

Exactly solvable model of superconducting magnetic alloys

Valery I. Rupasov*

Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A7

and

Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

(March 23, 2022)

Abstract

A model describing the Anderson impurity in the Bardeen-Cooper-Schriffer superconductor is proven to exhibit hidden integrability and is diagonalized exactly by the Bethe ansatz.

The basic theoretical models describing magnetic impurities in nonmagnetic normal metals, such as the s-d (Kondo) model, the Anderson model, etc., are integrable under *two additional conditions* [1]: (i) an electron-impurity coupling is assumed to be energy independent, and (ii) a band electron dispersion $\varepsilon(k)$ can be linearized around the Fermi level, $\varepsilon(k) \simeq v_F(k - k_F)$, where k_F and v_F are the Fermi momentum and velocity, respectively. Only under these conditions, both an electron-impurity scattering and an effective electron-electron coupling are described in terms of discontinuous jumps in the Bethe ansatz wave functions. Therefore a linear dispersion of particles and a pointlike particle-impurity coupling are considered now as the *necessary* mathematical conditions for integrability of the “impurity” models. Because a carrier dispersion in superconducting metals cannot be linearized, the “linear dispersion approximation” (LDA) is clear to eliminate superconductivity from an exact analysis of the behaviour of magnetic alloys [1].

It has recently been discerned [2] that LDA is not necessary for an exact diagonalization of the basic impurity models of quantum optics, describing a system of Bose particles with a nonlinear dispersion coupled to two-level atoms [3]. Making use of some mathematical analogies between “magnetic” and “optical” models, it can be shown [4] that the degenerate Anderson model with a nonlinear band electron dispersion also exhibits hidden integrability [2] and is diagonalized exactly by the Bethe ansatz. One of the most exciting applications of the approach developed [2–4] could be an exact treatment of the superconductivity problem in the presence of magnetic impurities. Since the pioneering work of Abrikosov and Gor’kov [5], the problem has been the subject of many theoretical and experimental studies [6] but still remains one of the most intriguing puzzles of modern physics. Therefore an extension of the Bethe ansatz technique to superconducting magnetic models accounting for a gap dispersion of charge carriers is of fundamental physical interest.

In the present letter, we report first results for a model describing the Anderson impurity placed within the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) superconductor. To diagonalize the model Hamiltonian, we introduce auxiliary particles and show that the multiparticle scattering process is factorized into two-particle ones, despite a nonlocal effective particle-

impurity coupling. The continuous multielectron wave functions result from an integral “dressing” of the discontinuous Bethe ansatz wave functions of auxiliary particles, the information about the electron dispersion being contained into a dressing function. Imposing the periodic boundary conditions on the multielectron wave functions, we derive the Bethe ansatz equations (BAE) for the cases of a rare-earth and a transition metal impurity with infinitely large Coulomb repulsion on the impurity orbital.

To derive the model under consideration, one can start with the Hamiltonian involving the Hamiltonians of the BCS and Anderson models,

$$H = \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow\downarrow} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\Delta a_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^{\dagger} a_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger} + \Delta^* a_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow} a_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} \right) + \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow\downarrow} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}} \left(a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{\sigma} + d_{\sigma}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \right) + \epsilon_d \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow\downarrow} d_{\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{\sigma} + U d_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} d_{\uparrow} d_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} d_{\downarrow}. \quad (1)$$

The Fermi operator $a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger}$ creates a conduction band electron with the momentum \mathbf{k} , spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ and the energy $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_F$, where $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ and ϵ_F are the kinetic and Fermi energies. An electron localized on the impurity d -orbital with energy ϵ_d is described by the Fermi operators d_{σ} . The third term of Eq. (1) represents the hybridization of a band and a d -level electrons with the matrix element $v_{\mathbf{k}}$, while the Coulomb repulsion on the impurity orbital is described by the last term. Two first terms of Eq. (1) are the standard BCS model, where the gap Δ is assumed to result from the Cooper pairing phenomenon. For our purposes, it is convenient to treat Δ and ϵ_F as some free parameters, which have to be found self-consistently, and to start our analysis with the bare vacuum of the model defined by $a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|0\rangle = d_{\sigma}|0\rangle = 0$. In the normal state ($\Delta = 0$), the model (1) is reduced to the Anderson model, which has been diagonalized by Wiegmann [8] within the LDA.

