Charge-ordered ferrom agnetic phase in m anganites

Tran Minh-Tien

Institute of Physics, NCST, P.O. Box 429, Boho, 10000 Hanoi, Vietnam, Electrophysics Department, National Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan.

A mechanism for charge-ordered ferrom agnetic phase in manganites is proposed. The mechanism is based on the double exchange in the presence of diagonal disorder. It is modeled by a combination of the Ising double-exchange and the Falicov-K in ball model. W ithin the dynamical mean-eld theory the charge and spin correlation function are explicitly calculated. It is shown that the system exhibits two successive phase transitions. The rst one is the ferrom agnetic phase transition, and the second one is a charge ordering. As a result a charge-ordered ferrom agnetic phase is stabilized at low tem perature.

PACS num bers: 71.27.+ a, 71.28.+ d, 75.30.-m

There has been much recent interest in the properties of doped m anganese oxides $R_1 _x A_x M nO_3$ (R = rare earth, $A = Ca_{r}Sr$).^{1,2} These materials present a very rich phase diagram involving phases with spin, charge and orbital order. The physically relevant electrons in m anganites are those from the Mn 3d levels, which are split by the cubic crystal eld into triply degenerate t_{2g} levels and higher-energy doubly degenerate eq levels. E lectrons from the e_a levels are able to hop between M n sites and form a conduction band. Electrons from the t_{2g} levels are localized. The it inerant electrons and local spins are correlated by the double-exchange (DE) mechanism $.^{3,4}$ The main feature of the DE is a cooperative e ect where the motion of an itinerant electron favors the ferrom agnetic (FM) ordering of local spins and, vice versa, the presence of the FM order facilitates the motion of the itinerant electron. The DE model qualitatively describes some of the magnetic properties of manganites,^{2,5} and provides a well-established starting point toward com prehensive understanding of the phase diagram of manganites.

Recently experiments have shown that beside the FM order a charge order can exist in the manganites.^{6,7} The charge order exists in regions with no net magnetization and, surprisingly, can also occur in FM regions.⁷ D oping of A²⁺ ions creates M n⁴⁺ holes in a M n³⁺ background. The presence of two valence states M $\rm n^{3+}$ and M $\rm n^{4+}$ m ay lead the com pounds to a charge-ordered (CO) state for appropriate doping. However, the DE model alone cannot explain the CO state which coexists in the FM phase. In principle, the nearest-neighbor C oulom b repulsion m ay stabilize a CO state. H ow ever, a large nearestneighbor repulsion likely destabilizes the hom ogeneous FM state and may produce a checkerboard charge order in three directions.² Another possible mechanism for the CO phase stabilization is the coupling of itinerant electrons to the Jahn-Teller distortions. However, the electron Jahn-Teller phonon coupling can only stabilize a CO-FM state where the CO phase transition occurs before the FM transition.8 At half lling experin ents have only observed a charge order below the FM transition tem perature.^{2,7} T herefore the Jahn-Teller coupling is unlikely responsible for the appearance of the CO-FM state at least at half lling. In this paper we

present a possible alternative explanation for the CO-FM state in the manganites. The key idea is an interplay of the DE and random ness of the A-site substitution. The random ness is inevitably introduced by experim ents. The importance of the random ness has been discussed both experimentally and theoretically.^{1,2} The random ness can substantially decrease the critical tem perature of the FM transition.9,10,11 Here we will incorporate the random ness of A-site substitution into the DE model. For simplicity, we adopt the random ness by A-site substitution as a random local potential of the inerant electrons, although the random ness may cause other e ects, for instance, random ness of the hoping or exchange integral.¹² It is well known that the diagonal disorder with binary distribution can be modeled by the Falicov-K in ball (FK) model.¹³ A though the FK model is simple, it contains a rich variety of phases. In particular, it illustrates the disorder-order phase transition driven by electron interaction.^{14,15} Incorporating the diagonal disorder of the FK type into the DE model, one m ay expect that a disorder-order phase transition could present. W hen the phase transition occurs, a CO-FM phase may be stabilized at low tem perature. In order to detect the phase transition we study the charge and spin response of system by using the dynamical mean-eld theory (DMFT).¹⁶ The DMFT has extensively been used for investigating strongly correlated electron system s.¹⁶ W ithin the DMFT we explicitly calculate the charge and spin correlation function. We nd that the system stabilizes a CO-FM state at low tem perature.

