PHZ7427:Solid State II

 $\bigodot {\rm Peter}$ Hirschfeld 2021

July 12, 2023

Contents

1	In	troduction 5			
	1.1	1 Goals in this course			
	1.2	Statistical mechanics of free Fermi gas	5		
		1.2.1 $T = 0$ Fermi sea	5		
		1.2.2 $T > 0$ Free energy	6		
		1.2.3 Avg. fermion number	7		
		1.2.4 Fermi gas at low T.	8		
		1.2.5 Classical limit.	9		
	1.3	Second quantization	10		
		1.3.1 Symmetry of many-particle wavefunctions	11		
		1.3.2 Field operators	12		
		1.3.3 2nd-quantized Hamiltonian	14		
		1.3.4 Schrödinger, Heisenberg, interaction representations	16		
	1.4	Phonons	17		
		1.4.1 Review of simple harmonic oscillator quantization	17		
		1.4.2 1D harmonic chain	18		
		1.4.3 Debye Model	20		
		1.4.4 Anharmonicity & its consequences	21		
0	$\mathbf{E}\mathbf{I}$	lectron-electron interactions	7		
4	1 21	Mean field theory (Hartree-Fock)	2-±		
	2.1	Vican field theory (fractice-rock)	20		
		2.1.1 Valuety of Hartree-Fock theory	21		
	2.1.2 Froblem with Hartree-Fock theory		20 20		
	2.2	221 Elementary treatment	29 20		
		2.2.1 Elementary treatment	29 20		
		2.2.2 Rubb formula	34 24		
		2.2.5 Correlation functions	04 25		
		2.2.4 Dielectric constant	36		
			90		

		2.2.6	Thomas-Fermi theory	38
	2.2.7 Friedel oscillations			38
		2.2.8	Plasmons	39
	2.3 Fermi liquid theory		ni liquid theory	41
		2.3.1	Particle-hole excitations	42
		2.3.2	Quasiparticles and quasiholes in interacting system	43
		2.3.3	Energy of quasiparticles	45
		2.3.4	Residual quasiparticle interactions	46
		2.3.5	Local energy of a quasiparticle	49
		2.3.6	Thermodynamic properties	50
		2.3.7	Quasiparticle relaxation time and transport properties	51
		2.3.8	Effective mass m^* of quasiparticles	53
3	Qı	uant	um Magnetism	55
	3.1 Introduction		oduction	55
		3.1.1	Atomic magnetic Hamiltonian	55
		3.1.2	Curie Law-free spins	56
		3.1.3	Magnetic interactions	57
3.2 Ising model		g model	62	
		3.2.1	Phase transition/critical point	62
		3.2.2	1D solution by transfer matrix	65
		3.2.2 3.2.3	1D solution by transfer matrix	65 65
	3.3	3.2.2 3.2.3 Feri	1D solution by transfer matrix	65 65 65

3.3	Ferromagnetic magnons	65
	3.3.1 Holstein-Primakoff transformation	65
	3.3.2 Linear spin wave theory	66
	3.3.3 Dynamical Susceptibility	68
3.4	Quantum antiferromagnet	70
	3.4.1 Antiferromagnetic magnons	72
	3.4.2 Quantum fluctuations in the ground state	74
	3.4.3 Nonlinear spin wave theory	77
	3.4.4 Frustrated models	77
3.5	1D & 2D Heisenberg magnets	77
	3.5.1 Mermin-Wagner theorem	77
	3.5.2 1D: Bethe solution	77
	3.5.3 2D: Brief summary	77
3.6	Itinerant magnetism	77
3.7 Stoner model for magnetism in metals		77
	3.7.1 Moment formation in itinerant systems	80
	3.7.2 RKKY Interaction	82
	3.7.3 Kondo model	82

4	\mathbf{El}	ectron-phonon interaction 8	86
	4.1	Hamiltonian	86
		4.1.1 Derivation of e^- -ph coupling	87
		4.1.2 Jellium model	89
		4.1.3 Screening.	89
	4.2	Polarons	91
		4.2.1 Polaron in 1D	91
	4.3	Bloch resistivity	93
	4.4	Effective $e^ e^-$ interaction	93
5	Su	perconductivity 9	94
0	51	Phenomenology	94
	5.2	Electron-phonon interaction	96
	5.3	Cooper problem	97
	5.4	Pair condensate & BCS Wavefetn	100
	5.5	BCS Model	101
	0.0	551 BCS wave function, gauge invariance, and number conservation.	101
		5.5.2 Is the BCS order parameter general?	102
	5.6	Thermodynamics	104
	0.0	5.6.1 Bogoliubov transformation	104
		5.6.2 Density of states	105
		5.6.3 Critical temperature	106
		5.6.4 Specific heat.	108
	5.7	Electrodynamics	108
		5.7.1 Linear response to vector potential	108
		5.7.2 Meissner Effect.	110
		5.7.3 Dynamical conductivity.	113
	5.8	GL Free Energy	114
	5.9	Type I and Type II superconductivity	119
	5.10	Vortex Lattice	124
	5.11	Properties of Single Vortex. Lower critical field H_{c1}	127
	5.12	Josephson Effect	130
6	To	pological States of Matter 13	35
	6.1	Introduction	135
	6.2	Berry phase, connection, curvature and all that	136
	6.3	Berry curvature of Bloch Bands	138
	6.4	Integer Quantum Hall Effect	141
	6.5	Graphene	145
	6.6	Quantum spin Hall effect and Kane-Mele model	149
		6.6.1 $S^z = 1^{}$	151

	6.6.2 $S^z = -1$	153
6.7	Edge states	154
6.8	Topological character of new insulating phase	156
6.9	Kitaev model for 1D topological SC	157

1 Introduction

1.1 Goals in this course

These are my hopes for the course. Let me know if you feel the course is not fulfilling them for you. Be free with your criticism & comments! Thanks.

- Teach basics of collective phenomena in electron systems
- Make frequent reference to real experiment and data
- Use 2nd quantized notation without field-theoretical techniques
- Get all students reading basic CM journals
- Allow students to practice presenting a talk
- Allow students to bootstrap own research if possible

1.2 Statistical mechanics of free Fermi gas

1.2.1 T = 0 Fermi sea

Start with simple model of electrons in metal, neglecting $e^- - e^-$ interactions. Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = -\sum_{j} \frac{\hbar^2 \nabla_j^2}{2m}, \quad j = 1, \dots N \text{ particles}$$
 (1)

Eigenstates of each $-(\hbar^2 \nabla^2/2m)$ are just plane waves $e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$ labelled by \mathbf{k} , with $k_i = 2\pi n_i/L_i$ in box with periodic B.C. Recall electrons are fermions, which means we can only put one in each single-particle state. Including spin we can put two particles $(v \downarrow)$ in each \mathbf{k} -state. At zero temperature the ground state of N-electron system is then formed by adding particles until we run out of electrons. Energy is $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \hbar^2 k^2/2m$, so start with two in lowest state k = 0, then add two to next states, with k_x or k_y or $k_z = 2\pi/L$, etc. as shown. Energy of highest particle called "Fermi energy" ε_F , magnitude of corresponding wave vector called k_F . Typical Fermi energy for metal $\varepsilon_F \simeq 1 eV \simeq 10^4 K$. At T = 0 only states with $k < k_F$ occupied (Fermi "sea" or Fermi sphere), so we can write density of electrons as 2^{*}#</sup> occupied states/Volume (2 is for spin):

$$n = \frac{2}{L^3} \sum_{k=0}^{k_F} \simeq 2 \int_{k < k_F} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F} k^2 dk = \frac{k_F^3}{3\pi^2}$$
(2)

 \mathbf{SO}

$$k_F = (3\pi^2 n)^{1/3}$$
 or $\varepsilon_F = \frac{\hbar^2 (3\pi^2 n)^{2/3}}{2m}$ (3)

in other words, nothing but the density of electrons controls the Fermi energy.



Figure 1: States of Fermi gas with parabolic spectrum, $\varepsilon = k^2/2m$.

The total ground state energy of the Fermi gas must be of order ε_F , since there is no other energy in the problem. If we simply add up the energies of all particles in states up to Fermi level get

$$\frac{E}{L^3} = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F} dk \ k^2 \left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m}\right) = \frac{\hbar^2 k_F^5}{10\pi^2 m} \tag{4}$$

and the ground state energy per particle $(N = nL^3$ is the total number) is

$$\boxed{\frac{E}{N} = \frac{3}{5}\varepsilon_F}.$$
(5)

1.2.2 T > 0 Free energy.

Reminder: partition function for free fermions in grnd conical ensemble is

$$Z = \operatorname{Tr} e^{-\beta(\hat{H}-\mu\hat{N})} \tag{6}$$

$$= \sum_{n_1, n_2 \dots n_{k_{\infty}}} \langle n_1, n_2 \dots n_{\infty} | e^{-\beta(\hat{H} - \mu \hat{N})} | n_1, n_2 \dots n_{\infty} \rangle$$
(7)

$$= \sum_{n_1, n_2...n_{\infty}} \langle n_1, n_2...n_{\infty} | e^{-\beta (\sum_i [\varepsilon_i n_i - \mu n_i])} | n_1, n_2...n_{\infty} \rangle$$
(8)

where *i* labels single-fermion state, e.g. $i = \mathbf{k}, \sigma$, and n_i runs from 0 to 1 for fermions. Since many-fermion state in occ. no. representation is simple product: $|n_1, n_2...n_{\infty}\rangle = |n_1\rangle|n_2\rangle...|n_{\infty}\rangle$, can factorize:

$$Z = \left(\sum_{n_1} e^{-\beta[\varepsilon_1 n_1 - \mu n_1]}\right) \cdots \left(\sum_{n_\infty} e^{-\beta[\varepsilon_\infty n_\infty - \mu n_\infty]}\right),\tag{9}$$

$$Z = \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(1 + e^{-\beta(\varepsilon_i - \mu)} \right)$$
(10)

Since the free energy (grand canonical or thermodynamic potential) is $\Omega = -k_B T \log Z$, with independent variables (T, V, μ) we get

$$\Omega = -k_B T \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \log \left(1 + e^{-\beta(\varepsilon_i - \mu)} \right)$$
(11)

which has the differential

$$d\Omega = -SdT - PdV - Nd\mu \tag{12}$$

$$S = -\left(\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial T}\right)_{V,\mu} \qquad P = -\left(\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial V}\right)_{T,\mu} \qquad N = -\left(\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\mu}\right)_{T,V}.$$
(13)

1.2.3 Avg. fermion number.

We may want to take statistical averages of quantum operators, for which we need the statistical operator $\hat{\rho} = Z^{-1}e^{-\beta(\hat{H}-\mu\hat{N})}$. Then any operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ has an expectation value $\langle \hat{\mathcal{O}} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}\hat{\mathcal{O}})$. For example, avg. no. of particles

$$\langle \hat{N} \rangle = \operatorname{Tr}(\rho \hat{N}) \tag{14}$$

$$= \frac{\operatorname{Tr}(e^{-\beta(\hat{H}-\mu\hat{N})}N)}{\operatorname{Tr}(e^{-\beta(\hat{H}-\mu\hat{N})})}$$
(15)

Now note this is related to the derivative of Ω wrt chem. potential μ :

$$\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\mu} = -k_B T \frac{\partial\log Z}{\partial\mu} = \frac{-k_B T}{Z} \frac{\partial Z}{\partial\mu}$$
(16)

$$= -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho \hat{N}) = -\langle \hat{N} \rangle \tag{17}$$

and using Eq. 11, we see

$$\langle \hat{N} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta(\varepsilon_i - \mu)}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} n_i^0 \tag{18}$$

where n_0^i is the avg. number of fermions in a single-particle state *i* in equilibrium at temperature *T*. If we recall *i* was a shorthand for \mathbf{k}, σ , but $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ doesn't depend on σ , we get Fermi-Dirac distribution function

$$n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{0} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu)}}$$
(19)

1.2.4 Fermi gas at low T.

Since the Fermi energy of metals is so high (~ $10^4 K$), it's important to understand the limit $k_B T \ll \varepsilon_F$, where the Fermi gas is nearly degenerate, and make sure the classical limit $k_B T \gg \varepsilon_F$ comes out right too. Let's calculate, for example, the entropy and specific heat, which can be obtained from the thermodynamic potential Ω via the general thermodynamic relations

$$S = -\left(\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial T}\right)_{V,\mu}; \quad C_V = T\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial T}\right)_{V,\mu}$$
(20)

From (11) and (18), and including spin, we have

$$\Omega = -2k_B T \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \log \left(1 + e^{-\beta(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu)}\right)$$

$$= 2k_B T L^3 \int d\varepsilon N(\varepsilon) \log \left(1 + e^{-\beta(\varepsilon - \mu)}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow$$

$$c_V \equiv \frac{C_V}{L^3} = 2 \frac{1}{k_B T} \int_0^\infty d\varepsilon N(\varepsilon) \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon}\right) (\varepsilon - \mu)^2$$

$$= 2 \frac{1}{k_B T} \int_{-\mu}^\infty d\xi \ N(\xi) \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial \xi}\right) \xi^2$$
(21)

where I introduced the density of k-states for one spin $N(\varepsilon) = L^{-3} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})$. The Fermi function is $f(\varepsilon) = 1/(1 + \exp \beta(\varepsilon - \mu))$, & I defined shifted energy variable $\xi = \varepsilon - \mu$. In general, the degenerate limit is characterized by k sums which decay rapidly for energies far from the Fermi surface, so the game is to assume the density of states varies slowly on a scale of the thermal energy, and replace $N(\varepsilon)$ by $N(\varepsilon_F) \equiv N_0$. This type of Sommerfeld expansion¹ assumes the density of states is a smoothly varying fctn., i.e. the thermodynamic limit $V \to \infty$ has been taken (otherwise $N(\varepsilon)$ is too spiky!). For a parabolic band, $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \hbar^2 k^2/(2m)$ in 3D, the delta-fctn. can be evaluated to find²

$$N(\varepsilon) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{n}{\varepsilon_F} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_F}\right)^{1/2} \,\theta(\varepsilon).$$
(24)

This can be expanded around the Fermi level:³

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon H(\varepsilon) f(\varepsilon) = \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} d\varepsilon H(\varepsilon) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n (k_B T)^{2n} \frac{d^{2n-1}}{d\varepsilon^{2n-1}} H(\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=\mu}$$
(22)

where $a_n = (2 - 1/2^{2(n-1)}) \zeta(2n)$ (ζ is Riemann ζ fctn., $\zeta(2) = \pi^2/6$, $\zeta(4) = \pi^4/90$, etc.).

 2 Here's one way to get this:

$$N(\varepsilon) = L^{-3} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) \to \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left| \frac{d\varepsilon}{dk} \right|^{-1} \delta(k - \frac{\sqrt{2m\varepsilon}}{\hbar}) = \int \frac{k^2 dk}{2\pi^2} \left(\frac{m}{\hbar^2 k} \right) \delta(k - \frac{\sqrt{2m\varepsilon}}{\hbar}) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{n}{\varepsilon_F} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_F} \right)^{1/2}$$
(23)

¹If you are integrating a smooth function of ε multiplied by the Fermi function derivative $-\partial f/\partial \varepsilon$, the derivative restricts the range of integration to a region of width $k_B T$ around the Fermi surface. If you are integrating something times $f(\varepsilon)$ itself, it's convenient to do an integration by parts. The result is (see e.g. Ashcroft & Mermin appendix C)



Figure 2: Density of states for parabolic spectrum, $\varepsilon = k^2/2m$

$$N(\xi) = N(0) + N'(0)\xi + \frac{1}{2}N''(0)\xi^2 + \dots$$
(26)

(In a horrible misuse of notation, N(0), $N(\varepsilon_F)$, and N_0 all mean the density of states at the Fermi level). The leading order term in the low-T specific heat is therefore found directly by scaling out the factors of T in Eq. (21):

$$c_V \simeq 2k_B^2 \frac{1}{T} N_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial \xi}\right) \xi^2 = 2k_B^2 T N_0 \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial x}\right) x^2}_{\pi^2/3}$$
(27)

So

$$c_V \simeq \frac{2\pi^2}{3} N_0 k_B^2 T + \mathcal{O}(T^3).$$
 (28)

This is the famous linear in temperature specific heat of a free Fermi gas. 4

1.2.5 Classical limit.

I won't calculate the classical limit. All the standard results for a Boltzman statistics gas, e.g. $c_V(T \gg \varepsilon_F) = (3/2)Nk_B$ follow immediately from noticing that the Fermi function

$$\delta \varepsilon_k |_{\varepsilon_F} \simeq \frac{\hbar^2 k_F \delta k}{m} \simeq \varepsilon_F \frac{\delta k}{k_F} \simeq \varepsilon_F \frac{a}{L},$$
(25)

Why:

At T=0, the Fermi function $n_{\mathbf{k}}^0 \rightarrow$ step function $\theta(\mu - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})$, so we know $\mu(T = 0)$ must just be the Fermi energy $\varepsilon_F =$

³When does the validity of the expansion break down? When the approximation that the density of states is a smooth function does, i.e. when the thermal energy k_BT is comparable to the splitting between states at the Fermi level,

where a is the lattice spacing and L is the box size. At T = 1K, requiring $k_B T \sim \delta \varepsilon$, and taking $\varepsilon_F/k_B \simeq 10^4 K$ says that systems (boxes) of size less than $1\mu m$ will "show mesoscopic" effects, i.e. results from Sommerfeld-type expansions are no longer valid.

⁴Note in (28), I extended the lower limit $-\mu$ of the integral in Eq. (21) to $-\infty$ since it can be shown that the chemical potential is very close to ε_F at low T. Since we are interested in temperatures $k_BT \ll \varepsilon_F$, and the range in the integral is only several k_BT at most, this introduces neglible error.

reduces to the Boltzman distribution,

$$f(\varepsilon) \to e^{-\beta(\varepsilon-\mu)}, \quad T \to \infty.$$
 (29)

(You will need to convince yourself that the classical result $\mu/(k_B T) \to -\infty$ is recovered to make this argument.)

1.3 Second quantization

The idea behind the term "second quantization" arises from the fact that in the early days of quantum mechanics, forces between particles were treated classically. Momentum, position and other observables were represented by operators which do not in general commute with each other. Particle *number* is assumed to be quantized as one of the tenets of the theory, e.g. Einstein's early work on blackbody radiation.

At some point it was also realized that forces between particles are also quantized because they are *mediated* by the exchange of other particles. In Schrödinger's treatment of the H-atom the force is just the classical static Coulomb force, but a more complete treatment includes the interaction of the H-atom and its constituents with the radiation field, which must itself be quantized ("photons"). This quantization of the fields mediating the interactions between matter particles was referred to as "second" quantization. In the meantime, a second-quantized description has been developed in which *both* "matter fields" and "force fields" are described by second-quantized field operators. In fact, modern condensed matter physics usually does go backwards and describe particles interacting via classical Coulomb forces again,⁵ but these particles are described by field operators. Once the calculational rules are absorbed, calculating with the 2nd-quantized formalism is easier for most people than doing 1st-quantized calculations. They must, of course, yield the same answer, as they are rigorously equivalent. I will not prove this equivalence in class, as it is exceedingly tedious, but merely motivate it for you below. I urge you to read the proof once for your own

 $\hbar^2 (3\pi^2 n)^{2/3} / 2m.$

$$n = \frac{N}{L^3} = 2L^{-3} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^{\infty} n_{\mathbf{k}}^0$$

$$= 2 \int d\varepsilon N(\varepsilon) f(\varepsilon)$$

$$\simeq \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} d\varepsilon N(\varepsilon) + \frac{\pi^2}{6} (k_B T)^2 N'(\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon = \mu} \quad \text{(continued on next page)}$$

$$\simeq \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\varepsilon_F} d\varepsilon N(\varepsilon) + (\mu - \varepsilon_F) N(\varepsilon_F) + \frac{\pi^2}{6} (k_B T)^2 N'(\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon = \mu}}_{n}$$

$$\boxed{\mu} \simeq \varepsilon_F - \frac{\pi^2}{6} (k_B T)^2 \frac{N'(\varepsilon_F)}{N(\varepsilon_F)}$$

Since N'/N is typically of order $1/\varepsilon_F^2$, corrections are small.

 ${}^{5}\mathrm{Q}$: when does this approximation break down?

 \Rightarrow

edification, however.⁶

1.3.1 Symmetry of many-particle wavefunctions

Quantum mechanics allows for the possibility of indistinguishable particles, and nature seems to have taken advantage of this as a way to construct things. No electron can be distinguished from another electron, except by saying where it is, what quantum state it is in, etc. Internal quantum-mechanical consistency requires that when we write down a many-identical-particle state, we make that state noncommittal as to which particle is in which single-particle state. For example, we *say* that we have electron 1 and electron 2, and we put them in states a and b respectively, but exchange symmetry requires (since electrons are fermions) that a satisfactory wave-function has the form

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = A[(\psi_a(\mathbf{r}_2)\psi_b(\mathbf{r}_1) - \psi_a(\mathbf{r}_1)\psi_b(\mathbf{r}_2)].$$
(30)

If we have N particles, the wavefunctions must be either symmetric or antisymmetric under exchange:⁷

$$\Psi^{B}(\mathbf{r}_{1}\ldots\mathbf{r}_{i}\ldots\mathbf{r}_{j}\ldots\mathbf{r}_{N}) = \Psi^{B}(\mathbf{r}_{1}\ldots\mathbf{r}_{j}\ldots\mathbf{r}_{i}\ldots\mathbf{r}_{N}) \quad \text{Bosons}$$
(31)

$$\Psi^{F}(\mathbf{r}_{1}\dots\mathbf{r}_{i}\dots\mathbf{r}_{j}\dots\mathbf{r}_{N}) = -\Psi^{F}(\mathbf{r}_{1}\dots\mathbf{r}_{j}\dots\mathbf{r}_{i}\dots\mathbf{r}_{N}) \quad \text{Fermions}$$
(32)

Given a set of single-particle wave functions $\phi_{E_i}(\mathbf{r})$, where E_i is a quantum number, e.g. energy (N.B. it can be any set of quantum numbers!) we can easily construct wave fctns. which satisfy statistics, e.g.

$$\Psi_{n_1...n_{\infty}}^{B}(\mathbf{r}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{r}_N) = \left(\frac{n_1!n_2!\cdots n_{\infty}!}{N!}\right)_{\mathcal{P}\in\{E_1,E_2...E_N\}}^{1/2} (\pm 1)^{\operatorname{Sgn}\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{P} \Pi_{i=1}^{N} \phi_{E_i}(\mathbf{r}_i), \quad (33)$$

where the factor in parentheses is the number of ways to arrange N objects in boxes, with n_1 in the first box, ...

Remarks on Eq. (33):

⁶See, e.g. Fetter & Wallecka, Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems

⁷This is related to the spin-statistics theorem first formulated by Fierz and Pauli. The proof requires the PCT theorem, proved by Schwinger, Lüders and Pauli, which says that PCT (parity-charge conjugation-time reversal) is a good symmetry for a system described by a Lorentz-invariant field theory). Recently, a generalization of Bose & Fermi statistics to particles called has been intensely discussed. Under exchange an anyon wavefunction behaves as $\Psi^A(\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_i \dots \mathbf{r}_j \dots \mathbf{r}_N) = e^{i\theta} \Psi^A(\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_j \dots \mathbf{r}_N)$ for some $0 \le \theta \le 2\pi$.

- sum all permutations of the E_i 's in product $\phi_{E_1}(\mathbf{r}_1)\phi_{E_2}(\mathbf{r}_2)\dots\phi_{E_N}(\mathbf{r}_N)$.⁸
- # distinct E_i 's occuring may be less than N, some missing because of multiple occupation in boson case. Example:



• Completely antisymmetric Fermionic wavefunction called Slater determinant:

$$\Psi_{n_1\dots n_{\infty}}(\mathbf{r}_1,\dots\mathbf{r}_N) = \left(\frac{1}{N!}\right)^{1/2} \begin{vmatrix} \phi_{E_{min}}(\mathbf{r}_1) & \dots & \phi_{E_{max}}(\mathbf{r}_1) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \phi_{E_{min}}(\mathbf{r}_N) & \dots & \phi_{E_{max}}(\mathbf{r}_N) \end{vmatrix}$$
(34)

where there are N eigenvalues which occur between E_{min} and E_{max} , inclusive, corresponding to N occupied states.

1.3.2 Field operators

2nd quantization is alternative way of describing many body states. We describe a particle by a *field operator*

$$\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i} a_{i} \phi_{E_{i}}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{35}$$

where *i* runs over the quantum numbers associated with the set of eigenstates ϕ , a_i is a "coefficient" which is an operator (I'm going to neglect the hats (^) which normally denote an operator for the *a*'s and a^{\dagger} 's), and ϕ_{E_i} is a "1st-quantized" wavefunction, i.e. a normal Schrödinger wavefunction of the type we have used up to now, such that (for example) $H\phi_{E_i} = E_i\phi_{E_i}$. Now we *impose* commutation relations

$$\left[\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}), \hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}')\right]_{\pm} = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$$
(36)

$$\left[\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}), \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}')\right]_{\pm} = \left[\hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}), \hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}')\right]_{\pm} = 0, \qquad (37)$$

⁸You might think the physical thing to do would be to sum all permutations of the particle labels. This is correct, but actually makes things harder since one can double count if particles are degenerate (see example of 3 bosons below.) The normalization factor is chosen with the sum over all permutation of the E_i 's in mind.

which implies

$$[a_i, a_j^{\dagger}]_{\pm} = \delta_{ij} \quad ; \quad [a_i, a_j]_{\pm} = [a_i^{\dagger}, a_j^{\dagger}]_{\pm} = 0.$$
(38)

The upper sign is for fermions and the lower for bosons in Eqs. (37) and (38).

Now construct many-body states from vacuum (no particles) $|0\rangle$. *a* called *annihilation* operator, a^{\dagger} creation operator (see below).

Examples & comments (all properties follow from commutation relations):

<u>Bosons</u>:

- one particle in state *i*: $a_i^{\dagger}|0\rangle \equiv |1\rangle_i$
- annihilate vacuum $a_i |0\rangle = 0$
- (Bosons)⁹ $a_i^{\dagger} a_i^{\dagger} |0\rangle \equiv |2\rangle_i$
- (Bosons) two in *i* and one in *j*: $a_i^{\dagger} a_i^{\dagger} a_j^{\dagger} |0\rangle \equiv |2\rangle_i |1\rangle_j$
- $a_i^{\dagger} a_i \equiv \hat{n}_i$ is number operator for state *i*.

Proof: (bosons)

$$\begin{aligned} (a_{i}^{\dagger}a_{i})|n\rangle_{i} &= (a_{i}^{\dagger}a_{i})(a_{i}^{\dagger})^{n}|0\rangle \\ &= a_{i}^{\dagger}(1+a_{i}^{\dagger}a_{i})(a_{i}^{\dagger})^{n-1}|0\rangle = |n\rangle_{i} + (a_{i}^{\dagger})^{2}a_{i}(a_{i}^{\dagger})^{n-1}|0\rangle \\ &= 2|n\rangle_{i} + (a_{i}^{\dagger})^{3}a_{i}(a_{i}^{\dagger})^{n-2}|0\rangle \dots = n|n\rangle_{i} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly show (bosons):¹⁰

- $a_i^{\dagger} |n\rangle_i = (n+1)^{1/2} |n+1\rangle_i$
- $a_i |n\rangle_i = n^{1/2} |n-1\rangle_i$
- many-particle state

$$\left(\frac{1}{n_1!n_2!\dots n_{\infty}!}\right)^{1/2} (a_1^{\dagger})^{n_1} (a_2^{\dagger})^{n_2} \cdots |0\rangle \equiv |n_1, n_2 \dots n_{\infty}\rangle$$
(39)

 \star occupation numbers specify state completely, exchange symmetry included due to commutation relations! (normalization factor left for problem set)

Fermions

⁹Analogous state for fermions is zero, by commutation relations-check!

 $^{^{10}}$ By now it should be clear that the algebra for the bosonic case is identical to the algebra of simple harmonic oscillator *ladder operators*.

• Anticommutation relations complicate matters, in particular note

$$a^2 = (a^{\dagger})^2 = 0 \implies n_i = \frac{1}{0}$$
 (Pauli principle) (40)

• SO

$$a^{\dagger}|0\rangle = |1\rangle \quad a|1\rangle = |0\rangle$$

$$a^{\dagger}|1\rangle = 0 \qquad a|0\rangle = 0$$
(41)

• many-particle state

$$(a_1^{\dagger})^{n_1} (a_2^{\dagger})^{n_2} \cdots |0\rangle \equiv |n_1, n_2 \dots n_{\infty}\rangle$$

$$(42)$$

 \star note normalization factor is 1 here.

• action of creation & annihilation operators (suppose $n_s = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} a_{s}|\dots n_{s}\dots\rangle &= (-1)^{n_{1}+n_{2}+\dots n_{s-1}}(a_{1}^{\dagger})^{n_{1}}\dots a_{s}a_{s}^{\dagger}\dots (a_{\infty}^{\dagger})^{n_{\infty}}|0\rangle \\ &= (-1)^{n_{1}+n_{2}+\dots n_{s-1}}(a_{1}^{\dagger})^{n_{1}}\dots (1-\underline{a_{s}^{\dagger}a_{s}})\dots (a_{\infty}^{\dagger})^{n_{\infty}}|0\rangle \\ &= 0 \\ &= (-1)^{n_{1}+n_{2}+\dots n_{s-1}}|\dots n_{s}-1\dots\rangle \end{aligned}$$

also

$$a_s | \dots 0 \dots \rangle = 0 \tag{43}$$

and similarly

$$a_{s}^{\dagger}|\dots n_{s}\dots\rangle = \begin{cases} (-1)^{n_{1}+n_{2}+\dots n_{s-1}}|\dots n_{s}+1\dots\rangle & n_{s}=0\\ 0 & n_{s}=1 \end{cases}$$
(44)

1.3.3 2nd-quantized Hamiltonian

 \star <u>Point:</u> Now "it can be shown"¹¹ that state vector

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{n_1, n_2 \dots n_{\infty}} f(n_1, n_2 \dots n_{\infty}, t) |n_1, n_2 \dots n_{\infty}\rangle$$
(45)

satisfies the Schrödinger equation (our old friend)

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\Psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H}|\Psi(t)\rangle \tag{46}$$

¹¹Normally I hate skipping proofs. However, as mentioned above, this one is so tedious I just can't resist. The bravehearted can look, e.g. in chapter 1 of Fetter and Wallecka.

if we take the "2nd-quantized" form of \hat{H}

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{ij} a_i^{\dagger} \langle i|T|j \rangle a_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijk\ell} a_i^{\dagger} a_j^{\dagger} \langle ij|V|k\ell \rangle a_\ell a_k$$
(47)

$$= \int d^3 r \hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}) T(\mathbf{r}, \nabla_{\mathbf{r}}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r})$$
(48)

$$+\frac{1}{2}\int\int d^{3}r \ d^{3}r'\hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r})\hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}')V(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}')\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}')\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r})$$
(49)

where the 1st quantized Hamiltonian was H = T + V. Here *i* indexes a complete set of single-particle states.

Translationally invariant system

It may be more satisfying if we can at least verify that this formalism "works" for a special case, e.g. translationally invariant systems. For such a system the momentum \mathbf{k} is a good quantum number, so choose single-particle plane wave states

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{r}) = \phi_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) = L^{-3/2} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} u_\sigma, \tag{50}$$

where u_{σ} is a spinor like $u_{\downarrow} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, etc. 1st quantized T is $-\nabla^2/(2m)$,¹² so 2nd-quantized kinetic energy is

$$\hat{T} \equiv \sum_{ij} a_i^{\dagger} \langle i|T|j \rangle a_j = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \left(\frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{2m}\right) a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \,. \tag{51}$$

Since we showed $a^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ is just number operator which counts # of particles in state $\mathbf{k}\sigma$, this clearly just adds up the kinetic energy of all the occupied states, as it should. For general two-particle interaction V, let's assume $V(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ only, as must be true if we have transl. invariance. In terms of the Fourier transform

$$V(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{L^3} \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \ e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \ V(\mathbf{r})$$
(52)

we have (steps left as exercise)

$$\hat{V} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q} \\ \sigma, \sigma'}} a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}\sigma'}^{\dagger} V(\mathbf{q}) a_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma} a_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma}$$
(53)

Note that if you draw a picture showing \mathbf{k}' and $\mathbf{k} + q$ being destroyed (disappearing), and \mathbf{k} and $\mathbf{k}' + q$ being created, you realize that the notation describes a scattering process with two incoming particles and two outgoing ones, where momentum is conserved; in fact, it is easy to see that momentum \mathbf{q} is transferred from one particle to another. This is called a Feynman diagram.

 $^{^{12}}$ I'll set $\hbar=1$ from here on out, unless required for an honest physical calculation.



Figure 3: Feynman diagram for 2-body interaction showing momentum conservation.

1.3.4 Schrödinger, Heisenberg, interaction representations

Here we just give some definitions & reminders on different (equivalent) representations of quantum mechanics. In different reps., *time dependence* is associated with states (Schrödinger), operators (Heisenberg), or combination (interaction).

• Schrödinger picture

state
$$|\hat{\psi}_{S}(t)\rangle$$
, operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S} \neq \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{S}(t)$
 $i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\hat{\psi}_{S}(t)\rangle = \hat{H}|\hat{\psi}_{S}(t)\rangle$

has formal solution

$$\left[|\hat{\psi}_{S}(t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}(t-t_{0})}|\hat{\psi}_{S}(t_{0})\rangle\right]$$
(54)

Note \hat{H} hermitian \Rightarrow time evolution operator $\left| \hat{U} \equiv e^{i\hat{H}(t-t_0)} \right|$ is unitary.

• Interaction picture (useful for pert. thy.)

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}'$$
 (where \hat{H}_0 usually soluble)

Def. in terms of Schr. picture:
$$|\hat{\psi}_I(t)\rangle = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t} |\hat{\psi}_S(t)\rangle$$

 $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I(t) = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_S e^{-i\hat{H}_0 t}$

$$\Rightarrow i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\hat{\psi}_I(t)\rangle = \hat{H}'(t) |\hat{\psi}_I(t)\rangle$$

with $\hat{H}'(t) = e^{i\hat{H}_0t}\hat{H}'e^{-i\hat{H}_0t}$

<u>Remarks:</u>

 states and ops. t-dependent in interaction picture, but time dependence of operators very simple, e.g.

$$\hat{H}_{0} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}}$$
$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} a_{\mathbf{k}I}(t) = e^{i\hat{H}_{0}t} [a_{\mathbf{k}}, \hat{H}_{0}] e^{-i\hat{H}_{0}t}$$
$$= \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}I}(t)$$

$$\Rightarrow a_{\mathbf{k}I}(t) = a_{\mathbf{k}}e^{-i\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}t}$$

- Time evolution operator determines state at time t:

$$|\hat{\psi}_I(t)\rangle = \hat{U}(t,t_0)|\hat{\psi}_I(t_0)\rangle$$

From Schrödinger picture we find

$$\hat{U}(t,t_0) = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t} e^{-i\hat{H}(t-t_0)} e^{-i\hat{H}_0 t_0}$$
(55)

(Note $([\hat{H}, \hat{H}_0] \neq 0!)$)

• Heisenberg picture

state
$$|\psi_H\rangle$$
 t-independent,
operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_H(t) = e^{i\hat{H}t}\hat{\mathcal{O}}_S e^{-i\hat{H}t}$

so operators evolve according to Heisenberg eqn. of motion

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{H}(t) = [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{H}(t), H]$$
(56)

 \star Note–compare three reps. at t=0:

$$|\hat{\psi}_H\rangle = |\hat{\psi}_S(0)\rangle = |\hat{\psi}_I(0)\rangle$$
(57)
$$\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_I(0) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_I(0)$$
(58)

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_S = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_H(0) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_I(0) \tag{58}$$

1.4 Phonons

1.4.1 Review of simple harmonic oscillator quantization

I will simply write down some results for the standard SHO quantization from elementary QM using "ladder operators". We consider the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2M} + \frac{K}{2}q^2$$
(59)

and extract the relevant dimensions by putting

$$\omega^{2} = \frac{K}{M}$$

$$\xi = q \left(\frac{M\omega}{\hbar}\right)^{1/2}$$

$$-i\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi} = p(\hbar M\omega)^{-1/2}$$
(60)

 \mathbf{SO}

$$H = \frac{\hbar\omega}{2} \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\xi^2} + \xi^2 \right). \tag{61}$$

We recall soln. goes like $e^{-\xi^2/2}H_n(\xi)$, where H_n are Hermite polynomials, and that eigenvalues are

....

$$E_n = \hbar\omega(n+1/2) \tag{62}$$

Define ladder operators a, a^{\dagger} as

$$a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\xi + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \right) \tag{63}$$

$$a^{\dagger} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\xi - \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \right) \tag{64}$$

Ladder ops. obey commutation relations (check)

$$[a, a^{\dagger}] = 1 \quad ; \quad [a, a] = 0 \quad ; \quad [a^{\dagger}, a^{\dagger}] = 0$$
 (65)

& then H may be written (check)

$$H = \hbar\omega \left(a^{\dagger}a + \frac{1}{2} \right).$$
(66)

 a, a^{\dagger} connect eigenstates of different quantum nos. n, as

$$|n\rangle = \frac{(a^{\dagger})^n}{(n!)^{1/2}}|0\rangle, \tag{67}$$

where $|0\rangle$ is state which obeys $a|0\rangle = 0$. Operating on $|n\rangle$ with a^{\dagger} may be shown with use of commutation relations to give

$$a^{\dagger}|n\rangle = (n+1)^{1/2}|n+1\rangle \quad ; \quad a|n\rangle = n^{1/2}|n-1\rangle$$
 (68)

so with these defs. the ladder operators for SHO are seen to be *identical* to *boson* creation and annihilation operators defined above in Sec. 1.3.2.

1.4.2 1D harmonic chain

If we now consider N atoms on a linear chain, each attached to its neighbor with a "spring" of spring constant K as shown in figure. First let's consider the problem classically. The



Figure 4: Linear chain with spring couplings K. Dynamical variables are $q_i \equiv x_i - x_i^{eq}$

Hamiltonian is

$$H = \sum_{\ell} \frac{p_{\ell}^2}{2m} + \frac{K}{2} (q_{\ell} - q_{\ell+1})^2,$$
(69)

where the q_{ℓ} 's are the displacements from atomic equilibrium positions. Now Hamilton's eqns. (or Newton's 2nd law!) yield

$$-M\ddot{q}_{j} = M\omega^{2}q_{j} = K(2q_{j} - q_{j-1} - q_{j+1}).$$
(70)

A standing sinusoidal wave $q_j = A\cos(kaj)$ satisfies this equation *if* the eigenfrequencies have the form

$$\omega_k^2 = \frac{K}{M} 2(1 - \cos ka),\tag{71}$$

where if a is the lattice constant, $k = 2\pi/\lambda$. Note that for small k, ω_k is linear, $\omega_k \simeq (K/M)^{1/2} ka.^{13}$

This is the *classical* calculation of the normal modes of oscillation on a 1D chain. To quantize the theory, let's *impose* canonical commutation relations on the position and momentum of the ℓ th and *j*th atoms:

$$[q_\ell, p_j] = i\hbar\delta_{\ell m} \tag{72}$$

and construct collective variables which describe the modes themselves (recall k is wave vector, ℓ is position):

$$q_{\ell} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{k} e^{ika\ell} Q_{k} ; \quad Q_{k} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{\ell} e^{-ika\ell} q_{\ell}$$
$$p_{\ell} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{k} e^{-ika\ell} p_{k} ; \quad P_{k} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{\ell} e^{ika\ell} p_{\ell}, \quad (73)$$

¹³Note since $k = 2\pi n/(Na)$, the ω_k are independent of system size

which leads to canonical commutation relations in wave vector space:

$$[Q_k, P_{k'}] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell,m} e^{-ikal} e^{ik'am} [q_\ell, p_m]$$
$$= \frac{i\hbar}{N} \sum_{\ell} e^{-ial(k-k')} = i\hbar \delta_{k,k'}.$$
(74)

Let's now express the Hamiltonian (69) in terms of the new variables. We have, with a little algebra and Eq. (71),

$$\sum_{\ell} p_{\ell}^2 = \sum_k P_k P_{-k}$$

$$\frac{K}{2} \sum_{\ell} (q_{\ell} - q_{\ell-1})^2 = \frac{K}{2} \sum_k Q_k Q_{-k} (2 - e^{ika} - e^{-ika}) = \frac{M}{2} \sum_k \omega_k^2 Q_k Q_{-k}$$
(75)

 \mathbf{so}

$$H = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{k} p_{k} p_{-k} + \frac{M}{2} \sum_{k} \omega_{k}^{2} Q_{k} Q_{-k}.$$
(76)

Note that the energy is now expressed as the sum of kinetic + potential energy of each *mode* k, and there is no more explicit reference to the motion of the atomic constituents. To *second quantize* the system, we write down creation and annihilation operators for each mode k. Define

$$a_k = \left(\frac{M\omega_k}{2\hbar}\right)^{1/2} \left(Q_k + \frac{i}{M\omega_k}P_{-k}\right)$$
(77)

$$a_{k}^{\dagger} = \left(\frac{M\omega_{k}}{2\hbar}\right)^{1/2} \left(Q_{-k} - \frac{i}{M\omega_{k}}P_{k}\right)$$
(78)

which can be shown, just as in the single SHO case, to obey commutation relations

$$\left[a_{k}, a_{k'}^{\dagger}\right] = \delta_{kk'} \tag{79}$$

$$[a_k, a_{k'}] = 0 (80)$$

$$\left[a_{k}^{\dagger}, a_{k'}^{\dagger}\right] = 0 \tag{81}$$

and the Hamiltonian expressed simply as

$$\sum_{k} \hbar \omega_k \left(a_k^{\dagger} a_k + \frac{1}{2} \right) \tag{82}$$

which we could have probably guessed if we had realized that since the normal modes don't interact, we have simply the energy of all allowed harmonic oscillators. Note this is a *quantum* Hamiltonian, but the energy scale in H is the *classical* mode frequency ω_k .

1.4.3 Debye Model

Let us imagine using the Hamiltonian (82) as a starting point to calculate the specific heat of a (3D) solid due to phonons. We take the Debye model for the dispersion to simplify the calculation,

$$\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{cases} ck & k < k_D \\ 0 & k > k_D \end{cases}$$
(83)

where the Debye wave vector $k_D = (6\pi^2 n)^{1/3}$ is obtained by replacing the first Brillouin zone of the solid by a sphere of radius k_D which contains N wave vectors, with N the number of ions in the crystal. The average value of the Hamiltonian is

$$U = \langle H \rangle = 3\sum_{k} \hbar \omega_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\langle a_{k}^{\dagger} a_{k} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \right) = 3\sum_{k} \hbar \omega_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\frac{1}{e^{\beta \hbar \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} - 1} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$$
(84)

since the average number of phonons in state \mathbf{k} is simply the expectation value of a boson number operator

$$\langle a_k^{\dagger} a_k \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}(\rho a_k^{\dagger} a_k) = b(\hbar \omega_{\mathbf{k}}),$$
(85)

where $b(x) = (\exp(\beta x) - 1)^{-1}$ is the free Bose distribution function. The factors of 3 come from the 3 independent phonon polarizations, which we consider to be degenerate here. Taking one derivative wrt temperature, the spec. heat per unit volume is¹⁴

$$c_{V} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial T}\Big|_{n} = 3\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\hbar ck}{e^{\beta\hbar ck} - 1} = 3\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\frac{\hbar c}{2\pi^{2}}\int_{0}^{k_{D}} dk\frac{k^{3}}{e^{\beta\hbar ck} - 1}$$
$$\simeq \frac{\partial}{\partial T}\frac{3(k_{B}T)^{4}}{2\pi^{2}(\hbar c)^{3}}\underbrace{\int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{x^{3}}{e^{x} - 1}}_{\pi^{4}/15} = \frac{\partial}{\partial T}\frac{\pi^{2}}{10}\frac{(k_{B}T)^{4}}{(\hbar c)^{3}} = \frac{2\pi^{2}}{5}k_{b}\left(\frac{k_{B}T}{\hbar c}\right)^{3}$$
(86)

So far we have done nothing which couldn't have been done easily by ordinary 1stquantized methods. I have reviewed some Solid State I material here by way of introduction to problems of interacting particles to which you have not been seriously exposed thus far in the condensed matter grad sequence. The second quantization method becomes manifestly useful for the analysis of *interacting* systems. I will now sketch the formulation (not the solution) of the problem in the case of the phonon-phonon interaction in the anharmonic crystal.

1.4.4 Anharmonicity & its consequences

As you will recall from Solid State I, most thermodynamic properties of insulators, as well as neutron scattering experiments on most materials, can be explained entirely in terms of the harmonic approximation for the ions in the crystal, i.e. by assuming a Hamiltonian of the form (82). There are some problems with the harmonic theory. First, at higher temperatures atoms tend to explore the anharmonic parts of the crystal potential more

¹⁴Recall
$$du = TdS - pdV$$
 and $\frac{\partial u}{\partial T}\Big|_{V} = T\frac{\partial S}{\partial T}\Big|_{V}$

and more, so deviations from predictions of the equilibrium theory increase. The thermal expansion of solids in the harmonic approximation is rigorously zero.¹⁵ Secondly, some important qualitative aspects of transport cannot be understood: for example, the harmonic theory predicts infinite thermal transport of insulators! (See A&M Ch. 25 for a qualitative discussion of these failures).

The obvious way to go beyond the harmonic approximation is to take into account higherorder corrections to the real-space crystal potential systematically, expanding¹⁶

$$U = \frac{1}{2!} \sum_{\ell m} D^{(2)}(\ell, m) q_{\ell} q_m + \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\ell m n} D^{(3)}(\ell, m, n) q_{\ell} q_m q_n + \dots,$$
(88)

where

$$D^{(n)}(\ell, m, \dots n) = \left. \frac{\partial^n U}{\partial q_\ell \partial q_m \dots \partial q_n} \right|_{u_i=0}$$
(89)

are the so-called dynamical matrices.¹⁷ Using Eqs. (73,78) we find

$$q_{\ell} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\frac{\hbar}{2m\omega}\right)^{1/2} \sum_{k} Q_{k} e^{ika\ell} = \sum_{k} (a_{k} + a_{-k}^{\dagger}) e^{ika\ell}$$
(90)

Note that the product of 3 displacements can be written

$$q_{\ell}q_{m}q_{n} = \frac{1}{(N)^{3/2}} \sum_{k_{1}k_{2}k_{3}} e^{i(k_{1}a\ell + k_{2}am + k_{3}an)} Q_{k_{1}}Q_{k_{2}}Q_{k_{3}}$$
(91)

so the cubic term may be written

$$H_3 = \sum_{k_1 k_2 k_3} V^{(3)}(k_1 k_2 k_3) Q_{k_1} Q_{k_2} Q_{k_3}$$
(92)

with

$$V^{(3)}(k_1k_2k_3) = \sum_{\ell m n} D^{(3)}(\ell, m, n) \exp[i(k_1\ell + k_2m + k_3n)]$$
(93)

Note now that the indices ℓ , m, n run over all unit cells of the crystal lattice. Since crystal potential itself is periodic, the momenta k_1, k_2 , and k_3 in the sum are not really independent. In fact, if we shift all the sums in (93) by a lattice vector j, we would have

$$\left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial T}\right)_p = \frac{\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial T}\right)_V}{\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial V}\right)_T} = 0 \tag{87}$$

 $^{^{15}}$ This follows from the independence of the phonon energies in harmonic approx. of the system volume. (see above) Since pressure depends on temperature only through the volume derivative of the mode freqs. (see A & M p. 490),

¹⁶I have dropped polarization indices everywhere in this discussion, so one must be careful to go back and put them in for a 2- or 3D crystal.

