

Exactly Solvable Kondo Lattice Model

D. F. Wang and C. Gruber

Institut de Physique Theorique

Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

PHB-Ecublens, CH-1015 Lausanne-Switzerland.

In this work, we solve exactly a Kondo lattice model in the thermodynamic limit. The system consists of an electronic conduction band described by unconstrained hopping matrix elements between the lattice sites. The conducting electrons interact with a localized impurity spin at each lattice cell. We have found the exact thermodynamics, the ground state energies of the system. At $T = 0$, we explicitly demonstrate that the system exhibits a metal-insulator phase transition at half-filling. In the limit of strong coupling between the impurity spin and the conduction electrons, $J = +1$, we have solved the system on a lattice of any size L . The ground states are the RVB-type Jastrow product wavefunctions. Various correlation functions can be computed for the impurity spins, and for the singlets formed by electrons and impurities.

PACS number: 71.30.+h, 05.30.-d, 74.65+n, 75.10.Jm

The heavy-fermion systems have been of great theoretical interests in recent years [1-6]. A basic model for a heavy fermion system is an $S = 1/2$ Kondo lattice with a conducting band interacting with a localized impurity spin at each unit cell. Quite recently, a possibility has been discussed that heavy-fermion superconductors involve odd-frequency triplet pairing, through a Majorana representation for the local moments to avoid a Gutzwiller projection [5]. In spite of several numerical study and approximate approaches to the Kondo lattice model, it is too difficult to find the exact solutions for the system.

In one dimension, the Kondo lattice model has been studied through various numerical and approximate methods. The results indicate the existence of a finite spin gap and a finite charge gap simultaneously at half filling [7-11]. The numerical renormalization group method can even deal with a finite lattice up to 24 sites [10], confirming further the charge gap at half-filling in the thermodynamic limit. It also shows that the charge gap is larger than the spin gap at half-filling [8,9]. The finite charge gap shows that the system described by the Kondo lattice model at half-filling is an insulator. However, due to the complexity, it has been impossible to prove the existence of the metal-insulator phase transition at the half-filling through any exact approach without employing an approximate scheme or numerical methods.

The single impurity Kondo model can be reduced to a one dimensional problem, as only the S-wave scattering on the impurity spin is important. The single impurity Hamiltonian, which represents a local Fermi liquid, is exactly solvable with the Bethe ansatz if the conduction band is described by continuum electrons with linear spectrum at the Fermi surface [13,14]. The Bethe-ansatz solutions explicitly demonstrate the dynamical energy scale that enters the expression of the thermodynamics of the system [12-14]. The screening of the impurity spin by conduction electrons, the crossover from weak coupling fixed point to strong coupling fixed point behavior can be explicitly illustrated with the Bethe-ansatz solutions [13,14].

Despite the Bethe-ansatz solutions for the single impurity Kondo model, no exact solution for more than one impurity spin is available by far, either in continuum case or on a lattice. In

this work, we introduce a Kondo lattice model in which the conduction electrons hop with unconstrained hopping matrix elements. The local moment at each site interacting with the conducting electrons is described by a spin 1/2. We solve this Kondo lattice system exactly in the thermodynamic limit at any temperature. Although the hopping matrix of the conducting electrons is far from the realistic case (electrons hop between the nearest neighboring sites in the tight binding picture), our model provides the first example where its exact solutions explicitly demonstrate the metal-insulator phase transition at half-filling, as the interaction between the local impurity moments and the conduction band is turned on.

