Ferromagnetic exchange field stabilized antiferromagnetic ordering in a cuprate superconductor
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We report an experimental evidence of thermal blocking of antiferromagnetic clusters in a composite made of a cuprate superconductor $La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO_4$ (LCu) and a ferromagnet $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_3$ (LCo). From linear and non-linear ac susceptibility measurement on this composite material it is found that the exchange field of LCo suppress the dynamic antiferromagnetic spin fluctuation of LCu and convert it into the short range ordered superparamagnetic type antiferromagnetic (AFM) clusters at the cost of superconducting volume fraction. These shrank superconducting volume fraction shows quantum size effect (QSE) and follows DeGennes-Tinkham theory on finite size effect of superconductor.

PACS numbers: 75.47.Lx, 71.27.+a, 75.40.Cx, 75.60.-d

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the long lived mystery associated with high temperature cuprate superconductor is the origin of coherent electron pairing in these compounds. The parent compound of a cuprate superconductor shows 3D Neel antiferromagnetic (AFM) ordering, doping of hole destroys the AFM ordering and emergence of superconductivity is observed [1]. Experimentally the coexistence of AFM type spin correlation and superconductivity is observed through out the phase diagram (hole doped), which can compete or assist superconductivity, depending on their dynamical nature [1–5]. In the optimally doped cuprate superconductor the reformation of antiferromagnetic type strip correlation and destruction of superconductivity is observed by chemical substitution or doping i.e. in $La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO_4$ (LCu) Lanthanum(La) is replaced by Niodiumm (Nd) [6–10]. Similarly while superconductivity is destroyed by applying extreme conditions (like very high magnetic field, large strain) [11–14] then the end state is observed as the CDW phase [8–10], AFM glass state [11–14] etc. So these observations are depicting a close correlation between AFM ordering and superconductivity in cuprate superconductor. However the above mentioned processes of destroying the superconducting state is not very well controlled and easily accessible too. The suppression of superconductivity and emergence of CDW phase or AFM state is also reveled in ferromagnet(FM) and cuprate superconductor hetero structure in normal condition [15–22], which has also opened up new perspective on the superconducting pairing mechanism of cuprate superconductor without applying any extreme conditions on the superconductor. Therefore a detailed magnetization study of this kind of hetero structure are required to get further knowledge about the involvement of antiferromagnetic type spin correlation in the pairing mechanism of cuprates.

Till now most of the research on SC/FM heterostructure are confined to the $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ (YBCO) based superconductor. The main problem associated with these YBCO based heterostructures is the high probability of CuO chain (charge reservoir) loss across the interface and change in charge carrier concentration of the ingredient during multilayer preparation, which modifies the physical property in bulk like manner unrelated to interface physics [23–26]. However, there are very few literature on copper oxide superconductor and ferromagnet interface in which the role of physical properties of the ingredients determine the interface properties instead of charge transfer phenomena (like, ferromagnetic exchange field effect [27], interfacial strain effect [27–28] on superconductivity etc.). It has been observed that the SC/FM interfaces consisting of LCu as superconductor does not show any dominant charge transfer and orbital reconstruction phenomena to take place across the interface [29, 30] and maintained their charge state intact with respect to the parent ingredient. Hence LCu based (or LCu type i.e. $Pr_{1.2}Ce_2CuO_4$) FM/SC composites (or bilayer) are ideal to study the effects of exchange field [27], as well as the interfacial strain effect on the magnetic properties of cuprate superconductors [27–30]. To explore the effect of magnetic exchange field on a hole doped cuprate superconductor we have prepared a composite made of superconductor LCu and a ferromagnet $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_3$ (LCo). LCo is chosen as a ferromagnetic counterpart because it shows a long range ferromagnetic ordering and large magneto crystalline anisotropy [31–34], which can facilitates substantial amount of exchange bias field on the spins of copper atom in LCu. Hence LCo is found as a better material other than manganites ($La_{1.7}Sr_{0.3}MnO_3$, $La_{0.7}Ca_{0.3}MnO_3$ [28–30]) to explore the exchange field effect on cuprate superconductors.

In this work we have experimentally detected that dynamic antiferromagnetic spin fluctuation of LCu [8–10, 35–37] is reduced due to the magnetic exchange field of LCo and short range order AFM phase is developed at the cost of superconducting volume fraction, as a result the bulk superconducting region shrinks to a finite size cluster, and quantum size effect (QSE) is reveled. The exchange field amplitude on LCu is tuned by changing the effective interface as well as by dc magnetic field. The
effective interface is varied by following several processes like, reducing (or increasing) the particle size, decreasing (or enhancing) the concentration of LCo in the LCu matrix [38] and grinding the composite pallet. The results obtained from these different set of tests are compared and then investigated in depth. The linear and nonlinear ac susceptibility measurements are found as very good tool in studying the various characteristics of type-2 superconductor, such as to identify the onset point of irreversibility, various type of flux dynamic, critical thermodynamical parameters etc. [39-42]. The higher order susceptibilities are also very accurate tool to discriminate between various metastable states like spin glass, cluster glass and superparamagnet [43-44] along with that they are very sensitive in determining various long range ordered state like ferromagnet, antiferromagnet etc [45-48]. Hence we have probed the changes of the magnetic state of cuprate superconductor utilizing techniques such as linear and nonlinear ac susceptibilities.

