

# Hubbard model with $SU(4)$ symmetry

Eugene Pivovarov

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125

(February 13, 2017)

In the model considered, the nonlocal interaction of the fermions in different sublattices of a bipartite lattice is introduced. It can also be regarded as local interaction of fermions with opposite “hypercharge”. The corresponding term in the Hamiltonian is  $SU(4)$ -invariant and appears to be the most tractable version of the  $SO(5)$ -invariant model that unifies antiferromagnetic and  $d$ -wave superconducting order parameters. The model has been studied primarily in the weak interaction limit and in the mean field approximation. Near the half-filling the antiferromagnetic critical temperature has a peak. However, the superconducting transition takes place when the Fermi surface crosses the area where the density of states is of order of inverse coupling coefficient. Thus, in mean-field approximation, there exist an interval of values of the chemical potential, for which the system is a superconductor for arbitrary high temperatures. The temperature dependence of specific heat, Hall coefficient, and DC conductivity in the normal phase agrees with that experimentally observed in high- $T_c$  cuprates.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Fd, 74.20.Mn, 74.25.-q

## I. INTRODUCTION

Among the properties of the high- $T_c$  cuprates that have long defied explanation are the proximity of the antiferromagnetic (AF) and  $d$ -wave superconducting (dSC) phases below the critical temperature and the anomalous temperature dependence of kinetic and thermodynamic quantities above the transition point. A recently proposed concept of an  $SO(5)$  symmetry between AF and dSC phases<sup>1</sup> aims to explain the former as well as the resonance mode observed in spin-flip neutron scattering on YBCO.<sup>2</sup> Several groups<sup>3–5</sup> have constructed microscopic models with exact  $SO(5)$  symmetry, and it has been argued<sup>6</sup> that the two-dimensional (2D) Hubbard model has approximate  $SO(5)$  symmetry.

The properties of the microscopic models with symmetries higher than  $SO(5)$  were also investigated earlier. In Refs. 7,8 the large- $n$  limit of  $SU(n)$  model has been studied and  $1/n$  expansion has been applied. It has been found that in the strong coupling limit the ground state breaks translational symmetry and represents a density wave in which each site forms a dimer with one of its nearest neighbors. As the doping increases, a “kite” state with charge-density wave and no charge gaps forms. In the weak interaction limit the “flux” state with full translational symmetry and gap vanishing at discrete points in momentum space was predicted. However, it was shown that at large  $n$  the ground state does not have off-diagonal long range order.

In Ref. 9 an  $SO(6)$  model has been suggested, in which AF, dSC, and flux phase are unified. This and the subsequent work<sup>10</sup> have shown that the pinning of the Fermi level near a Van Hove singularity can explain the observed stripe phases<sup>11</sup> in cuprate superconductors.

This paper presents a study of a relatively simple two-leg ladder model that possesses  $SU(4)$  symmetry, which is higher than  $SO(5)$  symmetry. The introduced inter-

action favors the state, in which each rung is occupied by the pairs of fermions corresponding to the opposite legs of the ladder, or “flavors”. This model is associated directly to a 2D bipartite lattice, since each rung can be related to a site in one of the sublattices. Then one leg will be simply this sublattice, while the other leg will correspond to the second sublattice (Fig. 1). The choice of such a correspondence is not unique and it affects the form that the interaction takes after the transition from the two-leg ladder model to an equivalent 2D bipartite lattice.




FIG. 1. 2D two-leg ladder: black and white circles comprise the first and the second legs, respectively. Solid lines denote rungs.

The kinetic term on the two-leg ladder includes next-neighbor hopping along the legs. For the equivalent 2D bipartite lattice, in general case, the hopping between remote sites will appear on the second sublattice. However, there exist<sup>4</sup> such a correspondence between the ladder and the bipartite lattice so that the kinetic term on the

bipartite lattice will include only next-neighbor hopping. Furthermore, the kinetic term will be  $SU(4)$ -invariant only if each of the sublattices is bipartite as well. Then the corresponding two-leg ladder will be bipartite too, and its rungs can be enumerated so that even and odd rungs will belong to different subladders. It is the *bipartite 2D two-leg ladder* that is considered in this paper.

The studied model is of special interest not only because of its probable relationship to high- $T_c$  cuprates, but also due to the possibility to synthesize such ladders and explore them experimentally.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, one of the goals of the presented work is to derive the analytical expressions for the critical temperature of the transition, as well as for specific heat and for components of DC conductivity tensor in normal state. The calculation is performed in weak coupling limit and mean-field approximation, however, some of the results can be qualitatively extended to the strong coupling regime.

In this regime there are six possible phases that correspond to 15 generators of the algebra and the Casimir operator. The values of the operators alternate their signs at the nearest neighbor rungs, although not all of the phases are density waves. In presence of symmetry breaking terms, only AF and dSC states remain.

A peculiarity of the constructed model is that the interaction part of the Hamiltonian is being split into two terms with  $SO(4) \times U(1)$  symmetry that renormalize independently. Consequently, these terms correspond both to different conditions on phase transition and to the different kind of the transition (AF or dSC). In particular, it will be shown that in mean-field approximation the possibility of the dSC transition is determined by the value of chemical potential, but not by temperature, and therefore, *the system can be in the dSC state at arbitrary high temperatures*. This property is the direct consequence of the presence of  $SU(4)$ -invariant interaction in the model that attracts the fermions of different “flavors”.

