## The dispersion of a single hole in an antiferrom agnet

Andrey V. Chubukov and Dirk K. Morr

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1150 University Ave., Madison, WI 53706

(M arch 23, 2024)

We revisit the problem of the dispersion of a single hole injected into a quantum antiferrom agnet. We applied a spin-density-wave form alism extended to large number of orbitals and obtained an integral equation for the full quasiparticle G reen's function in the self-consistent \non-crossing" Born approximation. We found that for t=J 1, the bare ferm ionic dispersion is completely overshadowed by the self-energy corrections. In this case, the quasiparticle G reen's function contains a broad incoherent continuum which extends over a frequency range of 6t. In addition, there exists a narrow region of width O (JS) below the top of the valence band, where the excitations are mostly coherent, though with a sm all quasiparticle residue Z J=t. The top of the valence band is located at (=2;=2). We found that the form of the ferm ionic dispersion, and, in particular, the ratio of the e ective m asses near (=2; =2) strongly depend on the assumptions one m akes for the form of the m agnon propagator. We argue in this paper that two-m agnon R am an scattering as well as neutron scattering experim ents strongly suggest that the zone boundary m agnons are not free particles since a substantial portion of their spectral weight is transferred into an incoherent background. We m odeled this e ect by introducing a cuto  $q_c$  in the integration over magnon momenta. We found analytically that for sm all q., the strong coupling solution for the G reen's function is universal, and both e ective m asses are equal to (4JS)<sup>1</sup>. We further computed the full ferm ionic dispersion for J=t = 0.4 relevant for  $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$ , and  $t^0 = -0.4J$  and found not only that the masses are both equal to (2J)  $^{1}$ , but also that the energies at (0;0) and (0; ) are equal, the energy at (0; =2) is about half of that at (0;0), and the bandwidth for the coherent excitations is around 3J. A llof these results are in full agreement with the experimental data. Finally, we found that weakly damped excitations only exist in a narrow range around (=2; =2). Away from the vicinity of (=2; =2), the excitations are overdam ped, and the spectral function possesses a broad maximum rather than a sharp quasiparticle peak. This last feature was also reported in photoem ission experiments.

## I. IN TRODUCTION

The dispersion of a single hole in a quantum antiferrom agnet is one of the issues in the eld of high-tem perature superconductivity which has attracted a substantial amount of interest over a number of years [1{19]. The parent compounds of the high- $T_c$ materials are quantum Heisenberg antiferrom agnets as was dem onstrated by neutron scattering [21], NM R [22] and Raman [23] experiments. The antiferrom agnetic spin ordering strongly m odi es the electronic dispersion which by all accounts is very di erent from what one would expect from band theory calculations. Upon hole doping, short-range antiferrom agnetism gradually disappears, and the overdoped cuprates possess an electronic dispersion which is consistent with band theory predictions [25]. How the electronic spectrum evolves with doping is currently a subject of intensive experim ental and theoretical studies [26{29]. As an important input for these studies, one needs to know what happens in the lim it of zero doping when a single hole is injected into a quantum antiferrom agnet.

The dispersion of a single hole in an antiferrom agnet has been intensively studied experim entally and theoretically . Experim ental inform ation com es from photoem ission experim ents on the half-lled  $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$  which is not a high- $T_c$  superconductor, but contains the same

 $C uO_2$  planes as the high-T<sub>c</sub> m aterials [30,31]. M ost of the theoretical analysis was perform ed in the fram ew ork of the t J and Hubbard m odels which are widely believed to adequately describe the low-energy physics of the underlying three-band m odel [1{13,15{19}}. Early analytical and num erical computations were perform ed in the antiferrom agnetically ordered phase and for the case when a hopping is only possible between nearest neighbors [1{3,5,12,13}. These studies have shown that in the strong coupling lim it (large U lim it in the Hubbard m odel ort J lim it in the t J m odel), the G reen's function of a single hole has the form

$$G(k;!) = \frac{Z}{! E_k} + G_{inc}(k;!); \qquad (1)$$

where the coherent part is conned to scales smaller than 2J, while the incoherent background stretches up to a few t. The quasi-particle residue of the coherent piece is small and scales as Z / J=t in the limit t J. The dispersion  $E_k$  has a maximum at k = (=2; =2) and symmetry related points. All calculations have demonstrated that the dispersion around this point is very anisotropic with a substantially larger mass along the (0; ) to (;0) direction than along the Brillouin zone diagonal. For t=J = 2.5 relevant to cuprates, the ratio of the masses is about 5 7 in the t J model (without a three-site term) [3], and it is even larger in the H ubbard model due to the presence of the bare dispersion J (cosk<sub>x</sub> + cosk<sub>y</sub>)<sup>2</sup>

which yields an extra contribution to the mass along the zone diagonal [20].

It turns out, how ever, that the experim ental results for Sr<sub>2</sub>CuO<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> [31,30] are rather di erent from these predictions. A lthough the photoem ission data have dem onstrated that the maximum of E<sub>k</sub> is at k = (=2; =2) consistent with the theory, the experimentally measured ratio of the masses is close to one in clear disagreement with the theoretical predictions. Moreover, the data show that the coherent peak in the spectral function exists only in a narrow region around (=2; =2) while away from this region, the hole spectral function is nearly featureless. This im plies that the ferm ionic excitations become e overdam ped already at energies which are substantially smaller than 2J.

A fier the data were reported, several attempts have been made to improve the agreement between theory and experiment. One scenario was put forward by researchers working on the \gauge theory" approach to cuprates [32], most recently by Laughlin [33]. He argued that the isotropy of the dispersion together with the observed mostly incoherent nature of the electronic excitations are signatures of a spin-charge separation. For a state where spin and charge degrees of freedom are described by separate quasiparticles (spinons and holons, respectively), the electron G reen's function is just a convolution of the spinon and holon propagators. It does not have a pole which norm ally would be associated with the coherent part of G(k;!), but rather a branch cut which describes fully incoherent excitations. Laughlin argued that since spinon and holon energies are well separated (the spinon energy has an overall scale of J, while the holon energy is 0 (t)), the position of the branch cut virtually coincides with the spinon dispersion. In the m ean-eld theory for the spin-charge separated state, the spinon energy has the form

$$E_{k}^{spinon} = C_{sw} (\cos^{2} k_{x} + \cos^{2} k_{y})^{1=2}$$
; (2)

where  $C_{sw}$  1:6J is the spin-wave velocity in a 2D S = 1=2 antiferrom agnet. This dispersion has an isotropic maximum at k = (=2; =2), a bandwidth of 2:2J and equal energies for k = (0;0) and (0; ) - all of these features are consistent with the data together with the near absence of the quasiparticle peak.

An obvious weakness of the mean-eld analysis of spinons and holons is that it neglects the elects due to a gauge eld. Beyond the mean-eld level, a gauge eld may glue spinons and holons into a bound state thus rendering the electron as a coherent quasiparticle. Laughlin conjectured that the con nem ent takes place only below  $T_{\rm N}$ , while the experimental data were actually collected at  $T=350 {\rm K}$  which is 100 K above the N eel temperature. He then proposed that ifm easurements are done at much lower temperatures, they should yield an anisotropic dispersion consistent with the results obtained in the ordered state with no spin-charge separation.

A nother, m ore conventional approach to the single hole problem assumes that there is no spin-charge separation

at any T, and that the experim ental data in fact re ect the behavior of the hole dispersion in the antiferrom agnetically ordered phase [15{19]. W ithin this approach, the discrepancy with the data is mainly attributed to the fact that the original model did not contain a hopping term t<sup>0</sup> between next-nearest neighbors (and, possibly, also between further neighbors). The presence of the a nite t<sup>0</sup> term in the Hubbard model is justi ed, at least partly, by studies which derived an e ective one-band model from the underlying three-band model by com paring the energy levels around the charge transfer gap [34]. These studies predicted that the second-neighbor hopping is about  $t^0 =$ 0.2t. By itself, this hopping is sm all com pared to t. How ever, in an antiferrom agnetic background, the hole can only move within the same sublattice, otherwise the antiferrom agnetic ordering is disturbed. The hopping term t<sup>0</sup> connects the sites within the same sublattice, and therefore is not a ected by antiferrom agnetism . On the contrary, the t term contributes to the hopping within a sublattice only via the creation of a virtual doubly occupied state which costs the energy U. As a result, the t part of the dispersion is rescaled and becomes of order  $t^2 = U = 0$  (J). One therefore has to com pare t<sup>0</sup> not with t but rather with J. For J=t 0:4. we then obtain  $t^0 =$ 0:5J, which immediately implies that the corrections due to  $t^0$  are actually quite relevant.

