Landau mapping and Fermi liquid parameters of the 2D t-J model

S. Nishimoto¹, Y. Ohta¹, and R. Eder²

¹Department of Physics, Chiba University, Inage-ku, Chiba 263, Japan

²Department of Solid State Physics, University of Groningen, 9747 AG Groningen, The Netherlands

(May 10, 2018)

An exact-diagonalization technique on small clusters is used to study the momentum distribution function $n(\mathbf{k})$ of the lightly doped t-J model in two-dimension (2D). We find that $n(\mathbf{k})$ can be decomposed into two components with bosonic and fermionic doping dependence. The bosonic component originates from the incoherent motion of holes and has no significance for low-energy physics. For the fermionic component we explicitly perform the one-to-one Landau mapping between all low-lying states of the t-J model and those of a system of spin-1/2 quasiparticles and extract the quasiparticle dispersion and Landau parameters. These results demonstrate that the t-J model is a Fermi liquid with a 'small' Fermi surface and a moderate attractive interaction between the quasiparticles.

74.20.-Z, 75.10.Jm, 75.50.Ee

Despite considerable experimental efforts, the Fermisurface topology of cuprate superconductors continues to pose an intriguing and not really well-understood problem. While it seemed to be settled for some time that the Fermi surface of these materials is simply the one predicted by the local-density approximation (LDA) with an only moderate 'correlation narrowing' of the bandwidth, recent developments in photoelectron spectroscopy, like the discovery of the 'shadow bands' [1] or the temperature dependent pseudogap at $(\pi, 0)$ [2], have challenged this point of view. There is moreover the long-standing problem that Fermi-liquid-like calculations based on the LDA Fermi-surface cannot describe the doping dependence of either Hall constant or dc-resistivity on the hole concentration δ ; both quantities consistently suggest a carrier density $\propto \delta$ [3], rather than $\propto (1 - \delta)$ as it would be for the Fermi surfaces predicted by the LDA. On the other hand, taking the shadow bands as true part of the Fermi surface, which then would have the topology of elliptical hole pockets centered on $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$, would immediately lead to complete accord between Fermi-surface topology and transport properties in the framework of a very simple Fermi-liquid-like picture [4]. While such a picture thus is quite appealing, clear experimental evidence for hole pockets has not been found so far [5]. It is the purpose of the present paper to address the problem of Fermi-surface topology of cuprates theoretically, by studying the 2D t-J model, the simplest strong correlation model which may give a realistic description of the CuO₂ plane. To that end we analyze the electron momentum distribution (EMD) function $n_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}) = \langle c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \rangle$. In both the conventional Fermi liquid, as well as more exotic quantum liquids such as the Luttinger liquid, the EMD shows singularities which mark the location in kspace of the extreme low-energy single-particle-like excitations. While $n(\mathbf{k})$ (for simplicity we omit the spin index unless it is indispensable) can be readily evaluated exactly for small clusters of strong correlation models,

one may not necessarily gain much from such data. The reason is that in the photoemission spectra of strongly correlated electrons the larger part of spectral weight resides in incoherent continua whereas the quasiparticle peak near the Fermi energy $E_{\rm F}$ carries only a small fraction of the weight. Since $n(\mathbf{k})$ is the zeroth moment of the spectral weight, it can be decomposed as a sum of the quasiparticle part, which is responsible for the step of magnitude Z at the Fermi surface, and an incoherent background:

$$n(\mathbf{k}) = Z \cdot \Theta(\omega_{\text{QP}} - E_{\text{F}}) + \int d\omega \, A_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{k}, \omega),$$
 (1)

