Numerical Analyses of a Quantum-Theoretic Eight-Dimensional Yang-Mills Field

Paul B. Slater
ISBER, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-2150
e-mail: slater@itp.ucsb.edu, FAX: (805) 893-7995
(February 20, 2014)

In this paper we exploit our recent calculations, with respect to a certain Euler angle parameterization, of the elements of the 8×8 Bures metric tensor and its inverse for the *eight*-dimensional convex set of 3×3 density matrices, representing the three-level quantum systems. These results enable us here to numerically approximate: (1) three norms of the curvature, shown by Dittmann to satisfy the source-free Yang-Mills equation; and (2) topological lower bounds to those norms, obtained by enforcing self-duality (octonionic) conditions satisfied by eight-dimensional Ricci-flat manifolds with $Spin(7)$ holonomy.

Keywords: Bures metric, Yang-Mills fields, three-level quantum systems, Pontryagin classes, action, numerical integration, octonionic instanton, topological invariants

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 81T13, 53C07, 58Z05

PACS Numbers 03.65.-w, 02.40.Ky, 02.60.Jh

arXiv:math-ph/0012031v1 14 Dec 2000

A metric of particular interest — the *minimal* member of the (nondenumerable) class of monotone metrics [1,2] — that can be attached to the (n^2-1)-dimensional convex sets of n-level quantum systems is the Bures metric [3–6] (cf. [7]). Dittmann [8] established that "the connection form (gauge field) related to the generalization of the Berry phase to mixed states proposed by Uhlmann satisfies the source-free Yang-Mills equation $*D*D\omega$, where the Hodge operator is taken with respect to the Bures metric on the space of finite-dimensional nondegenerate density matrices". Let us also note that Bilge *et al* [9,10], amongst others [11–13], have studied the properties of Yang-Mills fields in *eight* dimensions (as opposed to the original case of *four* [14]). Since the three-level ($n = 3$) quantum systems do, in fact, form an *eight*-dimensional convex set [16] — the $n \times n$ density matrices, in general, forming (n^2-1)-dimensional convex sets — it is of obvious interest to attempt to apply the analyses of Bilge *et al* in light of these findings of Dittmann concerning the relation between Yang-Mills fields and the Bures metric [8]. Such an effort constitutes, by and large, the substance of this communication.

Dittmann had noted [8] "that in affine coordinates (e. g. using the Pauli matrices for $n > 2$) the [Bures] metric becomes very complicated for $n > 2$ and no good parameterization seems to be available for general n". In [17], we attempted to address this lacuna, by deriving the 8×8 Bures metric tensor making use of a recently-developed Euler-angle parameterization of the 3×3 density matrices [18,19]. Six Euler angles (denoted $\alpha, \gamma, a, \beta, b, \theta$), used in parameterizing an element of $SU(3)$, are employed. Additionally, two (independent) eigenvalues (λ_1, λ_2) of the 3×3 density matrices enter into this "Schur-Schatten"-type parameterization of the 3×3 density matrices [20,21]. (Of course, by the requirement of unit trace, $\lambda_3 = 1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$.) Several of the tensor elements were then, in fact, found to be identically zero. (The 8×8 matrix tensor decomposes into a 6×6 block and a 2×2 one, in correspondence to the six Euler angles and the two independent eigenvalues.) However, we were not able to report concise symbolic expressions in [17] for *all* the tensor elements.

Subsequent to the issuance of [17], we have further pursued the matter, managing to derive symbolic expressions in relatively concise form for all the entries of the 8×8 Bures metric tensor (g_{ij}), as well as its inverse (g^{ij}). Several of the entries, however, particularly two in the inverse remain rather relatively cumbersome in nature, so far resisting further simplification. By way of illustration, making use of the LeafCount command in MATHEMATICA to measure the complexity of an expression, the largest leaf count (that is, the "total number of indivisible subexpressions") for any single one of the g_{ij}'s is 352, while the largest for any of the g^{ij}'s is 233, aside from the two relatively complicated ones, having scores of 921 and 1744. We note here that all these entries prove to be *independent* of the Euler angle α. Additionally, introducing the transformation $\gamma = \tau - a$, all the entries also become independent of the Euler angle a. Therefore, the two tensors are fully parameterizable with *six*, rather than eight variables. This reduction in dimensionality is exploited in the numerical integrations reported below.

