

Staggered flux state of electron in two-dimensional t-J model

Koichi Hamada and Daijiro Yoshioka

Department of Basic Science, University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Tokyo 153-8902

(April 14, 2024)

The competition between the staggered flux state, or the d-density wave state, and the d-wave pairing state is analyzed in two-dimensional t-J model based on the U(1) slave boson mean-field theory. Not only staggered flux of spinon but also staggered flux of holon are considered. In this formalism, the hopping order parameter of physical electron is described by the product of hopping order parameters of spinon and holon. The staggered flux amplitude of electron is the difference of staggered flux amplitude of spinon and that of holon. In π -flux phase of spinon, staggered fluxes of spinon and holon cancel completely and staggered flux order of electron does not exist. However, in staggered flux phase of spinon whose staggered flux amplitude is not π , fluxes does not cancel completely and staggered flux amplitude of electron remains. Thus, the phase transition between these two phases, π -flux phase and staggered flux phase of spinon, becomes a second order transition in physical electron picture. The order parameter which characterizes this transition is staggered flux order parameter of electron. A mean-field phase diagram is shown. It is proved analytically that there is no coexistence of staggered flux and d-wave pairing. The temperature dependences of Fermi surface and excitation gap at $(0; \pi)$ are shown. These behaviors are consistent with angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) experiments.

74.72.ch, 71.27.+a, 74.20.-z, 74.20.Mn, 71.10.Hf

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently the staggered flux state [1,2] has been revived as a candidate of pseudo-gap phase of high T_c superconductors. The staggered flux state is characterized by the staggered orbital-current. Time-reversal-symmetry is broken if staggered current is the current of physical electron. Weak magnetic signals were caught in recent experiments of underdoped $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{6+x}$ (YBCO) by neutron scattering [3,4]. Static alternating magnetic signals were also caught by muon spin rotation experiment in the vortex cores of underdoped YBCO [5]. The staggered flux state contains a density wave ordering whose symmetry is $d_{x^2-y^2}$ [6]. Because of this, it is also called d-density wave. Thus, there is the gap whose symmetry is $d_{x^2-y^2}$. Although $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -gap exists in both the staggered flux state and the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave pairing state, the structures of the fermion excitation in these states are different. The staggered flux state should have a segment-like Fermi-surface as observed in angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) experiments [7-14]. On the contrary, $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave pairing state has a point-like Fermi-surface. The absence of specific heat anomaly may be thought to deny the staggered-flux phase. However, we remark that there are arguments to justify the absence [15,16]. The lack of anomaly is either because of finite chemical potential [15], or because that this transition can be described by 6-vertex model [16].

The high- T_c superconductors are doped Mott-insulators. Essential physics of these materials comes from strong Coulomb repulsion. This physics is described by t-J model [17,18]. A method that restrict double occupancy is the slave boson method. In both the slave bo-

son methods, the U(1) method and the SU(2) method, the physical electron operator is described by a product of auxiliary fermions and bosons. In the U(1) slave boson theory, the physical electron operator c_i is described by a product of an auxiliary spin-1/2 neutral fermion operator f_i called spinon and a auxiliary spinless charged boson operator b_i called holon; $c_i = b_i^\dagger f_i$ with a constraint $b_i^\dagger b_i + f_i^\dagger f_i = 1$. Here, the repeated spin index is summed up over the two spin states. On the contrary, in the SU(2) slave boson theory [19,20], two auxiliary bosons are introduced. The physical electron operator c_i is described by a product of an auxiliary isospin-1/2 neutral fermion operator f_i and two auxiliary spinless charged boson operators, b_{i1}, b_{i2} ; $c_i = h_i^\dagger i = \frac{1}{2} = (b_{i1}^\dagger f_i + b_{i2}^\dagger f_i^\dagger) = \frac{1}{2}$ with three constraints, $\frac{1}{2} f_i^\dagger f_i + h_i^\dagger h_i = 0$. Here, $h_i^\dagger = (b_{i1}, b_{i2})$, $\tau_i^\dagger = (f_i; -f_i^\dagger)$, and $\sigma = (\sigma_1; \sigma_2; \sigma_3)$ are Pauli matrices.

Wen and Lee proposed based on the SU(2) theory [20,22] that the pseudo-gap state is a mixture of staggered flux state and $d_{x^2-y^2}$ superconducting state. These orders are dynamical rather than static and that the time-reversal symmetry is not broken. They discussed this in the region where bosons are condensed, $(z_{i1}; z_{i2}) \neq 0$, based on the O(4) sigma-model description. It is also proposed by Lee and Wen [21] that the static staggered-flux order can only exist in the vortex core. Shortcomings of this theory are that finite size Fermi-surface is not obtained naturally and that the condensation of bosons is assumed. The staggered current of physical electron and that of spinon are not equivalent in the staggered flux [1,2] phase at finite temperature because the stag-

gered ux phase of spinon exists above the temperature of Bose-condensation of holon [19,20,23]. Above the temperature of Bose-condensation, holon operators cannot be treated as classical numbers (c-number). [24] The correspondence between the electron current and the spinon current is not obvious.

On the contrary, Chakravarty, Laughlin, Morr, and Nayak [25] proposed that the staggered ux order exists as a static form in the pseudo-gap state. They proposed this at zero temperature based on Ginzburg-Landau theory. The staggered ux state they proposed is that of electron and time-reversal symmetry is broken. They also proposed that there exist three ground states. The ground state changes as doping increases from pure staggered ux phase to the coexisting phase of staggered ux state and d-wave superconductivity (dSC) state and finally to pure dSC phase. A short coming of their theory is that it is a phenomenology without microscopic foundation.

In this paper, we analyze the staggered-ux state of physical electron in two-dimensional t-J model by the U(1) slave boson method without assuming the Bose condensation of holons. The relation between the staggered current of electron and the staggered current of spinon is provided. In Sec. II, our formulation will be reviewed. Not only an auxiliary eld i_{ij} that describes spinon-hopping but also an auxiliary eld B_{ij} that describes holon-hopping will be introduced to decouple the hopping Hamiltonian. The advantages of this formulation will be stated in Sec. II A. For mean eld solution, not only staggered ux of spinon but also staggered ux of holon will be considered. This solution provides the relation between the staggered ux state of spinon and that of electron. In Sec. III, The self-consistent equations will be derived. In Sec. IV, the phase diagram is shown, where the staggered-ux phase of electron exists. In Appendix, it is proved analytically that the staggered ux and the d-wave pairing do not coexist. The instability of these two states, the staggered ux state and the d-wave pairing state, are discussed. In Sec. V, the temperature dependences of Fermi surface and excitation gap at $(0; \pi)$ are shown. We show that the Fermi surface in the staggered-ux state resembles segment-like Fermi surface observed by ARPES experiments. Finally, conclusion will be given in Sec. VI. Part of the present results will be published elsewhere [26].

