## A new num erical algorithm for the double-orbital H ubbard m odel H und-coupled pairing sym m etry in the doped case

Shiro Sakai, Ryotaro Arita, Hideo Aoki

Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

In order to numerically study electron correlation e ects in multi-orbital systems, we propose a new type of discrete transformation for the exchange (Hund's coupling) and pair-hopping interactions to be used in the dynamical mean eld theory + quantum M onte Carlo method. The transformation, which is real and exact, turns out to suppress the sign problem in a wide parameter region including non-half-lled bands. This enables us to obtain the dom inant pairing symmetry in the double-orbital Hubbard model, which shows that the spin-triplet, orbital-antisymmetric pairing that exploits H und's coupling is stable in a wide region of the band lling.

PACS num bers: 71.10 Fd,74.20 Rp,71.30.+ h

In the physics of correlated electron systems, as highlighted by the high- $T_c$  superconductivity, the prototypical transition-metal oxides have arrested attention because of a rich variety of physical properties, among which are anisotropic pairing symmetries in the cuprates and in  $Sr_2RuO_4$ , the colossal magnetoresistance in manganites, and a complex phase diagram for  $La_1 \ _x Sr_x M nO_3$ .[1] Since the d orbitals are relevant, we are actually talking about multi-orbital systems, and, while some of the phenomena should be generically captured within single-band models, understanding of the e ect of electron correlation in multi-orbital system remains a fundamental problem .[2]

N amely, the orbital degrees of freedom should couple to other degrees of freedom such as charge, spin, and lattice distortion, and we can expect even richerphysical properties. Indeed, the colossalm agnetoresistance results from Hund's coupling and the com plex phase diagram s of M n and C o com pounds are considered to arise from a com petition between Hund's coupling and the Jahn-Teller distortion. In perovskite-type oxides, the crystal eld splits the ve 3d orbitals into three-fold degenerate  $(t_{\alpha})$  and two-fold degenerate  $(e_{\alpha})$  levels. When the degenerate levels are not fully led, the degeneracy may be lifted by the Jahn-Teller e ect, where the system is e ectively mapped to a single-orbital model when the splitting is large enough. We take here the small splitting lim it to concentrate on the physics speci cally caused by the orbital degrees of freedom .

Both numerical and analytic methods have been developed to study correlated electron systems. The methods should preferably be non-perturbative if one wants to examine the e ect speci c to the electron correlation such as M ott's metal-insulator transition. The dynam ical mean eld theory (DMFT)[3], which can fully include temporal uctuations while spatial uctuations are neglected, rst succeeded in describing this transition both from metallic and insulating sides. In this method a lattice system (such as the Hubbard model) is mapped to an impurity model, which becomes an exact mapping in

the limit of in nite spatial dimension. A standard procedure is to solve the impurity problem with the (auxiliary-

eld) quantum M onte Carlo (Q M C) m ethod [4, 5], which involves no approximations except for the Trotter decomposition. So the DMFT+QMC method should be a desirable candidate for the multi-orbital cases. Unfortunately, it is di cult to extend the QMC method to multi-orbitals: First, it is impossible to express those (exchange and pair-hopping) interactions that are specied to multi-orbital cases in terms of the usual auxiliary elds. Second, even when we can accomplish this, the negative sign problem, a notorious problem in QMC calculations, is usually di cult to avoid for multi-orbitals.

This hasm otivated us to propose here a new auxiliaryeld transformation that is applicable to Hund's and pair-transfer term s. The transform ation, which is real and discrete, turns out to suppress the sign problem in a wide parameter region including non-half-lled bands. This enables us to exam ine the role of Hund's coupling and pair-transfer in a double-orbital model. One of the most intriguing questions for correlated electrons on multi-orbits is what should be the symmetry of the superconducting pairing that arises from the electron-electron interaction. We have exam ined the dom inant pairing sym metry in the double-orbitalHubbard modelwith the DMFT+QMC method. The result reveals that the spinorbital-antisym m etric triplet even-frequency pairing, which exploits H und's coupling, is stable in a wide region of the band lling.

So we take the two-fold degenerate H ubbard m odel[6] with a H am iltonian,

$$H = H_{0} + H_{1} + H_{2}; \qquad (1)$$

$$X \dot{X}^{i^{2}} X K_{im} C_{jm} n_{im}; \qquad (1)$$

$$H_{0} = t C_{im}^{y} C_{jm} n_{im}; \qquad (1)$$

$$H_{1} = U n_{im} n_{im} + U^{0} n_{i1} n_{i2}; \qquad (1)$$

$$H_{1} = U n_{im} n_{im} + U^{0} n_{i1} n_{i2}; \qquad (1)$$

$$H_{2} = J_{\substack{i,m \in m^{\circ}}}^{X} (C_{im}^{y} , C_{im}^{y} c_{im} c_{im}$$

