

# High $T_c$ Superconductivity, Skyrmions and the Berry Phase

B. Basu, S. Dhar<sup>y</sup> and P. Bandyopadhyay<sup>z</sup>

Physics and Applied Mathematics Unit

Indian Statistical Institute

Calcutta-700108

## Abstract

It is here pointed out that the antiferromagnetic spin fluctuation may be associated with a gauge field which gives rise to the antiferromagnetic ground state chirality. This is associated with the chiral anomaly and Berry phase when we consider the two dimensional spin system on the surface of a 3D sphere with a monopole at the centre. This realizes the RVB state where spinons and holons can be understood as chargeless spins and spinless holes attached with magnetic flux. The attachment of the magnetic flux of the charge carrier suggest, that this may be viewed as a skyrmion. The interaction of a massless fermion representing a neutral spin with a gauge field along with the interaction of a spinless hole with the gauge field enhances the antiferromagnetic correlation along with the pseudogap at the underdoped region. As the doping increases the antiferromagnetic long range order disappears for the critical doping parameter  $x_c$ . In this framework, the superconducting pairing may be viewed as caused by skyrmion-skyrmion bound states.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn, 12.39.Dc, 11.15.-q, 03.65.Vf

## I. INTRODUCTION

It is now well known that there exists an interplay between antiferromagnetism and d-wave superconductivity in cuprate materials. Indeed, on doping with holes, these insulating compounds develop into superconductors even for low concentration of holes. This implies that the antiferromagnetic spin fluctuation plays a significant role in the development of high  $T_c$  superconductivity in these materials and the d-wave superconducting phase is a nearly antiferromagnetic Fermi liquid. In this context Monthoux, Balatsky and Pines [1] have considered spin fluctuation driven pairing for the cuprates near optimal doping. Rantner and Wen [2], in the framework of U(1) gauge fluctuations, have studied the underdoped cuprates where the spin behavior shows the peculiar competition between antiferromagnetic order and singlet formation as is evidenced by pseudogap observed in NMR and neutron scattering. The spin pseudogap can be well explained in terms of the RVB state as proposed by Anderson [3]. It is argued that the effect of the preformed spin singlets present in the RVB picture on the doped holes can be described in terms of the fact that the spin of the doped holes becomes an excitation whereas the charge remains tied to the empty site. This leads to the chargeless spin excitations (spinons) and spinless charge excitations (holons). Superconductivity arises when coherence is established after spin-charge recombination [4]. However, underdoped cuprates have a peculiar property which is apparently very puzzling. As the doping is lowered both the pseudogap and the antiferromagnetic correlation increases. Naively, it is expected that the larger the pseudogap stronger the spin singlet formation and weaker the antiferromagnetic correlation. However, in the underdoped region the scenario is different and both the pseudogap and antiferromagnetic correlation increase.

In a study [5] of high  $T_c$  cuprates in the underdoped region from a gauge theoretical point of view it is shown that gauge field fluctuations effectively removes the deficiencies of the mean field theories in explaining the antiferromagnetic correlations as observed in experiments. It has been argued that gauge theory with an additional coupling to holons helps to enhance the antiferromagnetic correlations.

A model is proposed [6, 7] for high- $T_c$  superconductors which includes both the spin fluctuations of the  $\text{Cu}^{++}$  magnetic ions and of the spins of O doped holes (holons). The charge of the doped hole is associated to quantum skyrmion excitations (holons) of the  $\text{Cu}^{++}$  background. The quantum

---

<sup>E</sup>lectronic address: banasri@isical.ac.in

<sup>y</sup>Electronic address: samishthar@isical.ac.in

<sup>z</sup>Electronic address: pratul@isical.ac.in

skyrmion effective interaction potential is evaluated as a function of doping and temperature indicating that Cooper pair formation is determined by the competition between these two types of spin fluctuations. The superconducting transition occurs when the effective potential allows for skyrmion bound states.

In a recent paper [4] we have also proposed a mechanism of high  $T_c$  superconductivity from the view point of chirality and Berry phase. It is observed that the spin pairing and charge pairing is caused by a gauge force generated by magnetic flux quanta attached to them. Different phase structures associated with high  $T_c$  superconductivity have been studied from an analysis of the renormalization group equation involving the Berry phase factor which corresponds to the monopole strength associated with the magnetic flux quanta. It is found that there are two crossovers above the superconducting temperature  $T_c$ , one corresponding to the glass phase and the other represents the spin gap phase. However, the spin gap temperature  $T_2$  is found to be dependent on  $T_c$  and  $\frac{T_2}{T_c}$  shows a universal behavior with respect to the hole doping  $x_0$  with  $x_0$  being the optimal doping rate.

