

Correlation effects of exchange splitting and coexistence of spin-density-wave and superconductivity in single crystalline $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$

Y. Zhang¹, J. Wei¹, H. W. Ou¹, J. F. Zhao¹, B. Zhou¹, F. Chen¹, M. Xu¹, C. He¹, G. Wu², H. Chen², M. Arita³, K. Shimada³, H. Namatame³, M. Taniguchi³, X. H. Chen², D. L. Feng^{1*}

¹Department of Physics, Surface Physics Laboratory (National Key Laboratory), and Advanced Materials Laboratory, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, P. R. China
²Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P. R. China and
³Hiroshima Synchrotron Radiation Center and Graduate School of Science, Hiroshima University, Hiroshima 739-8526, Japan.

(Dated: October 28, 2018)

The nature of spin-density wave and its relation with superconductivity are crucial issues in the newly discovered Fe-based high temperature superconductors. Particularly it is unclear whether the superconducting phase and spin density wave (SDW) are truly exclusive from each other as suggested by certain experiments. With angle resolved photoemission spectroscopy, we here report exchange splittings of the band structures in $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ ($x = 0, 0.1, 0.2$), and the non-rigid-band behaviors of the splitting. Our data on single crystalline superconducting samples unambiguously prove that SDW and superconductivity could coexist in iron-pnictides.

Both the cuprates and the iron pnictides high temperature superconductors are in the vicinity of certain magnetic order [1]. For the cuprate, the antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations might likely facilitate the d -wave pairing, which makes the nature of the spin density wave (SDW) in the iron pnictides and its relation with the superconductivity central issues. Recently, we found that exchange splittings of the bands (instead of Fermi surface nesting) are responsible for the SDW formation in BaFe_2As_2 [2]. This is beyond the prediction of all the existing band structure calculations. Particularly, the momentum and band dependence of the splitting, and the anomalously small Stoner ratio (the ratio of exchange splitting over magnetic moment) illustrate the unusual properties of the SDW order. The detailed behaviors of the exchange splitting thus need to be uncovered to further understand its microscopic origin.

One relevant question is whether SDW and superconductivity can coexist at certain region of the phase diagram. Early resistivity data have indirectly suggested that SDW and superconductivity could coexist in $\text{LaO}_{1-\delta}\text{F}_\delta\text{FeAs}$ [3], $\text{SmO}_{1-\delta}\text{F}_\delta\text{FeAs}$ [4]. However, more recent neutron diffraction, muon spin relaxation (μSR), and Mössbauer spectroscopy indicate that they are exclusive from each other for $\text{CeO}_{1-\delta}\text{F}_\delta\text{FeAs}$ [5] and $\text{LaO}_{1-\delta}\text{F}_\delta\text{FeAs}$ [6]. The anomaly in resistivity is associated with the structural transition rather than the SDW. On the other hand, the situation seems to be quite different for $\text{Ba}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$, it has been shown recently that the SDW and superconductivity could coexist in polycrystalline samples for $x \in (0.1, 0.4)$ based on combined transport, x-ray and neutron diffraction studies[7]. If one could rule out the caveat of possible phase segregation, this would allude to a new ground

state in $\text{Ba}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$, where Cooper pairs are formed on a SDW background. This resembles the Hg-based five-layer cuprate, where antiferromagnetic order coexists with the superconductivity uniformly within single CuO_2 plane [8]. Novel properties might be expected.

In this Letter, we report angle resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) measurements of $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ single crystals. SrFe_2As_2 has the highest known SDW transition temperature (T_S) of about 205K in iron pnictides [9]. We show that the exchange splitting occurs in $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ for the doping concentration $x = 0, 0.1, 0.2$ with onset temperatures and amplitudes in descending order. The systematics shows that the exchange splitting is a fingerprint of the SDW on the electronic structure. Therefore, our results on single crystalline samples prove that superconductivity and SDW could coexist in $\text{Sr}_{0.8}\text{K}_{0.2}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ (superconducting tran-




FIG. 1: Relative resistance (with respect to the resistance at 280K) of $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ ($x = 0, 0.1, 0.2$) vs. temperature. The $x = 0$ and $x = 0.1$ curves are shifted up by 0.25 and 1 respectively.

