## Charge carrier correlation in the electron-doped t-J m odel

P.W. Leung

Physics Dept., Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear W ater Bay, Hong Kong

(D ated: M arch 23, 2024)

W e study the t- $\ell^0$ -J<sup>m</sup> odelw ith parameters chosen to model an electron-doped high temperature superconductor. The model with one, two and four charge carriers is solved on a 32-site lattice using exact diagonalization. Our results demonstrate that at doping levels up to x = 0:125 the model possesses robust antiferrom agnetic correlation. W hen doped with one charge carrier, the ground state has momenta ( ;0) and (0; ). On further doping, charge carriers are unbound and the momentum distribution function can be constructed from that of the single-carrier ground state. The Ferm i surface resembles that of small pockets at single charge carrier ground state momenta, which is the expected result in a lightly doped antiferrom agnet. This feature persists upon doping up to the largest doping level we achieved. We therefore do not observe the Ferm i surface changing shape at doping levels up to 0.125.

## I. IN TRODUCTION

It is well known that electron-doped high T<sub>c</sub> m aterials have very di erent properties com pared to hole-doped ones. Like hole-doped materials, their undoped parent com pounds are insulators with antiferrom agnetic spin order. But the electron-doped cuprate Nd<sub>2 x</sub> Ce<sub>x</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> remains an antiferrom agnetic insulator up to doping level x = 0.13 whereas in the hole-doped cuprate  $La_{2x} Sr_{x}CuO_{4}$  a relative sm all doping level of x 0:02 is enough to destroy its antiferrom agnetic correlation. Theoretically it has been postulated that this asymmetry in properties of electron- and hole-doped materials can be modeled by adding intra-sublattice hopping term s to the t-J model.<sup>2,3</sup> Compared to the nearest neighbor hopping motion in the t-J model, intra-sublattice hoppings do not frustrate the spin background. Consequently the antiferrom agnetic order of the undoped system is better preserved upon doping. W ithin this context, various theoretical and num erical studies have con med that the electron-doped model has robust antiferrom agnetic order. In addition, appropriate intrasublattice hopping term s shift single-carrier ground state m om enta from (=2;=2) in the t-J model to (;0)and its equivalent points. This means that in a lightly doped system small charge carrier pockets will form at (;0) and its equivalent points in the rst Brillouin zone. This agrees with angle-resolved photoem ission (ARPES) experiment $^{4,5}$  on Nd $_2$   $_{
m x}$  Ce $_{
m x}$ CuO $_4$ . Various properties of the electron-doped m odel<sup>6,7,8,9,10</sup> including its electronic states, spin dynam ics, and Ferm i surface evolution have been worked out with emphasis on comparison with experim ental results.<sup>11</sup>

In this paper we are interested in the interaction am ong charge carriers doped into the parent com pound. For this reason we conduct a system atic study on the electrondoped m odel with a few charge carriers using exact diagonalization. In this approach, larger lattices are always preferred in order to minimize nite-size e ects. Furtherm ore, in order to study Ferm i surface evolution the lattice m ust have allowed k points along the antiferrom agnetic Brillouin zone (AFBZ) boundary, i.e., from (;0) to (0; ). Square lattices having only 20 or 26 sites with periodic boundary conditions do not have this property. The 32-site lattice is the next available square lattice that has this property and on which calculations are still manageable. The t-J model with up to four charge carriers on this lattice has been studied in detail using exact diagonalization.<sup>12,13,14,15</sup> B ut previous calculations on the electron-doped model on this lattice have been limited to two charge carriers only.<sup>16</sup> Since antiferrom agnetic order in electron-doped cuprates is robust, we need more charge carriers to make the antiferrom agnetic phase unstable. In this paper we report results for the electron-doped model with one, two, and four charge carriers on a 32-site lattice, covering doping levels up to x = 0:125.

O ur paper is organized as follows. We not de ne the model in section II. In section III we look at quasiparticle properties of a single charge carrier doped into the system. Next we consider systems with multiple charge carriers and study the binding energies in section IV and the real space charge carrier correlation in section V. They provide the not evidence that charge carriers are unbound at these doping levels. Section VI deals with the momentum distributions of spin objects which indicates the Ferm i surface at di erent doping levels. In section V II we calculate the spin correlations which clearly demonstrate that antiferrom agnetic order persists upon doping, and in section V III we attempt to search for other exotic order when the antiferrom agnetic correlation is weakened. Finally we give our conclusion in section IX.

