The anisotropy of optical conductivity derived from the energy splitting in iron arsenides
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Abstract. We examine the anisotropy of optical conductivity above the Néel temperature in iron arsenides by mean-field calculation in a five-band Hubbard model. In order to represent the anisotropy, we artificially introduce the energy splitting between \(d_{zx}\) and \(d_{yz}\) orbitals. The calculated spectra are not enough to explain the anisotropy observed in experiments. The optical conductivity in the low-energy region is consistent with the observation, while in the high-energy region not. This implies that there should be some other effects to give rise to the anisotropy in the high-energy region.

1. Introduction

In-plane anisotropy is remarkable in iron arsenide superconductors and their parent compounds. In the antiferromagnetically ordered phase with orthorhombic structure, an electric anisotropy in the FeAs plane has been reported from scanning tunnelling microscopy [1], resistivity [2, 3], optical conductivity [4, 5], and angle resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) [6, 7]. The ARPES measurements above the Néel temperature \(T_N\) have shown the lift of degeneracy between \(d_{zx}\) and \(d_{yz}\) orbitals [8], which indicates a strong influence of the orbital degree of freedom on the nematic order and the electronic anisotropy below \(T_N\) [9]. In fact, the in-plane anisotropy of optical conductivity below \(T_N\) has been explained by taking into account orbital characters of interband excitation [10, 11].

In this paper, we discuss the anisotropic behavior of optical conductivity above \(T_N\) with an energy splitting of \(d_{zx}\) and \(d_{yz}\) orbitals. Experiments [4, 12] show an anisotropy above \(T_N\), and we compare them with our result. We find that the energy splitting is not enough to explain the anisotropy of optical conductivity in a wide range of energy.

2. Model and method

Considering an Fe square lattice, we start with the mean-field Hamiltonian for a \(d\)-electron system

\[
H_{\text{MF}} = \sum_{\mu, \nu} \sum_{k, \sigma} H_{\mu, \nu}(k, \sigma) c_{\mu \sigma}^\dagger c_{\nu \sigma},
\]

(1)
where $c_{k\mu\sigma}^\dagger$ creates an electron with a wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ and a spin $\sigma$ at an orbital $\mu$. The component of $H_{\text{MF}}$ is

$$H_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k}, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{\Delta} t(\Delta_x, \Delta_y; \mu, \nu) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\Delta} + \epsilon_\mu \delta_{\mu,\nu} + J \left[ \left( -\sum_{\mu'} \langle n_{\mu'}\mu'\sigma \rangle + 5 \langle n_{\mu\sigma} \rangle - 2n_0 \right) \delta_{\mu,\nu} + \left( 4 \langle n_{\mu\sigma} \rangle + \langle n_{\mu'\sigma} \rangle \right) (1 - \delta_{\mu,\nu}) \right] + U \left[ \left( n_0 - \langle n_{\mu\sigma} \rangle \right) \delta_{\mu,\nu} - \langle n_{\mu'\sigma} \rangle (1 - \delta_{\mu,\nu}) \right],$$

(2)

where $U$ is the intraorbital Coulomb interaction, $J$ is the Hund coupling and the pair hopping, $\langle n_{\mu\sigma} \rangle \equiv N^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle c_{\mathbf{k}\mu\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\mu\sigma} \rangle$, and $n_0 \equiv \sum_{\mu,\sigma} \langle n_{\mu\sigma} \rangle$ (in BaFe$_2$As$_2$, $n_0 = 6$). $N$ is the number of $\mathbf{k}$ points in the first Brillouin zone (BZ). $t(\Delta_x, \Delta_y; \mu, \nu)$ and $\epsilon_\mu$ are the in-plane hopping integrals and on-site energies, respectively, presented by Ref. [13]. The Fe-Fe bond length is set to unity and the $x$- and $y$-directions are along to the nearest Fe-Fe bonds.

We self-consistently solve mean-field equations with $\langle n_{\mu\sigma} \rangle$. The quasiparticle state $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mu\sigma} = \sum_{\mu} \psi_{\mu\sigma}(\mathbf{k}) c_{\mathbf{k}\mu\sigma}^\dagger$ diagonalizes the Hamiltonian with the eigenvalue $E_{\mathbf{k}\mu\sigma}$, where $\epsilon$ is the band index. The average $\langle \cdots \rangle$ is taken at zero temperature in our calculation. The computations are performed on a system with $N = 500 \times 500$. We set $U = 1.2$ eV and $J = 0.23$ eV as our previous calculation [11]. Comparing the results with those in the case $U, J = 0$, we find that the results are almost insensitive.

