

W = 0 Pairing in (N;N) Carbon Nanotubes away from Half Filling

Enrico Perfetto, Gianluca Stefanucci and Michele Cini

Istituto Nazionale per la Fisica della Materia, Dipartimento di Fisica,
Universita' di Roma Tor Vergata, Via della Ricerca Scientifica, I-00133
Roma, Italy

We use the Hubbard Hamiltonian H on the honeycomb lattice to represent the valence bands of carbon single-wall (N;N) nanotubes. A detailed symmetry analysis shows that the model allows $W = 0$ pairs which we define as two-body singlet eigenstates of H with vanishing on-site repulsion. By means of a non-perturbative canonical transformation we calculate the effective interaction between the electrons of a $W = 0$ pair added to the interacting ground state. We show that the dressed $W = 0$ pair is a bound state for reasonable parameter values away from half filling. Exact diagonalization results for the (1,1) nanotube confirm the expectations. For (N;N) nanotubes of length L , the binding energy of the pair depends strongly on the filling and decreases towards a small but nonzero value as $L \rightarrow \infty$. We observe the existence of an optimal doping when the number of electrons per C atom is in the range 1.2–1.3, and the binding energy is of the order of 0.1–1 meV.

I. INTRODUCTION

After the discovery of carbon nanotubes [1] the interest in such systems has been stimulated by their anomalous normal properties [2] and by the recently reported superconductivity [3]. Indeed there has been growing evidence of superconducting fluctuations in single-wall carbon nanotubes placed between superconducting contacts [4] [5] [6] up to the transition temperature of ~ 0.5 K [3].

A single-wall carbon nanotube (SWNT) is a graphite sheet wrapped onto a cylinder. The carbon atoms are arranged on the sites of a honeycomb lattice. The two primitive Bravais lattice vectors are $\mathbf{a}_1 = (d/\sqrt{3})(\hat{x}; \sqrt{3}\hat{y})$, where $d = \sqrt{3}$ is the nearest neighbor carbon separation, see Fig.(1). A SWNT is characterized by a pair of integers (N;M) which specifies the wrapping: the cylinder has the axis running perpendicular to $N\mathbf{a}_1 + M\mathbf{a}_2$, so that atoms separated by $N\mathbf{a}_1 + M\mathbf{a}_2$ are identified. Only in recent years, was it possible to study the electronic properties of atomically resolved SWNT's; it was found [7] that they are strongly dependent on the integers N and M.

From band-structure calculations [8] [9] one predicts that the "arm chair" (N;N) tubes are metals while the "zig-zag" (N; -N) ones [which are the same as the (N;0) tubes] are insulators or semiconductors. However, the Coulomb interaction cannot be neglected [10] [11]. Due to the quasi-one-dimensional structure, the SWNT's are believed to exhibit non-Fermi liquid behaviour [12]. The band structure of the arm chair nanotubes suggests [13] [14] that near half-filling the low-energy effective Hamiltonian should be a four-component Luttinger model. This theory was developed by the perturbative Renormalization Group [13] [15] and by the bosonization technique [16] [17] in the weakly doped case, revealing the presence of a superconducting instability for short-ranged interactions. Still in a one-dimensional scheme, phonon induced pairing mechanisms have also been reported [18] [19].

On the other hand, in this exploratory paper we consider a different scenario in which the electron density is so far from half-filling that any one-dimensional free-fermion model with a linear spectrum fails to describe the non-interacting Hamiltonian. This is motivated by the expectation [6] that an increased doping by chemical manipulations and/or external fields could enhance the superconducting transition temperature. In recent years, we proposed a pairing mechanism [20] [21] in the two-dimensional (one-band and three-bands) repulsive Hubbard model for the Cuprates. Here we show that the same idea extends to the case at hand. In our approach bound electron-pairs in SWNT are obtained by a symmetry-driven conformation interaction mechanism in which the transverse direction plays a crucial role.

In this paper, we do not (yet) include phonons even if we acknowledge that their contribution could be relevant. However, on one hand, we wish to explore an electronic mechanism which per se leads to bound pairs. On the other hand, any mechanism in low-dimensional systems, like the Cuprates and nanotubes, must overcome somehow the problem of the repulsion between confined charges. This is an obvious difference compared to the traditional superconductors where pairs have hundreds of Angstrom of space to delocalize. The notion that pairing can arise by a purely electronic mechanism, i.e. from purely repulsive electron-electron

interactions, was put forth by Kohn and Luttinger long ago [22]. They suggested that for large odd values of the relative angular momentum two electrons could stay enough far apart from each other to take advantage of the Friedel oscillations of the screened Coulomb potential. In our approach, based on a 2d Hubbard model, the first-order Coulomb repulsion is removed by symmetry.




FIG. 1. Illustration of the honeycomb lattice. The sites a (empty dots) and b (full dots) constitute the basis of each unit cell. We fix the origin in an a site. The $(N; M)$ nanotube is obtained by identifying sites separated by $N\mathbf{a}_+ + M\mathbf{a}_-$.

The plan of the paper is the following. In Section II we define the Hubbard model Hamiltonian H for the armchair $(N; N)$ SWNT and we introduce some useful notations. In Section III we use a general theorem to obtain all the two-body singlet eigenstates of H with vanishing Hubbard repulsion ($W = 0$ pairs). We exploit the Space Group symmetry of the system to get all the $W = 0$ pairs with zero total momentum. Remarkably, we find that their wave-function vanishes if the particles have the same x value. In Section IV we propose a non-perturbative canonical transformation to deal with the effective interaction between the electrons of a $W = 0$ pair added to the many-body ground state. Since the two extra particles cannot interact directly by definition of $W = 0$ pair, their effective interaction comes out from virtual electron-hole excitation exchange with the Fermi sea and in principle can be attractive. In Section V we consider the $(1; 1)$ nanotube, with length $l = 2d$. This system has 8 sites and is the smallest nanotube-like cluster showing the superconducting $W = 0$ pairing. Therefore, it represents a very good probe to test the pairing mechanism described in Section IV, since we can compare exact diagonalization results with the analytic ones. In Section VI we apply the canonical transformation approach to study the $(N; N)$ nanotubes of finite length and periodic boundary conditions. We obtain a Cooper-like equation for the binding energy of the $W = 0$ pair which is numerically solved for $2 \leq N \leq 6$ and length l up to $32d$; the results are then extrapolated to study the dependence of on the radius of the tube and on the Fermi energy in the limit of infinite length. Finally the conclusions are drawn in Section VII.

II. HUBBARD MODEL ON THE SWNT

The four outer-shell electrons of each carbon atom form three sp_2 bonds and a resonant bond with the remaining p_z electron. A simple description consists of a tight-binding Hamiltonian where only the p_z orbital is taken into account:

$$H_0 = t \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}' \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} c_{\mathbf{r}; \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{r}'; \sigma} + \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{r}} c_{\mathbf{r}; \uparrow}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{r}; \uparrow} c_{\mathbf{r}; \downarrow}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{r}; \downarrow}; \quad (1)$$

where $c_{\mathbf{r}; \sigma}^\dagger$ ($c_{\mathbf{r}; \sigma}$) is the creation (annihilation) operator of an electron of spin σ on the honeycomb site \mathbf{r} , the sum runs over the pairs $\langle \mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}' \rangle$ of nearest neighbour carbon atoms and t is the hopping parameter. The on-site Coulomb repulsion is

$$W = U \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}; \uparrow} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}; \downarrow}; \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}; \sigma} = c_{\mathbf{r}; \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{r}; \sigma}$ is the number operator referred to the site \mathbf{r} and to the spin σ . The full Hamiltonian reads

$$H = H_0 + W; \quad (3)$$

Although the the point symmetry Group of the graphite layer is D_{6h} , the simplified Hubbard Hamiltonian in Eq.(3) has C_{6v} symmetry since the fermionic operators are taken to be even under reflection with respect to the plane; for a SWNT only C_{2v} point symmetry remains, due to the wrapping. The C_{2v} Group is abelian and its table of characters is

C_{2v}	1	C_2	σ_x	σ_y	Symmetry
A_1	1	1	1	1	$x^2 + y^2$
A_2	1	1	-1	-1	$x=y \quad y=x$
B_1	1	-1	1	-1	x
B_2	1	-1	-1	1	y

Table I. Character table of the C_{2v} symmetry group. Here 1 denotes the identity, C_2 the 180 degrees rotation, σ_x and σ_y the reflections with respect to the $x = 0$ and $y = 0$ axes respectively. The C_{2v} symmetry group is Abelian and hence has four one-dimensional irreducible representations (irreps) denoted by A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 . In the last column simple basis functions for each irrep are shown.

