d-wave superconducting phase diagram of the two dimensional Hubbard model

A.-M. Tremblay

Giovanni Sordi, Patrick Sémon



Patrick Sémon



Giovanni Sordi

Y47.00001 8:00 AM–8:12 AM, Friday March 7, 2014 APS March meeting, Denver, Colorado



Strongly correlated vs weakly correlated: AFM as an example





Strongly correlated vs weakly correlated: AFM as an example



A finite-doping first order transition, linked to Mott transition up to optimal doping

Doping dependence of critical point as a function of U





Model and Method



Hubbard model



1931-1980

 $H = -\sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} t_{i,j} \left(c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{i\sigma} \right) + U \sum_{i} n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}$



h-doped cuprates are strongly correlated





C-DMFT

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}[\psi^{\dagger}, \psi] \,\mathrm{e}^{-S_{c} - \int_{0}^{\beta} d\tau \int_{0}^{\beta} d\tau' \sum_{\mathbf{K}} \psi_{\mathbf{K}}^{\dagger}(\tau) \Delta(\tau, \tau') \psi_{\mathbf{K}}(\tau')}_{\mathbf{K}}$$





EFFECTIVE LOCAL IMPURITY PROBLEM



SELF-CONSISTENCY CONDITION

Here: continuous time QMC

Mean-field is not a trivial

problem! Many impurity

solvers.

P. Werner, PRL 2006 P. Werner, PRB 2007 K. Haule, PRB 2007

$$\Delta(i\omega_n) = i\omega_n + \mu - \Sigma_c(i\omega_n) \\ - \left[\sum_{\tilde{k}} \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu - t_c(\tilde{k}) - \Sigma_c(i\omega_n)}\right]^{-1}$$

Standard 2 operator updates in CTQMC are not ergodic in SC state (fixed here)

Please ask in question period...



4 vs 2 operator updates: d-wave order parameter



Phys. Rev. B (2008)



Superconductivity at $U > U_{MIT}$



Dome moves to larger dopings with U



c-axis Superfluid density U = 9t, T=1/100





Compare with number of cariers



Peets et al. PRL 2009, Phillips and Jarrell, PRL 2010



Phase diagram for U = 6.2 t



P. Sémon, G. Sordi, A.-M.S. Tremblay, arxiv.org/1402.7087







Meaning of T_c^d

• Local pair formation



K. K. Gomes, A. N. Pasupathy, A. Pushp, S. Ono, Y. Ando, and A. Yazdani, Nature **447**, 569 (2007)



Meaning of T_c^d : Local pair formation



A. Pushp, Parker, ... A. Yazdani, Science **364**, 1689 (2009)

However, our measurements demonstrate that the nodal gap does not change with reduced doping. The pairing strength does not get weaker or stronger as the Mott insulator is approached; rather, it saturates.



Summary

- CTQMC hybridization expansion needs 4 operator updates on plaquette with d-wave SC
- Strongly correlated superconductivity
 - -T=0 max OP scales with 1st order transition
 - Superfluid density scales like doping beyond max. T_c^{d} and beyond max. OP.
 - T_c^d does not scale with T=0 d-wave orderparameter in underdoped regime.





André-Marie Tremblay





Le regroupement québécois sur les matériaux de pointe



CIAR The Canadian Institute for Advanced Research

Sponsors:



Fonds FCAR







Mammouth



compute • calcul

High Performance Computing

CREATING KNOWLEDGE DRIVING INNOVATION BUILDING THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

Le calcul de haute performance

CRÉER LE SAVOIR ALIMENTER L'INNOVATION BÂTIR L'ÉCONOMIE NUMÉRIQUE Calcul Québec







Ergodicity of the hybridization expansion with two operator updates and broken symmetry

$$\begin{split} H_{\rm imp} &= H_{\rm loc}(d_i^{\dagger}, d_i) + \sum_{i\mu} (V_{\mu i} a_{\mu}^{\dagger} d_i + V_{\mu i}^* d_i^{\dagger} a_{\mu}) \\ &+ \sum_{\mu} \epsilon_{\mu} a_{\mu}^{\dagger} a_{\mu}, \\ Z &= {\rm Tr} T_{\tau} e^{-\beta H_0} e^{-\int_0^{\beta} d\tau (H_{\rm hyb}(\tau) + H_{\rm hyb}^{\dagger}(\tau))} \\ &= \sum_{k\geq 0} \frac{1}{k!^2} \int_0^{\beta} d\tau_1 \cdots d\tau_k \int_0^{\beta} d\tau_1' \cdots d\tau_k' {\rm Tr} T_{\tau} e^{-\beta H_0} \\ &\times H_{\rm hyb}(\tau_1) H_{\rm hyb}^{\dagger}(\tau_1') \cdots H_{\rm hyb}(\tau_k) H_{\rm hyb}^{\dagger}(\tau_k'). \end{split}$$

$$\times F_{\uparrow(0,\pi),\downarrow(0,\pi)}\overline{F}_{\uparrow(\pi,0),\downarrow(\pi,0)}$$

P. Sémon, G. Sordi, A.-M.S. Tremblay, arxiv.org/1402.7087

