## No robust phases in aerogel: 3He-A with orientational disorder in the Ginzburg-Landau model. (Comment on papers by IA. Fom in on robust phases)

G E . Volovik

Low Temperature Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology P.O. Box 2200, FIN-02015 HUT, Finland

and

L.D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Moscow

March 23, 2024

## A bstract

In series of papers [1,2] Fom in introduced and discussed the so-called robust phases in a system with frozen orientational disorder (with application to super uid  $^3$ He in aerogel). We show that his consideration is based on the erroneous overestimation of the uctuation energy which comes from the interaction of the Goldstone modes with the frozen disorder. This interaction leads to the Imry-Mae ect, which destroys the orientational order, but is unable to destroy the local structure of  $^3$ He-A. There is no ground for the robust phases.

Following Fom in, let us discuss the super uid  $^3\mathrm{He}$  in aerogel using the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) model supplemented by the interaction with the frozen orientational disorder eld  $_{ij}$ :

$$F = F_0 + F_{\text{grad}} + F : \qquad (1)$$

Here  $F_0$  and  $F_{\text{grad}}$  are condensation and gradient energies, and

$$F = \sum_{ij}^{Z} (r)A_{i}(r)A_{j}(r)d^{3}r; \qquad (2)$$

where  $h_{ij}i = 0$ , and we only consider the orientational anisotropy, i.e. the tensor  $h_{ij}i = 0$ .

We assume that the disorder is relatively small. Therefore we can start with hom ogeneous states which have spatially uniform order parameter  $A_i = A_i^{(0)} = const.$  Since  $A_{ij}^{(0)} = 0$ , the energy of such state only comes from  $A_{ij}^{(0)} = 0$ .

$$F(A_{i}^{(0)}) = F_{0}(A_{i}^{(0)}) :$$
 (3)

We consider here the proper range of the parameters of the GL functional  $F_0$  (the -parameters of 4-th order terms in  $F_0$  [3]), for which  ${}^3{\rm H\,e\hbox{-}A}$  has minimum energy. The energy of the uniform  ${}^3{\rm H\,e\hbox{-}A}$  is smaller than the energy of any other uniform phase by the magnitude  $F_0$   $N_F$   ${}^2T_c^2$ , where  $N_F$  is the density of states in normal Fermi liquid, and  $F_0$   $F_$ 

Let us consider now the second-order ( $^2$ ) correction to the energy  $F_0$ . The uniform  $^3\text{H\,e-A}$  is not the minimum of the total GL functional (1), that is why its energy can be reduced by adding the non-uniform corrections (uctuations), A  $_i$  = A  $_i^{(0)}$  + a  $_i$ , with a / and thus hai = 0. The  $^2$  term s contain the linear and quadratic terms in a  $_i$ . In k representation after diagonalization of the  $a^2$  terms one obtains

$$F = F_0 (A_{i}^{(0)}) + F$$
 ; (4)

where the uctuation energy:

$$F = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,k}^{X} a_{n,k}^{2} n(k) + \sum_{n,k}^{X} \gamma_{n,k} a_{n,k} :$$
 (5)

Here  $\sim_{n,k}$  comes from the product of and A  $_i^{(0)}$  matrices, and  $_n$  (k) is the spectrum of the n-th mode. For Goldstone modes (GM),

$$_{G}$$
 (k)  $N_{F}$   $_{0}^{2}$ k<sup>2</sup>; (6)

and for other modes with gaps:

$$_{\text{non G}}$$
 (k)  $N_{\text{F}}$  ( +  $k^2$   $_0^2$ ) =  $N_{\text{F}}$  (1 +  $k^2$   $_2^2$ ); (7)

where =  $_{0}^{p}$  is the GL coherence length.

A first m in imization over a one obtains the contribution of uctuations that reduce the  ${}^3{\rm H}\,{\rm e-A}$  energy:

$$F = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,k}^{X} \sum_{n,k=1}^{2} (k);$$
 (8)

There is no divergence at small k, and the integral is concentrated at large k=1, if we assume that the frozen disorder is concentrated at  $l=_0>k=1$ . It mainly gives the shift of the transition temperature  $T_c$ . A ctually the traceless orientational disorder increases the transition temperature. Subtracting from Eq.(8) the integral with =0 in the denominator, one obtains the integral /  $^{\rm R}{\rm d}^3k=k^2\left(1+k^2~^2\right)$  concentrated at k  $^{\rm 1}$ :

$$F \qquad (A^{(0)})^2 \frac{{}^2}{{}^3N_F}^2 \qquad F_0 ; \qquad (9)$$

where  $_0^2 = _0^R d^3rh$  (r) (0) i and is the Larkin-O vchinnikov parameter [4]

$$= \frac{{2 \atop 0}}{{1=2 \atop 3} \atop 0} {N \atop F}^{2} \qquad 1 : \qquad (10)$$

We can already stop at this point, since the uctuation energy is small compared to the condensation energy, and thus  $^3\text{H\,e-A}$  remains the only possible phase. However, Fom in points out that the interaction of the frozen disorder with GM changes the situation, because due to these modes the amplitude of uctuations of the non-robust states diverges at smallk:  $\text{ha}^2\text{i}/\text{R}^3\text{k=k}^4$  dk= $\text{k}^2$  L, where L  $^1$  is the infra-red cut-o parameter. This gives

$$a^{2} = \frac{L}{a^{(0)}} (A^{(0)})^{2}$$
: (11)

At L , uctuations are small if 1, and this is the condition for the applicability of the GL approach. But uctuations become comparable to  $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$  at

$$L - ; (12)$$

and this scale L provides the infrared cut-o.

