

Quantum simulation for thermodynamics of infinite-size many-body systems by O(10) sites

Shi-Ju Ran^{1,2*}, Bin Xi³, Cheng Peng⁴, Gang Su^{4,5}, and Maciej Lewenstein^{2,6}

¹Department of Physics, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China

²ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain

³School of Physics Science and Technology, Yangzhou University, Yangzhou 225002, China

⁴School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, P. O. Box 4588, Beijing 100049, China

⁵Kavli Institute for Theoretical Sciences and CAS Center of Excellence in Topological Quantum Computation, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

⁶ICREA, Passeig Lluís Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain

*Corresponding author e-mail: shi-ju.ran@icfo.eu

October 4, 2018

In this work, we propose to simulate many-body thermodynamics of infinite-size quantum lattice models by few-body models of only O(10) sites, which we coin as quantum entanglement simulators (QES's). The boundary interactions in the QES are optimized by the tensor network methods to mimic the entanglement between the bulk and environment. The performance of the QES is testified on the 1D XY chain comparing with the exact solution of the infinite-size chain, and on the 2D Heisenberg model on honeycomb lattice comparing with quantum Monte Carlo results by the extrapolation to infinite size. Our work sheds light on modeling few-body systems to simulate or purposefully reproduce the thermodynamics of quantum many-body systems.

Simulating quantum many-body physics is one of the central tasks in condensed matter physics and the related fields such as quantum information and quantum simulation. While the analytical solutions are extremely rare, one important method to study a many-body system is by classical simulations. Paradigm approaches include the exact diagonalization (cf. (1)), quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) (2, 3), density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) (4, 5), and tensor network (TN) methods (6–11). However, due to the high complexity of the quantum many body problems, there are still many unsettled issues that cannot be reliably accessed by classical simulations. For instance, the possible candidate models for quantum spin liquids (12–15) in two and higher dimensions, as well as efficient algorithms to simulate their thermodynamics (16–24) are still under very hot debate.

Even for the many-body systems that are theoretically well understood, it is still a challenge to realize them in a controllable manner, or to demonstrate certain targeted many-body features

in experiments. A common way to do it is to search for materials occurring naturally. To name a few, the compounds α -RuCl₃ (25), YbMgGaO₄ (26) and ZnCu₃(OH)₆FBr (27) are the rare examples of spin-liquid candidates, which can be described by Kitaev model on honeycomb lattice, Heisenberg model on triangular and kagome lattices, respectively. Without natural materials, it is extremely difficult to realize the targeted many-body features in experiments by purposefully designing microscopic interactions in a material.

A much more flexible approach is to use quantum simulators (c.f. (28–32)), which are defined as the controllable and simple quantum systems that mimic quantum models of high complexity. This approach allows to design different interactions with the same experimental platform such as cold, or ultra-cold atoms/ions. Various phenomena have been successfully simulated by quantum simulators, including Bose-Einstein condensation (e.g., (33, 34)), quantum magnets (e.g., (35)), strongly correlated electrons (e.g., (36)), and so on. Quantum simulators offer a promising way to realize the targeted physics in controllable systems. One bottleneck for simulating lattice models is the difficulty of reaching large sizes, which hinders the exploration of the physics in the thermodynamic limit.

In this work, we show that with the few-body systems of only O(10) sites, coined as quantum entanglement simulators (QES's), the thermodynamics of infinite-size many-body systems in one and two dimensions can be accurately simulated. The key idea is to introduce the so-called entanglement-bath sites on the boundary, and optimize their interactions with the physical sites (37) (Fig. 1). The Hamiltonian of a QES reads

$$\hat{H}_{\text{QES}} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \text{bulk}} \hat{H}^{[i,j]} + \sum_{\langle i \in \text{bulk}, n \in \text{bath} \rangle} \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{[i,n]}. \quad (1)$$

$\hat{H}^{[i,j]}$ denotes the two-body Hamiltonian on the i - and j -th




Figure 1: (Color online) Illustrations of the quantum entanglement simulators of 1D (upper-right inset) and 2D systems.

physical sites in the bulk, and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{[i,n]}$ denotes the two-body Hamiltonian between the i -th physical and n -th bath sites. Here, we restrain ourselves to the nearest-neighboring interactions.

The aim is to mimic the thermodynamics of the infinite-size model

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \hat{H}^{[i,j]}. \quad (2)$$

The entanglement bath sites in a QES mimic the entanglement between the finite-size bulk and the rest in the infinite-size system, so that the physics of the target model can be accurately simulated (37). To be specific, the physical information is extracted from the reduced density matrix

$$\hat{\rho} = \text{Tr}_{\text{bath}} |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, \quad (3)$$

with $|\Psi\rangle$ the ground state of \hat{H}_{QES} and Tr_{bath} the trace over the degrees of freedom of the bath sites.

