Itinerant fermions on dilute frustrated Ising lattices
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Abstract. We consider itinerant spinless fermions as moving defects in a dilute two-dimensional frustrated Ising system where they occupy site vacancies. Fermions interact via local spin fluctuations, and we analyze coupled self-consistent mean-field equations of the Green functions after expressing the spin and fermion operators in terms of Grassmann variables. The specific heat and effective mass are analyzed with the solutions satisfying the symmetry imposed by the coupling layout. At low temperature, we find that these solutions induce stripes along the lines of couplings with the same sign, and that a low fermion density yields a small effective mass.

1 Introduction

Cooperative phenomena in correlated electronic systems yield to the emergence of spatial structures of the charge densities due to environmental constraints. For example, hole segregation was evidenced in the superconductor La$_{1.6-x}$Nd$_{0.4}$Sr$_x$CuO$_4$ and interpreted as the presence of a stripe modulation [1,2] which is assumed to be responsible for the suppression of superconductivity. One important question is how to probe for the possible existence of coherent states leading to superconductivity without the help of phonons [3], possibly using the indirect coupling induced by magnetic fluctuations. In this paper we focus on the physical properties that emerge between itinerant fermions in a dilute frustrated spin environment. The indirect coupling between fermions is mediated by spin fluctuations via site dilution, where fermions replace the missing spins, mimicking hole doping in two-dimensional cuprate materials, but with classical spin fluctuations. The itinerancy leads to spin disorder, but it is favorable for the fermions to move along the boundary of spin domains in order to lower the energy. In a different context, similar models such as the migration of electrons on ionic bonds have been studied theoretically [4,5], also with classical moving defects [6], and itinerant electrons coupled to a spin environment are known to generate various domain structures [7,8]. Models of coupled lattices between spins and fermions were introduced to investigate metal–insulator interfaces [9] with the help of quantum Monte Carlo methods. In a previous paper [10], we analyzed a similar system of itinerant fermions occupying the empty sites of a two-dimensional dilute Ising model. The dilution is known to suppress the magnetic order, but spin fluctuations induce an indirect correlation between electrons. For this kind of model, we observed the divergence of the effective mass in the critical region, and a diminution of its value at low temperature, whereas the fermions behave like slightly heavy quasiparticles in the high-temperature region. In the present paper, we investigate the properties of these itinerant fermions in the presence of frustration which does not display criticality but instead a macroscopic ground state degeneracy. In particular, we will discuss the nature of the fermion structures, such as stripes, induced by the presence of frustrated magnetic couplings that are geometrically imposed on the lattice and by the tendency of holes to self-organize in order to minimize the local energy by suppressing the frustration. These linear structures have to be compared with the two-dimensional stripe phases found in hole-doped antiferromagnet cuprates [11,12], and which form mainly because of the competition between the tendency of the holes to aggregate in the low magnetic regions and the long-range Coulomb interaction. These structures are different in nature but reveal the self-organization of holes, vacancies, or fermions in a fluctuating magnetic environment.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2, we introduce the quantum Hamiltonian describing the interaction between fermions that occupy the vacancies of a classical spin model displaying frustration at low temperature with a highly degenerate ground state. The method used in the present paper is based on Grassmann techniques [13] for the spin and fermion sectors [14]. The resulting action can be partially reduced by integrating over the spin components and self-consistent equations for the Green functions, and self-
Fig. 1 Two frustrated lattice configurations with periodic and antiferromagnetic couplings $-J$ (red) and ferromagnetic ones $J$ (black). Case (a) corresponds to the piled up dominoes model (PUD), and the second to the zig-zag dominoes model (ZZD), see [15]. Each plaquette is frustrated. The double arrow indicates a ground-state spin with two allowed orientations.

Energies are analyzed under the mean-field approximation on an effective action, see Sect. 3. A homogeneous solution is given in Sect. 3.1, and an investigation of a stripe solution satisfying the symmetry of the spin coupling configurations is developed in Sect. 3.2. Section 4 is dedicated to the Monte Carlo study of the classical equivalent of the quantum model, with fermions replaced by itinerant classical particles obeying Markov dynamics, and finally a discussion is given in the conclusions, Sect. 5.

2 Model Hamiltonian for the frustrated dilute spin system

In this section we introduce the main Hamiltonian of a system composed of Ising spins $\sigma_r = \pm 1$ and spinless fermions on a frustrated lattice of size $N = L \times L$. Fermions are described by operators $(c_r, c^\dagger_r)$ and fermion numbers $n_r = c^\dagger_r c_r$. When a fermion occupies a site $r = (m, n)$, the corresponding spin becomes inactive. Also, every fermion moves to a neighboring site with a kinetic or transfer energy $t$, which will be set to unity in the numerical applications. The Hamiltonian is then defined by

$$ H = -J \sum_{r, \delta = \pm \hat{x}, \pm \hat{y}} \epsilon_r \sigma_r \sigma_{r+\delta}(1 - n_r)(1 - n_{r+\delta}) - t \sum_{r, \delta = \pm \hat{x}, \pm \hat{y}} c^\dagger_{r+\delta} c_r, $$

(1)

where $\epsilon_r = \pm 1$ is the sign function of the local couplings $J_{\epsilon_r}$ between spins, and $\delta$ the discrete unit vectors of the lattice. Couplings are antiferromagnetic if $\epsilon_r = -1$, and ferromagnetic otherwise. We consider two simple models of Ising lattices in which the geometry of the couplings leads to spin frustration. By definition, a system is frustrated if the product of the four couplings around each plaquette is negative. This can be achieved by considering two simple configurations of couplings. The first one corresponds to the piled up dominoes model (PUD), and the second one to the zig-zag dominoes model (ZZD), as represented in Fig. 1. These models were previously studied extensively and exact solutions were given in the non-dilute case [15] using transfer matrix methods. Among the principal results is the macroscopic degeneracy of the ground state and a nonzero entropy per site at zero temperature with a nontrivial value. There is also no phase transition at nonzero temperature for the case where all the couplings have the same absolute value, and the system remains paramagnetic. The local couplings are defined for these two models by the function $\epsilon_r = \epsilon_{m,n}$ such that

$$ \epsilon_{m,n} = (-1)^n $$

for the PUD model,

$$ \epsilon_{m,n} = (-1)^{m+n} $$

for the ZZD model.

The non-frustrated Ising case where $\epsilon_{m,n} = 1$ was studied in a previous work [10] within a mean-field approximation on the Green functions of the fermionic sector.