¹⁷Recall that the theory with only harmonic and cubic terms is actually formally unstable, since arbitrarily large displacements can lower the energy by an arbitrary amount. If the cubic terms are treated perturbatively, sensible answers normally result. It is usually better to include quartic terms as shown in figure below, however.

$$V^{(3)}(k_1k_2k_3) = \sum_{\ell m n} D^{(3)}(\ell + j, m + j, n + j)e^{i(k_1a\ell + k_2am + k_3an)}e^{i(k_1 + k_2 + k_3)aj}$$

$$= \sum_{\ell m n} D^{(3)}(\ell, m, n)e^{i(k_1a\ell + k_2am + k_3an)}e^{i(k_1 + k_2 + k_3)aj}$$
(94)

where in the last step I used the fact that the crystal potential U in every lattice cell is equivalent. Now sum both sides over j and divide by N to find

$$V^{(3)}(k_1k_2k_3) = \sum_{\ell mn} D^{(3)}(\ell, m, n) \exp[i(k_1\ell + k_2m + k_3n)]\Delta(k_1 + k_2 + k_3),$$
(95)

where

$$\Delta(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j} e^{ikaj} = \delta_{k,G} \tag{96}$$

and G is any reciprocal lattice vector.

Return now to (92). We have ascertained that $V^{(3)}(\ell, m, n)$ is zero unless $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = G$, i.e. crystal momentum is conserved. If we expand (92), we will get products of 3 creation or annihilation operators with coefficients $V^{(3)}$. The values of these coefficients depend on the elastic properties of the solid, and are unimportant for us here. The momenta of the three operators must be such that momentum is conserved up to a reciprocal lattice vector, e.g. if we consider the term $a_{k_1}a^{\dagger}_{-k_2}a^{\dagger}_{-k_3}$ we have a contribution only from $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = G$.¹⁸ Note this term should be thought of as corresponding to a physical process wherein a phonon with momentum k_1 is destroyed and two phonons with momenta $-k_2$ and $-k_3$ are created. It can be drawn "diagrammatically" à la Feynman (as the 1st of 2 3rd-order processes in the figure below).

¹⁸As usual, processes with G = 0 are called *normal* processes, and those with finite G are called *Umklapp* processes.



Figure 5: Diagrams representing phonon-phonon collision processes allowed by energy and momentum conservation in 3rd and 4th order.

Questions:

- How does energy conservation enter? What is importance of processes involving destruction or creation of 3 phonons?
- If one does perturbation theory around harmonic solution, does cubic term contribute to thermal averages?
- Can we calculate thermal expansion with cubic Hamiltonian?

2 Electron-electron interactions

The electronic structure theory of metals, developed in the 1930's by Bloch, Bethe, Wilson and others, assumes that electron-electron interactions can be neglected, and that solidstate physics consists of computing and filling the electronic bands based on knowldege of crystal symmetry and atomic valence. To a remarkably large extent, this works. In simple compounds, whether a system is an insulator or a metal can be determined reliably by determining the band filling in a noninteracting calculation. Band gaps are sometimes difficult to calculate quantitatively, but inclusion of simple renormalizations to 1-electron band structure known as Hartree-Fock corrections, equivalent to calculating the average energy shift of a single electron in the presence of an average density determined by all other electrons ("mean field theory"), almost always suffices to fix this problem. There are two reasons why we now focus our attention on $e^- - e^-$ interactions, and why almost all problems of modern condensed matter physics as it relates to metallic systems focus on this topic:

1. Why does the theory work so well in simple systems? This is far from clear. In a good metal the average interelectron distance is of the order of or smaller than the range of the

interaction, e.g. the screening length $\ell_{scr} \sim (c/e^2m)^{1/2}\rho^{-1/6}$, where ρ is the density, of order 1nm for typical parameters. One might therefore expect that interactions should strongly modify the picture of free electrons commonly used to describe metals.

2. More complicated systems exhibit dramatic deviations from the predictions of band theory. I refer now not simply to large quantitative errors in the positions of 1-electron bands, but to qualitative discrepancies in the behavior of the materials. The most interesting modern example is the class of compounds known as the transition metal oxides, including the cuprate materials which give rise to high-temperature superconductivity (HTS).¹⁹

2.1 Mean field theory (Hartree-Fock)

Let's begin with the second-quantized form of the electronic Hamiltonian with 2-body interactions. The treatment will be similar to that of Kittel (Ch. 5), but for comparison I will focus on a translationally invariant system and do the calculation in momentum space. In this case as we have shown the Hamiltonian is²⁰

$$\hat{H} = \hat{T} + \hat{V}, \tag{97}$$

$$\hat{T} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \left(\frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{2m}\right) c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$$
(98)

$$\hat{V} = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\mathbf{q}\\\sigma,\sigma'}} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}\sigma'} V(\mathbf{q}) c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma}.$$
(99)

The 2-body interaction \hat{V} contains 4 Fermi operators c and is therefore not exactly soluble. The goal is to write down an *effective* 2-body Hamiltonian which takes into account the

 19 The parent compounds of the HTS (e.g. La₂CuO₄ and YBa₂Cu₃O₄ are without exception *antiferromagnetic* and *insulating*. Historically, this discovery drove much of the fundamental interest in these materials, since standard electronic structure calculations predicted they should be paramagnetic metals. This can easily be seen by simple valence counting arguments. The nominal valences in e.g. La_2CuO_4 are La^{3+} , O^{2-} , and Cu^{2+} The La and O ions are in closed shell configurations, whereas the Cu is in an $[Ar]3d^9$ state, i.e. a single d-hole since there are 10 d electrons in a filled shell. The 1 hole/unit cell would then suggest a 1/2 filled band and therefore a metallic state. The crystal field splittings in the planar Cu environment give the $3d_{x^2-y^2}$ state being lowest in energy (see later), and since the n.n.'s are the O's, it would seem likely that the lowest Ocrystal field state in the planar environment, the O 3p, will hybridize with it. Sophisticated LDA calculations confirm this general picture that the dominant band at the Fermi level is a 1/2-filled planar $Cu d_{x^2-y^2}$ - O 3p band. Instead, this compound is found experimentally to be an electrical insulator and an antiferromagnet with a Neel temperature of 300K! This strongly suggests that the band calculations are missing an important element of the physics of the high- T_c materials. In the transition metals and TMO's band theory is notoriously bad at calculating band gaps in insulators, because of the presence of strong local Coulomb interactions which lead to electronic correlations neglected in the theory. It is therefore reasonable to assume that a similar mechanism may be at work here: extremely strong Coulomb interactions in the Cu - O planes are actually opening up a gap in the 1/2-filled band at the Fermi level and simultaneously creating a magnetic state. This phenomenon has been studied in simpler systems since the 60s and is known as the *Mott-Hubbard* transition.

 20 For the moment, we ignore the ionic degrees of freedom and treat only the electrons. To maintain charge neutrality, we therefore assume the electrons move in a neutralizing positive background ("jellium model").

average effects of the interactions. We therefore replace the 4-Fermi interaction with a sum of all possible 2-body terms,

$$c_1^{\dagger}c_2^{\dagger}c_3c_4 \simeq -\langle c_1^{\dagger}c_3\rangle c_2^{\dagger}c_4 - \langle c_2^{\dagger}c_4\rangle c_1^{\dagger}c_3 + \langle c_1^{\dagger}c_4\rangle c_2^{\dagger}c_3 + \langle c_2^{\dagger}c_3\rangle c_1^{\dagger}c_4,$$
(100)

where the + and - signs are dictated by insisting that one factor of -1 occur for each commutation of two fermion operators required to achieve the given ordering. This can be thought of as "mean field terms", in the spirit of Pierre Weiss, who replaced the magnetic interaction term $S_i \cdot S_j$ in a ferromagnet by $\langle S_i \rangle S_j = \langle S \rangle S_j \equiv -H_{eff}S_j$, i.e. he replaced the field S_i by its homogeneous mean value S, and was left with a term equivalent to a 1-body term corresponding to a spin in an external field which was soluble. The mean field $\langle S \rangle$ in the Weiss theory is the instantaneous average magnetization of all the other spins except the spin S_j , and here we attempt the same thing, albeit somewhat more formally. The "mean field"

$$\langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}\rangle = \langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle\delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'} \equiv n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}$$
(101)

is the average number of particles $n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ in the state $\mathbf{k}\sigma$, which will be weighted with the 2-body interaction $V(\mathbf{q})$ to give the average interaction due to all other particles (see below).²¹

With these arguments in mind, we use the approximate form (100) and replace the interaction \hat{V} in (99) by

$$\hat{V}_{HF} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{q}\\\sigma\sigma'}} V(\mathbf{q}) \left[-\langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} \rangle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma} - \langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma} \rangle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} + \langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} \rangle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} \rangle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma} \right] \\
= -\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{q}\\\sigma}} V(\mathbf{q}) \langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \rangle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma} + V(0) \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\\\sigma\sigma'}} \langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \rangle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} \\
= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}\sigma}} \left(-\sum_{\mathbf{q}} n_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}\sigma} V(\mathbf{q}) + nV(0) \right) c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \qquad (102)$$

where the total density n is defined to be $n = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$. Since this is now a 1-body term of the form $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \Sigma_{HF}(\mathbf{k}) a^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$, it is clear the full Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian may be written in terms of a **k**-dependent energy *shift*:

$$\hat{H}_{HF} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + \Sigma_{HF}(\mathbf{k}) \right) c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \qquad (103)$$

$$\Sigma_{HF}(\mathbf{k}) = -\sum_{\mathbf{q}} n_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}\sigma} V(\mathbf{q}) + \underbrace{nV(0)}_{\mathbf{q}}$$
(104)

Fock Hartree
$$(105)$$

²¹Note we have not allowed for mean fields of the form $\langle c^{\dagger}c^{\dagger}\rangle$ or $\langle aa\rangle$. These averages vanish in a normal metal due to number conservation, but will be retained in the theory of superconductivity.

Note the Hartree or *direct Coulomb* term, which represents the average interaction energy of the electron $\mathbf{k}\sigma$ with all the other electrons in the system, is merely a constant, and as such it can be absorbed into a chemical potential. In fact it is seen to be divergent if V(q)represents the Coulomb interaction $4\pi e^2/q^2$, but this divergence must cancel exactly with the constant arising from the sum of the self-energy of the positive background and the interaction energy of the electron gas with that background.²² The Fock, or *exchange* term²³ is a momentum-dependent shift.

2.1.1 Validity of Hartree-Fock theory

Crucial question: when is such an approximation a good one for an interacting system? The answer depends on the range of the interaction. The HF approximation becomes asymptotically exact for certain quantities in the limit of high density Fermi systems if interactions are sufficiently long-range! This is counterintuitive, for it seems obvious that if the particles are further apart on the average, they will interact less strongly and less often, so a mean field theory like Hartree-Fock theory should work well. This is true if the interactions are short-ranged, such that for sufficiently low densities the particles spend no time within an interaction length. The interaction is typically characterized by a strength V and a range a, and if the interparticle spacing $r_0 \gg a$, the particles don't feel the potential much and the ground state energy, for example, of such a gas can be expanded at T = 0 in powers of a/r_0 . If $a \to 0$, the interaction dispapears and the the only characteristic energy left at T = 0 is the zero-point energy, i.e. the energy scale obtained by confining the particle to a cage of size the interparticle spacing r_0 , i.e. $\hbar^2/(2mr_0^2)$. This is just the Fermi energy in the case of a Fermi system. Thus we might expect HF theory to be quite good for a dilute gas of ³He, since the ³He-³He interaction is certainly short-ranged; unfortunately, liquid ³He has $a \simeq r_0$, so corrections to HF are always important.

What about for a metal? We can do a simple argument to convince ourselves that HF isn't applicable for low density systems with Coulomb interactions. Let's rewrite the basic 2-body Hamiltonian in dimensionless variables,

²²See e.g., Kittel

²³The origin of the term exchange is most easily seen in many-body perturbation theory, where the Fock term is seen to arise from a scattering process where the particle in state $\mathbf{k}\sigma$ changes places with a particle from the medium in an intermediate state.

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \left(\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} \right) c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{V}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\mathbf{q}\\\sigma,\sigma'}} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}\sigma'} \left(\frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2} \right) c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma}$$
(106)

$$= \frac{e^2}{2a_0r_s^2} \left(\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}\sigma} \bar{k}^2 c^{\dagger}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}\sigma} c_{\bar{\mathbf{k}}\sigma} + \frac{3r_s}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{\bar{k}}, \mathbf{\bar{k}}', \mathbf{\bar{q}} \atop \sigma, \sigma'} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{\bar{k}}\sigma} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{\bar{k}}' + \mathbf{\bar{q}}\sigma'} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{q}^2} \right) c_{\mathbf{\bar{k}}'\sigma'} c_{\mathbf{\bar{k}} + \mathbf{\bar{q}}\sigma} \right), \quad (107)$$

where I've used the system volume $\mathcal{V} = N(4/3)\pi r_0^3$, Bohr radius $a_0 = \hbar^2/me^2$, defined $r_s \equiv r_0/a_0$, and scaled all momenta as $\mathbf{k} = \bar{\mathbf{k}}r_0^{-1}$, etc. Applying dimensional analysis, we expect the two terms $\sum \bar{k}^2 c^{\dagger} c$ and $\sum c^{\dagger} c^{\dagger} (1/\bar{q}^2) cc$ to be of order 1, so that it is clear that the interaction term becomes negligible in the limit $r_s \to 0$ (high density). On the other hand, it's also clear that had the $1/q^2$ factor not been present in the interaction, it would have scaled as $1/r_s$ instead, and become negligible in the low density limit.

One can do a more careful, formal perturbation analysis for a simple quantity like the ground state energy $\langle H \rangle$ of the electron gas, which is discussed in many-body physics texts. The result is

$$E_0 = E_0^{HF} + E_{corr} \tag{108}$$

with E_0^{HF} the ground state energy calculated in the independent particle approximation with the Hartree-Fock energy shifts, and E_{corr} the correlation energy, defined to be the part of the g.s. energy not captured by HF. As the density increases, so does ε_F , which represents the average kinetic energy per electron; this increase is faster than the increase of the correlation energy, as

$$K.E. = \frac{3}{5}\varepsilon_F = \frac{2.21}{r_s^2}$$
 Ryd (109)

$$P.E.|_{HF} = \frac{-0.916}{r_s} \text{Ryd}$$
 (110)

$$E_{corr} = (0.0622 \log r_s - 0.096 + \dots) \text{Ryd}$$
 (111)

so it is clear the correlation term is less singular than the HF term in the limit $r_s \rightarrow 0$. At higher densities, particles are effectively independent.²⁴

2.1.2 Problem with Hartree-Fock theory

Although we argued that the Hartree-Fock approximation becomes a better approximation in the limit of high density for electrons interacting via the Coulomb interaction, it never becomes exact, as one can see by examining the Fourier transform of the Hartree-Fock energy shift. The Hartree term itself (being **k** independent) is absorbed into a redefinition of the chemical potential, so the shift is (T=0):

²⁴For a more detailed discus of these terms, see Fetter & Wallecka, Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems

$$\delta \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \pm \frac{1}{L^3} \sum_{|\mathbf{k}'| < k_F} \frac{4\pi e^2}{|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'|^2} \quad (112)$$

$$= \frac{2e^2 k_F}{\pi} F(k/k_F), \quad (113)$$

where F(x) is a function which has a log divergence in slope at x = 1, i.e. at the Fermi level.²⁵ This means while the energy *shift* might be small compared to the Fermi energy the *velocity* of an electron is $\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} / \partial \mathbf{k}|_{k_F}$, which contains a term which is infinite.

This problem can be traced back to the long-range nature of the Coulomb force. Two electrons at large distances $\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'$ don't really feel the full $1/|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|^2$ but a "screened" version due to the presence of the intervening medium, i.e. The electron gas rearranges itself to cancel out the long-range part of V.

2.2 Screening

2.2.1 Elementary treatment

To see how this works, let's first examine the problem of a single fixed (i.e. infinite mass) charge placed inside an electron gas. We are interested in how the electron gas responds to this perturbation (recall in the HF approximation the perturbation would simply be the interaction of the charge with the uniform gas). But since the electrons are mobile and negatively charged, they will tend to cluster around the test charge if its charge is positive, and be repelled (i.e. have a lower density) around the test charge if it is negative. In addition, Fermi statistics lead to long-range *oscillations* of the electron charge density far from the test charge.

This is not entirely a "Gedanken experiment". Impurities in solids may have different valences from the host, and thus acquire a localized charge, although the entire solid is still neutral. As an example of some relevance to modern condensed matter physics, consider

²⁵The integral is straightforward & useful:

$$\frac{1}{L^3} \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}')^2} = \int_0^{k_F} \frac{k^2 dk}{4\pi^2} \int_{-1}^1 dx \frac{1}{k^2 + k'^2 - 2kk'x} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2 k} \int_0^{k_F} dk' \ k' \ \log \left| \frac{k + k'}{k - k'} \right|$$
(114)

$$= \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left(\frac{k_F^2 - k^2}{k} \log \left| \frac{k_F + k}{k_F - k} \right| + 2k_F \right)$$
(115)

so with $z = k/k_F$ and (113) we have

$$F(z) = \frac{1-z^2}{4z} \log \left| \frac{1+z}{1-z} \right| + \frac{1}{2}$$
(116)

what happens when you put an extra Oxygen atom in the CuO₂ plane of a cuprate high- T_c superconducting material. Although the crystal structure of these materials is complex, they all contain CuO₂ planes as shown in the figures. The interstitial oxygen will capture two electrons from the valence band, changing it from a $2s^22p^4$ to a $2s^22p^6$ electronic configuration. The impurity will then have a net charge of two electrons. For **r** near the impurity, the



Figure 6: a) The CuO₂ plane of cuprate superconductor. b) Interstitial charged O impurity.

electronic charge density will be reduced by the Coulomb interaction. The electronic number density fluctuation is²⁶

$$n(\mathbf{r}) \approx \int_{-e\delta\phi(\mathbf{r})}^{\varepsilon_F} N(\omega + e\delta\phi(\mathbf{r})) d\omega \approx \int_0^{\varepsilon_F + e\delta\phi(\mathbf{r})} N(\omega') d\omega'$$
(117)

Note that this equation involves the double-spin density of states, which we will use throughout this section. On the other hand, in the bulk far away from the impurity, $\delta \phi(\mathbf{r}_{bulk}) = 0$,



Figure 7: Local repulsion of charge due to shift of electronic density of states near impurity

²⁶A note on signs: the electrostatic potential $\delta \phi(\mathbf{r}) < 0$ due to the excess negative charge at the impurity. You might worry about this: the total change in ϕ should include the self-consistently determined positive charge screening the impurity. We have fudged this a bit, and the correct separation between induced and external quantities will become clear later in the discussion. Note we take e > 0 always, so the electron has charge -e.

 \mathbf{SO}

$$n(\mathbf{r}_{bulk}) \approx \int_0^{\varepsilon_F} N(\omega) d\omega$$
 (118)

or

$$\delta n(\mathbf{r}) \approx \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_{F} + e\delta\phi(\mathbf{r})} N(\omega)d\omega - \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_{F}} N(\omega)d\omega$$
(119)

Let us assume a weak potential $|e\delta\phi| \ll \varepsilon_F$; therefore

$$\delta n(\mathbf{r}) \approx N(\varepsilon_F) \left[\varepsilon_F + e\delta\phi - \varepsilon_F \right] = +e\delta\phi N_0 \,. \tag{120}$$

We can solve for the change in the electrostatic potential by solving Poisson's equation.

$$\nabla^2 \delta \phi = -4\pi \delta \rho = 4\pi e \delta n = 4\pi e^2 N_0 \delta \phi \,. \tag{121}$$

Define a new length k_{TF}^{-1} , the Thomas-Fermi screening length, by $k_{TF}^2 = 4\pi e^2 N_0$, so that P's eqn. is $\nabla^2 \delta \phi = r^{-2} \partial_r r^2 \partial_r \delta \phi = k_{TF}^2 \delta \phi$, which has the solution $\delta \phi(\mathbf{r}) = C \exp(-k_{TF}r)/r$. Now C may be determined by letting $N(\varepsilon_F) = 0$, so the medium in which the charge is embedded becomes vacuum. Then the potential of the charge has to approach q/r, so C = q, i.e. in the electron gas

$$\delta\phi(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{qe^{-k_{TF}r}}{r},\tag{122}$$

where q = -2e for our example.

Let's estimate some numbers, by using the free electron gas. Use $k_F = (3\pi^2 n)^{1/3}$, $a_0 = \hbar^2/(me^2) = 0.53 \text{\AA}$, and $N(\varepsilon_F) = mk_F/(\hbar^2 \pi^2)$. Then we find

$$k_{TF}^{-2} = \frac{a_0 \pi}{4(3\pi^2 n)^{1/3}} \approx \frac{a_0}{4n^{1/3}}$$

$$k_{TF}^{-1} \approx \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n}{a_0^3}\right)^{-1/6}$$
(123)

In Cu, for which $n \approx 10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ (and since $a_0 = 0.5 \text{\ddot{A}}$)

$$k_{TF}^{-1} \approx \frac{1}{2} \frac{(10^{23})^{-1/6}}{(0.5 \times 10^{-8})^{-1/2}} \approx 0.5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm} = 0.5 \text{\AA}^{\circ}$$
 (124)

Thus, if we add a charged impurity to Cu metal, the effect of the impurity's ionic potential is exponentially screened away for distances $r > \frac{1}{2} \mathring{A}$. The screening length in a semiconductor can clearly be considerably longer because n is much smaller, but because of the 1/6 power which appears in, even with $n = 10^{-10}$, k_{TF}^{-1} is only about 150 times larger or 75Å.

What happens in the quantum-mechanical problem of an electron moving in the potential created by the impurity when the screening length gets long? As shown in the figure, the potential then correspondingly deepens, and from elementary quantum mechanics we expect it to be able to bind more electrons, i.e bound states "pop out" of the continuum into orbits bound to the impurity site.



Figure 8: Screened impurity potentials. As the density decreases, the screening length increases, so that states which were extended bound.

In a poor metal (e.g., YBCO), in which the valence state is just barely unbound, decreasing the number of carriers will increase the screening length, since

$$k_{TF}^{-1} \sim n^{-1/6} \,. \tag{125}$$

This will extend the range of the potential, causing it to trap or bind more states-making the one free valence state bound. Of course, this has only a small effect $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$ effect on the bulk electrical properties of the material. Now imagine that instead of a single impurity, we have a concentrated system of such ions, and suppose that we decrease n (e.g. in Si-based semiconductors, this is done by adding acceptor dopants, such as B, Al, Ga, etc.). This will in turn, increase the screening length, causing some states that were free to become bound, eventually possibly causing an abrupt transition from a metal to an insulator. This process is believed to explain the metal-insulator transition in some amorphous semiconductors.

2.2.2 Kubo formula

Many simple measurements on bulk statistical systems can be described by applying a small external probe field of some type to the system at t = 0, and asking how the system responds. If the field is small enough, the response is proportional to the external perturbation, and the proportionality constant, a *linear response coefficient*, is given always in terms of a *correlation function* of the system in the equilibrium ensemble without the perturbation. In Table 1 I list some standard linear response coefficients for condensed matter systems.

System	Perturbation	Response	Coefficient
metal	electric field \mathbf{E}	current j	conductivity σ
	temp. gradient ∇T	heat current \mathbf{j}_Q	thermal cond. κ
	point charge q	density fluct. δn	density correlation func-
			tion χ_c
	magnetic field B	magnetization M	susceptibility χ_s

The general theory of linear response is embodied in the Kubo formula.²⁷ Suppose a system is described by a time-independent Hamiltonian H, and a perturbation $\hat{H}'(t)$ is turned on at time t = 0. The idea is to express the subsequent time-dependence of expectation values of physical observables in terms of matrix elements of the perturbation in the unperturbed ensemble. The unperturbed ensemble with \hat{H} , or $\hat{H} - \mu \hat{N}$, may involve interactions, but we assume we know the exact energy eigenstates and eigenvalues. All observables can be calculated by knowing the time evolution of the statistical operator $\rho(t)$, given by the Heisenberg equation

$$i\frac{\partial\hat{\rho}}{\partial t} = [\hat{H} + \hat{H}', \hat{\rho}] \tag{126}$$

First one defines a canonical transformation²⁸:

$$\tilde{\rho}(t) = \hat{S}(t)\hat{\rho}(t)\hat{S}^{\dagger}; \quad S(t) \equiv e^{i\hat{H}t}$$
(127)

from which one can see by substituting into (126) that

$$i\frac{\partial\tilde{\rho}}{\partial t} = [\tilde{H}',\tilde{\rho}] \tag{128}$$

with $\tilde{H}' = \hat{S}\hat{H}'\hat{S}^{\dagger}$. This has the formal solution

$$\tilde{\rho}(t) = \tilde{\rho}(0) - i \int_0^t [\tilde{H'}, \tilde{\rho}] dt'.$$
(129)

The initial condition is $\tilde{\rho}(0) = \hat{S}(0)\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{S}(0)^{\dagger} = \hat{\rho}(0)$, and we can iterate the rhs by substituting $\hat{\rho}(0)$ for $\tilde{\rho}(t')$ in the integral, etc.²⁹ Since we are interested only in leading order, we write

$$\tilde{\rho}(t) \simeq \hat{\rho}(0) - i \int_0^t [\tilde{H}', \hat{\rho}(0)] dt'.$$
(130)

If we now multiply on the left by \hat{S}^{\dagger} and on the right by \hat{S} , we obtain the leading order in \hat{H}' change in the original ρ :

$$\hat{\rho}(t) \simeq \hat{\rho}(0) - i\hat{S}^{\dagger}(t) \left\{ \int_{0}^{t} [\tilde{H}', \hat{\rho}(0)] dt' \right\} \hat{S}(t),$$
(131)

²⁷R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 12, 570 (1957).

 $^{^{28}\}text{The}$ idea is to remove the "trivial" time-evolution of $\hat{\rho}$ on $\hat{H},$ to isolate the dependence on $\hat{H}'.$

²⁹Note $\hat{\rho}(0)$ is the initial but still possibly interacting density matrix (statistical operator). I reserve the symbol $\hat{\rho}_0$ for the noninteracting analog. Note further that $\hat{\rho}(0)$ contains only \hat{H} , not \hat{H}' , since we assumed perturbation was turned on at t = 0.

which can now be used to construct averages in the usual way. The expectation value of an operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ at nonzero T and at some time t is

$$= \operatorname{Tr}\left(\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{\mathcal{O}}\right) + i \int_{0}^{t} dt' \operatorname{Tr}\left(\hat{\rho}(0)[\tilde{H}',\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(t)]\right), \qquad (133)$$

where in the last step the cyclic property of the trace and the definition of the Heisenberg operator $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{S}\hat{\mathcal{O}}\hat{S}^{\dagger}$ was used. The change in the expectation value due to the perturbation is then

$$\delta \langle \hat{\mathcal{O}} \rangle = i \int_0^t dt' \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho}(0) [\tilde{H}', \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(t)] \right)$$
(134)

Since typically \hat{H}' is proportional to some external (c-number) field, we can write \hat{H}' as $\hat{H}'(t) = \int d^3r \hat{B}(\mathbf{r})\phi(\mathbf{r},t)$ (so $\tilde{H}'(t) = \int d^3r \tilde{B}(\mathbf{r},t)\phi(\mathbf{r},t)$). More often you will see the Kubo formula expressed as the change in the expectation value of the operator \hat{A} in response to an applied weak field \hat{B} ,

$$\delta\langle \hat{A}(1)\rangle = i \int_0^t \int \operatorname{Tr}\left(\hat{\rho}(0)[\tilde{B}(1'), \tilde{A}(1)]\right) \phi(1') d1'$$
(135)
$$\int_0^\infty Q_{-1}\left(1, 1'\right) \psi(1') d1'$$
(136)

$$\equiv \int_{0}^{\infty} G_{AB}(1,1')\phi(1')d1', \qquad (136)$$

with the notation $1 \equiv \mathbf{r}, t, \sigma, 1' = \mathbf{r}', t', \sigma', \int d1' \equiv \sum_{\sigma'} \int d^3r' dt'$, etc., and we defined $G_{AB}(1, 1') = G_{AB}(r, t; r', t') \equiv -i \operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho}(0) [\tilde{A}(r, t), \tilde{B}(r', t')] \right) \theta(t - t')$.³⁰ Remember that the operators \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} are just the Heisenberg *t*-dependent versions of the Schrödinger operators \hat{A}, \hat{B} .

2.2.3 Correlation functions

As a concrete example, consider the change in the density $\delta n(\mathbf{r}, t)$ of a system in response to a local change in its density perhaps at a different place and time $\delta n(\mathbf{r}', t')$, where $\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r})\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r})\rangle$, and $\langle \hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r})\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r})\rangle_{\hat{H}'=0} = n_0$. It's usually convenient to set $n_0 = 0$, i.e. we assume an overall neutral system. The linear response function is then

$$\chi(\mathbf{r}, t; \mathbf{r}', t') = -i \langle [\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t), \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}', t')] \rangle_{\hat{H}'=0} \theta(t - t'), \qquad (137)$$

where the exectation value is taken in the unperturbed system. The function G_{nn} measures the average amplitude in the unperturbed ensemble a particle is to be found at \mathbf{r}', t' and subsequently at \mathbf{r}, t . If the particles are statistically independent, χ factorizes, $\langle nn' \rangle \sim$ $\langle n \rangle \langle n' \rangle = 0$ (no correlations), so it has the interpretation of a correlation function.

³⁰The object Tr $(\hat{\rho}(0)[\hat{A}_H(1), \hat{B}_H(1')])$ which appears on the right-hand side of (134) is related to something called a retarded 2-particle Green's function, which I have promised not to oppress you with.

2.2.4 Dielectric constant

The simplest way to analyze this problem conceptually is to ask what is the potential a long distance from a test charge placed into the interacting electron gas medium. This potential will be the sum of the bare potential produced by the test charge in a vacuum, plus the induced potential due to the polarization of the medium.

Let's use what we learned about linear response in the last section to calculate the electric potential in the system $\phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ due to an *external* potential $\phi^{ext}(\mathbf{r}', t')$ (you may think of this as the potential due to a test charge if you like). From electrodynamics we recall these two are supposed to be proportional, and that the proportionality constant is just the dielectric constant ϵ . By analogy we write, in Fourier transformed language,

$$\phi^{ext}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \epsilon(\mathbf{q},\omega)\phi(\mathbf{q},\omega) \tag{138}$$

It is the dielectric constant of the medium (which is directly related to the conductivity) which we now wish to calculate.

The total potential in the material is the sum of the external potential and the induced potential,

$$\phi = \phi^{ind} + \phi^{ext},\tag{139}$$

but in fact we can calculate the induced potential ϕ^{ind} by

- first finding the induced change in density $\delta \rho^{ind}$ due to the external potential, using linear response theory; then
- using Poisson's equation to calculate the induced electric potential.

The additional term in the Hamiltonian in the presence of the "test charge" is

$$\hat{H}' = e \int d^3r \ \hat{n}(\mathbf{r})\phi^{ext}(\mathbf{r},t)$$
(140)

where \hat{n} is the 2nd-quantized density operator $\hat{\psi}^{\dagger}\hat{\psi}$. The induced change in charge density $\delta\rho = e\langle \hat{n} \rangle$ is then just given by the Kubo formula as above,³¹

$$\delta \rho^{ind}(1) = -ie^2 \int_0^t \int d^3 r' \operatorname{Tr}\left(\hat{\rho}(0)[\hat{n}_H(1), \hat{n}_H(1')]\right) \phi^{ext}(1') d1'$$
(141)

$$\equiv e^2 \int_0^\infty \chi(1, 1') \phi^{ext}(1') d1'$$
 (142)

where the density-density correlation function is³²

$$\chi(1,1') = -i \operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho}(0) [\hat{n}_H(1), \hat{n}_H(1')] \right) \theta(t-t').$$
(143)

 $^{^{31}\}text{Don't}$ confuse charge density ρ with statistical operator $\hat{\rho}.$

³²Instead of $G_{nn}^{(2)}$, it's more conventional to use the notation χ_{nn} or just χ . Note also the notation \hat{n}_H , which is the same as \tilde{n} in previous section for time evolution with Hamiltonian H.

For a translationally invariant system in Fourier transform rep., the convolution (142) reduces to

$$\delta \rho^{ind}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = e^2 \chi(\mathbf{q},\omega) \phi^{ext}(q,\omega).$$
(144)

Now using Poisson's equation $q^2 \phi^{ind} = 4\pi \delta \rho^{ind}$, and Eq. (139), we find³³

$$\phi^{ind}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2} \chi(\mathbf{q},\omega) \phi^{ext}(\mathbf{q},\omega) \equiv V(\mathbf{q})\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega) \phi^{ext}$$
(145)

 \mathbf{SO}

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{q},\omega) \equiv \frac{\phi^{ext}(\mathbf{q},\omega)}{\phi^{ind}(\mathbf{q},\omega) + \phi^{ext}(\mathbf{q},\omega)} = \frac{1}{1 + V(\mathbf{q})\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega)}.$$
(146)

2.2.5 Lindhard function

We've found the exact structure of the dielectric response,³⁴ but not really solved it because we still don't know the density-density correlation function χ . For the interacting system this can be a very difficult problem, but it is not too hard to find it for the free fermion gas. We will need

• The definitions of Fourier transforms

$$\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \int d^{3}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \int d(t - t') e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')} e^{-i\omega(t - t')} \chi(1,1')$$

$$c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \int d^{3}r e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{\psi}^{\dagger}(1)$$

$$c_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = \int d^{3}r e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{\psi}(1) \qquad (149)$$

• the integral expression for the theta function

$$\theta(t-t') = -\int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi i} \, \frac{e^{-i\omega'(t-t')}}{\omega' + i\eta^+},\tag{150}$$

where η^+ is a positive infinitesimal.³⁵

• the solutions of the Heisenberg equation of motion $i\partial_t \hat{\mathcal{O}}_H(t) = [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_H(t), H]$ for $c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(t)$ and $c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(t)$ for free fermions (check):

$$c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger}(t) = c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger}e^{i\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}t}$$
(151)

$$c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(t) = c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}e^{-i\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}t} \tag{152}$$

 $^{33}\mathrm{Compare}$ Eq. (121)

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{q},\omega) = 1 - V(\mathbf{q})\chi(\mathbf{q},\omega),\tag{147}$$

which is also claimed to be exact. This is because χ is defined to be the response to the total potential

$$\rho^{ind}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \chi|_{A\&M}(\mathbf{q},\omega)\phi(\mathbf{q},\omega)$$
(148)

³⁴Warning! Compare the treatment here with e.g., A& M pp. 337-340, and you will see that they arrive at the apparently different result

which is very difficult to calculate since ϕ is self-consistently determined.

³⁵The sign of the infinitesimal is important. It determines in which complex half-plane the contour can be completed to evaluate the integral by Cauchy's theorem. Check it!
• The commutator (check!)

$$[c_{k_1}^{\dagger}c_{k_2}, c_{k_3}^{\dagger}c_{k_4}] = \delta_{k_2k_3}c_{k_1}^{\dagger}c_{k_4} - \delta_{k_1k_4}c_{k_3}^{\dagger}c_{k_2}$$
(153)

• The expectation values in the noninteracting ensemble of the number operator at finite temperature T are

$$\langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}),$$
 (154)

where f is the Fermi function.

Then $(suppressing spin indices)^{36}$

$$\langle [n_{H}(1), n_{H}[1'] \rangle = \operatorname{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_{0}[n_{H}(1), n_{H}[1'])$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{k}_{1}...\mathbf{k}_{4}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}_{1}-\mathbf{k}_{2})\cdot\mathbf{r}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}_{3}-\mathbf{k}_{4})\cdot\mathbf{r}'} \langle [c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}_{1}}(t)c_{\mathbf{k}_{2}}(t), c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}_{3}}(t')c_{\mathbf{k}_{4}}(t')] \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{k}_{1}...\mathbf{k}_{4}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}_{1}-\mathbf{k}_{2})\cdot\mathbf{r}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}_{3}-\mathbf{k}_{4})\cdot\mathbf{r}'} e^{i([\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{3}}-\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{4}}]t'+[\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{1}}-\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{2}}]t)} \langle [c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}_{1}}c_{\mathbf{k}_{2}}, c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}_{3}}c_{\mathbf{k}_{4}}] \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{k}_{1}...\mathbf{k}_{2}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}_{1}\cdot[\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}']+\mathbf{k}_{2}\cdot[\mathbf{r}'-\mathbf{r}])} e^{i(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{2}}-\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{1}})(t'-t)} \langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}_{1}} \rangle$$

$$- \sum_{\mathbf{k}_{3}\mathbf{k}_{4}} e^{i(\mathbf{k}_{4}\cdot[\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}']+\mathbf{k}_{3}\cdot[\mathbf{r}'-\mathbf{r}])} e^{i(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{3}}-\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{4}})(t'-t)} \langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}_{3}} \rangle$$
(155)

so that (using (143) and (149), and putting back the spin sum)

$$\chi_0(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \frac{f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) - f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})}{\omega - (\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta}.$$
(156)

This is the so-called Lindhard function, the charge susceptibility of the free Fermi gas. Note that in the free gas the major contributions to the integral (156) come from contributions where $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+q} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \omega = 0$. These correspond to 2-particle "particle-hole excitations" where the Fermi sea is given a little energy ω which promotes a particle from below the Fermi surface (say **k**) to above (say $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}$). In the homework you will investigate when such excitations are possible within this model.

The use of the free gas susceptibility χ_0 for χ in Eq. (146) is a rather poor approximation, as it completely ignores the effect of the long-range Coulomb interaction on the intermediate states. The self-consistent field method, or random phase approximation, replaces the induced charge without interactions with the screened charge:

$$\chi_0 \equiv \left. \frac{\rho^{ind}}{\phi^{ext}} \right|_{V=0} \to \frac{\rho^{ind}|_{V=0}/\epsilon}{\phi^{ext}} = \frac{\chi_0}{\epsilon}.$$
(157)

 $\langle c_1^{\dagger} c_2 c_3^{\dagger} c_4 \rangle = n_1 n_3 (\delta_{12} \delta_{34} - \delta_{14} \delta_{23} + \delta_{14} \delta_{23} \delta_{12}) + n_1 (\delta_{14} \delta_{23} - \delta_{14} \delta_{23} \delta_{12})$

³⁶The following fermionic identity is also useful–check it!

Solving (146) for ϵ gives

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{q},\omega) \simeq 1 - V(\mathbf{q})\chi_0(\mathbf{q},\omega) \qquad (RPA/SCF) \tag{158}$$

This is sometimes called the Lindhard approx. to the dielectric function.

2.2.6 Thomas-Fermi theory

Let us consider the static limit of the theory we currently have. This will allow us to answer the original question we posed: if we insert a charge somewhere into a metal, what is the net electrostatic potential felt at some distance r away by a second charge? Taking the $\omega \to 0$ limit in (156), we find

$$\chi_0(\mathbf{q},0) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \frac{f(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) - f(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}})}{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}+q} - \varepsilon_k + i\eta^+}$$
(159)

First note that if we further take the limit $q \to 0$ we find (here N_0 is double-spin dos!)

$$\chi_0 \rightarrow -2\sum_{k} \frac{-\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}} \simeq -N_0 \int d\xi_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{-\partial f}{\partial \xi_{\mathbf{k}}} \simeq -N_0 \int d\xi_{\mathbf{k}} \delta(\xi_{\mathbf{k}}) = -N_0.$$

$$\overbrace{T \ll \epsilon_F}$$
(160)

The dielectric constant in the long-wavelength (i.e. small q) limit may thus be written

$$\epsilon(q,0) \simeq 1 + \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2} N_0 \equiv 1 + \frac{k_{TF}^2}{q^2},$$
(161)

where k_{TF} is the same Thomas-Fermi wave vector $k_{TF}^2 \equiv 4\pi e^2 N_0$ we discussed earlier. Now we go back: if we had placed a charge e in a vacuum, it would have produced a potential $\phi^{ext}(r) = e/r$, or $\phi^{ext}(q) = 4\pi e/q^2$ everywhere in space. From (138) we see that the actual potential in the medium is

$$\phi(q) = \phi^{ext}(q)/\epsilon(q) = \frac{4\pi e/q^2}{1 + k_{TF}^2/q^2} = \frac{4\pi e}{k_{TF}^2 + q^2},$$
(162)

i.e. the Thomas-Fermi wavevector *cuts off* the divergence of the bare long-range Coulomb interaction. In real space

$$\phi(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}}\phi(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{e}{r}e^{-k_{TF}r}, \qquad (163)$$

so the long-range interaction is indeed replaced by an exponentially cut off short-range one, with *screening length* scale k_{TF}^{-1} .

2.2.7 Friedel oscillations

The Thomas-Fermi theory is very intuitive and describes realistically how the singularities of the long-range Coulomb interaction are cut off by screening. It suffices to eliminate the anomalies encountered in Hartree-Fock theory of transport and density of states near the Fermi level. But because it is a long-wavelength approximation, it cannot describe adequately the response of the electron gas to a short-range perturbation. Our initial example of a point charge placed in an electron gas was just such a case. To get an accurate description of the screened impurity potential, the finite-q dependence of the charge susceptibility must be accounted for. This calculation involves simply replacing our Thomas-Fermi dielectric function $\varepsilon_{TF} = 1 + k_{TF}^2/q^2$ with the expression involving the full Lindhard function

$$\varepsilon_{RPA} = 1 - V(q)\chi_0(q, \omega = 0) = 1 + \frac{k_{TF}^2}{q^2}F(\frac{q}{2k_F}),$$
(164)

where F is the same function as in (116). Then we repeat the same calculation for the impurity potential

$$\phi(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \frac{\phi^{ext}(\mathbf{q})}{1 + \frac{k_{TF}^2}{q^2}F(\frac{q}{2k_F})} \simeq \frac{x^2}{(2+x^2)^2} \frac{\cos 2k_F r}{r^3},$$
(165)

where $x = k_{TF}/(2k_F)$. The main interesting feature of this result is of course the fact that the potential no longer has the simple Yukawa form with exponential decay, but in fact an oscillatory $1/r^3$ behavior. The last step in (165) is a bit long,³⁷ but I have attempted to give you a flavor of it in the homework. One of the main conclusions of the exercise there is that the potential is very sensitive to the details of the charge susceptibility at $2k_F$, which the Thomas-Fermi theory clearly gets wrong. Ultimately Friedel oscillations (and RKKY oscillations, their counterpart for magnetic spins) originate from the sharpness of the Fermi surface.

2.2.8 Plasmons

An examination of the dielectric function of the solid, e.g. Eq. (146), shows that the dielectric function can be zero, meaning the system responds very strongly to a small perturbation (see Eq. (138). These are the excitation energies of the electron gas. In the random phase approximation (158) this means there are excitations when

$$V(\mathbf{q})\chi_0(\mathbf{q},\omega) = 1 \tag{166}$$

Consider first a finite size box where the energy levels $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ are discrete. This means $\chi_0(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ is a sum of terms containing simple poles at the particle-hole excitation energies $\omega_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$. χ_0 will change sign and diverge as ω passes through these energies, therefore there will be a solution of (166) for each excitation energy. It is simplest to focus on the limit at

 $^{^{37}\}mathrm{See}$ e.g. Fetter & Wallecka

T = 0, where

$$\chi_0(\mathbf{q},\omega) \to -\sum_{\substack{k < k_F \\ |\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}| > k_F}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} - \frac{1}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) + i\eta} \right\}$$
(167)

In other words, the poles in the complex ω plane are particle-hole excitation energies $\pm \omega_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}$, where $|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}|$ is always above Fermi surface and \mathbf{k} always below.³⁸ The situation is depicted in figure 9. At T = 0, there is a maximum frequency above which there are no



Figure 9: Eigenfrequencies of electron gas in RPA.

more particle-hole excitations possible for given fixed q, i.e. the largest excitation energy occurs when $k = k_F$ and \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q} are parallel, so that for a parabolic band, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = k^2/(2m)$,

$$\omega_{max} = \frac{k_F q}{m} + \frac{q^2}{2m}.$$
(168)

 38 To arrive at this result, note from (156)

$$\begin{split} \chi_{0}(\mathbf{q},\omega) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}}) - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})) - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left\{ \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} - \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left\{ \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} - \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}}) + i\eta} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left\{ \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} - \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}}) + i\eta)}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}}) + i\eta} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left\{ \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} - \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}))}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) + i\eta} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}})(1 - f(\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}})) \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} - \frac{1}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) + i\eta} \right\} \\ &\lim_{T \to 0} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_F \\ |\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}| > k_F}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}}) + i\eta} - \frac{1}{\omega - (\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) + i\eta} \right\} \end{split}$$

There is another possible root of ϵ , as also shown in Fig. (9). In the limit $\omega > \omega_{max}$, we may expand (167) for small q, and find

$$\chi_{0}(\mathbf{q},\omega) \simeq \frac{2q^{2}}{m\omega^{2}} \sum_{k < k_{F}} \left[1 + \frac{2\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{q}}{m\omega} + 3\left(\frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{q}}{m\omega}\right)^{2} + \dots \right]$$
$$\simeq \frac{k_{F}^{3}}{3\pi^{2}} \frac{q^{2}}{m\omega^{2}} \left[1 + \frac{3}{5}\left(\frac{k_{F}q}{m\omega}\right)^{2} + \dots \right].$$
(169)

Now we look for a solution to $\text{Re}V\chi_0 = 1$ and find to leading order³⁹

$$\omega = \omega_{pl} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(q/k_F)^2 + \dots \right), \qquad (170)$$

with

$$\omega_{pl} = \left(\frac{4\pi ne^2}{m}\right)^{1/2} \tag{171}$$

which is of course the plasma frequency you found by elementary methods last semester. In contrast to the particle-hole excitations, which involve exciting only 1 particle from its position in the Fermi sea, a plasma oscillation perforce involves motions of all particles and is therefore referred to as a collective mode of the system. Plasmons have been observed indirectly in metals, primarily in thin metallic films.



Figure 10: Excitations (poles of $\epsilon(\mathbf{q}, \omega)^{-1}$) at T = 0.

