

Superconductivity in the t-J model

N. M. P. Lakida

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow
and

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik Komplexer Systeme, Dresden
(17 October 2002)

A comparison of microscopic theories of superconductivity in the limit of strong electron correlations is presented. We consider results for the two-dimensional t-J model obtained within the projection technique for the Green functions in terms of the Hubbard operators and the slave-fermion representation for the RVB state. It is argued that the latter approach resulting in the odd-symmetry p-wave pairing for fermions is inadequate.

I. INTRODUCTION

A mechanism of high-temperature superconductivity in cuprates is still unresolved since strong electron correlations in copper-oxygen planes prevent from applying well established methods of band structure calculations developed for conventional metals. An important role of electron correlations in cuprates was initially stressed by Anderson¹ who proposed to consider them within the framework of the Hubbard model or the so-called t-J model which follows from the Hubbard model in the limit of strong correlations. To study these models, a lot of numerical work have been done^{2,3} though the obtained results are still controversial. For instance, a robust d-wave pairing was observed for the t-J model⁴, while a long-range order was not found in the original Hubbard model.⁵

In analytical approaches mostly a mean-field theory (MFA) was applied in studies of the Hubbard model or the t-J model. The resonating valence bond (RVB) state in the t-J model was proposed by Baskaran et al.⁶ where superconductivity was obtained as a result of spin correlations induced by the superexchange interaction. Similar results were found by Cyrot⁷ for superconducting pairing mediated by superexchange interaction. To overcome the problem of strong correlations in the t-J model and nonfermionic commutation relations for the physical electron operators a number of auxiliary field representations was proposed (see, e.g.,⁸⁻³²). However, in these methods usually a spin-charge separation is assumed for spinon and holon fields which violates rigorous restrictions imposed by nonfermionic commutation relations as the "no double occupancy" constraint which may result in unphysical conclusions.

A reliable analytical approach to deal with strong correlations in the Hubbard or the t-J model is based on the Green function methods in terms of the Hubbard operators which rigorously preserve the nonfermionic commutation relations³³. Here we mention our results based on the Mori-type projection technique for the Green functions³⁴⁻³⁶ and the diagram technique calculations by Izyumov et al.^{37,38}. These approaches enable one

to go beyond MFA by taking into account self-energy corrections. For instance, a numerical solution of the Dyson equation in³⁶ revealed a non Fermi-liquid behavior in the normal state at low doping and the d-wave superconductivity mediated by the exchange and spin-uctuation pairing. In the recent paper³⁹ a microscopical theory of superconductivity in CuO₂ layer within the effective two-band p-d Hubbard model in the strong correlation limit was developed. It has been proved that the MFA for the Hubbard model results in the antiferromagnetic exchange d-wave pairing which is equivalent to pairing observed in the t-J model in MFA.

In the present paper we compare the results for the t-J model obtained within the Green function (GF) method in terms of the Hubbard operators³⁴⁻³⁶ and by applying the slave-fermion hard-boson representation²⁷ for the RVB state. It will be shown that the latter approach results in an odd-symmetry p-wave pairing for the spinless fermions as in the path-integral representation in³² which contradicts to known numerical and analytical calculations. It casts doubts on the validity of spin-charge separation approach in studying superconducting pairing in the t-J model.

In the next Section we present briefly the results of the projection technique for the GF³⁶ for the t-J model. In Sec.3 superconducting pairing within the slave-fermion representation for the Hubbard operators is considered. Results and discussions are given in Sec.4. Concluding remarks are in Sec.5.

II. GREEN FUNCTION METHOD

A. Dyson Equation for the t-J Model

In the present Section we consider superconducting pairing in the t-J model by applying the GF technique³⁴⁻³⁶. The t-J model in the standard notation^{1,42} reads:

$$H_{t-J} = \sum_{i \neq j} t \alpha_i^+ \alpha_j + J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (S_i S_j - \frac{1}{4} n_i n_j); \quad (1)$$

where $a_i^+ = a_i^+ (1 - n_{iP})$ are projected operators for physical electrons, $n_{iP} = a_i^+ a_i$ is the number operator and $S_i = (1/2) \sum_{s,s^0} a_{is}^+ a_{is^0}$ are spin-1/2 operators. Here t is effective transfer integral and J is antiferromagnetic exchange energy for a pair of nearest neighbor spins, $hi, j; i > j$.

To take into account on a rigorous basis the projected character of electron operators we employ the Hubbard operator technique. The Hubbard operators (HO) are defined as $X_i = |j\rangle\langle i|$; i, j for three possible states $|j\rangle$; i at a lattice site i : for an empty site $|j\rangle=|0\rangle$ and for a singly occupied site $|j\rangle = |i\rangle$ by an electron with spin $=2$ ($=1$; $=0$). They obey the completeness relation

$$\sum_i X_i^{00} + \sum_i X_i = 1; \quad (2)$$

which rigorously preserves the constraint of no double occupancy. The spin and density operators in Eq.(1) are expressed by HO as

$$S_i = X_i^z; \quad S_i^z = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i X_i; \quad n_i = \sum_i X_i; \quad (3)$$

The HO obey the following multiplication rule $X_i X_i = X_i$ and commutation relations

$$[X_i, X_j] = \pm X_i X_j; \quad (4)$$

where the upper sign stands for the Fermi-like HO (as, e.g., X_i^{00}) and the lower sign for the Bose-like operators (as the spin and number operators in Eq. (3)).

By using the Hubbard operator representation we write the Hamiltonian of the t - J model (1) in a more general form:

$$H_{t,J} = \sum_{i \neq j} t_{ij} X_i^{00} X_j^{00} + \sum_i J_{ij} X_i X_j; \quad (5)$$

The electron hopping energy for the nearest neighbors, $t_{ij} = t$, and the second neighbors, $t_{ij} = t^0$, on a 2D square lattice, and the exchange interaction $J_{ij} = J$ for the nearest neighbors⁴³ can be considered as independent parameters if, starting from a more realistic for copper oxides three-band p - d model⁴⁴, we reduce it to the t - J model⁴². In that case the parameters $t; t^0$ and J can be evaluated in terms of the original parameters of the p - d model (see, e.g.,^{45;46}). We introduced also the chemical potential which can be calculated from the equation for the average number of electrons

$$n = \langle n_i \rangle = \langle \sum_i X_i \rangle; \quad (6)$$

To discuss the superconducting pairing within the model (5) we introduce the Nambu notation for HO:

$$X_i = \begin{pmatrix} X_i^{00} \\ X_i^0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad X_i^+ = \begin{pmatrix} X_i^0 & X_i^{00} \end{pmatrix};$$

and consider the matrix GF

$$\hat{G}_{ij}(t-t^0) = \langle \langle X_i(t) X_j^+(t^0) \rangle \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} G_{ij}^{11} & G_{ij}^{12} \\ G_{ij}^{21} & G_{ij}^{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

where Zubarev's notation for the anticommutator GF is used⁴⁷.

