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ABSTRACT

Rich nematic/smectic orders in Fe-based superconductors are important unsolved problem in the strongly correlated electron systems. A unified understanding for these rich orders has been investigated for the last decade. In this article, we explain the $B_{1g}$ symmetry nematic transition in FeSe$_{1-x}$Te$_x$, the $B_{2g}$ symmetry nematicity in AFe$_2$As$_2$ (A=Cs, Rb), and the smectic state in BaFe$_2$As$_2$ based on the same framework. Here, we investigate the quantum interference mechanism between spin fluctuations, by developing the density wave equation with the self-energy correction. In this mechanism, the observed rich variety of nematic/smectic orders are naturally understood, depending on the characteristic shape and topology of Fermi surface of each compound. (i) In FeSe$_{1-x}$Te$_x$ ($n_d = 6.0$), each Fermi surface (FS) is very small and the $d_{xy}$-orbital hole pocket is below the Fermi level. Then, small spin fluctuations on three $d_{xz}, d_{yz}$, and $d_{xy}$ orbitals cooperatively lead to the $B_{1g}$ nematic ($q = 0$) order without magnetization. The experimental Lifshitz transition below the nematic transition temperature ($T_S$) is naturally reproduced. (ii) In BaFe$_2$As$_2$ ($n_d = 6.0$), the $d_{xy}$-orbital hole pocket emerges around M point, and each FS is relatively large. Then, the strong spin fluctuations due to the $d_{xy}$-orbital nesting give rise to the $B_{1g}$ nematic ($q = 0$) order and the smectic [$q = (0, \pi)$] order, and the latter transition temperature ($T^* \sim 170$K) exceeds the former one ($T_S \sim 140$K). (iii) In heavily hole-doped AFe$_2$As$_2$ ($n_d = 5.5$), the large $d_{xy}$-orbital hole pocket and the four tiny Dirac pockets appear due to the hole-doping. Then, the $B_{2g}$ nematic bond order emerges on the $d_{xy}$-orbital hole pocket due to the same interference mechanism. The present spin-fluctuation interference mechanism provides a unified explanation why the nematic/smectic orders in Fe-based superconductors are so rich, based on the well established fermiology of Fe-based superconductors.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The emergence of electron nematic ($q = 0$) state is one of the most important unsolved problems in Fe-based superconductors [1]. In LaFeAsO and Ba122 compounds, the antiferro (AF) magnetic state
appears at the Neél temperature $T_N$, which is lower than the nematic transition temperature $T_S$. Since the superconducting phase with high transition temperature ($T_c$) appears near the nematic phase and the AF magnetic phase, it is expected that the nematic fluctuations and the spin fluctuations are related to the mechanism of the high-$T_c$ superconductivity. However, there appear the questions before discussing the superconductivity: (i) What is the order parameter of the nematic state? (ii) What is the driving force of the nematic state? (iii) Why do the diverse nematic states emerge in various compounds.

It is known that the nematic order cannot be derived from the mean field theory, since the spin-channel order always dominates over the nematic order unless unphysical parameters (such as the negative Hund’s coupling) are assumed. Previously, in order to explain the nematic state [2], the vestigial order (spin nematic) scenario [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9], and the orbital order scenario [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21] have been proposed.

In order to investigate the nematic state, FeSe family is an ideal platform since the AF magnetic state is absent [22, 23, 24, 25]. This family is also attracting from the aspect of superconductivity since the highest $T_c \gtrsim 65$K in Fe-based superconductors has been reported in electron-doped FeSe [26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. In FeSe, the orbital between $d_{xz}$ and $d_{yz}$ orbitals in the nematic state has been observed by the angle-resolved-photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) [31, 32, 33, 34, 35]. To be more precise, the orbital polarization energy $E_{xz} - E_{yz}$ has $k$ dependence and changes the sign between $\Gamma$ point and $X(Y)$ point. This sign reversal orbital polarization has been explained by the orbital order scenario [16, 17, 18, 19] based on the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism and by the renormalization group theory [36, 37]. In both theories, the vertex correction (VC) of the Coulomb interaction, which corresponds to the higher order many body effect, plays the essential role. Since the AF magnetic correlation is weak in FeSe, it is difficult to explain the nematic state by the vestigial order (spin nematic) scenario. On the basis of the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism, the $B_{1g}$ nematic orders in LaFeAsO, FeSe [14, 15, 16, 17], and the nematic orders in cuprate superconductors [38, 39] and magic-angle twisted bilayer graphene [40] have been explained as the orbital/bond orders.

The rich variety of the nematicity in FeSe family remains an important open problem. In FeSe$_{1-x}$S$_x$, $T_S$ disappears at $x \sim 0.17$, where the emergence of nematic quantum critical point (QCP) has been suggested by experiments [41, 42, 43, 44]. Recently, whole $x$ dependent phase diagram for FeSe$_{1-x}$Te$_x$ ($x \lesssim 0.6$) has reported [45, 46, 47]. In the phase diagram shown in Fig. 1A, $T_S$ decreases with Te doping $x$, and $T_S$ disappears at $x \sim 0.5$. $T_c$ becomes maximum $\sim 15$K at $x \sim 0.6$, which indicates that the nematic fluctuations enlarge superconducting pairing interaction near the nematic QCP. Thus, it is important to clarify the mechanism of $x$ dependence of $T_S$ and the nematic QCP to understand the mechanism of superconductivity in FeSe family.

In addition, significant open issue in the nematicity is the emergence of another type of nematicity in various Ba122 compounds below $T = T^*$, which is higher than $T_S$ by tens of Kelvin as shown in Fig. 1B. A true bulk nematic transition at $T = T^*$ has been reported in many experimental studies, such as a magnetic torque study [48], an X-ray study [49], an optical measurement study [50], and a laser photoemission electron microscope (PEEM) study [51]. Since the orthohombicity $(a-b)/(a+b) \ll 0.1\%$ below $T^*$ is tiny, an extrinsic origin such as the inhomogeneity of the nematic transition temperature $T_S$ due to local uniaxial pressure and randomness was proposed [4, 52, 53, 54]. On the other hand, $T^*$ seems not to be sensitive to the sample quality, and the domain structure of nematicity observed above $T_S$ [50, 51] is homogeneous. It is noteworthy that the orbital polarization starts to emerge at $T = T^* (> T_S)$ in Ba122 compound according to the recent PEEM study [51]. In this paper, we will explain the multistage
smectic/nematic transitions: the smectic order at \( T = T^\ast \) and the nematic order at \( T_S \). In the smectic state, the translational symmetry is broken, and the wavevector satisfies \( \mathbf{q} \neq 0 \).