The system which we study is described by the follow-ing H am iltonian

$$H = \frac{t}{p} \frac{X}{d} \begin{pmatrix} X & X & X \\ c_{i}^{y} c_{j} & n_{i} & 2J_{H} & S_{i}^{z} s_{i}^{z} + \\ X & i & i \\ E_{w} & w_{i} + U & n_{i} w_{i}; \\ i & i & i \end{pmatrix} (1)$$

where c_i^y (c_i) is the creation (annihilation) operator of an itinerant electron with spin at lattice site i; t = d is the hoping parameter of the itinerant electrons. Here we have rescaled the hoping parameter with the dimension d of the system . S_i^z is the z component of local spin at lattice site i, and for sim plicity, it takes two values 1. $s_i^z = (n_{i''} \quad n_{i\#})=2, n_i = c_i^y c_i, w_i \text{ is a classical vari-}$ able that assumes the value 1(0) if site i is occupied (not occupied) by A ion. U is the disorder strength and is m apped onto the di erence in the local potential which splits energetically favor of M n^{3+} and M n^{4+} ions. The expectation value x =ihwii=N, (N is the num ber of lattice sites), corresponds to the concentration of unfavorable M n⁴⁺ sites. The chemical potential controls the carrier doping, while E w controls the fraction of the sites having the additional local potential. We shall use , hn₁ i=N is the the condition n + x = 1, where n =electron doping. This condition determines E w for each doping n. The third term of Ham iltonian (1) is the Hund coupling of itinerant and local electrons. For sim plicity we only take into account the Ising part of the Hund coupling. This simpli cation does not allow any spin- ip processes, which can be important at low temperature where spin-wave excitations may govern the therm odynam ics of the system . However, in the DE processes the spin of itinerant electron ferrom agnetically aligns with the local spin, hence, the Ising part of the Hund interaction plays a dom inant role. The DMFT calculations for the DE modelwith classical local spins show that the sim pli cation of the H und coupling does not change the self energy of the single-particle G reen function.⁵ M oreover, within the DMFT the num erical results for quantum local spins do not show a signi cant di erence from the ones for classical local spins.¹⁷ Thus, one expects that within the DMFT the simpli cation of the Hund interaction does not result in a serious backwardness. $J_{\rm H}\,$ is the strength of the Hund coupling, and in the following we will take the lim it $J_{\rm H}$! 1 . The $\mbox{ rst three term s of }$ Ham iltonian (1) constitute a sim pli ed DE model. This simplied model captures the most essential ingredient of the DE processes. The last two terms of Ham iltonian (1) describe a binary random ness of the A-site substitution. They together with the hoping term form the FK m odel.¹³ It is well known that within the FK m odel the U term induces a disorder-order phase transition.^{14,15} At low tem perature a checkerboard ordering phase is stabilized. Hence, the model (1) may display an interplay of the FM and CO phase.

W e solvem odel (1) by the DMFT.The DMFT is based on the in nite-dimension limit. In the in nite-dimension limit the self energy is pure local and has no momentum dependence. The G reen function of itinerant electrons satis es the D yson equation

$$G (k; i!_{n}) = \frac{1}{i!_{n} "(k) + (i!_{n})}; \quad (2)$$

where $!_n = T(2n + 1)$, "(k) = $2t^{r} d_{j=1} cos(k_j)$, and (i!_n) is the self energy. In the in nite-dimension limit

the bare density of states of itinerant electrons becomes (") = exp($\frac{n}{2}$ =t²)=¹ t and we take t as the unit of energy (t = 1). The self energy is determined by solving an electrive single-site problem. The electric action of this problem is

$$S_{e} = \begin{bmatrix} X & Z \\ & d & d^{0}C^{Y}() \\ & \\ & X & \\ & + & d & d^{2}() \end{bmatrix} + U_{W} \quad \text{wind} \quad S^{z} c() + E_{w} w;$$

where () describes the elective medium. This elective single-site problem can exactly be solved. Indeed, the dynamics of the localized spin S^z and in purity w involved in the elective action are independent, hence, we could independently take the trace over S^z and w in calculating the partition function. This is similar to the DMFT solving of the FK model.¹⁸ W electain the local G reen function in the limit $J_{\rm H}$!