II. FORMALISM

A. Slave boson t-J model and auxiliary elds

The starting Hamiltonian is two-dimensional t-J model on a square lattice [18],

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} P \left(c_i^{\sigma} c_j^{\sigma} + h.c. \right) P + J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i \cdot S_j; \quad (1)$$

Here, $\sum_{\langle ij \rangle}$ represents sum over the nearest-neighbor sites, the repeated spin index is summed up over the two spin states, and P is a projection operator to no doubly occupied state, $S_i = \frac{1}{2} c_i^{\sigma} c_i^{\sigma'} \sigma$, where $\sigma = (1; 2; 3)$ are Pauli matrices. One way to represent the projection to no double occupancy is the slave boson method. In the U(1) slave boson method, the electron operator c_i is described by a product of an auxiliary spin-1/2 neutral fermion operator f_i called spinon and an auxiliary spinless charged boson operator b_i called holon; $c_i = b_i^{\dagger} f_i$ with a constraint $b_i^{\dagger} b_i + f_i^{\dagger} f_i = 1$. Here, the repeated spin index is summed up over the two spin states. In the path integral formalism, the partition function $Z(\chi) = \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H)$ is described by following functional integral, $Z = \int [db][df][d\lambda] \exp(-S)$,

$$S = \int_0^{\beta} d\tau \sum_i \left(b_i^{\dagger} \partial_{\tau} b_i + f_i^{\dagger} \partial_{\tau} f_i \right) + H; \quad (2)$$

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \left(f_i^{\dagger} f_j b_j^{\dagger} b_i + c.c. \right) + J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i \cdot S_j + i \sum_i \left(b_i^{\dagger} b_i + f_i^{\dagger} f_i - 1 \right) e^{\sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \lambda_{ij} f_i^{\dagger} f_j}; \quad (3)$$

where β is the inverse temperature $\beta = 1/T$, $\int_0^{\beta} d\tau$ is the imaginary time, $[db] = \prod_i db_i^{\dagger}(\tau) db_i(\tau)$ is a complex boson integral, $[df] = \prod_i df_i^{\dagger}(\tau) df_i(\tau)$ is a complex Grassmann integral, $[d\lambda] = \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} d\lambda_{ij}(\tau)$ is the Lagrange multiplier integral that represents a constraint $b_i^{\dagger} b_i + f_i^{\dagger} f_i = 1$, $S_i = \frac{1}{2} f_i^{\dagger} \sigma f_i$, e^{χ} is chemical potential. We introduce three complex auxiliary elds i_{ij} , j_{ij} , and B_{ij} on links to decouple the Hamiltonian.

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \left(t B_{ij} f_j^{\dagger} f_i + i_{ij} b_i^{\dagger} b_j + c.c. \right) + t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} B_{ij} i_{ij} + B_{ij} j_{ij} + \frac{3J}{8} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} f_j^{\dagger} f_i + i_{ij} f_j f_i + c.c. + \frac{3J}{8} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} j_{ij} j_{ij}^{\dagger} + j_{ij} j_{ij}^{\dagger} + i \sum_i \left(b_i^{\dagger} b_i + f_i^{\dagger} f_i - 1 \right) e^{\sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \lambda_{ij} f_i^{\dagger} f_j}; \quad (4)$$

Then partition function $Z(\chi)$ is rewritten as; $Z = \int_P [db][df][d\lambda][di][dj][dB] \exp(-S^0)$, where $S^0 = \int_0^{\beta} d\tau \sum_i \left(b_i^{\dagger} \partial_{\tau} b_i + f_i^{\dagger} \partial_{\tau} f_i \right) + H^0$. The following relations are obtained by differentiating the integrand in Eq. (4) by i_{ij} , j_{ij} , and B_{ij} [27],

$$\begin{aligned} i_{ij} h_{ij} &= h f_i^{\dagger} f_j; \\ j_{ij} h_{ij} &= h f_i^{\dagger} f_{j\#} - f_{i\#} f_j; \\ B_{ij} h B_{ij} &= h b_i^{\dagger} b_j; \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

According to these relations, i_{ij} describes the hopping of spinon, j_{ij} describes the singlet pairing of spinon which is

called resonating-valence bond (RVB), and B_{ij} describes the hopping of holon. The quantity $B_{ij} = \langle b_i^\dagger b_j \rangle$ can have a finite value even if there is no Bose-condensation of holon (see Sec. IV).

Present treatment is different from previous one by Ubbens and Lee [23]. In Ref. [23], B_{ij} was not introduced. Then $\langle b_i^\dagger b_j \rangle$ can not be interpreted as spinon hopping $\langle f_i^\dagger f_j \rangle$, but the correct relation becomes $\langle b_i^\dagger b_j \rangle = \langle f_i^\dagger f_j \rangle + \frac{8t}{3J} \langle b_i^\dagger b_j \rangle$ as can be known from Eq. (4) without B_{ij} term. In their method, the four-boson term $b_i^\dagger b_j b_j^\dagger b_i$ is created by the decoupling, but it is neglected based on an argument that the effect of this term is small at low doping. The situation is similar in the SU(2) method [19,20], if B_{ij} is not introduced. Our treatment has a merit that the four-boson term does not appear in the decoupling.

