

Locality of variational gauge fields and slow operators

Dries Sels

Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, USA

*Department of Physics, Harvard University, 17 Oxford st., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA and
Theory of quantum and complex systems, Universiteit Antwerpen, B-2610 Antwerpen, Belgium*

(Dated: August 15, 2017)

THE PROBLEM

Let's separate the entire system in terms of our system of interest S and the environment E , such that we can write the Hamiltonian as $H = H_S + H_E + H_{SE}$. Here we'd like to consider the question, what is the best gauge potential if we only change the Hamiltonian of the system H_S and can only do counter-diabatic driving on the system itself. This has two direct applications: (i) Open systems that are coupled to some bath described by H_E and (ii) closed systems where we only have local control. Here we are primarily concerned with the latter; specifically we want to see if this is a natural way to remove the small denominator problem.

Variational gauge potentials

To be specific let's consider system-environment interactions of the general form

$$H_{SE} = \sum_i \gamma_i S_i \otimes E_i, \quad (1)$$

where S denotes an operator with support on the system and E an operator with support on the environment only. Moreover, without loss of generality we will consider the operators to be traceless, i.e. $\text{Tr} S_i = \text{Tr} E_i = 0$. Given, we can only access the system we are interested in the most general gauge potential of the form

$$A = A_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \quad (2)$$

Using same notation as usual, this variational ansatz results in

$$G = (\partial_\lambda H_S + i[A_S, H_S]) \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + \sum_i \gamma_i i[A_S, S_i] \otimes E_i. \quad (3)$$

Further assuming that the E_i are orthonormal $\text{Tr} E_i E_j = \delta_{ij}$, simply yields

$$S = \text{Tr} G^2 = \underbrace{\text{Tr}_S (\partial_\lambda H_S + i[A_S, H_S])^2}_{S_S} + \sum_j \gamma_j^2 \underbrace{\text{Tr}_S (i[A_S, S_j])^2}_{\text{coupling}}. \quad (4)$$

We notice that the full action consists of a sum of two terms. The bare action over the system + a coupling correction coming from the environment. Formally taking the functional derivative with respect to A_S yields the linear equation

$$[\partial_\lambda H_S + i[A_S, H_S], H_S] + \sum_j \gamma_j^2 i[[A_S, S_j], S_j] = 0. \quad (5)$$

Consequently if we define the eigenvalue problem

$$[[O_\nu, H_S], H_S] + \sum_j \gamma_j^2 [[O_\nu, S_j], S_j] = \omega_\nu^2 O_\nu, \quad (6)$$

the solution becomes

$$A = i \sum_\nu \frac{\text{Tr} ([\partial_\lambda H_S, H_S] O_\nu)}{\omega_\nu^2} O_\nu, \quad (7)$$

where sum should run over all non-zero eigenvalues! Note that whenever $\gamma_j = 0$ we recover the exact result since $O_\nu = |n\rangle\langle m|$ and $\omega_\nu = \epsilon_m - \epsilon_n$. For any non-trivial system/environment coupling we actually expect that there is

only a single zero eigenvalue solution to equation (6), namely the identity $\mathbb{1}_S$. Since the numerator of expression (7) vanishes for the identity we can simply shift the spectrum up by ϵ and sum over all states. This could be useful numerically. Furthermore, the eigenvalue equation (6) recently appeared in a work on slow operators [1] in 1D local quantum spin chains. The takeaway message of the work is that the smallest non-zero eigenvalue ω_1 only scales as a powerlaw with subsystem size L^z . This is in stark contrast to the scaling of the denominator for a closed system, which is exponential in system size. The latter is what causes the gauge potential and all related quantities such as mass and metric tensor to diverge exponentially. I believe the above result indicates that this unphysical divergence is removed by considering only local counter-diabatic drives.

outlook

I believe we should be able to make some progress using ETH. Next we should numerically investigate this problem and explicitly separate the behaviour of the denominators ω from the behavior of the eigenvectors O .

-
- [1] Hyungwon Kim, Mari Carmen Banuls, J. Ignacio Cirac, Matthew B. Hastings, and David A. Huse, Phys. Rev. E 92, 012128, (2015)