

Superconducting fluctuations in the Luther-Emery liquid

Edmond O'rignac

Laboratoire de Physique Theorique de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure CNRS-UMR 8549, F-75231 Paris Cedex 05, France

Didier Poilblanc

Laboratoire de Physique Theorique CNRS-FRE2603,
Université Paul Sabatier, F-31062 Toulouse, France

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

The single-particle superconducting Green's functions of a Luther-Emery liquid is computed by bosonization techniques. Using a formulation introduced by Poilblanc and Scalapino [Phys. Rev. B 66, 052513 (2002)], an asymptotic expression of the superconducting gap is deduced in the long wavelength and small frequency limit. Due to superconducting phase fluctuations, the gap exhibits as a function of size L a $(1/L)^{1-2K}$ power-law decay as well as an interesting singularity at the spectral gap energy. Similarities and differences with the 2-leg t-J ladder are outlined.

PACS numbers: PACS numbers: 75.10.-b, 75.10.Jm, 75.40.Mg

Superconductivity in cuprate materials has sparked an important theoretical effort to investigate superconducting order in strongly correlated materials. A long-ranged superconducting ground state (GS) is characterized by a non-zero superconducting Gorkov's off-diagonal one-electron Matsubara Green function [1] defined as

$$F(q; i) = -\hbar T c_{q; (i=2)} c_{q; (i=2)} i: \quad (1)$$

As proposed recently [2], basing on the Nambu-Eliashberg theory [1], the Matsubara frequency-dependent gap function $\Delta_{SC}(q; i_n)$ can be directly computed from the diagonal and off-diagonal Green functions $G(q; i_n)$ and $F(q; i_n)$ as

$$\Delta_{SC}(q; i_n) = \frac{2i!_n F(q; i_n)}{G(q; i_n) - G(q; i_{-n})} : \quad (2)$$

Such an expression has been used in numerical computations for the two-dimensional t-J model [2] and for two-leg t-J ladders [3]. A one-dimensional system such as the two-leg t-J ladder is actually far remote from a normal Fermi liquid or a conventional superconductor [4, 5, 6]. The t-J ladder belongs to the class of Luther-Emery (LE) liquids [7], which are characterized by spin/total charge separation, with a spectral gap in spin excitation and gapless charge excitations [8]. The gapless charge excitations lead to a perfect metallic conductivity [9] without any long range superconducting order [10]. The spectral gap in the spin excitations generates a gap in the one-electron spectral functions [11, 12]. In an infinite system, the absence of long range superconducting order implies that the correlation function (1) has to vanish. However, in a finite system, the function (1) does not vanish and the quantity defined in (2) may provide useful information on the pairing processes [3]. As a complementary study to numerical studies, it is interesting to investigate analytically the behavior of $\Delta_{SC}(q; i)$ in a finite size LE liquid. A complication in the case of the two-leg ladder

is that interband (but not total) charge excitations contribute to the formation of the spin-gap [5]. A simpler example of a LE liquid is a ladder by the $U < 0$ Hubbard chain [13, 14] or the related spin-gap phase of the t-J chain [15] in which the gap is developed purely in the spin mode. Moreover, this model of a LE liquid is integrable both on the lattice [14] and in the continuum limit [16]. Progress in the theory of integrable systems has made it possible to calculate correlation functions using the form factor expansion [17]. In the case of gapful systems, it has been shown that the first few terms of the expansion usually lead to good approximations of the physical quantities [18]. In the present paper, we will calculate Δ_{SC} in the case of an attractive one-dimensional Hubbard chain. The Hamiltonian reads:

$$H = \sum_{p=1}^N \left(\frac{v}{2} (c_{p+1}^\dagger c_p + \text{H.c.}) + U \sum_{p=1}^N n_p n_{p+\#} \right) \quad (3)$$

