

# Proof that Momentum Mixing Hatsugai Kohmoto equals the Twisted Hubbard Model

Yuting Bai<sup>1,\*</sup> and Philip W. Phillips<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Institute of Condensed Matter Theory,  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA*

(Dated: December 2024)

We prove formally that the momentum-mixing Hatsugai-Kohmoto model (MMHK) is the Hubbard model with a twist. With this result in tow, we rely on the proof of Watanabe's that two models which differ by a twist must have the same bulk physics. Consequently, we have proven that MMHK=Hubbard in the charge sector.

The dichotomy between localized and itinerant electrons leads to two distinct kinds of electronic eigenstates in quantum materials. For example, while the band picture of metals places electrons in Bloch states with a well-defined momentum, Mott physics is thought to reside in the opposite real-space or local limit where electrons live on atomic sites. Enshrining the latter is the Hubbard model in which an on-site repulsion frustrates the motion of electrons throughout the lattice. Because of the hopping term, no eigenstate of the Hubbard model preserves on-site particle number. As a result, understanding the Mott gap in real space is elusive. In momentum space, the problem is equally hopeless as the on-site repulsion mixes all momenta. Nonetheless, numerics[1–25] and exact Bethe ansatz[26] methods affirm the presence of dispersing lower and upper Hubbard bands in momentum space with a gap between them. Such momentum space bands ultimately suggest that a momentum-space picture of the Mott problem must exist. Indeed, a formulation of the Mott problem along these lines would then put the standard formulation of metals and Mottness on the same footing, thereby solving the Mott problem.

It is precisely such a formulation that we address here. Hatsugai and Kohmoto[27] took the first step along these lines with their momentum-space analogue,

$$H_{\text{HK}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} U n_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} n_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow} \quad (1)$$

of the Hubbard model. This model is exactly solvable and yields an insulator anytime the interaction exceeds the bandwidth. While this model lacks the momentum mixing of Hubbard, a continuous deformation between the two exists as has been recently formulated[28]. The trick[28] is to put in all the momentum mixing the HK model leaves out. We have shown that the momentum-mixing HK (MMHK) model[28] leads to accurate results with minimal computational cost.

What remains to be done is a formal mathematical proof that MMHK and Hubbard model have the same behavior in the charge sector. We provide that proof here.

In constructing this proof, it is useful to review the MMHK[28] scheme. For simplicity, we start with 2D band HK model. MMHK starts by introducing momentum scattering with the largest momentum transfer possible:  $\mathbf{k} + (\pi, \pi)$ . The interaction that this introduces into the HK model is of

the form,

$$H_{\text{int}, n=2}^{\text{MMHK}} = \frac{U}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \text{BZ}} \sum_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}=(0,0), (\pi, \pi)} c_{\mathbf{k}, \uparrow}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{Q}, \uparrow} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{P}, \downarrow}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{P}+\mathbf{Q}, \downarrow}, \quad (2)$$

Consider now the transformation:  $c_{\mathbf{k}A\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + c_{\mathbf{k}+(\pi, \pi), \sigma})$  and  $c_{\mathbf{k}B\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} - c_{\mathbf{k}+(\pi, \pi), \sigma})$ . In this new basis,  $H_{\text{int}, n=2}^{\text{MMHK}}$  is diagonal in  $n_{\mathbf{k}A\sigma}$  and  $n_{\mathbf{k}B\sigma}$ , taking on the form,

$$H_{\text{int}, N=2}^{\text{MMHK}} = U \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \text{rBZ}_2} \sum_{a=A, B} n_{\mathbf{k}a, \uparrow} n_{\mathbf{k}a, \downarrow}. \quad (3)$$

