# Self-energy analysis of frequency-dependent conductivity: Application to Pb, Nb, and MgB<sub>2</sub> in norm al state

Tae-Hyoung Gimm and Han-Yong Choi

Department of Physics, BK21 Physics Research Division, and Center for Nanotubes and Nanostructure Composites, Sung Kyun Kwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea.

(D ated: M arch 22, 2024)

We propose and demonstrate a microscopic way to analyze the frequency-dependent infrared conductivity: extraction of the electron self-energy from the inversion of experimentally measured infrared conductivity through the functional minimization and numerical iterations. The self-energy contains the full information on the coherent and incoherent parts of interacting electrons and, therefore, can describe their charge dynamics even when the quasi-particle concept is not valid. From the extracted self-energy, other physical properties such as the Raman intensity spectrum and the electron between electrons can also be computed. We will rst demonstrate that the self-energy analysis can be successfully in plemented by tting the frequency-dependent condcutivities of the sim plemetals such as Pb and Nb, and then calculating the electrons from the tunneling experiments. We then present the self-energy analysis of the MgB<sub>2</sub> superconductors in norm al state and clarify some of the controversies in their optical spectra. In particular, the small electron-phonon coupling constant obtained previously is attributed to an underestimate of the plasm a frequency.

## IN T R O D U C T IO N

The frequency-dependent conductivity (!) provides one of the most valuable and detailed inform ation on the charge dynam ics in a wide class of materials. It is analyzed using either the one-component or two-component models [1]. The two-component model interprets the (!) as arising from a combination of two types of carriers, free and bound ones. The free carriers are modeled in terms of the D rude term and the bound ones in terms of various Lorentzian oscillators. How ever, the interpretation of the individual Lorentzian terms, most of which are usually due to inter-band contributions, is not straightforward.

In the one-component picture, referred to as the extended D rude m odel (EDM), on the other hand, the frequency dependence of the conductivity (!) below interband contributions is described by extending the phenom enological parameters of the D rude m odel, the elective m ass m and scattering rate 1=, to be frequency dependent as [1]

$$(!) = \frac{ne^2}{m_b} \frac{1}{1 = (!) \quad i! m \ (!) = m_b}; \quad (1)$$

where  $m_b$  is the electron band m ass. The EDM interprets the experim entally obtained complex conductivity (!) in term s of 1= (!) and m (!) determined by

$$\frac{1}{(!)} = \frac{!_{p}^{2}}{4} \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{(!)} ; \frac{\mathrm{m}(!)}{\mathrm{m}_{b}} = \frac{!_{p}^{2}}{4} \frac{1}{!} \operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{(!)} ; (2)$$

where  $!_p = (4 \text{ ne}^2 = \text{m}_b)^{1=2}$  is the plasm a frequency, n the electron density, and e is the electron charge. The  $!_p$ can be found by integrating the realpart of the m easured conductivity from the sum rule

$$Z_{!_{max}} d! _{1} (!) = \frac{1}{8}!_{p}^{2}; \qquad (3)$$

where  $!_{max}$  is the cuto frequency above which interband contributions begin to contribute. The subscript 1 and 2 refer to, respectively, the real and imaginary parts. The EDM has been successfully employed to analyze (!) of the conventionalm etals as well as the heavyferm ions and high-T<sub>c</sub> cuprates [2].

For a class of correlated electron systems such as the nuthunates,  $Sr/C aR uO_3$ , how ever, the EDM breaks down and yields unphysical descriptions of the materials such as the negative elective mass [3, 4]. Similar behavior is also found for some molybdates,  $Sm_2M o_2O_7$  and  $N d_2M o_2O_7$  [5]. These observations clearly signal the inadequacy of the EDM and call for a new way of analyzing

(!) which can be applied to a wide class of materials. We, therefore, propose to analyze the frequency dependent infrared (IR) conductivity in terms of the electron self-energy (!) instead of the phenom enological param – eters of Eq. (2). The electron self-energy contains the full inform ation on the coherent and incoherent parts of interacting electrons and, therefore, can describe the charge dynam ics even when the EDM or the Ferm i liquid (FL) picture is no longer valid. In this self-energy analysis (SEA) method, the electron self-energy is extracted by inverting the experimentally measured infrared conductivity through the functional minimization and numerical iterations as will be discussed in detail in Section III. The SEA may be considered as a microscopic gener-

To whom the correspondences should be addressed. e-m ail: hy-choi@ skku.ac.kr

alization of the EDM, which can be applied to analyze the frequency-dependent conductivity data of the non-Fem i liquids as well as the Fem i liquids. Even for the FL where the EDM is expected to work, the SEA can yield quantitatively m ore reliable results than the EDM, especially for the FL with a strong electron-phonon coupling. The present paper is mainly devoted to a detailed description of the SEA method and its applications to relatively sim ple metals. For more com plicated cases of strongly correlated electron systems including cuprates, m olybdates and ruthunates, by which we were originally motivated, we plan to report the SEA results separately elsewhere. For these systems, qualitatively di erent results from the EDM results are expected.