G (i!_n) =
$$\frac{W_0}{Z_{(i!_n)}} + \frac{W_1}{Z_{(i!_n)}}$$
; (3)

where Z (i!_n) = i!_n + (i!_n), and

$$W = \exp E_{w} (^{0}) + \frac{\sum_{i=0;1}^{0} \sum_{i=1}^{0} E_{w}}{\sum_{i=1}^{1} \sum_{i=1}^{1} E_{w}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{1} E_{w} \right) + \frac{\sum_{i=0;1}^{0} \sum_{i=1}^{1} E_{w}}{\sum_{i=1}^{1} E_{w}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{1} E_{w} \right) + \frac{E_{w}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{1} E_{w} \right) + \frac$$

with = 0;1. In taking the limit $J_H \ ! \ 1$ in deriving Eq. (3) we must rst renormalize the chemical potential $! + J_H$. The self energy is determined by the D yson equation for the elective single-site problem

$$(i!_n) = Z (i!_n) G^{-1}(i!_n)$$
: (4)

W ithin the DMFT, the localG reen function must coincide with the single-site G reen function of the original lattice, i.e.,

G (i!_n) =
$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k}^{X}$$
 G (k; i!_n): (5)

Eqs. (2)-(5) form the complete set of equations, which self consistently determ ine the self energy and G reen function.

 \mathbbm{W} e are interested in calculating the charge (c) and spin (s) correlation function

$$c^{(s)}(i;j) = (n_{i''} n_{j''} n_{j''} n_{j''})$$
 (6)

in the hom ogeneous param agnetic (PM) phase ($n_i = n_i \quad h_i$ i). In order to calculate the charge and spin response of system one has to introduce an external eld into the Ham iltonian. The charge and spin correlation function can be obtained by di erentiating the G reen function respected to the external eld, and then taking the zero limit of the eld.¹⁸ Follow ing the standard techniques,¹⁸ one can express the correlation functions in the terms of charge (c) and spin (s) susceptibility c(s) (g;i!,) in momentum space

$$C^{(s)}(q) = T^{2} \qquad C^{(s)}(q; i!_{n}):$$
 (7)

The charge and spin susceptibility can be obtained by di erentiation of the G reen function. 18 W e obtain

$${}^{c(s)}(q;i!_{n}) = \frac{2 + \frac{P}{e_{0;1}} \frac{\underline{\theta}(i!_{n})}{\underline{\theta}W} G; W_{1}}{\left[0, (q;i!_{n})\right]^{1} \frac{\underline{\theta}(i!_{n})}{\underline{\theta}G(i!_{n})}W}; (8)$$

where $_{0}(q;i!_{n}) = {}^{P}_{k} G(k+q;i!_{n})G(k;i!_{n})$. The matrix $b^{c(s)}(q)$ satisfies the following equation

$$\dot{B}^{c(s)}(q)^{b^{c(s)}}(q) = \dot{Q}^{c(s)}(q); \qquad (9)$$

where $\dot{B}^{c(s)}(q)$ and $\dot{\Phi}^{c(s)}(q)$ have the following elements

$$B^{c(s)}(q) = +$$

$$X = \frac{A^{c(s)}(i!_{n})}{1 - G^{2}(i!_{n})} \frac{(q;i!_{n})G(i!_{n})}{(e_{G}(i!_{n}))} \frac{(q;i!_{n})}{e_{G}(i!_{n})} + (q;i!_{n})G(i!_{n})}; (10)$$

$$Q^{c(s)}(q) =$$

$$X = \frac{A^{c(s)}(i!_{n}) G^{2}(i!_{n})}{1 G^{2}(i!_{n}) \frac{\theta}{\theta G}(i!_{n})} \frac{1}{W} = 1}{1 G^{2}(i!_{n}) \frac{\theta}{\theta G}(i!_{n})} W + (q;i!_{n})G(i!_{n})} (11)$$