Although the Hubbard model in one-dimension is integrable, its form factors have proved very difficult to obtain [19]. Since we are mostly interested in the low-energy and long-wavelength, it is more convenient to take the continuum limit. The continuum Hamiltonian $H = H_s + H_c$ reads:

$$H_s = v \int_0^L \frac{dx}{2} [K (\psi^\dagger)^2 + \frac{1}{K} (\psi)^2]; \quad (4)$$

$$H_c = \int_0^L \frac{dx}{2} [v f (\phi^\dagger)^2 + (\phi)^2 g - \frac{U}{8} \cos \frac{p}{8}];$$

where ψ and ϕ are the bosonic fields describing respectively the spin and charge excitations, ψ^\dagger and ϕ^\dagger their conjugate variables, a is a short distance cut-off (lattice spacing) and $L = N a$ is the system size. Note that we assume here a unique velocity v for spin and charge excitations. The spin excitations are described by the sine-Gordon model. The term $\cos \frac{p}{8}$ is marginally

relevant and opens a spin gap M . The excitations above the ground state are known [16] to consist only of massive solitons (spinons) carrying the spin $S=1/2$ and charge zero, in agreement with the exact solution of the lattice Hubbard model [14]. It is important to note that with the usual definition of the spin gap as the gap between the ground state and the lowest triplet excited state, $\Delta_{\text{spin}} = 2M$. The fermion operators can be decomposed as $c_{p,r} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha} e^{ik_F r x} \psi_{\alpha}(x)$ ($x = p, r = \uparrow$ or \downarrow) and the fermionic fields ψ_{α} can be expressed as [7]:

$$\psi_{\alpha}(x) = \frac{e^{i\frac{x}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\frac{x}{2}} \psi_{\alpha}(x); \quad (5)$$

where ψ_{α} and ψ_{α} are the dual fields. Fermion propagators thus factorize into the product of a holon propagator and a spinon propagator. Since the charge Hamiltonian is quadratic, the calculation if the holon propagator is straightforward. For the spinon propagator, one needs to know the expression of the form factors of soliton-creating operators $e^{i(\frac{x}{2})}$ in the sine-Gordon model. These have been obtained recently in infinite volume [20] and these results have been applied to the calculation of the diagonal Green's functions [12] confirming the ansatz of Ref. [11]. In our case, we need form factors in a system of finite size. However, if the system size L is much larger than the correlation length $\xi = v/M$, since the dominant contribution to $\Delta_{\text{SC}}(q; !)$ comes from integration on the region $x; v$, it is a good approximation to replace infinite volume form factors by finite volume ones. Keeping this in mind, we define the diagonal and off-diagonal Green's functions as:

$$G(x;) = \langle \psi_{\alpha}(x;) \psi_{\alpha}(0; 0) \rangle; \quad (6)$$

$$F(x;) = \langle \psi_{\alpha}(x;) \psi_{\alpha}(0; 0) \rangle; \quad (7)$$

Following [12], the asymptotic (long-distance) behaviors of the diagonal and off-diagonal Green's functions is then obtained as,

$$G(x;) = \frac{Z_1}{2^{1/2}} \left(\frac{v}{2M} \right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{ix} \frac{1}{v} (-)^2 e^{-M|x|} e^{-i\pi v}; \quad (8)$$

$$F(x;) = \frac{Z_1}{2^{1/2}} \left(\frac{2}{L} \right)^{1/2K} \left(\frac{v}{2M} \right)^{1/2} (-)^2 e^{-M|x|} e^{-i\pi v};$$

where $\frac{1}{8} = \frac{1}{x^2 + (v)^2}$, $\frac{1}{8} = \frac{1}{8} (K + 1 = K - 2)$, $0 = \frac{1}{8} (K - 1 = K)$, Z_1 is a dimensionless constant calculated in [20] and M the single particle gap. These expressions show that G and F have a similar exponential decay at large distances above the characteristic length-scale $\xi = v/M$. More rapidly decaying terms like $e^{-3M|x|}$ and higher that involve more than one spinon in the intermediate state have been neglected. Note that the SC Green's function decays with system size like as $(1/L)^{1/2K}$ due to SC phase fluctuations. However, apart from this overall power-law scaling factor, we expect the SC gap




FIG. 1: Superconducting gap (normalized to its $Q = 0$ value) vs $Q\xi$.

