

# Possible vortex splitting in the cuprate superconductors

R. Hlubina

*Division of Solid State Physics, Comenius University, Mlynská Dolina F2, 842 48 Bratislava, Slovakia  
Centre of Excellence of the Slovak Academy of Sciences CENG*

We propose that the observed splitting of the vortices in the cuprates into fractional vortices (partons) may be of static rather than of dynamic origin. This interpretation is backed by a study of a model with a dominant  $d$ -wave and subdominant  $s$ -wave pairing interaction. We find that the vortex may split into two partons, both of which carry one half of the magnetic flux quantum. The partons are held together by a confining string along which the phase jumps approximately by  $\pi$  and their equilibrium distance increases with lowering the energy difference  $\varepsilon$  between the pairing states. The partons become deconfined at the critical point where  $\varepsilon$  vanishes.

The nonsuperconducting phase of the high temperature superconductors exhibits anomalous features [1]. On the other hand, the low-temperature superconducting state is believed to be well described by the standard Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer paradigm, if the  $d$ -wave pairing symmetry and the Landau Fermi liquid corrections are taken into account. In view of the anomalies of the normal phase, it is tempting to look for unconventional features in the superconducting phase as well. Interesting results have in fact been obtained by the scanning tunneling spectroscopy of the vortices in  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$  [2, 3], according to which the vortex cores may split into several subcomponents with a spacing in the range 10 - 100 Å. The experimental results were interpreted as a result of the vortex hopping between different pinning sites [2, 4]. The purpose of this paper is to propose an alternative interpretation of the experimental results, in which the splitting of the vortices into partons is considered to be of static origin. Based on an analogy with the physics of dislocations, we will show that the vortex may split into two fractional vortices (partons), each of them carrying one half of the magnetic flux quantum  $\Phi_0$ .

It is well known that screw dislocations in fcc materials can split into two Shockley partial dislocations whose (fractional) Burgers vectors add up to an integer lattice vector [5]. In that case the singular dislocation line transforms into a singular strip whose borders are formed by the partial dislocations. The relative displacement of the crystal on both sides of the strip is not equal to a lattice vector. The dynamical reasons for the stability of the partial dislocations are: (i) repulsion between the parallel partial dislocations and (ii) the low elastic energy cost of the displacement across the strip. In the vortex case we will show that in addition to (i), which is always true, the criterion (ii) may be satisfied in superconductors with sufficiently strong subleading pairing interactions.

Besides serving as an alternative explanation of the experiments [2, 4], the parton hypothesis provides additional support to the interpretations of the pseudogap in the high-temperature superconductors as an incoherent liquid of singlet electron pairs on the bonds of the  $\text{CuO}_2$  lattice [6]. The major open problem in this line of think-

ing is the question about the mechanism leading to the phase disordering of the pairs. It has been argued that in order to destroy the phase ordering and to stabilize the pseudogap state, the presence of cheap vortices in the cuprates is required [1]. We will show that the energy of the split vortices may be substantially reduced with respect to the conventional vortex energy.

Our main assumption is the existence, in addition to the leading  $d$ -wave interactions, of subleading pairing interactions in the  $s$ -wave sector. Our motivation is as follows. It seems reasonable to assume that the model of the cuprates should contain a strong on-site repulsion and a moderate antiferromagnetic nearest neighbor spin-spin interaction. It is well known that within this type of a model, condensates with both  $d$ -wave and  $s$ -wave symmetry may form [7]. On the other hand, we are not aware of direct experimental evidence for such subleading pairing tendencies in the cuprates. It has been argued, however, that the large second harmonics of the current-phase relation observed in the cuprate grain boundary Josephson junctions [8, 9] provides an indirect evidence for the existence of subleading pairing interactions [10].

