# Variational ansatz for the super uid Mott-insulator transition in optical lattices

J.J.G arc a-R ipoll and J.I.C irac

M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Q uantenoptik, H ans-K opferm ann-Str. 1, G arching, D -85748, G erm any. Juan R ipoll@m pqm pg.de

#### P.Zoller

Leopold-Franzens Universitat Innsbruck, Technikerstr. 24, Innsbruck, A-6020, Austria.

C.Kollath, U.Schollwock and J.von Delft

Ludwig-M axim ilians-U niversitat, Theresienstr. 37, D-80333 M unchen, G erm any.

A bstract: We develop a variational wave function for the ground state of a one-dimensional boson is lattice gas. The variational theory is initally developed for the quantum rotor model and later on extended to the Bose-Hubbard model. This theory is compared with quasi-exact numerical results obtained by Density Matrix Renormalization G roup (DMRG) studies and with results from other analytical approximations. Our approach accurately gives local properties for strong and weak interactions, and it also describes the crossover from the super uid phase to the Mott-insulator phase.

#### References and links

- 1. M.G reiner, O.M andel, T.Esslinger, T.W.Hansch, I.Bloch, \Quantum phase transition from a super uid to a M ott insulator in a gas of ultracold atom s," Nature 415, 39 (2002).
- 2. M.G reiner, O.M andel, T.W. Hansch and Im m anuel B loch, \Collapse and revival of the m atter wave eld of a Bose(E instein condensate," N ature 419, 51 (2002).
- 3. D.Jaksch, C.B ruder, J.I.Cirac, C.W. G ardiner and P.Zoller, \Cold Bosonic Atom s in Optical Lattices," Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3108-311 (1998); D.Jaksch, V.Venturi, J.I.Cirac, C.J.W illiam s and P.Zoller, \Creation of a M olecular Condensate by D ynam ically M elting a M ott Insulator," Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 040402 (2002)
- 4. B.Y. Chen, S.D. M ahanti and M.Yussou, \Helium atom s in zeolite cages: N ovelM ott-H ubbard and B ose-H ubbard system s," Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 473-476 (1995).
- 5. M in-ChulCha, M.P.A.Fischer, S.M.G irvin, M.W allin, A.P.Young, \Universal conductivity of two-dimensional lms at the superconductor-insulator transition," Phys. Rev. B 44, 6883-6902 (1991).
- 6. M.P.A.Fischer, G.Grinstein, S.M.Girvin, \Presence of quantum di usion in two dimensions: Universal resistance at the superconductor-insulator transition," Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 587-590 (1990); M.P.A.Fischer, \Q uantum phase transitions in disordered two-dimensional superconductors," Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 923-926 (1990).
- 7. S. Sachdev, Quantum Phase Transitions, (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2001).
- M. P. A. Fischer, P. B. Weichman, G. Grinstein, D. S. Fisher, \Boson localization and the super uid-insulator transition," Phys. Rev. B 40, 546-570 (1989).
- 9. J.K.Freericks and H.Monien, \Phase diagram of the Bose Hubbard model," Europhys.Lett.26, 545-550 (1994).
- 10. J.K. Freericks and H.M onien, \Strong-coupling expansions for the pure and disordered Bose-Hubbard model," Phys.Rev.B 53, 2691-2700 (1996).
- 11. D. van Oosten, P. van der Straten and H. T. C. Stoof, \Quantum phases in an optical lattice," Phys. Rev. A 63, 053601 (2001).

