

Fidelity Susceptibility in One-dimensional Disordered Lattice Models

Bo-Bo Wei^{1,*}

¹*School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen 518172, China*

We investigate quantum phase transitions in one-dimensional quantum disordered lattice models, the Anderson model and the Aubry-André model, from the fidelity susceptibility approach. First, we find that the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility are maximum at the quantum critical points of the disordered models, through which one can locate the quantum critical point in disordered lattice models. Second, finite-size scaling analysis of the fidelity susceptibility and of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility show that the correlation length critical exponent and the dynamical critical exponent at the quantum critical point of the one-dimensional Anderson model are respectively $2/3$ and 2 and of the Aubry-André model are respectively 1 and 2.375 . Thus the quantum phase transitions in the Anderson model and in the Aubry-André model are of different universality classes. Because the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility are directly connected to the dynamical structure factor which are experimentally accessible in the linear response regime, the fidelity susceptibility in quantum disordered systems may be observed experimentally in near future.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum phase transitions (QPT) [1] occur at zero temperature when the control parameter in the Hamiltonian of a quantum many-body system is tuned to a critical value, termed quantum critical point (QCP). Quantum many-body system at its QCP exhibits scaling and universality, which states that the equilibrium properties of physical observable close to QCP can be characterized by a few critical exponents [1, 2]. To extract the entire phenomena at QCP, for instance the critical control parameter, the universal critical exponents, and the scaling functions, physical quantities borrowed from the quantum information science [3], such as the quantum entanglement [4, 5] and the quantum fidelity [6] and the fidelity susceptibility [7], have been extensively studied in various physical systems [4–39]. In contrast to the order parameter in characterizing phase transition, the advantage of using concepts in quantum information science in studying QPTs is that one does not need to know the microscopic symmetry of the quantum many-body systems in advance [8].

While most investigations of the fidelity susceptibility and QPTs concentrate on the traditional quantum systems driven by competing quantum Hamiltonian [6–39], the fidelity and fidelity susceptibility in characterizing localization-delocalization phase transitions in quantum disordered systems [40–42] are largely overlooked [18, 43]. A natural question is whether the fidelity and fidelity susceptibility can be used to locate the QCP in quantum disordered systems? Whether we can extract the universal critical exponents and the universal scaling functions of the QCP in quantum disordered systems from the fidelity and fidelity susceptibility? The aim of this paper is to provide solutions to these problems.

In this work, we study the the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility in two paradigmatic quantum disordered lattice models, namely the 1D Anderson model [40] and Aubry-André model [41, 42]. We show

that: (i). One can locate the quantum critical points in the 1D Anderson model and in the Aubry-André model from the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility. (ii). One can extract the correlation length critical exponent and the dynamical critical exponent of the QPT in the 1D Anderson model and in the Aubry-André model from the finite-size scaling analysis of the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility. Recently two beautiful experiments [44, 45], one with a real-random potential (Anderson model) [44] and the one with a quasi-periodic potential (Aubry-André model) [45], showed that cold atoms can be employed to simulate disorder effects in quantum lattice models. Meanwhile, the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility are directly connected to the dynamical structure factor [31, 34] which are experimental accessible in the linear response regime, thus the universality of fidelity susceptibility and of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility in the disordered lattice models report in this work could be experimentally observed in cold atoms.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly present the quantum disordered models and its quantum phase transitions. In Sec. III, we review the physics of fidelity and fidelity susceptibility. Sec. IV, we show the numerical results of the fidelity susceptibility in the Anderson model. In Sec. V, we present the numerical results of the fidelity susceptibility in the Aubry-André model. Finally, Sec. VI is a discussion and summary.

II. QUANTUM DISORDERED LATTICE MODELS

We consider the following disordered Hamiltonian in one-dimensional (1D) lattice

$$H(\Delta) = -J \sum_{i=1}^N (c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} + h.c.) + \Delta \sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_i c_i^\dagger c_i, \quad (1)$$

where c_i and c_i^\dagger are respectively the creation and annihilation operators at site i with $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, J is the hopping amplitude between nearest neighbor sites, ϵ_i is the onsite potential and Δ is the overall strength of the onsite potential. In the

*Electronic address: weibobo@cuhk.edu.cn

following, we take J as the unity of energy. In this work, we consider two kinds of disordered models defined by different form of local onsite potential ϵ_i .

