Vortex nucleation barriers and stable fractional vortices near boundaries in multicomponent superconductors
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The magnetization process of a superconductor is determined by the potential barrier for vortex nucleation and escape. In multicomponent superconductors, fractional vortices with a winding in the phase of one of the components can be stable topological solitons that carry a fraction of the flux quantum. While the formation of such objects in bulk costs logarithmically or linearly divergent energy, these objects were shown to be stable near samples’ boundaries in the two-component London model. Therefore, the conventional Bean-Livingston picture of magnetic flux entry does not apply to these superconductors, since the entry process can involve fractionalization of a vortex. In this paper, we address the nonlinear problem of determining the potential barrier for fluxoid penetration in a multicomponent superconductor, including the effects of various intercomponent couplings, by using the recently developed gauged string method. The method allows numerically exact (i.e. convergent) calculation of a sphaleron configuration in a gauge theory and thus the height of the nucleation barrier. By using this method, we calculate how the fractionalized nucleation processes result in multiple sphalerons and intermediate states due to the complex shape of the energy landscape of multicomponent superconductors.

I. INTRODUCTION

Most superconductive systems of current interest have multiple components. That include multi-band superconductors with s-wave pairing, see e.g. [1–6], superconductors with broken time-reversal symmetry, which can be singlet s-wave superconductors [7–10], and superconductors materials with unconventional pairing [11]. When a superconductor has multiple components, the vortex excitations have a composite character: they are bound states of fractional-flux vortices, which, individually, have logarithmically divergent energy due to inter-component electromagnetic coupling, or linearly divergent density due to phase-difference-locking coupling, and therefore, form finite-energy bound states [12]. This affects the magnetic properties of such materials since, to enter a superconductor, a vortex needs to overcome a potential barrier.

In the Bean-Livingston picture, the origin of the surface barrier for a vortex is described within the London model, as the effect of the competition between the attractive force of a mirrored image-vortex with opposite vorticity, and the repulsive force with the surface current induced by the external magnetic field [13]. However, in general, the vortex position in the maximum energy configuration can be very close to the boundary, preventing the use of the superposition principle that holds only for linear theories. Therefore, a general description requires the solution of the full nonlinear problem, e.g. in a Ginzburg-Landau model.

These energy barriers correspond to infinite-dimensional saddle points of the free energy landscape of the theory called sphalerons, which are often associated with a transition between topologically distinct minima [14–16]. These saddle points in the configuration space can be better understood as the local maximum of the minimum energy path of the nucleation process. That is defined as a path in the configuration space such that it crosses the minimum in the cotangent space of the path point by point. Until the recent publication [17], there were no controllable analytical or numerical methods to find saddle points in nonlinear gauge theories.

In two-dimensional single-component systems, the number of processes featuring sphalerons is limited because the intervortex interaction is always repulsive, while the low dimensionality excludes processes involving complicated real-space topology changes like vortex reconnections. Indeed, sphalerons appear only in changes of the vortex lattice or in processes where vortices interact with the boundaries of the sample, like in the nucleation process.

When a second complex field comes into play, the energy landscape becomes much more complicated and many new configurations, both stable states and sphalerons, are possible. In the nucleation process of a composite vortex, the vortices in the two components can experience attraction and repulsion to the boundary at different distances. The presence of different zones of attraction and repulsion can lead to the existence of barriers and metastable intermediate states. Vortex entry in a multicomponent superconductor is a much more complex process that, under certain conditions, involves the formation of a stable fractional vortex near the boundary. Stable fractional vortices in two-component systems were demonstrated both within the London model [18] and numerically in the Ginzburg-Landau model [19].

While many works, both analytical and numerical, focused on the calculation of the nucleation fields, that is the magnetic field needed to suppress the barrier [20–24], the calculation of the barrier height and the
sphaleron configuration is very complicated and, until recently, there has been no analytical nor numerical fully-controllable approach to address this problem in gauge theories such as Ginzburg-Landau models. One of the many methods to compute the minimum energy path for other models is the string method [25; 26], originally designed to compute saddle points in molecular dynamics problems. In Ref. [17] it has been proposed a generalization of the string method for classical gauge theories that allows calculating, in a numerically controllable way, vortex nucleation processes in a single-component Ginzburg-Landau model.

