

Dual Quantum Monte Carlo Algorithm for Hardcore Bosons

G. G. Batrouni, H. Mabilat
Institut Non-Lineaire de Nice, Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis,
1361 route des Lucioles, 06560 Valbonne, France

August 12, 2018

Abstract

We derive the exact dual representation of the bosonic Hubbard model which takes the form of conserved current loops. The hardcore limit, which corresponds to the quantum spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg antiferromagnet, is also obtained. In this limit, the dual partition function takes a particularly simple form which is very amenable to numerical simulations. In addition to the usual quantities that we can measure (energy, density-density correlation function and superfluid density) we can with this new algorithm measure efficiently the order parameter correlation function, $\langle a_i a_j^\dagger \rangle, |i - j| \geq 1$. We demonstrate this with numerical tests in one dimension.

1 Introduction

The development of ever more efficient and sophisticated Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) algorithms has greatly advanced our understanding of quantum many body systems and the various phases that exist in such models (superfluid, Mott insulators, Bose glasses, supersolids etc) and the transitions between them. Examples of such QMC algorithms include the “path integral algorithm” which was used to study the details of the Helium superfluid transition in 2 and 3 dimensions[1], the World Line algorithm[2], which was used to study the various phases of the bosonic Hubbard model.[3] Improvements of the World Line algorithm for hard core bosons (infinitely

repulsive contact interaction) came in the form of *cluster* algorithms[4] where one updates many variables at a time. Such algorithms converge much faster and suffer much less from critical slowing down. The next improvement was to eliminate Trotter errors[5] which come from discretizing the imaginary time (*i.e.* inverse temperature) direction. These continuous imaginary time cluster algorithms[6] are the state of the art in hardcore boson simulations although their efficiency goes down in the presence of disorder and longer range interactions like next near neighbour.

In the case of extreme soft-core high density bosonic models a different algorithm was developed based on duality transformation. In this case, the amplitude of the order parameter is assumed constant, leaving only the phase, giving rise to a model of the *XY* variety called the Quantum Phase Model (QPM). The dual of this model is easily obtained when the Villain approximation[7] of the action is taken, leaving a model of interacting conserved integer current loops that can be quite easily simulated.[8] This loop algorithm was used productively by several groups to study the phases of the QPM with or without disorder.[8]

One major disadvantage of the above algorithms is their inability to measure the correlation function of the order parameter, $\langle a_i a_j^\dagger \rangle$ when $|i - j|$ is greater than 1. This quantity is very interesting since in phase transitions the behaviour of the order parameter is of prime importance.

We will outline below how to perform the duality transformation exactly for the soft and hard core bosonic Hubbard models. Then, concentrating on the hardcore case, we will construct the (exact) loop algorithm and demonstrate how it can be used to obtain the correlation function of the order parameter in addition to the the usual quantities of interest (energy, density-density correlation function, superfluid density).

2 The Bosonic Hubbard Model

We are interested in simulating models whose Hamiltonian has the form

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (a_i^\dagger a_j + a_j^\dagger a_i) - \sum_i \mu_i \hat{n}_i + V_0 \sum_i \hat{n}_i^2 + V_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j + V_2 \sum_{\langle\langle ik \rangle\rangle} \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_k. \quad (1)$$

In this equation, t is the transfer integral (the hopping parameter) which sets the energy scale (in the simulations we set it equal to 1), V_0 , V_1 , and V_2 are respectively the contact, the nearest neighbor, and the next near neighbor interactions, which we always take to be repulsive. On the square

lattice, the next near neighbor is chosen along the diagonal, while in one dimension the choice is the obvious one. a_i and a_i^\dagger are destruction and creation operators on site i satisfying the usual softcore boson commutation laws, $[a_i, a_j^\dagger] = \delta_{i,j}$, and $\hat{n}_i = a_i^\dagger a_i$ is the number operator on site i . In Eq. (1), $\langle ij \rangle$ and $\langle\langle ik \rangle\rangle$ label sums over near and next near neighbors. The first term which describes the hopping of the bosons among near neighbor sites gives the kinetic energy. $\mu_i = \mu + \delta_i$ is the site dependent chemical potential. For a clean system *i.e.* with no disorder, we take $\delta_i = 0$. To include the effect of disorder, we take δ_i to be a uniformly distributed random number $-\Delta \leq \delta_i \leq \Delta$. We have chosen to disorder the system with a random site energy, which preferentially attracts or repels bosons to particular sites. Other choices are possible, such as disordering the hopping parameter, t , or some of the interaction strengths, $V_{0,1,2}$. It is thought that these different ways of introducing disorder yield similar results.