In this note we shall study the topological excitations of high  $T_c$  superconductivity in cuprates in this framework and shall show that the charge carriers appear as skyrmion excitations of the  $Cu^{++}$  spin background. The enhancement of antiferromagnetic correlations along with pseudogap in the underdoped region is explained. The superconducting pairing caused by spin-charge recombination may be viewed as a consequence of formation of skyrmion-skyrmion bound state.

In sec.2 we shall discuss spin fluctuation and RVB theory from the view point of chirality and Berry phase. In sec.3 we shall discuss skyrmion excitations and the enhancement of antiferromagnetic correlation and pseudogap in the underdoped region. In sec.4 we shall derive the critical doping parameter  $x_{sc}$  for the destruction of the Neel order. In sec.5 we shall discuss superconducting pairing in terms of skyrmions.

## II. SPIN FLUCTUATION, RVB STATE AND BERRY PHASE

We start with a spin system which is antiferromagnetic in nature. In terms of Schwinger bosons we may write the localized spin  $S_j$  at site  $j$  as

$$\vec{S}_j = \frac{1}{2} (z_j^y ; z_j^x) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} z_j^y \\ z_j^x \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

Here  $z_j^y$  and  $z_j^x$  represent Schwinger bosons at site  $j$  and obey boson commutative relations  $[z_i^y ; z_j^y] = i\delta_{ij}$  and  $[z_i^x ; z_j^x] = [z_i^y ; z_j^x] = 0$ . We have also the constraint  $\sum_{\alpha} z_j^\alpha z_j^\alpha = 1$  for  $S = 1/2$ . The Hamiltonian for the localized spin system is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i < j} J_{ij} F_{ij}^y F_{ij}^x \quad (2)$$

where  $J_{ij} > 0$  and  $F_{ij}^y = \sum_{\alpha} z_i^\alpha z_j^\alpha$ .

If a hole is doped in this spin system an appreciable amount of spin fluctuations may arise which may be represented by  $Q_{ij}$  where  $\langle Q_{ij} \rangle = z_i^y z_j^y$ . We may note that the spin fluctuation  $Q_{ij}$  consists of the phase fluctuation and the amplitude fluctuation. However, as the latter is effectively a high energy mode, so we may concentrate on the phase fluctuation which is connected with the local gauge transformation of  $z_j^y$  and  $z_j^x$  at each site given by

$$z_j \rightarrow z_j \exp(i\theta_j) \quad (3)$$

This suggests that the transformation in the phase of  $Q_{ij}$  can be described by a gauge field,  $A_{ij}$ .

To visualize the spin fluctuation in a two dimensional antiferromagnetic system we consider the Heisenberg model with nearest neighbour interaction represented by the Hamiltonian

$$H = J \sum_{i,j} (S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y + S_i^z S_j^z) \quad (4)$$

where  $S_i$  is a spin operator of an electron at site  $i$  and  $J > 0$ . The ground state of antiferromagnetic system in 2-dimensions on a lattice which allows frustration is characterized by the chirality operator [8]

$$W(C) = \text{Tr} \prod_{i \in C} \left( \frac{1}{2} + i S_i^y \right) \quad (5)$$

where  $\tau_i$  are Pauli matrices and  $C$  is a lattice contour. The topological order parameter  $W(C)$  acquires the form of a lattice Wilson loop

$$W(C) = e^{i \oint_C A_{ij}} \quad (6)$$

which may be associated with the flux represented by the gauge field  $A_{ij}$ . Indeed, we may represent the chirality operator in terms of  $A_{ij}$  so that

$$W(C) = \prod_C e^{i A_{ij}} \quad (7)$$

where  $A_{ij}$  represents a magnetic flux which penetrates through a surface enclosed by the contour  $C$ . We may associate this  $A_{ij}$  with the phase fluctuation associated with the spin fluctuation caused by the doped hole when we have doping induced frustration in the system. As  $A_{ij}$  represents the Berry phase related to chiral anomaly when we describe the system in three dimensions we may write [4]

$$W(C) = e^{i 2\pi q} \quad (8)$$

where  $q$  represents the monopole strength ( $\sim c = e = 1$ ). In view of this when a two dimensional frustrated spin system on a lattice is taken to reside on the surface of a three dimensional sphere of a large radius in a radial magnetic field, we can associate the chirality with the Berry phase. Eventually this will give rise to RVB state [9].

