

# Ground state fidelity and quantum phase transitions in free Fermi systems

Paolo Zanardi,<sup>1</sup> Marco Cozzini,<sup>1,2</sup> and Paolo Giorda<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Scientific Interchange, Villa Gualino, Viale Settimio Severo 65, I-10133 Torino, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Dipartimento di Fisica, Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, I-10129 Torino, Italy*  
(Dated: April 1, 2022)

We compute the fidelity between the ground states of general quadratic fermionic hamiltonians and analyze its connections with quantum phase transitions. Each of these systems is characterized by a  $L \times L$  real matrix whose polar decomposition, into a non-negative  $\Lambda$  and a unitary  $T$ , contains all the relevant ground state (GS) information. The boundaries between different regions in the GS phase diagram are given by the points of, possibly asymptotic, singularity of  $\Lambda$ . This latter in turn implies a critical drop of the fidelity function. We present general results as well as their exemplification by a model of fermions on a totally connected graph.

*Introduction*– Quantum matter at zero temperature is known to exist in different phases that cannot be continuously deformed into each other without giving rise to a singular behaviour of some physical quantity. This singularity, which extends its influence over a finite range of temperature, is due to the competition between different kinds of quantum fluctuations trying to order the ground state according to distinct and alternative correlation patterns. These phenomena, known as quantum phase transitions (QPTs) recently attracted a big deal of attention [1]. In particular ideas drawn from Quantum Information [2] e.g., quantum entanglement, have been proven to be conceptually insightful as well as to provide effective tools to investigate QPTs [3].

In this paper we aim at further investigating the approach to QPTs advocated in Ref. [4]. There it was suggested, inspired by the results of Ref. [5], that the boundaries between different quantum phases can be analyzed in terms of an extremely simple quantity: the overlap i.e., the scalar product, between the ground states (GSs) corresponding to slightly different values of the coupling constants. The critical points being characterized by a large, possibly discontinuous, drop of the overlap. More interestingly, in Ref. [4] it has been shown that, for some models, the overlap contains information about finite-size scaling and universality classes. We shall use a quantity strictly related to the overlap, the *fidelity* [2, 6].

We shall deal with general systems of free-fermions [7]. This is a class of quantum models that are i) physically relevant ii) simple enough to allow for a rather comprehensive analytical treatment and, at the same time iii) sufficiently rich to feature non-trivial GS phase diagrams. More specifically the class of fermionic systems we are going to consider is the one described by the following quadratic Hamiltonians

$$H = \sum_{i,j=1}^L c_i^\dagger A_{i,j} c_j + 1/2 \sum_{i,j=1}^L (c_i^\dagger B_{i,j} c_j^\dagger + \text{h.c.}) , \quad (1)$$

where: the  $c_i$ 's ( $c_i^\dagger$ 's) are the annihilation (creation) operators of  $L$  fermionic modes,  $A, B \in M_L(\mathbb{R})$  are  $L \times L$  real matrices, symmetric and anti-symmetric respectively i.e.,  $A^T = A$ ,  $B^T = -B$ .

The Hamiltonian family (1), and their ground states, can be directly parametrized by the generic *real* matrix  $Z$  and the defining  $A := (Z + Z^T)/2$  and  $B := (Z^T - Z)/2$ . From this perspective the space of coupling constants of (1) is the  $L^2$ -dimensional full matrix algebra  $M_L(\mathbb{R})$  even though most of the  $Z$ 's will give raise to rather unphysical Hamiltonians e.g., highly non-local. In order to obtain physically meaningful models one might take, for example,  $A$  to be the adjacency matrix of some graph whose  $L$  vertices label the fermionic modes.

The central quantity of our study is the GS fidelity [8]

$$\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}) := |\langle \Psi_Z, \Psi_{\tilde{Z}} \rangle| , \quad (2)$$

where  $|\Psi_Z\rangle$  denotes the GS corresponding to the Hamiltonian (1). In the case in which  $\tilde{Z} = Z + \delta Z$  we will write  $\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}) = e^{-S(Z)}$ . The whole idea of the present approach is that QPTs are characterized by a singular behaviour i.e., drop (enhancement), of  $\mathcal{F}(Z)$  ( $S(Z)$ ).

