

The mystery of superconductivity in the cuprates evinced by London penetration depths measurements

T. Schneider

Physik-Institut der Universität Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190,
CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland

The London penetration depth plays a key role in determining and uncovering many properties of a superconductor, including homogeneity, anisotropy, isotope effects, importance of quantum and thermal fluctuations, and facets of the nature of superconductivity in a particular material. Guided by the generic phase diagram in the temperature-dopant concentration plane we examine experimental data on the temperature, isotope substitution, inhomogeneity and magnetic field dependence of the penetration depths to uncover some facets of the mystery of superconductivity in the cuprates.

To appear in Proceedings of the International School of Physics, Enrico Fermi Course CLV, The Physics of Complex Systems.

The London penetration depth is a fundamental quantity of a superconductor. It plays a key role in determining and uncovering many properties of a superconductor, including homogeneity, anisotropy, isotope effects, importance of quantum and thermal fluctuations, and facets of the nature of superconductivity in a particular material. In recent years experimental data on the temperature, dopant concentration, magnetic field and oxygen isotope mass dependence of the penetration depth became available for a variety of cuprate superconductors. Here we analyze and discuss the experimental data, guided by the generic phase diagram of the cuprates, depicted in Fig.1. After passing the so called underdoped limit ($p_u \approx 0.05$), where p is the hole concentration, T_c reaches its maximum value T_c^m at $p_m \approx 0.16$. With further increase of p , T_c decreases and finally vanishes in the overdoped limit $p_o \approx 0.27$ [1,2]. There is the line $T_c(p)$ of finite temperature phase transitions, separating the superconducting and non-superconducting states, with critical endpoints at p_u and p_o . Here T_c vanishes and the cuprates undergo at zero temperature doping (p) tuned quantum phase transitions. As their nature is concerned, resistivity measurements reveal a quantum superconductor to insulator (QSI) transition in the underdoped limit (p_u) and in the overdoped limit (p_o) a quantum superconductor to normal state (QSN) transition. Another essential experimental fact is the doping dependence of the anisotropy. In tetragonal cuprates it is defined as the ratio $\gamma = \lambda_c / \lambda_{ab}$ of the London penetration depths due to supercurrents flowing perpendicular (λ_c) and parallel (λ_{ab}) to the ab -planes. Approaching the QSN transition γ remains finite, while at the QSI transition it tends to infinity [3,4]. When γ remains finite the system exhibits anisotropic but genuine three dimensional (3D)-, while $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ implies 2D-behavior. The resulting competition between anisotropy and superconductivity raises serious doubts whether 2D mechanisms and models, corresponding to the limit $\gamma = 1$, can explain the essential observations of superconductivity in the cuprates [4]. There is mounting evidence that close to the phase transition line $T_c(p)$ thermal fluctuations dominate, while quantum fluctuations dominate both, the QSI and QSN transitions. Furthermore, due to the 3D to 2D crossover, tuned by the rise of γ with reduced dopant concentration, these fluctuations are enhanced. For these reasons, mean-field treatments, including the BCS theory are expected to apply far from the critical line only. This singles out the low temperature region around optimum doping p_m .




FIG. 1. Schematic phase diagram of cuprate superconductors. Variation of T_c and $\lambda(T=0) = \lambda_{ab}(T=0)$ with hole concentration p . Quantum phase transitions occur at the endpoints $p = p_u \approx 0.05$ and $p = p_o \approx 0.27$ of the critical line $T_c(p)$. At p_u a two dimensional quantum superconductor to insulator (2D-QSI)-and at $p_o \approx 0.27$ 3D quantum superconductor to normal state (3D-QSN)-transition occurs.

In the mean-field approximation the London penetration depth of an anisotropic superconductor in the Meissner state is given by [5,6]

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_i^2(T)} = \frac{e^2}{2mc^2} \int dS_F \frac{v_{Fi} v_{Fi}}{j_F j} + 2 \sum_k \frac{dE_k}{dE_k} \frac{\partial f(E_k)}{\partial E_k} \frac{E_k}{E_k^2} \quad (1)$$

dS_F , v_{Fi} and $j_F j$ are respectively the surface element of the Fermi surface, Fermi velocity in direction i and the magnitude of the Fermi velocity. $f(E_k)$ is the Fermi function and E_k the energy gap in direction k . The index refers to the principal crystallographic directions a, b and c . The second term which is negative, describes the decrease of $1/\lambda_i^2(T)$ caused by the thermal population of Bogoliubov quasiparticle levels with energy E_k , and it is this quantity where the anisotropy and magnitude of the energy gap enters. In this approximation $1/\lambda_i^2(T)$ vanishes close to T_c as $1/\lambda_i^2(T) = 1/\lambda_{i0}^2(1 - T/T_c)$ with $i=1,2$, while there is mounting evidence for $i=3$ in the experimentally accessible regime. Thus close to T_c where thermal fluctuations dominate the mean-field treatment fails. Otherwise, e.g. at sufficiently low temperatures and far away from the QSI and QSN transitions the neglect of fluctuations appears to be justified. Here Eq.(1) reduces for noninteracting quasiparticle excitations around the four d-wave nodes, which dominate the leading low temperature behavior, to [7]

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{ab}^2(T)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{ab}^2(0)} (1 - AT); A = \frac{2}{\lambda_{ab}^2(0)} \ln 2 \frac{k_B e^2 v_F}{2mc^2 d v_2}; \frac{1}{\lambda_i^2(0)} = \frac{e^2}{2mc^2} \int dS_F \frac{v_{Fi} v_{Fi}}{j_F j} \quad (2)$$

The Fermi velocities v_F and v_2 enter the quasiparticle excitation energies $E_k = \sqrt{v_F^2 k_1^2 + v_2^2 k_2^2}$ and refer to velocities along directions normal and tangential to the Fermi surface at each node. d is the mean interlayer spacing along the c -axis. The velocity ratio v_F/v_2 is a fundamental material parameter which measures the anisotropy of the quasiparticle excitation spectrum. This scenario is not restricted to the penetration depth. It predicts simple power-law temperature dependencies in the thermodynamic and transport properties at sufficiently low temperatures. For example, the penetration depth measurements find that $1/\lambda_{ab}^2$ exhibits in the clean limit and at low temperature a linear temperature dependence [8,9], in agreement with Eq.(2). The NMR relaxation rate exhibits the expected T^3 temperature dependence [10]. The predicted effect of impurities in giving rise to a universal thermal conductivity [11,12] has been confirmed [13]. The clean-limit specific heat varying as T^2 appears to have been observed [14-16].