We first consider only the spin Hamiltonian for the dilute case without the kinetic part of equation (1), with a coupling configuration displayed in Fig. 1a, b

$$ H_F = -J \sum_{m,n} (\epsilon_{m,n} y_{m,n} \sigma_m \sigma_{m+1,n} \sigma_{m+1,n+1} + y_{m,n+1} \sigma_m \sigma_{m,n+1} \sigma_{m+1,n+1}), $$

(3)

where $y_{m,n} = 1 - n_{m,n} = 0$ when a defect (hole or fermion) is present and $y_{m,n} = 1$ otherwise when the site is occupied by a spin. The total Hamiltonian including the kinetic part of the fermions, see Eq. (1), will be studied in Sect. 3 below, and an effective action
will be derived. We should note that the spin part of the Hamiltonian (3) which contains the number operators \(n_r\) does not commute with the kinetic part of the fermions in general. Introducing the partition function 

\[
Z_F = \sum_{\sigma_{m,n} = \pm 1} e^{-\beta H_F}
\]

we can rewrite the Boltzmann weights as

\[
Z_F = \sum_{\sigma_{m,n} = \pm 1} \cosh(K)^{2N} 
\times \prod_{m,n} \left( 1 + u \epsilon_{m,n} y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}} y_{m+1,n,\sigma_{m+1,n}} \right) 
\times \left( 1 + u y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}} y_{m+1,n,\sigma_{m+1,n+1}} \right),
\]

with parameters \(K = \beta J\) and \(u = \tanh(K)\). The general case in absence of vacancies can be solved using Grassmann variables and was derived extensively by Plechko [16–19] in the case of various lattice geometries, and the partition function can be expressed as the Pfaffian of a quadratic form. In the presence of vacancies, the Hamiltonian can be mapped onto an action with quadratic and quartic parts in Grassmann variables representing the interaction contribution [20–22], and therefore the partition function cannot be expressed by a simple Pfaffian. However, we can show using perturbative methods that the quartic part leads only to a small contribution\(^1\); see also [13]. In order to derive an effective action for the dilute frustrated models (2), we follow in detail the method given by Plechko in a previous work [20] and introduce two pairs of Grassmann variables \((a_{m,n}, \bar{a}_{m,n})\) and \((b_{m,n}, \bar{b}_{m,n})\) such that

\[
Z_F = \sum_{\sigma_{m,n} = \pm 1} \cosh(K)^{2N} \prod_{m,n} \int d\bar{a}_{m,n} d a_{m,n} e^{\sigma_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n}} 
\times (1 + a_{m,n} y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}})(1 + u \epsilon_{m,n} a_{m,n} y_{m+1,n,\sigma_{m+1,n}}) 
\times \int d\bar{b}_{m,n} d b_{m,n} e^{b_{m,n} \bar{b}_{m,n}} (1 + b_{m,n} y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}}) 
\times (1 + u \bar{b}_{m,n} y_{m,n+1,\sigma_{m+1,n}}) 
\times \sum_{\sigma_{m,n} = \pm 1} \cosh(K)^{2N} 
\times \prod_{m,n} \int d\bar{d}_{m,n} d b_{m,n} d\bar{a}_{m,n} d a_{m,n} e^{\sigma_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n} + b_{m,n} \bar{b}_{m,n}} 
\times (A_{m,n} \bar{A}_{m+1,n})(B_{m,n} \bar{B}_{m,n+1}),
\]

where the link operators in both directions are given by

\[
A_{m,n} = 1 + a_{m,n} y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}},
\bar{A}_{m,n} = 1 + u \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}},
B_{m,n} = 1 + b_{m,n} y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}},
\bar{B}_{m,n} = 1 + u \bar{b}_{m,n-1} y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}}.
\]

Moving the horizontal and vertical Grassmann factors inside the general product using the mirror ordering principle, for which the computational details are not presented here, we obtain the partition function as a series of ordered products

\[
Z_F = \cosh(K)^{2N} \prod_{m,n} \int d\bar{d}_{m,n} d b_{m,n} d\bar{a}_{m,n} d a_{m,n} 
\times e^{a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n} + b_{m,n} \bar{b}_{m,n}} 
\times \sum_{\sigma_{m,n} = \pm 1} \prod_{m} \left[ \prod_{n} \bar{A}_{m,n} B_{m,n} A_{m,n} \prod_{m} B_{m,n} \right],
\]

where the arrows indicate the order of the product, right or left. This allows for the summation over each individual spin variable using for example the fact that only even powers of \(\sigma_{m,n}\) do not vanish: \(\sum_{\sigma_{m,n} = \pm 1} \sigma_{m,n}^2 = 2\). We can then perform the exponentiation of the quadratic Grassmann factors

\[
Z_F = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} \prod_{m,n} \int d\bar{d}_{m,n} d b_{m,n} d\bar{a}_{m,n} d a_{m,n} 
\times \exp \left( \sum_{m,n} \left[ a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n} + b_{m,n} \bar{b}_{m,n} + y_{m,n} \left[ a_{m,n} b_{m,n} + u \left( \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} + \bar{b}_{m,n-1} \right) \left( a_{m,n} + b_{m,n} \right) + u^2 \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} \bar{b}_{m,n-1} \right] \right] \right).
\]

We then integrate over the pairs \((a_{m,n}, b_{m,n})\) in order to reduce the number of variables, using the general identity for any linear Grassmann factors \(L_{m,n}\) and \(\bar{L}_{m,n}\)

\[
\int d\bar{b}_{m,n} d b_{m,n} e^{y_{m,n,\sigma_{m,n}} b_{m,n}} = y_{m,n} + L_{m,n} \bar{L}_{m,n}.
\]

This yields the following integral over the remaining 2\(N\) Grassmann variables \((\bar{a}_{m,n}, \bar{b}_{m,n})\), which can be relabeled using the substitutions \(\bar{a}_{m,n} \rightarrow -a_{m,n}\) and \(\bar{b}_{m,n} \rightarrow \bar{a}_{m,n}\)

\[
Z_F = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} \prod_{m,n} \int d\bar{d}_{m,n} d a_{m,n} 
\times \exp \left( -u^2 y_{m,n,\epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n}} \bar{a}_{m,n-1} \right) 
\times \prod_{m,n} \left[ y_{m,n} + a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n} + u y_{m,n} (a_{m,n} + \bar{a}_{m,n}) \left( \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} - \bar{a}_{m,n-1} \right) \right].
\]

When a vacancy is present \(y_{m,n} = 0\), we have the simple result \(\int d\bar{d}_{m,n} d a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n} a_{m,n} = 1\), and when \(y_{m,n} = 1\) we obtain

\[1\] Unpublished results, work to be submitted.
\[
\int d\tilde{a}_{m,n} d\tilde{m}, n \exp \left( -u^2 \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} \right) \\
+ a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} + u(a_{m,n} + \tilde{a}_{m,n})(\epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} - \tilde{a}_{m,n} - 1) \right) \\
= \int d\tilde{a}_{m,n} d\tilde{m}, n e^{S_F m,n}. \tag{12}
\]

The total action \( S_F = \sum_{m,n} S_{F,m,n} \) corresponding to the undiluted spin system can be written as

\[
S_F = \sum_{m,n} \left( a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} + u(a_{m,n} + \tilde{a}_{m,n})(\epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} - \tilde{a}_{m,n} - 1) - u^2 \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} \right). \tag{13}
\]

Therefore, we can write the partition function as

\[
Z_F = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} \prod_{m,n} \int d\tilde{a}_{m,n} d\tilde{m}, n e^{S_F m,n} \\
\times \left[ (1 - y_{m,n}) a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} e^{-S_F m,n} + y_{m,n} \right] \tag{14}
\]

where

\[
a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} e^{-S_F m,n} = a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} \\
+ u^2 \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} - 1. \tag{15}
\]

