arXiv:cond-mat/9707004v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 1 Jul 1997

# New Vortex with Zero Fluxoid Quantum in a Superconductor : Anomalous Hall Effect in High $T_c$ and Low $T_c$ Superconductors

Sang Boo Nam

*University Research Center, 7735 Peters Pike, Dayton, OH 45414 USA*

and

*Department of Physics, Pohang University of Science and Technology*

*Pohang, Kyungbook 790-784, KOREA**

**abstract**

It is shown that there are three kinds of vortices in a superconductor; a vortex with the fluxoid quantum 1 (VF), a new vortex with 0 (VZF), and a vortex with $-1$ (VAF), respectively. The Hall field via three vortices is studied and found to change its sign, depending of the relative strength of contributions via VF and VAF, similar to that of a system with two kinds of carriers. VZF is suggested to act as a domain wall between VF and VAF regions, accounting for the flux and antiflux regions observed in Nb films.

PACS numbers: 74.60.-w, 74.60.Ge, 74.76.-w

keywords: superconductivity, vortex, zero fluxoid quantum, Hall effect

*e-mail : sbnam@galaxy.postech.ac.kr

Vortices play important roles for our understanding of the properties of superconductors. However, there has been no discussion, hitherto, of all possible fluxoid quantum numbers of vortices. Here, I discuss the fluxoid quantum states of vortices and their applications to the Hall anomaly.

Recently, it is shown [1], within the BCS [2] pairing theory, that to have a finite transition temperature $T_c$ in a superconductor, a finite pairing interaction range $T_d$ is required, and that not all carriers participate in pairings, yielding multiconnected supereconductors (MS). The region of unpaired carriers in a MS [3] may be considerd as a vortex with anti-flux (VAF) [flux(VF)], when the local magnetic flux around a vortex, is less [greater] than the equivalent flux via the supercurrent. In other words, VF and VAF are vortices with the London fluxoid quanta 1 and $-1$, respectively. Naturally, one may consider a vortex with zero fluxoid quantum (VZF), when the local magnetic flux is balanced with the equivalent flux via the supercurrent [in other words, the current(j) goes with the vector potential(A) as $j \propto -A$ near the vortex core (the London gauge)]. Indeed, I show later there are three kinds of vortices, analogous to three magnetic quantum states of the angular momentum 1. On the other hand, thermally activated vortex-antivortex [4] bindings below the Kosterlitz-Thouless temperature $T_{KT}$ [5] and dissociations above $T_{KT}$ are not to be discussed here.

The motion of a vortex is known to yield the Hall field in superconductors. The force responsible for the vortex motion is still controversial, the Lorentz force on the vortex core [6] or the Magnus force [7]. The latter is shown to be present in a superconductor [8]. The data [9] of the resistive transition initially incompatible with the Lorentz force can be understood in the frame work of the flux flow [10]. A scaling behavior of the Hall resistivity $\rho_{yx} \propto \rho_{xx}^2$, is understood in the vortex state with disordered dominated dynamics [11],

compatible with the flux flow picture [6]. But, both pictures of [6, 7] are not able to account for the sign changes of the Hall field during sweeping temperature T or magnetic field H; once [12], twice [13, 14] and three times [15]. To account for the sign change of the Hall field, there are proposals of the force via pinning centers [16] and the opposing drift of the thermally excited quasiparticles near $T_c$ [17]. The former is incompatible with data [13] and the latter with data [12-15] at low T. A charge at a vortex core [18] opposite to carrier charge, yielding a force opposite to the Lorentz force, is unlikely possible, due to the supercurrent. On the other hand, the time dependent Ginzberg Landau equation approach [19] requires the imaginary part of the relaxation time, reflecting the particle hole asymmetry. A proposal of breaking the particle hole symmetry [20], in the range of the coherence length being of the order of the mean free path, is hardly realizable, since the particle hole symmetry depends on neither the coherene length nor the mean free path. So far, one quantum vortex state, VF, has been examined via various proposals. It is desirable to explore a new approach, taking into account all possible quantum states of vortices.

