

Theory for Planar Hall Effect in Organic Dirac Fermion System

Yuki Nakamura* and Takao Morinari†

Course of Studies on Materials Science, Graduate School of Human
and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan

(Dated: November 21, 2023)

In a recent experiment on the interlayer magnetoresistance in the quasi-two-dimensional organic salt, α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃, it has been observed that at low temperatures, interlayer tunneling attains phase coherence, leading to the emergence of a three-dimensional electronic structure. Theoretically and experimentally it has been suggested that the system exhibits characteristics of a three-dimensional Dirac semimetal as a consequence of broken time-reversal symmetry and inversion symmetry. Here, we perform a theoretical calculation of the magnetoconductivity under an in-plane magnetic field and demonstrate that the system displays a planar Hall effect. Our calculations are based on a realistic model for α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃ incorporating interlayer tunneling and the tilt of the Dirac cone. Given that the planar Hall effect is anticipated as a consequence of chiral anomaly, our findings provide support for the classification of α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃ as a three-dimensional Dirac semimetal.

Massless Dirac and Weyl semimetals have been extensively studied recently because of their unique and intriguing electrical properties [1–9]. The energy spectrum in these systems is characterized by the touching of the valence band and conduction band at discrete momentum points. The key distinction between the Dirac/Weyl semimetal and the two-dimensional Dirac fermion system lies in the presence of broken time-reversal symmetry and/or inversion symmetry. To realize a Weyl semimetal, it is necessary to break either time-reversal symmetry or inversion symmetry, or both. On the other hand, a Dirac semimetal can be realized even when both time-reversal and inversion symmetries are preserved.

Organic charge-transfer salt, α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃, has been studied as a quasi-two-dimensional Dirac fermion system [10–12]. (Here, BEDT-TTF is bis(ethylenedithio)tetrathiafulvalene.) One of the present authors theoretically predicted [13, 14] that both time-reversal symmetry and inversion symmetry are broken, and, as a result, the system becomes a three-dimensional Dirac semimetal when the interlayer tunneling becomes phase coherent at low temperatures. The phase coherence in the interlayer tunneling is confirmed experimentally [15] by the observation of the peak structure in the interlayer magnetoresistance. Furthermore, the observation of the negative magnetoresistance and the planar Hall effect (PHE) has been reported recently [16] that is associated with chiral anomaly [17–26] in a Dirac semimetal.

In this Letter, we consider a model that includes interlayer tunneling and the tilt of the Dirac cone that exists in α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃ [10, 11]. Based on the semiclassical Boltzmann equation, we compute the magnetoconductivity under in-plane magnetic fields. We show that the system exhibits a PHE using a set of realistic parameters for α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃.

In the absence of the interlayer tunneling, there are two Dirac cones in the k_x - k_y plane [10, 11]. Upon incorporating interlayer tunneling between both the same and different molecules, four Dirac cones emerge, as detailed below. In contrast to systems where spin degeneracy is lifted due to the breaking of time-reversal symmetry caused by magnetic correlations, the spin remains degenerate in α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃ because the time-reversal symmetry breaking is not associated with magnetic correlations [13]. For the sake of simplicity, we neglect the spin degrees of freedom in the following analysis.

The Hamiltonian for two of the four Dirac cones is given by

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = \hbar v k_x \tau_x + \hbar v k_y \tau_y - 2t_2 \cos(ck_z) \tau_z + [-2t_1 \cos(ck_z) + \hbar u k_x] \tau_0 + \varepsilon_D. \quad (1)$$

