

Double fluctuations on the attractive Hubbard model: ladder approximation

S. Schafroth

Physik-Institut der Universität Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland.

J.J. Rodríguez-Núñez

Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal Fluminense,

Av. Litorânea S/N, Boa Viagem,

24210-340 Niterói RJ, Brazil.

e-mail: jjn@ifu.br

(February 21, 2022)

We explore, for the first time, the effect of double fluctuations on both the diagonal and off-diagonal self-energy. We use the T-Matrix equations below T_c , developed recently by the Zurich group (M.H. Pedersen et al) for the local pair attraction Hamiltonian. Here, we include as well the effect of fluctuations on the order parameter (beyond the BCS solution) up to second order in $U=t$. This is equivalent to approximating the effective interaction by U in the off-diagonal self-energy. For $U/t = 6.0$, $T/t = 0.05$, $t/t = 5.5$ and $t/t = 1.5$, we find four peaks both for the diagonal, $A(n(=16;=16);!)$, and off-diagonal, $B(n(=16;=16);!)$, spectral functions. These peaks are not symmetric in pairs as previously found. In addition: (a) in $A(n(=16;=16);!)$, the far left peak has a vanishing small weight; (b) in $B(n(=16;=16);!)$ the far left and far right peaks have very small weights. The physical picture is, then, that the pair physics in the normal phase ($T > T_c$) is still valid below T_c . However, the condensation of the e-h pairs produces an additional gap around the chemical potential as in BCS, in other words, superconductivity opens a gap in the lower branch of a Hubbard-type-I solution.

Pacs numbers: 74.20.Fg, 74.10.-z, 74.60.-w, 74.72.-h

I. INTRODUCTION

High-temperature superconductors display a wide range of behaviour atypical of the standard band-theory of metals. In the superconducting state these materials become extreme type II superconductors, with a short coherence volume, which one might take as an indication of bound pairs. These features indicate that correlation effects might be important in understanding the physical nature of these materials. One of the simplest models featuring superconductivity and allowing a systematic study of the effect of electron correlations is the attractive Hubbard model. Although this model is unlikely to be a microscopic model of high-temperature superconductors, it is likely that understanding it will provide insights into the effect of correlations on measurable properties. We adopt the local pairing potential in 2-D as a starting point to study the effect of correlations (beyond a simple BCS approach) due to the fact that the HTSC materials do not seem to be described by a mean-field approach, as it was recognized by Randeria et al [1]. Furthermore, Puchkov, Basov and Timusk [2] pointed out that in the HTSC, the Fermi surface is estimated to be $E_F = 1 - 2$ eV, which is not much larger than the energies probed in infrared experiments (4 - 300 meV). Such a low E_F could be a reason for violation of a quasi-particle description, i.e., we do not have well-defined elementary excitations. This fact may require the use of the local potential with correlations, and indeed, the damping obtained from numerical calculations is comparable to the Fermi energy, for small electron concentration.

In a previous work the effect of electron correlations on some normal-state properties of the attractive Hubbard model was studied using a self-consistent T-matrix formalism, going beyond simple mean-field treatments [3]. It was found that for intermediate coupling strengths the attractive interaction gives rise to large momentum bound states with energies below the two-particle continuum and with a pronounced effect on the spectral properties. Namely a splitting of the free band into two, one of which is associated with virtual bound states. Furthermore, a bending in the static spin-susceptibility was observed for temperatures just above the phase-transition [4].

In a following paper [5], the group of Ruschliko used the functional derivative formalism [6]. They derived the T-Matrix equations in the superconducting phase valid up to second order in the off-diagonal one-particle Green functions. The main feature of that communication was that the T-Matrix, appeared both in the diagonal (first order in the T-Matrix) and off-diagonal (order parameter plus a second order contribution in the T-Matrix) part of the

self-energy. The authors of Ref. [5] implemented a low order approximation with full fluctuations in the diagonal part of the self-energy while using a mean field approximation for the off-diagonal part of the self-energy, i.e., equal to the order parameter.