B. Saddle point solution

We approximate the integral by auxiliary fields ϕ_{ij} , $\hat{\phi}_{ij}$, and B_{ij} with their saddle point values ϕ_{ij} , $\hat{\phi}_{ij}$, and B_{ij} . For the saddle point solution of ϕ_{ij} and B_{ij} , we considered not only the staggered flux order of the spinon s but also the staggered flux order of the holon h (Fig. 1), namely

$$\phi_{i+\hat{x},i} = e^{i(\phi_s - 1)} = x_s + i(1)^i y_s; \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{\phi}_{i+\hat{y},i} = e^{-i(\phi_s - 1)} = x_s - i(1)^i y_s; \quad (7)$$

$$B_{i+\hat{x},i} = B e^{i(\phi_h - 1)} = x_h + i(1)^i y_h; \quad (8)$$

$$B_{i+\hat{y},i} = B e^{-i(\phi_h - 1)} = x_h - i(1)^i y_h; \quad (9)$$

Here, \hat{x} and \hat{y} are unit vectors in the x and y direction, $x_s = \cos(\phi_s/4)$, $y_s = \sin(\phi_s/4)$, $x_h = B \cos(\phi_h/4)$, $y_h = B \sin(\phi_h/4)$ [28]. The staggered flux state contains a density wave (particle-hole pairing) ordering whose symmetry is $d_{x^2 - y^2}$, which is called "d-density wave" [6]. The order parameters y_s and y_h correspond to the d-density wave order parameter of spinon and holon, respectively [29]. For the symmetry of spinon pairing, we considered $d_{x^2 - y^2}$ [30,31], namely

$$\phi_{i+\hat{x},i} = \phi_{i+\hat{y},i} = \phi_s; \quad (10)$$




FIG. 1. Staggered flux of spinon s and holon h .

The integral by Lagrange multiplier field ϕ_i is also approximated with its saddle point value $\phi_i = \phi_0$. Then spinon and holon have chemical potentials, $\mu_s = \mu_0$ and $\mu_h = \mu_0$, respectively. These chemical potentials enforce the global constraints of spinon number and holon number, $\langle f_i^\dagger f_i \rangle = 1$ and $\langle b_i^\dagger b_i \rangle = 1$, respectively.

This method that treats the spinon and the holon as separated degrees of freedom is justified because the low temperature phase of the t-J model is in the deconfinement phase of spinon and holon even when full gauge fluctuations (fluctuations around this saddle point) are included. It is shown based on the compact U(1) treatments of the gauge fields [32,33]. As the gauge field couples with finite density fermion, the gauge coupling gets weaker. In the deconfinement phase of spinon and holon, the gauge field can be treated perturbatively.

Our formalism is an extension of the study by Ubbens and Lee [23]. The $f_j^\dagger f_i$ term couples not only to $(3J/8)\phi_{ij}$ but also to tB_{ij} , namely the spinon feels the spinon staggered-flux (ϕ_s) and the holon staggered-flux (ϕ_h). The expectation values of the holon, B and μ_h , have finite values for the solution of self-consistency equations. Two advantages exist in our formalism; 1) this is a new saddle point solution whose free energy is lower than the previous one, 2) this solution provides the relation between the staggered-flux of electron and that of spinon.

With holon order parameters B_{ij} , the hopping order parameter of electron becomes a product of the hopping order parameters of spinon and holon,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle c_i^\dagger c_j \rangle &= \langle f_i^\dagger f_j \rangle \langle b_j^\dagger b_i \rangle = \phi_{ij} B_{ij} \\ &= B e^{i(\phi_s - \phi_h)/4}; \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The electron staggered-flux order parameter ϕ_e and the electron d-density wave order parameter y_e are given by

$$\phi_e = \phi_s - \phi_h, \quad y_e = B \sin(\phi_e/4); \quad (12)$$

According to eq.(12), the d-density wave order parameter of electron y_e can also be written as, $y_e = \frac{i}{2N} \sum_k (\cos k_x - \cos k_y) \langle c_k^\dagger c_{k+Q} \rangle$.

III. SELF CONSISTENT EQUATIONS

This saddle point is described by the following partition function $Z^{MF} = \int [d\phi][dB] \exp(-S^{MF})$, where $S^{MF} = \int d\tau \sum_i (\phi_i^\dagger \partial_t \phi_i + f_i^\dagger \partial_t f_i) + H^{MF}$,

$$\begin{aligned} H^{MF} &= H_{matter}^{MF} - N(\mu_s + \mu_h) \\ &\quad + 2N \frac{3J}{8} (x_s^2 + y_s^2 + x_h^2 + y_h^2) + 2t(x_s x_h + y_s y_h); \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

the spinon chemical potential is $\mu_s = \mu_0$, and the holon chemical potential is $\mu_h = \mu_0$. The saddle point value of ϕ_i is $\phi_i = \phi_0$. Here, the matter part of this Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_{matter}^{MF} = \sum_k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y_k \\ y_k & H_k^h \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} h_y & h_k \\ h_k & H_k^h \end{pmatrix}; \quad (14)$$

where, \sum_k stands for a sum over the half Brillouin zone. y_k and h_k are vector representations of spinon and holon, $y_k = (f_k^y; f_{k+Q}^y; f_{k\#}^y; f_{k-Q\#}^y)$, $h_k = (b_k^y; b_{k+Q}^y)$. The matrices H_k and H_k^h are,

$$H_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & iW_k & 0 & 1 \\ iW_k & (k_x + k_y) & 0 & k \\ 0 & 0 & (k_x - k_y) & iW_k \\ 0 & k & iW_k & (k_x - k_y) \end{pmatrix}; \quad (15)$$

$$H_k^h = \begin{pmatrix} h_k & h_k \\ iW_k^h & (h_k + h_k) \end{pmatrix}; \quad (16)$$

where

$$k_x = (2tx_h + \frac{3J}{4}x_s)(\cos k_x + \cos k_y); \quad (17)$$

$$W_k = (2ty_h + \frac{3J}{4}y_s)(\cos k_x - \cos k_y); \quad (18)$$

$$k_y = \frac{3J}{4}(\cos k_x - \cos k_y); \quad (19)$$

$$h_k = 2tx_s(\cos k_x + \cos k_y); \quad (20)$$

$$W_k^h = 2ty_s(\cos k_x - \cos k_y); \quad (21)$$

The spinon couples not only to spinon order parameters, x_s and y_s , but also to holon order parameters, x_h and y_h . The holon couples only to spinon order parameters, x_s and y_s . There exist two components, W_k and k , that generate the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ wave gap.

