

Why is the ARPES anti-nodal singularity at 40 meV shifted in superconducting state of HTSC, but the kink at 70 meV is not?

<sup>1</sup>M. L. Kulić and <sup>2</sup>O. V. Dolgov

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Physics, Theory II, University Augsburg, 86135 Augsburg, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Theoretical Physics, University Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

The theoretical model for the quasiparticle self-energy  $\Sigma(k; \omega)$  in HTSC is proposed, which is based on the forward scattering peak in the electron-phonon (EPI) interaction. By assuming that EPI dominates, the model explains qualitatively and in a consistent way the recent ARPES results. The latter show a kink in the normal state quasiparticle energy at 70 meV in the nodal direction, which is (surprisingly) not shifted in the superconducting (SC) state, while the singularity at 40 meV in the anti-nodal direction is shifted by the SC gap. The model predicts a dip-hump structure in the spectral function  $A(k_F; \omega)$ , which is observed in ARPES.

PACS numbers:

**Introduction** – The pairing mechanism in high-temperature superconductors (HTSC) is still under the debate [1]. However, recent ARPES [2], [3], gives evidence for pronounced phonon effects in the quasiparticle energy, while the theory [4], [5] predicts that strong correlations give rise to a pronounced forward scattering peak (FSP) in the electron-phonon interaction (EPI) and in the non-magnetic impurity scattering – the FSP model. It predicts: (i) d-wave pairing is due to the EPI and the residual Coulomb repulsion, which triggers it; (ii) the transport coupling constant  $\kappa_{tr}$  (entering the resistivity,  $\rho \propto \kappa_{tr} T$ ) is much smaller than the pairing one, i.e.  $\kappa_{tr} \ll \kappa_p$ ; (iii) robustness of d-wave pairing in the presence of non-magnetic impurities, etc. The FSP in the EPI of strongly correlated systems is a general effect which affects electronic coupling to all phonons. Numerical calculations on the Hubbard model with the EPI [7] confirm the theory of Ref. [4], [5].

Recent ARPES on various HTSC families [2] show a kink in the normal (N) state quasiparticle spectrum,  $\epsilon(k)$ , in the nodal direction  $(0;0) \rightarrow (\pi;0)$  at energy  $\epsilon_{kink}^{(70)} \approx 70$  meV, which is a characteristic oxygen vibration energy, i.e.  $\epsilon_{kink}^{(70)} \approx \epsilon_{ph}^{(70)}$ . Surprisingly the kink is not shifted in the SC state, contrary to the standard Eliashberg theory [8]. Furthermore, ARPES on  $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$  and BISCO crystals [6] show that in the anti-nodal direction  $(\pi;0) \rightarrow (\pi;\pi)$  a singularity appears in  $\epsilon(k)$  in the N state ( $T > T_c$ ) at  $\epsilon_{sing}^{(40)} \approx 40$  meV, which is a characteristic oxygen vibration energy  $\epsilon_{sing}^{(40)} \approx \epsilon_{ph}^{(40)}$ . It is shifted in the SC state (at low  $T$ ) to  $\epsilon \approx 60$  meV ( $= \epsilon_{ph}^{(40)} + \Delta_0$ ), where  $\Delta_0 \approx 20$  meV is approximately the maximal SC gap at the anti-nodal point. The different shifts of  $\epsilon_{kink}^{(70)}$  and  $\epsilon_{sing}^{(40)}$  in the SC state we call the ARPES shift-puzzle.

Why is the anti-nodal singularity  $\epsilon_{sing}^{(40)}$  shifted in the SC state, but the nodal kink  $\epsilon_{kink}^{(70)}$  is not? The ARPES shift-puzzle can not be explained by the standard (with the integration also over the whole Fermi surface) Eliashberg (or BCS) theory for any kind of pairing [8], which

