

Functional Integral Approach to the single impurity Anderson Model

R. Bulla, J. Keller, T. Pruschke

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg

93040 Regensburg, Germany

February 17, 2022

Abstract

Recently, a functional integral representation was proposed by Weller [1], in which the fermionic fields strictly satisfy the constraint of no double occupancy at each lattice site. This is achieved by introducing spin dependent Bose fields. The functional integral method is applied to the single impurity Anderson model both in the Kondo and mixed-valence regime. The electron Green's function and susceptibility are calculated using an Ising-like representation for the Bose fields. We discuss the difficulty to extract a spectral function from the knowledge of the imaginary time Green's function. The results are compared with NCA calculations.

keywords: functional integral, single impurity Anderson model, electron Green's function

1 Introduction

In systems of correlated fermions on a lattice one often encounters the presence of a very high local Coulomb repulsion U between two particles on the same lattice site. In this case simple perturbation theory in the parameter U no longer provides a good approximation. In the limit $U \rightarrow \infty$, the interaction term in the Hamiltonian can be eliminated completely if a constraint is introduced which allows only empty and singly occupied states.

Functional integral techniques are a very powerful tool for the investigation of lattice fermion systems and there are several ways to incorporate the constraint in the functional integral. Starting for example with a slave boson approach, the constraint is guaranteed by delta-functions in the integration measure.

The method we consider here is based on the idea of projecting out the doubly occupied sites already in the derivation of a coherent state functional integral. The new theory was

proposed and studied by Weller [1] and has already been applied to the one-[2] and two-[3, 4] dimensional Hubbard model.

In this paper, we focus on the single impurity Anderson model (SIAM) with infinite local Coulomb repulsion at the impurity site. This model was proposed by Anderson [5] to describe the properties of metals containing magnetic impurities and has been intensively studied (see e.g. [6, 7, 8]), so that good approximate results are available today. However, these methods do not work for all parameter ranges of the model or cannot easily be extended to the lattice case. Therefore there is still some need for alternative methods to solve the impurity Anderson model.

We have to state here that also with our method, we do not succeed in obtaining more satisfying results for the SIAM. Nevertheless, we think it is worth publishing the results because the new method is conceptually quite different to the approaches cited above and on the other hand may be useful in the future if the limitations by computer time become less serious. Even analytical approaches based on this functional integral method may become possible, perhaps also in the investigation of other models of strongly correlated electron systems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. After an introduction to the new functional integral method (section 2) we derive an effective action for the impurity states of the SIAM by integrating over the conduction electron degrees of freedom (section 3). This action is used as the starting point for the numerical investigation described in section 4. In section 5 we present results for the imaginary time Green's function $G(\omega)$ from which the f-occupancy can be derived immediately. Using a different procedure we obtain the spectral function $A(\omega)$. To demonstrate the limitation of the latter procedure we show that various quite different spectral functions can result in very excellent fits to the same given $G(\omega)$. We also discuss the case of the impurity f-level lying at the Fermi level. Here we expect the spectral function to consist of a single Lorentzian. Within this restriction we get a broadening and renormalization of the f-level consistent with calculations within a second order perturbation theory in the hybridization. We compare the results with NCA (Non Crossing Approximation) calculations for both parameter sets. With an additional magnetic field coupling to the impurity state we calculate the static susceptibility and the effective magnetic moment.

2 Theory

In this section we follow closely the method originally published by Weller [1]. We want to introduce the functional integral method by considering first the simple example of a fermionic system with one site and infinite Coulomb repulsion

$$H = \sum_{\sigma} \epsilon_f f_{\sigma}^{\dagger} f_{\sigma} + U f_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} f_{\uparrow} f_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} f_{\downarrow} \quad (U \rightarrow \infty) \quad : \quad (1)$$

Introducing Hubbard operators

$$X_0 = |0\rangle\langle 1| \quad \text{and} \quad X_1 = |1\rangle\langle 0| \quad (2)$$

which project out the doubly occupied states, the Hamiltonian can then be written as

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} t_{ij} X_i X_j^\dagger + \sum_i \epsilon_i X_i X_i^\dagger \quad (3)$$

Essential for the calculation of statistical properties of the fermionic system at finite temperatures is the partition function

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \hat{H}} \quad (\beta = \frac{1}{k_B T}) \quad (4)$$

with the trace in the restricted Hilbert space. We divide $\exp(-\beta \hat{H})$ into a product of N equal operators $\exp(-\hat{H} \Delta\tau)$, thereby defining steps $n = (n-1)\Delta\tau$ ($n = 1, \dots, N$; ($\beta = N\Delta\tau$)) in the imaginary time interval $[0, \beta]$. At each time step we insert unity operators Π_n which project out the doubly occupied states.

