

# Pairing on Small Clusters in the Peierls-Hubbard Model: Implications for $C_{60}$

J. Tinka Gammel<sup>a</sup>, F. Guo<sup>b</sup>, D. Guo<sup>b</sup>, K.C. Ung<sup>b</sup>, and S. Mazumdar<sup>b</sup>,

<sup>a</sup>Materials Research Branch, NRD, San Diego, CA 92152-5000, USA

<sup>b</sup>Dept. of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

**Abstract.** We study the pairing within the Peierls-Hubbard Model for electron- and hole-doped analogs of  $C_{60}$  accessible to exact diagonalization techniques (cube, truncated tetrahedron, *etc.*). We discuss how inclusion of electron-phonon interactions can substantially modify the conclusions about pairing obtained when this coupling is neglected. We also discuss potential pitfalls in the extrapolation from these small system calculations to  $C_{60}$ , and stress the necessity of having the correct intuitive picture.

## 1. Introduction

A great deal of numerical effort has gone into investigating whether pairing of the Cooper type occurs in the weakly doped two-dimensional Mott-Hubbard insulator. More recently, such a pairing mechanism has been proposed [1] for doped  $C_{60}$ . Specifically, these calculations involve determination of the ground state energies of the half-filled band system, and the electronic energies needed to add one and two electrons (holes). Pairing is supposed to occur if the quantity

$$\Delta E = 2E(N \pm 1) - E(N) - E(N \pm 2) \quad (1)$$

is positive. As approximate analytic techniques have been known to lead to qualitatively incorrect predictions for solid state systems with strong electron correlation, exact numerical techniques – exact calculation for a (small) finite clusters followed by extrapolation to the system size of interest – have been employed [2,3]. Within the Hubbard model,

$$H_{Hub} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \sigma} t_{ij} c_{i, \sigma}^+ c_{j, \sigma} + U \sum_i n_{i, \uparrow} n_{i, \downarrow}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\langle ij \rangle$  are nearest neighbors and  $t_{ij} = -t_0$ , pairing is found for the cube and the truncated tetrahedron [2,3,4].

## 2. Geometry, Distortion, and Pairing

For the geometries shown in Fig. 1, we have calculated the pair binding energy given in Eq. 1. The result is shown in Fig. 2. We see that there appear to be two regions where pairing can occur: one at small  $U$  and one near  $U/t_0=10$ . Our investigation indicates this oscillation may be related to (avoided) energy level crossings. Interestingly, large  $U$  pairing is found in the pentagonal prism, indicating that it is not limited to bipartite lattices. The pairing at small  $U$  appears to be related to the presence of energy level degeneracies at  $U=0$ .

In Ref. 4 we discussed how the variation in  $U$ -dependence of the Jahn-Teller distortion with filling masks this Jahn-Teller driven pairing (present on finite chains only!) as an electron-electron driven pairing at small  $U$ . Basically, by not letting the system distort, we are overestimating the energies in each case, but this overestimation is much stronger for the odd electron case than for the even electron case. The calculated energy required to add one hole (or electron) to the undistorted system is therefore too high, giving “pairing”.

To investigate the effects of distortion numerically, we first add a fixed external distortion  $\delta_{ij}$  from uniform bond length  $d_0$  and use  $t_{ij}=-t_0 + \alpha\delta_{ij}$  in the Hamiltonian Eq. 2. In Fig. 3 we show the results of our calculation for the truncated tetrahedron. For the undistorted case (Fig. 3), we merely reproduced the results of White *et al.* [2] — pairing was seen to occur at small  $U$ . With short bonds connecting the triangles — the distortion preferred at 1/2-filling — the pairing still exists. This is however not the Jahn-Teller mode, the noninteracting limit still having degeneracies. The pairing at small  $U$  disappears for the Jahn-Teller distorted truncated tetrahedron (calculated as the self-consistent distortion for  $N_{el}=N\pm 1$ , see below). This clearly indicates the relationship between pairing at small  $U$  and the degeneracies in the single particle limit: in the absence of distortion, the energy to add one hole or electron is being overestimated. In Ref. 4 we showed for the cube that the pairing at large  $U$  survives the  $U=0$  Jahn-Teller distortion. However, since there appears to be an energy-level crossing it may be that a different geometry than the  $U=0$  one should be considered the “large- $U$  Jahn-Teller” mode, and we are investigating this further.

