Phase diagram s of the 2D t t⁰ U H ubbard m odel from an extended m ean eld method

Edwin Langmann

M athem atical Physics, Physics D epartm ent, KTH, A lbaN ova, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

M ats W allin^y

Condensed M atter Theory, Physics D epartment, KTH, A lbaN ova, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden (D ated: June 24, 2004)

It is well-known from unrestricted H artree-Fock computations that the 2D H ubbard m odel does not have hom ogeneous mean eld states in signi cant regions of parameter space away from half lling. This is incompatible with standard mean eld theory. We present a simple extension of the mean eld method that avoids this problem. As in standard mean eld theory, we restrict H artree-Fock theory to simple translation invariant states describing antiferrom agnetism (AF), ferrom agnetism (F) and param agnetism (P), but we use an improved method to implement the doping constraint allowing us to detect when a phase separated state is energetically preferred, e.g. AF and F coexisting at the same time. We nd that such mixed phases occur in signi cant parts of the phase diagram s, making them much richer than the ones from standard mean eld theory. O ur results for the 2D t t^0 U H ubbard m odel demonstrate the importance of band structure e ects.

PACS num bers: 71.10 Fd,05.70 Fh,75.50 Ee

I. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

H ubbard-type m odels in two dimensions have been frequently studied in the context of high tem perature superconductivity and other strongly correlated system s.¹ D espite considerable e orts (for review see e.g. Ref. 2) there is still need for simplem ethods that can contribute to the understanding of the complex behavior of such m odels. In this paper we study an extension of mean eld (MF) theory which allows for the possibility of phase separated states, in addition to the usual MF states. We calculate full phase diagrams for the 2D t t⁰ U H ubbard m odel which, to our know ledge, are not available in the literature by other m ethods.

MF theory o ers several advantages compared to more complicated methods like unrestricted Hartree-Fock (HF) theory: It is easy to im plem ent, not restricted to small system sizes, and can produce phase diagram s for Hubbard-type models with a limited computational e ort. The disadvantage of standard MF theory is that it always predicts translation invariant states everywhere in the phase diagram, without giving any inform ation about the stability with respect to uctuations, or about the stability with respect to competing non-uniform states. In 2D Hubbard-type models these problem shave severely restricted the usefulness of the MF approach, 3,4 and the MF method is therefore not widely used. More correct m ethods indeed dem onstrate that the qualitative features of the standard MF predictions are restricted to parts of the phase diagram, e.g., the antiferrom agnetic (AF) phase at half lling. This suggests that the MF approach is unsatisfactory and motivates using more complicated m ethods. However, the more accurate theoretical methods tend to be computationally dem anding and therefore restricted to very small system sizes.

In this paper we adopt and clarify the extended MF

m ethod in Refs. 5,6 and use it to calculate phase diagram s of the 2D t t⁰ U Hubbard model. This method is designed to overcome the limitation of only producing uniform MF solutions, without increasing the computational e ort. W e use the standard m ean eld equations, 3,4,7 but we extend them by a method allowing us to detect possible instabilities towards phase separation.⁶ The phase diagram swe thus obtain are much richer than the ones obtained with conventional MF theory and no longer in contradiction with unrestricted HF results. In particular, conventional MF theory for the 2D Hubbard model $(t^0 = 0)$ predicts an AF phase in a nite doping regime around half lling (see Fig. 3 in Ref. 3) which is known to be qualitatively wrong. The phase diagram from the extended MF theory is shown in Fig.1. It shows that the AF phase exists only strictly at half lling, and at nite doping close to half lling no sim ple translation invariant state is therm odynam ically stable, in agreem ent with unrestricted HF theory.^{8,9,10,11} W hile ourm ethod does not account for uctuations or details of states which are not translational invariant, it allows to detect frustration in the sense of incom patibility between MF states and the doping constraint. Such frustration suggests interesting physical behavior to be explored by more sophisticated m ethods. Our theory should be useful also for other cases where no other methods are available.

