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Abstract

Superconductivity in the $t$-$J$ model is studied by extending the recently introduced extremely correlated fermi liquid theory. Exact equations for the Greens functions are obtained by generalizing Gor’kov’s equations to include extremely strong local repulsion between electrons of opposite spin. These equations are expanded in a parameter $\lambda$ representing the fraction of double occupancy, and the lowest order equations are further simplified near $T_c$, resulting in an approximate integral equation for the superconducting gap. The condition for $T_c$ is studied using a model spectral function embodying a reduced quasiparticle weight $Z$ near half-filling, yielding an approximate analytical formula for $T_c$. This formula is evaluated using parameters representative of single layer High-$T_c$ systems. In a narrow range of electron densities that is necessarily separated from the Mott-Hubbard insulator at half filling, we find superconductivity with a typical $T_c \sim 10^2$K.

1 Introduction

The single band $t$-$J$ model Eq. (1), and the closely related strong coupling Hubbard model have attracted much attention in recent years.
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In large part the interest is due to the potential relevance of these models in describing the phenomenon of High $T_c$ superconductivity, discovered in cuprate materials in 1987 [1] and later, in other materials. These models lead to a single sheet of the fermi surface, and are specified by fixing the band hopping $t$ and the exchange energy $J$ for the $t$-$J$ model, or equivalently $4t^2/U$ for the strong coupling ($U \gg t$) Hubbard model. The exotic possibility of superconductivity arising from such inherently repulsive systems, is surprising from a theoretical perspective, and also challenging. Significant theoretical work using a variety of tools on the $t$-$J$ and the strong coupling Hubbard models [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13] has given useful insights into the role of strong correlations in cuprate superconductivity. However given the non-triviality of the theoretical task of solving these models, and the consequent sweeping approximations frequently made, it has been difficult to reconcile the different methods, or to agree on the results.

In this work we extend the extremely correlated fermi liquid theory [14] recently formulated to overcome the technical difficulties of the strong coupling models, to include superconducting type broken symmetry. We obtain exact equations for the electron Greens function that generalize Gor’kov’s equations for BCS type superconductivity[15]. Our equations include the effect of extremely strong local repulsion between electrons. They are further expanded in terms of a parameter $\lambda$, representing the fraction of doubly occupied states [16]. This controlled expansion leads to a set of successive equations that are amenable to numerical study. Notable results within the normal state from $O(\lambda^2)$ version of the equations include calculations of the asymmetric photoemission lines[17], and most recently the calculation of the almost $T$-linear resistivity in single layer cuprates[18].

In order to obtain explicit, if approximate results, the $O(\lambda^2)$ terms for the superconductor are further simplified near $T_c$, and the lowest order condition for $T_c$ is formulated in Eq. (70). This condition is evaluated using a simple phenomenological electronic spectral func-
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This model has the advantage of leading to an explicit analytical formula for $T_c$, in terms of the various parameters of the $t$-$J$ model, thus allowing for a thorough understanding of the role of different parameters on the result. Evaluating this expression we find that the model supports a d-wave superconducting phase consistent with data [19, 20], located away from half filling. The $T_c$ is found to be typically $\sim 10^2$K, i.e. an order of magnitude smaller than that of the uncorrelated model, in a range of densities determined by the band parameters. The temperature-density phase diagram has the form of a tapered tower Fig. (1). A smooth dome structure reported in cuprates, is replaced here by a somewhat narrow density range and an exaggerated height near the peak. The location of the peak can be varied by choosing the hopping parameters, but always remains well-separated from the insulating limit as seen in Fig. (3).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section (2) we define the $t$-$J$ Hamiltonian, express it in terms of the correlated fermionic operators, and outline the method of external potentials employed to generate the exact dynamical equations for the electron Greens function $\mathcal{G}$ and the Gor’kov anomalous Greens function $\mathcal{F}$. In Section (3) the equation is expanded in $\lambda$ and further simplified near $T_c$. In Section (4) the condition for $T_c$ is evaluated using a model spectral function. This section contains expressions that involve only the electronic spectral function, and might be directly accessible to readers who are primarily interested in the concrete results. In Section (5) we conclude with a discussion of the results.
2 Theoretical Preliminaries

The $t$-$J$ Hamiltonian is

$$H_{tJ} = H_t + H_J$$

$$H_t = - \sum_{ij\sigma} t_{ij} c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma} - \mu \sum_i n_i$$

$$H_J = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - \frac{n_i n_j}{4})$$

with the density operator $n_i = \sum \sigma \tilde{c}^\dagger_{i\sigma} \tilde{c}_{i\sigma}$ and spin density operator

$$S^a_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} \tilde{c}^\dagger_{i\sigma} \tau^a_{\sigma\sigma'} \tilde{c}_{i\sigma'}$$

$\tau^a$ is a Pauli matrix and the correlated fermi destruction operator $\tilde{c}_i$ is found from the plain (i.e. canonical or un-projected) operators $c_i$, by sandwiching it between two Gutzwiller projection operators $\tilde{c}_{i\sigma} = P_G c_{i\sigma} P_G$. The creation operators follow by taking their hermitean conjugate. The physical meaning of this sandwiching process is that the fermi operators act within the subspace where projector $P_G$ enforces single occupancy at each site. In the following work we will also find it useful to study the uncorrelated $t$-$J$ model

$$H_{\text{unc-tJ}} = - \sum_{ij} t_{ij} c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma} - \mu \sum_i n_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - \frac{n_i n_j}{4})$$

where all operators, including the density and spin, are defined by the same expression as Eq. (1) but with the unprojected fermion operators $c_{i\sigma}, c^\dagger_{i\sigma}$'s. This model serves as a useful reference point in the study of the correlated problem, since it has a superconducting ground state that is expected to be well described by the BCS-Gor’kov mean-field theory for small enough $J$. Our aim is to study the effect of strong correlations on this mean-field theory solution of the model Eq. (2).

It is convenient for our calculations to use the operators invented by Hubbard to represent this projection process, where

$$\tilde{c}^\dagger_{i\sigma} \leftrightarrow X^0_{i\sigma}, \quad \tilde{c}_{i\sigma} \leftrightarrow X^{\alpha\sigma}_{i\sigma}, \quad c^\dagger_{i\sigma} \tilde{c}_{i\sigma'} \leftrightarrow X^{\alpha\sigma}_{i\sigma'}.\quad \quad \quad (3)$$

These operators satisfy the following fundamental anti-commutation
relations:
\[
\{ X_{i}^{0\sigma_{i}}, X_{j}^{0\sigma_{j}} \} = 0 = \{ X_{i}^{\sigma_{i}0}, X_{j}^{\sigma_{j}0} \} 
\]
(4)
\[
\{ X_{i}^{0\sigma_{i}}, X_{j}^{\sigma_{j}0} \} = \delta_{ij} \left( \delta_{\sigma_{i}\sigma_{j}} - \sigma_{i}\sigma_{j} X_{i}^{\delta_{\sigma_{i}\sigma_{j}}} \right), \quad \delta = -\sigma. 
\]
(5)

In physical terms, for a given site index \( i \), and with indices \( \{ a, b \} \in \{ 0, \uparrow, \downarrow \} \) limited to the three states of the projected Hilbert space, the operation of \( X_{i}^{ab} \) to its right causes transitions between the initial state \( b \) and the final state \( a \). To yield the correct fermion antisymmetry, the creation operator \( X_{i}^{\sigma_{i}0} \) anti-commutes with creation or destruction operators at different sites with any spin. In terms of these operators we can rewrite
\[
H_{t} = -\sum_{ij} t_{ij} X_{i}^{\sigma_{i}0} X_{j}^{0\sigma_{j}} - \mu \sum_{i} X_{i}^{\sigma_{i}0} 
\]
(6)
\[
H_{J} = -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \sigma_{i} \sigma_{j} X_{i}^{\sigma_{i}0} X_{j}^{\sigma_{j}0} 
\]
(7)

