# Computer Simulation on the Vortex Lattice Melting in Type-II Superconductor



### Hu Xiao

**National Institute for Materials Science** 



## **Ginzburg-Landau-Lawrence-Doniach model**

Gibbs free-energy functional for layered superconductors

$$G\left[\left\{\Psi_{n}\right\}A\right] = \int d^{2}R$$

$$\left\{d\sum_{n} \left[\left(\alpha |\Psi_{n}|^{2} + \frac{\beta}{2}|\Psi_{n}|^{4}\right) + \frac{\hbar^{2}}{2m} \left[\left(\frac{\nabla^{(2)}}{i} + \frac{2\pi}{\phi_{0}}A^{(2)}\right)\Psi_{n}\right]^{2} + \frac{\hbar^{2}}{2Md^{2}} |\Psi_{n+1}\exp\left(\frac{2\pi i^{(n+1)d}}{\phi_{0} \quad nd}\right) - \Psi_{n}|^{2}\right] + \int dz \left(\frac{B^{2}}{8\pi} - \frac{\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{H}}{4\pi}\right)\right\}$$
Approximations:  $\diamond$  constant B  $\Leftarrow \xi_{ab} < d_{v} < \lambda_{ab}$ 

$$\Rightarrow \gamma d << \lambda_{ab} \qquad \gamma^{2} = M/m$$
 $\diamond$  constant  $|\Psi| \qquad H << H_{c2}$ 
 $\diamond$  discretization in the *ab* plane  $\Leftarrow \xi_{ab} << l_{ab}$ 

## **3D** anisotropic XY model on phase variables



advantages: (i) loop excitations (ii) short-range forces
 disadvantage: need a huge system of phases to support a few vortices

## **Monte Carlo simulations**

□ Typical process of MC simulations:  $\diamond$  generate a random set of phases at a high T cool system according to the Metropolis scheme ♦ Measure *T* dependence of quantities ♦ Search lattice structure □ Parameters ♦ Temp. skip ♦ MC steps ♦ System size t~10<sup>7</sup> sweeps  $L_{xv} = 50, L_z = 40$  $\delta T = 0.001 J/k_{B}$  $\Box$  relation to real material:  $\gamma_{\text{model}} l_{ab} = \gamma_{\text{material}} d$  $\frac{\hbar^2 |\psi|^2 d}{d} = \frac{\phi_0^2 d}{2\pi}$  $f = B l_{ab}^2 / \phi_0$ unknown spatial and temporal scales Difficulties:



```
\gamma^2 = 10; f=1/25
```

## **First order thermodynamic phase transition**



 $C_{+}\approx 18.5k_{B}$   $C_{-}\approx 17.5k_{B}$   $C_{max}\approx 23k_{B}$ 

□ Finite size effects:

$$\Delta C = \frac{Q^2}{4k_B T_m^2} L_{xy}^2 L_z f \quad \Delta T = \frac{Q^2}{Q}$$

$$\Delta T = \frac{2k_B T_m^2}{QL_{xy}^2 L_z f}$$

Q≈0.07k<sub>B</sub>T<sub>m</sub> ∆T≈0.008T<sub>m</sub>

 $\delta T=0.001 J/k_B$ C=de/dT

# **Fluctuation of internal energy at T<sub>m</sub>**



 $\Box t_{p} \sim 3 \times 10^{5} \text{ MCS}$   $t = 10^{7} \text{ MCS}$ 

□ Double Gaussian peaks

□ Other method to differ 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> order trs:

2/3-V<sub>L</sub><sup>min</sup>~Q<sup>2</sup>/e<sup>2</sup> Q/e≈0.001

# Normal to superconductivity transition

#### □ Helicity modulus

 $\phi(z) \rightarrow \phi(z) + \theta(z)$  where  $\theta(z) = \theta \times (-1 + 2z/L)$ 



 $Y = \lim_{\theta \to 0} \frac{F(\theta) - F(0)}{(\theta/L)^2 S}$ 

 $\Box$  U(1) Gauge symmetry broken at same point  $T_m$ 

□ long-range SC at T<T<sub>m</sub>

☐ discontinuous jump in Y<sub>c</sub>
 → first-order transition

 $\Box$  Y<sub>ab</sub> zero down to T~0

 $\Box$   $\xi_+$ =10d ~ L<sub>c</sub>/4

 $\Box |\Psi|$  finite even for T>T<sub>m</sub>

# Y<sub>ab</sub> in presence of vortex along c axis



Slide the vortex to left side rightward

# **Melting of flux-line lattice**

#### 





♦ T>T<sub>m</sub>: flux line liquid
 ♦ T<T<sub>m</sub>: flux line lattice
 □ translational & rotational symmetry broken at T<sub>m</sub>
 □ simultaneous U(1) gauge and translational symmetry breakings

# **Real-space distribution of flux lines**





#### Flux-line liquid

Abrikosov flux-line lattice

Transition between flux line lattice to entangled line liquid

## **Mechanism of melting**



□ entanglement of flux lines

# **B-T phase diagram: melting line**



# $\square \quad B_m = 0.132 \times \frac{\phi_0}{(\gamma d)^2} \times (k_B T_m / J)^{-2}$

#### □ Clausuis-Clapeyron relation:

$$\Delta B = -\frac{4\pi\Delta s}{dH_m/dT}$$

Same as water!

