Fractionalization and Ferm i surface volume in heavy ferm ion compounds: the case of $Y bR h_2 Si_2$.

Catherine Pepin

SPhT, L'Orm e des Merisiers, CEA-Saclay, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

We establish an elective theory for heavy ferm ion compounds close to a zero temperature Anti-Ferrom agnetic (AF) transition. Coming from the heavy Ferm i liquid phase across to the AF phase, the heavy electron fractionalizes into a light electron, a bosonic spinon and a new excitation: a spinless ferm ionic eld. Assuming this eld acquires dynamics and dispersion when one integrates out the high energy degrees of freedom, we give a scenario for the volume of its Ferm i surface through the phase diagram. We apply our theory to the special case of YbR h_2 (Si $_{\rm X}$ Ge $_{\rm X}$)2 where we recover, within experimental resolution, several low temperature exponents for transport and therm odynamics.

72.10 Di, 75.30 Mb, 71.27+a, 75.50 Ee

In some heavy ferm ion compounds, pronounced deviations from the conventional Landau Ferm i liquid behavior have been reported when the compounds are tuned through an antiferrom agetic (AF) quantum critical point (QCP) [1]. Generically, the specic heat coecient is seen to diverge at the QCP, showing at least logarithm ic increase [25] as the temperature is decreased. The resistivity is quasi-linear in temperature [65]. NMR and

-SR studies, as well as neutron scattering measurements for one compound [4] show that the spin susceptibility acquires som e anom alous exponent [6,7]. Here we focus on the special case of Y bR h_2 (Si_{1 x} Ge_x)₂ doped with Geto reach a QCP at x = 0.05. In this compound, linear resistivity is observed, at the QCP, over three decades of tem perature, from 10 K to 10 m K [10]. At the same time, the speci c heat coe cient shows an upturn below 300 m K from its original logarithm ic increase, C=T ' 0:33 [7,11]. The entropy associated with the uptum is of the order of 5% of the total spin entropy of the Y b atom . Curiously, the upturn in speci c heat is un-correlated with transport, since one doesn't see any kink at 300 mK, or any deviation from the linear slope in the resistivity. An NMR study on the pure compound [12] shows that the relaxation time on $Si1=T_1T$ when the system is driven close to the QCP with applied m agnetic eld, suggesting that $^{\text{o}}$ $_{\text{q}}$ $^{\text{o}}$ (q;!)=! The Gruneysen parameter, ratio of the thermal expansion coe cient and the speci cheat is shown to diverge with an unusual exponent, i.e. $= = C T^{0:7}$, com =pared to the case of CeN i_2 Ge $_2$, well understood within a Spin Density Wave (SDW) scenario [13]. Latest measurements of the Hall constant [14] suggest that the Ferm i surface volume is increasing, when one goes from the AF to the eld induced heavy Ferm i liquid phase. A recent study of the heavy Ferm i liquid phase shows a generic scaling in B=T in the transport and speci cheat [11]. One also observes that the K adowaki-W oods ratio

{ $K = A = ^2$ where A is the T^2 coe cient of the resistivity and $= C = T_{\frac{1}{2} + 0}$ is the specic heat coe cient { increases in approaching the QCP. Likew ise the W ilson ration { $W = = \frac{1}{2} + 0$ where is the bulk susceptibility { shows a dram atic increase. In contrast, the ratio of $A = ^2$ stays constant over the whole magnetic eld range. We deduce from the fact that the A coe cient doesn't feel the upturn in specic heat, that the bulk susceptibility doesn't feel it either { their ratio being constant [15]. In other words, the excitations responsible for the upturn seen in C = T don't couple to the bulk susceptibility.

In this paper we introduce an e ective theory for heavy ferm ion compounds, which, in the particular case of Y bR $h_2 \, Si_2$, accounts for the whole set of experimental evidence quoted above.