In contrast to the \( B_{1g} \) nematicity in typical Fe-based superconductors, the emergence of \( 45^\circ \) rotated \( B_{2g} \) nematicity in heavily hole-doped \( \text{AFe}_2\text{As}_2 \) (A=Cs, Rb) has been reported in Refs. [55, 56, 57, 58], while Refs. [59, 60] have reported the absence of the nematic order. As shown in Fig. 1C, the dominant \( B_{1g} \) nematicity changes to the \( B_{2g} \) nematicity with doping \( x \) in \( \text{Ba}_{1-x}\text{Rb}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2 \). As for the mechanism of the \( B_{2g} \) nematicity, vestigial nematic order by using the double-stripe magnetic configuration was suggested [61]. However, no SDW transition has been observed [58, 62] in \( \text{AFe}_2\text{As}_2 \). As shown in Fig. 1C, the dominant nematicity changes to the \( B_{2g} \) nematicity in \( \text{AFe}_2\text{As}_2 \), and the spin fluctuations are weak around \( T_S \) in \( \text{RbFe}_2\text{As}_2 \) [63]. In this paper, we reveal the emergence of \( B_{2g} \)-symmetry bond order in \( \text{AFe}_2\text{As}_2 \).

As described above, the variety of nematicity in Fe-based superconductors are very rich. In order to understand the mechanism of nematic/smectic state and superconductivity, it is important to explain these nematic/smectic states in the same framework of theory.

In this paper, we study the \( B_{1g} \) nematicity in \( \text{FeSe}_{1-x}\text{Te}_x \) \( (n_d = 6.0) \), the tiny nematicity below \( T^\ast \) in \( \text{BaFe}_2\text{As}_2 \) \( (n_d = 6.0) \), and the \( B_{2g} \) nematicity in \( \text{AFe}_2\text{As}_2 \) \( (\text{A}=\text{Cs}, \text{Rb}) \) \( (n_d = 5.5) \), by developing the density wave (DW) equation theory. In this theory, the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism shown in Fig. 1D is taken into account. We also take account of the self-energy effect shown in Fig. 1E. In this mechanism, the rich variety of nematicity is naturally understood, depending on the shape and topology of FSs as shown in Figs. 2A, 2B, 2C. (i) In \( \text{FeSe}_{1-x}\text{Te}_x \), all FSs are very small, and \( d_{xy} \)-orbital hole pocket is absent. Then, the small spin fluctuations on the three \( d_{xz}, d_{yz}, \) and \( d_{xy} \) orbitals cooperatively lead to the \( B_{1g} \) nematic order, where the orbital order for \( d_{xz} \) and \( d_{yz} \) orbitals coexists with the bond order for the \( d_{xy} \) orbital. The experimental Lifshitz transition below \( T_S \) is naturally explained by the nematic order. The \( x \) dependence of \( T_S \) [45, 46, 47] is reproduced by introducing the self-energy. (ii) In \( \text{BaFe}_2\text{As}_2 \), the \( d_{xy} \) hole pocket emerges, and each FS is relatively large. Then, the smectic order at \( T = T^\ast (> T_S) \) and the nematic order at \( T = T_S \) emerge due to the strong \( d_{xy} \)-orbital nesting. The tiny nematicity below \( T^\ast \) is explained by the smectic order, and the multistage transitions are explained by the smectic and nematic orders. (iii) In heavily hole-doped \( \text{AFe}_2\text{As}_2 \), the large \( d_{xy} \)-orbital hole pocket and the four tiny Dirac pockets appear. Then, the \( B_{2g} \) nematic bond order emerges due to the \( d_{xy} \)-orbital spin-fluctuation interference mechanism, where the nesting between the Dirac pockets and the large \( d_{xy} \)-orbital hole pocket plays an important role. By considering the fermiology of each compound, these various nematic/smectic states are unifiedly explained by the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism.

2 MULTIORBITAL MODELS AND FORMULATION

2.1 Multiorbital models

Here, we introduce the multiorbital models based on the first-principles calculations. We analyze the following two-dimensional \( d-p \) Hubbard model with parameter \( r \) [16]:

\[
H_x = H_x^0 + rH_U,
\]

where \( H_x^0 \) is the first-principles model and \( H_U \) is the Coulomb interaction for \( d \)-orbitals. We neglect the Coulomb interaction for \( p \)-orbitals. We denote the five \( \text{Fe} \) \( d \)-orbitals \( d_{3z^2-r^2}, d_{xz}, d_{yz}, d_{xy}, d_{x^2-y^2} \) as \( l = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \), and three \( \text{Se(As)} \) \( p \)-orbitals \( p_x, p_y, p_z \) as \( l = 6, 7, 8 \). To obtain the model, we first use the WIEN2k [64] and Wannier90 [65] codes. Next, to reproduce the experimentally observed FSs, we
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Figure 1. (A) Schematic \( x-T \) phase diagram of FeSe\(_{1-x}\)Te\(_x\), where \( T_S \) decreases with \( x \), and \( T_c \) becomes maximum near the nematic QCP. (B) Schematic \( x-T \) phase diagram of BaFe\(_2\)(As\(_{1-x}\)P\(_x\))\(_2\), where the tiny nematicity appears for \( T_S < T < T^* \). We explain that “tiny nematicity” above \( T_S \) originates from smectic bond order in later section. (C) Schematic \( x-T \) phase diagram of Ba\(_{1-x}\)Rb\(_x\)Fe\(_2\)As\(_2\). \( B_{2g} \) nematic order appears for heavily hole doped region \( x > 0.5 \). (D) Feynman diagram of spin-fluctuation interference mechanism for the orbital/bond order. (E) Feynman diagram of the self-energy \( \Sigma(k) \).

