

Calculation of generalized spin stiffness constant of strongly correlated doped quantum antiferromagnet on two-dimensional lattice and its application to effective exchange constant for semi-itinerant systems

Suraka Bhattacharjee and Ranjan Chaudhury
Department of Condensed Matter Physics and Material Sciences
S.N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences,
Saltlake, Sector-III, Block-JD, Kolkata-700098, India
Email: surakabhattacha@bose.res.in
ranjan@bose.res.in

Abstract

The generalized spin stiffness constant for a doped quantum antiferromagnet has been investigated both analytically and numerically as a function of doping concentration at zero temperature, based on the strongly correlated t-J model on two-dimensional square lattice. The nature of the theoretical dependence shows a striking similarity with that of the effective exchange constant on doping obtained from the combination of other theoretical and experimental techniques in the very low doping region. This correspondence once again establishes that spin stiffness can very well play the role of an effective exchange constant even in the strongly correlated semi-itinerant systems. Our theoretical plot of the stiffness constant against doping concentration in the whole doping region exhibits the various characteristic features like a possible crossover in the higher doping regions and persistence of short range ordering even for very high doping, with the vanishing of spin stiffness occurring only at 100% doping. Our results receive very good support from various other theoretical approaches and also brings out a few limitations of some of them. Our detailed analysis highlights the crucial importance of the study of spin stiffness for the proper understanding of magnetic correlations in a semi-itinerant magnetic system described by the strongly correlated t-J model. Moreover, our basic formalism can also be utilized for determination of the effective exchange constant and magnetic correlations for itinerant magnetic systems in general, in a novel way.

Keywords:- generalized spin stiffness, t-J model, effective exchange coupling, no double occupancy, strong correlation, itinerant system.

I. Introduction

The discovery of high temperature superconductivity in the doped layered quantum antiferromagnetic insulators, is a revolutionary phenomenon in the field of both theoretical and experimental condensed matter physics in recent times [1,2]. The relevant antiferromagnetic parental compounds like La_2CuO_4 or $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_6$ can be well understood within the nearest neighbour quantum Heisenberg Hamiltonian, whereas the description of the doped compounds (like $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ or $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7+y}$) require quite different type of modeling. Two dimensional t-J model derived from strongly correlated Hubbard model is one such model to explain the magnetic correlations of these doped

antiferromagnets. The long range Neel ordering is lost in cuprates at temperature above the corresponding Neel temperatures and these materials can be treated as purely two dimensional systems in this regime. These pure two dimensional systems can be very well treated with t-J model. The inclusion of next-nearest-neighbour interaction has many significances including the pair formation in d-wave superconducting state [3]. Moreover, recently renormalized mean field (RMF) t-J model has been used to study the possibility of d-wave pairing in high temperature superconductors, which is able to produce results comparable to the variational Monte Carlo calculational results [4]. In addition to it, two dimensional t-J model on square lattice based on infinite projected-entangled pair states, has been used to study the occurrences of stripes and the competition of uniform d-wave states versus striped states [5,6].

Another issue that has been much talked about till today is the frustration in the quantum antiferromagnets where the most studied example is the J_1 - J_2 Heisenberg model for spin $\frac{1}{2}$ systems (where J_1 and J_2 are the nearest and next-nearest- neighbour exchange constants respectively). Sometimes even the third nearest-neighbour exchange interaction J_3 is taken into account and phase diagram of J_1 - J_2 - J_3 Heisenberg model, bearing the signature of possible quantum phase transitions, has been studied [7,8]. The spin fluctuations in doped quantum antiferromagnets is studied based on the extended t-J model taking into account the next-nearest-neighbour hopping term (t') [9]. Moreover, the t- J_1 - J_2 model has been tried out for investigating the magnetic behaviour and superconducting pair formation in various novel superconductors like iron pnictides having co-existing localized and itinerant electrons [10].

In this paper, we investigate the magnetic properties of two dimensional hole doped strongly correlated quantum antiferromagnets using the nearest-neighbour t-J model. This model involves mobile holes, which has a vast applicability in the layered cuprate systems [2,11]. Previously there were attempts to calculate the spin response of the doped phase, but the varied results obtained using t-J model were not sufficiently conclusive in predicting the magnetic phases for a strongly correlated quantum antiferromagnet [12-16]. Moreover, this model is oversimplified and can be physically applied only to very lightly doped region. The highly hole doped region in reality shows substantial weakening of the correlation between the charge carriers and may not be governed by the t-J model in real systems [17].

