

# London theory across superconducting phase transitions: application to $UPt_3$

D.F. Agterberg and Matthew J.W. Doddson

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201

Theory of Condensed Matter Group, Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge, CB3 0HE, United Kingdom

For multi-component superconductors, it is known that the presence of symmetry breaking fields can lead to multiple superconducting phase transitions. This phenomenon is best illustrated in  $UPt_3$ . Motivated by recent small angle neutron scattering experiments on the vortex state of  $UPt_3$ , the London theory in the vicinity of such phase transitions is determined. It is found that the form of this London theory is in general quite different than that for conventional superconductors. This is due to the existence of a diverging correlation length associated with these phase transitions. One striking consequence is that non-trivial vortex lattices exist arbitrarily close to  $H_{c1}$ . It is also found that the penetration depth develops a novel temperature dependence and anisotropy. Results of this theory for  $UPt_3$  are derived. Possible applications to  $CeIn_3$ ,  $U_{1-x}Th_xBe_{13}$ , electron doped cuprate superconductors,  $Sr_2RuO_4$ , and  $MgCNi_3$  are also discussed.

One of the qualitatively new phenomena associated with unconventional superconductors is the existence of multiple degrees of freedom in the Cooper pair wavefunction [1,2]. This leads naturally to the possibility of phase transitions between superconducting states of different symmetry. A well known example is  $UPt_3$ , which exhibits a phase diagram with three superconducting phases, each described by an order parameter with different symmetry [3-5]. Recently, using small angle neutron scattering (SANS), Huxley et al. observed a realignment of the flux-line lattice as the phase boundary between two different phases of  $UPt_3$  is crossed [6]. This measurement provides the motivation to derive the London theory in the vicinity of such transitions (see Ref. [7] for a recent study of this problem). Conceptually this raises the question: does the phase transition lead to non-trivial consequences for the low field vortex phases? Here we address this question and find that the London theory indeed develops a novel form near the transition. The resulting theory profoundly changes the vortex phase diagram from that expected from the usual London theory. One result is the appearance of a rectangular flux lattice structure at the lower critical field ( $H_{c1}$ ). Such a lattice structure is not thought to be possible in the dilute vortex limit near  $H_{c1}$ . Physically, this arises because the coherence length associated with the second transition diverges and thus becomes an important length scale near  $H_{c1}$ . The diverging coherence length allows a non-trivial anisotropy to exist arbitrarily close to  $H_{c1}$ . This anisotropy dictates the appearance of the resulting rectangular vortex phase. We show that such behavior should exist in  $UPt_3$ . Possible applications to  $U_{1-x}Th_xBe_{13}$ ,  $CeIn_3$ , electron doped cuprate superconductors,  $MgCNi_3$ , and  $Sr_2RuO_4$  are also discussed.




FIG. 1. Superconducting phase diagram of  $UPt_3$ . We are interested in the vortex phases near the A to B phase transition for fields near  $H_{c1}$ .

## Ginzburg Landau Free energy

To demonstrate the physics described above the superconducting state of  $UPt_3$  will be considered. The superconducting phase diagram of  $UPt_3$  exhibits three distinct superconducting phases (see Figure 1). There have been many theoretical interpretations of this phase diagram (see Ref. [5] for an overview). However, it appears that only those theories in which a doubly degenerate order parameter has its degeneracy broken by a symmetry breaking field are consistent with the recent SANS measurements of Huxley et al.. In particular, it was observed that the low-field

$$\begin{aligned}
f = & \quad \dot{f}^2 + \left( \frac{1}{2} \dot{f}^4 + \dot{f}^2 \ddot{f}^2 \right) \\
& + \left( \ddot{f}^2 + \ddot{f}^2 \right) \\
& + \sim [(\ddot{f}^2 + \ddot{f}^2) + c x]
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The goal of this work is to develop the London theory for the  $\text{d}_{x^2-y^2}$  along the six-fold symmetry axis as the A to B phase transition is crossed. This problem has been addressed recently by Champel and Mineev in Ref. [7]. The result of this study is that the vortex lattice will be a stretched hexagonal lattice near  $H_{c1}$ . This was found by determining the linear combination of  $\psi_+$  and  $\psi_-$  that stabilizes the homogeneous ground state (this linear combination will be denoted below by  $\psi_+$ ) and by examining the spatial variations of this order parameter. Such an analysis will not result in the physics discussed in the introduction. This physics is found by including the order parameter component orthogonal to that which minimizes the homogeneous minimizing free energy (denoted by  $\psi_-$ ). The component is induced by spatial variations of  $\psi_+$  through the  $\sim \nabla^2$  term in the free energy. As will be shown below, this coupling qualitatively changes physics of the London theory from that found by setting  $\kappa = 0$ .