Figure 2. FSs of (A) FeSe \( (n_d = 6.0) \), (B) BaFe\(_2\)As\(_2\) \( (n_d = 6.0) \), and (C) AFe\(_2\)As\(_2\) \( (A=Cs, Rb) \) \( (n_d = 5.5) \). The colors green, red and blue correspond to orbitals 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Variety of nematic/smectic states originates from the characteristic structure of FSs.

introduce the \( k \)-dependent shifts for orbital \( l \), \( \delta E_l \), by modifying the intra-orbital hopping parameters, as explained in Ref. [17]. In FeSe\(_{1-x}\)Te\(_x\) model, we shift the \( d_{xy} \)-orbital band and the \( d_{xz/yz} \)-orbital band at \([\Gamma, M, X]\) points by [0eV, −0.27eV, +0.40eV] and [−0.24eV, 0eV, +0.13eV], respectively. In BaFe\(_2\)As\(_2\) model, the shifts are absent. In CsFe\(_2\)As\(_2\) model, we shift the \( d_{xy} \)-orbital band and the \( d_{xz/yz} \)-orbital band at \([\Gamma, M, X]\) points by [0eV, +0.40eV, 0eV] and [−0.40eV, 0eV, +0.10eV], respectively.

We employ the \( d \)-orbital Coulomb interaction introduced by the constraint random phase approximation (RPA) method in Ref. [66]. The Coulomb interactions for the spin and charge channels are generally given as
where the irreducible susceptibility is

\[ \chi_m \equiv \frac{1}{\pi T} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{q}} + \mu - \mathbf{q}^2/(2m^*T)} \right]^2, \]

where \( \mu = \frac{\sigma, \sigma'}{\sigma, \sigma'} = 0 \) denotes spin.

By using the multiorbital Coulomb interaction, the spin (charge) susceptibility \( \chi^{(c)}(q) \) for \( q = (q, \omega_m = 2m^*T) \) is given by

\[ \chi^{(c)}(q) = \chi_0(q)[1 - \tilde{U}^{(c)}_0(q)]^{-1}, \]

where the irreducible susceptibility is

\[ \chi_0^{(c)}(q) = -\frac{T}{N} \sum_k G_{l,m}(k + q) G_{l',m'}(k). \]

\( \tilde{G}(k) \) is the multiorbital Green function with the self-energy \( \tilde{\Sigma} \), and given as \( \tilde{G}(k) = [(i\epsilon_n - \mu)\hat{1} - \tilde{h}^0(k) - \tilde{\Sigma}(k)]^{-1} \) for \( = [k, \epsilon_n = (2n + 1)\pi T] \). Here, \( \tilde{h}^0(k) \) is the matrix expression of \( H^0 \) and \( \mu \) is the chemical potential. The spin (charge) Stoner factor \( \alpha_s^{(c)} \) is defined as the maximum eigenvalue of \( \tilde{U}^{(c)}_0(q, 0) \). Since \( \chi^{(c)}(q) \propto (1 - \alpha_s^{(c)})^{-1} \) holds, spin (charge) fluctuations develop with increasing \( \alpha_s^{(c)} \), and \( \alpha_s^{(c)} = 1 \) corresponds to spin- (charge)-channel ordered state.

### 2.2 FLEX approximation

Here, we introduce the multiorbital fluctuation exchange (FLEX) approximation \[15, 67\]. The FLEX approximation satisfies the conserving-approximation formalism of Baym and Kadanoff \[68, 69\]. In the FLEX approximation, the self-energy is given as

\[ \tilde{\Sigma}(k) = \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k'} \hat{V} \Sigma(k - k') \tilde{G}(k'), \]

where \( \hat{V} \) is the fluctuation vertex.
which is shown by Feynman diagram in Fig. 1E. The effective interaction \( \hat{V}^\Sigma \) for the self-energy in the FLEX approximation is given as

\[
\hat{V}^\Sigma (q) = \frac{3}{2} \hat{U}^s \hat{\chi}^s(q) \hat{U}^s + \frac{1}{2} \hat{U}^c \hat{\chi}^c(q) \hat{U}^c + \frac{3}{2} \hat{U}^s + \frac{1}{2} \hat{U}^c
\]

\[
- \hat{U}^{\uparrow\downarrow} \hat{\chi}^0(q) \hat{U}^{\uparrow\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{U}^{\uparrow\uparrow} \hat{\chi}^0(q) \hat{U}^{\uparrow\uparrow},
\]

where \( \hat{U}^{\uparrow\downarrow} \equiv \frac{\hat{U}^c - \hat{U}^s}{2} \) and \( \hat{U}^{\uparrow\uparrow} \equiv \frac{\hat{U}^c + \hat{U}^s}{2} \) are denoted. We set \( \mu = 0 \). \( \hat{\chi}^{s(c)}(q), \hat{\Sigma}(k), \) and \( \hat{G}(k) \) are calculated self-consistently. In multiband systems, the FSs are modified from the original FSs due to the self-energy correction. To escape from this difficulty, we subtract the Hermite term \( [\hat{\Sigma}(k, +i0) + \hat{\Sigma}(k, -i0)]/2 \) from the original self-energy, which corresponds to the elimination of double-counting terms between LDA and FLEX.

