

Superconductivity in the two-band Hubbard model in Infinite Dimensions

Antoine Georges*, Gabriel Kotliar**, and Werner Krauth***

* Laboratoire de Physique Theorique de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure¹
24, rue Lhomond 75231 Paris Cedex 05; France
e-mail: georges@physique.ens.fr

* Serin Physics Laboratory, Rutgers University
Piscataway, NJ 08855-0849, USA
e-mail: kotliar@physics.rutgers.edu

**Laboratoire de Physique Statistique de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure²
24, rue Lhomond 75231 Paris Cedex 05; France
e-mail: krauth@physique.ens.fr

We study a two-band Hubbard model in the limit of infinite dimensions, using a combination of analytical methods and Monte-Carlo techniques. The normal state is found to display various metal to insulators transitions as a function of doping and interaction strength. We derive self-consistent equations for the local Green's functions in the presence of superconducting long-range order, and extend previous algorithms to this case. We present direct numerical evidence that in a specific range of parameter space, the normal state is unstable against a superconducting state characterized by a strongly frequency dependent order-parameter.

¹ Unité propre du CNRS (UP 701) associée à l'ENS et à l'Université Paris-Sud

² Laboratoire associé au CNRS (URA 1306) et aux Universités Paris VI et Paris VII

PACS numbers: 71.10+x, 75.10.Lp, 71.45.Lr, 75.30.Fv

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of high temperature superconductivity in the copper-based transition metal oxides has revived the interest in superconductivity of strongly correlated electron systems. Mechanisms of high temperature superconductivity which are not phonon-mediated have been sought for a long time, and their existence has remained a controversial subject. This old problem cannot be settled by perturbative methods [1].

The large-dimensionality limit of the strong correlation problem has received much recent attention [2], [3], [8], [4], [5], [7] [9] [10] [11] especially in the context of the Hubbard model. This is a nontrivial limit of the strong correlation problem which can be solved non-perturbatively.

In this paper we define a model with two degrees of freedom per unit cell which also has a well defined limit when the coordination number gets large. On the atomic scale the interactions in this model are purely repulsive. We show that the normal phase is stable against phase separation and displays interesting metal-insulator transitions as a function of doping, and of the interaction strength.

For the first time we give in this paper a derivation of the self-consistent equations for the local Green's functions in the presence of off-diagonal superconducting long range order that become exact in the limit of infinite dimensions. We then solve these equations by extending the Hirsch-Fye Quantum Monte Carlo algorithm [12].

We present evidence that in a well defined region of parameters of the two-band model the normal state is unstable against a superconducting state, characterized by a strongly frequency dependent superconducting order parameter. We observe that superconductivity in this model is promoted in regions of parameters where two different atomic configurations are close in energy, that is in the mixed valence regime.

II. THE MODEL

We consider the following hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_{i2A; j2B}^X t_{ij} d_i^\dagger p_j + \text{h.c.} + \sum_{j2B}^X p_j^\dagger p_j + \sum_{i2A}^X d_i^\dagger d_i + U_d \sum_{i2A}^X n_{i\uparrow}^d n_{i\downarrow}^d \quad (1)$$

($d; p$) represent two atomic orbitals on different sublattices (A;B) of a bipartite lattice. The ('copper') orbital d is strongly correlated, while the ('oxygen') orbital p is uncorrelated. Each site has identical connectivity z , so that the model describes a 'CuO'-type system. A two-dimensional three-band model has been proposed by Emery [17] and by Varna et al [18] as a minimal model of the copper-oxide CuO_2 planes. The model we consider is similar in spirit, while having a non-trivial large d limit (as opposed to other possible generalizations of multiband models which have somewhat degenerate large d limits [6], [19]). Multiband models have been investigated intensively, but no clear numerical evidence for superconductivity in two dimensions has so far been obtained [20], [23]. In infinite dimensions several circumstances facilitate the numerical work: the model reduces to an effective single-site model, in which the thermodynamic limit is taken exactly, without the need for finite-size extrapolations, and the Monte Carlo algorithm is free from minus-sign problems, allowing us to reach lower temperatures than in previous works [20] [23].