Because the variables \( y_{m,n} \) can take only the values 0 or 1, the expression (14) cannot in principle be exponentiated. Indeed, we first need to factorize the terms \( y_{m,n} \) in the brackets in order to exponentiate the quadratic and quartic terms exactly, following (15)

\[
y_{m,n} \left( 1 + \frac{1 - y_{m,n}}{y_{m,n}} a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} e^{-S_F m,n} \right) \\
= y_{m,n} \exp \left( \frac{1 - y_{m,n}}{y_{m,n}} a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} e^{-S_F m,n} \right). \tag{16}
\]

This presents in principle a singularity in the exponential term at \( y_{m,n} = 0 \). But this expression is formally true, since after integrating over the Grassmann variables in the overall integral (14), the result is a polynomial in \( y_{m,n} \) and does not contain any singularity when \( y_{m,n} = 0 \). However, we can assume that the \( y_{m,n} \) variables can be extended to real variables that take any positive value less than unity, as we will show in the density approximation presented in Sect. 3, and we obtain

\[
Z_F = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} \prod_{m,n} \int y_{m,n} d\tilde{a}_{m,n} d\tilde{m}, n \\
\times \exp \left( S_{F,m,n} + v_{m,n} a_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} \\
+ v_{m,n} u^2 \epsilon_{m-1,n} a_{m-1,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} \tilde{a}_{m,n} - 1 \right), \tag{16}
\]

where \( v_{m,n} = (1 - y_{m,n})/y_{m,n} \). The variables \( v_{m,n} \) can be viewed as local coupling parameters between the undiluted model and the vacancies whose contribution is represented by quadratic and quartic forms. In general, we assume that the contribution of the quartic form in (16) is small, since it contains in the continuous limit a double space derivative whose amplitude should be small for low momenta.

### 2.1 Partition function for the undiluted case

We consider for simplification the PUD case where \( \epsilon_{m,n} = (-1)^n \), see Fig. 1a, and use the Fourier decomposition \( a_r = L^{-1} \sum_k a_k e^{i k \cdot r} \), \( \tilde{a}_r = L^{-1} \sum_k \tilde{a}_k e^{-i k \cdot r} \) for \( r = (m,n) \) and \( k = (k_x, k_y) = (2\pi p/L, 2\pi q/L) \).

Using the identity \( \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{2i \pi n/L} (-1)^n = L \delta_{q, \pm L/2} \), we obtain after some algebra

\[
S_F = \sum_{k_x, k_y} a_{k_x, k_y} \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y} \\
+ u \left( a_{k_x, k_y} a_{-k_x, -k_y} e^{i k_x} + \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y} a_{-k_x, -k_y} e^{-i k_x} \right) \\
+ u \left( a_{k_x, k_y} \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y} e^{i k_y} + \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y} a_{-k_x, -k_y} e^{-i k_y} \right) \\
+ u^2 a_{k_x, k_y} \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y} e^{i (k_y - k_x)}. \tag{17}
\]

We can decompose the momentum zone by considering the reduced domain \( -\pi \leq k_x \leq \pi \) and \( 0 \leq k_y \leq \pi /2 \), see Fig. 2a, of independent momenta. This implies that only the following set of four pairs of independent Grassmann variables is necessary to decompose the partition function into independent blocks:

\[
a_k = a_{k_x, k_y}, \quad a_{-k} = a_{-k_x, -k_y}, \\
\tilde{a}_k = \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y}, \quad \tilde{a}_{-k} = \tilde{a}_{-k_x, -k_y}, \\
b_k = a_{k_x, k_y} \tilde{a}_{-k_x - k_y}, \quad b_{-k} = a_{-k_x - k_y} \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y}, \\
\tilde{b}_k = \tilde{a}_{k_x, k_y} a_{-k_x - k_y}, \quad \tilde{b}_{-k} = \tilde{a}_{-k_x, -k_y} a_{k_x, k_y}. \tag{18}
\]

In the reduced gray zone of Fig. 2a, and represented by a prime symbol on the sum over momenta, we obtain the following decomposition of the action into independent blocks of eight variables, after regrouping the different terms and further simplifications

\[
S_F = \sum_{k_x, k_y} a_k \tilde{a}_k (1 - u e^{i k_y}) + a_{-k} \tilde{a}_{-k} (1 - u e^{-i k_y}) \\
+ b_k \tilde{b}_k (1 + u e^{i k_y}) + b_{-k} \tilde{b}_{-k} (1 + u e^{-i k_y}) \\
+ 2iu \sin k_y \tilde{a}_k a_k - 2iu \sin k_y b_k \tilde{b}_k \\
+ a_k \left[ 2iu \sin k_x b_k - \tilde{b}_k u e^{-i k_x} (1 - u e^{i k_y}) \right] \\
+ a_{-k} \left[ -2iu \sin k_x \tilde{b}_k b_k - \tilde{b}_{-k} u e^{-i k_x} (1 - u e^{-i k_y}) \right] \\
+ a_k b_k u e^{-i k_x} (1 + u e^{i k_y}) + a_{-k} \tilde{b}_k u e^{i k_x} (1 + u e^{-i k_y}). \tag{19}
\]
The total partition function is therefore equal to the following set of integrals, where the $L \times L/2$ vectors $\vec{k}$ are located inside the reduced zone only

$$Z_F = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} \prod_{\vec{k}} \int d\bar{a}_k da_k d\bar{a}_{-k} da_{-k} \quad \bar{d}b_k db_k \bar{d}b_{-k} db_{-k} e^{S_F}. \quad (20)$$

We obtain after integration and simplifications

$$Z_F = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} (1 - u^2)^{N/2} \times \prod_{k_x, k_y} \left[ (1 + u^2) - 2u^2 (\cos(2k_x) + \cos(2k_y)) \right]. \quad (21)$$

This result can be further simplified by noting that $1 - u^2 = \cosh^{-2}(K)$, and we finally obtain a simple product

$$Z_F = 2^N \prod_{k_x, k_y} \left[ 1 + \sinh^2(2K)(\sin^2 k_x + \sin^2 k_y) \right]. \quad (22)$$

In the thermodynamical limit, the free energy per site is then equal to

$$-\beta F/N = \ln 2 + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} dk_x \int_{0}^{\pi/2} dk_y \times \ln \left[ 1 + \sinh^2(2K)\left( \sin^2 k_x + \sin^2 k_y \right) \right], \quad (23)$$

which corresponds to the result (6) of reference [15]. The entropy is given by $S = -\partial F/\partial T$, and specific heat by $C_v = T \partial S/\partial T$. In the limits $T \to 0$ and $L \to \infty$, a series expansion gives the entropy per site

$$\lim_{T \to 0} \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{S}{N} \sim \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} dk_x \int_{0}^{\pi/2} dk_y \times \ln \left[ 4 \left( \sin^2 k_x + \sin^2 k_y \right) \right] = \frac{G}{\pi} \simeq 0.291 \ 561, \quad (24)$$

where $G$ is the Catalan constant. The entropy is nonzero, as the ground state is macroscopically degenerate. In Fig. 3 we have plotted the specific heat and entropy per site. The specific heat presents no phase transition, but a Schottky peak around $T \simeq J$ as expected for a gaped system.
We can observe that for the ZZD model, equivalent results are found. We obtain the same expression for the free energy as equation (23), except that the terms \( \sin^2 k_x \) are replaced by \( \cos^2 k_x \). This does not change the overall expression of the free energy, since we can always perform the change in variables \( k_x \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2} - k_x \) within the domain of allowed momenta. In addition, since the function \( \epsilon_{m,n} \) of the ZZD model depends on both \( m \) and \( n \), the subsequent calculations imply that the momenta are restricted in the gray area of the Brillouin zone represented in Fig. 2b, with the introduction of 16 variables for each block. However, each block can be divided into two independent blocks of eight variables, and therefore the calculations are similar to the PUD case and can be simplified accordingly.

