Fixed Points of the Dissipative Hofstadter Model

E.Novais $_{\prime}^{1,2}$ F.Guinea $_{\prime}^{1,3}$ and A.H.Castro Neto¹

¹Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA, 02215

²Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham, NC, 27708

³Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales de Madrid, CSIC, E-28049 Madrid, Spain.

(D ated: M arch 23, 2024)

The phase diagram of a dissipative particle in a periodic potential and a magnetic eld is studied in the weak barrier lim it and in the tight-biding regime. For the case of half ux per plaquette, and for a wide range of values of the dissipation, the physics of the model is determined by a non trivial xed point. A combination of exact and variational results is used to characterize this xed point. Finally, it is also argued that there is an intermediate energy scale that separates the weak coupling physics from the tight-binding solution.

PACS num bers: 03.65.Y z, 03.75.Lm

Introduction A quantum particle interacting with an environm ent with a macroscopic number of degrees of freedom, the Caldeira-Leggett (CL) model [1], is one of the simplest models used in the study of decoherence in quantum systems. This model has been generalized to include the motion of a dissipative particle in a periodic potential [2], in a nite magnetic eld [3], and in a com bination of both situations [4]. The problem described by such a model applies to a large number of situations in condensed matter, quantum computation, and string theory. A few examples are: ux qubit dephasing in quantum computers [5], defects in Luttinger liquids [6], junctions between many Luttinger liquids [7], and nontrivial backgrounds in open string theory [4]. The CL model is also relevant to the study of the dephasing induced in m esoscopic system s by external gates [8, 9], and it always reproduces the short time dynamics of particles interacting with ohm ic environments [10]. The model also describes the quantum motion of a vortex in a lattice. This model has attracted interest in the study of d-wave superconductors with strong phase uctuations [11]. Note that, in this context, dissipation due to low energy modes arises naturally.

A lthough the phase diagram of a dissipative particle in a periodic potential is well understood [12, 13], there is no sim ilar degree of understanding when a magnetic eld is also added to the problem [4, 14]. This model became known as the dissipative H ofstadter model, and in the present work we analyze its phase diagram with a square lattice symmetry, the renormalization group (RG) ows and xed points. We use mappings into spin and fermion H am iltonians, and variational methods in order to obtain further information on the phase diagram, which, as discussed below, presents a number a new features with respect to the model without a magnetic eld.

The model. In the absence of dissipation, the Hofstadter problem has a complex energy spectrum [15]. The model has a duality between the weak coupling and tight binding limits of the periodic potential [16] and, in both cases, the spectrum can be described by Harper's equation [17]. A similar duality holds in the dissipative case [4], which adm its further extensions (see below).

W e start by considering the lim it where the periodic potential is weak. It was shown in Ref. [4] that from perturbation theory on the lowest Landau's levels the dissipative model can be described by a boundary conformal eld theory in (1 + 1) dimensions with action (we use units such that ~ = 1 = k_B),

where $_{ij}$ is the totally anti-sym metric tensor. The particle's coordinates are represented by the boundary degrees of freedom of the eld, $\hat{R}() = _1(0;)\hat{e}_x + _2(0;)\hat{e}_y$. In addition, the particle moves in a periodic potential of lattice spacing a and amplitude (= V= 1, where V is the potential strength, and is a high energy cuto), and is subject to a perpendicular magnetic eld of amplitude = $Ba^2 = _0$ (where $_0$ is ux quantum). D issipation arises from the rst term in the rh.s. of Eq. (1) when the bulk modes ($_i(x;)$ with x > 0) are traced out. The dissipation strength is given by $= a^2$ (where is the dissipation coe cient).