2.3 Fermi liquid theory

In a good metal the average interelectron distance is of the order of or smaller than the range of the interaction, e.g. the screening length $k_{TF}^{-1} \approx 0.5 (n/a_0^3)^{-1/6}$, where n is the density, of order 0.1-1nm for typical parameters. One might therefore expect that interactions should

³⁹Note this is a result for 3 dimensions. It is a useful exercise to obtain the analogous result for 2D, which has $\omega \sim q^{1/2}$, i.e a gapless mode.

strongly modify the picture of free electrons commonly used to describe metals. It turns out, however, that for $T \ll T_F$ the important degrees of freedom are mostly frozen out, and only a fraction T/T_F of all electrons near the Fermi surface participate in interaction processes. This leads to the possibility of a mapping between the free Fermi gas and the interacting Fermi system. IF the elementary excitations of the many-body system can be obtained from the single-particle states of the free electron gas by turning on the interaction adiabatically (and if the ground state has the full symmetry of the Hamiltonian), the distribution function $n_{k\sigma}$ of the interacting system would be the same as that of a free gas, and the particle and hole excitations of the gas would evolve into "quasiparticle" and "quasihole" states.



Figure 11: a) Evolution of quasiparticle states; b) T = 0 Quasiparticle distribution function n_k^0 ; c) T = 0true electron distribution function $\langle c_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$.

2.3.1 Particle-hole excitations

To understand what this really means, let's go back and review the definitions of the terms particles and holes. Let's take N free Fermions, mass m in a volume L^3 , where we know that the eigenstates are Slater determinants of N different single particle states, each given by

$$\psi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L^3}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}.$$
(172)

Let's stick to T = 0 for the moment, and recall that the occupation of each state is given by $n_{\mathbf{k}} = \theta(k_F - k)$, where k_F is the radius of the Fermi sea.

Now let's add one "test" particle to the lowest available state $k = k_F$. We then have for the chemical potential at T = 0,

$$\mu = E_0(N+1) - E_0(N) = \frac{\partial E_0}{\partial N} = \frac{k_F^2}{2m}.$$
(173)

Particles and holes are excitations of the filled Fermi sea. Excitations of the gas consist of taking a certain number of particles and moving them to the other side of the Fermi surface, yielding particles above and an equal number of holes below the Fermi surface. These excitations can be described in terms of the changes in the particle occupation numbers $\delta n_p = n_p - n_p^0$:

$$\delta n_k = \begin{cases} \delta_{k,k'} \text{ for a particle } k' > k_F \\ -\delta_{k,k'} \text{ for a hole } k' < k_F \end{cases} .$$
(174)

At nonzero temperatures, a thermal fluctuation will create changes in occupation numbers



Figure 12: Particle and hole excitations of the Fermi gas.

 $\delta n_p \sim 1$ only for excitations of energy within $k_B T$ of ε_F . Note that the total energy of the free gas is completely specified as a functional of the occupation numbers:

$$E - E_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{k^2}{2m} (n_k - n_k^0) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{k^2}{2m} \delta n_k \,.$$
(175)

Now take the gas and put it in contact with a particle reservoir. The appropriate thermodynamic potential is then the Gibbs free energy, which for T = 0 is $F = E - \mu N$, and

$$F - F_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\frac{k^2}{2m} - \mu\right) \delta n_k \equiv \sum_k \xi_k \delta n_k \,. \tag{176}$$

The free energy of one particle, with momentum **k** and occupation $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}'} = \delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}$ is $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}$ and it corresponds to an excitation outside the Fermi surface. The free energy of a hole $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = -\delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}$ is $-\xi_{\mathbf{k}}$, which corresponds to an excitation below the Fermi surface. For both species then the free energy of an excitation is $|\xi_k|$, which is always positive; i.e., the Fermi gas is stable with respect to excitations as it must be.

2.3.2 Quasiparticles and quasiholes in interacting system

Consider a system with interacting particles an average spacing a apart, so that the typical interaction energy is $\frac{e^2}{a}e^{-a/r_{TF}}$. As discussed above, we now suppose that we can create this system by turning on the interactions adiabatically starting from the free gas in a time t, such that the system evolves while staying always in its ground state.

If a state of the ideal system is characterized by the distribution $n_{\mathbf{k}}^{0}$, then the state of the interacting system will evolve adiabatically from $n_{\mathbf{k}}^{0}$ to $n_{\mathbf{k}}$. In fact if the system remains in its ground state, then $n_{\mathbf{k}}^{0} = n_{\mathbf{k}}$, i.e. the occupation of each state labelled by \mathbf{k} won't change (although the energy will). This is an assumption, and we will be studying some counterexamples to this ansatz (superconductivity and magnetism). But in general Landau expected this to hold if the *symmetry* of the interacting system was the same as the noninteracting one, and this appears to be the case for simple metals.

Let's follow what happens to a particle of momentum \mathbf{k} added to the top of the noninteracting Fermi gas when we slowly turn the interaction knob. As U increases, two things



Figure 13: Evolution of particle in state \mathbf{k} on top of Fermi sea as interaction is turned on. Particle becomes "dressed" by interactions with the rest of the system which changes the effective mass but not the momentum of the excitation ("quasiparticle").

happen. The **k** state of the original particle is no longer an eigenstate of \mathcal{H} , so it decays into the new excitations of the system, which according to our ansatz are also single-particle-like. Nearby particles also decay into the original state; this mixing has the effect of "dressing" the original free particle with a "cloud" of excitations of the surrounding system. However since momentum is conserved, the net excitation (called a *quasiparticle*)) can still be labelled with original momentum **k**. In the same way, holes of momentum **k** below the Fermi surface evolve into quasiholes. Occasionally an analogy from classical mechanics is useful: we think of a bullet being fired into a large container filled with cotton. It will drag some cotton with it, and create a "particle+cloud" with increased mass but the same momentum.

It is too much to hope that the interactions between quasiparticles will vanish altogether. The N-particle ground state wave-function may still be Slater-determinant like, but this doesn't necessarily imply that the quasiparticles are infinitely long-lived (exact) eigenstates of the system. So if each quasiparticle state **k** has lifetime $\tau_{\mathbf{k}}$, we have to worry a bit about the adiabatic switching on procedure if $\tau_{\mathbf{k}} < t$. If so, the quasiparticle will decay before we finish switching, and we won't be able to go reversibly back and forth. If we decrease ttoo much so again $\tau_{\mathbf{k}} \gg t$, then the switching on of U may not be adiabatic, i.e. we may knock the system into a state other than its ground state. It was Landau's great insight to recognize that these objections are overcome for quasiparticle states sufficiently close to the Fermi energy. In this case the Pauli principle strongly restricts the decay channels for a quasiparticle, and one can argue (see below) that the lifetime becomes infinite at the Fermi energy itself. Therefore for any time t there should be a narrow range of energies near the Fermi surface for which the $\tau_{\mathbf{k}}$ is long enough to make the whole construction work.

2.3.3 Energy of quasiparticles.

As in the free gas, excitations will be characterized only by the deviation of the occupation number from the ground state occupation $n_{\mathbf{k}}^{0.40}$

$$\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = n_{\mathbf{k}} - n_{\mathbf{k}}^0 \tag{177}$$

(I hide the spin index for now). At sufficiently low temperatures $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} \sim 1$ only for those excitations near the Fermi surface where the condition $\tau_{\mathbf{k}} \gg t$ is satisfied. Therefore we should be able to formulate a theory which depends only on $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$, not on $n_{\mathbf{k}}$ or $n_{\mathbf{k}}^{0}$, which are not well defined for \mathbf{k} far from the Fermi surface. $n_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $n_{\mathbf{k}}^{0}$ should never enter independently and are not physically relevant.

For the noninteracting system the dependence of the energy (T = 0) E on $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$ is very simple:

$$E - E_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{k^2}{2m} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} \,. \tag{178}$$

In the interacting case $E[n_{\mathbf{k}}]$ is more complicated generally, but if we take $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$ to be small (just a few excitations above the ground state) then we may expand:

$$E[n_{\mathbf{k}}] = E_o + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathcal{O}(\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}^2), \qquad (179)$$

where we now define $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \delta E / \delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$. If $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = \delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}$, then $E \approx E_0 + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}$; i.e., the energy of the quasiparticle with momentum \mathbf{k}' is $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}$.

As discussed, we will only need $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ near the Fermi surface where $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. So we may expand $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ around the Fermi level,

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \approx \mu + (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_F) \cdot \nabla_k \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \big|_{k_F} \tag{180}$$

⁴⁰Note we will now take over the notation $n_{\mathbf{k}}^0$ which in the previous discussion meant the distribution function of the noninteracting system. Now it means the ground state of the interacting system.

where $\nabla_k \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = v_{\mathbf{k}}$, the group velocity of the quasiparticle. We no longer know the exact form of $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$, but some exact relations must be obeyed because our system obeys certain symmetries. If we explicitly put the spin-dependence back in, we have symmetries

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} = \epsilon_{-\mathbf{k},-\sigma}$$
 time-reversal (181)

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} = \epsilon_{-\mathbf{k},\sigma}$$
 parity (182)

So unless we explicitly break *T*-symmetry by e.g. applying a magnetic field, we have $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} = \epsilon_{-\mathbf{k},\sigma} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k},-\sigma}$. Furthermore, as usual $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ has to respect the point and space group symmetries of the system, e.g. for an isotropic system $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ depends only upon the magnitude of \mathbf{k} , $|\mathbf{k}|$, so \mathbf{k} and $v_{\mathbf{k}} = \nabla \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}(|\mathbf{k}|) = \hat{k}(d\epsilon_k/dk)$ are parallel.⁴¹ Define $(m^*)^{-1}$ as the constant of proportionality at the Fermi surface⁴²

$$v_{k_F} = k_F/m^* \tag{183}$$

Then for the interacting system at the Fermi surface

$$N_{interacting}(\varepsilon_F) = \frac{m^* k_F}{\pi^2}, \qquad (184)$$

the same form as for the noninteracting system. Note the m^* (usually but not always > m) accounts for the dressing of the quasiparticle particle (bullet + cotton!). In other words, as far as the density of levels at the Fermi energy is concerned, the only thing which changes is the effective mass of the fermionic single-particle excitations.

2.3.4 Residual quasiparticle interactions

Let's go back to the Gibbs free energy of our system of quasiparticles characterized in some generalized excited state by distribution function $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$:

$$F - F_0 = E - E_0 - \mu (N - N_0).$$
(185)

where again F_0 , E_0 etc. characterize the ground state. Thus,

$$N - N_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} \,, \tag{186}$$

and since

$$E - E_0 \approx \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathcal{O}(\delta n^2),$$
 (187)

we get

$$F - F_0 \approx \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu \right) \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \xi_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathcal{O}(\delta n^2) \,. \tag{188}$$

 $^{^{41}\}mathrm{For}$ a cubic system $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ is invariant under 90° rotations, etc.

⁴²Note k_F is not changed by interactions (Luttinger's theorem for isotropic system)

As shown in Fig. 14, we will be interested in excitations of the system which deform the Fermi surface by an amount proportional to δ . For example, suppose that along the positive k_x axis, our excited system has $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = 1$ for some states \mathbf{k} above k_F , whereas along the negative k_x axis some states have $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = -1$. The approximation to the free energy above



Figure 14: Small deformations of the Fermi sphere, proportional to δ .

will remain valid provided

$$\delta \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}| \ll 1.$$
(189)

If we stick with our original criterion of using only states near the Fermi surface to construct our distortion, the $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}$ for those states with $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} \neq 0$ will also be of order δ . Thus,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \xi_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} \sim \mathcal{O}(\delta^2) \,, \tag{190}$$

so in order to keep terms of order δ^2 consistently we must also add the next term in the Taylor series expansion of the energy :

$$F - F_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \xi_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}'} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$$
(191)

where

$$f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} = \frac{\delta E}{\delta n_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}'}} \tag{192}$$

The term proportional to $f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}$, was proposed by L.D. Landau. It describes the residual interactions of the quasiparticle excitations which remain even after they are "dressed". A glance at the dimensions of the new term shows that $f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \sim 1/V$. But if $f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}$ is an interaction between quasiparticles, each of which (in plane-wave like state) is delocalized over the whole

volume V, so the probability that two will interact is roughly $\sim k_{TF}^{-3}/V$. Therefore

$$f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \sim k_{TF}^{-3}/(N_0 V)$$
 (193)

We can proceed as earlier with the quasiparticle energy $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ and ask how this unknown interaction function reflects the underlying symmetries of the physical system. To this end we reintroduce the hidden spin degrees of freedom. First in the absence of an external magnetic field, the system should be invariant under time-reversal, so

$$f_{\mathbf{k}\sigma,\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} = f_{-\mathbf{k}-\sigma,-\mathbf{k}'-\sigma'}, \qquad (194)$$

and, in a system with reflection symmetry (parity)

$$f_{\mathbf{k}\sigma,\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} = f_{-\mathbf{k}\sigma,-\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} \,. \tag{195}$$

Then since this implies

$$f_{\mathbf{k}\sigma,\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} = f_{\mathbf{k}-\sigma,\mathbf{k}'-\sigma'} \,. \tag{196}$$

it must be that f depends only upon the relative orientations of the spins σ and σ' , so there are only two independent components for given \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' , e.g. $f_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow,\mathbf{k}'\uparrow}$ and $f_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow,\mathbf{k}'\downarrow}$. It is more conventional to decompose f into spin-symmetric and antisymmetric parts:

$$f^{a}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} = \frac{1}{2} \left(f_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow,\mathbf{k}'\uparrow} - f_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow,\mathbf{k}'\downarrow} \right) \qquad f^{s}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} = \frac{1}{2} \left(f_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow,\mathbf{k}'\uparrow} + f_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow,\mathbf{k}'\downarrow} \right) \,. \tag{197}$$

 $f^a_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}$ may be interpreted as an exchange interaction, or

$$f_{\mathbf{k}\sigma,\mathbf{k}'\sigma'} = f^s_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} + \sigma\sigma' f^a_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}.$$
(198)

where σ and σ' are the spins of the quasiparticles with momentum **k** and **k'**, respectively.

The next important assumption entering Fermi liquid theory is that the quasiparticle interactions are short-ranged. This means that $f_{kk'}$ is essentially constant as a function of $|\vec{k}|, |\vec{k'}|$, and so depends only on the directions $\hat{k}, \hat{k'}, f_{kk'}^{s,a} \simeq f(\hat{k}, \hat{k'})$:

$$f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \simeq \left. f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \right|_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}=\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}=\mu} \tag{199}$$

or equivalently, only on the angle θ between them!

$$f^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} f^{\alpha}_{l} P_{l}(\cos\theta) \,. \tag{200}$$

Conventionally these f parameters are expressed in terms of dimensionless quantities.

$$N_0 f_l^{\alpha} = \frac{m^* k_F}{\pi^2} f_l^{\alpha} = F_l^{\alpha} \,. \tag{201}$$

We expect that the Landau parameters $F_{\ell}^{s,a}$ will be negligible for sufficiently large ℓ , so we have now achieved our goal of subsuming the complicated effects of interactions in a few phenomenological parameters.

2.3.5 Local energy of a quasiparticle

Now consider an interacting system with a certain distribution of excited quasiparticles $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}'}$. Let's add another particle, say of momentum \mathbf{k} and see how the energy changes. The distribution function goes from $(\delta n'_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow \delta n'_{\mathbf{k}} + \delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'})$. From Eq. 191 the free energy of the additional quasiparticle is

$$\tilde{\xi}_k = \xi_{\mathbf{k}} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} f_{\mathbf{k}',\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}'} , \qquad (202)$$

(since $f_{\mathbf{k}',\mathbf{k}} = f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}$). The second term on the right corresponds to the average interaction of a quasiparticle with the other quasiparticles in the system.⁴³

Substituting (200) and (201) in (202) gives the shift in energy of a quasiparticle due to the Landau interaction

$$\delta\xi_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \equiv \tilde{\xi}_k - \xi_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{N_0} [F_0^s \delta n + \sigma F_0^a \delta n_s + \frac{1}{k_F^2} F_1^s \vec{k} \cdot \vec{g} + \dots], \qquad (203)$$

where $\delta n = \sum_{k\sigma} \delta n_{k\sigma}$ is the density shift, $\delta n_s = \sum_{k\sigma} \sigma \delta n_{k\sigma}$ is the spin density shift, and $\vec{g} = \sum_{k\sigma} \vec{k} \delta n_{k\sigma}$ is the momentum density. The first two terms can be thought of as molecular field couplings representing the average effect of density and magnetization fluctuations in the surrounding medium on the quasiparticle energy. The third term is the famous "backflow" term which describes the effect of the quasiparticle streaming through the medium to which it couples. The flow pattern is of dipolar form, as depicted in Figure 15. Note that the Landau parameter F_1^s and m^* are not completely independent, but one has (in the Galilean invariant liquid case ONLY) $m * /m = 1 + F_1^s / 3$. In a crystal this relation does not hold.⁴⁴



Figure 15: Schematic of backflow around quasiparticle of momentum ${f k}$

Before leaving this section, let me just mention that the importance of the *local quasipar*ticle energy $\tilde{\xi}$ or rather the energy shift $\delta \tilde{\xi}$ is that when one writes down how external forces

 $^{^{43}}$ The structure may remind you of Hartree-Fock theory, to which it is similar, but keep in mind f is the residual interaction between quasiparticles, not electrons

⁴⁴For an extensive discussion of this and many other aspects of FL theory I've glossed over, see G. Baym and C. Pethick, Landau Fermi-Liquid Theory : Concepts and Applications, Wiley 1991

couple to the system to determine, e.g. transport properties, it is the gradient of $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{k}}$ which is the force a qp of momentum \mathbf{k} experiences due to spatial inhomogeneities in the system. There is a "Landau molecular field" proportional to

$$-\nabla \tilde{\delta} \xi_{\mathbf{k}} = -\nabla \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} f_{k'k} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{r})$$
(204)

which is responsible, e.g. for spin waves in spin polarized dilute gases. Eq. (204) is a simplified version of Landau's famous kinetic equation for a Fermi liquid which is the analog of the Boltzman equation for a weakly interacting gas.

2.3.6 Thermodynamic properties

The expression (203) for the quasiparticle energies and the fact that the equilibrium quasiparticle distribution function is just the Fermi function enables immediate calculations of thermodynamic observables in the Fermi liquid. Because the states of the gas and liquid are in one to one correspondence, for example, one immediately knows that the expression for the entropy of the liquid is the same as that for a free Fermi gas,⁴⁵

$$S = -\sum_{k\sigma} [n_{k\sigma} \log n_{k\sigma} + (1 - n_{k\sigma}) \log(1 - n_{k\sigma})].$$
(205)

Note now that the distribution function $n_{k\sigma}$ in *local equilibrium* must be a Fermi function evaluated at energy $\epsilon_{k\sigma}$ given by the bare energy plus the expression (202) in general. However, we are interested in calculating a quantity in *global equilibrium*, in which case the shifts $\delta n, \delta n_s, \vec{g}, \dots$ vanish. In this case the calculation reduces to the usual one for a free Fermi gas. For temperatures $T \ll T_F$ we replace the sum $\sum_{k\sigma}$ by $N_0 \int d\xi$. The temperature can then be scaled out, and the remaining integral performed, yielding the entropy density at low temperatures,

$$s = \frac{1}{3}\pi^2 N_0 T,$$
 (206)

and the specific heat at constant volume is therefore $C = T(\partial s/\partial T)_V = (m^*k_F/3)T$, where in the last step we have used $N_0 = m^*k_F/\pi^2$. The result for the liquid is identical to that for the gas, with the exception of the replacement of m by m^* .

Similarly, we may derive an expression for the spin susceptibility of the Fermi liquid by constructing the magnetization δn_s as above, and noting that the shift in the distribution function is due to the Landau shift in the quasiparticle energy (molecular field) as well as the external field \vec{H} :

⁴⁵Recall the *form* of the Fermi distribution function for the free gas is obtained purely from statistical considerations, not from any knowledge of the energies. Similarly the Fermi surface derivative $\partial n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}/\partial \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ is a delta function as in the noninteracting case since there is a discontinuity at k_F .

$$\delta n_{k\sigma} = \frac{\partial n_{k\sigma}}{\partial \epsilon_{k\sigma}} (\delta \epsilon_{k\sigma} - \mu_0 \sigma H).$$
(207)

Using $\delta n_s \equiv \sum_{k\sigma} \sigma \delta n_{k\sigma}$, and noting that since $\sigma \partial n / \partial \epsilon$ is isotropic and odd in σ , only the $\ell = 0$, spin-antisymmetric part of $\delta \epsilon_{k\sigma}$ contributes to the sum, we find for the spin susceptibility $\chi = \mu_0 (\partial n_s / \partial H)$

$$\chi = \frac{\mu_0^2 N_0}{(1+F_0^a)} = \frac{m^*/m}{1+F_0^a} \chi_0,$$
(208)

where χ_0 is the susceptibility of the free gas. Remember N_0 here is the renormalized DOS including m^* , not m.

2.3.7 Quasiparticle relaxation time and transport properties.

Calculations of transport properties require introducing the quasiparticle lifetime. Recall the quasiparticle states are *not* eigenstates of the many-body Hamiltonian, due to the weak residual interactions among them. We therefore expect a quasiparticle with momentum \vec{k} to decay except when it sits exactly at the Fermi surface and when T = 0, when it can easily be seen there is no phase space for scattering which conserves energy and momentum. But relaxing these conditions (\vec{k} not on FS, $T \neq 0$) allows phase space for scattering and hence a finite lifetime. Since the interactions among quasiparticles are assumed weak, we may use a golden rule type formula for the scattering rate"



Figure 16: 2-quasiparticle collision: states before (1,2) and after (3,4)

Let's consider a quasiparticle with energy $\xi_1 = \epsilon_1 - \mu$ above the Fermi level. A scattering process takes it to final state ξ_3 , and to conserve energy and momentum a quasiparticle with energy ξ_2 must be scattered to final state ξ_4 . I've assumed the interaction V is independent of momentum, frequency, etc. because the most important effects we are looking for are purely statistical, unless V is very singular.⁴⁶ The "golden rule" then gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\tau_1} &= 2\pi \int d\xi_2 N(\xi_2) \int d\xi_3 N(\xi_3) \int d\xi_4 N(\xi_4) |V|^2 f(\xi_2) (1 - f(\xi_3)) (1 - f(\xi_4)) \delta(\xi_1 + \xi_2 - \xi_3 - \xi_4) \simeq \\ &\simeq 2\pi N_0^3 |V^2| \int_0^{\xi_1} d\xi_3 \int_0^{\xi_1 - \xi_3} d\xi_4 = \pi N_0^3 |V|^2 \xi_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the delta function conserves energy and the Fermi factors ensure that there is a particle in state 2 and that states 3 and 4 are empty beforehand. For simplicity I evaluated the Fermi functions at T=0, giving the final simple result. Note I have neglected spin for the moment, but this is not essential.⁴⁷ Note now that for $N_0 V \ll 1$ (weak residual interactions) and $N_0 \sim 1/\varepsilon_F$, it is clear that for $\xi \ll \varepsilon_F$ the scattering satisfies the condition

$$\frac{1}{\tau_1} \ll \xi. \tag{209}$$

This means that the quasiparticle states are well-defined near the Fermi surface, since their damping is small compared to the energy of the state. (As expected, the relaxation rate exactly at the Fermi surface vanishes identically.) We therefore expect that Fermi liquid theory calculations in terms of a weakly interacting quasiparticle gas will be valid for frequencies and temperatures such that $\omega, T \ll \varepsilon_F$.

Two further comments about the scattering rate are of potential importance. First, I give without proof the full result at finite temperatures:⁴⁸

$$\frac{1}{\tau(\xi)} = \frac{\pi |V|^2}{64\varepsilon_F^3} [(\pi T)^2 + \xi^2], \tag{211}$$

so that at finite T one finds that $1/\tau$ varies as T^2 or ξ^2 , whichever is larger. Certain simple transport properties in a Fermi liquid reflect this directly. For example, the resistivity due to electron-electron scattering in a metal goes as T^2 at the lowest temperatures; it is usually

$$\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_3 = \mathbf{k}_4 - \mathbf{k}_2 \,. \tag{210}$$

Since ξ_1 and ξ_2 are confined to a narrow shell around the Fermi surface, so too are ξ_3 and ξ_4 . This can be seen in Fig. 16, where the requirement that $\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_3 = \mathbf{k}_4 - \mathbf{k}_2$ limits the allowed states for particles 3 and 4. Taking \mathbf{k}_1 fixed, allowed momenta for 2 and 3 are obtained by rotating $\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_3 = \mathbf{k}_4 - \mathbf{k}_2$; this rotation is constrained, however, by the fact that particles cannot scatter into occupied states. This restriction on the final states reduces the scattering probability by a factor of ξ_1/ε_F , but is the same restriction contained in the calculation above. Thus momentum conservation doesn't affect our T = 0 estimate above, except to modify the prefactor.

If these hand-waving arguments don't satisfy you (they shouldn't), see AGD or Fetter/Wallecka.

 $^{^{46}}$ In the case of the Coulomb interaction, which is very singular, screening takes care of this problem. See section 2.2.6

⁴⁷What I have done which is not really Kosher, however, is to neglect the constraints placed on the scattering by momentum conservation. It turns out in three dimensions this is not terribly important, and one obtains the correct answer. It is a useful exercise to convince yourself, for example, that in 2D the relaxation rate goes like $\xi^2 \log \xi$.

⁴⁸Our simple calculation has to be modified to account for momentum conservation, expressed as

masked by other, larger sources of scattering in ordinary metals, however.⁴⁹ The second remark is that if one were to find, for some microscopic model, that the relaxation rate was larger than the quasiparticle energy, the quasiparticles would be overdamped and the entire concept would be useless. One would then speak of an incoherent or "non-Fermi liquid" system. If, on the other hand, one found that $1/\tau$ were to scale precisely with max (ξ, T) (instead of max (ξ^2, T^2)), the quasiparticles would be in a certain sense critically damped, i.e. not quite well defined, but not completely washed out either. This is what is frequently referred to as a "marginal Fermi liquid".[MFL]

2.3.8 Effective mass m^* of quasiparticles

Here I give a quick derivation of the relation between the Landau parameter F_{1s} which appears in the current and the effective mass m^* .

The net momentum of the volume V of quasiparticles is

$$\mathbf{P}_{qp} = 2V \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k} n_{\mathbf{k}}, \text{ net quasiparticle momentum}$$
(212)

also the total momentum of the Fermi liquid. Since the number of particles equals the number of quasiparticles, however, the quasiparticle and particle currents must also be equal

$$\mathbf{J}_{qp} = \mathbf{J}_p = 2V \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} n_{\mathbf{k}} \text{ net quasiparticle and particle current}$$
(213)

or, since the momentum is just the particle mass times this current

$$\mathbf{P}_p = 2Vm \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} n_{\mathbf{k}}$$
 net quasiparticle and particle momentum (214)

where $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{p}} = \nabla_k \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}}$, is the velocity of the quasiparticle. So

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k} n_{\mathbf{k}} = m \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \nabla_k \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}} n_{\mathbf{k}}$$
(215)

Let's consider an arbitrary variation of $n_{\mathbf{k}}$, and remember that $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}}$ depends on $n_{\mathbf{k}}$, so that

$$\delta \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}} = 2V \sum_{\mathbf{k}} f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}'} \,. \tag{216}$$

For Eq. 215, this means that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = m \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \nabla_{k} \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$$

$$+ m 2V \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \left(f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}'} \right) n_{\mathbf{k}} ,$$
(217)

⁴⁹Of course this is not quite right. The electron-electron interactions in a solid conserve crysal momentum, and thus the conductivity of a pure crystal would be infinite at any temperature unless one explicitly accounts for Umklapp processes. Thus it is *not* true for the electrical conductivity that $\sigma \propto \tau$, with τ the 1-particle lifetime due to electron-electron interactions. However the Umklapp processes do also provide a transport rate varying as T^2 , so one often hears the not quite correct remark that the scattering rate in a Fermi liquid varies as T^2 , therefore so does the resistivity ρ .

or integrating by parts (and renaming $\mathbf{k} \to \mathbf{k}'$ in the last part), we get

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\mathbf{k}}{m} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \nabla_{k} \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$$

$$-2V \int \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \delta n_{\mathbf{k}} f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \nabla_{\mathbf{k}'} n_{\mathbf{k}'} ,$$
(218)

The usual variational argument says that since $\delta n_{\mathbf{k}}$ is arbitrary, we must have that the integrands are equal

$$\frac{\mathbf{k}}{m} = \nabla_{\mathbf{k}}\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}} - 2V\sum_{\mathbf{k}'} f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'}\nabla_{\mathbf{k}'}n_{\mathbf{k}'}$$
(219)

At $T = 0 \nabla_{\mathbf{k}'} n_{\mathbf{k}'} = -\hat{k}' \delta(k' - \mathbf{k}_F)$. The integral may now be evaluated by using the system isotropy in **k** space, and choosing **k** parallel \hat{z} . As we mostly concerned with Fermi surface properties we take $k = k_F$, and let θ be the angle between **k** (or the z-axis) and **k**', and finally note that on the Fermi surface $|\nabla_k \tilde{\epsilon}_k|_{k=k_F} = v_F = k_F/m^*$. Thus,

$$\frac{k_F}{m} = \frac{k_F}{m^*} + 2V \int \frac{k'^2 dk d\Omega}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \hat{k} \cdot \hat{k}' \delta(k'-k_F)$$
(220)

However, since both **k** and **k'** are restricted to the Fermi surface $\hat{k}' = \cos \theta$, and evaluating the integral over k, we get

$$\frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{m^*} + 2Vk_F \int \frac{d\Omega}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} f_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}'} \cos\theta \,, \tag{221}$$

If we now sum over (hidden) spins only the symmetric part of f appears

$$\frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{m^*} + \frac{4\pi V k_F}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \int d(\cos\theta) f^s(\theta) \cos\theta, \qquad (222)$$

Now use decomposition (200), orthonormality of Legendre polynomials, and def. of Landau parameters:

(223)

$$f^{\alpha}(\theta) = \sum_{l} f_{l}^{\alpha} P_{l}(\cos \theta), \qquad (224)$$

$$\int_{-1}^{1} dx P_n(x) P_m(x) dx = \frac{2}{2n+1} \delta_{nm}$$
(225)

$$VN_0 f_l^{\alpha} = \frac{Vm^*k_F}{\pi^2\hbar^3} f_l^{\alpha} = F_l^{\alpha} , \qquad (226)$$

we find that

$$\frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{m^*} + \frac{F_1^s}{3m^*} \,, \tag{227}$$

or $m^*/m = 1 + F_1^s/3$.

So effective mass and F_{1s} aren't independent, at least in a Galilean invariant system where (213) holds.

3 Quantum Magnetism

The main purpose of this section is to introduce you to ordered magnetic states in solids and their "spin wave-like" elementary excitations. Magnetism is an enormous field, and reviewing it entirely is beyond the scope of this course.

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Atomic magnetic Hamiltonian

The simplest magnetic systems to consider are insulators where electron-electron interactions are weak. If this is the case, the magnetic response of the solid to an applied field is given by the sum of the susceptibilities of the individual atoms. The magnetic susceptibility is defined by the the 2nd derivative of the free energy,⁵⁰

$$\chi = -\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial H^2}.\tag{228}$$

We would like to know if one can understand (on the basis of an understanding of atomic structure) why some systems (e.g. some elements which are insulators) are paramagnetic $(\chi > 0)$ and some diamagnetic $(\chi < 0)$.

The one-body Hamiltonian for the motion of the electrons in the nuclear Coulomb potential in the presence of the field is

$$H_{atom} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i} \left(\mathbf{p}_{i} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}_{i}) \right)^{2} + \sum_{i} V(r_{i}) + g_{0} \mu_{B} \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{S},$$
(229)

where $\sum_{i} \mathbf{S}_{i}$ is the total spin operator, $\mu_{B} \equiv e/(2mc)$ is the Bohr magneton, $g_{0} \simeq 2$ is the gyromagnetic ratio, and $\mathbf{A} = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{H}$ is the vector potential corresponding to the applied uniform field, assumed to point in the \hat{z} direction. Expanding the kinetic energy, H_{atom} may now be expressed⁵¹ in terms of the orbital magnetic moment operator $\mathbf{L} = \sum_{i} \mathbf{r}_{i} \times \mathbf{p}_{i}$ as

$$H_{atom} = \sum_{i} \frac{\mathbf{p}_i^2}{2m} + \sum_{i} V(r_i) + \delta H, \qquad (230)$$

$$\delta H = \mu_B (\mathbf{L} + g_0 \mathbf{S}) \cdot \mathbf{H} + \frac{e^2}{8mc^2} H^2 \sum_i (x_i^2 + y_i^2).$$
(231)

Given a set of exact eigenstates for the atomic Hamiltonian in zero field $|n\rangle$ (ignore degeneracies for simplicity), standard perturbation theory in δH gives

$$\delta E_n = -\mathbf{H} \cdot \langle n | \vec{\mu} | n \rangle + \sum_{n \neq n'} \left| \frac{\langle n | \mathbf{H} \cdot \vec{\mu} | n' \rangle \right|^2}{E_n - E_{n'}} + \frac{e^2}{8mc^2} H^2 \langle n | \sum_i (x_i^2 + y_i^2) | n \rangle, \tag{232}$$

 $^{^{50}\}mathrm{In}$ this section I choose units such that the system volume V = 1.

⁵¹To see this, it is useful to recall that it's ok to commute **r** and **p** here since, in the cross product, p_z acts only on x, y, etc.

where $\vec{\mu} = -\mu_B(\mathbf{L} + g_0 \mathbf{S})$. It is easy to see that the first term dominates and is of order the cyclotron frequency $\omega_c \equiv eH/(mc)$ unless it vanishes for symmetry reasons. The third term is of order $\omega_c/(e^2/a_0)$ smaller, because typical electron orbits are confined to atomic sizes a_0 , and is important in insulators only when the state $|n\rangle$ has zero magnetic moment (L = S = 0). Since the coefficient of H^2 is manifestly positive, the susceptibility⁵² in the $\mu = 0$ ground state $|0\rangle$ is $\chi = -\partial^2 \delta E_0/\partial H^2$, which is clearly < 0, i.e. diamagnetic.⁵³

In most cases, however, the atomic shells are partially filled, and the ground state is determined by minimizing the atomic energy together with the intraatomic Coulomb interaction needed to break certain degeneracies, i.e. by "Hund's rules".⁵⁴ Once this ground state (in particlular the S, L, and J quantum numbers is known, the atomic susceptibility can be calculated. The simplest case is again the J = 0 case, where the first term in (232) again vanishes. Then the second term and third term compete, and can result in either a diamagnetic or paramagnetic susceptibility. The 2nd term is called the *Van Vleck* term in the energy. It is paramagnetic since its contribution to χ is

$$\chi_{VV} = -\frac{\partial^2 E_0|_{2nd \ term}}{\partial H^2} = 2\mu_B^2 \sum_n \frac{|\langle 0|\vec{\mu}|n\rangle|^2}{E_n - E_0} > 0.$$
(233)

3.1.2 Curie Law-free spins

In the more usual case of $J \neq 0$, the ground state is 2J + 1 degenerate, and we have to be more careful about defining the susceptibility. The free energy as $T \rightarrow 0$ can no longer be replaced by E_0 as we did above. We have to diagonalize the perturbation δH in the degenerate subspace of 2J + 1 states with the same J but different J_z . Applying a magnetic field breaks this degeneracy, so we have a small statistical calculation to do. The energies of the "spin" in a field are given by

$$H = -\vec{\mu} \cdot \mathbf{H},\tag{234}$$

⁵²If the ground state is nondegenerate, we can replace F = E - TS in the definition of the susceptibility by the ground state energy E_0 .

 $^{^{53}\}mathrm{This}$ weak diamagnetism in insulators with filled shells is called Larmor diamagnetism

⁵⁴See A&M or any serious quantum mechanics book. I'm not going to lecture on this but ask you about it on homework.

and since $\vec{\mu} = -\gamma \mathbf{J}$ within the subspace of definite J^2 ,⁵⁵ the 2J + 1 degeneracy which existed at $\mathbf{H} = 0$ is completely broken. The free energy is⁵⁶

$$F = -T \log Z = -T \log \sum_{J_z=-J}^{J} e^{\beta \gamma H J_z}$$

= $-T \log \left[\frac{e^{\beta \gamma H (J+1/2)} - e^{-\beta \gamma H (J+1/2)}}{e^{\beta \gamma H/2} - e^{-\beta \gamma H/2}} \right],$ (235)

so the magnetization of the free spins is

$$M = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial H} = \gamma J B(\beta \gamma J H), \qquad (236)$$

where B(x) is the Brillouin function

$$B(x) = \frac{2J+1}{2J} \coth \frac{2J+1}{2J} x - \frac{1}{2J} \coth \frac{1}{2J} x.$$
(237)

Note I defined $\gamma = \mu_B g$. We were particularly interested in the $H \to 0$ case, so as to compare with ions with filled shells or J = 0; in this case one expands for $T >> \gamma H$, i.e. $\operatorname{coth} x \sim 1/x + x/3 + \dots, B(x) \simeq (J+1)x/(3J)$ to find the susceptibility

$$\chi = -\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial H^2} = \frac{\gamma^2 J(J+1)}{3T},\tag{238}$$

i.e. a *Curie law* for the high-temperature susceptibility. A 1/T susceptibility at high T is generally taken as evidence for free paramagnetic spins, and the size of the moment given by $\mu^2 = \gamma^2 J(J+1)$.

3.1.3 Magnetic interactions

The most important interactions between magnetic moments in an insulator are electrostatic and inherently quantum mechanical in nature. From a classical perspective, one might expect

$$\langle JLSJ_z | \vec{V} | JLSJ'_z \rangle = g(JLS) \langle JLSJ_z | \vec{J} | JLSJ'_z \rangle,$$

where \vec{V} is some vector operator. In other words, within the subspace of definite J, L, S but for arbitrary J_z , all the matrix elements $\langle J_z | \vec{V} | J'_z \rangle$ are $= g \langle J_z | \vec{J} | J'_z \rangle$, with the same proportionality const. g, called the Landé g-factor.

Obviously $\vec{\mu} = \mathbf{L} + g_0 \mathbf{S}$ is a vector operator since L and S are angular momenta, so we can apply the theorem. If J = 0 but L, S are not (what we called case II in class) it is not obvious at first sight that term 1 in Eq. (232) $\propto \langle 0|\mu_z|0\rangle$ vanishes since our basis states are not eigenstates of L_z and S_z . But using the WE theorem, we can see that it must vanish. This means for the case with ground state $J = 0, L, S \neq 0$, terms 2 and 3 in Eq. (232) indeed compete. Examine the matrix element in the numerator of 2 (van Vleck) in Eq. (232): while the ground state $\langle 0|$ is still $\langle J = 0LSJ_z = 0|$ on the left, the sum over the excited states of the atom $|n'\rangle$ on the right includes other J's besides zero! Thus the WE theorem does not apply. [for a more complete discussion, see e.g. Ashcroft and Mermin p. 654.]

⁵⁶Geometric series with finite number of terms: $\sum_{n=0}^{N} x^n = \frac{1-x^N}{1-x}$.

⁵⁵This is not obvious at first sight. The magnetic moment operator $\vec{\mu} \propto \hat{\mathbf{L}} + \mathbf{g}_0 \hat{\mathbf{S}}$ is not proportional to the total angular momentum operator $\hat{\mathbf{J}} = \hat{\mathbf{L}} + \hat{\mathbf{S}}$. However its matrix elements within the subspace of definite L, S, J are proportional, due to the Wigner-Eckart theorem. The theorem is quite general, which is of course why none of us remember it. But in it's simpler, more useful form, it says that the matrix elements of any vector operator are proportional to those of the total angular momentum operator J. You need to remember that this holds in a basis where atomic states are written $|JLSJ_z\rangle$, and that "proportional" just means



Figure 17: Dimensionless Brillouin fctn.

two such moments to interact via the classical dipolar force, giving a potential energy of configuration of two moments $\vec{\mu}_1$ and $\vec{\mu}_2$ separated by a distance **r** of

$$U = \frac{\vec{\mu}_1 \cdot \vec{\mu}_2 - 3(\vec{\mu}_1 \cdot \hat{r})(\vec{\mu}_2 \cdot \hat{r})}{r^3}$$
(239)

Putting in typical atomic moments of order $\mu_B = e\hbar/mc$ and distances of order a Bohr radius $r \sim a_0 = \hbar^2/me^2$, we find $U \simeq 10^{-4}eV$, which is very small compared to typical atomic energies of order eV. Quantum-mechanical *exchange* is almost aways a much larger effect, and the dipolar interactions are therefore normally neglected in the discussions of magnetic interactions in solids. Exchange arises because, e.g., two quantum mechanical spins 1/2 (in isolation) can be in either a spin triplet (total S = 1), or singlet (total S = 0). The spatial part of the two-particle wavefunctions is antisymmetric for triplet and symmetric for singlet, respectively. Since the particles carrying the spins are also charged, there will be a large energetic difference between the two spin configurations due to the different size of the Coulomb matrix elements (the "amount of time the two particles spend close to each other") in the two cases.⁵⁷ In terms of hypothetical atomic wave functions $\psi_a(\mathbf{r})$ and $\psi_b(\mathbf{r})$ for the two particles, the singlet and triplet combinations are $\psi_1^o(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \psi_a(\mathbf{r}_1)\psi_b(\mathbf{r}_2) \pm \psi_a(\mathbf{r}_2)\psi_b(\mathbf{r}_1)$,

 $^{^{57}}$ Imagine moving 2 H-atoms together starting from infinite separation. Initially the 3 S = 1 states and 1 S = 0 states must be degenerate. As the particles start to interact via the Coulomb force at very long range, there will be a splitting between singlet and triplet.

so the singlet-triplet splitting is approximately

$$-J \equiv E_0 - E_1 = \langle 0|H|0\rangle - \langle 1|H|1\rangle$$

$$\simeq 2 \int d^3r_1 d^3r_2 \psi_a^*(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_b^*(\mathbf{r}_2) V(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \psi_a(\mathbf{r}_2) \psi_b(\mathbf{r}_1),$$
(240)

where V represents the Coulomb interactions between the particles (and possible other particles in the problem).⁵⁸

We'd now like to write down a simple Hamiltonian for the spins which contains the physics of this exchange splitting. This was done first around 1939 by Heisenberg, who suggested

$$H_{2-spin} = J\hat{\mathbf{S}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2 \tag{242}$$

You can easily calculate that the energy of the triplet state in this Hamiltonian is J/4, and that of the singlet state -3J/4. So the splitting is indeed J. Note that the sign of J in the H_2 case is positive, meaning the S = 0 state is favored; the interaction is then said to be antiferromagnetic, meaning it favors antialigning the spins with each other.⁵⁹

The so-called Heitler-London model of exchange just reviewed presented works reasonably well for well-separated molecules, but for N atoms in a real solid, magnetic interactions are much more complicated, and it is in general not sufficient to restrict one's consideration to the 4-state subspace (singlet \oplus 3 components of triplet) to calculate the effective exchange. In many cases, particularly when the magnetic ions are reasonably well-separated, it nevertheless turns out to be ok to simply extend the 2-spin form (242) to the entire lattice:

$$H = J \sum_{i\delta} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i+\delta}$$
(243)

where J is the exchange constant, i runs over sites and δ runs over nearest neighbors.⁶⁰ This is the so-called Heisenberg model. The sign of J can be either antiferromagnetic (J > 0 in this convention), or ferromagnetic (J < 0). This may lead, at sufficiently low temperature,

$$V(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{e^2}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|} + \frac{e^2}{|\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2|} - \frac{e^2}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1|} - \frac{e^2}{|\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{R}_2|},$$
(241)

 $^{^{58}\}mathrm{For}$ example, in the H molecule,

where \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 are the sites of the protons. Note the argument above would suggest naively that the triplet state should be the ground state in the well-separated ion limit, because the Coulomb interaction is minimized in the spatially antisymmetric case. However the true ground state of the H_2 molecule is the Heitler-London *singlet* state $\psi_s(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \simeq \psi_a(\mathbf{r}_1)\psi_b(\mathbf{r}_2) + \psi_a(\mathbf{r}_2)\psi_b(\mathbf{r}_1)$. In the real H_2 molecule the singlet energy is lowered by interactions of the electrons in the chemical bond with the protons-the triplet state is not even a bound state!

⁵⁹Historically the sign convention for J was the opposite; J > 0 was usually taken to be ferromagnetic, i.e. the Hamiltonian was defined with another minus sign. I use the more popular convention $H = J \sum S_i \cdot S_j$. Be careful!

⁶⁰One has to be a bit careful about the counting. J is defined conventionally such that there is one term in the Hamiltonian for each *bond* between two sites. Therefore if i runs over all sites, one should have δ only run over, e.g. for the simple cubic lattice, $+\hat{x}$, $+\hat{y}$, and $+\hat{z}$. If it ran over all nearest neighbors, bonds would be double-counted and we would have to multiply by 1/2.

to a quantum ordered state with ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic-type order. Or, it may not. A good deal depends on the type and dimensionality of the lattice, as we discuss below.



Figure 18: a) Ferromagnetic ordering; b) antiferromagnetic ordering.

Although oversimplified, the Heisenberg model is still very difficult to solve. Fortunately, a good deal has been learned about it, and once one has put in the work it turns out to describe magnetic ordering and magnetic correlations rather well for a wide class of solids, provided one is willing to treat J as a phenomenological parameter to be determined from a fit to experiment.

The simplest thing one can do to take interactions between spins into account is to ask, "What is the average exchange felt by a given spin due to all the other spins?" This is the essence of the *molecular field theory* or *mean field theory* due to Weiss. Split off from the Hamiltonian all terms connecting any spins to a specific spin $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i$. For the nearest-neighbor exchange model we are considering, this means just look at the nearest neighbors. This part of the Hamiltonian is

$$\delta H_i = \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \cdot \left[J \sum_{\delta} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i+\delta} \right] - \vec{\mu}_i \cdot \mathbf{H}, \qquad (244)$$

where we have included the coupling of the spin in question to the external field as well. We see that the 1-spin Hamiltonian looks like the Hamiltonian for a spin in an effective field,

$$\delta H_i = -\vec{\mu}_i \cdot \mathbf{H}_{eff}, \tag{245}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{eff} = \mathbf{H} - \frac{J}{g\mu_B} \sum_{\delta} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i+\delta}, \qquad (246)$$

where the magnetic moment $\vec{\mu} \equiv \gamma \mathbf{S} = g\mu_B \mathbf{S}$. Note this "effective field" as currently defined is a complicated *operator*, depending on the neighboring spin operators $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i+\delta}$. The mean field theory replaces this quantity with its thermal average

$$\mathbf{H}_{eff} = \mathbf{H} - \frac{J}{g\mu_B} \sum_{\delta} \langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i+\delta} \rangle$$
(247)

$$= \mathbf{H} - \frac{zJ}{(g\mu_B)^2} \mathbf{M}, \tag{248}$$

where the magnetization $M = \langle \mu \rangle$ and z is the number of nearest neighbors again. But since we have an effective one-body Hamiltonian, thermal averages are supposed to be computed just as in the noninteracting system, cf. (236), but in the ensemble with effective magnetic field. Therefore the magnetization is

$$M = \gamma SB(\beta\gamma SH_{eff}) = \gamma SB\left(\beta\gamma S[H - \frac{zJ}{\gamma^2}M]\right).$$
(249)

This is now a nonlinear equation for M, which we can solve for any H and T. It should describe a ferromagnet with finite spontaneous $(H \rightarrow 0)$ magnetization below a critical temperature T_c if J < 0. So to search for T_c , set H = 0 and expand B(x) for small x (we are looking for a second order transition, where $M \rightarrow 0$ continuously):

$$M = -\gamma SB\left(\frac{zJ}{\gamma T_c}M\right) \simeq -\gamma S \frac{S+1}{3S} \frac{zJ}{\gamma T_c}M$$
(250)

$$\Rightarrow T_c = \frac{S(S+1)}{3}z(-J), \tag{251}$$

So the critical temperature in this mean field theory (unlike the BCS mean field theory!) is of order the fundamental interaction energy |J|. We expect this value to be an upper bound to the true critical temperature, which will be supressed by spin fluctuations about the mean field used in the calculation.