After the Bogoliubov transformation, diagonalized Hamiltonian is obtained,

$$H_{matter}^{MF} = \sum_{k;s=1}^X E_{ks} \begin{pmatrix} y_{ks} \\ y_{ks} \end{pmatrix} + E_{ks}^h \begin{pmatrix} h_y \\ h_k \end{pmatrix} \quad (22)$$

where

$$E_{ks} = \sqrt{(s^2 + \frac{2}{k} + W_k^2)^2 + \frac{2}{k}}; \quad (23)$$

$$E_{ks}^h = s \sqrt{\frac{h^2}{k} + W_k^2}; \quad (24)$$

Both y_{ks} and y_{ks} are fermionic elds, h_k is bosonic eld, and $E_{ks}^{(h)}$ is excitation spectrum of spinon (holon). Index s describes the band index, which takes the value +1 or -1. After integrating out spinon eld and holon eld, the free energy has the following form,

$$F = -2T \sum_{k;s} \ln \cosh(E_{ks}=2) + T \sum_{k;s} \ln(1 - e^{-E_{ks}^h}) + 2N \frac{3J}{8} (x_s^2 + y_s^2 + \frac{2}{k}) + 2t(x_s x_h + y_s y_h) - N \sum_{k;s} (h_k); \quad (25)$$

By minimizing the free energy F , we obtain the self-consistency equations,

$$x_s = (2tx_h + \frac{3J}{4}x_s) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k;s} \frac{\tanh(E_{ks}=2)}{2E_{ks}} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{s^2}{(k^2 + W_k^2)^{1/2}}}; \quad (26)$$

$$y_s = (2ty_h + \frac{3J}{4}y_s) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k;s} \frac{\tanh(E_{ks}=2)}{2E_{ks}} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{s^2}{(k^2 + W_k^2)^{1/2}}}; \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{3J}{4} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k;s} \frac{\tanh(E_{ks}=2)}{2E_{ks}}; \quad (28)$$

$$x_h = 2tx_s \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k;s} \frac{1}{2(k^2 + W_k^2)^{1/2}} \frac{(s)}{e^{E_{ks}^h} - 1}; \quad (29)$$

$$y_h = 2ty_s \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k;s} \frac{1}{2(k^2 + W_k^2)^{1/2}} \frac{(s)}{e^{E_{ks}^h} - 1}; \quad (30)$$

The chemical potential μ and μ_h are determined by

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k;s} \frac{s^2}{(k^2 + W_k^2)^{1/2}} \frac{\tanh(E_{ks}=2)}{E_{ks}}; \quad (31)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k;s} \frac{1}{e^{E_{ks}^h} - 1}; \quad (32)$$

where $k = \cos k_x - \cos k_y$.

At half-filling, where spinon chemical potential is zero and holon is absent ($B_{ij} = 0$, i.e. $x_h = y_h = 0$), $E_{ks} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{k} + (3J=4)^2 (y_s^2 + \frac{2}{k}) (\cos k_x - \cos k_y)^2}$, and both y_s and y_h have the same self-consistent equations. Thus, staggered flux state and d-wave pairing state are degenerate. All states that have the same value of $y_s^2 + \frac{2}{k}$ are degenerate. However, which state has the lower energy at finite doping is known only after actual minimization of the free energy is done.

IV. PHASE DIAGRAM AND STAGGERED CURRENT

A . Phase diagram




FIG. 2. Mean field phase diagram for $t=J=1$, where δ is hole concentration. The staggered-ux order of electron exists only in region 2. In this phase, staggered-uxes of spinon and holon do not cancel completely. Thus the staggered ux of electron remains. In region 1, both spinon and holon are in the -ux state. The uxes cancel completely. The region 3 is the d-wave RVB phase where the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ pairing of spinon exists. The region 4 is the uniform RVB phase where hopping order parameters exist however it is real. In the region 5, all order parameters are zero. The phase diagram for $t=J=2$ is quantitatively similar to the phase diagram for $t=J=1$.

We solved the self-consistency equations numerically, and obtained the phase diagram (Fig. 2) where 1) a region of the staggered-ux phase of the electron exists, 2) staggered-ux and d-wave pairing do not coexist, and 3) the ground state is a purely superconducting state.

At half-filling, the holon order parameter B_{ij} is zero and the degeneracy of spinon states between the staggered-ux state and the d-wave pairing state exists due to local $SU(2)$ symmetry [34]; $\delta=0; B_{ij}=0; y_s^2 + \delta^2 = \text{const} \neq 0$. In region 1, the staggered-ux of electron does not exist although the staggered ux of spinon exists. The spinon and holon states are both -ux state [35] respectively. In the electron picture, the staggered-ux is canceled completely; $\delta \neq 0; B \neq 0; s = h = \delta$; $y_e = 0$. The d-density wave order parameter of the electron is $y_e = B \sin(\delta) = 4 = 0$. The staggered-ux order of the electron exists only in region 2. The staggered current of electron exists in this phase. The spinon staggered-ux s and holon staggered-ux h are not equal to nor 0, and the holon staggered-ux amplitude h is not equal to the spinon staggered-ux amplitude s , $s \neq h$; $\delta \neq 0; B \neq 0; s \neq 0; h \neq 0; \delta = 0$, and $y_e = B \sin(s - h) = 4 \neq 0$. In region 3, $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave pairing exists; $\delta \neq 0$ and $B \neq 0; s = h = 0; \delta \neq 0$, and $y_e = 0$. In region 4, there exists only uniform hopping order; $\delta \neq 0; B \neq 0; s = h = 0$, and $y_e = 0$. In region 5, all order parameters are zero. Spinon and holon cannot hop; $\delta = B = s = h = 0$, and $y_e = 0$. The phase transitions, region 1 to region 3 and region 2 to region 3, are first order. Other phase transitions are second order. It is proved analytically that the staggered ux and the d-wave pairing do not coexist at

nite doping. Details are given in Appendix.

With the boson order parameter B_{ij} , the -ux phase and staggered-ux phase of spinon and holon extends to higher-doped region compared to the previous work [23], where B_{ij} was not considered. The transition between region 1 and region 2 is a second order transition in our theory. (If one only focuses on spinon degree of freedom, this does not look like phase transition [19,20,23].) There exists an order parameter that characterizes this transition. It is the staggered-ux of the electron. This is shown in Sec. IV B.

Although the ground state is the d-wave superconducting phase at finite doping, the staggered-ux phase exists at finite temperature. The staggered-ux state has larger entropy than the d-wave pairing state, due to the larger number of the excitation around finite size Fermi-surface. On the contrary, the Fermi-surface in the d-wave pairing state is always point-like. Therefore the staggered-ux state arises when temperature increases. These are shown in Sec. V.