Our starting point is the Kondo-Heisenberg lattice model, where we use a Schwinger representation for the spin of the impurities, which we refer to as the bosonic Kondo-Heisenberg (BKH) model. The BKH lattice Hamiltonian

$$H = H_{c} + H_{K} + H_{H} ;$$

$$w \text{ here } H_{c} = \text{ "}_{k} f_{k}^{y} f_{k} ;$$

$$\text{ } H_{K} = J_{K} \text{ } b_{i}^{y} b_{i} \circ f_{i}^{y} \circ f_{i} ;$$

$$\text{ } H_{H} = J_{H} \text{ } b_{i}^{y} b_{i} \circ b_{j}^{y} \circ b_{j}$$

$$\text{ } (1)$$

describes the conduction band (H $_{\rm c}$), the K ondo coupling between local m om ents and the conduction electrons at site i (H $_{\rm K}$), and the super-exchange between neighboring spins (H $_{\rm H}$). When we formulate the BKH model as a functional integral, we can decouple the elds as follows

$$H_{K} ! H_{K}^{0} = b_{i}^{y} p_{i}^{y} f_{i} + h_{E}^{i} \frac{y}{J_{K}}$$
(2)




FIG. 1. Evolution of the Ferm i surface volume from the AF phase to the heavy Ferm i liquid phase. D is the bandwidth.

 ${\tt FIG.2.}\ {\tt Two}$ possible phase diagrams in heavy ferm ion compounds.

$$\label{eq:HH} \text{H}_{\text{H}} \text{ ! } \text{H}_{\text{H}}^{0} = \begin{array}{c} \text{X} & \text{h} \\ \text{j}_{\text{ij}} \dot{\textbf{p}}^{i_{\overline{\textbf{a}}} (r_{1} \ r_{j})} b_{i}^{y} \ b_{j}^{y} \\ \end{array} \\ + \text{h}_{\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{X}}} \overset{\dot{\textbf{i}}}{\overset{\dot{\textbf{j}}_{\text{ij}} \dot{\textbf{j}}}{J_{\text{H}}}}$$

where the on-site bond variable in the rst term is a Grassman eld which doesn't carry a spin and the bond variable in the second term has been chosen following an SP (2) decomposition of the interaction [16].

We believe the ferm ion eld is a good decoupling of the K ondo interaction in the sense that it describes the set of elem entary excitations close to the QCP [17]. Through coupling to the spinons (b_k) and the itinerant electrons (f_k) the —ferm ion K ondo bond states acquire some dynamics, damping and dispersion. Within this set of variables, the formation of the K ondo heavy quasiparticle is described with the formation of a \band" for the —ferm ion bound state. To see how this happens it is instructive to step back to the impurity case.

M agnetism in the bosonic K ondo impurity model has been investigated in the past [18,19], but here we focus on the fate of the —ferm ion chem ical potential [20]. From (2), one notices that, for the antiferrom agnetic K ondo e ect $(J_K > 0)$, the energy level is negative, thus full, and the chem ical potential = $1=J_K$ ow s to zero at strong coupling. The —ferm ion becomes massless. This singularity accounts for the increase of the Ferm i surface volume by one. Oppositely, in the ferrom agnetic case $(J_K < 0)$, the energy level is positive, thus empty, and the chem ical potential = $1=J_K$ ow s to in nity at low energies, leaving the Ferm i surface volume unchanged.

In the K ondo lattice, the —ferm ion acquires some dynam ics, damping and dispersion. The competition between AF uctuations and the K ondo screening a ects the formation of the —band. M oreover, one can imagine that the lattice accommodates partial screening of the impurity spin through the —dispersion: the \unscreened" part of the spin {by analogy with ferrom agnetic K ondo { has positive energies, while the screened part of the spin has negative ones. Deep inside the AF phase (diagram a in Fig. 1), the spin of the impurities are partially screened and the —ferm ion bandwidth is large { partially lled band, with a rather \small" Ferm i surface. As the strength of AF uctuations is decreased, the number of empty energy levels decrease compared to full energy levels, the —band becomes atter and the Ferm i

surface is bigger (diagram b in Fig. 1). Deep inside the heavy Ferm i liquid phase, the K ondo e ect is dom inant, and one expects a situation similar to the one impurity case, with a totally at -band and a large Ferm isurface; in this phase the -ferm ion is no longer a good elem entary excitation and, being a at massless mode, the theory is ill de ned. Just at the brink of the Ferm i liquid phase, the -band is \almost" at (diagram c in Fig. 1). One can thus expect that the velocity vanishes for part of the Ferm i surface, producing a singularity.

