

A marginal remark on massless neutral boson, in U(1) × U(1) superconductors

Egor Babaev

Institute for Theoretical Physics, Uppsala University Box 803, S-75108 Uppsala, Sweden

We make some remarks on massless neutral boson in two-flavour Abelian Higgs model. Note added: this remark was merged with journal version of cond-mat/0111192 on a referee request.

The two-gap superconductivity appears being a very interesting phenomenon [1]– [6] both from experimental and theoretical points of view.

Also, the two-gap superconductivity was argued to occur in liquid metallic hydrogen and deuterium [6].

A two-gap superconductor can be described by a two-flavour (denoted by $\psi = 1, 2$) Ginzburg-Landau functional:

$$F = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2m_1} |\mathbf{j}(r + ie\mathbf{A})_1|^2 + \frac{1}{2m_2} |\mathbf{j}(r + ie\mathbf{A})_2|^2 + V(|\mathbf{j}_1|^2, |\mathbf{j}_2|^2) + \frac{B^2}{2} \right]$$

where $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}^1 + \mathbf{j}^2$ and $V(|\mathbf{j}_1|^2, |\mathbf{j}_2|^2) = \frac{b}{2} |\mathbf{j}_1|^2 |\mathbf{j}_2|^2 + \frac{c}{2} |\mathbf{j}_1|^4 + \frac{c}{2} |\mathbf{j}_2|^4$. The term $2|\mathbf{j}_1|^2 |\mathbf{j}_2|^2 \cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2)$ describes interband Josephson effect [3]. GL functional may also contain other terms which we drop in order to keep this discussion as simple as possible.

Much insight into two gap superconductivity can be gained by the equivalence mapping between the two-gap GL model and a version of Faddeev nonlinear O(3)-sigma model in interaction with a vector field [7] which is an extension of the model [8] which earlier was found being relevant in particle physics [10, 11] (see also a remark [12]). Based on equivalence mapping in [7] it was shown that two-band superconductors allow knotted solitons characterized by a nontrivial Hopf invariant. The existence of self-stabilized finite-length defects is one of the unique features of two-gap superconductor which, as it was found later has only a counterpart in ferromagnetic triplet superconductors [12].

In the London limit [9] in a simply-connected space the model consists of decoupled massless neutral O(2) and charged O(2) Bose fields. In [9] were discussed several types of vortices allowed in the London limit – in particular fractional flux vortices and composite one-flux-quantum vortices (for an extended discussion see a follow up paper [15], see also remark [13]). In this remark we make a connection with a different formalism to describe these vortices.

From (1) follows the equation for supercurrent

$$\mathbf{J} = \frac{ie}{2m_1} [\mathbf{r}_1 \psi_1 - \mathbf{r}_1 \psi_1] + \frac{ie}{2m_2} [\mathbf{r}_2 \psi_2 - \mathbf{r}_2 \psi_2] + e^2 \mathbf{A} \left[\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right] \quad (2)$$

Insight into the physical roots of the presence in the system of a neutral massless boson can be gained by considering simplest topological defects in this system. Such a defect corresponds to the situation when only phase ϕ_1 changes 2π around the core while the phase of the second condensate remains constant. In that case we have from (2):

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{J}{e^2} \left[\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right] \frac{1}{r} \hat{\mathbf{r}} \quad (3)$$

From this expression it follows [9] that this vortex carries the following fractional magnetic flux

$$\Phi = \oint \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{l} = \frac{2\pi J}{e^2 \left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)} \quad (4)$$

where $\Phi_0 = \frac{2\pi e}{c}$ is standard flux quantum.

