Angle-resolved photoem ission spectra in the cuprates from the d-density wave theory

Sudip Chakravarty, Chetan Nayak, and Sum anta Tewari
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1547
(Dated: January 17, 2022)

A ngle-resolved photoem ission spectra present two challenges for the d-density wave (DDW) theory of the pseudogap state of the cuprates: (1) hole pockets near (=2; =2) are not observed, in apparent contradiction with the assumption of translational symmetry breaking, and (2) there are no well-de ned quasiparticles at the antinodal points, in contradiction with the predictions of mean-eld theory of this broken symmetry state. Here, we show how these puzzles can be resolved.

PACS num bers:

At rst glance, the d-density wave (DDW) proposal for the pseudogap state of the cuprates seems to naturally explain the principal anomaly in photoem ission spectra in this state: the existence of a gap with $d_{x^2-v^2}$ sym metry without superconductivity. However, since DDW order breaks translational sym m etry, thereby splitting the Brillouin zone into two magnetic Brillouin zones, the Fermi surface in the rst magnetic Brillouin zone should be duplicated in the second magnetic Brillouin zone. Thus, the Ferm i surface consists of hole pockets, which is of importance in understanding a number of experiments, such as super uid density², Hallnum ber³, etc. However, in angle-resolved photoem ission spectroscopy (ARPES) in hole doped cuprates, Fermiarcs { not hole pockets { are observed 4 . There is spectral weight in the $\,$ rst, but not the second magnetic zone. In this paper, we show from a careful analysis that Fermi arcs rather than hole pockets are indeed the consequences of the DDW theory in ARPES.

A second important aspect of the proposal of a broken sym m etry state, even one of an unusual variety, is that it is expected to support electronic quasiparticles which are essentially Ferm i-liquid like, as they are in a BCS superconductor. However, from ARPES in underdoped samples no peak is observed at the antinodal points in the norm alstate, but one appears in the superconducting state upon cooling. This observation also nds a natural explanation within our theory. We show that the antinodal quasiparticles, being relatively high-energy excitations, decay by creating particle-hole pairs along the Fermi arcs in the DDW state. In contrast, in the d-wave superconducting state (DSC), or in the coexisting DDW and DSC state, the Fermi arcs shrink to points, and the decay rate is considerably reduced, resulting in a peak in the spectral function. This reduction is bolstered by the suppression of the decay matrix element by the superconducting coherence factors.

The explanation discussed here involves interaction between quasiparticles, whose absolute magnitude is set by a reasonable Hubbard-like interaction of magnitude 1.5 eV, but the precise magnitude is of not much consequence. There may be other sources of broadening of the quasiparticle peak, including uctuation e ects, bilayer splitting, fractionalization, etc., which we do not address here. We merely wish to point out that within the sim-

plest mean $\,\,$ eld picture of DDW , there are no obvious puzzles.

In our mean eld analysis, and indeed in many theories, the nodal quasipartcles, or excitations at the Ferm i arcs, should in principle be sharp, which is not entirely in keeping with ARPES, although a fairly well de ned peak is observed both above and below the superconducting transition temperature, $T_{\rm c}$. It remains to be seen if the present experimental situation changes with time or not.

To establish our notation, we begin with a brief summary of the mean eld theory of DDW . The Hamiltonian H can be simply written in the rst magnetic zone by introducing the Pauli matrices $_{x}$, $_{z}$, the identity matrix I, a row vector $_{k}^{y}$, $(_{k}^{y}$,; i_{k+Q}^{y} ,), and its Hermitian adjoint. The electron destruction operators of momentum k and spin are c_{k} ; and the momentum Q = (;). Thus, K = H N is given by

$$K = {\begin{array}{*{20}{c}} X \\ {}^{Y}{}_{k}; \\ {}^{k}; \\ {}^{k}; \\ {}^{k}; \\ {}^{k}; \\ {}^{m} & \text{I+} {}_{k} {}_{z} + W_{k} {}_{x} {}_{k}; \\ {}^{m} & \text{(1)} \\ {}^{m} & \text{(1)} \\ {}^{m} & \text{(2)} \\ {}^{m$$

where E $_k$ = $\frac{Q}{(_k)^2 + W_k^2}$. The coherence factors must trade places as k! k+Q, which is a consistency check as to why they cannot be functions of $_k$. The energy eigenvalues are:

$$E_{k} = {}^{+}_{k} \quad E(k); \tag{3}$$

The DDW gap is assumed to take the form:

$$W_{k} = \frac{W_{0}(T)}{2} (\cos k_{x} - \cos k_{y})$$
 (4)

The electron spectral function in a crystal need not be invariant under translation by a reciprocal lattice vector.