It may be remarked here that when a chiral current interacts with a gauge field, we have the anomaly which is related to the Berry phase through the relation [10]

$$q = 2 = \frac{1}{2} \oint J^5 d^4x = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \text{Tr} F F d^4x \quad (9)$$

where  $J^5$  is the axial vector current  $J^5_\mu$ ,  $F$  is the field strength and  $F$  is the Hodge dual. Evidently  $q = 2$  represents the Pontryagin index.

To study the spin system leading to a RVB state we consider a generalized nearly antiferromagnetic spin model with nearest neighbor interaction as

$$H = J \sum_{ij} (S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y + S_i^z S_j^z) \quad (10)$$

where  $J > 0$  and the anisotropy parameter  $\Delta = \frac{2+1}{2}$  [11]. The Berry phase factor can take the values  $\Delta = 0; 1/2; 1; 3/2; \dots$ . It is noted that  $\Delta = 1$  corresponds to  $\Delta = 1/2$  and represents the isotropic Hamiltonian which is  $SU(2)$  invariant. For  $\Delta \neq 1$ , it corresponds to an Ising system. When  $\Delta = 0$  ( $\Delta = 1/2$ ) we have the XX model. For a frustrated spin system, this corresponds to the singlets of spin pairs which eventually represents the RVB state giving rise to a non-degenerate quantum liquid.

In a recent paper [4] we have studied the different phases associated with superconductivity in cuprates through the renormalization group analysis involving the factor  $\Delta$ . It is noted that  $\Delta$  takes the usual discrete values of  $0; \frac{1}{2}; 1; \frac{3}{2}; \dots$  at fixed points of the RG flows where  $\Delta$  is stationary and represents the Berry phase factor of the theory. In terms of energy scale, it is found that as energy increases (decreases)  $\Delta$  also increases (decreases). So to study a critical phenomena, we can associate a critical temperature with a standard discrete value of  $\Delta$  corresponding to the Berry phase factor which represents a fixed point of the RG flows. To study the crossover, it is noted that for  $0 < j < 1$  there are three critical values corresponding to  $\Delta = 0$ ,  $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\Delta = 1$  which represent the fixed points of the RG flow. We associate three critical temperatures  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$  and  $T_c$  with fixed values of  $\Delta = 0$ ,  $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\Delta = 1$  respectively. However, in a frustrated spin system, the chirality demands that  $\Delta$  should be non-zero. So the critical value  $\Delta = 0$  is not achieved and as such there will be random coupling around the value  $\Delta = 0$ . This will then represent the cluster glass phase at this critical temperature  $T_1$ . In this situation, after doping, holes will form a glass of stripes. The next crossover will be at  $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}$  corresponding to the pseudogap (spin gap) phase. As  $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}$  corresponds to  $\Delta = 0$ , the spin chain will represent the system of spin singlets leading to RVB phase. The spin-charge separation here describes the spin gap (pseudogap) phase. Finally, we arrive at the superconducting transition temperature  $T_c$  at  $\Delta = 1$  corresponding to  $\Delta = 1/2$ . At this point, the Ising part coupling constant is  $-\frac{1}{2}J$  with a sign change which represents an attractive force causing the superconducting pair formation.

The concentration of doped holes may be parameterized by a length scale  $L$ . In view of this, we may consider  $\chi$  as a function of  $L$  at a fixed temperature. The doped holes will suppress the  $U(1)$  gauge fluctuation describing the antiferromagnetic spin fluctuation. At zero doping, we have the Heisenberg antiferromagnet. The Neel temperature  $T_N$  is reduced upon doping and at a critical doping  $T_N(c) = 0$ . As the doping is increased, the magnetic long range order is destroyed. However, as the doping is lowered both the pseudogap and the antiferromagnetic correlation is increased. This aspect will be discussed in the next section.

