

Scattering mechanisms and spectral properties of the one-dimensional Hubbard model

J. M. P. Carmelo

Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge,
Massachusetts 02139-4307, USA and
GCEP and Department of Physics, University of Minho, Campus Gualtar,
P-4710-057 Braga, Portugal

Abstract. It is found that the finite-energy spectral properties of the one-dimensional Hubbard model are controlled by the scattering of charged $s=0$ $2s=2$ holon composite objects, spin-zero $2s=2$ spinon composite objects, and charged $s=0$ spin-less and spin-less objects, rather than by the scattering of independent $s=1/2$ holons and $s=1/2$ spinons. Here $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2, \dots$. The corresponding S matrix is calculated and its relation to the spectral properties is clarified.

PACS numbers: 72.10.Dj, 71.10.Fd, 71.10.Pm, 71.27.+a

The description of the microscopic scattering mechanisms behind the unusual finite-energy spectral properties observed in low-dimensional materials remains until now an interesting open problem. The one-dimensional (1D) Hubbard Hamiltonian is the simplest model for the description of electronic correlations in a chain of N_a sites. It reads $\hat{H} = \hat{T} + U \hat{D}$ [$U=2$] [$\hat{N} = N_a=2$], where $\hat{T} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_a} \sum_{\sigma} t_{j,j+1}^{\sigma} c_{j,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{h.c.}$ is the kinetic-energy operator, $\hat{D} = \sum_j \hat{n}_{j,\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j,\downarrow}$ the electron double-occupation operator, $\hat{n}_j = \sum_{\sigma} \hat{n}_{j,\sigma}$ the electron number operator, and the operator $c_{j,\sigma}^{\dagger}$ creates a spin- σ electron at site j . In contrast to other interacting models [1] and in spite of the model exact solution [2], until recently little was known about its finite-energy spectral properties for finite values of the on-site repulsion U . Recently, the problem was studied by the pseudofermion dynamical theory (PDT) introduced in Refs. [3, 4], whose predictions agree quantitatively for the whole momentum and energy bandwidth with the peak dispersions observed for the TCNQ stacks by angle-resolved photoelectron spectroscopy in the quasi-1D conductor TTF-TCNQ and are consistent with the phase diagram observed for the (TMTTF) $_2$ X and (TMTSF) $_2$ X series of compounds [5]. More recently, results for the TTF-TCNQ spectrum consistent with those of the PDT were obtained by the dynamical density matrix renormalization group method [6]. Within the PDT, the finite-energy spectral properties are controlled by the functional character of the pseudofermion anticommutators [4, 5]. However, the relation of these anticommutators to the elementary-excitation S matrix remains an open question. Moreover, the fact that these anticommutators do not couple quantum objects with different spin or spin projections seems to be inconsistent with the form of the S matrix for elementary excitations calculated in Refs. [7, 8]. Thus, the study of the relation of the PDT to the elementary-excitation scattering is an important issue both for the clarification of that apparent inconsistency and the further understanding of the scattering mechanisms that control the exotic finite-energy spectral properties of low-dimensional materials and of the new quantum systems described by cold fermionic atoms on an optical lattice [5, 9].

In this Letter the above problems are solved by identifying the active scatterers and scattering centers which control the dynamical properties, calculating their S matrix, and clarifying its relation to the spectral properties. Moreover, the connection to the S matrix of Refs. [7, 8] is also clarified. The number of lattice sites N_a is considered large, units of Planck constant and lattice spacing one are used, and the lattice length is denoted by $L = N_a$ and the electronic charge by e . The densities $n = N/L$ and spin densities $m = [N_{\uparrow} - N_{\downarrow}]/L$ are in the domains $0 < n \leq 1$ and $0 \leq m < n$, respectively. The above Hamiltonian commutes with the generators of the spin and spin SU(2) algebras [10]. Here the spin and spin values of an energy eigenstate are called S_z and S , respectively, and the corresponding projections σ_z and S_z . A key result needed for our study is that all energy eigenstates of the model can be described in terms of occupancy configurations of spin-1/2 holons, spin-1/2, spinons, and spinless and spinless 0 pseudoparticles [10]. Below, the notation spin-1/2 holons and spin-1/2 spinons is used according to the values of spin and spin projections, respectively. The electron σ -rotated-electron unitary transformation [10] maps the electrons onto rotated

