The thermal Hall conductance of a symmetry-breaking topological insulator
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In this note we point out that a model proposed by Hsu, Raghu and Chakravarty\textsuperscript{[1]} has the potential to explain the unusual thermal Hall effect reported in Ref.\textsuperscript{[2]}. This model describes a topological insulator that breaks the spin rotation and point group symmetries. But it preserves the time-reversal symmetry. This insulator possesses staggered spin current loops. Like the spin Hall insulator, it exhibits helical edge modes, which are protected by the time reversal and/or the U(1) spin rotation around the symmetry-breaking axis. These edge modes conduct heat, and in the presence of a magnetic field produce a thermal Hall conductivity \( \kappa_{xy} / T \), which increases monotonically with magnetic field. Nonetheless the electric Hall conductance is zero. Like the quantum spin Hall insulator, there should be non-zero spin Hall and quantized two-terminal electrical conductances. The helical edge modes persist in the presence of the Neel order, so long as the latter is not too strong. Upon charge doping the system becomes a metal with Fermi pockets. However, the edge states persist hence their thermal transport properties remain.

Introduction

Symmetry-protected topological states (SPTs) has attracted lots of interests in recent years. These states do not break any Hamiltonian symmetry and are fully gapped in the bulk. In the presence of boundary, SPTs are characterized by gapless boundary modes. Importantly, as long as the protection symmetry is unbroken the gapless boundary states are protected.

Spontaneous symmetry breaking is ubiquitous among many-body systems. In the presence of such symmetry breaking the symmetry group \( G \) of the Hamiltonian is broken down to a subgroup \( H \). Due to the protection of \( H \), the symmetry breaking phase can also be divided into different topological classes. Transitions between topologically inequivalent phases are either first order or continuous quantum phase transitions. Moreover, the interface between different topological phases must harbor gapless modes. All of these features are the same as SPTs.

In the rest of the paper we revisit a model of symmetry-breaking topological insulator\textsuperscript{[1]}. The motivation for revisiting it is that we think it has the potential of explaining the unusual thermal Hall effect reported in Ref.\textsuperscript{[2]}.

In Ref.\textsuperscript{[2]} it is shown that La\textsubscript{2−x}Sr\textsubscript{x}CuO\textsubscript{4} at \( x = 0.06 \) (close to the boundary of the antiferromagnetic phase) exhibits an unusual thermal Hall conductivity in the presence of a magnetic field. The magnitude of \( \kappa_{xy} / T \) rises monotonically with the field strength starting from zero field. This thermal Hall conductivity is believed not to be caused by charge carriers because according to the Wiedemann-Franz law such contribution should be negligible. Interestingly, this anomalous thermal Hall conductivity persists even in the undoped La\textsubscript{2}CuO\textsubscript{4} under 15T. Importantly, it also exists in other underdoped cuprates including Nd-LSCO, Eu-LSCO and Bi2201, in doping range where the charge order is absent and under magnetic fields strong enough to kill superconductivity.

The model

Here we review the model of Ref.\textsuperscript{[1]}.

\[
H = H_0 + H_{\text{Neel}} + H_{\text{DDW}}
\]

\[
H_0 = -t_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \alpha} C_{i \alpha}^\dagger C_{j \alpha} - t_2 \sum_{\langle \langle ij \rangle \rangle, \alpha} C_{i \alpha}^\dagger C_{j \alpha} + h.c.
\]

\[
H_{\text{Neel}} = \sum_i (-1)^{i_x + i_y + i_z} \mathbf{m}_s \cdot \sigma_{\alpha \beta} C_{i \alpha}^\dagger C_{i \beta}
\]

\[
H_{\text{DDW}} = \sum_i (-1)^{i_x + i_y + i_z} \left\{ (i \hat{m}_2 \cdot \sigma_{\alpha \beta}) \left[ C_{i \alpha}^\dagger C_{i + x \beta} - C_{i \alpha}^\dagger C_{i - x \beta} \right] + m_1 \left[ C_{i \alpha}^\dagger C_{i + x + y \alpha} - C_{i \alpha}^\dagger C_{i - x + y \alpha} \right] + h.c. \right\}
\]

