

Effect of different site energies on polaronic properties

Jayita Chatterjee and A. N. Das
Theoretical Condensed Matter Physics Group
Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics
1/AF Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700064, India
(Dated: April 14, 2024)

Using the perturbation method based on a variational phonon basis obtained by the modified Lang-Firsov (M LF) transformation, the two-site single polaron Holstein model is studied in presence of a difference in bare site energies ($\epsilon_d = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1$). The polaronic ground-state wave function is calculated up to the fifth order of perturbation. The effect of ϵ_d (acts as a site-energy disorder) on the polaron crossover, polaronic kinetic energy, oscillator wavefunction and polaron localization are studied. Considering a double-exchange Holstein model with finite ϵ_d , role of disorder on the properties of the double-exchange system is also discussed.

PACS numbers: 71.38.+i, 63.20.kr

I. Introduction

Study of narrow band electronic systems with strong electron-phonon (e-ph) interaction has long been an active research area in condensed matter physics. The field has drawn renewed interest following evidence of polaronic charge carriers in underdoped high- T_c cuprates [1], manganites [2], and organic superconductors. The one-dimensional polaron problem is also relevant in semiconductor physics, quantum dots [3] and linear conjugated organic polymer conductors [4]. The simplest model for studying polarons is the Holstein model [5] where an electron in a narrow band interacts locally with optical phonons. For large e-ph coupling the polaron is a small polaron with high effective mass, while for small coupling it becomes a large polaron having a much lower effective mass for a finite adiabatic parameter. The crossover from a large to a small polaron and the corresponding change in the polaronic properties in the ground state have been studied for the Holstein model by different groups [6, 7, 8, 9] using various methods enlightening our understanding in this field. However studies on the nature and properties of polarons in presence of disorder are few and need much more attention. The imperfections or disorder may play an important role in complex materials (high- T_c oxides, manganites etc.) where signatures for polaronic carriers are found. Recently the small polaron concept has been used to explain the charge motion in DNA where the electronic band is very narrow and the presence of different kind of molecular units induces large disorder potential [10].

In absence of any disorder, translational symmetry ensures that the polaronic ground state is delocalized however large is the e-ph coupling strength provided other parameters (electronic hopping, phonon frequency) are finite. The large to small polaron crossover is a continuous one [8], which is consistent with the ground state

properties being analytic functions of e-ph coupling [11]. Localization requires a breakdown of the translational invariance which may be achieved through randomness of the site potential or hopping. The effect of site diagonal disorder on polaronic properties has been addressed by some authors. Shinozuka and Toyozawa [12] studied disorder induced self-trapping in a tight binding model in which the local site energies are randomly distributed between two values and found that the exciton-lattice interaction acts with the disorder to produce severe localization associated with a self-trapped exciton. In his study the lattice vibration was treated as classical oscillators. Bronold et al [13] studied similar model but with an infinite coordination number within the dynamical coherent potential approximation. However the limitation of the coherent potential approximation is that it cannot fully distinguish between localized and itinerant states. Bronold and Fehske [14] improved the method to overcome the above shortcoming. They followed statistical dynamical mean field theory to predict localization of small polarons by extremely small disorder. However a proper study of the effect of disorder on the polaron crossover is not made in any of the above investigations. In the present work we consider a two-site cluster with different site energies. This is the minimal system to study the competition of the inter-site electronic hopping with the localization induced by the combined effect of the e-ph coupling and the site energy disorder. Difference in site energies would remove the two-fold degeneracy of the system in the absence of hopping and would tend to localize the electron in the lower potential site. For convenience we will refer to the difference in site energies as disorder strength because it partly mimics the role of disorder in larger systems. Another aspect of choosing a two-site Holstein model is that almost exact results may be obtained for such a system with the perturbation method [15] using a modified Lang-Firsov (M LF) basis [16]. For the Holstein model the interaction is very short-ranged and the essential physics relating polaronic behavior for a larger system is similar to that in a two-site system. In studying a Hubbard-Holstein model

similar conclusion has been reached in Ref. [17]. The relevance of studying a two-site system in the context of Holstein and Holstein-double exchange models has been discussed in details in Ref. [18].

In Sec. II we discuss the formalism and perturbation calculations. In Sec. III we present the results obtained by MLF method and discuss the role of the disorder strength on the polaron crossover and the kinetic energy of the system. The localization of the polaron and ground state polaronic wavefunction will also be discussed. Extension of this model to the double-exchange model is included in Sec. IV. Finally, a summary of the results are presented in Sec. V.

