

Quantum phase transition in the Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov states of a two dimensional d -wave superconductor upon increasing the exchange field

Tao Zhou and C. S. Ting

Texas Center for Superconductivity and Department of Physics, University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77204

(Dated: November 21, 2018)

We studied the phase diagram for a two-dimensional d -wave superconducting system under an in-plane magnetic field or an exchange field. According to the spatial configuration of the order parameter, we show that there exists quantum phase transitions in which the uniform phase transforms to the one-dimensional Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov (FFLO) state, and then to two-dimensional FFLO state upon increasing the exchange field. The local density of states are calculated and suggested to be signatures to distinguish these phases.

The Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov (FFLO) state was predicted several decades ago by Fulde and Ferrell [1], and Larkin and Ovchinnikov [2] for the superconductor in a strong magnetic field, where the superconducting (SC) order parameter varies periodically in space. While the occurrence of the FFLO state requires very stringent conditions on the SC materials, namely, the Pauli paramagnetism effect should dominate over the orbital effect [3], and the material needs to be very clean [4]. As a result, this long thought of inhomogeneous SC state has never been observed in conventional superconductors.

For layered systems with an exchange field or a magnetic field parallel to the SC plane, the orbital effect will be suppressed strongly due to the low dimensionality. Thus they could be strong candidates to look for the FFLO state. Actually, in the past decade, indications for possible FFLO state have been reported in the heavy fermion materials CeCoIn₅ [5, 6], organic superconductors λ -(BETS)₂GaCl₄ [7], λ -(BETS)₂FeCl₄ [8, 9] and κ -(BEDT-TTF)₂Cu(NCS)₂ [10, 11]. All of them are quasi two dimensional (2D) layered compounds. The experimental developments have attracted renewed interest on the property of the FFLO state. Theoretically, the existence and the character of the FFLO state can be investigated through analyzing the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) free-energy function, which is valid at temperatures not too below the superconducting transition temperature. Another effective method is the Bogoliubov-de-Gennes (BdG) technique and it has been proven to be a powerful tool to study the inhomogeneous state and the local density of states (LDOS) self-consistently in the low-dimensional system. In fact, in the past, the FFLO state has been studied intensively based on the above two techniques [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. For a 2D system, it is somewhat established [14, 15] that the order parameter has a 2D checkerboard pattern for a superconductor with d -wave pairing symmetry, and a 1D stripe-like pattern for s -wave pairing symmetry [15, 16]. On the other hand, it has been shown that in the presence of dilute impurities, the pattern of the FFLO state becomes 1D stripe-like in a 2D d -wave superconductor [17, 18]. This implies that the 2D and 1D FFLO states may be present in the system in different parameter region. It was also argued without a calculation that the $H-T$ phase diagram for the 2D isotropic systems, regardless it is s or d -wave pairing, should include both 1D FFLO state and 2D FFLO states with square, triangular and hexagonal patterns [12] as

the exchange interaction becomes stronger. This result is significantly different from our previous understanding about the pattern of the FFLO state in 2D systems. Therefore it is of interest and timely to reexamine the formation of the FFLO state in a 2D superconducting system as a function of the exchange interaction.

In the present work, we calculate the spatially distributed order parameter self-consistently based on the BdG equations. The whole $H-T$ phase diagram is constructed. We verify numerically that the pattern of order parameters in the FFLO state for two-dimensional d -wave square lattice samples in presence of an exchange field is not always simply 2D. At zero temperature, the pattern changes from uniform to 1D FFLO state, and then to 2D FFLO state as the strength of the exchange field increases. The periodicity of the 1D and 2D FFLO states decreases as the exchange field increases. At finite temperature, the 1D FFLO state will transit to the uniform phase upon increasing the temperature. Thus near the SC transition temperature, only uniform phase and 2D FFLO state are observed. The LDOS for the above states are also calculated and they provide definitive signatures for the above mentioned FFLO states. In addition, our numerical study indicates that for a 2D s -wave superconductor, the FFLO state is always 1D like and no 2D pattern could be obtained, this conclusion is consistent with that of Ref. [15, 16] and the result will not be presented here.