$$f = j^2 j^2 + [\cos'(\theta_+ + \theta_-) + \sin'(\theta_+ j^2 - \theta_- j^2)] + \frac{1}{2} j^2 j^4 + \frac{1}{4} j^2 [(j_+ j^2 + j_- j^2)^2 - [\cos'(\theta_+ + \theta_-) + \sin'(\theta_+ j^2 - \theta_- j^2)]^2] - (j_+ j^2 + j_- j^2) + \frac{1}{2} \sim [(\mathcal{D}_-^2 + \mathcal{D}_+^2) (\mathcal{D}_+^2 - \mathcal{D}_-^2) (\mathcal{D}_-^2 + \mathcal{D}_+^2) + c\mathcal{D}] + \cos'[(\mathcal{D}_-^2 + \mathcal{D}_+^2) (\mathcal{D}_+^2 - \mathcal{D}_-^2) + (\mathcal{D}_-^2 - \mathcal{D}_+^2) (\mathcal{D}_+^2 + \mathcal{D}_-^2) + c\mathcal{D}] + \sin'[(\mathcal{D}_-^2 - \mathcal{D}_+^2) (\mathcal{D}_+^2 - \mathcal{D}_-^2) - (\mathcal{D}_-^2 + \mathcal{D}_+^2) (\mathcal{D}_+^2 + \mathcal{D}_-^2) + c\mathcal{D}]] \quad (2)$$

2

homogeneous value, introducing  $v_s = r \frac{2e}{hc} A$ , keeping only terms of order  $v_s^2$ , minimizing this free energy with respect to  $A$  (told  $v_s$  as a function of  $b = r A$ ) yields the following London energy for vortex lattice in the A phase [the vortex lattice was introduced as a gaussian source (with a cutoff given by the  $A$  phase coherence length  $\lambda_{A,+}$ ) for the London equation, as was done in Refs. [9,10]]

$$F = F_0 + \frac{B_0^2}{8} \sum_{q=G} \frac{e^{-q^2 \lambda_{A,+}^2}}{1 + \frac{2}{\lambda_A^2} \frac{q_x^2}{\sim} + \frac{q_y^2}{\sim} + \frac{4}{\lambda_A^2} \frac{\frac{(q_x^2 - q_y^2)^2}{2} + \frac{2}{\lambda_{A,+}^2} q^2}{2}} \quad (3)$$

where  $q$  is summed over all reciprocal lattice vectors of the vortex lattice,  $B_0$  is the spatially averaged magnetic induction,  $\lambda_A = \frac{1 + \frac{2}{\lambda_{A,+}^2} \frac{h^2 c^2}{32 e^2}}{\sim}$  is the penetration depth in the A phase when  $\sim = 0$ , and  $\lambda_{A,+} = \frac{2}{1 + \frac{2}{\lambda_{A,+}^2} \frac{h^2 c^2}{32 e^2}}$  is the coherence length that describes the transition to the B phase from the A phase. In the B phase vortex lattice the London energy is

$$F = F_0 + \frac{B_0^2}{8} \sum_{q=G} \frac{e^{-q^2 \lambda_{B,+}^2}}{1 + \frac{2}{\lambda_B^2} \frac{q_x^2}{\sim \sin'} + \frac{q_y^2}{\sim \sin'} + \frac{4}{\lambda_B^2} \frac{\frac{(q_x^2 - q_y^2)^2}{2} + 4 \cos^2 \theta \frac{q_x^2 q_y^2}{2}}{\frac{2}{\lambda_{B,+}^2} + \frac{2}{\lambda_B^2} q^2}} \quad (4)$$

where  $\lambda_B = \frac{1}{\sim} \frac{h^2 c^2}{32 e^2}$  is the penetration depth in the B phase when  $\sim = 0$ ,  $\sin' = \frac{2}{\lambda_{B,+}^2}$  (note  $\sin' = 1$  for  $T = T_{C;B}$ ),  $\lambda_{B,+} = \frac{2 \cos^2 \theta}{1}$  is the coherence length that describes the transition to the A phase from the B phase, and  $\lambda_{B,+}$  is the coherence length associated with the B phase + order parameter component. We take  $\lambda_{GL} = \lambda_B = \lambda_{B,+} = 60$  as is quoted by Huxley et al. [6] and for simplicity we take  $\lambda_B = \lambda_{B,+} = \lambda_A = \lambda_{A,+}$  (which is correct to within 10%).

