



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION
INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS
I.C.T.P., P.O. BOX 586, 34100 TRIESTE, ITALY, CABLE: CENTRATOM TRIESTE



SMR.959 - 36

MINIWORKSHOP ON STRONG ELECTRON CORRELATIONS
"Disorder and Interaction in Quantum Systems
and Their Classical Analogs"

(1 - 19 July 1996)

"Superconductor-Insulator Transition in a
Disordered Electronic System"

Nandini Trivedi
Tata Institute of Fundamental Research
Theoretical Physics Group
Bombay - Mumbai 400 005
India

These are preliminary lecture notes, intended only for distribution to participants.

MAIN BUILDING - STRADA COSTIERA, 11 TEL. 2240111 TELEFAX 224163 TELEX 460392 ADRIATICO GUEST HOUSE VIA GRIGNANO, 9 TEL. 224241 TELEFAX 224531 TELEX 460449
MICROPROCESSOR LAB VIA BEIRUT, 31 TEL. 2249911 TELEFAX 224600 TELEX 460392 GALILEO GUEST HOUSE VIA BEIRUT, 7 TEL. 2240311 TELEFAX 2240310 TELEX 460392

Superconductor-Insulator Transition in a Disordered Electronic System

Nandini Trivedi,¹ Richard T. Scalettar,² and Mohit Randeria¹

⁽¹⁾ *Materials Science Division 223, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL 60439
and Theoretical Physics Group, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay 400005, India**

⁽²⁾ *Department of Physics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616*

We study an electronic model of a 2D s-wave superconductor in a random potential using Quantum Monte Carlo simulations. The superfluid density and the strength of the delta function in the optical conductivity are found to vanish beyond a critical disorder. We calculate, for the first time, the temperature dependent resistivity $\rho_{dc}(T)$ for a highly disordered interacting Fermi system. Using this we identify the non-superconducting state as an insulator.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn 74.30.+h 74.20.-z 71.55.Jv

(December 29, 1995)

The problem of the effect of strong disorder on superconductivity and of the resulting superconductor(SC)-insulator(I) transition in low dimensional systems has been studied experimentally for a number of years [1]. Theoretically, the problem is challenging because of the complicated interplay between interactions and disorder [2]. Within mean-field theory [3] superconductivity persists essentially all the way to the site localized limit due to an inadequate description of the disorder-induced fluctuations of the local order parameter. Much of the recent theoretical effort has focused on the dirty boson problem [4] which is expected to capture the essential physics of these fluctuations. The boson models which are argued to describe universal properties in the vicinity of the SC-I transition are also more amenable to analytical [4] and numerical [5,6] studies. However, if one is interested in characterizing the phases, and testing the universality of the conductance at the transition, one has to go back to a description in terms of the electronic degrees of freedom.

As a first step in this direction we use Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) simulations to study the simplest fermionic problem – the attractive Hubbard model with onsite disorder – which can have superconducting, insulating, and (possibly) metallic phases. Our main results are:

- 1) At low temperatures, we calculate the superfluid stiffness D_s , a measure of the Meissner effect, and the charge stiffness D , related to the infinite conductivity. We find that $D_s = D$, and that both decrease with increasing disorder V . Beyond a critical V_c the system becomes non-superconducting.
- 2) We use a simple analytic continuation method to extract the T -dependent d.c. resistivity $\rho_{dc}(T)$ from QMC data for the first time. This method is argued to be valid for disordered systems, and independent checks on its validity are presented.
- 3) We find that, for $V > V_c$ the system shows insulating behavior with $d\rho_{dc}/dT < 0$.
- 4) The resistivity as a function of T and V is also used to independently estimate the critical disorder V_c , which

is in good agreement with that obtained from D_s .

5) Our results are consistent with a direct SC-I transition in 2D, without an intervening metallic phase.

