

Crossover between Local-Moment Magnetism and Itinerant-Electron Magnetism in the t-J Model

Fusayoshi J. OHKAWA

Division of Physics, Graduate School of Science,
Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan

(Dated: January 17, 2022)

Abstract

A Kondo-lattice theory is applied to the t-J model on a quasi-two dimensional lattice. The Kondo temperature T_K or $k_B T_K$ is defined as an energy scale of local quantum spin fluctuations, with k_B the Boltzmann constant. The bandwidth W of quasiparticles, which is approximately given by $W \sim 4k_B T_K$, is renormalized by the Fock-type term of the superexchange interaction. When the lifetime width of quasiparticles is so small and temperature T is so low that $\Gamma W < 1$ and $k_B T = W < 1$, the renormalization is large. Even in the limit of the half filling, for example, the bandwidth W is nonzero and of the order of $|J|$, with J the superexchange interaction constant between nearest neighbors. The Kondo temperature $k_B T_K$, which also gives a measure of the strength of the quenching of magnetic moments by local quantum spin fluctuations, increases away from the half filling; it is smaller for larger δ . Therefore, local-moment magnetism, which is characterized by $T_N \sim T_K$, with T_N the Neel temperature, appears for almost half fillings, and itinerant-electron magnetism, which is characterized by $T_N < T_K$, appears for fillings away from the half filling; T_N is higher for larger δ . The antiferromagnetic region as a function of electron fillings is wider for larger δ ; this result implies that it is wider in more disordered systems than it is in less disordered ones. The difference or asymmetry of disorder between electron-doped and hole-doped cuprate oxide superconductors must be, at least partly, responsible for that of antiferromagnetic phases between them.

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery¹ in 1986 of high critical temperature (high- T_c) superconductivity in cuprate oxides has revived intensive and extensive studies on strong electron correlations because it occurs in the vicinity of the Mott-Hubbard metal-insulator (M-I) transition or crossover. When no electrons or holes are doped, cuprates are insulators; they exhibit antiferromagnetism at low temperatures. When enough electrons or holes are doped, they become metals; they exhibit superconductivity at low temperatures. The M-I transition or crossover and the transition between antiferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases as a function of doping concentrations are asymmetric between electron-doped and hole-doped cuprates²; the insulating phase is much wider in electron-doped ones than it is in hole-doped ones, and the Neel temperature is relatively higher in electron-doped ones than it is in hole-doped ones. It is plausible that a relevant theory can explain not only high- T_c superconductivity but also the asymmetry of the M-I transition or crossover and that of the Neel temperature.

In 1963, three distinguished theories on electron correlations in a single-band model, which is now called the Hubbard model, were published by Kanamori,³ Hubbard,⁴ and Gutzwiller.⁵ Two theories among them are related with the M-I transition or crossover. According to Hubbard's theory,⁴ the band splits into two subbands called the lower and upper Hubbard bands. According to Gutzwiller's theory,⁵ with the help of the Fermi-liquid theory,^{6,7} a narrow band of quasiparticle appears on the chemical potential; we call them Gutzwiller's band and Gutzwiller's quasiparticles. The combination of the two theories implies that the density of states must be of a three-peak structure, Gutzwiller's band between the lower and upper Hubbard bands. This speculation was confirmed in a previous paper.⁸ The Mott-Hubbard splitting occurs in both metallic and insulating phases as long as the onsite repulsion U is large enough, and Gutzwiller's band is responsible for metallic behaviors. Then, we can argue that a metal in the vicinity of the M-I transition can become an insulator only when a gap opens in Gutzwiller's band or that it can behave as a bad metal or an insulator when lifetime widths of Gutzwiller's quasiparticles are larger than their bandwidth.

Not only Hubbard's⁴ and Gutzwiller's⁵ theories but also the previous theory⁸ are within the single-site approximation (SSA). This fact implies that local electron correlations must be responsible for the three-peak structure. Local electron correlations are rigorously considered

in SSA that includes all the single-site terms; such an SSA is rigorous for paramagnetic phases with no order parameter in infinite dimensions.⁹ It is reduced to solving the Anderson model,^{10,11,12} which is one of the simplest effective Hamiltonians for the Kondo problem. This approximation is often called the dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT).¹³ The Kondo problem has been almost settled or almost completely clarified^{14,15,16,17,18,19}. The Kondo temperature T_K or $k_B T_K$ is defined as an energy scale of local quantum spin fluctuations, with k_B the Boltzmann constant. Gutzwiller's band between the lower and upper Hubbard bands corresponds to the so called Kondo peak between two sub-peaks; its bandwidth W is about $W \sim 4k_B T_K$.

One of the most essential physics involved in the Kondo problem is that a magnetic moment is quenched by local quantum spin fluctuations so that the ground state is a singlet¹⁴ or a normal Fermi liquid.^{16,17} A strongly correlated electron liquid on a lattice is a normal Fermi liquid at $T < T_K$, where magnetic moments are quantum-mechanically quenched, while it is a nondegenerate Fermi liquid at $T > T_K$, where magnetic moments are thermally quenched. Local-moment magnetism occurs at $T > T_K$, and itinerant-electron one occurs at $T < T_K$; superconductivity can only occur at $T < T_K$. The M-I transition or crossover is related with the crossover between local-moment magnetism and itinerant-electron magnetism.

The coherence of quasiparticles is destroyed by not only thermal fluctuations but also disorder. When $k_B T \sim W$ or $\sim W$, with the quasiparticle lifetime width, quasiparticles are never well-defined; the liquid behaves as a bad metal or an insulator. When $k_B T < W$ and $\ll W$, on the other hand, they are well-defined; the liquid behaves as a metal. Disorder can also play a significant role in the M-I transition or crossover.

Kondo-lattice theories^{20,21,22} have been developed so far mainly in order to elucidate strong electron correlations in typical or canonical Kondo lattices of lanthanide and actinide alloys, which are also called dense Kondo systems or heavy-fermion systems. In these canonical Kondo lattices, almost localized 4f or 5f electrons and itinerant conduction electrons coexist and conduction electrons can play an important role not only in the quenching of magnetic moments of almost localized electrons but also in the appearance of an intersite exchange interaction mediated by conduction electrons such as the Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida (RKKY) exchange interaction²³ and the opening of the so called hybridization gaps or pseudogaps. In this paper, we are interested in electron correlations in non-canonical Kondo lattices such as transition-metal alloys in the vicinity of the M-I transition or crossover,

where the coexistence of almost localized electrons and conduction electrons is absent or it plays no essential role even if it is present.

A Kondo-lattice theory developed in this paper is a perturbation theory starting from a starting or an unperturbed state constructed in a non-perturbative method, that is, SSA or DMFT; intersite terms are perturbatively considered in terms of intersite exchange interactions. This perturbation is nothing but $1/d$ expansion, with d being spatial dimensionality.^{9,10,11} It has already been applied to typical issues on electron correlations in non-canonical Kondo lattices such as the Mott-Hubbard M-I transition,¹³ the Curie-Weiss law of itinerant-electron magnets,^{24,25} itinerant-electron antiferromagnetism²⁶ and ferromagnetism,²⁷ and related issues to high- T_c superconductivity,^{28,29} and so on. Early papers^{30,31} on a mechanism of d -wave high- T_c superconductivity can also be regarded within the framework of the Kondo-lattice theory. The interplay between correlations and disorder in a paramagnetic phase is investigated for the Hubbard model with the just half filling.³² One of the purposes of this paper is to study the interplay between correlations and disorder in the crossover between local-moment magnetism and itinerant-electron magnetism as a function of electron fillings in the t - J model. This paper is organized as follows: The Kondo-lattice theory is reviewed in § II. A paramagnetic unperturbed state is constructed in § III. Antiferromagnetic instability of the unperturbed state is studied in § IV. Discussion is given in § V. Conclusion is given in § VI. The self-energy of quasiparticles in disordered Kondo lattices is studied in Appendix.