In this paper, I show that there are three kinds of vortices; VF, VZF, and VAF, via the Ginzburg Landau (GL) equation, and that the sign of the Hall field depends on the relative strength of contributions via VF and VAF, assuming the vortex motion without addressing the force responsible for it. Here natural units of $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$ and the flux unit $\Phi_0 = hc/2e = 1$ are used.

Macroscopically, the current in a superconductor may be given by

$$j(r) = j_o(r)[\nabla\theta(r)/2\pi - A(r)/(hc/2e)], \tag{1}$$

where $\theta(r)$ is the phase of order parameter, $A(r)$ is the vector potential, and $j_o(r)$ is the

square of the order parameter amplitude times charge/mass ($2e/2m$). The London fluxoid quatnum (n) condition may be obtained as

$$n = \oint \nabla\theta(r)/2\pi \cdot dl = \Phi_A + \Phi_J, \tag{2}$$

where $\Phi_A$ is the magnetic flux enclosed by the integral contour, $\Phi_J$ is the effective flux via the line integral of $j(r)/j_o(r)$, and the integer n is a reflection of the single valuedness of the order parameter. Let us write the order parameter in the cylindrical coordinates with the origin where the order parameter vanishes, $\Psi(r,\varphi) = |\Psi(\infty)|f(r)\exp$ (i n $\varphi$), omitting the z-dependence. The GL and Maxwell's equations are given as [21]

$$\xi^2[(d/rdr)(rd/dr) - q(r)^2]f(r) + f(r) = f(r)^3, \tag{3}$$

$$(d/dr)(d/rdr)[rq(r)] = -8\pi^2 j(r) = q(r)f(r)^2/\lambda^2, \tag{4}$$

where $q(r) = n/r - 2\pi A(r)$ is the superfluid velocity, $A(r)$ and $j(r)$ are the vector potential and current in the azimuthal direction, $\lambda$ is the effective pentration depth length $\lambda^2 = 2m/4\pi|2e\Psi(\infty)|$ and $\xi$ is the coherence length. The magnetic field in the z-direction is $h(r) = (d/rdr)[rA(r)]$. From Eqs. (3) and (4), we can see that once $A(r)$ for VZF (n = 0) is known, $q(r)$ is obtained, and vice versa. Thus, three kinds of vortices with n = 1, 0 and $-1$ are possible in a MS. However, VZF is not possible in a singly connected superconductor, since a vortex is formed after a magnetic flux entered, that is, n = 1. To find a solution of $A(r)$ for VZF explicitly, let me consider $f(r) = (r/r_c)^p$ for $r <$ the effective core size $r_c$ which will be determined later by the variational method. Solving Eq. (4) for n = 0, we obtain $A(r)$ via the Bessel function with a pure imaginary argument as [22]

$$A(r) \propto K_u(Z), \text{ with } u = 1/(1+p) \text{ and } Z = u(r_c/\lambda)(r/r_c)^{1+p}. \tag{5}$$

Eq. (5) is also a solution for $q(r)$ for any n and its elaboration will be reported elsewhere [22]. For p = 0, Eq. (5) yields a solution $K_1(r/\lambda)$ of the London equation, and is not acceptable near a vortex core where the order parameter vanishes. For $p = 1, Z = r^2/2\lambda r_c$, we get $A(r)$, and $j(r)$ as

$$A(r) = -[\phi(0)/2\pi r]\exp(-Z), \text{ with } \phi(0) = 2\pi h(0)\lambda r_c, \tag{6}$$

$$h(r) = h(0)\exp(-Z), \tag{7}$$

$$j(r) = -[f(r)/\lambda]^2 A(r)/4\pi = [h(0)/4\pi\lambda r_c]r\exp(-Z). \tag{8}$$