The physical-bath interactions $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{[i,n]}$ are optimized by the infinite DMRG algorithm (4, 5), or its variants on infinite-size tree TN (38, 39). The current algorithms allow only to optimize the nearest-neighbor $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{[i,n]}$'s, but there should not be essential obstacles to introduce and optimize short-range $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{[i,n]}$'s.

After obtaining \hat{H}_{QES} , the simulation of the infinite-size model becomes that of the finite-size one. Since the size of \hat{H}_{QES} is small and the interactions are only two-body nearest neighbors, one way to simulate \hat{H}_{QES} is to use techniques such as cold atoms to do quantum simulations. Here, we generalize the linearized tensor renormalization group (LTRG) algorithm (40) with sufficiently large bond dimensions ($\chi = 400 \sim 600$) to numerically simulate the \hat{H}_{QES} .

The performance of the QES's are testified on one- and two-dimensional quantum lattice models, i.e, the XY chain and the Heisenberg model on honeycomb lattice. The accuracy of the QES's is shown to be one or two orders of magnitude higher than the models of the same size but without the entanglement bath. Our work provides a theoretical scheme of modeling novel quantum simulators that can accurately reproduce the targeted many-body features in the thermodynamic limit by a small number of sites. The QES's can be considered as prototype models to simulate strongly correlated systems of infinite size.




Figure 2: (Color online) The errors of the QES's that simulate the infinite-size 1D XY chain, comparing with the exact solution and the finite-size models without entanglement bath. The error versus the inverse temperature β for different (a) sizes L , (b) entanglement-bath dimensions D , and (c) Trotter steps τ are testified.

Results

We firstly simulate the infinite-size XY chain as a benchmark, where the Hamiltonian reads $\hat{H} = \sum_i (\hat{S}_x^{[i]} \hat{S}_x^{[i+1]} + \hat{S}_y^{[i]} \hat{S}_y^{[i+1]})$ with $\hat{S}_\alpha^{[i]}$ is the α component of the spin-1/2 operators ($\alpha = x, y, z$). Its thermodynamics can be analytically solved (41). Fig. 2 (a) shows the error of energy per site $|E - E_{\text{exact}}|$ at different inverse temperature β . We take the bath dimension $D = 2$, so that the bath sites are effectively spin-1/2's. When taking the same size, the accuracy of the QES is about one order of magnitude higher than that of the normal finite-size chain. In other words, the QES with 6 spins performs even slightly better than the normal chain with 20 spins. Note that the dips of the curves are due to the change of the signs of $E - E_{\text{exact}}$.

The accuracy can be improved by increasing the bath dimension D , as shown in Fig. 2 (b). We take four physical sites as the bulk and two bath sites on the boundary. The reason is that the QES with a higher D can capture more correlations and entanglement. Using the time matrix product state, it is known that $\xi \propto D^c$ with ξ the upper bound of the dynamic correlation length the QES can capture and c a state-dependent positive constant (42, 43). Therefore, a finite D might lead to the loss of the long-range correlations, which we call the *bath correlation error*.

For $D \geq 8$, the error converges to be around $O(10^{-4})$. This is in fact the *Trotter error* [$\sim O(\tau^2)$] (44, 45), as in LTRG




Figure 3: (Color online) The (14+12) and (18+12) QES's for the Heisenberg model on honeycomb lattice.

we take the finite-temperature density operator as $\hat{\rho}(\beta) = \exp(-\beta \sum \hat{H}^{[i,j]}) = [\prod \exp(-\tau \hat{H}^{[i,j]})]^K + O(\tau^2)$ with $\beta = K\tau$. Unlike the bath correlation error that is the error of the QES itself, Trotter error is a computational error of the LTRG algorithm that appears in the numerical simulations of the QES's. Fig. 2 (c) shows the error of different τ 's. Note that the computational cost increases linearly with $1/\tau$. The results are consistent with the fact that the Trotter error accumulates as β increases and finally converges to the Trotter error at zero temperature (ground state).

There exists one more error related to the dynamic correlation length. In a QES, we fixed the physical-bath Hamiltonians $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$ to be the same for all temperatures. This is a reasonable assumption so that the QES is described by a well-defined Hamiltonian. If the dynamic correlation length ξ is much shorter than the inverse temperature β , $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$ should indeed be temperature-independent. But $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$ should depend on β when β is comparable to ξ . It is responsible to the peak of the error near the crossover point (see Fig. 2). One way to improve the accuracy is to optimize $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$ according to the targeted temperature by using, e.g., the imaginary-time sweep algorithm (19). We opt not to do so because the QES will not have a well-defined Hamiltonian if $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$ is temperature-dependent. We dub the error from the temperature independence as *thermal correlation error*. The bath and thermal correlation errors are together coined as the correlation errors.