A fler the Introduction, we will discuss the frequencydependent conductivity (!) expressed in terms of the self-energy (!) and its relation with the EDM in Sec. II. This will clarify the inherent limitations of the widely em – ployed EDM analysis for the frequency-dependent conductivity. We will then describe in Sec. III the form ulation of the SEA method, which is reduced to the global minimization of a N-variable function. The SEA method will be applied to experimental data of Pb, Nb and MgB<sub>2</sub> and the results are presented in comparison with the EDM analysis in Sec. IV. In Sec. V, we give a brief sum – mary and some perspectives on the self-energy analysis method.

## OPTICAL CONDUCTIVITY AND SELF-ENERGY

The frequency-dependent conductivity (!) can be obtained from the current-current correlation function, and is written in terms of the electron self-energy (!) as [6, 7]

$$(!) = \frac{!_{p}^{2}}{4!_{1}!_{1}} \frac{i}{1} \frac{d}{1!} \frac{f(!)}{!} \frac{f($$

where f() is the Ferm i distribution function. We assumed a constant density of states over an in nite bandwidth and no long-range order. It is also assumed that the momentum dependence is much weaker compared with the frequency dependence,  $(\tilde{\kappa};!) = (!)$ , as in the dynam ical mean-eld theory, which renders the vertex correction vanish in the current-current correlation function [8].

The electron self-energy represents the e ects of electron interaction with various excitations in a system . The im aginary part of the self-energy can be written as

$$Z_{1} = \frac{Z_{1}}{1} d \cosh \frac{1}{2T} + \tanh \frac{!}{2T} P_{2}() + \frac{im p}{2}; (5)$$

where  $\frac{im}{2}^{p}$  is the frequency-independent contribution from in purities. P<sub>2</sub>(!) is the in aginary part of the e ective interaction satisfying P<sub>2</sub>(!) =  $\mathbb{P}(!)$  and T is the tem perature. The isotropically weighted phonon density of states for electron-phonon coupled system s is given by

<sup>2</sup>F (!) = 
$$\frac{1}{P_2}$$
 (!): (6)

Once the self-energy is known, we use Eq. (5) to nd the elective interaction spectrum  $P_2(!)$  using a derivative with respect to ! at low T or a convolution after Fourier transform ations [7].

In the zero tem perature  $\lim it T = 0$ , the (!) of Eq. (4) is reduced to

$$(!) = \frac{!_{p}^{2}}{4!} \frac{i}{!} \int_{0}^{Z} d \frac{1}{!} \frac{1}{!} (?) (?)$$

which means that in the low T lim it, only the self-energy () between 0 < < ! contributes to the conductivity at !. Thism ay be interpreted as (!) being an \average" of 1=[! () (!)] between 0 and !. This, in turn, suggests that the information from the EDM analysis, which is directly obtained from (!) using Eq. (2), is an average of the corresponding quantity from the SEA. This will be discussed in more detail below. The EDM can be obtained from Eq. (4) in an appropriate lim it. The (!) of Eq. (4) is reduced to the EDM form of Eq. (1) with m (!)=m  $_{\rm b} = 1 + (!)$  provided that

$$(!) + () ! (!) = (!) (8)$$

is satis ed [9]. For a FL, where  $_1(!)$  (!)! and  $_2(!)$   $_2^{im p}$  !<sup>2</sup>, this condition can be satis ed for small and !, if (!) has a weak !-dependence. Therefore, the EDM can give a satisfactory description of (!) for weak-coupling FL, where

$$\frac{1}{(!)} \qquad 2_2(!); \ \frac{m(!)}{m_b} \qquad 1+(!) \qquad 1 \quad \frac{@_1(!)}{@!}:(9)$$

