

The pairing glue in cuprate superconductors from the self-energy revealed via machine learning

Andrey V. Chubukov¹ and Jörg Schmalian^{2,3}

¹*School of Physics and Astronomy and William I. Fine Theoretical Physics Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA*

²*Institute for Theory of Condensed Matter, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

³*Institute for Quantum Materials and Technologies, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany*

Recently, machine learning was applied to extract both the normal and the anomalous components of the self-energy from photoemission data at the antinodal points in Bi-based cuprate high-temperature superconductors [Y. Yamaji *et al.*, [arXiv:1903.08060](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08060)]. It was argued that both components do show prominent peaks near 50 meV, which hold information about the pairing glue, but the peaks are hidden in the actual data, which measure only the total self-energy. We analyze the self-energy within an effective fermion-boson theory. We show that soft thermal fluctuations give rise to peaks in both components of the self-energy at a frequency comparable to superconducting gap, while they cancel in the total self-energy; all irrespective of the nature of the pairing boson. However, in the quantum limit $T \rightarrow 0$ prominent peaks survive only for a very restricted subclass of pairing interactions. We argue that the way to potentially nail down the pairing boson is to determine the thermal evolution of the peaks.

Introduction: The analysis of fine structures in the single-particle excitation spectrum is one of most reliable approaches to identify the interaction responsible for the pairing in superconductors. The prime example is the identification of phonons as pairing bosons in lead via their fingerprints in the single-particle tunneling density of states (TDOS)¹⁻³. There have been several attempts to extend this logic to cuprate superconductors, analyzing tunneling, angle-resolved photoemission (ARPES), optical, or inelastic neutron scattering spectra^{4,5,8-14}. Such approaches are particularly challenging for the cuprates because i) the d-wave pairing interaction depends on both momentum and frequency and ii) the pairing interaction likely changes due to feedback from superconductivity.

In a superconducting state two distinct self-energies emerge due to mixing of electrons and holes¹⁵⁻¹⁸. This gives rise to a matrix 2×2 structure of the fermionic Green's function. To determine the pairing glue it is highly desirable to have information about both, the normal self-energy $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ and the anomalous self-energy $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$. In a situation when the exchange of the same boson accounts for the pairing and for fermionic incoherence, the two self-energies are related. If both are extracted from the data, one can either verify - with a higher precision - the applicability of a given boson-mediated interaction, or put strong constraints on the pairing glue without assuming a particular scenario. However, single-particle probes, like TDOS and ARPES, provide information solely about the normal component of the Green's function $G_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$, which depends only on the combination $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\text{tot})}(\omega) = \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega) + W_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$, where

$$W_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega) = \frac{\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}^2(\omega)}{\omega + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}^*(-\omega)} \quad (1)$$

contains the information about $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$. To deduce two

complex functions Σ and Φ from only one observable seems hopeless at first glance. Recently, however, Yamaji *et al.*²¹ argued that this can be achieved using a Boltzmann machine-learning approach. They analyzed ARPES spectra^{22,23} for optimally doped Bi2212 with $T_c \approx 90$ K and underdoped Bi2201 with $T_c \approx 29$ K, both at antinodal momenta $\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}} \approx (0, \pi)$. In both cases they found sharp structures in $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ at a frequency near 50 meV, which is close to the value of the antinodal gap $\Delta_{\text{a.n.}}$ (panels (c) and (d) of Fig.1). They further argued that these structures do not appear in the total self-energy $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}^{(\text{tot})}(\omega)$ (black data in the panels).