For a spherical Fermi surface, one recovers for the zero temperature penetration depth the standard result, $1/\lambda^2(T=0) = 4ne^2/mc^2$, where n is the number density of the electrons in the normal state [17]. In recent years the penetration depth has been the subject of intense experimental investigation in high- T_c compounds [18-24]. It has become the practice to associate the anisotropy with anisotropic effective masses m_i and to interpret the experimental data in terms of the London formula

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_i^2(0)} = \frac{4n_s e^2}{m_i c^2} \quad (3)$$

by introducing the number density n_s of the super uid. In a real superconductor, the ionic potential modifies the spherical Fermi surface of free electrons drastically. In this case it is not evident what should be taken for the effective mass m_i and the number density n_s . Although, using Eqs.(2) and (3), we can define the ratio n_s/m_i , which often has been used to interpret experimental results, in terms of

$$\frac{1}{v_i^2(0)} = \frac{e^2}{2\pi^2 c^2} \int dS_F \frac{v_{F,i} v_{F,i}}{v_F v_F} = \frac{4 n_s e^2}{m_i c^2} \frac{n_s}{m_i} : \quad (4)$$

This relation shows that n_s/m_i is just a way of parameterizing experimental results, with no discernible connection to the band mass or carrier concentration. Indeed in the mean-field approximation $1/v_i^2(0)$ is determined by normal state properties, namely the integral of the Fermi velocity over the Fermi surface. Noting that in high- T_c superconductors band structure calculations [25] and ARPES [26,27] studies uncovered drastic deviations from the free electron picture it is evident that interpretations based on the ratio n_s/m_i obscure the origin of the anisotropy $v_{F,i} = v_{F,j}$ and the doping dependence of the zero temperature penetration depth, as well as the isotope effect on this quantity. Indeed, an inspection of Eq.(2) leads to the conclusion that the anisotropy stems from flat portions of the Fermi surface, while the doping dependence reflects that of the Fermi surface. On the other hand, there is little doubt about the importance of residual electron-electron and electron-phonon interactions, not accounted for in Eq.(2). Quantifying these interactions is difficult in the normal state of the cuprates, given the lack of well-defined single-particle excitations as revealed by various experiments. Contrariwise, well-defined quasiparticle excitations do exist in the superconducting state, and a description of the low temperature state in terms of super uid Fermi liquid theory is believed to apply. Fermi-liquid corrections account for the Fermi-liquid interactions between electrons. In the superconductor their effect is the renormalization of the Fermi velocity ratio in terms of $v_F = v_2 / v_F = v_2$ [7], where $v_F = v_2$ is the bare value entering Eq.(2). The comparison of $d^2 T / dT^2$ at $T = 0$ in Bi2212, evaluated with Eq.(2) and the ARPES estimate for $v_F = v_2$ [26] with the value deduced from penetration depth measurements [28] points to a substantial Fermi liquid renormalization, namely $v_F = 0.3 v_2$, due to interactions between the nodal quasiparticles in the superconducting state. To explore the doping dependence of the renormalization we invoke the empirical relation $T_c d^2 T / dT^2 (0) = v_{ab}^2(T) / T_{=0} = 0.6$ [9], which applies to variety of cuprates with T_c ranging from 30 to 130K and dopant concentrations extending from the underdoped to the optimally doped regime. It implies with the empirical relation, $T_c / 1 = v_{ab}^2(0)$ [23], established for underdoped cuprates, and Eq.(2) that $v_F = v_2$ is nearly doping independent.

Much less attention has been devoted to the renormalization of the Fermi velocity due to electron-phonon interaction. Isotope substitution, i.e. the exchange of ^{18}O by ^{16}O is a suitable probe, whereby the lattice parameters remain essentially unaffected [29,30], while the phonon frequencies associated with the mass of the oxygen ions, or more generally, the oxygen lattice degrees of freedom are modified [31]. In recent years the isotope effect on the zero temperature penetration depth has been investigated, using a variety of techniques. In Table I we listed the experimental estimates for the relative change

$$\frac{v_{ab}^2(T=0)}{v_{ab}^2(T=0)} = \frac{n_{ab}^2(T=0)}{m_{ab}^2(T=0)} ; \quad (5)$$

upon isotope exchange for various cuprates and MgB_2 , where $n = ^{18}\text{O}$, $m = ^{16}\text{O}$ in the cuprates and $n = ^{11}\text{B}$, $m = ^{10}\text{B}$ in MgB_2 . The data also reveals that within experimental accuracy $v_{ab}^2(T=0) = v_{ab}^2(T=0) = v_{ab}^2(0) = v_{ab}^2(0)$. At zero temperature and taking the anisotropy of the quoted materials into account ($v_c > v_a > v_b$) the mean-field expression (2) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{v_{ab}^2(T=0)} = \frac{e^2}{2\pi^2 c^2} \int dS v_{F,ab} : \quad (6)$$

Since the lattice parameters remain essentially unaffected [29,30] by isotope exchange, while the dynamics, associated with the mass of the respective ions, are modified, the substantial isotope effect on the zero temperature penetration depth requires a renormalization of the normal state Fermi velocity $v_F = v_F / v_F = (1 + f)$ where v_F is the bare velocity and f the electron-phonon coupling constant which changes upon oxygen isotope exchange in the cuprates but remains nearly unaffected by boron isotope substitution in MgB_2 . However, in the Migdal-Eliashberg [33] (ME) treatment of the electron-phonon interaction the coupling constant f is independent of the ionic masses and assumed to be small [34,35]. This is true if the parameter $\omega_0 f = E_F$ is small, where ω_0 is the relevant phonon frequency and E_F the Fermi energy. Thus the isotope effect on the penetration depth is expected to be small, of the order of the

adiabatic parameter $e = \epsilon_0 = E_F \ll 1$. The ME theory retains terms only of order 0. Cuprates, however, have Fermi energies much smaller than those of conventional metals [36] so that e is no longer negligible small. Thus the large oxygen isotope effects on the zero temperature in-plane penetration depth in the cuprates, listed in Table I, poses a fundamental challenge to this understanding and calls for a theory that goes beyond ME [37,38].

