arXiv:cond-mat/0003419v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 27 Mar 2000

Role of Bond-Bond Interaction in the Extended Hubbard Chain

Masaaki Nakamura, Kazuhito Itoh and Norihiro Muramoto

Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Roppongi, Tokyo 106-8666

(Received)

Phase diagrams of the one-dimensional extended Hubbard model with a nearest neighbor interaction V and site-off-diagonal (bond-charge X and bond-bond W) interactions at half-filling are obtained numerically, using the level-crossing approach for finite-size clusters. This analysis is straightforward extension of the preceding work [cond-mat/9909277], where only the X term is considered as a site-off-diagonal term. Similarly to the X term, the W term enlarges bond-charge-density-wave (BCDW) and bond-spin-density-wave (BSDW) phases for $W < 0$ and $W > 0$ cases, respectively. In the strong-coupling region, however, the W term causes ferromagnetism for $W > 0$, and shifts the boundary of the phase separation in the $U/t \ll -1$ region, which are different from the roles of the X term. In addition, we discuss a parameter region where the BSDW state is the exact ground state, and show that the exactly solvable point appears just on the phase boundary between the BSDW and the ferromagnetic phases.

KEYWORDS: site-off-diagonal interactions, g-ology, level-crossing approach, strong-coupling theory, bond-charge-density wave, bond-spin-density wave, exact solution

§1. Introduction

The Hubbard model has been considered to be one of the simplest models to describe electrons in metals.[1,2,3] However, since this model is derived by neglecting elements of the Coulomb integral except for the on-site term,[1] it may be unsufficient to describe phenomena where the neglected interactions play essential roles. The most dominant interaction next to the on-site term is considered to be a nearest-neighbor density-density interaction V. The Hubbard model including the V term is usually called "the extended Hubbard model". In addition, site-off-diagonal elements of the Coulomb integral give bond-charge X and bond-bond W interactions. Recently, effects of the site-off diagonal terms are pointed out in the real materials.[4] In this paper, we consider the role of these site-off-diagonal interactions in one-dimensional (1D) cases, where non-perturbative treatment is possible.

For this purpose, we consider the following generalized Hubbard model in the half-filled band,

$$\mathcal{H} = -t\sum_i B_{i,i+1} + U\sum_i n_{i\uparrow}n_{i\downarrow} + V\sum_i n_i n_{i+1} + W\sum_i (B_{i,i+1})^2 + X\sum_{i,s} B_{i,i+1,s}(n_{i,-s}+n_{i+1,-s}) + X'\sum_{i,s} B_{i,i+1,s}n_{i,-s}n_{i+1,-s}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$B_{ijs} \equiv c_{is}^\dagger c_{js} + c_{js}^\dagger c_{is}, \quad B_{ij} \equiv \sum_s B_{ijs}. \quad (2)$$

The three body term in eq. (1) (X' term) is not derived from the generalized Coulomb integral. This term is justified, for example, as an effective interaction in the three band model.[5] In fact, the W term is interpreted as an effective interaction in electron-phonon systems.[6]

Analysis of this model ($X' = 0$) in the half-filled band was performed by Campbell *et al.* ten years ago.[7,8] They discussed the existence of charge-density-wave (CDW), "bond-order-wave (BOW)" and ferromagnetic (FM) phases, but they did not discuss all the phases in this model. Especially, the nature of the "BOW" phase was left ambiguous.

The property of this model can be clarified by the level-crossing approach which is based on the conformal field theory and the renormalization group. This method enables us to determine the phase boundaries with high accuracy from numerical data of the finite-size clusters. Using this technique, one of the authors obtained the phase diagram of the model (1) for $W = 0$.[9,10] In this paper, we apply this approach to the case $W \neq 0$, and clarify the roles of the W term.

