

On the Abrikosov transition in disordered superconducting films.

A.V. Lopatin

Department of Physics, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855

(May 20, 2018)

We consider a disordered superconducting film in the magnetic field close to the upper critical field. Assuming that the phase transition to the glassy superconducting state exists and it is of the second order we show that it is exactly described by a zero-dimensional replica model having a form of one describing the phase transition in the SK (Sherrington-Kirkpatrick) spin-glass model. The dependence of the magnetic moment on the external magnetic field is shown to be more smooth than the Abrikosov mean field result for the clean case. While the total magnetic moment of the film close to the phase transition is diamagnetic, the part of it emerging due to the phase transition is paramagnetic, this shows tendency to the paramagnetic Meissner effect.

A magnetic field penetrates type-II superconductors forming the Abrikosov lattice of magnetic vortices¹. Obviously, formation of a purely periodical structure is possible only in homogeneous materials. The influence of disorder on the structure of the Abrikosov lattice was first considered in Ref.² assuming that the random force acting on the lattice is uncorrelated with the lattice displacements and it was shown that the long range order is destroyed by inhomogeneity. Later this problem was considered in Ref.³ using more complicated (but still not rigorous) methods where the result of absence of the long range order was confirmed and the correlation functions were analyzed more carefully. It is expected theoretically and it was seen experimentally⁴ that this system should have glassy properties. Therefore a systematic treatment of this problem is very complicated and is absent at the present time.

We consider a disordered superconducting film in the external magnetic field close to the upper critical field H_{c2} and show that the phase transition to the glassy superconducting state is exactly described by a zero dimensional replica model having a form of one describing the phase transition in the infinite-range SK spin-glass model. To obtain this result we assume that the phase transition exists and it is of the second order. The dependence of the magnetic moment M on the external magnetic field (or on temperature) following from this theory is smooth, only the first derivative dM/dH (dM/dT) has a kink in contrast with the Abrikosov mean field result for the clean case. The part of the magnetic moment emerging due to the transition to the glassy superconducting state is paramagnetic, i.e. the system exhibits tendency to the paramagnetic Meissner effect.

Our starting point is the Ginzburg-Landau free energy density

$$\mathcal{F} = \phi^* \left(-\frac{D^2}{2m^*} + u(r) + a \right) \phi + \frac{b}{4} \phi^* \phi^* \phi \phi + \frac{\mathbf{B}^2}{8\pi} - \frac{\mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}_0}{4\pi}, \quad (1)$$

where $D = \nabla + ie^*\mathbf{A}/c$, $e^* = 2|e|$, and \mathbf{H}_0 is an external magnetic field which is perpendicular to the film.

The order parameter field ϕ in (1) is supposed to be normalized such that $a = T - T_c$, where T_c is the mean field critical temperature. The width of the film d is supposed to be smaller than the coherence length. The potential $u(r)$ models the disorder in the system and it is assumed to be Gaussian with the correlator $\langle u(\mathbf{r}_1)u(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle = \sqrt{u} \delta(r_1 - r_2)$. This term emerges because in the random system the coefficient $a = T - T_c$ becomes a random quantity. In fact all the coefficients in (1) contain randomness, but apparently, close to the phase transition the most relevant effect comes from randomness of the coefficient a which we consider.

Using the replica trick we can average (1) over $u(r)$ getting the effective functional

$$\mathcal{F}n = \sum_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha}^* \left(-\frac{D^2}{2m^*} + a \right) \phi_{\alpha} - \frac{u}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \phi_{\alpha}^* \phi_{\beta}^* \phi_{\alpha} \phi_{\beta} + \frac{b}{4} \sum_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha}^* \phi_{\alpha}^* \phi_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha} + \frac{\mathbf{B}^2}{8\pi} - \frac{\mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}_0}{4\pi}, \quad (2)$$

where α, β are the replica indexes taking values from 1 to n . In the lowest Landau level approximation the fluctuations of the magnetic field can be integrated out giving the renormalization of the interaction term⁵

$$\mathcal{F}'n = \sum_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha}^* \left(-\frac{D^2}{2m^*} + a \right) \phi_{\alpha} - \frac{u}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \phi_{\alpha}^* \phi_{\beta}^* \phi_{\alpha} \phi_{\beta} + \frac{v}{4} \sum_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha}^* \phi_{\alpha}^* \phi_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha}, \quad (3)$$

where $v = b - (e^*/2mc)^2/2\pi$ and $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} + \mathbf{H}_0^2/8\pi$. We shall take the gauge $A_x = -Hy$ and use the Landau functions to diagonalize the quadratic part of the functional (3)

$$\phi_p = \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4} \sqrt{L_x l}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(y/l-pl)^2 + ipx}, \quad (4)$$

where $l = \sqrt{c/e^*H}$, L_x is the size of the film in the x - direction, and p is the momentum. In this basis the functional (3) becomes

