

Toroid Current States in Doped Mott Insulators

Dmitry I. Iudin¹, Alexander P. Protogenov^{1,2}

¹*Institute of Applied Physics of the RAS, Nizhny Novgorod 603950, Russia*

²*Max Planck Institute for Physics of Complex Systems, Dresden D-01187, Germany*

Abstract

The free energy bounds for inhomogeneous current states in doped antiferromagnetic insulators and spatial configurations of spin and charge degrees of freedom in lightly and heavily underdoped phases of this strongly correlated electron system are considered. It is shown that states are characterized by a small parameter of geometric origin, which determines the degree of packing in the knots of filament manyfolds of the order parameter distributions. We found a hierarchy of the spatial scales for flat knots, which gives rise to a free energy gain. A toroid moment in an underdoped state is found for the first time. It is shown that in the percolation picture of charge density distributions, that surround antiferromagnetic nanoclusters, the optimal level of the hole density is in qualitative agreement with the experimentally observed value.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn, 74.81.-g, 74.78.Na

1. Introduction

Doping of planar antiferromagnetic insulators breaks the antiferromagnetic order and gives rise to the state that precedes the high-temperature superconducting phase. After one of ten electrons is moved, roughly speaking, to the reservoir of dopants, the phase with short-wave length correlations of the electron degrees of freedom arises. This strongly correlated electron system has several key properties. Among them are strikingly small values of hole doping in the underdoped region of the phase diagram, where there are both unusual so-called pseudogap and superconducting phases.

The "normal" state is characterized by a nonuniform distribution of strongly correlated spin [1, 2] and charge [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8] degrees of freedom, as well as by an electron-hole asymmetry [9, 10]. A comparison of experimental data obtained from different types of superconductors shows that the universal two-component dynamics takes place in all cuprates investigated so far. The universal multi-component response is clear indication of the presence of the phase stratification [11] in cuprates. Study of cooperative behavior in inhomogeneous systems is recognized nowadays as one of the most challenging problems of the condensed matter physics [12, 13] and non-Abelian field theory [14, 15, 16, 17]. The aim of this paper is to find bounds on the free energy of inhomogeneous current states of doped antiferromagnetic insulators at a moderate level of doping.

Many recent experiments provided significant support to the idea [18] that pseudogap phase is the initial state for the superconducting phase due to precursor pairing and that it has basically the same origin as superconductivity. In this paper we focus on the universal description of both phases, considering them on equal footing. Starting from pseudogap phase, we use an equivalent

e-mail: alprot@appl.sci-nnov.ru

form of the spinor Ginzburg-Landau functional to study a free energy gain. To characterize the properties of the spatial configurations of strongly correlated spin and charge degrees of freedom in the partial coherent phase we introduce a toroid moment [19, 20, 21]. We show how to embed considered planar phenomena into three-dimensional space. Using quasi-one-dimensional character of spatial distributions of hole density and the percolation picture of the charge configurations, we argue also why is the optimal doping in high-temperature superconductors so small.

2. Model

To describe spatial distributions of the electron degrees of freedom, we shall use the following (3+0)D extended version [22] of the O(3) nonlinear model:

$$F = \int_Z F_n + F + F_c = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{4} (\partial_k n)^2 + H_{ik}^2 + (\partial_k)^2 b^2 + \frac{d}{2} c^4 + \frac{1}{16} c^2 + F_{ik}^2 - 2F_{ik} H_{ik} \right] : \quad (1)$$

In this equation, the field of the unit vector $n(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y};\mathbf{z})$ describes spin distributions, while the momentum field $c = J = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{A}$, where J is the total current, contains paramagnetic (\mathbf{a}) and diamagnetic (\mathbf{A}) parts. In Eq. (1) $F_{ik} = \partial_i c_k - \partial_k c_i$ and $H_{ik} = n \cdot [\partial_i \partial_k n] = \partial_i a_k - \partial_k a_i$. For simplicity, the Higgs potential in Eq. (1) is expressed only via two constants b and d . The density of the current energy $\frac{1}{16} c^2$, the surface energy F_{ik}^2 and the diamagnetic coupling $-2F_{ik} H_{ik}$ of the fields \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{c} determine contributions to the current part, F_c , of the free energy. The dimensionless units of all the variables are given in Ref. [23].