We calculate here the generalized spin stiffness constant of strongly correlated t-J model based on an idea originally proposed by Kohn and Thouless, both analytically with more rigour and numerically as well and study it in details as a function of doping concentration in the entire doping region [18]. Our results predict the weakening of spin stiffness constant with increase in doping concentration, which is in general agreement with the results from a previous analytical calculation [19]. This earlier treatment had also predicted the quantum melting of the long range antiferromagnetic ordering at a critical doping concentration, consistent with the experimental results from several cuprates [12,19,20]. The temperature dependence of the spin-spin correlation length in two dimensions has been derived analytically by Chakravarty, Halperin and Nelson (CHN) for pure two-dimensional nearest neighbor Quantum Heisenberg Antiferromagnet corresponding to undoped parent compound (La_2CuO_4). The calculations have been done using Renormalization Group technique, starting from a field theoretic action [21]. The calculation predicts the decrease of correlation length as temperature increases. This result has been modified later to take into account the large excess of charge carriers in real materials like laboratory-grown La_2CuO_4 [22]. Although the formulation of CHN was originally developed for pure (undoped) cuprates, the results are expected to be extendable even to very lightly doped cuprates [23]. Again, the experimental results of Thurston et al. show the fall in 2-dimensional correlation length (ξ_{2D}) with

increase in hole doping [2]. On the other hand, our numerical results for spin stiffness constant qualitatively and even quantitatively describe the nature of its decrease with increase in hole doping starting from half-filled band limit and interestingly is quite similar to the behaviour of the result obtained from the above experimental work. This carries a strong hint that spin stiffness constant may very well play the role of an effective exchange constant in doped antiferromagnets. Moreover, our analytical calculations and nature of our calculated spin stiffness constant goes in qualitative agreement with the experimental results for variation of 2D antiferromagnetic correlation length with doping combined with the Quantum Monte Carlo results in conjunction with CHN formalism, which predicts the reduction of antiferromagnetic ordering with the increase in hole doping [2,23]. A slightly different type of concept and estimate for effective exchange constant was introduced by Himeda and Ogata and we have presented a detailed comparison between their results and ours as well [12]. The significant point that comes out from the comparison is that the existence of a point of inflexion indicating an occurrence of possible quantum phase transition present in our plot, absent in that of Himeda and Ogata. Moreover, the effect of double occupancy was only included in the Gutzwiller factors in the later work, which is unable to capture the whole physics in the very low doping region and this has been described in details later.

It is also quite important to keep in mind that the doped phase of quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnet described by the t-J model, behaves essentially as an itinerant magnetic system with strong on-site correlations because of the presence of mobile holes with spin. Therefore our effective exchange constant is to be looked upon as that appropriate to an itinerant magnet. Here it can be mentioned that, the previous researches for determining the magnetic interactions done using the density-functional theory were for completely localized spins [24-26]. There were a few attempts to study the properties of conventional itinerant magnetic systems using coherent-potential, where local exchange-correlation approximation was used in the band calculations [27]. Later Antropov calculated the effective exchange coupling of the itinerant systems using a combination of ‘inverse susceptibility’ approach and multiple-scattering theory [28]. However, the above techniques and calculations were rather insufficient to determine the effective exchange coupling and magnetic interactions in the itinerant systems in the presence of strong Coulomb correlations. Henceforth, our rigorous analytical and numerical calculations presented here pave a simple and straight forward way for determination of effective exchange coupling and description of the magnetic correlations of semi-itinerant systems both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Thus, one of the major aims of this paper is to determine and establish a more quantitative relation between generalized spin stiffness constant and effective exchange constant corresponding to a doped strongly correlated quantum antiferromagnet in 2-dimension, described by the nearest-neighbour t-J model.

It may be recalled that the equivalence of stiffness constant with effective coupling is well known in many other problems such as Berezinsky-Kosterlitz-Thouless (BKT) transition [30, 31].

II. Mathematical Formulation and Calculation

The Hamiltonian of the strongly correlated nearest neighbour t-J model is given by [15]

$$H_{t-J} = H_t + H_J \quad (1)$$

where

$$H_t = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma} t_{ij} X_i^{\sigma 0} X_j^{0 \sigma} \quad (2)$$

and

$$H_J = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \{J_{ij} (S_i \cdot S_j - \frac{1}{4} n_i n_j)\} \quad (\text{with } J_{ij} > 0) \quad (3)$$

where t_{ij} is the nearest-neighbour hopping amplitude connecting j^{th} and i^{th} site and J_{ij} is the exchange constant between the carriers on nearest neighbours; X 's are the Hubbard operators, satisfying the appropriate commutation relations and the usual Hubbard algebra [19]. For nearest neighbour hopping and exchange interaction we take $t_{ij} = t$ and $J_{ij} = J$. It may be recalled that the quantities 't' and 'J' are considered independent.