Here \( \alpha, \beta \) are the spin indices, \( C_{i,\alpha} \) annihilates an electron with spin \( \alpha \) on the \( i \)th site of the square lattice, \( \sigma^{x,y,z} \) are the Pauli matrices. \( H_0 \) describes the bandstructure, the hopping amplitudes between nearest-neighbor and next-nearest-neighbor sites are \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \), respectively. In the rest of the paper we set \( t_1 = 1 \) and \( t_2 = -0.1 \), and denote the values of all other parameters in unit of \( t_1 \). In the “triplet DDW” Hamiltonian, \( H_{\text{DDW}} \), the term proportional to \( im_2 \) is a spin-dependent staggered (momentum \((\pi, \pi)\)) orbital current order parameter. It is the triplet version of the d-density-wave (DDW) order parameter in Ref.\textsuperscript{[3]}. The important difference is, in this case, the orbital magnetic moments due to the spin up and spin down electrons cancel. Therefore, unlike the DDW state, there is no detectable local moment. The order parameter proportional to \( m_1 \) causes a positive/negative second neighbor
hopping in the (1,1)/(−1,−1) directions, respectively. It, too, modulates with momentum $\vec{p}$, $H_{\text{Neel}}$, which is absent in Ref.[1] describes the usual Neel order. We schematically represent $H_{\text{Neel}}$ and $H_{\text{t-DDW}}$ in Fig. 1(a). It is worth noting that after Fourier transform to the momentum space, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) can be viewed as an antiferromagnet with $s$ plus $\pm d_{xy} + id_{z^2−y^2}$ form factors[1].

The order parameters

The above model should be viewed as the mean-field theory of certain interacting Hamiltonian along the line discussed in Ref.[4]. The order parameter $m_1$ is a real scalar. It breaks the translation symmetry and point group symmetries including 4-fold rotation and mirrors along the x and y axis. After such symmetry breaking the point group $C_{4v}$ is reduced to $C_{2v}$. The order parameter enters as $i\vec{m}_2 \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ is more subtle. It breaks SU(2) spin rotation symmetry down to U(1). However, interestingly, it preserves the time-reversal symmetry. This last statement explains why this order parameter does not generate any local magnetic moment. It is also the reason why this order parameter does not couple to probes such as neutron scattering, NMR and $\mu$SR as the usual Neel order parameter does.

The topological insulator

In Fig. 1(b) we plot the energy spectrum of Eq. (1) with $\vec{m}_s = 0$ and $m_1 = 0.15$ and $\vec{m}_2 = 0.5\hat{z}$ in open boundary condition along $\hat{y}$ and periodic boundary condition along $\hat{x}$. Here $k_x$ is a momentum in the antiferromagnetic Brillouin zone, it is 45 degrees rotated from the crystalline directions of the square lattice. For each of the two edges, there is a pair of counter-propagating helical edge modes, reminiscent of those in a quantum spin Hall insulator[1]. These edge modes are protected from back scattering by time reversal and the residual U(1) spin rotation symmetry[1]. In the absence of disorder it is also prevented from back scattering because of the Fermi momenta of the right and left movers are different. In Fig. 1(c) we plot the energy spectrum in the presence of a magnetic field. Here we have assumed $\vec{m}_2$ lies in the magnetic field direction, namely, $\hat{z}$. Clearly, the edge modes are Zeeman split.

