

Electron pairing in the Hubbard model as a result of on-site repulsion fluctuations

Igor N. Karnaukhov¹

¹G.V. Kurdyumov Institute for Metal Physics, 36 Vernadsky Boulevard, 03142 Kiev, Ukraine

*karnai@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

We focus our quantitative analysis on the stability of the insulator state in the Hubbard model at a half-filling. Taking into account large-scale fluctuations (with a long relaxation time) of the on-site Coulomb repulsion, we consider the possibility of realizing a stable state which is characterized by pairing for electrons. The pairing mechanism is as follows: due to fluctuations of on-site repulsion of electrons, holes, as excited states, are formed electron pairs. The bare values of on-site Coulomb repulsion and its fluctuations, for which the states with electron pairing are stable, are calculated. The proposed pairing mechanism is to some extent similar to the formation of a localized moment in the Wolf model¹. The calculations were performed for the chain, as well as square and cubic lattices.

Introduction

The Hubbard chain is unstable at half filling occupation, according to the Lieb-Wu solution² the fermion spectrum is gapped for arbitrary (non equal to zero) on-site repulsion^{2,3}. The authors note absence of Mott transition in the 1D model². At half filling in 2D and 3D lattices the Mott transition in insulator phase is realized at finite value of the on-site repulsion⁴. The Hubbard model also draws attention to the possible realization of electron pairing due to on-site repulsion of electrons, the so-called η -pairing⁵. Since the compounds, in which high-temperature superconductivity is realized, have been discovered the question of non-trivial nature of superconductivity remains relevant. Unfortunately, today we have quite exotic mechanisms of electron interaction to explain high-temperature superconductivity, which lead to pairing for electrons⁵⁻⁹. A large number of new superconducting materials have been also discovered: high temperature cuprate superconductors, ruthenates, ferromagnetic superconductors, organic materials. These materials have clear indications that pairing is due to electron correlations, in contrast to traditional superconductors. Studying the stability of the phase state of interacting electrons with respect to superconducting fluctuations (or electron pairing) can make it possible to propose a real pairing mechanism in high-temperature superconductors.

The gap in the Hubbard model is a result of hybridization of electrons different bands with momenta \mathbf{k} and $\mathbf{k}+\pi$ ⁴. Due to the hybridization the conservation of number of the particles in each band is broken, spontaneous symmetry is also broken^{10,11}. The gap formation mechanism in the Hubbard model is similar to the η pairing proposed by Yang^{5,12}, unfortunately η pairing is not realized in the framework of the Hubbard model with on-site repulsion. We believe that the nature of the gap can be more complicated when fluctuations of the on-site Coulomb repulsion are taken into account. At half filling occupation low energy excitations are holes, therefore fluctuations of the on-site Coulomb repulsion trigger holes in the electron spectrum, which can pairing with electrons, other words electrons polarized holes. In this case fluctuation of the on-site Coulomb repulsion is effective attractive potential, which can form pairs. The process of pairing for particles is determined by both values of the bare on-site repulsion and its

fluctuation. We use this idea to consider the stability of the Hubbard model in the framework of a mean field approach taking into account pairing for electrons. As result the fermion spectrum is determined by two gaps, the values of the gaps in chain and square, cubic lattices are calculated.

Model

We will analyze the behavior of fermions in the framework of the well-known Hubbard model, the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{int}$ is written as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_0 &= - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} a_{i,\sigma}^\dagger a_{j,\sigma} - \mu \sum_j \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} n_{j,\sigma}, \\ \mathcal{H}_{int} &= U \sum_j \left(n_{j\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(n_{j,\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right),\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where $a_{j,\sigma}^\dagger$ and $a_{j,\sigma}$ are the fermion operators on a site j with spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$, $n_{j,\sigma} = a_{j,\sigma}^\dagger a_{j,\sigma}$ denotes the density operator. The Hamiltonian (1) describes the hoppings of fermions between the nearest-neighbor lattice sites with the magnitudes equal to unit, μ is the chemical potential. \mathcal{H}_{int} term is defined by the on-site Coulomb repulsion with the value of U .