We start from a phenomenological BCS-type model with the Zeeman splitting effect caused by an exchange field or in-plane magnetic field. On a two-dimensional square lattice with a pairing interaction V between the nearest-neighbor sites, the mean-field Hamiltonian leading to the d wave superconductivity can be written as,

$$H = -\sum_{ij\sigma}(t_{ij}c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + h.c.) - \sum_{i\sigma}(\mu + \sigma h)c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} + \sum_{ij}(\Delta_{ij}c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger + h.c.), \quad (1)$$

where t_{ij} are the hopping constants and μ is the chemical potential. σh is the Zeeman energy term, caused by the interaction between the magnetic field and the spins, with $\sigma = \pm 1$ representing for spin-up and spin-down electrons, respectively. The d -wave SC order parameter has the following definition: $\Delta_{ij} = V\langle c_{i\uparrow}c_{j\downarrow} - c_{i\downarrow}c_{j\uparrow} \rangle/2$.

This Hamiltonian can be diagonalized by solving the BdG




FIG. 1: H-T phase diagram of the two-dimensional d -wave superconductor in the parallel magnetic field.

equations,

$$\sum_j \begin{pmatrix} H_{ij} & \Delta_{ij} \\ \Delta_{ij}^* & -H_{ij}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{j\uparrow}^n \\ v_{j\downarrow}^n \end{pmatrix} = E_n \begin{pmatrix} u_{i\uparrow}^n \\ v_{i\downarrow}^n \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where H_{ij} is expressed by,

$$H_{ij} = -t_{ij} - (\mu + \sigma h)\delta_{ij}. \quad (3)$$

The SC order parameter and the local electron density n_i satisfy the following self-consistent conditions,

$$\Delta_{ij} = \frac{V_{ij}}{4} \sum_n (u_{i\uparrow}^n v_{j\downarrow}^{n*} + u_{j\uparrow}^n v_{i\downarrow}^{n*}) \tanh\left(\frac{E_n}{2K_B T}\right), \quad (4)$$

$$n_i = \sum_n |u_{i\uparrow}^n|^2 f(E_n) + \sum_n |v_{i\downarrow}^n|^2 [1 - f(E_n)]. \quad (5)$$

Here $f(x)$ is the Fermi distribution function. We define the ferromagnetic (FM) spin order m_i and the on-site order parameter Δ_i as, $m_i = n_{i\uparrow} - n_{i\downarrow}$; $\Delta_i = 1/4(\Delta_{i,i+\hat{x}} + \Delta_{i,i-\hat{x}} - \Delta_{i,i+\hat{y}} - \Delta_{i,i-\hat{y}})$.

The LDOS is expressed by,

$$\rho_i(\omega) = \sum_n [|u_{i\uparrow}^n|^2 \delta(E_n - \omega) + |v_{i\downarrow}^n|^2 \delta(E_n + \omega)], \quad (6)$$

where the delta function $\delta(x)$ is taken as $\Gamma/\pi(x^2 + \Gamma^2)$, with $\Gamma = 0.01$. The supercell technical is used to calculate the LDOS.

In the following calculation, we take the hopping constant t_{ij} to be unity for nearest neighbors and zero otherwise. The pairing potential V and the filling electron density n are chosen as $V = 1.3$ and $n = 0.84$ (hole-doped samples with doping $\delta = 0.16$), respectively. The calculation is made on 48×48 lattice with periodic boundary condition and random distributed initial values of the order parameters are chosen. The 10×10 supercell is used to calculate the LDOS.

We summarize our main results in Fig.1, as seen, the $H-T$ phase diagram is plotted. At zero temperatures two critical Zeeman fields $h_1 = 0.14$ and $h_2 = 0.23$, are revealed. The whole SC state is divided to be three regions, namely, uniform




FIG. 2: (Color online) Plots of the order parameter Δ as a function of position for various Zeeman fields h .

d -wave SC state, 1D FFLO state, and 2D FFLO state, respectively. The periodicity will decrease as the magnetic field increases in both 1D and 2D FFLO states. As $h > 0.28$, the SC phase will be destroyed completely. The periodicity of the 1D FFLO state also increases as the temperature increases, and it will transit to the uniform state as the temperature increases further. As a result, the range of the FFLO phase will decrease upon increasing the temperature. Near the SC transition temperature, only uniform d -wave phase and 2D FFLO phase was observed, with the transition field at about $h = 0.225$.

The calculated order parameter amplitudes for various Zeeman fields h with the temperature $T = 10^{-5}$ are shown in Figs.2(a)-2(e). As seen, for weaker magnetic field, the order parameter is uniform [Fig.2(a)]. When the zeeman field increases, as we can see from Figs.2(b) and 2(c), the SC order forms the stripe pattern. The order parameter is of nearly cosine form with the periodicity of about 48 along x direction as $h = 0.16$. We have verified numerically that the periodicity is kept to be 48 for $0.14 < h < 0.175$. And the periodicity reduces to 24 as h increases ($0.175 < h < 0.23$). Here the finite size effect prevents us from obtaining solutions with periodicity not commensurate with the lattice size. As h increases further, the pattern changes to two-dimensional, with the pe-




FIG. 3: (Color online) Plots of the FM order m_i as a function of position for various Zeeman fields h .

riodicity decreases as h increases, which can be seen clearly from Figs.2(d) and 2(e).

