

# Properties of Quantum Spin Systems and their Classical Limit

joint work with prof. Valter Moretti, prof. Klaas Landsman, Dr. Robin  
Reuvers & prof. Gerrit Groenenboom

Christiaan van de Ven

University of Trento

Trieste, 26 July 2019

- Quantum Curie-Weiss Hamiltonian as a discretization of a Schroedinger operator with a symmetric double well potential.
  - Scientific paper yet available on the ArXiv. 'Quantum spin systems versus Schroedinger operators: A case study in spontaneous symmetry breaking'.
- Deformation quantization & application to quantum spin systems with their classical limit, special emphasis to spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB).
  - Publication in preparation.

QUANTUM CURIE-WEISS HAMILTONIAN AS A 1D DISCRETIZATION OF  
A SCHROEDINGER OPERATOR WITH A SYMMETRIC DOUBLE WELL  
POTENTIAL.

# Properties of the quantum Curie-Weiss model

- Quantum Curie-Weiss Hamiltonian  $h_N^{CW}$  defined on  $\mathcal{H}_N = \bigotimes_{n=1}^N \mathbb{C}^2$  by:

$$h_N^{CW} = -\frac{J}{2N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sigma_3(i)\sigma_3(j) - B \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_1(i). \quad (1)$$

- Existence of an invariant subspace for  $h_N^{CW}$  and a basis such that the restriction to this subspace represented in this basis is a tridiagonal matrix. One can show that the ground state is in the subspace.

- This subspace is the symmetric subspace  $\text{Sym}^N(\mathbb{C}^2)$ , namely the range of the symmetrizer  $S_N = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_N} L_\sigma$ . The corresponding basis is the canonical (Dicke) basis  $\{|k, N-k\rangle\}$ , where the vectors  $|k, N-k\rangle$  are given by permutations of qubits:

$$|k, N-k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{N}{k}}} \sum_{j,l} P_{j,l} \underbrace{|\uparrow\uparrow \cdots \uparrow}_{k \text{ times}} \underbrace{|\downarrow\downarrow \cdots \downarrow}_{N-k \text{ times}}\rangle, \quad (k = 0, \dots, N). \quad (2)$$

# Discretization: uniform case

- Principle: a process to approximate derivatives by linear combinations of function values at grid points.
- We focus on the central difference approximation method and apply this to the second order differential operator  $d^2/dx^2$ , which we would like to discretize with uniform grid spacing of  $\Delta = 1/N$  on the domain  $\Omega = [0, 1]$ .
- The second order derivative for a single-variable smooth function  $f$  is then approximated by

$$f_i'' \approx \frac{f_{i-1} - 2f_i + f_{i+1}}{\Delta^2} \quad (i = 1, \dots, N), \quad (3)$$

where  $f_i = f(x_i) = f(i\Delta)$ .

# Discretization: uniform case

- In matrix form we find

$$f'' \approx \frac{1}{\Delta^2} \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & -2 \end{pmatrix} f. \quad (4)$$

- This matrix is the result of a central finite difference discretization method of the second order derivative on a uniform grid consisting of  $N$  points of length  $\Delta \cdot N$ , with uniform grid spacing  $\Delta$ . In this specific case, we have  $\Delta = 1/N$ . We denote this tridiagonal matrix by  $\frac{1}{\Delta^2} [\cdot \cdot \cdot 1 \ -2 \ 1 \ \cdot \cdot \cdot]_N$ .

## Discretization: uniform case

- The other way around: suppose we are given a symmetric tridiagonal matrix  $A$  of dimension  $N$  with constant off- and diagonal elements,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} b & a & & & \\ a & b & a & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & 0 & a & b & a \\ & & & a & b & \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

- Goal: rewrite this matrix as a sum of kinetic and potential energy:

$$A = a[\cdot \cdot \cdot 1 \frac{b}{a} 1 \cdot \cdot \cdot]_N = a[\cdot \cdot \cdot 1 - 2 \ 1 \cdot \cdot \cdot]_N + \text{diag}(b + 2a). \quad (6)$$

## Discretization: uniform case

- It follows that  $A = T + V$ , for  $T = a[\cdot \cdot \cdot 1 \quad -2 \quad 1 \cdot \cdot \cdot]_N$ , and  $V = \text{diag}(b + 2a)$ .
- In view of the above, the matrix  $T$  corresponds to a discretization of a second order differential operator (kinetic energy), with uniform grid spacing  $1/\sqrt{a}$  on the grid of length  $N/\sqrt{a}$ . Since the matrix  $V$  is a diagonal matrix, it can be seen as a multiplication operator. Hence, we can identify  $A$  with a discretization of a Schrödinger operator.
- Apply this idea to the quantum Curie-Weiss tridiagonal matrix  $\rightarrow$  extract a discretized Schrödinger operator.