Here  $c_{im}^{y}$  creates an electron of spin in the orbital m (= 1; 2) at site i, and  $n_{im}$   $c_{im}^{y}$   $c_{im}$  . We only consider the nearest-neighbor hopping between the similar orbitals, electron-electron interactions are assumed to be intra-atom ic with the intra-(inter-)orbital C oulom b interaction denoted as U (U<sup>0</sup>), while the exchange and pair-hopping interactions as J. The H am iltonian is rotationally invariant not only in spin, but also in real space if we full ll the condition  $U = U^0 + 2J$  (as is the case with d-orbitals). We have divided the interaction into the density-density interactions H<sub>1</sub> and the exchange and pair-hopping interactions H<sub>2</sub>.

The DMFT+QMC method has been used by many authors for the single-orbital Hubbard model. For the usual on-site Hubbard interaction, a decoupling is done with the discrete Hubbard-Stratonovich (HS) transform ation [7],

$$e^{a[n*n_{\#} \frac{1}{2}(n*+n_{\#})]} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} P^{-1} e^{s(n*-n_{\#})} (a \ 0)}{\frac{1}{2} P^{-1} e^{s(n*+n_{\#} \ 1)+\frac{a}{2}} (a < 0)};$$
(2)

with  $\log(e^{\frac{j_R j}{2}} + \frac{p}{e^{j_R j}} \frac{1}{1})$ , which transforms the two-body interaction into one-body interactions sum med over an auxiliary eld s. Applying this to each interaction term on the discretized in aginary time, we can decompose the partition function Z of the many-body system into a sum of the partition functions  $Z_{fs_1g}$  of one-body system s as  $Z = \int_{fs_1g} Z_{fs_1g}$ : The QMC samples the single-particle system s according to the weight  $Z_{fs_1g}$ . The negative sign refers to the fact that the weight is not positive-de nite. The sign problem does not occur, as far as the DM FT is concerned, in the single-orbital Hubbard m odel because the in purity problem lacks the electron hopping term s.

W hile the auxiliary- eld QMC m ethod has been applied to som e multi-orbital Hubbard models by neglecting the term s other than the density-density interactions  $(H_1 \text{ in eq.}(1))$ , the QMC algorithm becomes a challenging problem for the exchange and pair-hopping interactions (H<sub>2</sub>): the HS transform ation (2) is obviously inapplicable to these term s.  $\mathbb{W}$  hile a decoupling, exp (J  $C_1^{y}C_2C_3^{y}C_4) =$  $(1=2)^{P} s^{1} \exp[s^{D} \overline{J} (c_{1}^{V} c_{2})]$  $c_3^{\gamma}c_4)$ ; is possible after breaking e H 2 into a product of exponentials, it leads to a serious sign problem [8]. A nother attempt by M otom e and Im ada [9] decouples H<sub>2</sub> with im aginary auxiliary elds to implement a QMC, but an electron-hole symm etry has to be assumed to avoid phase cancellation of the weights which become complex due to the imaginary auxiliary elds. Since the assumption dictates the half- led band and  $U = U^0$  (that violates  $U = U^0 + 2J$ ), investigation of non-half- lled bands and/or the rotationally symmetric case is di cult with this method.




FIG.1: The average sign plotted as a function of band lling at 1=T = 2 for  $U = U^0 = 1$ ; J = 0.5 and at = 10 for  $U = U^0 = 1$ ; J = 0.2 calculated with the present algorithm (circles) and with the one due to [9] (squares). In this particular plot we have set  $U = U^0$  to facilitate com parison with M otom e and Im ada's method.[11] Curves are guides to the eye here and in subsequent gures.

W e propose here a new type of discrete transform ation for the exchange and pair-hopping interaction terms,

$$e^{H_{2}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^{X} e^{r(f_{r} - f_{\#})} e^{a(N_{r} + N_{\#}) + bN_{r} N_{\#}}; \quad (3)$$

where

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \log (e^{2J} + p \overline{e^{4J} 1}); \\ a \qquad \log (\cosh ()); \quad b \quad \log (\cosh (J)); \\ f \qquad c_1^y c_2 + c_2^y c_1; \quad N \quad n_1 + n_2 \quad 2n_1 n_2: \end{array}$$

This transform ation is exact with the auxiliary eld (r) being real and all the operators being herm itian. A 1though a term N "N # which is forth order in n appears on the right hand side, we can apply the usual HS transform at ion to this term due to a property N<sup>2</sup> = N . The resulting terms in the form nn can be combined with the Coulomb terms, which are transformed with eq.(2), so that we need in total only two auxiliary- elds for  $H_2$ . Furtherm ore the interaction parameters U;U<sup>0</sup>;J can be varied independently, which means that we can treat the rotational sym m etric cases of  $U = U^{0} + 2J \cdot W$  e note that recently H an [10] proposed another type of HS transformation for the Hamiltonian (1). He adopts a continuous HS transform ation in combination with the discrete one (2), and avoided the sign problem in a wide parameter region at half- lling. In contrast all the transform ation are discrete in the present m ethod.

