

Time evolution of one-dimensional Quantum Many Body Systems

Salvatore R. Manmana[†], Alejandro Muramatsu and Reinhard M. Noack[†]

*Institut für Theoretische Physik III, Universität Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 57/V,
D-70550 Stuttgart, Germany*

*[†]AG Vielteilchennumerik, Fachbereich Physik, Philipps-Universität Marburg,
D-35032 Marburg, Germany*

Abstract. The level of current understanding of the physics of time-dependent strongly correlated quantum systems is far from complete, principally due to the lack of effective controlled approaches. Recently, there has been progress in the development of approaches for one-dimensional systems. We describe recent developments in the construction of numerical schemes for general (one-dimensional) Hamiltonians: in particular, schemes based on exact diagonalization techniques and on the density matrix renormalization group method (DMRG). We present preliminary results for spinless fermions with nearest-neighbor-interaction and investigate their accuracy by comparing with exact results.

1. INTRODUCTION

The time evolution of strongly interacting quantum many body systems is one of the most challenging experimental and theoretical problems in physics. Recently, there has been progress in the investigation of the non-equilibrium time evolution of quantum systems in optical lattices [1] which has spurred theoretical interest in the time evolution of many body systems. The analytical treatment of such systems in equilibrium is restricted to only a few models, but in low dimensions efficient *numerically exact* methods have been developed and successfully applied to a variety of models in recent years.

The perturbative Keldysh formalism can be applied to investigate the non-equilibrium behavior of such systems analytically [2]. Also, nonperturbative approximation schemes basing on functional integral techniques are under development in the context of high-energy physics [3]. Due to their perturbative or approximate character, these approaches cannot treat systems for arbitrary parameter values. Therefore, development of numerical tools which do not have such limitations is crucial. In this contribution, we will focus on one-dimensional systems because the techniques developed in the past decade work very well for them, whereas it is rather difficult to apply these methods with the same accuracy and efficiency to higher dimensional systems.

A number of different numerical methods for the investigation of one-dimensional strongly correlated quantum systems exist. The most important methods are Quantum Monte-Carlo (QMC) [4, 5], exact diagonalization (ED) [6], and the density-matrix renormalization group (DMRG) [7, 8, 9, 10]. Some approaches to time evolution using QMC are known [11, 12] and others are under development [13], but the numerical

calculations are difficult to control. Therefore, we focus on the exact diagonalization and on the DMRG. Although it is possible to calculate all desired quantities using the ED for small system sizes, it is necessary to use the more involved DMRG method in order to reach sufficiently large system sizes to carry out a controlled finite-size scaling to the thermodynamic limit or to describe experiments with a large but finite number of sites, which are, e.g., realizable in optical lattices. In this contribution, we present results for the time evolution of a one-dimensional system obtained using an ED approach and use them for testing different DMRG approaches to the time evolution of the same system.

The main difficulty in calculating the time evolution using the DMRG is that the effective basis determined at the beginning of the time evolution is not able, in general, to represent the state well at later times [14] because it covers a subspace of the system's total Hilbert space which is not appropriate to properly represent the state at the next time step. As will be shown in Sec. 5, it is possible that the representation of the time-dependent wave function very soon becomes quite bad. It is necessary either to mix *all* time steps $\psi(t_i)$ into the density-matrix [14, 15], or to *adapt* the density matrix. An approach for adaptive time-evolution basing on the Trotter-Suzuki decomposition of the time-evolution operator was developed in Refs. [16, 17, 18]. However, the method is restricted to systems with nearest-neighbor terms in the Hamiltonian only. In our approach, we use a general scheme closely related to exact diagonalization techniques to obtain the next time step during the time evolution, combined with an adaption scheme recently proposed by White [19, 20]. Using this more general approach, it is possible to treat Hamiltonians containing arbitrary terms as long as the system can be efficiently handled with standard DMRG procedures.

The article is organized as follows. First, we briefly review the DMRG method in Sec. 2. In Sec. 3, we discuss general schemes for obtaining the time evolution of arbitrary quantum systems. In Sec. 4, we focus on strongly correlated systems and present results calculated using an exact diagonalization scheme. Subsequently, in Sec. 5, we discuss approaches and preliminary results obtained with non-adaptive and adaptive time evolution using the DMRG method and compare the results with the outcomes of the exact diagonalization approach. Finally, we discuss the results obtained and future work in Sec. 6.