predicts that  $\epsilon_{sing}^{(40)}$  and  $\epsilon_{kink}^{(70)}$  are shifted in the SC state by the same value  $\Delta_0$ , i.e.  $\epsilon_{sing}^{(40)} \rightarrow \epsilon_{sing}^{(40)} + \Delta_0$  and  $\epsilon_{kink}^{(70)} \rightarrow \epsilon_{kink}^{(70)} + \Delta_0$ , where  $\Delta_0$  is the maximal gap value. ARPES can not be explained by the spin-fluctuation theory (SF) based on the 41 meV magnetic resonance mode [9] because of at least two reasons: (i) the kink at 70 meV is present also in the N state, where there is no magnetic resonance mode and (ii) the kink is seen in  $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ , where there is no magnetic resonance mode neither in the N nor in SC state [2]. ARPES gives also evidence for the linear (in  $\omega$ ) contribution to  $\text{Im} \Sigma(\omega)$  due to the Coulomb interaction (SF is only part of it) [3], i.e.  $\text{Im} \Sigma(\omega) \propto \omega$  for  $T < T_c$ . It is clearly discernable in ARPES for  $\epsilon_{ph} < \epsilon < \epsilon_c$  with  $\epsilon_c \approx 0.4$ . ARPES [2], [3] gives also that  $\epsilon_{ph} > 1$ .

Here we show that the ARPES shift-puzzle implies the FSP model with the following ingredients: (i) the EPI is dominant [5] and its spectral function  $^2F(k; k^0; \omega)$  has a pronounced FSP (at  $k - k^0 = 0$ ) due to strong correlations. Its width is very narrow  $\omega \ll k - k^0 \ll k_F$  even for overdoped systems; (ii) the dynamical part (beyond the Hartree-Fock) of the Coulomb interaction is characterized by the spectral function  $S_C(k; k^0; \omega)$ . The ARPES shift-puzzle implies that  $S_C$  is either peaked at small  $\omega \ll k - k^0$  or it is so small that it does not affect the shift. Which of these possibilities is realized is a matter of future ARPES. In order to minimize numerical calculations we assume here that the former case is realized.; (iii) The scattering potential on non-magnetic impurities has pronounced FSP, due to strong correlations [4], [5]. In the following we calculate  $\Sigma(k; \omega)$  in the N and SC state and show that the anti-nodal singularity at  $\epsilon_{sing}^{(40)}$  is shifted in the SC state by  $\Delta_0$ , while the nodal kink at  $\epsilon_{kink}^{(70)}$  is not. The FSP model predicts also the existence of a dip-hump structure in  $A(k; \omega)$ .

**Eliashberg equations for the FSP model** – The normal and the anomalous Matsubara Green's functions are defined [10] by  $G(k) = [Z(k)iI_n + \epsilon(k)]^{-1}D(k)$  and  $F(k) = Z(k)\epsilon(k)D(k)$  ( $\epsilon(k) = \epsilon(k; iI_n)$ ), respectively, where  $D(k) = [Z(k)iI_n + \epsilon^2(k) + (Z(k)\epsilon(k))^2]^{-1}$ .

The diagonal odd part of the self energy is  $\epsilon(k; !_n) = i!_n [Z(k; !_n)] = \epsilon(k; !_n)$ , while its even part is  $\epsilon_e(k; !_n) = \epsilon(k) - \epsilon_o(k) = \epsilon_e(k; !_n)$ , where  $\epsilon_o(k) = \epsilon_o(k)$ . Since in the following we assume the electron-hole symmetry, then  $\epsilon_e(k; !_n) = \epsilon_o(k)$ , i.e. it is a dull function of  $!$  which renormalizes the chemical potential and the bare quasiparticle energy [5], [10]. The 2D Fermi surface of HTSC oxides is parametrized by  $k = (k_F + k_\perp; k_F')$ , where  $k_F'$  is the Fermi momentum and  $k_F'$  is the tangential component of  $k$  at the point on the Fermi surface [10]. In that case  $R(k) = \psi(k)$  and  $d^2k[\dots] = d k_F' d' = v_F' d'$ . For simplicity we assume that near the Fermi surface the EPI spectral function  $\frac{2}{\text{ph}} F(k; k^0)$  is weakly dependent on energies  $;$ , i.e.  $\frac{2}{\text{ph}} F(k; k^0) = \frac{2}{\text{ph}} F(k'; k^0)$  [10] – see the item (i) in the discussion. In the presence of strong correlations one has  $\frac{2}{\text{ph}} F(k'; k^0) = \frac{2}{\text{c}} (k'; k^0)$ ; where the charge vertex  $c(k'; k^0)$  is strongly peaked at  $k' = k^0 = 0$  with the width  $k'_w$  even for overdoped hole doping [4], [5]. Then in the leading order one has  $\frac{2}{\text{ph}} F(k'; k^0) = \frac{2}{\text{ph}} F(k'; k^0) (k'; k^0)$  which picks up the main physics [5] whenever  $k'_w$  – see also the item (i) in the discussion. After integration over  $^0$  and for  $N'(\cdot) = N(0)$  one obtains the Eliashberg equations

