

Detection of topological phases by quasi-local operators

Wing Chi Yu,¹ P. D. Sacramento,^{2,3,*} Yan Chao Li,^{4,3} D.G. Angelakis,^{1,5} and Hai-Qing Lin³

¹*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543, Singapore*

²*CeFEMA, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Rovisco Pais, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal*

³*Beijing Computational Science Research Center, Beijing, China*

⁴*College of Materials Science and Opto-Electronic Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China*

⁵*School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Technical University of Crete, Chania, Crete, 73100 Greece*

(Dated: November 15, 2018)

It has been proposed recently by some of the authors that the quantum phase transition of a topological insulator like the SSH model may be detected by the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the reduced density matrix. Here we further extend the scheme of identifying the order parameters by considering the SSH model with the addition of triplet superconductivity. This model has a rich phase diagram due to the competition of the SSH "order" and the Kitaev "order", which requires the introduction of four order parameters to describe the various topological phases. We show how these order parameters can be expressed simply as averages of projection operators on the ground state at certain points deep in each phase and how one can simply obtain the phase boundaries. A scaling analysis in the vicinity of the transition lines is consistent with the quantum Ising universality class.

I. INTRODUCTION

In condensed matter physics, the order parameter plays an important role in the study of phase transitions. It characterizes the order of a phase and helps to detect the critical point. People usually rely on physical intuition or resort to methods such as group theory and the renormalization group analysis to identify the order parameters of a many-body system. However, those methods require a prior knowledge in the symmetries of the Hamiltonian and do not always apply, especially to systems exhibiting topological phase transitions. This calls for a general and systematic scheme to derive the order parameters without the aid of such an empirical knowledge.

Recently, a proposal based on using the dominant eigenstates of the reduced density matrix of a many-body system has been established by some of the authors^{1,2}. Unlike the other schemes proposed³⁻⁵, the approach is non-variational. Our scheme has also been extended to the detection of the topological phase of topological insulators^{6,7} such as the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger (SSH) model⁸, or equivalently the Schockley model⁹.

In our original proposal, one has to first determine the minimum size of the reduced density matrix that captures the extended correlations in the system by calculating the mutual information. Then the dominant states (with relatively larger eigenvalues) of the reduced density matrix are used to construct the order parameter. For example, in the Mott insulator phase of the fermion Hubbard model, the single site reduced density matrix has largest eigenvalues for the local state spin up and spin down. One can then define the order operator as a linear combination of the projectors of these two states which turns out to be the Pauli matrix in the z direction as expected². However, in some cases such as the topological phase of the SSH model, several eigenstates

of the reduced density matrix with comparable weights contribute and lead to an undetermined combination in the order parameter⁶.

In this work, we introduce a fundamental extension of our previous proposal⁶ to overcome the above mentioned issue by considering the projector to a subset of the system's ground state. The order parameter is then defined as the expectation value of this projector in the original representation. This method can be applied to any models that have a diagonal representation of the Hamiltonian at some specific points in the phase diagram. We apply the method to the SSH model with addition of triplet pairings between the fermionic states. The phase diagram of the model consists of a trivial phase, two topological phases of Kitaev type and one topological phase of SSH-type. The four order parameters that describe the various phases of the model are obtained.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we recap our original scheme of deriving the order parameter and introduce the new method. We then apply the method to obtain the order operators in the SSH model with triplet pairing in Sec. III and calculate the order parameters (ground state average of the order operators) in Sec. IV. We also study the universality class of the model from finite size scaling analysis of the derived order parameters in Sec. V. In Sec. VI, we mention that the application of the method to the Kitaev model leads to a quasi-local operator that may be identified with the local Hamiltonian. It is shown both for the Kitaev model and the SSH-Kitaev model that the local Hamiltonian may also be used to detect the topological transitions. Finally, a conclusion is given in Sec. VII.

II. THE METHOD

The first step in our original proposal¹ to derive the order parameter is to determine the minimum size of the block (or subsystem) that the mutual information does not vanish at a long distance. The mutual information is defined as

$$S(i, j) = S(\rho_i) + S(\rho_j) - S(\rho_{i \cup j}), \quad (1)$$

where $S(\rho_i) = -\text{tr}(\rho_i \ln \rho_i)$ is the von-Neumann entropy of the block i . The reduced density matrix ρ_i is obtained by tracing out all other degrees of freedom except those of the block i , i.e. $\rho_i = \text{tr} |\Psi_0\rangle \langle \Psi_0|$ where $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is the ground state of the system. If and only if the mutual information is non-vanishing at a long distance, there exists a long-range order (or quasi long range order) in the system^{10,11}.

The next step is to calculate the eigenvalues and eigenstates of the reduced density matrix of the desired block size. The order parameter is then defined as the linear combination of the dominant eigenstates¹, i.e.

$$O_i = \sum_{\mu \leq \xi} w_\mu a_{i\mu}^\dagger a_{i\mu}, \quad (2)$$

where $a_{i\mu}^\dagger (a_{i\mu})$ is the creation (annihilation) operator of the state μ at site i , and ξ is the rank of ρ_i . It can be proved that for any $\mu > \xi$, the operator $a_{i\mu}^\dagger a_{i\mu}$ does not correlate. The coefficients w_μ can be fixed by the traceless condition $\text{tr}(\rho_i O_i) = 0$ and the cut-off condition $\max(\{w_\mu\}) = 1$.