The first term in Eq. (1) is the energy of a Heisenberg antiferromagnet written in the long-wave length limit. The self-energy H_{ik}^2 of the internal magnetic field $H_i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ikl} H_{kl}$ in the long-wave length limit [24] includes the mean value $\langle 0 | \mathcal{S}_1 \mathcal{S}_2 \mathcal{S}_3 | 0 \rangle$ of the spin noncollinearity degree on the three sites of a plaquette of the square lattice which appears after the electron is moved from the fourth site to the reservoir of the dopants. These chiral three-spin correlations of spin degrees of freedom are the main building block for the formation of more complicated spin and charge structures considered below. The structures are encoded in Eq. (1) by the term $(H_{ik} - F_{ik})^2$ which describes also mutual frustration of the currents \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{c} .

For better understanding of the role of each term in free energy (1), it is useful to compare Eq. (1) with the Hamiltonian of the $t - J$ model

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} S_i S_j - \frac{1}{4} \sum_i n_i n_j + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} t_{ij} a_i^\dagger a_j + H_{\text{kin}}$$

in the inhomogeneous case. Here $a_i = c_i (1 - n_i)$, $n_i = c_i^\dagger c_i$, $S_i = c_i^\dagger - c_i = 2$. This model is a standart one when studying different phase states in doped antiferromagnetic insulators. At gradient expansion, the first and the second terms in this equation provide the first and the third terms in Eq. (1) respectively. The last kinetic term in the $t - J$ model ensures the existence of the term $\frac{1}{16} c^2$ in Eq. (1). The self-energy $B^2 = 8 \text{ curl}^2 \mathbf{A} = (H_{ik} - F_{ik})^2$ of the gauge field \mathbf{A} in Eq. (1) can be also obtained [25, 26] in the framework of the $t - J$ model.

The exchange integral modulation, the scalar field $n(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y};\mathbf{z})$ in (1) describes the spin stiffness $\frac{1}{2}$ and depends by the doping level. Indeed, the spin stiffness $\frac{1}{2}$ relates to the density $\frac{n}{2}$ of positively charged vacant sites, so-called "holes", by the constraint $\frac{n}{2} + \frac{n_h}{2} = 1$ [27]. If $\frac{n}{2} \ll 1$, the hole density $\frac{n_h}{2}$, like the term H_{ik}^2 , is localized at the boundaries of the regions of the nonzero spin density, i.e. it exists on the complement space with respect to the space of the spin density definition. Based on this remark and on the lattice patterns of the distributions of the spin degrees

of freedom, a low-dimensional analog of the holographic principle, which leads to the conclusion that the distribution of the states with broken antiferromagnetic order has the boundary character, was proposed in Ref. [28].

3. Knots and links of order parameters

The properties of different phases in model (1) depend on the distributions of competing order parameters n , c and \mathbf{c} in the ground states. At $c = 0$ and $\mathbf{c} = \text{const}$, the configurations of the field $n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z})$ are classified by the Hopf invariant [29, 30, 31] $Q = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3x \epsilon_{ikl} a_i \partial_k a_l$. At the compactification of $\mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow M = S^3$ and $n \in S^2$, an integer $Q \in \mathbb{Z}$ ($\in \pi_3(S^2)$) indicates the degree of linking or knotting of a filament manifold collection in the three-dimensional space M , where the field of the unit vector $n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z})$ is constant: $n(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}) = n$. For two linked loops $Q = 1$, for the trefoil knot $Q = 6$ and etc. In this case the local minima of the free energy F are determined [32] by the inequality:

$$F \geq 32\pi^2 Q^2 j^2, \quad (2)$$

The quasi-one-dimensional character of the distribution of the n -field in Eq. (1) at $\mathbf{c} = \text{const}$, $c = 0$, if $\mathbf{c} \neq \text{const}$, $c = 0$ affects also the hole density $n^2 = 1 - c^2$ [28]. The configurations of field n in the form of stripes and loops are most advantageous in this case.

When the field of the momentum $c \neq 0$ is unquenched and $\mathbf{c} = \text{const}$, free energy bound decreases [33]:

$$F \geq 32\pi^2 Q^2 j^2 - 1 \frac{Lj^2}{Qj}, \quad (3)$$

where the mutual linking number of the fields a and c equals $L = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3x \epsilon_{ksl} c_k \partial_s a_l$, is determined by the invariant $L \in \mathbb{Z}$. The universal gain of the free energy in Eq. (3) describes the condensation energy [34] in the considered model of strongly developed spin distributions.

The reduction of the free energy bound occurs due to the diamagnetic coupling of the currents in Eq. (1). The contribution of this last term is so significant that it consumes completely the energy F_c and a part of the energy F_n . This phase with large pair momentum differs from the FFLO state [35, 36] by the unquenched paramagnetic part of the total current. The second distinction corresponds in a general case to inhomogeneous distribution of the total momentum of pairs existing in the incoherent form [18] above the superconducting T_c .

