

Comment on equivalence between quantum phase transition phenomena in radiation-matter and magnetic systems

J. G. Brankov,^{1,*} N.S. Tonchev,^{2,†} and V. A. Zagrebnov^{3,‡}

¹*Institute of Mechanics, acad G Bonchev 4, 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria*

²*Institute of Solid State Physics, 72 Tzarigradsko Chaussée, 1784 Sofia, Bulgaria*

³*Université de la Méditerranée (Aix-Marseille II) and Centre de Physique Théorique, Luminy-Case 907, 13288 Marseille, Cedex 09, France*

Abstract

In this Comment we show that the temperature-dependent effective Hamiltonian derived by Reslen *et al* [Europhys. Lett., **69** (2005) 8] or that one by Liberti and Zaffino [arXiv:cond-mat/0503742] for the Dicke model cannot be correct for any temperature. They both violate a rigorous result. The former is correct only in the quantum (zero-temperature) limit while the last one only in the classical (infinite temperature) limit. The fact that the Dicke model belongs to the universality class of the infinitely coordinated transverse-field XY model is known for more than 30 years.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud – Entanglement and quantum nonlocality (e.g. EPR paradox, Bell's inequalities, GHZ states, etc.);

73.43.Nq – Quantum phase transitions;

75.10.-b – General theory and models of magnetic ordering.

*Electronic address: brankov@bas.bg

†Electronic address: tonchev@issp.bas.bg

‡Electronic address: zagrebnov@cpt.univ-mrs.fr

Recently a rapidly growing body of papers point to a connection between the thermodynamic and entanglement properties of the Dicke model and the thermodynamic and entanglement properties of an infinitely coordinated, transverse-field XY model (see [1, 2] and refs. therein). The attempt is to classify and understand the entanglement properties of the Dicke Hamiltonian by looking at an effective spin-spin exchange Hamiltonian.

For example in [1] the authors show that instead of the original Dicke Hamiltonian ($\hbar = c = \omega = 1$)

$$H_{Dicke} = a^\dagger a + \epsilon J_z - \left[\frac{2\lambda}{N^{1/2}} \right] (a^\dagger + a) J_x \quad (1)$$

for studying the thermodynamic properties one can use the following temperature-dependent effective Hamiltonian:

$$H_{qb}^2(\beta) = \epsilon J_z - \left[\frac{2\lambda}{N^{1/2}} \right]^2 \left[1 + \frac{2}{\beta(h(\beta) + 1)} \right] J_x^2, \quad (2)$$

where $J_z = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{i,z}$, $J_x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\sigma_i^\dagger + \sigma_i)$, and $h(\beta) = (e^\beta - 1)^{-1}$ is the Bose factor which determines the average photon number in an isolated cavity (single radiation mode of energy $\omega = 1$) at inverse temperature $\beta = (k_B T)^{-1}$.

In some agreement with [1], "to investigate the connection between the Dicke and the collective one-dimensional Ising model", in [2] the authors suggested the following effective Hamiltonian (for the sake of convenience, here and below we use the notation of [1]):

$$H_A^{eff}(\beta) = \epsilon J_z - \frac{\beta}{2} \left[\frac{2\lambda}{N^{1/2}} \right]^2 \coth \left(\frac{\beta}{2} \right) J_x^2. \quad (3)$$

The both statements are *wrong*, because it has been proven rigorously in [3] that Hamiltonian (1) is equivalent in the thermodynamic limit to the Hamiltonian (see Eqs. (2) and (34) in [3] at $\mu = 1$):

$$H_s|_{\mu=1} = \epsilon J_z - \left[\frac{2\lambda}{N^{1/2}} \right]^2 J_x^2. \quad (4)$$

This result was formalized as a rigorous mathematical statement for a much larger class of models of matter interacting with boson fields, a particular case of which is the Dicke model, see Theorem 4.1 in [4]. For the free energy densities

$$f_N[H_{Dicke}] = -\frac{1}{\beta N} \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H_{Dicke}), \quad f_N[H_s|_{\mu=1}] = -\frac{1}{\beta N} \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H_s|_{\mu=1}), \quad (5)$$

we have obtained the following estimates:

$$-\delta_N^H \leq f_N[H_{Dicke}] - f_N[H_s|_{\mu=1}] \leq \delta_N^B, \quad (6)$$

where $\delta_N^H = O(N^{-1/2})$ and $\delta_N^B = O(N^{-1} \ln N)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The result (6) is independent of the temperature and excludes the relation of Hamiltonians (2) or (3) with the thermodynamics of the Dicke model (1). About the same time this statement was obtained by completely different methods, see [5]-[7].

