi-periodic optical lattice, which can be generated by superimposing two 1D optical lattice with commensurate or incommensurate wavelength [13–15]. One interesting aspect of the 1D A-A model is that it can be mapped into the 2D Hofstadter model [16, 17], exemplifying the topologically-nontrivial 2D quantum Hall system on a 1D lattice.

In this paper, we focus on the manifestation of topological properties in the dynamics of topological states in 1D systems. In the absence of any symmetries, all 1D systems belong to the topologically trivial phases, while

in 2D systems there are topological phases of the integer quantum Hall effect [20]. Recently, it has been shown that one-dimensional quasi-periodic optical lattice systems can exhibit edge states [21] and possess the same physical origins of topological phases of 2D quantum Hall effects on periodic lattices. This makes the study of the 1D A-A model rather interesting, which is adopted as motivation to study the dynamics of the 1D A-A model.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the model and present the equation of motion for the system. In Sec. III, we study the dynamics of the Aubry-André(A-A) model, a quantity to characterize the dynamical localization, called average inverse participation ratio(AIPR), is introduced and calculated. The dependence of the AIPR on system parameters is given and discussed. In Sec. IV, we study the dynamics of off-diagonal Aubry-André(A-A) model. Finally, we conclude our results in Sec. V.

II. DIAGONAL A-A MODEL

Let us begin with a specific quasi-crystal, the 1D Aubry-André (A-A) model [12]. This is a 1D tight-binding model in which the on-site potential is modulated in space. The Hamiltonian of this model takes,

$$H = -J \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_{i+1} + \text{H.c.}) + \sum_{i=1}^N V \cos(2\pi\alpha i + \delta) \hat{n}_i, \quad (1)$$

where N is the number of the lattice sites, \hat{c}_i^\dagger (\hat{c}_i) denotes the creation (annihilation) operator of the fermion, and $\hat{n}_i = \hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_i$. J represents the hopping amplitude, V is the modulation amplitude of the on-site potential, and α controls the periodicity of the modulation. Whenever α is irrational the modulation is incommensurate with the lattice and the on-site term is quasi-periodic. Note that in this model the modulation phase δ appears as an additional degree of freedom representing a shift of the origin of the quasi-periodic order. We adopt open




FIG. 1: The average inverse participation ratio as a function of α with a given $V = 1.5J$ (top panel), and as a function of α and V (bottom panel). The total number of sites is $N = 99$. The other parameters chosen are $J = 1, \delta = \frac{2\pi}{3}$. The system is initially at site 1. V is chosen in units of J .

boundary conditions with $n = 1$ and $n = N$ being the two edge sites.

Suppose there is only one excitation in the 1D lattice, the wavefunction of the system at time t can be written as $|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_n \psi_n(t) c_n^\dagger |0\rangle$. Substituting this wavefunction into the Schrödinger equation leads to the following equation:

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi_n(t) = -J(\psi_{n+1}(t) + \psi_{n-1}(t)) + V \cos(2\pi\alpha n + \delta) \psi_n(t). \quad (2)$$

Here, $\psi_n(t)$ is the probability amplitude of finding the excitation at site n . For irrational α , it is shown that a localization transition appears in the A-A model as V is increased beyond the critical value ($V = 2J$) with all states being extended (localized) for $V < 2J$ ($V > 2J$). For rational α , the A-A model can be mapped into a 2D Hofstadter lattice by treating δ as the momentum of another spatial dimension[16, 17]. For $\alpha \neq \frac{1}{2}$, the Hofstadter lattice has gapped energy bands with non-trivial topology, characterized by non-zero Chern numbers. Thus localized edge states are expected for a finite-size system with boundary.

