

Spin and orbital excitation spectrum in the Kugel-Khomskii model

G. Khaliullin

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme, D-01187 Dresden, Germany

V. Oudovenko

Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany

(April 15, 2024)

We discuss spin and orbital ordering in the twofold orbital degenerate superexchange model in three dimensions relevant to perovskite transition metal oxides. We focus on the particular point on the classical phase diagram where orbital degeneracy is lifted by quantum effects exclusively. Dispersion and damping of the spin and orbital excitations are calculated at this point taking into account their mutual interaction. Interaction corrections to the mean-field order parameters are found to be small. We conclude that quasi-one-dimensional Neel spin order accompanied by the uniform $d_{3z^2-r^2}$ -type orbital ordering is stable against quantum fluctuations.

PACS numbers: 75.10.-b, 71.27.+a, 75.30.Et, 75.30.D

It is well known that the orbital (quasi)degeneracy of 3d-states in transition metal oxides plays an important role in their magnetic and lattice properties. An orbital ordering driven by exchange interactions and/or by Jahn-Teller effect occurs at low temperature resulting in a rich variety of magnetic structures (for a review see, e.g. [1]). On the other hand a little is known, however, on dynamical aspects of the coupling between spin and orbital degrees of freedom in these systems: a) What is the spectrum of low-energy orbital excitations, b) How orbital excitations are coupled to the spin sector, c) How this coupling affects magnetic order parameter and spin waves? In the present paper we address these questions by considering the superexchange model with twofold orbital degeneracy, which corresponds to the d^9 Mott-Hubbard insulator on a cubic lattice.

To be specific, we consider the following Hamiltonian derived by Kugel and Khomskii [1], and studied recently by Feiner et al. [2]:

$$H = \frac{t^2}{U} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} 4(S_i S_j) \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) - 1 : \quad (1)$$

In Eq.(1) we follow notations used in [2]: t is the hopping between $e_g(3z^2-r^2)$ orbitals along the c -axis, S_i is the spin $1/2$ operator. Operators τ_i act in the orbital subspace with basic vectors $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ corresponding to the $e_g(x^2-y^2)$ and $e_g(3z^2-r^2)$ orbitals respectively. The structure of τ_i depends on the index i which specifies the orientation of the bond ij relative to the cubic axes $a; b; c$:

$$\tau_i^{a(b)} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\begin{pmatrix} z \\ i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ i \end{pmatrix} \right); \quad \tau_i^c = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} z \\ i \end{pmatrix}; \quad (2)$$

where τ^z and τ^x are Pauli matrices.

It is rather easy to see that the classical Neel state (i.e. $\langle S_i S_j \rangle = 1/4$ in Eq. (1)) is infinitely degenerate: orbitals at each site may be rotated independently. Feiner et al. [2] have suggested that local orbital fluctuations associated with this degeneracy strongly affect spin-sector when quantum fluctuations around the Neel state are included, and drive the system into a disordered spin-liquid state even in three dimensions [3]. Our results presented below do not support this exciting scenario. We have investigated spin and orbital orderings, and their excitations in the model defined by Eqs. (1),(2). Our main findings are i) $d_{3z^2-r^2}$ -type orbital ordering favouring quasi-one-dimensional spin order is the most promising candidate for the ground state. ii) Orbital excitations have a gap generated by quantum effects. This gap controls well the fluctuations around the mean-field solution. iii) Spin-orbit coupling does indeed act to decrease the staggered moment, but this effect is not enough to destroy the long-range order in a cubic lattice.

