arXiv:cond-mat/0408351v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 16 Aug 2004

Unconventional density wave in $CeCoIn_5$?

Balázs Dóra
The Abdus Salam ICTP, Strada Costiera 11, I-34014, Trieste, Italy

Kazumi Maki
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles CA 90089-0484, USA

Attila Virosztek
Department of Physics, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, H-1521 Budapest, Hungary and Research Institute for Solid State Physics and Optics, P.O.Box 49, H-1525 Budapest, Hungary

András Ványolos
Department of Physics, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, H-1521 Budapest, Hungary

(Dated: March 22, 2022)

Very recently large Nernst effect and Seebeck effect were observed above the superconducting transition temperature 2.3 K in a heavy fermion superconductor $CeCoIn_5$. We shall interpret this large Nernst effect in terms of unconventional density wave (UDW), which appears around $T = 18$ K. Also the temperature dependence of the Seebeck coefficient below $T = 18$ K is described in terms of UDW. Another hallmark for UDW is the angular dependent magnetoresistance, which should be readily accessible experimentally.

PACS numbers: 75.30.Fv, 71.45.Lr, 72.15.Eb, 72.15.Nj

I. INTRODUCTION

The new heavy fermion superconductor $CeCoIn_5$ discovered recently has attracted considerable attention[1]. For example there are many parallels between $CeCoIn_5$ and high T_c cuprate superconductors: the quasi-two dimensionality, d-wave superconductivity and the appearance of superconductivity in the vicinity of antiferromagnetic state[2,3,4,5].




FIG. 1: The schematic magnetic field-temperature phase diagram of $CeCoIn_5$ after Ref. 5.

Very recently Bel et al. in Ref. 6 reported large thermoelectric power and Nernst effect in $CeCoIn_5$ above the superconducting transition temperature. The large thermoelectric effect is naturally understood in terms of the Kondo lattice[6]. The schematic phase diagram of $CeCoIn_5$ is shown in Fig. 1. From the Fermi liquid to UDW region, the resistivity changes[7] from T^2 to T. In this Letter we want to show that both the Seebeck coefficient and the Nernst effect below $T < 18$ K are described in terms of unconventional density wave (UDW).

UDW can be unconventional charge density wave or unconventional spin density wave, though further experiments are needed to select one of them. UDW is a kind of density wave with the quasiparticle energy gap $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$, which has usually nodes on the Fermi surface. Here $\mathbf{k}$ is the quasiparticle wave vector[8]. Many people think now that the pseudogap phase in high T_c superconductors is UDW[9,10,11]. Also we have shown recently that the low temperature phase of α-(BEDT-TTF)$_2$KHg(SCN)$_4$ is UCDW[12,13,14]. In fact high T_c cuprates in the pseudogap regime[15,16] and the LTP in α-(BEDT-TTF)$_2$KHg(SCN)$_4$ exhibit large negative Nernst effect[17].

The quasiparticle energy in UDW in a magnetic field is quantized[18]. Then in an electric field $\mathbf{E}$ within the conducting plane, the quasiparticle orbits drift with the velocity $\mathbf{v}_D = \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/B^2$. This gives rise to the transverse heat current $\mathbf{J}_{heat} = TS\mathbf{v}_D$, where T and S are the temperature and the entropy associated with the quasiparticles, respectively[14].

As to the Seebeck effect below $T < 18$ K, we have to assume that the large thermoelectric power around $T \sim 20$ K is due to the Kondo effect. We assume also that the Kondo lattice instability is disrupted by the appearance of UDW around $T = 18$ K. The present model describes the T linear electric resistance[5,7] observed for $T < 10$ K$\sim T_c/2$.

II. QUASIPARTICLE SPECTRUM

The quasiparticle spectrum in UDW in $CeCoIn_5$ is given by

$$E^{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \pm\sqrt{v^2(k-k_F)^2 + \Delta^2\cos^2(2\phi)} - \mu, \qquad (1)$$

where v, Δ and μ are the Fermi velocity, the maximum of the energy gap and the chemical potential, respectively. Here we have assumed d-wave DW as in high T_c cuprates[9,10,11]. In the vicinity of the nodal points it is convenient to replace $\Delta^2\cos^2(2\phi)$ by $v_\perp^2 k_\perp^2$, where $v_\perp/v = \Delta/E_F$[19]. Now in a magnetic field tilted by an angle θ from the c-axis, the energy spectrum becomes[14,18]

$$E_n^{\pm} = \pm\sqrt{\frac{2en}{m^*}|B\cos(\theta)|\Delta(T)} - \mu, \qquad (2)$$

where $m^* = \hbar k_F/v$ and $n = 0,\ 1,\ 2\ldots$. The energy spectrum is very similar to the one of the Dirac particle in a magnetic field[20]. From the above quasiparticle spectrum, the electric conductivity and Seebeck coefficient are obtained as