### 2.3 DW equation

We derive the most strongest charge-channel density-wave (DW) instability, without assuming the order parameter and its wavevector. For this purpose, we use the DW equation method developed in Refs. [16, 18, 70]. We obtain the optimized non-local form factor \( \tilde{f}^q(k) \) with the momentum and orbital dependences by solving the following linearized DW equation shown in Fig. 3A:

\[
\lambda_q f_{l\ell'}^q(k) = \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k',m,m'} K^q_{l\ell';m,m'}(k,k') f_{m,m'}^q(k'),
\]

\[
K^q_{l\ell';m,m'}(k,k') = \sum_{m_1,m_2} f_{l\ell';m_1,m_2}(k,k') g_{m_1,m_2;m,m'}^q(k'),
\]

where \( \lambda_q \) is the eigenvalue of the form factor \( \tilde{f}^q(k) \), \( g_{l\ell';m,m'}^q(k) \equiv -G_{l,m}(k+q) G_{m',l'}(k), \) and \( \hat{I}^q(k,k') \) is the charge-channel irreducible four-point vertex shown in Fig. 3B. The four-point vertex interaction \( \hat{I}^q(k,k') \) in the DW equation [10, 16, 18] is given by

\[
\hat{I}^q_{l\ell';m,m'}(k,k') = \sum_{b=s,c} \left[ -\frac{a^b}{2} V_{l,m;l',m'}^b(k-k') \\
+ \frac{T}{N} \sum_{p,l_1,l_2,m_1,m_2} \frac{a^b}{2} V_{l_1;l,m_2}^b(p+q) V_{m_1;l_2,m_1}^b(p) \times G_{l_1,m_1}(k-p) G_{l_2,m_2}(k'-p) \\
+ \frac{T}{N} \sum_{p,l_1,l_2,m_1,m_2} \frac{a^b}{2} V_{l_1;l,m_2}^b(p+q) V_{m_2;l_2,m_1}^b(p) \times G_{l_1,m_1}(k-p) G_{l_2,m_2}(k'+p+q) \right],
\]

where \( a^s = 3, a^c = 1, p = (p, \omega_k), \) and \( \hat{V}^{s(c)}(q) = \hat{U}^{s(c)} + \hat{U}^{s(c)} \hat{\chi}^{s(c)}(q) \hat{U}^{s(c)} \).

In Eq. (11), the first line corresponds to the Maki-Thompson (MT) term, and the second and third lines give the Aslamazov–Larkin (AL) terms, respectively. Feynman diagrams of the MT terms and AL terms are shown in Fig. 3B.
The AL terms are enhanced by the spin-fluctuation interference \( \hat{\chi}(Q) \times \hat{\chi}(Q') \) shown in Fig. 1D. Thus, \( q = Q + Q' = 0 \) nematic order is naturally induced by the spin-fluctuation interference at the same nesting vector \( (Q' = -Q) \). In the MT term, the first-order term with respect to \( \hat{U}_{s,c} \) gives the Hartree–Fock (HF) term in the mean-field theory. The charge-channel DW with wavevector \( q \) is established when the largest \( \lambda_q = 1 \). Thus, the smaller \( \lambda_q \) corresponds to the lower \( T_S \). The DW susceptibility is proportional to \( 1/(1 - \lambda_q) \) as explained in Ref. [19]. Therefore, \( \lambda_q \) represents the strength of the DW instability.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Results of FeSe\(_{1-x} \)Te\(_x\)

In this section, we show that (i) the \( B_{1g} \) nematic orbital+bond order originates from the spin-fluctuation interference, and (ii) the effect of self-energy is important to reproduce the \( x \) dependence of \( T_S \) shown in Fig. 1A in FeSe\(_{1-x} \)Te\(_x\). Hereafter, we fix \( T = 15 \) meV, and \( r = 0.35 \) with the self-energy, and \( r = 0.15 \) without the self-energy, unless otherwise noted.

Figures 4A and 4B show \( x \) dependent FSs and band structures, respectively. The FSs are small compared to other Fe-based superconductors. With increasing \( x \), \( d_{xy} \) orbital level \( E_{M}^{\Gamma} \) at M point increases as shown in Fig. 4C. This behavior is consistent with ARPES measurement [71, 72]. On the other hand, \( d_{xy} \) and \( p_z \) orbital level \( E_{\Gamma}^{\Gamma} \) at \( \Gamma \) point decreases with increasing \( x \). \( E_{\Gamma}^{\Gamma} \) becomes lower than the \( d_{xz}(yz) \) orbital level for \( x \gtrsim 0.3 \), and the topology of band changes. The change of topology has been observed between \( \Gamma \) and \( Z \) points in ARPES measurement of FeSe\(_{0.5} \)Te\(_{0.5} \) [73, 74]. Figure 4D shows the density of state (DOS) of orbitals 3 and 4 for \( x = 0, 0.5 \). DOS near the Fermi level for \( x = 0 \) is larger than that for \( x = 0.5 \) since the band width decreases and \( E_{M}^{\Gamma} \) comes close to the Fermi level with increasing \( x \). In addition, the dispersion of orbitals 2 and 3 at \( \Gamma \) point becomes flat as \( E_{\Gamma}^{\Gamma} \) decreases with increasing \( x \), which also enlarges the DOS for orbitals 2 and 3 near the Fermi level.

In order to discuss the self-energy effect, we calculate the mass enhancement factors. Figure 5 shows the obtained \( x \) dependence of the mass enhancement factors \( z_l^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) for orbital \( l = 3, 4 \), which are given by \( z_l^{-1}(k) = 1 - \text{Im}\Sigma_{l,l}(k, \pi T)/\pi T \) in the FLEX approximation. Value of \( z_l^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) increases with increasing \( x \), since the electron correlation increases due to the reduction of band width and the increase of DOS shown in Fig. 4D. Particularly, \( z_4^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) is enhanced by the \( d_{xy} \) orbital electron correlation between the electron pockets and the band around M point, since \( E_{\Gamma}^{\Gamma} \) comes close to the Fermi level as shown in Fig. 4C. The behaviors of \( z_l^{-1} \) are similar to those given by the dynamical mean-field theory [75] and experiment [76].
Figure 4. (A) FSs and (B) band structures of FeSe$_{1-x}$Te$_x$ for $x = 0$ and 0.5. (C) $x$ dependences of $E_{xy}^\Gamma$ and $E_{xy}^M$. (D) DOS of orbitals 3 and 4 for $x = 0, 0.5$.

Figure 5. $x$ dependences of mass enhancement factor $z_l^{-1}(-\pi, 0)$ for orbitals $l = 3$ and 4.

