## The pseudogap and photoem ission spectra in the attractive H ubbard m odel

P.E.Komilovitch<sup>1</sup> and Bum soo Kyung<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>B lackett Laboratory, Im perial College, Prince Consort Road, London SW 7 2BZ, UK

<sup>2</sup>M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Physik kom plexer System e, N othnitzer str. 38, D -01187, D resden, G erm any

(M arch 23, 2024)

A ngle-resolved photoem ission spectra are calculated m icroscopically for the two-dimensional attractive Hubbard model. A system of self-consistent T-matrix equations are solved numerically in the real-time domain. The single-particle spectral function has a two-peak structure resulting from the presense of bound states. The spectral function is suppressed at the chemical potential, leading to a pseudogap-like behavior. At high temperatures and densities the pseudogap diminishes and nally disappears; these indings are similar to experimental observations for the cuprates.

PACS numbers: 71.10 Fd, 74.20 M n

Real-space pairing [1] is the sim plest physical idea that enables one to explain the pseudogap phenom enon observed for the norm al state of high-T<sub>c</sub> superconductors (HTSC) [2{13]. At low tem peratures and densities carriers are paired in weakly overlapping bound states separated from the single-particle band by a binding energy of the order of a few hundred degrees. The chem ical potential is located between the two bands thereby reducing the intensity of the low-energy single-particle (photoem ission, speci c heat, tunneling), spin (susceptibility, nuclear relaxation rate), and particle-hole (optical conductivity) processes. At tem peratures of the order of the binding energy, carriers become unbound and restore the Ferm i-liquid behavior. The layered structure of the cuprates supports the scenario, since reduced dim ensionality favors pairing. A lso, the phenom enology of a charged Bose gas can be quite successfully used in the explanation of a number of norm al and superconducting properties of HTSC [1,14,15].

It is therefore in portant to study model system s with pairing, such as the two-dim ensional attractive Hubbard model. The simplicity of the model allows one to separate the net e ect of the attractive interaction from the com plications related to the origin of the pairing mechanism and to the complicated dependence of the e ective potential on m icroscopic param eters. O ne successful application of the attractive H ubbard m odel to the physics of cuprates is due to Randeria and co-workers [16,17]. Using the Quantum Monte Carlo method, they found a signi cant reduction of static spin susceptibility and nuclear relaxation rate at low tem peratures and interm ediate couplings. Recently, Vilk et al. [18] found a pseudogap in the spectral function of the attractive Hubbard m odelusing M onte C arlo simulations and the m axim um extropy technique. Thus, it was dem onstrated that realspace pairing can account for som e unusual properties of HTSC.

The self-consistent T-matrix approximation [19{21]

provides another m ethod for studying dynam ic properties of the attractive H ubbard m odel. This approach is based on the low density approximation to ferm ion systems due to G alitskii [22], which becomes exact in the lim it of vanishing density. However, the resulting system of self-consistent integral equations is not easy to solve. A nalytical treatment is very dicult, although it is sometimes attempted [23,24]. The full numerical solution of the equations is required. In the previous numerical studies of the problem [25,26] the equations were solved in imaginary times and results were then continued numerically to real times. In these papers relatively small couplings were studied and pseudogap features were found only at large momenta.

In our previous paper [27] we formulated and solved numerically the T-matrix equations for the twodimensional attractive Hubbard model for real times, thereby avoiding the necessity for analytical continuation. There, we focused on two-particle properties | primarily on the binding energy of pairs and its dependence on the particle density. In this paper we would like to discuss single-particle dynamics, in particular the singleparticle spectral function which is directly related to angle-resolved photoem ission spectra (ARPES).We nd a clear pseudogap behavior of the ARPES at sm all momenta k, low densities n, and low temperatures T. W ith increasing n and T, the pseudogap disappears, in accordance with experimental observations for the cuprates [28].

The two-dim ensional attractive H ubbard m odel is dened by the H am iltonian

$$H = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} X \\ {}_{k} \end{array}} ("_{k} ) q_{k}^{v} q_{k} \frac{jv j^{X}}{N} q_{k}^{v} q_{k+q}^{v} q_{p\#}^{v} q_{p} q^{\#};$$

$$(1)$$

written in standard notation.  $"_k = 2t (\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$  is the bare single-particle spectrum, jJ j is the coupling strength, and N is the total number of sites in the system.

