Triplet superconducting pairing and density-wave instabilities in organic conductors

J. C. Nickel, 1,2 R. Duprat, 1 C. Bourbonnais, 1 and N. Dupuis 2,3

¹Regroupem ent Quebecois sur les Materiaux de Pointe, Departem ent de physique,
Universite de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, J1K-2R1

²Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, CNRS UMR 8502, Universite Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay, France

³Departm ent of Mathematics, Imperial College, 180 Queen's Gate, London SW 7 2AZ, UK

(Dated: March 23, 2024)

U sing a renorm alization group approach, we determ ine the phase diagram of an extended quasione-dim ensional electron gas model that includes interchain hopping, nesting deviations and both intrachain and interchain repulsive interactions. We nd a close proximity of spin-density- and charge-density-wave phases, singlet d-wave and triplet f-wave superconducting phases. There is a striking correspondence between our results and recent puzzling experimental ndings in the Bechgaard salts, including the coexistence of spin-density-wave and charge-density-wave phases and the possibility of a triplet pairing in the superconducting phase.

PACS num bers: 71.10 Li,74.20 M n,74.70 K n

Since the discovery of organic superconductivity made in the Bechgaard $(TMTSF)_2X$ salts more than two decades ago [1], the di culty of determ ining the origin of this phase remains one of the main focal points of the physics of low dimensional conductors. The experimentalweight given recently to the hypothesis in favor of a triplet rather than singlet superconducting phase in these com pounds [2, 3, 4, 5], raises the problem of the microscopic conditions that can lead to triplet pairing in correlated quasi-one-dim ensional (quasi-1D) m etals. This problem takes on particular in portance in the Bechgaard salts series for which superconductivity in the phase diagram turns out to be surrounded by dominant spindensity-wave (SDW) correlations as one moves along the pressure, tem perature or the magnetic eld scale [6, 7, 8]. Repulsive intrachain interactions, that are at the root of SDW correlations, are well known to promote unconventional singlet pairing for superconductivity, whenever nesting properties of the quasi-1D Ferm i surface deteriorate under pressure [9]. In the fram ework of the quasi-1D electron gas model with repulsive intrachain interactions, the application of the renormalization group (RG) m ethod, which allows to go beyond mean-eld and RPA like theories, has shown that for su ciently large nesting deviations, the interchain electron pairing mediated by antiferrom agnetic uctuations becom es invariably singular in the singlet interchain 'd-wave' channel [10, 11].

On the other hand, the extent to which weaker but yet present charge uctuations can act in expanding the range of pairing possibilities is much less understood. For repulsive intrachain interactions, it was found from RPA like approaches that charge-density-wave (CDW) uctuations enhance pairing correlations in the triplet Y-wave channel [12], a result that agrees with the Kohn-Luttinger mechanism for high { odd { angular momentum pairing induced by Friedel oscillations in isotropic systems [13]. Recent RG calculations showed, however, that for repulsive intrachain interactions in the quasi-ID case, the in-

terchain Y-wave' correlations always remain subordinate to those of the U-wave' channel [11].

G iven that charges interact through the Coulomb interaction, not only intrachain but also interchain interactions for electrons are present in practice. The key role of interchain Coulomb interaction in the stabilization of a CDW ordered state in most Peierls quasi-1D organic conductors has been made abundantly clear in the past [14, 15, 16]. Their physical relevance in the Bechgaard salts has been borne out by the puzzling observation of a CDW state that actually coexists with SDW [17, 18]. In this Letter we give the sst RG determ ination of the phase diagram for an extended quasi-1D electron gas model that includes interchain hopping, nesting deviations and both intrachain and interchain repulsive interactions. The last interactions turn out to have a sizable im pact on the structure of the phase diagram. Unexpectedly, we nd that for a reasonably small amplitude of interchain interaction the 'd-w ave' superconducting (SC) ordered state is destabilized to the bene t of a triplet Ywave' phase with a similar range of Tc. The latter phase is preceded by dom inant antiferrom agnetic correlations in the norm alphase and by SDW order at small nesting deviations. In these conditions, the SDW state is found to be quite close in stability to a CDW phase.