- 12. A.M. Rey, K.Burnett, R.Roth, M.Edwards, C.J.W illiam s and C.W. Clarck, Jour.Phys.B, 36,825-841 (2003).
- 13. R.Fazio and H.van der Zant, Phys.Rep. 355, 235 (2001) and ref. therein.
- 14. A. van Otterlo, K. H. Wagenblast, R. Baltin, C. Bruder, R. Fazio and G. Schon, \Quantum phase transitions of interacting bosons and the supersolid phase," Phys. Rev. B 52, 16176–16186 (1995).
- 15. M.P.A.Fisher and G.Grinstein, \Quantum CriticalPhenom ena in Charged Superconductors," Phys.Rev.Lett. 60, 208-211 (1988).
- 16. S.R.W hite, \D ensity matrix formulation for quantum renormalization groups," Phys.Rev.Lett. 69, 2863-2866 (1992).
- 17. S.R.W hite, \D ensity-m atrix algorithm s for quantum renorm alization groups," Phys.Rev.B.48, 10345-10356 (1993).
- I. Peschel, X. W ang, M. Kaulke and K. Hallberg, Density-matrix Renormalization, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998).
- 19. T.D.Kuhner and S.R.W hite and H.Monien, \One-dimensional Bose-Hubbard model with nearest-neighbor interaction," Phys.Rev.B 61, 12474-12489 (2000).
- 20. T.D.Kuhner, Diplom a work (1997), University of Bonn.
- 21. S.Rapsch, U.Schollwock and W.Zwerger, \Density matrix renorm alization group for disordered bosons in one dimension," Europhys.Lett. 46, 559-564 (1999).
- 22. G.G.Batrouni, R.T.Scalettar and G.T.Zim anyi, \Supersolids in the Bose-Hubbard Ham iltonian," Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2527-2530 (1995).
- 23. G.G.Batrouni and R.T.Scalettar, \W orld-line quantum M onte Carlo algorithm for a onedimensionalBosemodel," Phys.Rev.B 46,9051 (1992).
- 24. P.N iyaz, R.T.Scalettar, C.Y.Fong and G.G.Batrouni, \Phase transitions in an interacting boson model with near-neighbor repulsion," Phys.Rev.B 50, 362-373 (1994).
- 25. N.V. Prokof'ev, B.V. Svistunov and I.S. Tupitsyn, Phys. Lett. A 238, 253 (1998).
- 26. N. Elstner and H. Monien, \D ynam ics and therm odynam ics of the Bose-Hubbard model," Phys. Rev. B 59, 12184-12187 (1999) and ref. therein.
- 27. D.S.Rokhsar and B.G.Kotliar, \Gutzwillerprojection for bosons," Phys.Rev.B 44, 10328-10332 (1991).
- 28. J.R.Anglin, P.D rum m ond and A.Smerzi, Exact quantum phase m odel form esoscopic Josephson junctions," Phys. Rev. A 64, 063605 (2001).

## 1 Introduction

During the last years a spectacular development in the storage and manipulation of cold atom s in optical lattices [1, 2] has taken place. G reiner et al. [1], to name one in portant example, succeeded in experimentally driving a quantum phase transition between a super uid and a M ott-insulating phase in bosonic system s. This experim ental progress has revived the interest in the Bose-H ubbard m odel [Eq. (1)] as a generic Ham iltonian for strongly correlated bosons, by which the quantum phase transition can be described [3]. The Bose-Hubbard Hamiltonian has been used previously in condensed m atter physics to study the adsorption of noble gases in nanotubes [4], or C opper pairs in superconducting Im swith strong charging e ects [5, 6]. In this context a lot of work has already been done to characterize the quantum phase transition, the statistics, and the low -energy excitations of the Bose-Hubbbard model [7, 8]. However, new interesting questions arise now due to the good tunability of the experiments with optical lattices. In particular, it becomes possible to study time-dependent processes such as driven quantum phase transitions [1]. A theoretical understanding of such phenom ena is challenging, since the characteristics of the super uid phase | where the atom s tend to delocalize throughout the lattice and large uctuations in the local density exist |, and the Mott-insulating phase | where the number uctuations decrease, and a gap in the excitation spectrum opens { must be covered at the same time. Both regions are separated by a non-analyticity of the spectrum, which in plies that a perturbative study [9,10] works best in strong coupling lim it, while a Hartree Fock-Bogoliubov mean eld works best in the super uid regime. In addition it is possible to develop a mean eld theory [11, 12] based on a Gutzwiller ansatz [3]: this reproduces the mean eld theory in the super uid limit, as well as the limit of in nite interaction, which raises the hope

that the theory also interpolates properly between these lim its.

In this paper we develop a variational description of the ground state of an ensemble of cold atom s in an one-dimensional optical lattice. Our trial wavefunction treats the connections between neighboring sites as entities which decouple in the lim it of in nitely large lattices. We apply this technique st to the quantum rotor model which describes the lattice for large and com m ensurate occupation per site [5], and has also been used to describe an array of Josephson junctions [13] , and next to the Bose-Hubbard Ham iltonian. The accuracy of the variational theory in both models is con rm ed by several comparisons. In the quantum rotor case, we use a spin wave approximation in the lim it of weak interaction, and a rst order perturbation theory in the lim it of weak tunneling. For the Bose-Hubbard model we compare against results obtained applying the quasi-exact, num erical DMRG method to one-dimensional lattices with up to 128 sites, and also with calculations based on the Gutzwiller ansatz. Our conclusion is that the variational picture of self-regulated connections between sites provides a rather cheap and simple, but very good description of the local properties of the system in the super uid and insulator regimes, and a fairly good interpolation across the quantum phase transition. It cannot describe, however, the algebraic decay with distance of the o -diagonal elements of the one-particle density matrix. The simplicity of the method suggests a possible generalization to higher dimensionalities and other physical models.