electrons such that rotated-electron double occupation, no occupation, and spin-up and spin-down single occupation are good quantum numbers for all values of U . The $1=2$ holons of charge $2e$ and zero spin and the charge-less $1=2$ spinons are generated from the electrons by that unitary transformation. The corresponding holon and spinon number operators $\hat{M}_{c; 1=2}$ and $\hat{M}_{s; 1=2}$, respectively, are of the form given in Eq. (24) of [10] and involve the electron - rotated-electron unitary operator. While the $1=2$ and $+1=2$ holons refer to the rotated-electron doubly occupied and unoccupied sites, respectively, the $1=2$ and $+1=2$ spinons correspond to the spin degrees of freedom of the spin-down and spin-up rotated-electron singly occupied sites, respectively. The charge degrees of freedom of the latter sites are described by the spin-less and -spin-less $c0$ pseudoparticles, which are composite objects of a charge $-e$ chargeon and a charge $+e$ antichargeon [10]. The c pseudoparticles (and s pseudoparticles) such that $c = 1; 2; \dots$ are -spin singlet (and spin singlet) 2 -holon (and 2 -spinon) composite objects. Thus, $M_{c; 1=2} = L_{c; 1=2} + \sum_{P=1}^P N_c$ where $c = c; s$, N_c denotes the number of c pseudoparticles, and $L_{c; 1=2} = \sum_z$ and $L_{s; 1=2} = \sum_{S_z}$ gives the number of $1=2$ Yang holons and $1=2$ HL spinons, respectively. Those are the holons and spinons that are not part of composite pseudoparticles. All energy eigenstates can be described by occupancy configurations of c pseudoparticles, $1=2$ Yang holons, and $1=2$ HL spinons [10]. For the ground state, $N_{c0} = N$, $N_{s1} = N_\uparrow$, $N_c = L_{c; 1=2} = L_{s; 1=2} = 0$ for $c \notin c0; s1$.

In our study we consider the pseudofermion subspace (PS), which is spanned by the initial ground state $|\Psi_S\rangle$ and all excited energy eigenstates contained in $\hat{O}|\Psi_S\rangle$, where $\hat{O}$ is any one-electron or two-electron operator. In reference [3] it is shown that within the PS there is a unitary transformation that maps the c pseudoparticle or hole onto the pseudofermion or hole, respectively. These objects differ only in the discrete momentum values. The c pseudoparticle or hole has discrete bare momentum values $q_j = 2\pi L I_j$ such that I_j are consecutive integers or half-odd integers [10]. These values are good quantum numbers whose allowed occupancies are one (pseudoparticle) and zero (hole) only. The pseudofermion or hole has discrete canonical momentum values given by,

$$q_j = q(q_j) = q_j + Q \quad (q_j) = L; \quad (1)$$

where $j = 1; 2; \dots; N$, $N = N_c + N_h$, and N_h denotes the number of pseudofermion holes, which equals that of c pseudoparticle holes, whose value is given in Eq. (B.11) of [10]. Such a canonical momentum pseudofermion is related in [3] to the local pseudofermion by a suitable Fourier transformation. The latter object occupies the sites of the effective lattice [3, 4]. Except for the discrete momentum values, the above pseudoparticle and pseudofermion have the same properties. Thus, all the energy eigenstates that span the PS can be described by occupancy configurations of pseudofermions, $1=2$ Yang holons, and $1=2$ HL spinons [3, 4]. The functional,

$$Q(q_j) = 2 \sum_{0 \leq j}^X; \quad q_j(q_j; q_j^0) N(q_j^0); \quad (2)$$

of equation (1) was introduced in [3] and is such that $Q(q_j)=2$ is found below to be an overall scattering phase shift. Here $N(q_j) = N(q_j) - N^0(q_j)$ is the branch bare-momentum distribution-function deviation relative to the ground state value and $\delta(q; q^0)$ is defined in [3] and is found below to be an elementary two-pseudofermion phase shift. Note that $Q(q_j) = 0$ for the initial ground state and thus $q_j = q_j$ for that state.

