d-wave M odel for M icrowave Response of H igh-T_c Superconductors

P.J.H irschfeld Physics Department, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

W O.Putikka NationalHigh Magnetic Field Laboratory, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306

> D J. Scalapino Physics Department, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106{9530

A bstract

We develop a simple theory of the electrom agnetic response of a d-wave superconductor in the presence of potential scatterers of arbitrary swave scattering strength and inelastic scattering by antiferrom agnetic spin uctuations. In the clean London lim it, the conductivity of such a system may be expressed in "D rude" form, in term s of a frequencyaveraged relaxation time. We compare predictions of the theory with recent data on YBCO and BSSCO crystals and on YBCO lm s. While ts to penetration depth m easurements are promising, the low temperature behavior of the measured microwave conductivity appears to be in disagreement with our results. We discuss implications for d-wave pairing scenarios in the cuprate superconductors.

I. Introduction

A remarkable series of recent m icrowave experiments on high quality single crystals of YBCO^{1;2;3;4;5} has been taken as evidence for d-wave pairing in the high-T_c oxide superconductors, complementing NMR,⁶ photoem ission,⁷ and SQUID phase coherence data⁸ supporting the same conclusion.⁹ In particular, there is thus far no alternate explanation for the observation of a term linear in temperature in the YBCO penetration depth,¹ other than an unconventional order parameter with lines of nodes on the Ferm i surface. Several initial questions regarding discrepancies between this result and previous similar m easurements, which reported a quadratic variation in temperature, have been plausibly addressed by analyses of the e ect of disorder, which have suggested that strong scattering by defects in the dirtier sam ples can account for these di erences.^{10;11}

We have recently attempted to analyze the dissipative part of the electrom agnetic response, i.e. the m icrow ave conductivity , within the same m odel of d-w ave superconductivity plus strong elastic scattering, to check the consistency of this appealingly simple picture.¹² W e found that the conductivity could be represented in a D rude-like form in which the norm all quasiparticle uid density and an average over an energy dependent quasiparticle lifetime entered. For m icrow ave frequencies small compared to the average relaxation rate, the conductivity was found to vary as T² at low temperatures approaching ne²= $_{0}$ m at zero temperature. Here $_{0}$ is the gap maximum over the Ferm i surface. At higher m icrow ave frequencies, the interplay between the m icrow ave frequency and the quasiparticle lifetime was found to lead to a nearly linear T dependence over a range of temperatures. W hile some of the qualitative predictions of this model are in agreement with experiment, the low-temperature T² predictions for the low-frequency m icrow ave conductivity di er from the linear-T dependence reported.

The main purpose of this paper is to explore further the overall consistency of the d-

wave pairing plus resonant scattering m odel predictions for the low-tem perature behavior of the electrom agnetic response of the superconducting state. We will also exam ine the electrom agnetic response over a wider tem perature regime by phenom enologically including the elects of inelastic spin-uctuation scattering. In the process we intend to provide the derivations of results reported in our previous short communication,¹² and address various questions raised by it:

- 1) To what extent can the m icrow ave conductivity in a $d_{x^2 y^2}$ -wave superconducting state be thought of in direct analogy to transport in a weakly interacting ferm ion gas with a norm all quasiparticle uid density n_{qp} (T) and a relaxation time (!) characteristic of nodal quasiparticles?
- 2) Can the temperature dependence of the microwave conductivity be used to extract information on the quasiparticle lifetime?
- 3) W hat is the characteristic low-tem perature dependence of the quasiparticle lifetim e for resonant impurity scattering in a $d_{x^2} v^2$ superconductor and how does it a ect?
- 4) W hat happens at higher tem peratures when inelastic processes enter?
- 5) W hat happens to $_1(T;)$, (T;) and the surface resistance R $_s(T;)$ at higher m icrow ave frequencies?
- 6) To what extent can a model with a $d_{x^2} y^2$ gap plus scattering describe the observed penetration depth and conductivity of the cuprates? C an the response of a $d_{x^2} y^2$ -wave state be distinguished from that of a highly anisotropic s-wave state?

The plan of this work is as follows. In section II, we derive the expressions necessary for the analysis of the conductivity and penetration depth of a superconductor in the presence of impurities of arbitrary strength within BCS theory. In section III, we exam ine several useful limiting cases of these results analytically. In Sec. IV, we introduce a natural de nition of the quasiparticle lifetim ewhich allows the conductivity to be cast in a D nudelike" form with a temperature dependent carrier concentration n_{qp} (T). Then we describe results obtained from a model for inelastic scattering by antiferrom agnetic spin uctuations and include these in a phenom enological way so as to describe the conductivity over a wider temperature regime. In section V, we compare results for the penetration depth, conductivity and surface impedance with data on high-quality samples, including both i) scaling tests of the d-wave plus resonant scattering theory at low temperatures, and ii) ts over the entire temperature range. In section V I we present our conclusions concerning the validity of the model and suggestions for future work.

II. E lectrom agnetic response: form alism

We ist review the theory of the current response of a superconductor with general order parameter k to an external electrom agnetic eld, with collisions due to elastic in purity scattering included at the t-m atrix level. $^{13;14;15}$ W e expect such a theory to be valid at low temperatures in the superconducting state, if inelastic contributions to the scattering rate fallo su ciently rapidly with decreasing tem perature. This is the case in the model we discuss most thoroughly, namely a d_{x^2} v^2 state with an electronic pairing mechanism. In such a case, as the gap opens, the low-frequency spectral weight of the interaction is supressed and the dynam ic quasiparticle scattering decreases. The scattering rate in the superconducting state contains two factors of reduced tem perature $T=T_c$ for electron-electron scattering, and one for the available density of states in the d-wave state, and therefore varies as $(T=T_c)^3$ at low tem peratures. At tem peratures of order :3 $4T_{\rm C}$ the dynam ic scattering has decreased by one or two orders of magnitude from its norm al state value, at which point elastic in purity scattering dom inates the transport. In this low temperature region, the gap is well formed and its frequency dependence occurs on scales larger than T_c. Thus it is appropriate to model this system within a BCS fram ework.

Furtherm ore, since the dom inant quasiparticle density is associated with the nodal regions, we assume that the qualitative features of the temperature dependence of the transport will be una ected by the details of the band structure, and consider a cylindrical Ferm i surface with density of states N₀, and an order parameter $_{\rm k} = _0$ (T)cos2 con ned to within a BCS cuto of this surface. A more complete theory capable of describing the higher temperature regime where inelastic scattering processes become important is discussed in section IV.

If an electrom agnetic wave of frequency is norm ally incident on a plane superconducting surface, the current response m ay be written

$$j(q;) = \overset{\$}{K}(q;) A(q;) = \overset{h_{\$}}{K}_{p}(q;) \frac{ne^{2}i}{mc} A(q;);$$
 (1)

where A is the applied vector potential. The response function is related simply to the retarded current-current correlation function, with

,

$$\begin{array}{c} \overset{s}{K}_{p}(q;) = < [j; j]^{R} > (q;)' \\ \overset{Z}{(\frac{2ne^{2}}{mc})} < \hat{k}\hat{k} \ d_{k}T \ tr \underline{g}(k_{+}; !_{n})\underline{g}(k_{+}; !_{n} \ m) >_{\hat{k}} \dot{j}_{m}! + i0^{+}; \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} (2) \\ \overset{k}{(\frac{2ne^{2}}{mc})} < \hat{k}\hat{k} \ d_{k}T \ tr \underline{g}(k_{+}; !_{n})\underline{g}(k_{+}; !_{n} \ m) >_{\hat{k}} \dot{j}_{m}! + i0^{+}; \end{array}$$

where k k q=2 and h = (2n + 1) T and m = 2m T are the usual M atsubara frequencies. The approximate equality in the last step above corresponds to the neglect of vertex corrections due to impurity scattering and order parameter collective m odes. The form er vanish identically at q = 0 for a singlet gap and s-wave impurity scattering,¹⁶ while the latter are irrelevant if the order parameter corresponds to a nondegenerate representation of the point group. As usual, in the last step we have perform ed the analytical continuation i $m ! + i0^+$. The single particle m atrix propagator <u>g</u> is given as, e.g., in R ef. 16 in terms of its components in particle-hole space

$$\underline{g}(k;!_{n}) = \frac{\underline{i} \cdot n_{n}^{0} + \tilde{k}_{k}^{3} + \tilde{k}_{k}^{1}}{\underline{k}_{n}^{2} + \tilde{k}_{k}^{2} + \underline{j} \cdot \tilde{k}_{k}^{2}}$$
(3)

where the $_^{i}$ are the Paulim atrices and \sim_{k} is a unitary order parameter in particle-hole and spin space. The renormalized quantities are given by $\ddagger_{n} = !_{n} = 0$ (!n), $\sim_{k} = _{k} + _{3}$ (!n), and $\sim_{k} = _{k} + _{1}$ (!n), where the self-energy due to swave in purity scattering has been expanded $_ = _{i_}^{i}$. The renormalization of the single-particle energies $_{k}$ measured relative to the Fermi level is required for consistency even in the swave case, although it is frequently neglected because in the Born approximation for in purity scattering such renormalizations amount to a chemical potential shift. For a particle-hole symmetric system, these corrections can be in portant for arbitrary scattering strengths, but are small in either the weak or strong scattering lim it.^{16;17} W e therefore neglect them in what follow s, and postpone discussion of the particle-hole asymmetric case, where these e ects can becom e large, to a later work.