II. Formalism

The two-site single-polaron Hamiltonian is

$$H = \epsilon_1 n_1 + \epsilon_2 n_2 + \sum_i t (c_1^\dagger c_2 + c_2^\dagger c_1) + g \sum_i n_i (b_i + b_i^\dagger) + \sum_i \omega b_i^\dagger b_i \quad (1)$$

where $i=1$ or 2 , denotes the site. ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 are the bare site-energies at site 1 and 2, respectively. c_i (c_i^\dagger) is the annihilation (creation) operator for the electron with spin at site i and n_i ($= c_i^\dagger c_i$) is the corresponding number operator, g denotes the on-site e-ph coupling strength, t is the usual hopping integral. b_i and b_i^\dagger are the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, for the phonons corresponding to interatomic vibrations at site i and ω is the phonon frequency. This Hamiltonian has spin degeneracy for the one electron case so the spin index is redundant.

Introducing new phonon operators $a = (b_1 + b_2)/\sqrt{2}$ and $d = (b_1 - b_2)/\sqrt{2}$, the Hamiltonian is separated into two parts ($H = H_d + H_a$):

$$H_d = \epsilon_1 n_1 + \epsilon_2 n_2 + \sum_i t (c_1^\dagger c_2 + c_2^\dagger c_1) + \omega \sum_i n_i (d + d^\dagger) + \omega d^\dagger d \quad (2)$$

$$\text{and } H_a = \omega a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2} g_+^2 \quad (3)$$

where $g_+ = g/\sqrt{2}$, $a = a + ng_+$. The a -oscillator couples only with the total number of electrons $n (= n_1 + n_2)$, which is a constant of motion. Consequently H_a describes just a shifted oscillator, while H_d represents an effective e-ph system where phonons couple with the electronic degrees of freedom. For a perturbation method it is desirable to use a basis where the major part of the Hamiltonian becomes diagonal. When the hopping (t) is appreciable compared to the polaron energy (g^2), a retardation between the electron and associated lattice distortion sets in. The retardation is important for low and intermediate values of g ; it produces a spread in the polaron size, the resultant polaron is a large one. In Ref.

[15] we have shown that the MLF perturbation method works much better than the Lang-Firsov (LF) method for a large region of parameter space where the retardation is important. In the strong-coupling limit the MLF method reduces to the LF method and it works well there. We use the MLF transformation where the lattice deformations produced by the electron are treated as variational parameters [16, 19]. For the present system, $H_d = e^R H_d e^{-R}$ where $R = \sum_i (n_1 - n_2) (d^\dagger - d)$ and is a variational parameter describing the displacement of the oscillator.

The transformed Hamiltonian is then obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_d = & \omega d^\dagger d + (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) n_1 + (\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1) n_2 \\ & + t [c_1^\dagger c_2 \exp(2(d^\dagger - d)) \\ & + c_2^\dagger c_1 \exp(-2(d^\dagger - d))] \\ & + \omega (g_+^2) (n_1 - n_2) (d + d^\dagger) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon_p = \omega (2g_+^2)$:

For the single polaron problem we choose the basis set,

$$\begin{aligned} |j; N, i\rangle &= (a_1 c_1^\dagger + a_2 c_2^\dagger) \mathcal{J}_i |e\rangle \mathcal{J}_N |i_{ph}\rangle \\ |j; N, i\rangle &= (a_2 c_1^\dagger - a_1 c_2^\dagger) \mathcal{J}_i |e\rangle \mathcal{J}_N |i_{ph}\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $|j, i\rangle$ and $|j, i\rangle$ denote the electronic states and $\mathcal{J}_N |i\rangle$ denotes the N th excited oscillator state in the MLF phonon basis. The normalization condition requires $a_1^2 + a_2^2 = 1$. The unperturbed part of the Hamiltonian is chosen as

$$H_0 = \omega d^\dagger d + (\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) n_1 + (\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1) n_2 + t_e (c_1^\dagger c_2 + c_2^\dagger c_1) \quad (6)$$

where $t_e = t \exp(-2\epsilon_+)$. The remaining part $H_1 = (\tilde{H}_d - H_0)$ is treated as a perturbation. The states $|j; N, i\rangle$ are the eigenstates of the unperturbed Hamiltonian (H_0) for $r = a_1 = a_2 = [d + \frac{1}{d^2 + 4t_e^2}] = 2t_e$ where $d = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1$. The corresponding eigen energies are given by

$$E_{j,N}^{(0)} = N\omega + \frac{(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{t_e^2}{(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)^2 + 4t_e^2} \quad (7)$$

The state $|j; 0, i\rangle$ has the lowest unperturbed energy, $E_0^{(0)} = \epsilon_1 + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{t_e^2}{d^2 + 4t_e^2}$.

The general off-diagonal matrix elements between the states $|j; N, i\rangle$ and $|j; M, i\rangle$ are calculated for $(N - M) > 0$ as follow:

for even $(N - M)$,

$$\langle N; j, i | H_1 | j; M, i \rangle = t_e \frac{2r}{(1 + r^2)} \quad (8)$$

$$\langle N; j, i | H_1 | j; M, i \rangle = t_e \frac{(1 - r^2)}{(1 + r^2)} \quad (9)$$

for odd $(N - M)$,

$$\langle N; j, i | H_1 | j; M, i \rangle = \frac{1}{N!} (g_+^2) \frac{(1 - r^2)}{(1 + r^2)} N^{M+1} \quad (10)$$

$$\langle N; j_1 j_2; M | i \rangle = \frac{1}{N!} (g_+)^N \frac{2r}{(1+r^2)^{N+1}} \quad (11)$$

It may be noted that for the ordered case ($d=0$, hence $r=1$) the off-diagonal matrix elements $\langle N; j_1 j_2; M | i \rangle$ are nonzero only for even $(N-M)$ while $\langle N; j_1 j_2; M | i \rangle$ are nonzero only for odd $(N-M)$.