In composite (or in heterostructure) the interplay between different electronic ground state is modulated through the extended interface effect, but in case of oxides heterostructure oxygen stoichiometry plays a big role in modifying the physical property which is unrelated to interface physics. Hence it is very important to determine the change in oxygen stoichiometry (i.e. spin state) of the ingredients with respect to their parent compounds for a conclusive discrimination between the phenomena related to interface effect or due to the degradation of oxygen stoichiometry. We have overcome these complexities and proposed a method to determine the spin state of a ferromagnet along with the hole concentration of a superconductor in a superconductor and ferromagnetic composite system by using the low field ac susceptibility technique and XRD measurement [38]. The detail analysis of the XRD spectra and spin state of the ferromagnet in the composite are discussed in the supplementary section. The weight percentage details of the corresponding parent ingredient present in the composites (i.e. A1, A2, A3, A4, A5) is given in Table I, where the cuprate superconductor $La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO_4$ is denoted as LCu and the ferromagnet $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_3$ is represented as LCo.

### Table I. List of composites and crystalline size details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Name</th>
<th>LCu [Weight %] + LCo (annealing Temperature) [Weight %]</th>
<th>average crystalline Size of LCo (nm)</th>
<th>average crystalline Size of LCu (nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>LCu [76%] + LCo (950) [24%]</td>
<td>69 (nm)</td>
<td>~ 400 (nm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>LCu [76%] + LCo (900) [24%]</td>
<td>47 (nm)</td>
<td>~ 400 (nm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>LCu [76%] + LCo (850) [24%]</td>
<td>27 (nm)</td>
<td>~ 400 (nm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>LCu [85%] + LCo (850) [15%]</td>
<td>27 (nm)</td>
<td>~ 400 (nm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>LCu [95%] + LCo (850) [5%]</td>
<td>27 (nm)</td>
<td>~ 400 (nm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIG. 1.** (Color Online) (a) $\chi^R_1$ is plotted against temperature of the Composites A1, A2, A3 (Inset shows the zoomed view of the anomalous region around superconducting onset ($T_{S(\text{onset})}$)). (b) $\chi^R_1$ is plotted against temperature for all three concentration[A3 (Black Square), A4 (Green Star) and A5 (Red Circle)] of LCo in LCu matrix along with the parent LCo (Blue line). The Pink star (Lower One) depicts $\chi^R_1$ of LCu is plotted against temperature. Inset shows the Zoomed view of the paramagnetic region. The measurements are performed at ac field ($h_{ac}$) = 3 Oe and frequency ($f$) = 231.1 Hz.
The crystalline size of the ferromagnet and the superconductor is calculated from the XRD pattern, are also listed in TABLE I.

The temperature dependent mole normalized real part of first order ac susceptibility ($\chi^R_1$) data of the composites A1, A2 and A3 is shown in FIG. 1a. All measurements are performed in heating cycle. Inset shows the zoomed view of the anomalous region around $T_{S(onset)}$. The normalization of $\chi^R_1$ is performed with respect to the the mole fraction of LCo as obtained from the Rietveld refinement of the XRD patterns [32]. Near $T_{S(onset)}$ a difference in $\chi^R_1(T)$ between the composites is observed (shown in the inset of FIG. 1a), along with that the difference of $T_C$ (i.e. paramagnetic to ferromagnetic transition temperature) between A1, A2 and A3 is also evident from FIG. 1a, which is because of the difference in oxygen stoichiometry of the corresponding ferromagnet present in them (obtained from tritration results, discussed in the supplementary section), but the ground state of the ferromagnet in all composites (i.e. A1, A2 and A3) doesn’t alter due to this oxygen stoichiometry variation [32]. There is no change of the spin state of LCo (present in the composite) is observed with respect to the corresponding parent LCo (discussed elaborately in the supplementary section). Therefore the unchanged value of structural parameters and spin state of LCo w.r.t parent ingredient indicates the magnetic state of LCo remains unperturbed in the composite (more elaborately discussed in the later sections). In case of A1 a flat region is observed just above $T_{S(onset)}$ (shown in FIG. 1a), where as in case of A2 small hump appear in $\chi^R_1(T)$ just above $T_{S(onset)}$ and this hump like anomaly in $\chi^R_1(T)$ become very much clear in case of A3. In case of A3 the effective interface between LCu and LCo is larger than A1 and A2 (because of larger surface to volume ratio of LCo850 than LCo900 and LCo950), due to this reason the anomaly around $T_{S(onset)}$ in case of A3 is more prominent than A1 and A2. To cross check the statement related to the interface effect another two alternate methods are obtained to decrease the effective interface between LCu and LCo, and the susceptibility behavior is monitored. In the first method the composite is prepared with lower LCo concentrations (A4 and A5 as mentioned before) and in second the composite pallets are grinded to powder to reduce the effective interface(discussed in the supplementary section). While reducing the concentration of LCo in LCu matrix then the number of LCo grains sprinkled across LCu domain reduces and hence the effective interface is suppressed. FIG. 1b shows the combined plot of normalized $\chi^R_1(T)$ for A3, A4 and A5, along with that the normalized $\chi^R_1(T)$ graph of parent LCo and LCu is also plotted for comparison purposes. LCu shows it’s $T_{S(onset)}$ around 32 K and above 32 K $\chi^R_1(T)$ shows Pauli paramagnetic behavior, LCo shows a paramagnetic to ferromagnetic transition at 233 K. Same value of effective magnetic moment ($\mu_{eff}=4.33 \mu_B$) and Curie temperature ($\theta=233$ K), obtained from the CW fitting of the paramagnetic region, shown in the inset of FIG. 1b) for all the composites and parent LCo confirms the spin state of LCo850 remain same for all composites. The anomalous hump in $\chi^R_1(T)$ measurement is observed to get suppressed with the reduction of LCo850 concentration in LCu matrix (shown in FIG. 1b) like for A4 the amplitude of the peak suppresses and become almost flat for A5. So the anomaly suppress in the similar manner as that of the case mentioned in particle size increment of LCo (shown in FIG. 1a). Therefore these results also indicate the anomaly around $T_{S(onset)}$ in $\chi^R_1(T)$ measurement is an interface driven effect.