It has been m entioned several times in the literature that the inclusion of  $t^0 = 0.5J$  into the Hubbard m odel yields a good agreem ent with the experimental data already at the mean-eld level [15,16]. Indeed, the mean-eld spin-density-wave (SDW) form ula for the hole dispersion at large U is

$$E_{k} = J \left( \cos k_{x} + \cos k_{y} \right)^{2} \quad 4t \cos k_{x} \cos k_{y} : \quad (3)$$

For  $t^0 = 0.5J$ , this form ula transform s into

$$E_{k} = J(\cos^{2} k_{x} + \cos^{2} k_{y})$$
(4)

(here we assumed that the chem ical potential is at the top of the valence band). This dispersion possesses two equal e ective masses if one expands around the maximum at (=2; =2), and has a a local maximum at (0; =2) with E = J. Both of these results are consistent with the most recent data by LaR osa et al. [31]. Furtherm ore, the data show that the energies at (0;0) and (0; ) are both equal to 2J. This also agrees with the photoem ission data [30,31].

The conventional mean-ekd SDW -type approach also possesses the weakness that it predicts fully coherent excitations upto 2J. The data, how ever, dem onstrate that away from the vicinity of (=2; =2), the coherent part of the dispersion is alm ost com pletely overshadowed by the incoherent background. Earlier studies [15] which went beyond the mean-ekd level have dem onstrated that selfenergy corrections reduce the quasiparticle residue thus transferring part of the spectral weight into the incoherent background. How ever, these corrections also effectively decrease  $t^0$  and thus render the spectrum m ore anisotropic (see Fig. 11 and 13 below). From this perspective, the observed isotropy of the dispersion around (=2; =2) is attributed in a conventional approach to some ne tuning of both J=t and t<sup>0</sup>=J and is therefore com pletely accidental [35].

In this paper we show that in a certain lim it specied below, the near-degeneracy of the spectrum around (=2; =2) turns out to be a fundam ental, universal property of a single hole in an antiferrom agnet, independent of the details of the physics at atom ic scales. Our key point is this: in all previous studies which yielded anisotropic spectra, it was assumed that m agnons behave as free particles for all m om enta. In this case, the integral over the magnon momenta in the self-energy term runs over the whole magnetic Brillouin zone (MBZ).On the other hand, R am an studies of the two-m agnon pro le in the insulating parent compounds of high T<sub>c</sub> materials have demonstrated that the width of the two-magnon peak is much broader than one would expect for free m agnons [23,24]. The dom inant contribution to this peak com es from the m agnons near the boundary of the M BZ. C om plim enting these ndings, neutron scattering experin ents on  $La_2CuO_4$  [36] have shown that about half of the spectral weight of the quasiparticle peak for the zone boundary m agnons is transferred into a broad incoherent background.

It has been suggested that the broadening is due to the strong interaction between these magnons and phonons [37,38]. This interaction is nite and not necessary small at T = 0 contrary to the magnon-magnon interaction which gives rise to an incoherent part of the magnon spectral function only at nite T and is irrelevant for T J [39].

In this situation, it seems reasonable to assume that the contribution from the zone boundary m agnons to the electronic self-energy is substantially reduced com pared to what one would obtain for free spin waves. This how ever is true only for zone-boundary m agnons. For longwavelength magnons, the magnon-phonon vertex scales linearly with the magnon momentum, and the incoherent part of the m agnon propagator is sm all. The sim plest way to model this e ect is to introduce an upper cuto  $q_c$  in the integration over magnon momenta. Naively, one m ight expect that the hole dispersion would strongly depend on  $q_c$ . However, we will demonstrate that at large t=J, when the bare dispersion is irrelevant, only the quasiparticle residue does depend on q, while the e ective masses are in fact independent of q in the lim it when qc is su ciently small. We explicitly show that in this lim it, both m asses turn out to be equal to 1=2J. The dispersion near (=2; =2) is then isotropic and has a form  $E_k =$  $J\tilde{k}^2$  where  $\tilde{k}$  is the deviation from (=2;=2). Furtherm ore, we show that for a certain range of q. the inclusion of  $t^0 = 0.5J$  extends the region where the two m asses are approxim ately equal to basically all values of t=J. This last result allow sus to correctly reproduce the m easured hole dispersion in  $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we outline the formalism and derive the integral equation for the quasiparticle G reen's function by expanding around them ean-eld SDW solution. In Sec. III we present our analytical results in the large t=J limit. In this section we also discuss the role of the vertex corrections to the spin-ferm ion vertex. In Sec. IV, we present the results of the num erical solution of the self-consistency equation for the quasiparticle G reen's function for di erent values of J=t. Sec. V contains a sum - m ary of our results.

## II. THE FORMALISM

As mentioned in the introduction, our starting point for the description of the insulating parent compounds of the high- $T_c$  materials is the elective 2D one-band Hubbard model [40[42], given by

$$H = \begin{array}{c} X & X \\ t_{i;j}c_{i;}^{V}c_{j;} + U & c_{i;i}^{V}c_{i;i}c_{i;i}^{V}c_{i;i} \in \end{array} (5)$$

is the spin index and  $t_{i;j}$  is the hopping integral Here which we assume to act between nearest and next-nearest neighbors (t and  $t^0$ , respectively). Throughout the paper we assume that the ground state of the Hubbard model is antiferrom agnetically ordered. In this situation, a way to calculate the spectral function in a systematic perturbative expansion is to extend the Hubbard model to a large number of orbitals, n = 2S, and use a 1=S expansion around the mean-eld SDW state [43]. The 1=S expansion for the Hubbard model has been discussed severaltimes in the literature [15,28] and we will use it here without further clari cation. To obtain the mean-eld solution, one introduces an antiferrom agnetic long range order parameter  $S_z = hc_k^y c_{k+Q}$  i and uses it to decouple the interaction term in Eq.(5). Diagonalizing then the quadratic form by means of a unitary transform ation one obtains two electronic bands for the conduction and valence ferm ions, whose energy dispersion is given by

$$E_{k}^{c;v} = (k_{k})^{2} + k_{k}^{2} + k_{k}^{+}; \qquad (6)$$

where

$$k = \frac{k + Q}{2} = U hS zi$$

$$_{k} = 4S (\cos k_{x} + \cos k_{y}) \quad \& S \cos k_{x} \cos k_{y} : (7)$$

Here  $E_k^{c,v}$  is the dispersion of the conduction and valence ferm ions, respectively,  $_k$  is the dispersion of free ferm ions, is the chem ical potential, and  $hS_z i$  is the sublattice m agnetization. To facilitate the 1=S expansion, we also introduced t = t=2S and t<sup>0</sup> = t<sup>0</sup>=2S. In the large-U lim it which we only consider, one can expand the square root and obtains

FIG.1. The lowest order self-energy correction for the valence ferm ions in the SDW m odel. The solid and dashed lines are the bare propagators of conduction and valence ferm ions, respectively. The wavy line describes transverse spin uctuations.

$$E_{k}^{C;v} = 2JS (\cos k_{x} + \cos k_{y})^{2}$$
$$\&^{0}S \cos k_{x} \cos k_{y} ; \qquad (8)$$

where  $J = 4t^2=U$ . At half-lling, the chem ical potential can be set to the top of the valence band (=); for S = 1=2 we then reproduce Eq.(3) from the introduction.

At in nite S, the mean-eld approach is exact. At nite S, the bare G reen's function is renorm alized due to the interaction with spin waves. The lowest order self-energy corrections for valence ferm ions are given by the diagrams in Fig. 1. The solid and dashed lines in these diagrams are the propagators of conduction and valence ferm ions, respectively. The wavy lines describe transverse spin uctuations which in the SDW approach are collective m odes of electrons. These collective m odes correspond to the poles of the transverse susceptibility, and are obtained by summing up an in nite RPA series in the particle-hole channel with the total momentum equal to either zero or Q. The interaction vertices between ferm ionic quasiparticle and m agnons have been calculated previously [44]. In the strong coupling lim it they are given by

where  $_{q}$  and  $_{q}$  are given by

$$_{q} = \frac{P}{S} \frac{1+q}{1-q}$$
;  $_{q} = \frac{P}{S} \frac{1-q}{1+q}$ ; (10)

and  $q = (\cos q_x + \cos q_y) = 2$ .

We see that there are two types of vertices:  $_{\rm cv,vc}$ which describes the interaction between conduction and valence ferm ions, and  $_{\rm cc,vv}$  which involves either only valence or only conduction ferm ions. Apparently, the second diagram in Fig. 1 is more relevant since the vertex which involves both conduction and valence ferm ions scales as U. How ever, incident and interm ediate ferm ions in this diagram belong to di erent bands and are therefore separated by a large, momentum independent gap

US. As a result, the rst diagram mostly contributes to the gap renorm alization, which is exactly cancelled by a renorm alization of  $hS_z$  i such that the fully renorm alized gap equals 2US as it indeed should be for the large U Hubbard model [15,44]. Expanding this diagram in J=U, we also obtain a momentum dependent



FIG.2. The lowest order vertex correction for the vertex between ferm ions and transverse spin uctuations. The diagram with only one wavy line is absent in the ordered state as it does not conserve the spin.

term of 0 (J) which contributes a regular 1=S correction to the bare dispersion.

