Magnon-Paramagnon Effective Theory of Itinerant Ferromagnets

Naoum Karchev*
Department of Physics, University of Sofia, 1126 Sofia, Bulgaria

arXiv:cond-mat/9908024v3 2 Sep 2001

Abstract

The present work is devoted to the derivation of an effective magnon-paramagnon theory starting from a microscopic lattice model of ferromagnetic metals. For some values of the microscopic parameters it reproduces the Heisenberg theory of localized spins. For small magnetization the effective model describes the physics of weak ferromagnets in accordance with the experimental results. It is written in a way which keeps $O(3)$ symmetry manifest,and describes both the order and disordered phases of the system.

Analytical expression for the Curie temperature,which takes the magnon fluctuations into account exactly, is obtained. For weak ferromagnets T_c is well below the Stoner's critical temperature and the critical temperature obtained within Moriya's theory.

75.10.Lp,71.27.+a,75.40.Gb

Typeset using REVTEX

I Introduction

The Heisenberg model of ferromagnetism, based on the exchange interaction of localized electrons gives an explanation of many properties of non-conducting magnetic systems at both low and high temperatures. However the development of a satisfactory theory of ferromagnetic metals has ran into difficulties.

Theories of weak ferromagnetic metals based on the Landau Fermi liquid theory have been developed by several theorists [1–4]. The spectrum of the spin excitations has been found. It consists of spin fluctuations of paramagnon type and a transverse spin-wave branch.

Murata and Doniach [5] have proposed a phenomenological mode-mode coupling theory to describe the temperature dependence of the quantities for a weak ferromagnet. However, they started from a classical Hamiltonian and ignored the quantum effects, which are important because of the low temperature nature of the weak ferromagnet.

An alternative approach to magnetic phase transition in Fermi systems has been developed by Moriya and Kawabata [6,7]. It is a self-consistent one loop approximation which accounts for the spin fluctuations.

The nonlinear effects of spin fluctuations are treated and in [8], using a self-consistent rotationally invariant Hartree approximation.

New results concerning magnetic phase diagram in Hubbard-type model have been obtained within the dynamical mean-field theory [9,10].

Perhaps the most striking feature of the itinerant ferromagnets is the quantum transition to paramagnet. In the paper [11], Hertz derives an effective paramagnon theory of a paramagnet to ferromagnet quantum phase transition. He analyzed the effective model by means of a renormalization group method that generalizes Wilson's treatment of classical phase transition and concludes that the critical behavior of itinerant ferromagnets in dimensions larger then one are described by a mean-field fixed point. Hertz's work has been reexamined in Ref. [12]. The results of this paper support those of Hertz in 3D case, but in many aspects differ from them in two dimensions.

More realistic model of ferromagnetic metals is considered in Refs [13,14]. It contains particle-hole spin-triplet interaction that causes ferromagnetism, as well as particle-hole spin-singlet and particle-particle interactions. The spin-triplet interaction is decoupled by introducing a vector field whose average is proportional to the magnetization, and performing a Hubbard-Stratanovich transformation. Then the fermionic degrees of freedom are integrated out accounting for the rest part of interaction by means of perturbation theory. The resulting effective field theory is nonlocal. It contains an effective long-range interaction between the order parameter fluctuations. The analysis in Refs [13,14] is restricted to power counting arguments at tree level. It shows that the critical behavior is governed by Gaussian fixed point and that all non-Gaussian terms are irrelevant in renormalization group sense. Logarithmic corrections to power-low scaling are obtained in $D = 3$ case. For $D < 3$ the deviations from the mean-field theory results depend on D.

There is a considerable interest in the finite temperature properties of weak itinerant ferromagnets. It was obtained in [4], that in the region below but close to the Curie temperature, the paramagnon contribution is dominant. Experimentally, the transition in the weak ferromagnet $MnSi$ has been investigated at different Curie temperatures by applying hydrostatic pressure [15]. The transition at high temperatures was found to be of second order, while at lower transition temperatures it is of first order. In the first order regime the

transition temperature was found to scale with pressure as $T_c \sim (p_c - p)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The scaling law is explained by a mean-field analysis, assuming a dynamical exponent $z = 3$. But in Hertz's theory [11], the dynamical critical exponent is equal to three due to paramagnon excitations. Hence, in order to correctly explain the characteristic features of itinerant ferromagnets it should be important to work with an effective theory that keeps explicitly the magnon as well as paramagnon excitations.

The present work is devoted to the derivation of an effective magnon-paramagnon theory starting from a microscopic lattice model of ferromagnetic metals. This is an effective theory of ferromagnets, and for some values of microscopic parameters it reproduces the Heisenberg theory of localized spins. On the other hand, for small magnetization the effective model describes the physics of weak ferromagnets in accordance with the experimental results. Thus, the effective magnon-paramagnon theory interpolates between theories of localized and itinerant electrons. The zero temperature dimensionless magnetization per lattice site m is introduced to describe this interpolation. It parameterizes the ground state of the system, and moving m we change the ground state and respectively the fluctuations above it. When m is maximal ($m = \frac{1}{2}$) all the lattice sites are occupied by one electron with spin up in the ground state, and the only relevant excitations are magnons. The effective theory is the Heisenberg theory of localized spins. When the magnetization is smaller, i.e. some of the lattice sites are doubly occupied or empty in the ground state, the spectrum consists of paramagnon and magnon excitations and the effective theory is a "spin m" Heisenberg theory coupled to paramagnon fluctuations. Decreasing the magnetization results in the changing the parameters of the spin fluctuations, and close to quantum critical point $m = 0$, the paramagnon becomes important due to the singularity in the paramagnon propagator. In the quantum paramagnetic phase ($m = 0$), the magnon excitations disappear from the spin spectrum and one obtains Hertz's effective model.

