

# Sudden reversal in the pressure dependence of $T_c$ in the iron-based superconductor $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ : A possible link between inelastic scattering and pairing symmetry

F. F. Tafti,<sup>1,\*</sup> J. P. Clancy,<sup>2</sup> M. Lapointe-Major,<sup>1</sup> C. Collignon,<sup>1</sup> S. Faucher,<sup>1</sup>  
J. Sears,<sup>2</sup> A. Juneau-Fecteau,<sup>1</sup> N. Doiron-Leyraud,<sup>1</sup> A. F. Wang,<sup>3</sup> X. G. Luo,<sup>3</sup>  
S. Desgreniers,<sup>4</sup> Young-June Kim,<sup>2</sup> X. H. Chen,<sup>3</sup> and Louis Taillefer<sup>1,5,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Département de physique & RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada*

<sup>3</sup>*Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

<sup>4</sup>*Faculty of Science, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada*

<sup>5</sup>*Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Toronto, ON, Canada*

(Dated: March 31, 2022)

We report a sudden reversal in the pressure dependence of  $T_c$  in the iron-based superconductor  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , similar to that discovered recently in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  [Tafti *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **9**, 349 (2013)]. As in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , we observe no change in the Hall coefficient at  $T \rightarrow 0$ , again ruling out a Lifshitz transition across the critical pressure  $P_c$ . We interpret the  $T_c$  reversal in the two materials as a phase transition from one pairing state to another, tuned by pressure, and investigate what parameters control this transition. Comparing samples of different residual resistivity  $\rho_0$ , we find that a 6-fold increase in impurity scattering does not shift  $P_c$ . From a study of X-ray diffraction on  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  under pressure, we report the pressure dependence of lattice constants and As-Fe-As bond angle. The pressure dependence of these lattice parameters suggests that  $P_c$  should be significantly higher in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  than in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , but we find on the contrary that  $P_c$  is lower in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . Resistivity measurements under pressure reveal a change of regime across  $P_c$ , suggesting a possible link between inelastic scattering and pairing symmetry.

PACS numbers: 74.70.Xa, 74.62.Fj, 61.50.Ks

## I. INTRODUCTION

To understand what controls  $T_c$  in high temperature superconductors remains a major challenge. Several studies suggest that in sharp contrast to cuprates where doping controls charge balance, the dominant effect of doping in iron-based superconductors is to tune the structural parameters – such as the As-Fe-As bond angle – which in turn control  $T_c$ .<sup>1,2</sup> This idea is supported by the parallel tuning of  $T_c$  and the structural parameters of the 122 parent compounds  $\text{BaFe}_2\text{As}_2$  and  $\text{SrFe}_2\text{As}_2$ .<sup>3,4</sup> In the case of  $\text{Ba}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ , the best studied hole-doped pnictide family, the consensus is that at optimal doping ( $x = 0.4$ ,  $T_c = 38$  K) the As-Fe-As bond angle is  $\alpha = 109.5^\circ$ , the ideal angle of a non-distorted  $\text{FeAs}_4$  tetrahedral coordination. Underdoping, overdoping, or pressure would tune the bond angle away from this ideal value and reduce  $T_c$  by changing the electronic bandwidth and the nesting conditions.<sup>3</sup>

$\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  is an iron-based superconductor with  $T_c = 1.8$  K and  $H_{c2} = 1.4$  T.<sup>5–7</sup> Based on the available X-ray data,<sup>5</sup> the As-Fe-As bond angle in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  is  $109.58^\circ$ , almost the same as the ideal bond angle of  $\text{FeAs}_4$  tetrahedron that yields  $T_c = 38$  K in the optimally-doped  $\text{Ba}_{0.6}\text{K}_{0.4}\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ . If the bond angle were the key tuning factor for  $T_c$ ,  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  should have a much higher transition temperature than 1.8 K.

In this article, we show evidence that  $T_c$  in  $(\text{K,Cs})\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$  may be controlled by details of the inelastic scattering processes contained in  $\rho(T)$  that are not

simply related to structural parameters. The importance of inter- and intra-band inelastic scattering processes in determining  $T_c$  and the pairing symmetry of iron pnictides is pointed out in several theoretical works.<sup>8–10</sup> Recently, it has been demonstrated that pairing symmetry can change by tuning the relative strength of different competing inelastic scattering processes *i.e.* different magnetic fluctuation wave vectors.<sup>11</sup> Experimentally, these ideas have not been explored much.

