Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by the University of California for the United States Department of Energy under contract W-7405 ENG 36

LA-UR--87-2805

DE87 014766

TITLE EXPERIMENTAL PERSPECTIVES ON HEAVY ELECTRON METALS

AUTHOR(S) Z. Fisk, H. R. Ott, and G. Aeppli

SUBMITTED TO LT-18, Kyoto, Japan
August 20-26, 1987

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

By acceptance of this article the publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution or to allow others to do so for U.S. Government purposes.

The Los Alamos National Laboratory requests that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy.

MASTER

Los Alamos Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

2. FISK/Experimental Perspectives on Heavy Electron Metals

case of UPt_3 , for which detailed band structure calculations exist, the extremal cross-sectional areas agree quite well with the calculations. This is in line with our qualitative remarks: Kondo-type interactions can only influence states within kT_0 of the Fermi level, affecting areas little.

Inelastic neutron scattering experiments are providing their own slant on the question of coherence. The most complete experiments addressing this are on $CeCu_2$ [6] and UPt_3 [7]. Strong antiferromagnetic correlations are found to be a property of the heavy-electron ground state, and these correlations are washed out above the coherence temperature (Fig. 2). The energy scale characterizing these fluctuations appears to vary from compound to compound in the same way that the coherence temperature does. It is also interesting to note that there has been little indication of significant phonon softening in reported neutron scattering experiments on heavy-electron metals.

3. SUPERCONDUCTIVITY

Much interest attends the various phase transitions observed in heavy-electron metals although a number occur just as coherence begins setting in. First among these are the superconducting phase transitions, now firmly established for $CeCu_2Si_2$, UBe_{13} , and UPt_3 . URu_2Si_2 , with a somewhat smaller γ should also be considered with this group. T_c in all cases is near 1 K, and it is also observed that (γ, ρ) for these metals lies near the Sommerfeld line. The important questions raised by the occurrence of superconductivity in materials with strong magnetic characteristics were both whether a new mechanism is involved and whether a new superconducting pairing is being seen.

It turns out that these questions are not easy to answer experimentally and that an accumulated body of data rather than a single definitive result is determining the current thinking on these matters. While the case has been made by Steglich and co-workers [8] for an isotropic singlet superconducting state in $CeCu_2Si_2$, there is growing evidence that in UPt_3 and UBe_{13} the superconducting state is anisotropic. The evidence comes from numerous measurements of non-BCS temperature dependences below T_c including ultrasonic attenuation [9],

specific heat [10], thermal conductivity [11] and London penetration depth (Fig. 3). The point is that the anisotropic states have zeros of the gap on parts of the Fermi surfaces, either points or lines. These zeros yield power laws in T rather than exponential dependences, as in the case where the gap is non-zero everywhere. These power laws are also to be distinguished from the more conventional gaplessness in magnetically doped conventional superconductors, which gives a linear in T contribution to the specific heat. This linear term has been claimed to be observed in UPt_3 , although recent work refutes this [13]. There also exists an unusual anisotropy in the ultrasonic attenuation in UPt_3 [14], as well as a peak below T_c in the ultrasonic attenuation in UBe_{10} [9].

One of the curiosities of heavy electron superconductivity is the behavior of UBe_{13} with Th impurities. The curve of T_c versus Th concentration is not monotonic, and an extensive set of

Fig. 2. Inelastic neutron spectra of UPt_3 for $Q = (0,0,2)$ and $(0,0,1.05)$ at three different temperatures. Dashed lines are fits to the magnetic scattering. The antiferromagnetic correlations, contributing only in the $(0,0,1.05)$ -scan, are gone by $T = 30$ K. From ref. 7.

Fig. 3. Comparison between the London penetration depth in UBe_{13} and Sn. From ref. 12.

measurements on the pressure dependence of T_c as a function of Th doping gives support to the idea that there are at least two different superconducting states involved as x varies [15] (Fig. 4). It has already been known for some time that there is a second phase transition of unknown origin below T_c for $x > 1.7\%$ Th. μ SR experiments [16] have been interpreted as showing that the lower phase transition is to a state with an ordered moment of $\sim 0.001 \mu_B/U$. (We note that superconducting pairings with some net ordered moment are possible.) Specific heat measurements have determined, in addition, that the upper and lower transitions for $x > 1.7\%$ track each other in applied magnetic fields.

