Coherent Inverse Photoem ission Spectrum for Gutzwiller Projected Superconductors

Seiji Yunoki

Istituto Nazionale per la Fisica della Materia (INFM) and International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA), via Beirut 4, 34014 Trieste, Italy (Dated: April 14, 2024)

R igorous relations for G utzw iller projected BCS states are derived. The obtained results do not depend on the details of m odel systems, but solely on the wave functions. Based on the derived relations, physical consequences are discussed for strongly correlated superconducting states such as high- T_c cuprate superconductors.

PACS num bers: 71.10.-w, 74.20.-z, 74.20 M n, 74.72.-h

Right after the discovery of high- T_{C} cuprate superconductors [1], Anderson has proposed a Gutzwiller projected BCS wave function | a quantum m any-body state incorporating strong on-site C oulom b repulsion to describe the superconducting state [2]. Since then there have been extensive studies in understanding the nature of this state and its variants [3, 4]. In addition, several reports have shown that this projected BCS wave function is indeed a good variational ansatz state to describe the ground state of t-J like models [5, 6, 7, 8], which are believed to capture the low energy physics of the cuprates [9]. Although these projected BCS states were proposed more than 15 years ago, very recently they have acquired a revived interest [10, 11, 12, 13]. This is probably because recent expensive num erical calculations based on the Gutzwiller projected variational ansatz clearly indicate that m any aspects of the physics of high-T_c cuprate superconductors can be understood within this fram ework [10].

In this short communication some rigorous relations are derived for the Gutzwiller projected BCS states. It is shown that, as a consequence of the derived relations, the one-particle added excitation spectrum tends to be more coherent than the one-particle removed excitation spectrum does. It is further shown numerically that this trend is still observed approximately for more involved Gutzwiller projected BCS states. Possible experimental implications of the present results are also discussed.

Here our general system consists of a single orbital per unit cellon the two-dimensional (2D) square lattice with L sites [14]. The creation and annihilation operators of spin (= ";#) particle at site i are denoted by c_i^y and \hat{c}_i , respectively. A Gutzwiller projected BCS state with N particles is described by

$$j_{0}^{(N)} i = \hat{P}_{N} \hat{P}_{G} \not BCSi;$$
(1)

where \hat{P}_N is the projection operator onto the xed num – ber N of particles, $\hat{P}_G = \sum_i (1 \quad \hat{n}_i \cdot \hat{n}_{i\#})$ is the G utzwiller projection operator to restrict the H ilbert space with no double occupancy on each site, and $\hat{n}_i = \hat{c}_i^{y} \hat{c}_i$. $\beta C Si = \sum_{k: k} \hat{p}_i$ is the ground state of the B C S m ean eld Ham iltonian where

are the standard Bogoliubov quasi-particle operators, $\Delta_k = \frac{1}{i}e^{ik} \hat{c}_i = L$, $\hat{D}i$ is the vacuum of particles, and the singlet pairing is assumed [15]. The nature of this state has been extensively studied specially in the context of high-T_c cuprates [5, 6, 7, 8, 10]

A one-particle added state with spin and momentum k is similarly de ned by using $\frac{A^{y}}{k}$:

$$j_{k}^{(N+1)} i = \hat{P}_{N+1} \hat{P}_{G} \hat{k}^{Y} \beta C S i$$
: (3)

This state was rst proposed by Zhang, et al [3], followed by several others [10, 12, 16]. Hereafter the norm alized wave functions for the N - and (N + 1)-particle states are denoted by $j_0^{(N-1)}$ i and $j_k^{(N+1)}$ i, respectively.

First it is useful to show that the following operator relation between c_k and c_k^V holds exactly:

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathrm{G}} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathrm{K}} \quad \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathrm{K}}^{\mathrm{V}} \quad \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathrm{G}} = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathrm{K}} \quad \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathrm{G}} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathrm{K}}^{\mathrm{V}} + \frac{1}{\mathrm{L}} \hat{\mathrm{N}} \quad \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathrm{G}} : \qquad (4)$$

Here $\hat{N} = {\stackrel{P}{}}_{i} c_{i}^{y} c_{i}$ and stands for the opposite spin of . This is easily proved by using $\hat{P}_{G} c_{i}^{y} \hat{P}_{G} = \hat{P}_{G} c_{i}^{y}$.

