

From Ising model to Kitaev Chain

An introduction to topological phase transitions

Kartik Chhajer

BS-MS, IISER Mohali

September 20, 2022

Abstract

In this general article, we map the Ising model of ferromagnetism to Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor, which has its application in fault-tolerant topological quantum computing. These models, are example for different classes of phase transition, namely classical second order phase transition, quantum phase transition and a new class of quantum critical phenomena, the topological phase transition. It is possible to map the classical Ising model described on $d + 1$ torus to the transverse field quantum Ising model on a d torus. Mapping Pauli's spin operators of one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model to spinless fermionic creation and annihilation operator by Jordan-Wigner transformation leads to a Hamiltonian form closely related to Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor.

1 Introduction

The Ising model is a statistical model of spins, $S_i = \pm 1$, described on a lattice of dimension, d . The spins can interact with external field and nearest neighbour. Wilhelm Lenz first introduced the model in 1920 as a problem to his student Ernst Ising. Ernst Ising solved the one-dimensional Ising model and showed that the model does not show the phase transition [1]. Two decades later, Onsager solved the two-dimensional Ising model using the transfer matrix method [2]. Surprisingly, the two-dimensional square-lattice Ising model, which is a simplified model of reality exhibits phase transition. Onsager showed that there is a specific temperature, called the Curie temperature or critical temperature, T_c below which the system shows ferromagnetic long-range order. Above T_c , it is paramagnetic and is disordered. Despite being simple in description, the model exhibits rich features like a phase

transition, symmetry breaking in the ferromagnetic phase. Near criticality, the model can be applied to a surprising number of different systems. This feature is known as Universality, where the same theory applies to all sorts of different phase transition, like liquid-gasses system, magnets, superconductor and many more [3].

In 2001, Kitaev proposed a one-dimensional toy model containing a tight-binding term and superconducting term for spinless electrons [4]. Kitaev chain, which is an example of a topological phase transition falls into Ising universality class for a given symmetry point [5]. Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor has its application in fault-tolerant topological quantum computing. One feature of Kitaev's open chain is that in one phase Majorana-zero-modes are present at its edges, while there are none in another phase. These Majorana-zero-modes are topologically protected from any non-local perturbation and thus form the basic building block for topological quantum computing.

In the context of High energy physics, fermion with property $a_j^\dagger = a_j$ implies that the particle's anti-particle is particle itself. Mathematically, Majorana fermion is perfectly well defined. To this date, no Majorana fermions have been found existing as a fundamental particle. The nature of neutrinos is not settled; they may be either Dirac fermions or Majorana fermions. However, in condensed matter physics, they have been found existing as quasi-particle.

An anti-particle, in condensed matter physics, means devoid of an electron, i.e., a hole. In quantum computing, 'electrons' and 'holes' are encoded as q-bits:

$$\bullet \rightarrow |1\rangle, \quad \circ \rightarrow |0\rangle$$

These q-bits are very sensitive to local perturbation. To remedy this caveat: two spatially separated Majorana bound states can be encoded as one fermionic degree of freedom in a very non-local way. Majorana bound states are topologically protected from any non-local perturbation. It is possible to experimentally design Kitaev's toy model using: a 1D wire with appreciable spin-orbit coupling, conventional s-wave superconductor, and external magnetic field [6, 7].

In section 2, we start with a description of a two-dimensional Ising model, giving a brief overview of the phase transition occurring in the model. Later in the same section, we study quantum cousin of two-dimensional classical Ising model, viz., one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model. In principle it is possible to map $d + 1$ dimensional classical Ising model to d dimensional quantum Ising model [8–10].

In section 3, we mapped the quantum Ising model to spinless fermionic

theory via JordanWigner Transformation [11]. The Hamiltonian structure we get after doing JordanWigner Transformation looks similar to famous Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor Hamiltonian. However, the fermionic number is not conserved. Since the Hamiltonian is quadratic (no interaction), it is possible to diagonalize Hamiltonian via Bogoliubov Transformation to a fermionic basis where the particle number would be conserved [12, 13]. In section 4, we study the physics of Kitaev Model. The appendices are added at the end covers mathematical gaps left in between.

2 The Ising Model

In the following section, we discuss the phase transition phenomena occurring in classical Ising model. We can map the Classical Ising model to Quantum Ising model and vice versa. The mathematics of former is doable but lengthy. Readers can refer appendix A, where we have summarized the mapping of two dimensional classical Ising model to one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model (fig. 1). The latter is more exciting and done by introducing imaginary time-slicing, as shown in appendix B. In the second part of the section, we study quantum cousin of two-dimensional classical Ising model, viz., one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model.




Figure 1: Mapping two-dimensional classical Ising model to one-dimensional quantum Ising model. Note, each spin in the quantum Ising chain is in two-dimensional Hilbert space.

2.1 Classical Ising Model

The Classical Ising model is a statistical model of spins, $S_i = \pm 1$, described on a lattice of dimension, d . The spins can interact with external field and

nearest neighbour. Hamiltonian for such a system can be written as

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i S_j - H \sum_i S_i$$

where $\langle ij \rangle$ means that we are summing over nearest neighbours. When $J > 0$, neighboring spins prefer to align in same direction, viz., either $\uparrow\uparrow$ or $\downarrow\downarrow$. In the context of magnetism, such a system is called a *ferromagnet*. When $J < 0$, neighbouring spins prefer to align in the opposite direction, viz., $\uparrow\downarrow$, and such a system is called a *anti-ferromagnet*. For the rest of the discussion, we will focus on two-dimensional ferromagnetic system (fig. 2a).




Figure 2: Two-dimensional Ising model with periodic boundary condition.

We will make spins at edges of the lattice to interact with geometrical opposite edges. This is known as the periodic boundary condition. It can be visualized more clearly if we consider a two-dimensional rubber sheet being folded into a torus with spins being on the surface of this topological structure (fig. 2b).

The partition function, \mathcal{Z} , and free energy density, \mathcal{F} , are given as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta\mathcal{H}}, \quad \mathcal{F} = -\frac{\ln \mathcal{Z}}{N\beta} \quad (1)$$

The partition function cannot be calculated analytically for general lattices, in arbitrary dimension d . Exact solution of partition function for Ising model are known for $d = 1$ and, when external field is zero, in $d = 2$. For $d = 3$ and, for $d = 2$ in presence of external field, the solutions are not determined exactly. The first successful attempt to find an exact solution for dimension $d = 2$, in the absence of external field, was done by Onsager is famously

complicated [2]. Since then, simpler solutions using more modern techniques have been discovered [14].

