

Doping dependence of the superconducting gap in $Tl_2Ba_2CuO_{6+x}$ from heat transport

D. G. Hawthorn,¹ S. Y. Li,¹ M. Sutherland,² Etienne Boaknin,¹ R. W. Hill,¹
 C. Proust,¹ F. Ronning,¹ M. A. Tanatar,¹ John Pierre Paglione,² and Louis Taillefer^{1,3}
¹Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, M5S 1A7

D. Peets, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, and W. N. Hardy
²Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, V6T 1Z4

N. N. Kolesnikov
 Institute of Solid State Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Chernogolovka, Russia
 (Dated: April 14, 2024)

We present low-temperature thermal conductivity measurements on the cuprate $Tl_2Ba_2CuO_{6+x}$ throughout the overdoped regime. In the $T \rightarrow 0$ limit, the thermal conductivity due to d-wave nodal quasiparticles provides a bulk measurement of the superconducting gap, Δ . We find Δ to decrease with increasing doping, with a magnitude consistent with spectroscopic measurements (photoemission and tunneling). This argues for a pure and simple d-wave superconducting state in the overdoped region of the phase diagram, which appears to extend into the underdoped regime down to a hole concentration of $x \approx 0.1$ hole/Cu. As hole concentration is decreased, the gap-to- T_c ratio increases, showing that the suppression of the superconducting transition temperature T_c (relative to the gap) begins in the overdoped regime.

PACS numbers: 74.25.Fy, 74.72.Jt

Over the past decade, low-temperature thermal conductivity has emerged as a powerful probe of the low-energy quasiparticle excitations in the cuprates. Unlike conventional s-wave superconductors, the nodes in the d-wave superconducting order parameter of cuprates lead to a finite quasiparticle density of states at zero energy resulting in "universal" transport in the low-temperature limit ($T \rightarrow 0$).^{1,2} By performing measurements in the $T \rightarrow 0$ limit, the complicated physics of quasiparticle transport in these materials is greatly simplified and meaningful quantitative comparisons between mean-field theories in the self-consistent T-matrix approximation (SCTMA)^{3,4,5} and experiments have been made.^{6,7,8}

In the mean-field theory, the low- T thermal conductivity is proportional to the slope of the gap near the nodes, $\Delta = \Delta_0 \sin(\theta/4)$. By assuming a gap with a simple d-wave form ($\Delta = \Delta_0 \cos(2\theta)$), the gap maximum, Δ_0 , can be inferred from $\Delta = \Delta_0/2$, making thermal conductivity a measure of the superconducting gap. This measure is notable for a number of reasons that make it an excellent complement to more conventional, spectroscopic measurements of the gap. First, it is a very low energy measurement of the gap, the energy scale being set by temperature (and impurity bandwidth, γ). Second, it measures the gap near the nodes (in the $\theta = \pi/4$ direction) as opposed to the antinodes ($\theta = 0$). Finally, thermal conductivity provides a bulk measure of the gap, unlike surface sensitive techniques such as photoemission (ARPES) and tunneling. Together these properties allow one to impose important constraints on the nature of superconductivity in cuprates.

The cuprate $Tl_2Ba_2CuO_{6+x}$ (Tl-2201) is an ideal material for quantitative investigations of d-wave superconductivity in the cuprates. It is a single-layer mate-

rial with $T_c^{\text{max}} \approx 90$ K, comparable to the well-studied cuprates $Bi_2Ba_2CaCu_2O_{8+x}$ (Bi-2212) and $YBa_2Cu_3O_y$ (YBCO). By varying the oxygen concentration, the material can be doped from optimal doping far into the overdoped region of the phase diagram. In this region, the metallic state is well-characterised in terms of a single coherent Fermi surface and there are no indications of competing phases, such as encountered in $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ (LSCO), for example. Moreover, Tl-2201 can be prepared with reasonably low levels of disorder because the dopant atoms are interstitial oxygen residing well away from the CuO_2 planes, instead of the more obtusive cation doping located close to the CuO_2 planes (as in LSCO, for example).

In this paper, we present low-temperature thermal conductivity measurements of Tl-2201 as a function of doping, spanning the overdoped region of the phase diagram. Expanding upon previous work on cuprates,^{1,2,6,7,8} we analyze our results using the mean-field SCTMA theory to provide a determination of the superconducting gap from thermal conductivity. We find agreement between thermal conductivity and spectroscopic measurements of the gap, confirming both the d-wave form of the superconducting gap as well as the validity of the mean-field description of low-temperature thermal conductivity in overdoped Tl-2201. We track the gap as a function of doping throughout the overdoped region and find a gap-to- T_c ratio, $\Delta_0/k_B T_c$, that increases with decreasing doping, starting with a value close to the weak-coupling BCS value ($\Delta_0/k_B T_c = 2.14$) at high doping and reaching a value twice as large near optimal doping ($\Delta_0/k_B T_c = 5-6$). This shows that the suppression of the onset of coherent superconductivity (or T_c) so characteristic of the underdoped regime actually begins above optimal doping.




