

Field-induced superconductivity with enhanced and tunable paramagnetic limit

A. Buzdin, S. Tollis, and J. Cayssol
 Condensed Matter Theory Group, CPMOH,
 UMR 5798, Université Bordeaux I,
 33405 Talence, France and
 (*)also Institut Universitaire de France, Paris

We demonstrate that in a superconducting multilayered system with alternating interlayer coupling a new type of nonuniform superconducting state can be realized under in-plane magnetic field. The Zeeman effect in this state is compensated by the energy splitting between bonding and antibonding levels. Such compensation mechanism at low temperature leads to the field-induced superconductivity. We discuss the conditions for the experimental observation of the predicted phenomena.

There are two mechanisms of the superconductivity destruction by a magnetic field: orbital and paramagnetic effects [1, 2]. Usually it is the orbitale effect that is more restrictive. However in the systems with large effective mass of electrons [3, 4] or in low-dimensional compounds, like quasi-one-dimensional or layered superconductors under in-plane magnetic field [5], the orbital magnetism is weakened and it is the paramagnetic effect which is responsible for the superconductivity destruction. The Chandrasekhar-Clogston paramagnetic limit [6, 7] is achieved when the energy of the polarization of the normal electron gas, $\mu_B H^2/2$, equals the superconducting condensation energy $N(0)\Delta_0^2/2$, where $N(0)$ is the density of states of the normal electron gas, μ_B its spin susceptibility and $\Delta_0 = 1.76T_c$ is the zero temperature superconducting gap. This gives the critical field $H_p = \Delta_0/(\mu_B)$ of the first order transition at $T = 0$, μ_B being the Bohr magneton. Later Larkin and Ovchinnikov [8] and Fulde and Ferrell [9] (FFLO) predicted the appearance at low temperature of a nonuniform superconducting state with the zero temperature critical field $H_{3D}^{FFLO} = 0.755 \Delta_0/\mu_B$, i.e. somewhat higher than the paramagnetic limit H_p . This prediction was made for three-dimensional superconductors. In quasi-two-dimensional superconductors the critical field of the FFLO state is even higher, namely $H_{2D}^{FFLO} = \Delta_0/\mu_B$ [10], while in quasi-one-dimensional systems there is no paramagnetic limit at all [11]. The appearance of the modulated FFLO state is related to the pairing of electrons with opposite spins which do not have the opposite momenta anymore due to the Zeeman splitting.

In this Letter, we demonstrate that in a ballistic superconducting bilayer at low temperature and strong enough coupling $t_1 \gg \Delta_0$ between the conducting planes, the paramagnetic limit is enhanced up to $H_c = \Delta_0/t_1$ far above the usual limit $H_{2D}^{FFLO} = \Delta_0/\mu_B$. More precisely, a very unusual superconducting phase is settled between a lower and an upper critical fields given by $H_B H_c = t_1^2 H_0^2 = \Delta_0^2$ and below a maximum temperature of the order of $T_c^2 = t_1$. Thus one obtains field induced superconductivity above the lower field while the upper one provides the enhanced paramagnetic limit which may

be tuned by varying the electronic coupling t_1 . This is due to the compensation of the the Zeeman splitting by the energy splitting t_1 between bonding and antibonding electronic states of the bilayer. As another important feature of this new phase, adjacent layers support opposite signs of the order parameter. Note that such a so-called phase was predicted before [12, 13] for the superconductor-ferromagnet multilayered systems where the atomic superconducting and ferromagnetic layers alternated and were weakly coupled in contrast to the present system.




FIG. 1: Multilayered system. The n^{th} unit cell contains two superconducting planes $'_n$ and $_n$. The transfer integrals are very different, $t_2 \ll t_1$. The superconducting phase difference between two adjacent planes can be either 0 or π .

