## Interm ediate phase of the one dim ensional half- lled H ubbard-H olstein m odel

R.T. Clay and R.P. Hardikar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>D epartm ent of Physics and Astronom y and ERC Center for Computational Sciences,

M ississippi State University, M ississippi State M S 39762

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

W e present a detailed num erical study of the H ubbard-H olstein m odel in one dimension at half lling, including full nite-frequency quantum phonons. At half lling, the e ects of the electronphonon and electron-electron interactions compete, with the H olstein phonon coupling acting as an e ective negative H ubbard onsite interaction U that promotes on-site electron pairs and a Peierls charge-density wave state. M ost previous work on this model has assumed that only Peierls or U > 0 M ott insulator phases are possible at half lling. However, there has been speculation that a third m etallic phase exists between the Peierls and M ott phases. W e present results con rm ing the interm ediate m etallic phase, and show that the Luttinger liquid correlation exponent K > 1 in this region, indicating dom inant superconducting pair correlations. W e explore the full phase diagram as a function of onsite H ubbard U, phonon coupling constant, and phonon frequency.

PACS num bers: 71.10 Fd, 71.30.+ h, 71.45.Lr

E lectron-phonon (e-ph) interactions can give rise to a num ber of interesting e ects in low-dimensionalmaterials, including superconductivity as well as charge-density wave and insulating phenom ena. Frequently these materials feature strong electron-electron (e-e) interactions as well, leading to very rich phase diagram s that com bine lattice, charge, and spin (magnetic) orderings. We will focus speci cally on materials where the electrons are coupled to localized vibrational modes, which may be of relatively high frequency. This type of e-ph interaction is most studied in molecular crystal materials, including the quasi-one- and quasi-two-dimensional organic superconductors[1] and fullerene superconductors [2]. In all of these materials, a fundamental question is whether the e ects of e-e and e-ph interactions com pete or cooperate with each other. In this Letter, we exam ine this issue within one of the most basic models. We nd that despite the two interactions each separately favoring insulating states, together they can mediate an unexpected m etallic phase with superconducting (SC) pair correlations.

The model we consider is the one-dimensional (1D) Hubbard-Holstein model (HHM), with Hamiltonian

$$H = t (c_{j+1}^{v}, c_{j}; + hc;) + U n_{j,"}n_{j;\#} (1)$$

$$X^{j;} X + g (b_{j}^{v} + b_{j})n_{j}; + ! b_{j}^{v}b_{j};$$

$$i; i j$$

where  $c_{j;}^{y}$  ( $c_{j;}$ ) are ferm ionic creation (annihilation) operators for electrons on site j with spin ,  $b_{j}^{y}$  ( $b_{j}$ ) are bosonic creation (annihilation) operators for phonons at site j, and  $n_{j;} = c_{j;}^{y} c_{j;}$ . The dispersionless phonons have frequency ! and are coupled to the local electron density with coupling strength g  $\beta$ ]. U is the Hubbard on-site e-e interaction energy. All energies will be given below in units of the hopping integralt.

The properties of the 1D 1/2-lled HHM are well understood in two limits: the static or ! ! 0 and the !! 1 lim it [4]. First, in the static lim it, the ground state is Peierls distorted for any nonzero e-ph coupling  $q = 0^+$ . As the phonons couple to the electron density, the Peierls state is a  $2k_F$  charge-density wave (CDW) consisting of alternating large and sm all site charges. In the !! 1 lim it, the retarded interaction between electrons m ediated by the phonons becom es instantaneous in imaginary time, and the phonons may be integrated out. This leads to an e ective renorm alized Hubbard interaction  $U_e = U \quad 2g = ! \cdot W$  hile strictly at !! 1 the Peierls state cannot occur, for nite ! the Peierls state m ay again occur, although the mapping to an e ective negative U is no longer exact. However, based on the !! 1 m apping, it has been believed that the ground state phase of the HHM m ay be determ ined through  $U_{e}$ .  $U_e$  should correspond to the U > 0 Hubbard model, which in 1D at 1/2 lling has a nite charge gap for any U > 0 and no spin gap. W e shall refer to this state as the M ott state. On the other hand, if  $U_e < 0$ , e-ph interactions dom inate over e-e interactions, and the ground state is Peierls CDW distorted.