In the weak-coupling lim it, where Eq. (8) is well satisfied, the optical scattering rate 1 = (!) can be approximately written as [2, 9, 10]

$$\frac{1}{(!)} = \frac{2}{!} \int_{1}^{2} d! \operatorname{coth} \frac{1}{2T} + (!) \operatorname{coth} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{tr}^{2} \operatorname{F}() + \frac{1}{\mathrm{im } p} \operatorname{coth} \frac{1}{\mathrm{im } p} \int_{tr}^{2} \operatorname{F}() + \frac{1}{\mathrm{im } p} \operatorname{coth} \frac{1}{\mathrm{im } p} \int_{tr}^{2} \operatorname{F}() + \frac{1}{\mathrm{im } p} \operatorname{coth} \frac{1}{\mathrm{im } p} \operatorname{c$$

where  $1 = _{im p}$  is the in purity contribution and  $^{2}_{tr}F$  (!) is a phonon density of states weighted by the am plitude for large-angle scattering on the Ferm isurface, which has the same spectral structure as  $^{2}F$  (!), but their am plitudes can be lower. In this paper we will not distinguish the  $^{2}F$  (!) and  $^{2}_{tr}F$  (!) from now on. We note that there were several previous attempts to invert  $^{2}F$  (!) [7, 11]. For instance, one may obtain  ${}^{2}F(!)$  in the T = 0 lim it of Eq. (10) using

<sup>2</sup>F(!) 
$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{d!^2} \frac{!}{(!)} \frac{1}{2} \frac{l_p^2}{4} \frac{d^2}{d!^2} Re \frac{!}{(!)}$$
;(11)

where the second expression follows by using the EDM of Eq. (1). This form ula, how ever, has limitations to be applied to the experimental IR data because large error bars are inevitable from the double dimensional and it is valid only when EDM is valid and at T = 0 [7].

For strong-coupling FL where (!) has a signi cant !-dependence, analysis based on the EDM becomes less accurate. For the marginal Ferm i liquid, where  $_1(!)$ ! ln j! jand  $_2(!)$  j! j the EDM is expected to give som ewhat less reliable description because  $_1(!)$ , unlike FL, deviates from the linearity in !. The situation becomes worse for non-Ferm i liquid, where  $_1(!)$   $!^{l}$ and  $_2(!)$   $!^{l}$  (0 < < 1), and the EDM may give m isleading and qualitatively incorrect descriptions as were observed in the nuthnates [3, 4].

#### FORM ULATION OF SELF-ENERGY ANALYSIS

We now present how one can analyze the frequencydependent infrared conductivity with the formula of Eq. (4). As is explained below, the problem is reduced to a globalm inimization of a N -variable function. Using Eq. (4), it is simple to calculate the conductivity (!) from a given self-energy (!). What we are trying to do here is exactly the inverse of that: W e wish to extract (!) from an experimentally measured (!).

The SEA is implemented by dening the functional W [2] as

$$\mathbb{X}_{!_{\circ}}$$

$$\mathbb{W} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \end{bmatrix} \qquad d! \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \exp (1)^{2}; \qquad (12)$$

where  $\frac{exp}{1}$  and  $\frac{1}{1}$  are the real parts of the experimental data and calculated conductivity using Eq. (4), respectively. Since the real part of self-energy  $_1(!)$  can be obtained from the imaginary part  $_2$  (!) by the K ram ers-K ronig transformation, we can consider  $_2(!)$  as the only independent function. The functional W is positive de nite, and has the globalm in im um of zero for the self-energy which reproduces the experim ental conductivity data. The self-energies de ned at the N discrete frequencies, xi  $_{2}(!_{i})$  for i = 1;;N € !c), are taken as the N independent variables of the function W  $(x_1; x_2;$  $_{\rm N}$ ); x W [2]. The cuto frequency  $!_{\,\rm c}$  is not necessarily equal to the  $!_{\,\rm m\,\,ax}$  of Eq. (3). Now, the problem is reduced to a globalm in im ization of a N variable function.

W e note that, depending on the problem s, other form s of the functional W m ay yield better results. For good m etals, for instance, whose m id-IR conductivity is very small compared with far-IR region,

$$W = d! [\ln_{1}(!)] \ln_{1}^{exp}(!)]^{2}$$
(13)

works better than the form of Eq. (12). For the region where  $! > !_c$ , which we need to know for the K ram ers-K ronig transformation, \_2(!) is taken as constant. A constant \_2(!) for  $! > !_c$  corresponds to the re ectivity R(!) = 1=!<sup>4</sup>, which is consistent with the standard procedure in the IR experiments.

