Phenomenological description of competing antiferromagnetism and \( d \)-wave superconductivity in high \( T_c \) cuprates

Bumsoo Kyung and A. M. Tremblay

Département de physique et Centre de recherche sur les propriétés électroniques de matériaux avancés.
1Institut canadien de recherches avancées
Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada J1K 2R1
(April 23, 2002)

In this paper the phase diagram of high \( T_c \) cuprates is qualitatively studied in the context of competing orders: antiferromagnetism, \( d \)-wave superconductivity and \( d \)-density wave. Local correlation functions are estimated from a mean-field solution of the \( t-J \) Hamiltonian. With decreasing doping the superconducting mean-field \( T_c^{MF} \) and order parameter \( d \) begin to decrease below some characteristic doping \( x_c \approx 0.2 \). where short-range antiferromagnetic correlations begin to develop. Dynamical properties that involve the energy spectrum, such as the normal state pseudogap, are calculated from effective interactions that are consistent with the above-mentioned local correlation functions. The total excitation gap \( \Delta_{tg} \) (in the superconducting state) and the normal state pseudogap \( \Delta_{pg} \) are in good agreement with experimental results. Properties of the condensate are estimated using an effective pairing interaction \( V_{eff} \) which takes into account (pair breaking) antiferromagnetic correlations. These condensate properties include condensation energy \( U(0) \), coherence gap \( \Delta_{cg} \) and critical field \( H_{c2} \). The calculated coherence gap closely follows the doping dependence of \( T_c \) or \( d \), and is approximately given as \( \Delta_{cg} \sim \Delta_{c} \sim \Delta_{pg} \) within our numerical uncertainties. The systematic decrease of superfluidity \( (d, U(0), \Delta_{cg}, H_{c2}) \), and systematic increase of \( \Delta_{pg} \) and \( \Delta_{c} \) with decreasing doping below \( x_c \) have their natural explanation in our approach. The overall description is however qualitative since it does not appear possible to obtain results that are in quantitative agreement with experiment for all physical quantities.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Fd, 71.27.+a

I. INTRODUCTION

Fifteen years have passed since the discovery of high temperature superconductivity in \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Ba}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) by Bednorz and Müller, yet there is no widely accepted theoretical explanation of the many anomalous features found in these materials. This is due to a large extent to the lack of reliable theoretical methods to study this strongly-correlated electron problem. Dynamical Mean Field theory, for example, \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \), works extremely well in three or higher dimensions but it lacks the momentum-dependent self-energy effects that are intrinsic to a two-dimensional situation with strong antiferromagnetic fluctuations. More recent dynamical cluster approaches correct this defect but these methods are still in their infancy and are entirely numerical. In this paper, we step back and take a more humble stand, seeking the simplest phenomenological approach that describes the main overall features of high-temperature superconductors. Let us recall what these features are.

First consider the generic phase diagram of a hole-doped cuprate \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) in the doping \( (x = 1 - n) \) and temperature \( (T) \) plane. Near half-filling and at low temperature, antiferromagnetic (AF) long-range order appears and is destroyed by 2% doping concentration \( (x = 0.02) \). When \( x \) reaches 0.05, superconducting (SC) long-range order starts to appear and is also destroyed by about 30% doping. In between them, \( T_c \) reaches a maximum value at \( x \approx 0.15 \). The SC gap was found to have mainly \( d \)-wave character, \( (d_{x^2-y^2}) \) in contrast to conventional BCS superconductors \( (s) \) with an isotropic \( s \)-wave gap.

Second, various recent experiments also show the existence of a crossover temperature \( T^* \) higher than \( T_c \) in underdoped and optimally doped samples. Below this so-called pseudogap temperature \( T^* \), low-frequency spectral weight begins to be strongly suppressed in many physical quantities. This anomalous phenomenon has been observed in angle resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES), \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) specific heat, \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) tunneling, \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) NMR, \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) and optical conductivity. Surprisingly the doping dependences of \( T^* \) and \( T_c \) are completely different in spite of their possibly close relationship suggested by ARPES \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) and tunneling \( \text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4 \) experiments. At optimal doping, where \( T_c \) is maximum, various non-Fermi liquid (NFL) properties are observed in the normal state. These include the linear temperature dependence (up to 1000 K) of ab-plane resistivity, the quadratic \( T \) dependence of Hall angle and so on. Far beyond optimal doping, there are indications that the normal state properties are probably well described by the conventional Landau Fermi liquid. Near and below optimal doping, the superfluid density \( n_s/m \) is systematically suppressed...
with decreasing doping in spite of the increasing excitation gap amplitude, as measured by ARPES, in the superconducting state. The resulting $2\Delta_{max}/k_BT_c$ ratio is very different from the universal BCS value, 4.3 for d-wave symmetry. In the overdoped regime, however, the SC properties are probably well explained in the conventional weak-coupling BCS theory, although this has not yet been checked in detail. 19

The approach that we take is as follows. First, we do a simple mean-field analysis of the $t – J$ Hamiltonian whose results are used only to obtain estimates for zero-temperature order parameters and to compute equal-time local correlation functions (such as double occupancy). Dynamical quantities, such as the response functions and single-particle spectral weight, are computed by using the values of the local correlation functions obtained in mean field to fix the value of the renormalized interaction vertices. We do not consider the possibility of spin-charge separation 20 21 but we take into account the no-double-occupancy constraint by replacing projectors in the $t – J$ Hamiltonian by their mean-field bosonic value, namely doping $x$. This is an effective-mass approximation. We cannot address the issue of a quantum critical point (QCP) 22 at $x_c$ even if it exists at the mean-field level. Non-Fermi liquid behavior above the pseudogap temperature is also beyond the domain of validity of our approach. The regime we consider is one where the temperature would normally be low enough for a Fermi liquid to appear but where fluctuations destroy that phase, especially in the underdoped regime.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section II the $t – J$ Hamiltonian is decoupled, in a mean-field approximation, with competing (SC, AF and $d$–density wave) order parameters. The mean-field Hamiltonian is diagonalized to compute mean-field ordering temperatures $T_{c_{MF}}$, $T_{N_{MF}}$ and mean-field order parameters $d$ and $m$. Dynamical quantities such as the normal-state pseudogap are computed and compared with experimental results in Section III. In Section IV the results of the previous sections are gathered to discuss the phase diagram of high $T_c$ cuprates. In Section V we discuss some of the properties of the SC condensate, such as the condensation energy, upper critical magnetic field and the coherence gap, using a model that takes into account the effect of (pair breaking) AF correlations in an effective manner. The present results are compared with some of the leading theories for the high $T_c$ superconductivity in Section VI as well as with experiments. The last Section summarizes the results and discusses its main limitation.