#### II. HOLE-AND ELECTRON-DOPED MODELS

W e start from the extended t-J m odel which was originally proposed to describe hole-doped m aterials,

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} X \\ t_{ij} (e_i^y e_j + e_j^y e_i) + J \\ hiji \end{pmatrix} X S_i S_j \frac{1}{4} n_i n_j :$$
(1)

The nearest neighbor (nn) spin exchange constant J is xed at 0.3. Farther than nearest neighbor hopping term s

are necessary in order to distinguish between hole and electron doping.  $t_{ij} = t; t^0$ ; and  $t^{00}$  when hiji is a pair of sites at distances 1, 2, and 2 apart respectively, and is zero otherwise. The best tting to ARPES results on  $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$  yields  $t = 1, t^0 = 0.3$ , and  $t^{00} = 0.2$ .<sup>17</sup> In the case of hole doping,  $e_i^y$  is a spin (or electron) creation operator . To describe electron-doped m aterials it is usual to apply the electron-hole transform ation,  $e_i ! a_i^y$ , where  $a_i^y$  is a hole creation operator. The resulting H am iltonian for electron-doped m aterials is identical to (1) but with  $c_i$  replaced by  $a_i$ , etc, and  $t_{ij}$  replaced by t<sub>ij</sub>. As a result we can turn the Ham iltonian (1) into an electron-doped model by ipping the signs of the hopping term  $st_{ij}$ <sup>2</sup> D espite this similarity, one should be rem inded that in the case of hole doping the operators ci in the H am iltonian are electron operators and the vacuum state is a state with no electron. The condition of no double occupancy m eans that no m ore than one electron can occupy the same site. At half-lling, each site has exactly one electron and doping with holes means creating vacancies by removing electrons. Translating into the language of the electron-doped m odel, the operators  $e_i$  are hole operators and the vacuum state is a state with no hole, i.e., it cannot accomm odate any more electron. The condition of no double occupancy means that each site can have no more than one hole. At half-lling, each site has exactly one hole and doping means lling up holes with electrons. To avoid confusion, we use the term s \spin ob jects" and \charge carriers" to describe objects in the Ham iltonian (1). In the case of hole doping, spin ob jects refer to electrons and charge carriers refer to holes. In the case of electron doping their meanings are reversed spin objects refer to holes and charge carriers refer to electrons. In this paper, by \electron-doped model" we mean (1) with hopping parameters t = 1,  $t^0 = 0.3$ , and  $t^{00} = 0.2$ . [18] In principle hole-doped m odel should refer to the sam e extended t-J m odel with  $t = 1, t^0 = 0.3$ , and  $t^{00} = 0.2$ . But due to complications caused by excited states of that model,<sup>14</sup> we choose to com pare the electron-doped model with the simple t-J model, i.e., with t = 1 and  $t^0 = t^{00} = 0$ . We remark that the t-J model was originally proposed to describe hole-doped m aterials. But since they have di erent hopping terms, it will be unfair to conduct a quantitative com parison between the t-J and electron-doped m odels. Instead we will mostly concentrate on their qualitative di erences.

The electron-doped m odel with H am iltonian (1) and parameters J = 0.3, t = 1,  $t^0 = 0.3$ , and  $t^{00} = 0.2$  is solved by exact diagonalization on a square lattice with 32 sites and periodic boundary conditions. Table I shows the ground state energies and sym m etries of the electrondoped m odel with one, two, and four electrons. Calculations on the m odel with four electrons were perform ed on a cluster of AM D O pteron servers with 64 CPUs.

TABLE I: G round state energies, m om enta and point group sym m etries of the electron-doped m odel w ith N  $_{\rm c}$  charge carriers. N  $_{\rm B}$  is the num ber of basis in that particular subspace. The ground state energy at half-lling E  $_0^0$  is 11:329720.

N <sub>c</sub>	N <sub>B</sub>	E 0 <sup>N c</sup>	k	sym m etry
1	150 <b>,</b> 297,603	13 <b>:</b> 913616	(;0),(0;	)
2	150 <b>,</b> 295 <b>,</b> 402	16 <b>:</b> 601689	(0;0)	d <sub>x 2 v 2</sub>
4	2,817,694,064	20:461647	(0;0)	s

## III. QUASI-PARTICLE DISPERSION IN THE ONE-ELECTRON SYSTEM

In the electron-doped model the spectral function of spin objects at half-lling is de ned as<sup>19</sup>

$$A(k;!) = \int_{n}^{X} \int_{n}^{1} \dot{g}_{k} j_{0}^{0} \dot{z}_{j}^{2} (! E_{n}^{1} + E_{0}^{0}); \quad (2)$$

