

Review article

The Role of Density of States Fluctuations in the Normal State Properties of High T_c Superconductors

A.A.Varlamov

Forum: Institute of Solid State Theory of INFM, Pisa - Florence,
Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Firenze, L.go E. Fermi, 2 Firenze
50125, Italy (e-mail: varlamov@fi.infn.it)

and

Department of Theoretical Physics, Moscow Institute for Steel and Alloys,
Leninski pr. 4, Moscow 117936, Russia

G.Balestrino, E.Milani

Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Fisiche ed Energetiche,
II Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", via Tor Vergata,
00133 Roma, Italy (e-mail: balestrino@uniroma2.it, milani@uniroma2.it)

D.V.Livanov

Department of Theoretical Physics, Moscow Institute for Steel and Alloys,
Leninski pr. 4, Moscow 117936, Russia (e-mail: livanov@trf.misa.ac.ru)

Abstract

During the last decade a lot of efforts have been undertaken to explain the unusual normal state properties of high temperature superconductors (HTS) in the framework of unconventional theories based on strongly interacting electrons, pre-formed Cooper pairs, polaron mechanism of superconductivity etc. A different approach to this problem would be to develop the perturbation theory for interacting electrons in the normal phase of strongly anisotropic superconductors without specifying the origin of this interaction. The Cooper channel of interelectron interaction is equivalent to the superconducting fluctuations which are unusually strong in HTS. We show that the peculiarities of such systems not only lead to the increase of the magnitude but are also frequently responsible for the change of the hierarchy of different fluctuation effects and even of the sign of the total corrections. As a result the fluctuation contributions can manifest themselves in very unusual forms.

The first and well known result is that that now one has the “pre-formed Cooper pairs” automatically, from *ab initio* calculations: taking into account thermal fluctuations leads to the appearance of a non-zero density of fluctuating Cooper pairs (with finite lifetime) within layers without the establishment of long range order in the system. The fluctuation Cooper pair density decreases with temperature very slowly ($\sim \ln \frac{T_c}{T-T_c}$ in 2D case). The formation of these pairs of normal electrons leads to the decrease of the density of one-electron states (DOS renormalization) at the Fermi level, and this turns out to be the key effect in our discussion.

The DOS contribution to the most of characteristics is negligible for traditional superconducting materials. However it becomes dominant when highly anisotropic materials are discussed, and therefore is very important in HTS, especially when transport along the c-axis is considered. We analyze the role of the DOS fluctuations in the properties of HTS and show how, taking into account this effect, many puzzling and long debated properties of HTS materials (such as the steep increase of the electrical resistivity along the c-axis just above T_c , the anomalous magnetoresistance, effects of the magnetic field on the resistive transition along the c-axis, the c-axis far infrared absorption spectrum, NMR characteristics around the critical temperature etc.) can be understood leading to a simple, consistent description in terms of the fluctuation theory.

Contents

1	Introduction	7
2	Excursus to superconducting fluctuation theory	11
3	The effect of fluctuations on the order parameter and critical temperature	15
3.1	Introduction	15
3.2	Fluctuation Cooper pairs above T_c	15
3.3	Fluctuations below T_c	19
3.4	Discussion	23
4	The effect of superconducting fluctuations on the one-electron density of states.	25
5	The effect of fluctuations on the tunnel current	29
5.1	Introduction	29
5.2	Preliminaries	30
5.3	The effect of fluctuations on the tunnel current	32
5.4	Zero-bias anomaly studies in HTS junctions	34
5.5	Analysis of the pseudo-gap observation experiments	36
5.6	Discussion	37
6	Theory of fluctuation conductivity in a layered superconductor	39
6.1	Introduction	39
6.2	Normal conductivity tensor of a layered metal. Electron interlayer hopping time	40
6.3	Qualitative consideration of different fluctuation contributions	43
6.4	Microscopic theory of fluctuation conductivity in layered superconductor	48
6.4.1	The model	48
6.4.2	Aslamazov-Larkin contribution	52
6.4.3	Contributions from fluctuations of the density of states	54
6.4.4	Maki-Thompson contribution	56

6.5	MT anomalous contribution as the precursor phenomenon of Josephson effect	60
6.6	The total fluctuation conductivity	62
7	Experimental observations of fluctuation conductivity in HTS	66
7.1	Introduction	66
7.2	In-plane resistance: Crossover phenomena observations	67
7.3	Out-of-plane resistance: fluctuation origin of the c-axis peak .	70
8	The effects of magnetic field	75
8.1	Introduction	75
8.2	Theory of c -axis conductivity in magnetic field	76
8.2.1	General expressions	76
8.2.2	Weak magnetic field	78
8.2.3	The AL and anomalous MT contributions in intermediate and strong fields	80
8.2.4	Renormalization of the DOS contribution divergency in intermediate and strong fields	81
8.2.5	Discussion	84
8.3	Magnetoresistance above T_c	86
8.3.1	In-plane magnetoresistance	86
8.3.2	Out-of-plane magnetoresistance	89
8.4	Fluctuation magnetoresistance below T_c	93
8.5	Final remarks	96
9	The fluctuation induced pseudogap in HTS	100
9.1	Introduction	100
9.2	Paraconductivity	101
9.3	Density of States contribution	103
9.4	Maki-Thompson contribution	104
9.5	Discussion	106
10	Thermoelectric power above the superconducting transition	110
10.1	Introduction	110
10.2	DOS contribution to thermoelectric coefficient	112
10.3	Discussion	115

11 DOS fluctuations on NMR characteristics in HTS	118
11.1 Introduction	118
11.2 Definitions	119
11.3 Spin Susceptibility	121
11.4 Relaxation Rate	122
11.5 Discussion	125
12 D versus S pairing scenario: <i>pro</i> and <i>contra</i> from the fluctuation phenomena analysis	127
12.1 Introduction	127
12.2 The fluctuation propagator	128
12.3 d.c. conductivity	130
12.4 NQR-NMR relaxation	130
12.5 Experiment and discussion	132
13 Conclusions	137
14 Acknowledgments	139
15 Appendix A: Calculation of the impurity vertex $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$	140
16 Appendix B: Calculation of the fluctuation propagator $L(\vec{q}, \omega_\mu)$	143
17 Glossary	147

To the memory of our good friends and colleagues
Lev Aslamazov and Paolo Paroli

1 Introduction

There are no doubts that the puzzling anomalies of the normal state properties of high temperature superconductors (HTS) are tightly connected with the physical origin of superconductivity in these materials. Among them are:

- a peak in the c-axis resistivity above T_c followed by a decrease to zero as temperature is decreased [1, 2];
- the giant growth of this peak in the presence of an external magnetic field applied along the c-axis and its shift towards low temperatures [3];
- the giant magnetoresistance observed in a wide temperature range above the transition [4, 5, 6];
- the deviation from the Korringa law in the temperature dependence of the NMR relaxation rate above T_c [7];
- the opening of a large pseudo-gap in the c-axis optical conductivity at temperatures well above T_c [8, 9] ;
- the anisotropic gap observed in the electron spectrum by angular resolved photo-emission experiments [10].
- the gap-like tunneling anomalies observed already above T_c [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16].
- the anomalies in the thermoelectric power above T_c [17, 18].
- the anomalies in the Hall effect above T_c [19, 20, 21, 22].
- the anomalies in the heat transport above T_c [23, 24].

These effects have been attributed by many authors to the opening of a “pseudo-gap”. Naturally this has led to numerous speculations about the physical origin of such a gap.

During the last decade a lot of efforts have been undertaken to explain the unusual normal state properties of HTS materials using unconventional theories of superconductivity based on ideas of spin-charge separation, pre-formed Cooper pairs, polaron mechanism of superconductivity, etc.(see for instance [25]). They have been widely discussed and we will not overview them here. In the case of HTS with a well developed Fermi surface (i.e. in the optimally doped or overdoped part of the phase diagram) one can approach this problem from another side, namely to develop the perturbation theory for interacting electrons in the normal phase of a strongly anisotropic superconductor. We will not specify the origin of this interaction: for our purposes it is enough to assume that this interaction is attractive and leads to the appearance of superconductivity with Cooper pairs of charge $2e$ at

temperatures below T_c . Of course, the smallness of the effects magnitude (necessary for the applicability of the perturbative approach) is a serious limitation of the proposed theory. Nevertheless the current state of HTS investigations in some respects reminds one of the situation which occurs in the study of metal-insulator transitions in the 1970s. The weak localization theory did not describe consistently the Anderson transition, but was successful in the explanation of a set of anomalous properties of the disordered metal systems; besides this it gave a hint to the development of the renormalization group approach to the description of the metal-insulator transition.

The Cooper channel of interelectron interaction is equivalent to taking into account superconducting fluctuations which are unusually strong in HTS [26]. The reasons for this strength are the effective low dimensionality of the electron spectrum, the low density of charge carriers and the high values of critical temperature of HTS. We will show that these peculiarities lead not only to the increase of the magnitude of the fluctuation effects, but frequently change the hierarchy of the different fluctuation contributions, leading to the appearance of competition among them and even to the change of the habitual (in conventional superconductivity) sign of the overall correction. As a result, the fluctuation effects can manifest themselves in very unusual form, so that their origin cannot be identified at first glance.

The first well-known result is that in the metallic phase one automatically has the non-equilibrium analogue of pre-formed Cooper pairs above T_c . Indeed, taking into account thermal fluctuations (or interelectron interaction in the Cooper channel) leads to the appearance of some non-zero density of fluctuation Cooper pairs (in contrast to pre-formed pairs with finite lifetime) in the superconducting layers without the establishment of the long range order in the system. It is important that in the 2D case, typical for HTS materials, the density of Cooper pairs decreases with temperature extremely slowly: $\sim \ln \frac{T_c}{T-T_c}$. One should therefore not be surprised that precursor effects can often be detected in the normal phase well above T_c (especially in underdoped samples, see section 5).

The formation of fluctuation Cooper pairs of normal electrons above T_c has an important though usually ignored consequence: the decrease of the density of one-electron states (DOS) at the Fermi level [27, 28]. This circumstance turns out to be crucial for the understanding of the aforementioned effects and it will constitute the quintessence of this review. In this way the following phenomena can be at least qualitatively (and in many cases

quantitatively as well) explained:

The behavior of the c-axis resistance [3] which has been explained in terms of the suppression of the one-electron DOS at the Fermi level and the competition of this effect with the positive Aslamazov-Larkin (AL) paraconductivity [29, 30, 31, 32, 33].

The giant growth of the c-axis resistance peak in the presence of an external magnetic field applied along the c-axis is explained using the same approach [34] which was shown to fit well the experiments [33, 35, 36].

The anomalous negative magnetoresistance observed above T_c in BSCCO samples [37, 5, 39] was again explained by the same DOS fluctuation contribution [40]. Moreover, its competition with the positive Aslamazov-Larkin magnetoresistance gave good grounds for the prediction of a sign change in the magnetoresistance as temperature decreases towards T_c [40]. The latter effect was very recently confirmed experimentally on YBCO samples [6].

The decrease of the thermoelectric power at the edge of transition turns out to be the result of the DOS fluctuation contribution which dominates over the AL term [41] previously assumed to play the crucial role [42, 43, 44, 45].

The temperature dependence of the NMR rate $\frac{1}{T_1T}$ can be explained as the result of the competition between the positive Maki-Thompson (MT) correction to the Korringa law and the negative DOS contribution at the edge of the transition [46, 47].

The observed pseudo-gap-like structure in the far infra-red optical conductivity along c-axis can also be attributed to the suppression of the one-electron DOS at the Fermi level. This leads to the appearance of a sizable negative contribution in optical conductivity, which shows up in a wide range of frequencies (up to $\omega_{DOS} \sim \tau^{-1}$), exceeding the positive AL and MT contributions in magnitude and range of manifestation [48].

We believe that the fact that even the simple approach proposed here was able to explain most of the anomalies of the normal state properties of HTS mentioned above is not accidental. It shows the importance of the interelectron interaction in the problem discussed and demonstrates that even the way of “up-grading” the traditional BCS theory to include the HTS peculiarities is creative in the explanation of the HTS properties. Further, the approach considered provides clear results which can be compared with those obtained from the alternative viewpoints and an attempt to match them in the region of the intermediate strengths of interaction may be undertaken.

The review is organized in the following way. The sections 2 and 3 in-

introduce the reader to the short story and simplest notions of the fluctuation theory. The existence of a finite non-equilibrium concentration of Cooper pairs at temperatures above the critical one is shown and the effect of fluctuations on the order parameter and critical temperature is discussed. In the section 4, the renormalization of the one-electron density of states is considered, and in section 5, its consequences on the tunneling properties are discussed. This preliminary introduction prepares the reader for the central section 6 where the different fluctuation effects are discussed in their variety, first at a qualitative level and, then, within the microscopic approach. The results obtained in section 6 are then applied in section 7 to the analysis of the experimental data for the c-axis electrical transport. Section 8 is devoted to the effect of an external magnetic field on the c-axis transport. In section 9 we demonstrate that the effect of DOS fluctuation renormalization causes the opening of a pseudo-gap type structure in the c-axis optical conductivity. The importance of the DOS fluctuation contribution for the thermoelectricity is shown in section 10. The last two sections are devoted to the discussion of the effect of fluctuations on the NMR characteristics at the edge of transition and the possibility of application of the effect discussed as a tool to study the order parameter symmetry of HTS.

2 Excursus to superconducting fluctuation theory

During the first half of the century, after the discovery of superconductivity by Kammerlingh-Onnes, the problem of fluctuations smearing the superconducting transition was not even considered. In bulk samples of traditional superconductors the critical temperature T_c sharply divides the superconducting and the normal phases. It is worth mentioning that such behavior of the physical characteristics of superconductors is in perfect agreement both with the Ginzburg-Landau phenomenological theory (1950) and the BCS microscopic theory of superconductivity (1957). However, at the same time, it was well known that thermodynamic fluctuations can cause strong smearing of other second -order phase transitions, such as the λ -point in liquid helium.

As already mentioned, the characteristics of high temperature and organic superconductors, low dimensional and amorphous superconducting systems studied today, differ strongly from those of the traditional superconductors discussed in textbooks. The transitions turn out to be much more smeared here. The appearance of thermodynamically nonequilibrium Cooper pairs (superconducting fluctuations) above critical temperature leads to precursor effects of the superconducting phase occurring while the system is still in the normal phase, often far enough from T_c . The conductivity, the heat capacity, the diamagnetic susceptibility, the sound attenuation etc. may increase considerably in the vicinity of the transition temperature.

So, what is the principal difference between conventional and unconventional superconductors with respect to fluctuation phenomena, and in general, what determines the role and the strength of fluctuations in the vicinity of the superconducting transition? How smeared out is the transition point in existing superconducting devices, and how can one separate the fluctuation contributions from the normal state ones? Which microscopic information can be extracted from the analysis of the fluctuation corrections in different physical characteristics of superconductors?

These questions, along with many others, find their answers in the theory of fluctuation phenomena in superconductors. This chapter of the superconductivity has been developed in the last 30 years.

The first numerical estimation of the fluctuation contribution to the heat capacity of superconductors in the vicinity of T_c was done by Ginzburg in

1960 [49]. In that paper he showed that superconducting fluctuations increase the heat capacity even above T_c . In this way the fluctuations smear the jump in the heat capacity which, in accordance with the phenomenological Ginzburg-Landau theory of second order phase transitions (see for instance [50]), takes place at the transition point itself. The range of temperatures where the fluctuation correction to the heat capacity of a bulk clean conventional superconductor is relevant was estimated by Ginzburg as

$$\frac{\delta T}{T_c} \sim \left(\frac{T_c}{E_F} \right)^4 \sim \left(\frac{a}{\xi} \right)^4 \sim 10^{-12} \div 10^{-14} \quad (1)$$

where a is the interatomic distance, E_F is the Fermi energy and ξ is the superconductor coherence length at zero temperature¹. It is easy to see that this is many orders of magnitude smaller than the temperature range accessible in real experiments. This is why fluctuation phenomena in superconductors were considered experimentally inaccessible for a long time.

In the 1950s and 60s the formulation of the microscopic theory of superconductivity, the theory of type-II superconductors and the search for high- T_c superconductivity attracted the attention of researchers to dirty systems, and the properties of superconducting films and filaments began to be studied. In 1968, in the well known paper of L. G. Aslamazov and A. I. Larkin [52], the consistent microscopic theory of fluctuations in the normal phase of a superconductor in the vicinity of the critical temperature was formulated. This microscopic approach confirmed Ginzburg's evaluation [49] for the width of the fluctuation region in a bulk clean superconductor, but much more interesting results were found in [52] for low dimensional or dirty superconducting systems. The exponent ν of the ratio (a/ξ_0) , which enters in (1), drastically decreases as the effective dimensionality of the electron motion diminishes: $\nu = 4$ for 3D, but $\nu = 1$ for 2D electron spectrum (in the clean case) which is the most appropriate for HTS materials.

Another source of the effective increase of the strength of fluctuation effects is the decrease of the coherence length, which occurs in dirty superconductors because of the diffusive character of the electronic motion. This

¹The same expression for the width of the strong fluctuations region was obtained by Levanyuk in [51]. So in the modern theory of phase transitions the relative width of fluctuation region is called the Ginzburg-Levanyuk parameter $Gi_{(D)}$ and its value strongly depends on the space dimensionality D and on the impurity concentration [50].

means that fluctuation phenomena are mainly observable in amorphous materials with removed dimensionality, such as films and whiskers, where both factors mentioned above come into play. HTS is of special interest in this sense, because their electronic spectrum is extremely anisotropic and their coherence length is very small. As a result the temperature range in which the fluctuations are important in HTS may reach tens of degrees.

The manifestation of superconducting fluctuations above critical temperature may be conveniently demonstrated considering the case of electrical conductivity. In the first approximation there are three different effects. The first one, a direct contribution, consists in the appearance of nonequilibrium Cooper pairs with the characteristic lifetime $\tau_{GL} = \pi\hbar/8k_B(T - T_c)$ in the vicinity of the transition. In spite of their finite lifetime, a non-zero number of such pairs (which depends on the proximity to T_c) is always present in the normal phase (below T_c they are in excess in comparison with the equilibrium value (see the next section)). Their presence gives rise, for instance, to the appearance of the precursor of the Meissner-Ochsenfeld anomalous diamagnetism in the normal phase: that is [53] the anomalous increase of the diamagnetic susceptibility at the edge of the transition. As far as the conductivity is concerned, one can say that above T_c , because of the presence of nonequilibrium Cooper pairs, a new, non-dissipative, channel of charge transfer has been opened. This direct fluctuation contribution to the conductivity is called *paraconductivity* or the *Aslamazov-Larkin (AL)* contribution [52].

Another consequence of the appearance of fluctuating Cooper pairs above T_c is the decrease of the one-electron density of states at the Fermi level. Indeed, if some electrons are involved in the pairing they can not simultaneously participate in charge transfer and heat capacity as one-particle excitations. Nevertheless, the total number of the electronic states can not be changed by the Cooper interaction, and only a redistribution of the levels along the energy axis is possible [27, 28] (see Fig. 2 in section 4). In this sense one can speak about the opening of a fluctuation pseudo-gap at the Fermi level.

The decrease of the one-electron density of states at the Fermi level leads to the reduction of the normal state conductivity. This, indirect, fluctuation correction to the conductivity is called the *density of states (DOS)* contribution and it appears side by side with the *paraconductivity*. It has an opposite (negative) sign and turns out to be much less singular in $(T - T_c)^{-1}$ in comparison with the AL contribution, so that in the vicinity of T_c it was usually omitted. However, in many cases [29, 34, 54, 55, 56], when for some special

reasons the main, most singular, corrections are suppressed, the DOS correction becomes of major importance. Such a situation takes place in many cases of actual interest (quasiparticle current in tunnel structures, c-axis transport in strongly anisotropic high temperature superconductors, NMR relaxation rate, thermoelectric power). In this context the study of the DOS contribution will be our main goal in this review.

The third, purely quantum, fluctuation contribution is generated by the coherent scattering of the electrons forming a Cooper pair on the same elastic impurities. This is the so called *anomalous Maki-Thompson (MT)* contribution [57, 58] which often turns out to be important in conductivity and other transport phenomena at the edge of the transition. Its temperature singularity near T_c is similar to that of paraconductivity, but this contribution turns out to be extremely sensitive to electron phase-breaking processes. In HTS materials there are several sources of strong pair-breaking above T_c (such as localized magnetic moments, thermal phonons etc.). So the MT contribution turns out to be depressed by these phase-breaking processes and can usually be omitted in HTS fluctuation analysis. Nevertheless in some special cases (like NMR relaxation rate) it has to be taken into account even in its overdamped form.

Finally, for completeness, we have to mention the regular part of the Maki-Thompson diagram which is much less singular and has an origin similar to the DOS renormalization contribution.

We will see below that the strong anisotropy of the electron motion in HTS makes the DOS contribution particularly important for c-axis transport and related phenomena, changing significantly the hierarchy of the fluctuation corrections in comparison with the conventional case.

3 The effect of fluctuations on the order parameter and critical temperature

3.1 Introduction

The order parameter temperature dependence and the critical temperature are among the main characteristics of superconductors. The traditional BCS approach gives simple expressions for both of them, but it turns out to be valid for 3D systems only. The effect of fluctuations in the 2D case becomes crucial [59] and leads to the break down of the fundamental idea of BCS theory: the association of superconductivity with long-range order in the system. The works of Berezinski [60], Thouless and Kosterlitz [61] demonstrated that the requirement $\langle \Psi(0)\Psi(\vec{r}) \rangle_{|\vec{r}| \rightarrow \infty} = \text{const}$ for an homogeneous 2D system is too rigid, actually the flow of supercurrent takes place even if the system possesses some “stiffness” only. More precisely the aforementioned correlator of the order parameter at different points only has to decrease with distance $|\mathbf{r}|$ as some power law (in contrast to its exponential decrease in the normal metal).

We will not discuss here the well known properties of the Berezinski-Thouless-Kosterlitz state (see, for instance, the review [65, 66]) but will concentrate on the crucial, for our purposes, fact of the nonequilibrium fluctuation Cooper pair formation above T_c in quasi-two-dimensional systems. As we will show below, in spite of the exponential decrease of spatial superconducting correlations above T_c , the density of nonequilibrium pairs in this case decreases only logarithmically with temperature.

3.2 Fluctuation Cooper pairs above T_c

Let us start from the calculation of the density of fluctuation Cooper pairs in the normal phase of a superconductor. We restrict ourselves to the region of temperatures near the critical temperature, so we can operate in the framework of the Landau theory of phase transitions [50].

When we consider the system above the transition temperature, the order parameter $\Psi(\vec{r})$ has a fluctuating origin (its mean value is equal to zero) and it depends on the space variables even in the absence of magnetic field. This is why we have to take into account the gradient term in the Ginzburg-Landau

functional for the fluctuation part of the thermodynamical potential $\Omega_{(fl)}$:

$$\Omega_{(fl)} = \Omega_s - \Omega_n = \alpha \int dV \left\{ \varepsilon |\Psi(\vec{r})|^2 + \frac{b}{2\alpha} |\Psi(\vec{r})|^4 + \eta_D |\nabla \Psi(\vec{r})|^2 \right\} \quad (2)$$

where $\varepsilon = \ln(T/T_c) \approx \frac{T-T_c}{T_c} \ll 1$ for the temperature region discussed and $\alpha = \frac{1}{4m\eta_D}$. The positive constant η_D of the phenomenological Ginzburg-Landau may be expressed in terms of microscopic characteristics of the metal:

$$\eta_D = -\frac{v_F^2 \tau^2}{D} \left[\psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi\tau T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi\tau T} \psi'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right] \rightarrow \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\pi v_F^2 \tau}{8DT} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \tau T \ll 1, \\ 7\zeta(3)/(2\pi^3 \tau T) & \text{for } \tau T \gg 1, \end{cases}$$

where v_F is the Fermi velocity τ is the quasiparticle scattering time, D is the space dimensionality, $\psi(x)$ and $\psi'(x)$ are the digamma function and its derivative respectively, and $\zeta(x)$ is the Riemann zeta function². Dealing mostly with $2D$ case we will often use this definition omitting the subscript "2": $\eta_2 \equiv \eta$.

Dealing with the region of temperatures $\varepsilon > 0$, in the first approximation we can neglect the fourth order term in (2). Then, carrying out the Fourier transformation of the order parameter

$$\Psi_{\vec{k}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \int \Psi(\vec{r}) \exp^{-i\vec{k}\vec{r}} dV \quad (4)$$

one can easily write the fluctuation part of the thermodynamic potential as a sum over Fourier components of the order parameter:

$$\Omega_{(fl)} = \alpha \sum_{\vec{k}} \left(\varepsilon + \eta_D k^2 \right) |\Psi_{\vec{k}}|^2. \quad (5)$$

Here

$$\vec{k} = \frac{2\pi}{L_x} n_x \vec{i} + \frac{2\pi}{L_y} n_y \vec{j} + \frac{2\pi}{L_z} n_z \vec{l},$$

where $L_{x,y,z}$ are the sample dimensions in appropriate directions; $\vec{i}, \vec{j}, \vec{l}$ are unit vectors along the axes; $n_{x,y,z}$ are integer numbers; V is the volume of the sample.

²We will mostly use the system $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$ everywhere, excluding the situations where the direct comparison with experiments is necessary.

In the vicinity of the transition the order parameter Ψ undergoes equilibrium fluctuations. The probability of the fluctuation realization of a given configuration $\Psi(\vec{r})$ is proportional to [50]:

$$\mathcal{P} \propto \exp \left[-\frac{\alpha}{T} \sum_{\vec{k}} (\varepsilon + \eta_D k^2) |\Psi_{\vec{k}}|^2 \right], \quad (6)$$

Hence the average equilibrium fluctuation of the square of the order parameter Fourier component $|\Psi_{\vec{k}}^{(fl)}|^2$ may be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\Psi_{\vec{k}}^{(fl)}|^2 \rangle &= \frac{\int |\Psi_{\vec{k}}|^2 \exp \left[-\frac{\alpha}{T} (\varepsilon + \eta_D k^2) |\Psi_{\vec{k}}|^2 \right] d |\Psi_{\vec{k}}|^2}{\int \exp \left[-\frac{\alpha}{T} (\varepsilon + \eta_D k^2) |\Psi_{\vec{k}}|^2 \right] d |\Psi_{\vec{k}}|^2} \\ &= \frac{T}{\alpha (\varepsilon + \eta_D k^2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The concentration of Cooper pairs $\mathcal{N}_{c.p.}$ is determined by the average value of the square of the order parameter modulus [50]. For the two-dimensional case, which is of most interest to us, one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{c.p.}^{(2)} = \langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2 \rangle &= \int \frac{d^2 \vec{k}}{(2\pi)^2} |\Psi_{\vec{k}}^{(fl)}|^2 \exp i(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r}) \Big|_{\vec{r} \rightarrow 0} = \\ &= \frac{T}{\alpha} \int \frac{1}{\varepsilon + \eta_2 \vec{k}^2} \frac{d^2 \vec{k}}{(2\pi)^2} = 2\mathcal{N}_e^{(2)} \frac{T_c}{E_F} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_e^{(2)} = \frac{m}{2\pi} E_F$ is the one-electron concentration in 2D case, and η_2 is defined by the expression (3)³.

³One can notice that the number of Cooper pairs in (8) surprisingly does not depend on the concentration of electrons even when *ad absurdum* the number of electrons tends to zero. In this relation it is worth to mention two circumstances. The first one consists in the fact that we used the degenerate Fermi gas model from the very beginning, so the electron density cannot tend to zero. The second comment concerns the very special role of the dimensionality "2" for electron systems (disordered, or superconducting). The well known universality of the paraconductivity expression in this case is directly related with the discussed property of (8) (see section 6).

We see that in the 2D case the density of fluctuation Cooper pairs decreases very slowly as the temperature increases : logarithmically only. Of course these are nonequilibrium pairs, their lifetime being determined by the Ginzburg-Landau time $\tau_{GL} = \frac{\pi}{8(T-T_c)}$ and there is no long range order in the system. Nevertheless, one can see that even in the normal phase of a superconductor at each moment there is a non-zero density of such pairs which may participate in charge transfer, anomalous diamagnetism, heat capacity increase near transition. In this sense we can speak about the existence of the average modulus of the order parameter (which is defined as the square root of the average square of modulus (8)).

The participation of normal electrons in nonequilibrium Cooper pairing above T_c is an inelastic process leading to some decay of the phase coherence between initial and final quasiparticle states. This means that fluctuations themselves act as a source of some phase-breaking time $\tau_\phi(\varepsilon)$ side by side with paramagnetic impurities and thermal phonons. The consequence of this fact is the shift of the transition temperature toward lower temperatures with respect to its mean field value T_{c0} .

This shift is easy to estimate by taking into account the next order correction ($\sim |\Psi|^4$) in the Ginzburg-Landau functional. We make the Hartree approximation by replacing the $|\Psi(\vec{r})|^4$ term in (2) by $\langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2 \rangle |\Psi(\vec{r})|^2$. This leads to the renormalization of the reduced critical temperature value

$$\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon + \frac{b}{2\alpha} \langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2 \rangle \quad (9)$$

and to appropriate reduction of the critical temperature T_c^* with respect to its BCS value T_{c0} . Using the microscopic values of α and b and also the results (7)-(8) for $\langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2 \rangle$, one can easily find within logarithmic accuracy:

$$\frac{\delta T_c}{T_c} = \frac{T_c^* - T_{c0}}{T_{c0}} \sim -Gi_{(2)} \ln \frac{1}{Gi_{(2)}} \quad (10)$$

where $Gi_{(2)}^{(d)} \sim \frac{1}{p_F^2 l d}$ for dirty, $Gi_{(2)}^{(cl)} \sim \frac{1}{p_F d} \frac{T_c}{E_F}$ for clean film of thickness d (l is the electron mean free path). In the case of HTS single crystal $Gi_{(2)}^{(cl)} \sim \frac{T_c}{E_F}$.

The consistent description of fluctuations in superconductors above T_c is possible only in the framework of the microscopic approach based on BCS theory and it will be presented later (section 6).

3.3 Fluctuations below T_c

The description of fluctuations is much more complicated at temperatures below T_c . In contrast to the simple fluctuation picture of the normal phase, where nonequilibrium pairs appear and decay, below T_c the consequent construction of the fluctuation theory requires one to go beyond the simple BCS picture of superconductivity and to take into account correctly the different channels of interelectron interaction.

The electron-electron interaction in a normal metal may be considered as the sum of the dynamically screened Coulomb interaction and virtual phonon exchange. Generally speaking both of them involve momentum transfers in the range of $|\Delta\vec{p}| \leq 2p_F$. However, in normal phase, it is usually possible to consider the interaction as taking place in just two channels: low-momentum and high-momentum transfer.

The first one is appropriate for the momentum transfers $\Delta p \rightarrow 0$ and is called the diffusion channel or the dynamically screened Coulomb interaction. Virtual phonon exchange is neglected in it. The role of this interaction becomes really pronounced in amorphous systems where the delay of the screening, due to the diffusive character of the electron motion, is considerable. It leads to the renormalization of the density of states and other thermodynamical and transport properties of a metal (see [67] and section 5).

The second, so-called Cooper, channel is appropriate for the values of the momentum transfers $\Delta p \approx 2p_F$, while the total momentum of two particles $\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2 \rightarrow 0$. Here both Coulomb and virtual phonon exchange interactions are important and it is this part of interaction which leads to superconductivity. In the BCS model it is described by the effective constant of the electron-electron interaction only.

Above T_c these two channels of interaction do not mix, so the interaction corrections from both channels can be considered separately [67]. Accounting for interaction in the diffusion channel leads to corrections important in the description of the disordered systems properties. An effective attraction in the Cooper channel, on the other hand, leads to the reconstruction of the electronic ground state below T_c to form the superconducting state. Taking into account the Cooper channel above T_c is equivalent to treating superconducting fluctuations.

Below T_c the interelectron interaction, in the framework of the BCS the-

ory, shows up itself via T_c only. Fluctuations are not taken into account here and the equilibrium coexistence of Cooper pairs condensate with one-particle excitations is supposed. Fluctuations may be taken into account by developing the perturbation series in the interaction beyond the BCS picture. It is important to stress that the interaction in a superconductor cannot be reduced to separate diffusion (screened Coulomb interaction) and Cooper channels only, as was done above T_c : the presence of the condensate mixes up the channels leading to a variety of collective processes. These include: the appearance and decay of non-equilibrium Cooper pairs, different types of quasiparticle scattering processes involving the condensate, and scattering of Cooper pairs between themselves [68, 69].

Another way of considering fluctuation phenomena in the superconducting phase is to speak in terms of fluctuations of the modulus and phase of the order parameter, to calculate their correlators in different points of the superconductor and to study the physically measurable values [69, 70, 71]. In this scheme, the inseparability of scalar potential (dynamically screened Coulomb interaction) and order parameter phase fluctuations below T_c becomes evident. Indeed, above T_c the dynamical screening of the charge fluctuation originates by the space and time redistribution of electrons only. Below the critical temperature such quasiparticle currents cause charge redistribution by means of supercurrent flows too, i.e. the appearance of gradients of the phase of order parameter. One can see that this means the linking of scalar potential and phase fluctuations, i.e. the appearance of off-diagonal elements in the matrix correlation function.

We can discuss the effect of fluctuations on T_c and the modulus of the order parameter $\Psi(T)$ starting from the superconducting phase (in contrast to the previous section). Evidently fluctuations suppress both of these with respect to their BCS values and, as we will see below, this effect is very similar to the effect of paramagnetic impurities. However, while in the case of paramagnetic impurities, it is possible, at least in principle, to clean up the sample and to determine the value of T_{c0} , it is impossible to do this with fluctuations. They reduce the values of the critical temperature and the order parameter modulus with respect to their BCS values, but there is no way to “switch them off” at finite temperatures and especially near the critical temperature ⁴.

⁴The effect of fluctuations in principle can be suppressed by external magnetic field but

We confine ourselves here to the discussion of the most interesting case of 2D fluctuations (films with thickness $d \ll \xi(T)$ or strongly anisotropic layered superconductors). The renormalization of the order parameter modulus may be calculated directly from the order parameter self-consistent equation by including the fluctuation corrections to Gorkov F-function. In the vicinity of T_c one finds for a thin film [69]:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2(T, T_{c0}) \rangle &= \Psi_0^2(T, T_{c0}) - \\ &- \frac{9\pi}{4p_F d} \left(\frac{T_c}{E_F} \right) \mathcal{N}_e \left\{ \ln \frac{T_{c0}}{T_{c0} - T} + 2 \ln \frac{L}{L_T} + \frac{8\pi^2}{63\zeta(3)} \ln^3 \frac{L_T}{d} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $L_T = \sqrt{\frac{D}{T}}$ is the diffusion length and D is diffusion coefficient. The inclusion of T_{c0} amongst the arguments of $\Psi_{(fl)}$ and Ψ_0 is done on purpose to underline that this parameter can vary due to the effect of fluctuations too. For a layered superconductor the analogous expression can be found by replacing the film thickness d by the interlayer spacing s in the coefficient, and replacing $d \rightarrow \max\{s, \xi_\perp \sim \frac{Js}{T}\}$ in the argument of the last logarithm (here J is a hopping integral describing the Josephson interaction between layers, see section 6).

The first correction to $\langle \Psi_{(fl)}^2 \rangle$ is due to fluctuations of the modulus of the order parameter and is primarily responsible for the temperature dependence. One can see that this term is analogous to $\langle \Psi_{(fl)}^2(T) \rangle$ from above the transition.

The second correction comes from the fluctuations of the phase of order parameter and depends on some longitudinal cut-off parameter L which has to be chosen in accordance with the problem considered. Its origin is connected with the destruction of long range order by phase fluctuations in low dimensional systems [59]⁵. Thus in the framework of such an approach the

this will change T_c with respect to the BCS value itself.

⁵Let us mention that whilst above T_c both degrees of freedom (modulus and phase of the order parameter) fluctuate in the same way, below the critical temperature their behavior is quite different. Namely, as one can see from the result (11), the modulus fluctuates qualitatively in the same way as above T_c , while the phase fluctuations lead to the destruction of the long range order. If the electron Fermi liquid were uncharged, one could associate phase fluctuations with the appearance of the Goldstone mode. In superconductors, due to the electro-neutrality condition, the massless Goldstone boson

longitudinal dimension of the specimen L has to be taken as a cut-off parameter in (11) and the divergence which appears there indicates the absence of long-range order for infinite 2D superconductors. However, as mentioned above, a supercurrent can flow in the system even when the average value of the order parameter is not well-defined. The only requirement is that the correlation function of the order parameter behaves as a power of r in the long-range limit $r \rightarrow \infty$. In the calculation of thermodynamical functions in such a state, the presence of vortices in 2D superconductors gives rise to another cut-off parameter for the contribution of phase fluctuations: the characteristic distance between vortices.

The last term on the right-hand side of (11) represents the contribution both of the scalar potential fluctuations and off-diagonal phase – scalar potential interference terms [69, 70]. One can see that it becomes important for very thin films with $d \ll L_T$, and for strongly anisotropic layered superconductors.

Such considerations lead to the renormalization of the critical temperature which can be obtained from (11) [69, 70, 74]. For not too thin (but with $d \ll \xi(T)$) superconducting films:

$$\frac{\delta T_c}{T_{c0}} \sim -Gi_{(2)} \ln \frac{1}{Gi_{(2)}} \quad (12)$$

in accordance with (10).

In the important for HTS case of a clean strongly anisotropic layered superconductor the consideration of the first two terms in (11) is analogous but the last term $\ln^3 \frac{\xi_{ab}}{\max\{s, \xi_c\}} \sim \ln^3 \frac{E_F}{\max\{J, T_c\}}$, generally speaking, cannot be omitted. As a result the shift of the critical temperature due to the inter-electron interaction (which includes fluctuations of the modulus and phase of the order parameter side by side with fluctuations of the scalar potential) in this case is determined by the formulae

$$\frac{\delta T_c}{T_{c0}} \sim -\frac{T_c}{E_F} \left[\ln \frac{E_F}{T_c} + \frac{4\pi^2}{63\zeta(3)} \ln^3 \frac{E_F}{\max\{J, T_c\}} \right] \quad (13)$$

and the last term can even dominate in the case of extreme anisotropy.

cannot propagate, but some traces of this phenomenon can be observed at finite frequencies [72, 73].

3.4 Discussion

We discuss here the full picture of the temperature dependence of the order parameter modulus $\sqrt{\langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2(T) \rangle}$ renormalized by fluctuations for quasi-two-dimensional systems (see Fig. 1):

We start from the unperturbed BCS curve $\Psi_0(T, T_{c0})$ (dashed-dot line at the Fig. 1). The effect of fluctuations is described by equation (11) and results in the deviation of $\sqrt{\langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2(T) \rangle}$ below $\Psi_0(T, T_{c0})$ (solid line) due to the growth of order parameter modulus fluctuations with the increase of temperature.

The second effect of fluctuations is the decrease of the critical temperature with respect to T_{c0} (see (12)), so we have to terminate our consideration based on (11) at the renormalized transition temperature T_c^* . One can see that the value of $\langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2(T_c^*, T_{c0}) \rangle$ is of the order of $N_e G i_{(2)} \ln \frac{1}{G i_{(2)}}$ and it matches perfectly with the logarithmic tail calculated for the temperatures above T_c in section 3.1. The full curve $\sqrt{\langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2(T) \rangle}$ is presented in Fig. 1 by the solid line.

One further comment should be made at this point. In practice the temperature T_{c0} is a formal value only, T_c^* is measured by experiments. So instead of $\Psi_0(T, T_{c0})$ the curve $\Psi_0(T, T_c^*)$ more naturally has to be plotted (dashed line at Fig. 1). It starts at T_c^* and, in accordance with [75], finishes at zero temperature a little bit below the BCS value $\Psi_0(0, T_{c0})$. The shift $\delta\Psi_0(0) = \Psi_0(0, T_{c0}) - \Psi_0(0, T_c^*)$ due to quantum fluctuations turns out to be have the same relative magnitude as δT_c :

$$\frac{\delta\Psi(0)}{\Psi(0)} \sim \frac{\delta T_c}{T_{c0}} \sim G i \ln G i \quad (14)$$

One can see that the renormalized by fluctuations curve $\sqrt{\langle |\Psi_{(fl)}|^2(T) \rangle}$ (11) passes above to this, more natural parametrization of the BCS $\Psi_0(T, T_c^*)$ temperature dependence.

The renormalization of the critical temperature by fluctuations (12) was first obtained by Yu.N. Ovchinnikov in 1973 [70] by means of the expansion of the Eilenberger equations in the fluctuations of the order parameter and scalar potential degrees of freedom. Then it was reproduced in different approaches in following studies [69, 74]. Nevertheless, the studies of the effect of fluctuations on the superconducting transition properties are still in

progress. For instance, the authors of [76] have revised the BCS theory including Goldstone bosons fluctuations. They have stated that this procedure led them to find the *increase* of the critical temperature due to fluctuations. Other authors [69, 74, 77] (including the authors of this review), are much less optimistic: it seems today evident that fluctuations can only reduce the critical temperature, and even suppress the zero-temperature value of the order parameter [75]. The growth of the critical temperature discovered in [76] is very likely related to a lack of the correct account of the "phase – scalar potential" correlations which leads to the exact cancelation of the logarithmic contribution from boson-like Goldstone phase fluctuations (see [70, 69]).

The decrease of the critical temperature is specially pronounced in the case of bad metals such as synthetic metals and optimally doped or slightly underdoped HTS compounds [78, 79]. We will see in the following that as oxygen concentration decreases the G_i number grows and the role of fluctuation effects (Cooper channel interaction) becomes more and more important, making inapplicable the perturbation theory methods far enough from the optimal oxygen concentration. The first example of this process is the strong suppression of T_c seen from the formula (12).

4 The effect of superconducting fluctuations on the one-electron density of states.

As was already mentioned, the appearance of non-equilibrium Cooper pairing above T_c leads to the redistribution of the one-electron states around the Fermi level. A semi-phenomenological study of the fluctuation effects on the density of states of a dirty superconducting material was first carried out while analyzing the tunneling experiments of granular *Al* in the fluctuation regime just above T_c [80]. The second metallic electrode was in the superconducting regime and its well developed gap gave a bias voltage around which a structure, associated with the superconducting fluctuations of *Al*, appeared. The measured density of states has a dip at the Fermi level ⁶, reaches its normal value at some energy $E_0(T)$, show a maximum at an energy value equal to several times E_0 , finally decreasing towards its normal value at higher energies (Fig. 2). The characteristic energy E_0 was found to be of the order of the inverse of the Ginzburg-Landau relaxation time $\tau_{GL} \sim \frac{1}{T-T_c} = T_c \varepsilon^{-1}$ introduced above.

The presence of the depression at $E = 0$ and of the peak at $E \sim (1/\tau_{GL})$ in the density of states above T_c are the precursor effects of the appearance of the superconducting gap in the quasiparticle spectrum at temperatures below T_c . The microscopic calculation of the fluctuation contribution to the one-electron density of states is a nontrivial problem and can not be carried out in the framework of the phenomenological Ginzburg-Landau theory. It can be solved within the diagrammatic technique by calculating the fluctuation correction to the one-electron temperature Green function with its subsequent analytical continuation to the real energies [27, 28]. We omit here the details of the cumbersome calculations and present only the results obtained from the first order perturbation theory for fluctuations. They are valid near the transition temperature, in the so-called Ginzburg-Landau region, where the deviations from the classical behavior are small. The theoretical results reproduce the main features of the experimental behavior cited above. The strength of the depression at the Fermi level is proportional to different powers of τ_{GL} , depending on the effective dimensionality of the electronic spectrum and the character of the electron motion (diffusive or ballistic). In a dirty superconductor for the most important cases of dimensions $D=3,2$

⁶Here we refer the energy E to the Fermi level, where we assume $E = 0$.

one can find the following values of the relative corrections to the density of states at the Fermi level [27]:

$$\delta N_{fl}^{(d)}(0) \sim - \begin{cases} \frac{T_c^{1/2}}{\mathbf{D}^{3/2}} (T_c \tau_{GL})^{3/2}, & D = 3 \\ \frac{1}{\mathbf{D}} (T_c \tau_{GL})^2, & D = 2 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{D} = \frac{v_F l}{D}$ is the diffusion coefficient. At large energies $E \gg \tau_{GL}^{-1}$ the density of states recovers its normal value, according to the same laws (15) but with the substitution $\tau_{GL} \rightarrow E^{-1}$.

It is interesting that in the case of the density of states fluctuation correction the critical exponents change when moving from a dirty to a clean superconductor [28]:

$$\delta N_{fl}^{(cl)}(0) \sim - \begin{cases} \frac{1}{T_c \xi_0^3} (T_c \tau_{GL})^{1/2}, & D = 3 \\ \frac{1}{T_c \xi_0^2} (T_c \tau_{GL}), & D = 2 \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

(the subscripts (cl) and (d) stand here for clean and for dirty cases respectively). Nevertheless, as it will be seen below, due to some specific properties of the corrections obtained, this difference between clean and dirty systems does not manifest itself in the physically observable quantities (tunneling current, NMR relaxation rate etc.) which are associated with the density of states by means of some convolutions.