In a previous paper, we reported the discovery of a sharp reversal in the pressure dependence of  $T_c$  in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , the fully hole-doped member of the  $\text{Ba}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$  series.<sup>12</sup> No changes of normal state properties such as Hall effect and resistivity were observed across the critical pressure  $P_c = 17.5$  kbar, indicating that the transition is not controlled by a sudden change in normal-state properties. Recent dHvA experiments under pressure reveal that the Fermi surface is the same on both sides of  $P_c$ , ruling out a Lifshitz transition and strengthening the case for a change of pairing state.<sup>13</sup> We interpret the sharp  $T_c$  reversal as a phase transition from  $d$ -wave to  $s$ -wave symmetry. Bulk measurements such as thermal conductivity<sup>14,15</sup> and penetration depth<sup>16</sup> favor  $d$ -wave symmetry at zero pressure. Because the high-pressure phase is very sensitive to disorder, a likely  $s$ -wave state is one that changes sign around the Fermi surface, as in the  $s_{\pm}$  state that changes sign between the  $\Gamma$ -centered hole pockets, as proposed by Maiti *et al.*<sup>10</sup> In  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ ,  $s$ -wave and  $d$ -wave states appear to be nearly degenerate, and a small pressure would be

enough to go from one to the other. Is  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  the only material that shows such an unusual  $T$ - $P$  phase diagram?

In this article, we report the discovery of a similar  $T_c$  reversal in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . While  $H_{c2}$  of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  and  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  are comparable,  $T_c$  is almost twice as high in the former. Both systems have tetragonal structure, but their lattice parameters are notably different.<sup>5</sup> Our high-pressure X-ray data show that 15 to 30 kbar of pressure is required to match the lattice parameters of  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  with those of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . Since  $P_c = 17.5$  kbar in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , we would expect that  $P_c = 30$ -50 kbar in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . Surprisingly, we find that  $P_c = 14$  kbar in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , *smaller* than in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . This observation clearly shows that structural parameters alone are not the controlling factors for  $T_c$  in  $(\text{K,Cs})\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ . Instead, we propose that competing inelastic scattering processes are responsible for tipping the balance between pairing symmetries.

## II. EXPERIMENTS

Single crystals of  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  are grown using a self flux method.<sup>7</sup> Resistivity and Hall measurements are performed on  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  single crystals in a six contact configuration in a clamp cell up to 20 kbar with pentane mixture as the pressure medium. Pressure is measured with a precision of  $\pm 0.1$  kbar by monitoring the superconducting transition temperature of a lead gauge placed besides the samples inside the clamp cell. Low temperature resistivity and Hall measurements are performed in an adiabatic demagnetization refrigerator.

Hall voltage is measured at plus and minus 10 T from  $T = 20$  to 0.2 K and the raw data are antisymmetrized to calculate the Hall coefficient  $R_H(T)$ . The resistivity and Hall measurements were done on two samples of  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  to check for reproducibility. We label the two samples as sample 1 and sample 2.

High pressure X-ray experiments were performed on polycrystalline powder specimens of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  up to 60 kbar at the Canadian Light Source, using diamond anvil cells with silicon oil as the pressure medium. Pressure is tuned in fine steps ( $< 1$  kbar) using the  $R_1$  fluorescent line of a ruby chip placed inside the sample hole.

## III. RESULTS

Figure 1(a) shows our discovery of a sudden reversal in the pressure dependence of  $T_c$  in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  at a critical pressure  $P_c = 14 \pm 1$  kbar. Panels (b) and (c) of Fig. 1 show normalized  $\rho(T)$  curves at three pressures below  $P_c$  and three pressures above  $P_c$ . The shift of  $T_c$  as a function of pressure clearly changes direction from decreasing to increasing across the critical pressure.  $T_c$  varies linearly near  $P_c$  resulting in a V-shape phase diagram similar to  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ .<sup>12</sup>




FIG. 1. a) Pressure dependence of  $T_c$  in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . The blue and the red circles represent data from sample 1 and sample 2, respectively. The critical pressure  $P_c$  marks a change of behaviour from decreasing to increasing  $T_c$ . Dotted red lines are linear fits to the data from sample 2 in the range  $P_c \pm 10$  kbar. The critical pressure  $P_c = 14 \pm 1$  kbar is defined as the intersection of the two linear fits. b) Low-temperature  $\rho(T)$  data, from sample 2, normalized to unity at  $T = 2.5$  K. Three isobars are shown at  $P < P_c$ . The arrow shows that  $T_c$  decreases with increasing pressure. c) Low-temperature  $\rho(T)$  data, from sample 2, normalized to unity at  $T = 1.5$  K. Three isobars are shown at  $P > P_c$ . The arrow shows that  $T_c$  increases with increasing pressure.