However, under the new basis, the kinetic term becomes,

$$T_{N=2}^{\text{MMHK}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \text{rBZ}_2, \sigma} \sum_{a, b=A, B} [\epsilon(\mathbf{k})]_{ab} c_{\mathbf{k}a, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}b, \sigma} \quad (4)$$

where,

$$\epsilon(k)_{ab} \equiv \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) + (-1)^{\delta_{ab}} \epsilon(\mathbf{k} + (\pi, \pi))] \quad (5)$$

thereby breaking the commutativity enjoyed by the equivalent terms in the HK model. It is from this non-commutativity that Hubbard dynamics arises. The procedure of turning on the largest momentum transfer and downfolding the Brillouin zone can be done iteratively. After  $n$  iterations, the resultant Hamiltonian,

$$H_{\text{int}, n}^{\text{MMHK}} = \frac{U}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \text{BZ}} \sum_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in B_n} c_{\mathbf{k}, \uparrow}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{Q}, \uparrow} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{P}, \downarrow}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{P}+\mathbf{Q}, \downarrow}, \quad (6)$$

contains an interaction term in which  $2^n$  momenta are coupled and possible momentum transfer is restricted to a finite set  $B_n$  with cardinality  $|B_n| = n$ . The reason why such a controlled expansion is achievable in  $\mathbf{k}$  space instead of real space is that the HK model is controlled by a fixed point that maximally breaks the  $Z_2$  symmetry[29] of a Fermi liquid.

Similarly, we find that  $H_{\text{int}, n}^{\text{MMHK}}$  is diagonal in the basis where  $n$  momenta are grouped into a single cell. To do this, we parametrize the whole Brillouin zone via  $B_n$ , the set of all possible momentum transfers. Then, any  $\mathbf{k} \in \text{BZ}$  can be decomposed as a sum of  $\mathbf{K} \in B_n$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \text{rBZ}_n \simeq \text{BZ}/B_n$ . Defining  $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{q}$ , and construct the new basis  $c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}\sigma}$ ,

$$c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}, \sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\mathbf{K} \in B_n} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}} c_{\mathbf{K}+\mathbf{q}, \sigma}, \quad (7)$$

through the appropriate Fourier transform on  $\mathbf{K}$ . After a partial Fourier transform, we find that  $H_{\text{int},n}^{\text{MMHK}}$

$$H_{\text{int},n}^{\text{MMHK}} = U \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{rBZ}_n} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} n_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R},\uparrow} n_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R},\downarrow}, \quad (8)$$

which lays plain[29] the diagonal structure and hence the  $Z_2$ -fixed point breaking structure.

Intuitively, when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we recover all momentum mixings and  $\text{rBZ}_n$  shrinks to a point. Hence, one intuitively expects that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{\text{int},n}^{\text{MMHK}}$  is related to the local in real space Hubbard interaction. Here, we present a rigorous proof that the  $n \rightarrow \infty$  limit of n-MMHK is the Hubbard model with twisted boundary conditions.

To prove this requires an analysis of the kinetic part,

$$T_n^{\text{MMHK}} = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{rBZ}_n} \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_a, \mathbf{R}_b} [T(\mathbf{q})]_{ab} c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_a, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_b, \sigma} \quad (9)$$

where,

$$[T(\mathbf{q})]_{ab} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{K} \in \mathbf{B}_n} e^{-i\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_a - \mathbf{R}_b)} \epsilon(\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{q}). \quad (10)$$

The momenta are summed over  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_d) \in \text{BZ}_n$ , a  $d$ -dimensional vector in the Brillouin zone. For large enough  $n$  and a smooth dispersion  $\epsilon(\mathbf{k})$ ,  $\|\mathbf{q}\| \leq \frac{\pi}{n}$ , always lies in the convergence radius of its Taylor series, which we write as

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{n_1=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{n_2=0}^{+\infty} \dots \sum_{n_d=0}^{+\infty} \frac{\epsilon^{(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)}(\mathbf{K})}{\prod_{m=1}^d n_m!} \prod_{m=1}^d q_m^{n_m}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\epsilon^{(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)}(\mathbf{K}) \equiv \partial_{K_1}^{n_1} \partial_{K_2}^{n_2} \dots \partial_{K_d}^{n_d} \epsilon(\mathbf{K}) = \prod_{m=1}^d \partial_{K_m}^{n_m} \epsilon(\mathbf{K})$ . We then perform the inverse transform of (7),

$$c_{\mathbf{K}+\mathbf{q}, \sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}} c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}, \sigma}. \quad (12)$$

In this new basis,  $c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}, \sigma}$ , the  $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)$  order term in the expansion is

