

Critical dynamics, duality, and the exact dynamic exponent in extreme type II superconductors

Flavio S. Nogueira*

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Freie Universität Berlin, Arnimallee 14, D-14195 Berlin, Germany

Dirk Manske†

Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung, Heisenbergstr. 1, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany

(Dated: Received May 22, 2019)

The critical dynamics of superconductors is studied using renormalization group and duality arguments. We show that in extreme type II superconductors the dynamic critical exponent is given exactly by $z = 3/2$. This result does not rely on the widely used models of critical dynamics. Instead, it is shown that $z = 3/2$ follows from the duality between the extreme type II superconductor and a model with a critically fluctuating gauge field. Our result is in agreement with Monte Carlo simulations.

PACS numbers: 74.20.De, 74.25.Fy, 74.40.+k

The high- T_c cuprate superconductors have very large values of the Ginzburg parameter κ . In a material like $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$ (YBCO) at optimal doping, we have $\kappa \sim 100$. It is therefore a good approximation to assume that these materials are extreme type II superconductors. By extreme type II superconductor we mean $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$. In such a regime it is expected that the static critical properties at zero external field are the same as in superfluid ^4He [1]. This expectation is confirmed by experiments measuring specific heat [2] and penetration depth [3] in bulk samples of YBCO. Thus, as far as static critical phenomena are concerned, there is no doubt that the critical behavior of bulk YBCO is governed by the three-dimensional XY universality class. On the basis of such a consensus, we might also expect that the dynamical universality class is the same as in superfluid ^4He . Unfortunately, we are far from reaching a consensus on the dynamical universality class of YBCO, or more generally, of any high- T_c cuprate. What is interesting here is that the lack of consensus comes both from the theoretical and experimental sides. The theoretical debate tries to establish whether the dynamical universality class corresponds to model A or model F dynamics [4]. Model A dynamics is purely relaxational and gives the value $z \approx 2.015$ for the dynamic critical exponent in three dimensions. Model F, on the other hand, features a conserved density coupled to a spin-wave mode and gives the *exact* value $z = d/2$ for $d \in (2, 4]$. For the dynamical universality class of extreme type II superconductors, Monte Carlo simulations give $z \approx 3/2$ [5, 6], which would be consistent with model F dynamics and therefore with superfluid ^4He dynamical universality class. However, in a recent letter Agi and Goldenfeld [7] claim that the correct result from a lattice model should be instead $z \approx 2$, i.e., consistent with model A dynamics. From the experimental side it is found either large values for z , typically in the range $z \sim 2.3 - 3.0$ [8], either values consistent with model F dynamics [9]. The arguments of Ref. [7]

were further discussed in two recent comments [10].

In principle model F dynamics is not compatible with superconductor critical dynamics, since screening effects tend to suppress the spin-wave mode [11, 12]. That is the reason why it is somewhat surprising that Monte Carlo simulations give a value of z in the universality class of model F dynamics [5, 6]. However, model A is also inappropriate to study the critical dynamics in superconductors. Indeed, model A does not give a gauge-independent result for z in the magnetic critical fluctuation (MCF) regime. A technically correct analysis should consider the extreme type II regime as a limit of the full MCF regime which has a genuine local gauge symmetry. It turns out that in a gauge-invariant theory the only operators with a nonzero expectation value are the gauge-invariant ones [13]. For instance, the AC conductivity is such a gauge-invariant quantity. Therefore, its scaling behavior is necessarily gauge-independent. Since evaluation of z through model A in the MCF regime gives a gauge-dependent result, we conclude that model A is also not the right option.

In this paper we use renormalization group (RG) and duality arguments to determine the dynamical universality class of extreme type II superconductors. We will establish that in three dimensions $z = 3/2$ *exactly*. This result will be obtained by combining exact scaling arguments with exact duality results. While the scaling arguments are generally valid in $d \in (2, 4]$, the duality arguments will be valid only at $d = 3$. The result will be obtained through the following strategy. First we use the RG to obtain exact scaling relations for the penetration depth and for the AC conductivity. This will be done in both the XY (extreme type II limit) and MCF regime. While much of the steps in this part of derivation are known, it is important to discuss this approach here to emphasize the intimate relationship between the scaling of the penetration depth and the one of the AC conductivity. The important point is that scaling behavior in the

XY regime is different from the one in the MCF regime. The second part of the paper uses the exact duality between an extreme type II superconductor at zero field and a model exactly equivalent to the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) model in the MCF regime. Indeed, the dual model features a fluctuating vector potential coupled to a complex field dubbed disorder parameter field as opposed to the order parameter field of the original model. The derived results for the GL model in the MCF regime will then be applied to the dual model and duality relations between the currents will be used to establish that $z = 3/2$.

