

# Dynamics of vortex glass phase in strongly type II superconductors

Qing-Hu Chen<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Physics, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua 321004, P. R. China*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, P. R. China*

<sup>3</sup> *Computational Materials Science Center, National Institute for Materials Science, Tsukuba 305-0047, Japan*

(Dated: May 28, 2019)

Dynamics of vortex matter in strongly type-II superconductors with strong random pinning potential is investigated within the frustrated 3D XY model. A strong evidence for finite temperature vortex glass transition in the unscreened limit is given. By dynamical scaling, both static and dynamical exponents in glass transition are extracted from the simulated IV data. A genuine continuous depinning transition is found at zero temperature. For low temperature creep motion, critical exponents and scaling functions are evaluated, and a non-Arrhenius creep motion is observed in vortex glass phase.

The industrialized application of superconductors crucially depends on the high electricity transport without dissipation. However, the resistivity would always be nonzero even in the presence of pinning centers. This conventional picture has been changed with the discovery of high- $T_c$  superconductors[1, 2] and the progress in random field systems[3]. Similar to the spin-glass system, Fisher et al suggested that, for high disorder, the system freezes into genuine thermodynamic amorphous vortex glass (VG) phase with some kind of glassy long-range order[4, 5]. It is a true superconducting state with vanishing linear resistivity by diverging energy barriers. The evidences to support the existence of a VG phase have been reported in many experiments by the dynamic scaling of the measured current-voltage data[6]. However this issue remains very controversial [7, 8].

Theoretically, the XY gauge glass model[9, 10, 11] has been extensively employed to study the VG transition. There is now general consensus that a finite temperature VG transitions occurs in three dimensions. The values for the critical exponents are similar to those obtained in certain recent experiments [6]. However, it lacks some of properties and symmetries due to the absence of net field, then is questioned to be a model of disordered superconductors in an applied field[12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. Some more realistic models are then proposed recently, but the conclusions are quite contradictory. Most models give a continuous finite temperature VG transition, but with various critical exponents. The simulation of the London-Langevin model, however, found no VG phase[8].

Among all vortex models, the frustrated 3D XY model, where net magnetic fields are included and quenched disorders are incorporated in the coupling constant, has provided a unified vortex phase diagram in Type-II superconductor[13, 14, 15, 17]. Within this model, the low field (weak disorder) low temperature phase is in general regarded as a dislocation-free Bragg glass with quasi-long-range order[17], which was observed directly in a neutron experiment[18]. A rich dynamical phase diagram of vortex matter for weak disorder was also obtained[19]. For high disorder, Olsson and Kawamura independently

observed the evidence of the VG transition in the unscreened limit by two typical sets of parameters[13, 14], but universal good scaling for some quantities was not achieved[15], possibly due to small system sizes accessed. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, the dynamical study is so far lacking, which is more relevant to experiments.

In this Letter, by large scale dynamical simulations, for two typical sets of parameters in Refs. [13, 14], a nearly perfect collapse of current-voltage data can be achieved, the previous discrepancy is then reconciled. The obtained static critical exponents are close to that of gauge glass model[10], while the dynamic critical exponents are found to be parameter dependent, similar to the experimental findings in different materials[6]. We also study the depinning and creep motion in the VG phase. A genuine continuous depinning transition is observed at zero temperature. With the notion of scaling, critical exponents and scaling functions are estimated, and a non-Arrhenius creep motion in the VG phase is found.

The frustrated 3D XY model on a simple cubic lattice is given by [13, 14]

$$H = - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} \cos(\phi_i - \phi_j - A_{ij}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\phi_i$  specifies the phase of the superconducting order parameter on site  $i$ ,  $A_{ij} = (2\pi/\Phi_0) \int_i^j \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$  with  $\mathbf{A}$  the magnetic vector potential of a field  $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$  along the  $z$  axis. We choose two typical random coupling distribution  $J_{ij}$  set by Olsson[13] and Kawamura[14], called Model I and II respectively. For simulations of Models I and II, we use the same parameters as Olsson in Ref. [13] with system size  $L_{xy} = 100, L_z = 60$  and Kawamura in Ref. [14] with system size  $L = 64$  for all directions. Note that the system sizes are considerably larger than those in literature.