The BCS part of the model Hamiltonian is diagonalized by the Bogoliubov-Valatin unitary transform [7] to give

$$H_{\text{BCS}} = \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \omega_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \quad (2a)$$

where $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = -\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + |\Delta|^2}$, for $k = |\mathbf{k}| < k_F$ and $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + |\Delta|^2}$ for $k > k_F$. In terms of new Fermi particles (which we will also call “electrons”), the hybridization term takes the

form

$$V = v \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(d_{\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{\sigma} \right), \quad (2b)$$

where we have set $k = k_F$ both in the hybridization matrix element, $v = v(k_F)$, and in the coefficients of the unitary transform. In addition, we have omitted in Eq. (2b) the terms $d_{\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger}$ and $d_{\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$, because they do not conserve the number of particles and could lead only to insignificant small corrections in comparison with a contribution of the term (2b). The bare vacuum of the model is defined now by $c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|0\rangle = d_{\sigma}|0\rangle = 0$. To obtain the ground state of the BCS Hamiltonian, one needs thus to fill all states with $k < k_F$.

Making use of the spherical harmonic representation for band electron operators [1], we arrive at the following one-dimensional form of the model Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \left\{ \omega(k) c_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(k) c_{\sigma}(k) + v \left[d_{\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\sigma}(k) + c_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(k) d_{\sigma} \right] \right\} + \epsilon_d \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} d_{\sigma}^{\dagger} d_{\sigma} + U d_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} d_{\uparrow} d_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} d_{\downarrow} \quad (3a)$$

where

$$\omega(k) = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{|\Delta|^2 + k^2} & , k < 0 \\ \sqrt{|\Delta|^2 + k^2} & , k > 0 \end{cases} \quad (3b)$$

and the function $\varepsilon(k)$ is linearized around the Fermi level, $\varepsilon(k) \simeq v_F(k - k_F)$. We also have set v_F equals to 1 and count the electron momentum k from k_F and the energy ϵ_d from ϵ_F . In the normal state, Eqs. (3) are reduced to the integrable version of the Anderson model. Hereafter, we restrict ourselves to very large values of U , so that the double occupancy of the d -level is unlikely and can be excluded.

The model Hamiltonian (3) describes the behavior of a transition metal impurity in a superconductor. In the case of rare-earth impurities, one needs to combine the BCS model and the degenerate Anderson model [1]. After analogous manipulations, we then obtain

$$H = \sum_{\alpha} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \left\{ \omega(k) c_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(k) c_{\alpha}(k) + v \left[c_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(k) X_{0\alpha} + X_{\alpha 0} c_{\alpha}(k) \right] \right\} + \epsilon_f \sum_{\alpha} X_{\alpha\alpha}. \quad (4)$$

Here, the Fermi operator $c_\alpha^\dagger(k)$ creates an electron with the total angular momentum projection α and the momentum modulus k . An impurity is described by the Hubbard operators X_{ab} with algebra $X_{ab}X_{cd} = \delta_{cb}X_{ad}$, where the index $a = 0, \alpha$ enumerates both the nonmagnetic state ($a = 0$) and the degenerate magnetic states ($\alpha = 1, \dots, n$) of the impurity with the f -level energy ϵ_f . The Coulomb repulsion on the impurity orbital is assumed to be very large, such the multiple occupancy is excluded. In the normal state, Eq. (4) is reduced to the n -fold degenerate Anderson model, which has been diagonalized by Schlottmann [9] within the LDA. In the particular case $n = 2$, the model (4) is equivalent to the nondegenerate model (3) with infinitely large Coulomb repulsion U .