In the absence of the potential the theory is G aussian and the eld propagator reads [4, 7, 14]

$$h_{i}(0;)_{j}(0; 0)i_{0} = 2 \sim \ln j j_{i;j} + i \sim sgn()_{i;j}(2)$$

where $\sim = = (2 + 2)$ and $\sim = = (2 + 2)$. The rst term in Eq. (2) is the well studied logarithm ic correlations. The second part of the propagator is the A haronov-B ohm phase that the particle picks due to the m agnetic eld. U sing this result, it is simple to write the partition function as an expansion in powers of

$$Z = \begin{pmatrix} X & X & X & Z & Z_{1} & Z_{n-1} \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & &$$

where A (i) = e^{i i (0; i)}. Eq. (3) has a simple physical interpretation: each insertion of A represents a jump of the center of the particle's Landau orbit by a vector of the \dual" lattice $\mathbf{r}_{m,n} = m a^{2} + \frac{2}{2} \mathbf{e}_{x} + na^{2} + \frac{2}{2} \mathbf{e}_{y}$ (n and m are integers) [14]. W hich, for = 0 is a distance proportional to the Larm or radius (! c¹⁼² = ¹⁼²a).

The complementary limit to the physics of Eq. (1) is to consider very large barriers. Thus, instead of the low – est Landau orbits, a tight binding approximation to the spectrum in the absence of dissipation is natural starting point[2, 4]. The partition function is now expanded in powers of the nearest neighbor hopping am plitude, t, between the minim a of the periodic potential. The result is identical to Eq. (3) with the substitutions of Table I.

		g	1=q
weak barriers	= V=	~	~
tight binding	t= t=		

TABLE I: Duality relations between the strong and weak coupling lim its of the dissipative H ofstadter m odel.

In the following, we focus on a cross section of the phase diagram, \sim or = 1=q with $q \ge Z$, that contains most of the interesting features. We found convenient to re-write the problem in an uni ed H am iltonian form alism

$$H = \frac{v_{s}}{2} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dz \frac{1}{2g} [\theta_{z x;y}(z)]^{2} + 2g [x;y(z)]^{2} + T_{x}e^{i_{x}(0)} + T_{y}e^{i_{y}(0)} + hx;; \qquad (4)$$

where we set v = 1, $[x_{,y}(z_1); x_{,y}(z_2)] = x_{,y}(z_1 z_2)$ and $T_{x,y}$ are p-dimensional matrices $(T_{x,y}^{1} = T_{x,y}^{y})$ that satisfy the algebra

$$T_x T_y = e^{2 i=q} T_y T_x :$$
 (5)

The correspondence between the parameters of Eq. (4)and the dissipative m odel are sum marize on Table I. The stability of the both limits is given by the lowest order renorm alization group (RG) equation

$$Q_{,} = (1 \quad g) ;$$
 (6)

where d' = d = . Since the scaling dimension of (') in the strong coupling case is not the inverse of the one at weak coupling, there are values of (;) where both

and thave runaway ows. This is similar to the case considered in Ref. [18, 19], where it was shown that a

particle in a triangular lattice can have a non trivial xed point at interm ediate coupling.

Variational treatment. For g < 1, (') scales toward strong coupling. This usually suggests that the elds $_{x,y}(0)$ become \pinned" at some value $_{x,y}(0)$. We can gain insight into this \pinned phase" using the Self-C onsistent H arm onic Approximation (SCHA) [20]. This approximation replaces the original periodic potential by harm onic wells adjusted self-consistently. W ithin SCHA we replace the boundary term in Eq. (4) by

$$V_{sc} = \frac{X}{a = x_{ry}} \frac{K_{a} [a(0) a]^{2}}{2} h_{0} J_{a} + T_{a}^{1} J_{a}$$

where K_x and K_y are variational parameters. The pdimensional state $\mathcal{D}i$ has also to be adjusted variationally, and $x_{xy} = \operatorname{arghO} f_{x,y} \mathcal{D}i$.




FIG.1: Set of degenerate m in im a obtained using the SCHA for q = 2. The arrows denote the orientation of the state jn;ni for m;n = 1;2. Possible hopping terms between these m in im a are also sketched.

