Revised 15 January 2004 (as published in Europhys. Lett. 65, 249–255 (2004)) F irst version 21 August 2003: http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-m at/0308423v1

On the energy saved by interlayer interactions in the superconducting state of cuprates

ManuelV.Ramallo¹

D epartm ent of Physics, University of Illinois, 1110 W . G reen Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801-3080, USA, and Laboratorio de Baixas Tem peraturas e Superconductividade (Unidad A sociada al ICM M -C SIC, Spain), D epartam ento de F sica da Materia Condensada, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, E-15782, Spain²

A bstract. A G inzburg-Landau { like functional is proposed reproducing the main low-energy features of various possible high- T_c superconducting m echanisms involving energy savings due to interlayer interactions. The functional may be used to relate these savings to experimental quantities. Two examples are given, involving the mean-eld speci c heat jump at T_c and the superconducting uctuations above T_c . Comparison with existing data suggests, e.g., that the increase of T_c due to the so-called interlayer tunneling (ILT) m echanism of interlayer kinetic-energy savings is negligible in optim ally-doped $B_{\frac{1}{2}}Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+x}$.

¹ fm ram a@ usc.es

²P resent and perm anent address, to where correspondence should be addressed

1 Introduction

O ne of the striking system atics of the superconducting critical tem perature T_c of the cuprate superconductors (HTSC) is its correlation, within each fam ily of chem ically sim ilar compounds, with the number N of CuO₂ planes per unit cell. [1{3]W ell-known examples of these fam ilies are the Ca-spaced series, with form ula ACa_{N 1} (CuO₂)_N, such as the so-called La-, Hg-, Tl₁-, and Tl₂-series (where A is, respectively, La_{2 x}Sr_xO₂, HgBa₂O₂, TlBa₂O₃, and Tl₂Ba₂O₄). In all these Ca-spaced series, the following rule is observed to be well obeyed, [1{3} at least for low N values, N 3 [4]:

$$\frac{T_{c}^{N}}{T_{c}^{N=1}} / \frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{N} ; \qquad (1)$$

where $T_c^{N=1}$ and T_c^N are the critical tem peratures of, respectively, the single-layered and the N -layered compounds (at zero magnetic eld and for bulk samples with optim alhole doping concentration). The origin of relation (1) could in principle be sought either in som e N -dependence of the param eters involved in in-plane interactions leading to superconductivity, or in the existence of c-direction (i.e., inter-layer) interactions contributing, at least in part, to the condensation energy. The latter way of thinking is consistent with the proposals made by various authors of di erent form s of interlayer interactions in HTSC saving energy in the superconducting state. [2,3,5] For instance, eq. (1) was obtained, for low N, by Leggett [3,4] by considering the screening of C oulom b interlayer interactions am ong carriers. E nergy savings in the superconducting state occur in this approach mainly in the potential energy of the electrons. [3] In what concerns eq. (1) and for low N, Leggett's form alism may be expected to apply in essence for a broad variety of superconducting mechanisms responsible for the c-direction attractive screening. [3] A notable exception is the so-called interlayer tunneling (ILT) mechanism proposed by Anderson, Chakravarty, and coworkers [2]. In the ILT model, savings occur in the kinetic energy due to a decon nement process of the Cooper pairs. This is originated by strong electronic correlations that block the coherent interlayer tunneling for single particles, but not for pairs. Strikingly, the ILT proposal again leads to eq. (1) in spite of the very di erent origin of the interlayer energy savings. [6]

An experimental test was proposed by Anderson [7] and Leggett [8] to estimate in single-layered (i.e., N = 1) HTSC the importance of the ILT mechanism. The

test involves the condensation energy E_0 , obtained from speci c heat data, and the c-direction magnetic penetration depth at T = 0 K. Anderson [7] argued that data existing for the N = 1 compounds of the La-series [9] and Hg-series [10] agreed with the ILT prediction. In contrast, subsequent measurements of $_c$ in the N = 1 compounds of the La-series, [11] Hg-series, [12] and Tl₂-series, [11,13] concluded that the ILT mechanism gives a negligible contribution to E_0 . Chakravarty et al. [14] then pointed that, in addition to these discrepancies between dimension energy that has been recently answered in part in [15]. Note that, because of the N = 1 limitation, the above tests have probed only the energy savings due to the interaction between layers in dimension cative one for enhancing T_c ; therefore, the failure of a given superconducting interlayer mechanism to account for the condensation energy of the N = 1 cuprates does not rule it out completely as a substantial source for the enhancement of T_c when N > 1 (see also below).