The gradual decrement of the diamagnetic fraction below $T_{S(onset)}$, while increasing the effective interface is evident from FIG. 1b. The crystalline size and the lattice parameter of LCo (and LCu) remain invariant for all composites (evident from the XRD graph), along with that the demagnetization factor and spin state of LCo also remain same for all the composites (evident from the equal values of the Hopkinson peak height at 226 K and paramagnetic moment), so the decrement of diamagnetic phase fraction is not related to the degradation of hole concentration or structural distortion of either LCu or LCo, it indicates that there has developed some kind of magnetic interaction between LCu and LCo across the interface which causes the observed changes in the magnetic state of LCu (like, the degradation of diamagnetic susceptibility and excess susceptibility across $T_{S(onset)}$), otherwise if it is due to the change in magnetic state of LCo then we could have observed a change around $T_C$ with increasing or decreasing concentration of LCo (in FIG. 1b), along with that above $T_{S(onset)}$ the magnetization strength of LCu(i.e. pauli paramagnetic) is much more smaller than LCo(ferromagnetic), which can not effect the magnetic state of LCo but the vice versa is highly probable, so it can be concluded that the magnetic state of LCu is getting effected. Whereas in the comparative plot of A1, A2 and A3 composite (Shown in FIG. 1a) an opposite behavior is observed, in this case increment of the diamagnetic fraction is observed with the enhancement of effective interface. This anomaly is due to higher values of demagnetization factor of LCo850 than LCo900 and LCo950 evident from lowest values of Hopkinson peak amplitude of A3(at 226 K) in compared to A2(at 222 K) and A1 (at 218 K). Due to this reason the overall susceptibility response of A3 composite is found lesser in magnitude at all temperature in comparison to A2 and A1. Therefore, if the demagnetization correction of the $\chi^R_1(T)$ graph of A1,A2 and A3 can be performed, then below $T_{S(onset)}$ the comparative plot of this demagnetization corrected $\chi^R_1(T)$ graph will also show similar behavior as it is observed in case of A3, A4 and A5 (shown in FIG. 1b).

To reveal the nature of the perturbed magnetic state of LCu and the type of magnetic interaction across the interface, the higher order (i.e. second order-$\chi_2$ and third order-$\chi_3$) ac susceptibility measurements are performed in case of the composite A3. In the temperature interval where $\chi^R_1$ shows hump like behavior, $\chi^R_3$ shows a dip like
feature around the similar temperature range (not shown here). This behavior is evocative of \( \chi_3^R \) as observed in spin glass (SG) [44, 49, 50] and superparamagnetic (SPM) systems [45, 51-53]. In the former case behavior of \( \chi_3^R \) has been used as a probing tool of the divergence of the Edward-Anderson order parameter, around the onset of a spin-glass transition, so in the limit of \( T \rightarrow T_g \) and magnetic field \( H \rightarrow 0 \), \( \chi_3^R \) diverges in the negative direction [44, 49, 50]. But in case of SPM \( \chi_3^R \) does not show any critical behavior with field frequency and temperature and the system follows the Wohlfarth SPM behavior [45, 51-53], hence \( \chi_3^R \) is a very good tool to discriminate between freezing and blocking phenomena [53].

The ac field dependent behavior of \( \chi_3^R \) is shown in the right hand side inset of FIG 2b and the value of \( |\chi_3^R| \) approaches towards saturation with decreasing the amplitude of ac field which indicates the observed phenomena is a blocking of some type of magnetic clusters. According to Wohlfarth SPM model [51] the magnetization(M) of a non interacting single domain SPM particle is represented as

\[
M = n\bar{\mu}L(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{k_BT})
\]

where \( n \) is the number of particles per unit volume, \( \bar{\mu} \) is the average magnetic moment of a single magnetic entity or particle, \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann’s constant, and \( L(x) \) is the Langevin function. So, from Eqn. 1 the linear susceptibility can be represented as

\[
\chi_1^R = \frac{\bar{\mu}}{3k_BT}
\]

and the third order susceptibility is represented as

\[
\chi_3^R = -\frac{n\bar{\mu}}{45}((\frac{\bar{\mu}}{k_BT})^3
\]