When the fluctuation around the saddle point solution (gauge field) is included, it is expected that the staggered ux phase extends to still higher doped region compared with the mean field phase diagram. There are three reasons, 1) the d-wave pairing of spinon will be destroyed, 2) the instability to the staggered-ux state exists, and 3) the symmetry breaking of the staggered-ux order is discrete. Let us elaborate these reasons. Firstly, the d-wave pairing of spinon is destroyed above the Bose-condensation temperature of holon when the fluctuation around the saddle point solution (gauge field) is included [36]. The d-wave RVB state without Bose-condensation does not occur, and the transition to the d-wave pairing state becomes the direct transition to the d-wave superconducting state. The second reason is that the instability to the staggered-ux state has been discovered also in the gauge theory that includes the full lattice structure [37,38]. It is to the staggered-ux state at low doped region and to the ux density-wave state (incommensurate staggered-ux state) at high doped region. The momentum that has anomaly is $Q = (\pi; 0)$ to the staggered-ux state, and is $(\pi; \pi)$ to the ux density-wave. At finite temperature, these anomalies occur. The third reason is that staggered ux state is more robust against the fluctuation than the d-wave pairing (d-wave RVB) state. This comes from the difference in the symmetry breakings. The symmetry breaking in the staggered-ux state is discrete symmetry, Z_2 . On the other hand, continuous symmetry, $U(1)$, is broken in the d-wave pairing state.

B . Staggered-ux of the electron

The doping dependences of the staggered-ux amplitudes are shown in Fig. 3. The electron staggered-ux amplitude y_e is a difference of the staggered-ux amplitude of spinon s and holon h Eq.(12). In Fig. 3 the

phase changes as doping increases from region 1 to region 2 and to finally region 3. In region 1 which is s -wave phase of spinon, staggered- u xes of spinon and holon cancel completely and staggered- u x order of electron does not exist. However, in region 2, staggered- u x amplitude is not zero, u xes does not cancel completely and staggered- u x amplitude of electron remains. The staggered- u x amplitude of holon decays rapidly as doping increases but it is not zero. At the transition point to d -wave pairing, staggered- u x order parameter becomes zero discontinuously.




FIG. 3. The staggered- u x order parameter of spinon s , holon h , and electron $e = s - h$ at $T = 0.15J$ for $t/J = 2$. δ is hole concentration.

C. Spontaneous current of the electron

Spinon current and holon current cancel locally,

$$J_{ij}^s + J_{ij}^h = 0: \quad (33)$$

The spinon current J_{ij}^s and the holon current J_{ij}^h are given by

$$J_{ij}^s = i\hbar \left(\frac{3J}{8} \right)_{ij} + tB_{ij} f_i^y f_j - \hbar c i; \quad (34)$$

$$J_{ij}^h = i\hbar_{ij} b_i^y b_j - \hbar c i; \quad (35)$$

The $\hbar_{ij} f_i^y f_j$ term does not contribute to the current because it is real. Only $\hbar B_{ij} f_i^y f_j$ term contribute to the current.

The local cancellation of spinon current and holon current does not exclude the possibility of the electron staggered current. In our formalism, the physical electron current is given by the imaginary part of the product of hopping order parameters of spinon c_{ij} and holon B_{ij} .

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ij}^e &= i\hbar c_i^y c_j - \hbar c i \\ &= i\hbar f_i^y f_j i\hbar b_j^y b_i - \hbar c i \\ &= 2t \text{Im} \quad c_{ij} B_{ij} \\ &= 2t \text{Im} \quad B e^{i(\phi_s - \phi_h) = 4\phi} : \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The explicit form of the electron current in this saddle point is $J_{i+\hat{x}i}^e = (-1)^{i_2} 2t B \sin(\phi_e = 4\phi) = (-1)^{i_2} 2t y_e$, $J_{i+\hat{y}i}^e = (-1)^{i_1} 2t B \sin(\phi_e = 4\phi) = (-1)^{i_1} 2t y_e$. The current of the electron is small at lower doped region because it is in proportion to the $B = \hbar b_j^y b_i$. At low doping, B is proportional to δ and small. The magnetic field due to the orbital current of electron is same order with previous estimations of $10^{-3}T$ [2,25].

V. FERMI SURFACE AND EXCITATION GAP AT $(0, \phi)$

The temperature dependences of Fermi surface and excitation gap at $(0, \phi)$ are shown. These behaviors are consistent with angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) experiments [7,14].

A. Fermi surface

Fermi surface is the loci of gapless excitation in momentum space. It is defined by the zero-energy line of the electron excitation energy. The Fermi surface for $\delta = 0.02$ is shown in Fig. 4 at several temperatures. When temperature decreases, the Fermi surface becomes smaller in the staggered- u x phase, and changes to a point-like Fermi surface discontinuously at the transition temperature to the d -wave pairing phase. However, this discontinuity is small because Fermi surface in the staggered- u x phase has shrunk almost to a point at the transition point. The shape of Fermi surface in the staggered- u x state of our theory is segment-like because the spectral weight has large enough value only along a part of the contour.




FIG. 4. The temperature dependence of the zero-energy-line of fermion at $\delta=0.02$. In (a), the first quadrant of the Brillouin zone is shown. In (b), expanded view around $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ is shown. In this doping, transition temperature to the d-wave pairing phase is about $T = 0.135J$.

This result is quite different from the $SU(2)$ mean-field theory, where the shape of Fermi-surface is always point-like because the particle-hole symmetry (i.e. $SU(2)$ symmetry) of fermion remains even at finite doping. As the filling of fermions are always half-filled, the staggered-ux state and d-wave pairing state can be assumed to be gauge equivalent. Artificial introduction of the phenomenological interactions are needed for the fermion to have a segment-like Fermi surface in the $SU(2)$ theory.

