The "unusual" isotope shift in high-tem perature superconductors can be explained by the usual theory of the electron-phonon interaction

¹E.G.Maksimov, ²O.V.Dolgov, and ³M.L.Kulic.
¹P.N.Lebedev Physical Institute, Leninskii Prosp. 53, 119991 Moscow, Russia, ²Max-Planck-Institut fur Festkorperphysik, Heisenbergstr.1, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany ³J.W.Goethe-Universitt Frankfurt am Main, Theoretische Physik, Robert-Mayer-Str. 8, 60054 Frankfurt/Main, Germany (Dated: April 14, 2024)

We show that recent ARPES results on the "unusual" oxygen isotope shift in the real part of the self-energy in the optim ally doped B i2212 sam ples [1] can be qualitatively (and sem i-quantitatively) explained by the theory of the electron-phonon interaction (EPI) elaborated few decades ago. However, for a quantitative analysis of the ARPES spectra it is necessary to know the momentum dependence of the EPI, the Coulomb contribution at high energies and the background due to impurities and defects.

PACS num bers:

Recently a very interesting paper was reported in the "Nature" with the title "An unusual isotope shift in high-tem perature superconductors" by Gwon et al [1], where the angle-resolved photoem ission (ARPES) spectra have been investigated in the optim ally doped B i2212 sam ples for dierent stages of the oxygen isotope substitution 16 O! 18 O! 16 O. It was shown that all energy distribution curves (EDS) demonstrate a rather smallbut nonzero isotope e ect. Each of these curves shows a peak, the position of this peak is a ected by the above mentioned isotope substitution. All isotope e ects have maximal values for frequencies of the order of 100-300 meV and vanish for larger energies.

In this short comm entwe demonstrate that the main part of ARPES results in Ref.[1] can be easily understood, and even sem i-quantitatively explained, in the fram ework of the standard M igdal-E liashberg m odel [2, 3, 4] for the electron-phonon interaction (EPI). For that purpose we discuss below the quasiparticle self-(!) due to the EPI in the simple model in which the quasiparticles interact with a dispersionless optical phonon (E instein model), which has been studied at length in Ref. [4] many years ago. In this analitically solvable model the Eliashberg spectral function has the form ${}^{2}F(!) = !_{0}(!)$ 10) Below we shall discuss the energy and isotope dependence of Re (!) for the quasiparticle m om enta in the nodal direction (0;0) (;), since in this case there are no additional e ects on (!) due to the superconducting gap and the pseudogap. The obtained results in the simple EPI model will be compared with those of the ARPES spectra in [1].

The real part of (!) in the simple EPIm odel has the following form [4]

Re
$$(!) = \frac{!_0}{2} \ln \frac{! + !_0}{!_0};$$
 (1)

where $= g^2N$ (0=! 2_0 is the EPI coupling constant, g is the matrix element of the EPI, N (0) is a quasiparticle density of states on the Ferm i level and ! $_0$ is the optical phonon energy. We would like to mention here that the

value Re (!) is negative, while jRe (!) jwas plotted in the inset of Fig 1 in Ref. [1].

From Eq.(1) it is seen that \Re e (!)j in the simple model is logarithm ically singular at ! '!0. It is well known that this singularity is smoothed by (i) the realistic phonon spectrum and the Eliashberg spectral function, and (ii) by the nonzero temperature e ects T \mod 0. This will be studied elsewhere for spectral dunctions related to high-temperature superconductors.

The position of the peak in Re (!) jdepends on isotope substitutions because the phonon energies depend on atom ic masses

$$!_0 = \frac{r}{M}$$
 (2)

Here is a force constant and M is an elective mass of a phonon mode. The high-energy optical phonon modes in high- $T_{\rm c}$ superconductors are mainly related to the oxygen motion. This means that the value M in Eq.(2) is an oxygen mass. Eq.(1-2) show the red shift of the peak position for the heavier isotope. The value of this shift is equal

$$! = !_{0}(^{16}O) !_{0}(^{18}O) ' 0:06!_{0}(^{16}O) (3)$$

whose order of magnitude is in a good agreement with the observation in Ref. [1].