We consider weakly coupled conducting chains with a quasi-1D electron dispersion $(k_k; k_?)$ $= v_{f}(\dot{x}_{k})$ $2t_{\rm F}^{\rm D}\cos 2k_{\rm P}$, where $v_{\rm F}$ is the longitu-2t cosk? dinal Ferm i velocity. The interchain hopping am plitude to is small with respect to the longitudinal bandwidth 2_{0} , so that the Ferm i surface consists of two warped quasi-1D sheets around $k_k =$ $k_{\!\scriptscriptstyle F}$. The next-nearest neighbor hopping in the transverse direction, t_{ij}^{0} is used to param etrize deviations from perfect nesting, which tend to suppress the SDW instability. We do not consider the small interchain hopping in the third direction, which does not play an important role in our calculation, although its existence is crucial for the stabilization of true long-range order at nite tem perature. Within the fram ework of an extended g-ology model, we write the bare interaction amplitude as (j = 1;2;3)

$$g_{i}(k_{i}^{0};k_{i}^{0};k_{i}^{0};k_{i}^{0};k_{i}^{0};k_{i}^{0}) = g_{i} + 2g_{i}^{2}\cos(k_{i}^{0},k_{i}^{0});$$
 (1)

where $k_{?\;1}$; $k_{?\;2}$ 0 ($k_{?\;1}^0$; $k_{?\;2}^0$) are the transverse mom enta and spins of the two incoming (outgoing) particles. q1 and q2 correspond to backward and forward scattering, respectively, and g3 to longitudinal Um klapp processes with a lattice momentum transfer $G = (4k_F; 0)$. The transverse momentum dependence comes from the nearest-neighbor interchain interactions. Longer range (bare) interactions in the transverse direction are expected to be very weak and are ignored. In this Letter, we consider only the physically relevant case of repulsive interactions $(g_j;g_i^2 > 0)$. For the intrachain interaction constants, we take $g_1 = 0.32$, $g_2 = 0.64$ and $g_3 = 0.02$, which falls into a realistic range of values com patible with various experiments in the Bechgaard salts [7, 9, 19, 20, 21]. The sm all (half-lling) Um klapp process am plitude g3 com es from the slight dim erization along the organic chains [19]. $g_j = g_j = v_F$ and $g_j^? = g_j^? = v_F$ are dim ensionless interaction constants. The bandwidth is taken to be 2 $_0$ = 30t, with t, = 200 K. Since the values of the interchain interaction amplitudes of are poorly known, we take them as free param eters with the only constraint that they remain smaller than the intrachain interaction amplitudes [22]. The latter condition is ful led in most CDW systems [15, 16]. In order to minim ize the number of independent parameters, we restrict the discussion to the case $g_1^2 = g_2^2$ and $g_3^2 = g_3 = g_1^2 = g_1$; this turns out to be su cient to understand the global picture that emerges from our results. These show no qualitative change over a sizable range of intrachain interaction param eters. The key experim ental control param eters are tem perature and pressure. Pressure a ects t_2 , g_1 ; g_1^2 and t_2^0 . However, its main e ect is to increase to and therefore deteriorate the nesting property of the Ferm i surface.

There are di erent ways to implement the RG approach to a quasi-1D system [10,23]. We use the so-called one-particle irreducible (1P I) momentum—shell scheme as developed in Ref. [23]. One-loop RG equations for the two-particle vertices and susceptibilities are solved numerically by dividing the Fermi surface into 2 32 patches. We retain only the k_2 dependence of the (running) couplings $g_j\left(k_{2,1}^0;k_{2,2}^0;k_{2,2};k_{2,1}\right)$. Various instabilities of the normal phase are signaled by the divergence of the corresponding susceptibilities.

