

Itinerant metamagnetism induced by electronic nematic order

Hae-Young Kee¹ and Yong Baek Kim^{1,2}

¹Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A7

²School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-722, Korea

(Dated: December 27, 2021)

It is shown that metamagnetic transition in metals can occur via the formation of electronic nematic order. We consider a simple model where the spin-dependent Fermi surface instability gives rise to the formation of an electronic nematic phase upon increasing the applied Zeeman magnetic field. This leads to two consecutive metamagnetic transitions that separate the nematic phase from the low-field and high-field 'isotropic' metallic phases. Possible connection to the physics of the bilayer Ruthenate, $\text{Sr}_3\text{Ru}_2\text{O}_7$, is also discussed.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Hf, 75.10.-b, 75.30.Kz

Introduction; In terms of structural properties of matter, liquid crystals of molecules have intermediate forms between the solid and liquid phases. Common examples of these 'soft' forms of matter include the smectic and nematic phases that have spontaneously broken unidirectional translational and rotational symmetries, and broken rotational symmetry, respectively [1]. It is much less appreciated, however, that strongly interacting electron systems can give rise to electronic liquid crystal phases where the electronic structure rather than the structural properties of the system is 'soft' [2]. For instance, in two-dimensional electron systems, the Wigner crystal and homogeneous electron liquid phases arise in the small and high density limits. One can ask whether an intermediate form of electronic structure arises in this case. The discovery of quantum Hall nematic phase in two-dimensional electron gas (2DEG) in high Landau levels [3] clearly shows that the answer is affirmative. In this system, the broken rotational symmetry of the nematic phase is demonstrated in a series of transport measurements [3].

When electrons reside in the lattice, broken translational and rotational symmetries would correspond to the broken point group symmetry of the underlying lattice. It has been suggested that some of these electronic smectic and nematic phases may play an important role in the physics of strongly correlated electron systems [2]. While one may try to understand these phases by following the studies of structural liquid crystals, namely introducing topological defects in the smectic and nematic phases, it turns out that a different approach may be more useful in the case of electronic systems. This amounts to studying the Fermi surface instability of electrons upon tuning the interaction strength in a novel channel and/or other parameters of the system [4, 5].

An effective model in this spirit that incorporates the two-body interaction between quadrupolar density of electrons has been proposed and analyzed [4, 6, 7, 8, 9]. It was shown that, in the lattice, the transition to the nematic phase as a function of chemical potential is generically first-order [8, 9]. This leads to abrupt changes in

various physical properties including the Fermi surface topology change from a closed to an open Fermi surface and Hall constant [8, 9]. On the other hand, there have been several studies of extended Hubbard models that reveal the existence of nematic phases in some parameter space of the models [5, 10, 11, 12]. The direct connection between two approaches is not known, but as will be mentioned later the effective quadrupolar model seems to be consistent with the conditions under which the nematic phases are seen in the studies of extended Hubbard models.

In this paper, we consider itinerant metamagnetism arising from the formation of a nematic phase. Metamagnetism in metals refers to a jump in magnetization from a low magnetization state to a high magnetization state as an external magnetic field increases. The transition is first order and associated with a jump in the relative volume of the spin-up and spin-down Fermi surfaces. In principle, this transition does not have to involve spontaneous breaking of the discrete rotational symmetry of the lattice. Here we show that metamagnetic transition in metals can occur due to the formation of a nematic phase where only the spin-up (or spin-down) Fermi surface spontaneously breaks the discrete rotational symmetry.

We study a generalized effective Hamiltonian on the square lattice with the quadrupolar-density interaction including the spin degree of freedom. As the magnetic field increases, the Fermi surface volume of the spin-up Fermi surface increases and when the spin-up Fermi surface gets close to the van-Hove singularity, the nematic distortion of the spin-up Fermi surface occurs via a first-order transition. This leads to the abrupt change in the spin-up Fermi surface topology from a closed to an open Fermi surface while the spin-down Fermi surface changes continuously. As emphasized in Ref [9], this is an example where the so-called Lifshitz transition [13] of non-interacting systems, which involves a continuous quantum transition between two states with topologically distinct Fermi surface structures without breaking any lattice symmetry, is avoided in interacting systems.