2. THE DMRG METHOD

The DMRG method [7, 8] is described in detail in another contribution in this volume [21]. However, in order to better understand the main difficulties related to the calculation of the time evolution of an initial state ψ_0 using DMRG, we will give a short description of the main steps of the method here. The basic idea of the density-matrix renormalization group method is to represent one or more pure states of a finite system approximately by dividing the system in two and retaining only the m most highly weighted eigenstates of the reduced density matrix of the partial system. In combination with the numerical renormalization group approach (NRG) developed by Wilson [22] and the superblock algorithms developed by White and Noack [23], this leads to a very powerful and efficient tool for the investigation of one-dimensional strongly correlated quantum systems on a lattice.




FIGURE 1. Sketch of the lattice and the flowchart of the DMRG iteration scheme. The left part of the lattice is the subsystem to which a site is added; the “sweep” proceeds from left to right. The flowchart shows the relevant steps of the DMRG procedure. For further details of the method see [21].

As depicted in Fig. 1, the key steps are to *increase* the number of degrees of freedom of the partial system by adding sites, then to *decrease* the number of degrees freedom by retaining states below a cutoff. In this way, the method carries out a renormalization group procedure closely related to Wilson’s NRG.

In the first step of the algorithm, in which a site is added to one of the subsystems, the site-Hamiltonian is represented *exactly* in the site’s many-body basis. This basic feature is exploited by the Trotter-Suzuki approach to time evolution [17, 18] to efficiently apply the local time-evolution operator in this part of the lattice. The subsystem’s Hamiltonian is usually represented in an *efficient* reduced basis built up from the m most important eigenstates of the subsystem’s reduced density-matrix. In the second step, the states one is interested in are obtained. These states are called “target states”. In the original ground-state algorithm, these are the ground state and the few lowest lying excited states of the system, which are obtained by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian of the *total* system, e.g. by using the Lánczos diagonalization algorithm described in Sec. 4. However, one is not restricted to eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, and in this step may obtain alternative states. These properties are crucial for the time-evolution algorithms. The main problem is that the time-evolved state is not given by solving an eigenvalue problem.

In the third step, the new effective basis is obtained by diagonalizing the reduced density matrix of the extended subsystem given by

$$\rho_{\text{subsystem}} = \text{Tr}_{\text{rest}} \left[\sum_i n_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \right] ; \quad \sum_i n_i = 1 ; \quad (1)$$

where the sum goes over all target states. In step four, only the m eigenstates with the largest eigenvalues are kept. The operators needed to represent the subsystem’s Hamiltonian, to form the pieces of the Hamiltonian connecting subsystems, and to calculate observables are transformed into this new reduced basis. This effective Hamiltonian of the subsystem is now the starting point for step one of the next iteration. In this way,




FIGURE 2. Comparison of the time evolution of the local density $\langle n_i \rangle$ using full diagonalization and the Lanczos-approach described in Sec. 4 for a system of spinless fermions on 14 lattice sites with open boundary conditions and interaction $V(\ell = 0) = 0.5; V(\ell > 0) = 2.5$. $m_L = 5$ Lanczos vectors were kept. As can be seen, the error is negligible even after long times.

every iteration step improves the accuracy of the obtained eigenstates and energies by improving the reduced basis used for the representation of the target states.

Since both the Hamiltonian and the wavefunction $|\psi(t)\rangle$ at time t are represented in an incomplete basis, the result for the next time step $|\psi(t + dt)\rangle$ will have additional errors because the reduced basis is not an optimum representation for this state. In order to minimize these errors, it is necessary to form a density matrix whose m most important eigenvectors are “optimal” for the representation of the state $|\psi(t)\rangle$, as well as for $|\psi(t + dt)\rangle$ in the reduced Hilbert space. In Sec. 5 we will discuss ways of dealing with this problem.

