

Stability Analysis of the Hubbard Model

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität
Philosophenweg 19, D-69120 Heidelberg*

An effective Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov-type interaction is calculated for the Hubbard model in second order in the coupling by means of flow equations. A stability analysis is performed in order to obtain the transition into various possible phases.

We find, that the second order contribution weakens the tendency for the antiferromagnetic transition. Apart from a possible antiferromagnetic transition the d -wave Pomeranchuk instability recently reported by Halboth and Metzner is usually the strongest instability. A newly found instability is of p -wave character and yields band-splitting. In the BCS-channel one obtains the strongest contribution for $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -waves. Other types of instabilities of comparable strength are also reported.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Fd, 71.27.+a, 74.20-z.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Hubbard model is commonly considered a model which contains essential features of the Cuprate layers of high-temperature superconductors.¹

In this paper we analyze the Hubbard model by means of flow equations². The basic idea is to eliminate off-diagonal matrix-elements of the interaction in order to obtain a diagonal or a block-diagonal Hamiltonian. This is done by a continuous unitary transformation of the Hamiltonian as a function of the flow-parameter l ,

$$\frac{dH(l)}{dl} = [\eta(l), H(l)]. \quad (1)$$

In the original paper² the Hamiltonian H was decomposed into two parts, the diagonal part H_d and the off-diagonal part H_r and the generator

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

η of the flow equation was chosen so that H_r was eliminated. This could be done for example by choosing

$$\eta = [H_d, H]. \quad (2)$$

In the case of interacting electrons the diagonal terms in (2) were those conserving the number of quasi-particles, i.e. electrons above and holes below the Fermi-sea. Thus the contributions creating and annihilating quasi-particles across the Fermi-surface were eliminated. This scheme was useful at zero temperature. However, at finite temperatures the Fermi-surface is no longer sharp. Then this scheme is no longer useful.

Instead we will choose a different approach. We rewrite eq.(2)

$$\eta = [H, H_r], \quad (3)$$

and in contrast to our previous approach we consider no longer terms to be either diagonal or off-diagonal, but we introduce a continuous quantity $r > 0$ associated to the terms in the Hamiltonian H_r which determines how *urgently* we wish to *eliminate* the corresponding term. $r = 0$ means, that we keep the term. The larger r the more urgently we eliminate it. We call r the elimination factor. In our previous scheme the terms in the diagonal part H_d have $r = 0$, the terms in the off-diagonal part H_r have $r = 1$. From now on r may be continuous.

We will use this scheme in order to transform the Hamiltonian into the form of a molecular-field type Hamiltonian, that is into a form which depends only on biquadratic terms $c_k^\dagger c_k$, $c_k^\dagger c_{-k}^\dagger$, and $c_{-k} c_k$, which yields a Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov-type interaction. In order to accomodate antiferromagnetism, too, we will keep terms $c_{k+q_0}^\dagger c_k$, and also $c_k^\dagger c_{q_0-k}^\dagger$, and $c_{q_0-k} c_k$, where $q_0 = (\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a})$ is the staggered wave-vector for lattice spacing a . This yields an effective interaction which contains the interaction terms described in eqs. (75,81,88, and 95). In this way we eliminate the fluctuations around the molecular-field type behavior. The calculation of this effective interaction is performed in second-order in the Hubbard-coupling U .

This scheme differs from the renormalization-group scheme described by Shankar³ and applied by Zanchi and Schulz⁴, by Salmhofer⁵ and by Halboth and Metzner⁶, and by Honerkamp et al.⁷ to the Hubbard model in so far, as they eliminate the degrees of freedom outside a shell enclosing the Fermi-surface. In our scheme however, first, the interactions connecting states far apart in energy, irrespective of their distance from the Fermi-level, are eliminated. This is in the same spirit as the similarity renormalization by Głazek and Wilson.⁸ Since we transform the interaction we always deal with an effective interaction and not with truncated and partially integrated correlations. This implies, that the interaction remains finite at phase-transitions.

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

Starting from the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov interaction we perform a stability analysis, that is we investigate, at which critical $(U/t)_c$ becomes the system unstable against any symmetry breaking contributions. It has long been known, that at half-filling the system becomes antiferromagnetic, and during recent years many calculations have shown, that the Hubbard model shows an attractive interaction for $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave pairing. Apart from the above mentioned^{4,6} We refer to the FLEX-approach by Bickers, Scalapino, and White^{9,10}, the review by Scalapino¹ and calculations by Hanke et al.¹¹. We find that often the strongest instability (apart from antiferromagnetism) is a d -wave Pomeranchuk-instability recently reported by Halboth and Metzner¹² and a band-splitting instability of p -wave character. The d -wave flux-phase instability (Kotliar¹⁴, Affleck and Marston¹⁵, Chakravarty et al.¹⁶) appears degenerate with the superconducting instability at half filling, and above at doping.

In section 2 we derive a general expression for the generator η from a gradient procedure and introduce the elimination factor r . In section 3 the second-order contribution to the effective electron-electron interaction is derived. In section 4 the expressions for the free energy of the Hubbard model are given. In section 5 the numerical results for the phase-instabilities are presented.

2. GENERATOR η FOR FLOW EQUATIONS FROM A GRADIENT PROCEDURE

In order to determine the generator η in the flow equation (1) we introduce a quadratic form of the Hamiltonian

$$G(H) = \frac{1}{2} \sum g_{ij,kl} H_{ji} H_{lk}. \quad (4)$$

This form is chosen in such a way that G becomes a minimum by means of the flow equations. Without restriction of the general procedure we require the symmetry

$$g_{ij,kl} = g_{kl,ij}. \quad (5)$$

G should be real. Since H is hermitean we have

$$G^*(H) = \frac{1}{2} \sum g_{ij,kl}^* H_{ij} H_{kl}. \quad (6)$$

Thus $G^* = G$ is obtained for

$$g_{ij,kl} = g_{ji,lk}^*. \quad (7)$$

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

We consider now the variation of G under the flow

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dG}{dl} &= \sum g_{ij,kl}(\eta_{jm}H_{mi} - H_{jm}\eta_{mi})H_{lk} \\ &= \sum \eta_{ji}(g_{mi,kl}H_{im}H_{lk} - g_{im,kl}H_{mj}H_{lk}).\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

Since dG/dl should be (semi-)negative, we choose

$$\eta_{ji} = -(g_{mj,kl}H_{im}H_{lk} - g_{im,kl}H_{mj}H_{lk})^* = -g_{jm,kl}H_{mi}H_{kl} + g_{mi,kl}H_{jm}H_{kl},\quad (9)$$

which can be rewritten

$$\eta = [H, H_r]\quad (10)$$

with

$$H_{r,ji} = g_{ij,kl}H_{kl}.\quad (11)$$

G should decrease under the flow. Therefore one chooses a quadratic form, which vanishes for the desired diagonal form, but whose other eigenvalues are positive. For this purpose one may use a double commutator with a hermitean operator v ,

$$H^r = [v, [v, H]].\quad (12)$$

With this choice those contributions to H are considered diagonal, which commute with v . If for example v is the operator of the quasi-numbers, then a matrix element H_{ij} which connects states with v_i and v_j quasi-particles contributes $(v_i - v_j)^2 H_{ij}H_{ji}$ to $G(H)$. For a general basis one has

$$g_{ji,kl} = (v^2)_{jk}\delta_{li} - 2v_{jk}v_{li} + \delta_{jk}(v^2)_{li}.\quad (13)$$

This matrix g is symmetric and hermitean as required.