In order to calculate the Greens functions for this model, we add an imaginary time \( \tau \) dependent external potential (or source term) \( \mathcal{A} \) to the definition of thermal averages. The expectation of an arbitrary observable \( Q(\tau_{1}, \ldots) \), composed e.g. of a product of several (imaginary) time ordered Heisenberg picture operators, is written in the notation
\[
\langle \langle Q(\tau_{1}, \ldots) \rangle \rangle = \text{Tr} P_{\beta} T_{\tau}\left\{ e^{-A} Q(\tau_{1}, \ldots) \right\}. 
\]
(8)

Here \( T_{\tau} \) is the time-ordering operator, an external potential term \( \mathcal{A} = \int_{0}^{\beta} d\tau \mathcal{A}((\tau) \), and \( P_{\beta} = e^{-\beta H} / \text{Tr} \left( e^{-\beta H} T_{\tau} e^{-A} \right) \) is the Boltzmann weight factor including \( \mathcal{A} \). Here \( \mathcal{A}(\tau) \) is a sum of two terms, \( \mathcal{A}_{\rho}(\tau) \) involving a density-spin dependent external potential \( \mathcal{V} \), and \( \mathcal{A}_{C}(\tau) \) involving \( J \) (\( J^{\ast} \)) Cooper pair generating (destroying) external potentials. These are given by
\[
\mathcal{A}_{\rho}(\tau) = \sum_{i} \mathcal{V}_{i}^{\sigma_{i}}(\tau) X_{i}^{\sigma_{i}0}(\tau) 
\]
\[
\mathcal{A}_{C}(\tau) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \left( J_{ij}^{\sigma_{i}0}(\tau) X_{i}^{0\sigma_{i}}(\tau) X_{j}^{0\sigma_{j}}(\tau) + J_{ij}^{\sigma_{j}0}(\tau) X_{i}^{\sigma_{i}0}(\tau) X_{j}^{\sigma_{j}0}(\tau) \right) 
\]
(9)
where we require the antisymmetry $J_{i\sigma, j\sigma} = -J_{j\sigma, i\sigma}$, and likewise for $J^*$. The external potentials $J, J^*$ in Eq. (9) couple to operators that add and remove Cooper pairs of correlated electrons, and are essential to describe the superconducting phase. At the end of the calculations, the external potentials are switched off, so that the average in Eq. (8) reduces to the standard thermal average. Tomonaga[21] in 1946 and Schwinger[22] in 1948 (TS) pioneered the use of such external potentials [23, 24]. We next illustrate this technique for the present problem.

2.1 Using external potentials

The advantage of introducing these external potential (or “sources”) is that we can take the (functional) derivatives of Greens function with respect to the added external potentials in order to generate higher order Greens functions. If we abbreviate the external term as $A = \sum_i U_i(\tau) V_i(\tau)$, where $U_i(\tau)$ is one of the above $c$-number potential, and $V_i(\tau)$ is the corresponding operator in the imaginary-time Heisenberg picture, and $Q_i(\tau)$ an arbitrary observable, straightforward differentiation leads to the TS identity

$$\text{Tr} P_\beta \tau \{ e^{-A} Q_i(\tau') V_i(\tau) \} = \langle \langle Q_i(\tau') \rangle \rangle \langle \langle V_i(\tau) \rangle \rangle - \delta \delta_{\hat{U}_i(\tau)} \langle \langle Q_i(\tau') \rangle \rangle \quad (10)$$

This important identity can be found by taking the functional derivative of Eq. (8) with respect to $U_j(\tau)$, and is now illustrated with various choices of the external potential.

From Eq. (10) we note the frequently used result

$$\langle \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \bar{X}_i^{\sigma_j}(\tau) Q(\tau') \rangle \rangle = \left( \gamma_{\sigma_i \sigma_j}(i\tau) - D_{\sigma_i \sigma_j}(i\tau) \right) \langle \langle Q(\tau') \rangle \rangle \quad (11)$$

where

$$\gamma_{\sigma_i \sigma_j}(i\tau) = \sigma_i \sigma_j \langle \langle X_i^{\sigma_j}(\tau) \rangle \rangle$$

$$D_{\sigma_i \sigma_j}(i\tau) = \sigma_i \sigma_j \frac{\delta}{\delta Y_i^{\sigma_j}(\tau)}, \quad (12)$$
The singlet Cooper pair operator is
\[
\left( X_i^{0\uparrow} X_j^{0\downarrow} - X_i^{0\downarrow} X_j^{0\uparrow} \right) = \sigma X_i^{0\sigma} X_j^{0\sigma},
\]
where summation over repeated spin indices is implied, and its Hermitian conjugate
\[
- \left( X_i^{0\uparrow} X_j^{0\downarrow} - X_i^{0\downarrow} X_j^{0\uparrow} \right) = \bar{\sigma} X_i^{0\bar{\sigma}} X_j^{0\bar{\sigma}}.
\]
We denote the Cooper pair correlation functions at time \( \tau \) as
\[
C_{ij}(\tau) = \langle\langle \sigma X_i^{0\sigma}(\tau) X_j^{0\sigma}(\tau) \rangle\rangle
\]
\[
C_{ij}^*(\tau) = \langle\langle \bar{\sigma} X_i^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) X_j^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) \rangle\rangle
\]
We note that \( C_{ij}^* \) equals the complex conjugate of \( C_{ij} \) only after the external potentials are finally turned off, but not so in the intermediate steps.

The basic equation Eq. (10) for the Cooper pair operators for an arbitrary operator \( Q \) are
\[
\bar{\sigma} \frac{\delta}{\delta J_{i\sigma j\bar{\sigma}}(\tau)} \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle X_j^{0\sigma}(\tau) X_i^{0\sigma}(\tau) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle - \langle\langle X_j^{0\sigma}(\tau) X_i^{0\sigma}(\tau) Q \rangle\rangle
\]
\[
\bar{\sigma} \frac{\delta}{\delta J_{i\sigma j\bar{\sigma}}(\tau)} \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle X_j^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) X_i^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) \rangle\rangle \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle - \langle\langle X_j^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) X_i^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) Q \rangle\rangle
\]
From these relations the Cooper-pair correlations can be found by summing over the spins
\[
\langle\langle \sigma X_i^{0\sigma}(\tau) X_j^{0\sigma}(\tau) Q \rangle\rangle = \left[ C_{ij}(\tau) - K_{ij}(\tau) \right] \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle
\]
\[
\langle\langle \bar{\sigma} X_i^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) X_j^{0\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) Q \rangle\rangle = \left[ C_{ij}^*(\tau) - K_{ij}^*(\tau) \right] \langle\langle Q \rangle\rangle
\]
where
\[
K_{ij}(\tau) = \sum_{\sigma} \bar{\sigma} \frac{\delta}{\delta J_{i\sigma j\bar{\sigma}}(\tau)}
\]
\[
K_{ij}^*(\tau) = \sum_{\bar{\sigma}} \bar{\sigma} \frac{\delta}{\delta J_{i\sigma j\bar{\sigma}}(\tau)}.
\]
2.2 Greens functions and their dynamical equations

We are interested in the electron Greens function

\[ G_{\tau, \tau'}^{i\sigma, j\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = -\langle\langle X_0^{\sigma i}(\tau) X_0^{\sigma j}(\tau') \rangle\rangle, \]  

(23)

where the usual time ordering is included in the definition of the brackets Eq. (8). To describe the superconductor, following Gor’kov [15] we define the anomalous Greens function:

\[ F_{\tau, \tau'}^{i\sigma, j\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = \bar{\sigma} \langle\langle X_{\bar{\sigma} i}^{\sigma i}(\tau) X_0^{\sigma j}(\tau') \rangle\rangle \]  

(24)

where \( \bar{\sigma} \equiv -\sigma \).

We note that the Cooper pair correlation functions Eq. (16), which plays a crucial role in defining the order parameter of the superconductor, can be expressed in terms of the anomalous Greens function using

\[ C_{\tau}^{i*} = \sum_{\sigma} F_{\tau, \tau'}^{i\sigma, j\sigma}(\tau, \tau'). \]  

(25)

We will also need the equal time correlation of creation operators \( C_{\tau}^{i}(\tau) \) Eq. (15). It is straightforward to show that when the external potentials \( A \) are switched off, this object is independent of \( \tau \) and can be obtained by complex conjugation of \( C_{\tau}^{i*} \). It is possible to add another anomalous Greens function with two destruction operators as in Eq. (24), corresponding to Nambu’s generalization of Gor’kov’s work. In the present context it adds little to the answers and is avoided by taking the complex conjugate of \( C_{\tau}^{i} \) to evaluate \( C_{\tau} \).