The existence of quasi-one-dimensional configurations with open ends and in the form of loops in the framework of the present model, when the free energy density has the form $f = (\partial_k n)^2 + V_{eff}(n) + (F_{ik} - H_{ik})^2$, with $V_{eff} = b_{eff} n^2 + (d=2)^4$ and $b_{eff} = b - (l=16)c^2 - (l=4)(\partial_k n)^2$, corresponds to different phase states [37, 38]. In the phase, where the gauge symmetry remains unbroken, $b_{eff} < 0$ and $n_{min} = 0$.

It follows from the equation for the energy V_{eff} that inhomogeneous distributions of the fields exist only in the case $b_{eff} > 0$. With the change of doping, approaching the phase with $b_{eff} > 0$, where the gauge symmetry is broken due to Higgs effect, the fraction of quasi-one-dimensional configurations with closed ends increases. In the phase $b_{eff} > 0$, there exist [38] quasi-one-dimensional configurations of length l , satisfying the relation $l_{min} = 2/n$. In the ground state $c = 0$, and the value n_{min} for the amplitude of the Higgs field in the ground state is determined by the contribution $(l=4)(\partial_k n)^2$ of the characteristic configurations of field n . In this case, distributions in the form of a ring are typical configurations of field n [28]. For greater values ($l_{min} > 2$) of the commensurability parameter l_{min} in the ground state, there exist closed quasi-one-dimensional

distributions of field \mathbf{n} . For sufficiently short ($0 < l_{min} < 2$) configurations of the field \mathbf{n} in the ground state, quasi-one-dimensional field distributions with open ends may be found. Summarizing, we see that in magneto-inhomogeneous phases, we encounter an internal hierarchical multi-scale structure, determined by the density field, which becomes crucial for the description of these phases.

We see also that the state with a finite value of the momentum field \mathbf{c} is characterized by the competing inhomogeneous order parameters \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{c} with non-local correlations¹ between them due to the entanglement of their one-dimensional distributions. Note that this conclusion is in agreement with one of the main statements of Refs. [39, 40] that inhomogeneous current states cannot be described with the aid of Ginzburg-Landau functional with the one-component order parameter. In our case the existence of inhomogeneous current states is due to the non-linear coupling of several order parameters \mathbf{n} ; \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{a} at the level of their equations of motion. The analogous conclusion may be made, starting from a lattice description of current states in a so-called staggered flux phase [41], considering strong correlations of charge and spin degrees of freedom in the mean field approach. Flux phases and D D V states [42, 43, 44], i.e. the phases with a modulation of the current density, are well-known particular examples of the toroid states. In this paper we focus our attention on non-perturbative analysis, and consider a general case when all inhomogeneous order parameters are present.

4. Inhomogeneous current states

The basic property of model (1) is the compactness of field \mathbf{n} , which leads to its one-dimensional distributions in the form of knots [29, 30, 31, 45, 46, 47], and to the discrete character of spectrum (2). To analyze the general case of $\mathbf{c} \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{a} \neq \text{const}$, we first write down the energy F_n at $\mathbf{a} = \text{const}$ and $\mathbf{x}_i \neq \mathbf{x}_i r$ in the form of $F_n = \int d^3x \left[g_1 (\partial_k n)^2 + g_2 H_{jk}^2 \right] = \int \frac{P}{g_1 g_2} (r=R + R=r)$, where r is the scale factor, $R = \sqrt{\frac{P}{g_2 g_1}}$ and $g_1 = 2$ and $g_2 = 1$ are the coupling constants. The latter equation shows that the characteristic knot size at the minimum of the energy F_n is proportional to R .

With the increase of doping $\frac{2}{h}$, i. e. with decrease of $\frac{2}{h}$, the radius $R = 1/\frac{2}{h}$ grows up to its certain critical value R_{cr} . Beginning from this radius, the configurations of field \mathbf{n} , forming the knot, are unstable [48] with respect to the scale transformations. This means that knots of a size greater than R_{cr} collapse, and form localized structures near the points of the stereographic projection $R^3 \rightarrow S^3$. This phenomenon appears to be the key one, when we compare different contributions to the free energy (1) in an inhomogeneous current state at small enough values of $\frac{2}{h}$.