In the present work, we introduce a G inzburg-Landau (GL) {type functional that reproduces in essence the main low -energy features of the above proposals of interlayer kinetic and/or potential energy savings in HTSC. This functional is based on a simple energy-balance argum ent expected to be a good approxim ation near the transition and for low Cooper-pair densities, and may be useful for noting experimentally testable relationships involving the interlayer superconducting energy savings in HTSC with 1. Two examples of such tests will be given in this letter: The rst is a rela-Ν tionship between N and the mean-eld speci c heat jump at T. If it is ful lled in a fam ily of chem ically sim ilar HTSC, it will indicate that the superconductors in the series di er only in their interlayer interactions (i.e., that eq. (1) is actually due to a superconducting interlayer m echanism). The second test will be provided by the G aussian superconducting uctuations above $T_c: 0$ ur present functional leads, for zero or weak magnetic elds, to uctuations identical to the well-known ones of multilayered superconductors with no interlayer energy savings; however, the involved parameters acquire now additionalm eanings. In particular, the interlayer Josephson tunnelings are related to the maximum increase of T_c that could be attributed to the LT mechanism. F inally, we end this letter with a brief discussion of available experimental data.

2 A prelim inary energy-balance argum ent leading to eq. (1)

In a layered superconductor with N superconducting layers in each c-direction unit cell of length s, we may write the free energy f saved in the superconducting state, per C ooper pair and unit volume, as the following sum :

$$f = s^{1} N f_{k} + (N 1) f_{? int} + f_{? ext}^{i}$$
 (2)

Here f_k , $f_{?int}$ and $f_{?ext}$ are the energy savings, per Cooper pair and unit area, due to, respectively, the in-plane interactions in each superconducting layer, the interactions between each two adjacent layers in the sam e cell (intra-cell interaction), and the interactions between each two adjacent cells (extra-cell interaction). We assumed in eq. (2) that all the superconducting layers and intra-cell separations between them are equivalent. We also assumed that the energies saved by each interlayer interaction m ay be considered as independent, and that the interactions between non-adjacent layers are negligible. These assumptions are expected to be good approximations in both Leggett's and ILT proposals. [2,3] Let us now expand f_k in powers of the reduced tem perature \mathbf{W}_{k} (T) $\ln (T = T_{ck})$ ' $(T = T_{ck}) = T_{ck}$, where T_{ck} is the critical tem perature of the system if the interlayer interactions were absent; this expansion is obviously rem iniscent of the type of reasonings used in the G L-like theories. So, for the in-plane $''_k$ (T), where is constant and posiinteractions above $\mathbf{W}_{k}(\mathbf{T}) = 0$ we write $\mathbf{f}_{k} =$ tive. For the interlayer interactions, as they will be less dependent on $"_{k}$ (T), we may write in rst approximation $f_{2 int} = int$ and $f_{2 ext} = ext$, where int and ext are dimensionless constants (positive, if the corresponding interactions help superconductivity). A fter these simple power expansions, the actual critical tem perature T_c^N can be easily calculated by just writing the condition $f(T_c^N) = 0$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{m}_{e}^{N}(\mathbf{T}_{c}^{N}) = 0; \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{m}_{e}^{N}(\mathbf{T}) \quad \mathbf{m}_{k}^{N}(\mathbf{T}) \quad \frac{\text{ext}}{N} \quad 1 \quad \frac{1}{N} \quad \text{int}:$$
(3)

which directly leads to:

$$\frac{T_{c}^{N} - T_{c}^{N-1}}{T_{c}^{N-1}} \, \prime \, \ln \frac{T_{c}^{N}}{T_{c}^{N-1}} = (_{int} - _{ext}) \, 1 - \frac{1}{N} \quad : \qquad (4)$$

We nd, therefore, a result equivalent to eq. (1), independently of whether the mechanism of interlayer energy savings in ply the kinetic or potential energies, or both. In the above equation we have considered it useful to explicitly emphasize the fact that the logarithm of the quotient of two temperatures is approximately equal to the relative distance between them; we will om it the explicit emphasis of this point in the remainder of this paper.