Another important respect in which the character of the density of states renormalization in the clean and dirty cases differs strongly is the energy scale at which this renormalization occurs. In the dirty case ($\xi_0 \gg l$) this energy turns out to be [27]:

$$E_0^{(d)} \sim T - T_c \sim \tau_{GL}^{-1}, \quad (17)$$

while in the clean one ($\xi_0 \ll l$) [28]:

$$E_0^{(cl)} \sim \sqrt{T_c(T - T_c)}, \quad (18)$$

To understand this important difference one has to study the character of the electron motion in both cases discussed [28]. We recall that the size of

the fluctuating Cooper pair is determined by the coherence length

$$\xi(T) = \xi_0 \left(\frac{T_c}{T - T_c} \right)^{1/2} \quad (19)$$

of the Ginzburg-Landau theory. The zero-temperature coherence length ξ_0 differs considerably for the clean and dirty cases:

$$\xi_{0,cl}^2 = \frac{7\zeta(3)}{12\pi^2 T_c^2} \frac{E_F}{2m} \quad (20)$$

$$\xi_{0,d}^2 = \frac{\pi \mathbf{D}}{8T_c} \quad (21)$$

To pass from the dirty to the clean case one has to make the substitution

$$\mathbf{D} \sim \frac{p_F l}{m} \sim \frac{E_F \tau}{m} \rightarrow \frac{E_F}{m T_c}. \quad (22)$$

The relevant energy scale in the dirty case is the inverse of the time necessary for the electron to diffuse over a distance equal to the coherence length $\xi(T)$. This energy scale coincides with the inverse relaxation time τ_{GL} :

$$t_\xi^{-1} = \mathbf{D} \xi^{-2} \sim \tau_{GL}^{-1} \sim T - T_c. \quad (23)$$

In the clean case, the ballistic motion of the electrons gives rise to a different characteristic energy scale

$$t_\xi^{-1} \sim v_F \xi^{-1} \sim (T_c \tau_{GL}^{-1})^{1/2} \sim \sqrt{T_c(T - T_c)}. \quad (24)$$

The fluctuation corrections to the density of states may be presented as a function of the energy and the temperature in a general form, for any dimensionality of the isotropic electron spectrum and any impurity concentration [28], but the relevant expressions are very cumbersome and we restrict ourselves to report the 2D clean case only

$$\begin{aligned} \delta N_{fl(2)}^{cl}(E) &= -N_{(2)} \frac{8aT_c}{\pi E_F} \frac{T_c^2}{(4E^2 + aT_c \tau_{GL}^{-1})} \times \\ &\times \left\{ 1 - \frac{2E}{(4E^2 + aT_c \tau_{GL}^{-1})^{1/2}} \ln \left[\frac{2E + (4E^2 + aT_c \tau_{GL}^{-1})^{1/2}}{(aT_c \tau_{GL}^{-1})^{1/2}} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $N_{(2)} = \frac{m}{2\pi}$ is the 2D density of electron states in the normal metal and a is some number of the order of unity. One can check that the integration of this expression over all positive energies gives zero. This is a consequence of conservation of the number of particles: the number of quasiparticles is determined by the number of cells in the crystal and cannot be changed by the interaction. So the only effect which can be produced by the interelectron interaction is the redistribution of energy levels near the Fermi energy. This statement can be written as the “sum rule” for the fluctuation correction to the density of states:

$$\int_0^\infty \delta N_{fl}(E) dE = 0 \quad (26)$$

This sum rule plays an important role in the understanding of the manifestation of the fluctuation density of states renormalization in the observable phenomena. As we will see in the next section the singularity in tunneling current (at zero voltage), due to the density of states renormalization, turns out to be much weaker than that in the density of states itself ($\ln \varepsilon$ instead of ε^{-1} or ε^{-2} , see (15)-(16)). The same features occur in the opening of the pseudo-gap in the c-axis optical conductivity, in the NMR relaxation rate etc. These features are due to the fact that we must always form the convolution of the density of states with some slowly varying function: for example, a difference of Fermi functions in the case of the tunnel current. The sum rule then leads to an almost perfect cancellation of the main singularity at low energies. The main non-zero contribution then comes from the high energy region where the DOS correction has its ‘tail’.

Another important consequence of the conservation law (26) is the considerable increase of the characteristic energy scale of the fluctuation pseudo-gap opening with respect to E_0 : this is $eV_0 = \pi T$ for tunneling and $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$ for c-axis optical conductivity.

5 The effect of fluctuations on the tunnel current

5.1 Introduction

One of the most currently discussed problems of the physics of high temperature superconductivity is the observation of pseudo-gap type phenomena in the normal state of these materials ⁷. In this Chapter we deal with the "pseudo-gap" type behaviour of the tunneling characteristics of HTS materials in the metallic phase (slightly under-, optimally or over-doped compounds, where the Fermi surface is supposed to be well developed). By this we mean the observation at temperatures above T_c critical one of non-linear $I - V$ characteristics usual for the superconducting phase where a real gap in the quasiparticle spectrum occurs.

First of all we would like to attract the readers attention to a possible, relatively old, scenario of a "pseudo-gap" opening in the tunneling resistance [81, 28]. This is caused by the fluctuation renormalization of the one-electron density of states in a very narrow interval of energies near the Fermi surface as discussed in the previous section. It turns out that, due to the conservation of particle number, this sharp renormalization manifests itself in the tunneling conductance by means of the appearance of an unexpectedly wide "pseudo-gap" type structure with a central minimum and two lateral maxima at a characteristic bias $eV = \pm\pi T$ and a strong temperature dependence of its magnitude in the vicinity of the transition. The appearance of a characteristic "kink" (of the same origin as the fluctuation growth of the c-axis resistance [29, 32, 33]) in the temperature dependence of the zero-bias conductance $G(V = 0, T)$ is also predicted at temperatures close to T_c . This theory was checked and confirmed long ago on the conventional superconducting junction $Al - I - Sn$ [82] and we now apply it to analysis of the very recent tunneling experiments on HTS materials.

⁷It is worth mentioning that some confusion with the concept of "pseudo-gap" takes place in literature. It is used often as synonym for the spin gap (even being far from the anti-ferromagnetic phase), the same definition is used in the description of a variety of HTS normal state anomalies observed by means of transport and photo-emission measurements, NMR relaxation, optical conductivity and tunneling at temperatures above T_c in all range of oxygen concentrations without any proof that it has the same origin in the different experiments.

We start with a discussion of the effect of the inter-electron interaction on the tunneling properties of superconductors. In the following subsection these results are then used to explain the anomaly in the zero-bias tunneling conductance $G(V = 0, T)$ of a $YBaCuO/Pb$ junction above the $YBaCuO$ transition temperature [11, 83, 84, 85]. Finally, we discuss the results of traditional electron tunneling spectroscopy [13], STM measurements [14] and interlayer tunneling spectroscopy [15], where pseudo-gap structures in the tunnel conductance of $BiSrCaCuO$ were found in a wide range of temperatures above T_c .

5.2 Preliminaries

It is quite evident that the renormalization of the density of states near the Fermi level, even of only one of the electrodes, will lead to the appearance of anomalies in the voltage-current characteristics of a tunnel junction. So-called zero-bias anomalies, which are the increase of the differential resistance of a junction with amorphous electrodes at zero voltage and low temperatures, have been observed for a long time. They have been explained in terms of a density of states depression in an energy range of the order of $E_{am} \sim \tau^{-1}$ around the Fermi level due to the electron-electron interaction in the diffusion channel.

The quasiparticle current flowing through a tunnel junction may be presented as a convolution of the densities of states with the difference of the electron Fermi distributions in each electrode (L and R):

$$I_{qp} = \frac{1}{eR_n N_L(0)N_R(0)} \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\tanh \frac{E + eV}{2T} - \tanh \frac{E}{2T} \right) N_L(E) N_R(E + eV) dE, \quad (27)$$

where R_n is the Ohmic resistance per unit area and $N_L(0)$, $N_R(0)$ are the densities of states at the Fermi levels in each of electrodes in the absence of interaction. One can see that for low temperatures and voltages the expression in parenthesis is a sharp function of energy near the Fermi level. The characteristic width of it is $E_{ker} \sim \max\{T, V\} \ll E_F$. Nevertheless, depending on the properties of densities of states functions, the convolution (27) may exhibit different properties.

If the energy scale of the density of states correction is much larger than E_{ker} , the expression in parenthesis in (27) acts as a delta-function and the zero-bias anomaly in the tunnel conductivity strictly reproduces the anomaly of the density of states around the Fermi level:

$$\frac{\delta G(V)}{G_n(0)} = \frac{\delta N(eV)}{N(0)}, \quad (28)$$

where $G(V)$ is the differential tunnel conductance and $G_n(0)$ is the background value of the Ohmic conductance supposed to be bias independent, $\delta G(V) = G(V) - G_n(0)$.

This situation occurs in a junction with amorphous electrodes [86]. In the amorphous metal, the electron-electron interaction with small momentum transfer (diffusion channel) is retarded and this fact leads to a considerable suppression of the density of states in the vicinity of the Fermi level, within an energy range $E_{\text{am}} \sim \tau^{-1} \gg T \sim E_{\text{ker}}$. At zero temperature for the 2D case one has:

$$\delta N_2(E) = \frac{\lambda}{4\pi^2 \mathbf{D}} \ln(E\tau), \quad (29)$$

where the constant λ is related to the Fourier transform of the interaction potential. In the 3D case the correction to the density of states turns out to be proportional to $|E|^{1/2}$.

In the framework of this approach Altshuler and Aronov [86, 87] analyzed the experimental data obtained in studies of the tunneling resistance of $Al - I(O_2) - Au$ junctions and showed it to be proportional to $|V|^{1/2}$ at $eV \ll T$. The identification of the “wings” in the $I - V$ characteristics of such junctions with (29) was a key success of the theory of the electron-electron interaction in disordered metals [67].

It is worth stressing that the proportionality between the tunnel current and the electron DOS of the electrodes is widely accepted as an axiom, but generally speaking this is not always so. As one can see from the previous section, the opposite situation occurs in the case of the DOS renormalization due to the electron-electron interaction in the Cooper channel: in this case the DOS correction varies strongly already in the scale of $E_0 \ll T \sim E_{\text{ker}}$ and the convolution in (27) with the density of states (25) has to be carried out without the simplifying approximations assumed to obtain (28). This

statement represents the central point of this section. We will see in the following that this fluctuation induced pseudo-gap like structure in the tunnel conductance differs drastically from the anomaly of the density of states (25), both in its temperature singularity near T_c and in the energy range of manifestation.

5.3 The effect of fluctuations on the tunnel current

Let us first discuss the effect of the fluctuation suppression of the density of states on the properties of a tunnel junction between a normal metal and a superconductor above T_c . The effect under discussion turns out to be most pronounced in the case of thin superconducting films ($d \ll \xi(T)$) and layered superconductors like HTS cuprates.

We now derive the explicit expression for the fluctuation contribution to the differential conductance of a tunnel junction with one thin film electrode close to its T_c . To do this we differentiate (27) with respect to voltage, and insert the density of states correction given in (25). This gives (see [81]):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta G_{fl}(V, \varepsilon)}{G_n(0)} &= \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dE}{\cosh^2 \frac{E + eV}{2T}} \delta N_{fl}^{(2)}(E, \varepsilon) = \\ &= Gi_{(2)}(4\pi T\tau) \ln \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \text{Re} \psi'' \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{ieV}{2\pi T} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\psi(x)$ is the digamma function, and τ is the electron's elastic scattering time. We have introduced the Ginzburg-Levanyuk parameter $Gi_{(2)}(4\pi T\tau)$, which characterizes the strength of fluctuations in the 2D case with arbitrary impurity concentration, and is given by :

$$\begin{aligned} Gi_{(2)}(x)|_{x=4\pi T\tau} &= \\ \frac{2}{x^2 [\psi(\frac{1}{2}) - \psi(\frac{1}{2} + x) + \frac{1}{x} \psi'(\frac{1}{2})]} \bigg|_{x=4\pi T\tau} \left(\frac{T_c}{E_F} \right) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi^3 E_F \tau} & \text{for } 4\pi T\tau \ll 1 \\ \frac{T_c}{14\zeta(3)E_F} & \text{for } 4\pi T\tau \gg 1 \end{cases} . \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

It is important to emphasize several nontrivial features of the result obtained. First, the sharp decrease ($\varepsilon^{-2(1)}$) of the density of the electron states generated by the inter-electron interaction in the immediate vicinity of the

Fermi level surprisingly results in a much more moderate growth of the tunnel resistance at zero voltage ($\ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$). Second, in spite of the manifestation of the density of states renormalization at the characteristic scales $E_0^{(d)} \sim T - T_c$ or $E_0^{(cl)} \sim \sqrt{T_c(T - T_c)}$, the energy scale of the anomaly development in the $I - V$ characteristic is much larger: $eV = \pi T \gg E_0$ (see Fig. 3).

This departure from the habitual idea of the proportionality between the tunnel conductance and the so-called tunneling density of states (28) is a straightforward result of the convolution calculated in (27) with the difference of Fermi-functions as a kernel. As already explained in the previous section the physical reason is that the presence of inter-electron interaction cannot create new electron states: it can only redistribute the existing states.

In the inset of Fig. 3 the measurements of the differential resistance of the tunnel junction $Al - I - Sn$ at temperatures slightly above the critical temperature of Sn electrode are presented. This experiment was accomplished by Belogolovski, Khachaturov and Chernyak in 1986 [82] with the purpose of checking the theory proposed by Varlamov and Dorin [81] which led to the result (30). The non-linear differential resistance was precisely measured at low voltages which permitted the observation of the fine structure of the zero-bias anomaly. The reader can compare the shape of the measured fluctuation part of the differential resistance (the inset in Fig. 3 with the theoretical prediction. It is worth mentioning that the experimentally measured positions of the minima are $eV \approx \pm 3T_c$, while the theoretical prediction following from (30) is $eV = \pm \pi T_c$. Recently similar results on an aluminium film with two regions of different superconducting transition temperatures were reported [88].

We will now consider the case of a symmetric junction between two superconducting electrodes at temperatures above T_c . In this case, evidently, the correction (30) has to be multiplied by a factor "two" because of the possibility of fluctuation pairing in both electrodes. Furthermore, in view of the extraordinarily weak ($\sim \ln(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$) temperature dependence of the first order correction, different types of high order corrections may manifest themselves on the energy scale $eV \sim T - T_c$ or $\sqrt{T_c(T - T_c)}$.

The first type of higher order correction appears in the first order of barrier transparency but in the second of fluctuation strength ($\sim Gi^2$) [81]. Such corrections are generated by the interaction of fluctuations through the barrier and they can be evaluated directly from (27) applied to a symmetric

junction [81]. The second order correction in Gi can be written as:

$$\delta G_{fl}^{(2)} \sim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dE}{\cosh^2 \frac{E + eV}{2T}} [\delta N_{fl}^{(2)}(E)]^2. \quad (32)$$

Because of the evident positive sign of the integrand, the condition (26) does not lead to the cancellation observed in the first order correction $\delta G_{fl}^{(1)}$. As a result this correction turns out to be small ($\sim Gi^2$), but it is strongly singular in temperature and has the opposite sign to $\delta G_{fl}^{(1)}$. Apparently it leads to the appearance of a sharp maximum at zero voltage in $G(V)$ with a characteristic width $eV \sim T - T_c$ in the immediate vicinity of T_c (one can call this peak the hyperfine structure). To our knowledge such corrections were never observed in tunneling experiments.

The second type of correction is related to the coherent tunneling of the Cooper pairs through barrier. These appear in the second order in transparency but in the first order of fluctuation strength Gi , so they can only be expected to be observed in transparent enough junctions. These corrections are similar to the *paraconductivity* and *anomalous Maki-Thompson* contributions to electric conductivity. Recently, some of them have been found to play an important role in the case of transverse resistance of strongly anisotropic layered superconductors, where the conducting layers are connected in the Josephson way [29, 34, 89]. The following sections will be devoted to the detailed discussion of the interplay of all these contributions.

5.4 Zero-bias anomaly studies in HTS junctions

The tunneling study of HTS materials is a difficult task for many reasons. For instance, the extremely short coherence length requires mono-layer-level perfection at surfaces which are subject to long oxygen anneals; in general they do not satisfy this stringent requirement. Another problem is the intrinsic, (unrelated to superconductivity), bias dependence of the normal tunnel conductance $G_n(V)$ in voltage ranges as wide as ~ 100 mV, in which it is necessary to scan for the study of $I - V$ characteristics of HTS junctions. Nevertheless in recent years high quality junctions were realized and $I - V$ characteristics can be measured today through a wide temperature and voltage range by means of different techniques [13, 14, 15]).

Much attention in the scientific literature is devoted to the temperature behaviour of the zero-bias conductance. The appearance of a kink around T_c has been often observed [83]) and in this section we demonstrate that quantitative fitting of $G(V = 0, \varepsilon)$ vs temperature can be obtained if the fluctuation contribution to the DOS in (27) is taken into account.

For the junction with one thin film (2D) superconducting electrode in the vicinity of T_c we have obtained the result (30); in the case of HTS tunnel junction it has to be modified to take into account the quasi-two-dimensional spectrum. In section 6, where the microscopic theory of fluctuation conductivity will be presented, it is demonstrated that the generalization of the logarithmic dependence on reduced temperature ε (see (30)) from 2D to the quasi-2D spectrum of the corrugated cylinder type (see (34)) is trivial: it is enough to replace

$$\ln\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \rightarrow 2 \ln\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{\varepsilon + r}}\right). \quad (33)$$

Here r is the anisotropy parameter (Lawrence-Doniach crossover temperature) which is defined precisely in the following section in terms of the microscopic parameters of the HTS material. Physically this dimensionless parameter determines the reduced temperature at which the c-axis Ginzburg-Landau coherence length reaches the interlayer distance: $\xi_c(\varepsilon = r) \simeq s$.

Experiments have been performed on *YBaCuO/Pb* planar junctions obtained by chemically etching the degraded surfaces of *YBaCuO* single crystals by a 1%*Br* solution in methanol. Careful quality controls [84] have been carried out on these junctions in order to assure that a pure tunneling process without any interaction in the barrier takes place.

In Fig. 4 we show the theoretical fitting (full line) for the normalized fluctuation part of the tunneling conductance at zero bias, $\delta G_{fl}(0, \varepsilon)/G_n(0, T = 140K)$ to formula (30) and (33) with $V = 0$. In the inset the complete set of experimental data between 30 K and 180 K is shown, as reported in [85]. The junction's critical temperature and the magnitude of the Ginzburg-Levanyuk parameter, have been taken as fitting parameters [90].

It is worth noticing that the tunneling spectroscopy probes regions of the superconducting electrodes to a depth of $(2 \div 3)\xi$ in contrast with resistive measurements which sense the bulk percolation length. The transition temperatures determined by the two types of measurement can be quite different

In our case the resistive critical temperature measured on the $YBaCuO$ single crystal was $T_c = 91\text{ K}$, while a "junction's T_c " = 89 K was obtained from the fitting procedure. This indicates that a slightly oxygen deficient $YBaCuO$ layer in the junction area is probed by the tunneling measurements. However the sample turns out to be still in the proper (metallic) region of the phase diagram.

The value of Lawrence-Doniach crossover reduced temperature $r = 0.07$ was taken from the analysis of the crossover between 2D and 3D regimes in the in-plane conductivity measurements [91]. Another independent measurement of r from the analysis of the non-linear fluctuation magnetization [92, 93] leads to the very similar value $r = 0.057$.

The magnitude of the fluctuation correction $|\psi''(\frac{1}{2})|Gi_{(2)} = 0.029 \simeq T_c/E_F$ for the sample under discussion leads to the value of $E_F \simeq 0.3\text{ eV}$ which is in the lower range of the existing estimates ($0.2 \div 1.0\text{ eV}$).

The temperature range in which (30) satisfactorily reproduces the behaviour of the zero-bias conductance, extends from the "junction T_c " up to 110 K .

5.5 Analysis of the pseudo-gap observation experiments

As we have mentioned above the fluctuation renormalization of the DOS at the Fermi level leads to the appearance of a pseudo-gap type structure in the tunnel conductance at temperatures above T_c which is very similar to the one in superconducting phase, with the maximum position being determined by the temperature T instead of the superconducting gap value: $eV_m = \pi T$. For the HTS samples this means a scale of $20 - 40\text{ meV}$, considerably larger than in the case of conventional superconductors.

The observations of the pseudo-gap type anomalies of $G(V, T)$ at temperatures above T_c obtained by a variety of experimental techniques on $BiSrCaCuO - 2212$ samples were reported very recently [13, 14, 15]. Let us discuss their results based on the theoretical discussion presented above.

1. The tunneling study of $BiSrCaCuO - 2212/Pb$ junctions (as grown single crystal samples) where the pseudo-gap type conductance nonlinearities were observed in the temperature range from $T_c = 87\text{ K} - 89\text{ K}$ up to 110 K (see Fig. 5 [13]. The maximum position moves to higher voltages with the growth of temperature and at $T = 100\text{ K}$ it turns out to be of the order of $30 - 35\text{ mV}$ (depending on the sample). Both the magnitude of the effect

and the measured maximum position are in qualitative agreement with the theoretical predictions ($eV_m(100\text{ K}) = \pm\pi T = 27\text{ mV}$).

2. The STM study of $Bi_{2.1}Sr_{1.9}CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$ vacuum tunneling spectra [14], demonstrates the appearance of pseudo-gap type maxima in $G(V, T)$ starting from temperatures far above T_c ($T^* = 260\text{ K}$ for optimum and $T^* = 180\text{ K}$ for overdoped samples). The energy scale characterizing the pseudo-gap dip was estimated by the authors to be of the order of 100 mV which again is consistent with the predicted maximum position $eV_m(100\text{ K}) = \pm\pi T = \pm 27\text{ mV}$.

3. Impressive results on tunneling pseudo-gap observations are presented in [15]. They were carried out by interlayer tunneling spectroscopy using very thin stacks of intrinsic Josephson junctions fabricated on the surface of $Bi_2SrCaCu_2O_8$ single crystal. The opening of the pseudo-gap was found in dI/dV characteristics at temperatures below 180 K . The data presented can be fitted (Fig. 6) by means of formula (30) with $Gi = 0.008$ and tunneling critical temperature $T_c = 87\text{ K}$ (in view of the strong anisotropy of the BSCCO spectrum $r = 0$ may be assumed)[90].

One can see that this fit reproduces not only the magnitude of the effect and the maxima positions, but also the shape of the experimental curves (especially at low voltages). At higher voltages the theoretical curves, being background voltage independent (Ohm law), overestimate the experimental results.

5.6 Discussion

We have demonstrated that the idea of relating the pseudo-gap type phenomena observed in tunneling studies with the fluctuation renormalization of one-electron DOS in the immediate vicinity of the Fermi surface permits us to fit the experimental data available with values of microscopic parameters (E_F, r) consistent with those obtained from independent measurements.

Two important comments are necessary. Both of them concern the limits of applicability of the approach proposed.

The first concerns the magnitude of the effect. It is clear that (30), being a perturbative result, has to be small, so the parameter $Gi \ln 1/\varepsilon$ has to be restricted. The temperature range is evidently restricted by $\varepsilon \geq Gi$, so the criterion for applicability of the theory is $Gi \ln 1/Gi \ll 1$. The analysis of experimental data obtained on samples with different oxygen concentra-

tion gives us grounds to believe that Gi increases as the oxygen concentration is decreased from optimal doping. It follows that the importance of the electron-electron interaction increases in the underdoped region of the phase diagram. The qualitative extension of our perturbative results to this poor metal - insulator region permits us to attribute the huge growth of the anomalies observed to the effect of the strong e-e interaction.

Secondly it is very important to discuss the temperature range in which pseudo-gap phenomena are expected to be observed following the approach proposed. The result (30) is obtained in the mean field region $\varepsilon \ll 1$, neglecting the contribution of the short wave-length fluctuations. Nevertheless, characteristic for 2D very slow (logarithmic) dependence of the fluctuation correction on $\varepsilon = \ln \frac{T}{T_c}$ permits us to believe that the result (30) can be qualitatively extended on wider temperature range up to several T_c . The study of high temperature asymptotics ($\ln \frac{T}{T_c} \gg 1$) for the e-e interaction in the Cooper channel [56] demonstrates the appearance of an extremely slow $\ln \ln \frac{T}{T_c}$ dependence which fits $\ln 1/\varepsilon$ in the intermediate region and shows the importance of the interaction effects up to high temperatures. In such a way one can understand the reported gap-opening temperature $T^* \sim 200 - 300 \text{ K}$ in the underdoped part of the phase diagram as the temperature where a noticeable concentration of short-lived ($\tau \sim \frac{\hbar}{k_B T}$) fluctuation Cooper pairs first manifests itself.

6 Theory of fluctuation conductivity in a layered superconductor

6.1 Introduction

Among all unconventional properties of the high temperature superconductors, the transport properties are the most puzzling. The transition in the “in-plane” resistivity is usually smeared for tens of Kelvins and then a mysterious linear increase with temperature takes place. If the smearing of the transition finds a satisfactory explanation in the framework of the fluctuation theory, the linear increase of the resistance is still the subject of much speculation and discussion.

The temperature dependence of the transverse resistivity turns out to be even more complicated. For not too underdoped samples at high temperatures (considerably higher than T_c) $R_c(T)$ diminishes linearly with the temperature in an analogous way to the in-plane resistivity. Nevertheless as temperature decreases, for many samples this moderate decrease is followed by a precipitous growth, the resistance passing through a maximum and then abruptly decreasing to zero as the sample passes into the superconducting phase. Such behavior in some degree has been observed in all high T_c compounds [3, 32, 94] and even in conventional layered superconductors [89].

As noted by Anderson [95], the difference in temperature dependence between the transverse and in-plane resistivities is extremely difficult to explain in the framework of conventional Fermi liquid theory. Following the general ideology of this review we show that such an explanation is possible by taking into account the electron-electron interaction in the Cooper channel. Discussing in detail the peculiarities of the fluctuation conductivity tensor of a layered superconductor we will identify at least one source of the difference between its transverse and longitudinal components: the interplay of the suppression of positive paraconductivity along the c-direction by the square of the interlayer transparency with the growth of the normal resistance due to the fluctuation depression of the density of states at the Fermi level.

In this section after a short review of the theory of electrical conductivity in a layered metal (section 6.2) the main fluctuation contributions to

conductivity (AL, MT, DOS) will be examined, first qualitatively (section 6.3) and then quantitatively within the full microscopic theory (section 6.4). Section 6.5 is devoted to the analysis of the role of the MT contribution as the precursor of the Josephson effect. The results obtained are summarized in section 6.6.

6.2 Normal conductivity tensor of a layered metal. Electron interlayer hopping time

The goal of this subsection is to discuss the charge transport mechanisms in a normal layered metal with an arbitrary impurity concentration and more specifically the c -axis transport. Interest in this problem of classical theory of metals was recently revived and the problem was discussed in various models [96, 97, 98, 99, 100] in connection with the study of the normal properties of high temperature layered superconductors. Below we present the traditional results of anisotropic diffusion theory which will be necessary for the following analysis. In addition we will demonstrate, on the basis of simple ideas of band motion, how the crossover between the normal Drude regime and the hopping regime can appear [100].

We assume that the electronic spectrum of a layered metal has the form:

$$\xi(p) = E(\mathbf{p}) + J \cos(p_z s) - E_F, \quad (34)$$

where $E(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{p}^2/(2m)$, $p \equiv (\mathbf{p}, p_z)$, $\mathbf{p} \equiv (p_x, p_y)$ is a two-dimensional intralayer wave-vector, and J is the effective nearest-neighbor interlayer hopping energy for quasiparticles. We note that J characterizes the width of the band in the c -axis direction taken in the strong-coupling approximation. The Fermi surface defined by $\xi(p_F) = 0$ is a corrugated cylinder (see Fig. 7), and E_F is the Fermi energy.

We assume that electrons are scattered by an elastic random potential of arbitrary origin, and that the scatterers are located in the layers and the scattering amplitude U is isotropic.

We start from the Einstein relation for conductivity expressed through the diffusion constant $\mathbf{D}_{\alpha\beta}$

$$\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = N(0)e^2 \mathbf{D}_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (35)$$

The dirty case ($\tau \ll J^{-1}$) is trivial, since the usual anisotropic diffusion takes place. The conductivity tensor is determined by the formula (35) with a diffusion coefficient

$$\mathbf{D}_{\alpha\beta}^{(d)} = \langle v_{\alpha\beta}^2(p_{\perp}) \rangle \tau = \tau \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}v_F^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{J^2 s^2}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (36)$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes angular averaging over the Fermi surface. This leads to a Drude conductivity with the substitution of v_F by its c -axis analogue for the transverse component:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{\parallel}^{(d)} \\ \sigma_{\perp}^{(d)} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} N(0) e^2 \tau \begin{pmatrix} v_F^2 \\ J^2 s^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (37)$$

Before starting the discussion of the clean case we recall the old story of Zener (or Bloch) oscillations [101]. In the case of a normal isotropic metal it seems that there are no restrictions on the applicability of the Drude formula for large τ , and at first glance one might say that the conductivity of a perfect crystal in the absence of any type of scattering processes is infinite. However, more careful consideration shows that when the work produced by the electric field on the acceleration of the quasiparticle is accelerated by the electric field to the edge of the Brillouin zone, it will be Bragg reflected. Consequently the electrons oscillate with an amplitude which is determined by the inverse value of the electric field and is huge on a microscopic scale (of the order of centimeters for a field $\sim 1 \frac{V}{cm}$). So no charge transfer takes place in this ideal case and the conductivity is zero. Naturally any scattering event destroys such a localized state and leads to a finite conductivity.

The same situation must occur in an ideal clean layered superconductor. The important point here is that the band along the c -axis direction is extremely narrow (for HTCS it is estimated that $J \sim 10 - 200K$) so the conditions on the mean free path are much less rigid than for the normal Zener oscillations. So one can believe that for an ideal layered crystal the c -axis conductivity has to be zero. Now we consider what happens if a small number of impurities are introduced (but $\tau \gg \mathcal{T} \sim J^{-1}$, where \mathcal{T} is the period of oscillations and τ is the elastic scattering time introduced above). In this case Zener oscillations of electrons along c -axis will be destroyed from time to time by the scattering events. In order to estimate the transverse resistance in this clean case one can use formula (35) with the diffusion

coefficient describing the process of charge transfer discussed above. The hopping of an electron from one plane to the next is possible only as the result of scattering on an impurity which dephases the Zener oscillations. So the diffusion coefficient in this case may be estimated as

$$\mathbf{D}_{\perp}^{(cl)} = \frac{\overline{\mathbf{r}_{\perp}^2(t)}}{\tau} \sim \frac{s^2}{\tau} \quad (38)$$

(the time average here is taken over an interval much larger than τ). The transverse conductivity in this case is

$$\sigma_{\perp}^{(cl)} \sim N(0)e^2 \frac{s^2}{\tau} \quad (39)$$

and one can see that it really vanishes in the clean limit in accordance with the Zener statement. This value evidently matches with transverse component of (37) in the crossover region $J\tau \sim 1$.

Let us try to understand the physical meaning of the result obtained. The diffusion in the case of a strongly anisotropic superconductor should not be thought of as the continuous traveling of an electron in the insulating space between metal layers. Even in the dirty case, the c-axis motion has the character of wavepacket propagation, but the impurity scattering destroying this state occur too often: $\tau \ll J^{-1}$ (we remind that the J determines the period of oscillations). In a weak enough electric field (in practice the only reachable in real experiment) the displacement of the wavepacket during the time τ is of the order of many interlayer distances and all above consideration concerning hopping to a neighbor plane remains the same as in the case of full oscillation.

We can estimate the characteristic time of anisotropic diffusion from one layer to a neighboring one (τ_{hop}) on the basis of the Einstein relation. The average displacement s in the direction of the field (c-axis) takes place in the time (τ_{hop}), so

$$s = \sqrt{\mathbf{D}_{\perp} \tau_{hop}^{(d)}} \quad (40)$$

and hence

$$\tau_{hop}^{(d)} \sim \frac{1}{J^2 \tau}, \quad (41)$$

Similarly we find

$$\tau_{hop}^{(cl)} \sim \tau. \quad (42)$$

The last result seems much more natural than the previous one. In the clean case each scattering process leads to a hop along the c -axis, while in the dirty case the hopping time turns out to be proportional to τ^{-1} . Nevertheless replacing τ in (38) by (41) reproduces the Drude formula.

In conclusion, the results of this subsection can be summarized as follows:

1. In the dirty limit ($J\tau \ll 1$) both components of the layered metal conductivity have the Drude form:

$$\sigma_{\perp} \propto \sigma_{\parallel} \propto \tau. \quad (43)$$

2. In the clean case ($J\tau \gg 1$) along the c -axis direction Zener oscillations with infrequent dephasing take place, the conductivity $\sigma_{\perp} \propto \tau^{-1}$ has a hopping character, and the components of the conductivity tensor satisfy the relation [96, 97, 98, 99]

$$\sigma_{\perp} \sigma_{\parallel} = \text{const.} \quad (44)$$

It is worth mentioning, that formally in the extremely clean case Zener oscillations can take place also in the ab -planes, but this possibility may be excluded from consideration for any real experimental situation.

6.3 Qualitative consideration of different fluctuation contributions

Let us start with the qualitative discussion of the various fluctuation contributions to conductivity [102].

The first effect of the appearance of fluctuation Cooper pairs above transition is the opening of a new channel for charge transfer. Cooper pairs can be treated as carriers with charge $2e$ and lifetime $\tau_{GL} = \frac{\pi}{8(T-T_c)}$. This lifetime has to play the role of scattering time in the Drude formula because, as is evident from its derivation, carrier scattering or annihilation are essentially equivalent.

Finally we should replace the electron concentration \mathcal{N}_e by the Cooper pair concentration $\mathcal{N}_{c.p.}$ in the Drude formula. This gives the paraconductivity

$$\delta\sigma_{AL}^{(2)} \sim \frac{\mathcal{N}_{c.p.}(2e)^2\tau_{GL}}{2m} = \frac{\pi e^2}{4m} \frac{1}{(T - T_c)} \mathcal{N}_{c.p.} \quad (45)$$

In the 2D case $\mathcal{N}_{c.p.}^{(2)} = \frac{p_F^2}{2\pi d} \frac{T_c}{E_F} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Substituting this result in (45) one reproduces with logarithmic accuracy the well known result of microscopic calculations [52]:

$$\delta\sigma_{AL}^{(2)} = \frac{e^2}{16d} \frac{T_c}{T - T_c} \quad (46)$$

The 2D result (46) is rather surprisingly identical for clean and dirty cases. For electronic spectra of other dimensions this universality is lost, and the paraconductivity becomes dependent on the electronic mean free path via the η_D parameter given in (3):

$$\delta\sigma_{AL}^{(D)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(\frac{e}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{4\eta_3\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} & \text{three - dimensional case,} \\ \frac{1}{16} \frac{e^2}{\hbar d \epsilon} & \text{film, thickness : } d \ll \xi, \\ \frac{\pi\eta_1^{1/2}}{16} \frac{e^2}{\epsilon^{3/2} S} & \text{wire, cross section : } S \ll \xi^2. \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

Nevertheless one can see that the paraconductivity critical exponent $\nu = (D - 4)/2$ depends only on the effective dimensionality of the electronic spectrum, and not on the nature of the scattering process.

This universality of the critical exponent obtained in the framework of the simple mean field theory of fluctuations turns out to be very robust. The recent revisions of the theory of paraconductivity for the models of superconductivity with Eliashberg's strong coupling [103], self-consistent treatment of the coexistence of superconductivity and localization [104, 105] and a derivation of TDGL theory using stochastic differential equations [106] resulted in the same critical exponents for $\delta\sigma_{AL}$. Only the overall coefficient depends on the characteristics of the model.

The correction to the normal state conductivity above the transition temperature related with the one-electron density of states renormalization can be reproduced in analogous way. The fact that some electrons participate in

fluctuation Cooper pairing means that the effective number of carriers taking part in one-electron charge transfer diminishes leading to a decrease of conductivity:

$$\delta\sigma_{DOS} = -\frac{\Delta\mathcal{N}_e e^2 \tau_{imp}}{m} = -\frac{2\mathcal{N}_{c.p.} e^2 \tau_{imp}}{m} \quad (48)$$

which in the 2D case yields

$$\delta\sigma_{DOS}^{(2)} = -\frac{e^2}{2\pi d} (T_c \tau) \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \quad (49)$$

The exact diagrammatic consideration of the DOS fluctuation effect on conductivity agrees with this estimate obtained in its sign and temperature dependence. The impurity scattering time dependence of (49) is correct in the dirty case ($\xi \ll l$) but in the clean case the exact calculations show a stronger dependence on τ (τ^2 instead of τ , see the next subsection).

Finally, we discuss the Maki-Thompson contribution. This anomalous term has the same singularity in ε as the AL one (within logarithmic accuracy), but has a purely quantum nature and does not appear in the usual TDGL approach at all⁸. Its physical nature has remained mysterious since 1968, when it was calculated in the diagrammatic approach by Maki. This contribution is related to coherent electron scattering, manifest itself only in transport properties, and is strongly phase sensitive. These facts suggest that the MT contribution should be treated in the same way as Altshuler and Khmelnitskii ([50]) have treated weak localization and interaction corrections to conductivity.

Let us consider possible types of Cooper pairing above T_c in real space. The simplest one is the appearance of Cooper correlation between two electrons with momenta \vec{p} and $-\vec{p}$ moving along straight lines in opposite directions. (see Fig. 8(a)). Such pairing does not have the characteristics mentioned above and has to be attributed to the AL process.

Nevertheless, another, much more sophisticated pairing process can occur: one electron with spin up and momentum \vec{p} can move along some self-intersecting trajectory; simultaneously another electron with spin down and

⁸Recently it was reported [107] that the account of the interference between superfluid and normal motions of charge carriers in TDGL scheme permits to derive the MT contribution

the opposite momentum $-\vec{p}$ can move in the opposite direction along the same trajectory (see Fig. 8(b)). The interaction of such a pair of electrons during their motion along the trajectory leads to the appearance of some special contribution similar to the localization and Coulomb interaction corrections to conductivity [67], but evidently singular in the vicinity of T_c . One can easily see that such pairing is possible only in the case of diffusive motion (necessary for the realization of a self-intersecting trajectory). Finally any phase-breaking mechanism leads to the loss of coherence and destruction of the Cooper correlation. So all properties of the Maki-Thompson contribution coincide with the properties of the process proposed. The contribution to the conductivity of such process must be proportional to the ratio of the number of interfering Cooper pairs $\delta\mathcal{N}_{s.i.}$ to the full concentration of fluctuation Cooper pairs. In the 2D case

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{N}_{s.i.}}{\mathcal{N}_{c.p.}} \sim \int_{\tau_{GL}}^{\tau_\phi} \frac{lv_F dt}{(\mathbf{D}t)} = \ln \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma_\varphi} \quad (50)$$

where τ_ϕ is the one-electron phase-breaking time and $\gamma_\varphi = \frac{\pi}{8T_c\tau_\phi}$ is the appropriate phase-breaking rate.

The denominator of this integral, as in [50], describes the volume available for the diffusive electronic motion with the coefficient \mathbf{D} during the time t , $(\mathbf{D}t)^{d/2}$. The numerator describes the volume element of the tube in which superconducting correlation of two electron states of opposite momenta, can occur. The width of the tube is determined by l (mean free path) while the element of arc length is $v_F dt$ (see Fig. 8). The lower limit of the integral is chosen so that at least one Cooper pair occurs along the trajectory. The upper limit reflects the fact that for times $t > \tau_\phi$ an electron loses its phase and coherent Cooper pairing of two electron states above T_c is impossible.

The contribution of Cooper pairs generated by coherent electrons moving along self-intersecting trajectories is therefore

$$\Delta\sigma_{s.i.}^{(2)} = \mathcal{N}_{c.p.}^{(2)} \ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma_\varphi}\right) \frac{(2e)^2 \tau_{GL}}{2m} \sim \sigma_{AL}^{(2)} \ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma_\varphi}\right). \quad (51)$$

One finds that this result coincides with the result of microscopic calculations of the anomalous Maki-Thompson contribution [58]:

$$\sigma_{MT}^{(2)} = \frac{e^2}{8d\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi} \ln \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma_\varphi} \quad (52)$$

In a similar way the correct temperature dependence of all contributions in all dimensions can be obtained.

We will now try to understand the effect of fluctuations on the transverse resistance of a layered superconductor in the same qualitative manner. As we have demonstrated above, the in-plane component of paraconductivity is determined by the Aslamazov-Larkin formula (46). To modify this result for c-axis paraconductivity one has to take into account the hopping character of the electronic motion in this direction. One can easily see that, if the probability of one-electron interlayer hopping is \mathcal{P}_1 , then the probability of coherent hopping for two electrons during the virtual Cooper pair lifetime τ_{GL} is the conditional probability of these two events:

$$\mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_1 \cdot (\mathcal{P}_1 \cdot \tau_{GL}). \quad (53)$$

The transverse paraconductivity may thus be estimated as

$$\sigma_{\perp}^{AL} \sim \mathcal{P}_2 \cdot \sigma_{\parallel}^{AL} \sim \mathcal{P}_1^2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (54)$$

We see that the temperature singularity of σ_{\perp}^{AL} turns out to be stronger than that in σ_{\parallel}^{AL} because of the hopping character of the electronic motion (the critical exponent "2" in the conductivity is characteristic of zero-dimensional band motion). However for a strongly anisotropic layered superconductor σ_{\perp}^{AL} , is considerably suppressed by the square of the small probability of inter-plane electron hopping which enters in the prefactor.

It is this suppression which leads to the necessity of taking into account the DOS contribution to the transverse conductivity. The latter is less singular in temperature but, in contrast to paraconductivity, manifests itself at the first, not the second, order in the interlayer transparency. One can estimate it in the same way as above by multiplying the in plane result (49) by the one-electron hopping probability:

$$\Delta\sigma_{\perp}^{DOS} \sim -\mathcal{P}_1 \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}. \quad (55)$$

It is important that, in contrast to the paraconductivity, the DOS fluctuation correction to the one-electron transverse conductivity is obviously negative and, being proportional to the first order of \mathcal{P}_1 , can completely change the traditional picture of fluctuations just rounding the resistivity

temperature dependence around transition. Excluding temporarily from consideration the anomalous Maki-Thompson contribution (which is strongly suppressed in HTS by strong pair-breaking effects [108]), one can say that the shape of the temperature dependence of the transverse resistance is determined by the competition of two contributions of the opposite sign: the paraconductivity, which is strongly temperature dependent but is suppressed by the square of the barrier transparency ($\sim J^4$) and the DOS contribution which has a weaker temperature dependence but depends only linearly on the barrier transparency ($\sim J^2$),

$$\sigma_{fl}^{\perp} \sim k_1 \mathcal{P}_1^2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} - k_2 \mathcal{P}_1 \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}. \quad (56)$$

Here k_1 and k_2 are coefficients which will be calculated in the framework of the exact microscopic theory presented in the next subsection. It is this competition which leads to the formation of a maximum in the c -axis resistivity.

6.4 Microscopic theory of fluctuation conductivity in layered superconductor

6.4.1 The model

In a layered superconductor the zero-field resistivity is a diagonal tensor ($\rho_{xx} \equiv \rho_a$, $\rho_{yy} \equiv \rho_b$, $\rho_{zz} \equiv \rho_c$), so the calculation of its various components is required. Neglecting weak in-plane anisotropy, we further assume that the most appropriate model for high-temperature superconductors has isotropic in-plane electronic motion ($\rho_{xx} \equiv \rho_{yy}$). Therefore, we will evaluate the fluctuation corrections to the two remaining independent components of the resistivity tensor, ρ_{xx} and ρ_{zz} .

We begin by discussing the quasiparticle normal state energy spectrum. While models with several conducting layers per unit cell and with either intralayer or interlayer pairing have been considered [109], it has recently been shown [110] that all of these models give rise to a Josephson pair potential that is periodic in k_z , the wave-vector component parallel to the c -axis, with period s , the c -axis repeat distance. While such models differ in their superconducting densities of states, they all give rise to qualitatively similar fluctuation propagators, which differ only in the precise definitions of the parameters and in the precise form of the Josephson coupling potential

[110]. Ignoring the rather unimportant differences between such models in the Gaussian fluctuation regime above $T_c(H)$, we therefore consider the simplest model of a layered superconductor, in which there is one layer per unit cell, with intralayer singlet s -wave pairing [111, 112]. These assumptions lead to the simple spectrum (34) and hence to a Fermi surface having the form of a corrugated cylinder. Experiments [113] confirm the assumption about the rough isotropy of the Fermi surface in the ab -plane for metallic part of the HTS phase diagram.

Some remarks regarding the normal-state quasiparticle momentum relaxation time are necessary. In the "old" layered superconductors such as $TaS_2(\text{pyridine})_{1/2}$, the materials were generally assumed to be in the dirty limit [112]. In the high- T_c cuprates, however, both single crystals and epitaxial thin films are nominally in the "clean" limit, with l/ξ_{ab} values generally exceeding unity, where l and ξ_{ab} are the intralayer mean-free path and BCS coherence length, respectively. However, as $l/\xi_{ab} \approx 2 - 5$ for most of the cuprates, these materials are not extremely clean. In addition, the situation in the cuprates is complicated by the presence of phonons for $T \simeq T_c \simeq 100K$, the nearly localized magnetic moments on the Cu^{2+} sites, and by other unspecified inelastic processes. In the following, we assume simple elastic intralayer scattering [112], keeping the impurity concentration n_i and the resulting mean-free path arbitrary with respect to ξ_{ab} ⁹. The phase-breaking time τ_ϕ is taken to be much larger than τ .

We now consider the various diagrams for the electromagnetic response operator $Q_{\alpha\beta}(\omega_\nu)$, ($\omega_\nu = (2\nu + 1)\pi T$ are the Matsubara frequencies) which contribute to the fluctuation conductivity of layered superconductors. The diagrams corresponding to the first order of perturbation theory in the fluctuation amplitude are shown in Fig. 9. In this notation, the subscripts α, β refer to polarization directions and thus to the conductivity tensor elements according to

$$\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = - \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{i\omega} [Q_{\alpha\beta}]^R(\omega) \quad , \quad (57)$$

Intralayer quasiparticle scattering is included in the Born approximation, giving rise to a scattering lifetime τ and resulting in a renormalization of the

⁹As it will be clear from the following assumptions for the impurity vertex calculations the necessity to deal with the anisotropic spectrum (34) restricts us in this section by the requirement $l < \xi_{ab}(T) = \frac{\xi_{ab}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$

single quasiparticle normal state Green's function to

$$G(p, \omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\tilde{\omega}_n - \xi(p)}, \quad (58)$$

where $\tilde{\omega}_n = \omega_n[1 + 1/(2|\omega_n|\tau)]$. Such renormalizations are indicated in the vertices of Fig. 9 by shadowing. The resulting expression for the triangle vertex, valid for impurity concentration n_i with the restrictions mentioned above, was calculated in [55] (see Appendix A):

$$\lambda(q, \omega_n, \omega_{n'}) = \left[1 - \frac{\Theta(-\omega_n \omega_{n'})}{\tau(\tilde{\omega}_n - \tilde{\omega}_{n'})} \left(1 - \frac{\langle [\xi(p) - \xi(q-p)]^2 \rangle}{(\tilde{\omega}_n - \tilde{\omega}_{n'})^2} \right) \right]^{-1}, \quad (59)$$

where $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function, and $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes an average over the Fermi surface. Performing the Fermi surface average, we find,

$$\langle [\xi(p) - \xi(q-p)]^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (v_F^2 \mathbf{q}^2 + 4J^2 \sin^2(q_z s/2)) \equiv \tau^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2, \quad (60)$$

where $v_F = |\mathbf{p}_F|/m$ is the magnitude of the Fermi velocity parallel to the layers.

