Strontium Ruthenate Why this material has remained interesting for 20 years and what is new now

Steve Simon Jesper Romers Thomas Scaffidi



Scaffidi, Romers, Simon PRB 89 220510R (2014) Scaffidi, Simon arXiv 1410.6073

Many thanks: Andy Mackenzie, Clifford Hicks Jim Sauls, Steve Kivelson, Sri Raghu, Catherine Kallin

High Temperature Superconductivity



Bednorz and Müller, 1986 (Nobel Prize, 1987)

- 1. Very two dimensional
- 2. Conduction in Cu-O planes
- 3. An insulator without Ba

"Layered Perovskite" Structure

30 years of study and still *very* controversial (>> 10⁵ publications)

Strontium Ruthenate (Sr_2RuO_4) first non-cuprate analog: $T_c \approx 1.5$ K



Maeno [Hashimoto], 1994

- 1. Very two dimensional
- 2. Conduction in Ru-O planes
- 3. A Fermi liquid above T_c

"Layered Perovskite" Structure

20 years of study and still **very** controversial (~10⁴ publications) [Needless to say: I will discuss only a handful of these!]



Conventional Superconductor



Singlet (conventional) pairing spins = $\uparrow \downarrow - \uparrow \downarrow$ = antisymmetric (S=0) orbital g($\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2$) = symmetric (L=0, ...) U(1)_{phase} order parameter

Superfluid ³He = A Triplet "Superconductor"



Triplet pairing (³He, Sr₂RuO₄, UPt₃) spins = $\uparrow\uparrow$ = symmetric (S=1) orbital g($\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2$) = antisymmetric (L=1, ...)

 $SO(3)_{spin} \times SO(3)_{orbit} \times U(1)_{phase}$ order param

Driven by strong short ranged repulsion

Evidence for Triplet?

NMR Knight Shift Measures spin susceptibility







Pair wavefunction with orbital angular momentum L=1 in 2D

 $\psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \sim e^{\mp i \arg(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)}$ $\psi_{\mathbf{p}} \sim e^{\pm i \arg \mathbf{p}} \sim p_x \pm i p_y$ $2\pi i$



2D versions

A=chiral
$$(p_x+ip_y)$$

B=helical

Both are "Topological Superconductors"

Protected Edge Modes (Analogy= Quantum Hall)

Chiral (T-breaking) : = $p_x + ip_y$ for both $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\rangle$ Helical (T-invariant) = $p_x + ip_y$ for $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $p_x - ip_y$ for $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$

chiral Non-Abelian Statistics of Half-Quantum Vortices in *p*-Wave Superconductors

D. A. Ivanov

(Based on earlier work by Read-Green, Volovik, Kopnin-Salomaa)

In the chiral phase,

vortex core contains a *isolated majorana operator*.

An isolated majorana grouped with another (far away) is a protected qubit. *Cannot be flipped by any local parity conserving operator!*

Useful in quantum computation...

How to know if it is T-breaking?



2D versions

A=chiral
$$(p_x+ip_y)$$

B=helical

Both are "Topological Superconductors"

Protected Edge Modes (Analogy=Quantum Hall)

Chiral (T-breaking) : = $p_x + ip_y$ for both $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$

Helical (T-invariant) = $p_x + ip_y$ for $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $p_x - ip_y$ for $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$

How to know if it is T-breaking? (expect magnetization μ_B per pair) ... But magnetic fields are screened by supercurrents!

1. Measure fields (currents) *near* edge (prediction ~ mT)

Chiral (T-breaking) : = $p_x + ip_y$ for both $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$

Helical (T-invariant) = $p_x + ip_y$ for $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $p_x - ip_y$ for $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$

PHYSICAL REVIEW B 81, 214501 (2010)

S

Limits on superconductivity-related magnetization in Sr₂RuO₄ from scanning SQUID microscopy

Clifford W. Hicks,^{1,2} John R. Kirtley,³ Thomas M. Lippman,^{1,3} Nicholas C. Koshnick,³ Martin E. Huber,⁴ Yoshiteru Maeno,⁵ William M. Yuhasz,⁶ M. Brian Maple,⁷ and Kathryn A. Moler^{1,3}



How to know if it is T-breaking? (expect magnetization μ_B per pair) ... But magnetic fields are screened by supercurrents!