The most important purpose of this paper is to clarify the nature of the "BOW" phase. Japaridze first pointed out using the bosonization technique that two types of "BOW" phases may appear in half-filled 1D systems by the effect of the site-off-diagonal terms.[11,12,13] The two "BOW" phases are bond-charge-density-wave (BCDW) and bond-spin-density-wave (BSDW) phases. Their order parameters are given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\rm BCDW}(j) = (-1)^j \sum_s B_{j,j+1,s}, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\rm BSDW}(j) = (-1)^j \sum_s s B_{j,j+1,s}. \quad (4)$$

Recently, Itoh *et al.* discovered that the BSDW state gives the exact ground state in some parameter region of a generalized Hubbard model.[14] In this paper, by using the same argument, we discuss the exactly solvable cases of the present model (1), and clarify the relation to the numerical results.

§2. Site-off-diagonal terms

To begin with, we consider the role of the site-off-diagonal terms by intuitive discussion. First, we consider roles of the bond-charge interaction (X, X') terms. Throughout this paper, we fix the parameters as $X' = -2X$ for simplicity. In this case, the bond-charge interaction terms are rewritten as

$$\mathcal{H}_X = X \sum_{is} (c_{is}^\dagger c_{i+1,s} + \text{H.c.})(n_{i,-s} - n_{i+1,-s})^2. \quad (5)$$

This term conserves SU(2)⊗SU(2)/Z(2) symmetry of the Hubbard model under the following canonical transformation,

$$c_{j\uparrow} \to c_{j\uparrow}, \quad c_{j\downarrow} \to (-1)^j c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger. \quad (6)$$

Hereafter, we call eq. (5) the X term. In a hopping process of an electron with spin s, the hopping term and the X term gives $-t$ when the two sites have zero or two electrons with the opposite spin $-s$, whereas they give $-t + X$ when the two sites have one electron with spin $-s$. Therefore, we can expect that electron pairs are stabilized when $X < 0$.

Next, we consider roles of the bond-bond interaction (W) term. This term can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{H}_W = -4W \sum_i (\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i+1} - \tfrac{1}{4}), \quad (7)$$

where $\boldsymbol{S}_i$ is the usual spin operator, and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ denotes the η-pairing operator whose components are defined by

$$\eta_i^+ = (-1)^i c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger, \quad \eta_i^- = (-1)^i c_{i\downarrow} c_{i\uparrow}, \quad \eta_i^z = \frac{1}{2}(n_i - 1). \quad (8)$$

Thus, the W term includes the spin exchange and the pair hopping. Since a pair hopping process gives an energy gain $2W$, one can expect that the dimer state is enhanced for $W/t < 0$. In addition, for $W/t > 0$, one can expect appearance of ferromagnetism for $U/t \gg 1$ and a phase separation (ferromagnetism in the η-pairing space) for $U/t \ll -1$.

Apparently, the W term also conserve the SU(2) ⊗ SU(2)/Z(2) symmetry of the Hubbard model, so that the present model keeps this symmetry when $V = 0$. The SU(2) symmetry of the η-pairing is broken when $V \neq 0$, and the entire symmetry is reduced to U(1)⊗SU(2).

§3. Weak-coupling region

The instability of the model in the weak-coupling limit can be discussed based on the g-ology.[13] The low-energy behavior of eq. (1) at half-filling is described by two sine-Gordon models for the charge and the spin sectors. Then, the phase boundaries are determined in terms of the bare coupling constants. According to the results, the spin sector with SU(2) symmetry has a gap for

$$U < 2V - \delta g, \quad (9)$$

where $\delta g = 4X/\pi + 8W$. On the other hand, the charge sector with U(1) symmetry has a gap in the following region

$$V > 0,\ U < \delta g, \quad (10)$$

$$U > -2V + \delta g,\ U > \delta g. \quad (11)$$

This region is given by two Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless (BKT) transition lines. Note that the BKT line given by $V = 0$ reflects the SU(2) symmetry of the η-paring. In the charge-gap region, there is a valley of the gap, and the gap vanishes on the Gaussian transition line,

$$U = 2V + \delta g,\ V < 0. \quad (12)$$

In the g-ology analysis, both X and W appear only through δg, so that they play similar roles in the weak-coupling cases. For $\delta g = 0$, CDW and spin-density-wave (SDW) phases appear in the charge-gap region, while in the metallic region, two phases appear where singlet or triplet superconducting (SS, TS) correlation is dominant. The BCDW appears for $\delta g < 0$ while the BSDW appears for $\delta g > 0$, between the CDW and the SDW phases.