We consider a model multilayered system with a crystallographic structure similar to those of the high- T_c superconductors [14], as shown in Fig. 1. Namely we assume that the electrons are confined in the atomic planes with the same zero-field dispersion relation $\epsilon(p) = p^2/2m$, E_F , E_F being the Fermi energy. The transfer integrals between the planes are different t_1, t_2 , both being smaller than the Debye energy $\sim \hbar \omega_D \ll E_F$. In this structure the n^{th} unit cell contains two conducting planes, labelled by $_n$ and $'_n$. The coordinate in the plane is r and the cells are separated by a distance a along the z -axis which is chosen perpendicular to the

planes. We suppose that the Cooper pairing occurs in the planes and perform our analysis in the framework of the standard mean field BCS Hamiltonian,

$$H = H_0 + H_{\text{orb}} + H_t + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \Delta_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{r}); \quad (1)$$

with

$$H_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{p}, m} \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \left(\psi_{\mathbf{n}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p}) \psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{p}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \psi_{\mathbf{n}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{q}) \psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}) + \text{h.c.} \right);$$

$$H_t = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \left(\psi_{\mathbf{n}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p}) t_1' \psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{p}) + t_2 \psi_{\mathbf{n}+1}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p}) + \text{h.c.} \right);$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbf{n}}$ is the BCS coupling constant, summation over repeated spin indexes σ is implied, and $\psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{q})$ is the Fourier transform of the superconducting order parameter $\psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{r}) = \psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{r}) e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$, \mathbf{q} being the second Pauli matrix. The operators $\psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\psi_{\mathbf{n}}'(\mathbf{p})$ destroy one electron with spin σ and momentum \mathbf{p} , respectively in planes \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{n}' . Our model includes both translation and gauge symmetry breaking. Indeed, the superconducting order parameter in the planes \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{n}' are respectively given by $\psi_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r} + i \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a}}$ and $\psi_{\mathbf{n}'}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r} + i \mathbf{n}' \cdot \mathbf{a}}$, where \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{a} are respectively the in-plane and the perpendicular modulation wave vectors. These vectors and the superconducting phase difference must be determined from the minimum energy condition.

The Gor'kov equations corresponding to the Hamiltonian (1) are solved exactly. In the small Δ limit, the linearized anomalous Gor'kov Green function $F_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma} = \langle \psi_{\mathbf{f}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p}) \psi_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{p}) \rangle$ reduces to the form [15]

$$F_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma} = \frac{(t_k \epsilon_k e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{a}} + \epsilon_{k+})}{(\epsilon_k^2 - \epsilon_{k+}^2)(\epsilon_{k+}^2 - \epsilon_{k-}^2)}; \quad (2)$$

where $t_k = t_1 + t_2 e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{a}}$, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} + \mu_B H$, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}+} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}+} + \mu_B H$ and $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}-} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}-} + \mu_B H$, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}+}$ and $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}-}$ being the Matsubara frequencies.

We first solve the isolated bilayer problem $t_2 = 0$. After integration of Eq.(2) over \mathbf{p} , one obtains the anomalous Eilenberger propagator $f_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma}(\mathbf{v}_F) = \langle \psi_{\mathbf{f}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p}) \psi_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{p}) \rangle_{\mathbf{a}=1}$ with

$$f_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma} = \frac{1 + i \mu_B H + i \frac{\mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{q}}{2} + i a t_1 e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{a}} \cos(\theta = 2)}{2(1 + i \mu_B H + i \frac{\mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{q}}{2})(1 + i \mu_B H + i \frac{\mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{q}}{2} + i a t_1)} \quad (3)$$

for positive Δ , where $\mathbf{a} = \pm 1$ labels bonding and antibonding states while \mathbf{v}_F is the Fermi velocity vector in the plane. Then the self-consistency relation (4) below implies that the superconducting phase difference between neighboring layers is either zero or π . In the

absence of Zeeman splitting $H = 0$, the superconducting order parameter is naturally the same in both layers, namely $\Delta = 0$. In this case, $f_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma} = \Delta$ coincides with the well-known anomalous Green function of a superconductor in the limit $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, and the self-consistency relation gives the bare critical temperature T_c of the isolated layer. More generally for $\Delta = 0$ and finite H , the interlayer coupling t_1 drops from Eq.(3) and one retrieves $f_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma} = \Delta(1 + i \mu_B H)$ for a two dimensional superconductor under parallel magnetic field. The other possible choice is $\Delta = \pi$, when the superconducting order parameter is opposite on adjacent layers. For small values of the magnetic field, this latter phase exhibits naturally a lower critical temperature than the $\Delta = 0$ phase.




