

## Exercises CFT-course fall 2013, set 1.

Due on Friday, september 20th.

The transverse-field Ising model.

The hamiltonian of the transverse-field Ising model in one dimension reads, in terms of the Pauli matrices  $\sigma$ ,

$$H = -J \sum_i (\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x + h \sigma_i^z) .$$

This model can be solved by means of a Jordan-Wigner transformation, which transforms the spin operators into fermionic ones. For simplicity, we will set  $J = 1$  throughout the exercise. To transform the spin degrees of freedom into (spin-less) fermions, we let a spin-up at site  $i$  correspond to an empty site. Conversely, a spin-down corresponds to a site occupied by a fermion. If we consider a single site  $i$ , the spin raising operator  $\sigma_i^+$  corresponds to the fermionic annihilation operator  $c_i$ . Conversely,  $\sigma_i^- = c_i^\dagger$ . These operators indeed satisfy the fermionic anti-commutation relations (with  $i = j$ )

$$\{c_i, c_j^\dagger\} = \delta_{i,j} \qquad \{c_i, c_j\} = \{c_i^\dagger, c_j^\dagger\} = 0 .$$

However, the spin operators on different sites commute, so the construction above does not work for  $i \neq j$ .

Jordan and Wigner solved this problem, by introducing

$$\sigma_i^z = 1 - 2c_i^\dagger c_i \qquad \sigma_i^+ = \left( \prod_{j<i} (1 - 2c_j^\dagger c_j) \right) c_i \qquad \sigma_i^- = \left( \prod_{j<i} (1 - 2c_j^\dagger c_j) \right) c_i^\dagger .$$

The inverse is

$$c_i = \left( \prod_{j<i} \sigma_j^z \right) \sigma_i^+ \qquad c_i^\dagger = \left( \prod_{j<i} \sigma_j^z \right) \sigma_i^- .$$

- a. Show that the  $\sigma$  operators defined above satisfy the correct commutation relations, by using the fermion anti-commutation relations given above.
- b. We will assume that the chain contains  $L$  sites, and is closed, so that the sites  $i = L$  and  $i = 0$  are identified (i.e., we assume  $\sigma_{i+L}^\alpha = \sigma_i^\alpha$ ). Show that after the Jordan-Wigner transformation, the hamiltonian reads

$$H = \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} g(2c_i^\dagger c_i - 1) + \sum_{i=0}^{L-2} (c_i c_{i+1} + c_i c_{i+1}^\dagger + c_{i+1} c_i^\dagger + c_{i+1}^\dagger c_i) - (-1)^F (c_{L-1} c_0 + c_{L-1} c_0^\dagger + c_0 c_{L-1}^\dagger + c_0^\dagger c_{L-1}) ,$$

where  $F$  is the number of fermions, which is conserved modulo two.

The boundary term can be taken into account by imposing periodic boundary conditions  $c_L = c_0$  when  $F$  is odd, and anti-periodic boundary conditions  $c_L = -c_0$  when  $F$  is even. With these boundary conditions, the hamiltonian is translationally invariant, namely

$$H = \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} g(2c_i^\dagger c_i - 1) + \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (c_i c_{i+1} + c_i c_{i+1}^\dagger + c_{i+1} c_i^\dagger + c_{i+1}^\dagger c_i) .$$

- c. To diagonalize the hamiltonian, we first have to go to momentum space, via  $c_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_k c_k e^{iakj}$ , with  $a = \frac{2\pi}{L}$ . Show that the hamiltonian takes the following form:

$$H = \sum_k 2(g - \cos(ak))c_k^\dagger c_k + i \sin(ak)(c_{-k}c_k + c_{-k}^\dagger c_k^\dagger) - g .$$

To bring the hamiltonian in diagonal form, one performs a Bogoliubov transformation to a different set of fermions:

$$\gamma_k = u_k c_k - i v_k c_{-k}^\dagger \qquad \gamma_k^\dagger = u_k c_k^\dagger + i v_k c_{-k} ,$$

where  $u_k$  and  $v_k$  are real, and satisfy  $u_k^2 + v_k^2 = 1$ ,  $u_{-k} = u_k$  and  $v_{-k} = -v_k$ , ensuring that the  $\gamma_k$  satisfy fermion anti-commutation relations.

- d. Choose the parametrization  $u_k = \cos \theta_k/2$  and  $v_k = \sin \theta_k/2$ , and find the condition on  $\tan \theta_k$ , such that terms which do not conserve the number of  $\gamma$  fermions (like  $\gamma\gamma$ ) are absent in the hamiltonian, expressed in terms of the  $\gamma$ 's.
- e. Finally, show that the hamiltonian takes the diagonal form

$$H = \sum_k \varepsilon_k \left( \gamma_k^\dagger \gamma_k - \frac{1}{2} \right) \qquad \varepsilon_k = 2(1 + g^2 - 2g \cos(ak))^{1/2}$$

Note that for  $F$  odd, the momenta take the values  $k = 0, 1, \dots, L-1$ , while for  $F$  even, the allowed momenta are  $k = 1/2, 3/2, \dots, L-1/2$ , because of the boundary conditions.