2.2.1 Greens function \( G \)

The equations for the Greens functions follow quite easily from the Heisenberg equations, followed by the use of the identity Eq. (10), and has been discussed extensively by us earlier. There is one new feature, concerning an alternate treatment of the \( H_J \) (exchange) term, necessary for describing superconductivity described below.
Taking the $\tau$ derivative of $G$ we obtain
\[
\partial_\tau \langle \langle X_i^{0\gamma}(\tau) X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle = \delta(\tau - \tau') \delta_f (\delta_0 \sigma_f - \gamma_0 \sigma_f (i\tau)) \\
+ \langle \langle [H_t + H_I + A(\tau), X_i^{0\gamma}(\tau)] X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle
\]  
(26)

We work on the terms on the right hand side. At time $\tau$ we note
\[
[H_t + A(\tau), X_i^{0\gamma}] = \mu X_i^{0\gamma} - \gamma_f^{\sigma\gamma} X_i^{0\gamma} + t_{ij} (\delta_\sigma \sigma_f - \sigma_\gamma \sigma_f) X_j^{0\gamma}. 
\]  
(27)

From this basic commutator, using Eq. (10), Eq. (11) and the definitions Eq. (12) we obtain
\[
\langle \langle [H_t + A(\tau), X_i^{0\gamma}] X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle = \left( \mu \delta_\sigma \sigma_f - \gamma_f^{\sigma\gamma} \right) \langle \langle X_i^{0\gamma}(\tau) X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle \\
+ t_{ij} \langle \langle X_i^{0\gamma}(\tau) X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle - t_{ij} (\gamma_0 \sigma_f (i\tau) - D_\sigma \sigma_f (i\tau)) \langle \langle X_i^{0\gamma}(\tau) X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle
\]  
(28)

For the exchange term
\[
[H_I, X_i^{0\gamma}] = \frac{1}{2} I_{ij} \sum_\sigma \sigma \sigma_f X_i^{0\gamma} X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}
\]  
(29)

\[
= -\frac{1}{2} I_{ij} \sigma \sigma_f X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma} \left( X_i^{0\gamma} X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma} - X_i^{\sigma\rho\gamma} X_j^{0\gamma} \right). 
\]  
(30)

In order to obtain Eq. (30) from Eq. (29), we used $X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma} = X_j^{0\gamma} X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}$ and anticommutated the equal time operators $X_i^{0\gamma} X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}$ into $-X_j^{0\gamma} X_i^{\sigma\rho\gamma}$, followed by summing over $\sigma_f$. This subtle step is essential for obtaining the superconducting phase, since the role of exchange in promoting Cooper pairs manifests itself here. Using Eq. (19) we find
\[
\langle \langle [H_I, X_i^{0\gamma}] X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} I_{ij} \sigma \sigma_f (C_{ij}(\tau^+) - K_{ij}(\tau^+)) \langle \langle X_j^{0\gamma}(\tau) X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle.
\]  
(31)

In treating this term we could have proceeded differently by sticking to Eq. (29), using Eq. (10) with a different external potential term as in Eq. (11) to write
\[
\langle \langle [H_I, X_i^{0\gamma}] X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle = \frac{1}{2} I_{ij} \sum_\sigma \sigma \sigma_f \langle \langle X_i^{0\gamma}(\tau) X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau) \rangle \rangle \\
= -\frac{1}{2} I_{ij} (\gamma_0 \sigma_f (j\tau) - D_\sigma \sigma_f (j\tau)) \langle \langle X_i^{0\gamma}(\tau) X_j^{\sigma\rho\gamma}(\tau') \rangle \rangle.
\]  
(32)
These two expressions Eq. (31) and Eq. (32) are alternate ways of writing the higher order Greens functions [25]. In order to describe a broken symmetry solution with superconductivity, we are required to use Eq. (31), since using the other alternative disconnects the normal and anomalous Greens functions altogether, thereby precluding a superconducting solution.

The term $\langle\langle [A_c(\tau), X_i^{0\sigma_{ij}}(\tau)] X_f^{\sigma_0}(\tau')\rangle\rangle$ generates a term that is linear in $\mathcal{J}$ which is treated similarly and the final result quoted in Eq. (34).

We summarize these equations compactly by defining

$$C_{0ij-r}^{-1} = \delta_{ij} \delta_{\sigma_{ij}} (\mu - \partial_{\tau}) + t_{ij} \delta_{\sigma_{ij}} - \delta_{ij} \gamma_{ij},$$

$$Y_{0ij-r} = t_{ij} \gamma_{ij}(i),$$

$$X_{0ij-r} = -t_{ij} D_{ij}(i),$$

and using a repeated spin index summation notation we write the exact equation

$$(G_{0ij-r}^{-1} - Y_{0ij-r} - X_{0ij-r}) \mathcal{G}_{ij-f}f_f(r, \tau') = \delta(\tau - \tau') \delta_{ij} (\delta_{\sigma_{ij}0} - \gamma_{ij}(i))$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} (C_{ij}(\tau) - \mathcal{K}_{ij}(\tau)) \mathcal{F}_{ij-f}f_f(r, \tau')$$

$$+ \mathcal{J}_{ij-f}f_f(r, \gamma_{ij}(i)) D_{ij}(i) \sigma_0 \mathcal{F}_{ij-f}f_f(r, \tau').$$

The final term drops off when we switch off the external potential $\mathcal{J}$.

2.2.2 Greens function $\mathcal{F}$

The Gor’kov Greens function $\mathcal{F}$ in Eq. (24) satisfies an exact equation that can be found as follows. First we note

$$\partial_{\tau} \langle\langle X_i^{\sigma_0}(\tau) X_f^{\sigma_0}(\tau')\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle [H_t + H_f + A(\tau), X_i^{\sigma_0}(\tau)] X_f^{\sigma_0}(\tau')\rangle\rangle$$

A part of the right hand side satisfies

$$\langle\langle [H_t + A(\tau), X_i^{\sigma_0}(\tau)] X_f^{\sigma_0}(\tau')\rangle\rangle = - (\mu \delta_{\sigma_{ij}} - \gamma_{ij}^{(0)}) \langle\langle X_i^{\sigma_0}(\tau) X_f^{\sigma_0}(\tau')\rangle\rangle$$

$$- t_{ij} \langle\langle X_i^{\sigma_0}(\tau) X_f^{\sigma_0}(\tau')\rangle\rangle + t_{ij} \langle\langle \gamma_{ij}(i\tau) - D_{ij}(i\tau) \rangle\langle X_i^{\sigma_0}(\tau); X_f^{\sigma_0}(\tau')\rangle\rangle$$

The exchange term is treated similarly to Eq. (29)

$$[H_f, X_i^{\sigma_0}] = \frac{1}{2} t_{ij} \left( X_i^{\sigma_0} X_j^{\sigma_0} - X_i^{\sigma_0} X_j^{\sigma_0} \right) \sigma_0 X_i^{\sigma_0}$$

(37)
so that using Eq. (20) we get
\[
\langle\langle [H, X^0_{\tau}] X_f^{\sigma_f (\tau')} \rangle\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} J_{ij} \sigma_i \left( C_{ij}^* (\tau^+) - K_{ij}^* (\tau^+) \right) \langle\langle X^0_{\tau} X_f^{\sigma_f (\tau')} \rangle\rangle
\]
(38)

We gather and summarize these equation in terms of the variables that are “time-reversed” partners of Eq. (34) and hence denoted with hats:
\[
\hat{G}^{-1}_{0i\sigma_i | j\sigma_j} = \delta_{ij} \delta_{\sigma_i \sigma_j} (\mu + \partial_{\tau}) + t_{ij} \delta_{\sigma_i \sigma_j} - \delta_{ij} \gamma_{\sigma_i \sigma_j} \\
\hat{Y}_{i\sigma_i | j\sigma_j} = t_{ij} \gamma_{\sigma_i \sigma_j} (i) \\
\hat{X}_{i\sigma_i | j\sigma_j} = -t_{ij} D_{\sigma_i \sigma_j} (i)
\]
(39)