Hence at ! = 0, the Peierls distortion occurs unconditionally, while at ! = 1 there is no Peierls state. Much less is known in the interm ediate ! region. In the U = 0 model, the Peierls state m ay be viewed as a traditional band insulator for small !, and as bipolaronic insulator composed of tightly bound pairs in the large ! limit, with a crossover between these pictures for ! t [5]. If ! > 0, the Peierls distortion only occurs for e-ph coupling g above some critical value  $g_c$  [6, 7]. For  $g < g_c$ , the ground state is then m etallic at 1/2 lling (at U = 0). For U = 0,  $g_c$  has been calculated using a functional integral m ethod [6] and also via the density m atrix renorm alization group (DMRG) [7]. For interm ediate U as wellas !, far less is known. How ever, it has been recently proposed




FIG .1: U = 0, ! = 1 results for long-wavelength charge (open sym bols) and spin ( lled sym bols) structure factors versus g for periodic system s of N = 16 (diam onds), N = 32 (circles), and N = 64 (squares) sites. Statistical errors are sm aller than the sym bols. The inset shows nite-size scaling of the critical coupling  $g_c$  (indicated by arrow) where K = 1.

that a m etallic ground state exists interm ediate between the M ott and P eierls states at 1/2 lling, i.e. when  $U_e$  is close to zero [8]. This m etallic phase occurs for interm ediate ! and hence cannot be predicted from the sm all and large ! lim its. Our goal in this Letter is to con m this m etallic state and investigate its properties. Its existence is perhaps not surprising given the known existence of a m etallic phase for  $g < g_c$  at U = 0; this region of the phase diagram continues to exist for nite U. W e further show that this m etallic region persists for a substantial range of param eters provided ! is not too sm all.

Ham iltonian Eq.1 is di cult to analyze in the interm ediate coupling region due to the presence of both electrons and phonons. The num ericalm ethod we use is the Stochastic Series Expansion (SSE) quantum M onte Carlo m ethod with directed loops [9]. SSE is a powerfulm ethod for non-frustrated quantum spin systems or 1D electron lattice models where no sign problem occurs. Im portantly, there are no approxim ations in the m ethod besides nite system size and tem perature. E lectron-phonon interactions have been incorporated in SSE for both spin models[10] and electron models[11]. As in these references, we treat the phonons in the occupation-number basis. The number of phonons per lattice site is unbounded in the therm odynam ic lim it, but for a nite system at a nite temperature, the number of phonons m ay be truncated. W e choose this truncation in a sim ilar m anner as the truncation of sequence length in the SSE m ethod [9]: in the equilibration phase of the calculation, the phonon truncation is increased to exceed the current number of phonons on any given lattice site whenever necessary. All results shown below used periodic lattices of N sites, with inverse tem peratures of at least =t = 2N and phonon cuto sofup to 30 phononsper lattice site. In this Letter we focus on results for the HHM m odel, and details on the SSE in plem entation will be published separately. Our code was checked extensively against Lanczos exact diagonalization results for several di erent observables. We also in plem ented the quantum paralleltem pering algorithm [12], where di erent processors of a parallel com puter are assigned di erent m odel param eters (U, g, and !). A M etropolis probability is then com puted to switch con gurations between processors with adjacent param eters. As in reference 12, we found this technique essential in obtaining sm ooth data across quantum phase transition boundaries.

The low energy properties of any 1D gapless interacting electron model may be mapped to an elective continuum model, or Luttinger Liquid (LL). The properties of the LL, and in particular the decay with distance of di erent correlation functions are then described by two correlation exponents, K for charge properties, and K for spin [13]. K values greater than 1 indicate dom inant attractive SC correlations (no SC long-range order is possible in strictly 1D system s), while K < 1 corresponds to repulsive charge correlations. For models with spin-rotation symmetry, K is always equal to 1. K = 0 then indicates the presence of a spin gap. These exponents are most easily computed via the SSE data from the static structure factors:

$$S ; (q) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq k}^{X} e^{iq(j k)} h(n_{j''} n_{j\#}) (n_{k''} n_{k\#}) i (2)$$

K and K are then proportional to the slope of the corresponding structure factor in the long wavelength lim it q! 0 [14]:

$$K_{i} = \frac{1}{q}S_{i} (q! 0)$$
 (3)

These values once nite-size scaled may then be used to determ ine the quantum phase boundaries. A second observable we will use are the charge and spin sti nesses, c and s, measured in the SSE method via the winding number [12]. A zero sti ness indicates a gap in the corresponding sector, while nonzero indicates no gap. We also veri ed directly that charge-charge (spin-spin) correlation functions showed staggered order in the Peierls (M ott) phases.