Eqn. 2 and Eqn. 3 depicts, in the SPM region \( \chi_1^R \) is positive and it follows \( T^{-1} \) behavior, where as \( \chi_3^R \) is negative and it follows \( T^{-3} \) behavior [51]. FIG. 2a shows the \( T^{-3} \) temperature dependence for experimentally obtained \( \chi_3^R \) and left inset of FIG. 2a shows the \( T^{-1} \) dependency of \( \chi_1^R \) above 32 K. The value of \( \bar{\mu} \) \((\sim 10^3 \mu_B - \mu_B) \) is Bohr magneton) is calculated from the slope ratio obtained from the straight line fitting of \( \chi_3^R \) and \( \chi_1^R \). In case of a conventional SPM cluster (smaller particles of ferromagnet) the values of \( \bar{\mu} \) are quite large (as it contains large number of ferromagnetically align spins inside its volume, for a pure ferromagnetic clusters it is of the order of \( 10^4 - 10^5 \mu_B \) than the number we obtained from fitting. It depicts that the SPM clusters are not ferromagnetic in nature, which is also evident from the zero dc field superimposed second order susceptibility \( (|\chi_2|) \) measurement and the graph corresponds to the imaginary part of first order susceptibility \( (\chi_4^R \) shown in FIG 2b). There is no anomaly in the temperature dependent \( |\chi_2| \) (scale: Left hand Y axis scale and temperature range 4-50 K) measurement is observed through out the temperature interval (upto 50 K), hence indicates zero value of internal field (i.e. non-ferromagnetic type clusters). FIG. 2b also shows the temperature dependent plot of \( \chi_4^R \) (scale: right hand Y axis scale), below 33 K a hump like features is observed in \( \chi_4^R \) graph and no further anomaly in \( \chi_4^R \) is observed above 33 K. \( \chi_4^R \) signifies area of minor magnetic hysteresis loop [39] and it shows no anomaly around \( T_B \) or above \( T_B \), hence ruled out the possibility of being ferromagnetic type of clusters and confirms AFM type of magnetic ordering in the clusters, because in ac susceptibility measurement at zero dc bias field the AFM cluster shows zero value of internal field (i.e. \( |\chi_2|=0 \)) and null value of minor hysteresis loop area (i.e. \( \chi_4^R=0 \)) [54].
So the fundamental and higher order susceptibility measurements confirm the excess susceptibility or hump in $\chi_1^R$ around $T_{S(onset)}$ appears due to the blocking of the SPM type AFM clusters.

SPM clusters are short range ordered magnetic clusters and its anisotropy energy is comparable to the thermal energy, due to this reason the clusters show dynamical behavior above blocking temperature but the microscopic spin structure or the interaction between the spins remain same to that of long range order magnetic structure or state [15]. These short range ordered AFM clusters can appear from the covalent bonding between Cu$^{+2}$ ions and Co$^{+3}$ or Co$^{+4}$ ions across the interface, as reported in YBCO/LCMO heterostructure in which the interface magnetic property of YBCO gets modified due to the covalent bonding between Copper and manganese ions [18,19], but in our case the large suppression of the diamagnetic fraction (shown in FIG. 4b) along with the significant change of $\chi_1^R(T)$ around $T_{S(onset)}$ ($\sim 10^{-5}$ emu, shown in FIG. 1a and FIG. 1b) indicates the perturbation is not only confined to the interface but it is propagated well inside the bulk of LCu i.e. the bulk magnetic property of LCu is modulated due to close proximity of LCo. Recently the emergence of bulk CDW phase is evident in cuprate/ferromagnet heterostructure [20,21] and the appearance of similar CDW phase, AFM phase, AFM glass phase is also evident while the superconductivity of a cuprate is destroyed by applying very high magnetic field or by applying very high strain on it [53–58]. Here we have observed the short range ordered SPM type AFM clusters along with decrement of diamagnetic fraction which are unrelated to change in crystal structure (evident from the XRD refinement) and change of charge carrier concentration, hence the most probable reason is, the AFM fluctuation of LCu can be suppressed by the exchange magnetic field of LCo (The exchange bias field can propagate through the covalent bonding between Cu$^{+2}$ ions and Co$^{+3}$ or Co$^{+4}$ ions across the interface or directly inside LCu, we can’t distinguish it here from bulk magnetization measurement) and results the observed short range order SPM type AFM clusters both across the interface and also at the bulk of LCu. In the optimally doped LCu the presence of AFM type fluctuation is already evident from various measurements like specific heat, neutron diffraction etc. [8,10,35–37], we have also revealed the AFM type of fluctuation in LCu from magnetic isotherm measurement above $T_{S(onset)}$, which is discussed in the following section.

The presence of AFM type of spin fluctuation in optimally doped LCu has already been proved from specific heat, neutron diffraction, X-ray scattering etc. [8,10,35–37] measurements. In this section we are going to emphasize on the phenomena related to exchange field stabilized AFM interaction by reducing the AFM fluctuation, which is verified by dc field superimposed $\chi_1$ and $\chi_2$ measurements. A small dc bias field is superimposed with the ac field during the susceptibility measurements, FIG. 3a shows the dc field superimposed $\chi_1^R(T)$ plot of composite A3, the peak value of $\chi_1^R(T)$ suppress and the peak temperature (corresponding to the blocking temperature $T_B$) shifts towards higher temperature ($\Delta(T_B) \sim 6$ K) with increasing the amplitude of dc bias field. Because of the small amplitude of dc bias field the Zeeman energy does not have sufficient strength to disturb the already formed AFM clusters in LCu, but the magnetic response of the loosely paired surface spins of LCo can get affected and the bulk spins will respond when the dc field amplitude exceeds the amplitude of demagnetization field of LCo($\sim$50 Oe), because above the demagnetization field the Zeeman energy compete with the magneto...
crystalline anisotropy energy of cobalt spins and makes them align along the direction decides by the competition between the Zeeman energy and magnetocrystalline anisotropy energy. As the cobalt spins are coupled with the copper spins by exchange field, so the effective exchange bias field on LCu created by LCo is also going to change. Therefore the preformed AFM clusters (formed due to exchange coupling between the copper spins and cobalt spins) feel this change and get biased indirectly by this small value of applied dc field due to the change of effective exchange bias field on it, and hence the decrement of relaxation peak height of $\chi_f^2(T)$ and the positive increment of $T_B$ with increasing the amplitude of dc bias field is observed.