where E  $_0^0$  and  $_0^0$  are the ground state energy and wave function of the model at half-lling, and E  $_n^1$  and  $_n^1$  are energy and wave function of the nth excited state of the model with one charge carrier. A (k;!) can be evaluated easily using the continued fraction expansion. At each k point we use 300 iterations and add an arti cial broadening factor = 0.05 to the delta function. Fig. 1 shows A (k;!) along three branches in the rst B rillouin zone. At the Brillouin zone center (0;0), the spectral function has a broad structure. It does not have any noticeable low energy peaks. As we move along the (1;1) direction towards (;) Fig. 1(a)] the spectral weight spreads to lower and higher energies, form ing well-de ned peaks at low energies. W hen we go pass (=2; =2), the reverse occurs and at (;), the spectral function has a broad structure again. A similar trend is observed in the branch from (0;0) to (;) through (;0) [fig.1(b)]. This branch has the largest dispersion. A di erent trend is observed along the AFBZ boundary, (;0) to (0; ) [Fig.1 (c)]. There the spectral weight mostly concentrates in low energy states. A susual we de ne the quasiparticle weight  $Z_k$  as

$$Z_{k} = \frac{j_{h} \frac{1}{n} j_{k} j_{0} \hat{j}_{j}}{h_{0} j_{k} \hat{j}_{k} \hat{q}_{k} \hat{j}_{0} \hat{j}_{j}}; \qquad (3)$$

where  $\frac{1}{n}$  is the lowest energy one-electron state which has non-zero overlap with  $e_k \neq 0^0$  i. These values are tabulated in Table II together with the quasiparticle energy,

$$E(k) = E_n^1 = E_0^0;$$
 (4)

which is the energy of the state  $\frac{1}{n}$  in Eq.(3) relative to the ground state energy at half-lling. M ost  $Z_k$  are too sm all to m ake their corresponding peaks visible in Fig.1. Their positions are indicated by shaded arrows. An obvious exception is k = (;0) which is the ground state m om entum of the one-electron system. There the lowest energy peak has m ore than 60% of the total spectral

TABLE II: Quasiparticle energy and weight in the electrondoped m odel.

k	E (k)	Z <sub>k</sub>
(0,0)	1:452767	0:00008
$\left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right)$	1:689698	0:00354
$(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$	1:596649	0:00465
$(\frac{3^{-}}{4}, \frac{3^{-}}{4})$	1:669586	0:00045
( <b>,</b> )	1:450790	0:00005
$(1, \frac{1}{2})$	1:986268	0:00237
( ,0)	2:583895	0 <b>:</b> 63608
( <del>,</del> 0)	2:007321	0:02755
$(\frac{3^{-}}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$	2:092922	0:01890

weight. The quasiparticle energy is plotted in Fig.2. The bandwidth is 3:777J, which is in qualitative agreement with the prediction of spin-polaron calculation.<sup>20</sup>

#### IV. BINDING ENERGY

The N  $_{\rm c}$ -charge carrier binding energy is de ned as the excess energy of a system with N  $_{\rm c}$  charge carriers over N  $_{\rm c}$  single-carrier system s $_{r}^{21}$ 

$$E_{N_{c}I}$$
 ( $E_{0}^{N_{c}}$   $E_{0}^{0}$ )  $N_{c}$  ( $E_{0}^{1}$   $E_{0}^{0}$ ): (5)

It indicates the tendency of the N<sub>c</sub> charge carriers to form a bound state. From values in Table I we nd that  $E_{2T} = 0.1042$  and  $E_{4T} = 1.2037$ . C om pared to the t-J m odelwhere  $E_{2I} = 0.0515$ ,<sup>13</sup> it is tempting to interpret these num bers as evidence showing that two charge carriers in the electron-doped m odel have larger tendency to form a bound pair than in the t-J model. However, we have two reasons to believe that this is not a fair conclusion. First of all we should not com pare the tendency to form bound pairs in the two models based on the magnitudes of their binding energies because they have di erent hopping terms. As we shall see in the next section, two charge carriers in the electron-doped model in fact have a smaller tendency to form a bound state than in the t-J model. Second, one must be careful in interpreting binding energies de ned in Eq. (5) because they are very susceptible to nite-size e ects. Binding energies found in a nite system tend to be lower than their true values in the therm odynam ic lim it. As already pointed out in Ref. 13, we have no a priori reason to believe that  $E_{21}$ can be extrapolated linearly in 1=N, where N is the lattice size. Nevertheless, doing so with results at N = 16and 32 we obtain  $E_{2T}$ 0:01. This sm all value already hinted that the charge carriers may not form a bound state. When there are four charge carriers in the system, the large and positive  $E_{4I}$  clearly shows that they have no tendency to form a bound state.