3. APPROACHES TO TIME EVOLUTION

The dynamics of a quantum system is given by the solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H} |\psi(t)\rangle : \quad (2)$$

This equation is a first-order ordinary differential equation (ODE) which can be numerically solved directly by approximate integration schemes such as the Runge-Kutta method [24]. This method has been used within a non-adaptive DMRG scheme in Ref. [25] to obtain the time-dependent tunneling currents through a quantum dot connected to both non-interacting and interacting leads. This approach is a standard approach with an error $\varepsilon \propto (dt)^4$, but does not conserve unitarity. The crucial numerical step in this procedure is the $\hat{H}(t) |\psi(t)\rangle$, which must be implemented efficiently. An alternative implicit integration scheme conserving unitarity is the Crank-Nicholson procedure [24]

$$|\psi(t + dt)\rangle = \frac{1 - i\hat{H}(t)\delta t/2}{1 + i\hat{H}(t)\delta t/2} |\psi(t)\rangle : \quad (3)$$

This approach has been used in Ref. [18] within a non-adaptive DMRG approach to obtain the time evolution of a Bose-Hubbard system with an instantaneous change in the interaction strength at the beginning of the time evolution. In this method, the most costly numerical step is the calculation of the inverse (the denominator in Eq. 3), which can be carried out using, e.g., a biconjugate gradient approach [18]. The accuracy of this operation also determines the error of this approach. Other, more involved implicit and explicit integration schemes are known (see, e.g., Ref. [24]), but none of them has been used yet within the DMRG.

An alternative to the direct integration of the Schrödinger equation is to treat the formal solution

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{U} |\psi(0)\rangle \quad (4)$$

directly, where $\hat{U} = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$ is the time evolution operator. When full diagonalization of the Hamiltonian is viable, the time evolution can be expressed in the eigenbasis by

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_n e^{-iE_n t/\hbar} |j_n\rangle \langle j_n | \psi_0 \rangle;$$

where E_n and $|j_n\rangle$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of \hat{H} and $|\psi_0\rangle$ is the initial state. However, for strongly interacting quantum systems it is not possible to fully diagonalize \hat{H} for all but the smallest system sizes, so that an approximation to the time-evolution operator is needed. In the next section we present an ED approach with which such an approximation can be obtained within the Krylov basis to very high accuracy.

4. TIME EVOLUTION USING EXACT DIAGONALIZATION

Efficient iterative eigensolvers exist which can calculate the ground state and low lying eigenstates of systems with Hamiltonians which can be represented as sufficiently sparse matrices. The full spectrum, however, cannot efficiently be obtained with these techniques. One example is the *Lanczos-procedure* [26, 27], which is presented in more detail in another contribution in this volume. In this procedure, the vectors of the Krylov subspace, the subspace spanned by vectors

$$|u_0\rangle; \hat{H}|u_0\rangle; \hat{H}^2|u_0\rangle; \dots; \hat{H}^n|u_0\rangle;$$

are orthogonalized with respect to the previous two vectors of the set, leading to the recursion relation

$$|u_{j+1}\rangle = \hat{H}|u_j\rangle - \alpha_j|u_j\rangle - \beta_j^2|u_{j-1}\rangle \quad (5)$$

with the coefficients

$$\alpha_j = \frac{\langle u_j | \hat{H} | u_j \rangle}{\langle u_j | u_j \rangle}; \quad \beta_j^2 = \frac{\langle u_j | u_j \rangle}{\langle u_{j-1} | u_{j-1} \rangle}; \quad (6)$$

The Hamiltonian is then represented by the tridiagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{T}_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & 1 \\ & \alpha_0 & \beta_1 & & \\ & \beta_1 & \alpha_1 & \beta_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ & & \beta_2 & \alpha_2 & \ddots \\ & & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \ddots & \beta_n \\ & & & & \beta_n & \alpha_n \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

which can be easily diagonalized. For a review, see Refs. [6, 27]. If n is equal to the dimension of the Hilbert space, the approach is equivalent to a full diagonalization of \hat{H} (albeit not a useful one due to numerical instability). However, it turns out that for the calculation of the ground state it is sufficient in most cases to carry out of the order of 100 such iterations.

It is possible to use a Krylov-space approach to approximate the time-evolution operator $\hat{U}_{dt} = e^{-idt = \hbar \hat{H}}$ from the time step t to the time step $t + dt$. In the following, we assume that the Hamiltonian \hat{H} has no explicit time-dependence for $t > 0$.