Previous works have noted that the structure of isolated vortex lines in superconductors with competing pairing interactions may become very rich. In particular, within phenomenological Ginzburg-Landau theory it has been shown that in the vicinity of the vortex cores in  $d$ -wave superconductors, there may nucleate a finite  $s$ -wave component with a nontrivial phase structure [11]. However, these results do not explain the experiment [2], since the dominant  $d$ -wave field has only one singularity. For the same reason, neither the more recently proposed non-singular vortices [12] can explain the experimental data. Also Volovik has suggested [13] that vortex splitting may have been observed in [2], but he has not presented any calculation to support this hypothesis.

We model the  $\text{CuO}_2$  plane as a square array of superconducting islands. There are two alternative interpretations of this lattice. Phenomenologically, one may think of it as a coarse-grained model of the  $\text{CuO}_2$  plane. Microscopically, adopting the short-range RVB picture for the sake of simplicity, the lattice may be thought of as the

set of the centers of mass of the nearest-neighbor Cu-Cu singlets. The fluctuations of the superconducting amplitudes of the islands are neglected and the only dynamical variable describing the island at  $i$  is supposed to be the phase of the condensate  $\theta_i$ . The islands are assumed to be coupled by the Josephson effect and we postulate that the Hamiltonian of the plane reads as

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} [\varepsilon \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j) - J \cos(2\theta_i - 2\theta_j)], \quad (1)$$

where the sum is taken over the nearest-neighbor sites. The  $d$ -wave pairing state is described by  $\varepsilon > 0$  and in the spin language it corresponds to an antiferromagnetic configuration of  $\theta_i$ . Note that for  $\varepsilon < 0$  it is the  $s$ -wave pairing state that is stable and therefore  $\varepsilon = 0$  corresponds to a quantum critical point. We assume that  $J > 0$  and therefore the ground state phase difference in Eq. (1) jumps discontinuously from  $\pi$  at  $\varepsilon > 0$  to 0 at  $\varepsilon < 0$ . The alternative choice  $J < 0$  would correspond to a continuous change of the ground-state phase difference, thus physically corresponding to a  $d+is$  state in the vicinity of  $\varepsilon = 0$ , i.e. to a time reversal-breaking mixture of the  $d$ -wave and  $s$ -wave pairing states. Such cooperation of different pairing states is generically favourable at weak coupling [7]. On the other hand, our case  $J > 0$  corresponds to a competition between the pairing states.

In order to proceed we modify the model Eq. (1) in several ways. First, we perform a gauge transformation  $\theta_i \rightarrow \theta_i + \pi$  on one of the sublattices. This changes the sign of the first term in Eq. (1) and, as a result, the  $d$ -wave state corresponds to the ferromagnetic state. Second, we redefine the zero of energy so that the homogeneous case corresponds to  $E = 0$  and finally, we include the coupling to the magnetic field. For the sake of simplicity, we consider a layered tetragonal material with in-plane lattice constant  $d$  and  $c$ -axis lattice constant  $d_c$  and we consider only vortices along the  $c$  axis. Finally we have

$$\tilde{E} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} e(\theta_{ij}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda^2}{d^2} \sum_i \varphi_i^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\tilde{E} = E/(4J + \varepsilon)$  is the dimensionless vortex energy per  $\text{CuO}_2$  plane and  $\lambda^{-2} = 4\pi^2 \mu_0 (4J + \varepsilon) / (\Phi_0^2 d_c)$ .

The first term in Eq. (2) corresponds to the sum of dimensionless Josephson energies of single bonds,

$$e(\theta) = (1 - 2c)(1 - \cos \theta) + \frac{c}{2}(1 - \cos 2\theta), \quad (3)$$

where  $c = 2J/(4J + \varepsilon)$  is a parameter measuring the strength of the second harmonic contribution to the Josephson energy of the bonds. We have introduced a dimensionless vector potential  $a_{ij} = 2\pi \int_i^j \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{r} / \Phi_0$  and a gauge invariant phase difference between lattice sites  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $\theta_{ij} = \theta_j - \theta_i + a_{ij}$ .

The second term in Eq. (2) corresponds to the energy of the magnetic field.  $\varphi_i$  is the dimensionless flux threading the plaquette with lower left point at  $i$ . If the plaquette is formed by the points  $ijkl$ , then  $\varphi_i = a_{ij} + a_{jk} + a_{kl} + a_{li}$ .