In some cases, the basis of the reduced density matrix may not be ideal because of degeneracies and making it hard to determine the coefficients w_μ in Eq. 2. In our previous work⁶ where the SSH model is considered, we demonstrated that such a difficulty can be overcome by a transformation into a Majorana basis. This allows a diagonal representation of the Hamiltonian in terms of fermionic operators, that are non-local combinations of the original fermion operators, at some specific points in the phase diagram. The dominant eigenstate of the reduced density matrix in this diagonal basis is then simply a subset of the system's groundstate.

This suggests one may try a different approach and motivates us to introduce a variation of our original scheme as used in this work. Consider a Hamiltonian which can be expressed in terms of some quasi-local Hamiltonians H_j . The quasi-local Hamiltonian is in general a function of a set of parameters, i.e. $H_j(g_1, g_2, \dots)$. We may identify inside a phase in the phase diagram a point (G_1, G_2, \dots) where we can diagonalize the Hamiltonian. Call $|G_1, G_2, \dots\rangle$ the groundstate of H_j at this point. Define an operator

$$\hat{O}_j = |G_1, G_2, \dots\rangle \langle G_1, G_2, \dots|, \quad (3)$$

which is a projector to a subset of the system's groundstate. We may now define the order parameter as the

average value of this operator in the groundstate of $H_j(g_1, g_2, \dots)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} O_j &= \langle g_1, g_2, \dots | \hat{O}_j | g_1, g_2, \dots \rangle \\ &= |\langle g_1, g_2, \dots | G_1, G_2, \dots \rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Physically, this is like a measure of the overlap between the ground state at two points in the phase diagram. However, unlike the conventional fidelity approach to quantum phase transitions¹²⁻¹⁴, the two points (g_1, g_2, \dots) and (G_1, G_2, \dots) are in general far apart. See also for instance^{15,16}. In the next section, we illustrate the method in more detail by applying it to the SSH model with triplet pairing (SSH-Kitaev model).

III. ORDER OPERATORS OF SSH MODEL WITH TRIPLET PAIRING

A. Model

This model may be viewed as a dimerized Kitaev superconductor¹⁷. The dimerization is parametrized by η and the superconductivity by Δ .

This model is given by the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -\mu \sum_j \left(c_{j,A}^\dagger c_{j,A} + c_{j,B}^\dagger c_{j,B} \right) \\ &\quad -t \sum_j \left[(1+\eta) c_{j,B}^\dagger c_{j,A} + (1+\eta) c_{j,A}^\dagger c_{j,B} \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + (1-\eta) c_{j+1,A}^\dagger c_{j,B} + (1-\eta) c_{j,B}^\dagger c_{j+1,A} \right] \\ &\quad + \Delta \sum_j \left[(1+\eta) c_{j,B}^\dagger c_{j,A}^\dagger + (1+\eta) c_{j,A} c_{j,B} \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + (1-\eta) c_{j+1,A}^\dagger c_{j,B}^\dagger + (1-\eta) c_{j,B} c_{j+1,A} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where t is the hopping, Δ is the pairing amplitude and μ is the chemical potential. The model with no superconductivity ($\Delta = 0$) is related to the Schockley model by taking $t_1 = t(1+\eta)$ and $t_2 = t(1-\eta)$. The region of $\eta > 0$ corresponds to $t_1 > t_2$ and vice-versa for $\eta < 0$. The Hamiltonian in real space mixes nearest-neighbor sites and also has local terms. We consider a system with $j = 1, \dots, N$ (N sites A and N sites B). The local terms can be grouped in the matrix

$$H_{j,j} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mu & -t(1+\eta) & 0 & -\Delta(1+\eta) \\ -t(1+\eta) & -\mu & \Delta(1+\eta) & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta(1+\eta) & \mu & t(1+\eta) \\ -\Delta(1+\eta) & 0 & t(1+\eta) & \mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

The non-local terms to the nearest-neighbors can be written as

$$H_{j,j+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -t(1-\eta) & 0 & -\Delta(1-\eta) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta(1-\eta) & 0 & t(1-\eta) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$




FIG. 1: (Color online) (a) Phases of SSH-Kitaev model for zero chemical potential. When $\Delta = 0$ the model reduces to the SSH model and for negative η the model is topologically non-trivial with edge states represented by the decoupled Majorana operators. As in the Schockley model since at each end site there are two decoupled Majoranas, these combine to form edge fermionic modes. This constitutes phase SSH2 with $\eta = -1, \Delta = 0$ and two edge modes. If superconductivity is present, and there is no dimerization $\eta = 0$, the model reduces to the Kitaev model. The phase K1 with $\eta = 0, \Delta = t$ has two decoupled Majorana operators, one at each end, and therefore there is one Majorana mode at each edge. The model interpolates between Majorana modes and fermionic modes as the parameters change. There is also a trivial phase with no zero energy modes denoted SSH0 which is similar to the trivial phase of the Schockley model. The Hamiltonian in terms of Majoranas simplifies at the four points marked with yellow squares and (b) shows an illustration of the Majorana modes at these four points respectively. At each of the lattice site j , the two dots represent the Majorana operators $\gamma_{j,\sigma,1}$ and $\gamma_{j,\sigma,2}$ ($\sigma = A$ or B). The lines represent the links between the Majorana operators.