3 Coupling with fermions

We would like to construct the total partition function \( Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} \simeq \int e^{\mathcal{S}[\phi]} \), where the effective action \( \mathcal{S}_{\text{eff}} \) includes the Ising part and the electron kinetic term in (1). This can be reformulated as a Grassmannian functional integral by substituting the Fermi operators with dimensionless Grassmann variables \( c_r \rightarrow c_r(\tau) \) and \( c^\dagger_r \rightarrow c^\dagger_r(\tau) \); see for example the technical details in references [14,23], where \( \tau \) is the imaginary time variable taking values between zero and \( \beta \):

\[
Z = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} \int \prod_r d\bar{a}_r d\alpha_r d\beta \int \prod_\tau d\bar{c}_r(\tau) dc_r(\tau) \\
\times \exp \left( S_F + \sum_r b_r \left[ \frac{1}{2} - \beta^{-1} \int_0^\beta d\tau \bar{c}_r(\tau)c_r(\tau) \right] \\
+ \sum_r \int_0^\beta d\tau \left[ -\bar{c}_r(\tau)\partial_\tau c_r(\tau) + t \sum_\delta \bar{c}_r+\delta(\tau)c_r(\tau) \right] \right).
\]

(25)

The additional nilpotent variables \( b_r \) in the integral are introduced in order to impose the hole constraints inside equation (14). Instead of a nilpotent variable, a pair of Grassmann variables could also have been introduced as well. The following prescription was considered whenever the product of two Fermi operators on the same site are encountered: \( c^\dagger_r c_r = (c^\dagger_r c_r - c_r c^\dagger_r + 1)/2 \rightarrow \bar{c}_r(\tau)c_r(\tau) + 1/2 \). Moreover, we assume that only the quadratic terms \( \alpha_r \bar{a}_r \) in equation (15) contribute to the interaction between the spins and fermions, as discussed previously. This will simplify the calculations, and the integrals are reduced to Pfaffians or determinants. In the following section, we study the extrema of this action using Lagrange multipliers in the mean-field approximation. From the action \( S_{\text{eff}} \) defined in Eq. (25), we impose antisymmetric boundary conditions \( c_r(0) = -c_r(\beta) \) and \( \bar{c}_r(0) = -\bar{c}_r(\beta) \). These operators can be expressed as a Fourier series using Matsubara frequencies \( \omega_n = (2n + 1)\pi/\beta, n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \cdots \), such that

\[
c_r(\tau) = \beta^{-1/2} \sum_{\omega_n} e^{-i\omega_n \tau} c_r(\omega_n), \\
\bar{c}_r(\tau) = \beta^{-1/2} \sum_{\omega_n} e^{i\omega_n \tau} \bar{c}_r(\omega_n).
\]

(26)

To simplify the problem, we observe that the functional (25) depends on two types of fluctuating operators, coming from the representation of the spins and fermions, with a coupling between them that depends on the local hole constraints. The spin fluctuations are described by the quadratic part with the pairs \( (a_r, \bar{a}_r) \), and the dynamics of the fermions also by a quadratic part with the time-dependent variables \( (c_r(\tau), \bar{c}_r(\tau)) \). Integrating over \( (a_r, \bar{a}_r) \) and the coupling operators \( b_r \) introduces nonlocal interactions between the fermions and is not treatable exactly because of the strong vacancy constraints, since the density operators in a factor of \( b_r \) have only zero or 1 as possible values. This strong condition can be lifted if we consider local mean-field density for the fermion sector. In that case, the singularities coming from the \( b_r \) couplings are smoothed out, and self-consistent local mean-field equations can be expressed as a function of the local densities and self-energies of the fermions. Under these assumptions, we replace the operators \( c_r(\omega_n)c_r(\omega_n) \) by a Green function \( G_r(\omega_n) \) with conjugate variable \( \Sigma_r(\omega_n) \), or self-energy, which serves as a Lagrange multiplier. After integration over the \( b_r \) variables, the total effective action, including the spin and fermion parts with their interaction, is finally given by a quadratic Grassmannian depending on \( (a_r, \bar{a}_r) \) and \( (c_r(\omega_n), \bar{c}_r(\omega_n)) \):

\[
S_{\text{eff}} = N \ln 2 + 2N \ln \cosh(K) + S_F \\
+ \sum_r \ln \left( \frac{1}{2} - \beta^{-1} \sum_{\omega_n} G_r(\omega_n) \right) \\
+ \sum_r \frac{1 + 2\beta^{-1} \sum_{\omega_n} G_r(\omega_n)}{1 - 2\beta^{-1} \sum_{\omega_n} G_r(\omega_n)} a_r \bar{a}_r \\
+ \sum_r \Sigma_r(\omega_n) \left[ G_r(\omega_n) - c_r(\omega_n)c_r(\omega_n) \right] \\
+ \sum_r \sum_{\omega_n} \left[ (i\omega_n + \mu) \bar{c}_r(\omega_n)c_r(\omega_n) \right] \\
+ t \sum_\delta \bar{c}_r+\delta(\omega_n)c_r(\omega_n).
\]

(27)

In this expression, we have introduced a chemical potential \( \mu \). The second term in the second line corresponds to the local constraints imposed by the Lagrange multipliers. The effective thermodynamical potential \( -\beta \Omega = \ln(\int e^{\mathcal{S}[\phi]}) \) after integration over the Grassmann variables is given by
\[ -\beta \Omega = N \ln 2 + 2N \ln \cosh(K) \]
\[ + \sum_r \ln \left( \frac{1}{2} - \beta^{-1} \sum_{\omega_n} G_r(\omega_n) \right) \]
\[ + \sum_r \omega_n \delta_r(\omega_n) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \det \left( A_F + V \right)_{r,r'} \]
\[ + \sum_{\omega_n} \ln \det \left( [i\omega_n + \mu - \Sigma_r(\omega_n)]\delta_{r,r'} \right) \]
\[ + t \sum_{\delta} \delta_{r',r+\delta}(V)_{r,r'} \],
where, explicitly, it follows that
\[ Z_F(v) = \frac{2^N \cosh(K)^{2N}}{(1+v)^N} \prod_{k_x,k_y} \left[ (1-u^4)^2 + (1+v)^4 \right. \]
\[ - 4vu^4 - 1 + 2u^4v^2 \cos 2(k_y - k_x) \]
\[ - 2u^2(1+v-u^2)^2 \left( \cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y \right) \].