By differentiating the GF (7) over the time t we get for the Fourier component the following equation

$$\omega \hat{G}_{ij}(\omega) = \sum_j Q_{ij}^0 \hat{G}_{ij}(\omega) + \langle \langle \hat{Z}_i \rangle \rangle; \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{Z}_i = [X_i; H]$, $Q = \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & Q \end{pmatrix}$ with $Q = \langle \langle X_i^{00} + X_i \rangle \rangle$. Since we consider a spin-singlet state the correlation function $Q = Q = 1 - n = 2$ depends only on the average number of electrons (6).

Now, we project the many-particle GF in (8) on the original single-electron GF

$$\langle \langle \hat{Z}_i \rangle \rangle = \sum_i \langle \langle \hat{E}_{i1} \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle \hat{Z}_i^{(irr)} \rangle \rangle; \quad (9)$$

where the irreducible (irr) part of the many-particle operator \hat{Z}_i is defined by the equation

$$\langle \langle \hat{Z}_i^{(irr)} \rangle \rangle + \sum_j g_j \langle \langle \hat{Z}_i \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle \hat{E}_{i1} \rangle \rangle; \quad \langle \langle \hat{Z}_i \rangle \rangle = 0;$$

which results in the definition of the frequency matrix

$$\hat{E}_{ij} = \langle \langle [X_i; H] \rangle \rangle + \sum_j g_j Q^{-1}; \quad (10)$$

Now we can introduce the zero-order GF in the generalized MFA which is given by the frequency matrix (10)

$$\hat{G}_{ij}^0(\omega) = Q \delta_{ij} \langle \langle \hat{E}_{ij} \rangle \rangle^{-1}; \quad (11)$$

To derive the Dyson equation for the single-electron GF (7) we write down an equation of motion for the irreducible part of the GF in (9) with respect to the second time t^0 for the right-hand side operator $X_j^+(t^0)$. Then performing the same projection procedure as in Eq. (9) we obtain the Dyson equation for the GF in the form

$$\hat{G}_{ij}(\omega) = \hat{G}_{ij}^0(\omega) + \sum_{k1} \hat{G}_{ik}^0(\omega) \hat{\Gamma}_{k1}(\omega) \hat{G}_{lj}(\omega); \quad (12)$$

where the self-energy operator $\hat{\Gamma}_{k1}(\omega)$ is defined by the equation

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}(\omega) = \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}(\omega) + \sum_{k1} \hat{\Gamma}_{ik}(\omega) \hat{G}_{k1}^0(\omega) \hat{\Gamma}_{lj}(\omega); \quad (13)$$

Here the scattering matrix is given by

$$\hat{T}_{ij}^{(1)} = Q^{-1} \text{tr} \hat{Z}_i^{(irr)} \hat{Z}_j^{(irr)+} \text{tr} \hat{Z}_i^{-1} \quad (14)$$

From Eq. (13) it follows that the self-energy operator is given by the irreducible part of the scattering matrix (14) that has no parts connected by the single zero-order GF (11):

$$\hat{T}_{ij}^{(1)} = Q^{-1} \text{tr} \hat{Z}_i^{(irr)} \hat{Z}_j^{(irr)+} \hat{Z}_i^{(irr)} Q^{-1} \quad (15)$$

Equations (11), (12) and (15) give an exact representation for the single electron GF (7). However, to solve the self-consistent system of equations one has to introduce an approximation for the many-particle GF in the self-energy matrix (15) which describes inelastic scattering of electrons on spin and charge fluctuations.

B. Self-consistent Equations

Here we derive a self-consistent system of equations in MFA. To calculate the frequency matrix (10) we use the equation of motion for the HO:

$$\frac{d}{dt} X_i^0 = \sum_j \tau_{ij} B_{i \rightarrow j} X_j^0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j J_{ij} (B_{1 \rightarrow 0} X_i^0) \quad (16)$$

where we introduced the operator

$$B_{i \rightarrow 0} = (X_i^{00} + X_i^0) + X_i^0 = (1 - \frac{1}{2} n_i + S_i^z) + S_i^0 \quad (17)$$

The Bose-like operator (17) describes electron scattering on spin and charge fluctuations caused by the kinematic interaction (the first term in (16)) and by the exchange spin-spin interaction (the second term in (16)).

By performing commutations in (10) we get for the normal and the anomalous parts of the frequency matrix:

$$E_{ij}^{11} = \tau_{ij} + \tau_{ij} \text{tr} \hat{Z}_i X_i^0 X_j^0 + \frac{1}{2} J_{ij} (Q - 1 + \text{cs}_{ij}=Q) \tau_{ij} (Q + \text{cs}_{ij}=Q) \frac{1}{2} J_{ij} \text{tr} \hat{Z}_j X_j^0 X_i^0 \quad (18)$$

$$E_{ij}^{12} = \tau_{ij} = \tau_{ij} \text{tr} \hat{Z}_i X_i^0 X_j^0 - X_i^0 X_j^0 + \frac{1}{2} J_{ij} \text{tr} \hat{Z}_i X_i^0 X_j^0 - X_i^0 X_j^0 \quad (19)$$

Here in calculation of the correlation function for the normal component of the frequency matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_i \text{tr} \hat{Z}_i X_i^0 B_j^0 X_i^0 = \\ & h(1 - \frac{1}{2} n_i + S_i^z) (1 - \frac{1}{2} n_j + S_j^z) + S_i S_j \\ & = h(1 - \frac{1}{2} n_i) (1 - \frac{1}{2} n_j) + h S_i S_j = Q^2 + \text{cs}_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

we introduce the charge- and spin- fluctuation correlation functions

$$\text{cs}_{ij} = \frac{1}{4} h n_i n_j + h S_i S_j$$

with $n_i = n_i - h n_i$. Further we neglect the charge fluctuations, $h n_i n_j \neq 0$, but take into account spin correlations given by spin correlation functions for the nearest ($1s$) and the next-nearest ($2s$) neighbor lattice sites:

$$1s = h S_i S_{i+a_1}; \quad 2s = h S_i S_{i+a_2} \quad (20)$$

where $a_1 = (a_x; a_y)$ and $a_2 = (a_x; a_y)$. In a paramagnetic state assumed here they depend only on the distance between the lattice sites.