The rst diagram in Fig. 1 involves only valence ferm ions. Here the vertex is reduced from U due to the coherence factors and scales as t. At the same time, both incident and internal quasiparticles are only O (J) away from the Ferm isurface which in plies that the denom inator scales as J. The total contribution from the second diagram then behaves as JS  $(t=J^{-}S)^2$  and in addition is strongly momentum dependent. Since the bare dispersion is of order JS, the relative self-energy correction from the second diagram scales as  $(t=J^{-}S)^2$  and is small only for extrem ely large S. For physically relevant values of the spin, the expansion parameter is obviously large, and one certainly cannot restrict with the second order in perturbation theory.

We now form ulate precisely under which conditions we carry out the calculations. We assume that S 1 and neglect all regular corrections in 1=S. At the same time, we assume that t=J S 1 and sum up an in nite series of diagram s in this parameter. The restriction to large S allow s us not only to neglect the self-energy diagram s which involve both valence and conduction ferm ions, but also to neglect the quantum corrections to the spin-wave propagator. At half-lling, these regular 1=S corrections can, with good accuracy, be absorbed into the renorm alization of the hopping term and the exchange interaction which are both input parameters for our calculations.

The next step is to select the series of diagram s which have to be sum m ed up. To lowest order in perturbation theory, both self-energy and vertex corrections are equally relevant: the self-energy correction yields a relative contribution of  $(t=J^{-}S)^2$ , while the leading order vertex correction shown in Fig. 2 yields a relative factor  $(t=J^{-}S)^4$  which is even larger. This result, how ever, changes if we estimate the strength of the self-energy and vertex corrections in a self-consistent manner, i.e., by considering all internal G reen's functions and all vertices in the diagram s in Figs. 1 and 2 as full ones. This in turn yields self-consistent equations for the full selfenergy and the full vertex. Our self-consistent calculation of the self-energy correction is sim ilar to the one perform ed by K ane, Lee and R ead (K LR) [2]. Follow-



FIG.3. a) The self-energy is given by an in nite sum of  $\non-crossing$ " diagram s. b) The Dyson equation which to-gether with the self-energy in a) yields Eq.(11).

ing KLR, we assume that the dom inant pole approximation for the full ferm ionic G reen's function is valid upto energies of the order of the typical spin wave energy, i.e., the full G reen's function can be approxim ated as Z = (!  $E_k$ ) where  $E_k = 0$  (JS) (we later con m this result by explicit calculations). Substituting this form into the self-energy term and performing standard manipulations we obtain for  $t=J^{T}S$ 1 the self-consistency condition  $t^2 Z^2 = J^2 S$ 1, where stands for the vertex renorm alization. It is essential that there is only one power of in this relation as only one of the two vertices in the self-energy diagram gets renormalized. On the other hand, in the vertex correction diagram, all vertices should be considered as fullones, and the self-consistency condition yields  $(t^2 Z^2 = J^2 S)^2 p \frac{1}{S}$  comparing these two conditions, we obtain  $Z = J \frac{1}{S} = t$  and t = 0 (1). The result for Z is consistent with the one obtained by KLR.Clearly then, the self-energy corrections are more relevant than the vertex corrections since the form er reduce the quasiparticle residue to a param etrically sm all value, while the latter only change the vertex by a factor of order 0 (1). Though the vertex corrections do not contain a factor 1=S, it seems reasonable to assume that they just change the overall am plitude of the vertex but do not introduce any new physics. We therefore rst neglect all vertex corrections and obtain the full self-energy and thus the full G reen's function in the self-consistent Bom approximation [45]. We then use the solution for the fullG reen's function to estim ate the relative strength of the vertex corrections. We nd that the vertex corrections change the vertex by roughly 20% and therefore can be neglected with reasonable accuracy.

In the Born approximation, the full self-energy is diagrammatically given by an innite series of  $\non-crossing"$  diagrams (see Fig.3a). Summing up this series, we obtain that the full self-energy has the same form as in second-order perturbation theory, but the G reen's function for the intermediate fermion is now replaced by the full one. The full G reen's function is then obtained from the D yson equation (see Fig.3b) and is analytically given by

$$\begin{array}{c} G & {}^{1}(k; !) = ! \quad (E_{k}^{v}) \\ \\ \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} d & (k; q)G (k + q; ! + )F (q; ); \end{array}$$
(11)

where F (q;!) is the spin-wave propagator, and

$$(k;q) = \frac{2}{vv} = 32St^{2} \frac{2}{k} + \frac{2}{k+q} \frac{2}{k} \frac{2}{k} \frac{q}{k+q} + \frac{1}{1} \frac{2}{q} \frac{1}{q} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{q} \frac{1}{1} \frac{2}{q} \frac{1}{q} \frac{1}{q}$$

The integration over the magnon momentum runs over the whole MBZ.

Eq.(11) is similar to the one derived earlier for the t  $J \mod [2,3,45]$  with the only dimension that Eq.11 contains the bare dispersion  $E_k^v$ . This dispersion is indeed also present when one derives that  $J \mod del$  from the Hubbard model at large U. However, it is due to the three-site term which is usually om itted in the elective t  $J \mod [46]$ .

As we discussed in the introduction, the quasiparticle spectral weight of the short-wavelength magnons in the parent com pounds of the high-T<sub>c</sub> m aterials is likely to be strongly reduced as dem onstrated by R am an and neutron scattering experiments. To account for this e ect, we adopt a sem i-phenom enological approach and introduce a cuto ,  $q_c$ , in the integration over m agnon m om enta in the r.h.s. of Eq.(11). We assume that for  $q > q_c$ , the m agnon spectral weight disappears into a broad background, and neglect the contribution to the self-energy from these q. 0 n the other hand, for  $q < q_c$ , we assume that the magnons are just free particles. Furthermore, for our analytical considerations, we will assume that q is rather small such that we can expand the dispersion of ferm ions and the spin-ferm ion vertex to linear order in the magnon momentum. This last assumption is not well justi ed as the magnitude of qc is unknown. Notice, how ever, that expanding upto leading order in  $q_c$ , we obtain two equale ective masses which are universal and independent of q. The sm allness of q is then only needed for the corrections to these universal results to be small.

For free spin waves, we have

$$F(q;) = \frac{1}{!_q + i};$$
 (12)

 $\begin{array}{c} q & \hline \\ \\ where !_q = 4JS & 1 & \frac{2}{q} \text{ is the spin-wave spectrum . The} \\ m agnon propagator has a pole in the lower half-plane of \\ . In this half-plane, the mean-eld ferm ionic G reen's \\ function G (k;!) = (! (E_k^v) + i sgn!)^1 is free from \\ nonanalyticities since E_k^v < 0. We assume, following \\ K LR, that the full G (k;!) is also analytic in the lower \\ half-plane of . Then one can straightforwardly perform \\ the integration over magnon frequency in Eq.(11) and \\ obtain \end{array}$ 

$$G^{-1}(k;!) = ! \qquad E_{k}^{v} \qquad )$$

$$Z \qquad \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} \qquad (k;q)G(k+q;!+!_{q}): \qquad (13)$$

We rst present our analytical results for the full G reen's function in certain limiting cases, and then present the full num erical solution of Eq.(13).

### III. A N A LY T IC A L R E SU LT S

We obtain the analytical solution of Eq.(13) in two di erent ranges of !. In Sec. IIIA we rst solve the self-consistency equation in the limit j!  $!_{m ax} j$ , where  $!_{m ax}$  is the highest frequency at which the full G reen's function rst acquires a nite imaginary part, and = JS (t=J S)<sup>1=3</sup>. We show that for j!  $!_{m ax} j$ 

the excitations are purely incoherent and extend over a region of  $\begin{pmatrix} 6 \\ 2S \end{pmatrix}$ . In Sec. IIIB we then consider the case j! !maxj . In this frequency range we nd coherent excitations which exist up to energies of O (JS) down from the maximal frequency.

## A . Incoherent part of the excitation spectrum

We rst observe that the interaction vertex in Eq.(13) has an overall scale of  $(t S)^2$ , while the quasiparticle G reen's function behaves as 1=! at very large frequencies (here, and in the following, we shifted the frequency by the mean-eld chem\_ical potential, = ). Obviously than, for !  $t^{T}S$ , the perturbative expansion in the spin-ferm ion interaction is convergent, and the density of states (DOS) is exactly equal to zero, as in the mean-eld theory. When ! is reduced to the scale of t S, the lowest-order self-energy term t<sup>2</sup>S=! becom es of the sam e m agnitude as the frequency in the bare G reen's function, i.e, the expansion parameter is 0 (1). We show that in this frequency range there exists a critical value of ! below which perturbation theory becom es non-convergent and there appears a nite DOS. It is essential that for sm all  $J^{T}$  S=t, the critical frequency is still much larger than the magnon frequency such that one can neglect  $!_q$  and  $E_k^v$  compared to ! in the r.h.s. of Eq.(13). The self-consistency equation then reduces to a conventional integral equation

$$G^{-1}(k;!) = ! \frac{d^2q}{4^2}(k;q-k)G(q;!)$$
(14)

in which the dependence on the external momentum is only present in the interaction vertex. Furthermore, we assume that ! t  $\overline{S}$  is larger than the total magnon bandwidth, including the incoherent part. In this situation, the integration over q runs over the whole MBZ.

