# Tight-binding model of graphene with Coulomb interactions Dominik Smith Lorenz von Smekal smith@theorie.ikp.physik.tu-darmstadt.de



TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT

#### Dedicated to the memory of Professor Mikhail Polikarpov

1. August 2013 | IKP TUD / SFB 634-D4 | D. Smith, L. Smekal | 1



# Introduction



Many properties of graphene are well understood in extreme weak coupling limit.

$$H = \sum_{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle, \mathbf{s}} (-\kappa) (\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}}^{\dagger} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s}} + \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s}}^{\dagger} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}}) \quad , \ \{\mathbf{a}_{\mu}, \mathbf{a}_{\nu}\} = \{\mathbf{a}_{\mu}^{\dagger}, \mathbf{a}_{\nu}^{\dagger}\} = \mathbf{0} \quad , \ \{\mathbf{a}_{\mu}^{\dagger}, \mathbf{a}_{\nu}\} = \delta_{\mu\nu}$$

- Well described by tight-binding theory.
- Conical dispersion at low energies.
- Low energy effective Dirac theory.
- Van Hove singularity at saddle points.
- Semi-metallic behavior (no band gap).



Phys.Rev.B81:125105.

2010

Include electromagnetic interaction: Low energy theory becomes  $QED_{2+1}$ . Simulated with staggered Fermions.

026802 (2009)

Buividovich et al. (ITEP), Phys. Rev. B 86 (2012), 045107

Presently: Go beyond low energies.  $\rightarrow$  Simulate hexagons directly.

# Introduction

First derivation of path-integral for hexagonal lattice:

Currently: Fight-binding with gauge-links.

### Tight-binding with instantaneous interactions.

Brower, Rebbi, Schaich, PoS(Lattice 2011)056

Buividovich, Polikarpov, Phys. Rev. B 86 (2012) 245117

Ulybyshev et al. (ITEP), arXiv:1304.3660

Our goal: Investigate effect of interactions on Van Hove singularity.

Dietz,Smekal et al. arXiv:1304.4764

Status: CUDA code operational and producing. Plausibility checks (find  $\alpha_c$ ) and cross-checks (ITEP).





# Outline



- Interacting tight-binding model with normal-ordering terms (non-compact Hubbard field).
- $\blacktriangleright$  Introducing the compact Hubbard field  $\longrightarrow$  results.
- ► Improved Fermion discretization (ITEP) → comparison.

### Interacting tight-binding theory



Since  $v_F \approx c/300 \ll c$ , model interactions by non-local potential (Brower et al.):

$$H = \sum_{\langle x,y \rangle,s} (-\kappa) (a_{x,s}^{\dagger} a_{y,s} + a_{y,s}^{\dagger} a_{x,s}) + \sum_{x,y} e^2 q_x V_{xy} q_y , \quad q_x = a_{x,1}^{\dagger} a_{x,1} + a_{x,-1}^{\dagger} a_{x,-1} - 1$$

Introduce hole operators  $b_x^{\dagger}$ ,  $b_x$  for spin -1 particles:

$$b_x^{\dagger} = a_{x,-1}$$
,  $b_x = a_{x,-1}^{\dagger}$ ,  $a_x^{\dagger} = a_{x,+1}^{\dagger}$ ,  $a_x = a_{x,+1} \longrightarrow q_x = a_x^{\dagger}a_x - b_x^{\dagger}b_x$ .

Apply normal ordering  $\rightarrow$  extra term from potential. Flip sign of  $b_x^{\dagger}$ ,  $b_x$  on one sub-lattice.

$$H = \sum_{\langle x,y \rangle,s} (-\kappa) (a_x^{\dagger} a_y + b_y^{\dagger} b_x + \text{h.c.}) + \sum_{x,y} e^2 : q_x V_{xy} q_y : + \sum_x e^2 V_{xx} (a_x^{\dagger} a_x + b_x^{\dagger} b_x)$$

Add "staggered" mass to break-sublattice symmetry:

$$H 
ightarrow H + \sum_{x} m_{S}(a_{x}^{\dagger}a_{x} + b_{x}^{\dagger}b_{x}) \quad (m_{S} \pm m, x \in A, B)$$

<sup>1.</sup> August 2013 | IKP TUD / SFB 634-D4 | D. Smith, L. Smekal | 5

## Functional-integral for interacting theory



Factor the exponential: 
$$e^{-\beta H} \approx e^{-\delta H} e^{-\delta H} \dots e^{-\delta H} \qquad \delta = \beta/N_t.$$

