

# $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$ Gauge Symmetry in High $T_c$ Superconductivity

Wei-Min Zhang

*Department of Physics, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, 701, Taiwan*

(November 1, 2018)

The square lattice structure of  $CuO_2$  layers and the strongly correlated property of electrons indicate that the high  $T_c$  superconductivity in cuprates can be described by a  $SO_M(5)$  coherent pairing state in which a  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  gauge symmetry is embedded. The spin and charge fluctuations that characterize the low energy magnetic excitations in cuprates are controlled by this intrinsic  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  gauge symmetry.

PACS numbers: 74.20.-z, 74.20.Mn, 74.25.Ha, 71.10.-w

The study of low energy quantum fluctuations in strongly correlated systems is one of the most difficult problems in theoretical physics. In copper-oxides, the low energy properties of electrons are indeed the central issue in the study of high  $T_c$  superconducting mechanism. Up to date, there exist no proper skills and tools to deal with low energy quantum fluctuations of strongly correlated electrons. However, solving a strongly correlated problem depends crucially on how to extract the relevant degrees of freedom that characterize low energy excitations. Determining low energy degrees of freedom lies mainly on intrinsic symmetries of the system. In this letter, I propose that the low-lying magnetic excitations observed [1–3] over a large range of dopings ( $0.05 \leq \delta \leq 0.25$ ) in cuprates originate neither from the conventional spin density wave (SDW) fluctuation associated with the breaking  $SU_S(2)$  spin rotational symmetry, nor from the charge density wave (CDW) fluctuation related to the breaking  $U_C(1)$  or  $SU_C(2)$  charge gauge symmetry of singlet pairs. There is an additional intrinsic symmetry, the  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  gauge symmetry that mixes the triplet magnetic pairs and singlet charge pairs. It is this  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  gauge symmetry that controls the low energy quantum fluctuations of spins and charges in cuprates.

In accordance with experimental observations, high  $T_c$  superconductivity (SC) arises as a consequence of hole (or electron) dopings from the parent copper-oxide compounds which are antiferromagnetic (AF) Mott insulators [4]. In the AF phase which is very closed to the half-filling ( $\delta \leq 0.03$ ), the low-lying excitations are mainly the SDW fluctuation with respect to the  $SU_S(2)$  spin rotational symmetry [5]. In the optimal dopings ( $0.15 \leq \delta \leq 0.3$ ), the  $d$ -wave SC order [6] implies that the low-lying excitations should be dominated by phase fluctuation associated with the  $U_C(1)$  gauge symmetry, in accordance to Anderson's RVB theory. [7] While in the underdoping region between the AF and dSC phases, Wen and Lee proposed that there may exist a  $SU_C(2)$  gauge symmetry that could address the pseudogap property [8].

However, the optimally doped  $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+\delta}$  in SC phase displays a sharp magnetic resonance centered at  $(\pi, \pi)$  in reciprocal space [1]. Meanwhile, in the un-

derdoping region, especially around  $\delta \sim 1/8$ , neutron-scattering experiments on  $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$  show clear evidences of incommensurate magnetic excitations disposed symmetrically about  $(\pi, \pi)$  [2]. These magnetic properties cannot be explained by  $U_C(1)$  or  $SU_C(2)$  charge gauge symmetry. C.S. Zhang has argued [9] that the magnetic  $\pi$  resonance may imply the existence of a  $SO_Z(5)$  superspin symmetry [10]. The discovery of incommensurate peaks furthermore brings another important issue, i.e. possible existence of a stripe phase [11]. More recently, many experiments have confirmed that incommensurate magnetic excitations exist not only in LSCO but also in YBCO copper-oxide superconductors in both underdoping and optimal doping regions [3]. From the universality of observed incommensurate structures, it is natural to ask whether there exists an intrinsic symmetry to underlying these low-lying magnetic degrees of freedom over the whole range of doped cuprates.

