Absence of Quantum Metallic Behavior in Disordered Granular Superconductors

Ryusuke Ikeda

Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

(D ated: A pril 14, 2024)

We exam ine the idea, postulated by Phillips et al., that a nite resistivity in T ! 0 limit in disordered granular superconducting (SC) Im s is explained as a consequence of the absence of phase sti ness in a phase glass (PG) peculiar to granular system s. It is found that, in spite of the absence of static phase sti ness, a coupling between the nonzero PG order and the ordinary SC uctuation m akes the conductivity divergent. However, an actual drop of resistance is argued to occur due to another SC glass ordering, induced by the precursory PG uctuation, corresponding to the vortex-glass transition in a nonzero magnetic eld.

+

PACS num bers:

Study of the phase diagram in disordered granular superconductors at low tem perature (T) is in portant in relation to understanding the superconductor-insulator (S-I) transition behaviors. Recently, D alidovich and Phillips [1, 2] have argued that, in a two dimensional (2D) phase glass (PG) expected to be induced in low T lim it by a disordered granular structure, the resistance is nite. 0 bservations of a quantum m etallic behavior [3, 4, 5] do not seem to be directly explained within available theories [6, 7, 9] for hom ogeneously disordered superconducting (SC) materials. Further, it is found that their analysis can be trivially extended to the 3D case and the case with nonzero magnetic eld (H \neq 0) and leads to a similar quantum metallic behavior. Since resistive data showing a metallic resistance curves attening upon cooling are available in quasi 2D system s [8] in H € 0, their proposal, if correct, m ight becom e a correct description of the corresponding phenom ena. On the other hand, it has been argued [10] that, in contrast to the hom ogeneouslydisordered case [9], the resistivity drop at low enough (but nite) tem peratures in disordered superconductors consisting of clustered SC islands (i.e., SC grains) should occur even in a wide eld range above an averaged (m ean eld) upper critical eld $H_{2}(0)$. Therefore, e ects of disordered granular structure on quantum resistive behaviors are not theoretically understood well at present.

To exam ine this problem, we use essentially the same model as in Ref.[1] expressing a random Josephson junction array with an on-site charging energy.

$$S = S_{0} \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{Z} d \qquad J_{ij}()S_{+i}()S_{j}() + cx;;$$
(1)

where the pair < i, j > denotes a nerest-neighbor pair, and

$$S_{0} = \int_{0}^{Z} d \int_{i}^{X} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta_{i}(0)}{\theta_{i}^{2}}^{2}; \qquad (2)$$

$$J_{ij}() = J_{ji}() = J_{ij} \exp [i(A_{ij}^{ext} + A_{ij}())];$$

$$S_{i}() = \exp(i_{i}()):$$

The gauge eld consists of the static component A_{ij}^{ext} for an applied uniform magnetic eld H and the dynam – ical uctuation A () introduced for deriving the linear responses. The quenched disorder in the system is incorporated in a random ness of J_{ij} with nonzero m ean J_0 $(\overline{J_{ij}} = J_0 > 0)$ for any < i, j > and with a Gaussian distribution. Only for a form aljustic cation of the mean-

eld approach on the PG ordering, the G aussian distribution on J_{ij} J_0 will be replaced by an in nite-ranged one. Then, after replicating the action and introducing PG and SC orderparameter elds, $\tilde{q}^b\left(1;\,_2\right)=(q^{ba}\left(2;\,_1\right))$ and $_i^a\left($), the random-averaged free energy is given by $\lim_{n\,!}\,_{+\,0}(\overline{Z}^n-1)=n$, where

$$\frac{\overline{Z}^{n}}{\overline{Z}^{n}_{0}} = D D D qexp(F_{e}(;q)); \qquad (3)$$

 $\overline{Z_0^n}$ is the replicated partition function for S_0 ,

$$F_{e}(;q) = \frac{N}{2J^{2}} d_{1} d_{2} X + \frac{1}{2} d_{1}^{(ab)}(1;2)^{2} d_{1} d_{2} + \frac{1}{4} d_{1}^{(ab)}(1;2)^{2} d_{1} d_{1} d_{2} d_{1} d_{$$

and the bracket h i_0 denotes the ensem ble average by the charging energy part S_0 . In eq.(4), a and b are replica indices, d is the spatial dimension, $D_i \quad D_i$ denotes the Laplacian on the gauge-invariant gradients de ned on the cubic lattice (for d = 3), and the factor N (the system size) in the rst and second terms arrises due to the replacement into the in nite-ranged model. The gauge uctuation A = A x applied externally is assumed to be small, and its site dependence was neglected because spatially uniform linear responses are considered below.