Now we give the details. The electron Green function G^e is described by the product of spinon Green function G^s and holon Green function G^h [39];

$$G^e(i\mathbf{l}_n; \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}} G^s(i\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{p}) G^h(i\mathbf{l}_n; \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}) \quad (37)$$

The contribution of holon Green function comes mainly from the bottom of the holon band. The momenta at the bottom of the boson band are $(0;0)$ and $(\pi; \pi)$ in the staggered-ux state, and are $(0;0)$, $(\pi;0)$, $(0;\pi)$, and $(\pi;\pi)$ in the -ux state. We can treat the bosons as if they are Bose condensed at these band minima. In this approximation, the spectral function of electron has the following form,

$$A^e(i\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2} u_k^2 (i\mathbf{l} - E_k^+) + j_k j_k^\dagger (i\mathbf{l} - E_k^-) + A^{in}(i\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k}); \quad (38)$$

where $u_k^2 = (1 + \epsilon_k = (\frac{\epsilon_k}{2} + W_k^2)^{1/2})^2 = 2$, $j_k j_k^\dagger = (1 - \epsilon_k = (\frac{\epsilon_k}{2} + W_k^2)^{1/2})^2 = 2$, $A^{in}(i\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k})$ is the incoherent part of the spectral function, $E_k = \pm \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_k}{2} + W_k^2}$ are spectrums of spinon in the staggered-ux state. In reality, the boson excitations exist at finite temperature. They make the discrete δ -function peaks have a finite width. This effect, however, will not change the shape of the Fermi-surface. Thus, we show the zero-energy-line of spinon in the staggered-ux phase defined by $E_k = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_k}{2} + W_k^2} = 0$ in Fig.4. The upper band spectrum E_k^+ is always positive at finite doping where 0 .

Although the zero-energy-line of fermion forms an ellipse, the Fermi-surface can be considered as segment-like. The reason is that the intensity of spectrum function $\frac{1}{2} j_k j_k^\dagger$ is not symmetric between in the inner region (where $j_x j_y > j_k j_k^\dagger$) and in the outer region (where $j_x j_y < j_k j_k^\dagger$). As shown in Fig.5 it is stronger in the inner region. For example, on the line $k_x = k_y$, where $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -gap due to staggered-ux order (W_k^2) is always zero, the intensity is $\frac{1}{2}$ at the inner side of the ellipse as $j_k j_k^\dagger = 1$, but the intensity is zero at the outer side of the ellipse as $j_k j_k^\dagger = 0$.




FIG. 5. The spectral weight $A^e(i\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{k})$ at $i\mathbf{l} = 0$ divided by $\frac{1}{2}$ (i.e. $j_k j_k^\dagger$) at $T = 0.178J$. View from the $(\pi; \pi)$ -direction is shown.

The temperature dependence of the excitation gap at $(0; \pi)$ looks almost continuous at the transition point between the staggered-flux phase and the d-wave pairing phase (Fig. 6), although it is a first order transition in the present mean-field analysis. The energy at $(0; \pi)$ are $E_{\text{staggered}}; (0; \pi) = 4t\gamma_h + 3J\gamma_s = 2j_p$ in the staggered flux state, and $E_{\text{d-wave pairing}}; (0; \pi) = \frac{j_p^2}{2 + (3J - 2)^2}$ in the d-wave RVB state, respectively.




FIG. 6. The temperature dependence of the excitation gap at $(0; \pi)$ at $t = 0.02$ for $t/J = 2$. The phase changes as temperature decreases from the uniform phase to the staggered-flux phase and finally to the d-wave pairing phase.

C. Comparison with experiments

The ARPES experiments on $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+x}$ (BSCCO) [7,13] and recent one on $\text{La}_2\text{SrCuO}_4$ (LSCO) [14] showed that a segment-like Fermi-surface exists near the $(\pi/2; \pi/2)$ in pseudo-gap region. [7,9]. There is the gap whose symmetry is $d_{x^2-y^2}$. The gap is largest near $(\pi/2; 0)$ and does not exist on the $(0; 0) - (\pi; \pi)$ line. The reason that these Fermi-surface often called segment-like, or arc, is due to the shape where the spectral weight is finite. It does not form a closed curve. When one scan on the $(0; 0) - (\pi; \pi)$ line, the spectral weight only exists in inner region of Brillouin zone (where $|k_x| + |k_y| < \pi/2$) [8]. Thus, this is called segment-like. When temperature decrease, the segment-like Fermi-surface become smaller in pseudo-gap phase and change to the Fermi-point in the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave superconducting state [10,13]. On the other hand, the temperature dependence of the excitation gap at $(0; \pi)$ almost looks continuous at the transition point between the pseudo-gap phase and the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave superconducting phase [13]. Our present results are consistent with these observations.

The competition between the staggered flux, or the d-density wave, and the d-wave pairing is analyzed in two-dimensional t - J model based on $U(1)$ slave boson mean-field theory. Not only staggered-flux of spinon but also staggered-flux of holon are considered, independently. In this formalism, the hopping order parameter of electron is described by a product of hopping order parameters of spinon and holon. The staggered-flux amplitude of the electron is a difference of staggered-flux amplitudes of spinon and holon. A phase diagram is obtained where 1) a region of the electron staggered-flux state exists, 2) the staggered-flux and the d-wave pairing do not coexist, and 3) the ground state is a purely d-wave superconducting state. In π -flux phase of spinon, staggered-fluxes of spinon and holon cancel completely and the staggered-flux order of the electron does not exist. However, in the staggered-flux phase of spinon whose staggered-flux is not π , fluxes do not cancel completely and staggered-flux order of electron exist. Thus, the phase transition between these two phases, π -flux phase and staggered-flux phase of spinon, becomes a second order transition in electron picture. The order parameter that characterizes this transition is the staggered-flux order parameter of the electron. The relation between the staggered current of electron and that of spinon is provided. The local cancellation of spinon current and holon current does not exclude the possibility of the electron staggered current. It is proved analytically that the staggered-flux and the d-wave pairing does not coexist except at half-filling. The condition for coexistence of staggered-flux and d-wave pairing as a saddle-point solution is provided. The instability of these two states, staggered flux and d-wave pairing, are discussed. The temperature dependence of following two quantities, Fermi surface and the excitation gap at $(0; \pi)$, are shown. The behaviors are consistent with ARPES experiments. When temperature decreases, the segments-like Fermi-surface in the staggered-flux phase becomes smaller and changes to a point at the transition temperature to the d-wave pairing phase. The temperature dependence of the excitation gap at $(0; \pi)$ looks continuous at the transition point between the staggered-flux phase and the d-wave pairing phase although these two phases are qualitatively different.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

K.H. thanks Akihiro Himeda, Takashi Koretsune, Youichi Yanase, Masao Ogata, Naoto Nagaosa, Jun-ichiro Kishine, Yousuke Ueno, Kentaro Nomura, Ryuuichi Shindou, Shinsei Ryu, Yoshifumi Morita, and Tetsuo Matsui for their useful discussions. Numerical computation in this work was partially carried out at the Yukawa Institute Computer Facility.

