

ARPES spectra of the stripe phase in the 2D t-J model

R. Eder¹ and Y. Ohta²

¹Institut für Festkörperphysik, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany

²Department of Physics, Chiba University, Chiba 263-8522, Japan

(dated: April 14, 2024)

The 2D t-J model with and without t^0 and t^{∞} hopping-terms is studied by exact diagonalization on a 5×4 cluster, which realizes a hole stripe in y-direction in a spin-Peierls. Next nearest hopping terms with a sign appropriate for hole-doped cuprates enhance the stripe formation. The dispersion of the quasiparticle-peaks in the single-particle spectrum is in good agreement with bond operator theory for hole motion in the spin-Peierls phase, particularly so for realistic values of t^0 and t^{∞} . The resulting spectral weight distribution and Fermi surface agree well with experimental ARPES spectra on $\text{La}_{1.28}\text{Nd}_{0.6}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Fd, 71.10.Hf, 75.40.Mg

The prediction of charged stripes[1] and their subsequent experimental verification[2] stand out as one of the rare instances, where a nontrivial theoretical prediction for cuprate superconductors was found consistent with experiment. Accordingly, there is currently considerable interest in the mechanism leading to the formation and the physical implications of stripes [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. On the other hand few experimental techniques provide such direct experimental insight into the electronic structure of a given compound as angle resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES). It is therefore quite natural to look for the fingerprints of stripes in ARPES spectra and indeed the results of Zhou et al. on $\text{La}_{1.28}\text{Nd}_{0.6}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$ [11] are widely considered as strong evidence for stripes. It is the purpose of the present manuscript to present single particle spectra obtained by 'computer spectroscopy' on the stripe phase of the 2D t-J model, presumably the simplest theoretical description of the CuO_2 planes in cuprate superconductors. As will be seen below these results combined with a relatively crude theory for hole motion in a spin-Peierls background already give a quite satisfactory description of most of the experimental results.

The t-J model reads

$$H = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\sigma} t_{i,j} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} + J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} S_i \cdot S_j - \frac{n_i n_j}{4}$$

Thereby $\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle}$ denotes summation over pairs of nearest neighbor sites, $c_{i,\sigma} = c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger$ ($1 - n_{i,\sigma}$) and S_i and n_i denote the operators of electron spin and density at site i , respectively. We denote the hopping matrix elements $t_{i,j}$ between (1;0)-like neighbors by t , between (1;1)-like neighbors by t^0 and between (2;0)-like neighbors t^{∞} , all other $t_{i,j}$ are zero. Throughout we will assume that $t^0=t^{\infty}=2$, as would be appropriate if the physical origin of these terms is hopping via the apex oxygen $2p_z$ orbital[12], and $t^0=t < 0$, as is the case for hole-doped compounds.

The method we apply to study this model is exact diagonalization of finite clusters by means of the Lanczos algorithm [13]. In a preceding paper[14] we have shown that by changing the geometry of the cluster from the

standard tilted square form to a rectangular one (more precisely: to a 5×4 cluster) a ground state with a pronounced stripe like charge inhomogeneity emerges. Here we want to discuss the single particle spectra of this state. A question to worry about first is, whether the stripes survive the additional hopping terms t^0, t^{∞} . Intuitively this is not what one would expect, because additional hopping terms increase the mobility of the holes, whence any spatial inhomogeneity should be washed out more efficiently. Surprisingly enough, the numerics show, that exactly the opposite is happening: the additional hopping terms even slightly enhance the charge inhomogeneity. This is demonstrated in Table I, which compares the static density correlation function $g_0(R) = \sum_j n_j n_{j+R}$ for vanishing and finite t^0 and t^{∞} . Next nearest-neighbor hopping terms with the proper sign for hole-doped cuprates thus seem to have a stabilizing effect on stripes – if any.