$$\mathcal{F}'n = \sum_{p_1+p_2=p_3+p_4} K_{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4} \left[-\frac{u}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \phi_{\alpha p_1}^* \phi_{\beta p_2}^* \phi_{\alpha p_3} \phi_{\beta p_4} + \frac{v}{4} \sum_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha p_1}^* \phi_{\alpha p_2}^* \phi_{\alpha p_3} \phi_{\alpha p_4} \right] + T_c \sum_{p, \alpha} \delta \phi_{\alpha p}^* \phi_{\alpha p}, \quad (5)$$

where $\delta = (e^* H/mc + a)/T_c$ and the kernel K is

$$K_{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4} = \frac{1}{L_x l \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-l^2[(p_1-p_2)^2 + (p_3-p_4)^2]/4}. \quad (6)$$

Note that the Lagrangian (5) is translationally invariant in the momentum p . In the clean case this invariance is broken when the Abrikosov lattice is formed. But in the disordered case which we consider we expect that all averaged quantities are translationally invariant in p . Therefore the averaged Green function

$$G_{\alpha, \beta}(p) = \langle \phi_{\alpha p}^* \phi_{\beta p} \rangle \quad (7)$$

should not depend on p . The functional (5) as usually can be presented as an expansion in the total Green function $G_{\alpha, \beta}(p)$. Deriving this effective functional one can perform all momentum integrations in each diagram because the momentum dependence of the Green function is trivial, and the resulting free energy functional contains $G_{\alpha, \beta}$ depending only on the replica indexes. Keeping the terms up to the forth order in G we get

$$F'n = NT_c \left[-Tr \log G + \delta Tr G + \kappa \sum_{\alpha} (G_{\alpha, \alpha})^2 - \theta Tr G^2 - \frac{\kappa^2}{4} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} (G_{\alpha, \beta})^4 - \frac{\theta^2}{2} Tr G^4 + \kappa \theta \sum_{\alpha} ([G^2]_{\alpha, \alpha})^2 \right], \quad (8)$$

where the dimensionless coupling constants are $\kappa = v/4\pi T_c l^2 d$, $\theta = u/4\pi T_c l^2 d$, and $N = e^* H_0 L_x L_y / 2\pi c$ is the number of quantum states at the lowest Landau level. Let us first analyze the model (8) and then we will discuss how the results are affected by the high order terms neglected in (8). Variation of (8) with respect to $G_{\alpha, \beta}$ gives the equation defining $G_{\alpha, \beta}$. In the normal phase the solution should be replica symmetric $G_{\alpha, \beta} = g \delta_{\alpha, \beta}$ because the model (3) is symmetric under the global $U(1)$ transformations within each replica. Variation of (8) with respect to g gives

$$-\frac{1}{g} + \delta + 2(\kappa - \theta)g + (4\kappa\theta - \kappa^2 - 2\theta^2)g^3 = 0 \quad (9)$$

In the glassy superconducting state we expect a non-replica-symmetric solution for $G_{\alpha, \beta}$ to appear. The glass transition corresponds to the instability of the replica-symmetric solution. Presenting $G_{\alpha, \beta}$ as a sum of diagonal and off-diagonal parts $G_{\alpha, \beta} = g \delta_{\alpha, \beta} + Q_{\alpha, \beta}$ and expanding (8) to the second order in Q we get

$$NT_c \sum_{\alpha, \beta} Q_{\alpha, \beta} \left[\frac{1}{2g^2} - \theta + g^2 \theta (2\kappa - 3\theta) \right] Q_{\alpha, \beta}. \quad (10)$$

At the glass transition this term becomes zero. This gives the value of g at the phase transition

$$g_c^2 = \frac{1}{2\theta} \frac{-1 + \sqrt{7 - 4\kappa/\theta}}{3 - 2\kappa/\theta}. \quad (11)$$

We see that within the approximation which we used the second order phase transition is possible only when the disorder is strong enough $\theta/\kappa > 4/7$. The value of δ at the phase transition is determined by (9)

$$\delta_c = \frac{1}{g_c} - 2(\kappa - \theta)g_c - (4\kappa\theta - \kappa^2 - 2\theta^2)g_c^3 = 0. \quad (12)$$