Let us consider the *bare* Hamiltonian of the GL model,

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_0)^2 + |(\nabla - iq_0 \mathbf{A}_0)\psi_0|^2 + \mu_0^2 |\psi_0|^2 + \frac{u_0}{2} |\psi_0|^4, \quad (1)$$

where $q_0 = 2e_0$ is the charge of the Cooper pair and $\mu_0^2 \propto \tau$, with $\tau = (T - T_c)/T_c$. In our notation the zero subindex denotes bare quantities while in renormalized quantities the zero subindices are absent. The bare Ginzburg parameter is $\kappa_0 = \lambda_0/\xi_0 = (u_0/2q_0^2)^{1/2}$, where λ_0 and $\xi_0 \equiv \mu_0^{-1}$ are the bare penetration depth and correlation length, respectively. We can rewrite the above Hamiltonian in terms of renormalized quantities as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{Z_A}{2}(\nabla \times \mathbf{A})^2 + Z_\psi |(\nabla - iq\mathbf{A})\psi|^2 + Z_\mu \mu^2 |\psi|^2 + \frac{Z_u u}{2} |\psi|^4. \quad (2)$$

The renormalized correlation length is given by $\xi = \mu^{-1}$. From the Ward identities it follows that the renormalized charge squared is given by $q^2 = Z_A q_0^2$. The dimensionless couplings are $f \equiv \mu^{d-4} q^2$ and $g \equiv \mu^{d-4} Z_\psi^2 u_0 / Z_u$, to which the RG β -functions $\beta_f \equiv \mu \partial f / \partial \mu$ and $\beta_g \equiv \mu \partial g / \partial \mu$ are associated. The fixed point structure is well known but cannot be completely obtained by perturbative means. The fixed points associated to nonzero charge, $f_* \neq 0$, are non-perturbative but their existence in the flow diagram is now well established [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. The infrared stable charged fixed point governs the MCF regime while the extreme type II or XY regime is governed by the *uncharged* XY fixed point. From the definition of f we can write β_f as

$$\beta_f(f, g) = [\gamma_A(f, g) + d - 4]f, \quad (3)$$

where $\gamma_A(f, g) \equiv \mu \partial \ln Z_A / \partial \mu$. The RG function $\gamma_A(f, g)$ gives at the fixed point the anomalous scaling dimension of the vector potential, $\eta_A \equiv \gamma_A(f_*, g_*)$. We have that $\eta_A = 0$ at the XY fixed point while from Eq. (3) it is readily seen that $\eta_A = 4 - d$ *exactly* in the MCF regime [17, 19, 22]. Below T_c the vector potential becomes massive through the Anderson-Higgs mechanism. The same mass scale can be used to derive RG functions below T_c

[21]. The renormalized Ginzburg parameter is then given by $\kappa = \mu/\mu_A$, where $\mu_A = \lambda^{-1}$ is the renormalized vector potential mass. Due to the Ward identities this can also be written as $\kappa = (g/2f)^{1/2}$, and therefore the renormalized Ginzburg parameter has the same form as the bare one. From this we obtain an *exact* evolution equation for the renormalized vector potential mass [21]

$$\mu \frac{\partial \mu_A^2}{\partial \mu} = \left(d - 2 + \gamma_A - \frac{\beta_g}{g} \right) \mu_A^2. \quad (4)$$

Eq. (4) implies that near the phase transition $\mu_A \sim \mu^{(d-2+\eta_A)/2}$. Thus, we obtain that in the XY regime the penetration depth exponent is given by $\nu' = \nu(d-2)/2$ [11], where ν is the correlation length exponent. At $d = 3$ we have $\nu \approx 2/3$ and $\nu' \approx 1/3$. The result $\nu' \approx 1/3$ is confirmed experimentally in high quality single crystals of YBCO [3]. Note that in the XY regime $\kappa_0 \rightarrow \infty$ while $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ [11]. In the MCF regime, on the other hand, we have $\nu' = \nu$ [19], which is confirmed by Monte Carlo simulations [20].