Instead of using one double-commutator one may use a sum of such contributions. This can be used for the investigation of systems at finite temperatures where due to the disappearance of a sharp Fermi-surface the concept of particles above and holes below the Fermi-surface is no longer valid. We describe the fermion system in terms of creation and annihilation operators c^\dagger and c and introduce the operator v as a one particle operator

$$v = \sum v_k c_k^\dagger c_k.\quad (14)$$

Then we obtain the contributions of H_r by multiplying the terms $H_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k'_1, k'_2, \dots} c_{k_1}^\dagger c_{k_2}^\dagger \dots c_{k'_1} c_{k'_2} \dots$ of H by the elimination function

$$r_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k'_1, k'_2, \dots} = (v_{k_1} + v_{k_2} + \dots - v_{k'_1} - v_{k'_2} - \dots)^2.\quad (15)$$

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

It indicates how strongly we wish to eliminate this term. The larger it is the more we consider it to be non-diagonal. If we now choose several of these contributions with functions

$$v_k^{(\alpha)} = (1 - p^2)^{1/4} \frac{p^{\alpha/2} H_\alpha(k/k_0)}{2^{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\alpha!}} e^{-pk^2/((1+p)k_0^2)} \quad (16)$$

with hermite polynomials $H_\alpha(x)$ and sum over all α (in d dimensions one has to introduce products of d such functions

$$v_{\mathbf{k}}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d} = v_{k_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots v_{k_d}^{\alpha_d} \quad (17)$$

and to sum over all of them) then one obtains for the term

$H_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k'_1, k'_2, \dots} c_{k_1}^\dagger c_{k_2}^\dagger \dots c_{k'_1} c_{k'_2} \dots$ the elimination factor

$$r_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k'_1, k'_2, \dots} = \sum_{i,j} r(k_j, k_j) - 2 \sum_{i,j} r(k_i, k'_j) + \sum_{i,j} r(k'_i, k'_j), \quad (18)$$

$$r(k, k') = \exp\left(-\frac{p}{1-p^2}(k-k')^2/k_0^2\right). \quad (19)$$

Use is made of the generating function (19.12.14) in ¹⁷. Here p and k_0 are appropriately chosen parameters. This function r has the following nice properties: If the momentum k of a creation operator and the momentum k' of an annihilation operator are equal, then the function r is the same if we remove these two operators. Therefore multiplication of a term with the number operator $c_k^\dagger c_k$ will not change r . Consequently if all the momenta k of c^\dagger and k' of c are pairwise equal, then the factor r vanishes. Indeed these matrix-elements to the hamiltonian are considered to be diagonal. If the differences between all momenta are large in comparison to k_0 , then only the contributions for $i = j$ are left, so that r approaches the sum of the number of creation and annihilation operators. If the number of creation operators is different from the number of annihilation operators, then for nearly equal momenta the factor r becomes the square of the difference of the number of creation and annihilation operators.

If a system is to undergo a superconducting transition then one should keep pairs of creation operators with momenta k and $-k$, similarly for annihilation operators. In this case it is more appropriate to sum only over the contributions with odd α in (16). In d dimensions one keeps those with odd $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_d$. For these odd α the contribution $v_k + v_{-k}$ vanishes, so that multiplication by $c_k^\dagger c_{-k}^\dagger$ or $c_k c_{-k}$ does not alter the factor r . If a matrix-element consists only of such factors and factors $c_k^\dagger c_k$, then its r vanishes. With this choice one obtains the elimination factor (18) with

$$r(k, k') = \frac{1}{2} \left(\exp\left(-\frac{p}{1-p^2}(k-k')^2/k_0^2\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{p}{1-p^2}(k+k')^2/k_0^2\right) \right). \quad (20)$$

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

It should be mentioned, that G need not necessarily be a quadratic form in the Hamiltonian. For a general differentiable G one obtains

$$\frac{dG}{dl} = \sum \frac{\partial G}{\partial H_{ij}} (\eta_{ik} H_{kj} - H_{ik} \eta_{kj}) = \sum \eta_{ji} (H_{ik} \frac{\partial G}{\partial H_{jk}} - H_{kj} \frac{\partial G}{\partial H_{ki}}). \quad (21)$$

Choosing now

$$\eta_{ji} = - (H_{ik} \frac{\partial G}{\partial H_{jk}} - H_{kj} \frac{\partial G}{\partial H_{ki}})^* \quad (22)$$

we obtain

$$\eta = [H, R] \quad (23)$$

with

$$R_{ji} = \frac{\partial G}{\partial H_{ij}}. \quad (24)$$

The choice

$$G = - \sum k H_{kk} \quad (25)$$

orders the states with increasing energies¹⁸. One obtains

$$R_{ji} = -j \delta_{ji}, \quad \eta_{ji} = (i - j) H_{ji}. \quad (26)$$

Other choices of G linear in H are the introduction of $\eta_{ji} = \text{sign}(i - j) H_{ji}$ which also orders the states in increasing order^{19,20} or choosing R being the double-occupancy in the Hubbard model²¹.

Note that the introduction of G gives a straightforward way to obtain an η which minimizes G . However it is not the only way to do this. A counterexample is the modification used for the spin-boson model²².

3. SECOND-ORDER PERTURBATON THEORY

We now use this scheme in order to determine the flow equations

$$\frac{dH(l)}{dl} = [\eta(l), H(l)] = [[H, V_r], H] = [[T + V, V_r], T + V] \quad (27)$$

up to second-order in the interaction V

$$H = T + V \quad (28)$$

$$T = \sum_{q,s} \epsilon_q : c_{qs}^\dagger c_{qs} : \quad (29)$$

$$V = \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k_1, q_1, s_1, k_2, q_2, s_2} V(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) : c_{k_1 s_1}^\dagger c_{q_1 s_1} c_{k_2 s_2}^\dagger c_{q_2 s_2} : \dots \quad (30)$$

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

where Ω is the volume of the system. In first order

$$\frac{dV_1(l)}{dl} = [[T, V_{1r}], T] \quad (31)$$

one obtains

$$\frac{dV_1(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2; l)}{dl} = -\Delta\epsilon(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2)^2 r(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) V_1(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2; l) \quad (32)$$

with

$$\Delta\epsilon(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) = \epsilon_{k_1} + \epsilon_{k_2} - \epsilon_{q_1} - \epsilon_{q_2} \quad (33)$$

and

$$V_1(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2; l) = e^{-\Delta\epsilon(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2)^2 r(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) l} V(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2). \quad (34)$$

Thus the decay of the off-diagonal terms does not only contain the factor $(\Delta\epsilon)^2$ in the exponential, but also the elimination factor r . The one-particle contribution T does not change in first order in V . We will neglect the second-order contribution to T .

