

Superconductivity in a Hubbard-Fröhlich Model and in cuprates.

T. M. Hardy,¹ J. P. Hague,^{1,2} J. H. Samson,¹ and A. S. Alexandrov¹

¹*Department of Physics, Loughborough University, Loughborough, LE11 3TU, U.K.*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, The Open University, MK7 6AA, U.K.*

Using the variational Monte-Carlo method we find that a relatively weak long-range electron-phonon interaction induces a d-wave superconducting state of doped Mott-Hubbard insulators and/or strongly-correlated metals with a condensation energy significantly larger than can be obtained with Coulomb repulsion only. Moreover, the superconductivity is shown to exist for infinite on-site Coulomb repulsion, removing the requirement for additional mechanisms such as spin fluctuations to mediate d-wave superconductivity. We argue that the superconducting state is robust with respect to a more intricate choice of the trial function and that the true origin of high-temperature superconductivity lies in a proper combination of strong electron-electron correlations with poorly screened Fröhlich electron-phonon interaction.

PACS numbers: 71.38.-k, 74.40.+k, 72.15.Jf, 74.72.-h, 74.25.Fy

It is now over 20 years since the discovery of the first high temperature superconductor¹ and yet, despite intensive effort, the origin of the superconductivity remains fundamentally unknown, with no widely accepted theory. The absence of consensus on the physics of the cuprates and the recent discovery of iron-based compounds with high transition temperatures has re-emphasized the importance of understanding the origins of superconductivity in quasi-two-dimensional materials². The canonical BCS-Migdal-Eliashberg theory could hardly account for well documented non-Fermi-liquid properties of cuprate superconductors. Moreover, calculations based on the local density approximation (LDA) often predict negligible electron-phonon interaction (EPI) insufficient to explain a kink in the quasiparticle energy dispersion observed by ARPES³. Hence, it is not surprising that a large number of researchers held the view that the repulsive Hubbard model would have the essential physics to account for the superconducting and non-Fermi-liquid normal states of cuprates. The idea behind this, originally proposed by Anderson⁴, is that mobile hole pairs are created via a strong on-site repulsion, U . Results by Paramekanti et al.⁵ and Yamaji et al.⁶, using a variational Monte Carlo (VMC) simulation with a (projected) BCS-type trial wave function, appeared to back this up.

However recent studies by Aimi and Imada⁷, using a sign-problem-free Gaussian-Basis Monte Carlo (GBMC) algorithm⁸ have shown that these variational methods, as well as some other approximations, overestimated the normal state energy and therefore overestimated the condensation energy by at least an order of magnitude, so that the Hubbard model does not account for high-temperature superconductivity either. This remarkable result is in line with earlier numerical studies using the auxiliary-field quantum (AFQMC)⁹ and constrained-path (CPMC)¹⁰ Monte-Carlo methods, none of which found superconductivity in the Hubbard model.

On the other hand compelling experimental evidence for a strong EPI has arrived from isotope effects¹¹, high resolution angle resolved photoemission spectroscopies (ARPES)¹², a number of optical^{13,14,15},

neutron-scattering^{16,17} and some other spectroscopies of cuprates¹⁸. Here we show that a long-range EPI combined with the Hubbard U provides sizable superconducting order in doped Mott-Hubbard insulators and/or strongly-correlated metals. Previous numerics have shown that d-wave order could exist in basic models of electron-phonon interactions as a consequence of second order effects (which look similar to those in repulsive models), with d- selected over s-wave order by the Hubbard repulsion, which acts as a kind of filter¹⁹. Other work determining the properties of strongly-coupled polarons and bipolarons have shown that the long-range discrete Fröhlich EPI in the presence of a strong Coulomb repulsion, does not lead to the enormous enhancement of the carrier effective mass characteristic of the Hubbard-Holstein model (HHM)^{20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28}. It is our thinking that the special properties of the Fröhlich type interaction are also likely to be interesting in the weak electron-phonon coupling regime with intermediate carrier density. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to determine if d -wave superconductivity is enhanced by a combination of the lighter carrier masses and propensity to intersite pairing found in models with long-range interactions and significant, repulsive Hubbard U .