In order to study the critical dynamics of superconductors we consider the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \psi^* (i\partial_t - qV) \psi + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}^2 - \mathcal{H}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla V - \partial_t \mathbf{A}$ is the electric field. The AC conductivity is then given by

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{q^2 K(-i\omega)}{-i\omega}, \quad (6)$$

where $K(-i\omega)$ is obtained from the current-current correlation function at zero momentum [24], i.e., $K(-i\omega) = \lim_{|\mathbf{p}| \rightarrow 0} K(-i\omega, \mathbf{p})$ where $K(-i\omega, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_\mu K_{\mu\mu}(-i\omega, \mathbf{p})$ with

$$K_{\mu\nu}(-i\omega, \mathbf{p}) = \langle |\psi|^2 \rangle \delta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{q^2} \langle \hat{J}_\mu(\omega, \mathbf{p}) \cdot \hat{J}_\nu(-\omega, \mathbf{p}) \rangle, \quad (7)$$

and $\hat{J}_\mu(\omega, \mathbf{p})$ is the Fourier transform of the superconducting current $J_\mu = -iq(\psi^* \partial_\mu \psi - \psi \partial_\mu \psi^*) - 2q^2 |\psi|^2 A_\mu$. The function $K_{\mu\nu}(-i\omega, \mathbf{p})$ is purely transverse [24]. The superfluid density ρ_s is given by $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} K(-i\omega)$ and thus, in virtue of the Josephson relation, we obtain

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} K(-i\omega) \sim (-i\omega)^{(d-2)/z}. \quad (8)$$

Since Eq. (3) implies $q^2 \sim \mu^{\eta_A}$, we obtain from Eq. (6) the behavior

$$\sigma(\omega)|_{T=T_c} \sim (-i\omega)^{(d-2-z+\eta_A)/z}. \quad (9)$$

Therefore, in the XY universality class we have $\sigma(\omega)|_{T=T_c} \sim (-i\omega)^{(d-2-z)/z}$ [11, 12], while in the MCF regime we obtain $\sigma(\omega)|_{T=T_c} \sim (-i\omega)^{(2-z)/z}$.

From Eq. (6) we obtain that below T_c the low frequency behavior of the AC conductivity is

$$\sigma(\omega) \approx \frac{\mu_A^2}{-i\omega}. \quad (10)$$

In Ref. [11] this is written simply as $\sigma(\omega) \approx \rho_s/(-i\omega)$, i.e., the charge is not shown explicitly since only the XY regime was considered and in this case the charge does not fluctuate. Taking the low frequency behavior (10) into account, we obtain from Eqs. (4) and (6),

$$\mu \frac{\partial \sigma(\omega)}{\partial \mu} \approx \left(d - 2 - z + \gamma_A - \frac{\beta_g}{g} \right) \sigma(\omega), \quad (11)$$

which implies that near the phase transition,

$$\sigma(\omega) \sim \mu^{d-2-z+\eta_A}. \quad (12)$$

Since in the XY universality class $\eta_A = 0$, we recover from Eq. (12) the well known scaling $\sigma(\omega) \sim \mu^{d-2-z}$ [11]. Note that Fisher *et al.* [11] need to assume the Josephson relation $\rho_s \sim \mu^{d-2}$ to derive the XY scaling of the AC conductivity. Within our approach the more general scaling relation (12) follows from Eq. (4) and the XY scaling emerges as a particular case. In the MCF regime we obtain $\sigma(\omega) \sim \mu^{2-z}$ [26, 27].

Next we show how to determine exactly the dynamic exponent z for extreme type II superconductors using duality arguments [28]. In the extreme type II limit $\kappa_0 \rightarrow \infty$ and we have essentially a superfluid model at zero field, i.e., the corresponding Hamiltonian is the same as in Eq. (1) with $\mathbf{A}_0 = 0$. The lattice version of this model in the London limit is exactly dual to the so called “frozen” superconductor [29, 30]. Starting from the Villain form of the XY model we obtain, after dualizing it, the following lattice model Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_l \left[\frac{1}{2K} (\nabla \times \mathbf{a}_l)^2 - 2\pi i \mathbf{M}_l \cdot \mathbf{a}_l \right], \quad (13)$$

where K is the bare superfluid stiffness, $a_{l\mu} \in (-\infty, \infty)$ and $M_{l\mu}$ is an integer link variable satisfying the constraint $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{M}_l = 0$. The lattice derivative is defined as usual, $\nabla_\mu f_l \equiv f_{l+\hat{\mu}} - f_l$. The link variables play the role of vortex currents and the zero lattice divergence constraint means that only closed vortex loops should be taken into account. Integration over $\mathbf{a}_l$ gives a long range interaction between the link variables. The link variables will interact through a potential $V(\mathbf{r}_l - \mathbf{r}_m)$ behaving at large distances like $V(\mathbf{r}_l - \mathbf{r}_m) \sim 1/|\mathbf{r}_l - \mathbf{r}_m|$. At short