We shall analyze the phase state of the system at half filling occupation for arbitrary dimension $d = 1, 2, 3$, which corresponds to $\mu = 0$. First of all, we consider the fluctuation of the local potential $\delta U > 0$ with a large relaxation time (compared with the relaxation time of fermions), the fluctuation also has a macroscopic scale. At a sufficiently large fluctuation, when $\delta U > \Delta$ (Δ is a gap in the fermion spectrum), the quasi-particle excitations in high energy band form holes in the spectrum. At half-filling and $\delta U = 0$ a low energy band is full filled. Attractive on-site interaction for particles and holes can to lead to forming particle-hole pairs. At the end of the fluctuation life, the phase state of fermions relaxes to initial state with the on-site interaction equal to U . The system can return to its initial state, determined by the Hamiltonian (1), or to another state, which also corresponds to the same interaction equal to U . Minimal energy of the system corresponds to the most probable phase state. We consider the model Hamiltonian in the form (1) with the following Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_{int}

$$\mathcal{H}_{int} = (U + \delta U) \sum_j \left(n_{j\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(n_{j,\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \delta U \sum_j \left(n_{j\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(n_{j,\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (2)$$

where the first term with the constant $U + \delta U$ generates the hole excitations in the fermion spectrum, the second term with the constant $-\delta U$ forms particle-hole pairs.

The Hamiltonians (1) and (2) are determined by the same on-site Coulomb repulsion U , but in the second case this phase state can be formed by excitations of fermions at $U + \delta U$ and pairing for particles and holes at $-\delta U$ by fluctuation δU . We have separated two processes: formation of holes in the spectrum of electrons and their polarization due to the attraction of electrons to them. We study instability of the Hubbard model induced by the formation of particle-hole states at half filling occupation.

Ground state

The solutions for λ_j and Λ_j are determined by unknown vectors \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{p} , they determine the energies of the quasiparticle excitations $E_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ (see section "methods"). $\mathbf{q} \neq 0$, $\mathbf{p} \neq 0$ lift the degeneracy of the spectrum over the spin of electron forming a complex fermion spectrum. Due to symmetry of the fermion spectrum the chemical potential is equal to zero at half-filling for arbitrary λ , \mathbf{q} , Λ , \mathbf{p} and dimension of the




Figure 1. (Color online) The gap Δ a) and the action δS_{eff} b) as function of δU at $U = 0$ for different dimension $d=1,2,3$ (where $\lambda = \Lambda$ and $\Delta = \lambda + \Lambda$)

model. It allows us to calculate the state of the system which corresponds to minimum energy at $\mu = 0$, the energy is equal to $E = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{16} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, E_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) < 0} E_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$. Numerical analyze shows that the minimum of energy E is always located at $q = \pi$, $p = 0$ (for arbitrary dimensions of the model and parameters of the $\lambda - \Lambda$ field). The ground state of the system is achieved at $q = \pi$, $p = 0$, when pairs have zero momentum, with following quasiparticle excitations

$$E_{\pm}^{\pm}(k) = \pm \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda + \Lambda)^2}{4} + \varepsilon_d^2(k)}, E_{\pm}^{-}(k) = \pm \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda - \Lambda)^2}{4} + \varepsilon_d^2(k)}, \quad (3)$$

where $\varepsilon_d(k) = \sum_{i=1}^d \cos k_i$, $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y, k_z)$. The spectrum is characterized by the gaps for each branch of excitations $\Delta_{\pm} = |\lambda \pm \Lambda|$.

Given (3) in (7) we can obtain the following equations that correspond to the saddle point of the action

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda}{U + \delta U} - \frac{\lambda + \Lambda}{4N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\lambda + \Lambda)^2 + 4\varepsilon_d^2(k)}} - \frac{\lambda - \Lambda}{4N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\lambda - \Lambda)^2 + 4\varepsilon_d^2(k)}} &= 0, \\ \frac{\Lambda}{\delta U} - \frac{\Lambda + \lambda}{4N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\Lambda + \lambda)^2 + 4\varepsilon_d^2(k)}} - \frac{\Lambda - \lambda}{4N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\Lambda - \lambda)^2 + 4\varepsilon_d^2(k)}} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Action $S_{eff}(U, \delta U)$ (7) has the following form

$$\frac{S_{eff}(U, \delta U)}{\beta} = \frac{\lambda^2}{U + \delta U} + \frac{\Lambda^2}{\delta U} - \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\sqrt{(\lambda + \Lambda)^2 + 4\varepsilon_d^2(k)} + \sqrt{(\lambda - \Lambda)^2 + 4\varepsilon_d^2(k)} \right), \quad (5)$$

where unknown λ and Λ are solution of Eqs (4).

The case $U=0$

Eqs (4) have both trivial solution $\lambda = \Lambda = 0$ which correspond to noninteracting fermions and nontrivial solution $\lambda = \Lambda \neq 0$, the solution that is determined by repulsive and attractive Hubbard interaction δU . A nontrivial solution for $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\Lambda \neq 0$ splits the branches of the spectrum (4), degenerated by the spin

of noninteracting electrons, on gapless $E_{\pm}^{-}(k) = \varepsilon_d(k)$ and gapped $E_{\pm}^{+}(k) = \pm\sqrt{\lambda^2 + \varepsilon_d^2(k)}$ with the gap $\Delta = 2\Lambda$ or $\Delta = 2\lambda$ (3) (see in Fig1a)).

