


Charge Density Waves and $x = 1/8$ anomaly in

I.A. Larionov and M.V. Erem'in

Magnetic Radiospectroscopy Laboratory, Kazan State University, 420008 Kazan, Russia

Abstract

We adopt a $t_1 - t_2 - t_3 - J - G$ model for explanation of $x = 1/8$ anomaly in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ family compound. The calculated charge susceptibility shows a maximum near (π, π) at intermediate temperatures and near $(\pi, \pi/2)$ as temperature approaches zero, in agreement with neutron scattering experiments. Coulomb repulsion G between the first neighbors turns out to be the source of Charge Density Waves (CDW) in narrow band $t_1^e; t_2^e; t_3^e < G$. For physically realistic hopping values we obtain the CDW amplitude $e_0 = x$. The in-phase domain structure as a candidate for "stripe" picture is proposed.

It is widely accepted, that high-temperature superconductivity (HTSC) appears in the vicinity of metal-insulator transition (MIT) in layered copper oxides [1]. In addition, these compounds possess a pseudogap phenomenon in the normal state of underdoped regime, namely the density of states suppression at Fermi level. The superconducting CuO_2 planes in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$, $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-y}$ and other copper oxide layered HTSC compounds present nearly an ideal realization of two-dimensional (2D) systems. Low dimensional character of these compounds suggests, that various phases are possible due to instabilities. It is known, that s-wave BCS Superconductivity compete with Charge Density Waves (CDW), where the anomalous averages were due to Frohlich interaction and did not depend on the wave vector. d-wave superconductivity was also found to compete with id-wave Peierls instability in bilayered underdoped HTSC, where both gaps were due to Superexchange and Coulomb interactions between the nearest neighbors [2]. Very recently this sliding vortex-antivortex current structures in CuO_2 planes attracted a renewed interest in connection with unusual nonsuperconducting state properties of layered copper oxide HTSC compounds [2-4].

Strong depression of T_c in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Ba}_x\text{CuO}_4$ [5], $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ [6] and $\text{La}_{1.48}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$ [7] within narrow region of x at $x=1$ is the well known important problem of the doped CuO_2 plane in the HTSC. The discovery of stripe like structure via neutron diffraction in $\text{La}_{1.48}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$ [8] gave a new accelerating impulse for study this intriguing problem (see [9] for review). New ideas regarding the relation between the fluctuating stripe motion and HTSC phenomenon were speculated [10]. The Q dependence of peaks as seen in neutron diffraction experiments seems to provide an evidence that stripes are a kind of CDW instability; this scenario was considered in a number of papers (see e.g. [11]). However, the crucial question, namely why at so narrow interval of concentration around $x=1$ the mystery of T_c strong depression occurs and accompanies by stripes pattern phenomenon is not been completely understood. Recently this problem was investigated by magnetic resonance method [12] and new evidence of the quasi-static charge-spins ordering at $x=1$ has been found at low temperatures in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Ba}_x\text{CuO}_4$ [13] and in $\text{La}_{1.48}\text{Eu}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$ [14]. Note that x-ray diffraction measurements have con-

the existence of charge order in $\text{La}_{1.48}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$ [15].

In this Letter we will concentrate ourselves to the description of properties for particular underdoped case $x = 1/8$ in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ on the microscopical basis. We start from the t_1, t_2, t_3, J G model Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{ij} t_{ij} c_{i, \text{pd}}^\dagger c_{j, \text{dp}} + \sum_{lm} J_{lm} (\mathbf{S}_l \mathbf{S}_m) - \frac{n_1 n_m}{4} + \sum_{lm} G_{lm} c_{l, \text{pd}}^\dagger c_{m, \text{dp}} + \sum_i F_i \left(\sum_{lm} \mathbf{S}_{i+lm} \right)^2; \quad (1)$$

where $n_1 = 1 - n_i$ is the number of extra holes per unit cell, $c_{i, \text{pd}}^\dagger$ ($c_{j, \text{dp}}$) are creation (annihilation) operators constructed on the singlet combination of copper (d) and oxygen (p) states basis (see Ref. [16] for details). The last term takes into account the polarization of nearest neighbor (n.n.) copper spins (l runs over n.n.) around copper-oxygen singlet at site i as described in [17].

