

Bosonization and phase Diagram of the one-dimensional t - J model

Guang-Hong Chen and Yong-Shi Wu

Department of Physics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Abstract

We present an analytic study of the phase diagram of the one-dimensional t - J model and a couple of its cousins. To deal with the interactions induced by the no double occupancy constraints, we introduce a deformation of the Hubbard operators. When the deformation parameter is small, the induced interactions are softened, accessible by perturbation theory. We combine bosonization with renormalization group techniques to map out the phase diagram of the system. We argue that when $U \gg t$, there is no essential change in the phase diagram. Comparison with the existing results in the literature obtained by other methods justifies our deformation approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Historical review

Since the discoveries of quantum Hall effects and high T_c oxides in 1980's, the strongly correlated systems have been of great interests both theoretically and experimentally. As far as the high T_c problem is concerned, the t - J model is believed to be the appropriate starting model Hamiltonian, because it captures the essence of the interplay between charge and spin degrees of freedom in superconducting Cu oxides^{1,2}. Although high- T_c cuprates are (at least) two-dimensional systems, it is very interesting to study its one-dimensional (1D) counterpart. As argued by Anderson¹, two-dimensional strongly correlated systems may share some properties of 1D systems. In addition, the physical understanding of the 1D systems is also extremely helpful for the study of the ladder systems, which have been realized experimentally and have attracted a lot of attention in recent years³⁻⁵.

In the 1D systems, the phase space of particle scattering is highly restricted. The occurrence of a single scattering event will spread quickly among all other particles, which invalidates the concept of individual excitations. Consequently, we are often confronted with correlated collective excitations. On the other hand, in some cases we can benefit from such phase space restriction. Namely, the many-particle scattering matrix could be nicely decomposed into the product of two-particle ones which satisfy the so-called Yang-Baxter integrable conditions⁶. This property provides us with the possibility to exactly solve some 1D models, e.g., the Hubbard model⁷, the Heisenberg model^{8,9}, and the supersymmetric t - J model¹⁰. The exact solutions in turn provide us with powerful guidelines to develop and to justify certain approximate schemes for other problems.

In some sense, the 1D t - J model could be viewed as a descendant of the Hubbard model in large on-site repulsion limit. Namely, the strong coupling limit of the Hubbard model can be mapped into the weak coupling limit of the t - J model. Naively, one may speculate that the integrability of the 1D Hubbard model would be inherited by the t - J model in

the whole parameter space. Unfortunately, this speculation is not correct: The $t-J$ model is only integrable at two special points in parameter space. The reason for this difference is that, in contrast to other 1D integrable models, the Hilbert space of the $t-J$ model is highly constrained: Double occupancy of any site is completely excluded. Furthermore, the integrable points of the $t-J$ model are located in the strong coupling regime ($|J| = 2t$ in our convention below), not in the weak coupling limit. Therefore, the integrability of the supersymmetric $t-J$ model is not simply inherited from the Hubbard model. Rather it is better to be viewed as a separate miracle of the interacting 1D many-particle system. Since the 1D $t-J$ model can not be exactly solved at a generic point in parameter space, the analytical studies of the $t-J$ model have been a painstaking task even in the 1D case.

To illustrate the points more clearly, let us take a close look at the $t-J$ model. The model delineates the behavior of hard core fermions on a discrete lattice, and the dynamics is given by the model Hamiltonian

$$H_{tJ} = -t \sum_j (c_{j+1}^\dagger + c_j) P + J \sum_j S_j^z S_{j+1}^z \quad (1)$$

Here P is the projection operator that prohibits double occupancy of any site, and the spin orientations (with $\sigma = 1$ for \uparrow , and -1 for \downarrow); t is the hopping amplitude and J the anti-ferromagnetic ($J > 0$) or ferromagnetic ($J < 0$) coupling. Due to the aforementioned constraints, at each site the states $|a\rangle$ can only be one of the following three possible states: with $a = \uparrow, \downarrow$, and $a = 0$ (empty). This Hilbert space is neither fermionic nor bosonic. One can check that the projection operators $P_{ab} = |a\rangle\langle b|$ close, under commutation and anti-commutation, to form a semi-simple supersymmetric Lie algebra, the $Sp(1|2)$ given by the relations¹¹

$$[f_i^{ab}, g_j^{cd}] = \delta_{ij} (f_i^{ad} g_j^{bc} - f_i^{bc} g_j^{ad}); \quad (2)$$

where f_i^0 and g_i^0 are fermionic operators that, respectively, create and annihilate a single electron. The bosonic operators $f_i^{\pm 1}$ are identified as the generators of the group $SU(2)$. Using these operators, the $t-J$ model can be neatly written as

$$H_{\text{tJ}} = \sum_{j=1}^N (t \sum_{\sigma} (c_{j+1}^{\sigma} c_j^{\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) + J \sum_{\sigma} c_j^{\sigma} c_{j+1}^{\sigma}) \quad (3)$$

in terms of the bilinears in the generators of $\text{Spl}(1;2)$. But the price we have to pay is to introduce both fermionic and bosonic operators simultaneously. As a consequence, it is difficult to make a simple, controlled approximation in this representation. To overcome the difficulties associated with the no-double-occupancy constraints, the slave boson and slave fermion method^{12;13} and, more recently, the supersymmetric Hubbard operator method¹⁴ have been invented to treat the t - J model, with the hope of the mean field ground state being relevant to the high- T_c problem. However, after more than one decade effort, it seems that a reliable ground state is still elusive.

