

Limitations of the mean field slave-particle approximations

E.A. Kochetov^{1,2} and A. Ferraz²

14th April 2024

¹Bogoliubov Theoretical Laboratory, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia

²International Centre for Condensed Matter Physics, Universidade de Brasília, 70910-900 Brasília- DF, Brazil

Abstract

We show that the transformation properties of the mean field slave boson/fermion order parameters under an action of the global SU(2) group impose certain restrictions on their applications to describe the phase diagram of the t-J model.

1 Introduction

The mean field (MF) slave-boson/fermion theory is a commonly used approach to address the t-J model when dealing with spin-charge separation in the context of a spin liquid, or the resonating valence bond (RVB) state. Within this scheme a spin-charge separation can be intuitively implemented representing the electron operator by a product of two commuting operators that carry separately spin and charge degrees of freedom. Namely, by introducing the “slave boson” (SB)[1] one rewrites the on-site electron operator in the form,

$$c_i = f_i b_i^y; \quad (1)$$

where b_i is a charged spinless (slave) boson operator (holon), while f_i is a neutral, spin 1/2 fermion operator (spinon) satisfying the constraint of no

double electron occupancy (NDEO)

$$b_i^\dagger b_i + \sum_{i \neq j} f_i^\dagger f_i = 1: \quad (2)$$

Alternatively, one can also introduce a spinless fermion f_i to describe the charge degree of freedom and a “spinning” boson b_i to describe the spin degree of freedom. This is the “slave fermion” (SF) approach [2, 3] ,

$$c_i = b_i f_i^\dagger \quad (3)$$

The NDEO constraint now reads

$$f_i^\dagger f_i + \sum_{i \neq j} b_i^\dagger b_i = 1: \quad (4)$$

In principle, both the SF and SB theories should produce physically identical results for the t-J model. However, in the MF approximation they give very different phase diagrams [4, 5, 6]. In particular, in the SB version the antiferromagnetic (AF) correlation is absent even for zero doping. Alternatively, in the SF approach, the ground state is antiferromagnetic for the undoped case and the long-range order persists until very high doping ($x \rightarrow 0.6$) [5]. It is commonly believed that these different results are due to the fact that in the MF approximation the crucial single occupancy constraint given by eq.(2)/eq.(4) is taken into account only on average. We show however that there is in fact another important reason for this discrepancy even within the standard MF approximation. We call attention to the fact that the SB and SF RVB singlet order parameters (OP) transform in different ways under a global SU(2) action that leaves the t-J hamiltonian invariant. While the RVB SB OP $S_{ij}^{SB} = \langle f_i^\dagger f_{j\#} - f_{i\#} f_j^\dagger \rangle$ is SU(2) invariant and, it is, therefore, more convenient to describe a phase with unbroken SU(2) symmetry, the SF RVB OP $S_{ij}^{SF} = \langle b_i^\dagger b_{j\#} - b_{i\#} b_j^\dagger \rangle$ breaks this symmetry explicitly and, therefore, seems more suitable for the description of the AF ordered state.

2 General Symmetry Considerations

Let us start by first discussing the symmetry properties of the t-J hamiltonian,

$$H_{t-J} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} t \sum_{\sigma} (c_i^\sigma c_j^\sigma + H.c.) + J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j - \frac{1}{4} n_i n_j ; \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha\beta} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} c_{i\beta}$ is the electron spin operator with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ as Pauli matrices, and $n_i = \sum_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha}$ is the electron number operator. The hamiltonian (5) is defined in a restricted Hilbert space without double electron occupancy.

It is clear, that the total number of the electrons, $N = \sum_i n_i$ is conserved, which results in the global U(1) symmetry of eq.(5). Besides, the spin operators $\mathbf{S} = \sum_i \mathbf{S}_i$ generate global SU(2) rotations of the electron operators (c_i, c_i^\dagger) which transform as SU(2) doublet,

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_i \\ c_{i\#} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_i \\ c_{i\#} \end{pmatrix}; \quad \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SU}(2); \quad (6)$$

leaving again the hamiltonian (5) invariant. Note that the SU(2) group parameters u and v are taken to be site-independent. Thus the t-J hamiltonian (5) possesses the global U(1) × SU(2) symmetry.