The generalized spin stiffness constant \bar{D}_{spin} is defined as [19],

$$\bar{D}_{spin} = \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta^2 E}{\delta \phi^2} \quad (4)$$

where $E(\phi)$ is the total ground state energy in the presence of staggered Peierl's phase (resembling a magnetic flux) ϕ_σ , arising from an applied vector potential $A(r)$, such that

$$\phi_\downarrow = -\phi_\uparrow = \phi \quad (5)$$

The hopping amplitude t_{ij} for a fermion with spin σ is modified to $t_{ij} e^{i\phi_\sigma}$, only if the vector potential has a component along the direction of hopping. We have included the factor of $(\frac{e}{\hbar c})$ in the phase ϕ in the final expression of \bar{D}_{spin} with proper scaling.

The total spin stiffness constant \bar{D}_{spin} , abbreviated as ' \bar{D}_s ', may be written as,

$$\bar{D}_s = \bar{D}_s^t + \bar{D}_s^J \quad (6)$$

where \bar{D}_s^t and \bar{D}_s^J are the contributions from the 't' term and the 'J' term respectively. They are defined as

$$\bar{D}_s^t = \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta^2 T}{\delta \phi^2} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\bar{D}_s^J = \lim_{\phi \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta^2 E_J^{sf}}{\delta \phi^2} \quad (8)$$

where T is the kinetic energy contribution and E_J^{sf} is the spin flip part of the exchange energy, which again are the ground state expectation values of the corresponding parts of the Hamiltonian. It may be pointed out that the direct part of the exchange energy term does not contribute to \bar{D}_s^J [19].

Furthermore, it may be noted that \tilde{D}_s^t and \tilde{D}_s^l both have the dimension of energy since \emptyset is a dimensionless quantity.

In calculating E, avoiding the rather complicated Hubbard algebra, we use the Gutzwiller state with ‘no double occupancy condition’ (NDOC) imposed upon it [32].

The very general form of the Gutzwiller state is given by [32]:

$$|\Psi_G\rangle = \prod_l (1 - \alpha \hat{n}_{l\uparrow} \hat{n}_{l\downarrow}) |FS\rangle \quad (9)$$

where $|FS\rangle$ is the Fermi sea ground state and α is the variational parameter determined by minimizing the expression for E. In the case of NDOC, $\alpha=1$.

Now writing the Fermi sea ground state in terms of fermion creation operators, we get

$$|\Psi_G\rangle_{\text{NDOC}} = \prod_l (1 - \hat{n}_{l\uparrow} \hat{n}_{l\downarrow}) \prod_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \sum_{i,j} C_{i\sigma}^+ C_{j-\sigma}^+ e^{(r_i - r_j) \cdot \mathbf{k}} |vac\rangle \quad (10)$$

where $|vac\rangle$ is the vacuum state (having fermionic occupation number equal to zero at all sites) and we have omitted the normalization constant for the time being which will be included later in the calculation for the energy eigen values. The symbols i, j and l all denote the lattice sites and \mathbf{k} represents the wave vector for the fermion (existing hole), bounded by k_F (Fermi wave vector) from above [19].

The equation (3) can now be rewritten as:

$$H_J = \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} H'_J \quad (11)$$

$$\text{where} \quad H'_J = S_i \cdot S_j - \left(\frac{1}{4}\right) n_i n_j \quad (12)$$

$$\text{Again,} \quad E_J = \left(\frac{4t_{\text{eff}}^2 \cos(2\emptyset)}{V_{\text{eff}}} \right) \frac{\langle \Psi_G | H'_J | \Psi_G \rangle_{\text{NDOC}}}{\langle \Psi_G | \Psi_G \rangle_{\text{NDOC}}} \quad (13)$$

where $\langle \Psi_G | \Psi_G \rangle_{\text{NDOC}}$ is the normalization for the Gutzwiller state, t_{eff} is the effective nearest neighbour hopping amplitude in presence of doped holes and V_{eff} is the effective Coulomb barrier potential in the doped phase within the effective one band scenario involved in a modeling for J_{ij} [16,19].