In second order in V we have

$$\frac{dV_2(l)}{dl} - [[T, V_{2r}], T] = [[T, V_{1r}], V_1] + [[V_1, V_{1r}], T] \quad (35)$$

From this equation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d}{dl} + \Delta\epsilon(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2)^2 r(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2)\right) V_2(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2; l) = \\ \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} f(k_1, k_2, p_1, p_2; p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2; l) (1 - n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\ + \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} f(k_1, p_1, q_1, p_2; k_2, p_2, q_2, p_1; l) (n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\ - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} f(k_1, p_1, p_2, q_1; k_2, p_2, q_2, p_1; l) (n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\ - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} f(k_1, p_1, q_1, p_2; k_2, p_2, p_1, q_2; l) (n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\ - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} f(k_1, p_1, p_2, q_2; k_2, p_2, p_1, q_1; l) (n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} f(\{a\}; \{b\}; l) = V_1(\{a\}; l) V_1(\{b\}; l) \\ \times (r(\{a\})(2\Delta\epsilon(\{a\}) + \Delta\epsilon(\{b\})) - r(\{b\})(\Delta\epsilon(\{a\}) + 2\Delta\epsilon(\{b\}))). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

For those momenta which obey $r(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & V_2(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2; \infty) = \\
 & \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} F(k_1, k_2, p_1, p_2; p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)(1 - n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\
 & + \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} F(k_1, p_1, q_1, p_2; k_2, p_2, q_2, p_1)(n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\
 & - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} F(k_1, p_1, p_2, q_1; k_2, p_2, q_2, p_1)(n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\
 & - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} F(k_1, p_1, q_1, p_2; k_2, p_2, p_1, q_2)(n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\
 & - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} F(k_1, p_1, p_2, q_2; k_2, p_2, p_1, q_1)(n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \tag{38}
 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F(\{a\}; \{b\}) = V(\{a\})V(\{b\}) \\
 & \times \frac{r(\{a\})(2\Delta\epsilon(\{a\}) + \Delta\epsilon(\{b\})) - r(\{b\})(\Delta\epsilon(\{a\}) + 2\Delta\epsilon(\{b\}))}{r(\{a\})\Delta\epsilon(\{a\})^2 + r(\{b\})\Delta\epsilon(\{b\})^2}. \tag{39}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the initial condition $V(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) = U\delta_{k_1+k_2, q_1+q_2}$ of the Hubbard model as well as r and $\Delta\epsilon$ are invariant upon exchange of the last two arguments and independently against exchange of the first two arguments, the same holds for V_1 . Consequently F obeys the symmetry relations

$$F(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4; \{b\}) = F(a_2, a_1, a_3, a_4; \{b\}) = F(a_1, a_2, a_4, a_3; \{b\}) \tag{40}$$

$$F(\{a\}; b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) = F(\{a\}; b_2, b_1, b_3, b_4) = F(\{a\}; b_1, b_2, b_4, b_3). \tag{41}$$

Then the second, third and fourth term in the expression (38) for V_2 cancel.

3.1. Effective Interaction in various Channels

We wish now to retain all terms in the interaction which seem to be important for phase-transitions in the Hubbard model. In particular we are interested to keep those relevant for antiferromagnetism and superconductivity that is terms of the form $c_{k+q_0}^\dagger c_k c_q^\dagger c_{q+q_0}$ and $c_k^\dagger c_{-k}^\dagger c_{-q} c_q$. We use the elimination factor r in the form

$$r(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) = \sum_{\alpha} (v^{\alpha}(k_1) + v^{\alpha}(k_2) - v^{\alpha}(q_1) - v^{\alpha}(q_2))^2. \tag{42}$$

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

In order to keep the interaction terms relevant for antiferromagnetism we choose

$$v^\alpha(q) = v^\alpha(q + q_0). \quad (43)$$

Further, in order to keep the pair-interaction we require

$$v^\alpha(q) = -v^\alpha(-q). \quad (44)$$

With this choice the contributions listed in the first column of table 1 will be kept. Obviously, V_B contains the effective interaction between pairs of electrons of total momentum 0, V_A contains the effective antiferromagnetic interaction with staggered wave-vector q_0 . V_C and V_A contain also charge waves. The contributions V_H and V_F contain the contributions kept in the Fermi-liquid picture. With the choice (43) and (44) also the terms V_Y survive, which describe the pair-interaction of electron pairs with total momentum q_0 .

With this choice of the elimination function r it turns out, that in all cases in the table we obtain $r(\{a\}) = r(\{b\})$. Then these factors cancel altogether and the expression for $F(\{a\}; \{b\})$ reduces to

$$F(\{a\}; \{b\}) = V(\{a\})V(\{b\}) \frac{\Delta\epsilon(\{a\}) - \Delta\epsilon(\{b\})}{\Delta\epsilon(\{a\})^2 + \Delta\epsilon(\{b\})^2}. \quad (45)$$

V	W	$\{a\}$	$\{b\}$
$V_{2B}(k,q)=V_2(k,-k,q,-q)$ $V_{2B}=W_B$	0 W_B	$(k,-k,p_1,p_2)$ $(k,p_1,p_2,-q)$	$(p_1,p_2,q,-q)$ $(-k,p_2,p_1,q)$
$V_{2H}(k,q)=V_2(k,q,k,q)$ $V_{2H}=W_H+W_F$	W_F W_H	(k,q,p_1,p_2) (k,p_1,p_2,q)	(p_1,p_2,k,q) (q,p_2,p_1,k)
$V_{2F}(k,q)=V_2(k,q,q,k)$ $V_{2F}=W_F$	W_F 0	(k,q,p_1,p_2) (k,p_1,p_2,k)	(p_1,p_2,q,k) (q,p_2,p_1,q)
$V_{2A}(k,q)=V_2(k,q+q_0,q,k+q_0)$ $V_{2A}=W_A$	W_A 0	$(k,q+q_0,p_1,p_2)$ $(k,p_1,p_2,k+q_0)$	$(p_1,p_2,q,k+q_0)$ $(q+q_0,p_2,p_1,q)$
$V_{2C}(k,q)=V_2(k,q+q_0,k+q_0,q)$ $V_{2C}=W_C+W_A$	W_A W_C	$(k,q+q_0,p_1,p_2)$ (k,p_1,p_2,q)	$(p_1,p_2,k+q_0,q)$ $(q+q_0,p_2,p_1,k+q_0)$
$V_{2Y}(k,q)=V_2(k,q_0-k,q,q_0-q)$ $V_{2Y}=W_Y$	0 W_Y	(k,q_0-k,p_1,p_2) (k,p_1,p_2,q_0-q)	(p_1,p_2,q,q_0-q) (q_0-k,p_2,p_1,q)

Table 1. Matrix-elements in second order perturbation theory. In the first line the data of the first term in (38) are given, in the second line those of the fifth term. In a number of cases $r = 0$. These terms do not contribute. They are indicated by $W = 0$ in the table.

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

This has the big advantage that we need not choose the functions v explicitly, which prevents us from any arbitrariness in the evaluation.