*Electronic address: dlffeng@fudan.edu.cn




FIG. 2: (color online) Electronic structure of SrFe_2As_2 . (a) Photoemission intensity along the $\Gamma - M$ cut as indicated in panel d. (b) The second derivative of the data in panel a. (c) The MDC's near Fermi energy for the data in panel a. (d) Photoemission intensity map at E_F in the Brillouin zone, where the measured Fermi surface sheets are shown by dashed curves. Only one set of Fermi surface around M is shown for a clearer view. Data were taken at 230K. (e,f,g,h) are the same as in panel a,b,c,d respectively, but taken at 10K.

sition temperature $T_c = 25\text{K}$). The phase diagram of the $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ thus would be very different from that of the iron oxypnictide. Moreover, the quite different manifestations of the exchange splitting in various systems further highlight its complexity and correlated nature, providing a new set of clues for sorting out the microscopic mechanism of the splitting.

The $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ ($x = 0, 0.1, 0.2$) single crystals were synthesized with tin flux method [10], where the doping x is determined through energy-dispersive x-ray (EDX) analysis. The resistivity data in Fig.1 indicate that the undoped compound ($x = 0$) enters the SDW state at about 202K, and there is an anomaly at 168K for $x = 0.1$, while the $x = 0.2$ compound enters the zero resistance superconducting phase at about 25K. ARPES measurements were performed with 24 eV photons from beamline 5-4 of Stanford synchrotron radiation laboratory (SSRL) and beamline 9 of Hiroshima synchrotron radiation center. With Scienta R4000 electron analyzers, the overall energy resolution is 10meV, and angular res-




FIG. 3: (color online) Electronic structure of $\text{Sr}_{0.8}\text{K}_{0.2}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$. (a) Photoemission intensity along the $\Gamma - M$ cut as indicated in panel d. (b) The second derivative of the data in panel a. (c) The MDC's near E_F for the data in panel a. (d) Photoemission intensity map at E_F in the Brillouin zone. Data were taken at 150K. (e,f,g,h) are the same as in panel a,b,c,d respectively, but taken at 10K.

olution is 0.3 degree. The samples were cleaved *in situ*, and measured under ultra-high-vacuum of $3 \times 10^{-11}\text{ torr}$.

The normal state band structure of SrFe_2As_2 is presented through the photoemission intensity and its second derivative with respect to energy along the $\Gamma - M$ cut [Figs. 2(a) and 2(b)]. Three bands (named as α , β and γ band respectively) could be identified to cross E_F , with the assistance from the momentum distribution curves (MDC's) in Fig. 2(c). Near M, the α and β bands become quite flat and degenerate within the experimental resolution, and do not cross the Fermi energy. There are thus two hole-type Fermi surfaces around Γ , and one electron-type Fermi surface around M [Fig. 2(d)], as predicted by the band structure calculations [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. In the SDW state, the data along the same cut are measured for comparison [Figs. 2(e-g)]. Three Fermi crossings (k_F 's) could be clearly resolved near Γ . The separation between the two α k_F 's on both sides of Γ is closer, giving a smaller hole pocket than the normal state one. The β band is pushed away from Γ , and splits into two bands, which are assigned as β_1 and β_2 respectively. Around




FIG. 4: (color online) Temperature dependence of the band dispersion along the $\Gamma - M$ cut for $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$. Second derivative of photoemission intensity with respect to energy (a-f) for $x = 0$ at 230K, 200K, 195K, 190K, 100K, and 10K respectively, (h-l) for $x = 0.1$ at 170K, 160K, 150K, 40K, and 10K respectively, and (n-s) for $x = 0.2$ at 150K, 145K, 140K, 130K, 100K, and 10K respectively. Dashed lines are the guides of eye for the bands. Note the minimum of the second derivative represents a peak, thus the lower part (red or white color) represents the band. (g), (m) and (t) are the temperature evolution of EDC's at $k = 0.6\text{\AA}^{-1}$ for $x = 0, 0.1$ and 0.2 respectively. Note the momentum window is slightly wider for $x = 0.1$ data.

M, the normal-state flat feature splits into three bands and well connected to features around Γ . Correspondingly, the β_1 band is pushed down by about 60 meV; the β_2 band is pushed up to cross the Fermi energy; and the α band is more or less unaffected. Moreover, the electron-like nature of the γ pocket could be better resolved in Figs.2(f-g) than in the normal state, and its k_F does not show any noticeable movement. Since Fermi surface folding in the SDW state is not observed, the SDW state has two more hole pockets, one around Γ and one around M [Fig. 2(h)] than the normal state. Similar to the BaFe_2As_2 case, no energy gap is observed for all the bands at their k_F 's, ruling out the ‘‘Fermi-surface-nesting’’ mechanism for SDW in itinerant electron systems like Chromium and its alloys [18].

