

Polarization fluctuations in insulators and metals: New and old theories merge

Ra aele Resta

INFN DEMOCRITOS National Simulation Center,
via Beirut 2, I-34014 Trieste, Italy
and Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste,
Strada Costiera 11, I-34014 Trieste, Italy

(Dated:)

The ground-state fluctuation of polarization P is finite in insulators and divergent in metals, owing to the SWM sum rule [L. Souza, T. W. Ilkens, and R. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B 62, 1666 (2000)]. This is a virtue of periodic (i.e. transverse) boundary conditions. I show that within any other boundary conditions the P fluctuation is finite even in metals, and a generalized sum rule applies. The boundary-condition dependence is a pure correlation effect, not present at the independent-particle level. In the longitudinal case $r \cdot P = 0$, and one equivalently addresses charge fluctuations: the generalized sum rule reduces then to a well known result of many-body theory.

PACS numbers: 77.22.-d, 71.10.-w, 71.10.Ca

In a paper appeared in 2000 Souza, Wilkens, and Martin [1] (SWM) proved a fluctuation-dissipation sum rule relating the ground-state fluctuation of polarization P in a quantum system to its macroscopic conductivity. The sum rule implies that P fluctuations are finite in insulators and divergent in metals, thus providing a clearcut qualitative difference between insulating and metallic ground states. In fact SWM complete the program initiated in 1964 by W. Kohn with his "Theory of the insulating state" [2]. However, a different and apparently unrelated fluctuation-dissipation sum rule is well known since the 1950s in many-body physics [3, 4]. The disturbing fact is that metals and insulators do not behave in a qualitatively different way as far as the latter sum rule is concerned. I show here that both sum rules are special cases of a more general one, the difference owing to the boundary conditions (BCs) adopted when taking the thermodynamic limit: SWM adopt periodic Born-von-Karman BCs, i.e. transverse, while within many-body physics it is customary to adopt longitudinal ones. The precise meaning of "transverse" and "longitudinal" in the present context is illustrated below. For any BC choice different from the purely transverse the ground-state P fluctuation is finite even in metals. I also show that the BC dependence of the P fluctuation is a combined effect of the long range of Coulomb interaction and of electron correlation. There is no such dependence for independent electrons (either Hartree-Fock or Kohn-Sham), where the standard SWM sum rule applies anyhow. The presentation starts considering a finite system with "open" BCs, and then proceeds to taking the thermodynamic limit in the appropriate way.

Let ψ be the singlet ground-state wavefunction of an N -electron system, with even N , within "open" BCs, i.e., is square-integrable. We address the first and second

moments of the position operator

$$\hat{R} = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i \quad (1)$$

Since it is expedient to deal with quantities that become intensive in the large- N limit, I define the first and second cumulant moments per electron:

$$\text{hr } i_c = \frac{1}{N} \langle \hat{j} \hat{R} \hat{j} \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \int d\mathbf{r} \, r \, n(\mathbf{r}); \quad (2)$$

$$\text{hr } r i_c = \frac{1}{N} (\langle \hat{j} \hat{R} \hat{R} \hat{j} \rangle - \langle \hat{j} \hat{R} \hat{j} \rangle \langle \hat{j} \hat{R} \hat{j} \rangle) \quad (3)$$

(Greek subscripts indicate Cartesian components throughout). The first moment (times the trivial factor $eN = V$) is the electronic term in the macroscopic polarization P , while the second cumulant moment $\text{hr } r i_c$ is its quadratic quantum fluctuation in the many-body ground state. We notice that the second moment is a function of the relative coordinates, while the first moment is a function of the absolute ones; indeed, the macroscopic polarization P is well defined only when the (classical) nuclear contribution is accounted for. As said above, SWM address the P fluctuations in extended system within periodic BCs. Therein, the position \hat{R} is a "forbidden" operator [5] and the definition of $\text{hr } r i_c$ looks formally quite different from Eq. (3) [6, 7].