In fact, it is weighted by the Fourier transform of the relevant W annier orbitals. If the W annier orbitals are functions, the spectral weight is the same in all B rillouin zones. On the other hand, if the W annier orbital is spread out spatially, then the spectral weight in higher B rillouin zones will be very small, and I (!; k+G) I (; k), where I (; k) is the angle-resolved photoem ission intensity. In the DDW state, the unit cell has been doubled. The coherence factors u_k ; v_k tell us how the two sites within the unit cell are superposed, so v_k = u_k plays the role of the W annier function. The corresponding spectral function in the DDW state is:

$$\frac{A(!;k)}{2} = u_k^2 \quad ! \quad E_k^+ + \dots + v_k^2 \quad ! \quad E_k^+ + \dots$$
 (5)

Consider < 0, the case of hole doping, such that the chem ical potential lies entirely in the valence band, so that E_k^+ > 0. Then the ARPES intensity is

$$I(!;k) / n_F(!) v_k^2 ! E_k +$$
 (6)

Since $v_{k+\,\mathbb{Q}}=u_k$, the photoem ission intensity in the $\;$ rst and second m agnetic zones di $\;$ er only by these coherence factors:

$$I(!;k) / n_F(!) v_k^2 ! E_k + ; (7)$$

$$I(!;k+Q) / n_F(!) u_k^2 ! E_k + : (8)$$

For k in the $\,$ rst magnetic zone (i.e. for k+Q in the second magnetic zone), u_k vanishes when W $_k$ vanishes. In other words, the photoem ission intensity in the second magnetic zone vanishes along the diagonals. For wavevectors close to the diagonals, the intensity goes as W $_k^2$. Thus, the outer section of the hole pockets will have small or even vanishing spectral weight, and may not be detected in ARPES experiments. The spectral weight at a typical point on the outer part of a hole pocket will depend on various details, including the band structure, the precise angular dependence of the DDW gap, etc.

A $com\ m$ only-used m odel for the band structure is given by

$$_{k}^{+} = 4t^{0} \cos k_{x} \cos k_{y}; \qquad (9)$$

$$k = 2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y); \qquad (10)$$

A generic parameter set is t=0.3 eV, $t^0\!\!=\!t=0.3$, =0.3 eV; with this set of parameters, the doping level is 14.3% The Ferm i surface with a typical value of W $_0$ (0) = 0.06 eV consists of four hole pockets as shown in Fig.1. The corresponding v_k^2 appearing in the photoem ission intensity is shown Fig.2. It is clear that only half of the hole pockets will be visible in the ARPES spectra, resulting in Ferm i arcs, despite the fact that the actual Ferm i surface consists of hole pockets. The results are similar for the second set of band structure parameters.

We now turn to a discussion of the lifetime of a quasiparticle at the antinodal region k close to (;0), where the free electron Ferm i surface crosses the band edge. The equation that determ ines k is obtained by solving

$$_{k}$$
 $_{jk_{y}}^{+}$ + $_{jk_{y}}$ = (11)




FIG. 1: The Ferm i surface for W $_0$ (0) = 0:06 eV . The band structure parameters are de ned in the text.




FIG. 2: The coherence factor \boldsymbol{v}_k^2 . The param eters are the sam e as in Fig.1.

for $\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$. A ntinodal quasiparticles at \boldsymbol{k} have an energy very close W o, the maximum of the DDW gap. Hence, they can scatter into a nearby wavevector while creating a particle-hole pair near the Ferm i arcs (the inner section of the hole pockets). This is very dierent from the situation in the d-w ave superconducting state, where there are only Ferm ipoints, not arcs, as a result of which, there is very little phase space for low-energy particle-hole pairs. Secondly, the density of states is enhanced at the gap edge, resulting in an abundance of available phase space into which the quasiparticle can be scattered. In the superconducting state, this density of states enhancem ent is cancelled by coherence factors. These coherence factors re ect the fact that the quasiparticles are neutral, so they are only weakly scattered by interactions which are coupled to charge.

W e w ill set up the lifetim e calculation in full generality, assum ing that both DDW and DSC order param eters are present, and then vary the size of the DSC order param eter. In order to more easily compare with experimental results, we will assume mean—eld—like temperature dependence for the DSC gap so that we can display our

results as a tem perature-dependent decay rate.