We see that at sufficiently small density $\frac{2}{h}$ or (which is the same) at sufficiently high level of doping $\frac{2}{h}$, beginning from the finite values of density $\frac{2}{h}$, in order to describe strongly correlated charge and spin degrees of freedom, one may introduce a small parameter, determined by the relation $R_0 = R$, where R_0 is the correlation length of the \mathbf{n} - and \mathbf{c} -field distributions. The radius R_0 has the geometric meaning of the filament thickness, for which the configurations of these fields are determined. A typical value of R_0 is of the order of 10 Å, i. e. it equals three-four lattice constants. Since Ginzburg parameter in this case is much less than unity, we may use the mean

¹In $(2+1)D$ dimensional form of the dynamical description, the non-local interaction between electrons may be described using Chern-Simons statistical gauge fields a^i , which induce strong correlations of the phases of fermion quantum states at large distances. The world line braiding matrix k_{ij} in the Chern-Simons action $S = \frac{k_{ij}}{4} \int d^3x \epsilon^{ijk} a^i \partial_j a^k$ in this case is proportional to the matrix K (see below), describing the knotting degree of the field configurations of the $(3+0)D$ free energy.

field approach (1). A characteristic scale R has the meaning [49] of the effective radius of current correlations.

Let us assume that $R_0 < R < R_{cr}$ and compare the decrease of the free energy (1) due to the diamagnetic term $-2F_{ik}H_{ik}$ with its increase due to the term $(\mathcal{E}_k)^2$. If the contribution of the diamagnetic term $-2F_{ik}H_{ik}$ is of the order of $c_0 R_0^3$, where c_0 is the amplitude of the momentum field c , the estimate of the maximum contribution of the term $(\mathcal{E}_k)^2$ yields $1=(R/R_0)^2$. The gain obviously should be also greater than the contributions of other terms in the last bracket in Eq. (1), i. e. of the surface term $F_{ik}^2 = \mathcal{G}^2 R_0^2$ as well as of the current energy $c^2 = F_{ik}^2 (R_0/R)^2$. Combining these inequalities, we see that at $1=(R_0/R)^2 < 1$ and at a finite value of the momentum determined by the inequality

$$R_0 < c_0 < 1/R_0 \quad (4)$$

even in a state with the inhomogeneous distribution of the density c^2 the free energy may be smaller due to diamagnetism than at $c = 0$ in Eq. (1). The parameter c_0 has the meaning of the degree of filament packing in the three-dimensional space. It is the *sought small parameter* in our problem of strongly correlated spin and charge degrees of freedom when all coupling constants are of the order of unity. In the case $n = \text{const}$, it is proportional to c^2 where c is the Ginzburg-Landau parameter.

To find the condition for a state with momentum from the range (4) when the energy is less, than at $c = 0$ (in spite of inhomogeneity), let us compare the gain of the total free energy with the contribution from the term $(\mathcal{E}_k)^2$. The loss of the energy is of the order of $R_z = R^2$. Here R_z is the "vertical" knot size. Therefore, the diamagnetic contribution is the main one for sufficiently flat knots [50], existing at $R_0 < R_z < R < R_{cr}$. This means that the energy of configurations in the sector with the topological invariant $L \neq 0$ even in the inhomogeneous state may be less than at $c = 0$. This conclusion is one of the main results of the paper. The condensation energy [34], which depends on the linking degrees L and Q , decreases in comparison with the case of $n = \text{const}$ [33]. The minimal value of the free energy gain ΔF can be estimated as $\Delta F \sim 64 Q^{1/4}$.

4. Toroid state

Let us assume that the level of doping is small enough, i.e. $n_h \ll 1$. Then the spin density c^2 is large and a knot size R is so small that $c \gg 1$. The decrease of the degree of filament packing in the knot with the increase of n_h is accompanied by the transition to a state, in which among planar field projections the field configurations $(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$ in the form of closed one-dimensional distributions are most preferable [28].

The fact, whether the boundary charge states at the boundaries of these insulating regions will form an infinite percolative cluster, depends on the hole density n_h . Let the level of doping be insufficient for the appearance of an extended connectable cluster. In accordance with Ginzburg's proposal, we will call this phase state with the spontaneous diamagnetism a toroid state [40]. The phase state, in which current order is characterized by a polar vector \mathbf{T} , that changes sign under time reversal, can be represented by the ordering of toroid moments. It is characterized by a toroid moment \mathbf{T} , which is defined in the following way [19, 20]

$$\mathbf{a} = \text{curl curl } \mathbf{T} : \quad (5)$$

Using the equality (4) and the identity [51]

$$(\text{curl } \mathbf{a})_i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ikl} n [\mathcal{E}_k n - \mathcal{E}_l n] \quad (6)$$

one can express the toroid moment via the chiral degree of noncollinearity $n = [\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}]$ in the form:

$$\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int d^3r^0 \frac{(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0)_k}{r^0^3} \int d^3r^\omega \frac{n = [\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}]}{r^{\omega 0} r^{\omega j}} : \quad (7)$$