# V. CHARGE CARRIER CORRELATION IN REAL SPACE

The real space correlation among charge carriers can be clearly displayed in the charge carrier correlation function

$$C(r) = h(1 n_r)(1 n_0)i;$$
 (6)

where  $n_r = e_r^v e_r$  is the number operator of spin objects as in Eq. (1). Note that we use the convention<sup>13</sup>

$$C(r) = \frac{1}{N_{c}N_{E}(r)} X (1 n_{i}) (1 n_{j})_{ji j j r} ; (7)$$

where N  $_{\rm E}$  (r) is the number of equivalent pairs with separation r. In this convention the correlation function satis es the sum rule

$$N_{\rm E} (r)C (r) = N_{\rm C} 1;$$
 (8)

and the probability for nding a pair of charge carriers at distance r apart is

$$P(r) = N_E(r)C(r) = (N_c 1):$$
 (9)

Results in the two-and four-electron systems are shown in Fig. 3. Note that we use di erent symbols to distinguish between two groups of correlations { those between pairs of electrons in the same and opposite sublattices. A striking feature in the two-electron system is that the correlation between two electrons in opposite sublattices does not decay signi cantly with r. It is alm ost constant, in plying that electrons in opposite sublattices are mostly uncorrelated. The correlation between two electrons in the same sublattice shows a very di erent trend. It is comparatively smaller than that in the other group and decays more signi cantly with distance r. The overall probability of nding a pair of electrons in the same and opposite sublattices are 0:3935 and 0:6065 respectively. From these results we conclude that in the two-electron system, electrons prefer to stay in opposite sublattices where they can move almost independently of each other. O byiously this results from the fact that intra-sublattice hopping term st<sup>0</sup> and t<sup>00</sup> in H do not frustrate the spin background and therefore allow electrons to move more freely. When we increase the number of electrons to four, the behaviors of the two groups of correlation become very sim ilar. They show small uctuations about the uncorrelated value (N  $_{\rm c}$  1)=(N 1), which is indicated by a dotted line in Fig. 3. This shows that even in the four-electron system the electrons are mostly uncorrelated. <u>Jhe</u> root-m ean-square separation between two electrons hr<sup>2</sup> i are 2,2786 and 2,4131 in the twoand four-electron system s respectively. The proxim ity of these values to the root-m ean-square separation between two uncorrelated electrons, 2.3827, again suggests that electrons in our systems are alm ost uncorrelated.



FIG.1: (Color online) Spectral function at half-lling A (k;!



FIG.2: Quasiparticle dispersion relation obtained from the spectral function at half-lling in Fig.1. The line is a guide to the eyes only.

## VI. CHARGE CARRIER CORRELATION IN MOMENTUM SPACE

Next we go to the momentum space and study the momentum distribution function of spin objects  $hn_k$  i =



FIG.3: (Color online) Charge carrier correlation in systems doped with two and four electrons. Squares and circles indicate that the pair of electrons are in the same and opposite sublattices respectively. Dotted lines are pair correlations of uncorrelated electrons in the respective cases.

 $hc_k^y e_k$  i. One motivation for studying  $hn_k$  i is to learn about the Ferm isurface of the model. For this purpose it is important to realize that in t-J-likem odels the momentum distribution function has a dome shape in the rst B rillouin zone. This feature results from m inim izing the kinetic energy<sup>22,23</sup> and is not related to the actual Ferm i surface of the m odel. Nevertheless, those k points along the AFBZ boundary are not a ected by this kinem atic effect. Therefore it is possible to extract inform ation on the Ferm i surface from these k points. A second motivation for studying the momentum distribution function is to see whether the single-carrier ground state is relevant to the physics of the multiply-doped system. This has been a subject of discussion in the t-J m odel.<sup>23,24,25</sup> N ote that in the electron-doped m odel som e authors choose to report the momentum distribution function of charge carriers,  $h\overline{n}_k$  i =  $h_k \ e_k^y$  i, instead of  $h_k$  i. These distribution functions have the follow ing properties:

$$\lim_{k} \frac{i}{X} + \frac{hn}{h} = n^{max} (N + N_{c}) = N;$$
 (10)

$$hn_k i = N ;$$
 (11)

where N is the number of spin objects with spin . In this section we will start with the single-electron momentum distribution functions. We will show that they are qualitatively similar to those in the t-J model. Thus their features are generic to t-J-like models. We will then discuss momentum distribution functions of the two- and four-electron systems. We will show that they can be constructed from the single-carrier result and that the Ferm isurfaces are consistent with smallpockets at single-carrier ground state momenta.

#### A. One-electron system

Let us begin with the one-electron ground state with  $S_z = 1=2$  and momentum (;0). (Note that  $S_z$  refers to the total spin of spin objects.) The momentum distribution functions are shown in Fig. 4. We immediately notice two very prominent features that exist in both  $m_{k^*}i$  and  $m_{k_{\#}}i$ : (i) there exist very sharp minima at (;0) or (0; ); (ii) besides these sharp minima, they are of a dome shape with a maximum around (; ) and slopes down towards a minimum at (0;0).