III. RESULTS

To simulate numerically the quantum evolution of the system, we choose two different initial states. In the first, the system is initially prepared to occupy site 1, while in the second, the system is initialized at the center of the lattice. To quantify the dynamical localization/extension of the system, we define an average inverse participation ratio(AIPR),

$$Lo = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \sum_n |p_n(t)|^2, \quad (3)$$

where $p_n(t)$ denotes the probability of finding the excitation at site n , therefore, $\sum_n p_n(t) = 1$. T denotes the evolution time. This definition can be understood as an extension of the inverse participation ratio averaged over the evolution time T . Therefore, the AIPR depends on the initial state of the system. In the following numerical simulation, we initialize the system to occupy one of the edge sites, say site 1, at the beginning of evolution. Due to the exchange symmetry of the 1D system, the edge eigenstates must appear in pairs or occupy the two edge sites with equal probability. In other words, when we find an edge state located at edge site 1, there must be another one at the edge site N . Otherwise, the edge eigenstate distributes equally at both edge sites. Assume the edge state is $c_1^\dagger |0\rangle$, i.e., the edge eigenstate is exactly the excited state of site 1, it is easy to show that $Lo = 1$. For edge states that not only locate exactly at the edge sites, the probability of finding the system at site 1 after an evolution time t is $P_1(t) = |\langle 1 | \Phi(t) \rangle|^2$, where $|\Phi(t)\rangle$ is the wavefunction of the system at time t with initial state $|1\rangle$. Straightforward calculation yields,

$$P_1(t) = \sum_n |a_n|^4 + 2 \sum_{m \neq n} |a_n|^2 |a_m|^2 \cos(E_m - E_n)t,$$

where a_n denotes a coefficient defined by $|1\rangle = \sum_n a_n |E_n\rangle$, and $|E_n\rangle$ is the n -th eigenstate of the system with eigenvalue denoted by E_n . Therefore,

$$Lo = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P_1^2(t) dt \sim |a_1|^8 + 4|a_1|^4 \sum_{m, n \neq 1} |a_n|^2 |a_m|^2, \quad (4)$$

where $|E_1\rangle$ being the edge state located at the edge site 1 is assumed. Thus, for a system having edge eigenstates, $Lo \rightarrow 1$, whereas $Lo \rightarrow 0$, for system that all eigenstates are extended states. Thus the AIPR can be taken as a measure to quantify the localization of the dynamics.

Fig.1 displays the average inverse participation ratio Lo as a function of V and α (lower panel). To show clearly the dependence of Lo on α , we present the Lo versus α with a fixed $V = 1.5$ in the upper panel. We find that Lo arrives at its maximum at about ($\alpha = \text{integer} + \frac{1}{3}$). As V is increased, the system becomes more dynamically localized at the edge sites. Lo is a periodic function of α and δ with periods 1 and 2π , respectively. This is a reflection of symmetry in the Hamiltonian, i.e., the Hamiltonian remains unchanged by substitution, $\alpha \rightarrow (1 + \alpha)$, $\delta \rightarrow (\delta + 2\pi)$. From Fig. 1 we can also observe that Lo is very close to zero at $\alpha = m$ and $\alpha = \frac{(2m+1)}{2}$ where m is an integer. This can be explained as a direct consequence of the space-independent on-site potential, $V_i = V \cos(2\pi\alpha i + \delta)|_{\alpha=m} = V \cos \delta$ and $V_i|_{\alpha=\frac{(2m+1)}{2}} = -\cos \delta$.

Fig.2 shows the AIPR as a function of V and δ . As α changes, Lo may have one peak or many peaks within one period of δ , each peak corresponds to an eigenstate well localized at the edge site 1. The observed dynamical localization quantified by AIPR depends on the initial




FIG. 2: The AIPR as a function of V and δ . The total number of sites is $N = 99$, the other parameters chosen are $J = 1$. For the top panel, $\alpha = \frac{1}{3}$, and for the bottom panel $\alpha = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/4$. The system is initially prepared at site 1. V is in units of J , δ is in units of π .