We noted that the two expressions (both symmetric in λ_1 and λ_2)

$$A = 3 - 7\lambda_1 + 4\lambda_1^2 + 7(-1 + \lambda_1)\lambda_2 + 4\lambda_2^2 \tag{1}$$

and

$$B = 4\lambda_1^3 + \lambda_1^2(-9 + 5\lambda_2) + \lambda_1(-1 + \lambda_2)(-7 + 5\lambda_2) + (-1 + \lambda_2)(2 + \lambda_2(-5 + 4\lambda_2)) \tag{2}$$

frequently occurred in the tensor elements. These two expressions are displayed in Figs. 1 and 2, making use of the transformation employed in [18]: $\lambda_1 = \cos^2\zeta_1$, $\lambda_2 = \sin^2\zeta_1 \cos^2\zeta_2$.




FIG. 1. The subexpression A — that is (1), after conversion to spherical coordinates — appearing in several tensor elements




FIG. 2. The subexpression B — that is (2), after conversion to spherical coordinates — appearing in several tensor elements

For example,

$$g_{\theta\theta} = -\frac{B + A(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)\cos 2b}{2(-1+\lambda_1)(-1+\lambda_2)}, \tag{3}$$

$$g^{\beta\beta} = -\frac{(B + A(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)\cos 2b)\csc^2\theta}{8(-1+2\lambda_1+\lambda_2)^2(-1+\lambda_1+2\lambda_2)^2}, \tag{4}$$

$$g^{\alpha\alpha} = \frac{g^{\beta\beta}\csc^2\beta\sec^2\beta}{4}. \tag{5}$$

In the two 6×6 (Euler angle) blocks of the Bures metric tensor and its inverse, the identically zero elements are $g_{\tau b}, g_{\tau\theta}, g_{ab}, g_{a\theta}, g_{b\theta}, g^{\alpha\beta}, g^{ab}$ and $g^{a\theta}$.

The volume element of the Bures metric, in particular for the case $n = 3$,

$$v.e. = \sqrt{|g|}\mathrm{d}\alpha\mathrm{d}a\mathrm{d}\tau\mathrm{d}\beta\mathrm{d}b\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}\lambda_1\mathrm{d}\lambda_2, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\sqrt{|g|} = \frac{\sin 2b \sin 2\beta \sin^2\theta \sin 2\theta}{8\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3}} \frac{(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)^2(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)^2}{(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}, \tag{7}$$

has been known from certain general considerations [22,23]. We were then able, using this as a test, to numerically validate our calculations of the g_{ij}'s to a very high degree of accuracy. Also, we were able to reproduce — using our intermediate computation of the Ricci tensor — the results of Dittmann [25] (cf. [26]) for the scalar curvature of the Bures metric, as applied to the $n = 3$ case,

$$s.c. = \frac{2(28e_3 - 49e_2 - 9)}{e_3 - e_2}, \tag{8}$$

where use is made of the elementary symmetric polynomials,

$$e_3 = \prod_{j=1,3} \lambda_j, \qquad e_2 = \lambda_1 - \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^2. \tag{9}$$

While the convex set of $n \times n$ density matrices endowed with the Bures metric is of *constant* curvature for $n = 2$, it is not even a *locally symmetric* space for $n > 2$ [24] (cf. [27]). Dittmann [25] argues that the scalar curvature achieves its *minimum* for the fully mixed states, while others [28], using another monotone metric (the *Kubo-Mori* one), argue that the scalar curvature is *maximum* for the fully mixed states. This disparity is clearly a matter of convention, depending upon what sign is designated for the Ricci tensor. (Somewhat relatedly, Grasselli and Streater have shown that "in finite dimensions, the only monotone metrics on the space of invertible density matrices for which the (+1) and (-1) affine connections are mutually dual are constant multiples of the Kubo-Mori metric" [29].)

Additionally, it was interesting to observe that numerical evidence we adduced indicated that a certain necessary and sufficient condition for *Riemannian* connections to satisfy the Yang-Mills equation [30–32],

$$(\nabla^g_X Ric)(Y,Z) = (\nabla^g_Y Ric)(X,Z), \tag{10}$$

was *not* fulfilled in our particular situation. Here X, Y, Z denote arbitrary smooth vector fields on the manifold in question — that is, the eight-dimensional convex set of 3×3 density matrices — which we will denote by M_8, and ∇^g_X the covariant derivative with respect to X.