The quantum statistical mechanics of this system is given by the partition function Z ,

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H}, \quad (2)$$

where β is the inverse temperature. The expectation value of a quantum operator is given by

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{O} e^{-\beta H}). \quad (3)$$

3 Coherent State Representation

We cannot do numerical simulations directly on this formulation of the partition function because it is in terms of operators. We must first find a c-number representation which can be incorporated into a simulation algorithm. There are several such representations. For example the wavefunction representation leads to what is known as the “path integral” method[1] and the occupation state representation leads to the World Line algorithm.[2] Here we will use the *coherent states* representation, *i.e.* eigenstates of the destruction operator,

$$a_i |\{\Phi\}\rangle = \phi(i) |\{\Phi\}\rangle, \quad (4a)$$

$$\langle\{\Phi\}| a_i^\dagger = \langle\{\Phi\}| \phi^*(i), \quad (4b)$$

where the eigenvalues $\phi(i)$ are complex numbers that are defined on the sites, i , of the lattice. In terms of the more familiar occupation number representation vacuum ($a|0\rangle = 0, a^\dagger|0\rangle = |1\rangle$) the coherent state $|\Phi\rangle$ is defined as follows

$$|\{\Phi\}\rangle = \exp\left(\sum_i \left(-\frac{\phi^*(i)\phi(i)}{2} + \phi(i)a_i^\dagger\right)\right)|0\rangle. \quad (5)$$

With this normalization we obtain the inner product of two coherent states

$$\langle\{\Psi\}|\{\Phi\}\rangle = \exp\left(\sum_i \left(\psi^*(i)\phi(i) - \frac{1}{2}\phi^*(i)\phi(i) - \frac{1}{2}\psi^*(i)\psi(i)\right)\right), \quad (6)$$

and the resolution of unity

$$1 = \int \prod_i \frac{d^2\phi(i)}{2\pi} |\{\Phi\}\rangle \langle\{\Phi\}|. \quad (7)$$

Now we write the partition function, Eq. (2), as

$$Z = \text{tr}(e^{-\delta H} e^{-\delta H} e^{-\delta H} \dots e^{-\delta H}), \quad (8)$$

where $\delta \equiv \beta/L_\tau$, L_τ is a large enough integer such that $\delta \ll 1$. We express the partition function this way because we can now express the exponentials in Eq. (8) in a form suitable for easy (albeit approximate) evaluation. Between each pair of exponentials introduce the resolution of unity, Eq. 7. Using standard manipulations[9] we find

$$Z = \int \prod_{r,\tau} \frac{d^2\phi(r,\tau)}{\pi} e^{-S(\phi^*,\phi)}, \quad (9)$$

where the action is given to first order in δ by[10]

$$S = \sum_{r,\tau} \phi^*(r,\tau)\Delta_{-\tau}\phi(r,\tau) + \delta \sum_{\tau} H[\phi^*(r,\tau+1), \phi(r,\tau)]. \quad (10)$$

In Eq. 10, τ denotes imaginary time, *i.e.* the inverse temperature direction β . Also, $H[\phi^*(r,\tau), \phi(r,\tau-1)]$ simply means that at the imaginary time τ , we replace in the Hamiltonian, Eq. 1, the destruction operator a_r by the

complex field $\phi(r, \tau)$, and the creation operator, a_r^\dagger , by $\phi^*(r, \tau + 1)$. [9] In this article our notation for the forward and backward finite difference operators are

$$\Delta_\mu \phi(r) \equiv \phi(r + \hat{\mu}) - \phi(r), \quad (11a)$$

$$\Delta_{-\mu} \phi(r) \equiv \phi(r) - \phi(r - \hat{\mu}), \quad (11b)$$

It is well known [9] that in the first term of Eq. 10 we must have $\Delta_{-\tau}$ and not Δ_τ although in the continuum limit one might argue that they both lead to the same result. Such arguments are incorrect. What is perhaps less strongly emphasized is that the following “approximation”,

$$\delta \sum_\tau H[\phi^*(r, \tau), \phi(r, \tau - 1)] = \delta \sum_\tau H[\phi^*(r, \tau), \phi(r, \tau)] + \mathcal{O}(\delta\beta). \quad (12)$$

which is often used in the literature, is not correct. The terms ignored are in fact of order β , not $\delta\beta$, which in effect changes the Hamiltonian under consideration. [11] This can be easily illustrated using with the quantum harmonic oscillator. We will not use this approximation in what follows.