Performing the cum ulant expansions with respect to $q^{(ab)}$ and ${}^{(a)}$, F_e is obtained in a form of a Landau free energy functional. Further, as in Ref.[11, 12], rewriting $q^{(ab)}(_{1; 2}) as Q_R^{(ab)}(_{R}; _2) C_{a,b}(_1 _2)$ in order to delete the term $d_1 d_2 p^{(ab)}(_{1; 2})^2$, we nally obtain the following elective action

 $\frac{\mathrm{tF}_{e}(\mathbf{j}Q)}{\mathrm{N}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}} \frac{\mathrm{d}^{2}}{\mathrm{d}_{1}\mathrm{d}_{2}} + \mathrm{r} Q^{(\mathrm{aa})}(\mathbf{j}_{1}; \mathbf{j})$

zero-dimensional case) with c_g ! 0 will be assumed because extending to higher dimensional and H \pounds 0 cases can be trivially performed. Then, the variational equation 0 = $\lim_{n\,!\ +\ 0} n^{-1} (e^{2\pi} = e^{2} (a^{(ab)} (\ _1;\ _2))$ is reexpressed by the following three equations:

$$\frac{Z}{3} = \frac{X}{1} \frac{1}{2} \frac{X}{2} \frac{(ab)}{2} \frac{(ab)}{1} \frac{(ab)}{1} \frac{(ab)}{2} \frac{(ab)}$$

where

$$\frac{\mathrm{tF}_{\mathrm{A}}}{\mathrm{N}} = \frac{\mathrm{t}}{4\mathrm{J}^{2}} X^{2} d_{1}d_{2} (\mathrm{A}(_{1}) - \mathrm{A}(_{2}))^{2} \mathcal{D}^{(\mathrm{ab})} (_{1};_{2}) \mathcal{D}^{2};$$
(6)

$$tF = \begin{bmatrix} X & Z & X \\ & d & r j_{i}^{(a)} ()^{2} \end{bmatrix}$$
(7)

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & + & c & \frac{(a)}{i} & 2 \\ & + & c & \frac{(a)}{i} & 2 \\ & & & \frac{(a)}{i} & \frac{1}{j} \\ & & X & Z & Z \\ & & & d_{1} & d_{2} \begin{pmatrix} (a) \\ i & (1) \end{pmatrix} Q^{(ab)} \begin{pmatrix} (1; 2) & 0 \\ i & (2) \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

For a moment, a j $\int 1^4$ term with positive coe cient will be neglected. The coe cients in eqs.(5) and (6) can be calculated from correlation functions on S () on the basis of the local action S₀, and, except r and r, all of them are always positive. For instance, the coe cient w is postive as far as J₀ > 0. The above expression of the action is of the same form as in Ref.[12].

Now, let us examine the mean $\quad \mbox{eld solution on } Q^{ab}$ by taking account of the presence of SC (-) uctuation. In H 6 0 case, this treatment may be appropriate above $H_{c2}(0)$ and in low enough temperatures [13]. Note that there is no reason why the SC uctuation is negligible in the mean eld analysis of the PG order because the - eld in eq.(7) couples to the Q-eld in a bilinear form (^(a)) ^(b). As shown below, including SC uctuations is essential to obtaining a correct result of conductivity. Following Ref.[11, 12], the mean eld ansatz $Q^{(ab)}(_1;_2) = q(1_{a;b}) + (\overline{q} + \frac{1}{e_{0}D}) + ($ replica symmetry in ! = 0 terms is su cient for the present purpose of showing a divergent conductivity because a breaking of replica sym m etry would be accom panied by an independent parameter such as a coe cient of a quartic term on ${\tt Q}^{\,{\tt ab}}.$ Further, only for the convenience of presentation, the on-site - uctuation (i.e.,

2 ${}^{2}q(\bar{q} q) + w G_{od}(0) = 0$: (10)

Here, the SC uctuation propagator
$$G^{(ab)}(!) = {}^{1} < ({}^{(a)}_{i}(!)) {}^{(b)}_{i}(!) > is given by G^{(ab)}(!) = {}^{a,b}_{a,b}(1)$$

 ${}^{(a)}_{!,0}G_{d}(!) + {}^{!}_{!,0}({}^{a,b}G_{d}(0) + (1) {}^{a,b}G_{od}(0)), where$

$$G_{d}(!) = \frac{t}{r + c !^{2} w \overline{D}_{!}}; \quad (11)$$

$$G_{od}(0) = \frac{w q}{t} (d (q))^{2};$$

$$G_{d}(0) = d (q) + G_{od}(0);$$

$$d (q) = \frac{t}{r + w q};$$

and $q = (q \overline{q})$. Noting that, when q > 0, eq.(10) becomes

$$q = \frac{w}{t} \frac{^{2}t}{^{2}} (d (q))^{2};$$
 (12)

we easily nd that the only physically meaningful solution of the PG order parameter is given together with eq.(12) by

$$\overline{q} = \frac{1}{D_{1}} X = \frac{1}{D_{1}} + u^{-1} ((q)^{2} + w d^{-1}r); (13)$$

$$\overline{D_{1}} = q^{-1} j! j \frac{1 + c w d^{2} = t}{1 + t^{-1} d^{3} (w = t)^{3}} :$$