The ferromagnetic order parameter is a vector $\vec{M}$ field. The transverse spin fluctuations (magnons) are described by $M_1 + iM_2$ ($M_1 - iM_2$) and the longitudinal fluctuations (paramagnons) by $M_3 - < M_3 >$. Alternatively the vector field can be written as a product of its amplitude $\rho = \sqrt{M_1^2 + M_2^2 + M_3^2}$ and an unit vector $\vec{n}$, $\vec{M} = \rho\vec{n}$. In the ferromagnetic phase one sets $M_3 =< M_3 > +\varphi$ and in linear (spin-wave) approximation obtains $\rho =< M_3 > +\varphi$. It is evident now, that the fluctuations of the ρ field, $\rho - < M_3 >$ are exactly the paramagnon excitations in a formalism which keeps 0(3) symmetry manifest. One can write the effective theory in terms of $\vec{M}$-vector components, or in terms of ρ and an unit vector $\vec{n}$. In ferromagnetic phase, in spin-wave approximation the effective theories coincide. I use the parameterization in terms of unite vector and spin singlet amplitude. Then, the effective action keeps the $O(3)$ symmetry manifest, and describes both the order and disorder phases of the system. Above Curie temperature the spectrum consists of spin singlet fluctuations of paramagnon type and spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ spinon fluctuations. The spinon has a gap, but near the critical temperature it approaches zero and spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fluctuations as well as paramagnon are essential describing the thermal phase transition of itinerant ferromagnets.

Analytical expression for the Curie temperature,which takes the magnon fluctuations into account exactly, is obtained. For weak ferromagnets the critical temperature scales like $T_c \sim m^{\frac{5}{3}}$. It is well below the Stoner's critical temperature $T_c \sim m$ and the critical temperature obtained within Moriya's theory $T_c \sim m^{\frac{3}{2}}$ [16].

Scaling arguments based on the Hert's renormalization group technique allow to obtain

a relation between spin stiffness and the Stoner's enhancement factor. The relation is a consequence of the fact that quantum critical exponent is equal to three. Making use of the relation one can obtain the contribution of magnon scattering to the Stoner's enhancement factor.

To derive the effective model a Schwinger-bosons-slave-fermions representation of the operators is used. The salient point is that within this approach the local Coulomb repulsion is treated exactly. As a result, the constants in the effective theory are finite and well defined for all values of the magnetization m.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II an effective magnon paramagnon theory of ferromagnetic metals is obtained. The Curie temperature is calculated and written in terms of magnetization and spin stiffness constant. In Sec III, Hertz's renormalization group in tree approximation is extended to include the magnon fluctuations. Section IV is devoted to the concluding remarks.

II Magnon-paramagnon effective model

The simplest model of ferromagnetic metals is determined by the Hamiltonian [17]

$$\hat{H} = -t \sum_{<i,j>,\sigma} (\hat{c}^{+}_{i\sigma}\hat{c}_{j\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) - J \sum_{<i,j>} \hat{\vec{S}}_i \cdot \hat{\vec{S}}_j + U \sum_i \hat{n}_{i\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\downarrow} - \mu \sum_i \hat{n}_i \tag{1}$$

Here $\hat{c}^{+}_{i\sigma}$ and $\hat{c}_{j\sigma}$ are creation and annihilation operators for electrons, $\hat{n}_{i\sigma} = \hat{c}^{+}_{i\sigma}\hat{c}_{i\sigma}$ and $\hat{n}_i = \sum_\sigma \hat{n}_{i\sigma}$ are density operators, and $\hat{\vec{S}}_i = 1/2 \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} \hat{c}^{+}_{i\sigma}\vec{\tau}_{\sigma\sigma'}\hat{c}_{i\sigma'}$, where $\vec{\tau}$ denotes the vector of Pauli matrices, are spin operators. The sums are over all sites of a three-dimensional cubic lattice, $< i, j >$ denotes the sum over the nearest neighbors, and μ is the chemical potential. In (1) the J-term corresponds to direct Heisenberg exchange which is generically ferromagnetic ($J > 0$) in nature.

In terms of Schwinger-bosons ($\hat{\varphi}_{i,\sigma}, \hat{\varphi}^{\dagger}_{i,\sigma}$) and slave-fermions ($\hat{h}_i, \hat{h}^{\dagger}_i, \hat{d}_i, \hat{d}^{\dagger}_i$) the operators have the following representation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{c}_{i\uparrow} = \hat{h}^{\dagger}_i\hat{\varphi}_{i1} + \hat{\varphi}^{\dagger}_{i2}\hat{d}_i, \qquad \hat{c}_{i\downarrow} = \hat{h}^{\dagger}_i\hat{\varphi}_{i2} - \hat{\varphi}^{\dagger}_{i1}\hat{d}_i, \qquad \hat{n}_i = 1 - \hat{h}^{+}_i\hat{h}_i + \hat{d}^{+}_i\hat{d}_i, \\
&\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{i\uparrow}\hat{c}_{i\uparrow}\hat{c}^{\dagger}_{i\downarrow}\hat{c}_{i\downarrow} = \hat{d}^{\dagger}_i\hat{d}_i, \qquad \hat{\vec{S}}_i = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\sigma\sigma'} \hat{\varphi}^{+}_{i\sigma}\vec{\tau}_{\sigma\sigma'}\hat{\varphi}_{i\sigma'}, \qquad \hat{\varphi}^{\dagger}_{i\sigma}\hat{\varphi}_{i\sigma} + \hat{d}^{\dagger}_i\hat{d}_i + \hat{h}^{\dagger}_i\hat{h}_i = 1
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The partition function can be written as a path integral over the complex functions of the Matsubara time τ $\varphi_{i\sigma}(\tau)$ $(\bar{\varphi}_{i\sigma}(\tau))$ and Grassmann functions $h_i(\tau)$ $\left(\bar{h}_i(\tau)\right)$ and $d_i(\tau)$ $\left(\bar{d}_i(\tau)\right)$.

