

Layered superconductors with long-range Josephson couplings

by
Małgorzata Sztyren *

March 23, 2022

Abstract

The present paper is an extension of *cond-mat/0312673*. The construction of a hybrid discrete-continuous model of layered superconductors is presented. The model bases on the classic Lawrence-Doniach scenario with admitting, however, long-range interactions between atomic planes. Moreover, apart from Josephson couplings they involve the proximity effects. The range of interactions can, in principle, be arbitrary large. The solutions corresponding to the range $K=2$ are found. The mechanism of enhancement of superconductivity caused by the proximity effect and the presence of higher Josephson couplings is shown. The physical meaning of coupling constants, with particular attention paid to their sign, is discussed. For the case $K=2$ the interpretation in terms of microscopic interactions between Cooper pairs in different planes, as well as the relation to experimentally measurable quantities, such as the out-of plane effective mass and bandwidth, is given.

1 Introduction

Most of the high-temperature superconductors like e.g. YBCO or BiSCCO have a layered structure. Such a strongly anisotropic situation results in the

*Department of Mathematics and Information Science, Warsaw University of Technology, Pl. Politechniki 1, PL-00-661 Warsaw E-mail: emes@mech.pw.edu.pl

fact that the material properties and behaviour of the fields in the direction (say z axis) orthogonal to the layers are totally different from the behaviour in directions parallel to the layers. The simplest effective phenomenology of such systems is given by the 3D anisotropic Ginzburg-Landau model [2, 1, 3].

However, the abilities of the 3D continuum to describe discrete array of atomic layers are limited: for a layered superconductor such a description can be justified only when $\xi_c \gg s$, where s is the (typical) interlayer spacing. The idea originally proposed by Lawrence and Doniach (LD) [6] is to consider the layered superconductor as an array of superconducting planes coupled by Josephson currents [6] flowing perpendicularly between adjacent layers. The planes themselves are described in terms of the 2D Ginzburg-Landau phenomenology. Under such circumstances the GL order parameter ψ appears as a function of two continuous variables (say x and y) and one discrete variable n – the index of the layer. The corresponding form of the free-energy functional was proposed in [6]. The model turned out very successful, and was subsequently modified and enriched in many papers and textbooks [7, 9, 8, 10]. A number of solutions for LD model are given in [12] or [11].

As compared with the 3D anisotropic GL, the LD model can be considered the other extreme case, justified when $\xi_c \leq s$. However, both the models together do not cover the entire range of the coherence lengths ξ_c in relation to the spacing s : there is a gap between the models corresponding to coherence lengths ξ_c which are too small for GL and too big for LD.

The higher grade hybrid model, proposed in the present paper, patches the above gap by admitting direct couplings not only between adjacent, but also between more distant atomic planes. Such couplings can be particularly expected due to strong interplanar electronic correlations. The low-temperature correlation lengths of many superconducting materials, such as e.g. $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_8$, with $\xi_c = 28\text{\AA}$, or $\text{Tl}_2\text{Ba}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_8$, with $\xi_c = 23\text{\AA}$, do not justify the restriction of interplanar couplings to nearest neighbours only. Since in both cases the interplanar spacing s is about 15\AA , the ratio ξ_c/s ranges, roughly speaking, from 1.5 to 2, and this suggests the need for interplanar couplings including nearest and next-nearest planes at least. The situation here is quite analogous to that in the theory of crystalline lattices: in general the nearest neighbour couplings alone are not sufficient for adequate description of lattice dynamics [16].

The paper is organized as follows. In the next sections we give a formal

presentation of our hybrid model with couplings among more distant neighbours – up to a (given, but arbitrary) range K , with emphasis on $K = 2$. Subsequently we determine the ground state solutions and discuss their stability in function of admissible coupling parameters. For the sake of brevity, in other (frequently important) respects we keep our considerations as close to classic LD model as possible, avoiding e.g. heterostructures, non-uniform interplanar spacings, or else gradient coupling [9]. Those factors will be discussed elsewhere.

In Section 7 we discuss the relation between 2D and 3D superconductivity in our model. The presence of interplanar couplings modifies the in-plane superconductivity. Depending on the coupling constants the modification can turn out suppression or enhancement. In particular, even overcritical planes can, under appropriate couplings, result in subcritical superconductivity of the whole array.