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{K} \in \mathbf{B}_n} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_1} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_2} \epsilon^{(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)}(\mathbf{K}) e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)} c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_1, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_2, \sigma}. \quad (13)$$

In the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the summation can be well approximated by an integration:  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{K} \in \mathbf{B}_n} \simeq \int \frac{d^d K}{(2\pi)^d}$ . This allows us to perform integration by part on  $\epsilon^{(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)}(\mathbf{K})$ , which yields

$$\int \frac{d^d K}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)} \prod_{m=1}^d \partial_{K_m}^{n_m} \epsilon(\mathbf{K}) = \int \frac{d^d K}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)} \prod_{m=1}^d [-i(\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)_m]^{n_m} \epsilon(\mathbf{K}). \quad (14)$$

We then perform the summation over  $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d)$ ,

$$\sum_{n_1=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{n_2=0}^{+\infty} \dots \sum_{n_d=0}^{+\infty} \prod_{m=1}^d \frac{[-iq_m(\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)_m]^{n_m}}{n_m!} = e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)} \quad (15)$$

which yields a phase factor. The exchange of integration and summation is allowed due to analyticity of the Taylor expansion. Thus, in the new basis  $c_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{R}, \sigma}$ ,

$$\int \frac{d^d K}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2} \epsilon(\mathbf{K}) e^{i(\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{q}) \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)} c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_1, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_2, \sigma}. \quad (16)$$

Recall that for a tight-binding model with  $n$  sites and hopping amplitude  $t_{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2}$ ,

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{K}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2} e^{-i\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)} t_{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2}, \quad (17)$$

the integration over  $\mathbf{K}$  yields  $t_{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2}$ . We conclude then that

within the new basis,  $c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R},\sigma}$ ,

$$T_{\mathbf{q},\sigma} = \sum_{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2} t_{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2} e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)} c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_1, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R}_2, \sigma}. \quad (18)$$

Hence, we have shown that the nMMHK model in the large  $n$  limit is equivalent to a Hubbard model with a twist in the boundary conditions. That is,

$$H_{\text{nMMHK}} = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \text{rBZ}_n} \sum_{\sigma} T_{\mathbf{q}\sigma} + H_{\text{int},n}^{\text{MMHK}}. \quad (19)$$

One may read off the twist from the hopping phase  $e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_2)}$ . For fixed  $\mathbf{q}$  and lattice of size  $\mathbf{N} = (N_1, N_2, \dots, N_d)$ , the corresponding twist in the boundary condition is  $(q_1 N_1, q_2 N_2, \dots, q_d N_d)$ , since  $\mathbf{q} \in \text{rBZ}_n$ .

We now invoke the theorem by Watanabe[30] to see if any of the gapped structure which is present in HK and any momentum-mixing version survives the twist in the boundary conditions. He has shown that a twist in the boundary conditions cannot lead to a gap closing in the Kallen-Lehmann spectrum [31]. Although the original conclusion only applies to a gapped Hamiltonian, which is not the case for Hubbard model since its spin sector is gapless, one can still apply Watanabe's theorem[31] by restricting his inequality in Eq. (2) to the charge sector. The key to this proof is exponential fall-off of the correlations in the presence of a spectral gap. As shown by Hastings[32], operators in the charge sector exhibit exponentially decaying correlations as a result of

the charge or Mott gap in the spectral function. Consequently, if the  $n \rightarrow \infty$  limit of MMHK has a charge gap, then so does the Hubbard model. This argument also works in reverse. Since the MMHK construction applies to any dimension, we have shown that all Hubbard models possess a charge gap that smoothly interpolates between the weak and strong-coupling limits at half-filling.

The error incurred in converting sums to integrals can be estimated explicitly. In fact, the error between nMMHK and  $n$ -site Hubbard has two origins. One is from the replacement of the summation,  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{K} \in \text{B}_n} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}} f(\mathbf{K})$  with the integral,  $\int \frac{d^d \mathbf{K}}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}} f(\mathbf{K})$ . The second is from the twist in the boundary conditions.