The first kind of model is the Anderson like disorder [40], where the onsite potential distributed uniformly in the interval

$$\epsilon_i \in [-1, 1]. \quad (2)$$

For Anderson like disorder in one-dimension, all eigenstates of the system are localized for $\Delta > 0$ and all eigenstates are delocalized at $\Delta = 0$. Thus there is a quantum phase transition at $\Delta_c = 0$. It was shown that [49] the correlation length of the 1D Anderson model at the QCP diverges as $\xi \sim |\Delta - \Delta_c|^{1/\nu}$ with the correlation length critical exponent $\nu = 2/3$ and the energy gap above the ground state vanishes as $E_G \sim |\Delta - \Delta_c|^{1/z}$ with the dynamical critical exponent $z = 2$.

The second kind of disordered model is the Aubry-André(AA) model [41, 42], where the onsite potential is quasi-periodic,

$$\epsilon_i = \cos(2\pi\alpha i + \phi). \quad (3)$$

Here $\alpha = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the golden ratio. The disorder like effects in the AA model come from the incommensurability between the local potential and the lattice. Aubry and André shown that this model presents a QPT at $\Delta_c = 2$ from a delocalized phase ($\Delta < 2$) where all the eigenstates are extended to a localized phase ($\Delta > 2$) where all the eigenstates are localized. For finite size lattice, it is convenient to replace α by $\alpha_n = F_{n+1}/F_n$ where F_n and F_{n+1} are two consecutive Fibonacci numbers and it is well known that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{n+1}/F_n = \alpha$. The lattice size can be chosen as $N = F_n$ for periodic boundary conditions. It was shown that [49] the correlation length of the Aubry-André model at the QCP diverges as $\xi \sim |\Delta - \Delta_c|^{1/\nu}$ with the correlation length critical exponent $\nu = 1$ and the energy gap vanishes as $E_G \sim |\Delta - \Delta_c|^{1/z}$ with the dynamical critical exponent $z \approx 2.374$.

Quantum Phase transitions induced by true random disorder and induced by quasi-periodic potential are of different universality classes as demonstrated by superfluid density [49]. Because the Anderson model and the Aubry and André are two paradigmatic models for understanding localization transitions, this novel phase transitions well deserve theoretical studies in more physical observable. Next, we show the physics of the fidelity susceptibility and of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility and their relations to QPTs.

III. FIDELITY SUSCEPTIBILITY AND QUANTUM PHASE TRANSITIONS

Let us consider a family of many body systems with Hamiltonian

$$H(\lambda) = H_0 + \lambda H_1, \quad (4)$$

where H_0 and H_1 are two competing Hermitian operators and λ is a control parameter. We assume that the many-body system described by $H(\lambda)$ undergoes a second order QPT at a




FIG. 1: (color online). Universal finite size scaling of the fidelity susceptibility in the 1D Anderson model. (a). Fidelity susceptibility $\chi_F(N, \Delta)$ as a function of disorder strength Δ for different lattice sizes, $N = 50$ (red circle), $N = 100$ (blue square), $N = 150$ (green upper triangle), $N = 200$ (magenta lower triangle). (b). Scaled fidelity susceptibility $\chi_F(N, \Delta)/\chi_{F,max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$. All curves for different system sizes collapse into a single curve when we choose the correlation length critical exponents $\nu = 0.667$ and $\Delta_m = 0$.

critical point $\lambda = \lambda_c$. Close to the QCP, the correlation length diverges $\xi \propto |\lambda - \lambda_c|^{-\nu}$ with ν being the correlation length critical exponent and the gap above the ground state vanishes as $E_G \propto |\lambda - \lambda_c|^{1/z}$ with z being the dynamical critical exponent. The universal critical exponents ν and z classify the universality of QPT and govern the universal scaling of physical observable close to QCP. In the following, we will review how to extract the critical exponents ν and z from the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility.

The ground state fidelity is defined as [6] the overlap between ground states at two different parameters λ and $\lambda + \delta\lambda$,

$$F(\lambda, \delta\lambda) = |\langle \Psi_0(\lambda) | \Psi_0(\lambda + \delta\lambda) \rangle|. \quad (5)$$

The fidelity depends on two parameters λ and $\delta\lambda$, where $\delta\lambda$ is usually taken to be small. Because the quantum states of a many-body system within one macroscopic phase are similar, the fidelity is approximately one when two ground states are in the same phase. While the ground states at two sides of a QCP are qualitatively different, and thus one may expect that the fidelity exhibits a sharp drop at the QCP. The dominate contributions in the fidelity is the fidelity susceptibility [7],