Because of the periodicity of the potential, states juins such that $\ln f_{x,y}$ juind if er by a phase, have the same ground state energy. It can be shown that the lowest energy is obtained for $10 f_x$ juing $10 f_y$ juing T and

$$K_{x} = K_{y} = T (T)^{\frac{1}{g-1}}$$
: (7)

Given a state Di, and using the relations in Eq. (5), we can construct p^2 states, jn; $ni = T_x^m T_v^n \hat{p}i; m; n =$;p 1 that lead to the same energy. Thus, the 1; SCHA leads to a degenerate set of states labeled by the minimum in the periodic potential. The situation is illustrated in Fig.[1], where the case q = 2 is shown. The scaling dimension of the hopping between minima in the sublattice de ned by a given vector jn ;ni is 1=g. Although tunneling is also possible between minima in di erent sublattices, it is reduced by the overlap factor tm;n in ⁰;n⁰ij. These m in in a are closer in real space, and their scaling dimension is 1 = (4g). Hence, for 1 = 4 < g < 1both the weak and strong coupling lim its are unstable further supporting the existence of an interm ediate xed point. For a general value of \sim (or) = 1=p this result generalize to $1=p^2 < g < 1$. Moreover, the overlap of the states jn ; ni de ne an e ective Berry's phase generated when moving around each plaquette. It is easy

to show that the ux per plaquette needed to generate this Berry's phase is p. Hence, within the SCHA the weak barrier problem has an additional duality property, which leaves \sim () unchanged, but replaces g \$ 1=(p²g).

M apping to a spin chain for q = 2. For $\sim = 1=2$ in the weak coupling case, or = 1=2 in the tight binding lim it, the operators T_x and T_y in Eq. (4) reduce to Pauli m atrices, $_x$; $_y$. This equivalence suggests the use of a spin H am iltonian with the sam e universal properties for the environment. Thus we replace Eq. (4) by two sem in nite XXZ chains

where = $\cos[(1 \ g)]$ and $v_s = j\sin(g) = (+2 \arcsin[\cos(g)])$.

The spin Ham iltonian provides a dierent perspective of the in nite coupling lim it studied by SCHA.AS ! 1, the low energy sector tends towards the tensor

product of two sem i-in nite chains (starting from sites 2) plus the low energy excitations of the three strongly coupled spins at sites -1, 0 and 1. As the SCHA suggested, there are four degenerate states (see Fig. (1)). When we consider < 1, the interaction between sites 2 and 1 can be treated as a perturbation of order 1= and we the degeneracy is lifted to a doublet. In fact, this doublet is protected by a hidden symmetry (see below). After dening dual spin variables [21], n = n + 1 and n = j + n + j, we nd that [n + 1] = 0. This conserved quantity is non-local in the original spin (dissipative) problem, thus it correspond to a topological charge.

We can further understand the intermediate xed point by solving the non-interacting" problem, g = 1=2. As a bonus to be solvable, it is also believed that this point separates four di erent phases in the (;) plane[4]. U sing the dual spin variables, the H am iltonian breaks into three independent parts,

$$H = \sum_{n=0}^{X} \sum_{n+1}^{x} \sum_{n=1}^{z} \sum_{n+1}^{x} + \sum_{n+1}^{x} \sum_{n+1}^{z} \sum_{n+1}^{z} + \nabla; (9)$$

with the de nitions: $\frac{i}{n} = \frac{i}{2n}$, $\frac{i}{n} = \frac{i}{2n}$ and V = (v_s 1) $\frac{x}{0} + \frac{z}{1} \frac{z}{0}$. Eq. (9) in plies that the odd sites of the original chain are mapped into two sem i-in nite quantum Ising chains with open boundary conditions. The even sites are mapped into a single quantum chain and an inpurity term (V). A fter ferm ionizing the three chains and taking the continuous limit, it is straightforward to show that V is an irrelevant operator of dim ension 2. Hence, the manifestly conformal invariant RG xed point is $v_s = 1$. In the ferm ionic language, the conservation of the topological charge is represented by a single M a jorana ferm ion localized at the origin. In addition, we just showed that for g = 1=2 the xed point is the resonance condition to a ferm ionic channel. Since dim V = 2 at the \non-interacting" point, it is very likely that V will also be an irrelevant operator for other values g. Eventually, as we consider g ! 1, the repulsive interaction between ferm ions became su ciently strong to close the ferm ionic channel through the localization of a second M a prana (! 0 xed point).