We first address the replacement of the summation with an integral. Since all the integrands are defined on the Brillouin zone, any Fourier transform of the form,

$$f(\mathbf{K}) = \sum_{\mathbf{l}} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{l}} c_{\mathbf{l}}, \quad (20)$$

is allowed. Here  $\mathbf{l} = (l_1, l_2, \dots, l_d)$  labels each Fourier component and  $c_{-\mathbf{l}} = c_{\mathbf{l}}^*$ , with a physical interpretation of  $c_{\mathbf{l}}$  being the hopping amplitude from site  $\mathbf{r}$  to site  $\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{l}$ . We may calculate  $\Delta I_n(\mathbf{R})$ , the error between the discrete sum  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{K} \in \text{B}_n} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}} f(\mathbf{K})$  and the continuous integral  $\int \frac{d^d \mathbf{K}}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R}} f(\mathbf{K})$ . Consider this difference for each Fourier component  $e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{l}}$ ,

$$\Delta I_{n,\mathbf{l}}(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{K}} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{l})} - \int \frac{d^d \mathbf{K}}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{l})} = \sum_{\mathbf{Q} \in \otimes_{i=1}^d \mathbf{N}_i \mathbf{Z}} \delta_{\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{Q}} - \delta_{\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{l}}. \quad (21)$$

We then calculate  $\Delta I_n(\mathbf{R})$  by summing over the error of each Fourier component,  $\Delta I_n(\mathbf{R}) = \sum_{\mathbf{l}} \Delta \mathbf{I}_{n,\mathbf{l}}(\mathbf{R}) c_{\mathbf{l}}$ ,

$$\Delta I_n(\mathbf{R}) = \sum_{\mathbf{Q} \in \otimes_{i=1}^d \mathbf{N}_i \mathbf{Z}} \delta_{\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{Q}} c_{\mathbf{n}} - c_{-\mathbf{R}}. \quad (22)$$

For a model with finite-range hopping  $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{B}}$ ,  $c_{\mathbf{n}} = 0$  for  $\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{B}}$ . Consequently, these two terms exhibit no difference  $\forall \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{N}_i > \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{B}}$ . Hence, the error due to twisted boundary conditions is exponentially small in the  $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow \infty$  limit [31].

We have proved that the recently formulated MMHK model differs from Hubbard by just a twist in the boundary conditions. As shown by Watanabe[30], any two gapped models that share only this difference must have the same bulk properties. As MMHK shows a charge gap so does Hubbard. Consequently, MMHK is an accurate simulator of the charge sector of Hubbard physics.

**Acknowledgements:** We thank Erica Macgee and Amir Ibrahim for characteristically level-headed remarks on the convergence of MMHK to Hubbard.

\* Electronic address: yutingb2@illinois.edu

† Electronic address: dimer@illinois.edu

- [1] Antoine Georges, Gabriel Kotliar, Werner Krauth, and Marcelo J Rozenberg. Dynamical mean-field theory of strongly correlated fermion systems and the limit of infinite dimensions. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 68(1):13, 1996.
- [2] Bo-Xiao Zheng, Chia-Min Chung, Philippe Corboz, Georg Ehlers, Ming-Pu Qin, Reinhard M. Noack, Hao Shi, Steven R. White, Shiwei Zhang, and Garnet Kin-Lic Chan. Stripe order in the underdoped region of the two-dimensional hubbard model. *Science*, 358(6367):1155–1160, 2017.
- [3] Edwin W. Huang, Christian B. Mendl, Hong-Chen Jiang, Brian Moritz, and Thomas P. Devereaux. Stripe order from the perspective of the hubbard model. *npj Quantum Materials*, 3(1):22, 2018.
- [4] Mingpu Qin, Chia-Min Chung, Hao Shi, Ettore Vitali, Claudius Hubig, Ulrich Schollwöck, Steven R. White, and Shiwei Zhang. Absence of superconductivity in the pure two-dimensional hub-

