

Homes' Law and Universal Planckian Relaxation

A. Shekhter,^{1,*} M. K. Chan,¹ R. D. McDonald,¹ and N. Harrison¹

¹*Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

(Dated: April 4, 2025)

According to Zaanen's interpretation of Homes' empirical law [Zaanen, *Nature* **430**, 512 (2004)], the superconducting transition temperatures in the cuprates are high because their metallic states are as viscous as quantum mechanics permits. Here, we show that Homes' law in fact implies three key points: (i) the resistivity is linear in temperature in the normal state near the transition temperature; (ii) the dimensionless coefficient of proportionality of the relaxation rate with temperature is of order unity—the so-called universal Planckian relaxation rate; and (iii) the logarithmically broad applicability of this law arises from an unusually wide range of effective masses throughout the cuprate phase diagram. In fact, a universal Planckian relaxation rate implies Homes' law only if the mechanism of mass renormalization is independent of the Planckian relaxation.

In the high-temperature superconducting cuprates and strongly coupled conventional superconductors, the superfluid density scales with the product of the transition temperature and the electrical conductivity just above it, a relationship known as “Homes' law” [1]. Immediately following this observation, Zaanen noted that this empirical law connects two previously unrelated facts: the highest achievable superconducting transition temperatures, and a “strange” metallic state [2] that is as viscous as permitted by quantum mechanics [3]. Homes' law has since been shown to apply to a broader variety of unconventional superconductors, as well as strongly coupled conventional superconductors [4, 5].

Here, we point out that Homes' law is, in fact, a simple manifestation of the linear-in-temperature resistivity ($\rho = AT$) in the strange metal, which is its defining characteristic. This is understood as a T -linear dependence of the scattering rate, $\hbar/\tau = \alpha k_B T$, where α is a universal dimensionless quantity of order unity [6, 7]. In the cuprates, this law implies a universal ‘Planckian’ relaxation rate associated with the strange metal state that is independent of doping. The law spans many orders of magnitude because of enormous variation of the effective mass with composition [6, 7]. Although though some of the data used by Homes and coworkers [1] lies outside the strange metal region, the law still applies to logarithmic accuracy.

Homes' law states that the zero-temperature value of the superfluid density, ρ_{s0} , is proportional to the product of the electrical conductivity, $\sigma(T_c)$, immediately above the superconducting transition temperature, and the transition temperature, T_c , itself. Hence [1, 4, 5],

$$\rho_{s0} = C T_c \sigma(T_c), \quad (1)$$

where C is a constant of proportionality. We can estimate C in Equation (1) starting from the superfluid density [1] $\rho_{s0} = c^2 \omega_{ps}^2 = (1/2\pi\lambda_L)^2$, where $\lambda_L^{-2} = 4\pi e^2 (n/m^*)/c^2$ is the inverse-square London penetration depth [8], c is the speed of light, and e is the electron charge; note that in optics studies [1], it is customary




FIG. 1. Plot of ρ_{s0} versus $T_c \sigma(T_c)$ for many superconductors, as discussed in the text, together with Homes' law $\rho_{s0} = C T_c \sigma(T_c)$, where $C = \alpha \times (k_B/\hbar)/\pi \approx \alpha \times 42 \Omega\text{cm}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$. Physical quantities are taken from Refs. 1, 4, and 5. The solid line corresponds to $\alpha = 2.6$.

to omit c when expressing frequencies in inverse centimeters. On the right-hand-side of Equation (1), we adopt the Drude approximation for the conductivity [9]: $\sigma(T) = e^2 (n/m^*) \tau(T)$. Substituting the expression for the Planckian relaxation rate at $T = T_c$, we arrive at $C = \alpha \times (k_B/\hbar)/\pi \approx \alpha \times 42 \Omega\text{cm}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$ [10]. Figure 1 shows a plot of $\rho_{s0} = C T_c \sigma(T_c)$, with the solid line representing $\alpha = 2.6$, and the dashed lines representing factors of two up and down in α .

