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A model for unconventional superconductivity of Sr$_2$RuO$_4$ is presented to resolve its puzzle. It is shown that the short-range ferromagnetic spin fluctuations give rise to the triplet pairing with $p$-like symmetry which is breaking the time-reversal symmetry and has a tiny gap due to the salient shape of the Fermi surface characteristic to Sr$_2$RuO$_4$. The effect of nonmagnetic-impurity scattering in the unitarity limit is shown to fill up easily the tiny gap giving rise to an appreciable residual density of states, which explains consistently the puzzling properties observed so far.

PACS numbers: 74.70.Dd, 74.20.−z

The superconductivity of Sr$_2$RuO$_4$ has attracted much attention since its discovery [1], not only because it has the same structure as La$_2$−xSr$_x$CuO$_4$ of high-$T_c$ cuprates but also because the data are strongly suggestive of a triplet order parameter breaking the time-reversal symmetry [2,3]. A puzzle about its superconducting state is that the possible states allowed by the group theoretical argument have a finite gap over the Fermi surface [4], while the experimental data on the specific heat indicates that there remains the residual density of states (DOS) of about half of $N_F$, DOS in the normal state [5], and those on $^{101}$Ru-NQR (and NMR) relaxation rate $1/T_1$ suggest the gap vanishes on the line of the Fermi surface [6]. A similar trend has also been observed in thermal conductivity [7].

In order to explain the former property, the nonunitary state in the triplet manifold has been proposed on the basis of group theoretical arguments [8,9]. However, it cannot explain the absence of any trace of the Hebel-Slichter peak near the transition temperature $T_c$ [6]. Furthermore, it is not so evident why the nonunitary state is stabilized. It needs in general to take into account the explicit character of Sr$_2$RuO$_4$ which would have been overlooked by the group theoretical arguments. For example, it has been proposed that the superconducting gaps on the branch $\alpha$ and $\beta$ of the Fermi surfaces are much smaller than that belonging to the main branch $\gamma$ due to the band symmetry of quasiparticles [10,11]. However, it also encounters the difficulty of $1/T_1$ mentioned above [6].

A purpose of this Letter is to present a model to resolve the above mentioned puzzle on the phenomenology relying on the experimental observations. According to the analysis of NMR experiments [6,12], the short-range ferromagnetic spin fluctuations are developed in the RuO$_2$ plane [13]. Therefore, it is natural to assume the short-range pairing interaction works between quasiparticles with parallel spins located at the nearest neighbor sites. Namely, the interaction matrix element $V_{k,k'}^{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}$ is assumed to be in the form

$$V_{k,k'}^{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta} = -2V_0[\cos(k_x - k'_x) + \cos(k_y - k'_y)] \times (\hat{\sigma}_\alpha \cdot \hat{\sigma}_\delta),$$

where we have assumed the 2D square lattice with unit lattice constant and $\hat{\sigma}$ is the vector formed by the Pauli matrices [14]. It is straightforward to take into account the effect of interaction between the second neighbors, the third neighbors, and so on [15]. Then, in the triplet manifold, the pairing interaction (1) is reduced to

$$V_{k,k'}^{\text{triplet}} = -2V_0(\sin k_x \sin k'_x + \sin k_y \sin k'_y).$$

It is difficult to determine, from purely theoretical considerations, the relative stability among the degenerate superconducting states in the triplet manifold. Namely, the relative importance of the spin-orbit coupling or the dipole interaction and the spin-fluctuation feedback effect, which lifts its degeneracy [16,17], is hard to estimate on the microscopic level. Then, we follow the experimental fact that the time-reversal breaking state seems to be realized [3]. Combining this fact and the type of pairing interaction (2), the $d$ vector is identified as that of the $\Gamma_5$ state classified in Refs. [4,17],

$$d_k = 2\Delta_0[\sin k_x \pm i \sin k_y],$$

where we have used the fact that the $xy$ plane is the easy plane of spin polarization [12]. This state satisfies the requirement of $D_{4h}$ symmetry, which gives rise to a crucial difference from the state $\Gamma_5$ discussed in Refs. [4,17] which is isotropic in the $xy$ plane of $k$ space. The amplitude of the gap, $|d_k|$, vanishes only if the following condition is satisfied:

$$\sin k_x = \sin k_y = 0,$$

which means $k = (0,0)$, $(0,\pm\pi)$, $(\pm\pi,0)$, and $(\pm\pi,\pm\pi)$. According to the band structure calculations [18], the Fermi surface of the main branch, $\gamma$ branch, is close to circular and passes through very near those points, $(0,\pm\pi)$ and $(\pm\pi,0)$. Therefore, the gap on the Fermi surface is extremely anisotropic leaving a tiny gap around those points. If we approximate the Fermi surface of the $\gamma$ branch by $k_F = (\pi R \cos \theta_k, \pi R \sin \theta_k)$, where $R$ parametrizes the diameter of the Fermi circle,
and $\theta_k$ is the angle measured from $k_x$ axis in the $k$ space, the amplitude of the gap on the Fermi surface is given by

$$|d_k| = \Delta_0 [\sin^2(\pi R \cos \theta_k) + \sin^2(\pi R \sin \theta_k)]^{1/2},$$

(5)

which exhibits rather anisotropic behavior for a realistic value of $R = 0.9$ [18] as shown by the solid line in Fig. 1. The expected gap $\Delta_0$ may be valid so that the superconducting gap is formed by the quasiparticles located near the Fermi level. We further introduce a model pairing interaction reproducing the expected gap $|d_k|$.  

$$\mathcal{V}_{k,k'} = -V f(\theta_k) f(\theta_{k'}) \times \theta(\omega_e - |\xi_k|) \theta(\omega_e - |\xi_{k'}|),$$

(7)

where the usual notations are used, and the basis function $f(\theta_k)$ is defined as

$$f(\theta_k) = \frac{[\sin^2(\pi R \cos \theta_k) + \sin^2(\pi R \sin \theta_k)]^{1/2}}{[1 - J_0(2\pi R)]^{1/2}} \times \text{sgn}(\sin \theta_k),$$

(8)

where $J_0(x)$ is the Bessel function of zeroth order. The function $f(\theta_k)$ is normalized as $\int_0^{2\pi} (d\theta) f(\theta) = 1$. 

The gap $\Delta_k$, obtained from (7), takes the form

$$\Delta_k = \Delta f(\theta_k),$$

(9)

where $\Delta$ is determined self-consistently by solving the gap equation as usual. Then, $N_s(E)$, the DOS in the superconducting state, is given by

$$\frac{N_s(E)}{N_F} = \text{Re} \left( \frac{E}{\sqrt{E^2 - |\Delta_k|^2}} \right)_{FS},$$

(10)

where $N_F$ is the DOS at the Fermi level, which is assumed to be uniform over the Fermi surface, and $\langle \cdot \cdot \rangle_{FS}$ indicates that the average over the Fermi surface is taken. The result for $N_s(E)/N_F$ is shown by the solid line in Fig. 2. It is remarked that a tiny gap $\Delta_{\text{min}} \approx 0.3 \times \Delta \ll \Delta_{\text{max}} \approx 1.3 \times \Delta$ is opened and $N_s(E)/N_F \approx E/\Delta_{\text{max}}$ for $\Delta_{\text{min}} < E \ll \Delta$, which is similar to that of a polarlike state, while the DOS show a sharp peak at $E = \Delta_{\text{max}}$ which is similar to that of the axial-like state. The specific heat jump at $T_c$ is given as [16]

$$\frac{\Delta C}{C_N} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \left( \frac{\Delta C}{C_N} \right)_{\text{BCS}},$$

(11)

where $\kappa = \int_0^{2\pi} (d\theta/2\pi) |f(\theta)|^4$ is calculated as

$$\kappa = \frac{5 + J_0(4\pi R) - 8J_0(2\pi R) + 2J_0(2\sqrt{2} \pi R)}{4[1 - J_0(2\pi R)]^2}.$$

(12)

For $R = 0.9$, $\kappa = 1.336$ giving $\Delta C/C_N \approx 1.07$. The above results contradict with the specific heat measurements and $T$ dependence of $1/T_1$ at $T \ll T_c$, which show that there exist appreciable DOS at zero energy, $N_s(0) \sim 1/2 \cdot N_F$. 