Now one has to make a choice of ϕ so that the perturbation corrections are small and perturbative expansion becomes convergent. Here we will follow the procedure of our previous work [15] to find out the variational phonon basis as a function of e-ph coupling. Minimizing the unperturbed ground state energy $E_0^{(0)}$ with respect to ϕ we obtain

$$\phi = \frac{!g_+}{! + \frac{4t_0^2}{d^2 + 4t_0^2}} \quad (12)$$

The perturbation corrections of different orders to the ground-state energy and the wavefunction may be calculated using the general off-diagonal matrix elements in Eqs.(8-11). The ground-state wave function in the M LF basis may be written as,

$$| \mathcal{G} \rangle = \frac{1}{N_G} \left[4 | j_1 j_2; 0 \rangle + \sum_{N=1,2,\dots} c_N^+ | j_1 j_2; N \rangle + \sum_{N=1,2,\dots} c_N | j_1 j_2; N \rangle \right] \quad (13)$$

The coefficients c_N are obtained in terms of the off-diagonal matrix elements and unperturbed energies and N_G is the normalization factor.

The correlation functions involving the charge and the lattice deformations $\langle n_1 u_1 i_0 \rangle$ and $\langle n_1 u_2 i_0 \rangle$, where u_1 and u_2 are the lattice deformations at sites 1 and 2 respectively, produced by an electron at site 1, are the standard measure of polaronic character and indicate the strength of polaron induced lattice deformations and their spread. Following Ref.[15], the correlation functions may be written as

$$\langle n_1 u_1 i \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (g_+ + \phi) \frac{B_0}{N_G} + \frac{A_0}{N_G} \quad (14)$$

$$\langle n_1 u_2 i \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (g_+ - \phi) \frac{B_0}{N_G} + \frac{A_0}{N_G} \quad (15)$$

$$\text{where } A_0 = \langle \mathcal{G} | j_1 (d + d^\dagger) | \mathcal{G} \rangle = \frac{2}{(1+r^2)} (rc_1 + r^2 c_1^+)$$

$$+ \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{N+1} \frac{r^2}{(1+r^2)} c_N^+ c_{N+1}^+$$

$$+ r(c_N c_{N+1}^+ + c_N^+ c_{N+1}) + c_N c_{N+1}$$

$$\text{and } B_0 = \langle \mathcal{G} | j_1 | \mathcal{G} \rangle = \frac{r^2}{(1+r^2)} + \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+r^2)} \frac{2rc_N c_N^+ + r^2 j_N^+ j_N + j_N j_N^+}{(1+r^2)}$$

The static correlation functions in Eqs. (14) and (15) are calculated for different d to examine the role of the disorder on the polaron crossover.

The kinetic energy of the system in the ground state is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{K,E} &= \langle \mathcal{G} | H_t | \mathcal{G} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{N_G} \left[4 \langle j_1 j_2; 0 | H_t | j_1 j_2; 0 \rangle + \sum_{N \neq 0} \langle j_1 j_2; N | H_t | j_1 j_2; N \rangle + \sum_{N \neq 0} \langle j_1 j_2; N | H_t | j_1 j_2; N \rangle \right] \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

where $H_t = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_k c_k^\dagger c_k \exp(2i\phi(d^\dagger - d)) + c_1^\dagger c_1 \exp(-2i\phi(d^\dagger - d))$ is the kinetic energy operator in the M LF basis. The occupation number $n(k)$ of the charge carrier for the ground state within M LF method is also calculated as

$$n_0 = \frac{1}{2} (c_1^\dagger - c_2^\dagger) (c_1 - c_2) \quad (17)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{G} | j_0 | \mathcal{G} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \frac{E_{K,E}}{t} \right] \quad (18)$$

where j_0 denotes the values of the wave vector k . Therefore, it basically reflects the nature of the kinetic energy.

The ground-state wave function for the d-oscillator is obtained from Eq. (13) by using the wavefunction for the N -th excited (M LF-displaced) harmonic oscillator for $| j_1 j_2; N \rangle$.

$$n(x) = \langle \mathcal{G} | j_1 | \mathcal{G} \rangle = \frac{1}{1+4} \frac{1}{2^n n!} e^{-(x-x_0)^2/2} H_n(x-x_0) \quad (19)$$

where $H_n(x)$ is the Hermite polynomial of degree n and x_0 is the displacement of the oscillator due to the M LF transformation.

