arXiv:cond-mat/0506712v2 [cond-mat.supr-con] 5 Jun 2006

Unrestricted renormalized mean field theory of strongly correlated electron systems

Qiang-Hua Wang[1], Z. D. Wang[1,2], Yan Chen[2], and F. C. Zhang[2]
[1] *National Laboratory of Solid State Microstructures, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China and*
[2] *Department of Physics & Center of Theoretical and Computational Physics, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China*

We generalized systematically the renormalized mean field theory in the case of uniform states to the unrestricted case of general inhomogeneous states with competing spin-, charge- and superconducting orders. Applying the theory to high-T_c superconductors, we discuss the issues of electronic inhomogeneity, the superfluid density, and in particular the local electron density of states. The results account for many intriguing aspects of the phenomenology.

As a prototype of strongly correlated electron systems, high-T_c superconductors reveal rich phenomenologies. Apart from the apparent competing antiferromagnetic and superconducting orders, recent scanning tunnelling microscopy (STM) measurements have suggested checkerboard charge-density-wave order in under-doped NaCaCuOCl and BiSrCaCuO superconductors [1]. On the other hand, earlier STM measurements already revealed nano-scale spatial inhomogeneity of the quasi-particle energy gap [2], but yet the local density of states (LDOS) at very low energy are remarkably homogeneous, seemingly ignorant of the gap inhomogeneity [3]. The physics behind the robust low energy quasi-particle states are intriguing. In short, strongly correlated electrons may support complex phases and their response to extrinsic impurities may be highly nontrivial. This motivates us to develop a reliable effective theory that takes proper care of the strong correlations and allows competing orders and inhomogeneous electronic states from the starting point.

A widely adopted model for high-T_c superconductors is the t-J model,

$$H_{t-J} = -t\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\sigma}(C^\dagger_{i\sigma}C_{j\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) + J\sum_{\langle ij\rangle} S_i\cdot S_j, \qquad (1)$$

where the constraint of no double occupation at any site is implied. In order to fit the band structure, hopping terms connecting next-nearest-neighbor sites and further neighboring sites may be necessary but they do not affect the following development of the theory. Recently the $t-U-J$ model has also been used to study the Gossamer superconductivity [4], in which the constraint of no-double-occupation is relaxed but a Hubbard U-term is added,

$$H = H_{t-J} + U\sum_i n_{i\uparrow}n_{i\downarrow}. \qquad (2)$$

The following development is formulated within this general model, Eq.(2), with obvious specific limits to the $t-J$ and Hubbard models at our disposal.

A very powerful way to take proper care of the strong correlation effects is to Gutzwiller project a trial wavefunction, $|\psi\rangle = P|\psi_0\rangle$, where $|\psi_0\rangle$ denotes a free-particle many-body wave-function, with possible order parameters, and $P = \Pi_i(1-\alpha D_i)$ is a projection operator. Here $D_i = n_{i\uparrow}n_{i\downarrow}$, and α is a variational parameter between 0 and 1. The calculation can be done by Monte Carlo methods [5]. However, it is limited by the lattice size and the parameter space. Alternatively the effect of Gutzwiller projection is taken into account approximately in a re-normalized mean field theory (RMFT) [6], which agrees qualitatively with the Monte Carlo result. The Gutzwiller projected d-wave BCS states appear to capture the basic features of high-T_c phase diagram [5, 6, 7]. In this paper, we develop a systematic extension of the RMFT to the case of unrestricted spin/charge densities. We then discuss the physical quantities based on the unrestricted RMFT and explain the robust low energy states observed in the STM.

Let $|\psi_0\rangle$ be a Hatree-Fock state which carries the bare variational unrestricted order parameters. In the usual mean field theory this wave function is used to calculate the expectation value of the Hamiltonian, and the optimization with respect to the order parameters leads to the mean field self-consistent equations. For strongly-correlated electrons, however, this usual type of approach misses the most important physics, namely, the possible emergence of Mott insulating phases. This physics is conveniently picked up by Gutzwiller projecting the Hatree-Fock state, namely, the trial state is given by $|\psi\rangle = P|\psi_0\rangle$. However, we are no longer justified to use a projector P with identical projection parameter α at each site, since the effect of strong correlations depends on the electron density. This motivates us to use a generalized projection operator $\mathcal{P} = \Pi_i\mathcal{P}_i$ so that $|\psi\rangle = \mathcal{P}|\psi_0\rangle$, with

