

Dumbbell Fermions and Spin Models on Honeycomb Lattices

Tom Banks

NHETC and Department of Physics
Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019
E-mail: tibanks@ucsc.edu

Abstract

We use the Kantor-Susskind [1] model of fermions as "dumbbells" connecting points on a honeycomb lattice to points on its dual, to define a duality between local fermionic models invariant under a Z_2 gauge symmetry and familiar models of a single Pauli spin on the honeycomb lattice. This is a rewriting of a familiar construction of Kitaev, which connects it to higher dimensional models of staggered fermions. We argue that all models with nearest neighbor spin couplings and external magnetic fields, can be reduced to single particle Schrodinger equations for fermions by Kitaev's technique, and that each spin model produces an infinite set of different fermion models in different Z_2 flux sectors.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Spin Models	2

1 Introduction

In a recent paper [2], we presented a general d dimensional formalism for writing $d + 1$ dimensional quantum models of $2d$ Pauli matrices on a cubic lattice in terms of "dumbbell" Majorana fermions coupled to a topological Z_2 gauge field. The Majorana fermions were intimately connected to the staggered fermions of Susskind [3]. In the present note we give a simple example of a similar construction on a honeycomb lattice in $2 + 1$ dimensions, where the dual spin model has only a single Pauli matrix.

In a general dumbbell model, the Clifford algebra of the fermions at a lattice point has the dimension V of the number of vertices in a simplex on the dual lattice, which surrounds that point. The spins at a point are the generators of the corresponding rotation group, in its irreducible spinor representation. This can of course be written in terms of a tensor product of Pauli matrices. For the honeycomb lattice $V = 3$ and the $Spin(3)$ spinor representation has only a single triplet of Pauli generators. If we use the irreducible two dimensional representation of this algebra, there is no consistent way to define an operator $(-1)^F$ which anti-commutes with all fermions. The formalism of [2] used the $(-1)^F$ operator to define the Gauss law of the topological Z_2 gauge theory that underlies Fermi-Pauli bosonization. Thus we must use the four dimensional reducible representation of the Pauli matrix algebra, which contains a $(-1)^F$ operator that squares to 1. It is then consistent to assume that Fermi generators $\chi(n, M)$ on different sites n of the hexagonal lattice satisfy

$$[\chi(n, M), \chi(m, K)]_+ = \delta_{mn} \delta_{MK}. \quad (1.1)$$

Here, for fixed n , M runs over the three dual lattice sites adjacent to n . The Z_2 gauge fields $U(n, m)$ live on the links of the honeycomb lattice and the canonical conjugate to $U(n, m)$, $V(M(m, n), N(m, n))$, lives on the dual lattice link that crosses the link (m, n) . Note that, since the gauge group is Z_2 the orientation of the links is irrelevant. The Gauss law is

$$V(n) = (-1)^F(n). \quad (1.2)$$

Here $V(n)$ refers to product of the three dual link operators on the triangle that encloses n . One can think of it as an operator defined at honeycomb lattice points, or dual lattice plaquettes. Closed Wilson loops of the gauge field and open Wilson lines of the form

$$\chi(m, M)U_\Gamma(m, n)\chi(n, N), \quad (1.3)$$

commute with the gauge constraint. It's easy to see that we can build any closed Wilson loop by multiplying open Wilson lines, so the open lines are a complete basis of gauge invariant operators.

2 Spin Models

The Pauli operators

$$\sigma_M(i) = -i\epsilon_{MNL}\chi(i, N)\chi(i, L), \quad (2.1)$$

form, with $(-1)^F(i)$ a basis for gauge invariant operators in the local Hilbert space. We can use them to form all of the usual local spin Hamiltonians on the honeycomb lattice. The

interesting question is whether the ground states of any of those systems allow fermions to propagate freely over relatively long distances. Kitaev found that the answer to that question was sometimes yes [4]. The key to his seminal paper is the local operator identity

$$\gamma(i, M)\gamma(i, N) = i\epsilon_{MNK}\gamma(i, K)(-1)^F(i). \quad (2.2)$$

Note that the sign on the RHS of this equation is changed if we move $(-1)^F(i)$ to the left. This reflects an ambiguity in the definition of $(-1)^F(i)$ in the construction of the reducible four dimensional representation of the three dimensional Clifford algebra, but we can also think of it as a Z_2 gauge ambiguity. Indeed, this equation is not invariant under Z_2 gauge transformations, although it is a valid operator identity in the full Hilbert space of the model.