Important thermodynamically measurable quantities for the Ising model is magnetization or the magnetic moment per site, M :

$$M = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \langle S_i \rangle = -\frac{1}{N} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial H} \quad (2)$$




Figure 3: Plot of magnetization and susceptibility for two-dimensional Ising model simulation for various lattice sizes. For $T \gtrsim 2.269$ it shows the system is in symmetric paramagnetic state with vanishing spontaneous magnetization, $m \sim 0$. While for $T \lesssim 2.269$, it shows that the system is an ordered ferromagnetic phase, $m \neq 0$.

In absence external field, when we plot magnetization as a function of temperature (fig. 3a), we see below a certain temperature, T_c , the magnetization¹

$$M \sim (T_c - T)^\beta; \quad \beta = 1/8 \quad (3)$$

And above T_c , the magnetization is zero. This could be understood as energy-entropy competition. $J > 0$ will make energetically favourable for all spin to align in the same direction (ordered phase). In contrast, the effect of temperature will be to randomize the spins (disordered phase), with entropy winning out over energy.

Using KramersWannier duality relation [15], which relates the partition function of a two-dimensional square-lattice Ising model at a low temperature to that of same Ising model at a high temperature to get the critical

¹Here, the critical exponent β is not to be confused with the inverse temperature.

temperature as a relation:

$$k_B T_c = \frac{2J}{\ln(1 + \sqrt{2})} \simeq 2.269J \quad (4)$$

2.1.1 KramersWannier Duality

We define $K = \beta J$. Since $S_i = \pm 1$, we substitute

$$e^{KS_i S_j} = \cosh(K) + \sinh(K S_i S_j)$$

in partition function

$$\mathcal{Z}(\beta, J) = \sum_{S_i = \pm 1} e^{\beta J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i S_j}$$

In High-temperature expansion, the partition function has form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{HTE} &= 2^N \cosh K^{2N} (1 + N \tanh K^4 + 2N \tanh K^6 + \dots) \\ &= 2^N \cosh K^{2N} f(\tanh K) \end{aligned}$$

While in low-temperature expansion, the partition function has a form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{LTE} &= 2e^{2NK} (1 + Ne^{-4 \times 2K} + 2Ne^{-6 \times 2K} + \dots) \\ &= 2e^{2NK} f(e^{-2K}) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{F}(K)$ denote the free energy density. Then,

$$\mathcal{F}(K) = \mathcal{F}(K^*) - \log \sinh(2K^*), \quad (5)$$

where

$$K^* = \operatorname{arctanh}(e^{-2K}). \quad (6)$$

This means that the free energy is essentially invariant under the transformation $\phi : K \mapsto K^*$, which interchanges the low and high temperature regimes: this function is an involution with a unique fixed point $K_{\text{sd}} = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \sqrt{2})$, which interchange the intervals $[0, K_{\text{sd}}]$ and $(K_{\text{sd}}, \infty]$. For an example, the function

$$g(x) = \frac{x}{1 + x^2}$$

equals $g(x^{-1})$ and $x = 1$ is self-dual point.

Since ϕ and $\log \sinh$ are both analytic functions on $(0, \infty)$, it follows from eq. (5) that any non-analytic behavior of \mathcal{F} at some K must also imply a non-analytic behavior at K^* . Consequently, if one assumes that the function $\mathcal{F}(K)$

1. is non-analytic at K_c ,
2. is analytic everywhere else,

then K_c must coincide with K_{sd} .

Above we have seen a classical example of KramersWannier duality relation [16], i.e., the partition function of the Ising model at inverse temperature β and $\tilde{\beta}$ are equivalent for

$$e^{-2\tilde{\beta}J} = \tanh \beta J \implies \sinh \tilde{\beta}J \sinh \beta J = 1$$

However, the physics for these two temperatures is different, as for one temperature the system is in the ordered phase, while for other it is in the disordered phase. The concept of duality of this kind is a major feature in much of modern theoretical physics. The key idea is that when the temperature gets large, there may be a different set of variables in which a theory can be written where it appears to live at low temperature. As we will see in section 2.2.2, the same idea holds in quantum theories, where duality maps strong coupling problems to weak coupling problems.

2.1.2 Critical Behavior

Another essential quantity of the Ising model is the magnetic susceptibility, χ :

$$\chi = \frac{\partial M}{\partial H}$$

The susceptibility show divergent behavior near critical temperature (fig. 3b) according to power law

$$\chi \sim |T - T_c|^{-\gamma}; \quad \gamma = \frac{7}{4} \tag{7}$$

The susceptibility can also be written as

$$\chi = \frac{1}{NkT} \sum_{i,j} \Gamma(i-j)$$

Above equation known as *static susceptibility sum rule*. Here $\Gamma(i-j)$ is two-point correlation function defined as

$$\Gamma(i-j) = \langle S_i S_j \rangle - \langle S_i \rangle \langle S_j \rangle \tag{8}$$

When system has translational symmetry we can write the magnetic susceptibility as

$$\chi = \beta \sum_i \Gamma(i)$$

The correlation length, $\xi(T)$ is characteristic length at which the value of correlation function $\Gamma(i)$ has decayed to e^{-1} :

$$\Gamma(i) \sim \exp\left(-\frac{|i|}{\xi(T)}\right)$$

And

$$\xi(T) \sim |T - T_c|^{-\nu}; \quad \nu = 1 \quad (9)$$

At zero temperature, every spin is aligned in either +1 (or -1) direction. When we increase the temperature, keeping below T_c , some spin starts orienting themselves in the opposite direction. The typical length scale of cluster forming is called correlation length, ξ , and it grows as we increase the temperature and diverges at T_c . If we go beyond T_c , the correlation length starts decreasing, and at the infinite temperature, it becomes zero (fig. 4).




Figure 4: Snapshot of 256x256 size lattice for various temperatures. At equilibrium, when $T < T_c$, typical configurations in the + phase look like a “sea” of + spins with “islands” of - spins. For larger lattice size, the “island” have “lakes” of + spins. In this picture, + spins are in blue, - spins are in red. Each connected red object is a cluster.