An intrinsic symmetry in condensed matter physics depends not only on basic interacting properties of electrons, but also on crystal structures of materials. In general, in terms of the 8-dim basis of charge, spin and crystal wave vector (in the reduced first Brillouin zone), the noninteracting electrons on lattice have a maximum  $U(8)$  symmetry [12]. However, for the high  $T_c$  superconductors, the conductivity is mainly in the  $CuO_2$  layers. In such a two-dimensional square lattice plane, the parity symmetry between  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $-\mathbf{k}$  reduces the general  $U(8)$  group to a smaller subgroup  $SO(8)$  [13]. The RVB  $U_C(1)$  and  $SU_C(2)$  gauge symmetries that describe the  $d$ -wave superconductivity (SC) and the pseudo-gap behavior [7,8] and the  $SO_Z(5)$  superspin symmetry that describes the antiferromagnetism (AF) to  $d$ -wave SC transition [9] are all subgroups of  $SO(8)$ .

To realize this  $SO(8)$  structure, I introduce a Nambu basis,  $\Psi_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}})$  with  $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = (c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger, c_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^\dagger, c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\uparrow}^\dagger, c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\downarrow}^\dagger)$  and  $\alpha_{-\mathbf{k}} = (c_{-\mathbf{k}\uparrow}, c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}, c_{-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\uparrow}, c_{-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\downarrow})$ . The generators of  $SO(8)$  are then given by

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{SO(8)} \Psi_{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \mathbf{b}_l \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} & \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \Delta_i^\dagger \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \\ \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}} \Delta_i \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} & -\alpha_{-\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{b}_l^t \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{k}$  is restricted in the reduced first Brillouin zone,

and  $\mathbf{b}_l$  and its transposition  $\mathbf{b}_l^t$  are  $4 \times 4$  hermitian matrices,  $\Delta_i$  and its hermitian conjugate  $\Delta_i^\dagger$  are  $4 \times 4$  antisymmetric matrices. Eq. (1) consists of 12 pair operators and 16 particle-hole operators. The 12 pair operators are the isotropic  $s$ -wave [14] or the  $d_{xy}$ -wave pair [15] denoted by  $\Delta_s$ , the extended  $s$ -wave or  $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave pair  $\Delta_d$  [7,16], the quasispin  $\eta$  pair  $\Delta_\eta$  [17] and the three triplet  $\pi$  pairs  $\Delta_\pi$  [10], plus their hermitian conjugates. These pair operators are represented in Eq. (1) by  $\Delta_{i\mathbf{k}} = \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}} \Delta_i \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}$  and  $\Delta_{i\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = (\Delta_{i\mathbf{k}})^\dagger = \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \Delta_i^\dagger \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ , where  $i = s, d, p, \pi$ , and  $\Delta_i = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^x \gamma^z, i\gamma^5 \gamma^y, -i\gamma^0 \gamma^y, \gamma^x \gamma^z \gamma)$ , and the  $\gamma$ -matrix is given in the standard Dirac representation in field theory:

$$\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -I_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \\ -\boldsymbol{\sigma} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

$\gamma^5 = i\gamma^0 \gamma^x \gamma^y \gamma^z$ . The 16 particle-hole operators include the charge  $Q$ , the intrinsic charge  $T$ , the spin  $\mathbf{S}$ , the intrinsic spin  $\mathbf{A}$ , the charge density wave  $C_{\mathbf{Q}}$ , the charge current  $J_c$ , the spin density wave  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Q}}$  and the spin current  $\mathbf{J}_s$ . They are given in Eq. (1) by  $B_{l\mathbf{k}} = \alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \mathbf{b}_l \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} - \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{b}_l^t \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$  with  $\mathbf{b}_l = \frac{1}{2}(I_4, \gamma^0, \gamma/2, \gamma^0 \gamma/2i, \gamma^5, i\gamma^5 \gamma^0, \gamma \gamma^5/2, \gamma^5 \gamma^0 \gamma/2)$  that corresponds to  $B_{l\mathbf{k}} \equiv (Q, T, \mathbf{J}_s, \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Q}}, C_{\mathbf{Q}}, J_c, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{S})_{\mathbf{k}}$ .

