V R . Shaginyan ^aP etersburg N uclear P hysics Institute, G atchina, 188300, R ussia

Abstract

The main properties and the type of the eld-tuned quantum critical point in the heavy-ferm ion metal $C \in CoIn_5$ arisen upon applying magnetic elds B are considered within the scenario based on the ferm ion condensation quantum phase transition. We analyze the behavior of the elective mass, resistivity, special cheat, charge and heat transport as functions of applied magnetic elds B and show that in the Landau Ferm i liquid regime these quantities demonstrate the critical behavior which is scaled by the critical behavior of the elective mass exhibits very special cheat of the high-eld non-Ferm i liquid regime, the elective mass exhibits very special cheat of $T^{2=3}$, and the resistivity demonstrates the T $^{2=3}$ dependence. Finally, at elevated temperatures, it changes to M $T^{1=2}$, while the resistivity becomes linear in T. In zero magnetic eld, the elective mass is controlled by temperature T, and the resistivity is also linear in T. The obtained results are in good agreement with recent experimental facts.

PACS num bers: 71.10 H f, 71.27.+ a, 74.72.-h

Typeset using REVT_EX

E {m ail: vrshag@ thd pnpi.spb.ru

Magnetic- eld tuning of quantum critical points (QCPs) in heavy-ferm ion (HF) metals becomes a subject of intense current interest because, as it is widely accepted, an understating of quantum criticality can clear up a mystery of fundam ental physics of strongly correlated system s [1]. A fundam ental question is whether the QCPs observed in HF m etals are di erent and related to di erent quantum phase transition or their nature can be captured by the physics of a single quantum phase transition. To answer this question, we have at least to explore a particular quantum critical point in order to identify its nature. It can hardly be done on pure theoretical grounds since there can exist a great diversity of quantum phase transitions and corresponding QCPs in nature [2,3]. Therefore, mutually complementary experimental facts related to the critical behavior and collected in measurements on the same HF metal are of crucial in portance for understanding the physics of HF m etals. O byiously, such HF m etal is to exhibit the critical behavior and has no additional phase transitions. For example, the HF m etal C eR u_2 S i_2 can be reqarded as t for such study because the m easurem ents have shown neither evidence of the magnetic ordering, superconductivity nor conventional Landau Ferm iliquid (LFL) behavior down to ultralow tem peratures [4]. Unfortunately, by now only precise ac susceptibility and static magnetization measurements at smallmagnetic elds and ultralow tem peratures are known [4]. While additionalm easurem ents of such properties as the heat and charge transport and the speci cheat could produce valuable inform ation about the existence of Landau quasiparticles and their degradation and clarify the role of the critical uctuations near the corresponding QCP. Such m easurements on the HF m etal $CeCoIn_5$ were recently reported [5{8]. It was shown that the resistivity (T) of $C \in CoIn_5$ as a function of temperature T is linear in T in the absence of magnetic eld [5]. Due to the existence of magnetic eld-tuned QCP with a critical eld B_{c0} ' 5:1 T, the LFL behavior is restored at magnetic elds B ₿o [6{8]. At the LFL regime, the measurements of the speci cheat and the coe cient A in the resistivity, $(T) = {}_{0} + A (B) T^{2}$, describing the electron-electron scattering, have demonstrated that the K adow aki-W oods ratio, $K = A(B) = {}^{2}(B)[9]$, is conserved [7]. Here (B) = C = T, and C is the specic heat. It was also shown that the coe cient A diverges as A (B) / (B B₀), with ' 4=3 [6,8]. Moreover, a recent study of CeCoIn₅ in magnetic elds B > B_{c0} have revealed that the coe cients A (B) and C (B), with C (B) describing a T^2 contribution to therm al resistivity $_{\rm r}$, possess the same critical eld dependence A (B) / C (B) / (B ₿₀), so that the ratio A (B)=C (B) = c [8]. Here c is a eld-independent constant characterizing electron-electron scattering in metals and having a typical value of 0:47, see e.g. [10,11]. The same study has discovered that the resistivity behaves as $(T) / T^n$ in the high - eld non-Ferm i liquid (NFL) regime, with n ' 2=3, while in the low - eld NFL regime, at B \mathbb{B}_0 , the exponent n ' 0:45 [8]. Note that the same behavior of the resistivity was observed in the HF metals URu₂Si₂ [12] and YbA qG e [13] on the verge of the LFL require, and that the critical behavior takes place up to rather high tem peratures com parable with the e ective Ferm i tem perature T_k and up to high m agnetic elds. For example, the resistivity m easured on CeCoIn, show s the $T^{2=3}$ behavior over one decade in temperature from 2.3 K to 20 K, and the coe cients A (B) and C (B) exhibit the same behavior at the elds from $B = B_{c0} = 5:1 \text{ T}$ to at least 16 T [8].