A s discussed above, the dom e shape is a generic feature that also exists in the t-J m odel.<sup>13</sup> The only di erence is that the locations of the maximum and minimum of the \dom e" are interchanged compared to those in the t-J m odel. This is obviously due to the opposite signs of t in the two m odels. This dom e-shape feature therefore does not represent the shape of the true Ferm i surface. N ote that  $m_{k,*}$  i and  $m_{k,*}$  i shift above and below the halflled value of 1/2 respectively due to the restriction from

Eq. (10),  $h_k$  i  $n^{max}$ .

Sim ilarly, sharp m inim a found in Fig. 4 are also found in the momentum distribution functions of the t-J m odel with one hole. Just like in the t-J m odel, a \dip" in  $h_{k\#}i$  is found at the ground state momentum [(;0) in



FIG. 4: Momentum distribution functions (a)  $hn_{k*}i$  and (b)  $hn_{k*}i$  in the ground state of the one-electron system with one spin-down object rem oved and momentum (;0). Due to symmetry, only one quadrant of the Brillouin zone is shown.

Fig.4 (b)], and an \antidips" in  $h_{k}$ " i is found at a k point which is displaced from the dip by the antiferrom agnetic m om entum (;) [(0;) in Fig.4 (a)]. From Fig.4 (b) we nd that the depth of the dip  $h_{(;)\#}$  i  $h_{(;0)\#}$  i is 0.334. This is very close to Z<sub>(;0)</sub>=2 which is 0.318, indicating its close tie with the Ferm i surface. Furtherm ore, Z<sub>k</sub> along the edge of the AFBZ are very sm all. Therefore our data is consistent with a sm all Ferm i surface, or carrier pocket, at (;0). This is to be expected in a lightly doped antiferrom agnet.<sup>26</sup> N ote that all features described so far are qualitatively the same in the hole-and electron-doped m odels. They are generic features resulting from the kinem atic e ect and the antiferrom agnetic order of the spin background. They do not re ect the di erent physics of the hole- and electron-doped m odels.

#### B. System s with two and four electrons

W hen there is an even num ber of spin objects,  $hn_{k}$ , i = $hn_{k\#}i$  and we drop the spin variable from  $hn_k$  i. Fig. 5 shows hnki in systems doped with two and four electrons. Again we can identity the same \dom e-shape" structure found in the one-electron system. It is a generic feature of the model and does not re ect the physics of the charge carriers. Further evidence for this com es from the \height" of the dom e, which is de ned as n  $\ln_{(;)}i$   $\ln_{(0;0)}i$ . In the two-electron system it is 0.114, which is roughly the same as  $n_{+} + n_{\#} = 0.117$ in the one-electron system . And in the four-electron system it is 0.225, roughly twice of that in the two-electron system. These agreements show that the dome-shaped structures at di erent doping levels are due to the sam e e ect.

A nother feature common to the one-, two- and fourelectron systems is that their  $lm_k$  i have very prominent dips at k = (;0) and (0;). These dips resemble electron pockets. This is certainly not a generic feature of t-J-likem odels because it is not found in the t-J m odel.<sup>13</sup> N ote that (;0) and (0;) are along the AFBZ boundary



FIG.5: Momentum distribution function  $hn_k i$  in systems with (a) two and (b) four electrons.

where  $hn_k i$  is not disguised by the generic dom e-shape feature. Therefore these pocket-like features should reect the physics of the system s. The fact that pocketlike features are found at these doping levels in m ediately suggests the relevance of the singly-doped state to the multiply-doped one. If electrons doped into the parent system behave like weakly interacting ferm ions, then it is reasonable to expect that multiple-electron systems can be approximated by lling up the single-electron band. This should lead to electron-pockets at single-electron ground state m om enta. To m ake this argum ent quantitative, we consider the charge-carrier distribution function  $h\bar{h}_k$ i. From Eq. (10),  $h\bar{h}_k$ i can be considered as the suppression of  $hn_k i$  from its maximum value upon doping. If multiple-electron states can be built up from single-electron states, we expect the suppressions in  $m_k i$ due to individual electrons doped into the system to be additive,

$$\overline{m}_{k} \dot{i}_{2} ' \overline{m}_{k} \dot{i}_{1} + \overline{m}_{k\#} \dot{i}_{1};$$

$$\overline{m}_{k} \dot{i}_{4} ' 2 (\overline{m}_{k} \dot{i}_{1} + \overline{m}_{k\#} \dot{i}_{1};)$$

$$(13)$$

where  $\overline{hn}_k i_{N_c}$  is the distribution function of a system with N<sub>c</sub> electrons. Table III shows that in the two-electron system the additive approximation is satisfied at all available k points. In the four-electron system it works satisfactorily at most k points. O bvious exceptions are (;0) and (3 =4; =4). Note that at this doping level Eq. (13) cannot hold at (;0) without violating Eq. (10). As a result, instead of lling states at (;0) some electrons will

If the next available low energy states which, according to Fig. 2, are at (3 = 4; = 4). Therefore our results show that the additive approximation works in the electrondoped model at doping levels up to at least 0.125. Note that this conclusion is consistent with that in section IV : if the electrons are uncorrelated, we expect that multiplydoped states can be build up from the singly-doped state.

