

Low-energy spectra in the t - J type models at light doping

Wei-Cheng Lee¹, T. K. Lee^{1,2}, Chang-Ming Ho² and P. W. Leung³

¹ *Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Nankang, Taipei, Taiwan 11529*

² *Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Sciences, P.O.Box 2-131, Hsinchu, Taiwan*

300

³ *Physics Department, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay,*

Hong Kong

(May 26, 2020)

Abstract

Based on a variational approach, we propose that there are two kinds of low energy states in the t - J type models at low doping. In a quasi-particle state an unpaired spin bound to a hole with a well-defined momentum can be excited with spin waves. The resulting state shows a suppression of antiferromagnetic order around the hole with the profile of a *spin bag*. These spin-bag states with spin and charge or hole separated form a continuum of low-energy excitations. Very different properties predicted by these two kinds of states explain a number of anomalous results observed in the exact diagonalization studies on small clusters up to 32 sites.

Typeset using REVTeX

Soon after the discovery of the high T_c superconducting cuprates, the t - J model was proposed [1] as the prototype to examine the phenomena. Since then it has been shown in theories [2,3] and experiments [4,5] that extra hoppings beyond nearest neighbors ($n.n.$) are also important to the low-energy features of the cuprates. Enormous theoretical effort has been devoted to predict the low-energy spectra of these t - J type models. But the strong correlation associated with these models has made perturbative approaches ineffective. With the many different mean-field theories presented so far, there is little consensus to the "correct" description of low-energy spectra of these models. To sort out the proper theory it is important to first have a detail comparison of the predictions with the results of exact calculations.

Recently, significant progress has been made at very low doping. Several different numerical techniques, such as exact diagonalization (ED) studies [6–9], self-consistent Born approximation (SCBA) [10] and the Green function Monte Carlo method [11], all have obtained similar results for the energy-momentum dispersion relation of a single hole doped into t - J type models. The results agree fairly well with experiments [5]. In addition, a mean-field or variational wave function (VWF) [12] constructed from the half-filled Mott insulating state with antiferromagnetic long-range order (AF LRO) has also obtained a similar success. In a recent paper [3] this single-hole VWF is generalized to treat systems with multiple holes or electrons. The new set of VWF's easily explained angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) results [4] for Fermi pockets around $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and $(\pi, 0)$ for hole-doped and electron-doped systems, respectively. It [3] also reproduced unusual patterns in momentum distribution functions (MDF's) of the ground state calculated by the ED method [13,14] for one and two holes in 32 sites. For these VWF's, doped holes or electrons behave like quasi-particles (QP's). In this paper we will show that in addition to these QP states, there is a continuum of charge excitations described by *spin-charge separated* states in the spectra of t - J type models. The presence of the two kinds of states is carefully examined by explaining several anomalous results reported by ED studies for clusters up to 32 sites.

As shown by Lee *et al.* [3], the ground state in the presence of a few doped holes

or electrons could be described by a VWF constructed from the half-filled Mott insulating state. At half-filling, the ground state of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian is described fairly accurately by including three mean-field parameters [12,16]: the staggered magnetization $m_s = \langle S_A^z \rangle = -\langle S_B^z \rangle$, where the lattice is divided into A and B sublattices; the uniform bond order parameters $\chi = \langle \sum_{\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} \rangle$; and d -wave resonating valence bond (d -RVB) order $\Delta = \langle c_{j\downarrow} c_{i\uparrow} - c_{j\uparrow} c_{i\downarrow} \rangle$ if i and j are $n.n.$ sites in x -direction and $-\Delta$ for y -direction. Without d -RVB order, the mean-field Hamiltonian has lower and upper spin-density-wave (SDW) bands with operators $a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \sigma \beta_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\sigma}$, and $b_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = -\sigma \beta_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\sigma}$, respectively. Here $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi, \pi)$, $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = \frac{1}{2}[1 - (\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}/\xi_{\mathbf{k}})]$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = \frac{1}{2}[1 + (\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}/\xi_{\mathbf{k}})]$. Energy dispersions for the two SDW bands are $\pm \xi_{\mathbf{k}} = \pm(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + (Jm_s)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = -\frac{3}{4}J\chi(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$. Inclusion of d -RVB pairing for electrons on total N_s sites, the VWF for the ground state has the form $|\Psi_0\rangle = P_e [\sum_{\mathbf{k}} (A_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^{\dagger} a_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger} + B_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^{\dagger} b_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger})]^{N_s/2} |0\rangle$, where $A_{\mathbf{k}} = (E_{\mathbf{k}} + \xi_{\mathbf{k}})/\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{k}} = -(E_{\mathbf{k}} - \xi_{\mathbf{k}})/\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ with $E_{\mathbf{k}} = (\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^2)^{1/2}$ and the constraint of one electron per site enforced by P_e . Here $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{3}{4}J\Delta d_{\mathbf{k}}$ with $d_{\mathbf{k}} = \cos k_x - \cos k_y$. Notice that the sum in $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is taken over the sublattice Brillouin zone (SBZ).