We rule out the possibility of a Lifshitz transition via two observations. First, there is no change in the zero temperature limit of the Hall coefficient across  $P_c$ . Fig. 2a shows the temperature dependence of the Hall coefficient  $R_H$  at five different pressures below and above  $P_c$ . The low temperature data extends down to 0.2 K. The zero temperature limit of the Hall coefficient  $R_H(T \rightarrow 0)$  clearly remains unchanged across  $P_c$  (Fig. 2b). Secondly,  $\rho(T)$  evolves smoothly across  $P_c$  with no anomalies. Each point on Fig. 2c is a cut through the  $\rho(T)$  curve at each pressure for sample 1 and sample 2 at  $T = 20$  K. While resistivity at 20 K is gradually suppressed, no sharp features are observed across the critical pressure. Similar observations also rule out a Lifshitz transition in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ .<sup>12</sup>




FIG. 2. a) Temperature dependence of the Hall coefficient in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  (sample 2), at five selected pressures. The low temperature data converge to the same value for all pressures below and above  $P_c$ . b) The value of  $R_H$  at  $T = 0$  is plotted at different pressures.  $R_H(T = 0)$  remains unchanged across the critical pressure. c) Resistivity of sample 1 (blue squares) and sample 2 (red squares) at  $T = 20$  K, plotted as a function of pressure.  $\rho(T = 20\text{K})$  goes through  $P_c$  smoothly.

Several studies on the  $\text{Ba}_{1-x}\text{K}_x\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$  series suggest that lattice parameters, in particular the As-Fe-As bond angle, control  $T_c$ .<sup>2-4,17</sup> Following this hypothesis, we measured the lattice parameters of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  from  $P = 0$  to 60 kbar to find out how much pressure is required to tune the lattice parameters of  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  to those of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . Cs has a larger atomic size than K, hence, one could consider  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  as a negative-pressure version of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . The four panels of Fig. 3 show the pressure variation of the  $a$  axis,  $c$  axis, unit cell volume ( $V = ac^2$ ), and As-Fe-As bond angle ( $\alpha$ ) in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . Black dotted lines on each panel are smooth fits to the data. The red horizontal line in each panel marks the lattice parameter of  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ .<sup>5</sup> In order to tune  $a$ ,  $c$ ,  $V$ , and  $\alpha$  in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  to match the values of  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , we require  $-10.6$ ,  $-28.5$ ,  $-21.8$ , and  $-21.8$  kbar, respectively. Adding these numbers to the critical pressure for  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  ( $P_c = 17.5$  kbar), we would naively estimate that the critical pressure in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  should be roughly




FIG. 3. Structural parameters of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  as a function of pressure. Panels (a), (b), (c), and (d) trace  $a$ -axis,  $c$ -axis, the unit cell volume ( $V = a^2c$ ), and the smaller As-Fe-As bond angle ( $\alpha$ ) as a function of pressure up to 60 kbar. Dotted solid lines are fourth order fits to the data on each panel. The crossing horizontal and vertical red lines mark lattice parameters of  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  on each panel.

in the range  $P_c = 30 - 50$  kbar. We find instead that  $P_c = 14$  kbar in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , ruling out the idea that the As-Fe-As bond angle determines  $T_c$  in these materials.

It is possible that the lower  $P_c$  in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  could be due to the fact that  $T_c$  itself is lower than in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  at zero pressure, *i.e.* that the low-pressure phase is weaker in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . One hypothesis for the lower  $T_c$  in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  is a higher level of disorder. To test this idea, we studied the pressure dependence of  $T_c$  in a less pure  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  sample. Fig. 4 compares the  $T$ - $P$  phase diagram in three samples: 1) a high-purity  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  sample, with  $\rho_0 = 0.2 \mu\Omega \text{ cm}$  (from ref. 12); 2) a less pure  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  sample, with  $\rho_0 = 1.2 \mu\Omega \text{ cm}$ , measured here; 3) a  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  (sample 2), with  $\rho_0 = 1.5 \mu\Omega \text{ cm}$ . First, we observe that a 6-fold increase of  $\rho_0$  barely changes  $P_c$  in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . Secondly, we observe that  $P_c$  is 4 kbar smaller between sample 2 ( $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ ) and the  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  sample with comparable  $\rho_0$ . These observations rule out the idea that disorder could be responsible for the lower value of  $P_c$  in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  compared to  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ .

#### IV. DISCUSSION

We establish a common trait in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  and  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ : both systems have a sudden reversal in the pressure dependence of  $T_c$  with no sign of a Lifshitz tran-




FIG. 4. Pressure dependence of  $T_c$  in three samples: pure  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  (black circles), less pure  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  (grey circles), and  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  (sample 2, red circles). Even though the  $T_c$  values for the two  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  samples are different due to different disorder levels, measured by their different residual resistivity  $\rho_0$ , the critical pressure is the same ( $P_c = 17.5 \pm 0.5$  kbar). However, the critical pressure in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  ( $P_c = 14 \pm 1$  kbar) is clearly smaller than in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , for comparable  $\rho_0$ .

sition. Our interpretation is a change of pairing symmetry across the critical pressure in both cases: a phase transition confined within the superconducting state. We rule out the idea that lattice parameters such as the As-Fe-As bond angle determine the pressure dependence of  $T_c$  and its reversal across  $P_c$  (see Fig. 3). We show that disorder has little effect on  $P_c$  (see Fig. 4). The question that remains is what controls the V-shape  $T$ - $P$  phase diagram of these fully hole-doped iron-based superconductors and why is  $P_c$  smaller in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  compared to  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ ?

Fig. 5 compares the pressure dependence of inelastic scattering measured via the difference  $\rho(20\text{K}) - \rho_0$ , in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  vs  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . The pressure axis is normalized to the respective critical pressure of each compound. Above the critical pressure,  $P/P_c = 1$ , inelastic scattering varies linearly with pressure. As we go from high to low pressures, both compounds show a clear rise of inelastic scattering below their respective  $P_c$ , over and above the linear regime. Fig. 5 therefore suggests a connection between the reversal of  $T_c$  and the increase of inelastic scattering.

In a recent theoretical work by Fernandes and Millis, it is demonstrated that different pairing interactions in 122 systems can favour different pairing symmetries.<sup>11</sup> In this theory, the Néel type magnetic fluctuations, with wavevector  $(\pi, \pi)$ , strongly suppress the  $s_{\pm}$  state and




FIG. 5. (a) The residual resistivity  $\rho_0$  is subtracted from  $\rho(T)$  at  $T = 20$  K and the result is plotted as a function of pressure for  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  (sample 2). The x-axis is normalized by  $P_c = 14$  kbar for  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  and  $P/P_c = 1$  is marked by a vertical red line.  $\rho(20\text{K}) - \rho_0$  is a measure of inelastic scattering. Notice the considerable decrease of inelastic scattering below the critical pressure. The dotted black line is a linear fit to the data above  $P/P_c = 1$ . (b) same as (a) for  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  except The pressure axis is normalized by  $P_c = 17.5$  kbar for  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ .

favour  $d$ -wave pairing, whereas SDW type fluctuations, with wavevector  $(\pi, 0)$ , favour  $s_{\pm}$  pairing. It is conceivable that pressure tilts the balance in favor of one interaction versus the other, causing a V-shaped  $T_c$  vs  $P$  curve.<sup>11</sup>

The Fermi surface of  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  includes three  $\Gamma$ -centered hole-like cylinders. A possible pairing state is an  $s_{\pm}$  state where the change of sign occurs between the middle cylinder and the outer cylinder, favored by a small- $Q$  interaction.<sup>10</sup> By contrast, the intraband inelastic scattering wave vectors that favour  $d$ -wave pairing are large- $Q$  processes.<sup>18</sup> Therefore one scenario to understand the evolution in the inelastic resistivity with pressure (Fig. 5), is that the large- $Q$  scattering processes, visible in the resistivity, that favor  $d$ -wave pairing at low pressure gradually weaken, and the low- $Q$  processes, less visible, become dominant above  $P_c$ , favoring the  $s_{\pm}$  state.

In summary, we discovered a pressure-induced  $T_c$  reversal in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , which we interpret as a change of pairing state similar to our previous finding in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ . The critical pressure  $P_c$  in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  is smaller than in  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$ , even though all lattice parameters would suggest otherwise. This shows, amongst other things, that the As-Fe-As bond angle alone does not control  $T_c$  in these particular materials. Our study of the pressure dependence of resistivity in  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  and  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  reveal a possible link between  $T_c$  and inelastic scattering. Our proposal is that the high-pressure phase is the same  $s_{\pm}$  state that changes sign between  $\Gamma$ -centered pockets. As the pressure is lowered, the inelastic scattering processes that favor  $d$ -wave pairing in pure  $\text{KFe}_2\text{As}_2$  and  $\text{CsFe}_2\text{As}_2$  grow until at a critical pressure  $P_c$  they change the pairing symmetry. The experimental evidence for this is the fact that below  $P_c$  the inelastic resistivity

$(\rho(20 \text{ K}) - \rho_0)$  deviates upwards from its linear pressure dependence at high pressure.

