arXiv:cond-mat/0408564v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 2 Aug 2005

Role of vertex corrections in the spin-fluctuation mediated pairing mechanism

Z. B. Huang[1,3], W. Hanke[1], and E. Arrigoni[1,2]

[1] *Institut für Theoretische Physik und Astrophysik, Universität Würzburg, am Hubland, 97074 Würzburg, Germany*
[2] *Institut für Theoretische Physik - Computational Physics, Technische Universität Graz, Petersgasse 16, A-8010 Graz, Austria*
[3] *Department of Physics, Hubei University, Wuhan 430062, China*

PACS. 71.27.+a – Strongly correlated electron systems; heavy fermions.
PACS. 71.10.Fd – Lattice fermion models (Hubbard model, etc.).

Abstract. – We study numerically and partly diagrammatically the renormalization of the electron-spin interaction or vertex in a two-dimensional one-band Hubbard model with spin-fluctuation momentum transfer $\mathbf{q} = (\pi, \pi)$. We find that the renormalized electron-spin vertex decreases quite generally with decreasing temperature at all doping densities. As a combination of two concurring effects, i.e. the decrease of the vertex and the increase of the spin susceptibility, the effective pairing interaction increases with lowering temperature in the intermediate-correlation regime, but *flattens off* in the strong-correlation regime. Our findings indicate that in the high-T_c cuprates the pairing mediated by antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations is substantially reduced due to vertex corrections.

Introduction. – The spin-fluctuation mediated interaction between charge carriers is a corner stone in a variety of theoretical and experimental issues [1, 2], which are presently in the center of focus of the high-T_c superconductivity research: it has been proposed that a spin-1 resonance mode, which is prominent in the magnetic response measured by neutron scattering, is responsible for significant features ("kink") seen in other spectroscopies such as photoemission [3–5] and optical absorption, which are sensitive to the charge dynamics, and even that this mode is the boson responsible for "mediating" the superconducting pairing [6]. This also has led to a variety of counter-arguments based on the small spectral weight of the resonance mode and (assumed weak) coupling to electron-hole pairs [7]. However, neither the original proposals for the resonant spin-fluctuation mode scenarios nor the counter-arguments take into account the effects of vertex corrections. The vertex function $\gamma(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}) = g_{\mathbf{kq}}/g^0_{\mathbf{kq}}$, which gives the ratio of the coupling $g_{\mathbf{kq}}$ of the boson ($\mathbf{q} = (\pi, \pi)$ magnon or resonance mode) with a dressed quasiparticle (which includes vertex corrections and also quasiparticle renormalization) to the bare vertex $g^0_{\mathbf{kq}}$, is expected to be substantially renormalized by strong electronic correlations. This has recently been demonstrated for the electron-phonon (el-ph) vertex [8] by using numerically accurate quantum-Monte-Carlo (QMC) techniques [9]:

© EDP Sciences

whereas at weak and intermediate Coulomb (Hubbard U) interactions, screening is the dominant correlation effect suppressing the el-ph coupling, at larger U values irreducible vertex corrections become dominant and give rise to an unexpected and substantial increase in the forward direction.

The need for clarifying the role of vertex corrections in the high-T_c schemes involving the exchange of spin-fluctuations also derives from a rather dramatic finding by Schrieffer [10]: he argued that the spin-fluctuation vertex is strongly suppressed in the long-ranged antiferromagnetic (AF) state or, in the paramagnetic state but with strong AF precursors, i.e.

$$\gamma(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) \propto [(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{Q})^2 + \frac{1}{\xi^2}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sim \frac{1}{[\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega=0)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \tag{1}$$

where ξ stands for the AF correlation length and $\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega=0)$ is the spin susceptibility. This finding is further confirmed by Chubukov *et al.* [11]. The vanishing of γ at $\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}\equiv(\pi,\pi)$ in the long-ranged AF state is a consequence of the Adler principle: in the (AF) ordered state, the magnons are Goldstone bosons and, therefore, they always decouple from other degrees of freedom [11]. This then leads to a strong renormalization of the pairing interaction V in the single spin-fluctuation exchange approximation:

$$V(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}) \propto |\gamma(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})|^2 \chi(\mathbf{q}), \tag{2}$$

which instead of diverging tends to a finite positive constant as $\mathbf{q}$ approaches Q and $\xi \to \infty$. On the other hand, for the appearance of d-wave superconductivity one would need a substantial enhancement of the interaction near $\mathbf{Q}$. There remains the question of how large the AF correlation length ξ must be for this reduction effect to be substantial. Furthermore, the theoretical argument uses the "frozen in" electron-spin model, where the holes move in an unaffected (by the presence of holes) AF background.

