

Temperature Derivative of the Superfluid Density in the Attractive Hubbard model.

F.F. Assaad¹, W. Hanke¹ and D.J. Scalapino²

¹ Physikalisches Institut, Universität Würzburg

8700 Würzburg, FRG.

² Department of Physics, University of California

Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9530

Abstract

Based on extensions of the grand-canonical Quantum Monte-Carlo algorithm to incorporate magnetic fields, we provide numerical data confirming the existence of a Kosterlitz-Thouless transition in the attractive Hubbard model. Here, we calculate the temperature derivative of the superfluid density, $\frac{\partial D_s(T)}{\partial T}$, to pin down the transition. The latter quantity is obtained from the difference in internal energy of systems which differ by a phase twist $\pi/2$ in the boundary condition along one lattice direction. Away from halfband filling, $\frac{\partial D_s(T)}{\partial T}$ shows a response which increases with lattice size at the transition temperature. In contrast, such a signal is not observed for the case of a halfband filling.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm

Numerical simulations of the attractive Hubbard Hamiltonian [1, 2, 3], indicate that this fermionic lattice model has an s-wave superconducting ground state in two-dimensions. A finite-size scaling analysis (up to one hundred sites) of the s-wave pair-pair correlation functions has provided some evidence that the model has a finite-temperature Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) [4] transition to a superconducting state away from halfband filling [3]. Based on extensions of the grand-canonical Quantum Monte-Carlo (QMC) algorithm, we present numerical data which clearly confirm the conjecture of a KT transition. Our approach relies on the calculation of the temperature derivative of the superfluid density, $\frac{\partial D_s(\beta)}{\partial \beta}$, where β is the inverse temperature. In the framework of such a KT transition, $D_s(\beta)$ shows a universal jump at the transition temperature [5]. Hence, $\frac{\partial D_s(\beta)}{\partial \beta}$ in the thermodynamic limit behaves like a Dirac delta-function at the transition temperature, and even on finite-sized clusters is expected to yield a very clear signal. Compared to previous estimations of the $T = 0$ superfluid density, via flux quantization [6] or linear response [7], the method described here leads to numerical results which exhibit a peak at T_{KT} which grows as the size of the system increases. This provides a clear signal of the KT transition. Such signatures of the KT transition have already been observed in classical [8] as well as in quantum XY models [9]. In this letter it is shown that, for the attractive Hubbard model, $\frac{\partial D_s(\beta)}{\partial \beta}$ is given by the difference in internal energy of systems which differ by a phase twist $\pi/2$ in the boundary condition along one lattice direction. The internal energies are extracted from finite temperature quantum Monte-Carlo (QMC) data on cluster sizes ranging from 4×4 to 8×8 . Comparison of the data for different lattice sizes, strongly supports the existence of a KT transition away from halfband filling.

The attractive Hubbard Hamiltonian we consider is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H(\beta) = & \sum_{i,j}^X \exp \left[\frac{2i}{L} \frac{\pi}{\phi_0} \right] c_{i,j}^y c_{i+a_x,j} + \exp \left[\frac{2i}{L} \frac{\pi}{\phi_0} \right] c_{i+a_x,j}^y c_{i,j} \\
 & + \sum_{i,j}^X c_{i,j}^y c_{i+a_y,j} + c_{i+a_y,j}^y c_{i,j} \\
 & + U \sum_i^X n_{i,\uparrow} n_{i,\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i^X n_{i,\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i^X n_{i,\downarrow}; \quad U < 0; \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, $c_{i,j}^y$ creates an electron with z-component of spin y on lattice site i , $a_{x/y}$ are the lattice vectors of unit length, $\phi_0 = \frac{hc}{e}$ is the flux quantum, and L is the linear length of

the square lattice. The fermionic operators obey periodic boundary conditions in both lattice directions. The above Hamiltonian thus describes an attractive Hubbard model on a torus. The phase factors in the kinetic energy term account for the presence of a magnetic field of flux threaded through the center of the torus. Through a canonical transformation, one may remove the phase factors in (1). However, under this canonical transformation, the x-boundary acquires a phase twist $\exp(2i\pi\phi_0)$ [10]. Hence, the threaded magnetic field acts merely as boundary effect.