Below T_c , we can calculate how the magnetization varies near the transition by expanding the Brillouin fctn. to one higher power in x. The result is

$$M \sim (T - T_c)^{1/2}$$
. (252)

Note this exponent 1/2 is characteristic of the disappearance of the order parameter near the transition of any mean field theory (Landau).



Figure 19: Plot of Mathematica solution to eqn. (249) for M vs. T using -J = g = 1; z = 4; S = 1/2. $T_c = 1$ for this choice. Upper curve: H = 0.1; lower curve: H = 0.

3.2 Ising model

The Ising model⁶¹ consists of a set of spins s_i with z-components only localized on lattice sites *i* interacting via nearest-neighbor exchange J < 0:

$$\mathcal{H} = J \sum_{i,j \in n.n.} S_i S_j - 2\mu_B H \sum_i S_i.$$
(253)

Note it is an inherently classical model, since all spin commutators vanish $[S_i, S_j] = 0$. Its historical importance consisted not so much in its applicability to real ferromagnetic systems as in the role its solutions, particularly the analytical solution of the 2D model published by Onsager in 1944, played in elucidating the nature of phase transitions. Onsager's solution demonstrated clearly that all approximation methods and series expansions heretofore used to attack the ferromagnetic transition failed in the critical regime, and thereby highlighted the fundamental nature of the problem of critical phenomena, not solved (by Wilson and others) until in the early 70's.

3.2.1 Phase transition/critical point

We will be interested in properties of the model (253) at low and at high temperatures. What we will find is that there is a temperature T_c below which the system magnetizes spontaneously, just as in mean field theory, but that its true value is in general smaller than that given by mean field theory due to the importance of thermal fluctuations. Qualitatively, the phase diagram looks like this:

Below T_c , the system magnetizes spontaneously even for field $H \to 0$. Instead of investigating the Onsager solution in detail, I will rely on the Monte Carlo simulation of the model

⁶¹The "Ising model" was developed as a model for ferromagnetism by Wilhelm Lenz and his student Ernst Ising in the early '20's.



Figure 20: Field-magnetization curves for three cases. M_0 is spontaneous magnetization in ferromagnetic phase $T < T_c$.

at http://mattbierbaum.github.io/ising.js/. The idea is as follows. We would like to minimize $F = T \log \operatorname{Tr} \exp -\beta H$ for a given temperature and applied field. Finding the configuration of Ising spins which does so is a complicated task, but we can imagine starting the system at high temperatures, where all configurations are equally likely, and cooling to the desired temperature $T.^{62}$ Along the way, we allow the system to relax by "sweeping" through all spins in the finite size lattice, and deciding in the next Monte Carlo "time" step whether the spin will be up or down. Up and down are weighted by a Boltzman probability factor

$$p(S_i = \pm 1/2) = \frac{e^{\pm \mu H_{eff}/T}}{e^{-\mu H_{eff}/T} + e^{\mu H_{eff}/T}},$$
(254)

where H_i^{eff} is the effective field defined in (246). The simulation picks a spin S_i in the next time step randomly, but weighted with these up and down probabilities. A single "sweep" (time step) consists of $L \times L$ such attempts to flip spins, where L is the size of the square sample. Periodic boundary conditions are assumed, and the spin configuration is displayed, with one color for up and one for down.

Here are some remarks on Ising critical phenomena, some of which you can check yourself with the simulation:

 At high temperatures one recovers the expected Curie law $\chi \sim 1/T$

⁶²This procedure is called simulated annealing

- The susceptibility diverges at a critical temperature below the mean field value.⁶³ Near, but not too near, the transition χ has the Curie-Weiss form $\chi \sim (T T_c)^{-1}$.
- With very careful application of the simulation, one should obtain Onsager's result that very near the transition ("critical regime")

$$M \sim (T_c - T)^{\beta},\tag{255}$$

with $\beta = 1/8$. The susceptibility actually varies as

$$\chi \sim |T - T_c|^{-\gamma},\tag{256}$$

with $\gamma = 7/4$. Other physical quantities also diverge near the transition, e.g. the specific heat varies as $|T - T_c|^{-\alpha}$, with $\alpha = 0$ (log divergence).

- There is no real singularity in any physical quantity so long as the system size remains finite.
- The critical exponents α, β, γ... get closer to their mean field values (β = 1/2, α =, γ =,...) as the number of nearest neighbors in the lattice increases, or if the dimensionality of the system increases.
- The mean square size of themal magnetization fluctuations gets very large close to the transition ("Critical opalescence", so named for the increased scattering of light near the liquid-solid critical point).
- Magnetization relaxation gets very long near the transition ("Critical slowing down").
- In 1D there is no finite temperature phase transition, although mean field theory predicts one. This is an example of the Mermin-Wagner theorem, which states that for short range interactions and an order parameter which obeys a continuous symmetry, there is no long range order in 1D, and none in 2D if T > 0. Note the Ising model escapes this theorem because it has only a discrete (so-called Z_2) symmetry: the magnetization can be $\pm S$ on each site.

⁶³This is given as a homework problem. Note the value of J used in the simulation is 1/4 that defined here, since S's are ± 1 .

3.2.2 1D solution by transfer matrix

3.2.3 Ferromagnetic domains

3.3 Ferromagnetic magnons

Let's consider the simplest example of an insulating ferromagnet, described by the ferromagnetic Heisenberg Hamiltonian

$$H = J \sum_{i\delta} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i+\delta} - 2\mu_B H_0 \sum_i \hat{S}_{iz}, \qquad (257)$$

where J < 0 is the ferromagnetic exchange constant, *i* runs over sites and δ runs over nearest neighbors, and H_0 is the magnetic field pointing in the \hat{z} direction. It is clear that the system can minimize its energy by having all the spins **S** align along the \hat{z} direction at T = 0; i.e. the quantum ground state is identical to the classical ground state. Finding the elementary excitations of the quantum many-body system is not so easy, however, due to the fact that the spin operators do not commute.

3.3.1 Holstein-Primakoff transformation

One can attempt to transform the spin problem to a more standard many-body interacting problem by replacing the spins with boson creation and annihilation operators. This can be done *exactly* by the Holstein-Primakoff transformation⁶⁴

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{+} = \hat{S}_{ix} + i\hat{S}_{iy} = (2S)^{1/2} \left(1 - \frac{a_{i}^{\dagger}a_{i}}{2S}\right)^{1/2} a_{i}$$
(258)

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{-} = \hat{S}_{ix} - i\hat{S}_{iy} = (2S)^{1/2}a_{i}^{\dagger} \left(1 - \frac{a_{i}^{\dagger}a_{i}}{2S}\right)^{1/2}.$$
(259)

Verify for yourselves that these definitions S_i^{\pm} give the correct commutation relations $[\hat{S}_x, \hat{S}_y] = i\hat{S}_z$ if the bosonic commutation relations $[a, a^{\dagger}] = 1$ are obeyed on a given lattice site. Note also that the operators which commute with the Hamiltonian are \hat{S}^2 and \hat{S}_z as usual, so we can classify all states in terms of their eigenvalues S(S+1) and S_z . To complete the algebra we need a representation for \hat{S}_z , which can be obtained by using the identity (on a given site i)

$$\hat{S}_{z}^{2} = S(S+1) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{S}^{+} \hat{S}^{-} + \hat{S}^{-} \hat{S}^{+} \right).$$
(260)

Using (259) and some tedious applications of the bosonic commutation relations, we find

$$\hat{S}_z = S - a^{\dagger}a. \tag{261}$$

 $^{^{64}\}mathrm{T.}$ Holstein and H. Primakoff, Phys. Rev. 58, 1098 (1940).

Now since the system is periodic, we are looking for excitations which can be characterized by a well-defined momentum (crystal momentum) \mathbf{k} , so we define the Fourier transformed variables

$$a_i = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_i} \ b_{\mathbf{k}} \quad ; a_i^{\dagger} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_i} \ b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}, \tag{262}$$

where as usual the F.T. variables also satisfy the bosonic relations $[b_{\mathbf{k}}, b_{\mathbf{k}'}] = \delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$, etc. Looking forward a bit, we will see that the operators $b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}$ and $b_{\mathbf{k}}$ create and destroy a magnon or spin-wave excitation of the ferromagnet. These turn out to be excitations where the spins locally deviate only a small amount from their ground state values ($\| \hat{z} \rangle$) as the "spin wave" passes by. This suggests a posteriori that an expansion in the spin deviations $a_i^{\dagger}a_i$ (see (261)) may converge quickly. Holstein and Primakoff therefore suggested expanding the nasty square roots in (259), giving

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{+} \simeq (2S)^{1/2} \left[a_{i} - \left(\frac{a_{i}^{\dagger} a_{i} a_{i}}{4S} \right) + \dots \right]$$

$$= \left(\frac{2S}{N} \right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}} - \frac{1}{4SN} \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\mathbf{k}''} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{k}'')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}'} b_{\mathbf{k}''} + \dots \right], \quad (263)$$

$$\hat{c}_{i} = c_{i} c_{i} c_{i}^{\dagger} a_{i}^{\dagger} a_{i} = 0$$

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{-} \simeq (2S)^{1/2} \left[a_{i}^{\dagger} - \left(\frac{a_{i}^{\dagger} a_{i}^{\dagger} a_{i}}{4S} \right) + \dots \right] \\
= \left(\frac{2S}{N} \right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{4SN} \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}',\mathbf{k}''} e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{k}'')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}'}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}''} + \dots \right], \quad (264)$$

$$\hat{S}_{iz} = S - a_i^{\dagger} a_i = S - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_i} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}'}.$$
(265)

Note that the expansion is formally an expansion in 1/S, so we might expect it to converge rapidly in the case of a large-spin system.⁶⁵ The last equation is exact, not approximate, and it is useful to note that the total spin of the system along the magnetic field is

$$S_{z,tot} = \sum_{i} S_{z} = NS - \sum_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}}, \qquad (266)$$

consistent with our picture of magnons tipping the spin away from its T = 0 equilibrium direction along the applied field.

3.3.2 Linear spin wave theory

The idea now is to keep initially only the bilinear terms in the magnon operators, leaving us with a soluble Hamiltonian, hoping that we can then treat the 4th-order and higher

 $^{^{65}}$ For spin-1/2, the case of greatest interest, however, it is far from obvious that this uncontrolled approximation makes any sense, despite the words we have said about spin deviations being small. Why should they be? Yet empirically linear spin wave theory works very well in 3D, and surprisingly well in 2D.

terms perturbatively.⁶⁶ Simply substitute (263)-(265) into (257), and collect the terms first proportional to S^2 , S, 1, 1/S, etc. We find

$$H = \frac{1}{2}JNzS^2 - 2\mu_B H_0 S + H_0^{magnon} + \mathcal{O}(1), \qquad (267)$$

where z is the number of nearest neighbors (e.g. 6 for simple cubic lattice), and

$$H_{0}^{magnon} = \frac{JS}{N} \sum_{i\delta\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} \left[e^{-i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} e^{i\mathbf{k}'\cdot\delta} b_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}'}^{\dagger} + e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}'\cdot\delta} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}'} - e^{-i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}'} \right] + \frac{2\mu_{B}H_{0}}{N} \sum_{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}'} = JzS \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} + \gamma_{-\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}} - 2b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}} \right] + 2\mu_{B}H_{0} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}}$$
$$= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[-2JzS(1-\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}) + 2\mu_{B}H_{0} \right] b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}}, \qquad (268)$$

where

$$\gamma_k = \frac{1}{z} \sum_{\delta} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\delta} \tag{269}$$

is the magnon dispersion function, which in this approximation depends only on the positions of the nearest neighbor spins. Note in the last step of (268), I assumed $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = \gamma_{-\mathbf{k}}$, which is true for lattices with inversion symmetry. For example, for the simple cubic lattice in 3D with lattice constant a, $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = (\cos k_x a + \cos k_y a + \cos k_z a)/3$, clearly an even function of \mathbf{k} . Under these assumptions, the magnon part of the Hamiltonian is remarkably simple, and can be written like a harmonic oscillator or phonon-type Hamiltonian, $H_0^{magnon} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} n_{\mathbf{k}} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}$, where $n_{\mathbf{k}} = b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} b_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the number of magnons in state \mathbf{k} , and

$$\omega_k = -2JSz(1 - \gamma_k) + 2\mu_B H_0 \tag{270}$$

is the magnon dispersion. The most important magnons will be those with momenta close to the center of the Brillouin zone, $k \sim 0$, so we need to examine the small-k dispersion function. For a Bravais lattice, like simple cubic, this expansion gives $1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} \simeq k^2$,⁶⁷ i.e. the magnon dispersion vanishes as $k \to 0$. For more complicated lattices, there will be solutions with $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} \to \text{const.}$ There is always a "gapless mode" $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} \to 0$ as well, however, since the existence of such a mode is guaranteed by the Goldstone theorem.⁶⁸ The figure shows a simple 1D schematic of a spin wave with wavelength $\lambda = 2\pi/k$ corresponding to about 10 lattice sites. The picture is supposed to convey the fact that the spin deviations from the ordered state are small, and vary slightly from site to site. Quantum mechanically, the wave function for the spin wave state contains at each site a small amplitude for the spin to be

⁶⁶physically these "nonlinear spin wave" terms represent the interactions of magnons, and resemble closely terms representing interactions of phonons in anharmonic lattice theory

⁶⁷Check for simple cubic!

⁶⁸For every spontaneously broken continuous symmetry of the Hamiltonian there is a $\omega_{\mathbf{k}\to 0} = 0$ mode.



Figure 21: Real space picture of spin deviations in magnon. Top: ordered ground state

in a state with definite S_x and/or S_y . This can be seen by inverting Eq. (264) to leading order, & noting that the spin wave creation operator $b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}$ lowers the spin with $\hat{\mathbf{S}}^- = \hat{S}_x - i\hat{S}_y$ with phase $e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_i}$ and amplitude $\sim 1/S$ at each site *i*.

3.3.3 Dynamical Susceptibility

Experimental interlude

The simple spin wave calculations described above (and below) are uncontrolled for spin-1/2 systems, and it would be nice to know to what extent one can trust them. In recent years, numerical work (exact diagonalization and quantum Monte Carlo) techniques have shown, as noted, that linear spin wave calculations compare suprisingly well with such "exact" results for the Heisenberg model. But we still need to know if there are any physical systems whose effective spin Hamiltonian can really be described by Heisenberg models. In addition, keep in mind that the utility of spin wave theory was recognized long before such numerical calculations were available, mainly through comparison with experiments on simple magnets. The most useful probe of magnetic structure is slow neutron scattering, a technique developed in the 40's by Brockhouse and Schull (Nobel prize 1994). This section is a brief discussion of how one can use neutron scattering techniques to determine the dispersion and lifetimes of magnetic excitations in solids.⁶⁹

Neutrons scatter from solids primarily due to the nuclear strong force, which leads to nonmagnetic neutron-ion scattering and allows structural determinations very similar to x-ray diffraction analysis. In addition, slow neutrons traversing a crystal can emit or absorb phonons, so the inelastic neutron cross-section is also a sensitive measure of the dispersion

⁶⁹A complete discussion is found in Lovesey, Theory of Neutron Scattering from Condensed Matter, Oxford 1984, V. 2

of the collective modes of the ionic system.⁷⁰ There is also a force on the neutron due to the interaction of its small magnetic dipole moment with the spin magnetic moment of the electrons in the solid. There are therefore additional contributions to the peaks in the elastic neutron scattering intensity (at the Bragg angles) corresponding to magnetic scattering if the solid has long-range magnetic order; they can be distinguished from the nonmagnetic scattering because the additional spectral weight is strongly temperature dependent and disappears above the critical temperature, or through application of an external magnetic field. Furthermore, in analogy to the phonon case, inelastic neutron scattering experiments on ferromagnets yield peaks corresponding to processes where the neutron absorbs or emits a spin wave excitation. Thus the dispersion relation for the magnons can be mapped out.⁷¹ I will not go through the derivation of the inelastic scattering cross section, which can be found in Lovesey's book. It is similar to the elementary derivation given by Ashcroft & Mermin in Appendix N for phonons. The result is

$$\left(\frac{d^{2}\sigma}{d\Omega d\omega}\right)_{inel} = a_{0}^{2}\frac{k'}{k}\left\{\frac{g}{2}F(\mathbf{q})\right\}^{2}e^{-2W(\mathbf{q})}\left(1+b(\omega)\right) \\
\times \frac{-N}{\pi(g\mu_{B})^{2}}\sum_{\alpha\beta}(\delta_{\alpha\beta}-\hat{q}_{\alpha}\hat{q}_{\beta})\operatorname{Im}\chi_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{q},-\omega),$$
(271)

where a_0 is the Bohr radius, **k** and **k'** are initial and final wave vector, $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'$, $F(\mathbf{q})$ atomic form factor, $e^{-2W(\mathbf{q})}$ the Debye-Waller factor, and $b(\omega)$ the Bose distribution function, N the number of unit cells, and ω is the energy change of the neuton, $k^2/(2m) - k'^2/(2m)$. The physics we are interested in is contained in the imaginary part of the dynamic susceptibility $\chi(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. For $\omega < 0$, this measures the energy loss by neutrons as they slow down while emitting spin waves in the solid; for $\omega > 0$ the neutrons are picking up energy from thermally excited spin waves.

To see the effect of spin excitations within linear spin wave theory, one calculates the transverse spin susceptibility

$$\chi_{+-}^{R}(\mathbf{R}_{i} - \mathbf{R}_{j}, t) \equiv -\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{\rho}[\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i}^{+}(t), \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{j}^{-}]\right)\theta(t)$$
(272)

and then its Fourier transform wrt momentum \mathbf{q} and frequency ω . I won't do this calculation explicitly, but leave it as an exercise. You express the S operators in terms of the b_k 's, whose time dependence is exactly known since the approximate Hamiltonian is quadratic. At the end, after Fourier transforming, one recovers

 $^{^{70}\}mathrm{cf.}$ Ashcroft & Mermin ch. 24

⁷¹Even in systems without long range magnetic order, neutron experiments provide important information on the correlation length and lifetime of *spin fluctuations*. In strongly correlated systems (e.g. magnets just above their critical temperature, or itinerant magnets close to a magnetic transition as in Sec. xxx), these can be thought of as collective modes with finite lifetime and decay length. This means the correlation function $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i}^{\alpha}(t) \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{j}^{\alpha} \rangle$ is not const. as $t, |\mathbf{R}_{i} - \mathbf{R}_{j}| \to \infty$, but may fall off very slowly, as "power laws" $t^{-\beta}$, $|\mathbf{R}_{i} - \mathbf{R}_{j}|^{-\gamma}$.

$$\chi_{+-}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \left(\frac{2S}{N}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\omega + \omega_{\mathbf{q}} + i0^+}\right).$$
(273)

Again, as for the Fermi gas, we see that the collective modes of the system are reflected as the poles in the appropriate response function.

The final cross section is now proportional to

Im
$$\chi_{+-}(\mathbf{q}, -\omega) \sim \delta(\omega + \omega_{\mathbf{q}}),$$
 (274)

i.e. there is a peak when a magnon is *absorbed* (neutron's energy $k'^2/(2m)$ is larger than initial energy $k^2/(2m) \Rightarrow \omega \equiv k^2/(2m) - k'^2/(2m) < 0$.). There is another similar contribution proportional to $\delta(\omega - \omega_{\mathbf{q}})$ (emission) coming from χ_{-+} . Thus the dispersion $\omega_{\mathbf{q}}$ can be mapped out by careful measurement. The one-magnon lines are of course broadened by



Figure 22: Neutron scattering data on ferromagnet. I searched a bit but couldn't come up with any more modern data than this. This is Fig. 1, Ch. 4 of Kittel, Magnon dispersions in magnetite from inelastic neutron scattering by Brockhouse (Nobel Prize 1994) and Watanabe.

magnon-magnon interactions, and by finite temperatures (Debye-Waller factor). There are also multimagnon absorption and emission processes which contribute in higher order.

Finally, note that I proposed to calculate χ_{+-} , the transverse magnetic susceptibility in Eq. 272. What about the longitudinal susceptibility χ^{zz} , defined in the analogous way but for z-components $\langle [S_z, S_z] \rangle$? Because the ordered spins point in the z direction, the mode for this channel is gapped, not gapless, with energy of order J!

3.4 Quantum antiferromagnet

Antiferromagnetic systems are generally approached by analogy with ferromagnetic systems, assuming that the system can be divided up into two or more *sublattices*, i.e. infinite inter-

penetrating subsets of the lattice whose union is the entire lattice. Classically, it is frequently clear that if we choose all spins on a given judiciously chosen sublattice to be aligned with one another, we must achieve a minimum in the energy. For example, for the classical AF Heisenberg model $H = J \sum_{i\delta} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+\delta}$ with J > 0 on a square lattice, choosing the A-B sublattices in the figure and making all spins up on one and down on another allows each bond to achieve its lowest energy of $-JS^2$. This state, with alternating up and down spins, is referred to as the classical Neél state. Similarly, it may be clear to you that on the triangular lattice the classical lowest energy configuration is achieved when spins are placed at 120° with respect to one another on the sublattices A, B, C. However, quantum magnetic systems



Figure 23: Possible choice of sublattices for antiferromagnet

are not quite so simple. Consider the magnetization M_A on a given sublattice (say the A sites in the figure) of the square lattice; alternatively one can define the staggered magnetization as $M_s = \sum_i (-1)^i \langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle$ (Note $(-1)^i$ means +1 on the A sites and -1 on the B sites.) Either construct can be used as the order parameter for an antiferromagnet on a bipartite lattice. In the classical Neél state, these is simply $M_A = NS/2$ and $M_s = NS$, respectively, i.e. the sublattice or staggered magnetization are saturated. In the wave function for the ground state of a quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnet, however, there is some amplitude for spins to be flipped on a a given sublattice, due to the fact that for a given bond the system can lower its energy by taking advantage of the $\hat{S}_x \hat{S}'_x + \hat{S}_y \hat{S}'_y$ terms. This effect can be seen already by examining the two-spin 1/2 case for the ferromagnet and antiferromagnet. For the ferromagnet, the classical energy is $-|J|S^2 = -|J|/4$, but the quantum energy in the total spin 1 state is also -|J|/4. For the antiferromagnet, the classical energy is $-JS^2 = -J/4$, but the energy in the total spin 0 quantum mechanical state is -3J/4. So quantum fluctuationswhich inevitably depress the magnetization on a given sublattice-lower the energy in the antiferromagnetic case. This can be illustrated in a very simple calculation of magnons in the antiferromagnet following our previous discussion in section 7.2.

3.4.1 Antiferromagnetic magnons

We will follow the same procedure for the ferromagnet on each sublattice A and B, defining

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{A+} = \hat{S}_{ix}^{A} + i\hat{S}_{iy}^{A} = (2S)^{1/2} \left(1 - \frac{A_{i}^{\dagger}A_{i}}{2S}\right)^{1/2} A_{i}$$
(275)

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{A-} = \hat{S}_{ix}^{A} - i\hat{S}_{iy}^{A} = (2S)^{1/2}A_{i}^{\dagger} \left(1 - \frac{A_{i}^{\dagger}A_{i}}{2S}\right)^{1/2}$$
(276)

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{B+} = \hat{S}_{ix}^{B} + i\hat{S}_{iy}^{B} = (2S)^{1/2} \left(1 - \frac{B_{i}^{\dagger}B_{i}}{2S}\right)^{1/2} B_{i}$$
(277)

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{B-} = \hat{S}_{ix}^{B} - i\hat{S}_{iy}^{B} = (2S)^{1/2} B_{i}^{\dagger} \left(1 - \frac{B_{i}^{\dagger}B_{i}}{2S}\right)^{1/2}$$
(278)

$$S_{iz}^A = S - A_i^{\dagger} A_i \tag{279}$$

$$-S_{iz}^B = S - B_i^{\dagger} B_i, \qquad (280)$$

i.e. we assume that in the absence of any quantum fluctuations spins on sublattice A are up and those on B are down. Otherwise the formalism on each sublattice is identical to what we did for the ferromagnet. We introduce on each sublattice creation & annihilation operators for spin waves with momentum \mathbf{k} :

$$a_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{i \in A} A_i e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}_i}; \qquad a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{i \in A} A_i^{\dagger} e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}_i}$$
(281)

$$b_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{i \in B} B_i e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}_i}; \qquad b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} = \frac{1}{N^{1/2}} \sum_{i \in B} B_i^{\dagger} e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}_i}.$$
(282)

In principle \mathbf{k} takes values only in the 1st magnetic Brillouin zone, or half-zone, since the periodicity of the sublattices is twice that of the underlying lattice. The spin operators on a
given site are then expanded as

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{A+} \simeq \left(\frac{2S}{N}\right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} a_{\mathbf{k}} + \dots\right], \qquad (283)$$

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{B+} \simeq \left(\frac{2S}{N}\right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}} + \dots\right], \qquad (284)$$

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{A-} \simeq \left(\frac{2S}{N}\right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} + \dots\right], \qquad (285)$$

$$\hat{S}_{i}^{B-} \simeq \left(\frac{2S}{N}\right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} + \dots\right], \qquad (286)$$

$$\hat{S}_{iz}^{A} = S - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}} a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}'}$$
(287)

$$\hat{S}_{iz}^B = -S + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_i} a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}'}.$$
(288)

The expansion of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian in terms of these variables is now (compare (267))

$$H = -NzJS^{2} + H_{0}^{magnon} + \mathcal{O}(1), \qquad (289)$$
$$H_{0}^{magnon} = JzS\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} + a_{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{k}}) + (a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}a_{\mathbf{k}} + b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}b_{\mathbf{k}}) \right] \qquad (290)$$

Unlike the ferromagnetic case, merely expressing the Hamiltonian to bilinear order in the magnon variables does not diagonalize it immediately. We can however perform a canonical transformation⁷² to bring the Hamiltonian into diagonal form (check!):

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} = u_{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{k}} - v_{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}; \quad \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} = u_{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} - v_{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{k}}$$
(291)

$$\beta_{\mathbf{k}} = u_{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{k}} - v_{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}; \quad \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} = u_{\mathbf{k}}b_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} - v_{\mathbf{k}}a_{\mathbf{k}}, \qquad (292)$$

where the coefficients $u_{\mathbf{k}}, v_{\mathbf{k}}$ must be chosen such that $u_{\mathbf{k}}^2 - v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = 1$. One such choice is $u_{\mathbf{k}} = \cosh \theta_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $v_{\mathbf{k}} = \sinh \theta_{\mathbf{k}}$. For each \mathbf{k} , choose the angle $\theta_{\mathbf{k}}$ such that the anomalous terms like $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}$ vanish. One then finds the solution

$$\tanh 2\theta_{\mathbf{k}} = -\gamma_{\mathbf{k}},\tag{293}$$

and

$$H_0^{magnon} = -NE_J + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \omega_{\mathbf{k}} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} + \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} + 1), \qquad (294)$$

where

$$\underline{\omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = E_J^2 (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2), \qquad (295)$$

 $^{^{72}}$ The definition of a canonical transformation, I remind you, is one which will give canonical commutation relations for the transformed fields. This is important because it ensures that we can interpret the Hamiltonian represented in terms of the new fields as a (now diagonal) fermion Hamiltonian, read off the energies, etc.



Figure 24: Integrated intensity of (100) Bragg peak vs. temperature for LaCuO₄, with $T_N = 195K$. (After Shirane et al. 1987)

and $E_J = JzS$. Whereas in the ferromagnetic case we had $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} \sim (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}) \sim k^2$, it is noteworthy that in the antiferromagnetic case the result $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} \sim (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}})^{1/2} \sim k$ gives a linear magnon dispersion at long wavelengths (a center of symmetry of the crystal must be assumed to draw this conclusion). Note further that for each \mathbf{k} there are two degenerate modes in H_0^{magnon} .

3.4.2 Quantum fluctuations in the ground state

You may wonder that there is a constant term in (294), since H_{magnon} was the part of the Hamiltonian which gave the excitations above the ground state in the ferromagnetic case. Here at T = 0 the expectation values (in 3D at least, see below) $\langle \alpha^{\dagger} \alpha \rangle$ and $\langle \beta^{\dagger} \beta \rangle$ vanish – there are no AF magnons in the ground state. But this leaves a constant correction coming from H_{magnon} of $-NE_J + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}$. The spin wave theory yields an decrease of the ground state energy relative to the classical value $-NJzS^2$, but an *increase* over the quantum ferromagnet result of -N|J|S(S+1) due to the zero-point (constant) term in (294).⁷³ The ground-state energy is then

$$E_0 \simeq -NzJS^2 - NzJS + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \omega_{\mathbf{k}}.$$
(296)

The result is conventionally expressed in terms of a constant β defined by

$$E_0 \equiv -NJzS\left(S + \frac{\beta}{z}\right),\tag{297}$$

 $^{^{73}}$ Recall the classical Neél state, which does not contain such fluctuations, is *not* an eigenstate of the quantum Heisenberg Hamiltonian.



Figure 25: a) Inelastic neutron scattering intensity vs. energy transfer at 296K near zone boundary Q = (1, k, 0.5) for oriented LaCuO₄ crystals with Neél temperature 260K; b) spin-wave dispersion $\omega_{\mathbf{q}}$ vs. q_{\parallel} , where q_{\parallel} is in-plane wavevector. (after Hayden et al. 1991)

and

$$\beta/z = N^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \right] = \begin{array}{c} 0.097 & 3\mathrm{D} \\ 0.158 & 2\mathrm{D} \end{array}$$
(298)

(I am checking these-they don't agree with literature I have)

Quantum fluctuations have the further effect of preventing the staggered magnetization from achieving its full saturated value of S, as in the classical Neél state, as shown first by Anderson.⁷⁴ Let us consider the average z-component of spin in equilibrium at temperature T, averaging only over spins on sublattice A of a D-dimensional hypercubic lattice. From (287), we have $\langle \hat{S}_z^A \rangle = S - N^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle A_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} A_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ within linear spin wave theory. Inverting the transformation (398), we can express the A's in terms of the α 's and β 's, whose averages we can easily calculate. Note the 0th order in 1/S gives the classical result, $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_z^A \rangle$, and the deviation is the spin wave reduction of the sublattice moment

$$\frac{\delta M_A}{N} = \langle \hat{S}_z^A \rangle - S = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$$

$$= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle (u_{\mathbf{k}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} + v_{\mathbf{k}} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) (u_{\mathbf{k}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}) \rangle$$

$$= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \langle \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle + v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle + v_{\mathbf{k}}^2,$$
(299)

where N is the number of spins on sublattice B. We have neglected cross terms like $\langle \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \rangle$ because the α and β are independent quanta by construction. However the diagonal averages $\langle \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ and $\langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ are the expectation values for the number operators of independent bosons

⁷⁴P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. 86, 694 (1952).

with dispersion $\omega_{\mathbf{k}}$ in equiblibrium, and so can be replaced (within linear spin wave theory) by

$$n_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \langle \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = b(\omega_{\mathbf{k}}), \qquad (300)$$

where b is the Bose distribution function. The transformation coefficients $u_{\mathbf{k}} = \cosh \theta_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $v_{\mathbf{k}} = \sinh \theta_{\mathbf{k}}$ are determined by the condition (293) such that

$$u_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = \cosh 2\theta_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2}} \tag{301}$$

$$v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2}} - 1 \right),$$
 (302)

such that the sulattice magnetization (299) becomes

$$\frac{\delta M_A}{N} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(n_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2}} \tag{303}$$

Remarks:

- 1. All the above "anomalies" in the AF case relative to the F case occur because we tried to expand about the wrong ground state, i.e. the classical Neél state, whereas we knew *a priori* that it was not an eigenstate of the quantum Heisenberg model. We were lucky: rather than breaking down entirely, the expansion signaled that including spin waves lowered the energy of the system; thus the ground state may be thought of as the classical Neél state and an admixture of spin waves.
- 2. The correction δM_A is independent of S, and negative as it must be (see next point). However relative to the leading classical term S it becomes smaller and smaller as S increases, as expected.
- 3. The integral in (303) depends on the dimensionality of the system. It has a *T*-dependent part coming from $n_{\mathbf{k}}$ and a *T*-independent part coming from the 1/2. At T = 0, where there are no spin waves excited thermally, $n_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$, and we find

$$\frac{\delta M_A}{N} \simeq \begin{cases} -0.078 \quad D = 3\\ -0.196 \quad D = 2\\ \infty \qquad D = 1 \end{cases}$$
(304)

The divergence in D = 1 indicates the failure of spin-wave theory in one dimension.

4. The low temperature behavior of $\delta M(T)$ must be calculated carefully due to the singularities of the bose distribution function when $\omega_k \to 0$. If this divergence is cut off by introducing a scale k_0 near $\mathbf{k} = 0$ and $\mathbf{k} = (\pi/a, \pi/a)$, one finds that δM_A diverges as $1/k_0$ in 1D, and as log k_0 in 2D, whereas it is finite as $\mathbf{k}_0 \to 0$ in 3D. Thus on this basis one does not expect long range spin order at any nonzero temperature in two dimensions (see discussion of Mermin-Wagner theorem below), nor even at T = 0 in one dimension.

3.4.3 Nonlinear spin wave theory

- 3.4.4 Frustrated models
- 3.5 1D & 2D Heisenberg magnets
- 3.5.1 Mermin-Wagner theorem
- 3.5.2 1D: Bethe solution
- 3.5.3 2D: Brief summary

3.6 Itinerant magnetism

"Itinerant magnetism" is a catch-all phrase which refers to magnetic effects in metallic systems (i.e., with conduction electrons). Most of the above discussion assumes that the spins which interact with each other are *localized*, and there are no mobile electrons. However we may study systems in which the electrons which magnetize, or nearly magnetize are mobile, and situations in which localized impurity spins interact with conduction electron spins in a host metal. The last problem turns out to be a very difficult many-body problem which stimulated Wilson to the develop of renormalization group ideas.

3.7 Stoner model for magnetism in metals

The first question is, can we have ferromagnetism in metallic systems with only one relevant band of electrons. The answer is yes, although the magnetization/electron in the ferromagnetic state is typically reduced drastically with respect to insulating ferromagnets. The simplest model which apparently describes this kind of transition (there is no exact solution in D > 1) is the Hubbard model we have already encountered. A great deal of attention has been focussed on the Hubbard model and its variants, particularly because it is the simplest model known to display a metal-insulator (Mott-Hubbard) transition qualitatively similar to what is observed in the high temperature superconductors. To review, the Hubbard model consists of a lattice of sites labelled by i, on which electrons of spin \uparrow or \downarrow may sit. The kinetic energy term in the Hamiltonian allows for electrons to hop between sites with matrix element t, and the potential energy simply requires an energy cost U every time two opposing spins occupy the same site.⁷⁵ Longer range interactions are neglected:

$$H = -t \sum_{\substack{\sigma \\ \langle i,j \rangle}} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} U \sum_{\sigma} n_{i\sigma} n_{i-\sigma}, \qquad (305)$$

where $\langle ij \rangle$ means nearest neighbors only.



In its current form the kinetic energy, when Fourier transformed, corresponds, to a tight binding band in d dimensions of width 4dt,

$$\epsilon_k = -2t \sum_{\alpha=1}^d \cos k_\alpha a,\tag{306}$$

where a is the lattice constant. The physics of the model is as follows. Imagine first that there is one electron per site, i.e. the band is half-filled. If U = 0 the system is clearly metallic, but if $U \to \infty$, double occupation of sites will be "frozen out". Since there are no holes, electrons cannot move, so the model must correspond to an insulating state; at some critical U a metal-insulator transition must take place. We are more interested in the case away from half-filling, where the Hubbard model is thought for large U and small doping (deviation of density from 1 particle/site) to have a ferromagnetic ground state.⁷⁶ In particular, we would like to investigate the transition from a *paragmagnetic* to a *ferromagnetic* state as Tis lowered.

This instability must show up in some quantity we can calculate. In a ferromagnet the susceptibility χ diverges at the transition, i.e. the magnetization produced by the application of an infinitesimal external field is suddenly finite. In many-body language, the static, uniform spin susceptibility is the retarded spin density – spin density correlation function,

⁷⁵What happened to the long-range part of the Coulomb interaction? Now that we know it is screened, we can hope to describe its effects by including only its matrix elements between electrons in wave functions localized on site i and site j, with |i - j| smaller than a screening length. The largest element is normally the i = j one, so it is frequently retained by itself. Note the Hamiltonian (305) includes only an on-site interaction for opposite spins. Of course like spins are forbidden to occupy the same site anyway by the Pauli principle.

⁷⁶At 1/2-filling, one electron per site, a great deal is known about the Hubbard model, in particular that the system is metallic for small U (at least for non-nested lattices, otherwise a narrow-gap spin density wave instability is present), but that as we increase U past a critical value $U_c \sim D$ a transition to an antiferromagnetic insulating state occurs (Brinkman-Rice transition). With one single hole present, as $U \to \infty$, the system is however ferromagnetic (Nagaoka state).

(for the discussion below I take $g\mu_B = 1$)

$$\chi = \chi(q = 0, \omega = 0) = \lim_{h_z \to 0} \frac{\langle S_z \rangle}{h_z} = \int d^3 r \int_0^\infty dt \langle [S_z(r, t), S_z(0, 0)] \rangle,$$
(307)

where in terms of electron number operators $n_{\sigma} = \psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger} \psi_{\sigma}$, the magnetization operators are $S_z = (1/2)[n_{\uparrow} - n_{\downarrow}]$, i.e. they just measure the surplus of up over down spins at some point in space.



Figure 26: 1a) Hubbard interaction; 1b) Spin susceptibility vs. T for free fermions.

Diagramatically, the Hubbard interaction $H_{int} = U \sum_{i} n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}$ looks like figure 26a); note only electrons of opposite spins interact. The magnetic susceptibility is a correlation function similar to the charge susceptibility we have already calculated. At time t=0, we measure the magnetization S_z of the system, allow the particle and hole thus created to propagate to a later time, scatter in all possible ways, and remeasure S_z . The so-called "Stoner model" of ferromagnetism approximates the perturbation series by the RPA form we have already encountered in our discussion of screening,⁷⁷ which gives $\chi = \chi_0/(1 - U\chi_0)$.⁷⁸ At sufficiently high T (χ_0 varies as 1/T in the nondegenerate regime, Fig. 26c)) we will have $U\chi_0(T) < 1$, but as T is lowered, $U\chi_0(T)$ increases. If U is large enough, such that $UN_0 > 1$, there will

Hamiltonian after mean field procedure is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{k\sigma} \epsilon_k c^{\dagger}_{k\sigma} c_{k\sigma} + U \sum_{k\sigma} n_{-\sigma} c^{\dagger}_{k\sigma} c_{k\sigma} + H(n_{\sigma} - n_{-\sigma})$$
(308)

which is quadratic & therefore exactly soluble. Also note units: H is really $\mu_B g H/2$, but never mind. Hamiltonian is equivalent to a free fermion system with spectrum $\tilde{\epsilon}_{k\sigma} = \epsilon_k + Un_{-\sigma} + H\sigma$. The number of electrons with spin σ is therefore

$$n_{\sigma} = \sum_{k} f(\tilde{\epsilon}_{k\sigma}) = \sum_{k} f(\epsilon_{k} + Un_{-\sigma} + H\sigma)$$
(309)

$$\equiv n_{\sigma}^{0} + \delta n_{\sigma}, \qquad (310)$$

where n_{σ}^0 is the equilibrium number of fermions in a free gas with no U. We can expand δn_{σ} for small field:

 $^{^{77}\}mathrm{In}$ the static, homogeneous case it is equivalent to the self-consistent field (SCF) method of Weiss.

be a transition at $U\chi_0(T_c) = 1$, where χ diverges. Note for $U\chi_0(T) > 1$ ($T < T_c$), the susceptibility is negative, so the model is unphysical in this region. This problem arises in part because the ferromagnetic state has a spontaneously broken symmetry, $\langle S_z \rangle \neq 0$ even for $h_z \to 0$. Nevertheless the approach to the transition from above and the location of the transition appear qualitatively reasonable.

It is also interesting to note that for $U\chi(0) = UN_0 < 1$, there will be no transition, but the magnetic susceptibility will be enhanced at low temperatures. So-called "nearly ferromagnetic" metals like Pd are qualitatively described by this theory. Comparing the RPA form

$$\chi = \frac{\chi_0(T)}{1 - U\chi_0(T)}$$
(315)

to the free gas susceptibility in Figure 9b, we see that the system will look a bit like a free gas with enhanced density of states, and reduced degeneracy temperature $T_F^{*,79}$ For Pd, the Fermi temperature calculated just by counting electrons works out to 1200K, but the susceptibility is found experimentally to be ~ 10× larger than N_0 calculated from band structure, and the susceptibility is already Curie-like around $T \sim T_F^* \simeq 300$ K.

3.7.1 Moment formation in itinerant systems

We will be interested in asking what happens when we put a localized spin in a metal, but first we should ask how does that local moment form in the first place. If an arbitrary impurity is inserted into a metallic host, it is far from clear that any kind of localized moment

$$\delta n_{\sigma} = \sum_{k} f(\epsilon_{k} + Un_{-\sigma} + H\sigma) - \sum_{k} f(\epsilon_{k} + H\sigma)$$

$$\simeq \sum_{k} \frac{df}{d\epsilon_{k}} \frac{d\tilde{\epsilon}}{dH}_{H=0} H - (U \to 0)$$

$$= \sum_{k} \frac{df}{d\epsilon_{k}} \left(U \frac{dn_{-\sigma}}{dH} + \sigma \right)_{H=0} H - (U \to 0).$$

$$\stackrel{\rightarrow}{H\to 0} -\chi_{0} U \frac{dn_{-\sigma}}{dH}_{H=0} H$$
(311)

where in the last step we set H = 0, in which case $n_{\sigma} = n_{-\sigma}$ (paramagnetic state). I used $\chi_0 = \sum_k -df/d\epsilon_k$ for Fermi gas. The magnetization is now

$$m \equiv \chi H = n_{\uparrow} - n_{\downarrow} = \chi_0 H + \delta n_{\uparrow} - \delta n_{\downarrow}$$
(312)

$$= \chi_0 H + \chi_0 U \chi H, \tag{313}$$

since $\chi = dm/dH$. So total susceptibility has RPA form:

$$\chi = \frac{\chi_0}{1 - U\chi_0}.$$
(314)

⁷⁹Compare to the Fermi liquid form

$$\chi = \frac{m^*}{m} \frac{\chi_0}{1 + F_0^a}.$$
(316)

will result: a donor electron could take its spin and wander off to join the conduction sea, for example. Fe impurities are known to give rise to a Curie term in the susceptibility when embedded in Cu, for example, but not in Al, suggesting that a moment simply does not form in the latter case. Anderson⁸⁰ showed under what circumstances an impurity level in an interacting host might give rise to a moment. He considered a model with a band of electrons⁸¹ with energy $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$, with an extra dispersionless impurity level E_0 . Suppose there are strong local Coulomb interactions on the impurity site, so that we need to add a Hubbardtype repulsion. And finally suppose the conduction (d) electrons can hop on and off the impurity with some matrix element V. The model then looks like

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + E_0 \sum_{\sigma} n_{0\sigma} + V \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} (c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_0 + c_0^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}) + \frac{1}{2} U \sum_{\sigma} n_{0\sigma} n_{0-\sigma}, \qquad (317)$$

where $n_{0\sigma} = c_{0\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{0\sigma}$ is the number of electrons of spin σ on the impurity site 0. By the Fermi Golden rule the decay rate due to scattering from the impurity of a band state ϵ away from the Fermi level E_F in the absence of the interaction U is of order

$$\Delta(\epsilon) = \pi V^2 \sum_k \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_k) \simeq \pi V^2 N_0 \tag{318}$$

In the "Kondo" case shown in the figure, where E_0 is well below the Fermi level, the scattering processes take place with electrons at the Fermi level $\epsilon = 0$, so the bare width of the impurity state is also $\Delta \simeq \pi V^2 N_0$. So far we still do not have a magnetic moment, since, in the absence of the interaction U, there would be an occupation of 2 antiparallel electrons. If one could effectively prohibit double occupancy, however, i.e. if $U \gg \Delta$, a single spin would remain in the localized with a net moment. Anderson obtained the basic physics (supression of double occupancy) by doing a Hartree-Fock decoupling of the interaction U term. Schrieffer and Wolff in fact showed that in the limit $U \to -\infty$, the virtual charge fluctuations on the impurity site (occasional double occupation) are eliminated, and the only degree of freedom left (In the so-called Kondo regime corresponding to Fig. 10a) is a localized spin interacting with the conduction electrons via an effective Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{Kondo} = J\mathbf{S} \cdot \sigma, \tag{319}$$

where J is an antiferromagnetic exchange expressed in terms of the original Anderson model parameters as

$$J = 2\frac{V^2}{E_0},$$
 (320)

⁸⁰PW Anderson, Phys. Rev. 124, 41 (1961)

⁸¹The interesting situation for moment formation is when the bandwidth of the "primary" cond. electron band overlapping the Fermi level is much larger than the bare hybridization width of the impurity state. The two most commonly considered situations are a band of *s* electrons with *d*-level impurity (transition metal series) and *d*-electron band with localized *f*-level (rare earths/actinides-heavy fermions).

S is the impurity spin-1/2, and

$$\sigma_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\alpha\beta} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} \left(\tau_i\right)_{\alpha\beta} c_{\mathbf{k}'\beta},\tag{321}$$

with τ_i the Pauli matrices, is just the conduction electron spin density at the impurity site.



Figure 27: Three different regimes of large U Anderson model depending on position of bare level E_0 . In Kondo regime ($E_0 \ll E_F$), large moments form at high T but are screened at low T. In mixed valent regime, occupancy of impurity level is fractional and moment formation is marginal. For $E_0 > E_F$, level is empty and no moment forms.

3.7.2 **RKKY** Interaction

Kittel p. 360 et seq.

