

# ARPES, Neutrons, and the High- $T_c$ Mechanism

Wei-Cheng Lee<sup>1,\*</sup> and A.H. MacDonald<sup>1,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA*

(Dated: March 22, 2019)

Extensive ARPES and low-energy inelastic neutron scattering studies of cuprate superconductors can be successfully described using a weak-coupling theory in which quasiparticles on a square lattice interact via scalar and spin-dependent effective interactions. In this article we point out that in  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{Ca}_{1-x}\text{Y}_x\text{Cu}_2\text{O}_8$  (Bi2212) both probes are consistent with dominant near-neighbour Heisenberg interactions. We discuss the implications of this finding for the mechanism of high- $T_c$  superconductivity.

PACS numbers:

*Introduction*— It is evident from many experiments<sup>1,2,3</sup> that high- $T_c$  superconductors can be described at low energies by a weak coupling theory with effective interactions between square-lattice quasiparticles that lead to short-coherence-length  $d$ -wave superconductivity. After many years of study, the source of this effective interaction has still not been established with certainty. The  $d$ -wave property is naturally associated with near-neighbor interactions, but these could be spin-independent ( $V$ ) and possibly lattice mediated or Heisenberg-like ( $J$ ) and possibly antiferromagnetic spin-fluctuation mediated. The resonance feature in inelastic neutron scattering<sup>2</sup>, which appears to be generic in cuprates but absent in conventional superconductors, can be explained<sup>5,6,7,8</sup> if interaction parameters are chosen so that the system is close to an antiferromagnetic instability, possibly one driven by strong on site repulsion  $U$ .

In this paper we attempt to draw conclusions about these interactions from the numerical arcana of cuprate superconductivity by requiring quantitative consistency between weak-coupling descriptions of neutron and ARPES data in  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{Ca}_{1-x}\text{Y}_x\text{Cu}_2\text{O}_8$ . From ARPES antinodal gap values we conclude that  $3J/2 - 2V \sim 250\text{meV}$ , while from the occurrence of the INSR phenomenon we conclude that  $2J + U \sim 350\text{meV}$ . The proximity of these two energy scales strongly suggests that the Heisenberg interaction  $J$  dominates and, as we will discuss, this in turn suggests that superconductivity is mediated by short-range antiferromagnetic interactions which are a remnant of the parent Mott-insulator.

*Effective Hamiltonian*— We consider a low-energy effective Hamiltonian for underdoped Bi2212,

$$H = \sum_{\vec{k}} \epsilon(\vec{k}) - \mu + H_U + H_V + H_J \quad (1)$$

where  $\epsilon(\vec{k})$  is the band energy and the interaction terms are

$$\begin{aligned} H_U &= U \sum_i \hat{n}_{i\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow}, \quad H_V = V \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \sigma \sigma'} \hat{n}_{i\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\sigma'}, \\ H_J &= J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We do not view this phenomenological Hamiltonian as

microscopic, but as what remains after incoherent high-energy electronic fluctuations are integrated out. In view of the Luttinger theorem, the chemical potential  $\mu$  is nevertheless fixed by the doping concentration  $x = 1 - \sum_{\vec{k},\sigma} \langle c_{\vec{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\vec{k}\sigma} \rangle$ . The effective interaction parameters  $U$ ,  $V$ , and  $J$  are assumed to be at least weakly doping dependent.