A further simplication arises for odd-parity states and certain d-wave states of current interest, where a rejection or other symmletry of the order parameter leads to the vanishing of the o-diagonal self-energy 1. In this case, the gap is unrenormalized (${}^{\sim}_{k} = {}_{k}$), leading to a breakdown of Anderson's theorem and the insensitivity of the angular (e.g., nodal) structure of the gap to pairbreaking elects.

Rather than solve the self-consistent problem in full generality, in most of what follows, we focus on two cases of special interest: i) s-wave pairing with weak scattering, for purposes of comparison; and ii) d-wave pairing without $_{\rm k}$ renorm alization for weak or resonant s-wave scattering. In case i), the self-energies $_{\rm 0} = _{\rm N} G_{\rm 0}$ and $_{\rm 1} = _{\rm N} G_{\rm 1}$ are the familiar integrated G meen's functions from A brikosov-G or'kov theory, where $_{\rm N}$ is the scattering rate at T_c attributable to impurities alone, and we have de ned G (i=2 N₀) $_{\rm k}$ Tr[g]. The G meen's function (3) and the self-energies must be calculated together with the gap equation, (k) = T $_{\rm n}^{\rm P} {}_{\rm N}^{\rm P} V_{\rm kk^0}$ Tr(1=2)g(k⁰;!n), where V_{kk⁰} is the pair potential. In Secs. II-III, all calculations are done self-consistently within weakcoupling BCS theory, which yields $_0=T_c=2:14$ for a pure $d_{x^2}_{y^2}$ state. When comparing with experim ental data in Secs. IV -V, we adopt larger values of $_0=T_c$ of 3 or 4 to simulate strong-coupling corrections.

We now continue the derivation of the response on a level su ciently general to subsum e both cases i) and ii) above. If we neglect $_k$ renorm alizations, the self-energies are given in a t-m atrix approximation by

$$_{0} = \frac{G_{0}}{c^{2} + G_{1}^{2} - G_{0}^{2}}; \quad _{1} = \frac{G_{1}}{c^{2} + G_{1}^{2} - G_{0}^{2}}; \quad (4)$$

where $n_i n = (N_0)$ is a scattering rate depending only on the concentration of defects n_i , the electron density n, and the density of states at the Ferm i level, N_0 , while the strength of an individual scattering event is characterized by the cotangent of the scattering phase shift, c. The Born limit corresponds to c 1, so that $=c^2 r_N$, while the unitarity limit corresponds to c = 0. To evaluate Eq. (2), we rest perform the frequency sum s, then perform the energy integrations as in Ref. 15, yielding in the general case

$$ReK^{\$}(q;) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{ne^2}{mc} \frac{d}{2} \hat{k} : \hat{k} \frac{d!}{d!} \tanh \frac{!}{2} \tanh \frac{(!)^{i}}{2} ReI_{+}^{*}(!;!) + \frac{h}{2} + \tanh \frac{(!)^{i}}{2} ReI_{+}^{*}(!;!) + \frac{h}{2} + \tanh \frac{(!)^{i}}{2} ReI_{+}^{*}(!;!) ;$$
(5)

$$\operatorname{Im} \overset{\$}{\mathrm{K}} (\mathbf{q};) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\operatorname{ne}^{2}}{\operatorname{mc}^{2}} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{2} \overset{\r{k}}{\mathrm{k}} : \overset{\r{k}}{\mathrm{k}} \operatorname{d!} \operatorname{tanh} \frac{!}{2} \operatorname{tanh} \frac{(!)^{1}}{2} \operatorname{tanh}$$

In calculating the surface impedance of the cuprate superconductors, it is important to take into account the anisotropy of these layered materials.¹⁸ Here we are interested in the response associated with currents which ow in the ab layers. The wavevector in the ab plane is determined by the long wavelength of the microwaves and hence can be set to zero. Furtherm ore, the short quasiparticle m can free path in the c-direction m cans that the surface impedance is determ ined by the conductivity of a CuO_2 layer. Thus the surface impedance in this case is given by

$$Z(;T) = \frac{i4}{c^{2}(_{1}(;T) - i_{2}(;T))} \stackrel{1=2}{:}$$
(7)

Here $_1$ i $_2$ is the complex frequency-and tem perature-dependent q = 0 layer conductivity. It is custom any to write the imaginary part of the conductivity in terms of a frequencyand tem perature-dependent inductive skin depth (;T),

$$_{2} = \frac{c^{2}}{4 - c^{2}(\mathbf{r})}:$$
(8)

At tem peratures a few degrees below T_c , $_2$ $_1$, so that the surface resistance R_s is given by

$$R_{s} = ReZ(;T) = \frac{8^{2} 2^{3}(;T)_{1}(;T)}{c^{4}};$$
(9)

and the surface reactance X $_{\rm S}$ is

$$X_{s} = Im Z (;T) = \frac{4 (;T)}{c^{2}}$$
: (10)

Thus m icrow ave surface in pedance m easurements provide information on the inductive skin depth (;T) and the real part of the conductivity $_1(;T)$. In the previous section, we have dropped the subscript 1 and denoted the real part of the conductivity simply by (;T), and in the limit ! 0, (0;T) is just the London penetration depth.

At q = 0, the energy-integrated bubbles I_{++} and I_{+-} are given by¹⁵

$$\mathbf{I}_{++}(!;!^{0}) = \frac{1}{0+} \qquad \frac{\mathbf{k}_{+}^{0}(\mathbf{k}_{+} + \mathbf{k}_{+}^{0}) + \mathbf{k}_{+}^{0}(\mathbf{k}_{+} - \mathbf{k}_{+}^{0})}{(0+ + 0) + 0+ 0+}$$
(11)

and

$$\mathbf{I}_{+} \quad (!;!^{0}) = \frac{1}{0+} + \frac{\mathbf{i}^{0} (\mathbf{i}_{+} + \mathbf{i}^{0}) + \mathbf{i}^{0} (\mathbf{i}_{k+} - \mathbf{i}^{0})}{(0+0)(0+0)(0+0)};$$
(12)

We rst consider the dissipative part of the response, rejected in the q = 0 conductivity $() = (c=) \text{Im} \overset{\$}{K} (q=0;) \text{. Com bining Eqs. (6,11-12) yields}$

$$ij() = \frac{ne^2}{2m} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & d! \text{ ftanh} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 & ! \end{bmatrix} \text{ tanh} \frac{1}{2} (!) \text{ blue } S_{ij}(!;); \quad (13)$$

where

$$S_{ij}(!;) = \operatorname{Im} \overset{Z}{=} \hat{k}_{i}\hat{k}_{j} \qquad \frac{\overset{L}{}_{+}^{0}(\overset{L}{+} + \overset{L}{+}^{0}) + \overset{O}{}_{k+}^{0}(\overset{C}{-}_{k+} & \overset{O}{-}^{0}_{k+})}{(\overset{2}{}_{0+}^{0} & \overset{Q}{-}^{0}_{k+})} \qquad \frac{1}{_{0+}^{0}} & \frac{1}{_{0+}^{0}} + \frac{1}{_{0+}^{$$

and primed quantities are evaluated at ! . For d-wave pairing there is no gap renormalization, so that ${}^{\sim}_{k} = {}_{k}$ and the kernel S_{ij} reduces to

$$S_{ij}(!;) = Im \frac{Z}{2} \hat{k}_{i} \hat{k}_{j} \frac{i_{+}^{0}}{i_{+}^{0}} \frac{1}{0+0} \frac{1}{0+0} + \frac{i_{-}^{0}}{0+0} \frac{1}{0+0} + \frac{i_{-}^{0}}{0+0} \frac{1}{0+0} + \frac{1}{0+0} (15)$$