and

$$H_{j,j-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -t(1-\eta) & 0 & \Delta(1-\eta) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\Delta(1-\eta) & 0 & t(1-\eta) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

The Hamiltonian matrices are the matrix elements in a basis

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{j,A} \\ c_{j,B} \\ c_{j,A}^\dagger \\ c_{j,B}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

In general, a fermion operator may be written in terms of two hermitian operators, γ_1, γ_2 , in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} c_{j,\sigma} &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{j,\sigma,1} + i\gamma_{j,\sigma,2}) \\ c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{j,\sigma,1} - i\gamma_{j,\sigma,2}) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The index σ represents internal degrees of freedom of the fermionic operator, such as spin and/or sub-lattice index, and the γ operators are hermitian and satisfy a Clifford algebra

$$\{\gamma_m, \gamma_n\} = 2\delta_{nm}. \quad (11)$$

In terms of Majorana operators the Hamiltonian is

written as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -\frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N (2 + i\gamma_{j,A,1}\gamma_{j,A,2} + i\gamma_{j,B,1}\gamma_{j,B,2}) \\ &\quad - \frac{it}{2}(1+\eta) \sum_{j=1}^N (\gamma_{j,B,1}\gamma_{j,A,2} + \gamma_{j,A,1}\gamma_{j,B,2}) \\ &\quad - \frac{it}{2}(1-\eta) \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (\gamma_{j+1,A,1}\gamma_{j,B,2} + \gamma_{j,B,1}\gamma_{j+1,A,2}) \\ &\quad + \frac{i\Delta}{2}(1+\eta) \sum_{j=1}^N (\gamma_{j,A,1}\gamma_{j,B,2} + \gamma_{j,A,2}\gamma_{j,B,1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{i\Delta}{2}(1-\eta) \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (\gamma_{j,B,1}\gamma_{j+1,A,2} + \gamma_{j,B,2}\gamma_{j+1,A,1}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Taking from now on $\mu = 0$ we have four special points, three corresponding to topological phases and one respecting to a trivial phase (Fig. 1): i) Taking $\eta = -1$ and $\Delta = 0$ we have a state similar to the SSH or Schockley models with two fermionic-like zero energy edge states, since the four operators $\gamma_{1,A,1}, \gamma_{1,A,2}; \gamma_{N,B,1}, \gamma_{N,B,2}$ are missing from the Hamiltonian. ii) and iii) $\eta = 0$ and $t = \pm\Delta$ are Kitaev like states since there are two Majorana operators missing from the Hamiltonian, such as $\gamma_{1,A,1}$ and $\gamma_{N,B,2}$, one from each end. iv) An example of a trivial phase is the point $\eta = 1$ and $\Delta = 0$ in which case there are no zero energy edge states. This model pro-

vides a testing ground for the comparison of fermionic and Majorana edge modes.

The order parameters (also called topological correlators in Ref.⁷) can be determined separately for each phase.

B. $\eta = -1, \Delta = 0$ topological phase

At the point $\mu = 0, \eta = -1, \Delta = 0$ shown in Fig. 1, the Hamiltonian reduces to

$$H = it \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (\gamma_{j,B,2} \gamma_{j+1,A,1} - \gamma_{j,B,1} \gamma_{j+1,A,2}). \quad (13)$$

Let us define non-local fermionic operators¹⁸

$$\begin{aligned} d_j &= \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{j,B,2} + i\gamma_{j+1,A,1}), \\ d_j^\dagger &= \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{j,B,2} - i\gamma_{j+1,A,1}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_j &= \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{j,B,1} - i\gamma_{j+1,A,2}), \\ f_j^\dagger &= \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{j,B,1} + i\gamma_{j+1,A,2}). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

We can show that

$$\begin{aligned} i\gamma_{j,B,2} \gamma_{j+1,A,1} &= 2d_j^\dagger d_j - 1, \\ -i\gamma_{j,B,1} \gamma_{j+1,A,2} &= 2f_j^\dagger f_j - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

In terms of these new operators we can write that

$$H = t \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (2d_j^\dagger d_j - 1 + 2f_j^\dagger f_j - 1) \quad (17)$$

and, therefore, the Hamiltonian is diagonalized. It is now clear that the ground state is obtained by taking $d_j^\dagger d_j = 0$ and $f_j^\dagger f_j = 0$ at each site. This new Hamiltonian in terms of the d and f operators is like a Hamiltonian with no hopping and just a chemical potential $\tilde{\mu} = -2t$.