In the absence of correlations ($U_d = 0$), diagonalization of H yields two bands (bonding and antibonding): $E_k = \epsilon_p + \frac{t_{ij}^2}{(\epsilon_p - \epsilon_d)^2 + 4t_k^2}g=2$, where t_k is the Fourier transform of t_{ij} . These bands are separated by a gap $2(\epsilon_p - \epsilon_d)$. (Having in mind the copper-oxides in the hole representation, we choose throughout this paper $\epsilon_d < \epsilon_p$). For a total hole density $n = \langle n_d \rangle + \langle n_p \rangle$ smaller than 2, the $U_d = 0$ ground state is a partially filled copper band and an empty oxygen band. For $2 < n < 4$, the $U_d = 0$ ground-state is a full d-band and a partially filled p-band. The $T = 0$ chemical potential is discontinuous as a function of density at $n = 2$, with $(n = 2^-) = \epsilon_d$, $(n = 2^+) = \epsilon_p$. Hence, for $U_d = 0$, this model describes a metal for all densities except $n = 2$, where one has a band insulator. The copper and oxygen density of states have simple expressions for $U_d = 0$:

$$N_d(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_k \frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_p)(\epsilon - \epsilon_d)} N_p(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_k \frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_p)(\epsilon - \epsilon_d)} \quad (2)$$

where $N(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_k)$.

The limit of infinite connectivity $z \rightarrow \infty$ requires a scaling of the hybridization t_{ij} as: $t_{ij} = t_{pd} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}}$, so that the density of states $N(\epsilon)$ has a proper limit [2]. In practice, one may consider the d -dimensional hypercubic lattice ($z = 2d$), for which: $N(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_{pd})^2} e^{-2t_{pd}^2}$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$ or the Bethe lattice with connectivity z for which $N(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_{pd})^2} = 2 \frac{1}{t_{pd}^2}$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. We shall establish the general equations for an arbitrary $N(\epsilon)$ but, for the sake of simplicity, will perform all numerical simulations for the Bethe lattice.

It is by now well-established that, in the limit $z \rightarrow \infty$, the problem reduces to a single-site 'impurity' model supplemented by a self-consistency condition. Standard methods [6] that will not be reviewed here allow us to derive the corresponding equations for the one-particle Green's functions. In this section, we assume no long-range order of any kind (magnetic or superconducting) and display equations valid in the paramagnetic normal state.

Since only the 'copper' sites are correlated, all the local quantities can be derived from an impurity model for those sites only. The effective action of the impurity model is given by:

$$S = U_d \sum_0 d^\dagger n_d n_d + \sum_0 d^\dagger \sum_0 d^0 X_d(\epsilon) D_0^{-1}(\epsilon) d^0 \quad (3)$$

We denote by $D(\epsilon) = \langle T d(\epsilon) d^\dagger(\epsilon) \rangle_S$ the interacting Green's function calculated with this action and by Σ_d the impurity self-energy (seen as a functional of D_0), $\Sigma_d(i!_n) = D_0^{-1}(i!_n) - D^{-1}(i!_n)$. The self-consistency equation for D_0 then reads, ($i!_n = (2n+1) = 0$):

$$D(i!_n) = \frac{1}{p(i!_n)} \sum_p \frac{N(\epsilon)}{p(i!_n) - \Sigma_d(i!_n)} \quad (4)$$

where we have set $p(i!_n) = i!_n + \frac{1}{p}$, $d(i!_n) = i!_n + \frac{1}{d}$ and $d(i!_n)$.

Once Eqs.(4), (3) are solved for D_0 , the impurity self energy evaluated at the self consistent value of D_0 gives the d electron lattice self energy. In the $(d_k; p_k)$ basis, it reads in matrix form:

$$\frac{1}{p_d - \frac{2}{k}} \quad \begin{matrix} p & k \\ k & d \end{matrix} \quad (5)$$

In the $z \rightarrow 1$ limit, self-energies become purely site-diagonal, so that ϵ_d depends only on frequency and the t_{pd} component is absent. The absence of the diagonal component ϵ_p in eq.(5) comes from the simplifying assumption of an uncorrelated p-orbital. From eq.(5), one sees that the self-consistency equation simply means that the impurity model Green's function must coincide with the on-site d-orbital Green's function: $D(i!_n) = \sum_k D(k; i!_n)$. Also, the p-orbital on-site Green's function is simply given by:

$$P(i!_n) = \epsilon_d(i!_n) \sum_k \frac{N(k)}{t_{pd}(i!_n) \epsilon_d(i!_n) - \epsilon_p(k)} \quad (6)$$

It is straightforward to extend these equations to a model involving a Hubbard repulsion on oxygen orbitals also. One then has to solve simultaneously two separate impurity models, one for each orbital, and both ϵ_d and ϵ_p enter the self-consistency equations (4,6). It is also possible to include a direct oxygen-oxygen hopping t_{pp} (with a $1/z$ scaling as $z \rightarrow 1$). For the sake of simplicity, these additional terms will not be considered in this paper.