## II. MODEL

In a two-leg ladder model each rung can have up to four fermions, differing in spin and “flavor”. This model is related to an equivalent 2D bipartite lattice if we assume that one flavor,  $c$ , corresponds to fermions on the first sublattice, while the other flavor,  $d$ , is a linear combination of the fermions on the second sublattice,  $d_\sigma(\mathbf{r}_j) = \sum_{\mathbf{r}'} \phi(\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}') c_\sigma(\mathbf{r}')$ , where  $\phi(\mathbf{r}) = 0$  for  $x+y$  even and  $j$  is labeling the sites within the first sublattice. In the important case<sup>4</sup> when  $\phi(\mathbf{r}) = (4/\pi)(x^2 - y^2)^{-1}$  for  $x+y$  odd, the operator  $c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} d_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$  takes the form of the dSC order parameter  $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = g_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{-\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ , where  $g_{\mathbf{k}} = \text{sign}(\cos k_x - \cos k_y)$  and the annihilation operators  $c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$  and  $c_{-\mathbf{k}\sigma}$  act on different sublattices.

The definition above leads to a number of important consequences. First, we can regard  $d$ -particles as well-defined fermions, since their creation and annihilation

operators obey canonical commutation relations. Second, the total number of  $d$ -fermions is equal to the number of fermions on the second sublattice. Third, in 2D case the contribution from the second sublattice to kinetic energy takes the same form as it written in terms of initial  $c$ -operators or newly defined  $d$ -operators. Thus, we conclude that  $d$ -fermions are the alternative representation of the second sublattice of the 2D bipartite lattice.

As it was mentioned in the introduction, we will assume that the two-leg ladder is bipartite. In order to simplify the construction of the Hamiltonian with explicit  $SU(4)$  symmetry, let us group the fermion operators on a rung into a 4-component operator

$$\Psi_j^\dagger = \left( c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger, c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger, (-1)^j d_{j\uparrow}, (-1)^j d_{j\downarrow} \right). \quad (2.1)$$

The terms that include only the scalar products of such operators are  $SU(4)$ -invariant. Those that involve the antisymmetric inner product  $\Psi_{j\alpha}^\dagger E_{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{j\beta}^\dagger$  reduce the symmetry of the group to  $Sp(4)$ , or equivalently,  $SO(5)$ . As we will see below, such terms bring about leg-to-leg hopping within a rung.

Consider a model with the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} + \mathcal{H}_C + \mathcal{H}_{\text{chem}} \quad (2.2)$$

Here the kinetic (hopping) and the scalar interaction terms are  $SU(4)$ -invariant:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = -t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \sigma} \left( c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + d_{i\sigma}^\dagger d_{j\sigma} \right) = -t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \Psi_i^\dagger \Psi_j \quad (2.3)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = U \sum_j Y_j^2 = U \sum_j \left( \Psi_j^\dagger \Psi_j - 2 \right)^2, \quad (2.4)$$

where the “hypercharge” operator  $Y_j = n_j^{(c)} - n_j^{(d)} = \Psi_j^\dagger \Psi_j - 2$ ,  $n_j^{(c)} = \sum_\sigma c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}$ , and  $n_j^{(d)} = \sum_\sigma d_{j\sigma}^\dagger d_{j\sigma}$ . Thus, different flavors have opposite hypercharge. Also note that the kinetic term is invariant only globally, since it contains scalar products of the operators on different rungs, while the interaction term is locally invariant as well.

The  $SU(4) \rightarrow SO(4) \times U(1)$  breaking terms are chemical potential and Coulomb interaction. The latter can be regarded also as dSC – AF anisotropy, as it can be expressed in terms of the square of the local spin operator:<sup>13</sup>

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{chem}} = -\mu_0 \sum_j n_j, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_C &= -\frac{4g}{3} \sum_j \left( \left| \mathbf{S}_j^{(c)} \right|^2 + \left| \mathbf{S}_j^{(d)} \right|^2 + n_j \right) \\ &= g \sum_j \left[ \left( n_j^{(c)} - 1 \right)^2 + \left( n_j^{(d)} - 1 \right)^2 - 2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Here  $n_j = n_j^{(c)} + n_j^{(d)}$ . One can also introduce the  $SU(4) \rightarrow SO(5)$  symmetry breaking terms so that their

combination with Eqs. (2.5,2.6) will finally reduce the symmetry to  $SO(3) \times U(1)$ . Such terms are the  $SO(5)$

“rotor”, or Casimir, operator and the inter-rung leg-to-leg hopping:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{rot}} = \frac{1}{2\chi} \sum_j \sum_{a < b} \mathcal{L}_{jab}^2 = \sum_j \left[ \frac{1}{2\chi} \left( n_j^{(c)} - 1 \right) \left( n_j^{(d)} - 1 \right) + \frac{2}{\chi} \mathbf{S}_j^{(c)} \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^{(d)} \right], \quad (2.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{hop}} &= -t' \sum_{j\sigma} \left[ 1 + \kappa \left( n_{j,-\sigma}^{(c)} - n_{j,-\sigma}^{(d)} \right)^2 \right] c_{j\sigma}^\dagger d_{j\sigma} \\ &\quad + h. c. \\ &= -t' \sum_{j\sigma} \left( 1 + \kappa \Psi_j^\dagger \Psi_j \right) \Psi_j^\dagger E \Psi_j + h. c., \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{jab}$  are the generators of  $SO(5)$  symmetry defined below in Eq. (2.10a),  $\mathbf{S}^{(c)} = \frac{1}{2} c^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma} c$ , and  $\mathbf{S}^{(d)} = \frac{1}{2} d^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma} d$ . In the absence of leg-to-leg hopping Eq. (2.8), the total hypercharge of the system  $\sum_j Y_j$  is a conserved quantity.