The corresponding electronic structure in the hole-doped $\text{Sr}_{0.8}\text{K}_{0.2}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ superconductor is illustrated in Fig. 3. At high temperatures [Fig. 3(a-d)], it is similar to that in the normal state of SrFe_2As_2 . As expected, the two hole pockets around Γ grow larger, and the electron pocket around M slightly shrinks with hole doping. At 10K, there is no obvious splitting near Γ . The most prominent difference occurs midway in the Γ -M cut, where two features are observed in Figs. 3(f) and 3(g), one of which (the β_2 band) crosses E_F , and gives an additional large hole pocket around M at 10K in Fig. 3(h).

To further illustrate the nature of splitting, detailed

temperature dependence of the bands in $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ ($x = 0, 0.1, 0.2$) are shown through the second derivative of the photoemission intensity in Fig. 4. For SrFe_2As_2 , although no obvious temperature dependence is observed for the α band within the experimental resolution, the splitting of the β band occurs abruptly between 200K and 195K Figs. 4(b-c), and develops rapidly with the decreasing temperatures. At the lowest temperature, the hybridization of the α and β_1 could also be resolved clearly when they cross. However, the bands are named as if they were not crossing.

For $x = 0.1$ and $x = 0.2$, band splittings occur very abruptly as well. The onset temperatures are estimated to be $165 \pm 5\text{K}$ and $135 \pm 5\text{K}$ for $x = 0.1$ and $x = 0.2$ respectively, as shown in Figs. 4(h-l) and Figs. 4(n-s). The splitting is momentum dependent in all cases. By extracting the largest splitting between the β_1 and β_2 bands at the k_F of β_2 (which are close to their splittings at M by fit), one gets 120 meV, 85 meV, and 60 meV respectively for $x = 0, 0.1$, and 0.2 respectively, consistent with the decreasing onset temperatures of the splitting. As a comparison, the splitting around Γ is just about 50 meV for $x = 0$. We note for BaFe_2As_2 , $T_S = 138\text{K}$, and the maximal splitting is about 75 meV near M [2]; both are close to the $\text{Sr}_{0.9}\text{K}_{0.1}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ case. Furthermore, all systems show similar spectral characters when the splitting are the most obvious. For example, the temperature evo-

lutions of photoemission spectra at $k = 0.6\text{\AA}^{-1}$ are quite similar in Figs. 4(g), 4(m) and 4(t) for $x = 0, 0.1, 0.2$ respectively.

The band splitting occurs almost exactly at their bulk SDW transition temperatures for both SrFe_2As_2 and BaFe_2As_2 , and at the resistivity anomaly temperature of $\text{Sr}_{0.9}\text{K}_{0.1}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$. Considering that T_S drops rapidly with doping [7], plus the drastically different low temperature band structures, one can conclude that the measured electronic structure reflects the bulk properties, and rule out any phase separation effects in all data. Similar to BaFe_2As_2 [2], such a splitting on the order of several $k_B T_S$ and its temperature dependence cannot be explained by factors such as structure transition or spin orbital coupling. Instead, it can be most naturally explained by the exchange splitting associated with the SDW formation. In fact, the electronic energy of the system can be saved through such a splitting, and thus it can be responsible for the SDW. Consistently, the band splitting is of the same scale as the exchange interactions between the nearest and next-nearest neighbor local moments estimated from LDA calculations[2, 19]. In this regard, the observed systematics, such as the correlations among doping/onset temperature/splitting amplitude, and similar spectral characters indicate that the origin of band splittings in $\text{Sr}_{0.8}\text{K}_{0.2}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ is no different from others. Therefore, our results on single crystalline samples provide a compelling piece of evidence for the coexistence of the SDW and superconductivity in an iron pnictide.

The paramagnetic state electronic structures of various iron pnictides qualitatively resemble each other [2, 20, 21, 22, 23], regardless of the chemical environment or doping, as exemplified here for $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$. Nevertheless, Fig.4 also illustrates that the detailed behaviors of exchange splitting in various system can be rather different besides their similarities mentioned above. Take the splitting at M as an example, the shifts of both the β_1 and β_2 bands are equally strong from the normal state position, and the α band does not split for $x = 0$; for $x = 0.1$, β_2 shifts much more than β_1 , and its α band shows a shift; for $x = 0.2$, only β_2 shows obvious shift. While for BaFe_2As_2 , all bands shift strongly at M[2]. Particularly, the electron Fermi pocket around M splits into one large and one small electron pockets in BaFe_2As_2 ; but for SrFe_2As_2 , the size of the γ pocket does not change noticeably, indicating a negligible splitting. Similarly, one could find further differences for exchange

splitting around Γ as well. These nontrivial findings unveil the correlated/non-rigid-band aspect of the exchange splitting.