$$\mathcal{Z}(\beta) = \int D\mu \left(\bar{\varphi}, \varphi, \bar{h}, h, \bar{d}, d, \right) e^{-S}. \tag{3}$$

The action is given by the expression

$$S = \int_0^\beta d\tau \left[\sum_i \left(\bar{\varphi}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\dot{\varphi}_{i\sigma}(\tau) + \bar{h}_i(\tau)\dot{h}_i(\tau) + \bar{d}_i(\tau)\dot{d}_i(\tau) \right) + H\left(\bar{\varphi}, \varphi, \bar{h}, h, \bar{d}, d\right) \right], \tag{4}$$

where β is the inverse temperature and the Hamiltonian is obtained from Eqs.(1) and (2) replacing the operators with the functions. In terms of Schwinger bosons and slave-fermions

the theory is $U(1)$ gauge invariant, and the measure includes δ functions that enforce the constraint and the gauge-fixing condition

$$D\mu\left(\bar{\varphi},\varphi,\bar{h},h,\bar{d},d\right) = \prod_{i,\tau,\sigma}\frac{D\bar{\varphi}_{i\sigma}(\tau)D\varphi_{i\sigma}(\tau)}{2\pi i}\prod_{i\tau}D\bar{h}_i(\tau)Dh_i(\tau)D\bar{d}_i(\tau)Dd_i(\tau)$$
$$\prod_{i\tau}\delta\left(\bar{\varphi}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\varphi_{i\sigma}(\tau)+\bar{h}_i(\tau)h_i(\tau)+\bar{d}_i(\tau)d_i(\tau)-1\right)\prod_{i\tau}\delta\left(g.f\right). \quad (5)$$

I make a change of variables, introducing new Bose fields $f_{i\sigma}(\tau)\left(\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\right)$ Ref. [18]

$$f_{i\sigma}(\tau)=\varphi_{i\sigma}(\tau)\left(1-\bar{h}_i(\tau)h_i(\tau)-\bar{d}_i(\tau)d_i(\tau)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$
$$\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)=\bar{\varphi}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\left(1-\bar{h}_i(\tau)h_i(\tau)-\bar{d}_i(\tau)d_i(\tau)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (6)$$

where the new fields satisfy the constraint

$$\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)f_{i\sigma}(\tau)=1. \quad (7)$$

In terms of the new fields the spin vector and the action have the form

$$\vec{S}_i(\tau)=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\sigma\sigma'}f^{+}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\vec{\tau}_{\sigma\sigma'}f_{i\sigma'}(\tau)\left(1-\bar{h}_i(\tau)h_i(\tau)-\bar{d}_i(\tau)d_i(\tau)\right) \quad (8)$$

$$S=\int_0^\beta d\tau\left\{\sum_i\left[\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\dot{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)+\bar{h}_i(\tau)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}-\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\dot{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\right)h_i(\tau)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left.+\bar{d}_i(\tau)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}-\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\dot{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\right)d_i(\tau)\right]+H\left(\bar{f},f,\bar{h},h,\bar{d},d\right)\right\}, \quad (9)$$

where $H\left(\bar{f},f,\bar{h},h,\bar{d},d\right)$ is the Hamiltonian

$$H=-t\sum_{<i,j>}\left[\bar{d}_id_j\bar{f}_{j\sigma}f_{i\sigma}+\bar{d}_jd_i\bar{f}_{i\sigma}f_{j\sigma}-\bar{h}_ih_j\bar{f}_{j\sigma}f_{i\sigma}-\bar{h}_jh_i\bar{f}_{i\sigma}f_{j\sigma}\right.$$
$$\left.+\left(h_id_j-h_jd_i\right)\left(\bar{f}_{i1}\bar{f}_{j2}-\bar{f}_{i2}\bar{f}_{j1}\right)+\left(\bar{d}_j\bar{h}_i-\bar{d}_i\bar{h}_j\right)\left(f_{i1}f_{j2}-f_{i2}f_{j1}\right)\right]$$
$$\times\left(1-\bar{h}_ih_i-\bar{d}_id_i\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(1-\bar{h}_jh_j-\bar{d}_jd_j\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$+\frac{J}{2}\sum_{<i,j>}\left[\bar{h}_ih_i+\bar{d}_id_i+\bar{h}_jh_j+\bar{d}_jd_j\right]-\frac{J}{2}\sum_{<i,j>}\left(\bar{h}_ih_i+\bar{d}_id_i\right)\left(\bar{h}_jh_j+\bar{d}_jd_j\right)$$
$$+\frac{J}{8}\sum_{<i,j>}\left(\vec{n}_j-\vec{n}_i\right)^2\left(1-\bar{h}_ih_i-\bar{d}_id_i\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(1-\bar{h}_jh_j-\bar{d}_jd_j\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$+U\sum_i\bar{d}_id_i-\mu\sum_i\left(1-\bar{h}_ih_i+\bar{d}_id_i\right) \quad (10)$$

In Eq.(10) $\vec{n}_i=\sum_{\sigma\sigma'}\bar{f}_{i\sigma}\vec{\tau}_{\sigma,\sigma'}f_{i\sigma'}$ is an unit vector. The Eq.(8) describes in an $O(3)$ covariant way the spin. When the lattice site is empty or doubly occupied the spin vector is zero.

When the lattice site is occupied by one electron the unit vector $\vec{n}_i$ identifies the local orientation. One can consider the first two components n_{i1} and n_{i2} as independent, and then $n_{i3} = \sqrt{1 - n_{i1}^2 - n_{i2}^2}$. In the leading order of the fields, the spin vector has the form

$$S_{i1} \simeq \frac{1}{2} n_{i1}, \qquad S_{i2} \simeq \frac{1}{2} n_{i2}, \qquad S_{i3} - \frac{1}{2} \simeq -\frac{1}{2} \left(\bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i \right). \tag{11}$$

The last equation shows that the longitudinal spin fluctuations are associated with the collective fields $(\bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i)$.