Using the generalized coherent state theory [18], a general quasiparticle picture in terms of the SO(8) Nambu basis can be defined as follows:

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}|0\rangle = 0 \quad \xrightarrow{SO(8)} \quad \beta_{\mathbf{k}}|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle = 0. \quad (3)$$

The quasiparticle vacuum state  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  is given by

$$|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle = \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \eta_s(\mathbf{k}) \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \eta_d(\mathbf{k}) \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \eta_p(\mathbf{k}) \Delta_{p\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \boldsymbol{\eta}_\pi(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\pi\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} |0\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where the crystal momentum  $\mathbf{k}$  covers the first Brillouin zone, and  $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow}^\dagger$ ,  $\Delta_{p\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow}^\dagger c_{-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\downarrow}^\dagger$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\pi\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = -c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha}^\dagger (i\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^y)_{\alpha\beta} c_{-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\beta}^\dagger$  are various singlet and triplet  $\pi$  pair operators in the SO(8) algebra. The quasiparticle operators ( $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ ) are determined by the corresponding SO(8) Bogoliubov transformation with respect to the physical vacuum state  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  [20],

$$\begin{pmatrix} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \\ \beta_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} W_{\mathbf{k}} & -Z_{\mathbf{k}} \\ Z_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger & W_{\mathbf{k}}^t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \\ \alpha_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

The notation  $Z_{\mathbf{k}}$  and  $W_{\mathbf{k}}$  are  $4 \times 4$  block matrices in the canonical SO(8) Bogoliubov transformations:

$$Z_{\mathbf{k}} = \eta \frac{\sin \sqrt{\eta^\dagger \eta}}{\sqrt{\eta^\dagger \eta}}, \quad W_{\mathbf{k}} = \cos \sqrt{\eta^\dagger \eta} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\eta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \eta_1(\mathbf{k}) & \eta_2(\mathbf{k}) & \eta_3(\mathbf{k}) \\ -\eta_1(\mathbf{k}) & 0 & \eta_4(\mathbf{k}) & \eta_5(\mathbf{k}) \\ -\eta_2(\mathbf{k}) & -\eta_4(\mathbf{k}) & 0 & \eta_6(\mathbf{k}) \\ -\eta_3(\mathbf{k}) & -\eta_5(\mathbf{k}) & -\eta_6(\mathbf{k}) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

with  $\eta_{1,6}(\mathbf{k}) = \eta_s(\mathbf{k}) \pm \eta_d(\mathbf{k})$ ,  $\eta_{4,3}(\mathbf{k}) = \eta_\pi^z(\mathbf{k}) \pm \eta_p(\mathbf{k})$ ,  $\eta_2(\mathbf{k}) = \eta_\pi^-(\mathbf{k})$  and  $\eta_5(\mathbf{k}) = -\eta_\pi^+(\mathbf{k})$ .

The state  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  is nothing but the SO(8)/U<sub>g</sub>(4) coherent pairing state which is, apart from a phase factor, obtained by acting SO(8) on the trivial vacuum  $|0\rangle$  [19], while the associated phase factor contains the freedom of U<sub>g</sub>(4) gauge transformations that describe quantum fluctuations of all the pairing wave functions  $\eta_i(\mathbf{k})$ . The pairing wave functions  $\eta_i(\mathbf{k})$  in Eq. (4) are generally *link-dependent* complex parameters with an additional constraint  $\eta_i(\mathbf{k}) = \eta_i(-\mathbf{k})$  from the parity symmetry. In fact,  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  is the underlying pairing state I proposed recently to describe high  $T_c$  superconductivity [21]. As I have discussed in [21],  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  consists of all electron pairs concerned in the study of superconductivity. These pairs can be classified according to the symmetric property of the pairing wave function under the transformation of  $\mathbf{k}$  to  $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q}$  as follows:  $\eta_s(\mathbf{k}) = \eta_s(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q})$  represents the isotropic  $s$ -wave and  $d_{xy}$ -wave ( $\sim \sin k_x \sin k_y$ ) singlet pairs etc.,  $\eta_d(\mathbf{k}) = -\eta_d(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q})$  describes the extended singlet pairs [including the extended  $s$ -wave ( $\sim \gamma(\mathbf{k}) = \cos k_x + \cos k_y$ ), the  $d$ -wave ( $\sim d(\mathbf{k}) = \cos k_x - \cos k_y$ ) and the  $s + id$ -wave ( $\sim \cos k_x + i \cos k_y$ ) pairs etc.], while  $\eta_p(\mathbf{k}) = \eta_p(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q})$  corresponds to the pseudo-spin pairs, and finally,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\pi(\mathbf{k}) = -\boldsymbol{\eta}_\pi(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q})$  describe the triplet  $\pi$  pairs.