Using QMC techniques [9], we aim at clarifying the role of electronic correlations on the effective electron-spin fluctuation (el-sp) coupling in a two-dimensional one-band Hubbard model. By comparing QMC results at a typical low doping ($\sim$ 10%) with diagrammatic ($\sim U^2$) calculations, we infer that the "weak correlation" regime, i.e. where $\gamma \sim 1$, is confined to rather small U ($U \leq 2t$, t: hopping) values (see Fig. 2). In this regime, and also in the intermediate correlation regime ($U \sim 4t$) where the bare vertex is already substantially suppressed ($\sim$ 50%), the strong increase of the susceptibility χ with decreasing temperature dominates the effective pairing potential V in Eq. (2). Thus, $V(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}=(\pi,\pi))$ with $\mathbf{p}$ close to the Fermi surface increases for decreasing temperatures. However, this standard behavior even qualitatively changes in the physically relevant strong correlation ($U \geq 8t$) regime: here, we do find in the underdoped regime that the vertex γ is so substantially reduced at low enough temperatures ($T \leq J = 4t^2/U$) that this reduction over-compensates the simultaneous increase of the spin susceptibility. Thus, at temperatures below the magnetic scale J, the vertex reduction introduces a substantial suppression of the effective pairing potential. At a first glance, this finding displays a similarity to Schrieffer's observation (see Eq. 2). We will argue, however, that in our calculation the AF precursor has not developed and that our findings are not consistent with a picture of hole fermions embedded in a long-range AF background, but rather with a short-range "real-space" picture, valid for strong correlations. Here, the spin fluctuation couples to the quasiparticle which forms a "spin-bag", i.e. a hole dressed by short-range AF fluctuations.

Model and numerical approach. – Our starting point is the one-band Hubbard model,

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle ij\rangle,\sigma} (c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma} + c^\dagger_{j\sigma} c_{i\sigma}) + U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}, \tag{3}$$

The operators $c^\dagger_{i\sigma}$ and $c_{i\sigma}$ as usual create and destroy an electron with spin σ at site i, respectively and the sum $\langle ij\rangle$ is over nearest-neighbor lattice sites. Here, U is the onsite Coulomb interaction and we will choose the nearest-neighbor hopping t as the unit of energy.

In our simulations, we have used the linear-response technique as in Ref. [8] in order to extract the el-sp vertex. In this method, one formally adds to Eq. (3) the interaction with a momentum- and (imaginary) time-dependent spin-fluctuation field in the z-direction $S_{\mathbf{q}}e^{-iq_0\tau}$ [12] in the form [13]

$$H_{el-sp} = \sum_{\mathbf{kq}\sigma} g^0_{\mathbf{kq}}\sigma c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k+q}\sigma}c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\ S_{\mathbf{q}}\ e^{-iq_0\tau}\ , \tag{4}$$

where $g^0_{\mathbf{kq}}$ is the bare el-sp coupling (equal to the Hubbard U in the one-band Hubbard model). One then considers the "anomalous" single-particle propagator in the presence of this perturbation defined as [12]

$$G_A(p,q) \equiv -\int_0^\beta d\tau\ e^{i(p_0+q_0)\tau}\langle T_\tau c_{\mathbf{p+q}\sigma}(\tau)c^\dagger_{\mathbf{p}\sigma}(0)\rangle_{H+H_{el-sp}}, \tag{5}$$

