## Spin-triplet superconductivity in quasi-one dimension

Mahito Kohmoto and Masatoshi Sato

Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, 7-22-1 Roppongi, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan

We consider a system with electron-phonon interaction, antiferromagnetic fluctuations and disconnected open Fermi surfaces. The existence of odd-parity superconductivity in this circumstance is shown for the first time. If it is applied to the quasi-one-dimensional systems like the organic conductors  $(TMTSF)_2X$  we obtain spin-triplet superconductivity with nodeless gap. Our result is also valid in higher dimensions(2d and 3d).

PACS numbers: 74, 74.25-q, 74.25.Dw, 74.62.-c

In recent years the signs for unconventional superconductivity in many compounds have been accumulated. Examples include high  $T_c$  superconductors, heavy fermions, organic conductors,  $Sr_2RuO_4$ , etc. The common features of those compounds are quasi-low dimensionality and proximity of antiferromagnetic(AF) order.

Here we consider seemingly the simplest quasi-onedimensional systems which are realized in  $(TMTSF)_2X$ family where  $X = PF_6$ ,  $AsF_6$ ,  $SbF_6$ ,  $ClO_4$ , etc.(Bechgaard salts). At ambient pressure, most of these extremely anisotropic compounds undergo a metal-insulator transition at low temperature and have a spin-densitywave(SDW) fundamental state. Under moderate pressure, the SDW instability is suppressed and replaced by a superconducting transition at a critical temperature of order of 1K [1]. (One exception to this is  $(TMTSF)_2ClO_4$ which is superconducting at ambient pressure.) Thus these compounds may be characterized by competition between superconducting and SDW ground states [2].

As for the gap symmetry, Takigawa et al. [3] measured nuclear relaxation rate of proton in  $(TMTSF)_2ClO_4$ . Their results show unconventional superconductivity(absence of coherence peak) and the existence of nodes. However their measurement is restricted to T > $0.5T_{\rm c}$  and the existence of nodes are not yet conclusive. More recently, Belin and Behnia [4] showed some evidences for nodeless gap by thermal conductivity measurement. Also experiments on  $(TMTSF)_2ClO_4$  and  $(TMTSF)_2 PF_6$  show that  $H_{c2}$  for  $\vec{B} \parallel \vec{a}$  and  $\vec{B} \parallel \vec{b}$  far exceed the Pauli-limiting field  $B_{\rm P} \sim \Delta_0 / (\sqrt{2}) \mu_{\rm B}) \sim 2$  Tesla for Bechgaard salts, where  $\Delta_0$  is the superconducting order parameter at T = 0 and  $\mu_{\rm B}$  is the Bohrmagneton [5,6]. This suggests spin-triplet superconductivity. Maki et al. studied theoretically impurity effects and vortex states on these compounds [7].

In this paper we consider AF magnetic coupling and electron-phonon interaction under open disconnected Fermi surfaces. The spin-triplet superconductivity is possible under electron-phonon interaction and AF magnetic coupling [8]. We assume that AF fluctuation is not strong enough to give SDW gap. We shall show the existence of spin-triplet superconductivity in this circumstance for the first time. Our result is also applicable to higher dimensions(2d and 3d).

– Open disconnected Fermi surface

The Fermi surface of the system we consider is quasi-onedimensional and consists of two separated parts, which are  $(k_{\rm F})_x \sim c > 0$  and  $(k_{\rm F})_x \sim -c$ . (c is a constant.) It is also supposed to be symmetric under parity transformation  $k \rightarrow -k$ . This type of Fermi surface is realized in (TMTSF)<sub>2</sub>X. The non-interacting part of the Hamiltonian of (TMTSF)<sub>2</sub>X is often written

$$E = -2t_a \cos(k_x a) - 2t_b \cos(k_y b). \tag{1}$$

Here the ratio of  $t_a$  and  $t_b$  is about 10:1.

We take two interactions between electrons: one comes from electron-phonon coupling, the other comes from AF fluctuations.