The Resistivity-Shunted-Junction dynamics is incorporated in simulations, which can be described as

$$\frac{\sigma \hbar}{2e} \sum_j (\dot{\phi}_i - \dot{\phi}_j) = - \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi_i} + J_{\text{ext},i} - \sum_j \eta_{ij}, \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1: Current-resistivity curves at various temperatures for (a) Model I and (b) Model II

where  $J_{\text{ext},i}$  is the external current which vanishes except for the boundary sites. The  $\eta_{ij}$  is the thermal noise current with zero mean and a correlator  $\langle \eta_{ij}(t)\eta_{ij}(t') \rangle = 2\sigma k_B T \delta(t-t')$ . In the following, the units are taken of  $2e = J_0 = \hbar = \sigma = k_B = 1$ .

In the present simulation, a uniform external current  $I_x$  along  $x$ -direction is fed into the system, analogous to experiments[6]. The fluctuating twist boundary condition [20] is applied in the  $xy$  plane to maintain the current, and the periodic boundary condition is employed in the  $z$  axis. In the  $xy$  plane, the supercurrent between sites  $i$  and  $j$  is now given by  $J_{i \rightarrow j}^{(s)} = J_{ij} \sin(\theta_i - \theta_j - A_{ij} - \mathbf{r}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{\Delta})$ , with  $\mathbf{\Delta} = (\Delta_x, \Delta_y)$  the fluctuating twist variable and  $\theta_i = \phi_i + \mathbf{r}_i \cdot \mathbf{\Delta}$ . The new phase angle  $\theta_i$  is periodic in both  $x$ - and  $y$ -directions. Dynamics of  $\mathbf{\Delta}_\alpha$  can be then written as

$$\dot{\Delta}_\alpha = \frac{1}{L^3} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle_\alpha} [J_{i \rightarrow j}^{(s)} + \eta_{ij}] - I_\alpha, \alpha = x, y \quad (3)$$

The voltage drop is  $V = -L\dot{\Delta}_x$ .

The above equations can be solved efficiently by a pseudo-spectral algorithm [19] due to the periodicity of phase in all directions. The time stepping is done using a second-order Runge-Kutta scheme with  $\Delta t = 0.05$ . Our runs are typically  $(4-8) \times 10^7$  time steps and the latter half time steps are for the measurements. The detailed procedure in the simulations was described in Ref. [19]. Our results are based on one realization of disorder. The present system size is much too larger than those reported in literature, we expect a good self-averaging




FIG. 2: Dynamic scaling of IV data at various temperatures for (a) Model I and (b) Model II

effect. We have simulated in two additional simulations with different realizations of disorder for further confirmation, and observed quantitatively the same behavior. In addition, it is practically difficult to perform any serious disorder averaging for such a rather large system size.

First, we study the VG phase transition in these two models. Figs. 1(a) and 1(b) present the resistivity  $R = V/I$  as a function of current  $I$  at various temperatures for model I and II, respectively. At lower temperatures,  $R$  tends to zero as the current decreases for both cases, which provides strong evidence of a true superconducting phase with zero linear resistivity.  $R$  tends to a finite value at higher temperatures, corresponding to an Ohmic resistivity.

In analyzing the glass transition from a vortex liquid with ohmic resistance to a superconducting VG state, Fisher, Fisher, and Huse [5] proposed the following dynamic scaling ansatz,

$$V = I\xi^{d-2-z} \Psi_{\pm}(I\xi^{d-1}). \quad (4)$$

where  $d$  is the dimension of the system,  $z$  is the dynamic exponent at the transition, and  $\xi = |T - T_g|^{-\nu}$  is the correlation length which diverges at the transition.

We examine the IV data at different temperatures by this dynamical scaling. Fig. 2(a) shows the data collapse well according to Eq. (4) with  $T_g = 0.124 \pm 0.002$ ,  $z = 5.8 \pm 0.3$ , and  $\nu = 1.6 \pm 0.1$ . The values of  $T_g$  and  $\nu$  are very close to  $T_g = 0.123 \pm 0.008$ ,  $\nu = 1.5 \pm 0.3$  obtained in Ref. [13] through equilibrium Monte Carlo simulations. Also as indicated in Fig. 2(b) that, using

$T_g = 0.81 \pm 0.01$ ,  $z = 2.5 \pm 0.2$ , and  $\nu = 1.2 \pm 0.1$ , an excellent collapse according to Eq. (4) is achieved. The values of  $T_g$  and  $\nu$  agree quite well with  $T_g = 0.81 \pm 0.02$ ,  $\nu = 1.2 \pm 0.3$  recently obtained by an equilibrium Monte Carlo simulations[14]. Both models give the correlation length exponents falling in the error bar of  $\nu = 1.39 \pm 0.2$  for the 3D gauge glass model, which suggests a common universality class. The dynamic exponents for these two models are quite different. Note that the dynamic exponents are just varied from sample to sample[6].