Carrying out detailed and more rigorous calculation after normalizing the Gutzwiller state and considering only the contribution from the nearest neighbour interaction we get the following result for the exchange energy contribution:

$$\frac{\langle \Psi_G | H'_J | \Psi_G \rangle_{\text{NDOC}}}{\langle \Psi_G | \Psi_G \rangle_{\text{NDOC}}} = \prod_k^{k_F} 2(1 - \delta)^2 \quad (14)$$

where δ is the doping (vacancy) concentration. Making use of equation (8) and by taking derivative of equation (13) twice we get the exchange part of the spin stiffness constant as,

$$\tilde{D}_s^J = -4J \prod_k^{k_F} 2(1 - \delta)^2 \quad (15)$$

Similarly the kinetic energy contribution of the Fermionic system at zero temperature can be found from the following equation,

$$T = \frac{\text{NDOC} \langle \Psi_G | H_t | \Psi_G \rangle \text{NDOC}}{\text{NDOC} \langle \Psi_G | \Psi_G \rangle \text{NDOC}} \quad (16)$$

The above quantity is evaluated in the presence of staggered phase ϑ_σ (staggered phase corresponding to up or down spins) making use of the orthogonality of the independent states and the result comes out to be:

$$T(\vartheta \neq 0) = (t) [\prod_{k,\sigma}^{k_F} \sum_{\sigma} 4 \cos(ka) (1 - \delta)^2 \cos(\vartheta_\sigma) - N_l \prod_{k,\sigma}^{k_F} \sum_{\sigma} 4 \cos(ka) \cos(\vartheta_\sigma) / N^2] \quad (17)$$

Here we use equation (5) for ϑ_σ corresponding to up and down spin respectively; ‘a’ is the lattice spacing, ‘ N_l ’ is the expectation value of the number operator corresponding to the total number of lattice sites singly occupied by spins and N is the total number of sites.

$$\text{Thus,} \quad N_l = N(1-\delta) \quad (18)$$

For 2D lattice, the vector potential $A(\mathbf{r})$ is assumed to be applied along the x direction and making use of equations (7) and (17), we get the expression for the kinetic part of the spin stiffness constant as:

$$\bar{D}_s^t = (-t) [\prod_{k,\sigma}^{k_F} 4 \cos(k_x a) (1 - \delta)^2 - N_l \prod_{k,\sigma}^{k_F} 4 \cos(k_x a) / N^2] \quad (19)$$

The vanishing of the total spin stiffness constant \bar{D}_s^t implies the loss of rigidity (rigidity arising from the antiferromagnetic coupling) of the spins of the carriers (holes) in the doped phase.

Now the vanishing of \bar{D}_s^t can arise from the vanishing of $\cos(k_x a)$ for at least one k_x value in whole set ($0 \leq k_x \leq k_F$) of k_x values.

$$\text{This condition leads to} \quad n \geq 0.39 \quad (20)$$

where n represents the original hole concentration. The above inequality is the same as was obtained earlier [19]. So for doping concentration less than 0.61, \bar{D}_s^t goes to zero. Therefore the region below 61% doping is entirely governed by spin stiffness from the exchange part (\bar{D}_s^J). Again \bar{D}_s^J vanishes only when $\delta \rightarrow 1$ ie, for 100% doping and for $\delta \rightarrow 1$, K_F also tends to zero and making \bar{D}_s^t vanish as well. Hence the total spin stiffness constant falls with increasing doping concentration and exactly goes to zero for $\delta=1$. Our detailed numerical results elaborated later show that the stiffness constant practically vanishes at a much lower value of doping concentration, but a negligibly small value prevails and it theoretically tends to zero as $\delta \rightarrow 1$. This result is in quantitative agreement with that of Himeda and Ogata that antiferromagnetic correlation prevails upto 100% doping [12].

Let us now come back to the conjecture involving the relation between the spin stiffness constant and the effective antiferromagnetic exchange coupling between mobile charge carriers in the doped phase, as stated earlier. In order to test this conjecture, total spin stiffness constant is first of all scaled down by the effective number of pair of mobile charge carriers (holes), $N_l C_2$, where N_l has been defined earlier. This makes the comparison between the spin stiffness constant and the antiferromagnetic exchange constant more meaningful and transparent in the background of a semi itinerant magnetic system produced by

doping. Moreover, \vec{D}_s shows a very drastic fall with very small increase of δ and in contrast to it, the scaled stiffness constant shows a comparatively moderate fall with the increase of δ , which is much more alike to the plot obtained from the combined results of experiments, CHN and Monte Carlo calculations. We have verified this result for all the lattice sizes including the 200x200 lattice, the largest lattice size we could handle here.

Thus the total spin stiffness constant corresponding to a single pair of mobile holes to be denoted as ‘ D_s ’ is given as:

$$D_s = (\vec{D}_s^J + \vec{D}_s^t) / N_l C_2 \quad (21)$$

This new quantity D_s is then calculated from our earlier obtained results for \vec{D}_s with parameters appropriate to $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ and is plotted against doping concentration. Our theoretical graph is then compared with the experimental results in combination with those from other theoretical and computational techniques.