To diagonalize the model Hamiltonian, it is convenient to rewrite Eq. (4) in terms of electron operators on the “energy scale”, $c_\alpha(\omega) = (d\omega(k)/dk)^{-1/2}c_\alpha(k)$, with algebra $\{c_\alpha(\omega), c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(\omega')\} = 2\pi\delta_{\alpha\alpha'}\delta(\omega - \omega')$,

$$H = \sum_\alpha \int_C \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \left\{ \omega c_\alpha^\dagger(\omega) c_\alpha(\omega) + V(\omega) [c_\alpha^\dagger(\omega) X_{0\alpha} + X_{\alpha 0} c_\alpha(\omega)] \right\} + \epsilon_f \sum_\alpha X_{\alpha\alpha}, \quad (5)$$

where $V(\omega) = v(d\omega(k)/dk)^{-1/2}$ is energy dependent because of the nonlinear electron dispersion (3b). The integration contour C consists of two semi-infinite intervals, $C = C_- \oplus C_+$, where $C_- = (-\infty, -\Delta)$ and $C_+ = (\Delta, \infty)$ correspond to the lower ($k < 0$) and upper ($k > 0$) branches of the electron dispersion.

We look now for one-electron eigenstates of the Hamiltonian (5) in the form

$$|\Psi_1\rangle = \sum_\alpha A_\alpha \left[g X_{\alpha 0} + \int_C \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} V(\epsilon) \phi(\epsilon) c_\alpha^\dagger(\epsilon) \right] |0\rangle,$$

where A_α is arbitrary. The vacuum state contains no band electrons and the impurity is in the nonmagnetic state, $c_\alpha(\epsilon)|0\rangle = X_{\alpha 0}|0\rangle = 0$. The Schrödinger equation $(H - \omega)|\Psi_1\rangle = 0$ then reads

$$(-i\partial_\tau - \omega)\phi(\tau|\omega) + g(\omega)\delta(\tau) = 0, \quad (6a)$$

$$(\epsilon_f - \omega)g(\omega) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \Gamma(\tau)\phi(\tau|\omega) = 0, \quad (6b)$$

where $\phi(\tau)$ is the Fourier image of the auxiliary wave function $\phi(\epsilon)$, while the effective

particle-impurity coupling $\Gamma(\tau)$ contains the information about the electron dispersion,

$$\phi(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \phi(\epsilon) e^{i\epsilon\tau}, \quad \Gamma(\tau) = \int_C \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} V^2(\epsilon) e^{-i\epsilon\tau}.$$

For $\omega \in C$, one gets $g(\omega) = [r(\omega) + i/2]^{-1}$ and

$$\phi(\tau|\omega) = \frac{r(\omega) - (i/2)\text{sgn}(\tau)}{r(\omega) + i/2} e^{i\omega\tau}. \quad (7)$$

The “rapidity” $r(\omega)$ is defined by

$$r = \frac{\omega - \epsilon_f}{V^2(\omega)} = \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_f}{\omega(k)}\right) \frac{k}{v^2}, \quad (8)$$

where $V^2(\omega)/2$ is the imaginary part of the self-energy

$$\Sigma(\omega) = \int_C \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{V^2(\epsilon)}{\epsilon - \omega - i0}.$$