To avoid misunderstandings, it is important to point out that the charge-waves are associated with the collective field $(\bar{d}_i d_i - \bar{h}_i h_i)$ (see the representation of the electron number operator (2)).

To formulate a mean-field theory I drop the terms of order equal or higher then six in the Hamiltonian Eq.(10). It is convenient to replace the term $\frac{J}{2} \sum\limits_{<i,j>} \left(\bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i \right) \left(\bar{h}_j h_j + \bar{d}_j d_j \right)$ in Eq.(10) with the local one $\frac{3J}{2} \sum\limits_i \left(\bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i \right)^2$. The difference is of higher order of derivatives, and I'll drop it. Then one can decouple this term, by means of the Hubbard-Stratanovich transformation, introducing a real, spin-singlet and gauge invariant field.

$$e^{\frac{3J}{2} \int\limits_0^\beta d\tau \sum\limits_i \left(\bar{h}_i(\tau) h_i(\tau) + \bar{d}_i(\tau) d_i(\tau) \right)^2}$$
$$= \int \prod_{i\tau} DS_i(\tau) e^{-\int\limits_0^\beta d\tau \sum\limits_i \left[\frac{3J}{2} S_i(\tau) S_i(\tau) - 3J \left(\bar{h}_i(\tau) h_i(\tau) + \bar{d}_i(\tau) d_i(\tau) \right) S_i(\tau) \right]} \tag{12}$$

Now, the action is quadratic with respect to the fermions and one can integrate them out. The resulting action depends on the spinons and the real field S_i. It has a minimum at the point $S_i = s_0, f_{i\sigma} = f_\sigma$, and the stationary condition is

$$s_0 = < \bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i > \tag{13}$$

Expanding the effective action around this point one obtains the effective model.

To improve the calculations I account for the terms of order six and higher, replacing the collective field $\bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i$ in these terms by its mean-field value from Eq.(13). The new Hamiltonian depends on the fields $\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)$, $f_{i\sigma}(\tau)$, $2\varphi_i(\tau) = s_0 - S_i(\tau)$, and is quadratic with respect to the fermions

$$\begin{aligned} H = & -t \sum_{<i,j>} \left[\bar{d}_i d_j + \bar{d}_j d_i - \bar{h}_i h_j - \bar{h}_j h_i \right] + (6mJ + U - \mu) \sum_i \bar{d}_i d_i + (6mJ + \mu) \sum_i \bar{h}_i h_i \\ & -2mt \sum_{<i,j>} \left[\left(\bar{d}_i d_j - \bar{h}_i h_j \right) \left(\bar{f}_{j\sigma} f_{i\sigma} - 1 \right) + \left(\bar{d}_j d_i - \bar{h}_j h_i \right) \left(\bar{f}_{i\sigma} f_{j\sigma} - 1 \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \left(h_i d_j - h_j d_i \right) \left(\bar{f}_{i1} \bar{f}_{j2} - \bar{f}_{i2} \bar{f}_{j1} \right) + \left(\bar{d}_j \bar{h}_i - \bar{d}_i \bar{h}_j \right) \left(f_{i1} f_{j2} - f_{i2} f_{j1} \right) \right] \\ & +6J \sum_i \varphi_i \left(\bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i \right) + \frac{(2m)^2 J}{8} \sum_{<i,j>} \left(\vec{n}_j - \vec{n}_i \right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $m = \frac{1}{2}(1 - s_0)$. Integrating out the fermions one obtains the action of the effective theory.

To get intuition how the effective action looks like, it is important to stress that the spinon fields contribute the action through the fields $\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\dot{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)$, $\bar{f}_{i\sigma}(\tau)\left(f_{j\sigma}(\tau)-f_{i\sigma}(\tau)\right)$, $(f_{i1}(\tau)f_{j2}(\tau)-f_{j1}(\tau)f_{i2}(\tau))$ and $\left(\vec{n}_j-\vec{n}_i\right)^2$ (see Eq.14) In the continuum limit they have the form $\bar{f}_\sigma\partial_\mu f_\sigma\,(\mu=\tau,x,y,z)$, $(f_1\partial_\nu f_2-f_2\partial_\nu f_1)$ $(\nu=x,y,z)$ and $\partial_\nu\vec{n}\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{n}$. The four-vector $A_\mu=i\bar{f}_\sigma\partial_\mu f_\sigma$ transforms as an $U(1)$ gauge field, $(f_1\partial_\nu f_2-f_2\partial_\nu f_1)$ as a charge-two complex field and $\partial_\nu\vec{n}\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{n}$ is a gauge invariant. Hence, the simplest gauge invariant and spin-singlet contributions of the first two fields have the form $\left(\bar{f}_1\partial_\nu\bar{f}_2-\bar{f}_2\partial_\nu\bar{f}_1\right)(f_1\partial_\nu f_2-f_2\partial_\nu f_1)$ and $\left(\partial_{\mu_1}A_{\mu_2}-\partial_{\mu_2}A_{\mu_1}\right)\left(\partial_{\mu_1}A_{\mu_2}-\partial_{\mu_2}A_{\mu_1}\right)$. It is not difficult to check that

$$\left(\bar{f}_1\partial_\nu\bar{f}_2-\bar{f}_2\partial_\nu\bar{f}_1\right)(f_1\partial_\nu f_2-f_2\partial_\nu f_1)\;=\;\frac{1}{4}\partial_\nu\vec{n}\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{n}. \tag{15}$$

The term $\left(\partial_{\mu_1}A_{\mu_2}-\partial_{\mu_2}A_{\mu_1}\right)\left(\partial_{\mu_1}A_{\mu_2}-\partial_{\mu_2}A_{\mu_1}\right)$ is of the same order as $\left(\partial_\nu\vec{n}\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{n}\right)^2$ and I'll ignore it. To obtain the effective theory it is convenient to set the gauge field $A_\mu=i\bar{f}_\sigma\partial_\mu f_\sigma$ equal to zero, and to account for the contribution of the complex field $(f_1\partial_\nu f_2-f_2\partial_\nu f_1)$, the real field φ, and $\partial_\nu\vec{n}\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{n}$. An important exclusion is the $\bar{f}_\sigma\partial_\tau f_\sigma$ field which contributes the action linearly.

