On the electronic phases of magically twisted bilayer graphene

Chuan Chen,1 A. H. Castro Neto,1,2 and Vitor M. Pereira1,2,∗
1Centre for Advanced 2D Materials and Graphene Research Centre, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117546
2Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117542
(Dated: July 29, 2019)

We explore in detail the electronic phases of a system consisting of three non-colinear arrays of coupled quantum wires, each rotated 120 degrees with respect to the next. A perturbative renormalization-group analysis reveals that multiple correlated states can be stabilized: a smectic or a d ± id superconductor, a charge density wave insulator, a two-dimensional Fermi liquid, and a 2D Luttinger liquid (also known as smectic metal or sliding Luttinger liquid). The model provides an effective description of electronic interactions in small-angle twisted bilayer graphene and we discuss its implications in relation to the recent observation of correlated and superconducting ground states near commensurate densities, as well as the “strange metal” behavior at finite temperatures as a natural outcome of the 2D Luttinger liquid phase.

The low-energy physics of interacting fermions in one dimension (1D) is determined by collective spin and charge density excitations that define what is known as Luttinger liquid (LL) behavior [1–3]. Soon after high-temperature superconductivity was discovered in cuprate oxides [4], it was proposed that the charges added upon doping a Mott insulator could end up distributed in stripes [5–7]. This led Anderson et al. to suggest that confined fermionic excitations in such presumed LL arrays (the stripes) could explain the non-Fermi-liquid nature of cuprates’ “normal” state [8]. Since then, theoretical investigation has assessed whether LL behavior can emerge in higher dimensions, especially in 2D [8–13], the natural route to that having been to study systems of coupled LLs in different guises. It is now known, for example, that, in an array of parallel LLs, marginal inter-wire density-density and current-current interactions lead to strong transverse charge-density fluctuations at incommensurate wave vectors which can frustrate electron crystallization and indeed stabilize a LL state, commonly designated “smectic metal” or “sliding Luttinger liquid” state [10–13]. However, previous work has been limited to exploring consequences of couplings among either one or two perpendicularly crossed arrays, without ever considering LLs interlinked in the form of a triangular net, possibly for lack of a realistic representative system.

Twisted bilayer graphene — The recent discovery of strongly correlated physics in twisted bilayer graphene (TBG) near the magic angle θ ≈ 1.1◦ [14, 15] set off a flurry of interest in the origin of the observed insulating and superconducting (SC) phases. It had been previously suggested that, at magic angles, the quasi-flatness of the electronic bands closest to the undoped Fermi level could promote electronic instabilities [16–19]. The development of effective tight-binding models for those bands [20–23] enabled, on the one hand, predictions of possible broken symmetries arising from weak-coupling mechanisms, such as Fermi surface nesting or enhanced density of states [22, 24–27]; on the other hand, it revealed trilobed Wannier functions centered at the AB/BA positions [21–23], which has in turn motivated strong-coupling perspectives based on extended and non-conventional Hubbard-type interactions [28–30]. Electronic interactions are an undisputed factor given that the ratio of the local Coulomb integral to bandwidth is estimated in the range U/w ∼ 5–10 [21]. The extremely large Moiré unit cells involved (~172 nm², about 100 times those of canonical Mott-insulators like cuprates) has also prompted the suggestion that the insulating phase can be a Wigner crystal, consistently with the extremely low densities, and the emergence of SC a result of its melting [31, 32].

Evidence accumulated from recent experiments and theoretical work motivates a different perspective over the effective electronic model governing correlations in TBG, which we develop in this paper. It is well known that, in the presence of perpendicular electrical fields, AB-BA domain boundaries host protected helical modes [33–36]. Small-angle TBG accommodates well defined, intrinsic, and periodically alternating AB/BA regions [19] whose network of boundaries was shown to likewise support the propagation of such confined states [37–39]. Moreover, since AB is favored against AA stacking, a considerable atomic relaxation within the Moiré unit cell maximizes the AB/BA regions, leaving sharply defined, atomic-scale domain boundaries [40–43]. Crucially, there is now unequivocal spectroscopic [40, 44–47] and transport [44, 48–50] evidence of the reality of this network of 1D modes in TBG, including in single-gated devices.