Within the MF approximation the spin liquid phase of the t-J model is believed to be adequately described by the globally SU(2) invariant RVB electron spin singlet OP $\phi_{ij} = \langle c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\beta} - c_{i\beta}^\dagger c_{j\alpha} \rangle$ [7]. It however breaks the U(1) global symmetry related to the conservation of the total number of the electrons. In the slave-particle representations the RVB OP takes on the following representations,

$$\phi_{ij} = \langle b_i^y b_j^y \rangle = \langle f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{j\beta} - f_{i\beta}^\dagger f_{j\alpha} \rangle$$

or

$$\phi_{ij} = \langle f_i^y f_j^y \rangle = \langle b_{i\alpha}^\dagger b_{j\beta} - b_{i\beta}^\dagger b_{j\alpha} \rangle :$$

Although both decompositions of ϕ_{ij} are SU(2) invariant their single constituents in general need not be so. This is because there is an additional U(1) local gauge invariance under the transformation $f_i \rightarrow f_i e^{i\theta_i}; b_i \rightarrow b_i e^{-i\theta_i}$ that leaves eqs.(1,3) intact. To appropriately reduce the number of degrees of freedom, one should “gauge-fix“ θ_i . The important point is that the gauge fixing must be SU(2) invariant. In other words, the gauge fixing must be compatible with the SU(2) invariance of the RVB OP ϕ_{ij} . As we shall see, this imposes some restrictions on the transformation properties of the f and b fields.

3 Slave Fermion Representation

Let us, first, consider the SF case. It will be more convenient to deal with the SF path-integral representation of the t-J partition function. Within that representation the classical counterparts of eqs.(3) and (4) read

$$c_i = b_i f_i; \quad (7)$$

$$f_i f_i + \prod_{i \neq j} b_i b_i = 1; \quad (8)$$

respectively, where now c_i and f_i are complex Grassmann parameters, whereas b_i stands for complex c-numbers. The OP's are now understood to be the path-integral averages, e.g.,

$$\langle b_{i^*} b_{j^*} b_{i\#} b_{j\#} \rangle = \frac{\int \mathcal{D} (b_{i^*} b_{j^*} b_{i\#} b_{j\#}) e^{S_{t-J}^{SF}(f; b_{i^*} b_{j^*} b_{i\#} b_{j\#})}}{\int \mathcal{D} e^{S_{t-J}^{SF}(f; b_{i^*} b_{j^*} b_{i\#} b_{j\#})}}; \quad (9)$$

where $S_{t-J}^{SF}(f; b_{i^*} b_{j^*} b_{i\#} b_{j\#})$ is the t-J action in the SF representation (7).

It is clearly seen that eq.(7) increases the number of degrees of freedom by two. The constraint (8) takes care of one of them, and the extra one must be dealt with by the fixing of the U(1) local gauge. This is achieved by fixing the phase of one of the bosonic fields, by requiring, e.g., that $\arg b_{i\#} = 0$. In other words, to fix the gauge, we impose the condition

$$\arg b_{i\#} = \frac{1}{2i} \log \frac{b_{i\#}}{b_{i\#}} = 0; \quad (10)$$

Let us first assume that the b_i fields transform in a linear spinor representation of SU(2) just as true fermionic amplitudes:

$$b_{i^*}^0 = u b_{i^*} + v b_{i\#};$$

$$b_{i\#}^0 = u b_{i\#} - v b_{i^*} \quad (11)$$

If this is the case, the slave fermion f_i should be a SU(2) scalar. However calculating the phase of the transformed operators gives

$$\arg b_{i\#}^0 = \frac{1}{2i} \log \frac{b_{i\#}^0}{b_{i\#}^0} = \frac{1}{2i} \log \frac{v b_{i^*} + u b_{i\#}}{v b_{i^*} + u b_{i\#}} = \frac{1}{2i} \log \frac{v z_i + u}{v z_i + u} \notin 0; z_i \quad b_{i^*} = b_{i\#};$$