Our model is defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}) - \sum_{i\sigma} (\mu - v_i) n_{i\sigma} - |U| \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}. \quad (1)$$

We set $t = 1$ and measure all energies in units of t . Here $c_{i\sigma}$ is a fermion destruction operator at site i with spin σ , $n_{i\sigma} = c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}$, and the chemical potential μ fixes the average density $\langle n \rangle$. The site energies v_i are independent random variables with a uniform distribution over $[-V, V]$. The lattice sum $\langle ij \rangle$ is over near neighbor sites on a two dimensional square lattice. Note that this model focuses on the localization induced by the disorder; it does not, however, incorporate the disorder-dependence of the effective electron-electron interaction [2].

QMC simulations have played an important role in the study of model (1) in the absence of disorder ($V = 0$): in elucidating its phase diagram [7] and its anomalous normal state behavior [8]. Here we use the same QMC technique [9], to study the disordered case, which is still free of the fermion sign problem.

We shall focus on various quantities obtained from the current-current correlation function Λ [10]. The (paramagnetic piece of the) current operator is defined as

$$j_x(l, \tau) = e^{H\tau} \left[it \sum_{\sigma} (c_{l+\hat{x},\sigma}^\dagger c_{l,\sigma} - c_{l,\sigma}^\dagger c_{l+\hat{x},\sigma}) \right] e^{-H\tau}. \quad (2)$$

The impurity averaged Λ_{xx} is then given by

$$\Lambda_{xx}(q; i\omega_n) = \sum_l \int_0^{\beta} d\tau \langle j_x(l, \tau) j_x(0, 0) \rangle e^{iq \cdot l} e^{-i\omega_n \tau}, \quad (3)$$

where $\omega_n = 2n\pi/\beta$, and $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes a thermal average at a temperature $T = \beta^{-1}$ for a given realization of disorder and an average over an ensemble of such realizations.

Gauge invariance requires that the longitudinal part of Λ satisfy the equality [10,11]

$$\Lambda^L \equiv \lim_{q_x \rightarrow 0} \Lambda_{xx}(q_x, q_y = 0; i\omega_n = 0) = -K_x, \quad (4)$$

where $K_x = (-t \sum_{\sigma} (c_{i+\hat{x},\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma} + c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i+\hat{x},\sigma}))$, the kinetic energy in the x direction, represents the diamagnetic part of the response. We have verified this equality as a non-trivial check on our numerics; see Fig. 1(a).




FIG. 1(a). The kinetic energy, $-K_x$, and transverse and longitudinal current-current correlation functions, Λ^T and Λ^L , are shown as a function of disorder V . Λ^L tracks $-K_x$ as required by gauge invariance. The difference between Λ^T and $-K_x$ signals a non-zero superfluid density (see eqn. (5)).




FIG. 1(b). The superfluid density D_s and charge stiffness D (a measure of infinite dc conductivity) as a function of disorder V . $D_s = D$ for all V .

The superfluid stiffness D_s is obtained from the transverse current-current correlation function [10,11]

$$\Lambda^T \equiv \lim_{q_y \rightarrow 0} \Lambda_{xx}(q_x = 0, q_y; i\omega_n = 0) \quad (5)$$

$$D_s = \pi[-K_x - \Lambda^T].$$

Results [12] for Λ^T , Λ^L and $-K_x$ are plotted in Fig. 1(a) for $U = -4$, $T = 0.10$, and $\langle n \rangle = 0.875$ as a function of V . Λ^T is estimated by using a linear extrapolation of the two smallest q_y values. In Fig. 1(b) we plot D_s , which decreases monotonically with disorder. There is a critical value V_c beyond which $D_s = 0$ and the system becomes non-superconducting. Note that D_s and D (to be defined below) were measured at T low enough that measurements of $\langle c_{i1}^\dagger c_{i1} c_{j1}^\dagger c_{j1} \rangle$ confirm that the pairing correlations are well formed across the entire lattice.