The grand potential given by (28) can be written in the mean-field approximation as
\[ -\frac{\beta}{N} \Omega = \ln 2 + 2 \ln \cosh(K + \ln(1-n_e) + \left( n_e - \frac{1}{2} \right) \beta \Sigma \]
\[ + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k} \ln \cosh \left[ \beta (\mu - \Sigma - \epsilon_k) \right] \]
\[ + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k} \ln \left[ (1-u^4)^2 + (1+v)^4 - 4vu^4 - 1 \right. \]
\[ \left. + 2u^2v^2 \cos 2(k_y - k_x) \right] \]
\[ - 2u^2(1+v-u^2)^2 \left( \cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y \right) \].

3.1 Homogeneous solution

We consider the mean-field approach of the effective action (27) with a homogeneous solution for the Green function and self-energy: \( G_r(\omega_n) = G(\omega_n), \Sigma_r(\omega_n) = \Sigma \). This implies that \( v_r = v = n_e/(1-n_e) \) where \( n_e = v/(1+v) \) is the fermion average density. By adding the action \( S_F \) (19) and the quadratic interaction part of Eq. (16), after discarding the quartic terms, we find that all the contributions depending on \( (a_r, a_r^\dagger) \) are included in the following action
\[ S_F + \text{int} = S_F + \sum_{m,n} a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n} - N \ln(1+v). \]

We can express the interaction part using Fourier modes in the reduced Brillouin zone of Fig. 2a
\[ v \sum_{m,n} a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,n} = v \sum_{k_x,k_y} \left( a_k \bar{a}_k + a_{-k} \bar{a}_{-k} + b_k \bar{b}_k + b_{-k} \bar{b}_{-k} \right), \]
and we obtain after integration the corresponding partition function
\[ Z_F(v) = 2^N \cosh(K)^{2N} \int e^{S_F + \text{int}}, \]

where, explicitly, it follows that
\[ \mathcal{F}(v) = \frac{4}{N} \sum_{k} \left[ (1+v)^3 - u^4 + u^4v \cos 2(k_y - k_x) - u^2(1+v-u^2) \left( \cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y \right) \right] \]
\[ \left. \left. \left( \cos 2(k_y - k_x) - 2u^2(1+v-u^2)^2 \cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y \right) \right) \right]. \]

Function \( \mathcal{F}(v) \) is plotted in Fig. 4 for different temperatures. Physically, \( \mathcal{F}(v) \) is defined for \( v \geq 0 \), whereas for \( v < 0 \) (negative densities) the function presents different singularities which are not real. However, we have represented these singularities for illustrative purposes only, as the mathematical domain of \( \mathcal{F}(v) \) is not restricted to positive values. \( \mathcal{F}(v) \) can be viewed as a local chemical potential due to the spin environment and as proportional to the fermion self-energy. This quantity is also related to the energy required to insert a hole inside the spin bath. In the limit of low density of fermions \( v \approx 0 \), we indeed have \( \Sigma(\mu) \approx k_BT(1 - \mathcal{F}(0)) \) which is not zero and
that the density of states is proportional to the effective
is temperature-dependent. When \( T = 0 \), a singularity appears at \( v = 0 \) and has the shape of a cusp; see the
green curve for \( T \) close to zero \((u = 0.9)\). This corre-
sponds to the phase transition of the undiluted frus-
trated model at \( T = 0 \). We estimate the effective mass
from the derivative of \( \Sigma \) with respect to the chemical
potential using the definition \( m^* = 1 - \partial \Sigma / \partial \mu \) \([24,25]\).
\( \Sigma'(\mu) \) can be computed and expressed with \( \mathcal{F}(v) \) and
its derivative \( \mathcal{F}'(v) = \partial_v \mathcal{F}(v) \):

\[
\beta \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \mu} = \frac{n_e'}{(1-n_e)^4} \left[ (1-n_e)^2 - 2(1-n_e)\mathcal{F}(v) - \mathcal{F}'(v) \right]
\]

\[
= n'_e \Lambda,
\]

(35)

with the density of states \( n'_e = \partial_\mu n_e \) defined by

\[
n'_e = \left( 1 - \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \mu} \right) \frac{\beta}{4N} \sum_k \left[ 1 - \tanh^2 \frac{\beta}{2} (\mu - \Sigma - \epsilon_k) \right]
\]

\[
= \left( 1 - \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \mu} \right) \frac{\beta n'_e}{4},
\]

(36)

where \( 0 < \tilde{n}_e' < 1 \) for any temperature. It is known
that the density of states is proportional to the effective
mass. We can finally express the effective mass as \( m^* = (1 + \tilde{n}_e' \Lambda/4)^{-1} \). In the high-temperature regime, we can
perform a series expansion for \( u \ll 1 \) of function \( \mathcal{F}(v) \)

\[
\mathcal{F}(v) \simeq \frac{1}{1 + v} + \frac{3av^4}{(1 + v)^4},
\]

(37)

and obtain an estimate of the self-energy, \( \Sigma \simeq -3(1 - n_e)^2 J^3/(k_B T)^3 < 0 \), from which

\[
m^* \simeq 1 - \frac{3}{2} u^4 (1 - n_e) < 1.
\]

(38)

For the non-frustrated Ising model, \( \epsilon_r = 1 \), it is worth
noting that we instead obtained the opposite sign for
this approximation in the same limit \( m^* \simeq 1 + \frac{3}{2} u^4 (1 - n_e) > 1 \) \([10]\).

### 3.2 Solution with stripes

The previous solution does not incorporate the symmetry
of the spin couplings. We expect that the charge
density will follow a modular structure similar to the local
couplings \( J_{\epsilon_r} \). We consider therefore the set of trial mean-field solutions with alternating values,
\( n_{m,n} = n_{1} \) if \( n \) is even and \( n_{m,n} = n_{2} \) otherwise when \( n \) is odd

\[
n_{m,n} = \frac{1}{2} n_1 (1 + (-1)^n) + \frac{1}{2} n_2 (1 - (-1)^n).
\]

(39)

We also define the quantities \( v_1 = n_1/(1 - n_1) \) and
\( v_2 = n_2/(1 - n_2) \). The quadratic interaction part of the
action \( (30) \) can be decomposed as

\[
\sum_{m,n} v_{m,n} a_{m,n} a_{m,n}
\]

\[
= \frac{v_1 + v_2}{2} \sum_{k_x,k_y} \left( a_k \bar{a}_k + a_{-k} \bar{a}_{-k} + b_k \bar{b}_k + b_{-k} \bar{b}_{-k} \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{v_1 - v_2}{2} \sum_{k_x,k_y} \left( a_k \bar{b}_k + a_{-k} \bar{b}_{-k} + b_k \bar{a}_k + b_{-k} \bar{a}_{-k} \right).
\]