Next we address a special feature of the 5×4 cluster, which will be essential to understand the hole dynamics, namely the presence of spin-Peierls dimerization even at half filling. Table II shows that the static spin correlation function is strongly anisotropic, with singlet-bonds predominantly in y-direction. Since the boundary conditions in 5×4 frustrate the Neel order, they apparently stabilize the energetically close spin-Peierls phase. In fact, the GS energy of the 5×4 cluster is only marginally higher than that of the square-shaped 20×20 cluster ($1.165J$ =site vs. $1.191J$ =site). Clearly, this is a confirmation of the proposal by Read and Sachdev [15] that the transition to a spin-Peierls phase is a likely instability

R _y "	2	0.298	0.139	0.035	0.303	0.151	0.037	
	1	0.239	0.144	0.041	0.261	0.144	0.043	
	0	2.000	0.049	0.018	2.000	0.016	0.010	
		0	1	2		0	1	2
		R _x !			R _x !			

TABLE I: Static density correlation function $g_0(R)$, 5×4 cluster with 2 holes, $J=t=0.5$. Other parameters are $t^0=t^{\infty}=0$ (left panel) and $t^0=t=0.4$, $t^{\infty}=0.2$ (right panel).




FIG. 1: Left: Photoemission spectrum (PES) for the half-filled 5×4 cluster, $J=t = 0.5$; $t^0=t = 0.2$, $t^{\infty}=t = 0.1$. Right: Dispersion of the quasiparticle peak as extracted from the numerical spectra (top) compared to the theoretical single-hole dispersion $\epsilon_1(k)$ in the spin-Peierls phase (bottom).

of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ 2D Heisenberg antiferromagnet.

Clear evidence for the spin-Peierls nature of the half-filled ground state can be seen in the single particle spectral function $A(k; \omega)$ (see Ref. [13] for a definition), which is shown in Figure 1. It is immediately obvious that this differs markedly from the familiar dispersion for a hole in an antiferromagnet: whereas for hole motion in a Neel state the top of the ARPES spectrum is at $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ [16, 17], the dispersion seen in the half-filled 5×4 cluster has its maximum at $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \pi/2)$ – which probably means $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \pi/2)$ in the infinite system. Another notable feature is the symmetry of the dispersion under the exchange $(k_x; 0) \leftrightarrow (k_x; \pi)$ – which is exactly what one would expect from the doubling of the unit cell by spin-Peierls order with dimers in y -direction. To be more quantitative, let us discuss the single-hole dispersion in the spin-Peierls phase. Starting from a product state of singlets, which cover the bonds of the lattice in the form of a columnar pattern, we derive a Hamiltonian for the motion of singly occupied

R_y	2	0.222	-0.162	0.052
	1	-0.389	0.173	-0.059
	0	0.750	-0.276	0.061
R_x	0	1	2	
	1			
	2			

TABLE II: Static spin correlation function for the half-filled 5×4 cluster.

dimers. The singlet state on a bond formed by the sites $(1;2)$ is $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c_{1,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{2,\downarrow}^\dagger - c_{1,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{2,\uparrow}^\dagger) |\Phi\rangle$. A dimer with a single hole can be in either the bonding or antibonding state: $|\psi\rangle = \frac{\text{sign}(\epsilon)}{\sqrt{2}} (c_{1,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{2,\downarrow}^\dagger - c_{1,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{2,\uparrow}^\dagger) |\Phi\rangle$. Introducing the creation operator $h_{jk}^\dagger = |\psi\rangle \langle \Phi|$ we can – by straightforward generalization of Refs. [18, 19, 20] – write down the following Hamiltonian describing the motion of these effective Fermions:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H = & \sum_{k,j} \left(t + t \cos(k_x) \frac{\cos(2k_y)}{2} \right) h_{+jk}^\dagger h_{+jk} + \sum_{k,j} \left(t^0 \cos(k_x) (1 + \cos(2k_y)) \right. \\
 & \left. + t^{\infty} (\cos(2k_x) + \cos(2k_y)) \right) h_{-jk}^\dagger h_{-jk} + V(k) h_{+jk}^\dagger h_{-jk} + H_{\text{core}} \\
 V(k) = & \frac{it}{2} \sin(2k_y) - it^0 \cos(k_x) \sin(2k_y) : \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the coupling of the dimer-Fermions to triplet excitations of the bonds [18, 19, 20] has been neglected for simplicity. Diagonalizing the Hamiltonian (1) we obtain the dispersion relation $\epsilon(k)$ and the quasiparticles $h_{jk}^\dagger = u_{jk} h_{+jq}^\dagger + v_{jk} h_{-jq}^\dagger$, where $2\epsilon_1/2g$. Figure 1 shows that there is good agreement between the numerical peak dispersion in the 5×4 cluster and our simple theory. The main differences are the attenuation of the cluster dispersion near the band maximum at $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \pi/2)$ and the smaller bandwidth in the numerical spectra, which is probably due to the coupling of the Fermions to triplet excitations [18, 19, 20]. Taking into account the simplicity of our calculation, however, the agreement is quite satisfactory. Summarizing our discussion so far we have seen that the 5×4 cluster shows a single-hole dispersion that differs markedly from that for a Neel background, but is in good agreement with a simple bond-operator calculation for hole motion in a spin-Peierls phase. This reflects the fact that the frustration of Neel order along the odd-numbered side of the 5×4 has driven the system into the spin-Peierls phase of the 2D Heisenberg antiferromagnet, consistent with arguments given by Read and Sachdev [15].