Indicating with $\mathbf{x}_i = (\mathbf{r}_i; \sigma_i)$ the space and spin coordinates of the i -th electron, the one-body and two-body densities are defined as:

$$n(\mathbf{r}_1) = N \int d\mathbf{x}_2 \dots d\mathbf{x}_N \psi^2(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{x}_2; \dots; \mathbf{x}_N) \quad (4)$$

$$n^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2) = N(N-1) \int d\mathbf{x}_3 \dots d\mathbf{x}_N \psi^2(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{x}_2; \dots; \mathbf{x}_N) \quad (5)$$

Straightforward manipulations lead to the equivalent form :

$$\hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{i}_c = \frac{1}{2N} \int_0^Z dr dr^0 (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0) \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0) [n(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}^0) - n^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0)] : \quad (6)$$

We observe that, for large values of the relative coordinate $\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0$, the electron distribution becomes uncorrelated and one has $n^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0) \rightarrow n(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}^0)$: this fact can be regarded as a manifestation of the "nearsightedness" principle [8]. For any finite N the integration in Eq. (6) obviously converges, owing to the boundedness of the ground wavefunction. One of the main questions is whether $\hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{i}_c$ goes to a well defined finite limit or instead diverges in the limit of large N .

A well known exact sum rule relates the two-body density to the frequency integral of the imaginary part of the linear response: such relationship belongs to the general class of fluctuation-dissipation theorems [9, 10]. By definition, the linear polarizability tensor

$\chi^{(1)}$ yields the component of the dipole \mathbf{d} linearly induced by an electric field \mathbf{E}_0 of unit magnitude in the direction, at frequency ω . I address purely electronic response, therefore assuming clamped nuclei. Furthermore I stress that \mathbf{E}_0 is the field far outside the finite sample, different from the screened macroscopic field \mathbf{E} inside. Starting e.g from Eq. (2.17) in Ref. [11] and using Eq. (6), it is straightforward to prove the sum rule:

$$\frac{1}{N} \int_0^Z d\omega \operatorname{Im} \chi^{(1)}(\omega) = \frac{e^2}{h} \hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{i}_c : \quad (7)$$

It is worth noticing that the rhs is by construction a ground-state property, while the lhs is a property of the excitations of the system. In Eq. (7), fluctuation and dissipation are perspicuous: from the definition of Eq. (3) the rhs is a quantum fluctuation, while the imaginary part of $\chi^{(1)}$ measures dissipation in the zero-temperature limit [9]. Because of the sum rule, the actual value of $\hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{i}_c$ in a given system can in principle be measured by actually probing the excited states.

I now discuss Eq. (7) in the limit of a macroscopic solid, where for the sake of simplicity the bulk is assumed as macroscopically homogeneous and isotropic. Therefore the macroscopic polarization $\mathbf{P} = d/V$ linearly induced by a macroscopic field at frequency ω can be written as:

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{\chi^{(1)}(\omega)}{4} \mathbf{E} ; \quad (8)$$

where $\chi^{(1)}$ is the electronic (clamped-nuclei) macroscopic dielectric function of the bulk material. In terms of \mathbf{E}_0 , this polarization is

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{V} \int_0^X \chi^{(1)}(\omega) \mathbf{E}_0 ; \quad (9)$$

where the relationship between \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{E}_0 depends on the shape of the sample.

Following a well-known practice for the study of dielectric bodies, we consider a sample of ellipsoidal shape, in which case the \mathbf{E} field is constant in the bulk, and the shape effects are embedded in the depolarization coefficients n_i , with $n_i = 1$. The main relationship is [12]:

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_0 ; \quad 4 \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{P} : \quad (10)$$

The extremely prolate ellipsoid ($n_x = n_y = 1/2; n_z = 0$) is a cylinder along z , while the extremely oblate one ($n_x = n_y = 0; n_z = 1$) is a slab normal to z . The slab geometry epitomizes both the longitudinal and the transverse cases: \mathbf{P} is purely longitudinal when along z , and purely transverse when along xy . In the former case, in fact, we have $P_z = P_z(z)$ (independent of xy): hence $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{P} \neq 0, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{P} = 0$. Conversely in the latter case we have $P_x = P_x(z)$ (independent of xy): hence $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{P} = 0, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{P} \neq 0$. It is worth noticing that the charge is uniquely related to \mathbf{P} via $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{P} =$ in the longitudinal case, whereas the charge does not enter a macroscopic description in the transverse one.