II. KONDO-LATTICE THEORY

A. Renormalized SSA

We consider the t - J model^{33,34} or the t - t^0 - J - U_1 model with $U_1 = t/t^0 + 1$ on a quasi-two dimensional lattice composed of simple square lattices:

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} t a_i^\dagger a_j + \sum_{\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle} t^0 a_i^\dagger a_j - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (S_i \cdot S_j) + U_1 \sum_i n_i n_{i\uparrow}; \quad (2.1)$$

with t the transfer integral between nearest neighbors $\langle ij \rangle$, t^0 between next-nearest neighbors $\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle$, $S_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \sigma_{\alpha\beta} a_i^\dagger \sigma_{\alpha\beta} a_i$, with σ_x , σ_y , and σ_z being the Pauli matrices, and $n_i = \sum_{\alpha} a_i^\dagger \alpha a_i$. In nitely large onsite repulsion U_1 is introduced to exclude doubly occupied

sites. The t - J model (2.1) itself can only treat less-than-half fillings. When the hole picture is taken, it can also treat more-than-half fillings. We consider two models: a symmetric one with $t^0 = 0$, where physical properties are symmetric between less-than-half and more-than-half fillings, and an asymmetric one with $t^0 \neq 0$, whose precise definition is made in x III. Effects of disorder and weak three dimensionality are phenomenologically considered in this paper. We assume $J = |t| = 0.3$; $t = (0.3-0.5)$ eV and $J = (0.10-0.15)$ eV for cuprate oxide superconductors.

We follow the previous paper²⁸ to treat U_1 . The selfenergy is divided into the single-site one $\sim \langle i''_n \rangle$ and the multisite one $\langle i''_n; k \rangle$. The single-site one $\sim \langle i''_n \rangle$ is given by that of the Anderson model with the same U_1 as that of the t - J model (2.1); other parameters should be selfconsistently determined to satisfy^{10,11}

$$G \langle i''_n \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k G \langle i''_n; k \rangle; \quad (2.2)$$

with N the number of sites, and $G \langle i''_n \rangle$ and

$$G \langle i''_n; k \rangle = \frac{1}{i''_n + E(k) - \langle i''_n \rangle - \langle i''_n; k \rangle} \quad (2.3)$$

the Green functions of the Anderson and t - J models, respectively. Here, μ is the chemical potential and $E(k) = 2t_{1s}(k) - 2t_{2s}(k)$, with

$$t_{1s}(k) = \cos(k_x a) + \cos(k_y a); \quad (2.4)$$

$$t_{2s}(k) = 2 \cos(k_x a) \cos(k_y a); \quad (2.5)$$

with a the lattice constant of the simple square lattices.

Note that the mapping condition (2.2) with eq. (2.3) depends on the multisite selfenergy, which should be perturbatively and selfconsistently calculated. There can be various approximations of single-site selfenergies or dynamical mean fields depending on it. As is shown in x III, the multisite selfenergy includes an energy independent part, which is denoted by $\langle k \rangle$, because the superexchange interaction constant does not depend on energies in the t - J model. In this paper, we include only $\langle k \rangle$ in eq. (2.3); the Green function that includes $\langle k \rangle$ instead of $\langle i''_n; k \rangle$ is denoted by $G^{(0)} \langle i''_n; k \rangle$.

The Kondo temperature T_K is defined by

$$k_B T_K = [1 - \gamma_s(0)]_T \neq 0; \quad (2.6)$$

where $\chi_s(i|_1)$ is the spin susceptibility of the Anderson model, which does not include the conventional factor $(1/4)g^2 \mu_B^{-2}$, with g and μ_B being the g factor and the Bohr magneton, respectively. The single-site selfenergy $\tilde{\Sigma}(i|_n)$ is expanded for $T < 2k_B T_K$ as $\tilde{\Sigma}(i|_n) = \tilde{\Sigma}(0) + (1 - \tilde{\chi}_0) i|_n + \dots$, with $\tilde{\chi}_0$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}(0)$ in nitesimally small spin-dependent chemical potential shifts. The Wilson ratio is defined by $W_s = \tilde{\chi}_s / \tilde{\chi}_0$, with $\tilde{\chi}_s = \tilde{\chi}_s(i|_n)$. For almost half fillings, charge fluctuations are suppressed so that $\tilde{\chi}_c = \tilde{\chi}_s + \tilde{\chi}_0 \approx 1$. For such fillings, $\tilde{\chi}_s \approx 1$ so that $W_s \approx 2$. The Green function is divided into coherent and incoherent parts: $G^{(0)}(i|_n; k) = (1 - \tilde{\chi}_0) g^{(0)}(i|_n; k) + (\text{incoherent part})$, with

$$g^{(0)}(i|_n; k) = \frac{1}{i|_n + \epsilon(k) + i \eta_n}; \quad (2.7)$$

with $\epsilon(k) = \epsilon_0(k) + \dots$ and $\eta(k) = \eta_0(k) + \dots$. We introduce a phenomenological lifetime width η . Although η depends on energies even if it is due to disorder, as is discussed in Appendix A, its energy dependence is ignored.³⁵

According to the Fermi-surface sum rule,^{6,7} the number of electrons per site for $T = T_K$ is $n = 0$ and $n = 1$ for $T < T_K$ and $T > T_K$ is given by

$$n = 2 \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \rho(\omega) f(\omega) = 2 \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \rho(\omega) f_{=0}(\omega); \quad (2.8)$$

with

$$\rho(\omega) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \frac{1}{[\omega^2 - \epsilon(k)^2 + \eta^2]^{1/2}}; \quad (2.9)$$

$$f_{=0}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Im} \left[\frac{1}{z} + \frac{i\omega}{2k_B T} \right]; \quad (2.10)$$

with $z(z)$ the digamma function. Note that $f_{=0}(\omega) = 1/2 \exp(\omega/k_B T) + 1/2$. We assume eq. (2.8) even for nonzero T and η . The parameter $\tilde{\chi}_0$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(0)$ can be determined from eq. (2.8) as a function of n .

B. Intersite exchange interaction

In Kondo lattices, local spin fluctuations at different sites interact with each other by an exchange interaction. Following this physical picture, we define an intersite exchange interaction $I_s(i|_1; q)$ by

$$I_s(i|_1; q) = \frac{\tilde{\chi}_s(i|_1)}{1 - \frac{1}{4} I_s(i|_1; q) \tilde{\chi}_s(i|_1)}; \quad (2.11)$$

where $\chi_s(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{q})$ is the spin susceptibility of the t-J model to be studied. Following the previous paper,²⁸ we obtain

$$I_s(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{q}) = J(\mathbf{q}) + 2U_1^2 \chi_s(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{q}); \quad (2.12)$$

with $J(\mathbf{q}) = 2J_{1s}(\mathbf{q})$ and $\chi_s(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{q})$ the multi-site part of the irreducible polarization function in spin channels; $2U_1^2 \chi_s(\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{q})$ is examined in x IV B and x IV C.