	T_c (K)	λ	$\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}$	Ref
$\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$	89.0	10	0.05	[20]
$\text{Y}_{0.7}\text{Pr}_{0.3}\text{Ba}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$	60.6	5	0.13	
$\text{Y}_{0.6}\text{Pr}_{0.4}\text{Ba}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$	45.3	5	0.11	
$\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ (ln)	89.3	4	0.05	[21]
$\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_{4+}$; $x = 0.08$	19.5	0	0.10 (2)	[19]
$\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_{4+}$; $x = 0.086$	22.4	0	0.08 (1)	
$\text{Bi}_{1.6}\text{Pb}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_2\text{Ca}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{10+}$	107	0	0.05	[18]
MgB_2	38.5	0	0.02 (2)	[24]

Table I: Experimental estimates for $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}$ with $n = {}^{18}\text{O}$, $m = {}^{16}\text{O}$ in the cuprates and $n = {}^{11}\text{B}$, $m = {}^{10}\text{B}$ in MgB_2

Indeed, the relative shifts $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}$ are substantial and surprisingly close to $\frac{16}{18} = \frac{16}{18} = \frac{16}{18} = 0.888$. This differs fundamentally from the behavior of optic O-phonon frequencies. The expected behavior, $\lambda \propto \omega^{-1/2}$, was confirmed in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ by measuring the frequency shift of the transverse optic phonons (copper-oxygen stretching modes), yielding $\lambda = 0.06$, in agreement with $\lambda = \frac{16}{18} = 0.888$ [31]. In any case the observed oxygen isotope effect on the zero temperature penetration depth uncovers together with Eq.(6), a substantial renormalization of the normal state Fermi velocity due to oxygen lattice degrees of freedom, while in MgB_2 this renormalization due to boron isotope exchange turns out to be marginal. This renormalization is also expected to affect the superconducting properties. Taking the empirical relation $T_c \propto \lambda(T) \propto \lambda(T=0) \propto \lambda(T=0)$ [9] for granted, Eq.(2) implies that

$$\frac{T_c}{T_c} = \frac{A}{A} = \frac{\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}(0)}{\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}(0)} = \frac{\hat{v}_F = v_2}{\hat{v}_F = v_2}; \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{v}_F = v_2$ is the bare ratio, renormalized with respect to electron-phonon coupling. Noting that close to optimum doping $T_c = T_c$ is negligible small, the oxygen isotope exchange uncovers a substantial electron-phonon renormalization of $v_F = v_2$, characterizing the quasiparticles in the superconducting state. Indeed, close to optimum doping $\hat{v}_F = v_2 = \hat{v}_F = v_2 = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}(0) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}(0)$ holds and this quantity varies from 0.05 to 0.11 (see Table I). This effect, providing direct evidence of the relevance of electron-phonon coupling in the superconducting state, should be observable with ARPES. Noting that thermally excited quasiparticles destroy superconductivity by driving $\lambda = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}(T)$ to zero, we can estimate T_c by extrapolating Eq.(2) to $\lambda = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0}(T) = 0$. This yields $T_c A \propto 1$ and confirms Eq.(7). In this context it is interesting to note that details of the Fermi-surface topology of deuterated $(\text{BEDTTF})_2\text{Cu}(\text{NCS})_2$ have been measured as a function of pressure and compared with equivalent measurements of the undeuterated salt. The data suggest that the negative isotope effect observed on deuteration is due to small differences in Fermi-surface topology caused by the isotopic substitution [32].

Close to the phase transition line $T_c(p)$ thermal fluctuations, neglected in mean-field treatments, dominate the thermodynamic properties. Approaching the phase transition line around $p = p_m$ from below (see Fig.1), there is mounting evidence that the critical behavior of homogeneous cuprates falls in the experimentally accessible temperature regime into the 3D-XY universality class [4,39{52]. Here critical 3D-XY fluctuations dominate because the fluctuations of the vector potential are strongly suppressed due to the small value of the effective charge of the pairs [39]. In the 3D-XY universality class the transition temperature T_c , the critical amplitude of the specific heat A and the critical amplitudes of the penetration depths λ_0 are universally related by [50]

$$(k_B T_c)^3 = \frac{2R}{16} \frac{1}{\frac{2}{a_0} \frac{2}{b_0} \frac{2}{c_0} A}; \quad (8)$$

$R = 0.815$ is a universal number. The critical amplitudes are defined as $c = (A =)t^{-1}$, $t = 1 - T/T_c$ and $\frac{2}{i} = \frac{2}{i0}t$, where $\frac{2}{i}$ and $\frac{2}{i0}$ are the critical exponents. Although T_c , A and $\frac{2}{i0}$ depend on the dopant concentration, isotope exchange etc., universality implies that this combination does not. Hence this relation puts a crucial constraint on the microscopic theory of superconductivity in cuprates. To illustrate this point it is instructive to consider the doping dependence of T_c , $\frac{2}{ab} = \frac{2}{ab0} + \frac{2}{ab0} \frac{p - p_u}{p_u}$ and A close to the 2D-QSI transition (see Fig.1). Here T_c , $\frac{2}{ab0}$ and $\frac{2}{i0}$ are known to scale as $T_c / 1 = \frac{2}{ab0} / 1 = \frac{2}{i0} / p - p_u$ so that the critical amplitude of the specific heat singularity vanishes according to Eq.(8) as $A \propto (p - p_u)^2 / T_c^2$. This is consistent with the specific heat data for underdoped $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ and underdoped $\text{Tl}_2\text{Ba}_2\text{CuO}_{6+x}$ [53]. Furthermore, the universal relation implies that the relative changes upon isotope substitution satisfy the relation [54]

$$\frac{T_c}{T_c} = \frac{A}{3A} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=a;b;c} \frac{\frac{2}{i0}}{\frac{2}{i0}}; \quad (9)$$

It explains why close to the transition temperature and optimum doping ($p = p_m$) a substantial isotope effect on the penetration depths is compatible with a negligible effect on T_c .

Approaching the 2D-XY-QSI transition in the underdoped regime (see Fig.1) a crossover to the universal relation [50]

$$T_c = \frac{\frac{2}{0} \bar{R}_2}{16 \cdot 3 k_B} \frac{d_s}{\frac{2}{ab}(0)}; \quad (10)$$

takes place and the cuprates correspond to a stack of independent sheets of thickness d_s . \bar{R}_2 is a universal number. The crossover to 2D {XY-QSI} behavior is experimentally well confirmed in terms of Uemura's plot [23]. It is a characteristic 2D property and also applies to the onset of superfluidity in ^4He films adsorbed on disordered substrates where it is well confirmed [55]. Although T_c , d_s and $\frac{2}{ab}(0)$ depend on dopant concentration, isotope substitution, etc., universality implies that this relation does not. This puts yet another constraint on the microscopic theory of superconductivity in the cuprates. Furthermore it yields for the relative changes upon isotope exchange the relation

$$\frac{T_c}{T_c} = \frac{d_s}{d_s} = \frac{\frac{2}{0ab}(0)}{\frac{2}{ab}(0)}; \quad (11)$$