Here k_x and k_y are in-plane wave numbers measured from the Dirac point and k_z is the wave number perpendicular to the k_x - k_y plane. We note that the position of the Dirac point in the plane is irrelevant for the following calculation, though we need to include them to make clear the presence of the symmetry breaking. The parameter u describes the tilt of the Dirac cone to the k_x axis, and we neglect anisotropy in the Dirac cone in the plane. c is the lattice constant in the c -axis. τ_x, τ_y, τ_z are the Pauli matrices and τ_0 is the 2×2 identity matrix. t_1 and t_2 are the parameters for the interlayer tunneling. t_1 is for the tunneling between the same molecules, and t_2 is for the tunneling between the adjacent molecules along the a -axis. When $t_1 \neq 0$ and $t_2 = 0$, the Dirac points shift along lines that are parallel to the k_z axis [27]. If $t_2 \neq 0$, the Dirac fermions acquire mass, with the exception at points where $k_z = \pm\pi/2$. Consequently, four Dirac points emerge within the three-dimensional Brillouin zone. The Dirac cone is type-I in the k_x - k_y plane [28], so the range of the parameter u is $-v < u < v$. The other two Dirac cones are described by Eq. (1) with $k_x \rightarrow -k_x$. We may assume $t_1 > t_2$ from the crystal structure of α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃ [29]. In this case, the

* nakamura.yuki.84v@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp

† morinari.takao.5s@kyoto-u.ac.jp

Dirac cone is type-II[30] in the k_z direction. The parameter ε_D denotes the energy of the Dirac point. We assign different values of ε_D to the two Dirac cones in the k_x - k_y plane to incorporate the symmetry breaking.

The energy dispersion is given by $E_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} = (\hbar v/a)\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}$ where

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} = \pm\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}} - 2\tilde{t}_1 \cos(ck_z) + \eta ak_x + \tilde{\varepsilon}_D, \quad (2)$$

with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_D = \varepsilon_D/(\hbar v/a)$ and

$$\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}} = \sqrt{a^2(k_x^2 + k_y^2) + 4\tilde{t}_2^2 \cos^2(ck_z)}. \quad (3)$$

Here, a is the in-plane lattice constant. We take the same lattice constants for a and b axes for simplicity. We defined the following dimensionless parameters,

$$\tilde{t}_1 = \frac{t_1}{\hbar v/a}, \quad \tilde{t}_2 = \frac{t_2}{\hbar v/a}, \quad \eta = \frac{u}{v}. \quad (4)$$

Taking $a = 1.0 \times 10^{-9}$ m and $v = 5.0 \times 10^4$ m/s, we find $\hbar v/a = 3.3 \times 10^{-2}$ eV.

Figure 1(a) shows the energy dispersion in the plane and Fig. 1(b) shows that in the k_z direction. We see that the Dirac cone is type-I in the k_x - k_y plane and type-II in the k_z axis as stated above. Figure 1(c) shows the Fermi surface. If the Fermi energy is larger than t_1 and t_2 , the Fermi surface is a warped cylinder[15]. For α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃, the Fermi energy is expected to be smaller than t_1 and t_2 [15]. In this case, the Fermi surface splits into a single electronic Fermi surface and two hole Fermi surfaces as shown in Fig. 1(c). Because of the tilt parameter η , which is slightly lower than one[28], the Fermi surface is largely deformed.

We calculate the magnetoconductivity using the semi-classical Boltzmann equation employing the relaxation time approximation. The application of the Boltzmann equation is justified when $\omega_c \tau < 1$ with ω_c being the cyclotron frequency and τ being the scattering time. Therefore, our result is limited to the regime of relatively weak magnetic fields. In the presence of the electric field \mathbf{E} and the magnetic field \mathbf{B} , the quasiclassical equation of motion is given by[31, 32]

$$\hbar \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{e}{\hbar} \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}} \times \left[-e\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbf{B} - e\mathbf{E} - \frac{e^2}{\hbar} (\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}} \right], \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{e}{\hbar} \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}} \times \left[\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{e}{\hbar} (\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}) \mathbf{B} + \frac{e}{\hbar} \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}} \right], \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the Berry curvature.

