

analytical calculation of the Peierls-Nabarro pinning barrier for one-dimensional parametric double-well models

Alain M. Dikandé

Centre de Recherches sur les Propriétés Électroniques des Matériaux Avancés, Département de Physique, Faculté des Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke J1K-2R1 Sherbrooke-Québec, CANADA
electronic mail: amdikand@physique.usherb.ca

(November 5, 2018)

Lattice effects on the kink families of two models for one-dimensional nonlinear Klein-Gordon systems with double-well on-site potentials are considered. The analytical expression of the generalized Peierls-Nabarro pinning potential is obtained and confronted with numerical simulations.

Many physical problems have greatly contributed to the interest on double-well potential(DWP) models [1]. Among the most important ones are the mechanism of protonic conductivity in molecular systems [2,3], structural instabilities in one-dimensional(1D) Perovskite-like systems [4] as well as Hydrogen-bonded ferroelectrics [5], and Peierls transition in 1D conductors [6]. The first problem owes its interest to the fundamental role of proton migrations among the surrounding(heavy) ions of the 1D molecular system. The 1D character of these systems sits in the very high conductivity along the Hydrogen-Bond(HB)-about 10^3 times greater-compared to the two other directions [7]. This strong anisotropic conductivity relies on structural defects, that is ionic and bonding defects [8]. Defects are consequent upon proton hopping and bond distortions across the energy barrier between the two most stretched proton positions along the HB. When evoking ferroelectricity and the Peierls transition(an instability of the electronic structure of a 1D electron-phonon system), the most natural framework is that of the Landau theory of second-order phase transition [9]. The "DWP" scheme in this theory is appropriate for such phenomena as the proton ordering transitions in the pseudo-1D ferroelectrics KH_2PO_4 [5] and structural instabilities in 1D organic and inorganic conductors [6]. For all these systems, in an idealized context in the absence of external bias(electric or magnetic fields), defect nucleations(soliton lattice) [10] and the intrinsic discrete structure of the background substrate lattice [11] are the two main processes influencing conductivity. In general they give rise to an activated transport property that consists either in a conducting phase or in an insulating phase [12,13]. In concrete terms, by the Kramers theory of diffusion it is easy to point out that the kink diffusion coefficient in a discrete medium will be weighted by an Arrhenius-like factor $R(\omega_p)$ which accounts for the escape rate of kink from the lattice trapping. This factor depends on the vibration frequency ω_p of the kink in its attempts to jump across the pinning potential barrier, thereby determining its lifetime in the discrete medium. At low temperatures, the discrete kink diffusion coefficient is of the form

$$D \sim D_o R(\omega_p), \quad R(\omega_p) \sim \omega_p \exp(-\beta E_{PN}) \quad (1)$$

E_{PN} in this formula is the lattice-induced trapping potential barrier, the kink pinning frequency ω_p is directly connected to this physical quantity. The activated diffusion coefficient given above is not only interesting in its own right, but also it furnishes relevant knowledge for capturing the essential features of all other transport parameters namely, the kink mobility and conductivity.

While DWP models have so become useful in the understanding of physical problems, insights gained from the earliest model i.e. the ϕ^4 rapidly saturated owing to several shortcomings. For instance, the rigidity prevents from getting further in the theory as to analytically account for the possibility of shifting the potential minima and hump to adjust the model to a desired context. This has been particularly dramatic for molecular solids which backbones are often so flexible that chemical bonds must continuously relax or contract to avoid bond breakings. To overcome these shortcomings, the Morse and double-Morse(DM) potentials were considered. Thus, the DM potential has been used in the recent studies of the protonic conductivity [14] and the proton ordering transitions [15]. For this last context, it has even been argued [15] that the DM model is to date the best candidate giving relatively good account of the so-called "geometric effect" .

In addition to the DM, several other parametrized DWP models are currently present in the literature [16,17]. By their essential virtues they allow theoretical manipulations at one wish. The present work deals with two versions among the most general ones. A main question in the theory of parametrized DWP (PDWP) is their analytical tractability. Indeed, except the soliton solutions that are often easy to obtain, several other physical quantities are explicitly unaccessible. Even their statistical mechanics are most often proceeded numerically [18], or by transfer integral methods which however can open only very narrow paths in the rather wide range of thermodynamic parameters of the system [19]. For the present two variants we will discuss the lattice discreteness properties to both analytical and numerical viewpoints. We start by deriving a generalized analytical expression of the Peierls-Nabarro

potential(PNP) [12]. Next, we carry out a numerical analysis to get into the intimate discrete structure of each model. By this last way we also provide an adequate framework to check the exactness of our analytical results. Starting, consider a 1D nonlinear Klein-Gordon system whose dynamics can be described by the Hamiltonian:

$$H = M_o \sum_{n=1} \left[\frac{1}{2} \phi_{n,t}^2 + \frac{C_o^2}{2\ell^2} (\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)^2 + \omega_o^2 V(\phi_n, \mu) \right] \quad (2)$$

