

Comment on "Vortices with Fractional Flux in Two-Gap Superconductors and Extended Faddeev Model", "Phase Diagram of Planar U(1) U(1) Superconductor" and "Flux Noise in MgB₂ Thin Films"

D. A. Gorokhov

Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics,
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-2501, USA
September 21, 2003

I show that recent theoretical [1, 2] and experimental [3] claims about the possibility of the Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless (BKT) transition of "fractional vortices" in thin films of MgB₂ are inconsistent with the parameters of the electron-phonon interaction in MgB₂.

1. Theory. In Ref. [1] Babaev investigates vortices in two-gap superconductors (TGS). He finds flux lines carrying a fraction of the flux quantum Φ_0 and suggests an experiment for the observation of the BKT-transition of such topological excitations in thin films of TGS. It is claimed that "the results could be relevant for the newly discovered two-gap superconductor MgB₂". I show that, i) in [1] the free energy is treated improperly and the vortex solutions obtained are invalid for MgB₂; ii) the careful analysis excludes the possibility to observe these vortices in the suggested in [1] experiment on MgB₂.

The free energy density F for a thin film made of a TGS with a nonzero Josephson coupling (JC) g (for the microscopic Hamiltonian, see Eq. (1) of [5]) can be written in the form $F = F_1 + F_2 + (g=2)(\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2)$, where $\phi_i = j_i e^{i\varphi_i}$, $i = 1, 2$ are the superconducting order parameters of the two condensates and

$$F_1 = -\frac{j_1}{2} \nabla^2 \varphi_1^2 + \frac{j_1}{4} \nabla^4 \varphi_1^2 + \frac{k_1}{2} \nabla^2 \varphi_1 \nabla^2 \varphi_2; \quad (1)$$

with $\nabla^2 = \nabla^2 + 2iA = 0$ and $k_1 l = x/y/z$. Remarkably, the above free energy F describes equally well a system of two superconducting layers situated close to each other. The topological excitations in layered superconductors such as Bi- and Tl-based high- T_c superconductors consist of pancake vortices [4] describing the singular phase fluctuations in each layer. In a zero magnetic field and for $g = 0$, pancake vortices in the same layer interact logarithmically at all distances R exceeding the core size and exhibit a BKT-like phase transition [4]. Also, individual pancake vortices carry a fraction of the magnetic flux quantum [4]. Hence, in a thin film of a two-gap superconductor, the elementary topological excitations found in Ref. [1] are equivalent to pancake vortices in a two-layer system. E.g., the vortex " $\phi_1 = 2\pi$; $\phi_2 = 0$ " defined in Ref. [1] corresponds to one pancake in the first layer (condensate) and to no pancakes in the second one.

For $g \neq 0$ there is a new lengthscale such that for $R > \xi$ vortex-antivortex pairs are attracted with a potential linear in R and thus exhibit confinement, i.e., the BKT-transition is quenched. However, if ξ is large, a BKT-like crossover smeared on the scale ξ can be observed [6].

i) It is claimed in [1] that if $L < \xi$ (L is the sample size and ξ is defined as "inverse mass of the field n_1 " in Ref. [1]), JC can be neglected. Solutions for fractional vortices have been obtained on all length scales (even exceeding ξ , the magnetic field penetration length). In fact, the lengths ξ_1 's and ξ_2 are characteristic for every superconductor and cannot be chosen arbitrarily. For MgB₂ the condition $\xi_1 < \xi_2(T)$; $\xi_2(T)$ holds (ξ_i 's are the coherence lengths of the condensates), i.e. even a single vortex cannot fit inside a superconductor of size $L < \xi_1$ contrary to what is described in [1].

ii) Let us then estimate the parameters ξ_1 and ξ_2 for the TGS and show that for MgB₂ the length ξ_1 is not large enough to neglect JC and observe the BKT-transition. Let the film be parallel to the xy -plane. We assume $e_{xx}^{xy} = \frac{y}{x} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{k_1}{k_2} = \frac{k_1}{k_2}$. These assumptions are valid for MgB₂. The indices $i = 1, 2$ correspond to the x - and y -bands respectively. Neglecting spacial fluctuations of j_i (thin film) and, varying the free energy F with respect to φ_1 and φ_2 , we obtain the equation $\nabla^2 \varphi_i = \sin \varphi_i$, with $\nabla^2 = \nabla_x^2 + \nabla_y^2$, $\nabla_x^2 = \nabla_1^2$, and

$$\nabla_2^2 = \frac{2}{g} \frac{1}{j_1 j_2} \frac{j_1 j_2}{j_1 j_2 + j_2 j_2}; \quad (2)$$