In this paper, we generalize to the multicomponent case the gauged string method presented in Ref. [17] that allows studying, extensively and free of approximations, the process of vortex nucleation and to calculate vortex nucleation barriers. The main objective is to study how nucleation is affected by the presence of a second component, looking for fractional vortex nucleation and edge pinning. Secondarily, this allowed the testing of the gauged string method for a system with more complicated gauge symmetry.

II. MODEL

We consider a Ginzburg-Landau model for a two-component superconductor with up to quartic order terms. This system features an order parameter \( \Psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2)^T \) where \( \psi_1 \) and \( \psi_2 \) are two complex scalar fields, which are coupled by some direct interaction \( V_{\text{int}} \), and to the electromagnetic field described by the gauge potential \( A \) (see e.g. [6]). The system has a free energy \( F[A, \psi_1, \psi_2] = \int F \, d^3r \) where the free energy density functional reads, in natural units,

\[
F[A, \psi_1, \psi_2] = \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \sum_{k=x,y} \frac{|D_k \psi_\alpha|}{2m_{\alpha,kk}} + \frac{b_\alpha}{2} \left( a_\alpha + |\psi_\alpha|^2 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \times A - H)^2 + V_{\text{int}}(\psi_1, \psi_2),
\]

(1)

Here the index \( k \) labels the axes of the coordinate system and the index \( \alpha \) denotes the superconducting components, the vector field \( A \) is the gauge field while \( \psi_\alpha = |\psi_\alpha|e^{i\theta_\alpha} \) are the two matter fields, and \( H \) is the external magnetic field. The parameters \( m_{\alpha,kk} \) are the masses of the two fields in the reference system. The operator \( D_k = -i \partial_k - q A_k \) is the covariant derivative where \( q \) is the electric charge of the superconducting components. Direct interactions comprise the linear Josephson coupling, controlled by the parameters \( \eta \), the density coupling \( \gamma \), and the biquadratic Josephson coupling represented by the term with \( \delta \). In this work, we do not consider the effects of time-reversal symmetry breaking and nematicity in the interaction potential, thus we set \( \delta = 0 \). More general interactions, higher gradient terms, and additional fields can be straightforwardly included. For a detailed microscopic discussion of the derivation and applicability of these models, see [27].

The vortex topological invariants of the model are represented by the two winding numbers defined as:

\[
N_i = \int_{\partial\Omega} \nabla \theta_i \cdot dl.
\]

(2)

If we neglect the direct interaction term \( V_{\text{int}}(\psi_1, \psi_2) \) the system described by the functional in Eq. 1 models two charged superfluids which only interact through the gauge field. In the absence of phase-locking or phase separation, the system has \( U(1) \times U(1) \) gauge symmetry.

The magnetic flux carried by a vortex line is:

\[
\Phi = \Phi_0 \left[ N_1 \frac{\overline{\psi}_1^2}{\psi_1 + \psi_2} + N_2 \frac{\overline{\psi}_2^2}{\psi_1 + \psi_2} \right],
\]

(3)

where \( \Phi_0 = 2\pi/q \) is the magnetic flux quantum and \( \overline{\psi}_\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{b_\alpha}{a_\alpha}} \) is the bulk equilibrium value of each order parameter. Therefore, the elementary excitations in the model are fractional vortices that have a nonzero winding only in one phase [12]. Fractional vortices are thermodynamically unstable in the bulk [12] but they can be stabilized near the boundary of a sample by the interaction with surface currents [18]. The vortex carries an integer number of flux quanta only when \( N_1 = N_2 \). In this case, it is given the name composite vortex and it is also stable in the bulk of the superconductor.

When interactions are included, other types of solitons can be present. For example, two well separated fractional vortices can stick together. These objects can be described as skyrmions of the pseudospin field \( S = \frac{\Psi^T \sigma \Psi}{\Psi^T \Psi} \) where \( \sigma \) is the Pauli matrices vector [19; 28].

An extremely useful tool to study the formation of solitons is the concept of minimum energy paths. A generic path in the configuration space of the system is a function \( q(s) = (A(s), \psi_1(s), \psi_2(s)) \), where the transition coordinate \( s \in [0, 1] \) has been introduced. A minimum energy path can be defined in a variational formulation as

\[
q_{\text{MEP}}(s) = \arg \min F(q(s)), \quad \forall s \in [0, 1],
\]