Following the idea of Zhang and Rice [18] about copper-oxygen singlets formation it was shown [16], that it is possible to describe correctly the elementary excitations spectrum in cuprates. This singlet correlated band is analogous to upper Hubbard band with essential distinction – the subband splitting is much smaller, compared to Hubbard model. Therefore it is possible to apply Hubbard formalism without strict restriction on t and J values in $t - J$ model. According to Angle Resolved Photoemission Electron Spectroscopy (ARPES) the bandwidth $W \approx 3J$ for optimally doped HTSC [19]. In undoped insulating $\text{SrCuO}_2\text{Cl}_2$, $W \approx J$, in agreement with Monte-Carlo and Exact Diagonalization simulations [19], and the valence-band dispersion has a maximum located near $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ [20]. The value of bare hopping between the first neighbors $t_1 = 78$ meV is known from comparison with ARPES [16]. We stress the importance of t_2 and t_3 hopping integrals, that expand our model and strongly affect on the Fermi surface form. The value of superexchange interaction between the nearest Cu neighbors for $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ is known from neutron scattering data $J = 135$ meV [21]. These arguments enforces us to study the opposite region of values $(t_1; t_2; t_3 < J)$, compared to usually used in celebrated $t - J$ model.

The hoppings t_{ij} are strongly affected by electron and especially by spin-spin correlations,

resulting to effective values of hoppings

$$t_n^e = t_n P_{pd} \left[1 + \frac{\langle S_i S_{j+i_n} \rangle}{P_{pd}^2} \right] \quad (2)$$

for $n = j \pm i$ -th neighbor. $P_{pd} = (1 + x)/2$ is Hubbard electronic reduction factor. The spin-spin correlation functions $\langle S_i S_j \rangle$ have been calculated in a variety of approaches [22] and numerical methods [19] within the 2D $t - J$ model. The most notable result is that $\langle S_i S_{j \pm 1} \rangle = 0.333$ in undoped antiferromagnet at zero temperature. These calculations suggest also that with doping the spin-spin correlations goes down first slowly in lightly doped and underdoped HTSC oxides and then rapidly decreases for optimally doped and overdoped regime. Therefore, for $x = 1/8$ we set $\langle S_i S_{j \pm 1} \rangle = \frac{P_{pd}^2}{0.3164}$ so that $t_1^e = 0$. Strong antiferromagnetic correlations block the hopping between the first neighbors so that the order is undamped [3]. Our initial Fermi surface with dispersion

$$\epsilon_k^e = 4t_2^e \cos k_x \cos k_y + 2t_3^e (\cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y); \quad (3)$$

has pockets centered around $(\pm\pi; \pm\pi)$ and is similar to that observed by LaRosa et al. [20] in $\text{Sr}_2\text{CuO}_2\text{Cl}_2$.

To select the instability wavevector for charge subsystem we have calculated the charge susceptibility, using the expressions given in [23]. The results are shown on Fig. 1. It is seen, that at low temperatures charge susceptibility has a maximum near $(\pm\pi; \pm\pi)$, in remarkable agreement with neutron scattering experiments [8]. With increasing temperature the charge susceptibility shows a peak around $Q = (\pi; \pi)$. These results are stable with respect to moderate variation of G value.

To formulate the self-consistent system of equations we use Green's function method and apply Roth's decoupling scheme [24]. The elementary excitations spectrum of the Hamiltonian (1) is given by the equation

$$\det \begin{vmatrix} \epsilon_k^e & \epsilon_{k+Q}^e \\ \epsilon_{k+Q}^e & \epsilon_k^e \end{vmatrix} = 0; \quad (4)$$

The quasiparticle dispersion relation has the form

$$\epsilon_k = P_{pd} \sum_{ij} t_{ij} \left(1 + \frac{\hbar S_i S_j}{P_{pd}^2} \right) e^{ikR_{ij}} - \frac{1}{2N P_{pd}} \sum_{k^0} \left(J_{k^0 k} - 2t_{k^0} \right) X_{k^0}^D X_k^{2E} + 2G_{k^0 k} X_{k^0}^D X_k^{2E}; \quad (5)$$

where $t_k = 2t_1 (\cos k_x + \cos k_y) + 4t_2 \cos k_x \cos k_y + 2t_3 (\cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y)$. The order parameter

$\epsilon_{k,Q}$ is responsible for abnormal properties of HTSC layered copper oxides due to instabilities.