The outline of the paper is as follows: In Sec. 2 we introduce the quantum rotor m odel as a possible limit of the Bose-Hubbard Ham iltonian. Next, information about the ground state of the quantum rotor model is obtained variationally as the solution of a M athieu equation. We can estimate energies, correlation functions and length, and the variance of the density as a function of the only free parameter. A comparison with perturbative estimates demonstrates the accuracy of the method when computing local properties. Since the quantum rotor model is only an approximate description of the optical lattice, in Sec. 3 we develop a similar variational theory for the Bose-Hubbard Ham iltonian. A fler bringing the Bose-Hubbard Ham iltonian to an appropriate form, we can estimate the local properties of its ground state. The variational solutions are compared in Sec. 3.3 with the results of DM RG studies of the Bose-Hubbard model. We common that the variational method describes very well the local properties of both the M ott-insulator and the super uid regime, and provides a fairly good interpolation across the phase transition. Finally, in Sec. 4 we summarize our results and comment on possible extensions.

2 Quantum phase model

# 2.1 Relation to the Bose-Hubbard model

In this section we show the equivalence of the Bose-Hubbard model

$$H_{BH} = \int_{j=1}^{X^{I}} J(a_{j+1}^{Y}a_{j} + a_{j}^{Y}a_{j+1}) + \frac{U}{2}a_{j}^{Y}a_{j}^{Y}a_{j}a_{j} = \frac{U}{2}M n (n 1); \quad (1)$$

and the quantum rotorm odel for large and integer occupation n [5]. In our notation, M is the num ber of lattice sites and N = nM the num ber of atom s.B oth the B ose-H ubbard m odel and the quantum rotorm odel show a phase transition due to the interplay between the kinetic term proportional to J and the interaction term proportional to U. For convenience we have subtracted the ground state energy in the perfect insulator lim it U=J !~1.

If we expand a con guration of the lattice using Fock states

$$ji = \begin{array}{c} X & X \\ c_n jni = & c_n jn_1 i \\ n & n \end{array}$$
 (2)

and the number of particles per lattice site is large,  $n_k > 1$ , we may approximate the hopping term s as follows

$$a_{1}^{y}a_{j}ji = {}^{p}\frac{}{n(n+1)}PA_{1}^{+}A_{j}jni+j_{1j}i$$
 (3)

Here, A  $j_{1i} = j_{1}$  li are ladder operators and P projects on states with non-negative occupation num bers,  $n_k$  0. To low est order the error  $j_{1j}$  is

$$j_{lj}i = C_{n} \frac{(n+1)(n_{j} - n) + n(n_{l} - n)}{2^{p} - n(n+1)} j_{n}i;$$
(4)

and its norm is bound by

$$k_{1j}k = \frac{s}{\frac{n^2 + (n+1)^2}{2n(n+1)}}_{1};$$
(5)

where  $_1 = h(n_1 \quad n)^2 i$  is the variance in the number of particles per lattice site. For the approximation (3) to be valid, the uncertainty in the number of atoms must be small compared to the mean value, n , and the interaction energy must exceed the neglected term s, Un (n 1) J .

Following the previous procedure the Bose-Hubbard model becomes

$$H_{QR} = P \sum_{j}^{X} 2J (A_{j+1}^{+}A_{j} + A_{j}^{+}A_{j+1}) + \frac{U}{2} (A_{j}^{z})^{2}$$
(6)

Here  $= \frac{p_{n}(n+1)}{n(n+1)}$  is approximately the density,  $A_j^z = a_j^y a_j$  n is essentially the number operator and we have used that  ${}_j A_j^z j$  i = 0 when we work with states that have a xed, commensurate number of particles. In the following we will de ne the energy per lattice site as

$$" \frac{1}{M} h_{QR} i:$$
 (7)

Since the physically interesting states will be concentrated around large occupations,  $n_k = n$ , the usual step now is to drop the projector, P , and m ove to the basis of phase states, de ned by

$$hn j \tilde{i} = e^{in} (2)^{M=2}; 2 [; ]^{M}:$$
(8)

In doing so, we obtain the identi cation  $A_j ! e^{i_k}$  and  $A_j^z ! i@=@_j$ , which produces the usual representation of the quantum rotor model

with the associated state writen as

$$j i = (2)^{M=2} d^{M} e^{in^{P}} (~)j\tilde{}i:$$
 (10)

A sim ilar derivation is possible using path integrals [15].



Fig.1. Instead of working directly with the population of each well,  $n_k$ , we can use other quantum numbers,  $w_k$ , de ned by the relation  $n_k = w_k \quad w_{k-1} + n$ , and which behave like a set of chem ical potentials acting on the barriers that connect neighboring sites.