When the magnetic field increases further, another first-order transition occurs; the spin-up Fermi surface changes from an open to a closed Fermi surface. The discrete rotational symmetry is now restored in the high-field phase. It is shown that two consecutive first-order transitions accompany the jumps in the magnetization, leading to two metamagnetic transitions. The transition turns into second order [9] at some finite temperature and the nematic phase is bounded above by second order transition. This behavior is reminiscent of that suggested for the unusual phase near the metamagnetic quantum critical end point of $\text{Sr}_3\text{Ru}_2\text{O}_7$ [14, 15, 19] and we will discuss possible application of our model to this material.

Effective Hamiltonian; The effective Hamiltonian is based on symmetry considerations such that the resulting order parameter theory has the correct symmetries. In the case of classical liquid crystals, the directions parallel and anti-parallel to the rod-like molecule do not make difference. As such, the nematic order parameter can be represented as a quadrupolar (second order symmetric traceless) tensor built from the spatial directions. In two-dimensions, it changes sign under a rotation by $\pi/2$ and is invariant under a rotation by π . In similar spirit, one can construct a quadrupolar order parameter for electronic systems using the momentum operators of electrons, i.e., $\hat{Q}_{ij} = \hat{p}_i \hat{p}_j - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \hat{p}^2$. The attractive interaction between quadrupolar densities will lead to the alignment or anti-alignment of electronic moments (they are equivalent just like the case of classical liquid crystals), namely the formation of the nematic order.

The simplest generalization of this idea to the electrons with spins on the square lattice leads to the following effective Hamiltonian. We also introduce the external magnetic field, H_{ext} , so that the effective Hamiltonian only has the Ising degree of freedom in the spin space.

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} \left(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu \right) c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + h \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^\dagger + c_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow} c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} \right) + \sum_{\mathbf{q}} F_2(\mathbf{q}) \text{Tr} [\hat{Q}(\mathbf{q}) \hat{Q}^\dagger(-\mathbf{q})] + h \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \sigma_{\mathbf{r}}; \quad (1)$$

where $h = \mu_B H_{\text{ext}}$ and μ_B is the Bohr magneton. Here $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the single particle dispersion and μ is the chemical potential. On the square lattice, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = 2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$. As discussed in Ref. [9], the inclusion of the next-nearest hopping does not change the qualitative picture, so we will not include this term for simplicity. $\hat{Q}(\mathbf{q})$ is the lattice analog of the quadrupolar density tensor [4] constructed from the momentum operators and has the following form in the square lattice.

$$\hat{Q}(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} \begin{pmatrix} \cos k_x & \cos k_y & \sin k_x \sin k_y \\ \sin k_x \sin k_y & \cos k_y & \cos k_x \end{pmatrix} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \quad (2)$$

Here the interaction, $F_2(\mathbf{q})$, can be any arbitrary short-ranged interaction such that $F_2(\mathbf{q}) \rightarrow F_2 < 0$ in the $q \rightarrow 0$ limit.

Some remarks on this model are in order. In the studies of extended Hubbard models, it was found that the nematic order (or Pomeranchuk instability) arises when there exist attractive (repulsive) interaction between electrons in the same (different) patches via forward scattering [5, 9]. This is consistent with our effective Hamiltonian where the form factor of the interaction, $F_2(\cos k_x, \cos k_y)(\cos k_x, \cos k_y)$ provides an attractive interaction between electrons from the same region near $(\pi/2, 0)$, and a repulsive interaction between an electron near $(\pi/2, 0)$ and another near $(0, \pi/2)$. Thus it appears that our effective Hamiltonian may be related to the low energy limit of extended Hubbard models in some parameter regime.