To further emphasize on this exchange bias model the dc field superimposed second order susceptibility ($\chi_2$) measurements are performed, as the application of dc bias field changes the amplitude of the effective exchange bias field feel by LCu, hence the copper spins are going to feel this change differently because of their different distance from the interface. So the internal spin arrangement or the effective internal field of the AFM clusters is not going to remain same as previous (i.e. while $h_{dc} = 0$ Oe) and this change of internal field amplitude is reflected in the temperature dependent second order susceptibility ($|\chi_2|(T)$) measurement (shown in FIG. 3b), the anomaly in $|\chi_2|(T)$ is observed to appear around 50 K and persists up to 5 K. These measurements are performed in ZFC(zero field cool) mode, the sample is cooled in zero field and the measurements are performed during warming cycle in the presence of dc field ($h_{dc} = 20, 50$ and 150 Oe respectively). One of the graph in FIG. 3b (Green Square) corresponds to the FCW (field cool warming) measurements taken at $h_{dc} = 50$ Oe. In this protocol dc field is applied above $T_C$ of A3, then cooled to 5 K and measurements are performed during warming cycle. In ZFC measurement initially the peak value of $|\chi_2|(T)$ (FIG. 3b) increases up to dc field of amplitude 50 Oe and then it decreases with further increasing the amplitude of the dc bias field. Inset shows the isotherm of $|\chi_2|$ (i.e.$|\chi_2|(H)$) at 35 K, revealing the same details as obtained from $|\chi_2|(T)$, viz $|\chi_2|$ decreases after a particular field (50 Oe). Similar measurements are performed for the parent ingredients, but no anomaly in $|\chi_2|$ is observed around these temperature. The temperature dependent $|\chi_2|$ measurement of LCu shows the appearance of $|\chi_2|$ below 25 K (In case of cuprate superconductor $|\chi_2|$ will only appear when critical current density is a function of applied magnetic field[40,42] and in case of LCo $|\chi_2|$ appear around $T_C$ (~233 K, because of the appearance of internal symmetry breaking field, below $T_C$, $|\chi_2|$ shows almost zero value because of demagnetization effect), so neither LCo nor LCu alone is responsible for the anomaly observed in $|\chi_2|$ around 45 K. This anomalous variation of $|\chi_2|$ with dc field is very nicely explained by using the exchange coupling model. The mathematical form to describe exchange coupling between two magnetic material across the interface is as follows

$$H_{ex} = -J \frac{S_{AFM} \times S_{FM}}{\mu \times t_{FM} \times M_{FM}}$$

$H_{ex}$ is the exchange bias field, J is the exchange integral across the FM/AFM interface per unit area, $S_{AFM}$ and $S_{FM}$ are the interface (or surface) magnetization amplitude of the antiferromagnet and the ferromagnet, respectively, $t_{FM}$ is the thickness of the ferromagnetic domain and $M_{FM}$ is the magnetization of the FM layer. At lower value of dc bias field (<50 Oe), the spins across the interface are only going to respond (i.e. $S_{FM}$, as they are loosely coupled to the bulk of LCo), whereas the bulk magnetization are not going to response at this low value of dc field i.e. $M_{FM}$ and $t_{FM}$ remain unchanged (because of higher values of demagnetization field). So the formula suggests at lower dc field amplitude the effective $H_{ex}$ (Local field) on copper spins is larger in amplitude, which causes comparatively sizable misalignment between the AFM coupled copper spin, due to this reason the increment of $|\chi_2|$ is observed up to a certain value of dc magnetic field (i.e. 50 Oe). On further increasing the dc field amplitude the bulk spins start to response as the dc field exceeds the demagnetization field of LCo (i.e. $M_{FM}$ and $t_{FM}$ increases simultaneously), as a result the effective number of active spins on the surface decreases than the volume, hence the resultant value of $S_{FM}$ also decreases in compared to $M_{FM}$ and due to this reason $H_{ex}$ reduces in accordance with Eqn. 4. As a result the misalignment between the copper spins also reduces and the decrement of $|\chi_2|$ is observed at higher value of dc field. In the same way the difference of $|\chi_2|(T)$ values between ZFC and FCW protocol (shown in FIG. 3b) can also be explained by using Eqn. 4. As the ferromagnetic domain size ($t_{FM}$) and $M_{FM}$ of LCo in FCW condition is larger than the ZFC condition (also evident from higher $|\chi_2|$ value in case of FCW than ZFC above 50 K, i.e. higher value of internal field), due to this reason the resultant exchange bias field values on copper spins is larger in ZFC case than FCW case. As a result the observed values of $|\chi_2|(T)$ below 50 K is lower in FCW case than in ZFC case, which further supports the proposed exchange bias model.