#### 2.2 Variational ansatz

In this section we estimate the properties of the ground state of  $H_{QR}$  variationally. Due to the previous splitting (10), any wavefunction (~) can only depend on the phase di erence between neighboring wells, j = j+1, These new quantum variables describe the connections between neighboring sites. In the limit of large lattices it seems reasonable to assume that these connections become independent from each other adopting the product state

$$(\sim) = \prod_{j=1}^{M} h(j = j+1)$$
: (11)

This representation becomes exact in the Mott-insulating limit,  $U_{\overline{P}J} ! 1$ , where  $h_{m ott}() = 1$ , and in the super uid limit, U=J ! 0, where  $h_{sf}() = \frac{1}{n^{2}Z} (2 n)$ , as can be veried by direct substitution in Eq. (10).

Even though the phase representation is the best one to nd a trial wavefunction, it is not the optim alone for performing computations. It is instead more convenient to work with the variables which are conjugate to the phase di erences j = j+1 j. These are the new quantum numbers,  $w_k$ , given by

$$n_k = w_k \quad w_{k-1} + n:$$
 (12)

In term softhese num bers, the ansatz (11) reveals itself as a sim ple product wavefunction

$$j i = f \tilde{n} i {}^{(M-1)} = {}^{X} \tilde{n}_{w_{1}} {}^{\tilde{n}}_{w_{M-1}} j w_{1} i {}^{M-1} j \tilde{w};$$
(13)

with coe cients given by the Fourier transform

$$\tilde{h}_{m} = h()e^{im} d : \qquad (14)$$

As sketched in Fig.1, the  $w_k$  play the roles of chem ical potentials which are established between di erent wells: the di erence between the potentials on the extrem es of a site gives the uctuations over the mean and com mesurate occupation n. In this picture

$$H_{QR} = \sum_{k=1}^{M_X \ 1} 2J \ ({}_{k}^{+} + {}_{k}^{-}) + \frac{U}{2} \ ({}_{k}^{z} {}_{k-1}^{z})^2 \ ; \tag{15}$$

where jwi = jw liare new in nite-dimensional ladder operators and z jwi = w jwi.

By m inim izing the energy associated with  $H_{QR}$  over all states within a given ansatz we can both obtain an upper bound to the energy of the ground state and approxim ate

its wave function. A simple computation with our product ansatz leads to the result [compare (7)]

"[
$$n$$
]' 4J Reh<sup>+</sup>i+Uh(<sup>z</sup>)<sup>2</sup>i Uh<sup>z</sup>i<sup>2</sup>; (16)

where the expected values are computed over a single connection, h  ${}^{z}i = {}^{P}{}_{w} w h_{w} f$ , and the wavefunctions are assumed to be normalized,  ${}_{w} h_{w} f = 1$ . Since the stationary states have a well de ned parity,  $\tilde{n}_{(w)} = (1)^{p} \tilde{n}_{w}$ , the optimal variational state must satisfy the linear equation

$$2J \ \tilde{k}_{j+1} + \tilde{h}_{j-1}) + U \ j^2 \tilde{h}_j = "_{est} \tilde{h}_j;$$
(17)

which is nothing but the Fourier transform of a M athieu equation

$$\frac{U}{2}\frac{Q^{2}}{Q^{2}} = 2J \cos()h() = "_{est}h();$$
(18)

The estimated ground state energy per site is given by the lowest eigenvalue of either equation.

U sing the product ansatz and the sam e approximations required to derive H  $_{\rm Q\,R}$ , we can also compute other properties of the ground state. For instance, the variance of the number of atom s per lattice site

$${}^{2}_{j} = h(a^{y}_{j}a_{j} n)^{2}i = 2h(z)^{2}i$$
: (19)

and the correlation functions

$$ha_{j+1}^{y}a_{j}i = h_{j}i_{1};$$
 (20)

$$ha_{j+1}^{\gamma}a_{j}i = \underset{k=j}{\overset{\gamma}{\underset{k=j}{}}} = \overset{1}{\underset{1}{}}; \qquad (21)$$

which decay exponentially with the distance. This implies that the ansatz (13) only describes properly the decay of the correlations in the M ott-insulating regime, since the correlations in the super uid regime follow a power law decay. However, as we will see below, localm agnitudes (; 1; ":::) are properly estimated even if long { range ones are not.