(4)
where $F_\perp$ is that the free energy functional $F$ restricted to the cotangent space of the trajectory in the point $\mathbf{q}_{\text{MEP}}(s)$ \cite{29}. Once the minimum energy path $\mathbf{q}_{\text{MEP}}(s)$ is obtained, it is possible to compute the quantities of interest, like the free energy $F$ or the winding numbers $N_\alpha$, and track their evolution along the path. The evolution along $s$ can be considered a pseudodynamics, which mimics some features of the real time dynamics simulated by time-dependent models. To calculate minimum energy paths in the two-component Ginzburg-Landau theory we used the gauged string method described in Ref. \cite{17}. To do so, we introduce the following gauge-invariant metric for the reparametrization step:

$$\Delta s_{\alpha}^b = \left( \| \mathbf{B}_n - \mathbf{B}_{n-1} \|^2 + \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \| \mathbf{j}_{\alpha,n} - \mathbf{j}_{\alpha,n-1} \|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ is the magnetic field and $\mathbf{j}_\alpha = \sum_{k=x,y} \left[ \psi_\alpha^* \frac{\partial \psi_\alpha}{\partial x} \right]_{m_{\alpha,k}} \psi_\alpha + \text{c.c.}$ are the component currents.

In this work, we mainly study minimum energy paths of the single vortex nucleation process. The energy of the principal sphaleron, the most important barrier in the process, is just the maximum of free energy along the minimum energy path $F_\S = \max_s F(s)$. We define $F_\M$ as the energy of the Meissner state, which is a state with no vortices in the bulk. When studying the nucleation of the first vortex in the sample, the nucleation barrier is therefore defined as $\Delta F_n = F_\S - F_\M$.

When looking at composite nucleation processes, the final point is a configuration when the vortex is in the center of the system. We denote the energy of this state as $F_\C$. If no bound states are present, the escape energy of the vortex is simply given by $\Delta F_e = F_\S - F_\C$. When considering fractional vortices, the most stable position is not in the center of the sample but usually near the surface, where the vortex forms a bond with surface currents. We label the free energy of this configuration by $F_\B$.

To characterize the surface-bonded fractional state, we are interested in evaluating the strength of the bond to the surface by comparing the energy of the system with the same quantity when the vortex is in the bulk. However, the state with the vortex in the center of the bulk is not a stable state of the system but rather an unstable equilibrium point. For this reason, a minimum energy path cannot, in principle, be calculated. To circumvent this problem, we remove the origin $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ from the superconductive domain. With this trick, we artificially introduce a local minimum of infinitesimal depth, with negligible effects on the total energy of the state with the vortex pinned in the exact center of the domain (whose energy is denoted also in this case by $F_\C$).

For the fractional nucleation curve, the escape barrier is then defined as the energy necessary to expel the vortex starting from the local minimum, $\Delta F_e = F_\S - F_\B$, while the bonding energy $\Delta F_b = F_\C - F_\B$ is the energy required to move the vortex from the edge toward a region deep in the bulk. All these quantities are more clearly shown in Fig. 1.

---

III. RESULTS

Since the model introduced in the previous section has thirteen independent parameters, for each series of simulations we fix all parameters except for one or a pair. The parameters used for type-2 simulations are listed in Table I. In particular, System E features two perfectly similar complex scalar fields, while System U introduces different length scales. Both systems belong to the type-2 class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$b_1$</th>
<th>$m_{xx,1}$</th>
<th>$m_{yy,1}$</th>
<th>$q_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$b_2$</th>
<th>$m_{xx,2}$</th>
<th>$m_{yy,2}$</th>
<th>$q_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System E</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System U</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Parameters used in the simulations of type-2 regime. Since the model has many independent parameters, for each series of simulations we fix all the parameters as in this table except for one or a pair which are mentioned.

In System U, the two fields have a different set of parameters. We can thus identify a component with a higher coherence length, $\psi_1$, and a component with a lower coherence length, $\psi_2$. Since when we later introduce direct interactions, it is not strictly correct referring to the coherence length. The reason is that coherence lengths, in the presence of direct interband interaction,
are associated with different linear combinations of the fields [30–32]. We will refer to $\psi_1$ as the large-core component while $\psi_2$ as the small-core component because of the typical dimension of the fractional vortex cores.

A. Fractional vortex surface bound state in $U(1) \times U(1)$ model

The first case we address is the vortex nucleation processes in an isotropic two-component system. In the case of a superconductor with two matter fields having different characteristic lengths, like System U in Table I, we observed a fractionalized nucleation. This means that the optimal nucleation process is, in general, split into two steps as the fractional vortices in each component enter the bulk in different stages. This is qualitatively in agreement with the earlier studies using the London model [18]. This behavior can be observed by computing the winding number for each field along the path $N_i(s)$ and comparing this curve with the free energy $F(s)$, as shown in Fig. 2. Indeed, the small-core vortex nucleates first, followed by a vortex in the large-core component. The two fractional vortices are bound together in a composite vortex which then, pushed by the repulsion of surface currents, moves towards the center of the domain.