In the presence of doped holes or electrons, we consider the t - J type model including longer-ranged hoppings, with amplitudes t' for the 2nd $n.n.$ and t'' the 3rd $n.n.$. By applying a particle-hole transformation [3,6] we can treat hole- and electron-doped cases in the same manner. However, here we will just concentrate on the hole-doped cases with $J/t=0.3 = -t'/t$ and $t''/t=0.2$.

When a hole is doped or an electron is removed from $|\Psi_0\rangle$, a pair must be broken with an unpaired spin left. Thus it is quite natural to have the following VWF [3,12] for a single doped hole, *e.g.*, with a lone up spin

$$|\Psi_1(\mathbf{q}_s)\rangle = P_d c_{\mathbf{q}_s\uparrow}^{\dagger} \left[\sum_{[\mathbf{k} \neq \mathbf{q}_h]} (A_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^{\dagger} a_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger} + B_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^{\dagger} b_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^{\dagger}) \right]^{(N_s/2)-1} |0\rangle,$$

where the hole momentum \mathbf{q}_h is excluded from the sum if \mathbf{q}_h is within the SBZ, otherwise, $\mathbf{q}_h - \mathbf{Q}$ is excluded. P_d here enforces the constraint of no doubly occupied sites. When we

choose the unpaired-spin momentum \mathbf{q}_s to be either the same as the hole momentum \mathbf{q}_h or $\mathbf{q}_h + \mathbf{Q}$, this VWF is equivalent to the Lee-Shih [12] wave function. Variational energies calculated vary with \mathbf{q}_h [3,12]. The energy dispersions for t - J and t - t' - t'' - J models are plotted as filled circles in Fig. 1(a) and (b), respectively. For both models, the ground state with one hole has momentum $(\pi/2, \pi/2) \equiv \mathbf{Q}/2$. As shown in Ref. [3], these dispersion relations are still followed when hole number is increased. The holes in these wave functions behave just like QP's, hence we denote $|\Psi_1(\mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{q}_s)\rangle \equiv |\Psi_1^{qp}\rangle$.

There are only two variational parameters: Δ/χ and m_s/χ in our VWF's. The extended hoppings t' and t'' are not used as variational parameters in both $|\Psi_1^{qp}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_1\rangle$. The effect of t is included in the RVB uniform bond χ . Since t' and t'' are compatible with AF LRO, there is little effect for them to be included in our VWF.

Clearly, the choice of unpaired spin to have the same momentum as the hole, *i.e.* $\mathbf{q}_s = \mathbf{q}_h$, is a special case for $|\Psi_1\rangle$. If we choose $\mathbf{q}_s \neq \mathbf{q}_h$, then not only the electron pair at \mathbf{q}_h and $-\mathbf{q}_h$ is excluded in the sum in $|\Psi_1\rangle$, the pair at \mathbf{q}_s and $-\mathbf{q}_s$ is also affected. Hence we expect it to be higher in energy. To make a distinction from the afore-mentioned QP states $|\Psi_1^{qp}\rangle$, these states will be denoted as the *spin-bag* (SB) states, *i.e.* $|\Psi_1(\mathbf{q}_s \neq \mathbf{q}_h)\rangle \equiv |\Psi_1^{sb}\rangle$. The variational energies as a function of \mathbf{q}_s for $|\Psi_1^{sb}\rangle$ with $\mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{Q}/2$ are plotted as empty circles in Figs. 1(a) and (b) for the t - J and t - t' - t'' - J models, respectively. Many SB states could be constructed with the same \mathbf{q}_s but different \mathbf{q}_h . While it is possible to have the SB states of even lower energy with $\mathbf{q}_h = (3\pi/4, 0)$ in the t - J model (gray circles in Fig. 1(a)), they are of higher energies than that of SB states with $\mathbf{q}_h = (\pi/2, \pm\pi/2)$ in the t - t' - t'' - J case. There are many such states, actually an infinite number of them for an infinite system, forming a continuum, as schematically illustrated by the shaded regions in Fig. 1(a) and (b).