with ; = 0;1. In deriving Eqs. (9)-(11) we have used the standard conversion¹⁸ $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & (q; i!_n) \end{bmatrix}^1 =$ $[G(i!_n)]^2 + (q;i!_n)[G(i!_n)]^1;$ and introduced quantity $A^{c(s)}(i!_n) = W = Z_{*}(i!_n)$ $W_{*} = Z_{\#}(i!_{n}):$ In the in nite dimension limit all of the wave vector dependence of $_0(q;i!_n)$ and $(q;i!_n)$ include in the term $_{j=1}^{d} \cos q_{j}$ =d. Hence, the spin and charge cor-X (q) = relation function only depend on momentum via X (q). Each of the derivatives appearing in Eqs. (8)-(11) can directly be calculated from the DMFT solution of Eqs. (2)-(5). In such the way $\mathbb{B}^{c(s)}(q)$ and $\mathbb{B}^{c(s)}(q)$ are calculable once the self-consistent equations of the DMFT are solved. Equation (9) reveals that $b^{c(s)}(q)$ will diverge at a tem perature where the determ inant of $\mathbb{B}^{c(s)}$ (q) vanishes, while $\phi^{c(s)}(q)$ remains nite. This results in an



FIG.1: The critical temperature $T_{\rm c}$ as a function of doping n for U = 0:5 (squares), U = 1 (circles). The lled (open) symbols are $T_{\rm c}$ of the FM (CO) phase transition. The solid line is $T_{\rm c}$ of the FM transition without disorder (U = 0).



FIG.2: The critical temperature T_c as a function of U for various doping n. The lled (open) symbols are T_c of the FM (CO) phase transition.

unphysical change of the sign of corresponding correlation function $^{c(s)}(q)$ so that the assumption of the homogeneous PM phase fails for lower temperature. By a similar way one could also calculate the spin correlation function $_{s}(q)$ of local spins. A fler some calculations we obtain

$$_{S}(q) = _{0}(q) + _{1}(q);$$
 (12)

X
B^s (q) (q) =
$$\frac{2W}{T}$$
: (13)
= 0;1

From Eqs. (9), (12)-(13) one can see that the spin correlation function of itinerant electrons and local spins will diverge at the sam e tem perature where the determ inant of $\dot{B}^{s}(q)$ vanishes. This means that the spin of itinerant electrons parallel aligns with local spin, and thus is an im portant feature of the DE.W e calculate the charge and spin correlation function (7) by solving the DMFT set of self-consistent Eqs. (2)-(5). We are only interested in the FM and checkerboard CO phase stability. Hence, we only calculate the spin correlation function at $X_{q} = 1$ and the charge correlation function at $X_q = 1$. It is found that the spin correlation function $s(X_q = 1)$ always diverges at a critical tem perature. This is the signal of the FM phase transition. The charge correlation function $^{c}(X_{q} = 1)$ only diverges for U \in 0. This means that without the disorder the system always is hom ogeneous. In Figs. 1 and 2 we present the critical tem perature T_c of the FM and CO phase transition as a function of doping and disorder strength. At half lling n = 0.5 both critical tem peratures reach their maxim al value. The T_c of the FM transition always decreases with increasing disorder strength. This means that the disorder substantially decrease T_c of the FM transition.^{9,10,11} At the same time, with increasing U, T_c of the CO phase transition rst increases, reaches its maxim al value, and then decreases. The behavior of T_c of the CO phase transition is similar to the one in the FK model.¹⁸ At very strong disorder (U 1) the two critical tem peratures



FIG.3: Upper panel: the tem perature dependence of the spin m agnetization m $_{\rm A}$ (m $_{\rm B}$) of sublattice A (B) (the dot and dashed line), and of the charge-order parameter (the solid line).

Low er panel: the tem perature dependence of the free energy F. The solid, long dashed, short dashed, and dot-dashed line are the free energy in the CO-FM, hom ogeneous FM, CO-PM, and hom ogeneous PM phase, respectively (U = 1, = U=2).