In the ellipsoidal geometry Eqs. (8) and (10) yield [12]:

$$\mathbf{E} = \frac{1}{1 + n_i [\chi^{(1)}(\omega) - 1]} \mathbf{E}_0 ; \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\chi^{(1)}(\omega) - 1}{1 + n_i [\chi^{(1)}(\omega) - 1]} \mathbf{E}_0 ; \quad (12)$$

The tensor is diagonal over the ellipsoid axes, and the above results transform Eq. (7) into:

$$\frac{V}{4N} \int_0^Z d\omega \operatorname{Im} \frac{\chi^{(1)}(\omega) - 1}{1 + n_i [\chi^{(1)}(\omega) - 1]} = \frac{e^2}{h} \hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{i}_c : \quad (13)$$

It is expedient to recast this sum rule in terms of the conductivity $\sigma^{(1)}$, which by definition measures the macroscopic current linearly induced by a field \mathbf{E} at frequency ω . Since the current is the time derivative of the electronic polarization, Eq. (8) yields $\chi^{(1)}(\omega) - 1 = 4 i \sigma^{(1)}(\omega)/\omega$ and

$$\hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{i}_c = \frac{V}{N} \frac{h}{e^2} \int_0^Z d\omega \operatorname{Im} \frac{i \sigma^{(1)}(\omega)}{1 + 4 i \sigma^{(1)}(\omega)/\omega} ; \quad (14)$$

which generalizes the SWM sum rule. In fact the assumption of periodic BCs corresponds to the choice $n_i = 0$, yielding the original SWM sum rule:

$$\hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{i}_c = \frac{V}{N} \frac{h}{e^2} \int_0^Z d\omega \operatorname{Re} \sigma^{(1)}(\omega) : \quad (15)$$

The rhs has a qualitatively different behavior in insulators and in metals. In the latter materials, in fact, the real

part of the conductivity is either finite or divergent in the dc ($\omega \rightarrow 0$) limit, thus implying in both cases the divergence of the integral, ergo of the P fluctuation. In insulators, instead, the integral in the rhs of Eq. (15) converges to a finite value.

Some precursor work, before SWM, attempted to relate ground-state fluctuations to dc conductivity [13, 14]. It is worth noticing that such work severely overlooks the role of BCs, while instead SWM provide a rigorous theory in a purely transverse framework. However, SWM neither consider different BCs, nor relate their work to the Nozières-Pines [15] early fluctuation-dissipation sum rule. Here we provide a generalization of SWM to all possible BCs, Eq. (14). Its novel outstanding message is that for any $n \neq 0$ choice the P fluctuation is finite even in metals (contrary to what stated in Ref. [14]).

The second cumulant moment $\hbar^2 i_c$ has been defined as a bulk property of the condensed system, which measures the quadratic quantum fluctuations of the polarization in the many-body ground state at zero temperature [1]. It may appear therefore disturbing that its expression, as given in Eq. (14), depends explicitly via the n coefficients on the shape which has been chosen for taking the large- V limit. In fact, this is a real physical effect and has a simple interpretation.

