arXiv:cond-mat/0305543v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 9 Jul 2003

Non-Hermitian Luttinger Liquids and Vortex Physics

Walter Hofstetter[1], Ian Affleck[2], David R. Nelson[1], and Ulrich Schollwöck[3]
[1] *Lyman Laboratory, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*
[2] *Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, USA*
[3] *Sektion Physik, Universität München, Theresienstr. 37, D-80333 München, Germany*
(Dated: March 22, 2022)

As a model of two thermally excited flux liquids connected by a weak link, we study the effect of a single line defect on vortex filaments oriented parallel to the surface of a thin planar superconductor. When the applied field is *tilted* relative to the line defect, the physics is described by a *nonhermitian* Luttinger liquid of interacting quantum bosons in one spatial dimension with a point defect. We analyze this problem using a combination of analytic and numerical density matrix renormalization group methods, uncovering a delicate interplay between enhancement of pinning due to Luttinger liquid effects and depinning due to the tilted magnetic field. Interactions dramatically improve the ability of a single columnar pin to suppress vortex tilt when the Luttinger liquid parameter $g \leq 1$.

INTRODUCTION

The past decade has seen considerable work on the statistical mechanics and dynamics of thermally excited vortices in type II high–temperature superconductors [1]. The competition between interactions, pinning and thermal fluctuations gives rise to a wide range of novel phenomena, including a first order melting transition of the Abrikosov flux lattice into an entangled liquid of vortex filaments [2] and a low–temperature *Bose glass* phase with vortices strongly pinned to columnar defects [3].

A convenient way of understanding interacting flux lines is provided by the formal mapping between the classical statistical mechanics of (d+1)–dimensional directed flux lines and the nonrelativistic quantum mechanics of d–dimensional bosons. In this mapping, flux lines traversing the sample along the direction of the external magnetic field $\mathbf{H} = H\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ correspond to boson world lines propagating in imaginary time τ. The classical partition function of thermally excited vortex lines is proportional to a quantum mechanical matrix element. The thickness of the sample in the z–direction, L_z, corresponds to the inverse temperature $\beta\hbar$ of the bosons, while thermal fluctuations of the vortices, due to finite k_BT, play the role of quantum fluctuations of the bosons, controlled by $\hbar$.

If the direction of the external magnetic field does *not* coincide with $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, the direction of the columnar defects, it is convenient to separate the transverse component of the field $H_\perp$ from the parallel one $H_\parallel$ along $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$. When $H_\perp \ll H_\parallel$, the transverse component $H_\perp$ plays the role of a constant imaginary vector potential for the bosons [3, 4]. The corresponding quantum Hamiltonian is *non–hermitian*, with new and interesting properties. Stimulated by vortex physics, there has been considerable interest in models of noninteracting quantum particles in a constant imaginary vector potential with a disordered pinning potential.

Less is known about non–hermitian models *with* interactions. A disordered array of parallel columnar defects leads to a strongly pinned low–temperature Bose glass phase. For $H_\perp$ less than a critical value $H_\perp^c$, this phase exhibits a "transverse Meissner effect", such that the vortex filaments remain pinned parallel to the columns even though the external field is tilted away from the column direction.

In this paper we study the effect of a *single* columnar pin (or an equivalent linear defect) on the statistical mechanics of thermally fluctuating vortex lines confined in a thin, superconducting slab (see Fig. 1). With exception of a brief discussion in [3] and the analysis of Ref. [5], little has been done on vortex physics in the limit of a dilute concentration of columns (or twin planes). If the average spacing between defects is d, this is the regime $H_\parallel \gg B_\Phi = \Phi_0/d^2$ where B_Φ is the "matching field" and Φ_0 is the flux quantum. The large number of "interstitial" vortices between defects could be locally crystalline or melted into a flux liquid. A third possibility (perhaps the situation most closely related to our calculations in 1+1 dimensions) is vortices in a "supersolid" phase, with extended correlations in both the translational and boson order parameters [6].




FIG. 1: Schematic snapshot of vortex lines and a columnar pin. The near–vertical segments occur at locations of maxima of the average density. For finite tilt these maxima become negligible for $|x| > \xi_\perp$. Here, the z–axis is denoted by τ.

The feasibility of studying vortex physics in sam-

ples which are effectively (1+1)–dimensional was demonstrated by Bollé et al. [7] in thin samples of $NbSe_2$, where the effect of point disorder on interacting vortices near H_{c1} was observed. Similar experiments might be possible on thin high–T_c samples where columnar defects could be implemented mechanically by cutting a thin "notch". A related problem in (2+1) dimensions concerns the effect of a single twin plane or grain boundary on vortex matter, where point disorder may lead to algebraic decay of density correlations [8] of the Abrikosov flux lattice similar to those discussed below. A single such plane has a similar pinning effect on bulk flux lines as does a linear defect in (1+1)–dimensional systems.

