

Nontrivially Topological Phase Structure of Ideal Bose Gas System within Different Boundary Conditions

Yonghui Xia,^{1,2,3,*} Hongtao Feng,^{4,†} and Hongshi Zong^{1,5,6,‡}

¹Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

²College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Nanjing 210093, China

³Nanjing Proton Source Research and Design Center, Nanjing 210093, China

⁴School of Physics, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, China

⁵Joint Center for Particle, Nuclear Physics and Cosmology, Nanjing 210093, China

⁶Department of Physics, AnHui Normal University, Wuhu 241000, China

(Dated: December 12, 2019)

The phase structure of ideal Bose gas system within different boundary conditions, *i.e.*, the periodic boundary condition and Dirichlet boundary condition in this work, in an infinite volume, is investigated. It is found that the ground states of ideal Bose gas within those two boundary conditions are both topologically nontrivial, which can not be classified by the traditional symmetry breaking theory. The ground states are different topological phases corresponding to those two boundary conditions, which can be distinguished by the off-diagonal particle number susceptibility. Moreover, this result is universal. The boundary condition may play an important role in pinning the critical endpoint of QCD diagram on the approach of the lattice simulations and the computation of some solvable statistical models.

Bose-Einstein condensation of Bose particles is a topic of interest to physical community for a long time, since Einstein firstly proposed his idea in 1924 [1]. In order to study the condensation of non-interaction Bose gas, on London's approach, the Bose system with particle number N is considered to be put in a cubic box within periodic boundary conditions [2], and then make the cubic box volume approach to infinity. According to Weyl's theorem [3], in the thermodynamics limit, one has the infinite particle number, $N \rightarrow \infty$, infinite system volume, $V \rightarrow \infty$ and a constant particle number density, $n = N/V = \text{constant}$, then the thermodynamical observables seem not to be sensitive to the boundary conditions. Therefore, for the convenience of calculations, the periodic boundary conditions or Dirichlet boundary conditions are usually adopted to investigate the thermodynamical properties of system in the thermodynamics limit. In this case, London's approach works well. This approach is widely used in many branches of physics, for example, L. Onsager's famous work on the exact solution of two-dimensional Ising model [4], in which the periodic boundary condition is adopted in a two-dimensional crystal model, and another well known example is the lattice quantum chromodynamics (QCD) simulations in hadron/nuclear physics, where periodic boundary conditions for both quark field and gluon field in the spatial directions at the boundaries are commonly imposed [5, 6].

Yet, about two decades ago, in the research on Bose-Einstein condensation of the non-interaction Bose gas, it is found that the fluctuations of the number of condensate particles remain sensitive to the boundary conditions, even in the large-system limit ($V \rightarrow \infty$) [7]. It implies that the different boundary conditions may introduce different physics into the statistical system even in the thermodynamics limit. Naturally a question arises: What is the physical mechanism behind this result? In this letter, we will explain the underlying physics behind the result in that system: The topological nature of the momentum spaces corresponding to different boundary conditions,

periodic and Dirichlet boundary conditions adopted in this work, are not the same, which leads that the corresponding ground states of non-interaction Bose gas are different. Specifically, those two corresponding ground states to different boundary conditions are topologically nontrivial. Moreover, they correspond to two different topological phases.

It is known that the quantum statistical mechanics should be considered in the thermodynamics limit. However, in an infinite volume, this requires knowledge of the advanced theory of Hilbert spaces and actually it is quite difficult mathematically. In fact, compactification of the infinite volume, for example, the system is confined in a box with hard walls and the different boundary conditions are imposed, makes the quantum statistical mechanics simple [8]. To study the influence of different boundary conditions, following London's approach [2], a non-interaction Bose gas system confined in a cubic box within different boundary conditions, *i.e.*, periodic boundary condition and Dirichlet boundary condition (hard wall) respectively, are taken into consideration. Then the volume V of the box with the side length L approaches to infinite. Since the Bose gas system is confined in the box, the particle number is fixed, thus a canonical ensemble at temperature T should be taken into account and the partition function $\mathcal{Z}(\beta)$ with different boundary conditions are given by Ref. [7]: for the periodic boundary condition

$$\mathcal{Z}_P(\beta) = \prod_{n_1, n_2, n_3 = -\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 - \exp[-\beta(\varepsilon(n_1, n_2, n_3) - \varepsilon(0, 0, 0))]},$$

$$\varepsilon(n_1, n_2, n_3) = \frac{2(n_1^2 + n_2^2 + n_3^2)\pi^2 \hbar^2}{mL^2}, \quad (1)$$