While the dimerization clearly renders the 5×4 cluster unsuitable to describe undoped compounds such as $\text{Sr}_2\text{CuO}_2\text{Cl}_2$ [16], it makes the interpretation of the spectra for the striped ground state at finite doping a lot easier – as will be seen now. Ignoring for the moment the formation of a hole stripe as well as the fact that the dimer-Fermions h_{jq}^\dagger actually obey a hard-core constraint, one would expect, that the doped holes accumulate near the top of the single-hole dispersion, thus forming to simplest approximation a cigar-shaped hole pocket [19, 20] centered at $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ (or rather $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ in the thermodynamical limit). Figure 2, which shows the single particle spectrum for the two-hole GS for different t^0 and t^{∞} , demonstrates that this is indeed exactly what




FIG. 2: Single particle spectrum for the 5×4 cluster with two holes. Parameter values are $J=t=0.5$; $t^0=t^\infty=0$ (Left) and $J=t=0.5$; $t^0=t=0.2$, $t^\infty=0.1$ (Right). Only the parts near the Fermi energy $E_F=t=1.5$ are shown.

happens. There is a clear analogy between the spectra for the doped case and half-filling, the dispersion of the quasiparticle peak being essentially unchanged. There are two major changes, both of whom could have been expected: first, peaks with a higher binding energy become rather diffuse, which is nothing but the familiar Landau-damping. Second, the peaks at $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ and (to a lesser extent) at $(\frac{2\pi}{5}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ cross to the IPES spectrum. It should be noted that due to finite-size effects there is always a significant gap between the PES and IPES spectrum of finite clusters – after all the electron numbers of initial and final state differ by a finite fraction (10% in the present case). It is therefore impossible to decide, whether the gap is simply a finite-size effect or due to the stripe formation. The only deviation from this ideal rigid-band behaviour is the appearance of high-energy IPES peaks along $(0; \pi)$! $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \pi)$. The interpretation of these peaks, however, is straightforward: in inverse photoemission, an electron is necessarily inserted into a dimer occupied by a single electron. The spins of the two electrons then can couple either to a singlet – which means the IPES process leads back to the spin-Peierls ‘vacuum’ – or to a triplet – which means the IPES process leaves the system in a spin-excited state. The IPES peaks along $(0; \pi)$! $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \pi)$ presumably originate from the latter process (we note that exactly the same holds true also for the ‘usual’ ground state of the t - J model, see [21]). Taken together, the data presented so far demonstrate, that the spin-Peierls order in the striped phase is the




FIG. 3: Left: Single-particle spectral function from bond-operator theory for $t^0=t=0.1$, $t^\infty=0.05$, the Fermi energy (vertical line) corresponds to a hole density of 0.16. Right: Single hole dispersion (top) and momentum distribution $n(k)$ (bottom) for 5×4 and the same parameters.

key to understand its single particle spectra. Neglecting subtleties such as the possible formation of a Luttinger liquid along the stripes[5], the possible condensation of d-like hole pairs along the stripes[22] or the formation of various kinds of order parameter[20], the spectra show, that the system can be described by the dispersion for a single hole in a spin-Peierls background being filled up with holes. Thereby the momentum $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ where the band crosses the Fermi energy is independent of t^0 and t^∞ – the reason is simply that irrespective of t^0 and t^∞ the dispersion is symmetric under reflection by the line $(0; \frac{\pi}{2})$! $(\frac{4\pi}{5}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ due to the underlying spin-Peierls order.