B. Deformed Hubbard operators

The seminal work by Jordan and Wigner¹⁵ and, later, by Lieb, Schultz, and Mattis¹⁶ provides an alternative idea to handle the above hybridized situation in statistics: Namely the spin operators are uniformly expressed in terms of fermionic operators, though the spin systems are neither bosonic nor fermionic ones. In the same spirit, one can also rewrite the t - J model in terms of fermions exclusively.

In addition to rewriting the magnetic interactions using the fermionic realization of the spin operators

$$S_j = \frac{1}{2} c_j^y \sim c_j \quad (4)$$

one may introduce as well the Hubbard operators¹⁷

$$c_j^y = c_j^y (1 - n_j) \quad (5)$$

and rewrite the hopping terms in terms of them. These operators also realize the constraints that exclude double occupancy on each lattice site. In this way, one gets a formulation of the t - J model completely in terms of fermionic operators.

However, one immediately sees that the old hopping terms will induce extra four-fermion and six-fermion interactions. These interactions are "hard" ones, in the sense that their strengths are exactly the same as the hopping amplitude t . This fact defies the attempts to treat the additional four- and six-fermion terms perturbatively. Therefore, at first glance, it looks silly to adopt this strategy to solve the t - J model unless new techniques can be invented to make the induced interactions tractable.

In the present paper we propose a technique that allows us to deal with these induced four- and six-fermion interactions. The key point is to use the idea of "adiabatic continuity" to soften the above-mentioned interactions induced by the no-double-occupancy constraints. Namely, we propose to introduce the following deformed Hubbard operators

$$c_j^\gamma = c_j^\gamma (1 - n_j) \quad (6)$$

with a deformation parameter $0 < \gamma < 1$. When γ approaches to unity, we recover the genuine Hubbard operators (5). For $0 < \gamma < 1$, there is a non-zero probability to allow leakage into states with double occupancy. With these deformed Hubbard operators (6) replacing the genuine Hubbard operators (5) in the hopping terms, we get a deformation of the original t - J model. The deformed model has the advantage that for small γ , the induced four- and six-fermion interactions are no longer "hard". This is because these interactions have strengths proportional to the deformation parameter γ and, therefore, is tractable in the sense of perturbation theory when γ is small.

Though small values of γ may not be "physical", after extracting possible structures in the phase diagram for small γ , we analytically continue our results back to $\gamma = 1$. The fundamental assumption underlying this continuation is the adiabatic continuity, namely that when the Hamiltonian of the model is adiabatically changed with γ varying from a small positive value to unity, there is no essential, qualitative change in the phase diagram of the model, though various phase boundaries in parameter space may undergo a continuous deformation. Historically, our idea of considering a deformed model is parallel to the ideas that underlie the replica method in treating disordered system, or the large N expansion in

field theory. Actually, even in the field of 1D exactly solvable models one can find a precedent: Yang and Yang⁹ proposed the XXZ model as a deformation of the XXX model, i.e. the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ 1D Heisenberg model, and used it to justify the Bethe Ansatz method in the latter by first studying the large anisotropic limit and then continuing back to the isotropic limit. In this paper we will first discuss some simpler cases and give arguments to justify the adiabatic continuity assumption together with our deformed Hubbard operators.

Of course, practically the justification may depend on how we treat the deformed model, which is a fully fermionized model containing four- and six-fermion interactions. In the present paper, we are going to combine the bosonization method and perturbative renormalization group (RG) techniques to deal with the deformed $t-J$ model. Namely we first bosonize the deformed model, and then use the RG flows to map out the phase diagram of the bosonized model. We will argue that the phase diagram obtained in this way does not change in an essential way, when the deformation parameter varies from a small positive value to unity.

For convenience, we will start with a simplified model. Namely, we will first consider a model in which the magnetic spin-spin interactions are Ising-like, i.e. of the form $J_z \sum_j S_j^z S_{j+1}^z$. This model, together with the usual hopping term, we call the $t-J_z$ model. Then with a bit more complication, we would like to modify the isotropic magnetic interactions in eq. (1) to anisotropic XXZ -type interactions:

$$H = t \sum_j c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j + h \sum_j c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j + J_x \sum_j (S_j^x S_{j+1}^x + S_j^y S_{j+1}^y) + J_z \sum_j S_j^z S_{j+1}^z \quad (7)$$

This model we call as the $t-J_x-J_z$ model. The phase diagram of the $SU(2)$ invariant $t-J$ model can be obtained in the double limit with $J_x \rightarrow J_z$ (the isotropic limit) and with the deformation parameter $\rightarrow 1$ (the physical limit with no double occupancy).

The paper is organized as follows: In section II, we discuss the phase structure of the extremely anisotropic limit of the $t-J_x-J_z$ model, namely, the $t-J_z$ model. The convention of our bosonization scheme is also presented in detail in this section. Then the discussions of the phase diagram for the 1D $t-J_x-J_z$ model are presented in the section III. In section IV,

we compare our results with other work. The discussions and conclusions are summarized in the section V.