Below, we shall diagonalize the kinetic term H_0 and introduce some useful notation. Let us write the position R of the cells in terms of a pair of integers $(n; m)$, $R = na + ma$. As illustrated in Figure 1, we set the origin at an a site, and therefore any R translation will take us to another a site; to get a b site one must translate by $R = (0; \frac{d}{2})$. It is convenient to rename the creation operators on the site r by distinguishing the a sites from the b sites:

$$c_r^\dagger = \begin{cases} c_R^{(a)\dagger} & \text{if } r = R \\ c_R^{(b)\dagger} & \text{if } r = R + (0; \frac{d}{2}) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where the spin index is omitted for the sake of simplicity. Let us introduce the Bloch creation operators

$$c_k^{(\dagger)} = \sum_R u^{(\dagger)}(k; a) c_R^{(a)\dagger} + u^{(\dagger)}(k; b) c_R^{(b)\dagger} e^{ik \cdot R}; \quad (5)$$

with

$$\frac{u(k; a)}{u(k; b)} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{4NL}} \frac{1}{\frac{A(k)}{A(k)}} \quad (6)$$

and

$$A(k) = 1 + 2e^{i\frac{d}{2}(p - 3k_y)} \cos \frac{dk_x}{2} : \quad (7)$$

The kinetic term H_0 can be written in a diagonal form as

$$H_0 = \sum_{k;+} \sum_{k;-} \epsilon(k) c_{k;+}^{(\dagger)} c_{k;-}^{(\dagger)}; \quad (8)$$

where

$$\epsilon(k) = \frac{S}{t} \frac{1 + 4 \cos^2 \frac{k_x d}{2} + 4 \cos \frac{k_x d}{2} \cos \frac{k_y p - 3d}{2}}{1 + 4 \cos^2 \frac{k_x d}{2} + 4 \cos \frac{k_x d}{2} \cos \frac{k_y p - 3d}{2}}; \quad (9)$$

are the bonding (-) and antibonding (+) bands.

The Hubbard interaction becomes

$$W = 2NL \sum_{k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4} \sum_{l; i; j; 3; 4} U_{l; i; j; 3; 4}(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) c_{k_1;+}^{(1)\dagger} c_{k_2;+}^{(2)\dagger} c_{k_3;-}^{(3)} c_{k_4;-}^{(4)}; \quad (10)$$

where

$$U_{l; i; j; 3; 4}(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = \sum_{a;b} u^{(1)}(k_1;+) u^{(2)}(k_2;+) u^{(3)}(k_3;-) u^{(4)}(k_4;-) \delta(k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4) \quad (11)$$

and $\epsilon_G(\mathbf{k})$ is 1 if \mathbf{k} is a reciprocal lattice vector \mathbf{G} and zero otherwise; in the $(N;N)$ nanotubes $\mathbf{G} = n\mathbf{G}_+ + m\mathbf{G}_-$, with n and m integers, and $\mathbf{G}_\pm = \frac{2}{d}(1; \pm\frac{1}{3})$. For the $(N;N)$ nanotubes of length $l = Ld$ and periodic boundary conditions along the \hat{x} direction the \mathbf{k} -vectors are quantized as

$$k_x = \frac{2}{Ld}m_x; \quad m_x = 0; 1; \dots; L-1; \quad k_y = \frac{2}{3Nd}m_y; \quad m_y = 0; 1; \dots; 2N-1; \quad (12)$$

For $\mathbf{k} = (\frac{2}{3d}; \frac{2}{3d})$ the bonding and antibonding bands touch each other and $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ linearly.

In the next Section we show that the Hamiltonian in Eq.(3) admits two-body singlet eigenstates with no double occupancy on the honeycomb sites and we shall refer to them as $W = 0$ pairs. $W = 0$ pairs are therefore eigenstates of the kinetic energy operator in Eq.(8) and of the Hubbard repulsion W of Eq.(10) with vanishing eigenvalue of the latter. The particles forming a $W = 0$ pair have no direct interaction and are the main candidates to achieve bound states in purely repulsive Hubbard models [20] [21] [23]. Incidentally, we note that such states are involved in the antiferromagnetic ground state of Hubbard and related models at half filling [24] [25] [26] [27].

III. $W = 0$ PAIRS IN THE ARMCHAIR $(N;N)$ SWNT

We obtained [21] [28] a powerful and elegant criterion to get all the $W = 0$ pairs. We can do that in terms of the Optimal Group G of the Hamiltonian, that we define as a symmetry group which is big enough to justify the degeneracy of the single particle energy levels. By definition, every one-body eigenstate of H can be classified as belonging to one of the irreducible representations (irreps) of G . We may say that an irrep is represented in the one-body spectrum of H if at least one of the one-body levels belongs to it. Let E be the set of the irreps of G which are represented in the one-body spectrum of H . Let j_i be a two-body eigenstate of the kinetic energy H_0 with spin $S_z = 0$. Then, it holds the

$W = 0$ Theorem :

$$\exists E, \quad W P^{(\cdot)} j_i = 0 \quad (13)$$

where $P^{(\cdot)}$ is the projection operator on the irrep \cdot . In other terms, any nonvanishing projection of j_i on an irrep not contained in E , is an eigenstate of H_0 with no double occupancy. The singlet component of this state is a $W = 0$ pair. Conversely, any pair belonging to an irrep represented in the one-body spectrum must have positive W expectation value.

The complete characterization of the symmetry of $W = 0$ pairs requires the knowledge of the Optimal Group G . A partial use of the theorem is possible if one does not know G but knows a subgroup. It is then still granted that any pair belonging to an irrep of the subgroup not represented in the spectrum has the $W = 0$ property. On the other hand, accidental degeneracies occur with a subgroup of the Optimal Group, because by mixing degenerate pairs belonging to irreps represented in the spectrum one can find $W = 0$ pairs also there. This is illustrated by the example reported in Section V.

Below, we shall apply the $W = 0$ Theorem in the $(N;N)$ SWNT to obtain $W = 0$ pairs of zero total-momentum. Let $|j_i\rangle$ denote the electron vacuum. Exploiting the invariance of the Hamiltonian under translations and C_{2v} -operations the determinant state $c_{k;1}^\dagger c_{k;2}^\dagger |j_i\rangle$ yields nothing if projected onto an irrep of the Space Group with non-zero momentum. Direct inspection of the Bloch functions in Eq.(6) shows that the $k = 0$ irreps represented in the one-body spectrum are B_2 in the bonding band and A_1 in the antibonding band; hence, $W = 0$ pairs may be obtained by projecting onto A_2 and B_1 . Let us consider the two-electron singlet state of vanishing momentum :

$$\begin{aligned} |1;2\rangle(\mathbf{k}; R_1; R_2) &= \frac{1}{2} h_0 j_{R_1; R_2}^{(\cdot)} [c_{k;1}^\dagger c_{k;2}^\dagger + c_{k;2}^\dagger c_{k;1}^\dagger] |j_i\rangle = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} u(\mathbf{k}; 1) u(\mathbf{k}; 2) e^{ik(R_1 - R_2)} + u(\mathbf{k}; 2) u(\mathbf{k}; 1) e^{ik(R_1 - R_2)} \phi_0; \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where ϕ_0 is a singlet spin function and for $i = 1; 2$ $i = a; b$. The projection onto the irrep \cdot of C_{2v} yields

$$|1;2\rangle(\mathbf{k}; R_1; R_2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\hat{O} \in C_{2v}} \chi^{(\cdot)}(\hat{O}) \hat{O} |1;2\rangle(\mathbf{k}; R_1; R_2); \quad (15)$$