Since high  $T_c$  superconductors are obtained by doping from the parent copper-oxides which are AF insulators, to demonstrate how can this picture be realized and what are the low-lying degrees of freedom involved, I should first check the AF order parameter and the hopping dynamics contained in the state  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$ . Without loss generality, I define  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\pi(\mathbf{k}) = \eta_\pi(\mathbf{k}) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}$  with  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}$  being a unit vector,  $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}| = 1$ . Then the AF order in  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_{AF} &\equiv \frac{1}{N} \langle \Omega_{SO(8)} | \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\beta} | \Omega_{SO(8)} \rangle \\ &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}' [z_d(\mathbf{k}) z_\pi^*(\mathbf{k}) + z_d^*(\mathbf{k}) z_\pi(\mathbf{k})] \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $z_i(\mathbf{k})$  is an element of  $Z_{\mathbf{k}}$  in Eq. (6), which is defined in the same form as in Eq. (7). For the leading hopping Hamiltonian, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_t \rangle &= \langle \Omega_{SO(8)} | \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} | \Omega_{SO(8)} \rangle \\ &= 4 \sum_{\mathbf{k}}' \varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) [z_s(\mathbf{k}) z_d^*(\mathbf{k}) + z_s^*(\mathbf{k}) z_d(\mathbf{k})] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and  $\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$ . Eq. (8) simply tells us that the AF state mixes the extended singlet pairs and the triplet  $\pi$  pairs. Meanwhile, Eq. (9) shows that the hopping requires the simultaneously present of the singlet pairs of  $\eta_s(\mathbf{k})$  and  $\eta_d(\mathbf{k})$ .

Zhang's SO<sub>Z</sub>(5) superspin theory [9] contains only the  $d$ -wave singlet pair plus the triplet  $\pi$  pairs. The corresponding pairing state can be generally expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Omega_{SO(6)}\rangle &= \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \eta_d(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \boldsymbol{\eta}_\pi(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\pi\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} |0\rangle \\
&= \begin{cases} \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \boldsymbol{\eta}_\pi(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\pi\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} |AF\rangle \\ \text{or} \\ \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \boldsymbol{\eta}_\pi(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\pi\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} \Big|_{\text{BCS}}^{d\text{-wave}} \end{cases}, \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

which gives a realization of the picture how the  $\pi$ -operator rotates the AF state into  $d$ -wave SC and vis-versus. However, from Eq. (9), one sees that the  $\text{SO}_Z(5)$  theory cannot describe hopping dynamics because of the lacking of the  $s$ -wave (or  $d_{xy}$ -wave) type pairing. This is why the doping process is artificially addressed through a chemical potential in Zhang's  $\text{SO}_Z(5)$  theory. On the other hand, Anderson's RVB state only consists of the extended singlet pairs,

$$|\Omega_{RVB}\rangle = P_G \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \eta_d(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} |0\rangle, \quad (11)$$

so that it cannot describe the AF magnetization, where  $P_G$  is the Gutzwiller projector that removes the doubly occupied sites when it is applied to the  $t - J$  model [7]. Consequently, both Anderson's RVB theory and Zhang's  $\text{SO}_Z(5)$  theory only catch a partial low-lying degree of freedom in high  $T_c$  superconductivity.