II. MEAN-FIELD $T – J$ HAMILTONIAN

Right after the discovery of high temperature superconductors, Anderson 23 first proposed the one-band Hubbard model as the simplest Hamiltonian that might capture the correct low energy physics of copper oxides. The $t – J$ model is known to be the large $U$ limit of the Hubbard Hamiltonian under certain assumptions. The $t – J$ model is described by the Hamiltonian

$$
H = -t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma} \left( (1 - n_{i,-\sigma}) c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} (1 - n_{j,\sigma}) + H.c. \right) + J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \left( \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - \frac{1}{4} m_i n_j \right) - \mu \sum_{i,\sigma} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma},
$$

(1)

where $c_{i,\sigma}$ destroys an electron at site $i$ with spin $\sigma$ on a two-dimensional square lattice, $t$ is the hopping matrix element between nearest neighbors $< i, j >$ and $J$ denotes superexchange coupling. Double occupancy of two electrons at the same lattice site is forbidden in the Hilbert space corresponding to Eq. (1) as can be seen by the projection operator $(1 - n_{i,-\sigma})$ in the hopping term. The chemical potential $\mu$ controls the electron density $n$. Finally, $\vec{S}_i$ and $n_i$ are spin and charge density operators, respectively, and they are defined by

$$
\vec{S}_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} c_{i,\alpha}^\dagger \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha, \beta} c_{i,\beta},
$$

$$
n_i = \sum_{\sigma} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma},
$$

(2)

where the components of $\vec{\sigma}$ are $2 \times 2$ spin Pauli matrices.

In general the (static) mean-field description is not accurate for strongly correlated electron systems such as the Hubbard and $t – J$ models in the physically relevant regime. Nevertheless it is known that, for example, the mean-field description of the antiferromagnetic state at $x = 0$ is quite accurate, even at large $U$. For example, spin waves with accurate spin-wave velocities can be obtained by performing RPA in the ordered phase. 24

We take the point of view that mean-field theory can be useful to select the leading correlations when there are several competing order parameters in the low energy sector. Due to the neglect of spatial and quantum fluctuations in mean-field theory, some caution is necessary in interpreting the results. First, the mean-field phase line is to be decreased in temperature to take into account the effect of quantum fluctuations (such as Kanamori-Brueckner screening 25). Second, since we work in two dimensions where antiferromagnetic long-range order is prohibited by the Mermin-Wagner theorem, the renormalized mean-field Néel transition line has to be interpreted as the onset of the corresponding short-range correlations instead of as a true thermodynamic phase transition. Whether given short-range correlations eventually grow to long-range order at low temperature or not, should be answered by studying how the zero-frequency correlation length grows when temperature is lowered. This question, as well as that of dynamical or quantum fluctuations that may take place on very short distance
scales.\footnote{3} can be examined by the fluctuation theory that we describe in Section \ref{sec:5}.

In the spirit of a mean-field approximation, terms with more than two operators should be decoupled in all possible ways. In principle there are infinitely many ways of decoupling the Heisenberg part of the Hamiltonian. In this situation, guidance from experiments and past theoretical considerations is helpful to find the most important leading correlations of the model, correlations whose stability is studied \textit{a posteriori}. We consider three competing mean-field order parameters, $m$, $d$, and $y$ for AF, $d$-wave SC, and $d$-density wave \cite{26} orders respectively, which are defined \cite{27} by

$$m = \langle \hat{m} \rangle = 1/(2N) \sum_{\vec{k},\sigma} \sigma \langle c_{\vec{k}+\vec{Q},\sigma}^\dagger c_{\vec{k},\sigma} \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3) 

$$d = \langle \hat{d} \rangle = 1/N \sum_{\vec{k}} \phi_d(\vec{k}) \langle c_{\vec{k},\uparrow}^\dagger c_{\vec{k},\downarrow} \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4) 

$$y = \langle \hat{y} \rangle = i/(2N) \sum_{\vec{k},\sigma} \phi_d(\vec{k}) \langle c_{\vec{k}+\vec{Q},\sigma}^\dagger c_{\vec{k},\sigma} \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (5) 

where $N$ is the total number of lattice sites, $\phi_d(\vec{k}) = \cos k_x - \cos k_y$ is the $d$–wave form factor and $\vec{Q}$ is the (commensurate) AF wave vector $(\pi, \pi)$ in two dimensions. The extended $s$–wave analogs of $d$–wave superconductivity and $d$–density wave orders are also present in the $t$–$J$ Hamiltonian, but they are always less relevant in mean-field studies. In this paper we restrict ourselves to a uniform solution. At the end of the paper the issue of inhomogeneous modulation of spin and charge degrees of freedom will be briefly discussed in the context of the present results. A similar mean-field decoupling for the AF and SC channels was previously considered by several groups.\cite{28,29} In the present study the projected operator $c_{\uparrow,\sigma}(1-n_{\downarrow,\sigma})$ is separated into the original electron operator $c_{\sigma}$ times the expectation of the bosonic operator $(1-n_{\downarrow,\sigma})$ which is taken as $x^{1/2}$. As long as the no-double-occupancy constraint is globally imposed, the average number of electron $n_e$ in our study is equal to $1-n_h$ with $x=n_h$. Clearly, at half-filling, one recovers the Heisenberg Hamiltonian. In addition, as we shall see later, for $T=0$, $n=1$, the no-double-occupancy constraint is satisfied exactly because the AF solution allows only one electron per site with the full moment. This would not be the case if we considered only $d$–wave and $d$–density wave mean-field solutions.

For a more systematic implementation of this constraint beyond the mean-field level, the slave boson representation can be useful.\cite{30,31} In the slave boson representation, an electron is explicitly decomposed into a spinon (fermion) and a holon (boson), $c_{\uparrow,\sigma}^\dagger = f_{\uparrow,\sigma}^\dagger b_{\sigma}$. The latter bosonic operator corresponds to $(1-n_{\downarrow,\sigma})$ in our approach and our global constraint $1=n_e+n_h$ corresponds to the no double-occupancy constraint in slave boson mean-field theories.

In terms of mean-field order parameters $m$, $d$, and $y$, the mean-field $t$–$J$ Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{\vec{k},\sigma} \varepsilon(\vec{k}) c_{\vec{k},\sigma}^\dagger c_{\vec{k},\sigma} - 4J m \hat{m} - J d \hat{d} - J y \hat{y} + F_0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (6) 

where

$$F_0 = N(2Jm^2 + Jd^2 + J y^2 - \mu).$$  \hspace{1cm} (7) 

$\varepsilon(\vec{k}) \simeq -2tx(\cos k_x + \cos k_y) - \mu$ with $x$ the hole density. The correlated hopping is taken into account through $x$ in a mean-field spirit, as explained above. In other words, the no-double-occupancy constraint manifests itself here as an effective mass, not as a change in the number of carriers. One has to keep in mind however that, at this level, $\varepsilon(\vec{k})$ and the corresponding effective mass are only bare values that are renormalized by interactions. This is discussed further at the end of the following section.