From the energy dispersion (2), the group velocity is




FIG. 1. (Color online) (a) Energy dispersion of the model described by the Hamiltonian (1) in the k_x - k_y plane and (b) along the k_z axis. The tilt parameter in the plane is $\eta = 0.7$, and so the Dirac cone is type-I. The interlayer hopping parameters are $\tilde{t}_1 = 0.10$ and $\tilde{t}_2 = 0.05$, and so the Dirac cone is type-II in the k_z axis. (c) The Fermi surface around the two Dirac cones. The Fermi energy is set to be zero and we set $\varepsilon_D = 0.03$. The Fermi surface consists of three portions: the middle one is the electron Fermi surface and the other two are the hole Fermi surfaces.

given by

$$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} = v \left(\pm \frac{ak_x}{\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}} + \eta, \pm \frac{ak_y}{\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}}, \mp \frac{4\frac{e}{a}\tilde{t}_2^2 \sin(ck_z) \cos(ck_z)}{\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}} + 2\frac{c}{a}\tilde{t}_1 \sin(ck_z) \right). \quad (7)$$

The Berry curvature[33] is given by

$$\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} = \left(\mp \frac{2a^2 c \tilde{\tau}_2 k_x \sin(ck_z)}{2\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^3}, \mp \frac{2a^2 c \tilde{\tau}_2 k_y \sin(ck_z)}{2\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^3}, \pm \frac{2a^2 \tilde{\tau}_2 \cos(ck_z)}{2\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^3} \right). \quad (8)$$

Here, $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(+)}$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(+)}$ are for the positive energy state, $\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(+)}$, and $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(-)}$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(-)}$ are for the negative energy state, $\tilde{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(-)}$.

Now we consider the contribution from the chiral anomaly and omit the term related to the anomalous Hall effect. From the Boltzmann equation, we obtain the

equations for the magnetoconductivities[20, 21]:

$$\sigma_{xx}^{(\pm)} = \frac{2e^2\tau}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{k} \left[-f'_{\text{eq}}(E_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}) \right] \frac{1}{1 + \frac{e}{\hbar} \mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}} \times \left[v_x^{(\pm)} + \frac{e}{\hbar} B_x (\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}) \right]^2, \quad (9)$$

$$\sigma_{xy}^{(\pm)} = \frac{2e^2\tau}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{k} \left[-f'_{\text{eq}}(E_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}) \right] \frac{1}{1 + \frac{e}{\hbar} \mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}} \times \left[v_x^{(\pm)} + \frac{e}{\hbar} B_x (\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}) \right] \times \left[v_y^{(\pm)} + \frac{e}{\hbar} B_y (\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)}) \right], \quad (10)$$

where f_{eq} is the equilibrium Fermi-Dirac distribution function. We compute the components of the positive energy state, denoted by superscript (+) and the negative energy state, denoted by superscript (-), separately. Here, the magnetic field is given by $\mathbf{B} = (B_x, B_y, 0) = (B \cos \phi, B \sin \phi, 0)$. In order to obtain the total magnetoconductivity, we take the sum of $\sigma_{xx}^{(+)} + \sigma_{xx}^{(-)}$ and $\sigma_{xy}^{(+)} + \sigma_{xy}^{(-)}$. We also calculate the contribution from the other two Dirac cones. The splitting of each Dirac cone in the k_z direction results in a twofold multiplication factor.

The result is shown in Fig. 2. We subtract the constant value σ_{xx}^0 from σ_{xx} , and the oscillating component $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ is shown in Fig. 2(a). As for σ_{xy} , we denote it as σ_{xy}^{PHE} in Fig. 2(b) to explicitly indicate that its contribution originates from the planar Hall effect. They are plotted as the function of ϕ for different values of $b = (a/\ell_B)^2$ with $\ell_B = \sqrt{\hbar/eB}$ the magnetic length. b is defined as the dimensionless magnetic field parameter. At $B = 1$ T, $b = 1.5 \times 10^{-3}$. The unit of conductivity is $\sigma_0 = e^2\tau v/(2\pi^3\hbar ac)$. For the interlayer tunneling parameters, \tilde{t}_1 and \tilde{t}_2 , we take $\tilde{t}_1 = 0.10$ and $\tilde{t}_2 = 0.05$. For the tilt parameter we take $\eta = 0.7$. This set of parameters is reasonable for α -(BEDT-TTF) $_2$ I $_3$. We note that both $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ and σ_{xy}^{PHE} exhibit the periodicity of π . This oscillating behavior can be associated with the chiral anomaly[20, 21]. Qualitatively similar behavior is observed in a recent experiment[16].