To begin with, we use the condition $\tau_{ij} = 0$ following from Eq. (2), and represent Eq. (1) in a more transparent way:

$$H = 3 + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \hat{J}^{ij} (S_i S_j + \frac{1}{4}); \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{J}^{ij} = 4 \tau_i \tau_j - 2(\tau_i + \tau_j) + 1; \quad (4)$$

The first term in (3) represents the classical Neel energy (in units of t^2/U) which we drop hereafter. From the above Hamiltonian the key feature of the Kugel-Khomskii model is evident: The exchange "constant" has in fact an internal operator structure accounting for the orbital dynamics, and its expectation value strongly depends on the orientation of orbitals. It follows from Eqs. (3),(4) that the strength of the intersite orbital coupling (hence

the energy gain due to the orbital ordering) is proportional to the deviation of spins from the Neel state, i.e. to the value of $\langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{i}$. This acts to reduce the effective dimensionality of the spin system: Orbitals are arranged in such a way which makes the exchange coupling strongly nonuniform thus enhancing spin fluctuations as much as possible. In low-dimensional models, a similar consideration suggest that the orbital ordering may lead to the spin-liquid state [4]. The z-type ordering of orbitals in the model (1) is suggested by this picture. Indeed, the expectation value of exchange coupling (4) between z orbitals is $J_c = 4$ along the c axis, and it is only small in the (ab) plane: $J_\parallel = 1/4$. Exchange energy is mainly accumulated in c chains and can be approximated as $J_c \langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{i}_c \cdot \mathbf{i}_c + 2J_\parallel \langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{i}_\parallel \cdot \mathbf{i}_\parallel \approx 0.65$ per site (using $\langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_{\mathbf{i}_c} = 1/4 \ln 2$ for 1D [5] and assuming $\langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_{\mathbf{i}_\parallel} = 0$). On the other hand x-type ordering results in the easy plane magnetic structure ($J_{a,b} = 9/4; J_c = 0$) with a much smaller energy gain ≈ 0.38 .

Our strategy is to study the Hamiltonian (3) within the following scheme. i) We rewrite (3) in the form $H = H_{sp} + H_{orb} + H_{int}$. Here the first two terms describe spin and orbital sectors in the mean-field level:

$$H_{sp} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij}^{\parallel} (\mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j + \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{i}); \quad (5)$$

$$H_{orb} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \left(\mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j + \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{i} \right) (\hat{J}_{ij}^{\parallel}); \quad (6)$$

where $A = A_{ij} \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{j}$. The crucial importance is the stability of the mean-field state against fluctuations generated by dynamical coupling between spin and orbital excitations. This coupling is represented by

$$H_{int} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\hat{J}_{ij}^{\parallel}) (\mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j); \quad (7)$$

ii) We assume the antiferromagnetic spin order and uniform z- or x-type ordering of orbitals. Then we employ spin (orbital) wave representation for \mathbf{S}_i (\mathbf{i}_i) operators. iii) We calculate spin-orbit interaction corrections to the excitation spectrum and to the order parameters. Since latter quantities enter in coupling constants in Eqs. (5),(6), all steps have to be done in the self-consistent way.

Consider z orbital order which results in a highly anisotropic quasi-1D magnetic structure. We discuss first mean-field results, which follow from Eqs. (5),(6). Spin and orbital wave energies are given by $\omega_{1k} = J_1 \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2} \cos 2k}$, and $\omega_{2k} = J_2 \sqrt{1 + 2 \cos 2k}$ respectively. Here $J_1 = (J_c + 2J_\parallel)$, and

$$J_c = \hbar \left(\frac{z_i}{i} \frac{z_j}{j} + \frac{z_i}{i} \frac{z_j}{j} \right) \mathbf{i}_c; \quad (8)$$

$$J_\parallel = \hbar \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{z_i}{i} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{z_j}{j} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{z_i}{i} \frac{z_j}{j} + \frac{3}{4} \frac{x_i}{i} \frac{x_j}{j} \right) \mathbf{i}_\parallel;$$

The orbital stiffness is controlled by $J_2 = 8 \left(\cos \frac{1}{4} \varphi \right)$,

with $\varphi = \langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{i}$. Momentum dependencies of

ω_{nk} (index $n = 1, 2$) are determined by the functions

$$\omega_{1k} = (J_c \cos k_z + 2J_\parallel \cos k_\parallel) = J_1, \quad \omega_{2k} = \frac{3}{2} \sqrt{1 - \cos k_\parallel},$$

where $\varphi = \varphi_c$, and $k_\parallel = \frac{1}{2} (\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$.