In this communication we compare the results of Ref.21 with the forms of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ obtained in various quantum-critical models of d -wave pairing due to a dynamic interaction $V_{\mathbf{q}}(\Omega)$, mediated by a soft boson. We show that thermal fluctuations give rise to peaks in both $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ at a frequency slightly above $\Delta_{\text{a.n.}}$, and these peaks do cancel in the total self-energy. The peaks are present for any form of $V_{\mathbf{q}}(\Omega)$, as long as a boson is soft and $V_{\mathbf{q}}(0)$ is large, and in this respect do not place constraints on a pairing interaction. They do, nevertheless, strongly support the view that in optimally doped and underdoped cuprates the pairing boson is soft. Our results for the self-energies due to thermal fluctuations are shown in Fig.1 (a). We can draw much stronger conclusions if singular structures in the self-energies survive in the quantum limit $T \rightarrow 0$. In this case it must hold that the momentum-averaged pairing interaction

$$\bar{V}(\Omega) = N_F \oint V_{\mathbf{q}}(\Omega) \sim 1/|\Omega|^\gamma \quad (2)$$

is governed by an exponent $\gamma > 1$. This would exclude Landau-overdamped spin or charge fluctuations with Ornstein-Zernike form of the static $V_{\mathbf{q}}$, or pairing due to nematic fluctuations, as for these theories $\gamma \leq 1$,




FIG. 1: Imaginary parts of the normal (red), total (black), and pairing (green) self-energies $\Sigma(\omega)$, $\Sigma_{\text{tot}}(\omega)$, and $W(\omega)$, respectively, obtained for a pairing interaction with thermal fluctuations (a), quantum fluctuations and $\gamma = 2$ (b) and from ARPES experiments using the machine-learning analysis of Ref.21 for Bi2212 (c) and Bi2201 (d).

even when we include the feedback from superconductivity on a pairing boson. On the other hand this condition is satisfied for the pairing by nearly dispersionless boson, in which case $\gamma = 2$ and $V_{\mathbf{q}}(\Omega) = V(\mathbf{q})/(\Omega_{\text{bos}}^2 - \Omega^2)$, where Ω_{bos} is small and $V(\mathbf{q})$ has an attractive d-wave component. This is the case for pairing by a soft optical phonon^{40–42} and the strong coupling limit in a model of dispersionless fermions randomly coupled to optical phonons^{37,38}. In Fig.1 (b) we show the self-energies for $\gamma = 2$ in the quantum regime.

The frequency dependence of all self-energies in panels (a) and (b) is in good agreement with the behavior obtained via machine learning, panels (c) and (d). The self-energies in Bi2212 and Bi2201, extracted in Ref.21, were obtained at $T = 11\text{ K}$ and $T = 12\text{ K}$, respectively^{22,23}, which are significantly below T_c . This indicates that the sharp features may be due to quantum fluctuations and thus do impose the restriction on the pairing mechanism.

Our scenario differs from the one presented in Refs.^{6,7}. In their approach, peaks in $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ originate from Mott physics, and the pole in $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(\omega)$ exists already in the normal state. In our scenario, the peak position is associated with the pairing gap and exists in the superconducting and pseudogap states, as long as pseudogap can be viewed as precursor to superconductivity.

The model: We use the Nambu-Gor'kov formalism with spinor $\psi(x) = (\psi_{\uparrow}(x), \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}(x))^T$, where $x = (\mathbf{x}, t)$ combines coordinates and time. The Green's function $\mathcal{G}(x, x') = -i\theta(t - t') \langle [\psi(x), \psi^{\dagger}(x')] \rangle$ is a (2×2) matrix. Fourier transformation to the momentum and frequency representation yields

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1}(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \omega - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega) & \Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega) \\ \Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega) & \omega + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}^*(-\omega) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

with bare dispersion $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ and two self-energies, $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$. The total self-energy $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{(tot)}}$ is defined via

$G_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1}(\omega) = \omega - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{(tot)}}(\omega)$, where $G_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ is the upper-left element of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}^{\text{(tot)}}(\omega)$, is given by Eq. (1). In what follows we assume particle-hole symmetry $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}^*(-\omega) = -\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$. This assumption breaks down near an antinodal point at energies above a few hundred meV, but holds at energies $\omega \sim \Delta_{\text{a.n.}}$.