Note that at zero temperature Hamiltonian (2) coincides with Hamiltonian (4). Precisely this makes correct the further calculations in the paper of Reslen *et al* [1] as far as they are carried out at zero temperature. In this connection, some doubts arise about the correct implementation of the cumulant projection method suggested by Polatsek and Becker [8] for construction of "size-consistent" effective Hamiltonians, at least with respect to the Dicke model. The above cited authors claim that "our derivation is general, and can be applied to any temperature, and to any sort of splitting of the Hamiltonian" [8]. Provided the Hamiltonian (2) is correctly derived by that method in [1], one faces a counter-example of its applicability.

In the other limit $\beta \rightarrow 0$, Liberti and Zaffino [2] call it "classical", Hamiltonian (3) also coincides with Hamiltonian (4). The source of incorrectness in obtaining Hamiltonian (3) seems to be more clear. In calculating the partition function on the basis of the Zassenhaus formula it is not sufficient to keep only the lowest-order terms (see Appendix B in [2]). One can see that in the "quantum" limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ Hamiltonian (3) is not a *bona fide* Hamiltonian since it does not belong to the trace-class operators.

Furthermore, even disregarding the spurious temperature-dependent term in (2) (or to consider only the classical limit in (3)), the statement in [1] that "the physics of the QPT (quantum phase transition) in the Dicke model is indeed captured by the effective Hamiltonian of Eq. (2)" may be taken only on trust. The concept of thermodynamic equivalence includes the equality of all the observable characteristics of the equilibrium state, such as average values of local operators and correlation functions of any finite order. Proving such a statement is quite complicated problem and needs special mathematical technics [4].

Our comments so far concerned thermodynamic properties only. The revived interest on the Dicke model is caused by the perceived relations between thermodynamic and entanglement properties. It is known that mean-field models, as the one under consideration, cannot provide nontrivial entanglement properties since the problem is effectively a single body one in the thermodynamic limit. That is why one has to consider finite-N systems [9] and the entanglement properties are necessarily tested in the framework of the finite-size

scaling (FSS) theory. May be the instructive part of Ref. [1] treats the entanglement properties. In this case the following question arises: If two Hamiltonians generate equivalent (in some sense) critical behaviour in the thermodynamic limit, are their finite-size properties similar? The answer to that questions is: not always. In the case under consideration the thermodynamic equivalence of the models (1) and (4) has been proved by the method of the approximating Hamiltonian, see e.g. [4, 11]. The application of this method is based on the fact that (1) and (4) have a common approximating Hamiltonian and the proof of their thermodynamic equivalence passes through the limit of an infinite system. For a finite N we have just the lower and upper bounds on the difference of the free energies per spin (6). The closeness of the finite-size properties of the original and the effective model poses a subtle problem. It has been shown that in some cases the FSS scaling functions for the original and the approximating Hamiltonians are different [10]. If this is so for thermodynamic functions, the problem of closeness of the measures of entanglement, such as the concurrence discussed in [1], is still more problematic, since it probes the internal structure of the ground-state in a more detailed way. Therefore, it is not surprising that the maximum value of the concurrence obtained in [1] was found to be overestimated by the effective Hamiltonian as compared to the original one (1). Up to now the link between entanglement and critical properties is not completely understood. In fact one must be able to control the convergence of the quantum Gibbs state for (1) to the state corresponding to the thermodynamically equivalent effective Hamiltonian (4). The accuracy of this control by any of the known methods [3]-[7] needs supplementary investigations. That is why we think the use of thermodynamically equivalent effective Hamiltonians for studying entanglement properties is still an open problem.

-
- [1] Reslen J., Quiroga L. and Johnson N. F., *Europhys. Lett.*, **69** (2005) 8.
 - [2] Liberti G. and Zaffino R.L., *arXiv:cond-mat/0503742*, (2005).
 - [3] Brankov J. G., Zagrebnov V. A. and Tonchev N. S., *Theoret. and Math. Phys.*, **22** (1975) 13.
 - [4] Bogolubov N. N. (jr), Brankov J. G., Zagrebnov V. A., Kurbatov A. M. and Tonchev N. S., *Russian Math. Surveys*, **39** (1984) 1.
 - [5] Hepp K. and Lieb E.H., *Ann. Phys.*, **76** (1973) 360.

- [6] Fannes M., Sisson P. N. M., Verbeure A. F. and Wolfe J.C., Ann. Phys., **98** (1976) 38.
- [7] Fannes M., Spohn H. and Verbeure A., J. Math. Phys., **21** (1980) 355.
- [8] Polatsek G. and Becker K. W., Phys. Rev B, **55** (1997) 16 096.
- [9] Vidal J., Palacios G. and Mosseri R., Phys. Rev B, **69** (2004) 022107.
- [10] Brankov J. G. Physica A, **168** (1990) 1035.
- [11] Brankov J. G., Danchev D. M. and Tonchev N. S., "Theory of Critical Phenomena in Finite-Size Systems: Scaling and Quantum Effects", Series in Modern Condensed Matter Physics, Vol. 9 (World Scientific, Singapore 2000).