Critical tem perature and giant isotope e ect in presence of param agnons.

O.V. Dolgov, ¹ I.I. Mazin, ² A A. Golubov, ³ S.Y. Savrasov, ⁴ and E.G. Maksim ov^5

¹M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Festkorperphysik, Heisenbergstr.1, 70569 Stuttgart, Germ any

²Center for Computational M aterials Science, N aval Research Laboratory, W ashington, D C 20375, U SA

³Faculty of Science and Technology, University of Twente, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands

 4 Department of Physics, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, New Jersey 07102, USA

⁵P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, RAS, Leninskii pr. 53, 119991 M oscow, Russia

(D ated: M arch 23, 2024)

We reconsider the long-standing problem of the e ect of spin uctuations on the critical temperature and isotope e ect in a phonon-mediated superconductor. A lthough the general physics of the interplay between phonons and param agnons had been rather well understood, the existing approximate form ulas fail to describe the correct behavior of T_c for general phonon and param agnon spectra. Using a controllable approximation, we derive an analytical form ula for T_c which agrees well with exact numerical solutions of the E liashberg equations for a broad range of param eters. B ased on both numerical and analytical results, we predict a strong enhancement of the isotope e ect when the frequencies of spin uctuation and phonons are of the same order. This e ect may have in portant consequences for near-magnetic superconductors such as M gCN is.

PACS num bers: 74.20 M n, 74.62.-c, 74.70.-b

In the last decade a large number of superconductors were discovered in which enhanced spin uctuations (SF) play a role in the superconductivity, e_{3} ; $Sr_{2}RuO_{4}$; $M qCN_{i_3}$; "-Fe, $ZrZn_2$; and others, bringing about new and interesting physics. However, understanding such materials, even at an intuitive level, has been hindered by the lack of a simple form ula that would approxim ate the full E liashberg theory in a compact analytical form, as the conventional M dM illan form ula (M M F) does. As a result, uncritical generalizations of the latter have been used as a substitute, despite the fact that, as we will show below, some of them are too approximate or outright incorrect. In this Letter we present an analogue of the MMF, derived in a controllable way and tested against num erical solutions of full E liashberg equations, including interaction with SF (param agnons). We point out the possibility of a giant phonon isotope e ect induced by SF.W e will also apply this theory, as an example, to a nearly-ferrom agnetic superconductor, M gCN is:

The understanding that SF are pair breakers in conventional superconductors is nearly as old as the BCS theory itself [1]. Moreover, it was soon realized that strong coupling manifests itself in a nontrivial way in the presence of SF [2, 3]. In a number of papers numerical solutions of the E liashberg equations were presented, incorporating phonon ${}^{2}F_{p}$ (!) as wellas SF ${}^{2}F_{s}$ (!) spectral functions (see, e.g., Refs. [4]). However, solving the full E liashberg equation is not always an option, and does not provide as much physical insight as analytical treatment. An analytical tool com parable to the fam ed MMF is needed.

R etrospectively, one can realize that the overwhelm ing success of the MMF is due to three facts: (a) it can be derived analytically using simple approximations, (b) it includes C oulomb repulsion e ects, (c) it has three universal adjustable parameters, which, after little tun-

ing, produce an expression which is surprisingly accurate for a large range of phonon frequencies and coupling strengths. Com pared to the BCS equation, the MMF includes three essential pieces of additional physics: e ective mass renormalization, logarithm ic reduction of the Coulomb repulsion, and proper (logarithm ic) averaging of the phonon frequency. All three e ects can be derived analytically in some approximations. In fact, it is known that the functional form of the MMF can be derived in two di erent ways. O ne, known as the squarewellm odel [5], uses the M atsubara representation, where the coupling with the phonons is param etrized in term s of the matrix (n;n⁰): The model assumes two dierent approximations for the same function $(n;n^0)$; depending on whether it is used in the equation for the mass renormalization Z or in the one for the gap function :

This models leads to an equation for the critical temperature, T_c ;

$$T_c = a!_{log} \exp f b(1 + z) = [(1 + c_z)];$$
 (2)

where the theoretical parameters are a = 1:14; b = c = 1, $z = R_1 = p = 2 \frac{R_1}{0} ! \frac{1}{2} F_p(!)d!$ and $p \ln !_{log} = 2 \frac{R_1}{0} ! \frac{1}{2} \ln ! \frac{2}{2} F_p(!)d!$. The renorm alized Coulomb potential is reduced from its bare value as $= = (1 + \ln \frac{!_c}{!_{log}})$; where $!_c$ characterizes the frequency cuto of the Coulomb interaction. The MMF form ula is given by Eq.2 with optimized parameters a = 1=12; b = 1:04; and c = 0:62:

SF, as opposed to phonons, induce repulsion for singlet pairs. However, they contribute to the mass renormalization just the same. Therefore the rst instinct is to let z = p + s; where s describes the SF, and = p s: Eq2 with this modi cation and standard a; b and c is the one routinely used in the literature for materials with SF (e.g., Refs.[6, 7, 8]).