FIG. 2: (color online). Universal finite size scaling of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility χ_4 in the 1D Anderson model. (a). The natural logarithm of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility $\chi_4(N, \Delta)$ as a function of disorder strength Δ for different lattice sizes, $N = 50$ (red circle), $N = 100$ (blue square), $N = 150$ (green upper triangle), $N = 200$ (magenta lower triangle). (b). The logarithm of the maximum of generalized adiabatic susceptibility as a function of the logarithm of the system sizes. Linear fit shows that $z = 1.982$. (c). Scaled fidelity susceptibility $\chi_4(N, \Delta)/\chi_{4, \max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$. All curves for different system sizes collapse into a single curve when we choose the correlation length critical exponents $\nu = 0.667$ and $\Delta_m = 0$.

which may be defined as,

$$\chi_F(\lambda) = \lim_{\delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{-2 \ln F(\lambda, \delta\lambda)}{(\delta\lambda)^2}. \quad (6)$$

In the eigen states representation of the Hamiltonian, the fidelity susceptibility is [7]

$$\chi_F(\lambda) = \sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{|\langle \Psi_n(\lambda) | H_1 | \Psi_0(\lambda) \rangle|^2}{[E_n(\lambda) - E_0(\lambda)]^2}, \quad (7)$$

where $|\Psi_n(\lambda)\rangle$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ are the eigen states of $H(\lambda)$ with eigen energy $E_n(\lambda)$. Assuming that the Hamiltonian $H(\lambda)$ satisfies the eigenvalue equation, $H(\lambda)|\Psi_n(\lambda)\rangle = E_n(\lambda)|\Psi_n(\lambda)\rangle$.

Eq. (6) and (7) can be considered as two different methods to evaluate the fidelity susceptibility.

If the control parameter is tuned as $\lambda(t) = \lambda_c + bt^r/r!\theta(t)$ with $\theta(t)$ being the step function and b the adiabatic control parameter. Then the adiabatic fidelity is the overlap between the instantaneous ground state $|\Psi_0(\lambda(t))\rangle$ and the time dependent driving state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$,

$$F(t) = |\langle \Psi(t) | \Psi_0(t) \rangle|. \quad (8)$$

As the energy gap at the quantum critical point vanishes, thus the system is excited by the time-dependent driving and the probability of excitations is [46–48]

$$P_{\text{ex}} = 1 - F(t)^2 = b^2 \chi_{2r+2}(\lambda_c), \quad (9)$$

where the adiabatic fidelity susceptibility is [46–48].

$$\chi_{2r+2}(\lambda) = \sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{|\langle \Psi_n(\lambda) | H_1 | \Psi_0(\lambda) \rangle|^2}{[E_n(\lambda) - E_0(\lambda)]^{2r+2}}. \quad (10)$$

One can see that the fidelity susceptibility is the generalized adiabatic susceptibility of order two ($r = 0$). For $r = 1$, we have the generalized adiabatic susceptibility of order four, χ_4 .

The behaviors of fidelity susceptibility at QCP have been extensively studied [6–39]. It was shown that the fidelity susceptibility of a finite system with size L in the neighborhood of a QCP takes the universal form [15, 21]

$$\chi_F(\lambda, L) = L^{2/\nu} \Phi_0((\lambda - \lambda_m)L^{1/\nu}), \quad (11)$$

where λ_m is the control parameter at which the fidelity susceptibility is maximum, ν is the correlation length critical exponent of the QCP and $\Phi_0(x)$ is a universal scaling function as it is independent of the size of the system. From Eq. (11), the maximum of fidelity susceptibility for system with size L , $\chi_{F, \max} \equiv \max[\chi_F(L, \lambda)] = L^{2/\nu} \Phi_0(0)$ and thus we have

$$\frac{\chi_F(\lambda, L)}{\chi_{F, \max}} = \frac{\Phi_0((\lambda - \lambda_m)L^{1/\nu})}{\Phi_0(0)}. \quad (12)$$

Eq. (12) implies that if we plot $\frac{\chi_F(\lambda, L)}{\chi_{F, \max}}$ for systems of different sizes as a function of scaled parameter $(\lambda - \lambda_m)L^{1/\nu}$, then all curves of different sizes collapse into a single curve defined by $\Phi_0(x)/\Phi_0(0)$. Of course, in reality, one needs to choose ν to obtain the best data collapse. Thus fidelity susceptibility provides a simple approach to determine the universal critical exponent ν [8].