As the correlation length diverges at a critical point, the system becomes blind to the microscopic dynamics of the system. That means, the critical behaviour might not depend on details of the model (underlying lattice, precise range of interaction), it does depend on general features (short-ranged or long-ranged interaction, symmetry group.). It also suggests that all system with the same general features belongs to the same Universality class near criticality. The Ising universality class is characterized by the critical exponents $\beta = 1/8$, $\gamma = 7/4$ and $\nu = 1$. For example, an Ising system (in 2d) with second nearest neighbour interaction, like,

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i S_j - J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i S_{j+1} - H \sum_i S_i$$

also exhibits a phase transition at $T_c > 2.269$ but the critical exponents β, γ and ν remain the same.

2.2 Transverse field Quantum Ising model

Transverse field quantum Ising model is considered as ‘‘Drosophila’’ of quantum phase transition. Unlike classical Ising model where thermal fluctuations drive phase transition, here phase transition is driven by quantum fluctuation. Consider the Hamiltonian for the one dimensional transverse-field Ising model

$$\mathcal{H}_Q = -Jg \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x - J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \quad (10)$$

where operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^{x,z}$ are the Pauli matrices at lattice site i . These operator commutes at different sites, i.e., $[\sigma_i, \sigma_j] = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Here g is referred as coupling parameter. The ferromagnetic interaction term, $\hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z$ favors aligned spins, whereas, field term $\hat{\sigma}_i^x$ favors spins pointing in x direction. The phase transition occurs for this model known as quantum phase transition present at $g = 1$. The system switches between the disordered ($g \gg 1$) and the ordered ($g \ll 1$) regime as one tunes coupling parameter.

The transverse field Ising model is invariant under \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry group (flipping all spins in z direction). The unitary symmetry transformation is given by $\zeta = \prod_i \sigma_i^x$:

$$\zeta | \uparrow \uparrow \downarrow \dots \rangle = | \downarrow \downarrow \uparrow \dots \rangle; \quad \zeta^2 = 1; \quad [\mathcal{H}_Q, \zeta] = 0$$

2.2.1 Quantum Paramagnet

For $g \gg 1$,

$$\mathcal{H}_Q \simeq -Jg \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x$$

the spins tend to align in direction of field. Here the ground state $|\psi_0\rangle = |\rightarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow\dots\rangle$ is unique:

$$\zeta|\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle$$

From quantum mechanics we know that the probability of finding $|+\rangle$ state in spin-up state and spin-down state is half-half, hence the magnetization component along z -axis, $m_z = 0$. Here the quasiparticle excitations corresponds to spin flip in negative x direction, i.e.,

$$|\psi_i\rangle = |\cdots \rightarrow\rightarrow \underbrace{\leftarrow}_{i^{\text{th}} \text{ spin-flip}} \rightarrow\rightarrow \dots\rangle$$

One spin-flip state is N -fold degenerate. The perturbation $V = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z$ will move the spin flip:

$$\langle \psi_i | V | \psi_j \rangle = -J(\delta_{j,i-1} + \delta_{j,i+1})$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff}|\psi_i\rangle = -J(|\psi_{i-1}\rangle + |\psi_{i+1}\rangle) + (E_0 + 2gJ)|\psi_i\rangle$$

For diagonalizing \mathcal{H}_{eff} , we do Fourier transformation

$$|\psi_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j e^{-ikj} |\psi_j\rangle$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{H} - E_0)|\psi_k\rangle &= 2J(g - \cos k)|\psi_k\rangle \\ &= \epsilon_k|\psi_k\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_k \simeq \Delta + Jk^2$ in long wavelength limit. And energy gap $\Delta = 2J(g - 1)$ closes at $g = 1$ (fig. 5).

2.2.2 Quantum ferromagnet

In limit $g \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathcal{H}_Q \simeq -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z$$

In ground state, all the spin gets aligned in one direction, and magnetization along z -axis, $m_z \neq 0$, corresponding to two degenerate ground states

$$|\psi_\uparrow\rangle = |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\dots\rangle, \text{ and } |\psi_\downarrow\rangle = |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\dots\rangle$$

However, these ground state does not respect symmetry. The linear combination of macroscopic ket states, $|\psi_\pm\rangle = \frac{|\psi_\uparrow\rangle \pm |\psi_\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ preserve the symmetry.




Figure 5: Energy dispersion for different values of g . The gap Δ closes at $g = 1$

The degeneracy is lifted by N^{th} order perturbation theory with perturbation $V = -Jg \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x$. The effective Hamiltonian in $\{|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle, |\psi_{\downarrow}\rangle\}$ basis is

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \begin{pmatrix} E_0 & g^N \\ g^N & E_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with eigen-states $|\psi_{\pm}\rangle$ and energy splitting $\delta = |E_+ - E_-| = \mathcal{O}(g^N)$. The true ground state is $|\psi_+\rangle$ with exponentially small splitting $\delta = e^{-N \ln(1/g)}$ with $|\psi_-\rangle$. If we prepare system in $|\psi(t=0)\rangle = |\psi_{\downarrow}\rangle$, after time t the system will be in state

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \frac{e^{-iE_+t}|\psi_+\rangle - e^{-iE_-t}|\psi_+\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$

The probability of finding system in $|\psi_{\downarrow}\rangle$ is

$$P(t) = |\langle +|\psi(t)\rangle|^2 = \cos^2\left(\frac{\delta t}{2}\right) \simeq 1 \text{ for } t \ll 1/\delta \approx e^{N \ln(1/g)}$$

So, for $N = N_{Avogadro}$, the initial state, $|\psi_{\downarrow}\rangle$ is the true ground state, unless one is willing to wait for time, $t = e^{10^{23}}$ to see tunneling process to $|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle$. The quasiparticle excitation are formation of domain walls which comes as independent pair to respect periodic boundary condition, i.e.,

$$\phi_{\bar{i}} = |\dots \uparrow\uparrow \underbrace{\vdots}_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \downarrow\downarrow \dots\rangle$$

