

Checkerboard density of states in strong-coupling superconductors

A. S. Alexandrov

Department of Physics, Loughborough University,
Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK

The Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) equations are solved in the strong-coupling limit, where real-space (preformed) pairs Bose-condense with finite center-of-mass momenta. There are two energy scales in this regime, a temperature independent incoherent gap Δ_p and a temperature dependent coherent gap $\Delta_c(T)$, modulated in real space. The single-particle density of states (DOS) reveals checkerboard modulations similar to the tunnelling DOS in cuprates.

PACS numbers: PACS: 74.72.-h, 74.20.Mn, 74.20.Rp, 74.25.Dw

Many independent observations show that the superconducting state of cuprates is as anomalous as the normal state. In particular, there is strong evidence for a d-like order parameter, which changes sign when the CuO_2 plane is rotated by $\pi/2$ [1]. A few phase-sensitive experiments [2] provide unambiguous evidence in this direction. A d-wave BCS gap could appear in the two-dimensional Hubbard model near half filling, as suggested by Scalapino, Loh, and Hirsch [3] concurrently with the discovery of novel superconductors. On the other hand, c-axis Josephson tunnelling [4], high-precision magnetic measurements [5], photo-excited quasi-particle relaxation dynamics [6] and some other experiments [7] support more conventional anisotropic s-like gap.

In fact, there are stronger deviations from the conventional Fermi/BCS-liquid behaviour than the gap symmetry. There is now convincing evidence for pairing of carriers well above T_c as predicted by the bipolaron theory [8], the clearest one is provided by the uniform magnetic susceptibility [9, 10], tunnelling, and photoemission. The tunnelling and photoemission gap is almost temperature independent below T_c [11, 12] and exists above T_c [11, 13, 14] with its maximum several times larger than expected in the weak and intermediate-coupling [15] BCS theory. Kinetic [16] and thermodynamic [17] data suggest that the gap opens both in charge and spin channels at any relevant temperature in a wide range of doping. A plausible explanation is that the normal state (pseudo)gap, Δ_p , is half of the bipolaron binding energy [18], although alternative models have been proposed [19].

Further studies of the gap function revealed even more complicated physics. Reflection experiments, in which an incoming electron from the normal side of a normal/superconducting contact is reflected as a hole along the same trajectory [20], showed a much smaller gap edge than the bias at the tunnelling conductance maxima [21]. Two distinctly different gaps with different magnetic field and temperature dependence were observed in the c-axis $I(V)$ characteristics [22]. They were also observed with the femtosecond time-resolved optical spectroscopy [23]. More recent STM experiments revealed checker-

board spatial modulations of the tunnelling DOS, with [24] and without [25, 26] applied magnetic fields.

We have proposed a simple model [27] explaining two different gaps in cuprates. The main assumption, supported by a parameter-free estimate of the Fermi energy [28], is that the attractive potential is large compared with the renormalised Fermi energy, so that the ground state is the Bose-Einstein condensate of tightly bound real-space pairs. In this letter I calculate the single particle DOS of strong-coupling (bosonic) superconductors by solving the inhomogeneous BdG equations. When pairs are Bose-condensed with finite center-of-mass momenta, I obtain a checkerboard DOS reminiscent of the tunnelling DOS in cuprates.

The anomalous Bogoliubov-Gor'kov average

$$F_{ss^0}(r_1; r_2) = \hat{\Delta}_s(r_1) \hat{\Delta}_{s^0}(r_2);$$

is the superconducting order parameter both in the weak and strong-coupling regimes. It depends on the relative coordinate $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2$ of two electrons (holes), described by field operators $\hat{\Delta}_s(\mathbf{r})$, and on the center-of-mass coordinate $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2)/2$. Its Fourier transform, $f(\mathbf{k}; K)$, depends on the relative momentum \mathbf{k} and on the center-of-mass momentum \mathbf{K} : In the BCS theory $K = 0$, and the Fourier transform of the order parameter is proportional to the gap in the quasi-particle excitation spectrum, $f(\mathbf{k}; K) \propto \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$. Hence the symmetry of the order parameter and the symmetry of the gap are the same in the weak-coupling regime. Under the rotation of the coordinate system, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ changes its sign, if the Cooper pairing appears in the d-channel. The Cooper pairing might also take place with finite center-of-mass momentum, if electrons are spin polarized [29].