For two-dimensional systems, we simulate the Heisenberg model on infinite-size honeycomb lattice, where the Hamiltonian reads $\hat{H} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (\hat{S}_x^{[i]} \hat{S}_x^{[j]} + \hat{S}_y^{[i]} \hat{S}_y^{[j]} + \hat{S}_z^{[i]} \hat{S}_z^{[j]})$. We construct three QES's of different numbers of physical and bath sites, dubbed as (8+8), (14+12), and (18+12) QES's (Figs. 1 and 3).

Fig. 4 shows the discrepancy of the energy per site between the results of the QES's by LTRG and QMC. In this work, all the QMC results are obtained by extrapolating the size to infinity. Fig. 4 (a) shows the discrepancy with different bond dimensions χ of LTRG. Our results imply that the computational error of LTRG due to the finiteness of χ , called the *truncation error*, is much more significant than the 1D cases. By increasing χ to the maximum that our computational resources can tolerate, the energy discrepancy is $O(10^{-2})$ near the crossover point, and $O(10^{-3})$ at the low temperatures. Note that the QES, if realized by quantum simulation or quantum computation, will not suffer the computational errors and the accuracy should be much more higher than our numerical results.

Besides the errors of the QES's of 1D chains, there exists the *structure error* for 2D systems that can be understood as the following. Considering that the coordination number of

honeycomb lattice is $z = 3$, one can define a super lattice called Bethe lattice (46) also with $z = 3$. If one checks only locally (e.g., one site and its neighbors), there will be no difference between these two lattices. The differences appear when one meets the loops in the honeycomb lattice, as there are no loopy structures in the Bethe lattice. This means that the models defined on the $z = 3$ Bethe lattice is a zero-loop approximation of that on honeycomb lattice (sometimes known as the Bethe approximation, or simple update scheme in the sense of the TN-states variational methods (47)), where the error is due to the destructions of loopy structures (19). For the Bethe lattice, the entanglement bath sites as well as the physical-bath interactions $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$'s can be efficiently calculated by the renormalization group (RG) flows using a generalized DMRG algorithm (38, 39). The dimension of the RG flow is the dimension of the entanglement bath site D (37, 48). Such $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$'s are put on the boundary of a QES, meaning that the environment is approximated by Bethe lattice, suffering from the structure error. Within the bulk, all interactions are fully considered, implying there is no structure error inside. This is why the QES possesses a higher accuracy than the Bethe approximation.

The results shown in Fig. 4 (b) support the above analyses. The Bethe approximations even with $D = 24$ show the highest discrepancy in our simulations. By using the super-orthogonalization (SO) trick (17), the optimal point of the Bethe approximation is better reached and the discrepancy is slightly lowered. For the (8+8) QES only with $D = 2$, the discrepancy near the crossover temperature is comparable with the Bethe approximation of $D = 24$ and is much smaller as β increases. It indicates the structure error is lowered due to the loopy structure inside the bulk of the (8+8) QES.

When we increase the bath dimension to $D = 4$ for the (8+8) QES, the discrepancy near the crossover temperature is considerably lowered. This is due to the decrease of the bath correlation error (since other errors should not change by increasing D). The discrepancy at lower temperatures becomes larger. This should be due to the increase of the truncation error of LTRG. When we increase the size to (14+12) and (18+12), more loops are contained in the bulk (see Fig. 3), but the discrepancy near the crossover temperature only changes slightly. This implies that the dominant error is no longer structure error but the thermal correlation error. At lower temperatures, the thermal correlation error rapidly decreases as discussed above, where the structure and truncation errors dominate. Note that at lower temperatures, the $D = 2$ (8+8) QES seems to give the lowest discrepancy. This should be due to the canceling of the errors of different signs, which is not controllable.

Without the $\hat{H}^{[i,n]}$'s for comparison, the finite-size effects in 2D are much more severe than those in 1D. If we take the finite lattices with the same sizes of the QES's, the discrepancy increases with β and converges to about 0.16 (8+8 sites) and 0.11 (18+12 sites), which are one or two orders of magnitude higher than the QES's. To reach small discrepancies, the size has to be very large. For instance, the discrepancy will reach $O(10^{-4})$ with $O(10^3)$ sites.