- Phonon-mediated interaction

It is written

1

$$H_{\rm int}^{\rm ph} = -\sum_{kk'q} \sum_{\alpha\beta} f(q) a_{k+q,\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{k,\alpha} a_{k'-q,\beta}^{\dagger} a_{k',\beta}, \qquad (2)$$

where a and  $a^{\dagger}$  are the usual fermion operators,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  represent spin orientations and f(q) > 0 has a peak at q = 0. We assume f(q) = f(-q). If one considers pairing interaction between k and -k, (2) reduces to

$$H_{\rm int}^{\rm ph} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,q} f(q) \left( \phi_0^{\dagger}(k+q)\phi_0(k) + \vec{\phi}^{\dagger}(k+q) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right),$$
(3)

where

$$\phi_0(k) = a_{k,\alpha}(\sigma_2)_{\alpha,\beta} a_{-k,\beta},\tag{4}$$

$$\vec{\phi}(k) = a_{k,\alpha} (\sigma_2 \vec{\sigma})_{\alpha,\beta} a_{-k,\beta}. \tag{5}$$

Here  $\phi_0(k)$  is the spin-singlet pairing and  $\phi(k)$  is the spin-triplet one:

$$a_{k,\alpha}a_{-k,\beta} = -\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_2)_{\alpha\beta}\phi_0(k) + \frac{1}{2}(\vec{\sigma}\sigma_2)_{\alpha\beta}\cdot\vec{\phi}(k).$$
(6)

Since f(q) has a peak at q = 0, this interaction is approximated by

$$H_{\text{int}}^{\text{ph}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k} f(0) \left( \phi_{0}^{\dagger}(k)\phi_{0}(k) + \vec{\phi}^{\dagger}(k) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right)$$
$$= -\sum_{k_{x}>0} f(0) \left( \phi_{0}^{\dagger}(k)\phi_{0}(k) + \vec{\phi}^{\dagger}(k) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right).$$
(7)

-Interaction due to AF fluctuations It is written

$$H_{\rm int}^{\rm AF} = -\sum_{kk'q} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} J(q) \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{\gamma\delta} a_{k+q,\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{k,\beta} a_{k'-q,\gamma}^{\dagger} a_{k',\delta}, \quad (8)$$

where J(q) > 0 represents interaction due to AF fluctuations and has a peak value at a nesting vector  $q = \pm Q$ . The nesting vector Q connects the two separated Fermi surfaces:  $Q_x \sim 2c$ . We assume J(q) = J(-q). A similar analysis to above leads to

$$H_{\rm int}^{\rm AF} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,q} J(q) \left( 3\phi_0^{\dagger}(k+q)\phi_0(k) - \vec{\phi}^{\dagger}(k+q) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right),$$
(9)

and this interaction is approximated by

$$H_{\text{int}}^{\text{AF}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k} J(Q) \left( 3\phi_{0}^{\dagger}(k+Q)\phi_{0}(k) - \vec{\phi}^{\dagger}(k+Q) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k} J(-Q) \left( 3\phi_{0}^{\dagger}(k-Q)\phi_{0}(k) - \vec{\phi}^{\dagger}(k-Q) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right).$$
(10)

For fermions on the Fermi surface, this becomes

$$\begin{split} H_{\text{int}}^{\text{AF}} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_x \sim -c} J(Q) \left( 3\phi_0^{\dagger}(k+Q)\phi_0(k) - \vec{\phi^{\dagger}}(k+Q) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_x \sim c} J(-Q) \left( 3\phi_0^{\dagger}(k-Q)\phi_0(k) - \vec{\phi^{\dagger}}(k-Q) \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k_x, k'_x \sim c} J(Q) \left( 3\phi_0^{\dagger}(k')\phi_0(k) + \vec{\phi^{\dagger}}(k') \cdot \vec{\phi}(k) \right). \end{split}$$
(11)

Here k' satisfies k' = Q - k.

