

Hall effect in doped Mott insulator: DMFT – approximation

E. Z. Kuchinskii, N. A. Kuleeva, D. I. Khomskii*, M. V. Sadovskii

*Institute for Electrophysics, RAS Ural Branch, Amundsens st. 106, Ekaterinburg 620016, Russia and
II Physikalisches Institut, Universitaet zu Koeln, Zuelpicher Str. 77, 50937 Koeln, Germany

In the framework of dynamical mean field theory (DMFT) we analyze Hall effect in doped Mott insulator as a parent cuprate superconductor. We consider the partial filling (hole doping) of the lower Hubbard band and calculate the dependence of the Hall coefficient and Hall number on hole doping, determining the critical concentration for sign change of the Hall coefficient. Significant temperature dependence of the Hall effect is noted. A good agreement is demonstrated with the concentration dependence of Hall number obtained in experiments in the normal state of YBCO.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Fd, 74.72.-h

INTRODUCTION

In recent years much interest was attracted to experimental studies of Hall effect at low temperatures in the normal state of high – temperature superconductors (cuprates), which is achieved in very strong external magnetic fields [1–3]. The observed anomalies of Hall effect in these experiments are usually attributed to Fermi surface reconstruction due to formation of (antiferromagnetic) pseudogap and corresponding quantum critical point [4].

At the same time rather commonly accepted view is that cuprates are strongly correlated systems and their metallic (superconducting) state is realized as a result of doping of a parent Mott insulator, which can be described most simply within the Hubbard model. However, there are almost no works devoted to systematic studies of doping dependence of Hall effect in this model. A common question here is what is determining the sign of the Hall coefficient? At small hole doping of a parent insulator like La_2CuO_4 or underdoped YBCO, it is obviously determined by hole concentration δ . Then at what doping level shall we observe the sign change of Hall coefficient, when is there a transition from a small hole Fermi surface to a large electron one? Solution of this problem is quite important also for the general transport theory in strongly correlated systems.

Rather general approach to study Hubbard model is the dynamic mean field theory (DMFT) [5–7]. The aim of the present paper is a systematic study of concentration and temperature dependence of Hall effect for different doping levels in the lower Hubbard band within DMFT approach, as well as comparison of theoretical results with experiments on YBCO [2]. We shall see that surprisingly good agreement with experiment at quantitative level can be achieved even for this elementary model.

BASIC RELATIONS

In DMFT [5–7] the electron self – energy in single – particle Green’s function $G(\mathbf{p}\varepsilon)$ is local and indepen-

dent of momentum. Due to this locality both the usual and Hall conductivities are completely determined by the spectral density:

$$A(\mathbf{p}\varepsilon) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} G^R(\mathbf{p}\varepsilon). \quad (1)$$

In particular the static conductivity is given by:

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{\pi e^2}{2\hbar a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon \left(-\frac{df(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon} \right) \sum_{\mathbf{p}\sigma} \left(\frac{\partial \varepsilon(\mathbf{p})}{\partial p_x} \right)^2 A^2(\mathbf{p}\varepsilon), \quad (2)$$

while Hall conductivity [5]:

$$\sigma_{xy}^H = \frac{2\pi^2 e^3 a H}{3\hbar^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon \left(\frac{df(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon} \right) \sum_{\mathbf{p}\sigma} \left(\frac{\partial \varepsilon(\mathbf{p})}{\partial p_x} \right)^2 \times \frac{\partial^2 \varepsilon(\mathbf{p})}{\partial p_y^2} A^3(\mathbf{p}\varepsilon). \quad (3)$$

Here a is the lattice parameter, $\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})$ is the electronic dispersion, $f(\varepsilon)$ is the Fermi distribution, and H the magnetic field along z – axis. Thus the Hall coefficient is:

$$R_H = \frac{\sigma_{xy}^H}{H \sigma_{xx}^2} \quad (4)$$

is also completely determined by the spectral density $A(\mathbf{p}\varepsilon)$, which will be calculated within DMFT [5–7]. To solve an effective single – impurity Anderson model in DMFT we used numerical renormalization group (NRG) [8].

We performed rather extensive calculations of Hall effect for different models of electronic spectrum. Below, keeping in mind comparison with the experimental data on YBCO, we limit ourselves to the results obtained for two – dimensional tight – binding model of electronic spectrum:

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}) = -2t(\cos(p_x a) + \cos(p_y a)) - 4t' \cos(p_x a) \cos(p_y a). \quad (5)$$

In this model we shall consider her two cases:

(1) the model with electron transfers only between nearest neighbors ($t' = 0$) and the complete electron – hole symmetry;

(2) the case of $t'/t = -0.4$, which is qualitatively corresponds to YBCO.

For other cuprates we should use different values of t'/t ratio.