On the other hand, the unit vector  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}$  in (8) is the normalized Néel field that describes a continuous manifold of degenerate ground states in  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  with regard to the  $\text{SU}_S(2)$  spin rotational symmetry. To highlight the dominated low-lying degrees of freedom in cuprates, I can rewrite Eqs. (4) equivalently as

$$|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle \rightarrow \exp \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{k}} \right\} |\Omega_{SU(4)}\rangle, \quad (12)$$

where  $|\Omega_{SU(4)}\rangle$  is defined as an intrinsic state in which  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}$  has been specified to along the easy  $z$ -axis:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Omega_{SU(4)}\rangle &= \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \eta_s(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \eta_d(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \eta_p(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{p\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \eta_\pi^z(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\pi^z\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} |0\rangle. \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

In fact, the intrinsic pairing state  $|\Omega_{SU(4)}\rangle$  is a reduction of the  $\text{SO}(8)/\text{U}_g(4)$  to  $\text{SU}(4)/\text{SU}_C(2) \times \text{SU}_M(2) \times \text{U}_C(1)$  coherent pairing state under the spin rotational symmetry. Under this decomposition, the conventional SDW arisen from spin fluctuation can be determined by varying  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{k}}$ . It can be shown that both the hoping [see Eq. (9) and the doping,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta &= \langle \Omega_{SO(8)} | 1 - \frac{\hat{n}}{N} | \Omega_{SO(8)} \rangle \\
&= 4 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} [1 - |z_s(\mathbf{k})|^2 + |z_d(\mathbf{k})|^2 + |z_p(\mathbf{k})|^2 + |z_\pi(\mathbf{k})|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

are independent from  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}$  [and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathbf{k})$ ]. In other words, the conventional SDW does not explicitly depend on dopings.

I thereby conclude that the incommensurability of the observed magnetic excitations that linearly depend on dopings [3] should not originate from the spin fluctuation of the *conventional* SDW. In fact, it is not the unit spin vector  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{k}}$  but the amplitude of staggered AF order,

$$m_{AF} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}' [z_d(\mathbf{k})z_\pi^*(\mathbf{k}) + z_d^*(\mathbf{k})z_\pi(\mathbf{k})] \quad (14)$$

that sensitively depends on dopings. The low-lying magnetic excitations in cuprates must arise from quantum fluctuations of the AF amplitude  $m_{AF}$  due to dopings rather than the SDW of spin fluctuations.

Furthermore, if I further drop the  $z$ -component of the  $\pi$  pairs, the state  $|\Omega_{SU(4)}\rangle$  is deduced to a  $\text{SO}_C(5)/\text{SU}_C(2) \times \text{U}_C(1)$  coherent pairing state:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Omega_{SO_C(5)}\rangle &= \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \eta_s(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \eta_d(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \eta_p(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{p\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} |0\rangle, \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

where the  $\text{SO}_C(5)$  group is obviously not the  $\text{SO}_Z(5)$  superspin symmetry in Zhang's theory. The subgroup  $\text{SU}_C(2) \times \text{U}_C(1)$  (generated by  $\{C_Q, J_c, T, Q\}$ ) is a gauge symmetry embedded in  $|\Omega_{SO_C(5)}\rangle$  that describes quantum fluctuations of the  $s$ ,  $d$ -wave pair orders, the CDW order and staggered flux order. The CDW and staggered flux orders are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\mathbf{Q}} &\equiv \frac{1}{N} \langle \Omega_{SO(8)} | \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\sigma} | \Omega_{SO(8)} \rangle \\
&= \frac{4}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}' [z_s(\mathbf{k})z_p^*(\mathbf{k}) + z_s^*(\mathbf{k})z_p(\mathbf{k})], \quad (16) \\
\chi &\equiv \frac{1}{N} \langle \Omega_{SO(8)} | \sum_{\langle ij \rangle > \sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} | \Omega_{SO(8)} \rangle \\
&= \frac{4}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}}' \gamma(\mathbf{k}) [z_p(\mathbf{k})z_d^*(\mathbf{k}) + z_p^*(\mathbf{k})z_d(\mathbf{k})], \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