The Hamiltonian of the system is given by:

$$H = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq L} \sum_{\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + J \sum_{i=1}^L c_i^\dagger \frac{\sigma_y}{2} c_i S_f(i); \quad (1)$$

where the hopping matrix element for the conduction electrons is given $t_{ij} = t$ for all $i \neq j$. J is the coupling constant between the local impurity moments and the conducting electrons. We assume that $t > 0$. The electron creation and annihilation operators have the usual anticommutation relations $\{c_i, c_j\} = 0; \{c_i^\dagger, c_j^\dagger\} = 0; \{c_i, c_j^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij}$. The local moments are described by the spin 1/2 operators, that is, $[S_f^x(k), S_f^y(k)] = iS_f^z(k)$ (plus two other commutation relations obtained by the cyclic permutations of $x; y; z$), with the relation $S_f^z(k) = \pm 1/2$, for all the sites $k = 1; 2; \dots; L$. Because of the special form of the conduction band, the dimensionality of the lattice is irrelevant, and the system is basically one dimensional. In the following, we always discuss the thermodynamic limit where the lattice size $L \rightarrow \infty$.

The Hamiltonian of the system has $SU(2)$ spin symmetry and the $SU(2)$ isospin symmetry, if we represent the local impurity moment through an f fermion: $S_f(k) = f_k^\dagger \frac{\sigma_y}{2} f_k$ at each site k with the condition that $f_k^\dagger f_k = 1$. The isospin operators are given by $I^+ = \sum_{i=1}^L (1 - f_i^\dagger f_i) (c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger - f_{i\uparrow}^\dagger f_{i\downarrow}^\dagger); I^- = (I^+)^{\dagger}; I_z = \sum_{i=1}^L (c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow} - f_{i\uparrow}^\dagger f_{i\uparrow} - 1) = 2$ [15]. In the Fourier space, the conduction electron Hamiltonian takes the following form

$$H_c = \sum_{i,j=1}^L \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} = \sum_{k=-L/2}^{L/2} \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} (k)_{\sigma}^\dagger c_k ; \quad (2)$$

where the Fourier transform of the fermion operators are $c_k^\dagger = \frac{1}{L^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^L e^{ikx_i} c_i^\dagger$; $c_k = \frac{1}{L^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^L e^{-ikx_i} c_i$. The wave vectors are given by $k = 2n/L$, with $n = (L-1)/2; \dots; (L+1)/2$. The dispersion of the conduction band is $\epsilon(k) = (\epsilon^0/L)_{k \neq 0} + t$. Here, $\epsilon^0 = t$, however, we treat this as an independent parameter in the following. The dispersion indicates that there are energy levels $(\epsilon^0/L + t)$ and t , and the plane waves with energy t have large degeneracies. Because of this, to find the thermodynamics of this Kondo lattice model, we shall employ the argument of van Dongen and Vollhardt [16] for the Hubbard model. The impurity spin interaction $H_{\text{im}}^J = J \sum_{i=1}^L c_i^\dagger \frac{\tau}{2} c_i \cdot S_f(i)$ can be treated as a perturbation, and the thermodynamic grand potential may be expanded as a power series of the coupling constant J . In the thermodynamic limit, we may see that the grand thermodynamic potential comes from two independent parts, with a correction of relative order $O(1/L)$ or $O(1)$, which is ignorable in the thermodynamic limit.

The partition function is given by

$$Z(t; J) = \text{Tr} \left[\exp \left(- \int_0^{\beta} d\tau (H_c(\tau) - N(\tau)) g \right) \right]; \quad (3)$$

where N the number of electrons, μ the chemical potential, and the grand thermodynamic potential is $\Omega = -\beta^{-1} \ln Z$. The trace is over the Hilbert space for electrons and impurities. Treating H_{im}^J as a perturbation term, we write $\Omega = \Omega_0 + \beta^{-1} W_{\text{eff}}(\mu; J)$, where $\Omega_0 = -\beta^{-1} \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\int_0^{\beta} d\tau (H_c - N))$. The contributions from all the connected diagrams are given by

$$W_{\text{eff}}(\mu; J) = \langle \text{Tr} \exp \left[- \int_0^{\beta} d\tau H_{\text{im}}^J(\tau) \right] \rangle_0^c : \quad (4)$$