### III. SKYRMIONS, ANTIFERROMAGNETIC CORRELATION AND PSEUDOGAP

To study the spinon and holon excitations in our model [4, 12, 13] let us consider a single spin down electron at a site  $j$  surrounded by an otherwise featureless spin liquid representing a RVB state. Due to the chirality caused by the gauge fluctuation we may consider the system such that a monopole represented by  $\chi = 1/2$  is in the background leading to RVB ground state. As a result, the single spin will be characterized by  $j_j = 1$  formed by the single spin state characterized by  $\chi = 1/2$  coupled with the orbital spin  $\chi = 1/2$  caused by the monopole in the background. This neutral spin attached with magnetic flux quanta given by  $j_j = 1$  will appear as an excitation and represent the spinon. Now when a doped hole interacts with this spinon, it will give rise to a spinless charged excitation called holon. Thus holons may also be represented by  $j_j = 1$  characterized by a flux  $\phi_0 = \frac{hc}{2e}$ . The residual spinon will then correspond to  $\chi_{eff} = 0$  which is realized when the unit of magnetic flux characterized by  $\chi = 1/2$  associated with the single down spin in the RVB liquid forms a pair with another up spin having  $\chi = +1/2$  associated with the hole. Again the holon having  $j_{eff} = 1$  will also eventually form a pair each characterized by  $j_j = 1/2$ . Indeed for any integer  $\chi$  the Berry phase may be removed to the dynamical phase and the geometric phase is realized when a pair is formed [14]. Thus the spinon and holon may be viewed as if a neutral spin as well as a charged spinless hole is attached with a magnetic flux quantum characterized by  $j_j = 1/2$  and these appear in a pair.

Now it is noted that when a spinless hole is dressed with a magnetic flux quantum given by  $j_j = 1/2$ , this will represent a skyrmion. Indeed, the magnetic flux quantum has its origin in the background chirality which is associated with the chiral anomaly and Berry phase. Indeed, from eqn.(9), we note that the Berry phase factor  $\chi$  is associated with  $F \wedge F$  and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \frac{1}{2} \int_Z \text{Tr} F \wedge F \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_Z \text{Tr} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} d^4x \\ &= \int_Z d^4x \theta \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where

$$\theta = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \text{Tr} (A \wedge F + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A) \quad (12)$$

is the Chern-Simons secondary characteristic class. In case we have  $F = 0$  we can write

$$A = g^{-1} dg; \quad g \in SU(2) \quad (13)$$

and  $\theta$  will represent a topological current  $J$  given by

$$J = \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \text{Tr} (g^{-1} dg) (g^{-1} dg) (g^{-1} dg) \quad (14)$$

This may be written in terms of chiral fields  $\psi_a$  ( $a = 0; 1; 2; 3$ ).

$$J = \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \epsilon^{abcd} \psi_a \psi_b \psi_c \psi_d \quad (15)$$

Now representing a hole by a Dirac fermion field  $\psi$  we may consider the doped hole coupling with the magnetic flux associated with the chirality in terms of the interaction given by the Lagrangian

$$L = \bar{\psi} (i \not{D} + i m (\psi_0 + i \psi_5 \sim)) \quad (16)$$

where  $\hat{D} = (\partial_t - iA)$  following the constraint  $\hat{D}_0^2 + \vec{D}^2 = 1$

The Dirac fermion may be viewed as if it has flavor  $N$  so that for polarized and unpolarized state we have  $N = 1$  and  $2$  respectively. Now integrating for fermions, we can write the action

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \int d^4x \ln \exp( \bar{\psi} D \psi ) \\ &= N \int d^4x \ln \det( i\hat{D} + im g^5 ) \\ &= iN \int d^4x A \cdot J + iN H_3 \\ &\quad + NM^2 \int d^4x \text{Tr} ( \partial_\mu g^{-1} \partial^\mu g ) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here  $g^5 = \frac{1+\gamma_5}{2}g + \frac{1-\gamma_5}{2}g^{-1}$ .  $M$  is a coupling constant having dimension of mass.  $H_3$  is a topological invariant of the map of the space-time into the target space  $S^3$ . There are only two homotopy classes  $\pi_4(S^3) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ , so that  $H_3 = 0$  or  $1$ . In fact the term  $iH_3$  is the geometric phase and represents the  $\pi$ -term. Thus we see that the charge carriers dressed with magnetic flux can be represented by a nonlinear model and may be treated as skyrmions.