So that
\[
\left( \hat{G}^{-1}_{0i\sigma_i | j\sigma_j} - \hat{Y}_{i\sigma_i | j\sigma_j} - \hat{X}_{i\sigma_i | j\sigma_j} \right) F_{\sigma_f | \sigma_f} = -\frac{1}{2} J_{ij} \left( C_{ij}^* - K_{ij}^* \right) \hat{G}^{\sigma_f | \sigma_f} \\
+ \sigma_i \sum_m J_{i\sigma_m | \sigma_m} (\delta_{\sigma_m \sigma_n} - \gamma_{\sigma_n \sigma_i} (i) + D_{\sigma_n \sigma_i} (i)) \hat{G}^{\sigma_m | \sigma_f}
\]
(40)

The final term arising from \(\langle\langle [A, X^0_{\tau}] X_f^{\sigma_f (\tau')} \rangle\rangle\) drops off when we switch off the external potential \(J^*\).

2.2.3 Summary of Equation in Symbolic Notation

The equations Eq. (34) and Eq. (40) are exact in the strong correlation limit. Noting that all terms containing \(\gamma\) and \(D\) in Eq. (34) and Eq. (40) arise from Gutzwiller projection, we obtain the corresponding equations for the uncorrelated \(t-J\) model in Eq. (2) by dropping these terms. Recall also that the external potentials \(J, J^*\) represent the imposed symmetry-breaking terms that force superconductivity, and are meant to be dropped at the end. In this uncorrelated case, let us understand the role of the terms with the Cooper pair derivatives \(K, K^*\). If we ignore these terms and also set \(J, J^* \to 0\) right away, the equations Eq. (34) and Eq. (40) reduce to the Gor’kov mean-field equations for the uncorrelated model [15], with the equation Eq. (25)
providing a self consistent determination of \( C_{ij}^* \) in terms of \( \mathcal{F} \). Thus by neglecting the terms with \( \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^* \), the role of the exchange \( J \) is confined to providing the lowest order electron-electron attraction in the Cooper channel, and amounts to neglecting the higher order dressings of the electron self energies and irreducible interaction by terms involving \( J \).

In the correlated problem strong interactions already strongly modify the Greens function \( \mathcal{G} \) from \( G_0 \), and the self energy terms due to \( J \) are minor\[14\]. The role of \( J \) is of course significant in providing a mechanism for superconducting pairing, so we shall retain that. Keeping this in mind, we drop the terms involving \( \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^*, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}^* \) in Eq. (34) and Eq. (40). This suffices for our initial goal, of generalizing a Gor’kov type\[15\] mean-field treatment of Eq. (2) to the strongly correlated problem Eq. (1).

Multiplying the \( \gamma \) and \( D \) terms, or equivalently the \( X \) and \( Y \) terms with \( \lambda \) and expanding the resulting equations systematically in this parameter constitutes the \( \lambda \)-expansion that we discuss below.

With these remarks in mind we make the following changes to the equations Eq. (34) and Eq. (40):

(i) We drop the terms proportional to \( \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}^* \) and the corresponding derivative terms \( \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^* \).

(ii) Defining the gap functions:

\[
\Delta_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} J_{ij} C_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{ij}^* = \frac{1}{2} J_{ij} C_{ij}^*
\]

(41)

(iii) We scale the each occurrence of \( \gamma, X, Y, \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y} \) by \( \lambda \).

With these changes we write the modified Eq. (34) and Eq. (40):

\[
(G^{-1} - \lambda Y_{i\sigma j\sigma j} - \lambda X_{i\sigma j\sigma j}) G_{j\sigma f\sigma f} = \delta(\tau - \tau') \delta_{\sigma f}(\delta_{\sigma f} - \lambda \gamma_{\sigma f}(i)) + \Delta_{ij} \mathcal{F}_{j\sigma f\sigma f}
\]

(42)

\[
(G^{-1} - \lambda \tilde{Y}_{i\sigma j\sigma j} - \lambda \tilde{X}_{i\sigma j\sigma j}) \tilde{G}_{j\sigma f\sigma f} = -\Delta_{ij}^* \mathcal{G}_{j\sigma f\sigma f}
\]

(43)

and the self consistency condition Eq. (16) and Eq. (25) fix the correlation functions \( C \)'s in terms of \( \mathcal{F} \). As \( \lambda \to 0 \) we get back the meanfield
equations of Gor’kov for the uncorrelated-J model. The \( \lambda \) parameter governs the density of doubly occupied states, and hence a series expansion in this parameter builds in Gutzwiller type correlations systematically. We expand the Greens functions to required order in \( \lambda \) and finally set \( \lambda = 1 \).

We write Eq. (42) and Eq. (43) symbolically as

\[
(\mathbf{g}_0^{-1} - \lambda \mathbf{Y} - \lambda \mathbf{X}) \mathcal{G} = (\mathbf{1} - \lambda \mathbf{\gamma}) + \Delta \mathcal{F} \quad (44)
\]

\[
(\mathbf{\bar{g}}_0^{-1} - \lambda \mathbf{\bar{Y}} - \lambda \mathbf{\bar{X}}) \mathcal{F} = -\Delta^* \mathcal{G} \quad (45)
\]

where the symbols \( \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F} \) etc are regarded as matrices in the space, spin and time variables, with the dot indicating matrix multiplication or time convolution. In the case of \( \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\bar{X}} \) it also indicates taking the necessary functional derivatives.

3 Expansion of the Equations in \( \lambda \)

We decompose of both Greens functions in Eq. (44) and Eq. (45) as

\[
\mathcal{G} = \mathbf{g} \tilde{\mu}, \quad \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{f} \bar{\mu} \quad (46)
\]

where \( \tilde{\mu} \) is a function of spin, space and time that is common to both Greens function. As an example of the notation, the equation \( \mathcal{G} = \mathbf{g} \tilde{\mu} \) stands for \( \mathcal{G}_{i\sigma j\sigma'}(\tau_i, \tau_j) = \sum_{k\sigma} \int_0^\beta d\tau_k \mathbf{g}_{i\sigma k\sigma}(\tau_i, \tau_k) \tilde{\mu}_{k\sigma' j\sigma'}(\tau_k, \tau_j) \). Here \( \bar{\mu} \) is called the caparison (i.e. a further dressing) function, in a similar treatment of the normal state Greens function. The terms \( \mathbf{g} \) and \( \mathbf{f} \) are called the auxiliary Greens function. The basic idea is that this type of factorization can reduce Eq. (44), to a canonical type equation for \( \mathbf{g} \), where the terms \( \mathbf{1} - \lambda \mathbf{\gamma} \) is replaced by \( \mathbf{1} \). We remark that this is a technically important step since the term \( \mathbf{1} - \lambda \mathbf{\gamma} \) modifies the coefficient of the delta function in time, and encodes the distinction between canonical and non-canonical fermions.

To simplify further, we note that \( \mathbf{X} \) contains a functional derivative with respect to \( \mathcal{V} \), acting on objects to its right. When acting on a pair of objects, e.g. \( \mathbf{X} \mathcal{G} = X \mathbf{g} \tilde{\mu} \), we generate two terms. One term is
(X,g)\tilde{\mu}, where the bracket, temporarily provided here, indicates that the operation of X is confined to it. The second term has the derivative acting on \tilde{\mu} only, but the matrix product sequence is unchanged from the first term. We write the two terms together as

\[ X.g.\tilde{\mu} = \overrightarrow{X.g.\mu} + \overrightarrow{X.g.\mu}, \]  

(47)

so that the ‘contraction’ symbol refers to the differentiation by X, and the ‘.’ symbol refers to the matrix structure. We may view this as the Leibnitz product rule.