In this Letter, we present an explanation of the observed behavior of the electronic system of the heavy-ferm ion m etal $C \circ C \circ In_5$ arisen upon applying m agnetic elds B. W e analyze the behavior of the electrone mass, resistivity, speci cheat, charge and heat transport as functions of the applied m agnetic eld B and show that in the Landau Ferm i liquid regime, these quantities dem onstrate the critical behavior which is scaled by the critical behavior of the electric m ass. In that case, the critical behavior is determined by the fermion condensation quantum phase

transition (FCQPT), whose physics is controlled by quasiparticles with the e ective mass which strongly depends on the applied magnetic eld B and diverges at B ! B_{c0} . In zero magnetic

eld, the e ective mass is controlled by temperature T, and the resistivity is linear in T. In the high-eld non-Fermi liquid regime when the system comes from the LFL behavior to the NFL one, the e ective mass exhibits very speci c behavior, M T²⁼³, and the resistivity demonstrates the T²⁼³ dependence. In the low-eld NFL regime, at B B₀, this behavior becomes complicated so that the resistivity behaves as Tⁿ, with n 0:7 0.8. At elevated temperatures and in zero magnetic eld, the behavior changes to M T¹⁼², while the resistivity becomes linear in T.

W e start with a brief consideration of the LFL regime restored by the application of magnetic eld $B > B_{c0}$. If the electronic system approaches FCQPT from the disordered side, the electrone mass M (B) of the restored LFL depends on magnetic eld B as [14,15]

M (B) /
$$\frac{1}{(B - B_{c0})^{2=3}}$$
: (1)

Note that Eq. (1) is valid at T T (B), where the function T (B) / (B B_{c0})⁴⁼³ determines the line on the B T phase diagram separating the region of the LFL behavior from the NFL behavior taking place at T > T (B) [14]. To estimate the coe cient A, we observe that at the highly correlated regime when M =M 1, the coe cient A / (M)², here M is the bare electron m ass [16]. As a result, we have

$$A^{2}(B) / \frac{1}{(B - B_{c0})^{4=3}};$$
 (2)

and observe that in the LFL regime, the K adow aki-W oods ratio, $K = A (B) = {}^{2} (B)$, is conserved because (B) / M (B).

Let us now turn to consideration of the system's behavior at elevated tem peratures paying special attention to the transition region. To do it, we use the well-know Landau equation relating the quasiparticle energy "(p) near the Ferm i surface to variations n(p;T) of the quasiparticle distribution function $n_F(p;T)$ [17,18]

"(p)
$$= \frac{p_F (p - p_F)}{M} + {}^Z F (p; p_1) n (p_1; T) \frac{dp_1}{(2)^3}$$
: (3)