# Curie-Weiss versus Schroedinger operator

- The Curie-Weiss tridiagonal matrix will be interpreted as an approximation ( $N$  large) of a  $1d$  discretized Schrödinger operator on  $L^2[0, 1]$  with a symmetric double well potential  $V_N(x)$ :

$$-\frac{1}{L^2 N^2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V_N(x), \quad (7)$$

where  $1/N$  plays the role of  $\hbar$ .

- Idea: split the tridiagonal matrix into two parts, one corresponding to the kinetic energy and the other to the potential energy.
- Main problem, our tridiagonal matrix does not have constant off-diagonal elements (entries even vary with the dimension), so we cannot apply the previous theory directly.

# Curie-Weiss versus Schroedinger operator

- However, In the semi-classical limit, the potential energy dominates the kinetic energy. We extracted this potential and observed that it has the shape of a symmetric double well.
- Spectral properties for bound states of our tridiagonal matrix and the discretization of (7), i.e.,  $-\frac{1}{L^2}[\cdot \cdot \cdot 1 - 2 \ 1 \cdot \cdot \cdot]_N + V_N(x)$  have been compared. They coincide up to a very good approximation and improve with increasing  $N$ .
- Ground state is localized in the minima of these wells, and is Gaussian shaped, exactly as expected for such a Schroedinger operator.
- To conclude, the compressed quantum Curie-Weiss model can be seen as a discretization of a Schrödinger operator with a symmetric double well potential.

DEFORMATION QUANTIZATION & APPLICATION TO QUANTUM SPIN  
SYSTEMS WITH THEIR CLASSICAL LIMIT, SPECIAL EMPHASIS TO  
SPONTANEOUS SYMMETRY BREAKING (SSB).

# Introduction

- Example. Consider  $h_{\hbar} = -\hbar \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x)$ , and the corresponding ground state eigenfunction  $\psi_{\hbar}^{(0)}$ , assuming the spectrum is discrete. How can  $\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \psi_{\hbar}^{(0)}$  be interpreted?
- Framework to deal with this question exists under the name deformation quantization. Mathematical concept establishing a link between classical and quantum mechanics, using the language of  $C^*$ -algebras and the theory of Poisson manifolds.
- Basic idea: A continuous bundle of  $C^*$ -algebras over base space  $I$  consists of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ , a collection of  $C^*$ -algebras  $(A_{\hbar})_{\hbar \in I}$  with norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\hbar}$ , and surjective homomorphisms  $\varphi_{\hbar} : A \rightarrow A_{\hbar}$  for each  $\hbar \in I$ , such that several (continuity) properties are satisfied.

# Deformation quantization

- A (strict) deformation quantization of a Poisson manifold  $X$  consists of a continuous bundle of  $C^*$ -algebras  $(A, \{\varphi : A \rightarrow A_{\hbar}\}_{\hbar \in I})$  over  $I$ , along with maps

$$Q_{\hbar} : \tilde{A}_0 \rightarrow A_{\hbar} \quad (\hbar \in I),$$

where  $\tilde{A}_0$  is a dense subspace of  $A_0 = C_0(X)$ , such that:

1.  $Q_0$  is the inclusion map  $\tilde{A}_0 \hookrightarrow A_0$ ;
2. Each map  $Q_{\hbar}$  is linear and satisfies  $Q_{\hbar}(f^*) = Q_{\hbar}(f)^*$ .
3. For each  $f \in \tilde{A}_0$ , the following map is a continuous section of the bundle:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\rightarrow f; \\ \hbar &\rightarrow Q_{\hbar}(f). \quad (\hbar > 0) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

# Deformation quantization

4. For all  $f, g \in \tilde{A}_0$  one has the Dirac-Groenewold-Rieffel condition:

$$\lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \left\| \frac{i}{\hbar} [Q_{\hbar}(f), Q_{\hbar}(g)] - Q_{\hbar}(\{f, g\}) \right\|_{\hbar} = 0.$$

- This map 'transfers' classical information to quantum data, and can therefore be used to identify classical theories as limits of quantum theories.
- Example 1. We define for any  $\hbar \in [0, 1]$ :

$$Q_{\hbar} : C_0(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow B_{\infty}(L^2(\mathbb{R}));$$
$$Q_{\hbar}(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{dpdq}{2\pi\hbar} f(p, q) |\phi_{\hbar}^{(p,q)}\rangle \langle \phi_{\hbar}^{(p,q)}|,$$

where the projections  $|\phi_{\hbar}^{(p,q)}\rangle \langle \phi_{\hbar}^{(p,q)}|$  are coming from so-called Schrodinger coherent states  $\phi_{\hbar}^{(p,q)}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