$$\begin{aligned} t_{n;'} &= !_n + T \sum_m \frac{\text{ph}_{;'} (!_n - !_m) t_{m;'}}{t_{m;'}^2 + \tilde{c}_{m;'}^2} \\ &+ c_{m;'} + \frac{1;'}{t_{n;'}^2 + \tilde{c}_{n;'}^2} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}_{n;'} &= T \sum_m \frac{\text{ph}_{;'} (!_n - !_m) \tilde{c}_{m;'}}{t_{m;'}^2 + \tilde{c}_{m;'}^2} + \tilde{c}_{m;'}; \\ &+ \frac{2;'}{t_{n;'}^2 + \tilde{c}_{n;'}^2} T \sum_m \frac{Z}{d' \frac{N'(\cdot)(0)}{N(0)}} \frac{c_{;'} \tilde{c}_{m;'}}{t_{m;'}^2 + \tilde{c}_{m;'}^2}; \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the EPI coupling  $\text{ph}_{;'} (!_n - !_m)$  is given by

$$\text{ph}_{;'} (!_n - !_m) = 2 \int_0^{Z/1} d \frac{\frac{2}{\text{ph}_{;'}} F'(\cdot)}{2 + (!_n - !_m)^2}; \quad (3)$$

$c_{m;}'$  is due to the dynamical Coulomb effects and it is the most difficult part of the problem. The theory predicts  $c = (e=e_e)V_C G$  where  $V_C$  is the Coulomb potential,  $e_e \notin 1$  is the electronic dielectric function and  $e_e$  is the vertex function [10]. The ARPES shift-puzzle implies that  $(e=e_e)V_C$  should be either peaked at small angles or so small that it does not affect the energy-shift. The former is also supported by the theory of strong correlations where  $e_e = c(k'; k^0) [1 + \dots]$  and  $c(k'; k^0)$  is peaked at small angles [4], [5]. Since we assume for

simplicity the former case, then  $c$  is assumed in the form (after the  $!$ -integration)

$$c_{m;'} = T \sum_m \frac{c_{;'} (!_n - !_m) t_{m;'}}{t_{m;'}^2 + \tilde{c}_{m;'}^2}; \quad (4)$$

where

$$c_{;'} (!_n - !_m) = 2 \int_0^{Z/1} d \frac{S_{c;'}(\cdot)}{2 + (!_n - !_m)^2}; \quad (5)$$

ARPES predicts that  $\text{Im } c_{;'} (!)$   $c_{;'} ! = 2$  at  $T < ! < !_c$  which we reproduce by taking  $S_{c;'} (!) = A_{c;'} (j! - j_T) (c - j! - j)$ .  $A_{c;}'$  is normalized in such a way to obtain  $c_{;'} < 0.4$ .