If the nearest-neighbour coupling dominates, one can pass to $K = 1$. The resulting hybrid model with $K = 1$ offers, however, more possibilities than the classic LD; the latter obtains as a specialized case of this variant. The relevant questions, including the relation to other existing models, are addressed in the Section 8. The final Section 9 is devoted to discussion of the physical significance of the coupling constants, with particular attention paid to their signs.

2 The hybrid model of grade K

Let us regard the layered superconductor as a one-dimensional chain of atomic planes with Josephson's bonds between them. Such bonds will be called J-links. The interplanar distance will be denoted by s . We assume the following convention for indexing the planes and links. If we locate the point $z = 0$ at an atomic plane, then the z -coordinate of any plane, equal ns , may be represented by the integer n , while the z -coordinate of the center of any interplanar gap, equal ls , by the half-integer l . Choosing the point $z = 0$ at the center of an interplanar gap – we index the planes by half-integers and the gaps by integers.

Let us consider the free-energy functional \mathcal{F} for a layered superconductor. We shall denote by ψ_n the order parameter associated to the layer indexed by the number n . Its complex conjugate (c.c.) will be denoted by $\bar{\psi}_n$. The

symbol m_{ab} and m_c will denote the in-plane and out-of-plane effective mass of superconducting current carriers, respectively. We start from the free energy functional of the following form

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_0 + \mathcal{F}_s + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int \mathbf{B}^2 d^3x. \quad (1)$$

The term \mathcal{F}_0 describes the normal state, while \mathcal{F}_s the superconducting one. The superconducting term is composed of two parts:

$$\mathcal{F}_s = \mathcal{F}_p + \mathcal{F}_J, \quad (2)$$

where the part

$$\mathcal{F}_p = s \sum_n \int dxdy F_n \quad (3)$$

describes the contribution of atomic planes, while \mathcal{F}_J corresponds to interplanar Josephson's bonds. For any plane indexed by n the free energy density F_n has the 2D Ginzburg-Landau form (in general, the parameters can depend on n)

$$F_n = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{ab}} |(\mathbf{D}\psi)_n|^2 + \alpha_0 |\psi_n|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \beta |\psi_n|^4, \quad (4)$$

where we have introduced the 2-dimensional continuous operator \mathbf{D} (covariant derivative)

$$D_\rho = \partial_\rho - \frac{ie^*}{\hbar c} A_\rho, \quad \rho = x, y. \quad (5)$$

The form (4) of the functional \mathcal{F}_p already ensures its invariance with respect to the gauge transformation

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{A} + \nabla \Lambda, \\ \psi_n \rightarrow \psi'_n = \psi_n e^{i\frac{e^*}{\hbar c} \Lambda}, \\ \bar{\psi}_n \rightarrow \bar{\psi}'_n = \bar{\psi}_n e^{-i\frac{e^*}{\hbar c} \Lambda} \end{array} \right. \quad (6)$$

(2-dimensional \mathbf{A} and ∇ for this case). The standard variational treatment of the functional \mathcal{F}_s with respect to A_ρ , $\rho = x, y$, gives the standard in-plane components of the superconducting current

$$j_\rho = -\frac{ie^*\hbar}{2m_{ab}} (\bar{\psi}_n \partial_\rho \psi_n - \psi_n \partial_\rho \bar{\psi}_n) - \frac{e^{*2}}{m_{ab}c} A_\rho |\psi_n|^2, \quad \rho = x, y. \quad (7)$$

Let us now construct the term \mathcal{F}_J in the free-energy. In general it is a functional which can depend on all $\psi_n, \bar{\psi}_n$ and on the vector potential \mathbf{A} . The simplest gauge invariant expression for the energy of J-link between n -th and $(n+q)$ -th planes will have the following form

$$\varepsilon_{qn} = \frac{1}{2} \{ \zeta_{qn} \bar{\psi}_n \psi_n + \eta_{qn} \bar{\psi}_{n+q} \psi_{n+q} - (\gamma_{qn} \bar{\psi}_n \psi_{n+q} e^{-ip_{qn}} + c.c.) \}, \quad (8)$$