Mean Field Theory; It is sufficient to concentrate on the $q \rightarrow 0$ limit of the interaction by letting $F_2(\mathbf{q}) \rightarrow F_2$ with $F_2 > 0$. In order to obtain mean field theory, the quartic interaction is decoupled via the following order parameters.

$$\langle \hat{Q}_{11}(0) \rangle = F_2 \langle \hat{Q}_{12}(0) \rangle = 0 \quad (3)$$

The effective single particle dispersion for each spin degree of freedom now becomes

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = 2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y) + F_2 \sin k_x \sin k_y \quad (4)$$

When a non-zero solution for $\langle \hat{Q}_{11}(0) \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{Q}_{12}(0) \rangle$ exists, the spin-Fermi surface will spontaneously break the discrete rotational symmetry of the lattice. It turns out that $\langle \hat{Q}_{12}(0) \rangle$ is always zero in our simple model so that the deformation of the Fermi surface occurs along the symmetric axes of the underlying lattice. Thus we will set $\langle \hat{Q}_{12}(0) \rangle = 0$ from now on.

The grand canonical free energy density in the mean field theory, $F(\beta; h; \mu; \mu_B) = F_{\text{el}} + F_{\text{ph}}$, is given by

$$F(\beta; h; \mu; \mu_B) = \frac{1}{\beta} \ln Z + F_{\text{ph}}(\beta; h; \mu; \mu_B); \quad (5)$$

where $\mu = \mu_B h$ and $\mu_B = \mu_B H_{\text{ext}}$. Here F_{el} is

$$F_{\text{el}}(\beta; h; \mu; \mu_B) = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln Z = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left(\int \prod_{\mathbf{k}} d\psi_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left(-\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu \right) \psi_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \psi_{\mathbf{k}} + h \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\psi_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger \psi_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^\dagger + \psi_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow} \psi_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} \right) \right) \right); \quad (6)$$

where $D(\epsilon)$ is the density of states of the renormalized single particle dispersion relation for each spin degree of freedom and has the following functional form.

$$D(\epsilon) = N_0 \text{Re} \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{4t^2}}} K \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2t} \right) - \frac{1}{(2t)^2} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \right]; \quad (7)$$

where $K(x)$ is the elliptic integral of the first kind and $N_0 = 1/(2\pi^2 t)$. Note the persistence of the logarithmic van Hove singularities at $(\epsilon = \pm 2t)^2 = 4t^2$ that are remnants of the van Hove singularity of non-interacting systems.

This leads to non-analytic behavior of the free energy at $(\Delta_F/2t)^2 = \frac{2}{N_0}$ or $(\Delta_F/2t)^2 = \frac{2}{N_0}$.

As the external magnetic field increases, Δ_F (Δ_F) increases (decreases) and when the spin-up Fermi surface gets close to the first Brillouin zone boundary, the non-analytic behavior of F^+ near the van Hove singularity, $(\Delta_F/2t)^2 = \frac{2}{N_0}$, leads to the first order transition to the nematic phase or the abrupt deformation of the spin-up Fermi surface. Here the spin-down Fermi surface is far away from the van Hove singularity so that the spin-down Fermi surface only changes gradually.

Nematic Order and Magnetization; At the zero temperature, the free energy, $F = F^+ + F^-$ can be further simplified when $\Delta_F/2t < 2t$ and F for each spin degree of freedom has the following form [9].

$$F = \frac{1}{F_2} + 2N_0 \frac{\Delta_F^2}{2} + N_0 \frac{\Delta_F^2}{2} \ln \frac{1 + \frac{\Delta_F^2}{4}}{4} + (\dots) \quad (8)$$

where all energy scales are in units of $2t$ for simplicity and Δ_F -independent terms are dropped.

The free energy is investigated as a function of the applied magnetic field, h , for a given chemical potential. We start with a closed Fermi surface. As the magnetic field, h , increases, the spin-up (spin-down) Fermi surface volume increases (decreases). For small magnetic fields, there is no spontaneous breaking of the lattice symmetry in the Fermi surfaces. When h reaches the value that makes the spin-up Fermi surface gets close to the van Hove singularity, the nematic order parameter for the spin-up electrons jumps to a finite value, $\Delta_F \neq 0$. This represents a first order transition from a closed to an open spin-up Fermi surface. As h further increases, another first order transition occurs such that Δ_F abruptly jumps down to zero and the lattice symmetry is restored. To summarize, a nematic phase exists in $h_1 < h < h_2$ and is bounded by two first order transitions from (to) the low (high) field 'isotropic' phases.

