

Fermionic description of spin-gap states of antiferromagnetic Heisenberg ladders in a magnetic field

Hiromitsu Hori and Shoji Yamamoto

Department of Physics, Okayama University, Tushima, Okayama 700-8530, Japan

(Received 28 February 2002)

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 75.60.Ej

Spin gaps the energy gaps in magnetic excitation spectra of low-dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnets have been attracting considerable interest in recent years. This fascinating subject was initiated by Haldane [1], renewed at the opportunity of high-temperature superconductivity being discovered [2], and further developed via the synthesis of ladder materials [3,4]. Dagotto, Riera and Scalapino [5] pioneeringly pointed out a possible electronic mechanism for the formation of spin gaps in two-leg ladders. Following investigations [6] revealed that assembling chains into ladders, the crossover between one and two dimensions is far from smooth. Heisenberg ladders with an even number of legs have a spin gap, while those with an odd number of legs have no gaps.

Spin ladders in a magnetic field provide further interesting topics. Their ground-state magnetization curves have extensively been studied [7-10] in an attempt to find quantized plateaux. Spin- S L -leg Heisenberg ladders

$$H = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^L J_{n,l} S_{n,l} \cdot S_{n+1,l} + J_0^0 \sum_{l=1}^L S_{n,l} \cdot S_{n,l+1} ; \quad (1)$$

may exhibit magnetization plateaux at $M = M_{\text{sat}} = m = LS$ provided $LS \geq 2Z$ [7,11,12], where M and M_{sat} are the magnetization and its saturated value, respectively. Since coupled-chain materials are likely to be systematically obtained in the case of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ [13], most of numerical efforts are being devoted to $S = \frac{1}{2}$ ladders. Then, without any bond polymerization, the most tractable system of our interest is the three-leg ladder. Lanczos diagonalization of finite systems [7], a series-expansion technique [8] and density-matrix renormalization-group calculations [10] are all in agreement to support the existence of the plateau at $M = M_{\text{sat}} = 1/3$ for strong inter-chain coupling $J^0 > J$. As for more-than-three-leg ladders, the existence of plateaux as well as their surviving region is still left to be verified.

Spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ two- and three-leg ladders are indeed realized in layer materials $\text{Sr}_{n-1}\text{Cu}_{n+1}\text{O}_{2n}$ ($n = 3; 5; \dots$) [4,13], while four- and five-leg ones in $\text{La}_{4+4n}\text{Cu}_{8+2n}\text{O}_{14+8n}$ ($n = 2; 3; \dots$) [14]. It is unfortunate that nevertheless large degrees of freedom prevent us from making numerical access to multi-leg ladders. In such circumstances, we propose a systematic approach to Heisenberg ladders in order to describe their spin-gap states in a field. Employing the Jordan-Wigner transformation on a unique path

and then making a mean-field treatment of the fermionic Hamiltonian, we semiquantitatively visualize the appearance of plateaux and estimate the corresponding critical interactions J_c^0 at an arbitrary number of legs, L .

It is along a snake-like path, $(n;l) = (1;1) \rightarrow (1;2) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (1;L) \rightarrow (2;L) \rightarrow (2;L-1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (2;1) \rightarrow (3;1) \rightarrow \dots$, that we define spinless fermions. This elaborately ordered path was first proposed by Dai and Su [15] and turned out to describe the spin gap as a function of L much better than the naively ordered path [16], which is usually employed. When we introduce renumbered spin operators $\mathbb{S}_{n;l} = S_{n,l}$ ($S_{n,L+1}$) for an odd (even) n , the spinless fermions are created as $c_{n;l}^y = \mathbb{S}_{n;l}^+ \exp[i(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^L \mathbb{S}_{i,j}^+ \mathbb{S}_{i,j} + \sum_{j=1}^L \mathbb{S}_{n,j}^+ \mathbb{S}_{n,j})]$. Making a standard mean-field treatment [15] of the fermionic Hamiltonian and assuming the spatial homogeneity $\langle \mathbb{S}_{n;l}^z \rangle = \langle c_{n;l}^y c_{n,l+1}^y \rangle = 1/2 = M/LN$, we obtain

$$H = \frac{M}{LN} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^L \left[2J + (2 - \frac{1}{L}) J_0^0 \right] c_{k,l}^y c_{k,l+1}^y + \frac{J_0^0}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^L c_{k,l}^y c_{k,l+1}^y + \frac{J}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^L e^{i(L-1)(2M-LN+1)} e^{ik} + e^{i(L-1)(2M-LN+1)} e^{ik} c_{k,l}^y c_{k,l+1}^y + J + \frac{L}{L} J_0^0 M + 1 + \frac{M}{LN} ; \quad (2)$$

where $c_{k,l}^y = \sum_{n=1}^N e^{ikn} c_{n,l}^y$. The effective Hamiltonian (2), together with the Zeeman term $H_Z = \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^L (c_{k,l}^y c_{k,l+1}^y - 1/2)$, is numerically diagonalized, adopting the open boundary condition along rungs, while taking the thermodynamic limit under the periodic boundary condition along legs.