respectively. It covers the  $\text{SU}_C(2)$  RVB gauge theory proposed by Wen and Lee when one imposes the constraint of no-double-occupied sites on the state  $|\Omega_{SO_C(5)}\rangle$  [8]. This state is capable of describing the coexistence of the  $d$ -wave superconductivity with the CDW and staggered flux phases. But it cannot address the dynamics of AF magnetic phase.

Upon date, there is no direct evidence on the existence of long range CDW or staggered flux order in cuprates. To concentrate on the observed magnetic excitations, I may set  $\eta_p(\mathbf{k}) = 0$  in Eq. (13). Then, the intrinsic pairing state  $|\Omega_{SU(4)}\rangle$  is reduced to another  $\text{SO}(5)$  coherent state, specifically, the  $\text{SO}_M(5)/\text{SU}_M(2) \times \text{U}_C(1)$  coherent pairing state,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Omega_{SO_M(5)}\rangle &= \prod_{\mathbf{k}} \exp \left\{ \eta_s(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \eta_d(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \eta_\pi^z(\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\pi^z\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \text{H.c.} \right\} |0\rangle. \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

From Eqs. (9) and (14), one sees that this  $SO_M(5)$  coherent pairing state can describe the hopping dynamics and the coexistence of the  $s$ ,  $d$ -wave superconductivities and the AF magnetism with local magnetic excitations. While, the subgroup  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  (generated by  $\{S_{\mathbf{Q}}^z, J_s^z, T, Q\}$ ) is the gauge symmetry embedded in  $|\Omega_{SO_M(5)}\rangle$  that controls quantum fluctuations of the  $s$ ,  $d$  and  $\pi^z$  pairs. The physical properties of  $|\Omega_{SO_M(5)}\rangle$  in Eq. (18) are very different from  $|\Omega_{SO_C(5)}\rangle$  in Eq. (15). The state  $|\Omega_{SO_M(5)}\rangle$  is magnetic charge dominated, while  $|\Omega_{SO_C(5)}\rangle$  is charge dominated. It is the former that can effectively describe the low-lying magnetic excitations.

In conclusion, the above analysis shows that the low energy degrees of freedom in cuprates that compasses SDW, CDW, staggered flux order, magnetic excitations and various pairing (including the  $s$ ,  $d$ -wave singlet and  $\pi$  triplet pair) orders can be encompassed by the  $SO(8)/U(4)$  coherent pairing state  $|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle$  [i.e. Eq. (4)]. The  $SO(8)$  coherent pairing state contains three different  $SO(5)$  subgroup pairing states. The first two states, Eqs. (11) and (15), cover Zhang's  $SO_Z(5)$  theory and Wen-Lee's  $SU_C(2)$  gauge theory, respectively, and the last one, the  $SO_M(5)$  symmetry is a new discovery.

$$|\Omega_{SO(8)}\rangle \rightarrow \begin{cases} |\Omega_{SO(6)}\rangle \rightarrow |\Omega_{SO_Z(5)}\rangle \\ |\Omega_{SU(4)}\rangle \rightarrow \begin{cases} |\Omega_{SO_C(5)}\rangle \\ |\Omega_{SO_M(5)}\rangle \end{cases} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

