Driven Imposters: Controlling Expectations in Many-Body Systems
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We present a framework to control and track the observables of a general solid state system driven by an incident laser field. The main result is a non-linear equation of motion for tracking an observable, together with a constraint on the size of expectations which may be reproduced via tracking. Among other applications, this model provides a potential route to the design of laser fields which cause photo-induced superconductivity in materials above their critical temperature. As a first test, the strategy is used to make the expectation value of the current conform to an arbitrary function under a range of model parameters. Additionally, using two reference spectra for materials in the conducting and insulating regimes respectively, the tracking algorithm is used to make each material mimic the optical spectrum of the other.

Introduction— Ohm’s law is one of the most ubiquitous relationships in all of physics, beginning as an empirical law 11 before both the Drude and free electron models provided a quantitative justification for its existence both classically and quantum-mechanically 2. In the Ohmic regime the relationship between a driving field and the observed current is linear, so that for a given current there is a unique and trivial solution for the control field required to produce it. While it is possible to find examples of Ohm’s law persisting down to the atomic scale 33, quantum mechanics abounds with phenomena such as persistent currents 12 and High Harmonic Generation (HHG) 5–7 where the linear relationship no longer holds. This has important consequences for the control of such systems, when the manipulation of an expectation with a non-linear dependence on the control field presents both significant challenges and opportunities.

The ability to manipulate expectations in this way is highly desirable, with obvious benefits. It presents an opportunity in materials science 8, 9 and chemistry 10, 11 to substitute simpler and cheaper compounds that can mimic the desired properties of more expensive materials. A concrete example of the need for control strategies beyond the linear regime can be found in recent experimental 12 and theoretical 13 work which demonstrates the possibility of photo-induced superconductivity in materials above their critical temperature Tc 13. This raises the possibility of designing laser pulses which favour superconductivity, even at ‘ultra-high’ temperatures, but to do so requires the ability to control expectations beyond the linear regime.

In this letter, we present a method for the tracking and control of expectations within many-body electronic systems when the current J(t) has a highly non-linear dependence on the control field E(t). We additionally show the precise constraints on the functional form of the tracked variable necessary both to avoid singularities and guarantee a unique system evolution. This model is then applied to the highly non-linear regime of HHG in the Hubbard model, both to induce arbitrary designed currents, as well as creating ‘driven imposters’ by using the tracking strategy to make the optical spectrum of one material mimic that of another.

Summary of Results— Our goal is to implement a tracking control 16 model for a general N-electron system subjected to a laser pulse described by the Hamiltonian (using atomic units) 17

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{\sigma} \int \frac{dx}{2} \psi_{\sigma}^\dagger(x) \left[ i \partial_x - A(t) \right]^2 \psi_{\sigma}(x) \\
+ \sum_{\sigma \sigma'} \int \frac{dx dx'}{2} \psi_{\sigma}(x) \psi_{\sigma'}^\dagger(x) U(x - x') \psi_{\sigma'}(x) \psi_{\sigma'}(x'),
\]

(1)

where \( \psi_{\sigma}(x) \) is a fermionic field operator which obeys the usual anticommutation relation, and \( A(t) \) is the electromagnetic vector potential. Specifically, we wish to calculate the control field \( A_T(t) \), such that the trajectory of an expectation \( \langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle \) is described by some desired function \( O_T(t) \) 15, 21.