We will be interested in the region close to the glass transition where we can simplify (8) expanding in Q . Taking $g = g_c + g'$, $\delta = \delta_c + \delta'$, expanding in Q , g' and eliminating g' we get the following effective free energy functional

$$nF_Q = NT_c \left[\delta' Tr Q^2 - \frac{\gamma}{3} Tr Q^3 - \frac{\alpha_1}{4} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} (Q_{\alpha, \beta})^4 - \frac{\alpha_2}{4} \sum_{\alpha} ([Q^2]_{\alpha, \alpha})^2 + \frac{\alpha_3}{4} Tr Q^4 \right], \quad (13)$$

where

$$\delta' = \frac{\theta}{g_c \kappa} \frac{\sqrt{7 - 4\kappa/\theta}}{1 + g_c^2 \theta (4 - 3\kappa/2\theta)} (\delta - \delta_c) \quad (14)$$

$$\gamma = g_c \left(6\theta^2 + \frac{1}{g_c^4} \right) \quad (15)$$

$$\alpha_1 = \kappa^2. \quad (16)$$

We do not write the expressions for the coefficients α_2, α_3 because they do not affect the results in the leading order⁶. The model (13) is standard in the spin-glass theory, it describes the phase transition in the SK spin-glass model (see for example Ref.⁶). The solution is known to have the form of the Parisi matrix which is parameterized by the function $q(x)$, $0 < x < 1$, after taking the limit $n \rightarrow 0$. For the model (13) the function $q(x)$ is

$$q(x) = x \frac{q_m}{x_m}, \quad x < x_m, \quad (17)$$

$$q(x) = q_m, \quad x_m < x < 1, \quad (18)$$

where $x_m = -\frac{3\alpha_1}{\gamma^2} \delta'$ and $q_m = -\frac{\delta'}{\gamma}$.

Now let us analyze the validity of the obtained results: According to (11) the Green function $G_{\alpha, \beta}$ is of the order of $1/\sqrt{\theta}$. Therefore the high order corrections to (8) are of the same order or less than the terms that were kept. It means that the values of the coefficients (14, 15, 16) are correct only by the order of magnitude. Also Eq.(11) can be used only as an estimation, therefore the existence of the second order phase transition in fact is an assumption. Nevertheless, the form of the functional (13) is correct because it contains all terms up to the forth order allowed by the replica symmetry of the original model and the expansion in Q is always possible close

to the phase transition. Therefore the phase transition is effectively described by a zero-dimensional model (not including the replica indexes). While this is typical for the infinite range spin-glass models it is a very surprising result for a real physical system.

The magnetic moment of the system can be written as

$$M = -\frac{dF'}{dH_0} = M_{fl} + M_Q, \quad (19)$$

where M_Q is the part of the magnetic moment emerging due to formation of the glass state

$$M_Q = -\frac{dF_Q}{dH_0}, \quad (20)$$

and M_{fl} is the part which can not be found from the effective functional (13) but it should not have any peculiarities at the phase transition. In the normal state $M_Q = 0$ and in the glass state from (13) we have

$$M_Q \sim -\frac{TrQ^2}{n} \Big|_{n \rightarrow 0} \sim \delta'^2. \quad (21)$$

We see that the dependence of the magnetic moment on the external magnetic field is smooth only the susceptibility dependence dM/dH_0 has a kink at the phase transition. Since the temperature enters the functional (5) in the same way as the magnetic field, analogously we conclude that the entropy is a smooth function of the temperature and the specific heat dependence on the temperature has a kink. For a comparison let us note that in the pure case the Abrikosov mean field theory predicts more singular behavior: the magnetic moment and specific heat dependences should have kinks at the phase transition.

Within the lowest Landau level approximation the total magnetic moment (19) is always negative, this is clear from (5) because $\langle \phi_{\alpha,p}^* \phi_{\alpha,p} \rangle > 0$. But the part of the magnetic moment emerging due to the transition to the glassy superconducting state is positive according to (21). It means that the system has tendency to exhibit the paramagnetic Meissner effect.

This theory can be applied for experiments on Nb superconducting films in magnetic fields close to H_{c2} . To the best of our knowledge the region close to the phase transition was not yet investigated. Our theory predicts classical critical exponents for dependences of magnetization and specific heat on temperature or magnetic field. The dependence of the magnetization M on the temperature or magnetic field is smooth, only the first derivatives dM/dT , dM/dH_0 should have kinks. Since our theory predicts that the magnetic moment emerging due to the phase transition is paramagnetic, experimentally one would expect that decreasing the temperature, the magnetization first decreases due to the effect of the diamagnetic fluctuations, but then increases bellow the phase transition.

It is interesting to mention the experiment on the superconducting disks⁴ where the phase transition region

was investigated in details. The results of this experiment qualitatively agree with our theory, but the thickness of the disks that were used is larger than the coherence length, therefore our theory can hardly be directly applied.

I am grateful to Elihu Abrahams, Thierry Giamarchi, Lev Ioffe, Gabriel Kotliar and A.I. Larkin for very useful discussions.

¹ A.A. Abrikosov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **32**, 1442 (1957) (Soviet Phys. JETP 5, 1147 (1957))

² A.I. Larkin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **58**, 1466 (1970)[Sov. Phys. JETP **31**, 784 (1970)].

³ T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1530 (1994)

⁴ L. Pust, L.E. Wenger and M.R. Koblischka *cond-mat/9807109*

⁵ I. Affleck and E. Brezin, Nucl. Phys. B **257**, 451 (1985)

⁶ K.H. Fischer and J.A. Hertz, *Spin Glasses* (Cambridge University Press, 1993)