III. Results

Neutron scattering studies have been carried out on $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ samples at different doping concentrations [2]. The results reveal the presence of finite intraplane magnetic correlation in 2-dimension above it's Neel temperature ($T_N=190\text{K}$) [2]. Above T_N , the long range interplane correlation is lost and 2-dimensional correlation length in pure La_2CuO_4 is $\sim 200 \text{ \AA}$ at 300 K.

The 2D antiferromagnetic correlation length, ξ_{2D} , has been measured in double-axis (energy integrating) experiments on a number of doped samples. It was found that ξ_{2D} is approximately independent of temperature, but it strongly depends on doping concentration [2] (see Fig.(1)).




Fig.(1). Magnetic correlation length vs. doping concentration δ .

This plot gives the relation between 2-dimensional correlation length and doping concentration; however to extract the dependence of effective exchange constant on doping

concentration from this, we make use of both CHN model and the Monte Carlo results for 2-dimensional Quantum Heisenberg Antiferromagnetic Model (2D QHAFM).

CHN calculated the temperature dependence of the magnetic correlation length of the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg antiferromagnet corresponding to pure La_2CuO_4 using renormalization group analysis of quantum non-linear σ model (QNL σ M). They obtained for $T \rightarrow 0$ [21]:

$$\xi_{2D} = C_\xi \exp \left[\frac{2\pi\rho_s}{K_B T} \right] \quad (22)$$

where ξ_{2D} is the 2-dimensional antiferromagnetic correlation length and $2\pi\rho_s$ is the well known spin wave stiffness constant which is proportional to the bare nearest neighbour antiferromagnetic exchange constant 'J'.

Although the correlation length obtained in CHN model is for pure La_2CuO_4 , the above relation (equation (22)) is expected to hold good approximately for highly under-doped samples, as stated earlier. It must be kept in mind that the bare exchange constant 'J' and the parameter ' C_ξ ' present in the above expression correspond to the undoped phase originally. We now make use of an attempt to extend this relation to the underdoped phase upto $\delta=0.05$, by assuming doping dependence of both 'J' and ' C_ξ ' keeping the validity of the formalism intact.

Again Quantum Monte Carlo studies have been done on doped 2-dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnet by Manousakis and others at $T \rightarrow 0$ and their numerical results are fitted with a function of exponential form, as in equation (22), and the best fit is given by [23]:

$$\xi_{2D} = \left(\frac{0.276a}{\sqrt{(1-\delta)}} \right) \exp [1.25 J/T] \quad (23)$$

where $a=3.77\text{\AA}$ is the lattice constant for La_2CuO_4 and 0.276a is the prefactor for pure 2-dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnet.

Using equation (23) and the best fit of the experimental result from neutron scattering [2] viz.,

$$\xi_{2D} = \frac{3.8}{\sqrt{\delta}} \quad (24)$$

we arrive at the following relation between the effective antiferromagnetic exchange constant $J_{\text{eff}} (>0)$ and δ at a particular temperature:

$$J_{\text{eff}} = \left(-\frac{T}{2.5} \right) \ln \left(0.075 \left(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \right) \right) \quad (25)$$

This equation shows a rapid decay of J_{eff} with increasing ' δ '. We have plotted J_{eff} versus δ at very low temperature ($T \sim 0\text{K}$) corresponding to equation (25) (see Fig.(2b)). This plot shows a striking resemblance with our D_s versus δ plot at zero temperature (see Fig.(2a)).




Fig.(2a).Spin stiffness constant 'Ds' vs.doping concentration plot obtained from our analytical calculation using t-J model at 0K temperature with $t \sim 8J$ (La_2CuO_4) for three different lattice sizes(100x100,128x128,200x200)




Fig.(2b). J_{eff} vs. doping concentration plot using equation (25) at very low temperature (0.001K)

It is very clear from the strong similarities between the nature of the graphs seen in the two plots in Fig.(2a) and Fig.(2b), that the pair spin stiffness constant (D_s), calculated from zero temperature t-J model with strict NDOC and multiplied with proper proportionality constant, can very well mimic the effective antiferromagnetic exchange coupling constant ' J_{eff} ' in the presence of doping at least qualitatively. Hence the pair spin stiffness constant can be considered as equivalent to the effective exchange coupling at least in the very low doping region. The similarity is also prevalent for other samples with different band widths ($2t$) and Coulomb repulsion barrier V_{eff} ie., for different t/J ratios following the same model $J=4t_{\text{eff}}^2/V_{\text{eff}}$ as used previously.