If, instead, we consider the nucleation of the fractional vortex with nonzero winding in the large-core component only, we verified in the simulations that a surface bound state can exist in a region of the parameters space. The minimum energy path of fractional vortex nucleation of this kind is shown in Fig. 3.

Studying the changes in the minimum energy path for fractional vortex nucleation as a function of the external magnetic field, we check that the stabilization mechanism is due to the interaction with surface currents induced by external magnetic fields. The fractional vortex is attracted by the surface of the domain and forms a bound state. As shown in Fig. 4, an increase of the external magnetic field makes the minimum deeper.
identify a region where fractional vortices are stabilized by surface currents. In the considered regime, the bonding energy $\Delta F_b$ is approximately constant with respect to the magnetic field, meaning that the stability of the surface-bonded fractional state is weakly affected by the external magnetic field $H$ in the given field range. Fractional surface-bonded vortices can exist in the region between $H = 0.7$ and $H = 1.4$ while higher fields cause the nucleation of composite vortices. In this zone, the bonding energy is constant while the escape barrier increases with the magnetic field intensity. Notice how, for fields higher than $H = 1.2$, the escape barrier exceeds the nucleation one, meaning that a fractional vortex is more stable than the Meissner state. This means that, for fields in the region starting from $H = 1.2$ to $H = 1.4$, a surface bonded fractional vortex phase is expected to be the equilibrium state of the system. This is consistent with the magnetization simulations of a slightly different model [19].

It can be seen in Fig. 6, for the considered parameters, that if the system has a vortex in the large-core component trapped near the surface, the activation energy for the nucleation of a vortex in the small-core component is usually low. The nucleation of a vortex in the other component frees the vortex from binding to the surface, as the composite vortex is repelled by the surface currents. This would limit the lifetime of the surface-bonded state.

FIG. 5. Free energy barriers for a fractional vortex in System U as a function of the external field $H$. At point $H = 0.7$ surface fractional vortex states became metastable as the escape barrier became nonzero. Fractional bounded vortices can exist in the region between $H = 0.7$ and $H = 1.4$, while higher fields cause the nucleation of composite vortices. In this zone, the bonding energy is constant while the escape barrier increases with the magnetic field intensity. Notice how for fields higher than $H = 1.2$ the escape barrier exceeds the nucleation one, meaning that a fractional vortex is more stable than the Meissner state. The bonding energy is approximately constant with respect to the magnetic field.

FIG. 6. Comparison of nucleation minimum energy paths of a composite vortex (C), a fractional vortex (F) and the process of nucleation of a second component vortex starting from a fractional one (F → C). The dot-dash line is the energy of the system with a fractional vortex, the dotted line is the energy of the Meissner state while the dashed line is the energy of the state with one composite vortex. Notice how the nucleation of a fractional vortex (red line) has a barrier that is only slightly less than the one of the composite vortex (blue line). Moreover, the nucleation process for a vortex in the second component starting from a vortex bounded near the surface has a very small barrier. This suggests that, in the given example, the fractional surface vortices are unstable to small fluctuations, for this set of parameters. System U, $H = 1.1$.

**B. Anisotropy effects**

The introduction of anisotropies in the model affects the nucleation process since it causes the geometrical deformation of the vortices. One way of introducing anisotropies in the model is altering the ratio between the mass parameter of the fields. In the following, we consider the ratios $m_{2,xx}/m_{2,yy} = 10$, and $m_{2,xx}/m_{2,yy} = 0.1$. Notice that in all the simulations discussed in the paper, the vortex enters along the $x$ direction. The two cases considered here can indeed be seen as rotations of the same system or equivalently nucleation processes at two different sides.