where the exponent p_{qn} is defined by the formula

$$p_{qn} = \frac{e^*}{\hbar c} \int_{ns}^{(n+q)s} A_z dz. \quad (9)$$

Let us note that for the model invariant with respect to the time reversal we have $\gamma_{qn} = \bar{\gamma}_{qn}$. In general, the coupling parameters ζ, η, γ as well as in-plane parameters α_0 and β can be different for different planes (which is the case for superconductors composed of various atomic planes). However, in this paper we shall consider the array of identical planes, hence the parameters will not depend on the index n . That implies $\eta_q = \zeta_q$. Hence instead of (8) we shall use

$$\varepsilon_{qn} = \frac{1}{2} \{ \zeta_q (|\psi_n|^2 + |\psi_{n+q}|^2) - \gamma_q (\bar{\psi}_n \psi_{n+q} e^{-ip_{qn}} + c.c.) \}. \quad (10)$$

Let P denote the (finite or infinite, but ordered) set of all indices of planes, and let $Q = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. The planes connected with the n -plane by Josephson coupling select the following subset of Q

$$P_n = \{q \in Q : (n+q) \in P\}. \quad (11)$$

Thus, the gauge invariant functional \mathcal{F}_J for the hybrid model of grade K has the following form

$$\mathcal{F}_J = s \sum_{n \in P} \sum_{q \in P_n} \int dx dy \varepsilon_{qn}, \quad (12)$$

with ε_{qn} given by (10). The coupling parameters ζ_q and γ_q vanish for $q > K$. Every J-link is represented in (12) by exactly one term.

3 Comparison with anisotropic GL model

To compare our hybrid model (HM) with the continuum GL model, we shall consider the infinite medium. In that case the summation index may be

shifted by the integer q . Moreover $P_n = Q$. This implies that

$$F_J = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \sum_q \{2(\zeta_q - \gamma_q)|\psi_n|^2 + \gamma_q|\psi_{n+q}e^{-ip_{qn}} - \psi_n|^2\}. \quad (13)$$

For very weak field A_z and very slow dependence of ψ_n on n we have the correspondence rules which, in the long wave limit, allow us to pass from the hybrid to the 3D continuum:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{s} \int dz, \\ \frac{1}{qs}(\psi_{n+q} - \psi_n) \rightarrow \psi'_n(z), \\ e^{-ip_{qn}} \rightarrow 1 - i\frac{e^*}{\hbar c}qsA_z. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Applying the rules to the functional (2) with (4) and (13) one obtains

$$\mathcal{F}_s \rightarrow \int d^3x \left\{ \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{ab}} |\mathbf{D}\psi|^2 + \alpha_0 |\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \beta |\psi|^4 + \sum_q [(\zeta_q - \gamma_q) |\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} q^2 s^2 \gamma_q |D_3\psi|^2] \right\}. \quad (15)$$

Hence, we have the following relation between m_c – the effective mass in z -direction (in the anisotropic GL model) and the coupling parameters γ_q :

$$\frac{1}{m_c} = \frac{s^2}{\hbar^2} \sum_q q^2 \gamma_q. \quad (16)$$

The presence of J-links modifies also the parameter α_0 to the form:

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 + \sum_q (\zeta_q - \gamma_q). \quad (17)$$

The condition of weak dependence of ψ_n on n , valid under usual assumption of nearly uniform states, is crucial for the transition from discrete to continuum picture in the z -direction. For strongly oscillating dependence, in particular for alternating ground-state solutions discussed in the sequel, transition (14) can no longer be established. Nevertheless, sufficiently weak and sufficiently smooth excitations from a given ground state can again be described by an effective 3D anisotropic GL model, specific for this ground state. The equations (16) and (17) remain valid only for excitations with

respect to the uniform ground-state. In the case of phase-oscillatory ground states $\overset{\circ}{\psi}_n$, making use of the substitution

$$\psi_n \rightarrow \overset{\circ}{\psi}_n (1 + \psi_n) \quad (18)$$

with a suitable reinterpretation of the correspondence rules (14), one arrives at the modified equations, which can be obtained from (16) and (17) through the replacement

$$\gamma_q \rightarrow \gamma_q \cos(q\theta). \quad (19)$$

The requirement of the overall stability of the system is responsible for the positive sign of the effective mass m_c .