It is caused by short ranged interactions and given by

$$\epsilon_{k,Q} = 4t_{k+Q} \frac{P \hbar S_i S_j t_{ij} e^{ikR_{ij}}}{P_{pd}^2} + \frac{P \hbar S_i S_j i J_{ij} e^{ikR_{ij}}}{2P_{pd}^2} \sum_{k=0} \frac{1}{2} J_Q \frac{1}{2} e_Q + S_Q^z +$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2N P_{pd}} \sum_{k^0} \left(J_{k^0 k} - 2t_{k^0} \right) X_{k^0}^D X_k^{2E} + 2G_{k^0 k} X_{k^0}^D X_k^{2E} \frac{1}{2} e_Q + S_Q^z$$

$$- \frac{1}{2N P_{pd}} \sum_{k^0} \left(J_{k^0 k} - 2t_{k^0} \right) X_{k^0+Q}^D X_k^{2E} + 2G_{k^0 k} X_{k^0+Q}^D X_k^{2E} + G_Q e_Q; \quad (6)$$

where $J_k = 2J (\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$, $G_k = 2G (\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$ and i is spin index. The latter contribution in Eq. (6), $G_Q e_Q$, will be important and we note, that $G_Q = G = -4$ is negative due to instability vector $Q = (\pi; \pi)$. The eigenvalues of the matrix (4) are given by

$$E_{1k,2k} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{k+Q} + \epsilon_k - \frac{1}{2} E_{12} \quad (7)$$

where

$$E_{12} = \frac{r}{\epsilon_{k+Q}^2 + \epsilon_k^2 + 4 \epsilon_{k+Q,Q} \epsilon_{k,Q}}; \quad (8)$$

It is seen that in the $t_1^E = 0$ case $\epsilon_{k,Q} = \epsilon_{k+Q,Q}$ and the quasiparticle energy is real, i.e. the regime realized has no damping.

$$e_Q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i e^{iQ R_i}; \quad S_Q^z = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i S_i^z e^{iQ R_i} \quad (9)$$

are Fourier amplitudes of CDW and Spin Density Wave (SDW) respectively and can be expressed via thermodynamic averages as

$$\langle e_Q \rangle = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_k \left(X_{k+Q}^D X_k^{2E} + X_{k+Q}^{2E} X_k^D \right); \quad (10)$$

$$S_Q^z = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_k \left(X_k^D X_{k+Q}^{2E} - X_k^{2E} X_{k+Q}^D \right); \quad (11)$$

We note, that the d -wave order does not contribute to expectation values of CDW (e_Q) and SDW (s_Q^z).

The relevant thermal average have the following form :

$$\langle X_{k+Q}^2 X_k^2 \rangle^E = \frac{P_{pd}(k,Q)}{E_{12}} [f(E_{1k}) - f(E_{2k})] : \quad (12)$$

In the $t_1^e = 0, t_2^e, t_3^e$ limit suggestions on solution of system of equations (6-12) may be obtained even analytically. Suppose, that we have non-negligible CDW amplitude e_Q . Then, due to large G , compared to hoppings, value, the contribution $G_Q e_Q$ will dominate in (6). Next, we note, that the order parameter will dominate in Eq. (8) and hence $E_{12} \approx J_{k,Q}$. Therefore the absolute value of thermal average (12) is equal to $\frac{1}{2}P_{pd}$. Substituting this result to Eqs. (10, 11) we obtain, that the SDW amplitude is $s_Q = 0$ and CDW amplitude $e_Q = \frac{1}{2}P_{pd}$.

Despite many attempts to calculate the numerical values of hoppings t_2^e and t_3^e ; their values are precisely still unknown together with the spin-spin correlation functions between the next-next nearest neighbors. The only known result from ARPES experiments and exact numerical simulations within 2D $t-J$ model is that the bandwidth $W \approx J$ for undoped antiferromagnet, that gives a restriction to the t_2^e and t_3^e values. We set the values of effective hoppings $J_2^e = J = 10$ meV and $t_3^e = 20$ meV, that are, in our opinion, the most relevant values for $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ with $x = 1-8$. For the spin-spin correlation function between the second neighbors we set $\langle S_i S_{j+2} \rangle = 0.15$, due to reasons described above. The value and even the sign of next-next nearest neighbors spin-spin correlation function is completely unknown, therefore we set $\langle S_i S_{j+3} \rangle = 0$. $F_i \approx 4$ meV was estimated in [17]. The value of screened Coulomb repulsion at $x = 1-8$ is $G \approx 75$ meV [23]. We have solved the system of equations (6-12) with this set of parameters. We have obtained, that in the low temperature limit the CDW amplitude $e_Q = x$, where x is the number of holes in CuO_2 plane due to Sr doping. In this case the undamped CDW completely destroy superconductivity at $x = 1-8$ in $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ and are responsible for drastic change in temperature dependencies of various physical quantities. The calculated wavevector dependence of k order parameter at