Further on, for two – dimensional models, the static conductivity will be measured in the units of universal two – dimensional conductivity $\sigma_0 = e^2/\hbar$, while Hall conductivity – in units of $e^3 a^2 H/\hbar^2$. Correspondingly, the Hall coefficient (4) is measured in units of a^2/e .

RESULTS OF CALCULATIONS AND COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT

For strongly correlated systems Hall coefficient is essentially dependent on temperature. At low temperatures in these systems when treated in DMFT approximation, besides upper and lower Hubbard bands also a narrow band forms close to Fermi level forming the so called quasiparticle peak in the density of states. In the hole doped Mott insulator (in the following we consider only the hole doping) this peak lies close to the upper edge of the lower Hubbard band (cf. Fig. 1). Thus, at low temperatures the Hall coefficient is determined by the filling of this quasiparticle band. At higher temperatures (of the order or higher than the width of quasiparticle peak) the quasiparticle peak broadens and Hall coefficient is determined by the filling of lower Hubbard band. Thus it is necessary to consider two rather different temperature regimes for Hall effect.

In low temperature regime both the amplitude and width of quasiparticle peak depend on band – filling and temperature. Temperature growth leads to the broadening of quasiparticle peak and some displacement of Fermi level below the maximum of this peak (cf. Fig. 1). This may lead to a noticeable drop of Hall coefficient, though further increase of temperature broaden the quasiparticle peak and leads to the growth of this coefficient. Significant dependence of quasiparticle peak on band – filling in low temperature regime leads to the regions of non monotonous dependence of Hall coefficient (cf. Fig. 2).

In high temperature regime the quasiparticle peak is strongly broadened and is practically absent due to temperature. In this case, deeply in the hole doped Mott insulator the Hall coefficient is in fact determined by filling of the lower Hubbard band (the upper Hubbard band is significantly higher in energy and is practically empty). In this situation, in the model with electron – hole symmetry ($t' = 0$) we can qualitatively estimate the band – filling corresponding to sign change of Hall coefficient as follows. Consider paramagnetic phase with




FIG. 1: Density of states in doped Mott insulator for different temperatures. Hubbard model parameters are shown in the Figure, $8t$ – initial bandwidth from (5). At the insert we show the density of states in wider energy interval including the upper Hubbard band.

$n_{\uparrow} = n_{\downarrow} = n$, so that in the following n denotes electron density per single spin projection, while the total electron density is $2n$. It is natural to assume that the sign change of Hall coefficient takes place close to half – filling of the lower Hubbard band $n_0 \approx 1/2$. Consider the states with “upper” spin projection, then the total number of states in the lower Hubbard band is $1 - n_{\downarrow} = 1 - n$. Then the band – filling is obtained as $n = n_{\uparrow} = n_0(1 - n) \approx 1/2(1 - n)$. Thus, for the band – filling corresponding to a sign change of the Hall coefficient we get $n_c \approx 1/3$.

The same result is easily obtained also in Hubbard I approximation, where the Green’s function for spin up electrons is written as [9]:

$$G_{\uparrow}^R(\varepsilon\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1 - n_{\downarrow}}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{-}(\mathbf{p}) + i\delta} + \frac{n_{\downarrow}}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{+}(\mathbf{p}) + i\delta}. \quad (6)$$

where $\varepsilon_{\pm}(\mathbf{p})$ is quasiparticle spectrum in upper and lower Hubbard bands. We can see that in this approximation the number of states with spin up projection in lower Hubbard band (first term in (6)) is really $1 - n_{\downarrow}$. During hole doping of Mott insulator the main band – filling goes into the lower Hubbard band, so that:

$$\begin{aligned} n &= n_{\uparrow} \approx \\ &\approx (1 - n_{\downarrow}) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon f(\varepsilon) \left(-\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{-}(\mathbf{p}) + i\delta} \right) = \end{aligned}$$




FIG. 2: Fig. 2. Dependence of Hall coefficient on band – filling at low (empty symbols) and high (filled symbols) temperatures for the model of two – dimensional electron spectrum (5) with transfers only between nearest neighbors ($t' = 0$).

$$= (1 - n)n_0. \quad (7)$$

Then for half – filled lower Hubbard band $n_0 = 1/2$ and the sign of Hall effect (effective mass of quasiparticles) changes, so that we get $n = n_c = 1/3$ again.

From Fig. 2 it is easily seen that the high – temperature behavior of Hall coefficient in doped Mott insulator ($U/2D = 4; 10$) in case of the complete electron – hole symmetry ($t' = 0$) fully supports this estimate. In case of noticeable breaking of this symmetry the simple estimate does not work, as even in the absence of correlations the sign change of Hall coefficient is observed not at half – filling (cf. Fig. 3).

