## Reply to the comment by D.G orokhov cond-mat/0502083

E. Babaev

Laboratory for Atom ic and Solid State Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-2501, USA Department of Physics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway

We show that the recent comment by D.G orokhov, is based on physically obvious errors and m is understandings of the content of the criticized papers and is readily refuted. We show that 1) In our paper [1] there were considered situations of both strong and weak interband coupling regimes. 2) In the ref [1] it was given a wide range of physical systems with Josephson coupling strength ranging from very strong to being exactly zero on symmetry grounds. 3) While the ref [1] is not a phenom enological study of M gB<sub>2</sub>, the moderately strong Josephson coupling results of [1] apply to M gB<sub>2</sub>: the described in [1] double-core vortices have been recently observed in M gB<sub>2</sub>.

The rst remark we would like to make is that the C omment is unfortunately based on a misunderstanding of a point which was stressed in all our papers: that in two-band superconductors U (1) U (1) symmetry is strictly forbidden because condensates are not independently conserved and are coupled by Josephson term. The BKT transition of the type discussed in [1,2] could not exist in principle in two-band superconductors. Specic c systems with a true U (1) U (1) symmetry (i.e. without Josephson coupling) were proposed in [1, 2]. A di erent story is indeed a possibility of occurrence in in Josephson coupled systems of nite size BKT-like crossovers (a study announced in [1] as the second paper in ref. [18]), we shall remark on it below.

Another m isunderstanding on which the comment is based is an assumption that even parts of the paper dealing with U (1) U (1) sym metry and zero Josephson term were devoted to M gB $_2$ . In [1] we considered all general situations ranging from condensates with strong interband coupling to multicom ponent condensates where interband Josephson coupling is forbidden. The paper [1] was not in any respect a phenom enological study of M  $qB_2$ , (M  $qB_2$  was listed among many other examples of weakly and strongly coupled two-gap superconductors) how ever the moderate Josephson-coupling results in [1] are indeed relevant for M gB<sub>2</sub>. In particular double-core integer ux vortices (a linearly bound state of two cocentered fractional vortices, i.e. type-\(ii)" described on the page 3 of [1]) were indeed observed in M  $qB_2$  [4]. Therefore the potential applicability of the results of [1] to M gB<sub>2</sub> mentioned in the abstract turned out to be correct. W hen we considered zero or weak Josephson coupling lim its in [1, 2] we listed the system s where it is the case like projected superconducting states of light atom s under extrem e pressure, certain states of spintriplet superconductors as well as Josephson-suppressed bilayer system s.

The technical side of the C om m ent is a substitution of the wellknown numbers characterizing interband Josephson coupling from ref. [7] to the equations in [1], all the equations in the comment can be found in [1] but simply in a di erent notation. Therefore nothing new in this respect is revealed. That is, in particular G orokhov asserts: (A). 'nite coupling  $g \in 0$  generates a new length scale ; for R & vortex {anti-vortex pairs attract with a potential linear in R and thus exhibit con nem ent, i.e., the BKT-transition is quenched.' (B). However, if

is much larger than the vortex core size, a BKT-like crossover sm eared on the scale can still be observed', Response for A): The \linear" interaction of Josephson vortices has indeed been discussed in [1]: the length scale has been also discussed but merely in di erent notations being called \the inverse m ass for  $n_1 \mod po$ nent of the unit vector n". The fact that in the presence of the Josephson e ect we have sine-Gordon vortices is discussed in detail in the paper (e.g. second page, left colum n). In particular it was written on the large Josephson coupling lim it: ... the energy per unit length of noncom posite vortices is divergent in an in nite sample both in cases of zero and nonzero Josephson coupling (in case of nite a vortex creates a dom ain wall which makes its energy per unit length divergent in in nite sample ... R esponse for B): The e ect that even in a presence of nite Josephson coupling there is a length scale where the BKT transition-like crossover can be observed is also m entioned brie y in conclusion though conditions for disappearance of the BKT transition were not discussed because the case for nite- was reserved for a separate paper (second paper cited as Ref.[13] in [1]): Moreover the BKT transition in a system of these vortices should be observable even in a type-I system both in the limits = 0, is large, where one has sine-G ordon vortices and when interacting with a linear potential [13] (in the later case we apparently speak about a nite size crossover). Here we stress that Josephson coupling is a singular perturbation any amount of it eliminates a true BKT transition, a question of the observation of nite size-crossovers in an experiment is more complicated than what was assum ed in [3] and depends on type of experim ental probe and requires stricter criteria. Because we do not consider nite-size crossovers of much interest, this question will not be detailed here.

