

High temperature superconductivity near Mott transition

Tian De Cao*

Department of physics, Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology, Nanjing 210044, China

Abstract

The superconductivity of the Hubbard model has been an open problem. We argue that high- T_c superconductivity be included in an extended Hubbard model. It is shown that the singlet superconductivity not only requires the total correlation should be strong enough but also the density of state around Fermi energy should be large enough, thus we conclude that the highest temperature superconductivity could be found only in the ranges near the Mott metal–insulator transition (MIT). The relations between our results and properties of superconductors are also discussed simply.

PACS: 74.20.-z ; 74.25.Jb; 74.72.-h; 74.62.Yb.

Keywords: D. superconductivity; D. Hubbard model; D. MIT

1. Introduction

The superconductivity of Cu-based superconductors [1-5] occur at the region where long-range antiferromagnetic order disappears, the one of Fe-based superconductors [6-10] may occur at the border of spin density wave (SDW) or other magnetic orders, in a word, the high temperature superconductivity usually appear in the border of the magnetic orders [11]. In addition, the superconductivity disappears when good metal behavior appears; examples include the heavily doped copper oxides and Au, Ag, Cu, etc. Then, what is the factor dominating the superconductivity? Our work suggested that superconductivity may be dominated by the

*Corresponding author.

*E-mail address: tdcao@nuist.edu.cn (T. D. Cao).

*Tel: 011+86-13851628895

spin-charge correlation [12], with which various excitations could mediate the superconducting pairing, and some ideas are suggested again in following experiments, such as Park and his coauthor's work [13] which argues that magnetic and charge fluctuations coexist and produce electronic scattering that is maximal at the optimal pressure for superconductivity. However, whether superconductivity is included in the Hubbard model [14-20] has been an open problem. We find that some negative results in superconductivity are because they have introduced operators similar to the summary over lattice sites in real space, these results should be unreliable. Pairing only occurs between some electrons which have some wave vectors. Thus we should find more details inducing superconductivity.

2. BCS based calculation

To consider the physics of actual materials, we should extend the Hubbard model to this form

$$H = \sum_{l,l',\sigma} (t_{ll'} - \mu\delta_{ll'}) d_{l\sigma}^+ d_{l'\sigma} + U \sum_l n_{l\sigma} n_{l\bar{\sigma}} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{l,l',\sigma,\sigma'} V_{ll'} n_{l\sigma} n_{l'\sigma'} - \sum_{l,l'} J_{ll'} \hat{S}_{lz} \hat{S}_{l'z}, \quad (1)$$

This model includes next nearest neighbor interactions, and it can be rewritten in

$$H = \sum_{k,\sigma} \xi_k d_{k\sigma}^+ d_{k\sigma} + \sum_q V(q) \hat{\rho}(q) \hat{\rho}(-q) - \sum_q J(q) \hat{S}_z(q) \hat{S}_z(-q) \quad (2)$$

where the charge-charge interaction matrix $V(q) = U + V_0(q)$, the spin-spin interaction $J(q) = U + J_0(q)$, the

charge operator $\hat{\rho}(q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,\sigma} d_{k+q\sigma}^+ d_{k\sigma}$, and the spin operator $\hat{S}(q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,\sigma} \sigma d_{k+q\sigma}^+ d_{k\sigma}$ in the wave vector space

with denoting $k \equiv \vec{k}$. It is found that the on-site interaction U contributes both charge-charge and spin-spin interaction. Because $\xi_{\vec{k}} \equiv \xi_{-\vec{k}} = \xi_k$, $V(\vec{q}) = V(q)$, $J(\vec{q}) = J(q)$, we will take $f(\vec{k}) = f(k)$ for any function depending on wave vectors.

Following Abrikosov et al, Green's functions are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} G(k\sigma, \tau - \tau') &= - \langle T_\tau d_{k\sigma}(\tau) d_{k\sigma}^+(\tau') \rangle \\ F^+(k\sigma, \tau - \tau') &= \langle T_\tau d_{k\sigma}^+(\tau) d_{\vec{k}\bar{\sigma}}^+(\tau') \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$F(k\sigma, \tau - \tau') = \langle T_\tau d_{\bar{k}\bar{\sigma}}(\tau) d_{k\sigma}(\tau') \rangle$$

where the spin singlet pairing is considered. If the effects of correlations are neglected, we find