4 The Duality Transformation

In what follows we will take $V_0 = V_1 = V_2 = 0$ in order to simplify the presentation. Nonzero values of these parameters can be dealt with in a straight-forward way. [11] Interestingly, the hardcore boson case (with no near and next near neighbor repulsion) is obtained directly from this case of zero interaction (see below).

To effect the duality transformation on the partition function, Eqs. 9 and 10, we follow the method of reference [12]. To this end we first write the coherent states field in terms of the amplitudes and phases: $\phi(r, \tau) = \alpha(r, \tau)e^{i\theta(r, \tau)}$. Consequently,

$$\int \prod_{r, \tau} d^2\phi(r, \tau) \rightarrow \int \prod_{r, \tau} \alpha(r, \tau) d\alpha(r, \tau) d\theta(r, \tau), \quad (13)$$

where we are dropping irrelevant overall constant factors. The action

$$S = \sum_{\vec{r}, \tau} \left(\phi^*(\vec{r}, \tau) \Delta_{-\tau} \phi(\vec{r}, \tau) - t\delta \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\phi^*(\vec{r}, \tau+1) \phi(\vec{r} + \hat{k}, \tau) + \phi^*(\vec{r} + \hat{k}, \tau+1) \phi(\vec{r}, \tau) \right) \right), \quad (14)$$

becomes

$$S = \sum_{\vec{r}, \tau} \left(\alpha(\vec{r}, \tau) e^{-i\theta(\vec{r}, \tau)} \left(\alpha(\vec{r}, \tau) e^{i\theta(\vec{r}, \tau)} - \alpha(\vec{r}, \tau - 1) e^{i\theta(\vec{r}, \tau - 1)} \right) - t\delta \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\alpha(\vec{r}, \tau + 1) \alpha(\vec{r} + \hat{k}, \tau) e^{i(\theta(\vec{r} + \hat{k}, \tau) - \theta(\vec{r}, \tau + 1))} + \alpha(\vec{r}, \tau) \alpha(\vec{r} + \hat{k}, \tau + 1) e^{i(\theta(\vec{r}, \tau) - \theta(\vec{r} + \hat{k}, \tau + 1))} \right) \right). \quad (15)$$

Here we took the model to be in d space dimensions indicated by the index $k = 1, \dots, d$. \hat{k} is a unit vector in the the k th direction.

We see in this equation that the phase, $\theta(\vec{r}, \tau)$, which is a site variable, appears only as differences of near neighbor sites[13]. Thus we can see the beginnings of an XY -like model. The fact that we always have this combination of variables motivates us to change the variable of integration from the site variable $\theta(\vec{r}, \tau)$ to the *link* or *bond* variables $\theta_k(\vec{r}, \tau) \equiv \Delta_k \theta(\vec{r}, \tau)$ and $\theta_\tau(\vec{r}, \tau) \equiv \Delta_\tau \theta(\vec{r}, \tau)$. In two space dimensions, the partition function thus becomes[12]

$$Z = \int \prod_{r, \tau, \mu=1,2,3} \left(\alpha(r, \tau) d\alpha(r, \tau) d\theta_\mu(r, \tau) \right) \prod_{\text{plaquettes}} \left(\delta \left[e^{i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} \Delta_\nu \theta_\rho(\vec{r}, \tau)} - 1 \right] \right) \prod_{\vec{r}} \left(\delta \left[e^{i\sum_\tau \theta_\tau(\vec{r}, \tau)} - 1 \right] \right) e^{-S}, \quad (16)$$

where $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}$ is the totally antisymmetric tensor in three dimensions. Note

