

From Ising model to Kitaev Chain

An introduction to topological phase transitions

Kartik Chhajed

Department of Physical Science, IISER Mohali, Punjab, India

May 23, 2022

Abstract

In this general article, we map the one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model of ferromagnetism to Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor, which has its application in fault-tolerant topological quantum computing. Kitaev Chain is an example of a new class of quantum critical phenomena, the topological phase transition. Mapping Pauli's spin operators of one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model to spinless fermionic creation and annihilation operator by JordanWigner transformation leads to a Hamiltonian form closely related to Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor.

1 Introduction

In 2001, Kitaev proposed a one-dimensional toy model containing a tight-binding term and superconducting term for spinless electrons [1]. Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor, which is an example of a topological phase transition falls into Ising universality class for a given symmetry point [2]. Kitaev Chain 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 [3, 4].

In section 2, we start with a description of the quantum cousin of two-dimensional classical Ising model, viz., one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model, giving a brief overview of the phase transition occurring in the model. In principle it is possible to map $d + 1$ dimensional classical Ising model to d dimensional quantum Ising model [5, 6]. In appendix A, as a special case, we map $1D$ transverse Ising model to $2D$ classical Ising model.

In section 3, we mapped the quantum Ising model to spinless fermionic theory via JordanWigner Transformation [7, 8]. 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 [9, 10]. In section 4, we study the physics of Kitaev Model, highlighting the emergence of topologically protected Majorana-zero modes.

2 Transverse field Quantum Ising model

In the following section, we discuss the quantum phase transition phenomena occurring in one-dimensional transverse field quantum Ising model. Using Suzuki-Trotter formalism, it can be shown that ground state of d -dimensional transverse Ising model is equivalent to a certain $(d + 1)$ -dimensional classical Ising model. The readers can refer appendix A, where we have summarized the mapping of the ground state of $1D$ transverse Ising model to $2D$ classical Ising model by introducing imaginary time-slicing.

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 1D transverse Ising model

$$\mathcal{H}_Q = -Jg \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x - J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \quad (1)$$

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 dimensionless coupling parameter. The ferromagnetic interaction term, $\hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z$ favors aligned spins, whereas, the field term $\hat{\sigma}_i^x$ favors spins pointing in x direction. The system switches between the disordered ($g \gg 1$) and the ordered ($g \ll 1$) phase as one tunes coupling parameter. The $g = g_c = 1$ is critical point.

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

$$\zeta | \uparrow \uparrow \downarrow \dots \rangle = | \downarrow \downarrow \uparrow \dots \rangle$$

and since $\zeta^2 = 1$, and $\zeta \sigma_i^x \zeta = \sigma_i^x$ and $\zeta \sigma_i^z \zeta = -\sigma_i^z$, we conclude

$$[\mathcal{H}_Q, \zeta] = 0$$

2.1 Quantum Paramagnet

When $g \gg 1$,

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

the spins tend to align in direction of field with unique ground state:

$$|\psi_0\rangle = | \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \dots \rangle; \quad \zeta |\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle$$

The order parameter, viz., transverse magnetization, $\langle \hat{\sigma}^z \rangle$ is zero. Here the quasiparticle excitations corresponds to spin flip in negative x direction, i.e.,

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

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

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

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

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

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

then

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

In long wavelength limit, the quasi-particle excitation energy is $\epsilon_k \simeq \Delta + Jk^2$, where $\Delta = 2J(g - 1)$ is “bulk” energy gap. Similar calculation can be extended for ferromagnetic phase, and we see that gap for creating spin flip closes at $g = 1$ (fig. 1).




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

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, corresponding to two degenerate ground states

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

and non-zero order parameter. These ground state does not respect symmetry.

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

However, the linear combination of macroscopic ket states,

$$|\psi_\pm\rangle = \frac{|\psi_\uparrow\rangle \pm |\psi_\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}; \quad \zeta|\psi_\pm\rangle = \pm|\psi_\pm\rangle$$

preserve the symmetry. The degeneracy is lifted by N^{th} order perturbation theory with perturbation $V = -Jg \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x$, and N is number of Ising spins in the $1D$ chain. The effective Hamiltonian in $\{|\psi_\uparrow\rangle, |\psi_\downarrow\rangle\}$ basis is

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

The states $|\psi_\pm\rangle$ are splitted by $\delta = |E_+ - E_-| = \mathcal{O}(g^N)$. 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

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

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 in ferromagnetic phase are formation of domain walls

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

To respect periodic boundary condition, the domain wall formation comes in pairs at the independent sites. In this phase, the perturbation $V = -J \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^x$ moves the domain wall to its neighbouring sites. This suggests, if we follow similar calculation done for paramagnetic phase, we will get the quasiparticle excitation as $\epsilon_k = 2J(1 - g \cos k) \simeq \Delta + Jk^2$ in ferromagnetic phase. Here the bulk energy gap for domain wall formation is $\Delta = 2J(1 - g)$, and gap closes at $g = 1$ (fig. 1). The symmetric gap function for strongly coupled Ising and weakly coupled Ising about critical point suggests duality between two phases

$$J \leftrightarrow gJ$$

which can be shown more formally as KramersWannier duality [11].