The behavior of the nematic order parameter for the spin-up Fermi surface as a function of h is shown in Fig.1. Here we choose $\Delta_F(2t) = 0.16$ and $F_2N_0 = 0.1$. Notice the order parameter jumps to a finite value at $h_1 = 0.0428$ and jumps down to zero at $h_2 = 0.277$. The behavior of the magnetization, $M = \frac{1}{B} \sum_k (\hbar c_k^y \alpha_k \cdot i \hbar c_k^\dagger \alpha_k \cdot i)$, as a function of magnetic field is shown in Fig.2. Note that the magnetization jumps up at h_1 and h_2 . Thus there exist two consecutive metamagnetic transitions. The corresponding Fermi surfaces in three different regions are shown in the inset in Fig.2. In principle, the nematic phase in $h_1 < h < h_2$ will exhibit anisotropic transport properties. In real systems, however, there will be domains with two possible orientations of the open Fermi surface for spin-up electrons.

Possible Applications to Experiments; Metam-




FIG. 1: The nematic order parameter, Δ_F , as a function of Zeeman magnetic field, h , for $F_2N_0 = 0.1$ and $\Delta_F(2t) = 0.16$ in unit of $2t$ at $T = 0$




FIG. 2: The magnetization, M , as a function of Zeeman magnetic field for $F_2N_0 = 0.1$ and $\Delta_F(2t) = 0.16$. Two sharp metamagnetic transitions are due to the phase transitions between the 'isotropic', (a) and (c), phases and the nematic state, (b). The inset shows the up-spin and down-spin Fermi surfaces in the nematic and 'isotropic' phases. Note that the down-spin Fermi surface volume gradually decreases as the Zeeman magnetic field increases, while the up-spin Fermi surface changes abruptly at the nematic-'isotropic' transitions.

agnetism occurs quite often in complex materials, but recent experiments on the bilayer ruthenate, $\text{Sr}_3\text{Ru}_2\text{O}_7$, seem to provide rather unique opportunity to look at the interplay between quantum fluctuations and metamagnetism [14, 15]. Early experiments on $\text{Sr}_3\text{Ru}_2\text{O}_7$ suggest that the metamagnetic critical end-point can be pushed down to zero temperature by changing the direction of the magnetic field [14, 15]. In this case, one expects that the fluctuations near the critical end point is inherently quantum mechanical [16, 17]. Indeed many signatures of quantum critical behavior are seen at finite tempera-

tures near the putative metamagnetic quantum critical end point [14, 15].

More recent experiments [18] on much cleaner samples, however, show that the system avoids the zero temperature quantum critical end point when the angle of the magnetic field gets very close to the ‘critical’ value. Instead of sustaining large quantum fluctuations, the system undergoes two consecutive first order transitions and the magnetization jumps at each transition [18]. It has been recently suggested [19] that a magnetic field can tune an itinerant system so that the majority-spin Fermi surface lies close to a van Hove point which may lead to a spin-dependent Pomerenchuk instability [20] which is destroyed by further application of the magnetic field.

At the phenomenological level, our simple model gives rise to a similar behavior. In the experiment, h_1 and h_2 are quite close while our mean field theory gives a relatively wide region of the nematic phase. However, the window of the nematic phase decreases as the value of F_2N_0 decreases. This quantitative feature can also change if one considers a different band structure or introducing an explicit interaction between spin-up and spin-down electrons. On the other hand, we need an attractive quadrupolar density interaction to get the nematic phase in a range of magnetic fields while the origin of this interaction in real system is not clear. Thus it is not easy to make a direct connection between our model and the experimental results on $\text{Sr}_3\text{Ru}_2\text{O}_7$. One can imagine, however, that when the metamagnetic fluctuations become very large, the Fermi surfaces get soft [14] and the dominant term in the low energy effective Hamiltonian might look like what we have studied.