3.7.3 Kondo model

The Hartree-Fock approach to the moment formation problem was able to account for the existence of local moments at defects in metallic hosts, in particular for large Curie terms in the susceptibility at high temperatures. What it did not predict, however, was that the low-temperature behavior of the model was very strange, and that in fact the moments present at high temperatures *disappear* at low temperatures, i.e. are screened completely by the conduction electrons, one of which effectively binds with the impurity moment to create a local singlet state which acts (at T = 0) like a nonmagnetic scatterer. This basic physical picture had been guessed at earlier by J. Kondo,⁸² who was trying to explain the existence of a resistance minimum in certain metallic alloys. Normally the resistance of

⁸²J. Kondo, Prog. Theor. Phys. 32, 37 (64).

metals is monotonically decreasing as the temperature is lowered, and adding impurities gives rise to a constant offset (Matthiesen's Rule) which does not change the monotonicity. For Fe in Cu, however, the impurity contribution $\delta \rho_{imp}$ increased as the temperature was lowered, and eventually saturated. Since Anderson had shown that Fe possessed a moment in this situation, Kondo analyzed the problem perturbatively in terms of a magnetic impurity coupling by exchange to a conduction band, i.e. adopted Eq. (319) as a model. Imagine that the system at $t = -\infty$ consists of a Fermi sea $|0\rangle$ and one additional electron in state $|\mathbf{k}, \sigma\rangle$ at the Fermi level. The impurity spin has initial spin projection M, so we write the initial state as $|i\rangle = c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|0; M\rangle$ Now turn on an interaction \mathcal{H}_1 adiabatically and look at the scattering amplitude⁸³

between $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle = c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}|0;M'\rangle$

$$\langle f|T|i\rangle = -2\pi i \langle f|\mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_1 \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mathcal{H}_0} \mathcal{H}_1 + \dots |i\rangle$$
 (325)

If \mathcal{H}_1 were just ordinary impurity (potential) scattering, we would have $\mathcal{H}_1 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\sigma\sigma'} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} V_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}$, and there would be two distinct second-order processes $\mathbf{k} \to \mathbf{k}'$ contributing to Eq. (325), as shown schematically at the top of Figure 28, of type a),

$$\langle 0|c_{\mathbf{k}'}c_{\mathbf{k}'}^{\dagger}V_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}}c_{\mathbf{p}}\frac{1}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}-\mathcal{H}_{0}}c_{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger}V_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{k}}c_{\mathbf{k}}c_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}|0\rangle = V_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}}\frac{1-f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}-\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}}V_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{k}}$$
(326)

and type b),

$$\langle 0|c_{\mathbf{k}'}c_{\mathbf{p}}^{\dagger}V_{\mathbf{pk}}c_{\mathbf{k}} \quad \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mathcal{H}_{0}} \quad c_{\mathbf{k}'}^{\dagger}V_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}}c_{\mathbf{p}}c_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}|0\rangle$$

$$= -V_{\mathbf{pk}}\frac{f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - (\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'})}V_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}}$$

$$= V_{\mathbf{pk}}\frac{f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}}V_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}}$$

$$(327)$$

where I have assumed **k** is initially occupied, and **k'** empty, with $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}$, whereas **p** can be either; the equalities then follow from the usual application of $c^{\dagger}c$ and cc^{\dagger} to $|0\rangle$. Careful checking of the order of the *c*'s in the two matrix elements will show you that the first process only takes place if the intermediate state **p** is unoccupied, and the second only if it is unoccupied.

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar v} |T|^2 \rho(E) \tag{322}$$

we frequently are able to get away with replacing the full T-matrix by its perhaps more familiar 1st-order expansion

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar v} |\mathcal{H}_1|^2 \rho(E) \tag{323}$$

(Recall the T matrix is defined by $\langle \phi_f | T | \phi_i \rangle = \langle \phi_f | T | \psi_i^+ \rangle$, where the ϕ 's are plane waves and ψ^+ is the scattering state with outgoing boundary condition.) In this case, however, we will not find the interesting log T divergence until we go to 2nd order! So we take matrix elements of

$$T = \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_1 \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mathcal{H}_0} \mathcal{H}_1 + \dots$$
(324)

This is equivalent and, I hope, clearer than the transition amplitude I calculated in class.

 $^{^{83}\}mathrm{Reminder:}$ when using Fermi's Golden Rule (see e.g., Messiah, Quantum Mechanics p.807):

Nnow when one sums the two processes, the Fermi function cancels. This means there is no significant T dependence to this order (ρ_{imp} due to impurities is a constant at low T), and thus the exclusion principle does not play an important role in ordinary potential scattering. **Potential Scatt**.



Figure 28: 2nd-order scattering processes: a) direct and b) exchange scattering. Top: potential scattering; bottom: spin scattering. Two terms corresponding to Eq. 325

Now consider the analogous processes for spin-scattering. The perturbing Hamiltonian is Eq. 319. Let's examine the amplitude for *spin-flip* transitions caused by \mathcal{H}_1 , first of type a),

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle 0M_{s'}|\mathcal{H}_{1}|0M_{s}\rangle \qquad (328) \\ &= \frac{J^{2}}{4}S_{\mu}S_{\nu}\langle 0M_{s'}|c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}^{\dagger}\tau_{\sigma'\sigma''}^{\nu}c_{\mathbf{p}\sigma''}\frac{1}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}-\mathcal{H}_{0}}c_{\mathbf{p}\sigma''}^{\dagger}\tau_{\sigma''\sigma}^{\mu}c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger}|0M_{s}\rangle \\ &= \frac{J^{2}}{4}\frac{1-f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}-\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}}\langle M_{S}'|S_{\nu}S_{\mu}\tau_{\sigma'\sigma''}^{\nu}\tau_{\sigma''\sigma}^{\mu}|M_{S}\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

and then of type b),

$$\frac{J^2}{4} \frac{f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}} \langle M'_S | S_{\nu} S_{\mu} \tau^{\nu}_{\sigma''\sigma} \tau^{\mu}_{\sigma'\sigma''} | M_S \rangle.$$
(329)

Now note that $\tau^{\mu}_{\sigma'\sigma''}\tau^{\nu}_{\sigma''\sigma} = (\tau^{\mu}\tau^{\nu})_{\sigma'\sigma}$, and use the identity $\tau_{\mu}\tau_{\nu} = \delta_{\nu\mu} + i\tau_{\alpha}\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu}$. The $\delta_{\mu\nu}$ pieces clearly will only give contributions proportional to \mathbf{S}^2 , so they aren't the important ones which will distinguish between a) and b) processes compared to the potential scattering case. The $\epsilon_{\alpha\nu\mu}$ terms give results of differing sign, since a) gives $\epsilon_{\alpha\nu\mu}$ and b) gives $\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu}$. Note the basic difference between the 2nd-order potential scattering and spin scattering is that the matrix elements in the spin scattering case, i.e. the S_{μ} , didn't commute! When we add

a) and b) again the result is

$$\frac{J^2}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{4} S(S+1) - \langle M'_S \sigma' | \mathbf{S} \cdot \sigma | M_S, \sigma \rangle \\ + f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}) \langle M'_S \sigma' | \mathbf{S} \cdot \sigma | M_S, \sigma \rangle \right\}$$
(330)

so the spin-scattering amplitude does depend on T through $f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}})$. Summing over the intermediate states $\mathbf{p}\sigma''$ gives a factor

$$\sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{f(\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}}} \simeq N_0 \int d\xi_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{f(\xi_{\mathbf{p}})}{\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}}}$$
$$= N_0 \int d\xi_{\mathbf{p}} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi_{\mathbf{p}}} \right) \log |\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{p}}|, \tag{331}$$

which is of order log T for states $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}$ at the Fermi surface! Thus the spin part of the interaction, to a first approximation, makes a contribution to the resistance of order $J^3 \log T$ (ρ involves the square of the scattering amplitude, and the cross terms between the 1st and 2nd-order terms in perturbation theory give this result). Kondo pointed to this result and said, "Aha!", here is a contribution which gets big as T gets small. However this can't be the final answer. The divergence signals that perturbation theory is breaking down, so this is one of those very singular problems where we have to find a way to sum all the processes. We have discovered that the Kondo problem, despite the fact that only a single impurity is involved, is a complicated many-body problem. Why? Because the spin induces correlations between the electrons in the Fermi sea. Example: suppose two electrons, both with spin up, try to spin flip scatter from a spin-down impurity. The first electron can exchange its spin with the impurity and leave it spin up. The second electron therefore cannot spin-flip scatter by spin conservation. Thus the electrons of the conduction band can't be treated as independent objects.

Summing an infinite subset of the processes depicted in Figure 28 or a variety of other techniques give a picture of a singlet bound state where the impurity spin binds one electron from the conduction electron sea with binding energy

$$T_K = De^{-1/(JN_0)}, (332)$$

where D is the conduction electron bandwidth. The renormalization group picture developed by Wilson in the 70s and the exact Bethe ansatz solution of Wiegman/Tsvelick and Andrei/Lowenstein in 198? give a picture of a free spin at high temperatures, which hybridizes more and more strongly with the conduction electron sea as the temperature is lowered. Below the singlet formation temperature of T_K , the moment is screened and the impurity acts like a potential scatterer with large phase shift, which approaches $\pi/2$ at T = 0.

4 Electron-phonon interaction

4.1 Hamiltonian

The subtle interplay of electrons and phonons was explained in the 50's by some of the earliest practitioners of quantum many-body theory, leading eventually to an understanding of the mechanism underlying superconductivity. Recall that the ions in a metal have two basic effects on the electronic states: 1) the *static* ionic lattice provides a periodic potential in which conduction electrons must move, leading to the evolution of plane wave states in the Fermi gas into Bloch waves in the crystal, and 2) the scattering of electrons by lattice vibrations, and vice versa. The first effect will be ignored here, as we are essentially interested in long-wavelength phenomena, where the differences between proper calculations using Bloch waves and simpler ones using plane waves are negligible. It suffices then to consider the phonons in a lattice interacting with a Fermi gas in which the most important effects of the long-range Coulomb interaction have been accounted for. Without the Coulomb interaction, the phonon frequencies are just those we would get from a classical model of balls of mass M (ionic mass) connected by springs. For a 3D solid with 1 atom per unit cell, there are 3N normal modes comprising 3 *acoustic* phonon branches ω_k^{λ} . When one includes the long-range Coulomb interaction but neglects the electron-phonon coupling, one finds that the longitudinal acoustic mode has been lifted to the ionic plasma frequency, $\omega_{pl}^{ion} \simeq (4\pi Z^2 e^2 n/M)^{1/2}$. The terms of the Goldstone theorem which insists on the existence of an acoustic mode for each spontaneously broken continuous symmetry are violated by the long-range nature of the Coulomb force, and the sloshing back and forth of the ion "fluid" at ω_{nl}^{ion} occurs for the same reason and at the same frequency (up to the mass difference) that it does in the electron case. At this point we are seriously worried that we don't understand how acoustic phonons ever exist in charged systems. If one now includes the electron-phonon coupling, however, the electronic medium screens the long-range Coulomb interaction, leading to a finite interaction length and the recovery of the Goldstone (acoustic) mode.

Let's give a brief overview of where we're going. I first want to get to the point where we can write down the full Hamiltonian for the problem. We want to show that it makes sense to write the Hamiltonian describing the electron-phonon system as

$$H = H_{el}^0 + H_{ph}^0 + H_{coul} + H_{int}, (333)$$

where

$$H_{el}^{0} = \sum_{k\sigma} \xi_{k} c_{k\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{k\sigma}$$
(334)

$$H_{ph}^{0} = \sum_{k\lambda} \omega_{k\lambda} (a_{k\lambda}^{\dagger} a_{k\lambda} + \frac{1}{2})$$
(335)

$$H_{Coul} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{kk'q\\\sigma\sigma'}} V(q) c^{\dagger}_{k'+q\sigma'} c^{\dagger}_{k\sigma} c_{k+q\sigma} c_{k'\sigma'}$$
(336)

$$H_{int} = \sum_{kk'\sigma\lambda} g_{kk'} c^{\dagger}_{k\sigma} c_{k'\sigma} (a^{\dagger}_{-q\lambda} + a_{q\lambda})$$
(337)

where $a_{k\lambda}^{\dagger}$ creates a phonon with wave vector $q \equiv k' - k$ and polarization λ , and $g_{kk'} \propto M^{-1/2}$ is the bare electron-phonon coupling. The unperturbed phonon Hamiltonian H_{ph} is of course just the sum of 3N independent harmonic oscillators in 2nd quantized form, and the bare Coulomb matrix element in H_{Coul} is $V(q) = 4\pi e^2/q^2$. The derivation of the electron-phonon Hamiltonian H_{int} and its quantization is relatively straightforward, and I will sketch it here.

4.1.1 Derivation of e^- -ph coupling

Assume the ion is located at position \mathbf{R}_i , at a displacement \mathbf{u}_i from its equilibrium position \mathbf{R}_i^0 . If the potential of the ion is assumed to be rigid, the interaction energy of the electronic charge density with the ions is simply⁸⁴

$$H_{int} = \sum_{i\sigma} \int d^3 r \psi^{\dagger}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i).$$
(338)

For small amplitude vibrations, we can expand in powers of \mathbf{u}_i :

$$H_{int} = \sum_{i\sigma} \int d^3 r \psi^{\dagger}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i^0) + \sum_{i\sigma} \int d^3 r \psi^{\dagger}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{R}_i} V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i) |_{\mathbf{R}_i^0} + \dots$$
(339)

Now expand the field operators ψ_{σ} in terms of Bloch waves:

$$\psi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}), \qquad (340)$$

where

$$\phi_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}_i^0) = e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_i^0}\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$$
(341)

⁸⁴This is for a Bravais lattice. If there is a basis one has to be a bit careful about labelling the lattice sites with additional intracell indices, i.e. $\mathbf{R}_{i\alpha}, \alpha = 1 \dots m$, where m is number of atoms/cell.

so the quantity which appears in Eq. (339) may be recast by performing a shift by a Bravais lattice vector and using the periodicity of $\nabla_{\mathbf{R}_{i}^{0}}V(\mathbf{r}-R_{i}^{0})$,

$$\int d^{3}r \phi_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma}^{*}(\mathbf{r}) \phi_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \nabla_{\mathbf{R}_{i}^{0}} V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_{i}^{0})$$

$$= \int d^{3}r \phi_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma}^{*}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}_{j}^{0}) \phi_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(\mathbf{r} + R_{j}^{0}) \nabla_{\mathbf{R}_{i}^{0}} V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_{i}^{0})$$

$$= e^{i(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{R}_{j}^{0}} \underbrace{\int d^{3}r \phi_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma}^{*}(\mathbf{r}) \phi_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \nabla_{\mathbf{R}_{i}^{0}} V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_{i}^{0})}_{\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}}$$
(342)
$$(343)$$

Now let us 2nd-quantize the displacement \mathbf{u} as we did when we were discussing the isolated phonon system,⁸⁵

$$\mathbf{u}_{i}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NM}} \sum_{\mathbf{q}\lambda} Q(\mathbf{k}, t) \mathbf{e}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}^{0}}$$
(345)

with

$$Q_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q})}} \left(a_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) + a_{\lambda}^{\dagger}(-\mathbf{q}) \right)$$
(346)

so interaction Hamiltonian can be rewritten

$$H_{int} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} \sum_{j} \mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}_{j}^{0}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{NM}} \times \sum_{\mathbf{q}\lambda} Q_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) \mathbf{e}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{j}^{0}}$$
$$= \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\sigma} \sum_{\lambda} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \left(\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} \cdot \mathbf{e}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{q})\right) Q_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) \sqrt{\frac{N}{M}}$$
$$\equiv \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\sigma\lambda} g_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\lambda} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \left(a_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) + a_{\lambda}^{\dagger}(-\mathbf{q})\right)$$
(347)

where now **q** due to momentum conservation (δ -function from summing over j) is to be interpreted as

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{G} \tag{348}$$

with G is a vector of reciprocal lattice (arose because \mathbf{q} was defined to lie in 1st B-zone). The electron-phonon coupling constant is

$$g_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\lambda} = \left(\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} \cdot \mathbf{e}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{q})\right) \sqrt{\frac{N}{2M\omega_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q})}},\tag{349}$$

which contains the original ball-and-spring phonon frequencies ω_{λ} . We have left out the Coulomb interactions, however, so at first sight it appears as though this expression should

$$\sum_{\alpha} \mathbf{e}_{\alpha}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot e_{\alpha}^{\lambda'}(\mathbf{k}) = \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \tag{344}$$

⁸⁵Before we dealt primarily with the 1D chain, so I suppressed the polarization indices. It is important to recall that in a 3 dimensional system there are 3N normal modes (3mN if there are m atoms per unit cell). For each value of **k** there are 3 acoustic (optical only if there are add'l atoms per unit cell requiring index α) modes denoted by different values of the branch index λ . The vectors $\mathbf{e}^{\lambda}(\mathbf{k})$ are the polarization vectors of the modes and satisfy the orthogonality condition

be modified by replacing ω_{λ} by ω_{pl}^{ion} if the mode is longitudinal and couples to the long-range Coulomb interaction. This does not include the ionic screening yet, however (see below).

Regardless of the form of $g_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$, the final result is that an electron in state \mathbf{k}, σ can undergo a scattering process with amplitude $g_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$, ending up in final state \mathbf{k}', σ by absorption (emission) of a phonon of momentum \mathbf{q} . This form is useful, but calculating $g_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$ from first principles is difficult because V is poorly known.

4.1.2 Jellium model

We can get some dimensionally reasonable results in the so-called "jellium" model, where the ions are represented as a featureless, positively charged elastic continuum,⁸⁶ we will simply replace the eigenfrequencies $\omega_{k\lambda}$ of the neutral system by the constant ω_{pl}^{ion} according to the arguments given above. Again we expand the crystal potential $V(r - R_j)$ around the equilibrium sites R_i^0 . The dispacements $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{R})$ in the jellium gives a charge density fluctuation⁸⁷ $-nZe\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$. This interacts with the electron gas through the Coulomb interaction, leading to the interaction

$$H_{int}^{jellium} = Ze^2 \sum_{\sigma} \int d^3r d^3r' \ \psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r})\psi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}'), \tag{350}$$

and then quantizing the ionic displacements $u_i = R_i - R_i^0$ as in Eq.(345), one finds

$$H_{int}^{jellium} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \left(a_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}) + a_{\lambda}^{\dagger}(-\mathbf{q}) \right) \frac{4\pi i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q})}{M^{1/2}} \frac{Ze^2 n}{q^2}$$
(351)

Comparing with Eq. (347), we see that the effective e-ph coupling constant in an isotropic system is

$$g(q) = \frac{4\pi i Z e^2}{q} \sqrt{\frac{N}{2M\omega_{pl}^{ion}}} = \frac{4\pi i Z e^2 n^{1/2}}{q M^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$
(352)

4.1.3 Screening.

The first point I would like to review is the renormalization of the electron-phonon coupling which leads to screening and the recovery of the acoustic spectrum. The main point is to realize that the singular behavior is due to the long-range Coulomb interaction, which will be screened. Any time a phonon of momentum q is excited, it creates charge density fluctuations because the ions are positively charged. These then interact with the electron gas. The bare potential created by the charge fluctuation is proportional to the electron-phonon coupling

 $^{^{86}}$... justified by the large masses and correspondingly long timescales for ionic motion (Born-Oppenheimer)

⁸⁷Recall from E& M the polarization charge density is $\rho_P = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P}$, where **P** is the polarization, and the polarization due to a density *n* of dipole moments $\mathbf{p} = Ze\mathbf{u}$ is therefore $nZe\mathbf{u}$.

constant, so screening the ionic charge amounts to replacing the bare coupling g with a screened coupling

$$\bar{g}(q,\omega_n) = g(q)/\epsilon(q,\omega_n), \qquad (353)$$

where q = k' - k and $\epsilon(q, \omega_n) = 1 - V(q)\chi(q, \omega_n)$ is the RPA dielectric constant. The frequency dependence of the dielectric constant will become important for us on scales of the Debye frequency ω_D or smaller, and this is normally a very small scale by electronic standards! So for most purposes we keep a frequency-independent screened coupling $\bar{g}(q) \simeq g(q)/\epsilon(q, 0)$.

We would like to see that this screening recovers acoustic modes as observed and expected. The *bare* interaction Hamiltonian may be written in the Jellium model as (see Eq. (347)

$$H_{int} = \sum_{q} g(q) n_{-q} Q_q \tag{354}$$

with $n_q = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} c_{\mathbf{k}}$. Consider now the entire Hamiltonian for the phonon coordinates, including the coupling to the electron gas (recall derivation of normal modes for linear chain in Section 1):

$$H_{ph} + H_{int} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \left(\frac{1}{M} P_{\mathbf{q}} P_{-\mathbf{q}} + M \omega_{pl}^{ion^2} Q_{\mathbf{q}} Q_{-\mathbf{q}} + 2g_{\mathbf{q}} Q_{\mathbf{q}} n_{-\mathbf{q}} \right)$$
(355)

The Heisenberg equation of motion for the operator $Q_{\mathbf{q}}$ becomes (check!)

$$\ddot{Q}_{\mathbf{q}} + \omega_{pl}^{ion^2} Q_{\mathbf{q}} + g_{-\mathbf{q}} n_{\mathbf{q}} = 0 \tag{356}$$

We noted above that the ionic charge density fluctuation *induced* by an ionic displacement \mathbf{u} was $en^{ion} = -nZe\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$; in Fourier space with Eq. (345) this reads

$$n_{\mathbf{q}}^{ion} = -iZ\sqrt{\frac{n}{M}}qQ_{\mathbf{q}} \tag{357}$$

Also recall the definition of the dielectric constant

$$\epsilon = \frac{\text{``external charge''}}{\text{total charge}}.$$
(358)

Now the total charge fluctuation is just electronic + ionic $n_{\mathbf{q}} + n_{\mathbf{q}}^{ion}$, so

$$n_{\mathbf{q}} = n_{\mathbf{q}}^{ion}(1-1/\epsilon) = -iZ\sqrt{\frac{n}{M}}qQ_{\mathbf{q}}(1-1/\epsilon)$$
(359)

$$= iZ\sqrt{\frac{n}{M}}qQ_{\mathbf{q}}\left(\frac{k_{TF}^2}{q^2+k_{TF}^2}\right),\tag{360}$$

where in the last step we have used the Thomas-Fermi approximation for the dielectric function, $\epsilon = 1 + k_{TF}^2/q^2$.

$$\omega_{phonon}^2 = \omega_{pl}^{ion^2} \left[1 - \frac{k_{TF}^2}{q^2 + k_{TF}^2} \right].$$
(361)

Equation of motion becomes

$$0 = \ddot{Q}_{\mathbf{q}} + \omega_{pl}^{ion^2} Q_{\mathbf{q}} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{4\pi i Z e^2 n^{1/2}}{q M^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)}_{q M^{\frac{1}{2}}} i Z \sqrt{\frac{n}{M}} q Q_{\mathbf{q}} \left(\frac{k_{TF}^2}{q^2 + k_{TF}^2}\right)$$
$$= \ddot{Q}_{\mathbf{q}} + \omega_{pl}^{ion^2} \left[1 - \left(\frac{k_{TF}^2}{q^2 + k_{TF}^2}\right)\right] Q_{\mathbf{q}}.$$
(362)

So the phonon oscillation frequencies are

$$\omega_{phonon}^2 = \omega_{pl}^{ion^2} \left(\frac{q^2}{q^2 + k_{TF}^2} \right) \tag{363}$$

Since $k_{TF}^2 = 6\pi n e^2/E_F$, we do in fact recover *acoustic* phonons $i\omega_n = cq$ as $q \to 0$, with speed

$$c = (m/3M)^{1/2} v_F. ag{364}$$

So we have proven that sound propagates in a metal, which you already knew, but it is important to remember that screening makes it happen!

4.2 Polarons

4.2.1 Polaron in 1D.

A polaron is formed when an electron has a bound state in the potential created by the ionic lattice distorted around itself due to its own charge. Consider a single electron in 1D, and represent the crystal lattice by "jellium", i.e. a positive continuum. The potential felt by the electron is $V = -\lambda du/dx$, where λ is the electron-phonon coupling constant and u(x) is the (smoothed) displacement of the ions from their equilibrium positions. The energy density associated with the deformation is $(B/2)(du/dx)^2$, where B is the bulk modulus.

1. Write down the appropriate Schrödinger equation, assuming that the lattice distortion takes the form $u = u_0 \tanh x/a_0$. Find the eigenenergies. (Hint: you may find the change of variables $x \to r = \tanh x/a_0$ helpful.)

Solution: Schrödinger equation is

$$\frac{-1}{2m}\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2} - \frac{V_0}{\cosh^2\frac{x}{a_0}}\psi = E\psi,\tag{365}$$

with $V_0 = \lambda u_0/a_0$. Introduce new variable $r = \tanh x/a_0$. Eqn. becomes

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(1-r^2)\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{2ma_0^2E}{1-r^2} + 2ma_0^2V_0\right]\psi = 0.$$
(366)

Now define $2ma_0^2 V_0 \equiv \ell(\ell+1)$ and $\mu = \sqrt{-2ma_0^2 E}$. Left with

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(1-r^2)\frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{\mu^2}{1-r^2} + \ell(\ell+1)\right]\psi = 0$$
(367)

and we have Legendre's equation. Eigenfunctions with appropriate falloff conditions at ∞ are P_{ℓ}^{μ} and eigenvalues are determined by condition $\mu - \ell = n$, with *n* integer n = 0, 1, 2... (* Note maximum *n* set by $n = \ell = (1/2) \left(-1 + \sqrt{1 + 8ma_0^2 V_0}\right)$. See, e.g. Landau-Lifschitz, *QM*).

Substituting back for E one obtains

$$E_{el} = \frac{-1}{8ma_0^2} \left[-(1+2n) + \sqrt{1+8ma_0^2 V_0} \right]^2,$$
(368)

with $n = 0, 1, 2 \dots$ The ground state energy is therefore

$$E_{el} = \frac{-1}{8ma_0^2} \left[-1 + \sqrt{1 + 8ma_0^2 V_0} \right]^2.$$
(369)

For attractive electron-phonon interactions (i.e. $\lambda > 0$ with current convention), ground state has negative energy, so electron can always gain energy by "digging a hole" in the lattice. Must also calculate lattice energy:

$$E_{ph} = \frac{1}{2} \int B\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{Bu_0^2}{a_0} \int \frac{dy}{\cosh^4 y} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{Bu_0^2}{a_0}.$$
(370)

2. Calculate the total energy of the coupled e^- -ph system $E = E_{ph} + E_e$.

Solution: Introduce dimensionless variables s and t by $u_0 = 3\lambda s/(2B^2)$ and $a_0 = B^2 t/(12m\lambda^2)$. Then the total energy is

$$E = -(\sqrt{1+st} - 1)^2 + s^2/t$$
(371)

3. By minimizing E with respect to u_0 and a_0 , show that the system is always unstable to polaron formation if $\lambda > 0$. Calculate the size of the polaron a_0 .

Solution: Energy minimized at s=1/3, t=24.



Figure 29: Contours for total polaron energy.

Transform back $\Rightarrow u_0 = \lambda/B, a_0 = B/(m\lambda)$.

N.B. **Physics:** Size of polaron is larger for rigid lattices (large B) or weak electronphonon interaction (small B). Note we have only taken a trial solution for the ionic distortion, not solved the whole problem! Even within this trial space, note our solution breaks down when $u_0/a_0 = m\lambda^3/B^2 \simeq 1$, because the harmonic approximation does.

4.3 Bloch resistivity

4.4 Effective $e^- - e^-$ interaction

For superconductivity it will be important to understand why one electron attracts each other effectively by polarizing the lattice. We now have at our disposal the effective screened electron-phonon interaction with coupling constant $g_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$ and renormalized phonon frequencies $\omega_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q})$. An interaction between electrons must involve the 1st electron polarizing the lattice, and the second interacting with this polarization, i.e. it must be a 2nd-order process in the coupling constant g. We can represent these processes in terms of Feynman-type pictures: The amplitude of the first process, according to 2nd-order perturbation theory, where the



Figure 30: Electron-electron interaction due to phonon exchange. Straight lines are electrons, wiggly are phonons, vertices are e-ph coupling constants g.

1st electron emits a phonon, is

$$V_q^1 = \frac{|g_q|^2}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}} - \omega_{\mathbf{q}}}$$
(372)

whereas for the process where it absorbs a phonon we get

$$V_q^2 = \frac{|g_q|^2}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} - \omega_{\mathbf{q}}}.$$
(373)

Note as usual we have energy conservation at every scattering event depicted in these processes, i.e.

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} \tag{374}$$

and I've assumed $\omega_{\mathbf{q}} = \omega_{-\mathbf{q}}$. According to quantum mechanics the two amplitudes contribute additively:

$$V_q = V_q^1 + V_q^2 == \frac{|g_q|^2 \omega_{\mathbf{q}}}{(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}})^2 - \omega_{\mathbf{q}}^2}.$$
(375)

Let's analyze this expression for the "effective electron-electron interaction" qualitatively. We will primarily be interested in $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}} \ll \omega_{\mathbf{q}}$, since this situation corresponds to electrons with their momenta both quite close to the Fermi surface, well within a shell of width ω_D , a typical phonon energy.

- attractive
- ind. of $\mathbf{k} \Rightarrow$ isotropic
- rapidly decreases when $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}} \sim \omega_D$.
- energy space: interaction spread over $\omega_D \Rightarrow$ in time space it's retarded
- comparable when spread over time to Coulomb interactions: some metals superconducting, some not.

Check prefactor of deGennes calculation-should lead to

$$V = \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2 + k_{TF}^2} \frac{\omega_q^2}{\omega_q^2 + k_{TF}^2}$$
(376)

5 Superconductivity

5.1 Phenomenology

Superconductivity was discovered in 1911 in the Leiden laboratory of Kamerlingh Onnes, who noticed that the resistivity of Hg metal vanished abruptly at about 4K. Although phenomenological models with predictive power were developed in the 30's and 40's, the microscopic mechanism underlying superconductivity was not discovered until 1957 by Bardeen Cooper and Schrieffer. Superconductors have been studied intensively for their fundamental interest and for the promise of technological applications which would be possible if a material which superconducts at room temperature were discovered. Until 1986, critical temperatures (T_c 's) at which resistance disappears were always less than about 23K. In 1986, Bednorz and Mueller published a paper, subsequently recognized with the 1987 Nobel prize, for the discovery of a new class of materials which currently include members with T_c 's of about 135K.



Figure 31: Properties of superconductors.

Superconducting materials exhibit the following unusual behaviors:

- 1. Zero resistance. Below a material's T_c , the DC electrical resistivity ρ is really zero, not just very small. This leads to the possibility of a related effect,
- 2. **Persistent currents**. If a current is set up in a superconductor with multiply connected topology, e.g. a torus, it will flow forever without any driving voltage. (In practice experiments have been performed in which persistent currents flow for several years without signs of degrading).
- 3. **Perfect diamagnetism.** A superconductor expels a weak magnetic field nearly completely from its interior (screening currents flow to compensate the field within a surface layer of a few 100 or 1000 A, and the field at the sample surface drops to zero over this layer).
- 4. Energy gap. Most thermodynamic properties of a superconductor are found to vary as $e^{-\Delta/(k_BT)}$, indicating the existence of a gap, or energy interval with no allowed eigenenergies, in the energy spectrum. Idea: when there is a gap, only an exponentially small number of particles have enough thermal energy to be promoted to the available unoccu-

pied states above the gap. In addition, this gap is visible in electromagnetic absorption: send in a photon at low temperatures (strictly speaking, T = 0), and no absorption is possible until the photon energy reaches 2Δ , i.e. until the energy required to break a pair is available.

5.2 Electron-phonon interaction

Superconductivity is due to an effective attraction between conduction electrons. Since two electrons experience a repulsive Coulomb force, there must be an additional attractive force between two electrons when they are placed in a metallic environment. In classic superconductors, this force is known to arise from the interaction with the ionic system. In previous discussion of a normal metal, the ions were replaced by a homogeneous positive background which enforces charge neutrality in the system. In reality, this medium is polarizable– the number of ions per unit volume can fluctuate in time. In particular, if we imagine a snapshot of a single electron entering a region of the metal, it will create a net positive charge density near itself by attracting the oppositely charged ions. Crucial here is that a typical electron close to the Fermi surface moves with velocity $v_F = \hbar k_F/m$ which is much larger than the velocity of the ions, $v_I = V_F m/M$. So by the time $(\tau \sim 2\pi/\omega_D \sim 10^{-13} \text{ sec})$ the ions have polarized themselves, 1st electron is long gone (it's moved a distance $v_F \tau \sim 10^8 cm/s \sim 1000 \text{\AA}$, and 2nd electron can happen by to lower its energy with the concentration of positive charge before the ionic fluctuation relaxes away. This gives rise to an effective attraction between the two electrons as shown, which may be large enough to overcome the repulsive Coulomb interaction. Historically, this electron-phonon "pairing" mechanism was suggested by Frölich in 1950, and confirmed by the discovery of the "isotope effect", wherein T_c was found to vary as $M^{-1/2}$ for materials which were identical chemically but which were made with different isotopes.



Figure 32: Effective attraction of two electrons due to "phonon exchange"

The simplest model for the total interaction between two electrons in momentum states \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{k}' , with $\mathbf{q} \equiv \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'$, interacting both by direct Coulomb and electron-phonon forces,

is given by

$$V(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2 + k_s^2} + \frac{4\pi e^2}{q^2 + k_s^2} \frac{\omega_q^2}{\omega^2 - \omega_q^2},$$
(377)

in the jellium model. Here first term is Coulomb interaction in the presence of a medium with dielectric constant $\epsilon = 1 + k_s^2/q^2$, and ω_q are the phonon frequencies. The screening length k_s^{-1} is 1*A* or so in a good metal. Second term is interaction due to exchange of phonons, i.e. the mechanism pictured in the figure. Note it is frequency-dependent, reflecting the *retarded* nature of interaction (see figure), and in particular that the 2nd term is attractive for $\omega < \omega_q \sim \omega_D$. Something is not quite right here, however; it looks indeed as though the two terms are of the same order as $\omega \to 0$; indeed they cancel each other there, and *V* is seen to be always repulsive. This indicates that the jellium approximation is too simple. We should probably think about a more careful calculation in a real system as producing two equivalent terms, which vary in approximately the same way with k_{TF} and ω_q , but with prefactors which are arbitrary. In some materials, then, the second term might "win" at low frequencies, depending on details. The BCS interaction is sometimes referred to as a "residual" attraction, i.e. what is left when the long-range Coulomb interaction is accounted for.

5.3 Cooper problem

A great deal was known about the phenomenology of superconductivity in the 1950's, and it was already suspected that the electron phonon interaction was responsible, but the microscopic form of the wave function was unknown. A clue was provided by Leon Cooper, who showed that the noninteracting Fermi sea is *unstable* towards the addition of a single pair of electrons with attractive interactions. Cooper began by examining the wave function of this pair $\psi(r_1, r_2)$, which can always be written as a sum over plane waves

$$\psi(r_1, r_2) = \sum_{kq} u_k(q) e^{ik \cdot r_1} e^{-i(k+q) \cdot r_2} \zeta$$
(378)

where the $u_k(q)$ are expansion coefficients and ζ is the spin part of the wave function, either the singlet $|\uparrow\downarrow - \downarrow\uparrow\rangle /\sqrt{2}$ or one of the triplet, $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$, $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$, $|\uparrow\downarrow + \downarrow\uparrow\rangle /\sqrt{2}$. In fact since we will demand that ψ is the ground state of the two-electron system, we will assume the wave function is realized with zero center of mass momentum of the two electrons, $u_k(q) = u_k \delta_{q,0}$. Here is a quick argument related to the electron-phonon origin of the attractive interaction.⁸⁸ The electron-phonon interaction is strongest for those electrons with single-particle energies $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}$ within ω_D of the Fermi level. In the scattering process depicted in Fig. 33, momentum is

⁸⁸Thanks to Kevin McCarthy, who forced me to think about this further



Figure 33: Electrons scattered by phonon exchange are confined to shell of thickness ω_D about Fermi surface.

explicitly conserved, i.e. the total momentum

$$\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{K} \tag{379}$$

is the same in the incoming and outgoing parts of the diagram. Now look at Figure 34, and note that if \mathbf{K} is not ~ 0, the phase space for scattering (attraction) is dramatically reduced. So the system can always lower its energy by creating $\mathbf{K} = 0$ pairs. Henceforth we will make this assumption, as Cooper did.



Figure 34: To get (attractive) scattering with finite cm momentum **K**, need both electron energies to be within ω_D of Fermi level– very little phase space.

Then $\psi(r_1, r_2)$ becomes $\sum_k u_k e^{ik \cdot (r_1 - r_2)}$. Note that if u_k is even in k, the wave function has only terms $\propto \cos k \cdot (r_1 - r_2)$, whereas if it is odd, only the $\sin k \cdot (r_1 - r_2)$ will contribute. This is an important distinction, because only in the former case is there an amplitude for the two electrons to live "on top of each other" at the origin. Note further that in order to preserve the proper overall antisymmetry of the wave function, u_k even (odd) in k implies the wave function must be spin singlet (triplet). Let us assume further that there is a general two-body interaction between the two electrons (the rest of the Fermi sea is noninteracting in the model!) $V(r_1, r_2)$, so that the Hamiltonian for the system is

$$H = -\frac{\nabla_1^2}{2m} - \frac{\nabla_2^2}{2m} + V(r_1, r_2).$$
(380)

Inserting the assumed form of ψ into the Schrödinger equation $H\psi = E\psi$, and Fourier transforming both sides with respect to the relative coordinate, $r = r_1 - r_2$, we find

$$(E - 2\epsilon_k)u_k = \sum_{k>k_F} V_{kk'}u_{k'},\tag{381}$$

where $\epsilon_k = k^2/2m$ and the $V_{kk'} = \int d^3r V(r) e^{i(k'-k)\cdot r}$ are the matrix elements of the two-body interaction.

Recall k, k' correspond to energies at the Fermi level ϵ_F in the absence of V. The question was posed by Cooper, is it possible to find an eigenvalue $E < 2\epsilon_F$, i.e. a *bound state* of the two electrons? To simplify the problem, Cooper assumed a model form for $V_{kk'}$ in which

$$V_{kk'} = \begin{cases} -V & \xi_k, \xi_{k'} < \omega_c \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(382)

where as usual $\xi_k \equiv \epsilon_k - \epsilon_F$. The BCS interaction $V_{kk'}$ is sometimes referred to as a "residual" attractive interaction, i.e. the attractive, short-distance part left when the long-range Coulomb interaction has been subtracted out, as in (377). The bound state equation becomes

$$u_k = \frac{V\sum_{k'}' u_{k'}}{2\epsilon_k - E},\tag{383}$$

where the prime on the summation in this context means sum only over k such that $\epsilon_F < \epsilon_k < \epsilon_F + \omega_c$. Now u_k may be eliminated from the equation by summing both sides \sum_{k}' , yielding

$$\frac{1}{V} = \sum_{k}^{\prime} \frac{1}{2\epsilon_k - E} \tag{384}$$

$$\simeq N_0 \int_{\epsilon_F}^{\epsilon_F + \omega_c} d\epsilon \frac{1}{2\epsilon - E} = \frac{1}{2} N_0 \log \frac{2\epsilon_F + 2\omega_c - E}{2\epsilon_F - E}.$$
(385)

For a weak interaction $N_0 V \ll 1$, we expect a solution (if at all) just below the Fermi level, so we treat $2\epsilon_F - E$ as a small positive quantity, e.g. negligible compared to $2\omega_c$. We then arrive at the pair binding energy

$$\Delta_{\text{Cooper}} \equiv 2\epsilon_F - E \simeq 2\omega_c e^{-2/N_0 V}.$$
(386)

There are several remarks to be made about this result.

1. Note (for your own information–Cooper didn't know this at the time!) that the dependence of the bound state energy on both the interaction V and the cutoff frequency ω_c strongly resembles the famous BCS transition temperature dependence, with ω_c identified as the phonon frequency ω_D , as given in equation (I.1).

- 2. the dependence on V is that of an essential singularity, i.e. a nonanalytic function of the parameter. Thus we may expect never to arrive at this result at any order in perturbation theory, an unexpected problem which hindered theoretical progress for a long time.
- 3. The solution found has isotropic or s-symmetry, since it doesn't depend on the k on the Fermi surface. (How would an angular dependence arise? Look back over the calculation.)
- 4. Note the integrand $(2\epsilon_k E)^{-1} = (2\xi_k + \Delta_{\text{Cooper}})^{-1}$ peaks at the Fermi level with energy spread Δ_{Cooper} of states involved in the pairing. The weak-coupling $(N_0 V \ll 1)$ solution therefore provides a bit of *a posteriori* justification for its own existence, since the fact that $\Delta_{\text{Cooper}} \ll \omega_c$ implies that the dependence of $V_{kk'}$ on energies out near the cutoff and beyond is in fact not terribly important, so the cutoff procedure used was ok.
- 5. The spread in momentum is therefore roughly $\Delta_{\text{Cooper}}/v_F$, and the characteristic size of the pair (using Heisenberg's uncertainty relation) about v_F/T_c . This is about 100-1000A in metals, so since there is of order 1 electron/ unit cell in a metal, and if this toy calculation has anything to do with superconductivity, there are certainly many electron pairs overlapping each other in real space in a superconductor.

5.4 Pair condensate & BCS Wavefctn.

Obviously one thing is missing from Cooper's picture: if it is energetically favorable for two electrons in the presence of a noninteracting Fermi sea to *pair*, i.e. to form a bound state, why not have the other electrons pair too, and lower the energy of the system still further? This is an *instability* of the normal state, just like magnetism or charge density wave formation, where a ground state of completely different character (and symmetry) than the Fermi liquid is stabilized. The Cooper calculation is a T=0 problem, but we expect that as one lowers the temperature, it will become at some critical temperature T_c energetically favorable for *all* the electrons to pair. Although this picture is appealing, many things about it are unclear: does the pairing of many other electrons alter the attractive interaction which led to the pairing in the first place? Does the bound state energy per pair change? Do all of the electrons in the Fermi sea participate? And most importantly, how does the critical temperature actually depend on the parameters and can we calculate it?

5.5 BCS Model.

A consistent theory of superconductivity may be constructed either using the full "effective interaction" or our approximation $V(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ to it. However almost all interesting questions can be answered by the even simpler model used by BCS. The essential point is to have an attractive interaction for electrons in a shell near the Fermi surface; retardation is secondary. Therefore BCS proposed starting from a phenomenological Hamiltonian describing free electrons scattering via an effective instantaneous interaction à la Cooper:

$$H = H_0 - V \sum_{\substack{kk'q\\\sigma\sigma'}} c^{\dagger}_{k\sigma} c^{\dagger}_{-k+q\sigma'} c_{-k'+q\sigma'} c_{k'\sigma}, \qquad (387)$$

where the prime on the sum indicates that the energies of the states k and k' must lie in the shell of thickness ω_D . Note the interaction term is just the Fourier transform of a completely *local* 4-Fermi interaction $\psi^{\dagger}(r)\psi^{\dagger}(r)\psi(r)\psi(r)$.⁸⁹

Recall that in our discussion of the instability of the normal state, we suggested that an infinitesimal pair field could produce a finite amplitude for pairing. That amplitude was the expectation value $\langle c_{k\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{-k-\sigma}^{\dagger} \rangle$. We ignore for the moment the problems with number conservation, and ask if we can simplify the Hamiltonian still further with a mean field approximation, again to be justified *a posteriori*. We proceed along the lines of generalized Hartree-Fock theory, and rewrite the interaction as

$$c_{k\sigma}^{\dagger}c_{-k+q\sigma'}^{\dagger}c_{-k'+q\sigma'}c_{k'\sigma} = [\langle c_{k\sigma}^{\dagger}c_{-k+q\sigma'}^{\dagger}\rangle + \delta(c^{\dagger}c^{\dagger})] \times \\ \times [\langle c_{-k'+q\sigma'}c_{k'\sigma}\rangle + \delta(cc)],$$
(388)

where, e.g. $\delta(cc) = c_{-k'+q\sigma'}c_{k'\sigma} - \langle c_{-k'+q\sigma'}c_{k'\sigma} \rangle$ is the *fluctuation* of this operator about its expectation value. If a mean field description is to be valid, we should be able to neglect terms quadratic in the fluctuations when we expand Eq (20). If we furthermore make the assumption that pairing will take place in a uniform state (zero pair center of mass momentum), then we put $\langle c_{-k'+q\sigma'}c_{k'\sigma} \rangle = \langle c_{-k'\sigma'}c_{k'\sigma} \rangle \delta_{q,0}$. The effective Hamiltonian then becomes (check!)

$$H \simeq H_0 - \left(\Delta \sum_k c^{\dagger}_{k\uparrow} c^{\dagger}_{-k\downarrow} + h.c.\right) + \Delta \langle c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} c^{\dagger}_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow} \rangle^*, \tag{389}$$

where

$$\Delta = V \sum_{k}^{\prime} \langle c_{-k\downarrow} c_{k\uparrow} \rangle, \qquad (390)$$

and the primed sum indicates that the sum is taken only over the **k**-shell of width ω_D over which V acts. What BCS (actually Bogoliubov, after BCS) did was then to treat the *order*

⁸⁹Note this is not the most general form leading to superconductivity. Pairing in higher angular momentum channels requires a *bilocal* model Hamiltonian, as we shall see later.

parameter Δ as a (complex) number, and calculate expectation values in the approximate Hamiltonian (389), insisting that Δ be determined self-consistently via Eq. (390) at the same time.⁹⁰

5.5.1 BCS wave function, gauge invariance, and number conservation.

What BCS actually did in their original paper is to treat the Hamiltonian (387) variationally. Their ansatz for the ground state of (387) is a trial state with the pairs $k \uparrow, -k \downarrow$ occupied with amplitude v_k and unoccupied with amplitude u_k , such that $|u_k|^2 + |v_k|^2 = 1$:

$$|\psi\rangle = \Pi_k (u_k + v_k c^{\dagger}_{k\uparrow} c^{\dagger}_{-k\downarrow})|0\rangle.$$
(391)

This is a *variational* wave function, so the energy is to be minimized over the space of u_k, v_k . Alternatively, one can diagonalize the Hartree-Fock (BCS) Hamiltonian directly, together with the self-consistency equation for the order parameter; the two methods turn out to be equivalent. I will follow the latter procedure, but first make a few remarks on the form of the wave function. First, note the explicit violation of particle number conservation: $|\psi\>>$ is a superposition of states describing 0, 2, 4 , N-particle systems. 91 In general a quantum mechanical system with fixed particle number N (like, e.g. a real superconductor!) manifests a global U(1) gauge symmetry, because H is invariant under $c_{k\sigma}^{\dagger} \to e^{i\theta}c_{k\sigma}^{\dagger}$. The state $|\psi\rangle$ is characterized by a set of coefficients $\{u_k, v_k\}$, which becomes $\{u_k, e^{2i\theta}v_k\}$ after the gauge transformation. The two states $|\psi\rangle$ and $\psi(\phi)$, where $\phi = 2\theta$, are inequivalent, mutually orthogonal quantum states, since they are not simply related by a multiplicative phase factor.⁹² Since H is independent of ϕ , however, all states $|\psi(\phi)\rangle$ are continuously degenerate, i.e. the ground state has a U(1) gauge (phase) symmetry. Any state $|\psi(\phi)\rangle$ is said to be a broken symmetry state, becaue it is not invariant under a U(1) transformation, i.e. the system has "chosen" a particular ϕ out of the degenerate range $0 < \phi < 2\pi$. Nevertheless the absolute value of the overall phase of the ground state is not an observable, but its variations $\delta \phi(r, t)$ in space and time are. It is the *rigidity* of the phase, i.e. the energy cost of any of these fluctuations, which is responsible for superconductivity.