Our Hubbard-Fröhlich model (HFM) contains the usual electron hopping, $t(\mathbf{n})$, and electron-electron on-site repulsive correlations, U . In addition there is a term to describe lattice vibrations, with frequency ω and mass M , and a term to describe the long-range interaction of the electrons with ion displacements,

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}', \sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow} t(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}') c_{\mathbf{n}'\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{n}\sigma} + U \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}\downarrow} + \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \left[\frac{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{m}}^2}{2M} + \frac{M\omega^2 \xi_{\mathbf{m}}^2}{2} \right] - \sum_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}, \sigma} f_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{n}) c_{\mathbf{n}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{n}\sigma} \xi_{\mathbf{m}}. \quad (1)$$

Here $c_{\mathbf{n}'\sigma}^\dagger$ and $c_{\mathbf{n}\sigma}$ create and annihilate the electron with spin σ at sites \mathbf{n}' and \mathbf{n} , respectively, $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{m}} = -i\hbar\partial/\partial\xi_{\mathbf{m}}$ is the ion momentum operator at site \mathbf{m} , and $\xi_{\mathbf{m}}$ is the ion displacement. The long-range Fröhlich EPI is char-

acterized by the force which has the form²²,

$$f_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{n}) = \frac{\kappa}{[(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{n})^2/a^2 + 1]^{3/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{n}|}{R_{sc}}\right), \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} are the lattice vectors, a is the lattice constant, and R_{sc} is the screening radius. That is, the screened force is the unscreened force multiplied by an exponential screening factor. The Fröhlich EPI, Eq.(2), routinely neglected in the Hubbard U and t - J models of cuprate superconductors²⁹ is of the order of 1 eV as estimated from optical data²⁰. The force function, Eq.(2), describes the EPI with c-axis polarized optical phonons, which is poorly screened since the upper limit for the out-of-plane plasmon frequency in cuprates³⁰ is well below the characteristic frequency of optical phonons.

The carrier mass and the range of the applicability of analytical weak and strong-coupling expansion effectively depend on the EPI radius. In particular the exact carrier mass calculated with the Fröhlich EPI using the continuous-time QMC algorithm²² was found to be several orders of magnitude smaller than in the Holstein model in the relevant region of $\hbar\omega/t$ ratio. The mass is well fitted by a single exponent remarkably close to those obtained using the Lang-Firsov transformation and subsequent averaging over phonons, for *any strength* of the Fröhlich EPI, justifying our use of the Lang-Firsov transformation in this work. Here we use the transformation³¹ to integrate out phonons (for technical details see for example Ref.²⁸) mapping the electron part of the transformed Hamiltonian, \tilde{H} , to an extended \tilde{U} - λ Hubbard model with renormalized hopping integrals, $\tilde{t}(\mathbf{n})$, a diminished on-site repulsion, \tilde{U} , and a long-range effective attraction, λW ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} = & \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{n}', \sigma} \tilde{t}(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}') c_{\mathbf{n}'\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{n}\sigma} + \tilde{U} \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}\downarrow} \\ & - \lambda W \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq \mathbf{n}', \sigma} \Phi(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}') \hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}'\sigma} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here $\tilde{t}(\mathbf{n}) = t(\mathbf{n}) \exp[-g^2(\mathbf{n})]$, $g^2(\mathbf{n}) = [E_p - \lambda W \Phi(\mathbf{n})]/\hbar\omega$, $\Phi(\mathbf{n}) = \kappa^{-2} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} f_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{0}) f_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{n})$, $\tilde{U} = U - 2E_p$, $W = z\tilde{t}(a)$ is the renormalized half-bandwidth, z is the coordination number and $\lambda = \kappa^2/2M\omega^2W$ is proportional the conventional BCS electron-phonon coupling constant. The latter is proportional to the single-particle density of states (DOS) and could be larger than λ due to the van-Hove singularity of DOS and correlation-enhanced effective mass of carriers. The polaronic shift, $E_p = (\kappa^2/2M\omega^2)\Phi(\mathbf{0})$, of atomic levels is included in the chemical potential. In the following only nearest-neighbor hops are allowed. As shown by Bonča and Trugman²⁴ the physical properties of (bi)polaronic carriers depend predominantly on the EPI coming from the first two sites in Eq.(2), so that we take $R_{sc} = \infty$ in our simulations.