Before we present the solution of Eq.(14), it is instructive to consider a simpli ed version of this equation in which  $(k;q \ k)$ , which is a smooth function of the ferm ionic m om entum, is just substituted by some constant  $t^2S$ . The equation for the fullG (!) then reduces to

$$G^{-1}(!) = ! \tilde{t}^{2}SG(!);$$
 (15)

where  $\tilde{t}=t = 0$  (1). Solving this algebraic equation, we obtain for positive !

G (!) = 
$$\frac{2}{!+1} \frac{p}{!^2} \frac{l_{max}^2}{l_{max}^2}$$
; (16)

where  $!_{max} = 2\tilde{t} \cdot \bar{s}$ . We see that for  $! > !_{max}$ , the Green's function is real. This is the frequency range where perturbation theory is valid. For  $! < !_{max}$ , how-ever, the expression under the square root is negative, and the solution possesses a nite imaginary part which gives rise to a nite DOS. The total width of the DOS is obviously W =  $2!_{max} = 4\tilde{t} \cdot \bar{s}$ .

We now solve Eq.(14) with the actual (k;q k). We introduce a new function  $f_k$  (!) via

$$G_{k}^{1}(!) = ! f_{k}(!^{2}) :$$
 (17)

Substituting this into Eq.(14), we obtain

$$f_{k} = 1 \qquad \frac{Z}{4} \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}f_{q}} = \frac{2}{q} \qquad \frac{2}{k} + \frac{\frac{2}{k} + \frac{2}{q}}{1} \frac{2}{\frac{2}{q} + \frac{2}{k}};$$
(18)

where we de ned =  $32t^2S=!^2$ .

The general solution of Eq.(14) can be obtained by expanding in the eigenfunctions of the D<sub>4h</sub> sym m etry group of the square lattice. The solution is in general rather cum bersom e because the vertex contains a k dependent term in the denom inator. However, it is easy to verify that the expression in the square brackets vanishes when  $_{q~k}$  ! 1. The dom inant contribution to the r.h.s. of Eq.(14) then comes from the region of q-space where  $_{q~k}$  is relatively sm all i.e., the denom inator is close to one. For sim plicity, we just set it equal to one. We then obtain

$$f_k = 1$$
  $\frac{d^2}{4^2 f_q} q^{-1} q^{-1} q^{-1} k q^{-1} k$  (19)

This equation is much simpler to solve because the decomposition of  $_{q-k}$  into the eigenfunctions of the square lattice involves only four eigenfunctions:

$$k_{q} = k_{q} + \gamma_{k} \gamma_{q} + k_{q} + \gamma_{k} \gamma_{q};$$
 (20)

where

$$_{k} = \frac{1}{2} (\cos k_{x} + \cos k_{y}); \quad \gamma_{k} = \frac{1}{2} (\cos k_{x} - \cos k_{y});$$

$$_{k} = \frac{1}{2} (\sin k_{x} + \sin k_{y}); \quad \gamma_{k} = \frac{1}{2} (\sin k_{x} - \sin k_{y}): (21)$$

W e now choose a general ansatz for  $f_k$  consistent with Eq.(19)

$$f_k = A + B \frac{2}{k} + C \frac{1}{k} + C \frac{1}{k} + E \frac{1}{k} - k$$
 (22)

and solve this set of self-consistent algebraic equations for the coe cients. W e found that the coe cients C;D and E are equal to zero, while A and B are the solutions of two coupled equations

$$A = 1 \quad 2 \quad \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} \frac{\frac{2}{q}}{A + B^{2}};$$
  

$$B = 2 \quad \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} \frac{\frac{2}{q}}{A + B^{2}};$$
(23)

Introducing A = 1 2 x; B = 2 x and separating real and imaginary parts of x by introducing  $x = x_1 + ix_2$ , we obtain an equivalent set of equations for  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ 

$$\mathbf{x}_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} Z & \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} \\ \frac{1}{4^{2}} \\ 1 & 2 \\ \mathbf{x}_{1} (1 \\ \frac{2}{q}) \\ 1 & 2 \\ \mathbf{x}_{1} (1 \\ \frac{2}{q}) \\ + 4^{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{2}^{2} (1 \\ \frac{2}{q})^{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{2} = \begin{bmatrix} Z & \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} \\ \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} \\ \frac{1}{1^{2}} \\ 2 \\ \mathbf{x}_{1} (1 \\ \frac{2}{q}) \\ + 4^{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{2}^{2} (1 \\ \frac{2}{q})^{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{1} (1 \\ \frac{2}{q}) \\ \mathbf{x}_{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{1} (1 \\ \frac{2}{q}) \\ \mathbf{x}_{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{2} \\$$

In term s of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , the quasiparticle G reen's function is given by

$$G(k;!) = \frac{1}{!} \frac{1 \quad 2 \quad x_{1} (1 \quad \frac{2}{k}) + i2 \quad x_{2} (1 \quad \frac{2}{k})}{1 \quad 2 \quad x_{1} (1 \quad \frac{2}{k})^{2} + 4 \quad ^{2}x_{2}^{2} (1 \quad \frac{2}{k})^{2}} :$$
(25)

O by iously, the spectral function and hence the DOS are nite when x\_2  $\notin$  0.

A simple analysis of Eq.(24) shows that the solution with  $x_2 = 0$  exists only for  $j! j > !_{max} = 2.97t \frac{2}{2S}$ (or  $< _{cr} = 0.448$ ). At the critical point, we obtain  $x_1 = 0.43$ . For smaller frequencies Eq.(24) yields a solution with nite imaginary part, just as we found with the toy model with momentum independent  $p \frac{The}{2S}$  upto tal bandwidth is equal to  $W = 2!_{max}$  &  $\frac{1}{2S} = \frac{1}{2S}$  upto corrections of order O (JS) which we neglected. For ! only slightly below  $!_{max}$ , we have

$$x_2 \frac{p_{max}}{!_{max}}$$
 : (26)

Substituting this into Eq.(25), we obtain that the DOS behaves near  $!_{\rm m\,\,ax}$  as

N (!) 
$$\frac{1}{t \ s} \frac{!_{max}}{!_{max}} = \frac{!_{max}}{!_{max}} = (27)$$

The above results are valid only as long as one can neglect the magnon dispersion. We now estimate the range of validity of this approximation. Recall that in transforming Eq.(13) into Eq.(14), we omitted the term

<sup>Z</sup> 
$$\frac{d^2q}{4^2}$$
 (k;q k) [G (q;! + !q) G (q;!)]: (28)

Far from  $!_{max}$ , we do not expect this term to be relevant. Near the maximum frequency, G (!) G  $(!_{max}) / (!_{max} !)^{j=2}$ , and  $(!_{max}) / (!_{max} !)^{j=2}$ , and  $(!_{max}) / (!_{max}) = 0$  (26) into Eq.(25) with  $x_2$  from Eq.(26) into Eq.(28) we nd that the term we omitted can be neglected when  $j!_{max}$  ! $j = 3 S^{5=2} t = (!_{max} / 1)^{j}$ , i.e., when  $j!_{max} ! j = 3 S (t=J S)^{1=3}$ . At frequencies closer to  $!_{max}$ , the magnon dispersion is not negligible, and the calculation of the spectral function should be done using the full self-consistency equation Eq.(13). We will proceed with this calculation in the next section.

### B.Coherent part of the excitation spectrum

In this section, we study the form of the quasiparticle G reen's function close to the top of the valence band, i.e., in the region  $j!_{max}$  ! j .

It is again instructive to consider rst a toy model with a momentum independent interaction. A sum e that typical value of the magnon frequency is JS with J=J = 0 (1). We then have instead of Eq.(15)

$$G^{-1}(!) = ! \tilde{t}^2 SG(! + JS):$$
 (29)

In the vicinity of  $!_{max}$ , the solution of this equation is

G(!) 
$$\frac{2}{!_{max}}$$
 1+  $\frac{2}{!_{max}}$   $\frac{((! !_{max})^3 + {}^{\sim}^3)^{1=2}}{j! !_{max}j}$  (30)

where  $!_{max} = 2\hat{t} \cdot S + 0$  (JS) and  $\sim = JS (\hat{t} = J \cdot S)^{1=3}$ . We see that there are two typical scales introduced by J. For j!  $!_{max}j$ , G (!) in Eq.(30) di ers from that in Eq.(16) only by sm all corrections. For JS j!  $!_{max}j$ , the frequency dependence of the full solution is di erent from that in Eq.(16), how ever, G (!) remains approximately equal to  $2=!_{max}$ . Finally, at j!  $!_{max}j$  JS, the full G reen's function begin to increase, and very near  $!_{max}$  we have

G(!) 
$$\frac{J^{p} \overline{s}}{\tilde{t}} \frac{1}{! !_{max}}$$
: (31)

We see that very near  $!_{max}$ , the G reen's function has a conventional pole with the residue  $Z = J^T S = \tilde{t}$ . This im plies that around  $!_{max}$ , there should exist coherent ferm ionic excitations.

