

Universal Scaling Properties of Superconductors in Magnetic Fields

Donjoe O'Connor

Departamento de Física,
Cinvestav, Apartado Postal 14-740,
México D.F. 07000

C.R. Stephens

Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares,
UNAM, Circuito Exterior, Apartado Postal 70-543,
México D.F. 04510.
(March 24, 2022)

Based on renormalization group arguments we establish that for a superconductor in the presence of a weak external magnetic field, B , the dependence on B and the deviation from the critical temperature, Δ , of a thermodynamic quantity, P , takes the scaling form $P = t \times (\frac{B}{B_0})^{2-\alpha} q^{1-\beta}$, where α and β are XY exponents, q is the scaled electromagnetic coupling and β is the associated crossover exponent. For $q \ll 1$, the experimentally accessible region in high- T_c superconductors, there is a reduction to one-variable scaling plus small corrections. In this region we find the shift in the specific heat maximum is given by $\Delta = x_0 (B/B_0)^{1/2}$ and that the singular part of the free energy at the critical temperature takes the form $F_{\text{sing}} = c(d) (B/B_0)^{d/2}$ where $c(d)$ is a universal amplitude. A one-loop approximation in three dimensions gives $c(3) \approx 0.22$. The results presented here should have equal applicability to the nematic to smectic-A transition.

PACS numbers: 74.25.Bt, 05.70.Jk, 64.60.Ak

Since the discovery of high- T_c superconductivity there has been a significant increase in interest in the critical properties of superconductors. As one of the principal experimental probes for the analysis of high- T_c materials involves their study in external magnetic fields it is important to have reliable and robust theoretical predictions for such a setting.

The formal analogy between a superconductor in an external magnetic field and a system constrained by finite size is well known [1]. In [2] we established that correlation functions of such a superconductor exhibit a scaling form identical to that of a near critical system in a confined geometry of size L , with the combination $(B/B_0)^{1/2}$, where B is the magnetic field and $B_0 = hc/4e$ is the unit flux quantum, playing the role of L . A crucial ingredient in our analysis was the assumption of a non-trivial, infrared stable renormalization group (RG) fixed point. In conventional superconductors such a fixed point is experimentally inaccessible. Additionally, there are theoretical arguments [3] that cast doubt on the existence of such a fixed point except in the artificial case where the number of components of the order parameter is large. For type-II superconductors there is some evidence [4] that very close to T_c the relevance of magnetic field fluctuations causes a crossover to a stable "charged-XY" fixed point with inverted temperature axis. Once again in the case of conventional supercon-

ductors this crossover would be unobservable.

On a more pragmatic note, experimentally there is now ample evidence [5-7] that for high- T_c superconductors, for $|T - T_c| \lesssim 10\text{K}$, the zero field transition exhibits critical behaviour characteristic of a three dimensional XY model. This fact, together with the finite size analogy, has been utilized [8] to collapse experimental specific heat data using a "finite size" scaling ansatz of the form $P = t \times (\frac{B}{B_0})^{2-\alpha}$, where t is a linear deviation from the critical temperature and α and β are XY exponents, with $\beta \approx 0.67$ for a three dimensional sample. In a recent letter Lawrie [9] presented two-loop arguments establishing that to this order, when fluctuations in the electromagnetic field are neglected, the two-point function of the order parameter in a magnetic field exhibits such a scaling form.

The neutral-XY fixed point where $e = 0$ is unstable with respect to a small perturbation of the electromagnetic coupling. Hence, one expects a region wherein electromagnetic fluctuations can be treated as a relevant perturbation, in a similar fashion to temperature, thus leading to a two-variable scaling formulation. For high- T_c superconductors, where the Ginzburg-Landau parameter, κ , is large (e.g. for $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-y}$, $\kappa \approx 87$ [10]) the corrections due to electromagnetic fluctuations, although relevant, are very small except in a region asymptotically close to T_c and can be taken into account as corrections

to scaling around the single variable scaling form associated with the neutral XY fixed point. Experimental evidence certainly seems to accord with this picture.