4 Field equations

By computing the variation of the functional \mathcal{F} with respect to A_z one obtains the Maxwell equation for the z -components of current density and curl H

$$\frac{1}{c}J(z) = \frac{1}{4\pi}(\text{curl } H)_z, \quad (20)$$

where

$$J(z) = \frac{se^*}{2i\hbar} \sum_{n \in P} \sum_{q \in P_n} \{\gamma_q \bar{\psi}_n \psi_{n+q} e^{-ip_{qn}} - c.c.\} \chi_{qn}(z), \quad (21)$$

P_n is given by (11), and the quantity p_{qn} by (9). The symbol $\chi_{qn}(z)$ denotes the characteristic function of the interval $[ns, (n+q)s]$. Let us note that for any layer $ns < z < (n+1)s$ the expression $J(z)$ does not depend on the value z ; only the ends of the interval are important. To better see the structure, let us first extend the set Q on the negative values

$$\bar{Q} = \{-K, \dots, -2, -1, 1, 2, \dots, K\}, \quad (22)$$

and introduce the symbols

$$\sigma_{qn} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (n+q) \in P, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Then the expression for Josephson current J_l describing tunneling across the interplanar gap indexed by l (half integer if P contains integers) will have the form

$$J_l = \frac{se^*}{2i\hbar} \sum_{q \in \bar{Q}} \sum_{n \in P_{lq}} \{ \gamma_q \sigma_{qn} \bar{\psi}_n \psi_{n+q} e^{-ip_{qn}} - c.c. \}, \quad (24)$$

where

$$P_{lq} = \{ n \in P : n < l < n + q \}. \quad (25)$$

By computing the variation of the functional \mathcal{F}_s with respect to $\bar{\psi}_n$, one obtains the equations

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{ab}} \mathbf{D}^2 \psi_n + \tilde{\alpha} \psi_n + \beta |\psi_n|^2 \psi_n - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q \in \bar{Q}} \gamma_q \sigma_{qn} \psi_{n+q} e^{-ip_{qn}} = 0 \quad (26)$$

where instead of α_0 we have introduced

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q \in \bar{Q}} \sigma_{qn} \zeta_q \quad (27)$$

which, for finite P , depends of n .

5 The ground states

Let us now consider the plane-uniform states of HM in the absence of magnetic field. The order parameter is then independent of the in-plane variables and the net supercurrents vanish. In detailed calculations we shall focus our attention on the grade $K = 2$, which seems to be sufficiently illustrative to grasp the idea on what is going on. The generalization to grades $K > 2$, although more complicated algebraically, is straightforward. In the region far from the boundary all the coefficients $\sigma_{qn} = 1$. For $K = 2$ the condition of vanishing Josephson current is equivalent to

$$\gamma_1(\bar{\psi}_n \psi_{n+1} - c.c.) + \gamma_2(\bar{\psi}_n \psi_{n+2} + \bar{\psi}_{n-1} \psi_{n+1} - c.c.) = 0, \quad (28)$$

and the equations (26) take the form

$$\tilde{\alpha} \psi_n + \beta |\psi_n|^2 \psi_n - \frac{1}{2} [\gamma_1(\psi_{n+1} + \psi_{n-1}) + \gamma_2(\psi_{n+2} + \psi_{n-2})] = 0. \quad (29)$$

We shall look for solutions with constant amplitude and difference of phase between adjacent atomic planes, so we use the ansatz

$$\psi_n = Ce^{in\theta}. \quad (30)$$

The result is the equation

$$\tilde{\alpha} + \beta C^2 - \gamma_1 \cos \theta - \gamma_2 \cos 2\theta = 0, \quad (31)$$

with the condition

$$\gamma_1 \sin \theta + 2\gamma_2 \sin 2\theta = 0. \quad (32)$$

Solving (32) with respect to θ , we obtain 3 variants: (a1) $\theta = 0$, (a2) $\theta = \pi$, and (a3) $\cos \theta = -\gamma_1/4\gamma_2$. The solution C to (31) has the form $C^2 = -\alpha^*/\beta$, where α^* depends on the variant. The variant (a1) implies the uniform solution to (29):

$$\psi_n = C, \quad (33)$$

with

$$\alpha^* = \alpha_0 + \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2, \quad (34)$$

what is the case of equation (17) for grade K=2. In the variant (a2) the solution to (29) has the alternating form

$$\psi_n = \pm C, \quad (35)$$

with

$$\alpha^* = \alpha_0 + \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \gamma_1 - \gamma_2. \quad (36)$$