$$\mathcal{P}_i = y_i^{n_i}(1-\alpha_i D_i) = E_i + y_i Q_i + \eta_i y_i^2 D_i, \qquad (3)$$

where $E_i = (1-n_{i\uparrow})(1-n_{i\downarrow})$ and $Q_i = \sum_\sigma n_{i\sigma}(1-n_{i\bar\sigma})$ are the empty and single occupation operators, respectively. These are standard projection operators, satisfying $E_i^2 = E_i$, $Q_i^2 = Q_i$ and $D_i^2 = D_i$. Therefore

$$\mathcal{P}_i^2 = E_i + y_i^2 Q_i + \eta_i^2 y_i^4 D_i. \qquad (4)$$

Here $\eta_i = 1-\alpha_i$, and the fugacity y_i is introduced so that the local charge density is not changed by projection [8, 9, 10], or $f_i = \langle\psi_0|n_i|\psi_0\rangle = \langle\psi|n_i|\psi\rangle/\langle\psi|\psi\rangle$, the

advantage of which is that the variation of η_i does not influence the local charge density. (In the $t-J$ model $\eta_i \equiv 0$.) We note that we are working in the grand-canonical ensemble, which proves more convenient than the usual canonical ensemble approach usually used in the case of uniform state RMFT.

We shall use the shorthand notations $\langle\cdot\rangle_0 \equiv \langle\psi_0|\cdot|\psi_0\rangle$ and $\langle\cdot\rangle \equiv Z^{-1}\langle\psi_0|\mathcal{P}\cdot\mathcal{P}|\psi_0\rangle$ with the normalization factor $Z = \langle\psi_0|\mathcal{P}^2|\psi_0\rangle = \langle\mathcal{P}^2\rangle_0$. Since $|\psi_0\rangle$ describes free particles, one can use Wick's theorem to obtain all the contractions in Z. Under the Gutzwiller approximation, inter-site correlations are ignored when expectation values of projection operators are evaluated. One thus obtains $Z = \Pi_i z_i$, with

$$z_i = \langle\mathcal{P}_i^2\rangle_0 = e_{0i} + y_i^2 q_{0i} + \eta_i^2 y_i^4 d_{0i}, \tag{5}$$

where $e_{0i} = \langle E_i\rangle_0 = 1 - f_i + d_{0i}$, $q_{0i} = \langle Q_i\rangle_0 = f_i - 2d_{0i}$ and $d_{0i} = \langle D_i\rangle_0 = r_{i\uparrow}r_{i\downarrow}$. In the above derivation, we have assumed the absence of on-site pairing and spin flipping order parameters in the wave-function $|\psi_0\rangle$. Similarly, we have $e_i = \langle E_i\rangle = e_{0i}/z_i$, $q_i = \langle Q_i\rangle = q_{0i}y_i^2/z_i$, and $d_i = \langle D_i\rangle = d_{i0}\eta_i^2 y_i^4/z_i$. The fugacity y_i is determined by enforcing $f_i = q_i + 2d_i$, and is a function of η_i, f_i and d_{0i} (or equivalently $r_{i\sigma}$). The calculation of y_i is even unnecessary. Eliminating y_i we find $d_i e_i/q_i^2 = \eta_i^2 d_{0i}e_{0i}/q_{0i}^2$, which determines d_i uniquely.

We now discuss the effect of projection on the local spin moment directed in the z-direction. Since S_i is already projective, we have $\mathcal{P}_i S_i \mathcal{P}_i = y_i^2 S_i$, and therefore

$$m_i = \langle S_i^z\rangle = \langle S_i^z\rangle_0 y_i^2/z_i = g_s(i)m_{0i}, \tag{6}$$

where $g_s(i) = q_i/q_{0i}$ is the re-normalization factor for the variational spin moment $m_{0i} = \langle S_i^z\rangle_0 = (r_{i\uparrow} - r_{i\downarrow})/2$. Similar consideration applies to the spin-spin exchange,

$$\langle S_i\cdot S_j\rangle = g_s(i)g_s(j)\langle S_i\cdot S_j\rangle_0. \tag{7}$$

