

Crossed spin-1/2 Heisenberg chains as a quantum impurity problem

S. A. Reyes and A. M. Tsvelik

*Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973-5000, USA and
Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3800, USA
(Dated: March 23, 2002)*

Using equivalencies between different models we reduce the model of two spin-1/2 Heisenberg chains crossed at one point to the model of free fermions. The spin-spin correlation function is calculated by summing the perturbation series in the interchain interaction. The result reveals a power law decay with a nonuniversal exponent.

Presence of impurities in interacting systems causes nonlinear effects which may result in a nontrivial scaling of thermodynamic quantities and correlation functions. Examples of impurity models discussed in the literature include various versions of the Kondo problem (a quantum spin in a noninteracting metallic host) and the Kane-Fisher or Boundary Sine-Gordon problem (a local static potential in a one-dimensional Luttinger liquid). They have numerous experimental applications in physics of diluted magnetic alloys ([1],[2]) and in such areas as interedge tunnelling in Quantum Hall effect (see, for example, [3],[4]). As a rule the impurity scattering in these models scales to strong coupling. The latter fixed point is rather simple in nature (fully screened spin in the Kondo problem, severed chain in the Kane-Fisher one). The exclusion is the fixed point in the underscreened Kondo problem where the fixed point occurs at an intermediate coupling first predicted in [5]. This fixed point is characterized by non-trivial universal indices.

In this paper we would like to call the attention to the situation when the operator describing a scattering on the impurity is exactly marginal (that is its scaling dimension is equal to the dimension of space-time, which in the present case is 2). Since such interaction does not flow under renormalization, the results for the correlation functions are bound to depend on the bare coupling constant. In particular, such situation exists when the underlying impurity problem is equivalent to a problem of noninteracting fermions scattering on a scalar potential. An interesting situation emerges when the fermion operators and observables are mutually nonlocal. In that case calculation of correlation functions of the physical fields still constitutes a nontrivial problem resulting in nonuniversal scaling dimensions.

One experimentally relevant realization of the Marginal Quantum Impurity problem is provided by the model of two spin-1/2 Heisenberg chains interacting at a single point by the exchange interaction:

$$H = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} J [\mathbf{S}_1(n) \cdot \mathbf{S}_1(n+1) + \mathbf{S}_2(n) \cdot \mathbf{S}_2(n+1)] + J_{\perp} \mathbf{S}_1(0) \cdot \mathbf{S}_2(0) \quad (1)$$

where $|J_{\perp}| \ll J$. This model can be treated as a particular version of the spin ladder problem. To describe

its low energy properties one can employ the technique developed in [6] (see also [7] for a more detailed description) and rewrite the Hamiltonian as the model of four species of massless real (Majorana) fermions coupled at point $x = 0$

$$H = \int dx \sum_{a=0}^3 \left[\frac{iv}{2} (-R_a \partial_x R_a + L_a \partial_x L_a) + ig_a \delta(x) (R_a L_a) \right] \quad (2)$$

where $g_i = J_{\perp} a_0 (i = 1, 2, 3)$; $g_0 = -3g_1$ and $v = \pi J a_0 / 2$ is the spinon velocity. The fermion operators satisfy the standard anticommutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} \{R_a(x), R_b(y)\} &= \{L_a(x), L_b(y)\} = \delta_{ab} \delta(x-y) \\ \{R_a(x), L_b(y)\} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and are real, that is $R^+ = R, L^+ = L$. The ratio g_0/g_a can be changed by introduction of the four-spin interaction [8]. Thus the model of interacting spins is reduced to the model of non-interacting fermions. This representation respects the original symmetry of the problem: the fermions $a = 1, 2, 3$ transform as an SU(2) triplet and the 0-th fermion is an SU(2) singlet. Fermionization of one-dimensional spin models has a long history going back to the work by Jordan and Wigner [9]. It is well known that a single spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain can be represented as a model of fermions which interaction depends on the anisotropy. At the isotropic point this interaction is quite strong. Therefore it is interesting to note that though a single isotropic spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain cannot be described as a model of noninteracting fermions, the two chain model can. Naturally, the spin operators of the original Heisenberg chains are nonlocal with respect to the Majorana fermions (the relationship between them resembles the one given by the Jordan-Wigner transformation). For that reason the problem of correlation functions still remains nontrivial. To calculate the spin correlators we will employ an alternative representation of model (2), namely, in the form of four quantum Ising models:

$$H = \sum_{a=0}^3 H_{Is}^a, \quad H_{Is}^a = H_{crit}^a + g_a \epsilon_a(x=0) \quad (4)$$

where H_{crit} is the Hamiltonian of the critical Ising model and $\epsilon(x, \tau)$ is the energy density field. The quantum Ising

model is described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -J \sum_n (\sigma_n^z \sigma_{n+1}^z + h \sigma_n^x) \quad (5)$$