2.3 KramersWannier duality

We define domain wall variables ζ_i^x and ζ_i^z as

$$\zeta_i^x := \sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z \text{ and } \zeta_i^z := \prod_{i > \bar{i}} \sigma_i^x$$

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

$$\zeta_i^x = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if domain wall at } \bar{i} \\ +1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and ζ_i^z 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 ζ variable is non-local, e.g., Majorana variables:

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

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

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

same Hamiltonian but different couplings

$$J \leftrightarrow gJ$$

The $g = 1$ is the self dual point. The paramagnetic phase of ζ spins corresponds to the ferromagnetic phase of σ spins, and vice-versa. Albeit, the ground state of the paramagnetic phase of ζ spins is unique, while the ground state of the 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. It 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. Since Hamiltonian is quadratic (no interactions), we can diagonalize Hamiltonian by doing 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 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 anti-commutation relations

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

The raising and lowering operators flips the spin

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

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 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 creation and annihilation operators, $c_i^\dagger, c_i, n_i \equiv c_i^\dagger c_i$. Since, spins can be flipped only once

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

the spins can be realized either as hard-core Bosons or as fermions satisfying Pauli exclusion. Since, the fermionic operators anticommute on different site, i.e., $\{c_i, c_j\} = \{c_i^\dagger, c_j^\dagger\} = 0$. whereas, the raising and lowering operators commute on different sites (Bosonic)

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

Therefore, raising and lowering operators should appropriately be treated as creation and annihilation operator of hard-core bosons (fig. 2).




Figure 2: Realization of Quantum Ising model as hardcore bosons on a chain.

In, 1928, Jordan and Wigner [8] 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 $\hat{\sigma}_i^z = 1 - 2c_i^\dagger c_i$:¹

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

¹Note: the fermionic operators are non-local since they depend on the state on each

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

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

Substituting expression for $\sigma_i^{x,z}$ into Hamiltonian of quantum Ising model eq. (1), we get

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

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 the boundary condition. If the spin chain has a periodic boundary condition, then the fermionic chain has an anti-periodic (periodic) boundary condition if there is even (odd) number of fermions [12]. 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. (2) is very similar to the famous Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Kitaev}} = \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\underbrace{-\frac{t}{2}(c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_{j+1})}_{\text{tight binding}} - \underbrace{\mu c_j^\dagger c_j}_{\text{chemical potential}} + \underbrace{\frac{\Delta}{2}(c_j^\dagger c_{j+1}^\dagger + h.c.)}_{\text{mean field p-wave superconducting term}} \right] \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta, t > 0$. In special case $t = \Delta$, we identify Kitaev's Hamiltonian same as quantum Ising Hamiltonian eq. (2). For $\mu > t$, the system forms a non-topological phase without Majorana modes in the open chain. Whereas for $\mu < t$, a topological phase emerges with Majorana zero modes in the open chain.

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.

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 [9, 10]. Before the Bogoliubov transformation, first, we will Fourier transform fermionic operators. Substituting

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

in Hamiltonian in eq. (2), we get

$$\mathcal{H}_f = \sum_k (2[Jg - J \cos(k)]c_k^\dagger c_k + iJ \sin(k)[c_{-k}^\dagger c_k^\dagger + c_{-k} c_k] - Jg) \quad (4)$$

Here a is the lattice constant which we can fix to unity. Ignoring constant term, the Hamiltonian in eq. (4) can also be written in standard Bogoliubov-de Gennes form

$$\mathcal{H}_{BdG} = J \sum_k \Psi_k^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} g - \cos k & -i \sin k \\ i \sin k & -g + \cos k \end{pmatrix} \Psi_k \quad (5)$$

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 ,

$$\mathcal{P} = \prod_k \sigma_k^x \kappa$$

Above, 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 doing Bogoliubov transformation. We define fermionic operators $\{\gamma_k\}$

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

In the context of BCS theory, γ_k -fermion are called *Bogoliubon* which are mixture of electron and hole. To respect normalization condition,

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

u_k and v_k should satisfies following property:

$$u_k^2 + v_k^2 = 1; u_{-k} = u_k; v_{-k} = -v_k \quad (6)$$

The following choice of u_k and v_k suffices the property (eq. (6)):

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

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

On substituting c_k in eq. (4), we indeed get diagonalized Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_k \epsilon_k (\gamma_k^\dagger \gamma_k - \frac{1}{2}) \quad (7)$$

where

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




Figure 3: Plot of ϵ_k with different values of g .