Expanding the effective functional around the mean-field point and keeping only the first three terms, one can write the effective action in the form

$$S_{eff}\;=\;S_{\rm H}\;+\;S_{\rm p}\;+\;S_{int}, \tag{16}$$

$S_{\rm H}$ is the action of the Heisenberg theory of localized spins. In continuum limit it has the form

$$S_H\;=\;\int d\tau d^3\vec{r}\left[2m\bar{f}_\sigma(\tau,\vec{r})\dot{f}_\sigma(\tau,\vec{r})\;+\;\frac{m^2J_{\rm r}}{2}\sum_{\nu=1}^{3}\partial_\nu\vec{n}(\tau,\vec{r})\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{n}(\tau,\vec{r})\right]. \tag{17}$$

In Eq.(17), $m=\frac{1}{2}(1-s_0)$, and s_0 comes from "tadpole" diagrams with one h or d line. The renormalized exchange coupling constant has the following representation in terms of microscopic parameters and at zero temperature [19]

$$J_r=J\;-\;\frac{4t^2}{12Jm+U}\;+\;\frac{8}{3}\frac{t^2}{12Jm+U}\frac{1}{N}\sum_k\left(\sum_{\nu=1}^{3}\sin^2k_\nu\right)\left(n_k^h+n_k^d\right). \tag{18}$$

In Eq.(18), n_k^d and n_k^h are the occupation numbers for d and h fermions respectively. The first term is due to the direct Heisenberg exchange term in Eq.(14), and the other terms are due to Anderson's superexchange. The last two terms are obtained calculating the one-loop self-energy diagrams of h and d fermions. The superexchange contribution to the exchange coupling constant goes to zero for small magnetization.Hence, near the quantum phase transition one can replace the renormalized coupling constant J_r by bare one J.

S_p is the contribution to the effective action of the paramagnon excitations

$$S_p\;=\;\frac{1}{2}\int\frac{d\omega}{2\pi}\frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3}\varphi(\omega,\vec{p})\left(r\;+\;a\frac{|\omega|}{p}\;+\;bp^2\right)\varphi(-\omega,-\vec{p}) \tag{19}$$

where

$$r \;=\; 12J\left[1 \;-\; 3J\left(N(\epsilon_F^h) \;+\; N(\epsilon_F^d)\right)\right] \tag{20}$$

and the constants a and b are calculated in continuum limit.

$$a \;=\; 18\pi J^2\left(\frac{N(\epsilon_F^h)}{v_F^h} \;+\; \frac{N(\epsilon_F^d)}{v_F^d}\right) \quad b \;=\; 3J^2\left(\frac{N(\epsilon_F^h)}{\left(k_F^h\right)^2} \;+\; \frac{N(\epsilon_F^d)}{\left(k_F^d\right)^2}\right). \tag{21}$$

It is obtained from the Lindhard functions for h and d fermions in the limit when p and $\frac{\omega}{p}$ are small.

Finally, the spinon-paramagnon interaction has the form

$$S_{\rm int} \;=\; m^2\lambda\int d\tau d^3\vec{r}\,\varphi(\tau,\vec{r})\left[\sum_{\nu=1}^{3}\partial_\nu\vec{n}(\tau,\vec{r})\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{n}(\tau,\vec{r})\right] \tag{22}$$

where

$$\lambda \;=\; \frac{16Jt^2}{(12Jm+U)^2}\frac{1}{N}\sum_k\left(\sum_{\nu=1}^{3}\sin^2 k_\nu\right)\left(1 \;-\; n_k^h - n_k^d\right). \tag{23}$$

The effective magnon-paramagnon coupling is obtained from triangular diagrams with two h and one d lines or with two d and one h lines.

To analyze the effective model, it is more convenient to rewrite it in terms of rescaled spinon fields

$$\bar{\zeta}_{i\sigma} \;=\; \sqrt{2m}\,\bar{f}_{i\sigma}, \qquad \zeta_{i\sigma} \;=\; \sqrt{2m}\,f_{i\sigma}. \tag{24}$$

The new fields satisfy the constraint

$$\bar{\zeta}_{i\sigma}\zeta_{i\sigma} \;=\; 2m, \tag{25}$$

and the action of the effective theory has the form

$$\begin{aligned} S_{eff} = \int d\tau d^3\vec{r}\Bigg[&\bar{\zeta}_\sigma(\tau,\vec{r})\dot{\zeta}_\sigma(\tau,\vec{r}) \;+\; \frac{J_{\rm r}}{2}\sum_{\nu=1}^{3}\partial_\nu\vec{M}(\tau,\vec{r})\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{M}(\tau,\vec{r}) \\ &+\frac{\lambda}{4}\varphi(\tau,\vec{r})\left[\sum_{\nu=1}^{3}\partial_\nu\vec{M}(\tau,\vec{r})\cdot\partial_\nu\vec{M}(\tau,\vec{r})\right]\Bigg] \;+\; S_p, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $\vec{M}$ is the spin vector

$$\vec{M} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\bar{\zeta}_\sigma\vec{\tau}_{\sigma,\sigma'}\zeta_{\sigma'}, \qquad \vec{M}^2 \;=\; m^2 \tag{27}$$

and S_p is given by Eq.(19).