$T = 50$ K is presented in Fig. 2. It is seen, that its value is mainly determined by wavevector independent CDW contribution $G_0 e_0$. The temperature dependence of CDW amplitude e_0 determined by temperature dependence of thermal average (12), which are, in turn, determined by mean field approximation via Fermi distribution functions $f(E_{1k}); f(E_{2k})$. The calculated CDW closure temperature is $T_{CDW} = 350$ K.

The described above scenario explains the reason of anomaly at $x = 1/8$. At this doping level conventional CDW are allowed (without damping) and they suppress superconductivity. According to our calculation CDW regime appeared at $x = 1/8$ far above T_C . The experimental observation of critical temperature $T_{d2} \approx 138$ K in $\text{La}_{2-x-y}\text{Eu}_y\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ with $x = 1/8$ at which the copper relaxation rate $1/T_1$ suddenly goes down [13] can be naturally interpreted as a transition related to CDW state. With lowering temperature the pinning process due to freezing of the spin fluctuation becomes important and charge-spin ordering tends to be quasi-static. In Fig. 3 we show our variant of copper-oxygen singlet ordering in plane which we expect to be appeared in $\text{La}_{2-x-y}\text{Re}_y\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ ($\text{Re} = \text{Nd}$ and Eu) below $T \approx 9$ K. The displayed stripe pattern has many common features with that suggested by Tranquada et al. [8]. The distinction is that our picture corresponds to the so-called in-phase domain walls in contrast to antiphase domain proposed in [8]. As one can see our model explains the observed magnetic superlattice peaks of the type $(1/2, \quad), (1/2, 0)$ (in 2 units) and charge-ordered peaks at $(2, 0, 0)$ [8], too. In addition it naturally follows from widely accepted copper-oxygen singlet formation picture [18], which provides the minimum in the energy of the exchange interactions between copper-oxygen and copper-copper spins [17]. The last term in (1) plays crucial role in this aspect. It was pointed in Ref. [13] that in-phase domain even better reproduce the observed high frequency tail in NQR spectra in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Ba}_x\text{CuO}_4$ with $x = 1/8$ at low temperatures compared to antiphase domain model [8]. This conclusion is consistent with the ferromagnetic stripe ordering suggestion [25] based on strong sensitivity to magnetic fields. The Coulomb term (G) is important, since without it there is no CDW-like instability. This statement is in agreement with conclusion of [26] that pure t - J model does not give any stripes.

Finally we comment the results of huge isotope shift changes with Sr doping in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ [27]. According to our findings the competition between d-wave superconductivity and CDW is stronger, compared to competition between d-wave SC and order, caused by short range interactions. Moreover, the latter type of competition becomes stronger with decreasing of doping. Thus we are able to explain the gradual increase of isotope effect with decreasing of Sr doping in underdoped regime together with nearly divergent behavior of isotope exponent near $x = 1/8$ anomaly in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$.

In summary, the calculated charge susceptibility shows a maximum near $(\pi; \pi)$ at intermediate temperatures and near $(\pi; 2\pi)$ as temperature approaches zero, in agreement with neutron scattering experiments. We have shown, that in two-dimensional systems with narrow bands, so that the hoppings $t_2^e; t_3^e < G$, $t_1^e = 0$ due to strong antiferromagnetic correlations, and with instability antiferromagnetic wave vector $Q = (\pi; \pi)$, due to large Coulomb repulsion between the first neighbors G the CDW are formed. For physically realistic values $t_2^e; t_3^e$ at $x = 1/8$ in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ the CDW amplitude $e_Q = x$, where x is Sr content. Based on the calculated charge susceptibility peaks position the in-phase domain structure as a candidate for "stripe" picture is proposed. In our opinion, this scenario sheds light on drastic change of various physical quantities at "magic" value of Sr content $x = 1/8$ in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$.

This work was supported in part by Russian State Science and Technology Program "Superconductivity" Grant No. 98014-2 and CRDF Rec 007. I.A.L. thanks INTAS YSF 2001/2-45 for support.