applicable close to the underdoped limit ($p = p_u$). Although the experimental data are rather sparse in the underdoped regime [54,56], suggestive evidence for an isotope effect on the effective thickness d_s of the superconducting sheet emerges, namely $d_s = d_s = {}^{18}d_s = {}^{16}d_s = {}^{16}d_s = 0.03$ [54]. Estimates for d_s can be derived from the crossing point phenomenon in the temperature dependence of the magnetization for various applied magnetic fields, applied parallel to the c-axis. In a 3D anisotropic superconductor, falling into the 3D-XY universality class, the magnetization data plotted in terms $m_z = H_z^{1/2}$ versus T will cross at T_c , where z is along the c-axis. Consistency with this behavior was found in a variety of cuprates [50]. On the contrary, in a 2D superconductor, corresponding to a slab of thickness d_s , the crossing point occurs in the plot m_z versus T at the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition temperature T_{KT} , where $m_z / k_B T_{KT} = (d_s / \xi_0)$. Even though bulk cuprates are strictly 2D only close to the 2D-QSI transition at $p = p_u$ (see Fig.1), in the highly anisotropic materials, such as Bi-2212 and Tl-223, 2D crossing point feature have been observed and used to estimate d_s , yielding values close to the c-axis lattice constant [50]. Since the lattice parameters remain essentially unaffected [29,30] by isotope exchange, while d_s does, the substantial relative change $d_s = d_s = {}^{18}d_s = {}^{16}d_s = {}^{16}d_s = 0.03$ [54] uncovers again the relevance of electron-lattice coupling. Going further, by combining Eqs.(7) and (11), extrapolated to the underdoped regime, we obtain the approximate relation

$$\frac{d_s}{d_s} = \frac{\hat{v}_F = v_2}{\hat{v}_F = v_2}; \quad (12)$$

which provides additional evidence for the coupling between superconducting properties and lattice degrees of freedom. The approximate nature of this relation stems from the fact that the d-wave quasiparticle scenario does not hold down to the 2D-QSI transition due to the neglect of quantum fluctuations, associated with the phase of the order parameter. Indeed, the linear-in- T temperature dependence of $1 = \frac{2}{ab}$ simply follows from the existence of a 2D-QSI transition. The result is, $(\frac{2}{ab}(0) = \frac{2}{ab}(T))^2 \propto 1 - T/T_c$, holds for d- and s-wave pairing [9].

Additional evidence for electron-lattice coupling emerges from the combined oxygen isotope and finite size effects. Due to inhomogeneities of extrinsic or intrinsic origin, cuprates are homogeneous over a finite extent only. Thus a

nite size effect [57] is expected to occur, whereby the correlation volume cannot grow beyond the volume of the homogeneous domains. When 3D-XY critical fluctuations dominate there is the universal relationship [50]

$$\frac{1}{l_i(T) l_j(T)} = \frac{16^{-3} k_B T}{2_0^2 l_i(T) l_j(T)}; \quad (13)$$

between the London penetration depths l_i and transverse correlation lengths l_i^t in directions i and j . In the presence of inhomogeneities with length scales L_i the $l_i^t = l_{i0}^t l_j^t$, where $t = T/T_c - 1$, cannot diverge but are bounded by

$$l_i^t l_j^t \leq L_k^2; i \neq j \neq k; \quad (14)$$

A characteristic feature of the resulting nite size effect is the occurrence of an inflection point at T_{pk} in $l = l_i(T) l_j(T)$ below T_c , the transition temperature of the homogeneous system. Here

$$l_i(T_{pk}) l_j(T_{pk}) = L_k^2; i \neq j \neq k; \quad (15)$$

and Eq.(13) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{l_i(T) l_j(T)}_{T=T_{pk}} = \frac{16^{-3} k_B T_{pk}}{2_0^2} \frac{1}{L_k}; \quad (16)$$

In the homogeneous case $l = (l_i(T) l_j(T))$ decreases continuously with increasing temperature and vanishes at T_c , while in the presence of inhomogeneities it exhibits an inflection point at $T_{pk} < T_c$, so that

$$d \frac{1}{l_i(T) l_j(T)}_{T=T_{pk}} = 0 \quad (17)$$

Since the experimental data for the temperature dependence of the penetration depths is available in the form l_{ab} and l_c only, we rewrite Eq.(16) as

$$L_c = \frac{16^{-3} k_B T_{pc}}{2_0^2} l_{ab}^2(T_{pc}); L_{ab} = \frac{16^{-3} k_B T_{pb}}{2_0^2} (l_{ab}(T) l_c(T))_{T=T_{pab}}; \quad (18)$$

Apart from the inflection point, an essential characteristic of a nite size effect is the nite size scaling function [58]. In the present case and for l_{ab} it is defined in terms of

$$\frac{l_{ab}^2(T)}{l_{ab}^2(T_c)} l_j^t = g_c(y); y = \text{sign}(t) l_j^t \frac{L_c}{l_{ab}^2(T_c)} = \text{sign}(t) \frac{t}{t_{pc}} \quad (19)$$

For $t = T/T_c - 1$ small and $L_c \neq 0$, so that $y \neq 0$, it should tend to $g_c(y \neq 0) = 1$ and $g_c(y \neq 0) = 0$, respectively, while for $t = 0$ and $L_c \neq 0$ it diverges as

$$g_c(y \neq 0) = g_{0c} l_j^t = g_{0c} \frac{t}{t_{pc}}; \quad (20)$$

whereby $(l_{ab} = l_{ab}(T_c; L))^2 = g_{0c} l_{pc}^2 = g_{0c} l_{0ab}^2 = L_c^2$. As expected, a sharp superconductor to normal state transition requires domains of finite extent. Moreover at t_{pc} , $y = 1$ and there is an inflection point because $d(l_{ab} = l_{ab}(T; L))^2/dT = 0$. Since the scaling function $g_c(y)$ depends on the type of confining geometry and on the conditions imposed (or not, in the case of free boundaries) at the boundaries of the domains, this applies to the amplitude g_{0c} as well. In Fig.2a we displayed the microwave surface impedance data for $l_{ab}^2(T=0) = l_{ab}^2(T)$ and $d(l_{ab}^2(T=0) = l_{ab}^2(T))/dT$ versus T of a high-quality $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+x}$ single crystal taken from Jacobs et al. [59]. The solid curve indicates the leading 3D-XY critical behavior of the homogeneous system, while the data uncovers a rounded transition which occurs smoothly. This behavior, together with the occurrence of an inflection point around $T_{pc} \approx 87\text{K}$, where $d(l_{ab}^2(T=0) = l_{ab}^2(T))/dT$ exhibits an extremum, points to a nite size effect. With $l_{ab}(T=0) = 1800\text{\AA}$ obtained from SR measurements [60], $T_{pc} \approx 87\text{K}$ and $l_{ab}^2(T=0) = l_{ab}^2(T_{pc}) = 0.066$ we obtain with the aid of Eq.(18) the estimate $L_c \approx 68\text{\AA}$. Although the spatial extent of the homogeneous domains along the c -axis appears to be of nanoscale only, the small critical amplitude of the transverse correlation length,