To study the localization effect due to disorder in site energy we calculate $\langle j_1 | \mathcal{G} | \mathcal{G} \rangle$ and $\langle j_2 | \mathcal{G} | \mathcal{G} \rangle$. These are the probabilities that the polaron in the ground state ($| \mathcal{G} \rangle$) lies at site 1 and site 2, respectively.

$$\langle j_1 | \mathcal{G} | \mathcal{G} \rangle = \frac{1}{N_G} \left[4 \langle j_1 | j_1 | j_1 j_2; 0 \rangle + \sum_{N \neq 0} \langle j_1 | j_1 | j_1 j_2; N \rangle + \sum_{N \neq 0} \langle j_1 | j_1 | j_1 j_2; N \rangle \right] \quad (20)$$

$$\langle j_2 | \mathcal{G} | \mathcal{G} \rangle = \frac{1}{N_G} \left[4 \langle j_2 | j_2 | j_1 j_2; 0 \rangle + \sum_{N \neq 0} \langle j_2 | j_2 | j_1 j_2; N \rangle + \sum_{N \neq 0} \langle j_2 | j_2 | j_1 j_2; N \rangle \right] \quad (21)$$

III. Results and discussions

In this paper all the results are derived by calculating the ground-state wavefunction up to the fifth order of perturbation. For the ordered case a comparison of our M LF-perturbation results [15] with the exact results by Rongsheng et al [20] shows that the M LF method up to the fifth order gives exact results for $t = 0.5$ (in a scale




FIG. 1: Plot of the correlation function $-\langle n_1 u_2 \rangle / \langle n_1 \rangle$ versus g_+ for $t = 0.5$ for different values of ϵ_d . Inset: on-site correlation function $-\langle n_1 u_1 \rangle / \langle n_1 \rangle$.

where $t = 1$) whereas for higher values of t ($t = 1.1$ and 2.1) very accurate results are produced by the M LF perturbation method for both strong and weak coupling regions. However in a narrow region of intermediate coupling the perturbation results for high values of t deviate from the exact results. In this paper we present the results mainly for the nonadiabatic regime ($t = 0.5$) for which the convergence of the M LF-perturbation series for both ordered and disordered cases is found to be very good in the entire region of the e-ph coupling strength. For the ordered case, the convergence in energy and correlation functions has already been reported in Ref.[15] and that for the wave function in Ref.[21].

In Fig. 1 we plot the variation of the correlation functions $-\langle n_1 u_1 \rangle$ and $-\langle n_1 u_2 \rangle$ with g_+ for $t = 0.5$ and for different values of the disorder strength ϵ_d . For intermediate coupling $-\langle n_1 u_2 \rangle$ has appreciable values and $-\langle n_1 u_1 \rangle / \langle n_1 \rangle$ (shown in inset) deviates downwards from its small polaronic LF value of $2g_+$. These are the signatures of retardation and directly show the spread up of the polaron. With increasing ϵ_d the value of $-\langle n_1 u_2 \rangle$ decreases and $-\langle n_1 u_1 \rangle$ shows less deviation from its LF value. This points to a reduced retardation effect with increasing disorder strength.

The polaron crossover from a large to a small polaron may be studied by the correlation function $-\langle n_1 (u_1 - u_2) \rangle / 2g_+ \langle n_1 \rangle$. In the small polaron limit the retardation effect is negligible and it gets its standard LF value ($= 1$). For a larger size polaron the value of $-\langle n_1 (u_1 - u_2) \rangle / 2g_+ \langle n_1 \rangle$ is lower. In Fig. 2(a) we plot $-\langle n_1 (u_1 - u_2) \rangle / 2g_+ \langle n_1 \rangle$ as a function of e-ph coupling strength. It is seen that the size of the polaron becomes more localized with increasing disorder strength. The polaron crossover is continuous, but a change in the curvature of $-\langle n_1 (u_1 - u_2) \rangle / 2g_+ \langle n_1 \rangle$ vs. g_+ plot is observed at a point in the crossover region. This point (in g_+ space) where the curvature in $-\langle n_1 (u_1 - u_2) \rangle / 2g_+ \langle n_1 \rangle$ vs. g_+ plot changes may be taken as the crossover point. The crossover point shifts to lower value




FIG. 2: (a) The variations of $-\langle n_1 (u_1 - u_2) \rangle / 2g_+ \langle n_1 \rangle$ with g_+ for different values of ϵ_d for $t = 0.5$. (b) The variation of the kinetic energy $E_{K.E}$ with g_+ for $t = 0.5$ and $\epsilon_d = 0, 0.5$ and 1.0 . (c) Different parts of the kinetic energy (see the three terms in Eq (16) referred as $K.E(1)$, $K.E(2)$ and $K.E(3)$, respectively) vs. g_+ for different ϵ_d .