Finally, there exist a class of terms that break symmetry to  $SU(3)$ . They correspond to the presence of certain inhomogeneous magnetic field that takes different values on the sublattices. An example of such a term is  $-\mathbf{H}^{(c)} \cdot \mathbf{S}^{(c)}$ .

The free energy spectrum of both  $c$  and  $d$ -fermions is  $\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$ . The interaction term in Eq. (2.2) can be written as a sum of 15 generators of  $SO(6) \cong SU(4)$  so that  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$  becomes  $\sum_j \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int},j}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int},j} &= U \left[ 4 - \frac{1}{5} \sum_{a=0}^5 \sum_{b=a+1}^5 \left( \Psi_j^\dagger M_{ab} \Psi_j \right)^2 \right] \\ &= 4U \left( 1 - \frac{1}{5} \sum_{a=1}^5 \mathcal{N}_{ja}^2 - \frac{1}{5} \sum_{a=1}^5 \sum_{b=a+1}^5 \mathcal{L}_{jab}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Here  $M_{ab}$  are the generators of the matrix representation of  $SO(6)$  that acts on the space of 4-by-4 matrices by conjugation,  $\mathcal{L}_{ab}$  are the generators of the representation of  $SO(5)$  and  $\mathcal{N}_a$  is the corresponding superspin:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \Psi^\dagger M_{ab} \Psi \quad \text{for } a, b = 1 \dots 5, \quad (2.10a)$$

$$\mathcal{N}_a = \frac{1}{2} \Psi^\dagger M_{0a} \Psi \quad \text{for } a = 1 \dots 5. \quad (2.10b)$$

It is convenient to choose the following representation for  $M_{ab}$ :<sup>3</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} M_{0a} &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_a & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_a^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad a = 1, 2, 3, \\ M_{04} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i\sigma_y \\ i\sigma_y & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_{05} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_y \\ \sigma_y & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ M_{ab} &= -\frac{i}{2} [M_{0a}, M_{0b}], \quad a, b = 1 \dots 5. \end{aligned}$$

The physical meaning of the components is  $\mathcal{N}_a = (m_x, m_y, m_z, \text{Re}\Delta_{\mathbf{Q}}, \text{Im}\Delta_{\mathbf{Q}})^T$ , where antiferromagnetic order parameter  $\mathbf{m} = \frac{1}{2} (c^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma} c - d^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma} d)$ ,  $\Delta_{\mathbf{Q}} = \Delta \exp(-i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r})$ , dSC order parameter  $\Delta = ic\sigma_y d$ ,  $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi, \pi)$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_{ab}$  incorporates rung spin operator  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^{(c)} + \mathbf{S}^{(d)}$ ,  $\pi$ -operator  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\dagger = -\frac{1}{2} c^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma_y d^\dagger$ , and electric charge density  $Q = \frac{1}{2} (n^{(c)} + n^{(d)}) - 1$ . In the absence of  $SU(4)$  symmetry breaking, the components of  $\mathcal{L}_{ab}$  can also evolve into order parameters, such as ferromagnetic order parameter and  $\pi$ -wave superconducting order parameter. Note that if we formally replace  $d$ -operators in  $\Delta_{\mathbf{Q}}$  by  $c$ -operators, the result will coincide with the expression for the  $\eta$ -operator that generates  $SO(3)$  pseudospin symmetry in the standard Hubbard model.<sup>14</sup>

All 15 generators of  $SU(4)$  algebra can be regarded as components of a *superspin* that transforms according to the adjoint representation of  $SU(4)$ . Although the superspin is not the order parameter, it is directly related to one.

It is known from the theory of the 2D standard Hubbard model<sup>13</sup> that at half-filling below the transition point the density-wave state has lower ground energy than the spatially homogeneous state if the lattice is bipartite. In such a state the components of the superspin will alternate the sign at even and odd rungs. Thus, if the ladder (or each of the sublattices of the equivalent bipartite lattice) is bipartite, charge-density wave (CDW), spin-density wave (SDW), and dSC state are the only actually possible ordered phases at half-filling. In the *pure*  $SU(4)$  theory<sup>15</sup> there are totally six phases that can be classified by the type of order and the parity with respect to the exchange of  $c$  and  $d$ -particles. The table below displays the components of the superspin that vary as  $\cos(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r})$  for CDW and SDW states and the actual order parameters for the dSC states, according to such a classification:

Order	CDW	SDW	dSC
odd parity	$n^{(c)} - n^{(d)}$	$\mathbf{S}^{(c)} - \mathbf{S}^{(d)}$	$\Delta, \Delta^\dagger$
even parity	$n^{(c)} + n^{(d)} - 2$	$\mathbf{S}^{(c)} + \mathbf{S}^{(d)}$	$\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^\dagger$

(2.11)

Note that the odd parity CDW phase takes place only when the coupling  $U$  is negative, while the rest only when it is positive.