We also require an appropriate expression for the London limit M eissner kernel $\stackrel{\text{s}}{\text{ReK}}$ (0;0) to evaluate the penetration depth. Taking ! 0 in Equation (5), we obtain ^{19;20}

$$\operatorname{ReK}_{ij}(0;0) = \frac{\operatorname{ne}^{2}}{\operatorname{mc}}^{Z} d! \operatorname{tanh} \frac{!}{2} \frac{Z}{2} \frac{d}{2} \hat{k}_{i} \hat{k}_{j} \operatorname{Re}^{n} \frac{Z^{2}}{0} \frac{k}{0+} (16)$$

In the special case of isotropic s-wave pairing and Born scattering this reduces to the well known result $^{21;22}$

$$\operatorname{ReK}(0;0) = \frac{\operatorname{ne}^{2}}{2\operatorname{mc}}^{Z} \operatorname{d!} \operatorname{tanh} \frac{!}{2} \operatorname{Re}^{n} \frac{p^{2}}{(v^{2} - 2)\left[v^{2} - 2 + i_{N}\right]}^{O}; \quad (17)$$

with $v = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = \tilde{}$.

III. Lim iting cases

We are primarily interested in the low-temperature, low-frequency conductivity required to discuss experiments in the microwave regime. Since the microwave energy is generally lower than the temperatures of interest, it is useful to replace (tanh !=2tanh (!)=2)=(2) by its small =T limit @f=@!, providing an exponential cuto above the temperature T in the integral (12). At low temperatures T ______0, the temperature dependence of the conductivity depends strongly on the lifetime of the lowenergy quasiparticle states, determined by the self-consistent solution to $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$, where ______0 and ______1 are given by Eq. (4).

In an ordinary superconductor with weak scattering, only the exponentially sm all num – ber of quasiparticles above the gap edge contribute to absorption. Resonant scattering, such as occurs in the case of a K ondo in purity in a superconductor, is known to give rise to bound states near the Ferm i level, rejected in a mite density of states at ! = 0 and leading to absorption below the gap edge.²³ A similar phenomienon occurs in unconventional superconductors, with the difference that, whereas in the s-wave (K ondo) case the bound state \impurity band" is isolated from the quasiparticle density of states above the gap edge, in unconventional states with nodes the \bound state" lies in a continuum, and the lifetim es of all states are nite.^{24;25}. Nevertheless the energy range between zero and the gap edge ₀ m ay be partitioned crudely into two regimes, separated by a crossover

energy or tem perature T dependent on the in purity concentration and phase shift. Below ! ' T , the scattering rate $2 \text{Im}_{0}(!)$ is large compared to !, and the e ects of self-consistency are important. The physics of this regime is similar to gapless superconductivity as described by the well-known A brikosov-G or kov²⁶ theory of pairbreaking by m agnetic impurities in ordinary superconductors. The low-temperature therm odynam ic and transport properties are given by expressions similar to analogous norm all state expressions, with the usual Ferm i surface density of states N₀ replaced by a residual density of quasiparticle states n₀ = N (! ! 0) in the superconductor. Above T , self-consistency can be neglected, and transport coe cients are typically given by power laws in temperature re ecting the nodal structure of the order param eter.²⁷ W e note that this "pure" regime will correspond to the entire temperature range if the impurity concentration is so sm all that T ! 0.

In this paper we focus primarily on the case of resonant scattering in an attempt to describe the physics of Zn doping in the cuprate superconductors. W hile Zn in purities are believed to have no, or very sm all, m agnetic m om ents²⁸, they nevertheless appear to act as strong pairbreakers.^{28,6} A possible explanation for this strong scattering could be associated with the fact that an inert site changes the local spin correlations of its nearest and next nearest neighbors²⁹ T hese changes can lead to strong scattering³⁰ and even to bound state form ation³¹ for the holes of the doped system. W ith this in m ind, here we assume that a Zn in purity m ay be approximated by an isotropic potential scatterer with a large phase shift close to =2.

The essential physics of gapless transport in unconventional superconductors was discussed in the context of heavy ferm ion superconductivity by H irschfeld et al.²⁴ and Schm itt-R ink et al.²⁵ A though both works presented calculations for m odel p-wave states, m ost conclusions reached regarding p-wave states with lines of nodes continue to hold for the d-wave states in quasi-two-dimensional materials of interest here. For example, the norm alized density of states N (!) Im G_0 (!) is linear in energy for the pure system, and varies as $n_0 + aT^2$ for T T for an in nitesimal concentration of impurities. Nereessyan et al.³² have recently called into question the existence of the residual density of states n_0 in a strictly 2D system. We believe nevertheless that both the underlying three{dimensional character of the layered cuprates, as well as the extrem ely low temperature at which the di erence between the logarithm ic term and the slow power law behavior found in Ref. 32 becom es signi cant, make such considerations irrelevant for our purposes.

All quantities of interest in the gapless regime may be obtained by expanding ! (and $_{k}$ if necessary) for ! < T , with the result $\frac{1}{2}$ ' i(+ b!²) + a!; where , a, and b are constants. T itselfm ay be shown to be of order . In the case of a d_{x^2} v^2 state over a cylindricalFerm i surface, satis es the self-consistency relation = $n_0 = (c^2 + n_0^2)$, where $n_0 = 2 = K$ (i $_0 =)$, with K the complete elliptic integral of the rst kind. For small im purity concentrations such that $_0$, one $ndsn_0'$ (2 = $_0$) ln (4 $_0$ =). In the Bom 1, ' $_{\rm N}$ n₀, and both and n₀ therefore vary as $_{0} \exp($ $_{0}$ = $_{\rm N}$). In the lim it, c resonant scattering case of primary interest, on the other hand, $= =n_0$ and for sm all concentrations the residual scattering rate is determined by $(=_0)^2 = () = [2_0 \ln (4_0 =)]$. The constants a and b are found to be $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1=(8), respectively. Thus for strong scatand the residual density of states n_0 vary as $(0)^{1=2}$ up to a logarithm ic tering both correction. This is important because it means that low-energy states may be strongly modied, even though the impurity scattering rate, which varies as near T_c, is insufcient to suppress T_c signi cantly. In the usual Born limit, on the other hand, gapless e ects become important only when N'_0 , implying a large T_c supression. As the norm al state inelastic scattering rate, of order T_c in temperature units, is much larger than the impurity scattering rate in clean samples, we expect that impurities are in any case relatively ine ective in suppressing T_c until the elastic scattering rate at the transition

becom es a signi cant fraction of the inelastic one (see Sections IV and V).

These estimates enable an immediate evaluation of Eqs. (13) and (15) in the gapless regime,

$$\sum_{xx} (= 0;T)' \qquad \sum_{00}^{h} 1 + \frac{2}{12} \frac{T}{2} = 2^{1}$$
 (18)

where $_{00} = ne^2 = (m _0(0))$ for a $d_{x^2} v^2$ state. The rst term in Eq. (18) is a remarkable result rst pointed out by PA.Lee,³³ namely that the residual conductivity (! 0;T! 0) of an anisotropic superconductor with line nodes on the Ferm i surface is nonzero and independent of impurity concentration to leading order. It arises technically from the rst term on the right hand side of Eq. (14), and is present in principle regardless of the scattering strength. Physically this rejects a cancellation between the impurity-induced density of states and the impurity quasiparticle scattering lifetime. The linear variation != 0 of the d-wave density of states is cut o when ! drops below the impurity scattering ¹. Therefore, at low energies there is a nite in purity-induced density of states rate which varies as $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \end{pmatrix}^{1}$. At low temperatures such that $T < \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$, the electric relaxation rate which determ ines the conductivity is proportional to the density of states ($_{
m 0}$) $^{
m 1}$ multiplied by , giving 1^{1} independent of the scattering strength. Very recently it was pointed out that a generalization of the present theory to include a nite scattering range results, in the lim it of su ciently large range or disorder, in a residual conductivity which scales with the scattering time (2) $^{1.34}$. The predicted residual conductivity in this regime is how ever too sm all to apply to the experim ents considered here.

