arXiv:1002.4892v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 26 Feb 2010

Competing s-wave and d-wave order in $A15$ superconductors

S. Mukherjee and D. F. Agterberg
Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53211

Competing pairing channels have been proposed in superfluid ^{3}He, in the high temperature cuprate superconductors, and pnictide superconductors. While strong experimental support exists for this in superfluid ^{3}He, the case for superconductors is weaker. Here, we show that $A15$ superconductors provide a compelling example for competing superconducting order. We present microscopic arguments that $A15$ superconductors have a competing d-wave order in addition to usual s-wave superconductivity and show that this d-wave order provides a unifying explanation for a series of diverse experimental results. These include: the emergence of a sharp mode in the superconducting state seen by Raman spectroscopy; the observed shrinking of the vortex core at anomalously low fields; and the large anisotropy measured in the upper critical field. We further show that multiple superconducting gaps can appear when these $A15$ superconductors are strained.

Competing pairing channels have played a prominent role in theories of superfluid ^{3}He, cuprate, and pnictide superconductors. In p-wave ^{3}He, an excited pair state, stemming from a competing f-wave channel, has recently been observed through interferometry in an acoustic cavity[1]. The observation of this f-wave pairing channel provides insight into the microscopic interactions of ^{3}He and leads to predictions of rich physics near impurities, surfaces, and vortices. In the cuprates, the possibility of a quantum critical point between d-wave and a competing extended s-wave pairing has been proposed[2] and a competing s-wave or d_{xy} order has been invoked to interpret the properties of surface Andreev bound states[3]. More recently in the superconducting pnictides, many theories find that a sign changing s-wave state and a competing d-wave state have close transition temperatures[4], leading to the prediction of a pair collective mode observable through Raman spectroscopy and a superconducting state that breaks time reversal symmetry[5]. Competing order leads to new physics and provides valuable insight into the microscopic description of superconductors and superfluids alike.

In this work we suggest that $A15$ superconductors provide an ideal example in which to examine both the theoretical and experimental aspects of competing superconducting order. $A15$s are type II s-wave superconductors with T_c on the order of 20 K[6]. Many $A15$ compounds undergo a Martensitic transition from a cubic to tetragonal phase which has been the subject of intense research[7,8]. In the following, we present microscopic arguments for the origin of both an attractive d-wave and s-wave pairing channel. We then show how a d-wave pairing can explain a series of diverse experimental results. These include Raman spectroscopy results which observe the emergence of a sharp mode corresponding to E_g symmetry in the superconducting state[9], muon spin rotation experiments that reveal an anomalous contraction in the vortex core structure at low magnetic fields[10,11], and specific heat measurements that find a large anisotropy in the upper critical field (H_{c2}) for V_3Si[12]. Finally we show how two superconducting gaps can appear in strained $A15$ superconductors.

Microscopic theory and generalized Ginzburg Landau theory: In contrast to the more familiar tetragonal examples of the cuprates and the pnictides, the $A15$ superconductors are either cubic or nearly cubic materials. Compounds with the $A15$ structure (cubic space group $Pm3n$) contain the formulae unit A_3B. The B atoms occur at the cubic body centered sites while the the A atoms form three sets of orthogonal chains that run through the faces of the cube[13]. An important conceptual limit is that in which the three orthogonal chains of A atoms are non-interacting. While this limit is not accurate, it helps to clarify some of the physics that emerges in this paper. In particular, since each chain is equivalent by cubic symmetry the superconducting order parameter must have three independent degrees of freedom in the limit of non interactring chains of A atoms. We label these three order parameters ψ_x, ψ_y, ψ_z, corresponding to the gaps for chains running along the three orthogonal x, y, z directions. For conventional spin-singlet cooper pairs they have the same symmetry properties as (x^2, y^2, z^2) respectively under cubic symmetry operations. The representation formed by this basis is reducible: it contains one s-wave (A_{1g}) solution described by $\psi_s = (\psi_x + \psi_y + \psi_z)/\sqrt{3}$; and one doubly degenerate d-wave (E_g) solution described by $\eta_1 = (2\psi_z - \psi_x - \psi_y)/\sqrt{6}$ and $\eta_2 = (\psi_x - \psi_y)/\sqrt{2}$. In the non-interacting chain limit these two representations have the same transition temperature. Once interactions between the chains are included, these two representations will have different transition temperatures. Typically, as will be seen later, the s-wave transition temperature will be higher but the d-wave transition temperature will remain finite. Conceptually, this is the origin of the competing d-wave order.