The spatial distributions of the FM order are shown in Figs.3(a)-3(e). The parameters are the same to those in Fig.2. As seen in Fig.3(a), in the uniform phase, the FM order is also uniform. Actually, the FM order competes with the SC order and is suppressed strongly by the SC order, as a result, the FM order could not survive at lower magnetic field ($h < 0.12$), and quite weak (≈ 0.003) as $h = 0.13$. We also checked numerically (not presented here) that the FM order will increase to about 0.05 in the normal state for the same magnetic field ($h = 0.13$). In the 1D FFLO state, as seen in Figs.3(b) and 3(c), the FM order is largest along the nodal lines and is suppressed when the SC order parameter increases. The FM order reaches the minimum value as the SC order is maximum. The pattern also forms 1D stripe but the periodicity is one-half of that of the order parameter. In the 2D FFLO state [Figs.3(d) and 3(e)], the FM order forms the checkerboard pattern. Similar to the case of 1D FFLO state, the FM order is largest at the nodal lines and minimum as the SC order is maximum. The periodicity along the parallel direction is the same as that of the order parameter. While the periodicity along the diagonal direction is only one-half of that of the order parameter.




FIG. 4: (Color online) The LDOS spectra for different phases. Panel (a) is the LDOS in the uniform phase with $h = 0.13$. Panels (b) and (c) are the spectra in the 1D FFLO phase with $h = 0.16$ at the nodal line and at the site which the order parameter is maximum, respectively. The right panels are the spectra in the 2D FFLO phase with $h = 0.235$, where (d-f) are the spectra at the saddle point where two nodal lines intersect, the mid-site between two neighboring saddle points, and the site where the order parameter has the maximum magnitude, respectively. The (blue) dotted line, (red) dashed line, and the (black) solid line are spin-up LDOS, spin-down LDOS, and whole LDOS, respectively.

We now turn to study the LDOS spectra. The LDOS [Eq. (6)] can be written as $\rho_i = \rho_{i\uparrow} + \rho_{i\downarrow}$. Here $\rho_{i\uparrow}$ and $\rho_{i\downarrow}$ are respectively the spin-up and spin-down parts of the LDOS. These two parts are exactly the same if the Zeeman field is absent. In presence of the Zeeman field, the spin up LDOS shifts to left and the spin down LDOS shifts to right. In Figs.4(a)-4(f), we plot the two parts of LDOS separately to discuss the properties of the LDOS. The whole LDOS spectra are also plotted so that the results can be compared with scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) experiments.

The LDOS spectra in the uniform phase are shown in Fig.4(a). As seen, the spin-up LDOS shifts to the left with the mid-gap point locating at $\omega = -h$. The SC coherent peaks shift to $\pm\Delta_0 - h$. The spin-down LDOS shifts to the right with the SC coherent peaks at $\pm\Delta_0 + h$. Outside the gap we can see the van Hove peak. As a result, the whole LDOS spectrum contains two stronger peaks at $\pm(\Delta_0 + h)$ and two weaker peaks at $\pm(\Delta_0 - h)$. The gap structure at low energies is "U"-shape. The density of states at zero energy $\rho(0)$ increases linear with the external field, indicating that the quasiparticle excitations due to the magnetic fields.

The LDOS spectra in the 1D FFLO phase with $h = 0.16$ are shown in Figs.4(b) and 4(c). Fig.4(b) is for the site on the nodal line. We can see very sharp and strong peaks at the position $\pm h$. The SC coherent peaks are suppressed and almost invisible. The peak at negative energy comes from the spin-

up LDOS, and the peak at positive energy are contributed by the spin-down LDOS. Taking into account the Zeeman shift, these in-gap peaks (bound states) at $\pm h$ locate just at the mid-gap position. These bound states are due to the sign change of the order parameter across the nodal lines and are related to the Andreev reflections, similar to the mid-gap states in d -wave superconductors [19]. The intensity of the in-gap peaks will decrease as the site moves away from the nodal line. As we can see from Fig.4(c), at the site where the order parameter is maximum, the in-gap peaks are turned to be a hump at the mid-gap position for both spin-up and spin-down LDOS spectra. The SC coherent peaks are seen clearly. The mid-gap hump is so weak that it is concealed in the whole LDOS (ρ_i) spectrum. We can see four peaks at the energies $[\pm(\Delta_0 \pm h)]$. And the spectrum of the whole LDOS is similar to that of the uniform phase while the gap structure at low energies is not "U"-shape but "V"-shape due to the presence of the mid-gap hump.