For (59) to be valid we have to make the assumption $\tau \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2 \ll 1$. This will prevent us from discussing non-local corrections in this section. We will explain what this means at the end of this subsection.

With each electromagnetic field component eA_α we associate the external vertex $ev_\alpha(p)$ where e is the quasiparticle electronic charge, and $v_\alpha(p) = \frac{\partial \xi(p)}{\partial p_\alpha}$. For longitudinal conductivity tensor elements (parallel to the layers, for which $\alpha = x, y$), the resulting vertex is simply ep_α/m . For the c -axis conductivity, the vertex $ev_z(p)$ is given by [111]

$$v_z(p) = \frac{\partial \xi(p)}{\partial p_z} = -Js \sin(p_z s). \quad (61)$$

Each wavy line in the diagrams represents a *fluctuation propagator* $L(q, \omega_\mu)$, which is a chain of superconducting bubble diagrams. This object, which is the two-particle Green's function of the fluctuation Cooper pair, was introduced in [52, 57] and is calculated from the Dyson equation in the ladder approximation (see Appendix B):

$$L^{-1}(q, \omega_\mu) = g^{-1} - \Pi(q, \omega_\mu). \quad (62)$$

Here g is the effective constant of the electron-electron interaction in the Cooper channel and the *polarization operator* $\Pi(q, \omega_\mu)$ consists of the correlator of two one-electron impurity Green functions:

$$\Pi(q, \omega_\mu) = T \sum_{\omega_n} \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \lambda(q, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n}) G(p+q, \omega_{n+\mu}) G(-p, \omega_{-n}), \quad (63)$$

In the absence of a magnetic field and in the vicinity of T_c , the inverse of $L(q, \omega_\mu)$ has the form

$$L^{-1}(q, \omega_\mu) = -N(0) \left[\varepsilon + \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T} + \alpha_q \right) - \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right], \quad (64)$$

where $\varepsilon = \ln(T/T_c)$ and

$$\alpha_q = \frac{4\eta \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2}{\pi^2 v_F^2 \tau}, \quad (65)$$

(we remind, that for simplicity we omit the subscript "2" in $\eta_2 : \eta_2 \equiv \eta$).

We integrate over the internal momenta q and sum over the internal Matsubara frequencies ω_μ , with momentum and energy conservation at each internal vertex (fluctuation propagator endpoint) in the analytical expressions for the diagrams presented at Fig. 9.

It is worthwhile making some comment there. As it was already mentioned above, the assumption $\tau \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2 \ll 1$ is necessary in order to derive an explicit expression for $\lambda(q, \omega_n, \omega_{n'})$ valid for an arbitrary spectrum. This expression will be used for the further treatment of fluctuation conductivity of layered superconductor. It is therefore important to understand, which are the effective momenta involved in the following integrations. It turns out that in the vicinity of T_c the convergence of integrals is determined by the fluctuation propagator $L(q, 0)$, which means

$$\alpha_q = \frac{4\eta \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2}{\pi^2 v_F^2 \tau} \sim \varepsilon \ll 1, \quad (66)$$

This does not imply any restrictions on q_z but $\mathbf{q}_{eff} \sim \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\xi_{ab}}$. It follows that the vertex part (59) does not permit us to treat the non-local limit $l \gg \frac{\xi_{ab}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} = \xi_{ab}(\varepsilon)$ appropriate to extremely clean systems or in the immediate

vicinity of T_c . Since we want to apply our result to the analysis of real HTS compounds with $l \sim 2 - 5\xi_{ab}$ we sacrifice the non-local limit here for the possibility of treating the anisotropic spectrum (34). We stress again that the most important arbitrary (in sense of the relation between l and ξ_{ab}) case is accessible to our consideration. The treatment of the non-local limit will be presented in section 11, where its consequences on the MT contribution will be discussed in detail for the example of NMR relaxation rate.

After these necessary introductory remarks and definitions we pass to the microscopic calculation of the different fluctuation contributions represented by the diagrams of Fig. 9.

6.4.2 Aslamazov-Larkin contribution

We first examine the AL paraconductivity (diagram 1 of Fig. 9). The proper contribution to the electromagnetic response tensor has the form:

$$Q_{\alpha\beta}^{AL}(\omega_\nu) = 2e^2 T \sum_{\omega_\mu} \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} B_\alpha(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu) L(q, \omega_\mu) L(q, \omega_\mu + \omega_\nu) B_\beta(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu), \quad (67)$$

where $\int d^3 q \equiv \int d^2 \mathbf{q} \int_{-\pi/s}^{\pi/s} dq_z$ is the appropriate momentum space integral for a layered superconductor [111, 29, 114], and the Green functions block is given by

$$B_\alpha(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu) = T \sum_{\omega_n} \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} v_\alpha(p) \lambda(q, \omega_{n+\nu}, \omega_{\mu-n}) \lambda(q, \omega_n, \omega_{\mu-n}) \times \\ \times G(p, \omega_{n+\nu}) G(p, \omega_n) G(q-p, \omega_{\mu-n}), \quad (68)$$

($\lambda(q, \omega_n, \omega_{n'})$ is defined by (59), and $\omega_{n\pm\nu} = \omega_n \pm \omega_\nu$, etc).

In the vicinity of T_c , the leading contribution to the response $Q_{\alpha\beta}^{AL}$ arises from the fluctuation propagators in (67) rather than from the frequency dependences of the vertices B_α , so we can neglect the ω_μ - and ω_ν -dependences of B_α . This approximation leads to [55, 34]

$$B_\alpha(\mathbf{q}, 0, 0) = -2\rho \frac{\eta}{v_F^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_\alpha} \langle [\xi(\mathbf{p}) - \xi(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p})]^2 \rangle = \\ = -2\rho \frac{\eta}{v_F^2} \begin{cases} sJ^2 \sin(q_z s) & \text{for } \alpha = z \\ v_F^2 q_\alpha & \text{for } \alpha = x, y \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

Notice, that since $v_z(p)$ is odd in p_z from (61), $B_z(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu)$ is proportional to J^2 to leading order in J .

Using the expression in (67) followed by analytic continuation of the external Matsubara frequencies to the imaginary axis (to obtain the appropriate retarded response $Q^R(\omega)$) and integration over q_z , the zero-frequency AL contribution to the in-plane fluctuation conductivity response was found in the static limit to be

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{xx}^{AL} &= \frac{\pi^2 e^2 \eta^2}{s} \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\mathbf{q}^2}{[(\eta \mathbf{q}^2 + \varepsilon)(\eta \mathbf{q}^2 + \varepsilon + r)]^{3/2}} \\ &= \frac{e^2}{16s} \frac{1}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2}} \rightarrow \frac{e^2}{16s} \begin{cases} (1/(\varepsilon r))^{1/2}, & \text{for } \varepsilon \ll r, \\ 1/\varepsilon, & \text{for } \varepsilon \gg r, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Here

$$r = 4\eta_2 J^2 / v_F^2 \rightarrow \begin{cases} \frac{\pi J^2 \tau}{4T} & \text{for } \tau T \ll 1, \\ \frac{7\zeta(3)J^2}{8\pi^2 T^2} & \text{for } \tau T \gg 1 \end{cases}, \quad (71)$$

where $r(T_c) = 4\xi_\perp^2(0)/s^2$ is the usual Lawrence-Doniach anisotropy parameter [115] characterizing the dimensional crossover from the 2D to the 3D regimes in the thermodynamic fluctuation behavior at T_{LD} , and $\xi_\perp(0)$ is the zero-temperature Ginzburg-Landau coherence length in the c -axis direction.

In the same way one can evaluate the AL contribution to the c -axis fluctuation conductivity [111, 29, 114]

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{zz}^{AL} &= \frac{\pi e^2 s r^2}{32} \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{[(\eta \mathbf{q}^2 + \varepsilon)(\eta \mathbf{q}^2 + \varepsilon + r)]^{3/2}} \\ &= \frac{e^2 s}{32\eta} \left(\frac{\varepsilon + r/2}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2}} - 1 \right) \rightarrow \frac{e^2 s}{64\eta} \begin{cases} (r/\varepsilon)^{1/2}, & \text{for } \varepsilon \ll r, \\ [r/(2\varepsilon)]^2, & \text{for } \varepsilon \gg r, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Note, that contrary to the case of in-plane conductivity, for σ_{zz} the crossover occurs from 0D to 3D at T_{LD} .

In the region $\xi_\perp(T) \ll s/2$ of two-dimensional fluctuation behavior, σ_{zz}^{AL} is smaller than the static in-plane fluctuation conductivity σ_{xx}^{AL} by the factor $[2\xi_\perp(T)/s]^2 (\sigma_{zz}^N / \sigma_{xx}^N)$, so that the other contributions to the transverse fluctuation conductivity need to be considered as well. The normal state conductivity tensor components in this model are $\sigma_{xx}^N = N(0)e^2 v_F^2 \tau / 2 = E_F \tau e^2 / (2\pi s)$, and $\sigma_{zz}^N / \sigma_{xx}^N = J^2 s^2 / v_F^2$ is the square of the ratio of effective Fermi velocities in the parallel and perpendicular directions, respectively.

6.4.3 Contributions from fluctuations of the density of states

The specific forms of the AL and, as shown below, MT contributions to the fluctuation conductivity, which are suppressed for small interlayer transparency, suggest that one should compare these terms with those arising from other, less divergent, diagrams which are of lower order in the transmittance [29]. Such diagrams are pictured in diagrams 5-10 of Fig. 9. These (DOS) diagrams arise from corrections to the normal quasiparticle density of states due to fluctuations of the normal quasiparticles into the superconducting state. In the dirty limit, the calculation of the contributions to the longitudinal fluctuation conductivity σ_{xx} from such diagrams was discussed previously [56]. Diagrams 9 and 10 arise from averaging diagrams 5 and 6 over impurity positions. It was shown [56] that, for σ_{xx} , diagrams 9 and 10 are less temperature dependent than diagrams 5 and 6, and can therefore be neglected. In the dirty limit, diagrams 7 and 8 were shown [56] to be equal to $-\frac{1}{3}$ times diagrams 5 and 6, which are evidently equal to each other. In the clean limit, diagrams 7 and 8 can be neglected relative to diagrams 5 and 6. For general impurity scattering, the ratio of these diagrams depends upon τ . As we are interested in the results for arbitrary impurity concentration, we shall evaluate all these diagrams separately. Calculations show that contrary to the case of the AL contribution, the in-plane and out-of-plane components of DOS contribution differ only in the square of the ratio of effective Fermi velocities in the parallel and perpendicular directions. This allows us to calculate both components simultaneously. The contribution to the fluctuation conductivity due to diagram 5 is

$$Q_{\alpha\beta}^5(\omega_\nu) = 2e^2T \sum_{\omega_\mu} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} L(q, \omega_\mu) T \sum_{\omega_n} \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} v_\alpha(p) v_\beta(p) \lambda^2(q, \omega_n, \omega_{\mu-n}) \times \\ \times G^2(p, \omega_n) G(q-p, \omega_{\mu-n}) G(p, \omega_{n+\nu}), \quad (73)$$

and diagram 6 gives an identical contribution. Evaluation of the integrations over the internal momenta \mathbf{p} and the summation over the internal frequencies ω_n are straightforward. Treatment of the other internal frequencies ω_μ is less obvious, but in order to obtain the leading singular behavior in $\varepsilon \ll 1$ of Q^5 , it suffices to set $\omega_\mu = 0$. After integration over q_z , we have

$$\sigma_{\begin{bmatrix} xx \\ zz \end{bmatrix}}^{5+6} = -\frac{e^2 s \pi r_1}{4} \left[\frac{(v_F/sJ)^2}{1} \right] \int_{|\mathbf{q}| \leq q_{\max}} \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{[(\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2)(\varepsilon + r + \eta \mathbf{q}^2)]^{1/2}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{e^2 s r_1}{8\eta} \begin{bmatrix} (v_F/sJ)^2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \ln\left(\frac{(\varepsilon + \eta q_{\max}^2)^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r + \eta q_{\max}^2)^{1/2}}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}\right) \\
&\approx -\frac{e^2 s r_1}{8\eta} \begin{bmatrix} (v_F/sJ)^2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where

$$r_1 = \frac{2(J\tau)^2}{\pi^2} \left[\psi'\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}\right) - \frac{3}{4\pi T\tau} \psi''\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right]. \tag{75}$$

In the clean limit, σ_{zz} in (74) reduces to that obtained in [29]. In (74), we have introduced a cutoff in the integral at $|\mathbf{q}| = q_{\max}$, where $\eta q_{\max}^2 \approx 1$, as in [29, 32, 31]. This cutoff arises from the q -dependence of the vertices and of the Green's functions, which had been neglected in comparison with the contribution from the propagator, and is appropriate for both the clean and dirty limits.

In a similar manner, the equal contributions from diagrams 7 and 8 sum to

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\begin{bmatrix} xx \\ zz \end{bmatrix}}^{7+8} &= -\frac{e^2 s \pi r_2}{4} \begin{bmatrix} (v_F/sJ)^2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \int_{|\mathbf{q}| \leq q_{\max}} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{[(\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2)(\varepsilon + r + \eta \mathbf{q}^2)]^{1/2}} \\
&\approx -\frac{e^2 s r_2}{8\eta} \begin{bmatrix} (v_F/sJ)^2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

where

$$r_2 = \frac{J^2 \tau}{2\pi^3 T} \psi''\left(\frac{1}{2}\right). \tag{77}$$

Comparing (74) and (76), we see that in the clean limit, the main contributions from the DOS fluctuations arise from diagrams 5 and 6. In the dirty limit, diagrams 7 and 8 are also important, having $-1/3$ the value of diagrams 5 and 6, for both σ_{xx} and σ_{zz} . Diagrams 9 and 10 are not singular in $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in the 2D regime, and can be neglected. The total DOS contributions to the in-plane and c -axis conductivity are therefore

$$\sigma_{\begin{bmatrix} xx \\ zz \end{bmatrix}}^{DOS} = -\frac{e^2}{2s} \kappa \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ (sJ/v_F)^2 \end{bmatrix} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}\right), \tag{78}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa &= \frac{r_1 + r_2}{r} = \frac{-\psi'\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi\tau T}\right) + \frac{1}{2\pi\tau T}\psi''\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}{\pi^2\left[\psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi\tau T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi\tau T}\psi'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right]} \\ &\rightarrow \begin{cases} 56\zeta(3)/\pi^4 \approx 0.691, & \text{for } T\tau \ll 1, \\ 8\pi^2(\tau T)^2/[7\zeta(3)] \approx 9.384(\tau T)^2, & \text{for } T\tau \gg 1 \end{cases} \quad (79)\end{aligned}$$

is a function of τT only.

6.4.4 Maki-Thompson contribution

We now consider the Maki-Thompson (MT) contribution (diagram 2 of Fig. 9) to fluctuation conductivity. The contributions from the two other diagrams of the MT type (diagrams 3 and 4 of Fig. 9) are negligible, because they are less singular in ε . Although the MT contribution to in-plane conductivity is expected to be important in the case of low pair-breaking, experiments on high-temperature superconductors have shown that excess in-plane conductivity can usually be explained in terms of the fluctuation paraconductivity alone. Two possible explanations can be found for this fact. The first one is that pair-breaking in these materials is not weak. The second is connected with the possibility of d -wave pairing which does not permit the anomalous Maki-Thompson process at all (see section 12 for details).

Concerning the out-of-plane MT contribution, as was stated in [29], even when the pair lifetime τ_ϕ is short, this contribution is proportional to J^4 for small J above T_{LD} , but is less singular above T_{LD} than the AL diagram, and was therefore excluded from that treatment. As we shall show in the following, neglecting the MT diagram is usually justified for the out-of-plane component of fluctuation conductivity in layered materials. Nevertheless, there are a variety of situations where the MT diagram may be important, depending upon the material parameters. Because of its dependence on τ_ϕ , the MT contribution to the transverse conductivity can have different temperature dependencies, and its order in the interlayer transmittance can vary. For completeness, we consider the scattering lifetime τ and the pair-breaking lifetime τ_ϕ to be arbitrary, but satisfying $\tau_\phi > \tau$. The MT contribution to the electromagnetic response tensor is then

$$Q_{\alpha\beta}^{MT}(\omega_\nu) = 2e^2T \sum_{\omega_\mu} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} L(q, \omega_\mu) I_{\alpha\beta}(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu), \quad (80)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\alpha\beta}(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu) &= \\
&= T \sum_{\omega_n} \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} v_\alpha(p) v_\beta(q-p) \lambda(q, \omega_{n+\nu}, \omega_{\mu-n-\nu}) \lambda(q, \omega_n, \omega_{\mu-n}) \times \\
&\quad \times G(p, \omega_{n+\nu}) G(p, \omega_n) G(q-p, \omega_{\mu-n-\nu}) G(q-p, \omega_{\mu-n}) . \quad (81)
\end{aligned}$$

In the vicinity of T_c , it is possible to take the static limit of the MT diagram simply by setting $\omega_\mu = 0$ in (80). Although dynamic effects can be important for the longitudinal fluctuation conductivity well above T_{LD} , the static limit is correct very close to T_c , as shown in [116, 117].

In evaluating the sums over the Matsubara frequencies ω_n in (81), it is useful to break up the sum into two parts. In the first part, ω_n is in the domains $] -\infty, -\omega_\nu[$ and $[0, \infty[$. This gives rise to the *regular* part of the MT diagram. The second (*anomalous*) part of the MT diagram arises from the summation over ω_n in the domain $] -\omega_\nu, 0[$. In this domain, analytic continuation leads to an additional diffusive pole in the integration over q , with a characteristic pair-breaking lifetime τ_ϕ .

We start with the MT contribution to in-plane conductivity. Since in this case the regular part of the MT diagram is completely similar to the DOS contribution [34], we list the result only:

$$\sigma_{xx}^{MT(reg)} = -\frac{e^2}{2s} \tilde{\kappa} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}\right) \quad (82)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\kappa} &= \frac{-\psi'\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}\right) + \psi'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}\psi''\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}{\pi^2\left[\psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}\psi'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right]} \\
&\rightarrow \begin{cases} 28\zeta(3)/\pi^4 \approx 0.3455 & \text{for } T\tau \ll 1, \\ \pi^2/[14\zeta(3)] \approx 0.5865 & \text{for } T\tau \gg 1 \end{cases} \quad (83)
\end{aligned}$$

is another function only of τT . We note that this regular MT term is negative, as is the overall DOS contribution.

For the anomalous part of in-plane MT contribution we have:

$$\sigma_{xx}^{MT(an)} = 8e^2\eta T_c \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{[1/\tau_\phi + \hat{\mathbf{D}}q^2][\varepsilon + \eta\mathbf{q}^2 + \frac{r}{2}(1 - \cos q_z s)]}$$

$$= \frac{e^2}{4s(\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi)} \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}{\gamma_\varphi^{1/2} + (\gamma_\varphi + r)^{1/2}} \right) \quad (84)$$

where

$$\gamma_\varphi = \frac{2\eta}{v_F^2 \tau \tau_\phi} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{8T\tau_\phi} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } T\tau \ll 1, \\ 7\zeta(3)/(2\pi^3 T\tau) & \text{for } T\tau \gg 1. \end{cases} \quad (85)$$

Equation (84) indicates that in the weak pair-breaking limit, the MT diagram makes an important contribution to the longitudinal fluctuation conductivity: it is of the same order as the AL contribution in the 3D regime, but is larger than the AL contribution in the 2D regime above T_{LD} . For finite pair-breaking, however, the MT contribution is greatly reduced in magnitude.

We now consider the calculation of the MT contribution to the transverse conductivity. From the forms of $v_z(p)$ and $v_z(q-p)$ in (81) obtained from (61), the bare electromagnetic vertices are proportional to $\sin(p_z s) \sin(q_z - p_z)s$. After integration over the momentum $p = (\mathbf{p}, p_z)$, the non-vanishing contribution is proportional to $\cos q_z s$. We take the limit $J\tau \ll 1$ in evaluating the remaining integrals, which may then be performed exactly. The normal part of the MT contribution to transverse conductivity is

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{reg})} &= -\frac{e^2 s^2 \pi r \tilde{\kappa}}{4} \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\cos q_z s}{\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + \frac{r}{2}(1 - \cos q_z s)} \\ &= -\frac{e^2 s \pi \tilde{\kappa}}{2} \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + r/2}{[(\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2)(\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + r)]^{1/2}} - 1 \right) \quad (86) \\ &= -\frac{e^2 s r \tilde{\kappa}}{16\eta} \left(\frac{(\varepsilon + r)^{1/2} - \varepsilon^{1/2}}{r^{1/2}} \right)^2 \\ &\rightarrow -\frac{e^2 s r \tilde{\kappa}}{16\eta} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \varepsilon \ll r, \\ r/(4\varepsilon) & \text{for } \varepsilon \gg r, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This term is smaller in magnitude than is the DOS one, and therefore makes a relatively small contribution to the overall fluctuation conductivity and to the temperature at which the c -axis resistivity is a maximum. In the 3D regime below T_{LD} , it is proportional to J^2 , and in the 2D regime above T_{LD} , it is proportional to J^4 .

The anomalous part of the MT diagram gives rise to a contribution to the transverse conductivity of the form

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{an})} = \frac{\pi e^2 J^2 s^2 \tau}{4} \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\cos q_z s}{[1/\tau_\phi + \hat{\mathbf{D}}q^2][\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + \frac{r}{2}(1 - \cos q_z s)]}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\pi e^2 s}{4(\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi)} \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \left[\frac{\gamma_\varphi + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + r/2}{[(\gamma_\varphi + \eta \mathbf{q}^2)(\gamma_\varphi + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + r)]^{1/2}} - \frac{\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + r/2}{[(\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2)(\varepsilon + \eta \mathbf{q}^2 + r)]^{1/2}} \right] \\
&= \frac{e^2 s}{16\eta} \left(\frac{\gamma_\varphi + r + \varepsilon}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2} + [\gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{1/2}} - 1 \right), \tag{87}
\end{aligned}$$

In examining the limiting cases of (87), it is useful to consider the cases of weak ($\gamma_\varphi \ll r, \equiv J^2 \tau \tau_\phi \gg 1/2$) and strong ($\gamma_\varphi \gg r, \equiv J^2 \tau \tau_\phi \ll 1/2$) pair-breaking separately. For weak pair-breaking, we have

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{an})} \rightarrow \frac{e^2 s}{16\eta} \begin{cases} (r/\gamma_\varphi)^{1/2} & \text{for } \varepsilon \ll \gamma_\varphi \ll r, \\ (r/\varepsilon)^{1/2} & \text{for } \gamma_\varphi \ll \varepsilon \ll r, \\ r/(2\varepsilon) & \text{if } \gamma_\varphi \ll r \ll \varepsilon. \end{cases} \tag{88}$$

In this case, there is the usual 3D to 2D dimensional crossover in the anomalous MT contribution at T_{LD} , for which $\varepsilon(T_{LD}) = r$. There is an additional crossover at T_1 (where $T_c < T_1 < T_{LD}$), characterized by $\varepsilon(T_1) = \gamma_\varphi$, below which the anomalous MT term saturates. Below T_{LD} , the MT contribution is proportional to J , but in the 2D regime above T_{LD} , it is proportional to J^2 .

For strong pair-breaking,

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{an})} \rightarrow \frac{e^2 s}{32\eta} \begin{cases} r/\gamma_\varphi & \text{for } \varepsilon \ll r \ll \gamma_\varphi, \\ r^2/(4\gamma_\varphi \varepsilon) & \text{for } r \ll \min(\varepsilon, \gamma_\varphi). \end{cases} \tag{89}$$

In this case, the 3D regime (below T_{LD}) is not singular, and the anomalous MT contribution is proportional to J^2 , rather than J for weak pair-breaking. In the 2D regime, it is proportional to J^4 for strong pair-breaking, as opposed to J^2 for weak pair-breaking. In addition, the overall magnitude of the anomalous MT contribution with strong pair-breaking is greatly reduced from that for weak pair-breaking.

Let us now compare the regular and anomalous MT contributions. Since these contributions are opposite in sign, it is important to determine which will dominate. For the in-plane resistivity, the situation is straightforward: the anomalous part always dominates over the regular and the latter can be neglected. The case of c -axis resistivity requires more discussion. Since we expect $\tau_\phi \geq \tau$, strong pair-breaking is likely in the dirty limit. When the pair-breaking is weak, the anomalous term is always of lower order in J than the regular term, so the regular term can be neglected. This is true for both

the clean and dirty limits. The most important regime for the regular MT term is the dirty limit with strong pair-breaking. In this case, when $\tau_\phi T \sim 1$, the regular and anomalous terms are comparable in magnitude. In short, it is usually a good approximation to neglect the regular term, except in the dirty limit with relatively strong pair-breaking and only for out-of-plane conductivity. However, we include it for generality.

As discussed in greater detail in the previous section, when $J\tau \ll 1$, the effective interlayer tunneling rate is of the order of $J^2\tau$. When $1/\tau_\phi \ll J^2\tau \ll 1/\tau$, the quasiparticles scatter many times before tunneling to the neighboring layers [112], and the pairs live long enough for them to tunnel coherently. When $J^2\tau \ll 1/\tau_\phi$, the pairs decay before both paired quasiparticles tunnel.

It is interesting to compare the anomalous MT contribution with the DOS and AL contributions to transverse fluctuation conductivity. This comparison is best made in the 2D regime above T_{LD} . For weak pair-breaking, the anomalous MT and DOS terms are proportional to J^2 , but opposite in sign, and the former has a stronger temperature dependence than the latter. With strong pair-breaking, the anomalous MT and AL contributions are proportional to J^4 , but the former is less singular in $\varepsilon \ll 1$ than is the latter. Hence, the transverse MT contribution is in some sense *intermediate* between the transverse DOS and AL contributions. Nevertheless, as we will show in the following, the MT contribution can be important in the overall temperature dependence of the transverse resistivity, eliminating the peak for weak pair-breaking.

6.5 MT anomalous contribution as the precursor phenomenon of Josephson effect

Now, after the cumbersome calculations, let us speculate about the nontrivial results obtained for the MT anomalous contribution to the c-axis current.

Comparing the results of section 5.2 ([81, 28]) and the section 6.4 one can notice the richness of the approach based on spectrum (34) with that based on tunneling Hamiltonian without the momentum conservation [81]. The latter does not take into account such delicate effects as the fluctuation pairing through the barrier, coherent hopping etc., while the former provides these possibilities. One can ask: does a precursor phenomenon of the Josephson

effect exist and, if so, with fluctuation process is it?

I.O.Kulik replied positively on this question [118, 119]. He demonstrated that although the average Josephson current above T_c in the absence of the an applied voltage is zero, precursor radiation of the Josephson junction can be expected above T_c at the frequency $\Omega \sim T - T_c$. He associated this radiation with the AL paraconductivity.

The analysis of the expression for σ_{zz}^{AL} contradicts to this association. In spite of the fact that the related current is due to the motion of Cooper pairs, it is evidently proportional to the square of transparency of the junction ($\sim J^4$) and can in no way be matched with the Josephson component of current flowing through the junction at temperatures below T_c . The DOS contribution occurs in the first order of the barrier transparency, but is evidently due to the quasiparticle branch of the tunnel current below T_c ([29, 30]). So the last candidate is the MT contribution and it is easy to see that under specified conditions it really represents the precursor phenomenon of the Josephson effect.

One can see that in the weak pair-breaking limit ($\tau_\phi \gg t_{hop}$) the σ_{zz}^{MT} is proportional to the first order of the barrier transparency and so the hypothetical current associated with the MT process can be matched in this parameter with the Josephson current below the transition. In the opposite case ($\tau_\phi \ll t_{hop}$) there are no traces of the Josephson effect above T_c .

These results can easily be understood from the picture of self-intersecting trajectories proposed in section 6.3. The hopping character of the electron motion along the c-axis leads to the minimal self-intersecting trajectory in this case consisting of intralayer diffusion, followed by scattering to a neighboring layer, diffusion in this layer, and hopping back to the same point in the original layer (see Fig. 10). The Josephson current below T_c is related to the phase coherence of the Cooper pairs condensate of both electrodes. Since the MT contribution appears as the pairing of two electrons moving along the trajectory described one can see that the condition ($\tau_\phi \gg t_{hop}$) is evidently necessary to permit the required phase coherence along the minimal self-intersecting trajectory.

And there is a final argument, formal but convincing. The Josephson current is represented diagrammatically as the correlator of two Gorkov's F-functions ([120, 69]). Approaching T_c from below the F-functions can be expended in powers of Ψ (see Fig. 11). Above T_c $\langle \Psi \rangle = 0$ but the correlator $\langle \Psi \Psi^* \rangle$ is nothing else as the fluctuation propagator and we pass to the MT

diagram.

The message of these speculations is the following: the layered superconductor with low phase-breaking could, in principle, irradiate or react to external irradiation at a frequency $\sim T - T_c$ [118] in the vicinity of T_c . This radiation can be related both to order parameter and pancake vortex fluctuations (at $T < T_c$). Nevertheless, the estimate for HTS compounds are very pessimistic: the necessary condition $\tau_\phi \gg \frac{\tau}{(J\tau)^2}$, $J\tau \ll 1$ is unrealistic.

6.6 The total fluctuation conductivity

From the previous considerations, the total zero-field in-plane and out-of-plane fluctuation conductivities are found to be

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{xx}^{fl} &= \sigma_{xx}^{AL} + \sigma_{xx}^{DOS} + \sigma_{xx}^{MT(\text{reg})} + \sigma_{xx}^{MT(\text{an})} \\ &= \frac{e^2}{16s} \left[\frac{1}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2}} - 8(\kappa + \tilde{\kappa}) \ln \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{4}{\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi} \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}{\gamma_\varphi^{1/2} + (\gamma_\varphi + r)^{1/2}} \right) \right]\end{aligned}\quad (90)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{zz}^{fl} &= \sigma_{zz}^{AL} + \sigma_{zz}^{DOS} + \sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{reg})} + \sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{an})} \\ &= \frac{e^2 s}{16\eta} \left[-r\kappa \ln \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}} \right)^2 + [(\varepsilon + r)^{1/2} - \varepsilon^{1/2}]^2 \left(\frac{1}{4[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2}} - \tilde{\kappa} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{\varepsilon + \gamma_\varphi + r}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2} + [\gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{1/2}} - 1 \right) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (91)$$

We note that the second term in (91) contains both the AL and the regular MT contributions. Writing the AL term in this fashion, it is easy to see that the AL term is generally larger in magnitude than the regular MT term, except when $r \ll \varepsilon \approx 1$.

Although equations (90) and (91) contain both positive (AL and anomalous MT) and negative (DOS and regular MT) contributions, the behavior of the overall in-plane and out-of-plane fluctuation conductivities is qualitatively different.

In fact, for σ_{xx}^{fl} , the negative contributions are less than the positive ones in the entire temperature range above the transition, leading to a total correction which is always positive. On the other hand, in the case of σ_{zz}^{fl} , both positive terms (AL and anomalous MT) are suppressed by interlayer transparency, leading to a competition between positive and negative terms. This can lead to a maximum in the c-axis fluctuation resistivity (minimum in the c-axis fluctuation conductivity), whilst the in-plane resistivity is expected to be monotonous. Since the temperature dependencies of r , κ , and $\tilde{\kappa}$ are weak compared with that present in ε , to obtain the position of the $\rho_c(T)$ maximum, it suffices to extremise (91) with respect to ε . Using the restriction $J\tau \ll 1$ for the validity of our theory, it is sufficient to consider the cases in which the resistive maximum occurs in the 2D regime. Setting $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_m$ at $T = T_m$, we have

$$\varepsilon_m/r \approx \frac{1}{(8r\kappa)^{1/2}} - \frac{1}{8\kappa} \left[\tilde{\kappa} - \frac{1}{2\gamma_\varphi} \right], \quad (92)$$

which is valid for $r\kappa \ll 1$ and $\gamma_\varphi\kappa > 1$.

We see that the regular MT term decreases the position of the maximum somewhat, but the anomalous term increases it somewhat. It is then qualitatively correct to neglect the MT terms altogether (as confirmed e.g. by [121]), but quantitatively, they can change the overall shape of the fluctuation resistivity. We remark that there may be cases in which T_m could occur in the 3D regime, but such cases cannot be addressed by our theory, as they would require a proper treatment of non-local effects, as well as the removal of the restriction $J\tau \ll 1$.

In Figs. 12 and 13, we have plotted ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N and ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N versus T/T_{c0} for various values of the scattering lifetime τT_{c0} and the pair-breaking lifetime $\tau_\phi T_{c0}$. We have taken $\sigma_{xx}^N = \frac{1}{2}N(0)e^2v_F^2\tau$ and $\sigma_{zz}^N = \frac{1}{2}N(0)J^2e^2s^2\tau$ here.

In these figures, the solid curves are plots of ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N . The dashed curves are plots of ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N , for the same sets of parameters. In Fig. 12, we have chosen $\tau T_{c0} = 1$, which is relevant for the high- T_c cuprates. In each of these figures, curves for $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 1, 10, 100$ are shown. We have $r(T_{c0}) = 0.1, 0.01$, and 0.001 in Figs. 12(a), (b), (c), respectively. These values correspond roughly to those expected for YBCO, BSCCO, and $\text{Tl}_2\text{Ba}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$ (TBCCO), respectively. In order that the overall fluctuation conductivity not give a large correction to the normal state conductivity at temperatures well above the transition (i. e., for $T > 1.03T_{c0}$), we have chosen $E_F/T_{c0} = 300$ for $r(T_{c0}) =$

0.1 and 0.001 [Figs. 12(a),(b)], but $E_F/T_{c0} = 500$ for $r(T_{c0}) = 0.001$ (Fig. 12(c)). As can be seen from each of these figures, for a fixed amount of pair-breaking and intralayer scattering, strong pair-breaking (e. g., $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 1$) gives rise to a peak, or maximum in ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N . A small, broad peak in ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N can also occur, but only for weak anisotropy ($r(T_{c0}) = 0.1$) and for such strong pair-breaking ($\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 1$). Increasing the anisotropy (or decreasing $r(T_{c0})$) greatly enhances the magnitude of the peak in ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N . Decreasing the amount of pair-breaking decreases the amplitude of the peak, as seen in each figure.

In Fig. 13, plots with the same parameters as in Fig. 12(b) are shown, except that the intralayer scattering lifetime has been decreased to $\tau T_{c0} = 0.1$, which is in the dirty limit. It can be seen that the magnitude of the peak in ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N is reduced by interlayer hopping, by interlayer scattering, and by pairbreaking. For highly anisotropic materials, no peak in ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N is expected for any amount of pair-breaking shown in these figures.

Another important issue which should be discussed is the role of the DOS term in the interpretation of in-plane resistivity data within fluctuation theory. As we have mentioned above, the DOS term in σ_{xx}^{fl} cannot result in a change of sign, but is able to change the magnitude of the total correction which is important for the quantitative comparison with experimental data. The DOS correction gives rise to the term proportional to κ in (91). In the dirty limit, since $\tilde{\kappa} \rightarrow 0.5\kappa$, the DOS contribution is not much larger than the (relatively small) regular MT term, and was therefore neglected by all previous workers. However, when $\tau T_{c0} = 1$, $\kappa(T_{c0}) = 14.3123$, which is much larger than $\tilde{\kappa}(T_{c0}) = 0.5578$, and the DOS contribution *cannot* be neglected relative to the other terms. Hence, fits to data in which the DOS term has been neglected can only be trusted for systems which are in the dirty limit. Since the cuprates are thought to have $\tau T_{c0} \approx 1$, it is necessary to include the DOS contribution in the fits. This term dramatically alters the shape of the overall parallel resistivity, even for zero magnetic field. This change in ρ_{xx} due to the inclusion of the DOS contribution is pictured in Fig. 14. In this figure, we have plotted ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N for $\tau T_{c0} = 1$, $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 10$, $E_F/T_{c0} = 300$, for both $r(T_{c0}) = 0.1$ (dashed curves), and $r(T_{c0}) = 0.01$ (solid curves), both with and without the DOS contribution. As is easily seen from Fig. 14, the DOS contribution greatly alters the overall resistivity, with the main aspect of the alteration being an overall increase in the resistivity.

However, as we will discuss in section 8.3.1, no experiment revealed up

to now a significant contribuion of the DOS fluctuations. Indeed, this small contribution can be masked by a change in the parameters of fits which do not include the DOS term.

7 Experimental observations of fluctuation conductivity in HTS

7.1 Introduction

We have already remarked that the normal state electrical transport properties of HTS are very peculiar in many aspects. Particularly interesting are the differences between the in-plane and c-axis resistivities. While the quantitative differences among them (up to a factor 10^4) are obviously due to the layered nature of these compounds, the explanation of their qualitative behavior is related to the quasi-2D character of HTS in a much less straightforward way. The apparently opposite behaviors of $\rho_{ab}(T)$ and $\rho_c(T)$ close to T_c in HTS (decrease of resistivity for the former, increase for the latter as temperature is decreased) could not be explained for a long time. Although the peak in $\rho_c(T)$ observed in all high T_c compounds [1, 2, 3, 32, 122, 123] appeared to be strictly connected with the anisotropy of the sample, being very pronounced in highly anisotropic samples (BSCCO, YBCO annealed in reducing atmosphere) but almost absent in samples with low anisotropy (fully oxygenated BSCCO or YBCO), every attempt to explain it through normal state conductivity models in highly anisotropic systems failed to give satisfactory results [97, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129]. This failure extends to recent models [130, 37] which, as we will see, do not satisfactorily match the experimental behavior in the vicinity of T_c .

However, it has been shown in section 6 how the different behaviors of $\rho_{ab}(T)$ and $\rho_c(T)$ close to T_c can be explained by a single physical mechanism (namely fluctuations), provided that all fluctuation contributions are taken into account, the hierarchy of the various fluctuation contributions being different for in-plane and c-axis conductivity. As we have seen, the suppression of the positive fluctuation paraconductivity along the c-direction by the square of the interlayer transparency together with the decrease of the normal state conductivity due to the fluctuation decrease of the density of states at the Fermi level leads to an increase of resistivity in c-axis measurements in samples having a sufficiently high anisotropy.

In the following sections we will analyze experimental data in the framework of the theory presented in section 6 and show how the theory can quantitatively describe the experimental data. Section 7.1 will be devoted to

a brief review of the role of fluctuations in the in-plane conductivity, where the AL paraconductivity dominates, section 7.2 will deal with the origin of the resistivity peak in transverse measurements, where competition between the positive AL paraconductivity and the negative DOS contribution to conductivity takes place. A comparison between the two methods employed to explain the transverse resistivity peak (normal state conductivity or fluctuation conductivity) concludes this section.

7.2 In-plane resistance: Crossover phenomena observations

Soon after the discovery of HTS superconductivity in the YBCO compound, the observation of a large in-plane excess conductivity above the superconducting transition in measurements was reported by Freitas et al. [131] and Dubson et al. [132]. This excess conductivity was attributed to thermodynamic fluctuations, which in HTS are expected to be much larger than in conventional superconductors because of their short coherence length and high transition temperature. An early review of the fluctuation effects on the electrical transport properties was given in [133]. As pointed out in [134, 135] earlier measurements, especially when carried out on bulk single crystals, were sometimes affected by T_c (oxygen-content) inhomogeneities. Such difficulties were surmounted mostly by using monocrystalline films with well defined geometries. A typical $\rho_{ab}(T)$ curve in HTS is shown in Fig. 15.

These measurements generated great interest, especially because the nature of thermodynamic fluctuations is related to the important topic of the dimensionality of superconductivity in HTS [137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144]. In fact, since the cuprate superconductors have layered structure, both 2D and 3D behavior can be observed, depending on the relative values of the temperature-dependent coherence length perpendicular to the layers $\xi_c(T)$ and of the spacing s between superconducting layers. When $\xi_c(T) \gg s$ (i.e. close to T_c) the behavior is 3D, while as the temperature is increased and $\xi_c(T)$ decreases, a Lawrence-Doniach crossover between the 3D and 2D regimes occurs at the temperature T_{LD} defined by the condition $\xi_c(T_{LD}) \approx s$.

For the YBCO compound [131] the excess conductivity has been described by the 3D AL fluctuation contribution ($\Delta\sigma \sim \varepsilon^{-1/2}$) in a wide temperature range $-4 \leq \ln \varepsilon \leq -2$, while at higher temperatures ($\ln \varepsilon > -2$) a breakdown

of this simple theory was observed as shown in Fig. 16. These conclusions were confirmed by later experiments [137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142]

On the other hand, the much more anisotropic BSCCO compound showed a 3D fluctuation behavior only in the close proximity of T_c , while at higher temperatures a clear 2D behavior ($\Delta\sigma \sim \varepsilon^{-1}$) was observed [145].

At sufficiently high temperatures the experimental behavior of fluctuation conductivity deviates from the simple AL theory, which is indeed valid only for $T - T_c \ll T_c$. Reggiani et al. [117] generalized the 2D AL theory for the high temperature region by taking into account the short wavelength fluctuations and obtained the following universal formula for paraconductivity

$$\sigma_{\text{fl}}^{2\text{D}} = \frac{e^2}{16\hbar s} f(\varepsilon). \quad (93)$$

Here $f(\varepsilon)$ is a function calculated in [117] which, for clean 2D superconductors, tends to $f(\varepsilon) = 1/\varepsilon$ in the GL region of temperature ($\varepsilon \ll 1$), so that the result coincides with the well known AL one, while in the opposite case ($\varepsilon \gg 1$), tends to the asymptotic $f(\varepsilon) \sim 1/\varepsilon^3 = 1/\ln^3(T/T_c)$.

In [136] the validity of this formula was carefully verified. Clearly, when dealing with the small fluctuation effects measured far from T_c extreme care must be taken in the method of measurement. Small sample-dependent deviations of the $R(T)$ curves from the optimal, "intrinsic" behavior could severely affect the fluctuation effects deduced from the $R(T)$ measurements. Therefore, from a batch of 20 epitaxial $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+x}$ films, only three were selected after checking their compositional homogeneity, structural quality and electrical transport properties (low extrapolated resistivity at 0 K, narrow transition). The $R(T)$ curves of these three films were directly compared by plotting their resistance normalized to a reference value (namely $R(1.33T_c)$) vs. the normalized critical temperature T/T_c as shown in Fig. 15. The curves for all three films superimpose very well, so that they can be assumed to represent the "intrinsic" resistive transition for the 2212 BSCCO compound in spite of the small spread of their critical temperature and resistivity values. For these films the excess conductivity was analyzed. A very good fitting with the formula (93) was found in the temperature region $0.02 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.14$ (i.e. $1.5 \text{ K} < T - T_c < 11 \text{ K}$), while the original AL theory fits the data only in a much narrower temperature range (Fig. 17). For temperatures below $T_c + 1.5 \text{ K}$ Eq. 93 fails because the sample is no longer in

the 2D region, while for $T > T_c + 11\text{ K}$ the usual choice of the normal state resistance as the linear extrapolation from the high-temperature behavior artificially forces the extracted fluctuation conductivity to go to zero as the temperature approaches the range used for the linear extrapolation.

As already mentioned, formula (93) predicts the asymptotic behavior $f(\varepsilon) \sim 1/\varepsilon^3 = 1/\ln^3(T/T_c)$ at high enough temperatures. In a recent paper [91] a careful analysis of the higher temperature region (above the edge of the region investigated in [136]) permitted observation of this asymptotic regime, although at a surprisingly low reduced temperature ($\varepsilon^* \sim \ln(T^*/T_c) \sim 0.23$) in YBCO, 2212 BSCCO and 2223 BSCCO samples. The background of the normal state conductivity $\sigma_N = 1/\rho_N$ was evaluated with particular accuracy by starting the linear extrapolation at temperatures higher than about 150 K and checking that in the range from 150 K to 330 K ρ_N did not change by shifting the interpolation temperature region. Therefore the upper limit of ε at which the excess conductivity could be analyzed was $\varepsilon_{\text{up}} \approx \ln(160/92) = 0.55$ for YBCO, $\varepsilon_{\text{up}} \approx 0.46$ for 2212 BSCCO and $\varepsilon_{\text{up}} \approx 0.51$ for 2223 BSCCO.

In Fig. 18 ($16\hbar s/e^2$) σ_{fl} is plotted for the three samples as a function of ε ; the solid line represents $1/\varepsilon$, the dashed line $1/\varepsilon^3$ and the dotted line $3.2/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. The value of the interlayer distance s is adjusted so that the experimental data follow the $1/\varepsilon$ behavior in the temperature region where the AL behavior is expected. Obviously, the extension of the region where the 2D AL behavior ($1/\varepsilon$) is followed depends on the sample anisotropy. The less anisotropic YBCO compound asymptotically tends to the 3D behavior ($1/\varepsilon^{1/2}$) for $\varepsilon < 0.1$, showing the LD crossover at $\varepsilon \approx 0.07$; the 2223 BSCCO curve starts to bend for $\varepsilon < 0.03$ while the most anisotropic 2212 BSCCO shows a 2D behavior in the whole temperature range investigated. All three compounds show a universal high temperature behavior of in-plane conductivity in the 2D regime, above the LD crossover. At $\varepsilon \approx 0.24$ all the curves bend down and follow the same asymptotic $1/\varepsilon^3$ behavior. Finally at the value $\varepsilon \approx 0.45$, close to the values of ε_{up} reported above, all the curves fall down indicating the end of the observable fluctuation regime.

A further refinement of the theory of the in-plane fluctuation conductivity was carried out considering two different interlayer distances and different strengths of the tunneling coupling between adjacent layers for YBCO [146, 147] and BSCCO 2212 [148]. This approach led to the same qualitative results as those obtained by the conventional single layer approach, but to a better quantitative agreement between the theory and experiments.

In conclusion, the analysis of in-plane fluctuation conductivity has shown that in the whole temperature range from T_c to temperatures high enough that the fluctuation contribution becomes lower than the experimental resolution, the AL theory, corrected to take into account short wavelength fluctuations, is able to explain all the experimentally observed features in HTS, correctly describing the crossovers between different regimes as the temperature is increased. Therefore in most cases there is no need to introduce other contributions to fluctuation conductivity (DOS, regular and anomalous MT), since they are small with respect to the AL one as predicted by (90). However very accurate measurements have shown that for YBCO, a logarithmic contribution to σ_{ab}^{fl} exists at temperatures as high as 180 K which could originate from in-plane DOS fluctuations [149].