We now proceed with the solution of the actual self-consistency equation with a momentum-dependent

 $(k;q \quad k)$ . Inspired by the solution of the toy model, we assume that there exists a frequency,  $!_{max}$  for which  $G^{-1}(k;!_{max}) = 0$  at som  $ek = k_0$ , and which diers from the previously found onset frequency only by an am ount of (JS). We will not be able to fully verify this assum ption analytically as it would require us to nd a solution of Eq.(13) for all k and  $! !_{m ax}$  which we cannot do. However, we will later verify this assumption in our numerical studies. We also assume and then verify that  $k_0 = (=2; =2)$ , and that near  $k = k_0$  and  $! = !_{m ax}$ , the excitations are mostly coherent, and the quasiparticle G reen's function has the form

$$G(k;!) = \frac{Z}{! !_{max} + E_k i (! !_{max})^2 (! !_{max})};$$
(32)

Here  $Z_k$  is the quasiparticle residue, is the damping coe cient, (x) = 1(0) if x < 0 (x > 0), and the hole excitation spectrum has the form

$$E_{k} = \frac{(k_{2} - k_{0})^{2}}{2m_{2}} + \frac{(k_{k} - k_{0})^{2}}{2m_{k}}; \qquad (33)$$

where  $k_{?}$ ;  $k_k$  are the m om enta along the boundary of the MBZ and along the zone diagonal, respectively.

In addition, as we discussed above, we introduce an upper cuto  $q_c$  1 in the integration over the m agnon momentum, and restrict with an expansion of the m agnon energy upto linear order in q. We recall that physically, the presence of this cuto rejects the experimental fact that the zone-boundary m agnons cease to exist as well-de ned quasiparticles and therefore electively do not contribute to the self-energy of the valence fermions. We will see that the quasiparticle residue Z scales as  $(q_c)^{1-2}$ , but the elective m asses are independent of  $q_c$ .

W e now substitute the coherent ansatz for G (k;!) into the self-consistency equation Eq.(13). Expanding around  $k_0$  and  $!_{m ax}$  and using the fact that G<sup>-1</sup> ( $k_0$ ;  $!_{m ax}$ ) = 0, we obtain self-consistent solutions for the quasiparticle residue, the quasiparticle spectrum and the damping coe cient. Consider rst the quasiparticle residue. Setting  $k = k_0$  and expanding the rhs. of the self-consistency equation Eq.(13) to linear order in  $!_{m ax}$  ! we obtain

$$\frac{1}{Z} = \frac{Z}{4} \frac{d^2q}{4^2} (k_0;q) \frac{Z}{(!_q + E_{k_0+q})^2}; \quad (34)$$

where the integration runs upto  $q_c$ . Since  $q_c$  1, we can expand the two terms in the denom inator to linear order in q. As  $!_q$  / q and  $E_{k_0+q}$  /  $q^2$ , the rst term is dom inant. Perform ing the integration with only  $!_q$  in the denom inator, we obtain

$$1 = Z + \frac{p \frac{1}{2t^2 Z^2 q_c}}{J^2 S} :$$
 (35)

In the limit  $J^{D} = t$  1, the term linear in Z can be neglected and we nd

$$Z = \frac{J^{p} \overline{S}}{t} - \frac{p}{q_{c}}^{2} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1$$

We see that Z scales linearly with  $J^{D} = t$  as in our toy model. This dependence was also obtained in earlier

studies [2]. It was however noticed in Ref. [3] that the linear dependence exists only for very small J=t. These authors argued that form oderate J=t, Z  $(J=t)^{l=2}$ . We also found deviations from the linear behavior already for m oderately small J=t, however, we did not nd a square root dependence for interm ediate J=t. A plot of Z versus J=t is presented in Figs. 6 and 7.

Next, we calculate the quasiparticle damping  $\cos - \operatorname{cient}$ . For this we again set  $k = k_0$ , neglect  $E_{k_0+q} \cos - \operatorname{pared} to !_q$ , but do not expand in !  $!_{m ax}$ . However, since we are interested in small deviations from  $!_{m ax}$  we can neglect the damping term on the rhs. of Eq.(13) compared to !  $!_{m ax}$ . The rhs. of the self-consistency equation then takes the form

$$\frac{Z}{\frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}}} (k_{0};q) \frac{Z}{! ! m_{ax} + !_{q} + i} :$$
(37)

C learly, for  $! > !_{max}$ , the denom inator is positive and the integral does not contain an imaginary part. For  $! < !_{max}$ , however, the integrand has a pole at  $! = !_{max}$  !<sub>q</sub>. Integrating around the pole, we obtain a nite imaginary part which in 2D scales as  $(! !_{max})^2$ . A fler perform ing the explicit calculations, we obtain

$$= \frac{t^2 Z^2}{(2S)^2 J^3} :$$
(38)

The same result was obtained earlier by K ane, Lee and Read [2]. Note in passing that in contrast to a recent claim in Ref. [17], we did not nd a missing factor of 2 in their formula. Substituting the expression for Z into Eq.(38), we nally obtain

$$=\frac{1}{4JS}\frac{p_{\overline{2}}}{q_{c}}:$$
 (39)

Comparing now the damping term with the term linear in frequency, we nd that the ferm ionic excitations are weakly dam ped for  $E_k = !_{max}$  ! 4JS (g= 2). For small q, this condition is satis eq only in a small region =2 and m  $^{1}$  4JS, around  $k_0$ . For example, for  $q_c = \frac{1}{2}$ the ferm ionic excitations are only weakly damped for k  $k_0 j < 0.75$  which constitutes only a small fraction of the MBZ. Away from this region, the dam ping term is dom inant, and the spectral function should possess a broad maximum around  $! = E_k$  rather than a sharp quasiparticle peak. This is in full agreement with the data [30,31] which show that the spectral function measured in photoem ission experiments possesses a clearly distinguishable quasiparticle peak only in the vicinity of k<sub>0</sub>.

We now proceed with the calculation of the elective masses. For this we set ! =  $!_{m ax}$  and expand in the magnon momentum. We restrict ourselves to the strong coupling lim  $\pm J^{-}S^{-}$  t and neglect the bare dispersion, which in this lim  $\pm$  is completely overshadowed by the self-energy correction. We then obtain

$$\frac{E_{k}}{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} Z & \frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}} & (k_{0};q) \\ G & (!_{m ax} + !_{q};k + q) & G & (!_{m ax} + !_{q};k_{0} + q) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{Z}{\frac{d^{2}q}{4^{2}}} & (k;q) & (k_{0};q) & G & (!_{m ax} + !_{q};k_{0} + q) \\ Z & ( ) \\ \frac{Z}{\frac{d^{2}q}{2^{2}}} & (k;q) & (k_{0};q) & G & (!_{m ax} + !_{q};k_{0} + q) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{Z}{\frac{d^{2}q}{2^{2}}} & (k;q) & (k_{0};q) \\ ( ) \\ G & (!_{m ax} + !_{q};k + q) & G & (!_{m ax} + !_{q};k_{0} + q) : (40) \end{bmatrix}$$

Expanding the quasiparticle G reen's function, we obtain

$$G (!_{max} + !_{q};k+q) \quad G (!_{max} + !_{q};k_{0}+q) = Z \frac{E_{k_{0}+q}}{(!_{q} + E_{k_{0}+q})^{2}} + Z \frac{(E_{k_{0}+q} - E_{k_{1}+q})^{2}}{(!_{q} + E_{k_{0}+q})^{3}} + \dots$$
(41)

where

$$E_{k+q} = \frac{k_{2}^{2}}{2m_{2}} + \frac{k_{k}^{2}}{2m_{k}} + \frac{k_{2} q_{2}}{m_{2}} + \frac{k_{k} q_{k}}{m_{2}} + (42)$$

The expansion of (k;q) upto quadratic order in k and upto linear order in q yields

$$(k;q) \qquad (k_{0};q) = 32t^{2}S \frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{4}k_{?}^{2}q(1 - \frac{q_{?}^{2}}{q}) \quad k_{?}q_{?} \quad \frac{k_{k}^{2}q_{?}^{2}}{2 - \frac{1}{2}q} : (43)$$