distances the potential is divergent. This short distance divergence can be regularized by adding to the Hamiltonian (13) a core energy term $(\varepsilon_0/2) \sum_l \mathbf{M}_l^2$. Writing the constraint $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{M}_l = 0$ using the integral representation of the Kronecker delta and performing the sum over $\mathbf{M}_l$ using the Poisson formula we arrive at the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_l \left[\frac{1}{2\varepsilon_0} (\nabla \theta_l - 2\pi \mathbf{N}_l - 2\pi \sqrt{K} \mathbf{a}_l)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \times \mathbf{a}_l)^2 \right], \quad (14)$$

where we have rescaled $\mathbf{a}_l$. The dual lattice Hamiltonian (14) has exactly the same form as the Hamiltonian for a Villain lattice superconductor. Note that $2\pi\sqrt{K}$ plays the role of the charge. The sum over the integers $\mathbf{N}_i$ can be converted into a disorder field theory [31] which has precisely the same form as the original GL model in Eq. (1), except that the physical properties of the fields have changed. The electromagnetic vector potential $\mathbf{A}_0$ is replaced by the gauge field $\mathbf{a}_0$ describing vortices, and the charge q_0 becomes the Biot-Savart-type coupling strength between vortices $2\pi\sqrt{\rho_s^0}$, where ρ_s^0 is the bare superfluid density. Note that this disorder GL-like theory is valid strictly in $d = 3$. Indeed, if we try to extrapolate to the range of dimensionalities as in the above scaling relations, we would obtain that the renormalized superfluid density, as the “charge” of the dual model, scales like $\rho_s \sim \mu^{4-d}$, which agrees with Josephson’s relation only for $d = 3$. The critical exponents α and ν of the dual model are the same as in the original model. This is because the dual model should give the *same* free energy of the original model, up to non-singular terms. Therefore, the exponent appearing in the scaling of the singular part of the free energy, α , is the same in both models. The hyperscaling relation then implies that ν is also the same in both models. The same holds for the dynamic exponent z , since the relaxation time of the original model and its dual should coincide. The anomalous dimension η , on the other hand, is not the same: it is given by $\eta \approx 0.04$ in the original model and by $\eta \approx -0.2$ in the dual model [32].

The duality scenario to be discussed here in the context of *classical* critical dynamics is in many respects similar to duality arguments used in the context of the *quantum* superconductor-insulator (SI) transition in two dimensions [25]. In our case the duality is in three space dimensions while in the SI transition it is in $2+1$ dimensions. Furthermore, our aim is to use duality to study the scaling behavior near the critical temperature, while in Ref. [25] it is a zero temperature phase transition that is being studied.

Now we will derive the value of the dynamic exponent z by combining our scaling analysis with the duality scenario. The AC conductivity $\bar{\sigma}(\omega)$ of the dual model is obtained through a formula similar to Eq. (6), with

the difference that the charge q is replaced by the dual charge $\tilde{q}$ and the function $K(-i\omega)$ is replaced by another one, $\tilde{K}(-i\omega)$, which is obtained from the vortex current-current correlation function. It is important to note here that the disordered phase of the dual model corresponds to the ordered phase of the original one and vice-versa. In the case of the SI transition this property leads to a duality relation where $\sigma\tilde{\sigma}$ is constant. Precisely the same result holds here and we can write

$$\sigma(\omega)\tilde{\sigma}(\omega) \sim \text{const.} \quad (15)$$

Since we are assuming that the original model is an extreme type II superconductor, we have that $\sigma(\omega) \sim \mu^{1-z}$ for $d = 3$. The dual model, on the other hand, features a fictitious fluctuating vector potential and therefore, upon applying our more general formula Eq. (12), we obtain $\tilde{\sigma}(\omega) \sim \mu^{2-z}$. Since from Eq. (15) the product between the AC conductivity and the dual AC conductivity is *scale-independent*, we obtain the main result of this paper:

$$z = \frac{3}{2}, \quad (16)$$

corresponding to the universality class of model F dynamics. This is in agreement with Monte Carlo simulations [5, 6]. Note that in order to derive the above result we have not used any self-duality hypothesis, as in the case of the SI transition where it is assumed that at the quantum critical point $\sigma = \tilde{\sigma}$ [25]. In fact, there *is no* self-duality in our case. The original and dual models are not self-dual even at the critical point. Even in the case of the SI transition the self-duality should, strictly speaking, be absent. However, in that case, the good agreement with experiments seems to indicate that the assumption of self-duality is a good approximation. Note one important consequence of Eq. (16): the AC conductivity due to vortex flow tends to zero as the critical point is approached, in contrast to the original model where the AC conductivity diverges as the critical point is approached. In terms of the reduced temperature τ , we can write $\sigma(\omega) \sim |\tau|^{-\nu/2}$ while $\tilde{\sigma}(\omega) \sim |\tau|^{\nu/2}$. The exponent $\nu/2$ is precisely the penetration depth exponent of an extreme type II superconductor in $d = 3$.