Using the above equation (4), it is readily shown that the momentum distribution function n (k) = $h_0^{(N)} \dot{\mathcal{F}}_k^{V} \Delta_k j_0^{(N)}$ is calculated for the state $j_0^{(N)}$ is related to the state $j_k^{(N+1)}$ i through

$$n_{k} = 1 \frac{N}{L} j_{k} \hat{j} \frac{h_{k}^{(N+1)} j_{k}^{(N+1)} i_{k}}{h_{0}^{(N)} j_{0}^{(N)} i};$$
(5)

where $\hat{N} \hat{P}_{G} = \hat{P}_{G} \hat{N}$ is used.

The quasi-particle weight for the one-particle added excitation is de ned by

$$Z_{k}^{(+)} = h_{k}^{(N+1)} \dot{f}_{k}^{V} j_{0}^{(N)} \dot{i}^{2} :$$
 (6)

Now we shall show that there exists a simple and exact relation between $Z_k^{(+)}$ and n (k). To this end, it is important to notice that since

$$h_{k}^{(N+1)} \dot{f}_{k}^{V} \dot{j}_{0}^{(N)} \dot{i} = u_{k} h_{k}^{(N+1)} \dot{j}_{k}^{(N+1)} \dot{i}$$
(7)

 $Z_k^{(+)}$ is simplied as

$$Z_{k}^{(+)} = j u_{k}^{2} j \frac{h_{k}^{(N+1)} j_{k}^{(N+1)} \dot{i}}{h_{0}^{(N)} j_{0}^{(N)} \dot{i}}$$
(8)

From Eqs. (5) and (8), we nally arrive at the desired relation, $\label{eq:eq:expectation}$

n (k) +
$$Z_k^{(+)} = 1 \frac{N}{L}$$
: (9)

It should be emphasized that to derive the above equation we have not m ade either any approximations or any assumptions except for the form of the wave functions for the N - and (N + 1)-particle states given by Eqs. (1) and (3), respectively.

The equation (9) is also simply veried numerically on small clusters using a M onte Carlo technique. Typical results are presented in Fig. 1. As seen in Fig. 1 and for all other cases studied, Eq. (9) is satistical errors.



FIG.1: n (k) (circles) and $Z_k^{(+)}$ (squares) calculated using a M onte C arlo technique for L = 16 16 and N = N = = 115 [17]. The sum of the two quantities (n (k) + $Z_k^{(+)}$) is also plotted by crosses, which are 1 N = L = 0.551 within the statistical error bars (sm aller than the size of the sym bols).

In order to discuss a physical consequence of Eq. (9) on the one-particle excitation spectrum, let us rst derive a simple same rule. The one-particle excitation spectra for removing one particle $\mathbb{A}^{PES}(k;!)$ and for adding one particle $\mathbb{A}^{PES}(k;!)$ are de ned respectively by

$$A^{PES}(k;!) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} \left(c_{k}^{V} + (\hat{H} - E_{0}) + i0^{+} - c_{k}^{V} + (\hat{H} - E_{0}) + i0^{+} - c_{k}^{V} + c_{k}^{PES}(k;!) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} \left(c_{k}^{V} + (\hat{H} - E_{0}) + i0^{+} - c_{k}^{V} + c_{k}^{V} +$$

where $h\hat{O}$ i is the expectation value of \hat{O} for the exact ground state of the system described by H am iltonian \hat{H} with its eigenvalue E₀. It is generally proved that for any model system s de ned within the restricted H ilbert

space with no double occupancy on any sites by particles, such as the t-J m odel, the 0-th m om ent of the spectral function satis as the following sum rules:

Ζ

¹
$$A^{PES}(k;!)d! = h \hat{c}_{k}^{V} \hat{c}_{k} i$$
 (10)

$$Z_{1}^{1}$$

A^{total}(k;!)d! = 1 N =L; (11)

where $A^{\text{total}}(k;!) = A^{\text{PES}}(k;!) + A^{\text{PES}}(k;!)$. The latter equation is easily proved by using Eq. (4). Eq. (10) is a rather standard sum rule, while Eq. (11) is due to the reduction of the H ilbert space by \hat{P}_{G} and it is indeed satis ed for, e.g., the t-J m odel [18].

