

(S.M.)

PART III : QUASI-ADIABATIC EVOLUTION

(1)

(Developed by M. B. Hastings in 2004)

Question: Assume that we are given a ^{family of} gapped Hamiltonian $H(s)$, that are sums of (quasi)-local interactions. Can we

construct a corresponding family of unitaries $U(s)$, such

that (i) $\partial_s U(s) = i \cdot D(s) \cdot U(s)$, with $U(0) = \mathbb{1}$ and

$D(s)$ a sum of quasi-local interactions,

(ii) For $P_0(s)$ the groundstate projector of $H(s)$,

we can write $P_0(s) = U(s) P_0(0) U^\dagger(s)$?

ANSWER: YES! The idea is to create an operator

$D(s)$ (Hermitian) that simulates the ^{action of the} generator of the

true adiabatic evolution on the groundstate subspace,

but in a way that preserves locality of interactions

as they change the Hamiltonian $H(s)$.

STEP 1: Assume $H(s)$ is family of gapped Hamiltonians with gap $E_1(s) - E_0(s) = \gamma(s) \geq \gamma > 0$, and $H(s)$ is differentiable

Differentiating $(H(s) - E_0(s)) P_0(s) = 0$, w.r.t. s , we get:

(*) $\left\{ \partial_s (H(s) - E_0(s)) \right\} P_0(s) = - (H(s) - E_0(s)) \partial_s P_0(s)$.

Since $P_0^2(s) = P_0(s)$, we have $\partial_s P_0^2(s) = \partial_s P_0(s) = (\partial_s P_0(s)) P_0(s) + P_0(s) (\partial_s P_0(s))$
 $\Rightarrow P_0(s) \partial_s P_0(s) P_0(s) = 0$ and $(1 - P_0(s)) \partial_s P_0(s) (1 - P_0(s)) = 0$.

This implies that $\partial_s P_0(s) = (1 - P_0(s)) (\partial_s P_0(s)) P_0(s) + P_0(s) (\partial_s P_0(s)) (1 - P_0(s))$

Combined with (*), we get:

$$- \frac{(1 - P_0(s)) \partial_s (H(s) - E_0(s))}{H(s) - E_0(s)} P_0(s) = (1 - P_0(s)) (\partial_s P_0(s)) P_0(s)$$

$$\Rightarrow \partial_s P_0(s) = - (1 - P_0(s)) \frac{\partial_s H(s)}{H(s) - E_0(s)} P_0(s) + P_0(s) \frac{\partial_s H(s)}{H(s) - E_0(s)} (1 - P_0(s))$$

where the inverse $(H(s) - E_0(s))^{-1}$ is well-defined in the $(1 - P_0(s))$

subspace. Denoting $G(s) = i (H(s) - E_0(s))^{-1} \partial_s (H(s) - E_0(s))$,

~~we have $(G^\dagger(s) - G(s))$ and~~ $\partial_s P_0(s) = i [\hat{G}(s), P_0(s)]$.

Let $\hat{G}(s) = G(s) + G^\dagger(s) = i [G(s) P_0(s) - i P_0(s) G^\dagger(s)]$

$(H(s) - E_0(s))^{-1} \equiv (1 - P_0(s))^{-1} (H(s) - E_0(s))^{-1} (1 - P_0(s))$

(3)

STEP 2: Recalling that $G(s) = i (1 - P_0(s)) (H(s) - E_0(s))^{-1} (1 - P_0(s)) \partial_s (H(s) - E_0(s))$

we wish to find an operator $D(s) = D^\dagger(s)$, such that

$$G(s) P_0(s) = D(s) P_0(s) \quad \text{and} \quad D(s) \text{ is sum of quasi-local}$$

terms.

Recalling that $P_0(s) G(s) P_0(s) = 0$, we want $P_0(s) D(s) P_0(s) = 0$

and $(1 - P_0(s)) G(s) P_0(s) = (1 - P_0(s)) D(s) P_0(s)$, or equivalently,

$$\otimes \otimes \quad \langle \Psi_n(s) | G(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle = \langle \Psi_n(s) | D(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle,$$

where $|\Psi_n(s)\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $H(s)$ with energy $E_n(s)$.

Now, recall that $E_n(s) - E_0(s) \geq \gamma(s) \geq \gamma$, for $n \geq 1$.