□ Competition:

♦ Elastic energy

♦ Thermal fluctuation

 $\diamond$ Length scale in ab plane:  $\gamma$ d

 $\Box$  Lindemann number:  $c_L = 0.18$ 

⇔ Cage model

# **Temperature scale**

$$J = \frac{\phi_0^2 d}{16\pi^3 \lambda_{ab}^2(T)} = \frac{\phi_0^2 d}{16\pi^3 \lambda_{ab}^2(0)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right)^2\right)$$



# Jump in entropy and magnetic induction

T-dependent Hamiltonian

$$J = \frac{\phi_0^2 d}{16\pi^3 \lambda_{ab}^2(0)} \left( 1 - \left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right)^2 \right)$$

$$S = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial T} = \frac{\langle H \rangle - F}{T} - \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial T} \right\rangle \implies \Delta S = \frac{1 + \left(T_{\rm m}/T_{\rm c}\right)^2}{1 - \left(T_{\rm m}/T_{\rm c}\right)^2} \times \frac{Q}{T_{\rm m}}$$

#### Magnetic induction

Entropy

Clausius-Clapeyron relation

$$\Delta B = \frac{-4\pi}{dH_{\rm m}/dT} \times \Delta S \times \frac{B_{\rm m}}{d\phi_0}$$

shape of melting line

$$\frac{dH_{\rm m}}{dT} \approx \frac{dB_{\rm m}}{dT} = \frac{-2B_{\rm m}}{T_{\rm m}} \times \frac{1 + \left(T_{\rm m}/T_{\rm c}\right)^2}{1 - \left(T_{\rm m}/T_{\rm c}\right)^2}$$

$$\implies \Delta B = \frac{2\pi Q}{d\phi_0}$$

# **Comparison with experiments**

 $\Box$  YBCO: d=12Å,  $\lambda_{ab}(0)$ =1000Å,  $\gamma$ =8, T<sub>c</sub>=92K,  $\kappa$ =100 by Schilling et al.

B=8T	T <sub>m</sub> [K]	$\Delta S[k_B/vortex]$	$\Delta B[G]$
simulation	81	0.55	0.19
experiment	79	0.4	0.25

 $\square$  BSCCO: d=15 Å,  $\lambda_{ab}(0)$ =2000 Å,  $\gamma$ =150, T<sub>c</sub>=90K,  $\kappa$ =100 by Zeldov et al.

B=160G	T <sub>m</sub> [K]	$\Delta S[k_B/vortex]$	$\Delta B[G]$
simulation	65	0.22	0.12
experiment	65	0.4	0.35

 $\Box$  Condition for our model:  $\xi < < d_v < < \lambda$ 

# **System size effect**

f=1/25, Γ=5



 $T_m(L_c) = T_m(\infty) + A/L_c$ 



#### □ H. Nordborg and G. Blatter -- Phys. Rev. B, **58** p.14556-14571 (1998).

The <u>absence of an analytical description of the vortex lattice melting</u> transition has led a large interest in numerical simulations. A popular approach is to use the frustrated XY model or the closely related lattice London model. Unfortunately, <u>many of the simulations have suffered</u> from highly nontrivial finite-size effects and have indicated two transitions instead of one at low filling factors, whereas a first-order transition was seen at large filling factors. <u>The problems have been</u> overcome recently [Hu et al. 1997], and a picture with a single first-order transition is emerging.

X. Hu, S. Miyashita and M. Tachiki: Phys. Rev. Lett. vol. 79, p.3498 (1997)

□ T. Schneider & J. M. Singer:

Phase transition approach to high temperature superconductivity: Universal properties of cuprate superconductors (Imperial College Press, 2000) on p.224: Ten years after Abrikosov's classic prediction of a lattice of quantized vortices, the Abrikosov vortex lattice, as the ground state of type II Eilenberger (1967) suggested that the lattice could melt close to the critical vortex lattice in high temperature superconductors could be experimentally resolved [Gammel et al. (1987) and Nelson (1988)]. While it now appears well melts in a first order phase transition, much less consensus has been reached on how to describe the state which the vortex lattice melts into, even in the clean limit. Recently, numerical simulations revealed, that the vortex liquid is incoherent, i.e. phase coherence is destroyed in all directions, including the direction of the applied magnetic field, as soon as the vortex lattice melts [Hu et al. (1997)...