II. AN EXTREMELY ANISOTROPIC LIMIT: THE t - J_z MODEL

A. The model

The 1D t - J_z model represents a strongly anisotropic limit of the $SU(2)$ t - J model, in which only has the Ising part of the magnetic interactions been included. Without hopping, this simplification is significant for understanding purely magnetic interactions. However, with hopping the model is more interesting in that it has incorporated the interplay between hopping and the exchange interactions, which makes the physics of the model highly non-trivial. Therefore, the model has recently attracted a lot of interests²⁶. It is known from the numerical studies that the low-energy physics in both the t - J_z and t - J models¹⁹ shares some common features even in two dimensions. In the real world, the possible origin of exchange anisotropy is the spin-orbital coupling²⁰. In the extremely anisotropic limit, the Hamiltonian (for the t - J_z model) reads

$$\begin{aligned} H_{tJ_z} &= \sum_j^X t (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.}) + J_z \sum_j^X S_j^z S_{j+1}^z \\ &= H_0(t) + U(J_z): \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Following Eq. (4), we use the representation of S_j^z given by

$$S_j^z = \frac{1}{2} (n_j - n_{j\#}): \quad (9)$$

Note the appearance of the Hubbard operators (5) in the hopping terms. It is the presence of the second term in eq. (5) that realizes the no double occupancy constraints. As a consequence, the term $H_0(t)$ is no longer a simple hopping of fermions: More interaction terms with four or six fermions are induced, with strengths of the same order of magnitude as the hopping amplitude t . How to deal with these interaction terms is an important issue.

To reduce the strengths of the interaction terms induced by the no double occupancy constraints, we propose to deform the model Hamiltonian (8) by replacing the Hubbard operators with the deformed Hubbard operators (6), resulting in

$$H_0(t) = H_h + H_1 + H_2 + H_3; \quad (10)$$

The Hamiltonians H_i ($i = h; 1; 2; 3$), in terms of the genuine fermion operators c_j and c_j^\dagger , are given by

$$H_h = -t \sum_j (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.}); \quad (11)$$

which represents the genuine hopping term, and

$$H_1 = t \sum_j (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} n_{j+1} + \text{H.c.}); \quad (12)$$

$$H_2 = t \sum_j (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} n_j + \text{H.c.}); \quad (13)$$

$$H_3 = -t^2 \sum_j (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} n_j n_{j+1} + \text{H.c.}); \quad (14)$$

Here H_1 and H_2 are the induced four fermion repulsive interaction to prevent double occupancy of the same lattice site, and the H_3 term is attractive, representing the effects from the six fermion interactions that compensate to the excessive repulsion in H_1 and H_2 . It is easy to see that now in the deformed model, all the induced terms H_1 , H_2 and H_3 are proportional to the deformation parameter in Eq. (6). If λ is small, the induced interactions are "softened", becoming tractable in perturbation theory. In the limit of $\lambda \rightarrow 1$, the total effects of the three terms precisely prevent double occupancy for each lattice site.

By using Eq. (9), the exchange term $U(J_z)$ is given by

$$U(J_z) = \frac{J_z}{4} \sum_j (n_j - n_{j\#})(n_{j+1} - n_{j+1\#}); \quad (15)$$

In this way, we rewrite the $t - J_z$ model in terms of fermion creation and annihilation operators exclusively. To look for the low energy effective Hamiltonian, we perform the standard procedure to bosonize the $t - J_z$ model in the next subsection.

B . Bosonization

The hopping term is easily diagonalized by Fourier transform, the energy spectrum is given by

$$\epsilon(k) = -2t \cos(ka); \quad (16)$$

where a is lattice spacing. In the ground state, all the states with momentum lower than the Fermi momentum k_F are filled. For a generic filling factor $\nu = N/M$ with N the particle number and M the number of lattice sites, the Fermi momentum is

$$k_F a = \frac{\nu}{2} \pi; \quad (17)$$

To get the low energy effective action for the excitations, we only need to focus on momenta close to k_F and linearize the spectrum as

$$\epsilon(k_F + q) = v_F q - 2t \cos(k_F a); \quad (18)$$

where the Fermi velocity is given by $v_F = 2ta \sin(k_F a)$. The second term is a constant and can be shifted away by redefining the energy zero point. We will drop it throughout the rest of the paper.

In one dimension, the definition of exchange statistics is ambiguous, since the no double occupancy condition excludes the possibility to physically exchange spatial position of two particles. This makes the statistics of fermionic particles lose its absolute meaning and make an alternative description in terms of bosons possible. This situation is quite different from that of the three dimensional case, where the exchange statistics of particles has an absolute meaning. In two dimensions, the definition of particle statistics only marginally makes sense and we can transmute the statistics arbitrarily by attaching the Chern-Simons flux to particles (the composite of particle and flux is dubbed as anyon^{21;22}). The statistics transmutation procedure in one dimension is called bosonization; it has been widely used in exploring the physics in one dimensional systems^{23;24}.

In practice, it is convenient to discuss the bosonization in real space. To do so, we expand the lattice fermion in terms of continuum fields

$$c_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} [\psi_R(x) e^{ik_F x} + \psi_L(x) e^{-ik_F x}] \quad (19)$$

$$c_j^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} [\psi_R^\dagger(x) e^{-ik_F x} + \psi_L^\dagger(x) e^{ik_F x}]; \quad (20)$$

where $x = ja$ is used. After linearization and dropping fast varying terms, we get the low energy effective Hamiltonian for the H_h term as

$$H_h = \int dx H_h(x) = \frac{v_F}{2} \int dx [\psi_R^\dagger i \partial_x \psi_R - \psi_L^\dagger i \partial_x \psi_L]; \quad (21)$$

describing a one-dimensional relativistic Dirac particle in continuum.