Here $\langle\rangle_{H+H_{el-sp}}$ is the Green's function evaluated with the Hamiltonian $H + H_{el-sp}$. Diagrammatically, $G_A(p,q)$ has the structure shown in Fig. 1 so that the el-sp vertex $\Gamma(p,q)$ can be expressed quite generally in terms of G_A and of the single-particle Green's function $G(p)$ in the form

$$\Gamma(p,q) = \lim_{S_{\mathbf{q}}\to 0}\frac{1}{g^0_{kq}}\frac{1}{S_{\mathbf{q}}}\frac{1}{1+U\,\chi_{zz}(q)}\frac{G_A(p,q)}{G(p+q)\,G(p)}\ , \tag{6}$$

with $\chi_{zz}(q)$ the longitudinal spin susceptibility. Due to the limit procedure in Eq. 6, it is sufficient to calculate the leading linear response of G_A to $H_{\rm el-sp}$, which is given by

$$G_A(p,q) = S_{\mathbf{q}}\ \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i(p_0+q_0)\tau}\int_0^\beta d\tau'\, e^{-iq_0\tau'}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma'} g^0_{\mathbf{kq}}\times$$
$$\langle T_\tau \sigma' c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k+q}\sigma'}(\tau'+0^+)c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma'}(\tau')c_{\mathbf{p+q}\sigma}(\tau)c^\dagger_{\mathbf{p}\sigma}(0)\rangle_H, \tag{7}$$

where 0^+ is a positive infinitesimal. Notice that $S_{\mathbf{q}}$ cancels in Eq. 6. The two-particle Green's function in Eq. (7) is evaluated with respect to the pure Hubbard Hamiltonian (Eq. (3)).

The effective vertex γ describing scattering processes between quasiparticles and spin waves is obtained by taking into account the wave-function renormalisation $Z(p)$:

$$\gamma(p,q) = \frac{\Gamma(p,q)}{\sqrt{Z(p)\,Z(p+q)}}\ . \tag{8}$$

Numerically, Z is obtained as $Z(p) = \mathrm{Im}[1/G(p)]/p_0$ [8,12]. In terms of $\gamma(p,q)$ and of the spin susceptibility $\chi_{zz}(q)$, the effective pairing interaction V under the exchange of a single spin wave is expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} V(p,q) &= |\gamma(p,q)|^2U^2\chi_{zz}(q) \\ &= [|\mathrm{Re}\gamma(p,q)|^2 + |\mathrm{Im}\gamma(p,q)|^2]U^2\chi_{zz}(q), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with

$$\chi_{zz}(q) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\beta d\tau\ e^{-i\ q_0\tau}\ \left\langle T_\tau m^z_{\mathbf{q}}(\tau)m^z_{-\mathbf{q}}(0)\right\rangle,$$

and




Fig. 1 – Diagrammatic representation of $G_A(p,q)$ within linear response to $S_{\mathbf{q}}$. The thick solid lines represent dressed single-particle Green's functions of the Hubbard model. The wavy line denotes the external perturbation in Eq. (4). The dashed line represent the Hubbard interaction U and the closed ellipse stands for the longitudinal spin susceptibility $\chi_{zz}(q)$.

$$m^z_{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \sigma c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \tag{10}$$

where $V(p,q)$ contains the contributions from both the real and imaginary parts of the vertex γ. Notice that due to the renormalisation in Eq. 8, $V(p,q)$ describes the effective interaction *between quasiparticles*.

Our numerical Monte Carlo simulations were performed on an 8×8 lattice at different doping densities and different temperatures [12]. In the high-T_c cuprates, the charge carriers near the $(\pi, 0)$ region are strongly affected by antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations. Therefore, we will examine the particular scattering process in which the incoming electron and spin fluctuation carry momenta $\mathbf{p} = (-\pi, 0)$ and $\mathbf{q} = (\pi, \pi)$, respectively. Within our $\mathbf{p}$-points mesh, these points lie sufficiently close to the Fermi surface.

Results. – The diagrams contributing to the vertex Γ up to order U^2 are displayed in Fig. 2(a). Figs. 2(b) and 2(c) show the comparison of QMC calculations with perturbation




Fig. 2 – (a) Low-order Feynman diagrams for the el-sp vertex $\Gamma(p,q)$. The thin solid lines are the non-interacting Green's functions and the dashed lines represent the Hubbard interaction U. The wavy lines stand for the spin-fluctuation fields. Real (b) and imaginary (c) parts of $\Gamma(p,q)$ vs U at $\delta = 0.12$ and $\beta = 2$. The solid circles are Monte Carlo results and the open symbols show the perturbation theory contributions shown in 2(a).