The time evolution through one interval $\hat{U}_{dt} |\psi\rangle$ can be approximated by [28, 29]

$$|\psi(t + dt)\rangle = e^{-idt = \hbar \hat{H}} |\psi(t)\rangle \approx \mathbf{V}_n(t) e^{-idt = \hbar \mathbf{T}_n(t)} \mathbf{V}_n^T(t) |\psi(t)\rangle \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{V}_n is the matrix containing all the Lánczos vectors $|\psi_j\rangle$. The error in this approximation is given by [30]

$$\varepsilon_n := \left\| |\psi(t + dt)\rangle - |\psi(t + dt)\rangle_{\text{approx}} \right\| \approx \frac{1}{12} \exp\left(-\frac{(\rho dt)^2}{16n}\right) \frac{e \rho dt}{4n}^n; \quad (9)$$

$$\text{with } n \approx \frac{1}{2} \rho dt : \quad (10)$$

Here $\|\cdot\|$ represents the euclidean norm and $\rho = E_{\max} - E_{\min}$ is the width of the spectrum of the Hamiltonian. This means that the number of Lánczos vectors and the size of the time interval dt needed to obtain a given accuracy depend on the total energy of the system. In general, the larger the system, the more Lánczos vectors are needed, assuming that dt and the filling are kept fixed. However, this is not a serious limitation because the characteristic oscillations take place on timescales of the order $\tau_{\text{char}} = \frac{\hbar}{\rho}$. In order to fully resolve the dynamics it is necessary to adjust dt to be of the order of τ_{char} anyways. Together with relation (10), for typical situations where an accuracy of, e.g., $\text{tol} < 10^{-6}$, is required, one finds that $n \approx 20$ is sufficient. Therefore, the matrices in Eq. (8) are very small. The most time-consuming part of the calculation is then the multiplication $\hat{H} |\psi_n\rangle$ needed to carry out the recursion to obtain the Lánczos vectors, it is important to implement this efficiently. Putting these steps together, the full procedure reads:

1. Estimate the number of Lánczos vectors m_L needed for the given time step to obtain $\varepsilon_n < \text{tol}$.




FIGURE 3. Plot of the local density $\langle n_i \rangle$ and the momentum distribution $\langle n_k \rangle$ for a system of 18 sites with periodic boundary conditions, $V(t=0) = 0.5$; $V(t > 0) = 100$ calculated with the ED approach presented in Sec. 4. One can clearly observe a collapse and revival of the discontinuity at the Fermi edge, while $\langle n_i \rangle = 0.5$ for all times. In this calculation, $dt = 0.001$ and $m_L = 10$ Lanczos vectors.

2. Obtain V_{m_L} and T_{m_L} by performing the Lanczos iteration scheme with $|\psi(t)\rangle$ as starting vector.
3. Compute $|\psi(t+dt)\rangle = V_n(t) e^{idt = \hbar T_n(t)} V_n^T(t) |\psi(t)\rangle$.
4. Calculate observables.
5. Continue starting with step 2 and replacing $|\psi(t)\rangle$ by $|\psi(t+dt)\rangle$ until t_{\max} is reached.

Using this approach, we calculate the time evolution of a system of spinless fermions given by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -t \sum_j c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j + h \sum_j x_j + V \sum_j n_j n_{j+1} ; \quad (11)$$

where we change the magnitude of the interaction strength V at $t=0$. The half-filled system is known to undergo a phase transition at the critical parameter value $V = 2$ from a metallic ($V < 2$) to a CDW insulating phase ($V > 2$) [31] in the thermodynamic limit. Thus, by starting with a ground state obtained for $V < 2$ and applying the time-evolution operator with an interaction strength $V > 2$, one would expect oscillations in time between these two different phases. In addition, one would expect time-dependent Friedel-like oscillations in the local density $\langle n_i \rangle$ near the boundaries for finite systems with open boundary conditions. Such oscillations are shown in Fig. 2 for two different times. In order to test the accuracy of the Lanczos calculations, we have compared to results obtained from full diagonalization of the Hamiltonian. As can be seen, the error remains negligible up to the fairly long times treated here.

In Fig. 3, results are shown for periodic boundary conditions for $L = 18$, a system size not accessible to full diagonalization. As can be seen, there is no change in the local density, for all times. This is expected due to translation symmetry, and is reproduced by the numerical calculations, which do not explicitly enforce the symmetry.




FIGURE 4. Flowcharts of adaptive time-evolution schemes. On the left, the procedure used in the Trotter-approach developed in [17, 18] is sketched. On the right, the approach presented by White in [19, 20] is shown. Note that the wave-function transformation is needed in both approaches (see Refs. [9, 21]).