We see that toroid moment \mathbf{T} is given by the non-local Biot-Savart law as well as by the factor which is determined by the Coulomb Green function. The vector \mathbf{T} characterizes the distribution of the poloidal component of the current on the torus [19, 20]. The magnetic field of this current is confined to the interior of the torus. For the degree of noncollinearity (localized at a point) $n = [\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}] = \mathbf{n}_{ki}(\mathbf{r})$ of the spin distributions, the toroid moment has the form

$$\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\mathbf{n}_{ki}}{16\pi^2} \int d^3r^0 \frac{(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0)_k}{r^0^3} = \frac{\mathbf{n}_{ki} \mathbf{x}_k}{8\pi r} : \quad (8)$$

If the chiral density $n = [\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{Q}] = (\mathbf{n}_{ki} = 2\mathbf{R}) \delta(\mathbf{z} - R)$ of spin distributions is localized in the plane $z = 0$ on a ring of radius R , the toroidal moment equals $\mathbf{T}_i(\mathbf{r}; z = 0) = \mathbf{n}_{ki}(\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{r})t(\mathbf{r})$ with the function $t(\mathbf{r})$ having its maximum at $r = R$ and $t(\mathbf{r}) = r^{-2}$ at $r = R$.

In the toroid state the diamagnetic susceptibility χ^0 is determined [40] by the radius R of current correlations in such a way that $\chi^0 = \chi_L$. Here $\chi_L = \frac{e^2 k_F}{12\pi^2 m c^2}$ is the Landau diamagnetic susceptibility for non-interacting electrons. For porous knots with $\chi_L \approx 1$, it can be rather significant. Anomalously great diamagnetic susceptibility is caused by a great radius R of current correlations. It should also be noted that the condition [49] $\chi_L \approx \frac{e^2 n r^2}{4\pi m c^2} > 1$ is equivalent to the inequality $r < r_D = c/\omega_p$ once again attract our attention to the boundary character of the considered phenomena. Here n is the mean electron density, r_D is the Debye radius, and $\omega_p = (4\pi e^2 n)^{1/2}$ is the plasma frequency. We pay attention to the fact that in this phase the total magnetic moment of clusters equals zero and the toroid state is *antisymmetric*.

The realization of the toroid state is achieved in systems belonging to 31 classes of magnetic symmetry where the vector \mathbf{T} can exist [49]. The conditions [49] for the realization of a toroid state are easier to satisfy (i) in the neighborhood of inhomogeneities and (ii) in systems with strong electron correlations. (iii) The toroidal state formed against the background of the antiferromagnetic state is the most likely situation as well as (iv) conditions of the presence of charged and magnetic impurities, i.e. holes and dynamical non-collinear spin distributions in our case. (v) Strong spin-orbit interaction also gives rise to effects associated with toroidal ordering. All these conditions are met in the system at hand.

5. Planar phenomena in 3D space

Under the conditions when all the coupling constants in (1) are of the order of unity² the main object of the study appears to be the geometric properties and the topology of knotted one-dimensional manifolds of the order parameter domain, which give the main contribution to the free energy. One of the results of this approach is the appearance of the parameter $\beta = (R_0/R)^2 < 1$, characterizing the degree of filament packing in the knot. The existence of the minimal value of the field β^2 , playing the role of the running coupling constant in Eq. (1), i.e. the existence of the minimal value $\beta_{min} = (R_0/R_{cr})^2$, is similar to the emergence of the solution for the superconducting gap in a two-component model [52], beginning (unlike BCS model) with the finite value of the coupling constant.

Let us describe a method of embedding planar phenomena into the 3D space. We choose a tuning parameter $\beta^2 = 1/R^2$ that $\beta_{min} < \beta < 1$. Let us consider the projection of complementary

²This is one of the reasons, why the problem discussed cannot be currently solved, even numerically.




Figure 1: (colour online). Complementary surfaces for a flat (l.h.s.) and extended along z -axis (r.h.s.) trefoil knots.

spaces for knots which are pulled over the knots (so-called Seifert surfaces) to the plane $(x; y)$. For definiteness, we consider the simplest (among torus knots) trefoil knot with $Q = 6$. In the case of the flat ($R_z < R$) knot, the complementary space is a triple twisted band. In the case of the knot stretched along the axis z (at $R < R_z < R_{cr}$) the Seifert surface is a torus with a hole (see Fig. 1) ³.

The charge degrees of freedom are distributed (as it has been already mentioned) at the boundary of the complementary space for knots. Therefore, the boundary line presents a circle, which is the projection of these one-dimensional boundary configurations for a sufficiently flat knot. For the stretched knot (at $R < R_z < R_{cr}$), the line is a stripe with the length of the order of R_0 , equal to the scale of the hole mentioned above. Summarizing, we can see that the free energy gain in an inhomogeneous current state is achieved, due to diamagnetism, for the distributions of the charge density on the plane in the form of loops.