For $g_i^2=0$, the phase diagram has already been discussed in Ref. [10]. When the nesting of the Ferm is urface is nearly perfect (small t_i^0), the ground state is a SDW . Above a threshold value of t_i^0 , the low-tem perature SDW instability is suppressed and the ground state becomes a $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave superconducting (SCd) state with an order parameter $_r(k_i)$ / $cosk_i$ [r=+= denotes the




FIG.1: T = 0 phase diagram as a function of t_2^0 = t_2 and g_1^2 = g_2^2 (with g_3^2 = g_3 = g_1^2 = g_1). Circles: SDW, squares: CDW, triangles: SCd ($_r$ (k_2) / $cosk_2$), crosses: SCf ($_r$ (k_2) / $rcosk_2$).




FIG. 2: Transition temperature as a function of $t_2^0 = t_2$ for $g_1^2 = 0$, 0.11 and 0.14, corresponding to solid, dotted, and dashed lines, respectively.

right/left sheet of the quasi-1D Ferm i surface].

The T = 0 phase diagram in the presence of interchain interactions $(g_i^2 > 0)$ is shown in Fig. 1. For weak interchain interactions, we reproduce the phase diagram obtained in Ref. [10]. As the interchain interactions increase, the region of stability of the d-wave SC phase shrinks, and a triplet f-wave (SCf) phase ($_{r}\left(k_{?}\right) /\ r\cos k_{?}$) appears next to the d-w ave phase for g? '0:1. The sequence of phase transitions as a function oft; then becomes SDW! SCd! SCf. For larger values of the interchain interactions, the SCd phase disappears and the region of stability of the f-wave SC phase widens. In addition a CDW phase appears, thus giving the sequence of phase transitions SDW! CDW! SCf as a function of t_2^0 . For $g_1^2 > 0:12$, the SDW phase disappears. Note that for g_1^2 0:11, the region of stability of the CDW phase is very narrow, and there is essentially a direct transition between the SDW and SCf phases.

The transition temperature of the SDW phase is not very sensitive to the values of the interchain interactions. The transition temperature of the SC phase decreases for $\mathbf{g}_1^2 \le 0.1$ (i.e. when the SC phase shrinks in the T = 0 phase diagram) and increases for $\mathbf{g}_1^2 \ge 0.1$ (i.e. when the T = 0 SC phase widens). Our RG calculations yield $T_c = 30$ K for the SDW phase in the case of perfect nesting and $T_c = 0.6 = 1.2$ K for the SC phase, in

fair agreem ent with experim ents in the Bechgaard salts. Fig. 2 shows the transition temperature T_c as a function of t_c^0 for three di erent values of the interchain interactions, $g_1^2=0$, 0.11 and 0.14, corresponding to the three di erent sequences of phase transitions as a function of $t_c^0: SDW \, ! \, SCd, SDW \, ! \, (CDW) \, ! \, SCf \, and CDW \, ! \, SCf$.

In the absence of interchain interactions, the e ective interaction m ediated by spin uctuations is attractive in the $d_{x^2-v^2}$ - and f-wave channels. It is repulsive in the $p_x - (r(k_2) / r)$ (at variance with a phenomenological approach to superconductivity [24]), the p_v – ($\sin k_v$) and d_{xy} -wave ($r \sin k_2$) channels. The d-wave correlations dom inate over the f-wave ones as they involve the three components of the spin uctuations. The origin of the f-wave SC and CDW phases can be understood by considering the contribution of the g? 's to the (bare) scattering am plitudes in the singlet and triplet particleparticle channels, as well as in the charge and spin channels. g_1^2 favors $(2k_F;)$ CDW and triplet SC uctuations, but suppresses the singlet SC uctuations; it does not a ect SDW uctuations. There is also an indirect e ect, since CDW uctuations, via the usual mechanism of uctuation exchange, enhance triplet SC uctuations and suppress singlet SC uctuations. A similar analysis shows that g_2^2 has a detrimental election both singlet and triplet nearest-neighbor chain SC pairing. Nevertheless, the RG calculation shows that weak intrachain Um klapp processes (as present in the Bechgaard salts) are su cient to neutralize this e ect through an enhancement of both spin and charge uctuations. As for the interchain Um klapp processes (g₃²), they oppose the e ect of q3, thus pushing the occurrence of the CDW and SCf phases to slightly higher values of $g_1^2 = g_2^2$.