Throughout the rest of this paper, we shall work with the $z = 1$ Bethe lattice with the semi-circular d.o.s. given above. This is motivated by the very simple form taken by the self-consistency equations in this case:

$$D_0^{-1} = i!_n + \epsilon_d - t_{pd}^2 P(i!_n) \quad P^{-1} = i!_n + \epsilon_p - t_{pd}^2 D(i!_n) \quad (7)$$

A direct way to derive these equations for the Bethe lattice is to integrate out fermionic degrees of freedom on all lattice sites except a single one. Because of the $z = 1$ limit, only one-particle processes (involving the full Green's functions $D; P$) are generated in this partial summation, yielding the effective action eq. (3), with D_0 explicitly given in terms of D by eq.(7).

In order to solve the coupled problem defined by eqs.(3), (7), we use a numerical method that has been described in detail elsewhere [7] [9] [10] [11]. It is based on an iterative procedure: for a given imaginary-time $D_0(\tau)$, the impurity model (3) is solved (given a discretization of the interval $[0; \beta]$ in $L = \beta/\tau$ time slices) using the Hirsch-Fye quantum Monte-Carlo algorithm. This produces a discretized $D(\tau)$ which, after Fourier transformation, is inserted into eq.(7) in order to produce a 'new' function D_0 . This process is iterated until convergence is reached.

III. METAL-INSULATOR TRANSITIONS

A. The metal-insulator transition at $n = 1$

For a density $n = 1$ this model displays a transition from a metallic to an insulating state following a scenario outlined by Zaanen, Sawatzky and Allen [13].

For very large $U_d = U_0$ and $t_{pd} \ll U_0 = \epsilon_p - \epsilon_d$, the $n = 1$ ground state has all copper sites nearly singly occupied and all oxygen sites nearly empty. Hybridization between the two orbitals costs an energy $\sim U_0$, while the kinetic energy gain is only $\sim t_{pd}^2/U_0$. Hence, for $t_{pd} \ll U_0$, we have a charge-transfer insulator at $n = 1$, with a jump in the chemical potential ($n = 1^+$) - ($n = 1^-$) $\neq 0$. The numerical data for $n_d; n_p$ and the total density

n as a function of the chemical potential $\sim U_d$ confirms these expectations. In fig. 1, we show data at $t_{pd} = 30$, $U_d = 8$, and $t_0 = 4$.

In the opposite limit ($t_{pd} \gg t_0$) the delocalization energy wins, and we have a strongly correlated metal with a strong hybridization of 'copper' and 'oxygen' orbitals. A metal to charge-transfer insulator transition separates these two regimes, at $(t_0 = t_{pd})_c = 0$ (1) for large U_d .

In the opposite regime of weak correlations ($U_d \ll t_0$), the metal-insulator transition at $n = 1$ has the character of a Mott transition within the copper band. Assuming that $t_{pd} \ll t_0$, most of the d-orbital density of states is, for $U_d = 0$, concentrated around ϵ_d , with a small bandwidth of order $t_{pd}^2 = t_0$ (see eq.2) and the hybridization with the oxygen orbital is weak. As U_d is increased, the lower copper band is gradually split by the interactions, and a Mott transition occurs when U_d becomes comparable to the bandwidth $t_{pd}^2 = t_0$, i.e. $(t_0 = t_{pd})_c \sim t_{pd} = U_d$ for small U_d . In fig. 2 we show data at $t_{pd} = 30$, $U_d = 1.5$, and $t_0 = 4$ displaying this behavior.

Based on these arguments, the phase boundary separating the metallic and insulating regimes at $n = 1$ is expected to have the schematic shape [13] described in fig. 3.

When $U_d \sim t_0$, there is a crossover regime which to our knowledge has not been investigated previously. Data in this region is shown in fig. 4. The detailed investigation of these phase transitions is left for future work.

B. The metal to band insulator transition at $n = 2$

Interactions can also induce a transition from insulating to metallic behavior at a density $n = 2$. At $U_d = 0$ the system is a band insulator with a band gap $\epsilon_0 - \epsilon_p - U_d$. Turning on the interactions has the effect of reducing the band gap. Whenever the gap is less than the temperature, we expect metallic behavior.