In this communication, we implement a higher order approximation to the off-diagonal self-energy by allowing fluctuations in the order parameter also, i.e., making $T(x; x^0) \neq U(x)$. We keep the full T -Matrix in the diagonal part of the self-energy as in Ref. [5]. The goal of the present work is to study the stability of the physical picture given in Ref. [5], which can be summarized as the appearance of four peaks, symmetric in pairs, both in $A(k; k; !)$ and $B(k; k; !)$. We caution the reader that we are exploring the effect of double fluctuations by approximating $T(x; x^0)$ by $U(x, x^0)$ in $\chi_2(x; x^0)$ as a step forward in taking into account the full effect of correlations. In Section II we present the model and the results of Ref. [5].

In Section III we keep the low order approximation taken in Ref. [5] and implement our second order approximation in the off-diagonal self-energy. Our implementation is performed with the fast-Fourier transform (FFT) and we discuss the physical meaning of our results. Section IV concludes.

II. THE MODEL AND THE T-MATRIX EQUATIONS.

The Hubbard Hamiltonian is defined as

$$H = \sum_{\langle l l^0 \rangle} t \sum_{\sigma} c_{l\sigma}^\dagger c_{l^0\sigma} + U \sum_l n_{l\uparrow} n_{l\downarrow} \quad (1)$$

where the c_l^\dagger (c_l) are creation (annihilation) operators for electrons with spin σ . The number-operator is $n_l = \sum_{\sigma} c_l^\dagger c_l$, t is the hopping matrix element between nearest neighbours l and l^0 , U is the onsite interaction and μ is the chemical potential in the grand canonical ensemble. Here we consider an attractive interaction, $U < 0$. For a review of the attractive Hubbard model see Micnas et al [7]. Previous authors have used this model to study the bismuthate superconductors [8].

By starting with the Nambu Green function

$$G_{xx^0}(\omega; \omega^0) = \frac{D}{T} \langle T_x(\omega) \begin{pmatrix} c_x \\ c_x^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{x^0}^\dagger \\ c_{x^0} \end{pmatrix} \rangle_{\omega^0} \quad (2)$$

where \otimes means the tensor product and T means the time ordering of the two Nambu operators, where these are defined, at position x and imaginary time, τ , by

$$T_x = \begin{pmatrix} c_x \\ c_x^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} c_{x^\#}^\dagger \\ c_{x^\#} \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \begin{pmatrix} c_x \\ c_x^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_x^\dagger \\ c_x \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} c_{x^\#} \\ c_{x^\#}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

the authors of Ref. [5] write the solution to Dyson's equation in $k; !$ -space as

$$G_{11}(k; i!_n) = \frac{G_{22}(k; -i!_n)}{i!_n + \mu_k - G_{11}(k; i!_n)} \quad ; \quad (4)$$

$$G_{12}(k; i!_n) = \frac{G_{21}(k; -i!_n)}{i!_n + \mu_k - G_{11}(k; i!_n)} \quad ; \quad (5)$$

where $i!_n = (2n+1)\pi/\beta$ are the fermionic Matsubara frequencies and $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$ the inverse temperature. The d-dimensional dispersion is given by $\mu_k = 2t \sum_{a=1}^d \cos(k \cdot a)$. Σ is the self-energy matrix [9] and d is the lattice dimension.

Then, by using the functional derivative technique [6], the authors of Ref. [5] get the self-energies to second order in G_{12} (G_{21})

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{11}(x; x^0) &= G_{22}(x; x^0) T(x^0; x) + G_{21}(x; \bar{a}) G_{22}(\bar{a}; \bar{b}) T(\bar{b}; x) G_{12}(\bar{b}; x^0) T(x^0; x) \quad ; \\ \Sigma_{12}(x; x^0) &= \Sigma(x) (x - x^0) + G_{22}(x; \bar{a}) G_{12}(\bar{a}; \bar{b}) T(\bar{b}; x) G_{11}(\bar{b}; x^0) T(x^0; \bar{a}) \quad ; \\ \Sigma_{21}(x; x^0) &= \Sigma^0(x) (x - x^0) + G_{11}(x; \bar{a}) G_{21}(\bar{a}; \bar{b}) T(\bar{b}; x) G_{22}(\bar{b}; x^0) T(x^0; \bar{a}) \quad ; \\ \Sigma_{22}(x; x^0) &= G_{11}(x; x^0) T(x^0; x) + G_{12}(x; \bar{a}) G_{11}(\bar{a}; \bar{b}) T(\bar{b}; x) G_{21}(\bar{b}; x^0) T(x^0; x) \quad : \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $T(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y})$ in reciprocal space has the following form