In the k -representation for the GF

$$G(k;!) = \sum_j G_{oj}(!) e^{ikj}$$

we get for the zero-order GF (11):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}^{(0)}(k;!) &= Q \text{tr} \hat{Z}_0 (\hat{\sigma}_k \sim) \hat{Z}_k \hat{Z}_1^{-1} \\ &= Q \frac{\hat{Z}_0 + (\hat{\sigma}_k \sim) \hat{Z}_1 + \hat{Z}_k \hat{Z}_1^{-1}}{!^2 (\hat{\sigma}_k \sim) \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_k \hat{Z}_j^{-1}} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\hat{Z}_0; \hat{Z}_1; \hat{Z}_3$ are the Pauli matrices. The quasiparticle energy ϵ_k and the renormalized chemical potential $\tilde{\mu} = \mu$ in the MFA are defined by the frequency matrix (18)

$$\epsilon_k = \tau(k) \frac{2J}{N} \sum_q (k-q) N_q \quad (22)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_q \tau(q) N_q - 2J (n=2, 1s=Q) \quad (23)$$

where $J(q) = 4J(q)$; $\tau(k) = 4t(k) + 4t^0(k)$ with $t(k) = (1-2)(\cos a_x q_x + \cos a_y q_y)$, $t^0(k) = \cos a_x q_x \cos a_y q_y$, while the renormalized hopping integral is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(k) &= 4t(k) Q (1 + 1s=Q^2) \\ &+ 4t^0(k) Q (1 + 2s=Q^2) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The average number of electrons in Eqs. (22), (23) in the k -representation is written in the form:

$$n_k = \text{tr} \hat{Z}_k X_k^0 X_k^0 = Q N_k$$

It should be pointed out that the renormalization of the hopping parameter (24) caused by the spin correlation

functions (20) are essential at low doping when short-range antiferromagnetic correlations are strong. For instance, for hole doping $n = 1 - n' = 0.5$ and $Q = (1 + \nu) = 2.53$ the correlation functions are estimated as³⁶: $\chi_{1s} = 0.3$; $\chi_{2s} = 0.2$; which results in complete suppression of the nearest neighbors hopping, while the next-neighbor hopping is quite large:

$$t_{\text{eff}} = tQ [1 + \chi_{1s} = Q^2]^{-1};$$

$$t_{\text{eff}}^0 = t^0 Q [1 + \chi_{2s} = Q^2]^{-1} = 0.9t^0;$$

For large doping the antiferromagnetic correlations are suppressed and the nearest neighbor hopping prevails: $t_{\text{eff}} = t_{\text{eff}}^0$, $t = t^0 = 1$.

The superconducting gap $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ in Eq. (21) is defined by the anomalous component of the frequency matrix (19):

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} [t(\mathbf{q}) - \frac{1}{2} J(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})] \chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0 X_{\mathbf{q}}^0; \quad (25)$$

There are two contributions in Eq. (25) given by the \mathbf{k} -independent kinematic interaction $t(\mathbf{q})$ and the exchange interaction $J(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})$. The kinematic interaction gives no contribution to the d -wave pairing in MFA, Eq. (25) (see³⁴), and we disregard it in the following equations⁴⁸. The anomalous correlation function in Eq. (25) can be easily calculated from the anomalous part of the GF (21):

$$\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0 X_{\mathbf{q}}^0 = Q \frac{q}{2E_{\mathbf{q}}} \tanh \frac{E_{\mathbf{q}}}{2T}; \quad (26)$$

which results in the BCS-type equation for the gap function:

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} J(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) \frac{q}{2E_{\mathbf{q}}} \tanh \frac{E_{\mathbf{q}}}{2T}; \quad (27)$$

where $E_{\mathbf{k}} = [(\hbar^2 \mathbf{k}^2 / 2m) + j_{\mathbf{k}}^2]^{1/2}$ is the quasiparticle energy in the superconducting state. As was proved in³⁹, the retardation effects for the exchange interaction are negligible and therefore there is no restriction in integration over the energy in Eq. (27). It means that all electrons in the conduction band participate in the superconducting pairing contrary to the BCS equation for the electron-phonon model where the energy integration and pairing are restricted to a narrow energy shell of the order of the phonon energy close to the Fermi energy.

The equation (27) is identical to the results in MFA of the diagram technique³⁷, while the gap equation obtained in⁴⁰ has an additional factor $Q = (1 - n) = 2$ which is spurious. This factor appears if we apply a simple decoupling procedure in the equation of motion (16) for GF instead of the projection technique given by Eq. (10). Writing the bosonic operators in the exchange interaction as a product of two fermionic operators: $X_{\mathbf{i}} = X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 X_{\mathbf{i}}^0$ and performing decoupling of the fermionic operators:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \chi_{\mathbf{i}}^0 X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 \rangle &= \langle X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 \rangle = \langle j X_{\mathbf{j}}^0 \rangle, \\ \langle \chi_{\mathbf{i}}^0 X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 \rangle &= \langle X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 X_{\mathbf{i}}^0 \rangle = \langle i \chi_{\mathbf{i}}^0 \rangle = \langle j X_{\mathbf{j}}^0 \rangle; \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

we obtain the same equation (27) for the gap function but with the additional Q -factor at the right hand side. In the decoupling we miss the normalization factor for the correlation functions in the denominator of the frequency matrix, Eq. (10), which cancels out with Q in the numerator of the corresponding GF (21). So, a rigorous way to apply MFA with a proper account of projected character of HO is to use the projection technique as discussed above.

The self-energy contribution (15) in the second order of the kinematic interaction is considered in³⁶ while it is omitted in³⁷. As discussed in^{36;39}, it mediates the spin-uctuation pairing and results in finite lifetime effects for the quasiparticle spectrum giving rise to an incoherent contribution to the single-particle density of states. Here we shall not discuss further these self-energy effects since for comparison the GF approach with the slave-fermion technique it will be sufficient to consider only MFA for the gap equation (27).

III. SLAVE-FERMION APPROACH

A. Slave-fermion representation

A number of auxiliary field representations has been proposed so far (see, e.g.,^{8,32}). In the slave-boson method⁸⁻¹⁰ the projected electron operator is expressed as a product of the auxiliary Bose field for the charge degree of freedom (holon) and the Fermi field for the spin degree of freedom (spinon). The main problem in this approach is the so called constraint imposed by projected character of electronic operators in the t - J model which prohibits double occupancy of any lattice site. To treat the constraint a site-dependent Lagrange multiplier is introduced. However, to solve the problem the MFA is usually applied and the Lagrange multiplier is taken to be independent on the lattice site so the local constraint is replaced by a global one with uncontrollable consequences. In the slave-fermion method the charge degree of freedom is represented by spinless fermion operators, while to describe the spin degree of freedom the Bose field (Schwinger bosons¹³⁻²² or spin operators²³⁻²⁷) are used. The Schwinger boson representation though being physically meaningful for the Heisenberg model^{11;12} gives poor results for the doped case: the antiferromagnetic ground state persists up to very high doping and it does not reproduce the large Fermi surface as in the slave-boson method. In the slave-fermion and spin operator representation the magnetic properties of the model are described in a more reliable way (see, e.g.,^{25;29;31}).