We now want to use this (rather oversimplified) scenario to discuss the experimental ARPES spectra on $\text{La}_{1.28}\text{Nd}_{0.6}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$ [11]. To compute the full ARPES spectrum we need the following representation of the electron annihilation operator:

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{2} \cos\left(\frac{k_y}{2}\right) h_{+q}^\dagger; \quad i \sin\left(\frac{k_y}{2}\right) h_{-q}^\dagger; \quad (2)$$

Thereby q is the backfolded version of k , so as to take into account that the Brillouin zone of the spin-Peierls phase is $[-\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2}] \times [-\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2}]$. Equation (2) is readily verified by taking matrix elements of both sides between $|j\rangle$ and $|j+1\rangle$. The spectral weight of a given quasiparticle branch then is $w = |j\rangle \langle j+1| \cos\left(\frac{k_y}{2}\right) + i |j\rangle \langle j+1| \sin\left(\frac{k_y}{2}\right) |j\rangle$. In Figure 3 the spectra for the symmetric momenta $(k_x; k_y)$ and $(k_y; k_x)$ have been averaged, as would be appropriate

ate for an ARPES experiment on a compound with domains of different singlet direction [11]. The experimental ARPES spectrum should be compared to the parts of the spectrum below the Fermi energy, indicated as the vertical line in Figure 3. Along the $(1;1)$ direction there is a band dispersing upwards and disappearing halfway between $(0;0)$ and $(\pi; \pi)$. This is actually not a Fermi level crossing – the dispersion of the band actually bends downwards again after passing through $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ – but rather a vanishing of the spectral weight due to a destructive interplay between the coefficients $(u_{\mathbf{k}}; v_{\mathbf{k}})$ and the ‘form factors’ $(\cos(\frac{k_x}{2}); i\sin(\frac{k_y}{2}))$ of the dimer fermions. The situation along $(1;1)$ thus is similar to the ‘Fermi surface’ in the half-filled compounds [23]. Along $(\pi; 0) \rightarrow (\pi; \pi)$ there are two ‘real’ Fermi surface crossings, which are symmetric around $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$. A gain due to matrix element effects, the one between $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ and $(\pi; \pi)$ has small spectral weight, which would probably render it unobservable in an ARPES experiment. Spectroscopically the system thus would look very much like having a single Fermi surface sheet near $(\pi; 0)$ running roughly parallel to $(1;0)$ (see Figure 3) and disappearing as $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ is approached. Compared to experiment, the band crossing along $(\pi; 0) \rightarrow (\pi; \pi)$ is too far away from $(\pi; 0)$ – it should be noted, however, that in the actual stripe phase the hole density is inhomogeneous, so that the hole density within the stripes – which probably determines the area of the cigar – is higher than average. Clearly, this would shift the Fermi surface crossing towards $(\pi; 0)$. No crossing should be seen along $(1;1)$, only a band dispersing upwards and disappearing somewhere below E_F . The agreement with experiment would be almost perfect if the band portion near $(\pi; 0)$ were slightly moved upward compared to the band maximum near $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ – such fine details are probably beyond our very simple bond-operator calculation. To compare to the data of Zhou et al. Figure 3 also shows the momentum distribution

