

Tensor Product Variational Formulation for Quantum Systems

Yukinobu NISHIO, Nobuya MAESHIMA¹, Andrej GENDIAR², and Tomotoshi NISHINO*

Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science, Kobe University, rokkodai 657-8501

¹ *Cybermedia Center, Osaka University, Machikaneyama 1-43, Osaka 560-0043*
² *Institute of Electrical Engineering, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Dúbravská cesta 9, SK-842 39 Bratislava, Slovakia*

(Received)

We consider a variational problem for the two-dimensional (2D) Heisenberg and XY models, using a trial state which is constructed as a 2D product of local weights. Variational energy is calculated by use of the the corner transfer matrix renormalization group (CTMRG) method, and its upper bound is surveyed. The variational approach is a way of applying the density matrix renormalization group method (DMRG) to infinite size 2D quantum systems.

§1. Introduction

As a precise numerical method for one-dimensional (1D) quantum systems, the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) has been widely applied to unsolved problems in condensed matter physics.^{1), 2), 3), 4)} If the linear dimension of the system is not so large (\sim of the order of ten), the method is also applicable to 2D quantum models by use of a mapping from a finite size 2D cluster to a 1D chain that contains long-range interactions.^{5), 6)}

On the other hand, it is difficult to apply DMRG to infinitely large 2D quantum systems. Apparently the mapping from 2D lattice to 1D chain is inapplicable if the system size is infinite. In addition, the decay of the density matrix eigenvalue is very slow in higher dimensions,^{7), 8)} and the phenomenon prevents to obtain a good renormalization group transformation that maps half (or quarter) infinite 2D system into a block spin. ** A naive extension of DMRG formulation to higher dimension shall encounter very poor numerical results, as was reported in an application of DMRG to 3D classical systems.⁹⁾

Stepping back to the DMRG formulation for 1D systems, the numerical efficiency of DMRG partially comes from its variational structure, where a trial state is represented as a product of orthogonal matrices.^{10), 11), 12), 13)} It is possible to extend such a construction of variational state to 2D quantum and 3D classical systems. For these higher dimensional systems one has to prepare a trial states that are represented as 2D product of local weights. For example, Martín-Delgad, *et al.* employed the 6-vertex model as a trial state for 2D lattice spin/electron systems.¹⁴⁾ Okunishi

* E-mail address: nishino@phys.sci.kobe-u.ac.jp

** Existence of a good renormalization group transformation is not excluded, in case that the transformation is created some method other than the diagonalization of the density matrix.

and Nishino considered an extension of the Kramers-Wannier approximation¹⁵⁾ to the 3D Ising model, representing the trial state as the 2D Ising model under magnetic field,¹⁶⁾ or more generally as the interaction round a face (IRF) model.¹⁷⁾ Let us call these variational approaches as ‘the tensor product variational approach’ (TPVA) in the following.

In this paper we investigate the numerical efficiency of TPVA when it is applied to the square lattice $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg and XY models. We employ an isotropic and uniform IRF model as the trial state, that contains 3 adjustable parameters. Our trial state includes the one parameter variational state proposed by Suzuki and Miyashita for the study of square lattice XY model.^{18), 19)} The local construction of the variational state enables us to numerically calculate the energy expectation value by use of DMRG²⁰⁾ or by Monte Carlo simulations.²¹⁾

In the next section we explain the construction of the trial state, and the way of calculating the energy expectation value. We show the numerical result in §3, and discuss a way of improving the variational formulation in the last section.

§2. Construction of the Variational State

We consider the $S = 1/2$ XXZ model on the square lattice as an example of 2D quantum systems. Its Hamiltonian is represented as

$$H = \sum_{\{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\}} (S_{\mathbf{r}}^x S_{\mathbf{r}'}^x + S_{\mathbf{r}}^y S_{\mathbf{r}'}^y + \alpha S_{\mathbf{r}}^z S_{\mathbf{r}'}^z), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\}$ denotes pairs of neighboring lattice sites. The parameter α is chosen to be either 1 (the Heisenberg model) or zero (the XY model). Since the lattice is bipartite, the following Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H} = \sum_{\{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\}} (-S_{\mathbf{r}}^x S_{\mathbf{r}'}^x - S_{\mathbf{r}}^y S_{\mathbf{r}'}^y + \alpha S_{\mathbf{r}}^z S_{\mathbf{r}'}^z), \quad (2.2)$$

has the same energy spectrum as H . In the following we treat \tilde{H} instead of H for the purpose of simplifying the variational formulation.* Our interest is in finding out a good variational function that minimizes the energy expectation value

$$A = \frac{\langle \Psi | \tilde{H} | \Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle} \quad (2.3)$$

within the restriction where $|\Psi\rangle$ is represented as a product of local weights.