Earlier I mentioned that it was possible to construct a number conserving theory. It is now instructive to see how: states of definite number are formed [Anderson 1958] by making

⁹⁰If the pairing interaction is momentum dependent the self-consistency or "gap" equation reads $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}'}' V_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} \langle c_{-\mathbf{k}'\downarrow} c_{\mathbf{k}'\uparrow} \rangle$, which reduces to (390) if one sets $V_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} = V$.

⁹¹What happened to the odd numbers? In mesoscopic superconductors, there are actually differences in the properties of even and odd-number particle systems, but for bulk systems the distinction is irrelevant.

⁹²In the normal state, $|\psi\rangle$ and $\psi(\phi)$ differ by a global multiplicative phase $e^{i\theta}$, which has no physical consequences, and the ground state is nondegenerate.

coherent superpositions of states of definite phase

$$|\psi(N)\rangle = \int_{0}^{2\pi} d\phi e^{i\phi N/2} |\psi(\phi)\rangle.$$
 (392)

[The integration over ϕ gives zero unless there are in the expansion of the product contained in $|\psi\rangle$ precisely N/2 pair creation terms, each with factor exp $i\phi$.] Note while this state has maximal uncertainty in the *value* of the phase, the rigidity of the system to phase fluctuations is retained.⁹³

It is now straightforward to see why BCS theory works. The BCS wave function $|\psi\rangle$ may be expressed as a sum $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{N} a_{N} |\psi(N)\rangle$ [Convince yourself of this by calculating the a_{N} explicitly!]. IF we can show that the distribution of coefficients a_{N} is sharply peaked about its mean value $\langle N \rangle$, then we will get essentially the same answers as working with a state of definite number $N = \langle N \rangle$. Using the explicit form (391), it is easy to show

$$\langle N \rangle = \langle \psi | \sum_{k\sigma} n_{k\sigma} | \psi \rangle = 2 \sum_{k} |v_k|^2 \quad ; \quad \langle (N - \langle N \rangle)^2 \rangle = \sum_{k} u_k^2 v_k^2. \tag{393}$$

Now the u_k and v_k will typically be numbers of order 1, so since the numbers of allowed k-states appearing in the k sums scale with the volume of the system, we have $\langle N \rangle \sim V$, and $\langle (N - \langle N \rangle)^2 \rangle \sim V$. Therefore the *width* of the distribution of numbers in the BCS state is $\langle (N - \langle N \rangle)^2 \rangle^{1/2} / \langle N \rangle \sim N^{-1/2}$. As $N \to 10^{23}$ particles, this relative error implied by the number nonconservation in the BCS state becomes negligible.

5.5.2 Is the BCS order parameter general?

Before leaving the subject of the phase in this section, it is worthwhile asking again why we decided to pair states with opposite momenta and spin, $k \uparrow \text{and } -k \downarrow$. The BCS argument had to do 1) with minimizing the energy of the entire system by giving the Cooper pairs zero center of mass momentum, and 2) insisting on a spin singlet state because the phonon mechanism leads to electron attraction when the electrons are at the same spatial position (because it is retarded in time!), and a spatially symmetric wavefunction with large amplitude at the origin demands an antisymmetric spin part. Can we relax these assumptions at all? The first requirement seems fairly general, but it should be recalled that one can couple to the pair center of mass with an external magnetic field, so that one will create spatially inhomogeneous (finite-q) states with current flow in the presence of a magnetic field. Even in zero external field, it has been proposed that systems with coexisting antiferromagnetic correlations could have pairing with finite antiferromagnetic nesting vector \vec{Q} [Baltensberger and Strässler 1963]. The requirement for singlet pairing can clearly be relaxed if there is

⁹³The phase and number are in fact canonically conjugate variables, $[N/2, \phi] = i$, where $N = 2i\partial/\partial\phi$ in the ϕ representation.

a pairing mechanism which disfavors close approach of the paired particles. This is the case in superfluid ${}^{3}He$, where the hard core repulsion of two ${}^{3}He$ atoms supresses T_{c} for s-wave, singlet pairing and enhances T_{c} for p-wave, triplet pairing where the amplitude for two particles to be together at the origin is always zero.

In general, pairing is possible for some pair mechanism if the single particle energies corresponding to the states $k\sigma$ and $k'\sigma'$ are degenerate, since in this case the pairing interaction is most attractive. In the BCS case, a guarantee of this degeneracy for $k \uparrow$ and $-k \downarrow$ in zero field is provided by Kramer's theorem, which says these states must be degenerate because they are connected by *time reversal* symmetry. However, there are other symmetries: in a system with inversion symmetry, *parity* will provide another type of degeneracy, so $k \uparrow$, $k \downarrow$, $-k \uparrow$ and $-k \downarrow$ are all degenerate and may be paired with one another if allowed by the pair interaction.

5.6 Thermodynamics

5.6.1 Bogoliubov transformation

We now return to (389) and discuss the solution by canonical transformation given by Bogoliubov. After our drastic approximation, we are left with a quadratic Hamiltonian in the c's, but with $c^{\dagger}c^{\dagger}$ and cc terms in addition to $c^{\dagger}c$'s. We can diagonalize it easily, however, by introducing the quasiparticle operators $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}$ and $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}$ by

$$c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} = u_{\mathbf{k}}^* \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} + v_{\mathbf{k}} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger}$$

$$c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger} = -v_{\mathbf{k}}^* \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} + u_{\mathbf{k}} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger}.$$
(394)

You may check that this transformation is canonical (preserves fermion comm. rels.) if $|u_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 + |v_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = 1$. Substituting into (389) and using the commutation relations we get

$$H_{BCS} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \xi_{\mathbf{k}} [(|u_{\mathbf{k}}|^{2} - |v_{\mathbf{k}}|^{2})(\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} + \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}) + 2|v_{\mathbf{k}}|^{2} + 2u_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}v_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} + 2u_{\mathbf{k}}v_{\mathbf{k}}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger}] + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} [(\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}u_{\mathbf{k}}v_{\mathbf{k}}^{*} + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}u_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}v_{\mathbf{k}})(\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} + \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}1} - 1) + (\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}v_{\mathbf{k}}^{*2} - \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}u_{\mathbf{k}}^{*2})\gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} + (\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}v_{\mathbf{k}}^{2} - \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}u_{\mathbf{k}}^{2})\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger} + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}\langle c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^{\dagger}c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger}\rangle^{*}, \qquad (395)$$

which does not seem to be enormous progress, to say the least. But the game is to eliminate the terms which are not of the form $\gamma^{\dagger}\gamma$, so to be left with a sum of independent number-type terms whose eigenvalues we can write down. The coefficients of the $\gamma^{\dagger}\gamma^{\dagger}$ and $\gamma\gamma$ type terms are seen to vanish if we choose

$$2\xi_{\mathbf{k}}u_{\mathbf{k}}v_{\mathbf{k}} + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}v_{\mathbf{k}}^{2} - \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}u_{\mathbf{k}}^{2} = 0.$$
(396)

This condition and the normalization condition $|u_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 + |v_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = 1$ are both satisfied by the solutions

$$\frac{|u_{\mathbf{k}}|^2}{|v_{\mathbf{k}}|^2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \frac{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}}{E_{\mathbf{k}}} \right),\tag{397}$$

where I defined the Bogolibov quasiparticle energy

$$E_{\mathbf{k}} = \sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + |\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}|^2}.$$
(398)

The BCS Hamiltonian has now been *diagonalized*:

$$H_{BCS} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} E_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} + \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1} \right) + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\xi_{\mathbf{k}} - E_{\mathbf{k}} + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} \langle c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^{\dagger} c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger} \rangle^{*} \right).$$
(399)

Note the second term is just a constant, which will be important for calculating the ground state energy accurately. The first term, however, just describes a set of *free fermion* excitations above the ground state, with spectrum $E_{\mathbf{k}}$.

5.6.2 Density of states

The Bogoliubov quasiparticle spectrum $E_{\mathbf{k}}$ is easily seen to have a minimum $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ for a given direction \mathbf{k} on the Fermi surface defined by $\xi_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$; $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ therefore, in addition to playing the role of *order parameter* for the superconducting transition, is also the *energy gap* in the 1-particle spectrum. To see this explicitly, we can simply do a change of variables in all energy integrals from the normal metal eigenenergies $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}$ to the quasiparticle energies $E_{\mathbf{k}}$:

$$N(E)dE = N_N(\xi)d\xi. \tag{400}$$

If we are interested in the standard case where the gap Δ is much smaller than the energy over which the normal state dos $N_N(\xi)$ varies near the Fermi level, we can make the replacement

$$N_N(\xi) \simeq N_N(0) \equiv N_0, \tag{401}$$

so using the form of $E_{\mathbf{k}}$ from (398) we find

$$\frac{N(E)}{N_0} = \begin{cases} \frac{E}{\sqrt{E^2 - \Delta^2}} & E > \Delta\\ 0 & E < \Delta \end{cases}.$$
(402)

This function is sketched in Figure 35.



Figure 35: a) Normalized density of states; b) Quasiparticle spectrum.

5.6.3 Critical temperature

The critical temperature is defined as the temperature at which the order parameter $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ vanishes. We can now calculate this with the aid of the diagonalized Hamiltonian. The self-consistency condition is

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{*} = V \sum_{\mathbf{k}'}^{\prime} \langle c_{\mathbf{k}'\uparrow}^{\dagger} c_{-\mathbf{k}'\downarrow}^{\dagger} \rangle^{*}$$

$$= V \sum_{\mathbf{k}'}^{\prime} u_{\mathbf{k}'} v_{\mathbf{k}'}^{*} \langle 1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1} \rangle$$

$$= V \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^{\prime} \frac{\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{*}}{2E_{\mathbf{k}}} \left(1 - 2f(E_{\mathbf{k}}) \right). \qquad (403)$$

Since $1 - 2f(E) = \tanh[E/(2T)]$, the BCS gap equation reads

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{*} = V \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \frac{\Delta_{\mathbf{k}'}^{*}}{2E_{\mathbf{k}'}} \tanh \frac{E_{\mathbf{k}'}}{2T}$$

$$\tag{404}$$

This equation may now be solved, first for the critical temperature itself, i.e. the temperature at which $\Delta \to 0$, and then for the normalized order parameter Δ/T_c for any temperature T. It is the ability to eliminate all normal state parameters from the equation in favor of T_c itself which makes the BCS theory powerful. For in practice the parameters ω_D , N_0 , and particularly V are known quite poorly, and the fact that two of them occur in an exponential makes an accurate first principles calculation of T_c nearly impossible. You should always be suspicious of a theory which claims to be able to calculate T_c ! On the other hand, T_c is easy to measure, so if it is the only energy scale in the theory, we have a tool with enormous predictive power.

First note that at T_c , the gap equation becomes

$$\frac{1}{N_0 V} = \int_0^{\omega_D} d\xi_k \frac{1}{\xi_k} \tanh \frac{\xi_k}{2T_c}.$$
(405)

This integral can be approximated carefully, but it is useful to get a sense of what is going on

by doing a crude treatment. Note that since $T_c \ll \omega_D$ generally, most of the integrand weight occurs for $\xi > T$, so we can estimate the tanh factor by 1. The integral is log divergent, which is why the cutoff ω_D is so important. We find

$$\frac{1}{N_0 V_0} \simeq \log \frac{\omega}{T_c} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T_c \simeq \omega_D e^{-1/N_0 V} \tag{406}$$

The more accurate analysis of the integral gives the BCS result

$$T_c = 1.14\omega_D e^{-1/N_0 V}$$
(407)

We can do the same calculation near T_c , expanding to leading order in the small quantity $\Delta(T)/T$, to find $\Delta(T)/T_c \simeq 3.06(1 - T/T_c)^{1/2}$. At T = 0 we have

$$\frac{1}{N_0 V} = \int_0^{\omega_D} d\xi_k \frac{1}{E_k} = \int_{\Delta}^{\omega_D} dE N(E) / E$$
(408)

$$= \int_{\Delta}^{\omega_D} dE \frac{1}{\sqrt{E^2 - \Delta^2}} \simeq \ln(2\omega_d/\Delta), \qquad (409)$$

so that $\Delta(0) \simeq 2\omega_D \exp(-1/N_0 V)$, or $\Delta(0)/T_c \simeq 1.76$. The full temperature dependence of $\Delta(T)$ is sketched in Figure 36). In the halcyon days of superconductivity theory, comparisons



Figure 36: BCS order parameter as fctn. of T.

with the theory had to be compared with a careful table of Δ/T_c painstakingly calculated and compiled by Mühlschlegl. Nowadays the numerical solution requires a few seconds on a PC. It is frequently even easier to use a phenomenological approximate closed form of the gap, which is correct near T = 0 and $= T_c$:

$$\Delta(T) = \delta_{sc} T_c \tanh\left\{\frac{\pi}{\delta_{sc}} \sqrt{a \frac{\delta C}{C_N} (\frac{T_c}{T} - 1)}\right\},\tag{410}$$

where $\delta_{sc} = \Delta(0)/T_c = 1.76$, a = 2/3, and $\delta C/C_N = 1.43$ is the normalized specific heat jump.⁹⁴ This is another of the "universal" ratios which the BCS theory predicted and which helped confirm the theory in classic superconductors.

⁹⁴Note to evaluate the last quantity, we need only use the calculated temperature dependence of Δ near T_c , and insert into Eq. (47).

5.6.4 Specific heat.

The gap in the density of states is reflected in all thermodynamic quantities as an activated behavior $e^{-\Delta/T}$, at low T, due to the exponentially small number of Bogoliubov quasiparticles with thermal energy sufficient to be excited over the gap Δ at low temperatures $T \ll \Delta$. The electronic specific heat is particularly easy to calculate, since the entropy of the BCS superconductor is once again the entropy of a *free* gas of noninteracting quasiparticles, with modified spectrum E_k . The expression (II.6) then gives the entropy directly, and may be rewritten

$$S = -k_B \int_0^\infty dE N(E) \{ f(E) \ln f(E) + [1 - f(E)] \ln [1 - f(E)] \},$$
(411)

where f(E) is the Fermi function. The constant volume specific heat is just $C_{el,V} = T[dS/dT]_V$, which after a little algebra may be written

$$C_{el,V} = \frac{2}{T} \int dEN(E) \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial E}\right) \left[E^2 - \frac{1}{2}T\frac{d\Delta^2}{dT}\right].$$
(412)

A sketch of the result of a full numerical evaluation is shown in Figure 31. Note the discontinuity at T_c and the very rapid falloff at low temperatures.

It is instructive to actually calculate the entropy and specific heat both at low temperatures and near T_c . For $T \ll \Delta$, $f(E) \simeq e^{-E/T}$ and the density of states factor N(E) in the integral cuts off the integration at the lower limit Δ , giving $C \simeq (N_0 \Delta^{5/2} / T^{3/2}) e^{-\Delta/T}$.⁹⁵

Note the first term in Eq. (47) is continuous through the transition $\Delta \to 0$ (and reduces to the normal state specific heat $(2\pi^2/3)N_0T$ above T_c), but the second one gives a discontinuity at T_c of $(C_N - C_S)/C_N = 1.43$, where $C_S = C(T_c^-)$ and $C_N = C(T_c^+)$. To evaluate (412), we need the T dependence of the order parameter from a general solution of (404).

5.7 Electrodynamics

5.7.1 Linear response to vector potential

The existence of an energy gap is not a sufficient condition for superconductivity (actually, it is not even a necessary one!). Insulators, for example, do not possess the *phase rigidity* which leads to perfect conductivity and perfect diamagnetism which are the defining characteristics

⁹⁵To obtain this, try the following:

- do integral by parts to remove singularity at Delta
- $\bullet~$ expand around Delta E = Delta + delta E
- change integration variables from E to delta E

Somebody please check my answer!

 $[\]bullet\,$ replace the derivative of Fermi function by exp-E/T
of superconductivity. We can understand both properties by calculating the current response of the system to an applied magnetic or electric field.⁹⁶ The kinetic energy in the presence of an applied vector potential \mathbf{A} is just

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{\sigma} \int d^3 r \psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(r) [-i\nabla - (\frac{e}{c})\mathbf{A}]^2 \psi_{\sigma}(r), \qquad (413)$$

and the second quantized current density operator is given by

$$\mathbf{j}(r) = \frac{e}{2m} \{ \psi^{\dagger}(r)(-i\nabla - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A})\psi(r) + [(i\nabla - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A})\psi^{\dagger}(r)]\psi(r) \} \quad (414)$$

$$= \mathbf{j}_{para} - \frac{e^2}{mc} \psi^{\dagger}(r) \psi(r) \mathbf{A}, \qquad (415)$$

where

$$\mathbf{j}_{para}(r) = \frac{-ie}{2m} \{ \psi^{\dagger}(r) \nabla \psi(r) - (\nabla \psi^{\dagger}(r)) \psi(r) \},$$
(416)

or in Fourier space,

$$\mathbf{j}_{para}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{e}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \mathbf{k} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$$
(417)

We would like to do a calculation of the linear current response $\mathbf{j}(q,\omega)$ to the application of an external field $\mathbf{A}(q,\omega)$ to the system a long time after the perturbation is turned on. Expanding the Hamiltonian to first order in \mathbf{A} gives the interaction

$$H' = \int d^3 r \mathbf{j}_{para} \cdot \mathbf{A} = \frac{e}{mc} \sum_{k\sigma} \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{q}) c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{q}\sigma}.$$
 (418)

The expectation value $\langle \mathbf{j} \rangle$ may now be calculated to linear order via the Kubo formula, yielding

$$\langle \mathbf{j} \rangle (\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \underline{K}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$$
 (419)

with

$$\underline{K}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = -\frac{ne^2}{mc} + \langle [\mathbf{j}_{para}, \mathbf{j}_{para}] \rangle(\mathbf{q},\omega).$$
(420)

Note the first term in the current

$$\mathbf{j}_{dia}(\mathbf{q},\omega) \equiv -\frac{ne^2}{mc} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{q},\omega) \tag{421}$$

is purely *diagmagnetic*, i.e. these currents tend to screen the external field (note sign). The second, *paramagnetic* term is formally the Fourier transform of the current-current correlation function (correlation function used in the sense of our discussion of the Kubo formula).⁹⁷ Here are a few remarks on this expression:

$$\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{q},\omega)=\sigma(\mathbf{q},\omega)\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{q},\omega)=K(\mathbf{q},\omega)\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{q},\omega),$$

⁹⁶To see this, note that we can choose a gauge where $\mathbf{E} = -(1/c)\partial \mathbf{A}/\partial t = -i\omega \mathbf{A}/c$ for a periodic electric field. Then the Fourier component of the current is

so $\sigma(\mathbf{q},\omega) = icK(\mathbf{q},\omega)/\omega$.

 $^{^{97}}$ We will see that the first term gives the *diamagnetic* response of the system, and the second the temperature-dependent *paramagnetic* response.

- Note the simple product structure of (419) in momentum space implies a *nonlocal* relationship in general between **j** and **A**., i.e. $\mathbf{j}(r)$ depends on the $\mathbf{A}(r')$ at many points r' around r.⁹⁸
- Note also that the electric field in a gauge where the electrostatic potential is set to zero may be written $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = -i\omega\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{q},\omega)$, so that the *complex* conductivity of the system defined by $\mathbf{j} = \underline{\sigma}\mathbf{E}$ may be written

$$\underline{\sigma}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \frac{i}{\omega} \underline{K}(\mathbf{q},\omega) \tag{423}$$

• What happens in a normal metal? The paramagnetic second term *cancels* the diamagnetic response at $\omega = 0$, leaving no real part of K (Im part of σ), i.e. the conductivity is purely dissipative and not inductive at ω , $\mathbf{q} = 0$ in the normal metal.

5.7.2 Meissner Effect.

There is a theorem of classical physics proved by Bohr⁹⁹ which states that the lowest energy configuration of a system of charged particles in an external magnetic field carries zero current. The essential element in the proof of this theorem is the fact that the magnetic forces on the particles are always perpendicular to their velocities. In a quantum mechanical system, the three components of the velocity do not commute in the presence of the field, allowing for a finite current to be created in the ground state. Thus the existence of the Meissner effect in superconductors, wherein magnetic flux is expelled from the interior of a sample below its critical temperature, is a clear proof that superconductivity is a manifestation of quantum mechanics.

The typical theorists' geometry for calculating the penetration of an electromagnetic field into a superconductor is the half-space shown in Figure 37, and compared to schematics of practical experimental setups involving resonant coils and microwave cavities in Figs. 37 a)-c). In the *gedanken* experiment case, a DC field is applied parallel to the sample surface, and currents and fields are therefore functions only of the coordinate perpendicular to the surface, $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}(z)$, etc. Since we are interested in an external electromagnetic wave of very long wavelength compared to the sample size, and zero frequency, we need the limit $\omega = 0, q \to 0$ of the response. We will assume that in this limit $\underline{K}(0,0) \to \text{const}$, which we

$$\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}) = \int d^3 r' K(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}')$$
(422)

⁹⁸If we transformed back, we'd get the convolution

⁹⁹See "The development of the quantum-mechanical electron theory of metals: 1928-33." L. Hoddeson and G. Baym, Rev. Mod. Phys., 59, 287 (1987).



Figure 37: a) Half-space geometry for penetration depth calculation; b) Resonant coil setup; c) Microwave cavity

will call $-(c/4\pi)\lambda^{-2}$ for reasons which will become clear! Equation (43) then has the form

$$\mathbf{j} = -\frac{c}{4\pi}\lambda^{-2}\mathbf{A},\tag{424}$$

This is sometimes called London's equation, which must be solved in conjunction with Maxwell's equation

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = -\nabla^2 \mathbf{A} = \frac{4\pi}{c} \mathbf{j} = -\lambda^{-2} \mathbf{A}, \qquad (425)$$

which immediately gives $\mathbf{A} \sim e^{-z/\lambda}$, and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_0 e^{-z/\lambda}$. The currents evidently screen the fields for distances below the surface greater than about λ . This is precisely the Meissner effect, which therefore follows *only* from our assumption that K(0,0) = const. A BCS calculation will now tell us how the "penetration depth" λ depends on temperature.

Evaluating the expressions in (420) in full generality is tedious and is usually done with standard many-body methods beyond the scope of this course. However for $\mathbf{q} = 0$ the calculation is simple enough to do without resorting to Green's functions. First note that the perturbing Hamiltonian H' may be written in terms of the quasiparticle operators (394) as

$$H' =$$

$$-\frac{e}{mc} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{q}) \left[(u_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} + v_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) (\gamma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}0}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}1}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}) + (v_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - u_{\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}) (\gamma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}0}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger} - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}1} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}) \right]$$

$$\rightarrow -\frac{e}{mc} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{A}(0) (\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1})$$

$$(427)$$

If you compare with the $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}$ Hamiltonian (399), we see that the new excitations of the

system are

$$E_{\mathbf{k}0} \to E_{\mathbf{k}} - \frac{e}{mc} k \cdot \mathbf{A}(0)$$

$$E_{\mathbf{k}1} \to E_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{e}{mc} k \cdot \mathbf{A}(0)$$
(428)

We may similarly insert the quasiparticle operators (394) into the expression for the expectation value of the paramagnetic current operator (417):

$$\langle \mathbf{j}_{para}(\mathbf{q}=0) \rangle = \frac{e}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k} \langle (\gamma_{\mathbf{k}0}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}0} - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}1}) \rangle$$
$$= \frac{e}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{k} \left(f(E_{\mathbf{k}0}) - f(E_{\mathbf{k}1}) \right).$$
(429)

We are interested in the *linear response* $\mathbf{A} \to 0$, so that when we expand wrt \mathbf{A} , the paramagnetic contribution becomes

$$\langle \mathbf{j}_{para}(\mathbf{q}=0) \rangle = \frac{2e^2}{m^2 c} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{A}(0) \right] \mathbf{k} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}} \right).$$
(430)

Combining now with the definition of the response function K and the diamagnetic current (421), and recalling $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow N_0 \int d\xi_{\mathbf{k}} (d\Omega/4\pi)$, with $N_0 = 3n/(4\epsilon_F)^{100}$ and $\int (d\Omega/4\pi)\mathbf{kk} = \underline{1}/3$, we get for the static homogeneous response is therefore

$$\underline{K}(0,0) = \frac{-ne^2}{mc} \left\{ 1 - \int d\xi_k \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial E_k} \right) \right\} \underline{1}$$
(431)

$$\equiv \frac{-n_s(T)e^2}{mc}\underline{1} \tag{432}$$

where in the last step, I defined the *superfluid density* to be $n_s(T) \equiv n - n_n(T)$, with normal fluid density

$$n_n(T) \equiv n \int d\xi_k \, \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial E_k}\right). \tag{433}$$

Note at T = 0, $-\partial f/\partial E_k \to 0$, [Not a delta function, as in the normal state case-do you see why?], while at $T = T_c$ the integral $n_n \to 1$.¹⁰¹ Correspondingly, the superfluid density as defined varies between n at T = 0 and 0 at T_c . This is the BCS microscopic justification for the rather successful phenomenological two-fluid model of superconductivity: the normal fluid consists of the thermally excited Bogoliubov quasiparticle gas, and the superfluid is the condensate of Cooper pairs.¹⁰²

Now let's relate the BCS microscopic result for the static homogeneous response to the penetration depth appearing in the macroscopic electrodynamics calculation above. We find

¹⁰⁰Here N_0 is single-spin DOS!

¹⁰¹The dimensioness function $n_n(T/T_c)/n$ is sometimes called the Yoshida function, Y(T), and is plotted in Fig.38.

¹⁰²The BCS theory and subsequent extensions also allow one to understand the limitations of the two-fluid picture: for example, when one probes the system at sufficiently high frequencies $\omega \sim \Delta$, the normal fluid and superfluid fractions are no longer distinct.



Figure 38: a) Yoshida function; b) superfluid density; c) penetration depth

immediately

$$\lambda(T) = \left(\frac{mc^2}{4\pi n_s(T)e^2}\right)^{1/2}.$$
(434)

At T = 0, the supercurrent screening excludes the field from all of the sample except a sheath of thickness $\lambda(0)$. At small but finite temperatures, an exponentially small number of quasiparticles will be excited out of the condensate, depeleting the supercurrent and allowing the field to penetrate further. Both $n_n(T)$ and $\lambda(T) - \lambda(0)$ may therefore be expected to vary as $e^{-\Delta/T}$ for $T \ll T_c$, as may be confirmed by explicit expansion of Eq. (433). [See homework.] Close to T_c , the penetration depth diverges as it must, since in the normal state the field penetrates the sample completely.

5.7.3 Dynamical conductivity.

The calculation of the full, frequency dependent conductivity is beyond the scope of this course. If you would like to read an old-fashioned derivation, I refer you to Tinkham's book. The main point to absorb here is that, as in a semiconductor with a gap, at T = 0 there is no process by which a photon can be absorbed in a superconductor until its energy exceeds 2Δ , the binding energy of the pair. This "threshold" for optical absorption is one of the most direct measurements of the gaps of the old superconductors. If one is interested simply in the zero DC resistance state of superconductors, it is frustrating to find this is not discussed often in textbooks. In fact, the argument is somewhat oblique. One notes that the Ferrell-Tinkham-Glover sum rule $\int d\omega \sigma(0,\omega) = \pi n e^2/(2m)$ requires that the integral under $\sigma(\mathbf{q} = 0, \omega)$ be conserved when one passes through the superconducting transition. Thus the removal of spectal weight below 2Δ (found in calculation of BCS conductivity, first by Mattis and Bardeen) implies that the lost spectral weight must be compensated by a delta-function in $\sigma(\omega)$ at $\omega = 0$, i.e. infinite DC conductivity.

5.8 GL Free Energy

While the BCS weak-coupling theory we looked at the last two weeks is very powerful, and provides at least a qualitatively correct description of most aspects of classic superconductors,¹⁰³ there is a complementary theory which a) is simpler and more physically transparent, although valid only near the transition; and b) provides exact results under certain circumstances. This is the Ginzburg-Landau theory [V.L. Ginzburg and L.D. Landau, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 20, 1064 (1950)], which received remarkably little attention in the west until Gor'kov showed it was derivable from the BCS theory. [L.P. Gor'kov, Zh. Eksp. Teor Fiz. 36, 1918 (1959)]. The theory simply postulated the existence of a macrosopic quantum wave function $\psi(r)$ which was equivalent to an order parameter, and proposed that on symmetry grounds alone, the free energy density of a superconductor should be expressible in terms of an expansion in this quantity:

$$\frac{f_s - f_n}{V} = a|\psi|^2 + b|\psi|^4 + \frac{1}{2m^*}|(\nabla + \frac{ie^*}{c}\vec{A})\psi|^2,$$
(435)

where the subscripts n and s refer to the normal and superconducting states, respectively.

Let's see why GL might have been led to make such a "guess". The superconductingnormal transition was empirically known to be second order in zero field, so it was natural to write down a theory analogous to the Landau theory of a ferromagnet, which is an expansion in powers of the magnetization, **M**. The choice of order parameter for the superconductor corresponding to **M** for the ferromagnet was not obvious, but a complex scalar field ψ was a natural choice because of the analogy with liquid He, where $|\psi|^2$ is known to represent the superfluid density n_s ;¹⁰⁴ a quantum mechanical density should be a complex wave function squared. The biggest leap of GL was to specify correctly how electromagnetic fields (which had no analog in superfluid He) would couple to the system. They exploited in this case the similarity of the formalism to ordinary quantum mechanics, and coupled the fields in the usual way to "charges" e^* associated with "particles" of mass m^* . Recall for a real charge in a magnetic field, the kinetic energy is:

$$<\Psi|\mathcal{H}_{kin}|\Psi> = -\frac{1}{2m}\int d^3r\Psi^*(\nabla+\frac{ie}{c}\vec{A})^2\Psi$$
(436)

$$= \frac{1}{2m} \int d^3r |(\nabla + \frac{ie}{c}\vec{A})\Psi|^2, \qquad (437)$$

after an integration by parts in the second step. GL just replaced e, m with e^*, m^* to obtain the kinetic part of Eq. (435); they expected that e^* and m^* were the elementary electron charge and mass, respectively, but did not assume so.

 $^{^{103}}$ In fact one could make a case that the BCS theory is the most quantitatively accurate theory in all of condensed matter physics

 $^{^{104}\}psi$ in the He case has the microscopic interpretation as the Bose condensate amplitude.



Figure 39: Mexican hat potential for superconductor.

A system described by this free energy will undergo a second-order phase transition in zero field when a = 0: clearly when a is positive, the system can minimize δf by having $\psi = 0$ (no superconductivity), whereas if a is negative, δf has a minimum with $\psi \neq 0$. The free energy (435) is a *functional* of the order parameter ψ , meaning the actual value of the order parameter realized in equilibrium satisfies $\delta f/\delta \psi = 0.^{105}$ Notice f is independent of the phase ϕ of the order parameter, $\psi \equiv |\psi|e^{i\phi}$, and so the ground state for a < 0 is equivalent to any state ψ related to it by multiplication by a pure phase. This is the U(1) gauge invariance of which we spoke earlier. This symmetry is broken when the system chooses one of the ground states (phases) upon condensation (Fig 1.).

For a uniform system in zero field, the total free energy $F = \int d^3r f$ is minimized when f is, so one finds for the order parameter at the minimum,

$$|\psi|_{eq} = [\frac{-a}{2b}]^{1/2}, \quad a < 0$$
(438)

$$|\psi|_{eq} = 0, \qquad a > 0.$$
 (439)

When a changes sign, a minimum with a nonzero value becomes possible. For a second order transition as one lowers the temperature, we assume that a and b are smooth functions of Tnear T_c . Since we are only interested in the region near T_c , we take only the leading terms

¹⁰⁵Thus you should not be perturbed by the fact that f apparently depends on ψ even for a > 0. The value of f in equilibrium will be $f_n = f[\psi = 0]$.

in the Taylor series expansions in this region: $a(T, H) = a_0(T - T_c)$ and b = constant. Eqs. (438) and (439) take the form:

$$|\psi(T)|_{eq} = \left[\frac{a_0(T_c - T)}{2b}\right]^{1/2}, \quad T < T_c$$
(440)

$$|\psi(T)|_{eq} = 0, \qquad T > T_c.$$
 (441)

Substituting back into Eqs. 435, we find:

$$f_s(T) - f_n(T) = -\frac{a_0^2}{4b}(T_c - T)^2, \quad T < T_c$$
 (442)

$$f_s(T) - f_n(T) = 0, T > T_c.$$
 (443)

The idea now is to calculate various observables, and determine the GL coefficients for a given system. Once they are determined, the theory acquires predictive power due to its extreme simplicity. It should be noted that GL theory is applied to many systems, but it is in classic superconductors that it is most accurate, since the critical region, where deviations from mean field theory are large, is of order 10^{-4} or less. Near the transition it may be taken to be exact for all practical purposes. This is not the case for the HTSC, where the size of the critical region has been claimed to be as much as 10-20K in some samples.

Supercurrents. Let's now focus our attention on the term in the GL free energy which leads to supercurrents, the kinetic energy part:

$$F_{\rm kin} = \int d^3 r \frac{1}{2m^*} |(\nabla + \frac{ie^*}{c} \vec{A})\psi|^2$$
(444)

$$= \int d^3r \frac{1}{2m^*} [(\nabla |\psi|)^2 + (\nabla \phi - e^*/c\mathbf{A})^2 |\psi|^2].$$
(445)

These expressions deserve several remarks. First, note that the free energy is gauge invariant, if we make the transformation $\vec{A} \to \vec{A} + \nabla \Lambda$, where Λ is any scalar function of position, while at the same time changing $\psi \to \psi \exp(-ie^*\Lambda/c)$. Second, note that in the last step above I have split the kinetic part of f into a term dependent on the gradients of the order parameter magnitude $|\psi|$ and on the gradients of the phase ϕ . Let us use a little intuition to guess what these terms mean. The energy of the superconducting state below T_c is lower than that of the normal state by an amount called the *condensation energy*.¹⁰⁶ From Eq. (435) in zero field this is of order $|\psi|^2$ very close to the transition. To make spatial variations of the *magnitude* of ψ must cost a significant fraction of the condensation energy is actually invariant with respect to changes in ϕ , so fluctuations of ϕ alone actually cost no energy.

¹⁰⁶We will see below from the Gorkov derivation of GL from BCS that it is of order $N(0)\Delta^2$.

¹⁰⁷We can make an analogy with a ferromagnet, where if we have a *domain wall* the magnetization must go to zero at the domain boundary, costing lots of surface energy.

With this in mind, let's ask what will happen if we apply a weak magnetic field described by **A** to the system. Since it is a small perturbation, we don't expect it to couple to $|\psi|$ but rather to the phase ϕ . The kinetic energy density should then reduce to the second term in Eq. (445), and furthermore we expect that it should reduce to the intuitive two-fluid expression for the kinetic energy due to supercurrents, $\frac{1}{2}mn_s v_s^2$. Recall from the superfluid He analogy, we expect $|\psi|^2 \equiv n_s^*$ to be a kind of density of superconducting electrons, but that we aren't certain of the charge or mass of the "particles". So let's put

$$f_{\rm kin} \simeq \frac{1}{2m^*} |(\nabla + \frac{ie^*}{c}\vec{A})\psi|^2 = \int d^3r \frac{1}{2m^*} (\nabla\phi + e^*/c\mathbf{A})^2 |\psi|^2 \equiv \frac{1}{2}m^* n_s^* v_s^2.$$
(446)

Comparing the forms, we find that the *superfluid velocity* must be

$$\vec{v_s} = \frac{1}{m^*} (\nabla \phi + \frac{e^*}{c} \vec{A}). \tag{447}$$

Thus the gradient of the phase is related to the superfluid velocity, but the vector potential also appears to keep the entire formalism gauge-invariant.

Meissner effect. The Meissner effect now follows immediately from the two-fluid identifications we have made. The supercurrent density will certainly be just

$$\vec{j_s} = -e^* n_s^* \vec{v_s} = -\frac{e^* n_s^*}{m^*} (\nabla \phi + \frac{e^*}{c} \vec{A}).$$
(448)

Taking the curl of this equation, the phase drops out, and we find the magnetic field:

$$\nabla \times \vec{j_s} = -\frac{e^{*2}n_s^*}{m^*c}\vec{B}.$$
(449)

Now recall the Maxwell equation

$$\vec{j_s} = \frac{c}{4\pi} \nabla \times \vec{B},\tag{450}$$

which, when combined with (14), gives

$$\frac{c}{4\pi}\nabla\times\nabla\times\vec{B} = -\frac{c}{4\pi}\nabla^2\vec{B} = -\frac{e^{*2}n_s}{m^*c}\vec{B},\tag{451}$$

or

$$\lambda^2 \nabla^2 \vec{B} = \vec{B},\tag{452}$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{m^* c^2}{4\pi e^{*2} n_s^*}^{1/2}.$$
(453)

Notice now that if we use what we know about Cooper pairs, this expression reduces to the BCS/London penetration depth. We assume e^* is the charge of the pair, namely $e^* = 2e$, and similarly $m^* = 2m$, and $|\psi|^2 = n_s^* = n_s/2$ since n_s^* is the density of pairs.

Flux quantization. If we look at the flux quantization described in Part 1 of these notes, it is clear from our subsequent discussion of the Meissner effect, that the currents which lead to flux quantization will only flow in a small part of the cross section, a layer of thickness λ . This layer encloses the flux passing through the toroid. Draw a contour C in the interior of the toroid, as shown in Figure 40. Then $v_s = 0$ everywhere on C. It follows



Figure 40: Quantization of flux in a toroid.

that

$$0 = \oint_C d\vec{\ell} \cdot \vec{v_s} = \frac{1}{m^*} \oint_C d\vec{\ell} \cdot (\nabla \phi + \frac{e^*}{c} \vec{A}).$$
(454)

The last integral may be evaluated using

$$\oint_C d\vec{\ell} \cdot \nabla \phi = 2\pi \times integer, \tag{455}$$

which follows from the requirement that ψ be single-valued as in quantum mechanics. Having $n \neq 0$ requires that one not be able to shrink the contour to a point, i.e. that the sample has a hole as in our superconducting ring. The line integral of the vector potential is

$$\frac{e^*}{c} \oint_C d\vec{\ell} \cdot \vec{A} = \frac{e^*}{c} \int_S d\vec{S} \cdot \nabla \times \vec{A}$$
(456)

$$= \frac{e^*}{c} \int_S d\vec{S} \cdot \vec{B} \tag{457}$$

$$= \frac{e^*}{c}\Phi.$$
 (458)

Here S is a surface spanning the hole and Φ the flux through the hole. Combining these results,

$$\Phi = 2\pi \frac{\hbar c}{2e} n = n \frac{\hbar c}{2e} = n \Phi_0, \qquad (459)$$

where n is a integer, Φ_0 is the flux quantum, and I've reinserted the correct factor of \hbar in the first step to make the units right. Flux quantization indeed follows from the fact that the current is the result of a phase gradient.¹⁰⁸

Derivation from Microscopic Theory. One of the reasons the GL theory did not enjoy much success at first was the fact that it is purely phenomenological, in the sense that the parameters a_0, b, m^* are not given within any microscopic framework. The BCS theory is such a framework, and gives values for these coefficients which set the scale for all quantities calculable from the GL free energy. The GL theory is more general, however, since, e.g. for strong coupling superconductors the weak coupling values of the coefficients are simply replaced by different ones of the same order of magnitude, without changing the *form* of the GL free energy. In consequence, the dependence of observables on temperature, field, etc, will obey the same universal forms.

The GL theory was derived from BCS by Gor'kov. The calculation is beyond the scope of this course, but can be found in many texts.

5.9 Type I and Type II superconductivity

Now let's look at the problem of the instability of the normal state to superconductivity in finite magnetic field **H**. At what magnetic field do we expect superconductivity to be destroyed, for a given $T < T_c$?¹⁰⁹ Well, overall energy is conserved, so the total condensation energy of the system in zero field, $f_s - f_n(T)$ of the system must be equal to the magnetic field energy $\int d^3r H^2/8\pi$ the system would have contained at the critical field H_c in the absence of the Meissner effect. For a completely homogeneous system I then have

$$f_s(T) - f_n(T) = -H_c^2/8\pi,$$
(460)

and from Eq. (8) this means that, near T_c ,

$$H_c = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi a_0^2}{b}} (T_c - T).$$
(461)

Whether this thermodynamic critical field H_c actually represents the applied field at which flux penetrates the sample depends on geometry. We assumed in the simplified treatment above that the field at the sample surface was the same as the applied field. Clearly for any realistic sample placed in a field, the lines of field will have to follow the contour of the sample if it excludes the field from its interior. This means the value of **H** at different points on the surface will be different: the homogeneity assumption we made will not quite hold. If we imagine ramping up the applied field from zero, there will inevitably come a point $\mathbf{H}_{appl} = \mathbf{H}_{appl,c}$ where the field at certain points on the sample surface exceeds the critical

¹⁰⁸It is important to note, however, that a phase gradient doesn't guarantee that a current is flowing. For example, in the

interior of the system depicted in Fig. 2, both $\nabla \phi$ and \vec{A} are nonzero in the most convenient gauge, and cancel each other! ¹⁰⁹Clearly it *will* destroy superconductivity since it breaks the degenerace of between the two components of a Cooper pair.

field, but at other points does not. For applied fields $H_{appl,c} < H_{appl} < H_c$, part of the sample will then be normal, with local field penetration, and other parts will still exclude field and be superconducting. This is the *intermediate state* of a type I superconductor. The structure of this state for a real sample is typically a complicated "striped" pattern of superconducting and normal phases. Even for small fields, edges and corners of samples typically go normal because the field lines bunch up there; these are called "demagnetizing effects", and must be accounted for in a quantitatively accurate measurement of, say, the penetration depth. It is important to note that these patterns are completely geometry dependent, and have no intrinsic length scale associated with them.

In the 50's, there were several materials known, however, in which the flux in sufficiently large fields penetrated the sample in a manner which did *not* appear to be geometry dependent. For example, samples of these so-called "type II" superconductors with nearly zero demagnetizing factors (long thin plates placed parallel to the field) also showed flux penetration in the superconducting state. The type-II materials exhibit a second-order transition at finite field and the flux **B** through the sample varies continuously in the superconducting state. Therefore the mixed state must have currents flowing, and yet the Meissner effect is not realized, so that the London equation somehow does not hold.

The answer was provided by Abrikosov in 1957 [A.A.A., Sov. Phys. JETP 5, 1174 (1957).] in a paper which Landau apparently held up for several years because he did not believe it. Let us neglect the effects of geometry again, and go back to our theorist's sample with zero demagnetizing factor. Can we relax any of the assumptions that led to the London equation (448)? Only one is potentially problematic, that $n_s^*(r) = |\psi(r)|^2 = \text{constant independent of}$ position. Let's examine–as Abrikosov did–the energy cost of making spatial variations of the order parameter. The free energy in zero field is

$$F = \int d^3r [a|\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2m^*} |\nabla\psi|^2 + b|\psi|^4], \qquad (462)$$

or

$$\frac{1}{-a}F = \int d^3r [-|\psi|^2 + \xi^2 |\nabla\psi|^2 + \frac{b}{-a}|\psi|^4], \tag{463}$$

where I've put

$$\xi = \left[\frac{1}{-2m^*a}\right]^{1/2} = \left[\frac{1}{-2m^*a_0(T_c - T)}\right]^{1/2}.$$
(464)

Clearly the length ξ represents some kind of *stiffness* of the quantitiy $|\psi|^2$, the superfluid density. [Check that it does indeed have dimensions of length!] If ξ , the so-called *coherence length*, is small, the energy cost of n_s varying from place to place will be small. If the order parameter is somehow changed from its homogeneous equilibrium value at one point in space by an external force, ξ specifies the length scale over which it "heals". We can

then investigate the possibility that, as the kinetic energy of superfluid flow increases with increasing field, if ξ is small enough it might eventually become favorable to "bend" $|\psi|^2$ instead. In typical type I materials, $\xi(T = 0)$ is of order several hundreds or even thousands of Angstrom, but in heavy fermion superconductors, for example, coherence lengths are of order 50-100A. The smallest coherence lengths are attained in the HTSC, where ξ_{ab} is of order 12-15A, whereas ξ_c is only 2-3A.

The general problem of minimizing F when ψ depends on position is extremely difficult. However, we are mainly interested in the phase boundary where ψ is small, so life is a bit simpler. Let's recall our quantum mechanics analogy once more so as to write F in the form:

$$F = \int d^3r [a|\psi|^2 + b|\psi|^4] + \langle \psi | \hat{H}_{kin} | \psi \rangle, \qquad (465)$$

where \hat{H}_{kin} is the operator

$$-\frac{1}{2m^*}(\nabla + \frac{ie^*}{c}\vec{A})^2.$$
 (466)

Now note 1) sufficiently close to the transition, we may always neglect the 4th-order term, which is much smaller; 2) to minimize F, it suffices to minimize $\langle \hat{H}_{kin} \rangle$, since the $|\psi|^2$ term will simply fix the overall normalization. The variational principle of quantum mechanics states that the minimum value of $\langle H \rangle$ over all possible ψ is achieved when ψ is the ground state (for a given normalization of ψ). So we need only solve the eigenvalue problem

$$\hat{H}_{kin}\psi_j = E_j\psi_j \tag{467}$$

for the lowest eigenvalue, E_j , and corresponding eigenfunction ψ_j . For the given form of \hat{H}_{kin} , this reduces to the classic quantum mechanics problem of a charged particle moving in an applied magnetic field. The applied field H is essentially the same as the microscopic field B since ψ is so small (at the phase boundary only!). I'll remind you of the solution, due to to Landau, in order to fix notation. We choose a convenient gauge,

$$\mathbf{A} = -Hy\hat{x},\tag{468}$$

in which Eq. 467 becomes

$$\frac{1}{2m^*}\left[(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{y}{\ell_M^2})^2 - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right]\psi_j = E_j\psi_j,\tag{469}$$

where $\ell_M = (c/e^*H)^{1/2}$ is the magnetic length. Since the coordinates x and z don't appear explicitly, we make the ansatz of a plane wave along those directions:

$$\psi = \eta(y)e^{ik_x x + ik_z z},\tag{470}$$

yielding

$$\frac{1}{2m^*} [(k_x + \frac{y}{\ell_M^2})^2 - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + k_z^2]\eta(y) = E\eta(y).$$
(471)

But this you will recognize as just the equation for a one-dimensional harmonic oscillator centered at the point $y = -k_x \ell_M^2$ with an additional additive constant $k_z^2/2m^*$ in the energy. Recall the standard harmonic oscillator equation

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2m}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{1}{2}kx^2\right)\Psi = E\Psi,\tag{472}$$

with ground state energy

$$E_0 = \frac{\omega_0}{2} = \frac{1}{2} (k/m)^{1/2}, \tag{473}$$

where k is the spring constant, and ground state wavefunction corresponding to the lowest order Hermite polynomial,

$$\Psi_0 \approx \exp[-(mk/4)^{1/2}x^2].$$
(474)

Let's just take over these results, identifying

$$\hat{H}_{kin}\psi_{k_x,k_z} = \frac{e^*H}{2m^*c}\psi_{k_x,k_z}.$$
(475)

The ground state eigenfunction may then be chosen as

$$\psi_{k_x,k_z} = \psi_0 \left(\frac{\pi \ell_M^2}{L_y^2}\right)^{-1/4} e^{ik_x x + ik_z z} \exp\left[-(y + k_x \ell_M^2)^2 / 2\ell_M^2\right)\right],\tag{476}$$

where L_y is the size of the sample in the y direction $(L_x L_y L_z = V = 1)$. The wave functions are normalized such that

$$\int d^3r |\psi_{k_x,k_z}|^2 = \psi_0^2 \tag{477}$$

(since I set the volume of the system to 1). The prefactors are chosen such that ψ_0^2 represents the average superfluid density. One important aspect of the particle in a field problem seen from the above solution is the large degeneracy of the ground state: the energy is independent of the variable k_x , for example, corresponding to many possible orbit centers.