In Figures 1 and 2 we illustrate the e ect of varying the phase shift and impurity concentration on the T (dependence of the conductivity with a full self-consistent num erical evaluation of Eqs. (13) and (15) for a $d_{x^2} y^2$ state. The intrinsic gapless behavior represented by Eq. (18) is clearly visible in the resonant limit, c ' 0, but in the Bom limit, c ' 1, the same limiting behavior is electively unobservable for sm all concentra-

tions at = 0. Instead, the conductivity tends to a value $_0 = ne^2 = 2m_N$ except at exponentially sm all tem peratures, where it again approaches $_{00}$, due to the narrow width

 $_0 \exp$ $_0 = N$ of the gapless range in this lim it.

For T > T ', we take $\frac{1}{2}$! ' $_{0}$ (!) rather than $_{0}$ ($\frac{1}{2}$), and keep only the leading singular terms in Eqs. (13) and (15) as ! 0, arriving at the remarkably simple expression,

$$_{xx}()' = \frac{ne^2}{m} \int_{1}^{2} d! \frac{@f}{@!} N (!) Im \frac{1}{i=(!)};$$
 (19)

where $1(!) = 2 \text{Im}_{0}(!)$, for any choice of phase shift. Note that N (!) is the density of states for a pure superconductor norm alized to N (0) and varies as j! = 0 j for a $d_{x^2} y^2$ state at low energies. Eq. (19) is exactly the result expected for the conductivity of noninteracting fermions with density of states N (!) and 1 {body relaxation time (!), and is reminiscent of the D rude-like expression used by B onn et al. to analyze their data. H ow ever, as pointed out in Ref. 12, the !-dependence of the superconducting density of states tends to induce a strong energy dependence in (!) in either the strong or weak scattering limits. For a $d_{x^2} y^2$ state we nd

$${}^{1}(!)' \qquad {}^{n}({}^{2}_{0}) = [2! \ln^{2}(4_{0} = !)] \qquad c' 0 \\ (4_{N}! = {}^{0}) \ln (4_{0} = !) \qquad c 1$$
(20)

leading to the pure lim it conductivity result for $_0=T$, T T_c,

$$xx (=0;T)' \qquad \frac{\frac{2}{3} 0(\frac{T}{0})^2 \ln^2 \frac{4}{T}}{0} \qquad c' 0 \\ c 1: \qquad (21)$$

In the opposite limit $_0=T$, T T_c we nd

$$_{xx}(;T)' \qquad \frac{\frac{ne^2}{m} \frac{2}{2} \ln \frac{2}{T} \frac{4}{T}}{\frac{ne^2}{m} \frac{4}{3} \frac{2}{2} \ln \frac{4}{T}} c' 0}{\frac{ne^2}{m} \frac{4}{3} \frac{2}{2} \ln \frac{4}{T}} c 1$$
(22)

It is instructive to compare the form of the previous results with the more familiar form of those expected for an swave superconductor with weak potential scattering. We begin with Eqs. (13) and (14), and proceed as before in the pure regime, neglecting selfconsistency in $_0$ and $_1$. We nd

$$_{xx}()' = \frac{ne^2}{m} 2^{\frac{Z}{1}} d! = \frac{0}{0!} N(!) \text{ Im } \frac{1}{i=(!)}; \quad (s-wave, Born) \quad (23)$$

where now however the quasiparticle relaxation time in the s-wave superconducting state is given by (2) $^{1} = \text{Im}_{0}(!)$ (=!)Im $_{1}(!)$, and N (!) = $! = p \frac{p}{!^{2}} \frac{2}{2}$. This relaxation rate has a similar form to that found, e.g., , by K aplan et al. ³⁵ for the electron-phonon quasiparticle relaxation in ordinary superconductors. In the limit ! 0;T ! 0, we nd

xx()'
$$\frac{ne^2}{m_N} \frac{1}{T} e^{-T} \ln - ;$$
 (24)

which is similar in form to the well-known M attis and Bardeen result.³⁶

The hydrodynam ic lim it results Eqs. (21) predict a T^2 behavior¹² for resonant scattering or a constant³⁷ behavior for weak scattering for the low -T conductivity of a d-wave superconductor under the assumptions set down above. Neither of these is consistent with the linear-T variation reported in experiment, which would correspond to the assumption of a constant relaxation time . Thus the low-tem perature experimental results appear to be inconsistent with the simplest d-wave model.¹² However, dierent physical relaxation mechanisms than those considered here could change the low-tem perature behavior.

The crossover regin e between the hydrodynam ic (Eq. (21)) and collisionless (Eq. (22)) lim its is an interesting one which we investigate further here. In Fig. 2, we illustrate this crossover in the B om lim it for a $d_{x^2} y^2$ gap, demonstrating that the result xx ! 0 holds only in the hydrodynam ic regim e N. This is a point of some importance, since experiments on Z n-doped samples appear to indicate a residual conductivity (T ! 0) which scales inversely with impurity concentration, rem iniscent of the zero-frequency B om result Eq. (21). On the other hand, Figure (2) shows that this behavior disappears at m icrow ave frequencies com parable to those used in the experiments. It therefore appears

unlikely to us that an explanation in term s of weak scattering can be compatible with the observations reported in Ref. 4 and Ref. 5.

In Fig. 3, we plot the low-tem perature conductivity for the case of resonant scattering to display the sam e crossover. It is interesting to note that a quasilinear behavior is in fact obtained over an interm ediate range of tem peratures when the frequency becomes comparable to the scattering rate, but this behavior does not appear to hold very far from

To close the discussion of the low -energy behavior of the conductivity, we give analytical results for the frequency-dependent conductivity at zero tem perature.³⁸ In this case the factor (tanh !=2 tanh (!)=2) appearing in Eq. (13) reduces to a window function limiting the range of integration from 0 to . The result m ay be expanded for sm all values of the integration variable, yielding in the resonant limit

$$xx' \frac{n_{00}[1+1=24] = 2\log 1(4_{0}=)]}{\frac{ne^{2}}{m} \frac{2}{2}\ln 2\frac{4}{0}}$$
(25)

In Fig. 4, we plot the frequency dependence of the T = 0 conductivity in the impuritydom insted regime.

A full analysis of surface in pedance m easurem ents requires, in addition to the conductivity , a know ledge of the inductive skin depth (;T), which reduces in the lim it ! 0 to the usual London penetration depth (T). The = 0 penetration depth in a $d_{x^2} y^2$ state in the presence of resonant in purity scattering has been calculated by several authors. In the gapless regime T < T , the linear-T behavior characteristic of a d-w ave system is destroyed, and one nds the result ' $_0^{-}$ + $_0^{-}T^2 = (6 \ _0)$, where $_0^{-} = \frac{p}{m} \frac{r^2 = 4 \ ne^2}{r^2 = 4 \ ne^2}$ is the pure London depth, and the renorm alized zero-T penetration depth is given by¹¹ ($_0^{-}$) = 0' (= (_0)) ln (4 _0 =)' = (2). At higher temperatures T < T $_{c}$,

the penetration depth crosses over to the pure result, (T) $'_0$ [l + ln 2 (T = $_0$)]. For com – pleteness, we show in Figure 5 the increase of the zero-tem perature London penetration depth for large values of the scattering parameters in the Born and unitary limits. These results are in agreement with those of K in et al.³⁹

The presence of low-energy quasiparticles can induce a strong frequency dependence to the low-tem perature inductive skin depth (T;), which can in some cases m in ic shifts in low-tem perature power laws. Some of these elects were explored in the context of heavy ferm ion superconductivity.⁴⁰ Here we observe that the skin depth tem perature dependence can be suppressed if the microw ave frequency is large enough such that > 1. In this case, it is necessary to use the penetration depth measured at rather than the limiting low frequency penetration depth, to extract the conductivity from surface resistance data. A simple expression for the frequency-dependent penetration depth (T;) may be obtained in the pure regime, T > T, by neglecting self-consistency in the imaginary part of the conductivity as well,

$$\frac{(T;0)}{(T;)}^{2}, 1 + \frac{(T;0)}{0}^{2} d! N (!) \frac{d!}{d!} \frac{h}{(1+1)^{2}}^{2} i : (26)$$

In the collisionless limit 1, the response of the system is perfectly diam agnetic in this approximation, (T;)! 0. In Fig. 6, we explicitly illustrate the elect of increasing the microwave frequency on the skin depth of a clean $d_{x^2} = v^2$ superconductor.