We utilized our determination of the g_{ij}'s and g^{ij}'s in performing the same type of calculations that have been shown in [9] to provide upper bounds on Pontryagin numbers for $SO(n)$ Yang-Mills fields. These bounds are

$$\int_{M_8} (F,F)^2 \geq k \int_{M_8} p_1(E)^2, \tag{11}$$

where

$$(F,F) = 2\sum_{a=1}^{8}\sum_{b>a}^{8}(F_{ab},F_{ab}), \tag{12}$$

and

$$\int_{M_8} (F^2,F^2) \geq k' \int_{M_8} p_2(E). \tag{13}$$

Here, the field strengths F_{ab}'s denote the skew-symmetric coordinate components of F, a two-form on the Euclidean space $\mathcal{R}^8$. The ij-entry of an 8×8 matrix F_{ab} was computed by us as R_{ijab} — that is, an element of the fully covariant (0,4)-Riemann curvature tensor [33, eq. (6.6.1)] (cf. [15]). Also, k and k' are certain constants, while $p_1(E)$ and $p_2(E)$ are the first and second Pontryagin classes for the bundle E in question. The principal $U(n)$-bundle E ($n = 3$) utilized by Dittmann [8] is $Gl(n,\mathcal{C}) \to Gl(n,\mathcal{C})/U(n)$, and $Gl(n,\mathcal{C})$ denotes the general linear group over the complex numbers $\mathcal{C}$, that is the nonsingular $n \times n$ matrices with complex entries [34, ex. 5.1]. (The Pontryagin number for a *four*-dimensional compact manifold M_4 is equal to the integral over M_4 of a representant of the first, and unique Pontryagin class of the bundle, that is the Chern number $\int_{M_4} \gamma_2$ of the complexified bundle [35].)

The first of the two bounds (11) was reported in [9] and the second (13) in [13]. The first is achieved by *strongly* [anti-] self-dual Yang-Mills fields, while the second is too restrictive in this regard [9]. An additional curvature invariant is $(\mathrm{tr}F^2, \mathrm{tr}F^2)$, so a "generic action density" can be taken to be of the form [9, eq. (17)]

$$p(F,F)^2 + q(F^2,F^2) + r(\mathrm{tr}F^2, \mathrm{tr}F^2). \tag{14}$$

("The action density should be written in terms of the local curvature 2-form matrix in a way independent of the local trivialization of the bundle. Hence it should involve invariant polynomials of the local curvature matrix. We want to express the action as an inner product in the space of k-forms, which gives a quantity independent of the local coordinates" [9].)

To evaluate the integrals over M_8 of the three curvature invariants occurring in the generic action (14), we first pursued a Monte-Carlo strategy [36–38] in which we *randomly* selected points in the six-dimensional hyperrectangular domain determined by the six active parameters (four Euler angles — τ, β, b, θ — and two independent eigenvalues reexpressed using spherical coordinates, that is, $\lambda_1 = \cos^2\zeta_1$, $\lambda_2 = \sin^2\zeta_1 \cos^2\zeta_2$ [18]). This six-dimensional domain has one side of length π (corresponding to the range of τ), three sides (for β, b and θ) of length $\pi/2$, one side (for ζ_1) of length $\cos^{-1}\pi/3 \approx .955317$ and one (for ζ_2) of length $\pi/4$. [18]. The two remaining (seventh and eighth) sides — associated with the Euler angles α and a, which we have noted are absent from the simplified transformed expressions for the g_{ij}'s [17] — are of length π. At each of the randomly selected points, we computed the products of the volume element (6) with the quantities $(F,F)^2$, (F^2,F^2), $(\mathrm{tr}F^2, \mathrm{tr}F^2)$. We multiplied the averages of each of these three products over the randomly chosen points by the full eight-dimensional Euclidean hyperrectangular volume, which is $\frac{\pi^7}{32}\cos^{-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \approx 90.1668$. However, we observed that the results were greatly influenced (inflated) by only a few points, apparently ones lying near the boundary $\zeta_1 = 0$, at which the volume element (6) is singular.