The chem ical potential determ ines the average particle density n. We regard Eq. (1) as a phenom enological model for the low-density system of holes in the norm al state of HTSC.

In the low-density lim it n 1, one can make use of the small gas parameter and select only ladder diagram s in a diagram matrix representation of the T-matrix [20,21], which leads to the expression

$$T (q;!) = \frac{j j j}{1 \quad j j j \frac{d!_{1}}{2} \frac{B (q;!_{1})}{!_{1}} + i \frac{j j j}{2} B (q;!)}; (2)$$

where

$$B (q;!) = \frac{1^{X}}{N} \sum_{k^{0}}^{Z} \frac{d!_{1}}{2} A (k^{0};!_{1}) A (q k^{0};!_{1}) \tanh \frac{!_{1}}{2};$$
(3)

where A (k;!) is the single-particle spectral function and

=  $(k_B T)^{-1}$  is the inverse absolute tem perature. The realand in aginary parts of the self-energy  $^{0}$  and  $^{0}$  are expressed via T = T $^{0}$ + iT $^{0}$  as follow s:

$${}^{0}(\mathbf{k}; !) = \frac{1}{N} \prod_{q}^{X} \frac{d!_{1}}{2} A (\mathbf{q} \mathbf{k}; !_{1})$$

$$f_{F} (!_{1})T^{0}(\mathbf{q}; !+!_{1}) + \frac{Z}{2} \frac{d!_{2}}{2} \frac{f_{B} (!_{2})T^{0}(\mathbf{q}; !_{2})}{!_{2} !_{1} !};$$
(4)

$${}^{00}(\mathbf{k}; !) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{q}^{X} \frac{d!_{1}}{2} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{q} \mathbf{k}; !_{1})$$
$$\mathbf{T}^{00}(\mathbf{q}; !+ !_{1}) [\mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{F}} (!_{1}) + \mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{B}} (!+ !_{1})]; \qquad (5)$$

where  $f_{F,B}$  (!) = [exp(!) 1]<sup>1</sup> are Ferm i- and Bose-functions respectively. Finally, the self-energy determines the spectral function as

$$A (k;!) = \frac{2^{\infty}(k;!)}{[! (''_k )^{\circ}(k;!)]^2 + [^{\infty}(k;!)]^2}: (6)$$

The integrals with singular kernels in Eqs.(2) and (4) are understood in the principal-value sense. The set of equations (2)-(6) is to be solved self-consistently for given jJ j, and temperature  $T_{\rm R}$  then the particle density is given by  $n = 2N^{-1}F_{\rm R} \frac{d!}{2}A(k;!)f_{\rm F}(!)$ . Usually, a self-consistent solution is obtained iteratively, starting from a guessed form of A(k;!) and using the fast-Fourier-transform algorithm to calculate momentum -frequency sum s [25,26]. In our calculations we used a 64 to 44 lattice and a uniform mesh of 512 points in the frequency interval 20t < ! < 30t. The convergence of the iterative process is the major problem of the method, which puts limitations on the values of model parameters for

which a self-consistent solution can be obtained. The convergence deteriorates for large jJ j and n and low T. The physically interesting values of jJ j start at 6t, when the binding energy of the pairs is of the order of t. In this work, jJ j = 8t is used. For this coupling, iterations converge down to T = 0.3t for very low densities n < 0.03, and up to n 0.20 for a high temperature T = 1.0t.

Once a self-consistent solution is obtained, the intensity of the photoem ission process is simply

$$I(k;!) = I_0(k)A(k;!)f_F(!);$$
(7)

where  $I_0$  (k) involves the electron-photon m atrix elem ent, and is frequency-independent. Eq. (7) is approximate, for a discussion of its validity see, e.g., [29]. In the following we set  $I_0$  (k) = 1.