Express partition function using coherent states  $|\psi_t, \eta_t\rangle$ ,  $\langle \psi_t, \eta_t|$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr} e^{-\beta H} &= \int \prod_{t=0}^{N_{t}-1} \left[ \prod_{x} d\psi_{x,t}^{*} d\psi_{x,t} d\eta_{x,t}^{*} d\eta_{x,t} \right] e^{-\sum_{x} (\psi_{x,t+1}^{*} \psi_{x,t+1} + \eta_{x,t+1}^{*} \eta_{x,t+1})} \langle \psi_{t+1}, \eta_{t+1} | e^{-\delta H} | \psi_{t}, \eta_{t} \rangle . \\ \\ \text{Using } \langle \xi | F(a_{\lambda}^{\dagger}, a_{\lambda}) | \xi' \rangle &= F(\xi_{\lambda}^{*}, \xi_{\lambda}') e^{\sum_{\lambda} \xi_{\lambda}^{*} \xi_{\lambda}'}, \text{ obtain} \\ \\ \operatorname{Tr} e^{-\beta H} &= \int \prod_{t=0}^{N_{t}-1} \left[ \prod_{x} d\psi_{x,t}^{*} d\psi_{x,t} d\eta_{x,t}^{*} d\eta_{x,t} \right] \exp \left\{ -\delta \left[ \sum_{x,y} e^{2} Q_{x,t+1,t} V_{xy} Q_{y,t+1,t} \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{\langle x,y \rangle} \kappa(\psi_{x,t+1}^{*} \psi_{y,t} + \psi_{y,t+1}^{*} \psi_{x,t} + \eta_{y,t+1}^{*} \eta_{x,t} + \eta_{x,t+1}^{*} \eta_{y,t}) + \sum_{x} m_{S}(\psi_{x,t+1}^{*} \psi_{x,t} + \eta_{x,t+1}^{*} \eta_{x,t}) \\ &+ \sum_{x} e^{2} V_{xx}(\psi_{x,t+1}^{*} \psi_{x,t} + \eta_{x,t+1}^{*} \eta_{x,t}) \right] - \sum_{x} \left[ \psi_{x,t+1}^{*} (\psi_{x,t+1} - \psi_{x,t}) + \eta_{x,t+1}^{*} (\eta_{x,t+1} - \eta_{x,t}) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_{x,t,t'} = \psi^*_{x,t}\psi_{x,t'} - \eta^*_{x,t}\eta_{x,t'}$ . Antiperiodic in time! Leading error is  $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ .

# The Hubbard field



Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation eliminates fourth powers:

$$\exp\left(-\delta e^{2} \sum_{x,y} Q_{x,t+1,t} V_{xy} Q_{y,t+1,t}\right) = \left[\det(...)\right]^{1/2} \\ \times \int \prod_{x} \left[\prod_{t=0}^{N_{t}-1} d\phi_{x,t}\right] \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{4} \sum_{t=0}^{N_{t}-1} \sum_{x,y} \phi_{x,t} V_{xy}^{-1} \phi_{y,t} - i e \delta \sum_{t=0}^{N_{t}-1} \sum_{x} \phi_{x,t} Q_{x,t+1,t}\right).$$

Gaussian integral can be carried out to obtain Fermion determinant

$$\operatorname{Tr} e^{-\beta H} = \int \left[ \prod_{t=0}^{N_t-1} \prod_{x} d\phi_{x,t} \right] \exp\left\{ -\frac{\delta}{4} \sum_{t=0}^{N_t-1} \sum_{x,y} \phi_{x,t} V_{xy}^{-1} \phi_{y,t} \right\} \left| \det\left(M + ie\frac{\beta}{N_t} \phi_{x,t} \delta_{xy} \delta_{t-1,t'}\right) \right|^2 M_{(x,t)(y,t')} = \delta_{xy} (\delta_{tt'} - \delta_{t-1,t'}) - \frac{\beta}{N_t} \kappa \sum_{\vec{n}} \delta_{y,x+\vec{n}} \delta_{t-1,t'} + \frac{\beta}{N_t} m_{\mathrm{S}} \delta_{xy} \delta_{t-1,t'} + \frac{\beta}{N_t} e^2 V_{xx} \delta_{xy} \delta_{t-1,t'} \right]^2$$

Suitable for HMC simulations! No sign problem!