Inserting now these expressions into Eq.(40) and using the result for the quasiparticle residue, we nd that one of the two contributions to the rst term on the rhs. of Eq.(40) cancels out the  $E_k=Z$  term on the lhs. The remaining terms are all proportional to , and therefore the energy scale t drops completely out of the problem. The only remaining scale is given by  $!_q$ , and the inverse e ective masses are therefore proportional to the spin-wave velocity. Furtherm ore, we found that the integrals over the magnon momentum in the remaining terms in Eq.(40) are con ned to the upper limit of the q integration, and all scale as  $q^2$ . Therefore, the cuto  $q_2$  also drops out of the problem. As a result, we obtain universal, model-independent equations for the masses

$$\frac{3}{(4JSm_{?})^{2}} \frac{1}{JSm_{?}} + 1 = 0;$$

$$\frac{1}{(4JSm_{k})^{2}} = 1 = 0:$$
(44)

The second equation yields  $m_k^{-1} = 4JS$ , while for  $m_2$ we obtain two solutions:  $m_2^{-1} = 4JS$  or  $\frac{4}{3}JS$ . We have checked that only the rst solution form  $_2$  can be continuously connected with the perturbative solution at weak



FIG.4. The schematic form of the DOS at half-lling. The DOS reaches a maximum at energies JS, below the gap, then drops down at slightly larger energies, and then gradually increases and saturates at energies which are taway from the gap.

coupling. Then only the rst solution is physically relevant, and we nally obtain

$$m_k = m_? = (4JS)^{-1}$$
: (45)

We see that in the limit q. 1 and for  $J^{D} = t$  1 when the bare dispersion can be neglected, the elective masses are equal, i.e., the top of the valence band is isotropic. This result is an intrinsic property of the Hubbard (or t J) model at strong coupling, independent of the form of the bare hopping. Note that the value of the masses is exactly the same as in the mean-eld theory with  $t^{0} =$ 0:5J.

We also estim ated the m agnitude of the corrections to this universal result for the m asses. We indeed found that as  $q_c$  increases, the dispersion becomes anisotropic with m<sub>2</sub> > m<sub>k</sub>. This trend is consistent with the results of other authors who integrated over the full m agnetic B rillouin zone in Eq.(13) [3,8,11]. Finally, the form of the coherent part of the G reen's function in Eq.(32) in plies that the DOS behaves as  $(!_{max} !)^{\hat{r}}$  very near  $!_{max}$  and reaches the value

$$N = \frac{Z}{JS} = \frac{1}{tS}$$
(46)

at  $!_{max}$  ! JS, which is the largest scale where this form is applicable. At even larger frequencies, the DOS scales as

$$N = \frac{Z}{!_{max} !}$$
(47)

and transforms into the fully incoherent DOS given by Eq.(27) at  $!_{max}$  ! . This incoherent density of states then gradually increases with frequency and satu- $!_{\,\text{m ax}}$  . These results in ply that the DOS rates at ! ! JS, then drops reaches a maximum at  $!_{max}$ down at slightly larger frequencies , and then gradually increases and passes through a broad maximum at  $!_{max}$ . The behavior of the DOS is presented in ! Fig. 4. This behavior is in agreement with the num erical results which also nd a strong coherent peak in the DOS at !max ! J on top of a smooth incoherent background [47].

# C.Vertex corrections

Finally, we consider the e ect of vertex corrections. We already found in Sec. II that these corrections do not introduce any new scale, but at the same time they do not possess a factor of 1=S and therefore can only be neglected due to a numerical smallness. To estimate the magnitude of the vertex renormalization, we computed the lowest-order vertex correction shown in Fig. 2 with the full quasiparticle G reen's functions from Eq.(32). We followed the same computational steps as before, i.e., expanded to linear order in the magnon momentum and integrated upto  $q_c$ . Performing these calculations, we obtain that at small external momenta the full vertex has the same functional form as the bare one and di ers from it by a factor (1 + ) where

$$= \frac{p \frac{p}{2t^2 Z^2 q_{\rm E}}}{2 J^2 S} I$$
 (48)

and

$$I = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dy \frac{xy}{(x+y)^{2}} = (\log 2 \quad 0.5) \quad 0.2 : (49)$$

Substituting Eq.(36) for Z into Eq.(48), we obtain that the term in brackets is equal to unity, i.e.,  $= I \quad 0.2$ . We see that the leading vertex correction accounts for only a 20% renorm alization of the bare vertex. We did not explicitly compute higher-order vertex corrections, but our estimates show that they are likely to be progressively smaller. We therefore estimate that our analytical and num erical results for the dispersion obtained without vertex corrections are valid with an accuracy of about 20%.

### IV . N U M E R IC A L R E SU L T S

We now proceed with the discussion of the full numerical solution of the self-consistency equation for the quasiparticle G reen's function.

As in the previous section, we begin by considering in Sec. IV A the frequency range j!  $!_{m ax} j$ , in which the spectrum is completely incoherent. In Sec. IV B we then consider frequencies close to  $!_{m ax}$  for which we obtain coherent excitations on the scale of O (JS). We present the results for the dispersion of a single hole for di erent values of J=t and t<sup>0</sup>=t, as well as di erent cuto s q<sub>c</sub>. For comparison with earlier studies we also present the results for the case when the magnons are considered as free particles.

W e will dem onstrate that for  $t^0 = 0$ , one recovers two equale ective masses only for very large t=J. How ever, after including a nearest-neighbor hopping  $t^0 = 0.5J$ , we obtain two roughly equalmasses for all values of t=J. In this situation, the only e ect of the decrease of J=t



FIG.5. The incoherent part of the hole excitation spectrum for several values of J=t (solid line J=t = 0.4, dashed line J=t = 0.007 and dotted lines J=t = 0.0007).

is the transfer of the spectral weight from the coherent to the incoherent part of the dispersion. Furtherm ore, for the experimentally relevant case J=t = 0.4, we nd m<sup>1</sup> (4JS)<sup>1</sup>. For S = 1=2 this yields m<sup>1</sup> (2J)<sup>1</sup>, which is the same value that was obtained in the photoem ission experiments on Sr<sub>2</sub>C uO<sub>2</sub>C l<sub>2</sub>.

### A. Incoherent part of the excitation spectrum

A swediscussed in Sec. IIIA, for j! !m axj wecan neglect the m agnon dispersion on the r.h.s of Eq.(11) and consider an integral equation only in momentum space. Following the same argument we also neglected the bare ferm ionic dispersion in Sec. IIIA. For our num erical studies, however, we kept the bare ferm ionic dispersion in order to illustrate how the DOS evolves with J=t. In Fig. 5 we present for several values of J=t the DOS resulting from the numerical solution of Eq.(14) for S = 1=2and  $t^0 = 0$ . We see that for intermediate J=t = 0.4(solid line), the DOS is asymmetric around ! = 0 with the density shifted towards negative frequencies. This indicates that the contribution from the bare dispersion which by itself yields a nite DOS only for negative ! is not negligible. W ith decreasing J=t the asymmetry becom es weaker, until it basically vanishes for J=t=0.007. This result is expected since in the lim it J=t ! 0 the bare dispersion becomes irrelevant, and we should recover a symmetric DOS.We also found that the total bandwidth only weakly depends on J=t and is roughly equal to W = 6.6t. This value is only slightly larger than W = 6t which we obtained analytically in Sec. IIIA.

#### B.Coherent part of the excitation spectrum

In order to solve Eq.(11) for the full G reen's function we use a discrete mesh in frequency and in k space.



FIG.6. Z as a function of J=t. The dotted and solid lines are the plots of Eqs.(35) and (36), respectively. The dashed line is our analytical result with subleading corrections in  $q_c$ . The led diam ands are our num erical results. The integration over m agnon m om enta is restricted to 1=4 of the M BZ.

W e assume that near the top of the valence band the quasiparticle G reen's function has the form presented in Eq.(32) and obtain the onset frequency  $!_{max}$  and the hole dispersion  $E_k$  from the conditions

$$G^{-1}(k = k_0; ! = !_{max}) = 0;$$
  

$$G^{-1}(k; ! = !_{max}) = E_k = Z : (50)$$

To obtain the quasiparticle residue, we compute G  $^{1}$  (k = k<sub>0</sub>;!) and use the relation

$$Z = \frac{!}{G^{-1}(k;!_{max} + !) - G^{-1}(k;!_{max})}; \quad (51)$$

where ! is a small shift from the maximal frequency. The dispersion extracted from Eq.(50) is form ally valid only in the vicinity of  $k_0$ . At larger distances from  $k_0$ ,  $E_k$  does not necessary coincide with the position of the maximum in the spectral function due to a strong quasiparticle damping. In our numerical procedure for solving the self-consistency equation, we relate the G reen's function at a given frequency ! to the G reen's function at a given frequency ! to the G reen's functions at larger ! + !q, and progressively compute G at smaller and smaller !. U sing this method, we cannot obtain the imaginary part of the full G reen's function and therefore are unable to compare  $E_k$  extracted from Eq.(50) with the position of the maximum in the spectral function. W e just assum e without proof that at least not too far from  $k_0$ ,  $E_k$  and the peak position roughly coincide.

