# **Heavy Fermion Superconductivity**

Eric Bauer Xin Lu Marc Janoschek Roman Movshovich Joe Thompson Pinaki Das Vladamir Sidorov Jianxin Zhu (LANL)

Soonbeom Seo Tuson Park (SKKU) Zach Fisk (UC Irvine) Philip Moll (ETH) Hiro Sakai (JAEA) Hiroshi Yasuoka (JAEA)

# Filip Ronning Los Alamos National Lab

## **Outline:**

- Heavy Fermion primer
- Superconductivity on the border of antiferromagnetism
- Non-universality of dopants
- Reduced Dimensionality
  - Localized  $\rightarrow$  delocalized crossover
- Competing Electronic States (exposed with magnetic fields)





# **Heavy Fermions**



# **m**\* >> **m**<sub>e</sub>

How do individual *f* electrons condense into the Kondo liquid to form the heavy fermion state?







## **Superconductivity in Heavy Fermions**





## Many varieties of heavy fermion SC's exist:



# SC in proximity to Antiferromagnetism



- Phase diagram generic for Cerium heavy fermion SC's
- Parent compound is an AF metal
- T<sub>c</sub>/T<sub>F</sub> ~ 0.1
- SC is unconventional (power laws/sign changing OP)
- Tunable with doping or pressure.
- Spin Fluctuations...



# Potential strength of spin fluctuations: CeCoIn<sub>5</sub>



#### Change in magnetic energy is 100 x SC condensation energy (from heat capacity)





# Cd vs Sn doping in CeColn<sub>5</sub> A Tale of Two Dopants





# **Doping CeColn<sub>5</sub> : Analog of CeRhln<sub>5</sub> (P)?**

hole and electron doping is both electronic tuning and pair breaking.



L. Pham, *et al*. PRL '06 E.D. Bauer, *et al*. PRB '06



#### Globally, doping looks like a chemical pressure effect, but details differ...



## NMR study



Cd = "AFM droplets"



Sn ≈ homogeneous



H. Sakai, et al. unpublished

## Zn doped cuprates





YBa<sub>2</sub>(Cu<sub>0.99</sub>Zn<sub>0.01</sub>)<sub>3</sub>O<sub>6.7</sub> (left) and YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>6.63</sub> (right ordinate). Inset: neutron scattering of YBa<sub>2</sub>(Cu<sub>0.99</sub>Zn<sub>0.02</sub>)<sub>3</sub>O<sub>6.7</sub> - Julien et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3422 (2000)

> Zn induces staggered moment at surrounding Cu sites: a competing order is revealed by Zn impurity

Los Alamos
NATIONAL LABORATORY

Caution: Intrinsic disorder is already present from hole doping through oxgen vacancy



## **Avoided criticality in Cd-doped CeColn<sub>5</sub>**



\* Cd is a weak pair breaker

# Shifted criticality in Sn-doped CeRhIn<sub>5</sub>



а



# Sn acts as positive pressure plus pair breaking

S. Seo, T. Park et al unpublished



### **Robustness to impurity scattering: CeCoIn<sub>5</sub>**



Little doubt that this system is  $d_{x2-y2}$ . Robustness likely due to strong coupling and extreme multiband.

# Are inhomogeneous dopants less pair-breaking than homogeneous ones?

Are filled shells less pair breaking (ie. Cd and Zn)?

Inhomogeneity can obscure signatures of criticality!

# Dimensionality

# (Localization → delocalization crossover)





# Criticality in Spin and Charge degrees of freedom







# **Dimensionality?**



# Criticality in Spin and Charge degrees of freedom



Los Alamos

Which instability is more important for SC?









H. Sakai, et al. PRL (2014)

Why would CePt<sub>2</sub>In<sub>7</sub> have less "G" than CeRhIn<sub>5</sub>?

## **Spin Waves in CeRhIn<sub>5</sub>**



$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{ij} \left[ J_{ij} \left( n_i^x n_j^x + n_i^y n_j^y \right) + \Delta J_{ij} n_i^z n_j^z \right]$$

4

The existence of a spin gap,

 $\Delta_{sg}$  = 0.25 meV, is unexpected for the ordered Q = ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , 0.297) moments.

#### Perhaps CeRhIn<sub>5</sub> is a more frustrated system than CePt<sub>2</sub>In<sub>7</sub>

P. Das, M. Janoschek, et al. ArXiv: 1408.6585

# **Competing Phases**



#### A field induced density wave in CeRhIn<sub>5</sub>



f-delocalization with field in CeRhIn<sub>5</sub>



### 2 Alternative Phase Diagrams for Pu-based SC



H. Yuan, et al. Science (2003)

 $P_{c2}$ 

Lattice density

Magnetic metal

 $P_{c1}$ 

# A weak coupling perspective

Superconductivity occurs when pairing fluctuations ( $\Gamma(q,\omega)$ ) match the charge susceptibility  $X_Q(q,\omega)$ . And we assume  $\Gamma(q,\omega) \sim X_s(q,\omega)$ 

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = -\sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \Gamma(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}') \frac{\Delta(\mathbf{k}')}{\sqrt{|\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'}|^2 + |\Delta(\mathbf{k}')|^2}}$$



- Electronic structure determines energy scales and nesting properties of  $X_Q(q,\omega)$ : The overall energy scale  $T_F \sim T_K$
- The magnetic structure  $X_s(q,\omega)$  is determined by the RKKY interaction (indirectly determined by electronic structure);



Does a weak coupling perspective have additional challenges for heavy fermions?



# Summary

 Many similarities between superconductivity in heavy fermions, cuprates, and Fe-based superconductors.

# New "Matthias' rules" for unconventional SC's:

- Proximity to AF good.
- Have large spin fluctuation energy scale.
- Charge fluctuations with AF fluctuations even better?
  - What is the source of multiple SC instabilities?
- Avoid pair breaking. How?
  - Pairing occurs at ~2  $\Delta$ ; inhomogeneity.
- Layered tetragonal structures are good.
- •???

Accelerate design process with machine learning.