Let us introduce a notation $\sigma_{\mathbf{r}} = 2S_{\mathbf{r}}^z = \pm 1$, and write the trial wave function as $\Psi(\{\sigma\}) \equiv \langle \{\sigma\} | \Psi \rangle$, where $\{\sigma\}$ represents a spin configuration of all the spins on the 2D lattice. We employ a trial wave function in the form of the uniform product of local weights

$$\Psi(\{\sigma\}) = \prod_{\mathbf{r}} W \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{j}}} & \sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{i}}+\hat{\mathbf{j}}} \\ \sigma_{\mathbf{r}} & \sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{i}}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.4)$$

* One has to prepare two different local weights for H and multiply them alternatively when constructing the variational state. Note that the mapping from H to \tilde{H} has nothing to do with the elimination of negative sign from the local weight.

The weight W is a function of 4 neighboring spin variables $\sigma_{\mathbf{r}}$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{i}}}$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{j}}}$, and $\sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{i}}+\hat{\mathbf{j}}}$ where $\hat{\mathbf{i}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{j}}$ represent the unit lattice vector to X and Y directions, respectively. According to the symmetries of the Hamiltonian \hat{H} , the local weight has only 3 independent parameters, that are

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 &= W \begin{pmatrix} + & - \\ - & + \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} - & + \\ + & - \end{pmatrix} \\
 a &= W \begin{pmatrix} + & + \\ - & - \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} + & - \\ + & - \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} - & - \\ + & + \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} - & + \\ - & + \end{pmatrix} \\
 b &= W \begin{pmatrix} + & - \\ - & - \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} - & + \\ - & - \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} - & - \\ - & + \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} - & - \\ + & - \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= W \begin{pmatrix} - & + \\ + & + \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} + & - \\ + & + \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} + & + \\ + & - \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} + & + \\ - & + \end{pmatrix} \\
 c &= W \begin{pmatrix} - & - \\ - & - \end{pmatrix} = W \begin{pmatrix} + & + \\ + & + \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.5}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have written up and down spins by '+' and '-', respectively. Since we have constructed the trial state as a uniform product, the minimization of the variational ratio (Eq.(2.3)) is equivalent to the minimization of the local energy for an arbitrary bond

$$\lambda(a, b, c) = \frac{\langle \Psi | (-S_{\mathbf{r}}^x S_{\mathbf{r}'}^x - S_{\mathbf{r}}^y S_{\mathbf{r}'}^y + \alpha S_{\mathbf{r}}^z S_{\mathbf{r}'}^z) | \Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle}, \tag{2.6}$$

where \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' are neighboring lattice points. In addition, the product structure of the trial state enables us to obtain the denominator

$$\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle = \prod_{\mathbf{r}} \left[W \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{j}}} & \sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{i}}+\hat{\mathbf{j}}} \\ \sigma_{\mathbf{r}} & \sigma_{\mathbf{r}+\hat{\mathbf{i}}} \end{pmatrix} \right]^2 \tag{2.7}$$

as the partition function of the isotropic IRF model, which is specified by the local Boltzmann weight W^2 . Thus the norm of the trial state can be accurately calculated by use of DMRG applied to 2D classical systems.²²⁾ Similarly the numerator is also a partition function of an IRF model that has additional structure around the bond $\{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\}$ in Eq.(2.6), and can be calculated with sufficient numerical precision by DMRG as proposed by Hieida et al.²⁰⁾ We use CTMRG,^{23), 24)} which is a variant of DMRG, for the calculations of the following result.

§3. Calculated Result

The minimum of the variational energy $\lambda(a, b, c)$ in Eq.(2.6) can be detected by way of the parameter sweep for a , b , and c . Table I shows the optimal parameter sets that give the lowest variational energy λ_{\min} for the isotropic Heisenberg model ($\alpha = 1$) and the XY model ($\alpha = 0$). The diagonal spin correlation $S_{\mathbf{r}}^z S_{\mathbf{r}'}^z$ and the off-diagonal one $S_{\mathbf{r}}^x S_{\mathbf{r}'}^x$ between the neighboring sites are also shown. In both cases the

Table I. Variational Energy and the value of optimal variational parameters.