The above form of $\overline{D}_{!}$ is valid up to 0 (j! j). In w ! 0 lim it where and Q elds are decoupled, the above solution reduces to the pure mean-eld solution [2, 11, 12] with q > 0 and = 0. The crucial point is that $\overline{D}_{!!0} \in 0$ in the presence of the - uctuation. Situation is sim ilar to the Ising spin-glass case in a magnetic eld [11]. A ctually, it will be recognized that, in eqs.(8) to (10), the uctuation propagator $G^{(ab)}$ plays sim ilar roles to an external magnetic eld in the spin-glass problem. Further, it will be clear that eq.(13) is also valid in higher dimensional case and H $\, \clubsuit \, 0$ case if the expressions of d^m , where m > 0 is an integer, are appropriately replaced.

Let us turn to exam ining the conductivity in terms of K ubo form ula. Contributions to arise from F_A and the D_{i} $_{i}$ $_{j}^{0}$ term in F . Due to the j! jdependence in $\overline{D}_{!}$, the latter contribution leads, as in Ref.[1], to a nite contribution[1] to in T ! 0 limit. The expression of F_A clearly implies the absence of static phase rigidity. How ever, it does not imply a nite conductivity because of $\overline{q} \notin \overline{D}_{!! 0} \notin 0$. The PG contribution to arising from F_A ,

$$P_{G}(i!) = \frac{4}{j! j_{n}! 0} \frac{1}{n} \frac{X}{a_{jb} 0} d(1 \ 3) e^{i! (1 \ 3)} (14)$$

$$Z$$

$$d_{2} (1 \ 3) \frac{1}{2} (ab) (1; 2) \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} (ab) (1 \ 3) \frac{1}{2} x$$

is essetially the same as eq.(14) in Ref.[2] and corresponds to the sum of ⁽¹⁾ and ⁽²⁾ de ned in Ref.[2]. The rst term ⁽¹⁾ results only from the static components q and \overline{q} and thus, should vanish consistently with the absence of static phase rigidity. A ctually, it was veried [2] through a delicate manipulation of an analytic continuation. We will focus rather on ⁽²⁾, which is given by

We are not interested in the rst two term s under the $!_1$ -sum m ation which will lead to a nite contribution to $^{(2)}$. The last term in the bracket, $2\overline{q}\overline{D}_0$, is positive at low T (= 1) lim it and when q > 0 because $\overline{q}' q$ O (T). Since, according to eq.(13), the second two terms in the bracket also give only a O (T) correction to the above term , a divergent conductivity in low T lim it results from eq.(15), as in the M eissner phase, as far as the PG order is present (i.e., q > 0) as a consequence of a nonzero J_0 / w .

Finally, we brie y show that this divergence of conductivity due to the PG order is preceded by that due to another SC glass ordering induced by the uctuation of PG order parameter Q^{ab}. This SC glass corresponds to the vortex-glass [14] studied so far for nongranularm aterials in H \notin 0, and we closely follow below the treatment in Ref.[15]. Let us relax the in nite-range approximation for the disorder part (/ J²) of the action to incorporate a gradient term (r Q^{ab})². Using results in Ref.[11] in the q = 0 case and integrating over the Q^{ab}- uctuation in the Gaussian approximation, one nds that the nonlinear terms in of F take the form [13]

$$F = \frac{{}^{3}w^{2}}{2t} X Y^{4} X Z$$

$$I_{1+12}I_{3+14}$$

$$I_{1+12}I_{3}I_{4}$$

 $G^{c}(k;!_{1};!_{3};!_{2})) \stackrel{(aa)}{!_{1};!_{3}}(k) \stackrel{(aa)}{!_{2};!_{4}}(k)$

$$\frac{{}^{2}w^{2}}{2t} X X X G(k;!_{1};!_{2}) {}^{(ab)}_{!_{1};!_{2}}(k) {}^{(ba)}_{!_{2};!_{1}}(k)$$

where u > 0, and [11]

