

Agterberg and Dodgson Reply

D.F. Agterberg¹ and Matthew J.W. Dodgson^{2,3}

¹Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201

²Theory of Condensed Matter Group, Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge, CB3 0HE, United Kingdom

³Institut de Physique, Université de Neuchâtel, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland

A reply to the Comment by Mineev and Champel.

In their Comment [1], Mineev and Champel have argued that our results are incorrect because of the simultaneous neglect of both non-linear and non-local terms in our theory. We disagree with this statement and point out that while Ref. [1] argue that these terms should be included, they do not give a convincing physical argument that these terms are important at low fields. In the following, we explicitly show that non-linear and non-local terms can be safely ignored near H_{c1} where our results are valid. Furthermore, our results agree with the assertion of Ref. [1] that there is no true A to B phase transition in the vortex phase. In Ref. [2], we refer to the diverging correlation length that describes the A to B transition in the Meissner phase.

To justify our claims, we give the missing steps between Eq. 2 and Eq. 3 of Ref. [2]. The expression used for \mathbf{j} in the A phase was

$$(\mathbf{j}_A; \nabla^2) \cdot \mathbf{r} = -(\nabla_x \nabla_y + \nabla_y \nabla_x) \cdot \mathbf{r} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{D}_i = \partial_i + i2 \mathbf{A}_i = 0$. Eq. 3 in Ref. [1] is found by setting the ∇^2 operator to zero. This operator cuts off the divergence that Ref. [1] point out in their Eq. 3. We work with $\sim = 1$ and within a London approach. Taking $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j}^i$, $\mathbf{r} = e^i \sim$, and defining the superfluid velocity as $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{r} + 2 \mathbf{A} = 0$ we get

$$(\nabla^2 + v^2 - 2i\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla - \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla) \sim \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j}^i (i\partial_x v_y + i\partial_y v_x - 2v_x v_y): \quad (2)$$

This last equation shows that \sim will be proportional to \mathbf{v} (for small \mathbf{v}). Consequently, for large vortex separations, the non-linear term in \mathbf{v} on the right hand side and the terms with \mathbf{v} on the left hand side of Eq. 2 can be ignored ($\mathbf{v} / e^i \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}$ and the derivatives give a factor $1 = \mathbf{v}$ for large \mathbf{r}). After Fourier transforming and using the Maxwell relation $\mathbf{v} = \frac{2}{0} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{B}$, Eq. 2 becomes

$$\sim(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j}^i \frac{q_x^2 - q_y^2}{2 + q^2} \frac{2}{0} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q}): \quad (3)$$

Using this expression in the free energy and minimizing with respect to $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q})$ gives the novel London equation that forms the basis of our results

$$\frac{h}{1 + \nabla^2 q^2} + \frac{2 \sim^2}{2} \frac{(q_x^2 - q_y^2)^2}{2 + q^2} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q}) = 0: \quad (4)$$

This gives a 4-fold symmetry to the structure of a flux line out to the distance \mathbf{A}_i , which diverges at the A to B transition temperature.

Using Eq. 3, $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{r} < \sim \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j}^i \frac{2 \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r})}{0}$ (take $q_x^2 - q_y^2 \neq q^2$ in Eq. 3). This, with $\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j}^i = 1 = \frac{2}{+}$ and $2 \nabla^2 \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) = 0 = \nabla^2 d^2$, we find:

$$\frac{h}{h} \frac{\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{r}} < \frac{\sim^2}{2} \frac{2}{\mathbf{A}_i^2} \frac{4}{d^4} \quad (5)$$

where d is the distance between vortices. Ref. [1] uses this result as their Eq. 5. H_{c1} marks a second order phase transition between the Meissner and the vortex phase. At this transition $\mathbf{B} = 0$, which implies that as $H \rightarrow H_{c1}$, $d \rightarrow 1$. Consequently, sufficiently near H_{c1} , the non-linear term can be safely neglected. Mineev and Champel argue that d is cut off when $d = \ln(\mathbf{A}_i)$. Presumably, this accounts for the very small range of H over which \mathbf{B} goes from H_{c1} to zero (or d goes from ∞ to 1). Nevertheless, this range is experimentally accessible, and furthermore, for at plate-like samples the demagnetization factors force the applied field H_{app} / \mathbf{B} , thus making the large d limit

even more accessible. It is also argued that when Eq. 6 in Ref.[1] is not satisfied, then non-local corrections must be included (these are terms that are $O(q^4)$ or larger in Eq. 4). To counter this, we point out that Eq. 4 implies new physics at low q (for small q and large d) while non-local terms give new physics at high q (for large q and small d). In fact, we find non-local terms are not important when $\tilde{m} > \frac{\Lambda_{i+}}{d}$. Consequently, non-local terms also become negligible in the large d limit.

DFA was supported by an award from Research Corporation. MJWD was supported by an EPSRC Advanced Fellowship AF/99/0725.

[1] V.P.Mineev and T.Champel, preceding comment.

[2] D.F.Agterberg and M.J.W.Dodgson, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89, 017004 (2002).