We now turn to the conductivity $\text{Re}\sigma(\omega) = D\delta(\omega) + \sigma_{\text{reg}}(\omega)$. The first term represents the infinite dc conductivity of a superconductor, with the charge stiffness [10] $D = \pi[-K_x - \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \text{Re}\Lambda_{xx}(q = 0; \omega + i0^+)]$. The regular part of the conductivity is given by $\sigma_{\text{reg}}(\omega) = \text{Im}\Lambda(q = 0; \omega)/\omega$, where $\Lambda(q; \omega + i0^+) = \text{Re}\Lambda(q; \omega) + i\text{Im}\Lambda(q; \omega)$, omitting the xx subscripts for simplicity. To study the dc limit we will use two independent methods. We first use the Matsubara correlation function

$$D(\omega_n) = \pi[-K_x - \Lambda_{xx}(q = 0, i\omega_n)], \quad (6)$$

shown in Fig. 2. From the spectral representation for $\Lambda(i\omega_n)$ and the sum rule $\int_0^\infty d\omega \text{Re}\sigma(\omega) = \pi(-K_x)/2$ we get

$$D(\omega_n) = D + 2\omega_n^2 \int_0^\infty d\omega \sigma_{\text{reg}}(\omega)/[\omega^2 + \omega_n^2]. \quad (7)$$




FIG. 2. $D(\omega_n)$ as a function of $n = \omega_n/2\pi T > 0$, for fixed $T = 0.1$ and various disorder strengths. The extrapolated value $D(\omega_n \rightarrow 0)$ is shown as a filled symbol at $n = 0$. For small V this extrapolation yields a non-zero D indicating a SC. For the metallic system $V = 3.25$ ($\approx V_c$) we obtain σ_{dc} from the slope at small n ; see text.

It follows that $D(\omega_n)$ increases monotonically with n from $D(\omega_n \rightarrow 0) = D$ to $D(\omega_n \rightarrow \infty) = \pi(-K_x)$ (not shown in Fig. 2 but verified in the data).

From the extrapolation $D(\omega_n \rightarrow 0)$ we get a nonvanishing D , and hence infinite dc conductivity for low disorder ($V < V_c$) superconducting systems; see Fig. 2. The V -dependence of D is shown in Fig. 1(b), and within the accuracy of our numerics, we find that $D = D_s$ for all disorder strengths. For $V > V_c$, we find $D = 0$. Note that, in contrast to non-random systems [10], D at $T = 0$ cannot be used to characterize the non-superconducting state for $V \geq V_c$ since neither dirty metals nor insulators have a δ -function in $\sigma(\omega)$.

We must therefore find a way to extract the T -dependent resistivity to distinguish a metal from an insulator. From the fluctuation-dissipation theorem we get

$$\Lambda_{xx}(q; \tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\pi} \frac{\exp(-\omega\tau)}{[1 - \exp(-\beta\omega)]} \text{Im}\Lambda_{xx}(q; \omega), \quad (8)$$

for $0 \leq \tau \leq \beta$. To obtain $\text{Im}\Lambda$ from $\Lambda(q; \tau)$, which is computed in the QMC, requires a numerical inversion of the Laplace transform. We instead use a technique [8] valid for $T \ll \Omega$, where Ω is the scale on which $\text{Im}\Lambda$ deviates from its low frequency behavior ($\text{Im}\Lambda \simeq \omega\sigma_{dc}$). Provided $T \ll \Omega$, eqn. (8) simplifies to

$$\Lambda_{xx}(q = 0; \tau = \beta/2) = \pi\sigma_{dc}/\beta^2, \quad (9)$$

which yields the dc conductivity. We note that this simplification may not be valid for non-random systems: e.g., for a Fermi liquid the scale $\Omega \simeq 1/\tau_{e-e} \sim N(0)T^2$ so one can never satisfy $T \ll \Omega$ at low T . However, for the highly disordered state that we study, we expect the scale Ω to be set by the disorder V and to be T -independent, so that eqn. (9) is valid. We will present below additional consistency checks of this approximation.