We consider a tight binding description of the $A15$ compounds in which we include only $3z^2 - r^2$ orbitals on the A atoms that form the chains along the z-direction and equivalent orbitals under cubic symmetry for the other two orthogonal chains[14]. We include nearest (t_1) and next nearest neighbor (t_2) hopping matrix elements between these orbitals. To describe the pairing interactions, we note that density functional theory also shows that the electron phonon interactions are dominant between the lattice vibrations of A atoms and electrons in these orbitals[15]. This



FIG. 1: The self-consistent $d_{x^2-y^2}$ like solution for the E_g symmetry gap function shown on the Fermi surface (for $t_2/t_1 = 0.22$). The gap values are represented by the different colors show in the box on the right. The (k_x, k_y, k_z) are in units of the inverse lattice spacing.

leads us to consider the following weak-coupling Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= t_0 \sum_i c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c_{i\sigma} + t_1 \sum_{i,j,(nn)} c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma} + t_2 \sum_{i,j,(nnn)} c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma} \\ &- V_0 \sum_i c^\dagger_{i\uparrow} c^\dagger_{i\downarrow} c_{i\downarrow} c_{i\uparrow} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here $i \neq j$ and spin σ is summed over. As in usual BCS theory V_0 is attractive within a thin layer over the Fermi surface, operators $c_{i\sigma}$, $c^\dagger_{i\sigma}$ are the electron annihilation and creation operators respectively with i representing the site index. In the limit $t_2 = 0$, the electrons on the individual chains are uncoupled. This limit was popular in early theories of $A15$s[16] until subsequent band structure results showed that interactions between the chains must be included. Nevertheless, the Fermi surfaces found from band structure clearly maintain many aspects of the independent chain limit. In particular, at a crude level, the FS can be interpreted as resulting from three intersecting orthogonal 1D bands[17]. While our model is simplified it contains the essential ingredients needed to describe the superconducting state.

Diagonalizing the quasi-particle Kinetic energy and defining the gap functions $\Delta_{\alpha,\uparrow\downarrow}(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{q}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}',\beta} V_{\alpha,\beta}(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}') < c_{\boldsymbol{k}+\boldsymbol{q}/2,\beta,\uparrow} c_{-\boldsymbol{k}+\boldsymbol{q}/2,\beta,\downarrow} >$ where α, β represent band indices and inhomogeneity of the order parameter is included through the index $\boldsymbol{q}$ the gap equation is found to be

$$\Delta_\alpha(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{q}) = V_0 T \sum_{n,\beta,\boldsymbol{k}'} \frac{V_{\alpha,\beta}(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}')\Delta_\beta(\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{q})}{(\omega_{\tilde{n}}^2 + \epsilon_\beta^2(\boldsymbol{k}') + |\Delta_\beta(\boldsymbol{k}')|^2)} \tag{2}$$

where $\omega_{\tilde{n}} = (2n+1)\pi T + i\boldsymbol{q}\cdot\nabla_{\boldsymbol{k}'}\epsilon_\beta(\boldsymbol{k}')$. If $\hat{U}$ is the transpose of the unitary eigenvector matrix of the band Hamiltonian whose components are U_{ij} then the momentum dependance of the quartic interaction term is $V_{\alpha,\beta}(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}') = -V_0 \sum_i U^*_{i,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{k}) U^*_{i,\alpha}(-\boldsymbol{k}) U^*_{i,\beta}(-\boldsymbol{k}') U^*_{i,\beta}(\boldsymbol{k}')$

Assuming a spatially uniform gap, we find that the self-consistent solutions yield both a A_{1g} (s-wave) and a E_g (d-wave) solution. In Figure 1, we show the self-consistent solution for the E_g gap degree of freedom corresponding to a $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry. This solution is qualitatively different than the $k_x^2 - k_y^2$ solution expected for a spherical Fermi surface. In fact, it is more appropriately described as having three nearly constant gap amplitudes (denoted by $\Delta, 0, -\Delta$). In Figure 2, we show the effective interactions for the A_{1g} and E_g pairing channels as a function of t_2/t_1 while keeping the Fermi surface volume constant (in the weak-coupling limit $T_c = \omega_D \exp\left(\frac{-1}{\lambda}\right)$ where λ is the effective interaction).