Important hints warrant a description in terms of such “network of linked quantum wires” to describe the observed correlated behavior: the confinement of electrons to 1D naturally boosts correlations; a phase diagram similar to that of magic-angle samples arises at other twist angles under pressure [51], in line with the expectation that an inter-layer coupling enhanced by pressure would amplify the lattice relaxation, in turn defining sharp do-
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and charge (c) Hamiltonian [1–3],
\[ H = \sum_{\alpha=\sigma,s} \int dx \frac{v_\alpha}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa_\alpha} (\partial_x \theta_\alpha)^2 + K_\alpha (\partial_x \phi_\alpha)^2 \right], \]
where \( \theta_\alpha(x) \) and \( \phi_\alpha(x) \) are the conventional phase-field operators, \( K_{\sigma/s} \) is the (inverse) charge/spin Luttinger parameter \((K_\sigma > 1 \text{ for repulsive/attractive interactions})\), and \( v_\alpha \) defines the velocity of each excitation. Spin backscattering adds the term \( 2g_\alpha/(2\pi \Lambda)^2 \int dx \cos (2\sqrt{2} \pi \phi_\alpha) \), where \( \Lambda \) is the cutoff of the theory, to Hamiltonian (1), leading to a sine-Gordon-like action and spin couplings that flow according to the equations [2]
\[ \frac{dg_\alpha}{dl} = 2(1 - \frac{1}{K_s}) g_\alpha, \quad \frac{dK_s}{dl} = \frac{g_\alpha^2}{2\pi^2 v_\alpha^2}. \]
As a result, when there is a spin gap, \( K_s \to \infty \).

To describe each periodic array of parallel wires separated by \( d \) as in Fig. 1, one must include the long-wavelength (charge) density-density and current-current interactions among wires in the fixed-point Hamiltonian, as first noted by Emery et al. [10]. It can then be shown that the charge part of the action reads, in Fourier space,
\[ S = \sum_q \frac{v(k_{\perp}) k^2}{2} \left[ \frac{\theta_{c,q}^2}{\kappa(k_{\perp})} + \kappa(k_{\perp}) |\phi_{c,q}|^2 \right] + i\omega_n k^{*}_{c,q} \phi_{c,q}, \]
where \( q \equiv (\omega_n, k, k_{\perp}) \) and \( k_{\perp} \) is the momentum along/perpendicular to the wires [10–12]. The spin part, for \( \theta_s \) and \( \phi_s \), is obtained by replacing \( [v(k_{\perp}), \kappa(k_{\perp})] \to [v_s, K_s] \). Direct comparison with Eq. (1) shows that an array of LLs effectively behaves as a LL, the net effect of the inter-wire coupling being a Luttinger parameter \( \kappa \) that is now a \( 2\pi/d \)-periodic function of \( k_{\perp} \). This periodicity justifies a Fourier expansion,
\[ \kappa(k_{\perp}) = K_0 [1 + K_1 \cos(k_{\perp}d) + K_2 \cos(2k_{\perp}d) + \ldots], \]
which we shall use below with \( K_{0,1,2} \) as free parameters [11–13].

Each of the three LL arrays depicted in Fig. 1 is assigned a (superscript) label \( j \in \{1,2,3\} \). Within each array \( j \), we consider the single-electron hopping (\( t_{\perp} \)) between nearest-neighboring wires, as well as inter-wire CDW (\( V_n \)) and SC (\( J_n \)) singlet interactions between neighboring wires. These are described, respectively, by the intra-array, inter-wire couplings
\begin{align}
\mathcal{H}_h^j &= t_{\perp} \sum_{l,\sigma} \sum_{\nu=\pm1} \psi_{l,\nu,\sigma}^\dagger \psi_{l+1,\nu,\sigma} + \text{H.c.}, \\
\mathcal{H}_{c,n}^j &= V_n \sum_{l,\sigma,\sigma',\nu} \psi_{l,\sigma,\nu}^\dagger \psi_{l-1,\sigma',-\nu}^\dagger \psi_{l+1,\nu,\sigma'} \psi_{l,\nu,\sigma}, \\
\mathcal{H}_{sc,n}^j &= J_n \sum_{l,\mu,\nu} \psi_{l,\mu,\nu}^\dagger \psi_{l,\mu,\nu} \psi_{l,\nu,\nu}^\dagger \psi_{l,\nu,\nu} + \text{H.c.},
\end{align}