The temperature dependence of the errors is illustrated in Fig. 5. At very high temperatures, the system is less correlated or entangled, thus there exist almost no errors except for certain Trotter error. As the temperature decreases, the system gains




Figure 4: (Color online) The energy discrepancy of the Heisenberg model on honeycomb lattice by comparing with QMC results (extrapolated to infinite size). In (a), we show the discrepancy of the (18+12) QES ($D = 4$) with different dimension cut-offs χ of the LTRG. (b) We present the results of (8+8), (14+12) and (18+12) QES's with $D = 2$ and 4. The results by the Bethe approximations (with and without superorthogonalization) are also presented for comparison. We take $\tau = 0.01$ and $\chi \geq 400$ for the LTRG simulations.

more and more dynamic correlations and entanglement. Then there appears the thermal correlation error. While approaching the crossover temperature, the correlation errors dominate because the dynamic correlation length reaches the maximum in this region and becomes (relatively) comparable to the inverse temperature. At the low temperatures, the thermal correlation error decays rapidly as β is much larger than the dynamic correlation length. Trotter error accumulates as the temperature decreases and may dominate depending on the value of τ .

Another error that may dominate near and below the crossover temperature is the truncation error. For 1D simulations, we take $\chi = 400 \sim 600$, where the results converge with χ and the truncation error is ignorable. For 2D simulations, the required χ increases with the bath dimension D and the size of the QES. The truncation error is more severe than the 1D simulations and dominates at finite and low temperatures with the maximal χ that can be reached by our computers.

The structure error (only for 2D cases) reaches the maximum near the crossover point. At low temperatures, the structure error still exists, but is sub-leading compared with the truncation or Trotter errors.

We shall stress that the truncation and Trotter errors are the computational errors of the LTRG algorithm, not from the QES itself. While our numerical simulations are accurate and reliable, the results can be further improved if one uses better algorithms or quantum simulations that do not suffer from the computational errors.




Figure 5: (Color online) The illustration of the errors of a QES, which are (bath and thermal) correlation errors, structure error, Trotter error and truncation error. See the main text for details.

Methods

The construction and optimization of the physical-bath interactions $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{[i,n]}$'s for the QES's were originally proposed in Refs. (37,48) for simulating ground states. For optimizing the QES's of 1D systems, we employ the infinite DMRG (iDMRG) algorithm (4, 5). For the QES's of 2D systems, the $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{[i,n]}$'s are optimized by using a variant of iDMRG that is developed to simulate the infinite-size models on Bethe lattices (38, 39). In this sense, the environment in the regular lattice (such as honeycomb lattice) is approximated by that of the Bethe lattice. Note that such an approximation can be understood mathematically by the rank-1 decomposition of higher-order tensors (19).

To numerically simulate the thermodynamic properties of the QES's, we use the LTRG algorithm. LTRG was originally proposed to simulate the thermodynamic properties of infinite-size 1D systems (40). The idea is to implement the imaginary-time evolution based on the so-called matrix product operator (MPO) form (49–52). In the 1D cases, the QES's are finite chains. Thus, the LTRG is modified on such systems to do imaginary-time evolutions with finite-size MPO's. In the 2D cases, the QES's are finite-size 2D models. We borrow the idea of 2D DMRG algorithm (53–55) to do the simulations. Specifically speaking, a 1D zig-zag path is chosen to cover the finite-size 2D lattice, and the MPO is defined along such a path. The same as the 2D DMRG, the trade-off of this trick is that some nearest-neighbor couplings in the original 2D lattice become long-range in the 1D path. To consider these long-range couplings and capture the (purified) entanglement of the 2D system by the 1D MPO (in fact a thermal state), one will have to face a higher computational complexity and need larger bond dimensions in the LTRG simulations compared with the 1D cases. Note that similar idea was used in Ref. (56) to construct 2D Hamiltonians instead of finite-temperature thermal states. Our data show that reliable results for small 2D systems (e.g., of $O(10)$ sites) are within the reach of our current computational resources by LTRG.

For the infinite-size XY chain, we use the exact solution by Lieb *et al* (41). For the infinite-size Heisenberg model on honeycomb lattice, we use the QMC algorithm, where the size is extrapolated to infinity. In detail, we use the continuous-time worldline QMC method with “worm” update, which was first developed by Prokofev and co-workers (57, 58). The “worm” update can efficiently treat the critical slowing-down problem, and there is no Trotter error caused by imaginary-time discretization (59, 60).

Experimental implementations

The approach discussed in this paper is particularly suitable for experimental implementations. For the spin models considered, one needs small-size systems to realize “simple” two-body interactions in the “small” bulk, and less complicated two-body interactions at the boundary. The state-of-the-art experimental platforms can access about $O(10)$ sites and be used to construct the QES’s. According to our numerical simulations, the QES’s will largely reduce the finite-size effects that appear in the normal models (without the \hat{H} ’s) of such sizes.