In the dSC states the components of the superspin vary as  $\cos(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r})$ , but due to the presence of  $(-1)^j$  factor in Eq. (2.1), these components (such as  $\Delta_{\mathbf{Q}}$ ) become naturally related to the quantities that are constant every-

where in the dSC state (such as  $\Delta$ ). The latter are the order parameters. In the case of CDW and SDW states, the order parameter is the amplitude of the variation, or the difference between the value of the superspin on even and odd rungs.

There are also 16 eigenstates of  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}$  [Eq. (2.9)] that can be labeled by the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{N}^2 = \sum_a \mathcal{N}_a^2$ ,  $\mathcal{L}^2 = \sum_a \sum_{b>a} \mathcal{L}_{ab}^2$ , rung spin component  $S_z$ , charge density  $Q$ , and hypercharge  $Y$  (Table I). The ground state of  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}$  is 6-fold degenerate, consisting of the state  $|\Omega\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} d_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} - c_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} d_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}) |0\rangle$  and its five transformations by the components of the  $SO(5)$  superspin. Therefore, in the ground state of the total interaction term  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$ , each rung is occupied only by  $c-d$  pairs.

The degeneracy of the ground state of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$  at half-filling includes the contributions from the states, in which every rung of the two-leg ladder is occupied by one  $c-d$  pair, and the states with some of the rungs being fully occupied and some empty, or in other words, with four-particle  $c-d$  Cooper pairs. In the absence of  $c-d$  Cooper pairs, the degeneracy of the ground state is one of standard Hubbard Hamiltonian,  $2^N$ , where  $N$  is a number of fermions on the lattice. Taking into account that  $k$  rungs can be empty and  $k$  rungs full, we can find the total degeneracy and express it in terms of hypergeometric function  $F \equiv {}_2F_1(a, b; c; x)$ :

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N/4} 2^{N-4k} \binom{N/2}{2k} \binom{2k}{k} = 2^N F\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{N}{4}, -\frac{N}{4}; 1; \frac{1}{4}\right),$$

and for large values of  $N$  this expression can be roughly approximated as  $5^{N/8} (8/N)^{1/2}$ .

In the strong coupling limit, the ground state is approximately one of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$  and we can derive the analog of the  $t-J$  model by computing the second-order correction to the kinetic term (as zero and first orders vanish in the ground state). Using the identity  $\mathbf{M}_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \mathbf{M}_{\gamma\delta} = 4\delta_{\alpha\delta}\delta_{\beta\gamma} - \delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\gamma\delta}$  and taking into account that  $Y_j = 0$  in the ground state of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$ , we find:

$$\mathcal{H}_{t-J} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} + J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (\mathcal{M}_i \cdot \mathcal{M}_j - \mathbf{t}_i^{\dagger} \cdot \mathbf{t}_j), \quad (2.12)$$

where  $J = t^2/U$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{j,ab} = \frac{1}{2} \Psi_j^{\dagger} M_{ab} \Psi_j$ , and  $\mathbf{t}_{j,ab} = \frac{1}{2} \Psi_j M_{ab} \Psi_j$ . Note that in the given representation for  $M_{ab}$  some of the components of  $\mathbf{t}_j$  vanish. The third term in Eq. (2.12) has a physical interpretation as pair hopping.

### III. CRITICAL TEMPERATURE

In this section we will use the temperature Green functions technique to derive the expression for the critical temperature of the phase transitions in the system with the Hamiltonian Eq. (2.2). The bare fermion

Green function is  $\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha\beta}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \delta_{\alpha\beta} / [i\omega_n - Y_{\alpha}(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu)]$ ,  $\omega_n = 2\pi(n + 1/2)k_B T$ , where Greek indices run from 1 to 4 and correspond to  $c_{\uparrow}$ ,  $c_{\downarrow}$ ,  $d_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}$ , and  $d_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}$ , respectively;  $Y_{\alpha} = +1$  for  $\alpha = 1, 2$ , and  $-1$  for  $\alpha = 3, 4$ . First, consider the case when  $g = 0$ . The antisymmetrized bare interaction vertex corresponds to the factor  $-\mathfrak{T}^{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2; \gamma_3, \gamma_4)}(k_1, k_2; k_3, k_4) = U(\delta_{\gamma_1 \gamma_4} \delta_{\gamma_2 \gamma_3} - \delta_{\gamma_1 \gamma_3} \delta_{\gamma_2 \gamma_4})$ , where the notation  $k = (\mathbf{k}, \omega)$  has been used.




FIG. 2. (a) Self-energy in one-loop order. (b) Correction to interaction vertex.

The chemical potential is  $\mu = \mu_0 + Y_{\alpha} \Sigma^{(\alpha, \alpha)}(0)$ , ( $\alpha = 1, \dots, 4$ ) where  $\Sigma^{(\alpha, \beta)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n)$  is the self-energy. The latter can be computed to one-loop order [Fig. 2(a)] and turns out to be a constant,  $\Sigma^{(\alpha, \beta)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n) = \Sigma^{(\alpha, \beta)}(0)$ . Therefore, in one-loop order the Green function does not change, since the correction to the single particle energy and one to the chemical potential cancel, hence, the Fermi level remains  $\varepsilon_F = \mu - Y_{\alpha} \Sigma^{(\alpha, \alpha)}(0) = \mu_0$ . The corresponding density of states can be found from the expression for the free-particle energy  $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$  and near the zero energy level  $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$  it diverges logarithmically:

$$\rho(\varepsilon) \simeq \text{sign}(\varepsilon) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{2t} \left[ 4 \ln \left( \frac{|\varepsilon|}{8t} \right) - 2.75 \right], \quad |\varepsilon| \ll 2t. \quad (3.1)$$