According to the Ward relation,³⁶ the irreducible single-site three-point vertex function in spin channels, $\tilde{\gamma}_s(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{i}''_n + \mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{l}_1)$, is given by

$$U_1 \tilde{\gamma}_s(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{i}''_n + \mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{l}_1) = 2\tilde{\gamma}_s = \tilde{\gamma}_s(\mathbf{l}_1); \quad (2.13)$$

for $\mathbf{j}''_n \cdot \mathbf{j} \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{j}''_1 \cdot \mathbf{j} \rightarrow 0$. We approximately use eq. (2.13) for $\mathbf{j}''_n \cdot \mathbf{j} < 2k_B T_K$ and $\mathbf{j}''_1 \cdot \mathbf{j} < 2k_B T_K$. A mutual interaction between quasiparticles mediated by spin fluctuations is given by

$$\frac{1}{4} \hbar 2\tilde{\gamma}_s = \tilde{\gamma}_s(\mathbf{l}_1) F_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}) = \tilde{\gamma}_s \frac{1}{4} I_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}); \quad (2.14)$$

with

$$F_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}) = \chi_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}) - \tilde{\gamma}_s(\mathbf{l}_1); \quad (2.15)$$

$$\frac{1}{4} I_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}) = \frac{\frac{1}{4} I_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q})}{1 - \frac{1}{4} I_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}) \tilde{\gamma}_s(\mathbf{l}_1)}; \quad (2.16)$$

The single-site term is subtracted in $F_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q})$ because it is considered in SSA. The expansion coefficient $\tilde{\gamma}_s$ appears as an effective or reducible single-site vertex function in eq. (2.14). Because the spin space is isotropic, the interaction in the transversal channels is also given by these equations. In the Kondo-lattice theory, intersite effects are perturbatively considered in terms of $I_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q})$, $\chi_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q})$, or $F_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q})$ depending on each situation.

III. RENORMALIZATION OF GUTZWILLER'S QUASIPARTICLES

In this section, we restrict the Hilbert space within paramagnetic states. There are two types of selfenergies linear in the exchange interaction: Hartree-type and Fock-type terms. The Hartree-type term vanishes in paramagnetic states. We consider the Fock-type term of the superexchange interaction:

$$\Sigma(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{3}{4} \tilde{\gamma}_s \frac{k_B T^X}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{p}} J(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}) e^{i\mathbf{n} \cdot 0^+} G(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{p}); \quad (3.1)$$




FIG. 1: Renormalized transfer integrals t^* of the symmetric model: (a) $k_B T = t_j = 0.02$, (b) $k_B T = t_j = 0.1$, (c) $k_B T = t_j = 0.2$, and (d) $k_B T = t_j = 0.4$. In each figure, topmost solid, dashed, broken, chain, and chain double-dashed lines show results for $t_j = 0.01, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4$, and 1, respectively. For comparison, $t^* = t$ is also shown by a bottom solid line.

The factor 3 appears because of three spin channels. When only the coherent part is considered,

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{t}}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{3}{4} W_s^2 J_{1s}(\mathbf{k}); \quad (3.2)$$

with

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_s(\mathbf{k}) f_{\mathbf{k}}: \quad (3.3)$$

The dispersion relation of quasiparticles is given by

$$(\mathbf{k}) = 2t_{1s}(\mathbf{k}) - 2t_{2s}(\mathbf{k}); \quad (3.4)$$

where t should be selfconsistently determined to satisfy

$$2t = \frac{2t}{\tilde{t}} - \frac{3}{4} W_s^2 J; \quad (3.5)$$

and t_2 is simply given by $t_2 = t^0 = \tilde{t}$.

For the symmetric model, $t^0 = 0$ so that $t_2 = 0$. In order to examine how crucial role the shape of the Fermi surface plays in the asymmetry, we consider a phenomenological asymmetric model with $t_2 = t = 0.3$.

Expansion parameters \tilde{t} and \tilde{t}_s are given by those of the mapped Anderson model. However, we approximately use those for the Anderson model with a constant hybridization energy. According to Appendix of the previous paper²⁷,

$$\tilde{t} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{j} + j \right) \frac{(\epsilon = 2)^2 (1 - j^2)}{\cos^2(\epsilon = 2)}; \quad (3.6)$$




FIG. 2: Plot of the asymmetric model for $k_B T = 0.02$. See also the caption of Fig. 1.




FIG. 3: Single-particle properties of the unperturbed state of the symmetric model. (a) Density of states for quasiparticles $\rho_\gamma(\epsilon)$, (b) effective chemical potentials, μ , as functions of carrier concentrations n , and (c) n as functions of μ . In these three figures, solid, dashed, broken, chain, and chain double-dashed lines show results for $J/t = 10^{-3}, 0.1, 0.3, 1$, and 3 , respectively. Note that the solid and dashed lines are the almost same as each other. (d) Fermi surfaces for $k_B T = J/t = 0$, $\mu = 0$, and 19 electron concentrations such as $n = 0.1$ i, with $i = 1$ to 19 being an integer. Dashed lines show Fermi surfaces for $n = 0.5, 1.0$, and 1.5 . Single-particle properties of the asymmetric model can be found in Fig. 2 of ref. 28.

$$\tilde{s} = \frac{1}{J} \frac{(\epsilon/2)^2 (1 - J/t)}{\cos^2(\epsilon/2)}; \quad (3.7)$$

where $\epsilon = 1 - n$ is the concentration of dopants, holes ($\epsilon > 0$) or electrons ($\epsilon < 0$). These are consistent with Gutzwiller's theory.⁵ Figures 1 and 2 show t of the symmetric and asymmetric models as a function of ϵ for various J/t . It is interesting that t is nonzero even for $\epsilon \neq 0$ if J/t and $k_B T$ are small enough. For the symmetric model ($t_2 = 0$), eq. (3.3) can be analytically calculated for $T = 0$ K, $\mu = 0$ and $\epsilon = 0$ ($\epsilon = 0$) in such a way that $t = 4\epsilon^2$. It follows that $|t| = t|_{\epsilon=0} = 3W_s^2 J/2t = 0.18$ for $J/t = 0.3$. If J/t or $k_B T$ is large

enough, on the other hand, χ and t vanish for $\beta \rightarrow 0$.

Figure 3 shows physical properties of the unperturbed state of the symmetric model. Those of the unperturbed state of the asymmetric model can be found in Fig. 2 of ref. 28. In x IV, we study antiferromagnetic instabilities of these paramagnetic unperturbed states.

IV. ANTIFERROMAGNETIC INSTABILITY

A. Reduction of T_N by local spin fluctuations

According to eq. (2.11), the Neel temperature T_N is determined by the competition between the Kondo effect and the intersite exchange interaction:

$$\frac{1}{\chi_s(0)} - \frac{1}{4} I_s(0; Q) = 0; \quad (4.1)$$

where Q is an ordering wave number to be determined. Effects of local spin fluctuations in SSA or those of dynamical mean fields in DMFT are included in the local term of $1/\chi_s(0)$; $I_s(0; Q)$ corresponds to the conventional Weiss's mean field, which is an intersite effect and can only be included beyond SSA.

The local susceptibility $\chi_s(0)$ is almost constant at $T = T_K$, while it obeys the Curie law at $T = T_K$. We use an interpolation between the two limits:

$$\chi_s(0) = \frac{n}{k_B} \frac{1}{n^2 T_K^2 + T^2}; \quad (4.2)$$

Here, T_K is an averaged one over T_K 's at different sites. In disordered systems, the mapping conditions are different from site to site so that T_K 's are also different from site to site. Such disorder in T_K causes energy-dependent lifetime widths, as is studied in Appendix. However, lifetime widths due to the disorder in T_K are small on the chemical potential in case of non-magnetic impurities. According to eqs. (2.2) and (2.6) together with the Fermi-liquid relation,^{18,19} it follows that

$$1/k_B T_K = 2W_s [\chi(\omega)]_{\omega=0}; \quad (4.3)$$

in the absence of disorder. Then, a mean value of T_K in disordered systems is approximately given by eq. (4.3) with nonzero but small η . It follows from eq. (4.3) that

$$k_B T_K = \frac{\eta}{c_{T_K}} \frac{1}{2W_s}; \quad (4.4)$$

with c_{T_K} a numerical constant depending on n . As is shown in Fig. 3(a), $c_{T_K} \approx 0.15$ for $0.1 < \mu_j < 1$ and $0.05 < j < 0.25$. We assume that c_{T_K} is independent of n for the sake of simplicity: $c_{T_K} = 0.15$. We are only interested in physical properties that never drastically change when c_{T_K} slightly changes.