and for Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\mathcal{Z}_D(\beta) = \prod_{n_1, n_2, n_3 = 1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 - \exp[-\beta(\varepsilon(n_1, n_2, n_3) - \varepsilon(1, 1, 1))]},$$

$$\varepsilon(n_1, n_2, n_3) = \frac{(n_1^2 + n_2^2 + n_3^2)\pi^2 \hbar^2}{2mL^2} \quad (2)$$

with $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$, where k_B denotes Boltzmann's constant, $\varepsilon(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ denotes single-particle energy and m denotes the particle mass of the Bose gas. The single-particle state can be labeled by the vector (n_1, n_2, n_3) . Here, it should be stressed that the sum product \prod runs over all the excited states except the ground state. Note that $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (0, 0, 0)$ denotes the ground state within the periodic boundary condition and $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (1, 1, 1)$ denotes the ground state within Dirichlet boundary condition respectively.

Then, the transition temperature T_c of Bose-Einstein condensation in the thermodynamics limit, which is given by the critical temperature that the excited particle number become less than the constant particle number density n , is obtained by the following equation:

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \int d^3k f(k) = \langle \hat{n} \rangle = n, \quad (3)$$

where the state density $f(k)$ is the boson distribution at finite temperature, which can be given by the partition function. Indeed, $f(k)$ denotes the single particle wave function in Fock space (also, $f(k)$ is regarded as a spectrum function) and all the particle wave functions then construct a Hilbert space. Because the $U(1)$ symmetry is broken below the critical temperature T_c [9], some Bose particles are condensed on the ground state. In the large-system limit, one has the partition functions $\mathcal{Z}_p(\beta) = \mathcal{Z}_D(\beta)$. Thus, it agrees with the Weyl's theorem. As the Weyl's theorem pointed out, the state density does not depend on the boundary conditions: At every momentum $\mathbf{k}(k_1, k_2, k_3)$, $f(k)$ are the same within different boundary conditions in the large-system limit, which is given by $f(k) = 1 / \left[\exp\left(\frac{k^2/2m}{k_B T_c}\right) - 1 \right]$. Undoubtedly, the T_c are the same by using different boundary conditions. This result is in accordance with the familiar textbook result [10], in which the grand canonical ensembles is commonly adopted. Then, a question arises: Since the spectrum function $f(k)$ are the same within different boundary conditions, can the ground states be confirmed identically? The answer may be "No", because the genius mathematicians have proven that *one can not hear the shape of a drum* [11]. It is to say that physically one can not obtain all the informations of the ground state *only* from the spectrum function. As shown in Ref. [7], within different boundary conditions, the fluctuations of the condensate particle number at the same temperature shows an obvious divergence. It implies that, these ground states are different. In addition, since the symmetry are the same below the critical temperature T_c , those phases can not be classified by the traditional Landau's symmetry breaking theory. Therefore, the classification approach beyond the traditional Landau's symmetry breaking theory must be taken into consideration.

Let us recall the case of integer quantum Hall effect. In the integer quantum Hall effect, the quantized Hall conductance corresponds to the first Chern number, which is a topological invariant of the base manifold – the two-dimensional Brillouin zone. In an external strong magnetic field, the two-dimensional Brillouin zone actually is a torus. Similar

to the two-dimensional Brillouin zone, within the different boundary conditions, the momentum space can also be considered as a base manifold and then the $f(k)$ is a fiber at momentum \mathbf{k} on the base manifold. It should also be noticed that the topology of the momentum space \mathcal{V} within different boundary conditions are obviously different, in other words, the momentum spaces within different boundary conditions can not be homeomorphic to each other, and that may result in different ground states. Every momentum \mathbf{k} can be mapped to a vector $\mathbf{n}(\theta, \phi, \varphi)$, where \mathbf{n} denotes a point on a two-dimensional sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , which is similar to the Bloch sphere in two-level quantum mechanical system. For the periodic boundary condition, the wave function satisfies $\psi(x, y, z) = \psi(x+L, y+L, z+L)$. In this case, one has $\mathbf{n}(\theta, \phi, \varphi) \sim \mathbf{n}(\theta+2\pi, \phi+2\pi, \varphi+2\pi)$ (here, symbol " \sim " denotes that both sides of the symbol are identified), thus the momentum space within periodic boundary condition is a three-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$. While for the case of Dirichlet boundary condition, due to that the wave function satisfies $\psi(x, y, z) = \psi(x+L, y+L, z+L) = 0$, one has $-\mathbf{n}(\pi-\theta, \pi-\phi, \pi+\varphi) \sim \mathbf{n}(\theta, \phi, \varphi)$, therefore, the momentum space within Dirichlet boundary condition is a three-dimensional projective space \mathbb{RP}^3 [8].