7.3 Out-of-plane resistance: fluctuation origin of the c-axis peak

The quantitative agreement of the transverse fluctuation theory outlined in section 6.3 with the experimental data was proved shortly after its proposal [31, 32, 94] by fitting the resistivity peaks of BSCCO and YBCO samples. This shows good metallic behavior far from the transition, and thus had relatively small resistivity peak (Fig. 19). For strongly oxygen deficient samples, the increase in the c-axis resistivity begins so far from T_c and the peak has such a large magnitude [94] that it cannot be due to fluctuation effects only: in this case the effect is probably due to some metal-insulator transition.

In [31] the theory was fit to data from 2212 BSCCO films grown on misaligned substrates (to allow measurement of c-axis resistivity on epitaxial films) in the temperature region 93–110 K. The fit used only the DOS contribution since the temperatures are far enough from T_c for the AL contribution to be negligible. In this way, using a single fitting parameter representing the amplitude of the DOS fluctuation correction to conductivity, the agreement of the logarithmic increase of resistivity with experimental data was proven. This analysis was later completed [32] by enlarging the fitting region to include the peak and considering the AL contribution besides the DOS one. Their different temperature dependencies allow them to be separated and therefore to extract the values of the physical parameters involved. Two fit-

ting parameters were necessary in this case, the Fermi velocity $v_F = 1.4 \cdot 10^7$ cm/s and the electronic elastic scattering time $\tau \simeq 5 \cdot 10^{-14}$ s. In the same paper the carrier concentration and the anisotropy of a BSCCO film were changed by means of reducing and oxidizing annealing treatments. As the AL contribution is heavily dependent on the interlayer coupling than the DOS one, a more pronounced peak is expected for materials with higher anisotropy. The carrier density also affects the magnitude of the peak, since a higher carrier concentration means a lower fluctuation contribution as compared to the normal-state conductivity. These facts strongly reduce the relative change in conductivity for samples having high oxygen content. The evolution of the resistivity peak under redox treatments confirmed these predictions.

We have just seen that the main features of the resistivity peak in HTS can be explained by the fluctuation theory including the DOS contribution. However, this is not the only possible approach. Indeed, both before and after this theory was proposed and experimentally checked, many attempts were carried out to describe such a peak by means of non metallic normal state conduction mechanisms. Although early attempts in this direction failed to give a satisfactory description of the steep increase of resistivity just above T_c [124, 125, 97, 126, 127, 128], recent approaches involving an "activated" behavior of the normal state resistivity seem more promising. It is therefore important to discuss these mechanisms in order to see whether the less traditional description in terms of fluctuations is really necessary. We will here analyze the resonant tunneling model proposed by Abrikosov [130] and a phenomenological model proposed by Yan et al. [37].

According to the model of Abrikosov the ratio between c-axis and ab-plane resistivity is

$$\frac{\rho_c(T)}{\rho_{ab}(T)} = A \frac{\cosh(T_0/T) + \cosh(T_1/T)}{\sinh(T_1/T)} \quad (94)$$

where T_0 and T_1 are respectively the mean energy and the half width of the energy spread of the resonant defects relative to Fermi level. The agreement of this formula with experimental data for both YBCO [130] and BSCCO [33] is very good in the whole temperature range between the temperature T_m at which the ratio of the resistivities shows a maximum, and room temperature. Even when the oxygen concentration in the samples is varied by annealing over a fairly wide range the quality of the fit remains good. However this large-scale agreement of the theory with experiment is not conclusive: re-

ally, the important temperature region for the comparison of normal-state and fluctuation theories of the resistivity peak is very close to T_c . It is here, indeed, that the two approaches are fundamentally different, since the fluctuation theory predicts a weak (logarithmic) divergence of $\rho_c(T)$ at T_c , while *any* normal state theory can at most provide a divergence at $T = 0$ K. If the $\rho_c(T)$ peak is fluctuation induced, therefore, a normal state theory should not be able to reproduce the divergence close to T_c , whilst we know that our fluctuation theory can. The comparison of the two approaches must therefore be carried out by comparing with experimental data the calculated "trends" of $\rho_c(T)$ close to T_c , rather than the absolute values of $\rho_c(T)$.

A closer look at the data on BSCCO [33] shows indeed that the fit with (94) tends to slightly overestimate the experimental data at both high and low temperatures, while underestimating it at intermediate temperatures (except for the oxygen annealed sample, which has a weak peak). Apparently, the fit is forced to increase as much as possible the curvature of the theoretical function to try to match the steep increase in $\rho_c(T)$ just above T_c . It is likely therefore that a good description of the region just above T_c (where fluctuation theory predicts a singular behavior) cannot be given by this model. To better understand this point in [33] the curvatures of the experimental data and of the fitting functions above T_m were compared. The result was that in spite of the apparently good fit of $\rho_c(T)$ in this temperature region, the curvature was strongly underestimated (up to a factor of about 3) by the fitting function for the as grown and argon annealed samples, even if the experimental curvature is partly depressed by the AL fluctuation contribution. Moreover, this underestimation disappears (within experimental resolution) for the sample having the highest oxygen content, which shows only a very weak peak (Fig. 20).

This seems to be a clear indication that the experimental data show a divergent trend at T_c which cannot be reproduced by any normal state theory. Such a divergence is predicted by the DOS contribution and is counterbalanced by the AL fluctuation contribution very near (a few K) to T_c . The gradual reduction in the curvature as the oxygen content is increased is consistent with the higher AL fluctuation contribution expected in less anisotropic samples. For the oxygen annealed sample the divergence is so weak that, within the experimental error, it is indistinguishable from a steep, non divergent behavior and the theory of Abrikosov works well even close to T_c .

It has been pointed out [33] that when $T_0, T_1 \gg T$ as is the case for the fits on both BSCCO and YBCO, (94) reduces to an activated behavior:

$$\rho_c(T)/\rho_{ab}(T) = A [1 + \exp(\Delta/T)] \quad (95)$$

Here $\Delta = T_0 - T_1$ is the energy of the lowest resonant impurity level relative to the Fermi level. Only the difference between T_0 and T_1 is therefore important and not their separate values, to which the fit is insensitive when $T_0, T_1 \gg T$. Eq. (95) is very similar to the semi-phenomenological formula for ρ_c proposed in [37]:

$$\rho_c(T) = A + BT + (C/T) \exp(\Delta/T) \quad (96)$$

(where Δ is some kind of pseudogap). Therefore, in spite of the additional $1/T$ dependence and the presence of four phenomenological parameters which slightly reduce the discrepancy with experimental data, (96) faces the same difficulties as (94) in describing the curvature of $\rho_c(T)$ just above T_c in 2212 BSCCO.

The above discussion leads to the conclusion that in models based on an "activated" behavior for $\rho_c(T)$ the strong divergence of the exponential at $T = 0$ K simulates the weaker divergence of the experimental data at T_c , except in the temperature region very close to T_c . It is then to be expected that these models will give a curvature which is too high when applied to the low T_c compound of the BSCCO family (2201 BSCCO) for which T_c is only about 15 K. Applying (94) to data [2] on 2201 BSCCO crystals indeed gives a very bad fit, as shown in [33]. Moreover, while Eqn.(94) predicts a lower curvature at T_c than that measured in 2212 BSCCO, the opposite is true for 2201 BSCCO.

In conclusion, when $T_c \simeq 100$ K, the curvature of the exponential, which diverges at $T = 0$ K, is not high enough to account for the apparent divergence of the experimental ρ_c just above T_c . On the other hand, when T_c is closer to 0 K, the exponential divergence becomes much higher than the experimental one.

The analysis carried out in the previous paragraph suggests that it will be very difficult for any normal state theory, with a divergence of any kind at $T = 0$ K, to reconcile both situations. The same is not of course true of course if the peak in ρ_c has a superconducting origin such as the DOS fluctuation contribution, whose divergence shifts with T_c , while remaining logarithmic

in shape in all cases. Although the semi-phenomenological formula for ρ_c proposed in [37], i.e. (96) correctly describes the $\rho_c(T)$ curves of the low T_c 2201 BSCCO phase, this is only true for $\Delta = 0$ K, when the exponential divergence is canceled and substituted by the $1/T$ one. In this case, however, the formula loses its significance.

If the DOS fluctuation correction to conductivity is responsible for the $\rho_c(T)$ peak just above T_c , it is clear that the goal of a normal state theory of electrical conductivity along the c axis in layered superconductors is not to give a detailed description of this peak. The normal state resistivity $\rho_{Nc}(T)$ curve must instead lie somewhere below the measured $\rho_c(T)$ one. To find out what a reasonable behavior of $\rho_{Nc}(T)$ would be, compatible with the fluctuation origin of the transverse $\rho_c(T)$ peak, in [33] the calculated contribution due to fluctuations was subtracted from the experimental $\rho_c(T)$, using (91) with values for the parameters taken from literature [32, 35, 40, 150, 151] ($\tau = 2 \cdot 10^{-14}$ s, $\tau_\phi = 2 \cdot 10^{-13}$ s, and $J = 40$ K), while the critical temperature T_c is taken from experimental data. Three simulated $\rho_{Nc}(T)$ curves were calculated for three different values of the Fermi energy E_F (i.e. 0.8 eV, 1.0 eV and 1.25 eV). The Fermi energy is just a scale factor for the global fluctuation contribution to conductivity σ_{fl} , and in order to keep the latter within the limits of validity of the theory underlined in section 6 ($\sigma_{fl} \ll \sigma_N$) it must be assumed to be of the order of 1 eV, somewhat higher than expected in these materials. These curves are plotted in Fig. 21 together with the experimental $\rho_c(T)$ for $T < 150$ K (for $T > 100$ K the theory is however no longer very accurate since the limit $\varepsilon \ll 1$ is not fulfilled). It is interesting that because of the less divergent behavior of the simulated $\rho_{Nc}(T)$ curve as compared to $\rho_c(T)$, simpler functional dependences for $\rho_{Nc}(T)$ could be compatible with it. Some of the theories for normal state transverse conductivity which failed to describe the c-axis resistivity peak could be in this context reconsidered.

We conclude that using the fluctuation theory to describe the transverse resistivity peak in HTS in zero external magnetic field is well justified. A further check of the theory must be sought by adding another parameter, besides temperature, on which the resistivity depends. This can be done by applying an external magnetic field, as described in the next section.

8 The effects of magnetic field

8.1 Introduction

The behavior of the resistivity peak under an external c-axis oriented magnetic field [3] is certainly one of the intriguing anomalies of HTS. As the field intensity is increased, the position of the peak in $\rho_c(T)$ is shifted towards lower temperatures. However above the peak temperature $T_m(B)$, the resistivity curve $\rho_c(T)$ retains the temperature dependence shown in zero field above the peak temperature $T_m(B = 0)$. As a result, the magnitude of the peak in $\rho_c(T)$ increases, and a very strong positive magnetoresistance is observed below $T_m(B = 0)$, as shown in Fig. 22.

The c-axis magnetoresistance shows an even more characteristic behavior above T_{c0} . In contrast to the ab-plane magnetoresistance which is positive at all temperatures, along the c-axis the magnetoresistance has been found to have negative sign not too close to T_{c0} in many HTS compounds - i.e. BSSCO [37, 185, 5, 186], LSSCO [38], YBCO [6] and TlBCCO [152] - and turn to positive values at lower temperatures. We will show how these behaviors find their explanation within the fluctuation theory in the magnetic-field induced suppression of the AL contribution along the c-axis.

In this section we will mainly discuss the relevance of fluctuations in the explanation of c-axis magnetoresistance data in HTS. The in-plane magnetoresistance is less interesting in the framework of this review, since it has already been shown in section 7.2 that in zero magnetic field the DOS contribution to in-plane transport properties is small, at least not too far from T_c . Many authors (see e.g. Refs. [157, 158, 159, 150, 160, 162, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156]) have therefore successfully explained in-plane magnetoresistance data in HTS (including BSCCO) using the AL and MT contributions only [64, 163, 165, 166].

After a review of the theoretical predictions in section 8.2, the experimental study of magnetoresistance above T_{c0} and the role of the DOS fluctuation contribution in it will be discussed in section 8.3. In section 8.3.1 a short survey of in-plane magnetoresistance results is given, then the peculiarities of the c-axis magnetoresistance are analyzed in section 8.3.2. Section 8.4 will be focused on magnetoresistance effects below T_{c0} . A summary and discussion of the informations given by both zero-field and in-field electrical transport measurements presented in sections 7 and 8 will conclude this section.

8.2 Theory of c-axis conductivity in magnetic field

8.2.1 General expressions

The full theoretical treatment of the effect of magnetic field on the fluctuation conductivity of layered superconductors above T_c has been given in [34]. The AL, DOS, regular and anomalous Maki-Thompson fluctuation contributions to the c-axis conductivity are considered there in detail. We recall here the qualitative aspects of the problem and present the results necessary to understand the following sections.

The effect of a magnetic field parallel to the c -axis is considered. For this particular field direction the current vertices do not depend upon the magnetic field, and both the quasiparticles and the pairs form Landau orbits within the layers. The c -axis dispersion remains unchanged from the zero-field form. For this simple field direction, it is elementary to generalize the zero-field results reported in section 6.3 to finite field strengths. One replaces

$$\eta \mathbf{q}^2 \rightarrow \eta (\vec{\nabla}/i - 2e\mathbf{A})^2 \quad (97)$$

in each of the integral expressions for the contributions to the fluctuation conductivity. The two-dimensional integration over \mathbf{q} is replaced by a summation over the Landau levels (indexed by n), taking account of the Landau degeneracy factor in the usual way [34],

$$\int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \rightarrow \frac{B}{\Phi_0} \sum_n = \frac{\beta}{4\pi\eta} \sum_n, \quad (98)$$

where $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. So the general expressions for all fluctuation corrections to c-axis conductivity in magnetic field can be simply written in the form:

$$\sigma_{zz}^{AL} = \frac{e^2 s r^2 \beta}{128\eta} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{[(\varepsilon_B + \beta n)(\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r)]^{3/2}} \quad (99)$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{DOS} = -\frac{e^2 s r \kappa \beta}{16\eta} \sum_{n=0}^{1/\beta} \frac{1}{[(\varepsilon_B + \beta n)(\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}} \quad (100)$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)} = -\frac{e^2 s \tilde{\kappa} \beta}{8\eta} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r/2}{[(\varepsilon_B + \beta n)(\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}} - 1 \right) \quad (101)$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)} = \frac{e^2 s \beta}{16\eta(\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\gamma_B + \beta n + r/2}{[(\gamma_B + \beta n)(\gamma_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}} \right)$$

$$- \frac{\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r/2}{[(\varepsilon_B + \beta n)(\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}} \Big) \quad (102)$$

where $\beta = 4\eta eB = B/[2T_c |dH_{c2}/dT|_{T_c}]$, $\varepsilon_B = \varepsilon + \beta/2$, and $\gamma_B = \gamma_\varphi + \beta/2$.

For the in-plane component of the fluctuation conductivity tensor the only problem appears in the AL diagram, where the matrix elements of the harmonic oscillator type, originating from the $B_{||}$ ($q_{||}$) blocks, have to be calculated. The other contributions are essentially analogous to their c-axis counterparts:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xx}^{AL} = & \frac{e^2}{4s} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1) \Big(\frac{1}{[(\varepsilon_B + \beta n)(\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}} - \\ & \frac{2}{\{[\varepsilon_B + \beta(n+1/2)][\varepsilon_B + \beta(n+1/2) + r]\}^{1/2}} + \\ & \frac{1}{\{[\varepsilon_B + \beta(n+1)][\varepsilon_B + \beta(n+1) + r]\}^{1/2}} \Big), \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

$$\sigma_{xx}^{DOS} + \sigma_{xx}^{MT(reg)} = -\frac{e^2\beta(\kappa + \tilde{\kappa})}{4s} \sum_{n=0}^{1/\beta} \frac{1}{[(\varepsilon_B + \beta n)(\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}}, \quad (104)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xx}^{MT(an)} = & \frac{e^2\beta}{8s(\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Big(\frac{1}{[(\gamma_B + \beta n)(\gamma_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}} - \\ & \frac{1}{[(\varepsilon_B + \beta n)(\varepsilon_B + \beta n + r)]^{1/2}} \Big). \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Note that we have included the DOS and regular MT terms together, as they are proportional to each other for this conductivity tensor element, and the DOS diagram differs from that for the transverse conductivity by the factor $(v_F/sJ)^2$, which measures the square of the ratio of the effective Fermi velocities. The same factor enters into the normal state conductivity, leading to the standard $\sigma_{xx}^N = \frac{1}{2}N(0)e^2v_F^2\tau = E_F\tau e^2/(2\pi s)$. We note that (103) was given previously in [111], using standard procedures [62], and rederived in [63]; the formula (106) was also given previously [63, 64].

These results can in principle be already used for numerical evaluations and fitting of the experimental data. Resistivity curves calculated by (99) (102) using reasonable parameter values are shown in Fig. 23. It can be seen that the simulated behavior is similar to the experimental one reported in Fig. 22.

Nevertheless, it is useful to manipulate formula (102) and (106) algebraically, in order to remove the apparent (but spurious) singularity at $\epsilon = \gamma_\varphi$. The low field expansions of all results (99) - (106) can be calculated in a straightforward way. The analysis of the “strong” field regime $\epsilon \ll \beta \ll 1$ turns out much more sophisticated. In this case, the sums over n for the AL and MT terms converge rapidly, and it is enough to keep only the $n = 0$ term in the sums. For the DOS contribution however the formal logarithmic divergence of the sum requires a little bit more careful treatment. We will deal with these expansions in the next sections.

8.2.2 Weak magnetic field

In the weak field regime ($\beta \ll \epsilon$), we expand the various conductivity contributions in powers of β [34]. Such expansions are simplified by using the Euler-Maclaurin approximation formula,

$$\sum_{n=0}^N f(n) = \int_0^N f(x)dx + \frac{1}{2}[f(N) + f(0)] + \frac{1}{12}[f'(N) - f'(0)] + \dots \quad (106)$$

If one writes the expressions in terms of ϵ_B , terms linear in B will appear. However, writing the expressions in term of the zero-field ϵ , all terms linear in B vanish identically, leaving leading terms of order B^2 . To order $B^2(\beta^2)$, we find

$$\sigma_{zz}^{AL} = \frac{e^2 s}{32\eta} \left[\left(\frac{\epsilon + r/2}{[\epsilon(\epsilon + r)]^{1/2}} - 1 \right) - \frac{\beta^2 r^2 (\epsilon + r/2)}{32[\epsilon(\epsilon + r)]^{5/2}} \right], \quad (107)$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{DOS} = -\frac{e^2 s r \kappa}{16\eta} \left[\ln \left(\frac{2}{\epsilon^{1/2} + (\epsilon + r)^{1/2}} \right)^2 - \frac{\beta^2 (\epsilon + r/2)}{24[\epsilon(\epsilon + r)]^{3/2}} \right], \quad (108)$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{reg})} = -\frac{e^2 s r \tilde{\kappa}}{16\eta} \left[\left(\frac{(\epsilon + r)^{1/2} - \epsilon^{1/2}}{r^{1/2}} \right)^2 - \frac{\beta^2 r}{48[\epsilon(\epsilon + r)]^{3/2}} \right], \quad (109)$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{an})} = \frac{e^2 s}{16\eta} \left[\left(\frac{\epsilon + \gamma_\varphi + r}{[\epsilon(\epsilon + r)]^{1/2} + [\gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{1/2}} - 1 \right) \right] \quad (110)$$

$$- \frac{\beta^2 r^2 (\varepsilon + \gamma_\varphi + r) [\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r) + \gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r) + [\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r) \gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{1/2}]}{96 [\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r) \gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{3/2} ([\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2} + [\gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{1/2})} \Big].$$

In (110), we have assumed $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\beta \ll 1$. Typically, 1 T corresponds to $\beta \simeq 10^{-2}$ so that the low field expansion is often realized in practice.

Using (110), one can find the position of the resistive maximum:

$$\varepsilon_m/r \approx \frac{1}{[8r\kappa]^{1/2}} \left(1 - \frac{5\beta^2\kappa}{3r}\right) - \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{8\kappa} + \frac{1}{16\gamma_\varphi\kappa}. \quad (111)$$

Note that the weak magnetic field reduces T_m by an amount proportional to B^2 .

We now present the low-field expansions for the contributions to the fluctuation conductivity parallel to the layers. Using the same Euler-Maclaurin approximation formula, we obtain

$$\sigma_{xx}^{AL} = \frac{e^2}{16s} \left[\frac{1}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{1/2}} - \frac{\beta^2 [8\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r) + 3r^2]}{32[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{5/2}} \right], \quad (112)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xx}^{DOS} + \sigma_{xx}^{MT(\text{reg})} &= -\frac{e^2(\kappa + \tilde{\kappa})}{4s} \left[2 \ln \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\beta^2(\varepsilon + r/2)}{24[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{3/2}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xx}^{MT(\text{an})} &= \frac{e^2}{8s(\varepsilon - \gamma)} \left[2 \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}{\gamma^{1/2} + (\gamma + r)^{1/2}} \right) - \frac{\beta^2}{24} \left(\frac{\gamma + r/2}{[\gamma(\gamma + r)]^{3/2}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{\varepsilon + r/2}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{3/2}} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

The zero-field term in σ_{xx}^{AL} was first given by Lawrence and Doniach [115], and the term of order β^2 was first obtained explicitly in [64] by inverting the order of the summation over n and the integration over q_z .

8.2.3 The AL and anomalous MT contributions in intermediate and strong fields

We start the discussion of the non-weak magnetic field ($\beta \gg \varepsilon$) from the simplest case of the well converging AL contribution. Performing the summation in (102)-(106) one finds

$$\sigma_{zz}^{AL}(\beta \gg \max\{\varepsilon, r\}) = \frac{7\zeta(3)e^2s}{128\eta} \cdot \frac{r^2}{\beta^2} \quad (115)$$

in the case of strong field and

$$\sigma_{zz}^{AL}(\varepsilon \ll \beta \ll r) = \frac{e^2s}{128\eta} \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{[(n+1/2)]^{3/2}} = \frac{4.57e^2s}{128\eta} \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}} \quad (116)$$

for the intermediate regime which can be realized in the 3D case.

An analogous treatment for the in-plane components results in:

$$\sigma_{xx}^{AL}(\beta \gg \max\{\varepsilon, r\}) = \frac{e^2}{4s\beta} \quad (117)$$

and

$$\sigma_{xx}^{AL}(\varepsilon \ll \beta \ll r) \approx \frac{e^2}{2s} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta r}}. \quad (118)$$

The anomalous MT contribution can be analyzed in the same way, but the situation is a little bit more cumbersome. Here is necessary to distinguish the cases of strong ($\beta \gg \max\{\varepsilon, r, \gamma_\varphi\}$) and several intermediate field regimes ($\varepsilon, \gamma_\varphi \ll \beta \ll r; \varepsilon \ll \beta \ll \gamma_\varphi, r$) which can be realized in the 3D situation. The first limit can be studied in the same way as was done above: the expansion of (102) over β^{-1} permits to evaluate the sum and results in the high field asymptotic:

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}(\varepsilon, \gamma_\varphi, r \ll \beta) = \frac{3\pi^2e^2s}{128\eta} \cdot \frac{(r + \varepsilon + \gamma_\varphi)}{\beta}, \quad (119)$$

In the intermediate cases one finds:

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}(\varepsilon, \gamma_\varphi, \ll \beta \ll r) = \frac{4.57e^2s}{64\eta} \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}, \quad (120)$$

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{an})}(\epsilon \ll \gamma_\varphi \ll \beta \ll r) = \frac{e^2 s}{32\eta} \sqrt{\frac{r}{\gamma_\varphi}} \quad (121)$$

and

$$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(\text{an})}(\epsilon \ll \beta \ll \gamma_\varphi \ll r) \sim \frac{e^2 s}{\eta} \quad (122)$$

The evaluation of the in-plane component gives:

$$\sigma_{xx}^{MT(\text{an})}(\epsilon, \gamma_\varphi, r \ll \beta) = \frac{3\pi^2 e^2}{16s} \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad (123)$$

$$\sigma_{xx}^{MT(\text{an})}(\epsilon, \gamma_\varphi, \ll \beta \ll r) = \frac{4.57e^2}{16s} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta r}} \quad (124)$$

and

$$\sigma_{xx}^{MT(\text{an})}(\epsilon \ll \beta \ll \gamma_\varphi, r) = \frac{e^2}{8s} \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma_\varphi} \cdot \ln \frac{\sqrt{\max\{\gamma_\varphi, r\}}}{\sqrt{\beta} + \sqrt{\beta + r}}. \quad (125)$$

8.2.4 Renormalization of the DOS contribution divergency in intermediate and strong fields

As mentioned in [6], the fit of experimental data with the theory based on the fluctuation renormalization of the one-electron density of states [29, 34] is excellent for weak magnetic fields but meets noticeable difficulties in the region of strong fields. This is due to the formal divergence of the DOS contribution to conductivity and to the dependence of the cut-off parameter on the magnetic field itself [34]. In this section we clarify the problem of the regularization of the DOS contribution in an arbitrary magnetic field

To avoid the problem of the ultraviolet divergence of the DOS contribution with the badly defined cut-off depending on the magnetic field [34] we calculate the cut-off independent difference [92]:

$$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\beta, \epsilon) = \sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\beta, \epsilon) - \sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(0, \epsilon). \quad (126)$$

For this purpose the zero-field value $\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(0, \epsilon)$ [34] may be rewritten in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(0, \epsilon) &= - \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{16\eta} \beta \int_{-1/2}^{1/\beta+1/2} \frac{dn}{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta(n+1/2)} \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta(n+1/2)}} = \\
&= - \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{16\eta} \beta \sum_{n=0}^{1/\beta} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta(n+x+1/2)} \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta(n+x+1/2)}} \\
&= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{16\eta} \sum_{n=0}^{1/\beta} \ln \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta n + \beta} + \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta n + \beta}}{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta n} + \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta n}}, \tag{127}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting expression (127) in (126), for the difference $\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\beta, \epsilon) - \sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(0, \epsilon)$ we may write the following formula, where the summation may be extended up to $N \rightarrow \infty$ since the sum is convergent (the n -th term of the sum is proportional to $n^{-3/2}$ for large n):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta \sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\beta, \epsilon) &= \sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\beta, \epsilon) - \sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(0, \epsilon) = \\
&= \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{16\eta} \beta \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{2}{\beta} \ln \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta n + \beta} + \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta n + \beta}}{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta n} + \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta n}} - \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta n + \beta/2} \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta n + \beta/2}} \right\} \tag{128}
\end{aligned}$$

This expression is very suitable for numerical calculation to analyze experimental data. It permits to obtain easily the asymptotic behavior of magnetoconductivity in the case of non-weak fields (note the inaccuracy of the analysis of this asymptotic in [34]). The case of very strong fields $h \gg \max\{\epsilon, r\}$, in contrast to [34], becomes now trivial: it is mainly determined just by the logarithmically large contribution of the $n = 0$ term in (128) (the contribution of $n \geq 1$ terms is the second in the parentheses below):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta \sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(h \gg \max\{\epsilon, r\}) &= \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{8\eta} \left\{ \ln \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}}{e(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sqrt{\epsilon + r})} + 0, 02 \right\} \approx \\
&\approx \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{8\eta} \cdot \ln \frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sqrt{\epsilon + r}}, \tag{129}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the logarithm $e = 2, 71\dots$

Further analysis of (128) shows that for the intermediate fields in the temperature range of three dimensional fluctuations ($\epsilon \ll \beta \ll r$) the DOS contribution shows the magnetic field dependence $\sim \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{r}}$ in contrast to $\sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}$ in the above discussed AL and MT contributions (nevertheless the magnitude of the former remains smaller than the latter up to $\beta \sim r$):

$$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\epsilon \ll \beta \ll r) = \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{16\eta} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \ln \frac{1 + \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}} \sqrt{n+1}}{1 + \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}} \sqrt{n}} - \right. \quad (130)$$

$$\left. - \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n+1}} \right\} = 0.428 \frac{e^2 sr \kappa}{16\eta} \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}}.$$

In addition to the DOS contribution it is necessary to take into account the regular Maki-Thompson one, which in the case of in-plane component, as we know, has the same sign and functional dependence as the overall $\Delta\sigma_{xx}^{DOS}$ and differs only by the impurity concentration dependent factor $\tilde{\kappa}$ (instead of κ).

In weak fields $\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(\beta \ll r, \epsilon)$ becomes comparable with (127) only in 3D case ($\epsilon \ll r$) and for the dirty or intermediate case ($T\tau \preceq 1$) when $\tilde{\kappa}$ is of the order of κ . In the dirty limit ($T\tau \ll 1$) $\kappa = 2\tilde{\kappa}$ and $\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(\beta \ll r, \epsilon)$ reaches a half of $\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\beta \ll r, \epsilon)$.

The evaluation of the regular Maki-Thompson contribution to magnetoconductivity may be done by the same procedure as in (127) for the analysis of non-weak fields :

$$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(\beta, \epsilon) = -\frac{e^2 s \tilde{\kappa}}{8\eta} \beta \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{\epsilon + \beta(n+1/2) + r/2}{\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta(n+1/2)} \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta(n+1/2)}} - \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{1}{\beta} [\sqrt{\epsilon + \beta(n+1)} \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta(n+1)} - \sqrt{\epsilon + \beta n} \sqrt{\epsilon + r + \beta n}] \right\} \quad (131)$$

For the 3D case in the region of intermediate fields it leads to

$$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(\epsilon \ll h \ll r) = \frac{e^2 sr \tilde{\kappa}}{8\eta} \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \sqrt{2n+2} - \sqrt{2n} - \right. \quad (132)$$

$$\left. - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n+1}} \right\} = 0.428 \frac{e^2 sr \tilde{\kappa}}{8\eta} \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}}.$$

One can see that in this region too the contribution $\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(\epsilon \ll \beta \ll r)$ has the same sign and differs from $\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\epsilon \ll \beta \ll r)$ (see (130)) only by the substitution of κ by $2\tilde{\kappa}$.

This means that for the 3D situation in the case of strong or intermediate ($T\tau \lesssim 1$) impurity concentration $\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(\beta)$ has to be taken into account side by side with $\Delta\sigma_c^{DOS}(\beta)$ for all fields up to $\beta \sim \max\{\epsilon, r\} = r$. In the case of strong scattering ($T\tau \ll 1$) both contributions coincide, while as the impurities concentration increases the role of the regular part of the MT contribution diminishes.

The analysis of (131) in the case of strong field ($\beta \gg \max\{\epsilon, r\}$) leads to

$$\Delta \sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(\beta \gg \max\{\epsilon, r\}) = \quad (133)$$

$$= \frac{e^2 s r \tilde{\kappa}}{16\eta} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\epsilon + r} - \sqrt{\epsilon}}{\sqrt{r}} \right)^2 - \frac{\pi^2 e^2 s \tilde{\kappa}}{128\eta} \cdot \frac{r^2}{\beta}. \quad (134)$$

The comparison of (134) with (129) demonstrates, that in the 3D dirty case it can at least contribute as a constant of the order of 1 in comparison with the large field dependent logarithm of (129). In the 2D case its contribution is negligible at all both in the absolute value and the magnetic field dependence.

8.2.5 Discussion

The results obtained for the c-axis magnetoconductivity are collected in Table 1.

Let us start the analysis from the 2D case ($r \ll \epsilon$) (to visualize them is enough to skip the third column in Table 1). One can see that the positive DOS contribution in the magnetoconductivity turns out to be dominant. It growth as B^2 up to $B_{c2}(\epsilon)$ and then the crossover to a slow logarithmic asymptote takes placed. At $B \sim B_{c2}(0)$ the value of $\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(\beta \sim 1, \epsilon) = -\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}(0, \epsilon)$ which means the total suppression of the fluctuation correction in such a strong field. The regular part of the Maki-Thompson contribution does not manifest itself in this case while the AL term can compete with the DOS one in the immediate vicinity of T_c , where the additional small anisotropy factor r can be compensated by the additional ϵ^3 in denominator. The MT contribution can contribute in the case of small pairbreaking only, which is an opposite to the expecting one in HTS.

In the 3D case ($\epsilon \ll r$) the behavior of the magnetoconductivity is more complex. In weak and intermediate fields the main, negative, contribution to magnetoconductivity occurs from the AL and the MT terms. At $B \sim B_{c2}(\epsilon)$ ($\beta \sim \epsilon$) the paraconductivity is already considerably suppressed by the magnetic field and the β^2 -dependence of the magnetoconductivity changes through the $\sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}$ tendency to the high field asymptote $-\sigma_{zz}^{(fl)}(0, \epsilon)$. In this intermediate region of fields ($\epsilon \ll \beta \ll r$), side by side with the decrease ($\sim \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}$) of the main AL and MT contributions, the growth of the still relatively small DOS term takes place. At the upper border of this region ($\beta \sim r$) its positive contribution is of the same order as the AL one and at high fields ($r \ll \beta \ll 1$) the positive DOS contribution determines the slow logarithmic decay of the fluctuation correction to conductivity which is completely suppressed only at $B \sim B_{c2}(0)$. The regular part of the Maki-Thompson contribution is not of special importance in 3D case. It remains comparable with the DOS contribution in the dirty case at fields $\beta \preceq r$, but decreases rapidly ($\sim \frac{r}{\beta}$) at strong fields ($\beta \succeq r$), in the only region where the robust $\Delta\sigma_c^{DOS}(\beta, \epsilon) \sim \ln \frac{\beta}{r}$ shows up surviving up to $\beta \sim 1$.

The analogous formulae for the in-plane magnetoconductivity are presented in Table 2.

Analyzing this table one can see that almost in all regions the negative AL and MT contributions determine the behaviour of in-plane magnetoconductivity. Nevertheless, similarly to the c-axis case, the high field behavior is again determined by the positive logarithmic $\Delta(\sigma_{xx}^{DOS} + \sigma_{xx}^{MT(reg)})$ contribution, which is the only one to survive in strong field.

It is important to stress that the suppression of the DOS contribution by magnetic field takes place very slowly. Such robustness with respect to the magnetic field is of the same physical origin as the slow logarithmic dependence of the DOS-type corrections on temperature. This difference between the DOS and the Aslamazov-Larkin and Maki-Thompson contributions [164] makes the former noticeable in a wide range of temperatures (up to $\sim 2 - 3T_c$) and magnetic fields ($\sim B_{c2}(0)$). The temperature scale of the suppression of DOS contribution is given by the value of the experimentally observed pseudogap. It is of the order of $\Delta_{pseudo} \sim 2 - 3T_c$ for magnetoconductivity and NMR, $\Delta_{pseudo} \sim \pi T_c$ for tunneling and $\Delta_{pseudo} \sim \tau^{-1}$ for optical conductivity.

8.3 Magnetoresistance above T_c

8.3.1 In-plane magnetoresistance

Soon after the discovery of HTS many investigations of the in-plane paraconductivity have been performed. It turned out that the early results obtained on bulk ceramic samples could be well reproduced in highly oriented thin films and single crystals [133]. A major drawback in the analysis of superconducting fluctuations from the paraconductivity is the need for separating fluctuation and normal-state conductivity contributions in the analysis. Usually, a linear temperature dependence of the resistivity in the normal state is postulated, but such assumption is lacking an undisputed theoretical background. To overcome the above-mentioned problems with the unknown transport properties of the normal-state in HTS, an analysis of the in-plane fluctuation magnetoconductivity above T_c has been proposed [64, 168]. Early studies of the in-plane fluctuation magnetoconductivity on YBCO ceramics, thin films, and single crystals [168, 169, 173, 170, 171, 156, 172, 158, 159, 147, 178, 121, 113], in oxygen-deficient YBCO with $T_c = 55$ K [174], 2212-BSCCO [176, 177, 178, 150, 186, 153], 2223-BSCCO [160, 151], $\text{Tl}_2\text{Ba}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_x$ [175], and $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ [38] were interpreted within the then available phenomenological dirty-limit [64, 63, 163, 179] and clean-limit theories [165] and reanalyzed including non-local corrections [166].

Within the phenomenological theoretical context, four different contributions to $\Delta\sigma_{xx}(B)$ were predicted. As discussed previously, the orbital AL and anomalous MT contributions result from the suppression of the paraconductivity by orbital interaction with a magnetic field. Due to the anisotropic nature of the cuprate superconductors, those effects are prominent with $B \parallel c$ (transverse orientation), but are severely suppressed with $B \parallel j \perp c$ (longitudinal orientation). In addition, an isotropic Zeeman effect on the spins of the fluctuating pairs has been proposed [163], which could dominate the magnetoconductivity of the anisotropic HTS with the magnetic field oriented parallel to the planes and result in two additional contributions, the AL-Zeeman and the anomalous MT-Zeeman terms.

The problem of the amplitude of the anomalous MT contribution in HTS, which could not be satisfactory resolved with paraconductivity analysis, was re-addressed by several authors with the analysis of the in-plane magnetoconductivity. Most authors observed that $\Delta\sigma_{xx}(B)$ with $B \parallel c$ is dominated by

the orbital AL process for $\epsilon < 0.1$, but in optimally-doped YBCO and 2212-BSCCO an additional contribution appears at higher temperatures which was at first associated with a considerable weight of the anomalous MT contribution. An analysis within both the dirty and clean-limit phenomenological models revealed several inconsistencies regarding the resulting value for τ_ϕ [165, 166, 156, 121]. This additional magnetoconductivity is suppressed in Zn-doped YBCO [6, 121], partially Pr-substituted YBCO [184] and in the more impure compounds 2223-BSCCO [160, 151] and oxygen-depleted YBCO [174]. The results obtained by various authors from the analysis of the in-plane magnetoconductivity of YBCO vary for $\xi_{ab}(0)$ from 11 to 18 Å, for $\xi_c(0)$ from 1 to 4.6 Å and, in those cases, where the anomalous MT contribution was detected, for τ_ϕ from 2.2×10^{-16} s to 5.7×10^{-13} s. For YBCO in the 60-K phase the respective values are: $\xi_{ab}(0) = 25$ Å, $\xi_c(0) = 0.9$ Å. In 2212-BSCCO several authors found $\xi_{ab}(0) = 10$ to 38 Å, $\xi_c(0) = 0.1$ to 2.3 Å, and $\tau_\phi = 0.13$ to 7.5×10^{-14} s. Only few results are available for other compounds, like 2223-BSCCO, with $\xi_{ab}(0) = 16$ Å, $\xi_c(0) = 1.4$ Å, $\text{Ti}_2\text{Ba}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_x$ with $\xi_{ab}(0) = 11.8$ Å, $\xi_c(0) = 0.12$ Å, $\tau_\phi = 2.9 \times 10^{-14}$ s, and $\text{La}_{1.85}\text{Sr}_{0.15}\text{CuO}_4$ with $\xi_{ab}(0) = 28$ Å and $\xi_c(0) = 1.4$ Å. In general the values obtained from the in-plane magnetoconductivity analysis agree well with those from other experimental methods, but the scatter in the results for τ_ϕ is quite large.

On the other hand, measurements of the in-plane magnetoresistance in YBCO single crystals near and above room temperature revealed an unconventional $\Delta\rho/\rho_0 \equiv (\rho_{xx}(B) - \rho_{xx}(0))/\rho_{xx}(0) \sim T^{-4}$ temperature dependence, which the authors attributed to the cyclotronic motion of normal-state quasiparticles. They proposed that in a fourfold-symmetric, two-dimensional metal the orbital magnetoresistance and the Hall effect measure the variance and the mean of the local Hall angle along the Fermi surface, respectively. Hence, the temperature dependence of the normal-state magnetoresistance is $\Delta\rho/\rho_0 = A \tan^2 \theta_H$, where $\tan \theta_H$ is the Hall angle in the material and $A = 1.7$ for YBCO [180]. However, superconducting fluctuations were entirely neglected in this analysis. Using these results and magnetoresistance data from YBCO thin films it was shown that neither the fluctuation picture alone nor the normal-state magnetoresistance can account for the data from about T_c to above room temperature [187] and it was proposed that the quasiparticle magnetoresistance resembles the anomalous MT contribution [156, 154]. In Fig. 24 it can be noticed that in fact the combination of

the four fluctuation contributions, the orbital AL and anomalous MT, and the respective Zeeman effects (ALO+ALZ+MTO+MTZ) fails to fit the data above $2T_c$. It should be noted that using the full theory outlined in the previous chapters (including the DOS and regular MT expressions) instead of the phenomenological model would not resolve this discrepancy. As an alternate scenario it was proposed that the magnetoconductivity close to T_c is dominated by the orbital AL term, with a crossover to the normal-state magnetoconductivity $\Delta\sigma_{xx} \cong -\Delta\rho/\rho^2$ at $\epsilon > 0.2$ (see Fig. 24). In this case the AL Zeeman and the DOS contributions, which are expected to gain importance relative to the orbital AL term at higher temperatures are masked by the normal-state magnetoresistance. Similar results were recently obtained on YBCO single crystals [121]. In this context the large scatter of the results for τ_ϕ and the apparent absence of the anomalous MT contribution in several materials rather reflect different shapes of the Fermi surface, resulting in a variation of the parameter A , i.e. a different ratio between the normal-state magnetoresistance and the Hall angle.

As can be seen from the previous paragraph, the DOS contribution is unlikely to have significance for the in-plane magnetoresistance of HTS as far as $B \parallel c$ is concerned. In the longitudinal orientation however, the orbital terms are suppressed due to the anisotropy of the cuprates and the normal-state magnetoresistance due to the absence of the Lorentz force on the quasiparticles, respectively, and, thus, the Zeeman terms become dominant. The results available for this geometry [169, 172, 162, 121, 174, 186, 153, 175] are not entirely conclusive, probably due to the required very accurate orientation of the magnetic field parallel to the CuO_2 planes. Some authors report a good accordance with the AL Zeeman term only. The anomalous MT Zeeman effect can be supposed to be negligible if the corresponding orbital anomalous MT contribution is not strong, a fact which is now well agreed for the cuprates. As mentioned in section 8.3.2, a DOS Zeeman process is needed to explain the longitudinal out-of-plane magnetoresistance data above T_c . Accordingly, the DOS Zeeman term can be expected to induce a sign change from negative to positive magnetoconductivity at temperatures considerably above T_c . Apart from a single report [153] this has not been observed so far. Certainly the application of the DOS effect to the in-plane magnetoresistance needs more attention in future.

Finally, two other effects commonly associated with the in-plane magnetoresistance are worth mentioning. It was shown that the sample shape, in

particular the usually almost square geometry of single crystals, has considerable influence on the in-plane magnetoresistance at higher temperatures due to bending of the carrier trajectories [181]. Thus, evaluations of the magnetoresistance in this temperature region have to be regarded with some caution. On the other hand, a large increase of the in-plane magnetoconductivity above theoretical predictions close to T_c , which was observed by several authors, can be naturally explained by a non-uniform T_c in the samples [182]. It was shown that measurements of the magnetoresistance in fact can serve as a very sensitive probe for T_c inhomogeneities in HTS [183].

8.3.2 Out-of-plane magnetoresistance

We will now address the problem of the origin of the negative out of plane magnetoresistance above T_{c0} , discussed in the Introduction. The negative c -axis magnetoresistance of *BSCCO* single crystals was first observed in [185] and then carefully measured in [37] (see Fig. 25) at temperatures above 95 *K*, where it was qualitatively interpreted in terms of the holon and spinon model by Anderson [124]. However, this analysis is not quantitative and is based on the phenomenological assumption of an "activated" behavior for $\rho_c(T)$, which in the previous section has been shown to be unsatisfactory.

On the other hand, from the data reported in [37] it can be seen that the effect becomes significant below approximately 140 *K* and its magnitude increases dramatically as the temperature goes down to 95 *K*. This temperature range is the same as that observed for the fluctuation induced *positive* ab-plane magnetoresistance, which naturally leads [40] to the hypothesis that fluctuations are also responsible for the negative c -axis magnetoresistance. Since the DOS fluctuation contribution is held responsible for the peak in $\rho_c(T)$, its contribution to magnetoresistance cannot be neglected and may determine its sign. This contribution is indeed expected to be *negative* in sign, since a suppression of the DOS contribution by the magnetic field would give a decrease of the resistivity. In the temperature region where the DOS contribution dominates over the AL one, a negative fluctuation induced c -axis magnetoresistance is therefore conceivable. All the features of the observed magnetoresistance are therefore consistent with its attribution to fluctuations, with a key role played by the DOS contribution. Starting from (110) the following expression for the fluctuation c -axis magnetoresistivity close to T_c in the presence of weak magnetic fields (this assumption is fulfilled in the

experiment reported in [37]) has been found [40]:

$$\frac{\rho_c(B, T) - \rho_c(0, T)}{\rho_c(0, T)} = 2.92 \cdot 10^{16} \rho_c(B, T) f(T) B^2, \quad (135)$$

The temperature dependence is mainly included in the factor $f(T)$:

$$\begin{aligned} f(T) = & \frac{s\eta r^2}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)]^{3/2}} \left\{ \frac{3(\varepsilon + r/2)}{\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)} - 8k \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{r} + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{k}}{k} \right) \right] + \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{2(\varepsilon + \gamma_\varphi + r) \left\{ \varepsilon(\varepsilon + r) + \gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r) + [\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r)\gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{1/2} \right\}}{[\gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r)]^{3/2} [(\varepsilon(\varepsilon + r))^{1/2} + (\gamma_\varphi(\gamma_\varphi + r))^{1/2}]} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (136)$$

Here cgs units are used except for the magnetic field B (measured in Tesla) and the resistivity $\rho_c(B, T)$ (measured in Ωcm).

The first term in (136) represents the AL contribution, the second is the sum of DOS and regular MT contributions and the third is the anomalous MT one. The fit of (135) with the experimental data was performed in [40] using as adjustable parameters v_F, τ and the phase pair-breaking lifetime τ_ϕ . The values of the interlayer spacing $s \approx 10^{-7} cm$ and of the hopping integral $J \approx 40 K$ were taken from literature data [32], since they are not likely to vary strongly from sample to sample (at least for BSCCO samples with metallic behavior far from T_c), while $\rho_c(B, T)$ and $T_c \cong 85 K$ have been extracted from the experimental curves.

