

Knight Shift in the FFLO State of a Two-Dimensional D-Wave Superconductor

Anton B. Vorontsov* and Matthias J. Graf†

**Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA*

†*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

Abstract. We report on the Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov (FFLO) state in two-dimensional d -wave superconductors with magnetic field parallel to the superconducting planes. This state occurs at high magnetic field near the Pauli-Clogston limit and is a consequence of the competition between the pair condensation and Zeeman energy. We use the quasiclassical theory to self-consistently compute the spatially nonuniform order parameter. Our self-consistent calculations show that the FFLO state of a d -wave order parameter breaks translational symmetry along preferred directions. The orientation of the nodes in real space is pinned by the nodes of the basis function in momentum space. Here, we present results for the Knight shift and discuss the implications for recent nuclear magnetic resonance measurements on CeCoIn₅.

Keywords: low-dimensional superconductivity, Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov phase, d -wave superconductivity.

PACS: 75.60.-d, 76.60.Cq, 74.81.-g

LA-UR-05-5255

The Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov (FFLO) state of spin-singlet superconductors is the compromise between the pairing condensate, favoring anti-parallel spin alignment, and the Zeeman effect, favoring parallel spin alignment along the field [1, 2]. This compromise leads to a spatially inhomogeneous state of “normal” and “superconducting” regions, where the “normal” regions are defined by a spectrum of spin-polarized quasiparticles.

The FFLO phase of d -wave superconductors is modified by the anisotropy of the order parameter in momentum space compared to s -wave superconductors. The upper critical transition line, $B_{c2}(T)$, has a kink at low temperatures, $T^* \sim 0.06T_c$, corresponding to the discontinuous change in the modulation of the order parameter [3, 4, 5, 6]. Recent calculations of the spatial modulation of the order parameter in 2D near B_{c2} predicted that the energetically favored state at low T and high B forms a “square lattice” instead of the 1D stripe order [7, 8].

Here, we restrict our study to temperatures above this structural phase transition, $T > T^*$, and address the quasiparticle response in the FFLO phase between the lower critical field B_{c1} and the upper critical field B_{c2} . In addition, we assume that \mathbf{B} is parallel to the superconducting planes. In this geometry the magnetic field affects the superconducting condensate only through the Zeeman coupling of the quasiparticle spin to the field. Furthermore, we assume a cylindrical Fermi surface.

Within the quasiclassical theory of superconductivity we calculate self-consistently the order parameter $\Delta(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})$ and the quasiclassical Green’s functions by solving Eilenberger’s equation in a constant magnetic field \mathbf{B} . The Zeeman coupling of the quasiparticle spin with magnetic field enters through $\mu\mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, where σ_i are Pauli spin

matrices and $\mu = (g/2)\mu_B$ is the absolute value of the magnetic moment of a quasiparticle with negative charge e ; $\mu_B = |e|\hbar/2mc$ is the Bohr magneton. Note that the g -factor is a free material parameter in this calculation.

From the solutions of Eilenberger’s equation we can calculate measurable quantities like the free energy, quasiparticle local density of states [6] and local magnetization $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{R})$. Here, we consider spin-singlet order parameters that factorize into $\Delta(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\mathbf{p}}) = \Delta(\mathbf{R}) \cos 2\phi$, with a spatially dependent amplitude, $\Delta(\mathbf{R})$, and an angular dependent $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave basis function.

The local magnetization is given by the paramagnetic response of the medium and the spin-vector component of the quasiclassical Matsubara Green’s function [9]:

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{R}) = 2\mu N_f \left[\mu\mathbf{B} + T \sum_{\epsilon_n} \int \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{p}}}{2\pi} \mathbf{g}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{R}; \epsilon_n) \right], \quad (1)$$

with the normal-state density of states N_f at the Fermi level. The normal-state susceptibility, $\chi_N = 2\mu^2 N_f$, is defined by $M_N = \chi_N B$.