In the following, we use the bosonization rule to bosonize the tight-binding model:

$$\psi_P(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a}} e^{i\phi_P(x)}; \quad (22)$$

where ϕ_P ($P = R, L = +, -$; ...) are the Klein factors to maintain the anti-commuting relations between particles on different sites. We can also realize the Klein factor as Majorana fermions which satisfy the following anti-commuting relations

$$\{\psi_r, \psi_s\} = 2\delta_{rs}; \quad (23)$$

The introduction of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2a}}$ in Eq. (22) maintains the correct dimension for the field $\psi_P(x)$ which has dimension $[\text{length}]^{-1/2}$ (see Eq. (19)). The fields are angular variables and thus dimensionless. To get the correct anticommutation for fermionic fields, we also require the bosonic fields $\phi_P(x)$ satisfy the following commutation relations

$$[\phi_P; \phi_P] = i\theta(x - x'); \quad (24)$$

$$[\phi_R; \phi_L] = i\theta; \quad (25)$$

where $\theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function.

Using these bosonization rules, we get the bosonic description for the hopping term (21) as

$$H_h = \frac{v_F}{4} \int dx [(\partial_x \psi_R)^2 + (\partial_x \psi_L)^2]; \quad (26)$$

For later convenience, let us introduce a pair of conjugate non-chiral bosonic fields for each species:

$$\psi_R = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (e^{i\phi_R} + e^{i\theta_R}); \quad (27)$$

$$\psi_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (e^{i\phi_L} - e^{i\theta_L}); \quad (28)$$

which satisfy

$$[\phi(x); \phi(y)] = i4 \ln|x-y|; \quad (29)$$

To organize the spin and charge modes more elegantly, we introduce new pairs of dual fields as follows:

$$\phi_c(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\phi_R + \phi_L); \quad \phi_s(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\phi_R - \phi_L); \quad (30)$$

$$\theta_c(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\theta_R + \theta_L); \quad \theta_s(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\theta_R - \theta_L); \quad (31)$$

Here the introduction of numerical factor $1/\sqrt{2}$ is to maintain the commutation relation in Eq. (29). The subscript 's' means the spin mode and 'c' the charge mode. Using these spin-charge separated modes, the bosonic Hamiltonian (26) can be cast into the following form

$$H_h = \frac{v_F}{8} \int dx [(\partial_x \phi_c)^2 + (\partial_x \phi_s)^2 + (\partial_x \theta_c)^2 + (\partial_x \theta_s)^2]; \quad (32)$$

To bosonize the induced interaction terms $H_{1/2}$, we note that, roughly speaking, both the H_1 and H_2 terms are of the type of Hubbard-like on-site interactions in the continuum limit and, therefore, provide interactions to renormalize the charge/spin velocity and the controlling parameters (i.e. K_{cs} ; see below) and the cosine term in the spin sector. By taking microscopic details of these two terms into account, we get an extra numerical factor $\cos(k_F a) = \cos(\pi/2)$. Both terms have the same bosonized form. Namely, the bosonized form of $H_1 + H_2$ is

$$H_1 + H_2 = 2H_1 \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{t a \cos(k_F a)}{2} \int dx [(\partial_x \phi_c)^2 - (\partial_x \phi_s)^2] + \frac{4t P \cos(k_F a)}{2a} \int dx \cos\left(\frac{P}{2} \phi_s\right) \\ &= \frac{v_F \cot(k_F a)}{2} \int dx [(\partial_x \phi_c)^2 - (\partial_x \phi_s)^2] + \frac{2v_F P \cot(k_F a)}{2a^2} \int dx \cos\left(\frac{P}{2} \phi_s\right); \end{aligned}$$

where $P = \frac{R - L}{R + L}$, since $P^2 = 1$, we get $P = \pm 1$; in the following, we will take $P = +1$.

Now we come to discuss the six-fermion term H_3 in the continuum limit; after a straightforward but tedious calculation we get

$$\begin{aligned} H_3 = & \frac{P}{4} \frac{t^2 a^2 \cos(k_F a)}{2} \int dx \partial_x \phi_c(x+a) [(\partial_x \phi_c)^2 - (\partial_x \phi_s)^2] \\ & + \frac{t^2 \cos(k_F a)}{2} \int dx \partial_x \phi_c(x+a) \cos\left(\frac{P}{2} \phi_s\right) \\ & + \frac{t^2 \sin(k_F a)}{2} \int dx \partial_x \phi_s(x+a) \sin\left(\frac{P}{2} \phi_s\right); \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

To get a sensible continuum limit, we have to take $a \rightarrow 0$, but keep ta finite consistently. An elegant way to accomplish this is to use the following operator product expansion (OPE):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{z_1} \phi_c(z_1) \partial_{z_2} \phi_c(z_2) &= \frac{1}{(z_1 - z_2)^2}; \\ \partial_{z_s} \phi_s(z) \sin\left[\frac{P}{2} \phi_s(0)\right] &= \frac{P}{2} \cos\left[\frac{P}{2} \phi_s(0)\right]; \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

with all other OPEs being regular. We finally get the continuum limit of the six-fermion term to be

$$H_3 = \frac{v_F}{2} \frac{t^2}{a^2} \int dx \cos\left(\frac{P}{2} \phi_s\right); \quad (36)$$