Summary and Discussion; In this paper, we consider a magnetic-field-tuned transition at zero temperature between an ‘isotropic’ (up to the discrete rotational symmetry of the lattice) and a nematic phase where the spin-up (or spin-down) Fermi surface spontaneously breaks the rotational symmetry of the lattice. Such a transition on the lattice is generically first order and naturally gives rise to metamagnetism with the jump in the magnetization across the ‘isotropic’-nematic transition. The first order transition turns into second order at some finite temperature so that the nematic phase is bounded above by second order transition [9].

More specifically, we consider a simple model of a quadrupolar density interaction between electrons in Zeeman magnetic field. As the magnetic field increases, the Fermi surface volume of the spin-up (spin-down) electrons increases (decreases). When the spin-up Fermi surface gets close to the van Hove filling, a first order transition to a nematic phase occurs. In the nematic phase, the spin-up Fermi surface spontaneously breaks the rotational symmetry of the lattice and becomes an open Fermi surface. As the magnetic field increases further,

another first order transition happens. In the high field phase, the lattice symmetry is restored and the spin-up Fermi surface becomes closed again. It is shown that the magnetization jumps at each transition between nematic and isotropic phase. Note that, in this case, the occurrence of the nematic order is the source of the metamagnetism.

In order to obtain these results, we assumed an attractive interaction between the quadrupolar densities of electrons. How this interaction can be generated in a more microscopic model is an interesting question and a subject of future study.

Acknowledgment: We are very grateful to Andy Mackenzie, Steve Kivelson, and Andy Schofeld for valuable discussions. We would also like to thank KITP at UCSB and Aspen Center for Physics for hospitality, where some parts of this work were performed. This work was supported by the NSERC of Canada, Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Canada Research Chair Program, and Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

-
- [1] See, for example, P. de Gennes, *Physics of Liquid Crystals* (Oxford University Press, 1987).
 - [2] S.A. Kivelson, E. Fradkin, and V.J. Emery, *Nature* 393, 550 (1998); E. Fradkin and S.A. Kivelson, *Phys. Rev. B* 59, 8065 (1999).
 - [3] M.P. Lilly et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 394 (1999); R.R. Du et al., *Solid State Comm.* 109, 389 (1999).
 - [4] V. Oganesyan, S.A. Kivelson, and E. Fradkin, *Phys. Rev. B* 64, 195109 (2001).
 - [5] C.J. Halboth and W. Metzner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85, 5162 (2000).
 - [6] Y.B. Kim and H.Y. Kee, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 16, 3139 (2004), cond-mat/0204037.
 - [7] H.Y. Kee, *Phys. Rev. B* 67, 073105 (2003).
 - [8] H.Y. Kee, E.H. Kim, and C.-H. Chung, *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 245109 (2003).
 - [9] I. KHAVKINE, C.-H. Chung, V. Oganesyan, and H.Y. Kee, cond-mat/0402565.
 - [10] V. Hankevych and F. Wegner, *Phys. Rev. B* 31, 333 (2003).
 - [11] A.P. Kampt and A.A. Katanin, *Phys. Rev. B* 67, 125104 (2003).
 - [12] W. Metzner, D. Rohe, and S. Andergassen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 066402 (2003).
 - [13] I.M. Lifshitz, *JETP* 11, 1130 (1960); *JETP* 38, 1569 (1960).
 - [14] R.S. Perry et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 2661 (2001).
 - [15] S.A. Grigera et al., *Science* 294, 329 (2001).
 - [16] A.J.M. Illis et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 217204 (2002).
 - [17] Y.B. Kim and A.J.M. Illis, *Phys. Rev. B* 67, 085102 (2003).
 - [18] R.S. Perry et al., cond-mat/0401371.
 - [19] S.A. Grigera et al., to be published.
 - [20] I.J. Pomerenchuk, *JETP* 8, 361 (1985).