The globalm inimization of W is achieved via the functional derivative and numerical iterations. We start with an initial conguration of  $x_i^{(0)}$ . A good initial guess can be  $x_i^{(0)} = -\frac{1}{2-(!\,_i)}$  obtained from EDM analysis, or a negative constant value for the whole frequency range. Then, we move to new  $x_i$  along the steepest descent direction of W .

$$\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(\text{new})} = \mathbf{x}_{i}^{(\text{old})} \qquad s \frac{dW}{d\mathbf{x}_{i}} \underset{\mathbf{x}_{i} = \mathbf{x}_{i}^{(\text{old})}}{s};$$
(14)

where  $\frac{dW}{dx_1}$  represents the functional derivative of the functional W [2] with respect to 2 (!) given by

$$\frac{dW}{dx_{i}} = 2 \int_{0}^{Z_{i_{o}}} d!^{0} [_{1} (!^{0}) - \int_{1}^{exp} (!^{0})] j_{!=!_{i}};$$

$$\frac{-1}{2} (!^{0}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} d - \frac{-1}{1} (!^{0}) P \frac{1}{!}; \quad (15)$$

where P stands for the principal value, and the use is made of  $\frac{1}{2(!)} = \frac{1}{2} P \frac{1}{!}$ . The step size s is chosen such that the W is maxim ally decreased along the steepest descent direction. The  $!_p^2$ , which sets the scale of (!) of Eq. (4) is updated at each iteration such that the calculated spectral sum is equal to the experimental spectral sum up to  $!_c$ . Note that this way of determ ining  $!_p$  does not require that  $!_c = !_m ax$  of Eq. (3) and, therefore, the extracted  $!_p$  is alm ost independent of  $!_m ax$  and more reliable than that from the sum rule of Eq. (3). This enables us to determ ine  $!_p$  more system atically as we will discuss in more detail below.

In general, the global m inim ization of a few hundred independent variables is an extrem ely dem anding problem . In the present case, how ever, it is rendered tractable because of the following observations: (1) W e know the value of the global m inim um unlike general global m inim m ization problem s. It is exactly zero. (2) W e have some ideas about the physically meaningful form of the \_2 (!). It should be a continuous function of the frequency and negative de nite. (3) W e have a better way to escape from local m inim a than trying a new random starting point,  $x_i^{(0)}$ : Take  $\binom{(new)}{2} (!) \binom{(old)}{2} (!) / \binom{1}{1} (!) \binom{exp}{1} (!)$ . An estimation of this process can be obtained in follow-ing way. The contribution to the conductivity at a given frequency ! is dom inated by the self-energy below ! in

the low temperature limit due to the thermal factor of [f( !) f()]=! of Eq. (4) as discussed in Eq. (7). By modifying the self-energy to be proportional to the di erence between calculated conductivity and the experimental data at each frequency, we can continue our minimization modifying the Wrong' region without spoiling a good' region.

From the extracted (!), other physical properties such as the plasm a frequency, e ective interaction between electrons, Raman spectra, and inelastic neutron scattering intensity can also be calculated. For instance, we use Eq. (5) to nd the e ective interaction spectrum  $P_2(!)$  from an extracted  $_2(!)$  which was discussed in the previous section. An important byproduct of the SEA is that the plasm a frequency  $!_{\rm p}$  can be determined m ore accurately than has been hitherto practiced, which is necessary to determ ine the D rude param eters of Eq. (2). Conventionally,  $!_p$  is determ ined by  $!_m ax$  of Eq. (3) which, in turn, is taken such that the sum as a function of  $!_{max}$  has the smallest slope. This procedure can be problem atic especially for the materials without a sharp plasm a edge in the re ectivity data. In contrast, SEA works in this case as well because the determination of !p, which sets the scale of (!), is almost independent of the  $!_{c}$  of the functional W . For instance, one can determ ine !p with only very restricted data between  $0 < ! < !_c$  (  $!_{max}$ ). This will be illustrated for Nb below.

A nother byproduct closely related to the  $!_{\rm p}$  determ ination is that we may separate the intra- and inter-band contributions more system atically. We can extract the self-energy of elective single-component carriers by thing the low-frequency experimental conductivity up to  $!_{\rm c}$   $!_{\rm max}$ . The conductivity (!) calculated by substituting the extracted (!) into Eq. (4) is intra-band conductivity. This process, how ever, is more sensitive to  $!_{\rm c}$  than the  $!_{\rm p}$  determination.

W e will dem onstrate in the next section that the SEA is straightforward to implement to extract the self-energy from experimental R conductivity without the local minimum problem. We have found that the SEA yields the same solution  $_2$  (!) from almost any initial conguration. The obtained solution  $_2$  (!), therefore, seem s unique.

