

# The optimal inhomogeneity for superconductivity

E. Arrigoni<sup>1,2</sup> and S. A. Kivelson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Institut für Theoretische Physik und Astrophysik,  
Universität Würzburg, Am Hubland, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany*

(Dated: November 16, 2018)

We study the effect of nonuniform transverse couplings on a quasi-one dimensional superconductor. We show that inhomogeneous couplings quite generally increase the superconducting (pairing) gap relative to the uniform system, but that beyond an “optimal” degree of inhomogeneity, they lead to a suppression of the tendency to phase coherence. The optimal conditions for superconductivity are derived. We also show that a *delocalized*, spin-gapped phase is stable against weak disorder in a four-leg-ladder with moderate repulsive interactions.

PACS numbers: 74.81.-g, 74.20.Mn, 72.15.Rn, 11.10.Hi

A number of experiments[1] including neutron scattering, angular resolved photoemission, and scanning tunnelling microscopy [2] suggest that many high- $T_c$  superconductors show a highly inhomogeneous electronic structure which often has a quasi-one dimensional nature - “stripes.” It is still unclear whether inhomogeneities, and stripes in particular, are an essential feature of high- $T_c$  superconductivity.

There is compelling *theoretical* evidence that quasi-one dimensional systems, such as two-leg Hubbard or  $t - J$  ladders (2LLs), have a strong tendency towards the formation of a spin gap and substantial superconducting (SC) pair-field correlations [3]. However, the gap size and the tendency to superconductivity tends to decrease rapidly with width for ladders with more legs. [4, 5] Due to the phenomenological similarity between 2LLs and two-dimensional cuprates, it has been suggested that the pairing mechanism for superconductivity in cuprates may have a quasi-one-dimensional origin [6]. However, strong pairing is often accompanied by a small superfluid stiffness, especially in quasi-one-dimensional systems, so a large spin gap does not necessarily imply a high- $T_c$  [6–8]. In other words, while local pairing develops easily in a 2LL, it is hard for the *phase* of the pairs on different weakly coupled 2LLs to develop coherence. Another problem with quasi-one dimensional superconductors is their extreme sensitivity to disorder [9]. Since weak disorder does not destroy superconductivity in two dimensions, it is intuitively clear that this sensitivity is mitigated if one increases the number of coupled chains. Taken together, these observations suggest there exists an intermediate “optimal” degree of inhomogeneity [4, 10] which maximizes  $T_c$ .

In this Letter, we analyze the relation between inhomogeneity and superconductivity in “microscopic” inhomogeneous multi-leg ladder Hubbard models in which the SC gap arises solely as a result of *repulsive* interactions between electrons. This allows us to make *quantitative* estimates (at least for weak coupling) of the optimal degree of inhomogeneity without *ad hoc* assumptions. In addition, we show that for a 4-leg ladder (4LL), there is a broad range of repulsive interactions for which disorder

is irrelevant in the renormalization-group sense.

Specifically, we have carried out a weak-coupling renormalization-group (RG) analysis of a model (Eq. 1) of two 2LLs with a repulsive on-site interaction  $U$  coupled via an interladder hopping  $t$  and with an on-site energy offset  $\varepsilon$  between the 2LL. We consider  $t$  in the range  $1 \geq t > 0$ ; in the units we have adopted  $t = 1$  and  $\varepsilon = 0$  corresponds to a homogeneous 4LL, while at  $t = 0$  there are two (inequivalent) decoupled 2LLs. For simplicity, in order to have a unique parameter which determines the degree of inhomogeneity,  $\varepsilon$  is taken to depend on  $t$  as  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0(1 - t^2)$ . Moreover, we have considered both a flat ladder, with open boundary conditions in the direction transverse to the chains (OBC), and of a cylindrical ladder, with periodic boundary conditions (PBC).