At the initial time step at temperature $T = 0$, for $V < 2$, the momentum distribution $n(k)$ has a singularity at the Fermi edge in the thermodynamic limit[32]. However, due to the limited system size, a step at k_F is observed rather than a singularity. This discontinuity vanishes and then reappears in the course of the time evolution. This may be interpreted as a collapse and revival of the metallic state of the system. Note, however, that a step at the Fermi edge in a finite one-dimensional system does not automatically induce a metallic state in the thermodynamic limit. At present, it is unclear whether the singularity in the thermodynamic limit is revived in the course of the time evolution. This issue is under investigation and will be presented elsewhere[33].

Within full diagonalization, sizes $L = 14$ are possible for this system. For ED, $L = 26$ can be reached on a supercomputer using a very basic code. By parallelizing the code and exploiting symmetries more completely, larger system sizes could be reached. However, they would nevertheless be small compared to the system sizes that we expect can be treated with the time-dependent DMRG.

5. ADAPTIVE TIME EVOLUTION USING THE DMRG

As pointed out in Sec. 2, the main problem in doing time evolution with DMRG is the update of the density matrix basis. In Fig. 4, we outline the algorithms for two different approaches to adaptive time evolution within the DMRG. In the first approach, a Trotter-Suzuki decomposition [34] of the time-evolution operator is used. The key feature of this method [17, 18] is the application of the exact local bond time-evolution operator to the two exactly treated sites for a particular superblock configuration, represented in Fig. 1 by filled circles. Results obtained by using this approach have been presented in Refs. [17, 18, 35, 36], an extensive error analysis is given in [35]. This approach is restricted to systems with nearest-neighbor terms in the Hamiltonian only because it relies on the fact that the sites to which the bond operator is applied are represented exactly. In order to formulate a more general method, it is useful to reexamine the approaches presented in Sec. 3. The most promising candidate is the Lánczos approach, presented in Sec. 4, which has small and well-controlled errors. An approach including states at all time-




FIGURE 5. Comparison between the time-evolution obtained with the ED approach of Sec. 4, DMRG without basis adaption, and DMRG with basis adaption, as described in Sec. 5 for a system of spinless fermions with 20 sites, open boundary conditions, and $V(t = 0) = 0.5; V(t > 0) = 2.5; m_L = 10$.

steps in the density-matrix rather than basis-adaption has been used in Ref. [15]. We now describe a Lanczos-based approach using *adaptive* time evolution within the DMRG. The key ingredient is the implementation of the basis adaption in a way which represents the state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ as well as $|\psi(t + dt)\rangle$ optimally. A scheme to do this has recently been proposed by White [19, 20]. In this approach, the density-matrix basis is formed by including different time-steps *within* the time interval $[t; t + dt]$. As in standard DMRG, finite-system sweeps are performed until convergence is achieved. At this point, the density matrix basis has been optimized to represent both the state at time t and the state at the time $t + dt$. Observables at the time step $t + dt$ can be calculated and $|\psi(t + dt)\rangle$ is then used as the starting point for propagation to the next time-step. In Fig. 4, we outline the procedure. While we currently include time steps $t; t + dt=3; t + 2dt=3$, and $t + dt$ in the density matrix, which intermediate states are optimal to include is still under investigation. At present, it is unclear how the sweeping influences the convergence behavior, although we believe that the accuracy of the state $|\psi(t + dt)\rangle$ can be improved by additional sweeping. Also, the errors in the reduced basis will accumulate with time. A more thorough error analysis and an investigation of possibilities to optimize this procedure are in preparation and will be presented elsewhere [33].

In Fig. 5, we show preliminary results for a system of spinless fermions with open boundary conditions for $L = 20$. As can be seen, the time evolution without basis adaption yields a result that is qualitatively wrong even for very small times, while the adaptive DMRG retains its accuracy for much longer times. A comparison of the non-basis-adapted and basis-adapted methods with our current time-evolution program, which does not utilize conserved quantum numbers [37], shows that the error is significant even after only 3 time steps for the non-adaptive method, while the adaptive method can reach 50 time steps before the error becomes discernable.

6. DISCUSSION

In this contribution, we have proposed schemes for the time evolution of strongly correlated one-dimensional quantum systems based on exact diagonalization and on the DMRG. In the ED-based variant, we have applied a Krylov-space approach utilizing a Lánczos iterative diagonalization scheme to a system of spinless fermions. We find that an adiabatic change in the interaction strength induces a collapse and revival of the metallic state. The same system was used to explore possible methods for adaptive time evolution within the DMRG. As discussed in detail, it is crucial to adapt the density-matrix basis to the changing state at each time step; we have implemented such a scheme based on a proposal by White [19, 20]. A comparison of results obtained with the adaptive DMRG scheme with the ED calculations shows that it can produce accurate results at fairly long time. However, a more thorough error analysis and a better understanding of how to optimize the scheme are necessary. Such work is in progress and will be presented elsewhere [33].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge useful discussions with S.R. White, U. Schollwöck, and C. Kollath. We thank the NIC at the Forschungszentrum Jülich for an allocation of computer time on the IBM-Cluster JUMP. S.R.M. acknowledges financial support by the European Graduate College “Electron-Electron Interactions in Solids” at the Universität Marburg.