To obtain the coupled equations for $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ in closed form we further assume, following earlier works⁸, that corrections to side vertices in the diagrams for Σ and Φ can be neglected. This allows one to obtain a set of self-consistent equations for the two self-energies. The coupled equations are expressed most naturally in the Matsubara formalism, where we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(i\omega_m) &= - \int_{k'} V_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'}(i\omega_m - i\omega_{m'}) \frac{i\omega_{m'} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}'}(i\omega_{m'})}{\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}'}(i\omega_{m'})}, \\ \Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(i\omega_m) &= \pm \int_{k'} V_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'}(i\omega_m - i\omega_{m'}) \frac{\Phi_{\mathbf{k}'}(i\omega_{m'})}{\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}'}(i\omega_{m'})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We defined $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}(i\omega_m) = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + (\omega_m + i\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(i\omega_m))^2 + \Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(i\omega_m)^2$ and $\int_k \dots = T \sum_{\omega_m} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \dots$. The upper (the lower) sign refers to the charge (spin) channel. Finally, we assume that the pairing interaction is attractive in the d-wave channel and that self-energies for antinodal fermions at $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}$, $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(i\omega_m) = \Sigma(i\omega_m)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{a.n.}}}(i\omega_m) = \Phi(i\omega_m)$, are primarily determined by internal fermions with momenta \mathbf{k}' that are also near one of antinodal points.

At this stage we are agnostic about the nature of the pairing interaction. It might come from spin or charge fluctuations (or the combination of the two)^{8,24–27}, from nematic fluctuations^{28–33}, from fluctuations of a current order parameter³⁴, or from soft phonons^{35–38}. The exponent γ of Eq.2 depends on the mechanism under consideration; see above. In all cases, $V_{\mathbf{q}}(\Omega)$ gives rise to a strong attraction in the pairing channel, and, simultaneously, to a large fermionic self-energy $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$, which

makes fermions incoherent. The incoherence and the pairing originate from the same $V_{\mathbf{q}}(\Omega)$ and compete with each other. The competition gives rise to structures in both, $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)$ that must be simultaneously understood.

We consider two complementary limits with regards to the electronic dispersion $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$. One is the case of a strong dispersion, where the momentum integration can be performed similar to the usual Eliashberg theory. In the opposite limit the dispersion near the antinodes is so flat that it can be ignored all-together (Ref. 37). This second

case has been extensively studied recently in the context of Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev-type models^{37,38}. Interestingly we find quantitatively the same behavior in both limits. Below we first present the results for a strong and then for a flat dispersion.

Thermal fluctuations: The thermal contributions to Σ and Φ come from the terms with $\omega_m = \omega_{m'}$ in (4). These terms contain the static interaction $V_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'}(0)$, which is large when the pairing boson is soft (e.g., $V_{\mathbf{q}}(0) = V(\mathbf{q})/\Omega_{\text{bos}}^2$ for $\gamma = 2$). Introducing, as usual, $\Sigma(i\omega_m) = i\omega_m(1 - Z(i\omega_m))$ and $\Phi(i\omega_m) = Z(i\omega_m)\Delta(i\omega_m)$ and singling out the thermal piece, we obtain from (4)