Previous studies have suggested that the $d$–density wave order parameter becomes important only quite close to half-filling.\cite{32} Here we find that this order parameter is \textit{never} a self-consistent solution of the mean-field equations when mean-field AF order is explicitly considered in Eq. (6). Hence, in the following, we restrict ourselves to AF and SC order parameters. By introducing a four component field operator $\Psi_{\vec{k}}^\dagger$

$$\Psi_{\vec{k}}^\dagger = (c_{\vec{k},\uparrow}^\dagger, c_{\vec{k},\downarrow}, c_{\vec{k}+\vec{Q},\uparrow}^\dagger, c_{\vec{k}-\vec{Q},\downarrow}),$$ 

Eq. (6) may be written in a more compact form to reflect the competition between AF and SC order,

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{\vec{k}} \Psi_{\vec{k}}^\dagger M_{\vec{k}} \Psi_{\vec{k}} + F_0.$$

The prime symbol on the summation restricts the summation over wave vectors to the magnetic Brillouin zone in order to take into account the doubling of the unit cell in the presence of (commensurate) AF order. Small incommensuration would not change appreciably the value of the local correlation functions that we will compute with the mean-field solution, hence we limit ourselves to the commensurate case. The matrix $M_{\vec{k}}$ in the last equation is given by

$$M_{\vec{k}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon(\vec{k}) & -Jd \phi_d(\vec{k}) & -2Jm & 0 \\
-Jd \phi_d(\vec{k}) & -\varepsilon(\vec{k}) & 0 & -2Jm \\
-2Jm & 0 & \varepsilon(\vec{k}+\vec{Q}) & Jd \phi_d(\vec{k}) \\
0 & -2Jm & Jd \phi_d(\vec{k}) & -\varepsilon(\vec{k}+\vec{Q})
\end{pmatrix}. $$  \hspace{1cm} (8) 

The energy eigenvalues of $M_{\vec{k}}$ yield four branches to the energy dispersion $\pm E_{\pm}(\vec{k})$.
where $g(\vec{k})$ is given as

$$g(\vec{k}) = \left( (\varepsilon_{\vec{k}}^2 - \varepsilon_{\vec{k}+\vec{Q}}^2) / 4 + ((\varepsilon_{\vec{k}} - \varepsilon_{\vec{k}+\vec{Q}})(2Jm) \right)^{1/2}. \quad (10)$$

The free energy is easily obtained either from the trace formula or from the Feynman theorem

$$F = -2T \sum_{\vec{k}} \sum_{\alpha=\pm} \log(2 \cosh \frac{E_{\alpha}(\vec{k})}{2T}) + F_0. \quad \text{Two mean-field equations are obtained from the station-}$$

ary condition on

$$E_{\pm}(\vec{k}) = \left[ (\varepsilon_{\vec{k}}^2 + \varepsilon_{\vec{k}+\vec{Q}}^2) / 2 + (2Jm)^2 + (Jd\phi_d(\vec{k}))^2 \right]^{1/2}, \quad (9)$$

The spin-triplet order parameter $\langle \vec{c}_{\vec{k}+\vec{Q}}^\dagger c_{\vec{k}} \rangle$ is “dynamically generated”\cite{33} when the two mean-field order parameters $m$ and $d$ coexist, even when it is not explicitly included in the mean-field factorization. We have checked that including this order parameter in the mean-field factorization changes the value of local correlation functions, such as $\langle |\Delta_d(0)|^2 \rangle$ which we need below for the dynamical calculation, by less than one percent. The values of $m$ and $d$, on the other hand, change by about 10%. The inclusion of this order parameter would then change the results of the present paper only quantitatively and at the few percent level only. We do not include it for now for simplicity. It should be included at a later stage when refining the approach.

Even though it is only an intermediate step in our calculations, for completeness we show in Fig.\ref{fig:fig1} the calculated mean-field phase diagram and zero-temperature mean-field order parameters $m$ and $d$ for $t/J = 3$. The AF order parameter dominates near half-filling and vanishes beyond $x = x_c \simeq 0.20$. On the other hand, $d$-wave SC correlations keep growing with decreasing doping down to $x_c \simeq 0.20$ where the AF order parameter is non-zero. Below $x_c$, we observe that $T_c^{MF}$ and $d$ begin to monotonically decrease with decreasing doping. The physical origin of this decrease of $T_c^{MF}$ and $d$ should be a combination of the effects of local moment formation and of the onset of AF correlations that break time-reversal symmetry, both of which lead to the destruction of the SC state. The importance of AF correlations in reducing $T_c$ to the experimental value ($\simeq 100 K$) was recently pointed out by Weng.\cite{34} In between half-filling and $x_c$, AF and SC orders coexist at the mean-field level. The overall features are similar to previous results\cite{35} based on a phenomenological model in which SC and AF orders come from different interaction terms.

The dashed curves in Fig.\ref{fig:fig1}(a) and (b) are $T_c^{MF}$ and $d$ when the interaction piece of the Hamiltonian is decoupled only in the (spinon) pairing channel in the slave boson mean-field theory\cite{35} or, equivalently, when $m$ is forced to zero in the present approach. This shows that, by itself, the diverging effective mass is not enough to reduce $T_c^{MF}$ and $d$ to zero at half-filling. In the slave-boson theory, $T_c^{MF}$ and $d$ keep increasing with decreasing doping. $T_c^{MF}$ is interpreted as pseudogap temperature $T^*$ and the corresponding ground state is dubbed as the resonating valence bond (RVB) state.\cite{23} In this theory, the true $T_c$ is governed by the Bose-condensation temperature of holons, which scales as $x$. Then the maximum $T_c$ occurs at very small doping concentration ($x < 0.05$).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig1.png}
\caption{(a) Calculated mean-field phase diagram in doping ($x = 1 - n$) and temperature ($T$) plane and (b) mean-field order parameters for $t/J = 3$. $T_c^{MF}$ and $d^{MF}(m = 0)$ are mean-field AF and SC ordering temperatures, while $m$ and $d$ are mean-field AF and SC order parameters. $T_c^{MF}(m = 0)$ and $d(m = 0)$ (dashed curves) are SC ordering temperature and order parameter, respectively, when the mean-field factorization of the interaction term ($J$) is in the SC channel only. The dashed curve for $T_c^{MF}(d = 0)$ is also shown in (b) but it is indistinguishable from the case where $d$ takes its mean-field value.}
\end{figure}
More recent versions of this slave-boson mean-field theory seem to correct this defect.