The real part of the self-energy, $\Sigma'(\omega) = \text{Re } \Sigma(\omega)$, equals to zero if ω lies outside the gap, $|\omega| > \Delta$. If ω lies inside the gap, $\omega \in G = (-\Delta, \Delta)$, the imaginary part of the self-energy vanishes, and Eqs. (6) admit also the discrete mode with the eigenenergy ω_d , which is found as a root of equation $\epsilon_f - \omega = \Sigma'(\omega)$, where $\Sigma'(\omega) = v^2\omega/2\sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}$ and $\omega \in G$. The discrete mode describes the electron-impurity bound state, which is a complete analog of the discrete mode predicted earlier by John and Wang [10] for a Bose system. If ϵ_f lies far from the gap, $|\epsilon_f| \gg \Delta$, the bound state energy ω_d is very close to the conduction band states, but becomes well separated if ϵ_f lies inside and around the gap. Note also that for many superconducting magnetic alloys $v^2 \gg \Delta$, therefore ω_d lies close to zero (the Fermi energy of the host metal) for arbitrary position of the impurity level energy ϵ_f . It should be also emphasized that the discrete mode is found here as a solution of the one-particle problem (6) rather than a multiparticle bound state discussed earlier by Shiba [11]. Therefore strong electron-electron correlations could result in a strong renormalization of the bare discrete mode energy ω_d .

The auxiliary wave function (7) is discontinuous, but the electron wave function $\psi_\alpha(x|\omega) \equiv \langle c_\alpha(x) | \Psi_1 \rangle = \psi(x|\omega) A_\alpha$ (where the operator $c_\alpha(x)$ is defined as $c_\alpha(x) =$

$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (dk/2\pi) c_{\alpha}(k) \exp(ikx)$ [1]) is continuous and results from the integral dressing of the auxiliary function,

$$\psi(x|\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau u(x; \tau) \phi(\tau|\omega),$$

with the dressing function

$$u(x; \tau) = v \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \left(\frac{d\omega(k)}{dk} \right)^{-1} \exp \{i[kx - \omega(k)\tau]\}.$$

In the LDA, the dressing function is nothing but the delta-function, $u(x; \tau) = v\delta(x - \tau)$, and hence the auxiliary wave function $\phi(\tau|\omega)$ is the same as the electron wave function $\psi(x|\omega)$.

The idea of auxiliary functions (or “auxiliary particles”) can easily be extended to the multielectron case. For instance, the two-electron wave functions in the energy space are represented as $\Psi_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = V(\epsilon_1)V(\epsilon_2)\Phi_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ and $J_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\epsilon) = V(\epsilon)G_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\epsilon)$, where the latter describes the state, in which one of the electrons is localized on the impurity. In the auxiliary τ -space, the Schrödinger equations for the Fourier images of the auxiliary functions $\Phi_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ and $G_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\tau)$ are then similar to those in LDA but with the nonlocal particle-impurity coupling $\Gamma(\tau)$. It is remarkable that, despite the nonlocal coupling, the two-particle scattering matrix is still found [2–4] in the well-known form:

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{r(\omega_1) - r(\omega_2) + i\mathbf{P}}{r(\omega_1) - r(\omega_2) + i} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{P} = \delta_{\alpha_1\alpha'_2}\delta_{\alpha_2\alpha'_1}$ is the permutation operator. The S -matrix satisfies obviously the Yang-Baxter equations. Hence the multiparticle scattering is factorized into two-particle ones and the auxiliary multiparticle wave functions have the ordinary Bethe ansatz structure. But due to the nonlinear dispersion, the multielectron wave functions

$$\Psi_{\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_N}(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi_{\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_2}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_N) \prod_{j=1}^N u(x_j; \tau_j) d\tau_j \quad (10)$$

are continuous functions of the coordinates x_j . The factorization of multielectron scattering and the Bethe ansatz construction for multielectron wave functions are thus *hidden* and manifested only in the limit of large interelectron separations.

Imposing the periodic boundary conditions on the N -electron wave function (10) on the interval of size L , we arrive at the following Bethe ansatz equations (BAE):

$$\exp(ik_j L) e_1(\lambda_j^{(0)}) = \prod_{a_1=1}^{M_1} e_1(\lambda_j^{(0)} - \lambda_{a_1}^{(1)}) \quad (11a)$$

$$\prod_{\nu=\pm 1} \prod_{a_{l+\nu}=1}^{M_{l+\nu}} e_1(\lambda_{a_l}^{(l)} - \lambda_{a_{l+\nu}}^{(l+\nu)}) = - \prod_{b=1}^{M_l} e_2(\lambda_{a_l}^{(l)} - \lambda_b^{(l)}) \quad (11b)$$