We rst present in Figs. 6 and 7 our results for the quasiparticle residue at  $k = k_0 = (=2; =2)$  as a function of J=t. We have chosen two values of  $q_c$ : a sm aller one  $q_c = \frac{p}{2} = 16$  and a larger one for which the integration over the m agnon m om enta runs over 1=4 of the MBZ.



FIG.7. The same as in Fig.6 for  $q_c = 2^{1=2}$  =16.

The squares in these gures represent our numerical results, the dotted line is our analytical form ula, Eq.(36), obtained to leading order in  $q_{\rm c}$ , and the dashed line incorporates subleading corrections in  $q_{\rm c}$ . We see that for smaller  $q_{\rm c}$ , the agreement between the numerical data and the results to leading order in  $q_{\rm c}$  is rather good. For larger  $q_{\rm c}$ , subleading corrections are more relevant. In both cases, how ever, the quasiparticle residue is substantially reduced from its value Z = 1 for free fermions already for moderate J=t. We also see that the linear dependence exists only for very small J=t (see linear t in Fig. 6).

In Fig. 8 we present the results for the ratio of the masses as a function of t=J for  $t^0 = 0$  and  $t^0 = 0.5J$ , respectively. In both cases, the integration over the m agnon m om enta runs over 1=4 of the M BZ.W e see that for both values of  $t^0$ , the ratio of the masses approaches one in the lim it t=J ! 1 . This is in full agreement with our analytical results. We also see, however, that for  $t^0 = 0$ , one needs very large, unphysical values of t=J to recover the limiting behavior. For  $t^0 =$ 0:5J, the ratio of the masses is equal to one already at the mean-eld level, and our results dem onstrate that the ratio rem ains roughly equal to one for all values of t=J including the experimentally relevant t=J = 2.5. In order to see the effect of the J=t ratio on the whole ferm ionic dispersion, we present the results for E (k) for  $t^0 = 0$  and two di erent values of J=t in Fig.9. W e clearly see that the variation of J=t mainly a ects the dispersion around (0; ). The excitation energy in this region increases with t=J, i.e., the dip in the dispersion becom es deeper, which im m ediately leads to a decrease in the ratio of the e ective masses. At the same time, the overall bandwidth only slightly increases with decreasing J=t. In Fig. 10 we compare the results for the ferm ionic dispersion for J=t=0:4 and for two values of  $t^0$ ;  $t^0 = 0$  and  $t^0 = 0$ : 4J (here the m agnon integration runs over 1=4 of the MBZ). We see that for



FIG.8. The ratio of the e ective masses m  $_{?}$  and m  $_{k}$  as a function of t=J for (a)  $t^{0}$  = 0 and (b)  $t^{0}$  = 0.5J. The integration over the m agnon m om enta runs over 1=4 of the M BZ.

 $t^0 = 0$ , the dispersion is rather an isotropic and inconsistent with the experim ental data [30,31]. On the contrary, for  $t^0 =$ 0:4J, not only the masses are equal, but also the energies at (0;0) and (0;) are nearly equal to each other, and the bandw idth for coherent excitations is about 3J. All three of these results are in full agreem ent with the data [30,31]. We also found that the energy at (0; =2) is about half of that at (0; 0) which agrees with the most recent data by LaRosa et al [31]. The results for  $t^0 =$ 0:5J are similar to those for f =0:4J and are presented in Fig. 11. In this gure we compare the dispersion for  $t^0 =$ 0:5J for two di erent ranges of integration over the m agnon m om entum . W e see that w hile the integration over 1=4 of the MBZ yields a dispersion roughly consistent with the data, the integration over the fullM B Z yields a highly an isotropic dispersion. How ever, one can increase  $t^0$  even further and reduce the energy at (0; ) thus making the dispersion near (=2; =2) more isotropic even for the integration over the full M B Z . W e illustrate this in Fig. 12 where we present the results for the ferm ionic dispersion for  $t^0 = J$  and for the integra-



FIG.9. The ferm ionic dispersions for  $t^0 = 0.0$  and two di erent values for J=t (solid line J=t = 0.4, dotted line J=t = 0.3). The magnon integration is restricted to 1=4 of the MBZ.



FIG.10. The ferm ionic dispersions for J=t = 0.4 and two di errent values for  $t^0$  (solid line  $t^0 = 0.0$ , dotted line  $t^0 = 0.4J$ ). The m agnon integration is restricted to 1=4 of the M BZ.

tion over the full M BZ.W e see, how ever, that the overall bandw idth is still larger than in the experiments. We therefore conclude that if the integration over m agnon m om entum runs over the full M BZ (which implies that m agnons are treated as free particles), the dispersion is inconsistent with the data for all reasonable values of  $t^0$ . In this situation, to account for the data one has to adjust the hopping to even further neighbors.

For completeness, we also present several results for the integration over the full MBZ in the conventional t J model without the three-cite term. This corresponds to neglecting the bare ferm ionic dispersion in Eq.(11). In Fig. 13 we present the results for the excitation energy for  $t^0 = 0$  and J=t = 0.4. This form of the dispersion is in very good agreement with the results of earlier studies [3,8,11]. As in previous studies, we found that the elective mass along the zone diagonal is roughly 7 times sm aller than the mass along the boundary of the MBZ.



FIG.11. The ferm ionic dispersions for J=t = 0.4 and  $t^0 = 0.5J$  and two di erent ranges of integration. The solid and dotted lines are the results for the integration over the fullM BZ and 1=4 of the M BZ, respectively.



FIG.12. The ferm ionic dispersions for J=t = 0.4 and  $t^0 = J$ . The integration over magnon momenta extends over the full MBZ.

In F ig. 14 we present the results for the evolution of the dispersion with  $t^0$ . We see that as  $t^0$  increases, the effective mass along (0; ) direction gets smaller. How - ever, a rather large  $t^0$  is needed to reproduce two equal m asses. Moreover, for equal m asses, the overall bandwidth is about two times smaller than in the experiments. We see again that without restricting the integration over m agnon momentum, one needs to add and to ne tune the hopping parameters to even further neighbors to reproduce the experimental data.

# V.SUMMARY

W e now sum m arize the results of our studies. W e considered in this paper the dispersion of a single hole injected into a quantum antiferrom agnet. W e applied a spin-density-wave form alism extended to large num ber of



FIG.13. The ferm ionic dispersion in the t  $\ J \ m \ odel$  for J=t=0.4 and  $t^0=0$ . The integration over m agnon m om enta runs over the full M BZ.

orbitalsn = 2S, and obtained an integral equation for the full quasiparticle G reen's function in the self-consistent non-crossing" Born approximation. At S = 1, the mean-eld theory is exact. At nite S, we found that the self-energy correction to the mean-eld formula for G(k;!) scales as  $t=J^{T}S$ , and for large t=J, relevant to experiments, is small only in the unphysical limit of a very large spin. We found that for  $t=J^{T}S$ 1, the bare ferm ionic dispersion is completely overshadowed by the self-energy corrections. In this case, the quasiparticle G reen's function contains a broad incoherent continuum which extends over a frequency range of 6t. Tn addition, there exists a narrow region of width O (JS) below the top of the valence band, where the excitations are mostly coherent, though with a small quasiparticle residue Z J S=t. The top of the valence band is located at (=2; =2).

We found that the form of the ferm ionic dispersion, and, in particular, the ratio of the e ective masses near (=2; =2) strongly depend on the assumptions one makes for the form of the magnon propagator. For free magnons, the integration over magnon momenta in the self-energy runs over the whole MBZ. In this case, we found, in agreement with earlier studies, that the dispersion around (=2; =2) is anisotropic with a much smaller mass along the zone diagonal. This result holds even if the bare dispersion contains a sizable  $t^0$  term.