Below we consider the slave-fermion hard-core (CP¹) boson representation proposed in²⁷ and later on employed in²⁸⁻³¹ to investigate different physical proper-

ties of cuprates within the t-J model. It has some advantage since the constraint of no double occupancy can be fulfilled without introducing the Lagrange multiplier. To decouple the charge and spin degrees of freedom for physical electrons the HO in the theory²⁷ is represented as a product of a spinless fermion h_i^+ for the charge degree of freedom (holon) and a hard-core boson b_i for the spin degree of freedom (spinon):

$$X_i^0 = h_i^+ b_i; \quad X_i^+ = h_i b_i^+; \quad (29)$$

which have the following commutation relations:

$$h_i^+ h_j + h_j h_i^+ = \delta_{ij}; \quad b_i b_j^+ - b_j^+ b_i = \delta_{ij} (1 - 2b_i^+ b_i);$$

The hard-core bosons are Pauli operators which commute on different lattice sites and anticommute on the same lattice site prohibiting double occupancy. The Pauli operators can be also represented by the spin-lowering S_i^- and spin-raising S_i^+ operators for spin-1=2:

$$b_i^+ = S_i^+; \quad b_i = S_i^-; \quad \text{or} \quad b_i^+ = S_i^-; \quad b_i = S_i^+;$$

The on-site electron local constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i X_i^0 X_i^0 &= \sum_i X_i = h_i h_i^+ b_i^+ b_i \\ &= h_i h_i^+ = 1 - h_i^+ h_i = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

is satisfied here since for the Pauli operators at any lattice site we have the equation

$$\sum_i b_i^+ b_i = S_i^+ S_i^- + S_i^- S_i^+ = 1; \quad (31)$$

and the spinless holon number $n_i^{(h)} = h_i^+ h_i$ can be equal to 1 or 0.

However, the spin-charge separation imposed by the representation (29) results in extra degrees of freedom: a spin 1=2 is assigned to any lattice site including an empty site, while in the HO representation, Eq. (2), we have only 3 states: an empty state and a filled state with spin 1=2. To cure this defect one should introduce a projection operator to exclude the unphysical states²⁷ (The same applies to other slave-fermion spin operator representations as in²³⁻²⁶). Otherwise the commutation relations for the original HO, Eq. (4), and their representation, Eq. (29), will give different results. For instance, for the physical electrons which are described by HO we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i X_i^0; X_i^0 g &= X_i^{00} + X_i = 1 - X_i; \\ \text{and} \quad \sum_i X_i^0; X_i^0 g i &= 2 - n_i = 1 +; \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the hole doping concentration $x = 1 - n$. If we use the representation (29) then we can write the commutation relations as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i X_i^0; X_i^0 g &= \sum_i h_i^+ b_i; h_i b_i^+ g \\ &= \sum_i h_i^+ h_i + (1 - 2h_i^+ h_i) b_i^+ b_i \\ \text{and} \quad \sum_i X_i^0; X_i^0 g i &= \sum_i h_i^+ h_i; \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

while direct calculation of the sum over gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i X_i^0; X_i^0 g &= \sum_i h_i^+ h_i - \sum_i b_i^+ b_i \\ + \sum_i h_i h_i^+ b_i^+ b_i &= \sum_i h_i^+; h_i g = 1; \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where we have used Eq. (31). For the average values in Eqs. (33),(34) we get, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i X_i^0; X_i^0 g i &= \sum_i h_i^+ h_i = 1 - x; \\ \sum_i X_i^0; X_i^0 g &= \sum_i h_i^+; h_i g = 1; \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

which contradicts to the rigorous result for HO, Eq. (32). So the double counting of empty sites results in controversial equation for an average number of electrons which is therefore valid only with accuracy of $\sim x$.

B. Mean-field approximation

Let us consider the resonating valence bond (RVB) state in the original Hamiltonian (5) as proposed by Baskaran et al.⁶. For this we should write the Bose-like spin operators in the exchange energy in H_{tJ} (5) as a product of two single-particle Fermi-like operators: $X_i = X_i^0 X_i^0$ and introduce the singlet operators

$$B_{ij}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{2} (X_i^{0+} X_j^0 - X_i^0 X_j^{0+}); \quad (36)$$

Then using MFA for the singlet operators in the exchange interaction of the t-J model we get the RVB effective Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} H_J &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} (X_i^+ X_j^+ - X_i^{++} X_j^-) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} b_{ij}^+ b_{ij} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} (B_{ij}^+ b_{ij} + b_{ij}^+ B_{ij}) - \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij}^2; \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where we introduced the RVB order parameter:

$$B_{ij}^{(s)} = \langle b_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle h X_i^{0+} X_j^0 - X_i^0 X_j^{0+} \rangle; \quad (38)$$

Here we should point out that in MFA (37) a decoupling of the Hubbard operators on the same lattice site is used:

$$\begin{aligned} X_i^+ X_j^+ &= X_i^+ X_i^0 X_i^0 X_j^0 X_j^0 \\ &+ \langle h X_i^+ X_j^0 \rangle X_j^0 X_i^0 X_i^0; \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

which is not unique and results in uncontrollable approximation since the Hubbard operators obey the multiplication rule: $X_i X_i = X_i$, and any intermediate state can be used in the decoupling.

To obtain a self-consistent equation for the order parameter we assume a spin-charge separation as it is usually done in the slave-particle methods by applying a decoupling of spinon and holon degrees of freedom introduced in Eq. (29):

$$B_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \langle h_i^+ b_i h_j^+ b_j \rangle - \langle h_i^+ b_i \rangle \langle h_j^+ b_j \rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \langle h_i^+ h_j^+ \rangle \langle b_i b_j \rangle - \langle h_i^+ h_j^+ \rangle \langle b_i b_j \rangle + F_{ij}^+ \langle b_i b_j \rangle; \quad (40)$$

$$b_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \langle h_i^+ b_i h_j^+ b_j \rangle - \langle h_i^+ b_i \rangle \langle h_j^+ b_j \rangle = F_{ij}^+ \langle b_i b_j \rangle; \quad (41)$$

Within these approximations we obtain the effective Hamiltonian for holons

$$H_h = \sum_{ij} t_{ij} h_i^+ h_j + \sum_{ij} J_{ij} (h_i^+ h_i h_j^+ h_j + h_j^+ h_j h_i^+ h_i); \quad (42)$$

where the effective hopping parameter and the exchange energy are given by

$$t_{ij} = t_{ij} \langle h_i^+ b_i \rangle \langle b_j \rangle + \langle b_i^+ b_j \rangle = t_{ij} \langle h_i^+ S_j + S_i S_j^+ \rangle$$

$$J_{ij} = J_{ij} \langle h_i^+ h_j \rangle = J_{ij} \frac{1}{2} \langle h_i^+ b_i b_j \rangle - \langle b_i^+ b_j \rangle; \quad (43)$$

To obtain a phase diagram for the RVB order parameter $B_{ij} = F_{ij}^+ \langle b_i b_j \rangle$ as a function of temperature T and hole doping x one should solve a self-consistent system of equations for the both order parameters, holon F_{ij}^+ and spinon $\langle h_i^+ h_j \rangle$ ones. Here we consider only equations for the holon order parameter by suggesting that there exists a region of $(T; x)$ where the spinon order parameter is nonzero.