This change from insulating to metallic behavior at $n = 2$ is clear in the n vs U_d curves in figs 1, 2 and 4. In fig 2 the case $U_d < t_0$ is realized, for which the atomic ground-state [14] at $n = 2$ has nearly all copper sites doubly occupied and all oxygen sites empty. We see gaps at $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ with $(n = 1^+) - (n = 1^-) \sim U_d$, $(n = 2^+) - (n = 2^-) \sim t_0 - U_d$. In fig 1 the case $U_d > t_0$ is realized and the corresponding atomic ground-state at $n = 2$ [14] has all copper and oxygen sites singly occupied. Here, gaps exist at $n = 1$ and $n = 3$, with $(n = 1^+) - (n = 1^-) \sim t_0$, $(n = 3^+) - (n = 3^-) \sim U_d - t_0$.

Hence an insulator to metal transition can be thought to occur at $n = 2$ at a critical value of the ratio $U_d = t_0$, which can be interpreted as the upper Hubbard band hitting the p level. In fig. (4) such an intermediate situation is realized. Below, we find that very interesting physics arises in the mixed valence regime ($U_d \sim t_0$), where the strongly correlated copper level lies close to the uncorrelated oxygen level.

Additional insights on this transition can be gained by looking at the self-consistency equation (7) for the special point $\mu = \epsilon_p$, which reads for low-frequency ($\omega \rightarrow 0$):

$$D(0 + i0^+)^{-1} + \epsilon_d(0 + i0^+) = \epsilon_p - \epsilon_d + D(0 + i0^+)^{-1} \quad (8)$$

The low-frequency behaviour of D and ϵ_d is severely constrained by this equation, which allows two different solutions: i) $D(i0^+) = 0$ and ii) $\epsilon_d(i0^+) + \epsilon_d = \epsilon_p$. Case i) is obviously

realized for small U_d , while case ii) can be interpreted as the effective d level $(i0^+) + \epsilon_d$ becoming degenerate with the p level. Although we cannot obtain the numerical solution at zero temperature we find numerical evidence that one goes from i) to ii) as U_d is increased. This is readily seen in the data of Fig. 5-8 for four different values of the interaction strength. From these curves, it is apparent that $\epsilon_d(i0^+)$ remains close to $\epsilon_p - \epsilon_d$ for all values of U_d larger than a critical value. These figures display in fact the results of two subsequent iterations of the self-consistency loop, which we display in order to highlight the remarkable accuracy of the Monte Carlo algorithm.

The qualitative behavior of n vs U_d can also be understood from a Hubbard III-type solution of the coupled equations (7), which takes into account the physics of high-energy processes in a qualitatively correct manner [9], [11]. The appropriate generalization of the Hubbard III approach to the two-band model inserts the following expression for $D(i!_n)$

$$D(i!_n) \approx \frac{1}{2} f D_0 + \frac{1}{D_0^{-1} - U_d} g \quad (9)$$

into the self-consistency equation (7), to obtain the following closed equation for $D(i!_n)$:

$$t_{pd}^4 (x_d^2 - U_d^2 = 4) D^3 + t_{pd}^2 (x_p U_d^2 = 2 - 2x_p x_d^2 + t_{pd}^2 x_d) D^2 + x^2 - U_d^2 x_p^2 = 4 + t_{pd}^2 x_p x_d + t_{pd}^2 x) D - x x_p = 0 \quad (10)$$

where $x_d = i!_n - \epsilon_d$, $x_p = i!_n - \epsilon_p$, $x = x_p x_d - t_{pd}^2$.

This simple approximation gives a rather satisfactory account of the various metal-insulator transitions described above: zero-temperature spectral densities are displayed in Fig. 9 for various values of the parameters. It is unable however to account for the low-energy quasiparticle excitations in the metallic regimes, since it just ignores the Kondo effect in the impurity model eq. (3).

IV. SUPERCONDUCTING PROPERTIES

A. Dynamical pairing in infinite dimensions

In this section we extend the $d = 1$ formalism to incorporate the possibility of superconducting long-range order. The equations that we will establish here allow the investigation of the model within the broken symmetry phase (cf [6] [11] where the Hubbard model was studied within magnetically ordered states). Let us define 'anomalous' Green's functions:

$$F_d(i!_n, 0) = T \langle d_{i,\uparrow}(0) d_{i,\uparrow}(0) \rangle = F_p(i!_n, 0) = T \langle p_{i,\uparrow}(0) p_{i,\uparrow}(0) \rangle \quad (11)$$

describing the formation of on-site pairs. Singlet pairing corresponds to F even: $F(i!_n) = F(i!_n) = F(i!_n)$, while $S_z = 0$ triplet pairing corresponds to F odd: $F(i!_n) = -F(i!_n) = F(i!_n)$. Allowing for a non-trivial time-dependence of F is crucial. The underlying physical idea is that on-site equal-time pairing is likely to be strongly suppressed in the presence of a strong on-site repulsion but that pairing involving a 'time-lag' between the paired holes may occur. This idea dates back to Berezinskii's proposal [21] for triplet pairing in ^3He , a generalization of which has been recently considered for cuprate superconductors by Balatsky and Abrahams [22] in the singlet case.