- **Ultracold ions** These systems allow for local control of interactions and thus designing sophisticated spin models, both in continuous time (cf. (61) with 54 qubits) as well as in digital approach (cf. (62) with 20 qubits)
- **Rydberg atoms** These systems have similar possibilities (cf. (63) with 51 atoms), and can mimic spin systems with long range interactions with local control of interactions.
- **Ultracold atoms in optical lattices** These systems are better suitable to simulate Hubbard models (cf. (64) with about 80 sites). Achieving local control of interactions and tunnelings in these systems is more trick, but can be achieved by local control of magnetic fields and thus Feshbach resonances, or appropriate laser induced hopping and lattice shaking (for some ideas in the context of realising dynamics in curved space via the local control of hoping, see (65)).
- **Superconducting qubits / existing quantum processors** Finally, one could use existing quantum simulators, such as those offered by D-Wave, Google, IBM, Microsoft, etc. (66), adapting their architectures to the problems of interest, or mapping the problems of interest onto the available architecture.

Discussions and prospective

This work offers a novel way to model quantum simulators (dubbed as QES) for the thermodynamic properties of infinite-size 1D and 2D quantum lattice models. The QES overcomes the size problem for experimental realizations, i.e., only $O(10)$ sites are needed to implement accurate simulations. The idea is to optimize the interactions on the boundary by TN methods so that the Hamiltonians of the QES can mimic the entanglement between the bulk and the infinite-size environment.

The total Hamiltonian of a QES has a simple form [see Eq. (1)]. The bulk only consists of the physical interactions of the original model, and the physical-bath interactions on the boundary are only two-body and nearest-neighbor. Therefore, QES provides a promising way to design the quantum simulators in experiments to simulate infinite-size strongly-correlated systems, and to purposefully realize many-body features in the bulk of small interacting systems.

To improve the accuracy of the QES at a given temperature, one possible way is to optimize the physical-bath interactions depending on the temperature by, e.g., the imaginary-time sweeping algorithm (19). But, there will be no Hamiltonian like Eq. (1) since different temperatures give different Hamiltonians.

To compute the thermodynamics of a QES more accurately by classical computers, one may employ the series expansion algorithm (67) that is Trotter-error-free. For 2D simulations, one may generalize the pure finite-size projected entangled pair states (68) to thermal states, where the TN ansatz will respect more the 2D nature of the model. The so-called full update algorithms (e.g., iTEBD (69, 70), CTMRG (71), etc.) can be employed in the same spirit to optimize the Hamiltonians of the QES’s in order to better mimic the environment by the bath sites (for instance with the bath-bath interactions).

In principle, the QES can accurately simulate the physics in equilibrium as long as the correlation and structure (only for 2D cases) errors are well controlled. For those out of equilibrium, the simulation could be reliable when the time is much shorter than the dynamic correlation length that the QES captures. For simulating the long-time dynamics by a QES, time-dependent optimization of the physical-bath interactions should work (see Ref. (72) as an inspiring example for 1D cases).

Acknowledgments

S.J.R. was supported by Fundació Catalunya - La Pedrera · Ignacio Cirac Program Chair. M.L. acknowledges the Spanish Ministry MINECO (National Plan 15 Grant: FISICATEAMO No. FIS2016-79508-P, SEVERO OCHOA No. SEV-2015-0522, FPI), European Social Fund, Fundaci Cellex, Generalitat de Catalunya (AGAUR Grant No. 2017 SGR 1341 and CERCA/Program), ERC AdG OSYRIS, EU FETPRO QUIC, and the National Science Centre, Poland-Symfonia Grant No. 2016/20/W/ST4/00314. C.P. and G.S. are supported by the MOST of China (Grant No. 2018YFA0305800), the NSFC (Grant No. 14474279), and the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant No. XDB07010100, XDPB08). S.J.R., C.P., and G.S. are supported by NSFC Grant No. 11834014. B.X. is supported by NSFC Grant No. 11834014, No. 11774300, and No. 11647316.

References

1. David Raventós, Tobias Graß, Maciej Lewenstein, and Bruno Juliá-Díaz. Cold bosons in optical lattices: a tutorial for exact diagonalization. Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics, 50(11):113001, 2017.
2. David Ceperley and Berni Alder. Quantum monte carlo. Science, 231(4738):555–560, 1986.
3. W. M. C. Foulkes, L. Mitás, R. J. Needs, and G. Rajagopal. Quantum monte carlo simulations of solids. Rev. Mod. Phys., 73:33–83, Jan 2001.
4. Steven R. White. Density matrix formulation for quantum renormalization groups. Phys. Rev. Lett., 69:2863, 1992.
5. Steven R. White. Density-matrix algorithms for quantum renormalization groups. Phys. Rev. B, 48:10345–10356, October 1993.
6. Frank Verstraete, Valentin Murg, and J. Ignacio Cirac. Matrix product states, projected entangled pair states, and