B. Exchange interaction arising from the exchange of pair excitations of quasiparticles

The second term of eq. (2.12) is the sum of an exchange interaction arising from the virtual exchange of pair excitations of quasiparticles, $J_Q(i_l; q)$, and the mode-mode coupling term,

$4(i_l; q)$:

$$2U_1^2 \chi_s(i_l; q) = J_Q(i_l; q) + 4(i_l; q); \quad (4.5)$$

When higher-order terms in intersite effects are ignored,

$$J_Q(i_l; q) = 4 \frac{\chi_s''}{\chi_s(0)} [P(i_l; q) - P_0(i_l)]; \quad (4.6)$$

with

$$P(i_l; q) = \frac{k_B T}{N} \sum_{n, k} g^{(0)}(i_n'' + i_l; k + q) g^{(0)}(i_n''; k); \quad (4.7)$$

The local contribution $P_0(i_l) = (1/N) \sum_q P(i_n''; q)$ is subtracted because it is considered in SSA. The static component is simply given by

$$P(0; q) = \frac{2}{N} \sum_k \frac{f(k+q)}{k} \frac{f(k)}{(k+q)} \frac{1}{i0}; \quad (4.8)$$

The magnitude of $J_Q(0; q)$ is proportional to $k_B T_K$ or the quasiparticle bandwidth.

Figures 4 and 5 show $[P(0; q) - P_0(0)]$ of the symmetric and asymmetric models. The polarization function at $q = (\pm a; \pm a)$ is relatively larger in electron-doping cases than it is in hole-doping cases.

C. Reduction of T_N by the mode-mode coupling term

Following previous papers,^{37,38,39,40} we consider mode-mode coupling terms linear in intersite spin fluctuations $F_s(i_l; q)$ given by eq. (2.15):

$$(i_l; q) = \chi_L(i_l) + \chi_s(i_l; q) + \chi_v(i_l; q); \quad (4.9)$$




FIG. 4: Static polarization function $[P(0;q) - P_0(0)]/t^*$ of the symmetric model: (a) $k_B T = t_j = 0.1$, (b) $k_B T = t_j = 0.3$, and (c) $k_B T = t_j = 1$. Solid, dashed, broken, chain, and chain double-dashed lines show results for $n = 1, n = 0.9, 0.8, 0.7$, and 0.6 , respectively. Here, Γ , X and M stand for $(0;0)$, $(\pi/2;0)$ and $(\pi/2;\pi/2)$, respectively.




FIG. 5: $[P(0;q) - P_0(0)]/t^*$ of the asymmetric model: $k_B T = t_j = 0.1$. A solid line shows a result for $n = 1$, dashed lines results of electron doping cases such as $n = 1.1, 1.2$ and 1.3 , and broken lines results for hole doping cases such as $n = 0.9, 0.8$, and 0.7 .

The first term $\chi_L(i_1)$ is a local mode-mode coupling term, which includes a single local four-point vertex function, as is shown in Fig. 4 of ref. 40. Both of $\chi_s(i_1;q)$ and $\chi_v(i_1;q)$ are intersite mode-mode coupling terms, which include a single intersite four-point vertex function; a single $F_s(i_1;q)$ appears as the selfenergy correction to the single-particle Green function in $\chi_s(i_1;q)$ while it appears as a vertex correction to the polarization function in $\chi_v(i_1;q)$, as are shown in Figs. 3(a) and 3(b), respectively, of ref. 40. Their static components are given by

$$\chi_L(0) = \frac{5}{2} \frac{k_B T}{\tilde{\chi}_s(0)} \frac{X}{N} F_s(i_1;q); \quad (4.10)$$

$$\chi_s(0; \mathbf{q}) = \frac{3}{\chi_s(0)} \frac{k_B T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{l}_1 \mathbf{p}}^X B_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}) F_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}) - \frac{1}{4} J(\mathbf{q}) \chi_s^2(\mathbf{l}_1) ; \quad (4.11)$$

$$\chi_v(0; \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2\chi_s(0)} \frac{k_B T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{l}_1 \mathbf{p}}^X B_v(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}) F_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{q}); \quad (4.12)$$

with

$$B_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}) = \frac{4W_s^4}{\chi_s^3(0)} k_B T \sum_{\mathbf{n}}^X \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^X g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{k})^2 g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n + \mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) \right. \\ \left. r^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n)^3 r^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n + \mathbf{l}_1) \right); \quad (4.13)$$

$$B_v(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}) = \frac{4W_s^4}{\chi_s^3(0)} k_B T \sum_{\mathbf{n}}^X \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^X g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{k}) g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n + \mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{p}) \right. \\ \left. g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n + \mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) - r^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n)^2 r^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n + \mathbf{l}_1)^2 \right); \quad (4.14)$$

with $r^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n) = \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^P g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{k})$. Because the selfenergy correction linear in $J(\mathbf{q})$ is considered in x III, $(1/4)J(\mathbf{q})\chi_s^2(\mathbf{l}_1)$ is subtracted in eq. (4.11).

In this paper, weak three dimensionality in spin fluctuations is phenomenologically included. Because $J(\mathbf{q})$ has its maximum value at $\mathbf{q} = (\pi/a; \pi/a)$ and the nesting vector of the Fermi surface in two dimensions is close to $\mathbf{q} = (\pi/a; \pi/a)$ for almost half filling, we assume that the ordering wave number in three dimensions is $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi/a; \pi/a; Q_z)$, with Q_z depending on interlayer exchange interactions. On the phase boundary between paramagnetic and antiferromagnetic phases, where eq. (4.1) is satisfied, the inverse of the susceptibility is expanded around \mathbf{Q} and for small $|\mathbf{j}_1|$ in such a way that

$$\chi^{-1}_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{q})|_{T=T_N} = A(\mathbf{q}) + |\mathbf{j}_1|^2 + \dots; \quad (4.15)$$

with

$$A(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{4} A_k (q_k a)^2 + \frac{1}{4} A_z [(c_x - Q_z) c]^2; \quad (4.16)$$

Here, c is the lattice constant along the z axis. Because $\chi_s(\mathbf{l}_1; \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{q})$ diverges in the limit of $|\mathbf{j}_1| \rightarrow 0$ and $|\mathbf{l}_1| \rightarrow 0$ on the phase boundary,

$$B_s(0; -\mathbf{Q}; \mathbf{Q}) = B_v(0; -\mathbf{Q}; \mathbf{Q}) \left(\frac{4W_s^4}{\chi_s^3(0)} k_B T \sum_{\mathbf{n}}^X \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}^X g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{Q})^2 g^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n; \mathbf{k})^2 r^{(0)}(\mathbf{i}''_n)^4 \right) \right); \quad (4.17)$$

can be approximately used for $B_s(i\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q})$ in eq. (4.11) and $B_v(i\mathbf{l}; \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q})$ in eq. (4.12). Then, it follows that

$$(0; Q) = \frac{5}{2\tilde{\chi}_s(0)} (1 + C_F - C_L); \quad (4.18)$$

with

$$C_F = \frac{8W_s^4}{\tilde{\chi}_s^3(0)N} \sum_k \left(\frac{f(k+Q)}{(k)} - \frac{f(k)}{(k+Q)} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{h}{f^0(k)} + f^0(k+Q) \right) \frac{1}{[f(k) - f(k+Q)]}; \quad (4.19)$$

$$C_L = \frac{16W_s^4}{\tilde{\chi}_s^3(0)} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{h}{d^2(\mathbf{x})} \left(\frac{f^0(\mathbf{x})}{2} - \frac{f^0(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_i)}{2} \right); \quad (4.20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{k_B T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{l}} \sum_{\mathbf{j}} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{\mathbf{c}} \frac{1}{A(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_z(\mathbf{q}_z c)^2}{4!}} \\ &= \frac{2c}{3A_k} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{\mathbf{c}} \sum_{\mathbf{l}} \sum_{\mathbf{j}} \left(\frac{1}{n(\mathbf{l})} + \frac{1}{2} \tan^{-1} \frac{A_k(\mathbf{q}_z a)^2 + A_z(\mathbf{q}_z c)^2}{4!} \right) \tan^{-1} \frac{A_z(\mathbf{q}_z c)^2}{4!}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

In eq. (4.19), $f^0(\mathbf{l})$ is the derivative of $f(\mathbf{l})$ defined by eq. (2.10). In eq. (4.20), \mathbf{e}_i is denoted by \mathbf{e}_i , and

$$\frac{1}{d^2(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{l}} \frac{f^0(\mathbf{l})}{\mathbf{l}^2}; \quad (4.22)$$

In eq. (4.21), the summation is restricted to $\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{l}_c$ and $\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{q}$. We assume that $\mathbf{q}_z = -3a$ and \mathbf{l}_c is given by a larger one of $8\mathbf{l}$ and \mathbf{j} .