O byiously, using two di erent approximations for the same physical function $(n;n^0)$ depending on whether it appears in the rst or second E liashberg equation cannot be justified by any logic. It appears that the MMF formula can be fortuitously derived in this way, but, as we will see below, this approach fails when SF are included. An alternative derivation of the MMF utilizes the real frequency axis form alism [9]. The one-mode approximation is used, which assume as an Einstein phonon at a frequency $!_p$; i.e., ${}^{2}F(!) = {}_{p}!_{p}(! {}^{l}_{p})=2$: The E liashberg equations are then solved iteratively. After the rst iteration one obtains [9]

$$T_{c} = 1.14!_{p} \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1 + p}{p}\right)^{2} = \frac{9}{p} (1 + 0.5\frac{p}{1 + p}); \quad (3)$$

which is similar to the square well form ula Eq 2w ith a = 1:14= e = 1=1:44 (note that this value of a ism uch closer to the optim ized one); b = 1; and c = 0:5=(1 + p). This approach is a controllable approximation with a concrete physical meaning. How ever, it has never been applied to superconductors with SF.

On the contrary, several attempts to apply the square wellm odel to SF have been reported. In Refs. [3, 4] the following expression was derived (for = 0):

$$T_{c} = 1:14!_{p}!_{s}^{1} \exp [(1 + p + s) = (p + s)]; (4)$$

with = p=(p s) (a)

or
$$=\frac{\frac{2}{p}}{\frac{p}{p-s}}$$
 $p = s + \frac{p + s}{1 + p + s} \ln \frac{!p}{!s}$ (b)

where the choice (a) is due to Carbotte et al. [4], and (b) to Vonsovskii et al. [3]. Unfortunately, neither authors give details of their derivations, so we do not know what was di erent in their models. We were not able to reproduce either result. The latest paper utililizing the square wellm odel (in the weak coupling lim it) is that by Shim ahara [10]. Our own result for the square wellm odel reduces to that of Ref.[10] in the weak lim it, and reads

$$T_{c} = 1:14!_{p} \exp\left[\frac{1+s+p}{p \frac{s(1+s)}{1+s+s \ln \frac{1}{1p}}}\right]; !_{s} !_{p} (5)$$

$$T_{c} = 1:14!_{s} \exp \left[\frac{1 + s + p}{\frac{p(1 + p)}{1 + p - p \ln \frac{1 + p}{1 s}}} \right]; !_{s} !_{p} (6)$$

Unlike Eq.4, Eqs.5, 6 reduce to the M cM illan form upon substitution $!_{s} ! !_{c} !_{p}; !_{s} !$; as it should.

Given the controversy about the square-well model, it is desirable to have a derivation in a controllable approximation, such as the real frequency axis form alism of Refs.[9]. A ssum ing an E instein phonon at a frequency $!_p$ and an \E instein" param agnon at $!_s$, 2 2 F (!) = $_p!_p$ (! $!_p$) $_s!_s$ (! $!_s$); we obtain the following iterative solution of the E liashberg equations.

$$T_{c} = 1:14_{8} p^{\frac{p}{p-s}} !_{s}^{\frac{s}{p-s}} exp(K)$$

$$< \frac{1+p+s}{p-s} (1-K\frac{p-s}{1+p+s});$$

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \frac{p-s}{(p-s)^{2}} 1 + \frac{!_{p}^{2} + !_{s}^{2}}{!_{p}^{2} - !_{s}^{2}} \ln \frac{!_{s}}{!_{p}} :$$
(7)

For $!_p ! !_s$, K = 1=2; and at = 0, Eq.7 reduces to Eq.4 with $= p=(p_s)$.