We set present results for U = 0 and ! = 1. Fig. 1 shows the slope of charge and spin structure factors S;  $(q_1)=q_1$  evaluated at the smallest wavevector  $q_1 = 2 = N$ , plotted versus e-ph coupling g. For g ! 0 both K and K tend to exactly 1, as required for free electrons. Finite size e ects become very small in this limit, consistent with the expected vanishing of logarithmic corrections when K = K = 1 [11, 15]. At a critical coupling  $g_c$ , K crosses 1 and tends to zero, marking the transition to the Peierls state. From nite-size scaling of 16, 32, and 64 site systems vs. 1=N (see Fig. 1 inset), we not the critical coupling  $g_c = 0.66$  0.01, with




FIG. 2: Long-wavelength charge (open symbols) and spin ( lled symbols) structure factors versus g. (a) U = 2, ! = 0.5; arrow indicates nite-size scaled  $g_c$  (b) U = 2, ! = 5; arrow s indicate nite-size scaled transitions  $g_{c1}$  and  $g_{c2}$ .

the uncertainty estimated from the linear t. A previous DMRG study, which did not attempt nite-size scaling found  $g_c$  0.8 [7]. For  $g < g_t$ , the LL exponent K > 1, and K scales to zero with increasing N. Therefore, for U = 0 and  $g < g_c$ , the ground state is metallic, with dom inant SC pair correlations and a spin gap.

For any nite U at q = 0 and 1/2 lling, the dom inant ground state correlations of Eq. 1 are spin-density wave (SDW). In this ground state K = 1, and K = 0indicating an insulating state with no spin gap. As this M ott state is not equivalent to the m etallic state found for g < g<sub>c</sub> in Fig. 1, we may then expect the possibility of three di erent phases for the HHM with U > 0 and q > 0: Mott, Peierls, and metallic SC.Fig.2 shows the charge and spin structure factors again versus  $q w \pm U = 2.W e$ rst discuss results for small phonon frequency ! = 0.5shown in Fig. 2(a). We nd that for small g, K tends toward 1 as system size increases. At a critical coupling q<sub>c</sub>, K becomes less than 1, indicating the opening of a spin gap and the transition to the Peierls state. The charge exponent K scales tow ards zero on both sides of the transition, developing a peak at  $g = g_c$ . Sim ilar results are found for the 1/2-lled 1D extended Hubbard model (EHM), where K also peaks at the transition between CDW and bond-order wave (BOW) phases [16]. The nite value of K on the boundary indicates that the transition is of continuous nature [16]. Like the CDW -




FIG.3: Charge (a) and spin (b) sti nesses versus g for U = 2, ! = 5. Open (closed) symbols are for N = 32 (16) site lattices. A rrows mark the transition points  $g_{c1}$  and  $g_{c2}$  determined from Fig.2(b).

(BOW)-SDW transition in the 1/2-lled EHM, we nd similar behavior for small! in the HHM as U increases: the value of K at the transition decreases with U, indicating that for large U the transition is rst order rather than continuous. The correspondence is not surprising, as the e ect of a nearest-neighbor interaction V U can be viewed as an e ective negative U [14].

Charge and spin response typical for large ! are shown in Fig. 2(b), here shown for U = 2 and ! = 5. Again, for small q, we nd K tends toward 1 as system size increases, and K tends toward 0, consistent with the M ott state. However, at a critical coupling gc1 K exceeds 1 and K becomes less than one, indicating the dom inant-SC state found for  $U = 0, g < g_c$ . The value of  $q_{c1}$  is very close to the expected value where  $U_e = 0$ . Increasing g further, for  $g = g_{c2} K$  becomes less than 1, indicating the opening of a charge gap and the Peierls state. In the intermediate region  $q_{c1} < q < q_{c2}$ , the properties of the m odel are identical to the U = 0 m odel for  $q < q_c$  as seen in Fig. 1, i.e. metallic with dom inant SC correlations. W hile the second transition point  $q_{c2}$  is nite-size dependent, nite-size e ects are very weak at the rst transition since K = K = 1. It is then clear that due to the crossing of K and K curves at exactly  $1 \text{ at } g = g_{c1}$ , a region of K > 1 m ust exist for  $g > g_{c1}$ .

To con m the structure factor results indicating two transitions at  $g_{c1}$  and  $g_{c2}$ , we present the charge ( <sub>c</sub>) and spin ( <sub>s</sub>) sti nesses in Fig. 3. A swith the structure factors, the presence of two transitions m ay only be detected from <sub>c</sub> and <sub>s</sub> after nite-size scaling has been performed. For clarity, we plot only two system sizes in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3(a) we see that for small g, <sub>c</sub> decreases with system size, indicating a charge gap. <sub>s</sub> is nearly




FIG. 4: Evolution of the interm ediate phase versus !. (a) !=0.5 (b) !=1 (c) !=5.0 pen circles indicate the boundary  $g_{c1}$  between M ott and SC phases, led diam onds the boundary  $g_{c2}$  between SC and Peierls phases, and open squares the boundary between M ott and Peierls phases. D ashed line indicates  $U = 2g^2 = !$ .

constant with system size, indicating no spin gap. In the interm ediate phase, this is reversed, with  $_{\rm c}$  remaining constant or increasing with system size, and  $_{\rm s}$  decreasing with system size. This again indicates a spin gap but no charge gap in the SC region. Finally, for g > g<sub>c2</sub>, both sti nesses go to zero in the Peierls state.

