

Relativistic BCS Theory in Quasi-(2+1)-Dimensions: Effects of an Inter-layer Transfer in the Honeycomb Lattice Symmetry

Tadafumi Ohsaku

*Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic,
Na Slovance 2, CZ-18221 Prague, Czech Republic**

(Dated: September 26, 2021)

Motivated by recent huge interests on graphene sheet and graphite as "relativistic" systems, a BCS superconductivity in a quasi-(2+1)-dimensional relativistic model is investigated. The intra-layer particle dynamics is described by a (2+1)-dimensional Gross-Neveu-type four-body contact interaction model, while inter-layer particle motions will be caused by a hopping term with a transfer parameter t . Especially, we examine the effects of non-vanishing t , chemical potential μ , and a mass parameter m which will give a gap at a conical intersection point of the relativistic band dispersion, in the BCS s -wave (scalar) superconducting gap function Δ .

PACS numbers: 11.10.-z, 70.20.Fg, 74.70.-b, 74.78.-w

The honeycomb lattice structure has been obtained remarkable interests recently in condensed matter physics. For example, graphite and a graphene sheet have the honeycomb lattice symmetry, and they show various interesting physical properties [1-22]. It is well-known fact that, a band structure of a system of honeycomb symmetry has conical intersections between the valence and conduction bands, and the band dispersions can be described by a Dirac model. Graphite can be regarded as a system where (2+1)-dimensional layers are stacked in a specific direction. Toward some efficient design for electronic substances, it is desirable for us to find simple but powerful tendencies/laws (especially as a function of inter-layer transfer t , which is approximatedly given by an overlapping integral between orbitals of two layers). A study by employing a simple field-theoretical model seems suitable for us for this purpose.

Toward an examination on superconductivity in the honeycomb lattice symmetry, the author studied a BCS-type theory in a single layer system (the exact (2+1)-dimensional case) in Ref. [7] as a first step. Recently, Ref. [5] investigated a kind of BCS-type superconductivity in a lattice model of graphene sheet. It is interesting for us to investigate some effects coming from an inter-layer interaction (particle hopping between two nearest neighbor layers) in relativistic BCS superconductivity. Of course, such motions of particles by hopping between layers surely exist in real substances, except the case of an ideal mono-layer situation. Therefore, we will investigate a BCS theory in a quasi-(2+1)-dimensional system where x and y directions are homogeneous, while particle motions of z -direction are described by a Hubbard-like hopping (lattice) model in this paper.

The energy spectra of particles near a conical intersection point with having a hopping term with a transfer parameter t perpendicular to two-dimensional layers will be given as follows:

$$E_{\pm}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) = \pm|k_{\perp}| - t \cos k_3, \quad k_{\perp} \equiv (k_1, k_2). \quad (1)$$

We will seek a model Lagrangian which will give the energy spectra of (1) from its kinetic term, while it also has a BCS-type interaction between particles. The candidate for us will be found in the following form:

$$\mathcal{L} \equiv \mathcal{L}_K + \mathcal{L}_I, \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_K \equiv & \bar{\psi}(x_0, x_{\perp}, n) \left[\gamma^0 (i\partial_0 + \mu) + i\gamma^{\perp} \cdot \partial_{\perp} - m \right] \psi(x_0, x_{\perp}, n) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}(x_0, x_{\perp}, n) \left[\gamma^0 t - u \right] \psi(x_0, x_{\perp}, n+1) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}(x_0, x_{\perp}, n+1) \left[\gamma^0 t - u \right] \psi(x_0, x_{\perp}, n), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_I \equiv G \left[\bar{\psi}(x_0, x_{\perp}, n) \psi(x_0, x_{\perp}, n) \right]^2, \quad (4)$$

(a similar model was discussed in Ref. [23]). \mathcal{L}_K has both the usual Dirac kinetic term in (2+1)-dimensions and the inter-layer hopping terms. The abbreviations for coordinates and derivatives inside the layer (i.e., perpendicular to the third, stacking direction) are defined by

$$x_{\perp} \equiv (x_1, x_2), \quad \partial_{\perp} \equiv (\partial_1, \partial_2), \quad (5)$$

while, we choose the following definition of the three-dimensional gamma matrices:

$$\gamma^0 \equiv \sigma_3, \quad \gamma^1 \equiv i\sigma_1, \quad \gamma^2 \equiv i\sigma_2, \quad \gamma^{\perp} \equiv (\gamma^1, \gamma^2). \quad (6)$$