The interesting physical behavior arises because  $\frac{2}{\lambda_{A,(B),+}} = 0$  at the  $T_{C;B}$  so that the non-local term (the term proportional to  $[\sim]^2$ ) becomes of order  $q^2$  and thus as important as the local term. This is due to the divergence of the correlation length associated with the A to B phase transition. Typically near  $H_{c1}$  the only relevant length scale is the distance between vortices and the usual analysis can be applied [11]. However, near the A to B phase transition the diverging correlation length appears as a second relevant length scale and, as will be seen below, plays an important role in the London theory. Corrections beyond the mean field model used here can be included in the London theory. This will change the temperature dependence of  $\lambda = \lambda_{A,(B),+}$ , but will not change the powers of  $q$  that appear in the non-local term [12]. It is the  $q$  dependence of the London theory that is important in what follows. The complete London theory will also contain additional non-local terms (like those that appear in the borocarbides [10]), however these corrections are small because they formally carry an additional factor  $(\lambda_{A,(B),+} = \lambda_{A,(B)})^2 - 1 = 3600$  [10,6]. Consequently, near  $H_{c1}$ , the above London energy will describe  $UPT_3$  very well in the vicinity of the  $T_{C;B}$ . Below we discuss some observable consequences of this London free energy.

#### Penetration Depth

The temperature dependence of the non-local term becomes of order  $q^2$  at the  $T_{C;B}$ . This indicates that the temperature dependence of the penetration depth will exhibit a non-trivial behavior. For the field along the  $c$ -axis and a surface with a normal along the crystallographic  $a$  axis, the penetration depth in the B phase is given by

$$\lambda^2 = 2 \frac{\lambda_B^2}{1 - \sin' + \frac{2}{\lambda_{B,+}^2} + \frac{1 + \frac{\sim^2}{2}}{1 - \sin' - \frac{2}{\lambda_{B,+}^2} + \frac{4 \frac{\sim^2}{2} \frac{\lambda_B^2}{2}}{2}}} \quad (5)$$

the result for the A phase is given by changing the label B to A and setting  $\sin' = 1$ . This behavior differs from the usual Ginzburg Landau behavior. The penetration depth will also exhibit an in-plane anisotropy that is maximal at  $T_{C;B}$ . However, this anisotropy will be obscured by the existence of multiple domains of a symmetry breaking field. Vortex lattice structure

The vortex lattice unit cell used here is defined in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. Real space unit cell of the vortex lattice.

The London energy derived above has the most significant impact on the vortex lattice structures for temperatures near  $T_{c;B}$ . Earlier analysis implied a stretched hexagonal lattice near  $T_{c;B}$  [7] which is not strongly field dependent (this was found for arbitrary  $\sim$ ). Such a lattice results from a re-scaling of the variables  $q_x$  and  $q_y$  to remove a  $q_x^2 - q_y^2$  orthorhombic symmetry term in the London energy [11]. The resulting London energy in the re-scaled variables is isotropic (which implies a hexagonal vortex lattice in the re-scaled parameters). This analysis neglects the divergence of  $\chi_{A(B)}$  as the temperature approaches  $T_{c;B}$ , which changes the results significantly. We performed a numerical analysis of the vortex lattice structure in the A phase for  $\sim = 0.36$ , the results are shown in Fig. 3. In this analysis, the  $q_x^2 - q_y^2$  anisotropy in the London energy is removed by re-scaling the  $q_x$  and  $q_y$  [11]. Since the re-scaled and original  $q_x$  and  $q_y$  differ by only a factor  $\sim$ , this re-scaling is ignored in the non-local term (note including the re-scaling in the non-local term is equivalent to keeping factors  $O(\sim^3 = 3)$  which have been previously thrown out). Fig. 3 only show results for  $H = 0.1 - 2B_c$  (numerically it was found that  $H_{c1} = 0.03 - 2B_c$  note also  $H_{c2} = 60 - 2B_c$ ). As can be seen for  $T = T_{c;B} = 400$  mK, the low-field vortex lattice phase is not hexagonal, but square for a substantial range of applied magnetic field. For  $T \ll T_{c;B}$ , the low-field vortex lattice is hexagonal. This can be understood by noting that  $\chi_{A;}$  is finite for  $T \ll T_{c;B}$  and consequently, only the usual London theory applies at the lowest fields (since the vortices become infinitely separated as  $H \rightarrow H_{c1}$ ). However for  $T = T_{c;B}$ ,  $\chi_{A;}$  is infinite, so that the non-local terms in the London theory are important even as  $H \rightarrow H_{c1}$ . Furthermore, it was found that for the lowest fields that were numerically accessible, the stable vortex phase for  $T = T_{c;B}$  was rectangular (a square lattice stretched along one of its sides). This lattice was found to be stable for  $H_{c1} < H < 1.003H_{c1}$  (this field range is not shown in Fig. 3). In comparing the theory to existing experimental results, it is important to point out that the high-field vortex phase agrees with that observed by Huxley et al. [6]. We found that the high-field (nearly) hexagonal lattice has one of the basis vectors rotated 15 degrees from the crystallographic  $a$  axis which is in agreement Ref. [6]. This is a non-trivial result of the theory found here. In particular, the sign of the non-local term derived in Eq. 3 is opposite that used by Huxley et al. to explain the observed orientation. For smaller  $\sim$ , the vortex phase diagram is very similar to that found in Fig. 3 with one important difference: the region where the square vortex lattice phase appears becomes suppressed to lower fields and to temperatures closer to  $T_{c;B}$ .