The results of the fit performed using (135) for the magnetoresistance curves are shown in (Fig. 26). The curves measured at $T = 95 K$ and $T = 100 K$ were fitted simultaneously (i.e. using the same values of the fitting parameters for both curves) to put more constraints on the fitting procedure. Those measured at $T = 105 K$ and higher temperatures were not considered in the fit because they lie outside the temperature region $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in which the theory is quantitatively accurate (at $105 K, \varepsilon = 0.21$). However, the theoretical curve at $105 K$ has been drawn in Fig. 26 using the values of v_F, τ and τ_ϕ found for the curves at $95 K$ and $100 K$ in order to show that, even at higher temperatures, the calculated temperature dependence of the transverse magnetoresistance is in substantial agreement with the experimental data.

The values of the fitting parameters were $v_F = 3.1 \times 10^6 \text{ cm/s}$, $\tau = 1.0 \cdot 10^{-14} \text{ s}$ and $\tau_\phi = 8.7 \cdot 10^{-14} \text{ s}$.

While the field dependence of the magnetoconductivity is simply B^2 , at least for moderate fields, its behavior with temperature, given by (136), is much more interesting. On the basis of (136) and using the above values for the fitting parameters, the expected temperature dependence of the transverse magnetoresistance has been calculated in [40] (see Fig. 27). The existence of an inversion temperature T_r at which a reversal of the sign of magnetoconductivity occurs is predicted. The physical origin of this change of sign is the same as for the appearance of the peak discussed in Section 6.1 : relatively far from T_c the AL negative magnetoconductivity is suppressed by its dependence on the square of the transparency and the positive DOS contribution dominate, while very close to T_c the very singular temperature dependence of the negative AL contribution ($\sim \varepsilon^{-4}$) makes it prevail over the less singular DOS one ($\sim \varepsilon^{-2}$), despite the latter's linear dependence upon transparency.

Last years the problem of the out of plane magnetoresistivity has been studied experimentally very carefully [5, 186, 187, 6]. Hashimoto et al. [5] measured the c-axis magnetoresistance of BSCCO single crystals in fields up to 30 T and found results similar to [37], except that at very high fields/low temperatures the field behavior is no longer concave, as can be expected from [34]). They fitted the experimental data to the original theory of Ioffe et al. [29] (which is valid only in the clean case) but including magnetic field and renormalization effects on the mass term. The agreement between theory and experiment is good for fields up to about 10 T , although at higher fields the measured magnetoresistance is higher than expected. Fitting parameters were the ratio $T_c/T_{c0} = 0.84$ (T_{c0} being the mean field critical temperature), the in-plane coherence length $\xi_{\parallel}(0) = 16 \text{ \AA}$ and the effective mass $m_{ab} = 3.6$, τ having been fixed to $1.2 \cdot 10^{-13} \text{ s}$ to match the clean limit assumption.

In [186] the negative c-axis magnetoresistance of BSCCO single crystals was again observed at temperatures higher than 100 K . The fit of experimental data was performed using AL and DOS terms only, with parameters $T_c = 93.5 \text{ K}$, $\tau = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-14} \text{ s}$, $\xi_{\parallel}(0) = 14 \text{ \AA}$ and $\xi_{\perp}(0) = 0.12 \text{ \AA}$. The unphysically low value of $\xi_{\perp}(0)$ was attributed to the possible overestimation of the intrinsic resistivity due to the influence of microcracks perpendicular to the crystal c-axis. The fit was anyway very good, except for a slight overestimation of the effect at the lowest temperature used ($T = 100 \text{ K}$). In a

later paper [187] the authors extended their analysis to include both longitudinal and transverse in-plane magnetoresistance data measured on the same sample in the fit. With the addition of an AL Zeeman term (necessary to describe in-plane longitudinal magnetoresistance, in which the other terms are suppressed), the experimental data were described very well for $B = 12\text{ T}$ in an extremely wide temperature range (up to about $2T_c$) using as parameters $v_F = 2.2 \times 10^7\text{ cm/s}$, $\tau = 1 \cdot 10^{-14}\text{ s}$ and $J = 4\text{ K}$.

In [6] the transverse magnetoresistance was measured down to temperatures close to T_c in two YBCO single crystals in different oxygenation states and with different twin densities. After corrections for the inhomogeneous current distribution the measured magnetoconductivity for $B = 12\text{ T}$ was fitted with (102), employing a weighted cutoff for the sum in the DOS contribution to smooth the field dependence of the calculated values. Its temperature dependence was found to follow the behavior shown in Fig. 28 and the existence of a sign reversal temperature was unambiguously confirmed at about 10 K above T_c . Assuming $v_F = 2 \cdot 10^7\text{ cm/s}$ and the temperature dependence $\tau = \tau_\phi \sim 1/T$ the fitting parameters were $\tau(100\text{ K}) = \tau_\phi(100\text{ K}) = (4 \pm 1) \cdot 10^{-15}\text{ s}$, $J = (215 \pm 10)\text{ K}$.

We point out that although YBCO generally shows a weak transverse resistivity peak because of its relatively small anisotropy, the different temperature dependences of the AL and DOS terms allow for a negative total magnetoresistance. This occurs at higher temperatures than for BSCCO, making the observation of the change of sign easier.

In [6] the sign reversal of magnetoresistance in HTS was proved, but the smallness of the negative magnetoresistance did not allow for a precise quantitative check of the predictions of the fluctuation theory. Very recently, similar measurements have been performed on single crystals of the very anisotropic Tl 2223 compound [152]. A strong negative magnetoresistance is observed a few degrees above T_c , initially increasing as temperature is decreased and then turning to positive as T_c is approached. In this extremely anisotropic compound this effect is very pronounced, so that the relative experimental errors on the data are very small. It turns out that the fit of the data with the fluctuation theory including the DOS contribution is excellent, the theoretical behavior being perfectly reproduced with quite reasonable values of the fitting parameters.

There is therefore now increasing evidence that the negative c-axis magnetoresistance observed in many HTS is really connected with the DOS fluc-

tuation contribution. The competition among the DOS and AL fluctuation contributions leads to the negative c-axis magnetoresistance observed above T_c and to its change of sign in the vicinity of T_c .

8.4 Fluctuation magnetoresistance below T_c

In this section we analyze the role of the DOS fluctuation contribution in the behavior of $\rho_c(H, T)$ below the zero field critical temperature T_{c0} , and the associated increase of the c-axis resistance peak with magnetic field. This effect was first measured by Briceno et al. [3] and then analyzed by several authors.

The main features observed are:

- 1) a well pronounced maximum at zero field in the $\rho_c(T)$ behavior;
- 2) a very strong shift of the zero resistance temperature in external magnetic field ($\Delta T_c \sim 30$ K already for $B \sim 1$ T)
- 3) a large broadening of the peak for nonzero magnetic fields with the appearance of a long resistivity tail for higher fields and a large associated positive magnetoresistance.

Kim and Gray [30] explained the broadening of the peak with increasing magnetic field in terms of Josephson coupling, describing a layered superconductor as a stack of Josephson junctions. The growth of the resistance above the transition was attributed to the DOS fluctuation contribution. The results obtained by the Kim and Gray model are interesting, and its agreement with experimental data is good, as seen in Fig. 29, but their approach introduces another element in the discussion beyond fluctuations and lacks a full microscopic foundation. The field dependence of ρ_c is described assuming that phase slips in layered superconductors are identical to phase slips in a single Josephson junction having area Φ_0/B . It has been remarked [188] that this model is inadequate to describe the field dependence of the activation energy extracted from resistivity curves in the low temperature region.

In [35] the first attempt to describe the experimental $\rho_c(T, H)$ curves for perpendicular magnetic fields up to 8 T using only the fluctuation theory was undertaken. The first step was to fit the zero-field data in the temperature range from 92 K to 115 K (which corresponds to $0.02 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.25$) with the fluctuation theory using (102). The values obtained for the fitting parameters were $\tau = (5.6 \pm 0.6) \cdot 10^{-14}$ s, $\tau_\phi = (8.6 \pm 1.4) \cdot 10^{-13}$ s, $E_F = (1.07 \pm 0.12)$ eV and $J = (43 \pm 4)$ K ($T_{c0} = 89.8$ K was taken as the midpoint

of the transition). Keeping these parameters fixed, the data measured in a magnetic field were then fitted using the field parameter β as a fitting parameter. It was found that to reproduce the shape of the peak the critical temperature $T_c(B)$ also had to be used as a fitting parameter, because the mean-field $T_c(B)$ incorporated with (102) appeared to be unable to describe the strong shift of the peak in magnetic field. With this correction the theory satisfactorily describes the resistivity behavior for weak fields $B < 1\text{ T}$, while at higher fields the strong broadening of the peak cannot be reproduced. It appears from Fig. 30 that (102) are able to fit the experimental data only for temperatures above the temperature $T_m(B)$ corresponding to the maximum in ρ_c . For $T < T_m(B)$ the experimental data decrease much more slowly than expected from the theory, and this discrepancy increases with increasing field strength.

This lack of agreement is not surprising. The first reason is the absence of critical fluctuations in the above treatment. As it was shown in Refs. [189, 190], the extension of fluctuation theory beyond the Gaussian approximation results in a shift of $T_c(B)$ to zero temperature with a corresponding broadening of the transition, which increases strongly with increasing magnetic field strength in qualitative agreement with experimental data. Another reason for peak broadening is the presence of a complex vortex structure which leads to an additional dissipation in the mixed state. However, it can be noticed that the broadening of the superconducting transition in HTS in the presence of an external magnetic field is quantitatively very similar for in-plane and c-axis experiments. This in spite of the quite pronounced qualitative difference, i.e. the presence of the resistivity peak in c-axis measurements as opposed to the monotonic decrease of in-plane resistivity with decreasing temperature. This suggests a common, intrinsic origin for this broadening, which in view of the results reported above and in the previous sections, could be attributed to fluctuations.

The possibility of describing the shape of the transverse resistivity peak in presence of an external magnetic field within the fluctuation theory using the Hartree approximation instead of the Gaussian one was analyzed in [36]. Here, (102) were modified within the self-consistent Hartree approximation developed by Ullah and Dorsey [190], in which ε_B is renormalized according

to self-consistent equation [190]:

$$\varepsilon_B = \tilde{\varepsilon}_B - \frac{1}{4} Gi^2 t \beta \sum_{n=0}^{1/\beta} \frac{1}{[(\tilde{\varepsilon}_B + \beta n)(\tilde{\varepsilon}_B + \beta(n+1) + r)]^{1/2}} \quad (137)$$

where $Gi = 2\pi T_c(0)/H_c(0)s\xi_{ab}^2(0)$ is the Ginzburg number ($H_c(0)$ is the zero-temperature thermodynamical critical field and $\xi_{ab}(0)$ is the zero-temperature Ginzburg-Landau coherence length in the ab -plane).

In this paper the authors report simultaneous measurements of both the in-plane and the out-of-plane resistivities of BSCCO films in magnetic fields up to 1 T. Measuring both $\rho_{ab}(T, B)$ and $\rho_c(T, B)$ on the same films allows them to use the same set of microscopical parameters for all curves, thus putting more constraints on the fitting procedure. They found that both $\rho_{ab}(T, B)$ and $\rho_c(T, B)$ are in remarkable agreement with the fluctuation theory in a very wide range of temperatures both below and above T_c . This gives a strong evidence in favor of the fluctuation origin of the transverse resistance peak.

Figures 31(a) and 31(b) show the $\rho_{ab}(T)$ and $\rho_c(T)$ dependences respectively for several applied magnetic fields in Ref.([36]). The curves were fitted with the formula $\rho = 1/(\sigma_N + \sigma_{fl})$. Here $\sigma_{fl} = \sigma^{AL} + \sigma^{DOS}$ is the fluctuation conductivity obtained replacing ε_B with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_B$ in (102) and neglecting the Maki-Thompson contribution, while $\rho_N = 1/\sigma_N$ is the normal-state resistivity which was assumed to be linear and extrapolated from the temperature range 150-200 K for both components of resistivity. The zero-field curves $\rho_{ab}(T, 0)$ and $\rho_c(T, 0)$ were fitted by the above equation with two free parameters, s and r . This procedure gave $s = (15 \pm 2) \text{ \AA}$ and $r = (5.0 \pm 0.6) \cdot 10^{-3}$ for both directions. These parameters were then kept fixed while the fit was performed for finite-field data using as free parameters β (field dependent) and Gi (field independent). This procedure provides a uniquely determined set of parameters for both components of the resistivity tensor. It was found that $Gi = 0.12 \pm 0.01$ for all curves, in agreement with estimates from microscopic parameters, while $\beta = B/[2T_c |dH_{c2}/dT|_{T_c}]$ (Eq.(35) in [34] must be corrected) was correctly found to vary linearly with the applied field, as expected, yielding a slope of the upper critical field of about 1 T/K at T_c . The agreement between theory and experimental data is remarkable, given the number of curves fitted the small number of free parameters used and the considerable qualitative and quantitative differences among in-plane and

transverse resistivity behaviors. The fit is unexpectedly good even down to temperatures at which the resistivity falls below about 10% of normal state value, i.e. a region where vortex dynamics is generally assumed to be the main source of dissipation.

Soon after similar conclusions were reached using a different approach [191]. It was reported that the ab-plane resistivity of YBCO films and crystals in external magnetic field could be well fitted down to low resistance values using the fluctuation theory developed by Ikeda et al. [192] in the Hartree approximation. In the same region a scaling law of the resistivity curves for different orientations of the magnetic field is valid. This, and the comparison of the similarities and differences among the behavior of films and crystals, leads to the conclusion that in a wide region of the H-T plane the dissipation is due only to intrinsic properties (fluctuations) and only at lower temperatures pinning-related dissipation processes take place.

There is convincing evidence, therefore, that the fluctuation theory in the Hartree approximation is able to describe very well the experimental $\rho_{ab}(T, B)$ and $\rho_c(T, B)$ curves, using consistent values for the fitting parameters for both current flow directions. There are clues that highly anisotropic layered superconductors can be described as a normal, strongly fluctuating phase rather than a superconducting mixed phase down to very low temperatures, possibly leading to a reconsideration of the role of vortex dynamics in these compounds.

To conclude this section, we want to mention again the paper by Nakao et al. [185] in which the resistance of a BSCCO single crystal was measured by sweeping an external magnetic field up to 40 T at a constant temperature. Below T_{c0} a peculiar behavior was observed, the resistance initially increasing steeply with field, then levelling off and finally decreasing in very high fields (Fig. 32(a)). This behavior (later observed also in [37, 193]) can be ascribed to the combined effect of the magnetic field induced destruction of the phase coherence between layers and the suppression of the DOS. Indeed, curves simulated using the fluctuation theory in [185] show a behavior very similar to the observed one (Fig. 32(b)).

8.5 Final remarks

At the end of this survey of conductivity and magnetoconductivity measurements explained in terms of the DOS fluctuation contribution, we want to

make some comments about the values of the parameters extracted from the fits by the various authors.

The variety of experiments on c-axis electrical transport properties which can be quantitatively explained by fluctuation theory alone convinces one of the substantial correctness of this approach. It must also be stressed that in this fluctuation theory all parameters have a well defined physical meaning, no phenomenological parameter ever being used. The reasonable values obtained for the physical parameters involved in the theory are an important check of the consistency of the theory itself. However, the values of the microscopic parameters found in the literature are not always fully compatible.

There are many obvious reasons for a certain scatter of the values of microscopic parameters found by comparing the results of several papers, apart from the intrinsic uncertainties. It can be ascribed both to differences among the samples used (single crystals vs. films, different oxygenation states) and to differences in the methods used to compute ρ_c from voltage drop measurements (see e.g. [32, 6]). Some uncertainty in the values of the fitting parameters is due to the rather arbitrary choice of additional parameters which are simply deduced from experimental data or taken from literature data and, apart from magnetoresistance measurements, the linearly extrapolated normal state resistance behavior. Also, the weak temperature dependencies of τ and τ_ϕ in the narrow temperature range considered have been neglected by some authors but estimated as $\sim 1/T$ by others, and formulae containing different approximations have been used in different papers. Finally, other physical effects can partially contribute to the observed phenomena.

In spite of this, we generally find a good overall agreement among the sets of parameters. For BSCCO (there are not enough papers concerning YBCO), τ is the range $1 \div 5 \cdot 10^{-14}$ s, while τ_ϕ varies over one order of magnitude from $8 \cdot 10^{-14}$ s to $8 \cdot 10^{-13}$ s. However, τ_ϕ only enters in the small Maki-Thompson term, so that the uncertainty on this parameter is likely to be rather large. E_F and v_F have a similar role in the fits (they define only the scale for the fluctuation conductivity) but cannot be directly compared. To provide indicative reference values for E_F we repeated the fits performed in Refs [32, 40] using the same formulae as in [35]. E_F is introduced in the formulae instead of v_F through the expression for the normal state conductivity, thus avoiding this source of error too. It turns out that for [32] (resistivity data on films) $\tau = 3.0 \cdot 10^{-14}$ s, $\tau_\phi = 3.6 \cdot 10^{-13}$ s and $E_F = 1.07$ eV, while for the

magnetoresistance data of single crystals analyzed in [40] $\tau = 0.9 \cdot 10^{-14} \text{ s}$, $\tau_\phi = 7.8 \cdot 10^{-14} \text{ s}$ and $E_F = 0.25 \text{ eV}$, values to be compared with those found in [35]. A big discrepancy is instead found among the values for J . However, it must be noticed that the estimate $J = 40 \text{ K}$ used by some authors was deduced from in-plane measurements in overdoped samples [32, 194], while the fitting value $J = 4 \text{ K}$ refers to c-axis measurements on samples optimally doped for the highest T_c and showing a very pronounced peak.

We have collected the parameters following from the analysis of the c-axis magnetoresistance in Table 3¹⁰.

It can be seen that τ is almost always close to $2 \cdot 10^{-14} \text{ s}$, which is a widely accepted value in the intermediate region between clean and dirty limits, while the ratio τ_ϕ/τ is always about 10, in good agreement with the expected one [34]. The τ_ϕ values imply that the pair-breaking in *BSCCO* has a moderate strength, which is consistent with several papers (see section 8.2) where it was shown that the AL term alone describes adequately the fluctuation contribution to the in-plane conductivity in *BSCCO*. The regular MT contribution is negligible in the clean and intermediate cases, while the relative importance of the anomalous MT contribution depends upon the relationship between γ_ϕ and r . For the parameters found above $\gamma_\phi \approx 5 \text{ } r$ which still corresponds to moderate pair-breaking, but closer to the weak limit. This is the reason why it usually suffices to consider only the AL contribution. As for the Fermi energy value, which being a scale factor is most influenced by the experimental conditions (oxygenation state, methods for calculating resistivity, etc.), it lies within a factor of 2 around 0.5 eV , in good agreement with the estimate given in [33] and not too far from that calculated using band structure calculations and photoemission measurements.

Comparing the values of parameters extracted using (102), it must also be noticed that these equations are used to describe both the zero-field corrections leading to the existence of the resistivity peak (i.e. a change in conductivity of the order of 20% in typical *BSCCO* films) and the small magnetoresistance corrections (i.e. an effect of the order of 0.1%), thus span-

^{10*} means that the parameters were recalculated by the authors of the review on the basis of the complete theory presented here; (x) means that this parameter was not used as a fitting one but was taken by authors from literature; x means that this parameter has been recalculated by the authors of the review from the original parameters presented by the authors of the article

ning more than two orders of magnitude. The consistency of the values for the fitting parameters, and especially those which only give the scale of the corrections (e.g. E_F) is much better than that.

We can conclude that the number of unexpected experimental facts concerning the electrical transport properties of HTS for which the fluctuation theory provides a quantitative explanation without any other additional assumption is impressive. Moreover, the theory uses no phenomenological parameter and, apart from a reasonable scatter of the values of the physical parameters involved, these values are certainly acceptable. No other theory at present has achieved so many successes in this field.

9 The fluctuation induced pseudogap in HTS

9.1 Introduction

The observations of pseudo-gap like phenomena in the normal state of HTS is currently one of the most debated problems. Among these an important place is occupied by measurements [8, 9] of the c -axis reflectivity spectra, in the FIR region on $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$ single crystals. With the decrease of temperature the c -axis optical conductivity decreases showing around $180K$ a transition from a Drude-like to a pseudogap-like behavior. The value of gap is $\omega_0 \sim 180cm^{-1}$ and it seems weakly dependent on temperature. The decrease of temperature does the gap structure more pronounced without any abrupt change at the superconducting transition temperature $T_c = 80K$.

There are many hypotheses concerning the origin of this pseudo-gap. We will show below that it can also be explained by the suppression of the one-electron density of states on the Fermi level due to the interelectron interaction. It will be demonstrated that the relatively low electromagnetic wave frequencies suppress the main positive AL and MT terms, while leaving almost unaffected the negative DOS contribution. This means that noticeable changes will occur in the electromagnetic wave reflectivity at frequencies well before the value $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$ expected for a Drude term. The positive AL and anomalous MT contributions show frequency dependence when $\omega \sim \min\{T - T_c, \tau_\varphi^{-1}\}$ [55, 195], whilst the negative DOS contribution shows dependence on scale $\omega \sim \min\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$. This competition results in the rapid decay of the dissipative processes at frequencies of the order of $\omega \sim T - T_c$ and in the appearance of a transparency window up to $\omega \sim \min\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$. The high frequency behavior of $\text{Re}[\sigma(\omega)]$ is mostly governed by $\sigma^n(\omega)$ which decreases, in agreement with the Drude law, for $\omega \geq \tau^{-1}$.

Below we will study the **a.c.** fluctuation conductivity tensor for a layered superconductor taking into account all contributions and paying attention to the most interesting case of c -axis polarization of the field. Nevertheless, for completeness, the ab -plane results of the old paper of Aslamazov and Varlamov [55] will be re-examined and discussed in application to the novel HTS layered systems.

9.2 Paraconductivity

The optical conductivity of a layered superconductor can be expressed by the same analytical continuation of the current-current correlator (electromagnetic response operator) $Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(R)}(\omega)$ as in the section 6 but in contrast to d.c. conductivity case, calculated without the assumption $\omega \rightarrow 0$:

$$\text{Re}[\sigma_{\alpha\beta}(\omega)] = -\frac{\text{Im}[Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(R)}(\omega)]}{\omega} \quad (138)$$

One can see that the calculations are analogous to those for the d.c. fluctuation conductivity, discussed in section 6.4, but here we cannot treat the external frequency as a small parameter. We will use the same model and definitions introduced in section 6.

Let us start with the AL contribution (diagram 1 of Fig. 9) to the **a.c.** fluctuation conductivity. The general expression for the appropriate contribution to the electromagnetic response operator as a function of the Matsubara frequencies of the external electromagnetic field ω_ν is defined by (67).

In the vicinity of T_c , for frequencies $\omega \ll T$, the leading singular contribution to the response operator $Q_{\alpha\beta}^{AL(R)}$ arises from the fluctuation propagators in (67) rather than from the frequency dependencies of the B_α blocks, so it suffices to neglect its frequency dependencies [55], as was done for the d.c. case. Carrying out the same calculations as in section 6.4 but without the limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$, one can find the explicit expression for the imaginary part of the retarded electromagnetic response operator ¹¹ for real frequencies $\omega \ll T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}[Q_{\perp}^{AL(R)}(\omega)] &= \frac{e^2 T}{4\pi s} \left(\frac{s^2}{\eta} \right) \left(\frac{16T_c}{\pi\omega} \right) \text{Re} \left\{ \left(\frac{\pi\omega}{16T_c} \right)^2 - \left(\varepsilon - \frac{i\pi\omega}{16T_c} + \frac{r}{2} \right) \times \right. \\ &\times \left. \left[\Delta D_2 \left(\varepsilon - \frac{i\pi\omega}{16T_c} \right) - \left(\frac{r}{2} \right)^2 \Delta D_1 \left(\varepsilon - \frac{i\pi\omega}{16T_c} \right) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

¹¹It is necessary to mention that the direct calculation of the expression (67) leads to the appearance of divergent expressions in the $\text{Re}Q$. Nevertheless, as it was shown in [55], the thorough summation of all diagrams from the first order of the perturbation theory for Q before momentum integration leads to the exact cancellation of $\text{Re}[Q^{\text{fl}}(0)]$. This fact justifies the possibility of the further calculation of different diagrammatic terms to Q^{fl} separately.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im} \left[Q_{\parallel}^{AL(R)}(\omega) \right] &= \frac{2e^2 T}{\pi s} \text{Im} \left\{ \left[1 + i \left(\frac{16T_c}{\pi\omega} \right) \left(\varepsilon + \frac{r}{2} \right) \right] \times \right. \\ &\times \left. \left[\Delta D_1 \left(\varepsilon - \frac{i\pi\omega}{16T_c} \right) \right] + i \left(\frac{16T_c}{\pi\omega} \right) \left[\Delta D_2 \left(\varepsilon - \frac{i\pi\omega}{16T_c} \right) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

where $D_1(z) = 2 \ln \left[\sqrt{z} + \sqrt{(z+r)} \right]$, $D_2(z) = -\sqrt{z(z+r)}$, $\Delta D_1(z) = D_1(z) - D_1(\varepsilon)$, $\Delta D_2(z) = D_2(z) - D_2(\varepsilon)$ and $r = 4\eta J^2/v_F^2$.

The expressions presented above solve the problem of the frequency dependence of the paraconductivity tensor in the general form for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\omega \leq T$ for an arbitrary relation between ε , r and ω , but they are too cumbersome.

We concentrate therefore on the most interesting case of $2D$ fluctuations where $\xi_c(T) \ll s$ ($r \ll \varepsilon$). σ_{\perp}^{AL} turns out to be suppressed by the necessity of the independent tunneling of each electron participating in the fluctuation pairing from one CuO_2 layer to the neighboring one. The approximation $r \ll \varepsilon$ simplifies considerably the expressions (139) and (140)¹² while still giving valid results for frequencies comparable to T_c :

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\perp}^{AL(2D)}(\varepsilon, \omega) &= \frac{e^2 s}{64\eta} \left(\frac{r}{2\varepsilon} \right)^2 \frac{1}{\tilde{\omega}^2} \ln(1 + \tilde{\omega}^2) = \\ &= \sigma_{\perp}^{AL(2D)}(\varepsilon, 0) \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\tilde{\omega}^2}{2} & \text{for } \tilde{\omega} \ll 1 \\ \frac{2}{\tilde{\omega}^2} \ln \tilde{\omega} & \text{for } \tilde{\omega} \gg 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\parallel}^{AL(2D)}(\varepsilon, \omega) &= \frac{e^2}{16s\varepsilon} \left\{ \frac{2}{\tilde{\omega}} \arctan \tilde{\omega} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\omega}^2} \ln(1 + \tilde{\omega}^2) \right\} = \\ &= \sigma_{\parallel}^{AL(2D)}(\varepsilon, 0) \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\tilde{\omega}^2}{6} & \text{for } \tilde{\omega} \ll 1 \\ \frac{\pi}{\tilde{\omega}} & \text{for } \tilde{\omega} \gg 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (142)$$

¹²The second expression coincides with that one obtained in [55, 195]

where $\tilde{\omega} = \frac{\pi\omega}{16(T - T_c)}$.

Two facts following from the expressions obtained should be stressed. First, the paraconductivity begins to decrease rapidly with the increase of frequency for $\omega \geq T - T_c$ (the critical exponents of this power decrease coincide with those of the ε -dependence of d.c. -conductivity tensor components: $\nu_{\parallel} = 1$ (2D fluctuations) and $\nu_{\perp} = 2$ (0D fluctuations)). Secondly the assumption that one can neglect the ω -dependence of the Green's functions blocks evidently breaks down at frequencies $\omega \geq T$ and has the effect of accelerating the decrease of paraconductivity.

9.3 Density of States contribution

The four main diagrams for the DOS contribution to the electromagnetic response tensor are diagrams 5–8 of Fig. 9. The general expression for the DOS contribution to $Q_{\alpha\beta}(\omega)$ from diagram 5 is given by expression (73). The external frequency ω_{ν} enters in this expression (73) only by means of the Green's function $G(\mathbf{p}, \omega_{n+\nu})$ and it is not involved in q integration. So, near T_c , even in the case of an arbitrary external frequency, we can choose the propagator frequency $\omega_{\mu} = 0$. The contribution of diagram 7 of Fig. 9 can be treated in the same manner.

The diagrams 5 and 6 of Fig. 9 are topologically equivalent and this fact would lead one to believe that they give equal contributions to $\sigma(\omega)$. Nevertheless the thorough analysis of the analytical continuation over the external frequency shows that their contributions differ slightly and for the total DOS contribution to conductivity one can find:

$$\text{Re} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\perp}^{\text{DOS}}(\omega)}{\sigma_{\parallel}^{\text{DOS}}(\omega)} \right) = -\frac{e^2}{2\pi s} \left(\frac{s^2 J^2}{v_F^2} \right) \ln \left[\frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon + r} + \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right] \hat{\kappa}(\omega, T, \tau), \quad (143)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\kappa}(\omega, T, \tau) = & \frac{T v_F^2}{\eta} \frac{1}{(\tau^{-2} + \omega^2)^2} \left\{ \frac{4}{\tau} \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) - \text{Re} \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) \right] + \right. \\ & + \frac{\tau^{-2} + \omega^2}{4\pi T \tau} \frac{1}{\omega} \text{Im} \psi' \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) + \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

$$+ (\tau^{-2} - \omega^2) \frac{1}{\omega} \left[\text{Im} \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) - 2 \text{Im} \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{i\omega}{4\pi T} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau} \right) \right] \Big\}.$$

In contrast to (139) and (140), this result has been found with only the assumption $\varepsilon \ll 1$, so it is valid for any frequency, any impurity concentration and any dimensionality of the fluctuation behavior. The function $\hat{\kappa}(\omega, T, \tau)$ can be easily used to fit experimental data. Nevertheless we also present the asymptotics of the expression (144) for clean and dirty cases. In the dirty case

$$\hat{\kappa}_d(\omega, T \ll \tau^{-1}) = \frac{T v_F^2}{2\eta} \begin{cases} \frac{\tau}{(2\pi T)^2} \left| \psi'' \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right| & \text{for } \omega \ll T \ll \tau^{-1} \\ \frac{\tau}{\omega^2} & \text{for } T \ll \omega \ll \tau^{-1} \\ -\frac{\pi}{\omega^3} & \text{for } T \ll \tau^{-1} \ll \omega \end{cases} \quad (145)$$

and in the clean case

$$\hat{\kappa}_{cl}(\omega, T \gg \tau^{-1}) = \frac{T v_F^2}{2\eta} \begin{cases} \frac{\pi \tau^2}{4T} & \text{for } \omega \ll \tau^{-1} \ll T \\ -\frac{\pi}{4\omega^2 T} & \text{for } \tau^{-1} \ll \omega \ll T \\ -\frac{\pi}{\omega^3} & \text{for } \tau^{-1} \ll T \ll \omega \end{cases} \quad (146)$$

9.4 Maki-Thompson contribution

The total contribution of the MT-like diagrams to $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}(\omega)$ has been analyzed in [34] for the case of zero frequency and the frequency dependence of $\sigma_{\parallel}(\omega)$ has been studied in [55]. In section 6.4 we have demonstrated that the *regular* part of the MT diagram can almost always be omitted. So we will not discuss it in this section and will concentrate instead on the *anomalous* MT contribution only.

In [55] it was demonstrated that in the case of quasi two-dimensional electron motion (34) there is no formal necessity to introduce the pair-breaking time τ_φ because the Maki-Thompson logarithmic divergence is automatically cut off by interlayer hopping. Nevertheless, all evidences show that the intrinsic pair-breaking in HTS is strong (at least one of its sources may be identified as thermal phonons) and an estimate of the appropriate $\tau_\varphi \sim 2 \div 5 \cdot 10^{-13} \text{ s}$ is only several times larger than T_c^{-1} . So we are actually in the overdamped

region of the MT contribution, and the latter does not noticeably affect the ϵ dependence of conductivity [34] (the major part of experimental results is explained in terms of AL or AL and DOS contributions). However we are still interested in the MT contribution because of its frequency dependence which evidently determines another characteristic scale in addition to the previous three ($T - T_c$, T , τ^{-1}) we have introduced: $\omega_{MT} \sim \tau_\varphi^{-1}$.

We start, as usual, from the general expression for the *anomalous* MT contribution to the electromagnetic operator tensor (80) and after the integration over momentum p and the summation over ω_n in the range $\omega_n \in [-\omega_\nu, 0[$ (*anomalous* part), one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} Q_{\perp}^{\text{MT(an)}}(\omega_\nu) \\ Q_{\parallel}^{\text{MT(an)}}(\omega_\nu) \end{pmatrix} = e^2 T \tau \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\nu}{2\pi T} \right) - \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \times \\ & \times \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \begin{pmatrix} J^2 s^2 \cos q_{\perp} s \\ v_F^2 \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{(\omega_\nu + \tau_\varphi^{-1} + \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2) (\varepsilon + \eta q^2 + r \sin^2(q_{\perp} s/2))} \end{aligned} \quad (147)$$

At this stage of calculation we artificially introduce the phase-breaking time in the “Cooperon”

vertices. Carrying out the integration and separating the real and the imaginary parts we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Re} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{\perp}^{\text{MT(an)}}(\omega) \\ \sigma_{\parallel}^{\text{MT(an)}}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{e^2}{2\pi s} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{s^2}{2\eta} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{T}{\omega} \text{Im} \left\{ \frac{\psi \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) - \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)}{\frac{i\pi\omega}{8T_c} + \varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi} \times \right. \\ & \times \left. \begin{pmatrix} -\Delta D_2 \left(-\frac{i\pi\omega}{8T_c} + \gamma_\varphi \right) + \left(\frac{i\pi\omega}{8T_c} + \varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi \right) \\ \Delta D_1 \left(-\frac{i\pi\omega}{8T_c} + \gamma_\varphi \right) \end{pmatrix} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

where $\gamma_\varphi = \frac{\pi}{8T_c \tau_\varphi}$. In the two-dimensional overdamped regime ($r \ll \varepsilon \leq \gamma_\varphi$) the expression (148) gives the following limits:

$$\sigma_{\perp}^{\text{MT(an)(2D)}}(\omega) = \frac{e^2 s}{2\eta} \frac{r^2}{\gamma_\varphi \varepsilon} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \omega \ll \tau_\varphi^{-1} \\ \left(\frac{8T_c \gamma_\varphi}{\pi \omega} \right)^2 & \text{for } \omega \gg \tau_\varphi^{-1} \end{cases} \quad (149)$$

$$\sigma_{\parallel}^{MT(an)(2D)}(\omega) = \frac{e^2}{8s} \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \ln\left(\frac{\gamma_{\varphi}}{\varepsilon}\right) & \text{for } \omega \ll \tau_{\varphi}^{-1} \\ \frac{\gamma_{\varphi}}{4T_c} & \text{for } \omega \gg \tau_{\varphi}^{-1} \end{cases} \quad (150)$$

We point out that the expression (148) has been obtained without any limitation on frequency. Nevertheless we have made the assumption $\tau \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2 \ll 1$ as in section 6 and it turns out that, while this condition doesn't restrict our results for the AL and the DOS contributions over the full range of frequency, temperature and impurity concentration, this is not so for the MT contribution. In fact, as already mentioned in section 6.4, in the ultra-clean (or non-local) limit, when $T\tau > 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, the assumption $\tau \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2 \ll 1$ is violated for the MT contribution and the results obtained are not valid there. Nevertheless one can see that this non-local situation can be realized only in the clean case ($T\tau \gg 1$) for temperatures in the range $1/(T\tau)^2 \ll \varepsilon \ll 1$. We suppose $T\tau \sim 1$, as in the case of HTS, so we postpone the discussion of the non-local limit up to section 11.

9.5 Discussion

We will now analyse each fluctuation contribution separately and then discuss their interplay in $\text{Re}[\sigma_{\perp}(\omega)]$. Because of the large number of parameters entering the expressions we restrict our consideration to the c -axis component of the conductivity tensor in the region of 2D fluctuations (above the Lawrence-Doniach crossover temperature). In purpose to make the discussion more transparent we present the asymptotics of the results obtained in the Table 4. The in-plane component will be discussed in the end of this section.

The AL contribution describes the fluctuation condensate response to the applied electromagnetic field. The currents associated with it can be treated as the precursor phenomenon of the screening currents in the superconducting phase. Above T_c the binding energy of virtual Cooper pairs gives rise to a pseudo-gap of the order of $T - T_c$, so it is not surprising that the AL contribution decreases with the further increase of ω ¹³. Actually $\omega^{AL} \sim T - T_c$ is the only relevant scale for σ^{AL} : its frequency dependence doesn't

¹³experimentally such decrease was observed recently on the in-plane conductivity measurements in the vicinity of T_c on YBCO samples [196]

contain T , τ_ϕ and τ . The independence from the latter is due to the fact that elastic impurities do not represent obstacles for the motion of Cooper pairs. The interaction of the electromagnetic wave with the fluctuation Cooper pairs resembles, in some way, the anomalous skin-effect where its reflection is determined by the interaction with the free electron system.

The anomalous MT contribution also involves the formation of fluctuation Cooper pairs, this time on self-intersecting trajectories. Being the contribution related with the Cooper pairs electric charge transfer it doesn't depend on the elastic scattering time but it turns out to be extremely sensitive to the phase-breaking mechanisms. So two characteristic scales turn out to be relevant in its frequency dependence: $T - T_c$ and τ_ϕ^{-1} . In the case of HTS, where τ_ϕ^{-1} has been estimated as at least $0.1T_c$ for temperatures up to $5 \div 10K$ above T_c , the MT contribution is overdamped, is determined by the value of τ_ϕ and is almost temperature independent.

The DOS contribution to $\text{Re}[\sigma(\omega)]$ is quite different with respect to those above. At low frequencies ($\omega \ll \tau^{-1}$) the lack of electron states at the Fermi level leads to an opposite effect in comparison with the AL and MT contributions: $\text{Re}[\sigma^{DOS}(\omega)]$ turns out to be negative and this means the increase of the surface impedance, or, in other words, the decrease of reflectance. Nevertheless, the applied electromagnetic field affects the electron distribution and at high frequencies $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$ the DOS contribution changes its sign. It is interesting that the DOS contribution, as a one-electron effect, depends on the impurity scattering in a similar manner to the normal Drude conductivity. The decrease of $\text{Re}[\sigma^{DOS}(\omega)]$ starts at frequencies $\omega \sim \min\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$ which for HTS are much higher than $T - T_c$ and τ_ϕ^{-1} .

The ω -dependence of $\text{Re}[\sigma_\perp^{\text{tot}}]$ with the most natural choice of parameters ($r \ll \varepsilon \leq \tau_\phi^{-1} \ll \min\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$) is presented in Fig. 33.

The positive AL and MT contributions are pronounced at low frequencies on the background of the DOS contribution which remains in this region a negative constant. Then at $\omega \sim T - T_c$ the former decays and the $\text{Re}\sigma_\perp$ remains negative up to $\omega \sim \min\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$. The DOS contribution changes its sign at $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$ and then it rapidly decreases. The following high frequency behavior is governed by the Drude law. So one can see that the characteristic pseudo-gap-like behavior in the frequency dependence of the optical conductivity takes place in the range $\omega \in [T - T_c, \tau^{-1}]$. The depth of the window increases logarithmically with ε when T tends to T_c , as shown in Fig. 34.

In case of *ab*-plane optical conductivity the two first positive contributions are not suppressed by the interlayer transparency, and exceed considerably the negative DOS contribution in a wide range of frequencies. Any pseudo-gap like behavior is therefore unlikely in $\sigma_{\parallel}^{fl}(\omega)$: the reflectivity will be of the metallic kind. The comparison between (142) and (143) shows that the compensation of the two contributions could only take place at $\omega_0 \sim T/\ln \varepsilon$ which is out of the range of validity of the AL contribution.

Let us compare now the results of these calculations with the experiments available. The recent measurements [8, 9] of the *c*-axis reflectivity spectra, in FIR region on $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$ single crystals, show the response of a poor metal with the additional contributions from *IR* active phonon modes (which we do not discuss here).

With the decrease of temperature the *c*-axis optical conductivity decreases showing around $180K$ a transition from a Drude-like to a pseudogap-like behavior. The value of gap is $\omega_0 \sim 180cm^{-1}$ and it seems weakly dependent on temperature. The decrease of temperature does the gap structure more pronounced without any abrupt change at the superconducting transition temperature $T_c = 80K$ (see Fig. 35).

Such experimentally observed behavior of the optical conductivity is in qualitative agreement with our results. The suppression of the density of states due to the superconducting fluctuations in the vicinity of T_c leads to a decrease of reflectivity in the range of frequencies up to $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$. The magnitude of this depression slowly (logarithmically) increases with the decrease of temperature but at the edge of the transition it reaches some saturation because of the crossover to the *3D* fluctuation regime (where instead of $\ln(1/\varepsilon)$ one has $\ln(1/r) - \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, see (143)). So no singularity is expected in the value of the minimum even in the first order of perturbation theory. Below T_c the fluctuation behavior of $\langle \Psi_{fl}^2 \rangle$ is mostly symmetrical to that one above T_c (see [81]) and, with the further decrease of temperature, the fluctuation pseudo-gap minimum in the optical conductivity smoothly transforms itself into the real superconducting gap, which opens very sharply in HTS. We stress that the temperature independence of the pseudo-gap threshold appears naturally in the theory: it is determined by $\omega_0 \sim \tau^{-1}$ (see (145), (146) and Fig. 36). Comparing Fig. 33(b) and Fig. 36, one can easily see that the threshold doesn't move when the temperature changes but varies when the inverse of the scattering rate changes. As far as far as the numerical value of ω_0 is concerned, assuming $T_c\tau = 0.35$ (which is the value for the

scattering rate of the sample used in the experiment under consideration [9], that is also in the experimental range of the inverse of the scattering rate $T\tau \approx 0.3 \div 0.7$ [197, 198]), one can see that the pseudo-gap threshold is predicted to be of the order of 200cm^{-1} , in quantitative agreement with the experimental data [8, 9].

The outlined theory is, strictly speaking, valid only in the vicinity of the critical temperature, where $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Nevertheless the logarithmic dependence on ε of the result obtained gives grounds to believe that qualitatively the theory can be valid up to $\varepsilon = \ln(T/T_c) \sim 1$, i.e. for temperatures up to 200K in the experiment discussed. So the theory is again in agreement with the experimental value of temperature 180K up to which the pseudo-gap is observable.

In conclusion we have calculated the optical conductivity tensor for layered superconductors. A pseudo-gap-like minimum of its c -axis component in a wide range of frequencies for temperatures in the vicinity of T_c is found. It is due to the fluctuation density of states renormalization which can be treated as the opening of a fluctuation pseudo-gap. These results are qualitatively, and in some aspects quantitatively, in agreement with recent experiments on $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$ samples. Further experiments, with more anisotropic samples like $BSSCO$ single crystals, would be useful, because the effect should be more pronounced.

10 Thermoelectric power above the superconducting transition

10.1 Introduction

Thermoelectric effects are difficult both to calculate and measure if compared to electrical transport properties. At the heart of the problem lies the fact that thermoelectric coefficients in metals are the small resultant of two opposing currents which almost completely cancel. In calculating thermoelectric power one finds that electrons above the Fermi level E_F carry a heat current that is nearly the negative of that carried by electrons below E_F . In the model of a monovalent metal in which band structure and scattering probabilities are symmetric about E_F , this cancellation would be exact; in a real metal small asymmetry survives. In calculating this small effect one cannot with impunity ignore any possible correction or renormalization merely on the grounds that it has been shown to be negligible in calculations of the conductivity alone. This small effect is proportional to the electron-hole asymmetry factor f_{as} , which is defined as the ratio of the difference between numbers of electrons and holes to the total number of particles. Apart from this factor, to estimate the thermoelectric coefficient, one should consider also the characteristic energy involved in thermoelectric transport, ϵ^* . The thermoelectric coefficient ϑ may then be obtained from electrical conductivity σ , if transport coefficients are defined through the electric current flowing on the system as a response on electric field and temperature gradient:

$$\mathbf{J}_e = \sigma \mathbf{E} + \vartheta \nabla T, \quad \vartheta \sim (\epsilon^*/eT) f_{as} \sigma$$

For non-interacting electrons $\epsilon^* \sim T$ and $f_{as} \sim T/E_F$, and therefore $\vartheta_0 \sim (T/eE_F)\sigma_0$. Because of their compensated nature, thermoelectric effects are very sensitive to the characteristics of the electronic spectrum, the presence of impurities and peculiarities of scattering mechanisms. The inclusion of many-body effects, such as electron-phonon renormalization, multi-phonon scattering, a drag effect, adds even more complexity to the problem of calculating the thermoelectric power. Among such effects, there is also the influence of thermodynamical fluctuations on thermoelectric transport in superconductor above the critical temperature. This problem has been attracting the attention of theoreticians for more than twenty years, since the

paper of Maki [42] appeared. After this pioneering work about ten contradictory papers appeared and up to now not only the magnitude, but also the temperature dependence and even the sign of the fluctuation correction to thermoelectric coefficient (ϑ) are under discussion.

The main question which should be answered is whether or not the correction to ϑ has the same temperature singularity in the vicinity of the critical temperature T_c as the correction to electrical conductivity σ . In the paper of Maki [42] the only logarithmically divergent contribution was predicted in the two-dimensional case and its sign was found to be opposite to the sign of the normal state thermoelectric coefficient ϑ_0 . Later on, in a number of papers [43, 199, 200, 201, 202] it was claimed that the temperature singularity of the fluctuation correction to ϑ is the same as it is for σ ($\propto (T - T_c)^{-1}$ in 2D). Finally, Reizer and Sergeev [44] have recently revisited the problem using both quantum kinetic equation and linear response methods and have finally shown that, in the important case of an isotropic electronic spectrum, strongly divergent contributions [43, 199, 200] are canceled out for any dimensionally, with the final result having the same logarithmic singularity as found by Maki, but of opposite sign. We should emphasize that in all papers cited above only the Aslamazov-Larkin (AL) contribution was taken into account, because the anomalous Maki-Thompson (MT) term was shown to be absent in the case of thermoelectric transport. It was mentioned [44] that the reason for discrepancy between different authors lies in the difficulties connected with the introduction of many-body effects in the heat-current operator. As a matter of fact, the incorrect evaluation of interaction corrections to heat-current operator can produce erroneously large terms which are really canceled out within the consistent procedure. Due to this strong cancellation the AL term turns out to be less singular compared with the corresponding correction to conductivity [44].