FIG. 1: (colour online) Thermal conductivity of one Tl-2201 sample, measured at two different hole concentrations, as indicated by the respective T_c values, plotted as κ/T vs T below 1 K. The lines are fits to Eq. 2. A three-fold decrease in T_c corresponds to a six-fold increase in the residual linear term (which is inversely proportional to the superconducting gap, via Eq. 5), hence a two-fold decrease in the gap-to- T_c ratio with doping.

Five flux-grown single crystals of $\text{Tl}_2\text{Ba}_2\text{CuO}_{6+x}$ are used in this study.^{9,10} The platelet samples have approximate length and width of 0.5 mm in the ab-plane and thickness 20–65 μm along the c-axis. The heat current is applied in the ab-plane and the magnetic field along the c-axis. The concentration of holes in the CuO_2 plane, p , is set by tuning the excess oxygen content in the TlO_2 layer. Concentrations between optimal doping and heavily overdoped were achieved by annealing the samples in atmospheres ranging from vacuum ($\sim 5 \times 10^{-7}$ torr) at 500 °C near optimal doping to 50–60 mbar oxygen at 400–480 °C for heavily overdoped samples. The value of p for each sample was estimated from the measured T_c (defined as the temperature at which the electrical resistivity has fallen to zero), using the well-known empirical formula¹¹

$$\frac{T_c}{T_c^{\text{max}}} = 1 - 82.6(p - 0.16)^3; \quad (1)$$

where $T_c^{\text{max}} = 90$ K is taken as the nominal T_c of optimally-doped Tl-2201. The value of T_c and p for each sample is listed in Table I.

Thermal conductivity, κ , was measured down to 50 mK in a dilution refrigerator using a standard 4-wire steady-state technique described elsewhere.⁸ Electrical contacts to the samples were made using evaporated gold pads, which were annealed to improve the contact conductance in the same anneal used to set the oxygen content. Silver wires were then attached to the contact pads using silver paint.




FIG. 2: (colour online) Thermal conductivity of four Tl-2201 samples, each with a different hole concentration, as indicated by their respective T_c values, plotted as κ/T vs T below 1 K. The lines are fits to Eq. 2.

TABLE I: Residual linear term, $\kappa_0 = T$, in the thermal conductivity of Tl-2201, from fits of κ/T vs T to Eq. 2, for five single crystals with hole concentration p estimated from measured T_c . The gap maximum, Δ_0 , is evaluated from $\kappa_0 = T$ using Eq. 5. The error applies to $\kappa_0 = T$, Δ_0 and $\Delta_0 = k_B T_c$.

| T_c (K) | p | $\kappa_0 = T$ (mW K ⁻² cm ⁻¹) | Δ_0 (meV) | $\Delta_0 = k_B T_c$ | error (%) |
|-----------------|-------|--|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| 84 ^a | 0.188 | 0.08 | 40 | 5.6 | 17 |
| 76 | 0.203 | 0.15 | 22 | 3.4 | 16 |
| 72 | 0.209 | 0.14 | 23 | 3.8 | 15 |
| 68 | 0.214 | 0.12 | 28 | 4.8 | 25 |
| 27 | 0.252 | 0.34 | 9.5 | 4.1 | 24 |
| 26 ^a | 0.253 | 0.48 | 6.7 | 3.0 | 17 |

^aD denotes the same sample measured at two dopings.

The largest error in the magnitude of Δ_0 , ranging from 15 to 25 % (see Table I), comes from the measurement of sample dimensions for the appropriate geometric factor. In order to eliminate this dominant source of uncertainty when comparing two different hole concentrations, one of the samples was measured twice with the same contacts, at two different dopings, $T_c = 84$ K and 26 K (see data in Fig. 1). This was achieved by first evaporating gold pads onto the sample and annealing the sample to set the doping, as described above. After measuring the sample, the wires and silver paint were removed, the sample was reannealed to a different doping and subsequently remeasured with the gold pads still in place.