In the presence of a non-zero F it is convenient to work with Nambu spinors $\begin{pmatrix} d^\dagger \\ d \end{pmatrix}$ (similarly $\begin{pmatrix} p^\dagger \\ p \end{pmatrix}$) and with the matrix formulation of one-particle Green's functions:

$$D(\omega) = T \langle d(\omega) d^\dagger(\omega) \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} G_d(\omega) & F_d(\omega) \\ F_d(\omega) & G_d(\omega) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \quad (12)$$

With these notations, the kinetic term of the hamiltonian H reads: $t_{ij} \sum_{\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}$ where σ denotes the Pauli matrix. Following the usual method, we integrate out fermionic variables on all sites except on a single copper site. The 'impurity' action obtained in this way now reads:

$$S_{\text{sup}} = U_d \sum_{\sigma} d_{\sigma}^\dagger d_{\sigma} n_{d\sigma}^\dagger n_{d\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{\sigma'} d_{\sigma}^\dagger D_0^{-1}(\omega) d_{\sigma'}(\omega) \quad (13)$$

where D_0 is given in terms of D and P by the self-consistency equations:

$$\begin{aligned} D_0^{-1}(i!_n) &= i!_n + \sum_{\sigma} t_{pd}^2 P(i!_n)_{\sigma} \\ P^{-1}(i!_n) &= i!_n + \sum_{\sigma} t_{pd}^2 D(i!_n)_{\sigma} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We can account for an externally applied dynamic pairing field $\Delta_d(i!_n)$ on all copper sites in the original lattice problem by adding a forcing term

$$\sum_{\sigma} \Delta_d(i!_n) d_{\sigma}^\dagger(i!_n) d_{\sigma}(i!_n) \quad (15)$$

to the r. h. s. of eq. (14).

The impurity action eq. (13) describes an Anderson impurity in a superconducting medium. Since this problem, even with static pairing [24] turns out to be highly non trivial, we can expect that the self consistent solution of eq. (14) will allow very intricate densities of states.

B. Algorithm in the presence of pairing [16]

In the present paragraph we show how the Hirsch-Fye algorithm [12] can be generalized in the presence of off-diagonal terms (in the spin indices) in the Green's function eq. (12) which, after the usual Trotter breakup, becomes a $2L \times 2L$ matrix.

The quartic term in the action is decoupled, as usual, by the introduction of Ising variables.

$$\exp[-U n^\dagger n^\dagger (n + n^\dagger)^2] = \text{Tr} \exp[-(1) [n^\dagger n^\dagger]] \quad (16)$$

According to the prescription given by Soper [15], all terms in the action have to be normal-ordered (here, in $\begin{pmatrix} d^\dagger \\ d \end{pmatrix}$; with $\begin{pmatrix} d^\dagger \\ d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d^\dagger \\ c_\# \end{pmatrix}$), before performing the discretization. Consequently, eq. (16) is written as

$$\text{Tr} \exp[-[c_1^\dagger c_1 + c_2^\dagger c_2]] \exp[-(1)] \quad (17)$$

The Green's functions for different spin configurations are related by the following Dyson equation:

$$D_{\sigma} = D + (D^{-1}) (\exp(W^{\sigma} - W) - 1) D_{\sigma} \quad (18)$$

where $D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}; \sigma)$ is the full $2L \times 2L$ matrix Green's function of σ for a given spin configuration (l) , and $W_{\mathbf{k}} = W_{\mathbf{k}+L}(\mathbf{k})$. Eq. (18) is derived in the same way as the one in ref. [12], and differs from that expression only in a sign for the down-spin sector. The Green's function of the model is given by

$$D(\mathbf{k}; \sigma) = \frac{\text{Tr} [D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}; \sigma) \det(D^{-1}) \exp(\frac{1}{P} \sum_{\mathbf{l}} D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}))]}{\det(D^{-1}) \exp(\frac{1}{P} \sum_{\mathbf{l}} D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}))} \quad (19)$$

The statistical weight of a configuration is thus given by the product of the usual fermion determinant, and of a scalar factor, which arises from the commutator in eq. (16).