Consider an initial quasiparticle state of momentum k_1 in the antinodal region (to be precise, k de ned above) and of energy E_{k_1} , where $E_k = \frac{1}{(E_k)^2 + j(k)^2}$. In the pseudogap state,

where the d-wave superconducting order parameter = 0, $E_k = E_k$ (k). Suppose that this initial state decays into a nal state of energy $E_{k_2} + E_{k_3} + E_{k_4}$. In low est order perturbation theory, the decay rate for such a process is

$$\frac{1}{1} = 2 \int_{k_2 k_3 k_4} M_{k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4} \tilde{J}(2)^2 (k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4) (E_{k_1} E_{k_2} E_{k_3} E_{k_4}) [1 f(E_{k_2})] [1 f(E_{k_3})] [1 f(E_{k_4})]; (12)$$

where $\frac{R}{k_2k_3k_4}=\frac{R}{(2)^2}\frac{d^2k_2}{(2)^2}\frac{d^2k_3}{(2)^2}\frac{d^2k_4}{(2)^2}$; M $_{k_1k_2k_3k_4}$ is a matrix element, and f (E $_k$) is the Fermi function. We have in mind a situation in which k_2 is close to k_1 and k_3 ; k_4 are close to the zone diagonal, but we will perform the integrals over the full B rillouin zone.

There is a second contribution to the decay rate, 1=2, resulting from scattering o therm ally-excited quasiparticles. The corresponding expression involves a dierent matrix element $N_{k_1k_2k_3k_4}$ and the quasiparticle at momentum k_2 is thermally excited with probability $f(E_{k_2})$. In all other respects the equation is the same as Eq. 12 except that the energy and momentum conserving functions must be changed accordingly. The total decay rate is the sum 1=10 and 1=11 and 1=12.

The m atrix elements M $_{k_1k_2k_3k_4}$ and N $_{k_1k_2k_3k_4}$ will depend on the form of the interaction between quasiparticles and also on the coherence factors. If we choose a Hubbard-like density-density interaction, "(q) # (q), between the original electrons, the coherence factors are extremely complicated in the coexisting DDW and DSC state, and the multidim ensional num erical integrations involved in calculating the scattering rates become next to impossible to carry out. To obtain upper bounds, we replace them by their maximum values. In the DDW state, we expect the coherence factors to be rather tame, but in the state with both DSC and DDW orders, they will suppress the decay rate as in a pure superconducting state. Thus, such an approximation will underestimate the di erence between the decay rates in the pseudogap and the underdoped superconducting states. We call this interaction, treated with this approximation, model A.

In order to capture the e ect of the coherence factors in the mixed DDW and DSC state, we consider a model interaction. Since we are only concerned with the interaction between the quasiparticles in the valence band, we choose the interaction to be (is the volume of the system .)

$$V = -\frac{X}{k'' k''} \frac{v_{y} v_{y} v_{y} v_{y} v_{y}}{k''' k'' q''' k''' k'' q''' k'' q'''};$$
 (13)

where ${vy \atop k}$ creates a quasiparticle in the valence band of the DDW state. We have ignored the temperature and momentum dependence of the interaction, because we

are prim arily interested in tem peratures much lower than the DDW transition tem perature, where the tem perature dependence of the DDW gap should be weak. Moreover, we merely wish to demonstrate how the development of superconductivity a ects the lifetime, so we also neglect the momentum space structure of the interaction. For this interaction, which we call model B, the coherence factors are equal to unity for the DDW order alone, but are non-trivial in the state with both orders as a result of the coherence factors associated with superconductivity in the mixed state. We can view the mixed state as DSC developing on top of DDW. Thus, the coherence factors for this interaction can be read of from the BCS theory and the matrix elements are

$$M_{k_1;k_2;k_3;k_4} = [V_{k_1}V_{k_2}U_{k_3}V_{k_4} + V_{k_1}U_{k_2}V_{k_3}V_{k_4}$$

$$U_{k_1}V_{k_2}U_{k_3}U_{k_4} + U_{k_1}V_{k_2}V_{k_3}U_{k_4}]$$
 (14)

and

$$N_{k_{1},ik_{2},ik_{3},ik_{4}} = \begin{bmatrix} V_{k_{1}}V_{k_{2}}V_{k_{3}}V_{k_{4}} & U_{k_{1}}U_{k_{2}}U_{k_{3}}U_{k_{4}} \\ & U_{k_{1}}V_{k_{2}}V_{k_{3}}U_{k_{4}} & V_{k_{1}}U_{k_{2}}U_{k_{3}}V_{k_{4}} \\ & + U_{k_{1}}V_{k_{2}}U_{k_{3}}V_{k_{4}} & V_{k_{1}}U_{k_{2}}U_{k_{3}}V_{k_{4}} \\ & U_{k_{1}}V_{k_{2}}V_{k_{3}}U_{k_{4}} + V_{k_{1}}U_{k_{2}}V_{k_{3}}U_{k_{4}} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(15)$$

w here

$$\frac{U_k^2}{V_k^2} = \frac{1}{2} \quad 1 \quad \frac{E(k)}{E(k)} \quad : \tag{16}$$

This form of the interaction allows us capture the dierence between the matrix elements in the pseudogap and superconducting states.