Let us now discuss what physical consequences would be expected. First we assume that there exists a system for which the ground state and the low-lying excited states are approxim ately described by the wave functions, Eqs. (1) and (3), introduced above. Then it follows im m ediately from Eqs. (9) { (11) that

$$A^{\text{IPES}}(k;!)d! = Z_{k}^{(+)}:$$
(12)

This relation implies that the one-particle added excitation spectrum is all coherent since only one state contributes to $A^{PES}(k;!)$. It should be noted here that while several studies have recently reached the sim ilar conclusions [12, 13], the argument presented here is more rigorous and transparent.

N ext we shall discuss to what extend Eq. (9) holds and therefore Eq. (12) remains approximately true for more involved wave functions. A natural and important extension of the simplest G utzw iller projected BCS states described by Eqs. (1) and (3) can be achieved by including charge Jastrow factors $\hat{J}_{\rm C}$, i.e.,

$$j_{0}^{(N)}i = \hat{P}_{N}\hat{P}_{G}\hat{J}_{C}\hat{B}CSi; \qquad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{j}_{k}^{(N+1)}\mathbf{i} = \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{N+1}\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{G}\hat{\mathbf{J}}_{C}\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{k}^{Y} \quad \mathbf{BCSi}; \quad (14)$$

for the ground state and the one-particle excited states, respectively. Here

$$\hat{J}_{C} = \exp^{\hat{\theta}} \sum_{\substack{X \\ i;j}}^{X} v_{ij} \hat{n}_{j} \hat{n}_{j}$$
(15)

 $\hat{n}_{i} = \hat{n}_{i"} + \hat{n}_{i\#}$, and the sum runs over all the independent pairs of sites i and j. The importance of \hat{J}_{C} has been already reported for various lattice models [7, 19]. A typical example of v_{ij} is presented in Fig. 2 (a) where all the independent v_{ij} are optimized for the 2D t t⁰-J model with J=t = 0:3, t⁰=t = 0:2, and N_" = N_# = 115 on L = 16 16 [16]. Certainly the inclusion of \hat{J}_{C} improves, e.g., the variational energy. Besides such quantitative changes, \hat{J}_{C} can also make a qualitative di erence. O ne of these examples is shown in Fig. 2 (b), where the charge structure factor N (q) = $\int_{-1}^{1} \exp(-iq) |h| \hat{m}_{i+1}$ if for small wave numbers are calculated using the wave functions with and without \hat{J}_{C} . As seen in Fig. 2 (b), N (q) ! 0 as jqj! 0 for j $_{0}^{(N)}$ i as expected, whereas N (q) ! nite as jqj! 0 for j $_{0}^{(N)}$ i [20]. This is because BCS i does not conserve the number of particles which is instead a conserved quantity for the tt⁰-J m odel [21, 22].



FIG.2: (a) Charge Jastrow factor v(r) = v_{ij} as a function of distances r = ji jj. These quantities are optim ized in such a way that the variational energy of $j_0^{(N)}$ i ism inim ized for the 2D t+t⁰-J m odel with J=t= 0:3, t⁰=t= 0:2, and N = N = 115 on L = 16 [16, 17]. (b) Charge structure factor N (q) calculated using $j_0^{(N)}$ i (circles) and $j_0^{(N)}$ i (crosses) for the 2D t+t⁰-J m odel with the same m odel parameters as in (a). The variational parameters are optim ized for both states. The statistical error bars are sm aller than the size of the symbols.



FIG.3: n (k) (circles) and $Z_k^{(+)}$ (squares) calculated using the wave functions $j_0^{(N-1)}$ i and $j_k^{(N-1)}$ i with \hat{J}_c . The model parameters used are the same as in Fig.2. The sum of the two quantities (n (k) + $Z_k^{(+)}$) and 1 N =L = 0.551 are also plotted by crosses and thick dashed lines, respectively. The statistical error bars are sm aller than the size of the symbols.