$\lambda_{0ab} = L_c (1 - T_{pc}/T_c)^{2=3}$ makes the 3D-XY critical regime ($\lambda_{ab}^2(0) = \lambda_{ab}^2(T) / (1 - T/T_c)^{2=3}$) attainable. An additional and essential characteristic of a finite size effect appearing in the temperature dependence of the in-plane penetration depth is the consistency of $(\lambda_{0ab} = \lambda_{ab}(T))^2 t_j$ versus $t = t_j/t_p$ with the shape and limiting behavior of the finite size scaling function (see Eq.(19)). In Fig 2b we displayed $(\lambda_{0ab} = \lambda_{ab}(T))^2 t_j$ versus $t = t_j/t_p$. The apparent agreement with the aforementioned characteristic behavior of this function, provides strong evidence for a finite size effect, due to the limited extent L_c of homogeneous superconducting domains along the c-axis. Clearly, such a finite size scaling analysis, performed on one set of data for one particular sample and material only, cannot distinguish between an intrinsic or extrinsic origin of the inhomogeneity. Noting that this behavior was found in a variety of cuprates and for data obtained with different techniques [61], one is lead to the conclusion that inhomogeneities, giving rise to a finite size effect, are yet another facet of the mystery of superconductivity in the cuprates. Clearly this finite size effect is not restricted to the penetration depth but should be visible in other thermodynamic properties. In the specific heat it leads to a rounding of the peak and its consistency with a finite size effect was established for the data taken on $YBa_2Cu_3O_{7-x}$ high quality single crystals [50]. In these samples the domain size was found to range from 300 to 400 Å. Furthermore nanoscale spatial variations in the electronic characteristics have also been observed in underdoped $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+x}$ with scanning tunnelling microscopy (STM) [62{65]. They reveal a spatial segregation of the electronic structure into 3nm diameter superconducting domains in an electronically distinct background.




FIG. 2. (a) Microwave surface impedance data for $\lambda_{ab}^2(T=0) = \lambda_{ab}^2(T) / (1 - T/T_c)^{2=3}$ and $d(\lambda_{ab}^2(T=0)/\lambda_{ab}^2(T))/dT$ versus T of a high-quality $Bi_{1-x}Sr_xCaCu_2O_{8+x}$ single crystal taken from Jacobs et al. [59]. The solid line is $\lambda_{ab}^2(0) = \lambda_{ab}^2(T) / (1 - T/T_c)^{2=3}$ and the dash-dot line its derivative with $T_c = 87.5K$, indicating the leading critical behavior of the homogeneous system. The dotted line is the tangent to the inflection point at $T_{pc} = 87K$, where $d(\lambda_{ab}^2(T=0)/\lambda_{ab}^2(T))/dT$ is maximum; (b) Finite size scaling function $g(y) = (\lambda_{0ab} = \lambda_{ab}(T))^2 t_j$ versus $y = t/t_p$ for the data shown in Fig 2a. The solid line in the inset is Eq.(19) with $g_{0c} = 1.6$.

Supposing that the limiting length scales change upon isotope exchange, we obtain from Eq.(18) the relation

$$\frac{T_{pc}}{T_c} = \frac{L_c}{L_c} \frac{\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc})}{\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc})}; \quad (21)$$

which matches Eq.(11), applicable in the 2D limit where the limiting length is set by d_s , the thickness of the independent sheets. Furthermore, this relation opens the possibility to probe the coupling between superfluidity and lattice degrees of freedom close to criticality, where mean-field treatments fail. Indeed, given the fact that the lattice parameters remain essentially unaffected [29,30] by isotope exchange, a purely electronic mechanism requires

$L_c = 0$. The effect of oxygen isotope substitution on the inhomogeneity induced finite size effect has been explored in $Y_{1-x}Pr_xBa_2Cu_3O_7$ [66]. From the resulting estimates, listed in Table II, several observations emerge. First, L_c increases systematically with reduced T_{pc} . Second, L_c grows with increasing x and upon isotope exchange (^{16}O , ^{18}O). Third, the relative shift of T_{pc} is very small. This reflects the fact that the change of L_c is essentially due to the superfluid, probed in terms of $1/\lambda_{ab}^2$. Accordingly, $L_c = L_c \frac{\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc})}{\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc})} = \lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc})$ for $x = 0; 0.2$ and 0.3 .

x	0	0.2	0.3
$T_{pc}=T_{pc}$	-0.000 (2)	-0.015 (3)	-0.021 (5)
$L_c=L_c$	0.12 (5)	0.13 (6)	0.16 (5)
$\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc}) = \lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc})$	0.11 (5)	0.15 (6)	0.15 (5)
$^{16}T_{pc}$ (K)	89.0 (1)	67.0 (1)	52.1 (2)
$^{18}T_{pc}$ (K)	89.0 (1)	66.0 (2)	51.0 (2)
$^{16}L_c$ Å	9.7 (4)	14.2 (7)	19.5 (8)
$^{18}L_c$ Å	10.9 (4)	16.0 (7)	22.6 (9)

Table II: Finite size estimates for $T_{pc}=T_{pc}$, $L_c=L_c$, $\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc}) = \lambda_{ab}^2(T_{pc})$, $^{16}T_{pc}$, $^{18}T_{pc}$, $^{16}L_c$ and $^{18}L_c$ for an ^{18}O content of 89% taken from [66].

To appreciate the implications of these estimates, we note again that for fixed Pr concentration the lattice parameters remain essentially unaffected [29,30]. Accordingly, an electronic mechanism, without coupling to lattice degrees of freedom implies $L_c = 0$. On the contrary, a significant change of L_c upon oxygen exchange uncovers the coupling between the superfluid, probed by λ_{ab}^2 , and the oxygen lattice degrees of freedom. A glance to Table II shows that the relative change of the superconducting domains along the c-axis upon oxygen isotope exchange is significant, ranging from 12 to 16%, while the relative change of the induction point T_{pc} is an order of magnitude smaller. For this reason the significant relative change of L_c at fixed Pr concentration is accompanied by essentially the same relative change of λ_{ab}^2 , which probes the superfluid. This uncovers unambiguously the existence and relevance of the coupling between the superfluid and oxygen lattice degrees of freedom. Furthermore, this behavior agrees with the isotope effect on d_s [54], the limiting length scale close to the 2D-Q SI transition. Potential candidates for the relevant lattice degrees of freedom are the Cu-O bond-stretching-type phonons showing temperature dependence, which parallels that of the superconductive order parameter [67].