Note that for N = 1;2 the above equations also lead to:

$$\ln \frac{T_{c}^{N=1}}{T_{ck}} = \exp ; \qquad \ln \frac{T_{c}^{N=2}}{T_{ck}} = \frac{\exp + int}{2} : \qquad (5)$$

These relationships indicate that if $_{ext}$ int is possible for $T_c^{N=2}$ to be quite diment from $T_c^{N=1}$ even if $T_c^{N=1}$ ' T_{ck} . In this respect, we note that the recent observation of superconductivity in a sample of the N = 1 La-series compound with thickness only one c-direction unit cell [16] is not contradictory with the existence of interlayer superconducting energy savings in HTSC. These aspects also enhance the interest of testing the existence or not of interlayer superconducting energy savings in the N > 1 compounds.

3 A simple G in zburg-Landau (G L) free-energy functional for H T SC with interlayer energy savings

Our next step is to introduce a GL-type functional consistent with the main proposals for interlayer kinetic and/or potential energy savings in HTSC. This functional must be chosen so that for low energies and Cooper-pair densities it recovers the energy balances of the previous section. This is full led by the following expression for the di erence between the superconducting and norm al-state free energies, F [], at zero magnetic eld:

In the above expression, r = (x;y) and r_{xy} are the in-plane coordinates and gradient (we neglect the possible in-plane anisotropy); the indexes (j;n) label each jth superconducting plane of the nth c-direction unit cell (we use also (N + 1;n) for the (1;n + 1) plane); $_{jn} = _{jn} (x;y)$ is the superconducting order parameter of the (j;n)-plane; $_{ab}(0)$ is the GL amplitude of the in-plane coherence length; a_0 and b are the GL constants. The interlayer interactions in the above functional are contained in the last two summands. In them, $_j$ is the usual Josephson coupling constant between the (j;n) and (j + 1;n) planes, and $_j$ parametrizes the interlayer energy savings due to interactions also between these two planes. These $_j$ parameters coincide with the ones already used in eqs. (3) { (4), and to our know ledge this is the rst time that they are introduced in a GL model of a layered superconductor. A swe did in the previous section, we may assume in the HTSC only two di erent interlayer separations (intra-and extra-cell) and so we take $_{N} = _{ext}$, $_{N} = _{ext}$ and $_{j \in N} = _{int}$, $_{j \in N} = _{int}$.

The parameters i deserve further discussion. When they are zero, the interlayer j+1n f. As the latter expression is never sum m and s in eq. (6) reduce to jj_{in} negative, it does not lead to energy savings. In fact, this is precisely the well-known expression for the interlayer interaction in the extended {Law rence-D on iach G L-functional form ultilayered superconductors without interlayer energy savings. [17{19] In contrast, when $_{i} > 0$ the interlayer energy can be negative: For instance, if $_{i} = 2_{i}$ the last interlayer sum m and in eq. (6) is zero and the rst one becomes proportional to \cos'_{j} , where $'_{j}$ is the dimension of the phases of $_{jn}$ and $_{j+1,n}$. This is precisely the form of the interlayer kinetic-energy savings proposed on m icroscopical grounds by the ILT m odel. [2,7] F inally, interlayer potential energy savings as those in Leggett's proposals for the superconducting mechanism [3] may also be crudely included in our functional by considering di erent $\frac{1}{1} > 0$. This is coherent with the fact that these savings may be expected to arise in the second of the interlayer interaction sum m ands, i.e., the one not involving the phase of the superconducting wave function. Let us also note that these kinetic and potential interlayer energy savings could coexist in the H T SC ; in that case, the i would result from the sum of the contribution of each energy-saving source, leading then to energy savings essentially of the form $A + B \cos'_{i}$, as in fact proposed in [8] for that mixed scenario.

It is not di cult to calculate the T_c^N resulting from eq. (6). For that, one just has to write the condition $F[_{jn}(0)](T_c^N) = 0$, where $_{jn}(0)$ are the equilibrium wave functions, verifying $P = P_{jn} = 0$. Just as expected, $T_c^N = P_{jn}$ follow seqs. (3) { (5).