Introducing k -vector representation for the correlation functions:

$$F_{ij} = \langle h_i h_j \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k e^{i(k \cdot (i-j))} F(k)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \sin(k \cdot (i-j)) \langle h_k h_{k+i} \rangle; \quad (44)$$

$$\langle h_i^+ h_j \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle h_i^+ b_i b_j \rangle - \langle b_i^+ b_j \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k e^{i(k \cdot (i-j))} \langle h_k^+ h_{k+i} \rangle$$

$$= \frac{2i}{N} \sum_k \sin(k \cdot (i-j)) \langle h_k^+ b_{k+i} \rangle; \quad (45)$$

the Hamiltonian (42) can be written in k -space as

$$H_h = \sum_k (\epsilon(k) - \mu) h_k^+ h_k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k f(k) h_k^+ h_k^+ + \sum_k g(k) h_k h_k; \quad (46)$$

where the chemical potential for holons $\mu_h = \mu$ and the holon spectrum $\epsilon(k)$ according to Eq. (43) is written in the form (cf. Eq. (24)):

$$\epsilon(k) = \epsilon(k) = 4t \cos(k_x) 2h_{i+a_1}^+ S_{i+a_1} + 4t^0 \cos(k_y) 2h_{i+a_2}^+ S_{i+a_2}; \quad (47)$$

Here we assumed that the spin correlation functions have s -wave symmetry, e.i., $\langle S_{i+a_x} S_{i+a_y} \rangle = \langle S_{i+a_y} S_{i+a_x} \rangle$. We also introduced the holon gap function defined by the equation

$$\langle h_k^+ h_{k+i} \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_q J(k-q) \langle h_q^+ h_{q+i} \rangle; \quad (48)$$

In Eqs. (47), (48) we used notation $\epsilon(k)$; $\epsilon(k)$ for the holon spectrum and the holon gap to distinguish them from that ones of physical electrons in Sec. 2.2.

The normal and anomalous correlation functions can be easily calculated for the BCS-type Hamiltonian (46):

$$\langle h_q^+ h_{q+i} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon(q)}{E(q)} \right) \tanh \frac{E(q)}{2T}; \quad (49)$$

$$F(q) = \langle h_q h_{q+i} \rangle = \frac{\epsilon(q)}{2E(q)} \tanh \frac{E(q)}{2T}; \quad (50)$$

where the quasiparticle spectrum $E(k) = \sqrt{(\epsilon(k) - \mu_h)^2 + J(k)^2}$. From these equations follow the self-consistent equations for the gap function and the average number of holes which defines the holon chemical potential μ_h :

$$\langle h_k^+ h_{k+i} \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_q J(k-q) \frac{\epsilon(q)}{2E(q)} \tanh \frac{E(q)}{2T}; \quad (51)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_q \langle h_q^+ h_{q+i} \rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_q \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon(q)}{E(q)} \right) \tanh \frac{E(q)}{2T} \right); \quad (52)$$

These equations are identical to the results obtained in³² where the path-integral representation for the t - J model was applied and an effective BCS-type Hamiltonian analogous to Eq. (46) was derived. Starting from the MFA for RVB order parameter as in Eq. (37), the authors introduced MFA for the spinon auxiliary field that resulted in the spin-charge separation as in our Eq. (41). Therefore, we have proved that the results of the path-integral representation for the t - J employed in Ref.³² are equivalent to the MFA for the slave fermion - hard-core boson approach considered in this section.

C. Holon Green functions

To avoid uncontrollable approximation caused by the decoupling of the Hubbard operators on the same lattice

site in Eq. (39) used in MFA for RVB state in the Hamiltonian (37), in the present section we consider projection technique for the holon GF for the spinon-holon model. By using the spinless fermion hard-core boson representation (29) we write the Hamiltonian of the t-J model (5) as follows:

$$H_{t-J} = \sum_{i \neq j} t_{ij} h_i h_j^+ (S_i^+ S_j + S_i S_j^+) + \sum_i h_i h_i^+ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} h_i h_j h_j^+ h_i^+ (S_i^+ S_j + S_i S_j^+) (S_j^+ S_i + S_j S_i^+); \quad (53)$$

To obtain equation for the holon GF we apply the projection technique described in Sec. 2.1. By introducing the matrix GF for holon operators:

$$\hat{G}_{ij}^h(t, t') = \begin{pmatrix} \langle h_i(t) h_j^+(t') \rangle & \langle h_i(t) h_j(t') \rangle \\ \langle h_i^+(t) h_j^+(t') \rangle & \langle h_i^+(t) h_j(t') \rangle \end{pmatrix};$$

we can obtain equation of motion for the GF as discussed in Sec. 2.1 (see Eqs. (8)-(11)). For the zero-order GF in MFA we get the following result:

$$\hat{G}^{(h;0)}(k;!) = \frac{! \hat{0} + (u(k) \quad h) \hat{3} + \tilde{\sim}(k) \hat{1}}{!^2 \quad (u(k) \quad h)^2 \quad j \tilde{\sim}(k) \quad j^2}; \quad (54)$$

where the the holon dispersion and the gap function are given by the equations:

$$u(k) = \epsilon(k) \frac{1}{N} \sum_q f J^0(k-q) J^0(0) g h_q^+ h_q i; \quad (55)$$

$$\tilde{\sim}(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_q J^0(k-q) h_q h_{-q} i; \quad (56)$$

In comparison with MFA for RVB state considered previously, in the GF approach we obtain additional renormalization for the holon dispersion, Eq. (47), while the gap equation has the same form, Eq. (48), but with a different renormalized exchange interaction:

$$J_{ij}^0 = J_{ij} \frac{1}{2} h S_i^+ S_j + S_i S_j^+ f i \\ = J_{ij} \left(\frac{1}{4} h S_i^z S_j^z i \right); \quad (57)$$

By using equation of motion method instead of MFA for RVB state we managed to take into account spinon correlations in the effective holon interaction (57) and obtained a simple formula for it by using the identities: $S_i^+ S_i^+ = 0$; $S_i S_i^+ = (1=2) S_i^z$ in the last equation. From Eq. (57) we get the following estimation for the effective exchange energy for the nearest neighbors: $J^0 \approx (0.5 \text{--} 0.25) J$ if we assume the AFM Neel phase: $\langle h S_i^z S_j^z i \rangle = 1=4$ or completely neglect AFM correlations: $\langle h S_i^z S_j^z i \rangle = 0$, respectively.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Spectral density

Spectral density for physical electron excitations in the lower Hubbard subband within the t-J model which is defined by the equation

$$A(k;!) = \frac{1}{!} \text{Im} \langle h X_k^0 j X_k^0 i i_{!+i} \rangle; \quad (58)$$

satisfies the sum rule:

$$\sum_! d! A(k;!) = \sum_! \langle h f X_i^0 ; X_i^0 g i \rangle \\ = 2Q = 1 + \dots; \quad (59)$$

In the MFA for the GF in terms of the HO, Eq. (21), we get:

$$A(k;!) = Q u_k (! - E_k) + Q v_k (! + E_k); \quad (60)$$

where

$$u_k = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{(u_k \quad \tilde{\sim})}{E_k} \right); \quad v_k = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{(u_k \quad \tilde{\sim})}{E_k} \right); \quad (61)$$

In MFA the spectral density (60) satisfies the sum rule (59) but have no incoherent background which appears if one takes into account the self-energy corrections as shown in Ref.³⁶.