The thermal conductivity measured below 1 K is shown

in Fig. 1 for this sample and in Fig. 2 for four other samples, each at a different doping. To extract the electronic contribution to the data are fitted to

$$\frac{\rho}{T} = \frac{\rho_0}{T} + AT; \quad (2)$$

where ρ_0/T (intercept) is the electronic contribution to the total thermal conductivity and the second term (slope) is the phonon contribution, $\rho_{ph}/T = AT$. The values of ρ_0/T from fits to Eq. 2 are listed in Table I, along with the error bars for each sample, estimated from the statistical error in the fits ($< 1.5\%$) and the error in the geometric factor (15–25%). These results can be compared to a previous study on a strongly overdoped Tl-2201 crystal,⁷ with $T_c = 15$ K, which gave $\rho_0/T = 1.4$ mW K² cm⁻¹ and an excellent fit to Eq. 2.

Note that in these overdoped samples ρ_{ph}/T^2 (over a decade in temperature). This is in contrast to previous reports of the low-temperature thermal conductivity of cuprates, measured typically at or below optimal doping, where $\rho_{ph}/T^{2.5}$,³ consistent with phonons being scattered from the boundaries of the sample.^{1,2,6,8,12,13} In overdoped Tl-2201, with its higher carrier concentration, we attribute the T^2 dependence of ρ_{ph} to dominant electron-phonon scattering, known to yield ρ_{ph}/T^2 at low T in a metal.¹⁴ Smith has shown that this is indeed the theoretically expected dependence of phonon transport in a d-wave superconductor,¹⁵ in the range 0.1–1.0 K. We emphasize that the main results of this paper, which stem from the doping dependence of ρ_0/T , are unaffected by alternative methods to fit ρ_{ph} , such as a power-law with adjustable power ($\rho_{ph} = a + bT$).

The T -linear electronic contribution to ρ is due to transport from d-wave nodal quasiparticles in the limit of $k_B T \ll \rho_0$, where ρ_0 is the impurity band width.^{1,4,5} In this limit, the residual linear term in the thermal conductivity is universal, in the sense that it is independent of scattering rate, and given by⁵

$$\frac{\rho_0}{T} = \frac{k_B^2}{3} \frac{n}{c} \frac{v_F}{v} + \frac{v}{v_F}; \quad (3)$$

where n is the number of CuO₂ planes per unit cell ($= 2$ for Tl-2201) and c is the c -axis lattice constant ($= 23.2$ Å for Tl-2201). The ratio v_F/v is the ratio of quasiparticle velocities normal and tangential to the Fermi surface at the node, respectively given by the Fermi velocity in the (0,0) – (π, π) direction, v_F , and

$$v = \frac{1}{\sim k_F} \frac{d}{d} \bigg|_{\text{node}}; \quad (4)$$

proportional to the slope of the gap at the node. Note that, unique amongst transport properties, ρ_0/T was shown to be robust against both Fermi liquid and vertex corrections.⁵




FIG. 3: (colour online) Upper panel: The gap maximum, Δ_0 , vs hole concentration, p , derived from thermal conductivity measurements on Tl-2201 (circles) and YBCO (square; Refs. 8 and 16). The solid (red) circles denote the same Tl-2201 sample measured at two different doping levels, as discussed in the text. Spectroscopic measurements of the gap from ARPES on Tl-2201 (red down-triangle; Refs. 17 and 9) and YBCO (blue down triangle; Ref. 18) and SIS tunneling on Bi-2212 (black up-triangles; Ref. 19) are also shown. The dashed line gives the BCS doping dependence of the gap based on the measured T_c , namely $\Delta_0 = k_B T_c$, using a strong-coupling value of $\lambda = 3$ and $T_c(p)$ from Eq. 1. Lower panel: The gap-to- T_c ratio, $\Delta_0/k_B T_c$, vs p , for Tl-2201 from thermal conductivity data. The solid (red) line is a fit through the two data points (full red circles) obtained on a single sample, for which the relative uncertainty is minimal ($\sim 3\%$), given the fixed geometric factor. The dashed (red) lines on either side reflect the uncertainty on the absolute value ($\sim 17\%$; see Table I). The horizontal (black) dashed line is the weak-coupling d-wave BCS prediction, namely $\Delta_0/k_B T_c = 2.14$.²⁰

The above formalism, however, is only valid in the limit $k_B T \ll \rho_0$. Before proceeding, it is important to determine whether this criterion is indeed satisfied for our samples, particularly since ρ_0 decreases with increasing doping and eventually goes to zero at the superconductor/metal phase transition.²¹ In the Appendix, we pro-

vide two independent and consistent estimates of Δ_0 for each sample which show that in all cases $\Delta_0 = k_B T_c > 10$ (for $T_c < 1$ K) and $\Delta_0 < 0.16$, validating the use of Eq. 3 for our Tl-2201 samples.