As can be seen in Fig. 7, the nucleation barrier in the case $m_{2,yy} > m_{2,xx}$ is lower and the bound state near the surface is very stable and characterized by a vortex with winding only in the isotropic field. On the contrary, if the heavy direction is parallel to the normal to the surface, the barrier is higher, and the vortex in the anisotropic component is the first to enter the sample. As evident in this example, anisotropies provide a way to enhance the stability of vortices near the boundary. This can lead to the case where fractional vortices can be stable when laying near the edges of the system aligned with one of the principal axes while being unstable near edges oriented in the orthogonal direction. This situation is shown in Fig. 7, as only one of the minimum energy paths has a clearly defined minimum which is also lower than the initial state.
FIG. 7. Minimum energy path of a composite vortex nucleation in a two-component superconductor with anisotropic kinetic terms in one of the two components. Two examples are shown with different field mass ratios. In these simulations, we study the vortex entry from a surface aligned with the $y$ direction. In the case where the heavy direction is parallel to the surface, the bound state energy is enhanced by the vortex core deformation. The base system used is System E.

C. Vortex nucleation in type-1.5 superconductors

When a superconductor has multiple coherence lengths, with some larger and some smaller than the magnetic field penetration depth, that regime is termed type-1.5 superconductivity [6; 27; 31–36]. In this regime, the interaction between vortices can be both attractive or repulsive depending on the distance between the cores. We show below that this affects the vortex nucleation process by exploring two representative cases of type-1.5 superconductors. In one case, the large-core component is the denser one, in the other case is the small-core component the denser one. The parameters are shown in Tab. II.

We found an unconventional behavior at elevated external magnetic fields, close to the breakdown of the Meissner phase. In the case of a denser large-core component with strong external fields, there is a metastable state in which the nucleation of a fractional vortex in the large-core component is possible and locally stable, while isolated composite vortices are unstable since the system is far from the type-2 regime. This is manifested by the natural expulsion of the small-core fractional vortex shown in Fig. 8 (a). Therefore, large-core fractional vortices are the only (meta)stable vortices for these systems. The most stable position for these vortices is the corners where they are pinned by the local magnetic field. In this situation, this fragile state can be destroyed if the two vortices get close enough to induce a perturbation in the magnetic field that makes the metastable phase collapse into the normal state. At a lower magnetic field, shown in Fig. 8 (b), the two fractional vortices undergo a merger-to-instability transition: if they get too close, the escape barrier is suppressed letting one of the two escape from the system.

FIG. 8. Minimum energy path of composite vortex nucleation (a) and of vortex fusion (b) in System DLC at high magnetic fields. The minimum energy path shown in (a) has been obtained by simulating a composite vortex entry at applied field $H = 2.8$. Is possible to observe as the fractional vortex in the large-core component is bounded to the surface, while the composite vortex is unstable. This means that the fractional vortex in the large-core component is the only metastable solution while the small-core fractional vortex is expelled. The minimum energy path in (b) has been evaluated at $H = 2.4$ and shows that the large-core fractional vortex’s most stable position is in the corner. Two large-core fractional vortices undergo a repulsive interaction at large distances while if brought at short distances they disrupt the surface barrier with the escape of one of the two shortly after.

The second system we explored has a denser small-core component, thus figuring closer to the type-2 regime. In Fig. 9, we simulated composite vortex nucleation when the system is subjected to a strong external magnetic field. Even in this case, the composite vortex is unsta-
ble, but differently from the other cases, also the surface-bonded large-core fractional vortex solution is unstable and spontaneously escapes the sample. Next, we found as an intermediate metastable solution, a surface-bonded cluster where two large-core component fractional vortices and one in the small-core component form a small cluster bonded to the edge of the system. This cluster with a total non-integer flux would be unstable in the bulk, but the interaction with the surface stabilizes it near the edge of the system.

D. Effects of intercomponent interaction on vortex nucleation

In this section, we consider the effect of direct interactions on the nucleation mechanism. As a start, we study the effect of bilinear Josephson on the nucleation process by simulating the nucleation of composite vortices in System E with the coupling term

$$V_{\text{lin}}[\psi_1, \psi_2] = \frac{\eta}{2} (\psi_1 \psi_2^* + \text{c.c.}) = \eta |\psi_1||\psi_2| \cos(\theta_{12}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

This term introduces phase-locking in the system such the spontaneously broken symmetry is reduced to $U(1)$. For positive $\eta$, the minimum is obtained for $\theta_{12} = \pm \pi$, while for negative values the minimum is for $\theta_{12} = 0$. In the following, we restrict the study to positive $\eta$ as the sign can be absorbed in the phase of one field.