To study the underdoped region of cuprates in this framework, we note that spinon-holon interaction through the gauge force effectively leads to a spin pair characterized by  $s_{eff} = 0$  where the isolated down spin in the background with  $s = -1/2$  forms the pair with the up spin of the hole with  $s = +1/2$ . Indeed this may be taken to represent as a spinon-antispinon bound state. This essentially corresponds to the SF flux phase as suggested by Rantner and Wen [2]. Indeed we can visualize a spin as a massless fermion and this picture of spinon-holon interaction may correspond to a massless fermion coupled to  $U(1)$  gauge field along with the holons coupled with the gauge field. The pair formed by massless fermions (spins) dressed with magnetic flux may be viewed as a spinon-antispinon bound state. This spinon-antispinon bound state present in the nearly antiferromagnetic chain will enhance the antiferromagnetic correlation of the system. The simultaneous presence of spin singlet state will lead to the pseudogap (spin gap). Thus in the underdoped region we will have the enhancement of the antiferromagnetic correlation along with the pseudogap. As mentioned earlier, as doping increases, the antiferromagnetic long range order is destroyed.

#### IV. SKYRMIONS, CRITICAL DOPING AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE ANTIFERROMAGNETIC ORDER

In the present framework, superconductivity arises with the charge spin recombination when a phase coherence is established. Indeed, prior to spin-charge recombination, a spinless holon may be viewed as if a spinless hole is moving in the background of a monopole. This eventually causes the hole pair formation each having a magnetic flux quantum characterized by  $j = 1/2$ . When the spin charge recombination occurs a spin pair each having unit magnetic flux interact with each other through a gauge force and a phase coherence is established. As we have pointed out in the earlier section that the charge carrier attached with a magnetic flux corresponds to a skyrmion, we may view the superconducting pair as a skyrmion-skyrmion bound state. Indeed, the skyrmion excitation is created at each position of the carriers and plays a role of magnetic field for the carriers. Because of the magnetic field around a carrier, the Lorentz force acts on another carrier. Due to this Lorentz force an attractive interaction is induced between carriers and leads to Cooper pair formation.

It is noted that the mechanism suggests a d-wave pairing. As already pointed out by Kotliar and Liu [15] that in the RVB theory spinons form the d-wave pairing. Now in the superconducting pair, the spin charge recombination occurring through spinon-holon interaction along with the phase coherence suggests the charge carriers also have d-wave pairing. Indeed, the fact that superconductivity occurs in the vicinity of antiferromagnetic long range order, the Cooper pair is d-wave.

It is known that skyrmion topological defects which are introduced by doping are responsible for the destruction of the antiferromagnetic order and their energy may be used as an order parameter [6, 7]. Indeed, in two spatial dimensions the nonlinear sigma field  $n^a$  may be expressed in the  $CP^1$  language in terms of a doublet of complex scalar fields  $z_i$ ;  $i = 1, 2$  with the component  $z_i^\dagger z_i = 1$  as

$$n^a = z_i^\dagger \sigma^a_{ij} z_j \quad (18)$$

where  $\sigma^a$  are Pauli matrices. In this language the continuous field theory corresponding to the Heisenberg antiferromagnet is described by the Lagrangian density in  $2+1$  dimensions

$$L_{ns} = (\partial_\mu \mathbf{z}_i)^Y (\partial_\mu \mathbf{z}_i) \quad (19)$$

where  $\mathbf{D} = \partial + i\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A} = iz_i^Y \partial \mathbf{z}_i$ . This possesses solitonic solutions called skyrmions and charge is defined as

$$Q = \int d^3x J^0 \quad (20)$$

where  $J^0$  is the zero-th component of the topological current  $\mathbf{J} = \frac{1}{2} \partial \mathbf{A}$ . It is noted that  $Q$  is nothing but the magnetic flux of the field  $\mathbf{A}$  indicating that skyrmions are vortices and represent defects in the ordered Neel state.

Now the following Lagrangian density may be proposed for describing the dopants and their interaction with the background lattice in  $2+1$  dimensions with the topological term

$$L_Z = (\partial_\mu \mathbf{z}_i)^Y (\partial_\mu \mathbf{z}_i) + i \mathbf{a} \partial_\mu \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{m} v_F \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{a} \partial_\mu \mathbf{A} + L_H \quad (21)$$

where the hole dopants are represented by a two-component Dirac field  $\mathbf{a}$ ;  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $v_F$  are respectively the effective mass and Fermi velocity of dopants. Here  $L_H$  is the Hopf term given by

$$L_H = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{A} \cdot \partial \mathbf{A} \quad (22)$$

It should be mentioned here that long ago it was shown that [16] antiferromagnetic spin correlation do not produce a Hopf term on a two dimensional square lattice. In fact, these authors have pointed out that the presence of the nontrivial Hopf term may come from something else other than the spin themselves. In this case, the Hopf term arises from the doped holes which will be revealed later.