Although the result of the g-ology is valid only in the weak-coupling limit, the description by the sine-Gordon model does not break down in the finite-coupling region, due to the concept of the Tomonaga-Luttinger liquid. In this case, the instabilities described by the sine-Gordon model can be identified as level-crossings in the excitation spectra in finite-size systems. In this approach, logarithmic corrections are canceled on the transition points, and the dependence of the system size L appears as $\mathcal{O}(1/L^2)$. This correction originates from the deviation from the linearized dispersion relation of the Tomonaga-Luttinger model. Therefore, phase diagrams can be obtained with high accuracy from the numerical data of the finite-size clusters. The detail of the level-crossing approach is discussed in ref. 10.

§4. Strong-coupling region

The differences between the role of the X and the W terms are clarified in the strong-coupling cases. First, we consider the transition between the phase-separated (PS) state and the SS phase, and the one between the SS and the CDW states. In the $U/t \ll -1$ region, the model can be mapped onto the spin-1/2 XXZ spin chain using the η-pairing operators defined in eq. (8) and the second-order perturbation theory:[16,17]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{XXZ}} = J \sum_i \left[\frac{1}{2}(\eta_i^+ \eta_{i+1}^- + \eta_i^- \eta_{i+1}^+) + \Delta \left(\eta_i^z \eta_{i+1}^z - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right], \quad (13)$$

where

$$J = \frac{4(t - X)^2}{|U|} - 4W, \quad J\Delta = J + 4V. \quad (14)$$

In the XXZ spin chain, $\Delta = 1$ gives a BKT-type transition between the XY (spin fluid) and the Néel states, and $\Delta = -1$ gives the first-order transition between the XY and the ferromagnetic phases. In the present case, the PS, the SS and the CDW states correspond to the ferromagnetic, the XY and the Néel states, respectively. Therefore, $V = 0$ gives the SS-CDW transition, and the asymptotic boundary of the SS-PS transition is given by

$$V = -\frac{2(1 - \xi)^2 t^2}{|U|} + 2W, \quad (15)$$

where $\xi \equiv X/t$. Note that this result is valid only for $W/t \leq 0$, because the SS-PS boundary do not intersect the SS-CDW line ($V = 0$) due to the property of the XXZ spin chain.

Next, we calculate the energies of the CDW and the SDW states by extending van Dongen's perturbative expansion.[18] Since the CDW state is described as a "Néel-ordered phase" ($\Delta > 1$) in the η-pairing space, the energy is given by

$$\frac{E_{\rm CDW}}{L} = \frac{U}{2} + 4|W|\,\varepsilon_{\rm XXZ}(|V/W-1|) - \frac{2(1-\xi)^2t^2}{(3v-1)U} \quad (16)$$
$$+ \frac{(1-\xi)^2\left[(36v^2-5v-1)(1-\xi)^2 - 8(3v-1)v\right]t^4}{v(3v-1)^3(4v-1)U^3},$$

where $v \equiv V/U$. $\varepsilon_{\rm XXZ}(\Delta)$ is the energy density of the XXZ spin chain (13) with $J = 1$, in the Néel-ordered region ($1 < \Delta$),

$$\varepsilon_{\rm XXZ}(\cosh\theta) = -\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sinh\theta}{1+{\rm e}^{-2|n|\theta}}, \quad (17)$$

where $\cosh\theta \equiv \Delta$. On the other hand, the perturbative expansion for the SDW state can be performed up to the fourth order, using the Bethe-ansatz result for the spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain as

$$\frac{E_{\rm SDW}}{L} = V - \left[\frac{(1-\xi)^2t^2}{(1-v)U} - W\right]4\ln 2 \quad (18)$$
$$+ 9\zeta(3)\frac{(1-\xi)^2\left[2(1-\xi)^2-1+v\right]t^4}{(1-v)^3U^3}.$$

The expansion for the SDW state is valid only for $W \leq 0$.