In the present study, the behavior of the mean-field order parameters reflects the competition between AF and SC correlations. As can be seen in Fig. I, SC correlations are most significantly modified due to the presence of (pair breaking) AF correlations, while the latter are virtually unchanged by the former. When Eq. 3 is converted into an effective Hamiltonian where the competing order parameters are expressed in terms of operators we find

$$H = \sum_{\overline{k},\sigma} \varepsilon(\overline{k}) c_{\overline{k},\sigma}^\dagger c_{\overline{k},\sigma} - 2J\hat{m}\hat{m} - \frac{1}{2}J\hat{t}\hat{t} - \frac{1}{2}J\hat{y}\hat{y}. \quad (12)$$

In this notation, it is clear that interactions that generate AF are stronger than those that generate SC by a factor of two and that the interactions that generate $d$-density wave order are even smaller. Note that to be able to make this comparison, the order parameters are normalized such that the largest value that either one of them can take in a mean-field solution is near 1/2 (when all other order parameters are forced to zero). In particular then, even if we drop the $d$-density wave, this mean-field $t-J$ Hamiltonian is not $SO(5)$ symmetric since in that case, the $\hat{m}\hat{m}$ and $\hat{t}\hat{t}$ terms would have the same coefficients, so as to form a five-dimensional superspin vector.

III. DYNAMICAL PROPERTIES : EXCITATION PSEUDOGAPS

In a previous study of the two-dimensional attractive Hubbard model, it was shown, by comparisons with Quantum Monte Carlo calculations, that the BCS mean-field ground state gave a good estimate (few percent) of double-occupancy in the normal state when the interaction strength satisfied $|U| > 3t$ and when the temperature is reasonably low ($T$ of order $0.5t$ or less). We expect this should remain true for correlation functions that are local in space and time. On the other hand, for dynamical quantities mean-field theory itself is clearly a bad estimate. Instead of a true antiferromagnetic gap as in Fig. I, we expect this should remain true for correlation functions $T$ near the zone edge when $T$ is of order 0.05 $t$ or less. At this temperature, the characteristic energy of the $d$-wave singlet fluctuations is 0.31 $J$ while the corresponding correlation length estimated from the wave vector dependence of the $\omega = 0 d$-wave singlet susceptibility around $q = 0$ is 0.48 lattice spacing.

In Fig. 2(b) the calculated pseudogap size $\Delta_{pg}$ (filled diamonds) from Ref. 11 is plotted along with the pseudogap energy (empty symbols) extracted from various experiments by Tallon and Loram. Note that the pseudogap rapidly takes its asymptotic low-temperature value when it opens up at finite temperature. That is the reason why we plot the value it would have at $T = 0$ if the superconducting phase did not appear. Since in the above calculational procedure, the local $d$-wave singlet correlation function $\langle |\Delta_d(0)|^2 \rangle$ that is used to compute the dynamical singlet susceptibility is computed from static antiferromagnetic mean-field order, the corresponding nor-
nal state pseudogap $\Delta_{pg}$ vanishes at $x \approx x_c$. The calculated $\Delta_{pg}$ is in good agreement with experimental results. Through interlayer tunneling spectroscopy of $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$ Krasnov also observed that the pseudogap decreases approximately linearly with doping and vanishes at the critical doping, $x_c \approx 0.19$.

The dashed curve is the pseudogap size predicted from the slave-boson mean-field theory of the $t-J$ Hamiltonian. In fact the (spinon) pseudogap size obtained in the latter theory is the same as $2jd$ calculated from Eq. (1) with $m = 0$. It is much larger than the experimentally extracted pseudogap energy throughout the interesting doping range. Furthermore there is no indication that it vanishes near $x_c$, in conflict with experimental results. Although spin degrees of freedom are the main driving force for the pseudogap behavior in the above theory and in ours, the detailed implementation is qualitatively different. In the slave-boson mean-field theory a pseudogap is caused by a pairing among spinons, while in our theory it is short-range spin correlations of electrons that induce an effective attraction in the particle-particle channel. The spinon pseudogap in the former theory has nothing to do with local moment formation and their short-range AF correlations with decreasing temperature.

The total excitation gap $\Delta_{tg}$, at $T = 0$, is obtained by allowing both $d$ and $m$ to be different from zero in the calculation of the quantity $\langle|\Delta_d(0)|^2\rangle$ that is used in the fluctuation-dissipation theorem to obtain the renormalized vertices entering the calculation of dynamical quantities. The calculated total excitation gap (or ARPES leading edge gap or SC gap), $\Delta_{tg}$, at $T = 0$ is also plotted in Fig. 3(b) as a function of doping with $t/J = 3$. The open circles with error bars are experimentally determined leading edge gap by Ding et al. in their ARPES measurement. Except a few points, which may be due to the effect of impurities as noted by the authors, our calculated $\Delta_{tg}$ is in reasonable agreement with experimental results and decreases more or less linearly with doping. In addition, the velocity defined by

$$v_2 = \frac{\Delta_{tg}}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \frac{k_F}{\sqrt{2}}$$

ranges from 1.0 to $2.0 \times 10^5 cm/s$ when $x$ varies from 0.2 to 0.1. Experiments on various compounds and dopings in that range give results of order $1.0 \times 10^6 cm/s$ according to Ref. More recent ARPES results Bi-2212 give a ratio of $v_2/\Delta_{tg}$ that can decrease by about a factor two from optimal to underdoping, while transport measurements suggest a much stronger doping dependence. Note that in our calculations of $\Delta_{pg}$ and $\Delta_{tg}$ we use the experimentally determined value of exchange coupling $J = 125$ meV. The only adjustable parameter is the ratio $t/J$ that we take, as in the previous sections, equal to 3.

$\Delta_{tg}$ is always larger than $\Delta_{pg}$ due to the additional contribution from $d \neq 0$ to the local spin-singlet amplitude $|\langle|\Delta_d(0)|^2\rangle|$. Since the SC order parameter vanishes at $T_c$, the SC gap below $T_c$ continuously evolves into the normal state pseudogap above $T_c$ with the same momentum dependence and magnitude.