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\hat{H} \Delta\tau} e^{-\hat{H} \Delta\tau} \dots e^{-\hat{H} \Delta\tau} \quad (5)$$

$$= \text{Tr} e^{-\hat{H} \Delta\tau} \Pi_N e^{-\hat{H} \Delta\tau} \Pi_{N-1} \dots \Pi_2 e^{-\hat{H} \Delta\tau} \quad (6)$$

with

$$\Pi_n = |0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1| \quad (7)$$

The unity operators actually do not depend on n . This index is used to distinguish auxiliary fields which will be introduced at each time step n (see (8)). The most elegant way to derive a functional integral for fermionic systems is to use projectors expressed in terms of coherent states (see e.g. [9]). Following Weller [1], we make the ansatz:

$$\Pi_n = \int \frac{d^2 z_n}{2\pi} e^{z_n^\dagger (b_n - |0\rangle\langle 0|) + \bar{z}_n (|1\rangle\langle 1| - b_n)} \quad (8)$$

with the coherent states

$$|j_n; b_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |b_n|^2}} \left(|0\rangle + b_n |1\rangle \right) \quad (9)$$

which are constructed to be eigenstates of the operator X_0

$$X_0 |j_n; b_n\rangle = |j_n; b_n\rangle \quad (10)$$

The b are Grassmann variables obeying the usual anticommutation relations. The b -variables are ordinary complex numbers and do not have a direct physical meaning. They just count the spin multiplicity for each step in the imaginary time interval. Because of the restriction to zero or singly occupied sites and because we used spin carrying b -variables in the ansatz (9), we only need one Grassmann field for each time step n .

$$\begin{matrix} \mathbb{Z} & & \mathbb{Z} & & \mathbb{Z} & & \mathbb{Z} & & \mathbb{Z} \\ b_i b_i = & b_{\#} b_{\#} = 1 ; & b_i b_{\#} = & b_{\#} b_i = 0 ; & 1 = 1 \end{matrix} \quad (11)$$

Replacing the trace by

$$\text{Tr}[\dots]! \quad \text{d} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{j} \quad \text{j} \quad \text{i} \quad ; \quad (12)$$

Finally we obtain the functional integral representation for the partition function:

$$Z = \prod_b \frac{Z_b}{D_b} \exp \left(\sum_i S(\mathbf{z}_i; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{b}) \right) \quad (13)$$

$$S(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{b}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \frac{y_n}{b_n} \exp\left(-\frac{y_n}{b_n}\right) \quad (14)$$
$$\mathbf{Z}_D^y \mathbf{D}^y = \mathbf{d}_N^y \mathbf{d}_N^y \mathbf{d}_{N-1}^y \mathbf{d}_{N-1}^y \cdots \mathbf{d}_1^y \mathbf{d}_1^y \quad (15)$$

The functional integral representation for the imaginary time Green's function

$$G(\lambda) = \langle X_0(\lambda) X_0(0) \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \text{Tr} e^{-H} X_0(\lambda) X_0(0) \quad (16)$$

$$G(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{Z_h} \sum_{\mathbf{b}} D(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{b}) \exp \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{y}_n^T \mathbf{b}_n \right) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^I S(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{b}_i) \right) \quad (17)$$
$$= (n-1) \frac{1}{N}; \quad n = 1 :: N \quad : \quad (18)$$

4

3 Action for the ($U = 1$) Single Impurity Anderson Model

Now we want to derive an effective action for the f -electrons of the SIAM by integrating out the conduction electron degrees of freedom. This action will be the starting point for the numerical investigation described in section 4.

In the limit $U \rightarrow 1$ the Hamiltonian of the SIAM is given by:

$$H = \sum_k \epsilon_f X_0 X_0 + \sum_k \epsilon_k c_k^\dagger c_k + \sum_k V X_0 c_k + c_k^\dagger X_0 \quad (19)$$

The operators c_k^\dagger (c_k) create (annihilate) a conduction electron with spin and wavevector k . The last term describes the hybridization between the localized f -state and the conduction electrons with the hybridization matrix element V independent of k . The energies ϵ_k and ϵ_f are to be measured from the Fermi level.