Having established the equivalence of ' D_s ' and ' J_{eff} ', we now study the variation of our calculated J_{eff} with doping concentration δ in the entire doping regime (see Figs.3(a)-3(c)). However, it must again be emphasized that the t-J model provides a genuine description of the real doped quantum antiferromagnet only in the low doping regime.





Fig.(3).Spin stiffness constant ' D_s ' vs. doping concentration δ upto 100% doping in logscale;(a)for 100x100 lattice,(b) for 128x128 lattice,(c) for 200x200 lattice

From these plots of ours it can be noticed that there is a huge decrease in the magnitude of spin stiffness constant ' D_s ' with increase in doping concentration and it practically becomes vanishingly small above 20% doping, which is again supported by the experimental results of Thurston et al. [2]. It can also be noticed that all the curves show the same trend.

It must however be highlighted that, some shoulder-like structures or a point of inflexion are seen in all the above plots near $\delta=0.61$, which indicates a point of cross-over or phase transition at zero temperature. This is in good general agreement with the results from theoretical work of Emery et al. which showed that phase separation of the system into hole rich region and hole deficient region can very well occur at high δ with various t/J ratios [33].

Furthermore, the exact vanishing of our calculated D_s as $\delta \rightarrow 1$ is the signature of the persistence of exchange coupling in the form of short range antiferromagnetic ordering upto 100% doping. This is quantitatively consistent with prediction of Himeda and Ogata as discussed previously [12]. Himeda and

Ogata tried to include the effect of no double occupancy implemented through the projection operator of Gutzwiller state by renormalizing the values of hopping amplitude and exchange constant with multiplicative factors g_t and g_J respectively in the background of a simple Fermi sea. The effective magnitudes of these parameters are given by:

$$t'_{\text{eff}}=g_t t \quad , \quad J'_{\text{eff}}=g_J J \quad (26)$$

where g_t and g_J are the Gutzwiller factors calculated from variational energy calculation by Ogawa et al. [13]. The Gutzwiller factor g_J has been derived as [12]:

$$g_J = \frac{4(1-\delta)^2}{(1-\delta^2+4m^2)^2} \quad (27)$$

where m is the expectation value of antiferromagnetic order parameter denoting the staggered magnetization in the long range antiferromagnetically ordered state. The vanishing of g_J and hence that of J'_{eff} at $\delta=1$ is evident from the above expression for g_J . The quantity m is doping dependent i.e., ($m = m(\delta)$) upto $\delta=0.1$ and $m \rightarrow 0$ approximately after 10% doping concentration. Here we have plotted the variation of g_J with doping concentration initiating from 10% doping concentration extending over the entire doping region ($\delta \rightarrow 1$) (see Fig.(4)):




Fig.(4). Gutzwiller factor for exchange constant (g_J) versus doping concentration δ plot upto 100% doping.

The g_J versus δ curve and hence J'_{eff} versus δ curve shows a monotonous fall from 10% doping onwards and reaching zero value at $\delta=1$ and this is qualitatively very similar to the fall observed in our D_s vs. δ plot (upto $\delta=0.61$) and to the acquiring of vanishingly small values of D_s as δ approaches 1. Very importantly however, the curve of Himeda and Ogata does not exhibit any phase separation-like signature present in our graph. Again, staggered magnetization is non-zero below 10% doping concentration ($m=m(\delta)$) which is the very strongly correlated regime where the Ogawa formalism of introducing the effect of projection operator in the effective values of exchange constant and hopping amplitude is mostly erroneous [12,13]. On the other hand, as doping concentration increases, the effective correlation in the system weakens and gradually it goes to the weakly correlated regime even with a given repulsive

potential U , as pointed out by Spalek [17]. Therefore, the very highly doped region at the first glance seems to satisfy the main conditions for being describable by Fermi-liquid (FL) theory; however there are very important subtleties which will be discussed below.

IV. Discussion

Our analytical calculations described above shows that D_s theoretically goes to zero at 100% doping concentration. The part of D_s due to kinetic energy part remains zero upto $\delta=0.61$ for 2-dimensional lattices, then increases and again goes to zero at $\delta=1$; however contribution to D_s from the exchange part monotonically decreases from very low δ and vanishes at $\delta=1$. The total D_s is plotted against δ and it bears a striking similarity with the J_{eff} versus δ plot obtained by a combination of CHN model, Monte Carlo results and experimental data upto $\delta=0.05$ [23]. We have used the results from CHN model, Monte Carlo calculations with its error limitations and experimental results to extract the dependence of J_{eff} on δ . Hence these errors and limitations are embedded in the J_{eff} vs δ plot in Fig.(2b). Most importantly, CHN have done the calculations using quantum non-linear σ model (QNL σ M) for pure quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnets, but it has been extended to the very low doping regime where this formalism strictly breaks down [23]. The extension to the very low doping region has been done on the basis of the fact that the number of mobile carriers are very small and assuming that their very little movement can be captured in the modification of the effective exchange constant J_{eff} and in the expression for correlation length. Regarding the results displayed in Fig.(2a), we could perform calculations on maximum lattice size only upto 200x200 for our calculations, which is much below the thermodynamic limit. In spite of all these limitations and crudeness, the similarity of the two plots under Fig.(2) is highly significant.

