Quasiparticle scattering and local density of states in graphite

Cristina Bena¹ and Steven A.Kivelson²

¹Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

²D epartm ent of P hysics and A stronom y, U niversity of C alifornia, Los Angeles, C alifornia 90095-1547, U SA

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

We determ ine the elect of quasiparticle interference on the spatial variations of the local density of states (LD O S) in graphite in the neighborhood of an isolated in purity. A number of characteristic behaviors of interference are identied in the Fourier transformed spectrum. A comparison between our results and scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) experiments could provide a critical test of the range (of energy) of applicability of the Ferm i liquid description of graphite, where some evidence of the breakdown of Ferm i liquid theory has recently been discussed. Moreover, given the similarity between the band structures of graphite and that of nodal quasiparticles in a d-wave superconductor, a comparison between results in the two materials is useful for understanding the physics of the cuprates.

PACS num bers: 68.37 E f, 81.05 Jw, 71.10 C a

There has been considerable interest recently in Fourier transform scanning tunneling spectroscopy (FT-STS) measurements, which may reveal some rather interesting electronic properties of conducting materials. In particular, recent experiments performed on certain cuprate high T_c superconductors^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, promise to shine some light on the low energy electronic excitations of the superconducting state, and on the pseudogap.

In this paper we study a simple two dimensional system, graphite, which is generally believed to be a Ferm i liquid. (Note, however, that this belief has been questioned in Refs. 8.) Graphite has many similarities to the cuprates; its band structure consists of two bands that touch only at the six corners of the Brillouin zone (BZ). As a result, graphite has nodal linear dispersing quasiparticle excitations - analogous to those of the D irac equation. This makes it in some ways analogous to a d-wave superconductor, where the nodal quasi particles are expected to have a (highly anisotropic) Dirac spectrum. Thus, our interest is in obtaining an experimentally testable understanding of the implications of quasiparticle interference, both as a test of the range of validity of Ferm i liquid theory in graphite, and to provide a duciary point for discussions of the more complex situation in the cuprates.

W e use a T-m atrix approach^{9,10,11} to obtain the quasiparticle interference spectra for various energies, in the presence of a single in purity. O ur predictions can be easily tested experim entally, as very clean graphite sam – ples are relatively easy to obtain. The resulting FT-STS m aps can be quite com plex, and contain regions of high intensity. Depending on the energy, these regions can be circular, triangular, or hexagonal, as shown in Fig. 4. For example, at low energy, the dom inant features in the FT-STS m aps are circles centered about the corners and the center of the BZ. The contours evolve with increasing energy: their radii increase, the circles centered about the corners becom e triangular, while the circle in the center becom es a hexagon. Beyond the critical energy de ned by the Van H ove singularity, the topology of the contours changes, and the LDOS exhibits hexagonally shaped lines of high intensity centered about the center of the BZ.W ith increasing energy these lines become sm aller and circular again, and they disappear altogether at even higher energies.

W e now review som e general properties of graphite and explain our T-m atrix calculation of the FT-STS m aps in graphite in the presence of a single im purity.

G raphite has a hexagonal lattice with one valence electron per atom and two electrons per unit cell. The band structure of graphite consists of two bands with an energy dispersion approximated¹² by the simple particlehole symmetric tight-binding band structure:

$$(k) = (1)$$

$$s = (1)$$

$$3 + 2\cos(3k_x a) + 4\cos(3k_x a) + 4\cos(3k_x a) + 3\cos(3k_y a) + 3\cos($$

where a is the distance between nearest neighbors, and

leV. For simplicity we will set = 1eV and a = 1 in the rest of the calculation. The two bands touch at the compary of the BZ, at points $K_0 = 2 = 9(2 \ \overline{3}; 0),$ $2 = 9(\overline{3}; 3)$. The band structure for graphite is depicted in Fig.1. At low energies, for wavevectors close to the commers of the BZ, the dispersion of the nodal quasiparticle excitations is linear (k) = 3 k K_0 j=2.

The single particle density of states (DOS) of graphite can be easily obtained by integrating the spectral function, _0 (!) = $d^2k = (4^2)A(k;!)$, where the integral is perform ed over the BZ, and

$$A (k;!) = 2 \lim_{j=1;2}^{N} [! j(k) + i]^{0} : (2)$$

In the numerical evaluation of the single particle density of states we took a nite quasiparticle inverse lifetime = 0.02eV. The result is sketched in Fig. 2. The tiny DOS at ! = 0, as well as the rounding of the



FIG.1: The equal energy contours $j_1 (k_x; k_y) j = j_2 (k_x; k_y) j$ in graphite. The six points marked by dots correspond to the corners of the BZ (also the points with ! = 0), and the BZ is indicated by the dashed lines. The band structure at sm all energies consists of circular energy contours centered about the corners and the center of the BZ.At larger energies, the circles change shape and size, and above som e energy ! = 1eV they become hexagons and then circles centered about the center of the BZ, to disappear altogether for energies larger than ! = 3eV.

van Hove singularities, are due to the nite quasiparticle lifetime. When the quasiparticle inverse lifetime approaches zero, the density of states at the Van Hove singularity diverges $_0(!_{VH}) / \ln(1=)$, and the density of states at zero energy goes to zero, $_0(0) / \ln(1=)$.