where $\chi^{(\cdot)}(\hat{O})$ is the character in \cdot of the operation \hat{O} of C_{2v} . While $|\phi_0\rangle = 0$, after some algebra one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} A_2 \\ 1; 2 \end{bmatrix} (k; R_1; R_2) &= \sin(k_x(X_1 - X_2)) \\ &\frac{1}{2} u(k;_1) u(-k;_2) e^{ik_y(Y_1 - Y_2)} - u(k;_2) u(-k;_1) e^{ik_y(Y_1 - Y_2)} = 0; \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $R_{ij} = (X_{ij}; Y_{ij})$. We can verify by direct inspection that $\begin{bmatrix} A_2 \\ 1; 2 \end{bmatrix} (k; R_1; R_2)$ vanishes for $X_1 = X_2$, that is the two-body singlet wavefunction vanishes if the particles lie on the same annulus of the $(N; N)$ tube. As a consequence $\begin{bmatrix} A_2 \\ 1; 2 \end{bmatrix} (k; R_1; R_2)$ is an eigenstate of the kinetic energy H_0 [with eigenvalue $2\epsilon(k)$] and of the on-site Hubbard repulsion W with vanishing eigenvalue of the latter, that is $\begin{bmatrix} A_2 \\ 1; 2 \end{bmatrix} (k; R_1; R_2)$ is a $W = 0$ pair.

$W = 0$ pairs of non-vanishing total momentum may be obtained in a similar way; however, in this preliminary work we concentrate on pairs of vanishing total momentum.

IV. CANONICAL TRANSFORMATION APPROACH TO THE PAIRING MECHANISM

In this Section we intend to study the effective interaction among the electrons of a $W = 0$ pair added to the n -body interacting ground state $|j_0(n)\rangle$. Since the two extra particles cannot interact directly by definition of $W = 0$ pair, their effective interaction comes out from virtual electron-hole excitation exchange with the Fermi sea and in principle can be attractive.

Many configurations contribute to the interacting $(n+2)$ -body ground state $|j_0(n+2)\rangle$ and we need a complete set S to expand it exactly; as long as it is complete, however, we can design S as we please. We can take the non-interacting n -body Fermi sphere $|j_0(n)\rangle$ as our vacuum and build the complete set in terms of excitations over it. In the subspace with vanishing spin z component, the simplest states that enter the configuration mixing are those obtained from $|j_0(n)\rangle$ by creating two extra electrons over it; we denote with $|j_n\rangle$ these states. Similarly, along with the pair-m states, we introduce the 4-body states, obtained from $|j_0(n)\rangle$ by creating 2 electrons and 1 electron-hole (e-h) pair. Then S includes the 6-body states having 2 electrons and 2 e-h pairs, and so on. We are using Greek indices for the configurations containing the electron-hole pairs, which here are playing largely the same rôle as phonons in the Cooper theory. By means of the complete set S we now expand the interacting ground state

$$|j_0(n+2)\rangle = \sum_m a_m |j_n\rangle + \sum_{\mu} a_{\mu} |j_i\rangle + \sum_{\nu} a_{\nu} |j_{ii}\rangle + \dots \quad (17)$$

and set up the Schrodinger equation

$$H |j_0(n+2)\rangle = E(n+2) |j_0(n+2)\rangle \quad (18)$$

We stress that Eq.(17) is configuration interaction, not a perturbative expansion. When the number n of electrons in the system is such that $|j_0(n)\rangle$ is a single non-degenerate determinant (the Fermi surface is totally filled), we can easily and unambiguously define and calculate the effective interaction between the two extra electrons since the expansion in Eq.(17) for the interacting ground state is unique: this is done by a canonical transformation [20], [29], [34] from the many-body Hamiltonian of Eq.(3). We consider the effects of the operators H_0 and W on the terms of $|j_0(n+2)\rangle$. Choosing the $|j_n\rangle, |j_i\rangle, |j_{ii}\rangle, \dots$ states to be eigenstates of the kinetic energy H_0 we have

$$H_0 |j_n\rangle = E_n |j_n\rangle; \quad H_0 |j_i\rangle = E_i |j_i\rangle; \quad H_0 |j_{ii}\rangle = E_{ii} |j_{ii}\rangle; \quad \dots \quad (19)$$

Since W can create or destroy up to 2 e-h pairs, its action on an $|j_n\rangle$ state yields

$$W |j_n\rangle = \sum_{m^0} W_{m^0, n} |j_{n^0}\rangle + \sum_{\mu} W_{\mu, n} |j_i\rangle + \sum_{\nu} W_{\nu, n} |j_{ii}\rangle \quad (20)$$

The action of W on the $|j_i\rangle$ states yields

$$W |j_i\rangle = \sum_m W_{m, i} |j_n\rangle + \sum_{\mu^0} W_{\mu^0, i} |j_{i^0}\rangle + \sum_{\nu} W_{\nu, i} |j_{ii}\rangle + \sum_{\lambda} W_{\lambda, i} |j_{iii}\rangle \quad (21)$$

where scattering between 4-body states is allowed by the second term, and so on. In this way we obtain an algebraic system for the coefficients of the configuration interaction of Eq.(17). However to test the instability of the Fermi liquid towards pairing it is sufficient to study the amplitudes a_m of the $|j_n\rangle$ states. In the weak coupling limit this can be done by truncating the expansion in Eq.(17) to the $|j_n\rangle$ states because, as we have

shown [29], the inclusion of the $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ states produces a E -dependent renormalization of the matrix elements of higher order in W , leaving the structure of the equations unaltered.

By taking a linear combination of the $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ states in such a way that

$$(H_0 + W)|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle = E_0 |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \quad (22)$$

the algebraic system reduces to

$$[E_m - E(n+2)]a_m + \sum_{m'} a_{m'} W_{m'm} + a_m W_{m'm} = 0 \quad (23)$$

$$E_0 - E(n+2)a + \sum_{m'} a_{m'} W_{m'm} = 0: \quad (24)$$

Solving for a and substituting in Eq.(23) we exactly decouple the 4-body states as well, ending up with an equation for the dressed pair $|j\rangle = \sum_m a_m |j_m\rangle$. The effective Schrodinger equation for the pair reads

$$(H_0 + W + S[E])|j\rangle = H_{\text{pair}}|j\rangle = E|j\rangle \quad (25)$$

where

$$(S[E])_{m'm} = \sum_{m''} \frac{W_{m'm''} W_{m''m}}{E_0 - E} \quad (26)$$

is the scattering operator. The matrix elements $W_{m'm}$ in Eq.(25) may be written as the sum of two terms representing the direct interaction $W_{m'm}^{(d)}$ among the particles forming the pair and the first-order selfenergy W_m :

$$W_{m'm} = W_{m'm}^{(d)} + W_m \delta_{m'm} \quad (27)$$

Analogously in $S[E]$ we may recognize two different contributions; one is the true effective interaction W_e between the electrons of the m states, while the other one is the forward scattering term F

$$S_{m'm} = (W_e)_{m'm} + F_{m'm} \quad (28)$$

The first-order selfenergy and the forward scattering term are diagonal in the indices m and m' . W_m and F_m renormalize the non-interacting energy E_m of the m states:

$$E_m \rightarrow E_m^{(R)} = E_m + W_m + F_m \quad (29)$$

Eq.(25) is of the form of a Schrodinger equation with eigenvalue $E(n+2)$ for the added pair with the interaction $W^{(d)} + W_e$. Here the $W = 0$ pairs are special because $W^{(d)}$ vanishes. We interpret a_m as the wave function of the dressed pair, which is acted upon by an effective Hamiltonian H_{pair} . This way of looking at Eq.(25) is perfectly consistent, despite the presence of the many-body eigenvalue $E(n+2)$. Indeed, if the interaction is attractive and produces bound states the spectrum of Eq.(25) contains discrete states below the threshold of the continuum (two-electron Fermi energy). This is a clear-cut criterion for pairing, which is exact in principle. The threshold is given by

$$E_F^{(R)} = \min_{fmg} [E_m^{(R)}(E)]; \quad (30)$$

which contains all the pairwise interactions except those between the particles in the pair; it must be determined once Eq.(25) has been solved (since F depends on the solution). The ground state energy E_m may be conveniently written as $E_F^{(R)} + \epsilon$. $\epsilon < 0$ indicates a Cooper-like instability of the normal Fermi liquid and its magnitude represents the binding energy of the pair.