The terms in the upper lines can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned}
 W_{F,A} &= \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} F(k_1, k_2, p_1, p_2; p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) (1 - n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\
 &= -\frac{U^2}{\Omega} \sum \frac{(1 - n_{p_1} - n_{p_2})(\epsilon_{p_1} + \epsilon_{p_2} - \frac{\epsilon^a + \epsilon^b}{2})}{(\epsilon_{p_1} + \epsilon_{p_2} - \frac{\epsilon^a + \epsilon^b}{2})^2 + (\frac{\epsilon^a - \epsilon^b}{2})^2} \delta_{p_1 + p_2, s} \quad (46)
 \end{aligned}$$

using

$$\Delta\epsilon(\{a\}) = \epsilon^a - \epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2} \quad (47)$$

$$\Delta\epsilon(\{b\}) = \epsilon_{p_2} + \epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon^b \quad (48)$$

and

	ϵ^a	ϵ^b	s
W_F	$\epsilon_k + \epsilon_q$	$\epsilon_k + \epsilon_q$	$k + q$
W_A	$\epsilon_k + \epsilon_{q+q_0}$	$\epsilon_q + \epsilon_{k+q_0}$	$k + q + q_0$

Table 2. ϵ^a , ϵ^b , and s in eq. (46).

The terms in the lower line can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
 W_{B,H,C,Y} &= -\frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} F(k_1, p_1, p_2, q_2; k_2, p_2, p_1, q_1) (n_{p_1} - n_{p_2}) \\
 &= -\frac{U^2}{\Omega} \sum \frac{(n_{p_1} - n_{p_2})(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2} + \frac{\epsilon^a + \epsilon^b}{2})}{(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2} + \frac{\epsilon^a + \epsilon^b}{2})^2 + (\frac{\epsilon^a - \epsilon^b}{2})^2} \delta_{p_2 - p_1, s} \quad (49)
 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\Delta\epsilon(\{a\}) = \epsilon^a + \epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2} \quad (50)$$

$$\Delta\epsilon(\{b\}) = \epsilon_{p_2} - \epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon^b \quad (51)$$

and

	ϵ^a	ϵ^b	s
W_B	$\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q$	$\epsilon_q - \epsilon_k$	$k + q$
W_H	$\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q$	$\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q$	$k - q$
W_C	$\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q$	$\epsilon_{k+q_0} - \epsilon_{q+q_0}$	$k - q$
W_Y	$\epsilon_k - \epsilon_{q_0 - q}$	$\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q_0 - k}$	$k + q - q_0$

Table 3. ϵ^a , ϵ^b , and s in eq. (49).

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

Using $\epsilon_{-p} = \epsilon_p$ both terms can be written in the form

$$-\frac{U^2}{\Omega} \sum \frac{(\hat{n}_{p_2} - n_{p_1})(\epsilon_{p_2} + \hat{\epsilon}_{p_1} - \frac{\epsilon^a + \epsilon^b}{2})}{(\epsilon_{p_2} + \hat{\epsilon}_{p_1} - \frac{\epsilon^a + \epsilon^b}{2})^2 + (\frac{\epsilon^a - \epsilon^b}{2})^2} \delta_{p_1+p_2, s}. \quad (52)$$

For the first term $W_{F,A}$ we have

$$\hat{n}_{p_2} = 1 - n_{p_2}, \quad \hat{\epsilon}_{p_1} = \epsilon_{p_1}, \quad (53)$$

whereas for the last term $W_{B,H,C,Y}$ one puts

$$\hat{n}_{p_2} = n_{p_2}, \quad \hat{\epsilon}_{p_1} = -\epsilon_{p_1}. \quad (54)$$

3.2. Isotropic Model

Before going for the Hubbard Model let us consider an isotropic electron gas without any lattice with one particle energy and interaction

$$\epsilon_k = \frac{k^2}{2m}, \quad V(k_1, k_2, q_1, q_2) = U \delta_{k_1+k_2, q_1+q_2}. \quad (55)$$

The numerical calculations were performed by K rding and are taken partly from²³. They yield for the three-dimensional system at zero-temperature with dimensionless quantities $k_F = 10$, $m = 1$, the following p -, d -, and f - wave-couplings W_B at the Fermi-surface $-0.1174U^2$, $-0.01808U^2$, and $-0.006241U^2$, resp. Thus the couplings decay rapidly with increasing angular momentum, but they are attractive.

In two dimensions the numerical calculation yields as a function of temperature

$1/T$	p -wave	d -wave
	coefficient of	
	$U^2 \cos(\theta)$	$U^2 \cos(2\theta)$
1	$-2.18 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-2.02 \cdot 10^{-3}$
2	$-1.10 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.06 \cdot 10^{-3}$
3	$-7.32 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-7.14 \cdot 10^{-4}$
4	$-5.50 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-5.39 \cdot 10^{-4}$

Table 4. Effective pairing interaction in the two-dimensional isotropic model.

One finds, that the contributions decay approximately proportional to T . The same tendency can be seen for the f - and g -wave. This is in agreement with the prediction by Feldman et al.²⁴, that at zero-temperature in second order of the coupling only the s -wave part of the pair-interaction is changed, but no contribution to higher angular momenta is obtained.

4. HUBBARD MODEL

Explicit calculations were performed for the Hubbard model on a square lattice described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle r',r \rangle, s} c_{r's}^\dagger c_{rs} + U \sum_r (n_{r\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2})(n_{r\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2}), \quad (56)$$

where the hopping-terms are summed over nearest neighbors.

4.1. Symmetries

As long as $\epsilon_{q_0-k} = -\epsilon_k$ we find a number of identities. Let us begin with

$$W_A = -\frac{U^2}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} \frac{(1 - n_{p_1} - n_{p_2})(\epsilon_{p_1} + \epsilon_{p_2})}{(\epsilon_{p_1} + \epsilon_{p_2})^2 + (\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q)^2} \delta_{p_1+p_2, k+q+q_0} \quad (57)$$

If one replaces under the sum p_1 by $p_1 + q_0$ and p_2 by $p_2 - q_0$ and considers only the 1 in the first paranthesis, one observes that this contribution changes into its negative. Therefore we may skip the 1. Moreover the expression is symmetric with respect to the exchange of p_1 and p_2 . Thus we may write

$$W_A = \frac{2U^2}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} \frac{n_{p_1}(\epsilon_{p_1} + \epsilon_{p_2})}{(\epsilon_{p_1} + \epsilon_{p_2})^2 + (\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q)^2} \delta_{p_1+p_2, k+q+q_0}. \quad (58)$$

If we now replace p_2 by $p_2 + q_0$, then we obtain

$$W_A = \frac{2U^2}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} \frac{n_{p_1}(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2})}{(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2})^2 + (\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q)^2} \delta_{p_1+p_2, k+q}. \quad (59)$$

Similarly the expressions for W_B and W_C can be rewritten

$$W_B = -\frac{2U^2}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} \frac{n_{p_1}(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2})}{(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2})^2 + (\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q)^2} \delta_{p_2-p_1, k+q}, \quad (60)$$

$$W_C = -\frac{2U^2}{\Omega} \sum_{p_1, p_2} \frac{n_{p_1}(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2})}{(\epsilon_{p_1} - \epsilon_{p_2})^2 + (\epsilon_k - \epsilon_q)^2} \delta_{p_2-p_1, k-q}. \quad (61)$$

From these expressions it is apparent, that

$$W_B(k, q) = W_C(k, -q) = -W_A(k, q) \quad (62)$$

A second similar relation is obtained for W_H and W_Y . In these cases $\epsilon^a = \epsilon^b$ and

$$W_H(k, q) = W_Y(k, q_0 - q) \quad (63)$$

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

hold. If moreover $\mu = 0$ (half-filling), then by replacing p_1 to $q_0 - p_1$ one obtains

$$W_F(k, q) = -W_Y(k, q). \quad (64)$$

Another class of symmetries is the following

$$W_{A,C,Y}(k, q) = W_{A,C,Y}(k + q_0, q + q_0). \quad (65)$$

In the first two cases ϵ^a and ϵ^b interchange. Thus the equation holds. In the last case ϵ^a and $-\epsilon^b$ have to be exchanged. If we simultaneously exchange the momenta p_1 and $-p_2$ in (49), then also the last equality is obtained.