It follows from Eq.(8) that the dimensionless magnetization of the system, per lattice site is defined by the equation,

$$< S_i^3 >= \frac{1}{2} < n_i^3 > \left(1 - < \bar{h}_i h_i + \bar{d}_i d_i >\right). \tag{28}$$

At zero temperature $< n_i^3 >= 1$ and using the Eq.(13) one obtains that m is zero temperature dimensionless magnetization of the system per lattice site, $m =< S_i^3 >$. The parameter m depends on the microscopic parameters of the theory and characterizes the vacuum. If, in the vacuum state, every lattice site is occupied by one electron with spin up, then $m = \frac{1}{2} \quad (s_0 = 0)$, the parameters a and b from Eq.(19) are equal to zero and $r = \frac{3J}{2}$. In this case one can integrate over the paramagnons and the resulting theory is the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg theory of the localized spins. When, in the vacuum state, some of the sites are doubly occupied ($< \bar{d}_i d_i >\neq 0$) or empty ($< \bar{h}_i h_i >\neq 0$), then $m < \frac{1}{2}$, the relevant excitations are the spinon and paramagnon excitations and the effective theory is a "spin m" Heisenberg theory coupled to paramagnon fluctuations defined by Eqs.(25,26,27). The system approaches the quantum critical point when $m \to 0 \quad (s_0 \to 1)$. One can see directly, from the stationary condition (13), that $r(m)$ approaches zero when $m \to 0$. Hence, the parameter r measures the distance from the quantum critical point. In quantum paramagnetic phase ($m = 0$), the spinon excitations disappear from the spin spectrum (see Eqs.(25,27)) and one obtains Hertz's effective model. One can add a four-paramagnon term , calculating one-loop diagrams with four h or d fermion lines, but I have dropped it motivated by the Hertz's result.

The effective theory is $U(1)$ gauge invariant. Below the Curie temperature it is convenient to introduce explicitly the magnon excitations. To this end, I impose the gauge-fixing condition in the form $arg\zeta_{i1} = 0$. Then the constraint (25) can be solved by means of the complex field $a_i(\tau) = \zeta_{i2}$ and $\zeta_{i1} = \sqrt{2m - \bar{a}_i(\tau)a_i(\tau)}$. For the components of the spin vector $M^+ = M_1 + iM_2$, $M^- = M_1 - iM_2$, and M_3 one obtains the Holstein- Primakoff representation:

$$M_i^+(\tau) = \sqrt{2m - \bar{a}_i(\tau)\, a_i(\tau)}\; a_i(\tau),\;\; M_i^-(\tau) \;=\; \bar{a}_i(\tau)\sqrt{2m - \bar{a}_i(\tau)\, a_i(\tau)},$$
$$M_i^3(\tau) = m \;-\; \bar{a}_i(\tau)\, a_i(\tau) \tag{29}$$

The kinetic term in the action and the measure are the same as the kinetic term and the measure in the theory of Bose field. The only difference is that the complex fields are subject to the condition $\bar{a}_i(\tau)a_i(\tau) \leq 1$.

In the spin-wave theory one approximates $\sqrt{2m - \bar{a}_i(\tau)a_i(\tau)}$ and integrates over the whole complex plane. Then, the model is simplified and can be written in terms of magnon $a_i(\tau)$ ($\bar{a}_i(\tau)$) and paramagnon $\varphi_i(\tau)$ fields

$$S_{eff} = \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi}\frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3}\left[\bar{a}(\omega,\vec{p})\left(i\omega \;+\; \rho p^2\right)a(\omega,\vec{p}) \;+\; \frac{1}{2}\varphi(\omega,\vec{p})\left(r \;+\; a\frac{|\omega|}{p} \;+\; bp^2\right)\varphi(-\omega,-\vec{p})\right]$$
$$+\; \frac{m\lambda}{2}\int\prod_{l=1}^{2}\frac{d\omega_l}{2\pi}\frac{d^3p_l}{(2\pi)^3}\,(\vec{p}_1\cdot\vec{p}_2)\,\bar{a}(\omega_1,\vec{p}_1)a(\omega_2,\vec{p}_2)\varphi(\omega_1-\omega_2,\vec{p}_1-\vec{p}_2) \tag{30}$$

where

$$\rho \;=\; m\, J_r \tag{31}$$

is the spin stiffness constant.

Let's rewrite the spin vector Eq.(8) in terms of the vector $\vec{M}$ Eq.(27) and use the Holstein-Primakoff representation Eq.(29). Then the magnetization of the system per lattice site is given by the expression

$$< S_i^3 >= m - < \bar{a}_i a_i > \tag{32}$$

The equation for the critical temperature is $< S_i^3 >= 0$. Having in mind that the magnon dispersion is $\epsilon_a(p) = \rho p^2$ one obtains for the Curie temperature

$$T_c = \kappa\, m^{\frac{2}{3}}\, \rho(m) \tag{33}$$

where the constant κ can be written in terms of gamma $\Gamma(z)$ and Riemann $\zeta(z,q)$ functions $\kappa = (\Gamma(\frac{3}{2})\zeta(\frac{3}{2},1)/4\pi^2)^{-\frac{2}{3}}$. In the spin-wave approximation the spin stiffness constant is given by Eq.(31), hence, when the system approaches quantum critical point ($m \to 0$), the critical temperature scales with magnetization like $T_c \sim m^{\frac{5}{3}}$. Recently, it was experimentally shown [15], that for weak ferromagnets the transition temperature scales with pressure like $T_c \sim (p_c - p)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. To explain the experimental result one has to assume that magnetization scales with pressure like $m \sim (p_c - p)^{0,3}$.

One can improve the equation for the Curie temperature replacing the zero temperature dimensionless magnetization m by the finite temperature solution $m(T)$ of the mean-field equation Eq.(13).

$$T_c = \kappa\, m^{\frac{2}{3}}(T_c)\, \rho(m(T_c)) \tag{34}$$

For conventional weak ferromagnets $m(T_c) \sim m$ and Eq.(33) is an appropriate expression for Curie temperature. But for high T_c weak ferromagnets $m(T_c) > m$ and the correct equation for the critical temperature is Eq.(34).

It is important to stress that the equations for the critical temperature follow from the exact representations for the third component of the spin (8,29,32).Hence they take the magnon fluctuations into account exactly.