of g_+ as ϵ_d increases. Thus the disorder favors formation of small polarons. In Fig. 2(b) we plot the kinetic energy of the polaron as a function of g_+ . The kinetic energy is suppressed in presence of disorder in the range from low to intermediate values of g_+ . But disorder has no significant effect on the kinetic energy for strong coupling where the polarons are small. The kinetic energy in Eq. (16) has three terms. The first term is the contribution to the kinetic energy from the unperturbed ground state which is significant for low to intermediate couplings. The second term is the contribution from the matrix elements of H_t connecting the unperturbed ground state to higher phonon states. The third term is due to the hybridization of higher phonon states through H_t . We plot these contributions separately as a function of g_+ in Fig. 2(c) for $\epsilon_d = 0$ and 0.5 . It is found that the first contribution, which is dominant in the range from low to intermediate couplings and proportional to the product of the coefficients




FIG. 3: The wave vector dependence of the occupation number $n(k=0; \pi)$ of the charge carrier for the ground state with e-ph coupling within MLF method for $\epsilon_d=0$ and 0.5. Exact results (for $\epsilon_d=0$) from Ref. [22] is also plotted for comparison.

coefficients a_1 and a_2 (see Eq.(16)), is suppressed substantially with increasing disorder strength. For strong-coupling regime the contribution to the kinetic energy comes only from the second term of Eq.(16) and that one is not affected by disorder in this region. It may be mentioned that contribution from the third term is too small to show up in the figure for the range of our study.

In Fig. 3, we have plotted the occupation number $n(k)$ of the polaron for the ground state with e-ph coupling. The difference between $n(k=0)$ and $n(k=\pi)$ depends directly on the delocalization of the polaron (see Eq.(18)). In absence of hopping this difference vanishes. With increasing e-ph coupling the difference between $n(k)$ reduces as the kinetic energy is more and more suppressed. For the disordered case and in the range from weak to intermediate coupling, the difference in occupations reduces further owing to disorder-induced suppression of the kinetic energy. In the strong-coupling regime, $n(k)$ does not show any change with ϵ_d because the kinetic energy is almost independent of ϵ_d in this region. The exact results for the occupation number [22] for the ordered case ($\epsilon_d=0$) are also shown in Fig. 3 for comparison with our MLF results.

In Figs. 4(a-d) we have shown the ground-state wave functions of the oscillator for different values of e-ph coupling for both the ordered and disordered cases considering that the electron is located at site 1. The results for the ordered case have been discussed in previous works [15, 20, 22]. The main changes, which are observed for the disordered case ($\epsilon_d=1.0$) in the adiabatic regime, are as follow :

(i) for weak coupling ($g_+=0.4$) the wave function, which shows displaced Gaussian-like single peak, is slightly more shifted; (ii) for intermediate coupling ($g_+=1.3$),




FIG. 4: Oscillator wave function (not normalized) vs. x with $t=0.5$ for $\epsilon_d=0$ and 1.0 for (a) $g_+=0.4$, (b) $g_+=1.0$, (c) $g_+=1.3$ and (d) $g_+=2.0$. (e) The coefficients c_N^e (see Eq.(13)) of the ground state wave function with phonon number N for $t=0.5$ and $g_+=2$ for $\epsilon_d=0$ and 1.0. Solid curve gives the value of c_N for odd N and c_N^+ for even N for the ordered case. For disordered case the thick dashed curve shows c_N^+ and the thin dashed curve shows c_N^- . (f) Magnitude of the coefficients ($|c_N^e|$) are shown for the same case as (e).

the additional shoulder, which appears (at the right side of the main peak) for the ordered case, is absent in presence of disorder; (iii) for strong coupling ($g_+=2.0$) though the wavefunction around the main peak is identical for both cases, the additional small broad peak, observed for the ordered case, is not found for the disordered case. The first feature indicates that the on-site polaronic deformation is larger for the disordered case; while the second feature may be due to the reduced retardation effect. The third feature, i.e., disappearance of the additional broad peak for the disordered case, has a contradiction with the behavior of the kinetic energy. Both this broad additional peak and the kinetic energy in the strong-coupling regime are determined by the coefficients c_N in Eq.(13). A logical question then arises why




FIG. 5: Plots of $|e\langle 1|G\rangle|^2$ and $|e\langle 2|G\rangle|^2$ versus g_+ for $t = 0.5$. $|e\langle 1|G\rangle|^2$ and $|e\langle 2|G\rangle|^2$ are the probabilities of site 1 and site 2 being occupied by the electron, respectively. (a) The solid line is for the ordered case ($\epsilon_d = 0$) where both occupancy are same, thick dashed line for $\epsilon_d = 0.1$ and thin dashed line for $\epsilon_d = 0.5$. (b) The same curves for $\epsilon_d = 0.001$. Polaron crossover (χ) is also shown. (c) Plots of χ and $|e\langle 1|G\rangle|^2$ for different values of t . χ is denoted by different symbols and $|e\langle 1|G\rangle|^2$ by broken line.

