

Probing dynamical properties of Fermi-Hubbard systems with a quantum gas microscope

Peter Brown Bakr Lab

Solvay workshop, February 19th 2019



Outline

- 1. Studying strongly-interacting quantum matter with ultracold atoms
- 2. The Fermi-Hubbard Model
- 3. Measuring diffusion and conductivity in the repulsive Hubbard model
- 4. Measuring spectral functions and the pseudogap in the attractive Hubbard model



Heavy fermion metals



Strongly correlated quantum matter



Topological phases



Spintronic materials





Yttrium Barium Copper Oxide

Hubbard model





Use a synthetic quantum system of ultracold atoms

- Feynman (paraphrased)

Interacting systems of ultracold atoms – enlarged model for condensed matter physics





Why ultracold atoms?

- Understood from first principles
- Complete control of microscopic parameters
- Clean systems, no impurities
- Dynamics on observable timescales
- Large interparticle spacing makes optical imaging/manipulation possible

Microscopy of ultracold atoms in optical lattices

Similar fermion microscopes at: Harvard, MIT, MPQ, Toronto, Strathclyde

Outline

- 1. Studying strongly-interacting quantum matter with ultracold atoms
- 2. The Fermi-Hubbard Model
- 3. Measuring diffusion and conductivity in the repulsive Hubbard model
- 4. Measuring spectral functions and the pseudogap in the attractive Hubbard model

The Fermi-Hubbard model



How much of the phenomenology of the cuprates does the Hubbard model reproduce?

Cuprate phase diagram



Cuprate phase diagram



Antiferromagnetic spin correlations



Detection of AFMs with microscopes: Parsons ... Greiner, Science 353, 1253 (2016) Boll ... Bloch, Gross, Science 353, 1257 (2016) Cheuk ... Zwierlein, Science 353, 1260 (2016) Previous work without microscopes: Grief ... Esslinger, Science 340, 1307 (2013) Hart ... Hulet, Nature 519, 211 (2015) Drewes ... Köhl, PRL 118, 170401 (2017)

Cuprate phase diagram



Outline

- 1. Studying strongly-interacting quantum matter with ultracold atoms
- 2. The Fermi-Hubbard Model
- 3. Measuring diffusion and conductivity in the repulsive Hubbard model
- 4. Measuring spectral functions and the pseudogap in the attractive Hubbard model

Cuprate phase diagram



Conventional (weakly interacting)



- Charge, spin, energy transported by quasiparticles
- Mean free path must be larger than lattice spacing. Mott-loffe-Regel (MIR) limit
- $ho \sim T^2$, Fermi-liquid

Unconventional (strongly correlated)



- Strong enough interactions destroy quasiparticles
- Momentum relaxation rate no longer gives resistivity
- "Bad metals" violate MIR limit and commonly show $\rho \sim T$

Previous Work

Mass transport experiments with Fermions

Mesoscopic systems:

Brantut *et al.* Science **337**, 1069 (2012) (ETH Zurich) ... Lebrat *et al.* PRX **8**, 011053 (2018) (ETH Zurich) Valtolina *et al.* Science **350**, 1505 (2015) (Florence)

Bulk systems:

Ott *et al.* PRL **92**, 160601 (2004) (Florence) Strohmaier *et al.* PRL **99**, 220601 (2007) (ETH Zurich) Schnedier *et al.* Nat. Phys **8**, 213 (2012) (Munich) Xu *et al.* arXiv:1606.06669 (2016) (UIUC) Anderson *et al.* arXiv:1712.09965 (2017) (Toronto)



- Load atoms in combined optical lattice + repulsive potential with sinusoidal modulation
- Turn off modulation, take fluorescence images at different times
- Macroscopic (ρ) transport connected to microscopic (D) through Nernst-Einstein relation:

$$\frac{1}{\rho} = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}\right)\Big|_T D$$

Brown *et. al.,* Science **363**, 379 (2019) Spin transport: Nichols ... Zwierlein, Science **363**, 383 (2019)



- Load atoms in combined optical lattice + repulsive potential with sinusoidal modulation
- Turn off modulation, take fluorescence images at different times
- Macroscopic (ρ) transport connected to microscopic (D) through Nernst-Einstein relation:

$$\frac{1}{\rho} = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}\right)\Big|_T D$$

Brown et. al., Science 363, 379 (2019)

time = 0⁻ μ s



- Load atoms in combined optical lattice + repulsive potential with sinusoidal modulation
- Turn off modulation, take fluorescence images at different times
- Macroscopic (ρ) transport connected to microscopic (D) through Nernst-Einstein relation:

$$\frac{1}{\rho} = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}\right)\Big|_T D$$

Brown et. al., Science 363, 379 (2019)