Formation of the SPM type AFM clusters are also observed to effect the superconductivity of LCu, hence a comprehensive understanding on the evolution of superconductivity in these composites system requires information on the critical thermodynamic parameters such as critical field ($H_{C2}$) and critical current density ($J_C$) of LCu. $H_{C2}$ and $J_C$ are observed to get effected mainly because of disorder and while the system size become comparable to certain characteristics length scale, like coherence length ($\xi_0$) and London penetration depth($\lambda_L$) [63–65]. Here the imaginary part of $\chi_1$ ($\chi_1^\prime$) have been used as a probing tool to study the nature of $H_{C2}$ and $J_C$. $\chi_1$ appears because of the phase lag between the ac driving field and corresponding magnetization response, in case of a type-2 superconductor $\chi_1^\prime$ appears...
around $T_{S(\text{onset})}$, because of vortex formation and pinning of it [66–68]. The maximum point of $\chi_1^d$ represents the temperature ($T_S$) at which the bulk superconductivity vanishes i.e. the critical current density ($J_C$) $\rightarrow 0$ and the applied magnetic field fully penetrates inside the superconductor [39–41]. According to Bean model [39], the hysteresis loss ($W$) is inversely proportional to the critical current density ($J_C$), hence at $T \rightarrow T_S$, $J_C \rightarrow 0$, so $W$ diverges at $T_S$, as a result of that at $T= T_S$ peak in $\chi_1^d$ is observed and depending upon the strength of $J_C$ the peak temperature and the upper critical field decides (according to $H_C$, $T_S$ and $J_C$ phase diagram of a superconductor it can be said that while the amplitude of $J_C$ is large then the amount of magnetic field ($H_C$) required to penetrate inside the bulk of the superconductor is also large, provided temperature ($T$) is fixed [39–41]). As we are using the ac susceptibility technique to study the corresponding critical parameters, so the major contribution is expected due to bulk response only. The dc field dependent behavior of $\chi_1^d$ around $T_{S(\text{onset})}$ describes the anomaly is because of superconductivity (The figure is briefly discussed in the supplementary section) [39]. The temperature dependent $\chi_1^d$ plot of A2, A3 and A4 are shown in FIG. 4a. The onset point of $\chi_1^d$ for A3, A4 and A2 are observed around 34 K, 31 K and 30 K respectively, whereas the diverging temperature of $\chi_1^d$ is observed at ~24.5 K, ~20 K, ~19 K for A3, A4 and A2, respectively. As the crystalline size of LCu is same for all the composite, hence according to Bean model and $H_C$, $T_S$ and $J_C$ phase diagram of a superconductor [39–41] the maximum point of $\chi_1^d$ is decided by the strength of the critical current density, in case of A3 maximum point of $\chi_1^d$ is observed at higher temperature than A2 and A1 which clearly depicts that the strength of critical current density is maximum in case of composite A3, and according to the obtained temperature values, the amplitude of critical current density of the three composites can be expressed in the following descending order i.e. $J_C(A3) > J_C(A4) > J_C(A2)$. Therefore the amplitude of the critical field required to penetrate inside the bulk is also higher for the corresponding material having highest critical current density. The plot of $H_{C2}$ against $T_S$ for A3, A2 and A4 is shown in FIG. 4b, where $H_{C2}$ can also be written in the following descending order $H_{C2}(A3) > H_{C2}(A4) > H_{C2}(A2)$. So all these results are depicting that the composites having larger AFM volume fraction shows smaller diamagnetic fraction (discussed previously) and largest values of $H_{C2}$ and $J_C$, this kind of unusual increment of the amplitude of critical thermodynamical parameters and decrement of diamagnetic fraction (shown in FIG. 1b) is often observed in the Quantum Size regime of superconductors, known as Quantum size effect (QSE). The QSE model was proposed by DeGennes and Tinkham [63, 62], where the mathematical expression for critical field ($H_{C2}$), critical current density ($J_C$) and effective London penetration depth ($\lambda_{eff}$) in the quantum limit can be represented as

$$H_{C2} \sim \frac{\xi_0 \lambda_l \xi_0}{r^{1.5}} \quad (5)$$

$$J_C \sim \frac{1}{r^2} \quad (6)$$

$$\lambda_{eff} = \lambda_l (1 + \frac{\xi_0}{r})^{0.5} \quad (7)$$

$\xi_0 = \frac{0.188 v_F}{k_B T_G}$ is the intrinsic coherence length, $v_F$ Fermi velocity, $\lambda_l$ London penetration depth and $r$ is the average size of the finite size superconducting clusters. According to Eqn. 5 and Eqn. 6 in the finite size regime the values of the critical parameters is decided by the
amplitude of the superconducting volume, hence larger amplitude of $H_{C2}$ (and $J_C$) in case of A3 compared to A2 and A4 indicates the superconducting volume fraction is smaller in A3 compared to A2 and A4. According to Eqn. 7 the effective London penetration depth also increases in the finite size region, which causes reduction of the effective diamagnetic fraction (or Meissner fraction), the superconducting volume fraction is found smaller in case of A3 compared to A4 and A5 (shown in FIG. 1b). From the XRD measurement data there is no change of crystalline volume of LCu is revealed in any of the composite compared to the parent LCu, so decrement of the superconducting volume fraction and increment of $H_{C2}$ and $J_C$ is not due to finite crystalline size effect, which indicates the formation of AFM clusters at the bulk of LCu reduces the superconducting volume fraction, as the static microscopic spin structure of the corresponding SPM cluster can not support superconductivity. Any kind of static magnetic condition is unfavorable for superconductivity, because the superconducting state of a cuprate evolves after diluting the antiferromagnetic network and only the dynamic AFM fluctuation present with superconducting ordering [13]. As the AFM type SPM volume fraction is found larger in magnitude in case of A3 compared to A2 and A4, hence the superconducting volume fraction in A3 is found smaller compared to A5, A4 and A2. These observation suggests the whole superconducting volume is divided into two phase separated regions, one phase consists of isolated SPM type AFM clusters and another phase is the finite size superconducting clusters.