that the product over plaquettes is over all space-space and space-time plaquettes. The δ -functions are the only Jacobian of this variable change.[12] Its geometrical interpretation is simple. Even though the model is now expressed in terms of bonds, it is actually a site model. It is clear from the definitions of the link variables that if we sum them along any directed closed path the result is zero (mod 2π). This is known as the Bianchi identity which is lost when the model is expressed in terms of bonds and needs to be enforced as a constraint. The first set of δ -functions in the above equation enforces the “local” Bianchi identities, *i.e.* those due to topologically trivial loops. The second set enforces the “global” Bianchi identities, *i.e.* those due to topologically nontrivial loops in the imaginary time direction due to the periodic boundary conditions. These constraints have several interesting relationships to various geometrical aspects of the theory.[12] Here we will simply exploit its relationship to the duality transformation. As was shown in Ref. [12] the dual variables are the Fourier conjugates to these constraints. In other words, the Fourier expansions of these δ -functions

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\text{plaquettes}} \left(\delta \left[e^{i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}\Delta_\nu\theta_\rho(\vec{r},\tau)} - 1 \right] \right) &= \sum_{\{l_\mu(\vec{r},\tau)=-\infty\}}^{+\infty} e^{i\sum_{\vec{r},\tau} l_\mu(\vec{r},\tau)\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}\Delta_\nu\theta_\rho(\vec{r},\tau)} \\ &= \sum_{\{l(\vec{r},\tau)=-\infty\}}^{+\infty} e^{-i\sum_{\vec{r},\tau} \theta_\rho(\vec{r},\tau)\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}\Delta_{-\nu}l_\mu(\vec{r},\tau)}, \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\prod_{\vec{r}} \left(\delta \left[e^{i\sum_\tau \theta_\tau(\vec{r},\tau)} - 1 \right] \right) = \sum_{\{n_\tau(\vec{r})=-\infty\}}^{+\infty} e^{i\sum_{\vec{r},\tau} n_\tau(\vec{r})\theta_\tau(\vec{r},\tau)}, \quad (18)$$

immediately give the dual variables. In the case of the local Bianchi constraints, Eq 17, the dual is the integer valued bond variable $l_\mu(\vec{r}, \tau)$, while in the global case, Eq 18, the dual variable is the integer valued field $n_\tau(\vec{r})$. Note that whereas $l_\mu(\vec{r}, \tau)$ is a *vector* bond variable which depends on both coordinates \vec{r} and τ and which has components in the x, y , and τ directions, the variable $n_\tau(\vec{r})$ is global and only points in the time direction. It depends only on the spatial coordinates and gives the value of the current flowing in the time direction from $\tau = 0$ to $\tau = L_\tau$ where L_τ is the number of steps in the imaginary time direction.[12] Also note that the form in which the dual variable $l_\mu(\vec{r}, \tau)$ appears is always $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}\Delta_{-\nu}l_\mu(\vec{r}, \tau)$. So we define the local electric current

$$j_\rho(\vec{r}, \tau) = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}\Delta_{-\nu}l_\mu(\vec{r}, \tau). \quad (19)$$

Due to the totally antisymmetric tensor ϵ , it is clear that the local integer current $j_\rho(\vec{r}, \tau)$ is conserved.

Substituting Eqs 17, 18 and 19 in Eq 16 we can integrate over the original variables, $\theta_\mu(\vec{r}, \tau)$ and $\alpha(\vec{r}, \tau)$. The details of the integration will be given elsewhere.[11] This leaves the partition function expressed only in terms of the dual variables n_τ, j_μ and s_k . The new variable s_k is positive semidefinite integer valued and is nothing but the dual to the amplitude field α . The partition function thus becomes:

$$Z = \sum_{\{n_\tau, j_\mu, s_k\}} (t\delta)^{\sum_{\vec{r}, \tau} 2s_k(\vec{r}, \tau)} \left(\prod_{\vec{r}, \tau} \frac{[n_\tau(\vec{r}) + j_\tau(\vec{r}, \tau)]!}{[n_\tau(\vec{r}) + j_\tau(\vec{r}, \tau) - M(\vec{r}, \tau)]!} \right) \left(\prod_{\vec{r}, \tau} [1 + \delta\mu(\vec{r})]^{n_\tau(\vec{r}) + j_\tau(\vec{r}, \tau) - M(\vec{r}, \tau)} \right) \left(\prod_{\vec{r}, \tau, k} \frac{1}{[s_k(\vec{r}, \tau)]! [s_k(\vec{r}, \tau) + j_k(\vec{r}, \tau)]!} \right), \quad (20)$$

where

$$M(\vec{r}, \tau) \equiv \sum_{k=1,2} (s_k(\vec{r}, \tau) + s_k(\vec{r} - \hat{k}, \tau) + j_k(\vec{r} - \hat{k}, \tau)). \quad (21)$$