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 + \sum_{n>0,\pm}\sigma_n\frac{1}{\exp(x_n^{\pm})+1}, \qquad (3)$$

$$S_{xx} = \frac{\pi^2}{3e}T\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}\ln(\sigma(\mu)) =$$

$$\frac{\pi^2}{3e}T\sigma^{-1}\left\{\sum_{n>0,\pm}\frac{\partial\sigma_n}{\partial\mu}\left(exp(x_n^{\pm})+1\right)^{-1}\right.$$

$$\left.\mp\frac{1}{T}\sum_{n>0,\pm}\sigma_n\exp(x_n^{\pm})\left(\exp(x_n^{\pm})+1\right)^{-2}\right\}, \qquad (4)$$

where $x_n^{\pm} = (\sqrt{2en\Delta(T)|B\cos(\theta)|/m^*} \pm \mu)/T$. Here we took the standard expression of the thermoeletric power[21]. A more systematic analysis of the Kondo effect plus Landau quantization will be dealt with in a future paper. Also we have assumed $\partial\sigma_n/\partial\mu \sim \sigma_n/T_K$ with the Kondo temperature $T_K \sim 20$ K, and this is expected to be the dominant contribution to the Seebeck coefficient. The Nernst effect is given on the other hand by[14]

$$\alpha_{xy} = -\frac{S}{B\sigma}, \qquad (5)$$

where the entropy S reads as

$$S = \frac{g(0)e|B\cos(\theta)|}{m^*}\left[\ln(2)+\right.$$

$$\left.\sum_{n>0,\pm}\left\{2\ln\left(2\cosh\left(\frac{x_n^{\pm}}{2}\right)\right) - x_n^{\pm}\tanh\left(\frac{x_n^{\pm}}{2}\right)\right\}\right], \qquad (6)$$

where $g(0)$ is the density of states at the Fermi energy in the normal state.




FIG. 2: The magnetic field dependence of the Seebeck coefficient is shown for $T = 1.3$ K, 1.65 K, 2.5 K, 3.5 k and 4.8 K from bottom to top. The circles denote the experimental data, the solid line is our fit.




FIG. 3: The magnetic field dependence of the Seebeck coefficient is shown for $T = 7.3$ K, 10.5 K and 15 K from bottom to top. The circles denote the experimental data, the solid line is our fit.

III. COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTS

We first show S_{xx} and α_{xy} versus B in Figs. 2, 3, 4 and 5 for several temperatures. The fittings to the data from Ref. 6 appear to be excellent except for very small fields. But these deviations are expected, since we used only 3 Landau levels ($n = 0$, 1 and 2) in these fittings. Also the fittings are expected to break down when the system becomes superconducting ($B < H_{c2}$ in Figs. 2 and 4). From the fittings, the temperature dependence of the conductivities (σ_n) can be extracted. Their be-




FIG. 4: The magnetic field dependence of the Nernst coefficient is plotted for $T = 1.3$ K, 1.65 K, 2.5 K, 3.5 k and 4.8 K from top to bottom. The circles denote the experimental data, the solid line is our fit.




FIG. 5: The magnetic field dependence of the Nernst coefficient is shown for $T = 7.3$ K, 10.5 K and 15 K from bottom to top. The circles denote the experimental data, the solid line is our fit.




FIG. 6: The temperature dependence of σ_n, $n = 0$ (circles), 1 (triangles) and 2 (squares) is shown as extracted from previous fittings. Below $T = 5$ K, σ_0 and σ_2 are proportional to $1/T$, σ_1 is finite, T independent.




FIG. 7: The temperature dependence of $(\Delta(T)/m^*)^{1/4}$ is plotted. Assuming a constant $\Delta \sim 40$ K, m^* varies as $1/(c+T)^4$, $c > 0$ constant.

haviour look somewhat strange, as seen in Fig. 6. First of all there is a clear break at $T \sim 5$ K, which may indicate some unknown transition. Below this temperature, σ_0 and σ_2 varies as $1/T$, while σ_1 turns out to be constant. The former is consistent with the observation[7] $\rho = 1/\sigma \sim T$. Their ratio at 10.5 K was found to be $\sigma_0/\sigma_2 = 0.02$ and $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 0.5$, which suggests that the resistivity is dominated by the $n = 2$ Landau level, but σ_1 becomes also important with increasing temperature. Also the temperature dependence of $\Delta(T)/m^*$ is unusual. By assuming $\Delta(T) \sim 40$ K independent of temperature in this T region, $v \sim 1/m^*$ increases with increasing temperature as $(c+T)^4$, $c > 0$ constant. Perhaps this can be the manifestation of quantum critical point in $CeCoIn_5$. Therefore, in spite of somewhat unusual temperature dependence of physical quantities like $\sigma_n(T)$ and $v(T)$, the simple theoretical expressions for the Seebeck and Nernst coefficients (Eqs. 4 and 5) work very well to describe the magnetic field dependence of S_{xx} and α_{xy}.