# Deformation quantization

- Example 2. We define for any  $1/N \in 1/\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ :

$$Q_{1/N} : C(S^2) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_N);$$

$$Q_{1/N}(f) = \frac{N+1}{4\pi} \int_{S^2} d\mu(\Omega) f(\Omega) |\Omega_N\rangle \langle \Omega_N|,$$

where  $\mu$  is a measure on the sphere  $S^2$ . The projections  $|\Omega_N\rangle \langle \Omega_N|$  are coming from so-called spin coherent states, induced by points  $\Omega \in S^2 = SU(2)/U(1)$ .

- The maps  $Q_{\hbar}$  and  $Q_{1/N}$  satisfy the properties of a deformation quantization in the above sense.
- In these two examples, both coherent states are involved to define the quantization map.

# 'Classical' limit

- Concerning example 2, the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  will be defined as follows: given unit vectors  $\psi_N \in \mathcal{H}_N$ , we say that that these vectors have a 'classical' limit if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi_N, Q_{1/N}(f)\psi_N \rangle = \omega_0(f) \quad (f \in C(S^2)), \quad (9)$$

where  $\omega_0$  is some probability measure on  $S^2$ , seen as a state on  $C(S^2)$ . A similar statement can be made for Example 1 sending  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ , or for other quantization maps.

- In the context of Schroedinger operators (Example 1) the limit  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$  typically means  $m \rightarrow \infty$  at fixed  $\hbar$  in  $\hbar^2/2m$ , so that one may physically see  $\hbar \rightarrow 0$  as a special case of  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .



## Definition

Let  $A$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra with time evolution, i.e., a continuous homomorphism  $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(A)$ . A ground state of  $(A, \alpha)$  is a state  $\omega$  on  $A$  such that:

1.  $\omega$  is time independent, i.e.,  $\omega(\alpha_t(a)) = \omega(a) \forall a \in A \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ .
2. The generator  $h_\omega$  of the ensuing continuous unitary representation

$$t \mapsto u_t = e^{ith_\omega} \quad (10)$$

of  $\mathbb{R}$  on  $\mathcal{H}_\omega$  has positive spectrum, i.e.,  $\sigma(h_\omega) \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ , or equivalently  $\langle \psi, h_\omega \psi \rangle \geq 0$  ( $\psi \in D(h_\omega)$ ).

- The set of ground states forms a compact convex subset of  $S(A)$ , and we denote this set by  $S_0(A)$ . We moreover assume that pure ground states are pure states as well as ground states.

## Definition

Suppose we have a  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ , a time evolution  $\alpha$ , a group  $G$ , and a homomorphism  $\gamma : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(A)$ , which is a symmetry of the dynamics  $\alpha$  in that

$$\alpha_t \circ \gamma_g = \gamma_g \circ \alpha_t \quad (g \in G, t \in \mathbb{R}). \quad (11)$$

The  $G$ -symmetry is said to be spontaneously broken (at temperature  $T = 0$ ) if

$$(\partial_e S_0(A))^G = \emptyset, \quad (12)$$

- Here  $\mathcal{S}^G = \{\omega \in \mathcal{S} \mid \omega \circ \gamma_g = \omega \ \forall g \in G\}$ , defined for any subset  $\mathcal{S} \in S(A)$ , is the set of  $G$ -invariant states in  $\mathcal{S}$ . (12) means that there are no  $G$ -invariant pure ground states. (12) means that there are no  $G$ -invariant pure ground states. This means also that if spontaneous symmetry breaking occurs, then invariant ground states are not pure.

# Application to quantum spin Hamiltonians and SSB

- Special case. Assume  $\psi_N^{(0)}$  is the ground state of some spin Hamiltonian on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_N$  (or e.g. the ground state eigenfunction of a Schroedinger operator). Given a quantization map, in view of equation (9) one can ask if the limit exists on some commutative algebra  $C(X)$ .
- This is probably (numerical evidence) the case for the one-dimensional quantum Curie-Weiss model (for  $X = B^3$  and some  $Q_{1/N}$ ):

$$h_N^{QW} = -\frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_{x,y=1}^N \sigma_3(x)\sigma_3(y) + B\sigma_1(x) \right)$$

- Note that this limit (i.e. equation (9) with  $\psi_N = \psi_N^{(0)}$ ) is different than the thermodynamic limit, where a infinite quantum spin system is considered.