It is now interesting to exam ine if the exact relation Eq. (9) proved for the states $j_{0}^{(N)}$ i and $j_{k}^{(N+1)}$ i, and thus Eq. (12), can still hold for these m ore involved wave functions $j_{0}^{(N)}$ i and $j_{k}^{(N+1)}$ i. The num erical results on sm all clusters are presented in Fig 3 for the 2D tt⁰-J m odel with the same m odel param eters as in Fig. 2. As seen in Fig 3, surprisingly Eq. (9) remains satis ed, at least approximately. Thus it can be still argued that, because of the sum rule for the one-particle excitation spectrum [Eqs. (10) and (11)], Eq. (12) is approximately satis ed, and therefore most of the one-particle added excitation spectrum consists of a coherent part. Further num erical calculations have been carried out for the 2D tt⁰-J m odel with di erent m odel param eters, and it was found that Eq. (9) is still satis ed within 10{15% [23]. So far we have only considered the one-particle added excitations. Let us brie y discuss the one-particle rem oved excitations. A one-particle rem oved state is analogously constructed by

$$j_{k}^{(N-1)} i = \hat{P}_{N-1} \hat{P}_{G} \hat{k}^{Y} \beta CSi:$$
(16)

A lthough j $_{k}^{(N-1)}$ i and j $_{k}^{(N+1)}$ i are of very like form, the sim ilar conclusion about the coherence of the one-particle excitations can not be drawn for the one-particle rem oved excitations. A simple reason for this is the following [12, 13]: for the one-particle added excitations,

$$\hat{P_{G}} \hat{c}_{k}^{V} j_{0}^{(N)} i = \hat{P_{N+1}} \hat{P_{G}} \hat{c}_{k}^{V} \frac{3}{B} C Si / j_{k}^{(N+1)} i;$$

i.e., $\hat{P}_{G} \hat{C}_{k}^{V} \stackrel{j}{}_{0}^{(N)} i$ consists of only one state, while for the one-particle removed excitations $\hat{P}_{G} \hat{Q}_{k} \stackrel{j}{}_{0}^{(N)} i = \hat{Q}_{k} \stackrel{j}{}_{0}^{(N)} i$, which is not described by $j \stackrel{(N-1)}{k} i$ above. It is also checked num erically on small clusters that the quasiparticle weight for the one-particle removed excitation, $Z_{k}^{()} = h \stackrel{(N-1)}{k} \stackrel{j}{}_{0} \stackrel{(N)}{}_{0} i^{2}$, is substantially dierent from n (k).

Finally we shall discuss experim ental in plications of the present results. A most relevant experim ent is angleresolved inverse photoem ission spectroscopy on the superconducting state for the hole-doped cuprates. If we assum e that the G utzw iller projected BCS states discussed here are faithfuldescription for the superconducting state in the cuprates, it is expected that the inverse photoem ission spectroscopy spectrum has more coherent characteristics than the direct photoem ission spectroscopy spectrum does [24]. The similar trend is also expected in the superconducting state for the electron-doped cuprates except now that the direct photoem ission spectroscopy spectrum has more coherent characteristics. This is because the t-J like m odels can also describe the electrondoped cuprates only after the particle-hole transform ation: \hat{q}_k ! \hat{h}_{k+0}^y [Q = (;)] [25], and the same argum ent presented here is still true for \hat{h}_{k}^{y} .

To sum marize, we have derived some rigorous relations for the Gutzwiller projected BCS states. Using a sum rule for the one-particle excitation spectrum, it was shown that the one-particle added excitation spectrum tends to be more coherent than the one-particle rem oved excitation does. Possible experimental implications were also discussed. Finally, it should be noted that all the results presented here are based on the Gutzwiller projected BCS states studied, and a question of whether these states can represent the exact eigenstates of som e particular model H am iltonian is beyond the scope of the present study.

The author is grateful to S. Sorella, R. Hubina, and E.Dagotto for stimulating discussions. This work was supported in part by INFM through contract n. OA04007678.