*Antinodal Gap*— The order parameter for the  $d$ -wave superconducting state is  $\langle c_{i\uparrow} c_{i+\hat{\tau}\downarrow} \rangle = (-)^\tau \Delta$ , where  $(-)^{\tau} = +1$  for  $\hat{\tau} = \pm\hat{x}$  and  $-1$  for  $\hat{\tau} = \pm\hat{y}$ , accounting for the  $d$ -wave character. Applying BCS mean-field theory to Eq. (1) leads to a gap function  $\Delta(\vec{k}) = V_p \Delta (\cos k_x - \cos k_y)$  and to band energies  $\epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon'$  which are modified by interactions. Here  $V_p = 3J/2 - 2V$  has contributions from both of interactions which can induce  $d$ -wave superconductivity. Mean-field ground state properties are completely determined by  $\epsilon'(\vec{k})$  and  $V_p$ . The BCS Hamiltonian yields quasiparticle energies  $\pm E(\vec{k}) = \pm(\epsilon'^2(\vec{k}) + \Delta^2(\vec{k}))^{1/2}$  which are measured in ARPES experiments. For  $\epsilon'(\vec{k})$  we use the experimental Bi2212 normal state quasiparticle band structure<sup>9</sup>. Given this, the pairing potential  $V_p$  of the  $d$ -wave superconductor is fixed by setting the mean-field maximum gap  $\Delta_0 = 2|V_p|\Delta$  equal to the ARPES antinodal gap<sup>10,11</sup>. Table I summarizes  $V_p$  values obtained in this way for several underdoped Bi2212 samples. For concreteness we focus our discussion of numerical consistency between ARPES and INSR on the case of doping  $x = .144$ , reserving a discussion of doping dependence to the end of the paper. For  $x = .144$ ,  $V_p \sim 250\text{meV}$ ; the central question of cuprate superconductivity is whether this pairing is due to spin-independent attraction or due to antiferromagnetic spin-dependent effective interactions.

*Competing Orders*— The conclusions reached in this paper depend critically on using the same weak-coupling Hamiltonian to consistently describe ARPES quasiparticle data and the INSR feature in neutron scattering experiments. As we explain in more detail below, the emergence of the INSR well below<sup>12</sup> the particle-hole continuum signals an incipient instability in cuprates, almost certainly the instability toward the antiferromagnetic state. In a weak-coupling generalized random-phase approximation (GRPA) theory the energy cost of static an-

TABLE I: Singlet-pairing potential  $V_p$  for several underdoped Bi2212 samples. The doping  $x$  is extracted from experimental  $T_c$  data, assuming the parabolic relation proposed by Presland *et al.*<sup>13</sup>.

$x$	$T_c$ (K)	$V_p$ (meV)	$\mu$ (meV)
0.144	92	250	-116.467
0.126	85	256	-111.358
0.11	75	278	-105.584
0.099	65	284	-102.369

tiferromagnetic fluctuations  $K^s$  is the sum of quasiparticle and interaction energy contributions. The quasiparticle contribution  $K_{qp}^s$  is a property of the mean-field state and based on ARPES data is  $\sim 400\text{meV}$ . We find below that  $K^s = K_{qp}^s - 2J - U$  and conclude from qualitative and quantitative aspects of the INSR phenomenon that  $K^s \ll K_{qp}^s$ ; more quantitatively a value close to  $\sim 50\text{meV}$  seems likely. It follows that  $2J + U \sim 350\text{meV}$ . This conclusion is consistent with many experiments which hint at a close competition<sup>14</sup> between spin and superconducting order in cuprates. To explain this assessment more completely, it is necessary to describe the weak-coupling theory of spin and superconducting fluctuations in d-wave superconductors in greater detail.