Finally, in the variant (a3), the solution exists if the parameters γ_1 and γ_2 fulfill the relation

$$|\gamma_1| \leq 4|\gamma_2|. \quad (37)$$

Then the parameter α^* is connected with the coupling constants by the formula:

$$\alpha^* = \alpha_0 + \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \gamma_2 \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_1^2}{8\gamma_2^2}\right). \quad (38)$$

There are two independent solutions

$$\psi_n = Ce^{\pm i\theta}, \quad \theta = \arccos\left(-\frac{\gamma_1}{4\gamma_2}\right). \quad (39)$$

They will be referred to as the phase modulated states. The solutions degenerate at the extremities $|\gamma_1| = 4|\gamma_2|$.

So far we confined our discussion to the existence of solutions which could serve as candidates for the ground state. However, unstable candidates, even uniform ones, have to be rejected. Note that alternating states were already found in the literature on different grounds – phenomenological [7] as well as microscopic ones [8]. The question of stability of the solutions will be addressed in the next section.

Let us note that the condition $\sin \theta = 0$ admits the solutions (33) and (35) for hybrid model of any grade K . Contrary to that, the analogues of the conditions (a3) and (37) can deliver, depending on the grade and on the coupling parameters, any number from 0 to $2(K - 1)$ modulated solutions.

6 Stability

To examine the stability of the solutions presented in Section 5, we shall analyze the Hessian matrix of the free energy \mathcal{F}_s describing small deviations from the ground state. The problem reduces to examining the function

$$\mathcal{E}(C, \theta) = \tilde{\alpha}C^2 + \frac{1}{2}\beta C^4 - C^2(\gamma_1 \cos \theta + \gamma_2 \cos 2\theta). \quad (40)$$

The solutions found in the previous section are stationary points of \mathcal{E} . If $\gamma_2 = 0$, then the stability of the solutions depends on the sign of γ_1 . If $\gamma_2 \neq 0$ then the sign of the respective eigenvalue depends on the values of the parameters γ_1 and γ_2 . For θ different from 0 and π the dependence has form according to the function

$$f(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \gamma_2(\gamma_1 + 4\gamma_2)(\gamma_1 - 4\gamma_2). \quad (41)$$

The straight lines $\gamma_1 + 4\gamma_2 = 0$ and $\gamma_1 - 4\gamma_2 = 0$ divide the plane γ_1, γ_2 into 4 regions (see Fig. 16).

As explained above, both the uniform and the alternating solutions always exist. However, in the region $\gamma_1 > 0$, $\gamma_1 + 4\gamma_2 > 0$, only the uniform solution (33) is stable, while in the region $\gamma_1 < 0$, $\gamma_1 - 4\gamma_2 < 0$, only the alternating solution (35) is stable. The region (S): $\gamma_2 < 0$, $4\gamma_2 < \gamma_1 < -4\gamma_2$, excludes the stability of both the uniform and the alternating solutions but, in contrast to that, ensures the existence and stability of the modulated solutions (39).

In the region (N): $\gamma_2 < 0$, $-4\gamma_2 < \gamma_1 < 4\gamma_2$, the modulated solutions exist but are unstable.

Let us note that in the regions (NW) and (W) of stability of the alternating solution (35) one can apply the construction of bi-continuum solution presented in [13]. Note also that, irrespectively of the values and signs of γ_1 , γ_2 , a stable ground state solution always exists.

7 Enhancement of the superconductivity

The asociation of the formulae (34), (36) and (38) with the regions of stability of the ground state shows that, for suitable relations between the coupling constants γ_1 and γ_2 , one can make the parameter α^* more negative than α_0 . In consequence, the 3D superconductivity can turn out enhanced with respect to the 2D superconductivity in the atomic planes. Such a possibility has been indicated in the literature [4]. The presence of coupling constants ζ_q allows to describe the proximity effect between atomic planes.

The corresponding shift of the parameter α depends on both ζ 's and γ 's. While the contribution from ζ 's reduces always to simple renormalization of α_0 by the same additive term $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2$, the contribution from γ 's in (34), (36) and (38) varies. To expose the dependence on γ 's, we shall count the enhancement with respect to the origin located at $\tilde{\alpha}$ given by (27). It is convenient to introduce the polar coordinates γ and φ in the plane γ_1 , γ_2 :

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma \cos \varphi, \quad \gamma_2 = \gamma \sin \varphi, \quad (42)$$

and the notation

$$\varphi_0 = \arctan\left(\frac{1}{4}\right). \quad (43)$$

The quantity $\Delta\alpha = \alpha^* - \tilde{\alpha}$ as a function of the coupling angle φ is plotted in Fig. 16 (the numerical values are computed for $\gamma = 1$).