TABLE III: Charge-carrier distribution function  $h_k$  i in system sdoped with two and four electrons. Numbers in brackets are the corresponding results from the additive approximation Eq. (13). Note that in Eq. (13) we have to average the one-carrier results over all degenerate ground states.

k	two-electron system	four-electron system
(0,0)	0.1150 (0.1179)	0,2280 (0,2357)
$(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$	0.0935 (0.0941)	0,2002 (0,1882)
$(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$	0.0304 (0.0301)	0.0614 (0.0602)
$\left(\frac{3^{2}}{4},\frac{3}{4}\right)$	0.0008 (0.0009)	0.0021 (0.0018)
(,)	0.0006 (0.0008)	0.0027 (0.0015)
(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	0.0024 (0.0021)	0.0051 (0.0042)
( ,0)	0.3574 (0.3550)	0.3901 (0.7099)
( <del>,</del> 0)	0.0932 (0.0928)	0,2108 (0,1855)
$(\frac{3^{2}}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$	0.0361 (0.0362)	0.1338 (0.0724)

#### VII. SPIN ORDER

Our previous discussions have been based on the scenario that antiferrom agnetic spin order is preserved upon doping. This is a direct consequence of the fact that the  $t^0$  and  $t^{00}$  hopping terms do not frustrate the spin background. In this section we provide evidence for the existence of antiferrom agnetic correlation. A ntiferromagnetic spin order can be measured directly using the spin correlation function  $hS_0$  Si. Results are shown in Fig. 6(a). At half-lling the system is known to possess long-range antiferrom agnetic order<sup>27</sup> and its spin correlation is shown as a reference. We note that in the twoelectron system the spin correlation is not much weaker than that at half-lling, and more im portantly it does not show signi cant decay beyond r = 2. This indicates that strong antiferrom agnetic spin order exists in the system . The same qualitative trend is also observed in the four-electron system . A lthough the spin correlation is inevitably weakened due to higher doping level, it does not decay signi cantly beyond r = 2. A nother way to display the sam e data is through the static structure factor,

$$S(k) = e^{ik} f S_0 \quad \text{Si:} \quad (14)$$

Fig. 6(b) shows the structure factors in systems doped with two and four electrons. As the doping level increases, the height of the antiferrom agnetic peak at (;) is reduced. But it still remains prominent and there is no sign of enhancement at any other k point. Our results therefore indicate that antiferrom agnetic order persists at least up to x = 0.125. Note that this doping level is close to the point where the antiferrom agnetic phase ends in the phase diagram of NdC eCu0,<sup>1</sup> which is x = 0.13.

### VIII. CHARGE CURRENT CORRELATION

The existence of a staggered pattern in the charge current correlation function has been established in the



FIG.6: (Color online) (a) Spin correlation function and (b) static structure factor of system s with two and four electrons. Results at half-lling are given for reference purpose. In (a), en pty and lled symbols represent positive and negative correlations respectively.

t-J model.<sup>28,29</sup> It has been interpreted as a direct evidence for the staggered-ux phase in the mean-eld picture.<sup>30</sup> In this picture the hopping motions of charge carriers frustrate the antiferrom agnetic spin background and lead to staggered chiral spin correlation. Binding of charge carriers is mediated through the attraction between charge carriers with opposite vorticity. Num erically it has been found that staggered current pattern exists in the two-hole t-J model with  $d_{x^2 v^2}$  symmetry only when the holes are loosely bound. It does not exist in states with other symmetry, nor when J=t is so large that the holes are tightly bound. The vorticity and charge correlations are found to be proportional to each other. However, in the electron-doped model a very basic ingredient of the above picture is m issing, namely, the hopping motions of charge carriers are mostly unfrustrating. The result is that antiferrom agnetic order is robust and charge carriers do not have signi cant correlation. Consequently it is very unlikely that staggered current correlation can exist. How ever, as antiferrom agnetic spin order is weakened at higher doping level, more subtle correlations m ay em erge.<sup>31</sup> W e therefore calculate the current correlation in the two-and four-carrier ground states and see if there exists a system atic trend as doping level increases.