As was shown in the previous paper,²⁸ $\beta \ll 1$ for $T = T_K \ll 1$ and $\beta = k_B T_K \ll 1$. Physical properties for $T = T_K \ll 1$ or $\beta = k_B T_K \ll 1$ scarcely depends on β . Then, we assume $\beta = 1$ for any T and β in this paper.

D. Almost symmetric T_N between $\beta > 0$ and $\beta < 0$

The Kondo temperature T_K is low in the limit of $\beta \rightarrow 0$ for nonzero T or β . When $T = T_K \ll 1$ or $\beta = k_B T_K \ll 1$, the instability condition (4.1) becomes simple:

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\chi}_s(0)} + \frac{5}{2\tilde{\chi}_s(0)} - \frac{1}{4} J(Q) = 0; \quad (4.23)$$




FIG. 6: T_N determined by eq. (4.23) for $J=|t|/2 = 0.3$ and $\delta = 0$ as a function of the exponent x of the anisotropy factor defined by $\tilde{A}_z = A_k = 10^{-x}$.

When we ignore $\chi_L(0) = 5/2 \sim \chi_S(0)$ and we assume $T_K = 0$, eq. (4.23) gives $T_N = (1/4)J(Q) = k_B = |t|/2$. This T_N is nothing but T_N in the mean-field approximation for the Heisenberg model, to which the t-J model with the half filling is reduced. On the other hand, χ diverges at non zero temperatures for $A_z = 0$; no magnetic instability occurs at nonzero temperature in complete two dimensions.⁴¹ The reduction of T_N by $\chi_L(0)$ or by quasi-two dimensional thermal spin fluctuations depends on the anisotropy of $A_z = A_k$. When only the superexchange interaction is considered, $A_k = |t|/2$. Although $(1/4)J_Q(0; Q + q)$ also contribute to the q-quadratic term, we assume $A_k = |t|/2$ for the sake of simplicity. Figure 6 shows T_N as a function of the exponent x of $\tilde{A}_z = A_k = 10^{-x}$ for the half filling ($\delta = 0$). When we take $x = 10$, for example, we obtain $T_N \approx 0.06|t|/2$ or $T_N \approx 0.2|t|/2$. We assume this anisotropy factor $x = 10$ in the following part of this paper.

Figures 7 and 8 show T_N of the symmetric and asymmetric models as a function of $\delta = 1 - n$ for various δ . The antiferromagnetic phase becomes narrower as δ decrease. As long as δ is almost symmetric between $\delta > 0$ and $\delta < 0$, T_N is also almost symmetric between them.

When $\delta = 0$ or $k_B T = 0$, T_N is determined by the competition between the superexchange interaction J and two quenching effects, $1/\chi_S(0)$ and $\chi_L(0)$. The reduction of T_N for small $|t|$ is mainly due to $\chi_L(0)$. On the other hand, the critical concentration j_c below which antiferromagnetic ordering appears at $T = 0$ K is determined by the competition between J and $k_B T_K$, because thermal spin fluctuations vanish at $T = 0$ K. Because the Kondo effect is rather weak, j_c is as large as $j_c \approx 0.14$, as is shown in Figs. 7 and 8.




FIG. 7: T_N of the symmetric model as a function of $\delta = 1 - n$. From the bottom, solid, dashed, broken, chain, and chain double-dashed lines show T_N for $j = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 1$, and 2 , respectively. The topmost solid line shows T_N determined from eq. (4.23) for comparison. The solid line with a positive slope shows $1/\tilde{\chi}$. Antiferromagnetic states whose T_N are much above and below this line are characterized as local moment ones and itinerant-electron ones, respectively, according to discussion in x V.




FIG. 8: T_N of the asymmetric model as a function of δ . See also the caption of Fig. 7. Note that T_N is almost symmetric between $\delta < 0$ and $\delta > 0$.

When $\tilde{W} < W$ and $k_B T < W$, well-defined quasiparticles can play roles in both of the enhancement and suppression of T_N . Antiferromagnetism is enhanced by $J_Q(i^n; q)$, in which the nesting of the Fermi surface can play a significant role. However, the difference of the Fermi surfaces cannot give any significant asymmetry of T_N . The reduction of T_N by the Kondo effect is large. The intersite mode-mode coupling term, $\chi_s(0; Q) + \chi_v(0; Q)$, also suppresses T_N in addition to the local terms, $k_B T_K$ and $\chi_L(0)$. The quenching effects overcome the enhancement effect, and T_N decrease with decreasing \tilde{W} .

V. DISCUSSION

One of the most serious assumptions in this paper is that the homogeneous lifetime width of quasiparticles, which is phenomenologically introduced in this paper, can be defined. This is relevant when there are many weak impurities and their distribution is totally random. When disorder is so small that quasiparticles are well defined, electrons behave as Landau's Fermi liquid. The assumption is obviously relevant in such a case. On the other hand, when disorder is so large in the vicinity of the Mott transition or crossover that quasiparticles are never well-defined, electrons behave as localized magnetic moments. Because μ_B plays no role, the theoretical framework of this paper must also be relevant in such a case. Then, an issue is whether the assumption is relevant or irrelevant in the crossover regime between the two regimes, for example, in the regime where the Anderson localization of quasiparticles occurs. Because the homogeneous lifetime width can be defined in the so called weakly localized regime of the Anderson localization,⁴² we expect that the results of this paper apply to such a regime. The assumption is irrelevant when scattering potentials of dopants are strong and the concentration of dopants is rather small. The strong Anderson localization, where the localization length is short, is out of scope in this paper. The crossover between the Mott-Hubbard insulator and the Anderson insulator, which is examined in ref. 32, is also out of scope in this paper.

One may suspect that the theoretical framework of this paper cannot apply to the limit of $J \rightarrow 0$ or to vanishingly small J . According to the combination of Gutzwiller's theory⁵ and the Fermi-liquid theory,^{6,7} the bandwidth of quasiparticles is vanishingly small but is still nonzero such as $W \sim 8J$. The Fermi liquid state is formed, at least, at $T \ll 8J/k_B$; the spectral weight of quasiparticles is vanishingly small. It is obvious that when the renormalization of quasiparticles due to the Fock-type term of the superexchange interaction is taken into account the bandwidth becomes as large as J , at least, at $T \ll 8J/k_B$. We show in this paper that these quasiparticles are stable not only for $k_B T \ll 8J$ and $8J$ but also for $k_B T \sim J$ and J . The existence of elementary excitations or quasiparticles whose bandwidth is of the order of J are implied by several studies on the t - J model on small lattices.^{43,44,45} Then, we can argue that when the Hilbert space is restricted within paramagnetic phases no divergence of the effective mass of quasiparticles or no M-I transition can occur except for $J \rightarrow 0$, $\mu_B \rightarrow 0$, and $T \rightarrow 0$ K. What can occur for

nonzero J is a M-I crossover rather than a M-I transition, as is shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

The coexistence phase of a metal and a Mott-Hubbard insulator is obtained for the Hubbard model with the just half filling and finite onsite U .³² It is interesting to examine whether or not the coexistence phase remains when the renormalization of quasiparticles by an intersite exchange interaction such as the superexchange interaction is included. It is also interesting to examine whether or not the coexistence phase remains for non-half fillings.