*The Ground State*– Let us start by an explicit analytical characterization of the ground state of the quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian (1). To this purpose we use the fact that, for even number of particles and sites, the (unnormalized) ground state of (1) is given by [10]

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_Z\rangle = \exp \left( 1/2 \sum_{i,j=1}^L c_i^\dagger G_{i,j} c_j^\dagger \right) |0\rangle , \quad (3)$$

where  $c_i|0\rangle = 0, \forall i$  and  $G$  is a  $L \times L$  anti-symmetric matrix, determined by  $gG + h = 0$  where  $g = 1/2(\Phi + \Psi)$ ,  $h = 1/2(\Phi - \Psi) \in M_L(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\Phi(A - B)(A + B) = \Lambda^2 \Phi$ ,  $\Lambda \Psi = \Phi(A - B)$ ,  $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_L) \geq 0$  [11]. The  $\Lambda_i$ 's comprise the *single-particle* energy spectrum. From these equations, by recalling  $Z = A - B$  and by assuming  $\Lambda$  (and hence  $Z$ ) to be *invertible* one can immediately obtain  $g = \Phi(\mathbb{1} + \Lambda_\Phi^{-1} Z)/2$  and  $h = \Phi(\mathbb{1} - \Lambda_\Phi^{-1} Z)/2$  where  $\Lambda_\Phi := \Phi^{-1} \Lambda \Phi$ . From which, if  $g$  is invertible, it follows

$$G = \frac{\Lambda_\Phi^{-1} Z - \mathbb{1}}{\Lambda_\Phi^{-1} Z + \mathbb{1}} = \frac{T - 1}{T + 1} = \frac{T^{1/2} - T^{-1/2}}{T^{1/2} + T^{-1/2}} , \quad (4)$$

where  $T := \Lambda_\Phi^{-1} Z$ . The eigenvalue equation above can be rewritten as  $ZZ^\dagger = \Lambda_\Phi^2$ , from which it follows that  $T$  is

the unitary part of the polar decomposition of  $Z = \Lambda_\Phi T$  [12]. The operator  $g$  is not invertible iff  $-1 \in \text{Sp}(T)$ , let be  $p$  its degeneracy. If  $p$  is even (odd) then it is easy to find out a canonical transformation, parity-conserving (parity-flipping), mapping  $T$  into a  $T'$  where all the  $-1$ 's are transformed into  $1$ 's [17]. The corresponding  $g'$  becomes then invertible and one has a GS with the form (3). This also implies that  $\det T = (-1)^p$  corresponds to the GS in the sector with parity  $(-1)^{\sum_j n_j} = (-1)^p$ . Since the parity is conserved by the Hamiltonian (1), its change in the GSs is always related to level-crossings i.e., *first order* quantum phase transitions, and these of course give rise to a discontinuous drop to zero of the fidelity. Now we are in the position of proving the following

*Proposition 0* If the ground state of (1) is in the even-number of particles sector then it has the form

$$|\Psi_Z\rangle = \otimes_{\nu=1}^{L/2} [\cos(\theta_\nu/2)|00\rangle_{\nu,-\nu} + \sin(\theta_\nu/2)|11\rangle_{\nu,-\nu}], \quad (5)$$

where  $\{e^{\pm i\theta_\nu}\}_{\nu=1}^{L/2} = \text{Sp}(T)$  and  $|0\rangle_\nu$  ( $|1\rangle_\nu$ ) denotes the vacuum (occupied) state of the new pairs of fermionic modes  $\tilde{c}_{\pm\nu}$  obtained from the  $c_j$ 's by means of a suitable  $L \times L$  unitary  $U$ .