$$F^+(k\sigma, i\omega_n) = - \frac{\Delta(k, \sigma)}{(i\omega_n - \tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma})(i\omega_n + \tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma}) - \Delta^2(k, \sigma)} \quad (4)$$

thus the BCS gap equation is

$$\Delta(k\sigma) = \sum_q [2U + J_0(k-q) + V_0(k-q)] \Delta(q\sigma) \cdot \frac{n_F(E_{q\sigma}) - n_F(-E_{q\sigma})}{2E_{q\sigma}} \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma} = \xi_k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_q [-J(q) + V(q)] G(k+q\sigma, \tau=0)$ and $E_{q\sigma} = \sqrt{\tilde{\xi}_{q\sigma}^2 + \Delta^2(q\sigma)}$. To arrive at Eq. (5), we

have taken $\bar{S}_z = 0$, and $F(k-q, \sigma, \tau=0) = F^+(k-q, \sigma, \tau=0)$ for non-ferromagnetic states. In this case,

$E_{q\sigma}$ and $\Delta(k\sigma)$ do not depend on the spin index.

On the basis of Eq. (5), superconductivity requires the matrix $2U + J_0(k-q) + V_0(k-q)$ is negative for most momentum transfer q , this will require a very large antiferromagnetic exchange parameter J , but this condition could not be met for actual Hamiltonians. That is to say, the superconductivity associated with spin-singlet pairing on the basis of the BCS gap equation does not appear in the actual tight binding model.

3. Correlation based effect

To consider the effect of correlations, we must establish the dynamic equations of many-particle correlation

functions such as $\partial_\tau \langle T_\tau \hat{S}(q) d_{k+q\sigma} d_{k\sigma}^+(\tau') \rangle$ and $\partial_\tau \langle T_\tau \hat{\rho}(q) d_{k+q\sigma} d_{k\sigma}^+(\tau') \rangle$. This arrive at these equations

$$\begin{aligned} & [-i\omega_n + \tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma} + \sum_q \frac{P(k, q, \sigma)}{i\omega_n - \xi_{k+q}}] G(k\sigma, i\omega_n) \\ & = -1 + \frac{V(0) \langle \hat{\rho}(0) \rangle}{-i\omega_n + \xi_k} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_q \frac{\xi_{k+q} - \xi_k}{-i\omega_n + \xi_{k+q}} [J(q) + V(q)] F(k+q\sigma, \tau=0) F^+(\bar{k}\bar{\sigma}, i\omega_n) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and

$$[-i\omega_n - \tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma} - \sum_q \frac{P(k, q, \sigma)}{i\omega_n + \xi_{k+q}}] F^+(k\sigma, i\omega_n)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_q \frac{\xi_{k+q} - \xi_k}{-i\omega_n - \xi_{k+q}} [J(q) + V(q)] F^+(k - q, \sigma, \tau = 0) G(\bar{k}\bar{\sigma}, i\omega_n) \quad (7)$$

where

$$P(k, q, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2} (\xi_{k+q} - \xi_k) (-J(q) + V(q)) G(k + q\sigma, \tau = 0) + J(-q) \langle \hat{S}(-q) \hat{S}(q) \rangle + J(q) - 2\sigma V(-q) \langle \hat{\rho}(-q) \hat{S}(q) \rangle + J(q) + V(-q) \langle \hat{\rho}(-q) \hat{\rho}(q) \rangle + V(q) \quad (8)$$

This function $P(k, q, \sigma)$ will exhibit effects of correlations. $\langle \hat{S}(-q) \hat{S}(q) \rangle \equiv \langle T_\tau \hat{S}(-q, \tau) \hat{S}(q, \tau - 0^-) \rangle$,

other correlation functions are similar to this. For simplification, we consider $T < T_c$ and $T \rightarrow T_c$, and get

$$F^+(k\sigma, \tau = 0) = -\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n [i\omega_n + \tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma} + \Sigma^{(+)}(k, i\omega_n)]^{-1} \cdot \frac{\Delta_+^{(-)}(k, i\omega_n)}{i\omega_n - \tilde{\xi}_{k\bar{\sigma}} - \Sigma^{(-)}(k, i\omega_n)} \left(1 - \frac{V(0) \langle \hat{\rho}(0) \rangle}{-i\omega_n + \xi_k}\right) \quad (9)$$

where

$$\Sigma^{(\pm)}(k, i\omega_n) = \sum_q \frac{P(k, q, \sigma)}{i\omega_n \pm \xi_{k+q}}$$

$$\Delta^{(\pm)}(k, i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_q \frac{\xi_{k+q} - \xi_k}{-i\omega_n \pm \xi_{k+q}} [J(q) + V(q)] F(k + q\sigma, \tau = 0) \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta_+^{(\pm)}(k, i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_q \frac{\xi_{k+q} - \xi_k}{-i\omega_n \pm \xi_{k+q}} [J(q) + V(q)] F^+(k + q\sigma, \tau = 0)$$

To obtain an evident solution, we consider non-Mott like model in which the in-site interaction U is not too large.