#### APPLICATIONS TO EXPERIMENTAL DATA

W e will now apply the SEA developed in the previous section to realm aterials, and demonstrate that it can be readily employed to analyze the frequency-dependent IR experimental data. In the rst two parts of this section, we will analyze the simple metals, Pb and Nb. From the SEA, we can extract the self-energy of the materials, and from the extracted self-energy we can nd the  ${}^{2}F$  (!) using Eqs. (5) and (6). It can be compared with

the measured  ${}^{2}F$  (!) wellestablished from the tunneling experiments [12]. But for such a good metal, it is a very dem anding task to measure the conductivity in far-IR region, since the re ectivity is very close to 100 % there. Thus there exist few published conductivity data for Pb and Nb. For Pb, we take the experimental  ${}^{2}F$  (!) obtained from the tunneling experiment and calculate the self-energy from Eqs. (5) and (6), and then calculate the conductivity from Eq. (4). This is taken as the \experimental" conductivity exp(!) for Pb. A fter that, the real experim ental data of N b is analyzed [13]. The results are compared with those obtained from the tunneling spectra. The last part of this section is devoted to the SEA for the norm alstate IR conductivity data of M gB<sub>2</sub> superconductor. W e will argue from the SEA results that the smallelectron-phonon coupling constant extracted previously from the T-dependence of the resistivity (T) and EDM analysis of (!), which is too small to account for the superconducting transition temperature  $T_{c,t}$  is most likely due to an underestim ate of the plasm a frequency !p.

#### A pplication to Pb: G enerated data

We take Pb as a test case of the proposed SEA because its <sup>2</sup>F (!) is well established from the tunneling [12]. The electron-phonon coupling constant of this metal is known to be 15. The frequency-dependent IR conductivity of Pb, how ever, is not available. Therefore, the IR conductivity data was generated with Eqs. (4) and (5) using the tunneling  ${}^{2}F$  (!) at 200 frequencies up to  $!_c = 15 \text{ meV}$  with an equal spacing. We took the self-energy due to impurity scattering  $\frac{im p}{2} =$ 1 m eV and T = 3 K as representative values. The generated conductivity in this way, shown in the left column of Fig. 1 with open circle, is taken as the \experimental" data  $\frac{\exp}{1}$  (!). It was then the by the SEA as explained above to extract the self-energy 2 (! i) without, of course, any inform ation about the self-energy used to generate the conductivity. The results are shown in the solid line in the left column of Fig. 1. The extracted and experim ental conductivities are alm ost indistinguishable. Note that the width (HW HM) of  $_1(!)$  is not given by  $2_2 (! = 0)$  because of the substantial frequency de-

pendence of  $_2(!)$ . In the right column of Fig. 1, we show the real and im aginary parts of the extracted self-energy in the form s of  $2_2(!)$  and  $1_1(!)=!$ , along with the generated experimental data. The extracted and experimental data are shown, respectively, by the solid line and open circles. They are practically indistinguishable. For com – parison, we also plotted the EDM analysis of the ex-

parison, we also plotted the EDM analysis of the experimental conductivity data, 1 = (!) and m  $(!) = m_b$ , in dotted lines, using Eq. (2). As discussed in Eq. (9), 1 = (!) and m  $(!) = m_b$  correspond, respectively,  $2_2(!)$ 

and 1  $_1(!)=!$ . The right panel demonstrate, however, that they can substantially deviate from each other even for the relatively simple metals. The EDM analysis in general yield smoother frequency dependences for 1= (!) and m (!)=m<sub>b</sub>. This is expected because 1= (!) is an \average" of the  $_2(!)$  as discussed previously in Section II. The curve shown by the thin solid line in the lower picture was calculated by using the approximate form ula Eq. (10), which is in a good agreem ent with the 1= (!) from the EDM analysis [9].

<sup>2</sup>F (!) can be ob-From the extracted self-energy, tained from a derivative with respect to !,  ${}^{2}F$  (!) =  $\frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{0}{\alpha} \frac{2}{\alpha} \frac{(!)}{\alpha}$ , which is valid at low T (dotted curve) or a convolution of Eq. (5) (thin solid curve) [7] as shown in the upper left in set of Fig. 1. The experimental  ${}^{2}$ F (!) is shown in the thick solid line. The extracted <sup>2</sup>F (!) from the convolution is again almost indistinguishable from the experimental one. These results from the SEA show substantial in provem ents over the previous attem pts [11] based on the assumptions of both T = 0 and weakcoupling limit. We argue from this example that even for the simple metals, for which the EDM can give the qualitatively valid description, the SEA can provide more accurate and reliable description of the material, which can be quite di erent from the EDM results.

#### Application to N b

We now proceed to apply the present method to the experimental IR data of N b. We used the far-IR conductivity data measured by Pronimetal. in the normal state at 9 K [13]. Their far-IR data are available from 84 up to 300 cm<sup>-1</sup> (with constant data in the D C limit measured via a dimenstrate that the !p can be obtained without a full intra-band spectrum in the SEA.