The $h(r)$ has a Gaussian distribution and $j(r)$ has a maximum at $r = (\lambda r_c)^{1/2}$. Thus, a vortex may be considered as a superconducting ringlet. Inserting Eq. (6) into Eq. (3) for $f(r)$, we find the condition

$$\phi(0) = 2\pi h(0)\lambda r_c = \text{ a flux unit} \tag{9}$$

to have a solution of $f(r)$ consistently. Eq. (9) provides a key for having three kinds of vortices, together with the idea of superconducting ringlets. Furthermore, we rewrite $A(r)$ of Eq. (6) near $r = 0$ as

$$A(r) = h(0)r/2 - \phi(0)/2\pi r. \tag{10}$$

The first term is like a vector potential of a magnetic field $h(0)$ and the second indicates the fluxoid quantum number n = −1, in opposing direction to $h(0)$. This confirms the notion of the circulating supercurrent guarding the normal region from a small magnetic field [3]. In other words, a vortex acts like a superconducting ringlet. For VF and VAF, $A(r)$'s may be given as $A(r) \propto (\pm)[1 - \exp(-Z)]/2\pi r$, where + for VF and − for VAF. $j(r)$'s may be written like Eq. (8) with the proper singns such that Eq. (2) is satisdied.

To determine $r_c$, let me consider the variational function

$$f(r) = \tanh(r/r_c) \tag{11}$$

and $A(r)$ of Eq. (6). The GL free energy density $F$ associated with a vortex, measured relative to the free energy of the Meissner state, in the dimensionless form, may be given as [21]

$$F = [1 - f^2(r)]^2/2 + [df(r)/\kappa dr]^2 + [A(r)f(r)]^2 + h^2(r), \tag{12}$$

where the GL parmeter $\kappa = \lambda/\xi$, the dimensionless quantities are $F$ in the units of $H_c^2/4\pi$ with the thermodynamical critical field $H_c$, $h(r)$ in the units of $\sqrt{2}H_c$, $A(r)$ in the units of $\sqrt{2}H_c\lambda$, and $r$ in the units of $\lambda$. By integrating $F$, we may obtain the energy per unit length of vortex line, or equivalently the low critical field $H_{c1}$ as

$$H_{c1}/\sqrt{2}H_c = (\kappa/2)\int_0^\infty \text{ rdr } F. \tag{13}$$

After carrying out all integrals in Eq. (13) and some algebra of minimizing it with respect to $r_c$, we may obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_{c1}/\sqrt{2}H_c &= [D(3z^2+2) + E_1(z/\kappa)]/4\kappa, \\ E_1(z/\kappa) &= \int_1^\infty dx \exp(-xz/\kappa)/x, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $D = 0.29543$, and $z = r_c/\xi$ is determined by $z^3 = [2 - \exp(-z/\kappa)]\kappa/2D$. For $k = 0.707$, we obtain $r_c = 1.3\xi$, and $H_{c1}/H_c = 1.042$ about 4% higher than the exact GL result of 1, and $h(0)/H_c = 1.088$ about 9% higher than the exact GL result of 1. The present model of Eqs. (11) and (6), appears to be reasonable. The variational function [23] $f(r) = r/[r^2 + r_c^2]^{1/2}$ has been studied and yields the results in good agreements with the numerical solutions [24] of the GL equations. In fact, the numerical field solution

[24] has a form of Eq. (7) which leads me consider vortices (flux lines) as noninteracting particles for later discussion of the Hall field.

Let us pause a moment and consider the energy of the n flux state in a superconducting ring, $E(n) \propto (n - \Phi_A)^2$. At $\Phi_A = n + 1/2$, the energies of $n$ and $n + 1$ states are same, $E(n) = E(n + 1)$, but the currents in n and n + 1 states flow in opposite directions, to staisfy the fluxoid quantum condition. The fluxoid quantum has been demonstrated experimentally some time ago [25]. We argue the same reasoning be applicable to a vortex, via $\phi(0)$ being $\Phi_A$, by considering a vortex as a superconducting ringlet as metioned before. Then, making use of a flux unit, $1 = 2\pi\sqrt{2}H_c\lambda\xi$, and shifting a center for VZF by 1 flux unit via Eq. (9), we may have, with $z = r_c/\xi$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{VF for } 3/2 < [\phi(0) \text{ or } h(0)z/\sqrt{2}H_c] < 5/2, \\ &\text{VZF for } 1/2 < [\phi(0) \text{ or } h(0)z/\sqrt{2}H_c] < 3/2, \\ &\text{VAF for } 0 < [\phi(0) \text{ or } h(0)z/\sqrt{2}H_c] < 1/2, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

