

# Ground state of the frustrated Hubbard model within DMFT: energetics of Mott insulator and metal from ePT and QMC

N. Blümer<sup>a,\*</sup> E. Kalinowski<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Institut für Physik, Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität, 55099 Mainz, Germany*

<sup>b</sup>*FB Physik, Philipps Universität, 35032 Marburg, Germany*

## Abstract

We present a new method, ePT, for extrapolating few known coefficients of a perturbative expansion. Controlled by comparisons with numerically exact quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) results, 10<sup>th</sup> order strong-coupling perturbation theory (PT) for the Hubbard model on the Bethe lattice is reliably extrapolated to infinite order. Within dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT), we obtain continuous estimates of energy  $E$  and double occupancy  $D$  with unprecedented precision  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$  for the Mott insulator above its stability edge  $U_{c1} \approx 4.78$  as well as critical exponents. In addition, we derive corresponding precise estimates for  $E$  and  $D$  in the metallic ground state from extensive low-temperature QMC simulations using a fit to weak-coupling PT while enforcing thermodynamic consistency.

*Key words:* Mott transition, DMFT, QMC

The half-filled Hubbard model has been subject of intense research; after clarifying the magnetic phases, DMFT studies have lately focused on the paramagnetic Mott metal-insulator transition observed in frustrated versions. In the following, we shortly summarize recent work; for more complete and self-contained presentations, see Ref. [1] and upcoming publications.

Kato-Takahashi perturbation theory (PT) for the half-filled frustrated Hubbard model

$$\hat{H} = - \sum_{(ij),\sigma} t_{ij} \left( \hat{c}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\sigma} + \hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\sigma} \right) + U \hat{D}$$

with  $\hat{D} = \sum_i \hat{n}_{i\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow}$ ,  $\hat{n}_{i\sigma} = \hat{c}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{i\sigma}$ , and semi-elliptic “Bethe” density of states ( $W = 4t$ ) yields [1] the energy  $E(U) = E_{PT}(U) + \mathcal{O}(t^{12} U^{-11})$ , where for  $t = 1$ :

$$E_{PT}(U) = -\frac{1}{2U} - \frac{1}{2U^3} - \frac{19}{8U^5} - \frac{593}{32U^7} - \frac{23877}{128U^9}. \quad (1)$$

Both the 10<sup>th</sup> order (in  $t$ ) expression (1) for  $E_{PT}$  and the resulting estimate  $D_{PT} = dE_{PT}/dU$  for the double occupancy are converged within  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$  for  $U \geq 6$ .

\* Nils.Blumer@uni-mainz.de




Fig. 1. Energy  $E$  and double occupancy  $D$  of Mott insulator: PT of various order (lines) in comparison with QMC (circles).

Similar precision can be reached at finite temperatures  $T$  using an advanced quantum Monte-Carlo scheme [1]; due to the almost negligible temperature dependence in the insulating phase this also applies to the Mott insulating ground state. As seen in Fig. 1, both methods indeed agree very well for  $U = 6$  (and deviate below).

The idea of the extended perturbation theory (ePT) is to extrapolate coefficients in the PT series  $E_{PT} =$




Fig. 2. Construction of ePT: Extrapolation of PT values for  $U_c[n]$  (squares) defines coefficients for smaller  $1/n$  (circles).




Fig. 3. Mott insulator: Energy/double occupancy from QMC (circles), ePT (solid line), and truncated ePT (dashed/dotted lines); all results after subtracting  $10^{\text{th}}$  order PT.

$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{2i} U^{1-2i}$  by fitting coefficient ratios  $U_{c1}[2i] \equiv \sqrt{a_{2i+2}/a_{2i}}$  to  $U_{c1}[n] \approx U_{c1} + u_1 n^{-1} + u_2 n^{-2}$ . As seen in Fig. 2, the convergence to this assumed asymptotic form is fast; consequently, both the extrapolation to  $U_{c1} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} U_{c1}[2i]$  and the extraction of higher-order coefficients  $U_{c1}[2i]$  are reliable. We can further derive algebraic exponents:  $a_n \propto n^{\tau} U_{c1}^n$ ,  $E_{\text{crit}}(U) \propto (U - U_{c1})^{\tau-1}$ ,  $D_{\text{crit}}(U) \propto (U - U_{c1})^{\tau-2}$ . Analytic and numerical arguments support [1]  $\tau = 3.5$ ,  $U_{c1} = 4.78$ . Fig. 3 shows the perfect agreement between ePT and QMC. These results mark a breakthrough in accuracy for correlated electron systems; the ePT curves (for which parameterizations are given in [1]) should be/are used as authoritative benchmarks [2]. New evidence confirms our estimate of  $U_{c1} = 4.78$  which in turn strongly supports our analysis of critical exponents (for which no reliable comparisons exist).

Continuous ground state estimates are much more difficult to obtain from finite-temperature methods (such as QMC) in the metallic phase due to the much stronger temperature dependencies (with divergent linear coefficient of specific heat for  $U \rightarrow U_{c2} \approx 5.84$ ). On the basis of careful extrapolations of data for  $1/T = 15, 20, 25, 32, 40$  (Fig. 4) we have obtained such estimates with precision  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$  as shown in Fig. 5; this accuracy suffices in order to discriminate between QMC estimates (circles) and  $2^{\text{nd}}$  order weak-coupling PT (dotted lines). The continuous and thermodynam-




Fig. 4. Metal: QMC Energy/double occupancy (symbols) vs. squared temperature  $T$  and extrapolation  $T \rightarrow 0$  (lines).




Fig. 5. Ground state of frustrated Hubbard model within DMFT: Energy  $E$  and double occupancy  $D$  of metal and insulator match at critical point  $U_{c2} \approx 5.84$  (circle).  $2^{\text{nd}}$  order weak-coupling PT (dotted lines) shown for comparison.

ically consistent fits (dashed lines) to QMC in Fig. 5 include the well-known  $2^{\text{nd}}$  order term and fits to few higher even order coefficients under the constraint of matching the ePT estimates for the insulator at  $U = U_{c2} \approx 5.84$  (circles). Note that our implicit estimate of the (weak-coupling)  $4^{\text{th}}$  order coefficient deviates strongly (and has opposite sign of) the analytic result found in the literature [3]. Explicit parameterizations are deferred to a full-length publication which will also discuss additional observables implicit in our derivations (such as the linear coefficient of the specific heat).

## References

- [1] N. Blümer and E. Kalinowski, Preprint cond-mat/0404568 (2004) and references therein.
- [2] M. Feldbacher, K. Held, F. F. Assaad, Preprint cond-mat/0405408 (2004); S. Nishimoto, F. Gebhard, E. Jeckelmann, Preprint cond-mat/0406666 (2004).
- [3] F. Gebhard, E. Jeckelmann, S. Mahler, S. Nishimoto, R. M. Noack, Eur. Phys. J. B **36**, 491 (2003).