FIG.2: The single particle density of states (!) plotted as a function of energy !. We note the v-shaped DOS of sm all energy and the presence of the van-H ove singularities at energies of 1eV. At energies j! j 3eV the DOS goes to zero.

W e note that the density of states is sym m etric about the origin ! = 0 and is v-shaped for energies j! j < 1eV. At the points $!_{VH} = 1eV$, the density of states show s van H ove singularities. This is the point where equalenergy contours change topology in the band structure (see Fig. 1). As expected, the DOS goes to zero at energies j! j = 3eV.

Following Refs. 10 and 11 we compute the e ect of a single in purity on the LDOS in graphite. We de ne a nite tem perature (in aginary time) G reen's function,

$$G(k_1;k_2;) = Tre^{(K)}T_{k_1}()_{k_2}^+(0);$$
 (3)

where K = H N, e = Tre ^K, and T is the imaginary time ordering operator. The impurity scattering problem can be solved by computing the Fourier transform of the Green's function from the T-matrix form ulation^{10,11}:

$$G (k_1; k_2; i!_n) = G_0 (k_1; i!_n) T (k_1; k_2; i!_n) G_0 (k_2; i!_n); (4)$$

where

$$G_{0}(k;i!_{n}) = \begin{bmatrix} i!_{n} & _{1}(k) \end{bmatrix}^{1} & 0 \\ 0 & [i!_{n} & _{2}(k)]^{1} ; (5)$$

and

$$T (k_{1};k_{2};i!_{n}) = V (k_{1};k_{2}) + V (k_{1};k^{0})G_{0} (k^{0};i!_{n})T (k^{0};k_{2};i!_{n}):$$
(6)

W e will assume that the impurity scattering potential is very close to a delta function so that V is independent of k and k^0 ,

$$V = v$$
 $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$: (7)

For this case we can solve Eq. (6), and obtain $\hat{}$

$$T (i!_{n}) = [I \quad V a \frac{d^{2}k}{4^{2}} G_{0} (k;i!_{n})]^{1} V \qquad (8)$$
$$= \frac{V}{1 \quad V a \frac{d^{2}k}{4^{2}} [G_{0}^{11} (k;i!_{n}) + G_{0}^{22} (k;i!_{n})]};$$

where I is the 2 2 identity matrix, $a = 3^{p} - 3^{-2}$ is the area of the real space unit cell of the honeycom b lattice, and the integral over k is perform ed over the entire B rilbuin zone. In the neighborhood of the impurity, spatial oscillations of the local density of states are induced. It is easier to extract inform ation about the quasiparticle characteristics from the Fourier transform of the LDOS:

$$(q;!) = i g(k;q;!);$$
 (9)

where $g(k;q;!) = \prod_{i=1,2} G_{ii}(k;k+q;!) G_{ii}(k+q;k;!)$, and G(k;k+q;!) is obtained by analytical continuation $i!_n ! ! + i$ from $G(k;k+q;i!_n)$. We obtain

v

$$(q; !) = 2 \frac{Z}{4^2 k}$$
 (10)

$$\sum_{i=1;2}^{n} \frac{T(!)}{[! i(k) + i][! i(k + q) + i]};$$

where T (!) = v=f1 va $R^{R} d^{2}k=(4^{2}) G_{0}^{11}(k;!+i) + G_{0}^{22}(k;!+i)]g$. Eq.(11) is analyzed num erically and the resulting LDOS is plotted in Fig. 4. For our num erical analysis we pick values of v = 2eV and = 0:02eV. A lso we perform our num erical integration on a 288 240 grid. We plot our results on a 144 120 grid. We have con rm ed that the results have converged in the sense that changing the size of the grid leads to no observable changes in the results.

At low energies, our analysis reveals that the dom inant features in the LDOS spectra are circular contours of radius 4!=3, centered about the corners and the center of the BZ. The shape of the contours changes with energy, and their size increases. At the energy != !_{VH} = 1eV, the spectral features change to hexagonal shaped contours centered about the center of the BZ.W ith increasing energy the contours become smaller and circular, and disappear for energies above != 3eV.