FIG. 2: Excitation spectrum. Usual singlet pairing (thin line circles) between opposite-spin electrons occupying the same orbital is affected by Zeeman effect. In contrast, coupling (thick line) between two electrons occupying a bonding and an antibonding orbitals may lead to the cancellation of the Zeeman splitting.

However for relatively large interlayer coupling $t_1 > T_c$ and high field, the situation becomes drastically different. Indeed, the excitation spectrum consists of four different branches $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{p}} + \mu_B H \pm t_1$ in the limit $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, see Fig. 2. The singlet pairing may occur here between one electron in the bonding orbital and the other electron in the antibonding orbital. This results in a very special coupling where, if $\mu_B H = t_1$, the Zeeman splitting is exactly compensated. Therefore enhanced superconductivity is expected in the vicinity of $\mu_B H = t_1$, at least at zero temperature.

In order to derive rigorously this prediction, we analyse the self-consistency relation,

$$\Delta = 2 \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} N_{2D}(\mathbf{q}) T \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \text{Re} f_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma}(\mathbf{v}_F, \omega); \quad (4)$$

in the phase where $f_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma}(\mathbf{v}_F)$ depends on the coupling t_1 in the following way

$$f_{\mathbf{f}}^{\gamma}(\mathbf{v}_F) = \frac{\Delta}{2(1 + i \mu_B H + i a t_1 + i \mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{q})}; \quad (5)$$

Here $N_{2D}(\mathbf{q}) = m/(2\pi)^2$ is the two-dimensional density of states per unit surface and per one spin orientation, and the brackets $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes averaging over the polar angle $\theta = (\mathbf{v}_F, \mathbf{q})$.

We first discuss the zero temperature second-order phase transition between the normal metal and the phase, as a function of the magnetic field. From Eqs.(4,5), the critical field H_c is shown to satisfy

$$H_c + t_1 = \frac{p}{(H_c + t_1)^2 X^2} \quad (6)$$

where $X = \hbar v_F / (2 t_1)$, and $H_0 = t_1 / 2$ is the critical field of the second-order superconducting phase transition in a two-dimensional monolayer. One must then find the value of X which maximizes the critical field H_c . If the phase is assumed to be uniform inside each plane, namely if $q = 0$, Eq.(6) merely reduces to $H_c^2 = t_1^2 = H_0^2$ and we obtain a lower and an upper critical fields respectively given by $H_{c-} = t_1$ and $H_{c+} = 2t_1$, in the limit $t_1 \rightarrow H_0$. Thus at zero temperature and strong enough coupling $t_1 \rightarrow 0$, the superconductivity destruction follows a very special scenario. At low fields, superconductivity is first suppressed in the usual manner at the paramagnetic limit $H_{2D}^{FFLO} = H_0$ leading to the normal metal phase. Then further increase of the field leads to a normal to superconducting phase transition at the lower critical field. This superconducting phase is finally suppressed at the upper critical field. This is a new paramagnetic limit which may be tuned far above the usual one merely by choosing the coupling t_1 greater than H_0 . Thorough analysis of Eq.(6) shows that the upper critical field is even increased by an in-plane modulation in analogy with the two-dimensional FFLO phase [10]. In this sense, the low-temperature phase in the present case should be called a FFLO- phase. The upper critical field is maximal for the choice $X = \hbar v_F / (2 t_1) = \hbar v_F / (2 t_1)$ and then Eq.(6) reduces to

$$\hbar v_F / (2 t_1) : H_c + t_1 = \frac{p}{2 H_c t_1} = 4 H_0^2; \quad (7)$$

which gives the upper and lower fields $H_{c-} = t_1$ and $H_{c+} = 2t_1$ in the $t_1 \rightarrow 0$ limit. Note that the period of the modulated order parameter $\hbar v_F / (2 t_1) = \hbar v_F / (2 t_1)$ ($t_1 = 0$) is larger than the corresponding period in the two-dimensional FFLO phase which coincides with the ballistic coherence length $\xi_0 = v_F \tau_0$ [10].