It is noted that the dopant dispersion relation is given by

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{q}{k^2 v_F^2 + (m v_F^2)^2} \quad (23)$$

which is valid for YBCO ( $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{6+x}$ ) where the Fermi surface has an almost circular shape which is centered at  $\mathbf{k} = 0$ . For LSCO ( $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ ) the Fermi surface is different [7] which corresponds to a dispersion relation of the form

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{r}{[(k_x - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (k_y - \frac{1}{2})^2] v_F^2 + (m v_F^2)^2} \quad (24)$$

Now following Marino [7] the doping parameter is introduced by means of a constraint in the fermion integration measure

$$D[\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{a}] = D_{\mathbf{a}} D_{\mathbf{a}} (\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{a}) \quad (25)$$

where  $\mathbf{a} = 4 \sum_{x \in L} \mathbf{d}^{-3}(\mathbf{z})$  for a dopant at the position  $\mathbf{x}$  and varying along the line  $L$ . Here the factor 4 corresponds to the degeneracy of the representation (4-component) for the Fermi fields. This yields the partition function

$$Z = \int D(\mathbf{z}_0; \mathbf{z}; \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{a}; \mathbf{a}) \int d\mathbf{z} \int d\mathbf{A} \exp \int_0^1 d^3x [2s (\partial_\mu \mathbf{z}_i^Y \partial_\mu \mathbf{z}_i) + (i \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{m} v_F \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{a} \partial_\mu \mathbf{A}) + L_H] g \quad (26)$$

where  $s$  is the spin stiffness and  $L_H$  is the Hopf term.

Upon integration over the fields  $\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{z}; \mathbf{a}; \mathbf{a}$  the resulting equation of motion for the zero-th component  $A_0$  yields the result

$$i^j \partial_i A_j = 4 \mathbf{a}^2 (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{x}(t)) \quad (27)$$

where  $x(t)$  is the dopant position at a time  $t$ . If  $B$  is the magnetic flux or vorticity of  $A$  then this equation becomes

$$B = 4\pi^2 (z - x(t)) \quad (28)$$

For the skyrmion  $B = 4\pi^2 (z - x(t))$  indicates that the skyrmion topological defect configuration coincides with the dopant position at any time and [6]

$$= 2 \quad (29)$$

When we translate this result in the  $3+1$  dimensional formalism where the 2D spin system is considered to reside on the surface of a 3D sphere with a monopole at the centre, we note that in the Lagrangian (21), apart from being a 4 dimensional index, we have to replace the Hopf term by the topological Pontryagin term given by

$$P = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} F \wedge F \quad (30)$$

where

$$F = \frac{1}{2} F \quad (31)$$

It is noted that in the partition function (26) when  $\int_{L_H} d^3x$  is replaced by  $\int_P d^4x$ , the latter integral just represents the Pontryagin index  $q$  related to the monopole strength through the relation  $q = 2$  as given by eqn.(11).

From dimensional hierarchy, the relation between topological terms suggests that in  $3+1$  dimensions, when  $L_H$  is replaced by  $L_P$ , the coefficient is related to  $\pi$ . Indeed replacing  $L_H$  by the Chern-Simons Lagrangian

$$L_{CS} = \frac{k}{4} A \wedge dA \quad (32)$$

we note that the current is given by

$$J = \frac{k}{2} dA \quad (33)$$

and the zeroth component corresponds to

$$J_0 = k \frac{B}{2} \quad (34)$$

So from the relation (22), (32) and (29) we find

$$= \frac{k}{2} = 2 \quad (35)$$

It is noted that if we take  $\pi = 0$  which represents the pure undoped quantum antiferromagnet we do not have the Hopf term which is consistent with the observation of Fradkin and Stone [16]

It has been shown in ref.[11] that the Chern-Simons coefficient  $k$  is related to the monopole strength in  $3+1$  dimensions by the relation  $k = 2\pi$ . This implies  $\pi = 2$ . As in the previous section we have noted that each charge carrier in the superconducting pair is associated with the skyrmion topological defect which is caused by the magnetic flux quantum having  $j = 1/2$ , superconductivity occurs at  $T = 0$  for the critical doping parameter  $x_{sc}$  given by  $j = 1/2 = 2x_{sc}$  yielding  $x_{sc} = 0.25$  for YBCO. When the doping parameter  $x$  is connected with the oxygen stoichiometry parameter  $y$  we have the relation  $x = y - 0.18$  so that we have  $x_{sc} = 0.43$ , which is in good agreement with the experimental value  $x_{sc} = 0.41 \pm 0.02$  [7, 17]. For LSCO, the Fermi surface has four branches and this yields  $x_{sc} = x_{sc} = 0.06$  which is to be compared with the experimental result  $x_{sc} = 0.02$  [18]. It is noted that  $x_{sc}$  is a universal constant depending only on the nature of the Fermi surface.