Now we consider $\Re e$ (!) jat low energies (! ! 0) where Eq.(1) gives a linear behavior

$$\Re (!)j'$$
 !: (4)

It is important to stress that in metals does not depend on the mass of vibrating atoms in the adiabatic and harmonic approximation, as it was rst shown in [6]. We stress that this result was observed in ARPES spectra of Ref.[1], where the slope of Ref.[1] is isotope independent. It means, that the high-tem perature superconductors are not in the so called nonadiabatic regime of the polaron formation. The expression Eq.(1) can be

expanded up to the next power of $!=!_0$ where

The small deviation (from the linear dependence) of Re (!)j is negative and is larger for the heavier isotope. This result is also in a good agreement with the ARPES results shown in the inset of Fig.(1b) in Ref.[1].

Let us now consider $\Re e$ (!) jat high energies! ! 0: In this case one has

$$\Re e (!)j_{\underline{}} !_{0}(\frac{!_{0}}{!});$$
 (6)

This expression shows that $\Re e$ (!)j 1=!, i.e. it falls o slow by by increasing!. Moreover $\Re e$ (!)j 1=M, i.e. it depends on the isotope mass. It means that the value of the isotope e ect is more pronounced at high energies then at low. This result is also in a qualitative agreement with the observed ARPES data in Ref.[1]. Note, the same analitical behavior should hold for more realistic spectral functions, than for the Einstein model), for! !max, where!max is the maximal phonon energy.

The simple theory presented here cannot explain the absolute value of the isotope e ect at very large!, which was observed in Ref.[1], since we do not know the contribution of the C oulomb interaction to Re (!) jat these energies. However, we can use the dierence between the experimental values of Re (!) j for 16 O and 18 O at rather high energy! = 0.2eV, i.e. Re (!) j $_{160}^{18}$ O Re (!) j $_{160}^{18}$ O Re (!) j $_{160}^{18}$ O, in order to estimate the EPI coupling constant $_{\rm (h)}$ (in the nodal direction) in the above simple model. In absence of much more detailed experimental details in this energy region, we estimate

the experimental value of $\Re e$ (!) j_{160}^{180} from the small inset in Fig.1 of Ref. [1] to be $\Re e$ (!) j_{160}^{180} (6 10) meV, which combined with Eq.(6), gives $_{(h)}$ (2 3) This value is at least by factor two larger than the coupling $_{(l)}$ 1 extracted from the slope of $\Re e$ (!)j at low ! !0 in the ARPES data [1], [7]. Although this discrepancy in coupling constants $_{(l)}$ and $_{(h)}$ is not too large, it requires more accurate experiments and theoretical analysis in the high-energy region.

We stress that for a quantitative analysis of the ARPES data in high-tem perature superconductors it is necessary to know (1) the EPI spectral function and its momentum dependence, (2) the contribution from the Coulomb interaction, (3) the background scattering, etc. For instance, the point (1) is in portant in order to explain the so-called non-shift ARPES puzzle, where the quasiparticle kink in the nodal direction at 70 meV is unshifted in the superconducting state, while the one near the anti-nodal point (at 40 meV) is shifted. This non-shift puzzle was explained in [8] by the existence of the forward scattering peak in the EPI and in purity scattering.

In conclusion, the theory of the electron-phonon interaction is capable in explaining the recent ""unusual" isotope shift of the real part of the self-energy of hightem perature superconductors [1], without invoking exotic mechanisms for the quasiparticle interaction. However, in spite the fact that recent ARPES data [1], [7], [9], [10] favor the EPI as the pairing mechanism in the hightem perature superconductors for a quantitative analysis the knowledge of much more microscopic details are needed.

^[1] G. H. Gweon, T. Sasagawa, S.Y. Zhou, J. Graf, H. Takagi, D. H. Lee, and A. Lanzara, Nature (London), 430, 187 (2004); cond-m at/0407556 (2004)

^[2] A.B.M. igdal, Sov. Phys. - JETP, 7, 996 (1958).

^[3] G M . E liashberg, Sov. Phys. - JETP, 11, 696 (1960).

^[4] S. Engelsberg and J.R. Schrie er, Phys. Rev., 131, 993 (1963).

^[5] G. Grim vall, Ch. 5 in The Electron-Phonon Interaction in Metals, North-Holland (1981)

^[6] A E.K arakozov and E.G.M aksim ov, Sov.Phys.-JETP, 47, 358 (1978).

^[7] A. Lanzara et al., Nature 423, 398 (2001)

^[8] M. L. Kulic, O. V. Dolgov, cond-m at/0308597 (2003); cond-m at/0405540 (2004)

^[9] X.J. Zhou etal, cond-m at/0405130 (2004)

^[10] T.Cuk et al, cond-m at/0403521 (2004)