REFERENCES

1. M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. W. Hänsch, and I. Bloch, *Nature*, **419**, 51 (2002).
2. J. Rammer, and H. Smith, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **58**, 323 – 359 (1986).
3. J. Berges, *hep-ph/0409233* (unpublished).
4. J. Grotendorst, D. Marx, and A. Muramatsu, editors, John von Neumann Institute for Computing, Jülich, 2002.
5. M. P. Nightingale, and C. J. Umrigar, editors, vol. 525, NATO Science Series, 1999.
6. N. Laflorencie, and D. Poilblanc, *Lect. Notes Phys.*, **645**, 227 (2004).
7. S. R. White, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **69**, 2863 (1992).
8. S. R. White, *Phys. Rev. B*, **48**, 10345 (1993).
9. I. Peschel, X. Wang, M. Kaulke, and K. Hallberg, editors, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
10. U. Schollwöck, *cond-mat/0409292*; *Rev. Mod. Phys.* (to appear January 2005).
11. C. H. Mak, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **68**, 899–902 (1992).
12. R. Egger, and C. H. Mak, *Phys. Rev. B*, **50**, 15210–15220 (1994).
13. M. Ostili, and C. Presilla, *cond-mat/0407758* (unpublished).
14. H. G. Luo, T. Xiang, and X. Q. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **91**, 049701 (2003).
15. P. Schmitteckert, *Phys. Rev. B*, **70**, 121302(R) (2004).
16. G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **93**, 040502 (2004).
17. S. R. White, and A. E. Feiguin, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **93**, 076401 (2004).
18. A. J. Daley, C. Kollath, U. Schollwöck, and G. Vidal, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp.*, p. P04005 (2004).
19. S. R. White, “Methods for Real time Dynamics,” 2004, URL <http://komet337.physik.uni-mainz.de/Jeckelmann/DMRG/workshop/proceedings/white.pdf>, talk given at the workshop “Recent Progress and Prospects in DMRG”.
20. A. E. Feiguin, and S. R. White (unpublished).
21. S. R. Manmana, and R. M. Noack (in preparation).

22. K. G. Wilson, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **47**, 773 (1975).
23. S. R. White, and R. M. Noack, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **68**, 3487 (1992).
24. W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes in C++*, Cambridge University Press, 1993, 2nd edn.
25. M. A. Cazalilla, and J. B. Marston, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **88**, 256403 (2002).
26. K. Lánczos, *J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand.*, **45**, 225 (1950).
27. J. K. Cullum, and R. A. Willoughby, *Lanczos algorithms for large symmetric eigenvalue computations*, vol. 1, Progress in Scientific Computing, 1985.
28. M. Hochbruck, and C. Lubich, *BIT*, **Vol. 39**, pp 620 – 645 (1999).
29. C. Moler, and C. V. Loan, *SIAM Review*, **45**, 3–49 (2003).
30. M. Hochbruck, and C. Lubich, *SIAM J. Numerical Anal.*, **Vol. 34**, pp 1911 – 1925 (1997).
31. J. Gubernatis, D. Scalapino, R. Sugar, and W. Toussaint, *Phys. Rev. B*, **32**, 103 – 116 (1985).
32. J. Voit, *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, **58**, 977–1116 (1995).
33. S. R. Manmana, A. Muramatsu, and R. M. Noack (in preparation).
34. M. Suzuki, *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, **56**, 1454 (1976).
35. D. Gobert, C. Kollath, U. Schollwöck, and G. Schuetz, *cond-mat/0409692* (unpublished).
36. C. Kollath, U. Schollwöck, J. von Delft, and W. Zwerger, *cond-mat/0411403* (unpublished).
37. (Our current time-evolution program is based on a simple DMRG program developed as part of the ALPS project and utilizes a Lánczos-code based on the IETL library, see <http://alps.comp-phys.org> and *cond-mat/0410407*).