An additional probe to unravel the mystery of superconductivity in the cuprates is the response to a magnetic field. In the early discussion of the symmetry of the order parameter, Yip and Sauls [68] proposed that the angular position of the gap nodes could be probed by a measurement of the magnetic field dependence of the penetration depth. In the local limit and for $T \neq 0$, they predicted the linear relationship, $(H \neq 0; T = 0) = (H; 0)^2 \propto 1/H$, where the factor of proportionality is independent of temperature. Several experimental groups tried to verify this prediction, but failed to identify a linear H term which scaled with temperature according to the theory [69-72]. On the other hand, calculations based on a d-wave model, treated in the quasichlassical approximation, suggest that $(H \neq 0; T = 0) = (H; 0)^2 \propto 1/H$ [74]. However, in these treatments fluctuations have been neglected. Close to the phase transition line $T_c(p)$, where thermal fluctuations dominate, the in-plane penetration depth scales as $\lambda_{ab}^2 / \lambda_c = \lambda_{ab}^2$, while the magnetic field applied parallel to the c-axis scales as $H_c / H_0 = \lambda_{ab}^2$. Thus the in-plane penetration satisfies at T_c the scaling form

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{ab}^2(T_c; H_c)} \propto \frac{1}{H_c^2}; \quad (22)$$

revealing that a superconductor is dramatically influenced by an applied magnetic field. This behavior can be understood by noting that in an applied magnetic field the correlation length cannot grow indefinitely. For nonzero magnetic field H_c there is the limiting length scale $L_{H_c} \propto \frac{1}{H_c} = (aH_c)^{-1}$ with $a \approx 3.12$ [61], related to the average distance between vortex lines. Indeed, as the magnetic field increases the density of vortex lines becomes greater, but this cannot continue indefinitely. The limit is roughly set on the proximity of vortex lines by the overlapping of their cores. Due to this limiting length scale the phase transition of a homogeneous superconductor is rounded and occurs smoothly. At $T = 0$ and close to the 2D-Q SI transition the in-plane penetration depth scales as $\lambda_{ab}^2 / \lambda_{ab}^z$, where z is the dynamic critical exponent of this transition. With $H_c / H_0 = \lambda_{ab}^2$ this yields the scaling form

$$\frac{(0;0)}{(H_c; T=0)} \propto \frac{1}{H_c^{z+2}}; \quad (23)$$

Contrariwise at $T = 0$ and close to the 3D-Q SN transition the in-plane penetration depth scales as $\lambda_{ab}^2 / \lambda_{ab}^{z+1}$ so that

$$\frac{(0;0)}{(H_c; T=0)} \propto \frac{1}{H_c^{(z+1)+2}}; \quad (24)$$

Since the order parameter is assumed to be a complex scalar, these scaling forms hold for both, s-wave and d-wave pairing. Taking the evidence for a 2D-QSI transition with $z = 1$ and a 3D-QSN transition with $z = 2$ into account [4], the scaling form $(H = 0; T = 0) = (H; 0)^2 / 1 / H_c^2$ is expected to hold in the underdoped regime, while in the overdoped limit $(H = 0; T = 0) = (H; 0)^2 / 1 / H_c^{3=2}$ should apply. In any case more extended experimental investigations are required, including samples covering the full doping range, to overcome the present impasse. Another property suite to shed light on the critical properties of the quantum transitions is the magnetic field dependence of the zero temperature specific heat coefficient. At $T = 0$ and close to the 2D-QSI or 3D-QSN transitions it scales as $(c=T)_{T=0} / \lambda_{ab}^2 \propto H_c^{(D+z)=2}$. The data taken on $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ [75] points to $(D+z)=2 \Rightarrow 1=2$, irrespective of the dopant concentration. This suggests respectively, $z = 1$ for the 2D-QSI and $z = 2$ for the 3D-QSN transition.

The doping dependence of the zero temperature penetration depths provides another link between the quantum critical behavior in the underdoped and overdoped regimes. In Fig.3 we displayed $1 = \lambda_{ab}^2(0)$ versus $p'x$ for $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ taken from Panagopoulos et al. [76]. Close to the quantum phase transitions $1 = \lambda_{ab}^2(0)$ scales as $1 = \lambda_{ab}^2(0) / \lambda_{ab}^{2(D+z)=2}$ [50], where $\lambda = p - p_c$ at the 2D-QSI and $\lambda = p_c - p$ at the 3D-QSN transition. The solid line indicates the crossover from a 2D-QSI transition with $z = \lambda = 1$ to a 3D-QSN transition with $z = 2$ and $\lambda = 1=2$. While the flow to the 2D-QSI transition is apparent, the data does not extend sufficiently close to 3D-QSN criticality to confirm this crossover unambiguously. In any case, it emerges that the properties of the ground state are controlled by the crossover from the 2D-QSI to the 3D-QSN critical point. For this reason it can be understood that away from these quantum critical points, around optimum doping ($p = p_m$, see Fig.1), quantum fluctuations are suppressed to the extent that Bogoliubov quasi-particle features are observable and mean-field treatments represent a reasonable starting point. A 2D-QSI transition with $z = 1$ and $\lambda = 1$ coincides with the theoretical prediction for a 2D disordered bosonic system with long-range Coulomb interactions [77(79). A potential candidate for 3D-QSN criticality is the disordered d-wave superconductor to disordered metal transition at weak coupling considered by Herbut [80] [38], with $z = 2$ and $\lambda = 1=2$. energy. Here the disorder destroys superconductivity, while at the 2D-QSI transition it localizes the pairs.




FIG. 3. $1 = \lambda_{ab}^2(0)$ versus $p'x$ for $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$. : experimental data taken from Panagopoulos et al. [76] The solid line indicate the crossover from a 2D-QSI transition with $z = \lambda = 1$ to a 3D-QSN transition with $z = 2$ and $\lambda = 1=2$.