The thermal Hall effect

Here we argue that the helical edge modes in Fig. 1(c) lead to the thermal Hall conductivity. In the presence of a temperature gradient in $\hat{y}$ (see Fig. 2(a)), the entropy of the top edge electrons is higher than that at the bottom edge. This entropy difference is proportional to the temperature gradient: $\Delta S \propto \Delta T$. For each spin direction the electrons at the top and bottom edges propagate in opposite directions. Due to the entropy difference, there is a spin-dependent heat current in the transverse direction ($\hat{z}$): $I_E \propto T v n_s \Delta S \propto T v n_s \Delta T$, where $s = \pm 1$ is the eigenvalue of $\vec{m}_2 \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ (which is $\sigma_z$ in this case), and $n_s$ is the $s$-resolved edge electron (line) density, $v$ is the edge mode velocity, and $T$ is the average temperature. Since the $s = \pm 1$ electrons propagate in opposite directions, the total heat current is $I_E = I_{E,+1} - I_{E,-1} \propto T v (n_{+1} - n_{-1}) \Delta T$. In the absence of magnetic field, $n_{+1} - n_{-1} = 0$ hence the net heat current vanishes. However, in the presence of a magnetic field the Zeeman energy results in a difference in the Fermi energy of the $s = +1$ and $s = −1$ electrons. Hence the cancellation no longer
holds. This leads to a net heat current in $\hat{z}$. Because the Fermi energy difference is proportional to the applied magnetic field (in weak field) we expect $I_E \propto T v(n_{+1} - n_{-1}) \Delta T \propto B v T \Delta T$. Consequently, the thermal Hall conductance $\kappa_{xy}/T = \frac{I_E}{2 k_B T} / B$ is resulted. The direction of the heat current, hence the sign of $\kappa_{xy}$, is determined by the Chern number of the $s = +1$ electrons. It is controlled by the sign of $m_1$. We will return to the sign of $\kappa_{xy}$ later.

The above “linear”-$B$ $\kappa_{xy}/T$ is observed in the $x = 0.06$ sample of La$_{2-x}$Sr$_x$CuO$_4$ in Ref. [2]. Here we have put quotation mark around linear, because in general the edge velocity depends on the Fermi energy, hence we only expect local linearity.

Despite the presence of a non-zero $\kappa_{xy}$ the electric Hall conductance is zero. To understand that let’s consider applying an electric field in $\hat{y}$, as shown in Fig. 2(b). This results in a difference between the Fermi energy at the upper and lower edges, which in turn causes a difference in the upper and lower edge electron densities. The voltage difference, however, does not cause an unbalance in the spin up and spin down electron densities. Thus, in zero magnetic field, the electric current carried by the counter-propagating edge modes vanishes for each edge. Therefore the electric Hall conductance is zero. In the presence of a magnetic field, the electric edge current is no longer zero for the top/bottom edges. However, because the direction of the upper edge current is opposite to that of the lower edge, the total electric current still remains zero, at least in the linear response regime. The above electric/thermal transport properties should be exactly the same as those of the quantum spin Hall insulator. This analogy leads us to expect a non-zero spin Hall conductance and a quantized two-terminal conductance.

**The sign of $\kappa_{xy}$**

Here we argue that in presence of a magnetic field it is energetically favorable for $m_1 \vec{m}_2$ to lie in the field direction. To understand that we note the topological insulator discussed above will possess a bulk orbital magnetic moment in a non-zero magnetic field. This field induced orbital moment is given by [5]

$$M = - \sum_{s=\uparrow,\downarrow} \frac{1}{4 \pi^2 c} C_s \Delta E_{F,s}. \quad (2)$$

Here $c$ is the speed of light and $C_s$ is the Chern number of the spin $s$ band. We note that $C_{-1} = -C_{+1}$ and $\Delta E_{F,s} = -s \mu_B \vec{m}_2 \cdot \vec{B}$ where $\mu_B$ is the effective electron magnetic moment. Hence upon reversal of $s$ both $C_s$ and $\Delta E_{F,s}$ changes sign. Consequently

$$M = - \frac{1}{2 \pi^2 c} C_{+1} \Delta E_{F,+1} = \frac{\mu_B}{2 \pi^2 c} C_{+1} \vec{m}_2 \cdot \vec{B}. \quad (3)$$

Eq. (6) implies that in the presence of a magnetic field it is energetically favorable for $m_1 \vec{m}_2$ to point in the same direction as $\vec{B}$. Thus magnetic field fixes the sign of $\kappa_{xy}/T$. The measured sign of the $\kappa_{xy}$ in Ref. [2] implies that, relative to the magnetic field direction, the Chern number of the spin up electron band is $+1$.