The experimental results used in the calculation are for pure 2-dimensional spin-spin correlation appropriate to the layered cuprate systems above the corresponding Neel temperature T_N and the Monte Carlo results have been taken at 10^{-3} K; whereas our calculations are for pure 2-dimensional system at zero temperature [2]. Detailed band structure effects and interlayer processes are completely neglected in our calculation, although it can help determining the magnetic phase boundaries in some of the real cuprate systems. The transition from long range to short range ordered phase has been studied previously using spin diffusion coefficient and generalized spin stiffness constant calculations [19]. Earlier calculation involving spin diffusion coefficient showed the survival of the long range ordered phase upto a critical doping concentration, implying the existence of a finite value of T_N in the regime $0 \leq \delta \leq 0.14$, if the system is made quasi-two dimensional [19]. In the present paper, the calculationally obtained sharp decay of D_s or J_{eff} with δ in the very low doping region does also represent the rapid fall of T_N with doping in this regime for the corresponding quasi-two dimensional system. Besides, one also confirms the existence of “novel paramagnetic phase” from our present calculations, if ‘ J ’ is taken to be vanishingly small [19].

The highly doped regions in our plots (Fig.(3)) and in the plot of Himeda and Ogata (Fig.(4)) represents in a way the weakly correlated regimes for the system [12,17]. The system in this regime appears reasonable to be described by the FL Theory. However, the stringent NDOC at each site ensures the manifestation of the non-Fermi Liquid character of this phase. Our detailed calculations here have been done taking into account only the nearest-neighbour exchange constant ‘ J ’ and hopping parameter ‘ t ’ which automatically leads to the renormalized effective exchange constant ‘ J_{eff} ’. This is in contrast to the

various heuristic models like, $t-t'-t''-J$ or $t-J_1-J_2$ model which also try to understand the doped phase [9,10]. Nevertheless, our first principle approach can very well capture the physics of doped quantum antiferromagnets.

In conclusion, the generalized stiffness constant calculation of ours for the strongly correlated t - J model is quite powerful and does bring out the concept of effective antiferromagnetic exchange constant appropriate to a semi-itinerant system, quite neatly. Furthermore, our theoretical results are in excellent agreement with those from various other theoretical approaches and also brings out limitations of some of them. As stated earlier, the effective exchange constants of some itinerant magnets like Fe, Ni, Gd have been determined using the techniques based on 'inverse susceptibility'. Moreover, the exchange correlation in itinerant magnets can be expressed in terms of the elements of scattering path matrix in the framework of density functional approach [25,28,29]. Band structure calculation based on multiple-scattering theory and spin-spiral techniques has also been done for estimating the exchange interaction in these itinerant magnets [29]. The effective exchange constant involving the nearest neighbour spins is related to the second order derivative of the magnetic energy with respect to the spin fields. Making use of this formalism the effective exchange constant turns out to be the inverse dynamic magnetic susceptibility (DMS), with some assumptions for the weakly interacting systems [28]. All these approaches described above, show that there has been ongoing theoretical research to determine the exchange constant and study the short range correlations even in weakly correlated itinerant magnetic systems, which is still a challenging problem in the field of theoretical condensed matter physics. In this context, our scheme based on generalized spin stiffness calculation provides a novel formalism for calculating the effective exchange constant of itinerant magnets, both weakly and strongly correlated.

V. *Future plan*

Our future plan includes:

(1) Extension of our present formalism to investigate charge stiffness for t - J model on 2-dimensional lattice.

In combination with our results obtained for spin stiffness, this would help in characterizing the microscopic state of the doped phase of 2-dimensional strongly correlated quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnets more clearly.

(2) Calculation of both spin and charge stiffness for t - J model on 1D lattice.

