

On a "Robust" A-like State of ^3He in Aerogel

G. A. Baramidze and G. A. Kharadze

Andronikashvili Institute of Physics, Tamarashvili str. 6,
0177 Tbilisi, Georgia (e-mail: gogi@iphac.ge)

January 3, 2022

Abstract

The orbitally isotropic Equal Spin Pairing (ESP) state has been proposed in Ref. [1] as a candidate of an A-like phase of superfluid ^3He in aerogel environment. In order to preserve an exact isotropy of the state in the presence of the magnetic field the condensate with equal values of the amplitudes $\psi_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $\psi_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ was adopted. Experimentally it is established that this version does not reproduce observed splitting asymmetry of ESP phase in aerogel under the action of an external magnetic field. Here we explore the behavior of the quasi-isotropic version of an axiplanar ESP phase with $\psi_{\uparrow\uparrow} \neq \psi_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ and show that for this state the splitting asymmetry ratio could be reconciled with experimental observations.

In the past decade a problem of the structure of ordered (superfluid) states of liquid ^3He placed in a disordered medium (aerogel) has attracted much attention.

Recently it was pointed out in [1] that the A-like phase in aerogel, which undoubtedly belongs to an ESP category of spin-triplet condensates, should be different from an axially anisotropic ABM state because the presence of a spatial disorder lifts the degeneracy of this phase with respect to the orientation of orbital anisotropy axes \hat{l} , thus preventing the establishment of

a true long-range order (see, also Ref.[2]). In Ref.[1] it has been proposed to start from ESP order parameter

$$A_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (\hat{d} a_i + \hat{e} b_i); \quad \hat{d} \neq \hat{e} \quad (1)$$

with orbital vectors $\mathbf{a} = \hat{m} + i\hat{n}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \hat{l} + i\hat{p}$, and to choose four real vectors $(\hat{m}; \hat{n}; \hat{l}; \hat{p})$ in a way as to satisfy an orbital isotropy condition

$$\text{Re}(A_i A_j) = \text{const} \delta_{ij}; \quad (2)$$

which guarantees that the superfluid state (1) will be "robust" with respect to local spatial irregularities in aerogel. This is because the phenomenologically introduced interaction of Cooper condensate with spatial disorder imposed by aerogel

$$F = \delta_{ij} \text{Re}(A_i A_j) = 0; \quad (3)$$

Here a traceless tensor $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(ij)}(\mathbf{r})$ characterizes the local action of aerogel environment on the superfluid condensate. As long as the condition (2) is satisfied, the orbital degeneracy is preserved and a long-range order of the type described by (1) can develop. This is in contrast to an orbitally anisotropic ABM state with an order parameter

$$A_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{d} (\hat{m} + i\hat{n}); \quad \hat{m} \cdot \hat{n} = \hat{l} \quad (4)$$

for which

$$F = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \hat{l}_i \hat{l}_j \quad (5)$$

and the rotational degeneracy of an orbital anisotropy axis \hat{l} is lifted locally.

The possibility of realization of an axiplanar orbitally isotropic ESP phase of type (1) as an equilibrium state is still under debate [3,4,5]. For the moment the most direct verification of the possible realization of an orbitally isotropic ESP phase is supplied by the observation of the splitting of A -like phase into A_1 -like and A_2 -like phases under the action of magnetic field. Most generally an ESP state in a magnetic field is described by an order parameter

$$A_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{P}{3} \left[\alpha (\hat{d} + i\hat{e}) (a_i - ib_i) + \beta (\hat{d} - i\hat{e}) (a_i + ib_i) \right] \quad (6)$$

where α and β stand for the amplitudes of Cooper condensates with α and β spin configurations, respectively. In zero magnetic field $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and (6) reduces to (1). In Ref.[1] even in the presence of magnetic field it was assumed that $\alpha = \beta$, and the adjustment of an ordered state (see Eq.(1)) to an external magnetic field is realized due to the presence of a spontaneous magnetic moment M of the condensate proportional to an orbital variable $\mathbf{L} = (\hbar \mathbf{l} - m \mathbf{p})$ and pointing along the spin quantization axis $\hat{s} = \hat{d} - \hat{e}$. According to Ref.[1] the free energy density of model (1) is given by $N(0)$ stands for the quasiparticle density of states at the Fermi level)

$$\frac{F(H)_{\text{Fomin}}}{N(0)} = \frac{H}{3} - \frac{2}{9} \epsilon_{15}^2 + \frac{4}{18} (\epsilon_{13} + 9\epsilon_2 + 5\epsilon_{45}); \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon = (T - T_\infty)/T_\infty$ (T_∞ being the critical temperature in zero magnetic field), linear-in-field term (proportional to a tiny particle-hole asymmetry coefficient ϵ) stems for the Zeeman energy HM , and $\epsilon_{ij} = \epsilon_i + \epsilon_j + \epsilon_{ij}$ is a combination of phenomenological coefficients regulating the fourth order contribution in ϵ .

