

Comment on "Exact bosonization for an interacting Fermi gas in arbitrary dimensions"

D. Galanakis,¹ S. Yang,¹ F.F. Assaad,² M. Jarrell,¹ P. Werner,³ and M. Troyer³

¹Department of Physics and Astronomy, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

²Institut für theoretische Physik und Astrophysik,

Universität Würzburg, Am Hubland, D-97074, Germany

³Theoretische Physik, ETH Zurich, 8093, Zurich, Switzerland

In a recent Letter [1] Efetov et al. propose an exact mapping of an interacting fermion system onto a new model that is supposed to allow sign-problem free Monte Carlo simulations. In this Comment, we show that their formalism is equivalent to the standard approach of Blackenbecker, Scalapino and Sugar (BSS) [2] for fermionic systems and has the same sign statistics and minus sign problem.

Our first observation is that the partition function for a given configuration of the auxiliary fields is the same in the standard formulation Z_f [Eq. (8) in Ref. [1]] and in their new bosonized scheme Z_b [Eq. (9)]:

$$Z_f[\phi] = Z_b[\phi]; \quad (1)$$

This observation is trivial in the limit of the time step

$\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0$, where both schemes reproduce the same partition function. Since Z_f can be negative also in this limit [2], Z_b is also not sign-positive. Both Z_f and Z_b are positive if ϕ is a smooth path [2], but restricting the configuration space to smooth paths amounts to a semiclassical approximation.

We next show that $Z_f[\phi] = Z_b[\phi]$ also holds for finite and piecewise constant paths where the field $\phi_r(\tau)$ is constant on the interval $[(l+1)\Delta\tau; (l+2)\Delta\tau]$. Efetov et al.'s Eq. (9) is equivalent to $Z_b[\phi] = \text{Tr} e^{-H_0 U_I(\phi; 0)}$ where $\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} U_I(\phi; \phi) = H_{I;1}(\phi) U_I(\phi; 0)$ and $H_{I;1}(\phi) = \sum_{r,r'} \phi(r,r') e^{H_0 m_{z;r}} e^{-H_0}$. Since $U_I(\phi; 0) = U_I(\phi; 1) U_I(\phi; 0)$, $Z_b[\phi] = \text{Tr} e^{-H_0} \prod_{n=0}^N U_I(\phi; (l+1)\Delta\tau)$. We are left with the task of evaluating $U_I(\phi; (l+1)\Delta\tau)$ on the l^{th} time interval where the fields are constant and take the values ϕ_{l1} . For this constant in time field configuration, $U_I(\phi; (l+1)\Delta\tau) = e^{-\phi_{l1} H_0} e^{-h_1} e^{-(l+1) H_0}$ with $H_1 = H_0 \sum_{r,r'} m_{z;r} \phi(r,r')$. Hence,

$$Z_b[\phi] = \det \left(1 + \sum_{l=0}^N e^{-h_1} \right) Z_f[\phi]; \quad (2)$$

We also demonstrate that the proposed formalism is equivalent to that of BSS [2]. Starting from the expression for Z found between Eq. (9) and Eq. (10) and using a matrix notation the partition function reads

$$\ln \frac{Z_b[\phi]}{Z_0} = \sum_0^{Z-1} \int_0^X \text{Tr} G; \quad (3)$$

where G is a matrix with elements $\langle r_l; r_0 | G | r_l; r_0 \rangle$, the trace is over the space time indices and

$$G = G^0 + u G^0 G = (1 - u G^0)^{-1} G^0; \quad (4)$$

where G^0 is the non interacting Green function. From Eqs. (3) and (4) we get

$$\ln \frac{Z_b[\phi]}{Z_0} = \sum_0^{Z-1} \int_0^X \text{Tr} \frac{1}{1 - u G^0} G^0; \quad (5)$$

The integral in terms of u and ϕ can be carried out analytically yielding the BSS partition function

$$Z_b[\phi] = Z_0 \exp \left(\text{Tr} \ln \frac{1}{1 - (G^0)^2} \right) = \frac{Z_0}{\det(1 - (G^0)^2)} = \frac{Y}{\det G}; \quad (6)$$

A sign problem is present in Eq. (3), but is hidden in the u integral. If G^0 has eigenvalues on the real axis with absolute value greater than 1, then the u integral runs over poles. This will give phases of i in the exponent which can lead to negative values of the exponential.

Finally, Efetov's et al. suggest an alternative way of evaluating the same weight Z_b from a bosonic field $A_{rr'}(\tau)$; however, the equation of motion that A satisfies, [their Eq. (13)], is singular. Furthermore, the equation of motion cannot uniquely determine A (not even with their additional constraint $\sum_r A_{rr}(\tau) = 0$). The latter can be shown, for example, using a two site cluster and a single time slice.

In conclusion, we have shown that for piecewise continuous paths the partition function obtained from Efetov et al.'s method [1] is equivalent to the standard BSS formulation and has, in particular, the same sign problem. However, their method provides a new perspective on the minus sign problem, as it can be viewed as originating from poles of the coupling constant (u) integral, or as branch cuts of a logarithm when the integral over u is performed analytically.

[1] K.B. Efetov, C. Pepin, and H. Meier, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 186403 (2009).

[2] R.B. Blackenbecker, D.J. Scalapino, and R.L. Sugar, Phys. Rev. D 24, 2278 (1981).