$$\begin{aligned} Z(i\omega_m) &\approx \pi T \frac{\bar{V}(0)}{\sqrt{(\omega_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega_m))^2}}, \\ \Delta(i\omega_m) &= \pi T \sum_{\omega'_m} \frac{\bar{V}(i\omega_m - i\omega'_m)}{\sqrt{(\omega'_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega'_m))^2}} \left(\Delta(i\omega'_m) - \Delta(i\omega_m) \frac{\omega'_m}{\omega_m} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We see from Eq.(5) that the thermal contribution $\bar{V}(0)$ determines the value of $Z(i\omega_m)$ but cancels out in the r.h.s. of the equation for $\Delta(i\omega_m)$. As the result, $\Delta(i\omega_m)$ is determined by non-thermal terms and remains non-singular even when $\bar{V}(0)$ diverges. The cancellation holds for the same reason as the Anderson theorem, because thermal fluctuations scatter with zero frequency transfer and a finite momentum transfer act as non-magnetic impurities. Because of this cancellation, $\Delta(i\omega_m)$ remains non-singular even at criticality and at small $|\omega_m|$ can be approximated by a frequency-independent constant Δ . This approximation holds for $|\omega_m| \leq \Delta$. Performing the analytical continuation to the real axis we then obtain normal and anomalous self-energies in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\omega)/\Delta &= -\Sigma(\omega)/\omega \approx \pi T \bar{V}(0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 - (\omega + i\delta)^2}}, \\ \Sigma^{(\text{tot})}(\omega) &\approx \pi T \bar{V}(0) \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 - (\omega + i\delta)^2}} \left(1 - \frac{\Delta^2}{\omega^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We see that both $\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\Phi(\omega)$ in Eq.(6) are singular at $\omega \approx \Delta$, but the singularities cancel out in the total self-energy because of the factor $\omega^2 - \Delta^2$. More detailed calculations, in which sub-leading terms in $Z(i\omega_m)$ are kept⁴³, give a very similar result, only the damping δ becomes finite and the singularity shifts to somewhat larger ω . We plot the real and imaginary parts of $\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\Phi(\omega)$ in panels a,b in Fig. (2) and in panel (a) of Fig.1. We see that $\text{Im}\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\text{Im}\Phi(\omega)$ have peaks at ω slightly above Δ . At larger ω , $\text{Im}\Sigma(\omega)$ saturates, while $\text{Im}\Phi(\omega)$ rapidly drops. $\text{Re}\Sigma(\omega)$ is linear in ω at small frequencies and $\text{Re}\Phi(\omega)$ is finite. Both pass through maximum at $\omega \approx \Delta$ and then rapidly drop and are already small at a frequency where $\text{Im}\Sigma(\omega)$ has a maximum. All these features are also present in the normal and anomalous self-energies extracted in Ref.21.

We emphasize that the existence of peaks in $\text{Im}\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\text{Im}\Phi(\omega)$ due to thermal fluctuations, and the cancellation of the peak in $\Sigma^{(\text{tot})}(\omega)$ are generic properties of any model of pairing by a soft boson. They are present as long the temperature is not too small such that $\bar{V}(0) \gg \bar{V}(2\pi T)$.

Quantum fluctuations: At $T = 0$ thermal fluctuations are absent, and one has to integrate over frequency in (4) instead of summing up over a discrete set of $\omega_{m'}$. To check whether the features in the self-energies are still present, we focus on the quantum-critical point, where these features are expected to be the strongest. In this case, $\bar{V}(\Omega_m) = g/|\Omega_m|^\gamma$, and

$$\begin{aligned} Z(i\omega_m) &= 1 + \frac{g}{\omega_m} \int \frac{d\omega'_m}{|\omega_m - \omega'_m|^\gamma} \frac{\omega'_m}{\sqrt{(\omega'_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega'_m))^2}}, \\ \Delta(i\omega_m) &= g \int \frac{d\omega'_m}{|\omega_m - \omega'_m|^\gamma} \frac{\Delta(i\omega'_m) - \Delta(i\omega_m) \frac{\omega'_m}{\omega_m}}{\sqrt{(\omega'_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega'_m))^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The gap function still saturates at $\Delta(i\omega_m) \approx \Delta$ at $|\omega_m| \leq \Delta$. Approximating $\Delta(i\omega_m)$ by Δ in the r.h.s. of equation for $Z(i\omega_m)$, evaluating the integral, and converting the result to real frequencies, we find that $Z(\omega)$ is featureless in all models with $\gamma < 1$.