We calculate all expectation values within linear spin (orbital) wave theory, with only one exception, the interchain spin correlator which we approximate as $\langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_{\mathbf{i}_\parallel} = \langle \mathbf{S}_i^z \mathbf{S}_j^z \rangle + \langle \mathbf{S}_i^+ \mathbf{S}_j^- \rangle$ [6].

Self-consistent mean-field calculations show that the orbital pseudospin is almost saturated (the mixture of jxi state is about one percent only). Coupling between chains J_\parallel is weak (see Table 1) but sufficient to produce quite large magnon dispersion in the (ab) plane (see thin dashed lines in Figs. 1,2). Orbital excitations are

TABLE I. Neel order parameter $\langle \mathbf{S}^z \rangle$ and some other expectation values (see text for notations) calculated in the self-consistent mean-field approximation ($V = 0$), and corrected by including fluctuation effects ($V \neq 0$).

	$\langle \mathbf{S}^z \rangle$	$\langle \mathbf{H}_\parallel \rangle = \langle \mathbf{H}_c \rangle$	$\langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_{\mathbf{i}_c}$	$\langle \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \rangle_{\mathbf{i}_\parallel}$	E_{mf}	E_0
$V = 0$	0.226	0.052	-0.417	-0.122	-0.609	-0.609
$V \neq 0$	0.191	0.072	-0.421	-0.103	-0.564	-0.690




FIG. 1. Dispersion ω_k and damping γ_k of the spin and orbital waves along the direction $\Gamma-M(\pi;0)\Gamma-R(\pi;\pi)\Gamma$ in the Brillouin zone, calculated including fluctuation effects (solid lines), and in the mean-field approximation (dashed lines). Thin (thick) lines correspond to the spin (orbital) excitation. γ_k for orbital waves is almost indistinguishable from the zero line.

gapful, since the orbital ordering is not associated with the breaking of any continuous symmetry. Of the similar spirit mean-field picture was recently discussed by Ishihara et al. [7] in context of their spin-orbital model for manganites. Quantitatively, we find that the orbital gap is smaller than the spin-wave bandwidth. The softness of the orbital excitations is related to that the orbital degeneracy in the model (1) can be lifted only due to quantum effects in the spin sector.




FIG. 2. The same as Fig. 1 but along the Γ - X (π ; 0; 0) - N (π ; π ; π) - Γ direction.

Now, what happens when we switch on the coupling between spin and orbital excitations? The latter is represented by H_{int} (7), which in terms of spin (σ_k) and orbital (τ_k) wave excitations reads as

$$H_{int} = \sum_{k,p} V \left(f_{k,p} \sigma_k^+ \sigma_p + \frac{1}{2} g_{k,p} (\sigma_k^+ \sigma_p + \tau_{k,p} \tau_q^+ + \tau_{k,p} \tau_q^+); \right) \quad (9)$$

where the lowest order (three magnon) terms are only kept. Here $V = \frac{1}{3} = 2$; and $q = k - p$. Matrix elements are

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k,p} &= (u_{2q} + v_{2q}) [q M_{k,p} + (k + p) N_{k,p}]; \\ g_{k,p} &= (u_{2q} + v_{2q}) [q N_{k,p} + (k + p) M_{k,p}]; \\ M_{k,p} &= (u_{1k} u_{1p} + v_{1k} v_{1p}); \quad N_{k,p} = (u_{1k} v_{1p} + v_{1k} u_{1p}); \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with $\epsilon_k = (\cos k_x - \cos k_y) = 2$. The Bogoliubov transformation coefficients in the spin subspace are given by $u_{1k} = f(s+1) = 2g^{1/2}$, $v_{1k} = f(s-1) = 2g^{1/2} \text{sgn } \epsilon_k$, and $s = (1 - \epsilon_k^2)^{-1/2}$. The factor $(u_{2k} + v_{2k}) = (1 + 2\epsilon_k)^{-1/4}$ in (10) is due to Bogoliubov transformation in the orbital sector.