$$E = \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_j \quad (11c)$$

where E is the eigenenergy, $\omega_j \equiv \omega(k_j)$ is the energy of a “charge” excitation of the system with the momentum k_j , and $e_n(x) = (x - in/2)/(x + in/2)$. If m_α is the number of electrons with the “color” α , the numbers M_l are defined by $M_l = \sum_{\alpha=l}^{n-1} m_\alpha$, M_0 being the total number of electrons, $M_0 \equiv N$. It is clear that only charge excitations with rapidities $\lambda_j^{(0)} \equiv r(k_j)$ contain the information about the nonlinear dispersion, while BAE for the color rapidities $\{\lambda^{(l)}\}$, $l = 1, \dots, n-1$ coincide with the corresponding equations in the LDA.

In the particular case $n = 2$, Eqs. (11) are reduced to the BAE of the nondegenerate model (3) with infinitely large U ,

$$\exp(ik_j L) \frac{r_j - i/2}{r_j + i/2} = \prod_{\alpha=1}^M \frac{r_j - \lambda_\alpha - i/2}{r_j - \lambda_\alpha + i/2} \quad (12a)$$

$$\prod_{j=1}^N \frac{\lambda_\alpha - r_j - i/2}{\lambda_\alpha - r_j + i/2} = - \prod_{\beta=1}^M \frac{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_\beta - i}{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_\beta + i}, \quad (12b)$$

where the spin projection of the system is given by $S^z = N/2 - M$. In the normal state, where $\omega = k$ and $r(k) = (k - \epsilon_{f,d})/v^2$, Eqs. (11) and (12) are the same as the well-known BAE of the Anderson model.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the approach developed in the present paper for superconducting magnetic alloys is easily generalized to Fermi systems with nonlinear spectrum of particles around the Fermi level. For instance, the BAE derived here are valid also for gapless Fermi systems [12], where the function $r(k)$ takes the form

$$r(k) = \frac{\omega(k) - \epsilon_f}{v^2} \frac{d\omega(k)}{dk}, \quad (13)$$

and $\omega(k)$ is the dispersion of particles of the system.

I am grateful to S. John and P. Wiegmann for stimulating discussions. I would like also to thank the Department of Physics at the University of Toronto for kind hospitality and support during the completion of this work.

REFERENCES

- * Present address: Department of Physics, University of Toronto;
internet: rupasov@physics.utoronto.ca
- [1] See, for a review, A. M. Tsvelick and P. B. Wiegmann, Adv. Phys. **32**, 453 (1983); P. Schlottmann, Phys. Rep. **181**, 1 (1989).
- [2] V. I. Rupasov and M. Singh, J. Phys. A **29**, L205 (1996).
- [3] V. I. Rupasov and M. Singh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 338 (1996); Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3614 (1996).
- [4] V. I. Rupasov, *to be published*.
- [5] A. A. Abrikosov and L. P. Gor'kov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **39**, 1781 (1960) [Sov. Phys. JETP **12**, 1243 (1961)].
- [6] See, for a review, S. V. Vonsovsky, Yu. A. Izyumov and E. Z. Kurmaev, *Superconductivity of Transition Metals* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982)
- [7] See, for instance, M. Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1996).
- [8] P. B. Wiegmann, Phys. Lett. **80A**, 163 (1980).
- [9] P. Schlottmann, Z. Phys. B **49**, 109 (1982).
- [10] S. John and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2418 (1990); Phys. Rev. B **43**, 12 772 (1991).
- [11] H. Shiba, Prog. Theor. Phys. **40**, 435 (1968).
- [12] D. Withoff and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 1835 (1989); L. S. Borkowski and P. J. Hirschfeld, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 9274 (1992); C. Gonzalez-Buxton and K. Ingersent, Phys. Rev. B **54**, R15 614 (1996).