Using it, we can rewrite a bilinear in spins as

$$\sigma_{MN}(i)\sigma_{KL}(j) = \epsilon_{MNR}\epsilon_{KLP}\gamma(i, R)\gamma(j, P)(-1)^F(i)(-1)^F(j). \quad (2.3)$$

The operators $(-1)^F(i)(-1)^F(j)$ commute with the bilinear fermion Hamiltonian, and with each other, so we can diagonalize them all and solve the model for each choice of eigenvalue. Note however that the operators $(-1)^F$ do not individually commute with the Hamiltonian so we cannot conclude that the Z_2 phases on each link are pure gauge. There are an infinite number of different choices of Z_2 flux around plaquettes of the honeycomb lattice and each will give rise to a different spectrum of propagating non-interacting fermions.

For example, the two simplest choices of flux, with fermion Hamiltonians that are simply a multiple of nearest neighbor hopping, are ± 1 around every plaquette. The fluxless Hamiltonian gives the familiar single fermion dispersion relation of graphene

$$\omega(\vec{q}) = \pm|1 + e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{R}_1} + e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{R}_2}|. \quad (2.4)$$

The constant magnetic field gives

$$\omega(\vec{q}) = \pm t\sqrt{3 \pm 2\sqrt{1 + [\cos^2(\vec{q}\cdot\vec{R}_2) - \cos^2(\vec{q}\cdot\vec{R}_1)]}}. \quad (2.5)$$

In these equations $\vec{R}_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2}(\mp\sqrt{3}, 3)^1$.

One should not be surprised that a single spin Hamiltonian gives an infinite number of answers in fermion language. The full gauge invariant Hilbert space contains states obtained by acting with Wilson loops on the state $f(U) = 1$ (up to gauge transformations). These all commute with the spin Hamiltonian, but it can have a different set of eigenvalues in each flux sector. There appears to be an enormously rich landscape of models to explore here. Checkerboard patterns of fluxes are probably exactly soluble and random averages over fluxes should be interesting as well. One can of course add single spin terms without affecting the solubility of the models. These add gaps to gapless fermion dispersion relations.

Generalization of this technique to higher dimensions depends on finding lattices such that each lattice point has exactly three nearest neighbors on the dual lattice. There are generalizations *e.g.* [5] of Kitaev's construction² to three dimensions. The authors of those

¹I'd like to thank P. Coleman for these formulae. Transcription errors are my own.

²I thank P. Coleman for this reference.

constructions do not specify the dual lattice to the three dimensional Kitaev lattices, but the fact that the construction works suggests that there are exactly three nearest neighbor dual points for each lattice point.

Acknowledgments

The work of T.B. was supported by the Department of Energy under grant DE-SC0010008. Rutgers Project 833012. Conversations with Piers Coleman and Shu Heng Shao are gratefully acknowledged.

References

- [1] R. Kantor and L. Susskind, “A Lattice model of fractional statistics,” Nucl. Phys. B **366**, 533-568 (1991) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(91)90029-W
- [2] T. Banks, “Dumbell Fermions and Fermi-Pauli Duality,” [arXiv:2404.13761 [hep-th]].
- [3] L. Susskind, “Lattice Fermions,” Phys. Rev. D **16**, 3031-3039 (1977) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.3031
- [4] A. Kitaev, ”Anyons in an Exactly Solved Model and Beyond”, arXiv:cond-mat/0506438v3, Annals Phys. 321 (2006) 1, 2-111.
- [5] K. O’Brien, M. Hermanns, S. Trebst, ” Classification of gapless Z₂ spin liquids in three-dimensional Kitaev models”, PHYSICAL REVIEW B 93, 085101 (2016).