To summarize, in the regime where mean-field treatments are expected to apply, the substantial isotope effect on the zero temperature penetration depth, established by a variety of experimental techniques, implies a renormalization of the normal state Fermi velocity due to a electron-lattice coupling, beyond the band velocity and the ME theory. This coupling also affects the superconducting properties and should be observable with ARPES. Close to the critical line $T_c(p)$ and the critical endpoints, either thermal or quantum fluctuations, not included in mean-field treatments, dominate. In these regions of the phase diagram the theory of quantum and thermal critical phenomena applies. Given the universality class of the respective transition, there are universal relations between critical properties, putting stringent constraints on the microscopic theory of superconductivity in the cuprates. Along the phase transition line there is in the experimentally accessible temperature regime mounting evidence for 3D-XY universality and for a 3D-2D-crossover as the underdoped limit is approached. Here a 2D-QSI transition occurs. This crossover, measured in terms of the ratio $\lambda = \lambda_{ab}^2$ (see Fig.1) is well documented [3,4] and implies that superconductivity in the cuprates is a genuine 3D phenomenon. The resulting competition between anisotropy and superconductivity raises serious doubts whether 2D mechanisms and models, corresponding to the limit $\lambda = 1$, can explain the essential

observations of superconductivity in the cuprates. Indeed, as the dopant concentration is increased, the cuprates undergo in the ground state a crossover from 2D-QSI to 3D-QSN criticality. For this reason the observation of Bogoliubov quasi-particle features far away from these quantum critical points, around optimum doping ($p = p_m$, see Fig.1), can be understood. Here quantum fluctuations do not dominate. Yet another facet of the mystery emerges from the evidence for a finite size effect in the temperature dependence of the in-plane penetration depth. Although the limiting length scales may depend on the history of the sample, their dependence on oxygen isotope substitution reveals and confirms the coupling between superconducting properties and lattice degrees of freedom. Although the majority opinion on the mechanism of superconductivity in the cuprates is that it occurs via a purely electronic mechanism, and lattice degrees of freedom are supposed to be irrelevant, we have shown that the oxygen isotope effect on the in-plane penetration depth uncovers yet another facet, the hitherto ignored coupling between lattice degrees of freedom and both, normal state and superconducting state properties, the existence of inhomogeneities giving rise to a finite size effect. Finally we note that a variety of other properties also display pronounced phonon and electron-lattice effects: superconductivity-induced lattice changes [45,51,73,81,82], superconductivity-induced phonon renormalization [67,83{87], tunnelling phonon structures [88,89], etc., give additional evidence of significant electron-lattice coupling. Furthermore we have seen that the occurrence of power law terms in the low temperature and low magnetic field dependence of the in-plane penetration depth do not necessarily single out d-wave pairing, but stem from fluctuations at work, associated with a complex scalar order parameter which is compatible with both, s- and d-wave pairing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to M. Cohen, R. Khasanov, H. Keller, K. A. Muller and D. R. Nelson for very useful comments and suggestions on the subject matter, and to Claudia Ambrosch-Drahl and R. Zeyher for clarifying correspondence.

-
- [1] J. L. Tallon et al, Phys. Rev. B 51, 12911 (1995).
 - [2] M. R. Presland et al, Physica C 176, 95 (1991).
 - [3] T. Schneider, Europhys. Lett. 60, 141 (2002).
 - [4] T. Schneider, Physica B 326, 289 (2003).
 - [5] B. S. Chandrasekhar and D. Einzel, Annalen der Physik 2, 535 (1993).
 - [6] P. J. Hirschfeld and N. Goldenfeld, Phys. Rev. B 48, 4219 (1993).
 - [7] A. C. Durst and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 62, 1270, (2000).
 - [8] W. N. Hardy, D. A. Bonn, D. C. Morgan, R. Liang, and K. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 3999 (1993).
 - [9] T. Schneiderl and J. M. Singer, J. of Superconductivity, 13, 789 (2000).
 - [10] J. A. Martindale, S. E. Barrett, K. E. O'Hara, C. P. Slichter, W. C. Lee, and D. M. Ginsberg, Phys. Rev. B 47, 9155 (1993).
 - [11] P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 1887 (1993).
 - [12] M. J. G. Raf, S-K. Yip, J. A. Sauls, and D. Rainer, Phys. Rev. B 53, 15147 (1996).
 - [13] L. Taillefer, B. Lussier, R. Gagnon, K. Behnia, and H. Aubin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 483 (1997).
 - [14] K. A. Moler, D. L. Sisson, J. S. Urbach, M. R. Beasley, A. Kapitulnik, D. J. Baar, R. Liang, and W. N. Hardy, Phys. Rev. B 55, 3954 (1997).
 - [15] D. A. Wright, J. P. Emerson, B. F. Woodfield, J. E. Gordon, R. A. Fisher, and N. E. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 1550 (1999).
 - [16] Y. Wang et al, Phys. Rev. B 63, 094508 (2001).
 - [17] M. Tinkham, Introduction to Superconductivity, McGraw Hill, New York 1975.
 - [18] G. Zhao, V. Kirtikar, and D. E. Morris, Phys. Rev. B 63, 024503 (2001).
 - [19] J. Hoffer et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 4192 (2000).
 - [20] R. Khasanov et al, J. Phys. Condensed Matter 15, L17 (2003).
 - [21] R. Khasanov et al, cond-mat/0305477.
 - [22] J. L. Tallon et al, cond-mat/0211071.
 - [23] Y. J. Uemura, Solid State Communications 126, 2338 (2003)
 - [24] D. D. Castro et al, cond-mat/0307330.
 - [25] W. E. Pickett, Rev. Mod. Phys. 61, 433 (1989).
 - [26] J. C. Camuzano, M. R. Norman, and M. Randeria, cond-mat/0209476.