There is an intuitive way to understand the difference between SB and QP states. The spin excitations of the QP states can be easily constructed by applying the spin operators, $S^{\dagger(-)}(\mathbf{k}') = \sum_{\mathbf{q}'} c_{\mathbf{q}'+\mathbf{k}'\uparrow(\downarrow)}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{q}'\downarrow(\uparrow)}$, to $|\Psi_1^{qp}\rangle$. Notice that these operators commute with the projection operator P_d . In the linear spin-wave theory \mathbf{k}' is the momentum of the spin wave. The particular term included in the sum of \mathbf{q}' with \mathbf{q}' equal to the momentum of the un-

paired spin $\mathbf{q}_s=\mathbf{q}_h$ changes the QP state $|\Psi_1^{qp}\rangle$ to the SB ones $|\Psi_1^{sb}(\mathbf{q}_s=\mathbf{q}_h + \mathbf{k}')\rangle$. Thus the SB states are actually just spin-wave excitations of the QP state with the same hole momentum. In Fig. 1(c) the difference of variational energies between the SB states and QP state with $\mathbf{q}_h=\mathbf{Q}/2$ for the t - t' - t'' - J model is plotted as a function of the difference of momentum $\mathbf{k}'=\mathbf{q}_s - \mathbf{q}_h$. The dotted line is the prediction of energy-momentum dispersion relation of linear spin-wave theory [17]. The slight differences between the two results at $\mathbf{k}'=\mathbf{Q}/2$ and $\mathbf{k}'=(\pi, 0)$ are due to the hole-renormalization effect [18]. SB states represent spin excitations of the QP states. The empty/gray circles in Figs. 1(a) and (b) are the lowest spin excitation energies of the ground state [19].

The two VWF's also give very different spin and hole correlations. When the hole is at the A sublattice, the correlation is $SH_A(\mathbf{r})=\sum_{i\in A}(-1)^{i+\mathbf{r}}\langle\Psi_1|n_i^h S_{i+\mathbf{r}}^z|\Psi_1\rangle/\sum_{i\in A}\langle\Psi_1|n_i^h|\Psi_1\rangle$, where n_i^h is the hole-number operator at site i ; similarly for the case when hole is at B sublattice. In our convention, the up spin prefers to be on sublattice A . If the hole and unpaired spin are uncorrelated, $SH_{A,B}$ equals to the value of uniform staggered magnetization. Values of SH_A for the QP state (filled triangles) with $\mathbf{q}_s=\mathbf{q}_h=(0, 0)$ and the SB state (empty triangles) with $\mathbf{q}_s=(0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{q}_h=\mathbf{Q}/2$ [20], respectively, are plotted as a function of distance from the hole in Fig. 2. Both states have an unpaired down spin and a single hole. The spin configurations around the hole are clearly different for the two states. The spin magnetization right next to the hole in the QP state $|\Psi_1^{qp}\rangle$ has values larger than the uniform background, 0.368. Thus the unpaired spin is bound to the hole. On the other hand, for the SB state the magnetization is suppressed around the hole, this is similar to the idea of a SB first proposed in Ref. [21]. The unpaired spin bound to the hole in the QP state is here being excited by the spin-wave excitation and becomes unbound in the SB state. This may be viewed as a spin-charge separated state.

The spin-charge separation observed in the SB states has many interesting consequences. In ED studies, it has been found [15] that the lowest energy state at $(\pi, 0)$ for the t - t' - t'' - J model is very different from that of the t - J model. The spin-spin correlation across the hole changes from ferromagnetic (FM) to AF when t' is turned on. This re-