In Fig. 3(a) we plot the dc resistivity $\rho_{dc} = 1/\sigma_{dc}$ as a function of temperature for various degrees of disorder. We use units where $e^2 = \hbar = 1$ so that the quantum of resistivity $\rho_Q \equiv h/(4e^2) = \pi/2$. For small disorder we see that ρ_{dc} decreases with lowering T ; with increasing disorder the T -dependence is altered qualitatively: for large V we see that $d\rho_{dc}/dT < 0$, strongly suggestive of insulating behavior ($\rho_{dc} = \infty$ at $T = 0$).

To see where this transition takes place it is useful to replot the data of Fig. 3(a) as ρ_{dc} as a function of the disorder strength V for different temperatures. This is done in Fig. 3(b); from the crossing point of the various curves we estimate the critical disorder V_c separating the SC from the insulator. We note that our results for $\rho_{dc}(T)$ (and $D(\omega_n)$ discussed below) for $|U| = 3, 4, 6$ are consistent with a direct SC-I transition in 2D, without an intermediate metallic phase [13].

The curves in Fig. 3 are remarkably similar to those found in the experimental literature [1], and represent the

first QMC calculations of the T -dependent resistivity in a disordered, interacting fermi system.




FIG. 3(a). Dc resistivity, obtained from eqn. (9), as function of temperature, with disorder strength $V = 1$ (lowest curve), 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.25, 3.5, 4, 4.5, and 5 (top curve). The point at $T = 0.10$, for $V = 3.25 \simeq V_c$, is obtained from $D(\omega_n)$; see Fig. 2.




FIG. 3(b). ρ_{dc} as a function of disorder V for various temperatures T . Representative error bars are shown.

In the SC state the form of $\text{Re}\sigma(\omega)$ changes due to the appearance of $D\delta(\omega)$ below T_c , and eqn. (9) is not applicable. Thus it cannot be used to see that the low disorder systems in Fig. 3(a) do indeed go superconducting at lower temperatures. To see the SC behavior explicitly, we recall the $D(\omega_n)$ analysis presented above, which works best at low T since it involves an $\omega_n \rightarrow 0$ extrapolation. As seen from the results of Figs. 1(b) and 2 the low disorder systems ($V < 3$) clearly show a non-zero D indicative of infinite dc conductivity.

As an independent check on the results of eqn. (9) we estimate the conductivity of the metal (with $V = V_c$), separating the SC from the insulator, from the small ω_n behavior of $D(\omega_n)$. The metal has a finite d.c. conductivity $\text{Re}\sigma(\omega \rightarrow 0) = \sigma_{dc}$, which leads to $D(\omega_n) = \pi\sigma_{dc}|\omega_n|$ for $\omega_n \rightarrow 0$, using eqn. (7). Thus the slope of $D(\omega_n)$ at small ω_n may be used to estimate the conductivity; see Fig. 2 where the best linear fit to the points at $n = 1, 2, 3$ is shown. The value of $\rho_{dc} = \sigma_{dc}^{-1}$ obtained using this method, at $T = 0.10$ for $V = 3.25 (\simeq V_c)$, is shown in Fig. 3(a). This low T estimate is in excellent agreement with the results of eqn. (9) at higher temperatures.

It is also worth emphasizing the consistency of results obtained from different observables. The critical V_c may be estimated in several independent ways. Low temperature estimates of V_c obtained from the vanishing of D , [14] and of D are clearly identical (see Fig. 1(b)). In addition, $D(\omega_n)$ is consistent with metallic behavior, i.e., a linear approach to the origin, only for $V \simeq V_c$; the SC systems have a non-zero intercept D and the insulators do not approach the origin linearly. Another estimate of V_c comes from the higher temperature crossing plots (see Fig. 3(b)). On the 8x8 systems studied, we find excellent agreement between these methods. For instance, for $|U| = 3$, $V_c = 3.5 \pm 0.7$ (from D_s) and $V_c = 3.8 \pm 0.5$ (from ρ_{dc}); while for $|U| = 4$, $V_c = 3.2 \pm 0.7$ (from D_s) and $V_c = 3.5 \pm 0.5$ (from ρ_{dc}).