respectively. $\phi(0)$ can not be $> 5/2$, because a vortex can have the fluxoid quantum $< 2$, unlike a superconducting ring, via the magnetic energy consideration. Physically, the fluxoid quanta 1, 0, and $-1$ for VF, VZF and VAF, are equivalent to the magnetic quantum numbers of the angular momentum 1. Note that all variables $h(0)$, $\lambda$, $\xi$ should be understood as the local variables depending on the local scattering centers and mean order parameter. Therefore, VF, VZF and VAF may be formed at different regions, depending on the local conditions. Let us consider VF and VAF far apart each other. The circulating currents between them, flow in the same direction, so that they are not collapsed. When VF and VAF are close together, they may or may not be collapsed, depending on the local conditions. We may think of a domain wall made of VZF which divides the regions

of VF and VAF, similar to the magnetic domain wall. The present scenario confirms the prediction [3] of VAF as observed in niobium films [26] and YBCO [27]. The key idea is that regions of unpaired carriers [1] act as vortices [3]. In the symmetry point of view, the global periodicity is broken to have VZF acting as a domain wall between VF and VAF regions where the local periodicities are maintained, compatible with data of VF and VAF in Nb films [26]. In other words, the local free energy minimum may play a role for the vortex states, rather than the global free energy minimum. Note that when a transport current flows in a system, then conditions for VAF and VZF may be enhanced via an additional circulating current induced by the transport current and magnetic field. Here no attempt is made to treat the magnetic field of transport current self-consistently.

Now we examine the Hall field via VF, VZF, and VAF by considering them like stable particles with the magnetic quantum numbers 1, 0, and $-1$, respectively. Let the transport current J be in the x-direction and the magnetic filed H in the z-direction of unit vector $\mathbf{k}$. We consider here the motions of vortices only. The momentum balance may be written as

$$J = \sum_i [a_i V_{Li} + b_i V_{Li} \times \mathbf{k}] \tag{16}$$

with the i-vortex velocity $V_{Li} = (x_i V_x, y_i V_y, 0)$, where $i = 1$ for VF, 2 for VAF and 3 for VZF. The parameters $a = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and $b = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ are to be determined later. Physically, $x_i$ and $y_i$ may be considered as the mean values of velocities of same all vortices in the units of $V_x$ and $V_y$. The electric field induced by a moving vortex with a flux $\Phi_i$, is known to be $-V_{Li} \times \mathbf{k}\Phi_i$ [28]. The total electric field induced by all vortices, may be given by

$$E = -\sum_i V_{Li} \times \mathbf{k}\Phi_i = \rho J \tag{17}$$

where $\rho$ is the flux flow resistivity tensor and $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3)$ with the i-flux in the z-direction $\Phi_i$ of the fluxoid quantum $n$ times the i-vortex number $n_i$. From Eqs. (16) and (17), we may get the resistivity tensor and the Hall angle $\theta_H$ as

$$\rho_{xx} = (y\Phi)(bx)/[(ax)(ay) + (bx)(by)], \tag{18}$$

$$\tan\theta_H = \rho_{yx}/\rho_{xx} = (x\Phi)(ay)/(y\Phi)(bx), \tag{19}$$

where $(AB) = \sum_i A_i B_i$ . By choosing $V_x = V_T = V_y$, we get $\rho_{xx} = (y\Phi)/eN$ with $eN = J/V_T$ and $\tan\theta_H = (x\Phi)/(y\Phi)$. By considering noninteracting vortices, $a_i$ and $b_i$ may be obtained by the basic equations of [6, 7],