The situation changes for $\gamma > 1$. Now the frequency integral in (7) diverges. One can cut-off the divergency by moving a system slightly away from the critical point, where $V^* = \int d\Omega \bar{V}(\Omega)$ is finite. We then obtain

$$Z(i\omega_m) \approx \frac{V^*}{\sqrt{(\omega_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega_m))^2}}. \quad (8)$$

Comparing Eqs.(8) and (5), we see that the functional form of $Z(i\omega_m)$ is the same in both cases. As a consequence, for $\gamma > 1$, the normal and anomalous self-energies in real frequencies show the same features at




FIG. 2: The real (blue) and imaginary (yellow) parts of the normal and anomalous self-energy, $\Sigma(\omega)$ (panels a and c) and $\Phi(\omega)$ (panels b and d). Panels a,b – at a finite temperature, when the dominant contributions to both self-energies come from thermal fluctuations. Panels c,d – at $T = 0$ for the case $\gamma = 2$ (see text). The frequency is in units of Δ and fermionic damping is 0.1Δ . The peaks in $\text{Im } \Sigma$ and $\text{Im } \Phi$ at $\omega \leq \Delta$ are clearly visible. At higher frequencies, $\text{Im } \Sigma(\omega)$ saturates, other self-energies drop, and, in the $T = 0$ case, $\text{Re}\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\text{Re}\Phi(\omega)$ change sign.

$T = 0$ due to quantum fluctuations as at $T > 0$ due to classical, thermal fluctuations.

The analysis at $T = 0$ can be further advanced for $\gamma = 2$. In this case the solution for $\Delta(\omega)$ in real frequencies is highly unconventional^{39–42}. Namely, it does saturate at a finite Δ at frequencies $\omega \leq \Delta$, but at larger ω behaves as $\Delta(\omega) \propto \Delta\omega / \sin \psi(\omega + i\delta)$, where $\psi(\omega + i\delta)$ is an increasing function of ω , approximately linear in ω (Ref. 42). In this situation, the self-energies behave as

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(\omega) &\approx -V^* \tan \psi(\omega + i\delta) + \dots, \\ \Phi(\omega) &\approx \frac{V^*}{\cos \psi(\omega + i\delta)} + \dots, \\ \Sigma^{(\text{tot})}(\omega) &\approx -V^* \cot \psi(\omega + i\delta) + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

where dots stand for non-singular terms. For infinites-

imally small δ , $\text{Im}\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\text{Im}\Phi(\omega)$ have strong peaks at ω where $\psi(\omega) = \pi/2 + n\pi$. At these frequencies, the singular part of $\Sigma^{(\text{tot})}(\omega)$ vanishes. Conversely, when $\psi(\omega) = m\pi$, $m \neq 0$, $\text{Im}\Sigma^{(\text{tot})}(\omega)$ has a peak, while the singular parts of $\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\Phi(\omega)$ vanish. For a finite δ , the peaks get broadened and only the peak at $\omega \approx \Delta$ remains. In panels c,d in Fig. (2) and in panel (b) of Fig.1 we show the self-energies using $\psi(\omega + i\delta) = \omega + i\delta$ and $\delta = \delta(\omega) = 0.1\omega^2/\Delta$. We see that the behavior is qualitatively similar to that in Fig. 2, the only difference is that $\text{Re}\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\text{Re}\Phi(\omega)$ change sign at $\omega \geq \Delta$. Interestingly, $\text{Re}\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\text{Re}\Phi(\omega)$, extracted by in Ref.21 also change sign at $\omega \geq \Delta$.