The study of such configurations of the charge density is based on measuring the density of states (DOS) by means of scanning tunneling microscope (STM). In such experiments [53] the formation of the DOS filaments in the form of rings have been discovered recently in the entangled labyrinthine pattern of quasi-one-dimensional distributions of the charge density in planar compounds $C_{a_2-x}N_{a_x}CuO_{2C_{b_2}}$ at the moderate doping x .

6. Optimal doping

Whether the phase both with $\mu_{cr} < \mu < 1$ and the finite pair momentum [35, 36] c_0 remains superconducting or appears to be an intermediate state with spontaneous diamagnetism [49] depends perhaps on the connectness of the total current cluster (see e.g. [54]), formed by the projections of Seifert surfaces on the plane.

It is natural to suppose that the occurrence of pre-formed electron pairs in the underdoped state [18] and a phase coherence in the superconducting phase are independent phenomena. Starting with the picture of pre-formed pairs, we discuss in this section some features of the phase coherence due to percolation [55] using charge density structures mentioned above. With the increase of

³The braided filaments of the trefoil, stretched along the time axis, one can consider in $(2+1)D$ dynamical case as the result of the action of b_1^2 on the quantum states of the braid group operator b_1 .

the hole density $\frac{2}{n}$, the size of ring-shaped current distributions increases to such an extent that the conditions arise for the appearance of two-dimensional connectable current clusters and the transition to the state with $c \neq 0$ with the gain of free energy. We shall find the level p_{best} , for which the temperature of the transition to the superconducting state is maximal.

If we did not take into account the distributions of the charge degrees of freedom at the boundaries of the filament configurations of the field n in the knot only, we would deal with 2D percolation problem with a well-known [54] answer $p_{cr} = 0.5$ for the bond percolation threshold value. A considerable distinction between the experimentally observed value $p_{best;exp} = 0.16$ from this value is a convenient test for checking the accepted point of view.

To solve the problem in question we shall use the recent experimental results [53]. With the aid of the scanning tunnel microscope it was found in [53] that among quasi-one-dimensional configurations with an increased density of charge states in the underdoped region, the fraction of filament field distributions in the form of ring-shaped structures increases with the increase of the doping level. Using the corresponding trial functions of paper [28] it was shown that in the framework of model (1), such configurations of the field n are preferable when the degree of doping increases. The interpretation of the results of measuring the distributions of the spin degrees of freedom in underdoped states on the basis of neutron scattering [1, 2] is also based on the assumption of quasi-one-dimensional nanoscale distributions in the planes of conducting clusters in the form of thin rings.

Let us suppose that the boundary currents are distributed along the boundaries of ring insulator regions with such a relationship that the ring thickness differs from its diameter, as it follows from the experiment [53], by one order ($\frac{1}{2} \approx 0.1$). The geometrical confinement allows us to neglect the contribution of internal (with respect to ring-shaped) distributions of degrees of freedom. Thus for the threshold of the flow along the connectable cluster, formed by ideal distributions in the form of rings, we get a considerably smaller value: $p_{best} = 0.5 - 0.314 = 0.186$ in comparison with the standard one $p_{cr} = 0.5$. For a current cell in the form of a hexahedron, $p_{best} = 0.179$. This example shows that comparatively slight deviations of the form of the elementary current cell from the ideal ring-shaped form may lead to a shift in the value p_{best} towards the experimentally observed value $p_{best;exp} = 0.16$. If a square, constructed by the distributions in the form of stripes, were used instead of a ring, we would have $p_{best} = 0.5 - 0.4 = 0.1$.

Study of general properties of high-temperature superconducting states, belonging to different classes of compounds, shows that the dependence of the critical temperature on the hole concentration, for example in $Y_{1-x}Ca_xBa_2Cu_3O_6$ and $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$, is well represented [56, 57] by the empiric curve $T_c = T_{cmax} = 182.6(p - 0.16)^2$ at $p = x/2$. This parabolic dependence $T_c(p)$, has zeros at $p_{min} = 0.05$, $p_{max} = 0.27$ and a maximum at $p_{best} = 0.16$. Optimally doped compounds based on thallium, for example $Tl_{0.5}Pb_{0.5}Sr_2Ca_{0.8}Y_{0.2}Cu_2O_7$, have $p_{best} = 0.15$. Some other classes of high-temperature superconductors point to similar values. We note also that the underdoped pseudo-gap phase with strong developed spin and charge distributions appears in the above mentioned classes of the compounds at a well-defined [58] hole concentration $p = 0.19$.