The action corresponding to the above Hamiltonian is:

$$S(\bar{c}; c; \bar{b}; b) = \sum_{n=1}^N \bar{c}_n^y \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_f}{N}\right) c_{n-1}^x (b_n b_{n-1}) + \sum_{nk} \bar{c}_{kn}^y \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_k}{N}\right) c_{kn-1}^x c_{kn}^x + \frac{V}{N} \sum_{nk} \bar{c}_n^y b_{n-kn-1}^x + \bar{c}_{kn}^y c_{n-1}^x b_{n-1}^x \quad (20)$$

For the conduction electron operators c_k^\dagger and c_k (whose corresponding Hilbert space is not restricted) we applied the standard method of replacing operators by Grassmann variables (see e.g. [9]). Now we have to integrate over three types of fields: the complex b -fields, the Grassmann variables for the f -electrons and the Grassmann variables for the conduction electrons. The partition function for the whole system then reads:

$$Z = \int_b \int_D \int_D \exp \left(\sum_i \bar{c}_i^y c_i^x + \sum_{ij} \bar{c}_i^y H_{ij} c_j^x + \sum_i \bar{c}_i^y c_i^x + \sum_i \bar{c}_i^y c_i^x \right) \quad (21)$$

The integrations can in principle be performed in several ways; we choose to first integrate over the Grassmann fields of the conduction electrons using the formula:

$$\int_D \int_D \exp \left(\sum_{ij} \bar{c}_i^y H_{ij} c_j^x + \sum_i \bar{c}_i^y c_i^x + \sum_i \bar{c}_i^y c_i^x \right) = (\det H) \exp \left(\sum_{ij} \bar{c}_i^y (H^{-1})_{ij} c_j^x \right) \quad (22)$$

The resulting action

$$S_e(\bar{c}; c; \bar{b}; b) = S_f(\bar{c}; c; \bar{b}; b) + \frac{V}{N} \sum_{nm} \bar{c}_{n+1}^y b_{n+1-m-1}^x b_{m-1}^x (H^{-1})_{nm}(k) \quad (23)$$

(S_f is the first term at the right hand side of (20).) reduces the problem to that of a single electron with a time dependent coupling mediated by the conduction electron Green's function H^{-1} with the matrix elements:

$$(H^{-1})_{nm}(k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1 + e^{-\beta \epsilon_k}}{1 + e^{-\beta \epsilon_k}} \exp\left(\frac{(n-m)\epsilon_k}{N}\right) & : n = m \\ \frac{1 + e^{-\beta \epsilon_k}}{1 + e^{-\beta \epsilon_k}} \exp\left(\frac{(N-(m-n))\epsilon_k}{N}\right) & : n < m \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Using the formula

$$\sum_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{ij}} \exp\left(\sum_{ij} M_{ij} \right) = \det M \quad (25)$$

with

$$M_{nm}(b) = \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_f}{N}\right) \left(\sum_n b_n b_{n+1}\right) \delta_{n-1,m} \delta_{n,m} \\ + \frac{V}{N} \sum_n b_n b_m \sum_k (H^{-1})_{n-1,m+1}(k) \quad (26)$$

the integration over the remaining Grassmann variables $\psi_{1::N}$ leads to

$$Z = (\det H) \det M(b) \quad (27)$$

for the partition function. For the imaginary time Green's function we get

$$G(\omega) = (\det H) \frac{1}{Z} \sum_b b_1 b_n (M^{-1}(b))_{1,n} \det M(b) \quad : \quad (28)$$

Note that this equation defines $G(\omega)$ only for the ω -values $\omega = (n-1)/N$ ($n = 1, \dots, N$). $G(\omega)$ cannot be calculated directly within this approach but is simply related to $G(0)$ by

$$G(\omega) = 1 - 2G(0) \quad (29)$$

in the case of no double occupancy. We do not actually need to calculate $\det H$ because this factor cancels in the Green's function.

4 Numerical Investigation

The resemblance of the theory to slave boson techniques and the success of slave boson mean field approaches may suggest that also in our case a saddle-point like approximation for the b -fields is possible. But due to the unusual kinetic part in the action any replacement of e.g. $\sum_n b_n b_{n+1}$ by a constant number not equal to one leads to divergences in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. So far we did not find any analytical approach with the action (23) as a starting point and therefore restrict ourselves to numerical results in this paper.

The most suitable representation of the b -fields for a numerical implementation of the equations (27) and (28) is an Ising-like representation [1]:

$$b_n = \pm 1 \quad b_{\#n} = \pm 1 \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{matrix} Z \\ b \end{matrix} \dots = \frac{1}{2} \begin{matrix} X \\ b_{\#n} = 1 \end{matrix} \dots \quad (31)$$

so that the sums in (27) and (28) contain 2^N terms. For each of these contributions we have to calculate the matrix M defined by (26). The sum over k in (26) is calculated using a constant density of states for the conduction electrons in the interval $[-D; D]$.

$$\sum_k (H^{-1})_{nm}(k) = \sum_b d''(b) (H^{-1})_{nm}(b) = \sum_D^Z d''(H^{-1})_{nm}(b) \quad (32)$$

These integrations are independent of the fields and therefore have to be performed only once. NAG routines are used to calculate the inverse and the determinant of M . For $N = 20$ the computation and summation of all contributions to $G(\omega)$ takes about one day CPU time on a workstation.