*Proof.* From Ref. [13] it follows that  $G$  can be brought by an unitary transformation  $U$  into the canonical block form  $G = U(\mathbf{0}_{L-2M} \oplus G_D)U^T$ ,  $G_D = i \oplus_{\nu=1}^M t_\nu \sigma_{(\nu)}^y$ . Here with  $\sigma_{(\nu)}^y$  we denote a  $\sigma^y$  Pauli matrix acting on the two-dimensional span of two single-particle modes (conventionally labelled by  $\nu$  and  $-\nu$ ) and  $t_\nu \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$ . By allowing the first  $L - 2M$  (an even number)  $t_\nu$ 's to be zero we can write  $G = UG_D U^T$  where the sum over  $\nu$  goes now from one to  $L/2$ . By redefining the fermionic modes via  $U$  and normalizing the state vector (3)  $|\Psi_Z\rangle := |\tilde{\Psi}_Z\rangle / \|\tilde{\Psi}_Z\|$  one then gets  $|\Psi_Z\rangle = \otimes_{\nu=1}^{L/2} [c_\nu |00\rangle_{\nu,-\nu} + s_\nu |11\rangle_{\nu,-\nu}]$ , with  $c_\nu := (1 + t_\nu^2)^{-1/2}$ ,  $s_\nu := t_\nu (1 + t_\nu^2)^{-1/2}$ . From the block decomposition of  $G$  [13] it follows that  $\text{Sp}(G) = \{\pm i t_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^{L/2}$ , on the other hand from (4) one has  $\text{Sp}(G) = \{i \tan(\theta_\nu/2)\}_{\mu=1}^L$  where  $\{e^{i\theta_\mu}\}$  is the spectrum of the unitary  $T$ . As stressed above we can assume  $T \in SO_L(\mathbb{R})$  and then  $T = e^K$  where  $K \in o_L(\mathbb{R})$  i.e., it is skew-symmetric. One can now apply the decomposition of [13] to  $K$  i.e.,  $K_D = UKU^T = \oplus_{\nu=1}^{L/2} i\theta_\nu \sigma_{(\nu)}^y$ , ( $\theta_\nu$ 's can vanish) and obtain  $\text{Sp}(T) = \{e^{\pm i\theta_\nu}\}_{\nu=1}^{L/2}$ . It follows that  $t_\nu = \tan(\theta_\nu/2)$  and from this (5) is obtained.  $\square$

To illustrate the formalism now we shall analyze the basic and elementary case of a pair of fermionic modes.

*Example 1.* Two fermionic modes:  $A = \epsilon \sigma^z$ ,  $B = i\Delta \sigma^y$ . Then  $H = \epsilon(c_1^\dagger c_1 - c_2^\dagger c_2) + \Delta(c_1^\dagger c_2^\dagger + \text{h.c.})$ , from which  $Z = \epsilon \sigma^z - i\Delta \sigma^y$ ,  $ZZ^\dagger = (\epsilon^2 + \Delta^2)\mathbb{1} + 2\Delta\epsilon\sigma^x$ ,  $\Lambda = \text{diag}(|\epsilon - \Delta|, |\epsilon + \Delta|)$ . By explicit computation of  $T = |Z|^{-1}Z$  one finds that  $T$  is either  $\sigma^x$  or  $i\sigma^y$ . Of course this model is trivially soluble with eigenvectors  $\{|10\rangle, |01\rangle, |00\rangle + |11\rangle, |00\rangle - |11\rangle\}$  and eigenvalues  $\{\epsilon, -\epsilon, \Delta, -\Delta\}$ . The zero-eigenvalue lines  $\epsilon = \pm\Delta$  splits the  $\epsilon - \Delta$  plane in four regions, in each of which the ground-state is given by one of the states above. By

considering instead the two fermion system with  $Z = \sigma_x + \mu\mathbb{1} - i\Delta\sigma^y$  (see the complete graph described below) one finds that  $T = \sigma_x$  ( $T = e^{-i\theta\sigma^y}$ ,  $\theta = \tan^{-1} \Delta/\mu$ ) for  $\mu^2 + \Delta^2 \leq 1$  ( $\mu^2 + \Delta^2 > 1$ ). The unit circle dividing the two regions is the set of points where  $Z$  is singular.