Next we allow  $g$  to take a small nonzero value. Then it is necessary to split  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$  Eq. (2.4) into a sum of two terms so that one of them will be similar to the Coulomb term Eq. (2.6). Introduce two vectors  $P^{(1)}$  and  $P^{(2)}$  defined as follows:  $P_{\alpha}^{(1)} = 1$  for  $\alpha = 1, 2$  and 0 for  $\alpha = 3, 4$  and  $P_{\alpha}^{(2)} = 1 - P_{\alpha}^{(1)}$ . Then each term in Eq. (2.9) can be represented as  $(\Psi_j^{\dagger} M_{ab} \Psi_j)^2 = \tilde{h}_{j,ab}^{(1)} + \tilde{h}_{j,ab}^{(2)}$ , where  $\tilde{h}_{j,ab}^{(1)} = \mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(1)2} + \mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(2)2}$ ,  $\tilde{h}_{j,ab}^{(2)} = 2\mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(1)} \mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(2)}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(i)} = \Psi_j^{\dagger} M_{ab}^{(i)} \Psi_j$ , and  $M_{ab}^{(i)} \equiv M_{ab} \cdot P^{(i)}$ . Thus,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} + \mathcal{H}_C = -\frac{1}{5} (U + g) \sum_j \sum_{a>b} (\mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(1)2} + \mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(2)2}) - \frac{U}{5} \sum_j \sum_{a>b} 2\mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(1)} \mathcal{M}_{j,ab}^{(2)}, \quad (3.2)$$

up to an additive constant. In the diagrammatic calculations, the vertices  $\mathfrak{T}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathfrak{T}^{(2)}$ , corresponding to the first and the second terms in Eq. (3.2) respectively, satisfy the identities  $\mathfrak{T}^{(z)} = \mathfrak{T} \circ \mathcal{U}^{(z)}$ ,  $z = 1, 2$ , where  $(A \circ B)^{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2; \gamma_3, \gamma_4)} \equiv \sum_{\beta_1 \beta_2} A^{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2; \beta_1, \beta_2)} B^{(\beta_1, \beta_2; \gamma_3, \gamma_4)}$ , and  $\mathcal{U}^{(z)(\gamma_1, \gamma_2; \gamma_3, \gamma_4)}$  are antisymmetric with respect to the interchange  $\gamma_1 \leftrightarrow \gamma_2$  and  $\gamma_3 \leftrightarrow \gamma_4$  and are defined by the components:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}^{(1)(12;12)} &= \frac{1}{2}, \quad \mathcal{U}^{(1)(34;34)} = \frac{1}{2}, \\ \mathcal{U}^{(2)(13;13)} &= \frac{1}{2}, \quad \mathcal{U}^{(2)(14;14)} = \frac{1}{2}, \\ \mathcal{U}^{(2)(23;23)} &= \frac{1}{2}, \quad \mathcal{U}^{(2)(24;24)} = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the components of  $\mathcal{U}^{(z)}$  that remain undetermined after antisymmetrization are zero. Then it follows that  $\mathcal{U}^{(z)}$  and  $\mathfrak{T}^{(z)}$  have the following properties:  $\mathcal{U}^{(1)} \circ \mathcal{U}^{(2)} = 0$ ,  $\mathfrak{T}^{(z)} \circ \mathcal{U}^{(z)} = \mathcal{U}^{(z)} \circ \mathfrak{T}^{(z)} = \mathfrak{T}^{(z)}$ ,  $\mathfrak{T}^{(z)} \circ \mathfrak{T}^{(z)} = (U^{(z)}/5)^2 \mathcal{U}^{(z)}$ , where  $U^{(1)} = U + g$  and  $U^{(2)} = U$ .

In order to calculate the critical temperature, we need to evaluate the effect of the renormalization of  $\mathfrak{T}_{ab}^{(z)}$  by the next-order corrections. There are three of them in the second order, and for the purpose of the calculation of interest, the primary contribution is given by [Fig. 2(b)]

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ab}^{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2; \gamma_3, \gamma_4)}(k_1, k_2; k_3, k_4) &= k_B T \sum_{\omega_q} \int \frac{d^2 q}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_{\beta_1 \beta_2} \mathfrak{T}_{ab}^{(\beta_1, \beta_2; \gamma_3, \gamma_4)}(q, s - q; k_3, k_4) \\ &\times \mathfrak{T}_{ab}^{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2; \beta_1, \beta_2)}(k_1, k_2; s - q, q) \mathfrak{G}_{\beta_1 \beta_1}^{(0)}(q) \mathfrak{G}_{\beta_2 \beta_2}^{(0)}(s - q), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 = \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_4$  and  $\omega_s = \omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega_3 + \omega_4$  are small. By considering simultaneously the corrections to the vertex  $(U/5)\mathcal{U}^{(z)}$  and taking into account that  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$  includes the sum over 15 generators [Eq. (2.9)], we find the expressions for the complete vertices,  $\mathfrak{T}_{ab}^{(z)} = \mathfrak{T}_{ab}^{(z)} / (1 - \sqrt{3/5} U^{(z)} \kappa^{(z)})$ ,  $z = 1, 2$ , where