-Spin-triplet superconductivity

Equation(7) shows that the phonon-mediated interaction of spin-triplet pairing has the same magnitude as that of spin-singlet one. In many systems, however, only the spin-singlet superconductivity is realized. This is because the Fermi surfaces of usual matters are connected. In a system of connected Fermi surface, the requirement of parity and continuity does not admit the constant spintriplet gap. Therefore, the s-wave superconductivity is favored from the kinematic reason.

The quasi-one-dimensional system we consider, however, has disconnected Fermi surfaces, so it admits constant spin-triplet gap:  $\vec{d}|_{k_x \sim c} = -\vec{d}|_{k_x \sim -c} = \text{const..}^*$ Therefore, there is no reason to prefer s-wave superconductivity. From (11), the interaction due to AF fluctuation disturbs the spin-singlet superconductivity more than the spin-triplet one, so the spin-triplet superconductivity is realized. This spin-triplet gap is nodeless. -BCS analysis

Finally, we apply the BCS weak coupling theory. Since  $T_c$  of  $(TMTSF)_2X$  is rather low, one can expect that the strong coupling corrections do not change our results qualitatively. For the sake of simplicity, the cutoffs of the phonon-mediated interaction and AF one are taken to be same and denoted by  $\hbar\omega_D$ . We approximate the spin-singlet gap by

$$\psi|_{k_x \sim c} = \psi|_{k_x \sim -c} = \text{const.},\tag{12}$$

and the spin-triplet gap by

$$\vec{l}|_{k_x \sim c} = -\vec{d}|_{k_x \sim -c} = \text{const.}$$
(13)

If we denote the density of states on the Fermi surface as  $N(k_{\rm F})$ , the critical temperature of the spin-singlet superconductivity becomes [9]

$$T_{\rm c}^{\rm even} = 1.13\hbar\omega_{\rm D}e^{1/\{N(k_{\rm F})V^{\rm even}\}},$$
 (14)

where

$$V^{\text{even}} = -f(0) + 3J(Q), \tag{15}$$

and that of spin-triplet becomes

$$T_{\rm c}^{\rm odd} = 1.13\hbar\omega_{\rm D}e^{1/\{N(k_{\rm F})V^{\rm odd}\}},$$
 (16)

where

$$V^{\text{odd}} = -f(0) + J(Q).$$
(17)

From (15) and (17), the condition  $V^{\text{odd}} < V^{\text{even}}$  is always satisfied. Thus  $T_c^{\text{odd}} > T_c^{\text{even}}$  and spin-triplet superconductivity is present if  $V^{\text{odd}} = -f(0) + J(Q) < 0$ . This simple result show that there is no superconductivity if AF fluctuations dominate and we have spin-triplet superconductivity if phonon-mediated interaction dominates. Since  $\vec{d}(k)$  is an odd function, the gaps at  $(k_{\text{F}})_x = \pm c$ have opposite signs and there is no node in the gap.

- For a review, see T. Ishigro, K. Yamaji, G. Saito, Organic Superconductors (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998).
- [2] D. Jérome et al., J. Phys. (Paris), Lett. 56, L95 (1980).
- [3] M. Takigawa, H. Yasuoka, and G. Saito, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 56, 873 (1987).
- [4] S. Belin and K. Behnia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 2125 (1997).
- [5] M.J. Naughton et al., Synthetic Metals 85, 1481 (1997).
- [6] I.J. Lee et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3555 (1997).
- [7] Maki et al, J. Superconductivity 12, 551 (1999); Physica C 317-318, 353 (1999); Sinth. Metals 103, 1933 (1999).
- [8] M. Sato and M. Kohmoto, (unpublished).
- [9] See, for example, P.G. De Gennes, Superconductivity of Metal and Alloys (Benjamin, New York, 1966).
- [10] A. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys.47, 331 (1975); M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Rev. Mod. Phys. 63, 239 (1991).

<sup>\*</sup> $\vec{d}$  and  $\psi$  is defined as  $\Delta(k) = i\sigma_2\psi(k) + i(\vec{d}(k)\cdot\vec{\sigma})\sigma_2$  [10].