For equilibrium simulations of Model II, some quantities failed to provide good scaling [14]. The helicity modulus was used in finite size scaling analysis of the VG phase transitions in both models[13, 15], a nice scaling is obtained in Model I, but scaling fails applied to Model II for data in system size  $L \leq 20$ . The collapse of the transverse helicity modulus with poor quality gives  $T_g = 0.63$ ,  $\nu = 1.5$ , which differed significantly from those of Ref. [14]. More seriously, it was impossible to collapse the data for the parallel helicity modulus. In the present simulations, we can perform the same dynamic scaling analysis for both models, and the obtained transition temperatures and static critical exponents agree well with previous ones[13, 14]. So the previous discrepancy is reconciled in the present large scale simulations.

With the VG phase in hand, in the remaining part of the paper, we will study the depinning and creep motion of the vortices in this phase for both models. To study the depinning transition at zero temperature, we start from high currents with random initial phase configurations. Fig. 3 presents the current-voltage ( $IV$ ) characteristics at  $T = 0$  for both models. Interestingly, we observe continuous depinning transitions with unique depinning currents[21], which can be described as  $V \sim (I - I_c)^\beta$  with  $I_c = 0.125 \pm 0.001$ ,  $\beta = 2.25 \pm 0.02$  for model I and  $I_c = 0.116 \pm 0.002$ ,  $\beta = 1.887 \pm 0.005$  for model II. Note that the depinning exponent for both models is greater than 1, consistent with the mean field studies on charge density wave models[21].

At low temperatures, the  $IV$  characteristics are rounded near the zero-temperature critical current due to thermal fluctuations. An obvious crossover between the depinning and creep motion can be observed around  $I_c$  for both models at the lowest accessible temperatures. In order to study the creep motion at low temperatures, a scaling relation among the voltage, current, and temperature has been proposed[21, 22, 23, 24]

$$V(T, I) = T^{1/\delta} S[T^{-1/\beta\delta}(1 - I_c/I)]. \quad (5)$$

It is implied that right at  $I = I_c$  the voltage shows a power-law behavior  $V(T, I = I_c) \sim T^{1/\delta}$  and the critical exponent  $1/\delta$  can be determined. The log-log  $V - T$  curves are plotted in Fig. 4 (a) and (b) at three currents for Models I and II. In Fig. 4(a), we can see that the critical current is between 0.115 and 0.135. The values of voltage at other currents within (0.115, 0.135) can be evalu-




FIG. 3: Log-log plots of  $IV$  curves at zero-temperatures for (a) Model I and (b) Model II.

ated by quadratic interpolation. The deviation of voltage from the power law is calculated as the square deviations. The current at which the square deviation is minimum is defined as the critical current  $I_c = 0.125 \pm 0.02$ , consistent with those obtained at zero temperature. The temperature dependence of voltage at the critical current is also plotted in Fig. 4(a). The slope of this curve yields  $1/\delta = 1.438 \pm 0.004$ . The similar analysis in Fig. 4(b) yields  $I_c = 0.116 \pm 0.02$  for Model II, consistent with that extracted from the zero-temperature simulation. The exponent  $1/\delta = 1.227 \pm 0.003$  is achieved by fitting the voltage-temperature curve in the low temperature regimes at the critical current.

With the critical exponent  $\delta$  and the critical current  $I_c$ , we can adjust the depinning exponent  $\beta$  to achieve the best data collapse according to the scaling relation Eq. (5) for  $I \leq I_c$ . In Fig. 5 (a) and (b), a perfect collapse of the  $IV$  data at various temperatures below  $T_g$  is shown with  $\beta = 2.25 \pm 0.01$  for Model I and  $1.887 \pm 0.005$  for Model II. The values of  $\beta$  estimated from low temperature creep motion are in excellent agreement with those derived at  $T = 0$  depinning transition. Moreover, the scaling function with the form  $V \propto T^{1/\delta} \exp[A(1 - I_c/I)/T^{\beta\delta}]$  is derived in the creep regime for both models, which are list in the legends of Fig. 5. Note that the product of the two exponents  $\beta\delta$  describes the temperature dependence of the creeping law. Interestingly,  $\beta\delta \simeq 1.56$  for model I and  $\beta\delta \simeq 1.54$  for model II, both deviate from unity, demonstrating that the creep law is a non-Arrhenius type. The values of  $\beta\delta$  in both models are close to  $3/2$ , which may motivate further analytical work. We believe it is not a coincidence that they are also in the same universality in the depinning transition.