It is proved analytically that the staggered ux and the d -wave pairing coexist only at half-filling. The instability of these two states, staggered ux and d -wave pairing, are also discussed.

From self-consistent equations (27) (28) (30), following equation is derived. It must be satisfied for any states whose free energy is at saddle point.

$$0 = y_s \left[(2t)^2 C A + B + \frac{3J}{4} B \right]; \quad (A1)$$

where the quantities, A , B , and C , are given by,

$$A = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,s} \frac{\frac{2}{k} \tanh(E_{ks}=2)}{E_{ks}}; \quad (A2)$$

$$B = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,s} \frac{\frac{2}{k} \tanh(E_{ks}=2)}{2 \left(\frac{2}{k} + W_k^2 \right)^{1/2} E_{ks}}; \quad (A3)$$

$$C = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,s} \frac{\frac{2}{k} (s)}{2 \left(\frac{h^2}{k} + W_k^2 \right)^{1/2} e^{E_{ks}^h} 1}; \quad (A4)$$

where $k_x = \cos k_x$, $k_y = \cos k_y$, $A > 0$, $B \leq 0$, $C \leq 0$. Here, the quantity B is different from B which describes the amplitude of the boson-hopping. B is zero at half-filling as $y_s = 0$, and is negative at finite doping. C is zero at half-filling or when all holon condense at $(0;0)$ or $(\pi;\pi)$, and is negative when excited holon exists or when holon condense at $(\pi;0)$ or $(0;\pi)$ which is the situation of ux state. If the staggered ux and the d -wave pairing coexist, y_s is non-zero. Then in order for the coexistence, eq.(A1) requires that the quantity in the square bracket must vanish. At half-filling, $B = C = 0$, so the condition is satisfied. At finite doping $B < 0$, so if $C = 0$ there is no coexistence. When $C \neq 0$, we cannot expect the quantity in the square bracket vanish except at a special point in the phase space. However, from the continuity of the order parameters, it is impossible to have both y_s and $y_s \neq 0$ only at a single point.

The curvature of free energy at the saddle points of pure staggered- ux state and pure d -wave pairing state have the following forms respectively,

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y_s^2} \Big|_{y_s=0} = 2N \left[\left(\frac{3J}{4} \right)^2 B + (2t)^2 C g \right]; \quad (A5)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y_s^2} \Big|_{y_s \neq 0} = 2N \left[\frac{3J}{4} B + \frac{3J}{4} f_1 - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{4(2t)^2}{3J} C} g \right]; \quad (A6)$$

The stability of the states depends on B and C . There are three cases: (i) The case that B and C are both zero: This is realized at half-filling, and $\left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y_s^2} \right) \Big|_{y_s=0} = \left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y_s^2} \right) \Big|_{y_s \neq 0} = 0$. We need not discuss this case. (ii) The case that B is negative and C is zero (this is the same situation that Zhang discussed

[40]): In this case, pure d -wave pairing are always stable, and pure staggered- ux state is unstable against infinitesimal d -wave pairing. The curvature at each state are $\left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y_s^2} \right) \Big|_{y_s=0} = 2N (3J/4)^2 B > 0$ and $\left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y_s^2} \right) \Big|_{y_s \neq 0} = 2N (3J/4)^2 B < 0$. (iii) The case that B and C are both negative: A region where pure d -density wave is stable and a region where d -wave pairing is stable can both exist.

The situation where B is zero and C is negative does not occur. B is zero only at half-filling where C is zero.

-
- [1] I. A. A. Eck and J. B. Marston, Phys. Rev. B 37, 3774 (1988); J. B. Marston and I. A. Eck, Phys. Rev. B 39, 11538 (1989).
 - [2] T. C. Hu, J. B. Marston, and I. A. Eck, Phys. Rev. B 43, 2866 (1991).
 - [3] H. A. Mook, P. Dai, and F. Dogan, Phys. Rev. B 64, 012502 (2001).
 - [4] H. A. Mook, P. Dai, S. M. Hayden, A. H. Ess, J. W. Lynn, S. H. Lee, and F. Dogan, cond-mat/0204002.
 - [5] R. I. Miller, R. F. Kiehl, J. H. Brewer, J. E. Sonier, J. Chakhalian, S. Dunsiger, G. D. Morris, A. N. Price, D. A. Bonn, W. H. Hardy, and R. Liang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 137002 (2002).
 - [6] C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B 62, 4880 (2000).
 - [7] A. G. Loeser, Z.-X. Shen, D. S. Dessau, D. S. Marshall, C. H. Park, P. Fournier, and A. K. A. Pitulnik, Science 273, 325 (1996).
 - [8] D. S. Marshall, D. S. Dessau, A. G. Loeser, C. H. Park, A. Y. Matsuura, J. N. Eckstein, I. Bozovic, P. Fournier, A. K. A. Pitulnik, W. E. Spicer, and Z.-X. Shen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4841 (1996).
 - [9] H. Ding, T. Yokoyama, J. C. Camuzano, T. Takahashi, M. Randeria, M. R. Norman, T. Mochiku, K. Kadowaki, and J. G. Papadimitrakopoulos, Nature 382, 51 (1996).
 - [10] J. M. Harris, Z.-X. Shen, P. J. White, D. S. Marshall, and M. C. Schabel, J. N. Eckstein and I. Bozovic, Phys. Rev. B 54, 15665 (1996).
 - [11] J. M. Harris, P. J. White, Z.-X. Shen, H. Ikeda, R. Yoshizaki, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, W. D. Si, J. W. Xiong, Z.-X. Zhao, and D. S. Dessau, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 143 (1997).
 - [12] H. Ding, M. R. Norman, T. Yokoyama, T. Takeuchi, M. Randeria, J. C. Camuzano, T. Takahashi, T. Mochiku, and K. Kadowaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2628 (1997).
 - [13] M. R. Norman, H. Ding, M. Randeria, J. C. Camuzano, T. Yokoyama, T. Takeuchi, T. Takahashi, T. Mochiku, K. Kadowaki, P. Gupta, and D. G. Hinks, Nature 392, 157 (1998).
 - [14] T. Yoshida, X. J. Zhou, T. Sasagawa, W. L. Yang, P. V. Bogdanov, A. Lanzara, Z. Hussain, T. Mizokawa, A. Fujimori, H. Eisaki, Z.-X. Shen, T. Kakeshita, and S. Uchida, cond-mat/0206469.
 - [15] H.-Y. Kee and Y. B. Kim, Phys. Rev. B 66, 012505 (2002).