In the spinon-holon representation (29) the spectral density, as follows from Eq. (35), does not obey the sum rule (59):

$$\sum_! d! A^{(sh)}(k;!) = \sum_! d! f \frac{1}{!} \text{Im} \langle h h_i^+ b_i j_i b_i^+ i i_{!+i} g \rangle \\ = \sum_! \langle h f h_i^+ b_i ; h_i b_i^+ g i \rangle = 1 \quad (\text{or } 1); \quad (62)$$

MFA for the spinon-holon GF in Eq. (62) results in the spin-charge separation which defines the spectral density (62) as a convolution of the anticommutator holon and the commutator spinon GF²⁸:

$$A^{(sh)}(k;!) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_q \frac{1}{2} \frac{Z_{+1} Z_{+1}}{Z_{-1} Z_{-1}} \frac{d!_1 d!_2}{!_1 !_2} \\ [\tanh(!_1=2T) + \coth(!_2=2T)] \\ \text{Im} \langle h h_q^+ j_{q!_1} \text{Im} \langle h S_{k-q} j_{S_{k-q}!_2} \rangle; \quad (63)$$

In this representation the spectral density of physical electron excitations is given by a superposition of the

spectral density for spinless fermion (holon) excitations and a background produced by spin excitations²⁸. In MFA the holon spectral density in the paired state below T_c is defined by the GF (54):

$$A^{(h)}(\mathbf{k};!) = \frac{1}{-i} \text{Im} \langle \langle \hat{h}_{\mathbf{k}}^+ \hat{h}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \rangle_{i, i+!} \\ = \mathfrak{u}_{\mathbf{k}} (! + E^*(\mathbf{k})) + \mathfrak{v}_{\mathbf{k}} (! - E^*(\mathbf{k})); \quad (64)$$

where $E^*(\mathbf{k}) = [(\mathfrak{u}(\mathbf{k}) - \mathfrak{h})^2 + \sum_j \tilde{v}_j(\mathbf{k}) j^2]^{1/2}$ is the quasiparticle energy and $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathbf{k}}; \mathfrak{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ are given by Eq. (61) but with quasiparticle energies for holons. The spectral density of electron excitations is measured in the angle-resolved photoemission (ARPES) experiments which provide information concerning the symmetry of the gap function. As discussed below, the symmetry of superconducting gap function $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ defined by Eq. (27) appears to be d-wave, while the holon gap function $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ in Eq. (51) has odd symmetry of the p-type as in the triplet pairing. This p-wave gap symmetry has never been observed in ARPES experiments in cuprates.

B. Gap symmetry

Formodels with strong electron correlations the s-wave component of superconducting gap must be strongly suppressed due to on-site Coulomb correlations. For the t-J model it follows from the constraint of no double occupancy on a single site given by the identity:

$$\hat{h}_{i+!} \hat{c}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{h}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}}; \quad \hat{c}_i = 0; \quad (65)$$

for the physical electron operators $\hat{c}_i = c_i (1 - n_{i+!})$. Since the anomalous correlation function $\hat{h}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}}; \hat{c}_i$ is proportional to the gap function $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$, Eq. (65) imposes a certain constraint on the symmetry of the gap function. In particular, for the solution (26) in MFA Eq. (65) reads^{34;35}:

$$\langle \langle \hat{h}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \rangle_{i, i+!} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \langle \langle \hat{h}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \rangle_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}+!} \\ = \frac{Q}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{\mathfrak{q}}{2E_{\mathbf{q}}} \tanh \frac{E_{\mathbf{q}}}{2T} = 0; \quad (66)$$

For a tetragonal lattice the Fermi surface (FS) is invariant under the C_4 -axis rotation in the k-space and therefore to satisfy the condition (66) for $E_{\mathbf{q}} > 0$ the gap function $\Delta_{\mathbf{q}}$ should change its sign along the FS. It means that the symmetric s-wave solution, $\Delta_{\mathbf{q}}(k_x; k_y) / (\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$, does not satisfy Eq. (66), while the d-wave solution with B_{1g} or B_{2g} symmetry, $\Delta_{\mathbf{q}}(k_x; k_y) = \Delta_{\mathbf{q}}(k_y; k_x)$, satisfies the condition (66). In general, Eq. (66) should be considered as a constraint on the symmetry of the gap function in the superconducting phase and solutions which violate this constraint should be disregarded.

Now we consider the symmetry of the spinon and holon order parameters. The condition (65) for the RVB order parameter reads

$$B_{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} B(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) F^+(\mathbf{q}) = 0; \quad (67)$$

which also imposes a constraint on the symmetry of the spinon and holon order parameters. Since the symmetry of the holon pairing order parameter, Eq. (44), for spinless fermions is odd, imposed by their anticommutation relations, it results in the odd symmetry of the gap $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ in Eq. (48). For a tetragonal lattice the symmetry is given by the odd two-dimensional irreducible representation E_u which can be modelled by the function: $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} / \Delta_p(\mathbf{k}) = (\sin k_x - \sin k_y)$ as in the p-wave triplet pairing. The same holds for the spinon order parameter in Eq. (45), $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} / \Delta_p(\mathbf{k})$.

The RVB order parameter $B_{ij} = \langle \hat{b}_{ij} \rangle = \langle \hat{c}_{ij} F_{ij}^+ \rangle$ as a product of two antisymmetric order parameters with E_u symmetry has either A_1 (s-wave) or B_{1g} (d-wave) symmetry. Namely, if we adopt only the nearest neighbor pairing for both the order parameters:

$$\hat{c}_{ij} = \langle \hat{c}_{i+j_x} \hat{c}_{j-i_x} \rangle - \langle \hat{c}_{i+j_y} \hat{c}_{j-i_y} \rangle g; \\ F_{ij}^+ = \langle \hat{c}_{i+j_x}^+ \hat{c}_{j-i_x}^+ \rangle - \langle \hat{c}_{i+j_y}^+ \hat{c}_{j-i_y}^+ \rangle g;$$

then for the Fourier transform of the RVB order parameter we get

$$B(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) F^+(\mathbf{q}) = 2b \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \text{fsin}(k_x - q_x) \\ \sin(k_y - q_y) g \text{fsin} q_x \sin q_y \\ = b (\cos k_x - \cos k_y) \quad (68)$$

where $b = \langle \hat{c}_{i+j_x} \hat{c}_{i+j_x}^+ \rangle$ and the sign + () in the last line corresponds to the same (different) signs in the first line. The solution (68) satisfies the condition (67) for both the s- and d-wave symmetry: $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} B(\mathbf{k}) / \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} (\cos k_x - \cos k_y) = 0$.

However, the explicit solution for the holon order parameter (50) shows its more complicated k-dependence which proves that the frequently used model for the nearest neighbor pairing is inadequate. For the solution (50) the condition (67) for the RVB order parameter reads:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) F^+(\mathbf{q}) = \\ \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) \frac{\Delta(\mathbf{q})}{2E(\mathbf{q})} \tanh \frac{E(\mathbf{q})}{2T} = 0; \quad (69)$$

which also imposes a requirement on the symmetry of the singlet (RVB) order parameter which should have only the d-wave symmetry, $B(k_x; k_y) = B(k_y; k_x)$, to satisfy this condition.