The function F^+ dominated by the frequency region where $\text{Im}\Sigma^{(+)}(k, \omega) = 0$ meets

$$F^+(k\sigma, \tau = 0) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{E_{k\sigma,1} - E_{k\bar{\sigma},2}} [n_F(E_{k\sigma,1}) z^{(+)}(E_{k\sigma,1}) \left(1 + \frac{V(0) \langle \hat{\rho}(0) \rangle}{E_{k\sigma,1} - \xi_k}\right) \sum_q \frac{\xi_{k+q} - \xi_k}{\xi_{k+q} + E_{k\sigma,1}}$$

$$- n_F(E_{k\bar{\sigma},2}) z^{(-)}(E_{k\bar{\sigma},2}) \left(1 + \frac{V(0) \langle \hat{\rho}(0) \rangle}{E_{k\bar{\sigma},2} - \xi_k}\right) \sum_q \frac{\xi_{k+q} - \xi_k}{\xi_{k+q} + E_{k\bar{\sigma},2}}] [J(q) + V(q)] F^+(k + q\sigma, \tau = 0) \quad (12)$$

Where the spectral weight $z^{(\pm)}(\omega) = [1 + \sum_q \frac{P(k, q, \sigma)}{(\omega \pm \xi_{k+q})^2}]^{-1}$. To arrive at Eq. (12), we suggest appropriate

model parameters should lead $\omega - \tilde{\xi}_{k\bar{\sigma}} - \text{Re}\Sigma^{(-)}(k, \omega) = 0$ and $\omega + \tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma} + \text{Re}\Sigma^{(+)}(k, \omega) = 0$ to have one real

solution each. In the concrete, $\omega = E_{k\sigma,1}$ expresses the real solution of $\omega + \tilde{\xi}_{k\sigma} + \text{Re}\Sigma^{(+)}(k, \omega) = 0$, and

$\omega = E_{k\bar{\sigma},2}$ the real solution of $\omega - \tilde{\xi}_{k\bar{\sigma}} - \text{Re}\Sigma^{(-)}(k, \omega) = 0$, in which the spin index dependences are duo to the

spin-charge correlation in Eq. (8). These also require U is not too large.

Because $E_{k_F\sigma,1} \neq 0$ if $E_{k_F\bar{\sigma},2} \neq 0$, when the chemical potential was not at the insider of energy band, Eq. (12) will not give a large T_c , thus the transition temperature large enough also requires U is not too large. There is the solution of $F^+(k_F) \neq 0$ for finite T_c in Eq. (12). For example, when the chemical potential is located at the inside of excitation energies, Eq. (12) in Fermi surface gives this result

$$F^+(k_F, \tau = 0) = \frac{1}{2k_B T_c} z^{(\pm)}(0) \frac{\xi_{k_F} - V(0) \langle \hat{\rho}(0) \rangle}{\xi_{k_F}} \sum_q \frac{\xi_{k_F} - \xi_{k_F+q}}{\xi_{k_F+q}} [J(q) + V(q)] F^+(k_F + q, \tau = 0) \quad (13)$$

Note $(\xi_{k_F} - \xi_{k_F+q}) / \xi_{k_F+q}$ are either positive or negative for different q , we get $F^+(k_F) \neq 0$ for finite T_c . Because $z^{(\pm)}(0)$ decrease with the increased U while $J(q) + V(q)$ increase with U , the highest- T_c will occur when U is appropriate. Our results require U is not too large, and they are beyond the Su's result [16]. Of course, Eq. (12) shows that the possible pairing is not only limited around the Fermi surface.

Having considered the depression of the possible ferromagnetism on the superconductivity, we conclude that the singlet superconductivity requires an antiferromagnetic exchange parameter $J_{II'}$ and a positive parameter $V_{II'}$ when the chemical potential is located at the inside of energy-band.