Let us now operate with X on the identity g\cdot g^{-1} = 1, where g^{-1} is the matrix inverse of g. Using the Leibnitz product rule, we find

\[ \overrightarrow{X.g} = - \left( \overrightarrow{X.g.g^{-1}} \right) \cdot g \]  

(48)

and hence we can rewrite Eq. (47) in the useful form

\[ X.g.\tilde{\mu} = - \left( \overrightarrow{X.g.g^{-1}} \right) \cdot g + \overrightarrow{X.g.\mu}. \]  

(49)

With this preparation we rewrite Eq. (44) the equation for \mathcal{G} as

\[ (g_0^{-1} - \lambda Y + \lambda \left( \overrightarrow{X.g.g^{-1}} \right) ) \cdot g.\tilde{\mu} = (1 - \lambda \gamma) + \Delta.f.\tilde{\mu} + \lambda \overrightarrow{X.g.\mu} \]  

(50)

We now choose g, f such that

\[ (g_0^{-1} - \lambda Y + \lambda \left( \overrightarrow{X.g.g^{-1}} \right) ) \cdot g = 1 + \Delta.f. \]  

(51)

Substituting Eq. (51) into Eq. (50), we find that \tilde{\mu} satisfies the equation

\[ \tilde{\mu} = (1 - \lambda \gamma) + \lambda \overrightarrow{X.g.\mu}. \]  

(52)

Note that Eq. (51) has the structure of a canonical equation since we replaced the 1 - \lambda \gamma term by 1 in Eq. (50). Thus the non-canonical Eq. (44) for \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F} is replaced by a pair of canonical equations for g, \tilde{\mu}. In Eq. (51) we note that the action of X is confined to the bracket \lambda \left( \overrightarrow{X.g.g^{-1}} \right), unlike the term \lambda X.\mathcal{G} in the initial Eq. (44). We may thus view the term in bracket in Eq. (51) as a proper self energy for g.
For treating the equation for $F$ Eq. (45) we use the same scheme Eq. (46) and find

$$
\hat{X} \cdot \mathcal{F} = \hat{X} \cdot f \hat{\mu}
$$

With this we rewrite Eq. (45) after cancelling an overall right multiplying factor $\hat{\mu}$

$$(\hat{g}_0^{-1} - \lambda \hat{Y} + \lambda \hat{X} \cdot f \cdot f^{-1}) \cdot f = -\Delta^* \cdot g + \lambda \hat{X} \cdot f \cdot \hat{\mu} \cdot (53)$$

Summarizing we need to solve for $f, g, \hat{\mu}, \Delta^*$ from Eqs. (51,52,54) by iteration in powers of $\lambda$.

### 3.1 Simplified Equations near $T_c$

For the present work, we note that the equation Eq. (54) simplifies considerably, if we work close to $T_c$. This truncated scheme is sufficient to determine $T_c$ for low orders in $\lambda$. In the regime $T \sim T_c$, $f$ may be assumed to be very small, enabling us to throw away all terms of $O(f^2)$ and also to discard terms of $O(\lambda f)$ giving

$$
f = -\hat{g}_0 \cdot \Delta^* \cdot g + o(\lambda f),
$$

so that Eq. (51) can be written as

$$
g^{-1} = g_0^{-1} - \lambda Y + \lambda \left( \hat{X} \cdot g \cdot g^{-1} \right) + \Delta \hat{g}_0 \cdot \Delta^*
$$

In this limit the above two are the equations $O(\lambda^2)$ required to be solved, together with Eq. (52) and the self consistency condition Eq. (41), Eq. (25). The latter can be combined with Eq. (24) as

$$
\Delta_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} I_{ij} C_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2} I_{ij} \sum_{\sigma} F_{i\sigma j\sigma}(\sigma^+, \sigma)
$$

and further reduced using Eq. (46). On turning off the external potentials we recover time translation invariance. We next perform a fourier transform to fermionic Matsubara frequencies $\omega_n = \frac{n}{\beta} \cdot (2n + 1)$ using the definition $\mathcal{F}(\tau) = \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n e^{-i\omega_n \tau} \mathcal{F}(i\omega_n)$, and write Eq. (46) in the frequency domain as

$$
\mathcal{F}_{pr}(i\omega_n) = f_{pr}(i\omega_n) \hat{\mu}_{pr}(i\omega_n).
$$
Thus taking spatial fourier transforms with the definition

$$J(q) = 2J \left( \cos q_x + \cos q_y \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (59)$$

so that the self consistency condition Eq. (57) finally reduces to

$$\Delta^*(k) = -\frac{1}{2\beta} \sum_{p \sigma \omega_n} J(k - p) f_{\sigma \rho}(i \omega_n) \tilde{\mu}_{\rho \sigma}(i \omega_n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (60)$$

We may write Eq. (55) as

$$f_{\sigma \rho}(i \omega_n) = -\tilde{g}_{\rho \sigma}(p, i \omega_n) \Delta^*(p) g_{\sigma \rho}(p, i \omega_n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (61)$$

where the time reversed free Greens function

$$\tilde{g}_0(p, i \omega_n) = \frac{1}{-i \omega_n + \mu_0 - \epsilon - p} = \frac{1}{-i \omega_n - \xi_p}$$  \hspace{1cm} (62)$$

with $\xi = \epsilon_p - \mu_0$ and by using $\epsilon_p = \epsilon_{-p}$, and $\mu_0$ is taken as the non-interacting system chemical potential, discarding the corrections of $\mu$ due to $\lambda$. Therefore Eq. (60) becomes

$$\Delta^*(k) = \frac{1}{2\beta} \sum_{p \sigma \omega_n} J(k - p) \tilde{g}_{\rho \sigma}(p, i \omega_n) \Delta^*(p) g_{\sigma \rho}(p, i \omega_n) \tilde{\mu}_{\rho \sigma}(i \omega_n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (63)$$

Here $g$ is taken from Eq. (56), i.e. the $O(\lambda^2)$ Greens function with a small correction (for $T \sim T_c$) from the gap $\Delta$. Performing the spin summation and recombining $g, \tilde{\mu} = \mathcal{G}$, we get the equation in terms of the physical electron Greens function

$$\Delta^*(k) = \frac{1}{2\beta} \sum_{p \sigma \omega_n} J(k - p) \tilde{g}_0(p, i \omega_n) \Delta^*(p) \mathcal{G}(p, i \omega_n).$$  \hspace{1cm} (64)$$

Here again the physical electron Greens function $\mathcal{G}$ is taken from the $O(\lambda^2)$ theory if we neglect the corrections from the gap, which vanishes above $T_c$ anyway. We express the physical Greens function in terms of its spectral function $A(p, \nu)$

$$\mathcal{G}(p, i \omega_n) = \int d\nu \frac{A(p, \nu)}{i \omega_n - \nu}$$  \hspace{1cm} (65)$$
The frequency integral in Eq. (57) can be performed as
\[
\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{\omega_n} \tilde{g}_0(p,i\omega_n) G(p,i\omega_n) = \int dv \ A(p,v) \frac{1 - f(v) - f(\xi_p)}{v + \xi_p}.
\] (66)

where \( f \) is the fermi distribution \( f(v) = 1/(1 + \exp \beta v) \). Hence
\[
\Delta^*(k) = \sum_p J(k - p) \Delta^*(p) \int dv \ A(p,v) \frac{1 - f(v) - f(\xi_p)}{v + \xi_p}.
\] (67)

In summary this eigenvalue type equation for \( \Delta^*(k) \), together with the spectral function \( A(p,v) \) determined from the \( O(\lambda^2) \) Greens function in Eq. (56), gives the self-consistent gap near \( T_c \). At sufficiently high temperatures, i.e. in the normal state \( T > T_c \), the gap \( \Delta^* \) vanishes, so that \( A \) is independent of \( \Delta^* \). In this case Eq. (67) reduces to a linear integral equation for \( \Delta^* \). We may then determine \( T_c \) from the condition that the largest eigenvalue crosses 1. For this purpose we only need the normal state electron spectral function of the strongly correlated metal.