*Example 2.* Two fermionic modes:  $A = \epsilon\mathbb{1}$ ,  $B = i\Delta\sigma^y$ . Then  $H = \epsilon(c_1^\dagger c_1 + c_2^\dagger c_2) + \Delta(c_1^\dagger c_2^\dagger + \text{h.c.})$ , from which  $Z = \epsilon\mathbb{1} - i\Delta\sigma^y$ ,  $ZZ^\dagger = (\epsilon^2 + \Delta^2)\mathbb{1}$ ,  $\Phi = \mathbb{1}$ ,  $\Lambda = \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + \Delta^2}\mathbb{1}$ ,  $T = \exp(-i\theta\sigma^y)$  where  $\theta := \tan^{-1}(\Delta/\epsilon)$ . Therefore  $G = (e^{-i\theta\sigma^y} - \mathbb{1})(e^{-i\theta\sigma^y} + \mathbb{1})^{-1} = -i \tan(\frac{\theta}{2}\sigma^y)$ . At variance with the former case now we have zero single-particle eigenvalues only in the trivial case  $\epsilon = \Delta = 0$  and  $T(\theta)$  is a smooth family of commuting matrices. This example can be readily extended to  $L = 2M$  fermionic modes by considering  $A = \oplus_{\nu=1}^M \epsilon_\nu \mathbb{1}_\nu$ ,  $B = i \oplus_{\nu=1}^M \Delta_\nu \sigma_{(\nu)}^y$ . Then one finds  $T = \oplus_{\nu=1}^M \exp(-i\theta_\nu \sigma_{(\nu)}^y)$ ,  $\theta_\nu = \tan^{-1}(\Delta_\nu/\epsilon_\nu)$ .

*The fidelity*– We give now an explicit evaluation of the of the fidelity (2). In order to do that we first recall the following result from Ref. [14]

$$\langle \Psi_{\tilde{Z}}, \Psi_Z \rangle = \frac{\det(\mathbb{1} + G^\dagger \tilde{G})^{1/2}}{\det(\mathbb{1} + G^\dagger G)^{1/4} \det(\mathbb{1} + \tilde{G}^\dagger \tilde{G})^{1/4}}. \quad (6)$$

*Proposition 1*

$$\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}) = \frac{1}{2^{L/2}} |\det(T + \tilde{T})|^{1/2} = \prod_{\nu=1}^{L/2} |\cos(\Theta_\nu/2)|. \quad (7)$$

where the second equality holds for  $T^{-1}\tilde{T} \in SO_L(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\text{Sp}(T^{-1}\tilde{T}) = \{e^{\pm i\Theta_\nu}\}_{\nu=1}^{L/2}$ . When  $\det(T^{-1}\tilde{T}) = -1$  one has  $\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}) = 0$ .

*Proof.* To prove the first equality it is a straightforward calculation from Eqs. (6), (4) and  $|\det T| = |\det \tilde{T}| = 1$ . Of course if  $-1 \in \text{Sp}(T^{-1}\tilde{T})$  then  $\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}) = 0$  but this happens necessarily when  $\det(T^{-1}\tilde{T}) = -1$ . If  $T^{-1}\tilde{T} \in SO_L(\mathbb{R})$  one has  $\text{Sp}(T^{-1}\tilde{T}) = \{e^{i\Theta_\mu}\}_{\mu=1}^L = \{e^{\pm i\Theta_\nu}\}_{\nu=1}^{L/2}$  (first equality from unitarity, second one from reality and speciality) thus one finds  $\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}) = \prod_{\mu=1}^L \sqrt{(1 + e^{i\Theta_\mu})/2} = \prod_{\nu=1}^{L/2} |\cos(\Theta_\nu/2)|$ .  $\square$