4.2. Free Energy in Molecular Field Approximation

After having calculated the effective interaction we are left with a problem which is much simpler than the original one. The reason is that the original two-particle interaction is a function of three independent momenta. Here, however, the interaction depends only on two independent momenta. Thus the fluctuations, which make calculations for the original interaction difficult are basically eliminated. It is now sufficient to find the minimum of the free energy within a Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov approximation. In practice we will start from the symmetric state and investigate, whether this state is stable against fluctuations of the order-parameters. Thus we have to expand the free energy

$$F = \langle H \rangle - TS, \quad (66)$$

in the fluctuations around the symmetric state (S denotes the entropy). For this purpose we represent $\langle H \rangle$ as a function of the expectations

$$\langle a_k^\dagger a_l^\dagger \rangle = \Delta_{kl}, \quad \Delta_{kl} = -\Delta_{lk}, \quad \langle a_l a_k \rangle = \Delta_{kl}^* \quad (67)$$

$$\langle a_k^\dagger a_l \rangle = n_k^0 \delta_{kl} + \nu_{kl}, \quad \nu_{kl} = \nu_{lk}^*. \quad (68)$$

We assume Δ and ν to be small quantities and expand the entropy up to second order in these quantities. After some calculation one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} S &= S^0 + k_B \beta \sum_k (\epsilon_k^0 - \mu) \nu_{kk} \\ &- \frac{k_B}{2} \sum_{kk'} |\nu_{kk'}|^2 f(\beta(\epsilon_k^0 - \mu), \beta(\epsilon_{k'}^0 - \mu)) \\ &- \frac{k_B}{2} \sum_{kk'} |\Delta_{kk'}|^2 f(\beta(\epsilon_k^0 - \mu), \beta(\mu - \epsilon_{k'}^0)), \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

I. Grote, E. Kording, and F. Wegner

with

$$S^0 = -k_B \sum_k \left(n_k^0 \ln n_k^0 + (1 - n_k^0) \ln(1 - n_k^0) \right), \quad (70)$$

$$f(x, y) = \frac{x - y}{\frac{1}{e^y + 1} - \frac{1}{e^x + 1}} = \frac{x - y}{e^x - e^y} (e^x + 1)(e^y + 1). \quad (71)$$

In total we have to consider four channels, two particle-hole and two particle-particle-channels, since the total momentum can be 0 and q_0 . In all cases we have to distinguish between singlet- and triplet-excitations.

4.2.1. Particle-particle channel, $q = 0$, interaction V_B

In this channel we consider the expectation values

$$\langle c_{k,s_1}^\dagger c_{-k,s_2}^\dagger \rangle = \epsilon_{s_1,s_2} \Delta_k^{s*} + (\epsilon \sigma^\alpha)_{s_1,s_2} \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \quad (72)$$

$$\langle c_{-k,s_2} c_{k,s_1} \rangle = \epsilon_{s_2,s_1} \Delta_k^s + (\sigma^\alpha \epsilon)_{s_2,s_1} \Delta_k^{t\alpha} \quad (73)$$

with $\epsilon = \sigma^y$. They obey the symmetries

$$\Delta_k^s = \Delta_{-k}^s, \quad \Delta_k^{t\alpha} = -\Delta_{-k}^{t\alpha}. \quad (74)$$

Due to these symmetries s - and d -wave pairing is of singlet type, p -wave pairing of triplet type. The interaction reads

$$H_B = \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_B(k, q) c_{ks}^\dagger c_{qs}^\dagger c_{-ks'} c_{-qs'}, \quad (75)$$

which yields the energy

$$\begin{aligned} E_B &= \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_B(k, q) (\epsilon_{ss'} \Delta_k^{s*} + (\epsilon \sigma^\alpha)_{ss'} \Delta_k^{t\alpha*}) (\epsilon_{s's} \Delta_q^s + (\sigma^\beta \epsilon)_{s's} \Delta_q^{t\beta}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} V_B(k, q) (\Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_q^s + \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_q^{t\alpha}). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

and the entropy

$$S_B = -k_B \sum_k f_B(k) (\Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_k^s + \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_k^{t\alpha}), \quad (77)$$

$$f_B(k) = f(\beta(\epsilon_k - \mu), \beta(\mu - \epsilon_k)). \quad (78)$$

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

4.2.2. Particle-hole channel, $q = 0$, interactions V_H and V_F

In this channel the expectation values

$$\langle c_{ks}^\dagger c_{ks'} \rangle = \delta_{s,s'}(n_k^0 + \nu_k^s) + \sigma_{s,s'}^\alpha \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha} \quad (79)$$

are considered. They obey the symmetries

$$\nu_k^{\text{s}*} = \nu_k^{\text{s}}, \quad \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha*} = \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha} \quad (80)$$

The corresponding part of the interaction reads

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{HF}} &= \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_H(k,q) : c_{ks}^\dagger c_{ks} c_{qs'}^\dagger c_{qs'} : \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_F(k,q) : c_{ks}^\dagger c_{qs} c_{qs'}^\dagger c_{ks'} : \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Its contribution to the energy is

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\text{HF}} &= \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} V_H(k,q) \nu_k^{\text{s}} \nu_q^{\text{s}} \\ &- \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_F(k,q) (\delta_{s,s'} \nu_k^{\text{s}} + \sigma_{s,s'}^\alpha \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha}) (\delta_{s',s} \nu_q^{\text{s}} + \sigma_{s',s}^\beta \nu_q^{\text{t}\beta}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} (2V_H(k,q) - V_F(k,q)) \nu_k^{\text{s}} \nu_q^{\text{s}} - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} V_F(k,q) \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha} \nu_q^{\text{t}\alpha}, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

and its entropy reads

$$S_{\text{HF}} = -k_B \sum_k f_H(k) ((\nu_k^{\text{s}})^2 + (\nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha})^2) \quad (83)$$

$$f_H(k) = f(\beta(\epsilon_k - \mu), \beta(\epsilon_k - \mu)). \quad (84)$$

4.2.3. Particle-particle channel, momentum q_0 , interaction V_Y

In this channel the expectation values

$$\langle c_{ks}^\dagger c_{q_0-k,s'}^\dagger \rangle = \epsilon_{ss'} \Delta_k^{\text{s}*} + (\epsilon \sigma^\alpha)_{ss'} \Delta_k^{\text{t}\alpha*} \quad (85)$$

$$\langle c_{q_0-k,s'} c_{ks} \rangle = \epsilon_{s's} \Delta_k^{\text{s}} + (\sigma^\alpha \epsilon)_{s's} \Delta_k^{\text{t}\alpha} \quad (86)$$

are considered with the symmetries

$$\Delta_{q_0-k}^{\text{s}} = \Delta_k^{\text{s}}, \quad \Delta_{q_0-k}^{\text{t}\alpha} = -\Delta_k^{\text{t}\alpha}. \quad (87)$$