In the spin-wave approximation the transverse components of the spin fields are proportional to the magnon fields

$$S_i^+(\tau) = \sqrt{2m} a_i(\tau), \quad S_i^-(\tau) = \sqrt{2m}\bar{a}_i(\tau) \tag{35}$$

and the field $\varphi_i(\tau)$ is exactly the paramagnon (longitudinal spin fluctuation)

$$S_i^3(\tau) - < S_i^3 >= \varphi_i(\tau). \tag{36}$$

Hence, in Gaussian approximation, spin-spin correlation functions have the form

$$D^{tr}(\omega, \vec{p}) = \frac{2m}{i\omega + \rho p^2}\ , \qquad D^{long}(\omega, \vec{p}) = \frac{1}{r + a\frac{|\omega|}{p} + bp^2} \tag{37}$$

III Scaling behavior

Scaling arguments, based on the Hertz's renormalization group technique allow to obtain a relation between the spin stiffness and the parameter r-the distance from the quantum critical point.

To begin with, I introduce a cutoff and redefine the momenta introducing dimensionless one. RG construction starts with a definition of "soft" and "fast" modes,

$$\Psi(\omega,\vec{p}) = \Psi_<(\omega,\vec{p}) \,+\, \Psi_>(\omega,\vec{p}) \tag{38}$$
$$\Psi_<(\omega,\vec{p}) = \Psi(\omega,\vec{p}) \qquad for \qquad |p| < e^{-l}$$
$$\Psi_>(\omega,\vec{p}) = \Psi(\omega,\vec{p}) \qquad for \qquad e^{-l} \le |p| \le 1.$$

where $\Psi(\omega,\vec{p})$ stands for magnons, $a(\omega,\vec{p}), \bar{a}(\omega,\vec{p})$ and paramagnon $\varphi(\omega,\vec{p})$ fields. The action Eq.(30) depends on the "slow" and the "fast" modes. In the tree approximation one keeps only the "slow" modes

$$S^{tree}(\bar{a},a,\varphi) \,=\, S(\bar{a}_<,a_<,\varphi_<). \tag{39}$$

The next step is to change the variables, letting

$$\vec{p}' \,=\, e^l\vec{p}, \qquad \omega' \,=\, e^{zl}\omega \tag{40}$$

The new momenta runs over the whole interval $0 \le |p'| \le 1$, and in terms of the new variables the action has the form

$$\begin{aligned} S^{tree} = e^{-(z+3)l} \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}\frac{d^3p'}{(2\pi)^3} \Big[\bar{a}_<(e^{-zl}\omega',e^{-l}\vec{p}')\left(ie^{-zl}\omega' \,+\, mJ_re^{-2l}p'^2\right)a_<(e^{-zl}\omega',e^{-l}\vec{p}') \\ +\, \frac{1}{2}\varphi_<(e^{-zl}\omega',e^{-l}\vec{p}')\left(r \,+\, e^{(-z+1)l}a\frac{|\omega'|}{p'} \,+\, e^{-2l}bp'^2\right)\varphi_<(-e^{-zl}\omega',-e^{-l}\vec{p}')\Big] \\ +\, \Lambda e^{-2(z+4)} \int \prod_{l=1}^{2} \frac{d\omega'_l}{2\pi}\frac{d^3p'_l}{(2\pi)^3}\,(\vec{p}'_1\cdot\vec{p}'_2)\,\bar{a}_<(\omega'_1,\vec{p}'_1)a_<(\omega'_2,\vec{p}'_2)\varphi_<(\omega'_1-\omega'_2,\vec{p}'_1-\vec{p}'_2), \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where I have used a short notation for the magnon-paramagnon coupling constant $\Lambda \,=\, \frac{m\lambda}{2}$.

It is apparent that if one chooses $z \,=\, 3$, the coefficient of $a\frac{|\omega'|}{p'}$, in the paramagnon quadratic term, is the same as the coefficient of bp'^2. Then rescaling the paramagnon φ, one can make the total coefficient of both of them unity.

$$\varphi'(\omega',\vec{p}') \,=\, e^{-\frac{z+5}{2}l}\varphi_<(e^{-zl}\omega',e^{-l}\vec{p}') \tag{42}$$

To complete the RG transformation, one has to rescale the magnon fields too, to make the coefficient of $i\omega'$ unity,

$$a_<(\omega',\vec{p}') \,=\, e^{-\frac{2z+3}{2}}a_<(e^{-zl}\omega',e^{-l}\vec{p}'), \qquad \bar{a}_<(\omega',\vec{p}') \,=\, e^{-\frac{2z+3}{2}}\bar{a}_<(e^{-zl}\omega',e^{-l}\vec{p}') \tag{43}$$

Then, for the transformed action one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} S'\left(\bar{a}',a',\varphi'\right) \,=\, \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi}\frac{d^3p'}{(2\pi)^3}\left[\bar{a}'(\omega',\vec{p}')\left(i\omega' \,+\, \rho'p'^2\right)a'(\omega',\vec{p}')\right. \\ \left. +\, \frac{1}{2}\varphi'(\omega',\vec{p}')\left(r' \,+\, a\frac{|\omega'|}{p'} \,+\, bp'^2\right)\varphi'(-\omega',-\vec{p}',)\right] \\ +\, \Lambda' \int \prod_{l=1}^{2} \frac{d\omega'_l}{2\pi}\frac{d^3p'_l}{(2\pi)^3}\,(\vec{p}'_1\cdot\vec{p}'_2)\,\bar{a}'(\omega'_1,\vec{p}'_1)a'(\omega'_2,\vec{p}'_2)\varphi'(\omega'_1-\omega'_2,\vec{p}'_1-\vec{p}'_2) \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where r', ρ' and Λ' are the transformed parameters

$$
\begin{aligned}
r' = r(l) &= re^{2l} \\
\rho' = \rho(l) &= \rho e^{(z-2)l} = \rho e^{l} \\
\Lambda' = \Lambda(l) &= \Lambda e^{\frac{z-5}{2}l} = \Lambda e^{-l}
\end{aligned}
\tag{45}
$$