μ SR experiments [16] also gave some evidence for a small moment present in pure UPt_3 . This is distinct from the magnetic ordering found at 5 K in Th- and Pd-doped UPt_3 [17], without superconductivity at lower temperatures. Now neutron experiments [18] have found a magnetic ordering with $T_N = 5$ K, and an ordered moment of $\sim 0.02 \mu_B/U$. This is believed to be a feature of the pure, and not the defect, lattice. A very interesting point is that below 5 K the order parameter grows to a value which becomes constant abruptly at $T_c = 0.5$ K. It is important to also remark that superconductivity co-exists with small moment magnetism in URu_2Si_2 [19] and perhaps $U_{1-x}Th_xBe_{12}$, as mentioned above. The presence of the small moment ordering and the strong antiferromagnetic correlations in the superconducting state makes a magnetic mechanism for T_c in these cases plausible.

1. ANTI-FERROMAGNETISM

Besides the superconducting phase transition, a number of heavy-electron metals are known to undergo antiferromagnetic phase transitions. The compound U_2Zn_{17} is one such, with $T_N = 9.7$ K. An extensive neutron investigation has been conducted on this material [20]. Magnetic-fluctuations highly localized in reciprocal space are found. A Kondo-like response function fits the data well, and it is an unusual result of this analysis that the phase transition is driven by the temperature dependence of the RKKY interaction and not that of χ . An instability criterion of the form $J\chi = 1$ becomes satisfied because J increases with decreasing temperature, χ remaining nearly constant near T_N . This temperature dependence of the RKKY interaction is the subject of the work of Jones and Varma. A possible explanation for the extreme sensitivity of T_N in U_2Zn_{17} to Cu additions [21] may then lie in the interference of these additions with the low temperature development of the RKKY interaction.

An interesting feature of the heavy-electron uranium compounds showing low temperature magnetic transitions is that the spin configurations have been found to be commensurate. Spin configurations in many Ce systems, we note, are often incommensurate. Another feature found for the heavy-electron uranium systems is that the ordered moments have either of two values: $\sim 0.7 \mu_B/U$ or $\sim 0.02 \mu_B/U$ [22]. Admittedly, the data set for this observation is small. But it is remarkable, for

Fig. 4. Phase diagram of T_c versus x for $U_{1-x}Th_xBe_{12}$ at various pressures. From ref. 14.

example, that Pd-doped UPt_3 orders at 5 K with $0.7 \mu_B/U$ while the pure UPt_3 has the same T_N with $0.02 \mu_B/U$.

Aspects of the magnetic ordering fit nicely into the qualitative model discussed earlier. Below the coherence temperature, the heavy-electron lattice is a kind of van Vleck singlet lattice, only here the singlets are not crystal-field singlets but Kondo singlets. Magnetic order can be thought about as occurring in such a lattice by a bootstrap process. Imagine a small field at one f-site. The Kondo ion there, in the small field, becomes slightly uncompensated, yielding a small net moment at that site. This small moment, via the RKKY interaction, generates a field at neighboring f-sites in the lattice. If the generated field at the neighboring sites is as large as the initial small field at our original site, a self-sustaining internal field can be generated. The internal field generated, in partially quenching the Kondo compensation, will reduce the effective mass of the conduction electrons. The loss in τ below T_N is then a loss in mass, not a loss of the Fermi surface. These losses in τ are, in fact, in accord with the comparison of high temperature effective moments and the ordered, except in the case of URu_2Si_2 . Small moment ordering of a strange kind is also indicated in μ SR experiments below 1 K in $CeAl_3$ [23].

It has not been so easy to identify heavy-electron cerium magnetic compounds because the τ 's in the magnetically ordered states are much smaller than in U cases. The reason for this appears to be that the Kondo temperature of Ce in its compounds is, fairly generally, an order of

magnitude smaller than for U in its compounds. If the internal fields generated upon ordering are roughly the same for both compounds, we expect a much stronger quenching of the Kondo compensation, since this will vary with the ratio H_{int}/T_0 .