Our results, valid qualitatively in a range electron concentrations per site  $\nu$  near but not equal to 1, are presented in Fig. 1, and can be summarized as follows: In the parameter range that we have considered, there are 4 bands which cross the Fermi energy, so there are potentially 4 distinct gapless charge ( $\rho$ ) and spin ( $s$ ) modes. Upon bosonization, these modes are represented by the collective bosonic fields,  $\phi_{\rho,a}$  and  $\phi_{s,a}$  where  $a = 1-4$  is a band index [11]. Phases (that is to say fixed points of the RG flows) are labelled CnSm according [5] to the number  $n$  and  $m$  of charge and spin modes that remain gapless in the presence of interactions. For the entire range of  $t$ , we will show that the 4LL is in the maximally gapped C1S0 phase in which all 4 spin modes and the 3 “relative” charge modes are gapped [12]. (So long as  $\nu$  is irrational, the total charge mode  $\phi_{\rho+} \equiv (1/2) \sum_a \phi_{\rho,a}$ , is always gapless[11].) This phase is characterized by slowly decaying power law SC correlations, and can be considered as the “SC” phase of the 4LL. For a range of  $t$ , a single, strong-coupling fixed point governs the physics, and hence all the gaps are “comparable” [13], in the sense that they all have the same singular dependence on the interaction strength - this single scale behavior is reminiscent of an anisotropic BCS superconductor. In other ranges, the RG flows pass close to an initial strong coupling fixed point before finally reaching the C1S0 fixed point. Here, there are two distinct gap scales, a “pseudo-gap” scale,

$\Delta_{PG}$  with magnitude governed by the flow to the initial strong-coupling fixed point, and a lower scale, which we call the superconducting gap  $\Delta_{SC}$ , governed by the second segment of the flow.




FIG. 1: Logarithm of  $\Delta_{SC}$  and  $\Delta_{PG}$  for a 4LL with OBC (solid line) and PBC (dashed) for  $\epsilon_0 = 1$ ,  $\nu = 1.2$ , and  $U = 1$ . We also indicate the positions of  $t_{opt}$ ,  $t^*$ , and  $t^{**}$  for OBC (upper row) and PBC (lower).

The crucial result (see Fig. 1) is that  $\Delta_{SC}$  is not a monotonic function of  $t$ , and, in particular, it has an absolute maximum at a certain  $t = t_{opt} < 1$ , i. e. for an *inhomogeneous* 4LL. We find three regimes of  $t$ : For  $t^{**} \geq t \geq t^*$ , all the gaps are comparable. In contrast, two distinct gap scales are found for  $1 \geq t > t^{**}$  and  $t^* > t > 0$ . The two-gap behavior at small  $t$  can be understood as follows: For  $t = 0$ , one of the 2LLs has an exponentially larger superconducting gap than the other due to the different Fermi velocities. For small but non-zero  $t$ ,  $\Delta_{PG}$  is continuously connected to this gap, i.e. it is the gap associated with the pair of bands predominantly associated with the more SC 2LL. However, for finite  $t$ , smaller gaps of magnitude  $\Delta_{SC}$  are induced in the remaining bands by a generalized version of the proximity effect [6].

*a. Inhomogeneous 4LL in weak coupling:* We consider a Hubbard Hamiltonian for two coupled 2LLs

$$\begin{aligned}
 H = & -t_{\parallel} \sum_{y=1}^4 \sum_{x,\sigma} [c_{x,y,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{x+1,y,\sigma} + \text{H.C.}] \\
 & - \sum_{x,\sigma} t_{\perp} [c_{x,1,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{x,2,\sigma} + c_{x,3,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{x,4,\sigma} + \text{H.C.}] \\
 & - \sum_{x,\sigma} [t c_{x,2,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{3,x,\sigma} + t' c_{x,4,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{x,1,\sigma} + \text{H.C.}] \\
 & + \sum_x \{ (U/2) \sum_{y=1}^4 [\hat{n}_{x,y}]^2 + \epsilon [\hat{n}_{x,1} + \hat{n}_{x,2}] \},
 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where,  $c_{x,y,\sigma}^{\dagger}$  creates an electron with spin  $\sigma$  on chain  $y$  at position  $x$  along the chain and  $\hat{n}_{x,y} \equiv \sum_{\sigma} c_{x,y,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{x,y,\sigma}$ . We choose units in which the hopping matrix elements along the ladders,  $t_{\parallel} = 2$ . We set  $t_{\perp} = 1$  along the rungs of each 2LL, and a different coupling  $t \leq t_{\perp}$  along the