In analysing the num erical results to be presented below, it is useful to keep in m ind the exactly solvable atom ic lim it (t = 0) of the Hubbard m odel:

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{A} (k; !) = \frac{n}{2} (! + + j J) + 1 \frac{n}{2} (! + ); (8)$$

from which the following properties are inferred. (i) The spectral function has the form of two peaks with weights  $\frac{n}{2}$  and  $1 \quad \frac{n}{2}$  (which are very di erent if n 1). (ii) The two peaks are separated by the binding energy of the pairs (which is jJ jin the atom ic lim it). (iii) At zero tem – perature,  $= \frac{jUj}{2}$ , and in Eq. (7) the Ferm i-function elim inates the second peak of A (k;!). The resulting intensity I (k;!) is a single peak located  $\frac{jUj}{2}$  below the chem ical potential. The system would therefore display a \pseudogap" (a true gap in this case) of size  $\frac{jUj}{2}$ . (iv) At higher tem peratures, the Ferm i-function is smoothed out giving rise to the second peak at a higher energy and weakening the rst one, so the form erm ight become stronger than the latter.

In the general case of nite t=jU j non-zero kinetic energy leads to a number of new e ects. It reduces the binding energy, i.e. the interpeak distance, and assigns nite widths to the peaks of A (k;!). Next, it restores the

k-dependence of A (k;!) and I (k;!). Finally, due to the

nite radii of pairs and their ovelapping, the binding energy becomes density-dependent [27]. However, our numerical results show that properties (i)-(iv) listed above remain valid even at nite t=jJ j. Moreover, we believe they are generic to any ferm ion model with attraction in the low-density limit.

In Fig. 1 we show the solution of Eqs. (2)-(7) for the lowest density n = 0.017 and T = 0.3t. I(k;!) displays a complicated k- and !-dependence which can be understood as follows. A particle with momentum k can be found in two distinctly di errent states: either in a state of the single-particle band with an extended wave function or as a component of a bound state with a localized wave function. The two possibilities give rise to



FIG.1. The intensity of ARPES I(k;!) = A (k;!) $f_F$  (!) for density n = 0.017, temperature T = 0.3t, and several momenta k = m ( $\frac{1}{8}$ ;  $\frac{1}{8}$ ), m = 0;1;2; and 3 (from the top curve down).

A (k;!), which consists of two peaks separated by the pair binding energy 4 E = 2:1t (for jJ = 8t). Multiplication by the Ferm i-function cuts o the high-energy (singleparticle band) peak, which depends on the energy of the latter and the temperature. For k = (0;0) in Fig. 1 the high-energy peak is reduced in height signi cantly to that of the low-energy peak, but not to zero. Note that after the cut-o , the peak is slightly shifted from its original position. The position of the high-energy peak disperses with k as does the bare specrum  $"_k$ , and, as k increases, the peak gets cut o by the Ferm i-function very rapidly (com pare the cases for the di erent m om enta k in Fig. 1 for ! > 0). Let us now turn to the low energy peak. The probability of nding a particle with m om entum k in a bound state is the square of the bound state's wave function. For zero totalm om entum P, one has

$$P = (0;0) (k) = \frac{C}{E - 2''(k)};$$
(9)

where C is the norm alization constant and E the energy of the bound state measured from the bare atom ic level. The relative height of low energy peaks in Fig. 1 is in good agreement with j (k)<sup>2</sup> for E = 2"(0;0) 4 E =

10:1 t. This corroborates the bound-state origin of the low energy peaks in A (k;!) and I (k;!). Thus, on the basis of F ig. 1, we conclude that A R P E S of the attractive H ubbard m odel exhibit a clear pseudogap behaviour at low tem peratures and densities. The m om entum and frequency dependences of the spectra have simple physical explanations.

The tem perature dependence of I (k;!) for n = 0.017



FIG.2. The temperature dependence of I(k;!) for density n = 0.017 and momentum k = (0;0).

and k = (0;0) is shown in Fig. 2. There are two main e ects as temperature increases. First, weight is transferred from the low-energy peak to the high-energy one. This is due to the progressive therm all excitation of particles to the single-particle band and consequent weaker in uence of the bound states on the single-particle spectral function. Secondly, the whole structure moves to higher energies relative to the chemical potential. These two e ects lead to the rapid suppression of the pseudogap as temperature increases. Note that the distance between the two peaks is T-independent and remains approximately the pair binding energy (slightly reduced by the cut o ), in accordance with the atom ic limit.