On the other hand, in every case where the main AL and MT fluctuation corrections are suppressed for some reason, the contribution connected with fluctuation renormalization of the one-electron density of states (DOS) can become important. In this section we show that the analogous situation also occurs in the case of the thermoelectric coefficient [203, 41]. In what follows we study the DOS contribution to the thermoelectric coefficient of superconductors with an arbitrary impurity concentration above T_c . We will be mostly interested in 2D case, but the generalization to the case of layered superconductor will be done at the end. We show that, although the DOS

term has the same temperature dependence as the AL contribution [44], it turns out to be the leading fluctuation contribution in both the clean and dirty cases due to its specific dependence on electron mean free path.

10.2 DOS contribution to thermoelectric coefficient

We introduce the coefficient ϑ in the framework of linear response theory as:

$$\vartheta = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Im}[Q^{(\text{eh})\text{R}}(\omega)]}{T\omega} \quad (151)$$

where $Q^{(\text{eh})\text{R}}(\omega)$ is the Fourier representation of the retarded correlation function of two current operators

$$Q^{(\text{eh})\text{R}}(X - X') = -\Theta(t - t') \langle \langle [J^{\text{h}}(X), J^{\text{e}}(X')] \rangle \rangle. \quad (152)$$

Here J^{h} and J^{e} are heat-current and electric current operators in Heisenberg representation, $X = (\mathbf{r}, t)$ and $\langle \langle \dots \rangle \rangle$ represents both thermodynamical averaging and averaging over random impurity positions. We use units with $\hbar = c = k_{\text{B}} = 1$.

The correlator in the diagrammatic technique is represented by the bubble with two exact electron Green's functions and two external field vertices, the first, $e\mathbf{v}$, associated with the electric current operator and the second one, $\frac{i}{2}(\epsilon_n + \epsilon_{n+\nu})\mathbf{v}$, associated with the heat current operator ($\epsilon_n = \pi T(2n + 1)$ is fermionic Matsubara frequency and $\mathbf{v} = \partial\xi(\mathbf{p})/\partial\mathbf{p}$ with ξ being the quasiparticle energy). Working to the first order of perturbation theory in Cooper interaction and averaging over impurity configurations one finds the ten diagrams presented in Fig.37.

As usual, the solid lines represent the single-quasiparticle normal state Green's function averaged over impurities. The shaded objects are the vertex impurity renormalization λ which, neglecting the \mathbf{q} -dependence (see Section 6) that is unimportant here, are given by

$$\lambda(\mathbf{q} = 0, \epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n'}) = \lambda(\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n'}) = \frac{|\tilde{\epsilon}_n - \tilde{\epsilon}_{n'}|}{|\epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n'}|} \quad (153)$$

Finally the wavy line represents the fluctuation propagator $L(\mathbf{q}, \Omega_k)$.

The first diagram describes the AL contribution to thermoelectric coefficient and was calculated in [44] with the electron-hole asymmetry factor

taken into account in the fluctuation propagator. Diagrams 2-4 represent the Maki-Thompson contribution. As was mentioned in Refs.[43, 44], neither anomalous nor regular parts of these diagrams contribute to ϑ in any order of electron-hole asymmetry. In what follows we will discuss the contribution from diagrams 5-10 which describes the correction to ϑ due to fluctuation renormalization of one-electron density of states.

Let us start from the contribution of the diagrams 5 and 6. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^{(5+6)}(\omega_\nu) &= 2eT \sum_{\Omega_k} \int (d\mathbf{q}) L(\mathbf{q}, \Omega_k) T \sum_{\epsilon_n} \frac{i(\epsilon_{n+\nu} + \epsilon_n)}{2} \int (d\mathbf{p}) v^2 \times \\
&\times \left[\lambda^2(\epsilon_n, -\epsilon_n) G^2(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_n) G(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}, -\epsilon_n) G(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) + \right. \\
&+ \left. \lambda^2(\epsilon_{n+\nu}, -\epsilon_{n+\nu}) G^2(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) G(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}, -\epsilon_{n+\nu}) G(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_n) \right]. \quad (154)
\end{aligned}$$

(We use the shorthand notation $(d\mathbf{q}) = d^D q / (2\pi)^D$, where D is dimensionality). Evaluating Eq. (154) one naturally obtains a vanishing result if electron-hole asymmetry is not taking into account. The first possible source of this factor is contained in the fluctuation propagator and was used in [44] for the AL diagram. Our calculations show that for the DOS contribution this correction to the fluctuation propagator results in non-singular correction to ϑ in 2D case and can be neglected. That's why we ignored such correction in Eq. (64). Another source of electron-hole asymmetry is connected with expansion of energy-dependent functions in power of ξ/E_F near Fermi level performing \mathbf{p} -integration in Eq. (154) (E_F is the Fermi energy). In the case under discussion we have to perform such expansion of the following product:

$$N(\xi) \mathbf{v}^2(\xi) = N(0) \mathbf{v}^2(0) + \xi \left[\frac{\partial(N(\xi) \mathbf{v}^2(\xi))}{\partial \xi} \right]_{\xi=0}. \quad (155)$$

Only second term in Eq. (155) contributes to thermoelectric coefficient. Contribution of diagrams 7 and 8 is described by the expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^{(7+8)}(\omega_\nu) &= \frac{eT}{\pi N(0)\tau} \sum_{\Omega_k} \int (d\mathbf{q}) L(\mathbf{q}, \Omega_k) T \sum_{\epsilon_n} \frac{i(\epsilon_{n+\nu} + \epsilon_n)}{2} \int (d\mathbf{p}) \mathbf{v}^2 \times \\
&\times \left[\lambda^2(\epsilon_n, -\epsilon_n) G^2(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_n) G(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) \int (d\mathbf{k}) G^2(\mathbf{k}, \epsilon_n) G(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}, -\epsilon_n) + \right. \\
&+ \left. \lambda^2(\epsilon_{n+\nu}, -\epsilon_{n+\nu}) G^2(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) G(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_n) \int (d\mathbf{k}) G^2(\mathbf{k}, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) G(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}, -\epsilon_{n+\nu}) \right]. \quad (156)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \lambda^2(\epsilon_{n+\nu}, -\epsilon_{n+\nu}) G^2(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) G(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon_n) \int (d\mathbf{k}) G^2(\mathbf{k}, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) G(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}, -\epsilon_{n+\nu}) \Big].$$

The calculation of this expression is analogous to Eq. (154), but the expansion of $N(\xi)\mathbf{v}(\xi)$ should be performed either in \mathbf{p} or in \mathbf{k} momentum integration. Diagrams 9-10 do not give any singular contribution to thermoelectric coefficient due to the vector character of external vertices and as a result an additional q^2 factor appears after \mathbf{p} -integration. The same conclusion concerns the MT-like diagram 3-4.

Performing integration over ξ we find the contribution of the important diagrams 5-8 in the form

$$Q^{(5-8)}(\omega_\nu) = -\frac{eT^2}{4} \left[\frac{\partial(N(\xi)\mathbf{v}^2(\xi))}{\partial\xi} \right]_{\xi=0} \int (d\mathbf{q}) L(\mathbf{q}, 0) (\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3) \quad (157)$$

In the last equation we have taken into account that near T_c only the term with $\Omega_k = 0$ is important and we have separated sums over semi-infinite $[-\infty, -\nu - 1]$, $[0, \infty[$ and finite $([-\nu, -1])$ intervals :

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 &= 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2\epsilon_n + \omega_\nu}{2\tilde{\epsilon}_n + \omega_\nu} \left(\frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_n + \omega_\nu}{(\epsilon_n + \omega_\nu)^2} + \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}}{\epsilon_n^2} \right), \\ \Sigma_2 &= \frac{1}{(1/\tau + \omega_\nu)^2} \sum_{n=-\nu}^{-1} (2\epsilon_n + \omega_\nu)^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_{n+\nu}}{\epsilon_{n+\nu}^2} - \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_n}{\epsilon_n^2} \right) \\ \Sigma_3 &= (1 + \omega_\nu \tau) \sum_{n=-\nu}^{-1} (2\epsilon_n + \omega_\nu) \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_{n+\nu}^2} - \frac{1}{\epsilon_n^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

Σ_1 and Σ_2 are associated with diagram 5-6, while Σ_3 with diagram 7-8. Calculating the sums (158) we are interested in terms which are linear in external frequency ω_ν . The sum Σ_1 turns out to be an analytical function of ω_ν and it is enough to expand it in the Taylor series after analytical continuation $\omega_\nu \rightarrow -i\omega$. The last two sums over finite intervals require more attention because of their nontrivial ω_ν -dependence and before analytical continuation they have to be calculated rigorously. As a result:

$$\Sigma_1^R = \frac{i\omega}{4T^2} ; \Sigma_2^R = -\frac{2i\omega\tau}{\pi T} ; \Sigma_3^R = -\frac{i\omega}{2T^2} \quad (159)$$

Finally, we perform integration over \mathbf{q} . In 1D case the total contribution associated with density of states renormalization takes the form

$$\vartheta_{1D}^{\text{DOS}} = \frac{e}{4} \frac{1}{p_F} \left(\frac{T_c}{T - T_c} \right)^{1/2} \left[\left(1 + \frac{\pi}{8T_c\tau} \right) T_c\tau \kappa(T_c\tau) \right]^{1/2}, \quad (160)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^*(T\tau) &= - \frac{1 + \frac{\pi}{8T\tau}}{T\tau \left[\psi \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau} \right) - \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau} \psi' \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right]} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{8\pi^2}{7\zeta(3)} T\tau \approx 9.4T\tau & \text{for } T\tau \gg 1 \\ \frac{1}{T\tau} & \text{for } T\tau \ll 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (161)$$

In 2D case:

$$\vartheta^{\text{DOS}} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \frac{eT_c}{\mathbf{v}_F^2 N(0)} \left[\frac{\partial(\mathbf{v}^2 N(0))}{\partial \xi} \right]_{\xi=0} \ln \left(\frac{T_c}{T - T_c} \right) \kappa^*(T_c\tau), \quad (162)$$

The generalization of this result to the important case of layered superconductor is straightforward. One has to replace $\ln(1/\varepsilon) \rightarrow \ln[2/(\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{\varepsilon + r})]$ and to multiply Eq. (162) by $1/p_F s$, where s is the interlayer distance. In the limiting case of 3D superconductor ($r \gg \varepsilon$) both the AL [44] and the DOS contributions are not singular.

10.3 Discussion

Comparing Eq. (162) with the results of [44] for the AL contribution, we conclude, that in both limiting cases of clean and dirty systems the decrease of ϑ due to fluctuation the DOS renormalization dominates the thermoelectric transport due to the AL process. Really, the total relative correction to thermoelectric coefficient in the case of 2D superconducting film of thickness s can be written in the form:

$$\frac{\vartheta^{\text{DOS}} + \vartheta^{\text{AL}}}{\vartheta_0} = -0.17 \frac{1}{E_\tau} \frac{1}{p_F s} \ln \left(\frac{T_c}{T - T_c} \right) \left[\kappa^*(T_c\tau) + 5.3 \ln \frac{\Theta_D}{T_c} \right], \quad (163)$$

where the first term in square brackets corresponds to the DOS contribution (162) and the second term describes the AL contribution from [44] (Θ_D is the Debye temperature). Assuming $\ln(\Theta_D/T_c) \approx 2$ one finds that the DOS contribution dominates the AL one for any value of impurity concentration: κ^* as a function of $T\tau$ has a minimum at $T\tau \approx 0.3$ and even at this point the DOS term is twice larger. In both limiting cases $T\tau \ll 1$ and $T\tau \gg 1$ this difference strongly increases. In one-dimensional case

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\vartheta_{1D}^{\text{DOS}} + \vartheta_{1D}^{\text{AL}}}{\vartheta_0} &= \\ &= -\frac{1}{(p_F s)^2} \left(\frac{T_c}{T - T_c} \right)^{1/2} \begin{cases} 1.15 \left[1 + \frac{0.47}{T\tau} \ln \left(\frac{\Theta_D}{T_c} \right) \right] & \text{for } T\tau \gg 1 \\ \frac{0.24}{(T\tau)^{1/2}} \left[\frac{1}{T\tau} + 8.86 \ln \left(\frac{\Theta_D}{T_c} \right) \right] & \text{for } T\tau \ll 1 \end{cases} \quad (164) \end{aligned}$$

and the DOS correction again turns out to be dominant.

The temperature and impurity concentration dependencies of fluctuation corrections to ϑ in important 2D case can be evaluated through a simple qualitative consideration. The thermoelectric coefficient may be estimated through the electrical conductivity σ as $\vartheta \sim (\epsilon^*/eT)f_{\text{as}}\sigma$, where ϵ^* is the characteristic energy involved in thermoelectric transport and f_{as} is the electron-hole asymmetry factor, which is defined as the ratio of the difference between numbers of electrons and holes to the total number of particles. Conductivity can be estimated as $\sigma \sim e^2 \mathcal{N} \tau^* / m$, where \mathcal{N} , τ^* and m are the density, lifetime and mass of charge (and heat) carriers, respectively. In the case of the AL contribution the heat carriers are nonequilibrium Cooper pairs with energy $\epsilon^* \sim T - T_c$ and density $\mathcal{N} \sim p_F^d \frac{T}{E_F} \ln \frac{T_c}{T - T_c}$ and characteristic time, given by Ginzburg-Landau time $\tau^* \sim \tau_{GL} = \frac{\pi}{8(T - T_c)}$. Thus in 2D case $\Delta \vartheta^{\text{AL}} \sim (T - T_c)/(eT_c)f_{\text{as}}\Delta\sigma^{\text{AL}} \sim e f_{\text{as}} \ln \frac{T_c}{T - T_c}$. One can easily get that the fluctuation correction due to the AL process is less singular (logarithmic in 2D case) with respect to the corresponding correction to conductivity and does not depend on impurity scattering [44].

The analogous consideration of the single-particle DOS contribution ($\epsilon^* \sim T$, $\tau^* \sim \tau$) evidently results in the estimate $\vartheta \sim e f_{\text{as}} T_c \tau \ln \frac{T_c}{T - T_c}$ which coincides with (162) in clean case. The dirty case is more sophisticated because the fluctuation density of states renormalization strongly depends on the character of the electronic motion, especially in the case of diffusive motion

[28]. The same density of states redistribution in the vicinity of Fermi level directly enters into the rigorous expression for ϑ and it is not enough to write the fluctuation Cooper pair density $\mathcal{N}_{c.p.}$ but is necessary to take into account some convolution with $\delta N_{\mathbb{R}}(E)$. This is what was actually done in the previous calculations.

Experimentally, although the Seebeck coefficient $S = -\vartheta/\sigma$ is probably the easiest to measure among thermal transport coefficients, the comparison between experiment and theory is complicated by the fact that S cannot be calculated directly; it is rather a composite quantity of electrical conductivity and thermoelectric coefficient. As both ϑ and σ have corrections due to superconducting fluctuations, total correction to the Seebeck coefficient is given by

$$\Delta S = S_0 \left(\frac{\Delta\vartheta}{\vartheta_0} - \frac{\Delta\sigma}{\sigma_0} \right) \quad (165)$$

Both these contributions provide a positive correction $\Delta\vartheta$, thus resulting in the decrease of the absolute value of S at the edge of superconducting transition ($\Delta\vartheta/\vartheta_0 < 0$). As for fluctuation correction to conductivity $\Delta\sigma/\sigma_0 > 0$, we see from Eq. (165) that thermodynamical fluctuations above T_c always reduce the overall Seebeck coefficient as temperature approaches T_c . So the very sharp maximum in the Seebeck coefficient experimentally observed in few papers [17, 18, 202] seems to be unrelated to the fluctuation effects within our simple model even leaving aside the question about the experimental reliability of these observations. This conclusion is supported by recent analysis of temperature dependence of thermoelectric coefficient close to transition in Refs. [45].

11 DOS fluctuations on NMR characteristics in HTS

11.1 Introduction

In this section we discuss the contribution of superconducting fluctuations to the spin susceptibility χ_s and the NMR relaxation rate $1/T_1$. We base on the work of M.Randeria and A.Varlamov [46] where the effect of fluctuations on χ_s was examined first time. The fluctuation contribution to NMR relaxation rate $1/T_1$ has been previously studied in the set of papers [204, 205, 206] focusing mainly on the most singular contribution, the anomalous Maki-Thompson (MT) term in the dirty limit $T\tau \ll 1$. Nevertheless in [207, 46] the problem was reexamined and the important role of the DOS contribution was underlined. The matter of fact that in conditions of the unusually strong pair breaking in high T_c materials, one might expect the main MT contribution to be suppressed and $1/T_1$ to be dominated by the less singular DOS contributions.

It has recently been suggested [208] that dynamic [209] pairing correlations beyond the perturbative weak coupling regime are responsible for the spin gap anomalies [210] observed well above T_c in the underdoped cuprates. The analysis presented here, which only treats static fluctuations very close to T_c , nevertheless constitutes the first correction [211] to Fermi liquid behavior, to order $\max(1/E_F\tau, T_c/E_F)$, arising from pairing correlations above T_c .

The main results of this section, valid for $\varepsilon \ll 1$, can be summarized as follows:

(1) Fluctuations lead to a suppression of the spin susceptibility χ_s , due to the combined effect of the reduction of the single particle density of states (DOS) arising from self energy contributions, and of the regular part of the Maki-Thompson (MT) process.

(2) “Cooperon” impurity interference terms, involving impurity ladders in the particle-particle channel, are crucial for the χ_s suppression in the dirty limit.

(3) The processes which dominate the results in (1) and (2) above have usually been ignored in fluctuation calculations (conductivity, $1/T_1$, etc.). The spin susceptibility is unusual in that the Aslamazov-Larkin, and the

anomalous MT terms, which usually dominate, are absent.

(4) For weak pair-breaking ($1/\tau_\varphi \ll T_c$), we find an enhancement of $1/T_1T$ coming from the anomalous MT term. We recover known results [205] in the dirty limit, and extend these to arbitrary impurity scattering.

(5) In the clean limit ($T_c\tau \gg 1$) we find a different asymptotic behavior of $1/T_1T$ depending on whether one has $T_c\tau$ is greater or smaller than $1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

(6) Finally, strong dephasing suppresses the anomalous MT contribution, and $1/T_1T$ is then dominated by the less singular DOS and the regular MT terms. These contributions lead to a suppression of spectral weight and a decrease in $1/T_1T$.

11.2 Definitions

We begin with the dynamic susceptibility $\chi_{+-}^{(R)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \chi_{+-}(\mathbf{k}, i\omega_\nu \rightarrow \omega + i0^+)$ where

$$\chi_{+-}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_\nu) = \int_0^{1/T} d\tau e^{i\omega_\nu\tau} \langle \hat{T} \left(\hat{S}_+(\mathbf{k}, \tau) \hat{S}_-(-\mathbf{k}, 0) \right) \rangle \quad (166)$$

with the Bose frequency $\omega_\nu = 2\pi\nu T$. Here \hat{S}_\pm are the spin raising and lowering operators, \hat{T} is the time ordering operator, and the brackets denote thermal and impurity averaging in the usual way. The uniform, static spin susceptibility is given by $\chi_s = \chi_{+-}^{(R)}(\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0, \omega = 0)$ and the NMR relaxation rate by

$$\frac{1}{T_1T} = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{A}{\omega} \int (d\mathbf{k}) \Im \chi_{+-}^{(R)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \quad (167)$$

where A is a positive constant involving the gyromagnetic ratio.

For non-interacting electrons $\chi_{+-}^0(\mathbf{k}, \omega_\nu)$ is determined by the loop diagram presented in Fig. 38. Simple calculations lead to the well known results for $T \ll E_F$: $\chi_s^0 = N(0)$ (Pauli susceptibility) and $(1/T_1T)^0 = A\pi[N(0)]^2$ (Korringa relaxation), where $N(0)$ is the DOS at the Fermi level. We shall present the fluctuation contributions in a dimensionless form by normalizing with the above results.

To leading order in $\max(1/E_F\tau, T_c/E_F)$ the fluctuation contributions to χ_{+-} are given by the diagrams shown in Fig. 38. The diagrams are constructed from fermion lines, fluctuation propagators (denoted by the wavy lines) and impurity vertex corrections (represented by shaded objects). It is important to note that the two fermion lines attached to the external vertex have opposite spin labels (up and down) for χ_{+-} . Consequently, the

Aslamazov-Larkin diagram (1) does not exist since one cannot consistently assign a spin label to the fermion line marked with a ‘?’ for spin-singlet pairing.

The next set of diagrams to consider is the Maki-Thompson (MT) diagram (2a and 2b), and the MT with the Cooperon impurity corrections (3) and (4). While the MT diagrams for χ_{+-} appear to be identical to the well known MT diagrams for conductivity, there is an important difference in topology which arises from the spin structure. It is easy to see, by drawing the fluctuation propagator explicitly as a ladder of attractive interaction lines (diagram (2b)), that the MT diagram is a non-planar graph with a single fermion loop. In contrast the MT graph for conductivity is planar and has two fermion loops. The number of loops, of course, affects the sign of the contribution.

The diagrams (5) and (6) represent the effect of fluctuations on the one-particle self energy, leading to a decrease in the DOS. The DOS diagrams (7) and (8) include impurity vertex corrections. (Note that these have only a single impurity scattering line as additional impurity scattering, in the form of a ladder, has a vanishing effect.) Finally (9) and (10) are the DOS diagrams with the Cooperon impurity corrections.

The fermion lines represent the one electron Green function $G(\mathbf{p}, \omega_n) = (i\tilde{\epsilon}_n - \xi(\mathbf{p}))^{-1}$, where $\tilde{\epsilon}_n = \epsilon_n + \text{sgn}(\epsilon_n)/2\tau$ describes the self-energy effects of impurity scattering. The momentum relaxation rate $1/\tau \ll E_F$, however, $T_c\tau$ is arbitrary. For simplicity, we will discuss the two-dimensional (2D) case for the most part, indicating at the end how the results are modified for the layered system, and the 2D to 3D crossover.

Pairing fluctuations above T_c are described in the usual way by means of the vertex part of electron-electron interaction in the Cooper channel [52, 55], or the fluctuation propagator (shown in Fig. 38 by the shaded wavy line) $L(\mathbf{q}, \Omega_\mu)$ where the arguments refer to the total momentum and frequency of the pair. The full (\mathbf{q}, Ω_μ) -dependence of L is important far from T_c ; see [55]. We restrict our attention here to the vicinity of transition and thus it suffices to focus on long wavelength, static ($\Omega_\mu = 0$) fluctuations. In this regime we have

$$L^{-1}(\mathbf{q}, \Omega_\mu = 0) = -N(0) [\varepsilon + \eta_D q^2], \quad (168)$$

We now turn to vertex corrections due to impurity scattering. First, it

can be shown ¹⁴ that the external vertices do not need to be renormalized by impurity lines. Next, the (three-legged) impurity vertex $\lambda(\mathbf{q}, -\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n+\nu})$ is defined as the sum of impurity ladders dressing the bare vertex consisting of two fermion lines, with frequencies $-\epsilon_n$ and $\epsilon_{n+\nu} = \epsilon_n + \omega_\nu$, and a fluctuation propagator with momentum and frequency (\mathbf{q}, ω_ν) . Having in mind to discuss in this section the non-local limit ($l \gg \xi_{ab}(\varepsilon)$) and to show how this modifies the MT contribution (the same situation takes place in conductivity, but we skipped this in the view of cumbersome calculations of the section 6) we use below the purely 2D presentation of the vertex, calculated for an arbitrary value of $\tau^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{D}}q^2$. The result differs from (59) (but naturally coincides with the latter in the local limit)

$$\lambda(\mathbf{q}, -\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) = \left(1 - \frac{\Theta(\epsilon_n \epsilon_{n+\nu})}{\tau \sqrt{(\tilde{\epsilon}_n + \tilde{\epsilon}_{n+\nu})^2 + v^2 q^2}} \right)^{-1}. \quad (169)$$

where $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function.

Finally, the Cooperon $C(\mathbf{q}, -\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n+\nu})$ is defined as the sum of impurity ladders in the particle-particle channel where $-\epsilon_n$ and $\epsilon_{n+\nu}$ are the frequencies of the two particle lines and \mathbf{q} is their *total* momentum. It is given by

$$C(\mathbf{q}, -\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n+\nu}) = \frac{1}{2\pi N(0)\tau} \left[\frac{1}{\tau} \frac{\Theta(\epsilon_n \epsilon_{n+\nu})}{|2\epsilon_n + \omega_\nu| + \mathbf{D}q^2} + \Theta(-\epsilon_n \epsilon_{n+\nu}) \right]. \quad (170)$$

Note that the diffusion pole involves the sum of the momenta and the difference of frequencies.

11.3 Spin Susceptibility

We note that, when the external frequency and momentum can be set to zero at the outset, as is the case for χ_s , there is no anomalous MT piece (which as we shall see below is the most singular contribution to $1/T_1$). The MT diagram (2) then yields a result which is identical to the sum of the DOS diagrams (5) and (6). We have:

$$\frac{\chi_{s5} + \chi_{s6}}{\chi_s^0} = -\frac{T_c}{E_F} \ln(1/\varepsilon) \quad (171)$$

¹⁴The external vertex correction equals zero for the case of χ_s since the external frequency $\omega_\nu = 0$. For $1/T_1$, the large external momentum \mathbf{k} leads to a suppression of this correction by the parameter $1/E_F\tau$.

and this result is valid for any impurity concentration.

We first discuss the clean limit, where the fluctuation contribution is given by $\chi_s^{\text{fl}} = \chi_{s2} + \chi_{s5} + \chi_{s6}$; all other diagrams are negligible for $T_c\tau \gg 1$. The final result is

$$\frac{\chi_s^{\text{fl}}}{\chi_s^0} = -\frac{2T_c}{E_F} \ln(1/\varepsilon) \quad \text{for } T_c\tau \gg 1. \quad (172)$$

In the dirty limit ($T_c\tau \ll 1$), the DOS diagrams (5) and (6), together with the regular part of MT diagram (2), yield the same result (172) of the order T_c/E_F . One can see, that this contribution is a negligible in comparison with the expected for the dirty case dominant one, of the order $\mathcal{O}(1/E_F\tau)$. The thorough study of all diagrams shows that the important graphs in dirty case are those with the Cooperon impurity corrections MT (3) and (4), and the DOS ones (9) and (10). This is the first example known to us where the Cooperons, which play a central role in the weak localization theory, give the leading order result in the study of superconducting fluctuations. Diagrams (4) and (5) give the one half the final result given below; diagrams (9) and (10) provide the other half. The total fluctuation susceptibility $\chi_s^{\text{fl}} = \chi_{s3} + \chi_{s4} + \chi_{s9} + \chi_{s10}$, is

$$\frac{\chi_s^{\text{fl}}}{\chi_s^{(0)}} = -\frac{7\zeta(3)}{\pi^3} \frac{1}{E_F\tau} \ln(1/\varepsilon) \quad \text{for } T_c\tau \ll 1. \quad (173)$$

It is tempting to physically understand the negative sign of the fluctuation contribution to the spin susceptibility in eqns. (172) and (173) as arising from a suppression of the DOS at the Fermi level. But one must keep in mind that only the contribution of diagrams (5) and (6) can strictly be interpreted in this manner; the MT graphs and the coherent impurity scattering described by the Cooperons do not permit such a simple interpretation.

11.4 Relaxation Rate

The calculation of the fluctuation contribution to $1/T_1$ requires rather more care than χ_s because of the subtleties of analytic continuation. We define the local susceptibility $K(\omega_\nu) = \int(d\mathbf{k})\chi_{+-}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_\nu)$. The “anomalous” MT contribution, denoted by a subscript (an), comes from that part of the Matsubara sum which involves summation over the interval $-(\omega_\nu/2\pi T) = -\nu \leq n \leq -1$. The reason this piece dominates, and has to be treated separately, is that

$S_{(\text{an})}$ has a singular \mathbf{q} -dependence as we shall see. The remaining terms in S , i.e., those with $n < -\nu$ and $n \geq 0$, are called the “regular” MT contribution.

We evaluate $S_{(\text{an})}$ using standard contour integration techniques and then make the analytic continuation $i\omega_\nu \rightarrow \omega + i0^+$ to obtain

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\omega} \Im K_{2(\text{an})}^{(R)}(\omega) = -\frac{\pi N(0)^2}{8} \int (d\mathbf{q}) L(\mathbf{q}, 0) \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{q}), \quad (174)$$

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{q}) = 2\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\cosh^2(z/4T\tau)} \frac{1}{\left(\sqrt{l^2 q^2 - (z-i)^2} - 1\right) \left(\sqrt{l^2 q^2 - (z+i)^2} - 1\right)} \quad (175)$$

where $l = v\tau$ is the mean free path.

The first simple limiting case for (175) is $lq \ll 1$, for which $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{q}) = 2\pi/\mathbf{D}q^2$. Since (174) involves a \mathbf{q} -integration, we need to check when the above approximation is justified, the characteristic q -values being determined from the fluctuation propagator L . In the dirty limit, we have $\mathbf{D}q^2 \sim \varepsilon T_c$, thus leading to $l^2 q^2 \sim \varepsilon T_c \tau \ll 1$. In the clean case, on the other hand, $v^2 q^2/T_c \sim \varepsilon T_c$ and $l^2 q^2 \sim \varepsilon (T_c \tau)^2 \ll 1$ only when $1 \ll T_c \tau \ll 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

For the above conditions (either $T_c \tau \ll 1$ or $1 \ll T_c \tau \ll 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$) we obtain the singular MT contribution $\int d^2 q [(\mathbf{D}q^2 + 1/\tau_\varphi)(\varepsilon + \eta_2 q^2)]^{-1}$ where we have introduced the pair breaking rate $1/\tau_\varphi$ as an infrared cutoff. We define the dimensionless pair-breaking parameter $\gamma_\varphi = \eta_2/\mathbf{D}\tau_\varphi \ll 1$; in the dirty limit $\gamma_\varphi = \pi/8T_c\tau_\varphi$ while for the clean case $\gamma_\varphi = 7\zeta(3)/16\pi^2 T_c^2 \tau_\varphi$. The “bare” transition temperature T_{c0} is shifted by the pair breaking, so that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 + \gamma_\varphi$, with $\varepsilon_0 = (T - T_{c0})/T_{c0}$, and we obtain the final result

$$\frac{(1/T_1 T)^{\text{fl}}}{(1/T_1 T)^0} = \frac{\pi}{8E_F \tau} \frac{1}{\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi} \ln(\varepsilon/\gamma_\varphi). \quad (176)$$

The other limiting case of interest is the “ultra-clean limit” when the characteristic q -values satisfy $lq \gg 1$. This is obtained when $T_c \tau \gg 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon} \gg 1$. From (175) we then find $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{q}) = 4 \ln(lq)/vq$, which leads to

$$\frac{(1/T_1 T)^{\text{fl}}}{(1/T_1 T)^0} = \frac{\pi^3}{\sqrt{14\zeta(3)}} \frac{T_c}{E_F} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \ln(T_c \tau \sqrt{\varepsilon}). \quad (177)$$

We note that in all cases the anomalous MT contribution leads to an *enhancement* of the NMR relaxation rate over the normal state Korringa

value. In particular, the superconducting fluctuations above T_c have the *opposite* sign to the effect for $T \ll T_c$ (where $1/T_1$ drops exponentially with T). One might argue that the enhancement of $1/T_1 T$ is a precursor to the coherence peak just below T_c . Although the physics of the Hebel-Slichter peak (pile-up of the DOS just above gap edge and coherence factors) appears to be quite different from that embodied in the MT process, we note that both effects are suppressed by strong inelastic scattering [46, 212, 213].

We now discuss the DOS and the regular MT contributions which are important when strong dephasing suppresses the anomalous MT contribution discussed above. The local susceptibility arising from diagrams (5) and (6) can be easily evaluated. The other remaining contribution is from the regular part of the MT diagram. This corresponds to terms with $n < -\nu$ and $n \geq 0$ in the Matsubara sum. It can be shown that this regular contribution is exactly one half of the total DOS contribution from diagrams (5) and (6). All other diagrams either vanish (as is the case for graphs (7) and (8)) or contribute at higher order in $1/E_F \tau$ (this applies to the graphs with the Cooperon corrections). The final results are given by

$$\frac{(1/T_1 T)^{\text{fl}}}{(1/T_1 T)^0} = -\frac{6T_c}{E_F} \ln(1/\varepsilon) \quad (178)$$

for $T_c \tau \gg 1$, and

$$\frac{(1/T_1 T)^{\text{fl}}}{(1/T_1 T)^0} = -\frac{21\zeta(3)}{\pi^3} \frac{1}{E_F \tau} \ln(1/\varepsilon) \quad (179)$$

for $T_c \tau \ll 1$.

The negative sign of the result indicates a suppression of low energy spectral weight as in the χ_s calculation, however in contrast to χ_s we note that the same graphs (2), (5) and (6) dominate in both the clean and dirty limits.

It is straightforward to extend the above analysis to layered systems by making the following replacement in the 2D results given above:

$$\ln\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \rightarrow 2 \ln\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{\varepsilon + r}}\right). \quad (180)$$

11.5 Discussion

The negative DOS contribution to the NMR relaxation rate is evident from the Korringa formula and its sign seems very natural while the sign of the positive Maki-Thompson contribution can generate a question about its physical origin. It is why we present here the qualitative consideration of the result obtained above from the microscopic theory in the spirit of the section 6.2.

In the case of nuclear magnetic relaxation rate calculations the electron interaction with nuclei with spin flip is considered. If one would try to imagine the AL process of this type he were in troubles, because the electron-nuclei scattering with the spin-flip evidently transforms the initial singlet state of the fluctuation Cooper pair in the triplet-one, what is forbidden in the scheme discussed. So the formally discovered absence of the AL contribution to relaxation rate is evident enough.

The negative density of states contribution in $\frac{1}{T_1}$ has the same explanation given above for the conductivity: the number of normal electrons decreases at the Fermi level and as a result the relaxation rate diminishes with respect to the Korringa law.

The positive Maki-Thompson contribution can be treated in terms of the pairing on the self-intersecting trajectories like this was done with that one in conductivity (see section 6.2). This consideration [214] clears up the situation with the sign and explains why the MT type of pairing is possible when the AL one is forbidden. Nevertheless the principle of the electron pairing on the self-intersecting trajectory in the case of the NMR relaxation rate has to be changed considerably with respect to the case of conductivity.

Let us consider a self-intersecting trajectory and the motion of the electron along it with fixed spin orientation (e.g. "spin up"). If, after passing of the full turn, the electron interacts with the nucleus and changes its spin state and momentum to the opposite value it can pass again the previous trajectory moving in the opposite direction (see Fig. 39). The interaction of the electron with itself on the previous stage of the motion is possible due to the retarded character of the Cooper interaction and such pairing process, in contrast to the AL one, turns out to be an effective mechanism of the relaxation near T_c . This purely quantum process opens a new mechanism of spin relaxation, so contributes positively to the relaxation rate $\frac{1}{T_1}$.

In conclusion of this section we want to say several words about the ex-

perimental difficulties in the observation of fluctuation effects in NMR. Much of the existing work on fluctuations as probed by NMR has been restricted to small particles (zero-dimensional limit) of conventional superconductors; see [215] for a review. There has been resurgence of interest in superconducting fluctuations since the high T_c cuprates show large effects above T_c due to their short coherence length and layered, quasi-two-dimensional structure. However, in order to extract the “fluctuation contributions” from experiments one needs to know the normal state backgrounds, which in a conventional metal would simply be the Pauli susceptibility for χ_s and the Korringa law for $1/T_1T$. The problem for the high T_c materials is that the backgrounds themselves have nontrivial temperature dependencies [7] above T_c : for example, the non-Korringa relaxation for the Cu-site in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$, and the spin-gap behavior [210] with $d\chi_s/dT > 0$ and the O and Y $1/T_1T \sim \chi_s(T)$. The attempt to overpass these difficulties was done in [47] which we discuss in the next section.

12 D versus S pairing scenario: *pro* and *contra* from the fluctuation phenomena analysis

12.1 Introduction

One of the hottest debate in solid state physics is the question of the pairing state symmetry in HTS. The determination of the order parameter symmetry is the crucial first step in the identification of the pairing mechanism in HTS and subsequent development of a microscopic theory of high temperature superconductivity. Recently much of the attention of both theoreticians and experimentalists has been focused on a pairing state with d -wave symmetry, although many other pairing symmetries are also possible. The challenge for investigators is to derive tests that are capable to distinguish the different possible pairing states and to make the determination of pairing state symmetry. The direct way to study the anisotropy of the phase of the order parameter is investigation of phase coherence of Josephson and tunnel junctions incorporating HTS. Recent phase coherence experiments support a scenario of superconducting pairing state with $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry in HTS [216, 217]. Nevertheless the studies of the amplitude of the order parameter may be also fruitful and the simplest experiments are studies of fluctuation effects above superconducting transition temperature. In view of the fact that the theory of fluctuation effects in different physical properties of superconductor is now well established, the main question of the present section is how the interpretation of experimental data on fluctuation effects in HTS alters if one assumes d - rather than s - pairing state and which experiment on fluctuation effect would be a test for a pairing state in HTS.

In the theoretical studies of fluctuation effects in d -wave superconductors two models were used. First is a model spherically symmetric superconductor with the bare electron-electron interaction with the interaction constant

$$V(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}') = g_0 P_2(\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}') \quad (181)$$

(P_2 is Legendre polynomial) [218]. The second model considers tight-binding electrons with nearest-neighbor transfer with underlying 2D square lattice [219, 205, 220]. In this case

$$V(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}') = g_0 (\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a) (\cos k'_x a - \cos k'_y a) \quad (182)$$

with a being a lattice constant. Both models lead essentially to the same results. Further we will use the second model which provides a more simple calculations. The main difference between s - and d - wave superconductors lies in the different manifestation of non-magnetic impurities, which are pair-breaking for the last. Further, in order to avoid cumbersome equations, we restrict ourselves to establish only dependencies of fluctuation contributions on temperature and impurity scattering thus ignoring numerical factors of order unity.

12.2 The fluctuation propagator

In the case of d -wave superconductor the fluctuation propagator depends upon directions of \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{k}' , but using the ansatz:

$$L_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \hat{L}(\mathbf{q})(\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)(\cos k'_x a - \cos k'_y a) \quad (183)$$

($\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'$), one can easily solve the Dyson equation for a quantity $\hat{L}(\mathbf{q})$. One has:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}(\mathbf{q})^{-1} &= g_0^{-1} - P(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k), \\ P(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k) &= T \sum_{\omega_n} \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} (\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)^2 G(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n) G(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}, \omega_k - \omega_n) \end{aligned} \quad (184)$$

Here

$$G(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n)^{-1} = i\omega_n + i\text{sgn}\omega_n/2\tau - \xi_k, \quad \xi_k = -t(\cos k_x a + \cos k_y a) - \mu \quad (185)$$

(t and μ are the transfer integral between the nearest-neighbor sites and the chemical potential, respectively). Note, that in contrast to s - wave pairing state, the impurity renormalization of quantity $P(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k)$ is simply absent [218, 205] due to dependence of bare interaction on the momentum directions.

For temperatures close to transition point, one can solve (184) for small \mathbf{q} and ω_k . In this case

$$\xi_{q-k} \approx \xi_k + \varsigma, \quad \varsigma = at(q_x \sin k_x a + q_y \sin k_y a) \quad (186)$$

Then one can replace the \mathbf{k} by $\nu/(2\pi)d\xi\langle\ldots\rangle$, where ν is 2D density of states and $\langle\ldots\rangle$ means averaging over angles of \mathbf{k} taken under condition $\xi_k = 0$.

After straightforward calculations one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k)}{\alpha_1 \nu} &= 4\pi T \sum_{n=0}^{4t} \frac{1}{2\omega_n + \tau^{-1}} - \frac{|\omega_k|}{4\pi T} \psi' \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T \tau} \right) - \\ &- \frac{\alpha_2(q)}{\alpha_1 4\pi T^2} \psi'' \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T \tau} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (187)$$

Here we defined:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= \langle (\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)^2 \rangle \approx 1 \\ \alpha_2(q) &= \langle (\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)^2 \eta^2 \rangle \approx a^2 t^2 q^2 \end{aligned}$$

The divergence of $\hat{L}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k)$ at $\mathbf{q} = 0, \omega_k = 0$ determines the critical temperature. Finally:

$$\hat{L}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k)^{-1} = \alpha_1 \nu \left[\varepsilon + \frac{|\omega_k|}{4\pi T} \psi' \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T \tau} \right) - \frac{\alpha_2(q)}{\alpha_1 4\pi T^2} \psi'' \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T \tau} \right) \right] \quad (188)$$

where

$$-\ln \frac{T_c}{T_{c0}} = \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\pi T \tau} \right) - \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (189)$$

is a shifted by impurities critical temperature and

$$T_{c0} = \frac{8\gamma t}{\pi} \exp \left(-\frac{2}{g_0 \nu \alpha_1} \right) \quad (190)$$

(where γ is the Euler constant) is the hypothetical critical temperature in the absence of impurities. One can see that usual non-magnetic impurities result in the reducing of critical temperature for d -wave superconductor in the same manner as magnetic impurities in the case of s -wave superconductor. It is interesting to note, that taking into account typical for HTS values of parameter $T\tau \approx 1$ one obtains a huge suppression of T_{c0} . Thus $T_{c0}/T_c = 2.86, 1.85$, and 1.43 for $T\tau = 0.5, 1$, and 2 , respectively, resulting in embarrassing prediction of critical temperature in pure HTS materials at room temperature. It seems that such prediction rules out completely the d -wave scenario. Nevertheless, one should realize that HTS materials are obtained by the isovalent substitutions from the parent compounds and structural disorder here is an intrinsic feature. Thus considering the “pure” limit for these materials has no sense.

12.3 d.c. conductivity

The contribution of AL process to in-plane conductivity was calculated by Yip [218]. Current-current response function, ignoring factors of order unity, is:

$$Q_{xx}^{\text{AL}} \approx e^2 \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} T \sum_{\omega_k} \left(\frac{\partial P(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k)}{\partial q_x} \right)^2 \hat{L}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k) \hat{L}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_k + \omega_\nu) \quad (191)$$

As a result:

$$\sigma_{xx}^{\text{AL}} \approx \psi' \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau} \right) \frac{e^2}{d\varepsilon} \quad (192)$$

Here ψ -function represents the pair-breaking effect of impurities which reduces the magnitude of AL conductivity in the dirty case with respect to s -wave superconductor. As impurity vertex corrections do not contribute, the anomalous MT contribution is simply absent [218]. Other terms (DOS and regular MT) give:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{xx}^{\text{DOS}} &\approx e^2 T \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \hat{L}(\mathbf{q}, 0) T \sum_{\omega_n} \int d\xi_k \nu \left(\frac{\partial \xi_k}{\partial \mathbf{k}} \right)^2 G(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n)^3 G(-\mathbf{k}, -\omega_n) \\ \sigma_{xx}^{\text{DOS}} &\approx -\frac{e^2}{d} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (193)$$

In contrast to what happens in the s -wave case, the DOS contribution does not depend on τ . It is easy to extend (192) and (193) to the case of layered superconductors. In this case one can calculate also out-of-plane component of conductivity tensor. The results are similar to those found above: both relevant contributions have the same temperature dependence as for s -wave case, but other dependence on τ . Namely, AL contribution is suppressed for dirty case, while the DOS contribution does not depend upon τ .

12.4 NQR-NMR relaxation

For s -wave the main contribution to spin relaxation originates from MT process, if the latter is not suppressed by strong intrinsic pair-breaking. Instead, the hierarchy of fluctuation contributions changes essentially if one consider the d -wave superconductor. As both AL and MT processes are absent, the

negative DOS term becomes the only present. Corresponding results for the d -wave superconductor with quasi-two-dimensional spectrum are

$$\frac{\chi_s^{DOS}}{\chi_s^{(0)}} \approx \frac{(1/T_1 T)_{B=0}^{DOS}}{(1/T_1 T)^{(0)}} \approx -\frac{T_c}{t} \ln \frac{2}{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}} \quad (194)$$

By comparing (194) with the appropriate result for s -wave case from [46] one can see that the type of pairing does not effect on the magnitude and temperature dependence of the DOS contribution.

Finally, one can conclude that the only essential difference between s - and d - pairing states in context of fluctuation theory consists in the absence of anomalous MT process in the latter. Therefore, studies based on measurements of thermodynamical character do not give the possibility to distinguish the type of pairing on the basis of fluctuation effects experiments. In-plane and out-of-plane conductivities, the experimental data in zero field do not manifest the signs of MT term. Nevertheless the measurements of fluctuation conductivity cannot provide reliable tests for possible d - or s -pairing because the high values of T_c determine strong pair-breaking (at least due to the electron-phonon scattering the expected minimal value of $\tau_\phi^{-1} \sim \frac{T}{\hbar} (\frac{T}{\Theta_D})^2$). Thus the MT process is ineffective even in the case of s -pairing scenario. Additionally, as the MT contribution to conductivity temperature dependence is similar to AL one, they can hardly be distinguished. The additional comparison with s -wave case ψ -function gives the numerical factor of order unity, which cannot be tested experimentally. Therefore, the only physical property related to superconducting fluctuations which is due to the MT contribution is the NMR relaxation rate, in which AL process does not contribute at all [46].

Within the context of the s -wave scenario both the positive MT singular contribution [205] and the negative DOS [46] (independent on phase-breaking) fluctuation renormalization exist. The concurrence of these two effects should be observable in the relaxation measurements. In the case of d -pairing, vice versa, the MT anomalous process in accordance with the consideration presented above does not contribute at all and in the NMR relaxation rate above T_c a monotonous decrease with respect to Korringa law has to be observed. Consequently, from point of view of fluctuation theory, the sign of the correction to NMR relaxation rate above T_c could be a test for the symmetry of the order parameter. Further, as the form of background

(normal state) relaxation is unknown, the better choice for experimental verification of the existence of the MT contribution is the study of relative change of $1/T_1$ in the vicinity of transition induced by external magnetic field. The main results for the fluctuation contributions to the relaxation rate in external field in the case of s -wave superconductor are the following. The DOS contribution has the same form as calculated above. The MT contribution is given by

$$\frac{(1/T_1 T)_{B=0}^{MT}}{(1/T_1 T)^{(0)}} \approx \frac{1}{E_F \tau} \frac{1}{\varepsilon - \gamma_\varphi} \ln \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2} + (\varepsilon + r)^{1/2}}{\gamma_\varphi^{1/2} + (\gamma_\varphi + r)^{1/2}} \quad (195)$$

While the MT contribution is very sensitive to the presence of pair-breaking, the simplest way to discriminate DOS and MT contributions is to apply an external magnetic field, a relative small value being expected practically to suppress the MT contribution.