rungs connecting the two 2LLs where  $t' = 0$  corresponds to OBC and  $t' = t$  to PBC. In addition, one of the two ladders is shifted in energy by an amount  $\epsilon = \epsilon_0(1 - t^2)$ . The electrons interact via a weak, on-site Hubbard interaction  $U \ll 2\pi t_{\parallel}$ . We fix the number of electrons per site, to be close to, but not equal to one.

*b. First stage renormalization:* It is by now a straightforward procedure [5] to derive the weak-coupling RG equations for the large number of distinct running couplings  $g_i$  that define the various low-energy two-particle scattering processes. These equations always have the form

$$d g_i / d \tau = A_{j,l}^i g_j g_l + \mathcal{O}(g^3), \quad (2)$$

where  $\tau$  is the log of the bandwidth (cutoff), and  $A_{j,l}^i$  are coefficients which depend on the details of the non-interacting system under consideration, i.e. in the present case they depend on  $\epsilon_0$ ,  $t$ , and  $\nu$ . The other inputs to the calculation are the initial values  $g_i(\tau = 0) = \lambda_j U \ll 1$ , where the dimensionless constants  $\lambda_j$  also depend on  $\epsilon_0$ ,  $t$ , and  $\nu$ . Information about the characteristic emergent energy scales is obtained by integrating these equations (typically numerically) until one or more coupling grows to be of order 1.

To be precise, a characteristic gap scale,

$$\Delta \sim \exp[-\tau^*] = \exp \left[ -\frac{\alpha}{U} + \mathcal{O}(\log U) \right]. \quad (3)$$

is obtained from the value of  $\tau = \tau^* = \alpha/U$  at which some set of couplings diverge. (The  $\mathcal{O}(\log U)$  correction represents the effect of the neglected cubic terms in powers of  $g$ .) For  $\tau$  near  $\tau^*$ , there are generally a set of strongly divergent couplings,  $g_i \sim G_i(\tau^* - \tau)^{-1}$ , which all grow to be of order 1 when  $(\tau^* - \tau) \sim 1$ , and so define the new “strong-coupling fixed point.” There is also a set of weakly or non-divergent couplings,  $g_i \sim G_i U^{\gamma_i} (\tau^* - \tau)^{-(1-\gamma_i)}$  with  $\gamma_i > 0$ , which remain small,  $g_i \sim G_i U^{\gamma_i}$ , when  $(\tau^* - \tau) \sim 1$  [5, 14]. What modes are gapped at this strong-coupling fixed point is then determined by bosonizing the model. The order 1 couplings are considered to be large and thus pin (gap) the appropriate modes. As we will discuss below, it may still be necessary to do further analysis to address the fate of the remaining gapless modes at this strong-coupling fixed point, and to account for the effects of the weak residual interactions between them [6]b. The coefficient  $\alpha$  in Eq. (3), which is the principle result of this initial analysis, clearly depends on the values of  $t$ ,  $\epsilon_0$ , and  $\nu$ .

Since this analysis straightforwardly extends the previous treatments of the 2LL and 4LL [5], we will not, here, present the details of the calculation. Some representative results, for parameters listed in the captions, are shown in Fig. 1. For homogeneous 2NLLs,  $\alpha$  increases with the number of chains  $2N$ , as pointed out in Ref. [5], so that the gaps decrease exponentially with  $N$ . In the present case,  $\alpha(t)$  must interpolate between the relatively large value for a homogeneous 4LL when  $t = 1$  and the smaller 2LL value when  $t = 0$  (See Table I.)