$$T(\mathbf{q};i_m^n) = \frac{U}{1 - U \langle \mathbf{q};i_m^n \rangle} ; \quad (7)$$

with

$$\langle \mathbf{q};i_m^n \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k};i_n^!}^X G_{22}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q};i_n^! - i_m^n) G_{11}(\mathbf{k};i_n^!) ; \quad (8)$$

and $i_n^! = 2\pi n/W$ are the bosonic Matsubara frequencies. This solution (see Eq. (6)) is valid for $U \ll W$, where $W = 2\pi/\Delta t$ is the bandwidth. In Eq. (6) summation over repeated indices is understood (space and imaginary time). The physical meaning of Eq. (6) is the repeated scattering of two particles many times, without polarization of the medium. This is equivalent to the T - M matrix approximation which is valid for small carrier concentrations. Another approximation involved in the derivation of Eq. (6) is the condition that $\langle T \rangle \ll W$. This is equivalent to a perturbation expansion to second order in $\langle T \rangle = W$. For a solution of the Eqs. (4,7,8,6) one would also need to fix the chemical potential from the particle number using

$$\langle T \rangle = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k};i_n^!}^X G(\mathbf{k};i_n^!) \exp(i i_n^! \beta) ; \quad (9)$$

where β is the electron concentration per spin and is defined in the interval $[0;1]$. Thus, the set of Eqs. (4,7,8,9) represents a set of non-linear self-consistent equations which needs to be solved numerically.

We note that an expansion of the β -equations, Eqs. (6), to first order in U simply gives the wellknown BCS expressions. To second in U the result is identical to that of Martın-Rodero and Flores [11].

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Before we disclose our approximation and present a numerical solution to it, we will discuss the approximation made in Ref. [5]. The authors of this reference approximate the set of Eqs. (6) in the following form [12,13]

$$\begin{aligned} 11(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= G_{22}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0)T(\mathbf{x}^0;\mathbf{x}) \\ 12(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle \\ 21(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle \\ 22(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= G_{11}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0)T(\mathbf{x}^0;\mathbf{x}) ; \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which is equivalent to keeping full fluctuations in the diagonal part of the self-energy while performing a mean field approximation in the off-diagonal self-energy, $12(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle$. Remember fluctuations enter through the T - M matrix, and this has been set equal to zero in the off-diagonal self-energy. The idea behind the point of view taken by these authors is that the effect of correlations is mainly present in the diagonal self-energy, i.e., correlations are linear in the T - M matrix. In addition, the authors of Ref. [5] took the pragmatic view of taking one step at a time, i.e., to study correlations in the same manner as they were studied in the normal state.

Here, we want to include fluctuations in the order parameter, or equivalently in the off-diagonal part of the self-energy. For this, we make $T(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) = U \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle$ in the off-diagonal self-energy while keeping the full fluctuations in the diagonal self-energy. Then, our approximation is equivalent to the following set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} 11(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= G_{22}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0)T(\mathbf{x}^0;\mathbf{x}) \\ 12(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle + U^2 G_{11}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) G_{12}(\mathbf{x}^0;\mathbf{x}) G_{22}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) \\ 21(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0 \rangle + U^2 G_{22}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) G_{21}(\mathbf{x}^0;\mathbf{x}) G_{11}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) \\ 22(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0) &= G_{11}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^0)T(\mathbf{x}^0;\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which are local in real space where they can be easily evaluated numerically. The Green's functions are determined self-consistently using Dyson's equation where the order parameter is used as input (see below). The technical aspects of the numerical solution using the FFT-technique has been detailed in [3]. We consider that the set of Eqs. (11) contains double fluctuations since we have full fluctuations in the diagonal part of the self-energy and fluctuations in the off-diagonal self-energy. The latter come through the one-particle Green functions themselves which must be

calculated self-consistently. The reason that we pursue the present approximation is that we believe that including fluctuations in the σ -diagonal self-energy will have a strong influence on the dynamical properties. The outcome of our numerical calculations vindicate this. Although the choice of $T(x; x^0) = U(x, x^0)$ in the σ -diagonal self-energy does not fully take into account all the fluctuations, it keeps the numerical implementation under control with present time workstation facilities. We leave to the future an implementation of the full T -matrix contribution.