$$V_{Li} \times \mathbf{k} = h_i V_T \times \mathbf{k} + V_T/W_i, \tag{20}$$

$$V_T e N_i = a_i V_{Li} + b_i V_{Li} \times \mathbf{k},$$

$$a_i/W_i h_i = b_i = eN_i W_i/[1 + (W_i h_i)^2], \tag{21}$$

where $V_T$ is the velocity of the transport carrier, $N_i$ is the carrier number associated with the i-vortex, and $\sum_i N_i = N =$ the carrier density. $h_i = \ < B > = B(T,H)/H_{c2} = [H - M(T,H)]/H_{c2}$ with the magnetization $-M(T,H)$, for the Lorentz force on the vortex core [6] and $h_i = 1$ for the Magnus force [7]. $W_i = eH_{c2}\tau_i/m = W_c\tau_i$ with the carrier scattering time $\tau_i$ in the i-vortex core. VZF moves with $V_T$ and yields no electric field in the transport direction, resulting in no dissipation of energy and no flux flow resistivity, equivalently, $W_3 = \infty$. For VAF, $H_{c2}$ should be $-H_{c2}$, because the circulating supercurrent is equivalent to $-H_{c2}$. Let us consider a case of $x = (h_1, h_2, 1)$ and $y = (1/\tau_1, -1/\tau_2, 0)/W_c$ with $V_x = V_T = V_y$, via Eq. (20). From Eqs. (19) and (21), we may obtain

$$\tan\theta_H = W_c[n_1 h_1 - n_2 h_2]/[n_1/\tau_1 + n_2/\tau_2]. \tag{19A}$$

Now, for $n_2/n_1$, I recapitulate the argument used to predict the sign changes of the Hall field three times [3] before the experiment [15] is known. For VF, $n_1 = AB(T,H)/\Phi_0$, with a sample area A. Since VAF is formed mainly by the circulating supercurrent, $n_2$ may be proportional to the superelectron density $N_s(T,H)$ times the normal fraction, $1 - N_s(T,H)/N = 1 - < N_s >$. We may get, $n_2 = PSA/\pi\xi^2$, with $S = < N_s > [1 - < N_s >]$. P is a parameter function of T, H and J, and zero for J = 0 and H = 0, since the circulating supercurrent is induced by J and H. In fact, $n_2$ is PS times total carriers in a sample/carriers inside a vortex volume. Then, $n_2/n_1 = 2PS/ < B >$ with $< B > = B(T,H)/H_{c2}$, we may get

$$\tan\theta_H = W_c[< B > h_1 - 2PSh_2]/[< B > /\tau_1 + 2PS/\tau_2]. \tag{19B}$$

2S has a finite value at T = 0 and H = 0, scince unpaired carriers are found to be 14% of carriers in HTS [1] and 4% in Pb [29] at T = 0 and H = 0, and may have a maximum value 1/2 at $< N_s > = 1/2$. For a given $T$, $B(T,H)/H_{c2}$ varies from 0 at $H = H_{c1}$ to 1 at $H_{c2}$. Eq. (19B) becomes $-W_2h_2$ at $H = H_{c1}$. For a given $H$, $B(T,H)/H_{c2}$ varies from $B(0,H)/H_{c2}$ to $B(T_c,H)/H_{c2} = H/H_{c2}$. For YBCO of [15], at $T = 0$, $B(0,H)/H_{c2} < H/H_{c2} = 6/100$, $2S = 2 \times 0.14 \times 0.86$, then Eq. (19B) is negative for $0.25 < Ph_2/h_1$. Thus, both cases of T and H sweepings, can have the sign changes of the Hall field three times, since S is not a monotonic function of T and H. Physically, the Lorentz force [6] may be responsible for VF motion and the Magnus force [7] for VAF, since VF [VAF] has the magnetic flux greater [less] than the effective flux via the circulating current. Then, $h_1 = < B >$ and $h_2 = 1$, Eq. (19B) varies as $< B > - 2PS/ < B >$ for $\tau_2/\tau_1 > 2PS/ < B > = n_2/n_1$, compatible with data [12a].

From Eqs. (18) and (21), we may get the resistivity/the normal state resistivity $\rho_n$ as

$$\rho_{xx}/\rho_n = \ < B > \tau/\tau_1 + 2PS\tau/\tau_2, \tag{22}$$

where $\tau$ is the carrier relaxation time in the normal state. From Eqs. (19B) and (22), we may get the scaling behavior of the Hall resistivity as

$$\rho_{yx} \propto \rho_{xx}^2[< B > h_1 - 2PSh_2]/[< B > \tau/\tau_1 + 2PS\tau/\tau_2]^2. \tag{23}$$

Without VAF terms, Eq. (23) becomes $\rho_{yx} \propto \rho_{xx}^2$ [11] for $h_1 = \ < B >$ and $\tau = \tau_1$ [6].