Our results are displayed in Fig. 3, where the decay rates are plotted against tem perature. In these plots we have kept the total gap E_k xed and equal to 0.06 eV, while assuming a mean—eld tem perature dependence for the superconducting gap

$$_{0}(T) = _{0}(0) 1 \frac{T}{T_{c}} : (17)$$

with $_0$ (0) = 0:03 eV and T_c = 60 K. This implicitly de nes the temperature dependence of the DDW gap, which is weak close to T_c , as noted earlier.




FIG. 3: The lifetime of a quasipartcle in the antinodal region at wave vector k, as defined in the text, plotted as a function of temperature. The open symbols are for without coherence factors and the solid symbols are with coherence factors. The square symbols correspond to 2 meV broadening of the energy conserving—function and the circles to 1 meV broadening. The electron-electron interaction parameter = 1:5 eV.

It is apparent from this gure that the decay rate drops dram atically as a result of the developm ent of superconducting order. From the calculation for model A, we see that there is a substantial drop resulting from the elimination of phase space. From model B, we see that the coherence factors reduce the decay rate further by a large amount.

The absence of an antinodal quasiparticle peak in the pseudogap state and its subsequent em ergence in the superconducting state has been interpreted here as the increase of its width as $T_{\rm c}$ is approached. However, when the width becomes comparable to the quasiparticle energy, i.e. as the curve reaches the dashed line in Figs. 3, the quasiparticle concept breaks down. Once this occurs, our perturbative calculation can no longer be trusted, and it is not meaningful to assign a width or weight to the quasiparticle. What is signicant is that it is possible to have a reasonably well-dened quasiparticle in the superconducting state as a result of phase space restrictions

and coherence factors, as we have found.

The broken sym m etry state m ay orm ay not have well-de ned quasiparticles at the single-particle gap edge. It depends on m any non-universal details: the locus in momentum space, the doping level, the interaction strength, etc. Thus, the absence of a well de ned antinodal quasiparticle does not preclude a broken symmetry state. However, it may have important e ects on non-universal aspects of the state, such as the temperature dependence of the order parameter which may, as a result, be strongly non-mean-eld-like. Also, our calculation leaves out uctuation e ects, which must be considered in the fiture.

We end with three concluding remarks: (1) Although hole pockets cannot be observed in ARPES, other experim ental probes can be used to look for their signature, for example, infrared Hall angle measurement in the underdoped regim e. (2) Because the interlayer tunneling m atrix element is so strongly peaked at (;0),8 we expect the c-axis optical conductivity to show a strong tem perature dependence at Tc given our lifetime calculation. Indeed, this is consistent with the known measurements.9 (3) We have not yet studied in detail the doping dependence. Nonetheless, it is possible to make a qualitative observation. There are two competing e ects. As the system is moderately underdoped, the DDW order param eter must increase. Thus, the quasiparticle in the (;0) regim e will have higher energy, increasing its scattering rate. On the other hand, the Ferm i arcs will also shrink and the phase space for particle-hole scattering will decrease. We wish to return to these issues in the near future.

C.N. has been supported by the NSF under Grant No.DMR-9983544 and the A.P. Sloan Foundation.S.C. and S.T. have been supported by the NSF under Grant No.DMR-9971138. We would like to thank Peter Arm itage, D in itriBasov, John Frestad, Eduardo Fradkin, KoichiHam ada, Jiangping Hu, Steven Kivelson, Richard Thompson, Douglas Scalapino, Daijiro Yoshioka, and Jan Zaanen for discussions.

S.Chakravarty, R.B. Laughlin, D.K.Morr, and C.Nayak, Phys. Rev. B 63, 094503 (2001).

² S. Tewari, H. -Y. Kee, C. Nayak, S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B 64, 224516 (2001).

³ S.Chakravarty, C.Nayak, S.Tewari, X.Yang, Phys.Rev. Lett.89, 277003 (2002).

See, for exam ple, the most recent review article by A.Damascelli, Z.Hussain, Z-X. Shen, Rev. Mod. Phys. 75, 473 (2003).

⁵ For other explanations and controversy surrounding this observation, see R ef. 4.

⁶ A similar conclusion has been reached from an entirely different perspective by K. Ham ada and D. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. B 67, 184503 (2003).

H.D.Drew, private communications.

S.Chakravarty, A. Sudb, P.W. Anderson, and S. Strong, Science 261, 337 (1993).

⁹ D.N.Basov, C.C.Homes, E.J.Singley, M.Strongin, T. Timusk, G.Blumberg, and D.vander Marel, Phys.Rev.B 63, 134514 (2001).