Here, the perturbation $V = -J \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x$ moves the domain wall. A similar calculation as done for paramagnetic phase gives $\epsilon_k = 2J(1 - g \cos k) \simeq \Delta + Jk^2$. Here also the energy gap for domain wall formation is $\Delta = 2J(1-g)$, and gap closes at $g = 1$ (fig. 5). These result suggests duality between two phases

$$J \leftrightarrow gJ$$

which can be shown as KramersWannier duality by defining domain wall variables ς_i^x and ς_i^z as

$$\varsigma_i^x := \sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if domain wall at } \bar{i} \\ +1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

here $\bar{i} = i + \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\varsigma_i^z := \prod_{i > \bar{i}} \sigma_i^x$$

create domain wall by flipping all spin to right of \bar{i} . The domain wall variables follows Pauli matrix algebra. A combination of σ variable and ς variable is non-local, e.g., Majorana variables:

$$a_i = \sigma_i^z \varsigma_i^z, \quad b_i = \sigma_i^y \varsigma_i^z$$

which are non-local because of string $\Pi \sigma^x$. We will come back to this in next section. On writing the quantum Ising Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_Q = -Jg \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x - J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z$$

in domain wall variables, we get

$$\mathcal{H}_Q = -J \sum_{\bar{i}} \hat{\varsigma}_i^x - Jg \sum_{\langle \bar{i} \bar{j} \rangle} \hat{\varsigma}_i^z \hat{\varsigma}_j^z$$

same Hamiltonian but different couplings

$$J \leftrightarrow gJ$$

The $g = 1$ as self dual point. The paramagnetic phase of ς spins corresponds to ferromagnetic phase of σ spins, and vice-verse. Though ground state of paramagnetic phase of ς spins is unique, while ground state of ferromagnetic phase of σ spins is doubly degenerate. This is because domain wall description is two-to-one mapping. For example, $|\uparrow\uparrow : \downarrow\downarrow \dots\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow : \uparrow\uparrow \dots\rangle$ maps to single domain wall variable.

3 Getting the Kitaev chain from Ising model

In the following section, we are going to perform the Jordan-Wigner transformation to rewrite the spin variables as fermionic variables. Using Jordan-Wigner transformation, we will map the transverse field Ising system to a system of spinless fermions. This involves rewriting the Pauli matrices so that they look like creation and annihilation operators. Nevertheless, it has a caveat. The number operator does not commute with the Hamiltonian. So, we do Bogoliubov transformation which will take care of the problem, and we can study bulk property.

3.1 The Jordan-Wigner transformation

We define raising and lowering operator, $\hat{\sigma}_i^\pm$ for transverse field Ising chain as

$$\hat{\sigma}_i^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\sigma}_i^x \pm i\hat{\sigma}_i^y)$$

which satisfy the fermionic anti-commutation relations on the same site

$$\{\sigma_i^-, \sigma_i^+\} = 1, \quad \{\sigma_i^-, \sigma_i^-\} = \{\sigma_i^+, \sigma_i^+\} = 0$$

The raising and lowering operators acts on spins $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$ as:

$$\hat{\sigma}^-|\uparrow\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle, \quad \hat{\sigma}^+|\downarrow\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle$$

and a spin can be flipped only once

$$\hat{\sigma}^-(\hat{\sigma}^-|\uparrow\rangle) = 0, \quad \hat{\sigma}^+(\hat{\sigma}^+|\downarrow\rangle) = 0$$

Suppose we define the spin-up state as a hole, viz., $|\uparrow\rangle \equiv \circ$ and the spin-down state as a particle, viz., $|\downarrow\rangle \equiv \bullet$. In that case, we are tempted to identify raising and lowering operators as fermionic creation and annihilation operators:

$$\hat{\sigma}^- \rightarrow c^\dagger, \quad \hat{\sigma}^+ \rightarrow c$$

The $\hat{\sigma}_i^\pm, \hat{\sigma}_i^z$ are generators of lie algebra isomorphic to fermionic creation and annihilation operators, $c_i^\dagger, c_i, n_i \equiv c_i^\dagger c_i$. Since, spins can be flipped only once can be realized as Pauli exclusion. In fact we are more tempted to identify $\hat{\sigma}_i^\pm$ as fermionic creation and annihilation operators. Albeit, it is not the case. The fermionic operators anticommute on different site, i.e., $\{c_i, c_j\} = \{c_i^\dagger, c_j^\dagger\} = 0$. But, raising and lowering operator, they commute on different sites (Bosonic)

$$[\sigma_i^+, \sigma_j^-] = 0, \quad [\sigma_i^-, \sigma_j^+] = 0; \quad i \neq j$$




Figure 6: Realization of Quantum Ising model as hardcore bosons on a chain.

In fact, the raising and lowering operators should appropriately be treated as creation and annihilation operator of hard-core bosons (fig. 6).

In, 1928, Jordan and Wigner [11] performed a transformation which recovers the true fermions commutation relations from spin-operators given by the following identification:

$$\hat{\sigma}_i^+ = \prod_{j<i} (1 - 2c_j^\dagger c_j) c_i$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_i^- = \prod_{j<i} (1 - 2c_j^\dagger c_j) c_i^\dagger$$

The Jordan-Wigner transformation can be inverted by identifying $\hat{\sigma}_i^z = 1 - 2c_i^\dagger c_i$:²

$$c_i = \prod_{j<i} (\hat{\sigma}_j^z) \hat{\sigma}_i^+, \quad c_i^\dagger = \prod_{j<i} (\hat{\sigma}_j^z) \hat{\sigma}_i^-$$

To simplify the algebra further, it is convenient to rotate the spin axes by angle $\pi/2$ about y -axis, so that $\hat{\sigma}_i^z \rightarrow \hat{\sigma}_i^x$ and $\hat{\sigma}_i^x \rightarrow -\hat{\sigma}_i^z$. In this frame, $\hat{\sigma}_i^z = -(\hat{\sigma}_i^+ + \hat{\sigma}_i^-)$ and in terms of fermionic operators

²Note: the fermionic operators are non-local since they depend on the state on each lattice site. The spin operator is only defined at a point (local), while the fermionic operator depends on the spin values along a whole line starting from the left boundary and ending at a given location.

$$\hat{\sigma}_i^x = 1 - 2c_i^\dagger c_i, \quad \hat{\sigma}_i^z = - \prod_{j<i} (1 - 2c_j^\dagger c_j)(c_i + c_i^\dagger)$$

Substituting expression for $\sigma_i^{x,z}$ into Hamiltonian of quantum Ising model eq. (10), we get

$$\mathcal{H}_{JW} = -J \sum_i (c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} + c_{i+1}^\dagger c_i + c_i^\dagger c_{i+1}^\dagger + c_{i+1} c_i - 2g c_i^\dagger c_i + g) \quad (11)$$

As mentioned earlier, because of term like $c_i^\dagger c_{i+1}^\dagger$ and $c_{i+1} c_i$, fermion number is not conserved. Nevertheless, since the additional terms are quadratic in the fermionic operator, so we can diagonalize the Hamiltonian. However, we should be careful about boundary condition. If the spin chain has a periodic boundary condition then the fermionic chain have an anti-periodic (periodic) boundary condition if there are even (odd) number of fermions [17]. The open boundary Ising model maps to an open boundary fermionic chain.