When EPI is strong compared with the renormalized kinetic energy, $\lambda \gg 1$, one can apply the $1/\lambda$ perturbation expansion reducing the multi-polaron problem to a

charged Bose-gas of small mobile bipolarons^{20,28}. Intermediate and weak coupling regimes, $\lambda \lesssim 1$, with large \tilde{U} require a variational approach. Here we use a standard VMC method as for example in Ref. 5 to minimize the energy $\tilde{H}|\Psi\rangle/|\Psi\rangle$. The difference is that we make an additional measurement of the long-range attraction in the extended Hubbard Hamiltonian, Eq.(3).

A BCS type trial wave-function is used, which has the form

$$|\Psi_T\rangle = P_N P_G \prod_{\mathbf{k}} (u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^\dagger) |0\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $P_N = \delta_{\sum_i \hat{n}_i, N}$ projects onto a fixed particle number state and $P_G = \prod_{\mathbf{n}} [1 - (1-g)\hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}\uparrow}\hat{n}_{\mathbf{n}\downarrow}]$ projects out double occupancy⁶. Our variational parameters are $0 \leq g \leq 1$ of the Gutzwiller double occupancy projection operator, P_G , and the chemical potential, μ , that enters through the kinetic energy, $\xi_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \tilde{t}(\cos k_x + \cos k_y) - \mu$, via $u_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = (1 + \xi_{\mathbf{k}}/\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^2})/2$ and $v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = (1 - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}/\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^2})/2$. We then vary the parameters to minimize the energy for values of the electron density ρ , \tilde{U} , superconducting order parameter $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ and λ keeping $\tilde{t} = 1$. We place 42 spin-up and 42 spin-down electrons on a 10×10 2D square lattice to simulate optimal doping, keeping the electron density fixed at $\rho = 0.84$. Two cases are investigated: a) an on-site repulsion $\tilde{U} = 8$ is used for comparison with results of Ref. 6, and b) an infinite \tilde{U} is used to see if the attraction induced by EPI, alone, is enough for superconductivity.

We examine the d-wave $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = \Delta(\cos k_x - \cos k_y)$, extended s-wave $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = \Delta(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$ and s-wave $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = \Delta$ order parameters. Following previous work⁶ periodic boundary conditions are used in one direction and anti-periodic boundary conditions are used in the other. The value of λ is varied to study the effect of increasing EPI and we find the value of Δ at which the energy minimum occurs. We also measure the energy of clustered states to ensure our results are stable against the formation of immobile clusters. In our results all energies quoted are *per electron*; note that Yamaji et al.⁶ use energy per site.

In the following, all energies are quoted in units of \tilde{t} . For the $\lambda = 0$ and $\tilde{U} = 8$ case shown in Fig.1 (top), we recover Yamaji's result⁶ with a minimum at $\Delta \approx 0.08$ and energy per electron of (-0.8780 ± 0.0004) , the normal state energy is (-0.8763 ± 0.0004) . It can clearly be seen that the effect of increasing EPI is to increase the depth of the minimum and therefore the stability of the superconducting state. Our minimum energy per electron is (-4.4008 ± 0.0004) at $\Delta = 0.16$ and $\lambda = 0.075$. The maximum condensation energy gain $|E(\Delta) - E(0)|$ with $\lambda = 0$ is (0.0017 ± 0.0006) and (0.0049 ± 0.0006) per electron with $\lambda = 0.075$.

A surprising result is found for infinite Coulomb repulsion, where mapping to the t - J model would result in $|J| = 4t^2/U = 0$ (so no spin fluctuations are present). Fig.1 (bottom) shows an increasing condensation energy




FIG. 1: Condensation energy per electron (in units of \tilde{t}) versus the amplitude of the superconducting d-wave order-parameter for $\tilde{U} = 8$, top, and $\tilde{U} = \infty$, bottom, with different EPI coupling, λ .

gain with λ for $\tilde{U} = \infty$: the maximum condensation energy gain is (0.00050 ± 0.00007) per electron at $\Delta = 0.06$. While this energy gain is not large enough to guarantee stability against other trial wave functions, it does suggest a d-wave superconducting state exists for $\tilde{U} = \infty$ with strong enough λ , that is *d*-wave order can be induced without spin-fluctuations (as expected, the $\lambda = 0$ curve shows no superconducting order).