IV. Spin uctuation model for quasiparticle relaxation

A soliscussed in Sec. III, in the \pure" lim it where T T T_c , we are not a \D rude"-like form (19) for the conductivity of a d-wave superconductor, with $(!) = 2 \text{ Im }_0(!)$ and N (!) the superconducting density of states. In this lim it the penetration depth for a $d_{x^2} = v^2$ state is given by

$$\frac{(0)}{(T)}^{2} = 1 \qquad \begin{array}{c} Z \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} d! \\ n \\ 1 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \end{array} \qquad$$

Then using $((0) = (T))^2 = 1$ $n_{qp}(T) = n$ to de ne a norm all quasiparticle uid density, may be written as

$$_{xx}() = \frac{n_{QP}(T)e^2}{m} \text{ Im } \frac{1}{i=(!)};$$
 (28)

where the average h::: is de ned by

hA (!)
$$i = \frac{\frac{R}{d! N (!)} \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial !} A (!)}{\frac{R}{d! N (!)} \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial !}}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial !}}$$
; (29)

In the limit where (!) 1, Eq. (28) reduces to $xx = n_{qp} (T) e^{2}h$ i=m.

For a $d_{x^2 y^2}$ gap, $n_{qp}(T)$ varies linearly with tem perature at low tem peratures. Thus if the average lifetime hiwere constant, x_x would vary linearly with T at low tem peratures. However, the impurity scattering lifetime is frequency (dependent due to the frequency dependence of the single-particle density of states. In Fig. 7 we show plots of 1(!)versus ! for the case of a $d_{x^2} y^2$ gap and various values of the scattering phase shift. In the unitarity limit we have

$$\frac{1}{(!)}' \frac{2T}{2! \ln^2 (4_0=!)} \frac{! < T}{! > T}$$
(30)

Thus in the "gapless" regime, ! < T, the impurity scattering rate saturates at 2T and in the "pure" regime, ! > T, varies linearly with ! to within logarithm ic factors. In this limit, as discussed in Sec. II, the conductivity rises with increasing temperature as T^2 times logarithm ic corrections. This type of behavior is characteristic of a $d_{x^2} y^2$ gap and resonant in purity scattering. One power of T comes from $n_{qp}(T)$ and the other from h i; both ultimately reject the linear ! variation of the single-particle energy density of states.

At higher tem peratures, inelastic scattering and recombination processes determ ine the quasiparticle lifetime. In models in which the $d_{x^2} y^2$ pairing arises from the exchange of antiferrom agnetic spin-uctuations,⁴¹ it is natural to expect that antiferrom agnetic spin uctuations rather than phonons provide the dom inant inelastic relaxation mechanism.

Calculations of the quasiparticle lifetim e^{42} have been carried out for a two-dimensional Hubbard model in which the spin-uctuation interaction is taken into account by introducing an elective interaction

$$V(q;!) = \frac{\frac{3}{2}\overline{U}}{1 \quad \overline{U}_{0}^{BCS}(q;!)};$$
(31)

Here \overline{U} is a renorm alized coupling, and

is the BCS susceptibility with $E_p = p^2 + p^2$, where $p = 2t(\cos p_x + \cos p_y)$ W ith the interaction given by Eq. (31), the lifetime of a quasiparticle of energy ! and momentum p in a superconductor at temperature T is given to leading order by

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} (p;!) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p^0}^{N}$$

$$n^{Z} : j_{p}^{0} j$$

 $d \text{Im } V (p p^{0};) (! p^{E};) 1 + \frac{p p^{0}}{! (!)} (n () + 1) [1 f (!)] + \frac{p p^{0}}{! (!)}$

+ d Im V (p
$$p_{j}^{0}$$
) (! p_{j}^{E}) 1 $\frac{p p^{0}}{! (!)}$ (n () + 1)f (!) +
!+ j_{p}^{0} j

$$+ d Im V (p p;) (! + E_0) 1 + \frac{p p^0}{! (! +)} n () [1 f (! +)]$$
(33)

Here n () and f (!) are the usual Bose and Ferm i factors, and a quasiparticle renorm alization factor has been absorbed into V. The second term of Eq. (32) corresponds to a process in which two quasiparticles recombine to form a pair with excess energy em itted as a spin uctuation. The rst and third term s describe scattering processes associated with the em ission or absorption of spin uctuations, respectively.

Quinlan et al. ⁴² num erically evaluated Eq. (31) to obtain the quasiparticle lifetime using parameters for \overline{U} ; t, and the band lling which had previously provided a basis for

tting the nuclear relaxation rate of YBCO⁴³ and gave a norm alstate quasiparticle lifetim e

¹ (T_c) of order T_c. The tem perature dependence of the inelastic quasiparticle lifetim e for a $d_{x^2 \ y^2}$ gap with 2 $_0=T_c=6$ to 8 was found to be in reasonable agreem ent with the higher tem perature transport lifetim e determ ined by B onn et al. At reduced tem peratures below $T=T_c$ of order 0.8, the $d_{x^2 \ y^2}$ gap is well-established and the occupied quasiparticle states are near the nodes. Setting p to its nodal value and ! = T, Q uinlan et al. found that the tem perature dependence of the num erical calculations of the quasiparticle lifetim e varied as T³, re ecting the available phase space.

Figure 8 incorporates results for h i obtained by setting the scattering rate equal to the sum of the impurity and inelastic rates. This procedure neglects the real parts of the self-energy as well as vertex corrections arising from the dynam ic processes. Nevertheless, it shows the qualitative behavior of h i versus $T = T_c$. Combining a simple parameterized t of the num erical results of R ef. 42 for $\frac{1}{in}$ (T) with the unitary elastic scattering rate, corresponding results for (T) versus $T=T_c$ are shown in Fig. 9. Here the peak in (T) arises from the rapid drop in the dynamic quasiparticle scattering rate as the gap opens below T_c and spectral weight is rem oved from the spin-uctuations.⁴⁴ The low-tem perature T 2 dependence in plies that at these energies, the quasiparticle scattering rate is increasing as the tem perature is lowered due to the linear decrease in the single-particle density of states and the fact that is proportional to this density of states in the unitary scattering $\lim it$.¹² A s the m icrow ave frequency is increased, the tem perature T_p, at which the peak (;T) occurs, increases. At the same time the peak value decreases. Adding the in num erical results for the inelastic scattering rate $\frac{1}{in}$ (T) to the unitary elastic scattering rate and evaluating Eq. (25) for various m icrowave frequencies, we nd that $T_p=T_c$ and

 $(;T_p) = (0;T_c)$ vary with as shown in Fig. 10.

V.Analysis

Quantitative comparison of the simple theory presented here with existing data is useful but dangerous. We rem ind the reader that m any features of the m odel are certainly oversim pli ed, including but not limited to the neglect of the real Ferm i surface anisotropy, higher-order in purity scattering channels, and strong coupling corrections. However, we do not expect inclusion of these aspects of the physics to qualitatively alter the nature of the tem perature power laws in the response functions at low tem peratures in the gapless and pure regimes. At higher tem peratures $T < T_c$, it is natural to expect that real-m etals e ects will produce nonuniversal behavior in the superconducting state even if the norm al state is a strongly renorm alized Ferm i liquid. W ith these remarks in m ind, we proceed as follows. We rst attempt to x the impurity scattering parameters within the resonant scattering m odel by comparison to the penetration depth data of Bonn et al.⁵ on Zn-doped sam ples of YBCO. It turns out the t obtained is relatively good in this case, although the scattering rates in the case of the Zn-doped sam ples are not xed with high accuracy because of uncertainties in the zero-T penetration depth. As discussed below, a di erent kind of scaling analysis can be perform ed on the thin Im data of Lee et al.⁴⁵

A sone knows from the heavy ferm ion superconductivity problem, claim s to determ ine the gap symmetry by thing a theoretical prediction to a single experiment on a single sample should be treated with caution. It is extremely important to correlate results on dierent kinds of measurements on dierent samples. The results of the British Columbia group a ord an excellent opportunity to do this kind of cross-checking. We therefore adopt for the moment the \best" results for the scattering parameters in the pure and Zndoped samples from the penetration depth analysis, and use them to compare calculated conductivities and surface resistances with the Bonn et al. data.⁵ The behavior of the temperature-dependent conductivity is much richer than that of the London penetration

21

depth, so it will be important for the consistency of the theory to see which aspects can be reproduced by the d-wave plus resonant scattering (plus inelastic scattering) model.

