Spectroscopic signatures of charge (and spin) dynamical fluctuations

Marco Grilli

Dipartimento di Fisica
Università di Roma "La Sapienza"

Collaborators:
Theory: S. Caprara, C. Di Castro, G. Seibold, J. Lorenzana
Raman Expts: R. Hackl, B. Muschler

What is the interaction mediator? The "glue" issue

doping a Mott insulator produces

a non-FL **phase** and pairing result from

- RVB (Anderson,Lee, Nagaosa, Wen)
- Stripes (Emery,Kivelson,Zaanen,..)

⇒Instantaneous interactions are more relevant (U,J,....)



Quantum **instability** (QCP) of the metallic phase:

- Stripes - Charge ordering (Rome), $q_c \approx (0,\pm\pi/2), (\pm\pi/2,0)$
- Circulating currents (Varma), $q_c=0$
- Pomeranchuk instability (Metzner), $q_c=0$
- retarded spin waves (Chubukov,Pines,....)

due to proximity to AF-QCP, $q_c \approx (\pi,\pi)$

⇒Crucial role of retarded critical interactions



If retarded (i.e. low-energy) modes are there the issue is:
How to identify them? What is their typical wavevector related to the ordered phase?

The dynamics of the “glue” is a crucial issue

Understanding the dynamics of the effective interactions would shed light on

- Pairing mechanism
- Competing phase (if any) (e.g., $q_c \sim (\pi,\pi)$ -> spin, $q_c \sim (\pi/2,0)$ -> ch. Order, $q_c \sim 0$ -> circulating currents or Pomeranchuk, …)
- why the order is so elusive

……

The CO-QCP



Hidden 2nd order transition:
CO competing with pairing, disorder….



See C. Di Castro's talk



smoothly evolving
into anharmonic stripes (spin & charge)

Rome proposal C. Castellani,et al., PRL (1995) QCP at x=0.19

Major consequence: abundant critical charge (and spin) flucts

strongly temperature and momentum-dependent interaction

Dynamic character of CO **may** make it elusive

but not so much by now, cf. Z-X Shen talk.....

An old example from ARPES

e.g. Nd-LSCO at x=0.15:



X.J. Zhou et al. PRL 2001



Large FS from low energy spectral weight only

Crossed FS (typical stripe signature) integrating SW up to 300 meV

STM





Non-dispersive Textured electronic Structure at higher energy > Δ_0

Alldredge et al. Nat.Phys. 2008

Uniform Bogoliubov structure of nodal QP's at low bias < Δ_0

Kohsaka et al., Nat.2008

1D TOY MODEL WITH $q_c=\pi$

M.G. et al, PRB 09



Mean field: $\chi''(q,\omega) \propto \delta(q-q_c)\delta(\omega)$

Cf. M. Imada yesterday



Dynamic flucts:

$$\chi''(q,\omega) \propto \delta(q-q_c)\delta(\omega-\omega_0)$$





$$\chi''(q,\omega) \propto \bigwedge_q \bigwedge_\omega$$



$+\Delta_{pp}$



CO with dynamical order parameter Seibold et al. PRL 2009

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{r}}^{CDW}(\omega) = \Delta_{\mathbf{r}}(\omega) \equiv \Delta_{\mathbf{r}}^{0} + v_{\mathbf{r}}^{2} f(\omega).$$

Even when this is zero. CO can be static and lona-range

We assume MFL dynamics $f(\omega) = 2\omega \ln \frac{\Gamma + i\omega}{\Omega} + i\pi\Gamma,$

vanishing at ω=0



Static CO has shadow features

Dyn. CO has no shadow features



Opposite contrast reversal
For static and dyn, CO:
Dyn. CO agrees with expts.

Back to the QCP scenario

The nearly critical modes mediate a retarded interaction

$$D(\vec{q},\omega) = -\frac{1}{m + \nu|\vec{q}-\vec{q}_c|^2 - i\omega - \frac{\omega^2}{\overline{\Omega}}}$$

$\omega < \overline{\Omega}$ The CM is more damped and diffusive

$\omega > \overline{\Omega}$ The CM is less damped and is propagating

$m \sim \xi^{-2}$ depends on proximity to the "missed instability"





Can we identify the collective modes with Raman?