One valuable property of the transform ation (3) is that negative weights are indeed reduced signi cantly. An unexpected asset is that the suppression of the sign problem is almost independent of the band lling. This is shown in Fig.1, where the average sign hsigni




FIG. 2: The average sign plotted as a function of inverse temperature for n = 1.8;  $U = U^0 = 1$ ; J = 0.2 calculated with the present algorithm (circles) and with the one due to [9] (squares).

 $_{fs_{i}g} Z_{fs_{i}g} = P_{fs_{i}g} \mathcal{I}_{fs_{i}g} j$  is plotted as a function of the band lling for two sets of values of 1=T and J for the two-orbitalHubbardmodelon an in nited im ensional hypercubic lattice, whose density of states is G aussian with the band width  $W = 2.W e \operatorname{can} \operatorname{see} \operatorname{that} \operatorname{the} \operatorname{sign} \operatorname{problem}$ is avoided alm ost independently of the band lling. Figure 2 depicts the tem perature dependence, which shows that hsignidecreases mildly as the tem perature lowers, so we can go to lower tem peratures with the present transform ation. One reason why the transform ation (3) reduces the amount of negative weights is that it has a single auxiliary eld (r in eq.(3)) as the source of the negative sign; the other auxiliary elds, related to the density-density interactions, are irrelevant to the negative weights.

To test how the present m ethod works, we have applied it to the calculation of the superconducting susceptibility for the Ham iltonian (1). Since o -site, anisotropic pairings (such asp and d-waves) cannot be treated within the DMFT, we con ned ourselves to s-wave pairing. Even within that channel, various pairing sym m etries are possible in multi-orbital system s, since the total sym m etry now consists of spin orbital frequency, so

	spin	orbital	frequency
1SE	singlet	sym m etric	even
3A E	triplet	antisym m etric antisym m etric	even
			odd
3SO	triplet	sym m etric	odd

are the possibilities. The pairs that are form ed across di erent orbitals are especially interesting. The orbital-sym m etric pairs are

$$S^{a}: C_{1} C_{1\#} + C_{2} C_{2\#};$$
  

$$S^{b}: C_{1} C_{1\#} C_{2\#} C_{2\#};$$
  

$$S^{c}: C_{1} C_{2\#} + C_{2} C_{2\#};$$
  
(4)

where  $c_{1"}c_{1\#}$  and  $c_{2"}c_{2\#}$  are combined into bonding and antibonding states due to the pair-hopping term, while the orbital-antisymm etric pair is

A: 
$$C_1 " C_2 # C_2 " C_1 #$$

Here we take, without the loss of generality, the  $S_z = 0$  channel for spin triplets, where  $S_z$  is the z-component of the Cooperon spin.

So the interest here is which pairing symmetry is favored in the double-orbital system, especially in the presence of H und's coupling. For the single-orbital case the sites are mostly singly-occupied by electrons around the half-lling, where the pairing (usually in d-wave channel) occurs. The question is what would be the corresponding picture for the double-orbital case around half-lling. So we have calculated the pairing susceptibility P, which is related to the two-particle G men function [12],

$$\begin{array}{c} \overset{11^{0}}{Z} \overset{m}{Z} \overset{0}{Z} \overset{0}{Z} \overset{1}{Z} \overset{0}{Z} \overset$$

through the equation,

$$P = g^{Y} g = \frac{X X}{\prod_{0}^{m} m \circ !_{n} !_{n}^{0}} g_{11^{0}} (!_{n}) \prod_{11^{0} \neq m} m \circ (i!_{n}; i!_{n}^{0}) g_{m} m \circ (!_{n}^{0}):$$

Here g is the form factor describing the pairing sym m etry in orbital-frequency space, which is either even or odd in ! for each orbital component. We adopt  $g_{odd}$  (!) = sign (!) and  $g_{even}$  (!) 1 here.

The two-particle G reen function (5) is obtained from the Bethe-Salpeter equation,

$$= _{0} + _{0} ;$$
 (6)

where is de ned in eq.(5),  $_0$  the bare two-particle G reen function calculated as a product of the one-particle G reen function, G \* (k; i!) G \* (k; i!), sum m ed over the m om enta, and the vertex function, all of them being m atrices with respect to orbital and frequency indices. W ithin the DM FT we can replace with the local one,

$$loc = \begin{pmatrix} loc \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}^{1} \begin{pmatrix} loc \end{pmatrix}^{1}$$

in the limit of in nite dimensions[13], where  $\frac{loc}{0}$  and  $\frac{loc}{0}$  are respectively the bare and the dressed two-particle G reen functions for the elective in purity model, which are computed in the QMC.