4 Estimate of \( T_c \)

4.1 Equation for determining \( T_c \)

The condition for obtaining a d-wave superconducting state is given by setting \( T = T_c^+ \) in Eq. (67) writing \( \Delta^*(k) = \Delta_0(\cos k_x - \cos k_y) \), using the normal state spectral function for \( A \) and canceling an overall factor \( \Delta_0(\cos k_x - \cos k_y) \). Following these steps we get
\[
1 = J \sum_p \{ \cos(p_x) - \cos(p_y) \}^2 \int dv \ \frac{1 - f(v) - f(\epsilon_p - \mu_0)}{v + \epsilon_p - \mu_0} A(p,v) \bigg|_{T_c}.
\] (68)

Instead of working with Eq. (68), it is convenient to make a useful simplification for the average over angles. Since Eq. (68) is largest when \( \vec{p} \) is on the fermi surface, we factorize the two terms and write
\[
1 = J \Psi(\mu_0) \Gamma \\
\Gamma = \sum_p \int dv \ \frac{1 - f(v) - f(\epsilon_p - \mu_0)}{v + \epsilon_p - \mu_0} A(p,v) \bigg|_{T_c}.
\] (69)

(70)
where $\Gamma$ is a particle-particle type susceptibility. Here $\Psi(\mu_0)$ is more correctly the weighted average of $\{\cos(p_x) - \cos(p_y)\}^2$ with a weight function that is the integrand in Eq. (70). We simplify it to the fermi surface averaged momentum space d-wavefunction

$$\Psi(\mu_0) = \frac{1}{n(\mu_0)} \sum_p \{\cos(p_x) - \cos(p_y)\}^2 \delta(\varepsilon_p - \mu_0) \tag{71}$$

where $n(\varepsilon)$ is the band density of states (DOS) per spin and per site, at energy $\varepsilon$,

$$n(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_p \delta(\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon). \tag{72}$$

Using this simplification and performing the angular averaging over the energy surface $\varepsilon_p = \varepsilon$, we write the (particle-particle) susceptibility $\Gamma$ (Eq. (70)) as

$$\Gamma = \int d\varepsilon \int d\nu \frac{1 - f(\nu) - f(\varepsilon - \mu_0)}{\nu + \varepsilon - \mu_0} \left| A(\varepsilon, \nu) \right|_{T_c}, \tag{73}$$

where $A(\varepsilon, \nu)$ is the angle-averaged version of the spectral function $A(p, \nu)$. We estimate this expression below for the extremely correlated fermi liquid, by using a simple model for the spectral function $A$.

In Eq. (73) if we replace the spectral function $A$ by the (fermi gas) non-interacting result $A_0(\varepsilon, \mu_0) = \delta(\varepsilon - \mu_0 + \mu_0)$, we obtain the Gor’kov-BCS mean-field theory, where the susceptibility $\Gamma$ reduces to

$$\int d\varepsilon \frac{n(\varepsilon) \tanh \frac{1}{2} \beta_c (\varepsilon - \mu_0)}{2(\varepsilon - \mu_0)}.$$ 

This expression is evaluated by expanding around the fermi energy, and utilizing the low T formula $\int_0^{W_0} d\varepsilon \tanh \frac{1}{2} \beta_c e \sim \log \left[ \frac{\zeta_0 W_0}{k_B T_c} \right]$, where $W_0$ is the half-bandwidth and $\zeta_0 = 1.13387 \ldots$. Equating $\Gamma$ to $1/\Psi(\mu_0)$ gives the d-wave superconducting transition temperature for the uncorrelated $t$-$J$ model

$$k_B T_c^{(un)} \sim 1.134 W_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$, \tag{74}$$
with the superconducting coupling constant

\[ g = j \Psi(\mu_0)n(\mu_0), \]  

(75)

is positive by our definition.

4.2 Model spectral function

We next use a simple model spectral function to estimate these integrals. It has the great advantage that we can carry out most integrations analytically and get approximate but closed form analytical expressions for \( T_c \), which provide useful insights. The model spectral function contains the following essential features of strong correlations namely:

- A quasiparticle part with fermi liquid type parameters, where the quasiparticle weight \( Z \) goes to 0 at half filling \( n = 1 \), and
- A wide background.

The model spectral function used is in the spirit of Landau’s fermi liquid theory\[26, 27, 28\] with suitable modifications due to strong correlation effects\[14\]. We take the spectral function as

\[ A(\epsilon, \nu) = Z\delta(\nu - \frac{m}{m^*}\epsilon) + (1 - Z) \frac{1}{2W_0} \Theta(W_0 - |\nu|). \]  

(76)

Here \( \Theta(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{x}{|x|}) \), \( W_0 \) the half-bandwidth \( \frac{m}{m^*} \) is the renormalized effective mass of the fermions, and \( Z \) is the fermi liquid renormalization factor. The first term is the quasiparticle part with weight \( Z \), and second part represents the background modeled as an inverted square-well. Integration over \( \nu \) gives unity at each energy \( \epsilon \). \( Z \) is chosen to reflect the fact that we are dealing with a doped Mott-Hubbard insulator so it must vanish at \( n = 1 \). For providing a simple estimate we use Gutzwiller’s result \[29, 30\]

\[ Z = 1 - n. \]  

(77)
The effective mass is related to $Z$ and the $k$-dependent Dyson self-energy $\Sigma$ through the standard fermi liquid theory\[26, 27, 28\] formula

$$\frac{m}{m^*} = Z \times \left(1 + \frac{\partial \Sigma(k, \mu)}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{k_F}. \quad (78)$$

The Landau fermi liquid renormalization factor $\frac{m}{m^*}$ can be inferred from heat capacity experiments provided the bare density of states is assumed known.

Using Eq. (76) in Eq. (73) and decomposing the susceptibility $\Gamma$ into a quasiparticle and background part, the equation determining $T_c$ is:

$$(\Gamma_{QP} + \Gamma_B) \bigg|_{T \to T_c} = \frac{1}{f(\mu)} \quad (79)$$

$$\Gamma_{QP} = Z \int d\epsilon n(\epsilon) \frac{1 - f(\epsilon - \mu_0) - f(\frac{m}{m^*}(\epsilon - \mu_0))}{(\epsilon - \mu_0)(1 + \frac{m}{m^*})} \quad (80)$$

$$\Gamma_B = \frac{(1 - Z)}{2W_0} \int d\epsilon n(\epsilon) \int_{-W_0}^{W_0} dv \frac{1 - f(\epsilon - \mu_0) - f(\nu)}{(\epsilon - \mu_0) + \nu}. \quad (81)$$

Using the same approximations that lead to Eq. (74) the $\Gamma_{QP}$ can be evaluated as

$$\Gamma_{QP} = \frac{Zn(\mu_0)}{1 + \frac{m}{m^*}} \int_0^{W_0} \frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon} \left( \tanh \frac{\epsilon}{2k_B T} - \tanh \frac{\epsilon m / m^*}{2k_B T} \right), \quad (82)$$

and hence at low enough $T$ the estimate

$$\Gamma_{QP} \sim n(\mu_0) \frac{2Z}{1 + \frac{m}{m^*}} \log \left[ \frac{\xi_0 W_0 \sqrt{\frac{m}{m^*}}}{k_B T} \right]. \quad (83)$$

Unlike the quasiparticle part with this $\log T$ behavior at low $T$, the background part is nonsingular as $T \to 0$, since a double integral over the region of small $\epsilon - \mu_0$ and $\nu$ is involved. It can be estimated by setting $T = 0$, $\epsilon - \mu_0 \sim \epsilon$ and replacing $n(\epsilon) \sim n(\mu_0)$. With

$$\Gamma_B \equiv n(\mu_0) \gamma_B, \quad (84)$$

$$\gamma_B = \frac{(1 - Z)}{2W_0} \int_{-W_0}^{W_0} \int_{-W_0}^{W_0} \frac{1 \text{sign}(\epsilon) + \text{sign}(\nu)}{\epsilon + \nu} d\epsilon dv. \quad (85)$$
Integrating this expression we obtain

$$\gamma_B = (1 - Z) \log 4.$$  \hspace{1cm} (86)