Fig. 7 shows the spatial variation of the current correlation function  $hj_{k1}j_{m,n}$  i, where

$$j_{k1} = i(e_k^y e_1 e_1^y e_k);$$
 (15)

for system s doped with two and four electrons. A nother way to display the same data is to de ne the vorticity V (r) of a square plaquette by summing up the current around it in the counterclockwise direction. The vorticity correlation  $C_{VV}$  (r) hV (r)V (0) i=x is shown in Fig. 8. O ur result for the two-electron system leaves little doubt

that there is no staggered pattern in either hj<sub>kl</sub>j<sub>m n</sub>i or  $C_{VV}$  (r). In the four-electron system there is again no clear indication of a staggered pattern. W e therefore conclude that intra-sublattice hopping term s in the electrondoped model do not favor the form ation of a staggered pattern in the current correlation. This agrees with a recent mean-eld study on the electron-doped model.<sup>31</sup> Furtherm ore, in the mean-eld picture the loss of vorticity correlation implies that charge carrier binding is not favored, which agrees with our results in section V. Finally we remark that in our four-electron system, it seems like at short distances the current correlation is stronger and exhibit a staggered pattern. This is most obvious when we compare Fig. 8 (a) and (b). This seems to suggest that at doping level x = 0.125 the system m ay be starting to develop som e other order due to the weakening of antiferrom agnetic correlation. How ever, the range within which we observe the \right" correlation is too short and the correlation is too weak for us to decide whether it has any signi cance. Therefore we are not able to make any de nite statem ent concerning this m atter.

#### IX. CONCLUSION

W e have solved the electron-doped model with one, two, and four charge carriers on a 32-site square lattice. Our results cover doping levels up to x = 0.125. In the electron-doped model, intra-sublattice hoppings of charge carriers do not frustrate the spin background. M ost of our results presented above can be understood as consequences of this fact. Since hopping motions are m ostly unfrustrating, charge carriers can propagate m ore freely. This is re ected in the large quasi-particle bandwidth in the singly-doped system . In system s doped with two and four electrons, the charge carrier correlation function shows that electrons are uncorrelated. Again this is due to the fact that electrons can hop m ore freely in the same sublattice. There is no evidence of charge carriers forming a bound state. Unfrustrating hopping motions also mean that antiferrom agnetic correlation in the spin background is better preserved upon doping. This is clearly shown in the spin correlation function and static structure factor. It also shows up in the Fermi surface of the system . In the singly-doped system quasiparticle weights at k points along the AFBZ boundary are sm all except at the single-carrier ground state m omenta, i.e., (;0) and its equivalent points. This resembles a Ferm i surface consisting of small pockets at single-carrier ground state m om enta, which is expected in a lightly doped antiferrom agnet.<sup>26</sup> These sm all pockets persist in our system s doped with two and four electrons and are clearly visible in their momentum distribution functions of spin objects. Furtherm ore, m om entum distribution functions of ourm ultiply-doped systems can be well approxim ated by adding up the singly-doped momentum distribution functions. This re-assures that



FIG.7: Current correlation  $h_{j_{k_1}j_{m_n}}$  i=x in the ground state of the (a) two-electron, and (b) four-electron system s. The reference bond m n is indicated by a shaded line. On other bonds, arrow s point along the directions of positive correlation and line widths are proportional to  $h_{j_{k_1}j_{m_n}}$  i=x. For reference purpose, num erical values of  $h_{j_{k_1}j_{m_n}}$  i=x are shown next to some of the bonds.



FIG. 8: Vorticity correlation  $C_{VV}$  (r) in the ground state of the (a) two-electron and (b) four-electron systems. The reference plaquette is indicated by a cross inside it. Those plaquettes touching the reference one do not have well-de ned vorticity correlation because current operators on overlapping bonds do not commute.

## charge carriers are uncorrelated.

Our results show that antiferrom agnetic order in electron-doped model persists at least up to doping level x = 0.125. We nd no clear evidence of other orders existing in our systems. This is consistent with the phase diagram of Nd<sub>2</sub>  $_x$  Ce<sub>x</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> whose antiferrom ag-

netic phase persists up to x = 0.13.<sup>1</sup> ARPES experiment on the same material shows that before the Ferm i surface becom es a large one centered at (;), sm all pockets will start to appear at ( =2; =2) (and its equivalent points) as those at (;0) evolve.<sup>5</sup> However, the quasiparticle energy E (k) at k = (=2; =2) in the electrondoped m odel is quite high (see Fig. 2). A ssum ing that the quasi-particle dispersion relation does not change much on further doping, electrons doped into the system will ll low er energy states at other k points st. Therefore it is not surprising that we do not see pockets developing at (=2; =2). A recent theoretical calculation predicts that pockets will start to appear at ( =2; =2) at x = 0:144when the Ferm i level crosses a di erent band from that at low er doping levels.<sup>9</sup> Therefore it is possible that our doping level is not large enough to observe the change in the Ferm i surface as revealed by ARPES experiment.