According to the fluctuation–dissipation theorem [12], different fluctuations of the number of condensate particles should correspond to different condensate particle number susceptibilities. Indeed, susceptibility is an intrinsic property of matter (phase), which can be used to distinguish the different phases of matter. For example, in the two-dimensional Ising model, the divergence of susceptibility at the critical temperature means that there undergoes an order-disorder phase transition. In order to study the influence of the different topology of momentum space on the ground state, analogy to the Hall conductivity in integer quantum Hall effect, the condensate particle number susceptibility tensor is investigated, which is defined as follows

$$\chi = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{xx} & \chi_{xy} & \chi_{xz} \\ \chi_{yx} & \chi_{yy} & \chi_{yz} \\ \chi_{zx} & \chi_{zy} & \chi_{zz} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Because of the permutation symmetry of spatial directions in the Bose gas system within both periodic and Dirichlet boundary conditions, the diagonal condensate particle number susceptibilities and off diagonal condensate particle number susceptibilities in the susceptibility tensor (4) respectively satisfy $\chi_{xx} = \chi_{yy} = \chi_{zz}$ and $\chi_{xy} = \chi_{xz} = \chi_{yz} = \chi_{yx} = \chi_{zx} = \chi_{zy}$. The off diagonal condensate particle number susceptibilities play the same role as the Hall conductance σ_{xy} in integer quantum Hall effect, which corresponds to the first Chern number of the two-dimensional Brillouin zone and therefore the quantum Hall state is considered as a topological phase. Similarly, the off diagonal condensate particle number susceptibility χ_{ij} ($i \neq j$) also corresponds to the topological invariant of base manifold and this will be shown clearly as below.

According to the linear response theory, by using the Kubo formula [13], the off diagonal condensate particle number sus-

ceptibility is given by

$$\chi_{ij} = i\hbar \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\langle \Omega | \hat{f}_j | \mathbf{k} \rangle \langle \mathbf{k} | \hat{f}_i | \Omega \rangle - \langle \Omega | \hat{f}_i | \mathbf{k} \rangle \langle \mathbf{k} | \hat{f}_j | \Omega \rangle}{(\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) - \varepsilon_0)^2}, \quad (5)$$

where \hat{f}_{ij} is the particle number density current operator. Due to that the coordinate variables x, y, z can be separable in Schrödinger equation, whether the periodic boundary or Dirichlet boundary condition is imposed, the wave function can be written in the form of following:

$$\Psi(x, y, z) = \Psi(x, y)\Psi(z) = \Psi(x)\Psi(y)\Psi(z). \quad (6)$$

Therefore, the state vector in momentum space can be rewritten as a direct product $|\mathbf{k}\rangle = |k_x\rangle \otimes |k_y\rangle \otimes |k_z\rangle$ obviously. Similar to the Bloch wave function in quantum Hall effect, the wave function (6) is transformed to

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{k}}(x, y, z) = \Psi_{(k_x, k_y)}(x, y)\Psi_{k_z}(z) = \Psi_{k_x}(x)\Psi_{k_y}(y)\Psi_{k_z}(z), \quad (7)$$

and the Hamiltonian operator \hat{H} can be written in the form of

$$\hat{H} = \exp(-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x})\hat{H}\exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}). \quad (8)$$

Therefore, the particle number current operator is

$$\hat{f}_i = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial k_i}. \quad (9)$$

Then, the off diagonal condensate particle number susceptibility χ_{xy} (since the off diagonal condensate particle number susceptibilities are the same, χ_{xy} is taken as an example for convenience) is

$$\chi_{xy} = \frac{i}{\hbar} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \left[\frac{\partial \Psi_k^*(x, y)}{\partial k_y} \frac{\partial \Psi_k(x, y)}{\partial k_x} - \frac{\partial \Psi_k^*(x, y)}{\partial k_x} \frac{\partial \Psi_k(x, y)}{\partial k_y} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Here, k denotes the two-dimensional momentum (k_x, k_y) , which is the projection of the three-dimensional momentum \mathbf{k} in a two-dimensional momentum plane $k_x Ok_y$ at $k_z = 0$. It is easy to find that the off diagonal condensate particle number density susceptibility (10) exactly corresponds to the first Chern number of the momentum subspace $\mathcal{V}[(k_x, k_y, 0)]$, which is similar to the Hall conductivity in the case of integer quantum Hall effect [14]. Thus, the ground states for the case of different boundary conditions can be distinguished by the topological nature of the momentum subspace $\mathcal{V}[(k_x, k_y, 0)]$.