FIG. 3: Probability distribution over sites at each instance of time. The system is initially at site 1. The total number of site is $N = 99$. $J = 1$, $V = 2.2J$, $\alpha = 0.3$, $\delta = \frac{2\pi}{3}$. The evolution time is $T_{max} = 600$ (in units of $\frac{1}{J}$). The inset is for the system initially at the site 50, i.e., the center of the lattice. This figure shows that the system is well localized when it is initially in site 1, but it is not dynamically localized when the system is initially at site 50.

state of the system, for example, the system is well dynamically localized with the excitation being initially at site 1, while it is extended with the central site being occupied, see Fig. 3. Further numerical results show that L_0 is sharply suppressed when the sites other than site 1 are occupied initially.

To understand the physics behind the dynamical localization, we calculate the largest probability of finding the system at site 1 when the system is in one of its eigenstates. This calculation would show the overlap between the site 1 and the eigenstate which exhibits largest probability to occupy site 1. The results are given in Fig. 4. Comparing Fig. 1, Fig. 2 and Fig. 4, we find that the L_0




FIG. 4: The largest probability of finding the system at site 1, when the system is in one of its eigenstates. $N = 99$ and $J = 1$. (a) The probability versus V with $\alpha = 1/3$ and $\delta = \frac{2\pi}{3}$. (b) The probability as a function of α with $V = 2.2$, and $\delta = \frac{2\pi}{3}$. (c) As a function of δ with $\alpha = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/4$, $V = 4$.

and P_1 reach their respective maximum and minimum at almost the same α and δ . The dependence of L_0 and P_1 on V manifests the same feature, i.e., they increase as V increases.

To shed light on the effect of boundary, we now turn to discuss the situation with a periodic boundary condition. The A-A model in this situation can be solved analytically as follows. Suppose that the n -th eigenstate of the Hamiltonian restricted to a single particle in the 1D lattice is given by $|E_n\rangle = \sum_i u_{i,n} c_i^\dagger |0\rangle$, the eigenvalue equation $H|E_n\rangle = E_n|E_n\rangle$ leads to the Harper equation,

$$E_n u_{i,n} = -J(u_{i+1,n} + u_{i-1,n}) + V \cos(2\pi\alpha i + \delta) u_{i,n}. \quad (5)$$

We shall consider the commensurate potential $V_i = V \cos(2\pi\alpha i + \delta)$ with a rational α given by $\alpha = p/q$ with p and q being integers which are prime to each other. Since the potential V_i is periodic with a period q , the wave functions take the Bloch form, $u_{i+q} = e^{ikq} u_i$, for the lattice with the periodic boundary condition. Omitting the eigenstate index n where not confused and taking $u_j = e^{ikj} \varphi_j(k)$ for $|k| \leq \pi/q$, we have $\varphi_{j+q}(k) = \varphi_j(k)$, Eq. (5) then follows

$$E(k)\varphi_j = -J(e^{ik}\varphi_{j+1} + e^{-ik}\varphi_{j-1}) + V \cos(2\pi j p/q + \delta)\varphi_j. \quad (6)$$

To be specific, we take $\alpha = 1/3$, then $q = 3$ and $-1/3 \leq k/\pi \leq 1/3$. By $\varphi_{j+q}(k) = \varphi_j(k)$, Eq. (6) reduces to,

$$M\Phi_E = E\Phi_E, \quad (7)$$

where

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} V \cos(\delta + \frac{2\pi}{3}) & -J e^{ik} & -J e^{-ik} \\ -J e^{-ik} & V \cos(\delta - \frac{2\pi}{3}) & -J e^{ik} \\ -J e^{ik} & -J e^{-ik} & V \cos \delta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

and $\Phi_E = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3)^T$. Solving the eigenvalue equation (7), we can obtain three eigenvalues for a given k ,