While the tracking strategy detailed here may be implemented for any Hamiltonian in the form of Eq. (1), we will restrict our focus to the discrete 1D Fermi-Hubbard model, where \( U(x - x') \) is modelled as a contact term 22, as

\[
\hat{H}(t) = - t_0 \sum_{j} \left( e^{-i \Phi(t)} \hat{c}_j \hat{c}_{j+1} + e^{i \Phi(t)} \hat{c}^\dagger_{j+1} \hat{c}^\dagger_j + U \hat{c}^\dagger_j \hat{c}_{j+1} \right) \\
+ \sum_j \left( \hat{c}^\dagger_j \hat{c}_{j+1} \right)
\]

(2)

using the phase \( \Phi(t) = a A(t) \) where \( a \) is the lattice constant.
Our aim is to have the expectation of the current operator \( \hat{J}(t) \) \[^{23}\]

\[
\hat{J}(t) = -i\alpha t_0 \sum_{j,\sigma} \left( e^{-i\Phi(t)} \hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j+1\sigma} - \text{h.c.} \right),
\]

track some predetermined target function \( J_T(t) \), such that \( \langle \hat{J}(t) \rangle = J_T(t) \). Imposing this constraint on the system evolution \( i \frac{d}{dt} \psi = \hat{H}(t) |\psi\rangle \) is equivalent to evolving the wave function via a field-free, non-linear evolution given by

\[
i \frac{d |\psi\rangle}{dt} = \hat{H}_T(J_T(t), \psi) |\psi\rangle,
\]

where \( \hat{H}_T(J_T(t), \psi) \) is the “tracking Hamiltonian” which takes the target function \( J_T(t) \) as a parameter. The full derivation of the tracking Hamiltonian is provided in Ref. \[^{24}\], and we quote the result here:

\[
\hat{H}_T(J_T(t), \psi) = \sum_{\sigma,j} P_+ e^{-i\theta(\psi)} \hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j+1\sigma},
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\sigma,j} P_- e^{i\theta(\psi)} \hat{c}_{j+1\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\sigma} + U \sum_j \hat{c}_{j\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\uparrow} \hat{c}_{j\downarrow},
\]

\[
P_{\pm} = -t_0 \left( \sqrt{1 - X^2(t, \psi)} \pm i X(t, \psi) \right),
\]

\[
X(t, \psi) = \frac{J_T(t)}{2at_0 R(\psi)}.
\]

The \( \psi \) dependent terms are defined by the neighbour hopping expectation in a polar form:

\[
\langle \psi \left| \sum_{\sigma,j} \hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j+1\sigma} \right| \psi \rangle = R(\psi) e^{i\theta(\psi)}.
\]

Using this tracking Hamiltonian to evolve \( \psi \) is equivalent to the evolution given by the Fermi-Hubbard Hamiltonian in Eq. \[^{2}\] when

\[
\Phi(t) = \Phi_T(t) = \arcsin \left( \frac{J_T(t)}{2at_0 R(\psi)} \right) + \theta(\psi).
\]

The form of the tracking Hamiltonian imposes some constraints on the currents that can be tracked successfully. In order to ensure that the evolution is unitary, and that Eq. \[^{4}\] has a unique solution for \( \psi \), it is sufficient to require that all physical wavefunctions evolved from the initial state satisfy \( R(\psi) > \epsilon_1 \) and

\[
|X(t, \psi)| < 1 - \epsilon_2,
\]

where \( \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \) are any positive finite constants. When these constraints are satisfied, the tracking Hamiltonian is not only Hermitian (i.e., \( P_\dagger = P_- \)) \[^{25}\], but also a Lipschitz continuous function \[^{25}\] over all valid wavefunctions. By the Picard-Lindelöf theorem, this property guarantees a unique solution for \( \psi \) \[^{26}\] despite the non-linear character of its evolution. The derivation of this result, along with a physical motivation for the constraints are again given in Ref. \[^{24}\]. While in principle this constraint is a highly non-linear inequality in \( \psi \), in practice it is relatively easy to satisfy via a heuristic scaling of the target to be tracked, as these constraints limit only the peak amplitude of current in the evolution, and otherwise allow for any function to be tracked when appropriately scaled. If one is concerned only with reproducing the shape of the target current, then using a scaled target \( J_s(t) = k J_T(t) \) such that \( |J_s(t)| < 2at_0 R(t) \) will allow tracking unproblematically. Alternately, if one treats the lattice constant \( a \) as a tunable parameter, this can always be set for the tracking system so as to satisfy Eq. \[^{10}\].