Minimizing the energy Eq. (2) with respect to  $a_{ij}$  we obtain the coupled set of discretized Maxwell equations

$$\varphi_{i-\hat{y}} - \varphi_i = \frac{d^2}{\lambda^2} j(\theta_{i+\hat{x}} - \theta_i + a_{i,i+\hat{x}}), \quad (4)$$

$$\varphi_i - \varphi_{i-\hat{x}} = \frac{d^2}{\lambda^2} j(\theta_{i+\hat{y}} - \theta_i + a_{i,i+\hat{y}}), \quad (5)$$

where  $\hat{x}$  and  $\hat{y}$  are elementary lattice vectors in the  $x$  and  $y$  directions, respectively, and we have introduced the dimensionless current  $j(\theta) = (1 - 2c) \sin \theta + c \sin 2\theta$ . Note that for slowly varying fields,  $|\theta| \ll 1$ ,  $j(\theta) = \theta$  for all values of  $c$ . Making use of Eqs. (4,5), we thus identify  $\lambda$  as the penetration depth and from  $\lambda \approx 2600 \text{ \AA}$  [14] and  $d_c \approx 7.5 \text{ \AA}$ , we estimate  $4J + \varepsilon \approx 6 \text{ meV}$  independently of  $c$ . Thus  $c$  is the only free parameter in the theory.

In what follows we make use of the inequality  $\lambda \gg d$  and solve Eqs. (4,5) perturbatively with the small parameter  $d/\lambda$ . To this end let us require that the phase field  $\theta_i$  satisfies the following equations for all sites  $i$ :

$$\sum_{\tau} j(\theta_{i+\tau} - \theta_i) = 0, \quad (6)$$

where the sum is taken over the four nearest neighbor directions  $\tau$ . Physically this corresponds to a lattice version of the continuity equation  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} = 0$  and more formally it might be thought of as a discretized version of the equation  $\nabla^2 \theta = 0$ . Once Eq. (6) is satisfied, one can estimate the magnetic fields by neglecting the vector potential  $a_{ij}$  on the right-hand sides of Eqs. (4,5) and one finds that  $\varphi_i \propto d^2/\lambda^2 \ll 1$ . The vector potential at distance  $R$  from the vortex center can therefore be chosen as  $a \sim (d/\lambda)^2 (R/d)$ . On the other hand, the typical phase difference  $\theta_{i+\tau} - \theta_i$  at distance  $R$  is  $d/R$ . Therefore the current distribution is well described by the phase-only solution inside the circle with radius  $R \sim \lambda$ . Beyond this range the correct solution should differ only marginally from the standard vortex solution [15]. In this paper we therefore concentrate only on the region  $R \ll \lambda$ .

Our task is therefore to find a solution to Eq. (6) with a finite winding number. Consider first the standard solution describing a phase winding by  $2\pi$  around the vortex center at  $(0.5, 0.5)$ . Consider further the straight line passing through the vortex center and parallel to the  $x$  axis. This line cuts the set of bonds connecting points  $(x, 0)$  and  $(x, 1)$  of the lattice. We will work in a gauge where the phase difference  $\Delta\theta_x = \theta_{x0} - \theta_{x1}$  changes between  $2\pi$  for  $x \rightarrow -\infty$  and 0 for  $x \rightarrow +\infty$ .

We have solved Eq. (6) on lattices  $200 \times 200$  numerically by the standard iterative procedure. By varying the initial configuration, several solutions could be found. The number of different solutions increased with  $c$ . For all




FIG. 1: Phase difference  $\Delta\theta_x = \theta_{x,0} - \theta_{x,1}$  for bonds which are cut by a straight line passing through the vortex center and parallel to the  $x$  axis, plotted versus the position  $x$  of the bond. The partons are located at  $x = 0.5 \pm a$ . Note the growth of the plateau at  $\Delta\theta_x = \pi$  as the quantum critical point  $c = 0.5$  is approached.

solutions we calculated their Josephson energy and for every studied  $c$ , we have identified the optimal solution with minimal energy. From now on, we will focus on the optimal solutions.