ψ is a two-component spinor. The Fourier transform of the fermion field in our model becomes

$$\psi(x_0, x_\perp, n) = \int_k \psi(k_0, k_\perp, k_3) e^{-ik_0 x_0 + ik_\perp \cdot x_\perp + ik_3 n}, \quad (7)$$

$$\int_k (\dots) \equiv \int \frac{dk_0}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dk_3}{2\pi} (\dots). \quad (8)$$

The integration of k_3 is restricted to the region $-\pi \leq k_3 \leq \pi$, namely the first Brillouin zone. Thus, the Fourier transformed expression for the kinetic Lagrangian is found to be

$$\mathcal{L}_K = \bar{\psi} \left(\gamma^0 \{k_0 + \mu + t \cos k_3\} + \gamma^\perp \cdot k_\perp - m - u \cos k_3 \right) \psi. \quad (9)$$

The diagonalization of \mathcal{L}_K at $\mu = m = u = 0$ gives (1) as its eigenvalues. Our Lagrangian \mathcal{L} becomes a (2+1)-dimensional Gross-Neveu model [7,24,25] at the zero transfer limit $t \rightarrow 0$, $u \rightarrow 0$. $u \cos k_3$ is a mass with an alternation (modulation) in the k_3 -direction.

In this paper, we only consider scalar-type fermion pair condensates σ (fermion-antifermion) and Δ (fermion-fermion). From possible functional (mathematical) structure of gap equations, this choice is relevant for considering BCS superconductivity [7]. We introduce the method of auxiliary fields of composites to our Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_K - \sigma \bar{\psi} \psi + \frac{\Delta}{2} \bar{\psi} C \bar{\psi}^T + \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{2} \psi^T C^{-1} \psi - \frac{\sigma^2}{2G} - \frac{|\Delta|^2}{2G} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2G} (\sigma^2 + |\Delta|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Psi} \mathcal{M} \Psi. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here, C is the charge conjugation matrix, and we have taken the four-component Nambu notation [26] of the following definition:

$$\Psi(x) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \psi(x) \\ \bar{\psi}^T(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{\Psi}(x) = (\bar{\psi}(x), \psi^T(x)), \quad \mathcal{M} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{11} & \mathcal{M}_{12} \\ \mathcal{M}_{21} & \mathcal{M}_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{11} &\equiv \gamma^0 \{i\partial_0 + \mu + t \cos k_3\} + i\gamma^\perp \cdot \partial_\perp - \sigma - m - u \cos k_3, \\ \mathcal{M}_{12} &\equiv \Delta(x)C, \quad \mathcal{M}_{21} \equiv \bar{\Delta}(x)C^{-1}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{22} &\equiv \gamma^{0T} \{i\partial_0 - \mu - t \cos k_3\} + i(\gamma^\perp)^T \cdot \partial_\perp + \sigma + m + u \cos k_3. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Hence, the partition function \mathcal{Z} considered in this paper is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\sigma \mathcal{D}\Delta \mathcal{D}\bar{\Delta} \exp \left[i \sum_n \int dx_0 dx_1 dx_2 \mathcal{L} \right]. \quad (13)$$

The effective potential becomes

$$V_{eff} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2G} + \frac{|\Delta|^2}{2G} + i \text{tr} \int_k \ln \det \mathcal{M}, \quad (14)$$

where the determinant is evaluated to be

$$\text{tr} \int_k \ln \det \mathcal{M} = \int_k \ln [k_0 - E_+] [k_0 + E_+] [k_0 - E_-] [k_0 + E_-]. \quad (15)$$

The eigenvalues appeared in V_{eff} will be obtained in the following forms:

$$E_\pm(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{(\sqrt{k_\perp^2 + [\sigma + m + u \cos k_3]^2 \mp [\mu + t \cos k_3]} + |\Delta|^2)}. \quad (16)$$