In Fig. 11, we show one possible t to the UBC penetration depth data.⁵ The curves represent the theoretical penetration depth (I) normalized to the pure London depth $_0$ for dierent values of the resonant scattering parameters as given. The value $_0=T_c = 3$ is chosen from the t of the asymptotic pure $d_{x^2} v^2$ penetration depth (T) $_0 \ln 2(T = _0)$ to the intermediate linear-T regime in the pure data (symbols). The value = $T_c = 8$ 10⁴ is then chosen by thing the curvature of the T² contribution at the low est tem peratures. As the absolute scale of the experimental (T = 0) is uncertain, we have chosen to add constant o sets to the various data sets to try to achieve reasonable ts. Figure 11 shows that it is possible to nd a consistent choice of such o sets, since the scattering rates used for the two Zn-doped data sets, $=T_c = 0.018$ and 0.009 are in the ratio 2:1 as are the nom inal Zn concentrations 0.31% and 0.15%. However, a roughly equally good t m ay be obtained using scattering rates of, e.g., $=T_c = 0.03$ and 0.006, which would then not be consistent with the theoretically predicted scaling of with the in purity concentration ni. C learly there is a relatively large range of acceptable scattering rates corresponding to the two Zn-doped curves, possibly a factor of two or more. A determ ination of the zero-tem perature limiting penetration depths of pure and Zn-doped samples from, e.g., SR experiments, is needed to x these values more precisely or rule out such a t.

A procedure for xing the zero-tem perature penetration depth relative to the singlecrystal data without new experiments has been suggested by Lee et al. They assume that the data for their YBCO lms follow a universal curve given by the form of the single crystal penetration depth in the intermediate tem perature regime, as suggested by the resonant scattering analysis. Using data on several lms, they show that such a scaling

is indeed possible, and assign zero-tem perature penetration depth values to several lm s on this basis. This allows an internal consistency check of the resonant scattering hypothesis, wherein one may check to see that the measured coe cients of the T 2 term in the penetration depth, equal to $c_2 = 0 = (6 \ 0)$ for a $d_{x^2} v^2$ state and resonant scattering, scale appropriately with the zero-tem perature penetration depth renorm alization, $_0)=_0$ ' (=($_0)$) ln (4 $_0=$) ' =(2). Since a given lm in the resonant scatter-(~_0 ing limit is characterized simply by its impurity concentration through the parameter , using the above expressions it is possible to check scaling without know ledge of the actual defect concentration. For example, in Fig. 12 we plot $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ vs. 1=c₂ for two \di erent" In sm easured in Ref. 45 actually the same Im before and after annealing (Im sA and A⁰ of Ref. 45). Each cluster of points in Figure 12 represents a single lm, the individual points corresponding to di ering assumptions regarding other constants, such as the absolute value of the pure penetration depth, which enter such an analysis. It is seen that the agreem ent with the theoretical scaling is remarkably good, and that this agreem ent is not particularly sensitive to varying assumptions on the subsidiary constants.

Next we explore whether an equally good t is possible for the resistive part of the conductivity which was also measured in Ref. 5. A swe have seen, even in the "pure" lim it T > T the conductivity depends on the quasiparticle lifetime. At low temperatures, elastic scattering from in purities determines this lifetime. At higher temperatures, however, inelastic scattering processes become important and we use a simple parameterized t to the numerical results for the inelastic scattering rate $^{1}(T)$ obtained by Quinlan et al.⁴² A s previously discussed, the parameters of the spin- uctuation interaction used in this work were used in thing the NMR data and the overall strength was adjusted to give $_{in}^{1}(T_{c})$ of order T_{c} . The total scattering rate is taken as the sum of the elastic and inelastic rates. U sing the usual expression, for the surface resistance R_{s} in terms of the real part of the conductivity and the penetration depth, $R_{s} = (8^{-2-3})=c^{4}$,

23

Bonn et al. extracted the conductivity for the sam e sam ples whose penetration depth is plotted in Fig. 11. In Figs. 13 and 14, we show the conductivity plotted for these sam ples calculated using the elastic scattering parameters taken from Fig. 10 and the inelastic scattering results from Fig. 8. A lthough the size, position, and scaling with frequency of the prominent maximum in the conductivity are reproduced qualitatively, it is clear that the low-tem perature behavior of the data does not correspond to the predictions of the model. In section II, we pointed out that, while a T behavior can be obtained in the pure regime if ' 1, it is not generic to the theory; by contrast, the data for at least the "pure" sam ple and 0.15% Zn appear to follow a low-tem perature linear-T law for all the sam ples shown. A sim ilar behavior is observed in YBCO thin Im s and BSSCO single crystals.⁴⁶

The further di culty apparent from the data shown in Figs. 13 and 14 is the rather large residual value of the conductivity as T ! 0 exhibited by all data sets. W hile the d-wave theory predicts a residual absorption, the limiting $_{00}$ ' ne²=m $_{\cap}$ of the theory is an order of magnitude or so lower than that extracted by the British Columbia group.4;5 W hile qualitatively di erent physical scattering m echanism s than those considered here, or a completely di erent picture for superconductivity in the cuprates m ight be responsible for the deviations from theory apparent in the data, we prefer to reserve judgem ent until further data is available. Very recent results from the British Columbia group indicate that tw in boundaries m ay be responsible for the residual conductivities observed, and possibly also account for part of the tem perature dependence observed at low tem peratures. In Fig. 15 we show data for a twin-free, high-purity YBCO crystal⁵ compared to the same theoretical prediction used for the low-frequency conductivity displayed in Fig. 13. It is evident that the residual conductivity in the untwinned has been dram atically reduced, and the low tem perature t to the d-wave theory correspondingly in proved. C learly highquality Zn-doped samples of this type are also desirable.

24

For completeness we also calculate and display the surface resistance $R_s(T)$ for various values of the scattering parameters in Figure 16. Here again, we see that the low – tem perature behavior of the theory is in disagreement with the data.^{2,3,4,5} This rejects the much lower residual conductivity predicted for our model, as well as the T^2 power law dependence. In addition, in order to reproduce the dramatic decrease in R_s which is observed below T_c , we need a large $_0=T_c=4$ ratio. It is also important in making this comparison to recall that the drop in R_s just below T_c rejects less the collapse of the inelastic scattering rate which enters the conductivity than the divergence of the penetration depth depth near T_c (recall R_s ³). The data suggests that the magnitude of the gap opensm ore rapidly than usual. This type of behavior has been found in model calculations based on the exchange of spin uctuations including processes not considered here.^{47,48} It is also possible that critical elects in a range of up to several degrees near the transition may lead to a divergence more rapid than in the usual mean eld case.⁴⁹

VI.Conclusions

In this paper we have calculated (;T) and (;T) within the fram ework of a BCS model in which the gap has $d_{x^2} y^2$ symmetry, and both strong elastic in purity scattering and spin-uctuation inelastic scattering processes are taken into account. We have sought to address a set of basic questions raised in the introduction. Here we summarize what we have learned.

 The m icrowave conductivity of the layered cuprates can be written in a D rude-like form

$$(;T) = \frac{n_{qp}(T)e^2}{m} \text{ Im } \frac{1}{(i=(!;T))}$$
 : (34)

Here $n_{qp}(T)$ is the norm all quasiparticle uid density and the brackets denote the frequency average de ned in Eq. (28). The inverse quasiparticle lifetim e 1(!;T) is the sum of the elastic in purity scattering rate and the inelastic spin- uctuation scattering.

The form of Eq. (28) describes the transport properties of nodal quasiparticles which have a relaxation time (!;T) and a density of states N (!).

- 2) In the hydrodynam ic lim it h i 1, $(T) = n_{qp}(T)e^{2}h$ i=m : This is just the form that Bonn et al. used to extract a quasiparticle lifetim e from their conductivity data. Here we have shown that h i corresponds to an average over a frequency- and tem peraturedependent lifetim e. Figure 8 shows a plot of h i¹ versus T for typical parameters.
- 3) We nd that for a $d_{x^2 \ y^2}$ gap, (T ! 0) goes to a constant $_{00} = ne^2 = m_0$ independent of the inpurity concentration (for sm all concentrations).³³ If we take 1 (T_c) ' T_c from DC resistivity measurements, and 2 $_0=kT_c=6$, then $_{00}=$ (T_c) = 1=3 so that the limiting value of $_{00}$ is a about an order of magnitude sm aller than (T_c). As the temperature increases, (T) grows as T^2 . For T > T, this can be understood as arising from the fact that both n_{qp} (T) and h i in the resonant scattering limit vary linearly with T. Note that we also nd that for T < T, (T) $_{00}$ varies as T^2 . If, in the pure limit T > T, h is each of the model we have considered. Both the fact that

(T ! 0) is independent of the in purity concentration and that (T) increases as T^2 appear to be in disagreem ent with the presently available data. There is some evidence that the residual conductivity m ay be substantially lowered by reducing the density of tw ins in the crystal,⁵ but the linear-T behavior remains a puzzle. W hether other scattering m echanism s can give rise to this behavior is not at present understood. The e ect of particle-hole asymmetry is of particular interest in the context of our observation that a constant relaxation time at low temperatures in pure samples is needed to produce a linear temperature dependence. The analytic properties of the self-energy of a particle-hole symmetric superconductor form ally preclude such a result, how ever. An investigation of particle-hole asymmetry e ects is in progress.