O ur main results are the full phase diagrams for 2D t t^0 U Hubbard model for $t^0 = 0$ and $t^0 = 0.35t$ in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively. They were obtained for a system size so large that they are practically identical with the therm odynam ic lim it. The phase diagrams are rem arkably rich and very di erent from the corresponding results from standard MF theory: com pare our Fig. 1 with Fig. 3 in Ref. 3 and our Fig. 2 with Fig. 1 in Ref. 4. O ur results dem onstrate that mixed phases are a typical feature of 2D Hubbard-type models: as one changes



FIG.1: Phase diagram of the 2D H ubbard m odel as a function of U and doping for parameters t = 1 and $t^0 = 0$. We use Hartree-Fock theory restricted to ferrom agnetic (F), antiferrom agnetic (AF) and paramagnetic (P) states, and we nd large m ixed regim es where neither of these translational invariant states is therm odynam ically stable. The results are for L = 60 and = 1000 which is practically indistinguishable from the therm odynam ic lim it.

doping one never goes directly from one MF phase to another, but there seems always a nite doping regime with a mixed phase in between. It is also interesting to note that the qualitative features of the phase diagram are very sensitive to changes in the next-nearest-neighbor (NNN) hopping constant t^0 , in qualitative agreement with the unrestricted HF results.¹² In particular, while a pure AF phase is possible only at half lling for $t^0 = 0$, the AF phase can be doped by electrons, but not holes, for $t^0 < 0$ at larger values of U, in agreement with previous results obtained with a more complicated m ethod.¹³

The plan of the rest of this paper is as follows. In the next section we explain and justify ourm ethod using physical argum ents. M athem atical details can be found in Sec. III. Section IV contains our conclusion and a sum – m ary.

II. THE METHOD

We now explain our method, concentrating on the point where we deviate from standard MF theory. Precise m athem atical form ulas in plementing this method will be given in the next section. As a representative example we discuss the computation of the phases by our method for the 2D Hubbard model with U = 6, and t = 1 and $t^0 = 0.16$ (see Eq. (6) below for the precise de nitions). O ne reason for this choice is that it shows nicely several qualitative features which can occur in the phase diagram, another that these parameter values are of interest for high-T_c com pounds.¹⁴

MF theory for the Hubbard model is obtained by re-



FIG.2: Phase diagram of the 2D H ubbard m odel as a function of U and doping for parameters t = 1, $t^0 = 0.35$, L = 60 and = 1000, computed as Fig.1. For large U and close to zero it becomes numerically di cult to distinguish between the F and P phase, which is the reason for the fuzzy phase boundaries in this region of the phase diagram.

stricting HF theory to translational invariant states describing antiferrom agnetism (AF), ferrom agnetism (F) and param agnetism (P).^{3,7} It would be straightforw and to generalize this and also allow for charge-density waves, ferrim agnetism etc. One thus starts with three variational states which all are Slater determ inants¹⁵ built of one-particle wave functions which are eigenstates of a m ean eld H am iltonian where the H ubbard interaction is replaced by external eld term s,

These elds include the the ferm ions density and the magnetization which is staggered for AF, constant for F, and zero for P, and they are determined by the usual Hartree-Fock equations. It is in portant to note that the ferm ion density is xed in the standard Slater states, but we use a generalization of Slater's variational principle to G ibbs states allowing for nite temperature and where the ferm ion density is varied by changing a chemical potential (grand canonical ensemble).^{6,16,17} W e now com - pute the Hartree-Fock ground state free energy per site, F_X , for each of these states X = AF, F and P, as a function of .

Figure 3 gives the result for our example. At xed value of , the m ean eld ground state is determ ined by the m inim um ,

$$F_{m in} = \min_{X = A F : F : P} F_X :$$
(2)

It is now in portant to note that the ferm ion density can be computed as derivative of the free energy as follows,

$$1 = \frac{\partial F_{\min}}{\partial q}; \qquad (3)$$



FIG.3: Mean eld free energy F_X of the 2D Hubbard model with $t = 1, t^0 = 0.16, U = 6, L = 60$ and = 1000 as a function of the chemical potential . Shown are the curves for X = AF, F and P (thin lines) and the absolute minimum F_{min} (thick line). The dashed lines indicate the particular values i, i = 1;2;3, of where the phases change. At these values the derivative of F_{min} has discontinuities, and this leads to doping regimes with mixed phases; see Fig. 4.