In light of this numerical instability, we undertook an alternative strategy in which the points in the six-dimensional hyperrectangle selected for evaluation were the nodes of imposed *regular* lattices of varying degrees of refinement. In general, for a lattice having m^6 points ($m = 2, \ldots, 6$), each of the six sides was divided into m equal intervals and the midpoints of those m intervals chosen to serve as coordinates. We obtained the (much better behaved) estimates of the three curvature norms (as well as certain topological bounds upon them)

no. of lattice points	$\int_{M_8}(F,F)^2$	lower bound	$\int_{M_8}(F^2,F^2)$	lower bound	$\int_{M_8}(\mathrm{tr}F^2,\mathrm{tr}F^2)$	lower bound
$2^6 = 64$	241.344	80.698	11.873	7.244	74.313	28.631
$3^6 = 729$	198.984	76.557	8.033	7.006	60.064	28.319
$4^6 = 4096$	179.768	63.530	7.074	5.293	53.421	22.747
$5^6 = 15625$	189.536	68.137	7.690	5.953	56.652	24.715
$6^6 = 46656$	159.799	*	6.321	*	47.087	*

Lemma 1 of [9] states that

$$3(F,F)^2 - 2(F^2,F^2) \geq 0. \tag{15}$$

We see that the tabulated results are clearly consistent with this lemma. The lack of a strict equality here for us signifies that the field we have associated with the Bures metric on M_8 is *not* a strongly self-dual one in the sense of [9] (cf. [39–43]). (The *octonionic* 4-form $\mathrm{Tr}F^2$ is neither self-dual or anti-self-dual [44].) Additional support for a finding of this nature comes from the fact that we found no numerical evidence that $F_{ab} = \pm F_{a'b'}, a < a', b < b'$ [9, eq. (15)]. From Lemma 2 of [9, eq. (25)] one also has the inequality

$$(\mathrm{tr}F^2, \mathrm{tr}F^2) - *\mathrm{tr}F^4 \geq 0, \tag{16}$$

which too is saturated for a strongly self-dual connection.

To compute the *lower bounds* in the table, we repeated our calculations, but having substituted — implementing the self-duality conditions presented in [9, eq. (15)] — F_{12} for the three coordinate components F_{34}, F_{56} and F_{78}; F_{13} for $-F_{24}, -F_{57}, -F_{68}$; ...; and F_{18} for $F_{27}, -F_{36}, -F_{45}$. (An asterix * in the table indicates that the quantity is in the [lengthy] process of being computed.) It also seems that self-duality could be enforced through use of the set of relations [45, eq. (6)]

$$F_{12} = F_{34} + F_{58} - F_{67}, \ldots, F_{18} = F_{25} + F_{36} + F_{47}, \tag{17}$$

that is by replacing F_{12} by the calculation of the quantity $F_{34} + F_{58} - F_{67}$, ... (However, our preliminary investigations have yielded "lower bounds" several times larger than those reported above.)

In the context of D-dimensional Euclidean gravity, Acharya and O'Loughlin have defined a generalization of the self-dual Yang-Mills equations as duality conditions on the curvature two-form R of a Riemannian manifold [15].

For $D = 8$, solutions to these self-duality equations are provided by manifolds of $Spin(7)$ holonomy [46–48], which are necessarily Ricci-flat. The holonomy group is then 21-dimensional. Acharya and O'Loughlin replaced the field strengths in the self-dual Yang-Mills equation

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\phi_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}F_{\lambda\rho} \tag{18}$$

by the components R_{ab} of the curvature two-form (as we have above). The duality operator, ϕ_{abcd} for $D = 8$, is the unique $Spin(7)$ invariant four-index antisymmetric tensor which is Hodge self-dual.

With an eye to possible future higher-dimensional generalizations and extensions of the analyses here, let us point out the convex set of $2m+1$-dimensional quantum systems has dimension $(2m+1)^2 - 1 = 4m(m+1)$, that is 8, 24, 48 ,... for $m = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express appreciation to the Institute for Theoretical Physics for computational support in this research, as well as to A. Uhlmann, A. Bilge, R. Montgomery, D. V. Alekseevskij, D. Eardley and D. Holz for various helpful communications.