The same set of results is obtained if one completely ignores the electronic dispersion. In this limit the equations for $Z(i\omega_m)$ and $\Delta(i\omega_m)$ become, at $T = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}Z(i\omega_m) &= 1 + \frac{g}{\omega_m} \int \frac{d\omega'_m}{|\omega_m - \omega'_m|^\gamma} \frac{\omega'_m}{Z(i\omega'_m)((\omega'_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega_m))^2)} \\ \Delta(i\omega_m) &= g \int \frac{d\omega'_m}{|\omega_m - \omega'_m|^\gamma} \frac{\Delta(i\omega'_m) - \Delta(i\omega_m) \frac{\omega'_m}{\omega_m}}{Z(i\omega'_m)((\omega'_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega'_m))^2)}\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

Solving these equations and converting the result to real frequencies, we find that $Z(\omega)$ is rather featureless for $\gamma < 1$, and $\Sigma(\omega)$ and $\Phi(\omega)$ do not display sharp features at $\omega \sim \Delta$. For $\gamma > 1$, the frequency integral for $Z(i\omega_m)$ again diverges, and

$$Z(i\omega_m) \approx \frac{V^*}{Z(i\omega_m)} \frac{1}{(\omega_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega_m))^2}.$$

Solving for $Z(i\omega_m)$ we find that it has the same functional form as for strong dispersion: $Z(i\omega_m) \approx (V^*)^{1/2} / \sqrt{\omega_m^2 + (\Delta(i\omega_m))^2}$. Substituting $Z(i\omega_m)$ into the gap equation we obtain

$$\Delta(i\omega_m) = g_{\text{eff}} \int \frac{d\omega'_m}{|\omega_m - \omega'_m|^\gamma} \frac{\Delta(i\omega'_m) - \Delta(i\omega_m) \frac{\omega'_m}{\omega_m}}{\sqrt{(\omega'_m)^2 + (\Delta(i\omega'_m))^2}},$$

where $g_{\text{eff}} = g/(V^*)^{1/2}$. This equation is exactly the same as the gap equation (7) for strong dispersion. Hence, the functional forms of normal and anomalous self-energies are the same as in Fig. (2).

Conclusions: The simultaneous extraction of the normal and anomalous self-energy from photoemission data, enabled by recent machine-learning approaches²¹, allows for significantly deeper insight into the nature of the dynamic pair formation. We argue that it implies that pairing is mediated by a soft, near-critical bosonic mode. Furthermore, if sharp peaks in both self-energies survive down to the lowest temperatures (i.e., they are due to quantum excitations), their presence alone imposes strong restrictions on the energy dependence of a soft pairing boson. We call for a systematic analysis of the peaks as function of temperature.

This work was supported by the Office of Basic Energy Sciences, U.S. Department of Energy, under award

DE-SC0014402 (A.V.C.) and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) through the SCHM 1031/7-1 (J.S.).