In this expression, which will be greatly simplified below, we allowed for the possibility of disorder in the chemical potential. Also, even though originally the values of n_τ ran from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ (Eq. 18), the θ_τ integrals impose the condition that n_τ is positive semidefinite. In fact we can easily prove[11] that the total current traversing a bond in the time direction is nothing but the number of bosons traversing that bond. In addition, it is understood that all the arguments of factorials are positive semidefinite. This imposes several severe constraints on the allowed configurations which we will exploit to simplify the partition function.

For simplicity, although this is not necessary, we will consider the no disorder case, *i.e.* $\mu(r) \rightarrow \mu$. In addition, we will consider the very important case of hardcore bosons where $n_\tau(\vec{r}) + j_\tau(\vec{r}, \tau)$ can take only the values 0 or 1. Combining this with the previously mentioned constraints on the arguments of the factorials, allows us to solve for the allowed electric loop configurations.[11] In this case the partition function simplifies drastically. For example for the one dimensional model it becomes

$$Z_Q = \sum_{\{n_\tau=0,1\}} \sum_{\{j_\mu=0,\pm 1\}} e^{\beta\mu \sum_x n_\tau(x)} (t\delta)^{\sum_{x,\tau} |j_x(x,\tau)|}, \quad (22)$$

for the grand canonical ensemble and

$$Z = \sum_{\{j_\mu=0,\pm 1\}} (t\delta)^{\sum_{x,\tau} |j_x(x,\tau)|}, \quad (23)$$

for the canonical case. These are the duals to the hardcore boson Hubbard model. The interpretation is very simple: The dual is a model of conserved integer current loops that take the values 0 or 1 in the time direction and $0, \pm 1$ in the space directions. The partition function is a sum over all deformations with each spatial hop (in this case x) costing $t\delta$. This is a very simple and appealing form and is very amenable to numerical simulations.

The algorithm is now very simple. For example for the canonical case, we start with all local currents zero, and with the desired number of nonzero global time currents, n_τ , corresponding to the number of bosons in the system. Then we visit each plaquette and randomly choose to add to it a positive or negative elementary current loop (plaquette). This attempt is rejected if (i) it introduces negative time currents, or (ii) it introduces currents larger than 1. If this test is satisfied, we accept this current loop in accordance with detailed balance: If $(t\delta)^2$ is greater than or equal to a uniformly distributed random number we accept the change.

5 Physical Quantities

Now that we have the partition function and the algorithm we need expressions for the physical quantities we want to measure. The expression for the energy can be easily obtained from $\langle E \rangle = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} \ln Z$. This gives

$$\langle E \rangle = -\frac{1}{\beta} \left\langle \sum_{x,\tau} |j_x(x,\tau)| \right\rangle. \quad (24)$$

The numerical values for $\langle E \rangle$ obtained with the above algorithm and Eq 24 are shown in Fig. 1 and compared with the results of exact diagonalization. We see that the agreement between the two results is excellent.

The expression for the equal time density-density correlation function is

$$\langle n(x_1)n(x_2) \rangle = \langle (n_\tau(x_1) + j_\tau(x_1, \tau))(n_\tau(x_2) + j_\tau(x_2, \tau)) \rangle, \quad (25)$$

since the number of particles on site (x, τ) is given by $(n_\tau(x) + j_\tau(x, \tau))$. We compare the numerical values of this correlation function with the exact values in Fig. 2. Again we see that agreement is excellent.