The generalized adiabatic susceptibility of a finite system with size L in the neighborhood of a QCP takes the universal form [48]

$$\chi_{2r+2}(\lambda) = L^{2/\nu+2z} \Phi_r((\lambda - \lambda_m)L^{1/\nu}). \quad (13)$$

where λ_m is the position of the parameter at which the generalized adiabatic susceptibility is maximum, z is the dynamical critical exponent, $\Phi_r(x)$ is a set of universal scaling functions which are independent of the size of the system. The maximum of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility for system




FIG. 3: (color online). Universal finite size scaling of the fidelity susceptibility in the Aubry-André model with odd number of lattice sizes. (a). The logarithm of the fidelity susceptibility $\chi_F(N, \Delta)$ as a function of disorder strength Δ for different odd number of lattice sizes, $N = 89$ (red circle), $N = 233$ (blue square), $N = 377$ (green upper triangle), $N = 987$ (magenta lower triangle). (b). Scaled fidelity susceptibility $\chi_F(N, \Delta)/\chi_{F,Max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$ with Δ_m being the position of the maximum of the fidelity susceptibility. All curves for odd number of lattice sizes collapse into a single curve when we choose the correlation length critical exponents $\nu = 1.00$.

with size L , $\chi_{2r+2,max} \equiv \max[\chi_{2r+2}(L, \lambda)] = L^{2/\nu+2zr}\Phi_r(0)$ and thus we have

$$\frac{\chi_{2r+2}(\lambda, L)}{\chi_{2r+2,max}} = \frac{\Phi_r((\lambda - \lambda_m)L^{1/\nu})}{\Phi_r(0)}. \quad (14)$$

Eq. (14) tells us that if we plot $\frac{\chi_{2r+2}(\lambda, L)}{\chi_{2r+2,max}}$ for systems with different sizes L as a function of scaled parameter $(\lambda - \lambda_m)L^{1/\nu}$, then all curves for different system sizes collapse into a single curve defined by $\Phi_r(x)/\Phi_r(0)$. In practice, one needs to choose ν to achieve the best data collapse. Thus investigations of fidelity susceptibility and of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility provide a simple approach to extracting the universal critical exponents ν, z and the universal scaling function, which determine the universality class of a QPT.

IV. THE FIDELITY SUSCEPTIBILITY IN THE ANDERSON MODEL

In this section, we present the numerical results of the fidelity susceptibility in the 1D Anderson model. We calculate the fidelity susceptibility through Eq. (7) and take averages over 7000 random configurations of the local potential ϵ_i . In




FIG. 4: (color online). Universal finite size scaling of the fidelity susceptibility in the Aubry-André model with even number of lattice sizes. (a). The logarithm of the fidelity susceptibility $\chi_F(N, \Delta)$ as a function of disorder strength Δ for different even number of lattice sizes, $N = 34$ (red circle), $N = 144$ (blue square), $N = 610$ (green upper triangle). (b). Scaled fidelity susceptibility $\chi_F(N, \Delta)/\chi_{F,max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$ with Δ_m being the position of the maximum of the fidelity susceptibility. All curves for even number of lattice sizes collapse into a single curve when we choose the correlation length critical exponents $\nu = 1.00$.

Fig. 1(a), we show the fidelity susceptibility for 1D the Anderson model as a function of the disorder strength Δ for different lattice sizes $N = 50, 100, 150, 200$. One can see that the maximum of fidelity susceptibility always appears at $\Delta = 0$, which is the QCP of the 1D Anderson model. As the disorder strength increases, the fidelity susceptibility decreases monotonically because one deviates from the QCP. Also the peak in the fidelity susceptibility increases as the size of the lattice increases. While if we plot the scaled fidelity susceptibility, namely $\chi_F(N, \Delta)/\chi_{F,max}$, where $\chi_{F,max}$ is the maximum of the fidelity susceptibility, as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$, then all curves for different system sizes collapse into a single one when we choose $\nu = 0.667$ and $\Delta_m = 0$ [Fig. 1(b)]. The extracted correlation length critical exponent is very close to the exact solution $\nu = 2/3$ [49].

In order to extract the dynamical critical exponent, we study the generalized adiabatic susceptibility in 1D Anderson model in Figure 2. In Fig. 2(a), we show the generalized adiabatic susceptibility χ_4 as a function of disorder strength for different lattice sizes $N = 50, 100, 150, 200$. Similar to that of the fidelity susceptibility, one can see that the maximum of generalized adiabatic susceptibility also appears at the QCP $\Delta_c = 0$. According to finite size scaling theory (Eq. (13)), the peak in the generalized adiabatic susceptibility $\chi_{4,max} \propto N^{2/\nu+2z}$. We thus show the logarithm of the maximum of the gener-

alized adiabatic susceptibility as a function of the logarithm of the system sizes in Fig. 2(b) and perform a linear fit to the data, i.e. $\ln\chi_{4,max} = a \ln N + b$ with $a = 6.961$ and $b = 1.939$. Since the correlation length critical exponent we have extracted is $\nu \approx 0.667$, thus the dynamical critical exponent is $z = 1.982$, which agrees to the exact solution $z = 2$ [49]. In Fig. 2(c), we plot the scaled generalized adiabatic susceptibility, $\chi_4(N, \Delta)/\chi_{4,max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$, then all curves for different system sizes collapse into a single one when we choose $\nu = 0.667$ and $\Delta_m = 0$ [Fig. 2(c)]. Thus we get the correlation length critical exponent and the dynamical critical exponent at the QCP of the 1D Anderson model through finite size scaling analysis of the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility, $\nu = 0.667, z = 1.982$, both of them are close to the exact values [49].