This tells us that eq.(10) is not truly SU(2) covariant. Nevertheless, the covariance can be restored if we multiply eq.(11) by an appropriate phase factor:

$$b_{i^*}^0 = e^{i \phi} (u b_{i^*} + v b_{i\#});$$

$$b_{i\#}^0 = e^{i \phi} (u b_{i\#} - v b_{i^*}); \quad (12)$$

where

$$\mathbf{i}_i = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{v z_i + u}{v z_i - u} : \quad (13)$$

In this way we can guarantee that $\arg b_{i\#}^0 = 0$: The same kind of phase factor shows up in the transformation law of the $SU(2)$ covariant Kaehler potential $K = s \log(1 + \mathbf{z}^2)$ for a spin s . In fact, under $SU(2)$ rotations of the two-sphere S^2 , or, equivalently, of the projective space $\mathbb{C}P^1$, one gets

$$K \rightarrow K + ' + ' ; \quad ' = s \log(v z + u);$$

so that $\mathbf{i} = ' - '$ at $s = 1/2$. Equation (4) defines a supersphere $\mathbb{C}P^{1|1}$ (see Appendix) whose body[8] coincides with the $\mathbb{C}P^1$ manifold. Since $\mathbb{C}P^1$ is a compact manifold, $SU(2)$ acts on it in a nonlinear way. For this reason, the function \mathbf{i} is a natural ingredient in the $SU(2)$ transformation law for the SF fields.

Since the true electron operators c_i are by definition transformed according to eq.(6) we conclude that the slave fermion must transform as

$$f_i \rightarrow f_i^0 = e^{-\mathbf{i}_i} f_i : \quad (14)$$

Despite the explicit site dependence of \mathbf{i}_i through the z_i field, eqs.(12,14) represent *global* $SU(2)$ transformations (the group parameters u and v are site - independent). This transformation has also nothing to do with the above discussed local $U(1)$ gauge invariance of the t - J model in the slave-particle representation. In fact we have already taken care of that gauge freedom by imposing the condition (10).

As is shown in the Appendix our somewhat heuristic argumentation that lead to (12,14) can be made rigorous by employing the $su(2|1)$ superalgebra representation of the Hubbard operators. Such a representation follows if we explicitly resolve the constraint of no double occupancy (8) which is basically an equation of the $SU(2|1)$ homogeneous supersphere embedded into a flat superspace. The spin group $SU(2)$, being a subgroup of $SU(2|1)$, acts on a supersphere homogeneously and in a nonlinear way, which reasserts itself in the highly nonlinear transformation laws for the f and b fields under the $SU(2)$ action.

Since both the SF action and the measure factor in eq.(9) are $SU(2)$ invariant, this means that, under (12,14), the SF RVB OP's are *not* $SU(2)$ invariant. They transform simply as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle b_i b_{j\#} \quad b_{i\#} b_j \rangle &\rightarrow e^{i(\mathbf{i}_i + \mathbf{j})} \langle b_i b_{j\#} \quad b_{i\#} b_j \rangle ; \\ \langle f_i^Y f_j^Y \rangle &\rightarrow e^{-i(\mathbf{i}_i + \mathbf{j})} \langle f_i^Y f_j^Y \rangle : \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

As a result this naturally explains why the use of the SF OP's is more appropriate for the description a phase with a broken SU(2) magnetic symmetry and may produce quite unreliable results for the doping regions which are not magnetically ordered. This has already been implicitly confirmed by direct calculations in the SF MF approximation[5].

4 Slave Boson Representation

We turn now to the SB case. Within the SB path-integral representation of the t-J partition function we get the operator classical counterparts

$$c_i = f_i b_i; \quad (16)$$

$$b_i b_i + \sum_{j \neq i} f_i f_j = 1; \quad (17)$$

where now c_i and f_i are complex Grassmann parameters, and the b_i 's stand for complex c-numbers. We can now fix the local U(1) gauge by choosing $\arg b_i = 0$. Since Grassmann parameters are not c-valued numbers, we are not able to fix the phase of the f field, by demanding, e.g., that $\log \frac{f_j}{f_i} = 0$. This expression is just meaningless for Grassmann variables..