By integrating the one-loop RG equations, we found, to our surprise, that even the dependence of  $\alpha$  on  $t$  is not monotonic;  $\alpha(t)$  first increases with decreasing  $t$  until it reaches a maximum value at  $t = t_{min}$ , and then decreases (i. e. the gaps increase exponentially) as  $t$  decreases further.

For  $t^* < t < t^{**}$  (See Table I.) *all* the couplings responsible for gapping the 3 charge and 4 spin modes diverge in proportion to  $(\tau^* - \tau)^{-1}$  at  $\tau = \tau^*$ , so that all gaps at this C1S0 fixed point are “comparable” [13]. On the other hand, for  $t^* \geq t > 0$  or  $1 \geq t > t^{**}$ , only the couplings responsible for the gaps in the spin and relative charge modes within two bands diverge like  $(\tau^* - \tau)^{-1}$ . More specifically, at the resulting (C3S2) fixed point,  $\Delta_{PG} = \Delta$  characterizes the pinning of the spin fields [11]  $\phi_{s,1}, \phi_{s,2}$  associated with two of the bands (labelled, for simplicity, 1 and 2), and of the relative “superconducting phase,”  $\theta_{\rho,(1-2)} \equiv (\theta_{\rho,1} - \theta_{\rho,2})/\sqrt{2}$ , where  $\theta_{\rho,a}$  is the field dual to  $\phi_{\rho,a}$ . Behavior of this sort has sometimes been interpreted [5, 14] as indicating a *transition* to a phase with additional gapless modes, i. e., in this case, from a C1S0 phase for  $t^{**} > t > t^*$  to a C3S2 phase for  $t < t^*$  and  $t > t^{**}$ . However, we shall see [6]b that there is a crossover, but no phase transition, at  $t = t^*$ .

*c. Second-stage renormalization:* For  $t < t^*$ , the C3S2 strong-coupling fixed point to which the weak-coupling flows have carried us can be thought of as describing a 1D superconductor in bands  $b_A = 1, 2$  and two ungapped Luttinger liquids (LL) corresponding to bands  $b_B = 3, 4$ . The fixed-point Hamiltonian thus consists of 3 gapless charge and 2 gapless spin modes with a renormalized ultra-violet cutoff  $\Delta_{PG}$ . However, several residual interactions are left at the end of the first stage of renormalization, and it is necessary to carry out a perturbative stability analysis of the C3S2 fixed point with respect to these interactions [6]. In the weak-coupling limit, it turns out that the four singlet Josephson couplings ( $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$ ) between the bands  $b_A$  and  $b_B$ , i.e. the amplitudes to scatter a zero-momentum pair from  $b_A$  to  $b_B$ , are the most relevant perturbations and make the C3S2 fixed point unstable. Other interactions, such as the interband or intraband scattering processes in the bands  $B$ , are either irrelevant or marginal in the  $U \rightarrow 0$  limit.

This can be seen by evaluating the scaling dimension of the  $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  ( $d_J$ , approximately equal for both  $b_B$ ), which can be estimated again using bosonization. Specifically, one replaces the gapped fields of the two bands  $b_A$  with their expectation values, while all other fields can be taken as nearly free, i. e. their (spin and charge) LL exponents  $K$  can be approximately set to 1, since the remaining couplings are small. This procedure (which is standard [6]) leads to the estimate

$$d_J \approx 1 + 1/(4 K_{\rho A}) \quad (4)$$

where  $K_{\rho A}$  is the charge Luttinger exponent of the total charge-mode of bands  $b_A$ . Since [15]  $d_J \approx 5/4 < 2$ ,