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

The interaction reads

$$H_Y = \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_Y(k,q) c_{ks}^\dagger c_{qs} c_{q_0-k,s'}^\dagger c_{q_0-q,s'}, \quad (88)$$

and its contribution to the energy

$$\begin{aligned} E_Y &= \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_Y(k,q) (\epsilon_{ss'} \Delta_k^{s*} + (\epsilon\sigma^\alpha)_{ss'} \Delta_k^{t\alpha*}) (\epsilon_{s's} \Delta_q^s + (\sigma^\beta \epsilon)_{s's} \Delta_q^{t\beta}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} V_Y(k,q) (\Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_q^s + \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_q^{t\alpha}). \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

Let us now divide the Brillouin zone into two halves. The contributions to the sum with $|k| < |q_0 - k|$ are denoted by a prime '. Then the energy reads by use of eq. (65)

$$\begin{aligned} E_Y &= \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} V_Y(k,q) (\Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_q^s + \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_q^{t\alpha}) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} V_Y(k, q_0 - q) (\Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_q^s - \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_q^{t\alpha}) \\ &= \frac{2}{\Omega} \left(\sum'_{k,q} V_Y(k,q) + V_Y(k, q_0 - q) \right) \Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_q^s \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} (V_Y(k,q) - V_Y(k, q_0 - q)) \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_q^{t\alpha}, \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

and the corresponding entropy

$$\begin{aligned} S_Y &= -\frac{k_B}{2} \sum_{k,s,s'} f_Y(k) (\epsilon_{ss'} \Delta_k^{s*} + (\epsilon\sigma^\alpha)_{ss'} \Delta_k^{t\alpha*}) (\epsilon_{s's} \Delta_k^s + (\sigma^\beta \epsilon)_{s's} \Delta_k^{t\beta}) \\ &= -k_B \sum_k f_Y(k) (\Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_k^s + \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_k^{t\alpha}) \\ &= -2k_B \sum_k f_Y(k) (\Delta_k^{s*} \Delta_k^s + \Delta_k^{t\alpha*} \Delta_k^{t\alpha}), \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

$$f_Y(k) = f(\beta(\epsilon_k - \mu), \beta(\mu - \epsilon_{q_0+k})). \quad (92)$$

4.2.4. Particle-hole channel, momentum q_0 , interactions V_A and V_C

Here the expectation values

$$\langle c_{ks}^\dagger c_{k+q_0s'} \rangle = \delta_{ss'} \nu_k^s + \sigma_{ss'}^\alpha \nu_k^{t\alpha} \quad (93)$$

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

are considered, which obey the symmetries

$$\nu_{k+q_0}^s = \nu_k^{s*} \quad \nu_{k+q_0}^{t\alpha} = \nu_k^{t\alpha*}. \quad (94)$$

The interaction reads

$$\begin{aligned} H_{AC} &= \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_A(k,q) c_{ks}^\dagger c_{qs} c_{q+q_0s'}^\dagger c_{k+q_0s'} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_C(k,q) c_{ks}^\dagger c_{k+q_0s} c_{q+q_0s'}^\dagger c_{qs'}. \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

Its contribution to the energy is

$$\begin{aligned} E_{AC} &= -\frac{1}{2\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s'} V_A(k,q) (\delta_{ss'} \nu_k^s + \sigma_{ss'}^\alpha \nu_k^{t\alpha}) (\delta_{s's} \nu_q^{s*} + \sigma_{s's}^\alpha \nu_q^{t\alpha*}) \\ &+ \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q,s,s*} V_C(k,q) \nu_k^s \nu_q^{s*} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} (2V_C(k,q) - V_A(k,q)) \nu_k^s \nu_q^{s*} - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} V_A(k,q) \nu_k^{t\alpha} \nu_q^{t\alpha*}. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Summation over half of the Brillouin zone yields with eq. (65)

$$\begin{aligned} E_{AC} &= \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} (2V_C(k,q) - V_A(k,q)) (\nu_k^s \nu_q^{s*} + \nu_k^{s*} \nu_q^s) \\ &+ \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} (2V_C(k,q+q_0) - V_A(k,q+q_0)) (\nu_k^s \nu_q^s + \nu_k^{s*} \nu_q^{s*}) \\ &- \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} V_A(k,q) (\nu_k^{t\alpha} \nu_q^{t\alpha*} + \nu_k^{t\alpha*} \nu_q^{t\alpha}) \\ &- \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} V_A(k,q+q_0) (\nu_k^{t\alpha} \nu_q^{t\alpha} + \nu_k^{t\alpha*} \nu_q^{t\alpha*}). \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

We now separate the real and the imaginary part of ν

$$\nu_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{\nu}_k + i\bar{\bar{\nu}}_k), \quad \nu_{k+q_0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{\nu}_k - i\bar{\bar{\nu}}_k) \quad (98)$$

$$\nu_k \nu_q + \nu_k^* \nu_q^* = \bar{\nu}_k \bar{\nu}_q - \bar{\bar{\nu}}_k \bar{\bar{\nu}}_q \quad (99)$$

$$\nu_k \nu_q^* + \nu_k^* \nu_q = \bar{\nu}_k \bar{\nu}_q + \bar{\bar{\nu}}_k \bar{\bar{\nu}}_q. \quad (100)$$

Then the energy reads

$$E_{AC} = \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} (2V_C(k,q) - V_A(k,q) + 2V_C(k,q+q_0) - V_A(k,q+q_0)) \bar{\nu}_k^s \bar{\nu}_q^s$$

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} (2V_C(k,q) - V_A(k,q) - 2V_C(k,q+q_0) + V_A(k,q+q_0)) \bar{\nu}_k^s \bar{\nu}_q^s \\
& - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} (V_A(k,q) + V_A(k,q+q_0)) \bar{\nu}_k^{\text{t}\alpha} \bar{\nu}_q^{\text{t}\alpha} \\
& - \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum'_{k,q} (V_A(k,q) - V_A(k,q+q_0)) \bar{\nu}_k^{\text{t}\alpha} \bar{\nu}_q^{\text{t}\alpha}. \tag{101}
\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding entropy is

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{AC}} &= -\frac{k_B}{2} \sum_{k,s,s'} f_C(k) (\delta_{ss'} \nu_k^s + \sigma_{ss'}^\alpha \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha}) (\delta_{s's} \nu_k^{s*} + \sigma_{s's}^\alpha \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha*}) \\
&= -k_B \sum_k f_C(k) (\nu_k^s \nu_k^{s*} + \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha} \nu_k^{\text{t}\alpha*}) \\
&= -k_B \sum_k f_C(k) ((\bar{\nu}_k^s)^2 + (\bar{\nu}_k^{\text{t}\alpha})^2 + (\bar{\nu}_k^s)^2 + (\bar{\nu}_k^{\text{t}\alpha})^2) \\
f_C(k) &= f(\beta(\epsilon_k - \mu), \beta(\epsilon_{k+q_0} - \mu)). \tag{102}
\end{aligned}$$