The new operators can be related to the original ones in terms of a non-local transformation as

$$\begin{aligned} d_j &= \frac{i}{2} (c_{j,B}^\dagger - c_{j,B} + c_{j+1,A} + c_{j+1,A}^\dagger), \\ f_j &= \frac{1}{2} (c_{j,B}^\dagger + c_{j,B} - c_{j+1,A} + c_{j+1,A}^\dagger). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} c_{j,A} &= \frac{1}{2} [-i(-d_{j-1}^\dagger + d_{j-1}) - (f_{j-1} - f_{j-1}^\dagger)], \\ c_{j,B} &= \frac{1}{2} [f_j^\dagger + f_j + i(d_j + d_j^\dagger)]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Note that the index j of the d and f operators refers to the bond connecting the j, B and $j + 1, A$ sites in

the original representation. At the special point we are considering we may also write

$$H = -2t \sum_j (c_{j+1,A}^\dagger c_{j,B} + c_{j,B}^\dagger c_{j+1,A}). \quad (20)$$

In the diagonal basis the order parameter is

$$\begin{aligned} O_-^{SSH} &= |00\rangle\langle 00|, \\ &= I - |10\rangle\langle 10| - |01\rangle\langle 01| - |11\rangle\langle 11|, \\ &= 1 - f_j^\dagger f_j (1 - d_j^\dagger d_j) \\ &\quad - d_j^\dagger d_j (1 - f_j^\dagger f_j) - f_j^\dagger f_j d_j^\dagger d_j, \\ &= (1 - f_j^\dagger f_j) (1 - d_j^\dagger d_j). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

These expressions are local in space. We may now use the relation between the d and f operators and the original operators in Eq. (18). This is a non-local transformation since it couples site j with the nearest-neighbor site $j + 1$. The operator may now be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} O_-^{SSH} &= \frac{1}{2} (c_{j+1,A}^\dagger c_{j,B} + c_{j,B}^\dagger c_{j+1,A}) \\ &\quad - n_{j,B} n_{j+1,A} + \frac{1}{2} (n_{j,B} + n_{j+1,A}). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

C. $\eta = 0, \Delta = t$ topological phase

Consider now the special point of the SSH-Kitaev model given by $\eta = 0, \Delta = t$. This point is deep inside the Kitaev-like phase, as shown in Fig. 1. At this point the Hamiltonian simplifies to

$$H = t \sum_j (i\gamma_{j,A,2} \gamma_{j,B,1} + i\gamma_{j,B,2} \gamma_{j+1,A,1}). \quad (23)$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned} i\gamma_{j,B,2} \gamma_{j+1,A,1} &= 2d_j^\dagger d_j - 1, \\ i\gamma_{j,A,2} \gamma_{j,B,1} &= 2g_j^\dagger g_j - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Here the operator d_j is defined in Eq. 14 and the operator g_j is given by

$$g_j = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{j,B,1} - i\gamma_{j,A,2}). \quad (25)$$

Therefore

$$g_j = \frac{1}{2} (c_{j,B}^\dagger + c_{j,B} - c_{j,A} + c_{j,A}^\dagger). \quad (26)$$

The groundstate is obtained by taking $n_{d,j} = 0$ and $n_{g,j} = 0$. Therefore let us define the new operator in the basis of these occupation numbers as

$$\begin{aligned} O_+^{SK} &= |00\rangle\langle 00|, \\ &= 1 - d_j^\dagger d_j - g_j^\dagger g_j + d_j^\dagger d_j g_j^\dagger g_j. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Using their expressions in terms of the original operators one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
O_+^{SK} &= \frac{1}{4} \left[c_{j,B}^\dagger (c_{j,A} + c_{j+1,A}) + (c_{j,A}^\dagger + c_{j+1,A}^\dagger) c_{j,B} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + c_{j,B} (c_{j,A} - c_{j+1,A}) + (c_{j,A}^\dagger - c_{j+1,A}^\dagger) c_{j,B}^\dagger \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4} (2n_{j,B} - 1) (c_{j+1,A}^\dagger c_{j,A} + c_{j,A}^\dagger c_{j+1,A} \\
&\quad + c_{j+1,A} c_{j,A} + c_{j,A}^\dagger c_{j+1,A}^\dagger) + \frac{1}{4}. \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

D. $\eta = 0, \Delta = -t$ topological phase

Taking $\eta = 0, \Delta = -t$, the Hamiltonian reduces to

$$H = -it \sum_j (\gamma_{j,A,1} \gamma_{j,B,2} + \gamma_{j,B,1} \gamma_{j+1,A,2}). \tag{29}$$

Define two new operators

$$f_j = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{j,B,1} - i\gamma_{j+1,A,2}), \tag{30}$$

$$h_j = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{j,A,1} - i\gamma_{j,B,2}). \tag{31}$$

$$\tag{32}$$

In terms of the original fermion operators,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_j &= \frac{1}{2} [c_{j,B} + c_{j,B}^\dagger - (c_{j+1,A} - c_{j+1,A}^\dagger)], \\
h_j &= \frac{1}{2} [c_{j,A} + c_{j,A}^\dagger - (c_{j,B} - c_{j,B}^\dagger)]. \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian at this point can be written as

$$H = t \sum_j (2h_j^\dagger h_j - 1 + 2f_j^\dagger f_j - 1). \tag{34}$$

Again the groundstate is obtained by taking the state of no occupation of number operators of the f and h operators. So let us define a new operator valid for negative Δ as

$$\begin{aligned}
O_-^{SK} &= |00\rangle\langle 00|, \\
&= 1 - f_j^\dagger f_j - h_j^\dagger h_j + f_j^\dagger f_j h_j^\dagger h_j, \tag{35} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \left[c_{j,B}^\dagger (c_{j,A} + c_{j+1,A}) + (c_{j,A}^\dagger + c_{j+1,A}^\dagger) c_{j,B} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + c_{j,B} (-c_{j,A} + c_{j+1,A}) + (-c_{j,A}^\dagger + c_{j+1,A}^\dagger) c_{j,B}^\dagger \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4} (2n_{j,B} - 1) (c_{j+1,A}^\dagger c_{j,A} + c_{j,A}^\dagger c_{j+1,A} \\
&\quad - c_{j+1,A} c_{j,A} - c_{j,A}^\dagger c_{j+1,A}^\dagger) + \frac{1}{4}. \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