Because J and V will result in spin-spin correlation and charge-charge correlation respectively, as shown in Eq. (8), we conclude that the spin-singlet superconductivity requires both spin correlation and charge correlation. Spin correlation and charge correlation necessarily lead to spin-charge correlation; therefore, the superconductivity requires spin-charge correlation.

However, the condition displaying superconductivity also includes $F^+(k\sigma) = F^+(k\bar{\sigma})$. When spin correlation exists, the spin-charge correlation also exists, and then $P(k, q, \sigma)$ depends on the spin index. Having substituted Eq. (8) into (10), we find $\Sigma(k, i\omega_n) = \Sigma_0(k, i\omega_n) + \sigma \Sigma_1(k, i\omega_n)$, this should lead the excitation energies to have such forms $E_\sigma(k) = E_0(k_x + \sigma Q_x, k_y + \sigma Q_y, \dots) + \sigma E_1(k)$. When the part $E_1(k)$ is large enough, the electron systems will show ferromagnetism, while this is impossible for our parameters in this article; when Q_α is large

enough, the electron systems should show antiferromagnetism or spin density wave. If both $E_1(k)$ and Q_α are small or they reach some “matching” in quantity, the electron systems do not show any low-range magnetic order. A particular supposing example is $E_\sigma(k) = \sin(ka + \sigma qa) + \sigma \cos ka \cdot f_k$ for 1D systems ($\mu=0$), which show ferromagnetic order for $f_k > 1$, spin density wave for $f_k = 0$, and no magnetic orders for $f_k \equiv -\sin(qa)$. This means that long-range magnetic order could not exist while the spin-charge correlation could be strong enough, and this could lead $F^+(k\sigma) = F^+(k\bar{\sigma})$ to be met. This arrives at such a conclusion: magnetic orders suppress superconductivity. An interesting case is that $F^+(k\sigma) = F^+(k\bar{\sigma})$ may be met in higher temperature instead of lower temperature, this is because of possible non-monotonous temperature dependence of correlations. An example is ErRh₄B which undergoes the transition from superconductor to ferromagnetism with decreased temperature [21], the ferromagnetic correlation in this material could be increased with the decreased temperature. When the spin correlation is too large, $E_1(k)$ and Q_α do not reach some “matching” in quantity, and $F^+(k\sigma) \neq F^+(k\bar{\sigma})$ at any limited temperature, thus superconductivity will disappear. This means that superconductivity requires some “harmonization” between spin correlation and charge correlation, which requires appropriate spin-charge correlation among electron systems. That is why superconductivity usually occurs at the border of spin or charge orders. This result also leads us to conjecture that the competition between spin order and charge order must be strengthened when both spin correlation and charge correlation are strong. We can understand that an appropriate spin-charge correlation will lead high temperature superconductivity, because the spin-charge correlation could lead strong spin fluctuations and strong charge fluctuations, these strong fluctuations would induce tight-binding pairs which are responsible for superconductivity. In another aspect, when U is very small, the tight binding model is no longer in force, a popular basis set is plane waves, $J = 0$ while $V_0(q)$ can be seen as perturbed one, spin correlation disappears while small charge correlation remains as seen in electron gas, and Eq. (12) will give $T_c = 0$. That is to say, superconductivity cannot occur in electron gas, such as the case in good metals. It seems the effects of phonons could be included in model (1) if the parameters are related to phonons; however,

this is not discussed in this work.

4. Discussion and conclusion

In summary, our work shows that the strong correlation favors the singlet superconductivity, and the highest temperature superconductivity requires that the correlation is strong enough and the spectral weight around the chemical potential is high enough. In a word, these calculations suggest that the highest temperature superconductivity should be found in the ranges near the Mott metal–insulator transition (MIT) if we use the notation from one band model. These works, and other authors such as in [21], also argue that spin orders (include SDW state) suppress superconductivity, or, one can conclude that superconductivity could occur when spin orders are suppressed for the strong correlated systems.

One may question these calculations; however, these conclusions on calculations are in agreement with the experiments on high temperature superconductors.

Firstly, all high temperature superconductivities are in the range near MIT. The electrons of all copper-based p-type superconductors are the so-called bandwidth-control MIT systems, and the optimal doped ones are in the ranges near MIT (in one-band model of theory). Some bandwidth-control MIT systems [22] do not show high temperature superconductivity, this is because the electron systems in these materials are far from the MIT, and they behave spin or charge orders.