The Jordan-Wigner transformation brings it to the fermionic form. The order parameter field $\sigma(x)$ of the Ising model is the continuum limit of σ_n^z , the energy density field is the continuum limit of σ_n^x . At $h < 1$ field σ has a nonzero vacuum average $\langle \sigma \rangle \neq 0$. Hamiltonian (5) can be rewritten in the dual form

$$H = -J \sum_n (h \mu_{n-1/2}^z \mu_{n+1/2}^z + \mu_{n+1/2}^x) \quad (6)$$

where the operators

$$\mu_{n+1/2}^z = \prod_{j \leq n} \sigma_j^x, \quad \mu_{n+1/2}^x = \sigma_n^z \sigma_{n+1}^z \quad (7)$$

obey the same commutation relations as the Pauli matrices σ^z, σ^x . The so-called disorder parameter field $\mu(x)$ is defined as the continuum limit of the operator $\mu_{n+1/2}^z$. It is clear that $\langle \mu \rangle \neq 0$ at $h > 1$. At $h = 1$ the models (5) coincides with its dual (6). Since σ and μ cannot have nonzero ground state expectation values simultaneously, at $h = 1$ their averages vanish and the model is quantum critical. At this point the Majorana fermion becomes massless. Thus model (5) with $h = 1$ is equivalent to the model of one species of massless Majorana fermions.

The advantage of the Ising model representation is that the original spin fields of the Heisenberg models can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_1(j) + \mathbf{S}_2(j) &= \frac{i}{2} \{ [\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}] + [\mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{L}] \} + (-1)^j \mathbf{n}_+(x) \\ \mathbf{S}_1(j) - \mathbf{S}_2(j) &= \frac{i}{2} \{ R_0 \mathbf{R} + L_0 \mathbf{L} \} + (-1)^j \mathbf{n}_-(x) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the most relevant parts of the spin operators given by the staggered magnetizations \mathbf{n}_\pm are expressed as local combinations of the order and disorder parameters of the Ising models [6]:

$$n_+^x = \sigma_1 \mu_2 \sigma_3 \mu_0, \quad n_+^y = \mu_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3 \mu_0, \quad n_+^z = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \mu_3 \mu_0 \quad (9)$$

In the expression for \mathbf{n}_- one has to interchange σ and μ . Correlation functions of the Ising model fields and their properties are well known and we are going to use this knowledge to calculate the correlators of the perturbed model (2). Using Eqs.(9) and taking into account that the change of sign of the coupling constant $g \rightarrow -g$ is equivalent to the substitution $\mu \rightarrow \sigma, \sigma \rightarrow \mu$, it is easy to relate the desired spin correlators to the correlation functions of the perturbed Ising model:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n_\alpha^a(\tau_1, x_1) n_\beta^a(\tau_2, x_2) \rangle &= \quad (10) \\ G_{\sigma,g}^2(\tau_{12}; x_1, x_2) G_{\mu,g}(\tau_{12}; x_1, x_2) G_{\sigma,3g}(\tau_{12}; x_1, x_2) + \\ (2\delta_{\alpha\beta} - 1) G_{\mu,g}^2(\tau_{12}; x_1, x_2) G_{\sigma,g}(\tau_{12}; x_1, x_2) \times \\ G_{\mu,3g}(\tau_{12}, x_1, x_2) \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$G_{\mu,g}(\tau; x_1, x_2) \equiv \langle \langle \mu(\tau, x_1) \mu(0, x_2) \rangle \rangle \quad (11)$$

$$G_{\sigma,g}(\tau; x_1, x_2) \equiv \langle \langle \sigma(\tau, x_1) \sigma(0, x_2) \rangle \rangle \quad (12)$$

and α, β label the chain to which the operator corresponds (1 or 2). Notice that the correlators remain translationally invariant only in time direction. To simplify the calculations we will consider the above correlation functions only at $x_{1,2} = 0$. To obtain these correlators we sum the leading logarithms in the perturbation expansion in small g_a .

Namely, the Ising order parameter field correlator, $\langle \langle \sigma(\tau_a) \sigma(\tau_b) \rangle \rangle$ (we omit the space coordinate x assuming $x = 0$) can be obtained by calculating the following series,

$$\langle \langle \sigma(\tau_a) \sigma(\tau_b) \rangle \rangle_g = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{g^n}{n!} C_n \quad (13)$$

where,

$$C_n \equiv \int d\tau_1 \dots d\tau_n \langle \langle \sigma(\tau_a) \sigma(\tau_b) \varepsilon(\tau_1) \dots \varepsilon(\tau_n) \rangle \rangle_0 \quad (14)$$

and $\langle \langle \rangle \rangle_0$ denotes the irreducible correlator in the unperturbed system and, $\varepsilon \equiv iRL(x=0)$ is the Ising model energy density at the impurity point.