At this point, one would like to reduce the computer time by restricting the summation to the most important contributions. This idea fails in our case! Due to the $\sum_b b_n b_{n-1}$ -term, contributions to the Green's functions can differ by a factor 2^0 to 2^N , so that simple Monte Carlo methods (like the Metropolis algorithm) are unable to explore the whole phase space of the b -variables. On the other hand we experienced, that taking into account only the most important contributions, the result is far away from the exact result received by summing over all contributions.

5 Results

Fig. 1 shows the imaginary time Green's function for the parameters $\mu_f = 0.2, V = 0.22$ and the inverse temperature $\beta = 3$ (energies in arbitrary units). It also contains the result of an NCA calculation which will be discussed below.

The f-occupancy equals

$$n_f = n_{\uparrow} + n_{\downarrow} = 2 \quad G(\omega = 0) = 0.72 \quad : \quad (33)$$

Although $G(\omega)$ seems to be rather structureless and indeed has no direct physical meaning, it is related to the spectral function by the transformation

$$G(\omega) = \sum_{l=1}^Z \frac{1}{l!} d^l e^{-i\omega l} \frac{A(l)}{1 + e^{-i\omega l}} \quad : \quad (34)$$

It is easy to calculate $G(\omega)$ with the knowledge of $A(l)$ but not vice versa. A lot of methods can be found in the literature to overcome this problem (see e.g. [10]) but determination of the spectral function $A(l)$ out of $G(\omega)$ remains an extremely ill posed problem as will be shown below in an example.

In order to allow the occurrence of an Abrikosov-Suhl resonance in addition to a broad peak at the f -level position we tried to fit the numerical $G(\omega)$ data with a superposition of two

Lorentz functions with variable weight, position and width as the input spectral function. The results are shown in Fig. 1 and 2a. Although we are able to fit the numerical data with an accuracy better than $5 \cdot 10^3$, several different fits are possible (only three of the innumerable possibilities are shown). Despite the chance of finding a spectral function fitting the data even more accurately, we do not think that it makes sense to decide between different fits, all having this extremely high accuracy (the $G(\omega)$ data themselves are not exact due to the finite N and the finite resolution of the computer)! Therefore we conclude that structures with small weight like an additional peak at the Fermi level cannot be derived from the knowledge of $G(\omega)$.

In Fig. 2b the result of a NCA calculation for the same set of parameters is shown. If the transformation (34) is applied to the spectral function the dotted line in Fig. 1 is obtained. We observe a significant difference between the NCA result and our numerical calculation (note the position of the maximum in the spectral function). Here we cannot decide which theory gives the better results because both are in a certain sense approximative (due to the finite N in the functional integral calculation and the leaving out of crossing diagrams respectively).

Fig. 3a shows results for $G(\omega)$ in case the f -level is equal to the chemical potential for different values of the hybridization. For $V = 0$ the empty and singly occupied states have equal probabilities:

$$n_0 = n_{\uparrow} = n_{\#} = \frac{1}{3} \quad (35)$$

This is the mixed-valence regime of the SIAM. With increasing hybridization more and more f -electrons are transferred to the conduction electron states. Therefore n_f decreases with increasing V (Fig. 3b). This decrease is a little bit stronger in the NCA data but proportional to V^2 in both cases.

We expect the spectral function to consist of only one Lorentz peak. With this input knowledge the fit procedure always leads to a well defined result (if the true spectral function really resembles a single Lorentzian). Again the accuracy is very high but decreases with increasing hybridization. The results are shown in Fig. 4a. For zero hybridization we would get a delta function at $\omega = 0$. If we increase the hybridization we observe a broadening and a shift of the peak to higher frequencies. Both effects are proportional to V^2 | this corresponds to calculations within a second order perturbation theory.

The NCA spectral functions (Fig. 4b) give qualitatively the same picture. They are broader and shifted to higher frequencies than the functional integral results.