Using the identities

$$\mathcal{P}_i C_{i\sigma}\mathcal{P}_i = [y_i(1-n_{i\bar\sigma}) + \eta_i y_i^3 n_{i\bar\sigma}]C_{i\sigma}, \tag{8}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_i C_{i\sigma}^\dagger\mathcal{P}_i = [y_i(1-n_{i\bar\sigma}) + \eta_i y_i^3 n_{i\bar\sigma}]C_{i\sigma}^\dagger, \tag{9}$$

we obtain

$$\langle C_{i\sigma}^\dagger C_{j\sigma}\rangle = g_{t\sigma}(i)g_{t\sigma}(j)\langle C_{i\sigma}^\dagger C_{j\sigma}\rangle_0, \tag{10}$$

with the re-normalization factors

$$g_{t\sigma}(i) = (1-r_{i\bar\sigma})\sqrt{\frac{e_i q_i}{e_{0i}q_{0i}}} + r_{i\bar\sigma}\sqrt{\frac{q_i d_i}{q_{0i}d_{0i}}}. \tag{11}$$

In Eq.(11) the first term arises from the hopping process that does not encounter $\bar\sigma$-electrons at site i, and the second is from that involving a double occupation. We note that the re-normalization factors for spin-spin exchange and the hopping reduce in disguise to the known results in uniform charge density and uniform magnetically ordered states [6]. The result in the non-magnetic case for the $t-J$ model was used for granted in Ref. [11].

The total internal energy $E = \langle H\rangle$ can then be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} E = &-t\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\sigma} g_{t\sigma}(i)g_{t\sigma}(j)(\chi_{ij\sigma}^* + \chi_{ij\sigma}) \\ &-\frac{3J}{8}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle} g_s(i)g_s(j)(\chi_{ij}^*\chi_{ij} + \Delta_{ij}^*\Delta_{ij}) \\ &+J\sum_{\langle ij\rangle} g_s(i)g_s(j)m_{0i}m_{0j} + \sum_i Ud_i, \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined $\chi_{ij\sigma} = \langle C_{i\sigma}^\dagger C_{j\sigma}\rangle_0$ and $\chi_{ij} = \sum_\sigma \chi_{ij\sigma}$, $\Delta_{ij} = \langle B_{ij}\rangle_0$ with $B_{ij} = C_{i\downarrow}C_{j\uparrow} - C_{i\uparrow}C_{j\downarrow}$, and used the standard decomposition

$$\langle S_i\cdot S_j\rangle_0 = m_{0i}m_{0j} - \frac{3}{8}(\chi_{ij}^*\chi_{ij} + \Delta_{ij}^*\Delta_{ij}). \tag{12}$$

It is understood that $r_{i\sigma}$, $\chi_{ij\sigma}$ and Δ_{ij} are determined by ψ_0, d_i is determined by $r_{i\sigma}$ and η_i, and therefore E is eventually a functional of ψ_0 and $\{\eta_i\}$.

The optimization of E requires $\delta E/\delta\langle\psi_0| = 0$ and $\partial E/\partial\eta_i = 0$. The first condition leads to a Schördinger equation $H_{MF}|\psi_0\rangle = \lambda|\psi_0\rangle$, with the mean field Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H_{MF} = &\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\sigma}\left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial\chi_{ij\sigma}}C_{i\sigma}^\dagger C_{j\sigma} + \text{h.c.}\right) \\ &+\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial\Delta_{ij}}B_{ij} + \text{h.c.}\right) + \sum_{i\sigma}\left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial r_{i\sigma}} - \mu\right)n_{i\sigma}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where μ is the chemical potential. This is a self-consistent unrestricted RMFT in the sense that 1) $|\psi_0\rangle$ is determined by H_{MF}, and so are the variational order parameters; 2) There is no restriction on the spatial variation of the order parameters; 3) The effect of strong correlation is reflected in the re-normalization coefficients $g_{t\sigma}$ and g_s; 4) The re-normalization coefficients depend on η_i, and the global minimum of the energy E is reached after the self-consistency of the mean field theory and the optimization of η_i are simultaneously achieved. In the case of $t-J$ model one simply sets $\eta_i = 0$ [12]. The theory has the advantage that the Mott physics is built in. In the literature [13], the unrestricted Gutzwiller projection has been applied to the multi-band Hubbard models in dealing with para- and ferromagnetic states in transition metals. Further encoded in the present theory are the intriguing unrestricted competing anti-ferromagnetic and superconducting orders, which are most interesting in layered cuprate superconductors.