We also examined the magnetic field parameter b dependence of the amplitude of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ and σ_{xy}^{PHE} as shown in Fig. 3(a). We find that the amplitude varies quadratically with the magnetic field. If there remains the effect associated with the tilt of the Dirac cone, we may expect a linear dependence, but there is no such component. This is understood by complete cancellation between the contribution from the Dirac cones with opposite tilts and chiralities. We note that the amplitudes of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ is slightly larger than σ_{xy}^{PHE} . This behavior is qualitatively in agreement with experimental observations, where the amplitude of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ is ten times larger than that of σ_{xy}^{PHE} at 3 T[16]. The difference of the amplitudes is associated with the interplay between the tilt parameter dependence of the group velocity and the density of states. To make clear the tilt parameter




FIG. 2. (Color online) (a) Longitudinal conductivity and (b) planar Hall conductivity as the function of ϕ for different values of b . The unit of conductivity is $\sigma_0 = e^2\tau v/(2\pi^3\hbar ac)$. The constant component is subtracted from σ_{xx} . The parameters are $\tilde{t}_1 = 0.10$, $\tilde{t}_2 = 0.05$, and $\eta = 0.7$. For the Dirac point energies, we set $\varepsilon_{\text{D}}/(\hbar v/a) = 0.5$ for two Dirac cones along the k_z axis and $\varepsilon_{\text{D}}/(\hbar v/a) = -0.4$ for the other two Dirac cones.

dependence, we calculate η dependence of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ and σ_{xy}^{PHE} as shown in Fig. 3(b). When $\eta = 0$, there is no difference in the amplitudes of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ and σ_{xy}^{PHE} . Their difference increases as we increase η . However, the result depends on the choice of two values of ε_{D} . If we take a different set of values for ε_{D} , we obtain a different η dependence. The energy dispersion exhibits particle-hole symmetry; however, the integrands in Eqs. (9) and (10) do not. Consequently, the η dependence of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ and σ_{xy}^{PHE} is non-trivial.

To conclude, we have shown that the magnetoconductivity exhibit PHE in a realistic model for α -(BEDT-TTF) $_2$ I $_3$. Since α -(BEDT-TTF) $_2$ I $_3$ does not show any indication of ferromagnetism[34], the presence of PHE suggests the chiral anomaly effect that is associated with a three-dimensional Dirac semimetal. While our analysis is confined to a small magnetic field range due to the utilization of the semiclassical Boltzmann equation, we anticipate the occurrence of the PHE at high magnetic fields, provided there is no qualitative change between the low and high magnetic field regimes. This seems to be consistent with the recent experiment[16]. In conjunction with the experimental findings[15, 16], our results




FIG. 3. (Color online) (a) The magnetic field dependence of the amplitudes of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ and σ_{xy}^{PHE} using the same parameters as in Fig. 2. The amplitude varies quadratically with the magnetic field and there is no linear term. (b) The tilt parameter dependence of the amplitudes of $\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xx}^0$ and σ_{xy}^{PHE} at $b = 0.001$.

provide strong support for the classification of α -(BEDT-TTF)₂I₃ as a three-dimensional Dirac semimetal under conditions of low temperatures and high pressures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank N. Tajima for helpful discussions and sharing experimental data. The research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22K03533.