Figure 6 shows $x$ dependences of $\chi_{3,3,3}^s(\pi, 0)$ and $\chi_{4,4,4}^s(\pi, 0)$ in the FLEX approximation and the RPA. $\chi_{3,3,3}^s(\pi, 0)$ is almost independent of doping $x$, which means that change of topology or number
of FS around Γ composed of $d_{xz}$ and $d_{yz}$ orbitals does not strongly affect the spin fluctuation for $d_{xz(yz)}$ orbital. On the other hand, $\chi^{s}_{4,4,4,4}(\pi,0)$ in the RPA without the self-energy is strongly enhanced with increasing $x$ since the electron correlation for $d_{xy}$ orbital between electron pockets and the band around M point is significant for the enhancement of $\chi^{s}_{4,4,4,4}(\pi,0)$. The strong enhancement of $\chi^{s}_{4,4,4,4}(\pi,0)$ is suppressed by the self-energy in the FLEX approximation. This suppression is necessary to reproduce the $x$ dependence of $T_{S}$ in the phase diagram as discussed later.

![Figure 6. $x$ dependences of $\chi^{s}_{3,3,3,3(4,4,4,4)}(\pi,0)$ in the FLEX approximation. Those in the RPA are shown in the inset.](image)

Hereafter, we discuss the DW instability given by the DW equation (9). Figure 7A shows $x$ dependences of $\lambda_{0}$ for the $B_{1g}$ nematic state with and without the self-energy. $\lambda_{0}$ without the self-energy rapidly increases with increasing $x$ due to the spin-fluctuation interference shown in Fig. 1D. $\lambda_{0}$ is enlarged by the interference between $\chi^{s}_{4,4,4,4}$ strongly enhanced in the RPA as shown in Fig. 6. Since this result means $T_{S}$ increases with $x$, phase diagram in Fig. 1A cannot be explained when the self-energy is absent. However, $\lambda_{0}$ including the self-energy decreases with doping $x$ since the enhancement of $\chi^{s}_{4,4,4,4}$ in the FLEX approximation is moderate and the self-energy suppresses the $\hat{G}$ and $\hat{I}$ in the DW equation (10). By decreasing $T$, the value of $\lambda_{0}$ increases as shown in Fig. 7B, $T = T_{S}$ is given when $\lambda_{0} = 1$ is satisfied. Thus, $T_{S}$ at $x = 0$ is higher than that at $x = 0.5$, and $T_{S}$ at $x = 0.65$ cannot be obtained for $T > 6$meV. The $x$ dependence of $T_{S}$ obtained by the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism including the self-energy is consistent with the phase diagram in Fig. 1A [45]. We see that $T$ dependences of the strength of nematic fluctuations $1/(1 - \lambda_{0})$ satisfy the Curie–Weiss law at low temperatures as shown in Fig. 7C. We note that the $B_{1g}$ nematic state is realized due to the small FSs even for the weak spin-fluctuations [16, 17].

Figure 8A shows $q$ dependences of $\lambda_{q}$ at $x = 0, 0.5$ with the self-energy. $\lambda_{q}$ has peak at $q = 0$, which means that the ferro nematic order is favored. Figure 8B shows $k$ dependences of the static form factors $f^{0}_{33}(k)$ and $f^{0}_{44}(k)$, where $f^{q}(k)$ is given by the analytic continuation of $f^{q}(k)$. $f^{0}_{33}(k_{x},k_{y}) = -f^{0}_{22}(k_{y},k_{x})$ represents $B_{1g}$ orbital order between orbitals 2 and 3. From the $k$ dependence of $f^{0}_{33(22)}(k)$, the sign-reversing orbital order is confirmed along $k_{x}(k_{y})$ axis. As shown in Fig. 8C, $k$ dependence of $f^{0}_{44}(k) \propto \cos(k_{x}) - \cos(k_{y})$ causes the $B_{1g}$ nearest-neighbor bond order, which is the modulation of correlated hopping. Based on the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism, we find that the small spin fluctuations on the three $d_{xz}$, $d_{yz}$, and $d_{xy}$ orbitals cooperatively cause $B_{1g}$ nematic order. By introducing the form factor with maximum value $f^{0}_{\text{max}} = 80$meV, the FSs and the band structure under the nematic order are shown in Figs. 8D and 8E. $f^{0}_{\text{max}} = 80$meV is consistent with ARPES measurements [34, 35].
by taking account of the mass enhancement factor \( z_l^{-1} = 2 \sim 4 \). The Lifshitz transition, where the FS around Y point is missing, has been reported in recent experiments \([77, 78, 79, 80]\). The Lifshitz transition is naturally explained by the increase of \( d_{xy} \) level around Y point induced by \( f_{44}(k) \). We note that the obtained coexistence of the bond order on the \( d_{xy} \) orbital and the orbital order on the \( (d_{xz}, d_{yz}) \) orbitals has already shown in the supplementary material of Refs. \([18, 19]\).

In Fig. 3D, we derived the Lifshitz transition by setting \( f_{\text{max}}^0 = 80\text{meV} \) by hand. It is noteworthy that the same result is recently obtained by solving the full DW equation in Ref. \([81]\). The full DW equation enables us to study the electronic states below \( T_S \) without introducing any additional fitting parameters.

Here, we confirm that the \( d_{xy} \) orbital levels at \( \Gamma \) and M points are important for the \( x \) dependence of \( \lambda_0 \). We employ the simple model, where only the shift of \( E_{xy}^\Gamma \) or \( E_{xy}^M \) is introduced for the \( x = 0 \) model. Figure 9A shows \( E_{xy}^\Gamma \) dependences of \( z_l^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) and \( \lambda_0 \), respectively. \( z_l^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) is almost independent of value of \( E_{xy}^\Gamma \), \( \lambda_0 \) decreases with decreasing \( E_{xy}^\Gamma \), which is consistent with the result in Fig. 7A. By decreasing \( E_{xy}^\Gamma \), the topology of band structure changes at \( \Gamma \) point, which plays important role to decrease \( \lambda_0 \). Figure 9B shows \( E_{xy}^M \) dependences of \( z_l^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) and \( \lambda_0 \), respectively. The behaviors of \( z_l^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) and \( \lambda_0 \) are similar to the results in Figs. 5 and 7A. The \( x \) dependences of \( z_l^{-1}(\pi, 0) \) and \( \lambda_0 \) are explained by the electron correlation between the electron pockets and the \( d_{xy} \) band around M point. \( \lambda_0 \) is suppressed by the self-energy for the \( d_{xy} \) orbital. The suppression becomes strong with increasing \( E_{xy}^M \) due to the feedback effect of the self-energy. To summarize, the \( B_{1g} \) nematic orbital-bond order is explained by the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism in \( \text{FeSe}_{1-x}\text{Te}_x \), and \( x \) dependence of \( T_S \) is well reproduced by the self-energy effect for the \( d_{xy} \) orbital.