LSCO: we focus on large dopings $x \geq 0.15$ to avoid PG effects

$$q_c \approx \left(\pm\frac{\pi}{2},0\right),\left(0,\pm\frac{\pi}{2}\right)$$

$$q_s \approx \left(\pm\pi,\pm\pi\right)$$

Nearly critical modes strongly couple hot regions of the FS

In Raman spectroscopy one can select the probed k-space
With specific form factors in the vertices:

B_{1g} $\gamma_k = \cos(k_x) - \cos(k_y)$

B_{2g} $\gamma_k = \sin(k_x)\sin(k_y)$





Spin and CO coll. modes: similar hot spots,but different q_c's
Is it possible to distinguish their effects?

What can we learn from the whole spectra?

B1g B2g



More rounded: two close humps

Step+hump structure

Different shapes in the two channels below ~4000 cm^{-1}:
Just fermiology or different scattering mechanisms?

We aim to reproduce the (gross) features of the spectra with scattering due to charge and spin CM's

B_{1g} or B_{2g} Raman vertices

The CM's characterize the spectra via:

-a spectral "glue" function $\alpha^2 F(\omega)$ depending on m(T), $\overline{\Omega}$

-T dependence from Bose function

Symmetry arguments for the leading contribution to χ″

B_{1g}: $\gamma_k = \cos(k_x) - \cos(k_y)$





The two diagrams cancel at leading order
(like transport with scattering at q~0)





The two diagrams add at leading order
(like transport with scattering at q~2k_F)

Similar arguments hold in the B_{2g} channel

At leading order (i.e. critical mode, low energy, linearized bands, vertices evaluated at E_F…)

	SPIN	CHARGE
B_{1g}	ALLOWED	FORBIDDEN
B_{2g}	FORBIDDEN	ALLOWED

This suggests that different B_{1g} and B_{2g} spectra are due to different modes

Of course at large energies (say above 1000-2000 cm^{-1}) and far from criticality the "forbidden" modes come in and the spectra become equal in the two channels

How different modes generate different spectra?



Large $\overline{\Omega} \Rightarrow$ more diffusive mode

Small $\overline{\Omega} \Rightarrow$ less diffusive mode

m rules the amount of scattering at low energy....

Changing the mode (more or less diffusive, $\overline{\Omega}$,mass m,...) one changes the shape of spectra

Notice: more propagating modes may even have a Marginal-FL (flattish) form with initial slope ~1/m~T

Fitting the LSCO spectra

T~100 K



Temperature dependence

$La_{1.80}Sr_{0.20}CuO_4$



How the CM's couple to the quasiparticles?







- The spin glue decreases with doping
- The charge glue increases with doping
- All charge glue functs. are centered at phononic energies (~500 cm^{-1}), but have larger weights at low T because of the CO instability which softens the phonon around q_c

How do we compare with optics?



In optics no "selection rules": both modes contribute



Van Heumen et al., arXiv:0904.2248

Bi-2212 different from LSCO?

•Two modes are present (agrees with van Heumen et al. PRB'09, cf Van der Marel talk)
•The phonon-CO mode has some T dependence (doesn't agrees with van Heumen et al., cf Van der Marel talk)
•The phonon-CO mode does not disappear in overdoped LSCO (different with respect to BSCCO? What happens at even Larger dopings? (cf Van der Marel talk)



Important qualitative feature:

The T dependence of $1/\tau$ at high ω increases with x

T-independent mode and couplings wouldn't produce it (but cf Millis yesterday

Conclusions 1/2

- Dynamical character of CO can account for the lack of shadow FS, uniformity of low-energy QP states, …

- Violation of p-h symmetry in the spectra at moderate energy can be a signature of CO. What happens at low energy? Where are the shadow bands?
  CO may appear or not….Help needed from expts.

Conclusions 2/2

From Raman experiments

- Depending on the more (large $\overline{\Omega}$) or less (small $\overline{\Omega}$) diffusive character of the mode, the glue functs. can be quite different (even MFL-like, although generated from strongly momentum-dependent mode!)

- Raman identifies two modes, spin and charge with different q_c's, different diffusivity,not so different critical behavior [i.e. m(T)]. QC behavior of charge can be understood around QCP, but what about spin? Just mimicks more complex spectra or real nearly critical behavior extends to high doping?