- variational renormalization group methods for quantum spin systems. Advances in Physics, 57:143–224, 2008.
7. J. Ignacio Cirac and Frank Verstraete. Renormalization and tensor product states in spin chains and lattices. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor., 42:504004, 2009.
 8. Ulrich Schollwöck. The density-matrix renormalization group in the age of matrix product states. Ann. Phys., 326:96–192, 2011.
 9. Roman Orús. A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states. Ann. Phys., 349:117, 2014.
 10. Jutho Haegeman and Frank Verstraete. Diagonalizing transfer matrices and matrix product operators: A medley of exact and computational methods. Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics, 8(1):355–406, 2017.
 11. Shi-Ju Ran, Emanuele Tirrito, Cheng Peng, Xi Chen, Gang Su, and Maciej Lewenstein. Review of tensor network contraction approaches. arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.09213, 2017.
 12. Frédéric Mila. Quantum spin liquids. European Journal of Physics, 21(6):499, 2000.
 13. Leon Balents. Spin liquids in frustrated magnets. Nature, 464:199, 2010.
 14. Steven R White. Quantum spin liquids: Tell-tale topology. Nature Physics, 8(12):863, 2012.
 15. Lucile Savary and Leon Balents. Quantum spin liquids: a review. Reports on Progress in Physics, 80:016502, 2017.
 16. Roman Orús. Exploring corner transfer matrices and corner tensors for the classical simulation of quantum lattice systems. Phys. Rev. B, 85:205117, 2012.
 17. Shi-Ju Ran, Wei Li, Bin Xi, Zhe Zhang, and Gang Su. Optimized decimation of tensor networks with super-orthogonalization for two-dimensional quantum lattice models. Phys. Rev. B, 86:134429, 2012.
 18. Piotr Czarnik, Lukasz Cincio, and Jacek Dziarmaga. Projected entangled pair states at finite temperature: Imaginary time evolution with ancillas. Phys. Rev. B, 86:245101, 2012.
 19. Shi-Ju Ran, Bin Xi, Tie-Yan Liu, and Gang Su. Theory of network contractor dynamics for exploring thermodynamic properties of two-dimensional quantum lattice models. Phys. Rev. B, 88:064407, 2013.
 20. Piotr Czarnik and Jacek Dziarmaga. Variational approach to projected entangled pair states at finite temperature. Phys. Rev. B, 92:035152, July 2015.
 21. Piotr Czarnik and Jacek Dziarmaga. Projected entangled pair states at finite temperature: Iterative self-consistent bond renormalization for exact imaginary time evolution. Phys. Rev. B, 92:035120, July 2015.
 22. Piotr Czarnik, Jacek Dziarmaga, and Andrzej M. Oleifm-mode acuteselse sfi. Variational tensor network renormalization in imaginary time: Two-dimensional quantum compass model at finite temperature. Phys. Rev. B, 93:184410, May 2016.
 23. Piotr Czarnik, Marek M. Rams, and Jacek Dziarmaga. Variational tensor network renormalization in imaginary time: Benchmark results in the Hubbard model at finite temperature. Phys. Rev. B, 94:235142, December 2016.
 24. Piotr Czarnik, Jacek Dziarmaga, and Andrzej M. Oleifm-mode acuteselse sfi. Overcoming the sign problem at finite temperature: Quantum tensor network for the orbital s_g model on an infinite square lattice. Phys. Rev. B, 96:014420, July 2017.
 25. A. Banerjee, C. A. Bridges, J. Q. Yan, A. A. Aczel, L. Li, M. B. Stone, G. E. Granroth, M. D. Lumsden, Y. Yiu, J. Knolle, S. Bhattacharjee, D. L. Kovrizhin, R. Moessner, D. A. Tennant, D. G. Mandrus, and S. E. Nagler. Proximate kitaev quantum spin liquid behaviour in a honeycomb magnet. Nature Materials, 15:733, 2016.
 26. Yao Shen, Yao-Dong Li, Hongliang Wo, Yuesheng Li, Shoudong Shen, Bingying Pan, Qisi Wang, H. C. Walker, P. Steffens, M. Boehm, Yiqing Hao, D. L. Quintero-Castro, L. W. Harriger, M. D. Frontzek, Lijie Hao, Siqin Meng, Qingming Zhang, Gang Chen, and Jun Zhao. Evidence for a spinon fermi surface in a triangular-lattice quantum-spin-liquid candidate. Nature, 540:559, 2016.
 27. Tian-Heng Han, Joel S. Helton, Shaoyan Y. Chu, Daniel G. Nocera, Jose A. Rodriguez-Rivera, Collin Broholm, and Young S. Lee. Fractionalized excitations in the spin-liquid state of a kagome-lattice antiferromagnet. Nature, 492(7429):406–410, 2012.
 28. Maciej Lewenstein, Anna Sanpera, and Veronica Ahufinger. Ultracold atoms in Optical Lattices: simulating quantum many body physics. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012.
 29. J. Ignacio Cirac and Peter Zoller. Goals and opportunities in quantum simulation. Nature Physics, 8(4):264–266, 2012.
 30. Immanuel Bloch, Jean Dalibard, and Sylvain Nascimbene. Quantum simulations with ultracold quantum gases. Nature Physics, 8(4):267, 2012.
 31. Aln Aspuru-Guzik and Philip Walther. Photonic quantum simulators. Nature Physics, 8:285, 2012.
 32. I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and Franco Nori. Quantum simulation. Rev. Mod. Phys., 86:153–185, Mar 2014.
 33. K. B. Davis, M. O. Mewes, M. R. Andrews, N. J. van Druten, D. S. Durfee, D. M. Kurn, and W. Ketterle. Bose-einstein condensation in a gas of sodium atoms. Phys. Rev. Lett., 75:3969–3973, Nov 1995.
 34. Mike H Anderson, Jason R Ensher, Michael R Matthews, Carl E Wieman, and Eric A Cornell. Observation of bose-einstein condensation in a dilute atomic vapor. science, 269(5221):198–201, 1995.