### 3.2 Results of \( \text{BaFe}_2\text{As}_2 \)

In this section, we review the results of multi nematicity in \( \text{BaFe}_2\text{As}_2 \) \([19]\). We reveal the origin of tiny nematicity below \( T = T^* \) and explain the multistage transitions at \( T = T^* \) and \( T_S \) in the phase diagram shown in Fig. 1B. As shown in Fig. 2B, the size of hole FS around M point composed of \( d_{xy} \) orbital is similar to that of electron FSs around X and Y points, which cause the good intra- and inter-orbital nestings. As explained later, the inter-orbital nesting is important to realize the smectic state at \( T = T^* \).
Figure 8. (A) $q$ dependences of $\lambda_q$ with the self-energy for $x = 0, 0.5$. (B) $k$ dependences of $f^0_{3,3}(k)$ and $f^0_{4,4}(k)$ for $x = 0$, where green lines denote FSs. $f^0_{3,3}(k)$ changes sign along $k_x$ axis (yellow dashed line). (C) $B_{1g}$ nearest-neighbor bond order corresponding to $f^0_{4,4}(k)$. (D) FSs and (E) band structure under the nematic order with $f^0_{\text{max}} = 80\,\text{meV}$ for $x = 0$.

Figure 9. (A) $E_{xy}^T$ dependences of $z_{l}^{-1}(\pi, 0)$ for $l = 3, 4$, and $\lambda_0$ given by introducing only $E_{xy}^T$ shift for the $x = 0$ model. (B) $E_{xy}^M$ dependences of $z_{l}^{-1}(\pi, 0)$ for $l = 3, 4$, and $\lambda_0$ given by introducing only $E_{xy}^M$ shift for the $x = 0$ model.
Figure [10]A shows the $q$-dependence of $\lambda_q$ with the self-energy at $T = 5\text{meV}$ and that without the self-energy at $T = 32.4\text{meV}$, $q = (0, \pi)$ smectic bond order is dominant over the $q = 0$ nematic orbital+bond order because of the relation $\lambda_{(0,\pi)} > \lambda_0$, which is robust in the presence of moderate spin fluctuations $\alpha_s \gtrsim 0.85$. Thus, the nematic orbital+bond transition temperature $T_S$ is lower than $T^*$, where the smectic bond order appears. Figure [10]B shows the dominant component of the static form factor, $f^q_{3,4}(k)$, for $q = (0, \pi)$. Focusing on the X and M points, $f^{(0,\pi)}(k)$ is proportional to $-\cos(k_y)$, which corresponds to the inter-orbital smectic bond order, where the $y$-direction hoppings between orbitals 3 and 4 are modulated by the correlated hopping $\delta t_{3,4}(y; y \pm 1) = -\delta t_{4,3}(y; y \pm 1) = \delta t(-1)^y$. Note that $\delta t_{l,m}(y; y')$ is real and equal to $\delta t_{m,l}(y'; y)$.

As shown in Fig. [1D], the origin of the smectic bond order $f^{(0,\pi)}(k)$ is the quantum interference between the spin fluctuations $\chi^s(Q)$ for $Q \approx (0, \pi)$ and $\chi^s(0)$ due to the AL terms. In this case, $q = (0, \pi)$ is given by $Q' = 0$. $\chi^s(Q)$ is enhanced when the FS appears around M point since the nesting between FSs around X and M points becomes good, while the moderate $\chi^s(0)$ is caused by the forward scattering. We find that $f^{(0,\pi)}(k)$ is significantly enlarged by inter-orbital nesting between the $d_{xy}$-orbital FS around M point and $d_{yz}$-orbital FS around X point. In addition to the quantum interference due to the AL terms, the MT terms strengthen the sign change of $\chi^s(k)$ between X and M points, as reported previously [16, 18, 36]. Thus, the smectic bond order originates from the cooperation between the AL and MT terms due to the good inter-orbital nesting between FSs around X and M points.

In contrast, the $B_{1g}$ nematic orbital+bond order shown in Figs. [10]C and [10]D originates from the interference between $\chi^s(Q)$ and $\chi^s(-Q)$. This nematic orbital+bond order is similar to that in FeSe and FeSe$_{1-x}$Te$_x$.

Here, we examine the DOS under the smectic bond order to verify the present theory. For $T < T^* = 32.4\text{meV}$ without the self-energy, we introduce the mean-field-like $T$-dependent form factor $\hat{f}^q(T) = f^{\text{max}} \tanh\left(1.74 \sqrt{T^*/T - 1}\right) \hat{f}^q$, where $\hat{f}^q$ is the obtained form factor for $q = (0, \pi)$ normalized as $\max_k |\hat{f}^q(k)| = 1$. We put $f^{\text{max}} = 60\text{meV}$. Figure [11]A shows the DOS at $T = T^*$ and $28\text{meV}(< T^*)$. For $T < T^*$, a pseudogap appears due to the smectic bond order, which is consistent with the experiments [82, 83]. Since the smectic bond order is an antiferroic order, the folded bandstructure emerges below $T^*$, which is also consistent with the experiment [84].