- Load atoms in combined optical lattice + repulsive potential with sinusoidal modulation
- Turn off modulation, take fluorescence images at different times
- Macroscopic (ρ) transport connected to microscopic (D) through Nernst-Einstein relation:

$$\frac{1}{\rho} = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}\right)\Big|_T D$$

Brown et. al., Science 363, 379 (2019)





time = 50 μ s

- Load atoms in combined optical lattice + repulsive potential with sinusoidal modulation
- Turn off modulation, take fluorescence images at different times
- Macroscopic (ρ) transport connected to microscopic (D) through Nernst-Einstein relation:

$$\frac{1}{\rho} = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}\right)\Big|_T D$$

Brown et. al., Science 363, 379 (2019)















Hydrodynamic Model

- Diffusion (Fick's Law) neglects finite time to establish current.
- D, diffusion constant
- Γ, current relaxation.
 rate.
- Crossover from diffusive mode to sound mode.



Hydrodynamic Parameters

- Simultaneous fit of all wavelength data for each temperature
- Low temperature, Pauli blocking closes scattering channels
- D does not violate MIR derived bound.
- Model less sensitive to Γ in overdamped limit.



Compressibility

- Images of both spin states versus chemical potential
- Temperature dependent in this range
- In high temperature limit of single band model:

$$\chi = n(1 - n/2)/T$$



Resistivity Versus Temperature Brown *et. al.,* Science 363, 379 (2019)

(lh)

- Resistivity from Nernst-Einstein $1/\rho = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}\right) D$
- Linear over this temperature range
- Exceeds resistivity bound inferred from MIR limit ("bad metal")

$$\rho_{\rm max} \approx \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{n}}\hbar$$

 $\rho(T) = \rho_o + AT + BT^2$ 15 $\rho_o = 1.1(1)\hbar$ $A = 1.55(15)\frac{\hbar}{t}$ $B = 0.03(3)\frac{\hbar}{4^2}$ 10 5 0 2 6 8 Temperature (t)

Resistivity Versus Temperature

- Resistivity from Nernst-Einstein $1/\rho = \left(\frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}\right) D$
- Linear over this temperature range
- Exceeds resistivity bound inferred from MIR limit ("bad metal")

$$\rho_{\rm max} \approx \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{n}}\hbar$$



Outline

- 1. Studying strongly-interacting quantum matter with ultracold atoms
- 2. The Fermi-Hubbard Model
- 3. Measuring diffusion and conductivity in the repulsive Hubbard model
- 4. Measuring spectral functions and the pseudogap in the attractive Hubbard model

Photoemission spectroscopy

- Using a photon, excite a particle from an interacting system
- Measure the energy and momentum of the ejected particle
- single-particle excitations of a many-body system



What does ARPES measure?

Remove particle (emission)

• How does an excitation $G^{R}(k,t) = -i\theta(t) \langle c_{k}(t)c_{k}^{\dagger}(0) + c_{k}^{\dagger}(0)c_{k}(t) \rangle$ propagate in a many-Bemove hole (injection)

What does ARPES measure?

- How does an excitation $G^{R}(k,t) = -i\theta(t) \langle c_{k}(t)c_{k}^{\dagger}(0) + c_{k}^{\dagger}(0)c_{k}(t) \rangle$ propagate in a many-Remove hole (injection)
- Momentum resolved density of states

$$A(k,\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Im} \{ G^{R}(k,\omega) \}$$

Emission + injection

Remove particle

(emission)

What does ARPES measure?

- How does an excitation $G^{R}(k,t) = -i\theta(t) \langle c_{k}(t)c_{k}^{\dagger}(0) + c_{k}^{\dagger}(0)c_{k}(t) \rangle$ propagate in a many-Remove hole (injection)
- Momentum resolved density of states
- ARPES particle current gives access to emission

Remove hole
(injection)

$$A(k,\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Im} \{ G^{R}(k,\omega) \}$$
Emission + injection

$$A^{-}(k,\omega) = A(k,\omega) f(\omega)$$

Emission only

Remove particle

(emission)

The BCS limit

- Fermi gas, excitations have definite momentum and energy
- BCS, pairing appears as a gap
- Dispersion exhibits "backbending"



The BCS limit

- Fermi gas, excitations have definite momentum and energy
- BCS, pairing appears as a gap
- Dispersion exhibits
 "backbending"



Quasimomentum

$$A(k,\omega) = |v_k^2| \,\delta(E_k + \omega) + |u_k^2| \,\delta(E_k - \omega)$$
$$|BCS\rangle = \prod_k \left(u_k + v_k c_{k\uparrow}^{\dagger} c_{-k\downarrow}^{\dagger}\right) |0\rangle$$

Pseudogaps

- Depression in the spectral function at the Fermi energy.
- Cold atom experiments: backbending in dispersion above T_c.
- Observed in High-T_c superconductors and unitary Fermi gas
- HTSC, PG origin controversial: precursor to SC or indicative of a competing order.