the broad peak in the oscillator wave function is modified by disorder while the kinetic energy in that region is unaffected. In Fig. 4(e) we plot c_N^e versus N for $g_+ = 2.0$ for both ordered and disordered cases. For the ordered case c_N^e is nonzero for odd N , while c_N^+ is nonzero for even N . For the disordered case both the coefficients c_N^e and c_N^+ are nonzero for any N . For strong coupling, the reduced polaronic hopping makes the value of r (see the expression of r after Eq.(6)) very large in case of disorder. As a consequence we find that c_N^+ takes negligible value except for $N = 1$, while c_N^e is appreciable for both odd and even N . c_N^e changes sign alternately with N . However, the magnitude of the coefficients ($|c_N^e|$) for any N do not change much with disorder strength in the strong-coupling regime (shown in Fig. 4(f)). In this regime we

observe that the kinetic energy essentially depends on the magnitude of c_N^e rather than on its sign, hence it remains almost unaffected by disorder. However, the oscillator wavefunction which is given by $\sum_N c_N^e c_N^+ |N\rangle_{ph}$, depends also on the sign of c_N^e and is affected by disorder.

In Fig. 5 we plot $|e\langle 1|G\rangle|^2$ and $|e\langle 2|G\rangle|^2$, which give the probabilities that the polaronic charge carrier in the ground state ($|G\rangle$) lies at site 1 and site 2, respectively. For the ordered case these probabilities are same ($= 0.5$) for any value of the coupling. With increasing disorder strength these probabilities differ from 0.5; the site with lower site-energy has higher probability of being occupied than the other. This difference in the occupancy increases rapidly during polaron crossover as a consequence of rapid suppression of the polaronic hopping (t_e) with increasing g_+ in the crossover region. For strong-coupling regime $|e\langle 1|G\rangle|^2$ becomes almost 1 while $|e\langle 2|G\rangle|^2$ approaches to zero showing localization of the polaron at site 1. This localization as well as the correlation function are shown in Fig. 5(a) and 5(b) for $\epsilon_d = 0.5, 0.1$ and 0.001 to show that the polaronic crossover precedes the localization for $t = 0.5$. In Fig. 5(c) similar plots are presented for different values of $t = 1.5$ and $\epsilon_d = 0.5$. With increasing t the polaron crossover and the localization occur at higher values of e-ph coupling as expected. However, the localization is abrupt but continuous for larger values of t while the polaron crossover is still very smooth for $t = 1.5$.

It may be mentioned that when $t = 1.2$ and $\epsilon_d = 0.5$ we find that the polaron crossover and the localization occur almost simultaneously. However, for such large values of our perturbation method does not converge properly in a small range around intermediate coupling where polaron crossover takes place.

In Fig. 6 we plot χ and $|e\langle 1|G\rangle|^2$ as a function of disorder strength for different values of e-ph coupling with $t = 0.5$. For very weak coupling ($g_+ = 0.1$) the polaron crossover is induced by disorder potential and is very smooth. Here the localization and the polaron crossover occur almost simultaneously but none of them is complete even at $\epsilon_d = 2$. For $g_+ = 0.4$, which is also in the weak coupling range, the localization follows the polaron crossover and a large value of disorder strength is required for localization. For intermediate coupling ($g_+ = 1$) the localization takes place in the small polaron region and 95% of the localization is achieved within $\epsilon_d = 1$. For higher values of coupling the polaron would be a small polaron even in absence of disorder and localization would occur for a small value of disorder strength. Our study points out that when the e-ph coupling is in the intermediate range, localization may be achieved with a disorder strength of the order of half (electronic) bandwidth of the system; this has also been pointed out in Ref.[23] in the context of manganites. For small e-ph coupling, disorder strength larger than the bandwidth is required for localization.

IV. Two-site Holstein model with double




FIG. 6: Plots of $|\langle S_1 S_2 \rangle|$ and $|\langle G \rangle|^2$ versus ϵ_d for different values of g_+ with $t=1=0.5$. $|\langle S_1 S_2 \rangle|$ is denoted by different symbols and $|\langle G \rangle|^2$ by broken line.

exchange: effect of disorder

The relevant Hamiltonian for studying a two-site double exchange Holstein model in presence of antiferromagnetic interaction between core spins is given by [18, 24]

$$H = \sum_i n_{1i} + \sum_i n_{2i} - t \cos(\theta/2) \sum_i (c_{1i}^\dagger c_{2i} + c_{2i}^\dagger c_{1i}) + g \sum_i n_{1i} (b_{1i} + b_{1i}^\dagger) + \sum_i n_{2i} (b_{2i} + b_{2i}^\dagger) + JS_1 S_2 \quad (22)$$