where $\omega_{\rm QP}$ denotes the quasiparticle dispersion and $A_{\rm inc}(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ the incoherent high-energy part of the spectral function. In general the latter part has a k-dependence of its own which is superimposed over the true Fermi surface discontinuities. In principle, the incoherent background should be a smooth function of k, so that a sufficiently good momentum resolution would allow to distinguish the step-like variations at $E_{\rm F}$; this however is out of the question with the relatively coarse k-meshes available in cluster diagonalization, so that any simple assignment of a Fermi surface is impossible (see Ref. [6] for a counterexample). On the other hand, numerical diagonalization yields the exact EMD for in principle all low-energy states without any statistical error, and in the following we want to take advantage of this feature. We will show that the smoothly varying incoherent component of $n(\mathbf{k})$ is practically identical for all the low-energy states with given hole number. This allows to subtract off this incoherent component from the EMD for the various low-energy states, and thus make visible the 'coherent structures' in $n(\mathbf{k})$, which originate from the true Fermisurface physics. These coherent structures, which give the k-space distribution of the quasiparticles rather than the bare electrons, then can be used to establish the Landau mapping between the exact low-energy eigenstates of the t-J model to those of a suitably chosen quasiparticle Hamiltonian and, by matching the excitation energies of the two systems, we can directly estimate the Landau parameters of the t-J model.

Let us first note that at half-filling the EMD for the t-J model is $n(\mathbf{k})=1/2$, i.e., independent of momentum, and that this is similar to a band insulator where we would have $n(\mathbf{k})=1$. Also, the EMD for a state with one hole at momentum \mathbf{k}_0 and total spin σ_0 would be $n_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k})=1-\delta_{\mathbf{k},-\mathbf{k}_0}\cdot\delta_{\sigma,\bar{\sigma}_0}$ in a band insulator, i.e., a constant with a 'dip' at $-\mathbf{k}_0$ and $\bar{\sigma}_0$. The true single-hole EMD for the t-J model however is quite different as we can see in Fig. 1. To emphasize small differences, this




FIG. 1. EMD for the single-hole ground state of the 20-site cluster (with total momentum $\mathbf{k}_0 = (\pi/5, 3\pi/5)$, $S_z = 1/2$, and J/t=0.5). The figures show (a) $n_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{k})$, (b) $n_{\downarrow}(\mathbf{k})$, and (c) $n_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{k})$, in the entire Brillouin zone. The edge of the square centered on a given \mathbf{k} -point is proportional to $|n_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}) - N_{\sigma}/N|$. Positive (negative) values are indicated by black (crossed) squares, and the 'calibration' for their magnitude is given in the bottom right figure.

figure shows $n_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k})$ with its mean value N_{σ}/N being subtracted (where N_{σ} denotes the number of σ -spin electrons and N is the cluster size). We then find that the dip expected at $-\mathbf{k}_0$ and $\bar{\sigma}_0$ does indeed exist but that it is quite shallow. Moreover, for both spin directions $n_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k})$ acquires an additional, apparently smooth component, and the oscillation of this component around the mean value is almost independent of σ . Another surprising result can be obtained by plotting the maximum amplitude of the EMD, i.e., $\Delta = n(0,0) - n(\pi,\pi)$ as a function of δ (see Fig. 2). We find that up to δ as large as 0.2 the relation $\Delta \propto \delta$ holds with high accuracy, which is on one hand an unexpected result if we adopt a free-electron-like picture where a change of the electron density should affect $n(\mathbf{k})$ predominantly near the noninteracting Fermi surface (which is far from either (0,0) or (π,π)). We could on the other hand understand this result if we were to assume that each hole 'brings with it' the same smooth contribution as for the single hole (see Fig. 1), so that

for each hole number $n(\mathbf{k})$ contains this component times the number of holes. Such an assumption in turn is very natural [7] if we assume that the doped holes are




FIG. 2. Amplitude $\Delta = n(0,0) - n(\pi,\pi)$ as a function of the hole concentration δ evaluated for various cluster sizes N and hole numbers N_h , where for odd N_h the average over spin directions has been taken. J/t = 0.4 is used. The full line is a guide to the eye.