4.3. Variation of the Free Energy

The expression for the free energy which is bilinear in ν and Δ , resp., has to be checked with respect to its stability. That is, as soon as some ν or Δ different from zero yields a lower free energy than for the symmetric state for which all ν and Δ vanish, then the symmetric state is unstable and the system will approach a symmetry broken state. This is the indication for a phase transition. The expression for the free energy has the form

$$\beta F = \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{k,q} (\beta U) (1 + \frac{U}{t} V_{k,q}) \Delta_k^* \Delta_q + \sum_k f_k \Delta_k^* \Delta_k \tag{103}$$

$$= \sum_{k,q} \left(\frac{U}{t} A_{k,q} + \left(\frac{U}{t} \right)^2 B_{k,q} + \delta_{k,q} \right) \sqrt{f_k} \Delta_k^* \sqrt{f_q} \Delta_q \tag{104}$$

with

$$A_{k,q} = \frac{\beta t}{\Omega \sqrt{f_k f_q}}, \quad B_{k,q} = \frac{\beta t V_{k,q}}{\Omega \sqrt{f_k f_q}}. \tag{105}$$

A similar bilinear contribution is obtained for ν instead of Δ , which is handled in the same way. Here the factor U^2/t is extracted from the matrix elements $V_{k,q}$. These matrix elements and the entropy coefficients f_k depend on βt and $\beta \mu$. The same is true for the coefficients $A_{k,q}$ and $B_{k,q}$.

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

The calculation is performed for the various representations under the group $C_4 = 4mm$. The representations of the even-parity states are one-dimensional. We denote them by $s_+ = s_1$, $s_- = g = s_{xy(x^2-y^2)}$, $d_+ = d_{x^2-y^2}$, $d_- = d_{xy}$. The odd-parity representation is two-dimensional, here simply denoted by p . Moreover in the channels V_A , V_C , and V_Y we can distinguish between eigen solutions $\nu_k = \pm\nu_{k+q_0}$, and $\Delta_k = \pm\Delta_{k+q_0}$, resp. In total the calculation is performed for 45 channels.

For each channel the eigenvalues λ of $\frac{U}{t}A + (\frac{U}{t})^2B$ have to be determined. Whenever the lowest eigenvalue (i.e. the most negative) equals -1 , then a critical $(U/t)_c$ is reached. For the s_+ representation (in case of V_A , V_C , V_Y only for $\nu_k = +\nu_{k+q_0}$, $\Delta_k = +\Delta_{k+q_0}$) one has to find the solution by iterating the eigenvalue equation as a function of U/t . In the case of all other representations the A -term does not contribute. Therefore then we determine the lowest eigenvalue λ of B , and obtain $(U/t)_c = 1/\sqrt{-\lambda}$.

5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

5.1. Numerics

In a first step we determine the matrix elements as given above on a grid of $2n_h \times 2n_h$ lattice points in the Brillouin zone. The results²⁵ presented below are calculated for $n_h = 16$. The calculation of the matrix-elements takes most of the computer time. It increases with the sixth power of n_h .

It is obvious that in a number of cases the denominator becomes extremely small or even vanishes. We remember, that the sums (52) are of the form

$$\sum_p \frac{b_p z_p}{z_p^2 + e^2}, \quad (106)$$

where e is independent of p . In particular if e vanishes then we have basically a main value integral

$$\int d^2p \frac{b_p}{z_p} \quad (107)$$

where z_p can vanish. In order to avoid, that we sum up terms close to a zero of z_p , which would yield erratic contributions we proceed as follows: We average over several points in momentum-space in the vicinity of p . More precisely if we have to sum

$$\sum_{p_1, p_2} \frac{z_{k, q, p_1, p_2}}{n_{k, q, p_1, p_2}} \delta_{k+q, p_1+p_2}, \quad (108)$$

then we calculate z and n not only for the given (k, q, p_1, p_2) , but also for $(k+\delta, q, p_1+\delta, p_2)$, $(k+\delta, q, p_1, p_2+\delta)$, $(k, q+\delta, p_1+\delta, p_2)$, $(k, q+\delta, p_1, p_2+\delta)$,

I. Grote, E. Körding, and F. Wegner

$(k + \delta, q - \delta, p_1, p_2)$, $(k, q, p_1 + \delta, p_2 - \delta)$ for four different δ s. They are $\delta = (\pm \frac{\delta p}{2}, 0)$ and $\delta = (0, \pm \frac{\delta p}{2})$, where δp is the momentum-spacing for the evaluation of the sums. Then we attribute to these the weights gn and to (k, q, p_1, p_2) the corresponding weight n , which means that we use

$$\sum_{p_1, p_2} \frac{z_{k, q, p_1, p_2} + g \sum_{\{\delta\}} z_{\dots \pm \delta \dots}}{n_{k, q, p_1, p_2} + g \sum_{\{\delta\}} n_{\dots \pm \delta \dots}} \delta_{k+q, p_1+p_2} \quad (109)$$

with some choice of g . Since n is never negative we obtain nearly always a positive denominator. An exception are the V_H and V_F -terms which obey $k = q = p$ and $2k = q_0$ modulo reciprocal lattice vector, and the V_Y -terms with $p = q - q_0 = -k$ and $2k = q_0$ (modulo reciprocal lattice vector). In these cases all ns vanish and we replace the term by the average of the four terms at $p \pm (\delta p, 0)$ and $p \pm (0, \delta p)$.

Since the matrix-elements are calculated by summing over a grid in the Brillouin zone, the question arises, how reliable are the results? Obviously at low temperatures the occupation numbers n vary rapidly. So the result may depend on the points in our grid. There are basically two criteria:

(i) In the channels V_{2F} , V_{2H} , and V_{2Y} the denominator in (106) contains an e which vanishes identically. Despite of the procedure described above one has to assume, that the calculated matrix-elements are less precise than those for V_B , V_A , and V_C .

(ii) The increase of the entropy factors f determines the extension in the wave-vector space contributing essentially to the order-parameter. Denoting $x = \beta(\epsilon - \mu)$ one observes, that $f_B = f(x, -x)$ increases like $2|x|$, whereas $f_H = f(x, x)$ increases like $e^{|x|}$ for large $|x|$. Thus the contributing phase space for V_B is larger than for $V_{H,F}$. The other interactions lie in between. Indeed it turns out, that the results for the particle-hole channels coming from $V_{H,F}$ show deviations between different n_{hs} at low temperatures, that is below $0.05t$.

5.2. Results

In the following figures we show the critical values of the lowest lying $(U/t)_c$ as function of T/t for different values of μ/t . We have chosen $g = 0.01$ in (109). Calculations for $g = 1/24$ instead yield practically no difference.

In the following table we summarize the frequently observed low-lying instabilities. In the second column we characterize the symmetries: ph stands for particle-hole, pp for particle-particle, si for singlet, tr for triplet, q_{\pm} for $\nu_{k+q_0} = \pm \nu_k$, and $\Delta_{k+q_0} = \pm \Delta_k$, otherwise 0. If there are instabilities in another channel with an $(U/t)_c$ less than that for the Pomeranchuk-




Fig. 1. $(U/t)_c$ at $\mu/t = 0$. Doping $x = 0$. Also shown: At $T/t = 0.01$ symmetry ($ph\ tr\ s_+$) (ferromagnetism, disappears for larger lattices).

instability with ($s_- = g$) and less than 10, then the lowest one of those is also shown.

	channel	color
Antiferromagnetism	$ph\ tr\ q_+\ s_+$	—
Pomeranchuk instability	$ph\ si\ 0\ d_+$	—
Band splitting	$ph\ si\ q_-\ p$	—
Superconductivity	$pp\ si\ 0\ d_+$	—
Flux phases	$ph\ si/tr\ q_-\ d_+$	—
Pomeranchuk instability	$ph\ si\ 0\ s_- = g$	—

Table 5. Channels with low-lying $(U/t)_c$.