In the uniform state (34) we have

$$\Delta\alpha = \sqrt{2}\gamma \sin\left(\varphi - \frac{3}{4}\pi\right), \quad -\varphi_0 \leq \varphi \leq \pi - \varphi_0. \quad (44)$$

The minimum $\Delta\alpha$ (hence the maximum enhancement) is reached at $\varphi = \pi/4$ and equals $-\sqrt{2}\gamma$.

In the alternating state (36), in turn, one obtains

$$\Delta\alpha = \sqrt{2}\gamma \sin(\varphi + \frac{3}{4}\pi), \quad \varphi_0 \leq \varphi \leq \pi + \varphi_0 \quad (45)$$

with the minimum value $-\sqrt{2}\gamma$ reached at $\varphi = \frac{3}{4}\pi$.

The enhancement for the phase modulated state (38) is represented by

$$\Delta\alpha = \gamma(1 + \frac{1}{8}\text{ctg}^2\varphi) \sin \varphi, \quad -\pi + \varphi_0 \leq \varphi \leq -\varphi_0. \quad (46)$$

In this case the minimum equals $-\gamma$ and is reached at $\varphi = -\pi/2$. Hence, the maximum enhancement in this case is smaller than in the uniform and alternating states.

Let us note that, in the enhancement mechanism discussed above, the 2D superconductivity of the planes is not a prerequisite for the 3D superconductivity of the array of the planes. In fact, one can obtain the negative α^* starting from positive α_0 . This is in concordance with ideas expressed in Anderson's discussion of his Dogma V in [5].

8 Special cases

The HM with $K=1$ has in general two coupling parameters ζ and γ . If they are equal to one another, one obtains either the Lawrence-Doniach [6] or Theodorakis [7] model, depending on the sign of γ . The formula for the effective mass in z-direction simplifies to

$$\frac{1}{m_c} = \frac{s^2}{\hbar^2} |\gamma|. \quad (47)$$

Due to $\gamma > 0$ the LD model has only one stable solution, namely the uniform ground state. The effective parameter $\alpha = \alpha_0$, and the interplanar coupling gives neither enhancement nor suppression of the critical temperature. Although the Josephson current coupling places the model on the enhancement side, the effect is precisely annulled by $\zeta = \gamma$.

Where the negative γ is concerned, the ground state solution is also unique. Contrary, however, to the LD case, this solution is alternating, the proximity effect is present, and the effective parameter $\alpha = \alpha_0 - 2|\gamma|$ results in enhancement of the supeconductivity.

9 Discussion

In the present section we shall discuss the physical meaning of the coupling constants γ_1 , γ_2 with special attention paid to their signs.

1. First of all it is expedient to note a certain symmetry between hybrid systems with negative and positive γ_1 . To that end consider the transformation

$$\begin{cases} \psi'_n = (-1)^n \psi_n, \\ \mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{A}, \\ \gamma'_q = (-1)^q \gamma_q, \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

with all the remaining quantities kept fixed. This transformation switches between systems with all the constants γ_q transformed according to the parity of q : the constants remain identical for even q 's and change sign for odd q 's; in particular $\gamma'_1 = -\gamma_1$ and $\gamma'_2 = \gamma_2$. At the same time the order parameter ψ_n is transformed by the sign-alternating factor; in particular the states of uniform order parameter are transformed into alternating ones, and *vice versa*.

An inspection of the equation (8) shows that the energy of the Josephson's coupling is invariant with respect to transformation (48). This invariance extends to the whole free energy functional (1). Note, in particular, the corresponding symmetry in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. Two hybrid systems related by the transformation (48) have identical ground state energies, excitation energy spectra, and all the thermodynamical properties, including T_c .

