arXiv:cond-mat/0208380v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 20 Aug 2002

Comment on "Critical Dynamics of a Vortex-Loop Model for the Superconducting Transition"

In a recent Letter [1], Aji and Goldenfeld (AG) study the critical dynamics of the normal- to superconducting phase transition in zero magnetic field. They study both continuum models of vortex loops and discrete lattice models, often used in numerical simulations, and come to the surprising conclusion that their dynamic critical behavior differ. In this Comment we point out a serious problem in their analysis of the lattice models.

The critical behavior of type-II superconductors can be characterized by large scale fluctuations of vortex loops. Close to the phase transition, it is reasonable to assume overdamped relaxational dynamics for the vortex degrees of freedom, such as generated by a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation. Simulation studies of lattice models have shown that the resulting dynamic critical exponent z is given by $z \approx 1.5$ for unscreened vortex interactions and $z \approx 2.7$ if the vortex interaction is assumed to be strongly screened [2, 3]. In high temperature superconductors, where critical fluctuations are most pronounced, the screening length is very large but finite. Under renormalization the screening length shrinks and hence both these limits are interesting to consider. The values of the critical exponents are surprising since the naive expectation from relaxational (Model-A) dynamics is an exponent close to $z \approx 2$ [4].

In their Letter, AG propose an explanation for the simulation results, but also argue that the lattice models do not capture the true continuum behavior which should instead have a dynamic exponent $z \approx 2$. They claim that the discrepancy is due to an incorrect identification of Monte Carlo time with real time. If true, this could have important consequences for many other studies of dynamics where one usually assumes that the artificial discreteness from a lattice is irrelevant for the critical properties, and that $t_{\rm real} \sim t_{\rm MC}$. Therefore this topic deserves careful study.

AG base their scaling analysis of the vortex Hamiltonian on the assumption that the coupling constant J, which is dimensionless in the lattice model, is not being renormalized, and hence does not carry any scale dependence. Requiring extensivity of the free energy they then arrive at a scaling dimension x of the vorticity $\vec{n} \sim L^{-x}$, which is 5/2 in case of long range unscreened interactions and 3/2 for short range interactions. However, the only reason why the coupling constant J is dimensionless in the discretized model is because it is multiplied by the appropriate power of the microscopic lattice spacing a. Therefore this does *not* exclude any nontrivial scale dependence of J. In fact, more standard scaling arguments give (see e.g. Ref. [5]) that $\vec{n} \sim L^{-2}$, i.e., $x = 2$. This follows because $\vec{n} = \nabla \times \nabla\theta/2\pi$, where θ is the phase of the superconducting order parameter. θ in turn has to have the trivial scaling dimension 0, since it should be 2π-periodic at any scale. Only with this scaling follows the well known finite size scaling relations for the superfluid density, $\rho_s \sim L^{2-d}$, and for the magnetic permeability, $\mu \sim L^{d-4}$, where d is the dimension. These are purely static quantities, whose scaling can be easily checked in numerical simulations without any assumption about the proper relation between real and MC time. This has been done many times for the models under consideration and is in fact one of the best ways to locate the transition [3]. The scaling dimensions proposed by AG would instead lead to the predictions $\rho_s \sim L^{2x-d-2}$, $\mu \sim L^{d-2x}$, which are not supported by MC data.

In conclusion, the explanation of the simulation results offered by AG is not acceptable, since it is based on incorrect assumptions. There is no need for a scale-dependent correction in the proportionality between real time and MC time, and hence no correction to the dynamic exponents found in simulations. It remains to explain why these values are so far from the naive expectation.

Discussions with Nigel Goldenfeld and Mats Wallin are gratefully acknowledged. This work was supported by the Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education (STINT) and the Swedish Research Council (VR) through Contract No. F 5104-278/2001.

Jack Lidmar

Department of Physics
Stockholm University, SCFAB
SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

Received 4 December 2001; Published 15 August 2002 in Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 109701 (2002).

[1] Vivek Aji and Nigel Goldenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 197003 (2001).
[2] H. Weber and H. J. Jensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2620 (1997).
[3] Jack Lidmar, Mats Wallin, Carsten Wengel, S. M. Girvin, and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 2827 (1998).
[4] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **49**, 435 (1977).
[5] Jack Lidmar and Mats Wallin, Europhys. Lett. **47**, 494 (1999).