We emphasize the fact that in principle the canonical transformation is exact because in this way our framework does not require $U \ll t$ to be small. The next problem is how to find a practical estimate of the renormalized Fermi energy. In the numerical calculations, some approximation is needed. In Section V and VI, we shall compute the bare quantities; that is, we shall neglect the 6-body and higher excitations in the calculation of W_e and F . This is a reasonable approximation if we compute small corrections to a Fermi liquid background and the exact numerical results in the (1,1) nanotube suggest that this is the case, see Section V.

We want to stress that once the expansion of $|j_0(n+2)\rangle$ in Eq.(17) is truncated as specified above we do not need to construct a good approximation of the interacting ground state wave function in order to get the a_m amplitudes at weak coupling; in this way we obtain information about pairing.

V. THE (1;1) NANOTUBE: EXACT DIAGONALIZATION AND PAIRING MECHANISM

There is evidence from cluster calculations that pairing can arise in the repulsive Hubbard model [23] [30] [31]. In this Section we shall consider the (1;1) nanotube, with $l = 2d$ and periodic boundary conditions, see Fig(2 a). This system has 8 sites and is the smallest nanotube-like cluster showing the superconducting $W = 0$ pairing. Therefore, it represents a very good probe to test the pairing mechanism shown in Section IV, since we can compare exact diagonalization results with the analytic approximations of the canonical transformation.

We define, following Refs. [32] [33],

$$\tilde{\epsilon}(n+2) = E(n+2) - E(n) - 2E(n+1): \quad (31)$$

where $E(n)$ is the ground state energy with n electrons (referenced to the electron vacuum). $\tilde{\epsilon}(n+2)$ is one definition of the pairing energy. This definition is simple, but requires computing the eigenvalues with great accuracy, and has several drawbacks. It says nothing about the dynamics which leads to pairing. Moreover, generally a negative $\tilde{\epsilon}$ does not unambiguously imply pairing, and further problems arise since the above definition depends on the comparison of systems with different n .

However, in several studies of $W = 0$ pairing in finite systems when it was possible to compute $\tilde{\epsilon}$ by exact diagonalization we pointed out [21] [23] [34] that at least at weak coupling it agrees well with $\tilde{\epsilon}$ as obtained by the canonical transformation. This supports the application of Eq.(31).

Below we perform a group-theoretical analysis and obtain $W = 0$ pairs by exploiting the $W = 0$ Theorem. Next, we compute the interacting ground state energy with 2, 3 and 4 electrons by exact numerical diagonalization in order to get $\tilde{\epsilon}(4)$. Finally the canonical transformation is applied to evaluate $\tilde{\epsilon}(4)$ which will be compared with $\tilde{\epsilon}(4)$.

A. Symmetry Properties and $W = 0$ Pairs

The First Brillouin Zone (FBZ) consists of 4 points and since there are two atoms in the unit cell, two bands result. The symmetry properties of this system are intriguing: it is not only invariant under the operations of the Space Group (translations and C_{2v} -operations), but also under the dynamical operation d shown in Fig.(2 b). The dynamical operation d is reminiscent of a similar symmetry which must be taken into account to understand the degeneracies in the 4 × 4 Hubbard model [21].




FIG. 2. (a) The Hubbard model of the (1,1) nanotube; the dashed lines denote hopping interactions due to the wrapping. (b) Illustration of the dynamical symmetry d ; the sites 1, 8, 7, 6 undergo a clockwise rotation while the sites 3, 2, 5, 4 undergo a counterclockwise rotation. One can see by direct inspection that the nearest neighbours of each site are the same of Fig.(2 a).

Including d and closing the multiplication table we obtain a symmetry Group G with 48 elements in 10 classes as shown in Table II.

C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	C_5	C_6	C_7	C_8	C_9	C_{10}
1	C_2	x	y	$x t_{1;0}^2$	$t_{1;0}^2$	$t_{1;0}$	d	$C_2 d$	$y d$

Table II. Top row : symbols of the 10 classes C_i of G ; bottom row : one typical operation for each of the classes; the others can be obtained by conjugation. The operations are: the identity 1, the translation $t_{n,m}$ of n steps along a_+ and

m along a ; d is the dynamical symmetry. The other operations $C_2, C_4, \sigma_x, \sigma_y$ are those of the Group of the rectangle and are referenced to the centre c of Fig (2 a).

In Table III we report the character table of the full symmetry Group G of the (1;1) nanotube of length $l = 2d$.

G	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃	C ₄	C ₅	C ₆	C ₇	C ₈	C ₉	C ₁₀
A ₁	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
A ₂	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1
B ₁	1	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	1	1
B ₂	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	1	-1
E ₁	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	-1	-1
E ₂	2	0	-2	0	-2	2	0	0	-1	1
T ₁	3	1	-1	1	3	-1	-1	-1	0	0
T ₂	3	-1	-1	-1	3	-1	1	1	0	0
T ₃	3	-1	1	1	-3	-1	-1	1	0	0
T ₄	3	1	1	-1	-3	-1	1	-1	0	0

Table III. Character table of the Optimal Group G . The irreps A_1, A_2, B_1 and B_2 reduce to the corresponding ones of the subgroup C_{2v} if G is broken.

The one-body eigenenergies for $t = 1$ eV are shown in Table IV together with the irreps of the associated eigenvectors. From Table II and III we see that G is an Optimal Group as defined above.

Quasimomentum	Energy (=)	Irrep	Energy (= +)	Irrep
$k_1 = (0;0)$	-3	B_2	3	A_1
$k_2 = (0; \frac{2}{3})$	-1	T_1	1	T_3
$k_3 = (\frac{1}{3}; 0)$	-1	T_1	1	T_3
$k_4 = (\frac{1}{3}; 0)$	-1	T_1	1	T_3

Table IV. One-body spectrum for $t = 1$ eV. The energies are in eV.

In Section III we have shown how to get all the $W = 0$ pairs of vanishing momentum and belonging to the irrep A_2 of C_{2v} . However, the (1;1) nanotube is too small to achieve this kind of $W = 0$ pair-states and the projection on the irrep A_2 of $c_{k,i}^y, c_{k,j,\#}^y$ is identically zero. Nevertheless, this cluster admits $W = 0$ -pair solutions of different type and they may be obtained by applying the $W = 0$ Theorem [28], which contains a very general prescription to determine all the $W = 0$ pairs, see Section III.

In the (1;1) nanotube $W = 0$ pairs formed by particles of the same kinetic energy may be obtained in the 3-fold degenerate one-body levels with energies ± 1 eV by projecting $c_{k,i}^y, c_{k,j,\#}^y$ with $i, j = 2; 3; 4$, onto the irreps which are not represented in the one-body spectrum. In this way we find two singlets

$$j_{11}^{1E_1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_{k_3,i}^y c_{k_3,\#}^y - c_{k_4,i}^y c_{k_4,\#}^y) \quad (32)$$

$$j_{22}^{1E_1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (2 c_{k_2,i}^y c_{k_2,\#}^y - c_{k_3,i}^y c_{k_4,\#}^y - c_{k_4,i}^y c_{k_3,\#}^y) \quad (33)$$

and three triplets

$$j_{11}^{3T_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_{k_3,i}^y c_{k_4,\#}^y - c_{k_4,i}^y c_{k_3,\#}^y) \quad (34)$$

$$j_{22}^{3T_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_{k_3,i}^y c_{k_2,\#}^y - c_{k_2,i}^y c_{k_3,\#}^y) \quad (35)$$

$$j_{33}^{3T_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_{k_4,i}^y c_{k_2,\#}^y - c_{k_2,i}^y c_{k_4,\#}^y) \quad (36)$$

while all the other projections yield nothing.

In the above expressions the Bloch states $c_{k,i}^y$ can be taken both in the bonding and the antibonding bands ($\epsilon = \pm 1$ eV respectively). In conclusions we found that the (1;1) nanotube with 8 sites has two $W = 0$ pairs in each band. As already observed, such pairs have a non-vanishing total momentum, contrarily to the $W = 0$ pairs of Section III.