In summary, the notion of MS [3] is essential to have three magnetic quantum states of vortices. VZF is a new vortex quantum state and may act as a domain wall between VF and VAF regions, accounting for the observation of the flux and antiflux regions in Nb films [26]. A direct detection of VZF may be hard as that of neutral particles. VF and VAF numbers are found to play major roles for the sign changes of the Hall field, even though the present analysis is based on the basic Eq. (20) of the vortex core models. In general, Eqs. (18) and (19) may be used. The notion of superconducting ringlets may account for the paramagnetic Meissner effect [22]. The fact that three vortices can account for data [26] and the Hall anomaly, indicates the present theory is sound.

I thank John R. Clem for Ref. [23] and Ju H. Kim for his interest in this problem by obtaining the Hall angles [30] quantitatively in good agreements with data of HTS and LTS, via modeling PS functions.

**References**


[1] S. B. Nam, Phys. Lett. A 193 (1994) 111; (E) A 197 (1995) 458.

[2] J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper, and J. R. Schrieffer, Phys. Rev. 108 (1957) 1175.

[3] S. B. Nam, Phys. Lett. A 198 (1995) 447.

[4] M. R. Beasly et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 1165.

S . Doniach and B. A. Hubermanm, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 1169.

B. I. Ivlevvet al, Phys. Rev. B 52 (1995) 13532.

[5] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C 6 (1973) 1181.

V. L. Berezinskii, JETP 32 (1971) 493; 34 (1972) 610.

[6] J. Bardeen and M. J. Stephen, Phys. Rev. 140 (1965) A1197.

[7] P. Nozieres and W. F. Vinen, Philos. Mag. 14 (1966) 667.

[8] P. Ao and D. J. Thouless, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 2158.

[9] Y. Iye et al. Physica C 167 (1990) 278.

[10] Z. Hao, C-R. Hu, and C. S. Ting, Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 9387.

[11] V. M. Vinokur et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 1242.

[12] J. Hagen et al, Phys. Rev. B 41 (1990) 11630 ; B 47 (1993) 1064.

(a) J. M. Harris et al, Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 12053.

D. M Ginsberg and J. T. Manson, Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 515.

Y. Matsuda et al , Phys. Rev. B 52 (1995) R15749.

[13] M. N. Kunchur et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 2259.

A. V. Samoilov et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1994) 2351.

The recent observation of the pining dependence of the Hall field in YBCO with columnar defects by W. N. Kang et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 (1996) 2993 may be understood as the scattering effects ($\tau_i$) in the present theory via Eqs (19A), (22),

and (23).

[14] J. M. Graybeal et al, Phys. Rev. B 49 (1994) 12923.

A. W. Smith et al, Phys. Rev. B 49 (1994) 12927.

[15] B. Parks et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 3265.

[16] Z. D. Wang et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 3618; 72 (1994) 3875.

[17] R. A. Ferrell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68 (1992) 2524.

[18] D. I. Khomskii and A. Freimuth, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 1384.

[19] A. T. Dorsey, Phys. Rev. B 46 (1992) 8376.

[20] A. van Otterlo et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 3736.

[21] A. A. Abrikosov, JETP 5 (1957) 1174.

[22] S. B. Nam, to be published.

[23] J. R. Clem. J. Low Temp. Phys. 18 (1975) 427.

[24] L. Neuman and L. Tewordt, Z. Physik 189 (1966) 55.

[25] W. A. Little and R. D. Parks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 9 (1962) 9.

[26] C. A. Duran et al, Phys. Rev. B 52 (1995) 75.

[27] J. R. Kirtley et al, Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 12057.

[28] B. D. Josephson, Phys. Lett. 16 (1965) 242.

[29] S. B. Nam, J. Korean Phys. Soc. 28 (1995) 102.

[30] J. H. Kim and S. B. Nam, to be published.