So from all the above discussion we can claim that, while AFM fluctuation is stabilized by the exchange magnetic field of LCo then the AFM order reforms and superconducting volume fraction suppresses again. These results are depicting that the AFM type fluctuation can be a mediator of superconductivity in cuprate superconductor. Another important observation is that, the reduced superconducting volume fraction shows quantum size effect, which is very difficult to achieve by preparing the nanoparticle of LCu (because of its very small coherence length ~ few Å and penetration depth $\lambda_{GL}$ ~ few hundred nm), and in the ‘nm’ size region the oxygen stoichiometry of cuprate superconductors start to degrade automatically, which causes spontaneous structural distortion and makes the finite size effect study difficult. So this composite provides a unique path way to understand the mechanism of cooper pairing along with a possibility to study the finite size effect on the superconducting property of cuprate superconductor with out degrading the oxygen stoichiometry.
[58] Lauren E. Hayward et al., Science 343, 1336 (2014).
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A. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

The Low field linear and nonlinear magnetic ac-susceptibility measurements have been performed using a homemade ac-susceptometer, which can be operated down to 4.2 K from 300 K and the measurements can be done in both cooling and heating cycle with a temperature accuracy much better than 1 mK. The estimated sensitivity of the setup is $\sim 10^{-7}$ emu [1]. The higher dc field (> 200 Oe) superimposed ac susceptibility measurements are performed in MPMS-XL (M/S, Quantum Design).

I. SAMPLE PREPARATION AND CHARACTERIZATION

Preparation of composites without any chemical reaction between the ingredients and characterization of them are the most important steps in the field of proximity effect study. Here we have chosen a cuprate superconductor $La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO_3.97$ (LCu) and and a cobalt based oxide ferromagnet $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_3$ (LCo) to study the proximity effect. The details of the preparation technique of parent ingredients and composites are elaborately explained in Ref.[2]. To probe the interface effect the effective magnetic field between LCu and LCo is varied by several methods, 1st the composites of LCo and LCu is prepared by reducing the particle size of LCo with same concentration, 2nd LCo concentration is varied in LCu matrix to play with the effective interface and 3rd grinding the composite pallet to powder.

The precursor (LCo) is heated at different temperatures 950°C, 900°C and 850°C giving rise to three different particle sizes (nomenclatured as LCo900, LCo900 and LCo850 respectively). Then 76 weight percentage of LCu and 24 weight percentage of LCo950 is mixed, palletized at comparatively high pressure (i.e. 150 kilonewton (kN)) and heated at 800°C to prepare composite A1, similarly A2 and A3 is prepared using LCo900 and LCo850 respectively. Then the concentration of LCo850 is varied in LCu matrix to change the effective interface between LCu and LCo. The weight ratio of LCu and LCo850 is chosen as 76:24, 85:15 and 95:5 and they are nomenclatured as A3, A4 and A5 respectively. The parent ingredients are independently grinned palletized at similar pressure (i.e.150kN) and annealed at same temperature for comparison purposes. The composites are nomenclatured as follows,

- $LCu(76\%) + LCo950(24\%) - A1$
- $LCu(76\%) + LCo900(24\%) - A2$
- $LCu(76\%) + LCo850(24\%) - A3$
- $LCu(85\%) + LCo850(15\%) - A4$
- $LCu(95\%) + LCo850(5\%) - A5$

A. Structural Characterization

X-ray diffraction (XRD) measurements are performed in Bruker X-ray diffractometer from $10^0 - 90^0$ at an interval of 0.02°. FIG. 1a shows the XRD pattern as well as two-phase Rietveld refinement of the composite A3 and FIG. 1b shows the XRD pattern of A1, A2 and A3 respectively. FIG. 2a shows the XRD and Rietveld refinement of the composite A5 and the combined plot of the XRD spectrum of A3, A4 and A5 composite are shown in FIG. 2b for comparison purpose. The phase fractions and other structural details obtained from two phase Rietveld refinement are given in TABLE1. The lattice parameters of LCu obtained from the two phase Rietveld refinement of composites(A1-A5) does not show any significant change i.e. the c/a ratio or the Orthorhombic distortion of LCu remain same for all composites. These observations depict that there is no change of hole concentration of LCu, otherwise a considerable amount of change of c/a ratio would have been observed. The crystalline size of LCu and LCo is calculated by using Williamson-Hall (W-H) analysis. The hole concentration of parent LCo has been determined by using Iodometric titration method. The chemical formula obtained from these results are as follows, like for LCu 950, LCo 900 and LCo 850 it is $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_{2.99}$, $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_{2.97}$, $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_{2.95}$ and $La_{0.6}Sr_{0.4}CoO_{3.01}$ respectively. From this chemical formula the concentration ratio of Co$^{3+}$ and Co$^{4+}$ ions can be calculated very easily and this ratio is further used to calculate the effective magnetic moment ($\mu_{eff}$) and saturation moment of the corresponding LCo theoretically. Experimentally the value of $\mu_{eff}$ has been calculated from the Curie-Weiss fitting in the paramagnetic region of LCo and the experimentally obtained value is compared with the theoretical value($\mu_{eff,exp}=4.33+0.001$). As LCu is a Pauli paramagnetic material so its value in low field ac susceptibility measurement would be negligible. Hence the effective magnetic moment value of parent LCo and the corresponding composites has to be same provided there is no change of hole concentration.
or chemical reaction. We have used this concept to determine the spin state (i.e., hole concentration) of LCo present in the composite, for more details look at Ref. [2].