The last thing in bosonizing the $t - J_z$ model is to bosonize the magnetic interaction $U(J_z)$ in Eq. (15). We decompose it into the following combinations:

$$\begin{aligned} U(J_z) &= \frac{J_z}{4} \sum_j (n_{j\uparrow} - n_{j\downarrow})(n_{j+1\uparrow} - n_{j+1\downarrow}) \\ &= \frac{J_z}{4} \sum_j (n_{j\uparrow} n_{j+1\uparrow} + n_{j\downarrow} n_{j+1\downarrow}) - \frac{J_z}{4} \sum_j (n_{j\uparrow} n_{j+1\downarrow} + n_{j\downarrow} n_{j+1\uparrow}); \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

The terms in the first bracket are Coulomb interactions between the electrons on different sites; in the continuum limit we get its bosonized form as

$$\frac{J_z}{4} \sum_j (n_{j\uparrow} n_{j+1\uparrow} + n_{j\downarrow} n_{j+1\downarrow}) = \frac{J_z a}{16} \int dx [(\phi_{x-c})^2 + (\phi_{x-s})^2]; \quad (38)$$

The terms in the second bracket of eq. (37) are the Hubbard-like interactions in the continuum limit; the bosonization procedure gives

$$\frac{J_z}{4} \sum_j (n_{j\uparrow} n_{j+1\uparrow} + n_{j\downarrow} n_{j+1\downarrow}) = \frac{J_z a}{16} \int dx [(\phi_{x-c})^2 + (\phi_{x-s})^2] + \frac{J_z \cos(2k_F a)}{4 a^2} \int dx \cos(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s); \quad (39)$$

Combining Eqs. (38), (39) with Eq. (37), we find that the terms involving the charge variable ϕ_c exactly cancel and we get the bosonized form of $U(J_z)$ as

$$U(J_z) = \frac{J_z a}{8} \int dx (\phi_{x-s})^2 - \frac{J_z \cos(2k_F a)}{4 a^2} \int dx \cos(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s); \quad (40)$$

It is worth noting that the absence of charge variables in the $U(J_z)$ term is natural, since we are dealing with pure magnetic interactions.

Therefore, after collecting all the results, the low energy effective Hamiltonian for the bosonized form of the $t-J_z$ model is nicely written as

$$H_{tJ_z} = \int dx (H_c + H_s); \quad (41)$$

where the Hamiltonian for the spin sector (H_s) and the charge sector (H_c) are given by

$$H_c = \frac{v_c}{2} K_c \phi_c^2 + \frac{1}{K_c} (\phi_{x-c})^2; \quad (42)$$

$$H_s = \frac{v_s}{2} K_s \phi_s^2 + \frac{1}{K_s} (\phi_{x-s})^2 + \frac{g}{8 a^2} \cos(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s); \quad (43)$$

where $\phi_c = \frac{1}{4} \phi_{x-c}$ and $\phi_s = \frac{1}{4} \phi_{x-s}$ are the conjugate momenta for the charge field ϕ_c and spin field ϕ_s respectively. The effective coupling constant g_s is given by

$$g = v_F \left[8 \cot\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) + \frac{J_z a}{v_F} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) \right]; \quad (44)$$

The velocities $v_{c=s}$ are renormalized by magnetic interactions and the interactions induced by the no double occupancy conditions:

$$v_c = v_F \frac{s}{1 + \frac{4}{s} \cot(\frac{\pi}{2})}; \quad (45)$$

$$v_s = v_F \frac{s}{1 + \frac{J_z a}{v_F} \frac{4}{s} \cot(\frac{\pi}{2})}; \quad (46)$$

The controlling parameters $K_{c=s}$ are given by

$$K_c = \frac{4}{1 + \frac{4}{s} \cot(\frac{\pi}{2})}; \quad (47)$$

$$K_s = \frac{4}{1 + \frac{J_z a}{v_F} \frac{4}{s} \cot(\frac{\pi}{2})}; \quad (48)$$

In passing, we would like to stress that the above results are derived for small t and $J_z a$. However, the general result of a renormalization of $v_{c=s}$ and $K_{c=s}$, but with no other changes, is expected to be valid more generally^{29,30}. In other words, the functional forms of the low energy effective Hamiltonians $H_{c=s}$, being basically dictated by the symmetry requirements, survive even if the interactions are strong, while the above values of $v_{c=s}$ and $K_{c=s}$ are not universal. Therefore, we conclude that if we adiabatically continue the value of t to unity, the low energy effective Hamiltonian of the $t - J_z$ model should be of the same form as the above charge and spin Hamiltonians $H_{c=s}$, with the renormalized values of $v_{c=s}$ and $K_{c=s}$ not restricted to those given by Eqs. (45) and (47).

C. The phase diagram

Now we are in the position to discuss the possible phase diagram for the $t - J_z$ model. For convenience, we only discuss the anti-ferromagnetic case, namely, we assume $J_z > 0$.

At first, we notice that the spin and charge degrees of freedom are well separated just like what happened in other 1D interacting models. However, from the expression for the controlling parameters $K_{c=s}$, we have already seen the interesting interplay between hopping and magnetic interactions. The phase diagram is determined by the competition of above two energy scales (t and J_z). This is quite different from the case of the Hubbard model or the XXZ model where the controlling parameter is only determined by the interaction strength. However, the charge sector is massless, described by a quadratic Hamiltonian with

no mass term. This means that charge excitations are gapless and the charged sector of the system is metallic. In contrast, the knowledge on the fate of the spin sector needs more work. The situation is similar to that of the Hubbard model.