$V(\phi, \mu)$ is the PDWP assumed of the form [17]:

$$V_\mu(\phi) = \frac{a}{8} \left(\frac{1}{\mu^2} \sinh^2(\alpha\phi) - 1 \right)^2 \quad (3)$$

The quantities a and α can take different values, namely:

$$a = a_o, \quad \alpha = \mu \quad (4)$$

For this value set, (3) is a DWP with variable positions of degenerate minima but fixed potential hump.

$$a = \frac{a_o \mu^2}{(1 + \mu^2) \text{arsinh}^2(\mu)}, \quad \alpha = \text{arsinh}(\mu) \quad (5)$$

for this second value set (3) is a DWP with fixed minima but variable potential hump. In the continuum limit ($x = n\ell$, where ℓ is the lattice spacing), the PDWP admits single-kink solutions explicitly given by:

$$\phi_n(s = n\ell - vt, \mu) = \pm \frac{1}{\mu} \text{artanh} \left[\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1 + \mu^2}} \tanh \frac{\gamma s}{\sqrt{2}d(\mu)} \right] \quad (6)$$

Where we set $\gamma^{-2} = 1 - \frac{v^2}{C_o^2}$ and call $d(\mu)$ the kink width:

$$d^2(\mu) = \frac{a_o d_k^2}{a \alpha^2} \frac{\mu^2}{1 + \mu^2}, \quad d_k^2 = \frac{C_o^2}{\omega_o^2 a_o} \quad (7)$$

d_k in this last relation is the kink "bare" width. At this step it is instructive to remark that according to the two model parameters, only the first will give rise to kink family whose widths effectively vary(decrease) as function of (with increasing) μ , whereas all kinks of the second family have their widths bounded to the constant d_k whatever μ . However, their "kink shape" is deeply affected by the deformability parameter as noticed elsewhere [17].

As our primary goal is the kink-lattice interactions, proceeding with we appeal to the PNP approach which assumes the existence of an effective potential field provided by the lattice substrate and via which kinks get pinned due to lattice discreteness. Several techniques are known for this problem. According to the recent [20](the collective-coordinate method), lattice discreteness act on the kink in two different aspects namely on the kink trajectory(time dependence of the kink center-of-mass coordinate within the discrete PNP), and shape. The renormalization of the kink shape(discreteness effect-induced kink shape dressing) is though to be manifest of radiations by the pinned kink, of discrete phonons as a shape response to the lattice discrete structure. To our knowledge there is yet a sound experimental evidence of such phenomenon, so we will not consider this aspect. Moreover, we are interested in the kink static configuration which is a suitable approximation of the "pinned-kink" configuration so regular in structural transition processes. Thus we are left with the sole problem of calculating the PNP. We start by writing the total energy of the discrete system considering the static part of eq. (2):

$$U = \sum_{n=1} G(n), \quad G(n) = M_o C_o^2 \left(\frac{d\phi_n}{dn} \right)^2 \quad (8)$$

The discrete sum in (8) can be evaluated using the Poisson summation formula [12,13],

$$U = M_o C_o^2 \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dn \left(\frac{d\phi_n}{dn} \right)^2 \exp(2\pi i m n) \quad (9)$$

The integrand in this last equation is derived from the single-kink solution eq. (6), which gives:

$$\left(\frac{d\phi_n}{dn}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{B_o}{\cosh(\frac{\sqrt{2}\ell n}{d(\mu)}) + \cosh(X_o)}\right)^2, \quad B_o^2 = \frac{2\ell(1+\mu^2)}{d^2(\mu)} \quad (10)$$

We take only the real part of eq. (9) which is equivalent to restrict the sum over cosine harmonics. Otherwise, this is consistent with the fact that $G(n)$ is an even function of n . It turns out that the coefficients of this series must be determined by the following class of integrals:

$$\int_0^\infty dX \frac{\cos(XY_m)}{[\cosh(X) + \cosh(X_o)]^2} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{\sinh^{3/2}(X_o)\Gamma(2+iY_m)\Gamma(2-iY_m)}{\Gamma(2)} \wp_{-1/2+iY_m}[\coth(X_o)] \quad (11)$$

$$X = \frac{2n\ell}{\sqrt{2}d(\mu)}, \quad Y_m = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi md(\mu)}{\ell} \quad (12)$$

where \wp is the Associate Legendre function [21]. The complex-argument Gamma function Γ appearing in this set of integrals is defined such that:

$$\Gamma(2+iY_m)\Gamma(2-iY_m) = \frac{|\Gamma(2)|^2}{\prod_{k=0}^\infty \left[1 + \frac{Y_m^2}{(2+k)^2}\right]} \quad (13)$$

The product function is evaluated by the standard formula [22]:

$$\prod_{k=0}^\infty \left[1 + \frac{4Y_m^2}{(2k+1)^2\pi^2}\right] = \cosh(Y_m) \quad (14)$$

Rewriting (9) as a Fourier series in m , combinations of eqs. (10)-(14) lead to the following expression of the Fourier components:

$$U_m = \frac{2d(\mu)\sqrt{\pi}\sinh^{3/2}(X_o)B_o^2M_oC_o^2}{\ell \cosh(\frac{\sqrt{2}\pi^2 md(\mu)}{\ell})} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \wp_{-1/2+iY_m}^{-3/2}[\coth(X_o)] \quad (15)$$