A common theme in tracking control is the presence of singularities in the control field generated by the tracking strategy \[^{27}\]. These singularities often lead to unbounded values of the control field, fluctuating from positive to negative unbounded values as it passes through the singularity \[^{28}\], which in turn make a specified trajectory impossible to reproduce \[^{16, 19}\]. As shown above, while singularities are present in this model, they are easily identifiable and amendable due to the form of the current expectation in the Fermi-Hubbard model.

Finally, we note that this tracking strategy can be extended to an arbitrary system expectation, via an analogous procedure detailed in Ref. \[^{24}\]. Briefly, to track an arbitrary observable \( \hat{O} \) such that \( \langle \hat{O} \rangle = O_T(t) \), one requires the following expectations

\[
R_O(t) e^{i\theta_O(t)} = \sum_{\sigma,j} \left\langle \hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j+1\sigma}, \hat{O} \right\rangle,
\]

\[
B(t) = -iU \sum_j \left\langle \left[ \hat{c}_{j\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\uparrow} \hat{c}_{j\downarrow}, \hat{O} \right] \right\rangle.
\]

Using these expectations, Eq. \(^7\) may be used to track the observable using the substitutions \( J_T(t) = O_T(t) \), \( R(t) e^{i\theta(t)} = R_O(t) e^{i\theta_O(t)} \) and

\[
X(t) = \frac{dO_T(t) - B(t)}{2at_0 R_A(t)},
\]

where Eq. \[^{10}\] constrains \( X(t) \) in the same way as in current tracking.

Reference systems- In order to test our tracking strategy, we shall employ two references systems, consisting of the Fermi-Hubbard model for two values of \( U \), namely \( \frac{U}{t_0} = 0 \) and \( \frac{U}{t_0} = 7 \). Unless otherwise stated, we consider an \( L = 10 \) site Hubbard chain with periodic boundary conditions at half-filling (an average of one electron per site), with a hopping parameter of \( t_0 = 0.52eV \) and a lattice constant of \( a = 4Å \). To each reference system we first apply a laser pulse of length \( N = 10 \) periods. This
external field is described by the Peierls phase

$$\Phi(t) = \frac{E_0}{\omega_0} \sin^2 \left( \frac{\omega_0 t}{2N} \right) \sin(\omega_0 t), \quad (14)$$

which is related to the electric field $E(t)$ via $aE(t) = -\frac{d\Phi}{dt}$. For the pulse parameters, we choose the experimentally feasible field amplitude $E_0 = 10$ MV/cm and frequency $\omega_0 = 32.9$ THz [29].

Driving the reference systems with this field produces highly non-linear behaviour. A particular example of this is the phenomenon of high-harmonic generation (HHG) [30, 31, 32], where an incident laser field produces high-order harmonics in the system current, drastically altering the electronic properties of the solid [33]. HHG has been observed both in molecular [31] and solid state [32] systems, and has proven to be a useful tool, enabling molecular orbital tomography [33] and femtosecond resolution imaging of strongly correlated systems [34]. HHG potentially even offers a route to studying dynamics in the attosecond regime [35], as well as precise chiral spectroscopy [36].

While the undriven 1D Hubbard model is an insulator for all $U > 0$ [37], when a laser pulse is applied, there are two distinct phases. The driven system may be in a Mott insulating phase, or – if the incident field is of sufficient amplitude – it undergoes a dielectric breakdown and becomes conducting [38]. In the regime of $\omega_0 < U$ where the linear response of the system cannot excite electrons across the gap, the dominant mechanism for this breakdown is non-linear quantum tunneling, with an associated critical field amplitude [39]

$$E_{th} \sim \Delta \frac{\xi}{2}, \quad (15)$$

where $\Delta$ is the Mott gap [40], and $\xi$ is the doublon-hole correlation length [39]. This threshold makes intuitive sense as the field strength required to separate a charge pair by a length large enough to distinguish them.