(40)

After including these terms in \( S_F \), we obtain the fol-
lowing partition function for the frustrated Ising part
that includes the fermion coupling:

\[
Z_F({v_1, v_2}) = \frac{2^N \cosh(K)^{2N}}{(1 + v_1)^{N/2} (1 + v_2)^{N/2}} \prod_{k} \left[ (1 - u^4)^2 + (1 + v_1)^2 (1 + v_2)^2 \right]
\]

\[
\times \left[ 2v_1 v_2 u^2 (1 + v_1) + 2u^4 2u^2 (1 + v_1) (1 + v_2) \right]
\]

\[
\times \left[ \cos (2k_x + \cos (2k_y) \right]
\]

\[
\times \left[ \cos (k_x) \right]
\]

\[
\times \left[ \cos (k_y) \right]
\]

\[
\times \left[ \cos (k_x - 2k_y) \right]
\]

\[
\times \left[ \cos (k_y - 2k_x) \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{2^N \cosh(K)^{2N}}{(1 + v_1)^{N/2} (1 + v_2)^{N/2}} Q_F(v_1, v_2).
\]

(41)

When \( v_1 = v_2 = v \), the last two terms in the product
vanish and we recover equation \( (31) \). \( Z_F(v, v) = Z_F(v) \).
The space asymmetry is revealed by the terms propor-
tional to \( (v_1 - v_2) \). The local self-energies and Green
functions are similarly expressed.
\[ \Sigma_r(\omega_n) = \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_1(\omega_n)(1 + (-1)^n) + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_2(\omega_n)(1 - (-1)^n) \]
\[ = S_1(\omega_n) + (-1)^n S_2(\omega_n), \]
\[ G_r(\omega_n) = \frac{1}{2} G_1(\omega_n)(1 + (-1)^n) + \frac{1}{2} G_2(\omega_n)(1 - (-1)^n), \]
and the determinant \( \Delta_{\omega_n}(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) \) of the fermionic kinetic part defined by
\[ \Delta_{\omega_n}(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) = \det \left( [i\omega_n + \mu - \Sigma_r(\omega_n)]\delta_{r,r'} + t \sum_\delta \delta_{r',r+\delta} \right)_{r,r'} \]
(43)
can be evaluated by considering the eigenvalues \( \lambda \) of the corresponding matrix in the Fourier space. If we note \( \varphi_k \) as the eigenvectors of \( \lambda \), we have the set of secular equations
\[ \begin{align*}
[& i\omega + \mu - S_1 - \epsilon_k - \lambda] \varphi_k - S_2 \bar{\varphi}_k = 0, \\
S_2 \bar{\varphi}_k - [i\omega + \mu - S_1 - \bar{\epsilon}_k - \bar{\lambda}] \varphi_k = 0,
\end{align*} \]
(44)
where \( \varphi_k = \varphi_{k = (k_x, k_y + \pi)} \) and similarly for \( \bar{\epsilon}_k = \epsilon_{k = (k_x, k_y + \pi)} \). This leads to the solutions
\[ \lambda = \lambda_k^\pm(\omega_n) = i\omega + \mu - S_1 - \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon_k + \bar{\epsilon}_k) \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\epsilon_k - \bar{\epsilon}_k)^2 + 4S_2^2}, \]
(45)
and the determinant \( \Delta_{\omega_n}(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) \) is directly equal to
\[ \Delta_{\omega_n}(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) = \left( \prod_k \lambda_k^+ (\omega_n) \lambda_k^- (\omega_n) \right)^2, \]
(46)
where the prime symbol corresponds as before to the sum reduced to the Fourier modes of the Brillouin zone of Fig. 2a, and the square takes into account the remaining modes that correspond to negative values of \( k_y \). The grand potential can then be expressed from Eq. (28) by replacing the different parameters with the trial solution. Thus
\[ \begin{align*}
-\frac{\beta \Omega}{N} &= \ln 2 + 2 \ln \cosh(K) + \frac{1}{2} \ln(1-n_1) + \frac{1}{2} \ln(1-n_2) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega_n} \Sigma_1(\omega_n) G_1(\omega_n) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega_n} \Sigma_2(\omega_n) G_2(\omega_n) \\
&+ \frac{1}{N} \ln Q_F(v_1, v_2) \\
&+ \sum_{\omega_n} \frac{2}{N} \sum_k' \ln(\lambda_k^+ (\omega_n) \lambda_k^- (\omega_n)).
\end{align*} \]
(47)
From this expression, we obtain the mean-field solutions by considering the different derivatives with respect to the quantities \( \{\Sigma_1(\omega_n), G_1(\omega_n), \Sigma_2(\omega_n), G_2(\omega_n)\} \), which leads to the following expressions for the pair of Green functions
\[ G_1(\omega_n) = \frac{2}{N} \sum_k' \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \frac{1}{\lambda_k^\sigma(\omega_n)} \left( 1 - \frac{2\sigma S_2}{\sqrt{(\epsilon_k - \bar{\epsilon}_k)^2 + 4S_2^2}} \right), \]
\[ G_2(\omega_n) = \frac{2}{N} \sum_k' \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \frac{1}{\lambda_k^\sigma(\omega_n)} \left( 1 + \frac{2\sigma S_2}{\sqrt{(\epsilon_k - \bar{\epsilon}_k)^2 + 4S_2^2}} \right), \]
The self-energies moreover satisfy the equations
\[ \begin{align*}
\beta \Sigma_1(\omega_n) &= \frac{1}{1 - n_1} - \frac{2}{(1 - n_1)^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1} \ln Q_F(v_1, v_2), \\
\beta \Sigma_2(\omega_n) &= \frac{1}{1 - n_2} - \frac{2}{(1 - n_2)^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_2} \ln Q_F(v_1, v_2),
\end{align*} \]
(48)
with the density average relation \( n_1 + n_2 = 2n_e \). They depend on the Green functions by the identities
\[ \begin{align*}
n_1 &= \frac{1}{2} + \beta^{-1} \sum_{\omega_n} G_1(\omega_n), \\
n_2 &= \frac{1}{2} + \beta^{-1} \sum_{\omega_n} G_2(\omega_n).
\end{align*} \]
(49)
The previous homogeneous case \( n_1 = n_2 = n_e \) is a particular solution of this set of equations. The associated effective masses \( m_i^e = 1 - \partial_{\mu_i} \Sigma_i \) are evaluated analytically, although the expressions are cumbersome. They can be derived directly from the following two equalities involving the densities of states \( n_{i,j} = \partial_{v_i} n_i \), the derivatives \( \mathcal{F}_i = \partial_{v_i} \ln Q_F(v_1, v_2) \), and \( \mathcal{F}_{i,j} = \partial_{v_i} \partial_{v_j} \ln Q_F(v_1, v_2) \):
\[ \begin{align*}
\beta \frac{\partial \Sigma_1}{\partial \mu} &= \frac{n_1'}{(1 - n_1)^4} \left[ (1 - n_1)^2 - 4(1 - n_1) \mathcal{F}_1 - 2 \mathcal{F}_{1,1} \right] \\
&+ \frac{2n_2'}{(1 - n_1)^2(1 - n_2)^2} \mathcal{F}_{2,1}, \\
\beta \frac{\partial \Sigma_2}{\partial \mu} &= \frac{n_2'}{(1 - n_2)^4} \left[ (1 - n_2)^2 - 4(1 - n_2) \mathcal{F}_2 - 2 \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \right] \\
&+ \frac{2n_1'}{(1 - n_1)^2(1 - n_2)^2} \mathcal{F}_{1,2}.
\end{align*} \]
(50)
The homogeneous solution \( (33) \) is recovered when \( \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = \Sigma \) by noting that \( \mathcal{F}'(v) = \mathcal{F}_{1,1} + \mathcal{F}_{1,2} + \mathcal{F}_{2,1} + \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \). We have plotted in Fig. 5 the effective masses \( m_1^e \) and \( m_2^e \) as a function of the average density \( n_e \). Their value is always less than unity and decreases to a minimum at low temperature. The minimum is more accentuated at low density. In the same figure we have also plotted in dashed lines the homogeneous solution \( m^* \), see equation \( (35) \). We observe in the whole temperature regime that \( m_1^* > m_2^* > m^* \) and that \( \Lambda > 0. \)
For a given density $n_e$, we define the free energy using the relation $F = \Omega + N\mu(n_e - 1/2)$. In Fig. 6, we have plotted the specific heat $C_v = -T\partial^2\Omega/\partial T^2$ for different chemical potentials, and in Fig. 7 the specific heat in the canonical ensemble $C_v = -T\partial^2 F/\partial T^2$. The relative density $(n_2 - n_1)/(n_2 + n_1)$ shows that the fermions predominantly align along the frustrated coupling lines, depending on the initial conditions. If we consider the ratio $C_v/T$ at low temperature, which in the theory of Fermi liquids tends to a constant proportional to the effective mass [26], it appears that this coefficient decreases with density in the canonical ensemble, see inset of Fig. 7. This is consistent with an effective mass decreasing with the density of fermions. However, in the inset of Fig. 6, the ratio $C_v/T$ at low densities or for low chemical potential seems to diverge in the grand canonical ensemble, which is inconsistent with a finite entropy and probably due to the mean-field approximation. This behavior can be seen experimentally in the ground state of some spin-ice systems such as DyTi$_2$O$_7$ [27], where a non-vanishing specific heat at zero temperature was observed, suggesting a spin-glass transition due to the increase in the spin relaxation time and macroscopic degeneracy of the ground state. This problem is not solved in our mean-field approximation and requires a more precise analysis. However, at higher temperature and above the Schottky peak, the decoupling between spins and fermions is evidenced in Fig. 6 by the dashed line which corresponds to the sum of the two independent specific heat values of the undiluted spin system and free fermions. The magnitude of the Schottky peak seems to suggest a strong coupling effect between the spins and fermions in the low-temperature regime near $T \simeq J$.