The temperature dependence of the pairing susceptibilities is shown in Fig.3 for n = 1.8,  $U^0 = 0.7$ , J = 0.4, and  $U = U^0 + 2J = 1.5$ . We can see that the spin-triplet, orbital-antisymmetric, even frequency pairing (denoted as 3AE) becomes dominant at low temperatures. The




FIG. 3: Tem perature dependence of the pairing susceptibilities for n = 1.8,  $U^0 = 0.7$ , J = 0.4,  $U = U^0 + 2J = 1.5$ . The sym bols denote pairing sym m etries (1: spin-singlet, 3: triplet;  $S^{a,b,c}$ : orbital-sym m etric (eq.(4)), A : antisym m etric; E : even-, O : odd-frequency).




FIG.4:Band-lling dependence of the pairing susceptibilities for  $= 60, U^0 = 0.7, J = 0.4, U = U^0 + 2J = 1.5$  with the same abbreviation for pairing symmetries as in Fig.3.

enhancement of such a pairing should be due to Hund's coupling, which tends to align electron spins across different orbitals. The result is consistent with Han's[10] for the semielliptical density of states. While in the work of Han the susceptibility diverges at T=W = 0.06 for J=W = 0.15;  $U^{0}=W = 0.45$ , we do not detect the divergence up to T=W = 1=180. This should be because electrons are less correlated in the hypercubic lattice than in the B ethe lattice (which the semielliptic density of states for the hypercubic lattice, with high-energy tails, has an effectively larger band width.

Figure 4 shows the band-lling dependence of the pairing susceptibilities at T=W = 1=120 for  $U^0 = 0.7$ , J = 0.4,

and  $U = U^{0} + 2J = 1.5$ . A new nding here is that the spintriplet, orbital-antisymmetric (3AE) pairing induced by H und's coupling remains dominant in a rather wide range (n = 1.6 2) of hole-doping at this temperature. It declines, how ever, at low llings (n = 1 1.4). This result m ay be related to a mechanism of superconductivity proposed by C apone [14] for multi-orbital systems close to the M ott transition, where the electron repulsion U is envisaged to assist a pairing even for s-waves.

In sum m ary, we have constructed a new discrete transform ation (which reduces the sign problem and is applicable to doped bands) for the exchange and pair-hopping terms in double-orbit m odels, and im plem ented this in a DMFT+QMC calculation. Superconducting susceptibilities of the s-wave pairings calculated with this m ethod shows that the spin-triplet, orbital-antisym m etric even frequency paring, enhanced by H und's coupling and being dom inant at half-lling, is robust against hole doping. W e note that it is di cult to investigate ferrom agnetism in thism odel even with the present transform ation, since the ferrom agnetism appears only in very strongly correlated regim e[15], where the sign problem becom es serious again, so this is a future problem.

Numerical calculations were partly performed on SR 8000 in ISSP, University of Tokyo.

- [1] Y. Tokura and N. Nagaosa, Science 288, 462 (2000).
- [2] L.M.Roth, Phys. Rev. 149, 306 (1966).
- [3] A.Georges, G.Kotliar, W.Krauth, and M.J.Rozenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68, 13 (1996).
- [4] J.E.Hirsch, Phys. Rev. B 31, 4403 (1985); J.E.Hirsch and R.M. Fye, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 2521 (1986).
- [5] M. Jarrell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 168 (1992); A. Georges and W. Krauth, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1240 (1992).
- [6] A.M.Oles, Phys. Rev. B 28, 327 (1983).
- [7] J. E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. B 28, 4059 (1983); erratum, Phys. Rev. B 29, 4159 (1984).
- [8] K.Held and D.Vollhardt, Eur.Phys.J.B 5, 473 (1998).
- [9] Y. M otom e and M. Im ada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 66, 1872 (1997); ibid 67, 3199 (1998).
- [10] J.E.Han, cond-m at/0401104 (2004).
- [11] hsigni is larger in M otom e-Im ada's m ethod at half-lling (n = 2) due to the electron-hole sym m etry, but it becomes sm aller for U = U  $^{0}$ + 2J.
- [12] M. Jarrell, Th. Maier, C. Huscroff, and S. Moukouri, Phys. Rev. B 64, 195130 (2001).
- [13] E.MullerHartmann, Z.Phys.B 74, 507 (1989); V.Zlatic and B.Horvatic, Solid State Commun. 75, 263 (1990).
- [14] M. Capone, M. Fabrizio, C. Castellani, and E. Tosatti, Science 296, 2364 (2002); cond-m at/0401090 (2004).
- [15] T.Momoiand K.Kubo, Phys. Rev. B 58, 567 (1998).