$\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  are relevant perturbations, and diverge at lower energy scales within a strong-coupling RG expansion about the C3S2 fixed point, as anticipated. Again, one can identify the energy scale at which one or more  $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  become of order 1 with the freezing of the associated modes and with the opening of corresponding gaps. Specifically,  $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  open a gap in the spin modes ( $\phi_{s, b_B}$  get locked) as well as in the relative charge modes (locking the relative SC phases  $(\theta_{\rho,1} + \theta_{\rho,2} - 2\theta_{\rho, b_B})/\sqrt{6}$ ) resulting in a C1S0 phase. Since all  $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  are comparable [13] and have the same scaling dimension [Eq. (4)], all these gaps are comparable as well. These smaller gaps are thus identified as  $\Delta_{SC}$  of the 4LL. In this C1S0 phase, only the global charge mode  $\phi_{\rho+}$  remains ungapped. The criterion discussed above yields

$$\Delta_{SC} \approx \Delta_{PG} \mathcal{J}_{AB}^{*1/(2-d_J)}. \quad (5)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{J}_{AB}^*$  is the value of the residual Josephson couplings  $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  left at the end of the first stage of renormalization, i. e. when  $(\tau^* - \tau) \sim 1$ . The numerical asymptotic analysis around the singular point  $\tau^*$  yields a weak divergence of the  $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  with a unique exponent  $\gamma_{AB} \approx 0.06$ . Thus, the  $\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}$  attain a value

$$\mathcal{J}_{b_A, b_B}^* \approx \mathcal{J}_{A, B}^* \sim U^{\gamma_{AB}} G_{AB}, \quad (6)$$

which is small but finite for small  $U$ . (It is interesting that  $\gamma_{AB} \approx 0.06$  is independent of  $t$  (See Table I.) , although clearly  $G_{AB}$  vanishes for  $t \rightarrow 0$ .)

	$t^*$	$t^{**}$	$t_{min}$	$\alpha_0$	$\alpha_1$	$\alpha(t=1)$	$\gamma_{AB}$	$G_{AB}^{(2)}$
OBC	0.65	0.91	0.81	20.1	16.8	35.1	0.06	0.05
PBC	0.92	1.0	0.91	20.1	38.9	41.8	0.06	0.01

TABLE I: Values of the parameters discussed in the text for a 4LL with OBC and PBC, and for  $\nu = 1.2$ , and  $\epsilon_0 = 1$ .

The optimal  $t$  is not given by  $t = t^*$ . Although the ratio  $\Delta_{SC}/\Delta_{PG}$  is a rapidly decreasing function of decreasing  $t$  for  $t < t^*$ ,  $\Delta_{SC}$  itself still, in general, initially increases due to the exponential increase of  $\Delta_{PG}$ . Anticipating the fact that the optimum value for  $t^2$  is of the order  $U$ , we can determine it by expanding  $\alpha$  for small  $t$  as  $\alpha(t) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t^2 + \mathcal{O}(t^4)$ , with  $\alpha_1$  given in Table I. Similarly,  $G_{AB} = G_{AB}^{(2)} t^2 + \mathcal{O}(t^4)$ . Then from Eq. (5) and from the expression for  $\mathcal{J}_{A, B}^*$

$$\Delta_{SC}(t) \approx \Delta_{PG}(t=0) \left[ U^{\gamma_{AB}} G_{AB}^{(2)} t^2 \right]^{x_J} e^{-\alpha_1 t^2/U}, \quad (7)$$

where  $x_J \equiv 1/(2 - d_J)$ . It is now straightforward to determine the value of  $t$  which maximizes  $\Delta_{SC}$ :

$$t_{opt}^2 = \frac{U}{(2 - d_J)\alpha_1} + \mathcal{O}(U^2) \quad (8)$$

*d. Quantitative considerations:* The various quantities describing the  $t$  dependence of the gaps discussed here are reported in Table I for  $\nu = 1.2$  and  $\epsilon_0 = 1$ . The curves in Fig. 1 have been computed as follows. We have

taken initial values of the coupling constants corresponding to  $U = 1$  and have integrated Eq. (2) numerically for different values of  $t$  until the largest of the couplings (in modulus) has reached the value 1. This determines  $\tau^*(t)$ , and where needed,  $\mathcal{J}_{AB}^*$ . The gaps are then evaluated by using Eq. (3), and Eq. (5) with  $d_J = 5/4$ , respectively.