We have pointed earlier out that in  $3+1$  dimensions chiral anomaly leads to the realization of fermions represented by doped holes interacting with chiral bosons  $\phi_i$ , with the constraint  $\phi_0^2 + \phi_i^2 = 1$ . The

mapping of the space-time manifold on the target space leads to the homotopy  $\pi_4(S^3) = \mathbb{Z}_2$  which takes the values 0 or 1 and leads to the  $\theta$ -term representing the geometric phase. The third term in eqn.(17) gives rise to the solitonic solution such that the charge carrier appears as a skyrmion. However in  $3+1$  dimensions, the stability of the soliton is not generated by this term alone as rescaling of the scale variable  $x \rightarrow \lambda x$  may lead to shrinking it to zero size. However, in the present framework, the attachment of magnetic field with the charge carrier will prevent it from shrinking it to zero size.

Indeed this gives rise to a gauge theoretic extension of the extended body so that the position variable may be written as

$$Q = q + iA \quad (36)$$

where  $q$  is the mean position.  $A = -1/2$  and  $+1/2$  corresponds to vortices in the opposite direction we may consider  $A$  as  $SU(2)$  gauge field when the field strength is given by

$$F = \partial A - \partial A + [A, A] \quad (37)$$

where  $A$  is a  $SU(2)$  gauge field. When  $F$  is taken to be vanishing at all points on the boundary  $S^3$  of a certain volume  $V^4$  inside which  $F \neq 0$ , in the limiting case towards the boundary, we can take

$$A = g^{-1} \partial g; \quad g \in SU(2) \quad (38)$$

This helps us to write the action incorporating the  $\theta$ -term as

$$S = \frac{M^2}{16} \int_V \text{Tr}(\partial g^{-1} \partial g) d^4x + \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \int_V \text{Tr}[\partial g g^{-1}; \partial g g^{-1}]^2 d^4x \\ + \frac{i}{24\pi^2} \int_{S^3} dS \text{Tr}[(g^{-1} \partial g)(g^{-1} \partial g)(g^{-1} \partial g)] \quad (39)$$

where  $M$  is a constant having the dimension of mass and  $\pi$  is a dimensionless coupling constant. Here the first term is related to the gauge noninvariant term  $M^2 A \cdot A$ , the second term (Skyrme term) is the stability term which arises from the term  $F \cdot F$  and the third term is the  $\theta$ -term given by  $F \cdot F$  which is related to the chiral anomaly and Berry phase.

Marino and Neto [7] have pointed out that at the critical doping  $x_{sc}$ , the energy of the skyrmion vanishes. When we compute the energy of the skyrmion from the action (39), we find the expression for the minimum energy [19] as

$$E_{min} = \frac{12\pi^2 M}{\pi} \quad (40)$$

and the size for  $E_{min}$  as

$$R_0 = \frac{1}{2M} \quad (41)$$

Taking  $M$  and  $\pi$  as a function of  $x$ , we note that for the vanishing energy we have  $M(x_{sc}) = 0$  which corresponds to the fact that the spin stiffness vanishes. From the relation for  $R_0$ , it indicates that the skyrmion size is infinite. However, we can have the vanishing energy for finite nonzero  $M(x)$  when  $\pi$  is infinite. This suggests that at this point  $R_0 = 0$ . This implies that for finite  $M$ , the vanishing energy suggests that the skyrmion shrinks to the zero size. So apart from energy, we can take the size of the skyrmion also as an order parameter.