B. Exact diagonalization data

We have performed the numerical diagonalization of the Hamiltonian in Eq.(3) for the (1;1) nanotube of length $2d$ and periodic boundary conditions, filled with 2; 3 and 4 electrons. The interesting case arises when the number of electrons is $n + 2 = 4$, since the non-interacting ground state $j_0(2)i$ is a non-degenerate singlet with vanishing momentum containing two electrons in the lowest energy level. Therefore, the two added electrons may form a $W = 0$ pair according to the result of Section V A.

We found that the interacting ground state $j_0(2)i$ with 2 electrons is a totally symmetric singlet with vanishing momentum for any value of the ratio $U=t$. On the other hand, $j_0(3)i$ is three-fold degenerate in the sector $S_z = \frac{1}{2}$, with momenta $(0; \frac{2}{3})$, $(\frac{1}{3}; 0)$ and $(\frac{2}{3}; 0)$, for $U=t < 10^5$. It belongs to the irrep T_1 in the weak coupling regime. With four electrons (784 configurations) the ground state is a doubly degenerate singlet, with momenta $(0; 0)$ and $(0; \frac{2}{3})$, and belongs to the irrep 1E_1 . This is the symmetry of the $W = 0$ pair; our approach predicts the correct symmetry of the ground state. The first excited state with 4 electrons is a three-fold degenerate triplet with momenta $(0; 0)$, $(\frac{1}{3}; 0)$ and $(\frac{2}{3}; 0)$ and belongs to E . We show below that we are able to predict the symmetry of this state as well. We found that there is no level-crossings up to $U=t < 10^5$.

In order to study the pairing between the two added electrons, we must compute the quantity $\tilde{\Delta}(4) = E(4) + E(2) - 2E(3)$, which is related to the effective interaction according to the discussion made at the beginning of Section V. $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ has been computed in a large range of $U=t$ values, and its trend is shown in Fig.(3).




FIG. 3. Trend of $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ versus $\text{Log } U=t$ for $U=t$ in the range 10^{-5} to 10^5 , $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ is in eV.

For arbitrary small values of $U=t$, $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ is negative and decreases up to a characteristic value of $U=t \approx 4 \times 10^4$, where a minimum is reached; at the minimum $\tilde{\Delta}(4) \approx -0.018 \text{ eV}$. Thus, as in the model Cu-O clusters [23], $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ is a new energy scale of the system, widely different from any of the input parameters. For larger $U=t$, $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ increases until $\tilde{\Delta}(4) = 0$ for $U=t \approx 14$. As far as $U=t \gg 1$, $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ increases monotonically up to the asymptotic positive value of 0.063 eV . We emphasize that $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ becomes positive for large values of $U=t$ and hence pairing disappears in the strong coupling regime. Therefore, the above pairing mechanism cannot be related to the ones considered within the framework of the t - J -like models, where an infinite U is required to forbid double occupation on the same site and pairing is achieved by means of residual attractive interactions.

C. Analytical Canonical Transformation: Pairing Mechanism

In this Section we study the (1;1) nanotube with 8 sites by implementing the canonical transformation described in Section IV but truncated to the π -states. We shall compare the analytic results with the numerical data obtained previously. The non-interacting Fermi sphere $j_0(2)i = c_{k_1}^\dagger c_{k_1}^\dagger |0\rangle$ has two electrons in the lowest level. Since the one-body levels are widely separated the intra-shell interaction is much more important than the inter-shell one. Therefore, we consider only the j_0 states having the added pair of electrons in the lowest unoccupied level of energy -1 eV , neglecting the higher-energy orbitals. We recall that in the three-fold degenerate level with energy -1 eV we can write 5 two-body states (2 singlets and 3 triplets) without double occupancy, see Eqs.(32-36). Hence, we may further reduce the set of the m states in the expansion of the interacting ground state $j_0(4)i$ [see Eq.(17)] by dropping the ones with non-zero direct interaction (which are expected to have wrong symmetries to be the ground state). A convenient basis for the analytic evaluation of

the matrix elements $W_{m\bar{m}0}$ and $(S[E])_{m\bar{m}0}$ (see below) is obtained in terms of the creation operators

$$f_{1;}'^y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{k_3;}'^y + c_{k_4;}'^y); \quad f_{2;}'^y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{k_3;}'^y - c_{k_4;}'^y); \quad (37)$$

The determinantal states

$$|j_{11}i\rangle = f_{1;}'^y f_{2;\#}'^y |j_0(2)i\rangle; \quad |j_{21}i\rangle = f_{2;}'^y f_{1;\#}'^y |j_0(2)i\rangle \quad (38)$$

have projection only on the first component of E_1 and on the first component of T_2 , and are mixed by the operators W and $S[E]$ in Eq.(25). Indeed, the symmetric combination of $|j_{11}i\rangle$ and $|j_{21}i\rangle$ yields $|j_{11}^{1E_1}i\rangle$ of Eq.(32), while the antisymmetric combination yields $|j_{11}^{3T_2}i\rangle$ defined in Eq.(34). Hence, the eigenvalue Eq.(25) reduces to:

$$\frac{E_{m_1} + W_{m_1} + F_{m_1}}{(W_e)_{m_2\bar{m}_1}} = \frac{(W_e)_{m_1\bar{m}_2}}{E_{m_2} + W_{m_2} + F_{m_2}} \frac{a_{m_1}}{a_{m_2}} = E \frac{a_{m_1}}{a_{m_2}}; \quad (39)$$

where we have taken into account that $W^{(d)} = 0$ since $|j_{11}i\rangle$ and $|j_{21}i\rangle$ have no-direct interaction and that the diagonal part of the effective interaction W_e vanishes due to the Pauli principle¹. We performed the sum in Eq.(26) over the states analytically using non renormalized state energies, which is justified at least in the weak-coupling regime. As a consequence of the fact that $(W_e)_{m\bar{m}} = 0$ the forward scattering term turns out to be given by

$$F_m = (S[E])_{m\bar{m}} = \frac{U^2}{8} \frac{1}{2E} + \frac{1}{E + 4t} f[E] \quad (40)$$

and it is independent of the pair index m . The first-order selfenergy W_{m_1} is equal to W_{m_2} and we defer the reader to Section VI for the proof in a more general case; here we limit to write the final result

$$W_F = W_{m_1} = W_{m_2} = \frac{3U}{32}; \quad (41)$$

The off-diagonal matrix elements $(W_e)_{m_1\bar{m}_2} = (W_e)_{m_2\bar{m}_1} w_e[E]$ are responsible for a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ -like effective interaction due to the structure of the states m_1 and m_2 . Performing the sum over the states and taking the bare energies E we get

$$w_e[E] = \frac{U^2}{32} \frac{1}{E + 4t}; \quad (42)$$

Hence, the eigenvectors of Eq.(39) are $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1;1)$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1;-1)$ and correspond to the states

$$|j_{11}^{1E_1}i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_{11}i\rangle + |j_{21}i\rangle) \quad |j_{11}^{1E_1}i\rangle \quad |j_0(2)i\rangle; \quad (43)$$

$$|j_{11}^{3T_2}i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_{11}i\rangle - |j_{21}i\rangle) \quad |j_{11}^{3T_2}i\rangle \quad |j_0(2)i\rangle; \quad (44)$$

From the symmetric combination we get the singlet belonging to the irrep 1E_1 and the lowest energy E_S satisfies the equation

$$8t + W_F + f[E_S] + w_e[E_S] = E_S; \quad (45)$$

According to the treatment described in Section IV we write $E_S = 8t + W_F + f[E_S] + [E_S]$ so that

$$[E_S] = w_e[E_S] \quad (46)$$

The antisymmetric combination corresponds to the triplet belonging to the irrep T_2 and the lowest energy E_T satisfies the equation

$$8t + W_F + f[E_T] - w_e[E_T] = E_T; \quad (47)$$

In this case $[E_T] = -w_e[E_T]$ and it coincides with the modulus of $w_e[E_S]$ in standard second-order perturbation theory [23], see Fig(4.a).

