

# Disorder and correlation-driven metal-insulator transitions

Matthias Balzer<sup>1</sup> and Michael Pottho<sup>1</sup>

Institut für Theoretische Physik und Astrophysik, Universität Würzburg, Germany

## Abstract

Metal-insulator transitions driven by disorder ( $\Delta$ ) and/or by electron correlations ( $U$ ) are investigated within the Anderson-Hubbard model with local binary-alloy disorder using a simple but consistent mean-field approach. The  $U$ - $\Delta$  phase diagram is derived and discussed for  $T = 0$  and finite temperatures.

Key words: metal-insulator transitions, dynamical mean-field theory, Anderson-Hubbard model

If spontaneous symmetry breaking is excluded, a system of electrons in a non-degenerate half-filled valence band may undergo a transition from a normal Fermi liquid to an insulator either due to Coulomb interaction or due to disorder. Metal-insulator transitions (MIT) in the presence of strong electron correlations and disorder are not well understood (even on the mean-field level). For the purely correlation-induced (Mott) MIT, the dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT) has uncovered a rather complex phase diagram [1]. The MIT to an (Anderson) insulator in case of non-interacting electrons and strong diagonal binary-alloy disorder can be described by the coherent-potential approximation (CPA) [2]. While spatial correlations are neglected in both cases, the residual mean-field physics at low temperatures  $T$  is non-trivial and relevant for three-dimensional transition-metal oxides, for example. The combined problem can be studied within the half-filled ( $n = 1$ ) Anderson-Hubbard model (AHM):  $H = -t \sum_{ij} c_i^\dagger c_j + \sum_i \epsilon_i n_i + U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}$ . Here the n.n. hopping is set to  $t = 1$ ,  $U$  is the on-site interaction,  $\epsilon_i = U/2$  the chemical potential, and  $\epsilon_i = \pm U/2$  with equal probabilities  $x = 1/2$  a random on-site energy at site  $i$ .  $\Delta$  measures the disorder strength.

Corresponding Author: Institut für Theoretische Physik und Astrophysik, Universität Würzburg, Am Hubland, 97074 Würzburg, Germany. Phone: +49-931-888-5724. Fax: -5141. Email: pottho@physik.uni-wuerzburg.de

<sup>1</sup> This work is supported by the DFG (Forschergruppe 538).




Fig. 1.  $U$ - $\Delta$  phase diagram for  $T = 0$  (insets:  $U$ - $T$  phase diagram for different  $\Delta$ ). Energy scale:  $t = 1$ .

"DMFT + CPA" [3] can be regarded as the optimum mean-field approach to this model. This, however, must be supplemented by stochastic [3] or renormalization-group techniques [4] or by further approximations, e.g. weak-coupling perturbation theory [5]. While parts of the phase diagram in the  $U$ - $T$  space are known [3,5], a comprehensive study is still missing.

Here we employ the self-energy-functional approach (SFA) [6] and the  $n_s = 2$ -site dynamical-in-purity approximation (2S-DIA) which nicely reproduces the phase diagram for  $\Delta = 0$  [6]. In case of disorder, a proper generalization of the formalism has to be applied [7]. Within the generalized framework, the 2S-DIA can be regarded as a strongly simplified but consistent DMFT-CPA approach. In the limit  $n_s \rightarrow 1$  one recovers the DMFT for  $\Delta = 0$ , the CPA for  $U = 0$ .

and the DMFT-CPA for  $U; \neq 0$ .

Operationally, the Green's function  $G^0$  of a single-impurity Anderson model  $H^0$  with two sites and impurity on-site energies  $\epsilon_i$  is obtained by exact diagonalization and averaged,  $\bar{G}^0 = \langle G^0 \rangle_i$ , to get the configuration-independent self-energy  $S^0 = G_0^{-1} - G^0$  where  $G_0$  is the free ( $U; = 0$ ) Green's function.  $S^0 = S(t^0)$  depends on the one-particle parameters of  $H^0$  and is used as a trial self-energy in a general variational principle,  $\langle S \rangle = 0$ , which gives the exact averaged grand potential of the AHM at the physical  $S$ . On the subspace given by  $S(t^0)$ , the functional can be evaluated rigorously (see [7]). We consider the paramagnetic phase of the AHM on a three-dimensional s.c. lattice consisting of  $10^3$  sites. Phase boundaries are obtained from the resulting  $\beta$  as a function of  $\beta$ ,  $U$  and  $T$ . The averaged interacting local density of states (DOS) of the AHM can be calculated via  $\langle \rho(\omega) \rangle = \text{Im} \langle G(\omega + i0) \rangle$  and  $\langle G(\omega) \rangle = (G_0^{-1} - S^0)^{-1}$  where  $G_0$  is the free ( $U; = 0$ ) lattice Green's function.