Assuming the system is large, one expects the interior of the chain to be the same for both boundary conditions. The key difference is the appearance of Majorana-zero-modes on the two ends in the open chain. The closed chain has a unique ground state, while the open-chain has degenerate ground state.

The Hamiltonian in eq. (11) is very similar to the famous Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_{Kitaev} = \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\underbrace{-\frac{t}{2}(c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_{j+1})}_{\text{tight binding}} - \underbrace{\mu c_j^\dagger c_j}_{\text{chemical potential}} + \underbrace{\frac{\Delta}{2}(c_j^\dagger c_{j+1}^\dagger + h.c.)}_{\text{mean field p-wave superconducting term}} \right] \quad (12)$$

where $\Delta, t > 0$. For $\mu > t$ the system forms a non-topological phase without Majorana modes in the open chain. While for $\mu < t$ a topological phase emerges with Majorana zero modes in the open chain. In special case $t = \Delta$, we identify Kitaev's Hamiltonian same as quantum Ising Hamiltonian eq. (11).

3.2 The Bogoliubov Transformation

In 1958, Nikolay Bogoliubov and John George Valatin independently developed the Bogoliubov transformation for finding solutions of BCS theory in

a homogeneous system [12, 13]. Before Bogoliubov transformation, first We will do Fourier transformation of the fermionic operators. Substituting

$$c_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j c_j e^{ikx_j}$$

in Hamiltonian in eq. (11), we get

$$\mathcal{H}_f = \sum_k (2[Jg - J \cos(ka)]c_k^\dagger c_k + iJ \sin(ka)[c_{-k}^\dagger c_k^\dagger + c_{-k} c_k] - Jg) \quad (13)$$

Here a is the lattice constant which we can fix to unity. Ignoring constant term, the Hamiltonian in eq. (13) can also be written in standard Bogoliubov-de Gennes form

$$\mathcal{H}_{BdG} = J \sum_k \Psi_k^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} g - \cos k & -i \sin k \\ i \sin k & -g + \cos k \end{pmatrix} \Psi_k \quad (14)$$

where

$$\Psi_k = \begin{pmatrix} c_{-k} \\ c_k^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$$

The particle-hole operator, \mathcal{P} is identified by an operator that exchanges the creation and annihilation parts of Ψ_k ,

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{I}_{N \times N} \otimes \sigma^x \kappa$$

Above, σ^x is the first Pauli matrix acting on spin-degrees of freedom, and κ is the complex conjugation operator. The squared operator $\mathcal{P}^2 = +1$ and $\{\mathcal{H}_{BdG}, \mathcal{P}\} = 0$. Given a solution with energy ϵ and momentum k , particle-hole symmetry dictates, in general, the presence of a solution with energy $-\epsilon$ and momentum $-k$.

Now, we will diagonalize the Hamiltonian by Bogoliubov transformation. We define fermionic operators $\{\gamma_k\}$ whose number is conserved:

$$\gamma_k = u_k c_k - i v_k c_{-k}^\dagger$$

In the context of BCS theory, γ_k -fermions are usually called *Bogoliubons* which is a mixture of electron and hole. To respect normalization condition, u_k and v_k satisfies following property:

$$u_k^2 + v_k^2 = 1; u_{-k} = u_k; v_{-k} = -v_k \quad (15)$$

The anti-commutation relations are preserved by this transformation:

$$\{\gamma_k, \gamma_l^\dagger\} = \delta_{kl}; \{\gamma_k^\dagger, \gamma_l^\dagger\} = \{\gamma_k, \gamma_l\} = 0$$

The following choice of u_k and v_k suffices the property (eq. (15)):

$$u_k = \cos\left(\frac{\theta_k}{2}\right), v_k = \sin\left(\frac{\theta_k}{2}\right)$$

$$\tan(\theta_k) = \frac{\sin(k)}{g - \cos(k)}$$

On substituting c_k in eq. (13), we indeed get diagonalized Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_k \epsilon_k (\gamma_k^\dagger \gamma_k - \frac{1}{2}) \quad (16)$$

where

$$\epsilon_k = 2J \sqrt{1 + g^2 - 2g \cos(k)}$$




Figure 7: Plot of ϵ_k with different values of g .

The energy gap vanishes at criticality, $g = g_c$ fig. 7. In the long wavelength limit, the energy gap goes as

$$\epsilon_k = 2J \sqrt{(1 - g)^2 + (k)^2};$$

4 Physics of Kitaev Chain

One can formally define Majorana operators, where two Majorana fermions describe one fermionic state,

$$a_j = c_j^\dagger + c_j, \quad b_j = i(c_j - c_j^\dagger)$$

with the properties

$$a_j^\dagger = a_j, \quad b_j^\dagger = b_j$$

$$\{a_j, a_{j'}\} = 2\delta_{jj'}; \quad \{b_j, b_{j'}\} = 2\delta_{jj'}; \quad \{a_j, b_{j'}\} = 0$$

On rewriting Hamiltonian in eq. (11) in terms of Majorana operators, we get

$$\mathcal{H} = iJ \sum_j (a_j b_{j+1} + g a_j b_j)$$

In limit $g \gg 1$, the coupling dominates between Majorana modes a_i and b_i at the same lattice site. The energy cost for each Majorana pair is gJ , and the chain has a gaped bulk and no zero-energy edge states (fig. 8).