E. $\eta = 1, \Delta = 0$ trivial phase

For $\eta > 0$, the mutual information is exponentially vanishing and the correlation is not captured by considering the single-site block with atoms A and B. However,

one could take the block consisting of an atom B at site j and an atom A at site $j + 1$. The mutual information obtained would be the mirror image of that in Fig. 4 of reference⁶ about $\eta = 0$. The eigenspectrum of the reduced density matrix in this case is shown in Fig. 5(b) of the same reference. Carrying out similar analysis as above, the order parameter takes the form of Eq. (22), but with the index $\{j + 1, A\}$ and $\{j, B\}$ being replaced by $\{j, B\}$ and $\{j, A\}$, respectively. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
O_+^{SSH} &= \frac{1}{2} (c_{j,B}^\dagger c_{j,A} + c_{j,A}^\dagger c_{j,B}) \\
&\quad - n_{j,A} n_{j,B} + \frac{1}{2} (n_{j,A} + n_{j,B}). \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

IV. PHASE DIAGRAM AND ORDER PARAMETERS

A. Calculation method

We may now calculate the order parameters (or topological correlators) as the groundstate average values of the operators $O_+^{SSH}, O_-^{SSH}, O_+^{SK}, O_-^{SK}$ defined in the previous section.

The average values may be obtained for instance using exact diagonalization, density matrix renormalization group¹⁹⁻²¹ (particularly useful if one introduces interactions between the original fermions) or via the solution of the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) equations in the absence of interactions. This last method allows the solution for large systems (suited for the finite size scaling analysis carried out ahead). We consider open boundary conditions in the followings. The results obtained using exact diagonalization or the BdG method agree.

We may write that

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{j,A} &= \sum_n (u_{j,A}^n \gamma_n + v_{j,A}^n \gamma_n^\dagger) \\
c_{j,B} &= \sum_n (u_{j,B}^n \gamma_n + v_{j,B}^n \gamma_n^\dagger) \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

where γ_n are the fermionic operators that diagonalize the Hamiltonian. The Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations are written in real space as

$$\sum_{j'} H_{j,j'} \begin{pmatrix} u_{j',A} \\ u_{j',B} \\ v_{j',A} \\ v_{j',B} \end{pmatrix} = \epsilon_n \begin{pmatrix} u_{j,A} \\ u_{j,B} \\ v_{j,A} \\ v_{j,B} \end{pmatrix} \tag{39}$$

where ϵ_n are the energy eigenvalues and $u_{A,B}$ and $v_{A,B}$ are the components of the eigenfunctions and j' is restricted to $j = j'$ and $j = j' \pm 1$.

The averages of the order parameters may then be obtained by solving the BdG equations and determining the wave functions. Considering a finite system of size N , the problem requires the diagonalization of a $(4N) \times (4N)$ matrix.




FIG. 2: Top panel: Order parameters as a function of Δ for constant values of $\eta = -0.5, 0, 0.5$. Bottom panel: Order parameters as a function of η for constant values of $\Delta = -0.5, 0, 0.5$. We consider open boundary conditions and a system size $N = 100$. The numbers in purple next to where the order parameters cross correspond to the cuts through the phase boundaries label in Fig. 1(a) respectively.

B. Results

We may now consider cuts in the phase diagram and calculate the order parameters. With open boundary conditions it is better to take average over alternating lattice sites⁷. Specifically

$$O = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{j=2i+1} O_j. \quad (40)$$

In Fig. 2 top panel we consider three cuts for $\eta = -0.5, \eta = 0, \eta = 0.5$ and in the bottom panel we consider cuts for $\Delta = -0.5, \Delta = 0, \Delta = 0.5$. We calculate the averaged order parameter and the results shown are for a large system size of $N = 100$. The results for the two types of cuts are quite symmetrical if we change η to Δ and vice-versa changing also appropriately the order parameters. The order parameters clearly identify various phases in the model and we observe the follows.

- i At the points where each order parameter is defined the order parameter is normalized to one since it is the groundstate average value of the projector to that state.
- ii At each phase the order parameter characteristic of that phase has the largest value.
- iii The order parameters cross at the transition lines.

V. SCALING AND CRITICAL EXPONENTS

We may now determine the scaling properties of the order parameters. The scaling allows to determine the critical exponents and the universality class of the system.