*Weak Coupling INSR Theory*— Because the interactions in our model Hamiltonian are either on-site or nearest-neighbor, fluctuations at wavevector  $\vec{q} = \vec{Q}$ , where  $\vec{Q}$  is the ordering wavevector of the parent antiferromagnetic Mott insulator, can be expressed in terms of a small number of coupled channels<sup>5,7</sup>. Specializing to the  $S_z = +1$  projection of the triplet fluctuation spectrum, we identify seven operators whose fluctuations are influenced by interactions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{A}_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{p}} S_{\vec{p}}^+ & \hat{A}_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}} \sum_{\vec{p}} s_{\vec{p}} S_{\vec{p}}^+ \\
\hat{A}_3 &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{p}} d_{\vec{p}} (D_{\vec{p}} + \bar{D}_{\vec{p}}) & \hat{A}_4 &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{p}} d_{\vec{p}} (D_{\vec{p}} - \bar{D}_{\vec{p}}) \\
\hat{A}_5 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}} \sum_{\vec{p}} d_{\vec{p}} S_{\vec{p}}^+ & \hat{A}_6 &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{p}} s_{\vec{p}} (D_{\vec{p}} + \bar{D}_{\vec{p}}) \\
\hat{A}_7 &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{p}} s_{\vec{p}} (D_{\vec{p}} - \bar{D}_{\vec{p}})
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where  $S_{\vec{p}}^+ = c_{\vec{p}\uparrow}^\dagger c_{\vec{p}+\vec{Q}\downarrow}$  is a spin-flip operator and  $D_{\vec{p}} = c_{\vec{Q}-\vec{p}\downarrow} c_{\vec{p}\downarrow}$  and  $\bar{D}_{\vec{p}} = c_{\vec{Q}-\vec{p}\uparrow}^\dagger c_{\vec{p}\uparrow}^\dagger$  are pair annihilation and creation operators. In Eq.(3)  $s_{\vec{k}} = \cos k_x + \cos k_y$  and  $d_{\vec{k}} = \cos k_x - \cos k_y$  are extended-s and d-wave form factors. The two-particle Greens functions which capture the fluctuations of these operators are:

$$\hat{\chi}_{ab}(\vec{Q}, \omega) = -i \int dt e^{i\omega t} \theta(t) \langle [\hat{A}_a(t), \hat{A}_b^\dagger(0)] \rangle. \tag{4}$$

We focus<sup>15</sup> on the s-wave spin and d-wave pair fields

( $\hat{A}_{1-4}$ ), which decouple from the d-wave spin and s-wave pair fields ( $\hat{A}_{5-7}$ ) and are responsible for the INSR.

The GRPA Greens functions can be derived by expanding the Hamiltonian to quadratic order around the mean-field state and solving the equation-of-motion for  $\hat{\chi}_{ab}(\vec{Q}, \omega)$ . We find that

$$\hat{\chi}^{-1}(\vec{Q}, \omega) = \hat{\chi}_{qp}^{-1}(\vec{Q}, \omega) - \hat{V} \tag{5}$$

where  $\hat{V} = \text{diag}(-U - 2J, J/2 - 2V, V + J/4, V + J/4)$  is the interaction kernel and

$$\hat{\chi}_{qp,ab}(\vec{Q}, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\vec{k}} \left( \frac{f_a f_b}{\omega - E(\vec{k}) - E(\vec{k}')} - \frac{(-1)^{a+b} f_a f_b}{\omega + E(\vec{k}) + E(\vec{k}')} \right) \tag{6}$$

is the bare mean-field-quasiparticle response function. In Eq.(6)  $\vec{k}' = \vec{Q} - \vec{k}$ , the factor  $(-1)^{a+b}$  specifies the simple relationship between quasiparticle pair-creation and pair-annihilation matrix-elements<sup>7</sup> at  $\vec{q} = \vec{Q}$ , and the form factors  $f_a$  are<sup>7</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned}
f &= (p^-(\vec{k}, \vec{k}'), \frac{s_{\vec{k}}}{\sqrt{2}} p^+(\vec{k}, \vec{k}'), d_{\vec{k}} l^+(\vec{k}, \vec{k}'), d_{\vec{k}} l^-(\vec{k}, \vec{k}')), \\
p^\pm(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') &= \frac{(u_{\vec{k}} v_{\vec{k}'} \pm v_{\vec{k}} u_{\vec{k}'})}{\sqrt{2}}, \\
l^\pm(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') &= \frac{(u_{\vec{k}} u_{\vec{k}'} \pm v_{\vec{k}} v_{\vec{k}'})}{\sqrt{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In the GRPA the  $\omega$  dependence of  $\hat{\chi}^{-1}$  comes from the  $\omega$ -dependence of  $\hat{\chi}_{qp}^{-1}$ , which depends only on the band-structure, on the doping  $x$ , and on  $V_p$ . Typical numerical results for  $\hat{\chi}_{qp}^{-1}(\vec{Q})$  are summarized in Fig. [1].

