

Comment on “Gapless Spin-1 Neutral Collective Mode Branch for Graphite”

N. M. R. Peres¹, M. A. N. Araújo² and A. H. Castro Neto³

¹*Departamento de Física e GCEP, Universidade do Minho, P-4710-057, Braga, Portugal,*

²*Departamento de Física, Universidade de Évora, P-7000, Évora, Portugal, and*

³*Department of Physics, Boston University, 590 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, MA, 02215*

PACS numbers: 71.10.-w, 79.60.-i, 81.05.Uw

The interest in strongly correlated systems in frustrated lattices has been increased recently due to the possible realization of exotic magnetic states [1], spin and charge separation in two dimensions [2], and the discovery of superconductivity in $\text{Na}_x\text{CoO}_2 \cdot y\text{H}_2\text{O}$ [3]. In a recent paper [4], Baskaran and Jafari have proposed the existence of a neutral spin collective mode for a graphene sheet that is modeled as a half-filled Hubbard model in the honeycomb lattice. These calculations were based on two main approximations: the random phase approximation (RPA), and the *single cone approximation*. Since inelastic neutron scattering can be used to study this spin collective mode in graphite, we decide to revisit the problem without making use of the single cone approximation but considering the entire band structure. We found that such a spin collective does not in fact exist within RPA, being a consequence of the single cone approximation.




FIG. 1: Transverse susceptibility denominator $D(\omega, \mathbf{q})$, Eq. (2), as function of ω , for $U = 2$, considering eight different \mathbf{q} -vectors along the Γ to K direction in the Brillouin Zone. For each wavevector, the line terminates at the point where ω enters the particle-hole continuum.

We treat the problem as two inter-penetrating triangular sub-lattices (a and b) with a Hamiltonian given by: $H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} [\phi(\mathbf{k}) a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + H.c.] + H_U$,

where \mathbf{k} is the momentum, $|\phi(\mathbf{k})| = \epsilon_+(\mathbf{k})$, $\epsilon_\pm(\mathbf{k}) = \pm t \sqrt{1 + 4 \cos(ak_x \sqrt{3}/2) \cos(ak_y/2) + 4 \cos^2(ak_y/2)}$ is the electronic dispersion, and $H_U = \sum_i U n_{i, \uparrow} n_{i, \downarrow}$. The transverse spin susceptibility is defined as: $\chi_{+-}^{\alpha, \gamma} = \int_0^\beta d\tau \sum_{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}} e^{i\omega_n \tau} \langle T_\tau \alpha_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}, \uparrow}^\dagger(\tau) \alpha_{\mathbf{p}, \downarrow}(\tau) \gamma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \downarrow}^\dagger \gamma_{\mathbf{k}, \uparrow} \rangle$, with $\alpha, \gamma = a, b$. In RPA the existence of two sub-lattices leads to a tensor form for the susceptibility given by $\chi_{+-} = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \chi_{+-}^0$, with

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - u \chi_{+-}^{a, a; 0} & -u \chi_{+-}^{a, b; 0} \\ -u \chi_{+-}^{b, a; 0} & 1 - u \chi_{+-}^{b, b; 0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

with $u = U/N$. The matrix elements $\chi_{+-}^{\alpha, \gamma; 0}$ of χ_{+-}^0 are the non-interacting susceptibilities. For $n = 1$ and $T = 0$ we have $\chi_{+-}^{a, a; 0} = \chi_{+-}^{b, b; 0} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} C(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q})$ and $\chi_{+-}^{a, b; 0} = [\chi_{+-}^{b, a; 0}]^* = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} F(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}) C(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q})$, with $F(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}) = [\phi^*(\mathbf{k}) \phi(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})] / [|\phi(\mathbf{k})| |\phi(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})|]$ and $C(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}) = [\epsilon_+(\mathbf{k}) + \epsilon_+(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})] / [(i\omega)^2 - (\epsilon_+(\mathbf{k}) + \epsilon_+(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}))^2]$. The collective magnetic modes are determined from $\det[\mathbf{D}] = 0$, or

$$D(\omega, \mathbf{q}) = 1 - 2u \chi_{+-}^{a, a; 0} + u^2 (\chi_{+-}^{a, a; 0})^2 - u^2 \chi_{+-}^{a, b; 0} \chi_{+-}^{b, a; 0} = 0. \quad (2)$$

Collective modes are only well defined outside the particle-hole continuum otherwise these modes become Landau damped. We searched for well defined magnetic modes, $\omega(\mathbf{q})$, below the continuum of particle-hole excitations, and found no solutions for any value of U . In Fig. 1 we plot $D(\omega, \mathbf{q})$ for eight different \mathbf{q} -vectors and ω ranging from zero to the point where the particle-hole continuum begins. As a consequence, the full structure of the Hubbard model's RPA susceptibility in the honeycomb lattice does not show a collective magnetic mode as proposed in ref. [4]. We have also made two other independent checks of Eq. (2): (i) in the limit $\mathbf{q}, \omega \rightarrow 0$ we obtain the well known Hartree-Fock critical value U_c for the antiferromagnetic instability [5]; (ii) when used in the antiferromagnetic ground state, Eq. (2) does give the correct spin-wave spectrum [6].

- [1] P. W. Anderson, Science **235**, 1196 (1987).
- [2] L. Balents *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 224412 (2002).
- [3] K. Takada *et al.*, Nature **422**, 53 (2003).
- [4] G. Baskaran and S. A. Jafari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 016402 (2002).

- [5] S. Sorella and E. Tosatti, Europhys. Lett. Vol **19**, 699 (1992).
- [6] N. M. R. Peres and M. A. N. Araújo, in preparation.