As in the Hirsch-Fye algorithm [12], we can use the Dyson equation to calculate the ratio R of statistical weights for flipping a spin $\sigma(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow \sigma'(\mathbf{k}) = -\sigma(\mathbf{k})$,

$$R = R_{\sigma} R_{\#} \exp(-2 \beta \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) \quad (20)$$

$$R_{\sigma} = 1 + \beta \sum_{\mathbf{l}} D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}) f \quad (21)$$

$$R_{\#} = 1 + \beta \sum_{\mathbf{l}} D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k} + L; \mathbf{k} + L) - D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k} + L; \mathbf{k}) D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k} + L) f = (1 + \beta \sum_{\mathbf{l}} D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}) f) f \quad (22)$$

with $f = \exp(-2 \beta \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - 1$. Once a flip of spin $\sigma(\mathbf{k})$ is accepted, all the elements of the $2L \times 2L$ Green's function are updated in a 2-step procedure, corresponding to the flip of $W_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $W_{\mathbf{k}+L}$.

$$D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{l}') = D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{l}') + (D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k}) - D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k}')) f = (1 + \beta \sum_{\mathbf{l}} D_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}) f) D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{l}') \quad (23)$$

$$D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{l}') = D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{l}') + D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k} + L) - D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k} + L') f = (1 + \beta \sum_{\mathbf{l}} D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{k} + L; \mathbf{k} + L') f) D^{\sigma}(\mathbf{k} + L; \mathbf{l}') \quad (24)$$

We have extensively compared the algorithm with exact diagonalization results for an impurity interacting with a few conduction electrons in the presence of explicit pairing terms $d^{\dagger} d^{\dagger}$, and conclude that the algorithm is correct, and practical. In g. 10 we show data of one such realization of the superconducting Anderson model for $\beta = 1; 5; 25; 125$, and ∞ (exact diagonalization). Notice the quadratic convergence.

C. Numerical Results

To investigate the transition into the superconducting state at finite temperature we define a pairing susceptibility $\chi_p(i!_n; i!_m)$

$$F_d(i!_n) = \sum_m \chi_p(i!_n; i!_m) d(i!_m) - d(i!_m) \neq 0 \quad (25)$$

This susceptibility is a well defined symmetric matrix and is finite in the normal state. The divergence of its largest eigenvalue signals the transition into the superconducting state.

In our approach it is natural to express χ_p in terms of two operators, χ_K and χ_{pd} . $\chi_K(i!_n; i!_m)$ describes the pairing response of the impurity model eq. (13)

$$F_d(i!_n) = \sum_m \chi_K(i!_n; i!_m) [G_{0d}^{-1}]_{12}(i!_m) - [G_{0d}^{-1}]_{12} = 0 \quad (26)$$

while the diagonal operator χ_{pd} describes the response of the self consistent medium to the impurity site and can be obtained from eq.(14) as $\chi_{\text{pd}}(n; m) = \sum_{n'm'} t_{pd}^4 P(i!_n) P(i!_{n'})$.

Clearly, χ_K , χ_{pd} and χ_p are related by the following equation

$$\chi_p = [\mathbb{I} - \chi_K]^{-1} \chi_K \quad (27)$$

When the largest eigenvalue of χ_K approaches one, the susceptibility diverges. It is clearly more accurate to study the behavior of the largest eigenvalue of χ_K and we do that by the power method using the full algorithm. To do this, we run the algorithm described in the previous section a large number of times, starting with a small value of the off-diagonal term $F(i!_n; i!_0)$ of the Green's function. In the normal state, $F(i!_n; i!_0)$ will converge to zero and two subsequent runs will yield two functions $F(i!_n; i!_0)$ and $F(i!_0; i!_0)$ obeying

$$F(i!_0; i!_0) = \lambda_{\text{max}}^{-1} F(i!_0; i!_0) F(i!_0; i!_0) \quad (28)$$

λ_{max} is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix (cf eq. (26) and $F(i!_0; i!_0)$ converges to the corresponding right eigenvector, which is also the eigenvector corresponding to the most unstable eigenvalue of the susceptibility matrix.

In fig (11), we show λ_{max} vs n at a relatively high temperature $T = 15$ in the singlet sector, i.e., after explicitly anti-symmetrizing the functions $F(i!_n)$ and $F_0(i!_n)$ with respect to $\sigma = 2$. In order to assess the importance of finite size effects, we have plotted λ_{max} for $L = 16; 32; 64$. Let us stress that this extrapolation is the only error in our calculation, since the statistical uncertainty and the uncertainty stemming from the self-consistency condition are extremely small. All of our data is consistent with quadratic convergence in L^{-2} for small values of n which we have clearly established for the Green's function itself.