The momentum subspaces $\mathcal{V}[(k_x, k_y, 0)]$ for the periodic and Dirichlet boundary conditions are shown in FIG. 1. From FIG. 1, one finds that the panel (a) is a torus \mathbb{T}^2 , which denotes the momentum subspace within the periodic boundary condition, while the panel (b) is a projective plane \mathbb{RP}^2 , which denotes the the momentum subspace within Dirichlet boundary condition. Therefore, according to simple mathematical calculation by Stokes's theorem [14], the off diagonal susceptibilities χ_{xy} within different boundary conditions are given by




FIG. 1. (Color online.) The schematic illustration of momentum subspace $\mathcal{V}[(k_x, k_y, 0)]$ within different boundary conditions. The panel (a) corresponds to the periodic boundary condition and the panel (b) corresponds to the Dirichlet boundary condition respectively.

in the following:

$$\chi_{xy} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2\pi\hbar}C, C \in \mathbb{Z}, & \text{periodic boundary condition} \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{Dirichlet boundary condition.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

It is found that the off diagonal susceptibility within periodic boundary condition is that an integer times a factor $-1/(2\pi\hbar)$, while that within Dirichlet boundary condition is always zero. Physically, it is not difficult to understand. The particle number density current in the x and y directions within the periodic boundary condition are $\langle \hat{f}_x^p \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{f}_y^p \rangle$ respectively. Considering the mirror symmetry in x and y directions for the case of Dirichlet boundary condition, the particle number density current can be regarded as consisting of two components, \hat{f}_i^p and $-\hat{f}_i^p$, which are the particle number current propagating in the opposite directions, thus the corresponding net particle number density currents in x and y directions are given by $\langle \hat{f}_x^D \rangle = \langle \hat{f}_x^p \rangle - \langle \hat{f}_x^p \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \hat{f}_y^D \rangle = \langle \hat{f}_y^p \rangle - \langle \hat{f}_y^p \rangle = 0$ respectively. Then, the off diagonal susceptibility χ_{xy} within Dirichlet boundary condition is always zero. However, it does not mean that the ground state within Dirichlet boundary condition is topologically trivial. If the Bose particle carries some ‘‘charge’’, for example, spin, then the net spin currents are not zero. In detail, due to the mirror symmetry in x and y direction, the opposite propagating particle number current carry the opposite spin and one has $\langle \hat{f}_{x\uparrow}^p \rangle = -\langle \hat{f}_{x\downarrow}^p \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{f}_{y\uparrow}^p \rangle = -\langle \hat{f}_{y\downarrow}^p \rangle$ respectively, in which $\langle \hat{f}_{i\uparrow}^p \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{f}_{i\downarrow}^p \rangle$ denote the spin currents, \uparrow and \downarrow denote the up and down spin direction respectively. Then, the spin currents in x and y directions are given by $\langle \hat{f}_{xs}^D \rangle = \langle \hat{f}_{x\uparrow}^p \rangle - \langle \hat{f}_{x\downarrow}^p \rangle = 2\langle \hat{f}_{x\uparrow}^p \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{f}_{ys}^D \rangle = \langle \hat{f}_{y\uparrow}^p \rangle - \langle \hat{f}_{y\downarrow}^p \rangle = 2\langle \hat{f}_{y\uparrow}^p \rangle$ re-

spectively, where $\langle J_{is}^D \rangle$ denotes the net spin current. Therefore, the corresponding off diagonal spin susceptibility is given by $-1/(\pi\hbar)C$. That is similar to the Hall spin current in the quantum spin Hall effect [15], and in which the ground state can be distinguished by the spin Chern number. Obviously, the ground state within different boundary conditions can be distinguished by the off diagonal condensate particle number susceptibility, which corresponds the different topological invariants of the base manifolds. Therefore, like quantum Hall effect, the ground states within these two different boundary conditions are both topological phases. Note that the topological phases here may not be described by topological order, which is proposed by Levin, Wen and Kitaev, Preskill to classify the topological phases [16].

As shown clearly above, in the ideal Bose gas system, although the compactification of an infinite space makes the physics simple, different compactification schemes for the same space would induce different ground states, even in the large-system limit. However, It does not conflict with Weyl's theorem. One should note that the phase transition temperature T_c of Bose–Einstein condensation, which is obtained by calculating the critical particle number density, does not depend on the boundary conditions. From Eq. (3), it is easy to find that the particle number density \hat{n} is a “local” operator in the momentum space and then it only depends on the Hilbert space, which are the same within different boundary conditions in the large-system limit. Moreover, the “local” observables are not affected by the boundary conditions, although the ground states are absolutely different. Since the topology of the base manifold (momentum space) does not depend on any assumption, this conclusion should be universal. For example, in the computation of some solvable statical models, compactification of an infinite volume is usually adopted to perform calculation [4]. However, this approach may change the physical nature of the statistical system and it is worthy to investigate in the future.