## V. DISCUSSION

It has been pointed out here that the antiferromagnetic spin fluctuation gives rise to a gauge field which determines the antiferromagnetic ground state chirality. This is related to the Berry phase and helps us to realize the RVB state where spinons and holons can be understood as chargeless spins and spinless holes attached with magnetic flux. The attachment of the magnetic flux of the charge carrier suggests



that this may be viewed as a skyrmion. The interaction of a massless fermion representing a neutral spin with a gauge field along with the interaction of a spinless hole with the gauge field enhances the antiferromagnetic correlation along with the pseudogap at the underdoped region. The superconducting pairing may be viewed as caused by skyrmion-skyrmion bound states. This effectively leads to topological superconductivity. It is also shown that the destruction of antiferromagnetic order is at the critical doping parameter  $x_{sc}$  which is a universal constant depending on the nature of the Fermi surface.

Abanov and Wiegman [20, 21] have pointed out that topological superconductivity in  $3+1$  dimensions and  $2+1$  dimensions has its roots in the 1D Peierls-Frohlich model which suggests that the 2 phase solitons of the Frohlich model [22] are charged and move freely through the system making it an ideal conductor. In spatial dimension greater than one this corresponds to superconductivity when the solitonic feature of a charge carrier is attributed to the attachment of a magnetic flux to it. It may be remarked here that in  $1+1$  dimensions we will have a nonlinear sigma model with the Wess-Zumino term when the target space is  $S^3$  which is the  $O(4)$  nonlinear sigma model. In the Euclidean framework however, this geometrically corresponds to the attachment of a vortex line to the two dimensional sheet which is topologically equivalent to the attachment of a magnetic flux [23]. This suggests that the topological feature of ideal conductivity visualized by Frohlich in  $1+1$  dimensions and that of superconductivity in  $2+1$  and  $3+1$  dimensions have a common origin.

- 
- [1] P. Monthoux, A. Balatsky and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 3448 (1991).  
see also:  
A. V. Chubukov and J. Schmalian, Phys. Rev. B 57, R11085 (1998).  
J. Schmalian, D. Pines and B. P. Stojkovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 3839 (1998).  
T. Moriya, K. Ueda and Y. Takahashi, J. Proc. Soc. Jpn. 49, 2905 (1990).  
T. S. Nunner, J. Schmalian and K. H. Bennemann, Phys. Rev. B 59, 8859 (1999).
- [2] W. Rantner and X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B 66, 144501 (2002).
- [3] P. W. Anderson, Science 235, 1196 (1987).
- [4] B. Basu, P. Bandyopadhyay and D. Pal, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 17, 293 (2003).
- [5] D. H. Kim and P. A. Lee, Annals Phys. 272, 130 (1999).
- [6] E. C. Marino, Phys. Lett. A 263, 446 (1999).
- [7] E. C. Marino and M. B. Neto, Phys. Rev. B 64, 092511 (2001).
- [8] P. Wiegmann, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. 101, 243 (1992); Topological Mechanism of Superconductivity in Field Theory, Topology and Condensed Matter Physics, ed. H. B. Geyer, Springer, Berlin, (1999).
- [9] B. Basu, D. Pal and P. Bandyopadhyay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 13, 3393 (1999).
- [10] D. Banerjee and P. Bandyopadhyay, J. Math. Phys. 33, 990 (1992).
- [11] P. Bandyopadhyay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 15, 1415 (2000).
- [12] D. Pal, B. Basu and P. Bandyopadhyay, Phys. Lett. A 299, 304 (2002).
- [13] D. Pal and B. Basu, Europhys. Lett. 56(1), 99 (2001).
- [14] B. Basu, D. Banerjee and P. Bandyopadhyay, Phys. Lett. A 236, 125 (1997).
- [15] G. Kotliar and J. Liu, Phys. Rev. B 38, 5142 (1988).
- [16] E. Fradkin and M. Stone, Phys. Rev. B 38, 7215 (1988).
- [17] J. Rossat-Mignod et. al., Dynamics of Magnetic Fluctuations in High-Temperature Superconductors, G. Reiter, P. Horsch and G. C. Paltakias, Eds., Plenum, NY, (1991).
- [18] F. Borsa et. al., Phys. Rev. B 52, 7334 (1995).
- [19] B. Basu, S. Dhar and P. Bandyopadhyay, preprint cond-mat/0208426.
- [20] A. G. Abanov and P. B. Wiegmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1319 (2001).
- [21] A. G. Abanov and P. B. Wiegmann, Nucl. Phys. B 570, 685 (2000).
- [22] G. Frohlich, Proc. Roy. Soc. A 223, 296 (1954).
- [23] A. Roy and P. Bandyopadhyay, J. Math. Phys. 33, 1178 (1992).