Since the INSR frequency is well below the particle-hole continuum, it is useful to expand  $\hat{\chi}_{qp,ab}(\vec{Q}, \omega)$  to leading order in  $\omega$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\chi}_{qp,ab}(\vec{Q}, \omega) &\approx R_0(a, b) - R_1(a, b)\omega + O(\omega^2) \\
R_0(a, b) &= \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{-f_a f_b [1 + (-1)^{a+b}]}{E(\vec{k}) + E(\vec{k}')} \\
R_1(a, b) &= \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{f_a f_b [1 - (-1)^{a+b}]}{[E(\vec{k}) + E(\vec{k}')]^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The leading coupling between even and odd  $a$  operators is the Berry-phase coupling which appears at first order in  $\omega$ ; the most important<sup>5,7,8</sup> of these is the coupling between spin ( $a = 1$ ) and d-wave-pair phase ( $a = 4$ ). Even-even and odd-odd fluctuations are coupled in the static limit.  $\chi_{qp}^{-1}$  has a similar low-frequency expansion in which even-even and odd-odd fluctuations have relatively little frequency-dependence until  $\omega$  approaches the particle-hole continuum closely as seen in Fig.[1]. The even-even and odd-odd elements of  $-\chi^{-1} \equiv K$  specify




FIG. 1:  $\hat{\chi}_{qp,ab}^{-1}(\vec{Q}, \omega)$  for  $\omega < \Omega_0$  where  $\Omega_0$  is the gap in the quasiparticle-pair excitation spectrum at  $\vec{q} = \vec{Q}$  established by  $d$ -wave order. For each channel  $a$ , the solid, dotted, dashed, and dash-dotted lines represent respectively  $\hat{\chi}_{qp,a1}^{-1}$ ,  $\hat{\chi}_{qp,a2}^{-1}$ ,  $\hat{\chi}_{qp,a3}^{-1}$ , and  $\hat{\chi}_{qp,a4}^{-1}$ . ( $\Omega_0 \approx 70\text{meV}$  for  $x=0.144$  using the  $V_p$  value listed in Table I.)

the energy cost of the corresponding density-fluctuations while the even-odd elements, approximately linear in frequency, specify how the collective fluctuation energy is quantized. The even-odd elements satisfy  $\chi_{qp,ab}^{-1} \approx \omega C_{ab}$ . *Magnetic Plasmon*— The INSR energy  $E^{res}$  solves

$$\det|\hat{\chi}^{-1}| = \det|\hat{\chi}^{0-1} - \hat{V}| = 0. \quad (9)$$

The results for  $E^{res}$  obtained from Eq.9 are represented by black dots in Fig.[ 2]; the same values of  $E^{res}$  can be obtained by the time-dependent mean-field theory described in our earlier work<sup>8</sup>. To achieve a qualitative understanding of these results we neglect the ( $a = 2$ ) extended- $s$  spin-density fluctuations which are much stiffer than other fluctuation modes, as shown in Fig.[ 1(b)], and the weak frequency dependence of the fluctuation energy contributions. With these approximations<sup>16</sup>

$$E^{res} \approx \sqrt{\frac{K^s K^\phi K^{am} - K^\phi (K_{13}^{qp})^2}{K^{am} C_{14}^2 + K^s C_{34}^2 - 2K_{13}^{qp} C_{14} C_{34}}} \sim \frac{\sqrt{K^s K^\phi}}{C_{14}} \quad (10)$$

where  $K^s = K_{11}^{qp} - U - 2J$ ,  $K^{am} = K_{33}^{qp} + V + J/4$ , and  $K^\phi = K_{44}^{qp} + V + J/4$  are spin,  $\pi$  amplitude mode, and  $\pi$  phase mode stiffnesses respectively. Since  $C_{14} \sim 2$  and the experimental value of  $E^{res} \sim 40\text{meV}$  is small compared to  $K_{11}^{qp} \approx 400\text{meV}$  and  $K_{44}^{qp} \approx 200\text{meV}$ , it is clear that interactions must substantially reduce the values of either  $K^s$  or  $K^\phi$ , or both.