Next, we focus on another mystery, the $T$-linear behavior of tiny nematicity $\psi$ in Ba122 [48] below $T^*$. In order to solve this mystery, we calculate the $T$ dependence of nematicity $\psi = (n_2 - n_3)/(n_2 + n_3)$ in Fig. [11]B, where both $\hat{f}^{(0,\pi)}(T)$ for $T < T^*$ and the ferro nematic orbital+bond order $\hat{f}^0(T)$ for $T < T_S (= 27.8\text{meV})$ without the self-energy are introduced. For $T < T_S$, we assume $\hat{f}^0(T) = f^{\text{max}} \tanh\left(1.74 \sqrt{T_S/T - 1}\right) \hat{f}^0$, where $\hat{f}^0$ is the obtained form factor normalized as $\max_k |\hat{f}^0(k)| = 1$. We employ $f^{\text{max}} = 60\text{meV}$, which corresponds to the $d_{xz(yz)}$ orbital energy split $\sim 60\text{meV}$ in the ARPES measurements [83] by considering the mass enhancement factor $z_l^{-1} \sim 2$ for $l = 2, 3$. The $T$-linear behavior $\psi \propto (T^* - T)$ for $T_S < T < T^*$ is a consequence of the relation $\psi \propto \left[f^{(0,\pi)}(T)^2\right]$ because the $f^{(0,\pi)}$ term cannot contribute to any $q = 0$ linear response. Note that the form factor $f^{(0,\pi)}(k)$ for $q = (\pi, 0)$ gives $\psi < 0$. Thus, the $T$-linear behavior of $\psi$ below $T^*$ is also naturally explained by the smectic bond order. On the other hand, $\psi \propto \sqrt{T_S - T}$ for $T < T_S$ is induced by the nematic orbital+bond order. To summarize, the multistage transitions at $T = T^*$ and $T_S$, and the $T$-linear $\psi$ below $T^*$, are naturally explained by the smectic bond order and nematic orbital+bond order. To realize the smectic bond order by the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism, the hole pocket around M point is necessary. We note
Figure 10. (A) $q$ dependence of $\lambda_q$ with the self-energy for $r = 0.68$ at $T = 5\text{meV}$ in BaFe$_2$As$_2$, and that without the self-energy for $r = 0.30$ at $T = 32.4\text{meV}$ in the inset. (B) $k$ dependence of the dominant form factor at $q = (0, \pi)$, $f_{3,4}^{(0,\pi)}(k)$ with the self-energy, which is given by the off-diagonal orbitals 3 and 4. $k$ dependences of form factors at $q = 0$, (C) $f_{4,4}^0(k)$ and (D) $f_{3,3}^0(k)$ with the self-energy. Green lines denote FSs.

that the multistage smectic/nematic transitions observed in NaFeAs [86] is also explained by the same mechanism. [19].

Figure 11. (A) DOS at $T = T^* = 32.4\text{meV}$ and that at $T = 28\text{meV}(< T^*)$ including the smectic bond order. (B) $T$ dependence of nematicity $\psi = (n_2 - n_3)/(n_2 + n_3)$ including both smectic-bond order for $T < T^*$ and ferro-orbital/bond order for $T < T_S$. 
3.3 Results of Ba$_{1-x}$Cs$_x$Fe$_2$As$_2$

In this section, we review the results of $B_{2g}$ nematicity in heavily hole-doped compound AFe$_2$As$_2$ (A=Cs, Rb) [18]. The direction of $B_{2g}$ nematicity is rotated by 45° from that of the conventional $B_{1g}$ nematicity. Figure 2C shows FSs of CsFe$_2$As$_2$: The hole FS around M point composed of $\Gamma_{0}$-orbital is large, while the Dirac pockets near X and Y points are small. In this system, the $\Delta_{xy}$-orbital spin fluctuations are dominant.

Figure 12A shows $q$ dependence of largest eigenvalue $\lambda_q$ with the self-energy for $r = 0.96$ at $T = 5$meV, and that without the self-energy for $r = 0.30$ at $T = 20$meV. $\lambda_q$ becomes maximum at $q = 0$ and the dominant form factor $f^{0}_{\Delta A} \left( k \right) \propto \sin( k_x ) \sin( k_y )$ at $q = 0$ is shown in Fig. 12B. As shown in Fig. 12C, this form factor corresponds to the $B_{2g}$ next-nearest-neighbor bond order for $\Delta_{xy}$ orbital, which is consistent with experimentally observed $B_{2g}$ nematicity [55, 56, 57, 58]. By analyzing the irreducible four point vertex $f^{0}_{\Delta A} \left( k, k' \right)$ in the DW Eq. (10), we find that the attractive (repulsive) interactions originate from the AL (MT) terms. The obtained $q = 0$ bond order is derived from these interactions. Since the AL terms are enhanced by the quantum interference between the spin fluctuations with $Q$ and $Q' = -Q$ as shown in Fig. 12D, $q = 0$ nematic bond order is realized. The value of $\lambda_0$ is strongly enhanced by the $\Delta_{xy}$-orbital spin-fluctuation interference. In this system, nesting vector is short $Q \sim (0.5\pi, 0)$ as shown in Fig. 12B. Due to repulsive interaction by the MT terms, $f^{0}_{\Delta A} \left( k \right)$ changes sign between $k$ points on the FSs connected by $Q$ as shown in Fig. 12D. To summarize, the AL terms strongly enlarge $\lambda_0$ due to the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism, and the MT terms favor the $B_{2g}$ symmetry. Cooperation of the AL and MT terms is important to realized the $B_{2g}$ bond order.

We comment on the recent experiments on RbFe$_2$As$_2$. The specific heat jump at $T_S = 40$K ($\Delta C/T_S$) is found to be very small [58]. However, it is naturally understood based on the recent theoretical scaling relation $\Delta C/T_S \propto T_S^b$ with $b \sim 3$ derived in Ref. [81]. Although the smallness of $B_{2g}$ nematic susceptibility in RbFe$_2$As$_2$ was recently reported in Refs. [59, 60], the field-angle dependent specific heat measurement has shown the finite $B_{2g}$ nematicity above $T_c$ [87]. Further experimental and theoretical studies are necessary to clarify the nematicity in AFe$_2$As$_2$ (A=Cs, Rb).

Finally, we discuss $x$ dependence of nematicity in Ba$_{1-x}$A$_x$Fe$_2$As$_2$ (A=Cs, Rb). The schematic phase diagram in Ba$_{1-x}$Rb$_x$Fe$_2$As$_2$ given by the experiment [58] is shown in Fig. 13C. We introduce model Hamiltonian for Ba$_{1-x}$Cs$_x$Fe$_2$As$_2$, by interpolating between BaFe$_2$As$_2$ model and CsFe$_2$As$_2$ model with the ratio $1 - x : x$.