In the conducting system, the charge-carriers are doublons and holes [32]. When the breakdown threshold is reached, the density of these charge carriers increases. This can be characterised by the **doublon occupation number** [39]:

$$D(t) = \frac{1}{L} \left\langle \sum_j \hat{c}_j^\dagger \hat{c}_{j+1} \hat{c}_j \hat{c}_{j+1}^\dagger \right\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Figure 1 shows that the rise in the doublon occupation occurs at roughly time $t_{th}$, when the incident field first meets the critical threshold:

$$\frac{\Delta}{2E_0 \xi} = \sin^2 \left( \frac{\omega_0 t_{th}}{2N} \right) \cos(\omega_0 t_{th})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2N} \sin \left( \frac{\omega_0 t_{th}}{N} \right) \sin(\omega_0 t_{th}), \quad (17)$$

where analytic expressions in the thermodynamic limit for the Mott gap [35] and $\xi$ [39, 42] can be used to approximate $t_{th}$.

One consequence of the driving field’s creation of charge excitations is in the optical response, where higher harmonics are generated in the spectrum of the dipole acceleration $(\frac{d^2J}{dt^2})$. Two contrasting regimes are shown in Fig. 2. For $\frac{U}{\omega} = 0$ the system is a conductor, while at $\frac{U}{\omega} = 7$ the onsite interaction is such that $E_{th}(U) > E_0$ and the system is unable to create charge carriers and remains a Mott insulator, even under driving.

The simulated currents shown in Fig. 2 conform well to established results. Systems close to the conducting limit exhibit well-defined peaks at odd harmonics, as observed in mono-band tight-binding models [34]. In contrast, these low-order harmonics are suppressed when the on-site interaction dominates and the system is in an insulating state. In this case, it is intra-band harmonic generation that dominates [33], broadening the spectrum, with a peak at $N \sim \frac{U}{\omega_0}$ [34].

**Material Mimicry.** A novel possibility when using tracking control is the ability to make one material mimic the spectral behaviour of another. To demonstrate this, we use the tracking strategy to make a $\frac{U}{\omega_0} = 0$ system mimic the reference spectra of the $\frac{U}{\omega_0} = 7$ system and vice versa.

The system expectations will be labeled by a superscript to indicate which ratio of the model parameters were used, e.g., the current expectation for the $\frac{U}{\omega_0} = 0$ is labeled $J^{(0)}(t)$, while for $\frac{U}{\omega_0} = 7$ the current expectation is $J^{(7)}(t)$. Finally, we will label the expectations generated by the mimicking tracking strategy with a subscript $T$. For example, the current expectation of the conduct-
In the conducting limit, where \( J \) scale is obeyed at all times. Alternatively, one could simply the conducting system’s reveals that even while imitating the insulator’s current, an alternate characterisation of the system state. This doublon occupation number (shown in Fig. 3) provides imitate the dipole acceleration spectrum of another, the can be tracked in the other.

Spectral mimicry, where each material’s reference spectra are focused peaks around odd integer overtones of the driving frequency. This high \( U \) occurred between the reference and tracked systems. At conductivity, the conducting system would not change its conductive property. In the converse case, a more dramatic change has happened between the reference and tracked systems. At this high \( U \), the electrons remain frozen by their strong Coulomb repulsion, and in order to match the spectral characteristics of a lower repulsion model with more mobile charge carriers, the tracking field must exceed the breakdown threshold given by Eq. (15). The result of this is that \( D^T(t) \) exhibits the rise in doublon occupancy characteristic of the dielectric breakdown of a Mott insulator. Importantly, the same qualitative behaviour also occurs when one instead chooses to scale the target current \( J_T(t) = kJ_R(t) \) rather than the lattice constant \( a \). This breakdown is confirmed by calculation of the time at which \( \Phi^T_T(t) \) exceeds the threshold associated with \( U = 7 \) and is shown in Fig. 3.