Finally we comment on the Fermi velocity in the nodal direction. Tabulation of angle-resolved photoemission (ARPES) data for the Fermi velocity along the zone diagonal in the range $0.1 < x < 0.15$ lead to Fermi velocities in the range from 1 to $2.5 \times 10^7 cm/s$. However, recent ARPES data on LSCO seem to suggest that the Fermi velocity along the diagonal is doping independent and of order $2.5 \times 10^7 cm/s$. A weak doping dependence for the limiting low frequency Fermi velocity is seen in Bi-2212. Our bare Fermi velocity varies linearly with $x$, but to compare with ARPES experiment, one should include the effect of residual interactions. The superconducting $d$-wave part of the interaction does not renormalize the Fermi velocity along the nodal direction, but antiferromagnetic fluctuations do. For $x = 0.15$ and $T = 0.05J$, we find that the bare velocity, estimated from the dispersion of the spectral weight, renormalizes from 1.27$aJ$ to 1.04 $aJ$. For $x = 0.1$, the peak in the spectral function is very broad and in fact the quasiparticle picture does not strictly apply since $\partial \Sigma/\partial \omega > 0$. Nevertheless, if we do like in experiment and measure the dispersion of the spectral weight maximum, we find that for $T = 0.2J$ and $0.1J$, the Fermi velocity renormalizes up (since $\partial \Sigma/\partial \omega > 0$) from $0.85 \, aJ$ to $0.95 \pm 0.05 \, aJ$. Hence, the physical value of the velocity is much more doping independent than the bare value suggests. Such doping-independent values were also found in variational calculations that take into account the no-double occupancy constraint. For $t/J = 3$, and $J = 125 meV$, our Fermi velocity in physical units is thus about $0.7 \times 10^7 cm/s$, which is smaller than experimental values by a factor 3 to 4.

IV. QUALITATIVE PHASE DIAGRAM OF HIGH $T_C$ CUPRATES

Applying the fluctuation approach of the previous section with the effective theory of the next section, one can use the resulting dynamical SC susceptibility to estimate the value of the correlation length $\xi_{sc}$ at the temperature where order appears according to mean-field theory. This length, $\xi_{sc}$, is of order one lattice spacing. We know that quantum renormalization effects (Kanamori-Brueckner type) should decrease even the mean-field $T_c$ to a lower value $T_c^{MF}$. In addition, thermal fluctuations decrease it even further. If we look empirically at the value of $\xi_{sc}$ when one reaches the experimentally determined superconducting transition temperature $T_c$, one finds that at that temperature, $\xi_{sc} \approx 3 - 4$. We know
that since $O(2)$ SC fluctuations also cause a pseudogap close to $T_c$. Some experiments may suggest that the $T^*$ line continues smoothly onto the dashed line (or more precisely the $T_c^{MF}$ line) in the overdoped regime.

In the present study $T_c$ and $T_c^{MF}$ have their maximum at $x_c \simeq 0.20$ where condensation energy $U(0)$, mean-field order parameter $d$ and the coherence gap $\Delta_{co}$ discussed in the following section are also maximized. In high $T_c$ cuprates, the highest $T_c$ is at $x = 0.16$ slightly lower than the critical doping ($x = 0.19$) where the strength of superconductivity is maximum. This subtle difference is beyond the scope of the present study.

Although short-range AF correlations persist up to $x_c$, they don’t lead to long-range (commensurate) AF order, remaining only as short-range order even at low temperature, unless the electron density is close to half-filling. For instance, at $x = 0.15$, the AF correlation length $\xi_{AF}$ computed from fluctuation theory saturates at $\xi_{AF} \sim 4$ at the lowest temperature studied while the SC correlation length $\xi_{sc}$ exponentially diverges. Thus the long-range (commensurate) AF phase boundary is not shown in Fig. 3. It is expected to lie close to half-filling where the present formulation is not valid for AF spin fluctuations since the effective bandwidth, $8xt$ becomes smaller than interaction strength.

\section{V. THE CONDENSATE}

At finite temperature algebraic (Kosterlitz-Thouless) superconducting order can develop in two dimensions, contrary to AF order, which is prohibited by the Mermin-Wagner theorem. Since short-range AF correlations can produce a (dynamical) pseudogap on short-distance scales while thermodynamic quantities, such as the SC condensate, are calculated in the static and long-distance limit, we should integrate out AF correlations to study the low energy physics of the SC state while taking into account the presence of the AF correlations in an effective manner. In principle, one should be able to do this and predict the onset of superconductivity from the interacting Green function of the previous sections, which exhibits a pseudogap. However, to do this calculation, one needs the corresponding irreducible vertex. It is not strictly correct to use the Thouless criterion in the form $1 - JGG = 0$ to find the superconducting $T_c$ because one cannot use the bare vertex $J$ to do a calculation with dressed Green functions. Since it is not known yet how to obtain a reliable approximation for irreducible vertices in the pseudogap regime, we have to proceed otherwise. Calculations with constant renormalization to the vertices and bare Green functions are expected to be more reliable. The phenomenological correlation length criterion of the previous section is such a calculation.

We want to take into account the presence of short-range AF correlations. To proceed with a calculation
that is done with constant renormalization to the vertices and bare Green functions, we have to make an additional hypothesis. We construct an effective low-energy Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{\vec{k},\sigma} \varepsilon(\vec{k}) c_{\vec{k},\sigma}^\dagger c_{\vec{k},\sigma} - V_{\text{eff}} \sum_i \Delta_i^x(i) \Delta_d(i)$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

such that the effective attraction $V_{\text{eff}}$ leads, at $T = 0$, to the same value of the SC order parameter as that obtained from the full mean-field theory (Fig. 1(b)). We will use this effective Hamiltonian only to compute properties of the condensate, including $\xi_{sc}$ of the previous section. As long as superconductivity, or condensation, is concerned, the above Hamiltonian already takes into account the effect of (pair breaking) short-range AF correlations in an effective manner.