A few comments about our results are in order. We note that the intensity inside and outside the circles is not zero but $nite^3$, which, depending on the quasiparticle inverse lifetime , can blur the interiors of the circles, especially at low energies.

The topology of the contours is identical for negative and positive energies. However the weight, and in some cases the sign of the peaks relative to the background, as well as the average spectral intensities are di erent, in particular at low energies. The asymmetry of the FT-STS spectra with respect to energy is not a direct band structure e ect, since for graphite the band structure is particle-hole symmetric. It is an e ect of the impurity scattering. W e will discuss this asymmetry also in connection to the e ect of the impurity scattering on the average density of states in Fig. 3.

For positive energies, the results presented here do not depend sensitively on the strength of the impurity potential, v. W e have repeated our calculation for the FT-STS spectra for di erent values of v, including the lim it of in nite scattering strength (\unitarity lim it") and the changes are not qualitatively signi cant. However, at negative energies, our FT-STS pictures evolve with increasing v, and at large scattering strengths they become sim ilar to their positive energy counterparts.

Ferm i liquid theory is most robust at sm all probing energies, and at these energies we would expect the experimentally observed features to have the best agreement with the theory. As noted in Fig. 4, at sm all positive energies the amplitude of the LD OS oscillations due to the impurity scattering is lower than at high energies, which m ay make the experimental observation of these oscillationsmore di cult. However, the fractional amplitude of the LD OS oscillations at sm all negative energies is larger than at higher energies.

The Van-H ove singularities which appear at high energies, are a \big" feature, so survive in some form unless there is a very serious failure of the quasiparticle picture. However, it is still possible that a strongly energy dependent quasiparticle lifetim e could considerably mute the Van H ove singularities, while leaving the Ferm i liquid behavior intact at much lower energies.

We note that at low energy the position of the dots/circles is determ ined by sym metry, while at higher energies the shape and the position of the high intensity lines is sensitive to the assumed band structure. Another interesting point is that in a two dimensional system, the general structure of singularities is lines instead of points¹³. This yields lines of high intensity regions in the in FT-STS spectra due to quasiparticle interference, as opposed to points¹³.



FIG .3: The spatially averaged single particle density of states (!), in the presence of an impurity of strength a) v=2.5eV, and b) v=1.

A nother interesting aspect we analyzed is how the spatially averaged single particle density of states (!) = $_0$ (!) + 2c_{im p} (q = 0;!) changes with the scattering strength v. Here c_{im p} is the concentration of impurities. We assume that c_{im p} is small, so the e ects of the im – purities are uncorrelated. The resulting density of states depends on the value of the impurity potential. For com – parison, in Fig. 3, we give (!) for v = 2.5eV (a), and for v = 1 (b). We a the impurity concentration to c = 1%. As expected, in the unitarity limit the e ect of the im – purity is to create a sharp peak centered at zero energy. For smaller impurity potential, the e ect of the impurity is to create a smaller and broader peak at negative energy. O ne also notes the existence of a sharp anti-bound state at an energy larger than 3eV. The position of the anti-bound state m oves to larger and larger energies as one increases the scattering strength.

W e also perform ed an analytical calculation of the local density of states as a function of position at low energy, where we can approxim ate the spectrum by a linear (D irac) dispersion ! = v_F kj. We focused on the case of a single in purity scattering. For points far from the im purity we found the correction to the density of states due to im purity scattering to have the form :

$$(\mathbf{x}; !) = \frac{X^{n}}{\sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{A_{i}}{\mathbf{y}_{i}}} \cos \frac{2!}{v_{F}} \mathbf{\dot{y}}_{i} + \mathcal{Q}_{i} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{i}; \quad (11)$$

where $v_F = 3 = 2$ is the Ferm i velocity. Here m = 2 is the number of the independent inter-nodal scattering vectors (that cannot be obtained from other scattering vectors by translation by a reciprocal lattice vector or by re ection). We can take, for example, $Q_0 = (0;0)$, $Q_1 = 2 = 9(2 \ 3;0)$, $Q_2 = 2 = 9(\ 3;3)$. The coe cients A_i and i depend on energy and on the in purity characteristics. As expected, at large j_{ij} the density of states