FIG. 3. Vortex lattice structure as a function of applied field and temperature in the A-phase for temperatures near the A to B transition ( $T_{c,B} = 440$  mK). Results have been included for fields  $H > 0.12B_c$ . The parameter  $\kappa = 1$  throughout the entire parameter range shown above.

Given that the intriguing behavior found here was due the diverging correlation length at  $T_{c,B}$ , it is clear that this physics is not restricted to  $U\text{Pt}_3$ . It will arise in other multi-component superconductors that exhibit multiple phase transitions. Some additional candidates for this behavior are  $U_{1-x}\text{Th}_x\text{Be}_{13}$  [13],  $\text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4$  [14{16}],  $\text{CeIn}_3$  [17], electron doped cuprates [18], and  $\text{MgCNi}_3$  [19,20]. In  $U_{1-x}\text{Th}_x\text{Be}_{13}$  multiple phase transitions have been observed [13]. Cubic  $\text{CeIn}_3$  is likely to have a superconducting phase diagram similar to  $U\text{Pt}_3$  with a two-component d-wave order parameter [21].  $\text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4$  has been established as an unconventional superconductor with a two-component order parameter [14{16}]. The application of uniaxial stress should give rise to multiple transitions in this case [22]. Electron doped cuprates have been argued to exhibit a d to s-wave pairing symmetry transition with doping [18]. If this is indeed the case, then there should exist a particular doping where the two symmetries co-exist. This would imply multiple phase transitions. Finally, cubic  $\text{MgCNi}_3$  has been argued to be a spin-triplet superconductor [20], for which it is likely that a multi-component order parameter arises [1]. In this case, the application of uniaxial pressure will then be required to give rise to multiple superconducting phase transitions.

In conclusion, we have shown that for superconductors that exhibit multiple superconducting phases in zero applied magnetic field, the London theory in the vicinity of phase transitions takes on a very novel form. In particular, the diverging correlation length associated with the phase transition allows non-trivial vortex lattice structures to exist arbitrarily close to  $H_{c1}$ . It was also found that the penetration depth will exhibit an unusual temperature dependence and anisotropy near such transitions. This theory was applied to  $U\text{Pt}_3$  and the possible application of this theory to  $U_{1-x}\text{Th}_x\text{Be}_{13}$ ,  $\text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4$ ,  $\text{CeIn}_3$ , electron-doped cuprates, and  $\text{MgCNi}_3$  was discussed.

We thank A. Huxley, R. Joynt, J. Moreno, P. Rodiere, and J. Sauls for useful discussions. DFA was supported by an award from Research Corporation and by a Research Committee Award from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. MJWD is supported by an EPSC Advanced Fellowship AF/99/0725.

- 
- [1] M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Rev. Mod. Phys. 63, 239 (1991).
  - [2] L. P. Gor'kov, Sov. Sci. Rev., Sect. A 9, 1 (1987).
  - [3] R. A. Fisher et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 1411 (1989).
  - [4] S. Adenwalla et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 2298 (1990).
  - [5] J. A. Sauls, Adv. Phys. 43, 113 (1994).
  - [6] A. Huxley, et al., Nature 406, 160 (2000).
  - [7] T. Champel and V. P. Mineev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 4903 (2001).
  - [8] K. A. Park and R. Joynt, Phys. Rev. B 53, 12346 (1996).
  - [9] R. Heeb and D. F. Agterberg, Phys. Rev. B 59, 7076 (1999).
  - [10] V. G. Kogan et al., Phys. Rev. B 55, R8693 (1997).
  - [11] V. G. Kogan, Phys. Lett. 85A, 298 (1981).
  - [12] P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, Principles of condensed matter physics, Cambridge University Press, New York (1995).
  - [13] R. H. Heiner et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 2816 (1990).
  - [14] Y. Maeno et al., Nature (London) 372, 532 (1994).
  - [15] T. M. Rice and M. Sigrist, J. Phys. Condens. Matter 7, L643 (1995).
  - [16] Y. Maeno, T. M. Rice, and M. Sigrist, Phys. Today 54, No. 1, 42 (2001).
  - [17] N. D. Mathur et al., Nature (London) 394, 39 (1998).
  - [18] A. Biswas et al., cond-mat/0111544 (2001).
  - [19] T. He et al., Nature (London) 411, 54 (2001).
  - [20] H. Rosner et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 027001-1 (2002).
  - [21] D. F. Agterberg, unpublished.
  - [22] M. Sigrist, R. Joynt, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 36, 5186 (1987).