FIG. 1. (a) Schematic of the local net spanned by the three coupled arrays of quantum wires, labeled \{1,2,3\}. One array consists of a set of parallel, identically colored wires. The superposition of the three arrays reproduces the net of AB-BA domain boundaries in small-angle TBG. (b) Domain of stability. The array’s effective Luttinger parameter, \( \kappa(k_{\perp}) \), is positive in the shaded domain for all \( k \in (-\pi/d, \pi/d) \). The LL phase exists only in the red-to-yellow region surrounding the upper boundary. Dashed lines indicate the cuts chosen to generate the phase diagrams in Fig. 2.
where $\psi_i^{\uparrow, \downarrow}$ is the field operator for a right/left-moving electron of spin $\sigma$ in the $l$-th wire of array $i$. The wires are also coupled at each intersection [white dots in Fig. 1(a)], requiring us to consider the additional inter-array hopping, CDW and SC interactions:

\begin{align}
H^{i,j}_h &= t \sum_{l,m,\sigma \mu,\nu} \psi_{l,\mu,\sigma}^\dagger \psi_{m,\nu,\sigma} + H.c., \quad (6a) \\
H^{i,j}_c &= \nu_0 \sum_{l,m,\sigma,\sigma', \mu,\nu} \psi_{l,\mu,\sigma}^\dagger \psi_{m,\nu,\sigma'} \psi_{l,\mu,\sigma'}^\dagger \psi_{m,\nu,\sigma} + H.c., \quad (6b) \\
H^{i,j}_sc &= J_0 \sum_{l,m,\mu,\nu} \psi_{l,\mu,\uparrow}^\dagger \psi_{l,-\mu,\downarrow} \psi_{m,\nu,\downarrow}^\dagger \psi_{m,-\nu,\uparrow} + H.c. \quad (6c)
\end{align}

**RG analysis** — We bosonize all the terms in Eqs. (5) and (6), and develop a perturbative RG analysis. To lowest order, the flow equations for the hopping ($t$, $t_\perp$), CDW ($V_n$), and SC ($J_n$) coupling parameters read:

\begin{align}
\frac{dV_n}{dt} &= (2 - \delta_{n,0} - \frac{1}{K_s} - \Delta_{C,n})V_n, \quad (7a) \\
\frac{dJ_n}{dt} &= (2 - \delta_{n,0} - \frac{1}{K_s} - \Delta_{S,n})J_n, \quad (7b) \\
\frac{dt_\perp}{dt} &= \left[ -\frac{1}{4} \left( K_s + \frac{1}{K_s} - \frac{1}{4} (\Delta_{C,1} + \Delta_{S,1}) \right) \right] t_\perp, \quad (7c) \\
\frac{dt}{dt} &= \left[ -\frac{1}{4} \left( K_s + \frac{1}{K_s} - \frac{1}{4} (\Delta_{C,0} + \Delta_{S,0}) \right) \right] t, \quad (7d)
\end{align}

where, $\Delta_{C,n} \equiv \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{2\pi} \left[ 1 - (1 - \delta_{n,0}) \cos(nk) \right] / \kappa(k/d)$ and $\Delta_{S,n} \equiv \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{2\pi} \left[ 1 - (1 - \delta_{n,0}) \cos(nk) \right] \kappa(k/d)$. It is physically reasonable to expect the intra-array couplings to decay rapidly so, henceforth, we only consider intra-array CDW and SC interactions up to second-neighbors. As for $\kappa(k_1)$, in line with Vishwanath and Carpentier [11], we truncate its Fourier expansion at the second order. Furthermore, in order to have a stable theory, $\kappa(k_1)$ must be positive for $k_1 \in (-\pi/d, \pi/d)$, which constrains $K_0 > 0$ and $(K_1, K_2)$ to the shaded domain shown in Fig. 1(b).