To understand the implications of this property more fully we start by discussing two extreme scenarios. We first assume that  $d$ -wave pairing is due entirely to

the Heisenberg near-neighbor interaction so that  $J = 2V_p/3 \approx 180\text{meV}$ . This choice is already consistent with the INSR experiments, even without invoking an additional on-site interactions, since it reduces  $K_s \rightarrow 40\text{meV}$  and  $E^{res} \rightarrow \sim 50\text{meV}$ , in agreement with experiment. Near-neighbor Heisenberg interactions are therefore able to account simultaneously for pairing and for the INSR character. The dependence of the INSR position on doping obtained from the full GRPA theory after setting  $J = 2V_p/3$  is shown in Fig.[ 2]. The good agreement across the full doping range strongly suggests that  $J$  is the only large coupling constant in the low-energy effective theory, with  $J$  ranging from  $\approx 166\text{meV}$  for  $x=0.144$  to  $\approx 190\text{meV}$  for  $x=0.099$ .

What does this suggest about the character of the low-energy quasiparticles? First of all, the absence of a large repulsion  $U$  suggests that strong correlations between opposite spin-electrons have very substantially reduced the quantum amplitudes for double-occupation of the same lattice site. The picture which appears appropriate is that of a single-particle Greens function which maintains Luttinger-theorem quasiparticle peaks near the Fermi energy, but has also developed incoherent lower and upper Hubbard band features in its spectral function. The interaction  $J$  would then seem to be the remanant of the parent Mott insulator's superexchange interactions. This picture is similar to the  $t - J$  model<sup>4</sup>, except that it does not start from rigid spin-charge separation. Indeed, even the size of the interaction  $J$  is reasonably consistent with antiferromagnetic-state exchange energies in cuprates. The reduction of the experimental band-width by approximately a factor of two compared to LDA estimates of bare bandwidths is also consistent with this scenario for the character of the quasiparticles in the weak-coupling theory. All this is just a picture and not a theory, of course - but it may suggest a direction for future work. It is remarkable that a single  $J$  can account simultaneously for both the the doping dependences of the antinodal gap and  $E^{res}$ .

The INSR position can also be accounted for by fine-tuning both  $U$  and  $V$  at fixed  $V_p$ , although *Occam's razor* considerations suggest that this scenario is much less likely. For example, if we first assume that  $d$ -wave pairing is due entirely to attractive spin-independent effective interactions,  $V = -V_p/2 \approx -130\text{meV}$ . This value of  $V$  results in a small phase stiffness,  $K^\phi \sim 70\text{meV}$  and would require that  $U \sim 300\text{meV}$  in order to reduce  $E^{res}$  into the experimental range. This is a weaker correlation scenario in which the effective value of  $U$  is still fairly large. The INSR *magnetic plasmon* in this case has approximately equal pair-phase and spin character; in the large  $J$  scenario on the other hand the INSR mode has dominant spin character because  $K^s \ll K^\phi$ . More plausible is the choice  $V = -J/4$ , commonly used in  $t - J$  model calculations and motivated by the theory of the superexchange mechanism. Compared to the  $J$ -only model, this choice shifts  $J$  slightly, from  $J = 2V_p/3$  to  $V_p/2$ , resulting in slightly larger  $K^s$  and smaller  $K^\phi$  without shifting the




FIG. 2: INSR energy  $E^{res}$  calculated from Eq. 9 (solid dots) with  $U = V = 0$  and  $J = \frac{2}{3}V_p$ . The long-dashed line plots the empirical rule  $E^{res} = 5.4k_B T_c$ . The triangles, white dots, and the black squares show the doping dependencies of  $\Omega_0$ ,  $2\Delta_0$  calculated from  $V_p$  and the large-J model values for  $K^s$ .

INSR position significantly.