-
- ¹ D. J. Scalapino, J. R. Schrieffer, J. W. Wilkins, *Strong-coupling superconductivity*, Phys. Rev., **148**, 263 (1966).
- ² D. J. Scalapino R.D. Parks (Ed.), *Superconductivity, The Electron-Phonon Interaction and Strong Coupling Superconductors*, Vol. 1, Dekker Inc, New York (1969), p. 449
- ³ W. L. McMillan, J. M. Rowell, M. Parks (Ed.), *Superconductivity, Tunneling and Strong Coupling Superconductivity, Vol. 1*, Dekker Inc, New York, p. 561 (1969).
- ⁴ Z.-X. Shen and J. R. Schrieffer, *Momentum, Temperature, and Doping Dependence of Photoemission Lineshape and Implications for the Nature of the Pairing Potential in High- T_c Superconducting Materials*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1771 (1997).
- ⁵ J. P. Carbotte, E. Schachinger, D. N. Basov, *Coupling strength of charge carriers to spin fluctuations in high-temperature superconductors*, Nature (London), **401**, 354 (1999).
- ⁶ Shiro Sakai, Marcello Civelli, and Masatoshi Imada, *Hidden fermionic excitation boosting high-temperature superconductivity in Cuprates*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **116**, 057003 (2016).
- ⁷ Shiro Sakai, Marcello Civelli, and Masatoshi Imada, *Hidden fermionic representation of self-energy in pseudogap and superconducting states in the two-dimensional Hubbard model*, Phys. Rev. B, **94**, 115130 (2016).
- ⁸ Ar. Abanov, A. V. Chubukov, and J. Schmalian, *Fingerprints of spin mediated pairing in cuprates*, Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena Volumes **117–118**, 129 (2001).
- ⁹ I. Vekhter and C. M. Varma, *Proposal to Determine the Spectrum of Pairing Glue in High-Temperature Superconductors*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 237003 (2003).
- ¹⁰ T. Dahm, V. Hinkov, S. V. Borisenko, A. A. Kordyuk, V. B. Zabolotnyy, J. Fink, B. Buchner, D. J. Scalapino, W. Hanke, and B. Keimer, *Strength of the spin-fluctuation-mediated pairing interaction in a high-temperature superconductor*, Nature Physics **5**, 217?221 (2009).
- ¹¹ E. van Heumen, E. Muhlethaler, A. B. Kuzmenko, H. Eisaki, W. Meevasana, M. Greven, D. van der Marel, *Optical determination of the relation between the electron-boson coupling function and the critical temperature in high- T_c cuprates*, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 184512 (2009)
- ¹² H.-Y. Choi, C. M. Varma, X.-J. Zhou, *Superconductivity in the cuprates: Deduction of mechanism for d-wave pairing through analysis of ARPES*, Front. Phys., **6**, 440 (2011).
- ¹³ E. van Heumen, E. Muhlethaler, A. B. Kuzmenko, H. Eisaki, W. Meevasana, M. Greven, D. van der Marel, *Optical determination of the relation between the electron-boson coupling function and the critical temperature in high- T_c cuprates*, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 184512 (2009).
- ¹⁴ J. M. Bok, J. J. Bae, H.-Y. Choi, C. M. Varma, W. Zhang, J. He, Y. Zhang, L. Yu, and X. J. Zhou, *Quantitative determination of pairing interactions for high-temperature superconductivity in cuprates*, Science Advances **2**, e1501329 (2016).
- ¹⁵ L. P. Gorkov, *On the energy spectrum of superconductors*, Sov. Phys. JETP **34**, 505 (1958).
- ¹⁶ P. W. Anderson, *Random-Phase Approximation in the Theory of Superconductivity*, Phys. Rev. **112**, 1900 (1958).
- ¹⁷ Y. Nambu, *Quasi-Particles and Gauge Invariance in the Theory of Superconductivity*, Phys. Rev. **117**, 648 (1960).
- ¹⁸ G. M. Eliashberg, *Interactions between electrons and lattice vibrations in a superconductor*, Sov. Phys. JETP **11**, 696 (1960).
- ¹⁹ L. P. Gor'kov, *Microscopic derivation of the Ginzburg-Landau equations in the theory of superconductivity*, Sov. Phys. JETP **36**, 1364 (1959).
- ²⁰ A. B. Migdal, *Interaction between electrons and lattice vibrations in a normal metal*, Sov. Phys. JETP **7**, 996 (1958).
- ²¹ Y. Yamaji, T. Yoshida, A. Fujimori, and M. Imada, *Hidden self-energies as origin of cuprate superconductivity revealed by machine learning*, [arXiv:1903.08060](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08060).
- ²² T. Kondo, R. Khasanov, T. Takeuchi, J. Schmalian, A. Kaminski, *Competition between the pseudogap and superconductivity in the high- T_c copper oxides*, Nature **457**, 296 (2009).
- ²³ T. Kondo, Y. Hamaya, A. D. Palczewski, T. Takeuchi, J. S. Wen, Z. J. Xu, G. Gu, J. Schmalian, and A. Kaminski, *Disentangling Cooper-pair formation above the transition temperature from the pseudogap state in the cuprates* Nature Physics **7**, 21 (2011).
- ²⁴ N. E. Bickers, D. J. Scalapino, and S. R. White, *Conserving approximations for strongly correlated electron systems: Bethe-Salpeter equation and dynamics for the two-dimensional Hubbard model*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 961 (1989).
- ²⁵ P. Monthoux and D. Pines, *$YBa_2Cu_3O_7$: A nearly anti-ferromagnetic Fermi liquid*, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 6069 (1993).
- ²⁶ M. Grilli, R. Raimondi, C. Castellani, C. Di Castro, and G. Kotliar, *Superconductivity, phase separation, and charge-transfer instability in the $U = \infty$ limit of the three-band model of the CuO_2 planes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 259 (1991).
- ²⁷ A. Perali, C. Castellani, C. Di Castro, and M. Grilli, *d-wave superconductivity near charge instabilities*, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 16216 (1996).
- ²⁸ Ch. Husemann and W. Metzner, *Incommensurate nematic fluctuations in the two-dimensional Hubbard model*, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 085113 (2012).
- ²⁹ H. Yamase and R. Zeyher, *Superconductivity from orbital nematic fluctuations*, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 180502(R) (2013).
- ³⁰ T. A. Maier and D. J. Scalapino, *Pairing interaction near a nematic quantum critical point of a three-band CuO_2 model*, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 174510 (2014).
- ³¹ S. Lederer, Y. Schattner, E. Berg, and S. A. Kivelson, *Enhancement of Superconductivity near a Nematic Quantum Critical Point*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 097001 (2015).
- ³² M. A. Metlitski, D. F. Mross, S. Sachdev, and T. Senthil, *Cooper pairing in non-Fermi liquids*, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 115111 (2015).
- ³³ J. Kang and R. M. Fernandes, *Superconductivity in $FeSe$ Thin Films Driven by the Interplay between Nematic Fluctuations and Spin-Orbit Coupling*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 217003 (2016).