To sum marize, our scenario predicts a new excitation close to the QCP, which is ferm ionic in nature and doesn't carry a spin. As one integrates out the high energy degree of fredom, this new ferm ion forms a \band": its dispersion has positive and negative energy levels. The band structure at the QCP is not universal, it depends on the relative strengths of the K ondo e ect and AF interactions (Fig. 2). If the AF interaction is small compared to the K ondo interaction, the QCP lies inside the heavy Ferm i liquid phase, which is expected to be the case for CeN iz Ge2 (diagram a in Fig. 2). In the opposite lim it, when the AF uctuations are strong compare to the K ondo effect, the Ferm i liquid phase can lie outside the AF phase, and one can expect singularities at the QCP (diagram b in Fig. 2). This is the case for the YbRh₂Si₂ com pound. The evolution of the -band structure accounts for the variation of the total Ferm i surface volume, with a smooth cross-over from a rather smallFerm isurface inside the AF phase to a big Ferm i surface inside the Ferm i liquid phase.

We now turn to the special class of YbRh $_2$ (Si $_1$ x Ge $_x$) $_2$ doped to criticality for x = 0.05. We assume that, at the QCP, the -band is well formed, but the velocity vanishes at the hot lines. The electron term S $_f$, a boson term S $_b$ which describes the critical spinons, the -fermion term S $_f$, and the interaction S $_f$ between those modes. Both the f and -fermion's Fermi surface have hot lines related by the ordering wave vector Q (Fig.3).

$$S = S_{f} + S + S_{b} + S_{int}$$

$$S_{f} = \frac{d! \ d^{3}k}{(2)^{4}} X f_{k}^{Y} i! v_{F} k f_{k}$$
(3)




FIG .3. The f-ferm ion and $\,$ -ferm ion Ferm is urfaces. The hot lines are points related by the ordering wave vector Q ; their width is proportional to T $^{1-3}$.

where the f-ferm ion as well as the -ferm ion dispersions have been linearized around the Ferm i surface, the Ferm i velocity v vanishes at the hot lines, leading to a singular in k^3 dispersion. We take = ! $\log(j!)$. It is assumed the width of the -ferm ion hot lines varies with temperature like $q = (T=a)^{1=3}$. The spinon dispersion is linearized close to the AFQCP , after diagonalizing H $_{
m H}$ in (1) in a mean eld approximation: ! q = with the Lagrange parameter im plementing the constraint on the SP (N) representation of the spin, and $q = (\sin q_x + \sin q_y + \sin q_z)$. At the QCP, and we have linearized $!_q$ around q = (=2; =2; =2). We rst evaluate the dynamical vertex g(;) around the hot lines, where and are the incoming ferm ion and boson frequencies respectively and nd

$$q(!;)$$
 M ax $[!;]^{5=6}$: (4)

The e ective theory (3) is thus stable with respect to the interaction g. It lies above its upper critical dimension. Critical exponents can be evaluated by computing self-consistently the self-energies at one loop (Fig. 4), the smallness of the vertex ensuring the validity of this treatment. Solving the set of three D yson equations for the three elds b, f and leads to momentum independent self-energies

(!) ij! j^{4-3} sgn (!) being irrelevant compared to the original damping.




FIG. 4. Feynm an diagram s associated with a) the spinon self-energy b) the f-ferm ion self energy c) the -ferm ion self-energy. Solid, dashed and wavy lines are respectively f-ferm ion, -ferm ion and boson propagators.