We recall that the order parameters defined above do not vanish at the transition points as usual. Also the order parameter does not separate a disordered phase with a vanishing order parameter from an ordered phase with finite values of the order parameter. The various averages of the order operators that represent the various topological phases cross at the driving parameter $g = g_c(N)$ with finite values $O_c(N)$. The scaling is then expected to be of the form

$$N^{\beta/\nu}(O - O_c) = f\left(N^{1/\nu}(g - g_c)\right). \quad (41)$$

Here β is the usual critical exponent associated with an order parameter and ν is the exponent associated with the correlation length. The function f is the scaling function. Plotting the left hand side of the scaling relation against the argument of the scaling function, we expect that the curves for different system sizes should collapse into a single curve near the critical point. Note that the scaling function is independent of the system size at the crossing point $g = g_c$, and the size dependence of each order parameter is such that in the thermodynamic limit the order parameter should converge to a value $O_c \neq 0$ in our problem.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Scaling of various order parameters for cuts 1, 2, 5, 6 with $\nu = 1, \beta = 1/8$. The black, red, green, and blue curve corresponds to $O_+^{SK}, O_-^{SK}, O_+^{SSH}$, and O_-^{SSH} , respectively. Here we use OBC and order parameters are averaged over all odd sites (or even sites) as defined in Eq. 40. We consider system sizes $N = 24, 28, 32, 36, 40$.

Consider first a single-band Kitaev model. The model is not expected to have some form of quasi-long range order. The correlation functions decay exponentially with a correlation length that indeed diverges at the topological transition with an exponent $\nu = 1$. This may be obtained using the scaling behavior of the energy gap $E_g \sim (g - g_c)^{\nu z}$, where z is the dynamical critical exponent. Since the energy spectrum is linear, we have $z = 1$ and the gap scales linearly which leads to $\nu = 1$ (as shown for instance in²²). Generalizing the Kitaev model to a multi-band model with an anti-symmetric coupling between the two bands leads to a rich phase diagram that displays a topological transition between a Weyl-like phase and a conventional superconductor that turns out to be in a different universality class of the Kitaev model²³. The dispersion relation near the transition points turns out to be quadratic leading to a dynamical critical exponent $z = 2$ and since the gap as a function of the driving parameter (the chemical potential) vanishes linearly, this leads to $\nu = 1/2$ (also using the hyperscaling relation $2 - \alpha = \nu(d + z)$, where d is the spatial dimension leads to $\alpha = 3/2$, while in the Kitaev universality class $\alpha = 0$).

Consider now the SSH model with no superconductivity. In ref.⁷ a mapping was established in some regime between the Schwinger model on a lattice and the SSH model. Using the order parameter O_-^{SSH} it was shown

that the model is in the universality class of the $d = 2$ classical Ising model or the quantum Ising model in a transverse field (recall that a mapping exists between a quantum model in d dimensions and a classical model in $d + z$ dimensions; therefore if $z = 1$ there is a mapping from a quantum one-dimensional model and a classical two-dimensional model). Note that the two-dimensional Ising model displays a true phase transition and it makes sense to define an order parameter. In this class the critical exponents are given by $\nu = 1, \beta = 1/8$. The results are consistent with previous treatments of the massive Schwinger model²⁴⁻²⁶.

A. Scaling in the Ising universality class

Let us now consider the SSH model with triplet pairing and consider open boundary conditions (ignoring the small discontinuity at the transition points observed for small system sizes yields similar results in the case of periodic boundary conditions). In order to consider the scaling we must choose the critical exponents and perform the analysis with different system sizes.

Consider some cuts in the phase diagram as indicated by the purple dash segments in Fig. 1(a). In Fig. 3, we show results for the scaling of the order parameters for some of the various cuts considered. Here we use




FIG. 4: (Color online) Minimization of spreading of scaled curves of O_{+}^{SK} around the critical point of cut 1.

the Ising universality class with $\nu = 1$ and $\beta = 1/8$ as obtained before for the SSH model. The scaling seems to work approximately well for the various cases since the curves near the transition points collapse basically into a single curve.

B. Optimizing the scaling

While the choice of critical exponents above describes well the scaling of the various order parameters near the various transition lines, we may find a pair of critical exponents that best fit the scaling ansatz in Eq. 41. A criteria may be used such that the deviations between the various curves for different system sizes in the vicinity of the critical point is minimized. One may also minimize the squares of these deviations. The logarithm of this deviation D is shown in Fig. 4, for the scaling of the order parameter O_{+}^{SK} across the transition associated with cut 1. Specifically for each value of the driving parameter around the critical point (in this case η), the squared differences between the minimum and maximum value of the order parameter for the various system sizes (taken here as $N = 24, 40, 60, 100, 200$) are considered. The result shown in Fig. 4 is the logarithm of the sum of this differences squared at each η value. The results obtained suggest that the universality class may be different from the Ising class. We may also fit a polynomial function to the results for the various system sizes and use the least squares method for a given scaling function. This leads to similar results. Similar results are also found for the other cuts considered in Fig. 1(a), and for the various order parameters and therefore are not shown here.

As we can see the deviation is minimized if we keep increasing ν and decreasing β . So a value of $\nu = 1$ is a large value and $\beta = 1/8$ is small but the agreement becomes better (but slowly varying) if we change along the lines mentioned. Note that $\beta = 0$ and a very large ν

leads to a scaling of the type

$$O - O_c = f((g - g_c)) \quad (42)$$

with no system size dependence at all. Clearly in the infinite system limit this holds.

The exponent $\nu = 1$ has also been obtained by other methods. In one dimensional systems of the Dirac type of class *AIII* it has been shown²⁷ that in general $\gamma = \nu$. Considering the case of the SSH model it was explicitly shown²⁷ that $\nu = 1$. Our results for cut 5 (with $\Delta = 0$ and changing η as in the SSH model) as for the other cuts are not inconsistent with the analytical behavior for the SSH model since the optimization shows a very slow change of the least-squares deviation.