Pseudogap reviews: Low Temp. Phys. **41**, 319 (2015) Rep. Prog. Phys. **80**, 104401 (2017)

3D Fermi Gas



Stewart ... Jin, Nature 454, 744 (2008) Gaebler ... Jin, Nature Phys. **6**, 569 (2010)

2D Fermi Gas



Pseudogap in the attractive Hubbard model

- Accessible model: on a lattice and no DQMC sign problem.
- BEC-BCS crossover with interaction strength.
- Temperatures near state-of-the-art for experiment





 Radiofrequency photon transfers to non-interacting state but preserves momentum



- Radiofrequency photon transfers to non-interacting state but preserves momentum
- Band mapping transforms quasimomentum to real momentum



- Radiofrequency photon transfers to non-interacting state but preserves momentum
- Band mapping transforms quasimomentum to real momentum
- ^T/₄ expansion in harmonic trap maps momentum space to real space (similar to time-of-flight measurement)



- Radiofrequency photon transfers to non-interacting state but preserves momentum
- Band mapping transforms quasimomentum to real momentum
- ^T/₄ expansion in harmonic trap maps momentum space to real space (similar to time-of-flight measurement)
- Freeze atoms in deep lattice and detect

ARPES data: increasing interaction strength Eur. Phys. J. B. 2, 30 (1998) 0.80 Temperature T/t 0.60 **PSEUDOGAP** 0.40 0.20 SUPERCONDUCTOR 0.00 0.0 2.5 5.0 7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 Interaction |U|/t

ARPES data: increasing interaction strength

- Determine U/t, T/t, and $\frac{a}{2}$ μ/t from fitting correlators to equilibrium DQMC
- Spectral weight shifts to lower energy (U < 0)
- Spectral peak shifts away from μ at stronger interaction



quasimomentum

ARPES data: increasing interaction strength

- Determine U/t, T/t, and $\frac{\mu}{t}$ from fitting correlators to equilibrium DQMC
- Spectral weight shifts to lower energy (U < 0)
- Spectral peak shifts away from μ at stronger interaction



ARPES data: increasing interaction strength

- Determine U/t, T/t, and $\frac{\mu}{t}$ from fitting correlators to equilibrium DQMC
- Spectral weight shifts to lower energy (U < 0)
- Spectral peak shifts away from μ at stronger interaction



ARPES data: increasing interaction strength Eur. Phys. J. B. 2, 30 (1998) 0.80 Temperature T/t 0.60 **PSEUDOGAP** 0.40 0.20 SUPERCONDUCTOR 0.00 0.0 2.5 5.0 7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 Interaction |U|/t

- Determine U/t, T/t, and μ/t from fitting correlators
 to equilibrium DQMC
- Second branch emerges with increasing temperature
- Lower branch: doublons
- Upper branch: singles



- Determine U/t, T/t, and μ/t from fitting correlators
 to equilibrium DQMC
- Second branch emerges with increasing temperature
- Lower branch: doublons
- Upper branch: singles



- Determine U/t, T/t, and μ/t from fitting correlators to equilibrium DQMC
- Second branch emerges with increasing temperature
- Lower branch: doublons
- Upper branch: singles



- Determine U/t, T/t, and μ/t from fitting correlators
 to equilibrium DQMC
- Second branch emerges with increasing temperature
- Lower branch: doublons
- Upper branch: singles



Challenges and opportunities

Pseudogap and Fermi-Surface Topology in the Two-Dimensional Hubbard Model

Wei Wu, Mathias S. Scheurer, Shubhayu Chatterjee, Subir Sachdev, Antoine Georges, and Michel Ferrero Phys. Rev. X **8**, 021048 – Published 22 May 2018

- ARPES of repulsive model: further cooling is a key challenge.
 - Entropy redistribution.
 - Immersion in bosonic baths.
 - Floquet engineering of t-J models.
- Dynamical observables
 - More challenging for theory
 - Test approximations
 - Toolkit small compared with materials



Thank you!

<u>PI</u> Waseem Bakr

<u>Graduate students</u> Debayan Mitra Peter Brown Elmer Guardado-Sanchez Lysander Christakis Jason Rosenberg Benjamin Spar

<u>Post-docs</u> Stanimir Kondov Peter Schauss <u>Undergraduates</u> Joseph Scherrer Adam Bowman Mark Stone Joe Zhang Maria-Claudia Popescu Nathan Agmon Arka Adhikari

<u>Theory support</u> David Huse (Princeton) Andre-Marie Tremblay (Sherbrooke) Jure Kokalj (U. of Ljubljana) Edwin Huang (Stanford) Tom Devereaux (Stanford)

<u>Funding</u>



the David & Lucile Packard





Alfred P. Sloan FOUNDATION