In this letter we establish using RG techniques that the appropriate scaling form for a general thermodynamic quantity, P , in a magnetic field takes the form $P = t^X (\frac{B}{B_0})^{1/2} (q/q_0)^{1/2}$. In the case where electromagnetic fluctuations are weak, such as high- T_c superconductors, we show that this reduces to a one-variable scaling form plus small corrections to scaling relative to the XY fixed point. In addition, our analysis provides several new theoretical predictions which should be testable as experiments on high- T_c superconductors become more refined in the vicinity of the critical point. The derivation elucidates the assumptions on which such a scaling form relies, in particular the result is quite robust.

Our starting point is the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson Hamiltonian for a superconductor, based on the Cooper pair density as order parameter, given by

$$H[\psi] = \int d^d x \left[\frac{1}{2} (\nabla \psi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \mathbf{A})^2 + \frac{1}{4} B^2 - \mu \psi^\dagger \psi + \frac{1}{2} \psi^\dagger \psi \mathbf{A} \cdot \nabla \psi \right] \quad (1)$$

Note that with the substitutions, $r_0 = \frac{2m}{h^2}$, $\phi_0 = \frac{12m^2}{h^4}$ and $\psi = \frac{h}{2m}$ we recast Eq. (1) into conventional form (as found in e.g. B latter et al. [10]). The only temperature dependent parameter is μ (and hence r_0), which is assumed to depend linearly on T . Though high- T_c superconductors are highly anisotropic, if the anisotropy is not so strong as to invalidate a continuous LGW formulation, the asymmetric results can be obtained from the symmetric ones by the rescaling methods of B latter, Gershkenbein and Larkin [11], hence we concentrate on the symmetric case.

In the case of a superconductor in a unidirectional magnetic field, B , fluctuations of ψ induce a renormalization of B even if electromagnetic fluctuations are ignored. This renormalization becomes ultraviolet divergent at the upper critical dimension and is encoded in the wavefunction renormalization of the vector potential A , i.e. $A = Z_A^{1/2} A_0$, (where we use a subscript 0 to indicate a bare or unrenormalized quantity). The electromagnetic coupling $e = Z_e e_0$ is similarly renormalized. Gauge invariance as implemented by the Ward identities relates the two renormalizations, $Z_e Z_A^{1/2} = 1$ [12]. An immediate consequence is that eB is an RG invariant. Furthermore, from the Hamiltonian (1) we see that only the combination $B = \phi_0$ arises in any correlation function or thermodynamic quantity associated with the ψ field. Thus $(\phi_0/B)^{1/2}$ is a nonlinear scaling field with the dimensions of length which behaves for RG purposes in a fashion very similar to the linear size L of a finite or layered system.

We begin by establishing the scaling form for a general correlation function. From the Hamiltonian (1) we see that correlation functions depend on r_0 , ϕ_0 , e_0 and the RG invariant $B = \phi_0$ together with a cutoff. Defining the renormalized correlation functions $G^{(N,M)}$ by

$$\langle \psi(1) \psi^\dagger(k) \psi^\dagger(k+1) \psi(N) \psi(1) \psi^\dagger(M) \psi^\dagger \rangle = G^{(N,M)}(t; e; \frac{B}{\phi_0}; x_1; \dots; x_N; y_1; \dots; y_M) \quad (2)$$

where t is the renormalized deviation from the zero field critical temperature, i.e. $r_0 = r_c + Z_{r,2} t$, the relation between the bare and renormalized correlation functions is

$$G^{(N,M)}(t; e; \frac{B}{\phi_0}) = Z_{\psi}^{N/2} Z_{\psi}^{M/2} G_0^{(N,M)}(r_0; \phi_0; e_0; \frac{B}{\phi_0})$$

where for convenience we have suppressed the dependence on position. $Z_{\psi}^{1/2}$ and $Z_{r,2}$ are the field and composite operator renormalization factors, $Z_{\psi} = \phi_0$ and is an arbitrary renormalization scale. Here we take ϕ_0 and e to be the dimensionless renormalized couplings.