Furthermore one may derive the full temperature-field phase diagram using Eqs.(4,5) and the result is shown in Fig. 3. When the temperature is increased, the lower critical field increases whereas the upper one decreases. Along the upper (resp. lower) critical line the FFLO modulation is lost at some temperature T_{up} (resp. T_{low}). For higher temperatures a uniform phase (U-) is recovered and the temperature dependence of the critical field is given by




FIG. 3: Phase diagram for $t_1 = 3.0$. U- (resp. FFLO-) denotes the uniform (resp. modulated) superconducting state with phase difference between the planes. Thick (resp. thin) solid lines represent second-order transition between U- (resp. FFLO-) and normal metal phase (N). We expect the U- / FFLO- transition lines (not calculated) to be in the vicinity of the (virtual) first order U- / normal metal lines (dash-dotted).

$$\ln \frac{T}{T_c} = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{1}{2} + i \frac{H_{c-}(T) + t_1}{2 T} \right]; \quad (8)$$

where $\gamma(x)$ is the Digamma function and $\gamma(1/2) = -\gamma - \ln 2 \approx -1.963$, γ being the Euler constant. Finally the lower and upper critical lines merge at field $H_{c-} = t_1 = H_0$ and temperature $T_M = e^{\gamma} T_c^2 / (4 t_1)$ in the limit $t_1 \rightarrow 0$. Therefore the field induced superconductivity is confined to temperatures lower than T_M . The structure of these U- and the FFLO- phases is reminiscent of the corresponding U-0 and the FFLO-0 phases although the former are shifted to higher fields and lower temperatures than the later.




FIG. 4: Phase diagram for $t_1 = 0$. Solid and dash-dotted lines have the same meaning than in Fig. 3.

Above results were obtained for relatively strong coupling. For lower coupling $t_1 \ll H_0$, the U- and the FFLO- phases merge continuously into the usual $\phi = 0$ phases as shown in Fig. 4, and finally disappear for t_1

slightly smaller than ϕ_0 . From an experimental point of view, one might choose a system with intermediate coupling t_1 small enough to settle the phase island in an available range of temperatures but also large enough to separate the phase island from the usual superconducting phases with $\phi = 0$.

Hereafter we discuss various physical mechanisms limiting the above predicted superconductivity: role of finite t_2 , in purity and orbital effects.

For finite coupling t_2 between the bilayers, the self-consistency relation (4) together with Eq.(2) leads to the following equation

$$\ln \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{\phi_0} \frac{H_0}{H_0 + X \cos^2 \theta}} \frac{2}{(t_1 + at_2)^2} = 0: \quad (9)$$

For $X = \hbar(t_1 + t_2) = \phi_0$, the singularity around $\phi = \phi_0$ produces a corrective term to the upper and lower critical fields found previously. However this correction is negligible if $t_1 t_2 \ll \frac{2}{\phi_0} H_0^2$. In the opposite regime, that is for larger values of the inter-bilayers coupling t_2 , the bonding and the antibonding electronic levels form bands whose dispersion avoids exact compensation between the intra-bilayer coupling t_1 and the Zeeman splitting. When $t_1 = t_2$, the quasi-two-dimensional case [10] is retrieved: the presently studied phases are lost in favor of FFLO phases modulated either along the planes or perpendicular to the planes.

Hence we see that the interlayer coupling must be rather small to prevent the smearing out of the electronic levels participating to the coupling. Extremely low coupling may in principle lead to the suppression of the transition due to the two-dimensional fluctuations [16]. However in the limit $t_2 \rightarrow T_c$, $T_c = E_F$ the fluctuations are limited in a very narrow temperature region near the critical temperature [17]. For $t_2 \rightarrow T_c$, $T_c = E_F$ Kosterlitz-Thouless regime may be attained near T_c [18] but the long range order is restored outside the vicinity of the critical temperature, namely for $(T_c - T) = T_c > (T_c = E_F) \ln(T_c^3 = E_F^2 t_2^2)$: This weak logarithmic divergence of the fluctuations as $t_2 \rightarrow 0$ means that in practice very weak coupling is enough to restore the transition. Finally, the FFLO phase is fully established if $t_2 \geq t_1$.