- [16] S. Chakravarty, cond-mat/0206282.
- [17] P. W. Anderson, Science 235, 1996 (1987).
- [18] F. C. Zhang and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 37, 3759 (1988).
- [19] X.-G. Wen and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 503 (1996).
- [20] P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, T. K. Ng, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B 57 6003 (1998).
- [21] P. A. Lee and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B 63, 224517 (2001).
- [22] For a recent review see Patrick A. Lee, cond-mat/0201052.
- [23] M. U. Ubbens and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 46, 8434 (1992).
- [24] Below the Bose-condensation temperature of holon, the holon operator can be treated as c-number; $b_i \rightarrow \langle b_i \rangle = z_i$, where z_i is complex c-number. Thus, in the U(1) theory the physical electron operator can be identified with the spinon operator; $c_i = z_i f_i$, where $\langle z_i \rangle^2 = 1$ if all bosons condensate. In the SU(2) theory, the electron operator is described by two terms; $c_i = z_{i1} f_i + z_{i2} f_i^\dagger$, where $z_{i1} = \langle b_{i1} \rangle$, $z_{i2} = \langle b_{i2} \rangle$, and $\langle z_{i1} \rangle^2 + \langle z_{i2} \rangle^2 = 1$ if all bosons condensate. The relations between operators, the electron and the spinon, are fixed when a direction in the $(z_1; z_2)$ space is chosen. However, above the Bose-condensation temperature of holon where $z_i = z_{i1} = z_{i2} = 0$, above discussions cannot be used. Boson operators cannot be treated as c-number. Unfortunately, the staggered flux phase exists in this region.
- [25] S. Chakravarty, R. B. Laughlin, D. K. Morr, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B 63, 94503 (2001).
- [26] K. Hamada and D. Yoshioka, to be published in Physica C. (Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Low Temperature Physics, Hiroshima, 2002.)
- [27] To be more precise, these identities are not only identities between expectation values but also identities between operators. The reason is following. Any correlation functions including these auxiliary fields, a_{ij} , B_{ij} , and c_{ij} , satisfy the identities. For example, by differentiating the integrand in (4) by a_{ij} , any correlation function $\langle O_1 O_2 \dots O_n \rangle$ derives to $\langle a_{ij} O_1 O_2 \dots O_n \rangle = \langle f_i^\dagger f_j O_1 O_2 \dots O_n \rangle = 0$. As O_1, O_2, \dots, O_n are arbitrary operators, this relation means that there is the identity, $a_{ij} = f_i^\dagger f_j$, in operator level. The auxiliary fields, B_{ij} and c_{ij} , also satisfies the following identities in the operator level, $B_{ij} = b_i^\dagger b_j$ and $c_{ij} = f_i^\dagger f_j + f_i b_j^\dagger$, respectively.
- [28] Many choices of the a_{ij} and the B_{ij} are equivalent. These choices of the form of the a_{ij} and the B_{ij} corresponds to a gauge fixing in the staggered-flux state. The only gauge invariant property of a_{ij} and B_{ij} is its flux through a plaquette. If dimerized phase is excluded, these auxiliary fields, a_{ij} and B_{ij} can parameterized by their amplitude and phase, $a_{ij} = e^{i\theta_{ij}}$ and $B_{ij} = B e^{i\phi_{ij}}$. The flux through a plaquette of spinon (holon) is $\theta_{ij} + \theta_{jk} + \theta_{kl} + \theta_{li}$. In the U(1) slave boson method, electron operator $c_i = f_i b_i^\dagger$ is invariant under the internal local U(1) transformation, $f_i \rightarrow f_i e^{i\alpha_i}$ and $b_i \rightarrow b_i e^{i\alpha_i}$. The action is also invariant under this transformation. Then auxiliary fields also transform as following, $e^{i\theta_{ij}} \rightarrow e^{i(\theta_{ij} + \alpha_i - \alpha_j)}$, and $B e^{i\phi_{ij}} \rightarrow B e^{i(\phi_{ij} + \alpha_i + \alpha_j)}$. However, the flux through a plaquette of a_{ij} and that of B_{ij} are gauge invariant. Of course, the hopping of the electron, $c_i^\dagger c_j = a_{ij} B_{ij}$, is also gauge invariant quantity, $B e^{i(\theta_{ij} + \phi_{ij})} \rightarrow B e^{i(\theta_{ij} + \phi_{ij})} e^{i(\alpha_i - \alpha_j + \alpha_i + \alpha_j)} = B e^{i(\theta_{ij} + \phi_{ij})}$.
- [29] The order parameters y_s and y_h are also represented in the following forms, respectively, $y_s = \frac{i}{2N} \sum_k (\cos k_x \cos k_y) h f_k^\dagger f_{k+Q}$ and $y_h = \frac{i}{2N} \sum_k (\cos k_x \cos k_y) h c_k^\dagger b_{k+Q}$. These forms show that these order parameters represent a density wave whose symmetry is $d_{x^2-y^2}$.
- [30] G. Kotliar and J. Liu, Phys. Rev. B 38, 5142 (1988).
- [31] Y. Suzumura, Y. Hasegawa, and H. Fukuyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 57, 2768 (1988).
- [32] N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 4210 (1993).
- [33] I. Ichinose, T. Matsui, and M. Onoda, Phys. Rev. B 64 104516 (2001); I. Ichinose and T. Matsui, Phys. Rev. B 51 11860 (1995).
- [34] I. A. Zou, Z. Zou, T. Hsu, and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B 38, 745 (1988).
- [35] The staggered-flux state is equivalent to the uniform-flux state because these states transform each other by a shift of the 2-flux. The 2-flux does not change physics.
- [36] M. U. Ubbens and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 49 6853 (1994).
- [37] R. Hlubina, W. O. Putikka, T. M. Rice, and D. V. Khveshchenko, Phys. Rev. B 46, 11224 (1992).
- [38] K. Kuboki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 63, 2012 (1994).
- [39] P. W. Anderson and Z. Zou, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 132 (1988).
- [40] F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 974 (1990)