When  $[T, \tilde{T}] = 0$  one has  $\Theta_\mu = 0, (\mu = 1, \dots, L - 2M)$ ,  $\Theta_\nu = \pm(\theta_\nu - \tilde{\theta}_\nu)$ , ( $\nu = 1, \dots, M$ ); therefore one gets the following result extending the analogous one obtained for the XY model [4]: suppose now that  $Z$  and  $\tilde{Z}$  are such that  $[T, \tilde{T}] = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}) = \prod_{\nu=1}^M \cos(\frac{\theta_\nu - \tilde{\theta}_\nu}{2})$ . For example the Hamiltonian of Ex. 1, for all possible choices of  $\{\epsilon\}_\nu$  and  $\{\Delta_\nu\}_\nu$ , gives rise to commuting  $T$ 's.

To summarize: the conceptual path to find the fidelity between two different ground states of (1) is described by the following chain of maps  $Z, \tilde{Z} \in M_L(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow T, \tilde{T} \in O_L(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \text{Sp}(T^{-1}\tilde{T}) \subset S^1$ . The first arrow denotes the passage from the matrices  $Z, \tilde{Z}$  to the orthogonal matrices  $T$  and  $\tilde{T}$  i.e., their polar parts, the second denotes the diagonalization of  $T^{-1}\tilde{T}$ . While the positive part of  $Z$  i.e.,  $|Z|$ , contains the single-particle energy spectrum,

in its polar part  $T$  are encoded all the data to defining the many-body ground state (5). In the points where  $Z$  becomes singular i.e., zeroes in the single-particle spectrum, the polar part is not uniquely defined: by crossing these points one can have a non smooth change of the  $T$ , which in turn results in a non smooth change of the ground-state structure. If singularity of  $Z$  is achieved for finite (infinite) size  $L$  one has a first (higher) order QPT. This kind of singular behaviour is reflected in Eq. (7) which clearly shows that an *abrupt decrease of the fidelity, moving from  $Z$  to the neighbouring  $\tilde{Z}$ , can be caused by the appearance of an eigenvalue of  $T^{-1}\tilde{T}$  with a 'large' negative part; the closer this latter gets to  $-1$  the smaller the fidelity.*

An instance of this phenomenon is of course provided by the discontinuous "first order" QPTs of *Example 1* in that  $\det(T^{-1}\tilde{T}) = -1$  when  $T$  and  $\tilde{T}$  are in different phases. A less trivial one can be obtained from the multi mode case in *Ex. 2*. Suppose that, for some  $\nu_0$ , one finds e.g., in the thermodynamical limit, that  $\Delta_{\nu_0} \mapsto 0^+$  and then  $\theta_{\nu_0} = \lim_{\Delta_{\nu_0} \rightarrow 0} \cos^{-1}(\epsilon_{\nu_0}/(\Delta_{\nu_0}^2 + \epsilon_{\nu_0}^2)^{1/2}) = (\pi/2)(1 - \epsilon_{\nu_0}/|\epsilon_{\nu_0}|)$ . If  $\epsilon_{\nu_0}$  can be driven (in the same limit) throughout zero one observes a jump of  $\theta_{\nu_0}$  with amplitude  $\pi$ ; this in turn implies  $-1$  is in the spectrum of  $T^{-1}\tilde{T}$  [ $T = T(\epsilon_{\nu_0} = 0^+)$  and  $\tilde{T} = \tilde{T}(\epsilon_{\nu_0} = 0^-)$ ]. This is the mechanism responsible for the fidelity drop in the XY model observed in the paramagnetic-ferromagnetic QPT [15]. The important aspect is that *the drop of (6) corresponds here at  $\epsilon_{\nu_0}^2 + \Delta_{\nu_0}^2 = 0$  i.e., the vanishing of one of the single-particle energies, or, equivalently, a gaplessness in the many-body energy spectrum.* This kind of correspondence between the fidelity behaviour and zeroes in single particle spectrum can be further unveiled by using the following "perturbative" result