To calculate the effects of variable distortion we use the Peierls-extended Hubbard Hamiltonian,

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \sigma} [-t_0 + \alpha\delta_{ij}](c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} + c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma}) + U \sum_i n_{i,\uparrow} n_{i,\downarrow} + \frac{1}{2}\kappa \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\delta_{ij} - d_0)^2 \quad (2')$$

where the  $\delta_{ij}$  are now self-consistently chosen to minimize the total energy, and thus depend on filling. In Fig. 4 we show the results of our calculation for the truncated tetrahedron.  $d_0$  and  $\kappa$  were chosen to depend on  $U$  such that the minimum energy distortion at  $N_{el}=N$  was independent of  $U$ :  $\delta_{ij}=0.1$  on the

Fig. 1. Geometries for which the pair binding energy has been calculated: (a) drum,  $N=8,10,12$ ; (b) twisted drum,  $N=8,10,12$ ; (c) truncated tetrahedron.

Fig. 2. Pairing in undistorted clusters for electrons (solid) and holes (dashed): (a,c,e) drums, (b,d,f) twisted drums, (g) truncated tetrahedron, (a,b)  $N=8$ , (c,d)  $N=10$ , (e,f,g)  $N=12$ . Note there are two regions, small and large  $U$ , where pairing can occur.

Fig. 3. Pair binding energies for the uniformly distorted truncated tetrahedron: (a) Peierls-distorted; (b) Jahn-Teller distorted. Notice the absence of pairing at small  $U$  in (b).

Fig. 4. Pair binding energies in the self-consistently distorted truncated tetrahedron. Note that the pairing is strongest at  $U=0$ .

triangular faces and  $\delta_{ij}=-0.2$  on the bonds connecting triangular faces. Using these values the self-consistent distortion for each filling was then found and the pairing as given in Eq. 1 calculated. Here, we find a greatly enhanced pairing, though maximum at  $U=0$  indicating again that it is driven by the Jahn-Teller distortion and not the electron-electron interaction (“bipolaronic” pairing).

### 3. Conclusions

We have calculated the pair-binding energy for a number of three dimensional molecules, and find the following. For an  $N$  site system, pairing at small  $U$  occurs only if the  $(N - 1)$  (or  $(N + 1)$ ) electron system has a strong tendency to have a Jahn-Teller distortion. This pairing is destroyed when a fixed Jahn-Teller distortion is introduced. Thus the mechanism of pairing in the undistorted cluster at small  $U$  in all these cases is related to the suppression of

Jahn-Teller distortion. Since the Jahn-Teller distortion results from the discrete level degeneracies in finite molecules, we conclude that the observed pairing in the small  $U$  region is a finite size effect.

Pairing at large  $U$  is unrelated to the tendency to have Jahn-Teller distortion [4], and is not necessarily accompanied by pairing at small  $U$ . The occurrence of such large  $U$  pairing in nonbipartite systems (*e.g.*, in a pentagonal prism) indicates that it is also apparently unrelated to antiferromagnetism. It may be related to energy level crossings. Currently we are investigating whether the large  $U$  pairing is also a finite size effect, and if so, the nature of the finite size effect.

The arguments here and in Ref. 4 indicate the absence of pairing in the two dimensional Hubbard model, as well as in weakly coupled layers. However, as  $C_{60}$  is a finite molecule, this “on-ball” pairing mechanism cannot be ruled out. Sawatzky [5] has argued, though, that since the long-range Coulomb interaction in a  $C_{60}$  molecule is essentially constant – for this finite system screening moves charge to the other side of the ball, not infinity, enhancing the long range interaction while suppressing the short range interaction – a (multi-orbital) Hubbard model where the “site” is a  $C_{60}$  in the molecular crystal rather than a C on an individual ball should be used. In this case the above conclusion that this pairing mechanism does not operate in infinite systems holds.

Finally, we note that the definition of pairing in Eq. 1 clearly is not synonymous with superconducting pairing; it may indicate *e.g.* phase segregation [4,6] instead. We also have not discussed the consequences of longer range Coulomb interactions. We note that  $V$  has been found to destroy pairing [2], though potentially it can be restored by other nearest neighbor Coulomb terms [7]. Clearly the effect of Jahn-Teller interactions must also be included before such conclusions can be considered final.

*Acknowledgements.* JTG was supported by a NRC-NRaD Research Associateship through grants from the ONR and DOE.

## REFERENCES

1. S. Chakravarty, M.P. Gelfand, and S. Kivelson, *Science* **254**, 970 (1991).
2. S.R. White, S. Chakravarty, M.P. Gelfand, and S.A. Kivelson, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 5062 (1992).
3. R.M. Fye, M.J. Martins, and R.T. Scalettar, *Phys. Rev. B* **42**, 6809 (1990).
4. F. Guo, D. Guo, K.C. Ung, S. Mazumdar, and J.T. Gammel, to appear in the Proceedings of the Discussion Meeting on Strongly Correlated Systems in Chemistry, Bangalore, India, 4-8 January 1993 (Springer) (cond-mat/9303003).
5. G.A. Sawatzky, these proceedings.
6. V.J. Emery, S.A. Kivelson, and H.Q. Lin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 475 (1990).
7. D.K. Campbell, private communication.