W e have solved Eq. (17) num erically in a truncated space. The results are sum marized in Fig. 2, where we also plot reference estimates arising from two other analytical methods. In the limit U J we compare with a rst order perturbative calculation around the solution j i = 1, which is possible thanks to the energy gap of order 0 (U) in the excitation spectrum. In the limit J U we rather use a spin wave or harm onic approximation in which the cosine-term of the Hamiltonian H  $_{\rm Q\,R}$  is expanded up to second order in the phase di erence between neighboring sites [see Sec. 2.3]. This approximation is valid in the super uid regime, where the phase does not vary much between neighboring wells. From the graphical comparison we see that, as expected, the variational wavefunction provides a fairly accurate description of the ground state of the quantum rotor model in both the super uid and insulating limits. As a side note, we must remark that this ground state has a divergent uctuation of the num ber of particles per site as J ! 0. This disagrees from the expected behavior of the ground state of the original Bose-H ubard H am iltonian, and it rem inds us that  $H_{OR}$  can only model the atom ic ensemble when the variance, , is small compared to the mean occupation num ber, n.



Fig. 2. E stim ates for (a) energy energy per lattice site and (b) density uctuations of the quantum rotor H am iltonian (6) obtained with the variationalm ethod (solid), and perturbative calculations for U J (dashed) and U J (dots).

# 2.3 Harmonic approximations to the quantum phase model

In the limit J U it is possible to estimate the ground state of the rotor model (6) analytically. Since we are deep in the super uid regime, the wavefunction will be concentrated around the line  $_1 = _2 = :::= _M$ , and we can approximate

$$H_{QR} \prime \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{U}{2} \frac{\theta^2}{\theta_j^2} J (j j+1)^2 : \qquad (22)$$

If we rem ove the periodic boundary conditions on  $_{i}$  and change variables, the preceding H am iltonian m ay be diagonalized, H =  $_{k}^{P}$ !  $_{k}$  A  $_{k}^{Y}$ A  $_{k}$  +  $\frac{1}{2}$ , with frequencies given by !  $_{k}$  =  $_{k}^{P}$  $\frac{1}{8J}$  U jsin (k=M) j where k is an integer in the range M + 1 < 2k < M which labels the di erent values of the momentum in the lattice. The ground state energy F ig. 4 (a)] m ay be estimated as the zero-point energy of the harm onic oscillator. For large M, the sum over k m ay be replaced with an integral, giving

$$E_{g}' \frac{2M}{2J} \frac{p}{2J} \frac{1}{2J}$$
(23)

The variance of the number of particles is related to the expectation value of the momentum using the same procedure as above

$$' \frac{1}{U}^{r} \frac{8J}{U}$$
: (24)

# 3 The Bose-Hubbard model

In this section we apply to the B ose-H ubbard H am iltonian the techniques that were developed in Sec.2.W ewilldo it in three steps: First we will develop a phase representation which is valid for all occupation numbers. Next we will prove that this representation is equivalent to a similarity transform ation of the H am iltonian which brings it to a form similar to (6), at the price of losing H emmitticity. Finally we will show how to implement the ansatz of independent connections (13) to produce estimates for the usual set of observables ("; 1; ), which are to be validated with DM RG calculations.

## 3.1 Coherent states

The phase coherent states j i are de ned by

$$\operatorname{hnj} i = e^{\operatorname{in}} = \frac{p}{n!}$$
(25)

Unlike the phase states de ned in Sec.2, they are not orthogonal to each other, h j i = exp e<sup>i()</sup>, but they form a complete basis, so that an expansion like (10) is still possible. A nice property of the coherent states is that we can rew rite the operators a, a<sup>y</sup>, a<sup>y</sup>a, etc, in terms of the phases very easily. For instance, a j i = e<sup>i</sup> j i, a<sup>y</sup> j i = ie<sup>i</sup>  $\frac{0}{0}$  j i, using this representation, we obtain an elective H am iltonian for the wavefunction (~), ie. H<sub>BH</sub> j i = (2) M = 2<sup>R</sup> d<sup>M</sup> e<sup>in P</sup> \* [H t<sub>coh</sub> (~)]j~i, which is of the form

$$H_{coh}^{t} = \int_{hi;ji}^{X} 2(n+1)\cos(i_{j}) ie^{i(i_{j})} \frac{\theta}{\theta} + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{j}^{X} \frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta} = \frac{1}{2}$$
(26)

Here H $_{coh}^{t}$  stands for the transpose of H $_{coh}$ . This operator was already used in Ref. [28] to study the Bose-Hubbard model with only two sites. On the one hand, it is a non-Herm itian operator<sup>1</sup> and we cannot do a simple variational study. On the other hand the Ham iltonian still depends on the phase di erences, and it is reasonable to look for approximate eigenstates which have the form (11). This will be done in the following section. However, since working with phase variables is inconvenient, we will develop a representation similar to that of Eq. (15) in the following.