Let us now consider the free energy,

$$F(\phi) = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H(\phi)}; \quad (2)$$

and expand it up to second order in $\phi - \phi_0$ around $\phi = 0$. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\phi) &= F(\phi = 0) + \frac{\beta}{2} D_s(\phi) + O(\phi^4) \quad \text{where} \\ D_s(\phi) &= \frac{2}{L} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \langle K_x \rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{r}} d \langle J_x(\mathbf{r}) J_x(0) \rangle; \\ J_x &= \sum_{\mathbf{r}} c_{\mathbf{r}}^y c_{\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{a}_x}; \quad c_{\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{a}_x}^y c_{\mathbf{r}}; \\ K_x &= \sum_{\mathbf{r}} c_{\mathbf{r}}^y c_{\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{a}_x} + c_{\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{a}_x}^y c_{\mathbf{r}}; \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, $D_s(\phi) = 2\phi^2$ corresponds to the superfluid density n_s in units where the hopping $t = 1$ [11]. The above equation may be transformed to give:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} (F(\phi) - F(\phi = 0)) = \frac{\beta}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} (D_s(\phi)) + O(\phi^4); \quad (4)$$

The left hand side of the above equation is just the difference in internal energy: $E(\phi) - E(\phi = 0)$. The right hand side contains the term we are interested in; namely the temperature derivative of the superfluid density. For an infinite lattice, the jump in the superfluid density at T_{KT} implies that

$$\frac{\partial D_s(\phi)}{\partial \phi} (T - T_{KT}) : \quad (5)$$

For a finite-size lattice, the delta-function peak scales as the number of sites N [8].

To determine which values of ϕ are most appropriate for our calculations, we consider the $T = 0$ limit. At zero temperature, the attractive Hubbard model is expected to

show off-diagonal long-range order (ODLRO), and thus flux quantization [12]. Hence, the quantity

$$E_0(\beta) - E_0(\beta = 0) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} (F(\beta) - F(\beta = 0)) \quad (6)$$

scales in the thermodynamic limit to a periodic function of period $\beta_0 = 2$. Furthermore, a non-vanishing energy barrier is to be seen between the minimum at $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = \beta_0 = 2$ [10, 12]. Thus, the maximal response in $E_0(\beta) - E_0(\beta = 0)$ should lie at $\beta = \beta_0 = 4$. The superfluid density, which corresponds to the curvature of the $E_0(\beta) - E_0(\beta = 0)$ function at $\beta = 0$ or $\beta = \beta_0 = 2$ [12, 7], may be approximated by:

$$\frac{D_s(T = 0)}{4^2} = E_0(\beta = \beta_0 = 4) - E_0(\beta = 0) - E_0(\beta = \beta_0 = 4) + E_0(\beta = \beta_0 = 2): \quad (7)$$

The above relations hold for the bose condensation of free charge two bosons on a square lattice. Numerical evidence for the validity of equation (7) for the quarter-filled and half-filled two-dimensional attractive Hubbard model may be found in reference [6].

Due to the above considerations, we have computed the quantity:

$$E(R) = E(\beta = \beta_0 = 4) - E(\beta = R) \text{ where } R = 0 \text{ or } R = \beta_0 = 2 \quad (8)$$

as a function of temperature and lattice size. $E(R)$ yields at finite temperature information on $\frac{\partial D_s(\beta)}{\partial \beta}$ (4) and at $T = 0$ converges for increasing lattice size to the superfluid density (7). Considering both $R = 0$ or $R = \beta_0 = 2$ yields a cross-check for finite size effects since both values of R converge to the same results only in the thermodynamic limit. As mentioned previously, the internal energies $E(\beta)$ were calculated through the use of the finite temperature QMC algorithm [13, 14]. We carry out a discrete Hubbard-Stratonovich (HS) transformation of the on-site interaction term in (1). After integration of the fermionic degrees of freedom, one obtains for the attractive Hubbard model:

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-H(\beta)} = \sum_s (\det M(s))^2 \quad (9)$$

where s denotes a HS configuration and M is an $L \times L$ matrix. For $\beta = 0$ or $\beta = \beta_0 = 2$ (i.e. antiperiodic boundary in the x-direction), M is real and thus no sign problem occurs. On the other hand, for $\beta = \beta_0 = 4$, M is complex and thus, $(\det M(s))^2$ is equally complex. Hence, this value of the flux yields a sign (or in our case a phase) problem.

This phase problem inhibits us of reaching very low temperatures. Another problem we encountered, is that of fixing the chemical potential. Since we are interested in the difference of two internal energies at a given particle number (8), the chemical potential has to be determined very precisely. Apart from the half-filled band case where $\mu = 0$ a brute force search for the desired chemical potential is numerically too expensive. We thus carried out at least three simulations with chemical potential corresponding approximately to the desired filling and fit the energy data to the form: $A + Bx + Cx^2$. The energy corresponding to the desired filling is then extrapolated from the fit. Thus, one data point in the $E(R)$ curve corresponds to at least six independent simulations.

Figure 1 plots $E(R)$ for both considered values of R (see equation (8)), and for the half-filled attractive Hubbard model at $U=t=4$ as a function of the temperature. The data points at $T = 0$ were obtained with the projector QMC algorithm (PQMC) [15]. Here, we consider three lattice sizes: 4×4 , 6×6 and 8×8 . At exactly half-band filling, the attractive Hubbard model may be mapped onto the repulsive Hubbard model by carrying out a particle-hole transformation in one spin sector. Under this transformation, one notices that the s-wave pair-pair (charge-charge) correlations of the attractive model map onto the transverse (z-component) spin-spin correlations of the repulsive model. In the strong-coupling limit, the repulsive Hubbard model may be mapped onto the Heisenberg model which shows no KT transition [16]. Hence, the strong-coupling attractive Hubbard model at half-band filling shows no KT behavior. In the intermediate coupling regime, the numerical data of figure 1, equally display no sign of a KT transition. Consider the $R = \mu_0=2$ curves. For this value of R , there is a bump appearing approximately at $T = 0.2t$. However, this structure fails to scale with increasing lattice size but rather appears to be suppressed. A similar, but less pronounced structure may be seen in the two largest lattice sizes of the $R = 0$ curves.

Let us now turn to three-quarters band filling. Our QMC data are plotted for $R = 0$ ($R = 0.5$) in figure 2a (2b). For the considered coupling ($U=t=4$) and band-filling ($\langle n \rangle = 0.75$), we were unable to reach inverse temperatures higher than $\beta = 7$ due to severe phase problems. Again, the data points at $T = 0$ were obtained with the PQMC algorithm [15]. Figures 2a and 2b show a striking difference between the 4×4 and 8×8

clusters. The slope of the $E(R)$ curves become very large for the 8×8 cluster size in the temperature region $7 < t < 5$ [17]. Finally, the available data, are compatible with the onset of a Dirac delta-function type response in $E(R)$ for both considered values of R at approximately $T = 0.1t$. This temperature value compares favorably with the KT transition temperature obtained from a finite-size scaling analysis of the pair-pair correlation functions [2].

In conclusion, extensions of the grand-canonical QMC algorithm have allowed us to calculate the temperature derivative of the superfluid density for the half and three-quarters filled attractive Hubbard model at $U/t = 4$. Comparing the numerical results for both band fillings provides convincing evidence that the three-quarters filled attractive Hubbard model at $U/t = 4$ has a KT transition to a superconducting state. In contrast, no signature of the KT transition is found at halfband filling.