Here, the notation of the expectation value $\langle \text{Tr} A(\tau_1) A(\tau_2) \dots A(\tau_n) \rangle_0^c$ is defined to be the sum of all the connected diagrams of

$$\langle \text{Tr} A(\tau_1) \dots A(\tau_n) \rangle_0 = \text{Tr} \text{Tr} e^{-\int_0^{\beta} d\tau (H_c - N)} A(\tau_1) A(\tau_2) \dots A(\tau_n) \text{Tr} e^{-\int_0^{\beta} d\tau (H_c - N)} : \quad (5)$$

The leading contributions to the quantity $W_{\text{eff}}(\mu; J)$ only come from those connected diagrams consisting of the bare electron propagators with momenta $k \neq 0$ scattering on the

in purity spins. The electron propagator with momentum $k = 0$ has t^0 -dependence as Lt^0 , so that its contribution to the perturbation expansion is of order of $O(L)$ or $O(1)$. The propagator with momentum $k \neq 0$ is independent of the momentum, as well as independent of the parameter t^0 . Therefore, we can put $t^0 = 0$ in the Eq. (4), and then include the momentum $k = 0$ in any of the momentum integral. The second step only gives rise to an error of order 1, so that

$$W_{t^0} = W_{t^0=0} + O(1); \quad (6)$$

where the first term is of the order $O(L)$. Therefore we see that in the thermodynamic limit, W_{t^0} is independent of the parameter t^0 .

According to the above argument, the grand thermodynamic potential comes from two contributions that are completely decoupled. Both parts can be found in a straightforward way, and we have in the thermodynamic limit

$$\Omega = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} = -2t \ln [2 + z(e^{3J=4} + 3e^{-J=4}) + 2z^2] \quad (7)$$

where $z = e^{\tilde{\mu}}$ and $\tilde{\mu} = \mu - \mu_0$. The electron density n of the infinite system, as function of the chemical potential is given by $n = \langle \partial \Omega / \partial \tilde{\mu} \rangle$, i.e.,

$$n = N/L = \frac{[z(e^{3J=4} + 3e^{-J=4}) + 4z^2]}{[2 + z(e^{3J=4} + 3e^{-J=4}) + 2z^2]}; \quad (8)$$

Given electron density n , the renormalized chemical potential $\tilde{\mu}$ is found from

$$e^{\tilde{\mu}} = \frac{1}{2(4-2n)} \left\{ (1-n)(e^{3J=4} + 3e^{-J=4}) + [(1-n)^2(e^{3J=4} + 3e^{-J=4})^2 + 8n(4-2n)]^{1/2} \right\} g; \quad (9)$$

At half-filling $n = 1$, and thus $\tilde{\mu} = 0$.

Let us then calculate the energy density for the infinite system, i.e., $e = \Omega/n + \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial t}$. we obtain

$$e = \Omega/n + f - 2t \frac{z[(3J=4 + \tilde{\mu})e^{3J=4} + 3(-J=4 + \tilde{\mu})e^{-J=4}] + 4\tilde{\mu}z^2}{[2 + z(e^{3J=4} + 3e^{-J=4}) + 2z^2]} g; \quad (10)$$

For fixed number of electron density n , taking the low temperature limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, the above becomes the ground state energy of the system. Let us first consider the case where the interaction between the local moment and conduction band is antiferromagnetic, $J > 0$. At less than half-filling $n < 1$, we see that $\mu \rightarrow -3J/4$ when $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. The ground state energy is thus

$$e_G = \frac{3}{4}Jn - 2t + \mu \quad (11)$$

At half-filling $n = 1$, $\mu = 0$, and the ground state energy is

$$e_G = \frac{3}{4}J - 2t + \mu \quad (12)$$

At more than half-filling $n > 1$, the chemical potential $\mu \rightarrow 3J/4$ when $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, and the ground state energy is given by

$$e_G = \frac{3}{4}Jn - 2t + \mu + \frac{3}{2}J(n - 1) \quad (13)$$

From these results, we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{de_G}{dn} \Big|_{n=1} &= \frac{3J}{4} + t \\ \frac{de_G}{dn} \Big|_{n=1^+} &= \frac{3J}{4} + t \\ \frac{de_G}{dn} \Big|_{n=n_0} &= \frac{3J}{4} + t; n_0 < 1 \\ \frac{de_G}{dn} \Big|_{n=n_0} &= \frac{3J}{4} + t; n_0 > 1: \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