Quasiparticles are well-defined for $T < T_K$ and $\hbar < k_B T_K$. According to refs. 24 and 25, the exchange interaction $J_Q(+i0; q)$, which arises from the virtual exchange of pair excitations of quasiparticles, shows an almost T -linear dependence consistent with the Curie-Weiss law at $T < T_K$ in a small region of $q \sim Q$, with Q being the nesting wavenumber, for itinerant-electron antiferromagnets where the nesting of the Fermi surface is significant.⁴⁶ On the other hand, the T -linear dependence of $1/\chi_s(0)$ at $T = T_K$ is responsible for the Curie-Weiss law of local-moment magnets or insulating magnets. Then, magnetism with $T_N = T_K$ is characterized as local-moment one, while magnetism with $T_N < T_K$ is characterized as itinerant-electron one. Local-moment magnetism appears for almost half fillings, and itinerant-electron magnetism appears for fillings substantially away from the half filling.

Because no order is possible at non-zero temperatures in two dimensions,⁴¹ it is likely that T_N is substantially reduced by critical thermal fluctuations in quasi-two dimensions. As is examined in x IV D, the reduction of T_N is large; $T_N \sim 0.2 J \hbar / k_B$ for the anisotropy of $A_z = A_k \hbar = 10^{-10}$. This explains observed $T_N \sim 300$ K for cuprate oxides, when we take $J \hbar \sim 0.15$ eV. The exponent 10 seems to be little larger than actual ones. We should consider the reduction of T_N by thermal critical fluctuations more properly than we do in this paper.

The nesting of the Fermi surface becomes less sharp as \hbar becomes larger, as is shown in Figs. 4 and 5. One may argue that antiferromagnetism is weakened by disorder in the itinerant-electron regime where the nesting of the Fermi surface plays a crucial role. However, this effect is overcome by the reduction of T_K by nonzero \hbar . The renormalization of the quasiparticle bandwidth by the superexchange interaction becomes small with increasing \hbar so that the Kondo temperature $k_B T_K$ becomes small. On the other hand, the superexchange interaction is not reduced by nonzero \hbar . Then, antiferromagnetism is strengthened with increasing \hbar even in the itinerant-electron region.

An antiferromagnetic state appears in a narrow range of $0 < \hbar < 0.02\{0.05$ in hole-

doped cuprates oxides ($\delta > 0$), while it appears in a wide range of $0.13 \leq \delta \leq 0.15$ in electron-doped cuprate oxides ($\delta < 0$). Tohyama and Maekawa⁴⁷ argued that the asymmetry between hole-doped and electron-doped oxides must arise from the difference of the Fermi surfaces, and that the $t-t^0$ - J model should be used. They showed that the intensity of spin excitations is relatively stronger in electron doping cases than it is in hole doping cases. According to Fig. 5, the polarization function at $q = (\pi, \pi)$ is relatively larger in electron doping cases than it is in hole doping cases. This asymmetry is consistent with that of spin excitations studied by Tohyama and Maekawa. However, the difference of the Fermi surfaces cannot explain the asymmetry of T_N , as is shown in Fig. 8.

The condensation energy at $T = 0$ K of the asymmetric model is also quite asymmetric;⁴⁸ it is consistent with the asymmetry of spin excitations and the polarization function discussed above. On the other hand, T_N is significantly reduced by quasi-two dimensional spin fluctuations as well as local spin fluctuations of the Kondo effect. This large reduction of T_N arises from the renormalization of normal states; not only the Neel states but also paramagnetic states just above T_N are largely renormalized. It is plausible that the asymmetry of the condensation energy of paramagnetic states just above T_N is similar to that of the Neel states at $T = 0$ K. It is interesting to examine by comparing the condensation energy of the Neel states and that of paramagnetic states just above T_N whether T_N is actually almost symmetric as is shown in this paper.

Electrical resistivities of electron-doped cuprates are relatively larger than those of hole-doped cuprates are.⁴⁹ Then, we can argue that disorder must be relatively larger in electron-doped cuprates than it is in hole-doped cuprates, and that the asymmetry of T_N can arise, at least partly, from the difference of disorder between them. It is interesting to examine whether or not the symmetric behavior of T_N can be restored by preparing hole-doped and electron-doped cuprates with similar degree of disorder to each other.

When nonmagnetic impurities of Zn ions are introduced on CuO_2 planes, antiferromagnetic moments appear in the neighborhood of Zn ions.⁵⁰ Because the configuration of Cu ions is $(3d)^9$ and that of Zn ions is $(3d)^{10}$, the phase shift at the chemical potential due to scatterings by Zn ions must be about $\pi/2$ according to the Friedel sum rule. Then, scatterings by Zn ions must be very strong. One of the plausible scenarios is that the renormalization of $k_B T_K$ by the Fock-type term of the superexchange interaction is small in the neighborhood of Zn ions because of strong scatterings, that is, the quenching of magnetic moments by local




FIG. 9: t^* of the symmetric model as a function of δ for various j and $k_B T = j = 0.02$; $\tilde{W}_s = 1$ or $r = 0.5$ is assumed instead of $\tilde{W}_s = 2$ or $r = 1$ (See text). From the top, solid, dashed, broken, and chain line show t^* for $j = 0.04, 0.1, 0.2$, and 0.4 , respectively. For the sake of comparison, $1/\tilde{\omega}$ is also shown by a bottom solid line.




FIG. 10: T_N of the symmetric model as a function of δ for various j ; $\tilde{W}_s = 1$ or $r = 0.5$ is assumed instead of $\tilde{W}_s = 2$ or $r = 1$ (See text). From the bottom, solid, dashed, broken, and chain lines show T_N for $j = 0.04, 0.1, 0.2$, and 0.4 , respectively. For comparison, T_N determined from eq. (4.23) is shown by a topmost solid line.

quantum spin fluctuations are weak there so that antiferromagnetism is enhanced there. It is interesting to develop a microscopic theory that can treat such an inhomogeneous effect.

The three-point vertex function $\tilde{\omega}_s$ and the mass-renormalization factor $\tilde{\omega}$ are those in SSA; $\tilde{W}_s = \tilde{\omega} = 2$ as is discussed in xIIA. When we take $\tilde{W}_s = 2$, on the other hand, the superexchange interaction constants as small as $j = 0.02-0.03$ eV, which are much smaller than experimental ones $j = 0.10-0.15$ eV, give T_c as high as $T_c = 50-150$ K,^{30,31} which are as high as observed T_c . This implies that the renormalization of the vertex

function and the mass renormalization factor by intersite effects such as antiferromagnetic and superconducting fluctuations should be included. Taking it into account, we treat \tilde{W}_s as another phenomenological parameter following the previous paper,²⁸ where $\tilde{W}_s = 0.7\{1$ is used instead of $\tilde{W}_s = 2$ in order to explain observed T_c and observed coefficients of T -linear resistivities when $|J| = 0.10\text{--}0.15$ eV are used. Then, we replace \tilde{W}_s by $r\tilde{W}_s$, with r a numerical constant smaller than unity; eq. (3.5) is replaced by

$$2t = r \frac{2t}{\sim} - \frac{3}{4} r \tilde{W}_s^2 J ; \quad (5.1)$$

and eqs. (4.3) and (4.4) are replaced by those with $r\tilde{W}_s$ instead of \tilde{W}_s .⁵¹ Figures 9 and 10 show t and T_N , respectively, of the symmetric model as a function of \tilde{W}_s for $r = 0.5$ and various J . The antiferromagnetic region extends with decreasing r .