Eq2 contains the Hartree-Fock pseudopotential  $(k'; k^0)$  [10] which is a dull function of  $(k'; k^0)$ , i.e.  $(k'; k^0) = c_0 > 0$ . It maximizes  $T_c$  when  $\tilde{c}_{n;}'$  is d-wave like.  $\tilde{c}_{m;}'$  in Eq(2) describes other effects of the Coulomb interaction to pairing which are unknown. The theory [10] gives  $\tilde{c} = (e=e_e)V_C G$  (with  $Z(k; !_n) > 1$  and  $(e=e_e) > 0$ ), then  $\tilde{c}$  is modeled according to ARPES. For instance, the SF approach assumes a phenomenological form for  $\tilde{c}(k; !_n)$  and for  $c$ , which depend on the dynamical spin susceptibility  $\chi_{\text{spin}}$ . Since  $\chi_{\text{spin}}(q; !)$  is peaked at  $Q = (\cdot; \cdot)$  this term is repulsive and favors d-wave pairing. However, the SF proponents assume an unjustifiable large coupling  $g_{\text{sf}} (0.5 - 0.65) \text{ eV}$  (i.e.  $g_{\text{sf}} = 2 - 3$ ). The analyzes of various experiments gives  $g_{\text{sf}} \sim 0.1 \text{ eV}$  (i.e.  $g_{\text{sf}} < 0.2$ ) [5], which is confirmed by ARPES [2], [3], [6] for  $\text{Im } c(k; !)$  at  $! > !_{\text{ph}}^{\text{ax}}$ . It gives also small  $g_{\text{sf}} (< c < 0.4)$ . Although the SF term in  $\tilde{c}_{m;}'$  is much smaller than the EPI it is important (together with  $c_0$  and other Coulomb terms) in triggering SC from s-wave to d-wave pairing [4], [5]. In Eqs(1-2) non-magnetic impurities are included and strong correlations [5] induce the FSP in the impurity scattering matrix, being  $t(k'; Q!)$   $\frac{2}{\text{c}} (k'; k^0)$ . In the leading order one has  $t(k'; Q!) = (k'; k^0)$ , thus not affecting (any kind of) pairing. In reality they are pair-breaking for d-wave pairing and the next to leading term is necessary. It is characterized by two scattering rates,  $1;'$  and  $2;'$ , where  $1;'$   $2;'$   $> 0$ .  $1;'$   $2;'$  means the extreme forward scattering and  $2;'$   $= 0$  means the isotropic pair-breaking scattering.

Quasiparticle renormalization in nodal and anti-nodal directions – The quasiparticle energy  $!(k)$  is the pole of the retarded Green's function. For numerical calculations we assume a Lorentzian shape for  $\frac{2}{\text{ph}_{;'}} F'(\cdot) = A_{\text{ph}_{;'}} (W^2 + (!_{\text{ph}_{;'}})^2)$ . The parameters  $A_{\text{ph}_{;'}}$ ,  $W$  are chosen so that  $\text{ph}_{;'}(0) = \text{ph}_{;}'$ , where  $\text{ph}_{;}'$  is an effective EPI coupling at the point  $'$ . Since our aim is a qualitative explanation of the ARPES shift-puzzle we perform calculations only for moderate couplings  $\text{ph} = 1$ ,  $c = 0.3$  in both, the nodal and anti-nodal direction. In fact their real values might be larger, i.e.  $\text{ph} \sim 2$ ,  $c \sim 0.4$ . Eqs(1-5) are local (angle-decoupled) on the




FIG. 1: a - The quasiparticle spectrum  $\omega(k)$  and b - the imaginary self-energy  $\text{Im} \Sigma(E)$  ( $\omega = 0; \zeta$ ) in the nodal direction ( $\ell' = \pi/4$ ) in the SC ( $T = 0.2$  meV) and N ( $T = 6$  meV) state.  $\zeta_c = 400$  meV is the cutoff in  $S_C$ .

Fermi surface, i.e.  $n_{\ell'}$  is locally "s-wave SC" and globally d-wave pairing, which is also manifested for more realistic interactions, whenever  $\ell'_w$  - see [5].

(1)  $\omega_{\text{kink}}^{(70)}$  - kink in the nodal direction ( $\ell' = \pi/4$ ) - The kink at  $\omega_{\text{kink}}^{(70)} = 70$  meV in  $\omega(k)$  means that the quasiparticles moving along the nodal direction interact with various phonons with frequencies up to 70 meV [11], i.e.  $\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(2)} = \omega_{\text{ph}}^{(4)} \neq 0$  for  $0 < \omega_{\text{ph}} < 70$  meV. Since it is unknown, a Lorentzian shape centered at  $\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(2)} = 70$  meV is assumed. In this case the theory predicts more singularity-like [11] than the observed kink-like behavior.

$\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(2)} = 0$  and Eq.(1) imply that  $\omega(k)$  is equal in the N and in the SC state, as it is shown in Fig.1a. It confirms that the kink in the nodal direction is not shifted in the SC state - in a qualitative agreement with ARPES findings [2].