- bard model. *Phys. Rev. X*, 10:031016, Jul 2020.
- [5] Mingpu Qin, Hao Shi, and Shiwei Zhang. Benchmark study of the two-dimensional hubbard model with auxiliary-field quantum monte carlo method. *Phys. Rev. B*, 94:085103, Aug 2016.
  - [6] J. P. F. LeBlanc, Andrey E. Antipov, Federico Becca, Ireneusz W. Bulik, Garnet Kin-Lic Chan, Chia-Min Chung, Youjin Deng, Michel Ferrero, Thomas M. Henderson, Carlos A. Jiménez-Hoyos, E. Kozik, Xuan-Wen Liu, Andrew J. Millis, N. V. Prokof'ev, Mingpu Qin, Gustavo E. Scuseria, Hao Shi, B. V. Svistunov, Luca F. Tocchio, I. S. Tupitsyn, Steven R. White, Shiwei Zhang, Bo-Xiao Zheng, Zhenyue Zhu, and Emanuel Gull. Solutions of the two-dimensional hubbard model: Benchmarks and results from a wide range of numerical algorithms. *Phys. Rev. X*, 5:041041, Dec 2015.
  - [7] Wenhui Xu, Kristjan Haule, and Gabriel Kotliar. Hidden fermi liquid, scattering rate saturation, and nernst effect: A dynamical mean-field theory perspective. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 111:036401, Jul 2013.
  - [8] Xiaoyu Deng, Jernej Mravlje, Rok Žitko, Michel Ferrero, Gabriel Kotliar, and Antoine Georges. How bad metals turn good: Spectroscopic signatures of resilient quasiparticles. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:086401, Feb 2013.
  - [9] H. Park, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar. Cluster dynamical mean field theory of the mott transition. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 101:186403, Oct 2008.
  - [10] S. S. Kancharla, B. Kyung, D. Sénéchal, M. Civelli, M. Capone, G. Kotliar, and A.-M. S. Tremblay. Anomalous superconductivity and its competition with antiferromagnetism in doped mott insulators. *Phys. Rev. B*, 77:184516, May 2008.
  - [11] Thomas Maier, Mark Jarrell, Thomas Pruschke, and Matthias H. Hettler. Quantum cluster theories. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 77:1027–1080, Oct 2005.
  - [12] Peizhi Mai, Seher Karakuzu, Giovanni Balduzzi, Steven Johnston, and Thomas A. Maier. Intertwined spin, charge, and pair correlations in the two-dimensional hubbard model in the thermodynamic limit. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(7):e2112806119, 2022.
  - [13] Peizhi Mai, Nathan S. Nichols, Seher Karakuzu, Feng Bao, Adrian Del Maestro, Thomas A. Maier, and Steven Johnston. Robust charge-density-wave correlations in the electron-doped single-band hubbard model. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):2889, 2023.
  - [14] Philipp Werner, Emanuel Gull, Olivier Parcollet, and Andrew J. Millis. Momentum-selective metal-insulator transition in the two-dimensional hubbard model: An 8-site dynamical cluster approximation study. *Phys. Rev. B*, 80:045120, Jul 2009.
  - [15] G. Rohringer, H. Hafermann, A. Toschi, A. A. Katanin, A. E. Antipov, M. I. Katsnelson, A. I. Lichtenstein, A. N. Rubtsov, and K. Held. Diagrammatic routes to nonlocal correlations beyond dynamical mean field theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 90:025003, May 2018.
  - [16] J. P. F. LeBlanc, Andrey E. Antipov, Federico Becca, Ireneusz W. Bulik, Garnet Kin-Lic Chan, Chia-Min Chung, Youjin Deng, Michel Ferrero, Thomas M. Henderson, Carlos A. Jiménez-Hoyos, E. Kozik, Xuan-Wen Liu, Andrew J. Millis, N. V. Prokof'ev, Mingpu Qin, Gustavo E. Scuseria, Hao Shi, B. V. Svistunov, Luca F. Tocchio, I. S. Tupitsyn, Steven R. White, Shiwei Zhang, Bo-Xiao Zheng, Zhenyue Zhu, and Emanuel Gull. Solutions of the two-dimensional hubbard model: Benchmarks and results from a wide range of numerical algorithms. *Phys. Rev. X*, 5:041041, Dec 2015.