At last we plot the LDOS spectra of the 2D FFLO phase in Figs.4(d)-4(f). Actually the features of the spin-up LDOS spectra are studied intensively in Ref. [15]. There are two kinds of Andreev bound states. One is due to the sign change of the order parameter across the nodal lines. The second is essentially localized at the saddle points. The order parameter is suppressed strongly in a intersecting region, which produces a potential well for a quasiparticle and thus generates two finite-energy andreev bound states. As a result, at the saddle points, four in-gap peaks exist in the spin-up LDOS spectra [Fig.4(d)] at the energies -0.575 , -0.385 , -0.08 and

0.105 . And mid-gap peaks exist between two neighboring saddle points [Fig.4(e)]. At the site where the order parameter is maximum, the LDOS spectrum [Fig.4(f)] is similar to that of the 1D FFLO state [Fig. 4(b)] and that of the uniform phase, namely, if the van hove peaks and the weak peak caused by the mid-gap hump are excluded, there are only four peaks left, locating at $\pm(\Delta_0 \pm h)$, contributed by the spin-up and spin-down LDOS, respectively.

We have shown the LDOS spectra of the three different phases. As seen in Figs.4(a)-4(f), the spectra are quite different and the spectra in each phase have their distinctive features as we discussed above. Thus they can be easily detected by the STM experiments and can be used as signatures to probe the FFLO states.

In summary, based on a BCS-type model and BdG equations, we studied the phase transition induced by the external magnetic field. The phase diagram is mapped out and the transitions from uniform phase to 1D FFLO state, and 1D FFLO state to 2D FFLO state are revealed. We also calculate the LDOS to discuss the signatures of the three phases, namely, the LDOS spectra in the uniform phase will contain four peaks due to the Zeeman shift. In the 1D FFLO state, the LDOS spectra show mid-gap states due to the Andreev reflection. In the 2D FFLO states, four in-gap peaks are revealed at the saddle point due to two kinds of Andreev bound states.

This work was supported by the Texas Center for Superconductivity at the University of Houston and by the Robert A. Welch Foundation under the Grant no. E-1146.

-
- [1] P. Fulde and R. A. Ferrell, Phys. Rev. **135**, A550 (1964).
 [2] A. I. Larkin and Yu. N. Ovchinnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 1136 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 762 (1965)].
 [3] L. W. Gruenberg and L. Gunther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 996 (1966).
 [4] L. G. Aslamazov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **55**, 1477 (1968) [Sov. Phys. JETP **28**, 773 (1969)].
 [5] A. Bianchi, R. Movshovich, C. Capan, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 187004 (2003).
 [6] K. Kumagai, M. Saitoh, T. Oyaizu, Y. Furukawa, S. Takashima, M. Nohara, H. Takagi, and Y. Matsuda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 227002 (2006).
 [7] M. A. Tanatar, T. Ishiguro, H. Tanaka, and H. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 134503 (2002).
 [8] S. Uji, H. Shinagawa, T. Terashima, T. Yakabe, Y. Terai, M. Tokumoto, A. Kobayashi, H. Tanaka, and H. Kobayashi, Nature **410**, 908 (2001).
 [9] L. Balicas, J. S. Brooks, K. Storr, S. Uji, M. Tokumoto, H. Tanaka, H. Kobayashi, A. Kobayashi, V. Barzykin, and L. P. Gorkov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 067002 (2001).
 [10] H. Shimahara, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **66**, 541 (1997).
 [11] S. Manalo and U. Klein, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **12**, L471 (2000).
 [12] Y. Matsuda and H. Shimahara, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **76**, 051005 (2007).
 [13] D. F. Agterberg and K. Yang, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **13**, 9259 (2001).
 [14] K. Maki and H. Won, Physica (Amsterdam) B **322**, 315 (2002).
 [15] Qian Wang, H.-Y. Chen, C.-R. Hu, and C. S. Ting, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 117006 (2006).
 [16] Qinghong Cui and Kun Yang, Phys. Rev B **78**, 054501 (2008).
 [17] Qian Wang, Chia-Ren Hu, and Chin-Sen Ting, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 184515 (2007).
 [18] Xian-Jun Zuo and Chang-De Gong, Eur. Phys. Lett. **86**, 47004 (2009).
 [19] C.-R. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1526 (1994).