approach to a same value . One also notices that $T_{\rm c}$ of the CO phase transition always is smaller than the FM transition temperature. Thus, one may expect that the CO state is stabilized in the FM phase at low temperature. However, this CO phase stability is respected to the hom ogeneous PM phase, and for safety we also study an inhom ogeneous phase. We divide the lattice into two penetrating sublattices A and B. This lattice division allow s us to study the checkerboard CO phase. By using the standard technique¹⁶ the matrix G reen function can be written in the follow ing form

$$\hat{O}^{1}(k;i!_{n}) = \overset{i!_{n} + A(i!_{n})}{(k)} \overset{(k)}{(k)} \overset{(k)}{(k)}$$

where $A^{(B)}(i!_n)$ is the self energy of the G reen func-

tion of sublattice A (B). The self energies are determined by solving the elective problem of single site of the sublattices.¹⁶ We nd that at low temperature a checkerboard CO-FM state is stabilized. We plot the magnetization $m_{A(B)} = 2^{-1} i_{2A(B)} h_{i}^{z} i = N$ of sublattice A (B) as a function of temperature in Fig. 3 (upper panel). In this gure we also plot the tem perature dependence of the charge-order parameter = $_{\rm j2\,B}$; hn_j i)=N . It shows that below _{i2A;} hn_i i a critical tem perature the magnetizations of both sublattices exist. They equal to each other until another critical tem perature, where the charge-order param eter exists. At low tem perature the system is in the checkerboard CO-FM state. In this phase the charge order coexists in the FM state, as experimentally observed.⁷ In the way the system exhibits two successive phase transitions. Initially the system goes to the hom ogeneous FM phase, and after that to the checkerboard CO phase, that the CO-FM phase is stabilized. We also calculate the free energy of the system . The free energy can only be expressed in terms of local quantities.¹⁶ W e plot the tem perature dependence of the free energy F in Fig 3 (lower panel). It shows that the CO-FM state has lowest free energy, hence the state must be stabilized at low tem perature.

In conclusions, we have proposed a mechanism for the CO-FM phase which has recently been observed. The mechanism is based on a combination of diagonal disorder and a simple DE model with local Ising spins. Employing the DMFT we have calculated the charge and spin correlation function. It is found that the FM and CO state are stabilized at low temperature. As a result the checkerboard charge order can occur in the FM state. However, the manganites are too complicated a system to be completely described by this simple model. In particular, the phase with inhom ogeneous percolation of FM and CO regions is beyond the scope of this paper.

This work was supported by the NationalProgram of .Basic Research on Natural Science of Vietnam, Project 4.1.2. The writing was completed at the NationalChiao Tung University, and was supported by Project NSC 91-2811-M -009-006 of ROC.

- ¹ M.B. Salam on and M. Jaime, Rev. M od. Phys. 73, 583 (2001).
- ² E.Dagotto, T.Hotta, and A.Moreo, Phys.Rep. 344, 1 (2001).
- ³ C.Zener, Phys.Rev. 82, 403 (1951).
- ⁴ P.W. Anderson and H. Hasegawa, Phys. Rev. 100, 675 (1955).
- ⁵ N.Furukawa, J.Phys. Soc. Jpn. 63, 3214 (1994); ibid. 64, 2754 (1995); ibid. 65, 1174 (1996).
- ⁶ M.Uehara, S.Mori, C.H.Chen, and S.W. Cheong, Nature 399, 560 (1999).
- ⁷ J.C.Loudon, N.D.M athur, and P.A.M idgley, Nature 420, 797 (2002).

- ⁸ S.Yunoki, T.Hotta, and E.D agotto, Phys.Rev.Lett.84 3714 (2000).
- ⁹ F. Zhong, J.D ong, and Z.D.W ang, Phys. Rev. B 58, 15 310 (1998).
- ¹⁰ B. M. Letfulov and J. K. Freericks, Phys. Rev. B 64, 174409 (2001).
- ¹¹ M.Auslender and E.Kogan, Phys.Rev.B 65, 012408 (2001).
- ¹² J.Burgy et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 277202 (2001).
- ¹³ L.M. Falicov and J.C.K in ball, Phys. Rev. Lett. 22, 997 (1969).
- ¹⁴ T.Kennedy and E.H.Lieb, Physica A 138, 320 (1986); ibid. 140, 240 (1986).

1837 (2000).

- $^{\rm 15}$ U .Brandt and R .Schm idt, Z .P hys.B 63, 45 (1986); ibid. 67,43 (1987).
- ¹⁶ A.Georges, G.Kotliar, W.K rauth, and M.J.Rozenberg, Rev.M od.Phys.68,13 (1996). ¹⁷ K.Nagai, T.M om oi, and K.Kubo, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.69,
- ¹⁸ U.Brandt and C.M ielsch, Z.Phys.B 75, 365 (1989); ibid. 79,295 (1990),ibid.82,37 (1991).