---

[1] Petz, D. and Sudár, C.: J. Math. Phys. 37 (1996), 2662.
[2] Lesniewski, A. and Ruskai, M. B.: J. Math. Phys. 40 (1999), 5702.
[3] Uhlmann. A.: Rep. Math. Phys. 33 (1993), 253.
[4] Hübner, M.: Phys. Lett. A 163 (1992), 239.
[5] Hübner, M.: Phys. Lett. A 179 (1993), 226.
[6] Slater, P. B.: Euro. Phys. J. 17 (2000), 471.
[7] Sjöqvist, E, Pati, A. K., Ekert, A., Anandan, J. S. *et al*: Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 (2000), 2845.
[8] Dittmann, J.: Lett. Math. Phys. 46 (1998), 281.
[9] Bilge, A.: Lett. Math. Phys. 36 (1996), 301.
[10] Bilge, A.: Intl. J. Theor. Phys. 35 (1996), 2507.
[11] Tchrakian, D. H.: J. Math. Phys. 21 (1980), 166.
[12] Corrigan, E., Devchand, C., Fairlie, D. B., and Nuyts, J.: Nucl. Phys. B 214 (1983), 452.
[13] Grossman, B., Kephart, T. W., and Stasheff, J. D.: Commun. Math. Phys. 96, 431 (1984).
[14] O'Raifeartaigh, L.: *The Dawning of Gauge Theory*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1997.
[15] Acharya, B. S. and O'Loughlin, M.: Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997), R4521.
[16] Bloore, F. J.: J. Phys. A 9 (1976), 2059.
[17] Slater, P. B.: *Bures Geometry of the Three-Level Quantum Systems*, quant-ph/0008069.
[18] Byrd, M. and Slater, P. B.: *Bures Measures over the Spaces of Two and Three-Dimensional Density Matrices*, quant-ph/0004055 (to appear in Phys. Lett. A).
[19] Boya, L. J., Byrd, M., Mims, M. and Sudarshan, E. C. G.: *Density Matrices and Geometric Phases for n-State Systems*, quant-ph/9810084.
[20] Twamley, J.: J. Phys. A 29 (1996), 3723.
[21] Hasegawa, H.: Rep. Math. Phys. 39 (1997), 49.
[22] Hall, M. J. W.: Phys. Lett. A 242 (1998), 123.
[23] Slater, P. B.: J. Phys. A 32 (1999), 8231.
[24] Dittmann, J.: Sem. Sophus Lie 3 (1993), 73.
[25] Dittmann, J.: J. Geom. Phys. 31 (1999), 16.
[26] Dittmann, J.: *On the Curvature of Monotone Metrics and a Conjecture Concerning the Kubo-Mori Metric*, quant-ph/9906009.
[27] Tanno, S.: Kyushu J. Math. 49 (1995), 321.
[28] Michor, P. W., Petz, D., and Andai, A.: *On the Curvature of a Certain Riemannian Space of Matrices*, Schrödinger Institute, Vienna, 1999.
[29] Grasselli, M. R. and Streater, R. F.: *On the Uniqueness of the Chentsov Metric in Quantum Information Geometry*, math-ph/0006030.
[30] Alekseevskij, D. V.: *Encyclopaedia of Mathematics*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1988, vol. 9, p. 515.

[31] Alekseevskij, D. V., Vinogradov, A. M., and Lychagin, V. V.: *Basic Ideas and Concepts of Differential Geometry*, Springer, Berlin, 1991, p. 166.
[32] Chaohao, G.: Phys. Rep. 80 (1981), 252.
[33] Weinberg, S.: *Gravitation and Cosmology*, Wiley, New York, 1972.
[34] Kobayashi,S. and Nomizu, K.: *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, Interscience, New York, 1963.
[35] Choquet-Bruhat, Y., DeWitt-Morette, C. and Dillard-Bleick, M.: *Analysis, Manifolds and Physics*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, p. 396.
[36] Halton, J. H.: SIAM Rev. 12 (1970), 1.
[37] James, F.: Rep. Prog. Phys. 43 (1980), 1145.
[38] Krommer, A. R. and Überhuber, C. W.: *Computational Integration*, SIAM, Philadelphis, 1998.
[39] Sibner, L. M., Sibner, R. J., and Uhlenbeck, K.: Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 86 (1989), 8610.
[40] Wang, H.-Y.: J. Differential Geom. 34 (1991), 701.
[41] Sadun, L. and Segert, J.: Commun. Math. Phys. 145 (1992), 363.
[42] Bor, G.: Commun. Math. Phys. 145 (1992), 393.
[43] Burzlaff, J. and Tchrakian, D. H.: J. Phys, A 26 (1993), L1053.
[44] Duff, M. J., Evans, M. J., Khuri, R. R., Lu, J. X. and Minasian, R.: Phys. Lett. B 412 (1997), 281.
[45] Figueroa-O'Farrill, J. M.: J. Geom. Phys. 32 (1999), 227.
[46] Joyce, D. D.: Invent. Math. 123 (1996), 507.
[47] Joyce, D. D.: J. Differential. Geom. 53 (1999), 89.
[48] Joyce, D. D.: *Compact Manifolds with Special Holonomy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.