The significance of Eq. 3 is that it provides a reliable way to measure the gap from a rather straightforward measurement of the thermal conductivity. Indeed, through Eqs. 3 and 4, the slope of the gap at the node, $\Delta_0 = \Delta_{\text{node}}$, is immediately obtained from $\Delta_0 = T_c$, provided v_F and k_F are known.^{6,8} Making the assumption that Δ has the standard $d_{x^2-y^2}$ form $\Delta(\theta) = \Delta_0 \cos(2\theta)$, Eq. 3 can be rewritten (for $v_F = v$) as

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{T_c} = \frac{k_B^2 n}{6 c} k_F \frac{v_F}{v} : \quad (5)$$

$\Delta_0 = T_c$ can thus be related in a straightforward fashion to the gap maximum, Δ_0 , by making use of the fact that v_F and k_F at the nodes are approximately doping independent. ARPES measurements²² have shown v_F to be independent of both doping and material and to have a value $v_F = 2.7 \times 10^7$ cm/s. Measurements of the Fermi surface by ARPES in LSCO²³, Bi-2212²⁴ and Tl-2201¹⁷, show k_F to have a value 0.7 \AA^{-1} along the nodal direction $(0,0) - (\pi, 0)$, essentially independent of material or doping (k_F only has significant doping dependence along $(0,0) - (0, \pi)$). In overdoped Tl-2201, this value of k_F was nicely confirmed by bulk sensitive angular magnetoresistance oscillation (AMRO) measurements.²⁵ The values of Δ_0 obtained for our Tl-2201 samples from Eq. 5 are listed in Table I, and plotted vs p in the top panel of Fig. 3. Also shown is the value of Δ_0 for an ultra-pure overdoped YBCO crystal,^{8,16} obtained in the same way (with $\Delta_0 = T_c = 0.16 \text{ mW K}^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-1}$) { it is in excellent quantitative agreement with the Tl-2201 data.

Δ_0 decreases with increasing doping and follows the doping dependence of the gap measured by spectroscopic probes such as tunneling^{19,26} and ARPES²⁷. In Figure 3 we also plot the doping dependence of Δ_0 in Bi-2212 measured using SIS tunneling¹⁹ and find good quantitative agreement with Δ_0 measured by thermal conductivity,²⁸ similar to previous work on optimally doped Bi-2212.⁶ Comparing directly to measurements on Tl-2201, recent ARPES measurements give $\Delta_0 \approx 12$ meV and $\Delta_0 \approx 24$ meV in samples with $T_c = 30$ K and 74 K respectively^{9,17} which is also in favorable agreement with thermal conductivity. (Δ_0 here is taken as the average of two commonly used measures of Δ_0 ; the peak position and the leading-edge midpoint, which are 17 meV (33 meV) and 8 meV (15 meV), respectively, for $T_c = 30$ K (74 K).)

The agreement between the different measures of Δ has important implications. First, it provides further compelling evidence for coherent nodal quasiparticle excitations that are correctly described by mean-field d-wave quasiparticle theory throughout the overdoped region of the phase diagram. Secondly, the fact that the gap derived from thermal conductivity (i.e. from low-energy

nodal quasiparticles) agrees well with the gap maximum derived from tunneling or ARPES (determined from anti-nodal quasiparticles at higher energies) suggests that the gap structure (as a function of angle) is not very different from the simple d-wave gap assumed in our analysis ($\Delta_0 \cos(2\theta)$). This places limits on any subdominant order parameter that may exist in the bulk. Subdominant order parameters that result in a fully gapped nodal region (such as s or id) are limited to having a magnitude much less than the impurity bandwidth,²⁹ which is estimated to be on the order of $\Delta_0 = 10$ in our Tl-2201 samples (see Appendix). An even more stringent restriction is provided by the YBCO measurements, where, in crystals of the highest quality, Δ can be orders of magnitude smaller than in Tl-2201.^{8,16} These conclusions are in agreement with the phase-sensitive tricrystal experiments, which show $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry of the order parameter and no signature of a subdominant imaginary contribution to the superconducting order parameter away from optimal doping.³⁰ (Note that a real component³¹ is allowed.)

