

Composite quasiparticles and the “hidden” quantum critical point in the topological transition scenario of high- T_c cuprates

T. K. Kopeć

*Institute for Low Temperature and Structure Research,
Polish Academy of Sciences, POB 1410, 50-950 Wrocław 2, Poland
(Dated: March 23, 2022)*

The quantum interference effects due to the Aharonov-Bohm-type phase factors are studied in the layered $t - t' - t_\perp - U - J$ strongly correlated system relevant for cuprates. Casting Coulomb interaction in terms of composite-fermions via the flux attachment facility, we argue that U(1) compact group instanton events labelled by a topological winding number are essential configurations of the phase field dual to the charge. The impact of these topological excitations is calculated for the phase diagram which displays the “hidden” quantum critical point of a novel type.

PACS numbers: 74.20.-z, 74.20.Mn, 74.72.-h

The discovery of high-temperature superconductors (HTSC) and follow-up studies of strongly correlated (SC) fermionic systems reveal that an explanation of their unusual properties appears unlikely in a way of thinking rooted in an independent electron picture. It is widely accepted that the central issue in the high temperature superconducting cuprates is physics of the doped Mott insulator [1]. There are also strong indications [2], that much of their behavior is governed by the proximity to a kind of quantum critical point (QCP). However, in approaches to the HTSC one customary concentrates on the low-energy physics usually discarding the hallmark of SC systems - the high energy scale given by the Coulomb interaction U by projecting out double-occupancy charge configurations. A detour from the strict projection program was recently proposed in a form of the “gossamer” superconductor [3] recognizing the role of correlations among expensive double-occupancy charge configurations.

Moreover, a SC electronic system can have non-trivial *topological* properties which can be described by gauge fields [4]: a phase of the many-body wave function might be arbitrary but correlations among the local phases of its constituents can bring unusual gauge structures [5]. Quantum theories with topological properties have raised considerable interest in connection with a wide range of problems, among them, the Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect [6], which establishes the reality of the electromagnetic gauge potential, is a typical example. In fact, the AB effect forms only the prelude to the even more general class of topological phenomena which are possible in gauge theories. In particular, the fractional quantum Hall effect [7, 8] is the prominent representative. A succinct account of the latter is given in terms of new particles called composite fermions (CF) by casting electron-electron correlation in terms of vortex attachment facility to grasp the intricate many-particle behavior [9].

In the present paper recognizing the significance of the AB non-integrable phase factor we consider, inspired by the CF idea, the representation of strongly correlated

electrons as a fermions plus attached “flux tubes”. This effectively removes most of the electron-electron interaction from the problem and leads to composite particles which are almost void of mutual interactions. Furthermore, taking into account the proper topology of the phase field dual to the charge, we recognize that the elementary excitations in strongly correlated system always carry 2π -kinks of the phase field characterized by the topological winding number. We reveal the impact of these topological excitations for the phase diagram of cuprates and show that they can induce its unusual feature: a “hidden” quantum critical point of a novel type that is not related to the symmetry breaking.

We consider an effective one-band electronic Hamiltonian on a tetragonal lattice that emphasize strong anisotropy and the presence of a layered CuO_2 stacking sequence in cuprates: $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_t + \mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_U$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_t &= \sum_{\alpha\ell} \left[- \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle} (t + \mu\delta_{\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}'}) c_{\alpha\ell}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}') \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle} t' c_{\alpha\ell}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}') - \sum_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'} t_\perp(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}') c_{\alpha\ell}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) c_{\alpha\ell+1}(\mathbf{r}') \right], \\ \mathcal{H}_J &= \sum_{\ell} \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle} J \left[\mathbf{S}_\ell(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{S}_\ell(\mathbf{r}') - \frac{1}{4} n_\ell(\mathbf{r}) n_\ell(\mathbf{r}') \right], \\ \mathcal{H}_U &= \sum_{\ell\mathbf{r}} U n_{\uparrow\ell}(\mathbf{r}) n_{\downarrow\ell}(\mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here, $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}' \rangle$ and $\langle \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}' \rangle \rangle$ identifies summation over the nearest-neighbor and next-nearest-neighbor sites labeled by $1 \leq \mathbf{r} \leq N$ within the CuO plane, respectively, with t, t' being the *bare* hopping integrals, while $1 \leq \ell \leq N_\perp$ labels copper-oxide layers and t_\perp stands for the inter-layer coupling. The operator $c_{\alpha\ell}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) (c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}))$ creates (annihilates) an electron of spin α at the lattice site (\mathbf{r}, ℓ) . Next, $S_\ell^a(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\alpha\beta} c_{\alpha\ell}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a c_{\beta\ell}(\mathbf{r})$ ($a = x, y, z$) stands for spin and $n_\ell(\mathbf{r}) = n_{\uparrow\ell}(\mathbf{r}) + n_{\downarrow\ell}(\mathbf{r})$ number operators, respectively, where $n_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}) = c_{\alpha\ell}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r})$ and μ is the