sult can now be understood as that the lowest energy state at $(\pi, 0)$ for the t - J model is the QP state $|\Psi_1^{qp}(\mathbf{q}_s=\mathbf{q}_h=(\pi, 0))\rangle$ as shown in Fig. 1(a), but it changes to a SB state $|\Psi_1^{sb}(\mathbf{q}_s=(\pi, 0), \mathbf{q}_h=\mathbf{Q}/2)\rangle$ for the t - t' - t'' - J model as shown in Fig. 1(b). In Table I we list correlations obtained between pairs of spins around the doped hole for QP and SB states. The correlation is defined as $C_{\delta, \delta'}(\mathbf{q}_s) \equiv \sum_i \langle \Psi_1^{qp, sb}(\mathbf{q}_s) | n_i^h \mathbf{S}_{i+\delta} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+\delta'} | \Psi_1^{qp, sb}(\mathbf{q}_s) \rangle$ with δ and δ' denoting two sites around the hole [15]. While the lower-energy QP states at $\mathbf{q}_s=\mathbf{q}_h=(\pi, 0)$ and $(0,0)$ behave as expected for a system with AF LRO, *i.e.* FM for spins at the same sublattice (pairs **a** and **b**) and AF otherwise, the result for a SB state with $\mathbf{q}_s=(\pi, 0)$ and $\mathbf{q}_h=\mathbf{Q}/2$ shows AF correlation at the same sublattice. This is exactly the behavior observed in ED results [15]. Our result in Fig. 1 shows that at $(0,0)$ the lowest energy state remains to be the QP state even when t' and t'' are included. The spin correlations are thus not changed, this is also consistent with what is found by Tohyama *et al.* [15]. All these results clearly support our identification of low-energy spectra to be consisted of QP and SB states.

TABLE I. $C_{\delta, \delta'}(\mathbf{q}_s)$ calculated for an 8×8 lattice using different VWF's with momenta indicated. The first and third rows are for QP states while others are for SB ones. **a** to **e** are different pairs of sites defined in the inset of Fig. 2. Positive(negative) values mean FM(AF) correlations.

\mathbf{q}_s	\mathbf{q}_h	a	b	c	d	e
(0,0)	(0,0)	0.188	0.188	0.202	-0.273	-0.264
(0,0)	$\mathbf{Q}/2$	-0.0288	-0.0254	-0.0302	-0.203	-0.195
$(\pi, 0)$	$(\pi, 0)$	0.123	0.15	0.071	-0.353	-0.279
$(\pi, 0)$	$\mathbf{Q}/2$	-0.0313	-0.0085	-0.002	-0.1921	-0.212

Another important difference between QP and SB states is in their MDF $\langle n_\sigma(\mathbf{k}) \rangle$. The results can actually be predicted. Since the hole momentum \mathbf{q}_h is excluded from the VWF $|\Psi_1\rangle$, we naturally expect $\langle n_\uparrow(\mathbf{k}) \rangle$ to have a smaller value or a dip at $\mathbf{k}=\mathbf{q}_h$ and $\mathbf{k}=\mathbf{q}_h + \mathbf{Q}$ than its neighbors, similarly for $\langle n_\downarrow(\mathbf{k}) \rangle$ at $\mathbf{k}=-\mathbf{q}_h$ and $\mathbf{k}=-\mathbf{q}_h + \mathbf{Q}$. However, in a QP state

with an up spin at momentum $\mathbf{q}_s=\mathbf{q}_h$, then $\langle n_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{k}=\mathbf{q}_h) \rangle$ is increased and there is no more a dip. As an example, the MDF obtained by the QP state with $\mathbf{q}_h=\mathbf{q}_s=(\pi, 0)$ is listed in Fig. 3(a). Because of the symmetry, only results for one quadrant of the BZ are shown. At each \mathbf{k} the upper(lower) number is for up(down) spin. Now for a SB state with a lone up spin at $\mathbf{q}_s(\neq \mathbf{q}_h)$, the original spin at \mathbf{q}_h in the QP state is excited and placed at \mathbf{q}_s , then $\langle n_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{k}=\mathbf{q}_h) \rangle$ still has a dip. Fig. 3(b) shows the MDF obtained for the SB state with $\mathbf{q}_s=(\pi, 0)$ and $\mathbf{q}_h=\mathbf{Q}/2$ [20]. Results are here for 32 sites and $(\Delta/\chi, m_s/\chi)=(0.1, 0.05)$.

This behavior of the MDF's is indeed found in the exact results of the t - t' - t'' - J and t - J models on 32 sites. MDF's obtained by the ED method for the lowest energy state at $(\pi, 0)$ of the t - J and t - t' - t'' - J models are shown in Fig. 3(c) and (d), respectively. The nice qualitative agreement achieved between 3(a) and (c) as well as between 3(b) and (d) [22] re-affirms our results shown in Fig. 1(a) and (b): the lowest energy state at $(\pi, 0)$ for a single hole is a QP state for the t - J model and a SB state for the t - t' - t'' - J model.