We employ the finite-temperature Matsubara formalism for our convenience of k_0 -integration [27-29]. The zero-temperature theory is converted into the Matsubara formalism by the following substitution in our theory:

$$\int \frac{dk_0}{2\pi i} \rightarrow \sum_n \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad k_0 \rightarrow i\omega_n, \quad \beta \equiv \frac{1}{T}, \quad (T; \text{temperature}), \quad \omega_n \equiv \frac{(2n+1)\pi}{\beta}, \quad (n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots), \quad (17)$$

After performing the discrete frequency summation, we get

$$V_{eff} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2G} + \frac{|\Delta|^2}{2G} - \int^\Lambda \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^\pi \frac{dk_3}{2\pi} \left(E_+ + E_- + \frac{2}{\beta} \ln(1 + e^{-\beta E_+})(1 + e^{-\beta E_-}) \right), \quad (18)$$

where, Λ is a two-dimensional momentum cutoff:

$$\int^\Lambda \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\Lambda |k_\perp| dk_\perp. \quad (19)$$

The gap equations, namely the stationary condition of V_{eff} will be obtained as follows:

$$0 = \frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{\sigma}{G} - \int^\Lambda \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^\pi \frac{dk_3}{2\pi} \left[\frac{\partial E_+}{\partial \sigma} \tanh \frac{\beta}{2} E_+ + \frac{\partial E_-}{\partial \sigma} \tanh \frac{\beta}{2} E_- \right] \quad (20)$$

and

$$0 = \frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial \Delta} = \frac{\Delta}{2G} - \int^\Lambda \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^\pi \frac{dk_3}{2\pi} \left[\frac{\partial E_+}{\partial \Delta} \tanh \frac{\beta}{2} E_+ + \frac{\partial E_-}{\partial \Delta} \tanh \frac{\beta}{2} E_- \right]. \quad (21)$$

Here, several derivatives in the gap equations become

$$\frac{\partial E_\pm}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{\sqrt{k_\perp^2 + [\sigma + m + u \cos k_3]^2} \mp [\mu + t \cos k_3]}{\sqrt{(\sqrt{k_\perp^2 + [\sigma + m + u \cos k_3]^2} \mp [\mu + t \cos k_3])^2 + |\Delta|^2}} \frac{\sigma + m + u \cos k_3}{\sqrt{k_\perp^2 + (\sigma + m + u \cos k_3)^2}} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial E_\pm}{\partial \Delta} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{(\sqrt{k_\perp^2 + [\sigma + m + u \cos k_3]^2} \mp [\mu + t \cos k_3])^2 + |\Delta|^2}}. \quad (23)$$

Our gap equations have model parameters as G (coupling constant), Λ (two-dimensional momentum cutoff), m (gap parameter at the conical intersection), u (a mass parameter alternating to the inter-layer direction), t (transfer matrix between two nearest neighbor layers) and μ (a chemical potential). We choose the unit $\Lambda = 1$ throughout this paper. The coupling constant G will be chosen to satisfy the condition $\sigma, \Delta \ll \Lambda$. In this paper, we do not consider a coexistent phase of $\sigma \neq 0$ and $\Delta \neq 0$, and study phases of both $\sigma \neq 0, \Delta = 0$ and $\sigma = 0, \Delta \neq 0$ separately.

First, we investigate the critical coupling for dynamical generation of σ . At $m = u = \Delta = T = 0$, the self-consistent gap equation for σ becomes like

$$0 = \frac{\sigma}{G} - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\Lambda k_\perp dk_\perp \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k_\perp^2 + \sigma^2}} \quad (24)$$

and this equation gives the critical coupling G_{cr} as

$$G_{cr} = \frac{2\pi}{\Lambda}. \quad (25)$$

Hence, one cannot find any effect of t in G_{cr} at $m = u = \Delta = T = 0$, namely the inter-layer hopping effect of t (and also μ) disappears in G_{cr} at this case. If we consider the case $\Delta \neq 0$ with $m = u = T = 0$, G_{cr} will obtain an expression which includes an effect of t , though we have to solve the gap equations of σ and Δ simultaneously for our confirmation of coexistence of dynamically generated σ and Δ . This is an interesting problem, though it is beyond scope of this paper.