4) At higher tem peratures, inelastic scattering processes become im portant and give rise

to a scattering rate which increases initially as $(T=T_c)^3$. As shown in Fig. 8, this leads to a minimum in h i¹ at a particular value of $T=T_c$.

- 5) At higher m icrow ave frequencies where h i 1, there is a crossover from the hydrodynam ic to the collisionless regime, and the relationship of (T;) to the quasiparticle lifetime involves an average of $(!;T)=(1 + 2^2(!;T))$. In this regime, the conductivity can exhibit a quasi-linear variation with T. We have shown in Fig. 10 how the temperature T_p of the peak conductivity varies with along with $(;T_p)=(T_c)$. We have also found that at higher m icrow ave frequencies, quasiparticle screening leads to a reduction in (T;). At a xed temperature (T;) can approach (0;0) as increases. We have used the full frequency dependence of (T;) and $_1(T;)$ in calculating the surface resistance $R_s(T;)$ shown in Fig. 16.
- 6) In Section V, we explored the extent to which the $d_{x^2 y^2}$ -wave plus scattering m odel can describe the surface in pedance observed in YB a₂C u₃O _{6.95} and its Zn-doped variants. It appears (Figs. 11 and 12) that the tem perature- and in purity-dependence of the penetration depth can be twithin the fram ework of thism odel. It will be interesting to compare the results for the -dependence of (T;) with experimental results which will soon be available.⁵⁰ The measured values of $_1$ (T;) shown in Fig. 14 for the pure and 0.15% Zn samples appear to have a linear low-temperature variation in contrast to the T² variation predicted from the model. In addition, as noted, the limiting residual value of the conductivity obtained from the theory is smaller than that observed in m any samples and is independent of the concentration of im purities. Nevertheless, as shown in Figs. 11 and 15, a simple d-wave model plus scattering provides a reasonable overall t to both the real and in aginary parts of the conductivity. O ne can ask whether alternative models such as an anisotropic s-wave pairing could provide similar ts to the data. In the absence of in purity scattering, the penetration depth and the low-frequency microwave conductivity (T) will both vary exponentially at

tem peratures below the minimum gap value. In addition, if the minimum gap value is nite, (T ! 0) will vanish as exp (min=T). An extreme example of an anisotropic s-wave gap is given by taking for the magnitude of the d $_{x^2}$ $_{y^2}$ gap, $_0$ (T) jcos2 j. In this case, the results in the pure lim it for (T) are identical to the d_{x^2} $_{y^2}$ results. However, the addition of impurities can lead to a qualitatively di erent behavior for the an isotropic s-wave case.⁵¹ A s discussed in Section II, both $\frac{1}{n}$ and $\frac{1}{k}$ are renormalized by in purities in the s-w ave case. In particular, potential scattering acts to average the gap over the Ferm i surface, thus reducing the peak value of the gap and increasing the m inimum value. Thus, even if one took the extrem e anisotropic s-wave case in which the gap has nodes but does not change sign, in purities would lead to a nite e ective gap and an exponential rather than T² crossover of the low -tem perature dependence of both (T) and (T). If "inert" defects like Zn in purities are found to have a magnetic character,⁵² how ever, distinguishing s and d wave states becomes more di cult.⁵¹ Further measurements of the low-temperature dependence of the surface impedance in pure and in purity doped cuprates along with detailed com parisons with theoretical m odels are necessary to determ ine the symmetry of the pairing state.

A cknow ledgm ents

The authors acknow ledge extrem ely useful discussions with D A.Bonn, W N.Hardy, and T.Lem berger, and are grateful to them for sharing their data prior to publication. S.Quinlan generously provided assistance with calculations of the inelastic quasiparticle lifetime. PJH is grateful to N.Goldenfeld for many enlightening exchanges. DJS was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant DMR 92{25027.WOP was supported by NSF DMR 91{14553 and by the NationalH igh Magnetic Field Laboratory at Florida State University. Num erical Com putations were performed on the Cray-YMP at the Florida State University Com puting Center.

28

REFERENCES

- 1. W N. Hardy, D A. Bonn, D. C. Morgan, R. Liang, and K. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 399, (1993).
- 2. D A.Bonn, R.Liang, T M. Risem an, D J.Baar, D C.Morgan, K.Zhang, P.Dosanjh, T L.Duty, A.MacFarlane, G D.Morris, J.H.Brewer, W N.Hardy, C.Kallin, and A J.Berlinsky, Phys. Rev. B 47, 11314 (1993).
- 3. D A.Bonn, K.Zhang, R.Liang, D J.Baar, and W N.Hardy, J.Supercond. 6, 219 (1993).
- 4. D A.Bonn, D C.Morgan, K.Zhang, R.Liang, D J.Baar, and W N.Hardy, J.Phys. Chem Sol. 54, 1297 (1993); K.Zhang, D A.Bonn, R.Liang, D J.Baar, and W N. Hardy, Appl. Phys. Lett. 62, 3019 (1993).
- 5. D.A.Bonn, S.Kamal, K.Zhang, R.Liang, D.J.Baar, E.Klein, and W.N.Hardy, preprint (1993).
- K. Ishida Y.K itaoka, T.Yoshitom i, N.Ogata, T.Kam ino, and K.Asayam a, Physica C179,29 (1991); JA.Martindale, SE.Barrett, CA.Klug, KE.O'Hara, SM.DeSoto, SP.Slichter, TA.Friedmann and DM.Ginsberg, Phys.Rev.Lett. 68, 702 (1992); K. Ishida, Y.Kitaoka, N.Ogata, T.Kam ino, K.Asayama, JR.Cooper, and N. Athanassopoulou, J.Phys. Soc. Japan 62, 2803 (1993).
- 7. Z. Shen, D.S. Dessau, B.O. Wells, D.M. King, W.E. Spicer, A.J. Arko, D.M. arshall, L.W. Lom bardo, A.Kapitulnik, P.Dickinson, S.Doniach, J.DiCarlo, T.Loeser, and C.H. Parks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1553 (1993); R.J. Kelley, J.M. a, G. M. argaritondo, and M. Onellion, preprint (1993).
- 8. D A.Wollman, D J. van Harlingen, W C. Lee, D M. Ginsberg, and A J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 2134 (1993).
- 9. For review s see J. Annett, N. Goldenfeld and S. Renn, Phys. Rev. B 43, 2778 (1991); D. Pines, Proceedings of the Conference on Spectroscopies on Novel Superconductors, Los A lam os, 1993 to appear in J. Chem. Phys. Solids; D. J. Scalapino, ibid.
- 10. M. Prohammer and J.Carbotte, Phys. Rev. B43, 5370 (1991); P.Arberg, M.Mansor and J.P.Carbotte, Sol. St. Commun. 86, 671 (1993).
- 11. P.J.Hirschfeld and N.Goldenfeld, Phys.Rev.B48 (1993).
- 12. P.J.Hirschfeld, W O.Putikka, and D J.Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3705 (1993).
- 13. R A K lemm, K. Schamberg, D. W alker, and C.T. Rieck, Z. Phys. 72, 139 (1988).
- 14. P.J.Hirschfeld, P.W ol e, D.Einzel, JA.Sauls, and W O.Putikka, Phys. Rev. 40, 6695 (1989).
- 15. P.J.Hirschfeld, W.O.Putikka, P.W ole and Y.Campbell, J.Low Temp. Phys. 88, (1992); erratum to be published, ibid (1994).
- 16. P.J.Hirschfeld, D.Einzel, and P.W ole, Phys. Rev. B 37, 83 (1988).
- 17. B.Ar, H.Bahlouli, C.J. Pethick, and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 2206 (1988).
- 18. J.-J. Chang and D J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B 40, 4299 (1989).