The numerical simulations were performed in two dimensions (2D), for $U/t = 6.0$, $t = 5.5$, $v = 1.5$ and $T/t = 0.05$. We have fixed the order parameter and the chemical potential because computationally it is much easier to find one root rather than two. The selected value of $t = 1.5$ for $U/t = 6.0$ is inside the range of validity of the approximation and close to the numerical value found in Ref. [5]. As is explained in Ref. [14] numerical convergence is based on the fact that the diagonal self-energy depends neither on x nor x^0 . This assumption is not longer valid here, making the program more complex. Because of these reasons, we have decided to fix x and x^0 and the carrier concentration, n . In addition, there is more than one solution for the equation $\epsilon(k; i) = \text{const}$ (see Fig. 8). Here one must note that due to the Mermin-Wagner theorem no phase-transition is expected in 2D systems with a continuous symmetry, and the formalism employed is therefore too simple to describe a Kosterlitz-Thouless phase-transition. Nonetheless, it is observed that the formalism does give a phase-transition, in agreement with the results above the transition temperature, where the signaling of a divergence of the T -matrix was observed.

In Figure 1, we present the diagonal one-particle spectral function, $A(k; i)$, defined by

$$A(k; i) = \frac{1}{i} \lim_{i \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Im} [G_{11}(k; i + i)]; \quad (12)$$

The value of the gap, $t = 1.5$ is within the region of validity of the expansion, Eqs. (6), i.e., $W < 1$, with $W = 8t$ the bandwidth in 2D. We observe three visible peaks, two symmetric around the chemical potential, μ , and the third is the the upper Hubbard branch. However, there is a fourth peak for $i < 0$, which for $n = 0$ is around $i = 3.8$. The equivalent peak for $i > 0$ is around $i = 3.25$. The peak at $i = 3.8$ has a vanishingly small weight (see the inset figure). So, we conclude that the symmetric peak structure does not hold anymore (at least for the most extreme peaks). If we consider that the peak at $i = 3.8$ is indeed small then we are left with effectively three peaks. These results are different from the ones obtained by the Zurich group [5]. Then, the picture which emerges from $A(k; i)$ is the appearance of three energy branches, a higher one which is already present in the normal phase and two lower ones which are symmetric around the chemical potential. These two superconducting lower branches correspond to the lower energy branch of the normal state. Now superconductivity ($\mu \neq 0$) opens up a gap in the normal lower energy branch. These two superconducting low branches are, then, due to the pairing of the electron-hole pairs across the chemical potential, similar to the BCS case. The only difference with respect to the weak coupling (BCS) limit is the appearance of the higher energy branch.

In Figure 2, we present the σ -diagonal one-particle spectral function, $B(k; i)$, which is defined as,

$$B(k; i) = \frac{1}{i} \lim_{i \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Im} [G_{12}(k; i + i)]; \quad (13)$$

From Figure 2 we see that this function has two symmetric and visible peaks. In the inset we show a blow up of the energy scale. We observe two additional two peaks at $i = 3.9$; 4.1 , for $n = 0$, which are not symmetric and their weights are small. So that we argue that they can be neglected. Finally, there are two symmetric peaks around ($i = 0$). The conclusion to be drawn from these observations is that the σ -diagonal spectral function remains qualitatively equal to the the BCS case, i.e., the inclusion of fluctuations both in the diagonal and σ -diagonal components of the Nambu self-energy does not change the basic BCS condensation picture. Only the diagonal spectral function suffers the effect of correlations (Figure 1), as should be, due to the presence of strong correlations. We have chosen k_x and k_y in units of $\pi/16$.