¹More generally, $(W_e)_{m\bar{m}} = 0$ if the m state is a determinantal state. Let $m = ('_{1;}', '_{2;\#})$ be a pair index containing two spin-orbitals; drawing the diagram for the effective interaction W_e with incoming $'_{1;}'$ and $'_{2;\#}$ and outgoing $'_{1;}'$ and $'_{2;\#}$ one realizes that one of the two spin-orbitals must be occupied twice.




FIG. 4. (a) $[\mathbb{E}_S]$ and $[\mathbb{E}_T]$ versus $U=t$. We note that for $U=t > 1$ it is evident that $[\mathbb{E}_S] \notin [\mathbb{E}_T]$. (b) Comparison between $[\mathbb{E}_S]$ and $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$.

In Fig.(4b) it is reported the comparison between $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$, as defined in Eq.(31), and $[\mathbb{E}_S]$ obtained from the canonical transformation. We have exactly fitted the 8 points for $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ and $[\mathbb{E}_S]$ by using a polynomial of order 7 in $U=t$. The ratio r between the quadratic coefficient of $[\mathbb{E}_S]$ and the quadratic coefficient of $\tilde{\Delta}(4)$ is $r = 1.00003$, while the linear coefficients are essentially zero in both cases. We observe that the analytical value $j[\mathbb{E}_S]$ is 2 times greater than $j[\tilde{\Delta}(4)]$ for $U=t' = 1$. This means that the inter-shell interactions and the renormalizations of the π -state energies have an important weight in determining the right value of $[\mathbb{E}_S]$. However, what is comfortable is that the analytical approach predicts the right trend of the binding energy: the singlets feel attraction, while triplet repulsion. This is the result we need to apply the canonical transformation to larger and more physical system s .

V I. PAIRING IN NANOTUBE-SUPERCELLS

A. Canonical Transformation and Pairing Mechanism for $(N;N)$ Nanotubes

Recently, Potassium [35] and Lithium [36] have been intercalated in single- and multi-wall carbon nanotubes and a net charge transfer was observed between the alkali metals and the carbon atoms. Since the intercalation causes a very small structural deformation, we may say that the alkali metal electrons fill the original bands of the nanotube carrying the system away from half-filling. In this Section we apply the canonical transformation to study the pairing mechanism in the electron-doped ($n_F > 0$) arm chair nanotubes of length $l = Ld$ and periodic boundary conditions. On fitting the band index we choose the m states as determinant eigenstates of the kinetic energy H_0 :

$$c_{k_1, \#}^y, c_{k_2, \#}^y j_0(n)i; \quad \epsilon(k_1); \epsilon(k_2) > \epsilon_F \quad (48)$$

where ϵ_F is the Fermi energy and $j_0(n)i$ is the non interacting Fermi sphere with n particles. The first-order self-energy W_m is given by

$$W_m = U \sum_{a,b} \sum_{k,k^0} \sum_{j_1(k; \epsilon_j) j_1(k^0; \epsilon_j)}^{\mathbb{X}^{cc}} j_1^2 + \sum_k \sum_{j_1(k; \epsilon_j)}^{\mathbb{X}^{cc}} \sum_{i=1}^2 j_1(k_i; \epsilon_j)^2 = U \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{n=2}{4N L} \epsilon_j^2 + \frac{n=2}{4N^2 L^2} \epsilon_j^2 W_F \quad (49)$$

where $j_1 i = c_{k_1, \#}^y, c_{k_2, \#}^y j_0(n)i$, the sums over k and k^0 run over the occupied states and we used the fact that $j_1(k; \epsilon_j)^2 = 1/(4N L)$ for any k and ϵ_j .

We truncate the expansion of the interacting ground state $j_0(n+2)i$ of Eq.(17) to the π states and a basis for them looks like

$$c_{k_1, \#}^y, c_{k_2, \#}^y, c_{k_3, \#}^y, c_{k_4, \#}^y j_0(n)i; \quad \epsilon(k_1); \epsilon(k_2); \epsilon(k_4) > \epsilon_F > \epsilon(k_3); \quad \epsilon = \epsilon; \# : \quad (50)$$

In this scheme of approximation, we want to obtain the effective interaction between the electrons forming the $W = 0$ pairs studied in Section III. Projecting on the irrep A_2 the vanishing momentum pair $j(k)i$ $c_{k, \#}^y, c_{k, \#}^y j_0(n)i$ we get from Eq.(26)

$$\begin{aligned} h^{[A_2]}(k) j[\mathbb{E}] j^{[A_2]}(k^0)i = & \sum_{p,q} \sum_{k} \sum_{j_1(k; \epsilon_j)}^{\mathbb{X}^{cc}} \sum_{j_1(k^0; \epsilon_j)}^{\mathbb{X}^{cc}} \frac{(\epsilon(k+p-q) - \epsilon_F) j_1(k;p; k+p-q; q) j_1^2}{(\epsilon(k+p+q) - \epsilon_F) (\epsilon(p) + \epsilon(q) + \epsilon(k) - \epsilon_F)} + \\ & \sum_{\hat{\sigma}^2 C_{2v}} \sum_{(A_2)} \sum_{(\hat{\sigma})} \sum_{p,q} \sum_{j_1(k; \epsilon_j)}^{\mathbb{X}^{cc}} \sum_{j_1(k^0; \epsilon_j)}^{\mathbb{X}^{cc}} \frac{U (\hat{\sigma}^2 k^0 + k + p; k \hat{\sigma}^2 k^0; p) U (k;p; \hat{\sigma}^2 k^0 + k + p; \hat{\sigma}^2 k^0)}{(\hat{\sigma}^2 k^0 + k + p) (\epsilon(p) + \epsilon(k^0) + \epsilon(k) - \epsilon_F)} \quad (51) \end{aligned}$$

where we have taken into account Eq.(50) for the states and we set $E^0 = E_F$, which is justified at least in the weak-coupling regime. The sums are over occupied p and empty q . Since $\mu_F > 0$, we omitted the band index $+$ of the electron eigenenergies ϵ , while we sum over the band index $-$ of the virtual hole. The vertex U is given by Eq.(11) where ψ refers to the Bloch-function depending on p , while all the other band indices are intended to be $+$. The first term on the r.h.s. of Eq.(51) is the forward scattering contribution $F(k)$, while the second term represents the effective interaction $W_e(k; k^0)$. We may see that standard perturbation theory yields the arithmetic mean of the two unperturbed limits $E \pm 2\mu(k)$ and $E \pm 2\mu(k^0)$. In particular, the forward scattering F in Eq.(51) coincides with the second-order self-energy of the one-particle propagator in the same limit.

We emphasize that Eq.(51) is characterized by a symmetry-induced quantum mechanical interference of several terms. This interference produces a partial cancellation, and the absolute value of the result is typically much smaller than individual contributions. This means that the interaction is dynamically small for $W = 0$ pairs: they have no direct interactions (that is $W^{(d)}$, defined in Eq.(27), is zero for $W = 0$ pairs), and because of the interference the effective interaction is reduced compared to what one could expect by a rough order-of-magnitude estimate. However, the presence of the theta functions and the anisotropy of the integrands prevent a total cancellation. Substituting Eqs.(49-51) into Eq.(25), we cast the result in the form of a Cooper-like Schrodinger equation

$$[2\mu(k) + W_F + F(k)]a_k + \sum_{k^0 \in D=4} W_e(k; k^0)a_{k^0} = E a_k; \quad (52)$$

for a self-consistent calculation of E (since W_e and F are E -dependent). The indices k and k^0 run over $D=4$ of the empty part of the FBZ and we denoted such a set of wavevectors as $D=4$. We are interested in the possibility that $E = 2\mu_F + W_F + F_{\min}(k_F) + \epsilon$, with a positive binding energy ϵ of the $W = 0$ pair; here $F_{\min}(k_F)$ is the minimum value of $F(k)$ among the k_F -wavevectors on the Fermi surface to be determined self-consistently with the eigenvalue E .