It is important to note that both the superfluid density and the conductivity are proportional to the ratio n/m^* , of the carrier density to the effective mass [1]. Thus, Homes' law tacitly implies that in the materials where Homes' law applies, the relaxation time, τ , entering the conductivity is inversely proportional to temperature, T , which is a defining characteristic of a strange

metal. Based solely on a dimensional analysis, Zaanen argued [3] that $\hbar/\tau \sim k_B T$ at $T = T_c$, where the scaling is determined by Boltzmann's constant, k_B , and Planck's constant, \hbar (here divided by 2π). In this particular context, $\hbar/\tau \sim k_B T$ has come to be known as the Planckian relaxation (or dissipation) rate [11, 12], and applies at all temperatures (not just T_c). Empirically, Homes' law gives $\alpha \approx 2.6$. This is consistent with a wider range of measurements [7].

It is important to note that Homes' law has logarithmic accuracy. In the cuprates, for example, $\hbar/\tau = \alpha k_B T$ accurately describes the resistivity, $\rho(T) = 1/\sigma(T)$, in the strange metal state, which occupies a funnel-shaped region in the temperature-versus-doping phase diagram [7, 13]. With the exception of a range of dopings close to a critical doping $p^* \sim 0.2$, T_c lies below the funnel region, meaning that the resistivity in the immediate vicinity of T_c departs from the Planckian form given by $\hbar/\tau = \alpha k_B T$. However, because the resistivity on the approach to T_c below the funnel region deviates from the linear form by a numerical factor (of three or less), this departure has no significant impact on the logarithmic scale in Fig. 1.

Given the dependence of both the superfluid density and electrical conductivity on the ratio n/m^* , the variation in this quantity is the sole reason why Homes' law spans multiple decades in Fig. 1. Hence, it is the large variation in n/m^* that makes Homes' law span so many decades. In the cuprates, for example, n/m^* within the a, b -planes changes by roughly an order of magnitude as a function of doping [6, 7]. Furthermore, although the superfluid density and conductivity are strongly anisotropic in the cuprates [1], Homes' law continues to hold because these anisotropies can be expressed in terms of an anisotropy in the effective mass, m^* . Finally, in non-cuprate superconductors, m^* is much larger in heavy fermion superconductors [14] than in conventional superconductors [15, 16]. Hence, Homes' law clearly demonstrates that superconductivity arises from an instability that occurs regardless of the underlying effective mass and the mechanism by which it is enhanced. From this perspective, the wide applicability of Homes' law across a logarithmically broad range of superfluid densities, conductivities, and transition temperatures suggests that the fluctuations responsible for the linear-in-temperature relaxation rate are largely independent of the electronic correlations responsible for enhancing the effective mass. This is discussed in some detail in Ref. [7].

In the cuprates, the T -linear relaxation rate is accompanied by a linear-in-energy relaxation rate, which is the result of a competition between energy and temperature associated with quantum criticality [17–21]. By contrast, phonon fluctuations in conventional metals do not exhibit such competition. Whereas the phonon-scattering relaxation rate depends on temperature, it does not depend significantly on energy [22]. The fact that the

values of α in strongly-coupled conventional superconductors are close to unity is the result of strong charge screening in these systems [15]. In heavy fermion systems (e.g. CeCoIn₅), the Planckian relaxation rate may be caused by quantum criticality in a similar manner to the cuprates [23, 24]. An alternative possibility is that this results from antiferromagnetic fluctuations behaving similarly to phonons [25].

This brings us to the question: what sets α close to unity in strange metals? One possibility is that $\alpha \sim 1$ is the natural value for such a dimensionless coefficient. Another possibility, as suggested in Ref. 26, is that $\alpha \sim 1$ represents the maximum possible value in a system with extensive many body quantum entanglement. Circumstantial evidence for such a possibility has been reported in viscosity studies of the quark-gluon plasmas [27] and the unitary regime of cold-atom Fermi gases [28].

It is finally important to note that because $\hbar/\tau = \alpha k_B T_c$ sets the magnitude of the normal-state conductivity at T_c , Homes' law does not itself depend on T_c . Hence, while a Planckian relaxation rate in the normal state is a prerequisite for high values of the superconducting transition temperature [3], it does not, in fact, provide an absolute bound on the value of T_c as claimed by Zaanen [3]. In other words, the scale-invariance of the Planckian relaxation cannot determine T_c . If anything, it is the magnitude of n/m^* that determines T_c in strange metal systems [29, 30]. In this sense, the high T_c observed in Homes' materials is simply a consequence of the fact that strange metals, due to their many body highly entangled state, become unstable to superconductivity at atypically high temperatures [31].