V. THE FIDELITY SUSCEPTIBILITY IN THE AUBRY-ANDRÉ MODEL.

The Aubry-André (AA) model can not be analytically solved except in some extreme cases. But we can numerically exact diagonalize the Hamiltonian. Because $H(\Delta)$ is quadratic, we assume the eigenstate of $H(\Delta)$ takes the form $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_j \phi(j)c_j^\dagger|0\rangle$, where $\phi(j)$ is the amplitude of the wave function at site j . Substituting the assumed wave function into the Schrödinger equation, we get the following system of linear equations for the amplitude of the wave function,

$$-J\phi(j+1) - J\phi(j-1) + \Delta\phi(j)\cos(2\pi\alpha j) = E\phi(j), \quad (15)$$

where $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Diagonalizing the set of linear equations, we obtain all the eigen energies and their corresponding wave functions. Then we can numerically evaluate the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility in the Aubry-André model through Eq. (7) and Eq. (10). For finite lattice sizes, one can replace $\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}$ by $\alpha_n = F_{n+1}/F_n$ where F_n and F_{n+1} are two consecutive Fibonacci numbers and we know that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{n+1}/F_n = \alpha$. Meanwhile the lattice size can be chosen as $N = F_n$ for periodic boundary conditions.

We study the finite size scaling of the fidelity susceptibility in the AA model for odd number of lattice sizes in Figure 3 and for even number of lattice sizes in Figure 4. Fig. 3(a) shows the fidelity susceptibility in the AA model as a function of the disorder strength Δ for odd number of lattice sizes $N = 89, N = 233, N = 377, N = 987$. First, one can see that the fidelity susceptibility shows a peak around the QCP in the AA model at $\Delta_c = 2$. Second, the peak in the fidelity susceptibility becomes more sharper as the size of the system increases. We then plot the scaled fidelity susceptibility $\chi_F(N, \Delta)/\chi_{F,max}$ as a function of scaled parameter $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$ for different lattice sizes. All curves for odd number of system sizes collapse into a universal curve (Fig. 3(b)) when we choose $\nu = 1.00$ and Δ_m is the parameter where the χ_F is maximum. Fig. 4(a) shows the fidelity susceptibility for even number of lattices sizes, $N = 34, N = 144, N = 610$, as




FIG. 5: (color online). Universal finite size scaling of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility χ_4 in the Aubry-André model with odd number of lattice sizes. (a). The logarithm of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility $\chi_4(N, \Delta)$ as a function of disorder strength Δ for different odd number of lattice sizes, $N = 89$ (red circle), $N = 233$ (blue square), $N = 377$ (green upper triangle), $N = 987$ (magenta lower triangle). (b). The logarithm of the maximum of generalized adiabatic susceptibility for odd number of lattice sizes as a function of the logarithm of the system sizes. Linear fit shows that $z \approx 2.38$. (c). Scaled generalized adiabatic susceptibility $\chi_4(N, \Delta)/\chi_{4,max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$. All curves for odd number of lattice sizes collapse into a single curve when we choose the correlation length critical exponents $\nu = 1.00$.

a function of control parameter Δ and Fig. 4(b) presents the scaled fidelity susceptibility as a function of scaled control parameter $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$. To achieve data collapse, we choose $\nu = 1.00$ (Fig. 4(b)). Although the universal scaling functions are different for the odd number of system sizes (Fig. 3(b)) and for even number of system sizes (Fig. 4(b)), the critical exponent for collapsing the data in two cases are the same.