We have now found the wavefunction which minimizes $\langle \hat{H}_{kin} \rangle$. Substituting back into (465), we find using (475)

$$F = [a_0(T - T_c) + \frac{e^*H}{2m^*c}] \int d^3r |\psi|^2 + b \int d^3r |\psi|^4.$$
(478)

When the coefficient of the quadratic term changes sign, we have a transition. The field at which this occurs is called the *upper critical field* H_{c2} ,

$$H_{c2}(T) = \frac{2m^* ca_0}{e^*} (T_c - T).$$
(479)

What is the criterion which distinguishes type-I and type II materials? Start in the normal state for $T < T_c$ as shown in Figure 3, and reduce the field. Eventually one crosses either H_c or H_{c2} first. Whichever is crossed first determines the nature of the instability in finite field, i.e. whether the sample expels all the field, or allows flux (vortex) penetration (see section C).



Figure 41: Phase boundaries for classic type II superconductor.

In the figure, I have displayed the situation where H_{c2} is higher, meaning it is encountered first. The criterion for the dividing line between type 1 and type II is simply

$$\frac{dH_c}{dT}| = |\frac{dH_{c2}}{dT}| \tag{480}$$

at T_c , or, using the results (461) and (479),

$$\frac{(m^*)^2 c^2 b}{\pi (e^*)^2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$
(481)

This criterion is a bit difficult to extract information from in its current form. Let's define the *GL parameter* κ to be the ratio of the two fundamental lengths we have identified so far, the penetration depth and the coherence length:

$$\kappa = \frac{\lambda}{\xi}.\tag{482}$$

Recalling that

$$\lambda^2 = -\frac{m^* c^2}{4\pi e^{*2} n_s^*} = -\frac{m^* c^2 b}{2\pi e^{*2} a}$$
(483)

and

$$\xi^2 = -\frac{1}{2m^*a}.$$
(484)

The criterion (58) now becomes

$$\kappa^2 = \frac{m^* c^2 b / 2\pi e^{*2} a}{1/2m^* a} = \frac{(m^*)^2 c^2 b}{\pi e^{*2}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$
(485)

Therefore a material is type I (II) if κ is less than (greater than) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. In type-I superconductors, the coherence length is large compared to the penetration depth, and the system is stiff with respect to changes in the superfluid density. This gives rise to the Meissner effect, where

 n_s is nearly constant over the screened part of the sample. Type-II systems can't screen out the field close to H_{c2} since their stiffness is too small. The screening is incomplete, and the system must decide what pattern of spatial variation and flux penetration is most favorable from an energetic point of view. The result is the *vortex lattice* first described by Abrikosov.

5.10 Vortex Lattice

I commented above on the huge degeneracy of the wave functions (476). In particular, for fixed $k_z = 0$, there are as many ground states as allowed values of the parameter k_x . At H_{c2} it didn't matter, since we could use the eigenvalue alone to determine the phase boundary. Below H_{c2} the fourth order term becomes important, and the minimization of f is no longer an eigenvalue problem. Let's make the plausible assumption that if some spatially varying order parameter structure is going to form below H_{c2} , it will be periodic with period $2\pi/q$, i.e. the system *selects* some wave vector **q** for energetic reasons. The x-dependence of the wave functions

$$\psi_{k_x,k_z=0} = \psi_0(\frac{\pi\ell_M^2}{L_y^2})^{-1/4} e^{ik_x x} \exp[-(y + k_x \ell_M^2)^2 / 2\ell_M^2)].$$
(486)

is given through plane wave phases, e^{ik_xx} . If we choose $k_x = qn_x$, with n_x =integer, all such functions will be invariant under $x \to x + 2\pi/q$. Not all n_x 's are allowed, however: the center of the "orbit", $k_x \ell_M^2$ should be inside the sample:

$$-L_y/2 < k_x \ell_M^2 = q \ell_M^2 n_x < L_y/2, \tag{487}$$

Thus n_x is restricted such that

$$-\frac{L_y}{2q\ell^2} = -n_{max}/2 < n_x < n_{max}/2 = \frac{L_y}{2q\ell^2}$$
(488)

and the total number of degenerate functions is $L_y/(q\ell_M^2)$.

Clearly we need to build up a periodic spatially varying structure out of wave functions of this type, with "centers" distributed somehow. What is the criterion which determines this structure? All the wave functions (486) minimize $\langle \hat{H}_{kin} \rangle$, and are normalized to $\int d^3r |\psi|^2 = |\psi_0|^2$. They are all therefore degenerate at the level of the quadratic GL free energy, $F = \int d^3r |\psi|^2 + \langle \hat{H}_{kin} \rangle$. The fourth order term must stabilize some linear combination of them. We therefore write

$$\psi(r) = \sum_{n_x} C_{n_x} \psi_{n_x}(r),$$
(489)

with the normalization $\sum_{n_x} |C_{n_x}|^2 = 1$, which enforces $\int d^3r |\psi(r)|^2 = \psi_0^2$. Note this must minimize $\langle \hat{H}_{kin} \rangle$. Let's therefore choose the C_{n_x} and q to minimize the remaining terms in

 $F, \int d^3r[a|\psi|^2 + b|\psi|^4]$. Substituting and using the normalization condition and orthogonality of the different ψ_{k_z,k_x} , we find

$$f = \tilde{a}\psi_0^2 + \tilde{b}\psi_0^4. (490)$$

with

$$\tilde{a}(H,T) = a_0(T-T_c) + \frac{e^*H}{2m^*c} = \frac{e^*}{2m^*c}(H-H_{c2}(T)),$$
 (491)

$$\tilde{b}(H) = sb, \tag{492}$$

and

$$s = \left(\frac{\pi \ell_M^2}{L_y^2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{n_{x1}, n_{x2}, n_{x3}, n_{x4}}^{n_{max}} C_{n_{x1}}^* C_{n_{x2}}^* C_{n_{x3}} C_{n_{x4}}$$
$$\int dz \int dx \ e^{iq(-n_{x1}-n_{x2}+n_{x3}+n_{x4})x} \times$$
$$\int dy \ e^{\left\{-\frac{1}{2\ell_M^2}\left[(y+qn_{x1}\ell_M^2)^2 + (y+qn_{x2}\ell_M^2)^2 + (y+qn_{x3}\ell_M^2)^2 + (y+qn_{x4}\ell_M^2)^2\right]\right\}}.$$
(493)

The form of $f[\psi_0]$ is now the same as in zero field, so we immediately find that in equilibrium,

$$\psi_0|_{eq} = (\frac{-\tilde{a}}{2\tilde{b}})^{1/2}.$$
 (494)

and

$$f = \frac{-\tilde{a}^2}{4\tilde{b}}.\tag{495}$$

This expression depends on the variational parameters C_{n_x} , q only through the quantity s appearing in \tilde{b} . Thus if we minimize s, we will minimize f (remember b > 0, so f < 0). The minimization of the complicated expression (493) with constraint $\sum_{n_x} |C_{n_x}|^2 = 1$ is difficult enough that A. Abrikosov made a mistake the first time he did it, and I won't inflict the full solution on you. To get an idea what it might look like, however, let's look at a very symmetric linear combination, one where all the C_{n_x} 's are equal:

$$C_n = n_{max}^{-1/2}.$$
 (496)

Then

$$\psi(r) \sim \sum_{n} e^{inqx} \exp[-(y + nq\ell_M^2)^2/2\ell_M^2],$$
(497)

which is periodic in x with period $2\pi/q$,

$$\psi(x + 2\pi/q, y) = \psi(x, y), \tag{498}$$

and periodic in y with period $q\ell_M^2$, up to a phase factor

$$\psi(x, y + q\ell_M^2) = e^{-iqx}\psi(x, y).$$
(499)

in a sufficiently large system. Note if $q = \sqrt{2\pi}/\ell_M$, $|\psi|^2$ forms a square lattice! The area of a unit cell is $(2\pi/q) \times (q\ell_M^2) = 2\pi\ell_M^2$, and the flux through each one is therefore

$$\Phi_{cell} = 2\pi \ell_M^2 H = 2\pi \frac{c}{e^* H} H = \frac{hc}{2e} = \Phi_0$$
(500)

where I inserted a factor of \hbar in the last step. We haven't performed the minimization explicitly, but this is a characteristic of the solution, that each cell contains just one flux quantum. The picture is crudely depicted in Fig. 42a). Note by symmetry that the currents



Figure 42: a) Square vortex lattice; b) triangular vortex lattice.

must cancel on the boundaries of the cells. Since $\vec{j_s} = -en_s \vec{v_s}$, integrating $\nabla \phi + \frac{2e}{\hbar c} \vec{A} = 0$ around each square must give, as in our previous discussion of flux quantization in a toroid,

$$\Phi_{cell} = n\Phi_0, n = integer.$$
(501)

Somehow the vortex lattice consists of many such rings. The problem with this idea is that the only way $\oint \nabla \phi \cdot d\vec{\ell} = \delta \phi$ around the boundary can be nonzero and the usual argument about single-valuedness of the wave function carried through is if there is a "hole" in the wave function. If there is no hole, or region from which the wave function is excluded, the path can be shrunk to a point, but the value of the integral must remain the same since the integrand is the gradient of a scalar field. This is unphysical because it would imply a finite phase change along an infinitesimal path (and a divergence of the kinetic energy!) The only way out of the paradox is to have the system introduce its own "hole" in itself, i.e. have the amplitude of the order parameter density $|\psi|^2$ go to zero at the center of each cell. Intuitively, the magnetic field will have an accompanying maximum here, since the screening tendency will be minimized. This reduction in order parameter amplitude, magnetic flux bundle, and winding of the phase once by 2π constitute a magnetic "vortex", which I'll discuss in more detail next time.

Assuming C_n = constant, which leads to the square lattice does give a relatively good (small) value for the dimensionless quantity s, which turns out to be 1.18. This was

Abrikosov's claim for the absolute minimum of $f[|\psi|^2]$. But his paper contained a (now famous) numerical error, and it turns out that the actual minimum s = 1.16 is attained for another set of the C_n 's, to wit

$$C_n = n_{max}^{-1/2}, \qquad n = even \tag{502}$$

$$C_n = i n_{max}^{-1/2}, \quad n = odd.$$
 (503)

This turns out to be a *triangular* lattice (Fig. 42b), for which the optimal value of q is found to be

$$q = \frac{3^{1/4} \pi^{1/2}}{\ell_M},\tag{504}$$

Again the area of the unit cell is $2\pi \ell_M^2$, and there is one flux quantum per unit cell.

5.11 Properties of Single Vortex. Lower critical field H_{c1}

Given that the flux per unit cell is quantized, it is very easy to see that the lattice spacing d is actually of order the coherence length near H_{c2} . Using (479) and (464) we have

$$H_{c2} = \frac{c}{e^*} \frac{1}{\xi^2} = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\xi^2}.$$
(505)

On the other hand, as H is reduced, d must increase. To see this, note that the area of the triangular lattice unit cell is $A = \sqrt{3}d^2/2$, and that there is one quantum of flux per cell, $A = \Phi_0/H$. Then the lattice constant may be expressed as

$$d = \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \xi(\frac{H_{c2}}{H})^{1/2}.$$
(506)

Since $\lambda \gg \xi$ is the length scale on which supercurrents and magnetic fields vary, we expect the size of a magnetic vortex to be about λ . This means at H_{c2} vortices are strongly overlapping, but as the field is lowered, the vortices separate, according to (500), and may eventually be shown to influence each other only weakly. To find the structure of an isolated vortex is a straightforward but tedious exercise in minimizing the GL free energy, and in fact can only be done numerically in full detail. But let's exploit the fact that we are interested primarily in strongly type-II systems, and therefore go back to the London equation we solved to find the penetration depth in the half-space geometry for weak fields, allow n_s to vary spatially, and look for vortex-like solutions. For example, equation (451) may be written

$$-\lambda^2 \nabla \times \nabla \times \vec{B} = \vec{B}.$$
 (507)

Let's integrate this equation over a surface perpendicular to the field $\vec{B} = \vec{B}(x, y)\hat{z}$ spanning one cell of the vortex lattice:

$$-\lambda^2 \int \nabla \times (\nabla \times \vec{B}) \cdot d\vec{S} = \int \vec{B} \cdot d\vec{S}, \qquad (508)$$

$$-\lambda^2 \frac{4\pi}{c} \oint \vec{j}_s \cdot d\vec{\ell} = \Phi_0.$$
(509)

But we have already argued that $\vec{j}_s \cdot d\vec{\ell}$ should be zero on the boundary of a cell, so the left side is zero and there is a contradiction. What is wrong? The equation came from assuming a two-fluid hydrodynamics for the superconductor, with a nonzero n_s everywhere. We derived it, in fact, from BCS theory, but only for the case where n_s was constant. Clearly there must be another term in the equation when a vortex-type solution is present, one which can only contribute over the region where the superfluid density is strongly varying in space, i.e. the coherence length-sized region in the middle of the vortex where the order parameter goes to zero (vortex "core"). Let's simply add a term which enables us to get the right amount of flux to Eq. (507). In general we should probably assume something like

$$\lambda^2 \nabla \times \nabla \times \vec{B} + \vec{B} = \Phi_0 g(\vec{r}) \hat{z}$$
(510)

where g(r) is some function which is only nonzero in the core. The flux will then come out right if we demand $\int d^3r g(\vec{r}) = 1$. But let's simplify things even further, by using the fact that $\xi \ll \lambda$: let's treat the core as having negligible size, which means it is just a *line singularity*. We therefore put $g(\vec{r}) = \delta(\vec{r})$. Then the modified London equation with line singularity acting as an inhomogeneous "source term" reads

$$-\lambda^2 \nabla^2 \vec{B} + \vec{B} = \Phi_0 \delta^2(\vec{r}) \hat{z}$$
(511)

$$-\lambda^2 \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \left(\rho \frac{\partial B_z}{\partial \rho}\right) + B_z = \Phi_0 \delta^2(\vec{r}), \qquad (512)$$

where ρ is the radial cylindrical coordinate. Equation (91) has the form of a modified Bessel's equation with solution:

$$B_z = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\lambda^2} K_0(\frac{\rho}{\lambda}). \tag{513}$$

The other components of \vec{B} vanish. If you go to Abramowitz & Stegun you can look up the asymptotic limits:

$$B_z = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\lambda^2} [\log(\frac{\lambda}{\rho}) + 0.116], \quad \xi < \rho \ll \lambda$$
(514)

$$B_z = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\lambda^2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi\lambda}{2\rho}} e^{-\rho/\lambda}, \quad \rho \gg \lambda.$$
(515)

Note the form (93) is actually the correct asymptotic solution to (91) all the way down to $\rho = 0$, but the fact that the solution diverges logarithmically merely reflects the fact that we didn't minimize the free energy properly, and allow the order parameter to relax as it liked within the core. So the domain of validity of the solution is only down to roughly the core size, $\rho \simeq \xi$, as stated. In Figure 43 I show schematically the structure of the magnetic and order parameter profiles in an isolated vortex. The solution may now be inserted into the free energy and the spatial integrals performed, with some interesting results:

$$F = L_z \frac{\Phi_0^2}{16\pi^2 \lambda^2} \log(\kappa).$$
(516)



Figure 43: Isolated vortex

It is easy to get an intuitive feel for what this means, since if we assume the field is uniform and just ask what is the magnetic energy, we get roughly

$$F_v = \frac{1}{8\pi} \times \text{vortex volume} \times B^2$$
 (517)

$$\simeq \frac{1}{8\pi} \times (\pi \lambda^2 L_z) \times (\Phi_0 / \pi \lambda^2)^2$$
(518)

$$= L_z \frac{\Phi_0^2}{8\pi^2 \lambda^2},\tag{519}$$

the same result up to a slowly varying factor. Now the *lower critical field* H_{c1} is determined by requiring the Gibbs free energies of the Meissner phase with no vortex be equal to the Gibbs free energy of the phase with a vortex.¹¹⁰ G differs from F through a term $-\int BH/4\pi$. In the Meissner state G = F, so we may put

$$F = F + E_{line}L_z - \frac{1}{4\pi}H_{c1}\int Bd^3r$$
(520)

$$= F + E_{line}L_z - \frac{1}{4\pi}\Phi_0 L_z,$$
 (521)

where E_{line} is the free energy per unit length of the vortex itself. Therefore

$$H_{c1} = \frac{4\pi E_{line}}{\Phi_0} \tag{522}$$

is the upper critical field. But the line energy is given precisely by Eq. (95), $E_{line} = \frac{\Phi_0^2}{16\pi^2\lambda^2}\log(\kappa)$, so

$$H_{c1}(T) = \frac{\Phi_0}{4\pi\lambda^2}\log(\kappa).$$
(523)

¹¹⁰We haven't talked about the Gibbs vs. Helmholtz free energy, but recall the Gibbs is the appropriate potential to use when the external field H is held fixed, which is the situation we always have, with a generator supplying work to maintain H.

5.12 Josephson Effect

In 1962 Brian Josephson¹¹¹, then a 22-year old graduate student, made a remarkable prediction that two superconductors separated by a thin insulating barrier should give rise to a spontaneous (zero voltage) DC current, $I_s = I_c \sin \Delta \phi$, where $\Delta \phi$ is the difference in phase across the junction. And that if a finite (DC) voltage were applied, an AC current with frequency $\omega = 2eV/\hbar$ would flow. I_c is called the Josephson critical current.

There is a myth that Brian Josephson did his calculation (1962) and won the Nobel prize (1973) as part of the solution to a homework problem of Phil Anderson's. The truth is that Anderson was a lecturer on sabbatical at Cambridge in 1961-62, and he gave a series of lectures in which he mentioned the problem of tunneling between two superconductors, which Josephson then promptly solved. The idea was opposed at first by John Bardeen, who felt that pairing could not exist in the barrier region¹¹². Thus much of the early debate centered on the nature of the tunneling process, whereas in fact today we know that the Josephson effect occurs in a variety of situations whenever two superconductors are separated by a "weak link", which can be an insulating region, normal metal, or short, narrow constriction.¹¹³

Let's first consider the last example as the conceptually simplest. The Ginzburg–Landau equation appropriate for this situation may be written

$$\xi^2 \frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} + f - f^3 = 0 \tag{524}$$

where $\xi = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2m^*a(T)}}$ is the GL coherence length and $f(x) \equiv \Psi(x)/\Psi_{\infty}$. Take $L \ll \xi$, so the deviations of Ψ coming from the bulk value Ψ_1 of the first SC is small, and vice versa for the second SC. Changes of Ψ in the constriction occur over a length scale of L, so that the first term is of $O((\xi/L)^2) \gg f - f^3$. So we must solve a Laplace equation for f, $(\frac{d^2f}{dx^2} = 0)$

¹¹¹Phys. Lett. 1, 251 (1962)
 ¹¹²Physics Today, July 2001

Subject: the Josephson myth

While browsing I came across your mention of the 'myth' that I discovered the effect because of a problem set by Anderson. Your correction is not completely correct either! It was Pippard, my supervisor, who drew my attention to Giaevar's tunnelling expts. and his theory, which started me thinking (especially as to how one could get away without using coherence factors). Anderson on the other hand told me of the Cohen/Falicov/Phillps calculation involving a single superconductor when it came our in PRL, which gave me the idea of how to do the two-sc. case. Previously I had got the broken symmetry idea which was crucial from a number of papers including Anderson's pseudospin model, and also expounded in his lecture course which I went to.

Best regards, Brian J.

¹¹³In Je. 2009 I received an email from Brian Josephson correcting this version of the history:

Date: Wed, 10 Jun 2009 09:43:54 +0100 From: Brian Josephson <bdj10@cam.ac.uk> To: pjh@phys.ufl.edu

Dear Peter,

with B.C. f(0) = 1, $f(L) = e^{i\Delta\Phi}$. The solution will be

$$f = \left(1 - \frac{x}{L}\right) + \frac{x}{L}e^{i\Delta\phi}.$$
(525)

The solution can be thought of as two terms, the first Ψ_1 , beginning to "leak" into the constriction from the left, the second Ψ_2 leaking into the constriction from the right. The GL expression for the current will be

$$\mathbf{j} = \frac{e^*\hbar}{2m^*i} \left(\Psi^* \nabla \Psi - \Psi \nabla \Psi^* \right) - \underbrace{\frac{e^{*2}}{m^*c} \Psi^* \Psi \mathbf{A}}_{\text{zero}}$$
$$= \frac{e^*\hbar}{2m^*i} \Psi_{\infty}^2 \left[\left(1 - \frac{x}{L} + \frac{x}{L} e^{-i\Delta\phi} \right) \left(-\frac{1}{L} + \frac{1}{L} e^{i\Delta\phi} \right) - c.c \right]$$
$$= \frac{e^*\hbar \Psi_{\infty}^2}{m^*L} \sin \Delta\phi, \tag{526}$$

which means that the current will be

$$I = I_c \sin \Delta \phi, \tag{527}$$

$$I_c = \frac{e^* \hbar \Psi_{\infty}^2}{m^* L} A, \tag{528}$$

where A is the cross-section.

Given that we have two weakly coupled QM systems, it is "not unreasonable" (justified by microscopic theory) to write down coupled Schrödinger equations

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi_1}{\partial t} = E_1\Psi_1 + \alpha\Psi_2 \tag{529}$$

$$i\frac{\partial\Psi_2}{\partial t} = E_2\Psi_2 + \alpha\Psi_1 \tag{530}$$

where $H_0^{(i)}\Psi_i = E_i\Psi_i$ and $E_1 = E_2 = E_0$ if the superconductors are identical. Take $|\Psi_i|^2$ to be the density of pairs in SC_i

$$\Psi_{i} = \sqrt{n_{i}}e^{i\phi_{i}} \Rightarrow \dot{\Psi}_{i} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n_{i}}}\dot{n}_{i}e^{i\phi_{i}} + i\sqrt{n_{i}}\dot{\phi}_{i}e^{i\phi_{i}} \Rightarrow$$
$$\frac{\dot{n}_{1}}{2\sqrt{n_{1}}} + i\sqrt{n_{1}}\dot{\phi}_{1} = -iE_{1}\sqrt{n_{1}} - i\alpha\sqrt{n_{2}}e^{i(\phi_{2}-\phi_{1})}$$
(531)

$$\frac{\dot{n}_2}{2\sqrt{n_2}} + i\sqrt{n_2}\dot{\phi}_2 = -iE_2\sqrt{n_2} - i\alpha\sqrt{n_1}e^{i(\phi_1 - \phi_2)}.$$
(532)

If we take the real parts and use $\dot{n}_1 = -\dot{n}_2$ we get

$$\frac{\dot{n}_1}{2\sqrt{n_1}} = \alpha \sqrt{n_2} \sin(\phi_2 - \phi_1)$$
$$-\frac{\dot{n}_1}{2\sqrt{n_2}} = \alpha \sqrt{n_1} \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_2) \Rightarrow$$
$$\dot{n}_1 = 2\alpha \sqrt{n_1 n_2} \sin(\phi_2 - \phi_1), \tag{533}$$

Note I've put V=A=1. Then the current is just $j = 2e\dot{n}_1$. If we take the imaginary parts



Figure 44:

we have

$$\sqrt{n_1}\dot{\phi}_1 = -E_1\sqrt{n_1} - \alpha\sqrt{n_2}\cos(\phi_2 - \phi_1)$$
(534)

$$\sqrt{n_2}\dot{\phi}_2 = -E_2\sqrt{n_2} - \alpha\sqrt{n_1}\cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2), \tag{535}$$

and by subtracting and assuming $n_1 \simeq n_2$ (let's couple 2 identical superconductors at first) we get

$$\dot{\phi}_1 - \dot{\phi}_2 = E_2 - E_1 = 2e(V_1 - V_2)$$
(536)

where for the second equality we used the fact that the potential difference between the superconductors shifts the pair energies by -2eV. So we see that a finite voltage difference leads to a time changing phase difference $\Delta \phi$ which means an AC current via Eq. (533).

<u>Magnetic fields.</u> Now put a flux through the junction where the **B** field is along the $-\hat{y}$ direction and $A = -Bx\hat{z}$. The phase of the wave function Ψ must change by

$$\phi \to \phi - \frac{2e}{c} \int d\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{A}$$
 (537)

for the theory to be gauge invariant. Notice that ϕ is now space–dependent. So the Josephson equations will read

$$j = \underbrace{4e\alpha\sqrt{n_1n_2}}_{j_c} \sin\left(\Delta\phi - \frac{2e}{c}\int_1^2 d\mathbf{S}\cdot\mathbf{A}\right),\tag{538}$$

$$2e(V_1 - V_2) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\phi_2 - \phi_1 - \frac{2e}{c} \int_1^2 d\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{A} \right), \tag{539}$$

and since

$$\int_{1}^{2} \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{A} = \int_{0}^{d} dz (-Bx) = -Bxd, \tag{540}$$

we will have

$$J = \int_0^L dx j(x) = \int_0^L dx j_c \sin\left(\Delta \Phi - \frac{2e}{c}Bxd\right)$$
$$= \frac{Lj_c}{2\pi\Phi/\Phi_0} \left[\cos\Delta \Phi - \cos\left(\Delta \phi + \frac{2\pi\Phi}{\Phi_0}\right)\right],$$
(541)

where $\Phi_0 = \frac{2\pi c}{2e}$. What is the maximum current through the junction for all possible $\Delta \phi$? We have to calculate $\frac{dJ}{d\Delta \Phi} = 0$ which leads to the relation

$$\tan \Delta \Phi = \cot \left(\pi \Phi / \Phi_0 \right) \tag{542}$$

and with a bit of tedious trigonometry to

$$J_c = L j_c \left| \frac{\sin \left(\pi \Phi / \Phi_0 \right)}{\pi \Phi / \Phi_0} \right|.$$
(543)

This formula produces the Josephson–Fraunhofer interference pattern. $\underline{DC SQUID}$ (Superconducting Quantum Interference Device)



Figure 45:



Figure 46:

We ignore resistance and capacitance for now. The inside SC thickness is assumed much greater than λ and since $v_s = 0$ we have $\nabla \phi = 2\mathbf{A}/\Phi_0$. The flux will be

$$\Phi = \oint d\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{A} = \int_{1}^{2} d\mathbf{s} \cdot A + \frac{\Phi_{0}}{2} \int_{2}^{3} d\mathbf{s} \cdot \nabla \phi + \int_{3}^{4} d\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{A} + \frac{\Phi_{0}}{2} \int_{4}^{1} d\mathbf{s} \cdot \nabla \phi$$
$$= \frac{\Phi_{0}}{2} (\phi_{3} - \phi_{2}) + \frac{\Phi_{0}}{2} (\phi_{1} - \phi_{4}) + \int_{1}^{2} d\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{A} + \int_{3}^{4} d\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{A}$$
$$= \underbrace{\frac{\Phi_{0}}{2} (\phi_{1} - \phi_{2}) + \int_{1}^{2} d\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{A}}_{\equiv -\gamma_{12}} + \underbrace{\frac{\Phi_{0}}{2} (\phi_{3} - \phi_{4}) + \int_{3}^{4} d\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{A}}_{\equiv -\gamma_{34}}$$

$$\Phi = \gamma_{43} - \gamma_{12}. \tag{544}$$

The Josephson current through the SQUID will be

$$J = J_c \left(\sin \gamma_{12} + \sin \gamma_{43} \right)$$

= $J_c \left(\sin \gamma_{12} + \sin(\gamma_{12} + \Phi) \right).$ (545)

Which means that the current oscillates with the flux. And as a result of that the SQUID can be a sensitive measure of magnetic fields. In practice we include the capacitance and resistance of the device.

6 Topological States of Matter

6.1 Introduction

The last 15 years have seen an explosion of interest in a variety of condensed matter models and materials that are studied under the framework of "topological matter". In reality many of the concepts underlying this field go back much further, to William Shockley, who identified in the 1950s band inversions and edge states in semiconductors that we would now call topological insulators, to the study of quantized vortices and vortex lattices in superconductors and superfluid He in the 60's, to the discovery and explanation of the Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless transition in 2D films and Grisha Volovik's ideas about the topological nature of superfluid ³He in the 1970s, to the discovery and theory of the integer quantum Hall effect in the early 1980s. It is fair to say, however, that it was a series of papers pointing out the similarities of these phenomena, and proposals for how nontrivial topological states could be realized in a variety of condensed matter systems, that created what was perceived as a coherent field unified by a set of ideas. The new concept, as articulated by Kane, Mele, Zhang, Fu and many others, was that a class of phase transitions involve ordered states where no symmetry is spontaneously broken. Instead, the observable distinction between states is based on topology rather than symmetry. This description of the connection between disparate topological systems was recognized by the Nobel prize in 2016 to Kosterlitz, Thouless, and Haldane¹¹⁴

6.2 Berry phase, connection, curvature and all that

Invariant integrals characterizing the order in topological phases can often be expressed in terms of quantities identified by Michael Berry as essential to describe the global adiabatic evolution of quantum states. In some sense the adiabatic effects in systems in the thermodynamic limit, limited to a particular topological sector because the energy barrier to other topological states is too great, can be thought of by analogy to electronic motion in molecules. The Born-Oppenheimer approach utilizes the high speeds of electrons compared to nuclei to suggest that the motion of the nuclei can be treated adiabatically. This works because the excitation energies of the electrons in the nuclear potential are very large and well separated, such that the slow motion of the nuclei never causes transitions between electronic states due to the exisitence of an energy gap.

Consider a Hamiltonian H^{115} , that depends on time through a set of parameters $\mathcal{R}_1(t)$, $\mathcal{R}_2(t)...\mathcal{R}_D(t)$. Note that D for now is just the number of independent parameters, and need not have anything to do with the dimension of space. For every $\vec{\mathcal{R}}$, we have a set of orthonormal eigenvectors of H,

$$H(\vec{\mathcal{R}})|n(\vec{\mathcal{R}})\rangle = \epsilon_n |n(\vec{\mathcal{R}})\rangle.$$
(546)

Assume the simplest situation, that H has a spectrum that is always discrete and has no degeneracies. If we prepare the system initially in a particular t = 0 nth state $|\psi_n(t=0)\rangle \equiv |n(\mathcal{R}(t=0))\rangle$, the adiabatic theorem of ordinary quantum mechanics says that the system remains in the nth state at a later time, but can acquire a phase:

$$|\psi_n(t)\rangle = C_n(t)|n(\hat{\mathcal{R}}(t))\rangle, \qquad (547)$$

where C_n is given by

$$C_n(t) = e^{i\gamma_n(t)} \exp\left[-i\int_0^t dt' \epsilon_n(t')\right].$$
(548)

The 2nd factor reduces to $e^{i\epsilon_n(t)}$ if H is time independent, and is thus just the ordinary evolution of an eigenfunction. The first factor is nontrivial and identical to the so-called

 $^{^{114}}$ Thouless shared 1/2 the prize, for contributions both to BKT transition and to edge states in quantum Hall effect. Haldane received 1/3 of the prize, for showing that differences in the excitation spectra of quantum spin chains of integer or half-integer

spin were topological in nature. See https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/physics/2016/advanced-information/.

¹¹⁵Presentation here follows that of Girvin and Yang, Modern Condensed Matter Physics.

Berry phase if the path $\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t)$ taken in parameter space closes on itself. For now, plug our result into the Schrödinger equation

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\psi_n(t)\rangle = H[\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t)]|\psi_n(t)\rangle$$
(549)

and take the inner product with $\langle \psi_n(t) |$ to get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma_n(t) = i\langle n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t)) | \frac{\partial}{\partial t} | n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t)) \rangle, \qquad (550)$$

 \mathbf{SO}

$$\gamma_n(t) = i \int_0^t dt' \langle n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t')) | \frac{\partial}{\partial t'} | n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t')) \rangle$$
(551)

$$= \int_{C} \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \cdot d\vec{\mathcal{R}}, \qquad (552)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) = i \langle n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) | \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\mathcal{R}}} | n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \rangle \qquad (\text{Berry connection}), \tag{553}$$

so we have replaced the time evolution by an integral over a path in parameter space C. In this sense γ_n depends on *geometry* (in Hilbert space) rather than actual dynamics.

The geometric phase γ_n was ignored for many years for the same reason that the Aharonov-Bohm phase (a precursive example of the Berry phase phenomenon) was ignored: it is gauge dependent¹¹⁶, and it was assumed that all such phases accumulated in the wave function could be gauged away. Berry showed in 1984¹¹⁷ that if one traverses a closed loop in parameter space, γ_n was gauge independent and therefore observable (if non-zero),

$$\gamma_n = \oint \vec{\mathcal{A}}^n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \cdot d\vec{\mathcal{R}}$$
 (Berry phase). (557)

The gauge transformation properties of the Berry connection $\vec{\mathcal{A}}^n(\vec{\mathcal{R}})$ suggests an analogy with the vector potential of electromagnetism, and immediately implies there should exist a gauge independent 2nd rank tensor analogous to $F^{\mu\nu}$. Define the "Berry curvature" as

$$\omega_{\mu\nu}^{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) = \partial_{\mathcal{R}_{\mu}}\mathcal{A}_{\nu}^{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) - \partial_{\mathcal{R}_{\nu}}\mathcal{A}_{\mu}^{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}).$$
(558)

Stokes' theorem then gives

$$\gamma_n = \int_{\partial S} \vec{\mathcal{A}}^n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \cdot d\vec{\mathcal{R}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_S d\mathcal{R}_\mu \wedge d\mathcal{R}_\nu \, \omega_{\mu\nu}^n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}).$$
(559)

$$|n(\vec{\mathcal{R}})\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\phi(\vec{\mathcal{R}})}|n(\vec{\mathcal{R}})\rangle$$
 (554)

so
$$\vec{\mathcal{A}}^{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{A}}^{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\mathcal{R}}} \phi(\vec{\mathcal{R}})$$
 (555)

and
$$\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma_n + \phi(\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t=0)) - \phi(\vec{\mathcal{R}}(t)),$$
 (556)

 $^{^{116} \}mathrm{If}$ we multiply by a $\vec{\mathcal{R}}\text{-dependent}$ phase,

so in general γ_n is gauge dependent.

¹¹⁷M.V. Berry, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A392, 45 (1984).

The integral on the left is taken around the boundary ∂S of a surface S, and the measure $d\mathcal{R}_{\mu} \wedge d\mathcal{R}_{\nu} = -d\mathcal{R}_{\nu} \wedge d\mathcal{R}_{\mu}$ is the oriented surface area element.

While all these concepts are familiar from E& M, it is important to remember that \mathcal{R} is not (necessarily) a position vector in a Cartesian space. IF the parameter space is 3D, we can express the curvature as a magnetic field,

$$\vec{b}^n \equiv \nabla_{\vec{\mathcal{R}}} \times \vec{\mathcal{A}}^n = i \langle \nabla_{\vec{\mathcal{R}}} n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) | \times | \nabla_{\vec{\mathcal{R}}} n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \rangle \qquad (\text{Berry field or curvature (3D only)}), (560)$$

 \mathbf{SO}

$$\gamma_n = \int_S \vec{b}^n \cdot d\vec{S} \tag{561}$$

is in this case a kind of "Berry flux".

For example, in the case of the Aharonov-Bohm experiment with two electron beams passing on opposite sides of a solenoid, the parameter $\vec{\mathcal{R}}_0$ may be taken as a position vector taken on a path encircling the solenoid, in which case it may be shown that

$$\gamma = \oint d\vec{\mathcal{R}}_0 \cdot \vec{\mathcal{A}}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}_0) = -2\pi \frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0},\tag{562}$$

so the Berry flux is directly related to the physical magnetic flux¹¹⁸.

Before continuing, we note that although the Berry curvature is gauge invariant, it is not explicitly so since it contains \mathcal{A} . There is another form of $\omega_{\mu\nu}^n$ that is often used, particularly in numerical calculations since the numerically generated eigenvector $n(\vec{\mathcal{R}})$ is gauge dependent and may have an $\vec{\mathcal{R}}$ -dependent phase factor that varies discontinuously with $\vec{\mathcal{R}}$. It is straightforward to show that

$$\omega_{\mu\nu}^{n} = i \sum_{n' \neq n} \frac{\langle n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) | \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathcal{R}_{\mu}} | n'(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \rangle \langle n'(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) | \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathcal{R}_{\nu}} | n(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) \rangle}{(\epsilon_{n}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}) - \epsilon_{n'}(\vec{\mathcal{R}}))^{2}}$$
(563)

6.3 Berry curvature of Bloch Bands

To describe the effects of topology on transport, we need to define Berry phase, etc. in a basis of Bloch states. Consider an electron moving in a magnetic field described by vector potential \mathbf{A} and a periodic lattice potential $V(\mathbf{r})$,

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \left[\mathbf{p} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A} \right]^2 + V(\mathbf{r})$$
(564)

Bloch eigenstates obey $\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$ where by substituting $\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}$ into the Schrödinger equation, we see that $u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$ satisfies a "**k**-dependent Schrödinger equation"

$$h(\mathbf{k})u_{n\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})u_{n\mathbf{k}},\tag{565}$$

¹¹⁸It's easy to see that if the trajectories wind around the flux n times, a factor n appears on the right hand side.

and

$$h(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \frac{1}{2m} \left[\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{k} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A} \right]^2 + V(\mathbf{r}).$$
(566)

Here I make a few remarks on the magnetic Bloch bands. In the presence of a uniform magnetic field in a 2DEG, the states are the usual Landau levels. The standard treatment is in Landau gauge, which gives a "band index" corresponding to the Landau level, and a momentum k_y (see our discussion of the vortex lattice in a superconductor), so it looks like band theory in a solid to a certain extent. But the wave vector k_y is of course 1D and gauge-dependent. We can write ordinary Landau level wave functions for a translationally invariant 2DEG in Bloch form by using the fact that there is a huge degeneracy of each level, and taking a linear combination that has the Bloch structure. One might start by wondering if we can even label our eigenstates in the 2DEG with a momentum index, since although **B** is uniform **A** is not. The solution is found by examining how **A** transforms under lattice translations. Since we must have

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{B}$$
(567)

 $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{a})$ are related by a gauge transformation, $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) + \nabla f_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{r})$, where the translated Hamiltonian $H' = e^{i\phi_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{r})}He^{-i\phi_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{r})}$, and $\phi_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{r}) = ef_{\mathbf{a}}/c$. Even in the 2DEG we can define a magnetic lattice of unit cell area $a_{x}a_{y} = 2\pi\ell^{2}$, where $\ell^{2} = c/(eB)$, as in the Abrikosov problem. Then one can construct Bloch like functions with momentum index \mathbf{k} confined to a Brillouin zone associated with the magnetic unit cell¹¹⁹. There are some slight differences with ordinary Bloch states under translation. The magnetic translation operator that commutes with H has the phase factor

$$\tilde{T}_{\mathbf{a}} = e^{i\phi_{\mathbf{a}}}T_{\mathbf{a}} \tag{568}$$

so the magnetic Bloch functions satisfy generalized periodic boundary conditions

$$\tilde{T}_{\mathbf{a}}u_{n\mathbf{k}} = e^{i\phi_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{r})}u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{a}) = u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}).$$
(569)

In the Landau gauge $\phi_{\mathbf{a}} = -2\pi y/a_y$.

The presence of a periodic lattice potential changes things a bit in that Landau subbands are introduced, i.e. the degeneracy of the Landau levels is broken. However the Bloch bands obey the same type of relation under translation, with general $\phi_{\mathbf{a}}$. For a more complete discussion, see e.g. Girvin and Wang, Ch. 12.

Using our discussion of the Berry phase, we see that \mathbf{k} can be thought of as a kind of parameter (restricted to the 1st Brillouin zone, since we carry along the band index n) of the Hamiltonian $h(\mathbf{k})$. Therefore we can define the corresponding Berry curvature for each band. Recalling that in the case of a D = 3 parameter space we can formulate the theory in terms of a Berry flux, we have immediately for each band n

$$\vec{b}^n = i \langle \partial_{\mathbf{k}} u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \times | \partial_{\mathbf{k}} u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle.$$
(570)

It is important to examine the role of symmetry on the Berry curvature, particularly time reversal (\mathcal{T}) and space inversion or parity (\mathcal{P}). Under (\mathcal{T}), $\mathbf{v} \to -\mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{k} \to -\mathbf{k}$, and $\mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{E}$. Under (\mathcal{P}) we have $\mathbf{v} \to -\mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{k} \to -\mathbf{k}$, and $\mathbf{E} \to -\mathbf{E}$. Comparing with (570), or see later explicit (585) we have

$$\mathcal{T}: \quad \vec{b}_n(\mathbf{k}) = -\vec{b}_n(-\mathbf{k}) \tag{571}$$

$$\mathcal{P}: \quad \vec{b}_n(\mathbf{k}) = \vec{b}_n(-\mathbf{k}). \tag{572}$$

 $^{^{119}}$ For full discussion see Girvin & Wang Ch. 12.

Thus, if both \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{P} are symmetries of the system, $\vec{b}_n(\mathbf{k}) = 0$.

We now take up the subject of the semiclassical equations of motion of an electron wave packet in a solid. This is one of these lovely problems involving Berry phase where the solution was "well-known", to the extent that it was included in textbooks (cf.Chapter 13 of Ashcroft & Mermin) and used in countless research papers, but later turned out to be incorrect (in some special situations). The Berry flux (570) leads to a correction to the "standard" average velocity of Bloch states in the presence of a uniform electric field. The "standard" derivation for a wave packet characterized by \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k} subject to slowly varying fields gives

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} = \frac{\partial \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathbf{k}} \tag{573}$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{k}}{dt} = -e\mathbf{E} - \frac{e}{c} \left(\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt}\right) \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}).$$
(574)

In quantum mechanics the expectation value of the velocity operator in the absence of external fields is¹²⁰

$$\langle \psi_{n\mathbf{k}} | \mathbf{v} | \psi_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \frac{\partial \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})}{\partial \mathbf{k}}.$$
 (577)

An external field modifies $|\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ and will change $\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle$. For example, if we add a uniform electric field to the Hamiltonian $V = e\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{r}$, it will change the wave functions by

$$\delta |\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle = e\mathbf{E} \cdot \sum_{n' \neq n, \mathbf{k}'} \frac{|\psi_{n'\mathbf{k}'}\rangle \langle \psi_{n'\mathbf{k}'} |\mathbf{r}|\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle}{\epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{n'\mathbf{k}'}}$$
(578)

$$= e\mathbf{E} \cdot \sum_{n' \neq n, \mathbf{k}'} \frac{|\psi_{n'\mathbf{k}'}\rangle \langle \psi_{n'\mathbf{k}'} | [\mathbf{r}, H] | \psi_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle}{(\epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{n'\mathbf{k}'})^2}$$
(579)

$$= ie\mathbf{E} \cdot \sum_{n' \neq n, \mathbf{k}'} \frac{|\psi_{n'\mathbf{k}'}\rangle \langle \psi_{n'\mathbf{k}'} | \mathbf{v} | \psi_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle}{(\epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{n'\mathbf{k}'})^2}, \qquad (580)$$

where $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{p}/m = -i\nabla/m$, and the $|\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ are the eigenfunctions of the $\mathbf{E} = 0$ Hamiltonian¹²¹.

It is easy to check that the matrix elements $\langle \psi_{n'\mathbf{k}'} | \mathbf{v} | \psi_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ are proportional to $\delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}$. This is because the integral over all space $\int d^3r = \sum_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{\mathbf{R}} d^3r$, and the integrand in each unit cell is identical except for a factor $e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{R}}$, which vanishes when summed over \mathbf{R} unless $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}'$.

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial \lambda} = \langle n(\lambda) | \frac{\partial H(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda} | n(\lambda) \rangle.$$
(575)

Note further that for our Hamiltonian, $\mathbf{p}\psi_{n\mathbf{k}} = e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{k})u_{n\mathbf{k}}$. so treating \mathbf{k} as a parameter and taking $\mathbf{A} = 0$,

$$\langle \psi_{n\mathbf{k}} | \mathbf{v} | \psi_{nk} \rangle = \langle \psi_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} | \psi_{nk} \rangle = \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{k})}{m} | u_{nk} \rangle = \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h(\mathbf{k})}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{nk} \rangle = \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}}$$
(576)

¹²¹Note that we are assuming a set of Bloch levels labelled by n, \mathbf{k} and considering only the change in the wave function due to the electric field. There will be additional terms if we treat the magnetic field as a perturbation on the field-free levels.

¹²⁰This follows from Hellman-Feynman theorem: if $H[\lambda]$ is a Hamiltonian depending on a parameter λ , $|n(\lambda)\rangle$ is an eigenstate, and $E(\lambda)$ is an eigenvalue,

So

$$\delta |u_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle = ie\mathbf{E} \cdot \sum_{n \neq n'} \frac{|u_{n'\mathbf{k}}\rangle \langle u_{n'\mathbf{k}}| \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} |u_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle}{(\epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{n'\mathbf{k}})^2}.$$
(581)

Therefore there are several contributions to the average velocity to 1st order in \mathbf{E} ,

$$\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle + (\delta \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} |) \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle + \langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} \delta | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle \equiv \frac{\partial \epsilon_n}{\partial \mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{v}_a(n, \mathbf{k}), \tag{582}$$

where the *anomalous velocity* is given by

$$\mathbf{v}_{a}(n,\mathbf{k}) = ie \sum_{n' \neq n} \frac{\langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{n'\mathbf{k}} \rangle \left[\mathbf{E} \cdot \langle u_{n'\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle \right] - c.c.}{(\epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{n'\mathbf{k}'})^{2}}.$$
(583)

If the first vector in the numerator is \mathbf{a} and the second term $\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{c}$, then since c.c. turns $\mathbf{a} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{c}$ this may be written

$$\mathbf{v}_{a}(n,\mathbf{k}) = ie\mathbf{E} \times \sum_{n' \neq n} \frac{\langle u_{n\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{n'\mathbf{k}} \rangle \times \langle u_{n'\mathbf{k}} | \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{k}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle}{(\epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{n'\mathbf{k}'})^{2}}$$
(584)

$$= e\mathbf{E} \times \vec{b}_n(\mathbf{k}), \tag{585}$$

where in the last step we used (563) and specialized to 3D to define $\vec{b}_n(\mathbf{k})$.