6. Conclusion

Under conditions of moderate doping $\frac{2}{n}$, the value of $\frac{2}{n}$ may be such that the knot size $R = \frac{1}{2} R_z$ appears to be comparable with the correlation length R_0 . Since all values in Eq. (1) are of the same order, these greater values of $\frac{2}{n}$ correspond to smaller values of the momentum c and due to Eq. (3) the energy gain is less. In the optimum case of great values c the self-dual state $F_n = F_c$, which is characterized by the dense packing of knot filaments (≈ 1), a $c = A = 0$ and

by the matrix [59] $K = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_M d^3x \epsilon_{ijk} a_i \partial_j a_k = \frac{Q}{L} \frac{L}{Q^0} = Q \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1}$, where $a_i^1 = a_i$, $a_i^2 = a_i$, may be considered as initial compressible state for the transition to the incompressible phase $\kappa < 1$ with the increase of the doping degree. The compressibility of the state at $\kappa = 1$ occurs due to the existence of non-zero Poisson bracket $\{x_0, y_0\}$ for the coordinates x_0, y_0 of the vortex filament center. The uncertainty of the location of the core center at the dense filament packing gives rise to the nullification of the linking degree Q due to the effect of the filament reconnection. This leads to the transition to the ground state with $Q = 0$.

The comparison of the results of the present paper with the conclusions of [60], following from the application of the conformal field theory methods to find the exact solution of the problem of superconducting states in cluster systems, requires thorough analysis of the details of the nullification ($\kappa + 2 = 0$) mechanism of the linking coefficients $\kappa + 2 = Q$ in $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons action.

In conclusion, we have compared the value of the free energy gain due to diamagnetism in the inhomogeneous current state with the value of the energy loss due to inhomogeneity and found the conditions, under which the energy of inhomogeneous states with a current appears to be less than in the absence of the current. Studying the threshold level of doping with the use of the percolation approach of describing current configurations, existing in doped antiferromagnetic insulators, we have found, that in the toroid state the optimal value of the hole concentration is close to the experimentally observed value. The toroid moment in this d -symmetric state is expressed via the chiral degree of noncollinearity of the distribution of the spin degrees of freedom.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to L. N. Bulaevskii, Yu. M. Gal'perin, L. D. Faddeev, P. Fulde, Yu. V. Kopaev, R. Ramazashvili, V. A. Rubakov, S. R. Shenoy and H. Takagi for helpful discussions and advices. This work was supported in part by the RFBR under Grant No. 04-02-16684.

References

- [1] B. Lake, G. Aeppli, K. N. Clausen, *et al.*, Science **291**, 1759 (2001).
- [2] B. Lake, H. M. Rönnow, N. B. Christensen, *et al.*, Nature **415**, 299 (2002).
- [3] J. E. Hoffman, E. W. Hudson, K. M. Lang, *et al.*, Science **295**, 466 (2002).
- [4] S. H. Pan, J. P. O'Neal, R. L. Badzey, *et al.*, Nature **413**, 282 (2001).
- [5] S. J. L. Billinge, E. S. Bozin, M. Gutmann, and H. Takagi, cond-mat/0005032.
- [6] S. Caprara, C. Castellani, C. Di Castro, M. Grilli, A. Perali, cond-mat/9907265.
- [7] K. McElroy, D.-H. Lee, J. E. Hoffman, *et al.*, cond-mat/0406491, cond-mat/0404005.
- [8] T. Hanaguri, C. Lupien, Y. Kohsaka, *et al.*, Nature **430**, 1001 (2004); cond-mat/0409102.
- [9] M. Z. Hasan, Y. Li, D. Qian, *et al.*, cond-mat/0406654.
- [10] J. E. Hirsh, cond-mat/0301610.