On the other hand, the symmetry of the order parameter could be different from the 'internal' symmetry of the pair wave-function, and from the symmetry of a single-particle excitation gap in the strong-coupling regime [8]. Real-space pairs might have an unconventional symmetry due to a specific symmetry of the pairing potential as in the case of the Cooper pairs [3]. The d-wave symmetry of the ground state could be also due to a topological

degeneracy of inter-site pairs on a square lattice [30], as proposed in Ref. [31]. But in any case the ground state and DOS are homogeneous, if pairs are condensed with $K = 0$. However, if a pairband dispersion has its minimum at finite K in the center-of-mass Brillouin zone, the Bose condensate is inhomogeneous. In particular, the center-of-mass bipolaron energy bands could have their minima at the Brillouin zone boundaries at $K = (\pi; 0)$ and three other equivalent momenta [32] (here and further I take the lattice constant $a = 1$, and $\hbar = 1$). These four states are degenerate, so that the condensate wave function $\langle m \rangle$ in the real (Wannier) space, $m = (m_x; m_y)$, is their superposition,

$$\langle m \rangle = \sum_{K=(\pi;0);(0;\pi)} b_K e^{iK \cdot m}; \quad (1)$$

where $b_K = \sqrt{\frac{P}{n_c}} = 2$ are c-numbers, and $n_c(T)$ is the atomic density of the Bose-condensate. The superposition, Eq.(1), respects the time-reversal and parity symmetries, if

$$\langle m \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{P}{n_c}} [\cos(m_x) \pm \cos(m_y)]; \quad (2)$$

Two order parameters, Eq.(2), are physically identical because they are related by the translation transformation. They have d-wave symmetry changing sign in the real space, when the lattice is rotated by $\pi/2$. This symmetry is entirely due to the pair-band energy dispersion with four minima at $K \neq 0$, rather than due a specific pairing potential. It reveals itself as a checkerboard modulation of the hole density with two-dimensional patterns, oriented along the diagonals. From this insight one can expect a fundamental connection between stripes detected by different techniques [33, 34] and the symmetry of the order parameter in cuprates [32].

Now let us take into account that in the superconducting state ($T < T_c$) single-particle excitations interact with the pair condensate via the same short-range attractive potential, which forms the pairs [27]. The Hamiltonian describing the interaction of excitations with the pair Bose-condensate in the Wannier representation is

$$H = \sum_m [t(m-n) + \sum_{s,\#} c_{sm}^\dagger c_{\#m}] + \sum_m [u(m)c_{sm}^\dagger c_{\#m} + v(m)c_{\#m}^\dagger c_{sm}]; \quad (3)$$

where $s, \#$ is the spin, $t(m)$ and c_{sm}^\dagger, c_{sm} are hopping integrals and the chemical potential, respectively, c_{sm}^\dagger and c_{sm} create (annihilate) an electron or hole at site m , and $\langle m \rangle / \langle m \rangle$. Applying equations of motion for the Heisenberg operators $c_{sm}^\dagger(t)$ and $c_{sm}(t)$, and the Bogoliubov transformation [35]

$$c_{sm}(t) = \sum_n [u(m-n)e^{-i\epsilon_n t} + v(m-n)e^{i\epsilon_n t}]; \quad (4)$$

$$c_{\#m}(t) = \sum_n [u(m-n)e^{-i\epsilon_n t} - v(m-n)e^{i\epsilon_n t}]; \quad (5)$$

one obtains BdG equations describing the single-particle excitation spectrum,

$$u(m) = \sum_n [t(m-n) + \sum_{s,\#} u(n) + \langle m \rangle v(n)]; \quad (6)$$

$$v(m) = \sum_n [t(m-n) + \sum_{s,\#} v(n) + \langle m \rangle u(n)]; \quad (7)$$

where excitation quantum numbers are omitted for transparency. These equations are supplemented by the sum rule $[u(m)u(n) + v(m)v(n)] = \delta_{m,n}$, which provides the Fermi statistics of single particle excitations and. Different from the conventional BdG equations in the weak-coupling limit, there is virtually no feedback of single particle excitations on the off-diagonal potential, $\langle m \rangle$, in the strong-coupling regime. The number of these excitations is low at temperatures below $T_p = k_B$, so that the coherent potential $\langle m \rangle$ is an external (rather than a self-consistent) field, solely determined by the pair Bose condensate [27].