REFERENCES

- [1] M . Im ada, A . Fujim ori, and Y . Tokura, Rev. M od. Phys. 70, 1039 (1998).
- [2] M . V . Erem in and I A . Larionov, JET P Lett. 68, 611 (1998); also in cond-m at/0105136.
- [3] M . Erem in and A . Rigam onti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 037002 (2002).
- [4] S. Chakravarty, R . B . Laughlin, D . K . Morr, and Ch. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B 64, 094503 (2001); S. Tewari, H . Y . Kee, Ch. Nayak, and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B 64, 224516 (2001); S. Chakravarty, H . Y . Kee, and Ch. Nayak, Int. J. M od. Phys. 15, 2901 (2001).
- [5] A . R . M oodenbaugh et al., Phys. Rev. B 38, 4596 (1988).
- [6] K . Kumagai et al., Physica (Am sterdam) 235C -240C , 1715 (1994).
- [7] M . K . Crawford et al., Phys. Rev. B 44, 7749 (1991); B . Buchner et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1841 (1994).
- [8] J M . Tranquada et al., Nature 375, 561 (1995); J M . Tranquada et al., Phys. Rev B 54, 7489 (1996); J M . Tranquada et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 338 (1997).
- [9] J M . Tranquada, in Neutron Scattering in Layered Copper-O xide Superconductors, ed. A . Furrer (K lwer, D ordrecht, 1998), p. 225.
- [10] V . J. Em ery, S A . K ivelson, Physica (Am sterdam) 263C , 44 (1996); V . J. Em ery, S A . K ivelson, and O . Zachar, Phys. Rev. B 56, 6120 (1997); C . Castellani, C D i. Castro, and M . Grilli, Z. Phys. B 103, 137 (1997); Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 4650 (1995); A . H . Castro Neto, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3931 (1997).
- [11] J. Zaanen and O . Gunnarsson, Phys. Rev. B 40, 7391 (1989); D . Poilblanc and T M . Rice, Phys. Rev. B 39, 9749 (1989); P . W robel and R . Eder, Phys. Rev. B 62, 4048 (2000);
- [12] G . B . Teitelbaum , B . Buchner, and H . de G ronckel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2949 (2000).

- [13] M .M atsum ura, T . Ikeda and H . Yam agata, J.Phys. Soc. Jpn., 69, 1023 (2000).
- [14] T .Sawa, M .M atsum ura and H . Yam agata, J.Phys. Soc. Jpn., 70, 3503 (2001).
- [15] M .v Z in m em ann et al, Europhys. Lett. 41, 629 (1998).
- [16] M .V .E rem in et al, Solid State Comm un. 88, 15 (1993); M .V .E rem in et al, JET P Lett. 60, 125 (1994); M .V .E rem in et al, JET P 85, 963 (1997).
- [17] M .V .E rem in and E .Sigm und, Solid State Com m . 90, 795 (1994).
- [18] F C .Zhang and T M .R ice, Phys.Rev.B 37, 3759 (1988).
- [19] E .D agotto, Rev.M od.Phys. 66, 763 (1994) (review).
- [20] S .LaRosa et al, Phys.Rev.B 56, R525 (1997).
- [21] S M .Hayden et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 67, 3622 (1991).
- [22] M .Takahashi, Phys.Rev.B 40, 2494 (1989); N M .P lakida, R .H ayn, and J.-L .R ichard, Phys.Rev.B 51, 16 599 (1995); S .W interfeldt and D . Ihle, Phys.Rev.B 56, 5535 (1997); A .Yu .Zavidonov, I A .Larionov, and D .B rinkm ann, Phys.Rev.B 61, 15 462 (2000).
- [23] M .E rem in, I .E rem in, and S .Varlam ov, Phys.Rev.B 64, 214512 (2001).
- [24] L M .Roth, Phys.Rev. 184, 451 (1969).
- [25] Y .Ando, A N .Lavrov, and K .Segawa, Phys.Rev.Lett. 83, 2813 (1999)
- [26] C S .Hellberg and E .M anousakis, Phys.Rev.Lett. 83, 132 (1999).
- [27] G .M .Zhao, K .Conder, H .K eller and K A .M ullaer, J.Phys.: Condens.M atter, 10, 9055 (1998).

FIGURES




FIG .1. The calculated real part of charge susceptibility at $T = 10$ K with the parameters as described in the text.




FIG .2. The calculated wavevector dependence of η_k order parameter. The main value of η_k originates by wavevector independent Coulomb CDW amplitude contribution $G_0 e_2$.




FIG .3. Sketch of in-phase "stripe" picture. The circles correspond to oxygen holes.