The fate of the spin sector is determined by the well-studied sine-Gordon Hamiltonian. In the spin sector we have the following renormalization group equations (RGE)^{30,29}:

$$\frac{dg}{dl} = (2 - \frac{K_s}{2})g; \quad (49)$$

$$\frac{dK_s}{dl} = -g; \quad (50)$$

where ϵ is a positive, regularization dependent parameter. With these two RG equations in hand, we can readily analyze the phase diagram for the spin sector.

(i) When $K_s > 4$ and $g \rightarrow 0^+$, the spin sector flows to the fixed point line:

$$g = 0; \quad (51)$$

$$K_s > 4; \quad (52)$$

Thus we get the Luttinger liquid behavior for the spin sector. Following the Balents-Fisher's notation⁵, we say that the system is in the C1S1 phase; here more generally a C_mS_n phase means a phase with m massless charge modes and n massless spin modes respectively.

(ii) When parameters K_s and g satisfy one of the following conditions:

$$K_s < 4; \quad g > 0; \quad (53)$$

or

$$K_s > 4; \quad g < (\frac{K_s}{4} - 1)^{-1}; \quad (54)$$

then the RGE flows toward $g = +1$. In this case, the behavior of the system is overwhelmingly determined by the minima of the cosine term. For $g > 0$, these minima are given by

$$\phi_s = \frac{2\pi}{K_s} (n + \frac{1}{2}); \quad (55)$$

but due to the angular nature of the variable s , we can have only two distinct ground states, distinguished by the even and odd values of n . This state is identified to be Peierls ordering of spin degrees of freedom. Due to quantum tunneling, degeneracy of the ground state is removed. Consequently, the excitations above either ground state are gapful. The dominant contributions to the mass gap come from the topological soliton excitations in the dilute gas approximation of solitons and anti-solitons. Therefore, in this phase, the spin sector is gapful, and we classify the phase of the system as a CISO phase.

(iii) In contrast to the case (ii), if the parameter K_s and g satisfy one of the following two conditions:

$$K_s > 4; \quad g < 0; \quad (56)$$

or

$$K_s > 4; \quad g < \left(\frac{K_s}{4} - 1\right)^{p-}; \quad (57)$$

then the RG flows toward $g = 1$. An argument similar to that in the case (ii) gives the ground states determined by

$$s = \frac{p-}{2n}; \quad (58)$$

In this state, we have a staggered expectation value for the z component of the spin. Therefore, the spin ordering is Neel-like.

In summary, we construct the phase diagram for the t - J_z model in Figure 1.

III. THE t - J_x - J_z MODEL

In this section, we will discuss the modified version (7) of the t - J model. Again the change to make is in the magnetic interactions. In addition to the $U(J_z)$ term discussed in the last section, we now add the XY part, $U(J_x)$, of the anti-ferromagnetic interactions:

$$\begin{aligned} U(J_x) &= J_x \sum_j (S_j^x S_{j+1}^x + S_j^y S_{j+1}^y) \\ &= \frac{J_x}{2} \sum_j (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1}^\dagger c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j^\dagger + c_j^\dagger c_j^\dagger c_{j+1}^\dagger c_{j+1}^\dagger): \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Following the bosonization procedure presented in the preceding section, we get the bosonized form for $U(J_z)$ as

$$U(J_z) = \frac{J_z}{2^2 a} \int dx \cos\left(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s\right) \cos\left(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s\right) \frac{J_z}{2^2 a} [1 - \cos(2k_F a)] \int dx \cos\left(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s\right): \quad (60)$$

Therefore, for the modified $t - J$ model (7), we have the bosonized low energy effective Hamiltonian

$$H = \int dx (H_c + H_s); \quad (61)$$

where the Hamiltonian of the charge sector, H_c , is still given by Eq. (42), since the $X Y$ part of magnetic interactions only changes spin dynamics. In contrast, due to the extra $U(J_z)$, the Hamiltonian H_s of the spin sector has been drastically modified to

$$\begin{aligned} H_s = & \frac{v_s}{2} [K_s \phi_s^2 + \frac{1}{K_s} (\partial_x \phi_s)^2] \\ & + \frac{g}{8^2 a^2} \int dx \cos\left(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s\right) - \frac{g}{8^2 a^2} \int dx \cos\left(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s\right) \\ & + \frac{g}{8^2 a^2} \int dx \cos\left(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s\right) \cos\left(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s\right): \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Compared to the $t - J_z$ model, the Hamiltonian H_s now has two extra terms with the coupling constants g and g respectively. The spin velocity (v_s) and controlling parameter (K_s) are still the same as those in Eqs. (45-47). Using Eq. (60), the coupling constants g and g are determined to be

$$g = 8J_z a \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right); \quad (63)$$

$$g = 4J_z a; \quad (64)$$

Due to the appearance of the interaction term g , which has a non-zero conformal spin, the dynamics for the spin sector becomes much more involved. When we use the scaling arguments to discuss the relevance of the interaction terms, we need to be more careful. We'd better use the RG flow for the Hamiltonian (62) to discuss the details of the spin dynamics. Fortunately, up to one loop level, the RGE for a Hamiltonian like (62) have been