Solving this equation for a vortex-antivortex pair and substituting the solution back into F one can find that for $R > \xi$ the interaction is linear in R . The coupling g is determined through $g = 12N_1 = (11 \ 22 \ 12 \ 21)$, with $11 = 0.81$, $22 = 0.285$, $12 = 0.119$, $21 = 0.09$, $N_2 = N_1 = 1.3$, see [7, 8]. The in-plane coherence lengths $\xi_i(T)$ can be estimated in the dirty limit as $\xi_i(T) = \xi_i^2$, with $\xi_i = 7$ (3) $N_i = 8 \cdot 2T_c^2$ [9] and N_i the density of states. Near critical temperature T_c , $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = 6$ [7]. Using $a_1 a_2 = (a_1 + a_2) < m \inf a_1; a_2 g$, with $a_i = j_i j_i^2$ and substituting the above values for the parameters into (2) we find that $\xi_1 < 1.55 \xi_1(T_{BKT})$ [$\xi_1(T_{BKT}) = T_c$]. Since $T_c = T_{BKT} = T_c$, then $\xi_1(T_{BKT}) = T_c$ and the lengthscale ξ_1 is not large enough. The same conclusion appears for the pure limit [10, 11].

In conclusion, the BKT-physics described in [1] is well-established for layered superconductors [4, 6] but is not applicable to the TGS MgB₂. The results of paragraph

ii) above also apply to Ref. [2] where the BKT-transition of "fractional vortices" is discussed and it is claimed that "it is very likely that in MgB_2 the JC is small". In fact, the JC strength g should be smaller at least by a factor of 10^3 in order to observe the BKT-like crossover in MgB_2 .

2. Experiment. In a recent paper [3] Festin et al. investigate flux noise in MgB_2 films. They observe sharp BKT-transitions and interpret the results in terms of vortices carrying an arbitrary fraction of a flux quantum "discussed in Refs. [1, 2]. Festin et al. claim that their result give support for the presence of fractional vortices and because of this the existence of a BKT transition in comparably thick MgB_2 films". The authors exclude the possibility of the BKT-transition of conventional vortices carrying the flux ϕ_0 . I show that: i) The BKT-transition of "fractional" (pancake) vortices cannot be observed in MgB_2 films; ii) The possibility of the BKT-transition of ordinary vortices cannot be excluded from the experimental data presented in [3].

i) This statement follows from the theoretical analysis presented above, see Section 1.

ii) It is claimed in [3] that "for ordinary Abrikosov vortices, the BKT transition would not be observed experimentally since there is an exponential cut-off in the logarithmic interaction for vortex separations being larger than the effective penetration depth". This statement is incorrect. In fact, in this situation one can observe a sharp BKT-like crossover if $\xi^2(T) = d$ (T), with d the film thickness and (T) the core size of the vortex carrying the flux ϕ_0 , as vortices have enough room to explore the logarithmic interaction. In the whole temperature range (except for temperatures T very close to T_{BKT}) a superconducting sample exhibits critical behavior indistinguishable from the BKT-transition. Only

when the BKT-correlation length $\xi_{BKT}(T)$ becomes of the order of $\xi^2(T) = d$, the transition becomes smeared. For the samples used in the experiment [3] the condition $\xi^2(T_{BKT}) = d \gg \xi(T_{BKT})$ is clearly satisfied since $\xi(T_{BKT}) \ll \xi(T_{BKT})$ and $\xi(T_{BKT}) \ll d$. This indicates that the possibility of the BKT-transition (sharp crossover) of conventional vortices cannot be excluded.

In conclusion, the experimental results [3] cannot be interpreted in terms of the BKT-transition of "fractional" (pancake) vortices and the possibility of the BKT-transition of conventional vortices carrying the flux ϕ_0 cannot be excluded based on the data presented in [3].

The present work was supported by the Packard Foundation.

-
- [1] E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 067001 (2002).
 - [2] E. Babaev, cond-mat/0201547 version 4.
 - [3] O. Festin, P. Svedlindh, W. N. Kang, E. M. Choi, and S.-I. Lee, cond-mat/0303337.
 - [4] J. R. Clem, Phys. Rev. B 43, 7837 (1991).
 - [5] H. Suhl, B. T. Matthias, and L. R. Walker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 3, 552 (1959).
 - [6] S. N. Arsenenko, I. G. Gorkova, and Y. I. Latyshev, JETP Lett. 49, 654 (1989).
 - [7] A. Gurevich, Phys. Rev. B 67, 184515 (2003).
 - [8] A. Y. Liu, I. I. Mazin, and J. Kortus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 087005 (2001).
 - [9] L. P. Gor'kov, Sov. Phys. JETP 37, 998 (1960).
 - [10] B. T. Geilikman, R. O. Zaitsev, and V. Z. Kresin, Sov. Phys. Sol. State 9, 642 (1967).
 - [11] M. E. Zhitomirsky and V. H. Dao, cond-mat/0309372.