Another consequence of this switch from a QP state to a SB one is the drastic change of the spectral weight, $Z_{\mathbf{k}}=|\langle \Psi_1(\mathbf{k})|c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle|^2/\langle \Psi_0|c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle$. Using $|\Psi_1^{qp}(\mathbf{q}=(\pi, 0))\rangle$ we obtained $Z_{\mathbf{k}} = 0.475$, it vanishes when we use the SB state $|\Psi_1^{sb}(\mathbf{q}_s=(\pi, 0), \mathbf{q}_h=\mathbf{Q}/2)\rangle$. This is consistent with exact results for the t - J model ($Z_{\mathbf{k}}=0.34$) [7] and t - t' - t'' - J model ($Z_{\mathbf{k}}=0$) [23]. In addition, spectral weights of the lowest energy states of both models at (π, π) and $(3\pi/4, 3\pi/4)$ are either exactly zero or very small. This is consistent with our identification that states at both momenta are SB ones. Since $c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle$, unlike the SB state, has momenta of the hole and unpaired spin related, it has a negligible overlap with the SB state. By contrast, states at $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and $(\pi/4, \pi/4)$ remain to be QP states in both t - J and t - t' - t'' - J models, hence large spectral weights are expected. It is noted that our QP (SB) states predict much larger (small) spectral weights in comparison with that of the exact 32 sites. This discrepancy is partly due to the fact that we have AF LRO in our VWF's while total spin is a good quantum number in the exact results. Another reason is that due to the projection operator P_d our QP states and SB states with the same quantum numbers (total momentum and total S_z) are actually not orthogonal to each other although they have very

small overlap. But there are many SB states in the continuum that could couple with a particular QP state. Hence, when the QP state has energies very close to the continuum, the spectral weight of the QP state is diluted by the coupling with SB states. This effect makes the quantitative prediction of spectral weight difficult. We leave this issue for the future work.

In summary, based on a mean-field theory with AF and d -RVB order parameters we have proposed that at low doping there are two kinds of low energy states for t - J type models. The single-hole QP states have a well-defined energy dispersion. By exciting the QP states with spin waves we obtain a continuum of SB states. The unpaired spin is separated from the hole in the SB states. A number of physical properties predicted by these two kinds of states are in good agreement with the exact results obtained by ED studies. Although our emphasis in this paper is to show the solid theoretical support of these two kinds of states, there are also experimental evidences. In Ref. [3], QP states were shown to explain well the single-hole dispersion observed by ARPES. However the overall variation pattern of spectral weights observed in the ARPES experiment on $Ca_2CuO_2Cl_2$ [4] is naturally understood with the presence of SB states: notable lowest energy peaks are only observed in small regions of k -space, e.g. near $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and $(\pi/2, 0)$ where QP states have lower energy than the SB states (Fig.1(b)). More comparison with experiments is in progress.

We are grateful to Profs. N. Nagaosa and C.-T. Shih for invaluable discussions and their supporting data. TKL is supported by the grant NSC91-2112-M-001-011 (R.O.C.). PWL is supported by the Hong Kong RGC grant number HKUST6159/01P.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. W. Anderson, *Science* **235**, 1196 (1987).
- [2] A. Nazarenko *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 8676 (1995); V. I. Belinicher, A. L. Chernyshev, and V. A. Shubin, *ibid.* **54**, 14914(1996); R. Eder, Y. Ohta and G. A. Sawatzky, *ibid.* **55**, R3414 (1997); F. Lema and A. A. Aligia, *ibid.* **55**, 14092 (1997); C. Kim *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4245 (1998).
- [3] T. K. Lee, C.-M. Ho and N. Nagaosa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 067001 (2003).
- [4] F. Ronning *et al.*, *Science* **282**, 2067 (1998), F. Ronning *et al.* *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 165101 (2003) for hole-doped systems; N. P. Armitage *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 257001 (2002), for electron-doped ones.
- [5] A. Damascelli, Z.-X. Shen and Z. Hussain, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 473 (2003).
- [6] T. Tohyama and S. Maekawa, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 3596 (1994); R. J. Gooding, K. J. E. Vos and P. W. Leung, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 12866 (1994).
- [7] P. W. Leung and R. J. Gooding, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, R15711 (1995).
- [8] P. W. Leung, B. O. Wells and R. J. Gooding, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 6320 (1997).
- [9] E. Dagotto, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 763 (1994), for review on early studies.
- [10] F. Marsiglio *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 10082 (1991); G. Martinez and P. Horsch, *ibid.* **44**, 317 (1991); Z. Liu and E. Manousakis, *ibid.* **45**, 2425 (1992); T. Xiang and J. M. Wheatley, *ibid.* **54**, R12653 (1996).
- [11] E. Dagotto, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 728 (1994).
- [12] T. K. Lee and C. T. Shih, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 5983 (1997).
- [13] A. L. Chernyshev, P. W. Leung and R. J. Gooding, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 13594 (1998).
- [14] P. W. Leung, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 205101 (2002).

