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## Band Touching

- Spaghetti Diagram
- When do they touch?
- Level repulsion argument
- Must tune 3 parameters for a touching at a generic wavevector - get "accidental" touchings at points in 3d.



## Graphene

- Sometimes 2d bands do touch!



## Stability

- Common reason: irreducible representation of Little group has dim>l.
- these touchings are very sensitive to symmetry.
- But sometimes they are more stable...


## Topological stability

- Dirac spinor: $2 \pi$ rotation $\psi \rightarrow-\psi$
- More generally:
- Berry gauge field $\vec{A}=\operatorname{Im}\left\langle u \mid \vec{\nabla}_{k} u\right\rangle$
- Flux

$$
\oint d \vec{k} \cdot \vec{A}=\int d^{2} k B(k)=\pi
$$

- T+l: $\quad B(k)=0$
- Singularity must be preserved!


## This talk

- A different kind of topological band touching
- Real space topology instead of momentum space


## Frustrated Hopping Models

- Certain lattice hopping Hamiltonians display flat bands
- These are interesting because they offer prospects for strong interaction physics (c.f. FQHE)

$$
H_{e f f}=\hat{P} V \hat{P}
$$

if V is small compared to the gap to the next band

## Optical lattices



Theoretical proposals from various atomic theory groups (Lewenstein, Demler/Lukin, Zoller)

## High field antiferromagnets



H

Single magnon excitations governed by frustrated hopping Hamiltonian
c.f. Tsunetsugu and others

## Kagome lattice



## Kagome lattice

- Flat band
- Band touchings
- Dirac points and touching of flat band



## Kagome lattice

- Flat band
- Band touchings
- Dirac points and touching of flat band

no Berry phase here!


## Honeycomb p-bands



## Honeycomb p-bands



## Pyrochlore lattice



## Pyrochlore bands



## Why all this touching?

- Touching is troublesome for strong interaction physics
- projection into flat band problematic because there is no gap
- Can we keep the flat band but remove the touching?


## Why flat bands?

- Wannier states are eigenstates
- localized states with finite support
- reason: interference
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## Similar in other lattices




## Flatness is not robust

- Interference condition violated by most additional hoppings
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## A sort of protection

- As long as the flat band remains flat, the touching always remains
- (somewhat) bad news for "LLL" projection
- Reason: real space topology


## Counting

- Flat band = localized states but...
- How many (linearly independent) localized states are there?
- Flat band (with periodic B.C.s)
- I state per unit cell


## Elementary Hexagons



One per unit cell?
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One per unit cell?

## Superposition
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## Superposition



Sum of all elementary hexagons $=0$ with PBCs!

## Problem

- On torus with N unit cells, find $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{I}$ linearly independent states
- Where is the missing state?


## Loops on torus



## Loops on torus



## Non-trivial Loops

- Two non-contractible loops can be formed on the torus
- The difference between any two loops with the same topology is a sum of elementary hexagons


Two more linearly independent states!

## Counting

- Elementary hexagons: N-I states
- Non-contractible loops: 2 states
- Total states: $\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{I}$ states
- I more state than the flat band!
- This requires another band to touch the flat band.


## Summary

- Band touchings in most frustrated hopping hamiltonians are "protected" in this way
- kagome, dice, pyrochlore, honeycomb porbital models