The gap-to- T_c ratio, $\Delta_0 = k_B T_c$, is plotted vs p in Figure 3. Δ_0 is seen to decrease with increasing doping from a strong-coupling BCS value of $\Delta_0 = 5-6$ near optimal doping towards the weak-coupling value of $\Delta_0 = 2.14$ at high doping. This trend is made compelling by comparing measurements on the same sample at two different dopings (solid red circles), for which the relative uncertainty is small. Indeed for sample a (see Table I), drops by a factor 1.9 (from 5.6 to 3.0) when the doping is increased from $p = 0.19$ ($T_c = 84$ K) to $p = 0.25$ ($T_c = 26$ K).

Having established how the superconducting gap grows with decreasing doping in the overdoped regime of the phase diagram, it is natural to ask how it continues to evolve below optimal doping, into the enigmatic underdoped regime. Heat transport measurements on YBCO have shown that $\Delta_0 = T_c$ decreases monotonically, at least down to $p \approx 0.1$.^{8,32,33} Based on Eq. 5, this was interpreted in terms of a gap that keeps on rising as p is reduced.⁸ Note, however, that recent measurements of the in-plane resistivity in the (field-induced) normal state of YBCO reveal a "metal-insulator" crossover at $p \approx 0.09$.³⁴ One should not expect the standard BCS analysis (leading to Eq. 3) to apply below that crossover. (The same situation was encountered in LSCO,⁸ setting in at a considerably higher doping since the "metal-insulator" crossover in that system is at $p \approx 0.17$.³⁵) The crossover to a non-metallic normal state may account for the qualitative change observed in the behaviour of $\Delta_0 = T_c$ when p is reduced to 5-6%, where it becomes independent of both doping and magnetic field.³⁶ This overall evolution of $\Delta_0 = T_c$ vs p in YBCO is corroborated by recent ARPES measurements on Bi-2212, which show the gap near the nodes to have comparable magnitude and to rise with decreasing p until $p \approx 0.08$, and then fall abruptly.³⁷

In conclusion, we have measured the doping depen-

dence of the low-temperature thermal conductivity in the overdoped cuprate Tl-2201. Analyzing the magnitude of $\kappa_0 = T$ using mean-field theory, we show quantitative agreement between the slope of the gap at the nodes from thermal conductivity and spectroscopic measurements of the gap maximum at the antinodes in overdoped cuprates. These measurements provide further confirmation of the applicability of mean-field SCTMA transport theory in the cuprates, and more generally the basic description of overdoped cuprates as d-wave superconductors. As a function of reduced doping, the gap-to- T_c ratio increases by nearly a factor 2 from $p = 0.25$ to $p = 0.19$. This reveals that the strong suppression of phase coherence (or T_c) characteristic of the underdoped regime, presumably caused by a combination of pair-breaking and phase fluctuations, in fact begins in the overdoped region, at least as high as $p \sim 0.2$, perhaps higher.

APPENDIX A: ESTIMATES OF THE IMPURITY BANDWIDTH

In this Appendix we estimate the impurity bandwidth, Γ , using two approaches: from the normal state transport and from the magnetic field dependence of $\kappa_0 = T$ in the superconducting state. Both approaches yield similar values of Γ which in all samples satisfy the two criteria for the validity of a "universal" limit analysis, namely Γ_0 and T_c .

1. From normal state transport

First, we estimate Γ from the normal state quasiparticle scattering rate, Γ_N . Because the normal state of our samples could not be reached with the magnetic field available in our lab (15 T), we turn to a previous study⁷ on a crystal with a similar quality but significantly lower T_c (higher doping), namely (15 K). In that crystal, Γ_N was estimated from $\Gamma_N = T$ to be 0.52 meV.⁷ Using this value as representative of Γ_N in our samples, we can estimate an upper bound on Γ via the relation $\Gamma \leq 0.63 \Gamma_N$, valid in the unitarity limit (which yields the largest Γ for a given value of Γ_N).³⁸ These estimates are listed in Table II, based on the κ_0 values of Table I. One can see that $\Gamma \leq k_B T > 13$ for $T < 1$ K and $\Gamma \leq \kappa_0 \sim 0.1$ in all cases, more precisely ranging from 0.07 to 0.16. When Γ is not negligible, there is a known correction to Eq. 3 (and Eq. 5), which for $\Gamma \leq \kappa_0 \sim 0.1$ is about 20%,³⁹ i.e. the clean-limit gap value is 20% larger than estimated using Eq. 5. An error of this magnitude has little impact on the conclusions of this article.