The fluctuating polarization P induces a surface charge at the boundary of the sample, which in turn generates a homogeneous depolarizing field E , which counteracts polarization: in the unperturbed $E_0 = 0$ case Eq. (10) reads

$$E = -4\pi n P : \quad (16)$$

Seen in this way, the effect obviously does depend on shape. But in condensed matter physics one tries to steer clear from any shape issue, and therefore one interprets Eq. (16), for any choice of n , as a choice of BCs for performing the thermodynamic limit. Indeed, Eq. (16) becomes the basic one, and any reference to shape is no longer needed. The condition $n = 1$ is not needed either. When adopting the usual periodic BCs in all three Cartesian coordinates, we are effectively imposing $E = 0$, i.e. $n_x = n_y = n_z = 0$. From what said above, and from Eq. (14), one would obtain the same fluctuation when working in a slab geometry and addressing the P component parallel to the slab, i.e. transverse. The other extreme case of Eq. (16), namely $n_x = n_y = n_z = 1$, is also well known in condensed matter physics. In fact, the BCs for zone-center phonon modes in cubic binary crystals are $E = 0$ for transverse modes, and $E = -4\pi P$ for longitudinal ones [16, 17, 18, 19].

There is a complete analogy between the ground-state fluctuations of polarization in a many-electron system at zero temperature, as discussed here, and the equilibrium fluctuations of polarization in a classical dipolar system at finite temperature. In the latter case, in fact, it is well known [20] that different BCs lead to different

fluctuations but to the same value for the static dielectric constant, provided the correct fluctuation formula is used for each case [21]. The shape-dependence is a combined effect of interparticle correlations and of the long-range nature of the interactions. The analogy goes further, since even in the quantum case the dependence on shape (or equivalently on BCs) is a pure correlation effect, not present at the independent-electron level (either Hartree-Fock or Kohn-Sham), where the many-body wavefunction is a Slater determinant. In fact, the second cumulant moment $\hbar^2 i_c$, Eq. (6), is a function of the two-body density: the latter, for the special case of a single-determinant wavefunction, is an explicit function of the one-body density matrix. As such, it can only be affected by the mean electric field (i.e. zero, for the unperturbed system), and not by its fluctuations.

This is confirmed by the present sum rule. Starting from Eq. (7), we notice that when we evaluate the rhs using the independent-electron two-body density, we must interpret the $(!)$ tensor in the lhs as the independent-electron polarizability, which by construction neglects self-consistency effects. Therefore $E = E_0$ i.e., after Eq. (11), $n = 0$. Therefore Eq. (14) reduces to Eq. (15), which is manifestly shape-independent (or BC independent). Incidentally, the conductivity $(!)$ therein must be understood as the independent-electron conductivity.

I now address the special form taken by Eq. (13) in the longitudinal case, where $n_x = n_y = n_z = 1$: the diagonal zz component is

$$\hbar^2 i_c = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi^2 e^2 N} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{1}{q} \text{Im} \frac{1}{\epsilon(\mathbf{q})} : \quad (17)$$

One would obtain the same fluctuation working in a slab geometry and addressing the fluctuation of the P component normal to the slab. Eq. (17) applies to correlated wavefunctions, and is invalid for independent-electron ones; it provides a finite value both in insulators and metals. We are going to verify the above general findings on the simplest metal of all, namely, the homogeneous electron gas, showing that $\hbar^2 i_c$ is finite in the noninteracting case, and finite in the interacting one.

In order to make contact with the electron-gas literature, we need to introduce the static structure factor defined as

$$S(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)} : \quad (18)$$

This is identically expressed in terms of the one- and two-body densities as:

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{k}) &= 1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \int d\mathbf{r} \int d\mathbf{r}' e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')} n^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}'); \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \int d\mathbf{r} \int d\mathbf{r}' e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')} [n^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}') - n(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}')] : \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

For $k = 0$ the second term is equal to N , which obviously diverges in the thermodynamic limit: such -like singularity is neglected as usual. We then expand in powers of k imposing centrosymmetry: therefore the second term is quartic, and we have to second order:

$$S(k) = \sum_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}^0} \frac{k \cdot k}{2N} \sum_{\mathbf{r}'} \sum_{\mathbf{r}''} [n^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0) - n(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}^0)] \quad (20)$$

Therefore for an isotropic system

$$\hbar^2 i_c = \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} S(k) = k^2: \quad (21)$$

For the noninteracting (either Hartree-Fock or Kohn-Sham) electron gas the one-body density, and hence $S(k)$, are known exactly [3]: this in fact leads to a divergent Eq. (21). Polarization fluctuations are indeed BC- (or shape-) independent, and diverge even in the longitudinal case, thus confirming our general finding.