The most indicated framework where to check the consistency of our analytical theory is the numerical treatment. We performed the integration in (9) following an extended midpoint scheme. Results are displayed on figures 1 and 2 for arbitrary values of the deformability parameter μ . The main variable here is the dimensionless kink bare width $\frac{d_k}{\ell}$. d_k corresponds to the asymptotic limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$, where the two models reduce to the well-known ϕ^4 model. Figures 1a and 1b are the kink continuum energies at rest i.e. $E_k = U_o$, while figures 2a and 2b represent the PNP barriers $E_{PN} = U_1$. Curves are plotted in unit of $M_oC_o^2$. Though the figures indicate rather complex behaviours of the PNP barrier with respect to μ , their most striking feature is the drastic exponential fall-off of the pinning barrier with increasing μ . For the first model, this feature relates to the fact that the greater the deformability parameter the narrower the kink. On the contrary, the kink width in the second model is independent on μ but however, one clearly sees that the corresponding PNP barriers show almost the same dependence on μ as in the first model.

The drastic fall-off of the PNP barriers can be interpreted in terms of the kinks the overcoming lattice pinning effect. Such a behaviour suggests an enhancement of the conducting regime in the discrete system at relatively narrow kink widths. This sounds consistent with previous predictions [10,12,13,20] within the ϕ^4 theory. otherwise, by tuning the deformability parameter(which in the context of 1D molecular systems may correspond to adjust the equilibrium positions of ions, for instance), it is expected that the correct order of magnitude of transport parameters of DWP systems will be obtained with relatively best accuracy [23].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank P. Wofo and T. C. Kofané of the University of yaoundé for enriching discussions.

- [1] M. Remoissenet: "Waves called solitons, Concepts and Experiments", Springer-Verlag, 2nd ed.(1999).
- [2] A. Kuwada, A. R. McGhie and M. M. Labels, J. Chem. Phys. 52, 1438(1970).
- [3] D. M. Alexander and J. A. Krumhansl, Phys. Rev.33, 7172(1986).
- [4] C. M. Varma, Phys. Rev. B14, 244(1976).
- [5] R. Blinc and B. Zeks, "Soft Modes in Ferroelectrics and Antiferroelectrics", North-Holland(Amsterdam)1974.
- [6] A. J. Heeger, S. Kivelson, J. R. Schrieffer and W. P. Su, Rev. Mod. Phys. 60, 781(1988).
- [7] J. Vanderkoy, J. D. Cuthbert and H. E. Petch, Can. J. Phys. 42, 1871(1964).
- [8] J. D. Bernal and R. H. Fowler, J. Chem. Phys. 1, 515(1933).
- [9] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifschitz, "Statistical Physics", Pergamon-Oxford(1958).
- [10] M. H. Jensen and P. Bak, Phys. Rev. B27, 6853(1983); B29, 6280(1984).
- [11] S. Aubry, J. Phys.(paris)44, 147(1983).
- [12] P. Bak and V. L. Pokrovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett.47, 958(1981); P. Bak, Phys. Rev. Lett.46, 791(1981).
- [13] V. L. Pokrovsky, J. Phys.(Paris)42, 761(1981).
- [14] O. Yanovitskii, G. Vlastou-Tsinganos and N. Flytzanis, Phys. Rev. B48, 12645(1993).
- [15] S. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. B42, 10488(1990) and references therein; H. Konwent, P. Machnikowski and A. Radosz, J. Phys: Condens. mat.8, 4325 (1996).
- [16] S. N. Behera and A. Khare, J. Phys.(Paris) C.42, 314(1981).
- [17] A. M. Dikandé and T. C. Kofané, J. Phys.: Condens. Mat.3, L5203(1991); Solid State Commun. 89, 559(1994).
- [18] A. Khare, S. Habib and A. Saxena, Phys. Rev. Lett.79, 3797(1997).
- [19] A. M. Dikandé and T. C. Kofané, Solid State Commun. 89, 283(1994).
- [20] C. R. Willis, M. El-Batanouny and P. Stancioff, Phys. Rev. B33, 1904(1986).
- [21] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, "Table of Integrals, Series and Products", 5th ed.(1994: Alan Jeffrey, editor) P.539, n^o 3.983-7 and P.1023, n^o 8.739 .
- [22] In ref. [21] p.45, n^o 1.431-4 and P.945, n^o 8.325-1.
- [23] P. Woaf, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 58, 1147(1997); P. Woaf, G. H. Nguénoué and A. S. Bocosah, Phys. Rev. E55, 1209(1997).

I. FIGURE CAPTIONS:

Figure 1a: Reduced continuum energy of a kink at rest for the first PDWP model in the text.

Figure 1b: Reduced continuum energy of a kink at rest for the second PDWP model.

Figure 2a: The reduced Peierls-Nabarro potential amplitudes for the first PDWP model.

figure 2a: The reduced Peierls-Nabarro potential amplitudes for the second PDWP model.