The energies for the PS and the FM states are not affected by the perturbation in the thermodynamic limit. In the PS state, the system separates into two domains: doubly occupied sites and a vacuum.[19] Then, the energy in the thermodynamic limit is given by

$$E_{\rm PS} = \frac{U+4V}{2}L. \quad (19)$$

On the other hand, the energy of the FM state is given by

$$E_{\rm FM} = VL. \quad (20)$$

Using the energies obtained above, we determine asymptotic forms of the four first-order transition lines by equating the energies as

$$E_{\rm CDW} = E_{\rm SDW}, \quad (21)$$
$$E_{\rm CDW} = E_{\rm FM}, \quad (22)$$
$$E_{\rm SDW} = E_{\rm PS}, \quad (23)$$
$$E_{\rm FM} = E_{\rm PS}. \quad (24)$$

In the $U, V \to \infty$ limit, the CDW-SDW phase boundary is $V - U/2 = 2|W|(2\ln 2 - 1)$ for $W \leq 0$, while the CDW-FM phase boundary is $V - U/2 = 2W$ for $W > 0$. The FM-PS boundary is fixed at $U = -2V$.

In the present strong-coupling theory, X appears in the every order of t^{2n}/U^{2n-1} in the perturbation series, while W appears only in the zeroth order. Therefore, the W term plays roles to shift the boundary lines of the phase separation, the CDW-SDW and the CDW-FM transitions.

§5. Exactly solvable case

We discuss the exact ground state of the BSDW state in the present model, using the argument in ref. 14, where the three body term (the X' term) is not included. The explicit wave functions for the BCDW and the BSDW states are given by products of "electron-hole dimers" as,

$$|{\rm BCDW}\rangle_s = \prod_{i=1}^{L/2}[2i-1,2i]_s[2i-1,2i]_{-s}|0\rangle, \quad (25)$$

$$|{\rm BSDW}\rangle_s = \prod_{i=1}^{L/2}[2i-1,2i]_s[2i,2i+1]_{-s}|0\rangle, \quad (26)$$

where $[i,j]_s \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{is}^\dagger + c_{js}^\dagger)$. These "electron-hole dimers" can be interpreted as electrons located on the bonds.

Now, we consider a local operator h_{ijs} for spin-s which satisfies $h_{ijs}[i,j]_s|0\rangle = 0$, and $h_{ijs}|{\rm otherwise}\rangle \geq 0$ for the other configurations. For example,

$$h_{ijs}^a = -B_{ijs} + n_{is} + n_{js}, \quad (27a)$$
$$h_{ijs}^b = -B_{ijs} - n_{is} - n_{js} + 2, \quad (27b)$$
$$h_{ijs}^c = -B_{ijs} + 1, \quad (27c)$$
$$h_{ijs}^d = -B_{ijs} + B_{ijs}^2. \quad (27d)$$

If the total Hamiltonian is written in the following form using the local operators as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{ij}\lambda_j h_{i,i+1,\uparrow}^{a_j}h_{i,i+1,\downarrow}^{b_j}, \quad \lambda_j > 0, \quad (28)$$

then $\mathcal{H}|{\rm BSDW}\rangle_s = 0$. Therefore, the BSDW state is the exact ground state of this Hamiltonian.[15] The present model (1) can be written using the above local operators as follows

$$\mathcal{H} - E = t\sum_i\left[\tfrac{1-\lambda}{2}(h_{i,i+1,\uparrow}^a h_{i,i+1,\downarrow}^a + h_{i,i+1,\uparrow}^b h_{i,i+1,\downarrow}^b)\right.$$
$$\left. +\lambda(h_{i,i+1,\uparrow}^c h_{i,i+1,\downarrow}^d + h_{i,i+1,\uparrow}^d h_{i,i+1,\downarrow}^c)\right], \quad (29)$$

where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, and the parameters and the ground-state energy of the model are

$$U = 2V = 2(1-\lambda)t, \quad (30a)$$
$$X = -X'/2 = -\lambda t, \quad (30b)$$
$$W = (1+\lambda)t/2, \quad (30c)$$
$$E = (1-\lambda)tL. \quad (30d)$$