The coexistence of SDW and superconductivity has profound consequences on the nature of the superconductivity. It not only suggests that the superconducting gap might open at one more (β_2) Fermi surface sheet in this material than in the $\text{Ba}_{0.6}\text{K}_{0.4}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ reported earlier [21, 22]. Because a split band is either majority or minority band that is in-phase or out-of-phase with the SDW spin order respectively, take a Cooper pair based on electrons at $\pm k_F$ of a majority band in the singlet pairing channel for example, its spin-up electron and spin-down electron must be mainly situated in the spin-up and spin-down sites of the SDW respectively. This gives a novel ground state that is not known before. Moreover, because the SDW does not open an gap at k_F , how it competes with the superconductivity in iron pnictides would be another interesting issue. On the other hand, the magnetic fluctuations related to SDW might even play a constructive role in superconductivity as in cuprates. We leave the detailed studies of these issues to future.

To summarize, we have measured the electronic structures of $\text{Sr}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$. We show that besides the quantitative differences, the detailed behaviors of the splitting differ prominently in various iron pnictides. Since band structure calculations so far failed to reproduce or predict the observed exchange splitting, our results provide important new clues for revealing the microscopic origin of the exchange splitting and SDW in iron pnictides. Particularly, we show in the single crystalline $\text{Sr}_{0.8}\text{K}_{0.2}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ that SDW and superconductivity could coexist, revealing a new kind of ground state, which would help understand the relationship between the SDW and superconductivity in iron pnictides.

We thank Dr. W. Bao for inspiring discussions, and Dr. D. H. Lu and Dr. R. G. Moore for their experimental assistance at SSRL. This work was supported by the Nature Science Foundation of China, the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (National Basic Research Program No.2006CB921300), and STCSM. SSRL is operated by the DOE Office of Basic Energy Science under Contract No. DE-AC03-765F00515.

Note added in support: During preparation of this manuscript, a similar finding on SDW/superconductivity coexistence in $(\text{Ba},\text{K})\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$, $(\text{Sr},\text{Na})\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$, and CaFe_2As_2 is posted online based on μSR experiments[24].

[1] C. de la Cruz *et al.*, Nature, **453**, 899 (2008).
 [2] L. X. Yang *et al.*, arXiv:0806.2627v2[cond-mat.supr-con].
 [3] Y. Kamihara, *et al.*, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **130**, 3296(2008).
 [4] R. H. Liu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. (in press) (2008), also available at arXiv:0804.2105[cond-mat.supr-con].
 [5] J. Zhao *et al.*, arXiv:0806.2528[cond-mat.supr-con].
 [6] H. Luetkens *et al.*, arXiv:0806.3533[cond-mat.supr-con].

[7] H. Chen *et al.*, arXiv:0807.3950 [cond-mat.supr-con].
 [8] H. Mukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 087001 (2006).
 [9] C. Krellner *et al.*, arXiv:0806.1043[cond-mat.supr-con].
 [10] J. Q. Yan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 024516 (2008).
 [11] D. J. Singh and M. H. Du, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 237003 (2008).
 [12] G. Xu, W. Ming, Y. Yao, X. Dai, and Z. Fang,

- arXiv:0803.1282[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [13] I. I. Mazin, D. J. Singh, M. D. Johannes, and M.H. Du, arXiv:0803.2740[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [14] C. Cao, P. J. Hirschfeld, and H.-P. Cheng, arXiv:0803.3236[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [15] F. Ma and Z. Y. Lu, arXiv:0803.3286[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [16] F. Ma, Z. Y. Lu and T. Xiang, arXiv:0806.3526[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [17] J. Dong *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **83**, 27006 (2008).
- [18] E. Fawcett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **60**, 209 (1988).
- [19] F. Ma, Z. Y. Lu, and T. Xiang, arXiv:0804.3370[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [20] D. H. Lu *et al.*, arXiv:0807.2009[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [21] L. Zhao *et al.*, arXiv:0807.0398[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [22] H. Ding *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **83**, 47001 (2008).
- [23] C. Liu *et al.*, arxiv: 0806.3453[cond-mat.supr-con].
- [24] T. Goko *et al.*, arxiv: 0808.1425[cond-mat.supr-con].