Fig. 4 shows the evolution of the interm ediate phase as a function of !, with phase boundaries determ ined from nite-size scaling of 16, 24, and 32 site structure factor data. In all cases, the SC phase exists for  $g < g_c$  exactly at U = 0. As U is increased at xed !, the SC region then shrinks. For small enough !, we see two di erent sequences of phases, either M ott-SC -P eierls for sm all U (as in Fig. 2(b)), or Mott-Peierls (as in Fig. 2(a)) for large U. Num erically it is di cult to precisely determ ine point where all three phases meet, but we nd that the SC phase disappears at U 1 for ! = 0.5, and at2 for ! = 1:0. In Fig. 4(a) and (b), we have not IJ plotted points for the Mott/Peierls boundary for large U, as in this region the transition becomes strongly rst order, making exact determ ination of the boundary difcult. However, the transition appears to remain close to  $q^2 = ! = U = 2$ . For ! = 5, we were not able to access large enough U to determ ine the upper cuto U necessary to suppress the SC state, but the interm ediate phase appears to persist up to at least U 7 for ! = 5. In all cases, we nd the line  $U_e = 0$  to very accurately predict either the M ott-SC or M ott-P eierls boundary, but not the SC-P eierls boundary. Our phase diagram is slightly di erent from reference 8, where the m etallic region was found to extend to either side of the  $U_e = 0$  line.

In conclusion, we have shown that a m etallic SC region exists interm ediate between Peierls and M ott phases in the 1D 1/2-lled HHM. W hile in the 1/2-lled m odel with small phonon frequency ! < t the interm ediate phase occupies a relatively small region of the phase diagram, we expect that in the presence of doping (in fact m ost of the organic SC's are 1/4-lled [1]), the size of this region will be greatly enhanced. Furtherm ore, while the SC pairing found here exactly at 1/2-lling consists of on-site pairs or bipolarons, with doping both onsite and nearest-neighbor pairing m ay be m ediated by the H olstein phonons[17]. We are currently exploring these possibilities in the doped m odel.

This work was supported by O ak Ridge Associated Universities. We thank A. Sandvik and P. Sengupta for discussions regarding the SSE method. Numerical calculations were performed at the Mississippi State University ERC Center for Computational Sciences.

- T. Ishiguro, K. Yamaji, and G. Saito, Organic Superconductors (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998).
- [2] O.Gunnarsson, Rev.M od.Phys. 69, 575 (1997).
- [3] T.Holstein, Ann.Phys. 8, 325 (1959).
- [4] J. E. Hirsch and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B 27, 1680 (1983).
- [5] H. Fehske, G. W ellein, G. Hager, A. W ei e, and A. R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. B 69, 165115 (2004).
- [6] C.W u, Q. Huang, and X. Sun, Phys. Rev. B 52, R15683 (1995).
- [7] E. Jeckelm ann, C. Zhang, and S.W hite, Phys. Rev. B 60, 7950 (1999).
- [8] Y.Takada and A.Chatterjee, Phys. Rev. B 67, 081102R (2003).
- [9] O.F. Syljuasen and A.W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. E 66, 046701 (2002).
- [10] A.W. Sandvik and D.K.Cam pbell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 195 (1999).
- [11] P.Sengupta, A.W. Sandvik, and D.K.Cam pbell, Phys. Rev.B 67, 245103 (2003).
- [12] P.Sengupta, A.W. Sandvik, and D.K.Cam pbell, Phys. Rev.B 65, 155113 (2002).
- [13] J.Voit, Rep. Prog. Phys. 58, 977 (1995).
- [14] R.T.Clay, A.W. Sandvik, and D.K.Campbell, Phys. Rev.B 59, 4665 (1999).
- [15] S.Eggert, Phys.Rev.B 54, R9612 (1996).
- [16] A.W. Sandvik, L.Balents, and D.K.Campbell, Phys. Rev.Lett. 92, 236401 (2004).
- [17] J.Bonca, T.Katrasnik, and S.A.Trugman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3153 (2000).