In the following we will consider a single columnar defect in a system of interacting flux lines in (1+1) dimensions. Although results can also be obtained using a flux–line related phonon formalism [9], we here found it convenient to work with an equivalent quantum Hamiltonian [1, 4]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= -\frac{(k_BT)^2}{2m}\int dx \Psi^\dagger(x)\left(\frac{d}{dx}-h\right)^2\Psi(x) \qquad (1)\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\int dxdy\, n(x)V\left(|x-y|\right)n(y)-\epsilon_0\, n(0) \end{aligned}$$

where $V(|x|)$ is a short–range repulsive vortex interaction potential, $\Psi(x)$ annihilates a bosonic flux line, $n(x) = \Psi^\dagger(x)\Psi(x)$ is the boson number density and m is the vortex tilt modulus. The imaginary vector potential $h = \Phi_0 H_\perp/(4\pi T)$ arises due to the tilted magnetic field and ϵ_0 is the strength of the defect modelled by a δ–potential at the origin. In the following we set $k_BT = 1$ (i.e. $\hbar = 1$ in the quantum model).

Without the local potential and the non–hermitian term this model has been well studied [10, 11]. In particular, Haldane [11] has shown that this spinless Luttinger liquid exhibits a line of critical points with continuously varying exponents. His calculation is based on the bosonization technique, where the boson field

$$\Psi^\dagger \sim \sqrt{n_0+\frac{du}{dx}}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i2\pi m(n_0x+u(x))}e^{i\phi(x)} \qquad (2)$$

is represented in terms of a boson phase operator $\phi(x)$ and (dimensionless) phonon operator $u(x)$. The two fields satisfy the commutation relation $[\phi(x),u(y)] = (i/2)\ \mathrm{sgn}(x-y)$. With applications to vortex physics in mind, we have extended the bosonization approach and work on quantum impurities [12, 13] to the non–hermitian case $h > 0$ and calculated asymptotic low–energy properties for the model (1).

In addition, we have performed a non–perturbative numerical analysis using the Density–Matrix Renormalization Group (DMRG) [14] for a discretized version of the Hamiltonian (1)

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \sum_{i=0}^{L}\big[-t\left(b_i^\dagger b_{i+1}e^h + b_{i+1}^\dagger b_i e^{-h}\right)+\frac{U}{2}n_i(n_i-1)\\ &+Vn_in_{i+1}\big]-\epsilon_0 b_0^\dagger b_0 \qquad (3) \end{aligned}$$

corresponding to a nonhermitean *Bose–Hubbard* model where $n_i = b_i^\dagger b_i$ and the hopping is $t = 1/2m$ (for unit lattice constant). In the following we set $t = 1$. We work in the canonical ensemble, fixing the density of bosons per site n_0. We have retained an onsite and a next–neighbor interaction, which turn out to be sufficient to qualitatively describe the full phase diagram. Furthermore, for computational purposes we allow at most 2 bosons per site, which effectively renormalizes the on–site repulsion. The lattice model (3) is a good approximation to (1) for small filling n_0 (average number of bosons per site). Our calculation is based on an extension of the DMRG to non–hermitian systems with complex eigenvalues and eigenvectors (for details see [15]).

In the hermitian case $h = 0$ without impurity we have first calculated the Luttinger liquid parameter g which governs the long–wavelength behavior of correlation functions and is important to understand the response at finite tilt. We adapt the DMRG work of Ref. [16] to *periodic* boundary conditions, essential for the study of persistent currents (i.e. arrays of tilted vortex lines) discussed below. We focus exclusively on the superfluid (Luttinger liquid) phase. Via DMRG we have calculated the boson correlation function, which from conformal field theory is expected to behave as $<\Psi^\dagger(x)\Psi(0)> \sim |L\sin(\pi x/L)|^{-1/2g}$. We have verified this behavior numerically with high accuracy and have extracted g by a fit to the data (see Fig. 2). We also determined g from the compressibility and the finite-size dependence of the ground state energy [17] with excellent agreement between the values of g obtained by both methods. For arbitrary short range potentials (in continuum or lattice models) we have derived the general low–density result $g \approx 1-2an_0+O(a^2n_0^2)$ where a is the two-particle scattering length. For our lattice Hamiltonian (3) we find $a = -(8t^2-4tV-UV)/(2tU+UV+4tV)$. As shown in Fig. 2, this asymptotic result is in good agreement with the numerical data.

We now include the pinning term proportional to ϵ_0 in Eq. (1). In order to determine the relevance of this term at long wavelengths we have performed a perturbative renormalization group (RG) analysis. We obtain the following renormalization flow of the pinning strength

$$\epsilon_0(l) = \epsilon_0(l_0)\left(\frac{l_0}{l}\right)^{g-1} \qquad (4)$$

where l is an effective length scale or inverse cutoff momentum. For $g > 1$ the renormalized coupling to flows to zero at long length scales while for $g < 1$ it diverges.