While the analytical solution is not possible for any arbitrary off-diagonal interaction $\langle m \rangle$, one can readily solve the infinite system of discrete equations (6,7) for a periodic $\langle m \rangle$ with a period commensurate with the lattice constant, for example

$$\langle m \rangle = \frac{1}{c} [e^{i\pi m_x} \pm e^{i\pi m_y}]; \quad (8)$$

which corresponds to the pair condensate at $K = (\pi; 0)$ and $(0; \pi)$, Eq.(2), with a temperature dependent (coherent) $c / n_c(T)$. In this case the quasi-momentum k is the proper quantum number, $\epsilon = k$, and the excitation wave-function is a superposition of plane waves,

$$u(m) = u_k e^{ik \cdot m} + u_k e^{i(k-g) \cdot m}; \quad (9)$$

$$v(m) = v_k e^{i(k-g_x) \cdot m} + v_k e^{i(k-g_y) \cdot m}; \quad (10)$$

Here $g_x = (\pi; 0)$, $g_y = (0; \pi)$, and $g = (\pi; \pi)$ are reciprocal doubled lattice vectors. Substituting Eqs.(9) and (10) into Eqs.(6,7) one obtains four coupled algebraic equations,

$$u_k = u_k + c(v_k - v_k); \quad (11)$$

$$u_k = u_k - g v_k + c(v_k - v_k); \quad (12)$$

$$v_k = u_k - g_x v_k + c(u_k - u_k); \quad (13)$$

$$v_k = u_k - g_y v_k + c(u_k - u_k); \quad (14)$$

where $\epsilon_k = \sum_n t(n)e^{ik \cdot n}$. The determinant of the system (11-14) yields the following equation for the energy spectrum:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\epsilon_k - \epsilon_k - g)(\epsilon_k - \epsilon_k - g_x)(\epsilon_k + \epsilon_k - g_x)(\epsilon_k + \epsilon_k - g_y) \\ & = \frac{c^2}{2} (2 + \epsilon_k - g_x + \epsilon_k - g_y)(2 - \epsilon_k - \epsilon_k - g); \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Two positive roots for ϵ describe the single-particle excitation spectrum. Their calculation is rather cumbersome,




FIG. 1: Single-particle excitation energy spectrum (arb. units) along the diagonal direction of the two-dimensional Brillouin zone

but not in the extreme strong-coupling limit, where the pair binding energy $2\epsilon_p$ is large compared with ϵ_c and with the single-particle bandwidth w . The chemical potential in this limit is pinned below a single-particle band edge, so that $\mu = (\epsilon_p + w/2)$ is negative, and its magnitude is large compared with ϵ_c . Then the right hand side in Eq.(15) is a perturbation, and the spectrum is

$$\epsilon_{1k} = \epsilon_k - \frac{2}{c}; \quad (16)$$

$$\epsilon_{2k} = \epsilon_k + \frac{2}{c}; \quad (17)$$

Its dispersion along the diagonal direction is shown in Fig.1 in the nearest neighbor approximation for the hopping integrals on a square lattice.

If a metallic tip is placed at the point m above the surface of a sample, the STM current $I(V; m)$ creates an electron (or hole) at this point. Applying the Fermi-Dirac golden rule and the Bogoliubov transformation, Eq.(4,5), and assuming that the temperature is much lower than $\epsilon_p = k_B$ one readily obtains the tunnelling conductance

$$I(V; m) = \frac{dI(V; m)}{dV} / \sum_j |\psi_j(m)|^2 \quad (\text{eV}^{-1}); \quad (18)$$

which is a local excitation DOS. The solution Eq.(9) leads to a spatially modulated conductance,

$$I(V; m) = I_{\text{reg}}(V) + I_{\text{mod}}(V) \cos(m_x + m_y); \quad (19)$$

The smooth (regular) contribution is

$$I_{\text{reg}}(V) = \sum_{k, r=1,2}^X (u_{rk}^2 + v_{rk}^2) \quad (\text{eV}^{-1}); \quad (20)$$

and the amplitude of the modulated contribution is

$$I_{\text{mod}}(V) = 2 \sum_{k, r=1,2}^X u_{rk} v_{rk} \quad (\text{eV}^{-1}); \quad (21)$$

where ϵ_0 is a constant. Conductance modulations reveal a checkerboard pattern, as the Bose condensate itself, Eq.(2),