A remark on the point i in the comment: As mentioned above in the paper [1] we considered di erent lim - its, in particular solutions for vortex in a general case of zero Josephson coupling, also there was given a criterion L < when in a general system (whether it is a superconductor or layered system) Josephson coupling can beneglected in the whole sample (where L is the sampledimension and is the Josephson length). This sort ofcriteria is indeed applicable to a sample which is largecompared to other length scales in the problem. System swhere it is the case were listed before going to this lim itin [1] with no M qB<sub>2</sub> mentioned in the list.

A lso indeed [1] does not feature absurd statem ents that coherence, penetration and Josephson lengths \can be chosen arbitrarily for every superconductor" and that \one can t vortices in sample smaller than coherence length" which were attributed in the C om m ent to [1] for unclear reasons.

W e note that indeed [1] was not a phenom enological study of M gB<sub>2</sub> in any respect, rather oppositely: albeit essential physics of the Josephson coupled superconductivity discussed in [1] applies to M gB<sub>2</sub>, it is in fact one of the least interesting applications of the questions discussed in [1]. W e also rem ark that in recent years there appeared m ore physical system s which were proposed either to be two-gap superconductors or nonsuperconducting system s where U (1) U (1) sym m etry appears as an e ective description [8].

In the Comment it is also claimed that the BKT transition physics in [1, 2] is \wellestablished" and experimentally observed in layered systems [5, 6]. First the sim ilarities with layered system physics were discussed in [1, 2], second the di erences between layered (spatially separated) condensates and two-gap superconductors are apparent, for example the form er case is not described by the extended Faddeev m odel in [1] because of the spatial separation. Third, the ux carried by a vortex in one layer in a system of N identical layers [5] is a function of layer thickness, penetration length and distance to surface. It should not be confused with the ux quantization in a general two-gap superconductors with arbitrary ratio of spatially nonseparated condensates given by eq. (5) in [1]. A more important circum stance is that the phase transition and the experim ental probe in [6] have little to do with the transition considered in [1, 2]. That is, we did not consider a superconducting transition, our point was a separation of variables in general case and identi cation of a state with quasi-long-range order in phase di erence which was discussed explicitly in [2]. In layered systems (connection to which was indeed made in [1, 2]) such a transition is related to dissipationless oppositely directed supercurrents belonging to two layers. For layered superconductors a proposal for concrete counter ow experiment and corresponding calculations were done only this year [? ] and no experim ental conmation of this transition has been yet reported.

Regarding the criticism of the experimental paper by Festin et. al. The comment  $[\beta]$  also features

criticism of the experimental paper by Festin et.al. This discussion is also based on physically obvious errors and in part on attribution to [10] claim swhich were not made there. Festin et. al. never claim ed that for Abrikosov vortices BKT -like crossover (not a transition indeed) cannot be observed but in fact they are the authors of a PRL paper where such a crossover was observed Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 5567 (1999). In the cond-m at/0303337 the observation by Festin at. al. is di erent: they observed that a relative sharpness of crossover in very thick M gB<sub>2</sub> lm s was unexpectedly much narrower than that in much thinnerYBCO Im swhich reasonably led to a possibility of very weakly coupled bands interpretation in [10]. Later other experim ents and calculations gave opposite picture about which the authors of [10] were well inform ed long time ago. It should be noted that the measurements [10] were done much earlier than the publication of the eprint [10] and back then there was no consensus on interband coupling strength in M  $qB_2$  and in particular there were reasons to expect it being very weak. Interband coupling can vary in a wide range and even can be either positive or negative. M icroscopic origin of possibility of weak interband couplings in two-band system can be found in a num ber of publications including [7, 9]. Detailed duiscussion of vortex physics in M gB<sub>2</sub> can also be found in eg. [9]

The claim in the Comment that if A brikosov vortices have logarithm ic interaction at some nite scale it results in a sharp BKT transition is also based on a physically obvious error: in a charged system a vortex has a niterange interaction and nite energy. Therefore single vortices can be excited by therm al uctuations and an existence of a certain scale of logarithm ic interaction does not lead to a BKT transition. It is a well known exact result that that for one-com ponent system with a gauged U (1) symmetry there is no true sharp BKT transitions and no super uid density jum p. An existence of ill-de ned BKT crossovers is indeed possible but that was not denied by Festin et. al. In fact, as mentioned above such questions were studied in their previous publications. Besides that Festin et. al. studied granular samples (which were essentially Josephson junctions arrays) and any serious discussion of the multiple peaks experiment [10] should take into accout this circum stance rst of all.