#### 3.2 Variational procedure for non-Herm itian operators

In this section we will not the best variational function which has the product form of Eq. (11). However, as it happened in Sec. 2, instead of working with phase variables it is more convenient develop a representation of the Bose-Hubbard Ham iltonian in terms of connections. This is once more a two-steps process. First we use a similarity transform ation suggested by the de nition of the coherent states

$$Ojni = \bigvee_{k=1}^{\Psi} p \underset{k=1}{\underline{p_{k}!jni}}$$
(27)

Since  $Oa_jO^{-1} = A_j$  and  $Oa_j^yO^{-1} = A_j^zA_j^+$ , we nd

$$H_{coh} = OH_{BH}O^{1}$$

$$= J_{A_{i}^{z}}A_{i}^{z} + nA_{i}^{+}A_{j} + \frac{U}{2}X_{j}^{x}(A_{j}^{z})^{2};$$
(28)

The Ham iltonians (26) and (28) are equivalent: while one is de ned in terms of phase variables, the other one is de ned with occupations numbers, and both are related by a Fourier transform. The second and nal step is to rewrite everything in terms of connections, using the quantum numbers from Eq. (12), and the relations x = + +, y = i( +). The result is a decomposition of the Ham iltonian

$$H_{coh} = H_1 + H_2;$$
 (29)

 $<sup>^1</sup> The herm iticity of H_{\rm B\,H}$  is maintained due to an implicit projection that takes place when we reconstruct the state H\_{\rm B\,H} j i from H\_{\rm coh}^{\rm t} (~) (See Ref. [28]).

$$H_{1} = Jn^{x} + iJ_{j}^{z} + U_{j}^{y} + U_{j}^{z} + U_{j}^{z};$$

$$H_{2} = J_{j}^{z} + J_{j}^{z} + J_{j+1}^{z} + U_{j+1}^{z};$$

into term s which are local, H<sub>1</sub>, and term s which involve pairs of connections, H<sub>2</sub>.

For the quantum rotor model we proved that the optimal product wavefunction was an eigenstate of a Ham iltonian which did not couple connections, like H<sub>1</sub>. The di erence now is that, since the operator H<sub>coh</sub> is not Hem itian, we cannot establish a variational principle and that proof is no longer valid. Nevertheless, we will again propose a variational ansatz which is an eigenstate of the local operator H<sub>1</sub> fii <sup>M</sup> = M "<sub>est</sub> fii <sup>N</sup>. U sing the follow ing equality

$$"_{0} = \min_{\substack{\notin 0 \\ \notin 0}} \frac{h \, \overset{}{H}_{BH} \, j \, i}{k \, k^{2}} = \min_{\substack{\notin 0 \\ \# 0}} \frac{h \, \overset{}{D} \, \overset{^{2}H}{}_{coh} \, j \, i}{h \, \overset{}{D} \, \overset{^{2}J}{}_{j} \, i};$$
(30)

and the product ansatz j i =  $fii^{M}$ , we arrive to an upper bound for the lowest eigenvalue of the Bose-Hubbard Ham iltonian, expressed in terms of the non-Herm itian one

$$"_{0} "_{est} + \frac{1}{N} \frac{h \tilde{h} j^{M} O^{2} H_{2} \tilde{h} i^{M}}{h \tilde{h} j^{M} O^{2} \tilde{h} i^{M}} "_{est} + "_{est}:$$
(31)

The way to use this variational principle is as follows. First, for a given J and U we compute the lowest eigenstate of H<sub>1</sub> and this way obtain  $\tilde{n}$ . A fler the equivalence (14), nding the ground state of the local H am iltonian H<sub>1</sub> becomes equivalent to solving a modi ed M athieu equation

$$U \frac{\theta^2}{\theta^2} = 2J(n+1)\cos(0) = 2J\sin(\frac{\theta}{\theta} = "_{est}h;$$
 (32)

which describes exactly the static properties of a pair of sites with open boundary conditions [28]. Once we have " $_{est}$  we must still compute the correction " $_{est}$  using a rather straightforward expansion which is shown in Sec. 3.4. Surprisingly, " $_{est}$  happens to be negative, so that it is actually an improvement over the simple estimate given by " $_{est}$  [See Fig. 5].