In order to discuss the therm odynam ics of our model, we rely on a scaling argument. The free energy is comprised of three term $sF = F_f + F + F_{bos}$, where F_f is the free energy of the heavy f-ferm ions, F is the contribution from the ferm ions and $F_{\rm bos}$ from the boson modes. Any of these individual contributions is extensive and proportional to the phase space volum e F T qi, where qi is the momentum width in the i-direction. For the -ferm ions, only two directions, perpendicular to the hot lines, reduce the phase space with $q_{1;2}$ $(T=a)^{1=3}$ T $(T=a)^{2=3}$. The boson modes scale in all leading to F directions, leading to F_{bos} T ($_b$ (T)=)³ T². The fferm ions scale in two directions, perpendicular to the hot lines, with q_1 $(T=a)^{1=3}$ and q_2 $_f$ $(T)=v_F$, leading to $F_{f;hot}$ T^2 . Notice that the scaling exponents of the hot ferm ion's and the boson's entropy are the sam e, which is a property of spin-ferm ion models above their upper critical dimension [27]. At low temperatures, F is the dom inant contribution, leading to a speci c heat coe cient which captures the upturn observed in the experim ents:

$$= C = T a^{2-3} T^{1-3} : (6)$$

We now turn to the behavior of the conductivity at criticality. The f-ferm ions are the sole contributors to electric transport because the velocity of the -ferm ion vanishes on the hot lines. Assuming that the scattering processes from magnetic spinons dominate the transport, one distinguishes the contributions from the cold and hot regions $(T) = \frac{1}{\cosh(T)} + \frac{1}{hot}(T)$. Following [21], the conductivity is the sum of inverse scattering rates associated with the hot and cold regions, multiplied by the phase space allowed to these regions

cold
$$\frac{1}{x+t^2}$$
; hot $\frac{t^{1-3}}{x+t^{2-3}}$;

where x is a dimensionless parameter which characterizes the residual resistivity { for example, the inverse of the Residual Resistivity Ratio (RRR), being the ratio of the resistivity at 100 K to the resistivity at 10 K.t is a dimensionless parameter characteristic of the temperature { one can take for example $t=T=T_K$, where T_K is the one in purity K ondo temperature of the compound. $t^{1=3}$ is the width of the hot lines, t^2 is the inverse scattering rate of the cold conduction electrons, and $t^{2=3}$ is the inverse scattering rate of the conduction electrons { up to




FIG .5. Linear in T resistivity and variation of the tem-perature exponent as function of $t=T=T_K$. x is the inverse R esidual R esistivity R atio.

logarithm s{ from the param agnetic spinons around the hot lines. One sees three regimes in the conductivity:

t <
$$x^{3-2}$$
; x^{3-2} < t < x^{1-2} ; x^{1-2} < t
= $x + t$; cross-over; t^2 :

W ith x ' 0:1 and $T_{\rm K}$ ' 30K for Y bR $h_2\,{\rm Si}_2$, one sees that the resistivity is linear in T, below T = 3K down to the lowest tem perature (Fig.5), while the T 2 behavior would appear roughly above T = 10K, corresponding to the experimental observation. To conclude the study of them all observables, we focus on the G runeysen parameter, defined as = =C $_p$ with $\frac{{\rm GF}}{{\rm T}\,{\rm Gp}}$ and C_p $\frac{{\rm GF}}{{\rm GT}}$. p is the hydrostatic pressure. Calling r = (p $p_c)$ =pc the departure from the QCP, and noticing, from a small displacement of the fermion hot line that r $q_{\rm typ}^2$ T $^{2=3}$, one nds T $^{2=3}$ close to the QCP. This exponent is in good agreement with the experiments [13].

Several theoretical descriptions have been advanced to account for the striking experim ental results around the QCP of heavy ferm ions. A nisotropic (2D) spin density wave scenario [22,23] can explain the linear in T resistivity, as well as the logarithm ic dependence of the speci c heat coe cient. A theory with a \local" mode, as well as 2D spin uctuations at criticality, has been advocated [23], which also captures the anom alous exponent of the spin susceptibility. None of those theories can account for the uptum in the speci cheat coe cient. Our approach has some analogies with the idea of \fractionalization" [24] and decon nement [1], in the sense that a new excitation appears at the QCP, which is ferm ionic in nature, and which, at high energies, is the gauge eld which characterizes the K ondo bound state. W hen the new excitation is ferm ionic in nature, one might expect the em ergence of a new \phase" where the excitation is stabilized [17,25]. Som e analogies exist with the \two-uid model" advanced recently to describe CeCoIn₅ [26]: in our model also, the impurity spins are partially screened, the dierence being that at very low energies, the unscreened part of the spin, instead of remaining intact, \fractionalizes" into a spinon, a spinless ferm ion, and a \light" electron.