chemical potential. Subsequently, U is the on-site repulsion Coulomb energy of the order of bandwidth and J the antiferromagnetic (AF) exchange. The values of J in cuprates are known to be not strongly dependent on materials with the magnitude of 0.1–0.16 eV. The electronic dispersion is $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, k_z) = \epsilon_{\parallel}(\mathbf{k}) + \epsilon_{\perp}(\mathbf{k}, k_z)$, where the in-plane contribution is $\epsilon_{\parallel}(\mathbf{k}) = -2t[\cos(ak_x) + \cos(ak_y)] + 4t'\cos(ak_x)\cos(ak_y)$ with $t' > 0$. Furthermore, the c -axis dispersion is $\epsilon_{\perp}(\mathbf{k}, k_z) = 2t_{\perp}(\mathbf{k})\cos(ck_z)$, while $t_{\perp}(\mathbf{k}) = t_{\perp}[\cos(ak_x) - \cos(ak_y)]^2$ as predicted on the basis of band calculations [10].

We write the partition function $Z = \int [\mathcal{D}\bar{c}\mathcal{D}c] e^{-\mathcal{S}[\bar{c}, c]}$ with the action $\mathcal{S}[\bar{c}, c] = \int_0^{\beta} d\tau [\sum_{\alpha\ell} \bar{c}_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \partial_{\tau} c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) + \mathcal{H}(\tau)]$ using coherent-state fermionic path integral over Grassmann fields $c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau), \bar{c}_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ depending on the “imaginary time” $0 \leq \tau \leq \beta \equiv 1/k_B T$ with T being the temperature. The last term in Eq.(1) we write as $\mathcal{H}_U(\tau) = U \sum_{\mathbf{r}\ell} \{(1/4)n_{\ell}^2(\mathbf{r}\tau) - [\mathbf{\Omega}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)]^2\}$ singling out the charge U(1) and spin sector in SU(2)/U(1) coset space, where the unit vector $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ sets varying in space-time spin quantization axis [12]. In the following we fix our attention on U(1) invariant *charge* sector, and use Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation to decouple the Coulomb term giving rise to fluctuating imaginary “voltage” $iV_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ conjugate to the number of charged particles $n_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$. Furthermore, we write the field

$V_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ as a sum of a static $V_{0\ell}(\mathbf{r})$ and periodic function $\tilde{V}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \equiv \tilde{V}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau + \beta)$: $V(\mathbf{r}\tau) = V_0(\mathbf{r}) + \tilde{V}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$. Using Fourier series $\tilde{V}(\mathbf{r}\tau) = (1/\beta) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [\tilde{V}(\mathbf{r}\omega_n) e^{i\omega_n \tau} + c.c.]$ with $\omega_n = 2\pi n/\beta$ ($n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2$) being the (Bose) Matsubara frequencies. Now, we introduce the *phase* (or “flux”) field $\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ via the Faraday-type relation

$$\dot{\phi}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \equiv \frac{\partial \phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)}{\partial \tau} = \tilde{V}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau), \quad (2)$$

to remove the imaginary term $i \int_0^{\beta} d\tau \dot{\phi}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) n_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \equiv i \int_0^{\beta} d\tau \tilde{V}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) n_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ for all the Fourier modes of the $V_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ field, except for the zero frequency by performing the local gauge transformation to the *new* fermionic variables $f_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$:

$$c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) = \exp \left[i \int_0^{\tau} d\tau' \tilde{V}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau') \right] f_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \quad (3)$$