In order to verify the reliability of the present approach, we plot in Fig. 1 the thus-obtained spin gaps (H_{c1}) and saturation fields (H_{c2}), the former of which are compared with highly precise numerical estimates [17], whereas the latter of which with the exact solutions $H_{c2} = 2J + J^0[1 + \cos(\pi/L)]$. Although the present scheme somewhat overestimates H_{c1} with increasing L , it correctly tells whether the gap survives or not. As

Figure 1 consists of two vertically stacked plots, (a) and (b), showing the ratio of the second moment of the central peak to the total second moment, H_{C2}/J , as a function of the number of layers L . The x-axis for both plots is L , ranging from 2 to 8. The y-axis for both plots is H_{C2}/J , ranging from 0.0 to 3.8. Plot (a) shows data for a 2D Ising model with a central peak at $L=2, 4, 6, 8$ and a horizontal line at $H_{C2}/J = 0.8$. Plot (b) shows data for a 2D Ising model with a central peak at $L=2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$ and a horizontal line at $H_{C2}/J = 0.8$. Both plots show a decreasing trend in H_{C2}/J as L increases.

Figure 1 consists of two subplots, (a) and (b), showing the normalized magnetization M/M_{sat} as a function of the normalized magnetic field H/J . The y-axis for both plots ranges from 0.0 to 1.0, and the x-axis ranges from 0.0 to 10.0. In both plots, a solid line represents $J=1$ and a dashed line represents $J=2$. Plot (a) is for a spin-1/2 system, showing a step-like increase in magnetization with increasing field. Plot (b) is for a spin-1 system, showing a similar step-like increase but with a different shape, particularly at higher fields where the magnetization approaches 1.0 more gradually.

Now we explore the main issue in Fig. 3. The critical value $J_c^0 = 1.04 \pm 0.01$ for $L = 3$ is in good agreement with the previous estimate J_c^0 [8] obtained through the series expansion from the strong-coupling limit $J = J^0 \rightarrow 0$. J_c^0 appears to increase with L , where even- and odd- L ladders may form distinguishable series of their own. Here is a conclusive remark: Among possible nontrivial quantized magnetizations, $M = M_{\text{sat}} = 1 - 2/L; 1 - 4/L; \dots; 1 - 2/L$ ($1 = L$), the inner plateaux are easier to induce. The plateaux at the end-value magnetizations $M = M_{\text{sat}} = 1 - 2/L; 1 - 4/L$ ($1 = L$) are generally induced with larger J^0 than those at the inner-value magnetizations are. Practical observation of multiplateau magnetization curves may less be feasible with increasing L . At the least, however, an available

L	T_c/T	Label
3	1.05	$\frac{1}{3}$
4	1.10	$\frac{2}{4}$
5	1.25	$\frac{3}{5}$
5	1.55	$\frac{1}{5}$
6	1.35	$\frac{2}{6}$
6	1.45	$\frac{4}{6}$
7	1.35	$\frac{3}{7}$
7	1.85	$\frac{5}{7}$
7	2.10	$\frac{1}{7}$
8	1.45	$\frac{4}{8}$
8	1.70	$\frac{2}{8}$
8	2.25	$\frac{6}{8}$

We are grateful to Prof. M. Takahashi for useful comments. This work was supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture, and by the Sumitomo Foundation.

- [1] F. D. M. Haldane: Phys. Rev. Lett. 50 (1983) 1153.
- [2] J. G. Bednorz and K. A. Müller: Z. Phys. B 64 (1986) 188.
- [3] D. C. Johnston, J. W. Johnson, D. P. Goshorn and A. J. Jacobson: Phys. Rev. B 35 (1987) 219.
- [4] Z. Hiroi, M. Azuma, M. Takano and Y. Bando: J. Solid State Chem. 95 (1991) 230.
- [5] E. Dagotto, J. Riera and D. Scalapino: Phys. Rev. B 45 (1992) R5744.
- [6] E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice: Science 271 (1996) 618.
- [7] D. C. Cabra, A. Honecker and P. Pułł: Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 5126.
- [8] D. C. Cabra, A. Honecker and P. Pułł: Phys. Rev. B 58 (1998) 6241.
- [9] D. C. Cabra and M. D. Grynberg: Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 1768.
- [10] K. Tandon, S. Lal, S. K. Pati, S. Ramasesha and D. Sen: Phys. Rev. B 59 (1999) 396.
- [11] M. Oshikawa, M. Yamanka and I. A. A. eck: Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 (1997) 1984.
- [12] K. Totsuka: Phys. Lett. A 228 (1997) 103.
- [13] M. Azuma, Z. Hiroi, M. Takano, K. Ishida and Y. Kitaoka: Phys. Rev. Lett. 73 (1994) 3463.
- [14] B. Batlog and R. Cava, unpublished.
- [15] X. Dai and Z. Su: Phys. Rev. B 57 (1998) 964.
- [16] M. Azzouz, L. Chen and S. M. Oukouri: Phys. Rev. B 50 (1994) 6233.
- [17] S. R. White, R. M. Noack and D. J. Scalapino: Phys. Rev. Lett. 73 (1994) 886.