The energy gap vanishes at criticality, $g = g_c = 1$ fig. 3. In the long wavelength limit, the energy gap goes as

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

At critical point $g = g_c$,

$$\epsilon_k = 2J|k|$$

and we get dynamical critical exponent $\epsilon_k \sim k^z$, $z = 1$.

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. (2) 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. 4).




Figure 4: Majorana Chain in two limits: $g \gg 1$ and $g \rightarrow 0$. In the 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. 3).




Figure 5: 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. 5). 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.

We see in fig. 4, 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. The doubly degenerate ground state of 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 as Kitaev's Chain using a spin-orbit coupled wire, proximity induced superconductivity and external magnetic field [3, 4].

We see emerging Dirac physics where bulk gap closes. In long wavelength limit, the Bogoliubov-de Gennes Hamiltonian in eq. (5) 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 mass² $m = J(g - 1)$. 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:³

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

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 [3]. In real space,

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

²It is convenient to work in natural units, $\hbar = k = 1$.

³The subscript c is used to make distinction between Bogoliubons vacuum state and c -fermions vacuum state.

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 $g \gg 1$ 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 [13].

5 Conclusion

This review article involves a detailed mapping of the Ising model to Kitaev's one-dimensional p-wave superconductor. We started with the description of the transverse field quantum Ising model. The Jordan-Wigner 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. [1].

Acknowledgment

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

Appendix

A Mapping transverse Ising model to classical Ising model

In the following section, we will map 1D transverse Ising model to 2D classical Ising model by introducing imaginary time-slicing. There are two terms

in Hamiltonian

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

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, $\sum_{\{S^z\}} |S^z\rangle \langle S^z| = 1$, we will insert this identity indexed with l between every $e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}}$. The partition function then becomes

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

Note, in $|S_{i,l}^z\rangle$ the first index i is lattice site, and second 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 $\langle S_{i+1,l}^z | e^{-\Delta\tau\mathcal{H}} | S_{i,l}^z \rangle$:

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

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

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

with this new definition

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

The partition function

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

can identify as the partition function for a two-dimensional anisotropic classical Ising 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] A. Yu Kitaev. 6. QUANTUM COMPUTING: Unpaired Majorana fermions in quantum wires. *Physics Uspekhi*, 44(10S):131, October 2001.
- [2] Gennady Y. Chitov. Local and nonlocal order parameters in the kitaev chain. *Phys. Rev. B*, 97:085131, Feb 2018.
- [3] 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.
- [4] 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.
- [5] Masuo Suzuki. Relationship between d-Dimensional Quantal Spin Systems and (d+1)-Dimensional Ising Systems: Equivalence, Critical Exponents and Systematic Approximants of the Partition Function and Spin Correlations. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 56(5):1454–1469, 11 1976.

- [6] Masuo Suzuki. Relationship among Exactly Soluble Models of Critical Phenomena. I*): 2D Ising Model, Dimer Problem and the Generalized XY-Model. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 46(5):1337–1359, 11 1971.
- [7] Bruria Kaufman. Crystal statistics. ii. partition function evaluated by spinor analysis. *Phys. Rev.*, 76:1232–1243, Oct 1949.
- [8] P. Jordan and E. Wigner. Über das Paulische Äquivalenzverbot. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 47(9-10):631–651, September 1928.
- [9] J. G. Valatin. Comments on the theory of superconductivity. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, 7(6):843–857, March 1958.
- [10] N. N. Bogoljubov. On a new method in the theory of superconductivity. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, 7(6):794–805, March 1958.
- [11] H. A. Kramers and G. H. Wannier. Statistics of the two-dimensional ferromagnet. part i. *Phys. Rev.*, 60:252–262, Aug 1941.
- [12] Sei Suzuki, Jun-ichi Inoue, and Bikas Chakrabarti. *Quantum Ising Phases and Transitions in Transverse Ising Models*, volume 862. 01 2013.
- [13] Martin Greiter, Vera Schnells, and Ronny Thomale. The 1d ising model and topological order in the kitaev chain. *Annals of Physics*, 351, 02 2014.