6

4 Jump at T_c of the mean-eld specic heat

It is also quite direct to calculate from eq. (6) the mean-eld speci c heat jump at the transition, c_{jump}^{N} , i.e., the discontinuity at $T = T_{c}^{N}$ in the speci c heat when considering the uniform wave function minimizing F[]. We get:

$$c_{jum p} = \frac{N}{sT_c^N} \frac{a_0^2}{b};$$
 (7)

where again s is the layered-structure repetition distance. This proportionality of $C_{jum p}^{N}$ and N =sT_c has been to the best of our know ledge unnoticed up to now even for layered superconductors with no interlayer energy savings. Two in portant additional remarks are: F irst, $C_{jum p}^{N}$ is found to be independent of the interlayer interaction parameters, both $_{j}$ and $_{j}$ (except indirectly trough T_{c}^{N} , see eq. (4)). Second, according to eq. (7) the quantity $c_{jum p} = (N = sT_{c})$ will be the same for all the HTSC with equal in-plane interactions (and hence equal G L parameters a_{0} and b). In particular, experimental veri cation of this constancy in a series of chemically similar HTSC would provide a compelling argument favoring that eq. (1) is in fact due only to the existence of a superconducting interlayer mechanism, and not to some N -dependence of the parameters involved in in-plane interactions. (We note however that failure of full ln ent of that proportionality would not rule out completely interlayer interactions contributing at least in part to the T_c enhancement, as they could still coexist with in-plane e exts varying a_{0} and b in the series.)

5 Gaussian-Ginzburg-Landau (GGL) uctuations above T_c

Let us now consider the superconducting uctuations above T_c that result from functional (6). For that, we apply to it the same form alism previously used in [18,19] to study the Gaussian regime of the superconducting uctuations in multilayered superconductors without interlayer energy savings, i.e., with j = 0. The calculations go in parallel to those in [18,19], and so we will not make them explicit in this letter. The important result is that the uctuation spectrum of functional (6) with arbitrary jis just the same as found in [18,19] for j = 0, if we interpret in these equations T_c as T_c^N . This applies also to the results directly derived from that spectrum, including the uctuation-induced observables calculated in [18,19] at $T > T_c$ for zero magnetic elds and also for weak magnetic elds perpendicular to the layers, i.e., the in-plane paraconductivity [18], the in-plane magnetoconductivity [18], the uctuation susceptibility [18], and the uctuation speci cheat [19]. Therefore, for all these observables we conclude that the nal expressions obtained in refs. [18,19] (i.e., eqs.(3.4){(3.8) and (4.5){(4.7) in ref. [18], and (9){(12) in ref. [19]) are applicable for all values of j.

The above result indicates that any analysis of experimental data based on the above equations of refs. [18,19] will be also applicable in the $_{\rm j}$ 6 0 scenario. This is an important information because those analyses are able to determ inerather unambiguously the values of the Josephson couplings between layers, int and ext (see [18{22}] and also below). Precisely these Josephson couplings give a maximum limit for the interlayer kinetic energy savings in eq. (6). In particular, the maximum relative increase of T_c that may be due to the ILT mechanism is given by eq. (5) with int = 2 int and ext = 2 ext. Note that in [18{22}] instead of the variables int and ext it is often used the equivalent set composed by c(0) and int/ext, where c(0) is the c-direction G L coherence length amplitude; in terms of these alternative variables, eq. (5) leads to a maximum increase of T_c due to the ILT mechanism of:

$$\ln \frac{T_{c \, \text{LT}}^{N=1}}{T_{ck}} \qquad 2 \, \frac{c(0)}{s}^{1/2}; \qquad (8)$$

$$\ln \frac{T_{c \, \text{ILT}}^{N=2}}{T_{ck}} \qquad 2 \frac{\frac{c(0)}{s}}{s}^{l_2} \qquad 1 + \frac{\text{ext}}{\text{int}} \qquad 1 + \frac{\text{int}}{\text{ext}} \qquad (9)$$