As expected at half-filling ($\mu/t = 0$) the lowest lying is the antiferromagnetic one. It turns out, that the second order contribution to the antiferromagnetic channel suppresses antiferromagnetism (at least in the s -channel). Therefore antiferromagnetism disappears at larger values of U/t . This is expected since in the strong-coupling limit the magnetic interaction vanishes with $J = 4t^2/U$ in the t - J -model. As we leave half-filling the antiferromagnetism becomes weaker and disappears at some doping. This observation is remarkable, since although we work with a weak-coupling calculation, we obtain results expected at strong couplings.

The next instability is a Pomeranchuk-instability. It has recently been observed from RG-calculations by Halboth and Metzner¹². It should be




Fig. 2. $(U/t)_c$ at $\mu/t = 1/24$. Doping varies from $x = 0.0625$ to $x = 0.0174$. Also shown: For $T/t = 0.01$ to 0.02 with symmetry $(pp\ tr\ q- p)$.




Fig. 3. $(U/t)_c$ at $\mu/t = 1/8$. Doping varies from $x = 0.0807$ to $x = 0.0519$. Also shown: At $T/t = 0.01$ symmetry $(ph\ tr\ p)$. From $T/t = 0.02$ to 0.04 with symmetry $(pp\ si\ s- = g)$.




Fig. 4. $(U/t)_c$ at $\mu/t = 1/4$. Doping varies from $x = 0.1159$ to $x = 0.1030$.

mentioned, that our calculations become less reliable for the $ph0$ -sector at very low temperatures. Thus we do not know, whether (except from the antiferromagnetic instability) it is the lowest lying one as T approaches zero. Depending on the choice of n_h the slope of the curve remains positive at low temperature or it becomes negative.

The next instability is a particle-hole instability of singlet type with q_- - and p -type symmetry. It corresponds to an strengthening and weakening of the hopping matrix-elements at alternating bonds along the x - or y -direction or both superimposed. This instability leads to a splitting into two bands. Within the present approximation they are not separated by a gap. One may speculate, that in higher orders they develop into the two Hubbard bands. We observe, however, that at sufficiently low temperatures either antiferromagnetism or d -wave superconductivity yield a lower critical (U/t) .

Then the superconducting $d_{x^2-y^2}$ instability follows, which is much stronger than superconducting instabilities of other symmetries.

symmetry	$T = 0.1t$	$T = 0.03t$
s_+	12.51 ... -0.10	25.90 ... -0.39
$s_- = g$	0.00 ... -0.71	0.00 ... -1.75
d_+	0.01 ... -2.49	0.01 ... -5.49
d_-	0.69 ... -0.04	2.36 ... -0.06
p	1.35 ... -0.32	2.74 ... -0.97

Table 6. The range of the eigenvalues λ at half-filling¹³ multiplied by 100. Here only the second-order contribution is taken into account for s_+ .

I. Grote, E. Kording, and F. Wegner

Finally we observe a flux-phase instability, which has been discussed by Kotliar¹⁴, and by Affleck and Marston¹⁵. It has been recently discussed by Chakravarty et al. as d -density wave-order¹⁶. The singlet and triplet eigenvalues are degenerate for even parities (apart from $(q_+ s_+)$), since according to table 1 and eqs. (62,101) the singlet interaction $2V_{2C} - V_{2A} = 2W_C + W_A = -W_A$ equals the triplet interaction $-V_{2A}$. At $\mu = 0$ it is moreover degenerate with the superconducting instability, since $V_{2B} = W_B = -W_A = -V_{2A}$ and for vanishing μ also the entropy factors $f_B = f_C$ agree.

At even higher values another Pomeranchuk-instability appears with $s_- = g$ wave-character. A few other low-lying instabilities observed only at special parameters are shown in the figures in black. The ferromagnetic instability at $T = 0.01t$ and $\mu = 0$ may be a remnant of the Nagaoka-ferromagnetism²⁶, although it is expected at larger values of U/t . For $n_h = 24$ it does no longer appear in our calculation even at $T/t = 0.01$.

One phase may suppress another phase. To which extend two order-parameters can coexist with each other is another question, which should be investigated in the future.

5.3. Conclusion

In these calculations we obtain many critical couplings $(U/t)_c$ of the order of 5. Since this is not a small number, calculations which do not handle the coupling perturbatively, should be performed. Nevertheless it becomes clear that this type of calculation gives a good estimate of the most important instabilities. We have found all commonly discussed types of order. Moreover, a p -wave instability which yields band-splitting, appears. Although our calculation is performed for weak coupling, a number of effects normally obtained in the strong-coupling limit are reproduced reasonably well by means of the flow equations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to Andreas Mielke and to Matthias Vojta for useful comments.

REFERENCES

1. D.J. Scalapino, *Phys. Repts.* **250**, 329 (1995).
2. F. Wegner, *Annalen der Physik* (Leipzig) **3**, 77 (1994).

Stability Analysis of Hubbard Model

3. R. Shankar, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 129 (1994).
4. D. Zanchi, H.J. Schulz, *Z. Phys. B* **103**, 339 (1997); *Europhys. Lett.* **44**, 235 (1998).
5. M. Salmhofer, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **194**, 249 (1998).
6. C.J. Halboth, W. Metzner, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 4364 (2000).
7. C. Honerkamp et al., *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 035109 (2001); M. Salmhofer and C. Honerkamp, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **105**, 1 (2001).
8. S.D. Glazek and K.G. Wilson, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 5863 (1993); *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 4214 (1994).
9. N.E. Bickers, D.J. Scalapino, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **193**, 206 (1989).
10. N.E. Bickers, S.R. White, *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 8044 (1991).
11. S. Meixner et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4902 (1997); W. Hanke et al. in *Festkörperprobleme/Advances in Solid State Physics* **38** (1999); R. Eder, W. Hanke, S.C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 13781 (1998).
12. C. J. Halboth, W. Metzner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5162 (2000).
13. F. Wegner, in *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on the Exact Renormalization Group, Rome 2000* World-Scientific, to appear.
14. G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 3664 (1988).
15. I. Affleck, J.B. Marston, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 3774 (1988).
16. S. Chakravarty et al. *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 094503 (2001).
17. A. Erdelyi (ed.) *Higher Transcendental Functions, Volume III*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1955).
18. A. Mielke, private communication.
19. A. Mielke, *Euro. Phys. Jour. B* **5**, 605 (1998).
20. J. Stein, *J. Phys. G* **26**, 377 (2000).
21. J. Stein, *J. Stat. Phys.* **90**, 889 (1998).
22. S. Kehrein, A. Mielke, P. Neu, *Z. Phys. B* **99**, 269 (1996).
23. E. Körding, diploma thesis, Heidelberg (2001).
24. J. Feldman et al. *Helv. Phys. Acta* **70**, 154 (1997).
25. The numerical calculations on the Hubbard model were performed by I. Grote and F. Wegner.
26. Y. Nagaoka, *Phys. Rev.* **147**, 392 (1966).