The realistic phonon spectrum will smear the theoretical singularity in  $\omega(k)$  - seen in Fig.1a. In Fig.1b is shown  $\text{Im} \Sigma(E)$  ( $\omega = 0; \zeta$ ), where a qualitative similarity with ARPES [2] is obvious. For  $\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(70)} < \omega < \zeta_c$  the linear term  $\text{Im} \Sigma_c(E)$  ( $\omega = 0; \zeta$ ) is discernable, while near  $\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(70)}$   $\text{Im} \Sigma(E)$  ( $\omega = 0; \zeta$ ) is steeper due to  $\omega_{\text{ph}} = 1$  and  $\zeta_c = 0.3$ .

(2)  $\omega_{\text{sing}}^{(40)}$  - singularity in the anti-nodal direction ( $\ell' = \pi/2$ ) - The singularity (not the kink) at  $\omega_{\text{sing}}^{(40)}$  in  $\omega(k)$  in the anti-nodal direction is observed in ARPES in the N




FIG. 2: a - The quasiparticle spectrum  $\omega(k)$  and b - the imaginary self-energy  $\text{Im} \Sigma(E)$  ( $\omega = 0; \zeta$ ) in the anti-nodal direction ( $\ell' = 0; \pi/2$ ) at  $T = 0.2$  meV in the SC ( $T = 0.2$  meV) and N ( $T = 6$  meV) state.

and SC state of  $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$  and BISCO [6], which means that the quasiparticle moving in the anti-nodal direction interact with a narrower phonon spectrum centered around  $\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(40)} = 40$  meV. So, the assumed (by us) the Lorentzian shape for  $\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(2)} = \omega_{\text{ph}}^{(40)}$ , centered at  $\omega_{\text{ph}} = 40$  meV, is acceptable approximation. Since  $\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(2)} = 0$  then Eq.(1) gives that  $\omega(k)$  in the N-state is singular at  $\omega_{\text{sing}}^{(40)} = \omega_{\text{ph}}^{(40)}$ , while in the SC state it is shifted to  $\omega_{\text{sing}}^{(40)} = (\omega_{\text{ph}}^{(40)} + \omega_0)$ . This is confirmed by numerical calculations shown in Fig.2a -  $\omega(k)$ , and in Fig.2b -  $\text{Im} \Sigma(E)$  ( $\omega = 0; \zeta$ ), for  $\omega_{\text{ph}} = 1$  and  $\zeta_c = 0.3$ .

The  $\omega_{\text{sing}}^{(40)}$  singularity is shifted in the SC state, contrary to the nodal kink at  $\omega_{\text{kink}}^{(70)}$  which is not. So, the different shifts of  $\omega_{\text{kink}}^{(70)}$  and  $\omega_{\text{sing}}^{(40)}$  in the SC state is a direct consequence of the forward scattering peak in the charge scattering processes. Since we assume a rather narrow phonon spectrum (centered around  $\omega_{\text{ph}}$ ) the behavior of  $\text{Im} \Sigma(E)$  ( $\omega = 0; \zeta$ ) at  $\omega_{\text{ph}}$  is due to the Coulomb interaction - the small tails in Fig.1b and Fig.2b.

(3) ARPES dip-hump structure - The FSP model explains qualitatively the dip-hump structure in  $A(\ell'; \omega)$  ( $= \frac{1}{2} \text{Im} G(\ell'; \omega)$ ). The latter was observed recently in ARPES [3], where the dip is very pronounced in the SC state. In Fig.3a it is seen that the dip-hump structure is realized (also in the presence of impurities) already for




FIG. 3: a - The spectral function  $A(\xi=0; \omega)$  and b -  $-dA(\xi=0; \omega)/d\omega$  in the antinodal direction in the SC ( $T = 0.2$  meV) and N ( $T = 6$  meV) state for various non-magnetic impurity scattering rate  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2 = 0$ ;  $\rho_{ph} = 1$ ,  $c = 0.3$ .

a moderate coupling  $\rho_{ph} = 1$  in the N state, while it is more pronounced in the SC state.  $A(\omega)$  is appreciably narrowed in the SC state. It seems that the dip-energy can not be attached to the (shifted) phonon energy at  $\omega_{ph} = 40$  meV only, since the maxima of  $-dA/d\omega$  have more universal meaning (than the minima of  $A$ ) - see Fig. 3b. The maxima in  $-dA/d\omega$  appear near the energies  $(\omega_0 \pm \omega_{ph})$ . The calculations give the dip structure also in the antinodal density of states  $N_{\pm 2}(\omega)$  (not shown) already for  $\rho_{ph} = 1$ , which is much more pronounced for larger  $\rho_{ph}$ .