Each transition from the initial ground state to a PS excited energy eigenstate can be divided into two elementary processes. The first process is a scattering-less finite-energy and finite-momentum excitation which transforms the ground state onto a well defined virtual state. This excitation involves the pseudofermion creation, annihilation, and particle-hole processes associated with the PS excited state and the discrete bare-momentum shift $Q^0=L$, whose possible values are $0; \pm L$ [3], for branches with finite occupancy in that state. For > 0 branches that excitation can involve a change in the number of discrete bare-momentum values. Although the $\epsilon < 0; s1$ branches have no finite pseudofermion occupancy in the initial ground state, one can define the values $N = N^h$ for the corresponding empty bands [10, 3, 4]. In this first step the pseudofermions acquire the excitation momentum and energy needed for the second-step scattering events. Thus, the virtual state is the in asymptote of the pseudofermion scattering theory. The second elementary step of the ground-state transition involves a set of elementary scattering events where all pseudofermions or holes of momentum $q_j + Q^0=L$ of the in asymptote are the scatterers. Each of these elementary scattering events leads to a phase factor in the wave function of the pseudofermions or holes given by,

$$S_{\delta}(q_j; q_{j^0}) = e^{i2\delta(q_j; q_{j^0})} N_{\delta}(q_{j^0}) : \quad (3)$$

The scattering centers are the $q_{j^0} + Q^0=L$ pseudofermions or holes of momentum $q_{j^0} + Q^0=L$ created in the ground-state - virtual-state transition and thus such that $N_{\delta}(q_{j^0}) \neq 0$. Indeed, note that $S_{\delta}(q_j; q_{j^0}) = 1$ for $N_{\delta}(q_{j^0}) = 0$. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the local rotated-electron occupancy configurations that describe the PS energy eigenstates and the local pseudofermion occupancy configurations and $1=2$ Yang holon and $1=2$ HL spinon occupancies that describe the same states [4]. The corresponding effective lattices have the same length L as the original lattice. Our analysis refers to periodic boundary conditions and the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. Under a ground-state - excited-energy-eigenstate transition, by moving the pseudofermion or hole of initial ground-state momentum q_j once around the length L lattice ring, its wave function acquires the following overall phase factor,

$$\begin{aligned} S(q_j) &= e^{iQ^0} \prod_{j^0=1}^{N_{Y^0}} S_{\delta}(q_j; q_{j^0}) \\ &= e^{iQ(q_j)} ; \quad j = 1; 2; \dots; N : \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Interestingly, $Q(q_j)=L$ is the net pseudofermion or hole discrete canonical-momentum shift that arises due to the above transition [3, 4] and thus in this equation,

$$Q(q_j) = Q^0 + Q(q_j); \quad (5)$$

is such that $Q(q_j)=2$ is a pseudofermion or hole overall phase shift. Indeed, if when moving around the lattice ring the pseudofermion or hole departs from the point $x = L=2$ and arrives to $x = L=2$, one finds that $\lim_{x \rightarrow L=2} q_x = q_x + Q(q)=2$ where q refers to the initial ground state. From Eqs. (2) and (5) it then follows that $S_{\uparrow\downarrow}(q_j; q_{j^0})$ is an elementary two-pseudofermion phase shift. (If instead one considers $x = 0$ and $x = L$, the overall phase shift and the two-pseudofermion phase shifts read $Q(q)$ and $2 S_{\uparrow\downarrow}(q_j; q_{j^0})$, respectively [13]. However, the choice of either definition is a matter of taste and the uniquely defined quantity is the above S matrix.)

