

Absence of Quantum Metallic Behavior in Disordered Granular Superconductors

Ryusuke Ikeda

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

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

We examine the idea, postulated by Phillips et al., that a finite resistivity in $T \rightarrow 0$ limit in disordered granular superconducting (SC) films is explained as a consequence of the absence of phase stiffness in a phase glass (PG) peculiar to granular systems. It is found that, in spite of the absence of static phase stiffness, a coupling between the nonzero PG order and the ordinary SC fluctuation makes the conductivity divergent. However, an actual drop of resistance is argued to occur due to another SC glass ordering, induced by the precursory PG fluctuation, corresponding to the vortex-glass transition in a nonzero magnetic field.

PACS numbers:

Study of the phase diagram in disordered granular superconductors at low temperature (T) is important in relation to understanding the superconductor-insulator (S-I) transition behaviors. Recently, Dalidovich and Phillips [1, 2] have argued that, in a two dimensional (2D) phase glass (PG) expected to be induced in low T limit by a disordered granular structure, the resistance is finite. Observations of a quantum metallic behavior [3, 4, 5] do not seem to be directly explained within available theories [6, 7, 9] for homogeneously 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 field ($H \neq 0$) and leads to a similar quantum metallic behavior. Since resistive data showing a metallic resistance curves attening upon cooling are available in quasi 2D systems [8] in $H \neq 0$, their proposal, if correct, might become a correct description of the corresponding phenomena. On the other hand, it has been argued [10] that, in contrast to the homogeneously-disordered case [9], the resistivity drop at low enough (but finite) temperatures in disordered superconductors consisting of clustered SC islands (i.e., SC grains) should occur even in a wide field range above an averaged (mean field) upper critical field $H_{c2}(0)$. Therefore, effects of disordered granular structure on quantum resistive behaviors are not theoretically understood well at present.

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

$$S = S_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_0^Z \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle}^X J_{ij}(\cdot) S_i(\cdot) S_j(\cdot) + c.c.; \quad (1)$$

where the pair $\langle i, j \rangle$ denotes a nearest-neighbor pair, and

$$S_0 = \sum_0^Z \sum_i^X \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\phi_i(\cdot))^2}{e}; \quad (2)$$

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

$$S_i(\cdot) = \exp(i\phi_i(\cdot));$$

The gauge field consists of the static component A_{ij}^{ext} for an applied uniform magnetic field H and the dynamical fluctuation $A(\cdot)$ introduced for deriving the linear responses. The quenched disorder in the system is incorporated in a randomness of J_{ij} with nonzero mean J_0 ($J_{ij} = J_0 > 0$) for any $\langle i, j \rangle$ and with a Gaussian distribution. Only for a formal justification of the mean-field approach on the PG ordering, the Gaussian distribution on J_{ij} will be replaced by an infinite-ranged one. Then, after replicating the action and introducing PG and SC order parameter fields, $q^{(b)}(1; 2) = (q^{(a)}(2; 1))$ and $\bar{q}_i^{(a)}(\cdot)$, the random-averaged free energy is given by $\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n} \ln(Z^n - 1) = n$, where

$$\frac{\bar{Z}^n}{Z_0^n} = \int \prod_i d\bar{q}_i^{(a)} \exp(-F_e(\cdot; \bar{q})); \quad (3)$$

\bar{Z}_0^n is the replicated partition function for S_0 ,

$$F_e(\cdot; \bar{q}) = \frac{N}{2J^2} \sum_{d=1}^Z \sum_{d=2}^Z \sum_{a,b}^X \bar{q}^{(ab)}(1; 2) \bar{f}^2 + 1 + \frac{(\bar{A}(1) - \bar{A}(2))^2}{2} + \frac{1}{4d} \sum_i^X \sum_a^Z \sum_i^X \bar{q}_i^{(a)} \bar{f}^2 + \ln T \exp \frac{P}{J_0} \sum_{d=1}^Z \sum_a^X \sum_i^X S_{+i}^{(a)}(\cdot) + \frac{D_i - D_1}{2d} + 1 \sum_{i=2}^{1=2} (\bar{q}_i^{(a)}(\cdot)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d=1}^Z \sum_{d=2}^Z \sum_{a,b}^X q^{(ba)}(2; 1) \sum_i^X S_{+i}^{(a)}(1) S_i^{(b)}(2) + c.c.; \quad (4)$$