A different situation occurs when  $\epsilon_0 = 0$ . In this case, the wave functions of the  $U = t = 0$  part of the Hamiltonian are equally distributed on the two 2LL for any nonvanishing  $t$ . As a consequence, the dependence of the gaps on  $t$  obtained by the method described above is very weak (for PBC there is no dependence at all). In this case, one should use a different method in which couplings with crystal momentum not exactly conserved at the Fermi points have to be included in the first stage of the renormalization. Qualitatively, the results are similar to the  $\epsilon_0 \neq 0$  case, i. e., the SC gap increases with increasing inhomogeneity, there is an optimal value  $t = t_{opt}$ , and a “pseudogap” behavior. However, in this case  $t_{opt}$  is much smaller and of the order of the 2LL gap  $\Delta_{PG}(t = 0)$  [16].

*e. The effects of disorder.* Orignac and Giamarchi [9] have shown that disorder is a relevant perturbation (i.e. leads to localization) in the C1S0 phase of the 2LL unless there are strong enough *attractive* interactions such that the Luttinger exponent,  $K_{\rho+}$ , associated with the gapless total charge mode is greater than  $3/2$  [15]. We now consider the effect of a single-particle disorder potential in the C1S0 phase of the 4LL.

Neglecting forward scattering terms, which turn out not too be crucial here, one can write this potential as

$$H_{dis} = \int d x \sum_{b,b'=1}^4 \hat{v}_{b,b'}(x) e^{i[k_{F,b} + k_{F,b'}]x} + H.C. \quad (9)$$

Here, the operator  $\hat{v}_{b,b'}(x)$  scatters an electron from band  $b$  to band  $b'$  and from left to right.  $\hat{v}_{b,b'}$  is straightforwardly expressed in terms of the bosonic fields. Since in the C1S0 phase, all spin-fluctuations are gapped, to study the low energy consequences of weak disorder we can replace all factors of the form  $e^{i\alpha\phi_{s,b}}$  by its constant expectation value. The remaining dependence on the charge and dual spin fields is

$$\hat{v}_{b,b'}(x) \sim \frac{\xi_{b,b'}(x)}{2\pi a} e^{i\frac{\phi_{\rho,b} + \phi_{\rho,b'}}{\sqrt{2}}} \cos\left(\frac{\theta_{s,b} - \theta_{s,b'}}{\sqrt{2}} + \eta\right) \quad (10)$$

where the  $x$  dependence of the bosonic fields is left implicit, and  $\eta$  is a  $x$ -independent phase. The  $\xi_{b,b'}(x)$  are the random potentials which, for the sake of definiteness, can be taken to obey a Gaussian distribution  $\xi_{b_1,b_2}(x)\xi_{b_3,b_4}(y)^* = W_{b_1,b_2|b_3,b_4} D\delta(x-y)$ , where  $D$  is the disorder strength (proportional to the inverse of the mean-free path), and  $W$  are numbers of order unity that depend upon details of the band structure. The precise form of the  $W$  as well as the value of  $\eta$  are not important for the following analysis.

Now we get to the nub of the problem. The only low energy fluctuations in the C1S0 phase involve the total

charge mode,  $\phi_{\rho+}$ . Since the spin-fields are pinned, the dual spin fields are wildly fluctuating, so that any operator that depends on  $e^{i\alpha\theta_{s,b}}$  has exponentially falling correlations, and is hence irrelevant in the RG sense. Similarly, since the relative superconducting phases,  $\theta_{\rho,b} - \theta_{\rho,b'}$ , of the various bands are pinned, any operator with a factor  $e^{i\alpha[\phi_{\rho,b} - \phi_{\rho,b'}]}$  is similarly irrelevant. Therefore, both terms in Eq. (10) are irrelevant at low temperatures.