The Hamiltonian (1) defines a renormalizable field theory for any dimension $d \leq 4$. As ultraviolet divergences are unaffected by the presence of an external B field the Z_i obtained via a B independent renormalization scheme, such as minimal subtraction, are sufficient to renormalize the theory for $B \neq 0$. The RG equation obeyed by $G^{(N,M)}$ is equivalent to the statement that the bare functions are independent of the arbitrary renormalization scale chosen to define the renormalized theory; hence the renormalized correlation functions obey the equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{e} \frac{\partial}{\partial e} + \frac{1}{\phi_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_0} \right) G^{(N,M)}(t; e; \frac{B}{\phi_0}; x; y) = 0; \quad (3)$$

where $\frac{\partial}{\partial e} = \frac{de}{de} \frac{d}{de}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_0} = \frac{d\phi_0}{d\phi_0} \frac{d}{d\phi_0}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \frac{d \ln Z_{\psi}}{dt} \frac{d}{dt}$ and $\frac{1}{2} t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \frac{d \ln Z_{r,2}}{dt} \frac{d}{dt}$ are the anomalous dimensions of ψ and ψ^2 respectively. The solution of Eq. (3) is

$$G^{(N,M)}(t; e; \frac{B}{\phi_0}) = e^{-1} \frac{R}{\phi_0^{N/2}} \cdot (x)^{N/2} \cdot (y)^{M/2} \cdot \frac{d^N x}{dx^N} \cdot \frac{d^M y}{dy^M} \quad (4)$$

The absence of a term of the form $B \frac{\partial}{\partial B} = \frac{\partial}{\partial B}$ in (3) is due to the fact that B only appears in the RG invariant combination $B = \phi_0$ and is directly analogous to the absence of a term $L \frac{\partial}{\partial L} = \frac{\partial}{\partial L}$ in the RG equation for a finite system. The latter is a crucial element in the proof of finite size scaling [13].

To proceed further we need to make some assumption about the fixed points of the model. The Landau-Ginzburg model under discussion has several potential

candidates. In [2] we assumed an infrared stable fixed point, $e = e^*$, $t = 0$. By going to a "dual" formulation there is some theoretical evidence [4] that for type-II superconductors the zero field transition is associated with a fixed point of this type which is in the universality class of the charged-XY model with inverted temperature axis. This fixed point is associated with only one relevant direction, t , and in its vicinity scaling functions depend on only one scaling variable. In the case of superconductivity there is at present no experimental evidence for such a fixed point. Another candidate is the Gaussian fixed point $e = 0$, $t = 0$, however, a scaling formulation based on an expansion around this fixed point is in disagreement with experimental results for high- T_c superconductors.

Given that there is compelling experimental evidence that the XY fixed point is relevant to critical fluctuations in high- T_c superconductors we will now concentrate our attention on a scaling description based on the fixed point: $e = 0$, $t = 0$ where is the Wilson-Fisher fixed point coupling for an $O(d)$ model. One might worry that at such a fixed point, since $e = 0$, the dependence on B would drop out. This is not the case since eB is an RG invariant and if it is non-zero at the beginning of an RG flow it is non-zero at the end.

There is an essential difference between this fixed point in the context of a superconductor and the standard XY case since in the scaling neighbourhood of this neutral-XY fixed point, as can be seen from the work of Halperin, Lubensky and Ma [3], there are two relevant variables, t and e , and therefore one has generically two-variable scaling functions, with t being the leading relevant perturbation. As $e(t; e) = e^*(t; e)$ linearization about $e = 0$ ensures that there is no mixing of e and t in the relevant direction, though the irrelevant direction is a linear combination of e and t [3]. For $d = 3$ estimates give $e^* = 0.67$ and $e^* = 1$.

Since the RG equations for the two relevant variables are

$$\frac{de}{d} = e^*(t; e)e \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dt}{d} = \nu_2(e; t)t; \quad (5)$$

in the scaling neighbourhood of the fixed point we have $\nu_2(t; 0) = 2 - 1/\nu$, where ν is the XY correlation length exponent and $e^*(t; 0) = e^*$ is the scaling dimension of the charge. Integrating (5) yields $t(\lambda) = t^2 \lambda^{1-\nu}$ and $e(\lambda) = e^* \lambda^{1-\nu}$. The general scaling form of (4) then becomes

$$G^{(N, M)} = (\lambda)^{-N/M} G^{(N, M)} \left(\frac{B}{(\lambda)^2}; \frac{q}{(\lambda)^{1-\nu}} \right) \quad (6)$$

where $N/M = \frac{N}{2}(d-1) + M(d-1)$, $\lambda = t^{1-\nu}$, $q = e^{1-\nu}$ and $G^{(N, M)}$ has been rescaled by a factor $\lambda^{\frac{N}{2} - M(2-1)}$. Since the co-ordinates x_i do not get renormalized they enter the dimensionless functions