At this level of approximation, the RG equations (7) are independent. The relevancy of the different couplings can thus be immediately established and is summarized in Table I. Since $\kappa$ is strictly positive, $\Delta_{C,0} + \Delta_{S,0} > 0$, which, according to Eq. (7d), implies that the single-electron hopping at the wire intersections ($t$) is, at most, marginal if $K_s = 1$ and $\kappa(k/d) = 1$ for all $k$; it is otherwise irrelevant in nearly the whole phase space. This justifies considering $t$ globally irrelevant and, accordingly, it will be ignored in the subsequent analysis. Similarly, one can see that $\Delta_{C,1} + \Delta_{S,1} \geq 2$ so that the intra-array hopping ($t_\perp$) may be relevant when $3 - 2\sqrt{2} \leq K_s \leq 3 + 2\sqrt{2}$. The CDW and SC couplings are relevant only if $K_s > 1/2$ in the intra-array case ($V_1$ and $J_{1,2}$), while the corresponding inter-array couplings ($V_0$ and $J_0$) are relevant for $K_s > 1$.

Up to this point, the spin Luttinger parameter $K_s$ has been considered free; Table I thus covers the most general scenario in relation to the possible magnetic phases. However, addition of the spin backscattering term mentioned earlier to Eq. (1) makes $K_s$ a running coupling, governed by the flow Eqs. (2). The solution where $K_s \to \infty$ corresponds to a spin-gapped state, in which case we find the single-electron hoppings $t$ and $t_\perp$ to be irrelevant (last column of Table I), in correspondence with previous calculations for a single array of coupled quantum wires [10]. In contrast, if $K_s \to 0$ we have a spin gapless state and all the couplings considered here are irrelevant — the system consists of decoupled LLs.

**Phase diagram** — While one may explore any range of $K_s$, we will now focus on $K_s = 2$. Table I shows that this falls in the regime where all couplings but $t$ are relevant and, therefore, it is representative of the physical scenarios involving phase competition, as is the case of TBG, either driven by inter- or intra-array interactions (or both). Figure 2 shows the phase diagram in two representative scenarios, defined by different magnitudes of the second harmonic in the Fourier expansion (4). Although $K_0$ is not strictly the Luttinger (charge) parameter of an individual wire, Eq. (3) implies it does represent the effective Luttinger parameter of an array behaving collectively as a LL [10]. Therefore, $K_0 < 1$ signals an effectively attractive regime while $K_0 > 1$ describes repulsion. In this context, one qualitatively understands the fact that the SC phase (blue region) dominates in the small-$K_0$ portion of the phase diagram, while the CDW eventually becomes the only relevant phase for large $K_0$.

In the crossover region $K_0 \sim 1$, the domains of relevancy for the CDW and SC orders overlap; in addition, the intra-array hopping is relevant as well in this case (gray region enclosed by the dot-dashed line) which, should the hopping become dominant over the CDW and SC instabilities, implies the existence of a 2D FL phase. This indicates that the transition between SC and CDW with increasing repulsion (increasing $K_0$) can occur either directly or via an intervening FL phase, depending on the magnitude of $K_1$ (which is a measure of the nearest-neighbor inter-wire coupling within an array). The pre-

---

**Table I.** Relevance of each coupling for the different ranges of the spin Luttinger parameter ($K_s$) specified in the first row. The symbol $\checkmark$ means that a coupling may be relevant while "_" indicates it is always irrelevant within that interval of $K_s$. $K_- \equiv 3 - 2\sqrt{2} \approx 0.17$, $K_+ \equiv 3 + 2\sqrt{2} \approx 5.83$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupling</th>
<th>$[0, K_-]$</th>
<th>$(K_-, 1/2)$</th>
<th>$(1/2, 1)$</th>
<th>$(1, K_+)$</th>
<th>$(K_+, \infty)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V_n$ (CDW)</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_n$ (SC)</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_\perp$ (hop)</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**inter-array (at wire crossings)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupling</th>
<th>$[0, K_-]$</th>
<th>$(K_-, 1/2)$</th>
<th>$(1/2, 1)$</th>
<th>$(1, K_+)$</th>
<th>$(K_+, \infty)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V_0$ (CDW)</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_0$ (SC)</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ (hop)</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
<td>$\checkmark$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mensurate as $K$ diverges at $K_0$ for couplings are irrelevant within that region. In contrast, Carpentier [11], enhanced transverse incommensurate wires within an array, which is detrimental to the stabil-