- 1. Measure fields (currents) *near* edge (prediction ~ mT)
- 2. Kerr Rotation



Chiral (T-breaking) : =
$$p_x + i p_y$$
 for both $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$

Helical (T-invariant) = $p_x + ip_y$ for $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $p_x - ip_y$ for $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$

High Resolution Polar Kerr Effect Measurements of Sr₂RuO₄: Evidence for Broken Time-Reversal Symmetry in the Superconducting State

Jing Xia,¹ Yoshiteru Maeno,² Peter T. Beyersdorf,³ M. M. Fejer,⁴ and Aharon Kapitulnik^{1,4}



The conflict that has framed the field for 10 years:



Some New Ideas Needed to Resolve This... (Need more detailed understanding of the material !!)

Some Basic Facts



Ru orbitals are "active"

After crystal field splitting 3 Ru d-orbitals are near Fermi surface

 d_{xy}, d_{xz}, d_{yz}



High T_c Analog (Perovskite)





Conventional Wisdom: The 2d γ band is the important one

Approaching a Van Hove singularity (at midpoint of edge of zone) it is very close to unstable to Ferromagnetism (Stoner criterion).

Supported by functional RG calculation (Wang, ... Rice, 2013)

Strong chiral gap on γ band Weak (almost no) gap on α , β band



ARPES bandstructure Damiscelli 2000

New(ish) Idea

Maybe the 1d physics of α, β bands is the important thing!

PRL 105, 136401 (2010) PH

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

week ending 24 SEPTEMBER 2010

Hidden Quasi-One-Dimensional Superconductivity in Sr_2RuO_4

S. Raghu, A. Kapitulnik, and S. A. Kivelson

Scenario by which supercond is on α,β bands only: edge currents could cancel even with T breaking.

Supported by a microscopic RG calculation "exact" in limit of weak interaction

(triplet: chiral and helical close to degenerate...)

How the RG calculations work:





Actually, ALL bands are important!



Specific heat data requires sizable gap on all three bands



So what was missing in prior RG calculations?

What is missing in prior RG calc?

- RG starts with band structure as input.
- Spin-orbit and band mixing (1000 Kelvin!) is included only *after* RG is run down to gap scale ~1K.

Scaffidi, Romers, Simon PRB 89 220510R (2014)

Re-do the RG with spin-orbit included first

Only one unknown parameter = interaction ratio J/U

0.05 < J/U < 0.23

Some results

- Triplet always wins over singlet
- For J/U > 0.065 helical wins over chiral... but only by a tiny bit

•Ratio of gap on γ to α , β close to 1 for a range of J/U \qquad (agrees with specific heat data)

0.05 < J/U < 0.23







Residual Density of States C/T vanishes at low T



No ungapped density of states

Nodes or Nearly Nodes = points on Fermi surface where superconducting gap is very small.

C/T vanishes linearly..





Nearly Nodes!







Phases

• β and γ have multiple twists!

Phase and





Phases

• β and γ have multiple twists!

Phase and amplitude

- Weren't we looking for chiral p-wave?
- Shouldn't that force phase ~ $e^{i\theta}$?





Chern number C = # of twists of the phase determined mod 4.



To see quantized thermal Hall

Must be at T < Δ_{min}



C/T vanishes at low T



Explained by near nodes?

Can we measure this at much lower T?



Calculations suggest that above gap scale, edge current is *tiny*. Only at T < Δ_{min} will edge currents appear.

So is it chiral p-wave?

- T-breaking experiments hard to explain otherwise (with some caveats)
- Given the structure of the expected gap function (and given disordered edges) very large reduction in edge current is expected at all temperatures examined so far.

OR

... We really don't understand something...

Strontium Ruthenate Why this material has remained interesting for 20 years and what is new now

Steve Simon Jesper Romers Thomas Scaffidi