*Proposition 2* If  $T(\lambda) = e^{K(\lambda)}$ ,  $K \in o_L(\mathbb{R})$  and  $Z = Z(\lambda)$ ,  $\tilde{Z} = Z(\lambda + \delta\lambda)$  one has  $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{Z}, Z) = e^{-S(Z)}$  where

$$S(Z) = -\frac{1}{16}\text{Tr}(K'\delta\lambda)^2 + O(\delta\lambda^3) \quad (8)$$

where  $K' := \partial K/\partial\lambda$ .

*Proof.* From Eq. (7), using  $\det A = \exp(\text{Tr} \log A)$ , one has  $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{Z}, Z) = \exp\{(1/2)\text{Tr} \log[(1 + T^{-1}\tilde{T})/2]\}$ , by using the Taylor expansion of the logarithm one obtains  $e^{S(\lambda)}$ ,  $S(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} L_n$  where  $L_n = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n2^{n+1}}\text{Tr}(T^{-1}\delta T)^n$ . Now one can write  $T(\lambda) = e^{K(\lambda)}$ ,  $K \in o_L(\mathbb{R})$  then  $\delta T = \tilde{T} - T = K'T\delta\lambda + (1/2)[K''T + (K')^2T]\delta\lambda^2 + O(\delta\lambda^3)$  (prime denotes derivation). From unitarity one has that  $K', K''$  are traceless, hence  $L_1 \approx 1/8\text{Tr}(K'\delta\lambda)^2$  and  $L_2 \approx -1/16(K'\delta\lambda)^2$ . From here using the above expansion one obtains Eq. (8).  $\square$

To illustrate this result let us consider the system in *Example 2* i.e.,  $K(\lambda) = i\sum_{\nu}\theta_{\nu}(\lambda)\sigma_{\nu}^y$  with  $\epsilon_{\nu}$  and  $\Delta_{\nu}$  functions of the parameter  $\lambda$ . In this case, by taking the derivative of  $\theta_{\nu} = \tan^{-1}(\Delta_{\nu}/\epsilon_{\nu})$  one gets  $\text{Tr}(K')^2 = -2\sum_{\nu}(\theta'_{\nu})^2$  and hence  $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{Z}, Z) = e^{-\delta\lambda^2 S_2 + o(\delta\lambda^3)}$ , where  $S_2 = 1/8\sum_{\nu}(\frac{\epsilon_{\nu}^2}{\epsilon_{\nu}^2 + \Delta_{\nu}^2}D_Z^{\nu})^2$  with  $D_Z^{\nu} = \epsilon_{\nu}^{-1}\Delta'_{\nu} - \epsilon_{\nu}^{-2}\Delta_{\nu}\epsilon'_{\nu}$ .

This equation suggests that *if some of the  $|Z|$  eigenvalues  $\sqrt{\epsilon_{\nu}^2 + \Delta_{\nu}^2}$  is zero, or asymptotically vanishing for  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , then the function  $S_2$  should have a sharp increase and accordingly the fidelity a sharp decrease.*

*Complete graph*– In the remaining of the paper we will provide a GS fidelity study for the fermionic system (1) with an underlying topology of a *complete* graph. A detailed analysis of this diagram will be reported in a separated publication [17]. More precisely, now we consider the Hamiltonian (1) defined by the following matrix data  $A(\mu)_{ij} = 1 + (\mu - 1)\delta_{ij}$ ,  $B(\gamma)_{ij} = \gamma \text{sign}(j - i)$  where  $(i, j = 1, \dots, L)$ . We analyze now some simple cases in the  $(\mu, \gamma)$  plane.