The correspondence with the SCHA give us as simple picture about the particles m obility. In SCHA, the four m in in a of the potential are organized in sub-lattices depicted in Fig. (1). With the mapping to the spin chain, they can also be classi ed accordantly to the two possible values of the topological charge $\begin{pmatrix} z \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. This fact suggests that at the interm ediated xed point the lattice breaks into two sub-lattices. Tunneling between m inim a of different sub-lattices does not occur, while the amplitude for wells in the same sub-lattice is given by the renormalized value of 1= . This is very similar to the intermediated xed point of a Brownian motion in a trianqular lattice [19], where there are three geom etrical sublattices. For interm ediate values of dissipation, there is a regim e where the particle avoids one of the sub-lattices, but moves on the other two. This scenario of an interm ediated m obility can be further supported by noticing that for the exact solution, g = 1=2, the current operator also becom es quadratic in the ferm ion operators. Since the correlations will decay as ² at long tim es, the particle mobility, $ij = \lim_{l \neq 0} |h_i(0;l)_j(0; l)i$, is nite at the xed point [22].

Fixed point at or near g = 1. When ;~ = 1 the diagonal correlations between the $e^{i_x(0)}$; $e^{i_y(0)}$ operators decay as ². The RG equation can be derived in an = 1 g[14, 23] expansion scheme,

$$Q_{1} = C \sin^{2}(=q)^{3} + O^{2};^{5};$$
 (10)

where C is a constant of order unity. For q = 2, Eq. (10) in plies a renormalized / p^- . As $g \mid 1$, this xed point merge with the trivial = 0. The physical meaning of = 0 is straightforward when we bok from the perspective of a quantum in purity problem. In Eq. (4), the two bosonic elds favor the localization of the spin variable along orthogonal directions. Thus, when g = 1, the \frustration" decouples the spin from the baths[24].

Phase diagram for half ux per unit cell. We now focus on a magnetic led which corresponds to half ux per plaquette, = 1=2, which illustrates the dimension xed points mentioned above. We sum marize the discussion on Fig. (2).

In the tight binding lim it, the particle is localized for

1. C base to / 1 there is an intermediate xed point, t / $\frac{1}{1}$. For 1=2 the exact solution shows that t 1. Finally, the duality transform ation obtained by variational means indicates that a localized solution is unstable for 1=4, so that an intermediate xed point exists for 1=4 < < 1.

In the weak barrier lim it, except at = 1=2, the = 0 xed point is unstable for all values of . For = 1=2 the




FIG. 2: Phase diagram of the dissipative H ofstadter m odel with half ux per unit cell, = 1=2. The lines and symbols show the expected xed points.

RG ow of is zero, leading to a line of xed points [4]. This point in the phase diagram is equivalent to the well known line of xed points of the model without the magnetic eld [2]. This happens because as the particle hops in the \dual" lattice x, it picks a phase of 2 around each plaquette. For = 3=2, the partition function is identical to the partition function in the tight-biding lim it. Since the model is self-dual there ought to be at least one xed point at intermediate coupling. For = $1=(2^{-3})$ we nd $\sim = 3=2$. The model has the same properties as when $\sim = 1=2$, and the action, eq.(1), is form ally equivalent to the action obtained in the tight binding lim it. It seems likely that the xed point obtained from the variational approach in this regime has the same properties as the one in the tight binding lim it.