The mean field internal energy $\langle H_{MF} + \mu N\rangle_0$ is different from E, but a self-consistent $|\psi_0\rangle$ minimizes E so that $\delta E = \sum_n \epsilon_n\delta f_n + \sum_{n,n'} V_{n,n'}\delta f_n\delta f_{n'} + \cdots$ where

$\{\epsilon_n\}$ is the single-particle spectrum of H_{MF}, f_n is the Fermi-Dirac occupancy of the n-th single-particle orbital, and $V_{n,n'}$ is the residual two-body interaction kernel. The mean-field single-particles are not necessarily the electrons themselves, but are the bare Landau quasi-particles. The interpretation of these states, and in particular, the excitation energy spectrum, would be obscured if the charge density in $|\psi_0\rangle$ were different from that in $|\psi\rangle$.

In what follows we shall apply the theory to the $t-J$ model, relevant to the cuprates. First, we discuss the effect of the projection on the observables. Since the theory is projective, the order parameters in the RMFT are different from the measured ones. The re-normalization in the spin moment $m_i = g_s(i)m_{0i}$ has been derived previously. For the superconducting pairing order parameters, it can be shown easily using the method described above that $\tilde{\Delta}_{ij} = \langle B_{ij}\rangle = g_\Delta(i,j)\Delta_{ij}$, with $g_\Delta(i,j) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_\sigma g_{t\sigma}(i)g_{t\bar{\sigma}}(j)$. In the charge-uniform non-magnetic states, $g_\Delta = 2x/(1+x) < 1$ where x (with $e_i = x$) is the hole-doping level away from half-filling. This result is well-known in the literature, and is argued to be related to the existence of pseudo-gap [6, 7]. The pair-pair correlation function on disconnected bonds is re-normalized in a similar fashion, $\langle B^\dagger_{ij}B_{kl}\rangle = g^2_\Delta\langle B^\dagger_{ij}B_{kl}\rangle_0$. This justifies the assignment of $\tilde{\Delta}$ as representing the long-range off-diagonal order. However, the pair-pair correlation on the same bond is re-normalized quite differently, since $B^\dagger_{ij}B_{ij}$ projects out a singlet spin pair on the bond $\langle ij\rangle$, $\langle B^\dagger_{ij}B_{ij}\rangle = -2\langle S_i\cdot S_j - \frac{1}{4}n_in_j\rangle = -2g_s(i)g_s(j)\langle S_i\cdot S_j\rangle_0 + \frac{1}{2}f_if_j$. (In the $t-J$ model $Q_i = n_i$ so that $q_i = f_i$.) Therefore we expect significant incoherent part in the pair-pair susceptibility due to short-range spin correlations.

The superfluid density ρ_s is related to the second order response of free energy to a vector potential. At zero temperature, it is related to the kinetic energy and is therefore re-normalized in the same way as the hopping parameters are, so that $\rho_s = g^2_{t\sigma}t\chi = 2xt\chi/(1+x)$ in a uniform state, where χ is the variational hopping order parameter in the RMFT. (The expression is slightly changed in the presence of longer-range hopping, but the re-normalization factor is the same.) One realizes that this relation is consistent with the result of elaborate gauge theory [14]. Indeed integrating over gauge fluctuations in the gauge theory effectively restores, to some extent, the strong correlation effects. The appealing feature of the projected density functional theory is that no slave degrees of freedom, and therefore no gauge fields are involved.