and the bracket $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ denotes the ensemble average by the charging energy part S_0 . In eq.(4), a and b are replica indices, d is the spatial dimension, $D_i - D_1$ denotes the Laplacian on the gauge-invariant gradients defined on the cubic lattice (for $d = 3$), and the factor N (the system size) in the first and second terms arises due to the replacement into the infinite-ranged model. The gauge fluctuation $A = A \hat{x}$ applied externally is assumed to be small, and its site dependence was neglected because spatially uniform linear responses are considered below.

Performing the cumulant expansions with respect to $q^{(ab)}$ and $\langle a \rangle$, 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 $Q_R^{(ab)}(\vec{R}; 2) = C_{a,b}(1; 2)$ in order to delete the term $d_1 d_2 Q^{(ab)}(1; 2)^2$, we finally obtain the following effective action

$$\frac{tF_e(1; Q)}{N} = \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 \sum_a^X \frac{Q^2}{Q_1 Q_2} + r Q^{(aa)}(1; 2) \quad (5)$$

$$- \frac{1}{3} \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 d_2 d_3 \sum_{a,b,c}^X Q^{(ab)}(1; 2) Q^{(bc)}(2; 3) Q^{(ca)}(3; 1)$$

$$+ \frac{u}{2} \sum_a^X Q^{(aa)}(1; 2)^2 + \frac{tF_A}{N} + \frac{tF_B}{N};$$

where

$$\frac{tF_A}{N} = \frac{t}{4J^2} \sum_{a,b}^X d_1 d_2 (A(1) - A(2))^2 Q^{(ab)}(1; 2)^2; \quad (6)$$

$$tF_B = \sum_i^X d_i \sum_a^X r j_i^{(a)}(1)^2 \quad (7)$$

$$+ c \frac{Q_i^{(a)2}}{Q} + c_g \sum_i^X Q_i^{(a)2} j_i^2$$

$$w \sum_{a,b}^X d_1 d_2 (Q_i^{(a)}(1) - Q_i^{(b)}(2)) Q^{(ab)}(1; 2) Q_i^{(b)}(2);$$

For a moment, a j_i^4 term with positive coefficient will be neglected. The coefficients in eqs.(5) and (6) can be calculated from correlation functions on $S(1)$ on the basis of the local action S_0 , and, except r and r , all of them are always positive. For instance, the coefficient w is positive as far as $J_0 > 0$. The above expression of the action is of the same form as in Ref.[12].

Now, let us examine the mean field solution on Q^{ab} by taking account of the presence of SC fluctuation. In $H \neq 0$ 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 fluctuation is negligible in the mean field analysis of the PG order because the Q -field in eq.(7) couples to the Q -field in a bilinear form $\langle a \rangle \langle b \rangle$. As shown below, including SC fluctuations is essential to obtaining a correct result of conductivity. Following Ref.[11, 12], the mean field ansatz $Q^{(ab)}(1; 2) = q(1 - a,b) + \bar{Q} + \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 \bar{D}_1 e^{i\vec{l} \cdot (\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2)}$ will be used together with $\langle a \rangle(1) = \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 \sum_i^X \langle a \rangle(1) e^{i\vec{l} \cdot \vec{r}_i}$. The assumption of replica symmetry in $\epsilon = 0$ terms is sufficient for the present purpose of showing a divergent conductivity because a breaking of replica symmetry would be accompanied by an independent parameter such as a coefficient of a quartic term on Q^{ab} . Further, only for the convenience of presentation, the on-site fluctuation (i.e.,