<sup>1.</sup> August 2013 | IKP TUD / SFB 634-D4 | D. Smith, L. Smekal | 7

# Hybrid Monte-Carlo for non-compact Hubbard field



Force terms for Hubbard field  $\phi$  and momentum *p*:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\phi_{\mathbf{x},t} = p_{\mathbf{x},t}, \quad -\frac{d}{d\tau}p_{\mathbf{x},t} = \frac{\beta}{2N_t}(V^{-1}\phi)_{\mathbf{x},t} - 2\frac{\beta}{N_t}e\operatorname{Im}\left(\chi_{\mathbf{x},t+1}^*(B^{-1}\chi)_{\mathbf{x},t}\right)$$

Order parameter for sub-lattice symmetry breaking ("chiral condensate")

$$\begin{split} \langle \Delta_N \rangle &= \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \widehat{\Delta}_N \mathbf{e}^{-\beta H} \right] & \left( B = M + i \mathbf{e} \frac{\beta}{N_t} \phi_{x,t} \delta_{xy} \delta_{t-1,t'} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{ZN_t} \int \mathcal{D} \psi \mathcal{D} \psi^* \mathcal{D} \eta \mathcal{D} \eta^* \Big[ \sum_{X_{A},t} \left( \psi^*_{x,t+1} \psi_{x,t} + \eta^*_{x,t+1} \eta_{x,t} \right) - \sum_{X_{B},t} \left( \psi^*_{x,t+1} \psi_{x,t} + \eta^*_{x,t+1} \eta_{x,t} \right) \Big] \mathbf{e}^{-\beta H} \\ &= \frac{-1}{\beta Z} \int \mathcal{D} \phi \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \det \left( BB^{\dagger} \right) \right] \mathbf{e}^{-S[\phi]} = \frac{-2}{\beta Z} \int \mathcal{D} \phi \det \left( BB^{\dagger} \right) \operatorname{Re} \operatorname{Tr} \left( B^{-1} \frac{dB}{dm} \right) \mathbf{e}^{-S[\phi]} \\ &= \frac{-2}{N_t} \sum_{t=0}^{N_t-1} \langle \sum_{x \in A} B^{-1}_{(x,t+1)(x,t)} - \sum_{x \in B} B^{-1}_{(x,t+1)(x,t)} \rangle \end{split}$$

Doesn't work (no symmetry breaking)! Why??

# The compact Hubbard field



No sub-lattice symmetry breaking observed. Possible reason: Non-compact Hubbard field  $\phi$  in Fermion determinant (thanks Maksim Ulybyshev!)

The determinant of  $\left(M + ie\frac{\beta}{N_t}\phi_{x,t}\delta_{xy}\delta_{t-1,t'}\right)$  is  $\sim \phi^V \longrightarrow$  uncontrollable errors from floating point rounding.

Solution: Use compact Hubbard field instead!

Brower, Rebbi, Schaich, PoS(Lattice 2011)056

Replacement: 
$$\left(\frac{\beta}{N_t}e^2 V_{xx}\delta_{xy}\delta_{t-1,t'} + ie\frac{\beta}{N_t}\phi_{x,t}\delta_{xy}\delta_{t-1,t'}\right) \longrightarrow \exp\left(ie\frac{\beta}{N_t}\phi_{x,t}\right)\delta_{xy}\delta_{t-1,t'}$$

Changes Fermion force term:

$$-\frac{d}{d\tau}p_{x,t} = \frac{\beta}{2N_t}(V^{-1}\phi)_{x,t} - 2\frac{\beta}{N_t}e\operatorname{Im}\left(\chi_{x,t+1}^*\exp\left(ie\frac{\beta}{N_t}\phi_{x,t}\right)(B^{-1}\chi)_{x,t}\right)$$

Sub-lattice symmetry breaks!

<sup>1.</sup> August 2013 | IKP TUD / SFB 634-D4 | D. Smith, L. Smekal | 9

### The potential



Constructed piecewise: Constrained random phase approximation (cRPA) at short distances (Wehling et al. PRL 106, 236805 (2011)), Coulomb otherwise. Corrected for periodic boundary (one image in each direction). Differs from ITEP.



### Results



Simulating at  $\beta$  = 2.0 on  $N_x$  = 6. Extrapolating  $N_t \rightarrow \infty$  from  $N_t$  = 8, 10, 12, 14, 16. Several hundreds of independent measurements for each set ( $N_t$ ,  $\alpha$ , m).



Limit  $m \to 0$  from  $\langle \Delta_N \rangle = a_0 + a_1 m + a_2 m^2$ . Probably large finite-volume errors! (In progress: Improve  $V_{xy}^{-1}$  computation  $\to$  larger  $N_x$  will be feasible.)