The superfluid density is, in general, related to the winding number, W , of current configurations by[3]

$$\rho_s = \frac{\langle W^2 \rangle}{2t\beta}. \quad (26)$$

We have so far only discussed local moves in our Monte Carlo algorithm, and such moves can never change the winding number of a configuration. Therefore, the system is stuck in the winding number sector of the initial configuration. If the initial configuration has $W = 0$, this will give $\langle W^2 \rangle = 0$ and therefore zero superfluid density. This obstacle can be overcome with a trick. Define the *total* x -current at a given time τ by $J_x(\tau) = \sum_x j_x(x, \tau)$ and calculate the Fourier transform of the current-current correlation function

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\omega) = \sum_{\tau, \tau_0} e^{i\frac{2\pi}{L\tau}\omega\tau} \langle J_x(\tau_0)J_x(\tau_0 + \tau) \rangle. \quad (27)$$

We can show[3] that $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\omega \rightarrow 0) = W^2$ which allows us to calculate the superfluid density ρ_s . In Fig. 3 we show ρ_s as a function $(\rho_c - \rho)$ where $\rho_c = 1$ is the critical density at which the hardcore boson system becomes an incompressible Mott insulator and ρ is the boson density. From scaling arguments[14] we expect $\rho_s \sim (1 - \rho)^{\nu z}$ with $\nu z = 1$. [15] Our numerically obtained value on a small system is $\nu z = 0.96$ in excellent agreement with the theoretical values.

These three quantities can be easily measured by existing QMC algorithms mentioned earlier. What is qualitatively new here is that we can measure the correlation function of the order parameter very easily. Let $\mathcal{N}(r)$ be the number of jumps of length r in a spatial direction (in this case x) in a given loop configuration. We can show[11]

$$\langle a(x_1)a^\dagger(x_2) \rangle = \frac{1}{\beta\delta^{|x_1-x_2|-1}} \left\langle \sum_{l=0}^{\frac{L_x}{2}-|x_1-x_2|} (l+1)\mathcal{N}(|x_1-x_2|+l) \right\rangle, \quad (28)$$

where $|x_1 - x_2| \geq 1$. This quantity is shown in Fig. 4 for $\beta = 0.5$ and 4 for

$L_x = 8$. We see that agreement with exact values is excellent for $\beta = 0.5$ and gets worse for $\beta = 4$ as $|x_1 - x_2|$ increases. The reason is that the exact diagonalization results sum over all winding number sectors whereas our simulation stays in the $W = 0$ sector. At high temperature ($\beta = 0.5$) the correlation length is short and the boundary conditions are less important so we get good agreement. At lower temperatures the correlation length is longer and consequently the boundary conditions become very important for small systems. For the more interesting larger system sizes the boundary conditions will become less important.

6 Conclusions

We have outlined how to perform the duality transformation exactly for the soft and hard core bosonic Hubbard models. In the hard core case the dual model is particularly simple. The dual partition function was used to construct a loop Quantum Monte Carlo algorithm and we showed that the numerical results agree very well with those of exact diagonalization for a system with 8 sites and 4 bosons.

In particular we showed that with our algorithm we can calculate easily the order parameter correlation function, $\langle a(x_1)a^\dagger(x_2) \rangle$ which is very difficult to do with most other QMC algorithms. This interesting quantity is very important for the elaboration of the quantum phase transitions exhibited by the system.

This representation of the Hubbard model has many common features with the World Line representation for which very efficient cluster algorithms have been constructed.[4, 6] It, therefore, seems possible to improve the efficiency of this algorithm in the same way. A cluster algorithm would improve the convergence properties and in addition would lift the restriction to zero winding number sector.[4] This would greatly improve the calculation of the order parameter correlation function. This is currently under investigation.

Note added. After the completion of this work we became aware of two other algorithms which allow to calculate the correlation function of the order parameters. These are the “worm” algorithm[16] and the cluster algorithm with a new interpretation of the clusters.[17]

7 Acknowledgements

We thank Richard Scalettar for many very helpful discussions and for the exact diagonalization results used in this article.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- FIG. 1 The average energy per site as a function of β . L_x, N_b are the number of lattice sites and bosons respectively.
- FIG. 2 The density-density correlation function as a function of distance. Open symbols are exact diagonalization values, full symbols are simulation results. The lines are just to guide the eyes.
- FIG. 3 The superfluid density, ρ_s , as a function of $(1 - \rho)$. The theoretical value of νz is 1.
- FIG. 4 The correlation function of the order parameter, $\langle a(x_1)a^\dagger(x_2) \rangle$ as a function of distance for two values of β .