As usual, the ultim ate test for any approximation is num erical calculations. W e solved the E liashberg equations for a variety of model ²F (!) including SF and com pare them with the proposed analytical form ulas. In Fig.1 we show this comparison for the simplest "onem ode" approxim ation, one phonon and one param agnon (we have veried that other model spectra lead to sim ilar results). A swe can see, while the Eq.7, as well as its sim pli ed version Eq.4 (a), describe the num erical results rather well when $!_s$ and $!_p$ are comparable, the latter fails at $!_s$!_p; and both fail at !_s !_p:Both e ects can be easily understood: Eq.4 includes !s in a negative power in all regimes, thus leading to a total suppression of superconductivity at $!_s ! 1 :$ In reality, in this lim it the negative e ect of the SF is renorm alized down logarithm ically in the same spirit as the Coulomb repulsion.

Eqs. 7, 4 diverge at $!_s ! 0$. This is due to the fact that the derivations above assume that $!_s;!_p \& T_c$. It is possible to treat this regime separately. If $!_s T_c$; the SF act as static magnetic defects, and the standard theory of the magnetic pair-breaking [11] can be applied. In the M atsubara representation, at $!_s = 0$ one needs only to keep the term with n = m in $_s(!_n !_m)$. Then the equations reduce to the standard form [5, 11] with the pair-breaking parameter $(1=2_P)=T_c=_s$. In the weak coupling lim it, T_c is

$$T_c = T_{c0} \exp[((1=2)) (1=2+)];$$
 (8)

where $T_{c0} = T_c$ ($_s = 0$): 0 ne important di erence exists between pair-breaking by SF with $!_s = 0$ and by magnetic impurities: in the former case the pair-breaking parameter now does not depend on T_c . This has consequences for the isotope e ect, as we will see below.

For small, but nite $!_s$ T_c summation of $_s$ (n m) over n m provides the expression for the pair breaking rate in Eq.8: $= \frac{T_c}{2!_s} \operatorname{coth} \frac{T_c}{2!_s}$. This result coincides with Eq. 5.8 of Ref.[12] for dynam ical pair breaking in anisotropic superconductors if the anisotropy parameter g (as de ned in Ref. [12]) is set to -1. When $!_s$ increases, T_c drops sharply with a complete loss of superconductiv-




FIG.1: Comparison of $T_{\rm c}$ and isotope coe cient with the exact num erical calculations. (color on line)

O ne can take into account the strong coupling e ects in the square-wellm odel, resulting in a renorm alization

 $\begin{array}{ll} &=(1+_{\rm p})=\frac{s}{1+_{\rm p}}\frac{T_{\rm c}}{2!_{\,\rm s}}\coth\frac{T_{\rm c}}{2!_{\,\rm s}}: A\ s\ the\ com\ parison\\ w\ ith\ num\ erical\ calculations\ show\ s\ (F\ ig.\ 1),\ this\ approx-im\ ation\ underestim\ ates\ T_{\rm c}\ .\ H\ ow\ ever,\ it\ illustrates\ w\ hy\\ T_{\rm c}\ attens\ out\ at\ a\ nite\ value\ sm\ aller\ than\ T_{\rm c0}\ ,\ w\ hen\ !\ s\ !\ 0\ ,\ instead\ of\ raising\ as\ Eq.7\ suggests. \end{array}$

W ealso show in Fig.1 that both Eq.4 (b) and the square well model, Eqs.5 and 6, disagree qualitatively with the numerical results in the whole range of $!_s$.

W e will now turn to the isotope e ect. Looking at Eq.4, one observes that the isotope coe cient, $= =2 = p=2(p_s) > 0.5$; is always enhanced compared to its BCS value and is independent of the SF frequencies. C learly, this should hold approximately in the range of the applicability of this form ula, $!_s ' !_p T_c$: Indeed, the m ore accurate Eq.7 yields for

$$= 0:5 - \frac{p}{p-s} - 1 - \frac{s}{p-s} F - \frac{!\frac{s}{2}}{!\frac{p}{2}}$$
(9)
F (r) = (r² - 2r ln r - 1)=(r - 1²):

The second term here is the correction to Eq.4. It can be of either sign, since with growing r the F (r) monotonically grows from -1 to 1, and F (1) = 0:A s discussed, Eq.4 itself becomes invalid at $!_s < T_c:As!_s! 0$, according to Eq.8, = 0.5 (note that in the case of magnetic in -

purities > 0.5 due to the dependence of on T_c [5]). Therefore, the isotope e ect has to have a maximum at som e 0 < !_s < !_p; and max > p=2(p s):

This is con med by numerical calculations, which do show that the maximum isotope e ect for given $_{s}$; $_{p}$ is achieved close to $!_{s}$ $!_{p}$ and is not far from $_{p}=2(p_{s})$: This is a very in port result, and we em phasize it again: if superconductivity is depressed by spinuctuations, the total isotope e ect increases compared to its BCS value.