4 Numerical results with a classical model

In this section we present a Monte Carlo algorithm based on the diffusion of classical particles on the frustrated PUD lattice. The particles in the model (1) are considered classical in order to simplify the numerical difficulties inherent in quantum Monte Carlo algorithms. We expect however qualitative results that can be applied to the quantum case. Monte Carlo simulations on classical particle-spin models were performed [6] to mimic the physics of “telephone number” or ladder compounds such as cuprates (La, Sr, Ca)$_{14}$Cu$_{24}$O$_{41+\delta}$ [28]. Their idea is to construct a spin-1 Hamiltonian with, in particular, ferromagnetic couplings between spins $\sigma_r = \pm 1$ on the horizontal lines and antiferromagnetic couplings on the vertical lines. The holes or defects are represented by $\sigma_r = 0$, and the two horizontal spins
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**Fig. 5** Effective masses $m_{1*}$ and $m_{2*}$ as a function of the temperature for different densities $n_e$ ($L = 150$). The dotted lines represent the solution $m^*$ in the homogeneous case.
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**Fig. 6** Specific heat as a function of the temperature for different chemical potentials ($L = 200$). The dotted line is the specific heat for the spins of the undiluted PUD system, and the dashed line is the sum of the previous specific heat with the specific heat of free fermions at $\mu = 0$, which corresponds to low density of particles. At high temperature, it coincides with the correlated system. In the insets are represented the relative difference of the densities and the ratio $C_v/T$. This ratio diverges at low temperature for low density or low chemical potential.
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**Fig. 7** Specific heat in the canonical ensemble as a function of the temperature for different fermion densities ($L = 200$). In the insets are represented the relative difference of the densities and the ratio $C_v/T$. This ratio tends to a constant at low temperature, which decreases with density.
surrounding the hole are connected by one antiferromagnetic coupling. The phase diagram displays vertical lines of holes as they tend to form stripes at low temperature. Although the model does not incorporate frustration, the appearance of stripes seems to depend strongly on the experimental coupling values and the choice of their configurations on the lattice. The corresponding classical Hamiltonian includes quadratic spin-spin couplings as well as a quartic term that represents the presence of the itinerant holes.

The algorithm presented in this section is performed at fixed particle density. Each move is described by the following procedure: Each site is occupied by a spin or hole, and at every update a site is randomly chosen. If the site is occupied by a spin, its direction is reversed and the new configuration is updated depending on the acceptation rate. If the site is occupied by a hole, it is exchanged randomly with one of the four neighboring spins (or possibly holes), mimicking the kinetic transfer but without energy scale $t$. The simulations consist of $10000 \times N$ updates or $10000$ MC steps at different temperatures and concentrations of particles. In Fig. 8 are plotted two final configurations at $n_e = 0.4$ and for two different temperatures. At low temperature, the holes tend to align along the ferromagnetic couplings and they form an alternating structure of stripes. For higher temperatures, this alignment breaks into smaller linear hole structures. The system seems to minimize the frustration by forming linear arrangements along the ferromagnetic couplings. We should also note that positioning the holes along the antiferromagnetic couplings should also be a solution, as this should lower the energy as well, and this solution indeed appears to depend on the initial conditions for the set of self-consistent equations. In order to probe the stripe formation and the coherence of these structures, we have plotted in Fig. 9 horizontal and vertical correlators $C_{\text{right}}$ and $C_{\text{up}}$, which are defined as follows: We count the number of sets of two fermions that are aligned horizontally or vertically, respectively, which provides insight into the stripe structure. We observe in this figure that the horizontal correlations are indeed larger than the vertical ones for temperatures approximately below the coupling value $J$, which is the threshold for the formation of stripes. We also note that for low densities, these observables are highly fluctuating, as the probability of finding two fermions close to each other is smaller than for denser configurations.