Physically, the interaction (9) accounts for the process when spin exchange is accompanied by the simultaneous orbital transition $j \rightarrow i$, thus enhancing the

x orbital component in the ground state. Spin-orbital coupling leads to the conventional 2 \times 2 matrix bosonic Green's function in both subspaces, with a diagonal (G) and nondiagonal (F) components given by

$$\begin{aligned} G_{i,jk} &= [(i! - A_{i,jk}) + (i_k + S_{i,jk})] D \epsilon; \\ F_{i,jk} &= \frac{(a)}{i,jk} D \epsilon; \\ D \epsilon &= (i! - A_{i,jk})^2 \\ &\quad (i_k + S_{i,jk} - \frac{(a)}{i,jk}) (i_k + S_{i,jk} + \frac{(a)}{i,jk}) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here $A_{i,jk}$ and $S_{i,jk}$ represent the antisymmetric and symmetric (with respect to the Matsubara frequency $i!$) components of the diagonal self-energy $\frac{(n)}{i,jk}$ respectively, while $\frac{(a)}{i,jk}$ is a nondiagonal element of the self-energy matrix. It is implied that all quantities in Eq. (11) carry the subspace index n as well, and $n = 1(2)$ stands for spin (orbital) waves. We calculate self-energies from the lowest order diagrams shown in Fig. 3.




FIG. 3. Spin-orbital interaction corrections to the spin (i) and orbital excitations (ii), and to the ground state energy (iii). Lines (wavy lines) represent spin (orbital) waves.

In spin subspace we find (at zero temperature):

$$\begin{aligned} A_{i,jk} &= V^2 \sum_p (f_{k,p}^2 - g_{k,p}^2) \frac{i!}{(i + i)^2} \frac{1}{n_{k,p}^2} \\ S_{i,jk} &= \frac{(a)}{i,jk} = V^2 \sum_p (f_{k,p} - g_{k,p})^2 \frac{n_{k,p}}{(i + i)^2} \frac{1}{n_{k,p}^2} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here $n_{k,p} = (i_{1p} + i_{2q})$; $q = k - p$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (f^2 - g^2)_{k,p} &= \left[\frac{2}{q} (\epsilon_k + \epsilon_p)^2 \right] x_{2q}; \\ (f - g)_{k,p}^2 &= (\epsilon_k + \epsilon_p - \epsilon_q)^2 (x_{1k} x_{1p})^{-1} x_{2q}; \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $x_{1k} = [(1 - \epsilon_k) = (1 + \epsilon_k)]^{1/2}$; $x_{2k} = (1 + 2\epsilon_k)^{-1/2}$.

In the orbital sector one finds that $A_{i,jk} = 0$, and

$$S_{i,jk} = \frac{(a)}{i,jk} = 2V^2 \sum_p g_{k+p,p}^2 \frac{n_{k,p}}{(i + i)^2} \frac{1}{n_{k,p}^2} \quad (14)$$

where $n_{k,p} = (i_{1p} + i_{1k+p})$, and $g_{k+p,p}^2$ can be found from Eq. (13). We recall that the "bare" energies i_{nk} in Eqs. (11)–(14) are also affected by the interaction, due to the renormalization of parameters J_n and n_k .

Results of self-consistent calculations by including interaction corrections are presented in Table 1 and

Figs. 1,2. Dynamical spin-orbit coupling results in the following: i) It enhances quantum fluctuations in both subspaces thus reducing the staggered moment, and increasing the weight of the x orbital component (which is about 6 percent). The latter effect is also reflected in a larger value of the ratio $J_z = J_c$. ii) Spin and orbital excitations are both softened, which is more pronounced in the $k_y = 0$ plane (and in equivalent ones), see Fig 2. The orbital gap still remains well defined. A spin-Peierls like instability is absent, because of the vanishing matrix elements in Eq. (9) for momenta along z (note $(0;0;q_z) = 0$), and because of the finite interchain coupling. iii) Spin waves get a finite damping. Orbital waves are almost undamped since the density of spin states inside the orbital gap is small. iv) Joint spin-orbital fluctuations significantly lower the ground state energy (see Table 1). The latter is given by $E_0 = E_{mf} + \hbar H_{int}$, where the interaction correction to the mean-field result, calculated from the last diagram in Fig. 3, is

$$\hbar H_{int} = -V^2 \sum_{k,p} g_{k,p}^2 (I_{1k} + I_{1p} + I_{2,k-p}): \quad (15)$$