The above three  $SO(5)$  coherent pairing states are generated by different pair operators, and they describe different physical properties of strongly correlated electrons in cuprates. Only the  $SO_M(5)$  symmetry is capable of describing the low-lying magnetic excitations incorporating with the hopping dynamics. Specifically, all the three pairing states contains the  $d$ -wave superconducting order. However, they carry different gauge degrees of freedom associated with different quantum fluctuations:

$$\frac{SO(8)}{U(4)} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \frac{SO(6)}{SU_S(2) \times SU_{S_{\mathbf{Q}}}(2) \times U(1)} \rightarrow \frac{SO_Z(5)}{SU_S(2) \times U(1)} \\ \frac{SU(4)}{SU_C(2) \times SU_M(2) \times U(1)} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \frac{SO_C(5)}{SU_C(2) \times U(1)} \\ \frac{SO_M(5)}{SU_M(2) \times U(1)} \end{cases} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

In Zhang's  $SO_Z(5)$  theory, the gauge symmetry is represented by the spin rotational  $SU_S(2)$  group plus the charge  $U_C(1)$  group. It separately describes the SDW quantum fluctuation and the  $U_C(1)$  charge fluctuation. However, they are not essential to the magnetic excitations. Also the doping can only be added artificially through a chemical potential in this theory. In Wen and Lee's  $SU_C(2)$  gauge theory, the  $SU_C(2)$  gauge symmetry

describes the CDW and the staggered flux phase but no AF feature. Only in the  $SO_M(5)$  coherent pairing theory, the  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  gauge group can simultaneously and *dynamically* addresses quantum fluctuations of the AF amplitude and hoppings as well as the  $d$ -wave pairing. This  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  gauge symmetry has not been realized in the previous study of high  $T_c$  theories. It should be this  $SU_M(2) \times U_C(1)$  gauge symmetry that describes the various magnetic excitations in cuprates. I will discuss its applications in more details in a separate publication. This work is supported by the grant NSC89-2112-M006-029.

- 
- [1] J. Rossa-Mignod et al., *Physica* (Amsterdam) **169B**, 58 (1991); J. M. Mook et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3490 (1993); H. F. Fong et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 316 (1995).
  - [2] S. W. Cheong et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 1791 (1991); J. M. Tranquada et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 1003 (1994).
  - [3] G. Aeppli et al., *Science* **278**, 1432 (1997); K. Yamada et al., *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 6165 (1998); P. Dai et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1738 (1998); H. A. Mook et al., *Nature* **395**, 580 (1998); M. Arai et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 608 (1999); B. Lake et al. *Nature* **400**, 43 (1999); F. Ronning et al., *Science* **282**, 2067 (1998);
  - [4] E. Dagotto, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 763 (1994).
  - [5] A. Auerbach, "Interacting Electrons and Quantum Magnetism", (Springer-Verlag, 1994).
  - [6] Z. X. Shen et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1553 (1993); C. C. Tsuei et al., *Science* **271**, 329 (1996).
  - [7] P. W. Anderson, *Science* **235**, 1196 (1987).
  - [8] X. G. Wen and P. A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 503 (1996).
  - [9] S. C. Zhang, *Science* **275**, 1089 (1997).
  - [10] E. Demler and S. C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4126 (1995); *Nature* **369**, 733 (1998).
  - [11] J. M. Tranquada et al., *Nature* **375**, 561 (1995). V. J. Emery and S. A. Kivelson, cond-mat/9808083.
  - [12] A. I. Solomon, and J. L. Birman, *J. Math. Phys.* **28**, 1526 (1987); S. Östlund, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1695 (1992).
  - [13] A similar  $SO(8)$  algebra based on Van Hove singularities has also been constructed by R. S. Markiewicz and M. T. Vaughn, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, R14052 (1998).
  - [14] J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper and J. R. Schrieffer, *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 1175(1957).
  - [15] R. B. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5188 (1998).
  - [16] I. Affleck, Z. Zou, T. Hsu and P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 745 (1988).
  - [17] C. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 2144 (1989); C. S. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 120 (1990).
  - [18] W. M. Zhang et al., *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **62**, 867 (1990).
  - [19] W. M. Zhang et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2032 (1987).
  - [20] W. M. Zhang, *Chin. J. Phys.* **38**, 371 (2000).
  - [21] W. M. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, R898 (2000).