6 A brief comparison with existing experimental information

Testing eq. (7) in a given fam ily of HTSC requires reliable know ledge of $c_{jum p}$ on it. Unfortunately, the latter proves di cult. An illustrative example of these di culties happens in the T l_2 -series. The N = 2 and 3 compounds of this series were measured by the same group, in similar samples, and using the same criterion for obtaining $c_{jum p}$, in [23]. The corresponding $c_{jum p} = (N = sT_c)$ are equal to 2:6 10³ J/m² for N = 2, and 2:8 10³ J/m² for N = 3. This suggests full liment of eq. (7), i.e., that the T_c(N) variation in this series is due only to interlayer interactions. However, measurements by other group [24] in the N = 1 compound of the same series revealed a quite small and symmetric speci cheat peak around T_c . This may be interpreted as a negligible c_{jump} (and then not full lm ent of eq. (7)), or could have its origin in, e.g., T_c -inhom ogeneities broadening and symmetrizing the speci cheat peak around T_c [25], or in pseudogap-induced e ects [24]. Therefore, an ultimate testing of eq. (7) would imply a more extensive analysis of the experimental speci cheat. Naturally, it should also include other Ca-spaced series. Such a detailed study is beyond the scope of the present letter.

M uch less an biguity exists at present in understanding the superconducting uctuations above T_c in HTSC in terms of the GGL m odel of multilayered superconductors. As commented above, for our present purposes the main interest lies in the N > 1com pounds. Measurements in high-quality single-crystal samples are available for at least two bilayered and optimally doped HTSC, $B_{12}Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+x}$ (Bi-2212) and $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ (Y - 123). Those data were extensively analyzed in terms of the GGL m odel of multilayered superconductors with null interlayer energy savings. [18{22] A s m entioned above, these kinds of analyses rem ain fully applicable in the case of nonzero interlayer energy savings, with the bonus that the obtained Josephson coupling param eters give the maximum increase of T_c that could be attributed to the LT mechanism. For instance, in [18,19,22] it was determined for Y-123 that $_{c}(0)$ / 1:1 0:1A, and 1=30 < int = ext < 30. By using eq. (9), these values suggest an upper lim it of around 70% for the increase of T_c due to kinetic-energy savings. In the case of Bi-2212, the results are more conclusive: The analysis of the superconducting uctuations in this compound leads to $_{\rm c}(0) < 0.5$ A, and to $_{\rm int} = _{\rm ext}$ values whose boundaries compatible with experiments depend on $_{\rm c}$ (0) roughly as $_{\rm c}^2$ (0) < $_{\rm int} = _{\rm ext} < _{\rm c}^2$ (0) (where $_{\rm c}$ (0) is in A). [21,22] W hen these values are used in eq. (9), they lead to around 1% m axim um increase of T_c due to the LT mechanism in Bi-2212.

7 Conclusions

We introduced a simple G inzburg-Landau {type functional that reproduces the main low -energy features of the existing proposals of interlayer kinetic and/or potential energy savings in HTSC. This functionalm ay be used to nd relationships between these savings and experimental observables. Two examples of such relationships were proposed: The rst involves them ean-eld speci cheat jump at J, c_{jump} , and the normalized mean interlayer distance $sT_c=N$; if both are inversely proportional to each other in a series of HTSC, this would indicate that they share identical in-plane interactions and their T_c 's are dimensional uncluations above T_c at zero or weak magnetic elds, from which it may be obtained a maximum limit for the relative increase of T_c due to interlayer kinetic energy savings (as those in the LT model). When compared with available experiments, this second relationship indicates that the increase of T_c due to interlayer kinetic energy savings is negligible in optimally-doped B i=2212, and between zero and 70% in optimally-doped Y -123. A lithough based on a simplied model, these conclusions can be expected to be, at least, qualitatively correct. They provide, to the best of our knowledge, the rest test of the signi cance of the interlayer kinetic energy savings is 1 HTSC.

A cknow ledgem ents

The main part of this research was performed in the D epartment of Physics of the University of Illinois at U rbana-Cham paign thanks to support from the Fulbright Foundation and to the hospitality of Prof. A J. Leggett, who insticated may attention to the problem of the interlayer condensation energy in cuprates and with whom I enjoyed various valuable talks on the subject. I am also grateful to Prof. F. V idal for many enlightening discussions about the superconducting in uctuations and the jump at T_c of the specific cheat. Financial support is also adknow ledged to the CICYT, Spain, under grant No. MAT 2001-3053.