FIG. 2: Luttinger–liquid parameter g vs. density. The dashed lines show the analytic result at low densities.




FIG. 3: Friedel oscillations of the flux line density vs. distance x from the defect, calculated numerically for $U = 10$, $V = 4$, $L = 128$ and $n_0 = 0.25$, corresponding to $g \approx 0.72$.

Remarkably, while in fermionic systems with (generic) repulsive interactions one always has $g < 1$, the *bosonic* Luttinger liquid studied here can be tuned to either regime. This can be easily seen by setting $U = \infty, V = 0$ in (3): Since hardcore bosons in 1d are equivalent to non-interacting spinless fermions, we obtain $g = 1$. Smaller U increases g from 1 while additional next–neighbor interactions $V > 0$ lead to $g < 1$. In the following we will denote the special situation $g = 1$ as the *free fermion limit*, for which we have replaced the DMRG by computationally less expensive exact diagonalization.

The irrelevance/relevance of the pin can be clearly observed in the Friedel oscillations of the boson density $\Delta n(x) \equiv \langle n(x)\rangle - n_0$, for which we find the analytic result

$$\Delta n(x) \sim \frac{\cos(2\pi n_0|x|)}{|x|^\alpha}\, e^{-|x|/\xi_\perp(h)}. \qquad (5)$$

with an interaction–dependent exponent $\alpha = \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} g \\ 2g-1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ for $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} g<1 \\ g>1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ and a *decay length* $\xi_\perp \sim 1/h$. At zero tilt h we therefore find a pure power–law decay of the density perturbation which is more rapid when the pin is irrelevant. When $h > 0$, the Friedel oscillations acquire an additional exponential decay.

As illustrated in Fig. 3, the density oscillates with a phase set by the impurity position, and an algebraic envelope before exponential decay sets in for $x > \xi_\perp(h)$. In the vortex picture (see Fig. 1), configurations are dominated by parallel, tilted flux lines at distances larger than $\xi_\perp(h)$ from the pin. Closer in, vortices attempt to align with the maxima in the density oscillations present when $h = 0$. This alignment is limited by interactions as vortices enter and leave the aligned region with increasing imaginary time τ. The resulting vortex configurations resemble a symmetric traffic jam, with vortices queuing up (and occasionally changing places) in the vicinity of the columnar defect. With our conventions, the slope of the lines far from the pin is h/m, so new vortices enter the jam at imaginary time intervals $\xi_\parallel \approx m/hn_0$, where n_0 is the linear density of "bosons". If c is the Luttinger liquid velocity we expect that $\xi_\perp(h) \sim c\,\xi_\parallel \sim 1/gh$, a diverging length scale we confirm with our analytic calculations. Note that the pinning strength is reduced dramatically for length scales $x > \xi_\perp(h)$ even for $g < 1$.

When $h > 0$, the non–hermiticity leads to a finite persistent current $J_b = -\frac{i}{L} d\langle \hat{H}\rangle/dh$ in the ground state. This current is purely imaginary and corresponds to the transverse magnetization in the original flux line system [4]:

$$M_\perp \sim \Phi_0 \mathrm{Im} J_b. \qquad (6)$$

The defect reduces this current, due to flux lines pinned even in the presence of a tilted magnetic field. Although a single pin cannot modify the bulk current in the thermodynamic limit $L \to \infty$, it creates nontrivial finite–size effects. Since $\mathrm{Im}J_b = hN_b/mL$ in the absence of pinning (where $N_b \equiv n_0 L$), it is convenient to define a "pinning number" N_p for vortices given by $\mathrm{Im}J_b \equiv h(N_b - N_p)/mL$. Because $\mathrm{Re}J_b = 0$, this can be written

$$N_p \equiv N_b[J_b(0) - J_b(\epsilon_0)]/J_b(0) \qquad (7)$$

The quantity N_p may be readily calculated for the free fermion case $g = 1$ where the groundstate energy is determined by filling up all the states below the "Fermi surface". The pinning number obtained in this way has the asymptotic behaviour ($L \to \infty$)

$$\begin{aligned} N_p &\to \frac{(m\epsilon_0)^2}{2\pi^2 n_0 h}, \quad (m\epsilon_0 << h) \\ &\to \frac{n_0}{h}\ln(|\epsilon_0|/n_0), \quad (m\epsilon_0 >> h), \end{aligned} \qquad (8)$$

results valid provided $h \ll n_0 = N_b/L$. Remarkably, N_p diverges as $h \to 0$. When the pinning is strong, the functional form (8) can be understood in terms of the aligned local density wave which extends out to a distance $\xi_\perp$. The $N_p \approx \xi_\perp n_0 \approx n_0/h$ vortices entrained in this "traffic jam" do not contribute to the current. To check this




FIG. 4: Pinning number in the free fermion limit $g = 1$ for $L = 100$ and $\epsilon_0 = 2$. Note the "step" due to single–vortex depinning and the strong enhacement at small tilt h.