An antiferromagnetic state in the range of $0 < \tilde{W}_s < 0.02$ of hole-doped $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{M CuO}_4$ ($\text{M} = \text{Sr}$ or Ba) is characterized as a local moment one. The so called spin-glass or Kumagai's phase⁵² appears in the range of $0.02 < \tilde{W}_s < 0.05$. We characterize the tail part of the solid line in Fig. 10 as a critical line to the Kumagai phase;⁵³ $\tilde{W}_s = |J| = 0.04$ are needed to reproduce Kumagai's phase. According to Fig. 9, $|J| = |J'| = 0.05$ for $\tilde{W}_s = 0.04$. Then, we can argue that $k_F l' \sim 2k_B T_K = \pi^2 |J|$, with k_F the Fermi wave number and l the mean free path, must be $4\{8$ in Kumagai's phase. According to Fig. 4(b), the nesting of the Fermi surface is substantial at least for $|J| < 0.3$; the nesting cannot be ignored for $|J| < 1$. Kumagai's phase must be a spin density wave (SDW) state in a disordered system rather than a spin glass. The divergence⁵² of the nuclear quadrupole relaxation (NQR) rate at T_N supports this characterization.

VI. CONCLUSION

The t - J model with $J = |J| = 0.3$ on a quasi-two dimensional lattice is studied. First, an unperturbed state is constructed in SSA or DMFT. The Kondo temperature T_K or $k_B T_K$ is defined as the energy scale of local quantum spin fluctuations. The unperturbed state is a normal degenerate or almost degenerate Fermi liquid at $T < T_K$ and is a non-degenerate Fermi liquid at $T > T_K$. No metal-insulator transition is possible within paramagnetic phases; what occurs is a metal-insulator crossover. The bandwidth W of quasiparticles, which is about $W \sim 4k_B T_K$, is renormalized by the Fock-type selfenergy due to the su-

perexchange interaction J , so that W is larger for lower T and smaller x , with x being the phenomenologically introduced lifetime width of quasiparticles. The bandwidth W is approximately given by the sum of terms of $O(xt)$ and $O(xJ)$, with x being the concentration of dopants added to the just half-filled system; the term of $O(xt)$ is consistent with Gutzwiller's theory, and the coefficient of the term of $O(xJ)$ is $O(1)$ for $k_B T = J$, $x < 1$ and $= J$, $x < 1$ and is vanishingly small for $k_B T = J$, $x = 1$ or $= J$, $x = 1$.

Next, antiferromagnetic instability of the unperturbed state is examined perturbatively in terms of intersite exchange interactions. This perturbation theory can treat both of local moment magnetism and itinerant-electron magnetism. When $T_N = T_K$, with T_N the Neel temperature, or local thermal spin fluctuations are dominant over local quantum spin fluctuations at T_N , magnetism is characterized as local moment magnetism; it appears for almost half fillings of electrons. In the opposite case where $T_N < T_K$ or local quantum ones are dominant over local thermal ones at T_N , magnetism is characterized as itinerant-electron magnetism; it appears for fillings away from the half filling.

The reduction of T_N by quasi-two dimensional thermal critical fluctuations is large when the anisotropy of the exchange interaction constants is large. For example, $k_B T_N = J$ in complete two dimensions, as is expected. The Neel temperature $T_N \approx 300$ K observed in cuprates with no doping can be explained, when we assume $J = 0.10-0.15$ eV and $J_z = J$, 10^{-10} , with J and J_z the exchange interaction constants between nearest neighbors within a CuO_2 plane and between CuO_2 planes, respectively.

When W or $k_B T = W$, $W = O(xt)$ or $k_B T_K = O(xJ)$ so that the quenching of magnetic moments by local quantum spin fluctuations is rather weak. Because thermal spin fluctuations vanish at $T = 0$ K, an antiferromagnetic state is stabilized in a wide range of x . When $x < W$ and $k_B T < W$, quasiparticles are well-defined. Because the nesting of the Fermi surface is substantial, the exchange interaction arising from the virtual exchange of pair excitations of quasiparticles is also responsible for antiferromagnetic instability in addition to the superexchange interaction. On the other hand, the quenching of magnetic moments by local quantum spin fluctuations is strong. Not only quasi-two dimensional thermal critical fluctuations but also the quenching of magnetic moments by local quantum fluctuations make T_N substantially reduced or they destroy antiferromagnetic ordering. An antiferromagnetic state is stabilized only for small x ; the critical concentration x_c below which antiferromagnetic ordering appears is smaller for smaller x . This result implies that

T_N is lower and a magnetic phase is narrower in a cleaner system.

The difference or asymmetry of disorder between electron-doped and hole-doped cuprates must be, at least partly, responsible for that of T_N and antiferromagnetic phases between them. We characterize the so called Kumagai's phase as a spin density wave (SDW) state in disordered system rather than a spin glass.

Acknowledgments

The author is thankful for discussion to M. Ido, M. Oda, N. Momono, and K. Kumagai. This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) Grant No. 13640342 from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.

APPENDIX A : SCATTERING POTENTIAL IN DISORDERED KONDO LATTICES

In disordered Kondo lattices, the mapped Anderson models are different from site to site. The selfenergy for the j th one is expanded in such a way that $\tilde{\epsilon}_j(\omega + i0) = \tilde{\epsilon}_j(0) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\epsilon}_j'' + \dots$. When the energy dependence of the hybridization energy ($\tilde{\epsilon}_j$) is ignored, it follows according to Shiba⁵⁴ that

$$E_{dj} + \tilde{\epsilon}_j(\omega + i0) = \tilde{\epsilon}_j(0) \tan \frac{1}{2} \pi n_j; \quad (\text{A1})$$

with E_{dj} and n_j being the localized-electron level and the number of electrons with spin \uparrow , respectively. It follows from Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7) that $\tilde{\epsilon}_j'(\omega^2=8) = \frac{1}{2} \pi n_j$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{js}'(\omega^2=4) = \frac{1}{2} \pi n_j$ with $n_j = n_{j\uparrow} + n_{j\downarrow}$, for almost half filling $n_j \approx 1$. We assume non-magnetic impurities so that $n_{j\uparrow} = n_{j\downarrow}$.

We denote the average number of electrons and their mean-square deviation by $n = \langle n_j \rangle_{\text{dis}}$ and $n^2 = \langle n_j^2 \rangle_{\text{dis}}$, respectively, where $\langle \dots \rangle_{\text{dis}}$ stands for an ensemble average over disordered systems. We assume that there is no correlation between different sites: $\langle (n_i - n)(n_j - n) \rangle_{\text{dis}} = 0$ for $i \neq j$.

We consider the site-dependent part of $E_{dj} + \tilde{\epsilon}_j(\omega + i0)$ as a static but energy-dependent scattering potential; it is approximately given by

$$V_j(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{8}{2} \omega^2 \left(n_j - n \right) \frac{1}{2} \frac{n}{n_j} + \dots; \quad (\text{A2})$$

Here, the averages of \tilde{v}_j and $\tilde{v}_j(0)$ are simply denoted by \tilde{v} and $\tilde{v}(0)$. When we treat $V_j(\omega)$ in the second-order SSA or the Born approximation, the coherent part of the ensemble averaged Green function is given by

$$G^{(0)}(\omega + i0; k)_{\text{dis}} = \frac{1}{\tilde{v} + \frac{1}{(k)_{\text{dis}}(\omega + i0)}}; \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

with

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{v} + \frac{1}{(k)_{\text{dis}}(\omega + i0)}} = \frac{\tilde{v}}{2} + \frac{8}{2} \tilde{v}^2 n^2(\omega); \quad (\text{A } 4)$$

for $\hbar\omega < k_B T_K$.