A key to solve this discrepancy may be taking into account the effect of impurity scattering, because $\xi_0$ is large of the order of $10^3$ Å so that a tiny amount of impurities, even in the sample where the de Haas–van Alphen oscillations are detected [19], can give rise to the residual DOS if they are the scattering center of the

FIG. 1. Magnitude of superconducting gap $|d_k|/\Delta_0$ as a function of $\theta_k$, the angle on the Fermi surface. The solid line represents (5) for the parameter $R = 0.9$. The dashed line is for (6) with $r = 0.692$ which has the minimum gap the same as (5) with $R = 0.9$. 

FIG. 2. Density of states, $N_s(E)/N_F$, for the pure system and that under the effect of impurity scattering in the unitarity limit. The degrees of impurity scattering are parametrized by $\Gamma_N/\Delta$, where $\Gamma_N$ is the scattering rate in the normal state and $\Delta$ is the gap parameter, defined by (9), at $0 \leq T \leq T_c$. 
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where \( c \) is the pair breaking parameter, and \( \eta_c \) is the scattering rate of quasiparticles in the unitarity limit. Therefore, the DOS is given by the formula

\[
N_s(E) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \tilde{G}(E + i0^+). \tag{15}
\]

Using the numerical solution of (14), the DOS (15) is calculated by means of (13). The results for a series of values of \( \Gamma_N \) are shown in Fig. 2. It is noted that the residual DOS appears even for the scattering rate which has little effect on the reduction of \( T_c \). For the case \( \Gamma_N/\Delta > 0.1 \), the overall shape of \( N_s(E) \) is similar to that for the polar state with a small amount of impurities in the unitarity limit. Therefore, the \( T \) dependence of the physical quantities at low temperatures, \( T \ll T_c \), is expected to look like that of the polar state with impurities.

The reduction of \( T_c \) due to impurity scattering is determined by the conventional Abrikosov-Gor’kov formula,

\[
\ln \left( \frac{T_{c,0}}{T_c} \right) = \psi \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) - \psi \left( \frac{1}{2} + \eta_c \right), \tag{16}
\]

where \( T_{c,0} \) is the transition temperature of the pure system, \( \eta_c = \Gamma_N/2\pi T_c \) is the pair breaking parameter, and \( \psi(x) \) is the digamma function. By eliminating the explicit dependence of \( \Gamma_N \) from \( N_s(0) \), (15), and \( T_{c,0} \), (16), we obtain a direct relation between \( T_c \) and \( N_s(0) \) which is shown in Fig. 3a.

The specific heat jump at \( T_c \) is given by

\[
\frac{\Delta C}{C_N} = \frac{24[1 - \eta_c \psi^{(1)}(\eta_c + \frac{1}{2})]^2}{\eta_c^4 \psi^{(1)}(\eta_c + \frac{1}{2}) - \kappa \psi^{(2)}(\eta_c + \frac{1}{2})}, \tag{17}
\]

where \( \psi^{(n)}(x) \) is the \( n \)th derivative of the digamma function \( \psi(x) \). The relation \( \Delta C/C_N \) vs \( N_s(0)/N_F \) is obtained after eliminating the explicit dependence of \( \eta_c \) and is shown in Fig. 3b.

For comparison with experiments, we also plot the experimental data points from Refs. [5] and [20] in Fig. 3.

Although the quantitative agreement with the theory is not very good, the qualitative agreement is rather nice considering the crudeness of our model. The present model would offer at least a good starting point for understanding the heart of the superconducting state of \( \text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4 \). On the basis of the present model, we can revise the theory by taking into account a more realistic nature of \( \text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4 \), for instance, the effect of pairing interaction between second and third neighbor sites, the effect of other branches of band, nonuniformity of the DOS around the Fermi level, and so on.