'spin bags' [8] where the bare hole oscillates rapidly inside a region of reduced spin correlation. In this picture the smooth component of $n(\mathbf{k})$ comes from the (incoherent and high-energy) oscillation of the hole 'inside' the spin bag [7]. If this high-energy motion is sufficiently decoupled from much slower drift motion of the entire quasihole (i.e., the hole plus its dressing region), one may expect that this high-energy oscillation contributes identically to $n(\mathbf{k})$ for each quasihole, whence the scaling of $n(\mathbf{k})$ with hole number follows naturally. In 'spin-charge-separation language' one might say that the physical quasiparticle is a firmly bound state of spinon and holon. The rapid oscillation of the bound holon then might correspond to the motion of a boson in a localized orbital, and it is easy to understand that bosons which populate a localized orbital which is smaller than the cluster size have a momentum distribution proportional to the boson (=hole) density. Finally, one may expect that the picture proposed by Lee et al. [9], who modeled the charge degrees of freedom by bosons diffusing in a fluctuating magnetic field, would also give a diffuse component in $n(\mathbf{k})$ proportional to the hole number.

With these ideas in mind we now assume that the smooth component in $n(\mathbf{k})$ indeed accurately scales with hole number throughout the Brillouin zone; in other words, we write the EMD for a single hole:

$$n_{\sigma}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{N_{\sigma}}{N} - Z \, \delta_{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}_0} \cdot \delta_{\sigma, \bar{\sigma}_0} + n_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{k}). \tag{2}$$

Then, in the first step, we 'close the dip' at $-\mathbf{k}_0$ by replacing this $n(\mathbf{k})$ value by that for a symmetry-equivalent \mathbf{k} -point; e.g., in Fig. 1 where $\mathbf{k}_0 = (\pi/5, 3\pi/5)$, we replace $n_{\downarrow}(-\pi/5, -3\pi/5) \rightarrow n_{\downarrow}(-3\pi/5, \pi/5)$. Subtracting now the constant term N_{σ}/N , we obtain the incoherent contribution $n_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{k})$, which, as discussed above, should correspond to the oscillation of the bare hole inside the

spin-bag-like quasiparticle. For simplicity we average $n_{\rm inc}(\mathbf{k})$ over spin directions and point-group operations (see Fig. 1c). Next, we assume that also at higher doping levels each hole gives a two-fold contribution to the EMD: i.e., a 'dip', which marks the total momentum of the quasiparticle, and the same $n_{\rm inc}(\mathbf{k})$ as for the single hole. If this is correct, the EMD for an eigenstate $|\Psi_{\nu}\rangle$ with N_h holes (which we assume to be even) should take the form

$$n(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{N - N_h}{2} - Z \cdot n_{\text{coh}}(\mathbf{k}) + N_h \cdot n_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{k}).$$
 (3)

Thereby the coherent part, $n_{\rm coh}(\mathbf{k})$, corresponds to the EMD of N_h spin-1/2 fermions which form a state with the same total momentum, spin, and point-group symmetry as $|\Psi_{\nu}\rangle$. It can be readily obtained numerically by subtracting $\frac{N-N_h}{2}+N_h\cdot n_{\rm inc}(\mathbf{k})$ from the exact EMD and dividing by -Z. To judge the outcome of this procedure we now have to know how the N_h quasiholes distribute themselves in \mathbf{k} -space for given total momentum and spin. In other words, we need to guess the quasiparticle Hamiltonian. The generic form is

$$H = \sum_{ij\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + \sum_{ij} (V_{ij} n_i n_j + J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j). \tag{4}$$

We have chosen a next-nearest-neighbor hopping dispersion, i.e., only the hopping integrals t_{11} and t_{20} between the second-nearest (i.e., (1,1)) and third-nearest (i.e., (2,0)) neighbors are different from zero. Moreover we retain nearest-neighbor density-density and exchange interactions, V_{10} and J_{10} . In view of the many complicated ways in which two 'dressed holes' in an antiferromagnet can interact with each other [10], this may be a very oversimplified choice; however this will turn out to be sufficient to get reasonable results [11]. The EMD for the different eigenstates of this Hamiltonian are easily computed and can then be compared to the 'coherent components' obtained by the above subtraction procedure for the t-J model.