This does not mean disorder is irrelevant. As discussed in Refs. 17, 18, additional terms get generated in early stages of the RG flow as the gapped fields get integrated out. It is straightforward to show that the most relevant term is obtained only at fourth order in  $\hat{v}$ , and has the form

$$H_{eff} = \int d x \frac{\xi_{eff}(x)}{2\pi a} e^{i\sqrt{8}\phi_{\rho+}} + H.C., \quad (11)$$

where  $\xi_{eff}$  is an effective disorder potential, which is again Gaussian distributed:  $\xi_{eff}(x)\xi_{eff}(y)^* = D_{eff}\delta(x-y)$ , where  $D_{eff} \sim D(D/v_F^2)^3$ .

For weak enough bare disorder [19], and for energies below the SC gap  $\Delta_{SC}$ , the RG flow for the renormalized disorder strength  $D_{eff}$  associated with Eq. (11) can be easily derived in the usual way [9]. The RG equation reads

$$\frac{d D_{eff}}{d \tau} = D_{eff}(3 - 4K_{\rho+}), \quad (12)$$

i. e. disorder is irrelevant for  $K_{\rho+} > 3/4$ . This results is very important, as it signals the presence of a localized-delocalized transition in a quasi-one-dimensional system *for purely repulsive interactions* [15]. Moreover, the fact that delocalization is present in weak coupling, i. e. within the range of validity of the present RG procedure, makes the 4LL one of few low-dimensional models in which one can show the occurrence of delocalized states in a controlled manner. This result is valid provided the disorder does not destroy the gaps, i. e.  $D \ll v_F \Delta_{SC}$  [19].

*f. Comments and Speculations.* The present results were derived for small  $U$ , where all the emergent energy scales are exponentially small. In many cases, the same physics, and in particular the existence of an optimal degree of inhomogeneity, can be shown [6, 16] to apply in the strong-coupling limit, as well, where the gap scales are a significant fraction of the exchange interaction,  $J$ . However, quantitative results in this regime generally require some input from numerical experiments.

We note that the present results for the 4LL are qualitatively similar to what happens in high- $T_c$  superconductors such as  $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$  [20, 21]. In the overdoped region the system is relatively homogeneous, both the pairing and SC scales are relatively small and roughly equal. With decreasing doped hole concentration,  $x$ , stripe correlations become more prominent and the interstripe distance increases, i. e. the system becomes more effectively inhomogeneous. At the same time, the pseudo-gap scale increases monotonically with decreasing  $x$ , while

the SC  $T_c$  has a maximum at a “optimum”  $x$  and then decreases. Besides High- $T_c$  superconductors, the effects studied here could be relevant for quasi-one-dimensional systems, such as quantum wires or carbon nanotubes, in which more than one channel cross the Fermi surface. Finally, this idea could, possibly, give direction to the search for better superconductors [8].

We would like to acknowledge useful discussions with T. Giamarchi, D. J. Scalapino, and O. Zachar. EA was supported, in part, by the DFG via a Heisenberg fellowship (AR 324/3-1) and by DOE grant n. DE-FG03-00ER45798. SAK was supported, in part, by NSF grant #DMR 01-10329 at UCLA.