---

\* Fazel.Fallah.Tafti@USherbrooke.ca

† Louis.Taillefer@USherbrooke.ca

- <sup>1</sup> J. Zhao, Q. Huang, C. de la Cruz, S. Li, J. W. Lynn, Y. Chen, M. A. Green, G. F. Chen, G. Li, Z. Li, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang, and P. Dai, *Nature Materials* **7**, 953 (2008).
- <sup>2</sup> M. Rotter, M. Pangerl, M. Tegel, and D. Johrendt, *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* **47**, 79497952 (2008).
- <sup>3</sup> S. A. J. Kimber, A. Kreyssig, Y.-Z. Zhang, H. O. Jeschke, R. Valent, F. Yokaichiya, E. Colombier, J. Yan, T. C. Hansen, T. Chatterji, R. J. McQueeney, P. C. Canfield, A. I. Goldman, and D. N. Argyriou, *Nature Materials* **8**, 471 (2009).
- <sup>4</sup> P. L. Alireza, Y. T. C. Ko, J. Gillett, C. M. Petrone, J. M. Cole, G. G. Lonzarich, and S. E. Sebastian, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **21**, 012208 (2009).
- <sup>5</sup> K. Sasmal, B. Lv, B. Lorenz, A. M. Guloy, F. Chen, Y.-Y. Xue, and C.-W. Chu, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 107007 (2008).
- <sup>6</sup> A. F. Wang, B. Y. Pan, X. G. Luo, F. Chen, Y. J. Yan, J. J. Ying, G. J. Ye, P. Cheng, X. C. Hong, S. Y. Li, and X. H. Chen, *Physical Review B* **87**, 214509 (2013).
- <sup>7</sup> X. C. Hong, X. L. Li, B. Y. Pan, L. P. He, A. F. Wang, X. G. Luo, X. H. Chen, and S. Y. Li, *Physical Review B* **87**, 144502 (2013).
- <sup>8</sup> S. Graser, T. A. Maier, P. J. Hirschfeld, and D. J. Scalapino, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 025016 (2009).
- <sup>9</sup> S. Maiti, M. M. Korshunov, T. A. Maier, P. J. Hirschfeld, and A. V. Chubukov, *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 147002 (2011).
- <sup>10</sup> S. Maiti, M. M. Korshunov, and A. V. Chubukov, *Physical Review B* **85**, 014511 (2012).
- <sup>11</sup> R. M. Fernandes and A. J. Millis, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 117004 (2013).
- <sup>12</sup> F. F. Tafti, A. Juneau-Fecteau, M.-. Delage, S. Ren de Cotret, J.-P. Reid, A. F. Wang, X.-G. Luo, X. H. Chen, N. Doiron-Leyraud, and L. Taillefer, *Nature Physics* **9**, 349 (2013).
- <sup>13</sup> T. Terashima, K. Kihou, K. Sugii, N. Kikugawa, T. Matsumoto, S. Ishida, C.-H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, and S. Uji, *arXiv:1401.6257 [cond-mat]* (2014).
- <sup>14</sup> J.-P. Reid, M. A. Tanatar, A. Juneau-Fecteau, R. T. Gordon, S. R. de Cotret, N. Doiron-Leyraud, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, R. Prozorov, and L. Taillefer, *Physical Review Letters* **109**, 087001 (2012).
- <sup>15</sup> J. K. Dong, S. Y. Zhou, T. Y. Guan, H. Zhang, Y. F. Dai, X. Qiu, X. F. Wang, Y. He, X. H. Chen, and S. Y. Li, *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 087005 (2010).
- <sup>16</sup> K. Hashimoto, A. Serafin, S. Tonegawa, R. Katsumata, R. Okazaki, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, H. Ikeda, Y. Matsuda, A. Carrington, and T. Shibauchi, *Physical Review B* **82**, 014526 (2010).
- <sup>17</sup> S. L. Bud'ko, M. Sturza, D. Y. Chung, M. G. Kanatzidis, and P. C. Canfield, *Physical Review B* **87**, 100509 (2013).
- <sup>18</sup> R. Thomale, C. Platt, W. Hanke, J. Hu, and B. A. Bernevig, *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 117001 (2011).