ſι

$$G^{c}(\mathbf{k};!_{1};!_{3};!_{2}) = \frac{u}{t}G(\mathbf{k};!_{1};!_{3})G(\mathbf{k};!_{2};!_{4}) \quad (17)$$

$$1 + u^{1}G(\mathbf{k}; + !_{1}; + !_{3}) \quad :$$

$$G(k;!_1;!_2) = \frac{t}{k^2 + \frac{p!_1^2}{!_1^2 + r} + \frac{p!_2^2 + r}{!_2^2 + r}};$$

where $!_{1;1,2}$ (k) is the Fourier transform of $(_{i}(!_{1}))_{i}(!_{2})$, and the length scale was properly normalized. The G^c term in eq.(16), due to its tendency enhancing with decreasing r, dom inates over the original u term and suggests a great enhancement [9] of quantum SC uctuation due to the granular structure. The onset of PG order is signaled, within the Gaussian uctuation, by r ! +0, while the SC glass ordering is signaled by a divergence of the glass susceptibility [14]

$$sg = N^{2} \int_{i;j}^{X} \frac{1}{j_{1,i}(!=0)(j_{1,j}(!=0)) i_{j}^{2}}$$
(18)

If expressing $_{sq}$ by ladder diagrams like $_{sq} = 1 +$ n=1 Iⁿ, its irreducible vertex I is proportional to the vortex-pinning energy term, i.e., the minus second term of eq.(16), with vertex corrections due to the interaction term (the rst term of eq.(16)). Let us restrict ourselves to the lowest Landau level (LLL) of the - uctuation and assume the presence of PG order in low T limit (i.e., r(T ! 0) ! + 0). Since the - uctuation in LLL is noncritical at low T lim it, a r-dependence of I primarily determines sq. If the interaction vertex corrections are neglected, we nd that I in LLL is divergent upon cooling like r $^{1=4}$, suggesting that the SC glass ordering occurring prior to the PG ordering induces a divergence of conductivity. Hence, it is in portant to verify whether this divergence is suppressed or not by the interaction vertex corrections. If calculating this vertex correction in a consistent way with the Hartree approxin ation [15, 16], the strength $/ r^{1=4}$ of the resulting renormalized vortex-pinning energy is modi ed in the m anner

$$\mathbf{r}^{1=4} ! \mathbf{r}^{1=4} 1 \frac{\mathbf{v}_{q_{y}} G (\mathbf{q}_{y} \hat{\mathbf{y}}; 0; 0)}{1 + \mathbf{v}_{q_{y}}} \frac{\mathbf{v}^{P}}{\mathbf{p}} (G (\mathbf{q}_{y} \hat{\mathbf{y}}; !; !))^{2}} ;$$
(19)

where $v_{q_y} = e^{-q_y^2 = 2}$, and q_y is an external wave number carried by the - uctuation propagator. Further, the factor in the bracket of eq.(17) was neglected because it plays no roles in r ! 0 lim it, and the positive coe cients w , u, and t were set to be unity because their detailed values are unimportant here. Focusing on the T ! 0 lim it, one easily veri es that the $(\ln [m in (q_{y}^{2}; r)])^{2}$. Thus, the result obtained without the interaction vertex correction is essentially una ected, and, even in $H > \overline{H}_{c2}(0)$, the SC transition (vanishing of resistivity) in nonzero elds is expected to be driven by the vortex-glass ordering induced by an elective vortex-pinning elect.

This result, independent of the dimensionality of systems, is apparently similar to but di erent from the main

- [L] D. Dalidovich and P. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 027001 (2002).
- [2] P.Phillips and D.Dalidovich, cond-m at/0305373.
- [3] H.M. Jaeger et al, Phys. Rev. B 34, 4920 (1986).
- [4] L.Hemandez et al, cond-m at/0210493.
- [5] N. M ason and A. K apitulnik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 5341 (1999).
- [6] R. Ikeda, Int. J. M od. Phys. B 10, 601 (1996).
- [7] A. van Otterlo et al., Phys. Rev. B 48, 3316 (1993);
 D. Dalidovich and P. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 737 (2000).
- [8] S. Okuma et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 3136 (2001); T. Sasakiet al, Phys. Rev. B 66, 224513 (2002).

conclusion in Ref.[10]. In Ref.[10], an upper lim it of the SC transition eld at T = 0 is obtained above $H_{c2}(0)$ within the range where a random XY model similar to eq.(1) is applicable. On the other hand, the critical PG

uctuation inducing the SC ordering in the present model exists in any H as far as the granular model is valid and the SC uctuation is present. Namely, an upper limit of T = 0 SC transition eld in the present case is roughly given by the eld at which the model eq.(1) breaks down.

- [9] R. Ikeda, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 109703 (2002).
- [10] V M. Galitski and A. I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 087001 (2001).
- [11] N. Read, S. Sachdev, and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. B 52, 384 (1995).
- [12] D. Dalidovich and P. Phillips, PhysRev B 59, 11925 (1999).
- [13] S. John and T. C. Lubensky, Phys. Rev. B 34, 4815 (1986).
- [14] M.P.A.Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 1415 (1989).
- [15] R. Ikeda, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 65, 3998 (1996).
- [16] D. Sherrington, Phys. Rev. B 22, 5553 (1980).