The results for the phase jump  $\Delta\theta_x$  for several values of  $c$  are shown in Fig. 1. In agreement with our expectations, as a function of  $x$ ,  $\Delta\theta_x$  exhibits only a single step [16] for sufficiently small  $c$ . However, for  $c > 0.25$  two partial steps develop. The phase jump  $\Delta\theta_x$  at those steps changes from 0 to  $\pi$  and from  $\pi$  to  $2\pi$ , respectively, corresponding to the presence of two partons. The spacing between the partons,  $2a$ , defined as the distance between the steps, is plotted in Fig. 2. Note the step increase of  $a(c)$  for  $c$  approaching the quantum critical point at  $c = 0.5$ .




FIG. 2: The equilibrium half-distance  $a$  between the partons (in units of  $d$ ) as a function of  $c$ . The inset shows the energy of all solutions found for  $c = 0.475$  as a function of their  $a$ . On the vertical scale, only energy differences are meaningful, since the energy contains an additive constant dependent on the lattice size.

Once the phase fields are known, the magnetic field distribution can be calculated making use of Eqs. (4,5). The result of this calculation is shown in Fig. 3 which explicitly shows that the vortex splits into two partons.




FIG. 3: Spatial distribution of the dimensionless magnetic flux  $\varphi_i$  in a split vortex for  $c = 0.475$ .




FIG. 4: Kinetic energy (in units of  $4J + \varepsilon$ ) of the bonds along the  $x$  direction (a) and along the  $y$  direction (b) for  $c = 0.475$ .

Let us discuss the energetics of vortex splitting in more detail. Figure 4a shows the Josephson (kinetic) energy of the bonds in the  $x$  direction. By the standard argument about instability of multiply charged vortices one can see that this configuration has a lower total kinetic energy in the  $x$  direction,  $\tilde{E}_x$ , than the usual vortex solution. Thus, the gradient of  $\tilde{E}_x$  pushes the partons apart [17].

There is however an opposing force, which is caused by the necessary existence of a cut joining the partons, across which the phase has to jump approximately by  $\pi$ . The kinetic energy of the bonds in the  $y$  direction is shown in Fig. 4b. One can see explicitly that, at long distances  $2a$  between the partons, the total kinetic energy in the  $y$  direction,  $\tilde{E}_y$ , grows linearly with  $a$  due to the

energy cost of the cut, thus forming a confining potential for the partons.

The competition between the repulsive and attractive forces leads to the presence of a minimum of the total vortex energy as a function of the parton distance, as demonstrated explicitly in the inset to Fig. 2.

So why don't the partons always form? The reason for this is that, for  $c < 0.25$ , the Josephson energy Eq. (3) has a local maximum at  $\theta = \pi$ . This destabilizes the parton solution at those values of  $c$ . For  $c > 0.25$ , the parton is locally stable, but the equilibrium interparton distance is in general very short, see Fig. 2, because the string tension associated with the cut is huge. However, when approaching the quantum critical point  $c = 0.5$ , the energy difference  $e(\pi) - e(0)$  measuring the string tension diminishes and the interparton distance  $2a$  grows.

The theory as developed so far applies only to situations when  $a \ll \lambda$ . Therefore it does not apply in the immediate vicinity of the quantum critical point. In order to check the robustness of our picture we have solved the full equations (4,5) at the critical point  $c = 0.5$  for a single fractional vortex. To this end we have rewritten Eqs. (4,5) as

$$\varphi_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau} \arcsin \left[ \frac{2\lambda^2}{d^2} (\varphi_{i+\tau} - \varphi_i) \right] + \pi \delta_{i0}, \quad (7)$$

where the first term can be thought of as a discretized Laplacian and only the nearest-neighbor sites contribute to the sum over  $\tau$ . The second term is the source term for a vortex whose phase winds by  $\pi$ . The solution to Eq. (7) was obtained by the standard iterative procedure. We have checked explicitly that in the core region  $R \ll \lambda$  the approximate solution which satisfies Eq. (6) is in perfect agreement with the full solution.