While we have not included Coulomb interactions, we note that these interactions would increase the E_g channel T_c relative to A_{1g} channel T_c. To provide a means to examine existing experimental results, we use a Ginzburg Landau (GL) theory.

The general GL free energy density in the chain basis is



FIG. 2: Ratio of eigenvalues λ_d/λ_s vs t_2/t_1.

$$f = \alpha\sum_i |\psi_i|^2 + \epsilon\sum_{i\neq j}\psi_i\psi_j^* + \sum_i(\kappa_1|D_i\psi_i|^2 + \beta_1|\psi_i|^4) + \kappa_2\sum_{i\neq j}|D_i\psi_j|^2 + \kappa_3\sum_{l,i\neq j}(D_l\psi_i)(D_l\psi_j)^* + \kappa_4\sum_{l\neq i\neq j}(D_l\psi_i)(D_l\psi_j)^*$$
$$+ \sum_{i\neq j}(\beta_2\psi_i^2\psi_j^{*2} + \beta_3|\psi_i|^2|\psi_j|^2) + \sum_{l\neq i\neq j}(\frac{\beta_4}{2}\psi_i\psi_j^*|\psi_l|^2 + \beta_5\psi_i\psi_j\psi_l^{*2} + \beta_6(\psi_i+\psi_j)\psi_l^*|\psi_l|^2 + c.c) \quad (3)$$

where $D_i = -i\partial_i - 2eA_i$ and $\boldsymbol{B} = \nabla\times\boldsymbol{A}$. Using our weak-coupling theory, we can derive the coefficients in this free energy as a function of t_2/t_1, these are shown in Figure 3. For a wide range of t_2/t_1, the free energy is dominated by the coefficients κ_1, κ_2, β_1, and β_3. When examining the physics in low magnetic fields, we will only include these contributions. However, when discussing the anisotropy in the upper critical field, it is possible to make more statements that do not depend upon the specific values of the GL coefficients. We now turn to a discussion of some relevant experimental results.

Raman Resonance Mode: When the chains are uncoupled, the phase of each component in the chain basis is a $U(1)$ degree of freedom leading to a theory with $U(1)\times U(1)\times U(1)$ symmetry. As a consequence, there are two new goldstone modes associated with excitations in the phase differences between the different components in the chain basis. Once the chains are coupled and the ground state is A_{1g} (s-wave), these two modes become gapped but may exist as an excitation with E_g symmetry. In principle such a mode can be observed by Raman scattering. Indeed, gap modes in the A_{1g}, T_{2g} and E_g symmetries have been observed by Raman scattering measurements. Of particular relevance to the work presented here, is that the mode in the E_g channel is at lower frequency and also much sharper than the modes seen in the A_{1g} and T_{2g} channels[9]. We interpret this as a consequence of the collective modes described above. Indeed, it has been suggested that this mode is due to a two-particle electronic bound state coupled to an E_g phonon[18]. Such a bound state shares the same symmetry as the mode we propose here. We leave a detailed examination of this mode to a later work.