2. The second coupling constant γ_2 represents the microscopic interactions between Cooper pairs located in next-nearest layers. Similarly as in the case of γ_1 , corresponding to q_3 in [8], the sign of γ_2 reflects the attractiveness or repulsiveness of those interactions, both signs being equally well admissible on physical grounds. Contrary, however, to γ_1 , the sign of γ_2 can not be relativized by the transformation (48). To discuss this situation let us first select one of the admissible ground states determined in Section 5, and then consider the related excited states resulting from z -dependent variations of the order parameter with respect to the selected ground state.

3. For simplicity we start here from the case of sufficiently weak coupling between next-nearest layers, so that $|\gamma_2| < |\gamma_1|/4$, what corresponds to the western and eastern sectors in Fig. 1, with the alternating and uniform ground states, respectively. The strong coupling sectors will be commented in the sequel.

Understood as the excess energy over the ground state and considered as a function of the wave vector, the excitation energy equals

$$\epsilon_k = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{ab}}(k_x^2 + k_y^2) + |\gamma_1|(1 - \cos k_z s) + \gamma_2(1 - \cos 2k_z s). \quad (49)$$

Note that the contribution from γ_1 is always positive.

In the present work it will be sufficient to consider only excitations with $k_x = k_y = 0$. They are characterized by the effective mass

$$m_c = \frac{\hbar^2}{s^2}(|\gamma_1| + 4\gamma_2)^{-1} \quad (50)$$

in the vicinity of the ground state $k = 0$, and by the bandwidth

$$W = 2|\gamma_1|; \quad (51)$$

the latter furnishes an alternative interpretation of γ_1 in this case. Provided that the bandwidth W and the effective mass m_c (as well as the interlayer distance s) are known from measurements, the coupling constant γ_2 can be determined from the equation

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{8}\left(\frac{4}{M} - W\right) \quad (52)$$

where

$$M = \frac{2s^2 m_c}{\hbar^2} \quad (53)$$

represents the effective mass, scaled conveniently for the sequel. The inequalities

$$2 \leq MW \leq \infty \quad (54)$$

hold in the western and eastern sectors.

The quantity $W_{LD} = 4/M$ represents the bandwidth for $\gamma_2 = 0$, which corresponds to the LD model. This bandwidth is entirely determined by the spacing s and the effective mass m_c alone, what is one of artifacts due to oversimplification of the model resulting from $\gamma_2 = 0$. In our model the effective mass and the bandwidth are independent measurable parameters. According to equation (52), the sign of γ_2 is directly determined by the relation between the measured bandwidth W and the parameter W_{LD} calculated

from the effective mass: when $W < W_{LD}$, the constant γ_2 is positive, and when $W > W_{LD}$, it is negative.

4. Now we shall briefly discuss the case of strong next-nearest coupling, defined by the relation (37), represented by the remaining two sectors in Fig. 1. The dispersion (49) is no longer monotonic, and in place of the simple expression (51) for the bandwidth we have

$$W = |\gamma_1| + 2|\gamma_2| + \frac{\gamma_1^2}{8|\gamma_2|}, \quad (55)$$

the formula common for both sectors. However, the ground-state effective masses in the northern ($\gamma_2 > 0$) and the southern ($\gamma_2 < 0$) sector differ from one another.

In the northern sector we have, according to the results of Section 5, two stable solutions with generically different energies: the ground state and the metastable state. For the ground state effective mass the equation (50) is still valid. Combined together, the equations (55) and (50) allow to establish the inequalities

$$1 \leq MW \leq 2 \quad (56)$$

which restrict the admissible range of (m_c, W) in the northern sector. Provided that these restrictions are satisfied, the equations (55) and (50) furnish the unique solution for the coupling constants

$$|\gamma_1| = \frac{2}{M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{MW}\right), \quad (57)$$

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2M^2W}. \quad (58)$$

The southern sector is characterized by two symmetric phase-modulated ground states. The corresponding effective mass is given by

$$m_c = \frac{\hbar^2}{s^2} \frac{4|\gamma_2|}{16\gamma_2^2 - \gamma_1^2} \quad (59)$$

and in place of the inequalities (56) we obtain

$$1 \leq MW < \infty. \quad (60)$$

Finally, under the above restriction, the coupling constants are uniquely determined from (M, W) as

$$|\gamma_1| = \frac{1}{2}(W - \frac{1}{M^2W}), \quad (61)$$

$$\gamma_2 = -\frac{W}{8}(1 + \frac{1}{MW})^2. \quad (62)$$

5. For a known sector, making use of the relevant pair of equations (51)-(52) or (57)-(58) or else (61)-(62), one can uniquely determine $|\gamma_1|$ and γ_2 from experimental values of the effective mass M and the bandwidth W . However, identification of the sector with the aid of inequalities (54), (56), and (60) is possible only partially: eg. west, east and northern sectors can be mixed with the southern one, while $MW = 2$ constitutes the border between west and east sectors on one side, and the northern sector on the other side. Nevertheless, more detailed knowledge concerning identification of the sectors can be gained from closer examination of the excitation spectra. In particular, a feature which distinguishes sectors N+S from W+E is the presence of a strong in-band singularity of the density of states $N(\epsilon_k)$.