Let us make some connections with the results in [9] using more traditional notations than that used in [9]. Further exploring the solution for the vortex ($\phi_1 = 2\pi$; $\phi_2 = 0$) we can write the vector potential as

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{r}{r_0} \frac{e_z}{r} \mathbf{A}(r) \hat{\mathbf{r}} \quad (5)$$

where r measures distance from the core and e_z is a unit vector pointing along the core. The magnetic field is then given by

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} (r \mathbf{A}) \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (6)$$

The equation (2) can then be rewritten as

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left[\frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} (r \mathbf{A}) \right] + \frac{1}{m_1} \mathbf{A} \dot{\phi}_1^2 - \frac{e^2}{r} + \frac{1}{m_2} \mathbf{A} \dot{\phi}_2^2 = 0$$

For such a vortex the solution for vector potential is

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)} \frac{1}{er} \left[\frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)} K_1 e^{-\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)} r} \right] \hat{\mathbf{r}} \quad (7)$$

Indeed the magnetic field vanishes exponentially from the vortex core at the characteristic length scale of magnetic field penetration length $\lambda = \frac{1}{e \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)}}$ [9]:

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{m_1} K_0 e^{-\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)} r} \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (8)$$

Also in contrast to the Abrikosov vortex [14], besides fractionalization of magnetic flux such a vortex also features neutral vorticity. This, in particular, can be seen by substituting the solution (7) into (1). At the length scales larger than magnetic field penetration length from the vortex core it gives the following expression for the energy density:

$$F = \frac{1}{2m_1} \left(r + i \frac{1}{m_1} \left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right) \frac{1}{r} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2m_2} \left(i \frac{1}{m_1} \left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right) \frac{1}{r} \right)^2 \quad (9)$$

Thus the energy per unit length of the vortex ($\alpha_1 = 2$; $\alpha_2 = 0$) is divergent. This is due to the fact that such a topological configuration necessarily induces in two-gap system a neutral superflow. Indeed the expression (9) is equivalent to the energy density in a neutral system with a vortex in a neutral phase field ψ_1 with effective stiffness $\frac{1}{2m_1 m_2} \left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)^2$:

$$F = \frac{1}{2m_1 m_2} \left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} \right)^2 \psi_1^2 \quad (10)$$

Let us remark that this procedure is equivalent to that used in [9] with the only difference that in [9] first the variables were separated into a neutral and a charged fields (the London limit of the general procedure [7]), and then there were found the solutions for the vortices, while in the presentation in this paper first the solution found in [9] is substituted in (1) and then the divergent part associated with neutral vorticity extracted from both kinetic terms in (1).

It displays in a transparent way the roots of the presence in the system of a massless neutral boson: a topologically nontrivial configuration ($\alpha_1 = 2$; $\alpha_2 = 0$), besides current in the field ψ_1 also necessarily induces current in the component ψ_2 . Abeit in such a configuration there are no gradients of ψ_2 however the two condensates are not independent but are connected by the vector potential. A mixture of oppositely directed superflow of the component ψ_2 which necessarily accompanies such a vortex in two-gap system, leads to situation when two superflows partially compensate the induced by each other magnetic field which leads to the existence of the effective neutral superflow in the system. From (1) it is seen that when we can not neglect the term $2j_1 j_2 \cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)$ we deal with sine-Gordon vortices, the regime with finite is relevant for two-band superconductors like MgB_2 where two condensates are not independently conserved.

In conclusion: earlier it was shown that the model (1) is dual to Faddeev model which consists of a unit vector field with $O(3)$ symmetry and a massive vector field which are coupled by Faddeev term. In the London limit

these variables decouple. But in a non-simply-connected space (zero of the order parameter in the vortex core makes the space being non-simply-connected) even in the London limit these fields remain topologically coupled. Which results in the fractionalization of magnetic flux. So in the London limit in a non-simply-connected space the system may be viewed as topologically coupled neutral and charged $O(2)$ bosons. In this brief note we made some explanatory remarks on the physical roots of this effect.

The author is grateful to Prof. G.E. Volovik, Prof. S. Girvin, D.F. Agterberg and especially to D. Gorokhov, K. Zarembo and V. Cheianov for discussions and/or comments on this topic. It is also a great pleasure to thank Prof. Ludwig D. Faddeev, Prof. Antti J. Niemi, for many general discussions of the model (1). This work has been supported by grant STINT-IG 2001-062 and the Swedish Royal Academy of Science.