Figure 8: Majorana Chain in two limits: $g \gg 1$ and $g \rightarrow 0$. In former limit, the Majoranas ‘pair up’ at the same lattice site. In the latter, Majoranas couple at adjacent lattice sites, leaving two ‘unpaired’ Majorana zero-modes b_0 and a_N at the ends of the chain.

Limit $g \rightarrow 0$, couples Majorana fermions only at adjacent lattice sites with energy cost J . The ends of the chain now support ‘unpaired’ zero-energy Majorana modes. Hence, we have a one-dimensional system with

a gaped bulk and zero energy states at the edges. However, it should be noted that Majorana zero-modes solutions are not restricted to the extreme limit of $g \rightarrow 0$. As long as the bulk gap is open, Majorana zero modes are protected. This kind of topological protection is a generic characterization of topological edge modes that define the topological phase. Entering and exiting topological phase requires a closing of the bulk gap, which is referred to as topological quantum phase transition (fig. 7).




Figure 9: Plot of dispersion relation for particle-hole symmetric Hamiltonian. For different value of coupling parameter g . The bulk gap closes at $g = 1$.

The particle-hole energy spectrum is symmetric around zero energy (fig. 9). When $g \rightarrow 0$, we have two zero energy levels, corresponding to the Majorana zero modes which are localized far away from each other and separated by a gaped medium. It is not possible to move these levels from zero energy individually (as one needs to respect particle-hole symmetry). The only way to split the Majorana modes in energy is first to close the bulk energy gap [18].

We see in fig. 8, for topological non-trivial phase, we get two free Majorana edge modes for free boundary condition, i.e., $[H, b_0] = [H, a_N] = 0$. We can form as Dirac fermion from edge state

$$d^\dagger = \frac{b_0 + ia_N}{2}$$

The d -fermion can either be occupied or empty corresponding to two degenerate ground state. In bulk, the ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases look identical. Still, the ferromagnetic phase for spins maps onto a topologically non-trivial phase of the fermion with no order parameter, just edge states. The d -fermion can be used as q-bits

$$|\uparrow\rangle = d^\dagger|0\rangle; \quad |\downarrow\rangle = |0\rangle$$

These q-bits are topologically protected from decoherence. In practice, finite wire at $T > 0$ can be realized using a spin-orbit coupled wire, proximity induced superconductivity and external magnetic field [6, 7].

We see emerging Dirac physics where bulk gap closes. In long wavelength limit, the Bogoliubov-de Gennes Hamiltonian in eq. (14) can be written in terms of Pauli matrices τ

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_k \Psi_k^\dagger H_{Dirac}(k) \Psi_k; \quad H_{Dirac}(k) = m\tau^z + Jk\tau^y$$

with mass³ $m = J(g - 1)$. When $m \rightarrow 0$, there are two energy eigenstates which are also eigenstates of τ^y . That means eigenstates are equal superposition of electrons and holes. They are in fact Majorana modes free to propagate in the chain with speed $v = J$.

Since $\epsilon_k \geq 0$, the ground state $|Gs.\rangle$ has no Bogoliubons, that is to say,

$$|Gs.\rangle = |0\rangle$$

with $\gamma_k|0\rangle = 0 \forall k$. The n^{th} excitation, $\gamma_{k_1}^\dagger \gamma_{k_2}^\dagger \dots \gamma_{k_n}^\dagger |0\rangle$, corresponds to excitations in quantum Ising model, viz., domain wall formation in ferromagnetic phase and spin flip in paramagnetic phase. The ground state in terms of c_k -fermions can be calculated by writing wave-function as an arbitrary combination of Cooper pairs:⁴

$$|Gs.\rangle = \mathcal{N} \prod_q e^{\alpha_q c_{-q}^\dagger c_q} |0\rangle_c$$

and using property

$$\gamma_k |Gs.\rangle = 0 \implies u_k c_k |Gs.\rangle = v_k c_{-k}^\dagger |Gs.\rangle$$

The ground state in terms c_k -fermions is

$$|Gs.\rangle = u_k^2 \prod_k (1 + \psi_{Cp.}(k) c_{-k}^\dagger c_k) |0\rangle_c$$

where $\psi_{Cp.}(k)$ can be loosely interpreted as wave-function of Cooper pairs [6]. In real space,

$$|\psi_{Cp.}(x)| = \left| \int_k e^{ipx} \psi_{Cp.}(k) \right| \sim \begin{cases} e^{-|x|/\zeta}, & g \gg 1 \\ \text{const.}, & g \rightarrow 0 \end{cases}$$

The limit $g \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to the weak pairing of Cooper pairs of infinite size. The weak pairing is topologically non-trivial. Whereas, the limit $g \gg 1$

³To shorten notations, we will often employ units such that $\hbar = k_B = 1$.

⁴The subscript c is used to make distinction between Bogoliubons vacuum state and c -fermions vacuum state.

corresponds to the strong pairing of Cooper pairs over a length scale of ζ . The strong pairing is topologically trivial.

We end our discussion with a remark that despite the entire energy spectrum of two models are equivalent. However, the states in the fermionic model are topologically ordered, while the spin model is conventionally ordered in the sense of a spontaneously broken symmetry. Both these models have a two-fold degenerate ground state. It is non-locality of the Jordan-Wigner transformation which triggers a dichotomy of mathematical equivalence and a physical inequivalence [19].

5 Conclusion

This review article involves detailed mapping of the classical Ising model to Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor. We started with the description of classical Ising model and its quantum cousin transverse field quantum Ising model. The JordanWigner transformations of spin operators in quantum Ising model leads to Hamiltonian whose mathematical structure was similar to Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor which has its application in fault-tolerant quantum computing. We have analyzed how a quantum Ising model can (as far as energy spectrum is concerned) be mapped into a fermion model with non-trivial topological properties, the 1D p-wave superconductor studied by Kitaev [4]. It is possible to experimentally design Kitaev's toy model using: a 1D wire with appreciable spin-orbit coupling, conventional s-wave superconductor, and external magnetic field [6, 7].

Acknowledgment

I want to thank Prof. PK Mohanty for his support and guidance. I would also like to thank my parents, my sister, for their support.