TABLE II: Estimates of the impurity bandwidth, Γ , from the normal state scattering rate $\Gamma_N = 0.52$ meV, in the unitarity limit.

| T_c (K) | p | Γ_N (meV) | κ_0 (meV) | $\Gamma = \kappa_0$ |
|-----------|-------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 84 | 0.188 | 2.6 | 40 | 0.065 |
| 76 | 0.203 | 2.0 | 22 | 0.088 |
| 72 | 0.209 | 2.0 | 23 | 0.085 |
| 68 | 0.214 | 2.2 | 28 | 0.078 |
| 27 | 0.252 | 1.3 | 9.5 | 0.134 |
| 26 | 0.253 | 1.1 | 6.7 | 0.16 |

2. From the magnetic field dependence of $\kappa_0 = T$

As a crosscheck, we can also make use of the magnetic field dependence of the thermal conductivity in the T ! 0 limit to estimate Γ in our samples. Unlike the zero-field thermal conductivity, which is independent of Γ , the field dependence of the thermal conductivity is dependent upon the quasiparticle scattering rate.^{40,41} In a d-wave superconductor $\kappa_0 = T$ increases with an applied magnetic field due to the Volovik effect⁴² and in optimally doped cuprates^{13,41,43} the thermal conductivity is well described by semi-classical calculations of the field dependence of $\kappa_0 = T$ based on the Volovik effect.^{40,44}




FIG. 4: (colour online) Thermal conductivity in an applied magnetic field ($H = c$) for the Tl-2201 sample with $T_c = 76$ K, plotted as $\kappa(T)$ vs T . $\kappa_0 = T$ increases by a factor of 3 in an applied field of 11.5 T. The lines are fits to Eq. 2. Inset: The in-field electronic thermal conductivity $\kappa_0(H) = T$ normalized to the zero-field value $\kappa_0(0) = T$ as a function of magnetic field in a Tl-2201 sample with $T_c = 89$ K (not used in the main study). The solid line is a fit to the semi-classical model (Eq. A1), which yields $\Gamma = 0.1$ (see text).

An analytic model of $\kappa_0(H) = T$ for $H \ll H_{c2}$ and $J \gg \Gamma$ by Kubert and Hirschfeld⁴⁰ gives:

$$\frac{\kappa_0(H) = T}{\kappa_0(0) = T} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\Gamma^2}{\sinh^2 \Gamma}}; \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\epsilon_0 = T$ is the universal value in zero field (Eq. 3) and (for $H > H_H$)

$$\frac{\epsilon_0}{H} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{H_H} = E_H : \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

Here $E_H = \frac{\epsilon_0}{H} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{H_H} = E_H$ is the average energy shift experienced by a quasiparticle due to the Volovik effect, a is a constant dependent upon the geometry of the vortex lattice ($= 1/2$ for a square lattice⁴⁵) and ϵ_0 is the quantum of flux. Note that aside from ϵ_0 , Eq. A1 is only dependent upon known constants. As such, we can estimate ϵ_0 from a single parameter fit to the field dependence of $\epsilon_0 = T$ at $H = H_{c2}$.

In Figure 4, we show $\epsilon_0 = T$ vs T for the Tl-2201 sample with $T_c = 76$ K, in $H = 0$ T and 11.5 T. We see that $\epsilon_0 = T$ is enhanced by a factor 3 or so. Similar field-induced enhancements of $\epsilon_0 = T$ are observed in all samples, by a factor which varies from 2 to 4.⁴⁶ In the inset, we show $\epsilon_0(H) = T$ (normalized to $\epsilon_0(0) = T$) vs H in a separate Tl-2201 sample ($T_c = 89$ K).⁴⁷ Eq. A1 provides a reasonable fit (solid line) to the data, giving $H = 3.36 T^{1/2}$,

which results in $\epsilon_0 = 3.8$ meV, so that $\epsilon_0 = 0.1$. This is similar in magnitude to our above estimate from normal state transport, providing a non-trivial validation for both methods of estimating ϵ_0 .

We conclude that within possible corrections on the order of 20% or so, it is legitimate to use Eqs. 3 and 5 to extract an estimate of ϵ_0 from a measurement of $\epsilon_0 = T$ in the Tl-2201 samples considered here.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank K. Behnia, J. Carbotte, A. Damascelli, A. Millis, M. Smith, A. M. Tremblay and J. Wei for stimulating discussions. This work was supported by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research and funded by a Canada Research Chair, the Walter Sumner Foundation, the Canadian Foundation for Innovation and the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

Present address: Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

^y Present address: Département de physique and RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada.

^z Present address: Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K.

^x Present address: Department of Physics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada.

[†] Present address: Laboratoire National des Champs Magnétiques Pulsés, Toulouse, France.