Above $x_c$, $V_{\text{eff}}$ is given by $J$, because $m$ vanishes there. We take the vanishing of $m$ as signaling that the antiferromagnetic correlation length has become smaller than one lattice spacing. Below $x_c$, $V_{\text{eff}}$ rapidly vanishes with decreasing doping in Fig. 3(a). As a first approximation, we use the above effective Hamiltonian, let us calculate the condensation energy at $T = 0$. The total energies in the SC state and in the normal state are, in a mean-field approximation, given by

$$E_d = \langle \Psi_d | H_{\text{eff}} - \mu N | \Psi_d \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{k}} ((\varepsilon_{\vec{k}} - \mu) - (\varepsilon_{\vec{k}} - \mu)^2 - |V_{\text{eff}}| d^2)$$,

$$E_n = \langle \Psi_n | H_{\text{eff}} - \mu N | \Psi_n \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{k}} ((\varepsilon_{\vec{k}} - \mu) - |\varepsilon_{\vec{k}} - \mu|)$$,  \hspace{1cm} (14)

where $E_{\vec{k}} = \sqrt{(\varepsilon_{\vec{k}} - \mu)^2 + (d\phi_d(\vec{k}) V_{\text{eff}})^2}$. The $T = 0$ condensation energy $U(0) = - (E_d - E_n)$ is plotted in Fig. 3(b) as a function of doping concentration with $J = 125$ meV. $U(0)$ is maximum at $x_c$, and rapidly decreases beyond and below $x_c$. This is because $U(0)$ scales like $d^2$. This feature is qualitatively consistent with specific-heat measurements by Loram et al. \[54\] The maximum $U(0)$ in our calculation is about $14k$ unit cell at $x_c$, two to three times larger than what the above authors obtained $(5 - 6k$ unit cell). It is clear that the actual condensation energy should be smaller than what we calculate since fluctuation effects are completely neglected in the above calculation. If we had stuck to a mean-field calculation with both AF and SC order present, we would have estimated the condensation energy from the difference between the ground-state energies computed with $d$ finite and with $d$ forced to zero. For $x > x_c$ we would have found the same result as on Fig. 4(b) and for $x < x_c$ we would have also found a result that decreases with doping, but it would have been larger than what is found above, suggesting that the above effective Hamiltonian approach is indeed a better way to take into account $T = 0$ long-range SC order in the presence of short-range AF correlations.

Another quantity of interest is the coherence-gap $\Delta_{cg}$. Deutscher \[55\] has proposed that this gap, accessible through Andreev reflection experiments with point-contact spectroscopy, can be different from the single-particle gap observed in tunneling. Recent experiments \[56\] seem to confirm this. To estimate this coherence gap, one can use the mean-field solution of the effective BCS model Eq. (13). However, a better estimate can be obtained by computing the precursor pseudogap with the method explained below. Indeed, it is known \[59\] in the attractive Hubbard model that this precursor pseudogap reaches its asymptotic low-temperature value very rapidly. In addition, this precursor pseudogap contains quantum renormalization effects that are absent from a pure mean-field calculation. The following calculation is in the spirit of Ref. [10]. First we compute how much the $d$-wave pair correlation function $\chi_{pp}$ is enhanced over $\chi_{pp}^0$ by applying the local-pair sum rule for $\chi_{pp}$

$$T \sum_q \chi_{pp}(q)e^{-iv_0 q^2} = \langle |\Delta_{d}(0)|^2 \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

The right-hand side of the above equation is evaluated in the mean-field state of Eq. (3) and $\chi_{pp}$ is related to $\chi_{pp}^0$ through the renormalized vertex $V_{pp}$

$$\chi_{pp}(q) = \frac{\chi_{pp}^0(q)}{1 - V_{pp}^0 \chi_{pp}^0(q)}$$,

where the irreducible susceptibility is defined as

$$\chi_{pp}^0(q) = \frac{T}{4N} \sum_k (\phi_d(\vec{k}) + \phi_d(\vec{q} - \vec{k}))^2 G^0(q - k) G^0(k).$$

Finally the following self-energy is used to estimate the effect of $d$-wave pairing correlations on quasiparticles.
When $\Delta_{tg} \simeq \Delta_{pg} + \Delta_{cg}$ is generalized to finite temperature, the total excitation gap is composed of the normal state pseudogap and the coherence-gap in Fig. 5(b). $\Delta_{pg}$ is virtually temperature independent from $T = 0$ to $T = T_c$, because it is caused by short-range spin correlations of order one lattice spacing. On the other hand, we expect that $\Delta_{cg}$ is strongly temperature dependent since it opens up at $T_c$. For purposes of illustration, we added a BCS-like temperature dependence to $\Delta_{cg}$. Its zero temperature-value and $T_c$ were estimated above. As one can see from Fig. 5(b), at large underdoping ($x = 0.08$), $\Delta_{pg}$ (or ARPES leading edge gap) is mainly given by $\Delta_{pg}$, while at optimal doping ($x = 0.15$) it is more or less equally made of $\Delta_{pg}$ and $\Delta_{cg}$ below $T_c$. At large overdoping ($x = 0.22$) $\Delta_{tg} = \Delta_{cg}$, thus leading to the conventional BCS behavior. This feature is also qualitatively consistent with ARPES experiments.

A similar behavior of $\Delta_{tg}$ is used by Chen et al. [57] to calculate the temperature dependence of some physical quantities within their SC fluctuation theory of the pseudogap. The crucial difference between their theory and ours is that their $\Delta_{pg}$ vanishes at $T = 0$ so that when superconductivity is completely destroyed, for instance, by a strong magnetic field, their ground state becomes a perfect Fermi liquid. In our picture, however, we predict that the ground state has a pseudogap. [1] Our calculated temperature dependence of the total excitation gap (or ARPES leading edge gap from the experimental point of view) contrasts with some theories based on the idea of spin-charge separation. In these theories the only difference between $A(\vec{k}, \omega)$ above and below $T_c$ is the line shape due to the Bose condensation of holons, namely, the appearance of the quasiparticle peak below $T_c$ without change of the gap magnitude itself. At large underdoping, there is indeed no much change in the ARPES leading edge gap [11-12], because from our point of view, $\Delta_{tg}$ is composed mainly of the temperature independent $\Delta_{pg}$. At optimal doping the above ARPES experiments show a significant change of the excitation gap itself with decreasing temperature in addition to the sharpening of the peak. From our point of view, this significant change of $\Delta_{tg}$ (at optimal doping) with temperature is due to the strong temperature dependence of the coherence gap $\Delta_{cg}$ near the transition.