Thus, as a result of Coulomb correlations the electron acquire a phase shift similar to that in the electric (i.e. scalar) AB effect [6]; Eq.(3) means that an electron has a composite nature made of the fermionic part $f_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ with the attached “flux” (or AB phase) $\exp[i\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)]$. The transformed action $\mathcal{S}[\bar{c}, c] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}[\bar{f}, f]$ then reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}[\bar{f}, f] = & \sum_{\ell} \int_0^{\beta} d\tau \left\{ \frac{1}{U} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \left[\frac{\partial \phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)}{\partial \tau} \right]^2 + \frac{2\mu}{U} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial \phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)}{\partial \tau} - \bar{\mu} \sum_{\mathbf{r}\alpha} \bar{f}_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) f_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \right. \\ & - \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle} t e^{-i[\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) - \phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}'\tau)]} \sum_{\alpha} \bar{f}_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) f_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}'\tau) + \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle} t' e^{-i[\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) - \phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}'\tau)]} \sum_{\alpha} \bar{f}_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) f_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}'\tau) \\ & \left. - \sum_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'} t_{\perp}(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}') e^{-i[\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) - \phi_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{r}'\tau)]} \sum_{\alpha} \bar{f}_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) f_{\alpha\ell+1}(\mathbf{r}'\tau) - J \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle} \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau, \mathbf{r}'\tau) \mathcal{B}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau, \mathbf{r}'\tau) \right\} \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mu} = \mu - n_f U/2$ and $n_f = \langle \bar{f}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}\tau) f_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \rangle$ is the occupation number for f -fermions while $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau, \mathbf{r}'\tau) = (1/\sqrt{2})[\bar{f}_{\uparrow\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \bar{f}_{\downarrow\ell}(\mathbf{r}'\tau) - \bar{f}_{\downarrow\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \bar{f}_{\uparrow\ell}(\mathbf{r}'\tau)]$ is the singlet pair (valence bond) operator [13]. The chief merit of the transformation in Eq.(4) is that we have managed to cast the strongly correlated problem into a system of *weakly* interacting f -fermions with residual interaction given by J , submerged in the bath of strongly fluctuating U(1) gauge potentials (on the *high* energy scale set by U) minimally coupled to f -fermions via “dynamical Peierls” phase factors. It is clear that the action of these phase factors “frustrates” the motion of the fermionic subsystem. However, it is only when charge fluctuations become *phase coherent* the frustration of the kinetic energy is released. On average, the effect of this frustrated motion

is the effective mass enhancement of carriers due to the band narrowing, so that the “dressed” band parameters $t_X^* = t_X \langle e^{-i[\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) - \phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}'\tau)]} \rangle$ (where $t_X = t, t', t_{\perp}$) are used to match electronic spectra of HTSC using *low*-energy scale $t - J$ model [11]. Typically, in cuprates $t^* \sim 0.5$ eV, $t^*/t \sim 0.15 - 0.35$ and t_{\perp}^* is of order of magnitude smaller than the in-plane hopping parameters [10].

Because for SC system the *charge quantization* matters, the electromagnetic U(1) group governing the phase field is *compact*, i.e. $\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau)$ has the topology of a circle (S_1). Genuine topological effects can arise due to non-homotopic mappings of the configuration space onto the gauge group $S_1 \rightarrow \text{U}(1)$. The total time derivative Berry phase [15] imaginary term in Eq.(4) is *nonzero* due to phase field configurations with $\phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}\beta) - \phi_{\ell}(\mathbf{r}0) = 2\pi m_{\ell}(\mathbf{r})$

where $m_\ell(\mathbf{r}) = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$ marks the $U(1)$ *winding* (or Chern) number. Therefore, the proper integration measure over ϕ in a *multiply-connected* domain is then [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} \int [\mathcal{D}\phi] \dots &\equiv \sum_{\{m_\ell(\mathbf{r})\}} \int_0^{2\pi} \prod_{\mathbf{r}\ell} d\phi_{0\ell}(\mathbf{r}) \times \\ &\times \int_{\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}0)=\phi_{0\ell}(\mathbf{r})}^{\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\beta)=\phi_{0\ell}(\mathbf{r})+2\pi m_\ell(\mathbf{r})} \prod_{\mathbf{r}\ell\tau} d\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) \dots \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where in each topological sector the integration goes over the gauge potentials with the Chern number equal to $m_\ell(\mathbf{r})$. This is an important observation since these global topological effects are *not* encoded in the operator algebra of the original $c_{\alpha\ell}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}), c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r})$ operators.