The susceptibility seems to have a local maximum close to the density $n = 1$, and is again large at around $n = 2$. We notice that the tendency towards superconductivity is largest near half filling and near $n = 2$, i.e. in the mixed valence regime.

We have been able to produce perfectly converged superconducting solutions of the mean-field equations in the singlet case for temperatures within our reach. The solution for $F(i!_n)$, at temperatures just below T_c is very similar to the largest eigenvector of the susceptibility matrix above T_c . The finite value of T_c produces large finite size effects in the value of $T_c(L)$. At this point we have established that $T_c(L = 64) = 37$, $T_c(L = 128) = 59$ and $T_c(L = 192) = 75$. A reliable finite size scaling of this quantity to determine the value of the critical temperature requires larger simulations and will be described elsewhere. Here we use the fact that the largest eigenvector of the susceptibility matrix converges very well to discuss the nature of the possible superconductivity in this system. Of particular importance is the different and strong frequency dependence on the copper and the oxygen sites.

Examples of such numerical solutions are given in fig 12 for 128 time slices, at the value which seems to be most favorable for the appearance of superconductivity $\beta_0 = 4$. The

Fourier transform of the order parameter on the copper site near T_c are displayed in fig 13. Notice (inset of fig 12) that the pairing amplitude is much larger on oxygen sites than on copper sites, as expected, and that the equal-time pairing $F(0)$ is nearly zero on copper sites.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper we introduced a controlled approach to the study of the occurrence of superconductivity in strongly correlated systems. We extended the mean field approach to the strong correlation problem of ref. [4] to derive a self consistent picture of a correlated superconductor which becomes exact in infinite dimensions. As in the corresponding treatment of the normal state ([4]) an impurity model plays the role of the mean field hamiltonian. The impurity model corresponding to a correlated superconductor is an Anderson impurity model embedded in a superconducting medium. The quantities that correspond most closely to the Weiss field is now a set of two functions that describe the diagonal and the off diagonal response of the effective medium. A numerical solution of the self consistent equations for the Green's functions revealed a strong frequency dependence of the superconducting order parameter.

Using this method we investigated the most promising regions for high temperature superconductivity in the present version of the extended Hubbard model in large dimensions. The largest tendencies towards superconductivity were found when the normal phase is in a mixed valence regime.

There are several natural extensions of this work. One can study the effect of adding extra interactions in the hamiltonian on the superconducting transition temperature of the system. While the critical temperatures we found are relatively high, a better understanding of the behaviour of the solution of our equations may lead to higher transition temperatures. Finally, as emphasized throughout the text, larger simulations are called for. They should allow the finite size scaling analysis which can fully elucidate the existence of the superconducting state proposed here. A completely open problem is the study of the physical properties of this superconducting state. We stress that because of the strong correlations a non perturbative treatment like the one outlined in our paper is necessary for tackling this problem.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

W. Krauth would like to thank the physics department at Rutgers University for its kind hospitality. G. Kotliar acknowledges the support of the NSF under grant DMR 922-4000 and the hospitality of the theoretical physics group at the ENS where this work began.