Appendix

A Mapping Classical Ising model to Quantum Ising model

In the following section we will map 2D Classical Ising model to 1D Transverse field Quantum Ising model using transfer matrix approach. The procedure is followed from [9]. The Hamiltonian for the classical two-dimensional

Ising model of m rows and n columns with anisotropic couplings is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_C = - \sum_{i,j} \left[J_h S_{i,j} S_{i+1,j} + J_v S_{i,j} S_{i,j+1} \right]$$

Let $\mu_i = \{S_{i,1}, S_{i,2} \dots S_{i,n}\}$ be the configuration of spins on the i^{th} row, then the energy of i^{th} row configuration (fig. 10) and i^{th} and j^{th} row interaction is given by

$$E[\mu_i] = J_v \sum_{k=1}^n S_{i,k} S_{i,k+1}; \quad E[\mu_i, \mu_j] = J_h \sum_{k=1}^m S_{i,k} S_{j,k}$$




Figure 10: Configurational energy of i^{th} row and energy interaction between i^{th} and j^{th} row.

The transfer matrix T is defined by

$$T_{\mu_j}^{\mu_i} = \langle \mu_i | T | \mu_j \rangle = \exp \left[-\beta (E[\mu_i, \mu_j] + \frac{1}{2} E[\mu_i] + \frac{1}{2} E[\mu_j]) \right]$$

Now, the partition function, \mathcal{Z} in terms of T can be written as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \sum_{\mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_m} \langle \mu_1 | T | \mu_2 \rangle \langle \mu_2 | T | \mu_3 \rangle \dots \langle \mu_m | T | \mu_1 \rangle = \text{Tr} T^m$$

where we have used periodic boundary condition. We can write the transfer matrix, $T_{\mu_j}^{\mu_i}$ in terms of two matrices, T_h and T_v as

$$T_{\mu}^{\mu'} = \sum_{\mu''} [T_h]_{\mu}^{\mu''} [T_v]_{\mu''}^{\mu'}$$

Here the summation is over all possible spin configurations of the i^{th} row, and $[T_h]_{\mu}^{\mu''} = \exp(K_h E[\mu]) \delta_{\mu}^{\mu''}$ and $[T_v]_{\mu'}^{\mu''} = \exp(K_v E[\mu'', \mu'])$ with $K_h = \beta J_h$ and $K_v = \beta J_v$.⁵ Now, if we Taylor expand T_h in limit $K_h \ll 1$:

$$[T_h]_{\mu}^{\mu''} = \delta_{\mu}^{\mu''} \left(1 + K_h \sum_{x=1}^n (S_{ix} \delta_{S_{ix}}^{S''_{ix}}) (S_{i,x+1} \delta_{S_{i,x+1}}^{S''_{i,x+1}}) \right)$$

Since, the spins take values ± 1 , we define relation:

$$[\hat{\sigma}_x^z]_{S_{1x}}^{S''_{1x}} = S_{ix} \delta_{S_{ix}}^{S''_{ix}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

This relation brings us to

$$T_h = e^{H_h}$$

$$\text{where, } H_h = -K_h \sum_{x=1}^n \hat{\sigma}_x^z \hat{\sigma}_{x+1}^z$$

T_v can be written as

$$[T_v]_{\mu'}^{\mu''} = \prod_{x=1}^n e^{K_v S''_{ix} S_{jx}}$$

and by taking $K_v \gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned} [e^{K_v S''_{ix} S_{jx}}]_{S''_{ix}}^{S_{jx}} &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{K_v} & e^{-K_v} \\ e^{-K_v} & e^{K_v} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= e^{K_v} (I + e^{-2K_v} \sigma_{ix}^x) \\ &\approx e^{K_v} e^{-2K_v \hat{\sigma}_{ix}^x} \end{aligned}$$

The mapping is being done for anisotropic 2D Ising model. However, $K_h \ll 1$ and $K_v \gg 1$ are not necessary conditions and the result can be generalized to arbitrary dimension [20]. By combining all into one

$$\begin{aligned} T &= e^{K_v n} e^{-\beta H} \\ H &= -\gamma \sum_{x=1}^n \hat{\sigma}_x^x - J_h \sum_{x=1}^n \hat{\sigma}_x^z \hat{\sigma}_{x+1}^z \end{aligned}$$

with $\gamma = e^{-2\beta J_v} / \beta$. On comparing with quantum Ising Hamiltonian (eq. (10)) we can identify

$$\begin{aligned} g\beta J &= e^{-2\beta J_v} \\ J &= J_h \end{aligned}$$

⁵We absorbed coupling parameter $J_{j/h}$ in inverse temperature. We are allowed to do so if we redefine $E[\mu_i]$ and $E[\mu_i, \mu_j]$.

B Mapping Quantum Ising model to Classical Ising model

In the following section we will map Quantum Ising model to Classical. The procedure is followed from [10] by introducing imaginary time-slicing. For quantum Ising model in transverse field, the Hamiltonian can be written in two terms:

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z, \quad \mathcal{H}_1 = -Jg \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x$$

We can write the partition function \mathcal{Z} by slicing inverse temperature β into several L parts such that $\beta = L\Delta\tau$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z} &= \text{Tr} e^{-\beta\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \text{Tr}[e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} \dots e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}}] \\ &= \sum_{\{S^z\}} \langle S^z | e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} \dots e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} | S^z \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $|S^z\rangle \equiv |S_1^z\rangle \otimes |S_2^z\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |S_N^z\rangle$ and $|S_i^z\rangle$ is the spin at lattice point i on the ring. Since, $\sum_{\{S^z\}} |S^z\rangle \langle S^z| = 1$,⁶ we will insert this identity indexed with l between every $e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}}$ and the partition function then is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z} &= \sum_{\{S_{i,l}^z\}} \langle S_{1,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} | S_{L,l}^z \rangle \langle S_{L,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} | S_{L-1,l}^z \rangle \\ &\quad \dots \langle S_{2,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} | S_{1,l}^z \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Note, in $|S_{i,l}^z\rangle$ the first index i is lattice site and index l is for imaginary time. We can expand $e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_0 - \Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_1}$ using Suzuki-Trotter approximation as

$$e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_0 - \Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_1} = e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_0} e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_1} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta\tau^2[\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1])$$

with approximation $\Delta\tau J \ll 1$. Since, \mathcal{H}_0 acts on eigen state of σ^z , we can evaluate $\langle S_{i+1,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} | S_{i,l}^z \rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S_{i+1,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_0} e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_1} | S_{i,l}^z \rangle &= \langle S_{i+1,l}^z | e^{\Delta\tau J \sum_{i=1}^N S_{i,l} S_{i+1,l}} e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}_1} | S_{i,l}^z \rangle \\ &= e^{\Delta\tau J \sum_{i=1}^N S_{i,l} S_{i+1,l}} \langle S_{i+1,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau h \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^x} | S_{i,l}^z \rangle \end{aligned}$$

⁶A state in lattice point i , is in 2 dimensional Hilbert space \mathbb{H}^2 . One choice of complete set of basis is: $\{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}$.