studied thoroughly, though in quite different context^{27 {29}}. The resulting RGE for the double cosine term g is

$$\frac{dg}{dl} = 2 - \frac{K_s}{4} + \frac{4}{K_s} g \quad (65)$$

Since we know

$$\frac{K_s}{4} + \frac{4}{K_s} = 2; \quad (66)$$

the double cosine term in the Hamiltonian (62) is always irrelevant. Of course, the action of RG will generate more terms, such as single cosine terms. However, the arguments of these single cosine terms are twice bigger and these terms are more irrelevant than the existing terms. Thus we can neglect them. This situation is quite different from that of the two coupled Luttinger liquid case^{27 {29}}. Therefore, we only need to focus on the following effective Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H_s &= \frac{v_s}{2} [K_s \phi_s^2 + \frac{1}{K_s} (\partial_x \phi_s)^2] + \frac{g}{8\pi^2 a^2} \int dx \cos(\frac{p}{2} \phi_s) - \frac{g}{8\pi^2 a^2} \int dx \cos(\frac{p}{2} \bar{\phi}_s); \\ &= \frac{v_s}{2} [\tilde{\phi}_s^2 + (\partial_x \tilde{\phi}_s)^2] + \frac{g}{8\pi^2 a^2} \int dx \cos(\phi_s \tilde{\phi}_s) - \frac{g}{8\pi^2 a^2} \int dx \cos(\tilde{\phi}_s \phi_s); \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where we have introduced $\tilde{\phi}_s = \frac{p}{K_s} \bar{\phi}_s$ and $\tilde{s} = \frac{p-s}{K_s}$. The definitions of ϕ_s and $\tilde{\phi}_s$ are

$$\phi_s = \frac{q}{2K_s}; \quad \tilde{\phi}_s = \frac{16}{p-2K_s}; \quad (68)$$

It is now easy to observe that the low energy effective Hamiltonian possesses the following duality property: Namely, the Hamiltonian (67) is invariant under the following transformation

$$\phi_s \rightarrow \tilde{\phi}_s; \quad g \rightarrow -g; \quad (69)$$

Note that such a duality does not appear in the t - J_z model or in the Hubbard model. But it is also interesting to note that it appeared in the 1D XY Z Thirring model²⁹ and in the case of two coupled Luttinger liquids^{27 {29}}.

Compared with the sine-Gordon system, the symmetry of Eq. (67) is discrete, while there is a hidden $U(1)$ symmetry in the sine-Gordon system, which reflects the $U(1)$ invariance of its dual fermionic model (the Massive Thirring model).

It is also easy to get the scaling dimension for the cosine terms of the fields and its conjugates as

$$\Delta_{\phi} = \frac{K_s}{2}; \quad \Delta_{\bar{\phi}} = \frac{8}{K_s}; \quad (70)$$

Therefore, one of the two cosine terms is always relevant, which is associated with the ordering of the ϕ - or $\bar{\phi}$ -eld. Let us discuss the following two different cases separately.

(i) When the scaling dimension $\Delta_{\phi} < 2$, the $\cos(\frac{p}{2}\bar{\phi}_s)$ term is relevant. This case is similar to the $t - J_z$ case, and the system eventually flows to the spin-Peierls phase for $g > 0$ or the Ising-Neel order for $g < 0$ respectively.

(ii) When the scaling dimension $\Delta_{\bar{\phi}} < 2$, the $\cos(\frac{p}{2}\phi_s)$ term is relevant. In this case, since g is always negative, therefore the system flows toward the Ising-Neel phase only.

In summary, we see that the phase diagram in Fig. 1 can only be partially accessed in the $t - J$ model. The difference in the two cases reflects the fact that the duality transformation (69) can only be realized in part of the parameter space, since the coupling constant g is definitely negative, while the coupling constant g can be either negative or positive, depending on the interplay between t and J_z .

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this paper, the phase diagram of the most general 1D $t - J_x - J_z$ model is discussed based on bosonization and RGE. To make sense of the bosonization procedure for the interactions induced by no double occupancy constraints, we have introduced deformed Hubbard operators (6), which contain a deformation parameter α . While at $\alpha = 1$ the no double occupancy constraints at each site are recovered, the case with a small positive α is accessible to perturbative RG analysis. Since the basic structure of the bosonized low energy

effective Hamiltonian is argued to be determined only by the symmetry requirements, the bosonized form of the low energy effective Hamiltonian with a small deformation parameter is expected to survive the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$. However, we can not simply use the values of $v_{C=S}$ and $K_{C=S}$ to make precise predictions on the phase diagram, since these values are not reliable at $\alpha = 1$. We should take the strategy in which both $v_{C=S}$ and $K_{C=S}$ are considered as phenomenological parameters.

For the case with $J_z = J_\perp$, the model is reduced to the so-called $t-J_z$ model. In this case, the spin sector can flow to three distinct phases: the gapless phase, the spin-Peierls phase, and the Ising-Neel phase, depending on the range of the parameters, meanwhile the charge dynamics remains always gapless. In the case with $J_z > J_{zc}$, where the J_{zc} represents the value to make $g = 0$ and $K_s < 4$, the system flows to the Ising-Neel ordering in spin dynamics. We identify this phase as the so-called phase separation (PS) phase. For the case with $J_z < J_{zc}$ and $K_s < 4$, the spin sector eventually flows to the spin-Peierls phase which is gapful. We can identify this phase as a superconducting phase (SC). Finally, for $K_s > 4$, the spin sector flows toward a gapless phase and thus the system flows toward the Tomonaga-Luttinger liquid phase. Such a phase is consistent with the phase diagram constructed by Los Alamos group in Ref. 26, where the authors mapped the $t-J_z$ model into the 1D XXZ model and construct the phase diagram from the knowledge of exact solutions for the 1d XXZ model. This consistency also helps us to justify our proposal to use the deformed Hubbard operators and the continuation from the case of $\alpha = 1$ to the desired case $\alpha = 1$.