we use conventions such that particle-hole symmetry is m anifest, 1! 1 corresponds to 1 and t⁰ ! t⁰. From Figs. 3 and 4 is is obvious that this 1 is, in general, only piecew ise continuous, function and it has jumps at the particular values of where the minimum free energy curve changes, for example, from the AF to the F curve at the value = $_2$. The physical interpretation of this is as follows. We start at = 0where we obviously have the AF ground state and half-1 = 0. As we decrease , lling, 1 rem ains zero since F_{AF} does not change. This is due to the AF gap: as long as remains in the gap the ferm ion density cannot change. For large enough values the AF band edge is reached and the slope of F_{AF} starts to decrease. How ever, before this can happen the F free energy has become low er and taken over: as one decreases the F free energy decreases, and at a value $= _2$ the two curves cross, $F_{AF} = F_F$ at $= _2$. At this point we go from the AF to the F phase. Since the ferm ion densities $_X$ ($_2$) 1 = $(F_X = 0 \ j_{=2})$ for the states X = AF and X = Fare di erent, it is impossible to get a density value in between with either state. There is, how ever, a possibility to realize such a ferm ion density with the following state exactly at = $_{2}$,

$$jm$$
 ixedi = $w_jAFi + (1 w)_jFi;$ (4)

with the relative weight w determ ined by the density as follows,

$$= w_{AF}(_{2}) + (1 w)_{F}(_{2}); 0 < w < 1:$$
 (5)



FIG.4: Doping 1 of the 2D H ubbard m odel as a function of the chemical potential . The parameters are as in Fig 3 (t = 1, t⁰ = 0:16, U = 6, L = 60 and = 1000). The curves are the derivatives of the corresponding ones in Fig.3. The thick line determ ines the m ean-eld phase diagram, with the discontinuities at = $_{i}$, i = 1;2;3 determ ining doping regions where no pure phase F, AF or P is therm odynamically stable. The wiggles of the curves are due to nite size e ects which, how ever, have no e ect on the phase boundaries (this is dem onstrated in the inset of Fig.5).

We now discuss the interpretation of this mixed solution. One possibility is that the system has phase separated and split up into AF and F regions.¹⁸ O fcourse, the spatial structure of the actual state is not available in the MF description by them ixed state, but it can in principle be calculated using unrestricted HF. How ever, since the bulk free energy dom inates over the interfacial free energies in the therm odynam ic lim it, the m ixed state gives an accurate description of the therm odynam ics. W e stress that the appearance of such a m ixed state does not necessarily mean phase separation. The e ect of the phase boundaries and other possible states have been excluded in our approximation. To know the actual state in the m ixed regions thus is beyond our calculation and can be decided only by doing m ore work, e.g., using unrestricted HF taking into account more complicated states. Nevertheless, the occurrence of such a mixed states proves that no simple translational invariant state of the kind assumed in our MF ansatz is therm odynamically stable. The mixed regions of the phase diagram are of particular interest since there the free energy is degenerate and thus the details of the solution can be strongly a ected by uctuations, phase boundaries, or details neglected in the model.

It is in portant to note that there are two further jumps of and two further corresponding mixed phases: one at = $_1$ with F coexisting with P, and another at = $_3$ with AF and P coexisting. It is also interesting to note that, while for $t^0=0$ the mean eld free energies are invariant under the electron-hole transform ation $\ !$, the nite value of $t^0=0.16$ here leads to a qualitative di erence between hole doping (<0) and electron doping (>0). As seen in Fig. 3, the F state can compete with the AF state only for <0, and this implies that it is possible to dope the AF state by electrons but not by holes.

We thus see that, even though we restricted Hartree-Fock theory to simple translation invariant states as in Eq. (1), our way of treating the doping constraint has implicitly also included the possibility of having a mixed state as in Eq. (4) as groundstate, and we nd that such a mixed state indeed occurs in a signi cant part of the doping regime.

We stress that our method to determ ine the phase boundary does not increase the computational e ort of mean eld theory, and it is easy to do the computations also for large system sizes. Most of our computations were done for a L L lattice with L = 60. W hile at this values of L some nite size e ects are still visible in the relation between doping and the chem ical potential (see Fig. 4), the inset in Fig. 5 dem onstrates that resulting phase boundaries are practically identical with the ones in the therm odynam ic lim it. We also checked that the value = 1000 we used for the inverse tem perature practically gives the zero tem perature phase boundaries.



FIG.5: Phases of the 2D H ubbard m odel as a function of the chem ical potential for the same parameters as in Fig.2 (t = 1;t⁰ = 0:35; = 1000; L = 60). Inset: B low up of the region around the minimum of the phase lines in the main gure, showing interesting ne structure in the phase diagram. A lso shown is the result from a calculation for system size L = 120 (crosses). The coincidence between results for two di erent system sizes demonstrate that L = 60 is practically already in the therm odynam ic lim it.