Vortex state in low magnetic field : In a recent series of experiments a hexagonal to square vortex lattice transition has been observed[19] at anomalously low magnetic fields accompanied by a profound reduction of coherence length[11]. The latter has been attributed to the delocalization of the quasi-particles bound by the vortex core[10]. Here we examine the possibility that the competing d-wave order is responsible for shrinking of the vortex core. In particular, we use a London approach keeping only the largest parameters in the GL free energy. The difference with the usual London theory is that we allow all three order parameter phases in the chain basis to vary as opposed to requiring them to be equal as in the s-wave phase. Writing $\psi_i = |\psi|e^{i\phi_i}$, our London free energy density is

$$f_L = \epsilon|\psi|^2\sum_{i\neq j}\cos(\phi_i-\phi_j) + \kappa_1|\psi|^2\sum_i(\partial_i\phi_i - 2eA_i)^2$$
$$+ \kappa_2|\psi|^2\sum_{i\neq j}(\partial_i\phi_j - 2eA_i)^2 + \frac{(\nabla\times A)^2}{8\pi} \quad (4)$$



FIG. 3: Coefficients of the GL theory vs interchain interaction. The volume enclosed by the Fermi surface has been kept constant with the variation in t_2/t_1.

In the single vortex solution, the term proportional to ϵ (the phase locking term) is the most important. This is because it yields a diverging energy contribution that is proportional to the area of the system, while the other contributions (the usual London terms) give a finite energy. Consequently, the phase locking term requires $\phi_x = \phi_y = \phi_z$ (for $\epsilon < 0$) leading to a single vortex with s-wave symmetry. However, once there is a finite density of vortices, the usual London terms also yield a contribution that is proportional to area, and therefore compete with the phase locking term. The usual London term prefers anisotropic vortices, with a different anisotropy for each component ψ_i (see Figure 4). To capture the competition between the anisotropy induced by the usual London terms and the phase locking term we have used a simplified variational solution. We include the screening currents only through the penetration depth (valid in the extreme type II limit), ignore any contributions that depend logarithmically on anisotropy, and ignore interactions between vortices in the usual London terms (valid if inter-vortex spacing is much larger that the penetration depth). The variational free energy we use is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F}{AL_z} &= |\psi|^2 - |\epsilon| \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} dx \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} dy \sum_{i \neq j} \cos(\phi_i - \phi_j) \\ &+ 2\pi \frac{B}{\Phi_0} [(\kappa_1 \mu^2 + \frac{\kappa_2}{\mu^2}) + \kappa_2] \ln(\kappa) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the phase variables are given as $\phi_\alpha = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \arctan\left(\frac{y-y_j}{x-x_i} \frac{1}{\mu_\alpha^2}\right)$ where (x_i, y_j) represent the location of N vortices, the index α runs over (x, y, z), and (μ_x, μ_y, μ_z) take values $(\mu, 1/\mu, 1)$, the sample area is given by A, L_z is the length along the z direction, and Φ_0 is the flux quantum. The variational parameter is μ. The variational solution is shown in figure 4. In the limit $B = 0$ $\mu = 1$, which is the usual s-wave solution. In the high field limit, $B' >> \frac{B\sqrt{\epsilon}}{Hc_1 \lambda^2 \ln \kappa}$, $\mu = (k_2/k_1)^{\frac{1}{4}}$. The important feature is that at a field $B' \approx \frac{B\sqrt{\epsilon}}{Hc_1 \lambda^2 \ln \kappa}$, the anisotropy in the London terms allows the vortex cores to shrink, providing a plausible explanation for the μSR results.

Upper Critical Field Anisotropy: The H_{c2} shows a pronounced anisotropy in V_3Si at low temperatures (estimated to be 20 %)[12]. It was observed that H_{c2} is highest for the field along the $\langle 100 \rangle$ direction, lower for fields along the $\langle 110 \rangle$ direction, and lowest for the field along the $\langle 111 \rangle$ direction[12]. Interestingly, the GL theory given above yields the same anisotropy as seen experimentally, *independent of the values of the coefficients* κ_i. The detailed calculations will be shown in a future work.