For instance, the results shown by dashed lines in Fig. 3 are in better agreement with the experiments. These have been obtained by using the model pairing (7) with

\[
f(\theta_k) = \frac{[1 - \cos(4\theta_k)]}{\sqrt{1 + r^2/2}}, \tag{18}
\]

with \( r = 0.7 \), which gives approximately the same gap (6) with \( r = 0.692 \). The model gap (6) can be regarded as that taking into account the effect of second and third neighbor interaction [15]. It is because \( \cos k_x = \cos k_y < 0 \) at the Fermi surface corresponding to \( \theta_k = \pi/4 \), and \( \Delta_1 \) and \( \Delta_2 \) are in the sign opposite to \( \Delta_0 \) (if both \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) are positive as expected) leading to a result that \( \Delta_0 + \Delta_1 \cos k_x + \Delta_2 \cos k_y \) at \( \theta_k = \pi/4 \) is larger than \( \Delta_0 \) and that at \( \theta_k = 0 \) (or \( \pi/2 \)) is smaller than \( \Delta_0 \).
The effect of branches other than the \( \gamma \) branch would certainly change a result quantitatively. In our model, the gap given by (3) is induced in general also on the \( \{ \alpha, \beta \} \) branches as long as the pair-hopping interaction remains no matter how small it is. The results for quantities concerning the transition point, such as \( T_c \) and \( \Delta C \), remain essentially the same as above if the magnitude of the induced gaps on \( \{ \alpha, \beta \} \) branches is small enough. Since \( C_N \) is increased by the contribution from the \( \{ \alpha, \beta \} \) branches, \( \Delta C / C_N \) tends to decrease improving the discrepancy between the theory and experiments shown in Fig. 3b, if \( N_s(0) \) would have remained unchanged. If the quasi-1D nature of the \( \{ \alpha, \beta \} \) branches is assumed [18], \( \Delta_{\text{max}}^\alpha = \sqrt{3}/2 \Delta_\alpha \) and \( \Delta_{\text{min}}^\alpha = \sqrt{3}/2 \Delta_\alpha \), giving rise to rather large anisotropy \( \Delta_{\text{max}}^\alpha / \Delta_{\text{min}}^\alpha = \sqrt{2} \) and \( \Delta_{\text{max}}^\beta / \Delta_{\text{min}}^\beta = \sqrt{7}/3 \), respectively. This would cause some small structure in \( N_s(E) \) at \( E < \Delta_\alpha \) and \( \Delta_\beta \) which are more easily smoothed, compared to the \( \gamma \) branch, by the impurity scattering giving rise to an additional contribution to the residual DOS \( N_s(0) \). Such an effect tends to decrease the discrepancy between the theory and experiments shown in Fig. 3a, while the above mentioned improvement of Fig. 3b may be lessened to some extent. It is left for future study to estimate those values quantitatively on the basis of a model with a more microscopic base.

In conclusion, we have shown that the short-range ferromagnetic spin fluctuations induce a novel type of 2D triplet superconducting state in \( \text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4 \) with the help of the special nature of the Fermi surface characteristic to \( \text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4 \). The results obtained from this model are consistent with those of \( \text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4 \) observed so far resolving a puzzle about its superconductivity.
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[15] The interactions between the second and third neighbors give (1) the terms \( -\{ -4\text{V}_1\cos(k_x - k_x')\cos(k_y - k_y') - 2\text{V}_2\cos(k_x - k_y)\cos(k_y - k_y')\} \) (\( \sigma_{ab} \cdot \sigma_{ab'} \)) and (2) the terms \( -\{ -4\text{V}_1\sigma_S\sigma_S'\sigma_C'\sigma_C'' + \sigma_S\sigma_S'\sigma_C'\sigma_C'' - 8\text{V}_2\sigma_S\sigma_S'\sigma_C'' \} \), where \( \sigma_S = \text{sink}_x \), \( \sigma_C' = \text{cosk}_y \), and so on. Then, the \( \textbf{d} \) vector takes the form \( \textbf{d}_k = \frac{3}{2}[\sigma_S[\Delta_0 + \Delta_1 \sigma_C + \Delta_2 \sigma_C''] + i\sigma_S[\Delta_0 + \Delta_1 \sigma_C + \Delta_2 \sigma_C'']] \).