5 Conclusion

Properties of itinerant fermions in a frustrated dilute spin medium with indirect interaction induced by doping were analyzed in order to probe the effect of spin fluctuations and frustration. The fermions are found to organize themselves into lines or stripes along the antiferromagnetic or ferromagnetic lines in order to reduce
the frustration. These lines arise because of the geometrical constraint imposed by the PUD couplings, which are the lines along which frustration can be lowered by distributing the holes. In the ZZD model, these holes would self-organize differently. The effective mass in the mean-field approximation decreases in the regime of low temperature and low fermion density. This is consistent with the limiting value of \( C_v/T \) in the canonical ensemble at low temperature. In the high-temperature regime, the effective mass is less than unity, contrary to the non-frustrated Ising case. This suggests that spin fluctuations decrease the effective mass when the system possesses some degree of frustration. The presence of low-temperature anomalies at low density in the grand canonical specific heat could be explained by a possible spin-glass solution of the ground state which is not reported by our approximation, or an artifact of this approximation. Such anomalies were however previously observed in the specific heat of spin-ice materials [27], which may point to a complex ground state. Our model can be generalized with negative couplings different from \( -J \), which induces either a ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic phase transition. It is worth considering in this case the influence of the proximity of a phase transition on the effective mass at low temperature. A more precise theoretical analysis would effectively lead to greater insight, using either diagrammatic methods or dynamical mean-field theory. The latter method may be implemented starting from the original Hamiltonian, which appears to be similar to a model of spinless fermions with repulsive or attractive next-nearest interactions.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Christophe Chatelain for useful discussions.

Author contributions

JYF contributed to the development, the analytical calculations, and management of the project. PL contributed to the analytical calculations and performed the numerical simulations.

Data Availability Statement This manuscript has no associated data or the data will not be deposited. [Authors’ comment: This method is part of a work in progress.]

References

1. S.-W. Cheong, H.. Y. Hwang, C.. H.. Chen, B. Batlogg, L.. W.. Jr. Ruupp, S.. A.. Carter, Charge-ordered states in (La,Sr)\(_2\)NiO\(_4\) for hole concentrations \( n_h = 1/3 \) and 1/2. Phys. Rev. B 49(10), 7088 (1994)
2. J.M. Tranquada, B.J. Sternlieb, J.D. Axe, Y. Nakamura, S. Uchida, Stripe correlations of spins and holes in copper oxide superconductors. Nature 375, 561–563 (1995)
3. P. Monthoux, D. Pines, G.G. Lonzarich, Superconductivity without phonons. Nature 450(7173), 1177–1183 (2007)
4. Paul E. Scesney, Mobile-electron Ising ferromagnet. Phys. Rev. B 1(5), 2274–2288 (1970)
5. I.Q. Silakana, J.E. Lowther, Sublattice structure of a site dilute Ising lattice. Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) 167, 281–290 (1991)
6. W. Selke, V.L. Pokrovsky, B. Buechner, T. Kroll. Ising magnets with mobile defects. Eur. Phys. J. B 30(1), 83–92 (2002)
7. Hana Čenčárková, Pavol Farkášovský, M Žonda. Model of magnetic ordering in coupled electron and spin systems. J. Phys.: Conf. Ser., 200:012018, (2010)
8. Yin Wei Guo, Lee Chi-Cheng, Ku. Wei. Unified picture for magnetic correlations in iron-based superconductors. Phys. Rev. Lett. 105(10), 107004 (2010)
9. R. Mondaini, T. Paiva, R.T. Scalettar, Magnetic and metal-insulator transitions in coupled spin-fermion systems. Phys. Rev. B 90(14), 144418 (2014)
10. Jean Yves Fortin, Singular self-energy for itinerant electrons in a dilute Ising spin bath. J. Phys. Condens. Matter 33, 085602 (2021)
11. V.J. Emery, S.A. Kivelson, J.M. Tranquada, Stripe phases in high-temperature superconductors. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 96(16), 8814–8817 (1999)
12. John M. Tranquada, Spins, stripes, and superconductivity in hole-doped cuprates. AIP Conf. Proc. 1550, 114–187 (2013)
13. M. Clusel, J.-Y. Fortin, Grassmann techniques applied to classical spin systems. Condens. Matter Phys. 12(3), 463–478 (2009)
14. A. Lichtenstein. Path integrals and dual fermions. In E. Pavarini, E. Koch, R. Scalettar, and R. M. Martin, editors, The Physics of Correlated Insulators, Metals, and Superconductors, Modeling and Simulation Vol. 7. Verlag des Forschungszentrum Jülich, (2017)
15. G. Andre, R. Bidaux, S.P. Carton, R. Conte, L. de Seze, Frustration in periodic systems: Exact results for some 2D Ising models. J. Phys. Paris 40(5), 479–488 (1979)
16. V.N. Plechko, Simple solution of two-dimensional Ising model on a torus in terms of Grassmann integrals. Theo. Math. Phys. 64, 748–756 (1985)
17. V.N. Plechko, The method of Grassmann multipliers in the Ising model. Sov. Phys. Doklady 30, 271–273 (1985)
18. V.N. Plechko, Fermionic integrals and analytic solutions for two-dimensional Ising models. J. Phys. Stud. (Ukr) 1(4), 554–563 (1997)
19. V.N. Plechko, Free fermions two-dimensional Ising model. J. Phys. Stud. 3, 312–330 (1999)
20. V.N. Plechko, Fermionic structure of two-dimensional Ising model with quenched site dilution. Phys. Lett. A 239(4), 289–299 (1998)
21. V.N. Plechko, Fermionic path integrals and two-dimensional Ising model with quenched site disorder, in Path Integrals from PeV to TeV: 50 Years after Feynman’s Paper, ed. by R. Casalbuoni, R. Giachetti, V. Tognetti, R. Vaia, P. Verrucchi, pp. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999), pp. 137–141
22. V.N. Plechko, Fermions and disorder in Ising and related models in two dimensions. Phys. Part. Nucl. 41(7), 1054–1060 (2010)
23. Alexander Altland and Ben D. Simons. *Condensed Matter Field Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, (2010)

24. Gerald D. Mahan. *Many-particle physics*. Physics of solids and liquids. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 3rd ed edition, (2000). pages 128 and 368

25. R. Asgari, B. Davoudi, M. Polini, Gabriele F. Giuliani, M. P. Tosi, G. Vignale, Quasiparticle self-energy and many-body effective mass enhancement in a two-dimensional electron liquid. Phys. Rev. B 71(4), 045323 (2005)

26. C.M. Varma, Z. Nussinov, Wim Van Saarloos. Singular non-Fermi liquids. Phys. Rep. 361, 267–417 (2002)

27. D. Pomaranski, L.R. Yaraskavitch, S. Meng, K.A. Ross, H.M.L. Noad, H.A. Dabkowska, B.D. Gaulin, J.B. Kycia, Absence of Pauling’s residual entropy in thermally equilibrated Dy₂Ti₂O₇. Nat. Phys. 9(6), 353–356 (2013)

28. Mark S. Golden, Christian Dürr, Andreas Koitzsch, Sibylle Legner, Zhiwei Hu, Sergey Borisenko, Martin Knupfer, Jörg. Fink, The electronic structure of cuprates from high energy spectroscopy. J. Electron Spectros. Relat. Phenomena 203—222, 117–118 (2001)