- [11] L. P. Gor'kov, A. V. Sokol, JETP Lett. **46**, 420 (1987).
- [12] M. Yu. Kagan, K. I. Kugel, D. I. Khomskii, JEPT, **93**, 415 (2001).
- [13] M. Yu. Kagan, D. I. Khomskii, M. V. Mostovoy, Eur. Phys. J. B **12**, 217 (1999).
- [14] L. Faddeev, A. J. Niemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1624 (1999).
- [15] L. Faddeev, A. J. Niemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3416 (2000).
- [16] Y. M. Cho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 252001 (2001); hep-th/0110076.
- [17] R. Casalbuoni, G. Nardulli, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 263 (2004), hep-ph/0305069.
- [18] V. J. Emery, S. A. Kivelson, Nature **374**, 434 (1995).
- [19] V. M. Dubovik, L. A. Tosunyan, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **14**, 504 (1983).
- [20] M. A. Miller, Sov. Phys. Usp. **27**, 69 (1984).
- [21] V. M. Dubovik, V. V. Tugushev, Phys. Rep. **187** 145 (1990).
- [22] E. Babaev, L. D. Faddeev, A. J. Niemi, Phys. Rev. **B 65**, 100512(R) (2002).
- [23] L. S. Isaev, A. P. Protogenov, JETP **96**, 1140 (2003).
- [24] P. Voruganti, S. Doniach, Phys. Rev. **B 41**, 9358 (1990).
- [25] X. G. Wen, A. Zee, Phys. Rev. **B 41**, 240 (1990).
- [26] P. B. Wiegmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2070 (1990).
- [27] L. B. Ioffe, P. B. Wiegmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 653 (1990).
- [28] L. S. Isaev, A. P. Protogenov, Phys. Rev. **B 69**, 012401 (2004).
- [29] L. D. Faddeev, A. J. Niemi, Nature **387**, 58 (1997).
- [30] V. M. H. Ruutu, U. Parts, J. H. Koivuniemi, M. Krusius, E. V. Thuneberg, G. E. Volovik, JETP Lett. **60**, 671 (1994).
- [31] Yu. G. Makhlin, T. Sh. Misirpashaev, JETP Lett. **61**, 49 (1995).
- [32] A. F. Vakulenko, L. V. Kapitanskii, Sov. Phys. Dokl. **24**, 433 (1979).
- [33] A. P. Protogenov, V. A. Verbus, JETP Lett. **76**, 53 (2002).
- [34] S. Chakravarty, H.-Y. Kee, E. Abrahams, cond-mat/0211613.
- [35] P. Fulde, R. A. Ferrel, Phys. Rev. **135**, A550 (1964).
- [36] A. I. Larkin, Yu. N. Ovchinnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 762 (1964)].
- [37] A. M. Polyakov, Sov. Phys. JETP **41** 988 (1975).
- [38] A. J. Niemi, Phys. Rev. **D 67**, 106004 (2003).
- [39] B. A. Volkov, A. A. Gorbatsevich, Yu. V. Kopaev, V. V. Tugushev, Sov. Phys. JETP **54**, 391 (1981).

- [40] B. A. Volkov, A. A. Gorbatsevich, Yu. V. Kopaev, Sov. Phys. JETP **59**, 1087 (1984).
- [41] P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, T. K. Ng, X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. **B 57**, 6003 (1998).
- [42] B. I. Halperin, T. M. Rice, Solid State Phys. **21**, 116 (1968).
- [43] H. J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. **B 39**, 2940 (1989).
- [44] C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. **B 62**, 4880 (2000); **62**, R6135 (2000).
- [45] J. Gladikowski, M. Hellmund, Phys. Rev. **D 56**, 5194 (1997).
- [46] R. A. Battye, P. M. Sutcliffe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4798 (1998).
- [47] J. Hietarinta, P. Salo, Phys. Lett. **B451**, 60 (1999).
- [48] R. S. Ward, Nonlinearity **12**, 1 (1999); hep-th/9811176.
- [49] V. L. Ginzburg, A. A. Gorbatsevich, Yu. V. Kopaev, B. A. Volkov, Solid State Commun. **50**, 339 (1984).
- [50] R. Metzler, A. Hanke, P. G. Dommersnes, Y. Kantor, M. Kardar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 188101 (2002); cond-mat/0110266.
- [51] N. D. Mermin, T.-L. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **36**, 594 (1976).
- [52] W. V. Liu, F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 047002 (2003).
- [53] Y. Kohsaka, T. Hanaguri, K. Kitazawa, M. Azuma, M. Takano, H. Takagi, Physica C **388**, 283 (2003); Y. Kohsaka, K. Iwaya, S. Satow, T. Hanaguri, M. Azuma, M. Takano, H. Takagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 097004 (2004).
- [54] V. F. Gantmakher, *Electrons in disordered medium*, M., 2003, p. 160.
- [55] D. Mihailovic, V. V. Kabanov and K. A. Müller, Europhys. Lett. **57** 254 (2002).
- [56] J. L. Tallon, C. Bernhard, H. Shaked, R. L. Hitterman, and J. D. Jorgensen, Phys. Rev. **B 51**, R12911 (1995).
- [57] J. L. Tallon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 5294 (1997).
- [58] G. S. Boebinger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 5417 (1996).
- [59] V. I. Arnold, B. A. Khesin, *Topological Methods in Hydrodynamics*, Appl. Math. Sci. **125** (1998), Chapt. 3.
- [60] G. Sierra, Nucl. Phys. **B572** [FS], 517 (2000); hep-th/0111114.