Numerical results from the gap equation for Δ are given in Figs. 1, 2 and 3. Figure 1 shows the BCS gap function Δ at $\sigma = 0$ as a function of the inter-layer transfer parameter t . We set parameters as $\Lambda = 1$ (unit), $G = 4$, $T = u = \mu = 0$ ($\mu = 0$ corresponds to the "Dirac" vacuum state). The four examples of $m = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$ are depicted in this figure. When t (m) increases, Δ increases (decreases). There is no non-trivial solution for Δ at

the cases of $t = 0, m = 0.3$ and $t = 0.1, m = 0.3$, and this fact indicates the existence of a "critical transfer" (and also, a "critical coupling") for dynamical generation of finite Δ in our theory.

Figure 2 gives the BCS gap function Δ at $\sigma = 0$ as a function of t . The parameters Λ, G, T and u are set as same as Fig. 1, while we choose $\mu = 0.2$. Increasing of μ causes the enhancement of Δ .

Figure 3 shows Δ at $\sigma = 0$ shown as a function of t . The parameters Λ, G, T and u are set as same as Figs. 1 and 2, and chemical potential is chosen as $\mu = 0.4$. In this figure, Δ decreases when t increases. Hence, t -dependence of Δ is not trivial, and it is affected by μ . It is also the case that, when m is small enough, the difference of choices of numerical values of μ disappears at large t (effect of μ is washed out by a large t). See the differences of energy scales of Figs. 1, 2 and 3.

Temperature dependence of gap function Δ is shown in Figs. 4 and 5. We choose three values of μ in Fig. 4, while the three examples of t are chosen in Fig. 5. In both of these figures, the ratio $\Delta(T = 0)/T_c$ (T_c ; critical temperature) becomes 1.7 ± 0.1 , i.e., the BCS universal constant $\Delta(T = 0)/T_c = 1.76$ is almost satisfied, though it seems the case that there are tiny but finite deviations from the constant. The gap function always show the character of second order phase transition.

We summarize our conclusions as the following tendencies: (1) When m increases, Δ decreases. (2) When μ increases, Δ increases. (3) Δ depends on t non-trivially, and its dependence on t is qualitatively changed by choices of numerical values of μ .

If we consider a real substance like graphite, μ corresponds to a charge doping concentration to the system. Our results indicate that a charge doping and an inter-layer coupling do not always give cooperative effects to an amplitude of a BCS gap function. The results of this paper can also be used to consider superconductivity of MgB_2 [30] which also has the honeycomb lattice symmetry [7]. It is very interesting for us to use parameters obtained by an *ab initio* band structure calculation or a molecular orbital calculation for getting numerical values of t , so forth.

* Present Address; Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, tadafumi@physics.utexas.edu

¹ G. W. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 2449 (1984).

² F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2015 (1988).

³ J. González, F. Guinea and M. A. H. Vozmediano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3589 (1996), Phys. Rev. **B63**, 134421 (2001), J. González, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 076404 (2002), N. M. R. Peres, A. H. Castro Neto and F. Guinea, Phys. Rev. **B73**, 195411 (2006), A. H. Castro Neto, F. Guinea and N. M. R. Peres, Phys. Rev. **B73**, 205408 (2007), E. V. Castro, K. S. Novoselov, S. V. Morozov, N. M. R. Peres, J. M. B. Lopes dos Santos, J. Nilsson, F. Guinea, A. K. Geim and A. H. Castro Neto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 216802 (2007), J. Nilsson, A. H. Castro Neto, F. Guinea, and N. M. R. Peres, arXiv:0712.3259, F. Guinea, B. Horovitz and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. **B77**, 205421 (2008), F. Guinea, arXiv:0805.3908.

⁴ A. H. Castro Neto, F. Guinea, N. M. R. Peres, K. S. Novoselov and A. K. Geim, arXiv:0709.1163.

⁵ B. Uchoa and A. H. Castro Neto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 146801 (2007).

⁶ D. V. Khveshchenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 246802 (2001), Phys. Rev. **B74**, 161402(R) (2006), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 036802 (2006), Phys. Rev. **B75**, 153405 (2007).

⁷ T. Ohsaku, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B18**, 1771 (2004).