	$4\lambda_{\min}$	$S_{\mathbf{r}}^x S_{\mathbf{r}'}^x$	$S_{\mathbf{r}}^z S_{\mathbf{r}'}^z$	a	b	c
Heisenberg	- 1.3089	- 0.1245	- 0.0782	0.8342	0.7483	0.5075
XY	- 1.0848	- 0.1356	- 0.0383	0.9420	0.8796	0.6936

variational state is disordered, since there is no phase transition from the parameter limit $a = b = c = 1$ to the shown parameter cases. Even at the Heisenberg point, the state is not isotropic, as is observed from the difference between $S_{\mathbf{r}}^z S_{\mathbf{r}'}^z$ and $S_{\mathbf{r}}^x S_{\mathbf{r}'}^x$.

Table II. Energy expectation values.

	Heisenberg	XY
SM ¹⁸⁾		- 1.0743
TPVA	- 1.3089	- 1.0848
MC ²⁵⁾	- 1.33888	- 1.09764

Let us compare the calculated variational energy with two representative ground state energy estimations. Table II shows our result, a recent Monte Carlo (MC) result by Sandvik,²⁵⁾ and the variational energy calculated by Suzuki and Miyashita in 1978.¹⁸⁾ Our result for the Heisenberg (or the XY) model is 2.3 % (or 1.2 %) higher than the MC result.

§4. Discussions

As an application of DMRG for infinite size 2D quantum systems, we employ TPVA for the square lattice $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg and XY models. The obtained variational state is disordered even for the Heisenberg point, the result which suggests the loss of the antiferromagnetic correlation. The problem may be improved by increasing the variational parameter, as Nishino *et al* have introduced auxiliary variables to the local weight when they applied TPVA to 3D classical models.^{26), 27), 28)}

Acknowledgments

The authors thank to K. Okunishi, Y. Hieida, Y. Akutsu, and S. Miyashita for valuable discussions. The present research is partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid from Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan. A. G is supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (P01192) and by VEGA grant No. 2/3118/23.

References

- [1] S.R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992), 2863.
- [2] S.R. White, Phys. Rev. B **48** (1993), 10345.
- [3] *Density-Matrix Renormalization — A New Numerical Method in Physics*, Lecture notes in Physics, eds. I. Peschel, X. Wang, M. Kaulke, and K. Hallberg (Springer Verlag, 1999).
- [4] N. Shibata, J. Phys. A **36** (2003), 381.
- [5] S. Liang and H. Pang, Phys. Rev. B **49** (1994), 9214.
- [6] T. Xiang, J.Z. Lou, and Z.B. Su, Phys. Rev. B **64** (2001), 104414.
- [7] M.C. Chung and I. Peschel, Phys. Rev. B **62** (2000), 4191.

- [8] M.C. Chung and I. Peschel, *Phys. Rev. B* **64** (2000), 064412.
- [9] T. Nishino and K. Okunishi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **67** (1998), 3066.
- [10] S. Östlund and S. Rommer, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **75** (1995), 3537.
- [11] S. Rommer and S. Östlund, *Phys. Rev. B* **55** (1997), 2164.
- [12] J. Dukelsky, M.A. Martín-Delgado, T. Nishino and G. Sierra, *Europhys. Lett.* **43** (1998), 457.
- [13] M. Andersson, M. Boman, and S. Östlund, *Phys. Rev. B* **59** (1999), 10493.
- [14] M.A. Martín-Delgado, M. Roncaglia, and G. Sierra, *Phys. Rev. B* **64** (2001), 075117.
- [15] H.A. Kramers and G.H. Wannier, *Phys. Rev.* **60** (1941), 263.
- [16] K. Okunishi and T. Nishino, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **103** (2000), 541.
- [17] T. Nishino, K. Okunishi, Y. Hieida, N. Maeshima and Y. Akutsu, *Nucl. Phys. B* **575** (2000), 504.
- [18] M. Suzuki and S. Miyashita, *Can. J. Phys.* **56** (1978), 902.
- [19] S. Miyashita, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **53** (1984), 44.
- [20] Y. Hieida, K. Okunishi and Y. Akutsu, *New J. Phys.* **1** (1999), 7.
- [21] H. Niggemann, A. Klümper and J. Zittartz, *Z. Phys.* **B104** (1997), 103.
- [22] T. Nishino, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **64** (1995), 3598.
- [23] T. Nishino and K. Okunishi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **65** (1996), 891.
- [24] T. Nishino and K. Okunishi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **66** (1997), 3040.
- [25] A.W. Sandvik, *Phys. Rev. B* **60** (1999), 6588.
- [26] T. Nishino, Y. Hieida, K. Okunishi, N. Maeshima and Y. Akutsu, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **105** (2001), 409.
- [27] N. Maeshima, Y. Hieida, Y. Akutsu, T. Nishino, and K. Okunishi, *Phys. Rev. E* **64** (2001), 016705.
- [28] A. Gendiar, N. Maeshima, and T. Nishino, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **110** (2003), 691.