

Comment on “Plateaus Observed in the Field profile of Thermal Conductivity in the Superconductor $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_8$ ”

H. Aubin, K. Behnia

Laboratoire de Physique des Solides (CNRS), Université Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay, France

S. Ooi and T. Tamegai

Department of Applied Physics, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku Tokyo 113, Japan
(November 10, 1997)

Recently, Krishana *et al.* [1] reported that the thermal conductivity, κ , of $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_8$ at low temperature becomes field-independent above a temperature-dependent threshold field $H_k(T)$. This remarkable result indicates a phase transition separating a low-field state where the thermal conductivity decreases with increasing field and a high-field one where it is insensitive to the applied magnetic field. The authors argue that this phase transition is not related to the vortex lattice because of the temperature-dependence of $H_k(T)$ (roughly proportional to T^2) as well as its magnitude. Instead, they suggest a field-induced electronic phase transition leading to a sudden vanishing of the quasi-particle contribution to the heat transport. One possible scenario would be the introduction of an additional id_{xy} component to the parent $\text{d}_{x^2-y^2}$ superconducting order parameter above the threshold field.

In the mixed state of high- T_c cuprates, the magnitude of κ can depend on the magneto-thermal history of the sample which leads to different field profiles [2]. Is the field-independent thermal conductivity of the high-field state insensitive to the way the magnetic field is applied? Ref. 1 does not address this question.

In order to gain insight on the nature of this phase transition, we studied the thermal conductivity of a $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_8$ single crystal as a function of a magnetic field ramped up and down and then reversed. This procedure is similar to the one used in the magnetization studies. Fig.1 shows the results at $T = 8.4$ K. On the top panel, beginning with a Zero-Field Cooled (ZFC) sample, the thermal conductivity decreases with increasing magnetic field and at about 1.5 T ($\approx H_k(T = 8.4$ K) in Ref.1), a kink occurs in $\kappa(H)$ followed by a quasi-constant thermal conductivity up to 5 T. Then, the magnetic field is decreased and, surprisingly, a sharp drop of κ is observed over a small range in magnetic field (0.2 T), followed by a second plateau with a lower magnitude. At 2 T, κ begins to increase again, but it does not attain its initial ZFC magnitude which indicates that trapped vortices affect thermal conductivity. As seen in the figure, the same sequence of events occur when the measurements are pursued to negative values of magnetic field. The bottom panel represents subsequent measurements for fields ramped up and down to 10 T and -1.3 T. The same features are present and the magnitude of the drop in κ at 10 T is comparable to what was observed at

5 T. Note that the drop occurs concomitantly with the sign change in the irreversible magnetization. In a simple Bean model, this is related to a modification of field profile in the sample for ascending and descending fields.




FIG. 1. Field-dependence of thermal conductivity at $T=8.4$ K. The field was ramped up and down in the directions indicated by arrows. Note the schematic field profile in the sample for the two ramping directions (demagnetization effects are neglected).

To explain the insensitivity of thermal conductivity in the plateau regime, Krishana *et al.* invoked two independent constraints. The first one implies no heat transport

by quasi-particles in fields above H_k and the second regards the absence of vortex scattering of phonons. According to their picture, the background thermal conductivity is exclusively due to phonons which do not “see” the vortices. Our findings show that this background depends on the field profile in the sample which is incompatible with this picture. In conclusion, we think that alternative scenarios for this anomaly must be considered, including those involving the vortex lattice.

- [1] K. Krishana, N. P. Ong, Q. Li, D. Gu, N. Koshizuka, *Science* **277**, 83 (1997).
- [2] R.A. Richardson , S. D. Peacor, Franco Nori , C. Uher , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 3856 (1991).