In Figure 3 we present the imaginary part of the two-particle Green's function, $\text{Im} G_2(q; i)$. The Cooper resonance almost disappears since the peak weights for $i < 0$ are negligible (see inset). In addition, for every value of k we find ($i > 0$) a main peak with some two broad peaks of reasonable weights. These additional broad peaks have an effect on $\epsilon(k; i|_n)$. As $\epsilon(k; i|_n)$, $G(k; i|_n)$ and $F(k; i|_n)$ are coupled together, then, these peaks which in the are going to have an effect on the quasi-particle spectra. All this is due to the fact that our equations are self-consistent. We observe a well defined two-particle structure for all values of momentum for $i > 0$. The fact that the Cooper resonance is, in certain sense, washed out is probably due to the fact that the effect of double fluctuations favor pairing formation, which implies that the interaction is stronger. A discussion of this point is treated in the paper of Ranninger and Robin [15]. Another difference between our results and those of the Zurich group, is that our band of two particles is wider than theirs. This has deep physical consequences, as we will see later.

In Figure 4 we present the imaginary part of the diagonal self-energy, $\text{Im} [\epsilon(n(\pi/16; \pi/16); i)]$ for the same parameters of Figure 3. We observe an opening of the gap at the chemical potential, $i = 0$. This gap is much bigger

than twice the order parameter. In the inset we have a blow up of the energy scale concluding that it is composed of two peaks, one of them broad. The authors of Ref. [3,4] found that $\text{Im } \Sigma$ almost has a peak in the normal phase. The presence of this peak is the origin to the two peaks in $A(n=16;=16;!)].$ In the superconducting phase, the authors of Ref. [5] find that $\text{Im } \Sigma$ still has one peak which implies the presence of four peaks, symmetric in pairs, both in $A(n=16;=16;!)]$ and $B(n=16;=16;!)].$ Now, in our approach with double fluctuations, we observe that $\text{Im } \Sigma$ has no well defined single peak structure. This, we argue, will wash out the pair symmetry. The presence of double fluctuations is responsible for the cancellation of the leftmost peak of $A(n=16;=16;!)].$ So, the picture which emerges is a Hubbard-type-I solution combined with a superconducting gap in the lower branch [16].

In Figure 5 we show the real part of the diagonal self-energy, $\text{Re}[\Sigma(n=16;=16;!)]$, for the same parameters given in Figure 3. We observe in Figure 4 that the width of these peaks is bigger than those of the Zurich group. The consequence of this is that we are no longer able to define a well defined peak in the self-energy, so that the four peak structure (with symmetric pair of peaks) of the Zurich group is not longer valid. Thus, the picture is the following: above T_c we have two peaks which are due to the pair formation physics, i.e., the upper and lower branches; below T_c one of the bands is split into two to the spontaneous symmetry breaking, $\neq 0$.

In Figures 6 and 7 we show the frequency dependence of the real and imaginary part of the off-diagonal self-energy, i.e., $\text{Re}[\Sigma_{12}(n=16;=16;!)]$ and $\text{Im}[\Sigma_{12}(n=16;=16;!)]$, for the same parameters as given previously. For the case of $\text{Im}[\Sigma_{12}(n=16;=16;!)]$ we have not shown the full energy range. However, it is fully antisymmetric. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first presentation of these results in the literature. We observe that $\text{Im}[\Sigma_{12}(n=16;=16;!)]$ and $\text{Im}[\Sigma(n=16;=16;!)]$ have almost the same values for large frequencies. However, the position of their peaks is at a different frequency for each n . In addition, the effect of correlations (fluctuations) is important since they decrease the value of $\text{Re}[\Sigma_{12}(n=16;=16;!)]$ from down to almost $=2$, for $n=0$ and $!=0$. If we take a closer look at Eqs.(4,5) we see that Σ_{12} plays the role of an energy gap. Then, the energy gap is $(k;!)$ -dependent and it of the same order of magnitude than the order parameter, (T) . This analogy leads us to conclude that the order parameter, (T) , and the energy gap are two different quantities. So, a local interaction produces a $(k;!)$ -dependent energy gap, which is the quantity that experimentalists are most likely measuring.

In Figure 8 we have a plot of ρ vs μ for different fixed values of the order parameter, Δ . We see that there is an abrupt change of density as a function of μ . Also, for a fixed value of μ there are up to three different values of the chemical potential. Then, our scheme is not valid for large densities, a condition we take as granted by the definition of the T-Matrix formalism. On the other hand, when we increase the temperature the step of ρ vs μ tends to disappear. This implies that our scheme is valid for temperatures which are not too low. We would like to point out that the implementation of the T-Matrix approach in the normal phase ($\Delta=0$) did not converge for small temperatures and high densities [3]. We interpret the non-convergence of the T-Matrix program above T_c as due the fact that we are approaching a parameter region where there are no physical solutions. For example, in another context, Figueira and Foglio [17], have found multivalued for the chemical potential in the periodic Anderson model and they choose the solution of minimum Helmholtz free energy.