12.5 Experiment and discussion

As it is clear from discussion above the most appropriate physical property those measurement would be used as a test for a pairing state symmetry in HTS is NQR-NMR relaxation rate. Thus below we present the result of recent experimental work [47] performed in order to get a clear evidence of the role of superconducting fluctuations and meantime to achieve some conclusion about the pairing mechanism in HTS.

At first, we discuss experimental details which are important for interpretation of a such kind of experiments in HTS. From the recovery of the ^{63}Cu signal after RF saturation in both type of NQR and NMR experiments one arrives at $1/T_1 = 2W$ given by

$$2W = \frac{\Gamma^2}{2} \int \langle h_+(t) h_-(0) \rangle e^{-i\omega_R t} dt \quad (196)$$

where Γ is the gyromagnetic ratio of ^{63}Cu nucleus. In (196) h_\pm are the components of the field at the nuclear site transverse with respect to the c axis both for NQR where the quantization axis is the Z one of the electric field gradient tensor as well as for NMR when the external field is along the c axis itself. ω_R , the resonance frequency, is $\omega_R(0) = 31$ MHz in NQR (zero field) and $\omega_R(H) = 67$ MHz in NMR for $H = 5.9$ T. In the following this difference

will be neglected. The fictitious field \vec{h} can be related to the electron spin operators S_{\pm} through the electron-nucleus Hamiltonian and the relaxation rate can formally be written in terms of a generalized susceptibility. One can write

$$2W = \frac{\Gamma^2}{2} k_B T \sum_{\vec{k}} A_k \frac{\chi''(\vec{k}, \omega_R)}{\omega_R} \simeq \frac{\Gamma^2}{2} k_B T \langle A_k \rangle_{BZ} \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{\chi''(\vec{k}, \omega_R)}{\omega_R} \quad (197)$$

where A_k is a term involving the square of the Fourier transform of the effective field \vec{h} , which can be averaged over the Brillouin zone. In a Fermi gas picture in (197) one can introduce, in the limit $\omega_R \rightarrow 0$, the static spin susceptibility $\chi^o(0, 0)$ and the density of states $N(0)$, namely $W \propto T[\chi^o(0, 0)/(1 - \alpha)]\hbar N(0)$ (α is a Stoner-like enhancement factor) and the Korringa law $1/T_1 \propto T$ is thus recovered. Having to discuss only the effect of the external field H on W around T_c^+ , in the assumption that the field does not change appreciably the electron-nucleus Hamiltonian (as it is proved by the equality $W(0) = W(H)$ for $T \gg T_c$) we will simply write $W/T \propto \chi_{ab} \equiv \chi$, where χ is then the k -integrated, $\omega_R \rightarrow 0$ contribution. The fact that in YBCO the Korringa law is not obeyed above T_c for ^{63}Cu NQR-NMR relaxation rates (most likely because of correlation effects) should not invalidate the comparison of $W(0)$ to $W(H)$ in the relatively narrow temperature range of 10 K above T_c .

The ^{63}Cu NQR and NMR relaxation measurements have been carried out in an oriented powder of $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{6.96}$. From the ^{63}Cu NMR line-width (FWHI $\simeq 40$ kHz) the spread in the direction of the c axis was estimated within 1–2 degrees. The superconducting transition was estimated $T_c = 90.5$ K in zero field and $T_c = 87.5$ K in the field of 5.9 T used for NMR relaxation. In ^{63}Cu NQR measurements the recovery of the amplitude $s(t)$ of the echo signal at the time t after complete saturation of the $\pm 1/2 \rightarrow \pm 3/2$ transition was confirmed of exponential character, thus directly yielding the relaxation rate. The temperature was measured with precision better than 25 mK and the long term stabilization during the measurements was within 100 mK. In the presence of the magnetic field the sample was aligned with $c \parallel \vec{H}$. The echo signal for the central transition was used to monitor the recovery of the nuclear magnetization after fast inversion of the $\pm 1/2$ populations.

From the solution of the master equations one derives for the recovery law $y(t) = 0.9\exp(-12Wt) + 0.1\exp(-2Wt)$. This law was observed to be very well obeyed and the relaxation rate was extracted. The experimental error in the evaluation of W was estimated well within 5 %. In Fig. 40 the experimental results for $2W(0)$ and $2W(H)$ around T_c are reported. It is noted that $W(0) = W(H)$ for $T \gtrsim T_c + 15$ K while the effect of the field, namely a decrease of the relaxation rate, is present in a temperature range where paraconductivity and anomalies in the c axis transport are observed.

Let us discuss the interpretation of the experimental results in terms of the contributions related to superconducting fluctuations. The relative decrease of W around $T_c(H)$ and $T_c(0)$ induced by the field is about 20 %. We can evaluate if this decrease is quantitatively consistent with the picture of superconducting fluctuations. First one should estimate the strength of pair-breaking. By using the reasonable values, $\tau \simeq 10^{-14}$ s and $\tau_\phi \simeq 2 \times 10^{-13}$ s, one finds that the pair-breaking parameter γ_ϕ is about 0.15. The effective anisotropy parameter r in YBCO can be estimated around 0.1. Finally one can observe that in zero field the relative MT contribution is larger than the absolute value of the DOS contribution by a factor 1.5, thus providing the positive fluctuation correction to W . The effect of the field on these two contributions can be expected as follows. In the case of strong pair-breaking $\gamma_B > \{\varepsilon_B, r\}$ ($\varepsilon_B = \varepsilon + \beta/2$, $\gamma_B = \gamma_\phi + \beta/2$, $\beta = 2B/H_{c2}(0)$) there are two different regimes for the fluctuation corrections in magnetic field [34]. Low-field regime ($\beta \ll \varepsilon$) corresponds to a decrease quadratic in β of the fluctuation correction. In the high-field regime ($\varepsilon \ll \beta$) one can use lowest Landau level approximation. In our experiment $\varepsilon \approx 0.05$, while β is about 0.2. Since relative corrections to W coincide with relative corrections to conductivity [34], one easily finds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(W)_B^{DOS}}{(W)^{(0)}}(\beta \succeq \varepsilon) &= -\frac{21\zeta(3)}{\pi^3} \frac{1}{\epsilon_F \tau} \ln(1/\sqrt{\beta}) \\ \frac{(W)_B^{MT}}{(W)^{(0)}}(\beta \succeq \varepsilon) &= \frac{\pi}{8\epsilon_F \tau} \frac{1}{\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (198)$$

Direct calculations according to these equations show that the MT contribution is much more affected by the magnetic field. In fact from (136) the modification in W^{DOS} induced by the field is small, of the order of 15 %. On

the contrary, according to (199) the field reduces the MT term to 1/4 of its zero field value. In the case of *d*-wave pairing symmetry, as it was already noted above, the MT contribution is absent and the applied magnetic field results only in the slight reducing of the DOS contribution in accordance with the equation similar with (136). If the decrease of W by magnetic field is due to the reduction of the MT term, then one deduces that zero-field total fluctuation correction to NMR relaxation rate is positive and is within 10 % of background, due to the partial cancellation of MT and DOS contribution. In a field of 6 T the total fluctuation correction becomes negative with an absolute value about 15 % of the background. The lack of detailed information on the normal-state NMR relaxation rate in HTS does not allow one to achieve more quantitative estimates. However, it should be remarked that the observation of the decrease of W in a magnetic field cannot be accounted for in the case of *d*-wave pairing. Finally we would like to emphasize the following. It has been recently pointed out by Müller [221] that two type of condensates, with different symmetry but the same transition temperature, can exist in oxide superconductors. It is conceivable that also the spectrum of the fluctuations of the order parameter above T_c could reflect both components, if present. Since the effect of the magnetic field discussed in our paper works only on the component of *s* symmetry, our conclusion is not in contrast with the experimental evidences indicating *d*-wave pairing and it could be considered a support to the hypothesis of order parameter having simultaneously *s* and *d* symmetry.

Summarizing, from the accurate comparison of ^{63}Cu NQR and NMR relaxation rates in zero field and in a field of 5.9 T around T_c^+ in $YBa_2Cu_3O_x$, we have provided evidence of a contribution to W related to the superconducting fluctuations, in a temperature range of about 10 K. The experimental observation of a decrease in W induced by the field is consistent with the hypothesis of a strong reduction of the MT contribution¹⁵. Since the MT contribution does not exist in the case of a *d*-wave scenario, the interpreta-

¹⁵Concerning the behaviour of $W(H)$ there is still some controversy in literature. Results analogous to those presented above, were obtained by the Urbana group [222] and indicate that the magnetic field reduces the relaxation rate in accordance with our consideration. However a comparison of NQR and NMR measurements in the $YBa_2Cu_4O_x$ phase yields an opposite behaviour of $W(H)$, which turns out to be larger than $W(0)$ [223, 224]. The reason of this discrepancy could be due either to the presence of a negligible *s*-component in the orbital pairing of the $YBa_2Cu_4O_x$ or to the role of diamagnetic terms [214].

tion of the experimental finding is an indication in favor of the presence of an s symmetry component in the orbital pairing.

13 Conclusions

Several comments should be made in the conclusion. We have demonstrated that the strong and narrow in energy scale renormalization of the one-electron density of states in the vicinity of the Fermi level due to the Cooper channel interelectron interaction manifests itself in experiments as the wide enough pseudo-gap-like structures. The scale of these anomalies, as we have seen above, is different for various phenomena ($eV = \pi T$ for tunnel conductance, $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$ for optical conductivity, $T \sim T_c$ in NMR and conductivity measurements).

The results presented above are based on the Fermi liquid approach which is formally expressed through the presence of a small parameter of the theory $Gi_2 \ln \frac{1}{Gi_2} \approx \frac{T_c}{E_F} \ln \frac{E_F}{T_c} \ll 1$ in obtained results. Moving along the phase diagram of HTS from the metal region (overdoped or optimally doped samples) to poor metals (underdoped compounds) one can see that the small parameter of the perturbation theory grows ($E_F \rightarrow 0$) causing the effects discussed to be more pronounced. Nevertheless, analysing the rapid growth of the normal state anomalies with the decrease of the oxygen content below the optimal doping concentration one can notice that it strongly overcomes our theoretical prediction. We can attribute this discrepancy to the simplicity of the Fermi surface model supposed above to be isotropic in the ab-plane. The ARPES study of HTS shows the presence of the strong anisotropy of the Fermi surface of such type and even the existence of two characteristic energy scales $E_F \approx 0.3eV$ and $\Delta \approx 0.01eV$ (extended saddle point of the spectrum). So one can suppose that as the oxygen concentration decreases below the optimal one, by some reasons the massive part of the Fermi surface is "obliterated" and the crossover in properties related with the special role of "slow" electrons of extended saddle points takes place. Formally in this case the large value $E_F \approx 0.3eV$ in the denominator of the Ginzburg-Levanyuk parameter has to be substituted by small $\Delta \approx 0.01eV$ making rapidly the perturbation approach to be unapplicable.

The existence of the nonequilibrium Cooper pairs in the normal metal phase of HTS (the state with $\langle \Psi^2 \rangle \neq 0, \langle \Psi \rangle = 0, \langle \phi \rangle = 0$) resembles the state of preformed Cooper pairs in the underdoped phase [226, 227] ($\langle \Psi^2 \rangle \neq 0, \langle \Psi \rangle \neq 0, \langle \phi \rangle = 0$). Both of them are determined by the presence of interelectron interaction and it would be interesting to study the plausible "condensation" of the fluctuation pairs in the preformed ones in the

unknown land "*hic sunt leones*" where $Gi_2 \approx 1$. Such crossover qualitatively was discussed by M.Randeria [225], but its systematic study requires the formulation of the appropriate model.

In conclusion, we have presented here what we hope to be a comprehensive overview of the theoretical and experimental facts which allow us to attribute an important role in the behaviour of HTS (the metal part of its phase diagram) to the fluctuation theory, and especially, to the frequently neglected DOS contribution. We did show that a large number of non-trivial experimental observed anomalies of HTS normal state properties can be qualitatively, and often quantitatively, described under this model. Of course, as a rule, this is not the only explanation which can be given for these behaviours. However, in our opinion, alternative approaches often lack the internal coherence and self consistency of the picture based on the fluctuation theory. In particular, it is important that all the experimental facts reviewed here can be explained by the fluctuation theory alone, without need for any other *ad hoc* assumption or phenomenological parameters, and that the values of all physical parameters extracted from the fits are always in a good agreement with independent measurements. Even more important is the fact that within the same approach one can explain so many different properties of HTS, in the wide temperature range from tens of degrees below to tens of degree above the critical temperature. It is very unlikely that these circumstances are purely fortunate.

Therefore we believe that, although almost for all experiments discussed the alternative explanations can be proposed, no other model, besides the fluctuation theory, has the same appeal embracing in a single microscopic view the wide spectrum of unusual properties which have been discussed in this review.

14 Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to all colleagues in collaboration with whom the original results which constitute the background of this review were obtained. We would like to thank A.A.Abrikosov, B.L.Altshuler, M.Ausloos, A.Barone, A.I.Buzdin, C.Castellani, C.Di Castro, F.Federici, R.A.Klemm, A.Koshelev, A.I.Larkin, K.Maki, D.Rainer, M.Randeria, A.Rigamonti, Yu.N.Ovchinnikov, S.Pace, A.Paoletti, O.Rapp, C.Strinati, V.Tognetti, R.Vaglio, L.Yu for the numerous discussions of the problems discussed above. We would like to thank A.M.Cucolo for the elucidating discussion of the tunneling experiments on HTS and permission to include in section 5.3 some unpublished results. We are grateful to W.Lang for numerous discussions and valuable contribution in section 8. Special thanks to R.A.Smith for the attentive reading of the manuscript and valuable comments and suggestions.

Two of us (A.A.V. and D.V.L.) acknowledge the financial support of the Collaborative NATO Grant N 941187 in the framework of which this article was partially accomplished. All authors acknowledge support from the INTAS Grant N 96 - 0452 and inter-university collaboration programme between "Tor Vergata" University and Moscow Steel and Alloys Institute.

15 Appendix A: Calculation of the impurity vertex $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$

Let us demonstrate the details of calculations of the impurity vertex $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ which appears in the particle-particle channel as the result of the averaging over the impurities configuration. These calculations can be done in the frameworks of the Abrikosov-Gorkov approach to the diagrammatic description of the alloys [228].

In the assumption of relatively small impurity concentration $p_F l \gg 1$ (what in practice means the mean free path up to tens of interatomic distances) and for the spectra with dimensionality $D > 1$ one can neglect the contribution of the diagrams with intersecting impurities lines. In these conditions the renormalized vertex $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is determined by the graphical equation of the ladder type (see Fig. 41):

Analytically the last equation can be written in the form

$$\lambda^{-1}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = 1 - \frac{1}{2\pi N(0)\tau} \mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2), \quad (199)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) &= \int (d\vec{p}) G(\vec{p} + \vec{q}, \omega_1) G(-\vec{p}, \omega_2) = \\ &= N(0) \langle \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\xi(\vec{p})}{(\xi(\vec{p}) - i\tilde{\omega}_1 + \Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F}) (\xi(\vec{p}) - i\tilde{\omega}_2)} \rangle_{F.S.} = \\ &= 2\pi N(0) \Theta(-\omega_1 \omega_2) \langle \frac{1}{|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2| + i \text{sign}(\omega_1) \Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F}} \rangle_{F.S.} \end{aligned} \quad (200)$$

Here $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step-function and

$$\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F} = [\xi(\vec{p} + \vec{q}) - \xi(-\vec{p})]|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F}. \quad (201)$$

Now one has to reduce the formal averaging of the general expression (200) over the Fermi surface ($\langle \dots \rangle_{F.S.}$), to the particular one of the expression (201). For an arbitrary \vec{q} it is possible to accomplish this program for some simple spectra types only. Below we will show such exact solution for the important for HTS case of the 2D isotropic spectrum, but let us start before from the analysis of the practically important calculation of $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ for small momenta in the case of an arbitrary spectrum.

The angular averaging of (200) over the Fermi surface can be carried out in general form for values of

$$\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F} \ll |\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|, \quad (202)$$

what in the case of corrugated cylinder spectrum (34) means $q_{\parallel} \ll \min\{\xi_{ab}^{-1}, l^{-1}\}$. Expanding the denominator of (200) over the appropriate small parameter one can find:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi N(0)} \mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{\Theta(-\omega_1\omega_2)}{|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|} - \frac{\langle(\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2\rangle_{F.S.}}{|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|^3} \Theta(-\omega_1\omega_2) \quad (203)$$

and

$$\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|}{|\omega_1 - \omega_2| + \frac{\langle(\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2\rangle_{F.S.}}{\tau|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|^2} \Theta(-\omega_1\omega_2)}. \quad (204)$$

It is easy to see that the restriction (202) is not too severe and almost always can serve as a reasonable approximation for temperatures near T_c (the exclusion is the very clean case, when the non-local fluctuation effects take place (see section 11)). For instance, from the calculations of section 6 one can see that not far from T_c the effective propagator momenta are determined by $|\mathbf{q}|_{eff} \sim [\xi_{ab}^{GL}(T)]^{-1} = \xi_{ab}^{-1} \sqrt{\epsilon} \ll \xi_{ab}^{-1}$, while in Green functions the \vec{q} -dependence becomes important for much larger momenta $q \sim \min\{\xi_{ab}, l^{-1}\}$ (what is equivalent to the condition (202)).

The last average in (204) can be easily calculated for some particular types of spectra. For example in the cases of $2D$ and $3D$ isotropic spectra it is expressed in terms of the diffusion coefficient \mathbf{D}_D :

$$\langle(\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2\rangle_{F.S.D} = \tau^{-1} \mathbf{D}_D q^2 = \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{D}, \quad (205)$$

while in the case of the quasi-two-dimensional electron motion (34) expression (201) may be presented by means of the action of the diffusion operator \hat{D} on the momentum \vec{q} :

$$\langle(\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2\rangle_{F.S.} = \frac{1}{2} (v_F^2 \mathbf{q}^2 + 4J^2 \sin^2(q_z s/2)) \equiv \tau^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2, \quad (206)$$

The vertex $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ in this case can be written as

$$\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|}{|\omega_1 - \omega_2| + \frac{(v_F^2 \mathbf{q}^2 + 4J^2 \sin^2(q_z s/2))}{2\tau|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|^2} \Theta(-\omega_1 \omega_2)}. \quad (207)$$

and namely this expression was used through the review. In the dirty case ($T\tau \ll 1$) this expression is reduced to (59).

Finally we discuss the exact calculation of the vertex $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ in the case of 2D electron spectrum which turns out to be necessary for the consideration of the Maki-Thompson contribution in the extra-clean limit $l \gg \xi_{ab}^{GL}(T)$. In this case the \vec{q} -dependence of the vertices in the domain of small momenta becomes of the same importance than that one which comes from the propagator, but because of the large value of l the condition (202) is violated. This is why we express (201) in the exact for 2D case form

$$\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F} = [\xi(\vec{p} + \vec{q}) - \xi(-\vec{p})]|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F} = v_F q \cos \varphi, \quad (208)$$

which is valid for any $v_F q \ll E_F$, and average (200) without any expansion. The angular average in this case is reduced to the calculation of the integral

$$\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{2\pi N(0)\Theta(-\omega_1 \omega_2) \text{sign}(\omega_1)}{iv_F q} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\varphi}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\cos \varphi - \frac{i \cdot \text{sign}(\omega_1)|\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|}{v_F q}}. \quad (209)$$

which can be easily carried out. Really, the integral in (209) is calculated by means of the substitution $z = e^{i\varphi}$:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\varphi}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\cos \varphi - ia} = \frac{i \cdot \text{sign}(a)}{\sqrt{1 + a^2}} \quad (210)$$

what gives for $\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$:

$$\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{2\pi N(0)\Theta(-\omega_1 \omega_2)}{\sqrt{v_F^2 q^2 + (\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2)^2}}. \quad (211)$$

The proper exact expression for $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ can be written as

$$\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \left(1 - \frac{\Theta(-\omega_1, \omega_2)}{\tau \sqrt{(\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2)^2 + v_F^2 q^2}} \right)^{-1}. \quad (212)$$

which was used for the study of non-local limit in section 11. One can see that this expression can be reduced to (204)- (205) in the case of $v_F q \ll |\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2|$.

16 Appendix B: Calculation of the fluctuation propagator $L(\vec{q}, \omega_\mu)$

In this section we discuss the calculation of the fluctuation propagator $L(q, \omega_\mu)$ which is nothing else than the two-particle Green function of electrons interacting in the Cooper channel. Graphically it is presented by the sum of the diagrams with two entrances and two exits. In the BCS theory it is demonstrated that the ladder type diagrams with the accuracy of $\ln^{-1}(\frac{\omega_D}{2\pi T})$ turn out to be of first importance in the calculation of $L(q, \omega_\mu)$. This statement can be applied for any type of weak interaction with characteristic energy $\varepsilon_0 \gg T_c$ in the range of temperatures $T_c \leq T \ll \varepsilon_0$, so in purpose to calculate the fluctuation propagator $L(q, \omega_\mu)$ one has to solve the ladder type Dyson equation presented in the Fig. 42:

Analytically this equation can be written in the form

$$L^{-1}(q, \omega_\mu) = g^{-1} - \Pi(q, \omega_\mu) \quad (213)$$

where g is the effective constant of the electron-electron interaction in the Cooper channel and the *polarization operator* $\Pi(q, \omega_\mu)$ ($\omega_\mu \geq 0$) is determined as the two one-electron Green's functions correlator averaged over impurities positions, which can be expressed in terms of the introduced above functions $\lambda(q, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n})$ and $\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n})$ (see Appendix 1) :

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(q, \omega_\mu) &= T \sum_{\omega_n} \lambda(q, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n}) \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} G(p+q, \omega_{n+\mu}) G(-p, \omega_{-n}) \\ &= T \sum_{\omega_n} \lambda(q, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n}) \mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n}), \end{aligned} \quad (214)$$

One can easily calculate $L(q, \omega_\mu)$ for the most important case of small momenta $\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F} \ll |\tilde{\omega}_{n+\mu} - \tilde{\omega}_{-n}| \sim \max\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$. Using the proper expressions for $\lambda(q, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n})$ and $\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n})$ it is possible to find:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\vec{q}, \omega_\mu) &= 2\pi T N(0) \sum_{\omega_n} \Theta(-\omega_{n+\mu} \omega_{-n}) \frac{1 - \frac{\langle (\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2 \rangle_{F.S.}}{|\tilde{\omega}_{n+\mu} - \tilde{\omega}_{-n}|^2}}{|\omega_{-n} - \omega_{n+\mu}| + \frac{\langle (\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2 \rangle_{F.S.}}{\tau |\tilde{\omega}_{n+\mu} - \tilde{\omega}_{-n}|^2}} = \\ &= 4\pi T N(0) \left[\sum_{\omega_n=0} \frac{1}{2\omega_n + \omega_\mu} - \right. \end{aligned} \quad (215)$$

$$-\langle (\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2 \rangle_{F.S.} \sum_{\omega_n=0} \frac{1}{(2\omega_n + \omega_\mu)(2\omega_n + \omega_\mu + \frac{1}{\tau})^2}]$$

The calculation of sums can be accomplished in terms of the logarithmic derivative of Γ -function $\psi(x)$ what leads to the explicit expression for $\Pi(q, \omega_\mu)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N(0)}\Pi(q, \omega_\mu) &= \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T} + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2\pi T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T}\right) - \\ &- \tau^2 \left[\psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau} \psi'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right] \langle (\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2 \rangle_{F.S.} \end{aligned} \quad (216)$$

The term proportional to $\langle (\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F})^2 \rangle_{F.S.}$ may be expressed in terms of the η -coefficient of Ginzburg-Landau theory or diffusion operator $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$:

$$\frac{1}{N(0)}\Pi(q, \omega_\mu) = \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T} + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2\pi T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T}\right) - \hat{\eta}\vec{q}^2. \quad (217)$$

The definition of the critical temperature as the temperature T_c at which the pole of $L(0, 0, T_c)$ takes place

$$L^{-1}(0, 0, T_c) = g^{-1} - \Pi(0, 0, T_c) = 0 \quad (218)$$

permits us to express the fluctuation propagator in terms of the reduced temperature $\epsilon = \ln(\frac{T}{T_c})$:

$$L(q, \omega_\mu) = -\frac{1}{N(0)} \frac{1}{\ln(\frac{T}{T_c}) + \psi(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T}) - \psi(\frac{1}{2}) + \hat{\eta}\vec{q}^2} \quad (219)$$

One has to remember that this expression was carried out in the assumption of the small momenta $\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F} \ll |\tilde{\omega}_{n+\mu} - \tilde{\omega}_{-n}| \sim \max\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$, so the range of its applicability is restricted by the Ginzburg-Landau region of temperatures $\epsilon = \ln(\frac{T}{T_c}) \ll 1$, where the integrated functions in diagrammatic expressions have the singularities at small momenta.

Nevertheless it is possible to generalize the last expression for arbitrary momenta. The first hint appears in the dirty case when $\eta \sim \psi'(\frac{1}{2})$ and one can suppose that the term $\hat{\eta}\vec{q}^2$ is nothing else as the first term of the expansion of the function $\psi(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu + \hat{\mathbf{D}}\vec{q}^2}{4\pi T})$. One can find the confirmation of this hypothesis in the fact that the analytically continued expansion of the propagator

$$L^R(q, -i\omega) = -\frac{1}{N(0)} \frac{1}{\epsilon - \frac{i\pi\omega}{8T} + \hat{\eta}\bar{q}^2}, \quad (220)$$

which is valid for the region $\Delta\xi(\vec{q}, \vec{p})|_{|\vec{p}|=p_F} \ll \max\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$ and $\omega \ll T$, is nothing else as the Time Dependent Ginzburg-Landau (TDGL) equation's fundamental solution. As it is well known [229] the Maki-De Gennes equation, which in the case discussed has the form

$$\left(\ln\left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right) + \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu + \hat{\mathbf{D}}(\vec{q} - \frac{2e}{c}A)^2}{4\pi T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right) \Phi = 0 \quad (221)$$

serves as the generalization of TDGL equation. So it is natural to suppose that the most general form of the propagator, valid for arbitrary momenta and frequencies, has the form

$$L(q, \omega_\mu) = -\frac{1}{N(0)} \frac{1}{\ln\left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right) + \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu + \Omega_L + \hat{\mathbf{D}}\bar{q}^2}{4\pi T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)} \quad (222)$$

(The Larmour frequency Ω_L appeared in (222) as electron eigen-energy of the Landau state in magnetic field).

The second confirmation of the correctness of the hypothesis proposed is the direct calculation of the polarization operator from the formula (214) for the case of a $2D$ spectrum, when it is possible to carry out exactly the angular average over the Fermi surface in $\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n})$. Really, using the definition of $\lambda(q, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n})$ we can rewrite the polarization operator in the form:

$$\Pi(q, \omega_\mu) = T \sum_{\omega_n} \frac{1}{[\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_{n+\mu}, \omega_{-n})]^{-1} - \frac{1}{2\pi N(0)\tau}} \quad (223)$$

In Appendix 1 for $2D$ spectrum case it was found:

$$\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{2\pi N(0)\Theta(-\omega_1\omega_2)}{\sqrt{v_F^2 q^2 + (\tilde{\omega}_1 - \tilde{\omega}_2)^2}}, \quad (224)$$

what gives for the polarization operator

$$\Pi(q, \omega_\mu) = N(0) \sum_{n=0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left(n + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T} + \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}\right)^2 + \frac{v^2 \bar{q}^2}{16\pi^2 T^2} - \frac{1}{4\pi T\tau}}} \quad (225)$$

For $\max\{\frac{v^2 \bar{q}^2}{16\pi^2 T^2}, \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T}\} \gg 1$ the summation can be substituted by integration and one can find (for simplicity we put $T\tau \rightarrow \infty$):

$$L(q, \omega_\mu) = -\frac{1}{N(0)} \times \frac{1}{\ln(\frac{T}{T_c}) + \ln\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T}\right)^2 + \frac{v^2 \bar{q}^2}{16\pi^2 T^2}}\right) - \psi(\frac{1}{2})} \quad (226)$$

Taking into account that $\psi(x \gg 1) \rightarrow \ln x$ one can see that (226), in the limit of $\max\{\frac{v^2 \bar{q}^2}{16\pi^2 T^2}, \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T}\} \gg 1$, coincides with (222).

17 Glossary

- AL term (paraconductivity, $\delta\sigma_{AL}$) is Aslamazov-Larkin contribution;
 ARPES is angular resolved photo-emission;
 A_α is a vector-potential;
 a is the interatomic distance;
 $\alpha = \frac{1}{4m\eta_D}$ is the coefficient of the Ginzburg-Landau theory;
 $\alpha_1 = \langle (\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)^2 \rangle \approx 1$ is the coefficient of the Ginzburg-Landau theory for d-pairing;
 $\alpha_2(q) = \langle (\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)^2 \eta^2 \rangle \approx a^2 t^2 q^2$ is the kinetic energy part of the Ginzburg-Landau theory for d-pairing;
 $\alpha_q = \frac{4\eta_2 \mathbf{D} q^2}{\pi^2 v_F^2 \tau}$ is dimensionless kinetic energy in the fluctuation propagator;
 $B_\alpha(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu)$ is the integrated three Green functions block of AL contribution;
 $\beta = B/[2T_c |dB_{c2}/dT|_{T_c}] = 4\eta e B = \frac{B}{B_{c2}}$ is reduced magnetic field;
 B is magnetic field;
 B_{c2} is upper critical magnetic field at zero temperature;
 Γ is the gyromagnetic ratio;
 γ is the Euler constant;
 $\gamma_\varphi = \frac{2\eta}{v_F^2 \tau \tau_\phi} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{8T\tau_\phi}$ is the phase-breaking rate related with τ_ϕ ;
 $\gamma_B = \gamma_\varphi + \beta/2$ is the phase-breaking rate related with τ_ϕ in the presence of a magnetic field;
 \mathbf{D} is diffusion coefficient; $\mathbf{D} \sim \frac{p_F l}{m} \sim \frac{E_F \tau}{m} \rightarrow \frac{E_F}{mT_c}$ is its generalization from dirty to clean case;
 $\mathbf{D}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the diffusion tensor;
 DOS term ($\delta\sigma_{DOS}$) is the density of states fluctuation contribution;
 D is the space dimensionality;
 $D_1(z) = 2 \ln [\sqrt{z} + \sqrt{(z+r)}]$ is the function of complex variable;
 $D_2(z) = -\sqrt{z(z+r)}$ is the function of complex variable;
 $\Delta D_1(z) = D_1(z) - D_1(\varepsilon)$ is the function of complex variable;
 $\Delta D_2(z) = D_2(z) - D_2(\varepsilon)$ is the function of complex variable;
 d is the films thickness;
 E_F is the Fermi energy;
 $E(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{p}^2/(2m)$, is the kinetic energy of $2D$ free electron;

$E_0(T)$ is the energy scale at which the DOS renormalization occurs;
 $E_0^{(cl)} \sim \sqrt{T_c(T - T_c)}$,
 $E_0^{(d)} \sim T - T_c$;
 $\varepsilon = \ln(T/T_c)$ is reduced temperature;
 $\varepsilon_B = \varepsilon + \beta/2$ is reduced temperature in magnetic field;
 $\zeta(x)$ is the Riemann zeta function;
 $f_{as} \sim T/E_F$, the symmetry factor entering in the thermo-epf;
 $f(\varepsilon)$ is a universal function entering in $2D$ AL paraconductivity;
 $Gi_{(D)} = Gi_{(D)}(4\pi T\tau)$ is Ginzburg-Levanyuk parameter;
 $G(V=0, T)$ is the tunnel junction zero-bias conductance;
 $G(V)$ is the differential tunnel conductance;
 $G_n(0)$ is the background value of the Ohmic conductance supposed to be bias independent;
 $\delta G(V) = G(V) - G_n(0)$;
 $G(p, \omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - \xi(p)}$ is the single quasiparticle normal state Green's function;
 $I_{qp}(V)$ is tunneling current;
 $\int(d\mathbf{q}) = \int d^D q / (2\pi)^D$;
 $\int d^3 q \equiv \int d^2 \mathbf{q} \int_{-\pi/s}^{\pi/s} dq_z$ is momentum space integral transformation for a layered superconductor;
 $I_{\alpha\beta}(q, \omega_\mu, \omega_\nu)$ is the integrated four Green functions block entering in the MT contribution;
 $\vec{i}, \vec{j}, \vec{l}$ are the unit vectors along the axes;
 J is a hopping integral describing the Josephson interaction between layers;
 J^h and J^e are heat-current and electric current operators in Heisenberg representation;
 $\eta_D = -\frac{v_F^2 \tau^2}{D} \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi\tau T}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi\tau T} \psi'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$ is the coefficient of the gradient term of D -dimensional Ginzburg-Landau theory; $\eta \equiv \eta_2$;
 HTS - high temperature superconductors;
 $H_c(0)$ is the zero-temperature thermodynamical critical field;
 h_\pm are the components of the magnetic field at the nuclear site transverse with respect to the c axis both for NQR as well as for NMR;
 $K(\omega_\nu) = \int(d\mathbf{k}) \chi_{+-}(\mathbf{k}, \omega_\nu)$;
 $\kappa = \frac{r_1 + r_2}{r}$, $\tilde{\kappa}$ are the functions of the impurity concentration entering in the DOS contribution in the case of an arbitrary impurity concentration;

$\hat{\kappa}(\omega, T, \tau^{-1})$ is the function determinating the frequency and temperature dependence of the pseudogap in optical conductivity;
 $L_{x,y,z}$ are the sample dimensions in appropriate directions;
 l is the intralayer mean-free path;
 $L_T = \sqrt{\frac{D}{T}}$ is the diffusion length;
 $L(q, \omega_\mu)$ is the fluctuation propagator; in the absence of the magnetic field and in the vicinity of T_c , it has the form : $L^{-1}(q, \omega_\mu) = -N(0) \left[\varepsilon + \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_\mu}{4\pi T} + \alpha_q\right) - \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right]$;
 $L_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \hat{L}(\mathbf{q})(\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)(\cos k'_x a - \cos k'_y a)$ is the fluctuation propagator in the case of d-pairing;
 $\lambda(q, \omega_n, \omega_{n'})$ is the impurity vertex in the Cooper channel;
 μ is a chemical potential;
MT term, anomalous and regular ($\delta\sigma_{MT} = \delta\sigma^{MT(reg)} + \delta\sigma^{MT(an)}$), is the Maki-Thompson contribution;
 $\mathcal{N}_{c.p.}$ is the concentration of Cooper pairs;
 $\delta\mathcal{N}_{s.i.}$ is the concentration of interfering Cooper pairs;
 $\mathcal{N}_e^{(2)} = \frac{m}{2\pi} E_F$ is the one-electron concentration in 2D case;
 $N_{(2)} = \frac{m}{2\pi}$ is the density of states for 2D electron gas;
 $N_L(0), N_R(0)$ are densities of states at the Fermi levels in each of electrodes of tunnel junction in the absence of interaction;
 $\delta N_{fl}^{(2)}(E, \varepsilon)$ is the fluctuation correction to the density of states of the 2D electron gas;
 n_i is the impurity concentration;
 $\xi(p) = E(\mathbf{p}) + J \cos(p_z s) - E_F$ is the spectrum of corrugated cylinder type;
 ξ_0 is the superconductor coherence length at zero temperature: $\xi_{0,cl}^2 = \frac{7\zeta(3)}{12\pi^2 T_c^2} \frac{E_F}{2m}$ in the clean case
and $\xi_{0,d}^2 = \frac{\pi D}{8T_c}$ in the dirty case;
 $\xi(T) = \xi_0 \left(\frac{T_c}{T - T_c} \right)^{1/2}$ is the temperature dependent coherence length of the Ginzburg-Landau theory;
 ξ_{ab} is the in-plane BCS coherence length of layered superconductor;
 ξ_c is the out of plane BCS coherence length of layered superconductor;
 $\langle [\xi(p) - \xi(q - p)]^2 \rangle \equiv \tau^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{D}} q^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(v_F^2 \mathbf{q}^2 + 4J^2 \sin^2(q_z s/2) \right)$;
 $\mathcal{P}(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is the two one-electron Green's function loop integrated over internal electron momentum;

$\Pi(q, \omega_\mu)$ is the polarization operator defined as the two one-electron Green's function correlator averaged over impurities positions;

$p \equiv (\mathbf{p}, p_z)$ is a vector of momentum space;

$\mathbf{p} \equiv (p_x, p_y)$ is a two-dimensional intralayer wave-vector;

$Q^{(\text{eh})\text{R}}(\omega)$ is the Fourier representation of the retarded correlation function of two current operators;

$Q^{(\text{eh})\text{R}}(X - X') = -\Theta(t - t') \langle\langle [J^h(X), J^e(X')] \rangle\rangle : X = (\mathbf{r}, t) \text{ and } \langle\langle \dots \rangle\rangle$ represents both thermodynamical averaging and averaging over random impurity positions;

$Q_{\alpha\beta}(\omega_\nu)$ is the electromagnetic response operator;

R_n is the Ohmic resistance for unit area;

$\rho_{ab}(T)$ and $\rho_c(T)$ the components of the resistivity tensor in ab -plane and along c -axis;

$r = 4\eta_2 J^2 / v_F^2 = 4\xi_\perp^2(0) / s^2$ is the Lawrence-Doniach anisotropy parameter;

r_1, r_2 are the functions of impurity concentration accounting for the contributions of DOS diagrams;

$S = -\vartheta / \sigma$ is the Seebeck coefficient;

$\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ is the conductivity tensor;

$\sigma^n(\omega)$ is Drude conductivity;

T_{c0} is the BCS value of critical temperature;

T_c^* is the critical temperature reduced by the effect of fluctuations;

δT_c is the fluctuation shift of the critical temperature;

T_0 and T_1 are respectively the mean energy and the half width of the energy spread of the resonant defects referred to Fermi level;

\mathcal{T} is the period of electron Bloch oscillations;

$1/T_1 = 2W = \frac{\Gamma^2}{2} \int \langle h_+(t) h_-(0) \rangle e^{-i\omega_R t} dt$ is the NMR relaxation rate;

∇T is a temperature gradient;

$t_\xi^{-1} = \mathbf{D}\xi^{-2} \sim \tau_{GL}^{-1} \sim T - T_c$ is the inverse of the time necessary for the electron to diffuse over a distance equal to the coherence length $\xi(T)$;

$t_\xi^{-1} \sim v_F \xi^{-1} \sim \sqrt{T_c(T - T_c)}$ the same value for the ballistic motion;

t is the transfer integral between the nearest-neighbor sites in the theory of d-pairing;

$\tau_\phi(\varepsilon)$ is the one-electron phase-breaking time;

$\tau_{GL} = \pi\hbar / 8k_B(T - T_c)$ is the characteristic time of the Time-Dependent Ginzburg-Landau Theory; plays the role of a fluctuation Cooper pair lifetime

in the vicinity of T_c ;

τ is the quasiparticle scattering time;

τ_{hop} is the characteristic time of anisotropic diffusion from one layer to the neighboring one;

$\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function;

Θ_D is the Debye temperature;

ϑ is the thermoelectric coefficient;

Φ_0 is the elementary magnetic flux;

V is the volume of the sample;

$V(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}') = g_0(\cos k_x a - \cos k_y a)(\cos k'_x a - \cos k'_y a)$ is the interaction potential for the case of d-pairing;

$v_\alpha(p) = \frac{\partial \xi(p)}{\partial p_\alpha}$ is the quasiparticle velocity; v_F is the Fermi velocity in ab -plane;

$v_z(p) = \frac{\partial \xi(p)}{\partial p_z} = -Js \sin(p_z s)$ is the electron velocity along the c -axis direction;

$\chi_{+-}^{(R)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \chi_{+-}(\mathbf{k}, i\omega_\nu \rightarrow \omega + i0^+)$ is the dynamic susceptibility;

$\chi_s = \chi_{+-}^{(R)}(\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0, \omega = 0)$ is the spin susceptibility;

$\Psi(\vec{r})$ - superconducting order parameter, $\Psi_{\vec{k}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \int \Psi(\vec{r}) \exp^{-i\vec{k}\vec{r}} dV$ is its Fourier transform;

$\psi(x)$ and $\psi^{(n)}(x)$ are the digamma function and its derivatives respectively;

$\Omega_{(fl)}$ is the fluctuation part of the thermodynamical potential;

Ω_L is the Larmor frequency;

$\omega_\nu = (2\nu + 1)\pi T$ are the Matsubara frequencies;

$\tilde{\omega}_n = \omega_n[1 + 1/(2|\omega_n|\tau)]$ are the Matsubara frequencies renormalized by the impurity scattering;

$\omega_{n\pm\nu} = \omega_n \pm \omega_\nu$, is the sum of Matsubara frequencies;

$\tilde{\omega} = \frac{\pi\omega}{16(T - T_c)}$ is dimensionless electromagnetic field frequency;

ω_R is the resonance frequency.

References

- [1] T.Penney, S.von Holnar, D.Kaiser, F.Holtzeberg, and A.W.Kleinsasser, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 2918 (1988).
- [2] S.Martin, A.T.Fiory, R.M.Fleming, L.F.Schneemeyer and J.V.Waszcak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 2194 (1988).
- [3] G.Briceno, M.F.Crommie, A.Zettle, *Phys.Rev. Lett.*, **66**, 2164 (1991).
- [4] Y. F. Yan, P. Matl, J. M. Harris, and N. P. Ong, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, R751 (1995).
- [5] K.Hashimoto, K.Nakao, H.Kado and N.Koshizuka, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 892 (1996).
- [6] J.Axnas, W.Holm, Yu.Eltsev, and O.Rapp, *Phys Rev.Lett.* **77**, 2280 (1996).
- [7] C. H.Pennington and C. P.Slichter, in *Physical Properties of High Temperature Supeconductors*, ed. by D. M. Ginzberg World Scintific, Singapore, (1990).
- [8] D.N.Basov, T.Timusk, B.Dabrowski and J.D.Jorgensen, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 3511 (1994).
- [9] D.N.Basov, T.Timusk, B.Dabrowski, H.A.Mook, *Phys. Rev B* **52**, 13141 (1995).
- [10] A.G.Loesser, Z.-X. Shen, D.S.Dessau, *Physica C* **263** , 208 (1996).
- [11] M.Gurvitch, J.M.Valles jr, A.M.Cucolo, R.S.Dynes, J.P.Garno, L.F.Schneemeyer, and J.V.Waszcak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 1008 (1989).
- [12] A.M.Cucolo, C.Noce, and A.Romano,*Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 5864 (1992).
- [13] H.J.Tao, Farun Lu, E.L.Wolf, *Physica C* **282-287**, 563 (1997).
- [14] T.Watanabe *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **79**, 2113 (1997); submitted to *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, (1998).

- [15] M.Suzuki, S.Karimoto, K.Namekawa, *Journ. of Phys. Soc. of Japan*, **67**, v.3 (1998).
- [16] Ch.Renner, B.Revaz, J-Y. Genoud, K.Kadowaki and O.Fischer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **80**, 149 (1998).
- [17] M.A.Howson *et al*, *Phys. Rev.* **B 41**, 300 (1990).
- [18] N.V.Zavaritsky, A.A.Samoilov, and A.A.Yurgens, *JETP Letters* **55**, 127 (1992).
- [19] J.M. Harris, Y.F.Yan, N.P.Ong, *Phys.Rev.* **B 46**, 14293 (1992).
- [20] T.R.Chien *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **B 43**, 6242 (1991).
- [21] T.R.Chien, Z.Z.Wang, N.P.Ong, *Phys.Rev.* **B 46**, 14293 (1992).
- [22] A.V.Samoilov, *Phys.Rev.* **B 49**, 1246 (1994).
- [23] K.Krishana, N.P.Ong, Q.Li, G.D.Gu, N.Koshizuka, *Science* **277**, 83 (1997).
- [24] M.Houssa, H.Bougrine, S.Stassen, R.Cloots, M.Ausloos, *Phys.Rev.* **B 54**, R6885 (1996).
- [25] B.G.Levi, *Physics Today*, **49**, 17 (1996).
- [26] J.L.Tholence *et al.*, *Physica C* **235-240**, 1545 (1994).
- [27] E.Abrahams, M.Redi, and C.Woo, *Phys. Rev.* **B 1**, 218 (1970).
- [28] C.Di Castro, C.Castellani, R.Raimondi, A.Varlamov, *Phys. Rev.* **B 49**, 10211 (1990).
- [29] L.B.Ioffe, A.I.Larkin, A.A.Varlamov, L.Yu, *Phys.Rev.* **B 47**, 8936 (1993).
- [30] K.E.Gray, D.H.Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1693 (1993).
- [31] G.Balestrino, M.Marinelli, E.Milani, A.Varlamov, L.Yu, *Phys. Rev.* **B 47**, 6037 (1993).

- [32] G.Balestrino, E.Milani, A.Varlamov, *Physica C* **210** , 386 (1993).
- [33] G.Balestrino, E.Milani, C.Aruta, and A.Varlamov, *Phys. Rev B* **54**, 3628 (1996).
- [34] V.V.Dorin, R.A.Klemm, A.A.Varlamov, A.I.Buzdin, D.V.Livanov, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 12951 (1993).
- [35] A.S.Nygmatalin, A.Varlamov, D.Livanov, G.Balestrino and E.Milani, *Phys. Rev. B* **53** (1996).
- [36] D.Livanov, E.Milani, G.Balestrino and C.Aruta, *Phys. Rev. B* **55** R8701 (1997).
- [37] Y.F.Yan, P.Matl, J.M.Harris and N.P.Ong, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, R751 (1995) ; N.P.Ong, Y.F.Yan, and J.M.Harris, *proceedings of CCAST Symposium on High Tc Superconductivity and the C60 Family*, Beijing, (1994).
- [38] T. Kimura, S. Miyasaka, H. Takagi, K. Tamasaku, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, M. Hiroi, M. Sera, K. Kobayashi, *Phys.Rev. B* **53**, 8733 (1996).
- [39] W.Lang, *Physica C* **282-287**, (1997).
- [40] G.Balestrino, E.Milani, and A.A.Varlamov, *JETP Letters* **61**, 833 (1995).
- [41] A.Varlamov, D.Livanov, F.Federici, *JETP Letters* **65**, 182 (1997).
- [42] K.Maki, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **14**, 419 (1974).
- [43] A.A.Varlamov and D.V.Livanov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **71** , 325 (1990).
- [44] M.Yu.Reizer and A.V.Sergeev, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 9344 (1994).
- [45] J.Mosqueira, J. A.Veira, and Felix Vidal, *Physica C* **229**, 301 (1994); J.Mosqueira, A.Veira, J.Maza, O.Cabeza, and Felix Vidal, *Physica C* **253**, 1 (1995).
- [46] M.Randeria and A.A.Varlamov, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 10401 (1994).