Another consequence of Eq. (6) is that it eliminates the Goldstone mode associated with the fluctuation of $\vec{m}_2$. In the absence of the magnetic field, it is interesting to ask whether the topological t-DDW insulator can exist even when $\vec{m}_2$ is thermally disordered [1]. The reason one might suspect an affirmative answer is because whether $\vec{m}_2$ is disordered or not the time reversal symmetry remains intact.

![FIG. 3. Projected band structure of Eq. (1) with periodic boundary condition in x-direction and open boundary condition in y-direction. The number of rows in y-direction is $n_y = 100$. In these plots $\vec{m}_1$ is set to 0.2$\pi$, $m_1 = 0.15$. In panel (a) $m_2 = 0.5\pi$ and in panel (b) $m_2 = 0.5\pi$. In panel (c) and (d) we turn on a magnetic field in the $z$ direction. The associated Zeeman energy equals to 0.2.](image.png)
Except La$_2$CuO$_4$, the thermal Hall data on all other samples in Ref. [2] were obtained under strong magnetic field (in order to suppress the superconductivity). The argument presented above suggests that for all those cases the direction of $m_1\hat{m}_2$ should be pinned by the direction of the magnetic field. Thus even when one cycles the temperature to above the ordering temperature(s) of $m_1$ and $\hat{m}_2$, the sign of $\kappa_{xy}$ will not appear random among different cooling downs.

The Neel ordered phase

In the cuprates it is well known that the Neel order parameter lies in the $ab$ plane (this is so when there is a magnetic field in the $c$-direction as well). In this case there is the important question concerning whether $\hat{m}_2$ agrees with the direction of the Neel order parameter or with the magnetic field. The answer to this question determines whether a non-zero thermal Hall conductance can be induced by the magnetic field. In Fig. 3(a) and (b) we show the edge modes dispersion when $\hat{m}_2$ is fixed in the $\hat{x}$ direction and $\hat{m}_2$ is in the $\hat{z}$ (a) or $\hat{x}$ (b) directions. For comparison, we also show the effect of a $\hat{z}$ direction magnetic field on the edge mode dispersion for these two cases. Clearly in case (d) where the direction of $\hat{m}_2$ agrees with the Neel order parameter (hence both are perpendicular to the magnetic field) the magnetic field has no effect. Usually with the edge electron spin polarized in the $\hat{x}$ direction, a $\hat{z}$ direction magnetic field will induce back scattering. The reason it does not in Fig. 3(d) is because of momentum conservation. As we mentioned earlier, due to the mismatch of the Fermi momenta of the right and left moving edge branches, an uniform magnetic field can not produce back scattering. However, in the presence of disorder this will no longer be true. Under such condition we do expect the presence of back scattering which will cause the localization of edge electron at low temperatures.

Thus we will only expect the same field induced $\kappa_{xy}/T$ if $\hat{m}_2$ lies perpendicular to the Neel order parameter direction (but parallel to the magnetic field direction). The possibility for this to happen must again be due to the Zeeman coupling between the induced orbital moment and the magnetic field. Currently we do not know whether such cross aligned Neel order parameter and $\hat{m}_2$ is actually realized.

The effect of residual electronic correlation on the edge states

The main effect of the electronic correlation is to render the system in the mean-field state described by Eq. (1). In the following we discuss the effects of residual electronic correlation on the edge dynamics. The fact that this is necessary is because the edge modes are gapless.

The edge Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_E = i\nu_F \int dx \left[ \psi_{L\uparrow}^\dagger(x) \partial_x \psi_{L\uparrow}(x) - \psi_{R\uparrow}^\dagger(x) \partial_x \psi_{R\uparrow}(x) \right]$$

(7)

where $\psi_{L\uparrow}$ and $\psi_{R\uparrow}$ are the annihilation operator of the left (spin down) and right (spin up) moving edge electrons, and $\nu_F$ is the edge velocity. Due to the time reversal and/or the $S_z$ rotation symmetry, the single-particle backscattering terms, $\psi_{R\uparrow}^\dagger \psi_{L\uparrow} + \psi_{L\uparrow}^\dagger \psi_{R\uparrow}$, and $i\psi_{R\uparrow}^\dagger \psi_{L\downarrow} - i\psi_{R\downarrow}^\dagger \psi_{L\uparrow}$, are not allowed.