$$\kappa^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2 q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\tanh\left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) - \mu_0}{2k_B T}\right)}{\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) - \mu_0}, \quad (3.4a)$$

$$\kappa^{(2)} = \rho(\mu_0). \quad (3.4b)$$

At critical temperature some of the complete vertices  $\mathfrak{T}_c^{(z)}$  diverge. It takes place when either of the following conditions is satisfied:

$$k_B T_c \simeq 2tD \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}} \frac{\pi^2}{\ln\left(\frac{2t}{|\mu_0|}\right)} \frac{2t}{U+g}\right), \quad \frac{k_B T_c}{2t} \ll \frac{|\mu_0|}{2t} \ll 1, \quad (3.6a)$$

$$\simeq 2tD \left(\frac{|\mu_0|}{2t}\right)^{3/8}, \quad \frac{|\mu_0|}{2t} \ll \frac{k_B T_c}{2t} \ll 1, \quad (3.6b)$$

$$\simeq \left(\frac{3}{5}\right)^{1/2} \frac{U+g}{4}, \quad \frac{k_B T_c}{2t} \gg 1, \quad (3.6c)$$

where  $D = \gamma^{21/4}/\pi^{1/2} \approx 0.387$  and  $\gamma \approx 0.577$  is Euler's constant. We see that if  $|\mu_0| \simeq 2tD^{8/5}$ , the critical temperature can be as high as the difference between the Fermi level and the zero energy level  $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$ . For temper-

The divergence of  $\mathfrak{T}_c^{(1)}$  can be regarded as one of the Coulomb term  $\mathcal{H}_C$ , even if initially the latter was neglected. It implies that the corresponding transition is antiferromagnetic. Therefore, Eq. (3.5a) is the condition on AF transition and, similarly, Eq. (3.5b) is one on dSC transition. The integral in the right-hand side of Eq. (3.4a) can be evaluated (see Appendix), which gives the value of the critical temperature of AF transition:

atures higher than  $2t$  the critical temperature attains the value Eq. (3.6c), although this assumes that  $U/2t \gg 1$  and therefore can not be regarded as a rigorous solution. However, the latter result allows one to make a quali-

tative conclusion that in the strong coupling limit the critical temperature is of order of  $U$ .

Eq. (3.5b) appears to be an equation on the critical value of chemical potential  $\mu_{0c}$  so that the transition takes place at small values of  $\mu_0$ . This has to do with the fact that in one-loop order the density of states is diverging at the zero energy level and this is why Eq. (3.5b) can be solved for  $\mu_{0c}$  for arbitrary weak interaction  $U$ . In next orders the density of states will likely to become finite and the peak will decrease with temperature, therefore, the equation (3.5b) will evolve into one on the critical temperature for the dSC transition.

Finally, by explicitly diagonalizing the mean-field Hamiltonian,<sup>13</sup> one can find the spectrum of the excitations below critical temperature and the gap. For the AF transition, i.e., when one of the components of the superspin varies as  $\langle N_j \rangle = -(5/8U) N_0 \cos(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r})$ , where  $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi, \pi)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , or  $3$ , the Hamiltonian eigenvalues are  $E_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \mu \pm (\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + N_0^2/4)^{1/2}$  (double degenerate). Similarly, for dSC transition ( $j = 4$  or  $5$ ), there are four branches,  $E_{\pm}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = [(\mu \pm \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})^2 + N_0^2/4]^{1/2}$  and  $E_{\pm}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}) = -E_{\pm}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$ . In the purely  $SU(4)$  case<sup>15</sup>  $\mu = g = 0$ , the gap is equal  $N_0 = (8\pi/e)t \exp(-5\pi t/U)$ .

#### IV. SPECIFIC HEAT AND ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY

The calculation in the previous section shows that in the mean-field approximation for a certain interval of the values of chemical potential the system is in dSC state at all temperatures. Certainly, if we included higher orders into our calculation, there would appear finite critical temperature. Although, strictly speaking, we have not shown existence of a transition to the normal phase as temperature increases, we can nonetheless consider the study of such a phase as a separate problem.

The most interesting case is when the critical temperature for the dSC transition is of order or higher than hopping  $t$ . Then the normal state becomes automatically the high-temperature regime for the gas of fermions, which dramatically changes the temperature dependence of kinetic and thermodynamic quantities.

The high-temperature limit of specific heat can be computed using the formula:<sup>16</sup>

$$c_V = \frac{1}{2(k_B T)^2} \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\omega \omega^2 \text{Im} \left[ G_R^{-1} \frac{\partial G_R}{\partial \omega} \right]_{\omega=0} = \frac{1}{2(k_B T)^2} \int d\varepsilon \varepsilon^2 \rho(\varepsilon), \quad (4.1)$$

where  $G_R(\omega, \mathbf{k})$  is the retarded Green function. Thus,  $c_V \propto (t/T)^2$  for  $k_B T \gg t$ .

The DC conductivity can be derived from Kubo formula. In the large relaxation time approximation  $\tau t \gg 1$ ,

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{e^2}{2\hbar^2 a} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\varepsilon K(\varepsilon - \mu) \rho_1(\varepsilon), \quad (4.2)$$

$$K(\varepsilon - \mu) \simeq 2\tau \sum_{\alpha} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega \left( -\frac{\partial f_F}{\partial \omega} \right) \times A(\omega - Y_{\alpha}(\varepsilon - \mu)),$$

$$\rho_1(\varepsilon) = \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \left( \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_x} \right)^2 \delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}),$$

where the spectral weight  $A(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im}(\omega + i/2\tau)^{-1}$ ,  $a$  is a lattice constant for the sublattices, and  $\tau$  is the relaxation time.