Impurities produce further broadening of the electronic levels over an energy range $1 = \lambda$, being the elastic collision time. One may infer that disorder leads to the destruction of field-induced superconductivity since the phases originate from exact compensation of the Zeeman splitting by the t_1 splitting between bonding and antibonding electronic levels. As a rough estimate, $1 = \lambda$ plays a similar role than the inter-bilayer coupling t_2 and thus $1 = \lambda = \frac{2}{\phi_0} H_0^2 = t_1$ defines a degree of disorder above which the phases are unlikely to survive. Consequently the observation of the above predicted phenomena requires

even cleaner samples than the observation of the two-dimensional FFLO state which was expected to exist for $1 = \lambda < \frac{2}{\phi_0} H_0$ [19].

Up to now the orbital effect has been neglected. If we choose the in-plane coherence length as $\xi \approx 100 \text{ \AA}$ and $t_1 = E_F \xi \approx 10^2 - 10^3$, orbital effects are expected to be important above $H_{c2}^{orb} = (\phi_0 = 2) (E_F = t_1) \xi \approx 10^3 - 10^4 \text{ T}$, ϕ_0 being the magnetic flux quantum.

Modern nanotechnology permits now to design and fabricate a rich variety of different superconducting structures. In the present Letter we demonstrate that the system comprising weakly coupled superconducting bilayers may reveal a new type of the FFLO - superconducting state when the spin effect prevails against the orbital effect of the magnetic field. The critical field of such state can exceed many times the standard paramagnetic limit. Moreover the phenomenon of the field-induced superconductivity at low temperature is predicted. Note that this field-induced superconductivity is very different from that recently observed in quasi-two-dimensional organic conductor (BEDT)FECI₄ [5], where the exchange field of aligned Fe³⁺ spins compensates the external field by means of the Jaccarino-Peter effect [20].

We are grateful to M. Houzet and A. Koshelev for useful comments.

-
- [1] A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gor'kov, and I. E. Dzyaloshinski, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics* (Dover, New York) (1963).
 - [2] D. Saint-James, G. Sarma, and E. J. Thomas, *Type II Superconductivity*, Pergamon, New York (1969).
 - [3] A. Bianchi et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 187004 (2003).
 - [4] C. Capan et al, *Phys. Rev. B* 70, 134513 (2004).
 - [5] S. Ujiet al, *Nature* (London) 410, 908 (2001).
 - [6] B. S. Chandrasekhar, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 1, 7 (1962).
 - [7] A. M. Clogston, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 9, 266 (1962).
 - [8] A. I. Larkin and Y. N. Ovchinnikov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 47, 1136 (1964) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 20, 762 (1965)].
 - [9] Fulde, P., and R. A. Ferrell, *Phys. Rev.* 135, A550 (1964).
 - [10] L. N. Bulaevskii, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 64, 2241 (1973) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 37, 1133 (1973)].
 - [11] A. I. Buzdin and V. V. Tugushev, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 85, 735 (1983) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 58, 428 (1983)].
 - [12] A. V. Andreev, A. I. Buzdin, and R. M. Osgood III, *Phys. Rev. B* 43, 10124 (1991).
 - [13] M. Houzet and A. I. Buzdin, *Europhys. Lett.* 58, 596 (2002).
 - [14] L. N. Bulaevskii and M. V. Zyskin, *Phys. Rev. B* 42, 10230 (1990).
 - [15] Exact expressions for the Green functions will be published elsewhere and then used to study thoroughly the low coupling $t_1 \rightarrow 0$ limit where various nonuniform phases also appear, but not the presently studied - FFLO phase.
 - [16] T. M. Rice, *Phys. Rev.* 140, A1889 (1965).

- [17] A.I. Larkin and A.A. Varlamov, p. 95 in *The Physics of Superconductors*, Vol.I, edited by K.H. Bennemann and J.B. Ketterson, Springer (2003).
- [18] L.I. Glazman and A.E. Koshelev, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 97, 1371 (1990) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 70 (4), 774 (1990)].
- [19] L.G. Aslamazov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 55, 1477 (1968) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 28 (4), 773 (1969)].
- [20] V. Jaccarino and M. Peter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 9, 290 (1962).