This consideration is certainly true, but it is the well known  ${\rm Im}\ ry{-}{\rm M}\ a$  e ect [5]: Since the Eq.(11) describes the uctuations of the GM , it corresponds to the change in the orientation of the order parameter A without

disturbing its structure. The scale L at which  $ha^2i$   $(A^{(0)})^2$  thus indicates the scale at which the orientation of A changes by angle of order =2. This is just the Im ry-M a length scale. The state looses the orientational long-range order due to interaction of the GM with the frozen orientational disorder. The similar destruction of the long-range translational order in the mixed state of superconductors by inhom ogeneities was found even earlier [6]. The Im ry-M a e ect applied to  $^3H$  e-A in aerogel was discussed in [7].

Fom in claims that the GM also leads to the divergent contribution to uctuation energy, which is absent in the robust phases. Let us see. The contribution of the GM with wavelength L to the uctuation energy F in Eq. (8) is proportional to  ${}^{R_{1}=L}_{0}$   $k^{2}dk=k^{2}$  1=L. The uctuation energy in Eq.(9) comes from scale and is proportional to  ${}^{R_{1}=L}_{0}$   $k^{2}dk=(k^{2}+1=2)$   ${}^{R_{1}=L}_{0}$  dk 1=L. Thus the contribution of GM with wavelength L is by factor L=L smaller, and gives the second-order in correction to the GL energy. This is just the Im ry-M a energy gain due to the orientational disorder of the order parameter:

$$F_{\text{Im rv M a}} \qquad F \qquad ^2F_0 \qquad F_0$$
: (13)

At the Im ry-M a wavelength L, the interaction with the frozen disorder is on the order of the gradient energy [5]. Thus the contribution of GM with wavelength L to the energy is on the order of the gradient energy at this scale, and thus contains the small factor  $^2$ =L $^2$  compared to the condensation energy F $_0$ . This is demonstrated in Eq. (13), since =L = 1.

The equation (13) contradicts to the statement by Fom in [2], who erroneously concludes that the contribution of GM contains the large factor 1= compared to the contribution of the non-Goldstone modes: F  $_{\rm flG}$ 

 $^1\,F_{\,\mathrm{fl}\,\mathrm{non}\,\,\mathrm{G}}$  , and thus, due to GM , the uctuation energy is comparable to the condensation energy:  $F_{\,\mathrm{fl}\,\mathrm{G}}$   $F_0$ . This provides the justication for introduction of the robust phases where the disorder does not interact with GM , and thus there is no divergence in the amplitude of the order parameter. This justication is wrong and thus there is no basis for the robust phase. The same conclusion was made by M ineev and Zhitom irsky in their Comment [8].

In conclusion, the Goldstone modes, i.e. uctuations in the direction of the degeneracy of the order parameter, do lead to the divergence of the amplitude of the order parameter. But their contribution to energy does not experience any divergence and is small compared to the condensation energy by the parameter <sup>2</sup> 1. This is nothing but the Imry-Mae ect, which

leads to disorder in the orientation of the order parameter at large length L== without changing the local structure of the order parameter. Since the condensation energy  $F_0$  is dominating, the local order parameter must be in the  ${}^3\mathrm{H\,e\text{-}A}$  state everywhere (at least within the GL model (1)). The robust phase is not the extremum of  $F_0$ , and thus is not the solution of GL equations. Thus within the GL model with the frozen orientational disorder the Im ry-M a approach is valid and it does not leave any room for the robust phase.

I thank IA. Fom in, N.B. Kopnin and V.P.M ineev for discussions.

## R eferences

- [1] IA.Fom in, Pis'm a ZhETF 75, 220 (2002) [JETP Lett. 75,187 (2002)]; Pis'm a ZhETF 77, 285 (2003) [JETP Lett. 77, 240 (2003)]; ZhETF 125, 1115 (2004) [JETP, 98, 974 (2004)]; J.Low Temp.Phys. 134, 769 (2004); 138, 97 (2005).
- [2] IA. Fom in, P is'm a ZhETF 81, 362 (2005), cond-m at/0504067.
- [3] D. Vollhardt and P. Wole, The Super uid Phases of Helium 3 (Taylor and Francis, London, 1990).
- [4] A.J. Larkin and Yu.N. Ovchinnikov, In uence of inhomogeneities on superconductor properties, JETP 34, 651 (1972).
- [5] Y. Im ry and S. Ma, Random eld instability of the ordered state of continuous sym metry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 1399 (1975).
- [6] A J. Larkin, E ect of inhom ogeneities on the structure of them ixed state of superconductors, JETP 31, 784 (1970).
- [7] G.E. Volovik, G. lass state of super uid <sup>3</sup>He-A in aerogel, Pis'm a ZhETF 63, 281 (1996) [JETP Lett. 63, 301 (1996).
- [8] V P. M ineev and M E. Zhitom irsky, Comment on \Order parameter of A-like <sup>3</sup>He phase in aerogel", Pisma ZhETF 81, 360 (2005).cond-mat/0502549