We can also estimate the resistance at V_c using eqn. (9) and independently from the slope of $D(\omega_n)$, both of which give very similar results. We find $\rho(V_c)/\rho_Q = 4.1 \pm 1.3$ (for $|U| = 3$); 5.2 ± 1.5 (for $|U| = 4$); and 8.3 ± 2.0 (for $|U| = 6$). The finite lattice estimate of $\rho(V_c)$ appears to depend on the strength of the attractive interaction $|U|$ (as a function of which one expects a crossover from a fermionic to a bosonic regime in this model; for the non-random models, see [8]). The dirty boson model predicts [15] that $\rho(V_c)$ is universal, while the experiments [1] show sample and material dependence, with some indications [1](d) that the fermionic quasiparticles are responsible for the non-universality of this quantity.

A finite size scaling analysis of QMC data can clearly answer the question of universality of $\rho(V_c)$, and is currently being pursued. What we have shown here, for the first time, is that reliable low temperature calculations in a disordered, interacting fermion model are feasible in the vicinity of a quantum critical point, and one can determine experimentally interesting quantities such as the superfluid density and T-dependent dc resistivity.

We gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of the Institute of Theoretical Physics, Santa Barbara, where this work was started. We thank K. Runge for providing useful scripts for doing the disorder averaging. The numerical calculations were performed primarily on Cray C-90 computers at SDSC and NERSC. This work was supported by the NSF under grants No. DMR 9528535 and No. ASC-9405041 (R.T.S.), and by DOE grant No.

* present address

- [1] (a) D.B. Haviland, Y.Liu, and A.M. Goldman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2180, (1989); (b) A.F. Hebard and M.A. Paalanen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 927 (1990); and (c) J.M. Valles, R.C. Dynes, and J.P. Garno, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 3567 (1992); (d) A. Yazdani and A. Kapitulnik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3037 (1995).
- [2] For theoretical reviews, see: P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57**, 287 (1985); D. Belitz and T. Kirkpatrick, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 261 (1994).
- [3] M. Ma and P. A. Lee, *Phys. Rev.* **B32**, 5658 (1985).
- [4] M.P.A. Fisher *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **B40**, 546 (1989).
- [5] G. G. Batrouni, R. T. Scalettar and G. T. Zimanyi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1765 (1990); R. T. Scalettar, G. G. Batrouni and G. T. Zimanyi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 3144 (1991).
- [6] W. Krauth, N. Trivedi and D. M. Ceperley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 2307 (1991); M. Makivic, N. Trivedi and S. Ullah, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 2307 (1993).
- [7] R.T. Scalettar *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1407 (1989); A. Moreo, and D.J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 946 (1991).
- [8] M. Randeria, N. Trivedi, A. Moreo, and R.T. Scalettar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2001 (1992); N. Trivedi and M. Randeria, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 312 (1995).
- [9] R. Blankenbecler, R.L. Sugar, and D.J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev.* **D24**, 2278 (1981); S. R. White *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **B40**, 506 (1989).
- [10] D.J. Scalapino, S.R. White, and S.C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev.* **B47**, 7995 (1993).
- [11] G. Baym, in *Mathematical Methods in Solid State and Superfluid Theory* (Scottish Universities Summer School, 1967), edited by R. C. Clark and G. H. Derrick (Plenum, New York, 1969).
- [12] We have run on 8x8 lattices with a discretization of β of $\Delta\tau = 1/8$. We have averaged over 10-20 disorder realizations, doing 200-800 equilibration sweeps followed by 1000-5000 measurement sweeps for each realization. The error bars in all the figures are determined by the sample-to-sample variations (due to disorder); the statistical fluctuations (from the QMC) are smaller by a factor of about five.
- [13] For $|U| = 0$, the scaling theory of Anderson localization shows that there is no metallic phase in 2D [2] For $|U| \rightarrow \infty$, there are general arguments against the existence of a Bose metal at $T = 0$ in any dimension; see A. J. Leggett, *Physica Fennica* **8**, 125 (1971). Thus, if there is a metallic phase in the 2D model, it can only be at intermediate $|U|$ where the QMC should be most reliable. Note that the model of eqn. (1) would very likely have a metallic phase for small $|U|$ in 3D.
- [14] Since $D_s \simeq (V - V_c)^\zeta$ with [4] $\zeta = z\nu > 1$, we expect V_c to lie in the small D_s tail in Fig. 1(b).
- [15] M.P.A. Fisher, G. Grinstein and S.M. Girvin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 587 (1990).