**Tracking a current ‘switch’**. As a further test for the tracking strategy, we use it to manipulate the current of a system so that it changes abruptly from zero to non-zero, which would have uses as a current ‘switch’. Forcing \( J_T(t) \) to track an arbitrary function is possible provided Eq. (10) is obeyed. We therefore assign the target current \( J_T(t) \) to a box-like switch function:

\[
J_T(t) = \frac{1}{4(1 + e^{-2(t-T/5)})} - \frac{1}{4(1 + e^{-2(t-4T/5)})}. 
\]

In Fig. 4 we show the result of applying the tracking algorithm, along with the tracking phase \( \Phi^T_T(t) \) necessary to produce \( J_T(t) \) at several interaction strengths. While the target current can be tracked at all selected model parameters, increasing the on-site repulsion results in compensatory oscillations within the control phase \( \Phi^T_T(t) \). This reflects the increasing nonlinearity in Eq. (7) as one increases the onsite repulsion.

**Discussion**. In this paper we have demonstrated a strategy for manipulating the current, (and therefore HHG spectra) of a strongly-correlated solid. Several applications of this technique were discussed. In addition to tracking an arbitrary function at various system parameters, it was possible to construct control fields such that a material in one phase could mimic the dipole acceleration spectrum of the other. Using the doublon occupation as an alternate characterisation of the state of the system, it was found that the conductor mimicking an insulator
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**Figure 2.** Using tracking, it is possible to make the spectra of one system mimic the other. Here tracking has been implemented to swap the spectral characteristics of two systems, i.e. \( J^{(0)}_T(t) = J^{(7)}_R(t) \) and \( J^{(7)}_T(t) = J^{(0)}_R(t) \). The top section shows the original and tracked control fields and currents in the time domain, while the bottom section demonstrates the strategy’s success in mimicking spectra.
a breakdown of the insulating state. Strategies that tracking the spectrum of a conductor necessitates a large enough to cause a dielectric breakdown. This breakdown time for \( D_2(t) \) is calculated via Eq. (15), and demonstrates that tracking the spectrum of a conductor necessitates a breakdown of the insulating state.

Finally, tracking control on many-electron systems provides a route to exerting fine control over the HHG spectrum of a strongly-correlated system, and its experimental feasibility is discussed in Ref. [24]. Given the utility of HHG for the resolution of ultrafast many-body dynamics [34], this approach provides a potential route to controlling system dynamics on a sub-femtosecond time-scale.
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Figure 3. The doublon occupation number shows the effect of tracking on the charge-carrier density. In particular, the conducting system’s occupation number is largely insensitive to the current being produced, i.e. \( D_2(t) \approx D_0(t) \). Conversely, at high \( \frac{U}{t_0} \), the peak amplitude of the tracking control field needed to mimic the spectrum of the conducting system is large enough to cause a dielectric breakdown. This breakdown time for \( D_2(t) \) is calculated via Eq. (15), and demonstrates that tracking the spectrum of a conductor necessitates a breakdown of the insulating state.

Figure 4. Here currents are tracked such that they obey Eq. (18) at parameter settings \( \frac{U}{t_0} = [0, 0.5, 1, 1.5] \). The upper panel shows the necessary control-field needed to reproduce this current is sensitive to the \( \frac{U}{t_0} \) model parameter.

remained in the conducting limit, while in the converse case, mimicking a conductor’s current necessitated a dielectric breakdown that destroyed the insulating state.

While a restriction on the size of imitable currents was derived, this can be circumvented either by scaling the current one wishes to track, or modifying system parameters such that Eq. (10) is obeyed. The ability to transparently identify and remove singularities via scaling represents a tangible advantage over more generic tracking strategies [19].
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