Fig. 3 presents the density dependence of I(k;!) for T = 0.5t and k = (0;0). C learly, the pseudogap disappears as n increases. We have already argued elsewhere [27] that this is a result of the rise of the two-particle level due to the packing e ect when pairs begin to overlap. (Intuitive arguments of this kind were given earlier in [16].) Since the binding energy decreases with n, the temperature becomes progressively more e ective in unbounding pairs, washing away the pseudogap.

It is quite remarkable that such a simple system as the attractive H ubbard m odel and such complex systems as high-T<sub>c</sub> superconductors have very similar dynamical properties. They both display pseudogaps at low tem peratures and carrier densities, which disappear as T and n increase. This suggests the conclusion that the carriers in HTSC do experience some sort of short-range attraction. HTSC therefore exhibit properties which are generic to ferm ionic system sw ith attraction and which are captured in our m odel calculations.

One could now proceed in elaborating the model while trying to keep the properties obtained intact. Further



FIG.3. The density dependence of I (k;!) for tem perature T = 0.5t and m om entum k = (0;0).

insight into the problem can be gained by considering the opposite limit of nearly complete lling 2 n 1.In this case, Eq. (1) may be viewed as a phenom enological m odel for electrons rather than holes. (To some extent, the nearly fully led band in itates the nearly led lower Hubbard band when the Coulomb repulsion is taken into account. Unfortunately, this analogy is not complete, due to di erent tem perature behaviour of ; see below .) The quantity I(k;!) of Eq. (7) has now the meaning of the number of electrons emitted from the system per time unit, which brings the whole model closer to reality. There is no need to recalculate the spectra, since on a bipartite lattice the dilute and nearly lled limits are related by the particle-hole transform ation, which leads to the relation

$$A(k;!;n)f_F(!) = A(k+Q; !;2 n)[l_{f}(!)];$$
  
(10)

where Q = (;) for the square lattice. Due to the inversion of the occupation numbers, it is now the pairinginduced peak that gets cut o by Ferm i-function. The inversion of the frequency places the remaining peak below the chemical potential. The resulting ARPES are shown in Fig. 4. They are complementary to the spectra of Fig. 1. C learly, pseudogap is present, because the spectrum with the largest momentum k = (;) is still peaked far below the chemical potential.

The overall picture looks very much like spectra of a weakly-interacting system but shifted from by half of the pair binding energy. We emphasize that pairs them - selves are not seen explicitly in the spectra, since the pair-induced peak of A (k; !) has been cut o by the Ferm i-function. Nevertheless, the pairs are present in plicitly,



FIG.4. I(k;!) for the nearly complete lling n = 1:983, tem perature T = 0:3t, and several momenta k = m  $(\frac{1}{16};\frac{1}{16})$ .

m anifesting them selves in the shift of the chem ical potential. This observation is important for understanding the ARPES of HTSC.

We do not present temperature and density dependences of I (k;!) for the nearly lled case, for they are complementary to Figs. 2 and 3, respectively. The pseudogap now vanishes with decreasing electron density (increasing hole doping), in accordance with Fig. 3. The temperature dependence is, however, dierent from the dilute limit. At nearly full lling, the chemical potential goes up, with temperature and the distance between

and the single-particle band increases. Therefore, the pseudogap is expected to rise with T in this case. To obtain the correct tem perature behaviour one would need to consider the density regime close to half-lling, which is outside the range of validity of the T-m atrix approximation.

In conclusion, we have shown that photoem ission spectra of the attractive Hubbard model in the low-density lim it display a clear pseudogap behavior, qualitatively sim ilar to that of high- $T_c$  superconductors. Our notings support the suggestion that the pseudogap feature observed in HTSC results from real-space pairing and the form ation of bound pairs in the norm al state.

W e thank E.G.K lep sh for valuable discussions on the subject. PEK acknow ledges the support of EPSRC grant GR/L40113.