- ¹ J. E. Homan, K. McElroy, D. H. Lee, K. M Lang, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, and J. C. Davis, Science 297, 1148 (2002).
- ² C.Howald, H.Eisaki, N.Kaneko, M.Greven, and A.Kapitulnik, Phys. Rev. B 67, 014533 (2003).
- ³ K.M cElroy, R.W. Simmonds, J.E.Homan, D.H.Lee, J. Orenstein, H.Eisaki, S.Uchida, J.C.Davis, Nature 422, 592 (2003)
- ⁴ A.Fang, C.Howald, N.Kaneko, M.Greven, and A.Kapitulnik, cond-m at/0404452.
- ⁵ M. Vershinin, S. Misra, S. Ono, Y. Abe, Y. Ando, and A. Yazdani, Science 303, 1995 (2004).
- ⁶ J.E.Homan, E.W. Hudson, K.M. Lang, V.M adhavan, H.Eisaki, S.Uchida, and J.C.Davis, Science 295, 466 (2002).
- ⁷ K.McEhroy, D.H.Lee, J.E.Homan, K.M Lang, E.W. Hudson, H.Eisaki, S.Uchida, J.Lee, and J.C.Davis, cond-m at/0404005.
- ⁸ J.Gonzales, F.Guinea, and M.A.H.Vozm ediano, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3589 (1996); J.Gonzales, F.Guinea, and M.A.H.Vozm ediano, Phys. Rev. B 59, R2474 (1999); S.

decays as $1=j_{x}j_{z}$ If one takes into account also the nite quasiparticle lifetime the above equation for the density of states changes to

$$(x;!)!$$
 $(x;!)e^{jxj}=v_{F};$ (12)

where = (!) is the quasiparticle lifetime. A measurement of the density of states as a function of position thus release the position of the nodes Q_i), the quasiparticle dispersion, v_F , and the energy dependence of the quasiparticle lifetime.

A cknow ledgm ents

W e would like to thank Hongwen Jiang and Jianping Hu for interesting discussions. C.B. has been supported by the NSF under G rant No. DMR-9985255, and also by funds from the Broida-Hirschfeller Foundation, the A.P. Sloan Foundation and the Packard Foundation. S.K. has been supported by the DOE under G rant No. DE-FG 03-00ER 45798.

Yu, J.Cao, C.C.M iller, D.A.M ontell, R.J.D.M iller, and Y.Gao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 483 (1996).

- ⁹ J.M. Byers, M. E. Flatte, and D. J. Scalapino, Phys.Rev. Lett. 71, 3363 (1993); M. I. Salkola, A. V. Balatsky, and D. J. Scalapino, Phys.Rev.Lett. 77, 1841 (1996); W. Ziegler, D. Poilblanc, R. Preuss, W. Hanke, and D. J. Scalapino, Phys.Rev.B 53, 8704 (1996); P. J. Hirschfeld, P. W ol e, and D. Einzel, Phys.Rev.B 37, 83 (1988); A. Polkovnikov, S. Sachdev, and M. Vojta, Phys.Rev.Lett. 86, 296 (2001); D. Podolsky, E. Dem ler, K. Dam le, and B. I. Halperin, Phys.Rev.B 67, 094514 (2003).
- ¹⁰ Q.H. W ang and D.H. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 67, 020511 (2003).
- ¹¹ C.Bena, S.Chakravarty, J.Hu, and C.Nayak, Phys.Rev. B 63, 134517 (2004); C.Bena, S.Chakravarty, J.Hu, and C.Nayak, cond-m at/0405468.
- ¹² P.R.W allace, Phys. Rev. 71, 622 (1947).
- ¹³ S.A.K ivelson, I.P.B indloss, E.Fradkin, V.O ganesyan, J. M.Tranquada, A.K apitulnik, and C.Howald, Rev.M od. Phys. 75, 1201 (2003).



FIG. 4: The FT-STS quasiparticle interference m aps in graphite in the presence of a single in purity. We plot (q; !) at the energies ! = 0.17, 0.4, 0.8, 1, 1.1, 2, 0.17, 0.8 and 1.1eV. The x and y axis of each plot are q_x and q_y , and we display our results for 1.15 q_x 1.15 and q_y . For clarity we draw the BZ in dashed lines. Note the change in the contours topology with increasing energy. The plots are drawn using a normalized linear gray scale, with white being the highest (1) intensity, and black being the low est (0) intensity, as indicated. The actual values of the FT-LDOS corresponding to the low est (0) and highest (1) intensity are diment for each energy, and we nd them to be (0.12, 1.73) for 0.17eV, (0.04, 2.16) for 0.4eV, (0.27, 3.6) for 0.8eV, (0.45, 14.3) for 1.9eV, (0.41, 3.96) for 1.1eV, (0.22, 6.45) for 2.0eV, (8.2, 3.26) for 0.17eV, (1.1, 4.07) for 0.8eV, and (0.29, 5.22) for 2.0eV in arbitrary units