W e, how ever, argued in the paper that the two-m agnon R am an scattering [23] as well as neutron scattering experim ents [36] strongly suggest that the zone boundary m agnons are not free particles since a substantial portion of their spectral weight is transform ed into an incoherent background. M ost probably, this transform ation is due to a strong m agnon-phonon interaction. In this situation, only m agnons with sm allm om enta, for which the interac-



FIG.14. The fermionic dispersion within the t  $J \mod d$ for J=t = 0.4 and for two di errent values of t<sup>0</sup> (dotted line t<sup>0</sup> = 0.4J, solid line t<sup>0</sup> = J). The integration over m agnon m om enta runs over the full M BZ.

tion with phonons is necessary sm all, actually contribute to the self-energy. W e modeled this e ect by introducing a cuto  $q_c$  in the integration over m agnon m om enta. W e found analytically that for sm all q, the strong coupling solution for the G reen's function is universal, and both of the e ective m asses are equal to  $(4JS)^{-1}$ . W e further studied num erically the shape of the dispersion for interm ediate J=t and found that for  $t^0$ 0:5J the ratio of the masses remains roughly equal to one for basically all values of J=t. This particular value for t<sup>0</sup> is obtained from a comparison of the low energy excitations in the underlying three-band model and the e ective one-band Hubbard model [34]. We computed the full ferm ionic dispersion for J=t = 0.4 relevant for  $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$ , and  $t^0 =$ 0:4J and found that not only the masses are both equal to  $(2J)^{-1}$ , but also the energies at (0;0) and (0;)are equal, the energy at (0; =2) is about half of that at (0;0), and the bandwidth for the coherent excitations is around 3J. Allof these results are in full agreem ent with the experim ental data by LaR osa et al [31] and also by W ells et al [30] (except for a slightly sm aller bandw idth and larger energy at (0; )) Finally, we computed the dam ping of the coherent ferm ionic excitations and found that it is smallonly in a narrow range around (=2; =2). Away from the vicinity of (=2; =2), the excitations are overdam ped, and the spectral function possesses a broad maximum rather than a sharp quasiparticle peak. This last feature was also reported in the photoem ission experim ents.

O ne of the goals of the present paper was to dem onstrate that the experim ental data for  $Sr_2CuO_2Cl_2$  can be described without introducing a spin-charge separation. In this respect, we predict that the data should not change much if the experim ents are perform ed well below  $T_c$  though som e anisotropy of the m asses is possible because the spin dam ping decreases with decreasing T and hence q should become larger. This prediction is contrary to the one derived from a model with spincharge separation [33]. In this last case, it was suggested that the minim alm odel with  $t^0 = 0$  already accounts for the key experimental features, and that well below T<sub>c</sub>, spinons and holons are con ned such that one should recover a strong anisotropy of the masses, sim ilar to that in Fig. 13

A nalremark. Though the point of departure of our analysis is very di erent from the one in the scenario based on spin-charge separation [33], in many respects there exists a striking similarity between the results obtained in both approaches. First, we found that the excitations are mostly incoherent, and the bandwidth of incoherent excitations is several t. Second, we obtained that the dispersing excitations observed in photoem ission m easurem ents exists up to an energy scale which is given by J rather than by t. Both of these results are in full agreem ent with the results obtained by Laughlin in the fram ework of spin-charge separation. However, contrary to Laughlin, we did nd a conventional Ferm i-liquid pole in G (k;!) near (=2;=2). The quasiparticle residue of the coherent excitations is small in the strong coupling lim it and vanishes when J=t! 0. In view of these results, we suspect that spinons and holons are actually con ned even above the Neelten perature, but the con nem ent is weak near (=2; =2) and disappears when J=t ! 0. A detailed study of this con nem ent is clearly called for.

It is our pleasure to thank G.Blum berg, E.D agotto, R.Joynt, R.Laughlin, M.Onellion, Z-X.Shen and O. Sushkov for useful discussions. The work was supported by NSF-DMR 9629839 and by A P.Sloan Fellow ship (A. Ch).

- B. I. Shraim an and E. D. Siggia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 740 (1988); 61, 467 (1988).
- [2] C L.K ane, P A.Lee, and N.R ead, Phys. Rev. B 39, 6880 (1989).
- [3] F. Marsiglio, A E. Ruckenstein, S. Schmitt-Rink, and C M. Varma, Phys. Rev. B 43, 10882 (1991).
- [4] J.R. Schrie er, X.G. W en, and S.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 39,11663 (1989); A.V. Chubukov and D.M. Frenkel, Phys. Rev. B 46, 11884 (1992).
- [5] J.E.Hirsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54, 1317 (1985); C.G ros,
   R.Joynt, and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 36, 381 (1987).
- [6] . E. Dagotto, R. Joynt, A. Moreo, S. Bacci and E. Gagliano, Phys. Rev B 41, 9049 (1990).
- [7] E.Dagotto, Rev.M od. Phys. 66, 763 (1994).
- [8] E.D agotto, A.N azarenko and M.Boninsegni, Phys.Rev. Lett. 73, 728 (1994); A.N azarenko, K J.E.Vos, S.Haas, E.D agotto and R.Gooding, Phys. Rev. B 51, 8676 (1995).

- [9] A. Singh and Z. Tesanovic, Phys. Rev. B 41, 11457 (1990).
- [10] G. Vignale and M. R. Hedayati, Phys. Rev. B 42, 786 (1990).
- [11] M. Boninsegni and E. Manousakis, Phys. Rev. B 43, 10353 (1991); Z. Liu and E. Manousakis, Phys. Rev. B 45, 2425 (1992).
- [12] S.Trugm an, Phys. Rev B 37, 1597 (1988).
- [13] S.Sachdev, Phys. Rev B 39, 12232 (1989).
- [14] V J.Belinicher, A L.Chemyshev and V A.Shubin, Phys. Rev.B 54, 14914 (1996).
- [15] A.V. Chubukov and K.A. Musaelian, Phys. Rev. B 50, 6238 (1994).
- [16] D.Du y and A.Moreo, Phys. Rev. B 52, 15607 (1995).
- [17] B.K yund and S.I.M ukhin, Phys. Rev. B 55, 3886 (1997).
- [18] P W .Leung and R J.G ooding, Phys.Rev.B 52, R15711 (1995); P W .Leung, B D.W ells and R J.G ooding, unpublished
- [19] O P. Sushkov, Phys. Rev. B 54, 9988 (1996) and references therein.
- [20] see e.g., J.Bala, A M. O les and J.Zaanen, Phys. Rev. B 52, 4597 (1995)
- [21] S.M. Hayden, G. Aeppli, H.M. ook, D. Rytz, M.F. Hundley, and Z. Fisk, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 3622 (1991).
- [22] T. Im ai, C.P. Slichter, K. Yoshim ura, and K. Kosuge, Phys. Rev. Lett 70, 1002 (1993).
- [23] G. Blumberg. P. Abbamonte, M.V. Klein, W.C. Lee, D.M. Ginsberg, L.L.Miller, and A.Zibold, Phys. Rev. B 53, R11930 (1996) and references therein.
- [24] R R P. Singh, Comments Cond. Mat. Phys. 15, 241 (1991).
- [25] K. G ofron et al, Phys. Rev. Lett 73, 3302 (1994); Jian M a et al, Phys. Rev. B 51, 3832 (1995); D S. M arshallet al, Phys. Rev. Lett 76, 4841 (1996)
- [26] Z-X Shen and J.R. Schrie er, Phys. Rev. Lett., bf 78, 1771 (1997).
- [27] A. Chubukov, D. M orr and K. Shakhnovich, Phil. M ag., 74, 563 (1996).
- [28] A.V. Chubukov and D.K. Morr, Phys. Rep., to appear (1997).
- [29] J.Schm alian, D.P ines and B.Stojkovic, Phys.Rev.Lett, to appear.
- [30] B.O. Wells et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 964 (1995).
- [31] S.LaRosa et al, Phys.Rev.B 56, R525 (1997).
- [32] L B. Io e and A J. Larkin, Phys. Rev B 39, 8988 (1989);
  N. Nagaosa and P A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2450 (1990); P A. Lee and X.-G. W en, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 503 (1996).
- [33] R B. Laughlin, preprint cond-m at 9608005 and private com m unication.
- [34] M.S.Hybertsen, E.B.Stechel, M.Schluter, and D.R. Jennison, Phys. Rev. B 41, 11068 (1990).
- [35] O A. Starykh, O F. de Alcantara Bon m and G. Reiter, Phys. Rev B 52, 12534 (1995).
- [36] G. Aeppli, T.E. Mason, S.M. Hayden and H.A. Mook, preprint.
- [37] W H. Weber and G W. Ford, Phys. Rev. B 40, 6890 (1989).
- [38] P.Knoll, C.Thom sen, M.Cardona, and P.Murugaraj, Phys. Rev. B 42, 4842 (1990).

- [39] B.I.Halperin and P.C.Hohenberg, Phys. Rev. 188, 898 (1969); D.Forster, Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry, and Correlation Functions (Benjam in/Cummings, Reading, MA, 1975)
- [40] PW .Anderson and J.R.Schrie er, Phys. Today 44, 55 (1991).
- [41] D J. Scalapino, Phys. Rep. 250, 329 (1995) and references therein.
- [42] A P.Kampf, Phys.Rep. 249, 219 (1994).
- [43] I.A eck and D.Haldane, Phys. Rev. B 36, 5291 (1987).
- [44] A.V. Chubukov and D.M. Frenkel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3057 (1995); Phys. Rev B 52, 9760 (1995).
- [45] S. Schm itt-R ink, C M. Varma, and A E. Ruckenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 2793 (1988).
- [46] see e.g., F. Lema and A.A. Aligia, Phys. REv. B 55, 14092 (1997).
- [47] R. Preuss, W. Hanke, and W. von der Linden, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1344 (1995).