Here, is the chem ical potential, p_F is the Ferm im omentum, F (p;p₁) is the Landau amplitude. For the sake of simplicity the summation over the spin variables is omitted. In our case, the variation n(p;T) is induced by temperature T and de ned as n(p;T) = p(p;T) n_F(p;T = 0) with n_F(p;T) being given by the Ferm i-D irac function

$$n_{\rm F} (p;T) = \left(1 + \exp\left(\frac{("(p))}{T}\right)^{\#}\right)^{-1} :$$
(4)

Taking into account that " $(p' p_F) = p_F (p p_F)=M$, one directly obtains from Eqs. (4) that $n_F (p;T ! 0) ! (p_F p)$, where $(p_F p)$ is the step function. In our case, Eq. (3) can be used to estimate the behavior of the elective mass M (T) as a function of temperature. A ctually, dimensional parts of Eq. (3) with respect to the momentum p, we observe that the dimension p = M (T) $p_F = M$ (T = 0) is given by the integral. In its turn, the integral I

can be estimated upon using the standard procedure of calculating integral when the integrand contains the Ferm i-D irac function, see e.g. [19]. As a result, we obtain that

$$\frac{M}{M(T)}' \frac{M}{M} + a_1 \frac{TM(T)}{T_kM}^{!2} + a_2 \frac{TM(T)}{T_kM}^{!4} + ...$$
(5)

Here a_1 and a_2 are constants proportional to the derivatives of the Landau amplitude with respect to the momentum p. Equation (5) can be regarded as a typical equation of the LFL theory with the only exception for the e ective mass M which strongly depends on the magnetic eld and diverges at B ! B_{c0} as it follows from Eq. (1). Nonetheless, at T ! 0, the corrections to M (B) start with T² terms provided that

$$M = M (B) a_1 \frac{TM (B)}{T_k M}^{!2};$$
 (6)

and the system exhibits the LFL behavior. At some temperature T_1 (B) T_k , the value of the sum on the right hand side of Eq. (5) is determined by the second term. Then Eq. (6) is not valid, and upon om itting the rst and third terms, Eq. (5) can be used to determ ine the e ective mass M (T) in the transition region,

M (T) / T
$$^{2=3}$$
: (7)

W enote, that Eq. (7) has been derived in [15]. Upon comparing Eq. (1) and Eq. (7) and taking into account that the elective mass M (T) is a continuous function of T, we can conclude that T_1 (B) / (B B_{c0}).

A few remarks are in order here. Equation (7) is valid if the second term in Eq. (5) is much bigger than the second term in Eq. (5) is much

$$\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{k}}} \qquad \frac{\mathrm{M}}{\mathrm{M}} \stackrel{3=2}{;} \tag{8}$$

and this term is bigger then the third one,

$$\frac{T}{T_{k}} = \frac{M}{M} :$$
(9)

Obviously, both Eq. (8) and (9) can be simultaneously satis ed if M = M 1. It is seen from Eqs. (1) and (9) that at B ! B_{c0} , the range of tem peratures over which Eq. (7) is valid shrinks to zero, as well as T_1 (B) ! 0. Thus, it is possible to observe the behavior of the e ective mass given by Eq. (7) in a wide range of tem peratures provided that the e ective mass M (B) is diminished by the application of the high magnetic eld, see Eq. (1). At B ! B_{c0} and nite tem peratures, Eq. (9) cannot be satis ed. Therefore, at elevated tem peratures, the third term com es into play making the function M (T) be complicated. To estimate the exponent n, we take into account only the third term in Eq. (5) and obtain M (T) / Tⁿ, with n = 4=5. As a result, at B ! B_{c0} and T > T_1 (B), we have an approximation

$$M (T) / T^{n}; (10)$$

with the exponent n 0.7 0.8. The contribution coming from the other terms can only enlarge the exponent. On the other hand, n < 1 because behind FCQPT, when the ferm ion condensate