In the region 0 < < 1=4 the weak and tight binding lim its have RG ow towards strong coupling. The SCHA suggests that the particle is indeed delocalized with a phenom enology quite di erent from the = 0 xed point. Instead of moving in the \dual" lattice, r, it freely moves in the lattice induced by the potential [25].

The existence of the self-dual point strongly suggests that for some parameters both the weak and the tight binding lim its can be used to describe the model. However, at = 1=2 the dimensional approaches lead to m arkedly di erent results. Sim ilar discrepancies do exit in m any other parts of the phase diagram . H ence, it is not obvious how to extrapolate the results from the weak barrier case to the tight binding lim it and vice-versa. These di erences between the weak barrier and tight binding lim its are related to the range of validity of the eld theories that describe each one. For instance, when the RG ow of the weak coupling case leads to energy scales of the order of $max(;!_c)$, Eq. (1) is no longer justified. Then, the theory must be supplemented with operators due to transitions to higher Landau levels. This is clear in the = 1=2 case, where the particle in the weak barrier lim it e ectively hops in a \dual" lattice with lattice

parameter $P_{\overline{2}a}$. Hence, starting from Eq. (1) it is not possible to account for the e ects of the particle tunneling between m inim a of the periodic potential separated by a. Thism eans that at a certain energy scale the line of xed points stops, and the problem starts to renorm alize to the exact solution that we discussed in the text. C onversely, using the duality properties of the model, there are other regions of the phase diagram where the tight binding su ers by the same problem.

In conclusion, we studied the dissipative Hofstadter model using scaling, exact results, and a variational approach. This allowed us to characterize the intermediate coupling xed point of the model. Finally, we showed that results obtained in weak barrier or tight binding limits cannot be straightforward connected.

One of us (F.G.) is thankful to the Quantum Condensed M atter V isitor's Program at Boston University. A H C N. was partially supported through NSF grant DMR-0343790.

- [1] A.O.Caldeira and A.Leggett, Ann. Phys. 149, 374 (1983).
- [2] A.Schmid, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 1506 (1983).
- [3] S. D attagupta and J. Singh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 961 (1997).
- [4] C.Callan and D.Freed, Nucl. Phys. B 374, 543 (1992).
- [5] M.Grajcar et al, (2004), cond-m at/0501085.
- [6] C.L.Kane and M.P.A.Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 46, 15233 (1992).
- [7] C. Chamon, M. Oshikawa, and I. A eck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 206404 (2003).
- [8] F.Guinea, R.A. Jalabert, and F. Sols, Phys. Rev. B 70, 085310 (2004).
- [9] F.Guinea, Phys. Rev. B 71, 045424 (2005).
- [10] F.Guinea, Phys. Rev. B 67, 045103 (2003).
- [11] L.Balents et al., (2004), cond-m at/0408329.
- [12] S.Bulgadaev, Pis'm a Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz.39,264 (1984), JETP Lett. 39, 315 (1984).
- [13] F. Guinea, V. Hakim, and A. Muramatsu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54, 263 (1985).
- [14] C.G.Callan, A.G.Felœ, and D.E.Frœed, Nucl.Phys. B 392, 551 (1993).
- [15] D.Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. B 14, 2239 (1976).
- [16] D. Langbein, Phys. Rev. 180, 633 (1969).
- [17] P.G.Harper, Proc. Phys. Soc. London 68, 874 (1955).
- [18] H.Yiand C.L.Kane, Phys. Rev. B 57, R 5579 (1998).
- [19] I. A eck, M. O shikawa, and H. Saleur, Nucl. Phys. B 594, 535 (2001).
- [20] G.Gom ez-Santos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4223 (1996).
- [21] F.Guinea, Phys. Rev. B 32, 7518 (1985).
- [22] E. N ovais and F. G uinea and A. H. Castro N eto, unpublished.
- [23] G. Zarand and E. Dem ler, Phys. Rev. B 66, 024427 (2002).
- [24] A.H.C.Neto et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 91, 096401 (2003).
- [25] The conclusion that the particle is delocalized for this parameters is in agreement with Ref. [4].