- ³⁴ C. M. Varma, *Non-Fermi-liquid states and pairing instability of a general model of copper oxide metals*, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 14554 (1997).
- ³⁵ S. Johnston, I. M. Vishik, W. S. Lee, F. Schmitt, S. Uchida, K. Fujita, S. Ishida, N. Nagaosa, Z. X. Shen, and T. P. Devereaux, *Evidence for the Importance of Extended Coulomb Interactions and Forward Scattering in Cuprate Superconductors*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 166404 (2012).
- ³⁶ I. Esterlis, B. Nosarzewski, E. W. Huang, B. Moritz, T. P. Devereaux, D. J. Scalapino, and S. A. Kivelson, *Breakdown of the Migdal-Eliashberg theory: A determinant quantum Monte Carlo study*, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 140501(R) (2018).
- ³⁷ I. Esterlis and J. Schmalian, *Cooper pairing of incoherent electrons: An electron-phonon version of the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model*, Phys. Rev. B **100**, 115132 (2019).
- ³⁸ Y. Wang, *A Solvable Random Model with Quantum-critical Points for Non-Fermi-liquid Pairing*, [arXiv:1904.07240](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.07240).
- ³⁹ J. P. Carbotte, *Properties of boson-exchange superconductors*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 1027 (1990).
- ⁴⁰ F. Marsiglio and J. P. Carbotte, *Gap function and density of states in the strong-coupling limit for an electron-boson system*, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 5355 (1991).
- ⁴¹ A. E. Karakozov, E. G. Maksimov, and A. A. Mikhailovsky, *The investigation of Eliashberg equations for superconductors with strong electron-phonon interaction*, Solid State Commun. **79**, 329 (1991).
- ⁴² R. Combescot, *Strong-coupling limit of Eliashberg theory*, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 11625 (1995).
- ⁴³ Yi-Ming Wu, Artem Abanov, Yuxuan Wang, Andrey V. Chubukov, *The special role of the first Matsubara frequency for superconductivity near a quantum-critical point – the non-linear gap equation below T_c and spectral properties in real frequencies*, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 144512 (2019).