- 19. F.Gross, B.S.Chandrasekhar, D.Einzel, K.Andres, P.J.Hirschfeld, H.R.Ott, J. Beuers, Z.Fisk and JL.Sm ith, Z.Phys. 64, 175 (1986).
- 20. C.H. Choiand P.M uzikar, Phys. Rev. B 39, 11296 (1989).
- 21. A A . A brikosov, L P. G or'kov, and I. E. D zyaloshinski, M ethods of Q uantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics, (D over Books: New York, 1963).
- 22. S. Skalsi, O. Betbeder-M atibet, and P.W eiss, Phys. Rev. 136, A 1500 (1964).
- 23. See, e.g.E.M uller-H artm ann, in M agnetism, vol.V, ed.by H.Suhl, (A cadem ic P ress: New York, 1973), and references therein.
- 24. P.J.Hirschfeld, D.Vollhardt, and P.W ol e, Solid State Commun. 59, 111 (1986).
- 25. S.Schm itt-R ink, K.M iyake, and C M. Varm a, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 2575 (1986).
- 26. A A . A brikosov and L P.G or kov, JETP 39 (1960), 1781.
- 27. C J. Pethick and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 270 (1986).
- 28. R.W alstedt et al, Phys. Rev. B 48, 10646 (1993).
- 29. N.Bulut, D.Hone, D.J. Scalapino, and E.Y. Loh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2192 (1989).
- 30. P.M onthoux and D.P ines, preprint (1993).
- 31. D.Poilblanc, W. Hanke and D.J. Scalapino, in Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 884 (1994).
- 32. A.A. Nersesyan, A.M. Tsvelick, and F.W enger, preprint (1994).
- 33. P.A.Lee, Phys.Rev.Lett. 71, 1887 (1993).
- 34. A.V. Balatsky, A. Rosengren, and B.L. Altshuler, preprint (1994).
- 35. S.B.Kaplan, C.C.Chi, D.N.Langenberg, J.J.Chang, S.Jafarey, and D.J.Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B14, 4854 (1976).
- 36. D.C.M attis and J.Bardeen, Phys. Rev. 111, 412 (1958).
- 37. L.Co ey, T M. Rice, and K. Ueda, J. Phys. C18, L813 (1985).
- 38. See also W D. Putikka and P.J. Hirschfeld, to be published in Proc.XX Int.Conf. on Low Temp.Phys. (Eugene, 1993).
- 39. H.Kim, G.Preosti, and P.Muzikar, preprint (1993).
- 40. W O.Putikka, P.J.Hirschfeld, and P.W ole, Phys. Rev. B 41, 7285 (1990).
- 41. N.E.Bickers, D.J.Scalapino, and S.R.W hite, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 961 (1989); P. Monthoux and D.Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 961 (1992).
- 42. S.Quinlan, D.J. Scalapino, and N. Bulut, preprint (1993).
- 43. N.Bulut and D.J.Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 706 (1992); D.Thelen, D.Pines, and J.P.Lu, Phys. Rev. B 47, 915 (1993).
- 44. M C.Nuss, PM.Mankiewich, M L.O'Malley, EH.Westerwick, and PB.Littlewood, Phys.Rev.Lett. 66, 3305 (1991).
- 45. J.Y. Lee, K. Paget, T. Lemberger, S. Foltyn and X. Wu, preprint (1993).

- 46. Z.M a et al., Phys. Rev. Lett 71, 781 (1993); Z.M a, private communication.
- 47. P.M onthoux and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett., to be published.
- 48. C.H. Pao and N.E. Bickers, Phys. Rev. Lett., to be published.
- 49. S.Kamal, D.A.Bonn, N.Goldenfeld, P.J.Hirschfeld, R.Liang, and W.N.Hardy, preprint (1994).
- 50. N.K lein and J.O renstein, private communications.
- 51. L.Borkowski and P.J.Hirschfeld, preprint (1994).
- 52. H.Alloul, P.M endels, H.Casalta, J.F.M arucco and J.A rabski, Phys.Rev.Lett. 67, 3140 (1991).

- 1. Normalized low -T conductivity, = $_{00}$ vs. the reduced temperature T=T_c form icrow ave frequency = 0. The solid lines correspond to resonant scattering, c = 0, =T_c = 0:01;0:003;0:001, and dashed line corresponds to c = 0:3; =T_c = 0:01.
- 2. Normalized low-T conductivity, $=_{00}$ vs. the reduced temperature $T=T_c$ in the Born lim it, $_N=T_c=0.01$; $=T_c=0.01$; $=T_c=0$
- 3. Normalized low -T conductivity, $=_{00}$ vs. the reduced temperature $T = T_c$ in the resonant limit, for c = 0, $= T_c = 0.001$, and $= T_c = 0.0032;0.01$:
- 4. Normalized conductivity, = $_{00}$ vs. the reduced frequency =T_c for T = 0, and =T_c = 0:001;0:01;0:1.
- 5. Normalized zero-tem perature London penetration depth, $(T = 0) = _0$ vs. the reduced scattering rate, $=T_{c0}$ in the resonant scattering lim it, c=0.
- 6. Normalized London penetration depth, (T)= $_0$ vs. the reduced temperature, T=T_c for resonant scattering, =T_c = 0:0008, c = 0, and =T_c = 0:0:002;0:018.
- 7. Impurity relaxation rate $1=T_c$ (!) vs. the reduced frequency $!=_0$ for $=T_c = 0.01;0.001$ and c=0 (solid lines) and $=T_c = 0.01; c= 2$ (dashed line).
- 8. Relaxation rate including inelastic scattering $1=T_ch$ i vs. the reduced temperature $T=T_c$ for $=T_c = 0.0008; 0.009; 0.018, c = 0, _0=T_c = 3$ (solid lines) and $=T_c = 0.0008; c = 0; _0=T_c = 4$ (dashed line).
- 9. Normalized conductivity including inelastic scattering, $=_{00}$ vs. the reduced tem perature $T=T_c$ in the resonant limit, c = 0 for $=T_c = 0.018; c = 0;$ and $=T_c = 0.0008; 0.009; 0.018$.
- 10. Reduced conductivity peak tem perature, $T_p=T_c vs. =T_c for =T_c = 0.001; 0.01, c = 0;$ and $_0=T_c = 3$ (left axis); norm alized peak conductivity (T_p ;)= (T_c ; 0) vs. = T_c (right axis).

- 11. C om parison of d-wave penetration depth with penetration depth data on YBCO single crystals.⁵ N orm alized penetration depth, $(T) = _0$ vs. the reduced tem perature $T = T_c$ for $= T_c = 0.018;0.009;0.0008$ and c = 0.D at afor pure YBCO crystal (circles), 0.15% Zn (diam onds), and 0.31% Zn (squares).
- 12. Normalized T = 0 normal uid density 1 $\begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ vs. the reduced coe cient of T² term, $_0 = \begin{pmatrix} c_2 & 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ in the $d_{x^2} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ y^2 \end{pmatrix}$ plus resonant scattering model. Each cluster of points represents one YBCO lm from Ref. 45.
- 13. Normalized theoretical conductivity $=_1(T_c)$ vs. the reduced temperature $T=T_c$ for impurity parameters $=T_c = 0.0008$ and c = 0, including inelastic scattering for $=T_c =$ 0.002 and 0.018 (solid lines). Data points are normalized conductivities of YBCO single crystals from Ref. 5 for m icrowave frequencies 3.88 GHz (circles) and 34.8 GHz (triangles).
- 14. Normalized theoretical conductivity $=_1(T_c)$ vs. the reduced temperature $T=T_c$ for impurity parameters $=T_c = 0.0008; 0.009$ and 0.018 with c = 0, including inelastic scattering for $=T_c = 0.018$ (solid lines). Data points are normalized conductivities of YBCO single crystals from Ref. 5 for frequency 34.8 GHz, for samples nom inally pure (circles), 0.15% Zn (triangles), and 0.31% Zn (squares).
- 15. E ect of detwinning. Normalized theoretical conductivity $=_1(T_c)$ vs. the reduced tem perature $T=T_c$ for in purity parameters $=T_c = 0.0008$ and c = 0, including inelastic scattering for $=T_c = 0.002$ (solid line). Data points are normalized conductivities of detwinned YBCO single crystal from Ref. 5 for frequency 4.1 GHz.
- 16. Normalized surface resistance, $R_s=R_s(T_c)$ vs. the reduced temperature $T=T_c$. Theory for $=T_c = 0.002$ and impurity parameters $=T_c = 0.0008; c = 0$, including inelastic scattering, for $_0=T_c=3$ (solid line) and $_0=T_c=4$ (dashed line). Data from Ref. 5, 3.88G Hz, nom inally pure YBCO crystal.