The Hamiltonian (1) has SU(2) symmetry under global rotation in the spin space. In other words, the operator for the total spin $S_{\rm tot}^\alpha \equiv \sum_i S_i^\alpha$ commutes with the Hamiltonian, so that $(S_{\rm tot}^+)^n|{\rm BSDW}\rangle_s$ with $n \leq L/2$ also gives the ground state. Therefore, the fully ferromag-

netic (FM) state ($n = L/2$),

$$|\mathrm{FM}\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{L} c_{is}^{\dagger}|0\rangle, \tag{31}$$

also degenerates with the BSDW state. This large degeneracy is consistent with the result of the bosonization theory where a BSDW is described as bond-located spins with gapless excitations.[11, 10)]

In finite-size systems, there is no spontaneous breaking of the translational symmetry, so that the actual wave functions of the BSDW states are reconfigured by linear combinations of eq. (26) for $s =\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ as

$$|\mathrm{BSDW}\rangle_{\pm} = |\mathrm{BSDW}\rangle_{\uparrow} \pm |\mathrm{BSDW}\rangle_{\downarrow}. \tag{32}$$

These two states appear at two different wave numbers $k = 0, \pi$. When the parameters of the model shifts from the exactly solvable case toward the spin-gapless region, the $k = 0$ mode remains the ground state, while the $k = \pi$ mode gives the lowest excited state.

We can also construct a model which has a BCDW state as an exact ground state, if the local operators in eq. (28) is replaced as $h^{a_j}_{i,i+1,\uparrow} \to h^{a_j}_{i-1,i,\uparrow}$. In this case, the obtained Hamiltonian includes interactions among three sites.

§6. Numerical results

Using the level-crossing approach as in the same way of ref. 10, we determine the phase diagrams of eq. (1) in the U-V plain for $W \neq 0$, $X = X' = 0$ by analyzing the numerical data of the exact diagonalization for $L = 12$ systems. We determine first-order transition lines for the FM and the PS states by comparing the ground-state energies with eqs. (20) and (19). Then, we obtain the results as shown in Figs. 1(d)-(f). For comparison, we also show the phase diagrams for $W = 0$, $X = -X'/2 \neq 0$ in Figs. 1(a)-(c) which are taken from ref. 10.

For $W < 0$, the BCDW phase appears between CDW and SDW phases, while for $W > 0$, a BSDW phase appears instead of the BCDW phase. This property is similar to the effects caused by the X term. The result is consistent with the estimation that a dimer (BCDW) state is stabilized for $X, W < 0$ as was discussed in Sec. 2. In ref. 8, existence of the "BOW" state is discussed for $X = X' = 0, W > 0$, so that this "BOW" phase corresponds to the BSDW state in the present results.

The differences between the roles of the X and the W terms are clarified in the strong-coupling region. One is a property of the PS boundary in the $U/t \ll -1$ region. For $W < 0$, the PS boundary shifts toward the negative-V side, and flows into $(U, V) = (-\infty, -2|W|)$. On the other hand, for $W > 0$, the boundary shifts toward the positive-V side, but it does not cross the $V = 0$ line. Therefore, a direct CDW-PS transition takes place at $V = 0$.

The other difference is appearance of a FM state for $W > 0$. For $W/t = 1/5$, a tetracritical point appears among PS, TS, SDW and FM states. As W is increased, the SDW region and the Gaussian line in the charge part are swallowed by the FM region, and a direct BSDW-FM transition takes place.

For $W/t = 1/2$, an exactly solvable point ($\lambda = 0$) appears at $(U/t, V/t) = (2, 1)$. This point is just on the boundary between the BSDW and the FM phases as was discussed in Sec. 5. The exactly solvable point moves on the $U = 2V$ line as λ is increased. When $W/t = -X/t = 1$ ($\lambda = 1$), exactly solvable point appears at $(U/t, V/t) = (0, 0)$. In this case, CDW, PS, FM and BSDW phases degenerates on this point. The other regions of the phase diagram are occupied only by CDW, PS and FM states (see Fig. 2).