-
- [1] S. Murakami, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 356 (2007).
[2] A. A. Burkov and L. Balents, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011).
[3] K.-Y. Yang, Y.-M. Lu, and Y. Ran, *Phys. Rev. B* **84** (2011).
[4] G. Xu, H. Weng, Z. Wang, X. Dai, and Z. Fang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 186806 (2011).
[5] S. M. Young, S. Zaheer, J. C. Y. Teo, C. L. Kane, E. J. Mele, and A. M. Rappe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 140405 (2012).
[6] Z. Wang, Y. Sun, X.-Q. Chen, C. Franchini, G. Xu, H. Weng, X. Dai, and Z. Fang, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 195320 (2012).
[7] Z. Wang, H. Weng, Q. Wu, X. Dai, and Z. Fang, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 125427 (2013).
[8] M. Neupane, S.-Y. Xu, L. A. Wray, A. Petersen, R. Shankar, N. Alidoust, C. Liu, A. Fedorov, H. Ji, J. M. Allred, Y. S. Hor, T.-R. Chang, H.-T. Jeng, H. Lin, A. Bansil, R. J. Cava, and M. Z. Hasan, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 235406 (2012).
[9] N. P. Armitage, E. J. Mele, and A. Vishwanath, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015001 (2018).
[10] S. Katayama, A. Kobayashi, and Y. Suzumura, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **75**, 054705 (2006).
[11] A. Kobayashi, S. Katayama, Y. Suzumura, and H. Fukuyama, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **76**, 034711 (2007).
[12] K. Kajita, Y. Nishio, N. Tajima, Y. Suzumura, and A. Kobayashi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **83**, 072002 (2014).
[13] T. Morinari, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **89**, 073705 (2020).
[14] T. Morinari, arXiv:2308.11141.
[15] N. Tajima, Y. Kawasugi, T. Morinari, R. Oka, T. Naito, and R. Kato, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **92** (2023).
[16] N. Tajima, Y. Kawasugi, T. Morinari, R. Oka, T. Naito, and R. Kato, arXiv:2302.05616.
[17] H. Nielsen and M. Ninomiya, *Phys. Lett. B* **130**, 389 (1983).
[18] D. T. Son and B. Z. Spivak, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 104412 (2013).
[19] A. A. Burkov, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **27**, 113201 (2015).
[20] S. Nandy, G. Sharma, A. Taraphder, and S. Tewari, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 176804 (2017).
[21] A. A. Burkov, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 041110(R) (2017).
[22] J. Xiong, S. K. Kushwaha, T. Liang, J. W. Krizan, M. Hirschberger, W. Wang, R. J. Cava, and N. P. Ong, *Science* **350**, 413 (2015).
[23] X. Huang, L. Zhao, Y. Long, P. Wang, D. Chen, Z. Yang, H. Liang, M. Xue, H. Weng, Z. Fang, X. Dai, and G. Chen, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 031023 (2015).
[24] M. Hirschberger, S. Kushwaha, Z. Wang, Q. Gibson, S. Liang, C. A. Belvin, B. A. Bernevig, R. J. Cava, and N. P. Ong, *Nat. Mater.* **15**, 1161 (2016).
[25] C.-L. Zhang, S.-Y. Xu, I. Belopolski, Z. Yuan, Z. Lin, B. Tong, G. Bian, N. Alidoust, C.-C. Lee, S.-M. Huang, T.-R. Chang, G. Chang, C.-H. Hsu, H.-T. Jeng, M. Neupane, D. S. Sanchez, H. Zheng, J. Wang, H. Lin, C. Zhang, H.-Z. Lu, S.-Q. Shen, T. Neupert, M. Z. Hasan, and S. Jia, *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 10735 (2016).
[26] H. Li, H. He, H.-Z. Lu, H. Zhang, H. Liu, R. Ma, Z. Fan, S.-Q. Shen, and J. Wang, *Nat. Commun.* **7** (2016).
[27] A. Kobayashi, Y. Suzumura, and H. Fukuyama, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **77**, 064718 (2008).
[28] N. Tajima and T. Morinari, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **87**, 045002 (2018).
[29] K. Bender, I. Hennig, D. Schweitzer, K. Dietz, H. Endres, and H. J. Keller, *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* **108**, 359 (1984).
[30] A. A. Soluyanov, D. Gresch, Z. Wang, Q. Wu, M. Troyer, X. Dai, and B. A. Bernevig, *Nature* **527**, 495 (2015).
[31] C. Duval, Z. Horváth, P. A. Horváthy, L. Martina, and P. C. Stichel, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* **20**, 373 (2006).
[32] D. Xiao, Y. Yao, Z. Fang, and Q. Niu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 026603 (2006).
[33] D. Xiao, M.-C. Chang, and Q. Niu, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 1959 (2010).
[34] T. Konoike, T. Terashima, S. Uji, Y. Hattori, and R. Kato, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **91**, 043703 (2022).