Superconductor - Insulator Transition in Disordered Fermion Systems

Richard Scalettar

UC Davis, USA

Mohit Randeria

TIFR, Bombay, India

amorphous films





FIG. 1. Evolution of the temperature dependence of the sheet resistance $R(T)$ with thickness for a Bi film deposited onto Ge. Fewer than half of the traces actually acquired are shown. Film thicknesses shown range from 4.36 to 74.27 Å.

↑ disorder



SC

Goldman's group
PRL 62 2180 (89)




FIG. 3. Dependence of the mean-field transition temperature of Bi and Pb films on sheet resistance.


2D films.

DRASTIC REDUCTION
OF T_c with DISORDER

Finkel'stein Sov. Sci. Rev. A
Phys. 14 1 (1990)

Belitz & Kirkpatrick ...

Quantum Phase Transition




disorder \rightarrow
magnetic field \rightarrow
 \leftarrow density (gate voltage)

$$\xi \sim \delta^{-\nu}$$

$$\Omega \sim \delta^{\nu}$$


statics & dynamics coupled.

Quantum Phase Transition




$\xi \sim \delta^{-\nu}$ $\Omega \sim \delta^{z\nu}$
 Statics & dynamics coupled


T=0 Transition



$\sim 3 \left(\frac{h}{4e^2} \right) \rightarrow$



$h/4e^2 \rightarrow$



Data scales:
evidence for
Quantum critical
behavior.

FIG. 3. Top: Scaling of $R_Q(B, T, E = 0)$ for sample 2 measured at $T = 80, 90, 100, 110$ mK ($B_c = 4.19$ kG, $\nu z = 1.36$). Bottom: Scaling for sample 5 of the data measured at $T = 100, 200, 300, 400$ mK ($B_c = 25.6$ kG, $\nu z = 1.36$). Bottom inset: R_Q/R_c versus the scaling variable for samples 2 and 5 together.

Yazdani & Kapitulnik
PRL 74 3037 (95)

FERMIONS MAY BE IMPORTANT




FIG. 2. Tunnel junction conductances as a function of voltage for the 8.0-k Ω/\square (lowest curve) and 5.8-k Ω/\square (middle curve) films at $T=0.13$ K and for a $R_0(7\text{ K})=75\ \Omega/\square$ (upper curve) at $T\approx 0.3$ K. The junction conductances normalized by that of the 75- Ω/\square film measured at a temperature above its T_c . Inset: The data for the 5.8- and 8.0-k Ω/\square films on an expanded scale.

high disorder



broken Cooper pairs

Valles, Dynes, Garno

PRL 69 3567 (1992)




FIG. 1. Resistance as a function of temperature for two sequentially evaporated films that had sheet resistances at 7 K, $R_0(7\text{ K})$, of 5.8 and 8.0 k Ω/\square .

SC-I transition occurs in a non perturbative region of high disorder in an interacting system.