$n(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{A} \sum_{\mathbf{d}} A(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{d})$ obtained from the cluster diagonalization. This shows some anisotropy, with in particular a ‘ridge’ of almost constant $n(\mathbf{k})$ running along $(1;0)$. The cross-shaped character is not as pronounced as in the experiment, but this is simply due to the ‘partial occupation’ of the momentum $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$, which crosses only partially from PES to IPES, see Figure 2, and thus retains a relatively large $n(\mathbf{k})$. Nevertheless one may say, that when combined with the simple bond-operator theory, the numerical data give a good description of the experimental data on $\text{La}_{1.28}\text{Nd}_{0.6}\text{Sr}_{0.12}\text{CuO}_4$. In summary, numerically exact diagonalization results show, that the 2D t - J model with next-nearest neighbor hopping terms appropriate to describe hole doped cuprates has a spin-Peierls phase which leads to the formation of pronounced hole-strips. Given that stripes are an experimental fact in cuprates [2] and that the density matrix renormalization group calculations on much larger clusters of the t - J model [6, 9] have also shown clear evidence for stripes, one may be confident that these hole-strips are indeed representative for those in the bulk system. The single particle spectrum in the stripe phase then is found to be in good agreement with a simple bond-operator theory for hole motion in a spin-Peierls phase, thus providing further evidence for the intimate relationship between spin-Peierls ordering and stripe formation. Upon doping, holes accumulate near the top of the single-hole dispersion, to simplest approximation forming cigar-shaped pockets centered on the corner of the spin-Peierls Brillouin zone at $(\frac{\pi}{2}; \frac{\pi}{2})$ – the latter in full agreement with bond-operator theory [19, 20]. The notion of a Fermi surface should not be taken too literal, because close to E_F the stripe formation is likely to change this simply free-particle picture drastically, but all in all the quasiparticle dispersion and spectral weight distribution of the stripe phase as seen in the simulations are in good agreement with ARPES experiments.

-
- [1] D. Poilblanc and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 39, 9749 (1989); J. Zaanen and O. Gunnarsson, Phys. Rev. B 40, 7391 (1989); K. Machida, Physica C 158, 192 (1989); M. Kato et al., J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 59, 1047 (1990).
 - [2] J. M. Tranquada, B. J. Sternlieb, J. D. Axe, Y. Nakamura, and S. Uchida, Nature 375, 561 (1995).
 - [3] U. Low et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1918 (1994).
 - [4] H. T. Sunetsugu, M. Troyer, and T. M. Rice Phys. Rev. B 51, 16456 (1995).
 - [5] J. Zaanen, O. Y. Osman, and W. van Saarloos, Phys. Rev. B 58, R11 868 (1998); J. Zaanen, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 59, 1769 (1998); J. Zaanen, O. Y. Osman, H. V. Kruis, Z. Nussinov, and J. Tworzydło, Philos. Mag. B 81, 1485 (2001).
 - [6] S. R. White and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1272 (1998); 81, 3227 (1998).
 - [7] M. Vojta and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3916 (1999).
 - [8] A. L. Chernyshev, A. Castro Neto and A. Bishop, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 4922 (2000); A. L. Chernyshev, S. R. White, and A. H. Castro Neto Phys. Rev. B 65, 214527 (2002).
 - [9] G. B. Martins et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5844 (2000); G. B. Martins, C. Gazza, and E. Dagotto, Phys. Rev. B 62, 13926 (2000).
 - [10] A. H. Castro Neto, Phys. Rev. B 64, 104509 (2001).
 - [11] X. J. Zhou et al., Science 286, 268 (1999).
 - [12] R. Raimondi, J. H. Jefferson, and L. F. Feiner, Phys. Rev. B 53, 8774 (1996).
 - [13] E. Dagotto, Rev. Mod. Phys. 66, 763 (1994).
 - [14] R. Eder and Y. Ohta, cond-mat/0304554.
 - [15] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 1694 (1989).
 - [16] B. O. Wells et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 964 (1995).
 - [17] A. Nazarenko et al., Phys. Rev. B 51, 8676 (1995); V. I. Belinicher et al., Phys. Rev. B 54, 14 914 (1996); R. Eder et al., Phys. Rev. B 55, R3414 (1997); F. Lema and A. A. Lija, Phys. Rev. B 55, 14 092 (1997); V. Yu.

- Yushankhai et al, Phys. Rev. B 55, 15562 (1997).
- [18] R. Eder, Phys. Rev. B 57, 12832 (1998).
- [19] O. P. Sushkov, Phys. Rev. B 63, 174429 (2001).
- [20] K. Park and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B 64, 184510 (2001).
- [21] R. Eder and Y. Ohta, Phys. Rev. B 54, 3576-3579 (1996).
- [22] S. R. White and D. J. Scalapino, cond-mat/9610104.
- [23] F. Ronning et al, Science 282, 2067 (1998).