- [1] J.G. Bednorz and K.A. Muller, Z. Phys. B 64, 189 (1986).
- [2] P.W. Anderson, Science 235, 1196 (1987).
- [3] F.C.Zhang, C.Gros, T.M. Rice, and H.Shiba, Supercond Sci. Technol. 1, 36 (1988).
- [4] For a recent review, see, e.g., P.A. Lee, N.N agaosa, and X.-G.W en, cond-m at/0410445, and references therein.
- [5] C.Gros Ann.ofphys. (N.Y.), 189, 53 (1989).
- [6] H.Yokoyam a and M.Ogata, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.65, 3615 (1996).
- [7] S. Sorella, G. B. Martins, F. Becca, C. Gazza, L. Capriotti, A. Parola, and E. Dagotto, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 117002 (2002).
- [8] C.T.Shih, T.K.Lee, R.Eder, C.-Y. Mou, and Y.C. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 227002 (2004).
- [9] F.C. Zhang and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 37, R3759 (1988).
- [10] A.Param ekanti, M.Randeria, and N.Trivedi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 217002 (2001); Phys. Rev. B 70, 054504 (2004).
- [11] P.W. Anderson, P.A. Lee, M. Randeria, T.M. Rice, N. Trivedi, and F.C. Zhang, J. Phys. Condens. M atter 16, R 755 (2004).
- [12] P.W. Anderson and N.P.Ong, cond-m at/0405518.
- [13] M.Randeria, R.Sensam a, N.Trivedi, and F.-C.Zhang, cond-m at/0412096.
- [14] Even though the 2D square lattice is considered in this paper, the results presented here for the projected BCS states without charge Jastrow factor $\hat{J_c}$ can be also applied on any spatial dimensions with any lattice geometry.
- [15] See, e.g., Theory of Superconductivity, by J.R. Schrie er, (Addison-Wesley, New York, 1988).
- [16] S.Yunoki, E.D agotto, and S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 037001 (2005).
- [17] Following the standard BCS theory with d-wave

pairing [15], $j_{k}f = [1 + _{k}=E_{k}]=2$ and $j_{k}f = [1 + _{k}=E_{k}]=2$ are parameterized by $E_{k} = \frac{p}{_{k}^{2} + j_{k}f}$, $_{k} = 2t(\cos k_{x} + \cos k_{y}) + 4t^{0}\cos 2k_{x}\cos 2k_{y}$, and $_{k} = (\cos k_{x} - \cos k_{y})$. For the calculations presented in Fig. 1, =t = 0.448, $t^{0}=t = 0.302$, and =t = 0.675 are chosen, which are optimized variational parameters for the 2D t-t^{0}-J m odel with J=t = 0.3 and $t^{0}=t = 0.2$ [16].

- [18] W . Stephan and P. Horsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 2258 (1991).
- [19] M. Capello, F. Becca, M. Fabrizio, S. Sorella, and E. Tosatti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 026406 (2005).
- [20] This asymptotic behavior of N (q) has been observed for various lattice sizes used.
- [21] S. Sorella, private communication. See also, for example, Ref. [15] in Chapter 8.
- [22] W ithin cluster sizes used (L up to 450), it is found that v(r) can be tted by $a_0 + a_1 = r$, where a_0 and a_1 are tting parameters. Based on a RPA treatment [19], the long-range nature of v(r) 1=r in $j_0^{(N)}$ i can alter the sm all jrj behavior of N (q) for BCS i to N (q) jrj, which is in good agreement with the present num erical calculations presented in Fig. 2 (b).
- [23] An important counter example is found in onedimensional interacting lattice systems where the Gutzwiller projected states with singular Jastrow factor v(r) ln jrj can describe the Tom onaga-Luttinger physics [see, for example, C.S.Hellberg and E.J.Mele, Phys.Rev.Lett. 67, 2080 (1991)].
- [24] D ue to the coupling to other degrees of freedom such as phonons, presum ably the spectrum gets broadened.
- [25] T.Tohyam a, S.M aekawa, Phys. Rev. B 49, 3596 (1994);
 R.J.Gooding, K.J.E.Vos, P.W .Leung, Phys. Rev. B 50, 12866 (1994).