The RG approach also provides in portant inform ation about the uctuations in the normal phase. It has already been pointed out that the dominant uctuations above the SCd phase are SDW uctuations [10], as observed experim entally [7]. Although the SDW uctuations saturate below T the where the SCd uctuations increase, the latter dominate only in a very narrow tem perature range above the SC transition (Fig. 3). Above the SCf and CDW phases, one expects strong uctuations driven by g_1^2 . Figs. 4-5 show that for 0:12, strong SDW and CDW gi: coexist above the SC f phase. Remarkably, there are regions of the phase diagram where the SDW rem ain the dom inant ones in the norm alphase above the SCf or CDW phase (Fig. 5).

A central result of this Letter is the close proximity of SDW, CDW and SCf phases in the phase diagram of a quasi-1D conductor with realistic range of values for the repulsive interactions. Although this proximity is found only in a small range of interchain interactions, there are several features of our results that suggest that this part of the phase diagram is the relevant one for the Bechgaard salts. i) SDW uctuations remain important




FIG. 3: Tem perature dependence of the susceptibilities in the norm alphase above the SCd phase $\mathbb{L}^0_2=0.152t_2$ and $g_1^2=0.08$]. The continuous line corresponds to SDW, the dotted line to CDW, the dashed line to SCd and the dashed-dotted line to SCf correlations which already show enhancement.




FIG. 4: Tem perature dependence of the susceptibilities in the normal phase above the SCf phase $t_2^0 = 0.152t_2$ and $g_1^2 = 0.12$].

in the normal phase throughout the whole phase diagram; they dominate above the SCd phase, and remain strong (being sometimes even dominant) above the SCf phase where they coexist with strong CDW uctuations, in accordance with observations [7,18]. ii) The SCf and CDW phases stand nearby in the theoretical phase diagram, the CDW phase is always closely following the SCf phase when the interchain interactions increase. This agrees with the experimental nding that both SDW and CDW coexist in the DW phase of the Bechgaard salts [17] and the existence, besides SDW correlations, of CDW uctuations in the normal state above the SC phase [18].




FIG. 5: Sam e as Fig. 4, but for $t_2^0 = 0.176t_2$.

iii) Depending how one moves in practice in the phase diagram as a function of pressure in Fig. 1, our results are compatible with either a singlet d-wave or a triplet f-wave SC phase in the Bechgaard salts. Moreover, we cannot exclude that both SCd and SCf phases exist in these materials, with the sequence SDW! SCd! SCf under pressure. It is also possible that the SCf phase, not sensitive to the Pauli pair breaking e ect, is stabilized by a magnetic eld [11, 26]. This would provide an explanation for the existence of large upper critical elds exceeding the Pauli \lim it [3, 4] and for the tem perature independence of the NMR Knight shift in the SC phase [5]. Finally, the predicted existence of nodes in the SC gap for the d-and f-wave scenarios may appear in contradiction with the thermal conductivity and speci c heat jum p m easurem ents for the Bechgaard salt (TM TSF)₂C 10₄, which are apparently consistent with a nodeless order param eter [25]. Owing to the anion lattice superstructure of this com pound, how ever, an 'anion' gap

 $_{\rm X}$ $\,$ $\,$ $T_{\rm c}$ m ust be taken into account in the calculations so that a direct comparison with the RG m ethod can be made.

 $J\mathcal{L}$ N. is grateful to the Gottlieb Daim ler- und Karl Benz-Stiffung for partial support. C.B. thanks D. Jerom e, Y. Fuseya, M. Tsuchiizu, Y. Suzum ura, L.G. Caron and S.Brown for useful discussions.