Notes added: We call reader's attention to long range interacting pancake vortices and BKT transitions which have been considered in connection with High- T_c layered superconductors in [16], the author thanks G. Blatter for pointing that out. This eprint was merged on a referee request with journal version of Ref. [9]

-
- [1] H. Suhl, B.T. Matthias, L.R. Walker, Phys.Rev.Lett.3, 552 (1959)
 - [2] J. Kondo Progr. Teor. Phys. 29 1 (1963); D.R. Tilley Proc.Phys.Soc 84 573 (1964);
 - [3] A.J. Leggett, Prog.of Theor.Phys. 36, 901 (1966)
 - [4] see e.g. F. Bouquet et. al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 047001 (2001) P. Szabo et. al. Phys.Rev.Lett. 87, 137005 (2001)
 - [5] T. Yokoya et. al. Science 294 2518 (2001)
 - [6] K. Mouloupoulos and N.W. Ashcroft Phys. Rev. B 59 12309 (1999) J. Olliva and N.W. Ashcroft Phys. Rev. B 30 1326 (1984). N.W. Ashcroft J. Phys. A 129 12 (2000).
 - [7] E. Babaev, L.D. Faddeev, A.J. Niemi Phys. Rev. B 65, 100512 (2002); cond-mat/0106152
 - [8] L. Faddeev, Quantisation of Solitons, preprint IAS Preprint-75-QS70, 1975; and in Einstein and Several Contemporary Tendencies in the Field Theory of Elementary Particles in Relativity, Quanta and Cosmology vol. 1, M. Pantaleo, F. De Finis (eds.), Johnson Reprint, 1979 see also A.F. Vakulenko, L.V. Kapitanski, Dokl. Akad. Nauk USSR 248 810 (1979)
 - [9] E. Babaev cond-mat/0111192
 - [10] L. Faddeev, A.J. Niemi, Nature 387 (1997) 58; Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 1624; Phys. Lett. B 525 195 (2002). A.J. Niemi, K. Palo and S. Virtanen, Phys. Rev. D 61, 085020 (2000); E. Langmann and A.J. Niemi, Phys. Lett. B 463, 252 (1999)
 - [11] Y.M. Cho, H.W. Lee, D.G. Pak Phys. Lett. B 525 347 (2002); W.S. Bae, Y.M. Cho, S.W. Kim Phys. Rev. D 65 025005 (2002). Y.M. Cho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 252001 (2001), S.V. Shabanov Phys. Lett. B 458 322 (1999), Phys. Lett. B 463 263 (1999)

- [12] Similar model has been found to be relevant for spin-triplet superconductors E. Babaev Phys.Rev.Lett.89 067001 (2002)
- [13] For a review of different examples of flux fractionalization in systems other than two-band superconductors see G.E.Volovik, Proc.Nat.Acad.Sci.97, 2431 (2000)
- [14] A.A.Abrikosov Sov. Phys. JETP 5 1174 (1957) this concept has been applied in high energy physics in H.B.Nielsen and P.Olesen, Nucl.Phys.B 61, 45 (1973).
- [15] E.Babaev cond-mat/0201547
- [16] S.N.Artemenko et al., JETP Lett. 49, 654 (1989); A.Buzdin and D.Feinberg, J.Phys. (France) 51, 1971 (1990); M.V.Feigel'man, V.B.Geshkenbein, and A.I.Larkin, Physica (Amsterdam) 167C, 177 (1990); J.R.Clem, Phys.Rev.B 43, 7837 (1991); L.N.Bulaevskii, S.V.Meshkov and D.Feinberg Phys.Rev.B 43, 3728 (1991); V.Pudikov Physica C, 212, 155 (1993); M.J.W.Dodgson, A.E.Koshelev, V.B.Geshkenbein, and G.Blatner Phys.Rev.Lett. 84, 2698 (2000).