We shall now apply this form alism to a superconductor where T_c is believed to be substantially suppressed by SF, MgCN is [7, 14, 15], which has attracted substantial interest not because of its relatively modest criticaltem perature, T_{c} 8 K, but because of its unusual antiperovskite crystal structure and proximity to ferromagnetic instability. The latter was rst pointed out by Rosner et al. [7], who believed in such strong coupling with SF that they proposed a p wave superconductivity. Singh and M azin [14] also cam e to the conclusion that SF should play a role in superconductivity of M gCN is; but, based on their frozen phonon calculation, they deduced a large electron-phonon coupling constant (p & 1) due to the bond-bending Niphonons. They reconciled this relatively large $_{p}$ with a modest T_{c} within a scenario of s-wave phonon-induced superconductivity depressed by SF. Later this scenario was re-invented by Shan et al. [15], who proved the s-symmetry of the order parameter by tunneling experiments. This point has been since con med by several groups and seems to be well established.

Singh and Mazin's [14] prediction of the Niphonon playing the major role in the electron-phonon coupling in MgNiC3 was based on a limited number of calculations at a high-sym m etry point in the B rillouin zone, and therefore was more an educated guess than a quantitative argum ent. A guantitative analysis was provided by Ignatov et al. [16], who perform ed linear-response calculations of the phonon frequencies and their coupling with electrons for the whole Brillouin zone. They found a gigantic coupling for the Nibond-bending modes, and the most strongly coupled modes (the mode considered by Singh and Mazin was not among them) actually unstable. In other words, they found a set of double-well type instabilities involving mostly Niatoms. This was veried by EXAFS measurements [16]. Ignatov et al. [16] estim ated the total electron-phonon coupling constant as 1.5 and the logarithm ically averaged phonon frequency as 131 K .

Thus, the scenario of Ref. [14] was modi ed in Ref. [16] in the sense that electron-phonon coupling and superconductivity were coming from highly anharmonic predom inantly N im odes, but not exactly the simple rotations of the N i₆ octahedra considered in Ref. [14]. Unfortunately, strong anharmonicity of these modes makes it in possible to evaluate their coupling with electrons




FIG. 2: T_c for the electron-phonon spectral function calculated in [16] for M gC N is (inset). (color on line)

in the linear response calculations, but it is obviously strong. However, one can estim ate the electron-phonon and electron-param agnon coupling indirectly from experim entaldata. Indeed, speci c heat renorm alization, from di erent reports, ranges from 2.6 to 3.1 (see Ref. [17] and refs. therein), im plying that the sum $_{\rm p}$ + $_{\rm s}$ varies between 1.6 and 2.1. W alte et al. [17] estim ated !_p 143 K, sm aller than, but com parable to the calculation in Ref.[16], !_s 25 K and the mass renorm alization due to param agnons as 1 + $_{\rm s}$ 1:43: Then, using M M F, = 0:13; and T_c = 6:8 K, as measured for their sam - ples, they deduced $_{\rm p}$ =1.91.

H ow ever, there are several problem s with this derivation. First of all, as shown above, the proper form ula is Eq.4. U sing this form ula instead of Eq.2, and keeping all their other parameters, we get a much more reasonable number, $_{\rm p}$ = 1.61, not far from the value of 1.51 obtained in R ef. [16]. How ever, the SF model adopted in R ef. [17] cannot be considered as proven. It is based on the disputable assumption that the uptum of the speci c heat quotient at low temperature and high magnetic eld is due to the param agnon contribution to speci c heat, but there m any other explanations of this e ect. 25 K seem s to be unrealistically soft. A lso, low T_c and high residual resistance cast doubt on the sam ple quality in this study.

Here we adopt a di erent approach: we adopt the calculated values $_{p}=1.5$ and $!_{p}=131$ K, in the harmonic approximation, and total mass renormalization $1 + _{p} + _{s} = 2.85$; so that $_{s} = 0.35$: The results of the numerical solution of the E liashberg equations with the 2 F (!) function calculated by Ignatov et al.[16] and = 0:12 are shown in Fig 2, together with the curve

calculated from Eq.7. This way, we nd $!_s$ 50 K, which, we believe, is a more realistic number than 25 K. The corresponding total isotope e ect coe cient is 0.75.