It can easily be checked that the SU(2) transformations lead to

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i\alpha}^0 &= u f_{i\alpha} + v f_{i\beta}; \\ f_{i\beta}^0 &= u f_{i\beta} - v f_{i\alpha}; \\ b_i^0 &= b_i \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which are compatible with the gauge fixing condition, $\arg b_i = 0$. Therefore, the SB RVB OPs $\langle f_{i\alpha} f_{j\beta} - f_{i\beta} f_{j\alpha} \rangle$ as well as $\langle b_i^\alpha b_j^\alpha \rangle$ are SU(2) invariant and are more suitable to the description of the doping range not associated with magnetic ordering, i.e., the superconducting phase[4].

5 Conclusion

To conclude, mathematically, the distinctions in the transformation properties between SF and SB amplitudes can be attributed to the fact that eq.(8) defines a supermanifold, $\mathbb{C}P^{1|1}$ that has a *compact* body manifold $\mathbb{C}P^1$. In contrast, eq.(17) defines a supermanifold $\mathbb{C}P^{0|2}$ which is essentially fermionic and contains no compact body manifold. Our results explain quite naturally

why the SF mean field approximations produce qualitatively good results for magnetically ordered state whereas the SB representation is more appropriate to represent the superconducting state at larger dopings.

Acknowledgements: E.A.K wants to acknowledge the hospitality of the ICCMP's staff and the financial support received from CAPES - Brazil.

Appendix

In this Appendix we derive rigorously eqs.(12,14).

First, we show that constraint of no double occupancy (8) is explicitly resolved in terms of the $su(2|1)$ path-integral representation used in Refs.[9]. We start with the path-integral SF representation of the t -J partition function (9). Basic ingredients that enter the SF path-integral action are the classical symbols of the SF Hubbard operators X . Let $X_{ij}; i = 1, 2, 3$ be a 3×3 matrix of the Hubbard operator X . Consider a complex composite vector $d^t = (b; b_{\#}; f)^t$. Then, the SF representation reads $X^{cl} = \int dX d; \text{ where}$

$$X \int d d = b \cdot b + b_{\#} b_{\#} + f f = 1$$

at every lattice site. Let us now make a change of variables that explicitly resolves this constraint,

$$b = \frac{z}{1 + |z|^2}; \quad b_{\#} = \frac{1}{1 + |z|^2};$$

$$f = \frac{1}{1 + |z|^2}; \quad (19)$$

Geometrically, the set $(z;)$ appears as local (projected) coordinates of a point on the supersphere $CP^{1|1}$ defined by eq.(8). They are related to the homogeneous (defined up to a scaling factor) coordinates by $z = b/b_{\#}; = f/b_{\#}; b_{\#} \neq 0$: Note that according to our choice, $\arg b_{\#} = 0$:

In terms of the local coordinates, $SU(2)$ acts on a supersphere by the linear fractional transformations,

$$z \rightarrow z^0 = \frac{uz + v}{vz + u}; \quad \theta^0 = \frac{u}{vz + u}; \quad \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} \in SU(2); \quad (20)$$

Substituting this into eq.(19) results in eqs.(12,14).

References

- [1] G. Baskaran and P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev.B **37**, 580 (1988); S.E. Barnes, J. Phys. F **6**, 1375 (1976); P. Coleman, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 3035 (1984); N. Read and D.M. Newns, J. Phys. C **16**, 3273 (1983).
- [2] D. Yoshioka, J.Phys.Soc. Jpn. **58**, 32, 1516 (1989).
- [3] D.P. Arovas and A. Auerbach, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 316 (1988).
- [4] H. Fukuyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **108**, 287 (1992).
- [5] C.L. Kane et al, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 2653 (1990).
- [6] S. Feng, Z.B. Su and L. Yu, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 2368 (1994).
- [7] G. Baskaran, Z. Zou and P.W. Anderson, Solid State Commun. **63**, 973 (1987).
- [8] Roughly speaking a body of a $(n|m)$ dimensional complex supermanifold with *local* coordinates $(z_i; \psi_j); i = 1, 2, \dots, n; j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ can be defined by setting all odd-valued parameters to be equal to zero, $\psi_j = 0$. For more details, see,e.g., B. DeWitt, “Supermanifolds“ (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992).
- [9] E. Kochetov and M. Mierzejewski, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 1580 (2000); *ibid.* **68**, 016502 (2003).