Only the largest divergent terms will be kept at each order in g . The irreducible correlators under consideration will have its largest divergencies in the regions where each of the τ_i 's approach either τ_a or τ_b corresponding to the fusion of ϵ and σ operators. Divergencies corresponding to the fusion of ϵ operators are not present in the irreducible correlation functions being cancelled by the corresponding divergencies in the partition function. To calculate the leading logarithms we take advantage of the Operator Product Expansion (OPE) for the critical Ising model [10]:

$$\varepsilon(\tau_i) \sigma(\tau_{a,b}) = \frac{1}{2|\tau_{a,b} - \tau_i|} \sigma(\tau_{a,b}) + \dots \quad (15)$$

where the dots stand for less relevant terms. The most divergent part of C_n is given by

$$C_n \approx \left[2 \ln \left(\frac{|\tau_{ab}|}{\tau_0} \right) \right]^n \quad (16)$$

where τ_0 is an ultraviolet cutoff. The factor 2^n comes from the number of regions with divergent integrand that exist (that is to say, the number of ways the n different τ_i variables can approach either τ_a or τ_b) and the logarithm comes from integrating over this regions.

Now, replacing this result into (13) is easy to see that,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\sigma,g} &= \langle \sigma(\tau_a) \sigma(\tau_b) \rangle_0 \left(\frac{\tau_0}{|\tau_{ab}|} \right)^{-2g_1} \quad (17) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\tau_{ab}|^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\frac{\tau_0}{|\tau_{ab}|} \right)^{-2g_1} \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \sigma(\tau_a) \sigma(\tau_b) \rangle_0 \sim |\tau_{ab}|^{-1/4}$ is the correlator of the unperturbed system.

Similar considerations are valid for the perturbation series for the disorder parameter, $\langle \mu(\tau_a) \mu(\tau_b) \rangle$. The only difference is that the OPE contains minus sign [10]:

$$\varepsilon(\tau_i) \mu(\tau_{a,b}) = -\frac{1}{2|\tau_{a,b} - \tau_i|} \mu(\tau_{a,b}) + \dots \quad (18)$$

Then the same steps that lead to (17), now lead to:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu,g} &= \langle \langle \mu(\tau_a) \mu(\tau_b) \rangle \rangle_0 \left(\frac{\tau_0}{|\tau_{ab}|} \right)^{2g} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\tau_{ab}|^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left(\frac{\tau_0}{|\tau_{ab}|} \right)^{2g} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $g = g_1$ for μ_a ($a=1,2,3$) operator and g_0 for the μ_0 operator.

Substituting (17,19) into (10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{n}_\alpha(\tau_a) \cdot \mathbf{n}_\beta(\tau_b) \rangle &= \\ \frac{3}{|\tau_{ab}|} \left[\left(\frac{\tau_0}{|\tau_{ab}|} \right)^{-8\tilde{g}} + (2\delta_{\alpha\beta} - 1) \left(\frac{\tau_0}{|\tau_{ab}|} \right)^{8\tilde{g}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\tilde{g} = (g_1 - g_0)/4$. The nonuniversal power law behavior of the spin-spin correlation functions is reflected in the power law behavior of the local magnetic susceptibility:

$$\chi(x=0) \sim (T/T_0)^{8\tilde{g}} + (T/T_0)^{-8\tilde{g}}, \quad T_0 \sim J \quad (21)$$

As one may expect, the susceptibility does not depend on the sign of the interchain interaction. Since the perturbing impurity operator is exactly marginal, it does

not generate any nontrivial corrections to the specific heat. The impurity magnetic susceptibility diverges with a nonuniversal index (21).

Thus we have found a nontrivial example of the impurity problem where strong correlations in the bulk generate nonuniversal scaling dimensions. This model may be a member of a class of models which Hamiltonians can be written as a scattering problem of free particles, whose creation and annihilation operators and the observables are mutually nonlocal.

This research was supported by US DOE under contract numbers DE-AC02-98 CH 10886. S. A. R. is grateful to Robert Konik for many useful discussions.

-
- [1] A. M. Tsvelik and P. B. Wiegmann, *Adv. Phys.* **32**, 331 (1983).
 - [2] P. Schlottmann, *Phys. Rep.* **181**, 1 (1989).
 - [3] P. Fendley, A. W. W. Ludwig and H. Saleur, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3005 (1995).
 - [4] A. M. Chang, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 1449 (2003).
 - [5] P. Nozieres and A. Blandin, *J. de Physique* **41**, 193 (1980).
 - [6] D. G. Shelton, A. A. Nersesyan and A. M. Tsvelik, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 8521 (1996).
 - [7] A. O. Gogolin, A. A. Nersesyan and A. M. Tsvelik, *Bosonization in Strongly Correlated Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
 - [8] A. A. Nersesyan and A. M. Tsvelik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3939 (1997).
 - [9] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, *Z. Phys.* **47**, 631 (1928).
 - [10] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu and D. Senechal, *Conformal Field Theory* (Springer, New York, 1997).