Also, the compactification approach plays an important role in the first principle calculation, for example, lattice QCD simulations. As is known, locating the possible critical endpoint (CEP) in QCD phase diagram at finite temperature and baryon density is an attractive topic in both theoretical and experimental sides for high energy nuclear physics community. Measuring the cumulants of the fluctuations of the baryon number in thermal and chemical equilibrium in heavy ion collision experiments is a very important approach to pinning the CEP [17–19]. As shown in Ref. [17], comparing the experimental measurements with the lattice QCD simulation predictions, the critical temperature for the QCD phase transition at vanishing chemical potential is determined at 175_{-7}^{+1} MeV (In a recent investigation, the critical temperature is about 156 MeV [20]). Note that the periodic boundary condition in spatial directions for both quark field and gluon field are commonly used in the lattice QCD simulations [5, 21]. As mentioned above, due to that the base manifold is topologically nontrivial within that boundary condition, it would induce the ground state absolutely different. As shown in Ref. [7], the

higher cumulants of fluctuations of particle numbers show a manifest divergence with different boundary conditions, especially in the regime near the phase transition temperature T_c . Therefore, one has to re-examine the boundary conditions adopted in the lattice QCD simulations. To reflect this point more clearly, in the effective continuous field theory models of QCD, for example, (Polyakov–loop extended) Nambu–Jona–Lasino (NJL) model, quark–meson model and Dyson–Schwinger equations, the study on the cumulants of the fluctuations of the baryon number within different boundary conditions has been carried on. The papers are in preparation and will be submitted soon.

The authors thank professor H.-B. Zeng and X.-F. Luo for their fruitful discussions; Yonghui Xia thanks Z. -X. Yu, T. Zhao and Z. Zhang for their useful discussions on the topology and he is also grateful to his wife Ms. Q. Hu for her inspiring discussions.

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (under Grants No. 11475085, No. 11535005 and No. 11690030) and by Nation Major State Basic Research and Development of China (under Grant No. 2016YFE0129300).

* xiayh@xiahome.com

† fenght@seu.edu.cn

‡ zonghs@nju.edu.cn

- [1] A. Einstein, *Preuss. Akad. Wiss* **261** (1924).
- [2] F. London, *Nature* **141**, 643 (1938); *Phys. Rev.* **54**, 947 (1938).
- [3] M. Kac, *Am. Math. Mon* **73**, 1 (1966).
- [4] L. Onsager, *Phys. Rev.* **65**, 117 (1944).
- [5] J. Smit, *Introduction to Quantum Fields on a Lattice* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- [6] H.-T. Ding, F. Karsch, and S. Mukherjee, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **24**, 1530007 (2015).
- [7] M. Holthaus, K. T. Kapale, and M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 036129 (2002).
- [8] M. Nakahara, *Geometry, topology and physics* (CRC Press, 2003).
- [9] A. Schmitt, *Lect. Notes Phys* **888** (2015).
- [10] J. I. Kapusta and C. Gale, *Finite-Temperature Field Theory: Principles and Applications*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- [11] C. Gordon, D. L. Webb, and S. Wolpert, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **27**, 134 (1992); *Invent. Math.* **110**, 1 (1992).
- [12] H. B. Callen and T. A. Welton, *Phys. Rev.* **83**, 34 (1951).
- [13] R. Kubo, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **12**, 570 (1957).
- [14] D. J. Thouless, M. Kohmoto, M. P. Nightingale, and M. den Nijs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 405 (1982).
- [15] C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 226801 (2005).
- [16] M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110405 (2006); A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110404 (2006).
- [17] S. Gupta, X. Luo, B. Mohanty, H. G. Ritter, and N. Xu, *Science* **332**, 1525 (2011).
- [18] X. Luo, *Nucl. Phys. A* **956**, 75 (2016); X. Luo and N. Xu, *Nucl. Sci. Tech.* **28**, 112 (2017).
- [19] M. M. Aggarwal *et al.* (STAR Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 022302 (2010); L. Adamczyk *et al.* (STAR Collaboration),

- Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 032302 (2014); Phys. Lett. B **785**, 551 (2018).
- [20] A. Bazavov *et al.* (HotQCD Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **795**, 15 (2019).
- [21] B. Klein, Phys. Rept. **707**, 1 (2017), and references therein.