Combining Eqs. (79,83,86) we find

$$k_B T_c \sim 1.134 W_0 \times \sqrt{\frac{m}{m^*}} \times e^{-\frac{1}{s_{\text{eff}}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (87)

where the effective superconducting coupling:

$$s_{\text{eff}} = \frac{2Z}{(1 + \frac{m}{m^*})} \left\{ J_{\text{eff}} \Psi(\mu_0)n(\mu_0) \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (88)

and an effective exchange

$$J_{\text{eff}} = \frac{J}{1 - \gamma_B \Psi(\mu_0)n(\mu_0)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (89)

where the denominator represents an enhancement due to the background spectral weight. In comparing Eq. (87) with the uncorrelated result Eq. (74) several changes are visible. The bandwidth prefactor is reduced by correlations due to the factor of $\sqrt{\frac{m}{m^*}} \ll 1$. This factor vanishes as $n \to 1$ thereby diminishing superconducting $T_c$ in the close proximity of the insulator. A similar but even more drastic effect arises from multiplying factor $\frac{2Z}{(1 + \frac{m}{m^*})}$ in the coupling $s_{\text{eff}}$ Eq. (88). This term reflects the quasiparticle weight in the pairing process, and vanishes near the insulating state. Being situated in the exponential, it kills superconductivity even more effectively than the bandwidth prefactor. Away from the close proximity of the insulator other terms in $s_{\text{eff}}$ become prominent, allowing for the possibility of superconductivity. Amongst them is the replacement of the exchange energy by $J_{\text{eff}}$. In a density range where $\Psi(\mu_0)n(\mu_0)$ is appreciable, this enhances $J_{\text{eff}}$ over $J$ due to the feedback nature of Eq. (89), and has an important impact on determining the phase region with superconductivity.

4.3 Numerical Estimates of $T_c$

We turn to the task of estimating the order of magnitude of the $T_c$ in this model. When we take typical values for cuprate systems: $W_0$ ~
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$10^4$K (i.e. $\sim 1$ eV) and $J \sim 10^3$K (i.e. $\sim 0.1$ eV), the transition temperature of the uncorrelated model $T_c^{(un)}$ Eq. (74) is a few thousand K, at most densities. It remains robustly non-zero at half filling, since in this formula correlation effects are yet to be built in and the Mott-Hubbard insulator is missing. For the correlated system, we estimate $T_c$ from Eq. (87) using similar values of model parameters. The terms arising from correlations in Eq. (87) are guaranteed to suppress superconductivity near the insulating state, since $Z \to 0$ and the quasiparticle is lost. A more refined question is whether an intermediate density regime ($\delta > 0$) can support superconductivity. And if so, whether the temperature scales are robust enough to be observable. The answer is yes to both questions, within the approximations made.

4.3.1 Choice of model parameters

In order to estimate the order of magnitude of the $T_c$, its dependence on $J$ and band parameters, we choose parameters similar to those used in contemporary studies for the single layer High $T_c$ compound $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$. The hopping Hamiltonian $-\sum_{ij} t_{ij} \tilde{C}_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} \tilde{C}_{j\sigma}$, gives rise to band energy dispersion $\varepsilon(\vec{k}) = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y) - 4t' \cos k_x \cos k_y - 2t''(\cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y)$ on a square lattice. Thus the hopping amplitudes $t_{ij}$ are equal to $t$ when $i, j$ are nearest neighbors, $t'$ when $i, j$ are second-nearest neighbors, and $t''$ when $i, j$ are third-nearest neighbors. For this system we will use the values [31, 13]

$$t = 0.45 \text{ eV}, \; t'/t = -0.16 \pm 0.02, \; t''/t = .01. \quad (90)$$

This parameter set is roughly consistent with the experimentally determined fermi surface of $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ [31], we comment below on considerations leading to a more precise choice. The tight binding band extends from $-W_0 \leq \varepsilon \leq W_0$, where $W_0 = 4t$, neglecting a small shift due to $t'$. The exchange energy is chosen to be

$$J/t = 0.3, \; \text{or} \; J/k_B \sim 1550K, \quad (91)$$

as determined from two magnon Raman experiments[32] on the parent insulating $La_2CuO_4$. Note that the $t$-$J$ model is obtainable from
the Hubbard model by performing a large $U/t$ super-exchange expansion, giving $J = \frac{4t^2}{U}$. Thus our choice of $J$ corresponds to a strong coupling type magnitude of $U/t \sim 13.3$ in the Hubbard model, placing it in a perturbatively inaccessible regime of that model.

We now discuss the enhancement of effective mass $\frac{m}{m^*}$ \[33\]. In the proximity of the Mott-Hubbard insulating state $n \to 1$, an enhancement in $\frac{m}{m^*}$ is expected on general grounds, reflecting a diminished thermal excitation energy scale due to band narrowing. For illustrating the role of this parameter we use two complementary estimates

\[ \frac{m}{m^*} \sim 3.4 (1 - n), \quad (a) \]
\[ \frac{m}{m^*} = Z, \quad (b) \]

where estimate (a) gives a two-fold enhancement of $\frac{m}{m^*}$ at $\delta = .15$, while estimate (b), obtained by neglecting the $k$ dependence of the self energy in Eq. (78), gives a seven-fold enhancement. The formulas used are simple enough so that the effect other estimates for $\frac{m}{m^*}$ should be easy enough for the reader to gauge.

4.3.2 Results

In Fig. (1) the superconducting transition temperature for d-wave symmetry is shown as a function of the hole density $\delta = 1 - n$ where the band parameters are indicated in the caption. It shows that $T_c$ is maximum at $\delta \sim 0.15$ and falls off rapidly as one moves away from that density in either direction. The scale of $T_c$ is a few hundred K, which is an order of magnitude lower than that of the uncorrelated system. The small kink-like features to the right of the peak reflect structure in the DOS shown as inset in Fig. (2). In Fig. (2) the effective superconducting coupling $g_{eff}$ is shown for three different symmetries of the Cooper pairs: d-wave, extended s-wave, and s $+ id$-wave. It is clear that within this theory, only d-wave symmetry leads to robust superconductivity, the other two symmetries lead to effects too small to be observable. From Fig. (3) we see that the peak density is shifted
Figure 1: The superconducting transition temperature for the correlated model $T_c$ (Eq. (87)) ($t'/t = -0.159$, $t''/t = 0.01$, $m^* = Z$). The scale of the maximum transition temperature is smaller by an order of magnitude from the uncorrelated model. As the insulator is approached $\delta \to 0$, and $T_c$ decreases drastically. This is easy to understand since the quasiparticle weight $Z$ shrinks on approaching the insulating state, killing the coupling $g_{\text{eff}}$ Eq. (88). When $\delta$ goes beyond the peak (optimum) value, the effective superconducting coupling $g_{\text{eff}}$ again falls off as seen in Fig. (2) and in Fig. (5) due to the other factors in Eq. (88). When $g_{\text{eff}}$ drops below $\sim 0.12$, the resulting $T_c$ is negligible.
Figure 2: The figure and inset use $t'/t = -0.159$, $t''/t = 0.01$, and $m/m^* = Z$. The effective superconducting coupling $g_{\text{eff}}$ (Eq. (88)) for three Cooper pair symmetries: (i)(blue) d-wavefunction $\langle \{ \cos(k_x) - \cos(k_y) \}^2 \rangle_{FS}$, (ii)(brown) extended s-wavefunction $\langle \{ \cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y) \}^2 \rangle_{FS}$, and (iii)(magenta) $s + id$ wavefunction $\langle \{ \cos^2(k_x) + \cos^2(k_y) \} \rangle_{FS}$. For the d-wavefunction, the drastic decrease of $T_c$ on both sides of the peak values in Fig. (1) can be understood by referring to the second y-axis, giving the temperature scale $T_c^{app} = 10^4 e^{-\frac{1}{m'}}$ K. This scale provides an order of magnitude of $T_c$ at a given $g_{\text{eff}}$ by assuming a prefactor $10^4$K. It illustrates the rapid reduction of $T_c$ when $g_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 0.12$. The other two symmetries lead to much smaller couplings and are therefore ineffective. Inset: The band DOS at the fermi energy shows an enhancement around the hole density $\delta = 0.15$. 
Figure 3: The superconducting transition temperature for the correlated model $T_c$ (Eq. (87)) for three parameter sets- (i) (red) $t'/t= -0.159, t''/t= 0.01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.15$, (ii) (blue) $t'/t= -0.137, t''/t= .01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.13$ and (iii) (purple) $t'/t= -0.181, t''/t= 0.01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.17$. The solid lines use $m^*_F = Z$ for and the dashed lines $m^*_F = 3.4\delta$. \textbf{Inset:} $\Psi(\mu_0)$ the fermi surface averaged $d$-wavefunction $\langle \{\cos(k_x) - \cos(k_y)\}^2 \rangle_{FS}$ is shown for the three sets of band parameters. The peak values occur at the densities where $T_c$ is highest. Their peak magnitude $\sim 3.2$ indicates a strong constructive interference effect from $\vec{k} \sim \{\pm \pi, 0\}, \{0, \pm \pi\}$, where $|\cos(k_x) - \cos(k_y)| \sim 2$. 