We took  $!_c = 250 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and N = 200. For 0 1 84 m eV, we constrain  $_2$  (!) to remain constant. This implies vanishing  ${}^{2}F(!)$  in the region as shown in the upper right inset of Fig. 2 and, consequently, a reduced, and the D rude behavior in  $_1(!)$ . The tted (solid curve) and experim ental (crosses)  $_1$  (!) are plotted in Fig. 2. The electron-phonon coupling constant  $[0_1(!)=0!]_{!0}$  from the SEA is 0.51 which is = som ew hat reduced com pared with the experim entalvalue of 0:9 1 [12] as discussed above. The calculated plasm a frequency is 7.8 eV while the experimental value is 7.2eV [13]. In the lower left inset, the extracted  $_2(!)$  is shown. The above results clearly dem onstrate that the SEA works also for the case with only restricted data.

These two examples of the SEA establish that the method can indeed be applied to analyze the frequency conductivity and it can provide the most m icroscopic information of interacting electron systems, the self-energy (!) and the electric interaction P (!). The SEA can

5

provide for the Ferm i liquids m ore reliable and accurate information than the conventional EDM analysis. For the non-Ferm i liquids, it is expected to provide qualitatively di erent information which is not accessible with the EDM .

### A pplication to M gB $_{\rm 2}$

Let us now analyze the IR data of norm al state c-axis oriented  $MgB_2$  Im measured by Tu et al. [14], which we regard as being due to intra-band excitations of an e ective single band system [7]. In Fig. 3 (a), the experim ental conductivities of Tu et al. at T = 45 K and 295 K are shown together with the tted conductivities using the SEA with N = 300 and  $!_{c}$  = 6000 cm  $^{1}$ . The solid curves represent the tted conductivities, and the dashed and dotted curves, respectively, the experim ental ones at T = 295 K and T = 45 K. The sm all discrepancies are due to phonons. In Fig. 3(b), the results from the EDM analysis are shown in the left column, and those from the present SEA in the right column. The solid and dashed curves are, respectively, for T = 45 K and 295 K.Tu et al. found from the sum rule of Eq. (3) that  $!_p$ is 14750 cm  $^1$  which yields, through the EDM , a very weak electron-phonon coupling as shown in the left column of Fig. 3(b). They obtained tr 0:13 using the Bloch-Gruneisen formula to analyze the T-dependence of the resistivity, which is consistent with the EDM analysis [14, 15]. To the extent that tr , it seem s too sm all to account for the superconducting transition temperature  $T_c = 39 \text{ K} \cdot 0 \text{ n}$  the other hand, we found from the SEA that 0:56 and 0.41 at, respectively, T = 45 and 295 K as shown in Fig. 3(b), which are substantially larger than what Tu et al. found. The local density approxim ation calculation yields tr 0:6 [16]. One way of seeing the discrepancy between EDM and SEA is that the !p from SEA is larger than that from EDM .W e found that  $!_{p} = 16690 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ at } T = 45 \text{ K}$ , and 16740 cm  $^{-1}$  at T = 295 K. If the enhanced  $!_p$  are used in the EDM, the resulting tr are in good agreem ent with the SEA . As far as the EDM and the T-dependence of the resistivity are concerned, the enhanced !p resolves the problem of the small tr.

W ith the SEA, we may go further and perform the spectral analysis to see the frequency range that contributes to , which can not be carried out with the EDM analysis. =  $2 {}^{R_1}_0 d \frac{{}^{2}F()}{}^{2}$ , where  ${}^{2}F(!) = \frac{1}{P_2}(!)$  may be obtained from the extracted  ${}_2(!)$  using Eq. (5). The  $2 {}_2(!)$  is shown in the right column of Fig. 3 (b). The extracted  ${}^{2}F(!)$  is shown in Fig. 4 together with those from tunneling [17] (dashed line) and LDA calculation [16] (thin solid line). They are shown in a wider frequency range in the inset. The extracted  ${}^{2}F(!)$  from SEA are characterized by two frequency regions which make dom inant contributions to ; around !

70 and 300 m eV, which is, interestingly, consistent with the model proposed by M arsiglio [15]. The low frequency region around 70 m eV is the contribution from the E  $_{2g}$  phonon mode, while the nature of the high frequency region is not clear. The two regions contribute almost equally to : phonon 0:36 (0.21) and the total is 0.56 (0.41) for T = 45 K (T = 295 K).