The calculation of the f -susceptibility and the corresponding effective magnetic moment is straightforward within the theoretical scheme described above. We just add to the Hamiltonian a term

$$H_B = -g_B B \left(f_{\uparrow}^y f_{\uparrow} - f_{\#}^y f_{\#} \right) \quad (36)$$

and calculate the foccupancies n_{\uparrow} and n_{\downarrow} . The susceptibility is then de ned by

$$\chi = \frac{\partial (n_{\uparrow} - n_{\downarrow})}{\partial B} \Big|_{B=0} : \quad (37)$$

In Fig. 5 we show the dependence of the e ective magnetic moment $\mu_{\text{eff}} = g_B \mu_B$ on the temperature for di erent values of the hybridization. For zero hybridization, the e ective magnetic moment takes its maximum value at $T = 0$. For $V = 0.1$, due to the screening of the conduction electrons, the e ective magnetic moment decreases with decreasing temperature. Of course, the exact behaviour for $T \rightarrow 0$ cannot be extrapolated from the data which are restricted to temperatures higher than $k_B T = 0.2$.

6 Conclusion

In this paper have we investigated the $U = 1$ single impurity Anderson model using a new functional integral technique in which the constraint of no double occupancy of the impurity site is fulfilled exactly by auxiliary complex elds. We obtained an e ective action for the impurity as the starting point for the numerical calculation of the electron Green's function.

We discussed the di culties to extract detailed information for the spectral function out of the imaginary time Green's function. In the mixed-valence regime, where we expect that a single peak function is a good approximation for the spectral function, we can confirm a shift and broadening of the peak at the impurity level proportional to V^2 .

Comparison with NCA results showed small but significant differences. The origin of these differences is not yet clear.

Calculation of the susceptibility at the impurity showed the expected temperature dependence. While for zero hybridization, the e ective magnetic moment reaches its maximum value for $T \rightarrow 0$, for finite hybridization we observe a decrease of $\mu_{\text{eff}} = g_B \mu_B$ with decreasing T .

7 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Prof. W. Weller for many helpful discussions. This work has been partly supported by the Graduiertenkolleg "Komplexitat in Festkorpem: Phononen, Elektronen und Strukturen" at the University of Regensburg.

References

- [1] Weller, W.: phys. stat. sol. (b) 162, 251 (1990)

- [2] W eller, W ., Vo ĵa, T .:preprint
- [3] Zhang, X .Y ., Abraham s, E ., K otliar, G .:Phys.Rev.Lett. 66, 1236 (1991)
- [4] Zhang, X .Y .:M od.Phys.Lett. 5, 1255 (1991)
- [5] Anderson, P W .:Phys.Rev.124, 41 (1961)
- [6] Bickers, N E ., Cox, D L ., W ilkins, J W .:Phys.Rev.B 36, 2036 (1987)
- [7] T svelick, A M ., W iegm ann, P B .:A dv.Phys. 32, 453 (1983)
- [8] K rishna-m urthy, H R ., W ilkins, J W ., W ilson, K G .:Phys.Rev.B21 1003 & 1044 (1980)
- [9] Negele, J W ., O rland, H .:Q uantum M any-P article System s. Redwood C ity, Cali-
fornia:Addison-W esley Publishing Com pany 1988
- [10] G ubematis, J E ., Jarrell, M ., Silver, R N ., Sivia, D S .:Phys.Rev.B44, 6011 (1991)

R .Bulla, J.K eller, T .P ruschke
 Institut für Theoretische Physik
 Universität Regensburg
 93040 Regensburg
 G erm any
 em ail: bulla@ rphs1.physik.uni-regensburg.de
 tel: 0941-943 2046
 fax: 0941-943 4382

Figure captions

Fig. 1 Green's function $G(\omega)$ on the imaginary time axis (parameters: $V = 0.22$; $U_f = 0.2$; $U = 3.0$; $D = 3.5$; $\beta = 1$; $N = 20$). The crosses are the numerical result. Also shown are fits (nearly indistinguishable) calculated from the three spectral functions in Fig. 2a. The dotted line is the NCA result calculated from Fig. 2b.

Fig. 2 a) Three different spectral functions whose corresponding $G(\omega)$ (see Fig. 1) fit the numerical data equally well. b) Comparison of the NCA spectral function with fit 1 of Fig. 2a.

Fig. 3a Imaginary time Green's function for $U_f = 0$; $U = 2.0$; $D = 3.5$; $\beta = 1$; $N = 20$ and different values of the hybridization.

Fig. 3b Dependence of the f-occupancy n_f on the hybridization (same parameters as in Fig. 3a).

Fig. 4 a) Fits for the spectral function to the data shown in Fig. 3a with a single Lorentzian. b) The NCA spectral functions for the parameter set of Fig. 3a.

Fig. 5 Dependence of the effective magnetic moment on the temperature for different values of the hybridization (parameters: $U_f = 0.2$; $D = 3.5$; $U = 1$; $N = 16$). The line corresponds to the analytical result for $V = 0$.