The bandwidth of quasiparticles is about $4k_B T_K$; typical lifetime width is as large as

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{v}} \text{Im}^{(\text{dis})}(\tilde{v} + i0) \sim i(64\pi^3) \tilde{v}^2 n^2(\omega); \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

The energy-independent term can be ignored because $\tilde{v} \sim 1$ for almost half fillings. It is quite likely that $\tilde{v} n^2 = O(1)$ and $\tilde{v} n^2 = O(1)$ for almost half fillings.

It is straightforward to extend the above argument to a system in the presence of magnetic fields and a system with magnetic impurities. In such cases, $n_{i\uparrow}$ and $n_{i\downarrow}$ can be different from site to site; $\text{Im}^{(\text{dis})}(\tilde{v} + i0) \sim \tilde{v}$ can be large even for $\omega = 0$.

-
- ¹ J.G. Bednortz and K.A. Müller: Z.Phys.B 64 (1986) 189.
 - ² See for example, H. Takagi, Y. Tokura and S. Uchida: Physica C 162-164 (1989) 1001.
 - ³ J. Kanamori: Prog. Theor. Phys. 30 (1963) 275.
 - ⁴ J. Hubbard: Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A 276 (1963) 238; A 281 (1964) 401.
 - ⁵ M.C. Gutzwiller: Phys. Rev. Lett. 10 (1963) 159; Phys. Rev. A 134 (1963) 293; A 137 (1965) 1726.
 - ⁶ J.M. Luttinger and J.C. Ward: Phys. Rev. 118 (1960) 1417.
 - ⁷ J.M. Luttinger: Phys. Rev. 119 (1960) 1153.
 - ⁸ F.J. Ohkawa: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 58 (1989) 4156.
 - ⁹ W. Metzner and D. Vollhardt: Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 (1989) 324.
 - ¹⁰ F.J. Ohkawa: Phys. Rev. B 44 (1991) 6812.
 - ¹¹ F.J. Ohkawa: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 60 (1991) 3218; 61 (1992) 1615.
 - ¹² A. Georges and G. Kotliar: Phys. Rev. B 45 (1992) 6479.

- ¹³ See, for example, G. Kotliar and D. Vollhardt: Phys. Today 57 (2004) 53.
- ¹⁴ K. Yosida: Phys. Rev. 147, 223 (1966).
- ¹⁵ P. W. Anderson: J. Phys. C 3 (1970) 2436.
- ¹⁶ K. G. Wilson: Rev. Mod. Phys. 47 (1975) 773.
- ¹⁷ P. Nozières: J. Low. Temp. Phys. 17 (1974) 31.
- ¹⁸ K. Yamada: Prog. Theor. Phys. 53 (1975) 970; 54 (1975) 316.
- ¹⁹ K. Yosida and K. Yamada: Prog. Theor. Phys. 53 (1970) 1286.
- ²⁰ C. Lacroix: J. Magn. Magn. Mat., 100 (1991) 90. See, for example, this and the following references^{21,21} for canonical Kondo lattices.
- ²¹ G. Zwicknagl: Adv. Phys. 41 (1992) 203.
- ²² P. Coleman and N. Andrei: J. Phys. Condens. Matter 1 (1989) 4057.
- ²³ F. J. Ohkawa: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 67 (1998) 525. According to this reference, the RKKY interaction works only at high temperatures such as $T > T_K$ or in the so called localized regime where almost localized electrons such as 4f and 5f ones behave as localized magnetic moments. At low temperatures such as $T < T_K$ or in the so called itinerant electron regime where they behave as itinerant electrons, it is replaced by the exchange interaction arising from the virtual exchange of pair excitations of quasiparticles, which are admixtures of almost localized electrons and conduction electrons. The exchange interaction corresponds to $J_Q(i\mathbf{l};\mathbf{q})$ in this paper. Therefore, the Hubbard or t-J model can be a relevant effective Hamiltonian for canonical Kondo lattices where the hybridization gap plays no essential role.
- ²⁴ F. J. Ohkawa: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 67 (1998) 535.
- ²⁵ E. Miyai and F. J. Ohkawa: Phys. Rev. B 61 (2000) 1357.
- ²⁶ F. J. Ohkawa: Phys. Rev. B 66 (2002) 014408.
- ²⁷ F. J. Ohkawa: Phys. Rev. B 65 (2002) 174424.
- ²⁸ F. J. Ohkawa: Phys. Rev. B 69 (2004) 104502.
- ²⁹ F. J. Ohkawa: Phys. Rev. B 70 (2004) 184514.
- ³⁰ F. J. Ohkawa: Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. 26 (1987) L652.
- ³¹ F. J. Ohkawa: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 56 (1987) 2267.
- ³² K. Byczuk, W. Hofstetter and D. Vollhardt: Phys. Rev. Lett. 94 (2005) 056404.
- ³³ J. E. Hirsch: Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 1317.
- ³⁴ F. C. Zhang and T. M. Rice: Phys. Rev. B 37 (1988) R3759.

- ³⁵ Because of this simplification, we can carry out analytically summations over Matsubara's frequencies in many equations of this paper.
- ³⁶ J.C. Ward: Phys. Rev. 68 (1950) 182.
- ³⁷ A. Kawabata: J. Phys. F 4 (1974) 1447.
- ³⁸ T. Moriya: Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism (Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences 56, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York Tokyo, 1985).
- ³⁹ K. Miyake and O. Narikiyo: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 63 (1994) 3821.
- ⁴⁰ F.J. Ohkawa: Phys. Rev. B 57 (1998) 412.
- ⁴¹ N.D. Mermin and H. Wagner: Phys. Rev. Lett. 17 (1966) 1133.
- ⁴² See, for example, Anderson Localization, ed. Y. Nagaoka and H. Fukuyama (Springer Series in Solid-State Science 39, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1982).
- ⁴³ T. Tohyama, P. Horsch and S. Maekawa: Physica C 235-240 (1994) 2231.
- ⁴⁴ A. Moreo, S. Haas, A.W. Sandvik and E. Dagotto: Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) R12045.
- ⁴⁵ Wei-Cheng Lee, T.K. Lee, Chang-Ming Ho and P.W. Leung, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 057001.
- ⁴⁶ In itinerant-electron ferromagnets where the density of state has a sharp peak around the chemical potential, the exchange interaction $J_Q (+i0; q)$ shows an almost T -linear dependence consistent with the Curie-Weiss law in a small region of $q \rightarrow 0$ ²⁵. In itinerant-electron antiferromagnets where the nesting of the Fermi surface is never significant and itinerant-electron ferromagnets where the density of states is almost constant around the chemical potential, on the other hand, the mode-mode coupling term shows an almost T -linear dependence consistent with the Curie-Weiss law³⁸.
- ⁴⁷ T. Tohyama and S. Maekawa: Phys. Rev. B 49 (1994) 3596.
- ⁴⁸ H. Yokoyama, T. Tanaka, M. Ogata and H. Tsuchiura: cond-mat/0308264 (unpublished).
- ⁴⁹ A. Sawa, M. Kawasaki, H. Takagi and Y. Tokura: Phys. Rev. B 66 (2002) 014531.
- ⁵⁰ H. Aloul, P. Mendels, H. Casalta, J.F. Marucco and J. Arabzi: Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 3140.
- ⁵¹ In eqs. (4.3) and (4.4), we should use a multiplication factor slightly different from r because \tilde{s} appearing there is a purely single-site property. In the first term of eq. (5.1), we should also use another one slightly different from r because no \tilde{s} appears there. However, we assume the same r in every equation for the sake of simplicity; this corresponds to an approximation where only the renormalization of the mass-enhancement factor is considered.

- ⁵² K .K umagai, I.W atanabe, H .Aoki, Y .Nakamura, T .Kinura, Y .Nakamichi and H .Nakajima:
Physica 148B (1987) 480.
- ⁵³ The dependence of on should be included in order to explain more precisely the dependence
of T_N on .
- ⁵⁴ H .Shiba: Prog.Theor.Phys. 54 (1975) 967.