Figure 13A shows $x$ dependence of $\lambda_q = 0$ without the self-energy for the $B_{2g}$ and the $B_{1g}$ symmetries by fixing $T = 30$meV and $r = 0.30$. Below $x = x_c \sim 0.5$, $B_{1g}$ nematic orbital order is dominant as discussed in the previous section, while $B_{2g}$ nematic bond order dominates over the $B_{1g}$ nematic orbital order for $x > x_c$. As shown in Fig. 13B, the Lifshitz transition occurs at $x \sim x_c$, where the electron pockets split into the four tiny Dirac pockets. Thus, the $B_{2g}$ nematic bond order appears when the nesting vector $Q$ between the electron pockets and hole pocket around M point becomes short $Q \sim (0.5\pi, 0)$. By taking account of the Lifshitz transition at $x \sim x_c$, the schematic phase diagram in Fig. 13C is also well reproduced by the orbital/bond order due to the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism. We note that the $q = (0, \pi)$ smectic order is dominant over the $q = 0$ $B_{1g}$ nematic order for $x = 0$ as shown in previous section.
Figure 12. (A) $q$ dependence of $\lambda_q$ with the self-energy at $T = 5\text{meV}$ in CsFe$_2$As$_2$, and that without the self-energy at $T = 20\text{meV}$ in the inset. (B) $k$ dependence of $B_{2g}$ form factor $f_{4,4}^0(k) \propto \sin(k_x) \sin(k_y)$, where the green lines and black arrow denote FSs and nesting vector $Q \sim (0.5\pi, 0)$, respectively. (C) The $B_{2g}$ next-nearest-neighbor bond order corresponding to the $f_{4,4}^0(k)$. (D) $B_{2g}$ form factor $\propto \sin(k_x) \sin(k_y)$ driven by the attractive interactions (red arrows) A and B, and the repulsive interaction (blue arrow) C in the DW equation, where green lines denote nodes in the $B_{2g}$ form factor.

Figure 13. (A) $x$ dependences of $\lambda_q=0$ without the self-energy for $B_{1g}$ and $B_{2g}$ symmetries in Ba$_{1-x}$Cs$_x$Fe$_2$As$_2$. (B) FSs for $x = 0.4$ and $x = 0.6$. Dominant nematic order changes at $x = x_c \sim 0.5$ near the Lifshitz transition, where the electron FSs split into the four tiny Dirac pockets.

4 CONCLUSION

We unifiedly discussed the rich variety of nematic/smectic states in Fe-based superconductors, based on the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism. In this mechanism, the charge-channel order is induced by the quantum interference between the spin fluctuations as shown in Fig. ID. The form factor and wavevector of the DW instability is derived from the DW equation based on the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism. Recently, a rigorous formalism of the DW equation has been constructed based
on the Luttinger–Ward (LW) theory in Ref. \[81\]. According to Ref. \[81\], the solution of the DW equation gives the minimum of the grand potential in the LW theory. Thus, the nematic/smectic order discussed in the present manuscript is thermodynamically stable in the framework of the conserving-approximation.

By considering the characteristic fermiology of each compound, the rich variety of the nematic/smectic states is unifiedly explained by the spin-fluctuation interference mechanism. In Figs. 14A, 14B, 14C, we summarized the nematic/smectic orders revealed by the mechanism in the present study. (i) In FeSe\textsubscript{1−x}Te\textsubscript{x}, each FS is very small and the \(d_{xy}\)-orbital hole pocket is absent. Then, the small spin fluctuations on the three orbitals cooperatively lead to the \(B_{1g}\) sign reversing orbital order for \(d_{xz}\) and \(d_{yz}\) orbitals coexisting with the \(d_{xy}\)-orbital bond order as shown in Fig. 14A. The nematic order causes the Lifshitz transition, where the FS around Y point disappears, consistently with the recent experiments. The \(x\) dependence of \(T_S\) in the phase diagram is reproduced by introducing the self-energy. (ii) In BaFe\textsubscript{2}As\textsubscript{2}, the \(d_{xy}\)-orbital hole pocket emerges. Since each electron- or hole-pocket is relatively large and similar in size, the strong \(d_{xy}\)-orbital spin fluctuations due to good nesting give rise to the smectic order shown in Fig. 14B and the \(B_{1g}\) nematic order. The tiny \(T\)-linear nematicity below \(T = T^* (> T_S)\) is explained by the smectic order. We predict the multistage transitions with the smectic order at \(T = T^*\) and nematic order at \(T_S\). (iii) In heavily hole-doped AFe\textsubscript{2}As\textsubscript{2} (A=Cs, Rb), the tiny Dirac pockets around X(Y) point and the large \(d_{xy}\)-orbital hole pocket appear due to the hole-doping. Then, the \(B_{2g}\) bond order for the \(d_{xy}\) orbital shown in Fig. 14C emerges due to the \(d_{xy}\)-orbital spin-fluctuation interference mechanism. The \(B_{2g}\) bond order is triggered by the Lifshitz transition of the electron FSs by the hole-doping.

It is important future problem to clarify the mechanism of superconductivity and non-Fermi-liquid behaviors of transport phenomena in FeSe family by considering the nematic fluctuations enlarged near the nematic QCP. This issue will be discussed in future publications \[88\].

**Figure 14.** (A) Schematic picture of the \(B_{1g}\) nematic orbital+bond order in FeSe\textsubscript{1−x}Te\textsubscript{x} and BaFe\textsubscript{2}As\textsubscript{2}, where the orbital order for \(d_{xz}\) and \(d_{x2z}\) orbitals coexists with the bond order for \(d_{xy}\) orbital. (B) Schematic picture of the smectic bond order for \(d_{yz}\) and \(d_{xy}\) orbitals in BaFe\textsubscript{2}As\textsubscript{2}. (C) Schematic picture of the \(B_{2g}\) nematic bond order for \(d_{xy}\) orbital in AFe\textsubscript{2}As\textsubscript{2} (A=Cs, Rb).
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