From the optim alvariational state,  $j = 0^{-1} fi M$ , and the estim ate for the energy, "var = "est + "est, we may compute other observables. For the density uctuations and nearest neighbor correlations we use the virial theorem

$$ha_{j+1}^{y}a_{j}i = \frac{0}{0J}"_{var};$$
 (33)

$${}^{2} = \frac{\theta}{\theta U} "_{var} n^{2}; \qquad (34)$$

w hereas for other properties one has to evaluate num erically the m atrix products show n in Sec. 3.4. This allows us to prove that for the product states fii <sup>M</sup> correlations decay exponentially, opposite to what is expected in the super uid phase, whose correlations should decay algebraically. Nevertheless, as we will see next, this family of states does estim ate accurately the local properties of the optical lattice.

## 3.3 Comparison to DMRG results

W e will now compare the results for the ground state energy, the correlation functions, and the variance of the particle number provided by the two variational ansatz, (18)



Fig. 3. (a) The ground state energy per site, ", (b) nearest neighbor correlation,  $c_1 = ha_{j+1}^{\gamma} a_j i$ , and (c) variance of the number of atom s per site,  $^2 = h(n_j \quad n)^2 i$ . P lots (b) and (c) use a log-log scale. The results of the DMRG (solid line) are obtained on a system with 128 sites, a maximum occupation number of 9 bosons per site and a reduced space of states of about 200 states. The estimates from the variational theory are plotted using dashed lines. The vertical lines mark the location of the phase transition according to [10]. The mean occupation numbers are denoted with circles (n = 1), diam onds (n = 2) and boxes (n = 3).

and (32), and the Gutzwiller ansatz [14] with those obtained by DM RG studies of the Bose-Hubbard model. The DM RG, developed 1992 by W hite [16, 17] in the area of condensed m atter theory, is a very powerful num erical tool to investigate static and dynam ic properties of strongly correlated quasi-one-dim ensional spin, ferm ionic or bosonic quantum system s. The DM RG is an essentially quasi-exact num erical method. The fundam ental ideas stem from real space renorm alization methods: the system size is grown iteratively while the (exponentially diverging) size of the H ilbert space is kept constant by decimation. Hereby one tries to retain only that subset of states that is essential to describe the physical quantity under consideration. In DM RG these are expectation values with respect to low -lying states (\target states"), and in particular with respect to the ground state wave function.

DMRG builds up the system linearly: at each growth step, suitable density matrices for the target states are derived that yield information on the relevance of H ilbert space states. Building on this information, the states and operators are projected onto H ilbert subspaces of xed dimension M containing the most relevant states. M is chosen to be small enough to be handled numerically, but large enough to obtain the desired accuracy; numerical results can be extrapolated in M to the exact limit of in nite M in the therm odynamic limit. However, results presented here have converged for the largest M considered and no further extrapolation was necessary. Details on the DMRG method may for example be found in [18]. In the case of the Bose-Hubbard model the DMRG has been used to study properties of the system [19, 20, 21]. The results of DMRG agree very well with exact diagonalization results for small system s, with quantum M onte-C arlo simulations e.g. [22, 23, 24, 25], and with 13th order perturbation theory [26].

We have used the DMRG to study the properties of the ground state of the Bose-Hubbard model on one-dimensional lattices with 128 sites, and commensurate llings n = 1;2; and 3. In Figs. 3(a-c) we show the results for the mean energy per site ", the nearest neighbor correlations,  $c_1 = ha_{j+1}^{y}a_{j}i$ , and the variance of the density, calculated both with the DMRG and with the variational estimates developed above. As expected, there are no indications of the phase transitions in these quantities, neither in the variational results nor in the num erical solutions. Rather, an in exion of the nearest neighbor correlation points out the location of the super uid-insulator transition which lies roughly between 3n and 4n (see [19] and ref. therein). The agreement of the two m ethods is fairly good above the phase transition and below it.

A more detailed comparison is provided in Fig. 4 for the case n = 1. In this gure we plot together results from the DMRG, the variational ansatz derived above, the quantum rotor model and the well-known Gutzwiller ansatz. The Gutzwiller ansatz [27, 3] is a variational ansatz which reduces the wave function to a product of single-site wave functions,  $j_G i = M_{j=1}^M j_j i$ , where  $j_j i = P_{m=0}^{P_{j=1}} f_m^{(j)} j_m j_i$  and  $f_m^{(j)}$  are constants. Such a wavefunction cannot be used in the one-dimensional M ott insulator regime, because a perturbative study of the Gutzwiller ansatz shows that the corrections of order 0 (J=U) are lost and all correlations become zero. How ever this ansatz gives good results in the super uid regime, where the long-range order is well described by j  $_{\rm G}$  i, and we can use these results and those of the DMRG to assert the accuracy of our variational estim ates. A s F ig. 4 shows, in the M ott insulator regime, the D M RG results agrees perfectly with our variational theory for the Bose-Hubbard model and for the quantum rotor model. C lose to the phase transition is the point at which the quantum rotor m odel no longer describes well the atom s in the optical lattice due to the grow th of density uctuations. At this point we also observe a small disagreem ent between the DMRG and the coherent states, which is due to the growth of long range correlations and vanishes as we get deeper into the super uid regime.