In the opposite limit, namely $J_z \rightarrow J_\perp$, the modified $t-J$ model can be reduced to the $t-J_\perp$ model. In this case, we still have g generally non-zero due to the no-double-occupancy induced interactions. Therefore, the phase diagram of the $t-J_\perp$ model is expected to be similar to the case of the most general $t-J_\perp-J_z$ model. Namely, the system is generically gapful in the spin sector and thus can not flow toward the Tomonaga-Luttinger phase. This result is a little bit different from the naive speculation that the $t-J_z$ model should be basically similar to the $t-J$ model. From our study, we conclude that there are some

delicate differences between the two cases, since the XY part and the Ising part of the magnetic interactions play a different role in spin ordering.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the US National Science Foundation under Grants No. PHY-9970701.

REFERENCES

- ¹ P.W .Anderson, *Science*, 235, 1196 (1987).
- ² F.C .Zhang and T.M .Rice, *Phys. Rev. B*, 37, 3759 (1988); *ibid*, 41, 7243 (1990).
- ³ for a review, see E.D agotto and T.M .Rice, *Science*, 271, 618 (1996). E.D agotto, *Science*, 293, 2430 (2001).
- ⁴ H.M aya re et al., *Science*, 279, 345 (1998); J.H .Schon et al., *Science*, 293, 2430 (2001).
- ⁵ L.Balents and M .P.A .Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B*, 53, 12133 (1996); H.H .Lin, L.Balents, and M .P.A .Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B*, 56, 6569; *ibid*, *Phys. Rev. B*, 58, 1794 (1998).
- ⁶ C.N .Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 19, 1312 (1967).
- ⁷ E.H .Lieb and F.Y .Wu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 20, 1445 (1968).
- ⁸ H.A .Bethe, *Z. Physik*, 71, 205 (1931).
- ⁹ C.N .Yang and C.P .Yang, *Phys. Rev.*, 150, 321 (1966).
- ¹⁰ C.K .Lai, *J. Math. Phys.*, 15, 1675 (1974); B .Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. B*, 12, 3795 (1975); P .Schlotmann, *Phys. Rev. B*, 36, 5177 (1987); P.A .Bares, G .B latter, and M .O gatta, *Phys. Rev. B*, 44, 130 (1991).
- ¹¹ P.B .W iegmann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 60, 821 (1988).
- ¹² P.Coleman, *Phys. Rev. B*, 29, 3035 (1984).
- ¹³ N .Read, D .M .Newns, and S.D oniach, *Phys. Rev. B*, 30 3841 (1984).
- ¹⁴ P.Coleman, C .Pepin, and A .M .T svelik, *Phys. Rev. B*, 62, 3852 (2000).
- ¹⁵ P .Jordan and E.W igner, *Z. Physik.*, 47, 631 (1928).
- ¹⁶ E.H .Lieb, T.D .Schultz, and D.C .M attis, *Ann. Phys.*, 16, 407 (1961).
- ¹⁷ J.Hubbard, *Proc. R .Soc. (London), Ser. A* 277, 237 (1964).

- ¹⁸ M .O gata et al, Phys. Rev. Lett., 66,2388 (1991).
- ¹⁹ E .D agotta, Rev. M od. Phys., 66, 763 (1994).
- ²⁰ N .E .B onsteel et al, Phys. Rev. Lett., 68, 2684 (1992).
- ²¹ F .W ilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett., 48, 1144 (1982);ibid 49, 957 (1982).
- ²² Y .S. W u, Phys. Rev. Lett., 52, 2103 (1984);ibid 53, 111 (1984).
- ²³ F .D .M .H aldane, J. Phys. C , 14,2585 (1981).
- ²⁴ for a review , see, H .J. Shulz, G .C uniberti, and P .P ieri, cond-m at/9807366; J. von D elft and H .S choeller, cond-m at/9805275.
- ²⁵ A .L uther and V .J. E m ery, Phys. Rev. Lett., 33, 589 (1974).
- ²⁶ C .D .B atista and G .O rtiz, Phys. Rev. Lett., 85, 4755 (2000).
- ²⁷ F .V .K usm artsev, A .L uther, and A .A .N ersesyan, JET P Lett., 55, 724 (1992).
- ²⁸ V .M .Y akovenko, JET P Lett., 56, 510 (1992).
- ²⁹ A .O .G ogolin, A .A .N ersesyan, and A .M .T svelik, B osonization and Strongly C orrelated System s (C am bridge, New York, 1998).
- ³⁰ S .S achdev, Q uantum Phase T ransitions, (C am bridge, New York, 1999).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. The schematic phase diagram. The RG flow gives the possible fate of the J_z model as the spin-Peierls phase (S.P.), Ising-Néel phase (I.N.), and Tomonaga-Luttinger phase (T.L.).




Fig. 1