\begin{align*}
\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.15, \quad \delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.13, \quad \delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.17.
\end{align*}
by varying the band hopping parameters. As the peak density moves towards small \( \delta \), its height falls rapidly. This is understandable as the effect of the quasiparticle weight \( Z \) in the formulas Eqs. (87,88). We also note that the use of different expressions for the effective mass in Eqs. (92,93) change the width of the allowed regions somewhat, but are quite comparable.

The inset in Fig. (3) displays the d-wavefunction averages corresponding to the same sets of parameters. It is interesting to note that the height of the peaks \( \Psi_{\max} \sim 3.2 \) are close to their upper bound 4, from a type of constructive interference that requires comment. Note first that the DOS can be expressed as a line integral in the octant of the Brillouin zone \( n(\mu_0) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{0}^{k_{\max}} \frac{dk_x}{|v_y(k)|} \), where the velocity \( v_y(k) = 2 \sin(k_y)(t + 2t' \cos k_x + 4t'' \cos k_y) \) is evaluated with \( k_y \to k_y(k_x, \mu_0) \) on the fermi surface. Thus the region of small \( |v_y| \) dominates the integral. If \( v_y \) vanishes on the fermi surface, we get a (logarithmic van Hove) peak in the DOS. Now the average of \( \Psi(\mu_0) \) is largest, when \( \bar{k} \) is close to \( \{ \pm \pi, 0 \} \) and \( \{ 0, \pm \pi \} \). Therefore if the fermi surface passes through \( \{ \pm \pi, 0 \} \) and \( \{ 0, \pm \pi \} \) for an “ideal density”, then we simultaneously maximize the average of \( \Psi \), and obtain a large DOS. The condition for this is found by equating the band energy at \( \{ \pm \pi, 0 \} \) to the chemical potential \( \mu_0 = 4t' - 4t'' \), thereby fixing the corresponding density \( \delta \). It follows that a given \( \delta \) can be found from several different sets of the parameters \( t', t'' \). The inset of Fig. (3) shows the average \( \Psi(\mu_0) \) displays peaks, the middle one (red) coincides in location with the peak in the DOS in the inset of Fig. (2).

In Fig. (4) we illustrate the role of the feedback enhancement of the exchange \( J \) due to the background spectral function discussed in Eq. (89). For each set of parameters, there is a density region where both the DOS at the fermi energy and the averaged d-wavefunction are enhanced, and the confluence directly enhances \( J_{\text{eff}} \). In turn this is reflected in the superconducting coupling \( g_{\text{eff}} \). In Fig. (5) we see how the confluence of enhancements in the DOS and in the d-wavefunction \( \Psi(\mu_0) \), further boosts the superconducting coupling \( g_{\text{eff}} \) and offsets to
Figure 4: The effective exchange $J_{\text{eff}}$ from Eq. (89) for the three parameter sets- (i) (red) $t'/t = -0.159$, $t''/t= 0.01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.15$, (ii) (blue) $t'/t= -0.137$, $t''/t = .01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}}=0.13$ and (iii)(purple) $t'/t= -0.181$, $t''/t= 0.01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}}=0.17$. Since we assumed $J/t \sim 0.3$ (Eq. (89)), $J_{\text{eff}}/t$ is considerably enhanced in the range of densities exhibiting high $T_c$. This enhancement in turn boosts up $g_{\text{eff}}$, via Eq. (88), and hence plays an important role in giving an observable magnitude of $T_c$ in Fig. (1) and Fig. (3).

Figure 5: The effective superconducting coupling $g_{\text{eff}}$ (Eq. (88)) for the three curves in Fig. (3), with parameter sets- (i) (red) $t'/t = -0.159$, $t''/t= 0.01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.15$, (ii) (blue) $t'/t= -0.137$, $t''/t = .01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.13$ and (iii)(purple) $t'/t= -0.181$, $t''/t= 0.01$ with $\delta_{\text{peak}} = 0.17$. The drastic decrease of $T_c$ on both sides of the peak values in Fig. (3) can be understood by referring to the the second y-axis, giving the approximate temperature scale $T_c^{\text{appx}} = 10^4 \times e^{-\frac{1}{g_{\text{eff}}}} \text{ K.}$
some extent the suppression due to a small magnitude of \( Z \), as seen in Eq. (88). As a result of this competition \( T_c \) turns out to be in the observable range. The additional y-axis in Fig. (5) translates the superconducting coupling \( g_{\text{eff}} \) to an order of magnitude type transition temperature \( T_{c^{\text{appx}}} = 10^4 e^{-1/g_{\text{eff}}} K \). This scale helps us to understand why \( T_c \) falls off so rapidly when \( \delta \) increases beyond the peak value where the coupling \( g_{\text{eff}} \) falls below \( \sim 0.12 \), thereby rapidly suppressing \( T_c \).

5 Conclusions

This work presents a new methodology for treating extremely correlated superconductors. The exact equations of the normal and anomalous Greens functions in the superconductor are derived. These are further expanded in powers of a control parameter \( \lambda \) related to the density of double occupancy, and the second order equations are given in Eqs. (51,52,54), together with the self consistency conditions Eqs. (25,41). A further simplification is possible for \( T \sim T_c \) where the anomalous terms are small. This leads to a tractable condition for \( T_c \) given in Eq. (69), expressed in terms of the electron spectral function. Further analysis uses a model spectral function Eq. (76), which is simple enough to yield an explicit expression for \( T_c \) in Eq. (87). More elaborate calculations should be feasible upon the availability of reliable spectral functions, when one may directly solve Eq. (68).

The present approximate calculation gives an insight into the factors determining \( T_c \) in this model. We see that in the optimal \( T_c \) case that the average of the d-wavefunction Eq. (71) peaks simultaneously with the DOS. This is possible when the energy bands at the fermi energy pass through \( \{ \pi, 0 \} \) and symmetry related points in the Brillouin zone. This peaking of the d-wavefunction average has the potential for verification in photoemission studies.

In the approximation used here, the maximum \( T_c \) is nominally unbounded in a narrow density range here due to the logarithmic singu-
larity of the DOS. It is expected to be cutoff to a finite value of $O(10^2\text{K})$ due to a more exact integration over energies, when using a reliable spectral function instead of Eq. (76). Such an integration would also supersede the Gor’kov-type approximation of expanding around the fermi surface ($\int d\epsilon \, n(\epsilon) \sim n(\mu_0) \int d\epsilon$) employed here, thereby flattening out the sharp peak into a smoother shape. Finally this mean-field description of the superconductor is expected to be corrected by fluctuations of the phase, in a strictly two dimensional case, and by interlayer coupling, in the physically realistic case of a three dimensional system of weakly coupled layers.

In conclusion this work contains the outline of a new formalism to treat superconducting states of models with extremely strong correlations. A transparent calculation for the $t$-$J$ model is carried out within a low order scheme, using typical model parameters. It leads to superconductivity with $T_c$’s of $O(10^2\text{K})$, in a finite range of densities located slightly away from the insulator, in parallel to the experimental situation in cuprate superconductors. These results demonstrate that the exchange energy $J$ can indeed provide the fundamental binding force between electrons forming Cooper pairs in cuprates.
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