Three different phases are identified at  $T = 0$  (see Fig. 1): a paramagnetic metallic phase (PM), a Mott insulator (MI), and an Anderson insulator (AI). For any disorder strength  $\beta$ , we find the AI at weak  $U$  (and  $\beta_c(U)$ ) to be well separated from the MI at strong  $U$  by the PM in between. For  $\beta = 0$  the critical interaction for the Mott MIT is found to be  $U_c = 13.9 - 1.6W$  (with  $W = 12$  the free band width) while  $\beta_c = 5.4 - 0.46W$  for the MIT at  $U = 0$ . This agrees well with full DMFT and CPA estimates, respectively [1,2,6]. For  $U_{c1} < U < U_{c2}$ , a coexistence of the stable PM phase with the metastable MI phase is observed ( $U_{c1} = 12.4$ ). This scenario for the Mott MIT is well known for  $\beta = 0$  [1] and is shown here to survive for any finite disorder strength with a dependent coexistence region  $U_{c1}(\beta) < U < U_{c2}(\beta)$  and  $U_c(\beta) = U_{c2}(\beta)$ . A discontinuous Mott MIT with  $U_{c1}(\beta) < U_c(\beta) < U_{c2}(\beta)$  is found for finite temperatures  $0 < T < T_c(\beta)$ . For  $T > T_c(\beta)$  there is a smooth crossover only. For  $\beta \neq 1$ , the critical interactions approach a linear dependence,  $U_{c1,2}(\beta) \approx \text{const} + 1/2$  while  $T_c(\beta) \approx T_c$  saturates.

The topology of the phase diagram can be understood by looking at the DOS, see Fig. 2. Characteristic for the MI at  $\beta = 0$  and  $U > U_c$  is the insulating gap between the lower and upper Hubbard band (LHB, UHB). For finite  $\beta$  the gap decreases due to a broadening and, eventually, a splitting of each of the Hubbard bands (Fig. 2,  $\beta = 6$ ). The closure of the gap is preempted by the occurrence of a quasi-particle peak (QP) at  $\omega = 0$  which marks the transition to the PM (see  $\beta = 14$ ). Apart from the QP, the spectrum can be understood as being composed of two Hubbard bands at  $\omega = \pm U/2$  for each of the two atomic configurations  $\beta = \pm 2$ . This explains the strong spectral-weight transfer when increasing  $\beta = 18$  to  $\beta = 20$ :




Fig. 2. Average density of states for  $U = 18$  and different Lorentzian broadening width  $\beta = 0.25$ .

As the  $\beta = \pm 2$ -DOS ( $\beta = \pm 2$ -DOS) becomes almost completely unoccupied (occupied), the weight of the UHB (LHB) must disappear. Finally, a further increase of  $\beta$  induces a splitting into an upper and lower alloy band (UAB, LAB) and a MIT to the AI.

Recently, Byczuk et al [4] have shown that DMFT+CPA predicts the AHM to exhibit a Mott MIT also for fillings  $n \neq 1$  if  $x = n$ . Similar to the presently considered case  $n = 1 = 2x$ , a sharp QP at  $\omega = 0$  (even for strong disorder) as well as a coexistence of the PM and the MI is found close to the MIT. We like to point out that the phase diagram for  $n = x \neq 1$  [4] can be understood by an analysis of the DOS completely analogous to the  $n = 1 = 2x$  case discussed above – although its topology is quite different.

Concluding, we have proposed a mean-field scenario for the MIT in the AHM at half-filling  $n = 1 = 2x$  on the basis of a simplified DMFT+CPA approach. The phase diagram can be understood by a quasi-atomic interpretation of the DOS in combination with the Mott MIT scenario of the pure system. This should be contrasted with full DMFT+CPA calculations in the future which may also clarify the importance of disorder scattering due to a finite self-energy  $\text{Im} S(\omega \neq 0)$  which has been neglected here.

## References

- [1] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth and M. J. Rozenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68, 13 (1996).
- [2] B. Velicky, S. Kirkpatrick and H. Ehrenreich, Phys. Rev. 175, 747 (1968).
- [3] M. Ullrich and V. Janis and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. B 51, 10411 (1995).
- [4] K. Byczuk, W. Hofstetter and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. B 69, 045112 (2004).
- [5] M. S. Laad, L. C. raco and E. M. uller-Hartmann, Phys. Rev. B 64, 195114 (2001).
- [6] M. Pottho, Eur. Phys. J. B 32, 429 (2003); Eur. Phys. J. B 36, 335 (2003); M. Pottho, M. Aichhorn and C. Dahnken, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 206402 (2003).
- [7] M. Pottho and M. Balzer, to be published.