The intra-array hopping ($t_\perp$) is relevant in the gray domain bounded by the dash-dotted line, implying that the system might be a Fermi liquid in this region. To the left of the blue-dashed line, the inter-array SC coupling is relevant, whereas the inter-array CDW coupling is relevant to the right of the orange-dashed line. The green area indicates a regime where all the couplings are irrelevant, corresponding to a 2D LL state. The main difference between (a) and (b) is the absence of the LL phase in the latter.

array CDW coupling will crystallize the system and there is no LL phase. Indeed, comparing Figs. 2(a) and 2(b), we see that a LL phase is stabilized at the expense of the CDW phase in the repulsive region ($K_0 > 1$), without much impact on the region of SC stability. At large $K_0$, both intra-array (rightward off the solid orange line) and inter-array (rightward off the dashed orange line) CDW couplings are relevant — the electrons crystallize and an insulator ensues.

If $K_0 < 0.5$, the inter-array Josephson coupling is relevant. At each wire crossing, the phases of the three SC order parameters couple via

$$\propto J_0 \sum_{i,j \in \{1,2,3\}} \cos(\varphi_i^j - \varphi_r^j).$$

Assuming that the intra-array SC coupling promotes uniform SC within each array, Eq. (8) indicates that the global SC phase depends on the sign of $J_0$: if $J_0 < 0$, the Josephson coupling favors $s$-wave SC with all $\varphi_i$ equal; but, if $J_0 > 0$, that coupling is frustrated and will result in a $2\pi/3$ difference between the phase of the SC order parameter of one array ($j$) with respect to the next ($j+1$). This originates a $d \pm id$ SC symmetry. A similar conclusion has been drawn by Wu et al. who have further considered triplet pairing and discuss the additional possibility of $p \pm ip$ symmetry [52].

In a conventional (i.e., single) LL problem, the proximity to commensurate electron densities is described by considering the Umklapp process within each wire [2] which, in the notation of Eq. (1), has the form

$$g_U/(2\pi \alpha^2) \int dx \cos[2\sqrt{2}\pi \phi_c + (4k_F - G)x],$$

where $G$ is a vector of the reciprocal superlattice. The couplings $g_U$ and $K_c$ flow according to Eq. (2), with the replacements $g_\perp \to g_U$, $K_s \to K_c$ [2]. In the present case, however, the effective Luttinger parameter $\kappa$ is a function of the transverse momentum [cf. Eq. (3)] due to the marginal interactions between wires within each array; this complicates the flow equations in the charge sector. We proceed by assuming, as a first approximation, that the flow equations for $g_U$ and $K_0$ behave analogously to those in Eq. (2), in which case we naturally obtain distinct behaviour at and away from half-filling: Our phase diagram in Fig. 2 indicates that, away from half-filling, the system is a SC provided $K_0$ is not too large; at (or near) half-filling, a large enough $g_U$ is able to drive the system to an insulating state even for very small $K_0$. Such SC-to-insulator transition is a general feature of the competing instabilities in a LL with commensurate density, because the Umklapp terms provide a “condensation” energy gain that ultimately makes the charge-gapped CDW state energetically favorable [2, 53, 54]. This picture bears directly on the TBG experiments, which have shown that the ground-state is either a FL at generic densities, a SC near commensurate fillings, or an insulator at commensurability [14, 15].
Conclusions — The propagation of interacting electrons along the quantum channels provided by the well-defined AB-BA domain boundaries of small-angle TBG [Fig. 1(a)] provides a natural low-energy picture for the emergence of competing SC and insulating states. At generic densities and moderate Luttinger parameter ($|K_0| \sim 1$), SC and possibly FL are the dominant phases, with SC stabilized even for repulsive Coulomb interactions ($K > 1$); at commensurate densities, the system is a charge-insulator. This holds both when $K_s < 1$ and $K_s > 1$, particularly in the spin gapped regime ($K_s > 1$). When increased temperatures destroy the insulating and SC states [55], the field is assumed to exist persistently in SC puddles at the wire net with $C_4$ symmetry rather than $C_0$, local SC order is assumed to exist persistently in SC puddles at the intersections, and couplings are considered only at the intersections, without intra-array interactions. Where our models match, the conclusions agree.
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