- [15] G.B. Martins, R. Eder and E. Dagotto, Phys. Rev. B **60**, R3716 (1999); T Tohyama, *et al.*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **69**, 9 (2000).
- [16] T. K. Lee, and S. P. Feng, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 11809 (1988); G. J. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 2662 (1990).
- [17] The spin-wave energy dispersion at half-filling is $v_{SW}[1 - (\cos k_x + \cos k_y)^2/4]^{1/2}$. In Fig.1(c), $v_{SW} \approx 3J$ is used and this is larger than the value of $2.4J$ obtained by G. Chen, H. Q. Ding and W. A. Goddard, III, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 2933 (1992).
- [18] Same behaviour is found in an analytic study in the undoped case, with presumably finite on-site repulsion between (π -)flux fermions: see C.-M. Ho *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1626 (2001); see, also, for the magnetic-field effect, O. F. Syljuåsen and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 207207 (2002).
- [19] The gap between the continuum and the QP dispersion is an artifact of the finite size. For an infinite system, there is no gap.
- [20] Notice that results for SB states are average over the two degenerate ones with $\mathbf{q}_h=(\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and $\mathbf{q}_h=(\pi/2, -\pi/2)$.
- [21] J. R. Schrieffer, X. G. Wen and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 944 (1988).
- [22] Due to the assumption of AF LRO, our values of MDF's outside of the SBZ are larger than ED results.
- [23] Note that the $(\pi, 0)$ state reported in Ref. [8] is *not* the lowest energy state with the same momentum. The lowest one has zero overlap with $c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle$ and, consequently, $Z_{\mathbf{k}}=0$. This state was missing from the spectrum in Ref. [8].

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Variational energies calculated for the (a) t - J and (b) t - t' - t'' - J model Hamiltonians for one hole on an 8×8 lattice by applying our TWF's. Filled circles, connected by solid lines, are VMC results using the $|\Psi_1^{qp}(\mathbf{q}_s)\rangle$ discussed in the text; empty(gray) circles by $|\Psi_1^{sb}(\mathbf{q}_s, \mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{Q}/2((3\pi/4, 0)))\rangle$. Shaded regions indicate a possible continuum for an infinite system. A minus sign has been multiplied to all the data shown here. (c) Difference of variational energies between the QP ground state at $\mathbf{Q}/2$ and the SB states at $\mathbf{q}_s = \mathbf{Q}/2 + \mathbf{k}'$ in (b) as a function of \mathbf{k}' . The dotted line is the prediction of energy dispersion of linear spin-wave theory [17]. Results here are obtained with parameters $(\Delta/\chi, m_s/\chi) = (0.25, 0.125)$.

FIG. 2. Spin-hole correlation functions, SH_A (defined in the text), for an 8×8 lattice calculated using the QP state (filled triangles) with $\mathbf{q}_s = \mathbf{q}_h = (0, 0)$ and the SB state (empty triangles) with $\mathbf{q}_s = (0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{Q}/2$ [20]. Inset: pairs of sites, denoted by letters **a** to **e**, where spin-spin correlations listed in Table I are computed. Parameters are the same as used in Fig. 1.

FIG. 3. Momentum distribution functions in one quadrant of \mathbf{k} space the BZ for 32 sites obtained by (a) $|\Psi_1^{qp}(\mathbf{q} = (\pi, 0))\rangle$, (b) $|\Psi_1^{sb}(\mathbf{q}_s = (\pi, 0), \mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{Q}/2)\rangle$, (c) ED results for $(\pi, 0)$ state of the t - J model and (d) t - t' - t'' - J model. The upper number is result for up spin and lower for down spin.

This figure "nk-32-pi0.JPG" is available in "JPG" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0306424v1>

This figure "qp-sb-disp1.JPG" is available in "JPG" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0306424v1>

This figure "sh-qp-sb-00-1.JPG" is available in "JPG" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0306424v1>