The exchange energy gain $E_0 = -0.69$ per site is found, which is close to our above estimation from physical considerations. Summarizing, interaction effects do not qualitatively change predictions of the self-consistent mean-field theory, which seems to work quite reasonably. This is an important observation giving some credit to the mean-field ansatz in studying more complicated spin-orbital models. Of course, the latter fails when the orbital gap is softened close to the phase boundaries between different orbitally ordered states, and the dynamical spin-orbit coupling becomes of crucial importance.

Considering x-type ordering, we found it to be unstable against fluctuations. It turns out that orbital excitations around this mean-field state are gapless at the point, $I_{2q} = q$. In addition, the spin-orbit interaction vertex remains finite at $q = 0$, since the orbital pseudospin is not conserved quantity, and orbital waves can not be considered as Goldstone modes. All these lead to the divergencies in perturbation theory indicating that an x-type ordered state is not an appropriate one, as we already mentioned above. This result is consistent with [2].

In summary, we have studied the spin-orbital coupling problem in the specific model, where this coupling is particularly important because of infinite degeneracy of the classical Neel state in this model. The problem of the orbital frustration pointed out in [2] is actually removed by reducing the effective dimensionality of the spin system. Quantum spin fluctuations then generate an orbital excitation gap through the spin-orbit coupling mechanism. Orbital degeneracy in the model (1) should manifest itself in a strong reduction of the Neel temperature, by favouring soft quasi-1D spin structure. This is consistent with

a basic idea of Feiner et al. [2] that orbital degeneracy, in general, acts to enhance quantum spin fluctuations. In contrast to [2] we find, however, that this effect is not strong enough to destroy the Neel order. Melting of the long-range magnetic order by orbital fluctuations suggested in [2] does not occur in a cubic perovskite systems, by simple reason: A certain (model dependent) orbital ordering always results in the three dimensional (albeit very anisotropic) network of exchange interactions among spins. Three dimensionality of the spin sector and existence of the orbital gap are important factors stabilizing the Neel order. We believe that the orbital gap is a robust property of Mott-Hubbard insulators, which is related to the fact that the underlying symmetry in orbital subspace is only discrete one. In a metallic state, doped holes can drastically change the situation, by inducing low-energy orbital fluctuations [8]. A study of the orbital melting in the Kugel-Khomskii model, driven by hole doping, deserves further work.

We would like to thank A.M. Oles, P. Horsch and V. Zevin for stimulating discussions and useful comments. We are also grateful to K. Davies for a careful reading of the manuscript. Partial financial support by the Russian State Program "High-Temperature Superconductivity", Grant No 95065, and by the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research, Grant No 96-02-17527, is acknowledged by one of us (V.O.).

Permanent address: Kazan Physicotechnical Institute, 420029 Kazan, Russia

Permanent address: Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia

- [1] K.I. Kugel and D.I. Khomskii, Sov. Phys. Usp. 25, 231 (1982).
- [2] L.F. Feiner, A.M. Oles and J. Zaanen, Phys. Rev. Lett., 78, 2799 (1997).
- [3] It was found [2] that the Hund's splitting J_H of the intermediate d^8 state and finite splitting E_z of the e_g orbitals may stabilize the long range order. We consider the most "dangerous" case by setting $J_H = E_z = 0$.
- [4] H.F. Pen, J. van den Brink, D.I. Khomskii and G.A. Sawatzky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 1323 (1997).
- [5] Spin-wave theory reproduces this exact result with ~ 6 percent of error; see D.C. Mattis, The Theory of Magnetism I (Springer-Verlag, 1981), p.183.
- [6] This approximation is crucial to guarantee that the interchain correlator $\hbar S_i S_{j+1} = 0$, and vanishes as $J_z \rightarrow 0$.
- [7] S. Ishihara, J. Inoue and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. B 55, 8280 (1997).
- [8] S. Ishihara, M. Yamataka and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B 56, 686 (1997).