  - [17] Thomas Schäfer, Alessandro Toschi, and Karsten Held. Dynamical vertex approximation for the two-dimensional hubbard model. *Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials*, 400:107–111, 2016. Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Magnetism (Barcelona) 5-10 July 2015.
  - [18] Thomas Schäfer, Nils Wentzell, Fedor Šimkovic, Yuan-Yao He, Cornelia Hille, Marcel Klett, Christian J. Eckhardt, Behnam Arzhang, Viktor Harkov, François-Marie Le Régent, Alfred Kirsch, Yan Wang, Aaram J. Kim, Evgeny Kozik, Evgeny A. Stepanov, Anna Kauch, Sabine Andergassen, Philipp Hansmann, Daniel Rohe, Yuri M. Vilk, James P. F. LeBlanc, Shiwei Zhang, A.-M. S. Tremblay, Michel Ferrero, Olivier Parcollet, and Antoine Georges. Tracking the footprints of spin fluctuations: A multimethod, multimessenger study of the two-dimensional hubbard model. *Phys. Rev. X*, 11:011058, Mar 2021.
  - [19] A. N. Rubtsov, M. I. Katsnelson, and A. I. Lichtenstein. Dual fermion approach to nonlocal correlations in the hubbard model. *Phys. Rev. B*, 77:033101, Jan 2008.
  - [20] Tudor D. Stanescu and Gabriel Kotliar. Fermi arcs and hidden zeros of the green function in the pseudogap state. *Phys. Rev. B*, 74:125110, Sep 2006.
  - [21] Michel Ferrero, Pablo S. Cornaglia, Lorenzo De Leo, Olivier Parcollet, Gabriel Kotliar, and Antoine Georges. Pseudogap opening and formation of fermi arcs as an orbital-selective mott transition in momentum space. *Phys. Rev. B*, 80:064501, Aug 2009.
  - [22] Wei Wu, Mathias S. Scheurer, Shubhayu Chatterjee, Subir Sachdev, Antoine Georges, and Michel Ferrero. Pseudogap and fermi-surface topology in the two-dimensional hubbard model. *Phys. Rev. X*, 8:021048, May 2018.
  - [23] Emanuel Gull, Olivier Parcollet, and Andrew J. Millis. Superconductivity and the pseudogap in the two-dimensional hubbard model. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:216405, May 2013.
  - [24] Edwin W. Huang, Ryan Sheppard, Brian Moritz, and Thomas P. Devereaux. Strange metallicity in the doped hubbard model. *Science*, 366(6468):987–990, 2019.
  - [25] Peter T. Brown, Debayan Mitra, Elmer Guardado-Sanchez, Reza Nourafkan, Alexis Reymbaut, Charles-David Hébert, Simon Bergeron, A.-M. S. Tremblay, Jure Kokalj, David A. Huse, Peter Schauf, and Waseem S. Bakr. Bad metallic transport in a cold atom fermi-hubbard system. *Science*, 363(6425):379–382, 2019.
  - [26] Elliott H. Lieb and F. Y. Wu. Absence of mott transition in an exact solution of the short-range, one-band model in one dimension. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 20:1445–1448, Jun 1968.
  - [27] Yasuhiro Hatsugai and Mahito Kohmoto. Exactly solvable model of correlated lattice electrons in any dimensions. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 61(6):2056–2069, 1992.
  - [28] Peizhi Mai, Jinchao Zhao, Gaurav Tenkila, Nico A. Hackner, Dhruv Kush, Derek Pan, and Philip W. Phillips. Twisting the hubbard model into the momentum-mixing hatsugai-kohmoto model. *Nature Physics (published 28 November 2025)*, 2025.
  - [29] Jinchao Zhao, Gabriele La Nave, and Philip W. Phillips. Proof of a stable fixed point for strongly correlated electron matter. *Phys. Rev. B*, 108:165135, Oct 2023.
  - [30] Haruki Watanabe and Ashvin Vishwanath. Criterion for stability of Goldstone modes and Fermi liquid behavior in a metal with broken symmetry. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 111(46):16314–16318, nov 2014.
  - [31] Haruki Watanabe. Insensitivity of bulk properties to the twisted boundary condition. *Phys. Rev. B*, 98:155137, Oct 2018.
  - [32] Matthew B Hastings and Tohru Koma. Spectral gap and exponential decay of correlations. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 265(3):781–804, 2006.