Acknowledgements. This work was performed as part of the Department of Energy (DoE) BES project 'Science of 100 tesla.'

* email: arkadyshekhter@gmail.com

- [1] C. C. Homes, S. V. Dordevic, M. Strongin, D. A. Bonn, R. Liang, W. N. Hardy, S. Komiya, Y. Ando, G. Yu, N. Kaneko, X. Zhao, M. Greven, D. N. Basov, and T. Timusk, *Nature* **430**, 539 (2004).
- [2] P. W. Anderson, in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 169 (AIP Publishing, 1988) pp. 141–157.
- [3] J. Zaanen, *Nature* **430**, 512 (2004).
- [4] C. C. Homes, S. V. Dordevic, T. Valla, and M. Strongin, *Physical Review B* **72**, 134517 (2005).
- [5] S. V. Dordevic, D. N. Basov, and C. C. Homes, *Scientific Reports* **3**, 1713 (2013).
- [6] A. Legros *et al.*, *Nature Phys.* **15**, 142 (2019).
- [7] A. Shekhter, B. J. Ramshaw, M. K. Chan, and N. Harrison, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12133* (2024), [arXiv:2406.12133](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12133) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [8] M. Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity*, 2nd ed. (Dover Publications, Mineola, New York, 2004).
- [9] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics*

- (Saunders College Publishing, Orlando, 1976).
- [10] D. Adams, *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* (Pan Books, London, 1979).
- [11] S. A. Hartnoll and A. P. Mackenzie, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **94** (2022), 10.1103/RevModPhys.94.041002.
- [12] P. W. Phillips, N. E. Hussey, and P. Abbamonte, *Science* **377** (2022), 10.1126/science.abh4273.
- [13] Y. Ando, S. Komiya, K. Segawa, S. Ono, and Y. Kurita, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 267001 (2004).
- [14] A. C. Hewson, *The Kondo Problem to Heavy Fermions*, Cambridge Studies in Magnetism (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [15] J. P. Carbotte, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **62**, 1027 (1990).
- [16] J. A. N. Bruin, H. Sakai, R. S. Perry, and A. P. Mackenzie, *Science* **339**, 804 (2013).
- [17] T. Valla, A. V. Fedorov, P. D. Johnson, Q. Li, G. D. Gu, and N. Koshizuka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 828 (2000).
- [18] A. Kaminski, H. M. Fretwell, M. R. Norman, M. Randeria, S. Rosenkranz, U. Chatterjee, J. C. Campuzano, J. Mesot, T. Sato, T. Takahashi, T. Terashima, M. Takano, K. Kadowaki, Z. Z. Li, and H. Raffy, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 014517 (2005).
- [19] J. M. Bok, J. J. Bae, H.-Y. Choi, C. M. Varma, W. Zhang, J. He, Y. Zhang, L. Yu, and X. J. Zhou, *Science Advances* **2**, e1501329 (2016).
- [20] D. N. Basov and T. Timusk, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 721 (2005).
- [21] N. Armitage, “Electrodynamics of correlated electron systems,” (2018), arXiv:0908.1126 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [22] J. Ziman, *Electrons and Phonons: The Theory of Transport Phenomena in Solids*, Oxford Classic Texts in the Physical Sciences (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1960).
- [23] H. von Löhneysen, A. Rosch, M. Vojta, and P. Wölfle, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **79**, 1015 (2007).
- [24] P. Gegenwart, Q. Si, and F. Steglich, *Nat. Phys.* **4**, 186 (2008).
- [25] P. Monthoux, D. Pines, and G. G. Lonzarich, *Nature* **450**, 1177 (2007).
- [26] J. Zaanen, *SciPost Phys.* **6**, 061 (2019).
- [27] W. Busza, K. Rajagopal, and W. van der Schee, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **68**, 339 (2018).
- [28] C. Cao, E. Elliott, J. Joseph, H. Wu, J. Petricka, T. Schäfer, and J. E. Thomas, *Science* **331**, 58 (2011).
- [29] V. Emery and S. Kivelson, *Nature* **374**, 434 (1995).
- [30] G. Baskaran, Z. Zou, and P. W. Anderson, *Solid State Communications* **63**, 973 (1987).
- [31] J. Zaanen, “Private communication,” (2018).