The authors would like to thank W. Metzner and H. Kleinert for helpful discussions. F.S.N. acknowledges the hospitality of the Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung where part of this work was done, and the financial support of the DFG Priority Program SPP 1116.

- [1] T. Schneider and J. M. Singer, *Phase Transition Approach to High-Temperature Superconductivity* (Imperial College Press, London, 2000).
- [2] M. B. Salamon, J. Shi, N. Overend and M. A. Howson, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 5520 (1993); N. Overend, M. A. Howson and I. D. Lawrie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3238 (1994); A. Junod, A. Erb, and C. Renner, Physica C **317-318**, 333 (1999); A. Junod, M. Roulin, B. Revaz, and A. Erb, Physica B **280**, 214 (2000).
- [3] S. Kamal, D. A. Bonn, N. Goldenfeld, P. J. Hirschfeld, R. Liang and W. N. Hardy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1845 (1994); S. Kamal, R. Liang, A. Hosseini, D. A. Bonn and W. N. Hardy, Phys. Rev. B **58**, R8933 (1998).
- [4] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **49**, 435 (1977).
- [5] H. Weber and H.J. Jensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2620 (1997).
- [6] J. Lidmar, M. Wallin, C. Wengel, S. M. Girvin and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 2827 (1998).
- [7] V. Aji and N. Goldenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 197003 (2001).
- [8] J. C. Booth *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4438 (1996).
- [9] J.T. Kim, N. Goldenfeld, J. Giapintzakis, and D.M. Ginsberg, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 118 (1997).
- [10] J. Lidmar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 109701 (2002); V. Aji and N. Goldenfeld, *ibid.*, 109702 (2002).
- [11] D. S. Fisher, M. P. A. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 130 (1991).
- [12] A.T. Dorsey, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 7575 (1991).
- [13] S. Elitzur, Phys. Rev. D **12**, 3978 (1975).
- [14] C. Dasgupta and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1556 (1981).
- [15] H. Kleinert, Lett. Nuovo Cimento **35**, 405 (1982).
- [16] M. Kiometzis, H. Kleinert, and A. M. J. Schakel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1975 (1994).
- [17] B. Bergerhoff, F. Freire, D. F. Litim, S. Lola and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 5734 (1996).
- [18] R. Folk and Y. Holovatch, J. Phys. A **29**, 3409 (1996).
- [19] I. F. Herbut and Z. Tešanović, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4588 (1996); I. F. Herbut, J. Phys. A **30**, 423 (1997).
- [20] P. Olsson and S. Teitel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1964 (1998).
- [21] C. de Calan and F. S. Nogueira, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 4255 (1999).
- [22] J. Hove and A. Sudbø, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3426 (2000).
- [23] H. Kleinert and F.S. Nogueira, Nucl. Phys. B **651**, 361 (2003).
- [24] B.I. Halperin and D.R. Nelson, J. Low Temp. Phys. **36**, 599 (1979).
- [25] M. P. A. Fisher, G. Grinstein, and S.M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 587 (1990).
- [26] C.-Y. Mou, Phys. Rev. B **55**, R3378 (1997).
- [27] F. S. Nogueira, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 14559 (2000).
- [28] H. Kleinert, *Gauge Fields in Condensed Matter*, vol. 1, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989), readable at <http://www.physik.fu-berlin.de/~kleinert/re.html#b1>.
- [29] M. Peskin, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **113**, 122 (1978).
- [30] T. Neuhaus, A. Rajantie, and K. Rumukainen, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 014525 (2003).
- [31] The dual disorder field theory of the GL model was first derived for *both* type I and type II superconductors by H. Kleinert in Ref. [15]. See also Chapters 12 and 13 in the textbook [28].
- [32] J. Hove, S. Mo, and A. Sudbø, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2368 (2000).

* Electronic address: nogueira@physik.fu-berlin.de

† Electronic address: d.manske@fkf.mpg.de