

6. Exercise on QFT for many-body systems

24/06/2016

11. Van Hove singularities

2+3+1 = 5+1* points*

Consider the dispersion relation (single-particle energy states) for electrons on a simple hyper-cubic lattice in d dimensions, with only nearest-neighbor hopping:

$$\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = -2t \sum_{i=1}^d \cos k_i, \quad (1)$$

with the hopping amplitude t and the lattice constant $a = 1$. The density of single-particle states (DOS) in this system is then given by

$$D(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} d^d k \delta(\epsilon - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}). \quad (2)$$

In the first exercise you have calculated numerically and then plotted these densities of states for $d = 1, 2, 3$. Here, the singular structures (divergences, cusps) of these functions should be analyzed analytically.

- a) Calculate $D(\epsilon)$ for $d = 1$ explicitly and determine the interval $[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$ on which $D(\epsilon) \neq 0$. Moreover, identify the values ϵ^* where the DOS diverges, i.e. where $D(\epsilon^*) = \infty$. From which points \mathbf{k}^* in the dispersion relation do these divergences originate? Are these special points for the function $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$? Show that the divergences can be reproduced by taking into account only the contributions from these \mathbf{k}^* -points (*Hint: Replace $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ in Eq. (2) by a corresponding Taylor-expansion around these points up to second order.*).
- b) For $d = 2$ one can show that $D(\epsilon)$ is essentially given by a complete elliptic integral of the first kind. Here, however, only the singular contributions to $D(\epsilon)$ should be analyzed. As in the one-dimensional case a singular contribution ($D(\epsilon^*) = \infty$) originates from stationary points in the dispersion relation. Determine the kind of stationary point (i.e., maximum, minimum or saddle point) which generates this so-called “*Van Hove singularity*” in the two-dimensional DOS and determine the singular contribution to $D(\epsilon)$ by expanding $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ around corresponding stationary point in Eq. (2) as for the one-dimensional case in **a**).
- c) Try to predict how the singular behavior of the DOS evolves with the dimensions of the system for $d \geq 3$.

12. Magnetic susceptibilities in d dimensions 1.5+1.5+1+1+1* = 5+1* *points*

Consider a system of non-interacting electrons on a (hyper)cubic lattice whose energy dispersion is given by Eq. (1).

- a) Compute the *magnetic* susceptibility, i.e. the Fourier transform of the spin-spin response function $\langle T_\tau S_z(\mathbf{r}_i, \tau) S_z(0, 0) \rangle$, for the frequency $i\Omega_m = 0$ (static susceptibility), and for the two momenta $\mathbf{Q} = (0, 0, 0, \dots)$ (ferromagnetic susceptibility) and $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi, \pi, \pi, \dots)$ (antiferromagnetic susceptibility).

- b) Determine the leading divergences of the ferromagnetic and the antiferromagnetic susceptibilities for $T \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{2}$ dimensions. To this end write the total density of states as a sum of a singular and a regular contribution as calculated in **11 b)**. (*Hint: Consider the derivative of the antiferromagnetic susceptibilities with respect to β and perform a Sommerfeld-like expansion for the regular part of the DOS.*)

- c) Discuss how the results of **b)** are modified in $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{3}$ dimensions.

- d) Consider the same electronic system for $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{2}$, but now in presence of a local (repulsive) Hubbard interaction $U > 0$, and calculate within the random-phase approximation (RPA) the two (ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic) susceptibilities in the corresponding particle-hole channel. On the basis of your RPA calculations, make your final considerations about the tendency of the system towards a given magnetic order at $T = 0$.

- e) Would the results of **d)** change in the attractive case ($U < 0$)? Why?