The extracted  ${}^{2}F(!)$ , compared with the local density approximation (LDA) calculation, correctly captured the main E<sub>2g</sub> contribution but missed smaller contributions from other phonon modes; among the modes in the  ${}^{2}F(!)$  obtained from the LDA calculation shown in Fig. 4, the modes whose  ${}^{2}F(!)$  are smaller than 0.5 are absent in the SEA results. This, we suspect, may be a consequence of the broad features around 160 and 880 cm  ${}^{1}$  in the experimental (!), which were not predicted by phonon calculations [14] and possibly due to M gO impurities. We did not eliminate these contributions for the present calculations. This may smear out otherwise sharper frequency dependence of (!), and reduce the electron-phonon coupling constant.

Apart from these discrepances, the SEA successively describes the frequency-dependent conductivity of the M gB<sub>2</sub> and yields an increased than the previous estimate. The SEA suggests, which made more accurate determ ination of  $!_p$  possible, that the small reported in the c-axis oriented sample is most likely due to underestimated  $!_p$ , and the total from the SEA is substantially larger. However, the  $_{phonon}$  =2 still seem s a bit too small to account for the T<sub>c</sub>.

## SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

In this paper we have proposed and demonstrated a m icroscopic way to analyze the frequency-dependent infrared conductivity, referred to as self-energy analysis, which is valid for the non-Ferm in liquids as well as the Ferm i liquids. Additional advantage of the self-energy analysis is that the plasm a frequency !p can be obtained with a better accuracy. Through the self-energy analysis, we extracted the electron self-energy from the inversion of experim entally measured infrared conductivity, and the e ective interaction between electrons from the extracted self-energy. A fler we dem onstrated that the self-energy analysis method can be successfully applied for simple m etals like P b and N b, we applied the m ethod to the IR conductivity data of norm al state M gB2. We have found that the from the self-energy analysis is substantially larger than that obtained from the conventional analysis of the T-dependence of the resistivity and extended D rude m odel. The discrepancies between the self-energy analysis and conventionalm ethod for M gB<sub>2</sub> is attributed to the underestim ated  $!_p$  from the conventionalm ethod. However, the phonon from the self-energy analysis still seems a bit sm all to account for the T<sub>c</sub>.

Now that we have demonstrated that the self-energy analysis of the frequency-dependent infrared conductivity really works and can be very powerful, some concluding remarks and outlooks are in order. First, one may wonder if the solution to the global minimization of the functional W  $\left[\begin{array}{c} _2 \right]$  is unique. The answer seems positive: the converged solutions, with di erent initial con gurations, of given conductivity data all agree with each other. This means that the extracted self-energy 2 (!) is indeed unique. Second, we have also checked if there is any spurious feature from the Kramers-Kronig transformation used in the present work to obtain the realpart of the self-energy from the imaginary part. We therefore have tted the complex conductivity by treating both the real and in aginary parts of (!) as independent variables, which elim inates the use of K ram ers-Kroniq. This gives the same  $_{2}(!)$  with the procedure using W  $[_2]$ , demonstrating the reliability of the present method. Third, we plan to report results of the self-energy analysis of the conductivity for other correlated electron systems such as the high T<sub>c</sub> superconductors,  $Sm_2/Nd_2Mo_2O_7$ , and  $Ca/SrRuO_3$  mentioned in the introduction. The di erences between the self-energy analysis and the extended D rude m odel analysis are expected to be quantitative for the Ferm i liquids, but be qualitative for the non-Ferm i liquids. It will therefore be very interesting to see what inform ation the self-energy analysis provide for the strongly correlated electron system s. A lso am ong the plan are extending the self-energy analysis to non constant density of states and broken symmetry states, and doing the analysis for other twoparticle probes such as the electronic R am an and inelastic neutron spectra. W e believe that the self-energy analysis seems timely and urgent in view of the mounting interests in the correlated electron or non-Ferm i liquid systems for which the phenom enological analyses may yield inadequate results.

W e would like to thank J.J.Tu and A.V.Pronin for providing their experim ental data for our analyses. W e also thank Tae W on Noh, Jae H oon K im, In-Sang Yang, Jaejun Yu, Yunsang Lee, M i Ock M un, Jooyoung Lee, Seki K im, M.J.Rice, D. van der M arel, D.B.Tanner, T.T im usk, F.M arsiglio, S.V.Shulga, and S.L.Cooper for helpful comments and discussions. This work was supported by the K orea Science & Engineering Foundation (KOSEF) through grant No.R01-1999-000-00031-0 and CNNC, and by the M inistry of Education through BK 21 SNU-SKKU program.