The conventional vortex energy at  $c = 0$  can be estimated using the London theory [17] and we find  $\tilde{E}(0) \approx \pi \ln(\lambda/d)$ . Taking  $d$  in the interval between  $3.8 \text{ \AA}/\sqrt{2}$  and  $\xi \approx 14 \text{ \AA}$  [18], we estimate  $\tilde{E}(0) \approx 16 - 22$ . From our numerical solution we can determine the change of the vortex energy with  $c$  and, *e.g.* at  $c = 0.475$ ,  $\tilde{E}(0) - \tilde{E}(0.475) \approx 4.85$ . It is seen that finite values of  $c$  may lead to a substantial reduction of the vortex energy.

Before concluding let us discuss the relevance of our results to the experiment [2]. Following [2], we assume that the pinning effects are decisive in determining the vortex shape. The difference with respect to [2] is that in our picture all vortices in a perfect sample should be split. The observation of unsplit vortices can be explained by the attraction of the partons to the same pinning center by a potential which is stronger than the energy gain due to splitting [19]. Moreover, the interpretation of the observed slow temporal evolution of the vortex shapes proposed in [2] is applicable also in our picture.

In [2], the quantum tunneling of vortices between

nearby pinning sites was considered as the most likely mechanism of vortex delocalization. Thus the vortex should be described by a linear superposition of wavefunctions describing the vortex localized at the various pinning sites. It is a subtle issue to distinguish a vortex described by such a wavefunction from our stable parton picture. We believe the best way to distinguish these two alternatives is to determine whether split vortices form also in perfect samples.

In conclusion, within a simple model we have shown that, in the vicinity of a quantum phase transition between pairing states of different symmetry, the vortex cores may acquire a nontrivial parton structure. We believe that this result is interesting in several respects: (i) in scanning tunneling spectroscopy of the cuprates, the parton structure of the vortex cores has been observed in some of the samples; (ii) the phenomenon is analogous to the formation of the partial Shockley dislocations; (iii) the parton structure lowers the energy of the vortices and this may be relevant for the interpretation of the pseudogap phase; (iv) precisely at the quantum critical point  $\varepsilon = 0$ , fractional vortices become deconfined.

The author thanks S. Saxena for an interesting discussion. This work was supported by the grants APVV-51-003505, VEGA 1/2011/05, and COST P-16.

- 
- [1] P.A. Lee, N. Nagaosa and X.G. Wen, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 17 (2006).
  - [2] B. W. Hoogenboom *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 9179 (2000).
  - [3] G. Levy *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 257005 (2005).
  - [4] Ø. Fischer *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 353 (2007).
  - [5] J.P. Hirth and J. Lothe, *Theory of Dislocations*, 2nd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1982), p. 296.
  - [6] P.W. Anderson, *Science* **235**, 1196 (1987).
  - [7] G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 3664 (1988).
  - [8] E. Il'ichev *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 3096 (1999)
  - [9] E. Il'ichev *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5369 (2001).
  - [10] R. Hlubina, M. Grajcar, and E. Il'ichev, in *Studies of High Temperature Superconductors*, edited by A. V. Narlikar (Nova Science, Commack, NY, 2003), Vol. 45, pp. 1-33.
  - [11] M. Franz *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 5795 (1996).
  - [12] A. S. Mel'nikov *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 11820 (2000).
  - [13] G.E. Volovik, *The Universe in a Helium Droplet*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2003), p. 180.
  - [14] T. Jacobs *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4516 (1995).
  - [15] Except for the case  $c \rightarrow 0.5$ .
  - [16] The step is defined as the locus of steepest descent of  $\Delta\theta_x$  as a function of  $x$ .
  - [17] M. Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity*, 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1996), pp. 148-155.
  - [18] H. C. Ri *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 3312 (1994).
  - [19] The inset to Fig. 2 shows that the parton-parton potential is quite soft.