Present address: Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, USA.

^{yy} Present address: Département de physique and RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada; Permanent address: Inst. Surf. Chem., N.A.S. Ukraine.

^{zz} Present address: Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA.

^{xx} Electronic address: Louis.Taillefer@Usherbrooke.ca; Present address: Département de physique and RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada

¹ L. Taillefer, B. Lussier, R. Gagnon, K. Behnia, and H. Aubin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 483 (1997).

² S. Nakamae, K. Behnia, L. Balicas, F. Rullier-Abenque, H. Berger, and T. Tamegai, Phys. Rev. B 63, 184509 (2001).

³ P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 1887 (1993).

⁴ M. J. G. Raf, S.-K. Yip, J. A. Sauls, and D. Rainer, Phys. Rev. B 53, 15147 (1996).

⁵ A. C. Durst and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 62, 1270 (2000).

⁶ M. Chiao, R. W. Hill, C. Lupien, L. Taillefer, P. Lambert, R. Gagnon, and P. Fournier, Phys. Rev. B 62, 3554 (2000).

⁷ C. Proust, E. Boaknin, R. W. Hill, L. Taillefer, and A. P. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 147003 (2002).

⁸ M. Sutherland, D. G. Hawthorn, R. W. Hill, F. Ronning, S. Wakimoto, H. Zhang, C. Proust, E. Boaknin,

C. Lupien, L. Taillefer, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, R. Gagnon, N. E. Hussey, T. Kimura, M. Nohara, and H. Takagi, Phys. Rev. B 67, 174520 (2003).

⁹ D. C. Peets, J. D. F. Mottershead, B. Wu, I. S. Elmov, R. Liang, W. N. Hardy, D. A. Bonn, M. Raudsepp, N. J. C. Ingle, and A. Damascelli, New J. Phys. 9, 28 (2007).

¹⁰ N. N. Kolesnikov, M. P. Kulakov, I. F. Schegolev, R. P. Shibaeva, O. M. Vyasilev, V. N. Molchanov, V. I. Simonov, and R. A. Tamazyan, Physica C 242, 385 (1995).

¹¹ M. P. Resland, J. Tallon, R. Buckley, R. Liu, and N. F. Lower, Physica C 176, 95 (1991).

¹² J. Takeya, Y. Ando, S. Komiyama, and X. F. Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 077001 (2002).

¹³ D. G. Hawthorn, R. W. Hill, C. Proust, F. Ronning, M. Sutherland, E. Boaknin, C. Lupien, M. A. Tanatar, J. Paglione, S. Wakimoto, H. Zhang, L. Taillefer, T. Kimura, M. Nohara, H. Takagi, and N. E. Hussey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 197004 (2003).

¹⁴ W. H. Butler and R. K. Williams, Phys. Rev. B 18, 6483 (1978).

¹⁵ M. F. Smith, Phys. Rev. B 72, 052511 (2005).

¹⁶ R. W. Hill, C. Lupien, M. Sutherland, E. Boaknin, D. G. Hawthorn, C. Proust, F. Ronning, L. Taillefer, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, and W. N. Hardy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 027001 (2004).

¹⁷ M. Plate, J. D. F. Mottershead, I. S. Elmov, D. C. Peets, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, S. Chirizbaian, M. Falub, M. Shi, L. Patthey, and A. Damascelli, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 077001 (2005).

¹⁸ K. Nakayama, T. Sato, K. Terashima, H. Matsui, T. Takahashi, M. Kubota, K. Ono, T. Nishizaki, Y. Takahashi, and N. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. B 75, 014513 (2006).

¹⁹ N. Miyakawa, J. F. Zasadzinski, L. Ozyuzer, P. Gupta, D. G. Hinks, C. Kendziora, and K. E. Gray, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1018 (1999).

²⁰ H. Won and K. Maki, Phys. Rev. B 49, 1397 (1994).