It is interesting to compare results for the gap equation derived in MFA for the t-J model and that one for

the Hubbard model. By applying the projection technique for the GF for the Hubbard model one can get the following equation for the gap function (see, e.g.,³⁹):

$$i_j / \hbar X_i^{02} N_j i = \hbar c_{i\#} c_{i\#} N_j i; \quad (70)$$

where we have used the identity for the Hubbard operators, $X_i^{02} = X_i^{0\#} X_i^{\#2} = c_{i\#} c_{i\#}$. From Eq. (70) follows that the pairing occurs on one lattice site but in the different Hubbard subbands. By using equation of motion for the GF $\hbar X_i^{02}(t) j N_j(t^0)$ the anomalous correlation function $\hbar X_i^{02} N_j i$ can be calculated without any decoupling that results in the same gap equation as in the MFA for the t-J model³⁹: $i_j = J_{ij} \hbar X_i^0 X_j^0$ where we have used the notation of the present paper. Therefore the symmetry constraint considered above is also applicable for the gap solutions obtained in the Hubbard model.

C. Superconducting T_c

In the present section we compare the pairing temperature T_c defined by the gap equation for physical electrons (27) and that one for holons, Eq. (51). We study T_c as a function of corresponding chemical potential $\mu = \mu - W$ for a given value of the pairing interaction $\mu = J = W$ where all energies are measured in units of the renormalized halfbandwidth for pairing fermions $W = 4t$:

$$e(k) = \frac{\mu(k)}{W} = \mu(k) + \mu^0(k); \quad d(k) = \frac{\mu(k)}{W}; \quad (71)$$

where $\mu^0 = \mu_{eff}^0 = t_{eff}^0$. The gap Eqs. (27), (51) (or (56)) can be written in the form

$$d(k) = \frac{4}{N} \sum_q \frac{\mu(k-q) d(q)}{2[(e(q) + \mu^0(q)) + d(q)]^{1/2}} \tanh \frac{[(e(q) + \mu^0(q)) + d(q)]^{1/2}}{2T}; \quad (72)$$

Let us consider $T_c(\mu)$ for different pairing symmetry, $d(k) = d(\mu, k)$:

$$\begin{aligned} s \text{ wave: } & \mu_s(k) = (\cos k_x + \cos k_y); \\ d \text{ wave: } & \mu_d(k) = (\cos k_x - \cos k_y); \\ p \text{ wave: } & \mu_p(k) = (\sin k_x - \sin k_y); \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

By integrating Eq. (72) with the corresponding symmetry parameter $\mu(k)$ we obtain Eq. (72) for $T = T_c$ in the same form for any symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \mu(k)^2 \frac{1}{2(e(k) + \mu^0(k))} \tanh \frac{e(k)}{2T_c(\mu)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \mu(k) \frac{d(\mu, k)}{2T_c(\mu)} \tanh \frac{e(k)}{2T_c(\mu)}; \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

if we introduce an effective density of state (DOS) for the corresponding symmetry, $\mu = s; d; p$:




FIG. 1. Effective density of states, Eq. (75), for s (solid line), d (dot-dashed line) and p (dashed line) symmetry.

$$N(\mu, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \mu(k)^2 \delta(\epsilon - e(k)); \quad (75)$$

which is normalized

$$\sum_k N(\mu, \epsilon) = 1; \quad \text{since } \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \mu(k)^2 = 1;$$

The results of calculation of the effective DOS, Eq. (75), for different symmetry $\mu = s; d; p$ is presented on Fig. 1 for $\mu^0 = 0$. From this dependence it is easy to draw a conclusion that the $T_c(\mu)$ function will follow the dependence $N(\mu, \epsilon)$ for corresponding symmetry since the effective coupling constant $V' = N(\mu, \epsilon)$ reaches its maximum value at the maximum value of $N(\mu, \epsilon)$. In the logarithmic approximation a solution for $T_c(\mu)$, Eq. (74), can be written in the conventional BCS form:

$$T_c(\mu) = \frac{V'}{2} \frac{1}{(W + V')} \exp(-1/V'); \quad V' = JN; \quad (76)$$

but with the prefactor proportional to the Fermi energy, $\mu = E_F$ which can result in high- T_c . The highest $T_c(\mu)$ appears for the d-wave pairing and the lowest $T_c(\mu)$ for the p-wave pairing since in the former case the van Hove singularity gives a strong contribution for DOS ($[d(k = (\mu; 0))]^2 = 4$), while in the latter case it is completely suppressed ($[p(k = (\mu; 0))] = 0$). This estimation can be checked by a direct numerical solution of Eq. (74) (see, e.g.^{35;36} and ⁴⁹ for the p-wave symmetry).

V. CONCLUSION

In the present paper we consider superconducting pairing mediated by the exchange interaction which is generic

for system with strong electron correlations as cuprates. The mechanism of the exchange pairing is the lowering of kinetic energy of electron pairs due to their coherent hopping between different Hubbard subbands. Since the excitation energy of this hopping is much larger than the Fermi energy the retardation effects in the exchange interaction are negligible³⁹ which results in pairing of all electrons (holes) in the conduction band and a high- T_c proportional to the Fermi energy, Eq. (76).

To obtain estimation for the superconducting T_c it is tempting to use a mean-field approximation for the exchange interaction within the t-J model. However, meaningful physical results can be obtained only if one takes into account strong electron correlations on a rigorous basis which is provided by the Hubbard operator technique. Any auxiliary field representations applied within MFA inevitably violates rigorous commutation relations for HO which may result in unphysical conclusions. In the present paper we have proved this by comparing the results for superconducting gap equation derived within the slave fermion-hard-core boson representation, Eq. (29), and HO technique for the Green functions (Sec. 2.1). In the former method the projected character of physical electron operators is neglected that results in double counting of empty states and violation of the sum rule, Eq. (62). The spin-charge separation which occurs in MFA, Eqs. (40), (41), results in separate equations for two order parameters for spinons and holons instead of one equation for physical electrons as in the GF method. The gap equation (51) for spinless fermions has only antisymmetric solutions which results in the p-wave gap for the quasiparticle excitations in superconducting state never observed in ARPES experiments in cuprates and much lower T_c than for the d-wave pairing given by Eq. (27) for physical electrons.

The obtained results within MFA for the spinless fermion-hard-core bosons in Sec. 2 appears to be identical to the path-integral representation for the t-J model employed in Ref.³². Therefore the latter results have the same flaws as discussed above which casts doubts on approaches based on the idea of spin-charge separation. Violation of the local constraint in the two-band Hubbard model may lead also to unphysical results, as shown in Ref.⁵⁰.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks V. Oudovenko for preparing Fig. 1 and V. Yu. Yushankhai for discussions. The author is grateful to Prof. P. Fulde for the hospitality extended to him during his stay at M. P. I. P. K. S., where the final version of the paper was prepared.