Interband contributions to the real part of the optical conductivity are expressed as [15]

$$\sigma_{\alpha\beta}(\omega > 0) = \frac{\pi}{\hbar} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \epsilon, \epsilon', \sigma} \left[ f(E_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon\sigma}) - f(E_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon'\sigma}) \right] \zeta^{(\alpha)}_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon\sigma} \zeta^{(\beta)}_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon'\sigma} \delta(E_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon\sigma} - E_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon'\sigma} - \omega),$$

(3)

where $\epsilon$ is the elementary charge, $f$ is the Fermi distribution function, and $\zeta^{(\alpha)}_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon\sigma}$ arising from the current operator has the form

$$\zeta^{(\alpha)}_{\mathbf{k}\epsilon\sigma} = \frac{1}{\Delta_{\mu,\nu}} \sum_{\Delta_{\mu,\nu}} \Delta^{(\alpha)} t(\Delta_x, \Delta_y; \mu, \nu) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\Delta} \psi_{\mu\sigma}(\mathbf{k}) \psi^*_{\mu'\sigma}(\mathbf{k}),$$

(4)

with $\Delta^{(\alpha)}$ the $\alpha$ component of the vector $\Delta$. Equation (3) does not contain the Drude component coming from the intraband transition.

We use a renormalized energy scale with a factor 1/3 to the energy axis: 0.1 eV in the figures of optical conductivity shown below corresponds to 0.3 eV on the original scale of our calculations. This factor is taken from comparisons between the dispersion observed by ARPES and the theoretical dispersion determined by first-principles calculation [14, 16]. The factor corresponds to the band renormalization effect that is not included in either the first-principles calculation or our mean-field calculation.

3. Optical conductivity

As discussed above, the electric anisotropy has been confirmed by recent experiments above the magneto-structural transition, and this suggests the presence of nematic order. From the comparison between ARPES and band structure calculation [8], this effect would be explained by on-site energy splitting $\delta$ between $d_{zx}$ and $d_{yz}$. We replace the on-site energies $\epsilon_{zx}$ and $\epsilon_{yz}$ in Equation (2) with

$$\epsilon'_{zx} = \epsilon_{zx} + \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad \epsilon'_{yz} = \epsilon_{yz} - \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

(5)
Since the $d_{zx}$ and $d_{yz}$ band rises up and falls down, respectively, in the ARPES measurement, $\delta$ should be negative.

The evolution of optical conductivity $\sigma_{xx}(\omega)$ and $\sigma_{yy}(\omega)$ along the $x$- and $y$-direction is illustrated in Figure 1 (a) and (b), respectively. When $\delta = 0$, these completely coincide. Corresponding to the appearance of the energy splitting, $\sigma_{xx}$ and $\sigma_{yy}$ show different behavior. In Figure 1 (a), $\sigma_{xx}$ is suppressed around 0.05 eV and enhanced around 0.1 eV and 0.37 eV. In Figure 1 (b), $\sigma_{yy}$ is also suppressed around 0.05 eV and, in contrast to $\sigma_{xx}$, suppressed around 0.37 eV. In addition to these changes, a peak structure appears around 0.17 eV in $\sigma_{yy}$.

We examine the excitations at 0.1 eV, where $\sigma_{xx}$ is enhanced while $\sigma_{yy}$ is almost unchanged by the energy splitting. The excitations contributing to $\sigma_{xx}$ and $\sigma_{yy}$ occur near the $X$ point in the BZ. In the $k$ points where the large contribution to $\sigma_{xx}$ with the energy splitting, the orbitals of the initial and final states are mainly $d_{xy}$ and $d_{yz}$, respectively. However, in the same $k$ points with no energy splitting, the orbitals of the initial and final states are mixture of $d_{yz}$ and $d_{xy}$. On the other hand, the excitations contributing to $\sigma_{yy}$ occur on the $k_x$ axis; the orbitals of the initial and final states are dominantly $d_{yz}$ and $d_{xy}$, respectively, in either case of the finite or zero energy splitting. Thus, the change of orbital character induces the anisotropy of optical conductivity.

In order to compare $\sigma_{xx}$ with $\sigma_{yy}$, the optical conductivity of each direction at $\delta = 0.20$ eV is plotted together in Figure 2. This shows that $\sigma_{xx}$ is larger than $\sigma_{yy}$ in the whole energy range, except for around 0.17 eV, where a peak structure appears in $\sigma_{yy}$. In the optical conductivity measurement above $T_N$ [12], $\sigma_{xx}$ is more suppressed than $\sigma_{yy}$ in low-energy region (below 1350 cm$^{-1}$), while $\sigma_{yy}$ is slightly larger than $\sigma_{xx}$ in the higher-energy region. Our results are, therefore, consistent with the measurement in the low-energy region, but are not in high-energy region.

4. Conclusion
We introduce the on-site energy splitting between $d_{zx}$ and $d_{yz}$ and obtain that the anisotropy of optical conductivity above $T_N$ is consistent with the measurement in the low-energy region. However, the anisotropy in the high-energy region is inconsistent with the measurement. This implies that we should consider another effect to cause energy-dependent anisotropy, such as energy dependence of self-energy.
**Figure 2.** The comparison of optical conductivity between $\sigma_{xx}(\omega)$ and $\sigma_{yy}(\omega)$ where the energiesplitting $\delta = -0.20$ eV.

After compiling this work, we became aware of a similar calculation about the anisotropy of optical conductivity under orbital nematic order [17].
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