We should note, before discussing the results, that the procedure is based on a whole sequence of quite strong assumptions: we assume that $n(\mathbf{k})$ really can be meaningfully decomposed into two components, as in Eq. (3), that the smooth component indeed scales accurately with the hole number, and consequently is the same for all low-energy states of the t-J model, and finally that a one-to-one correspondence exists between the states of the t-J model and those of the quasihole Hamiltonian. The outcome of this procedure, which is shown in Figs. 3 and 4, is however all the more surprising. To begin with, it is obvious that the calculated 'coherent components' $n_{\rm coh}(\mathbf{k})$ are indeed coherent, i.e., in most cases they are sharply localized in momentum space and nearly zero almost everywhere in the Brillouin zone. This shows that for most k-points our scaling procedure indeed gives a good guess for $n(\mathbf{k})$. We would like to stress again that we have subtracted one and the same estimated incoherent contribution from the exact EMD for *all* the different low-energy states in the t-J model to obtain the $n_{\rm coh}(\mathbf{k})$. Next, comparing $n_{\rm coh}(\mathbf{k})$ with the EMD for the model system, a remarkable correspondence is obvious. Under 20 different states shown in Figs. 3 and 4 only the singlet state with $\mathbf{k} = (\pi/3, \pi/3)$ in the 18-site cluster deviates significantly. It should be noted that, with the exception of the high-symmetry points (0,0) and (π,π) , Figures 3 and 4 comprise the lowest singlet and triplet




FIG. 3. Comparison between the 'coherent component' $n_{\rm coh}(\mathbf{k})$ for all exact low-energy states of the 20-site cluster t-J model with 2 holes (circles) at J/t=0.5 and the EMD of the quasihole Hamiltonian Eq. (4) with 2 particles (squares). Each graph is labeled by the total momentum and spin of the respective eigenstate and shows the entire Brillouin zone. The diameters of the circles (edges of the squares) centered on each \mathbf{k} -point are proportional to the respective $n(\mathbf{k})$ (see the lower right edge for the 'gauge'). Momenta for the quasihole Hamiltonian are -1 times those for the t-J model.

states for all the allowed momenta in both 18- and 20-site clusters; a similarly good correspondence can also be seen for the 16-site cluster, which we do not show here. The reason for the deviations in the state with $\mathbf{k} = (\pi/3, \pi/3)$ and S = 0 are unclear; this state may correspond to a charge-density-wave or stripe-like hole arrangement, as can be seen for larger values of J [14]. Finally, the correspondence between the t-J model and the quasiparticle system also becomes apparent in a comparison of the excitation energies in Fig. 5. While we may not expect

to obtain perfect agreement with our rather simplified choice of the interaction terms in Eq. (4), the relative errors are mostly $\leq 20\%$ and the 'dispersion' of the excitation energy is reproduced reasonably well. The optimized parameter values in Eq. (4) are t_{11} =0.255, t_{20} =0.15,




FIG. 4. Same as Fig. 3 but for 2 holes in the 18-site cluster.

 $V_{10} = -0.6375$, and $J_{10} = 0.15$.