#### 3.4 Num erical evaluation of the upper bound

In this section we will show how to compute the corrections to the local energy, " $_{\rm est}$ , from Eq.(31).W ebasically need a method to compute expectation values of the operator O  $^2$  around product states which have the form

$$j i = fi_1$$
  $h_k j A h_k B h_{k+1} h_{k+2}$   $h_M j$  (35)

in which at most two contiguous vectors are a ected by two single-connection operators. For instance, this is the case of  $H_2j$  i, where A and B are <sup>+</sup>, or <sup>z</sup>, and also of j i, where A and B are just the identity. A fler some manipulations it is possible to write, for the optimal variational state j i = 0 <sup>1</sup> fii <sup>M</sup>,

$$hO^{2}H_{2}i = u^{t}O(HO)^{k-1}Z_{k}O(HO)^{M-k-1}u;$$

$$K = 1$$

$$Z_{k} = J(H_{2}OH_{+} HOH_{2}) U(H_{2}OH_{2});$$

with the realm atrices and vectors

$$H_{ij} = \tilde{f}_{i} \tilde{f}_{ij};$$



Fig. 4. (a) The ground state energy per site, ", (b) nearest neighbor correlation,  $c_1 = ha_{j+1}^{Y}a_{j}i$ , and (c) variance of the number of atom s per site,  $^2 = h(n_j \quad n)^2 i$ . Plot (b) and (c) are in log-log scale. Using lling factor n = 1, we show results from the variationalm odel for the Bose-H ubbard m odel using phase coherent states (solid), the quantum rotor m odel (dashed), the Gutzwiller ansatz for the Bose-H ubbard H am iltonian (dots) and DM RG (circles).Vertical dash-dot lines m ark the location of the phase transition according to [10].

We have used this technique to compute numerically the correction " $_{est}$  using dimensional dimension dimension dimension dimension dimension dimension dimensional dimensi dimensional dimensi dimensiona dimensional dimensional dime

U sing the sam e type of expansion we may compute other correlations

$$ha_{k+}^{\gamma} a_{k}i = \frac{u^{t}O(HO)^{k-1}(HO)}{u^{t}O(HO)^{M}u} :$$
(36)

For large values of and large lattices, the numerator will decay exponentially as  $_1$ , where  $_1$  is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix H  $\,$  0.

# 4 Conclusions

In this work we have studied analytically and num erically the properties of the ground state of an ensemble of bosonic atom s in an 1D optical lattice. For the study of the



Fig. 5. The energy of the product ansatz contains a contribution from each connection, " $_{est}$ , plus the interaction between neighbouring connections, " $_{est}$ . In Fig. (a) we show that " $_{est}$  (dash) is actually negative, and in proves the estim ate " $_{est}$  m oving it towards the exact value, " $_{D M RG}$  (circles). Everything has been computed for n = 1. In Fig. (b) we show that the correction " $_{est}$  does not change m uch for large lattices.

atom ic ensemble we have used both the quantum rotor model and the Bose-Hubbard model. Exploiting the fact that in these models there exists only nearest neighbor hopping and local interactions, we have developed a variational wavefunction that may be used to easily estimate local properties, such as the energy per well, the nearest neighbor correlations and the uctuations of the density. In the case of the quantum rotor model we have veri ed our results with perturbative calculations around the strongly interacting regime, and with a spin wave approximation around the super uid regime. In the case of the Bose-Hubbard model we have compared the variational estimates with numerical results obtained using the DMRG technique for a maximum density of three atoms per well. We have concluded that this procedure leads to fairly good estimates of local ground state properties of both Ham iltonians, in both the super uid and the insulator regime, the largest disagreem ent being localized around the phase transition. In future work we forsee the application of these methods to time dependent problems.

# A cknow ledgm ents

We thank W. Zwerger for fruitful discussions.J.J.G arc a-R ipolland J.I.C irac thank the Deutsche Forschungsgem einschaft (SFB 631) and the K om petenznetzwerk Quanteninform ationsverarbeitung der Bayerischen Staatsregierung.C.K. and U.S. thank the Hess-Preis of the DFG and the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes for nancial support. W ork at the University of Innsbruck is supported by the Austrian Science Foundation, EU Networks and the Institute for Quantum Inform ation.PZ.thanks the M ax P lanck Institut fur Quantenoptik for hospitality during his stay in G arching, and thanks the Hum boldt Foundation for support during this stay.