FIG. 5: Main plot: Finite–size scaling of the current (DMRG results) for filling $n_0 = 0.25$ and a relevant pin ($g \approx 0.72$). Notice the data collapse in the linear–response regime $hL \to 0$. Inset: pinning number N_p as a function of h for the same parameters. The dashed line gives the logarithmic behavior in Eq. (9) with an offset of *const.* = 0.5.

divergence, we have also calculated the pinning number numerically within the lattice model (3), both in the free fermion limit ($U = \infty, V = 0$) and for general interactions. Results are shown in Fig. 4. A clearly visible feature is the "step" at intermediate tilt for low boson densities, corresponding to the single–vortex depinning transition at $h_c \approx m\epsilon_0$ [4]. Most prominent, however, is the dramatic increase in the number of pinned vortices at small tilt. We find similar results with DMRG for $g < 1$. In the *linear response* limit ($hL \to 0$) we find more generally that $N_p \sim L^{3-2g}$ for an irrelevant defect ($g > 1$), while in the relevant case almost all vortices are pinned, i.e. $N_p \to N_b$ for large system size L. The *residual* current for a relevant pin has the linear response form $J_b(h)|_{h\to 0} \sim hL^{1-1/g}$, which vanishes as $L \to \infty$. A similar result for fermions was obtained by Gogolin and Prokov'ev [18] in the case of a real vector potential. We have verified this finite–size dependence of the current with good accuracy in the DMRG calculation (see Fig. 5).

The equivalence to a real vector potential breaks down at finite h. Our results are consistent with two qualitatively different types of behaviour depending on the value of g. While for an irrelevant pin ($g > 1$) a simple power–law scaling ansatz $N_p(h) = h^{-3+2g}\Phi(hL)$ works, our analytic work suggests a nontrivial logarithmic correction for $g < 1$:

$$N_p(h) = (n_0/h)\,(-(1/g-1)\ln(h) + \text{const.}) \qquad (9)$$

This equation is valid for $hL \gg 1$ and $h \ll n_0$. The DMRG data (see inset of Fig. 5) are consistent with this conjecture.

In conclusion, we have studied the effect of a single columnar defect on a sea of interacting vortices in 1+1 dimensions, in the presence of a tilted magnetic field. The physics is described in terms of the groundstate of a nonhermitian Luttinger liquid. Our calculations demonstrate that repulsive interactions can lead to a dramatic enhancement in the number of pinned flux lines for $g < 1$ and thus to a strong transverse Meissner effect controlled by $\xi_\perp(h)$. Details of our analytic and numerical work will appear later [19].

Acknowledgements: We would like to acknowledge discussions on the experimental situation with M. Marchevsky and E. Zeldov, and conversations with L. Radzihovsky. Work by W.H. and D.R.N. was supported by the National Science Foundation through Grant DMR-0231631 and the Harvard Materials Research Laboratory via Grant DMR-0213805. W.H. and U.S. also acknowledge financial support from the German Science Foundation (DFG). Work by I.A. was supported by the National Science Foundation through Grant DMR-0203159.

[1] G. Blatter *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 1125 (1994).
[2] D.R. Nelson and H.S. Seung, Phys. Rev. **B39**, 9153 (1989).
[3] D.R. Nelson and V.M. Vinokur, Phys. Rev. **B48**, 13060 (1993).
[4] N. Hatano and D.R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. **B56**, 8651 (1997).
[5] L. Radzihovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4923 (1995).
[6] E. Frey *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B49**, 9723 (1994).
[7] C.A. Bollé *et al.*, Nature **399**, 43 (1999).
[8] T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1530 (1994).
[9] T. Hwa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B48**, 1167 (1993).
[10] E.H. Lieb and W. Liniger, Phys. Rev. **130**, 1605 (1963).
[11] F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1840 (1981).
[12] C.L. Kane and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. **B46**, 15233 (1992).
[13] S. Eggert and I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. **B46**, 10866 (1992).
[14] S.R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992).
[15] E. Carlon *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **B12**, 99 (1999).

[16] T. Kühner *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B61**, 12474 (2000).
[17] H.W.J. Blöte *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 742 (1986); I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. **56**, 746 (1986).
[18] A. Gogolin and N. Prokof'ev, Phys. Rev. **B50**, 4921 (1994).
[19] I. Affleck, W. Hofstetter, D.R. Nelson, and U. Schollwöck, to appear.