The factor $g_{t\sigma}(i)$ measures the overlap between the bare quasi-particle state in the RMFT and a corresponding real electron wave function at the given site. Therefore, the electron Green's function may be written as $G(i\sigma,j\sigma) = g_{t\sigma}(i)g_{t\sigma}(j)G_0(i\sigma,j\sigma) + G_{inc}(i\sigma,j\sigma)$ [9], where the first contribution is the coherent part from RMFT. We suppressed the energy arguments for brevity. Consider the on-site Green's function. A corresponding decomposition applies for the spectral function, $A_\sigma(i) = g^2_{t\sigma}(i)A_{0\sigma}(i) + A_{inc,\sigma}(i)$. Even though RMFT does not provide $A_{inc,\sigma}$ directly, some properties of it can be argued, as discussed previously in the literature [16]. We extend the discussion here for generally inhomogeneous cases. Since $\int^0_{-\infty}\sum_\sigma A_\sigma(i) = \int^0_{-\infty}\sum_\sigma A_{0\sigma}(i) = f_i$ but $g_{t\sigma}(i) < 1$, one concludes that there is incoherent spectral weight in the *occupied* side. While the general expression is quite complicated in general, it has a simple form for a nonmagnetic site, which is given by $\int^0_{-\infty}\sum_\sigma A_{inc,\sigma}(i) = (1-e_i)^2/(1+e_i)$. On the other hand, the number of *unoccupied* states at site i is given by $\sum_\sigma\int d\omega\langle C_{i\sigma}\delta(\omega - H)C^\dagger_{i\sigma}\rangle = 2e_i$, where we dropped a contribution q_i from the upper Hubbard band , which is out of the Hilbert space of the $t-J$ model. To this total unoccupied spectral weight, the contribution from the coherent part of G, which does describe excitations below the Mott gap, is given by

$$\sum_\sigma g_{t\sigma}(i)^2(1-r_{i\sigma}) = \frac{2e_i}{1+4m^2_{0i}/(1-e^2_i)}.$$

Of particular interest is the nonmagnetic case ($m_{0i} = 0$), in which the above discussion predicts that the unoccupied spectral weight is exhausted by the coherent part, in agreement with a recent argument [16, 17]. By continuity, one would expect that the incoherent part in the occupied side vanishes while approaching the Fermi level. The fact that incoherent excitations are abundant in the occupied side preferably at higher energies implies that 1) the nodal excitations at the Fermi energy are quite robust against strong correlations and 2) the antinodal excitations are largely incoherent due to strong correlations. This seems to be consistent with the the energy-dependence of the spectral function widely observed in angle-resolved photo-emission measurements [18].

We now calculate the LDOS in the $t-J$ model with weak random on-site potential, relevant to STM data. The inset of Fig.1(a) shows the scalar impurity potential profiles. The main panel of Fig.1(a) shows the coherent part of the LDOS calculated from the RMFT at an average doping level $x = 0.1$. The system carries d-wave pairing order without spin moments. While the DOS at and above the gap energy scale disperse from site to site, the low energy DOS seems to be independent of position and ignorant of the random impurities, in qualitative agreement with experiments [2]. In order to see whether this is a universal feature of doped Mott insulators, we deliberately erased the pairing order to find that the system evolves to a staggered-flux (or d-density-wave) state, with circulating currents whose chirality switches from plaquette to plaquette [19]. The LDOS in this state is shown in Fig.1(b). Now the low energy LDOS at different sites no longer merge together, but those at an

energy above the Fermi level does. Since the DOS at the band-gap minimum vanishes linearly with energy in a charge-uniform staggered-flux state in the same way as at the Fermi level in a uniform d-wave paired state, we conclude that the homogeneity in the low energy DOS in a d-wave superconductor is merely a result of vanishing DOS in the parent uniform phase. In other words, the strong correlation effect stabilizes the d-wave pairing or density-wave states, and then some quasi-particles are protected by the small phase space available to elastic scattering.

A few remarks are in order. First, we are exaggerating the density of impurities in Fig.1. The phase-space protection of the quasi-particles is limited to weak disorder and low impurity concentrations. At stronger disorder and denser impurities, the inhomogeneities of the LDOS prevail at all energies. Second, in comparison with the U(1) slave boson mean field theory [20], our results are in better agreement with experiments. This is because the U(1) mean field theory underestimates the kinetic energy so that the holes are more susceptible to impurity localization. In addition, as compared to calculations without the projection and the self-consistency, the LDOS in our case are more uniform against potential impurities in space. The physics is best seen in the Mott insulator limit, where the low-lying excitations are spinons, which are completely ignorant to potential impurities. This means that strong correlation effect reduces the charge susceptibility. Third, the peak-to-peak gap in our case varies less severely than in experiments [2, 3]. We note that in order to mimic the experimental data, gap-impurities were introduced phenomenologically in a recent model [21]. It would be highly interesting to find a mechanism that could lead to such gap impurities.