References

- [1] Cava R.J., J.Am. Ceram. Soc. 83, 5 (2000).
- [2] Anderson P.W., The Theory of Superconductivity in High-T_c Cuprates (Prince-ton University Press, Princeton, NJ) 1997, and references therein.
- [3] Leggett A.J., J. Phys. Chem. Solids 59, 1729 (1998); Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 392 (1999).
- [4] The di culties that appear when trying to apply eq. (1) for N > 4 are commented in β] and also in Jansen L. and Block R., Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 3983 (2000); Leggett A.J., Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 3984 (2000). See also [26].
- [5] For som e examples of other proposals of superconducting mechanism s involving interlayer interactions in cuprates see, e.g., Tesanovic Z., Phys. Rev. B 36, 2364 (1987); Harshman D.R. and M ills A.P., Jr., Phys. Rev. B 45, 10684 (1992); Kettemann S. and Efetov K.B., Phys. Rev. B 46, 8515 (1992); Liechtenstein A.I., Mazin I.I. and Andersen O.K., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2303 (1995); Sule P., cond-m at/0303585.
- [6] A nother possible way to obtain eq. (1), at least approximately, is using K osterlitz-Thouless{transition ideas. See, e.g., M at suda Y . et al., Phys. Rev. B 48, 10498 (1993); C or son J. et al., Nature 398, 221 (1999).
- [7] Anderson P.W., Science 268, 1154 (1995); 279 (1998) 1196.
- [8] Leggett A .J., Science 274, 587 (1996).
- [9] Uchida S., Tamasaku K. and Tajima S., Phys. Rev. B 53, 14558 (1996).
- [10] Panagopoulos C. et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2320 (1997).
- [11] Schutzmann J. et al, Phys. Rev. B 55, 11118 (1997).
- [12] Kirtley J.R. et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2140 (1998).
- [13] Moler K A. et al, Science 279, 1193 (1998); T svetkov A A. et al, Nature 395, 360 (1998).
- [14] Chakravarty S., Kee H.-Y. and Abrahams E., Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 2366 (1999); Phys. Rev. B 67, 100504 (R) (2003).
- [15] van der Marel D. et al, Phys. Rev. B 66, 140501 (2002).

- [16] Bozovic I. et al, Nature 422, 873 (2003).
- [17] Klemm R.A., Phys. Rev. B 41, 2073 (1990).
- [18] Ramallo M .V., Pomar A. and Vidal F., Phys. Rev. B 54, 4341 (1996), and references therein.
- [19] Ramallo M .V. and Vidal F., Phys. Rev. B 59, 4475 (1999).
- [20] In [18,19] a BCS value was in plicitly assumed for the relaxation time of superconducting uctuations. This was shown to be in fact correct for HTSC in Ramallo M.V. et al., Europhys. Lett. 48, 79 (1999).
- [21] Pomar A. et al, Phys. Rev. B 54, 7470 (1996), and references therein.
- [22] A review of the analyses of superconducting uctuations in HTSC in terms of the multilayered GGLm odelw ithout interlayer energy savings was presented in V idal F. and R am allo M.V., The gap symmetry and uctuations in high temperature superconductors, edited by J.Bok et al. (Plenum, London) 1998, p. 477. These analyses have been recently extended also to the high-" region (" > 0:1); see, e.g., V idal F. et al., Europhys. Lett. 59, 754 (2002) and references therein.
- [23] Junod A. et al, Physica C 159, 215 (1989).
- [24] Loram J.W .et al, Physica C 235, 134 (1994).
- [25] Ramallo M .V., Carballeira C. and Vidal F., Physica C 341-348, 173 (2000).
- [26] After the rst version of the present e-print appeared, it was posted the work C hakravarty S., K ee H.-Y. and V oelker K., cond-m at/0309209. There, rst these authors write a functional similar to our eq. (6) with j = 2 j (corresponding therefore to the ILT limit) and then they propose, in order to explain the dependence of T_c on hole doping, and also on N for N > 4 (when eq. (1) m ay fail [4]), to add to that functional the possible elects of a competing (pseudogap) order parameter and of charge (doping) in balances between nonequivalent layers. These elects are not expected to signil cantly in luence the tests discussed in the present letter, at least for the N 3 and optim ally-doped case on which we have focused.