is formed, M (T) / 1=T [20]. Detailed analysis of this item will be published elsewhere. Then, at elevated temperatures, the system comes to a di erent regime. Sm oothing out the step function (p_r, p) at p_r , the temperature creates the variation n(p)1 over the narrow region $p \in M$ $T = p_{\rm F}$. In fact, the series on the right hand side of Eq. (5) representing the value of the integral I in Eq. (3) is valid, provided that the interaction radius q_0 in the momentum space of the Landau amplitude F is much larger than p, q p. 0 therw ise, if q_0 p, the series do not represent I and Eqs. (5) and (7) are no longer valid. Such a situation takes place at rising tem peratures because the product M T grows up as q_0 $M T = p_F / T^{1=3}$, as it р follows from Eq. (7). As a result, the integral runs over the region q_0 and becomes proportional to M $T = p_{F}$. Upon om itting the rst term on the right hand side of Eq. (3) and substituting the integral by this estimation, we obtain the equation which determines the behavior of the e ective mass at T > T (B) as [14,21]

M (T) / T
$$^{1=2}$$
: (11)

To capture and summarize the salient features of the LFL behavior observed recently in $C \in CoIn_5$ [7,8], we apply the above consideration based on FCQPT. The study of $C \in CoIn_5$ in the LFL regime have shown that the coe cients A (B) and C (B), determining the T^2 contributions to the resistivity and thermal resistivity _r respectively, possess the same critical eld dependence [8]

$$A(B) / C(B) / \frac{1}{(B - B_{c0})^{4=3}}$$
: (12)

The observed critical exponent 4=3 is in excellent agreement with that of given by Eq. (2). Such the parallel behavior of charge and heat transport with the scattering rate growing as T² shows that the delocalized fermionic excitations are the Landau quasiparticles carrying charge e. We note that these should be destroyed in the case of conventional quantum phase transitions [2,3]. Nonetheless, let us assume for a moment that these survive. Since the heat and charge transport tend to strongly di er in the presence of the critical uctuations of superconducting nature, the constancy of the ratio rules out the critical uctuations [8]. Therefore, we are led to the conclusion that the observed value of the critical magnetic eld B_{c0} = 5:1 T that coincides approximately with H_{c2} = 5 T, the critical eld at which the superconductivity vanishes, cannot be considered as giving grounds for the existence of quantum critical behavior of new type. Then, one could expect that some kind of critical uctuations could cause the observed parallel behavior of charge and heat transport. For example, it is in possible in the case of ferrom agnetic

uctuations with a wavevector q' 0, but large-q scattering from antiferrom agnetic uctuations of nite m om enta could degrade the heat and charge transport in a sim ilar way [11]. In this case, in order to preserve the K adow akiW oods ratio these uctuations are to properly in uence the speci c heat which characterizes the therm odynam ic properties of the system and is not directly related to the transport one. On the other hand, there are no theoretical grounds for the conservation of the K adow akiW oods ratio within the fram eworks of conventional quantum phase transitions [22]. Therefore, the conservation of the K adow akiW oods ratio be not be observed in recent m easurem ents on $C \in CoIn_5$ [7] de nitely seem s to rule out these uctuations. W hile both the constancy of K adow akiW oods ratio [7] and the constancy of the A (B)=C (B) ratio [8] give strong evidence in favor of the quasiparticle picture.

Now we turn to consideration of the resistivity (T). As we will see below, the striking recent measurements of the resistivity [8,12,13] furnish new evidence in favor of the quasiparticle picture and the existence of FCQPT.

As it follows from Eq. (11) and the mention above relation A / (M)², the term AT^2 / M T^2 turns out to be / T [14]. As a result, in zero magnetic eld and relatively high temperatures $T > T_c$, the resistivity of $CeCoIn_5$ is linear in T. Here T_c is the critical temperature at which the superconductivity vanishes. This observation is in good agreement with experimental facts [5].

At temperatures T < T_1 (B) and magnetic eld B > B_{c0} , the system exhibits the LFL behavior with the T² dependence of the resistivity (T). Such a behavior is in agreement with experimental facts [6{8].