III. FORMALISM

W e now give the form alim plem entation of ourm ethod. W e start by xing our notation. W e consider the 2D Hubbard m odel de ned by the H am iltonian

$$H = t \begin{pmatrix} X & X & X \\ c_{ij}^{y} & c_{jj} & t^{0} & c_{ij}^{y} & c_{jj} + H c: \\ & & & & \\ & &$$

with the on-site repulsion U > 0 and the hopping am plitudest > 0 and t⁰ between the nearest neighbor sites hi; ji and next-nearest neighbor (NNN) sites hi; jii on a square lattice with L² sites, respectively; the ferm ion operators $c_{i;}^{(y)}$ are param eterized by the spin variable = ";# and lattice sites i = (i_x ; i_y) where $i_{x;y}$ = 1;2;:::;L, and $n_{i;} = c_{i;}^{y} c_{i;}$ are number operators, as usual. The ferm ion density is

$$=\frac{1}{L^2} \mathop{\rm Im}_{\rm i;} i \qquad (7)$$

with h $% \left({{\mathbf{x}}_{i}} \right)$ is the ground state expectation value to be specified below .

W e recall that unrestricted Hartree-Fock (HF) theory is form ally obtained by introducing

$$q_i = hn_i i; \quad m_i = hs_i i$$
 (8)

and replacing the Hubbard interaction by external eld term s as follows,

$$n_{i;"}n_{i;\#} ! \frac{1}{4} (m_{i}^{2} \ _{i}^{2}) + \frac{1}{2} (q_{i}n_{i} \ m_{i} \ _{i});$$

where $\frac{1}{2}Um_i$ and $\frac{1}{2}Uq_i$ are mean elds coupling to the ferm ion spin $s_i = \frac{1}{2} c_{i}^y c_{i$

$$H_{HF} = \sum_{i}^{X} \frac{U}{4} (m_{i}^{2} - q_{i}^{2}) + \sum_{i;j; i}^{X} c_{i;}^{y} h_{i; j; 0} c_{j; 0}$$
(9)

where

$$\begin{array}{rcl} h_{i;\;;j;\;\circ} = & t_{ij} & \circ + & {}_{ij} & \frac{1}{2} U & & & \circ + \\ & & & & & (q_i & 1) & \circ & & \circ & (10) \end{array}$$

is a self-adjoint $2L^2$ $2L^2$ -matrix which can be interpreted as a one-particle H am iltonian. One now interprets h i in Eq. (8) as the expectation value in the ground state of H_{HF} in Eqs. (9,10). This yields the HF equations allowing to self-consistently compute q_i and m_i (see e.g. Sec. II in Ref. 11).

W e now observe that these HF equations can also be obtained as saddle point equations $@F = @m_i = @F = @i = 0$ from the free energy function

$$F = \frac{1}{L^2} \log Z$$
 (11)

where

$$Z = Tre^{H_{HF}}$$
(12)

is the partition function de ned by a trace over the ferm ion H ilbert space, and is the inverse tem perature. A straightforward com putation yields

$$F = \frac{U}{4L^{2}} X (m_{1}^{2} - \frac{2}{1}) \frac{1}{L^{2}} \log \cosh \frac{E}{2}; \quad (13)$$

with $E \cdot$ the eigenvalues of the one-particle H am iltonian $h = (h_{ij}, j_{ij}, \circ)$ in Eq. (10).⁶

The physical solution of the HF equations are such that

$$F_{\min} \min_{\substack{m_i \\ q_i}} \max_{q_i} F(m_i;q_i); \qquad (14)$$

see Ref. 17 for a mathematical proof or Ref. 6 for a derivation using functional integrals. The corresponding fem ion density is then given by Eq. (3). We stress that Eq. (14), while implying standard HF theory, is not equivalent to it: the standard HF equations can have several solutions, but Eq. (14) provides a simple method to solve HF equations so as to avoid the unphysical solutions: rst maximize F with respect to the q_i , and then m inim ize with respect to the m $_i$. In case we restrict HF theory by making a simplifying ansatz for the m ean elds q_i and m $_i$ as below, it can happen that one must take the solution m inim izing F.