$$\frac{I_{\text{reg}}}{I_{\text{reg}}} = A \cos(m_x + m_y); \quad (22)$$

where

$$A = 2 \sum_{k, r=1,2}^X [u_{rk} v_{rk} \quad (\text{eV}^{-1}) + u_{2k} v_{2k} \quad (\text{eV}^{-1})] = \sum_{k, r=1,2}^X (u_{1k}^2 + v_{1k}^2) \quad (\text{eV}^{-1}) + (v_{2k}^2 + u_{2k}^2) \quad (\text{eV}^{-1})$$

is the amplitude of modulations depending on the voltage V and temperature. An analytical result is obtained in the strong-coupling limit with the excitation spectrum given by Eqs. (16,17) for the voltage near the threshold, $\text{eV} = \epsilon_p$. In this case only states near bottoms of each excitation band, Fig.1, contribute to the integrals in Eq.(22), so that

$$v_{1k} = \frac{k}{1k} \frac{1k}{k} u_{1k} \quad v_k \frac{2}{c} u_{1k}; \quad (23)$$

and

$$u_{2k} = \frac{k}{2k} \frac{g}{k} \frac{2k}{k} v_{2k} \quad v_k \frac{2}{c} v_{2k}; \quad (24)$$

Substituting these expressions into A , Eq.(22), yields in the lowest order of ϵ_c ,

$$A = \frac{2}{w} \frac{2}{c}; \quad (25)$$

The result, Eq.(22) generally agrees with the STM experiments [24, 25, 26, 36, 37], where the spatial checkerboard modulations of w were observed in a few cuprates. The period of the modulations was found either commensurate or non-commensurate depending on a sample composition. In our model the period is determined by the center-of-mass wave vectors K of the Bose-condensed preformed pairs. While the general case has to be solved numerically [38], the perturbation result, Eq.(22) is qualitatively applied for any K at least close to T_c , where the coherent gap is small, if one replaces $\cos(m_x + m_y)$ by $\cos(K_x m_x + K_y m_y)$. The period of DOS modulations does not depend on the voltage in the perturbation regime, as observed [39], but it could be voltage dependent well below T_c , where higher powers of ϵ_c are important. Different from any other scenario, proposed so far [40], the hole density, which is about twice of the condensate density at low temperatures, is spatially modulated with the period determined by the inverse wave vectors corresponding to the center-of-mass pair band-minima. This 'kinetic' interpretation of charge modulations in cuprates, originally proposed [32] before STM results became available, is consistent with the inelastic neutron scattering, where incommensurate inelastic

peaks were observed only in the superconducting state [41]. The vanishing at T_c of the incommensurate peaks is inconsistent with any other stripe picture, where a characteristic distance needs to be observed in the normal state as well. In our model the checkerboard charge modulations should disappear above T_c , where the Bose-condensate evaporates and the coherent gap $\Delta_c(T)$ vanishes, so that $A = 0$ in Eq.(22). While some STM studies [39] report incommensurate DOS modulations somewhat above T_c , they might be due to extrinsic inhomogeneities. In particular, preformed pairs in the surface layer could Bose-condense at higher temperatures compared with the bulk T_c . Our model is microscopically derived using the strong-coupling (bipolaron) extension of the BCS theory [8]. If the electron-phonon interaction is strong, such that the BCS coupling constant $\lambda > 1$, electrons form bipolarons above T_c , which are Bose condensed below T_c . The polaron bandwidth is exponentially reduced, which explains a low estimate of the Fermi energy using the experimental London penetration depth in cuprates [28]. Evidence for an exceptionally strong electron-phonon inter-

action in high-temperature superconductors is now overwhelming (see, for example, [42, 43]). Yet, generally, the model describes charge modulations due to the Bose condensation with non-zero center-of-mass momenta of preformed pairs formed by any pairing interaction.

In conclusion, I solved BdG equations with the periodic off-diagonal potential caused by the Bose condensation of preformed pairs with non-zero center-of-mass momenta, and found the checkerboard modulations of the single-particle DOS similar to those observed in cuprates. The main assumption that the ground state of superconducting cuprates is the Bose-Einstein condensate of preformed pairs, is supported by a growing number of other experiments [8]. The model links charge orders, pairing, and pseudo-gaps as manifestations of a strong attractive interaction in narrow bands.

The author acknowledges support of this work by the Leverhulme Trust (London) and by The Royal Society (UK). I would like to thank A.F. Andreev, V.V. Kabanov, A. Lanzara, K.M. McElroy, and V.N. Zavaritsky for illuminating discussions.