where S_1, S_2 represent the local core spins (for manganites it is the spin of t_{2g} electrons) at sites 1 and 2, respectively and θ is the angle between them. J is the superexchange antiferromagnetic interaction between the neighbouring core spins S . The transfer hopping integral (t) of the itinerant electron is modified to $t \cos(\theta/2)$ because of the double exchange process which originates from strong Hund's coupling between the spins of the core electrons and itinerant electron [25]. Here we would treat the core spins classically. For manganites the core spins have $S = 3/2$. However, for small values of J/t , the qualitative behavior of the phase diagram of the two-site Holstein-double exchange model does not depend on the value of the spin or hopping as observed in Ref. [18]. Furthermore, D. M. Edwards and his group [23] pointed out that for such models the resistivity and transition temperature T_c do not vary much with S , so that classical spin is a convenient approximation to $S = 3/2$ spins. Considering the out-of-phase phonon mode which only couples with the electronic degrees of freedom and treating the spin classically, we obtain the M L F transformed Hamiltonian [24] as

$$H_d = \sum_h d^\dagger d + \sum_i (n_{1i} + n_{2i}) \cos(\theta/2) + \sum_i c_{1i}^\dagger c_{2i} \exp(2i(\theta/2)) + c_{2i}^\dagger c_{1i} \exp(-2i(\theta/2))$$

$$+ \sum_i (g_+ n_{1i} + g_- n_{2i}) (d + d^\dagger) + JS^2 \cos \theta \quad (23)$$

In our previous work [24] we studied the above Hamiltonian for a single polaron as a function of e-ph coupling for the ordered case ($\theta = 0$) using perturbation theory with the variational M L F basis. We found that the nature of the ferromagnetic (FM) to antiferromagnetic (AFM) transition as well as that of the polaronic state depends on the relative values of J and t . For small values of $JS^2=t$ the magnetic transition does not coincide with the polaronic crossover and a FM small polaronic state exists between a large polaronic FM state and extremely small polaronic AFM state. Similar phase diagrams have also been observed for both adiabatic and antiadiabatic limits in Ref. [18] for small values of $JS^2=t$. Here we will examine the effect of site-energy disorder on such polaronic state and crossover. We have followed the procedure of our previous work [24] to find out the ground state properties of the double exchange Holstein model with site disorder.

In manganites the ratio of the site energy disorder potential to the half band-width, when calcium is doped in LaMnO_3 , is about 0.4 [23]. The value of the disorder strength used in the present work is of that order. It may be mentioned that previous studies [26] with a double exchange model have shown that the metal-insulator (MI) transition due to off-diagonal disorder (associated with random spins in the paramagnetic phase) requires also a large diagonal disorder strength. This led to the conclusion that disorder cannot alone account for the MI transition in manganites and an e-ph coupling of intermediate range is needed for this purpose [23].

In Fig. 7(a) and 7(b) we plot the angle (θ) between the core spins, the correlation function $\langle n_1(u_1) n_2(u_2) \rangle = 2g_+ n_1$ and the kinetic energy ($E_{K,E}$) as a function of g_+ to show the FM-AFM transition, polaron crossover and the polaron-delocalization energy for both the ordered and disordered cases. In presence of disorder, the FM-AFM magnetic transition and polaron crossover occur at lower values of g_+ . The reason behind this behavior is that disorder effectively reduces the hopping, hence favors formation of small polaron and the AFM phase. In the AFM phase, the polarons are small polarons with almost vanishing kinetic energy. However, the FM phase may have a large polaron character or a small polaron character depending on values of g_+ . For low values of t ($= 0.7$), it is difficult to distinguish between the regions of FM large polaron and FM small polaron since the change in θ is small and the curves for both θ and $E_{K,E}$ are very smooth for disordered case. In Fig. 7(b) we consider a higher value of t ($= 1.5$) with $JS^2=t = 0.05$ as relevant for manganite systems [27]. Here a crossover from the FM large polaronic state to a FM small polaronic state with reduced kinetic energy is seen for the disordered case, before the transition to the AFM state. So the site disorder does not make any drastic change to the qualitative features of the ground-state properties of the double-exchange Holstein model but smoothen the po-




FIG. 7: Variation of χ , $\theta = \langle n_1(u_1 - u_2) \rangle = 2g_+ \ln 11$ and $E_{K,E}$ with g_+ for $\epsilon_d = 0$ and 0.5 in absence of magnetic field for (a) $t = 0.7$ and $JS^2 = 0.05$, and for (b) $t = 1.5$ and $JS^2 = 0.075$. (c) The magnetoresistance $MR = (E_{K,E}(h) - E_{K,E}(0))/h$ as a function of g_+ for $t = 1.5$, $JS^2 = 0.075$ and $h = 0.04$, h represents the applied magnetic field.

laron crossover. In Fig. 7 (c) we plot the change in $E_{K,E}$ due to the magnetic field (h) as a function of g_+ . This quantity may be related to the magnetoresistance for a system in the thermodynamic limit as pointed out in Ref. [24]. In general, the $E_{K,E}$ is a measure of delocalization of the polarons and its change with the magnetic field

gives field-induced delocalization of the polaronic charge carriers. In Ref. [24] we reported for the ordered case that for $JS^2/t = 0.05$ the change in $E_{K,E}$ due to the field has a broad peak around the FM-AFM transition. We find that disorder makes the peak more broader but the value of the change in $E_{K,E}$ remains almost the same. We believe that the magneto-resistance of similar model system in the thermodynamic limit would show similar qualitative features. We do not present here the results for larger values of JS^2/t where the magnetic transition coincides with the polaron crossover and the change in the $E_{K,E}$ shows a sharp peak at the FM-AFM transition [24] as we find that the site disorder does not change that behavior.