In order to analyze the Hall effect, it is necessary to modify the kinetic term in the Hamiltonian by taking into account the presence of weak magnetic field:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \sum_{\alpha\sigma} \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \left( -te^{ik_x} c_{\alpha\sigma\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} c_{\alpha\sigma, \mathbf{k}_x, k_y - b_{\alpha}} - te^{-ik_x} c_{\alpha\sigma, \mathbf{k}_x, k_y - b_{\alpha}}^{\dagger} c_{\alpha\sigma\mathbf{k}} - 2t \cos k_y c_{\alpha\sigma\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} c_{\alpha\sigma\mathbf{k}} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $b_a = Y_a b$ ,  $b = |e| a^2 B_z / \hbar c$ , and we have assumed that the carriers are negative-charged. The  $xy$  component of the conductivity tensor is

$$\sigma_{xy} = -\frac{2|e|^3 a B_z}{3\hbar^4 c} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\varepsilon 2\tau K(\varepsilon - \mu) \rho_2(\varepsilon), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\rho_2(\varepsilon) = \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \left( \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial k_x} \right)^2 \frac{\partial^2 \varepsilon}{\partial k_y^2} \delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}),$$

and the Hall coefficient  $R_H = \sigma_{xy}/\sigma_{xx}^2$ . In the high-temperature limit  $k_B T \gg t$ , the derivative of the Fermi function  $\partial f_F / \partial \omega \simeq 1/4k_B T$  and consequently, in the same approximation as in the previous section, we find

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{e^2}{\hbar^2 a} \frac{t^2 \tau}{k_B T}, \quad (4.5a)$$

$$\sigma_{xy} = -\frac{8|e|^3 a B_z}{3\hbar^4 c} \frac{t^3 \tau^2}{k_B T}, \quad (4.5b)$$

$$R_H = -\frac{8a^3 B_z}{3|e|c} \frac{k_B T}{t}. \quad (4.5c)$$

As we can see, the Hall coefficient increases linearly with temperature. On the contrary, in the low-temperature limit, we recover the usual linear dependence of specific heat and weak parabolic dependence of DC resistivity on temperature as well as no dependence of the Hall coefficient on temperature.

#### V. CONCLUSION

I have studied the model on a 2D bipartite lattice, which is equivalent to the two-leg ladder, that includes interaction of fermions from opposite sublattices. The corresponding term in the Hamiltonian is  $SU(4)$ -invariant.

The symmetry breaking factors include chemical potential and Coulomb interaction. Fermions that belong to different sublattices have opposite “hypercharge”, a symmetry-related quantum number. In the absence of leg-to-leg hopping the total hypercharge of the system conserves.

The physical meaning of the components of the order parameter is slightly different from those given in Ref. 1, primarily in that the ground state of the “antiferromagnetic” phase is actually a density wave with varying rung Néel vector. In the strong  $SU(4)$  interaction limit, the degeneracy of the ground state is higher than one of the standard Hubbard model and the Hamiltonian resembles one of  $t - J$  model, but also includes a pair hopping term with operators similar to those introduced in Ref. 17.

The condition on the phase transition has been evaluated in one-loop order in weak interaction limit. It leads to the equation on critical temperature for the AF transition. However, for the dSC transition, it depends on the density of states at the Fermi level, but not on temperature. In the latter case, the dependence on temperature will probably appear in the next orders of perturbation, but the resulting value of critical temperature will be still abnormally high. Furthermore, if we formally consider the strong coupling limit in the derived formulae, the condition on dSC transition will be always satisfied, except when the Fermi surface lies in the area where the density of states is smaller than a threshold value of order of inverse coupling coefficient. Since the density of states will have a drop at the zero energy level, the AF transition will occur near to half-filling and dSC transition away from half-filling. When chemical potential  $\mu_0 = 0$ , no transition at finite temperatures takes place due to the Mermin – Wagner theorem.

The fact that the critical temperature of the dSC transition can be of order or higher than hopping implies that in the normal state the gas of fermions will no longer resemble the usual zero-temperature Fermi liquid with discontinuity of the distribution function at the Fermi surface. The distribution function will almost linearly de-

crease with energy, which will result in abnormal temperature dependence of all experimentally measured characteristics. In particular, specific heat will be inverse proportional to the square of the temperature, and the DC electrical resistivity and the Hall coefficient will be linearly proportional to the temperature. Such dependence agrees with experimental data on high- $T_c$  cuprates.<sup>18</sup>

I would like to thank Prof. J. Preskill, S.-C. Zhang, and P. Weichman for useful discussions and K. Yang for comments. This work is supported in part by U. S. Dept. of Energy under grant no. DE-FG03-92-ER 40701.