At the high applied magnetic eld and nite temperatures T > T(B) when the system comes into the NFL regime, the elective mass M is determined by Eq. (7). In that case, the range of temperatures over which Eq. (7) is held becomes rather wide, and the system demonstrates the anomalous $T^{2=3}$ resistivity. A ctually, upon using the same arguments, we obtain that $AT^2 / (M)^2T^2 / T^{2=3}$ and conclude that the resistivity $(T) / T^{2=3}$. Again, this result is in excellent agreement with the reported observations [8,12,13].

If the magnetic eld B ! B_{c0} and the temperature is relatively high, $T > T_1$ (B), so that the system enters the NFL regime, the electrive mass is given by Eq. (10). In that case, the resistivity $(T) / (M)^2 T^2 / T^k$, with k = 2 2n = 0.6 0.4. This result is in reasonable agreement with the reported observation of anom alous $T^{0.45}$ dependence of the resistivity in a small region near the critical eld $B_{c0} = 5.1 T$ [8].

In conclusion, we have shown that the experim entally observed behavior of the electronic system of the heavy-ferm ion m etal $C \in OIn_5$ arisen upon applying magnetic elds can be understood within the fram eworks of the FCQPT scenario. We have shown that in the LFL regime the resistivity, speci c heat, charge and heat transport as functions of the applied magnetic

eld B dem onstrate the critical behavior which is scaled by the critical behavior of the e ective m ass. W e have observed that this critical behavior is determ ined by FCQPT, whose physics is controlled by quasiparticles with the e ective m ass which in the LFL regime strongly depends on the applied magnetic eld and diverges at B ! B_{c0} . In zero magnetic eld, the e ective m ass is controlled by tem perature T, and the resistivity is linear in T. In the high-eld NFL regime, the e ective m ass exhibits very speci c behavior, M T²⁼³, while the resistivity dem onstrates the T²⁼³ dependence. At elevated tem peratures, the behavior changes to M T¹⁼², while the resistivity becomes linear in T.

REFERENCES

- [1] G R. Stewart, Rev. M od. Phys. 73, 797 (2001).
- [2] S. Sachdev, Quantum Phase transitions, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [3] M. Vojta, Rep. Prog. Phys. 66, 2069 (2003).
- [4] D. Takahashiet al, Phys. Rev. B 67, 180407 (2003).
- [5] C. Petrovic et al., J. Phys. Condens. M atter 13, L337 (2001).
- [6] J. Paglione et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 246405 (2003).
- [7] A.Bianchiet al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 257001 (2003).
- [8] J. Paglione et al., cond-m at/0405157.
- [9] K.Kadowaki and S.B.Woods, Solid State Commun. 58, 507 (1986).
- [10] A J.Bennet and M J.Rice, Phys. Rev. 185, 968 (1969).
- [11] J. Paglione, cond-m at/0404269.
- [12] K.H.Kim et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 256401 (2003).
- [13] S.L. Bud'ko, E. Morosan, and P.C. Can eld, Phys. Rev. B 69, 014415 (2004).
- [14] V R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 77, 99 (2003); V R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 77, 178 (2003).
- [15] M.V.Zverev and V.A.Khodel, JETP Lett. 79, 772 (2004).
- [16] V A.Khodeland P.Schuck, Z.Phys.B 104, 505 (1997).
- [17] L.D. Landau, Sov. Phys. JETP 3, 920 (1956).
- [18] E M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, Statistical Physics, Part 2, Butterworth-Heinem ann, 1999.
- [19] E M. Lifshitz and L P. Pitaevskii, Statistical Physics, Part 1, Butterworth-Heinem ann, 2000, p. 168.
- [20] J.Duckelsky et al., Z.Phys.B 102, 245 (1997).
- [21] V R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 79, 344 (2004).
- [22] V R. Shaginyan, J.G. Han, and J. Lee, Phys. Lett. A, in press; cond-m at/0405025.