$G^{(N, M)}$ in the combination x_i . Eq. (6) implies $G^{(N, M)}$ is a homogeneous function, therefore the variable λ can be used to eliminate one of the arguments. We choose to eliminate λ by setting $(\lambda)^{1-\nu} = 1$. The general scaling form in the vicinity of the neutral-XY fixed point is then

$$G^{(N, M)} = \lambda^{-N/M} G^{(N, M)}(x; y) \quad (7)$$

where the scaling variables are $x = B/\lambda^2$ and $y = q/\lambda^{1-\nu}$ and $G^{(N, M)}$ is a universal scaling function. A single-variable scaling function is recovered in the limit $q \rightarrow 0$, or alternatively in the limit $T \rightarrow T_c$ if there exists a non-trivial stable infrared fixed point.

The free energy takes the two-variable scaling form

$$F_{\text{sing}} = \lambda^{-2} F(x; y) \quad (8)$$

with x and y as above. When the temperature is precisely tuned to the critical temperature it is no longer appropriate to eliminate λ in terms of the temperature variable but instead one can use the condition $B = 0$ ($\lambda^2 = 1$). The dependence on the external field of the free energy then takes the simplified form

$$F_{\text{sing}} = \frac{B}{0} F^{d=2} q \frac{0}{B} \quad (9)$$

with a corresponding expression for the specific heat.

We have shown here that generically one expects to see two-variable scaling functions when electromagnetic fluctuations are taken into account, however, one-variable scaling seems to give a very good fit to current experimental data. The consistency of these two seemingly contradictory facts can be seen by making a Taylor expansion of the scaling functions (7-9). One finds, for instance, for the correlation functions to first order in e

$$G^{(N, M)} = \lambda^{-N/M} (1 + q^{1-\nu} D(x)) G^{(N, M)}(x); \quad (10)$$

For strongly type-II superconductors the correction to scaling factor, even though it is associated with a relevant operator, will be very small unless one gets very close to the critical point, and hence a one-variable scaling form associated with the XY fixed point should offer a very good description. Naturally it would be very interesting to see if such corrections to scaling due to electromagnetic fluctuations could be observed experimentally.

With the scaling formulation given above and the analogy with finite size scaling there are several interesting corollaries regarding critical temperature shifts and rounding. For $d < 4$ one does not expect any critical divergence for $B \neq 0$, hence any shifts will be associated with a pseudo-critical temperature $T_p(B)$, which we take to be the point at which the specific heat is a maximum, i.e. $\partial C / \partial T|_{T_p(B)} = 0$. Given that the specific heat is

proportional to $\int d^d x G^{(0;2)}$, then $G^{(0;3)} = \partial C / \partial \mu$ has the scaling form

$$G^{(0;3)}(\mu; e; \frac{B}{B_0}) = \mu^{-d-3} M(x; y): \quad (11)$$

The shift in temperature of the specific heat maximum $T_p(B) - T_c(0)$ is given by the zero of the universal scaling function M , i.e. $M(x; y) = 0$. Once $y = \mu^{-1}$ we can set $\mu = 0$ in (11), a good approximation experimentally, (corrections to scaling can of course be added). Denoting this universal zero, x_0 , one finds

$$T_p(B) - T_c(0) = x_0 \frac{B}{B_0}^{1/2} \quad (12)$$

which is identical to the corresponding formula familiar in finite size scaling [14]. A similar expression for the specific heat rounding follows from the standard argument that finite size effects will start to become important when $\xi_0 (B = 0)^{-1/2}$, where ξ_0 is the zero field coherence length.