VI. LOCAL HAMILTONIAN AS "ORDER PARAMETER"

A. Single band Kitaev model

Consider the single-band Kitaev model at a zero chemical potential described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -t \sum_j (c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_{j+1}) + \Delta \sum_j (c_j c_{j+1} + c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j^\dagger). \quad (43)$$

The Hamiltonian takes a simple form at the points $\Delta = t$ and $\Delta = -t$, as discussed above for the generalization of the model to two sublattices. A similar procedure allows to determine two operators associated with the diagonalization of the Hamiltonian at these two points. The order parameters are simply given by the average of the projectors to a single-site zero occupation of the d_j operators defined in eq. 14 (and the corresponding for the case of $\Delta = -t$). We obtain then that

$$\begin{aligned} O_{j,+}^K &= |0\rangle\langle 0| = 1 - d_j^\dagger d_j \\ &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} H_j(t = \Delta = 1) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

and

$$O_{j,-}^K = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} H_j(t = -\Delta = 1) \quad (45)$$

where H_j is the contribution from site j to the Hamiltonian

$$H_j(t = \Delta = 1) = -c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j - c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + c_j c_{j+1} + c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j^\dagger \quad (46)$$

and

$$H_j(t = -\Delta = 1) = -c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j - c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} - c_j c_{j+1} - c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j^\dagger, \quad (47)$$

respectively. Diagonalizing the full Hamiltonian at an arbitrary point in the phase diagram we may write that

$$\begin{aligned} O_{j,+}^K &= \frac{1}{2} + \sum_n v_j^n (u_{j+1}^n + v_{j+1}^n), \\ O_{j,-}^K &= \frac{1}{2} + \sum_n v_j^n (-u_{j+1}^n + v_{j+1}^n). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$




FIG. 5: (Color online) Order parameters for the single band Kitaev model as a function of Δ for $N = 32$.

In Fig. 5 we calculate the order parameters as a function of Δ and take the average over odd sites as in the previous section. The order parameters cross at the transition point. Since these operators are basically the local Hamiltonian plus a constant this suggests that the local Hamiltonian itself may be used as an order parameter. While in the case of the single-band Kitaev model the procedure to determine the projectors leads to the local Hamiltonian at that specific point in the phase diagram, this does not occur in the SSH-Kitaev model, as shown in Sec. III.

In any case, let us consider the local Hamiltonian of the SSH-Kitaev model to see if it can be used as a suitable operator that leads to an order parameter.

B. SSH-Kitaev model

Write the Hamiltonian in Eq. 5 as $H = \sum_j H_j$ and then define four operators as the local Hamiltonian, H_j , at the points indicated in Fig. 1(a). We calculate their averages at an arbitrary point of the phase diagram using the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian at this arbitrary point. Note that in general these states are not the eigenstates of the Hamiltonians at the special points marked in Fig. 1(a). As an example let us consider that we fix $\Delta = 0.5$ and change η from -1 to 1 . The results for other ranges of values lead to similar conclusions. In Fig. 6 we show the results for this cut in the phase diagram for the four local Hamiltonians. The results are strikingly similar to the ones obtained using the order parameters $O_+^{SK}, O_-^{SK}, O_+^{SSH}, O_-^{SSH}$ and the transitions are clearly signaled by the crossings of the various order parameters defined from the local Hamiltonians.

We may as well identify the phase transitions considering only one of the order parameters and actually we do not have to limit their definition to the special points where a diagonalization of the Hamiltonian can be performed analytically (as easily done using the Majorana representation). Let us consider the local Hamiltonian, H_j , in an arbitrary point in the phase diagram




FIG. 6: (Color online) Local Hamiltonian order parameters for the SSH-Kitaev model as a function of η at $\Delta = 0.5$, using OBC and taking $N = 32$.




FIG. 7: (Color online) Local Hamiltonian order parameters for the SSH-Kitaev model and its derivatives with respect to η as a function of η at $\Delta = 0.5$, using OBC and taking $N = 100$. In the left panel, the local Hamiltonian at the point $\eta = 0.9$ and $\Delta = -0.1$ is considered. In the right panel we take the local Hamiltonian at $\Delta = 0.5$ and at the sequence of values of η along the cut. Therefore, in the right panel it is the energy per site.

of the SSH-Kitaev model (this should hold for an arbitrary Hamiltonian). Let us now consider a cut in the phase diagram that crosses some transition or transition lines (points). We will show now that the derivative of the average of this local Hamiltonian in the basis of the eigenstates of the full Hamiltonian at each point along the cut with respect to the parameter that defines the cut, detects the transition lines. We will focus on some example but the result can be checked for arbitrary examples.