# Improved discretization



Error of standard Fermion operator is  $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ . Strategy for improvement: **split** Hamiltonian (ITEP).

$$\operatorname{Tr} e^{-\beta H} \approx \operatorname{Tr} \left[ e^{-\beta H_{TB}} e^{-\beta H_C} \right] = \int \left[ \prod_{t=0}^{2N_t - 1} \prod_x d\psi_{x,t}^* d\psi_{x,t} d\eta_{x,t}^* d\eta_{x,t} \right] \\ \times \left\{ \prod_{t=0}^{N_t - 1} e^{-\sum_x (\psi_{x,2t}^* \psi_{x,2t} + \eta_{x,2t}^* \eta_{x,2t} + \psi_{x,2t+1}^* \psi_{x,2t+1} + \eta_{x,2t+1}^* \eta_{x,2t+1})} \\ \times \langle \psi_{2t}, \eta_{2t} | e^{-\delta H_{TB}} | \psi_{2t+1}, \eta_{2t+1} \rangle \langle \psi_{2t+1}, \eta_{2t+1} | e^{-\delta H_C} | \psi_{2t+2}, \eta_{2t+2} \rangle \right\}$$

Leads to 2nd-order Fermion action:

$$\begin{split} S_{F}[\phi] &= \sum_{t=0}^{N_{t}-1} \left[ \sum_{x} \psi_{x,2t}^{*} \left( \psi_{x,2t} - \psi_{x,2t+1} \right) - \delta \kappa \sum_{< x, y >} \left( \psi_{x,2t}^{*} \psi_{y,2t+1} + \psi_{y,2t}^{*} \psi_{x,2t+1} \right) \right. \\ &+ \sum_{x} \psi_{x,2t+1}^{*} \left( \psi_{x,2t+1} - \mathrm{e}^{-i\delta \mathrm{e}\,\phi_{x,t}} \psi_{x,2t+2} \right) + \delta \sum_{x} \pm m \psi_{x,2t}^{*} \psi_{x,2t+1} \right]. \end{split}$$

1. August 2013 | IKP TUD / SFB 634-D4 | D. Smith, L. Smekal | 12

# Improved discretization (II)



Improved Fermion matrix:

$$M_{(x,t)(y,t')} = \begin{cases} \delta_{xy}(\delta_{tt'} - \delta_{t+1,t'}) - \frac{\beta}{N_t} \kappa \sum_{\vec{n}} \delta_{y,x+\vec{n}} \delta_{t+1,t'} + \frac{\beta}{N_t} m_{\rm S} \delta_{xy} \delta_{t+1,t'} & : t \text{ even} \\ \delta_{xy} \delta_{tt'} - \delta_{xy} \delta_{t+1,t'} \exp(-i\frac{\beta}{N_t} e\phi_{x,(t-1)/2}) & : t \text{ odd} \end{cases}$$

Hubbard field only on odd timeslices!

HMC force: 
$$-\frac{d}{d\tau}p_{x,k} = \frac{\beta}{2N_t}(V^{-1}\phi)_{x,k} - \frac{2\beta}{N_t}e \operatorname{Im}\left(\chi_{x,2k+1}^* \exp\left(i\frac{\beta}{N_t}e\phi_{x,k}\right)(M^{-1}\chi)_{x,2k+2}\right)$$

Order parameter:

$$\begin{split} \langle \Delta_N \rangle \propto \int \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\psi^* \mathcal{D}\eta \mathcal{D}\eta^* \big[ \sum_{X_{A},t} \left( \psi_{x,2t}^* \psi_{x,2t+1} + \eta_{x,2t}^* \eta_{x,2t+1} \right) - \sum_{X_{B},t} \left( \psi_{x,2t}^* \psi_{x,2t+1} + \eta_{x,2t}^* \eta_{x,2t+1} \right) \big] e^{-\beta h} \\ &= \frac{-1}{\beta Z} \int \mathcal{D}\phi \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \det \left( M M^{\dagger} \right) \right] e^{-S[\phi]} = \frac{-2}{N_t} \sum_{t=0}^{N_t-1} \langle \sum_{x \in A} M_{(x,2t)(x,2t+1)}^{-1} - \sum_{x \in B} M_{(x,2t)(x,2t+1)}^{-1} \rangle \end{split}$$

Operator inserted only on even timeslices! Perhaps a problem...

<sup>1.</sup> August 2013 | IKP TUD / SFB 634-D4 | D. Smith, L. Smekal | 13

# Comparison



 $N_t \rightarrow \infty$  extrapolation for naive and improved Fermion operators.



Within errors no difference.  $O(\delta)$  behavior in both cases. Reason currently unknown. Coulomb energy shows similar behavior.

1. August 2013 | IKP TUD / SFB 634-D4 | D. Smith, L. Smekal | 14

# Comparison (II)



Similar results for different  $\alpha$ . Self-consistency is confirmed, but no improvement...



### Conclusion: Much work ahead.