The above general argument can also be used to derive in the present context the analog of phenomenological renormalization [15]. Denoting the coherence length via the second moment of the two-point correlation function leads to

$$\frac{\chi(B)}{\chi_0} = R \frac{B}{B_0}^2 \quad (13)$$

where R is a universal scaling function and once again we are neglecting electromagnetic corrections to scaling. Denoting a scale transformation $B \rightarrow B^0, t \rightarrow t^0$ via $B^{-2}(t; 0) = B_0^{-2}(t^0; 0)$ leads to

$$t^2 \frac{B}{B_0} = t_0^2 \frac{B^0}{B_0} = B_0^0 = B \quad (14)$$

which represents an exact RG transformation. $T = T_c(0)$ is a fixed point of this equation and the critical exponent can be obtained by linearizing around this fixed point to find

$$1 + \frac{1}{B_0} \ln \frac{B}{B_0} = \ln \frac{-\partial G^{(0;2)}/\partial B}{-\partial G^{(0;2)}/\partial B_0}: \quad (15)$$

In the approximation where electromagnetic fluctuations can be neglected, or if a charged-X-Y fixed point exists, the above scaling formulation also leads to many new universal critical-point ratios. For instance, the ratio $2B = B_0$, evaluated at the critical temperature, should be a universal number. Also, the singular part of the free energy at $T = T_c(0)$ will have the form $F_{\text{sing}} = c(d) (B = B_0)^{d/2}$ where $c(d)$ is a universal number analogous to the Casimir amplitude familiar in finite size scaling [16]. A one loop approximation gives

$$c(d) = (1 - \frac{d}{2}) (1 - \frac{d}{2}; \frac{1}{2}) \quad (16)$$

which for $d = 3$ gives $c(3) = 0.22$.

To conclude: we have derived using RG methods the scaling behaviour of thermodynamic functions in the critical region for a superconductor in a magnetic field. We find that in the neighborhood of the X-Y fixed point the relevance of electromagnetic fluctuations leads to a two-variable scaling formulation. For $\mu^{-1} \ll 1$, the experimentally accessible region for high- T_c superconductors, this two-variable formulation reduces to a one-variable form plus corrections to scaling due to the electromagnetic fluctuations.

We believe that various predictions we have made here should be experimentally verifiable in high- T_c superconductors. In particular, the analogy with finite size scaling is robust and it should be possible to determine in exactly what regions the data collapses onto a one-variable scaling formulation and to what extent corrections to scaling can describe any deviations. It should also be possible to measure some of the universal critical point ratios that arise naturally in the present scaling formulation and the predicted shift of the specific heat maximum. It would be interesting to extend the present approach to include dynamics, anisotropy and/or disorder. The conclusions of this letter should also be of relevance to the nematic to smectic-A phase transition in liquid crystals which is believed to be in the same universality class.

This work was supported in part by Conacyt under grant number 211085-5-0118PE.

-
- [1] P.A. Lee and S.R. Shenoy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 1025 (1972); A.J. Bray, Phys. Rev. B 9, 4752 (1974); D.J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 946 (1975).
 - [2] Denje O'Connor and C.R. Stephens, Phys. Rev. B 43, 3652 (1991).
 - [3] B.I. Halperin, T.C. Lubensky and S.K. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 292 (1974).
 - [4] C.D. Asgupta and B.I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 1556 (1991); M. Kimmetsis, H. Kleinert and A.M.J. Schakel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1975 (1994).
 - [5] M.B. Salamon, J. Shi, N. Overend and M.A. Howson, Phys. Rev. B 47, 5520 (1993).
 - [6] N. Overend, M.A. Howson and I.D. Lawrie, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 3238 (1994).
 - [7] S. Kamal et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1845 (1994).
 - [8] S.E. Inderhees, M.B. Salamon, J.P. Rice and D.M. Ginsburg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 232 (1991).
 - [9] I.D. Lawrie, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 131 (1997).
 - [10] G. Blatter, M.V. Feigel'man, V.B. Geshenbein, A.I. Larkin and V.M. Vinokur, Rev. Mod. Phys. 66, 1125 (1994).

- [1] G . Blatter, V . B . Geshenbein and A . I . Larkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 875 (1992).
- [2] C . Itzykson and J.B . Zuber, Quantum Field Theory, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980).
- [3] E . Brezin, J. Phys. (Paris) 43, 23 (1982).
- [4] M . E . Fisher and M . N . Barber, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 1516 (1972).
- [5] M . P . Nightingale, Physica A 83, 561 (1976).
- [6] M . Krech, The Casimir Effect in Critical Systems (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).