References

- [1] E.L. Pollock and D.M. Ceperley, Phys. Rev. **B30**, 2555 (1984); D.M. Ceperley and E.L. Pollock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 351 (1986); and E.L. Pollock and D.M. Ceperley, Phys. Rev. **B36**, 8343 (1987).
- [2] J.E. Hirsch, R.L. Sugar, D.J. Scalapino and R. Blankenbecler, Phys. Rev. **B26**, 5033 (1982).
- [3] G. G. Batrouni, R. T. Scalettar, and G. T. Zimanyi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 1765, and Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 3144; P. Niyaz, R. T. Scalettar, C.Y. Fong, and G. G. Batrouni, Phys. Rev. **B44** (1991) 7143, and Phys. Rev. **B50** (1994) 362; G. G. Batrouni and R. T. Scalettar, Phys. Rev. **B46** (1992) 9051; G.G. Batrouni, B. Larson, R.T. Scalettar, J. Tobochnik, and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. **B48** (1993) 9628; G. G. Batrouni, R. T. Scalettar, G. T. Zimanyi and A. P. Kampf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 2527; R. T. Scalettar, G. G. Batrouni, A. P. Kampf and G. T. Zimanyi, Phys. Rev. **B51** (1995) 8467.
- [4] H.G. Evertz, G. Lana, and M. Marcu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 875 (1993); U.-J. Wiese and H.-P. Ying, Phys. Lett. **A 168**, 143 (1992); Z. Phys. **B 93** (1994) 147; N. Kawashima, J.E. Gubernatis, and H.G. Evertz, Phys. Rev. **B 50** 136 (1994); N. Kawashima and J.E. Gubernatis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1295 (1994).
- [5] H.F. Trotter, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **10**, 545 (1959). M. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. **113A**, 299 (1985); R.M. Fye, Phys. Rev. **B33**, 6271 (1986); and R.M. Fye and R.T. Scalettar, Phys. Rev. **B36**, 3833 (1987).
- [6] B.B. Beard and U.-J. Wiese, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 5130 (1996).
- [7] J. Villain, J. Phys. **36**, 581 (1975).
- [8] See for example: M. C. Cha *et. al.* Phys. Rev. **B44**, 6883 (1991); A. van Otterlo and K.-H. Wagenblast, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3598 (1994), A. van Otterlo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B52**, 16176 (1995); H. Rieger, J. Kisker; Physica A 246, 348 (1997) and Phys. Rev. **B 55**, 11981R (1997).
- [9] See for example J. W. Negele and H. Orland, “Quantum Many-Particle Systems”, Addison-Wesley, Reading MA (1988).

- [10] This is not quite correct. If we normal order $e^{-\delta H}$ only to order δ we will end up with a dual model that does not allow hops of more than one lattice spacing at a time. There is no physical basis for this restriction, and in addition it leads to underestimates of the kinetic energy. The correct procedure is to normal order the exponential of the kinetic energy operator to all orders in δ . This is easy since this operator is quadratic,
- [11] G. G. Batrouni, and H. Mabilat, in preparation.
- [12] G. G. Batrouni, Nucl. Phys. **B208** 467 (1982); G. G. Batrouni and M. B. Halpern, Phys. Rev. **D30** 1775 (1984).
- [13] Differences of next near neighbors can always be expressed as the sums of differences of near neighbors.
- [14] M. P. A. Fisher *et al*, Phys. Rev. **B40**, 546 (1989).
- [15] ν is the correlation length critical exponent and z is the dynamic critical exponent. They are expected to have the mean-field values $\nu = 1/2, z = 2$.
- [16] N. V. Prokof'ev, B. V. Svistunov and I. S. Tupitsyn, Phys. Lett **A 238** 253 (1998).
- [17] R. Brower, S. Chandrasekharan and U.-J. Wiese, unpublished (cond-mat/9801003)




Figure 1

G.G. Batrouni, H. Mabilat

“Dual Quantum Monte Carlo Algorithm for Hardcore Bosons”




Figure 2

G.G. Batrouni, H. Mabilat

“Dual Quantum Monte Carlo Algorithm for Hardcore Bosons”




Figure 3

G.G. Batrouni, H. Mabilat

“Dual Quantum Monte Carlo Algorithm for Hardcore Bosons”




Figure 4

G.G. Batrouni, H. Mabilat

“Dual Quantum Monte Carlo Algorithm for Hardcore Bosons”