We thank Dung-Hai Lee, P. W. Anderson, T. M. Rice, Dieter Vollhardt, V. N. Muthukumar, and T. K. Ng for stimulating communications. The work at Nanjing University was supported by NSFC 10325416, 10429401 and 10021001, the Fok Ying Tung Education Foundation No.91009, and the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (973 project No: 2006CB601002), and the work at the University of Hong Kong was supported by the RGC grants of Hong Kong.




FIG. 1: (Color online) The coherent part of the LDOS calculated in a RMFT of the $t-J$ model with $t/J=3$ and at the average doping level $e=10\%$. The curves as functions of energy at different positions in an 8×8 unit cell in a 400×400 lattice are clumped together in order to see the difference induced by the impurities at different energies. (a) LDOS in a d-wave superconducting state; (b) LDOS in a staggered flux state evolved from erasing the superconducting order. The inset in (a) shows the impurity potential profiles.

[1] T. Hanaguri, C. Lupien, Y. Kohsaka, D. H. Lee, M. Azuma, M. Takano, H. Takagi, and J. C. Davis, Nature **430**, 1001(2004); M. Vershinin, S. Misra, S. Ono, Y. Abe, Y. Ando, and A. Yazdani, Science **303**, 1995 (2004);

[2] S. H. Pan, J. P. O'Neal, R. L. Badzey, C. Chamon, H. Ding, J. R. Engelbrecht, Z. Wang, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, A. K. Gupta, K.-W. Ng, E. W. Hudson, K. M. Lang, and J. C. Davis, Nature **413**, 282 (2001).

[3] K. McElroy, D.-H. Lee, J. E. Hoffman, K. M. Lang, J. Lee, E. W. Hudson, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, and J. C. Davis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 197005 (2005).

[4] See, *e.g.*, F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 207002 (2003); J. Y. Gan, Y. Chen, Z. B. Su, and F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 067005 (2005).

[5] C. Gros, Phys. Rev. B **38**, R931 (1988); C. Gros, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **189**, 53 (1989); H. Yokoyama and H. Shiba, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **57**, 2482 (1988); T.K. Lee and S. Feng, Phys. Rev B**41**, 11110 (1990).

[6] D. Vollhardt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **56**, 99 (1984); F. C. Zhang, C. Gros, T. M. Rice, and H. Shiba, Supercond. Sci. Tech. **1**, 36 (1988).

[7] P. W. Anderson, P. A. Lee, M. Randeria, T. M. Rice, N. Trivedi, and F. C. Zhang, J. Phys. Cond. Mat. **16**, R755 (2004).

[8] B. A. Bernevig, R. B. Laughlin, and D. I. Santiago, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 147003 (2003); R. B. Laughlin, preprint condmat-0209269.

[9] P. W. Anderson, and N. P. Ong, preprint condmat-0405518.

[10] B. Edegger, N. Fukushima, C. Gros, and V. N. Muthukumar, preprint condmat-0506120.

[11] Huai-Xiang Huang, You-Quan Li, and Fu-Chun Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 184514(R) (2005).

[12] M. Ogata and A. Himeda, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **72**, 374 (2003).

[13] J. Bünemann and W. Weber, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 4011 (1997); J. Bünemann, W. Weber, and F. Gebhard, *ibid* **57**, 6896 (1998).

[14] Dung-Hai Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2694 (2000); Qiang-Hua Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 057003 (2004).

[15] The decomposition of the Green's function is general, but is different from that proposed in Ref.[9].

[16] M. Randeria, R. Sensarma, N. Trivedi, and F. C. Zhang, preprint condmat-0214096.

[17] This argument fails in one dimension where the physics is governed by Luttinger-liquid behavior. The Gutzwiller projection is expected to work better in higher dimensions.
[18] A. Damascelli, Z. Hussain, and Z. X. Shen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 473 (2003), and references therein.
[19] S. Chakravarty, R. B. Laughlin, D. K. Morr, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 094503 (2001).
[20] Qiang-Hua Wang, Jung Hoon Han, and Dung-Hai Lee, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 054501 (2001).
[21] T. S. Nunner, B. M. Andersen, A. Melikyan, and P. J. Hirschfeld, preprint condmat-0504693.
[22] G. Kotliar and D. Vollhardt, Physics Today **57**, 53 (2004), and references therein.