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \sqrt{4J^2 + V^2} \cos \theta, \\ E_2 &= \sqrt{4J^2 + V^2} \cos\left(\theta + \frac{2\pi}{3}\right), \\ E_3 &= \sqrt{4J^2 + V^2} \cos\left(\theta - \frac{2\pi}{3}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\theta = \frac{1}{3} \arccos\left(-\frac{d}{2\sqrt{(J^2 + \frac{1}{4}V^2)^3}}\right)$, $d = 2J^3 \cos(3k) - \frac{V^3}{4} \cos(3\delta)$. The corresponding three eigenstates are,

$$\Phi_E = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1(E) \\ \varphi_2(E) \\ \varphi_3(E) \end{pmatrix}, \quad E = E_1, E_2, E_3, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1(E) &= g(E)\varphi_2, \\ \varphi_2(E) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |g(E)|^2 + |e(E)|^2}}, \\ \varphi_3(E) &= e(E)\varphi_2, \\ g(E) &= \frac{e^{ik} + B(E)e^{-2ik}}{A(E) - B(E)}, \\ e(E) &= B(E) \cdot \frac{e^{2ik} + A(E)e^{-ik}}{A(E) - B(E)}, \\ A(E) &= \frac{V \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{3} + \delta\right) - E}{J}, \\ B(E) &= \frac{J}{V \cos \delta - E}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Collecting these equations, we calculate the AIPR and exhibit the results in Fig. 6 (bottom panel). The AIPR under the periodic condition is very small, by contrast, the open boundary condition helps dynamical localization, as the top panel of Fig. 6 shows. This again can be explained as a consequence of small overlap between the site 1 and the eigenstates of the system. In fact, under the periodic condition, all eigenstates of the system are extended, this is enforced by the Bloch theorem.

The time evolution of an isolated macroscopic quantum system initially prepared in an out-of-equilibrium state is currently turning from an abstract concept to a real phenomenon that can be observed and studied experimentally. This striking change has been mainly driven by experiments on cold atoms[22, 23], but it will be surely given further impulse in the near future by the fast progresses in time-resolved spectroscopy on condensed-matter systems.

IV. OFF-DIAGONAL A-A MODEL

Now we extend the study to the the generalized 1D A-A model, which is described by the following Hamilto-




FIG. 5: The AIPR as a function of V and δ for different boundary conditions. Top panel is for open boundary condition, while the bottom is for periodic boundary condition. The system is initialized at the edge site 1. $N = 99$, $J = 1$, and $\alpha = 1/3$.

nian,

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -J \sum_{i=1}^N [1 + \lambda \cos(2\pi\alpha i + \delta_{off})] (\hat{c}_i^\dagger \hat{c}_{i+1} + \text{H.c.}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N V \cos(2\pi\alpha i + \delta) \hat{n}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

This Hamiltonian is different from the model in Eq. (1) at the inhomogeneity in hopping strength described by cosine modulations. The modulations have the same periodicity as in the on-site potential energy and its amplitude is characterized by λ . The special case with $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to the diagonal A-A model, and the generalized A-A model can be derived starting from an ancestor 2D Hofstadter model with next-nearest-neighbor hopping terms. It has been shown recently [24] that the commensurate off-diagonal A-A model is topologically nontrivial in the gapless regime and supports zero-energy edge modes. Unlike the incommensurate case, the nontrivial topology in the off-diagonal A-A model is attributed to the topological properties of the one-dimensional Majorana chain.

Fig. 6 shows the AIPR as a function of λ , J and δ_{off} with the system initially at site 1. We find that V , the modulation amplitude of the on-site potential, does not shift the peak, but the larger the V , the bigger the AIPR is (Fig. 6-(a)). Randomness of V increases the AIPR, see Fig. 6-(b), which is reminiscent of Anderson localization in a disordered medium. The phases δ and δ_{off} can be tuned independently in experiment, so δ and δ_{off} can be treated as independent variables. The phase δ_{off} can alter the AIPR, see Fig. 6-(c), the AIPR arrives at a




FIG. 6: The AIPR as a function of λ , J and δ for $N = 100$ sites. (a) $J = 1$, $V = 14, 7, 0.7$ (from dashed to square), $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 2\pi/3$, $\delta_{off} = \pi/4$. (b) $\lambda = 0$, $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 2/3\pi$, $\delta_{off} = \pi/4$, (c) $J = 1$, $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 0$, $\lambda = 0.4$, $V = 0$.

maximum when $\delta_{off} = 0$, and it is very close to 0 when

δ_{off} in an interval of $[\pi/2, 3\pi/2]$.