Several properties play an important role in the pseudofermion scattering theory. First, the elementary scattering processes associated with the phase factor (3) conserve the total energy and total momentum. Second, the elementary scattering processes are of forward-scattering type and thus conserve the individual asymptotic pseudofermion or hole momentum and energy. These processes also conserve the branch, usually called channel in the scattering language. Moreover, the scattering amplitude does not connect objects with different spin or spin. Last but not least, for each pseudofermion or hole of initial ground-state momentum q_j , the S matrix associated with the ground-state - excited-energy-eigenstate transition is simply the phase factor given in Eq. (4). For each excited energy eigenstate (out asymptotic) the number of pseudofermions plus the number of pseudofermion holes whose S matrix is of the form (4) is given by $N_a + N_{s1} + \sum_{c0;s1}^P (j N_j - j) N_j$. Here $\chi(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x = 0$.

Importantly, the form of the scattering part of the overall phase shift (5), Eq. (2), reveals that the value of such a phase-shift functional is independent of the changes in the occupation numbers of the $l=2$ Yang holons and $l=2$ HL spinons. Thus, these objects are not scattering centers. Moreover, they are not scatterers, once their momentum values remain unchanged under the ground-state - excited-energy-eigenstate transitions. In turn, the pseudofermions and holes are scatterers and scattering centers. Since the $c0$ pseudofermion is a $\uparrow$ -spin-less and $\downarrow$ -spin-less object and for $\uparrow > 0$ the pseudofermions are $\uparrow$ -spin ($\uparrow = c$) and $\downarrow$ -spin ($\downarrow = s$) singlet 2-holon and 2-spinon composite objects, respectively, their S matrix has dimension one: it is the phase factor (4). The factorization of the Bethe-ansatz (BA) bare S matrix for the original spin $l=2$ electrons is associated with the so called Yang-Baxter Equation (YBE) [7]. On the other hand, the factorization of the S matrix (4) in terms of the elementary S matrices $S_{\uparrow\downarrow}(q_j; q_{j^0})$, Eq. (3), is commutative. Such a commutativity is stronger than the symmetry associated with the YBE and results from the elementary S matrices $S_{\uparrow\downarrow}(q_j; q_{j^0})$ being simple phase factors, instead of matrices of dimension larger than one. This seems to be inconsistent with all PS energy eigenstates being described by occupancy configurations which, besides $c0$ pseudofermions, involve finite spin $l=2$

spinons and $\pm$ spin $1=2$ holons [10]. Indeed, the S matrix of finite $\pm$ spin or spin objects has dimension larger than one. However, due to the correlations the quantum liquid self organizes in such a way that the scatterers and scattering centers are the c_0 pseudofermions, $\pm$ spin singlet 2 -holon composite c pseudofermions, and spin singlet 2 -spinon composite s pseudofermions.

Let us clarify how the pseudofermion S matrix (4) controls the unusual spectral properties of the model. Consider a pseudofermion of canonical momentum q and a 0^0 pseudofermion of canonical momentum q^0 such that the values q and q^0 correspond to a PS excited energy eigenstate and the initial ground state, respectively, and thus $q^0 = q^0$. Importantly, from the use of Eq. (4) it is found that the pseudofermion anticommutation relations introduced in [3] can be expressed solely in terms of the difference $[q - q^0]$ and the S matrix of the pseudofermion associated with the excited state,

$$ff_{q;0}^y; f_{q^0;0}g = ; 0^0$$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i_1=2}^h S(q) e^{i(q - q^0)=2} \frac{\text{Im } S(q)}{\sin(k - q^0)=2} ; \quad (6)$$

and the anticommutators between two creation or annihilation operators vanish. This reveals that the S matrix (4) fully controls the pseudofermion anticommutators. Since within the PDT these anticommutators determine the value of the matrix elements between energy eigenstates [4], it follows that the S matrix (4) controls the spectral properties. If it had dimension larger than one, the pseudofermion algebra would be much more involved, for the pseudofermion anticommutators would also be matrices of dimension larger than one.