-
- [1] For a recent review of this problem see the lectures by P. Littlewood to appear in 'Correlated Electron Systems', proceedings of the Jerusalem Winter School of Theoretical Physics, V. J. Emery ed. (World Scientific).
- [2] W. Metzner and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 324 (1989).
- [3] V. Janis Z. Phys. B 83, 227 (1991) V. Janis and D. Vollhardt Int. Jour. Mod Phys. B 6, 731 (1992).
- [4] A. Georges and G. Kotliar Phys. Rev. B 45 6479 (1992)
- [5] For a recent review and references, see e.g. D. Vollhardt, to appear in 'Correlated Electron Systems', proceedings of the Jerusalem Winter School of Theoretical Physics, V. J. Emery ed. (World Scientific). (preprint RWTH/IITP-C 6/92).
- [6] For a review of the method to derive self consistent equations for interacting Fermi systems on a lattice with infinite coordination, see A. Georges, G. Kotliar and Q. Si, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 6, 705 (1992)
- [7] M. Jarrell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 168 (1992).
- [8] F. Okhawa Phys. Rev. B 44. 6812 (1991)
- [9] M. Rozenberg, X. Y. Zhang and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1236 (1992)
- [10] A. Georges and W. Krauth, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1240 (1992)
- [11] A. Georges and W. Krauth, LPTENS preprint 92/24 (1992)
- [12] J. E. Hirsch and R. M. Fye, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56 2521 (1986)
- [13] J. Zaanen, G. A. Sawatzky, and J. W. Allen Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 418 (1985)
- [14] Note that, in the atomic limit $t_{pd} = 0$, the total hole density vs: chemical potential is given by:
- $$n_{\text{atomic}} = (n_d) + (n_d + U_d) + 2(n_p).$$
- [15] D. Soper Phys. Rev. D 18, 4596 (1978)
- [16] In this section we follow the Hirsch and Fye notation and define the Green's functions with an extra minus sign relative to the other sections.
- [17] V. Emery Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 2794 (1987).
- [18] C. Vamata S. Schmitt-Rink and E. Abrahams Solid State Comm 62, 681 (1987).
- [19] C. Gros, preprint
- [20] G. Dopf, A. Muramatsu and W. Hanke Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 353 (1992)
- [21] V. L. Berezinskii, JETP Lett. 20, 287 (1974)
- [22] A. V. Balatsky and E. Abrahams, Phys. Rev. B 45, 13125 (1992)
- [23] M. Imada J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 56, 3793 (1987)
- [24] E. Muller-Hartmann and J. Zittartz, Z. Phys. B 234, 58 (1970) M. Jarrell, D. Sivia and B. Patton Phys. Rev. B 42, 4804 (1990) H. Shiba K. Satori O. Sakai and Y. Shimizu (Preprint).

Figure Captions

1. n_p (full line) n_d (dotted line) and n (dashed line) vs β_d at $\beta_0 = 4$ $U_d = 8$, and $\beta = 30$.
2. n_p (full line) n_d (dotted line) and n (dashed line) vs β_d at $\beta_0 = 4$ $U_d = 1.5$, and $\beta = 30$.
3. The Zaanen Sawatzky Allen phase diagram. The special point occurs when $U_d = \beta_0$
4. n_p (full line) n_d (dotted line) and n (dashed line) vs β_d at $\beta_0 = 4$ $U_d = 4.5$, and $\beta = 30$.
5. $\text{Im}(G(i\beta_n))$ (full line) and $\text{Re}(G(i\beta_n))$ (dotted line) for $U_d = 1.5$, $\beta_d = 4$, $\beta_0 = 4$, and $\beta = 45$ ($L = 128$).
6. $\text{Im}(G(i\beta_n))$ (full line) and $\text{Re}(G(i\beta_n))$ (dotted line) for $U_d = 2.5$, $\beta_d = 4$, $\beta_0 = 4$, and $\beta = 45$ ($L = 128$).
7. $\text{Im}(G(i\beta_n))$ (full line) and $\text{Re}(G(i\beta_n))$ (dotted line) for $U_d = 4.5$, $\beta_d = 4$, $\beta_0 = 4$, and $\beta = 45$ ($L = 128$).
8. $\text{Im}(G(i\beta_n))$ (full line) and $\text{Re}(G(i\beta_n))$ (dotted line) for $U_d = 6.5$, $\beta_d = 4$, $\beta_0 = 4$, and $\beta = 45$ ($L = 128$).
9. Hubbard III approximation for the one-particle density of states $\rho_d(\beta)$ vs β for $\beta_0 = 4$, and $U_d = .25; 3; 4.5; 8$
10. Green's function $G(\beta = 0)$ and $F(\beta = 0)$ in one realization of the superconducting Anderson model for $\beta = 1; .5; .25; .125$, and 0 (exact diagonalization). We have observed quadratic convergence of the Green's functions for any value of β and a wide range of parameters.
11. ρ vs n at $\beta = 15$ and $L = 16$ (upper curve), 32, and 64 (lower curve) at the special point $\beta_0 = 4$, $U_d = 4.5$, $\beta_d = 4$,
12. Green's functions $G_d(\beta)$ and $F_d(\beta)$ at the special point $\beta_0 = 4$, $\beta_d = 4$, at $U_d = 4.5$. $\beta = 64$ and $L = 128$. The inset shows $S_d(\beta)$ and $F_p(\beta)$.
13. The real part of $F_d(i\beta_n)$ vs β_n on the special point at $L = 128$ and inverse temperatures $\beta = 64$ (full line), $\beta = 70$ (dotted line), and $\beta = 80$ (dashed line),
14. Imaginary part of $G_d(i\beta_n)$ on the special point at $L = 128$ and inverse temperatures $\beta = 64$ (full line), $\beta = 70$ (dotted line), and $\beta = 80$ (dashed line).