[1] A lexandrov A S and M ott N F 1994 High-Tem perature

Superconductors and other Super uids (London: Taylor and Francis)

- [2] Takigawa M, Reyes A P, Thom pson J D, He ner R H, Fisk Z and Ott K C 1991 Phys.Rev.B 43 247
- [3] W illiam s G W M, Tallon J L, M einhold R and Janossy A 1995 Phys.Rev.B 51 16503.
- [4] Loram JW, Mirza K A, Cooper JR and Liang W Y 1993 Phys.Rev.Lett. 71 1740 Loram JW, Mirza K A, W ade JM, Cooper JR and Liang W Y 1994 Physica C 235C -240, 134
- [5] Ito T, Takenaka K and Uchida S 1993 Phys.Rev.Lett. 70 3995
- [6] Batlogg B, Hwang H Y, Takagi H, Cava R J, Kao H L and Kwo J 1994 Physica C 235C -240 130
- [7] Rotter L D, Schlesinger Z, Collins R T, Holtzberg F, Field C, W elp U W, Crabtree G W, Liu J Z, Fang Y, Vandervoort K G and Fleshler S 1991 Phys.Rev.Lett. 67 2741
- [8] Hom es C C, T in usk T, Liang R, Bonn D A and Hardy W N 1993 Phys.Rev.Lett.71 1645
- [9] Loeser A G, Shen Z X, Dessau D S, Marshall D S, Park C H, Fournier P and Kapitulnik A 1996 Science, 273 325
- [10] Nemetschek R, OpelM, Homann C, Muller PF, Hackl R, Berger H, Forro L, Erb A and Walker E 1997 Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 4837
- [11] T jemberg O, Nylen H, Chiaia G, Soderholm S, Karlsson U O, Qvarford M, Lindau I, Puglia C, Martensson N and Leonyuk L 1997 Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 499
- [12] W illiam s G V M, Tallon J L, Haines E M, M ichalak R and Dupree R 1997 Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 721
- [13] Puchkov A V, Foumier P, Basov D N, Tinusk T, Kapitulnik A and Kolesnikov N N 1996 Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 3212
- [14] Uem ura Y J, Keren A, Le L P, Luke G M, W u W D, Kubo Y, M anako T, Shim akawa Y, Subram anian M, Cobb J L and M arkert J T 1993 Nature 364 605
- [15] A lexandrov A S and R anninger J 1992 Solid State C om m un.81 403
  A lexandrov A S, Beere W H, Kabanov V V and Liang W Y 1997 Phys.Rev.Lett. 79 1551
- [16] Randeria M, Trivedi N, Moreo A, Scalettar R T 1992 Phys.Rev.Lett. 69 2001
- [17] TrivediN and Randeria M 1995 Phys.Rev.Lett. 75 312
- [18] Vilk Y M, Allen S, Touchette H, Moukouri S, Chen L and Tremblay A-M S 1997 Preprint cond-m at/9710013, to be published in J.Chem.Phys.
- [19] Kanam ori J 1963 Prog. Theor. Phys. 30 275
- [20] Fetter A L and W alecka J D, 1971 Quantum Theory of M any-Particle Systems (New York: M cG raw-H ill)
- [21] Kadano L P and Baym G 1962 Quantum Statistical Mechanics (New York: Benjamin)
- [22] Galitskii V M 1958 Sov.Phys.-JETP 34 104
- [23] Kagan M Yu, Fresard R, Capezzali M and Beck H 1998 Phys. Rev. B 57 5995
- [24] Letz M and G ooding R J 1998 J.P hys.: C ond.M atter 10 6931
- [25] Fresard R, Glasser B and W ole P 1992 J.Phys.: Cond.M atter 4 8565
- [26] M icnas R, Pedersen M H, Schafroth S, Schneider T, Rodriguez-Nunez J J and Beck H 1995 Phys.Rev.B 52 16223

- [27] Kyung Bum soo, K lep sh E G and Komilovitch P E 1998 Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 3109
- [28] Ding H, Yokoya T, Cam puzano JC, Takahashi T, Randeria M, Norm an M R, Mochiku T, Kadowaki K, Giapintzakis J 1996 Nature 382 51
- [29] Randeria M, Ding H, Cam puzano J C, Bellm an A, Jennings G, Yokoya T, Takahashi T, Katayam ayoshida H, Mochiku T and Kadowaki K 1995 Phys.Rev.Lett. 74 4951