- ²¹ Assuming unitary impurity scattering, $\rho_0 = \rho_0 / \sqrt{1 - \rho_0}$.³⁸ Thus, as ρ_0 is driven to zero with increasing doping, the samples are by necessity driven into the limit $\rho_0 \rightarrow 1$ as $\rho_0 \rightarrow 0$.
- ²² X. J. Zhou, T. Yoshida, A. Lanzara, P. V. Bogdanov, S. A. Kellar, K. M. Shen, W. L. Yang, F. Ronning, T. Sasagawa, T. Kakeshita, T. Noda, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, C. T. Lin, F. Zhou, J. W. Xiong, W. X. Ti, Z. X. Zhao, A. Fujimori, Z. Hussain, and Z. X. Shen, *Nature* 423, 398 (2003).
- ²³ A. Ino, C. K. In, M. Nakamura, T. Yoshida, T. Mizokawa, A. Fujimori, Z. X. Shen, T. Kakeshita, H. Eisaki, and S. Uchida, *Phys. Rev. B* 65, 094504 (2000).
- ²⁴ H. Ding, M. R. Norman, T. Yokoya, T. Takeuchi, M. Randieria, J. C. Camuzano, T. Takahashi, T. Motohiku, and K. Kadowaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78, 2628 (1997).
- ²⁵ N. E. Hussey, M. Abdel-Jawad, A. Carrington, A. P. Mackenzie, and L. Balicas, *Nature* 425, 814 (2003).
- ²⁶ C. Renner, B. Revaz, J.-Y. Genoud, K. Kadowaki, and O. Fischer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 80, 149 (1998).
- ²⁷ P. J. White, Z. X. Shen, C. K. In, J. M. Harris, A. G. Loeser, P. Fournier, and A. Kapitulnik, *Phys. Rev. B* 54, R15669 (1996).
- ²⁸ It should be cautioned that there is considerable scatter in the collected gap values available in literature from various techniques and groups, not shown here for the sake of clarity. This scatter is likely due to sample quality issues and variance in the modeling procedures used to determine ρ_0 and doping, p. For a representative compilation of ρ_0 see a review of the pseudogap by Timusk and Statt⁴⁸.
- ²⁹ V. P. Gusynin and V. A. Miransky, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 37, 363 (2004).
- ³⁰ C. C. Tsuei, J. R. Kirtley, G. Hamerl, J. Mannhart, H. R. A. y, and Z. Z. Li, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 93, 187004 (2004).
- ³¹ J. R. Kirtley, C. C. Tsuei, A. Ariando, C. J. M. Verweij, S. Harkema, and H. Hilgenkamp, *Nature Physics* 2, 190 (2006).
- ³² X. F. Sun, K. Segawa, and Y. Ando, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 93, 107001 (2004).
- ³³ M. Sutherland, S. Li, D. Hawthorn, R. Hill, F. Ronning, M. Tanatar, J. Paglione, H. Zhang, L. Taillefer, J. DeBenedictis, R. Liang, D. Bonn, and W. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 94, 147004 (2005).
- ³⁴ C. Proust, L. Taillefer, M. Sutherland, N. Doiron-Leyraud, D. LeBoeuf, J. Levallois, M. Nardone, H. Zhang, N. E. Hussey, S. Adachi, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, and W. N. Hardy, to be published.
- ³⁵ G. S. Boebinger, Y. Ando, A. Passner, T. Kimura, M. Okuya, J. Shimoyama, K. Kishio, K. Tamasaku, N. Ichikawa, and S. Uchida, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 5417 (1996).
- ³⁶ N. Doiron-Leyraud, M. Sutherland, S. Y. Li, L. Taillefer, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, and W. N. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 97, 207001 (2006).
- ³⁷ K. Tanaka, W. S. Lee, D. H. Lu, A. Fujimori, T. Fujii, R. Isidiana, I. Terasaki, D. J. Scalapino, T. P. Devereaux, Z. Hussain, and Z. X. Shen, *Science* 314, 1910 (2006).
- ³⁸ P. J. Hirschfeld and N. Goldenfeld, *Phys. Rev. B* 48, R4219 (1993).
- ³⁹ Y. Sun and K. Maki, *Europhys. Lett.* 32, 355 (1995).
- ⁴⁰ C. Kubert and P. J. Hirschfeld, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 80, 4963 (1998).
- ⁴¹ M. Chiao, R. W. Hill, C. Lupien, B. Popic, R. Gagnon, and L. Taillefer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 2943 (1999).
- ⁴² G. E. Volovik, *JETP Lett.* 58, 469 (1993).
- ⁴³ H. Aubin, K. Behnia, S. Ooi, and T. Tamagai, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 624 (1999).
- ⁴⁴ I. Vekhter and A. Houghton, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83, 4626 (1999).
- ⁴⁵ N. Hussey, *Advances in Physics* 51, 1685 (2002).
- ⁴⁶ D. G. Hawthorn, Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto (2005).
- ⁴⁷ This sample, while suitable for relative measurements of $\rho_0(H)=T$, has an irregular geometry that does not allow for an accurate determination of the absolute value of $\rho_0=T$.
- ⁴⁸ T. Timusk and B. Statt, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 62, 61 (1999).