⁸ V. P. Gusynin and S. G. Sharapov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 146801 (2005). V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, S. G. Sharapov and I. A. Shovkovy, cond-mat/0612488, arXiv:0801.0708, arXiv:0806.2136. E. V. Gorbar, V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky and I. A. Shovkovy, arXiv:0806.0846. E. V. Gorbar, V. P. Gusynin and V. A. Miransky, arXiv:0710.3527.

⁹ C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 226801 (2005), C. L. Kane, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B21**, 1155 (2007).

¹⁰ N. A. Sinitsyn, J. E. Hill, H. Min, J. Sinova and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 106804 (2007).

¹¹ K. Nomura and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 256602 (2006), Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 076602 (2007).

¹² K. Yang, S. Das Sarma and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. **B74**, 075423 (2006).

¹³ Y. Barlas, T. Pereg-Barnea, M. Polini, R. Asgari and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 236601 (2007).

¹⁴ H. Min, G. Borghi, M. Polini and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. **B77**, 041407(R) (2008).

¹⁵ M. Polini, R. Asgari, Y. Barlas, T. Pereg-Barnea and A. H. MacDonald, Solid State Commun. **143**, 58 (2007).

¹⁶ M. Polini, A. Tomadin, R. Asgari and A. H. MacDonald, arXiv:0803.4150.

¹⁷ H. Min and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. **B77**, 155416 (2008), arXiv:0806.2792.

¹⁸ D. Xiao, W. Yao and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 236809 (2007).

¹⁹ Y. Hatsugai, T. Fukui and H. Aoki, Phys. Rev. **B74**, 205414 (2006).

²⁰ M. Kohmoto, arXiv:0709.2213

²¹ P. Ghaemi and F. Wilczek, arXiv:0709.2626.

²² D. L. Bergmann and K. Le Hur, arXiv:0806.0379.

²³ V. M. Loktev, R. M. Quick and S. G. Sharapov, Physica **C314**, 233 (1999).

²⁴ K. G. Klimenko, Z. Phys. **C37**, 457 (1988), **C54**, 323 (1992).

FIG. 1: Δ shown as a function of t . We set parameters as $\Lambda = 1$ (unit), $G = 4$, $T = u = \sigma = \mu = 0$ ($\mu = 0$ corresponds to the "Dirac" vacuum state). The four examples of $m = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$ are depicted.

FIG. 2: Δ shown as a function of t . We set parameters as $\Lambda = 1$ (unit), $G = 4$, $T = u = \sigma = 0$ and $\mu = 0.2$. The four examples of $m = 0, 0.1, 0.2$ are depicted in this figure.

FIG. 3: Δ shown as a function of t . We set parameters as $\Lambda = 1$ (unit), $G = 4$, $T = u = \sigma = 0$ and $\mu = 0.4$. The four examples of $m = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3$ are depicted in this figure.

FIG. 4: Δ as a function of temperature T . We have set parameters as $\Lambda = 1$ (unit), $G = 4$, $u = \sigma = 0$, $m = 0.1$ and $t = 0.2$. Three examples of $\mu = 0, 0.2, 0.4$ are shown in this figure.

FIG. 5: Δ as a function of temperature T . We have set parameters as $\Lambda = 1$ (unit), $G = 4$, $u = \sigma = 0$, $m = 0.1$ and $\mu = 0.2$. Three examples of $t = 0, 0.2, 0.4$ are shown in this figure.

²⁵ B. Rosenstein, B. J. Warr and S. H. Park, Phys. Rep. **205**, 59 (1991).

²⁶ Y. Nambu, Phys. Rev. **117**, 648 (1960).

²⁷ T. Matsubara, Prog. Theor. Phys. **14**, 351 (1955).

²⁸ H. Ezawa, Y. Tomozawa and H. Umezawa, Nuovo Cim. **5**, 810 (1957).

²⁹ A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gor'kov and I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics*, (Dover, New York, 1963).

³⁰ J. Nagamatsu, N. Nakagawa, T. Muranaka, Y. Zenitani and J. Akimitsu, Nature **410**, 63 (2001).

This figure "quasi3-super1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/0806.4298v4>

This figure "quasi3-supertemperature1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/0806.4298v4>

This figure "quasi3-super2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/0806.4298v4>

This figure "quasi3-supertemperature2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/0806.4298v4>

This figure "quasi3-super3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/0806.4298v4>