Discussion and conclusions - In obtaining Eqs. (1-5) in the FSP model several approximations are made: (i) the charge scattering spectral functions are assumed to

be  $\delta(\omega - \omega_{ph})$ . This extreme limit is never realized in nature, but for the self-energy it is a good starting point. The finite  $\gamma_w$  effects (but  $\gamma_w \ll \gamma_{imp}$ ) will not change the qualitative picture but only the quantitative one [5]. In previous studies [5] the EPI spectral function was treated in the extreme momentum FSP limit, where they were proportional to  $(k - k_0)^2$  - the MFSP model. The latter resolves the ARPES shift-puzzle too, but its self-energy is more singular than in the FSP model. In reality the spectral functions are broadened in the interval  $|k - k_0| \leq k_F - k_0$  and the effects of finite level-spacing ( $1/N$ ) in  $k$ -space are absent; (ii) the Migdal theory is assumed to hold and vertex corrections due to the EPI are neglected. However, in the FSP model vertex corrections may be important for  $\rho_{ph} < 1$  [12], by increasing  $T_c$  significantly; (iii) the role of the Coulomb repulsion in the anomalous self-energy  $E_q(2)$  is unknown, but since the calculation of  $T_c$  was not the (main) purpose of this paper and because ARPES and other experiments suggest that  $c_{ph}$  we have omitted its contribution to the gap equation.

In conclusion, we analyze the quasiparticle self-energy effects for HTSC oxides in the theoretical model with the pronounced forward scattering peak in the electron-phonon interaction (which dominates in HTSC), Coulomb interaction and impurity scattering - the FSP model. The different shifts of the nodal kink (at 70 meV) and antinodal singularity (at 40 meV) in the superconducting state, which are observed in the ARPES experiments on HTSC oxides [2], [6], are explained by the FSP model in a consistent and unique way. However, a quantitative refinement of the FSP model is needed, which must take into account realistic phonon and band structure, bilayer structure, less (than delta-function) singular spectral functions, etc.

Acknowledgment - M. L. K. thanks Prof. Ulrich Eckern and Drs. Igor and Lila Kulic for support.

[1] P. B. Allen, Nature, 412, 494 (2001)  
 [2] A. Lanzara et al., Nature, 412, 510 (2001); X. J. Zhou et al., Nature, 423, 398 (2003)  
 [3] A. Damascelli, Z.-X. Shen, Z. Hussain, Rev. Mod. Phys., 75, 473 (2003) and references therein  
 [4] M. L. Kulić, R. Zeyher, Phys. Rev. B 49, 4395 (1994); R. Zeyher, M. L. Kulić, Phys. Rev. B 53, 2850 (1996)  
 [5] M. L. Kulić, Physics Reports 338, 1 (2000) and references therein  
 [6] Z.-X. Shen, talk at the Int. Symp. "Competing phases in novel condensed-matter systems, Würzburg, Germany, July 9-11 (2003)  
 [7] Z. Huang et al., cond-mat/0306131 Jun 2003  
 [8] J. R. Schrieffer, D. J. Scalapino, J. W. Wilkins, Phys.

Rev. Lett. 10, 336 (1963); D. J. Scalapino, inspiring talk at the Int. Symp. "Competing phases in novel condensed-matter systems, Würzburg, Germany, July 9-11 (2003)  
 [9] M. R. Norman, H. Ding, Phys. Rev. B 57, R11089 (1998)  
 [10] O. V. Dolgov, E. G. Maksimov, Sov. Phys. Usp. 24, 1019, (1981); P. B. Allen, B. Mitrovic, in: Solid State Physics, eds F. Seitz et al., Vol. 37, 1 (1982)  
 [11] E. Schachinger, J. J. Tu, J. P. Carbotte, Phys. Rev. B 67, 214508-1 (2003); S. Verga, A. Knigavko, F. Marsiglio, Phys. Rev. B 67, 054503 (2003)  
 [12] C. Grimaldi, L. Pietronero, S. Strassler, Phys. Rev. B 52, 10 516 (1995); ibid. 52, 10 530 (1995)