M ean eld theory is obtained from HF by restricting to m ean elds which are invariant under translations by two sites. For the di erent states discussed in this paper one further simpli es to

where e_z is the unit vector in z-direction. W ith this restrictions it is easy to compute the eigenvalues $E \ by$ Fourier transform . One obtains

AF:
$$E_{k}$$
; $= \frac{1}{2} (k) + (k + Q) + U (q - 1)$
 $q - \frac{(k)}{(k + Q) + (Um_{AF})^2}$
F: E_{k} ; $= (k) + U (q - 1 - m_F)$
P: E_{k} : $= (k) + U (q - 1)$ (16)

where the quantum numbers labeling the eigenvalues are (k;) with = a band index and $k = (k_x; k_y)$ with $k_{x,y} = (2 = L)$ integer m om enta restricted to the B rillouin zone $k_{x,y}$; Q = (;) is the AF vector, and

$$(k) = 2t[\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)] \quad 4t^0 \cos(k_x) \cos(k_y) \quad (17)$$

is the usual tight binding band relation. Thus the mean eld free energy becom es

$$F_{X} = \frac{U}{4} m_{X}^{2} q^{2} \frac{1}{L^{2}} \sum_{k;"=1}^{K} \cosh \frac{1}{2} E_{k;"}$$
 (18)

for X = AF, F and P (m_P = 0), where the k-sum becomes an integral in the therm odynamic limit L ! 1. The standard mean eld equations (see e.g. Sec. II in Ref. 4) are obtained from this from di erentiation, $@F_X = @q =$ $@F_X = @m_X = 0$. Note that $q = _X$ (ferm ion density at xed in the X-state) but, as explained in Sec. II, the relation of _x to the system density is som ew hat subtle.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In conclusion, we have presented a simple generalization of standard mean eld theory, including the possibility of phase separated mean eld states. We have presented results for the phase diagram of the 2D t t⁰ U Hubbard model, including values of parameters suggested by the high-T_c materials. We not that the NNN hopping t⁰ signi cantly alters the solution. The resulting rich and nontrivial phase diagram s show signi cant qualitative di erences between electron and hole doping. Moreover, a nite t⁰ suppresses order in the weak coupling regime, but can have the opposite e ect at strong coupling; see Figs. 2 and 5. Thus the results presented here are much richer than those obtained by standard MF theory.^{3,4} The correctness of our method is justi ed by mathem atical rigorous results.¹⁷

We stress that the method presented here does not necessarily produce accurate solutions to the problem, as is often the case with mean eld theory. Nevertheless the method provides a useful starting point for estimating the structure of the phase diagram, providing cheap guidance form ore accurate but costly calculation methods towards interesting regimes in the phase diagram.

The simple theory presented here can be straightforwardly generalized to a number of interesting cases, including more general mean eld states like ferrim agnetism or stripes, and to more com plicated models with additional interaction terms or more bands, etc.

A cknow ledgm ents

We thank M anfred Salm hofer for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the Swedish Science Research Council (VR) and the Goran Gustafsson Foundation.

langm ann@ theophys.kth.se

- ^y wallin@ theophys.kth.se
- ¹ M. Imada, A. Fujim ori, and Y. Tokura, Rev. M od. Phys. 70, 1039 (1998).
- ² E.Dagotto, Rev.M od.Phys. 66, 763 (1994).
- ³ J.E.Hirsch, Phys.Rev.B 31, 4403 (1985).
- ⁴ H.Q.Lin and J.E.Hirsch, Phys.Rev.B 35, 3359 (1987).
- ⁵ E. Langmann and M. Wallin, Europhys. Lett. 37, 219 (1997).
- ⁶ E. Langmann and M. Wallin, Phys. Rev. B 55, 9439 (1997).
- ⁷ D.Penn, Phys. Rev. 142, 350 (1966).
- ⁸ W .P.Su, Phys. Rev. B 37, 9904 (1988).
- ⁹ D.Poilblanc and T.M.Rice, Phys.Rev.B 39, 9749 (1989).
- ¹⁰ J. Zaanen and O. Gunnarsson, Phys. Rev. B 40, 7391

(1989).

- ¹¹ J.A.Verges, E.Louis, P.S.Lom dahl, F.Guinea, and A.R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. B 43, 6099 (1991).
- ¹² B.Valenzuela, M.A.H.Vozm ediano, and F.Guinea, Phys. Rev.B 62, 11312 (2000).
- $^{\rm 13}$ A.Singh and H.Ghosh, Phys.Rev.B 65, 134414 (2002).
- ¹⁴ M.S.Hybertsen, E.B.Stechel, W.M.C.Foulkes, and M.Schluter, Phys.Rev.B 45, 10032 (1992).
- ¹⁵ J.C.Slater, Phys. Rev. 35, 210 (1930).
- ¹⁶ V.Bach, E.H.Lieb, and J.P.Solovej, J.Stat. Phys. 76, 3 (1994).
- ¹⁷ V. Bach and J. Poelchau, M arkov P rocess. R elated Fields 2, 225 (1996).
- ¹⁸ P.B.Visscher, Phys. Rev.B 10, 943 (1974).