Fig. 3 – Real (a) and imaginary (b) parts of the effective el-sp vertex $\gamma(p,q)$ vs T at $U=4$ and $U=8$ for the doping density $\delta=0.12$. Figs. (c) and (d) show the T-dependence of the spin susceptibility $\chi_{zz}(q)$ and the effective pairing interactions between quasiparticles $V(p,q)$.

theory. As one can see, the perturbative calculations are in good agreement with Monte Carlo simulations only for $U \lesssim 2$.

Monte Carlo results for $\gamma(p,q)$, $\chi_{zz}(q)$, and $V(p,q)$ are displayed in Figs. 3(a)-3(d). We notice that in the underdoped regime ($\delta=0.12$) for both intermediate correlation ($U=4$) and strong correlation ($U=8$), γ is strongly renormalized at characteristic temperatures (below $T\approx J=0.5$ for $U=8$). There is a clear temperature trend observable in Reγ, which tends to go to zero (or to a very small value), at least for $U=8$. At our lowest accessible T's, Im$\gamma(p,q)$ is small at weak and intermediate correlations, but for $U=8$ it can become larger. Our numerical results clearly show that, whereas in the weak and intermediate correlation regimes the strong enhancement of the spin susceptibility dominates the low-T behavior of V, which then strongly increases for decreasing T, the behavior is different in the strong correlation ($U=8$) regime. Here, the pairing potential V only displays a mild increase or a saturation at low T's. Nevertheless, even at the lowest temperatures accessible at $U=8$, our conclusion that vertex corrections are crucial is already quite clear: there is an order of magnitude reduction [$\sim O(10)$] in the effective pairing interaction V (Fig. 3(d)) compared with the RPA (with full χ_{zz}) result. Our finding at $U=4$ is in good agreement with the work of Bulut *et al.* [14], which shows that the effective particle-particle interaction created by the Hubbard U increases with lowering temperature and can reach large values.

Figure 4 gives for both the intermediate ($U=4$) and strong correlation ($U=8$) cases the doping dependence of the susceptibility $\chi_{zz}(q)$, of the renormalization factor $|\gamma(p,q)|^2$, and of the effective pairing interaction $V(p,q)$. Again, we note the competing influences of the temperature on χ and γ: χ increases both as a function of lowering doping and temperature; this happens in both $U=4$ and $U=8$ cases. On the other hand, the effective el-sp vertex γ decreases as a function of lowering temperature (as we have seen in Fig. 3), and is almost




Fig. 4 – Spin susceptibility $\chi_{zz}(q)$, the renormalization factor $|\gamma(p,q)|^2$ (i. e. the reduction of V with respect to the RPA result), and the effective pairing interaction $V(p,q)$ as a function of doping density δ for (a) $U = 4$ and (b) $U = 8$. The value of the inverse temperature β is indicated by the shape of the symbol.

doping independent. As already mentioned, at intermediate correlations, the T-dependence of χ still dominates the pairing interaction, resulting in an increase of the effective pairing upon reducing T, especially for low dopings. But even here, at $U = 4$, vertex corrections reduce V substantially, as can be seen in the $|\gamma|^2$ value, which is reduced compared from the bare value 1 down to about ~ 0.25. This vertex influence on the effective pairing interaction is most dramatic at $U = 8$. Here $|\gamma|^2$ reduces V by a factor of 8 at the lowest accessible T's and dopings δ.

Discussion and conclusions. – How can we understand the rather dramatic role of vertex corrections in the strongly-correlated underdoped regime, where we have a short-ranged (of order Cu-Cu distance) correlation length ξ [15] and not Schrieffer's situation, where holes move in an unaffected (by the charge carriers) AF ($\xi \to \infty$) background? The important point is that in our calculation, a strong vertex suppression is obtained *even though the AF precursor has not developed*. What our QMC calculations demonstrate, is that below the characteristic temperature $T \sim J$, vertex corrections become so large that in the physically relevant strong-correlation ($U = 8$) regime, an order of magnitude reduction in the pairing interaction results. This reduction happens more or less independent of doping. This doping independence is at variance with Schrieffer's result (1), where of course ξ depends crucially on doping. Thus, our results suggest the following picture: It is known from our QMC work on the single-particle spectral function $A(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ [15] that below $T \sim J$, a "band" of width $O(J)$ forms, where "spin-bag"-like quasiparticles propagate coherently. This happens again more or less independent of doping, i.e. from the underdoped insulator ($\xi \to \infty$) up to optimal doping ($\xi \approx$Cu-Cu distance). It can also be shown on the basis of exact