The combined temperature-dependent plot of normalized $\chi_i^R$ (the real part of first order susceptibility) for all the composites A1, A2 and A3 and their respective ferromagnetic components (LCo) is shown in Fig. 3. The measurements are performed in heating cycle. The normalization of $\chi_i^R$ is performed with respect to the mole fraction of LCo as obtained from the Rietveld refinement of the XRD patterns [2]. Fig. 3a shows the combined temperature dependent plot of $\chi_i^R$ ($\chi_i^R(T)$) and LCo950, there is not much difference in $\chi_i^R(T)$ plot of A1 and LCo950 is observed near $T_{S(onset)}$, the transition temperature for superconductor, whereas Fig. 3b and Fig. 3c shows a deviation in their $\chi_i^R(T)$ near $T_{S(onset)}$ form the susceptibility values of the corresponding LCo. A small hump near $T_{S(onset)}$ is seen in the composite A2 and seems to be much evident for the composite A3. There is no change of Curie temperature ($\theta_C$) and effective magnetic moment ($\mu_{eff}$) of the composites with respect to their parent LCo is evident from the paramagnetic region shown in Fig. 3a, Fig. 3b and Fig. 3c, $\theta_C$ and $\mu_{eff}$ have been calculated from the Curie-Weiss fitting of the paramagnetic region of $\chi_i^R(T)$ graph [2]. This observation suggests the magnetic structure (or oxygen stoichiometry) of LCo in the composites remain same with respect to their parent LCo. Hence the anomaly around $T_{S(onset)}$ indicates the modification of the magnetic state of LCo due to close proximity of LCo. In case of A3 the effective interface between LCu and LCo is larger than A1 and A2, the reason behind this can be explained as due to the smaller particle size of LCo850, it has larger surface to volume ratio than LCo900 and LCo950, and hence the effective interface between LCu and LCo850 is larger in case of A3 than A1 and A2, that is why the anomaly around $T_{S(onset)}$ in case of A3 is more prominent than A1 and A2.

We have also demonstrated the interface effect further by taking sample pellet (A2) and crushing it into powder to reduce the effective interface and then comparing their $\chi_1^R(T)$ (Shown in Fig. 4). The distinction between the $\chi_1^R(T)$ plot of powder and pellet around $T_{S(onset)}$ is clearly distinguishable from the figure shown in the inset of Fig. 4, which is for the powder the hump is suppressed as a result of reduction of the effective interface. So all these measurements confirm that the observed anomaly around $T_{S(onset)}$ is interface induced.

\[ \chi_1(\approx \delta m/\delta h) \text{ is linear susceptibility and } \chi_2, \chi_3, \chi_4... \text{ are nonlinear susceptibilities. If the magnetization has an inversion symmetry with respect to the applied field } h_{ac} \text{ then all the even order susceptibilities, like } \chi_2(\approx \delta^2 m/\delta^2 h), \chi_4(\approx \delta^4 m/\delta^4 h) \text{ are zero but in the presence of a symmetry-breaking field with respect to the applied ac field all the even order susceptibilities show non zero values [4] (like in case of a ferromagnet, ferrimagnet, small ferromagnetic clusters etc.). For this reason the second order susceptibility is very useful tool to study the presence of internal field in various materials [5–8].} \]

The magnetization ($m$) can be expanded with respect to the applied ac field $h_{ac}$ as

\[ m = m_0 + \chi_1 h + \chi_2 h^2 + \chi_3 h^3 + \chi_4 h^4 ...(1) \]
FIG. 3. (Color Online) (a),(b) and (c) shows the combined plot of composite (A1 and LCo950), (A2 and LCo900), and (A3 and LCo850) respectively. All the measurements are done in an ac field of amplitude 3 Oe and frequency 231.1 Hz.

FIG. 4. (Color Online) The combined plot of $\chi_1$ against temperature for A2 composite in two different conditions. The red square block shows the plot after annealing and the black circle after making a powder of the annealed pallet. Inset shows the Zoomed view of the anomalous region. The measurements are performed at ac field ($h_{ac}$) = 3 Oe and frequency (f) = 231.1 Hz.

C. Dc field dependent $\chi_1$

The onset temperature and the peak temperature of $\chi_1$ decreases with increasing the amplitude of dc bias field shown in FIG. 5, which is a typical signature of superconductor i.e. decrement of superconductivity while increasing the amplitude of dc bias field.