It should be noted that the quasiparticle peak in the density of states is widened and suppressed not only by temperature but also by disorder [10, 12], as well as by pseudogap fluctuations, which are completely ignored in local DMFT approach [11, 12]. Thus, the range of applicability of the simple estimates made above for electron – hole symmetric case in reality may be significantly wider.

In Fig. 4 we show the comparison of our calculations for the Hall number (Hall concentration) $n_H = \frac{a^2}{eR_H}$ for typical model parameters with experimental data for YBCO from Ref. [2]. We can see that even for this, rather arbitrary, choice of parameters we obtain almost quantitative agreement with experiment, with no assumptions on Hall effect connection with the Fermi surface reconstruction by pseudogap and closeness to corresponding quantum critical point, which were used in Refs. [2–4]. It is more or less obvious that similar data of Ref. [3] for NLSCO can be interpreted within our model with appropriate change of parameters t/t' and U . Thus it is quite possible that our interpretation of Hall effect in




FIG. 3: Fig. 3. Dependence of Hall coefficient on band – filling at low (empty symbols) and high (filled symbols) temperatures for the model of two – dimensional electron spectrum (5) with transfers between nearest and next – nearest neighbors ($t'/t = -0.4$).




FIG. 4: Fig. 4. Dependence of Hall number n_H on doping — comparison with experiment [2] on YBCO, $\delta = 1 - 2n$ – hole concentration. Stars – our calculations, blue circles – experiment.

cuprates based on the doping of lower Hubbard band of Mott insulator can be a viable alternative to the picture of quantum critical point.

It may be of great interest to make the detailed studies of the Hall effect in the vicinity of critical concentration corresponding to the sign change of Hall coefficient (divergence of Hall number). This can be done in the

systems (cuprates), where such sign change takes place under doping.

CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the behavior of the Hall coefficient in metallic phase appearing due to hole doping of the lower Hubbard band of Mott insulator. The change of sign of Hall effect in simplest (symmetric) case takes place close to doping $n_c = 1/3$ per single spin projection or total electron density $2/3$ in the lower Hubbard band, corresponding to hole doping $\delta = 1 - 2n = 1/3$, though in general case it depends rather strongly on the choice of model parameters. This concentration follows from simple qualitative estimates and is not related to more sophisticated factors, such as change of topology of Fermi surface or quantum critical points.

More than satisfactory agreement of theoretical concentrations dependencies obtained in the experiments on YBCO [2] shows, that our model may be a reasonable alternative to the picture of Hall effect in the vicinity of quantum critical point, related to closing pseudogap [4].

The work of EZK, NAK and MVS was partly supported by RFBR Grant No. 20-02-00011. The work of DIK was funded by DFG under project No. 277146847 - CRC 1238.

- (2009)
- [2] S. Badoux, W. Tabis, F. Laliberte, B. Vignolle, D. Vignolles, J. Beard, D.A. Bonn, W.N. Hardy, R. Liang, N. Doiron-Leyraud, L. Taillefer, C. Proust. *Nature* **531**, 210 (2016)
 - [3] C. Collignon, S. Badoux, S.A.A. Afshar, B. Michon, F. Laliberte, O. Cyr-Choiniere, J.-S. Zhou, S. Licciardello, S. Wiedmann, N. Doiron-Leyraud, L. Taillefer. *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 224517 (2017)
 - [4] C. Proust, L. Taillefer. *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **10** 409 (2019)
 - [5] Th. Pruschke, M. Jarrell, J. K. Freericks. *Adv. Phys.* **44**, 187 (1995).
 - [6] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, M. J. Rozenberg. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 13 (1996).
 - [7] D. Vollhardt in “Lectures on the Physics of Strongly Correlated Systems XIV”, eds. A. Avella and F. Mancini, AIP Conference Proceedings vol. 1297 (AIP, Melville, New York, 2010), p. 339; ArXiv: 1004.5069.
 - [8] R. Bulla, T.A. Costi, T. Pruschke, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **60**, 395 (2008).
 - [9] D.I. Khomskii. *Basic Aspects of the Quantum Theory of Solids*. Cambridge University Press, NY, 2010
 - [10] E.Z. Kuchinskii, I.A. Nekrasov, M.V. Sadovskii. *Zh. Eksp. Teor Fiz.* **133**, 670 (2008); [*JETP* **106**, 581 (2008)]
 - [11] M.V. Sadovskii, I.A. Nekrasov, E.Z. Kuchinskii, Th. Pruschke, V.I. Anisimov. *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 155105 (2005)
 - [12] E.Z. Kuchinskii, I.A. Nekrasov, M.V. Sadovskii. *Usp. Fiz. Nauk* **182**, 345 (2012); [*Physics Uspekhi*, **55**, 325 (2012)]

[1] F.F. Balakirev, J.B. Betts, A. Migliori, I. Tsukada, Y. Ando, G.S. Boebinger. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 017004