i) For  $\gamma = 0$  the corresponding number-conserving single-particle Hamiltonian is readily diagonalized:  $\text{Sp } A(\mu) = \{L + \mu - 1, \mu - 1\}$ , where the first (second) eigenvalue has degeneracy one ( $L - 1$ ). We see that  $\mu = 1$  corresponds to the vanishing of the lowest eigenvalue (for any  $L$ ). ii) For  $(\mu = 0, \gamma = 1)$  the matrices  $Z$  and  $Z^{\dagger} = Z^T$  become lower and upper triangular respectively. By explicit computation one finds  $(ZZ^{\dagger})_{ij} = 4 \min(L - i, L - j)$ , which has the last column and row identically vanishing. Accordingly  $0 \in \text{Sp } |Z(0, 1)| \forall L$ . iii) Changing the sign of  $\gamma$  simply corresponds to transforming  $Z$  into  $Z^{\dagger}$ . Since  $\text{Sp}(ZZ^{\dagger}) = \text{Sp}(Z^{\dagger}Z)$ , the single particle spectrum is not affected by the transformation. Furthermore, since  $T(-\gamma) = T^{\dagger}(\gamma)$  and  $\det T = \det T^{\dagger}$ , the overlap behaviour is symmetric with respect to the  $\gamma = 0$  axis.

The GS fidelity in the  $\mu$ - $\gamma$  plane is reported in Fig. 1 for  $L = 400$ . By using  $\mathcal{F}_{\min} = \min[\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}_{\delta\mu}), \mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}_{\delta\gamma})]$ , where  $\tilde{Z}_{\delta\mu} = Z(\mu + \delta\mu, \gamma)$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{\delta\gamma} = Z(\mu, \gamma + \delta\gamma)$ , i.e., by plotting the minimum of the fidelity with respect to variations in both directions, one gets a clear diagram of the 'degree of orthogonality' of neighbouring ground states in the parameter space. The drops in the GS overlap identify all the QPTs of the system. In general, the actual value of the drop at a given point in the  $\mu$ - $\gamma$  plane depends both on the chosen variations  $\delta\mu$ ,  $\delta\gamma$ , and on the system size  $L$ . For even values of  $L$  and in the thermodynamic limit, the phase diagram is reported in the left panel of Fig. 2. The boundary of the region  $\mu < 1$ ,  $|\gamma| < 1$  corresponds to a first order QPT. Indeed, while the ground state inside this region contains an odd number of fermions ( $\det T = -1$ ), it becomes even outside ( $\det T = 1$ ). Such a QPT is simply interpreted in terms of a level crossing in the energy spectrum. The phase diagram of this first order QPT can be clearly calculated also for finite values of  $L$ . In the right panel of Fig. 2 the cases  $L = 2, 4, 6, \infty$  are shown. The line  $\mu = 1$ , for  $|\gamma| > 1$ , marks instead a second order QPT, accompanied by the vanishing of the energy gap in the thermodynamic limit. Here the fidelity vanishes only in the thermodynamic limit [16].

Finally, we observe a similar drop in the fidelity also at  $\gamma = 0$ , for any value of  $\mu$ . Here the model is exactly solvable and, as mentioned above, the energy gap in the thermodynamic limit is given by  $\mu - 1$ . In spite of the

gapfulness of the spectrum, we identify the fidelity drop with a higher order QPT. Indeed, the line  $\gamma = 0$  shows the same finite-size scaling properties as the transition for  $\mu = 1$ ,  $|\gamma| > 1$ .




FIG. 1: GS fidelity in the complete graph for  $L = 400$ . The plotted function is  $\mathcal{F}_{\min} = \min[\mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}_{\delta\mu}), \mathcal{F}(Z, \tilde{Z}_{\delta\gamma})]$  (see text), with  $\delta\mu = \delta\gamma = 0.1$ . Note the symmetry with respect to the  $\gamma = 0$  axis.