Since the zero-temperature critical field $H_{c2}$ is a property of the condensate, the above $V_{eff}$ model can also be used to estimate it. Using the $d$-wave estimate [58] $H_{c2} = 0.521 \Phi_0 (2\pi \xi_0^2)^{-1}$ with $\xi_0 = h v_F (\pi \Delta_{cg})^{-1}$ and $\Phi_0 = \hbar c (2e)^{-1}$, we find that $H_{c2}(x = 0.08) = 42 T$ and $H_{c2}(x = 0.15) = 151 T$. The experimental values [59] are, respectively, around 300 $T$ and 600 $T$, somewhat smaller. However, there is still disagreement on the experimental value of $H_{c2}$ and recent estimates are larger [59]. The above model is extremely crude since it does not take into account the anisotropy and interaction renormaliza-

FIG. 5. (a) Calculated total excitation gap $\Delta_{tg}$ (empty diamonds), pseudogap $\Delta_{pg}$ (filled diamonds) and condensation gap $\Delta_{cg}$ (empty circles) at $T = 0$ as a function of doping. The dashed and long-dashed curves denote $\Delta_{tg} - \Delta_{pg}$ and $\sqrt{\Delta_{tg}^2 - \Delta_{pg}^2}$, respectively. (b) The total excitation gap $\Delta_{tg}$ as a function of temperature for three representative doping levels ($x = 0.08$ for underdoping, $x = 0.15$ for optimal doping and $x = 0.22$ for overdoping).

$$\Sigma_{pp}(k) = -\frac{1}{4} V_{eff} V_{pp} \frac{T}{N} \sum_q \left( \phi_d(\vec{k}) + \phi_d(\vec{q} - \vec{k}) \right)^2 \chi_{pp}(q) G(0, q - k).$$ (16)

This procedure is analogous to that used earlier in the case of the attractive Hubbard model ($s$-wave symmetry) [59] to obtain good agreement with QMC calculations. Even though the above formula has not been obtained with the same rigor, one expects it to give a good estimate of what happens in the case of $d$-wave symmetry.

Figure 5(a) shows $\Delta_{cg}$ (empty circles) together with $\Delta_{pg}$ (empty diamonds) and $\Delta_{pg}$ (filled diamonds) as a function of doping at $T = 0$. Below $x_c$, $\Delta_{cg}$ monotonically increases with doping and above $x_c$ it reduces to $\Delta_{tg}$. The doping dependence of $\Delta_{cg}$ is qualitatively similar to $T_c^{MF}$ and $d$, as found in the experiments of Ref. [56]. It is surprising to observe that $\Delta_{cg}$, $\Delta_{tg}$ and $\Delta_{pg}$ are more or less linear in doping concentration, in spite of the fact that they are obtained through highly nonlinear equations. In fact the linear behavior of $\Delta_{tg}$ and $\Delta_{pg}$ in doping are observed by Tallon and Loram [43], and by Ding et al. [44] in their respective experiments. To find out an empirical relation between $\Delta_{cg}$, $\Delta_{tg}$ and $\Delta_{pg}$, we plotted $\sqrt{\Delta_{tg}^2 - \Delta_{pg}^2}$ (long-dashed curve) and $\Delta_{tg} - \Delta_{pg}$ (dashed curve). The former is nearly independent of doping, in agreement with the result often found by other authors using $\Delta_{sg} = \sqrt{\Delta_{tg}^2 - \Delta_{pg}^2}$ [42] to extract the coherence gap from experiment. Within our numerical uncertainties, the coherence-gap $\Delta_{cg}$ is approximately given as $\Delta_{tg} - \Delta_{pg}$ and its behavior is easier to reconcile with the doping dependence of $T_c$ and $d$. Recently Krasnov [41] also found that the coherence gap (dubbed as the SC gap in his paper) shows a doping dependence similar to that of $T_c$. 

\[ \text{FIG. 5. (a) Calculated total excitation gap } \Delta_{tg} (\text{empty diamonds}), \text{pseudogap } \Delta_{pg} (\text{filled diamonds}) \text{and condensation gap } \Delta_{cg} (\text{empty circles}) \text{at } T = 0 \text{as a function of doping. The dashed and long-dashed curves denote } \Delta_{tg} - \Delta_{pg} \text{and } \sqrt{\Delta_{tg}^2 - \Delta_{pg}^2}, \text{respectively. (b) The total excitation gap } \Delta_{tg} \text{as a function of temperature for three representative doping levels } (x = 0.08 \text{for underdoping, } x = 0.15 \text{for optimal doping and } x = 0.22 \text{for overdoping).} \]
of the Fermi velocity. Within this crude model, we have that $H_{c2}$ will decrease at dopings larger than optimal because above optimal doping $\Delta_{c\varphi}$ decreases.

VI. DISCUSSION

In this Section we compare the present results with the predictions of some of the leading theories for the high $T_c$ superconductors and we provide further comparison with experiments. Before we proceed, we should stress that the starting point of our approach is meant to apply to the intermediate to strong-coupling regime and thus should be distinguished from spin-fluctuations theories that apply from weak to intermediate coupling.

First, consider the question of why the superconducting $T_c$ decreases near half-filling. As is clear by now, in our study the reduction of $T_c$ near half-filling occurs already at mean-field level due to the competition with AF correlations (or local moment formation) that open up a mean-field gap, making SC order less favorable. Although SC fluctuations will indeed make $T_c$ decrease with decreasing doping because of the smaller superfluid density, such fluctuations are not necessary to have the correct qualitative behavior.

Second, what is the nature of the normal state pseudogap? In this paper the pseudogap is just a crossover phenomenon due to short-range equal-time spin correlations which induce short-range dynamical fluctuations in the particle-channel channel. The latter are very effective in creating a pseudogap for several reasons. First note that the mass renormalization makes the bandwidth and the Fermi velocity quite small. In addition, the pseudogap opens up near the band edges where the local Fermi velocity is smallest. This means that the correlation length associated with the fluctuations does not need to be large to be in the renormalized classical regime. Second, for $q = 0$ d-wave singlet fluctuations, no umklapp condition needs to be satisfied contrary to antiferromagnetic hot spots. The proposed origin for the pseudogap contrasts with some of the recent proposals in which mean-field flux phase, circulating current phase, and density wave phase are interpreted as the pseudogap state. In these scenarios, the pseudogap state has broken symmetry such as time reversal, translational and rotational symmetries, and the crossover-like behavior observed in experiments is argued to be caused by an impurity effect.

Third, let us consider experimental evidence that there are significant short-range AF correlations below $x_c$. Recent muon spin relaxation and ac-susceptibility measurements, show the existence of slow spin fluctuations below $x = 0.19$. By using polarized and unpolarized elastic neutron scattering experiments as well as zero-field muon spin resonance, Sidis et al. observed an unusual commensurate AF phase on a nanosecond time scale that coexists with superconductivity in underdoped YBa$_2$Cu$_3$O$_{6+\delta}$. Lake et al. found AF correlations inside a vortex core in underdoped cuprates. Most recently, Hodges et al. have even shown that the addition of Co to an optimally doped YBCO compound induces antiferromagnetism above $T_c$ that survives and coexists with $d$-wave superconductivity below $T_c$. The coexistence seems to be at the microscopic level with $\xi > 200\AA$. In the present paper, the presence of AF correlations below $x_c$ does not come from any extra symmetry between AF and SC correlations such as SO(5) symmetry, but from the fact that the $J$ part of the $t - J$ Hamiltonian has those competing correlations in the low energy sector. Table 1 gives a few results for the temperature-dependent antiferromagnetic correlation length in our approach for two dopings. As expected, the correlations decrease with doping. An upper bound, order of magnitude estimate for the value of the static local moment is given by the value of $m$ in Fig.1(b).