#### A cknow ledgm ents

This work was supported by a grant from the Hong Kong Research Grants Council (Project No. HKUST 6159/01P).

PW Leung@usthk

- <sup>1</sup> E.Dagotto, Rev.M od.Phys. 66, 763 (1994).
- <sup>2</sup> T. Tohyam a and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. B 49, 3596 (1994).
- <sup>3</sup> R.J.Gooding, K.J.E.Vos, and P.W .Leung, Phys. Rev. B 50, 12866 (1994).
- <sup>4</sup> N.P.Am itage, F.Ronning, D.H.Lu, C.Kim, A.Dam ascelli, K.M. Shen, D.L.Feng, H.Eisaki, Z.-X. Shen, P.

K.Mang, N.Kaneko, M.Greven, Y.Onose, Y.Taguchi, and Y.Tokura, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 257001 (2002).

- <sup>5</sup> A.Dam ascelli, Z.Hussain, and Z.X.Shen, Rev.Mod. Phys.75,473 (2003).
- <sup>6</sup> T. Tohyam a and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. B 64, 212505 (2001).
- <sup>7</sup> T. Tohyam a and S. M aekawa, Phys. Rev. B 67, 92509 (2003).

- <sup>8</sup> T.Tohyam a, Phys.Rev.B 70, 174517 (2004).
- <sup>9</sup> Q.Yuan, Y.Chen, T.K.Lee, and C.S.Ting, Phys.Rev. B 69, 214523 (2004).
- <sup>10</sup> Q.Yuan, T.K.Lee, and C.S.Ting, Phys. Rev. B 71, 134522 (2005).
- <sup>11</sup> W e rem ark that there is another approach to the electrondoped m odel w hich, in contrast to the strong coupling lim it assumed in the t-J m odel, emphasizes the importance of interm ediate coupling. See, for exam ple, D. Senechal and A.-M.S.Trem blay, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 126401 (2004), and references there-in.
- <sup>12</sup> P.W .Leung and R.J.Gooding, Phys. Rev. B 52, R15711 (1995).
- <sup>13</sup> A.L.Chemyshev, P.W .Leung, and R.J.G ooding, Phys. Rev.B 58, 13594 (1998).
- <sup>14</sup> P.W .Leung, Phys. Rev. B 65, 205101 (2002).
- $^{\rm 15}$  P.W .Leung, cond-m at/0511568.
- <sup>16</sup> P.W .Leung and K.K.Ng, Int.J.M od.Phys.B 17, 3367 (2003).
- <sup>17</sup> P.W. Leung, B.O.W ells, and R.J.Gooding, Phys. Rev. B 56, 6320 (1997).
- <sup>18</sup> It has been suggested that in the electron-doped m odelnot only the signs and the m agnitudes of the hopping term s are di erent from those in the hole-doped m odel (see R ef. 32). But since we are not interested in the detail quantitative di erences, we only change the signs of the hopping term s in the electron-doped m odel.
- <sup>19</sup> Note that in the electron-doped model this de nition of

A (k;!) corresponds to inverse photoem ission spectroscopy on the undoped insulator. A similar de nition in the t-J m odel corresponds to photoem ission spectroscopy, see R ef. 17.

- <sup>20</sup> V.I.Belinicher, A.L.Chemyshev, and V.A.Shubin, Phys. Rev.B 53, 335 (1996).
- <sup>21</sup> J.A.Riera and A.P.Young, Phys. Rev. B 39, R9697 (1989).
- <sup>22</sup> R.Eder and P.W robel, Phys.Rev.B 47, 6010 (1993).
- <sup>23</sup> R.Eder, Y.Ohta, T.Shim ozato, Phys. Rev. B 50, 3350 (1994).
- <sup>24</sup> W . Stephan and P. Horsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 2258 (1990).
- <sup>25</sup> R.Eder and Y.Ohta, Phys. Rev. B 51, 6041 (1995).
- <sup>26</sup> P. Fulde, Electron Correlations in Molecules and Solids, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, (Springer, Berlin, 1995).
- <sup>27</sup> E.Manousakis, Rev.Mod.Phys. 63, 1 (1991).
- <sup>28</sup> D.A. Ivanov, P.A. Lee, and X.-G.W en, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3958 (2000).
- <sup>29</sup> P.W .Leung, Phys. Rev. B 62, R 6112 (2000).
- <sup>30</sup> W e rem ark that there is another independent interpretation of the sam e result in the spin-polaron picture. See P. W robel and R. Eder, Phys. Rev. B 64, 184504 (2001).
- <sup>31</sup> T.C.Ribeiro and X.-G.W en, Phys. Rev. B 68, 24501 (2003).
- <sup>32</sup> H.Eskes and G.A.Sawatzky, Physica C 160, 424, (1989).