Wakimoto, et al, PRL 2007



- The spin glue decreses with doping (but still strong at x=0.15), the charge glue increses with doping. Who is the main character of this comedy? Open question... (cf. T. Dahm, this morning)



x=0.26
χ''
ω [cm-1]
0
1000
2000
3000
4000
0
2
4
6
8

High doping

SPin

Charg









Wakimoto, et al, PRL 2(



Wakimoto, et al, PRL 2004

Check with neutrons:

Qualitative agreement with Neutron structure factors…

From x=0.25 to x=0.27 spin χ''(ω) is reduced by factor 2



$$n_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \int d\omega A(\mathbf{k},\omega) f(\omega),$$

2D toy model with qc=$(\pi,0)$



Ordered and disordered eggbox (checkerboard)





Seibold et al., EPJ B 2000

Fig. 7. Bandstructure in the full Brillouin zone corresponding to the Fermi surface in Figure 1. Intensities: $I > 50\%$: full points, $10\% < I < 50\%$: circles, $1\% < I < 10\%$: small dots. (a) $\Gamma \leq k \leq X$, (b) $M \leq k \leq X$.

G. Seibold, M.G., and J. Lorenzana, PRL 2009



FIG. 2 (color online). LDOS for the model with (a) static CDW scattering ($\Delta_2^0 - \Delta_1^0 = 0.054$ eV) and (b) frequency dependent CDW scattering. The upper insets depict the modulations of $\Delta_{\mathbf{r}}^0$ (a) and $v_{\mathbf{r}}^2$ (b) in the unit cell. Further parameters: chemical potential $\mu = -0.23$ eV, (doping $x \approx 0.07$), $\Gamma =$ 1 meV, and $\Omega = 1$ eV.



FIG. 3 (color online). Fourier-transformed LDOS at the CDW scattering vector, $\mathbf{Q} = \frac{2\pi}{4}$. (a) Static CDW scattering with $\Delta_2^0 - \Delta_1^0 = 0.054$ eV, (b) frequency dependent CDW scattering. The phase has been chosen such that $\mathrm{Im} N_{\mathbf{Q}}(\omega) = 0$. Lower insets: LDOS at $\omega = +5$ meV (squares) and $\omega = -5$ meV (circles). Further parameters as in Fig. 2.

Understanding the effective interaction can shed light on the state: The "GLUE" issue

In particular, if retarded (i.e. low-energy) modes are present (point of view n.2), the issues are:
How to identify them?
How do they look like?
Can one determine the broken-symmetry phase?

e.g.
- Circulating currents $\Rightarrow q_c=0$ instability (C. M. Varma, since '94 on)
- AF spin waves $\Rightarrow q_c \approx (\pi,\pi)$ (A. Chubukov, D. Pines, …)
- Pomeranchuk instability $\Rightarrow q_c=0$ instability (W. Metzner)
- Charge Ordering $q_c \approx (0,\pm\pi/2), (\pm\pi/2,0)$ (Rome, since 94+ε)
- …….

Hot and cold spots

Strongly k-dependent interaction mediated by Charge (but also spin) modes: clear distinction between hot and cold regions on the Fermi surface



Theory: Castellani et al PRL'95; Perali et al, PRB '96;....

Experiments:

…nodal and antinodal QPs behave very differently……low energy scattering which operates primarily on antinodal QP… this may be associated with QP scattering across the nearly parallel segments of the FS near the antinodes ARPES ex. in LASCO .

Zhou et al. PRL 04
Vershinin et al Scince '04
Shen et al Science 05
…

Spin and CO coll. modes: similar hot spots,but different q's
Is it possible to distinguish their effects?

Cuprates are anomalous metals ($\rho \sim T$, pseudogap,…)



Where all these anomalies come from?

Point of view n. 1:



•Non-FL anomalous **phase** "per se":

•RVB (P.W. Anderson, P. Lee, Nagaosa,Wen),

• 1d stripes (Emery, Kivelson,…)

Mottness is crucial

⇒Instantaneous interactions (U,J,…)

Point of view n. 2:



Proximity to **instability**

QCP people:

C.M. Varma, Rome, Chubukov, Pines,…

anomalies come from lots of quantum **fluctuations**

⇒Retarded critical interactions