35. A. Friedenauer, H. Schmitz, J. T. Glueckert, D. Porras, and T. Schaetz. Simulating a quantum magnet with trapped ions. Nature Physics, 4:757, 2008.
36. Robert Jördens, Niels Strohmaier, Kenneth Günter, Henning Moritz, and Tilman Esslinger. A mott insulator of fermionic atoms in an optical lattice. Nature, 455:204, 2008.
37. Shi-Ju Ran, Angelo Piga, Cheng Peng, Gang Su, and Maciej Lewenstein. Few-body systems capture many-body physics: Tensor network approach. Phys. Rev. B, 96:155120, Oct 2017.
38. Marie-Bernadette Lepetit, Maixent Cousy, and Gustavo M. Pastor. Density-matrix renormalization study of the Hubbard model on a Bethe lattice. Eur. Phys. J. B, 13:421, 2000.
39. Naoki Nakatani and Garnet K. L. Chan. Efficient tree tensor network states (TTNS) for quantum chemistry: Generalizations of the density matrix renormalization group algorithm. J. Chem. Phys., 138:134113, 2013.
40. Wei Li, Shi-Ju Ran, Shou-Shu Gong, Yang Zhao, Bin Xi, Fei Ye, and Gang Su. Linearized tensor renormalization group algorithm for the calculation of thermodynamic properties of quantum lattice models. Phys. Rev. Lett., 106:127202, 2011.
41. Elliott Lieb, Theodore Schultz, and Daniel Mattis. Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain. Ann. Phys., 16(3):407 – 466, 1961.
42. Luca Tagliacozzo, Thiago de Oliveira, Sofyan Iblisdir, and José I. Latorre. Scaling of entanglement support for matrix product states. Phys. Rev. B, 78:024410, July 2008.
43. Emanuele Tirrito, Maciej Lewenstein, and Shi-Ju Ran. Studying criticality and excitations of one dimensional systems by time matrix product states. [arXiv:1608.06544](https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.06544).
44. M. Suzuki and M. Inoue. The ST-transformation approach to analytic solutions of quantum systems. I general formulations and basic limit theorems. Prog. Theor. Phys., 78:787, 1987.
45. Makoto Inoue and Masuo Suzuki. The ST-transformation approach to analytic solutions of quantum systems. II: Transfer-matrix and Pfaffian methods. Progress of theoretical physics, 79(3):645–664, 1988.
46. Hans A. Bethe. Statistical Theory of Superlattices. Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser A., 150:552–575, 1935.
47. Hong-Chen Jiang, Zheng-Yu Weng, and Tao Xiang. Accurate determination of tensor network state of quantum lattice models in two dimensions. Phys. Rev. Lett., 101:090603, 2008.
48. Shi-Ju Ran. Ab initio optimization principle for the ground states of translationally invariant strongly correlated quantum lattice models. Phys. Rev. E, 93:053310, 2016.
49. Frank Verstraete, Juan J. Garc'ia-Ripoll, and J. Ignacio Cirac. Matrix Product Density Operators: Simulation of Finite-Temperature and Dissipative Systems. Phys. Rev. Lett., 93:207204, November 2004.
50. Michael Zwolak and Guifré Vidal. Mixed-State Dynamics in One-Dimensional Quantum Lattice Systems: A Time-Dependent Superoperator Renormalization Algorithm. Phys. Rev. Lett., 93:207205, November 2004.
51. Jonas Becker, Thomas Köhler, Alexander C. Tiegel, Salvatore R. Manmana, Stefan Wessel, and Andreas Honecker. Finite-temperature dynamics and thermal intraband magnon scattering in Haldane spin-one chains. Phys. Rev. B, 96:060403, August 2017.
52. Adil A. Gangat, Te, and Ying-Jer Kao. Steady States of Infinite-Size Dissipative Quantum Chains via Imaginary Time Evolution. Phys. Rev. Lett., 119:010501, July 2017.
53. Steven R. White and Douglas J. Scalapino. Density matrix renormalization group study of the striped phase in the 2d $t - j$ model. Phys. Rev. Lett., 80:1272, 1998.
54. Tao Xiang, Jizhong Lou, and Zhaobin Su. Two-dimensional algorithm of the density-matrix renormalization group. Phys. Rev. B, 64:104414, August 2001.
55. Edwin M. Stoudenmire and Steven R. White. Studying two-dimensional systems with the density matrix renormalization group. Ann. Rev. Cond. Matter Phys., 3:111–128, 2012.
56. F. Fröwis, V. Nebendahl, and W. Dür. Tensor operators: Constructions and applications for long-range interaction systems. Phys. Rev. A, 81:062337, Jun 2010.
57. Nikolai V. Prokof'ev, Boris V. Svistunov, and Igor S. Tupitsyn. Exact quantum monte carlo process for the statistics of discrete systems. Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics Letters, 64(12):911–916, 1996.
58. N. V. Prokof'ev, B. V. Svistunov, and I. S. Tupitsyn. worm algorithm in quantum monte carlo simulations. Physics Letters A, 238(4-5):253–257, 1998.
59. V. A. Kashurnikov, N. V. Prokof'ev, B. V. Svistunov, and M. Troyer. Quantum spin chains in a magnetic field. Physical Review B, 59(2):1162, 1999.
60. Bin Xi, Shijie Hu, Jize Zhao, Gang Su, B. Normand, and Xiaoqun Wang. Low-energy properties of anisotropic two-dimensional spin-1 2 heisenberg models in staggered magnetic fields. Physical Review B, 84(13):134407, 2011.
61. Jiehang Zhang, Guido Pagano, Paul W Hess, Antonis Kyprianidis, Patrick Becker, Harvey Kaplan, Alexey V Gorshkov, Z-X Gong, and Christopher Monroe. Observation of a many-body dynamical phase transition with a 53-qubit quantum simulator. Nature, 551(7682):601, 2017.
62. Nicolai Friis, Oliver Marty, Christine Maier, Cornelius Hempel, Milan Holzäpfel, Petar Jurcevic, Martin B Plenio, Marcus Huber, Christian Roos, Rainer Blatt, et al. Observation of entangled states of a fully controlled 20-qubit system. Physical Review X, 8(2):021012, 2018.
63. Hannes Bernien, Sylvain Schwartz, Alexander Keesling, Harry Levine, Ahmed Omran, Hannes Pichler, Soonwon Choi, Alexander S Zibrov, Manuel Endres, Markus Greiner,