In order to check the validity of the result in the strong-coupling region, we show in Fig. 1 (d), asymptotic forms of the PS boundaries given by eqs. (15) and (23).[19)] They well agree with the numerical result. In Fig. 3, we show the phase boundaries near the $U = 2V$ line for $L = 8$-14 systems, and asymptotic boundaries given by the perturbation theory up to the second and the fourth orders. In Fig. 3 (a), the CDW-SDW transition line given by eq. (21) agrees with the Gaussian line in the charge part. Although the size dependence of the the spin-gap phase boundary is large, it also approaches to the same line in the strong-coupling regime as the system size is increased. In Figs. 3 (b) and (c), eq. (22) agrees with the CDW-FM transition lines. In Fig. 3 (b), the BCDW phase appears in the very narrow region, and a tetracritical point appears among the BSDW, the BCDW, the SDW and the CDW phases.

§7. Summary

We have studied the phase diagram of the extended Hubbard chain including the bond-charge X and the bond-bond W interactions, using the level-crossing approach. We have clarified the similarity of the roles of the X and the W terms in the weak-coupling case (appearance of BCDW and BSDW phases), and difference in the strong-coupling case (appearance of a FM state, properties of the PS boundary). We have also shown the exact BSDW state appears just on the phase boundary between the BSDW and the ferromagnetic regions.

§8. Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to M. Ogata and M. Takahashi for useful discussions. The computation in this work was partly done using the facilities of the Supercomputer Center, Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo.



Fig. 1. Phase diagram of the 1D extended Hubbard model with site-off-diagonal interactions determined by the data of the $L = 12$ system at half-filling. [CDW (SDW): charge- (spin-) density wave, BCDW (BSDW): bond-CDW (bond-SDW), SS (TS): singlet (triplet) superconducting phase, PS: phase-separated state, FM: ferromagnetic phase] The asymptotic phase boundaries for the PS are given by eqs. (15) and (23). (a)-(c) are taken from ref. 10 for comparison.



Fig. 2. Phase diagram of the 1D extended Hubbard model with site-off-diagonal interactions ($W/t = -X/t = 1$) determined by the data of the $L = 12$ system at half-filling.



Fig. 3. Phase boundaries [(G) Gaussian transition for the charge sector, (S) spin-gap transition] near the $U = 2V$ line for (a) $W/t = -1/5$, (b) $W/t = 1/5$ and (c) $W/t = 1/2$, determined in $L = 8$-14 systems. The strong-coupling results [eqs. (21) and (22)] agrees with the Gaussian line of the charge sector in (a), and the CDW-FM boundaries in (b) and (c), respectively.

[1] J. Hubbard: Proc. R. Soc. London A **276** (1963) 238.
[2] J. Kanamori: Prog. Theor. Phys. **30** (1963) 275.
[3] M. C. Gutzwiller: Phys. Rev. Lett. **20** (1963) 159.
[4] For example, H. Ikeda and Y. Ohashi: Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 3723.
[5] M. E. Simón and A. A. Aligia: Phys. Rev. B **48** (1993) 7471.
[6] J. Voit: Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 1053.
[7] D. K. Campbell, J. Tinka Gammel and E. Y. Loh, Jr.: Phys. Rev. B **38** (1988) 12043.
[8] D. K. Campbell, J. Tinka Gammel and E. Y. Loh, Jr.: Phys. Rev. B **42** (1990) 475.
[9] M. Nakamura: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **68** (1999) 3123 (cond-mat/9903227).
[10] M. Nakamura: cond-mat/9909227.
[11] G. I. Japaridze: Phys. Lett A **201** (1995) 239.
[12] G. I. Japaridze and E. Müller-Hartmann: J. Phys. Condens. Matter **9** (1997) 10509.
[13] G. I. Japaridze and A. P. Kampf: Phys. Rev. B **59** (1999) 12822.
[14] K. Itoh, M. Nakamura and N. Muramoto: preprint.
[15] This argument was first applied to discuss the ground state of spin-orbital systems: K. Itoh: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **68** (1999) 322.
[16] V. J. Emery: Phys. Rev. B **14** (1976) 2989.
[17] M. Fowler: Phys. Rev. B **17** (1978) 2989.
[18] P. G. J. van Dongen: Phys. Rev. B **49** (1994) 7904.
[19] H. Q. Lin and J. E. Hirsch: Phys. Rev. B **33** (1985) 8155.