Consider for example the same cut as above, where $\Delta = 0.5$ and we change η from -1 to 1 . There are two transition points at $\eta = -0.5$ and $\eta = 0.5$. Consider the local Hamiltonian at the point $\eta = 0.9, \Delta = -0.1$, some arbitrary point in the phase diagram and not on the cut that we choose. We also calculate the average energy per site. The results are shown in Fig. 7. While the transi-

tions are detected by calculating the second derivative of the energy per site with respect to the driving parameter, η , (this is like a susceptibility or related to the fidelity susceptibility) it is enough to calculate the first derivative of the average of the local Hamiltonian at an arbitrary point in the phase diagram not necessarily located in a point on the cut.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

With the method introduced, we obtained the order parameters that clearly signal the various phase transitions in the SSH model with triplet pairing. Also the magnitudes of the various order parameters are in complete agreement with the sequence of phases in the sense that the larger order parameter corresponds to the dominant characteristic of each phase. We expect our method can also be applied to other models, for example the multiband hybridized superconductors^{23,28}, that has a diagonal representation of the Hamiltonian at specific points of the phase diagram.

The finite-size scaling results with exponents $\nu = 1$ and $\beta = 1/8$ seem to support that the model belongs to the

quantum Ising universality class. This is consistent with previous results obtained for the SSH model. However, the least square optimization analysis also showed that ν and β can be values larger than 1 and 1/8 respectively. This suggests some non-trivial scaling relations may be required to describe the quantum criticality in the model since we have competing order parameters. One possibility is related to the existence of more than one order parameter as discussed for instance in reference²⁹. Another possibility is the existence of more than one correlation length as discussed in reference³⁰.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge support from the National Research Foundation and the Ministry of Education of Singapore, NSAF U1530401 and computational resources from the Beijing Computational Science Research Center. This research was also partially funded by Polisimulator project co-financed by Greece and the EU Regional Development Fund. PDS acknowledges partial support from FCT through grant UID/CTM/04540/2013.

-
- * Electronic address: pdss@cefema.tecnico.ulisboa.pt
- ¹ S. J. Gu, W. C. Yu, and H. Q. Lin, *Ann. Phys.* **336**, 118 (2013).
 - ² W.C. Yu, S.J. Gu and H.Q. Lin, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **89** 212 (2016).
 - ³ S. Furukawa, G. Misguich, and M. Oshikawa, *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **96**, 047211 (2006).
 - ⁴ C. L. Henley and H. J. Changlani, *J. Stat. Mech.* P11002 (2014).
 - ⁵ S.-A. Cheong and C. L. Henley, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 212402 (2009).
 - ⁶ W.C. Yu, Y.C. Li, P.D. Sacramento and H.-Q. Lin, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 245123 (2016).
 - ⁷ G. Magnifico, D. Vodola, E. Ercolessi, S.P. Kumar, M. Müller and A. Bermudez, arXiv: 1804.10568.
 - ⁸ W.P. Su, J.R. Schrieffer, A.J. Heeger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 1698 (1979); *Phys. Rev. B* **22**, 2099 (1980); A.J. Heeger, S. Kivelson, J.R. Schrieffer and W.P. Su, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **60**; 781 (1988).
 - ⁹ W. Shockley, *Phys. Rev.* **56**, 317 (1939); S.S. Pershoguba and V.M. Yakovenko, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 075304 (2012).
 - ¹⁰ M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, M. B. Hastings, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 070502 (2008).
 - ¹¹ S. J. Gu, C. P. Sun, and H. Q. Lin, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41**, 025002 (2008).
 - ¹² H. T. Quan, Z. Song, X. F. Liu, P. Zanardi, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 140604 (2006).
 - ¹³ P. Zanardi and N. Paunkovic, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 031123 (2006).
 - ¹⁴ S. J. Gu, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **24**, 4371 (2010).
 - ¹⁵ T.P. Oliveira and P.D. Sacramento, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 094512 (2014).
 - ¹⁶ P.D. Sacramento, B. Mera and N. Paunkovic, arXiv:1808.06187.
 - ¹⁷ R. Wakatsuki, M. Ezawa, Y. Tanaka and N. Nagaosa, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 014505 (2014).
 - ¹⁸ A. Y. Kitaev, *Phys.-Usp.* **44**, 131 (2001).
 - ¹⁹ S. R. White, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2863 (1992).
 - ²⁰ U. Schollwöck, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 259 (2005).
 - ²¹ U. Schollwöck, *Ann. Phys.* **326**, 96 (2011).
 - ²² M.A. Continentino, H. Caldas, D. Nozadze, and N. Trivedi, *2014 Phys. Lett. A* **378**, 3340 (2014).
 - ²³ T.O. Puel, P.D. Sacramento, and M.A. Continentino, *J. Phys. Cond. Matt.* **27**, 422002 (2015).
 - ²⁴ S. Coleman, *Ann. Phys.* **101**, 239 (1976).
 - ²⁵ C. J. Hamer, J. Kogut, P. Crewther, and M. M. Mazzolini, *Nuc. Phys. B* **208**, 413 (1982).
 - ²⁶ T.M.R. Byrnes, P. Sriganesh, R. J. Bursill, and C. J. Hamer, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 013002 (2002).
 - ²⁷ W. Chen, M. Legner, A. Rüegg, and M. Sigrüst, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 075116 (2017).
 - ²⁸ T.O. Puel, P.D. Sacramento, and M.A. Continentino, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 094509 (2017).
 - ²⁹ P.M. Chaikin and T.C. Lubenski, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics*, Cambridge University Press.
 - ³⁰ H. Shao, W. Guo and A.W. Sandvik, *Science* **352**, 213 (2016).