To study the nature of the ground state, we employ the idea due to Mattis [17,18], defining $\epsilon^+ = E_G(N+1) - E_G(N)$; $\epsilon^- = E_G(N) - E_G(N-1)$. The idea is that the system is a metal if $\epsilon^+ = \epsilon^- = 0$, while the system is an insulator if $\epsilon^+ > 0$. At half-filling, there is a kink in the chemical potential $\epsilon^+ > 0$, indicating that the system is an insulator due to the impurity spins. At less than half-filling $n < 1$, $\epsilon^+ = \epsilon^- = -3J/4$, and the system is metallic. When the filling number is larger than one, $n > 1$, $\epsilon^+ = \epsilon^- = 3J/4$, indicating that the system is metallic. From these analysis, we see that a metal-insulator phase transition occurs at half-filling, as we turn on the antiferromagnetic interaction between the local impurity

moments and the conduction electrons. This phase transition would occur even at very small interaction parameter.

Finally, the analysis of the situation of ferromagnetic coupling $J < 0$ leads to the same conclusion: At less than half-filling $n < 1$, $\sim 1 - 2J$ when $J > 0$, and the ground state energy density is

$$e_g = -2Jn + \frac{1}{2}t + \frac{1}{2}n^2 \quad (15)$$

At exact half-filling, the chemical potential $\mu = 0$, and the ground state energy of the system is given by

$$e_g = -2J + \frac{1}{2}t \quad (16)$$

When the electron density is more than 1, we find that $\sim 1 - 2J$ when $J > 0$, and the ground state energy is

$$e_g = -2Jn + \frac{1}{2}t - 2J(n-1)^2 \quad (17)$$

From these results, we see that the system is metallic if $n \neq 1$, as indicated by $\rho = 0$. However, at half-filling $n = 1$, we have $\rho = 0$, showing that the system is an insulator.

At zero temperature, when there is no interaction $J = 0$, the system is metallic (a simple Fermi liquid). This fixed point is unstable at half-filling against infinitesimal interaction. Our analysis has shown that, at half-filling, a finite charge gap of the order J is open in the excitation spectrum, when turning on the interaction. As we have seen, due to the long range aspect of the hopping matrix, for the thermal potential, the kinetic energy part decouples with the interaction energy in the thermodynamic limit. Loosely speaking, at half-filling, to lower the energy of the system, each conduction electron would attempt to form a singlet (triplet) at each site, when an antiferromagnetic (ferromagnetic) interaction is turned on. For an electron to hop from a site to any other site on the chain, even with the long range hopping, it would have to break two singlet (triplet) pairs first,

giving rise to a finite charge gap proportional to $|J|$. In the end, both ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions will drive the system to an insulating phase. In the above study, the diagrammatic argument does not give us any information on whether one can solve the Kondo lattice model on a finite size lattice, nor does it provide explicit wavefunctions of the system. However, as will be demonstrated below, in the limit of strong interaction, one can actually find the ground state wavefunctions rigorously, for a lattice of any size L .