The symmetry-allowed four fermions interactions include

$$H_{\text{int}} = \int dx \left\{ g_2 \psi_{R\uparrow}^\dagger(x) \psi_{R\uparrow}(x) \psi_{L\uparrow}^\dagger(x) \psi_{L\uparrow}(x) + g_4 \psi_{R\uparrow}^\dagger(x) \psi_{R\uparrow}(x) \psi_{L\uparrow}^\dagger(x+\delta) \psi_{L\uparrow}(x+\delta) + R \rightarrow L \right\}$$

(8)

It is easy to show that the above interactions just renormalizes the edge velocity and the Luttinger liquid parameter: $v = \nu_F \sqrt{(1 - g_2/\nu_F)(1 - g_4/\nu_F)}$, $K = \sqrt{v_F - g_2 + g_4}/v_F + g_2 + g_4/v_F$.

The usual process that opens the charge gap is the umklapp scattering $g_6 \psi_{R\uparrow}^\dagger \psi_{R\downarrow} \psi_{L\uparrow} \psi_{L\downarrow}$. This term is forbidden by the Fermi statistics in the present situation due to the spin-momentum locking of the edge electrons.

The singlet DDW topological insulator

By slightly modifying Eq. (1), namely, replacing $H_{-\text{DDW}}$ with $H_{-\text{DDW}}$ where

$$H_{-\text{DDW}} = \sum_i (-1)^{i_y+i_x} \left\{ \mu_2 [C_{io}^\dagger C_{i+x+\alpha} - C_{io}^\dagger C_{i+y\alpha}] + \hat{m}_1 \cdot \hat{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} [C_{io}^\dagger C_{i+x+y\beta} - C_{io}^\dagger C_{i-x+y\beta}] + h.c. \right\}$$

(9)

we also arrived at a symmetry-breaking topological insulator, with helical edge modes. The reason we don’t consider this case further is because, like in Ref. [3], there will be local orbital magnetic moment induced by the ordering of $m_2$ and $\hat{m}_1$. Currently there is no experimental evidence of such local moment.

Final discussions

In the temperature regime where a non-zero $\kappa_{xy}/T$ is observed we expect a non-zero two-terminal conductance due to the edge states. This edge contribution will be difficult to discern if the sample is metallic.
However, in the insulating state where the Neel order and the topological triplet DDW order coexist, we do expect a measurable two terminal conductance. As far as we know there is no experimental evidence for that.

In addition, we take note of several related experimental facts. (1) There is a report from thermal transport that the pseudogap temperature $T^*$ coincides with the onset of 90 degree rotation symmetry breaking\cite{7}. This could be due to the symmetry breaking induced by $m_1$. Ref.\cite{8} reports that in the pseudogap regime, YBCO exhibits inversion symmetry breaking below $T^*$. In addition, the polar Kerr effect suggests the breaking of time reversal symmetry\cite{9}. In the model considered so far we do not predict these symmetry breaking. Although it is certainly possible to modify Eq. (1) to incorporate these symmetry breaking, we shall not discuss them in order to keep things as simple as possible.

As already pointed out in Ref.\cite{1,3} the breaking of translation symmetry can explain the Fermi pocket (rather than large Fermi surface) needed to explain the sharp decrease of the carrier density near the pseudogap critical doping\cite{10}. Finally in an ARPES experiment on Bi2201, in doping range near the AFM phase boundary, a small nodal gap was observed\cite{11}. Interestingly in Bi2201 the unusual $\kappa_{xy}/T$ is also observed at 20\% doping near the quantum critical doping. It is interesting to ask whether such nodal gap can be due to the gapping caused by $m_1$.

Before the end, we take note of three recent interesting theory papers\cite{12–14} on the same subject. Our theory, in particular Eq. (9), bears a strong resemblance to that in Ref.\cite{12}. The most important difference is that the fermion in our theory is the physical electron. As a result, we do not have to deal with the gauge confinement issue.
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