D.B.Tanner and T.Timusk, in Physical Properties of High Temperature Superconductors Vol. III (W orld Scienti c, 1992), p. 363.

<sup>[2]</sup> A.V.Puchkov, D.N.Basov, T.Timusk, J.Phys.Cond. M att. 8, 10049 (1996).

- [3] P. Kostic, Y. Okada, N. C. Collins, Z. Schlesinger, J. W. Reiner, L. Klein, A. Kapitulnik, T. H. Geballe, and M. R. Beasley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2498 (1998).
- [4] Y.-S.Læ, J.Yu, J.S.Læ, T.W. Noh, T.-H.G im m, and H.-Y.Choi, Phys. Rev. B. 66, 41104 (2002).
- [5] M.-W. Kim and T.W. Noh, preprint.
- [6] S.B.Nam, Phys.Rev.156,470 (1967); ibid,487 (1967).
- [7] S.V. Shulga, cond-m at/0101243; High-T<sub>c</sub> Superconductors and Related M aterials, ed. by S.L.D rechsler and T.M ishonov, pp. 323-360 (K luwer A cadem ic Publishers, D ortrecht, 2001).
- [8] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, M. J. Rozenberg, Rev. M od. Phys. 68, 13 (1996).
- [9] S.V.Shulga, O.V.Dolgov, and E.G.Maksim ov, Physica C 178, 266 (1991).
- [10] P.B.Allen, Phys. Rev. B 3, 305 (1971).
- [11] F. Marsiglio, T. Startseva, J. P. Carbotte, Phys. Lett.

A 245, 172 (1998); F.M arsiglio, J. Supercond. 12, 163 (1999).

- [12] E.L.W olf, Principles of Electron Tunneling Spectroscopy (Oxford University Press, N.Y., 1996).
- [13] A. V. Pronin, M. Dressel, A. Pimenov, A. Loidl, I.V. Roshchin, and L.H.G reene, Phys. Rev. B 57, 14416 (1998).
- [14] J. J. Tu, G. L. Carr, V. Perebeinos, C. C. Homes, M. Strongin, P.B.Allen, W. N. Kang, E.-M. Choi, H.-J.Kim, and S.-I.Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 277001 (2001).
- [15] F.M arsiglio, Phys.Rev.Lett.87,247001 (2001).
- [16] A.Y.Liu, I.I.Mazin, J.Kortus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 087005 (2001).
- [17] A. I. D'yachenko, V. Y. Tarenkov, A. V. Abal'oshev, S. J. Lew andow ski, cond-m at/0201200.



FIG.1: Left: 1(!) is plotted for Pb with  $\frac{\text{im }p}{2} = 1 \text{ m eV}$ and at T = 3 K. The extracted and generated conductivities are shown, respectively, in solid line and open circles. The dashed and thin solid curves in the inset were obtained from, respectively,  ${}^{2}F(!) = \frac{1}{\varrho} \frac{\varrho}{\varrho} \frac{2}{(!)}$  and the convolution using Eq. (5), and the latter is alm ost indistinguishable with the input tunneling data (solid line). Right: The 1 1(!)=! and 2 2(!) obtained from the SEA are plotted, respectively, in the upper and low er panels. The extracted (generated) ones

the upper and lower panels. The extracted (generated) ones are shown in solid line (open circles). These SEA analysis results are compared with the EDM results. The dotted lines represents 1= (!) and m (!)=m<sub>b</sub>, respectively, obtained from EDM using the generated conductivity. 1= (!) (thin solid line) calculated by using Eq. (10) is also shown in the lower right panel for comparison.



FIG. 2: The calculated and experimental  $_1$  (!) of N b are shown with solid curve and crosses, respectively. In the insets, the extracted  $^2F$  (!) and  $_2$  (!) are shown along with the tunneling  $^2F$  (!) (dashed).



FIG. 3: (a) The calculated and measured  $_1$  (!) of M gB<sub>2</sub> for T = 45 and 295 K. The sm all discrepancies are due to phonons. (b) Left: extended D rude analysis of experimental data indicating the weak electron-phonon coupling. R ight: the corresponding quantities from the self-energy analysis. Note that m =m  $_{\rm b}$  and 1= (!) show much sm oother frequency dependence compared with the corresponding 1  $_1$  (!) and 2  $_2$  (!) as noted previously for P b in Fig. 1.



FIG.4: The extracted  ${}^{2}F$  (!) from  ${}_{2}$  (!) of Fig.3 along with those from LDA and tunneling. The extracted  ${}^{2}F$  (!) shown in a wider frequency range in the inset are characterized by two dom inant contributions around ! 70 and 300 m eV.