The addition of the anomalous velocity term makes the semiclassical equations symmetric¹²² (compare Eq. (574):

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} = \frac{\partial \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathbf{k}} + \left(\frac{d\mathbf{k}}{dt}\right) \times \vec{b}_n(\mathbf{k})$$
(586)

$$\frac{d\mathbf{k}}{dt} = -e\mathbf{E} - \frac{e}{c} \left(\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt}\right) \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}).$$
(587)

6.4 Integer Quantum Hall Effect

We now specialize this rather general formalism to a 2D electron system in Hall geometry, i.e. in crossed electric and magnetic field perpendicular to the 2D system. This is the geometry where the Integer Quantum Hall Effect (IQHE) was discovered by von Klitizing in 1980 (Nobel prize 1985). I will describe the effect and some basic concepts of how it works before returning to the Berry formalism to show how it allows us to understand the IQHE and identify it as a fundamental paradigm of topological matter.

This discussion is taken mostly from Chs. 12 and 13 in Girvin and Yang.

In Fig. 47, we see a measurement of the IQHE in a MOSFET (Metal-Oxide-Semiconductor Field Effect Transistor), which includes some strange aspects. The Hall resistance exhibits plateaux at which the resistivity value is $\rho_{xy} = h/ne^2$, n an integer (recall in 2D resistance

 $^{^{122}}$ I didn't really calculate change in wave function perturbatively due to magnetic field, so you have to go back and complete this step as well.



Figure 47: IQHE: Hall resistivity vs. magnetic fields showing plateaux at $\rho_{xy} = h/ne^2$. (*n* is labelled *i* in the figure).

and resistivity are the same, $R_H = \rho_{xy}$). The longitudinal resistivity ρ_{xy} goes to zero for wide regions of the field B, and then recovers to a finite value only over the transition region between plateaux. The data look extremely clean, and one could imagine that what one was observing was characteristic of a clean, idealized 2DEG¹²³.

However there is a problem with this picture. Ignore the background ionic lattice for the moment, and consider a perfectly clean 2DEG in the xy plane exposed to a perpendicular magnetic field. In the laboratory frame, $\mathbf{v} = 0$, $\mathbf{E} = 0$, and $\mathbf{B} = B\hat{z}$. If the system is quantum, the eigenvalues are the Landau levels (LL), $E = n\omega_c$, with cyclotron frequency $\omega_c = eB/mc$. In a large system, each LL is massively degenerate with "filling" (degeneracy) $\nu = N_e/N_{\Phi}$, with N_e the number of electrons in the system and $N_{\Phi} = BL^2/\Phi_0$ the number of flux quanta $\phi_0 = hc/e$ passing throug the system.

Now in a frame moving with respect to the lab with constant velocity v electrons have (average) velocity $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{E} = -\frac{1}{c}\mathbf{v}\times\mathbf{B}$, and $\mathbf{B} = B\hat{z}$. We can define the current to be $\mathbf{j} = -en\mathbf{v}$, where n is the density of electrons, in which case the induced electric field $\mathbf{E} = \frac{B}{nec}\mathbf{j}\times\mathbf{B}$, perpendicular to both the longitudinal current and the magnetic field. This is the Hall field. The linear response coefficients are defined

Ĵ

$$j_{\mu} = \sigma_{\mu\nu} E_{\nu} \tag{588}$$

$$E_{\mu} = \rho_{\mu\nu} j_{\mu} \tag{589}$$

we get the response tensors

$$\underline{\rho} = \frac{B}{nec} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1\\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(590)

$$\underline{\sigma} = \frac{nec}{B} \begin{vmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$
(591)

¹²³This was before higher mobility samples showed addiitonal plateaux at rational fractional indices, the fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE).

In other words, $\rho_{xy} \propto B$, i.e. a linear behavior with no plateaux to speak of. The argument depends only on Lorentz invariance, and should not depend on whether the system is quantum or classical. So what is missing? It must be that our assumption of a perfect, translationally invariant 2DEG is wrong. And of course it must be, because real samples always contain impurities at fixed positions that destroy this latter symmetry.

When we think about this more deeply, it is even more puzzling. In two dimensions, And erson localization at B = 0 is supposed to affect all bulk states, such that electrical conduction at T = 0 is not possible at all. Applying a magnetic field should localize states further. So how is it possible to have a longitudinal current and generate a Hall voltage at all? "It turns out" (see Girvin and Yang, chs. 12 and 13) that each Landau level is indeed broadened by disorder, as one would expect, but there is for each level "one" state that remains extended and can therefore carry a current. This turns out to be a quantummechanical edge state, the analog of a "skipping orbit" one might have in a semiclassical description, where the electron conducts half a circular orbit in the field, specularly reflects, and then continues skipping around the edge. Such states are confined to the edge of the sample, and as such are not included in the system considered to lead to localization of all states in 2D. In addition, "one can show" they are protected from backscattering, and therefore carry a dissipationless current. This is because they cannot mix with the bulk states, and other edge states are localized a distance the size of the sample away, so matrix elements for decay fall off exponentially with this distance. We will discuss this topological protection more below.

For now, let us simply examine the consequences of this picture for the IQHE. As shown in Fig. 48, the extended states are at the center of the Landau level, as we would expect because they are immune to the effects of disorder. As the field is increased, the various LL's pass through the Fermi energy one at a time. When the Fermi energy sits anywhere except for the center of a LL, it is in a region of localized states, so $\sigma_x x = 0$, and the states are occupied smoothly with no change in Hall voltage (plateau). When the Fermi energy sits in an extended state, a current can flow, so the longitudinal conductivity has a peak and the Hall voltage makes a transition. Thus the observation of the IQHE depends existentially on the existence of disorder.

Let's now return to the semiclassical equations of motion (587) including the anomalous velocity term. Imagine solving first the QM problem of the electron moving in a (not necessarily weak) uniform field perpendicular to a lattice. The Landau levels will be labelled by n, \mathbf{k} with $\mathbf{k} = k_x, k_y$. The "periodic" part of the Bloch wavefunctions will be $u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$. Now apply an electric field along x. We will examine the drift velocity of electrons in this electric field along y, which will be, according to (587), proportional to $\mathbf{v}_a \propto \mathbf{E} \times \vec{b}_n$, the fictitious



Figure 48: Broadened Landau Levels with localized bulk states everywhere except for extended edge states at center of level, and corresponding conductivities.

Lorentz force. There is no need to consider an explicit magnetic field in the equations any more, since its effect is included in the new $|n\mathbf{k}\rangle$ (\mathcal{T} -breaking is reflected in nonzero \vec{b}^n). Note \mathbf{v}_a is along y since $\mathbf{E}||x$ and $\vec{b}_n(\mathbf{k})$ is along z since the vectors \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{c} discussed above are in the plane due to the 2 dimensionality of the system. We neglect the $\frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \mathbf{k}}$ component along y because when we sum over the BZ it will not yield a net current, and the ordinary $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$ term since we take $\mathbf{B} = 0$ since it is accounted for in the eigenstates $u_{n\mathbf{k}}$ already. Thus the drift velocity is just \mathbf{v}_a , so we may write the current density from a given filled LL n as

$$\mathbf{j}_n = \frac{-e}{A} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in BZ} \mathbf{v}_a \equiv \underline{\sigma} \mathbf{E}$$
(592)

where $A = a^2$ is the area of the magnetic unit cell, $a = \sqrt{c/eH}$ is the magnetic length, and $\underline{\sigma}$ is the conductivity *tensor*. So the Hall conductivity is

$$\sigma_{xy} = \frac{e^2}{A} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in BZ, n} b_n(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{e^2}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_n \int_{BZ} dk_x dk_y \, b_n(\mathbf{k}).$$
(593)

So quite generally the Hall conductance is proportional to the total Berry curvature of all bands. To understand at least the topological essence of the integer QHE, it remains only to show that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{BZ} dk_x dk_y \, b_n(\mathbf{k}) = C_n,\tag{594}$$

where C_n is a topological integer called the Chern number, to find immediately the usual result that $\sigma_{xy} = e^2 n/(2\pi) \rightarrow (e^2 n)/h$, where in the last step I put in \hbar to get the correct dimensions. The Hall conductance is quantized in units of e^2/h , as discovered by von Klitzing.
To prove this, start with the left hand side of (594) and use Stokes:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{BZ} \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathcal{A}_n(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint \mathcal{A}_n(\mathbf{k}) \cdot d\mathbf{k}$$
(595)

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint d\mathbf{k} \cdot \int d^2 r \, u_{n\mathbf{k}}^*(\mathbf{r}) \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$$
(596)

where the closed path is the edge of the Brillouin zone. Thus it becomes important to relate the wave function $\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}$ on both sides of the Brillouin zone, separated by a reciprocal lattice vector **G**. In general they are identical up to a phase:

$$\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i\theta}\psi_{n\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{G}} \tag{597}$$

In a normal periodic system Bloch says that $\theta = \mathbf{G} \cdot \mathbf{r}$, in which case θ has no \mathbf{k} dependence; there will then be a cancellation of the integrand from opposite sides of the BZ due to the direction of the path, so we will get $C_n = 0$. But as we have seen above there is an additional phase factor that can occur in a magnetic system under translation. If this phase depends on a nontrivial way on \mathbf{k} , we can get a different result. Inserting the phase factor into $\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}$ via

$$\psi_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{-i\theta_n(\mathbf{k})}\tilde{\psi}_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}),\tag{598}$$

with $\tilde{\psi}_{n\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{G}} = \tilde{\psi}_{n\mathbf{k}}$, we find for the right hand side of (596)

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \oint d\mathbf{k} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \theta_n(\mathbf{k}) = C_n.$$
(599)

Note the left hand side is just the same mathematically as the circulation of the superfluid velocity in a vortex, and is quantized for the same reason.

6.5 Graphene

Graphene is a single layer of graphite, identified as an interesting system early on by theorists, but considered unrealizable in practice until it was isolated using "scotch tape" in 2004 by Geim and Novoselov (Nobel Prize 2010). Graphene has a honeycomb lattice structure, which must be described as a Bravais lattice with a basis, hence has two primitive vectors which may be chosen, e.g. as

$$\vec{a}_1 = \frac{a}{2}(\hat{x} + \sqrt{3}\hat{y}), \quad \vec{a}_2 = \frac{a}{2}(-\hat{x} + \sqrt{3}\hat{y}),$$
(600)

where a is the lattice constant of the triangular Bravais lattice. The reciprocal space is spanned by

$$\vec{b}_1 = \frac{1}{a}(\hat{x} + \frac{\hat{y}}{\sqrt{3}}), \quad \vec{b}_2 = \frac{1}{a}(-\hat{x} + \frac{\hat{y}}{\sqrt{3}}),$$
(601)



Figure 49: Graphene direct and reciprocal lattice structure

so it is convenient to write any vector in 1st BZ as $\mathbf{k} = \kappa_1 \vec{b}_1 + \kappa_2 \vec{b}_2$, $\pi/a \leq \kappa_{1,2} \leq \pi/a$. The tight-binding Hamiltonian is

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle i\alpha, j\beta \rangle} (c^{\dagger}_{i\alpha} c_{j\beta} + h.c.) + \sum_{i\alpha} m_{\alpha} c^{\dagger}_{i\alpha} c_{i\alpha}, \qquad (602)$$

where i, j label different unit cells, while $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ label the basis sites within each cell. For the moment I've suppressed the spin indices. m_{α} is an on-site energy which can be different on the two sites within the cell. This might be the type of term you would include in the model Hamiltonian if you wanted to describe a plane of two different atoms on the A and B sublattice, e.g. boron nitride instead of graphene. Let's consider in particular a site energy + on A and - on B, $m_{\alpha} = (-1)^{\alpha}m$. Now diagonalize H by transforming to the new basis

$$c_{i\alpha}^{\dagger} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha}^{\dagger} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i}}.$$
(603)

In this simplest tight-binding approximation, note $\langle i\alpha, j\beta \rangle$ means hoppings only connect sublattices A(1) and B(2),

$$H = -t \sum_{i} \left(c_{i1}^{\dagger} c_{i2} + c_{i1}^{\dagger} c_{i-\vec{a}_{1},2} + c_{i1}^{\dagger} c_{i-\vec{a}_{2},2} + h.c. \right) + \sum_{i\alpha} m_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{i\alpha}$$
$$= -t \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[c_{\mathbf{k}1}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}2} \left(1 + e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{1}} + e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{2}} \right) + c_{\mathbf{k}2}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}1} \left(1 + e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{1}} + e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{2}} \right) \right]$$
$$+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} m_{\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha}. \tag{604}$$

Note that the sum **k** runs over the hexagonally shaped 1st Brillouin zone of the triangular lattice (Fig. 1). This can be represented in a simple way if we identify the sublattice degree of freedom 1,2 as a pseudospin v, \downarrow , and rewrite

$$H = -\frac{t}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\alpha\beta} \left[\sigma^{+}_{\alpha\beta} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}\beta} \left(1 + e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{1}} + e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{2}} \right) + \sigma^{-}_{\alpha\beta} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}\beta} \left(1 + e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{1}} + e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\vec{a}_{2}} \right) \right] + m \sum_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} \sigma^{z}_{\alpha\alpha} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha},$$

$$(605)$$

where $\sigma^{\pm} = \sigma^x \pm i\sigma^y$. To compactify even further, introduce a vector **d** such that

$$d^{z}(\mathbf{k}) = m$$

$$d^{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = -t \left(1 + e^{\mp i \mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_{1}} + e^{\mp i \mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_{2}}\right)$$

$$d^{x}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2} (d^{+}(\mathbf{k}) + d^{-}(\mathbf{k})) = -t \left(1 + \cos \mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_{1} + \cos \mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_{2}\right)$$

$$d^{y}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2i} (d^{+}(\mathbf{k}) - d^{-}(\mathbf{k})) = -t \left(\sin \mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_{1} + \sin \mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_{2}\right)$$
(606)

such that the Hamiltonian takes the form

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k},\alpha,\beta} \mathbf{d} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}\beta}.$$
 (607)

Now we can find the eigenvalues and eigenstates of H easily by using the properties of the Pauli matrices. Let $H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\alpha\beta} H_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{k}) c^{\dagger}_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}\beta}$ with $H(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ and note that¹²⁴

$$H^{2}(\mathbf{k}) = (\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \vec{\sigma})(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}) = d_{i}d_{j}\sigma^{i}\sigma^{j} = \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) + \vec{\sigma} \cdot (\mathbf{d} \times \mathbf{d})$$
$$= \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}).$$
(608)

So eigenvalues are

$$\epsilon_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \pm \sqrt{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})},\tag{609}$$

i.e. two bands symmetric around zero energy. If the "mass" m = 0, all atoms are alike, $d^z = 0$, and both $d^x(\mathbf{k})$ and $d^y(\mathbf{k})$ vanish at two distinct wave vectors in the Brillouin zone:

$$\mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_1 = \kappa_1 = \frac{2\pi}{3}, \quad \mathbf{k} \cdot \vec{a}_2 = \kappa_2 = -\frac{2\pi}{3}, \tag{610}$$

so that $k_x = (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)/a$ and $k_y = (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2)/(\sqrt{3}a)$. Recalling

$$\mathbf{k} = \kappa_1 \vec{b}_1 + \kappa_2 \vec{b}_2 = \kappa_1 \frac{1}{a} (\hat{x} + \frac{\hat{y}}{\sqrt{3}}) + \kappa_2 \frac{1}{a} (-\hat{x} + \frac{\hat{y}}{\sqrt{3}})$$
(611)

Now we can rewrite

$$d^{x}(\mathbf{k}) = -t(1 + \cos \kappa_{1} + \cos \kappa_{2}) = -t \left[1 + 2\cos \frac{k_{x}a}{2}\cos \frac{\sqrt{3}k_{y}a}{2} \right]$$
$$d^{y}(\mathbf{k}) = -t(\sin \kappa_{1} + \sin \kappa_{2}) = -2t\cos \frac{k_{x}a}{2}\sin \frac{\sqrt{3}k_{y}a}{2}$$
(612)

which vanish when

$$k_x = \frac{4\pi}{3a}, \quad k_y = 0$$
 (613)

$$k_x = \frac{-4\pi}{3a}, \quad k_y = 0$$
 (614)

¹²⁴Recall $\sigma^{i^2} = 1$, $\sigma^i \sigma^j = i\epsilon_{ijk}\sigma^k$ for $i \neq j$, and $(\vec{a} \cdot \vec{\sigma})(\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) = (\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b})\mathcal{I} + i(\vec{a} \times \vec{b}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}$



Figure 50: Graphene Dirac points.

Of course these are just two of the 6 k related by 60° rotations where the bands touch.

Now let's expand the Hamiltonian around the 2 Dirac points we've picked. Let $k_x = k_x^0 + \delta k_x$, $k_y = \delta k_y$, and expand the cos and sin's. Result is

$$d_{\pm}^{x} = \pm \frac{\sqrt{3ta}}{2} \delta k_{x} \tag{615}$$

$$d^y_{\pm} = \frac{\sqrt{3}ta}{2}\delta k_y, \tag{616}$$

where \pm just means the two points with $k_x = \pm \frac{4\pi}{3a}$.

Now let $v = \sqrt{3}ta/2$ (dimensions of velocity), and rewrite

$$H_{+}(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x \sigma^x + k_y \sigma^y) \tag{617}$$

$$H_{-}(\mathbf{k}) = v(-k_x\sigma^x + k_y\sigma^y), \qquad (618)$$

and for fun (now; later it will be important), let's add the mass term which distinguishes the two sublattices:

$$H_{+}(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_{x}\sigma^{x} + k_{y}\sigma^{y}) + m\sigma^{z}$$

$$H_{-}(\mathbf{k}) = v(-k_{x}\sigma^{x} + k_{y}\sigma^{y}) + m\sigma^{z},$$
(619)

and again the eigenvalues can be found by constructing H_{\pm}^2 , so that we have two bands

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = \pm \sqrt{v^2 k^2 + m^2},\tag{620}$$

i.e. we have the dispersion of a massive Dirac particle. When m = 0 the Dirac fermion has a linear spectrum; this corresponds to true graphene.

6.6 Quantum spin Hall effect and Kane-Mele model

Reference: Kane and Mele, PRL 95, 226801 (2005).

We will start by considering the Hamiltonian (619) as a model of something, and add some new physics to make it more interesting. One question is what types of terms can induce a gap in the graphene Hamiltonian. We have already seen that splitting the sublattice "masses" can do so, with a term $m\sigma_z$. There is another type of term that can do so, that was discovered by Haldane. Interesting effects, in particular a transition to a topological state, can arise from the competition between these two types of masses.

Before we go further, let's discuss the effects of parity $(\mathcal{P} : \mathbf{k} \to -\mathbf{k})$ and time reversal $(\mathcal{T} : \mathbf{k} \to -\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{S} \to -\mathbf{S})$. Recall σ^i in (617) acts on the sublattice degree of freedom. Let's call the two symmetry-distinct band touching wave vectors $\mathbf{k}_{\pm} = \pm (4\pi/(3a), 0)$, and introduce a new pseudospin variable (sometimes called "valley degeneracy") $\vec{\tau}$ which acts on the \mathbf{k}_{\pm} degree of freedom. Then instead of writing $H_{\pm}(\mathbf{k})$ let's just write $H(\mathbf{k})$ with

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x \tau^z \sigma^x + k_y \sigma^y) + m\sigma^z, \tag{621}$$

where I've included our sublattice mass modulation term. Let's examine the effects of parity and time reversal on this H. First of all, parity takes sublattice 1 into 2 and vice versa, so that

$$\mathcal{P}: \sigma^z \to -\sigma^z. \tag{622}$$

(Under $\mathcal{P}, \sigma^x \to \sigma^x$ and $\sigma^y \to -\sigma^y$, so $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ (graphene) is invariant [check!]). But \mathcal{P} also interchanges \mathbf{k}_{\pm} so

$$\mathcal{P}: \tau^z \to -\tau^z. \tag{623}$$

So if we ever had a term like $\tau^z \sigma^z$ it would be invariant under \mathcal{P} , but violate time reversal (\mathcal{T}). To see this, note that since all momenta change sign under time reversal, $\mathcal{T} : \tau^z \to -\tau^z$. However time reversal does not affect the sublattice degree of freedom, $\mathcal{T} : \sigma^z \to \sigma^z$, so this term breaks \mathcal{T} . A term $m_H \tau^z \sigma^z$ will therefore gap the Dirac points but H will break different symmetries than the H with sublattice mass m; this is the model invented by Haldane (Haldane Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2015 (1988)), as shown in Fig. 51, which consists of imaginary second-neighbor hoppings that flip sign upon reversal. Haldane showed that this model has a nonzero Chern number and therefore a nonzero quantum Hall effect without the need for any external field.

Kane and Melé asked if one could generate a term which is invariant under both \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{T} . This is essentially two copies of the Haldane model, where the Haldane mass (hoppings) has one sign for spin up, and the other for spin down. This is a simplified version of the spin-orbit interaction in these materials. Let's imagine adding a term to the nearest-neighbor



Figure 51: Sense of hoppings leading to positive hopping in Haldane Hamiltonian or spin-up Kane-Melé spin-orbit Hamiltonian.

tight-binding Hamiltonian we have so far involving imaginary spin-dependent hoppings on the next-nearest neighbor bonds, as shown in Fig. 51. Remember that until now we have suppressed the true electron spin, but we will now bring it back in the form of an interaction

$$\sigma^z \tau^z S^z, \tag{624}$$

where S^z is the z-component of the electron spin. Since $\mathcal{T}: S^z \to -S^z$, and **S** doesn't care about parity, the product of all three is invariant under \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P} . Thus

$$H_{SO} = -it_2 \sum_{\langle \langle i,j \rangle \rangle \alpha\beta} \nu_{ij} (S^z)_{\alpha\beta} c^{\dagger}_{i\alpha} c_{j\beta} + h.c., \qquad (625)$$

where $\nu_{ij} = -\nu_{ji} = \pm 1$, depending on the orientation of the two nearest neighbor bonds \mathbf{d}_1 and \mathbf{d}_2 the electron traverses in going from site j to i. $\nu_{ji} = +1(-1)$ if the electron makes a left (right) turn to get to the next nearest neighbor site (see arrows in Fig. 51). (Check that this tight-binding model can be put into a form $H(\mathbf{k}) = m_H \tau^z S^z$ for each S_z .)

Now, including spin dependence, $\nu_{ij}(S^z)$ can be written in a coordinate independent representation as $\mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \mathbf{S}$. Just as with the nearest-neighbor hopping for the tb graphene model, we can Fourier transform (625) and calculate corrections to $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$, and then linearize around the Dirac points. This gives a term in our compact notation (check!!!)

$$H_{SO}(\mathbf{k}) = \Delta_{SO} \sigma^z \tau^z S^z, \tag{626}$$

which is invariant under both \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P} as discussed above. Δ_{SO} turns out to be $3\sqrt{3}t_2$.¹²⁵

¹²⁵Remember the origin of spin-orbit coupling in atoms: it's a relativistic effect which can be understood crudely by boosting to a moving electron's frame, and saying there is a magnetic field **B** due to the moving charged nucleus (or here, the ionic lattice), equal to $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{E})/c = (\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{E})/(mc)$. **B** acts on the electron spin, thus coupling spin and momentum.

Remarks:

- Notice that there is no term in the Hamiltonian at present which actually couples up and down real electron spin. Kane and Mele showed however that provided the gap does not close, the system is robust against the addition of terms S^x, S^y.
- Since T and P are preserved, we expect no total Chern number and therefore no integer quantum Hall effect in this system. The spin-up and spin-down currents cancel. However there is a so-called "spin Hall effect", as we will see below.

6.6.1
$$S^z = 1$$

Therefore let's consider one spin sector at a time. For spins up, $S^z = 1$, we have

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x \tau^z \sigma^x + k_y \sigma^y) + \Delta_{SO} \sigma^z \tau^z, \qquad (627)$$

or for each "valley" (Dirac point) separately:

$$H_{+}(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x \sigma^x + k_y \sigma^y) + \Delta_{SO} \sigma^z \tag{628}$$

$$H_{-}(\mathbf{k}) = v(-k_x\sigma^x + k_y\sigma^y) - \Delta_{SO}\sigma^z.$$
(629)

This is the same situation we analyzed for the sublattice mass problem, so we know

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = \pm \sqrt{v^2 k^2 + \Delta_{SO}^2}.$$
(630)

Now let's reintroduce the mass, which cared about sublattice but not about valley pseudospin. Therefore if we have both m and Δ_{SO} we get

$$H_{+}(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x\sigma^x + k_y\sigma^y) + (m + \Delta_{SO})\sigma^z$$
(631)

$$H_{-}(\mathbf{k}) = v(-k_x\sigma^x + k_y\sigma^y) + (m - \Delta_{SO})\sigma^z.$$
(632)

Now we can consider two extreme possibilities. First, imagine $m >> \Delta_{SO}$. As discussed above, this opens up a gap m at the Dirac points, so we have an insulator simply because we put a different potential on the 1 and 2 sublattices. This is called an "atomic" or "trivial" insulator. Now increase Δ_{SO} relative to m. Nothing happens in the H_+ block, but in the H_- block the gap closes and reopens again when $\Delta_{SO} > m$. The $\Delta_{SO} > m$ insulator is separated from the atomic insulator by a gap-closing phase transition. Therefore (see below) the distinction between the two is topological.

Let's investigate what this really means by looking at the response of the system to an applied field. We are really interested in the \mathcal{T} invariant case without field, but it will help us to classify the states and then we will take the field strength to zero. To include the field we will replace \mathbf{k} everywhere by $-i\nabla + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}$, and choose gauge $\mathbf{A} = xB\hat{y}$ for a field $B\hat{z}$. This gives for valleys \pm :

$$H_{+} = -iv\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\sigma^{x} + \left(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{x}{\ell_{B}^{2}}\right)\sigma^{y} + (m + \Delta_{SO})\sigma^{z}$$
(633)

$$H_{-} = iv\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\sigma^{x} + \left(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{x}{\ell_{B}^{2}}\right)\sigma^{y} + (m - \Delta_{SO})\sigma^{z}, \qquad (634)$$

where $\ell_B = \sqrt{c/eB}$ is magnetic length. Again we will use the trick of squaring H_{\pm} in order to find the eigenvalues. For example

$$H_{+}^{2} = \left[-iv\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\sigma^{x} + v\left(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{x}{\ell_{B}^{2}}\right)\sigma^{y} + (m+\Delta_{SO})\sigma^{z}\right]$$

$$\cdot \left[-iv\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\sigma^{x} + v\left(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{x}{\ell_{B}^{2}}\right)\sigma^{y} + (m+\Delta_{SO})\sigma^{z}\right]$$

$$= -v^{2}\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial x^{2}} + v^{2}\left(i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{x}{\ell_{B}^{2}}\right)^{2} + (m+\Delta_{SO})^{2} + \text{cross - terms}$$

and for the cross-terms we use the anticommutation of the Pauli matrices $\sigma_i \sigma_j = \sigma_j \sigma_i$ for $i \neq j$. Check then that these just reduce to $-iv^2 i \sigma^z (1/\ell_B^2) [(\partial/\partial x), x] = (v^2/\ell_B^2) \sigma^z$, so

$$H_{+}^{2} = -v^{2} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial x^{2}} + v^{2} \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{x}{\ell_{B}^{2}} \right)^{2} + (m + \Delta_{SO})^{2} + \omega_{B}^{2} \sigma^{z}, \qquad (635)$$

where $\omega_B = v/\ell_B$ is the Dirac cyclotron frequency, and $\ell_B = \sqrt{c/(eB)}$ is the magnetic length. Note the first two terms have the form of H (not H^2) for a regular 2DEG with "mass" $1/(2v^2)$. The corresponding "cyclotron frequency" is

$$\omega_c^{eff} = \frac{eB}{mc} \equiv \frac{2v^2}{\ell_B^2} = 2\omega_B^2. \tag{636}$$

Thus the eigenvalues of H^2_+ can be read off

$$2\omega_B^2(n+1/2) + (m+\Delta_{SO})^2 + \omega_B^2 \sigma^z ; \quad n = 0, 1, 2...,$$
(637)

and the spectrum of H_+ itself is

$$\epsilon_{n+} = \pm \sqrt{2\omega_B^2 n + (m + \Delta_{SO})^2}; n = 1, 2, \dots$$
 (638)

$$\epsilon_{0+} = -(m + \Delta_{SO}). \tag{639}$$

Now one can go back and do the same thing for H_{-} (still for real spin up!), and find

$$H_{-}^{2} = 2\omega_{B}^{2}(n+1/2) + (m-\Delta_{SO})^{2} - \omega_{B}^{2}\sigma^{z}$$
(640)

$$\epsilon_{n-} = \pm \sqrt{2\omega_B^2 n + (m - \Delta_{SO})^2}; n = 1, 2, \dots$$
 (641)

$$\epsilon_{0-} = m - \Delta_{SO}. \tag{642}$$

Eigenvalues $-\epsilon_{0+}$ and $-\epsilon_{0-}$ do not occur although they are in principle square roots of eigenvalues of H^2_{\pm} . ¹²⁶. Now when $m > \Delta_{SO}$, we have the same number of Landau levels above and below zero energy. The Hall conductivity with $\epsilon_F = 0$ is therefore $\sigma_{xy} = 0$. However, once $\Delta_{SO} > m$, both ϵ_{0+} and ϵ_{0-} are below $\epsilon = 0$, so there is one extra filled Landau level in this case so that the Hall conductivity becomes $\sigma_{xy} = e^2/h$.¹²⁷ Now notice that the ordering of levels or the sign of their energies did not depend on the strength of the applied field B. Thus we can take $B \to 0$ and will be left with an insulator (quantum Hall insulator) which displays $\sigma_{xy} = +e^2/h$ for $S^z = 1$, i.e. spins \uparrow .

6.6.2 $S^z = -1$

Now follow exactly the same steps for $S^z = -1$. For completeness I'll write it out explicitly, but basically only signs of Δ_{SO} terms change:

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x \tau^z \sigma^x + k_y \sigma^y) + m\sigma^z - \Delta_{SO} \sigma^z \tau^z, \qquad (643)$$

$$H_{+}(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x \sigma^x + k_y \sigma^y) + (m - \Delta_{SO})\sigma^z$$
(644)

$$H_{-}(\mathbf{k}) = v(-k_x\sigma^x + k_y\sigma^y) + (m + \Delta_{SO})\sigma^z.$$
(645)

so the Landau level structure is

$$\epsilon_{n+} = \pm \sqrt{2\omega_B^2 n + (m - \Delta_{SO})^2}; n = 1, 2, \dots$$
 (646)

$$\epsilon_{0+} = -(m - \Delta_{SO}) \tag{647}$$

$$\epsilon_{n-} = \pm \sqrt{2\omega_B^2 n + (m + \Delta_{SO})^2}; n = 1, 2, \dots$$
 (648)

$$\epsilon_{0-} = m + \Delta_{SO}. \tag{649}$$

so when $\Delta_{SO} > m$, there is one more Landau level *above* $\epsilon = 0$, so by the same argument the Hall conductivity should become $\sigma_{xy} = -e^2/h$, again even for $B \to 0$. Thus the picture

¹²⁶This is because the zero mode (eigenvalue) of the graphene Hamiltonian for a given valley is unique. For example for H_+ , the zero mode and is an eigenstate of σ_z with eigenvalue $\sigma_z = -1$ (A. H. Castro Neto, F. Guinea, N. M. R. Peres, K. S. Novoselov, and A. K. Geim Rev. Mod. Phys. 81, 109 (2009), pp. 126-127. I thank Ammar Jahin for discussing these aspects with me.) Thus adding the mass $m + \Delta_{SO}$ shifts the zero mode *down*, hence $\epsilon_{0+} < 0$. Now for the opposite valley $\tau_z = -1$, the eigenvalues are shifted by $(m - \Delta_{SO})\sigma_z$, which is indeed *up* if $m > \Delta_{SO}$, since this zero mode is an eigenstate with $\sigma_z = +1$, but *down* if $m < \Delta_{SO}$. Only for $m < \Delta_{SO}$ are there LL's, that each contribute $e^2/2h$ to total $\sigma_{xy} = e^2/h$ for Haldane insulator, representing a spontaneous IQHE in zero applied field. This is the same as the Kane-Mele model for the $S_z = 1$ sector, but σ_{xy} is cancelled by $-e^2/h$ from $S_z = -1$ sector.

¹²⁷In the integer quantum Hall effect we expect $\sigma_{xy} = ne^2/h$ for a filled Landau level. For graphene ϵ_F at the Dirac point, $\sigma_{xy} = 0$, due to two doubly degenerate levels corresponding to n = 0.

which emerges is that of an insulator which differs from the trivial one in that spins have finite, but opposite Hall conductivities even in zero field, due to the spin-orbit interaction. Thus spins up and down will accumulate on opposite sides of a Hall bar carrying a longitudinal electric current due to an applied electric field. This is not unique to topological insulators, of course, but is a property of semiconductors with spin-orbit coupling.



Figure 52: Spin-carrying edge states in a topological insulator. From Qi and Zhang, Physics Today 63 (1), 33–38 (2010).

6.7 Edge states

In fact we haven't yet shown that the spin current is carried by edge states, as in Fig. 52. This can be done by a gauge argument analogous to that given by Laughlin for the integer QHE, or by explicit solution for a given geometry. The Schrödinger equation can be solved numerically in finite geometry by imposing open transverse boundary conditions. In this case Kane and Mele showed the solution (Fig. 5), which exhibits the bulk gapped Dirac like states and two characteristic states which cross at the Dirac point and carry the current; direct examination of the eigenfunctions shows that they are indeed edge states.

We can show without involved numerics that such edge states exist if we put in the "edge" by a bit of sleight of hand. Consider for example the H_{-} block for spin up $S^{z} = 1$. Assume the sample has an edge at y = 0, and the sample exists for y < 0, and y > 0 is vacuum. There will be some spatial variation along the y direction giving the edge state wave function, but we can assume translational invariance along x and take $k_{x} = 0$. Then the Hamiltonian is

$$H_{-}(y) = -iv\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\sigma^{y} + (m - \Delta_{SO})\sigma^{z} \equiv -iv\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\sigma^{y} + \tilde{m}(y)\sigma^{z}, \qquad (650)$$

where I'm now considering a y-dependent potential given by $\tilde{m}(y)$, which I will insist change sign at the edge, such that \tilde{m} is < 0 for y < 0, i.e. in the sample, $\tilde{m} > 0$ for y > 0. We're looking for a zero-energy edge state wave function. Make the ansatz for the solution to the



Figure 53: Energy bands for a strip of graphene with SO coupling. The bands crossing the gap are spin filtered edge states. From Kane and Mele, PRL 2005.

Schrödinger equation

$$\psi(y) = i\sigma^y e^{f(y)}\phi,\tag{651}$$

where ϕ is a 2-component spinor field. Plugging in, we get

$$\left(v\frac{df}{dy} + \tilde{m}(y)\sigma^x\right)\phi = 0,\tag{652}$$

which has the formal solution

$$f(y) = -\frac{1}{v} \int_0^y dy' \tilde{m}(y') \quad ; \qquad \sigma^x \phi = \phi, \tag{653}$$

i.e. ϕ is an eigenstate of σ^x with e-value 1. Note that the effect of $i\sigma^y = \exp i\frac{\pi}{2}\sigma^y$ is to rotate by π around the y-axis. So the total solution is

$$\psi(y) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{v} \int_0^y dy' \tilde{m}(y')\right) |\sigma^x = -1\rangle.$$
(654)

One can be more explicit by assuming an "edge" like $\tilde{m}(y) = \tilde{m}_0 \tanh(y/y_0)$, in which case one finds $\psi \propto \exp(-(y\tilde{m}_0/v)\log\cosh(y/y_0))$, which is a state of width v/\tilde{m}_0 .

Remarks:

- 1. The fact that the state is an eigenstate of σ^x apparently reflects the fact that it mixes the two sublattices by hopping along the boundary.
- 2. At finite k_x , the same state has energy $\epsilon(k_x) = -vk_x$, so that $v(k_x) = \partial \epsilon(k_x)/\partial k_x = -v$.
- 3. For $S^z = -1$ we would take $\tilde{m} \to -\tilde{m}$ in the large Δ_{SO} limit to find an edge state with velocity in the opposite direction.
- 4. I chose arbitrarily one Dirac point H_{-} . Could have chosen H_{+} as well. There should be two edge state solutions there as well, one for each spin.

6.8 Topological character of new insulating phase

We've been dancing around the obvious question, what's actually topological about topological insulators? This question is important because to qualify as a new state of matter they need to have something fundamentally different, and the claim is that such new insulating states do NOT (necessarily) break any symmetry, as do magnets, superconductors, crystals, and other phases we regard as distinct. The claim is that there is a topological invariant which characterizes such a phase, reflecting a finite energy gap towards deformation of the state into a new phase of trivial topological invariant, i.e. the state is robust against small perturbations.

To see this explicitly, let's again take $S^z = 1$ and $consider H_{\pm}(\mathbf{k})$

$$H_{+}(\mathbf{k}) = v(k_x \sigma^x + k_y \sigma^y) + (m + \Delta_{SO})\sigma^z$$
(655)

$$H_{-}(\mathbf{k}) = v(-k_x\sigma^x + k_y\sigma^y) + (m - \Delta_{SO})\sigma^z, \qquad (656)$$

recalling that we can write the Hamiltonian in terms of a **d**-vector, $H_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{d}_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}$,

$$d_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = (\pm vk_x, vk_y, m \pm \Delta_{SO}), \tag{657}$$

and define $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\pm} = \mathbf{d}_{\pm}/|\mathbf{d}_{\pm}|$. $\hat{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{k})$ defines a mapping of 2D momentum space k_x, k_y to a unit sphere, for given v, m, Δ_{SO} . This mapping can be assigned a topological index (Chern number)

$$n = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{\alpha} \int d^2 k \left(\partial_{k_x} \hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\alpha} \times \partial_{k_y} \hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\alpha} \right) \cdot \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\alpha}, \tag{658}$$

Note this represents an integral of the Berry curvature, or the number of times that the mapping taking the 2D **k**-space¹²⁸ into the unit sphere represented by $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$. n is the number of times the map wraps around the sphere as a function of **k**, and for smooth $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ it may be shown that n is always an integer. In Fig. 54 I sketch $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\pm}$ for the simple example given in Eq. 657. For $m > \Delta_{SO}$ the d_z component is a positive constant, i.e. $d_z > 0$. Since $\partial_x \hat{d}_\alpha \times \partial_y \hat{d}_\alpha$ points along \hat{z} , the Chern number is just the winding around a contour in the k_x, k_y plane weighted by sgn d_z which is +1 for $m > \Delta_{SO}$ so since the windings are ± 1 for valleys + and -, the sum is $n = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} = 0$. For the case $m < \Delta_{SO}$, however, the \hat{d}_z component is reversed for $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_-$, which means the winding numbers add, $n = \frac{1}{2}(+1) + (-\frac{1}{2})(-1) = 1$. This index therefore distinguishes a trivial insulator from a topological one.

 $^{^{128}}$ In principle the mapping is performed from the torus (1st Brillouin zone) to the unit sphere. However for the graphene case if the gap is small, the Berry curvature is concentrated in the neighborhood of the 2 Dirac points, so the edges of the zone don't contribute.



Figure 54: *d*-vector for Haldane or K-M Hamiltonian. $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{\pm}$ is plotted over a contour surrounding $k_x, k_y = 0$ and at $k_x, k_y = 0$. a) Case $m > \Delta_{SO}$ showing different windings of *d* in plane for \pm valleys. Winding numbers cancel for 2 valleys. b) Topologically nontrivial case $\Delta_{SO} > m$. d_z has negative sign for – valley, leading to summing of two winding numbers to 1.

6.9 Kitaev model for 1D topological SC

The revival of interest in topological superconductivity may be due in part to an influential paper written by Kitaev which introduced a model for a 1D p-wave superconducting chain,

$$H_{Kitaev} = -\sum_{i} t(c_i^{\dagger} c_{i+1}) - \mu c_i^{\dagger} c_i + \Delta(c_i c_{i+1} + h.c.),$$
(659)

where *i* labels the sites on a chain, *t* is the NN hopping, μ the chemical potential and Δ the *p* wave pairing amplitude for the *spinless* fermions which move on the chain. Note that the Fourier transform of $\Delta c_i c_{i+1}$ is $i\Delta \sin k \ c_k c_{-k}$, so that the gap in momentum space is indeed of odd parity, which we will call *p* wave. An odd parity state of this type satisfies the Pauli principle with its orbital sign change under particle exchange without the need for spin degrees of freedom. Such a model is otherwise unphysical in many different ways, but has the virtue that one can exhibit very simply the existence of two distinct topological sectors. To see this, consider Fig. 56a): there are clearly two different situations with respect to the



Figure 55: Kitaev 1D p-wave superconducting chain

chemical potential. It can lie inside the band, as in the standard BCS case; with the current convention for the Hamiltonian, this means $|\mu| < t$. Alternatively, it can lie outside the band, $|\mu| > t$; in this situation, BCS theory would say there is no superconductor. However, within the model, we can simply assert that the range in energy over which states are paired is very large, so that one can pair states away from the Fermi surface. It is interesting to examine the bulk theory first to see if there are differences between the two sectors. The ground state of the Hamiltonian is of course just the BCS wave function, which we write as

$$\Pi_k (1 + \phi(k)c_{-k}c_k)|0\rangle, \tag{660}$$

where $\phi(k) \equiv v_k/u_k$ is the form factor for the occupied pair, or Cooper wave function. In real space (1D), it is a function of the relative coordinate,

$$\phi(r) \sim \begin{cases} e^{-r/\zeta} & |\mu| > t \text{ strong pairing} \\ \text{const.} & |\mu| < t \text{ weak pairing} \end{cases}$$

We see that in the case labelled "strong pairing", the pair size decays exponentially over a



Figure 56: (a) Definition of strong and weak pairing sectors according to value of μ . (b) Mapping of \hat{d} vector onto unit sphere under sweep of k from 0 to π .

length scale ζ , ... (?), exactly as it does in the BCS theory when the interaction is made comparable or large compared to the Fermi energy, resulting in a very different theory corresponding to the Bose-Einstein pairing of molecules. In 1D, the usual BCS case "weak pairing" has an infinitely long range pair size. This distinction does not guarantee a *topological* difference between the two sectors by itself, but this can be shown as well. If we write the Hamiltonian (659) in terms of a Nambu representation¹²⁹

$$H_{Kitaev} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k} \vec{c}_{k}^{\dagger} \mathcal{H}_{k} \vec{c}_{k}, \qquad \mathcal{H}_{k} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{k} & \Delta_{k} \\ \Delta_{k}^{*} & -\epsilon_{k} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (661)$$

with $\vec{c}_k = (c_{-k}, c_k^{\dagger}), \ \epsilon_k = -t \cos k - \mu, \ \Delta_k = -i\Delta_0 \sin k$, the matrix \mathcal{H}_k may be written as a sum over Pauli matrices,

$$\mathcal{H}_k = \mathbf{h}(k) \cdot \vec{\tau}. \tag{662}$$

It's important that $\mathbf{h}(k)$ obey the symmetry $h_{x,y}(k) = -h_{x,y}(-k)$ and $h_z(k) = h_z(-k)$, which it does if the gap has odd parity. Now define a new unit vector $\hat{h}(k) \equiv \mathbf{h}(k)/|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})|$. We can ask what the trajectory is on the unit sphere as k sweeps over the interval $0, \pi$ in the Brillouin zone. At both 0 and π , the gap vanishes and the direction of \hat{h} is determined by the sign of the kinetic energy ϵ_k , which we'll call s_0 and s_{π} , respectively. We see that in the strong pairing sector we have either $\mu > t \Rightarrow s_0 = -1$, $s_{\pi} = -1$ or $\mu < -t$, such that $s_0 = 1$, $s_{\pi} = 1$. Thus in the strong pairing case the mapping to the unit sphere is trivial: the vector $\hat{h}(k)$ follows a trajectory as k runs from 0 to π on the unit sphere that begins and ends at the same point. On the other hand if $|\mu| < t$, $s_0 = -s_{\pi}$, so the mapping goes from one pole to the other. These are topologically distinct trajectories distinguished by the \mathbb{Z}_2 invariant $\nu = s_0 s_{\pi}$, which evidently can be 1 (trivial) or -1 (topological).

We now follow Kitaev and show that the finite chain exhibits Majorana end-chain excitations. Majorana fermions¹³⁰ can be thought of as half a Dirac Fermion. Each spinless fermion in our original Hamiltonian (659) may be written as a sum of Majoranas, $c_i = (1/2)(\beta_{Bi} + i\beta_{Ai})$, yielding

$$H_{Kitaev} = -\frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 + i\beta_{Bi}\beta_{Ai}) -\frac{i}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} [(\Delta_0 + t)\beta_{Bi}\beta_{Ai+1} + (\Delta_0 - t)\beta_{Ai}\beta_{Bi+1}]. \rightarrow -i\frac{t}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \beta_{Bi}\beta_{Ai+1},$$
(663)

where in the last step we set $\mu = 0$ and $\Delta = t$, a special case where it can be easily shown that the solution supports Majorana zero modes. This can be seen by noting that H now

¹²⁹In the topological superconductivity literature, the matrix representation of the Hamiltonian in particle-hole space is usually referred to as the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) representation, and the BdG symmetry, the antiunitary transformation which involves exchanging a particle for a hole and complex conjugating, $\Xi H_{BdG}\Xi^{-1} = -H_{BdG}$ is one of the symmetries (along with time reversal and chiral symmetry) used to classify topological superconductors and insulators.

¹³⁰Majorana fermions β are operators defined by Ettore Majorana as a possible description of the neutrino. Such objects are defined to be their own antiparticle, $\beta = \beta^{\dagger}$, and obey the commutation relations $\{\beta_i, \beta_j\} = 2\delta_{ij}$.

couples Majoranas A and B only at nearest neighbor sites. However there is no coupling for the B Majorana on site N, nor for the A Majorana on site 0. These therefore cost zero energy and are decoupled from the rest of the system. The rest of the system still has a gap for excitations, since it's a superconductor. So we have system with quite usual excitations above a gap $\Delta = t$, but in addition two independent zero modes located at the chain ends. We emphasize that the Majorana representation of the Hamiltonian was not necessary to obtain this result: we can diagonalize the finite system in the ordinary fermionic representation like any other mean field (BdG) Hamiltonian, and will find a zero-energy eigenstate whose wave function has weight only on the two end sites. The more general case with $\Delta \neq t$ and $|\mu| < t$ but $\mu \neq 0$ can also be solved and give the same qualitative picture, with the Majorana modes decaying exponentially into the bulk of the chain.