diagonalization that it is the "spin-bag" quasiparticle and not the incoherent "lower Hubbard band" background which couples most effectively to the perturbing spin potential H_{el-sp} in Eq. (4) [16]. Therefore, as soon as the quasiparticle with its spin dressing has been formed (for low enough T's and large enough U's) the scattering amplitude or vertex is more or less independent of doping (see Fig. 4). This picture is clearly different from the doping dependent "screening effect" implicit in Eq. (1). Our results were obtained for a model with nearest-neighbor hopping only. For a nonvanishing next-nearest-neighbor hopping $t'/t < 0$, spin fluctuations get damped. In this case, calculations within the spin-fermion model show that vertex corrections are reduced [11]. We carried our QMC calculations for finite $t'/t = -0.25$, showing that indeed vertex corrections are smaller than for $t'/t = 0$ [17], although the difference is not as pronounced as in Ref. [11].

In summary, based on quantum Monte Carlo simulations, we have studied the renormalization of the el-sp interaction or vertex in the one-band Hubbard model. We found that the renormalized el-sp vertex decreases quite generally with decreasing temperature. On the other hand, the temperature dependence of the effective pairing interaction is rather different in the intermediate- and strong-correlation regimes: It increases with lowering temperature in the intermediate-correlation regime, but flattens off in the strong-correlation regime.

* * *

We would like to thank Prof. D.J. Scalapino for useful discussions. The Würzburg group acknowledges support by the DFG under Grant No. DFG-Forschergruppe 538, by a Heisenberg Grant (AR 324/3-1), by the Bavaria California Technology Center (BaCaTeC), and the KONWHIR project CUHE. The calculations were carried out at the high-performance computing centers LRZ (München) and HLRS (Stuttgart).

REFERENCES

[1] D.J. Scalapino, Physics Reports **250**, 329-365 (1995).
[2] M. Imada, A. Fujimori, and Y. Tokura, Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 1039 (1998).
[3] A. Lanzara *et al.*, Nature **412**, 510 (2001).
[4] M. Eschrig and M.R. Norman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3261 (2000).
[5] Ar. Abanov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 177002 (2002).
[6] J. Carbotte, E. Schachinger, and D.N. Basov, Nature (London) **401**, 354 (1999).
[7] H.Y. Kee, S.A. Kivelson, and G. Aeppli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 257002 (2002).
[8] Z.B. Huang, W. Hanke, E. Arrigoni, and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 220507(R) (2003).
[9] R. Blankenbecler, D.J. Scalapino, and R.L. Sugar, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 2278 (1981).
[10] J.R. Schrieffer, J. Low Temp. Phys. **99**, 397 (1995).
[11] A.V. Chubukov and D.K. Morr, Physics Reports **288**, 355 (1997); Ar. Abanov, A.V. Chubukov, and J. Schmalian, Adv. in Phys. **52**, 119 (2003).
[12] In our convention, unbolded variables denote both Matsubara frequency and momentum, i.e., $p = (p_0, \mathbf{p})$ and $q = (q_0, \mathbf{q})$. We have set the frequencies to their minimum values, i.e., $p_0 = \pi T$ for fermions and $q_0 = 0$ for bosons.
[13] The imaginary-time-dependent perturbation (4) has a well-defined meaning within a functional-integral formulation, where it leads to the linear-response result (7).
[14] N. Bulut, D.J. Scalapino, and S.R. White, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 2742 (1993).
[15] C. Gröber, R. Eder, and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 4336 (2000); R. Preuss, W. Hanke, C. Gröber, and H.G. Evertz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1122 (1997).
[16] R. Eder, Y. Ohta, and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 5124 (1995).
[17] Details will be given elsewhere, Z.B. Huang, W. Hanke, and E. Arrigoni *in preparation.*