In the case $t < 0$, at zero temperature, similar analysis indicates the metal-insulator phase transition occurs in the system at half-filling, when one turns on J . At finite temperature T , the free energy density is found to be

$$f = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F}{L} = f_0 - \frac{1}{2} \ln 2 + z(e^{3J/4} + 3e^{-J/4}) + 2z^2 \ln 2; \quad (18)$$

where $z = e^{-(\mu - \epsilon)}$ and μ is the chemical potential. The diagrammatic analysis has shown that the free energy of the system can be written in closed form. However, we would like to emphasize that one can not treat the system as if the hopping matrix were $t = 0$, and each electron would form localized singlet (triplet) with the impurity at each site for positive J (or negative J), uncorrelated with each other. The long range hopping matrix would delocalize them, and induce strong correlations between them, as shown below. Consider the special situation $t < 0; J = +1$. In the limit $J = +1$, supposing that there are N_e electrons on the lattice L , with $N_e < L$, each electron will attempt to form a singlet with the impurity spin at each site, to lower the energy of the system as much as possible. Some unpaired impurity spins are left over on the lattice. Therefore, we work in the Hilbert space where each site can be either a unpaired impurity spin or a singlet of electron-impurity bound state. Due to the hopping of the conduction electrons, the singlets can hop on the lattice. Let us rewrite the Hamiltonian in the following way:

$$H = -t \sum_{i,j} c_i^\dagger c_j + J \sum_{i=1}^{N_e} c_i^\dagger \frac{\sigma_i}{2} c_i \quad S_f(i); \quad (19)$$

In the limit $J = +1$, the basis vectors can be written as

$$|j\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N_e} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N_e} (1 - P_{ii}) \right) c_{x_1-1}^\dagger c_{x_2-2}^\dagger \dots c_{x_{N_e}-N_e}^\dagger |j\rangle$$

$$|j\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|1; 2; \dots; 1; \dots; 2; \dots; L; N_e\rangle + |1; 2; \dots; 2; \dots; 1; \dots; L; N_e\rangle \right) \quad (20)$$

where the singlets are located at positions $\mathbf{x}_g = (x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{N_e})$, the unpaired impurity spins $(\uparrow; \downarrow; \dots; \uparrow; \downarrow; \dots; L; N_e)$ are positioned at sites $\mathbf{y}_g = (y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_{N_e})$. Here, the operator $P_{i_1 i_2}$ permutes the spin indices i_1 and i_2 to form a singlet of electron and impurity at site \mathbf{x}_{i_1} .

Denoting the projection operation onto the $J = +1$ subspace by P , the projected Hamiltonian would take the form :

$$\tilde{H} = P H P = P T P + c = H_1 + c; \quad (21)$$

where T is the kinetic energy of the conduction electrons, the infinite constant $c = (J=4)N_e$ only shifts the origin of the energy of the system, a reference energy which is unimportant physically. In the space where the z-component of the total spin is fixed, that is, $S_z = M$, the number of the unpaired up-spin impurities is $A = M + (L - N_e)/2$, the number of the unpaired down-spin impurities is $B = M - (L - N_e)/2$. The dimension of the Hilbert space associated with $J = +1$ is thus $C_L^{N_e} = C_L^A C_L^B$. Any eigenenergy state of the Hamiltonian $H_1 = P T P$ can be written as a linear combination of the basis vectors,

$$|j\rangle = \sum_i C_i |i\rangle; \quad (22)$$

To find the ground state wavefunctions, we may identify the singlets as spinless fermions, the unpaired impurities as hard core spin 1/2 bosons hopping on the lattice. Let us consider a system described by the following Hamiltonian:

$$H = (1/2) \sum_{i \neq j} P_G (t_{ij} g_i^\dagger g_j b_i^\dagger b_j) P_G \quad (23)$$

where the b fields are bosonic, g fields are fermionic, and $t_{ij} = t_j$ for any $i \neq j$. The b fields commute with the g fields, and $\sum_i g_i^\dagger g_i = N_e$. The Gutzwiller projector P_G restricts the system to be in the subspace $g_i^\dagger g_i + \sum_{j \neq i} b_j^\dagger b_j = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, L$. For this system, the basis vectors may be represented as follows:

$$|j\rangle = g_{x_1}^y g_{x_2}^y \cdots g_{x_{N_e}}^y b_{y_1-1}^y b_{y_2-2}^y \cdots b_{y_{L-N_e}}^y |0\rangle; \quad (24)$$