To address the issue of the phase order we trace over the fermionic degrees of freedom using Eq.(4) to obtain an effective action is the phase field:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}[\phi] &= \sum_\ell \int_0^\beta d\tau \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \left[\frac{1}{U} \dot{\phi}_\ell^2(\mathbf{r}\tau) + \frac{2\mu}{U} \frac{1}{i} \dot{\phi}_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) \right] \right. \\ &- \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle} \mathcal{J}_\parallel(\Delta) \cos[2\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) - 2\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}'\tau)] \\ &- \sum_{\langle \langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle \rangle} \mathcal{J}'_\parallel(\Delta) \cos[\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) - \phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}'\tau)] \\ &\left. - \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \mathcal{J}_\perp(\Delta) \cos[2\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) - 2\phi_{\ell+1}(\mathbf{r}\tau)] \right\}, \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

where the microscopic *phase stiffnesses* to the lowest order in the hopping amplitudes are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_\parallel(\Delta) &= \frac{t^2}{4} \int_{-2}^2 dx dy \frac{x^2 y^2}{y^2 - x^2} \rho(x) \rho(y) \times \\ &\times \left\{ \frac{\tanh\left[\frac{1}{2}\beta\epsilon(x)\right]}{\epsilon(x)} - \frac{\tanh\left[\frac{1}{2}\beta\epsilon(y)\right]}{\epsilon(y)} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{J}'_\parallel(\Delta) &= -t'\bar{\mu} \int_{-2}^2 dx \frac{\bar{\rho}(x)}{\epsilon(x)} \tanh\left[\frac{1}{2}\beta\epsilon(x)\right], \\ \mathcal{J}_\perp(\Delta) &= \frac{9t_\perp^2 |\Delta|^2}{16} \int_{-2}^2 dx \frac{x^2 \rho(x)}{\epsilon^3(x)} \left\{ 2 \tanh\left[\frac{\beta\epsilon(x)}{2}\right] \right. \\ &\left. - \beta\epsilon(x) \text{sech}^2\left[\frac{\beta\epsilon(x)}{2}\right] \right\} \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Here, we denote $\epsilon(x) = \sqrt{\bar{\mu}^2 + |\Delta|^2 x^2}$ and $\rho(x) = (1/\pi^2) \mathbf{K}(\sqrt{1 - (x^2/4)})$ while $\bar{\rho}(x) = \rho(x) - (2/\pi^2) \mathbf{E}(\sqrt{1 - (x^2/4)})$, where $\mathbf{K}(x)$ and $\mathbf{E}(x)$ are the complete elliptic integrals of the first and second kind, respectively [14]. While \mathcal{J}_\parallel and \mathcal{J}_\perp depend on the square of the corresponding hopping elements, which render them similar to the Josephson *pair* tunneling amplitudes, the stiffness \mathcal{J}'_\parallel is different: it depends *linearly* on t' and governs the process of correlated *particle-hole* motion. Collective pair (and in general multiple charge)

tunneling events are costly for large U , so that excitonic coherent charge transfer dominates the in-plane physics [17]. The inter-plane stiffness \mathcal{J}_\perp is essential, however, in establishing bulk superconductivity via the Josephson coupling. All the stiffnesses in Eq.(7) rest on a gap due to the in-plane *momentum space* pairing of the f -fermions induced by AF exchange J : a Gorkov-type decoupling of the valence bond term in Eq.(4) readily gives for the gap parameter $|\Delta(\mathbf{k})|$

$$1 = \frac{J}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{[\cos(k_x a) - \cos(k_y a)]^2}{2\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k})} \tanh\left[\frac{\beta\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k})}{2}\right] \quad (8)$$

with the quasiparticle spectrum of the f -fermions, $\mathcal{E}^2(\mathbf{k}) = [\epsilon_\parallel^*(\mathbf{k}) - \bar{\mu}]^2 + |\Delta(\mathbf{k})|^2$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = \Delta[\cos(k_x a) - \cos(k_y a)]$. Obviously, the presence of the “ d -wave” pair function $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$ is *not* a signature of the superconducting state—it merely marks the region of non-vanishing phase stiffness. The state with truly off-diagonal long range order is signalled by $\langle e^{i\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau)} \rangle \neq 0$ marking the *macroscopic quantum phase coherence*. To proceed, we introduce the unimodular complex scalar $z_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) = e^{i\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau)}$ and rewrite the partition function as $Z = \int [\mathcal{D}^2 z] \prod_{\mathbf{r}\ell} \delta(|z_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau)|^2 - 1) e^{-\mathcal{S}[z, z^*]}$ where the unimodularity constraint can be imposed with a real Lagrange multiplier λ , so that the effective action reads

$$\mathcal{S}[z, z^*] = \frac{1}{\beta N N_\perp} \sum_{\mathbf{q}\omega_n} z^*(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n) \Gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n) z(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n). \quad (9)$$