We examined the energies of various cluster formations. The lowest clustering energy for $\lambda = 0.075$ is -3.6824 per electron, so that the system is stable against the formation of clusters. It is found that there is no s-wave or extended s-wave superconducting state for both $\tilde{U} = 8$ and $\tilde{U} = \infty$ with λ up to 0.075 see Fig.2.

Accurate QMC studies have proven that the Hubbard U and t - J models are unlikely to account for the high critical temperatures of cuprate superconductors⁷. On the other hand ab-initio LDA calculations of EPI have led to a conclusion that phonons fail to explain high-temperature superconductivity either³. It is well known




FIG. 2: Condensation energy per electron (in units of \tilde{t}) versus the amplitude of the superconducting s-wave order-parameter (top) for $\tilde{U} = \infty$ and $\tilde{U} = 8$, showing no s-wave ground state. The condensation energy versus the amplitude of the extended s-wave order-parameter (bottom) for $\tilde{U} = \infty$ and $\tilde{U} = 8$, showing no extended s-wave ground state.

that LDA badly underestimates the role of the Coulomb correlations, incorrectly predicting that the parent compounds of cuprate superconductors (such as La_2CuO_4) are metallic rather than insulating. Also, the anisotropy of the electron response functions determined with LDA is much smaller than the experimentally observed value in these layered materials. It is not surprising at all that EPI turns out to be very weak in this “metallic” picture due to electron screening of the long-range electron-ion interaction. Moreover, it has been noted that the inclusion of Hubbard U via the LDA+ U scheme significantly enhances the EPI strength³² since the system becomes a doped Mott insulator with poor screening in at least the *c*-axis direction as anticipated in Refs. 33 and 20.

These theoretical results, as well as many experiments^{11,12,13,14,15,16,17}, tell us that any realistic theory of high-temperature cuprate superconductors should include strong electron-electron correlations and

the finite-range EPI on equal footing, as previously discussed by Alexandrov and Mott³³. When an extended Fröhlich EPI is considered, the picture changes drastically compared with the local Holstein interaction, where carriers are readily self-trapped on a single lattice site even by a moderate electron-phonon coupling²⁸. It is interesting to note the profound effect of long range electron-phonon coupling on the magnitude of the superconducting order, since such long range interactions have equally dramatic effects when electron-phonon coupling is strong. For example, we found that small mobile bipolarons could exist when electrons interact via a strong *finite-range* Fröhlich EPI with high-frequency optical phonons^{20,25,26}.

Here, we showed using the VMC method, that even a relatively weak Fröhlich EPI is sufficient to induce a d-wave superconducting state with substantial condensa-

tion energy in a doped Mott-Hubbard insulator and/or strongly-correlated metals. The calculated condensation energy and the difference between clustering and superconducting energies in a wide region of λ are larger than any difference between VMC and the more exact GBMC algorithm of Aimi and Imada⁷, so that our superconducting state is very likely to be robust with respect to a more complicated choice of the trial function. As a result we believe that the true origin of high-temperature superconductivity lies in the proper combination of strong electron-electron correlations with long range electron-phonon interactions.

We would like to thank Pavel Kornilovitch for long-standing collaboration and helpful discussions. We acknowledge support of this work by EPSRC (UK) (grant number EP/C518365/1).