One can easily verify the following matrix elements

$$\langle j_1 | j \rangle = \langle j | j \rangle; \quad (25)$$

Therefore, the two systems considered here are isomorphic to each other, and we have the one-to-one correspondence $|j\rangle \leftrightarrow |j\rangle$ for the basis vectors. Using the superalgebra representation

$$\begin{aligned} P_F(i) F_i^y P_F(i) &= P_G b_i^y g_i P_G \\ P_F(i) F_i P_F(i) &= P_G b_i g_i^y P_G; \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $P_F(i) = (1 - F_{i-1}^y F_{i-1} F_{i+1}^y F_{i+1})$ is the Gutzwiller operator, and F is a fermionic field, we have

$$h = \sum_{i \neq j}^X P_F F_i^y F_j P_F; \quad (27)$$

where $P_F = \prod_{i=1}^L P_F(i)$, and the number of the F fermions on the chain is $N_F = L - N_e$.

For the system $h = \sum_{i \neq j}^P P_F F_i^y F_j P_F$, it has been proved before that the ground state energy of the Hamiltonian with $N_F = L - N_e$ is [19]

$$e_G = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) N_e; \quad (28)$$

This ground state is highly degenerate, and one has

$$|j_G\rangle = P_F F_{0\#}^y F_{0\#}^y \cdots F_{0\#}^y F_{k_1-1}^y |0\rangle; \quad (29)$$

where $F_{0\#}^y, F_{0\#}^y$ and $F_{k_1-1}^y$ creat up spin F fermion with momentum 0, down-spin F fermion with momentum 0, and F fermion with spin \downarrow and momentum k_1 , respectively. One can also find some trivial excited energy levels. For example, one eigenenergy is $e_1 = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) (L - N_e)$, another one is $e_2 = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) N_e$.

We can write out some of the ground state wavefunctions explicitly. Denote any state vector in the following fashion

$$|j\rangle = \sum_{fX_g; fY_g}^X (fX_g; fY_g) \prod_{i=1}^Q F_{Y_i}^Y \prod_{j=1}^B F_{X_j}^Y F_{X_j}^Y |P\rangle; \quad (30)$$

where the reference state $|P\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^Q F_{Y_i}^Y |P\rangle$, $Q = N_e$, $B = M + (L - N_e) = 2$, the amplitude is antisymmetric in the positions fY_g , while symmetric in the positions fX_g . We have proven that the following Jastrow wavefunctions are the eigenenergy states with energy $(j)N_e$,

$$(fX_g; fY_g) = e^{(2-i=L)(m_s - iX_i + m_h - jY_j)} \prod_{i < j}^Y d^2(X_i - X_j) \prod_{i < j}^Y d(Y_i - Y_j) \prod_{i < j}^Y d(X_i - Y_j); \quad (31)$$

where the function $d(n) = \sin(n/L)$, and the quantum numbers m_s, m_h are integers or half-integers, which make sure of the periodic boundary conditions, and satisfy the following constraints

$$\begin{aligned} (Q + B + 1) &= 2 - m_h - L & (Q + B + 1) &= 2 \\ (Q + A + 1) &= 2 - (m_h - m_s + L) - L & (Q + A + 1) &= 2: \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The effect of the up-spin Fermion hopping operator can be calculated readily, when it acts on the Jastrow wavefunctions. Rewriting the Jastrow wavefunctions in terms of the positions of the up-spin Fermions and the holes, the resultant amplitude still takes a similar Jastrow product form. The down-spin Fermion hopping operator effect can then be handled in the same way. With these simple calculations, we have been able to show that the wavefunctions Eq. (31) are indeed the eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian h , with the ground state energy $e_g = (j)N_e$, as long as the quantum numbers m_s and m_h satisfy the constraints Eq. (32).