The non-Arrhenius type creep behaviors have been previously observed in charge density waves[23] and the flux line system with weak pinning in a Bragg glass[24]. By simulations of overdamped London-Langevin model, Luo and Hu observed an Arrhenius law for the creep mo-




FIG. 4: Log-log plots of  $V - T$  at three currents around  $I_c$  for (a) Model I and (b) Model II.

tion with a linearly suppressed energy barrier for strong pinning [24], inconsistent with the present study. In the same model, the stable VG phase is not found[8]. Whereas within the frustrated 3D XY model, the existence of a stable VG phase is well established in the unscreened limit through both previous equilibrium studies [13, 14, 15] and present dynamical simulations. Even in the real strongly type-II superconductors, the screening induced rounding of the sharp VG transition is only a weak effect, and only visible at temperatures very close to  $T_g$ . The good scaling behavior in the creep motion is just observed far below  $T_g$ . We believe that the different nature of the phases may be the possible reason for the discrepancy. It is interesting to note that the combined exponent  $\beta\delta = 3/2$  in strong disorder is close to that for weak-pinning in London-Langevin model[24]. Further work is needed in order to clarify this observation.

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 10574107, PNCET and PCSIRT in University in China, National Basic Research Program of China (Grant No. 2006CB601003). The present simulations were partially performed on SR11000 (HITACHI) at NIMS, Japan.




FIG. 5: Scaling plot of the IV data at various temperatures below  $T_g$  for (a) Model I and (b) Model II.

[1] G. Blatter *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 1125 (1994); G. W. Crabtree, and D. R. Nelson, Physics Today **45** 38 (1997).  
 [2] T. Nattermann and S. Scheidl, Adv. Phys. **49**, 607(2000).  
 [3] P. Young, Spin Glass and Random fields (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).  
 [4] M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1415 (1989).  
 [5] D. Fisher, M. P. A. Fisher, and D. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 130 (1991).  
 [6] R. H. Koch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1511 (1989); R. Koch, V. Foglietti, and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2586 (1990); P. Gammel, L. Schneemeyer, and D. Bishop, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 953 (1991); A. M. Petrean *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5852 (2000); J. E. Villegas

[7] D. R. Strchan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 067007(2001); I. L. Landau and H. R. Ott, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 064511 (2002).  
 [8] C. Reichhardt *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1994 (2000); S. Bustingorry *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 027001(2006).  
 [9] D. A. Huse and H. S. Seung, Phys. Rev. B **42**, R1059 (1990); J. D. Reger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 7147 (1991).  
 [10] T. Olson and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 12467(2000); H. G. Katzgraber and I. A. Campbell, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 094413 (2004).  
 [11] J. M. Kosterlitz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4672 (1998).  
 [12] A. Vestergren *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 117004 (2002).  
 [13] P. Olsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 077002 (2003).  
 [14] H. Kawamura, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 220502(R) (2003).  
 [15] P. Olsson, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 144525 (2005).  
 [16] J. Lidmar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 097001(2003); Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 100503 (R) (2004).  
 [17] Y. Nonomura and X. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5140(2001); P. Olsson and S. Teitel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 137001(2001).  
 [18] T. Klein *et al.*, Nature (London) **413**, 404(2001).  
 [19] Q. H. Chen and X. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 117005(2003).  
 [20] Q. H. Chen, L. H. Tang, and P. Q. Tong, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 067001(2001); L. H. Tang and Q. H. Chen, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 024508 (2003); Q. H. Chen and X. Hu, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 064504 (2007).  
 [21] D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1486 (1983); Phys. Rev. B **31**, 1396 (1985).  
 [22] L. Roters *et al.*, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 5202 (1999).  
 [23] A. A. Middleton, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 9465 (1992).  
 [24] M. B. Luo and X. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 267002(2007).