Here, $\mathbf{q} \equiv (\mathbf{k}, k_z)$ and $\Gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n) = \lambda - \Sigma(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n) + \gamma_0^{-1}(\omega_n)$. Subsequently, $\Sigma_{\ell\ell'}(\mathbf{r}\tau, \mathbf{r}'\tau') = \mathcal{J}_\perp \delta_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} \delta_{\ell-\ell', 1} + \mathcal{J}'_\parallel \delta_{\ell\ell'} \delta_{\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{d}_{2nd}} + \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_\parallel \Gamma_{\ell\ell'}(\mathbf{r}\tau, \mathbf{r}'\tau') \delta_{\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{d}_{1st}}$ while \mathbf{d}_{1st} and \mathbf{d}_{2nd} are the lattice vectors connecting nearest neighbors and next-nearest neighbors in the CuO plane, respectively. Furthermore, $\gamma_0(\omega_n)$ is the Fourier transform of the bare phase correlator $\langle e^{-i[\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) - \phi_{\ell'}(\mathbf{r}'\tau')]} \rangle_0$ originating from the kinetic and topological part of the action in Eq.(6). Using Poisson summation formula we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e^{-i[\phi_\ell(\mathbf{r}\tau) - \phi_{\ell'}(\mathbf{r}'\tau')]} \rangle_0 &= \frac{\vartheta_3\left(\frac{2\pi\mu}{U} + \pi\frac{\tau-\tau'}{\beta}, e^{-\frac{4\pi^2}{\beta U}}\right)}{\vartheta_3\left(\frac{2\pi\mu}{U}, e^{-\frac{4\pi^2}{\beta U}}\right)} \\ &\times \exp\left\{-U\left[|\tau-\tau'| - \frac{(\tau-\tau')^2}{\beta}\right]\right\} \delta_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} \delta_{\ell\ell'} \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

where $\vartheta_3(z, q)$ is the Jacobi theta function [14] which is β -periodic in the imaginary-time τ as well as in the variable $2\mu/U$ with the period of unity which emphasize the special role of the integer values of the reduced chemical potential. At criticality, the condition $\Gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{0}, 0)|_{\lambda=\lambda_c} = 0$ fixes the Lagrange parameter while the phase-coherence boundary is: $1 = \frac{1}{\beta N N_\perp} \sum_{\mathbf{q}\omega_n} \Gamma(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n)|_{\lambda=\lambda_c}$. Theoretically it is much simpler to consider the fixed chemical potential case and the results at fixed density can always




FIG. 1: (Color online) The critical temperature T_c as a function of the chemical potential for the parameters as indicated in the plot. The label lQCP marks the special point inside the superconducting lobe where the local charge susceptibility diverges and superconductivity is most robust. Inset: $\tilde{\chi}_c \equiv U\chi_c/2$ and the occupation number n_b for $T = 0.1U$.