As in PART II (ENERGY FILTERING), we will make

use of the "filter" function $w_\gamma(t)$, which satisfied:

$$(i) \quad w_\gamma(t) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{w}_\gamma(\lambda) = 0, \quad \text{for } |\lambda| \geq \gamma$$

$$(ii) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w_\gamma(t) dt = 1 \quad (\text{normalized } \hat{w}_\gamma(0)) \quad \text{and} \quad w_\gamma(t) = w_\gamma(-t),$$

$$(iii) \quad w_\gamma(t) \leq O\left(\exp\left\{-\frac{2}{7} \gamma |t| / \log^2(\gamma |t|)\right\}\right)$$

↑ order of, up to polynomial factors in $\gamma |t|$.

(4)

STEP 3: We compute $\langle \Psi_n(s) | G(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle = \frac{i}{E_n(s) - E_0(s)} \cdot \langle \Psi_n(s) | \partial_s H(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle$

$$\text{Define } D(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \omega_f(t) \int_0^t du e^{iuH(s)} \partial_s H(s) e^{-iuH(s)}.$$

Calculating the term $\langle \Psi_n(s) | D(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle$, we get:

$$\langle \Psi_n(s) | D(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \omega_f(t) \int_0^t du e^{iu(E_n(s) - E_0(s))} \cdot \langle \Psi_n(s) | \partial_s H(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \omega_f(t) \left(\frac{e^{it(E_n(s) - E_0(s))} - 1}{i(E_n(s) - E_0(s))} \right) \cdot \langle \Psi_n(s) | \partial_s H(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle$$

$$= \left[\frac{\hat{\omega}_f(E_n(s) - E_0(s))}{i(E_n(s) - E_0(s))} + \frac{i}{E_n(s) - E_0(s)} \right] \langle \Psi_n(s) | \partial_s H(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle$$

$$= \langle \Psi_n(s) | G(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle, \text{ since } \hat{\omega}_f(E_n(s) - E_0(s)) = 0!$$

Finally, since $\omega_f(t)$ is an even function, we have:

$$\langle \Psi_0(s) | D(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle = \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \omega_f(t) \cdot t \right) \cdot \langle \Psi_0(s) | \partial_s H(s) | \Psi_0(s) \rangle$$

$$= 0, \text{ as desired.}$$

At this point, we have shown that $\otimes \otimes$ in page 3 is

valid, which implies that $\partial_s P_0(s) = i [D(s), P_0(s)]$ and

hence, $P_0(s) = U(s) P_0(0) U^\dagger(s)$, with $\partial_s U(s) = i D(s) U(s)$, $U(0) = 1$.

(5)

STEP 4: It remains to show that $D(s)$ is a sum of quasi-local terms. Recall that $H(s)$ is a sum of (quasi)-local terms such that $H(s) = \sum_{Z \in \Lambda} H_Z(s)$, where Z may be taken as a subset of sites within a ball of radius R_0 of site $z \in \Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Then, $\partial_s H(s) = \sum_{Z \in \Lambda} \partial_s H_Z(s)$, which is also local, with

$\partial_s H_Z(s)$ supported on sites that $H_Z(s)$ acted on, non-trivially.

Since we will be making use of Lieb-Robinson bounds

(presented in PART I), we assume appropriate bounds on

the locality and strength^{norm} of $H_Z(s)$ and $\partial_s H_Z(s)$.

Now, we may write $D(s) = \sum_{Z \in \Lambda} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt w_f(t) \int_0^t du T_u^{H(s)} (\partial_s H_Z(s))$

where $T_u^{H(s)}(A) = e^{iuH(s)} A e^{-iuH(s)}$.

Setting $D_Z(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt w_f(t) \int_0^t du T_u^{H(s)} (\partial_s H_Z(s))$, we have

$D(s) = \sum_{Z} D_Z(s)$. It remains to show that each $D_Z(s)$ can

be decomposed into a sum of terms with \uparrow support and \downarrow strength

(6)

STEP 5: (Locality of $D_Z(s)$)

Back in PART II of the series, we proved a Lemma that used Lieb-Robinson Bounds to calculate the worst error we could make by approximating the evolution $T_t^{H(s)}(A_u)$, by a local version $T_t^{H_u(s,r)}(A_u)$, where $H_u(s,r)$ is the Hamiltonian $H(s)$ with interactions restricted within a ball of radius r , around the support of the operator A_u .

Let us now recall that Lemma and the statement of Lieb-Robinson bounds for $H(s) = \sum_{z \in \Lambda} H_z(s)$, where the support of each $H_z(s)$ is assumed to be $B_z(1)$, the ball of radius 1, centered on $z \in \Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$. (see p. 3 of Part II)

But, first, we write $D_Z(s) = \sum_{r \geq 0} D_Z(s,r) + \partial_s H_Z(s)$,

where $D_Z(s,r) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \omega_f(t) \int_0^t du \left[T_u^{H_u(s,r)} (\partial_s H_Z(s)) - T_u^{H_u(s,r)} (\partial_s H_Z(s)) \right]$

with $H_u(s,r) = \sum_{z: B_z(1) \subseteq B_u(r)} H_z(s)$ and $H_u(s,0) = 0$.