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary we have analysed recent magnetothermopower data from $CeCoIn_5$ for $T < 20$ K in terms of UDW, which appears around 18 K. As stressed elsewhere, the large negative Nernst effect is the hallmark of UDW[22]. Indeed, UDW provides us with excellent description of both Seebeck coefficient and Nernst coefficient observed in $CeCoIn_5$. This situation is very similar to what we encounter in α-(BEDT-TTF)$_2$KHg(SCN)$_4$[22] salt, (TMTSF)$_2$PF$_6$[23] and in high T_c cuprates YBCO, LSCO and Bi2212[24].

Also we recall, that the large Nernst effect observed in $NbSe_2$[25] indicates, that CDW in this material should be UCDW[26]. We expect also that the giant Nernst effect will provide definitive signature of UDW in candidate systems like the antiferromagnetic phase in URu_2Si_2[27], $CeRhIn_5$, $CeCu_2Si_2$, UBe_{13} and the glassy phase in κ-(ET)$_2$ salts.

Acknowledgments

We thank Kamran Behnia and Yuji Matsuda for providing us with their experimental data prior to publication. We are grateful to R. Bel, Y. Matsuda, S. Haas and H. Won for useful discussion on $CeCoIn_5$. K. M. and B. D. acknowledge gratefully the hospitality of the Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems and Max Planck Institute for Chemical Physics of Solids at Dresden, where some part of this work was done. This work was supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund under grant numbers OTKA T046269, NDF45172 and TS040878.

[1] C. Petrovic, P. G. Pagliuso, M. F. Hundley, R. Movshovich, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, Z. Fisk, and P. Monthoux, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **13**, L337 (2001).
[2] R. Movshovich, M. Jaime, J. D. Thompson, C. Petrovic, Z. Fisk, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5152 (2001).
[3] K. Izawa, H. Yamaguchi, Y. Matsuda, H. Shishido, R. Settai, , and Y. Onuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 057002 (2001).
[4] V. A. Sidorov, M. Nicklas, P. G. Pagliuso, J. L. Sarrao, A. V. B. Y. Bang, and J. D. Thompson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 157004 (2002).
[5] J. Paglione, M. A. Tanatar, D. G. Hawthorn, E. Boaknin, R. W. Hill, F. Ronning, M. Sutherland, L. Taillefer, C. Petrovic, and P. C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 246405 (2003).
[6] R. Bel, K. Behnia, Y. Nakajima, K. Izawa, Y. Matsuda, H. Shishido, R. Settai, and Y. Onuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 217002 (2004).
[7] A. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, I. Vekhter, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 257001 (2003).
[8] B. Dóra and A. Virosztek, Eur. Phys. J. B **22**, 167 (2001).
[9] L. Benfatto, S. Caprara, and C. Di Castro, Eur. Phys. J. B **17**, 95 (2000).
[10] S. Chakravarty, R. B. Laughlin, D. K. Morr, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 094503 (2001).
[11] B. Dóra, A. Virosztek, and K. Maki, Acta Phys. Pol. B **34**, 571 (2003).
[12] K. Maki, B. Dóra, M. V. Kartsovnik, A. Virosztek, B. Korin-Hamzić, and M. Basletić, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 256402 (2003).
[13] T. Fujita, T. Sasaki, N. Yoneyama, and N. Kobayashi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73**, 1525 (2004).
[14] B. Dóra, K. Maki, A. Ványolos, and A. Virosztek, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 241102 (2003).
[15] Y. Wang, Z. A. Xu, T. Kakeshita, S. Uchida, S. Ono, Y. Ando, and N. P. Ong, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 224519 (2001).
[16] C. Capan, K. Behnia, J. Hinderer, A. G. M. Jansen, W. Lang, C. Marcenat, C. Marin, and J. Flouquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 056601 (2002).
[17] E. S. Choi, J. S. Brooks, and J. S. Qualls, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 205119 (2002).
[18] A. A. Nersesyan and G. E. Vachnadze, J. Low Temp. Phys. **77**, 293 (1989).
[19] M. Chiao, R. W. Hill, C. Lupien, B. Popic, R. Gagnon, and L. Taillefer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2943 (1999).
[20] V.S.Weisskopf, Kongelige Danske Videns. Selskab Mathematisk-fysiske Meddelelser **6**, 14 (1936).
[21] see for example A. A. Abrikosov, *Fundamentals of the Theory of Metals* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998).
[22] B. Dóra, K. Maki, and A. Virosztek, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **18**, 327 (2004).
[23] B. Dóra, K. Maki, A. Ványolos, and A. Virosztek, Europhys. Lett. (in press).
[24] K. Maki, B. Dóra, A. Virosztek, and A. Ványolos, Curr. Appl. Phys. (in press).
[25] R. Bel, K. Behnia, and H. Berger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 066602 (2003).
[26] A. H. Castro-Neto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4382 (2001).
[27] R. Bel, H. Jin, K. Behnia, J. Flouquet, and P. Lejay, cond-mat/0407147.