This may sound in agreement with the recent experiment by K lim czuk and C ava [13], who have measured the

isotope e ect to be 0.54 on carbon only. If the total isotope e ect is 0.75, this suggests a seem ingly reasonable N i isotope e ect of 0.21, suggesting that N i phonons couple with the electrons twice weaker than C ones. Unfortunately, the rst-principles calculations suggest that the N im odes couple with electrons at least an order ofm agnitude stronger than the C modes (there is hardly any C character present at the Ferm i level). In the moment, the only way to reconcile this with the measurem ents of Ref. [13] is to assume that the observed isotope e ect is not a result of the frequency shift of the C modes, but of som e subtle changes in the crystal structure induced by the isotope substitution. Such a possibility is suggested by an earlier study [19], where it was found that (i) T_c depends on the lattice param eter at a rate of 310 K/A, which translates an error of 0:0015A in the lattice parameter [13] into an error of 0.46 K in T_c; larger than the isotope shift of 0.3 K, and (ii) that two sam ples with the same lattice parameter and the same neutronm easured C content have T_c di ering by 0.71 K .A possible explanation is that, given the proximity of M gCN is to a ferrom agnetic instability, crystallographic defects m ay induce local magnetic moments which, in turn, work as pair-breakers. The concentration of such defects, even for the same net C content, may depend on the sample preparation and, possibly, on isotope substitution.

Therefore further studies of the isotope e ect both on C and on N i are necessary, in particular combined with accurate m easurem ents of the isotope shift of the phonon m odes.

W e acknow ledge support from the NW O -RFBR grant 047.016.005 and from the NSF DMR grants 0342290 and 023188.

- N.F.Berk and J.R.Schrie er, Phys.Rev.Lett, 17, 433 (1966); G.G.ladstone, M.A.Jensen and J.R.Schrie er, in Superconductivity, ed. by R.D.Parks, V.2, Marcel Dekker, 1969, Chap. 13.
- [2] H. Rietschel and H W inter, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 1256 (1979).
- [3] S.V. Vonsovsky, Yu A. Izyum ov, and E.Z. Kurm aev, Superconductivity of Transition M etals, Their Alloys and C om pounds, Springer Verlag, 1982.
- [4] P.J.W illiam s and J.P.Carbotte, Phys. Rev. B 43, 7960 (1991); E.J.N icol and J.P.Carbotte, Phys. Rev. B 44, 12511 (1991).
- [5] P.B. Allen and B. M itrovic, in Solid State Physics, ed. by H. Erenreich, F. Zeitz, and D. Turnbull, (A cademic, N.Y., 1982), V. 37, , p.1.
- [6] I.I. Mazin, D A. Papaconstantopoulos, and M J. Mehl, Phys. Rev. B 65, 100511 (R) (2002).
- [7] H.Rosner et al, Phys.Rev.Lett.88,027001 (2001).
- [8] T. Jarlborg, Physica C 385, 513 (2003).
- [9] A E. Karakozov, E.G. Maksim ov, and S.A. Mashkov, Sov. Phys. JETP 41, 971 (1976); E.G. Maksim ov and D.I. Khom skii, in High-Tem perature Superconductivity,

edited by V L.G inzburg and D A.K irzhnits, Consultants Bureau, New York, 1982, Chap.4.

- [10] H Shim ahara, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. 72, 1851 (2003).
- [11] A A.Abrikosov and L P.G or kov, Sov. Phys. JETP 12, 1243 (1961).
- [12] A.J.M illis, S.Sachdev, and C.M.Vanm a, Phys. Rev.B 37, 4975 (1988).
- [L3] T.K lim czuk and R.J.Cava, Phys.Rev.B 70, 212514 (2004).
- [14] D.J.Singh and I.I.Mazin, Phys.Rev.B 64, 140507 (2001).
- [15] L.Shan et al, Phys.Rev.B 68, 144510 (2003).
- [16] A.Y. Ignatov, S.Y. Savrasov, and T.A.Tyson, Phys. Rev.B 68, 220504(R) (2003).
- [17] A.W alte et al., Phys. Rev. 70 70, 174503 (2004).
- [18] S.Y.Lietal, Phys.Rev.B 65,064534 (2002).
- [19] T G. Am os et al, Solid State Comm. 121, 73 (2002).