Fourth, we point out that there is numerical and experimental evidence that short-range spin correlations are closely related to the normal state pseudogap. In their recent calculations obtained from the dynamical cluster approximation (DCA) for the Hubbard model, Jarrell et al. noted that the fall of $T^*$ with doping is closely tied to the diminishing of the short-range spin correlations. In the exact diagonalization study of the $t - J$ model, Sakai and Takahashi found that the pseudogap behavior is associated with the development of static AF spin correlations with decreasing temperature. In his high temperature series expansion study of the $t - J$ model, Putikka showed that pseudogap crossover occurs when static AF correlation length is about one lattice spacing. By analyzing various experiments (Raman, spin-lattice relaxation rate, ARPES, Zn-substitution effects, inelastic neutron scattering experiment and so on), Tallon and Loram concluded that the pseudogap is intimately connected with short-range AF correlations. Short-range dynamical AF correlations can also cause the normal state pseudogap through AF spin fluctuations. As explained above however, it was found in a recent paper that the pseudogap always appears earlier in the dynamical particle-particle channel than in the dynamical AF spin fluctuation channel, even though the

| $T$ | $x = 0.1$ | $x = 0.15$ |
|-----|-----------|-----------|
| $0.02J$ | 133 (IC) | 4.1 (IC) |
| $0.04J$ | 25.5 (C) | 2.6 (IC) |
| $0.06J$ | 6.1 (C) | 1.9 (IC) |
short-range equal-time correlations that generate these
dynamical fluctuations are due to AF correlations. One
of the difficulties with AF spin fluctuation scenario of the
pseudogap is how the normal state pseudogap happens
to have the same momentum dependence and magnitude
as the SC gap near $T_c$, as ARPES and tunneling ex-
periments show. In our case, this occurs naturally. Our
results remain qualitatively the same when $t'$ is $-0.3t$.

Fifth, is $x_c \simeq 0.19 - 0.20$ accidental for the special
choice of $t/J = 3$? According to the calculations of the
slave-boson mean-field solution of the Hubbard model
[75,76], the onset of short range AF correlations starts
to appear from $x = 0.20 - 0.21$ for a wide range of $U =
7t - 16t$ (See Fig.1 of Ref. [76] for more details). In our
approach, $x_c$ varies from 0.22 to 0.17 when $t/J$ varies
from 2.5 to 4. It is believed that a realistic strength of the
Coulomb repulsion $U = 4t/J$ is of the order of the bare
bandwidth $8t$ in two dimension. [77]

Last, through the microscopic separation of hole-rich SC
regions from AF regions, the stripe structure tends to
maintain AF correlations more effectively than the other
case in which they are uniformly suppressed by
doped holes. Then one can surmise that in the stripe
state $T_c$ is somewhat suppressed from that in the uniform
state. While the differences between the stripe state and
the uniform state can be quite substantial, we do not
see the stripes as necessary to obtain superconductivity.
The main results reached in this paper are not expected
to qualitatively change in the presence of a dynamical
stripe structure.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper we proposed a simple phenomenological
procedure that allows one to study the competition be-
tween antiferromagnetism and $d$-wave superconductivity
in the high $T_c$ cuprates. The no-double-occupancy con-
straint is taken into account in the effective mass approx-
imation. Correlation functions that are local in space and
time are evaluated from a mean-field factorization of the
$t - J$ Hamiltonian in both the AF and the $d-$wave SC
channels. (The $d-$density wave channel does not con-
tribute in the whole doping range.) The local correlation
functions are then used in the fluctuation-dissipation the-
orem to compute renormalized vertices that allow one
to obtain the full dynamical susceptibilities. In other
words, in this approach, equal-time correlation functions
determine the value of effective vertices in all available
channels. In particular, short-range equal-time AF cor-
relations determine the value of effective interactions
in the particle-particle channel. This effective weak to
intermediate-coupling approach cannot work for $x < 0.08$
where the bandwidth becomes less than the interaction
strength.

The calculated total excitation gap $\Delta_{cg}$ (in the su-
perconducting state) and the normal state pseudogap
$\Delta_{pg}$ are in good agreement with experimental results,
as shown earlier in Ref. [40]. Obtaining a description of
superconducting properties arising from a highly corre-
lated state remains a challenge. Here we have taken the
simplest approach. We compute an effective strength
of pairing interactions which takes into account (pair
breaking) AF correlations, $V_{eff}$, by requiring that the
zero-temperature order parameter $d$ obtained with $V_{eff}$
equals that obtained in the full mean field equations cor-
responding to Eq.(1). This effective interaction allows
one to obtain properties of the condensate (and of the
condensate only), namely the condensation energy $U(0)$,
the coherence gap $\Delta_{cg}$ that has been observed in Andreev
reflection [50] as well as $H_{c2}$. The calculated coherence
gap closely follows the doping dependence of $T_c$ or $d$, and
is approximately given as $\Delta_{cg} \sim \Delta_{tg} - \Delta_{pg}$ within
our numerical uncertainties. A qualitative phase diagram
for the cuprates may thus be obtained. The systematic
decrease of $U(0)$, $\Delta_{cg}$ and $H_{c2}$ with decreasing doping
below $x_c \sim 0.2$ can be understood as a result of the com-
petition between AF and SC order occurring in the low
energy sector of the mean-field $t - J$ Hamiltonian. On
the other hand, in the present picture the systematic in-
crease of $\Delta_{pg}$ and $\Delta_{tg}$ when $x$ decreases below $x_c \sim 0.2$
is due to the growing short-range equal-time spin corre-
lations which induce dynamical singlet fluctuations with
$d$-wave symmetry, low characteristic frequency but with
small correlation length. As pointed out before in Ref.
[40] one prediction of this approach is that the pseudogap
should survive if the superconducting state is destroyed
by a magnetic field. This is consistent with the obser-
vation of antiferromagnetic ordering inside vortex cores.
[78] Neutron scattering experiments should be able to
check from energy integrated structure factor that the
short-range spin correlation functions are in good agree-
ment with the mean-field predictions. Finally, we expect
$H_{c2}$ to decrease with doping in the overdoped region.

Although some of the results of this paper are in quan-
titative agreement with experiment, the overall descrip-
tion is definitely qualitative only. The main disagree-
ment with experiment is that the renormalized Fermi velocity
that we find is three to four times smaller than measured.
A satisfactory theory of high $T_c$ will necessitate a better
treatment of strong-coupling short-range correlations.
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