# Band touching from real space topology

Doron Bergman Congjun Wu LB

TASSP, Kyoto June 2008

### **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>1.
  - 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  $\vec{A} = \operatorname{Im} \langle u | \vec{\nabla}_k u \rangle$
  - Flux  $\oint d\vec{k} \cdot \vec{A} = \int d^2k B(k) = \pi$
- **T+I:** 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)

$$H_{eff} = \hat{P}V\hat{P}$$

*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

Н



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!





#### Pyrochlore lattice





# 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



# Why flat bands?

- Wannier states are eigenstates
  - localized states with *finite* support
  - reason: interference



#### Similar in other lattices





#### Flatness is not robust

 Interference condition violated by most additional hoppings



#### Flatness is not robust

 Interference condition violated by most additional hoppings



# 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?

### Elementary Hexagons



One per unit cell?

### Elementary Hexagons



One per unit cell?











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

#### Problem

- On torus with N unit cells, find N-1 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: N+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