6. In consequence of the symmetry (48), one can not experimentally discriminate between sectors W and E by measurements based on the ground state or excitation energies, or else on any physical quantities determined by the energy spectra. Nevertheless, such a discrimination should be possible with the aid of suitably chosen measurable physical quantities which are not invariant under (48). A similar problem has already been addressed by Lazarides, Schneider, and Sørensen in [8], where solutions differing by the sign-alternating factor and yet having identical energies have been found in a BCS-like microscopic model of multilayer superconductors, depending on the sign of the coupling between adjacent layers. Attractive interaction leads to positive coupling constant and uniform ground state, while repulsive interaction results in negative coupling constant and alternating ground state. The authors suggest two experimental settings which can determine the negative sign of this constant: a superconducting loop able to detect trapped half-integer flux quanta, and a DC SQUID configuration able to detect the presence of π -junctions, corresponding to alternating solutions.

10 Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Science Research Committee (Poland) under grant No. 5 TO7A 040 22.

References

- [1] A. A. Abrikosov, *Fundamentals of the Theory of Metals*, North-Holland 1988
- [2] G. Blatter, M. V. Feigel'man, V. B. Geshkenbein, A. I. Larkin and V. M. Vinokur, *Vortices in high-temperature superconductors*, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **66**, 1125(1994)
- [3] D. Rogula, *Dynamics of magnetic flux lines and critical fields in high T_c superconductors*, *Journal of Technical Physics* **40** (1999), p.383
- [4] P. W. Anderson, *Intralayer tunneling mechanism for high- T_c superconductivity: comparison with c-axis infrared experiments* included in: P. W. Anderson, *The theory of superconductivity in the high- T_c cuprates*, Princeton University Press 1997
- [5] P. W. Anderson, *The theory of superconductivity in the high- T_c cuprates*, Princeton University Press 1997
- [6] W. E. Lawrence and S. Doniach, *Theory of layer structure superconductors*, in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Low Temperature Physics*, Kyoto, ed. E. Kanda, Academic Press of Japan 1971, p.361
- [7] S. Theodorakis *A phenomenological model for high T_c superconductors*, *Physics Lett. A*, **132**, 287(1988)
- [8] N. Lazarides, T. Schneider, M. P. Sorensen, *Multilayer high-temperature superconductors*, *Physica C*, **210**, 228(1993)
- [9] S. Theodorakis *A new kinetic term in the phenomenology of layered superconductors*, *Physica C*, **216**, 173(1993)

- [10] J.B. Ketterson and S.N. Song, *Superconductivity*, Cambridge Univ. Press 1999
- [11] S. V. Kuplevakhsky, *Exact solutions of the Lawrence-Doniach model in parallel magnetic fields*, Phys. Rev. B, **63**, 054508(2001)
- [12] V. M. Krasnov, *In-plane fluxon in layered superconductors with arbitrary number of layers*, Physical Review B **63**, 064519-11(2001)
- [13] M. Sztyren, *Bi-continuum modelling of layered structures and crystalline interfaces*, Journal of Technical Physics, **43**, 265(2006)
- [14] M. Sztyren, *Higher grade hybrid model of layered superconductors*, arXiv.org, cond-mat/0312673
- [15] D. Rogula, M. Sztyren, *Long-range Josephson couplings in superconducting systems*, Journal of Technical Physics, **47**, (2006)
- [16] M. Born, K. Huang, *Dynamical Theory of Crystal Lattices*, Clarendon Press 1954




Figure 1. The regions of stability: uniform \ominus , alternating \oplus , and phase modulated \approx states.




Figure 2. Enhancement of superconductivity by Josephson couplings: $\Delta\alpha$ vs. φ .