Δ_{SC} to remain finite and bear interesting q and $!$ dependence. Using the Fourier transforms of the above expressions (8), the momentum and Matsubara-frequency dependence of the gap is given by

$$\Delta_{\text{SC}}(q; !_n) = C M \left(\frac{2}{L} \right)^{1/2K} \frac{{}_2F_1\left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{0; \frac{5}{4}}{2}; 1; y\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(1, \frac{3}{2}; 2; y\right)}; \quad (9)$$

where $y = (Q\xi)^2$, $Q^2 = (q - k_F)^2 + (!_n)^2 = v^2$, ${}_2F_1$ is the hypergeometric function [21] and $C = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{L} \right)^{1/2K} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{L} \right)^{1/2K}$. The approximate expression (9) although a long-wavelength limit still applies up to momentum $Q = 2\pi/L$. Note that $(Q\xi)^2$ terms are dropped since Δ_{SC} is maximum (minimum) at $Q = 0$ (i.e. at the Fermi momentum) for $K < 1.57$ ($K > 1.57$) and shows only a very moderate dependence in Q as shown in Fig. 1. For $Q \neq 0$, $\Delta_{\text{SC}}(q; !_n) = \Delta_{\text{SC}}(0; 0) (1 - C^0(Q\xi)^2)^{1/2}$. The constant $C^0 = \frac{1}{64} \left(\frac{1}{2} K^2 - 4K + 13 + \frac{2}{8} K + \frac{1}{2K^2} \right)$ decreases for increasing SC correlations i.e. for increasing K , e.g. $C^0 = 0.674, 0.188$ and 0.016 for $K = 0.5$ (charge density wave regime), 1 and 1.5 (superconducting regime), respectively.

The real-frequency expression of the gap is obtained by the analytic continuation $(!_n)^2 \rightarrow (! + i0)^2$ in Eq. (9). For $! > M$, the hypergeometric functions have branch cuts, leading to a nonzero imaginary part in $\Delta_{\text{SC}}(0; !)$ as can be seen on Fig. 2(b). Above the threshold, the gap function presents a singular behavior: $\Delta_{\text{SC}}(0; !) = \Delta_{\text{SC}}(0; 0) (1 - \frac{(! + i0)^2}{M^2})^{1/2K}$. The divergence at $! = M$ is in fact cut-off once $! = M < j < 1 = L$ since we are really dealing with a system of finite size, so that $\Delta_{\text{SC}}(q; ! = M) = M$. The full $!$ -dependence of Δ_{SC} plotted in Fig. 2(a) indeed reveals a strong singularity at $! = M$ increasingly pronounced as system size is increased.

In the absence of data for a single attractive Hub-




FIG. 2: Real (a)) and imaginary (b)) parts of the superconducting gap vs ω obtained by bosonization results for a 1D LE liquid (energies are in units of the spectral (solitonic) gap M) for $K = 1.3$ and $q = k_F$. Data for two lengths are shown.

bard chain or a single t-J chain, we compare our results to numerical calculations on the t-J ladder model at 1/8-doping and $J = 0.4$ [3]. The numerical calculations on 2 × 12 ladder show that there are two spinon gaps, $M(q_y = 0) = 0.08t$ and $M(q_y = \pi) = 0.12t$ such that $F(q_y = 0; \omega)$, $G(q_y = 0; \omega)$ and $G(q_y = \pi; \omega)$ develop an imaginary part for $\omega > M(q_y)$. The comparison of these spinon gaps with the actual spin gap of a 2 × 24 ladder [24] (defined as the gap between the lowest triplet excitation and the singlet ground state) gives $M(q_y = 0) = 0.11t$, $2M(q_y = 0)$ and $M(q_y = \pi) = 0.17t$, $M(q_y = \pi) + M(q_y = 0)$. The discrepancies could result from a spinon-spinon attraction or from the overestimation of the spinon gaps in the 2 × 12 ladder. It is also important to note that in [3], the correlation length is of the order of magnitude of the system size. We note that no sharp peak is present in the imaginary part at the threshold, in contrast to the prediction of (9), but the prediction of a rather constant behavior of below the threshold is in agreement with (9).