Secondly, the strong correlation dominated superconductivities originates from the electron-electron interaction renormalized by various factors, no matter what these superconductivities are mediated by ether spin or charge excitations. In another aspect, these have also explained why various high-temperature superconductivities could not be explained by a single

kind of excitation, as questioned between physicists.

Thirdly, it seems no properties of high-temperature superconductors are inconsistent with this mechanism. For example, we can conceive that the total correlation arrive at the strongest strength (but near MIT) for the optimally doped p-type superconductors, although the spin correlation of underdoped cuprates and the charge correlation of overdoped ones may be stronger. Therefore, the little isotope effect is because the parameters of model are almost not changed by isotope substitution, the T-linear resistivity is due to the strong correlation[23], the moderate optical conductivity of low-frequency is because the chemical potential comes into the inside of energy band, and the highest- T_c appear in these optimal cuprates as discussed above. Other factors, such as phonons and impurities, will play role in the properties of superconductors as soon as the total correlation is weakened. For other behaviors of superconductors, such as the element substitution effect, the pressure effect, the pairing symmetry, they all are consistent with this mechanism, while the detail discussion is not given in this work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work thanks Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology for financial support.

References

- [1] J. G. Bednorz and K. A. Müller, *Z. Phys. B* 64(1986)189.
- [2] M. K. Wu, J. R. Ashburn, C. J. Torng, P. H. Hor, R. L. Meng, L. Gao, Z. J. Huang, Y. Q. Wang and C. W. Chu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 58(1987)908.
- [3] H. Maeda, Y. Tanaka, M. Fukutomi and T. Asano, *Jpn. J. Appt. Phys. Pt. 2*(1988)27:L209-10.
- [4] Z. Z. Sheng, A. M. Hermann, A. El Ali, C. Almasan, J. Estrada, T. Datta and R. J. Matson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60(1988)937.
- [5] C. W. Chu, P. H. Hor, R. L. Meng, L. Gao, Z. J. Huang and Y. Q. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 58(1987)405.
- [6] Y. Kamihara, T. Watanabe, M. Hirano and H. Hosono, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 130(2008)3296.
- [7] H. H. Wen, G. Mu, L. Fang, H. Yang and X. Y. Zhu, *Europhys. Lett.* 82(2008)17009.
- [8] X. H. Chen, T. Wu, G. Wu, R. H. Liu, H. Chen and D. F. Fang, *Nature* 453(2008)761.
- [9] G. F. Chen, Z. Li, D. Wu, G. Li, W. Z. Hu, J. Dong, P. Zheng, J. L. Luo and N. L. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100(2008)247002.
- [10] Z. A. Ren, J. Yang, W. Lu, W. Yi, G. C. Che, X. L. Dong, L. L. Sun and Z. X. Zhao, *Materials Research Innovations* 12(2008)105.
- [11] P. Monthoux, D. Pines and G. G. Lonzarich, *Nature (London)* 450(2007)1177.
- [12] T. D. Cao, *Solid state communication* 147(2008)4.
- [13] T. Park, V. A. Sidorov, F. Ronning, J-X. Zhu, Y. Tokiwa, H. Lee, E. D. Bauer, R. Movshovich, J. L. Sarrao and J. D. Thompson, *Nature* 456(2008)366.
- [14] T. Aimi and M. Imada, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* 76(2007)113708.
- [15] R. T. Clay, H. Li and S. Mazumdar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 101(2008)166403.
- [16] G. Su, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86(2001)3690.

- [17] T. Takimoto and T. Moriya, Phys. Rev. B 66(2002)134516.
- [18] J. Reiss, D. Rohe and W. Metzner, Phys. Rev. B 75(2007)075110.
- [19] E. G. Batyev, *Supercond. Sci. Technol.* **13**(2000)323.
- [20] Yu A. Izyumov and B. M. Letfulov, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **3**(1991)5373.
- [20] W. A. Fertig, D. C. Johnston, L. E. DeLong, R. W. McCallum, M. B. Maple and B. T. Matthias, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38(1977)987.
- [21] B.-L. Yu, J.C.F. Wang, A.D. Beyer, M.L. Teague, G.P. Lockhart, J.S.A. Horng, S.-P. Lee, N.-C. Yeh, Solid State Communications 149, (2009)261.
- [22] M. Imada, A. Fujimori, & Y. Tokura, Rev. Mod. Phys. 70(1998)1039.
- [23] T. D. Cao, arXiv:0706.0059V2 (2009).