Finally we comment briefly on the role of inter-channel Berry phase coupling, which has often been neglected in theoretical analyses, in determining the INSR position and character. When only the spin-channel is included the equation for the resonance frequency is  $K^s(E^{res}) = 0$ . Because of the weak energy dependence

of  $K_{qp}^s$  below the particle-hole continuum we see that when coupling is ignored,  $U + 2J$  has to be adjusted to more than 90% of  $K_{qp}^s$  to explain the resonance position, placing the system even closer to the antiferromagnetic state instability point. For a given value of the interaction strength, mode coupling substantially lowers the resonance frequency. Mode coupling is therefore important in explaining the experimental relationship between the value of the resonance frequency and the proximity of the antiferromagnetic state.

In summary, we have performed a weak-coupling analysis of ARPES and INSR experiments in Bi2212. We find that the doping dependences of the superconducting gap, and the INSR energy  $E^{res}$  can be consistently explained by a model with near-neighbor Heisenberg interactions with a strength that is consistent with superexchange interactions. This result suggests that strong short-range repulsion and incoherent remnants of the antiferromagnetic insulating parent compound are key to high-temperature superconductivity.

This work is supported by the Welch Foundation and by the National Science Foundation under grant DMR-0547875. The authors would like to thank W.J.L. Buyers, A.V. Chubukov, P.A. Lee, W.S. Lee, M.R. Norman, and O. Tchernyshov for helpful discussions, and to acknowledge the computation resources provided by Texas Advanced Computing Center (TACC) at the University of Texas at Austin.

\* Electronic address: leewc@ph.utexas.edu

† Electronic address: macd@ph.utexas.edu

<sup>1</sup> A. Damascelli, Z. Hussain, and Z.X. Shen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 473 (2003).

<sup>2</sup> T. Moriya and K. Ueda, Adv. Phys. **49**, 555 (2000); M.A. Kastner *et al.* Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 897 (1998).

<sup>3</sup> O. Fischer *et al.* Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 353 (2007).

<sup>4</sup> For a recent review see P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, and X.-G. Wen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 17 (2006) and references therein.

<sup>5</sup> E. Demler, H. Kohno, and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 5719 (1998) and work cited therein.

<sup>6</sup> J. Brinckmann and P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2915 (1999); J. Brinckmann and P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 014502 (2002).

<sup>7</sup> O. Tchernyshov, M.R. Norman, and A.V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 144507 (2001).

<sup>8</sup> Wei-Cheng Lee, Jairo Sinova, A.A. Burkov, Yogesh Joglekar, and A.H. MacDonald, arXiv:cond-mat/0711.1192.

<sup>9</sup> M.R. Norman, M. Randeria, H. Ding, and J.C. Cam-

puzano, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 615 (1995).

<sup>10</sup> Kiyohisa Tanaka *et al.*, Science **314**, 1910 (2006).

<sup>11</sup> W.S. Lee *et al.*, Nature **450**, 81 (2007).

<sup>12</sup> H. He *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1610 (2001).

<sup>13</sup> M.R. Presland, J.L. Tallon, R.G. Buckley, R.S. Liu, and N.E. Flower, Physica C **176** 95 (1991); S.D. Obertelli, J.R. Cooper, and J.L. Tallon, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 14928 (1992).

<sup>14</sup> B. Lake *et al.*, Nature **415**, 299 (2002); J. Chang *et al.* arXiv:cond-mat/0712.2182; Ying Zhang, Eugene Demler, and Subir Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 094501 (2002).

<sup>15</sup> The extended-s spin-flip channel was not included in Refs. 5 and 7 and the equation for the total spin response therefore involved three rather than four coupled channels. As we will explain in the text, omission of this channel is a good approximation.

<sup>16</sup> The simplest approximate form in Eq.10 follows from the observation that  $K^{am} \gg K_{13}^{qp}$  and  $C_{14} > C_{34}$ , as can be seen in Fig.[ 1]. These properties depend only on  $V_p$  and the band structure.

<sup>17</sup> Wei-Cheng Lee and A.H. MacDonald, unpublished.