
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Volovik, G.E.

Comment on "T dependence of the magnetic penetration depth in unconventional superconductors at low temperatures: Can it be linear?"

Published in:
Physical Review Letters

DOI:
[10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.4023](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.4023)

Published: 01/01/1998

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Please cite the original version:
Volovik, G. E. (1998). Comment on "T dependence of the magnetic penetration depth in unconventional superconductors at low temperatures: Can it be linear? Physical Review Letters, 81(18), 4023.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.4023>

This material is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Comment on “*T* Dependence of the Magnetic Penetration Depth in Unconventional Superconductors at Low Temperatures: Can It Be Linear?”

In a recent Letter Schopohl and Dolgov (SD) suggested that a pure $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -pairing state becomes invalid in the zero temperature limit, $T \rightarrow 0$ [1]. Their arguments are based on thermodynamics: if the magnetic penetration length depends linearly on T at low T , the Nernst theorem—the third law of thermodynamics—is violated. We show here that this conclusion is the result of the incorrect procedure of imposing the limit $T \rightarrow 0$ in the electromagnetic response. To illustrate their reasoning let us consider a simplified case of the uncharged Fermi superfluid with lines of zeros in the quasiparticle spectrum, the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ pairing being an example. In superfluids the density of the superfluid component $\rho_s(T)$ corresponds to the magnetic penetration length in superconductors, $1/\lambda^2(T) \propto \rho_s(T)$. In the case of the nodal lines it has linear dependence on T at low $T \ll T_c$: $\rho_s(T) = \rho - \rho_n(T)$, where the normal component density in such liquid is $\rho_n(T) \propto \rho T/T_c$. The kinetic energy contribution to the free energy of the liquid flowing with the superfluid velocity \mathbf{v}_s along the channel is

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_s(T) v_s^2. \quad (1)$$

We consider the superflow circulating in an annular channel. This circulation is fixed, if one discards the negligibly small decay of the supercurrent via vortex formation, so one can consider \mathbf{v}_s as temperature independent. This results in the finite entropy in $T = 0$ limit:

$$S(T = 0) = - \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial T} \right|_{T=0} = \frac{1}{2} \left. \frac{\partial \rho_n}{\partial T} \right|_{T=0} v_s^2 \propto v_s^2 \frac{\rho}{T_c}. \quad (2)$$

If one follows the argumentation in Ref. [1], such a violation of the Nernst theorem suggests that the superfluid density ρ_s (or the related penetration length λ in superconductors) cannot be a linear function of T , which would mean that the pairing states with nodal lines are prohibited at $T = 0$ by the Nernst theorem.

There is, however, a loophole in this argumentation. The superfluid density $\rho_s(T)$ is the linear response function of the current \mathbf{j} to the superfluid velocity \mathbf{v}_s , and thus is obtained in the limit $\mathbf{v}_s \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand the Nernst theorem requires the limit $T \rightarrow 0$ at finite \mathbf{v}_s . These two limits are not commuting for the kinetic energy \mathcal{F} . The crossover parameter, $x = T/p_F v_s$, regulates the scaling behavior of \mathcal{F} in different limiting cases: $\mathcal{F}(T, x) = f(x) \rho v_s^2 T/T_c$, where $f(x)$ is the di-

mensionless function of x [2]. The regime $x \gg 1$ corresponds to the linear response to the superfluid velocity, i.e., to the order of limits when $v_s \rightarrow 0$ first. In this “high temperature” case, $T \gg p_F v_s$, the scaling function $f(x) \rightarrow \text{const}$ and one obtains the finite entropy, $S(T) = \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \lim_{v_s \rightarrow 0} -d\mathcal{F}/dT \propto \rho v_s^2/T_c$ in Eq. (2).

In the opposite limit of low T , $x \ll 1$, the scaling function has the asymptote $f(x) \rightarrow \frac{a}{x} + bx$, where a and b are parameters of order unity [2]. In this true Nernst limit the entropy is zero at $T = 0$:

$$\lim_{v_s \rightarrow 0} \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} - \frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dT} \propto v_s T \frac{\rho}{p_F T_c}, \quad (3)$$

in complete agreement with the Nernst theorem. Thus the linear T dependence of the linear response function $\rho_s(T)$ does not violate the third law of thermodynamics: the Nernst principle does not prohibit a pure $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -pairing state to exist at $T = 0$ in an uncharged Fermi liquid.

The same can be immediately applied to the charged case, where the superfluid velocity \mathbf{v}_s is to be substituted by the external electric current \mathbf{j} discussed by SD [1]. Considering the true $T = 0$ limit of the energy, $\lim_{j \rightarrow 0} \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} -d\mathcal{F}/dT \propto jT$, one satisfies the Nernst principle. This does not contradict to the linear T dependence of the linear electromagnetic response, which for the wave vector $k = 0$ gives

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \lim_{j \rightarrow 0} \frac{d\lambda(k = 0, T)}{dT} = \text{const}. \quad (4)$$

For $k \neq 0$ there is another scaling parameter, $y = T/v_F k$, which regulates the dependence of the electromagnetic response on the wave vector k and produces the T^2 dependence of the penetration length at finite k , i.e., at $y \ll 1$ [3]. In the opposite case, $y \gg 1$, Eq. (4) is restored.

In conclusion, lines of nodes in clean superconductors are not in conflict with the Nernst theorem. The answer to the question in the title of their paper [1] is yes.

G. E. Volovik
Helsinki University of Technology
Low Temperature Laboratory
P.O. Box 2200, FIN-02015 HUT, Finland,
and Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics
117334 Moscow, Russia

Received 26 May 1998 [S0031-9007(98)07550-4]
PACS numbers: 74.25.Nf, 74.20.Fg, 74.72.Bk

- [1] N. Schopohl and O. V. Dolgov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4761 (1998).
- [2] G. E. Volovik, JETP Lett. **65**, 491 (1997).
- [3] I. Kosztin and A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 135 (1997).