zero-dimensional case) with $c_g \neq 0$ will be assumed because extending to higher dimensional and $H \neq 0$ cases can be trivially performed. Then, the variational equation $0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} n^{-1} \partial Z^n / \partial Q^{(ab)}(1; 2)$ is reexpressed by the following three equations:

$$\sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 (1 + r) \bar{D}_1^2 + u \bar{Q} + \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 \sum_i^X \bar{D}_1 = w G_d(1) = 0; \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 r \bar{Q}^2 + u \bar{Q} + \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 \sum_i^X \bar{D}_1 = w G_d(0) = 0; \quad (9)$$

$$2 \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 q \bar{Q} + w G_{od}(0) = 0; \quad (10)$$

Here, the SC fluctuation propagator $G^{(ab)}(1) = \langle a(1) a(1) \rangle - \langle a(1) \rangle \langle a(1) \rangle$ is given by $G^{(ab)}(1) = \sum_{a,b} (1 - a,b) G_d(1) + \sum_{a,b} (1 - a,b) G_{od}(0) + (1 - a,b) G_{od}(0)$, where

$$G_d(1) = \frac{t}{r + c + 1 + w \bar{D}_1}; \quad (11)$$

$$G_{od}(0) = \frac{w}{t} q (d(1) - q)^2;$$

$$G_d(0) = d(1) + G_{od}(0);$$

$$d(1) = \frac{t}{r + w + q};$$

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

$$q = \frac{w}{t} \frac{t}{2} (d(1) - q)^2; \quad (12)$$

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

$$\bar{Q} = \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 \sum_i^X \bar{D}_1 + u (1 - q)^2 + w d(1) r; \quad (13)$$

$$\bar{D}_1 = q \sum_{1=2}^Z d_1 j_j \frac{1 + c w d^2 = t}{1 + t + d^3 (w = t)^3}; \quad 1=2$$

The above form of \bar{D}_1 is valid up to $O(j_j^2)$. In $w \neq 0$ limit where \bar{Q} and Q fields are decoupled, the above solution reduces to the pure mean-field solution [2, 11, 12] with $q > 0$ and $\bar{Q} = 0$. The crucial point is that $\bar{D}_1 \neq 0$ in the presence of the fluctuation. Situation is similar to the Ising spin-glass case in a magnetic field [11]. Actually, it will be recognized that, in eqs.(8) to (10), the fluctuation propagator $G^{(ab)}$ plays similar roles to an external magnetic field in the spin-glass problem.

vertex correction merely brings an enhancement factor $(\ln \ln \ln (\frac{c_2^2}{4} \frac{1}{1-r}))^2$. Thus, the result obtained without the interaction vertex correction is essentially unaffected, and, even in $H > H_{c2}(0)$, the SC transition (vanishing of resistivity) in nonzero fields is expected to be driven by the vortex-glass ordering induced by an effective vortex-pinning effect.

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

conclusion in Ref.[10]. In Ref.[10], an upper limit of the SC transition field 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 fluctuation inducing the SC ordering in the present model exists in any H as far as the granular model is valid and the SC fluctuation is present. Namely, an upper limit of $T = 0$ SC transition field in the present case is roughly given by the field at which the model eq.(1) breaks down.

-
- [1] D. Dalidovich and P. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 027001 (2002).
 - [2] P. Phillips and D. Dalidovich, cond-mat/0305373.
 - [3] H. M. Jaeger et al, Phys. Rev. B 34, 4920 (1986).
 - [4] L. Hernandez et al, cond-mat/0210493.
 - [5] N. Mason and A. Kapitulnik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 5341 (1999).
 - [6] R. Ikeda, Int. J. Mod. 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. Sasaki et al, Phys. Rev. B 66, 224513 (2002).
 - [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, Phys. Rev. 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).