For comparison, we show in Fig. 1 the calculated temperature dependence of the magnetization in the uniform superconducting (USC) phase for three different values of B . Increasing B changes the T -dependence of the magnetization from linear to quadratic with a residual zero-temperature value due to the field induced shift in the spin-split density of states of the gapless d -wave superconductor. This result is in agreement with scaling arguments by Yang and Sondhi [10].

In Fig. 2, we show temperature scans of the minimum, average and maximum local magnetization for the stable FFLO phase, with spatial order-parameter modulation along the $\langle 110 \rangle$ direction, i.e., along the nodal direction




FIGURE 1. Magnetization M of the spatially uniform superconducting (USC) phase normalized by the normal-state magnetization M_N for different magnetic fields $b = \mu B/2\pi T_c$.

of the gap function. The Knight shift K is proportional to the change in the local magnetic field at the nucleus, thus it is directly proportional to the local magnetization. Since K is weighted by the field distribution, the largest contribution comes from areas where the derivative of \mathbf{M} vanishes, which are at the minimum and maximum locations of \mathbf{M} . The calculated bifurcation between minimum and maximum local magnetization seen in Fig. 2 is in qualitative agreement with measurements of the Knight shift on CeCoIn₅ reported by Kakuyanagi et al. [11].

In Fig. 3, we show field scans of the local magnetization at $T/T_c = 0.1$ starting in the USC phase and into the FFLO $\langle 110 \rangle$ phase. It illustrates the nonlinear magnetic response of the quasiparticles due to an external field and the continuous second order transition at the lower critical field B_{c1} , which also is signaled by the appearance of a single domain wall. This finding clearly contradicts the claim by Yang and Sondhi [10] about a first order transition at B_{c1} between the USC and FFLO phase.

In addition, we calculated the spin-resolved local density of states in the FFLO state [6] (not shown). We found that the characteristic Andreev bound states, due to the periodic sign change of the order parameter, are responsible for the excess spin polarization of quasiparticles at the domain walls seen in Figs. 2 and 3. Therefore, the Andreev bound states should be clearly visible features in scanning tunneling spectroscopy measurements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank N. J. Curro, R. Movshovich and V. F. Mitrović for helpful discussions and A. V. Balatsky and J. A. Sauls for suggesting this problem. This research is supported by the Department of Energy, under contract W-7405-ENG-36, (MJG) and the LSU Board of Regents (ABV).




FIGURE 2. Temperature scan of the normalized local magnetization at fixed magnetic field $b = 0.2$ in FFLO phase for $\langle 110 \rangle$ orientation of spatial order-parameter modulation. Inset: Phase diagram with temperature and field scans across FFLO phase.




FIGURE 3. Field scan of the normalized local magnetization at fixed temperature $T/T_c = 0.1$ across USC and FFLO phases for $\langle 110 \rangle$ orientation of order-parameter modulation.

REFERENCES

1. P. Fulde and R. Ferrell, *Phys. Rev.* **135**, A550–A563 (1964).
2. A. I. Larkin and Y. N. Ovchinnikov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **20**, 762–769 (1965).
3. K. Maki and H. Won, *Czech. J. Phys.* **46**, 1035–1036 (1996).
4. H. Shimahara and D. Rainer, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **66**, 3591–3599 (1997).
5. U. Klein, D. Rainer, and H. Shimahara, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **118**, 91–104 (2000).
6. A. B. Vorontsov, J. A. Sauls, and M. J. Graf, *cond-mat/0506257* (2005).
7. H. Shimahara, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **67**, 736–739 (1998).
8. K. Maki and H. Won, *Physica B* **322**, 315–317 (2002).
9. J. A. X. Alexander, T. P. Orlando, D. Rainer, and P. M. Tedrow, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 5811–5825 (1985).
10. K. Yang and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 8566 (1998).
11. K. Kakuyanagi et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 047602 (2005).