In reference [8] the excited states generated from the $n = 1$ and $m = 0$ ground state were described in terms of $1=2$ holon and $1=2$ spinon occupancy configurations. Following the analysis of Refs. [11, 12] for the related spin $1=2$ isotropic Heisenberg chain, the holes of the BA length-one spin string spectrum (spin singlet two-spinon composite s_1 pseudoparticle spectrum) were identified in [8] with the spinons. Inspired in such an interpretation, the studies of the latter reference identified the holons with the holes of the BA distribution of k^0 s [2, 10] spectrum [c_0 pseudoparticle spectrum]. This is behind the charge e found for the $1=2$ holons in [8], which is half of the value found in [10]. However, the c_0 pseudoparticle and hole band occupancy configurations do not correspond to $\pm$ spin $SU(2)$ irreducible representations. Indeed, in [10] it is shown that for the whole Hilbert space all such representations exactly correspond to the BA charge string and $1=2$ Yang holon occupancy configurations. Following directly the analysis of Refs. [11, 12], the studies of [8] consider that the $1=2$ holons and $1=2$ spinons are the scatterers and scattering centers. This leads to two 4×4 S matrices for holons and spinons, respectively, and a related 16×16 S matrix for the full scattering problem. In spite of being mathematically elegant and obeying the YBE, these matrices are not suitable for the description of the spectral properties. Moreover, provided that

within the $x = 0$ and $x = L$ boundary conditions one defines the overall phase shift as $Q(q)$, the phase shifts given in Eqs. (5.19)–(5.21) of the phase shifts given in Eqs. (5.19)–(5.21) of the first paper of [8], which appear in the entries of these matrices, are nothing but very particular cases of $\uparrow$ -spin-less and $\downarrow$ -spin-less c0 pseudofermion hole or $\uparrow$ -spin-zero s1 pseudofermion hole overall phase shifts given in Eq. (5) [13]. Indeed, these phase shifts correspond to the $n = 1$ and $m = 0$ initial ground state and the specific excited states considered in Refs. [7, 8]. Let q_1 or q_1^0 be the bare momenta of the scattered c0 or s1 pseudofermion hole, respectively, of the latter states. For the $\uparrow$ -spin triplet, $\uparrow$ -spin singlet, and $\uparrow$ -spin and $\downarrow$ -spin doublet excited states considered in these references, it is found that $\pi + Q_{c0}(q_1)$ equals the phase shift π_{CT} and π_{CS} given in Eq. (5.19) and π_S in Eq. (5.21) of the above paper, respectively. For the $\downarrow$ -spin triplet, $\downarrow$ -spin singlet, and $\downarrow$ -spin and $\uparrow$ -spin doublet excited states, $Q_{s1}(q_1^0)$ equals the shift functions π_{ST} and π_{SS} given in Eq. (5.20) and π_S given in Eq. (5.21), respectively [13]. Thus, the BA phase shifts of Refs. [7, 8] are particular cases of the c0 and s1 pseudofermion hole overall phase-shift functionals of Eq. (5) and are associated with a set of excited states which span a subspace smaller than the PS of the one- and two-electron excitations. According to the studies of [10], for all the transitions associated with these phase shifts the deviations in the $\uparrow$ -spin and $\downarrow$ -spin values are provided by the $\uparrow$ -1=2 Yang holons and $\downarrow$ -1=2 HL spinons occupancy changes, respectively, which do not contribute to the phase-shift values. In turn, the holes created in the c0 and s1 bands by these transitions are both scatterers and scattering centers and it follows from the analysis of [10] that they do not correspond to single $\uparrow$ -1=2 holons and $\downarrow$ -1=2 spinons, respectively. Moreover, the phase shifts of Refs. [7, 8] were evaluated up to an overall constant term by the method of [14]. Equation (5) provides the full phase shift value and reveals that the above extra π in π_{CT} , π_{CS} , and π_S is not physical, as discussed elsewhere [13]. The results reported here also apply to other models. For instance, for the isotropic Heisenberg chain it is found that the phase changes for the $\downarrow$ -spin singlet and triplet excited states given in Eq. (11) of [11] equal the phase shifts for the same states of a scattered hole of the zero-spin two-spinon s1 pseudofermion spectrum. Thus, for the study of the spectral properties, these two excited states correspond to two s1 pseudofermion hole S matrices, rather than to the single 4×4 S matrix of Eq. (5.1) of [12]. This analysis can also be extended to the same model with an odd number of lattice sites.