In the chain the gap state is realized for an arbitrary value of fluctuation δU . In weak δU limit the gap is exponential small $\Delta = 4G \exp(-2\pi/\delta U)$, where G is cutoff that defines the region of integrating for the momentum near $\mu = 0$. In square and cubic lattices a nontrivial solution for λ, Λ takes place at finite $\delta U > \delta U_c$, where δU_c is a minimal value of on-site repulsive fluctuation at which the particle-hole states are realized or this is a criterion for phase stability. This fact leads from numerical calculation, such $\delta U_c = 0.3$ for square and $\delta U_c = 1$ for cubic lattices. $\delta U_c = 0$ is not surprising in the chain because the same behavior of the fermion spectrum takes place in the Hubbard chain².

The phase transition is accompanied by a decrease in action, which leads to a stable state of the new phase. Numerical calculations $\delta S_{eff} = S_{eff}(U, \delta U) - S_{eff}(U, 0)$ at $U = 0$ for different dimensions of the system are shown in Fig 1b).

The cases $U=0.5$ and $U=1$

The formation of the ground state of the model for the bare Coulomb repulsion $U = 0.5$ and $U = 1$ and an arbitrary dimension of the system is considered. Nontrivial solutions for λ and Λ determine the ground state of the interacting fermions, these solutions take place at finite values of δU . A minimal value of δU , at which the phase with electron pairing is realized, increases with value of bare repulsion U . We illustrate these calculations at $U = 0.5$ and $U = 1$ for different dimension of the system (see in Figs 2, 3, 4). Numerical calculations of the averages λ and Λ and action δS_{eff} as function of δU are shown in Figs 2, 3, 4. The behavior of the system is similar for different dimension, the main result that this state is stable and can be realized. In Fig 5 we have calculated the ground state phase diagram in the coordinates $U, \delta U$ for square and cubic lattices. The curves separate the regions in which the pairing for electrons is carried out (above the curves) and not realized (below the curves).

Conclusions

The discovered instability of the Hubbard model at half filling occupation allows us to propose a possible new mechanism of pairing for electrons. To realize such a pairing mechanism, sufficiently large large-scale fluctuations of the Coulomb repulsion between electrons are preferable in a low-dimensional system. Repulsion fluctuations should be of the order of the magnitude of the bare interaction between electrons. Many high-temperature superconductors have an effective dimension of two, which is preferred in this case. The gap in the fermion spectrum is determined by the magnitude of the fluctuation of the Coulomb repulsion; therefore, we are talking about a large value of the gap and the electron-electron mechanism of pairing for particles.

Acknowledgments

The studies were also supported by the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine within the budget program 6541230-3A "Support for the development of priority areas of scientific research".

Methods

Let us introduce the operators $\chi_j^{\dagger} = a_{j,\uparrow}^{\dagger} a_{j,\downarrow}$ and $\eta_j^{\dagger} = a_{j,\uparrow}^{\dagger} a_{j,\downarrow}^{\dagger}$ and redefine the term \mathcal{H}_{int} (2) is the following form $\mathcal{H}_{int} = -(U + \delta U) \sum_j \chi_j^{\dagger} \chi_j - \delta U \sum_j \eta_j^{\dagger} \eta_j$. The Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation




Figure 2. (Color online) The components of $\lambda - \Lambda$ -field a) and action δS_{eff} b) as function of δU calculated at $U = 0.5$ and $U = 1$ for chain, where $\lambda = 0, \Lambda = 0.061$ at $\delta U = 1$, when $U = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 0, \Lambda = 0.193$ at $\delta U = 1.51$ when $U = 1$.

maps interacting fermion systems to non-interacting fermions moving in an effective field, we define the interaction term introducing the action S_0

$$S_{int} = S_0 + \sum_j \left(\frac{\lambda_j^* \lambda_j}{U + \delta U} + \frac{\Lambda_j^* \Lambda_j}{\delta U} \right) + \sum_j (\lambda_j \chi_j + \Lambda_j^* \eta_j^\dagger + H.c.) \quad (6)$$

The canonical functional is defined as $\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}[\lambda, \Lambda] \int \mathcal{D}[\chi^\dagger, \chi, \eta^\dagger, \eta] e^{-S}$, where the action $S = \frac{1}{U + \delta U} \sum_j \lambda_j^* \lambda_j + \frac{1}{\delta U} \sum_j \Lambda_j^* \Lambda_j + \int_0^\beta d\tau \Psi^\dagger(\tau) [\partial_\tau + \mathcal{H}_{eff}] \Psi(\tau)$ with $\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \sum_j (\lambda_j a_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger a_{j,\uparrow} + \Lambda_j^* a_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger a_{j,\downarrow} + H.c.)$, where $\Psi(\tau)$ is the wave function. We expect that λ_j and Λ_j are independent of τ because of translational invariance.