To extract the dynamical critical exponent, we study the generalized adiabatic susceptibility in AA model for odd number of lattice sizes in Figure 5 and for even number of lattice sizes in Figure 6. In Fig. 5(a), we show the generalized adiabatic susceptibility χ_4 as a function of disorder strength




FIG. 6: (color online). Universal finite size scaling of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility χ_4 in the Aubry-André model with even number of lattice sizes. (a). The logarithm of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility $\chi_4(N, \Delta)$ as a function of disorder strength Δ for different even number of lattice sizes, $N = 34$ (red circle), $N = 144$ (blue square), $N = 610$ (green upper triangle). (b). The logarithm of the maximum of generalized adiabatic susceptibility for even number of lattice sizes as a function of the logarithm of the system sizes. Linear fit shows that $z \approx 2.37$. (c). Scaled generalized adiabatic susceptibility $\chi_4(N, \Delta)/\chi_{4,max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$. All curves for even number of lattice sizes collapse into a single curve when we choose the correlation length critical exponents $\nu = 1.00$.

for different odd number of lattice sizes $N = 89$, $N = 233$, $N = 377$, $N = 987$. The generalized adiabatic susceptibility for even number of system sizes, $N = 34$, $N = 144$, $N = 610$, are presented in Fig. 6(a). One can see that the maximum of generalized adiabatic susceptibility also appears at the QCP $\Delta_c = 2$. According to finite size scaling theory described in Eq. (13), the peak in the generalized adiabatic susceptibility $\chi_{4,max} \propto N^{2/\nu+2z}$. We then show the logarithm of the maximum of generalized adiabatic susceptibility as a function of the logarithm of the system sizes in Fig. 5(b) and Fig. 6(b), which are respectively for odd number of lattice sizes and for even number of lattice sizes. We perform a linear fit of the data in Fig. 5(b) and Fig. 6(b),

In $\chi_{4,max} = a \ln N + b$ with $a = 6.77, b = -16.61$ (Fig. 5(b)) and $a = 6.74, b = -13.15$ (Fig. 6(b)). Because the correlation length critical exponent $\nu = 1.00$, then the extracted dynamical critical exponent in the AA model is $z \approx 2.38$ (odd system sizes) and $z \approx 2.37$ (even system sizes). Both of them are close to the value extracted from the superfluid density $z \approx 2.374$ [49]. In Fig. 5(c), we plot the scaled generalized adiabatic susceptibility, $\chi_4(N, \Delta)/\chi_{4,max}$ as a function of scaled variable $(\Delta - \Delta_m)N^{1/\nu}$ for all odd number of system sizes, then all curves for different odd number of system sizes collapse into a single one when we choose $\nu = 1.00$. Fig. 6(c) is the same as that of Fig. 5(c) except for even number of system sizes. Thus we get the correlation length critical exponent $\nu = 1.00$ and the dynamical critical exponent $z \approx 2.375$ at the QCP of the AA model through finite size scaling analysis of the fidelity susceptibility and of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility.

In the AA model, the fidelity susceptibility (the generalized adiabatic susceptibility) collapse into two universal curves for odd numbers of system sizes and for even numbers of system sizes. This is of course a finite size effect. For finite lattice sizes, we replace the α by the ratio of two Fibonacci numbers F_{n+1}/F_n and the random potential at site i is $\epsilon_i = \cos(2\pi F_{n+1}/F_n i)$ for system with lattice size $N = F_n$. The profile of the random potentials are reflection symmetric about the middle site when we exclude the last site where the random potential is always fixed at one ($\epsilon_N = 1$). However, for even number of lattice sizes $N = F_n$, the lattice of the system has one middle site where the strength of the random potential is always fixed at -1. While for odd number of lattice sizes $N = F_n$, there is no middle site. The two different profiles of the random potential for odd number of lattice sizes and for even number of lattice sizes govern that the physical quantities in the AA model for odd number of lattice sizes and for even number of lattice sizes collapse into two different universal functions.

VI. SUMMARY

In summary, we have investigated the fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility in two paradigmatic disordered models, 1D Anderson model and the Aubry-André model. Both of them present delocalization to localization quantum phase transition as the strength of the disorder increases. We found that the fidelity susceptibility is maximum close to the quantum critical point in both models, through which one can locate the quantum critical point in disordered systems. Finite-size scaling analysis of the fidelity susceptibility and of the generalized adiabatic susceptibility show that the correlation length critical exponent and the dynamical critical exponent at the QCP of the 1D Anderson model are $\nu = 2/3$ and $z = 2$, which are respectively $\nu = 1$ and $z = 2.375$ in Aubry-André model. The fidelity susceptibility and the generalized adiabatic susceptibility are directly connected to the dynamical structure factor [31, 34] which are experimentally accessible through linear response theory. Recently two experiments [44, 45], one with a real-random

potential (Anderson model) [44] and the other with a quasi-periodic potential (Aubry-André model) [45], showed that the disorder effects in quantum lattice models can be simulated in cold atoms, the universality of fidelity susceptibility in quantum disordered systems may be observed experimentally in near future. Besides, we have investigated the quantum phase transitions induced by disorder in non-interacting systems from the fidelity susceptibility approach and it would be very interesting to investigate the fidelity and the fidelity susceptibility in the many-body localization transitions [50–56] and the fidelity susceptibility approach may be able to extract

accurate universal critical exponents at the many-body localization transitions and clarify some unsolved issues there [56].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Number 11604220) and the President's Fund of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen.