To sum marize, starting from the K ondo-H eisenberg model at high energies, we have introduced a new e ective theory for the QCP of YbRh $_2$ (Si $_0.95$ Ge $_0.05$) $_2$. This

e ective theory shows the emergence of a new excitation at low energies, ferm ionic and spinless in nature, characterizing the Kondo bound state. This new ferm ion {the

-ferm ion { form sa \band" when high energy degrees of freedom are integrated out. The total Ferm i surface volum e evolves from a small Ferm i surface to a big Ferm i surface as the -ferm ion band lls up. Assum ing a vanishing velocity in the -ferm ion band structure close to the QCP, one can reproduce many striking experim ental observations of Y bR h_2 (Si_{0:95} G $e_{0:05}$)₂. One captures the uptum in the speci c heat coe cient, with the right exponent with tem perature, as well as the linear resistivity at very low tem peratures. The upturn in the specic heat coe cient doesn't couple to transport, and couples only indirectly {via the spinons and f-ferm ions{ to the bulk spin susceptibility. This explains the observation that the ratio A = 2 is constant in the heavy Ferm i liquid phase [15]. One also reproduces the variation of the Gruneysen parameter with the anomalous temperature exponent.

I would like to thank A.V. Chubukov, P.Coleman, J. Custers, P.Gegenwart, K. Le Hur, M. Norman, I.Paul, O.Parcollet, S.Pashen, J.Rech, and F. Steglich formany discussions related to this work. A special thanks to the Max Planck Institut fur Chemische Physik fester Stoe in Dresden, for their hospitality and where part of this work was completed.

- [1] P.Colem an et al., J. Phys. Cond. M at. 13 R 723, (2001).
- [2] H. von Lohneysen et al., J. Phys. Cond. M at. 8 (1996) 9689.
- [3] O. Trovarelli et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 (2000) 626.
- [4] A. Schroder et al. Nature 407 (2000) 351.
- [5] A. Bianchiet al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 257001 (2003).
- [6] M .G rosche et al., J.Phys.Cond.M att.12 (2000), 533.
- [7] P.G egenwart et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002), 56402.
- [8] S.R. Julian et al., J. Phys. Cond. M att. 8 (1996), 9675.
- [9] J-P. Paglione et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003), 246405.
- [10] J. Custers Ph.D. Thesis, Dresden (2004), p. 35.
- [11] J. Custers et al., Nature 424,524-527 (2003).
- [12] K. Ishida et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 107202 (2002).
- [13] R. Kuechler et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 066409 (2003).
- [14] S. Pashen et al., Acta Phys. Pol. B 34, 359 (2002) and preprint to Nature.
- [15] J.Custers Ph.D.Thesis, Dresden (2004), p. 72.
- [16] N.Read and S.Sachdev Phys.Rev.Lett.66,1773 (1991).
- [17] C. Pepin, cond-m at/0402447.
- [18] P.Colem an et al.Phys.Rev.B.68, 220405 (2003).
- [19] O .Parcollet et al.Phys.Rev.Lett.79,4665 (1997).
- [20] C.Pepin and I.Paul, in preparation.
- [21] A.Rosch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 4280.
- [22] A.Rosch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 159.
- [23] Q. Siet al., Nature 413 (2001) 804.

- [24] T. Senthilet al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 216403 (2003).
- [25] T. Senthilet al, Science 30, 1490 (2004)
- [26] S.Nakatsuji, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 16401 (2004).
- [27] Ar. Abanov et al. Adv. in Phys. 52, 119 (2003).