Mean Field Theory

Ma & Lee PRB 32 5658
(1985)

SC persists until very high disorder ...
fluctuations of order parameter not included

Boson models

MPA Fisher, Grinstein, Girvin
PRL 64 587 (1990)

SC-I : Quantum phase trans.

cooper pair \approx boson

SC-I transition in same universality class as SF-I transition for bosons in random potential.

universal resistance at transition

$$R_0^* \approx h/(2e)^2 \sim 6.45 \text{ k}\Omega/\square$$

Fermion problem not tackled until recently:

* (1) Fermion sign problem

* (2) P(T) requires analytic continuation

(3) Finite Size scaling

Minimal Model:

Attractive Hubbard Model with Disorder

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{h.c.} - |u| \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}$$

↑
on-site pairing

$$+ \sum_{i\sigma} V_i n_{i\sigma} - \mu \sum_i n_{i\sigma}$$

random potential
chosen from uniform
distrib. $[-V, V]$

↑
fixes average density


Quantum Monte Carlo

coherent state path integral.

interacting electron system

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle = \frac{\text{Tr}_{\{\psi, \bar{\psi}\}} \hat{O} e^{-\beta(H - \mu N)}}{Z}$$

↑ imag. time τ



Hubbard - Stratonovich Fields $\phi(\vec{x}, \tau)$

- $n_{\uparrow} + n_{\downarrow}$ density decoupling
- discrete ϕ 's

non-interacting electrons in presence of fluctuating fields $\phi(\vec{x}, \tau)$

Integrate out fermions

effective "bosonic" theory

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle = \sum_{\{\phi\}} \dots$$

USE MONTE CARLO TO generate configurations of ϕ fields and do the Σ .

$$Z = \sum_{\{\phi\}} \underbrace{\text{Det } M_{\uparrow} \text{ Det } M_{\downarrow}}_P$$

$\text{Det } M_{-} = \text{Det } M_{+}$

$$J_{\text{induced}}(\vec{q}, \omega) = - \left[\underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{diamagnetic} \\ \text{response}}}{n} - \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ \text{paramagnetic} \\ \text{response}}}{\Lambda_{xx}(\vec{q}, \omega)} \right] A_x(\vec{q}, \omega)$$


Note: $\langle -\mathbf{k}_x \rangle$ on lattice

$$\Lambda_{xx}(\vec{q}, \tau) = \langle j_x(\vec{q}, \tau) j_x(-\vec{q}, 0) \rangle$$

Longitudinal response:

$$\Lambda_L \equiv \Lambda_{xx}(q_x \rightarrow 0, q_y = 0, i\omega_n = 0)$$

$$\boxed{\Lambda_L = n}$$



Cont. eqn.
or
Gauge inv.

Transverse response:


$$\Lambda_T \equiv \Lambda_{xx}(q_x = 0, q_y \rightarrow 0, i\omega_n = 0)$$

$$\Lambda_T \neq \Lambda_L \Rightarrow \text{LRO} \quad \xrightarrow{\quad n_{\text{normal}} \quad}$$

$$J_x(q_y) = - \left[n - n_{\text{normal}} \Lambda_T \right] A_x(q_y)$$

$$= - \rho_s A_x(q_y)$$


\uparrow
superfluid stiffness



$$N = 8 \times 8 \times \underbrace{80}_{\text{time slice}}$$

$\frac{V}{t}$ disorder \rightarrow

$$\frac{D_s}{\pi} = \langle -k_x \rangle - \Lambda^T(q_y \rightarrow 0)$$



$\frac{V}{t}$ disorder \rightarrow

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}}^2 \sim \lambda^2 \left(\frac{\xi_0}{l} \right)$$

$$D_s \sim \rho_s \sim \frac{1}{2} \sim l \cdot \lambda_{\text{eff}}$$

$$\rho_s \sim \frac{1}{|v|^2}$$

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}}^2 \sim \left(1 + \frac{\xi_0}{l} \right)^2$$

$$\rho_s \sim 1 - a|v|^2$$

dc conductivity

$$\sigma_{dc} = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Lambda''(q=0, \omega)}{\omega}$$

By QMC we measure:

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\tau) = \langle j(\tau) j(0) \rangle \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq \beta$$


$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\pi} \frac{e^{-\omega\tau}}{1 - e^{-\omega\beta}} \Lambda''(\omega)$$

To extract $\Lambda''(\omega)$ requires doing an inverse Laplace transform - non trivial!