## APPENDIX:

In this Appendix the integral that appears in the right-hand side of Eq. (3.4a) is evaluated:

$$I = \int_0^\pi \frac{dk_x}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{dk_y}{2\pi} \frac{\tanh\left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) - \mu_0}{2k_B T_c}\right)}{\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) - \mu_0}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

First, we make a substitution  $k_+ = (k_x + k_y)/2$ ,  $k_- = (k_x - k_y)/2$  and expand the energy in terms of  $k_+$  about the Fermi level  $\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) = \mu_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) - \mu_0 &\simeq -\sqrt{(4t \cos k_-)^2 - \mu_0} \\ &\times \left[ k_+ - \arccos\left(\frac{\mu_0}{4t \cos k_-}\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

In the limit of  $\mu_0/2t \rightarrow 0$ , the integral  $I$  diverges logarithmically. The internal integral can be taken by parts, which results in a logarithmic part and a convergent integral. In the latter the limits can be replaced by  $\pm\infty$ . Then there will be a region of integration at  $k_x = 0$ ,  $k_y = \pi/2$  that will not be covered and a symmetric region that will be covered twice. However, the expression in the integral takes the same value in both regions, therefore the result remains unchanged and after the limit replacement no corrections will be necessary:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2} \arccos(\frac{\mu_0}{2t} - 1)} \frac{dk_-}{\sqrt{(4t \cos k_-)^2 - \mu_0}} \ln \left\{ \left[ \pi + \arccos\left(\frac{\mu_0}{4t \cos k_-}\right) - k_- \right] \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left[ \arccos\left(\frac{\mu_0}{4t \cos k_-}\right) - k_- \right] \left[ (4t \cos k_-)^2 - \mu_0 \right] \left( \frac{\gamma}{\pi k_B T} \right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Here Euler’s constant  $\gamma \approx 0.577$  and  $\mu_0$  is assumed to be positive. Furthermore, Eq. (A1) does not depend on the sign of  $\mu_0$ , thus, we can replace  $\mu_0$  by  $|\mu_0|$ . The asymptotic expansion at  $|\mu_0|/2t \rightarrow 0$  is

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 t} \ln\left(\frac{2t}{|\mu_0|}\right) \ln\left(\frac{\gamma^{2^{1/4}}}{\pi^{1/2}} \frac{2t}{k_B T}\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{32\pi^2 t} \ln\left(\frac{2t}{|\mu_0|}\right)^2 + O\left[\left(\frac{|\mu_0|}{2t}\right)^0\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

- 
- <sup>1</sup> S.-C. Zhang, Science **275**, 1089 (1997)  
<sup>2</sup> H. F. Fong *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 316 (1995)  
<sup>3</sup> D. Scalapino, S.-C. Zhang, and W. Hanke, cond-mat/9711117  
<sup>4</sup> C. L. Henley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3590 (1998)  
<sup>5</sup> C. P. Burgess, J. M. Cline, R. MacKenzie, and R. Ray, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 8549 (1998)  
<sup>6</sup> S. Meixner, W. Hanke, E. Demler, and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4902 (1997)  
<sup>7</sup> I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 966 (1985)  
<sup>8</sup> J. B. Marston and I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 11538 (1989)  
<sup>9</sup> R. S. Markiewicz and M. T. Vaughn, cond-mat/9709137  
<sup>10</sup> R. S. Markiewicz, C. Kusko, and M. T. Vaughn, cond-mat/9807067  
<sup>11</sup> J. M. Tranquada *et al.*, Nature **375**, 561 (1995)

- <sup>12</sup> E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice, Science **271**, 618 (1996)  
<sup>13</sup> E. Fradkin, *Field theories of condensed matter systems* (Addison-Wesley, New York, 1994)  
<sup>14</sup> C. N. Yang and S. C. Zhang, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **4**, 759 (1990)  
<sup>15</sup> The pure  $SU(4)$  case has to be regarded as a limit of vanishing chemical potential, since, strictly speaking, talking about long range order in such a case does not make sense by virtue of Mermin – Wagner theorem. However, dSC order may exist even if  $\mu_0 = 0$  due to the Kosterlitz – Thouless transition. I am grateful to Prof. S.-C. Zhang for this remark.  
<sup>16</sup> A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gorkov, and I. E. Dzyaloshinski, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics* (Dover, New York, 1963)  
<sup>17</sup> S. Sachdev and R. N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 9323 (1990)  
<sup>18</sup> *Physical Properties of High Temperature Superconductors*, edited by D. M. Ginsberg (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989)

TABLE I. Classification of the eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_{\text{int}}$ .

state	$\mathcal{N}^2$	$\mathcal{L}^2$	$Q$	$S_z$	$Y$	$E_{\text{int}}/U$
$ \Omega\rangle$	20	0	0	0	0	0
$(N_1 + iN_2) \Omega\rangle$	4	16	0	2	0	0
$(N_1 - iN_2) \Omega\rangle$	4	16	0	-2	0	0
$N_3 \Omega\rangle$	4	16	0	0	0	0
$(N_4 + iN_5) \Omega\rangle$	4	16	2	0	0	0
$(N_4 - iN_5) \Omega\rangle$	4	16	-2	0	0	0
$c_{\uparrow} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	1	-1	-1	1
$c_{\downarrow} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	1	1	-1	1
$d_{\uparrow} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	1	-1	1	1
$d_{\downarrow} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	1	1	1	1
$c_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	-1	1	1	1
$c_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	-1	-1	1	1
$d_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	-1	1	-1	1
$d_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \Omega\rangle$	5	10	-1	-1	-1	1
$\Psi E \Psi  \Omega\rangle$	0	0	0	0	-2	4
$\Psi^{\dagger} E \Psi^{\dagger}  \Omega\rangle$	0	0	0	0	2	4