- [1] D. Jerom e, A. Mazaud, M. Ribault, and K. Bechgaard, J. Phys. (Paris) Lett. 41, L95 (1980).
- [2] L. P. Gorkov and D. Jerom e, J. Phys. Lett. 46, L643 (1985).
- [3] I. J. Lee, M . J. Naughton, G . M . Danner, and P. M . Chaikin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3555 (1997).
- [4] J.I.Oh and M.J.N aughton, Phys.Rev.Lett.92,67001 (2004).
- [5] I.J.Lee, S.E.Brown, W.G.Clark, M.J.Strouse, M.J. Naughton, W.Kang, and P.M.Chaikin, Phys.Rev.Lett. 88, 17004 (2002).
- [6] D .Jerom e and H .Schulz, A dv. in Physics 31, 299 (1982).
- [7] P. W zietek, F. Creuzet, C. Bourbonnais, D. Jerome, K. Bechgaard, and P. Batail, J. Phys. I (France) 3, 171 (1993).
- [8] P.Chaikin, J. Phys. I (France) 6, 1875 (1996).
- [9] V. J. Em ery, Synthetic M etals 13, 21 (1986); M. T. Beal-Monod, C. Bourbonnais, and V. J. Em ery, Phys. Rev. B 34, 7716 (1986); L. G. Caron and C. Bourbonnais, Physica 143B, 453 (1986).

- [10] R. Duprat and C. Bourbonnais, Eur. Phys. J. B 21, 219 (2001).
- [11] Y. Fuseya and Y. Suzum ura, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 74, 1263 (2005).
- [12] K. Kuroki, R. Arita, and H. Aoki, Phys. Rev. B 63, 094509 (2001); Y. Tanaka and K. Kuroki, Phys. Rev. B 70, R060502 (2004); S. Onari, R. Arita, K. Kuroki, and H. Aoki, Phys. Rev. B 70, 94523 (2004).
- [13] W . Kohn and J. M . Luttinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 15, 524 (1965).
- [14] L.P.G or'kov and I.E.D zyaloshinskii, Sov.Phys.JETP
 40,198 (1974); P.A.Lee, T.M.Rice, and R.A.Klemm,
 Phys.Rev.B 15,2984 (1977).
- [15] S. Barisic and A. Bjelis, in Theoretical Aspects of Band Structures and Electronic Properties of Pseudo-One-Dimensional Solids, edited by H. Kaminura (D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1985), p. 49.
- [16] J.P.Pouget and R.Comes, in Charge Density W aves in Solids, edited by L.P.Gorkov and G.Gruner (Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 1989), p.85.
- [17] J. P. Pouget and S. Ravy, J. Phys. I (France) 6, 1501 (1996); S. Kagoshima, Y. Saso, M. Maesato, R. Kondo, and T. Hasegawa, Sol. State. Comm. 110, 479 (1999).
- [18] N. Cao, T. Timusk, and K. Bechgaard, J. Phys. I (France) 6,1719 (1996).
- [19] V. J. Emery, R. Bruinsma, and S. Barisic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1039 (1982).
- [20] A. Schwartz, M. Dressel, G. Gruner, V. Vescoli, L. Degiorgi, and T. Giam archi, Phys. Rev. B 58, 1261 (1998).
- [21] C. Bourbonnais and D. Jerome, in Advances in Synthetic Metals, Twenty Years of Progress in Science and Technology, edited by P. Bernier, S. Lefrant, and G. Bidan (Elsevier, New York, 1999), pp. 206{261, arXiv:cond-mat/9903101.
- [22] K. Saub, S. Barisic, and J. Friedel, Phys. Lett. A 56, 302 (1976).
- [23] C. Honerkam p, M. Salm hofer, N. Furukawa, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 63, 35109 (2001); B. Binz, D. Baeriswyl, and B. Doucot, Ann. Phys. 12, 704 (2003).
- [24] A.G. Lebed, K. Machida and M. Osaki, Phys. Rev. B 62, R795 (2000).
- [25] S.Belin and K.Behnia, Phys.Rev.Lett.79,2125 (1997);
 P.G aroche et al., J.Phys. (Paris) Lett.43, L147 (1982).
 It should be emphasized that for the (TM TSF)₂C D₄ compound, the nodes of the d-wave and f-wave order parameters, which occur at k_? = =2, are precisely located where a gap opens due to the C D₄ ordering at 24 K T_c (SC), thus making these two phases e ectively nodeless. For a more detailed discussion of the BCS d-wave case, see H. Shim ahara, Phys.Rev.B 61, R14936 (2000).
- [26] H. Shim ahara, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 69, 1966 (2000).