[LOCALITY ESTIMATES DETOUR]

- ① (Lieb-Robinson Bounds): Given a Hamiltonian $H = \sum_z H_z$ and operators A_x and B_y , supported on subsets X, Y of the lattice \mathbb{Z}^d , the following bound holds:

$$\rightarrow \|[T_t^H(A_x), B_y]\| \leq 2 \min\{|X|, |Y|\} \|A_x\| \cdot \|B_y\| e^{v_0 |t|} e^{-\mu_0 d(x,y)},$$

where $T_t^H(A_x) = e^{itH} A_x e^{-itH}$, $d(x,y) = \min_{\substack{x \in X \\ y \in Y}} d(x,y)$, $\mu_0 > 0$

and $v_0 = e^{\mu_0} (2J B_1(d))$, where $J = \max_{z \in \Lambda} \|H_z\|$ and $B_1(d) =$

volume of unit ball in \mathbb{Z}^d .

- ② ("Localizing evolution" Lemma): Let $H_u(r) = \sum_{\substack{z \\ B_z(d) \subseteq B_u(r)}} H_z$ and $T_t^{H_u(r)}(A_u)$, as above. Then, the following bound holds:

$$\rightarrow \|T_t^{H_u(r+t)}(A_u) - T_t^{H_u(r)}(A_u)\| \leq \|A_u\| \cdot (c_0 \cdot r^{d-1}) e^{-\mu_0 r} e^{v_0 |t|},$$

where $c_0 =$ surface area of the unit ball in \mathbb{Z}^d .

NOTE: The proofs of ① and ② are given in PART I and PART II, respectively. In particular, ② follows from an application of ①.

STEP 5 (continued...)

Recall that $D_Z(s) = \sum_{r>0} D_Z(s,r) + \partial_s H_Z(s)$.

It remains to show that $D_Z(s,r)$ has support on $B_u(r\pm 1)$ and strength $\|D_Z(s,r)\| \leq \|\partial_s H_Z(s)\| \cdot f_0(r)$, where f_0 is a rapidly decaying function.

(i) By definition of $D_Z(s,r)$ and $T_u^{H_u(s,r\pm 1)}(\partial_s H_Z(s))$, we see that each interaction term is supported non-trivially on $B_u(r\pm 1)$, the support of $H_u(s, r\pm 1)$.

(ii) Using a similar argument as the bound on p. 6 of PART II, we get:

$$\|D_Z(s,r)\| \leq \int_{-T}^T dt \omega_\gamma(t) \left(\|\partial_s H_Z(s)\| \cdot C_0 r^{d-1} e^{-\mu_0 r} \right) \int_0^{|t|} e^{-\frac{r_0 |u|}{2v_0}} du$$

$$+ 2 \|\partial_s H_Z(s)\| \int_{|t| \geq T} dt |t| \cdot \omega_\gamma(t)$$

$$\leq \|\partial_s H_Z(s)\| \cdot f_0(r),$$

where $f_0(r) = 2 \left[\frac{C_0 r^{d-1} e^{-\left(\frac{\mu_0 r}{2}\right)}}{r_0^2} + \int_{|t| \geq \frac{\mu_0 r}{2v_0}} dt |t| \omega_\gamma(t) \right]$, where $T = \frac{\mu_0 r}{2v_0}$.



(9)

Conclusions: Recalling the almost-exponential decay of $w_\gamma(t) \sim \exp\left\{-\frac{2}{7} \delta |t| / \log^2(\delta |t|)\right\}$, we immediately see that the function $f_0(r)$ has decay of the order $\exp\left\{-c_1 r / \log^2(c_2 r)\right\}$ for $c_1 = \frac{2}{7} \left(\frac{\delta \mu_0}{2v_0}\right)$, which is super-polynomial in r . This implies that the quasi-adiabatic evolution $U(s)$ is generated by a quasi-local Hermitian operator, exactly what we need for Lieb-Robinson-type bounds on evolutions based on $U(s)$.

These Lieb-Robinson bounds are proven using techniques very similar to those in PART I and have applications in proving rigorous results about the properties of low-energy states of interacting Hamiltonians with a gap to the excited sector.

For some good examples, see recent results on the arXiv by Hastings, Nachtergaele, Ogata and Sims (some with co-authors and others individually.)