In the interacting case $S(k)$, as defined here, depends on shape via Eq. (20), whereas in the existing electron-gas literature $S(k)$ is apparently shape-independent. The reason is very simple: such literature addresses charge fluctuations, not polarization fluctuations. It has been stressed above that no macroscopic charge is associated to transverse polarization fluctuations: charge fluctuations manifest themselves only within longitudinal BCs, which are therefore implicitly assumed by electron-gas theorists. Our longitudinal Eq. (17), together with Eq. (21), yields

$$S(k) = \frac{\hbar k^2}{4 \pi^2 e^2 N} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}'} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}; \quad (22)$$

which indeed is the standard fluctuation-dissipation theorem for the interacting electron gas, known since the 1950s [4]. The frequency integral is finite: replacement into Eq. (21) confirms that the longitudinal polarization fluctuation $\hbar^2 i_c$ is finite as well.

In conclusion, I have reconciled two different forms of the fluctuation-dissipation sum rule for quantum many-body systems: one recent [1] and one old [4]. The two were apparently contradictory and apparently unrelated. Instead, I have shown that a more general sum rule holds, yielding the previously known ones as special cases. At

the root of the generalization is a careful treatment of electron correlation in Coulomb systems. Remarkably, the novel feature found here is a pure correlation effect, not present at the Hartree-Fock or Kohn-Sham level.

Discussions with G. Senatore are gratefully acknowledged. Work supported by ONR grant N00014-03-1-0570 and grant PRIN 2004 from the Italian Ministry of University and Research.

-
- [1] I. Souza, T. W. Ilkens, and R. M. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B 62, 1666 (2000).
 - [2] W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. 133, A171 (1964).
 - [3] D. Pines, The Many Body Problem (Benjamin, New York, 1962).
 - [4] P. Nozières and D. Pines, Nuovo Cimento 9, 470 (1958); reprinted in Ref. [3], p. 235.
 - [5] R. Resta, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1800 (1998).
 - [6] R. Resta and S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 370 (1999).
 - [7] R. Resta, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 14, R625 (2002).
 - [8] W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 3168 (1996).
 - [9] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, Statistical Physics II, Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics, Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences, Vol. 31, (Springer, Berlin, 1985).
 - [10] D. Forster, Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry, and Correlation Functions (Benjamin, Reading, 1975).
 - [11] A. D. McLachlan and M. A. Ball, Rev. Mod. Phys. 36, 844 (1964).
 - [12] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, Electrodynamics of Continuous Media (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1984), Ch. 2.
 - [13] K. Schonhammer and W. Brenig, Phys. Lett. 42A, 447 (1973).
 - [14] E. K. Kudinov, Fizika Tverdogo Tela 33, 2306 (1991) [English translation: Sov. Phys. Solid State 33, 1299 (1991)].
 - [15] P. Nozières and D. Pines, Nuovo Cimento 9, 470 (1958).
 - [16] K. Huang, Proc. Roy. Soc. A 203, 178 (1950).
 - [17] A. A. Maradudin, E. W. Montroll, G. H. Weiss, and I. P. Ipatova, Theory of Lattice Dynamics in the Harmonic Approximation, Solid State Physics, Suppl. 3 (Academic, New York, 1971).
 - [18] S. Baroni, S. de Gironcoli, A. Dal Corso, and P. Giannozzi, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73, 515 (2001).
 - [19] The case of general n is considered in: Ph. Ghosez, J.-P. Michenaud, and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. B 58, 6224 (1998).
 - [20] D. Frenkel and B. Smit, Understanding Molecular Simulation: from Algorithms to Applications, 2nd ed. (Academic, San Diego, 2002).
 - [21] M. Neumann, Mol. Phys. 50, 841 (1983).