In summary, we have shown that the EMD for all the lowenergy states of the small-cluster $t\!-\!J$ model in 2D can be accurately decomposed into an incoherent contribution, which has a boson-like dependence on hole density and is independent of the total momentum and spin of the respective state,




FIG. 5. Excitation energies $\omega_{\rm ex}$ for the eigenstates states shown in Figs. 3 and 4: triangles are for the t-J model and squares are for the quasiparticle Hamiltonian Eq. (4). The numbers in the horizontal axis indicate the panels in Figs. 3 and 4, counted from top left, right way, to bottom right.

and a coherent contribution, which corresponds to that of spin-1/2 quasiholes. Using the coherent contributions

we have directly established the Landau mapping between the low-energy states of the t-J model and those of a 'quasiparticle Hamiltonian' describing the system as a Fermi liquid of spin-1/2 particles corresponding to the doped holes. The quasiparticle dispersion is dominated by the next-nearest-neighbor hopping, as would be expected for a dispersion dominated by antiferromagnetic spin correlation [12], but also for a 'spinon' in an RVB state [13]. The interaction between quasiparticles is dominated by a nearest-neighbor attraction. Our results establish, in our opinion conclusively, that the small clusters behave like the finite-size equivalents of a Landau Fermi-liquid, in that there is a one-to-one mapping between the exact eigenstates of the interacting system and those of an interacting system of quasiparticles. The most obvious extrapolation to the infinite systems is of course that the same quasiparticle Hamiltonian also describes the thermodynamic limit. There is good reason to believe that the cluster diagonalization quite accurately describes short-range processes, which are the dominant ones in strongly correlated systems; for the paramagnetic regime with its very short-range spin correlations it seems moreover plausible that longer-range processes are of little importance for either propagation or interaction of the holes, so that we believe that the extrapolation of the quasiparticle Hamiltonian from the clusters to the infinite system is a quite reasonable approximation. Unless the interaction between holes (which may be either the interaction intrinsic to the t-J model or the extra Coulomb repulsion) drives the system into a charge-density-wave state [14] (as may be the case in $La_{1.875}Sr_{0.125}CuO_4$), the system should thus behave like a Fermi liquid with a hole-pocket Fermi surface centered on $\mathbf{k} = (\pi/2, \pi/2)$. This work was supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for

This work was supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture of Japan. Financial supports of S. N. by Sasakawa Scientific Research Grant from the Japan Science Society and of Y. O. by Saneyoshi Foundation are gratefully acknowledged. Computations were carried out in Computer Centers of the University of Groningen, the Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, and the Institute for Molecular Science, Okazaki National Research Organization.

P. Aebi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2757 (1995). S. La Rosa et al., preprint.

^[2] A. G. Loeser et al., Science 273, 325 (1996).

^[3] B. Batlogg et al., Physica C 235, 130 (1994).

^[4] S. A. Trugman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 500 (1990); E. Dagotto et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 728 (1994).

^[5] H. Ding et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2628 (1997).

^[6] R. Eder and Y. Ohta, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2816 (1994).

^[7] R. Eder and K. W. Becker, Phys. Rev. B 44, 6982 (1991).

^[8] J. R. Schrieffer, X. G. Wen, and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 39, 11663 (1989).

- [9] D. K. K. Lee, D. H. Kim, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4801 (1996).
- [10] R. Eder, Phys. Rev. B 45, 319 (1992); M. Yu. Kuchiev and O. P. Sushkov, Physica C 218, 197 (1993); P. Wrobel and R. Eder, Phys. Rev. B 49, 1233 (1994).
- [11] A similar Hamiltonian was suggested by E. Dagotto, A. Nazarenko, and A. Moreo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 310 (1995); see also V. I. Belinicher et al., Phys. Rev. B
- $\bf 51,\ 6076\ (1995);\ Y.\ Ohta,\ M.\ Yamaguchi,\ and\ R.\ Eder,\ preprint.$
- [12] R. Eder and K. W. Becker, Z. Phys. B 78, 219 (1990); Z.
 Liu and E. Manousakis, Phys. Rev. B 45, 2425 (1992).
- [13] B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3786 (1988).
- [14] R. Eder et al., Phys. Rev. B 55, 12313 (1997); S. R. White and D. J. Scalapino, preprint cond-mat/9705128.