- 
- [1] For a brief review of the evidence of widespread local stripe order in the cuprates, see V. J. Emery, S. A. Kivelson, and J. M. Tranquada, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **96**, 8814 (1999).
  - [2] J. E. Hoffman, E. W. Hudson, K. M. Lang, V. Madhavan, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, and J. C. Davis, *Science* **295**, 466 (2002); C. Howald, H. Eisaki, N. Kaneko, M. Greven, and A. Kapitulnik, cond-mat/0208442 (unpublished).
  - [3] D. J. Scalapino, *Nature (London)* **377**, 12 (1995); E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice, *Science* **271**, 618 (1996); C. A. Hayward, D. Poilblanc, R. M. Noack, D. J. Scalapino, and W. Hanke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 926 (1995); R. M. Noack, S. R. White, and D. J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 882 (1994); see also Refs. [5, 6, 14].
  - [4] S. Chakravarty *et al.*, *Science* **261**, 337 (1993) and S. Chakravarty and S. A. Kivelson, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 64511 (2001).
  - [5] L. Balents and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 12133 (1996); H. J. Schulz, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, R2959 (1996); H.-H. Lin, L. Balents, and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 6569 (1997). See also C. M. Varma and A. Zawadowski, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 7399 (1985); M. Fabrizio, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 15838 (1993); D. V. Khveshchenko and T. M. Rice, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 252 (1994).
  - [6] a) V. J. Emery, S. A. Kivelson, and O. Zachar, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 6120 (1997); b) V. J. Emery, S. A. Kivelson, and O. Zachar, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 15641 (1999); c) For a critical review, see E. W. Carlson, V. J. Emery, S. A. Kivelson, and D. Orgad, “Concepts in High Temperature Superconductivity,” cond-mat/0206217, to appear in ‘The Physics of Conventional and Unconventional Superconductors’ ed. by K. H. Bennemann and J. B. Ketterson (Springer-Verlag).
  - [7] V. J. Emery and S. A. Kivelson, *Nature (London)* **374**, 434 (1995).
  - [8] S. Kivelson, *Physica B* **318**, 61 (2002).
  - [9] E. Orignac and T. Giamarchi, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, R10453 (1996) ; *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 7167 (1997). See also T. Giamarchi and H. J. Schulz, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 325 (1988).
  - [10] J. Eroles, G. Ortiz, A. V. Balatsky, and A. R. Bishop, *Europhys. Lett.* **50**, 540 (2000).
  - [11] We adopt a normalization convention such that  $\rho_b(x) = -\partial_x \phi_{\rho,b}/\pi$  is the long wave-length charge density associated with band  $b$ .
  - [12] We consider only parameters for which the four Fermi momenta  $k_{F,a}$  are mutually incommensurate.
  - [13] We define two quantities to be “comparable” if their ratio remains finite in the  $U \rightarrow 0$  limit.
  - [14] E. Arrigoni, *Phys. Lett. A* **215**, 91 (1996).
  - [15] In Eq. (4) ,  $K_{\rho(1+2)}$  is the LL exponent associated with  $\theta_{\rho(1+2)}$ . One expects that for weak repulsive interactions and not too different Fermi velocities both  $K_{\rho(1+2)}$ , and  $K_{\rho+} \approx 1$ , similarly to the two-chain case [5, 17].
  - [16] This will be discussed in detail in a future publication. E. Arrigoni and S. A. Kivelson, *in preparation*.
  - [17] E. Arrigoni, B. Brendel, and W. Hanke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2297 (1997).
  - [18] E. Orignac and T. Giamarchi, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, R10453 (1996).
  - [19] Actually, one can show [16] that in the “pseudogap” regime a weaker condition is sufficient, namely  $[D/(v_F \Delta_{PG})]^2 (\Delta_{SC}/\Delta_{PG}) \ll 1$ .
  - [20] J. M. Tranquada, B. J. Sternlieb, J. D. Axe, Y. Nakamura, and S. Uchida, *Nature (London)* **375**, 561 (1995); H. A. Mook, P. Dai, F. Dogan, and R. D. Hunt, *Nature (London)* **404**, 729 (2000).
  - [21] K. Yamada, C. H. Lee, K. Kurahashi, J. Wada, S. Wakimoto, S. Ueki, H. Kimura, Y. Endoh, S. Hosoya, G. Shirane, R. J. Birgeneau, M. Greven, M. A. Kastner, and Y. J. Kim, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 6165 (1998).