

Boulder notes by Victor V. Albert.

## I. EUN-AH KIM

We focus on experimentally realizing topological superconductors (TSCs), with Hamiltonian

$$H = T + H_{int}.$$

Two strategies are manipulating  $T$  to produce exotic non-interacting systems (e.g., arXiv:1606.00857) or  $H_{int}$  for interactions. TSCs are similar to TIs in their exotic properties, but have also particle-hole symmetry and (as a result) Majorana zero modes.

If we study the Hubbard model using mean-field and picking the superconducting channel ( $c^\dagger c^\dagger$ ) as opposed to the magnetic/charge channel ( $c^\dagger c$ ), we get a superconductor, but it is  $s$ -wave and not  $p$ -wave. So BdG is insufficient for guiding materialization.

Consider a fermionic Cooper pair wavefunction

$$\Psi_{CP}(r_1, r_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = g(r_1 - r_2) \chi(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \quad \Psi_{CP}(r_2, r_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_1) = -\Psi_{CP}(r_1, r_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2).$$

1. In singlet SCs ( $s, d$ -wave),  $g$  is symmetric and  $\chi$  is antisymmetric.
2. In triplet SCs ( $p$ -wave),  $g$  is antisymmetric:  $g_k = -g_{-k}$ . Now our wavefunction is entangled:

$$\Psi_{CP}(r_1, r_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = g_{\uparrow\uparrow}(r_1 - r_2) |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + g_{\downarrow\downarrow}(r_1 - r_2) |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle + g_{\uparrow\downarrow}(r_1 - r_2) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)$$

and the order parameter is matrix-valued:

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow} & \Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow} \\ \Delta_{\downarrow\uparrow} & \Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Realizations of this are discussed in  $^3\text{He}$  (either time-reversal invariant or not) and StRu.

- (a) In the  $^3\text{He}$  ABM phase (TRS  $T$  broken),

$$\Delta_{ABM} = \Delta_0(k_x + ik_y) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\Delta_0$  is an odd function of  $k$ . We get a chiral state:

$$T\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}(k) = \Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}^*(-k) = -\Delta_0(k_x - ik_y) \neq \Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}(k) = \Delta_0(k_x + ik_y).$$

- (b) In the BW phase (TRS upheld),

$$\Delta_{BW} = \Delta_0 \begin{pmatrix} -(k_x - ik_y) & 0 \\ 0 & k_x + ik_y \end{pmatrix}.$$

There is ‘‘spin-orbit locking’’.

$$T\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}(k) = \Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}^*(-k) = -\Delta_0(k_x - ik_y) = \Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}(k).$$

3. We consider a BdG with equal spin pairing (as opposed to  $c_{k,\uparrow}c_{-k,\downarrow}$  as in Tinkham),

$$H = \sum_k \left[ \xi_k c_k^\dagger c_k + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta^* c_{-k} c_k + H.c.) \right] \quad \xi_k = \frac{|k|^2}{2m} - \mu \quad \Delta_k = \Delta_0(k_x + ik_y).$$

This was diagonalized in Nick Read’s talk:

$$H = \sum_k E_k \gamma_k^\dagger \gamma_k \quad E_k = \pm \sqrt{\xi_k^2 + |\Delta_k|^2},$$

and we get the weak and strong pairing phases. The wavefunction is

$$|\Psi_{BCS}\rangle = \prod_k u_k \left( 1 + g_k c_k^\dagger c_{-k}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle$$

with  $g_k = v_k/u_k$ . In position space, we obtain the Pfaffian<sup>1</sup>

$$\langle r_1 \dots r_N | \Psi_{BCS} \rangle = a \{g(r_i - r_j)\} = \text{Pf} \{g(r_i - r_j)\} \quad g(r) = \int dk g(k) .$$

We now calculate the topological index (defined for  $\mu \neq 0$ , where map is continuous)

$$M(\hat{n}) = \int_{S^2} d^2k \epsilon_{ij} \hat{n}_k \times (\partial_i \hat{n}_k \times \partial_j \hat{n}_k) ,$$

which is the Pontryagin index/Chern number. The vector  $\hat{n}_k = \frac{1}{E_k} \langle \Re \Delta_k, -\Im \Delta_k, \xi_k \rangle \in S^2$  is a map from *non-translationally invariant*  $k$ -space (the **2D** base space  $S^2$ , since we've identified  $k \rightarrow \infty$  with the North Pole<sup>2</sup>) to the sphere (target space  $S^2$ ). This is then just an element of the **second** homotopy group, i.e., space of equivalence classes of maps from  $S^2$  to  $S^2$ :

$$\pi_2(S^2) = \mathbb{Z} .$$

Calculating this invariant, which basically tells you how much you've wrapped around the sphere.

---

<sup>1</sup> Antisymmetrized products of  $g(r_i - r_j)$  do not correspond to a Slater determinant since that is of the form  $f_i(r_j)$ .

<sup>2</sup> We can only do this if the limit as  $\langle k_x, k_y \rangle \rightarrow \infty$  is defined, i.e., if all limits to  $\infty$  yield the same value of  $\hat{n}$ . If this was not the case and we instead had, e.g.,  $E \rightarrow \text{constant}$  as  $k_y \rightarrow \infty$ , then large  $k_y$ 's would be participating in the behavior at long timescales (since they are constant, they are not high frequency and would not be integrated out at large times).