V. Conclusions

To summarize, we have presented the results on the two-site single polaron Holstein model in presence of a site energy disorder ϵ_d which appears as a difference in site energies. With increasing ϵ_d the retardation between the electron and associated deformation becomes weaker and the polaron crossover occurs at lower values of e-ph coupling. The polaronic kinetic energy is suppressed appreciably with disorder in the range from weak to intermediate couplings. But in the strong-coupling region where the hopping through multi-phonon process is dominant, kinetic energy is almost independent of ϵ_d . For the oscillator wavefunction, a broad peak in strong-coupling region is observed for the ordered case ($\epsilon_d = 0$) in addition to the main peak. In presence of disorder ($\epsilon_d = 1.0$), this feature disappears. We find that even a small disorder ($\epsilon_d = 0.001$) can localize the electron in presence of e-ph coupling. The polaron crossover precedes the localization in the non-adiabatic regime for low to intermediate values of disorder ($\epsilon_d \sim t$).

For the double exchange Holstein model both the magnetic transition and polaron crossover shift toward lower values of e-ph coupling with increasing disorder strength. The qualitative features of the ground-state phase diagram does not change much with disorder. The magnetoresistance for the model shows up in a broader region of parameter space in presence of disorder.

- [1] J.P.Falk, A.Levy, M.A.Kastner, and R.J.Birgeneau, Phys.Rev.B 48, 4043 (1993); Xiangxi Bian and Peter C. Ekland, Phys.Rev.Lett. 70, 2625 (1993).
- [2] G.Zhao, K.Conder, H.Keller and K.A.Muller, Nature 381, 676 (1996); G.Zhao, M.B.Hunt, H.Keller and K.A.Muller, ibid 385, 236 (1997).
- [3] Y.Lepine and G.Bruneau, J.Phys.: Condens.Matter 10, 1495 (1998).
- [4] W.P.Su, J.R.Schrieffer and A.J.Heeger, Phys.Rev.

- Lett. 42, 1698 (1979).
- [5] T.Holstein, Ann.Phys.(NY) 8, 325 (1959).
- [6] E.Jeckelmann and S.R.White, Phys.Rev.B 57, 6376 (1998).
- [7] A.H.Romero, D.W.Brown, and K.Lindenberg, Phys.Rev.B 59, 13728 (1999).
- [8] J.Bonca, S.A.Trugman and I.Batistic, Phys.Rev.B 60, 1633 (1999).
- [9] O.S.Barisic, Phys.Rev.B 65, 144301 (2002).

- [10] R.G. Endres, D.L. Cox and R.R.P. Singh, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 195 (2004).
- [11] H. Lowen, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 8661 (1988).
- [12] Y. Shinozuka and Y. Toyozawa, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **46**, 505 (1979).
- [13] F.X. Bronold, A. Saxena and A.R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 235109 (2001).
- [14] F.X. Bronold and H. Fehske, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 073102 (2002).
- [15] A.N. Das and Jayita Chatterjee, *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. B*, **13**, 3903 (1999); J. Chatterjee and A.N. Das, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 4592 (2000).
- [16] A.N. Das and S. Sil, *Physica C* **207**, 51 (1993); *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **5**, 1 (1993); M. Zoli and A.N. Das, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **16**, 3597 (2004).
- [17] Y. Takada and A. Chatterjee, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 081102 (2003).
- [18] M. Capone and S. Ciuchi, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 104409 (2002).
- [19] A.N. Das and P. Choudhury, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 13219 (1994).
- [20] Han Rongsheng, Lin Zijiang and Wang Kelin, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 174303 (2002).
- [21] A.N. Das, Jayita Chatterjee and M. Mitra, *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. B*, **15**, 2647 (2001).
- [22] E.V.L. de Melo and J. Ranninger, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 14872 (1997).
- [23] D.M. Edwards, *Adv. in Phys.* **51**, 1259 (2002) and references therein.
- [24] J. Chatterjee, M. Mitra and A.N. Das, *Euro. Phys. Jour. B* **18**, 573 (2000).
- [25] P.W. Anderson and H. Hasegawa, *Phys. Rev.*, **100**, 675 (1955); P.G. de Gennes, *Phys. Rev.* **118**, 141 (1960).
- [26] Q. Li, J. Zang, A.R. Bishop and C.M. Soukoulis, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 4541 (1997); L. Sheng, D.Y. Xing, D.N. Sheng and C.S. Ting, *ibid* **56**, R7053 (1997).
- [27] S. Yunoki, A. Moreo and E. Dagotto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5612 (1998).