Using identity $e^{\Delta\tau h\sigma_i^x} = \mathbb{I} \cosh(\Delta\tau h) + \sigma_i^x \sinh(\Delta\tau h)$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \uparrow | e^{\Delta\tau h\sigma_i^x} | \uparrow \rangle &= \cosh(\Delta\tau h) \equiv \Lambda e^\gamma \\ \langle \downarrow | e^{\Delta\tau h\sigma_i^x} | \downarrow \rangle &= \cosh(\Delta\tau h) \equiv \Lambda e^\gamma \\ \langle \downarrow | e^{\Delta\tau h\sigma_i^x} | \uparrow \rangle &= \sinh(\Delta\tau h) \equiv \Lambda e^{-\gamma} \\ \langle \uparrow | e^{\Delta\tau h\sigma_i^x} | \downarrow \rangle &= \sinh(\Delta\tau h) \equiv \Lambda e^{-\gamma}\end{aligned}$$

where γ and Λ can be indentified as

$$\gamma = -\frac{1}{2} \log(\tanh(\Delta\tau h)), \quad \Lambda^2 = \sinh(\Delta\tau h) \cosh(\Delta\tau h)$$

and

$$\langle S^z | e^{\Delta\tau h\sigma_i^x} | \rangle \equiv \Lambda e^{\gamma S^z}$$

with this new definition

$$\langle S_{i+1,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau \mathcal{H}_0} e^{-\Delta\tau \mathcal{H}_1} | S_{i,l}^z \rangle = \Lambda^N e^{\Delta\tau J \sum_{i=1}^N S_{i,l} S_{i+1,l} + \gamma \sum_{i=1}^L S_{i,l} S_{i,l+1}}$$

With this the partition function is

$$\mathcal{Z} = \Lambda^{NL} \sum_{\{S_{i,l}^z\}} e^{\Delta\tau J \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^L S_{i,l} S_{i+1,l} + \gamma \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^N S_{i,l} S_{i,l+1}}$$

We can identify the partition function above similar to the partition function for a two-dimensional anisotropic classical model with $\beta J_x = \Delta\tau J$ and $\beta J_y = \gamma$. With this, we complete our discussion on Classical-Quantum Ising model correspondence.

References

- [1] Ernst Ising. *Beitrag zur Theorie des Ferromagnetismus*. PhD thesis, February 1925.
- [2] Lars Onsager. Crystal statistics. i. a two-dimensional model with an order-disorder transition. *Phys. Rev.*, 65:117–149, Feb 1944.
- [3] Leo P. Kadanoff. Scaling laws for ising models near T_c . *Physics Physique Fizika*, 2:263–272, Jun 1966.
- [4] A. Yu Kitaev. 6. QUANTUM COMPUTING: Unpaired Majorana fermions in quantum wires. *Physics Uspekhi*, 44(10S):131, October 2001.

- [5] Gennady Y. Chitov. Local and nonlocal order parameters in the kitaev chain. *Phys. Rev. B*, 97:085131, Feb 2018.
- [6] Jason Alicea. New directions in the pursuit of majorana fermions in solid state systems. *Reports on progress in physics. Physical Society*, 75 7:076501, 2012.
- [7] Stevan Nadj-Perge, Ilya Drozdov, Jian Li, Hua Chen, Sangjun Jeon, Jungpil Seo, A. Macdonald, B Bernevig, and Ali Yazdani. Observation of majorana fermions in ferromagnetic atomic chains on a superconductor. *arXiv:1410.0682*, 346, 10 2014.
- [8] John B. Kogut. An introduction to lattice gauge theory and spin systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 51:659–713, Oct 1979.
- [9] Sjabbo Schaveling. The two dimensional ising model. Master’s thesis, Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics, Universiteit van Amsterdam, February 2016.
- [10] Paolo Molignini. Analyzing the two dimensional ising model with conformal field theory, 2013.
- [11] P. Jordan and E. Wigner. Über das Paulische Äquivalenzverbot. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 47(9-10):631–651, September 1928.
- [12] J. G. Valatin. Comments on the theory of superconductivity. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, 7(6):843–857, March 1958.
- [13] N. N. Bogoljubov. On a new method in the theory of superconductivity. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, 7(6):794–805, March 1958.
- [14] R J Baxter and I G Enting. 399th solution of the ising model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 11(12):2463–2473, dec 1978.
- [15] Sacha Friedli and Yvan Velenik. *Statistical Mechanics of Lattice Systems: A Concrete Mathematical Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [16] H. A. Kramers and G. H. Wannier. Statistics of the two-dimensional ferromagnet. part i. *Phys. Rev.*, 60:252–262, Aug 1941.
- [17] Sei Suzuki, Jun-ichi Inoue, and Bikas Chakrabarti. *Quantum Ising Phases and Transitions in Transverse Ising Models*, volume 862. 01 2013.

- [18] Jay Sau. Kitaev chain and bulk-edge correspondence, 2013.
- [19] Martin Greiter, Vera Schnells, and Ronny Thomale. The 1d ising model and topological order in the kitaev chain. *Annals of Physics*, 351, 02 2014.
- [20] R. J. Elliott, P. Pfeuty, and C. Wood. Ising model with a transverse field. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 25:443–446, Aug 1970.
- [21] David Sncchal Philippe Francesco, Pierre Mathieu. *Conformal Field Theory*. Graduate Texts in Contemporary Physics. Springer-Verlag New York, 1997.
- [22] Subir Sachdev. *Quantum Phase Transitions*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [23] Paolo Molignini. The ising model in conformal field theory, 2013.
- [24] Kerson Huang. *Statistical Mechanics*. John Wiley and Sons, 1987.