- [27] A. Lanzara et al, Nature 420, 511 (2001).
- [28] S. F. Lee et al, Phys. Rev. B 53, 11825 (1996).
- [29] K. Conder et al., in Phase Separation in Cuprate Superconductors, edited by E. Sigmund and K. A. Müller (Springer, Berlin 1994) p. 210.
- [30] F. R. A. et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5912 (1998).
- [31] N. L. Wang et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 087003 (2002).
- [32] T. Biggs et al, cond-mat/0203392.
- [33] A. B. Migdal, Sov. Phys. JETP 7, 996 (1958); G. M. Eliashberg, Sov. Phys. JETP 11, 696 (1960).
- [34] E. I. Maksimov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 37, 1562 (1969).
- [35] J. P. Carbotte, Rev. Mod. Phys. 62, 1027 (1990).
- [36] A. Paramakanti, M. Randeria, and N. Trivedi, cond-mat/0305611.
- [37] A. D. Eppeler and A. J. M. Illis, Phys. Rev. B 65, 100301 (2002).
- [38] A. D. Eppeler and A. J. M. Illis, Phys. Rev. B 65, 224301 (2002).
- [39] D. S. Fisher, M. P. A. Fisher, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 43, 130 (1991).
- [40] T. Schneider and H. Keller, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 8, 487 (1993).
- [41] N. Overend, M. A. Howson, and I. D. Lawrie, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 3238 (1994).
- [42] M. A. Hubbard et al, Physica C 259, 309 (1996).
- [43] S. Kamale et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1845 (1994).
- [44] S. Kamale et al, Phys. Rev. B 58, 8933 (1998).
- [45] V. Pasler et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1094 (1998).
- [46] T. Schneider, J. Hofer, M. W. Ilse, J. M. Singer, and H. Keller, Eur. Phys. J. B 3, 413 (1998).
- [47] T. Schneider and J. M. Singer, Physica C 313, 188 (1999).
- [48] J. Hofer et al, Phys. Rev. B 60, 1332 (1999), B 62, 631 (2000)
- [49] T. Schneider and J. S. Singer, Physica C 341-348, 87 (2000)
- [50] T. Schneider and J. M. Singer, Phase Transition Approach To High Temperature Superconductivity, Imperial College Press, London, 2000.
- [51] C. Meingast et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1606 (2001).
- [52] K. D. Osborn, D. J. Van Harlingen, V. I. A. K. N. Goldenfeld, S. Oh, and J. N. Eckstein, cond-mat/0204417
- [53] J. W. Loram et al, Physica C 235-240, 134 (1994).
- [54] T. Schneider, Phys. Rev. B 67, 134514 (2003).
- [55] P. A. Crowell, F. W. van Keuls, J. R. Reppy, Phys. Rev. B 55, 12620 (1997).
- [56] T. Schneider and H. Keller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 4899 (2001).
- [57] M. E. Fisher and M. N. Barber, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28 1516 (1972); M. E. Fisher, Rev. Mod. Phys. 46, 597 (1974); V. Privman, Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems, World Scientific, Singapore 1990.
- [58] N. Schultka and E. M. Anousakis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2710 (1995).
- [59] T. Jacobs, S. Sridhar, Q. Li, G. D. Gu, N. Koshizuka, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 4516 (1995)
- [60] S. F. Lee et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3862 (1993)
- [61] T. Schneider, cond-mat/0306668.
- [62] J. Liu, J. Wan, A. Goldman, Y. Chang and P. Jiang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 2195 (1991).
- [63] A. Chang, Z. Rong, Y. Ivanchenko, F. Lu and E. Wolf, Phys. Rev. B 46, 5692 (1992).
- [64] T. Cren, D. Rodichev, W. Sacks, J. Klein, J. B. Moussy, C. Deville-Cavellin, and M. Lauges, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 147 (2000).
- [65] K. M. Lang, V. Madhavan, J. E. Hoffman, E. W. Hudson, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida and J. C. Davis, Nature 415, 413 (2002).
- [66] T. Schneider, R. Khasanov, K. Conder and H. Keller, cond-mat/0302403.
- [67] J. H. Chung et al, Phys. Rev. B 67, 014517 (2003).
- [68] S. K. Yip and J. A. Sauls, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2264 (1992).
- [69] A. Maeda, Y. Iino, T. Hanaguri, N. Motohira, K. Kishio, and T. Fukase, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 1202 (1995); A. Maeda, T. Hanaguri, Y. Iino, S. M. Asaoka, Y. Kakata, J. Shimoyama, K. Kishio, H. Asaoka, Y. Matsushita, M. Hasegawa, and H. Takei, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 65, 3638 (1996).
- [70] A. Carrington, R. W. Giannetta, J. T. Klem, and J. G. Lapintzakis, Phys. Rev. B 59, 14 173 (1999).
- [71] C. P. Bidinosti, W. N. Hardy, D. A. Bonn, and Ruixing Liang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3277 (1999).
- [72] J. E. Sonier, J. H. Brewer, R. F. Kiehl, G. D. Morris, R. I. Miller, D. A. Bonn, J. Chakhalian, R. H. Heener, W. N. Hardy, and R. Liang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 4156 (1999).
- [73] H. You, U. Welp and Y. Fang, Phys. Rev. B 43, 3660 (1991).
- [74] S. G. Sharapov, V. P. Gusynin and H. Beck, Phys. Rev. B 66, 012515 (2002).
- [75] S. J. Chen, et al., Phys. Rev. B 58, 14573 (1998).
- [76] C. Panagopoulos, T. Xiang, W. Anukool, J. R. Cooper, Y. S. Wang, and C. W. Chu, Phys. Rev. B 67, 220502 (2003).
- [77] M. P. A. Fisher, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 587 (1990).
- [78] M. C. Cha, M. P. A. Fisher, S. M. Girvin, M. Wallin, P. A. Young, Phys. Rev. B 44, 6883 (1991).
- [79] I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. B 61, 14723 (2000).
- [80] F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 1532 (2000).

- [81] O. Chmaissem, J. D. Jorgensen, S. Short, A. Knizhnik, Y. Eckstein and H. Shaked, *Nature* 397, 45 (1999).
- [82] N. L. Sani, A. Bianconi and A. Oyanagi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* 70, 2092 (2001).
- [83] L. Pintschovius and W. Reichardt, in *Physical Properties of High Temperature Superconductors IV*, edited by D. Ginsberg, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994), p. 295.
- [84] T. Egami and S. J. L. Billinge, in *Physical Properties of High Temperature Superconductors V*, edited by D. Ginsberg, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1996), p. 265.
- [85] V. G. Hadjiev, X. J. Zhou, T. Strohm, M. Cardona, Q. M. Lin, and C. W. Chu, *Phys. Rev. B* 58, 1043 (1998).
- [86] H. A. Mook and F. Dogan, *Nature (London)* 401, 145 (1999).
- [87] A. Lanzara, P. V. Bogdanov, X. J. Zhou, S. A. Keller, D. L. Feng, E. D. Lu, T. Yoshida, H. Eisaki, A. Fujimori, K. Kishio, J. Shimoyama, T. Noda, S. Uchida, Z. Hussain, and Z.-X. Shen, *Nature (London)* 412, 510 (2001).
- [88] D. Shinada, Y. Shiina, A. Mottate, Y. Ohyagi, and N. Tsuda, *Phys. Rev. B* 51, R16495 (1995).
- [89] R. S. Gonnelli, G. A. Ummarino and V. A. Stepanov, *Physica C* 275, 162 (1997).