# Application to quantum spin Hamiltonians and SSB

- There is numerical evidence that the ground state eigenvector converges (in the above sense) to a classical mixed state given by  $\omega_0^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_+ + \omega_-)$ , where  $\omega_0^\pm$  are Dirac measures (i.e. pure states) corresponding to the minima of the classical Hamiltonian on  $C(B^3)$  which is given by  $h = -(\frac{z^2}{2} + Bx)$ .
- One can show that these degenerate pure classical ground states  $\omega_0^\pm$  are not  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -invariant (for  $0 < B < 1$ ), under the homomorphism induced by the map  $(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, -y, -z)$ , which basically means that the pure classical ground states are not invariant under parity symmetry. According to our definition, one can show that the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetry is spontaneously broken. However, for finite  $N$  it can be shown that the ground state is unique and hence  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -invariant.
- Therefore, this theory also gives a mathematical explanation of spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB).

## Further research

- Generalize these type of quantization maps to more arbitrary spaces, like the state space  $S(B)$  of a unital  $C^*$ -algebra  $B$

$$Q_{1/N} : C(S(B)) \rightarrow B^{\otimes N}.$$

- Work in progress (with Valter Moretti): give a proof of the existence of a deformation quantization in the case  $B = M_k(\mathbb{C})$ . No coherent states, different approach is needed!
- Apply to spin Hamiltonians (e.g. quantum Curie Weiss-model or quantum Ising model), and prove the possibly existence of classical limits. Try to understand natural emergent phenomena like SSB from this point of view.
- Different quantum Hamiltonians seem to share similar properties in their classical limit.
- Thank you for your attention! I hope you all enjoyed it.

- G. Graffi, V. Grecchi, and G. Jona-Lasinio, Tunnelling instability via perturbation theory, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 17, 2935-2944 (1984), doi:10.1088/0305-4470/17/15/011
- G. Jona-Lasinio, F. Martinelli, and E. Scoppola, New approach to the semiclassical limit of quantum mechanics, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 80, 223–254 (1981), doi:10.1007/BF01213012.
- D. Kuzmin, Introduction to CFD, lecture 4: Finite difference method (2017), [www.mathematik.uni-dortmund.de/~kuzmin/cfdintro/lecture4.pdf](http://www.mathematik.uni-dortmund.de/~kuzmin/cfdintro/lecture4.pdf).
- Landsman, N.P. (2017). *Foundations of Quantum Theory*. Springer.
- Perelomov, A. (1986). *Generalized Coherent States and their Applications*. Berlin: Springer.



- The non-degenerate states  $(\psi_N^{(0)}, \psi_N^{(1)})$  converge (in algebraic sense) to mixed classical states, i.e.,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \psi_N^{(0)} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \psi_N^{(1)} = \omega_0^{(0)},$$

where  $\omega_0^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_0^+ + \omega_0^-)$ .

- In contrast, the localized pure ground states

$$\psi_N^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_N^{(0)} + \psi_N^{(1)}),$$

converge (in algebraic sense) to pure classical states, i.e.,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \psi_N^\pm = \omega_0^\pm.$$



## Definition

Let  $I$  be a locally compact Hausdorff space. A continuous bundle of  $C^*$ -algebras over  $I$  consists of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$ , a collection of  $C^*$ -algebras  $(A_{\hbar})_{\hbar \in I}$  with norms  $\|\cdot\|_{\hbar}$ , and surjective homomorphisms  $\varphi_{\hbar} : A \rightarrow A_{\hbar}$  for each  $\hbar \in I$ , such that

1. The function  $\hbar \mapsto \|\varphi_{\hbar}(a)\|_{\hbar}$  is in  $C_0(I)$  for all  $a \in A$ .
2. The norm for any  $a \in A$  is given by

$$\|a\| = \sup_{\hbar \in I} \|\varphi_{\hbar}(a)\|_{\hbar}. \quad (13)$$

3. For any  $f \in C_0(I)$  and  $a \in A$ , there is an element  $fa \in A$  such that for each  $\hbar \in I$ ,

$$\varphi_{\hbar}(fa) = f(\hbar)\varphi_{\hbar}(a). \quad (14)$$

- A continuous (cross-) section of the bundle in question is a map  $\hbar \mapsto \underline{a(\hbar)} \in \underline{A_{\hbar}}, (\hbar \in I)$ , for which there exists an  $a \in A$  such that  $a(\hbar) = \varphi_{\hbar}(a)$  for each  $\hbar \in I$ .