Coupling to Strain: Martensitic Transition and Multiple Superconducting Gaps : It has been observed that strain leads to strong non-linear effects on the superconducting transition temperature[20]. Furthermore, the appearance of the Martensitic transition is partially associated with the development of the non-zero $2\epsilon_{zz} - \epsilon_{xx} - \epsilon_{yy}$ strain. It is therefore relevant to consider the role of strain on the superconducting state discussed here. We do so phenomenologically, the lowest order free energy contribution of the coupling between the strain and the superconducting order parameter is :

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} [\gamma_1 (2\epsilon_{ii} - \epsilon_{jj} - \epsilon_{kk}) |\psi_i|^2 \\ &+ (\epsilon_{xx} + \epsilon_{yy} + \epsilon_{zz}) [\gamma_2 |\psi_i|^2 + \gamma_3 (\psi_i \psi_j^* + c.c)]] \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$



FIG. 4: Figures show constant order parameter magnitude contour for isolated vortex structures. The s-wave solution corresponds to $\mu = 1$, where all components have cylindrical symmetry that minimizes.

Setting $2\epsilon_{zz} - \epsilon_{xx} - \epsilon_{yy} \neq 0$ changes the nature of the s-wave ground state (where $\psi_x = \psi_y = \psi_z$). In particular, the order parameter becomes $(\psi_x, \psi_y, \psi_z) = \psi'(\eta, \eta, 1)$ where, $\eta = \alpha + (2\epsilon_{zz} - \epsilon_{xx} - \epsilon_{yy})/4 - |\epsilon|/2 + \sqrt{9(2\epsilon_{zz} - \epsilon_{xx} - \epsilon_{yy})^2 + 36|\epsilon|^2 + 12|\epsilon|(2\epsilon_{zz} - \epsilon_{xx} - \epsilon_{yy})}$. In the limit of non-interacting chains, this implies that two chains would have the same gap value, while the third chain would have a different gap value. Insofar as the momentum distribution of the gap amplitudes for the d-wave solution are well described by three constant values $\Delta, 0, -\Delta$ (see Fig. 2), the coupling of the strain to the superconducting order parameter would result in a two gap behavior. It is of interest to note that two gap behavior has been observed in specific heat measurements[21], where strains are non-vanishing. Furthermore, surface probes observe that different surface orientations also show different gap values[22], as would be expected if the surfaces lead to the development of strains.

In conclusion we have given microscopic arguments to justify the existence of both s-wave and d-wave order in $A15$ superconductors. We show that this d-wave order can account for a series of diverse experimental results including: the observation of a sharp Raman scattering mode in the E_g channel, the shrinking of vortex cores under applied fields, the anisotropy in the upper critical field, and the appearance of two multiple superconducting gaps. This theory therefore provides one of the first cases where a theoretically predicted model of a competing superconducting order is well supported by experiment.

This work was supported by NSF grant DMR-0906633.

[1] J.P. Davis et al. Nature Physics **4**, 571 (2008).
[2] M. Vojta, Y. Zhang, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B. **62**, 6721 (2000).
[3] M. Fogelström, D. Rainer, J. A. Sauls, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 281 (1997).
[4] K. Kuroki et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 087004 (2008).
[5] W. C. Lee, S. C. Zhang, and C. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 217002 (2009).
[6] B. T. Matthias et al. Phys. Rev. **95**, 1435 (1954).
[7] B. W. Batterman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 390 (1964).
[8] G. Shirane, Phys. Rev. B **4**, 2957 (1971).
[9] R. Hackl and R. Kaiser, J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **21**, L453 (1988).
[10] J. E. Sonier et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 017002 (2004).
[11] R. Kadano et al. Phys. Rev. B **74**, 024513 (2006).
[12] M. N. Khlopkin, JETP Letters **69**, 26 (1999).
[13] S. A. Geller, Acta Cryst. **9**, 885 (1956).
[14] L. F. Mattheiss and W. Weber, Phys. Rev. B **25**, 2248 (1982).
[15] B. Sadigh and V. Ozoli, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 2793 (1997).
[16] J. Labbe and J. Friedel, J. Phys. Radium **27**, 153 (1966).
[17] L. F. Mattheiss, Phys. Rev. **138**, A112 (1965).
[18] T. P. Devereaux and R. Hackl Review Of Modern Physics **79**, 175 (2007).
[19] M. Yethiraj et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5112 (1999).

[20] L. R. Testardi, Phys. Rev. B **3**, 95 (1970).
[21] V. Guritanu et al. Phys. Rev. B. **70**, 184526 (2004).
[22] S. Morito et al. Physica B & C **126**, 601 (1984).