References

- [1] P.W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, (2006), 017001
T. Tohyama, S. Maekawa, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, (2003), 092509
M.B. Maple, *Preprint cond-mat/9802202 (unpublished)* (1998)
- [2] T.R. Thurston, R.J. Birgeneau, M.A. Kastner,
N.W. Preyer, G. Shirane, Y. Fujii, K. Yamada, Y. Endoh, K. Kakurai,
M. Matsuda, Y. Hidaka, T. Murakami, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, (1989), 4585

- [3] N.S. Mondal, N.K. Ghosh, *Pramana* **74**, (2010), 115
- [4] J. Jedrak, J. Spalek, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, (2011), 104512
- [5] P. Corboz, T.M. Rice, M. Troyer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, (2014), 046402
- [6] P. Corboz, S.R. White, G. Vidal, M. Troyer, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, (2011), 041108(R)
- [7] A.V. Chubukov, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, (1991), 392
A.V. Chubukov, S. Sachdev, T. Senthil, *Nucl. Phys. B* **426**, (1994), 601
- [8] P. Sindzingre, N. Shannon, T. Momoi, *J. Phys: Conference Series* **200**, (2010), 022058
M. Mambrini, A. Läuchli, D. Poilblanc, F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, (2006), 14422
- [9] T. Tanamoto, H. Kohno, H. Fukuyama, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **62**, (1993), 717
- [10] Y.Z. You, F. Yang, S.P. Kou, Z.Y. Weng, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, (2011), 054527
- [11] M.A. Kastner, R.J. Birgeneau, T.R. Thurston, P.J. Picone, H.P. Jenssen, D.R. Gabbe, M. Sato, K. Fukuda, S. Shamoto, Y. Endoh, K. Yamada, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, (1988), 6636
- [12] A. Himeda, M. Ogata, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, (1999), 9935(R)
M. Ogata, A. Himeda, *Preprint cond-mat/0003465 v1 (unpublished)* (2000)
A. Himeda, M. Ogata, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, (2000), 4345
- [13] T. Ogawa, K. Kanda, T. Matsubara, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **53**, (1975), 614
- [14] A. Sherman, M. Schreiber, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **32**, (2003), 203
A. Sherman, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, (2004), 184512
O.P. Vajk, M. Greven, P.K. Mang, J.W. Lynn, *Solid State Commun.* **126**, (2003), 93
T.C. Ribeiro, A. Seidel, J.H. Han, D.H. Lee, *Europhys. Lett.* **76**, (2006), 891
- [15] R. Chaudhury, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **136**, (2003), 1022
D. Volhardt, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **56**, (1984), 99
F.C. Zhang, T.M. Rice, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, (1988), 3759
- [16] N.M. Plakida, *Z. Phys. B* **103**, (1997), 383
N.M. Plakida, V.S. Oudovenko, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, (1999), 11949
G. Jackeli, N.M. Plakida, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **114**, (1998), 335
- [17] J. Spalek, *Preprint cond-mat/0806.0773v1 (unpublished)* (2008)
- [18] W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev. A* **133**, (1964), 171
D.J. Thouless, *Phys. Rep.* **13**, (1974), 94
B.S. Shastry, B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, (1990), 243
- [19] R. Chaudhury, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **19**, (2007), 496203
- [20] C. Panagopoulos, J.L. Tallon, B.D. Rainford, J.R. Cooper, C.A. Scott, T. Xiang, *Solid State Commun.* **126**, (2003), 47
S. Uchida, *Solid State Commun.* **126**, (2003), 57
- [21] S. Chakravarty, B.I. Halperin, D.R. Nelson, *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, (1989), 2344

- [22] P. Hasenfratz, F. Niedermayer, *Phys. Lett. B* **268**, (1991), 231
- [23] E. Manoussakis, *Phy. Rev. B* **45**, (1992), 7570(R)
H.Q. Ding, M. Makivic, *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, (1991), 2662
- [24] A.I. Liechtenstein, V.I. Anisimov, J. Zaanen, *Phy. Rev. B* **52**, (1995), 5467(R)
- [25] V.P. Antropov, M.A. Katsnelson, A.I. Liechtenstein, *Physica B* **237-238**, (1997), 336
- [26] E. Ruiz, S. Alvarez, J. Cano, V. Polo, *J. Chem. Phys.* **123**, (2005), 164110
- [27] S.H. Liu, *Phy. Rev. B* **15**, (1977), 4281
- [28] V.P. Antropov, *J. Mag. and Magn. Mat.* **262**, (2003), 192
- [29] V.P. Antropov, M.V. Schilfgaarde, S. Brink, J.L. Xu, *J. Appl. Phys.* **99**, (2006), 08F507
- [30] D.R. Nelson, J.M. Kosterlitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **39**, (1977), 1201
- [31] A.W. Sandik, R.G. Melko, *Annals of Physics* **321**, (2006), 1651
- [32] M.C. Gutzwiller, *Phys. Rev. A* **137**, (1965), 1726
- [33] V.J. Emery, S.A. Kivelson, H.Q. Lin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, (1990), 3562