IV. CONCLUSIONS.

Using the analytical results of Ref. [5], we have implemented a program where we have included fluctuations both in the diagonal and off-diagonal self-energy. This approach we call double fluctuation since we have full fluctuations in the diagonal part of the self-energy while going beyond the mean field solution (BCS) in the order parameter. This represents a higher order approximation than those used in Ref. [5]. We have presented the one-particle and two-particle spectral functions pointing out the differences with the low order approximation performed by the Zurich group [5]. We have indicated that the pair formation, which is a phenomenon valid even above T_c remains valid in our scheme. However, the effect of fluctuations in the off-diagonal part of the diagonal self-energy (double fluctuations) does not produce a well defined peak in the diagonal part of the one-particle self-energy and this breaks the four peak structure found by the Zurich group, resulting in a clearer picture since only one of the Hubbard bands is split into two around the chemical potential. The off-diagonal spectral density is qualitatively similar to the one of BCS, but the diagonal spectral function suffers the effect of strong correlations. As has been said before, the physical picture which emerges from our work is that of superconductivity opening a gap in the lower branch of a Hubbard-type-I solution. We have performed additional calculations and found that the opening of the correlation gap is hard to achieve. For $U/t=12.0$, $T/t=0.1$ and $\Delta/t=8.5$ we find that the correlation gap is more or less visible but not fully developed. This is due to the fact that the shifting of the electronic states around the chemical potential sends electronic states above μ and this closes the correlation gap. We have also discussed the parameter space where our approximation is valid and we have made a connection with the calculations above the transition temperature discussing the validity of each. To end, we mention that a previous calculation by Rodriguez-Nunez, Cordeiro and

Del no [18] has used the ideas presented in this work within the framework of the moment approach of Nolting [19] in the superconducting phase.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

We would like to thank Brazilian Agency CNPq (Project No. 300705/95-96), CONDES-LUZ and CONICIT (Project No. F-139). Very useful discussions with Prof. M.S. Figueira and Prof. Gerardo Martinez are fully acknowledged. We thank Dr. A. Umerski and Prof. Mar Adobres Garcia-Gonzalez for reading the manuscript.