Excluding the scaling parameter l one obtains the relations (RG invariants)

$$
\frac{r'}{\rho'^2} = \frac{r}{\rho^2}, \qquad r'\Lambda'^2 = r\Lambda^2 \tag{46}
$$

The bare parameter r scales with magnetization like $r = r_0 m^2$, and the bare spin stiffness constant is proportional to the magnetization (see Eq.30). Hence, for weak ferromagnets, one obtains

$$
r(m) \sim \rho^2(m) \tag{47}
$$

The relation Eq.(47) is a consequence of the fact that quantum critical exponent is equal to three ($z = 3$). It holds even if the magnon-magnon interaction is introduced. Calculating the magnon contribution to the spin stiffness, one can use it to obtain the the magnon scattering corrections to the parameter r (Stoner's enhancement factor)

Making use of Eq.(47) one can obtain that

$$
T_c \sim m^{\frac{2}{3}} T_s \tag{48}
$$

where, $T_s = const\sqrt{r} \sim m$ is the Stoner's expression for the critical temperature (see Eq.20). For weak ferromagnets $m < \frac{1}{2}$, and T_c is well below the Stoner's critical temperature, as should be.Curie temperature obtained within Moriya's theory scales wit magnetization like $\sim m^{\frac{3}{2}}$ [16].

The result indicates that the spin-m Heisenberg model coupled to paramagnon provides a good description of the itinerant ferromagnets.

IV Conclusions

An effective magnon-paramagnon theory of itinerant ferromagnets has been obtained. It is written in a way which keeps $O(3)$ symmetry manifest.

The effective model differs from the models discussed in Refs. [11,13,14] in two ways. First, it describes in unified way both the order and disordered phases of the system. Altering the parameters, it interpolates between the Heisenberg theory of localized spins and Hertz's theory of nearly ferromagnetic metals. In ferromagnetic phase the important spin fluctuations are transversal magnon fluctuations and longitudinal paramagnon fluctuations. In thermal paramagnetic phase (above Curie temperature) the spectrum consists of spin singlet fluctuations of paramagnon type and spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ spinon fluctuations. Well above the critical temperature the spinon has a large gap, and the physics of ferromagnetic metals is dominated by the paramagnon fluctuations. But just above T_c the spinon's gap approaches zero [20], and the contribution of the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fluctuations is essential. Crossing the quantum critical point ($m = 0$), the spinon excitations disappear from the spectrum and only the paramagnon survives in the quantum paramagnetic phase.

Second, I have accounted for the on site Coulomb repulsion exactly. The Hubbard interaction is the strongest, and to drop it, as in Ref. [11], or to treat it perturbatively, as in Refs. [13,14] is not adequate. As a result, I obtain that the vertices in the effective functional exist in the limit of zero frequencies and wavenumber, and that the constants are well defined for all values of the magnetization.

The effective model Eqs.(26,30) enables to estimate the correctness of the Green's functions calculations [4], and the Moriya Kawabata approximation [6].Within these approaches, the spin stiffness constant is proportional to the magnetization. The same result follows from the effective model Eq.(30) where the nonlinear magnon-magnon interaction is not considered. From spin-wave expansion follows that the magnon vertices are of order $(\frac{1}{m})^n$, and on the verge of ferromagnetism are relevant. One way to obtain the effects of magnon-magnon interaction is to use a renormalization group approach in the spin-wave theory, which allows for the analysis of systems with small spins [21].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank K.Bedell and K.Blagoev for valuable discussions. This research is supported by the USA National Science Foundation Grant-DINT#9876873.

REFERENCES

* Electronic address: naoum@phys.uni-sofia.bg

[1] A. A. Abrikosov and I. E. Dzyloshinskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **35**, 771 (1959) [Sov. Phys. JETP. **8**, 535 (1959)].
[2] T. V. Ramakrishnan, Solid State Commune. **14**, 449 (1974); Phys. Rev. B **10**, 4014 (1974).
[3] A. Kawabata, J. Phys. F **4**, 1477 (1974).
[4] I. E. Dzyaloshinskii and P. S. Kondratenko, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **70**, 1987 (1974) [Sov. Phys. JETP, **43**, 1036 (1975)].
[5] K. Murata and S. Doniach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 285 (1972)
[6] T. Moriya and A. Kawabata, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **34**,639
[7] The works are summarized in T. Moriya, *Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism.* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1985).
[8] G. Lonzarich and L. Taillefer, J. Phys. C **18**, 4339 (1985).
[9] W. Metzner and D. Vollhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 324 (1989).
[10] N. Blümer, J. Wahle, J. Schlipf, K. Held, and D. Vollhardt, in preparation.
[11] J. Hertz, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 1165 (1976).
[12] A. J. Millis, Phys.Rev. B **48**, 7183 (1993).
[13] T. Vojta, D. Belitz, R. Narayanan, and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Europhys.Lett. **36**, 191 (1996)
[14] T. Vojta, D. Belitz, R. Narayanan, and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Z. Phys. B **103**, 451 (1997).
[15] C. Pfleiderer, G. J. McMullan, S. R. Julian, and G. G. Lonzarich, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 8330 (1997).
[16] G. Gumbs and A. Griffin Phys. Rev. B **13**, 5054 (1976)
[17] D. Vollhard, N. Blümer, K. Held, M. Kollar, J. Schlipf, and M. Ulmke, Z. Phys. B **103**, 283 (1997).
[18] D. Schmeltzer, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 8650 (1991).
[19] The present discussion is correct if the renormalized exchange coupling constant is positive. To this end, it is sufficient the microscopic parameters to satisfy the inequality $\frac{4t^2}{U} < J$.
[20] D. P. Arovas, and A. Auerbach, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 1316 (1988)
[21] N.Karchev, Phys. Rev B **55**, 6372 (1997)