-
- [1] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2011).
- [2] J. L. Cardy, *Scaling and Renormalization in Statistical Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [3] M. A. Nilesen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
- [4] A. Osterloh, L. Amico, G. Falci, and R. Fazio, Scaling of entanglement close to a quantum phase transition, *Nature (London)* **416**, 608 (2002).
- [5] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Entanglement in many-body systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 517 (2008).
- [6] P. Zanardi and N. Paunković, Ground state overlap and quantum phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 031123 (2006).
- [7] W. L. You, Y. W. Li, and S. J. Gu, Fidelity, dynamic structure factor, and susceptibility in critical phenomena, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 022101 (2007).
- [8] S. J. Gu, Fidelity approach to quantum phase transitions, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **24**, 4371 (2010).
- [9] P. Zanardi, P. Giorda, and M. Cozzini, Information-Theoretic Differential Geometry of Quantum Phase Transitions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 100603 (2007).
- [10] L. Campos Venuti and P. Zanardi, Quantum Critical Scaling of the Geometric Tensors, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 095701 (2007).
- [11] M. F. Yang, Ground-state fidelity in one-dimensional gapless models, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 180403 (R) (2007).
- [12] Y. C. Tzeng and M. F. Yang, Scaling properties of fidelity in the spin-1 anisotropic model, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 012311 (2008).
- [13] N. Paunković, P. D. Sacramento, P. Nogueira, V. R. Vieira, and V. K. Dugaev, Fidelity between partial states as a signature of quantum phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 052302 (2008).
- [14] S. Chen, L. Wang, Y. Hao, and Y. Wang, Intrinsic relation between ground-state fidelity and the characterization of a quantum phase transition, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 032111 (2008).
- [15] S. J. Gu, H. M. Kwok, W. Q. Ning and H. Q. Lin, Fidelity susceptibility, scaling, and universality in quantum critical phenomena, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 245109 (2008).
- [16] S. Yang, S. J. Gu, C. P. Sun, and H. Q. Lin, Fidelity susceptibility and long-range correlation in the Kitaev honeycomb model, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 012304 (2008).
- [17] H. M. Kwok, W. Q. Ning, S. J. Gu, and H. Q. Lin, Quantum criticality of the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model in terms of fidelity susceptibility, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 032103 (2008).
- [18] L. Y. Gong and P. Q. Tong, Fidelity, fidelity susceptibility, and von Neumann entropy to characterize the phase diagram of an extended Harper model, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 115114 (2008).
- [19] W. C. Yu, H. M. Kwok, J. P. Cao, and S. J. Gu, Fidelity susceptibility in the two-dimensional transverse-field Ising and XXZ models, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 021108 (2009).
- [20] D. Schwandt, F. Alet, and S. Capponi, Quantum Monte Carlo Simulations of Fidelity at Magnetic Quantum Phase Transitions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 170501 (2009).
- [21] A. F. Albuquerque, F. Alet, C. Sire, and S. Capponi, Quantum critical scaling of fidelity susceptibility, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 064418 (2010).
- [22] M. M. Rams and B. Damski, Quantum Fidelity in the Thermodynamic Limit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 055701 (2011).
- [23] A. Langari and A. T. Rezakhani, Quantum renormalization group for ground-state fidelity, *New J. Phys.* **14**, 053014 (2012).
- [24] S. H. Li, Q. Q. Shi, Y. H. Su, J. H. Liu, Y. W. Dai, and H. Q. Zhou, Tensor network states and ground-state fidelity for quantum spin ladders, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 064401 (2012).
- [25] V. Mukherjee, A. Dutta, and D. Sen, Quantum fidelity for one-dimensional Dirac fermions and two-dimensional Kitaev model in the thermodynamic limit, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 024301 (2012).
- [26] S. Greschner, A. K. Kolezhuk, and T. Vekua, Fidelity susceptibility and conductivity of the current in one-dimensional lattice models with open or periodic boundary conditions, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 195101 (2013).
- [27] J. Carrasquilla, S. R. Manmana, M. Rigol, Scaling of the gap, fidelity susceptibility, and Bloch oscillations across the superfluid-to-Mott-insulator transition in the one-dimensional Bose-Hubbard model *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 043606 (2013).
- [28] B. Damski, Fidelity susceptibility of the quantum Ising model in a transverse field: The exact solution, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 052131 (2013).
- [29] B. Damski and M. M. Rams, Exact results for fidelity susceptibility of the quantum Ising model: the interplay between parity, system size, and magnetic field, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47**, 025303 (2014).
- [30] M. Lacki, B. Damski, and J. Zakrzewski, Numerical studies of ground-state fidelity of the Bose-Hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 033625 (2014).
- [31] S. J. Gu and W. C. Yu, Spectral function and fidelity susceptibility in quantum critical phenomena, *Europhys. Lett.* **108**, 20002 (2014).
- [32] L. Wang, Y. H. Liu, J. Imriška, P. N. Ma and M. Troyer, Fidelity susceptibility made simple: A unified quantum Monte Carlo approach, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 031007 (2015).
- [33] G. Sun, A. K. Kolezhuk, and T. Vekua, Fidelity at Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless quantum phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 014418 (2015).
- [34] W. L. You and L. He, Generalized fidelity susceptibility at phase transitions, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **27**, 205601 (2015).