- ¹ Anderson P.W., *Science*, 1987, vol. 235, p. 1196-1198; The theory of superconductivity in the high- T_c cuprates. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1997.
- ² For a review see: Scalapino D.J., *Phys. Reports*, 1995, vol. 250, p. 329-365; arXiv:cond-mat/9908287.
- ³ E. Dagotto D., *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 1994, vol. 66, p. 763-840.
- ⁴ Sorella S., Martinis G.B., Becca F., Gazza C., Capriotti L., Parola A., and Dagotto E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2002, vol. 88, No. 117002, p. 1{4.
- ⁵ Huang Z.B., Lin H.Q., and Gubematis J.E., *Phys. Rev. B*, 2001, vol. 64, No. 205101, p. 1{9.
- ⁶ Baskaran B., Zou Z., and Anderson P.W., *Solid State Comm.*, 1987, vol. 63, p. 973{976.
- ⁷ Cyrot M., *Solid State Comm.*, 1987, vol. 62, p. 821-823; *Solid State Comm.*, 1987, vol. 63, p. 1015-1018.
- ⁸ Ruckenstein A.E., Hirschfeld P.J., and Appel J., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1987, vol. 36, p. 857{860.
- ⁹ Kotliar G., Liu J., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1998, vol. 38, p. 5142{5145.
- ¹⁰ Suzumura Y., Hasegawa Y., and Fukuyama H., *Jour. Phys. Soc. Jpn.*, 1988, vol. 57, p. 401{404.
- ¹¹ Arovas D.P. and Auerbach A., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1988, vol. 38, p. 316{332.
- ¹² Auerbach A., and Arovas D.P., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1988, vol. 61, p. 617{620.
- ¹³ Yoshioka D., *Jour. Phys. Soc. Jpn.*, 1989, vol. 58, p. 32{35.
- ¹⁴ Yoshioka D., *Jour. Phys. Soc. Jpn.*, 1989, vol. 58, p. 1516{1519.
- ¹⁵ Sarker S., Jayaprakash C., Krishnamurthy H.R., and M. M. A.M., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1989, vol. 40, p. 5028{5035.
- ¹⁶ Flensberg K., Hedegard P., and Pedersen M.B., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1989, vol. 40, p. 850{853.
- ¹⁷ Hedegard P. and Pedersen M.B., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1990, vol. 42, p. 10035{10040.
- ¹⁸ Hedegard P., and Pedersen M.B., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1991, vol. 43, p. 11504{11507.
- ¹⁹ Kane C.L., Lee P.A., Ng T.K., Chakraborty B., and Read N., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1990, vol. 41, p. 2653{2656.
- ²⁰ Chakraborty B., Read N., Kane C.L., and Lee P.A., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1990, vol. 42, p. 4819{4822.
- ²¹ Li Y.M., Sheng D.N., Su Z.B., and Yu Lu., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1992, vol. 45, p. 5428{5437.
- ²² Khalilullin G. and Horsch P., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1993, vol. 47, p. 463{469.
- ²³ Khalilullin G., *JETP Lett.*, 1990, vol. 52, p. 389-393.
- ²⁴ Richard J.L. and V. Yu. Yushankhai V. Yu., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1993, vol. 47, p. 1103{1106.
- ²⁵ Wang Y.R., Wu J., and Franz M., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1993, vol. 47, p. 12140{12152.
- ²⁶ Wang Y.R., and Rice M.J., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1994, vol. 49, p. 4360{4363.
- ²⁷ Shiping Feng, Su Z.B., and Yu Lu., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1994, vol. 49, p. 2368{2384.
- ²⁸ Shiping Feng and Song Y., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1997, vol. 55, p. 642{646.
- ²⁹ Shiping Feng and Huang Z., *Phys. Rev. B*, 1998, vol. 57, p. 10328{10331.
- ³⁰ Xianglin Ke, Feng Yuan, and Shiping Feng., *Phys. Rev. B*, 2000, vol. 62, p. 134{137.
- ³¹ Feng Yuan, Shiping Feng, Zhao-Bin Su, Yu Lu.,

- Phys. Rev. B, 2001, vol. 64, No. 224505, p. 1{5.
- ³² Kochetov E., Mierzejewski M., Phys. Rev. B, 2000, vol. 61, p. 1580{1583.
- ³³ Izyumov Yu A., Physics Uspekhi, 1997, vol. 40, p. 445.
- ³⁴ Plakida N M., Yushankhai V. Yu., Stasyuk I V., Physica C, 1989, vol. 160, p. 80{88.
- ³⁵ Yushankhai V. Yu., Plakida N M., Kalinay P., Physica C, 1991, vol. 1174, p. 401{408.
- ³⁶ Plakida N M. and Oudovenko V S., Phys. Rev. B, 1999, vol. 59, p. 11949{11961.
- ³⁷ Izyumov Yu A. and Letfulov B M., J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 1991, vol. 3, p. 5373-5391.
- ³⁸ Yu A. Izyumov and B M. Letfulov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B, 1992, vol. 6, p. 321.
- ³⁹ N. M. Plakida, L. Anton, S. Adam, G. H. Adam., Preprint of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, E-17-2001-59, Dubna, 2001 p.1-24; arXiv:cond-mat/0104234.
- ⁴⁰ Onufrieva F., Petit S., and Sidis Y., Phys. Rev. B, 1996, vol. 54, p. 12464{12487.
- ⁴¹ Plakida N M., Hayn R., and Richard J.-L., Phys. Rev. B, 1995, vol. 51, p. 16599{16607.
- ⁴² Zhang F C., Rice T M., Phys. Rev. B, 1988, vol. 37, p. 3759{3761.
- ⁴³ Sometimes a coefficient (1=2) instead of (1=4); is written in Eq. (5) for the exchange energy J (see, e.g.,^{34;35}).
- ⁴⁴ Emery V J., Phys. Rev. Lett., 1987, vol. 58, p. 2794{2797; Vamra C M., Schmitt-Rink S., and Abraham s E., Solid State Commun., 1987, vol. 62, p. 681.
- ⁴⁵ Feiner L F., Jefferson J H., and Rainondi R., Phys. Rev. B, 1996, vol. 53, p. 8751{8773; Rainondi R., Jefferson J H., and Feiner L F., Phys. Rev. B, 1996, vol. 53, p. 8774{8788.
- ⁴⁶ Yushankhai V. Yu., Oudovenko V S., and Hayn R., Phys. Rev. B, 1997, vol. 55, p. 15562{15575.
- ⁴⁷ D N. Zubarev D N., Sov. Phys. Uspek., 1960, vol. 3, p. 320.
- ⁴⁸ Superconducting pairing mediated by the kinematic interaction was first proposed by Zaitsev and Ivanov: Zaitsev R O. and Ivanov V A., Fiz. Tver. Tela., 1987, vol. 29, p. 2554, p. 3111 (in Russian); Int. J. Mod. Phys. B, 1988, vol. 5, p. 153; Physica C, 1988, vol. 153{155, p. 1295{1296.
- ⁴⁹ Kuz'min E V. and Baklanov I O., JETP, 1999, vol. 89, p. 349{357.
- ⁵⁰ Zhang L., Jain J K., Emery V J., Phys. Rev. B, 1993, vol. 47, p. 3368.