While, through the anticommutators (6), the use of the S-matrix introduced here leads to a successful description of the spectral features observed in real materials [5], the 16×16 S matrix of [8] is unsuitable for such a task. Indeed, independent $\uparrow$ -1=2 holons and $\downarrow$ -1=2 spinons that are not part of composite pseudofermions are neither scatterers nor scattering centers. Interestingly, these objects remain invariant under the electron-rotated-electron unitary, whereas the pseudofermion and holes are not in general invariant under such a transformation.

The method for evaluation of the finite-energy spectral-weight distributions of a 1D correlated metal introduced in [4] fully relies on the scattering theory introduced here. The exotic metallic quantum phase of matter found for quasi-1D compounds [5]

by use of such a method is expected to emerge at finite energies in carbon nanotubes, ballistic wires, and systems of cold fermionic atoms in one-dimensional optical lattices with on-site atomic repulsion [9]. This confirms the general scientific interest of the scattering theory introduced here. While in this Letter it is applied specifically to the 1D Hubbard model, the theory is of general nature for many integrable quantum problems and therefore will have wide applicability.

I thank N. Andrei, D. Bozi, A. Castro Neto, F. Guinea, V. E. Korepin, P. A. Lee, Sung-Sik Lee, G. Ortiz, K. Penc, T. Ribeiro, and P. D. Sacramento for illuminating discussions, the hospitality of the MIT, and the financial support of the Gulbenkian Foundation, Fulbright Commission, and FCT grant POCTI/FIS/58133/2004.

References

- [1] Simons BD, Lee PA, and Altshuler BL 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 4122; Penc K and Shastri BS, 2002 Phys. Rev. B 65, 155110.
- [2] Lieb Elliott H and Wu FY 1968 Phys. Rev. Lett. 20, 1445; Takahashi M 1972 Prog. Theor. Phys. 47, 69.
- [3] Carmelo JM P, cond-mat/0405411.
- [4] Carmelo JM P, Penc K, and Bozi D, at press in Nucl. Phys. B (cond-mat/0505601).
- [5] Carmelo JM P et al. 2004 Europhys. Lett. 67, 233; Carmelo JM P et al. 2004 Europhys. Lett. 68, 839.
- [6] Benthien H, Gebhard F, and Jeckelmann E 2004 Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 256401.
- [7] Andrei N 1994 Series on Modern Condensed Matter Physics – Vol. 6, 458, World Scientific, Lecture Notes of ICTP Summer Course [cond-mat/9408101].
- [8] Essler Fabian HL and Korepin Vladimir E 1994 Nucl. Phys. B 426, 505; 1994 Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 908.
- [9] Hiro Yoshi I et al. 2003 Nature 426 540; O. M. A. Auslaender et al. 2005 Science 308 88; Jaksch D and Zoller P 2005 Ann. of Phys. 315 52.
- [10] Carmelo JM P, Roman JM, and Penc K 2004 Nucl. Phys. B 683, 387.
- [11] Faddeev LD and Takhtajan LA 1981 Phys. Lett. 85A, 375.
- [12] Faddeev LD and Takhtajan LA 1981 Proc. Sci. Sem. in. Steklov Math. Inst. 109, 134.
- [13] Carmelo JM P, Bozi D, and Sacramento PD, in preparation.
- [14] Korepin VE 1980 Theor. Math. Phys. 76, 165.