-
- [1] J. Annett, N. Goldenfeld and A.J. Leggett in *Physical Properties of High Temperature Superconductors 5* (ed. Ginsberg D.M., World Scientific, Singapore) 375 (1996).
 - [2] C.C.T. Szei and J.R. Kirtley, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 72, 969 (2000).
 - [3] D.J. Scalapino, J.E. Loh, and J.E. Hirsch, *Phys. Rev. B* 34, 8190 (1986).
 - [4] Q. Li et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83, 4160 (1999).
 - [5] K.A. Müller, *Phil. Mag. Lett.* 82, 279 (2002).
 - [6] V.V. Kabanov et al, *Phys. Rev. B* 59, 1497 (1999).
 - [7] G.M. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. B* 64, 024503 (2001).
 - [8] A.S. Alexandrov, *Theory of Superconductivity: from Weak to Strong Coupling* (IoP Publishing, Bristol-Philadelphia, 2003).
 - [9] A.S. Alexandrov, V.V. Kabanov and N.F. Mott, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 4796 (1996).
 - [10] K.A. Müller et al, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 10, L291 (1998).
 - [11] Ch. Renner et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 80, 149 (1998).
 - [12] H. Hancotte et al, *Phys. Rev. B* 55, R3410 (1997).
 - [13] H. Ding et al, *Nature (London)* 382, 51 (1996).
 - [14] Z.-X. Shen and J.R. Schrieffer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78, 1771 (1997).
 - [15] G.M. Eliashberg, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 38, 966 (1960) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 11 696 (1960)].
 - [16] B. Batlogg et al, *Physica C* 135-140, 130 (1994);
 - [17] J.W. Loram et al, *Physica C*, 235, 134 (1994).
 - [18] A.S. Alexandrov, *Physica C* 182, 327 (1991).
 - [19] T. Timusk and B. Statt, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 62, 61 (1999).
 - [20] A.F. Andreev, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 46, 1823 (1964) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 19, 1228 (1964)].
 - [21] G. Deutscher, *Nature* 397, 410 (1999).
 - [22] V.M. Krasnov et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84, 5860 (2000).
 - [23] J. Demas et al, *Phys. Rev. B* 63, 054519 (2001).
 - [24] J.E. Hoffman et al, *Science* 295, 466 (2002).
 - [25] J.E. Hoffman et al, *Science* 297, 1148 (2002).
 - [26] C. Howard et al, *Phys. Rev. B* 67, 014533 (2003).
 - [27] A.S. Alexandrov and A.F. Andreev, *Europhys. Lett.* 54, 373 (2001).
 - [28] A.S. Alexandrov, *Physica C* 363, 231 (2001).
 - [29] A. Larkin and Yu. Ovchinnikov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 44, 1136 (1964); P. Fulde and R. Ferrel, *Phys. Rev.* 153, 550 (1964).
 - [30] A.S. Alexandrov and P.E. Komilovitch, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 14, 5337, (2002).
 - [31] A.F. Andreev, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 79, 100 (2004).
 - [32] A.S. Alexandrov, *Physica C* 305, 46 (1998). Different from Cooper pairs the stability of preformed pairs on a lattice increases with K (P. Komilovitch, cond-mat/0311195).
 - [33] J.M. Tranquada et al, *Nature* 375, 561 (1996).
 - [34] A. Bianconi, *J. Phys. IV France* 9, 325 (1999).
 - [35] N. Bogoliubov, *J. Phys. USSR* 11, 23 (1947).
 - [36] for an experimental summary see H.C. Fu, J.C. Davis and D.-H. Lee, cond-mat/0403001.
 - [37] K.M. McElroy et al, cond-mat/0406491
 - [38] A.S. Alexandrov and V.V. Kabanov, to be published.
 - [39] M. Vershinin et al, *Science* 303, 1995 (2004).
 - [40] The Wigner crystal of doped holes or hole pairs is refutable because their Coulomb repulsion is relatively weak. The relevant dimensionless parameter is $r_s = m^* e^2 / \epsilon_0 (4\pi n)^{1/3}$. The Wigner crystallization could appear at $r_s \sim 100$, which corresponds to an unrealistically small atomic density of holes $n \sim 10^{16}$ with the static dielectric constant $\epsilon_0 = 30$ and the effective mass $m^* = 5m_e$.
 - [41] P. Bourges et al, *Science*, 288 1234 (2000); *J. Supercond.* 13, 735 (2000).
 - [42] G. Zhao et al, *Nature* 385, 236 (1997).
 - [43] A. Lanzara et al, *Nature*, 412, 510 (2001).