We wish to thank A. Muramatsu, J. Deisz, J. Stein for instructive conversations. F.F. Assaad would like to thank the DFG for financial support under the grant number Ha 1537/6-1, W. Hanke the financial support of the Bavarian "FORSUPRA" program on high- T_c research, and D.J. Scalapino financial support from the NSF under the grant number DMR 92-25027. The calculations were performed on the Cray YMP of the HLHZ in Jülich as well as on the Cray YMP of the LRZ in Munich.

References

- [1] R.T. Scalettar, E.Y. Loh, J.E. Gubernatis, A. Moreo, S.R. White, D.J. Scalapino, R.L. Sugar and E. Dagotto, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 1407 (1989).
- [2] A. Moreo and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 946, (1991).
- [3] A. Moreo, D.J. Scalapino and S.R. White, Phys. Rev. B 45, 7544 (1992).
- [4] J.M. Kosterlitz and D.J. Thouless, J. Phys. C 6, 1181, (1973).
- [5] D.R. Nelson and J.M. Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 1201 (1977).
- [6] F.F. Assaad, W. Hanke and D.J. Scalapino Würzburg preprint 1992.

- [7] D.J. Scalapino, S.R. White and S.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 2830 (1992). D.J. Scalapino, S.R. White and S.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 47, 7995, (1993).
- [8] J.E. Van Himerbergen and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B 23 359 (1981).
- [9] E. Loh, Jr., D.J. Scalapino and P.M. Grant, Phys. Rev. B 31, 4712 (1985).
- [10] N. Byers and C.N. Yang, Phys Rev. Lett. 7, 46, (1961).
- [11] Note that to obtain the $T = 0$ super uid density from the expression for $D_s(\omega)$ in equation (3) one should first take the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ and then the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$. This ordering of the limits removes the ambiguity between the super uid density and the Druide weight. (see also ref. [7])
- [12] C.N. Yang, Reviews of Mod. Phys. 34, 694 (1962).
- [13] J.E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. B 31, 4403 (1985).
- [14] S.R. White, D.J. Scalapino, R.L. Sugar, E.Y. Loh Jr., J.E. Gubernatis, and R.T. Scalettar, Phys. Rev B 40 506, (1990).
- [15] G. Sugiyama and S.E. Koonin, Anals of Phys. 168, 1, (1986). S. Sorella, S. Baroni, R. Car, and M. Parinello, Europhys. Lett. 8, 663 (1989). S. Sorella, E. Tosatti, S. Baroni, R. Car, and M. Parinello, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B1, 993 (1989).
- [16] H.Q. Ding and M.S. Makić, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 1449, (1990).
- [17] An accurate scaling of the peak height as a function of the lattice size is out of reach in the present approach due to the phase problem we encounter for values of $\mu = \mu_0 = 4$. At $\langle n \rangle = 0.75$, we did not consider the 6×6 lattice since for this lattice size $\langle n \rangle = 0.75$ does not correspond to a well defined particle number in the $S_z = 0$ Hilbert space. Hence, the PQMC algorithm may not be unambiguously applied to obtain the $T = 0$ data point.

Figure captions

Fig. 1 $E(\beta = \beta_0=4) - E(\beta = R)$ as a function of temperature for the half-filled attractive Hubbard model at $U=t=4$. Here, we consider three lattice sizes: 4×4 , 6×6 and 8×8 . The three upper (lower) curves correspond to $R = \beta_0=2$ ($R = 0$). The solid lines are a spline fits to the data. The data points at $T = 0$ were obtained with the PQMC algorithm.

Fig. 2 a) $E(\beta = \beta_0=4) - E(\beta = 0)$ as a function of temperature for the three-quarters filled attractive Hubbard model at $U=t=4$. The data points at $T = 0$ were obtained with the PQMC algorithm. The solid lines are spline fits to the data.

b) Same as figure a) but we consider: $E(\beta = \beta_0=4) - E(\beta = \beta_0=2)$.




Figure 1

$$E(\frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} = 0.25) - E(\frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} = 0)$$




Figure 2a

$$E(\frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} = 0.25) - E(\frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} = 0.5)$$




Figure 2b