At the on-site hybridization and pairing and due to translation invariance, only the phases of λ_j and Λ_j are depend on j , a namely $\lambda_j = \exp(i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{j}) \lambda$ and $\Lambda_j = \exp(i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{j}) \Lambda$, where \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{p} are unknown wave vectors. The task is reduced to moving fermions in a static inhomogeneous $\lambda - \Lambda$ field. We can integrate out fermions to obtain the following action S_{eff} per an atom (6) (N is the total number of atoms with lattice constant equal to 1)

$$\frac{S_{eff}(U, \delta U)}{\beta} = -\frac{T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_n \sum_{\alpha=1}^{16} \ln[-i\omega_n + E_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})] + \frac{|\lambda|^2}{U + \delta U} + \frac{|\Lambda|^2}{\delta U}, \quad (7)$$

where $\omega_n = T(2n + 1)\pi$ are Matsubara frequencies, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q} are the momenta of electrons, \mathbf{p} is the momentum of Cooper pair, 16-quasiparticle excitations $E_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, 16$) determine the fermion state in the $\lambda - \Lambda$ field. In the saddle point approximation the canonical functional \mathcal{Z} will be dominated by the minimal action S_{eff} (7), that satisfies the following conditions $\partial S_{eff} / \partial \lambda = 0$ and $\partial S_{eff} / \partial \Lambda = 0$.

References

1. P.A.Wolf, Localized Moments in Metals, Phys. Rev., 124 (1961) 1030; <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.124.1030>
2. E.H.Lieb and F.Y.Wu, Absence of Mott Transition in an Exact Solution of the Short-Range, One-Band Model in One Dimension, Phys.Rev.Lett. 20 (1968) 1445; <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.21.192.2>




Figure 3. (Color online) The components of $\lambda - \Lambda$ -field a) and action δS_{eff} b) as function of δU calculated at $U = 0.5$ and $U = 1$ for square lattice, where $\lambda = 0, \Lambda = 0.061$ at $\delta U = 1$, when $U = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 0, \Lambda = 0.193$ at $\delta U = 1.51$ when $U = 1$.




Figure 4. (Color online) The components of $\lambda - \Lambda$ -field a) and action δS_{eff} b) as function of δU calculated at $U = 0.5$ and $U = 1$ for cubic lattice, where $\lambda = 0, \Lambda = 0.092$ at $\delta U = 1.644$, when $U = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 0, \Lambda = 0.271$ at $\delta U = 2.2$ when $U = 1$.




Figure 5. (Color online) The minimal value of δU , above of which the phase state with nontrivial solutions for λ and Λ is realized, is calculated as function of U for square and cubic lattices, where $\delta U_c = 0.3$ and $\delta U_c = 1$ at $U = 0$ in square and cubic lattices.

3. A.A.Ovchinnikov, Excitation spectrum in one-dimensional Hubbard model, Soviet Physics JETP, 30 (1970) 1160.
4. I.N.Karnaukhov, Mott transition in two-band fermion model with on-site Coulomb repulsion, arXiv:2004.09331 [cond-mat.str-el].
5. C.N.Yang, η pairing and off-diagonal long-range order in a Hubbard model, Phys.Rev.Lett. 63 (1989) 2144, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.2144>
6. M.E.Raikh, L.I.Glazman and L.E.Zhukov, Two-Electron State in a Disordered 2D Island: Pairing Caused by the Coulomb Repulsion, Phys. Rev. Lett., 77 (1996) 1354, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.1354>
7. J.E.Hirsch and D.J.Scalapino, Excitonic mechanism for superconductivity in a quasi-one-dimensional system, Phys. Rev. B, 32 (1985) 117, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.32.117>.
8. W.A.Little, Possibility of synthesizing an organic superconductor, Phys. Rev., 134 (1964) A1416, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.134.A1416>
9. P.Goswami and B.Roy, Axionic superconductivity in three-dimensional doped narrow-gap semiconductors. Phys.Rev.B,90 (2014) 041301(R), <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.90.041301>
10. I.N.Karnaukhov, Spontaneous breaking of time-reversal symmetry in topological insulators, Phys. Lett. A, 381 (2017) 1967, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physleta.2017.04.014>
11. I.N.Karnaukhov, Spontaneous breaking of timereversal symmetry in topological superconductors, Scientific Reports, 7 (2017) 7008, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07673-z>
12. A.Lowe, M.Ortugo and I.V.Yurkevich, Topological phase transition in superconductors with mirror symmetry, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, 32 (2019) 035603, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-648X/ab467d>