be obtained after a Legendre transformation. The resulting temperature-chemical potential phase diagram is depicted in Fig.1. First, it shows that T_c correlates with the diagonal hopping t' in accord with the observation that the next-nearest-neighboring hopping dominates the variation of the maximum T_c in hole doped cuprates [18]. Further, the phase diagram in Fig.1 exhibits the special point at μ_c defined by $2\mu_c/U = 1/2$ away from the incompressible Mott state at $2\mu_c/U = 1$ from which the superconducting lobe emanates. In cuprates there is clear evidence for the existence of a special doping point x_c in the lightly-overdoped region where superconductivity is most robust. Such behavior indicates this point could be a QCP while the associated critical fluctuations might be responsible for the unconventional normal state behavior [2]. However, the resemblance to a conventional QCP is *incomplete* due to the lack of any clear signature of thermodynamic critical behavior: a QCP is generally the endpoint of a line of phase transition. Experiments appear to exclude any broken symmetry around this point although a sharp change in transport properties is observed [19] and $\partial\mu/\partial x$ becomes vanishingly small due to slow chemical potential shift implying a divergence of charge susceptibility [20]. We argue that due to topological excitations indeed such a singularity arises at μ_c in the *local* charge susceptibility $\chi_c = \partial n_e / \partial \mu$ where $n_e \equiv \langle \bar{c}_\alpha(\mathbf{r}\tau) c_{\alpha\ell}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \rangle$ is the electron filling. From Eq.(4) we readily obtain that $n_e = n_f + n_b - 2\mu/U$ where the topological contribution is given by $n_b = 2\mu/U + (2/iU)\langle \dot{\phi}(\mathbf{r}\tau) \rangle$. In the large- U limit $\mu \rightarrow n_f U/2$ so that $n_e \rightarrow n_b$, which means, via Eq.(5), that for strong correlations n_e is governed by the topolog-

ical winding numbers rather than the number of fermionic oscillators. However, the winding number is a topologically conserved quantity and is “protected” against the small changes of μ . Being an integer it can not change at all if it has to change continuously. For substantial perturbations the ground state crosses over abruptly to other eigenstates: n_b can change only when level degeneracies occur which happens at isolated discrete values of $2\mu/U$. For $T = 0$, specializing to the topological and the leading kinetic term in Eq.(6) we obtain $n_b = 2\mu/U - h(2\mu/U)$ where $h(\xi + 1/2) + 1/2 = \xi - [\xi]$, while $[\xi]$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to ξ . Clearly, charge susceptibility diverges at μ_c , thus marking the *local* QCP of a novel type, not related to the paradigm of symmetry breaking but resulting from topological effects in strongly correlated system. This substantiates the notion of the topological order [21], which differentiates the electronic ground state into two states labelled by the topological winding number and with the degeneracy point separating them. It controls a remarkable concurrence between normal state properties and the ground-state superconducting order setting up a unique critical doping point in the phase diagram where the transport properties change very suddenly and where superconductivity is most robust. It is also an example of the emergent phenomenon since its topological underpinning (which has to be recognized) is not simply encoded in the microscopic electronic model, Eq.(1), in which it arises.

This work was supported by the Polish Science Committee (KBN) under the grant No. 2P03B 009 25 in years 2003-2005.

-
- [1] N. F. Mott, *Metal-Insulator Transitions* (Taylor & Francis, London, 1990).
 - [2] C.M.Varma, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 14554 (1997); S.H. Naqib, J.R. Cooper, J.L. Tallon and C. Panagopoulos, cond-mat/0301375.
 - [3] R. B. Laughlin, cond-mat/0209269.
 - [4] J. Fröhlich and U. Studer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **65**, 733 (1993).
 - [5] F. Wilczek, *Fractional Statistics and Anyon Superconductivity*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).
 - [6] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **115**, 485 (1959).
 - [7] D. C. Tsui, H. L. Störmer, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1559 (1982).
 - [8] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).
 - [9] J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199, (1989).
 - [10] O. K. Andersen, A. I. Liechtenstein, O. Jepsen, and F. Paulsen, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **56**, 1573 (1995).
 - [11] T. Tohyama and S. Maekawa, Supercond. Sci. Technol. **13**, R17 (2000).
 - [12] Z. Y. Weng and C. S. Ting and T. K. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **43**, R3790 (1991).
 - [13] G. Baskaran, Z. Zou, and P. W. Anderson, Solid State Commun. **63**, 973 (1987).
 - [14] M. Abramovitz and I. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical*

- Functions* (Dover, New York, 1970).
- [15] M. V. Berry, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. **A** 392, 451 (1984).
 - [16] L. S. Schulman, *Techniques and Applications of Path Integration* (Wiley, New York 1981).
 - [17] T. K. Kopec, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 054518 (2004).
 - [18] E. Pavarini, I. Dasgupta, T. Saha-Dasgupta, O. Jepsen and O. K. Andersen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 047003 (2001).
 - [19] T. Ito, K. Takenaka, and S. Uchida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3995 (1993).
 - [20] N. Harima, A. Fujimori, T. Sugaya and I. Terasaki, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 172501 (2003).
 - [21] X.-G. Wen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **4**, 239(1990); Advances in Physics **44**, 405 (1995).