- [1] Mohit Randeria, Nandini Trivedi, Adriana Moreo and Richard T. Scalettar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2001 (1992).
- [2] A.V. Puchkov, D.N. Basov and T. Timusk, Cond-Matter/9611083. In this paper, the authors study the presence of the pseudogap in HTSC by means of infrared measurements, which in our view points toward the need of strong correlations; see, also, A.V. Puchkov, P. Fournier, D.N. Basov, T. Timusk, A. Kapitulnik and N.N. Kolesnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3212 (1996). In this last paper, the authors study the frequency-dependent scattering rate $1/\tau(\omega; T)$ and its doping dependence. While they observe a normal-state gaplike depression in $1/\tau(\omega; T)$ in the underdoped regime, it is not observed in the overdoped regime. This points to the fact that the high- T_c cuprates are strongly correlated materials in the underdoped regime.
- [3] R.M. Icnas, M.H. Pedersen, S. Schafroth, T. Schneider, J.J. Rodriguez-Nunez and H. Beck, Phys. Rev. B, 52, 11223 (1995).
- [4] T. Schneider, M.H. Pedersen and J.J. Rodriguez-Nunez Z. Phys. B 100, 263 (1996); J.M. Singer, M.H. Pederson, T. Schneider, H. Beck and H.-G. Matuszewska-Petkus, Phys. Rev. B 54, 1286 (1996).
- [5] M.H. Pedersen, J.J. Rodriguez-Nunez, H. Beck, T. Schneider and S. Schafroth. (Z. Physik B, 1996). Accepted.
- [6] Kadano and Baym, Quantum Statistical Mechanics. (Advanced Book Classics, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company 1989); G. Baym and Leo P. Kadano, Phys. Rev. 124, 287 (1961); G. Baym, Phys. Rev. 127, 1391 (1962).
- [7] R.M. Icnas, J. Ranninger and S. Robaszkiewicz, Rev. Mod. Phys. 62, 113 (1990).
- [8] M. Rice and L. Sneddon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 689 (1981); A.S. Alexandrov, J. Ranninger and S. Robaszkiewicz, Phys. Rev. 33, 4526 (1986).
- [9] Richard D. Mattuck, A Guide to Feynman Diagrams in the Many-body Problem. Dover (1992). Eqs. (10.18) and (15.58).
- [10] R. Fresard, B. G. Lasser and P. Wolfe, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 4, 8565 (1992).
- [11] A. Martn-Rodero and F. Flores, Phys. Rev. B 45, 13008 (1992).
- [12] J.J. Rodriguez-Nunez, S. Schafroth, H. Beck, T. Schneider, M.H. Pedersen and R.M. Icnas, Physica B 206-207, 654 (1995).
- [13] J.J. Rodriguez-Nunez, S. Schafroth, R.M. Icnas, T. Schneider, H. Beck and M.H. Pedersen, J. Low Temp. Phys. 99, 315 (1995).
- [14] S. Schafroth, J.J. Rodriguez-Nunez and H. Beck, (J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 1996). Submitted.
- [15] J. Ranninger and J.M. Robin, Sol. State Commun. 98, 559 (1996).
- [16] J. Hubbard, Proc. Roy. Soc. A 276, 238 (1963).
- [17] M.S. Figueira and M.E. Foglio, Physica A 208, 279 (1994).
- [18] J.J. Rodriguez-Nunez, C.E. Cordeiro and A. Del no, Physica A (1996, at press).
- [19] W. Nolting, Z. Physik 225, 25 (1972); W. Nolting, G. Rundkurs: Theoretische Physik. 7 Viel-Teilchen-Theorie. Verlag Ziemann-Neufang (Ulm -1992).

Figures.

FIG .1. The diagonal one-particle spectral function, $A(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{p});!)$ vs $!$ for different momenta along the diagonal of the Brillouin zone ($\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{n};\mathbf{n}) = 16$) for $U=t = 6.0$, $T=t = 0.05$, $\mu = 1.5$ and $\beta = 5.5$. We have used an external damping of $\gamma = 0.1$. We have used 16×16 points in the Brillouin zone and 1024 Matsubara frequencies. After self-consistent calculation of the coupled non-linear equations, we obtain a density, $n = 0.035942$. we have runned our source code in single precision requiring 18 M B of RAM memory. Each iteration takes 2.5 minutes of CPU time.

FIG .2. The off-diagonal one-particle spectral function, $B(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{=16}; \mathbf{=16});!)$ vs $!$ for different momenta along the diagonal of the Brillouin zone. Same parameters as in Figure 1.

FIG .3. $\text{Im}[G_2(\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{=16}; \mathbf{=16});!)]$ vs $!$ for different momenta along the diagonal of the Brillouin zone ($\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{m};\mathbf{m}) = 16$). Same parameters as in Figure 1.

FIG .4. $\text{Im}[\chi(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{=16}; \mathbf{=16});!)]$ vs $!$ for different momenta along the diagonal of the Brillouin zone ($\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{n};\mathbf{n}) = 16$). Same parameters as in Figure 1.

FIG .5. $\text{Re}[\chi(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{=16}; \mathbf{=16});!)]$ vs $!$ for different momenta along the diagonal of the Brillouin zone ($\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{n};\mathbf{n}) = 16$). Same parameters as in Figure 1.

FIG .6. $\text{Im}[\chi_{12}(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{=16}; \mathbf{=16});!)]$ vs $!$ for different momenta along the diagonal of the Brillouin zone ($\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{n};\mathbf{n}) = 16$). Same parameters as in Figure 1.

FIG .7. $\text{Re}[\chi_{12}(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{=16}; \mathbf{=16});!)]$ vs $!$ for different momenta along the diagonal of the Brillouin zone ($\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{n};\mathbf{n}) = 16$). Same parameters as in Figure 1.

FIG .8. χ vs $!$ for different fixed values of the order parameter, χ , at $T=t = 0.05$ and $T=t = 0.2$.