Minimization of (7) (at $\epsilon_{15} < 0$) shows that the A_1 -like ferromagnetic phase (with $\epsilon = 1/2$) is realized as an equilibrium state in a temperature interval

$$1 + \frac{B}{12} \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 \quad \epsilon_2 = H/6 \quad (8)$$

with $B = 9\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3 + 5\epsilon_4 + 4\epsilon_5$. The $A_1 - A_2$ splitting asymmetry ratio

$$r = \frac{T_{c1} - T_\infty}{T_\infty - T_{c2}} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{15}{15 + B}; \quad (9)$$

which in weak-coupling limit is equal to 0.16. This estimate shows that r_{Fomin} is too small to be reconciled with recent experimental observations [6]. This fact poses a question about the origin of mentioned discrepancy. One way of resolving this problem is to lift the assumption $\alpha = \beta$, adopted in Ref.[1]. In a model with $\alpha \neq \beta$ an exact orbital isotropy of an ESP state with

an order parameter (6) is lost (see below), although the orbital anisotropy which appears is minute (proportional to ϵ). Even in the presence of a tiny orbital anisotropy of an order parameter the spatial irregularities imposed by aerogel environment will tend the superfluid state to break up into domains of a finite size with linear dimension L , but in this case L should be large enough to maintain the coherency of the condensate in the main body of the system.

In order to realize the above-mentioned approach we start from an order parameter

$$A_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{p}{p-3} \left(\hat{d} + i\epsilon \right) \left[\hat{n} + i(\hat{n} \cdot \hat{l}) \hat{l} \right]_i + \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{d} - i\epsilon \right) \left[\hat{n} + i(\hat{n} \cdot \hat{l}) \hat{l} \right]_i; \quad (10)$$

where $(\hat{n}; \hat{l}; \hat{l})$ is a triad of mutually orthogonal unit orbital vectors. The order parameter (10) is a simple version of a general ESP state. It can be readily shown that for (10)

$$\text{Re}(A_i A_j) = \frac{1}{6} \left[(\hat{n}_i^2 + \hat{n}_j^2) \delta_{ij} - (\hat{n}_i^2 - \hat{n}_j^2) (\hat{n}_i \hat{l}_j + \hat{l}_i \hat{n}_j) \right]; \quad (11)$$

which reveals an orbital anisotropy of (10) proportional to $(\hat{n}_i^2 - \hat{n}_j^2)$. In a standard way a free energy density corresponding to (10) can be constructed:

$$\frac{F(H)}{N(0)} = \frac{1}{2} (H)^2_{nn} + \frac{1}{2} (\epsilon + H)^2_{\# \#} + \frac{1}{4} (\epsilon^4_{nn} + \epsilon^4_{\# \#}) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2_{nn} \epsilon^2_{\# \#}; \quad (12)$$

where

$$\epsilon^2_{nn} = \epsilon^2_{24} + \frac{1}{9} \epsilon^2_{33}; \quad (13)$$

$$\epsilon^2_{\# \#} = \frac{1}{9} (2 \epsilon^2_{11} + 9 \epsilon^2_{22} + \epsilon^2_{34} + 10 \epsilon^2_{55});$$

The free energy density (12) coincides in form with that of an A-phase (axial ABM state) for which $\epsilon^2_{nn} = \epsilon^2_{24}$ and $\epsilon^2_{\# \#} = \epsilon^2_{24} + 2 \epsilon^2_{55}$. On the other hand, there is a crucial difference between ABM state and the state described by Eq.(10): the former is characterized by strong interaction with spatial

disorder (see Eq.(5)) whereas the latter has only a weak orbital contact with aerogel structure ($F = \frac{1}{6} (\frac{2}{\mu\mu} \frac{2}{\#\#})_{ij} (\hat{n}_i \hat{l}_j + \hat{l}_i \hat{n}_j)$).

In the temperature interval

$$\frac{+}{1} \frac{1}{1} = H \quad (14)$$

an A_1 -like phase is realized within a domain of linear size L , and at the A_2 -like phase is stabilized. For $\frac{2}{\mu\mu}$ and $\frac{2}{\#\#}$ the following solution is obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\mu\mu} &= N(0) \frac{1}{+}; \\ \frac{2}{\#\#} &= 0; \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\mu\mu} &= N(0) \frac{+}{+} \frac{2}{1}; \\ \frac{2}{\#\#} &= N(0) \frac{1}{+} \frac{1}{1}; \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

On lowering the temperature below T_{c1} the difference $(\frac{2}{\mu\mu} - \frac{2}{\#\#})$ increases gradually and saturates (on reaching T_{c2}) at the level $(\frac{2}{\mu\mu} - \frac{2}{\#\#})_{\max} = 2N(0) \frac{H}{1}$, so that

$$F^{\max} = \frac{1}{3} N(0) \frac{H}{1} \sum_{ij} (\hat{n}_i \hat{l}_j + \hat{l}_i \hat{n}_j); \quad (17)$$

As mentioned above, the interaction strength of a condensate having the order parameter (10) with spatial irregularities imposed by aerogel is very weak due to the presence of a tiny coefficient. At the same time the $A_1 - A_2$ splitting asymmetry ratio for this case reads as

$$r = \frac{1}{2} = 1 - \frac{2}{+} \frac{1}{1}; \quad (18)$$

and in the weak-coupling approximation (where $\beta = 0$) the splitting asymmetry is absent ($r = 1$). This fact seems not to be in conflict with experimental data.

We thank G. E. Volovik for correspondence.

References

- [1] I. A. Fomin, LANL ArXiv, cond-mat/0307618 (2003).
- [2] G. E. Volovik, JETP Lett. 63, 301 (1996).
- [3] V. P. Mineev and M. E. Zhitomirsky, Pis'ma ZhETF 81, 360 (2005).
- [4] G. E. Volovik, LANL ArXiv, cond-mat/0505281 (2005).
- [5] I. A. Fomin, LANL ArXiv, cond-mat/0505650 (2005).
- [6] H. C. Choi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 93 145302-1 (2004).