We have performed numerical estimates of ϵ by working on supercells of $2N_L = N_C$ cells. Here we solved the Cooper-like equation in a virtually exact way for N up to 6 and L up to 32. The results have been reported in Table V a, V b, V c and V d where the hopping parameter $t = 1$ eV. As a reasonable value, we have taken $U = t = 1.7$ which is of the correct order of magnitude for graphite [37] [38]. In line with our previous finding in the small (1,1) cluster, $W = 0$ A_2 singlets show pairing. The calculations are performed with the Fermi energy μ_F varying between 0.5 eV and 1.2 eV (half filling corresponds to $\mu_F = 0$). We see that the binding energy ϵ of the pairs decreases monotonically both with the radius and the length of the tube.

We need to work away from half filling in order to operate our mechanism; on the other hand, close to half filling the system is a Luttinger liquid down to extremely low temperatures where a gap could open [14].

L	N	V	
10	2	12.0	0.43
20	2	5.7	0.38
32	2	3.6	0.35

L	N	V	
10	4	6.3	0.37
20	4	3.1	0.38
32	4	2.0	0.35

L	N	V	
10	6	4.0	0.39
20	6	2.4	0.47
32	6	1.5	0.38

Table V a. Data at $\mu_F = 0.5$ eV; ϵ is in meV; V is in eV, $t = 1$ eV and $U = 1.7$ eV.

L	N	V	
10	2	11.6	0.42
20	2	6.0	0.40
32	2	3.7	0.36

L	N	V	
10	4	6.0	0.40
20	4	3.0	0.40
32	4	2.0	0.43

L	N	V	
10	6	4.2	0.38
20	6	2.2	0.36
32	6	1.1	0.30

Table V b. Data at $\mu_F = 0.8$ eV; ϵ is in meV; V is in eV, $t = 1$ eV and $U = 1.7$ eV.

L	N	V	
10	2	11.1	0.40
20	2	6.0	0.40
32	2	3.9	0.38

L	N	V	
10	4	6.5	0.24
20	4	2.9	0.15
32	4	1.8	0.14

L	N	V	
10	6	4.4	0.17
20	6	3.5	0.25
32	6	1.6	0.18

Table V c. Data at $\mu_F = 1.0$ eV; ϵ is in meV; V is in eV, $t = 1$ eV and $U = 1.7$ eV.

L	N	V	L	N	V	L	N	V			
10	2	10.5	0.40	10	4	5.5	0.40	10	6	4.4	0.25
20	2	6.0	0.44	20	4	3.2	0.43	20	6	1.6	0.34
32	2	3.9	0.45	32	4	1.9	0.37	32	6	1.0	0.33

Table V d. Data at $\mu_F = 1.2$ eV; μ is in meV; V is in eV, $t = 1$ eV and $U = 1.7$ eV.

B. Extrapolation to large L

With supercell sizes $N_C > 400$ numerical calculations become hard. Since we are concerned with the asymptotic behaviour for fixed N and $L \rightarrow \infty$ and $\Delta(N; L)$ depends on N and L in a complicated way, we need a method to make reliable extrapolations of the numerical results. To this end, like in previous work [20], [31] we define the Average Effective Interaction V . This is such that setting in Eq.(52) $W_e = \frac{V}{N_C}$, with a constant $V > 0$ for all k and k^0 in $D=4$, one obtains the correct value of Δ . In other terms, once the binding energy Δ is known by solving Eq.(52), the constant V must be chosen in such a way that

$$\frac{1}{V} = \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{k \in D=4} \frac{1}{[2(\mu(k) + F(k)) - 2(\mu_F + F_{in}(k_F))] - \Delta(N; L)}; \quad (53)$$

In Table V a, V b, V c and V d. we have reported the value of V which remains fairly stable around 0.4 eV and does not drop to 0 in the limit of large L. Therefore V must be interpreted as a characteristic energy scale of the system which is largely independent on the Fermi energy and on the radius. We have numerically observed that $\mu(k) - F_{in}(k_F) \rightarrow 0$; hence we may extrapolate the asymptotic value of Δ from Eq.(53) by dropping the difference $F(k) - F_{in}(k_F)$ and taking the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. The domain is extended to D and the result is divided by 4. Since k_x is the component along the tube axis, we convert the summation into an integral:

$$\frac{1}{V} = \frac{1}{8N} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_y} \int dk_x \frac{(\mu(k_x; k_y) - \mu_F)}{2(\mu(k_x; k_y) - \mu_F) - \Delta_{asymp}(N)}; \quad (54)$$

with $\Delta_{asymp}(N) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Delta(N; L)$. We solved the above equation for the unknown $\Delta_{asymp}(N)$ for several values of N and μ_F , using a typical value $V = 0.4$ eV obtained from the calculations in supercells. We found that Δ_{asymp} is strongly dependent on the filling at fixed N. Remarkably, there exists an optimal doping at the Fermi energy $\mu_F = 1$ eV where $\Delta_{asymp}(N)$ is appreciably different from zero, while Δ_{asymp} is strongly suppressed far from it for $N > 4$, see Fig.(5 a).




FIG. 5. Results of the canonical transformation approach with $t = 1$ eV and $U = 1.7$ eV. (a) Δ_{asymp} as a function of the Fermi energy μ_F for $N = 4$ (empty triangles), $N = 8$ (black boxes) and $N = 16$ (grey diamonds). The Fermi energy varies in the range 0.6 to 1.2. (b) Δ_{asymp} as a function of N for N in the range 4 to 36 and $\mu_F = 1$ eV.

The existence of an optimal doping can be understood by looking at the density of states $\rho(\mu)$ and at the integrand $1/[2(\mu - \mu_F) - \Delta_{asymp}] - g(\mu)$ in Eq.(54). From Fig.(6) we see that $\rho(\mu)$ has an absolute maximum at $\mu = 1$ eV, which is reminiscent of the Van Hove singularity in the graphite sheet, and exhibits well-defined oscillations as a function of the nanotube radius [39]. On the other hand, $g(\mu)$ is peaked at $\mu = \mu_F$. Therefore, for $\mu_F = 1$ eV we have a synergy which leads to an absolute maximum of Δ_{asymp} . The prediction of

an optimal doping follows from Eq.(54) and is therefore largely mechanism-independent. A trend similar to the one shown in Fig.(5b) was reported by Benedict et al. [40], although they considered a phonon-driven mechanism.




FIG. 6. Density of states in the (4;4) (a), (8;8) (b) and (16;16) (c) nanotube. (") is in eV^{-1} .

At the optimal doping we observe that $\epsilon_{\text{asym pt}}(N)$ decreases monotonically as the radius $R = \frac{a}{2N}$ of the tube increases, see Fig.(5b). However, in the limit of large N , $\epsilon_{\text{asym pt}}(N)$ remains stable around 1.7 meV and may be interpreted as the binding energy of the $W = 0$ pair in an optimally doped graphite sheet. By a rough order of magnitude estimate, we may say that the superconducting critical temperature predicted by our approach at $\mu_F = 1 \text{ eV}$ (which corresponds to a number of electrons per graphite atom of 1.25) is $T_c^{\text{asym pt}}(1) \approx 10 - 20 \text{ K}$. These results may be compared with the available experimental data on the alkali-graphite intercalation compounds (GIC). There is experimental evidence that the critical temperature T_c in alkali-GIC C_xM (where M is a given alkali metal) grows as x decreases [41]. The number of electrons per graphite atom f is related to x by an empirical formula [42] $f = \alpha x$ where α is the fractional charge transfer. A typical value for α is 0.5 - 0.6 [43] and hence the filling $f = 1.25$ corresponds to the alkali-GIC's C_2M . Under high-pressure, high metal concentration samples such as C_6K , C_3K , C_4Na , C_3Na , C_2Na , C_2Li have been synthesized; for C_2Na the value of T_c is 5 K while for C_2Li , $T_c = 1.9 \text{ K}$; in both cases the superconducting critical temperature is of the same order of magnitude of $\epsilon_{\text{asym pt}}(1)$. Quite recently Potassium [35] and Lithium [36] have been intercalated also in single- and multi-wall carbon nanotubes up to high concentration (the highest metal concentration was obtained with Lithium in C_2Li). Our mechanism predicts that the binding energy of the $W = 0$ pairs is bigger in nanotubes than in graphite sheets and this suggests a higher critical temperature for the former, see Fig(5b). This is also supported by the measurements of a $T_c \approx 15 \text{ K}$ in the 4 Angstrom SWNT by Tang et al. [5].