- [47] P.Carretta, A.Rigamonti, A.A.Varlamov, D.V.Livanov, *Phys.Rev.* **B 54**, R9682 (1996).
- [48] F.Federici, A.A.Varlamov, *JETP Letters* **64**, 497 (1996).
- [49] V.L.Ginzburg, *Soviet Solid State*, **2**, 61 (1968).
- [50] A.A.Abrikosov, *Fundamentals of the Theory of Metals*, North-Holland, Elsevier, Groningen (1988).
- [51] A.P.Levanyuk, *Soviet Zh. Exp. Teor. Fiz.* **36**, 810 (1959).
- [52] L.G.Aslamazov, A.I.Larkin, *Soviet Solid State*, **10**, 875 (1968).
- [53] M.Tinkham, W.J.Schockpol *Progr.Mod.Phys.* **38**, 1061 (1975).
- [54] L.G.Aslamazov and A.I.Larkin, *Soviet JETP* **67**, 647 (1973).
- [55] L.G.Aslamazov and A.A.Varlamov, *Journ. of Low Temp. Phys.* **38**, 223 (1980).
- [56] B.L.Altshuler, M.Yu.Reizer and A.A.Varlamov, *Soviet JETP* **57**, 1329 (1983) .
- [57] K.Maki, *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **40**, 193 (1968).
- [58] R.S.Thompson, *Phys. Rev.* **B 1**, 327 (1970).
- [59] P.C.Hohenberg, *Phys. Rev.* **158**, 383 (1967).
- [60] P.C.Berezinskii, *Soviet JETP Letters* **34**, 610 (1971).
- [61] J.M.Kosterlitz and P.J.Thouless, *J. Phys.* **C 6**, 1181 (1973).
- [62] H.Mikeska and A.Schmidt, *Z.Phys.* **39**, 2767 (1989).
- [63] K.Maki, R.S.Thompson, *Phys. Rev.* **158**, 383 (1967).
- [64] S.Hikami, A.I.Larkin, *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **B 2**, 693 (1988).
- [65] P.Minnhagen, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **59**, 1001 (1987).

- [66] P.Minnhagen in *"Fluctuation Phenomena in High Temperature Superconductors"*, ed. by M.Ausloos and A.A.Varlamov, NATO-ASI Series, Kluwer (1997).
- [67] B.L.Altshuler and A.G.Aronov, *Electron-Electron Interaction in Disordered Conductors* in Efros, A.L. and Pollak, M. (eds.), Elsevier Scientific Publishing (1985).
- [68] M.Dinter, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **26**, 39 (1977); *ibid* **29**, 43 (1977); *ibid* **32**, 529 (1978).
- [69] A.A.Varlamov, V.V.Dorin, *Sov. JETP* **64**, 1159 (1986).
- [70] Yu.N.Ovchinnikov, *Soviet JETP* **36**, 366 (1973).
- [71] A.A.Varlamov, V.V.Dorin and I.E.Smolyarenko, *Soviet JETP* **67**, 2536 (1988).
- [72] S.Artemenko, A.Volkov, *Soviet JETP* **42**, 896 (1975).
- [73] I.O.Kulik, O.Entin-Wolmann, R.Orbach, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **43**, 591 (1980).
- [74] A.M.Finkelstein, *Soviet JETP Letters* **45**, 37 (1987).
- [75] R.Smith, M.Reizer, J.Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 6470 (1995).
- [76] H.Chu, H.Umezava, F. Khanna, *Phys. Lett. A* **191**, 174 (1994).
- [77] T.Koyama, M.Tachiki, *Physica C* **221**, 91 (1994).
- [78] V.J.Emery, S.A.Kivelson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3253 (1995).
- [79] G.Deutscher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 1555 (1995).
- [80] R.W.Cohen and B.Abels, *Phys. Rev.* **168**, 444 (1968).
- [81] A.A.Varlamov and V.V.Dorin, *Soviet JETP* **57**, 1089 (1983).
- [82] M.Belogolovski, O. Chernyak and A.Khachaturov, *Soviet Low Temperature Physics* **12**, 630 (1986).

- [83] A.M.Cucolo, R. Di Leo, P.Romano, L.Schneemeyer, J.Waszcak, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, R2857 (1991).
- [84] A.M.Cucolo, R. Di Leo, P.Romano, B.Dabrowski, D.G.Hinks and P.G.Radelli, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, R10397 (1994).
- [85] A.M.Cucolo, R. Di Leo, A.Nigro, P.Romano, F.Bobba, E.Bacca and P.Prieto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 1920 (1996).
- [86] B.L.Altshuler and A.G.Aronov, *Solid State Communications* **30**, 115 (1979).
- [87] B.L.Altshuler and A.G.Aronov, *Soviet JETP* **50**, 968 (1979).
- [88] M.Park, M.S.Isaacson, J.M.Parpia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3740 (1995).
- [89] R.Klemm, *Layered Superconductors*, to be published.
- [90] A.M.Cucolo, M.Cuoco, A.Varlamov, submitted to *Phys. Rev.* (1998).
- [91] M.R.Cimberle, C.Ferdeghini, D.Marrè, M.Putti, S.Siri, F.Federici, A.Varlamov, *Phys. Rev. B*, **B55**, R14745 (1997).
- [92] A.Buzdin, V.Dorin in "*Fluctuation Phenomena in High Temperature Superconductors*", ed. by M.Ausloos and A.A.Varlamov, NATO-ASI Series, Kluwer, Dordrecht (1997).
- [93] C.Baraduc, A.Buzdin, J.Y.Henry, J.P.Brisson, L.Puech, *Physica C* **248**, 138 (1995).
- [94] B.Veal, private communication; C.Ayache, private communication.
- [95] P.W.Anderson and Z.Zou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **60**, 132 (1988).
- [96] A.Koshelev, *Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz.* **95**, 662 (1989).
- [97] N.Kumar, P.A.Lee, and B.Shapiro, *Physica A* **168**, 447 (1990).
- [98] M.J.Graf, D.Rainer, J.A.Sauls, *Phys.Rev. B* **47**, 12089 (1993).
- [99] A.Rojo, K.Levin, *Phys.Rev. B* **48**, 16861 (1993).

- [100] A.A.Varlamov, *Europhys. Letters* **28**, 347, (1994).
- [101] M.Ya.Azbel, M.I.Kaganov and I.M.Lifshitz, *Electron Theory of Metals*, p.7. Consultants Bureau, New York (1973).
- [102] L.B.Ioffe, A.I.Larkin, A.A.Varlamov, L.Yu, *Physica C* **235-240**, 1963 (1994).
- [103] B.N.Narozhny, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 6375 (1994).
- [104] L.N.Bulaevski, M.V.Sadovskii, A.A.Varlamov, *Soviet Phys. Solid State* **28**, 997 (1986).
- [105] M.V.Sadovskii, *Phys. Rep.* **282**, 225 (1997).
- [106] D.Ch.Damianov, T.M.Mishonov, *Superlattices and Microstructures* **21**, 467 (1997).
- [107] A.M.Gulian, *Phys. Lett. A*, **200**, 201 (1995).
- [108] M.L.Horbach, F.L.J.Vos, W. van Saarloos, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 3539 (1994).
- [109] R.A.Klemm and S. H.Liu, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 6375 (1994).
- [110] S. H.Liu and R.A.Klemm *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 4080; *ibid* 10650 (1993).
- [111] R.A.Klemm, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **16**, 381 (1974).
- [112] R.A.Klemm, M.R.Beasley, and A.Luther, *Phys. Rev. B* **8**, 5072 (1973); *ibid.* **B 12**, 877 (1975).
- [113] W.Holm,Yu.Eltsev, O.Rapp, *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 11992 (1995).
- [114] C.Baraduc, V Pagnon, A.Buzdin, J.Y.Henry, and C.Ayache, *Phys. Lett. A* **166**, 267 (1992).
- [115] W.E.Lawrence and S.Doniach, *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Low Temperature Physics*, edited by E.Kanda, Academic Press of Japan, Kyoto, p.361 (1971).
- [116] R.A.Klemm, *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 2073 (1990).

- [117] L.Reggiani, R.Vaglio, A.Varlamov, *Phys.Rev.* **B 44**, 9541 (1991).
- [118] I.O.Kulik, *Pisma v ZhETF* **10**, 488 (1969).
- [119] I.O.Kulik, *Zh.Exp.Teor.Fiz.* **60**, 2171 (1970).
- [120] A.Barone and G.-F.Paterno, *Physics and Applications of the Josephson Effect*, Wiley-Interscience, New York (1981).
- [121] K.Semba, A.Matsuda, *Phys.Rev.* **B55**, 11103 (1997).
- [122] S. Martin et al., *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **54**, 72 (1989).
- [123] S. Martin et al., *Phys. Rev.* **B 42**, 846 (1990).
- [124] P.W.Anderson and Z.Zou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 132 (1988).
- [125] M.F.Crommie , A.Y.Liu, A.Zettl, M.L.Cohen, P.Parilla, M.F.Hundley, W.N.Creager, S.Hoen, and M.S.Sherwin, *Phys.Rev.* **B 39** , 4231 (1989).
- [126] M.F.Crommie, and A.Zettl, *Phys.Rev.* **B 43**, 408 (1991).
- [127] N.Kumar and A.M.Jayannavar, *Phys.Rev.* **B 45**, 5001 (1992).
- [128] P.B.Littlewood and C.M.Varma, *Phys.Rev.* **B 45**, 12636 (1992).
- [129] R.A.Klemm in "*Fluctuation Phenomena in High Temperature Superconductors*", ed. by M.Ausloos and A.A.Varlamov, NATO-ASI Series, Kluwer, (1997).
- [130] A.A.Abrikosov, *Phys. Rev.* **B 52**, R7026 (1995).
- [131] P.P.Freitas, C.C.Tsuei, and T.S.Plaskett, *Phys.Rev.* **B 36**, 833 (1987).
- [132] M.A.Dubson, J.J.Calabrese, S.T.Herberto, D.C.Harris, B.R.Patton, and J.C.Garland, *Novel Superconductivity*, ed. by S.A.Wolf and V.Z.Kresin, Plenum, New York, p.981 (1987).
- [133] M.Ausloos S.K.Patapis and P.Clippe, *Physics and Material Science of HTS II* Edited by R.Kossowski, S.Methfessel, D.Wohlleben and S.K.Patapis, Kluwer, Dodrecht, p.755 (1992).

- [134] R.Vaglio, C.Attanasio, L.Maritato and A.Ruosi, *Phys.Rev.* **B 47**, 15302 (1993).
- [135] J.Mosqueira, A.Pomar, A.Diaz, J. A.Veira, and Felix Vidal, *Physica C* **225**, 34 (1994).
- [136] G.Balestrino, M.Marinelli, E.Milani, L.Reggiani, R.Vaglio, A.Varlamov, *Phys. Rev.* **B 46**, 14919 (1992).
- [137] M.Ausloos and C.Laurent, *Phys.Rev.* **B 37**, 611 (1988).
- [138] N.P.Ong, Z.Z.Wag, S.Hagen, T.W.Jing, J.Clayhold, and J.Horvath, *Physica C* **153-155**, 1072 (1988).
- [139] B.Oh, K.Char, A.D.Kent, M.Naito, M.R.Geballe, R.H.Hammond, A.Kapitulnik, and J.M.Graybeal, *Phys.Rev.* **B 37**, 7861 (1988).
- [140] F.Vidal, J.A.Veira, J.Maza, J.J.Ponte, F.Garcia-Alvarado, E.Moran, and M.A.Alario *Physica C* **153-155**, 1371 (1988).
- [141] F.Vidal, J.A.Veira, J.Maza, F.Migueluez, E.Moran, and M.A.Alario, *Solid State Commun.* **66**, 421 (1988).
- [142] J.A.Veira, J.Maza, and F.Vidal, *Phys. Lett A* **131**, 310 (1988).
- [143] S.H.Han, O.Rapp, *Solid St. Comm.*, **94**, 661 (1995).
- [144] S.N.Bhatia, C.P.Dhard, *Phys. Rev.* **B49**, 12206 (1994).
- [145] G.Balestrino, A.Nigro, R.Vaglio, and M.Marinelli, *Phys. Rev.* **B 39**, 12264 (1989).
- [146] A.Pomar, A.Diaz, M.V.Ramallo, C.Torron, J. A.Veira and Felix Vidal, *Physica C* **218**, 257 (1993).
- [147] M.V.Ramallo, A.Pomar and Felix Vidal, *Phys. Rev.* **B 54**, 4341 (1996).
- [148] A.Pomar, M.V.Ramallo, J.Mosqueira, C.Torron and Felix Vidal, *Phys. Rev.* **B 54**, 7470 (1996).
- [149] M.Ausloos, F.Gillet, C.H.Laurent and P.Clippe, *Z. Phys.* **B 84**, 13 (1991).

- [150] Yu.I.Latyshev, O.Laborde and P.Monceau, *Europhysics Letters* **29**, 495 (1995).
- [151] W. Lang, *Z. Phys.* **B97**, 583 (1995).
- [152] A. Wahl, D. Thopart, G. Villard, A. Maignan, V. Hardy, J.C. Soret., unpublished.
- [153] T.Watanabe, A.Matsuda, *Physica* **C263**, 313 (1996).
- [154] W.Lang, *Physica* **C245**, 69 (1995).
- [155] W. Volz, F.S. Razavi, G. Quiron, H.-U. Habermeier, A.L. Solovjov, *Phys. Rev.* **B 55** 6631 (1997).
- [156] C.Sekirnjak, W.Lang, S.Proyer, P.Schwab, *Physica* **C243**, 60 (1995).
- [157] M.Suzuki and M. Hikita, *Phys. Rev.* **B 44**, 249 (1991).
- [158] J.Sugawara, H.Iwasaki, N.Kobayashi, H.Yamane and T.Hirai, *Phys. Rev.* **B 46**, 14818 (1992).
- [159] W.Holm, M.Andersson, O.Rapp, M.A.Kulikov and I.N.Makarenko, *Phys. Rev.* **B 48**, 4227 (1993).
- [160] W.Lang, G.Heine, W.Kula and R.Sobolewski, *Phys. Rev.* **B 51**, 9180 (1995).
- [161] G.Heine, W.Lang et al., *Phys.Rev.*, in press (1998).
- [162] W.Holm, O.Rapp, C.N.L.Johnson and U.Helmersson, *Phys. Rev.* **B 52**, 3748 (1995).
- [163] A.G.Aronov, S.Hikami and A.I.Larkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 965 (1989).
- [164] S.Ami, K.Maki *Phys. Rev.* **B 18**, 4714 (1978).
- [165] J.B.Bieri and K.Maki, *Phys. Rev.* **B 42**, 4854 (1990).
- [166] J.B.Bieri, K.Maki, and R.S.Thompson, *Phys. Rev.* **B 44**, 4709 (1991).
- [167] A.Buzdin, A.Varlamov, *Phys. Rev.* **B**, in press.

- [168] Y. Matsuda, T. Hirai, and S. Komiyama, *Solid State Commun.* **68**, 103 (1988).
- [169] Y. Matsuda, T. Hirai, S. Komiyama, T. Terashima, Y. Bando, K. Iijima, K. Yamamoto, and K. Hirata, *Phys. Rev.* **B 40**, 5176 (1989).
- [170] K. Winzer and G. Kumm, *Z. Phys.* **B 82**, 317 (1991).
- [171] N. Overend and M. A. Howson, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **4**, 9615 (1992).
- [172] K. Semba, T. Ishii, and A. Matsuda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 769 (1991).
- [173] M. Hikita and M. Suzuki, *Phys. Rev.* **B 39**, 4756 (1989).
- [174] W. Lang, W. Göb, W. Kula, and R. Sobolewski, *Z. Phys.* **B 98**, 453 (1995).
- [175] D. H. Kim, K. E. Gray, R. T. Kampwirth, and D. M. McKay, *Phys. Rev.* **B 43**, 2910 (1991).
- [176] C. M. Fu, W. Boon, Y. S. Wang, V. V. Moshchalkov, and Y. Bruynseraede, *Physica C* **200**, 17 (1992).
- [177] C. P. Dhard, S. N. Bhatia, P. V. P. S. S. Sastry, J. V. Yakhmi, and A. K. Nigam, *J. Appl. Phys.* **76**, 6944 (1994).
- [178] F. Gollnik, H. C. Ri, A. Beck, R. Gross, P. Wagner, and H. Adrian, *Physica C* **235-240**, 1933 (1994).
- [179] R. S. Thompson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 2280 (1991).
- [180] J. M. Harris, Y. F. Yan, P. Matl, N. P. Ong, P. W. Anderson, T. Kimura, and K. Kitazawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1391 (1995).
- [181] W. Göb, W. Lang, R. Sobolewski, *Phys. Rev.* **B 57**, R8150 (1998).
- [182] W. Lang, *Physica C* **226**, 267 (1994).
- [183] W. Lang, *Physica C* **235**, 1447 (1994).
- [184] A. Matsuda and K. Semba, *Physica C* **185-189**, 797 (1991).

- [185] K.Nakao, K.Takamaku, K.Hashimoto, N.Koshizuka and S.Tanaka, *Physica B* **201**, 262 (1994).
- [186] G.Heine, W.Lang, X.L.Wang and X.Z.Wang, *J.Low Temp. Phys.* **105** 945 (1996).
- [187] W.Lang, G.Heine, W.Liebich, X.L.Wang and X.Z.Wang, in "*Fluctuation Phenomena in High Temperature Superconductors*", M.Ausloos and A.A.Varlamov Editors, NATO-ASI Series, Kluwer (1997).
- [188] J.H.Cho, M.P.Maley, S.Fleshler, A. Lacerda, L.N. Bulaevskii, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 6493 (1994).
- [189] R.Ikeda, T.Ohmi, and T.Tsuneto, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. Letters* **58**, 1377 (1989).
- [190] S.Ullah and A.T.Dorsey, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, 262 (1991).
- [191] S. Sarti, D. Neri, E. Silva, R. Fastampa, M. Giura, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 2356 (1997).
- [192] R. Ikeda, T. Ohmi, T. Tsuneto, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **60**, 1051 (1991).
- [193] J.H.Cho, M.P.Maley, H.Safar, J.Y.Coulter, L.N. Bulaevskii, *Physica, C* **265**, 277 (1996).
- [194] M.Houssa, M.Ausloos, R.Coots, H.Bourguine, *Phys.Rev B* **56** (1997).
- [195] H.Schmidt, *Ann. Phys. Lpz.* **216**, 336 (1968).
- [196] J.C.Booth, S.M. Dong Ho Wu, Anlage, *Czechoslovak Journal of Physics*, **46**, 1399 (1996).
- [197] D.B.Tanner and T.Timusk, "Optical Properties of High T_c Superconductors" in *Properties of High Temperature Superconductors III*, edited by D.M.Ginsberg, World Scientific Singapore, p.428 (1992).
- [198] P.Calvani, "*Infrared Optical Properties of High- T_c Cuprates*" in *High T_c Superconductivity: Theory and Experiments*, edited by M.Acquarone, World Pub. Co., Singapore, p.233 (1996).

- [199] A.V.Rapoport, *Sov. Phys. Solid State* **33**, 309 (1991).
- [200] D.Kumar, *J. Phys. Cond. Matter* **5**, 8227 (1993).
- [201] Yong Lu, B.R.Patton, *Journal of Physics* **7**, 9247 (1995).
- [202] S.Keshri, P.K.Barhai, *Czechoslovak Journal of Physics*, **47**, 249 (1997).
- [203] A.A.Varlamov, L.Reggiani, D.V.Livanov *Phys. Lett.*, **A 165**, 369 (1992).
- [204] S.Alexander, T.Maniv, *Physica* **C9**, 1699 (1976).
- [205] K.Kuboki, H.Fukuyama, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn* **58**, 376 (1989).
- [206] J.Heym, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **89**, 869 (1992).
- [207] M.Crisan, *Phys.Rev.* **49**, 9874 (1994).
- [208] M.Randeria, N.Trivedi and R.T.Scalettar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2001 (1992).
- [209] C.A.R.Sá de Melo, M.Randeria, and J.R.Engelbrecht, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3202 (1993).
- [210] W.W.Warren *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1193 (1989); M.Takigawa *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **B 43**, 247 (1991).
- [211] D.Rainer (private communication); D. Rainer in *Prog. Low Temp. Phys.*, edited by D. F. Brewer, Elsevier, (1986).
- [212] J.Appel, D.Fay, *Journal of Low Temp. Phys.*, **99**, 549 (1995).
- [213] J.Appel, D.Fay, C.Kautz, *Journal of Superconductivity* , **7**, 607 (1994).
- [214] A.Rigamonti, A.Varlamov, *Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo – Accademia di Scienze e Lettere*, Milano (1997).
- [215] D.E.MacLaughlin, in *Solid State Physics*, Vol 31, edited by H.Ehrenreich *et al.*, Academic (1976).
- [216] D.J.Van Harlingen, *Review of Modern Physics* **67** , 515 (1995).

- [217] A.Barone, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **D 16**, 1635 (1994).
- [218] S.Yip, *Physical Review* **B 41**, 2612 (1990); *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **31**, 129 (1990).
- [219] K.Maki and H.Won, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 1738 (1994); H.Won and K.Maki, *Phys. Rev.* **B 49**, 15305 (1994).
- [220] M.Ney-Nifle, M.Gabay, *Physica C*, **250**, 349 (1995).
- [221] K.A.Müller, *Nature* 377, 133 (1995).
- [222] R.L. Corey N.J.Curro, K.O'Hara, T.Imai, C.B.Slichter, K.Yoshimura, M.Katoh and K.Kosuge, *Phys.Rev* **B 53**, 5907 (1996).
- [223] H.Zimmermann, M.Mali, M.Bankey, D.Brinkmann, *Physica C* **185 - 189**, 1145 (1991); D. Brinkmann, *Appl. Magn. Resonance* **8**, 67 (1995).
- [224] M.Bankey, M.Mali, J.Roos, I.Mangelschots, D.Brinkmann, *Phys. Rev.* **B 46**, 11228 (1992).
- [225] M.Randeria, *Physica* **B 199-200**, 373 (1994).
- [226] J.Maly, K.Levin, D.Z.Liu, *Phys. Rev.* **B 54**, R15657 (1996).
- [227] V.B.Geshkenbein, L.B.Ioffe, A.I.Larkin, *Phys. Rev.* **B 55**, 3173 (1997).
- [228] A.A.Abrikosov, L.P.Gorkov, I.E.Dzyaloshinski, *Methods of the quantum field theory in statistical physics*, Dover Publications, New York (1963).
- [229] *Superconductivity*, Edited by Parks, vol.2, (1969).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. The temperature dependence of the averaged order parameter after renormalisation by fluctuations. The dash-dotted line represents the BCS curve for the unperturbed transition temperature, T_c . The dashed line is the BCS curve for the fluctuation-renormalised transition temperature, T_c^* . The solid line is the fluctuation-renormalised average of the squared order parameter, $\langle |\Psi_{fl}|^2 \rangle (T)$, as given in Eq. (11).

Figure 2. The theoretical prediction of Eq. (25) for the normalised correction $\delta N(E)$ to the single-particle density of states vs energy E (measured in units of T_c) for a clean two-dimensional superconductor above T_c . τ_{GL}^{-1} assumes the values $0.02T_c$, $0.04T_c$ and $0.06T_c$. In the inset the dependence of the energy at which $\delta N(E)$ is a maximum, E_0 , on τ_{GL}^{-1} is shown [28].

Figure 3. The theoretical prediction of Eq. (30) for the fluctuation-induced zero-bias anomaly in tunnel-junction resistance as a function of voltage for reduced temperatures $t = 1.05$ (top curve), $t = 1.08$ (middle curve) and $t = 1.12$ (bottom curve). The insert shows the experimentally observed differential resistance as a function of voltage in an Al-I-Sn junction just above the transition temperature [82].

Figure 4. Theoretical fit (solid line) of the experimentally observed temperature dependence zero-bias conductance of the YBaCuO/Pb junction of Ref. [85]. The theory used is that of Eqs. (30) and (33) with $r = 0.07$ and $T_c = 90K$. The inset shows the same results in a wider region of temperature.

Figure 5. Normalised tunneling conductance data of the BSSCO-2212/Pb junctions of Ref. [13]. Pseudo-gap type non-linearities are seen in the temperature range from $T_c = 87 - 89K$ to $110K$.

Figure 6. Theoretical fit of the $G(V, T)$ data from the BSSCO-2212 junctions of Ref. [15]. The solid lines are the experimental data at $T = 90K$ and $100K$ for a sample where $T_c = 87K$. The thin lines are the theory of Eq. (30) with parameters $r = 0$ and $Gi_{(2)} = 0.008$.

Figure 7. The electronic spectrum for our model of HTSC materials as written in Eqn. (34). The Fermi surface takes the form of a corrugated cylinder.

Figure 8. The origin of the Aslamazov-Larkin and Maki-Thompson contributions to fluctuation conductivity in terms of electron-electron pairing. (a) Correlations between electrons of opposite spin and momenta moving in a straight line in opposite directions lead to the Aslamazov-Larkin terms. (b) Correlations between electrons of opposite spin moving in opposite directions

along a self-intersecting trajectory in real space lead to the Maki-Thompson terms.

Figure 9. Feynman diagrams for the leading-order contributions to fluctuation conductivity. Wavy lines are fluctuation propagators, thin solid lines with arrows are impurity-averaged normal-state Green's functions, shaded semicircles are vertex corrections arising from impurities, dashed lines with central crosses are additional impurity renormalisations and shaded rectangles are impurity ladders. Diagram 1 is the Aslamazov-Larkin term; diagrams 2–4 are the Maki-Thompson terms; diagrams 5–10 arise from corrections to the normal state density of states; diagram 11 is an example of a higher-order contribution.

Figure 10. The minimal self-intersecting trajectory for the Maki-Thompson contribution to the c -axis conductivity. A quasiparticle hops from one layer to neighbouring layer, diffuses within that layer, hops back to the first layer, and finally diffuses back to its starting point.

Figure 11. The graphical form of the Maki-Thompson contribution showing that it is the precursor phenomenon of the Josephson effect. Starting from the diagram for the Josephson current for $T < T_c$, we expand the Gorkov F-functions to linear order in Δ as $T \rightarrow T_c$, and for $T > T_c$ replace Δ , Δ^* by the $\Delta\Delta^*$ propagator which is just the fluctuation propagator L .

Figure 12. Theoretical predictions [34] for the zero-field resistivities ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N (dashed curves) and ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N (solid curves) vs reduced temperature T/T_{c0} . In each plot $\tau T_{c0} = 1$ and $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 1$ (top curves), $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 10$ (middle curves) and $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 100$ (bottom curves). All temperatures shown are in the region $1 \leq T/T_{c0} \leq 1.06$. Plots (a)–(c) differ in the values of the parameters r and E_F : (a) $r(T_{c0}) = 0.1$, $E_F/T_{c0} = 300$, (b) $r(T_{c0}) = 0.01$, $E_F/T_{c0} = 300$, (c) $r(T_{c0}) = 0.001$, $E_F/T_{c0} = 500$.

Figure 13. Theoretical predictions [34] for zero-field resistivities ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N (dashed curves) and ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N (solid curves) vs reduced temperature T/T_{c0} for the parameters $r(T_{c0}) = 0.01$, $E_F/T_{c0} = 300$, $\tau T_{c0} = 0.1$ and $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 1$ (top curves), $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 10$ (middle curves) and $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 100$ (bottom curves). Changing the value of τT_{c0} into the dirty limit has suppressed the peak in ρ_{zz}/ρ_{zz}^N .

Figure 14. Theoretical predictions [34] for zero-field resistivity ρ_{xx}/ρ_{xx}^N with (top curves) and without (bottom curves) the density of states contributions. The parameters used are $E_F/T_{c0} = 300$, $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 10$ and $r(T_{c0}) = 0.1$ (dashed curves) or $r(T_{c0}) = 0.01$ (solid curves). We see that the DOS conti-

butions lead to an overall increase in resistivity.

Figure 15. Resistance $R(t)$ vs reduced temperature $t = T/T_c$ for the three BSCCO-2212 samples utilised in [136] for fluctuation measurements. Resistances are normalised to their values at $T = 1.33T_c$.

Figure 16. Temperature dependence of the excess conductivity of 4 YBCO samples as measured in [131]. The solid lines are the predictions of the AL theory for 3D and 2D cases. The dashed line is the modified theory of [91].

Figure 17. The normalised excess conductivity $f(\epsilon) = (16\hbar s/e^2)\Delta\sigma$ of the BSCCO samples in Fig. 15 plotted against $\epsilon = \ln(T/T_c)$ in a ln-ln plot as described in [136]. The solid line is the extended theory of Reggiani, Vaglio and Varlamov [117]. The dashed line is the 2D AL theory.

Figure 18. The normalised excess conductivity $f(\epsilon) = (16\hbar s/e^2)\Delta\sigma$ for samples of YBCO-123 (triangles), BSCCO-2212 (squares) and BSCCO-2223 (circles) plotted against $\epsilon = \ln(T/T_c)$ in a ln-ln plot as described in [91]. The dotted and solid lines are the AL theory in 3D and 2D respectively. The dashed line is the extended theory of [117].

Figure 19. Fit of the temperature dependence of the transverse resistance of an underdoped BSCCO c-axis oriented film with the results of the fluctuation theory [32]. The inset shows the details of the fit in the temperature range between T_c and 110K.

Figure 20. Comparison of the curvatures of experimental curves of ρ_c/ρ_{ab} vs temperature for a BSSCO film [33] with the predictions of the resonant tunneling model of Abrikosov (94). The solid lines are the theoretical fits; the points are the data for a reduced sample (open squares), as-grown sample (closed circles) and oxidised sample (open diamonds). These fits show that the experimental data cannot be fit by a theory which predicts singular behaviour at $T = 0$ instead of at $T = T_c$. The dashed line is the simulated behavior according to the fluctuation theory for the argon annealed sample.

Figure 21. Plots of the possible behaviour [33] of the normal-state c-axis resistance of a BSSCO-2212 sample after the predicted fluctuation contributions have been subtracted from the experimental data (open circles). The solid lines are the subtracted data for three values of the Fermi energy: $E_F = 0.8\text{eV}$ (bottom curve), $E_F = 1.0\text{eV}$ (middle curve) and $E_F = 1.25\text{eV}$ (upper curve). We see that after subtraction of the fluctuation contribution, there may still be a weaker temperature dependence of the normal-state resistance to explain.

Figure 22. Experimental data showing the effect of a magnetic field par-

allel to the c -axis on the in-plane resistivity $\rho_{ab}(T)$ and transverse resistivity $\rho_c(T)$ of BSCCO single crystals [3]. The insets show the zero field behaviour. We see that the size of the peak increases and moves to lower temperature.

Figure 23. Theoretical prediction [34] for the magnetic field dependence of resistivities $\rho_{xx}(T)/\rho_{xx}^N$ (dashed curves) and $\rho_{zz}(T)/\rho_{zz}^N$ (solid curves). The parameters used are $\tau T_{c0} = 1$, $\tau_\phi T_{c0} = 10$, $r(T_{c0}) = 0.01$, and $E_F/T_{c0} = 300$, with field strengths corresponding to $\beta(T_{c0}) = 0, 0.05$ and 0.1 .

Figure 24. Transverse magnetoconductivity of YBCO thin films (\circ) (from [156]) and single crystals (\bullet) (calculated from [180]) as a function of the reduced temperature ϵ (after [187]). The broken line is a fit to the clean-limit theory [165, 179] including all four contributions and the solid line represents the sum of the orbital AL contribution and the quasiparticle magnetoconductivity estimated from the Hall effect with $A = 1.7$. The latter two are also shown separately by dash-dotted and dotted curves, respectively.

Figure 25. Negative c -axis magnetoresistance at various temperatures in 2212 BSCCO single crystals after [37].

Figure 26. Fit [40] of the experimental c -axis magnetoresistance in the BSCCO-2212 samples of Ref. [37] to the fluctuation theory predictions of Eqs. (99)–(102). The fitting parameters used were $v_F = 3.1 \times 10^6$ cm/s, $\tau = 1.0 \times 10^{-14}$ s and $\tau_\phi = 8.7 \times 10^{-14}$ s.

Figure 27. Theoretical prediction of Eq. (136) [40] for the temperature dependence of the c -axis magnetoresistivity of BSSCO-2212. The fitting parameters are the same as those used in Fig. 26 to fit the data of Ref. [37].

Figure 28. Measured temperature dependence of the c -axis magnetoconductivity of two YBCO single crystals at $B = 12T$ [6]. The solid lines are fits to the fluctuation theory prediction of Eq. (136) with fitting parameters $v_F = 2 \times 10^7$ cm/s, $\tau(100K) = \tau_\phi(100K) = (4 \pm 1) \times 10^{-15}$ s and $J = (215 \pm 10)K$. The inset is an enlarged view of the temperature region close to T_c .

Figure 29. Fit of c -axis resistance curves of BSCCO-2212 single crystals in a magnetic field with the Josephson coupling theory of Kim and Gray [30].

Figure 30. Fit of the measured temperature dependence of the c -axis magnetoresistance of a BSSCO-2212 film to the fluctuation theory [33]. The points are experimental data at different magnetic fields: $B = 0T$ (circles), $B = 0.2T \equiv \beta = 0.003$ (squares) and $B = 0.4T \equiv \beta = 0.006$ (triangles). The lines are the predictions of Eqs. (99)–(102) with fitting parameters $\tau = (5.6 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-14}$ s, $\tau_\phi = (8.6 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-13}$ s, $E_F = (1.07 \pm 0.12)eV$ and $J = (43 \pm$

4) K . For temperatures below the resistance maximum the fit underestimates the resistance, the discrepancy becoming larger with increasing field.

Figure 31. (a). Fit of experimental $\rho_{ab}(T)$ curves of a 2212 BSCCO film in various external magnetic fields (see inset) with the fluctuation theory in the Hartree approximation after [36] (b). Fit of experimental $\rho_c(T)$ curves of the same film as in (a) in various external magnetic fields with the fluctuation theory in the Hartree approximation after [36]. Fitting parameters (see text) are the same as for (a).

Figure 32. (a). c -axis resistance vs. magnetic field in 2212 BSCCO single crystals. Temperatures are 63.9 K, 68.1 K, 70.4 K, 74.0 K, 77.8 K, 80.1 K, 84.4 K, 91.4 K, 95.7 K, 99.5 K from above. T_c was 79 K. (b). Calculated c -axis magnetoresistance at several temperatures according to the fluctuation theory including the DOS contribution. After [185].

Figure 33. The theoretical dependence [48] of the real part of conductivity, normalized on the Drude normal conductivity, on ω/T , $\Re[\sigma'(\omega)] = \text{Re}[\sigma(\omega)]/\sigma^n$. The dashed line refers to the ab -plane component of the conductivity tensor whose Drude normal conductivity is $\sigma_{\parallel}^n = N(0)e^2\tau v_F^2$. The solid line refers to the c -axis component whose Drude normal conductivity is $\sigma_{\perp}^n = \sigma_{\parallel}^n J^2 s^2 / v_F^2$. In this plot we have put $T\tau = 0.3$, $E_F/T = 50$, $r = 0.01$, $\varepsilon = 0.04$, $T\tau_{\varphi} = 4$.

Figure 34. The theoretical behavior [48] of the c -axis component of conductivity frequency dependence, for different values of temperature, is shown. The solid line refers to $\varepsilon = 0.04$; the dashed line refers to $\varepsilon = 0.06$; the dot-dashed line refers to $\varepsilon = 0.08$. $T\tau = 0.2$ for all the curves. The other parameters of this plot are the same used in Fig. 33

Figure 35. The opening of the pseudo-gap in the c -axis conductivity measurements on $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$ samples [8]

Figure 36. The theoretical dependence [48] of $\text{Re}[\sigma_{\perp}(\omega)/\sigma_{\perp}^n]$ on ω/T for different values of $T\tau$. The solid line refers to $T\tau = 0.4$; the dot-dashed line refers to $T\tau = 0.3$; the dashed line refers to $T\tau = 0.2$. The other parameters of this plot are the same used in Fig. 33.

Figure 37. The Feynman diagrams for the fluctuation correction to thermoelectric coefficient are shown. Shaded partial circles are impurity vertex corrections (153), dashed curves with central crosses are additional impurity renormalizations, and shaded thick lines are additional impurity vertex corrections.

Figure 38. Diagrams for the fluctuation contribution to the dynamic spin

susceptibility χ_{+-} .

Figure 39. The transformation of the MT type diagram for the NMR relaxation rate in self-intersecting trajectory.

Figure 40. The ^{63}Cu relaxation rates in zero field $2W(0)$ (from NQR relaxation) and $2W(H)$ in a field of 5.9 T (from NMR relaxation of the $-1/2 \rightarrow 1/2$ line) in the oriented powders of YBCO, with $T_c(0) = 90.5$ K and $T_c(H) = 87.5$ K. In the inset the relaxation rates, normalized with respect to $W(H) = W(0)$ for $T \gg T_c$, are reported as a function of T/T_c .

Figure 41. The Dyson equation in the ladder approximation for the particle particle channel vertex $\lambda(\vec{q}, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ renormalized by impurities (shaded partial circles). Here the dashed line, as usually, presents the "impurity propagator" $1/2\pi N(0)\tau$ (which is nothing else as the square of the scattering amplitude $|U|^2$ averaged over the solid angles), solid lines are one-electron Green functions (58) already averaged over impurities configuration.

Figure 42. The Dyson equation in the ladder approximation for the fluctuation propagator.

Table 1

	$\beta \ll \epsilon$	$\epsilon \ll \beta \ll r \quad (3D)$	$\max\{\epsilon, r\} \ll \beta \quad (2D)$
$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{DOS}$	$\frac{e^2 s \kappa}{3 \cdot 2^7 \eta} \frac{r(\epsilon+r/2)}{[\epsilon(\epsilon+r)]^{3/2}} \beta^2$	$0.428 \frac{e^2 s \kappa}{16 \eta} \cdot r \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}}$	$\frac{e^2 s \kappa}{8 \eta} \cdot r \cdot \ln \frac{\sqrt{\beta/2}}{\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sqrt{\epsilon+r}}$
$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}$	$\frac{e^2 s \tilde{\kappa}}{3 \cdot 2^8 \eta} \frac{r^2}{[\epsilon(\epsilon+r)]^{3/2}} \beta^2$	$0.428 \frac{e^2 s \tilde{\kappa}}{8 \eta} \cdot r \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}}$	$\sigma_{zz}^{MT(reg)}(0, \epsilon) - \frac{\pi^2 e^2 s \tilde{\kappa}}{2^7 \eta} \cdot \frac{r^2}{\beta}$
$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{AL}$	$-\frac{e^2 s}{2^{10} \eta} \frac{r^2(\epsilon+r/2)}{[\epsilon(\epsilon+r)]^{5/2}} \beta^2$	$-\sigma_{zz}^{AL}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{4.57 e^2 s}{\eta} \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}$	$-\sigma_{zz}^{AL}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{7\zeta(3) e^2 s}{2^7 \eta} \cdot \frac{r^2}{\beta^2}$
$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}$ $\min\{\epsilon, r\} \ll \gamma_\varphi$	$-\frac{e^2 s}{3 \cdot 2^9 \eta} \frac{r^2}{[\epsilon(\epsilon+r)]^2} \beta^2$	$-\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{e^2 s}{32 \eta} \sqrt{\frac{r}{\gamma_\varphi}}$	$-\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{3\pi^2 e^2 s}{2^7 \eta} \frac{\max\{r, \epsilon\}}{\beta}$
$\Delta\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}$ $\gamma_\varphi \ll \min\{\epsilon, r\}$	$-\frac{e^2 s}{3 \cdot 2^9 \eta} \frac{\sqrt{r}}{\epsilon \gamma^{3/2}} \beta^2$	$-\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}(0) + \frac{4.57 e^2 s}{64 \eta} \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}$	$-\sigma_{zz}^{MT(an)}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{3\pi^2 e^2 s}{2^7 \eta} \frac{(r+\epsilon)}{\beta}$

Table 2

	$\beta \ll \epsilon$	$\epsilon \ll \beta \ll r$	$\max\{\epsilon, r\} \ll \beta$
$\Delta\sigma_{xx}^{AL}$	$-\frac{e^2}{2^9 s} \frac{[8\epsilon(\epsilon+r)+3r^2]}{[\epsilon(\epsilon+r)]^{5/2}} \beta^2;$	$-\sigma_{xx}^{AL}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{e^2}{2s} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta r}};$	$-\sigma_{xx}^{AL}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{e^2}{4s} \frac{1}{\beta};$
$\Delta\sigma_{xx}^{MT(an)}$ ($\min\{\epsilon, r\} \ll \gamma_\varphi$)	$-\frac{e^2}{3 \cdot 2^7 s} \frac{(\epsilon+r/2)}{[\epsilon(\epsilon+r)]^{3/2}} \beta^2;$	$-\sigma_{xx}^{MT}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{e^2}{8s} \frac{1}{\gamma_\varphi} \ln \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_\varphi}}{\sqrt{\beta} + \sqrt{\beta+r}};$	
$\Delta\sigma_{xx}^{MT(an)}$ ($\gamma_\varphi \ll \min\{\epsilon, r\}$)	$-\frac{e^2}{3 \cdot 2^7 s} \frac{1}{\epsilon \gamma^{3/2} r^{1/2}} \beta^2;$	$-\sigma_{xx}^{MT}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{4.57e^2}{16s} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta r}};$	$-\sigma_{xx}^{MT}(0, \epsilon) + \frac{3\pi^2 e^2}{16s} \frac{1}{\beta};$
$\Delta(\sigma_{xx}^{DOS} + \sigma_{xx}^{MT(reg)})$	$\frac{e^2(\kappa+\tilde{\kappa})}{3 \cdot 2^9 s} \frac{(\varepsilon+r/2)}{[\varepsilon(\varepsilon+r)]^{3/2}} \beta^2;$	$0.428 \frac{e^2(\kappa+\tilde{\kappa})}{2^6 s} \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2r}};$	$\frac{e^2(\kappa+\tilde{\kappa})}{32s} \cdot \ln \frac{\sqrt{\beta/2}}{(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sqrt{\epsilon+r})}.$

Table 3

	$\tau(s)$	$\tau_\varphi(s)$	J(K)	$E_F(eV)$	$v_F(cm/s)$
Balestrino et al.[32]	$5 \cdot 10^{-14}$	-	(40)	-	$1.4 \cdot 10^7$
*	$3 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$3.6 \cdot 10^{-13}$	(40)	1.07	-
Balestrino et al.[40]	$1 \cdot 10^{-14}$	-	(40)	-	$3.1 \cdot 10^6$
*	$9 \cdot 10^{-15}$	$7.8 \cdot 10^{-14}$	(40)	0.25	-
Heine et al. [186]	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-14}$	-	{10}	-	-
Lang et al. [187]	$1 \cdot 10^{-14}$	-	4	-	$2.2 \cdot 10^7$
Nygmatulin et al.[35]	$5 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$8.6 \cdot 10^{-13}$	43	1.07	-
Axnas et al. [6] (YBCO)	$5.0 \cdot 10^{-15}$	(= τ)	225	-	($2 \cdot 10^7$)
	$3.1 \cdot 10^{-15}$	(= τ)	205	-	

Table 4

	$\omega \ll \min\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$	$\min\{T, \tau^{-1}\} \ll \omega \ll \max\{T, \tau^{-1}\}$	$\max\{T, \tau^{-1}\} \ll \omega$
$\Delta\sigma_{\perp}^{DOS(2D)}(\omega)$ $T \ll \tau^{-1}$	$-\frac{7\zeta(3)}{2^3\pi^3} \frac{e^2 s}{\eta} \frac{J^2 \tau}{T} \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$	$-\frac{e^2 s}{4\pi\eta} \frac{J^2}{\omega^2} (T\tau) \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} + \frac{e^2 s}{4\eta} \frac{J^2 T}{\omega^3} \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$	$-\frac{e^2 s}{4\pi\eta} \frac{J^2}{\omega^2} (T\tau) \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} + \frac{e^2 s}{4\eta} \frac{J^2 T}{\omega^3} \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$
$\Delta\sigma_{\perp}^{DOS(2D)}(\omega)$ $\tau^{-1} \ll T$	$-\frac{\pi}{2^4} \frac{e^2 s}{\eta} (J\tau)^2 \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$	$+\frac{e^2 s}{2^4\eta} \frac{J^2}{\omega^2} \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}} + \frac{e^2 s}{4\eta} \frac{J^2 T}{\omega^3} \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$	$+\frac{e^2 s}{4\eta} \frac{J^2 T}{\omega^3} \ln \frac{2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon+r}+\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$
$\Delta\sigma_{\perp}^{AL(2D)}(\varepsilon, \omega)$ $r \ll \varepsilon$	$\omega \ll T$ $+\frac{e^2 s}{\eta} \left(\frac{r}{\pi\omega}\right)^2 \ln[1 + (\frac{\pi\omega}{16\varepsilon})^2]$	—	—
$\Delta\sigma_{\perp}^{MT(2D)}(\varepsilon, \omega)$ $r \ll \varepsilon \ll \gamma_{\varphi}$	$\omega \preceq \tau_{\varphi}^{-1} \quad \tau_{\varphi}^{-1} \preceq \omega \ll T$ $+\frac{e^2 s}{2^7\eta} \frac{r^2}{\gamma_{\varphi}\varepsilon} + \frac{e^2 s}{2\pi^2\eta} \frac{r^2\gamma_{\varphi}T_c^2}{\varepsilon\omega^2}$	—	—