A more detailed comparison between analytic and numerical result is possible. In the case of the ladder system, away from half-filling, the gapped modes is expected to present an approximate $SO(6) \times SU(4)$ symmetry [22, 26]. This allows a description of the gapped modes by the $SO(6)$ Gross-Neveu (GN) model [23] and a form factor calculation of the superconducting gap $\Delta_{sc}(q; \omega_n)$ along the lines of the present paper [26]. The novelty in the case of the $SO(6)$ GN model is that on top of the spinon excitations of mass M (known as kinks in the literature on the GN model), there are massive

fermion excitations (bound states) with a mass $M\sqrt{2}$. This implies a second threshold in $\Delta_{sc}(q; \omega_n)$ at the energy $\omega = M(1 + \sqrt{2})$ besides the threshold at energy $\omega = M$. Whether this could be related to some higher energy features seen in numerics [3] needs further clarifications. This will be discussed in more details in a separate publication.

In conclusion, we have computed the fluctuating SC gap of the LE chain. A simple form is obtained with a factorization into a power-law factor accounting for SC suppression due to quantum phase fluctuations multiplied by a function containing the dynamics of the pairing interaction. We point out some differences with the case of the 2-leg t-J ladder and suggest that the gapped sectors of the latter could be better described by the $SO(6)$ GN model.

-
- [1] J. R. Schrieffer, in *Theory of Superconductivity* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1964), Chap. 7.
 - [2] D. Poilblanc and D. J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 052513 (2002).
 - [3] D. Poilblanc, D. J. Scalapino and S. Capponi (unpublished).
 - [4] E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice, *Science* **271**, 618 (1996), and references therein.
 - [5] H. J. Schulz, in *Correlated fermions and transport in mesoscopic systems*, edited by T. Martin, G. Montambaux, and J. Tran Thanh Van (Editions frontieres, Gif sur Yvette, France, 1996), p. 81.
 - [6] E. Dagotto, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **62**, 1525 (1999).
 - [7] H. J. Schulz, in *Mesoscopic quantum physics*, Les Houches LXI, edited by E. Akkermans, G. Montambaux, J. L. Pichard, and J. Zinn-Justin (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995), p. 533.
 - [8] For numerical studies see e.g. C. A. Hayward et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 926 (1995); D. Poilblanc, D. J. Scalapino, and W. Hanke, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, 6796 (1995).
 - [9] H. J. Mikeska and H. Schmidt, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **2**, 371 (1970).
 - [10] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **17**, 1133 (1967).
 - [11] J. Voit, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **5**, 505 (1998).
 - [12] A. M. Tsvelik and F. H. L. Essler, cond-mat/0205294 (unpublished).
 - [13] A. Luther and V. J. Emery, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 589 (1974).
 - [14] N. Andrei, in *Low-Dimensional Quantum Field Theories For Condensed Matter Physicists*, edited by S. Lundqvist, G. Morandi, and L. Yu (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993), and references therein.
 - [15] M. Nakamura, K. Nomura, and A. Kitazawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3214 (1997), cond-mat/9708204.
 - [16] N. Andrei and J. H. Lowenstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 1698 (1979).
 - [17] M. Karowski and P. Wiesz, *Nucl. Phys. B* **139**, 455 (1978).
 - [18] D. Controzzi, F. H. L. Essler, and A. M. Tsvelik, in

- New Theoretical approaches to strongly correlated systems, Vol. 23 of NATO Science Series II. Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry, edited by A.M. Tsvelik (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2001), p. 25.
- [19] F.H. Essler and V.E. Korepin, cond-mat/9808018 (unpublished).
 - [20] S. Lukyanov and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B 607, 437 (2001).
 - [21] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun, Handbook of mathematical functions (Dover, New York, 1972).
 - [22] H. Schulz, cond-mat/9808167 (unpublished).
 - [23] D.J. Gross and A. Neveu, Phys. Rev. D 10, 3235 (1974).
 - [24] Data obtained using an approximate Contractor Renormalisation (CORE) method; see S. Capponi and D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B 66, 180503 (2002) and references therein.
 - [25] Numerical investigations of boundstates are given in D. Poilblanc, O. Chiappa, S. White and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B 62, R14633 (2000).
 - [26] A calculation of the spectral functions in the ladder using the SO(6) GN model has been reported in C. Ahn and E. Paik, J. Korean Phys. Soc. 39, 965 (2001).