-
- ¹ J. G. Bednorz and K. A. Müller, Z. Phys. B **64**, 189 (1986).
² Y. Kamihara, T. Watanabe, M. Hirano, and H. Hosono, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **130**, 3296 (2008).
³ R. Heid, K.-P. Bohnen, R. Zeyher, and D. Manske, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 137001 (2008).
⁴ P. W. Anderson, Science **235**, 1196 (1987).
⁵ A. Paramekanti, M. Randeria, and N. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 054504 (2004).
⁶ K. Yamaji, T. Yanagisawa, T. Nakanishi, and S. Koike, Physica C **304**, 225 (1998).
⁷ T. Aimi and M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **76**, 113708 (2007).
⁸ J. F. Corney and P. D. Drummond, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 125112 (2006); J. F. Corney and P. D. Drummond, J. Phys. A: Math Gen. **39**, 269 (2006).
⁹ M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **60**, 2740 (1991); N. Furukawa and M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61**, 3331 (1992).
¹⁰ S. Zhang, J. Carlson, and J. E. Gubernatis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4486 (1997).
¹¹ G. M. Zhao and D. E. Morris, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 16487 (1995); G.-M. Zhao, M. B. Hunt, H. Keller, and K. A. Müller, Nature (London) **385**, 236 (1997); R. Khasanov, D. G. Eshchenko, H. Luetkens, E. Morenzoni, T. Prokscha, A. Suter, N. Garifanov, M. Mali, J. Roos, K. Conder, and H. Keller Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 057602 (2004).
¹² A. Lanzara, P. V. Bogdanov, X. J. Zhou, S. A. Kellar, D. L. Feng, E. D. Lu, T. Yoshida, H. Eisaki, A. Fujimori, K. Kishio, et al., Nature **412**, 510 (2001); G.-H. Gweon, T. Sasagawa, S.-Y. Zhou, J. Craf, H. Takagi, D.-H. Lee, and A. Lanzara, Nature **430**, 187 (2004); X. J. Zhou, J. Shi, T. Yoshida, T. Cuk, W. L. Yang, V. Brouet, J. Nakamura, N. Mannella, S. Komiyama, Y. Ando, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 117001 (2005); W. Meevasana, N.J.C. Ingle, D.H. Lu, J.R. Shi, F. Baumberger, K.M. Shen, W.S. Lee, T. Cuk, H. Eisaki, T.P. Devereaux, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 157003 (2006).
¹³ D. Mihailovic, C. Foster, K. Voss, and A. Heeger, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 7989 (1990).
¹⁴ P. Calvani, M. Capizzi, S. Lupi, P. Maselli, A. Paolone, P. Roy, S. Cheong, W. Sadowski, and E. Walker, Solid State Commun. **91**, 113 (1994).
¹⁵ R. Zamboni, G. Ruani, A. J. Pal, and C. Taliani, Solid St. Commun. **70**, 813 (1989).
¹⁶ T. R. Sendyka, W. Dmowski, T. Egami, N. Seiji, H. Yamauchi, and S. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 6747 (1995); T. Egami, J. Low Temp. Phys. **105**, 791 (1996).
¹⁷ D. Reznik, L. Pintschovius, M. Ito, S. Iikubo, M. Sato, H. Goka, M. Fujita, K. Yamada, G. D. Gu, and J. M. Tranquada, Nature **440**, 1170 (2006).
¹⁸ J. Lee, K. Fujita, K. McElroy, J. A. Slezak, M. Wang, Y. Aiura, H. Bando, M. Ishikado, T. Masui, J.-X. Zhu, et al., Nature **442**, 546 (2006).
¹⁹ J. P. Hague, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 060503(R) (2006).
²⁰ A. S. Alexandrov, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 2863 (1996).
²¹ J. T. Devreese (VCH Publishers, 1996), vol. 14 of *Encyclopedia of Applied Physics*, p. 383.
²² A. S. Alexandrov and P. E. Kornilovitch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 807 (1999).
²³ H. Fehske, J. Loos, and G. Wellein, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 8016 (2000).
²⁴ J. Bonča and S. A. Trugman, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 094507 (2001).
²⁵ A. S. Alexandrov and P. E. Kornilovitch, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **14**, 5337 (2002).
²⁶ J. P. Hague, P. E. Kornilovitch, J. H. Samson, and A. S. Alexandrov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 037002 (2007).
²⁷ G. D. Filippis, V. Cataudella, A. S. Mishchenko, and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 146405 (2007).
²⁸ A. S. Alexandrov, in *Polarons in Advanced Materials* (Springer, New York, 2007), vol. 103 of *Springer Series in Material Sciences*, p. 257; H. Fehske and S. A. Trugman, *ibid*, p. 393; A. S. Mishchenko and N. Nagaosa, *ibid*, p. 503.
²⁹ P. W. Anderson, P. A. Lee, M. Randeria, T. M. Rice, N. Trivedi, and F. C. Zhang, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **16**, R755 (2004).
³⁰ J. Kim, B. Feenstra, H. Somal, D. van der Marel, W. Lee, A. Gerrits, and A. Wittlin, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 13065 (1994).
³¹ I. G. Lang and Y. A. Firsov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **43**, 1843 (1962), *sov. Phys. JETP* **16**, 1301 (1963).
³² P. Zhang, S. G. Louie, and M. L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 067005 (2007).

³³ A. S. Alexandrov and N. F. Mott, *Journal of Superconductivity* **7**, 599 (1994).