- et al. Probing many-body dynamics on a 51-atom quantum simulator. Nature, 551(7682):579, 2017.
64. Anton Mazurenko, Christie S Chiu, Geoffrey Ji, Maxwell F Parsons, Márton Kanász-Nagy, Richard Schmidt, Fabian Grusdt, Eugene Demler, Daniel Greif, and Markus Greiner. A cold-atom fermi–hubbard antiferromagnet. Nature, 545(7655):462, 2017.
65. Javier Rodríguez-Laguna, Leticia Tarruell, Maciej Lewenstein, and Alessio Celi. Synthetic unruh effect in cold atoms. Phys. Rev. A, 95:013627, Jan 2017.
66. Some websites about quantum computation: www.dwavesys.com (D-waveb); ai.google/research/teams/applied-science/quantum-ai (Google AI); www.research.ibm.com/ibm-q (IBM Q); www.microsoft.com/en-us/quantum (Microsoft).
67. Bin-Bin Chen, Yun-Jing Liu, Ziyu Chen, and Wei Li. Series-expansion thermal tensor network approach for quantum lattice models. Phys. Rev. B, 95:161104, April 2017.
68. Michael Lubasch, J. Ignacio Cirac, and Mari-Carmen Bañuls. Algorithms for finite projected entangled pair states. Phys. Rev. B, 90:064425, 2014.
69. Guifré Vidal. Classical Simulation of Infinite-Size Quantum Lattice Systems in One Spatial Dimension. Phys. Rev. Lett., 98:070201, 2007.
70. Jacob Jordan, Roman Orús, Guifré Vidal, Frank Verstraete, and J. Ignacio Cirac. Classical simulation of infinite-size quantum lattice systems in two spatial dimensions. Phys. Rev. Lett., 101:250602, 2008.
71. Tomotoshi Nishino and Kouichi Okunishi. Corner transfer matrix renormalization group method. J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., 65:891–894, 1996.
72. Andrew J. Daley, Corinna Kollath, U. Schollwöck, and Guifré Vidal. Time-dependent density-matrix renormalization-group using adaptive effective Hilbert spaces. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2004(04), 2004.