*Conclusions*— In this paper we analyzed general systems of free-fermions. We have showed that the information about the zero-temperature phase diagram of these linear system is encoded in the polar decomposition of the  $L \times L$  matrix of their coupling constants; the ana-

lyticity properties of this decomposition dictate those of the ground state. We have given an explicit expression for the fidelity between different ground states in terms of the unitary parts of the corresponding polar decompositions and analyzed the ground state phase diagram in terms of it. In particular we showed a connection between the gaplessness of the many-body energy spectrum and the fidelity drops. Finally, to exemplify the general results of the paper, we have presented a preliminary study of




FIG. 2: Phase diagram in the  $\mu$ - $\gamma$  plane for  $L$  even. Solid and dashed lines correspond to first and higher order QPTs respectively. Left panel: thermodynamic limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Right panel: phase boundaries of the first order QPT for  $L = 2, 4, 6, \infty$ .

the ground-state diagram of a free-fermi system over a totally connected graph. What appears to be rather remarkable in this fidelity approach lies in its universality and purely (Hilbert space) geometrical nature : no a priori understanding of the nature of the quantum phases separated by critical points is required.

- 
- [1] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, Cambridge University Press (1999).
  - [2] For a review, see e.g., D.P. DiVincenzo and C.H. Bennett, *Nature* **404**, 247 (2000).
  - [3] A. Osterloh, L. Amico, G. Falci, and R. Fazio, *Nature* **416**, 608 (2002); G. Vidal, J.I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 227902 (2003); J.I. Latorre, E. Rico, and G. Vidal, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **4**, 48 (2004).
  - [4] P. Zanardi and N. Paunkovic, *quant-ph/0512249*.
  - [5] H.T. Quan, Z. Song, X.F. Liu, P. Zanardi and C.P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 140604 (2006).
  - [6] Fidelity to study QPTs has been independently used by H.-Q. Zhou and J.P. Barjaktarevic, private communication.
  - [7] For an analysis of entanglement and QPTs in these kind of systems see W. Li *et al.*, *quant-ph/0602094*.
  - [8] The quantity (2) represent a generalization of the Loschmidt echo analyzed, in relation to QPTs, in Ref. [5] and in [9]. To see this notice first that the bilinears  $\{c_i^\dagger c_j, c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger, \dots\}$  of fermionic operators close into a Lie-algebra  $so(2L, \mathbb{R})$  [14], this implies that  $\exp(iH_W t) H_Z \exp(-iH_W t) = H_{Z(t)}$ . and thus that  $e^{iH_W t} |\Psi_Z\rangle = |\Psi_{Z(t)}\rangle$ . Moreover  $\mathcal{F}(0, t) = |\langle \Psi_{Z(0)}, \Psi_{Z(t)} \rangle| = |\langle \Psi_{Z(0)}, e^{iH_W t} \Psi_{Z(0)} \rangle|$ . When  $W = Z + \delta Z$  the latter expression gives the Loschmidt echo.
  - [9] F.M. Cucchietti *et al.*, *quant-ph/0604136*; D. Rossini *et al.*, *quant-ph/0605051*.
  - [10] M.-C. Chung and I. Peschel, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 064412 (2001); I. Peschel, *J. Phys. A* **36**, L205 (2003).
  - [11] E. Lieb, T. Schulz, and D. Mattis, *Ann. of Phys.* **16**, 407 (1961).
  - [12] R. Bathia, *Matrix Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Inc., 1997.
  - [13] J. Schliemann *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **64** 022303 (2001).
  - [14] A. Perelomov, *Generalized coherent states and their applications*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Inc., 1986.
  - [15] In that case  $\epsilon_{\nu_0} = \cos(2\pi/L) - \lambda$ ,  $\Delta_{\nu_0} = \gamma \sin(2\pi/L)$  where  $\lambda$  and  $\gamma$  are the external magnetic field and anisotropy parameter respectively.
  - [16] Unless the ground state is constant in a given phase, the fidelity function always vanishes in the thermodynamic limit. However, the rate of decrease in the overlap is much faster in the proximity of QPTs.
  - [17] M. Cozzini, P. Giorda, and P. Zanardi, *in preparation*.