Extract low freq. behavior:

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\tau = \beta/2) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\pi} \frac{2}{\sinh(\beta\omega/2)} \Lambda''(\omega)$$

Structure in $\Lambda''(\omega)$
on freq. scale Ω
(set by disorder V
 $\therefore T$ -indep.)




As T gets lower than Ω pick up only linear piece

$$\sigma_{dc} = \frac{1}{\pi T^2} \tilde{\Lambda}(\tau = \beta/2)$$

T-dependence of resistivity

$$\sigma_{dc} = \left[\frac{\text{Im } \Lambda(\omega)}{\omega} \right]_{\omega \rightarrow 0}$$

By QMC we know $\Lambda(\tau) = \langle j(\tau) j(0) \rangle$
 $0 < \tau < \beta$





analytic continuation to get $\Lambda(\omega)$

$$\Lambda(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\pi} \frac{e^{-\omega\tau}}{1 - e^{-\beta\omega}} \text{Im } \Lambda(\omega)$$

avoid doing inverse Laplace transform!
 Extract low freq. behavior.


$$\sigma_{dc} = \frac{1}{\pi T^2} \Lambda(\tau = \beta/2)$$

$$\sigma_Q = \frac{(2e)^2}{h} = \left(\frac{e^2}{h}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)$$



$$\rho^* \equiv \rho(V_c) \sim 5\rho_Q$$

Conductivity




$$= D \delta(\omega) + \sigma_{\text{reg}}(\omega)$$

↓

$$\Rightarrow \infty \text{ conductivity}$$

$$D(\omega_n) = \pi \left[\langle -k_x \rangle - \Lambda(i\omega_n) \right]$$

$T = 0.1$



$$\omega_n = 2n\pi T$$

$D \approx D_s$ in SC

$D = 0$ in metal but

$$D(\omega_n) = \pi \sigma_{dc} |\omega_n|$$

for $\omega_n \rightarrow 0$

$D = 0$ in insulator also.

universal resistance




FIG. 3. (a): Estimates for V_c at intermediate couplings $|U| = 3, 4, 6$ from vanishing of D , (squares), and from ρ_{dc} crossing (triangles), which have been offset for clarity. The full circle at the origin is the $U = 0$ result $V_c = 0$ for 2D non-interacting electrons. We expect $V_c \propto t^2/U$ at large couplings and $V_c \sim t \exp(-t/|U|)$ at small U . (b): Estimates for $\rho_{dc}(V_c)$ for $|U| = 3, 4, 6$ obtained from the ρ_{dc} crossing plots.

For finite system:

Estimates of V_c

1. Vanishing of D_s ■
2. Crossing of ρ_{dc} ▲
3. $D \sim \omega_n$

consistent —

Estimate of $\rho^* = \rho(V_c)$

1. Crossing of ρ_{dc}
2. $D^* = \frac{\omega_n}{\rho^*}$

consistent

Is $\rho^* =$ resistance at the transition universal


Finite system results $\rightarrow \rho^*$ depends on $|U|$!
(attraction)

NEED —

Finite size scaling analysis to extract exponents and settle question about universality of resistance at $T=0$ SC-I transition

Summary

Life beyond
Bosons!



1. minimal model for SC-I transition with fermions
2. numerically problem now within reach
3. possible to calculate current-current correlation functions to characterize the Phases

Future Directions:

1. Phase Transition:

Detailed Finite Size Scaling

* exponents

* resistance at transition. $\rho_{dc}(V_c)$

is $\rho_{dc}(V_c)$ universal?

is the boson model sufficient for even the universal aspects?

2. What is the mechanism by which the transition takes place?

can SC persist in a localized system?
(where single particle states are localized).


how?

modified MFT including fluctuations of local order parameter $\Delta(\vec{r})$

3. Nature of phases -

what is the insulator like?

localized Cooper pairs? localized electrons



disorder \rightarrow