- [35] G. Y. Sun, Fidelity Susceptibility Study of Quantum Long-Range Antiferromagnetic Ising Chain, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 043621 (2017).
- [36] B. B. Wei and X. C. Lv, Fidelity susceptibility in the quantum Rabi model, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 013845 (2018).
- [37] Z. Q. Zhu, G. Y. Sun, W. L. You, and D. N. Shi, Fidelity and criticality of a quantum Ising chain with long-range interactions, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 023607 (2018).
- [38] Q. Luo, J. Z. Zhao, and X. Q. Wang, Fidelity susceptibility of the anisotropic XY model: The exact solution, *Phys. Rev. E* **98**, 022106 (2018).
- [39] Y. M. Wang, W. L. You, M. X. Liu, Y. L. Dong, H. G. Luo, G. Romero and J. Q. You, Quantum criticality and state engineering in the simulated anisotropic quantum Rabi model, *New J. Phys.* **20**, 053061 (2018).
- [40] P. W. Anderson, Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1492 (1958).
- [41] S. Aubry and G. André, Analyticity breaking and Anderson localization in incommensurate lattices, *Ann. Isr. Phys. Soc.* **3**, 133 (1980).
- [42] M. Modugno, Exponential localization in one-dimensional quasi-periodic optical lattices, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 033023 (2009).
- [43] N. T. Jacobson, S. Garnerone, S. Haas and P. Zanardi, Scaling of the fidelity susceptibility in a disordered quantum spin chain, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 184427 (2009).
- [44] G. Roati, C. D'Errico, L. Fallani, M. Fattori, C. Fort, M. Zaccanti, G. Modugno, M. Modugno and M. Inguscio, Anderson localization of a non-interacting Bose-Einstein condensate, *Nature*, **453**, 895 (2008).
- [45] J. Billy, V. Josse, Z. Zuo, A. Bernard, B. Hambrecht, P. Lugan, D. Clément, L. Sanchez-Palencia, P. Bouyer, and A. Aspect, Direct observation of Anderson localization of matter waves in a controlled disorder, *Nature*, **453**, 891 (2008).
- [46] C. De Grandi, V. Gritsev, and A. Polkovnikov, Quench dynamics near a quantum critical point, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 012303 (2010).
- [47] C. De Grandi, V. Gritsev, and A. Polkovnikov, Quench dynamics near a quantum critical point: Application to the sine-Gordon model, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 224301 (2010).
- [48] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore Colloquium: Nonequilibrium dynamics of closed interacting quantum systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 863 (2011).
- [49] J. C. C. Cestari, A. Foerster, M. A. Gusmão and M. Continentino, Critical exponents of the disorder-driven superfluid-insulator transition in one-dimensional Bose-Einstein condensates, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 055601 (2011).
- [50] D. M. Basko, I. L. Aleiner, and B. L. Altshuler, Metal-Insulator Transition in a Weakly Interacting Many-Electron System with Localized Single-Particle States, *Ann. Phys.* **321**, 1126 (2006).
- [51] I. Gornyi, A. Mirlin and D. Polyakov, Interacting electrons in disordered wires: Anderson localization and low-T transport. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 206603 (2005).
- [52] A. Pal and D. A. Huse, Many-Body Localization Phase Transition, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 174411 (2010).
- [53] V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, Localization of Interacting Fermions at High Temperature, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 155111 (2007).
- [54] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, Many-Body Localization and Thermalization in Quantum Statistical Mechanics, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **6**, 15 (2015).
- [55] E. Altman and R. Vosk, Universal Dynamics and Renormalization in Many-Body-Localized Systems, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **6**, 383 (2015).
- [56] V. Khemani, D. N. Sheng and David A. Huse, Two Universality Classes for the Many-Body Localization Transition, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 075702 (2017).