V II. CONCLUSIONS

Currently, carbon nanotubes superconduct at much lower temperatures than high- T_c Cuprates and the two kinds of materials are apparently quite different. However, symmetry arguments based on the $W = 0$ theorem tell us that, despite the obvious differences, part of the story must be the same, i.e. by a suitable choice of Dirac's characters the on-site Coulomb interaction is utterly turned off. This produces the singlet pairing and constrains the ground state spin-orbital symmetry of the interacting system. We presented analytic expressions for the effective interaction and obtained the binding energy for $(N;N)$ arm chair nanotubes; in the case $N = 1$ we verified these predictions numerically and got high-precision agreement.

Although the results presented in this paper cannot be quantitatively compared with the experimental data, the order of magnitude of the pair binding energy agrees with experiment. Furthermore, the decreasing of the binding energy with N is suggested by recent measurements on nanotubes with diameter of few Angstrom [5].

The paired state we have obtained here is essentially two-dimensional, that is the transverse direction is crucial to have a non-Abelian symmetry group and hence $W = 0$ pairs; the pairing mechanism uses degenerate electronic states that exist in 2d away from half filling. This opens up the interesting possibility that two distinct superconducting order parameters appear in the phase diagram, if it turns out that close to half-filling there is another one due to a breakdown of the Luttinger liquid.

REFERENCES

-
- [1] S. Iijima, *Nature* (London) 354, 56 (1991).
 - [2] M. Bockrath, D. H. Cobden, J. Lu, A. G. Rinzler, R. E. Smalley, L. Balents and P. L. McEuen, *Nature* (London) 397, 598 (1999); Z. Yao, H. W. C. Postma, L. Balents and C. Dekker, *Nature* (London) 402, 271 (1999); H. W. C. Postma, M. de Jonge, Z. Yao and C. Dekker, *Phys. Rev. B* 62, R10653 (2000).
 - [3] A. Y. Kasumov, R. Deblock, M. Kociak, B. Reulet, H. Bouchiat, I. I. Khodos, Yu. B. Gorbatov, V. T. Volkov, C. Joumet and M. Burghard, *Science* 284, 1508 (1999); see also A. Yu. Kasumov, in *Proceedings of the School and Workshop on Nanotubes and Nanostructures 2000*, Santa Margherita di Pula (Ca), Italy.
 - [4] A. F. Morpurgo, J. Kong, C. M. Marcus and H. Dai *Science* 286, 263 (1999).
 - [5] Z. K. Tang, Lingyue Zhang, N. Wang, X. X. Zhang, G. H. Wen, G. D. Lee, J. N. Wang, C. T. Chan and Ping Sheng, *Science* 292, 2462 (2001).
 - [6] M. Kociak, A. Yu. Kasumov, S. Guéron, B. Reulet, I. I. Khodos, Yu. B. Gorbatov, V. T. Volkov, L. Vaccarini and H. Bouchiat, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 2416 (2001).
 - [7] Jeroen W. G. Wildoer, L. C. Venema, A. G. Rinzler, R. E. Smalley and C. Dekker, *Nature* (London) 391, 59 (1998); T. W. Odom, J. Huang, P. Kim and C. M. Lieber, *Nature* (London) 391, 62 (1998).
 - [8] N. Hamada, S. Sawada and A. Oshiyama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 68, 1579 (1992).
 - [9] X. Blasé, Lorin X. Benedict, Eric L. Shirley, and Steven G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 72, 1878 (1994); C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, *ibid*, 78, 1932 (1997).
 - [10] S. J. Tans, M. H. Devoret, H. J. Dai, A. Thess, R. E. Smalley, L. J. Geerlings and C. Dekker, *Nature* (London) 386, 474 (1997).
 - [11] Marc Bockrath, David H. Cobden, Paul L. McEuen, Nasreen G. Chopra, A. Zettl, Andreas Thess, and R. E. Smalley, *Science* 275, 1922 (1997).
 - [12] S. Bellucci and J. Gonzalez, *Phys. Rev. B* 64, 201106 (2001).
 - [13] L. Balents and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* 55, R 11973 (1997).
 - [14] Jeno Solyom, in *Proceedings of the School and Workshop on Nanotubes and Nanostructures 2000*, Santa Margherita di Pula (Ca), Italy.
 - [15] Y. A. Krotov, D. H. Lee and S. G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78, 4245 (1997).
 - [16] R. Egger and A. O. Gogolin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79, 5082 (1997).
 - [17] H. Yoshioka and A. A. Odintsov *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 374 (1999).
 - [18] A. Sedky, L. G. Caron and C. Bourbonnais, *Phys. Rev. B* 65, 140515 (2002).
 - [19] J. Gonzalez, cond-mat/0204171.
 - [20] Michele Cini, Gianluca Stefanucci and Adalberto Balzarotti, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 10, 293 (1999).
 - [21] Michele Cini, Enrico Peretto and Gianluca Stefanucci, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 20, 91 (2001).
 - [22] W. Kohn and J. M. Luttinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 15, 524 (1965).
 - [23] Michele Cini and Adalberto Balzarotti, *Phys. Rev. B* 56, 14711 (1997).
 - [24] Michele Cini and Gianluca Stefanucci, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 13, 1279 (2001).
 - [25] Michele Cini and Gianluca Stefanucci, *Solid State Commun.* 117, 451 (2001).
 - [26] Gianluca Stefanucci and Michele Cini, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 14, 2653 (2002).
 - [27] Gianluca Stefanucci and Michele Cini, accepted by the *Phys. Rev. B*.
 - [28] Michele Cini, Adalberto Balzarotti, Ra aella Brunetti, Maria Gimelli and Gianluca Stefanucci, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* 14, 2994 (2000).
 - [29] Michele Cini, Gianluca Stefanucci and A. Balzarotti, *Solid State Commun.* 109, 229 (1999).
 - [30] R. Citro and M. Marinaro, *Z. Phys. B* 103 153 (1997).
 - [31] W. Fettes and I. Morgenstern, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 9, 9509 (1996).
 - [32] J. E. Hirsch, S. Tang, E. Loh and D. J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60, 1668 (1988).
 - [33] C. A. Balseiro, A. G. Rojo, E. R. Gagliano and A. A. Jascio, *Phys. Rev. B* 38, 9315 (1988).
 - [34] Michele Cini, Adalberto Balzarotti and Gianluca Stefanucci, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 14, 269 (2000).
 - [35] M. Bockrath, J. Hone, H. Zettl, P. L. McEuen, A. G. Rinzler and R. E. Smalley, *Phys. Rev. B* 61, R10606 (2000).
 - [36] B. Gao, A. Kleinhammes, X. P. Tang, C. Bower, L. Fleming, Y. Wu and O. Zhou, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 307, 153 (1999); J. Zhao, A. Buldum, J. Han and J. Ping Lu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85, 1706 (2000).
 - [37] M. P. Lopez Sancho, M. C. Muñoz and L. Chico, *Phys. Rev. B* 63, 165419 (2001).

- [38] A .L.Tchougreof and R.Ho man, J.Phys.Chem . 96, 8993 (1992).
- [39] M .S.Ferreira, T .G.D argam , R .B.M uniz and A .Latge', Phys.Rev.B 63, 245111 (2001).
- [40] Lorin X .Benedict, V incent H .C respi, Steven G .Louie and M arvin L.Cohen Phys.Rev.B 52, 14935 (1995).
- [41] J.T.Belash, O .V.Zharikov and A .V.Pal'nichenko, Solid State Comm . 63, 153 (1987); J.T.Belash, A .D.Bronnikov, O .V.Zharikov and A .V.Pal'nichenko, Solid State Comm . 64, 1445 (1987); J.T.Belash, A .D.Bronnikov, O .V.Zharikov and A .V.Pal'nichenko, Solid State Comm . 69, 921 (1989).
- [42] U.M izutani, T.Kondow and T.B.M assalski, Phys.Rev.B 17, 3165 (1978).
- [43] R.A .Jishi, M .S.D resselhaus, Phys.Rev.B 21, 12465 (1992).
- [44] Hannay et al.Phys.Rev.14, 225 (1965)