As show in Fig. 10 (a), the nucleation barrier gets higher with increasing coupling. The curves can be fitted reasonably well thought an exponential regression using $\Delta F_n(\eta) = C_1[1 - \exp(-C_2(H - H_n))]$ as the ansatz, where $C_1$, $C_2$ and $H_n$ are the coefficients estimated for each value of $\eta$. In this way, we estimated the nucleation field shown in Fig. 10 (b). From the simulations it appears that in the considered regime, the nucleation field $H_n(\eta)$ increase linearly as a function of $\eta$. Note that the fractional vortex interaction potential is asymptotically linear in the presence of this coupling.

To check the effect of bilinear Josephson coupling on fractional surface vortices, we simulated the minimum energy path of fractional vortex nucleation for System U and $H = 1.2$. The bilinear Josephson coupling has a detrimental effect on surface-bound states. Already for $\eta = 0.01$, the fractional surface vortex becomes a metastable state with energy higher than the Meissner state. Increasing further $\eta$, we find that, at values around 0.04, the nucleation barrier for a vortex in the second component reaches zero such that the surface-bounded fractional vortex state becomes unstable.

Let us now consider the density coupling

$$V_{\text{den}}[\psi_1, \psi_2] = \frac{\gamma}{2} |\psi_1|^2|\psi_2|^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

this term does not break the $U(1) \times U(1)$ gauge symmetry. Depending on the sign of $\gamma$, this term promotes an attraction or repulsion between fractional vortices in different components. A repulsive (positive $\gamma$) interaction can lead to the formation of skyrmions in the system [19; 37]. In this case, the composite vortex formed by exactly coinciding vortex cores is a metastable soliton, while the stable skyrmion is formed by spatially separated bonded vortices.

We observe that the presence of repulsive density coupling decreases the nucleation barrier and fields, as shown in Fig. 11. Since the fractionalized entry is favored even in the case of System E, where the two fields are perfectly equal, the metastable field configuration featuring
only one fractional vortex can be viewed as a partial-skyrmion state.

We have tested the effect of density coupling for System U (with $H = 1.2$) through a simulation of the decay of the fractional surface vortex by nucleation of a second fractional vortex in the small-core component. We observe that the nucleation barrier for this process decreases as $\gamma$ increases. Moreover, the metastable minimum state is found for a vortex further from the surface. For $\gamma \simeq 0.5$ the surface vortex states spontaneously decay and multiple vortices in the small-core component nucleate. Also negative $\gamma$ has a detrimental effect on surface vortex states, but with a different mechanism. The direct interaction leads to a reduction of the escape barrier for the fractional vortex such that, already for $\gamma = -0.2$, we observe spontaneous decay to a Meissner state. We have also verified that, for some parameters, skyrmions are weakly attracted to the system’s boundaries due to image antiskyrmions.

**IV. CONCLUSIONS**

In this paper, we studied the minimum energy path of the vortex nucleation process for the Ginzburg-Landau model of two-component superconductors. We obtained solutions that feature multiple sphalerons connected to the entry of a single fractional vortex. Even composite vortices enter the sample through fractionalized nucleation in many systems. In the type-2 regime, in agreement with the previous studies based on the London model [18], fractional vortices with winding in the large-core component can be stabilized by the interaction with boundary currents. We characterized the stability of these solutions and the conditions for their appearance in a fully nonlinear theory. The method that we developed allowed to include and analyze the effect of direct interaction between the fields like the bilinear Josephson coupling and density coupling. We find that fractional vortices are stable near boundaries even for nonzero Josephson coupling. Note that in some of the considered cases the barrier for the process of nucleation of the vortex in the second component is very low. Since composite vortices are free to move towards the center of the superconductor, we do not expect the surface vortex states to be generically observed. In type-1.5 superconductors, vortex clusters are stable near boundaries. We found that the stability can be enhanced by anisotropies, which induce a deformation of the vortex core. These surface-trapped objects can be observed in scanning probes and can serve as smoking-gun evidence of multicomponent order parameters in multiband superconductors, superconductors...
that break multiple symmetries, including models proposed for superconductivity in magic-angle twisted bilayer graphene [38; 39]. Applied currents can move these solitons along boundaries making them distinguishable from ordinary vortices pinned to a defect lose to the surface. In such a case, a surface of high quality is required. The formation of these objects can also be affected by the surface effects discussed in [40]. This opens up the possibility of the creation of a new platform for fluxonix information processing.

As a secondary result, we have shown how the gauged string method can be applied to a system with additional gauge symmetries, like the $U(1) \times U(1)$ model, confirming the flexibility of this method. This can be easily extended to systems with other gauge symmetries or used to study other processes like vortex clustering in type-1.5 systems.
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