On a separate note we would like to remark on a question of observability of fractional ux in a situation of nonzero Josephson coupling. A very large ratio of the coherence length to the Josephson length noticed in [3] after substituting numbers from [7] to corresponding equations is an apparent consequence of being extrem ely close to  $T_c$  taking into account temperature dependence of and . This particular point not only does not adequately characterizes strength of interband coupling of any material in full range of temperatures but it also does not invalidate a possibility to observe split fractional vortices in principle. Besides BKT transitions there is a number of

other possibilities to induce vortices, one such a possibility is to exploit duality to Faddeev-Skym e model which is robust against Josephson term perturbation and there are situations when Faddeev-Skym e term can provide a repulsive force between two vortices with phase windings in only one order parameter (details can be found in Appendix)

Sum m ary of points:

1. Gorokhov asserts that [1] is a study of M gB<sub>2</sub> and fractional vortices in the lim it of zero or weak Josephson coupling. A nsw er: There were considered both lim its of weak and strong and zero Josephson coupling in a general two-gap G inzburg-Landau functional, it was shown that in strong Josephson coupling regime vortices are con ned linearly. Examples of a range of system s with weak or zero Josephson coupling were given.

2. A lbeit in [1] a phenom enological discussion of M gB<sub>2</sub> was not even attempted how everm oderate coupling lim it considered in the paper is applicable to M gB<sub>2</sub>, in particular double-core integer ux vortices described in [1] were later observed in [4]. Therefore potential applicability to M gB<sub>2</sub> mentioned in the abstract of [1] turned out to be correct.

A ppendix So the question is: if a G inzburg-Landau model exists with a m derately strong Josephson term (e.g. just strong enough to forbid the BKT mechanism for therm alcreation of pairs of fractional vortices), could it nonetheless possess fractional vortices as spatially separated topological excitations? The answer is positive: in our papers the variables were separated in general case and in we have shown in [11] that if to go beyond the London limit, two-gap superconductor has a selfinduced Faddeev-Skyme term, which counter-balances Josephson term in the circum stances discussed below : If we go beyond London lim it and consider the order param eter n [11], we observe that the model also adm its \baby" Skym ions [12] which are topological defects of the R<sup>2</sup> ! S<sup>2</sup>  $_{\rm H}$  ap characterized by topological charge  $deg[n] = 1 = 4 d^2 x n Q n Q_2 n$ . The addition of mass terms like the Josephson term  ${}^{2}$ K n<sub>1</sub> [1] is a necessary condition for the existence of stable baby skym ions, which in the absence of mass terms for n diverges [12] (there is also a mass term for  $n_3$  coming from G inzburg-Landau potential [11]). Despite in terms of the variable n, a baby Skymion is a coreless object, however the

situation is actually more complicated because the order parameter  $n = (\sin \cos(1 2); \sin \sin(1 2); \cos)$ is de ned with the help of the angle given by:  $j_{1,2}j =$  $\left[\frac{1}{2m_{1}}\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\right);\frac{1}{2m_{2}}\cos\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right]$ . Thus north and south poles of the order parameter space S<sup>2</sup> correspond to zero of the condensates  $j_1$  j and  $j_2$  j in physical space. Thus a baby skym ion in two-gap superconductor makes physical space multiply connected and one must im pose singlevaluedness condition: around zeroes of j 1;2 j the phases 1;2 should change 2 times integer. In [13] we show that, for a defect with a given H opf invariant, the winding of (1 2), specied by the Hopf invariant, is consistent with singlevaluedness conditions only when one has the following phase windings around these lines of zeroes:  $(_i = 2; _i = 0)$ . This condition leads to a nontrivial con guration of the eld C [13]; thus in a baby Skymion of  $R^2$  !  $S^2$  map, preimages of north and south poles of  $S^2$  are the fractional vortices. So, a baby Skymion in a TGS, in a simplest case em its two fractional vortices like that considered in [1]. These fractional vortices attract each other; how ever the attraction is counterbalanced by the Faddeev-Skyme term which provides a repulsive force [11].

- [1] E.Babaev, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89, 067001 (2002).
- [2] E. Babaev NuclPhys. B 686 397 (2004) [condmat/0201547]
- [3] D.Gorokhov, cond-m at/0502083.
- [4] M Eskilsen et.al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 187003 (2002)
- [5] J.R.Clem, Phys.Rev.B 43, 7837 (1991).
- [6] S.N.Artem enko et al, JETP Lett. 49, 654 (1989).
- [7] A.Gurevich, Phys. Rev. B 67, 184515 (2003).
- Y. Matsunaga, M. Ichioka, and K. Machida Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 157001 (2004), H. G. Luo, T. Xiang Phys. Rev.Lett. 94, 027001 (2005), O. Motrunich and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B 70, 075104 (2004).
- [9] M.E.Zhitom insky, V.H.Dao Phys. Rev. B 69, 054508 (2004)
- [10] O rjan Festin, Peter Svedlindh, W N.K ang, Eun-M iChoi, Sung-Ik Lee cond-m at/0303337
- [11] Egor Babaev, Ludvig D. Faddeev, Antti J. Niemi PhysRev.B65 (2002) 100512
- [12] B.Piette et. al. Nucl. Phys. B 439 204 (1995)
- [13] to be published.