It should be remarked that the singlets and the unpaired impurity spins are strongly correlated with each other, as seen from the Jastrow product wavefunctions, due to the long range hopping aspect. Various correlations between the unpaired impurities and the singlets can be computed exactly in compact form. Given the Gutzwiller-Jastrow wavefunctions with the quantum number m_s and m_h , we can trivially generalize Forrester's work ($m_s = L=2; m_h = L=2$) [20] to these wavefunctions. In the conventional case, where the conduction electrons hop between the nearest neighboring sites, in the strong interaction limit $J = +1$,

the general eigenenergies can be found with the Bethe-ansatz solution as for the 1D Hubbard model with strong repulsion between the Fermions. It was impossible to obtain the closed form of the correlation functions of the impurity spins and the singlets exactly, except their approximate long distance behaviors using finite size scaling analysis of conformal field theory. Finally, we would like to note that these solutions are valid for any lattice size L , unlike our first part of finite J discussion that deals with the large lattice. Moreover, like in the long range Hubbard model, the thermodynamic limit and the large J limit do not commute with each other.

In summary, we have solved exactly the Kondo lattice model in the thermodynamic limit. Due to the long range hopping matrix, we have been able to show that the contribution of some scattering processes to the thermal potential scales as $O(1)$ or $O(1/L)$, while the rest, which can be computed explicitly, scales as $O(L)$. The thermodynamics and the ground state energy of the system have been obtained in this limit. Our exact solutions demonstrate explicitly the metal-insulator phase transition at half-filling, as the interaction of the local impurity moments and conduction band is switched on at zero temperature. At any nonzero temperature, the free energy has no singularity, indicating that there is no phase transition in this system.

We would like to thank the World Laboratory Foundation for the financial support. The useful conversations with Prof. P. Coleman, Dr. B. Douçot and Dr. Q. F. Zhong are also gratefully acknowledged. Part of the work was finished when research was financially supported by the Swiss National Foundation for Science, to which we feel very grateful.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. A. Lee, T. M. Rice, J. W. Serene, L. J. Sham and J. W. Wilkins, Comments Condens. Matter Phys. 12, 99 (1986). General references can be found in this review article.
- [2] P. Flude, J. Keller and G. Zwicknagl, Solid State Phys. 41, 1 (1988).
- [3] P. Coleman, Phys. Rev. B 30, 3035 (1984).
- [4] N. Read, D. M. Newns and S. Doniach, Phys. Rev. B 30, 6420 (1984).
- [5] P. Coleman, E. Miranda and A. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B 49, 8955 (1994).
- [6] T. M. Rice and K. Ueda, Phys. Rev. B 34, 6420 (1986).
- [7] R. M. Fye and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B 44, 7486 (1991). M. Troyer and D. Wurtz, Phys. Rev. B 47, 2886 (1993).
- [8] H. Tsunetsugu, Y. Hatsugai, K. Ueda and M. Sigrist, Phys. Rev. B 46, 3175 (1992).
- [9] Z. Wang, X. P. Li and D. H. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 47, 11935 (1993).
- [10] Clare C. Yu and Steven R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3866 (1993).
- [11] A. M. Tsvelik, Oxford-preprint, cond-mat/9405024.
- [12] P. W. Anderson, G. Yuval and D. R. Hamann, Phys. Rev. B 1, 2719 (1989).
- [13] N. Andrei, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 379 (1980).
- [14] N. Andrei, K. Furuya and J. H. Lowenstein, Rev. Mod. Phys. 55, 331 (1983).
- [15] B. A. Jones, C. M. Varma and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 125 (1988).
- [16] P. van Dongen and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. B 40, 7252 (1989).
- [17] D. Mattis (unpublished).
- [18] E. H. Lieb and F. Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 20, 1445 (1968).

- [19] J.A. Verges, F. Guinea, J. Galan, P.G.J. van Dongen, G. Chippe and E. Louis, Phys. Rev. B 49, 15400 (1994), U. Brandt and A. Gieseke, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 2648 (1992).
- [20] P. Forrester, preprint cond-mat/9408090, (1994).