V. CONCLUSION

To conclude, we have found a signature for the existence of edge states in terms of dynamical feature of the system. A quantity to measure the dynamical localization called average inverse participation ratio (AIPR) is introduced and discussed. We have calculated the AIPR for the diagonal and off-diagonal diaAubry-André model. Our findings suggest that the AIPR can be taken as a measure to quantify the dynamical localization of quantum system, in particular it can be chosen as a witness of edge state. Our strategy is to make use of the definition of edge states and it is applicable for both gapped and gapless systems in one dimension.

This work is supported by the NSF of China under Grants Nos 61078011, 10935010 and 11175032 as well as the National Research Foundation and Ministry of Education, Singapore under academic research grant No. WBS: R-710-000-008-271.

-
- [1] B. A. Bernevig, T. L. Hughes, and S. C. Zhang, *Science* **314**, 1757 (2006).
 [2] L. Fu, C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 106803 (2007).
 [3] M. König, S. Wiedmann, C. Brüne, A. Roth, H. Buhmann, L.W. Molenkamp, X.-L. Qi, and S.-C. Zhang, *Science* **318**, 766 (2007).
 [4] D. Hsieh, D. Qian, L. Wray, Y. Xia, Y. Hor, R. J. Cava, and M. Z. Hasan, *Nature (London)* **452**, 970 (2008).
 [5] Y. L. Chen, J. G. Analytis, J.-H. Chu, Z. K. Liu, S. K. Mo, X. L. Qi, H. J. Zhang, D. H. Lu, X. Dai, Z. Fang, S. C. Zhang, I. R. Fisher, Z. Hussain, and Z.-X. Shen, *Science* **325**, 178 (2009).
 [6] Y. Xia, D. Qian, D. Hsieh, L. Wray, A. Pal, H. Lin, A. Bansil, D. Grauer, Y. S. Hor, R. J. Cava, and M. Z. Hasan, *Nature Phys.* **5**, 398 (2009).
 [7] D. Hsieh, Y. Xia, D. Qian, L. Wray, F. Meier, J. H. Dil, J. Osterwalder, L. Patthey, A. V. Fedorov, H. Lin, A. Bansil, D. Grauer, Y. S. Hor, R. J. Cava, and M. Z. Hasan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 146401 (2009).
 [8] K. Kuroda et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 206803 (2012).
 [9] N. Y. Yao, A. V. Gorshkov, C. R. Laumann, A. M. Läuchli, J. Ye, and M. D. Lukin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 185302 (2013).
 [10] C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 1083 (2008).
 [11] J. E. Moore, *Nature (London)* **464**, 194 (2010).
 [12] S. Aubry and G. André, *Ann. Israel Phys. Soc.* **3**, 133 (1980).
 [13] L. Fallani, J. E. Lye, V. Guarrera, C. Fort, and M. Inguscio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 130404 (2007).
 [14] G. Roati, C. D'Errico, L. Fallani, M. Fattori, C. Fort, M. Zaccanti, G. Modugno, M. Modugno and, M. Inguscio, *Nature* **453**, 895 (2008).
 [15] B. Deissler et al., *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 354 (2010).
 [16] P. G. Harper, *Proceedings of the Physical Society. Section A* **68**, 874 (1955).
 [17] D. R. Hofstadter, *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 2239 (1976).
 [18] J. Billy, V. Josse, Z. Zuo, A. Bernard, B. Hambrecht, P. Lugan, D. Clement, L. Sanchez-Palencia, P. Bouyer and, A. Aspect, *Nature* **453**, 891 (2008).
 [19] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1492 (1958).
 [20] Y. Avron, R. Seiler, and B. Shapiro, *Nucl. Phys. B* **265**, 364 (1986).
 [21] Li-Jun Lang, Xiaoming Cai, Shu Chen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 220401 (2012).
 [22] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 885 (2008).
 [23] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 863 (2011).
 [24] S. Ganeshan, K. Sun, and S. Das Sarma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 180403(2013).