Another aspect of the Ce system is that because T_0 is typically of order 1 K for them, RKKY interactions often cause magnetic ordering before the heavy electron state can develop. In some cases, such as $CeCu_2$, it appears possible to develop, with impurity substitution a heavy-electron state from what appears to be a simple magnetic state (Fig. 5).

The most interesting substitutions which alter the properties of heavy-electron systems are ordered ones, since the possibility for coherence survives. Unfortunately such substitutions can not often be achieved. An interesting case is that of adding Au to UPt_3 to produce $UAuPt_3$, where the Au is believed to fill a special position in the lattice. Here the γ changes from 90 mJ/mole-K² to 700 mJ/mole-K² for $UAuPt_3$. [24].

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is believed that a theory for heavy electron metals can be developed from studies of the Anderson lattice Hamiltonian. What one hopes to achieve is a phase diagram encompassing the rich variety of phenomena observed experimentally. Do the small moment orderings, for example, only occur near the Sommerfeld line in the (γ, x) plot? And how are we to think about phase transitions occurring, as in UCu_2 , in a heavy-electron state which develops in the presence of higher temperature magnetic order [15]?

It is important to understand how the very small energy scales observed come into being. These compounds can provide a useful approach to such question because here pressure can be used as a clean probe to push to f^{13} configuration towards integral occupancy. It would be interesting if superconductors were to be found in the process.

The heavy electron problem appears as a piece of the more complicated transition metal problem. Spin fluctuations appear to dominate the physics of the heavy-electron metals, not charge fluctuations. In the transition metals the magnetic electrons enter into the bonding, and are consequently importantly involved in the free energy of the materials. There must exist transition metal compounds where the spin-fluctuations dominate, and if external conditions could be changed so as to mix in charge fluctuations, an important new attack on the larger problem could be made from the heavy-electron arena.

REFERENCES

- 1) P. Coleman, P. W. Anderson, and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 414 (1985); J. Schoenes and J. J. M. Franse, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 5148 (1986); T. Penney, J. Stankiewicz, S. Van Molnar, Z. Fisk, J. L. Smith and H. R. Ott, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. **54-57**, 370 (1986).
- 2) B. Jones and C. M. Varma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 643 (1987).
- 3) B. Batlogg, D. J. Bishop, E. Bucher, B. Goiding, Jr., A. P. Ramirez, Z. Fisk, J. L. Smith, and H. R. Ott, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. **63 & 64**, 441 (1987).

Fig. 5. Low temperature C/T versus T^2 for $CeAlCu_2$. Inset shows specific heat data below 1 K, the slope giving a low-temperature limiting $\gamma = 2.20$ J/mole-K². From ref. 24.

- 4) P. H. P. Reinders, M. Springford, P. T. Coleridge, H. Bonlet, and D. Ravot, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1631 (1986).
- 5) L. Taillefer, R. Newbury, C. G. Lonzarich, Z. Fisk, and J. L. Smith, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. **63 & 64**, 372 (1987).
- 6) G. Aeppli, H. Yoshizawa, Y. Endoh, E. Bucher, J. Hufnagel, Y. Onuki, and T. Komatsubara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 122 (1986).
- 7) G. Aeppli, A. Goldman, C. Shirane, E. Bucher and M. Ch. Lux-Steinler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 908 (1987).
- 8) F. Steglich, U. Ahlheim, J. J. Franse, N. Grewe, D. Rainer, and U. Rauchschwalbe, J. Magn. Magn. **52**, 54 (1985).
- 9) B. Goiding, D. J. Bishop, B. Batlogg, W. H. Haemmerle, Z. Fisk, J. L. Smith, and H. R. Ott, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2479 (1985); D. J. Bishop, C. M. Varma, B. Batlogg, E. Bucher, Z. Fisk, and J. L. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 1009 (1984).
- 10) F. Steglich, U. Rauchschwalbe, U. Gottwick, H. M. Mayer, G. Sparr, N. Grewe, U. Poppe, and J. J. M. Franse, J. Appl. Phys. **67**, 3054 (1985); A. Sulpice P. Candit, J. Chaussy, J. Flouquet, D. Jaccard, P. Lejay, and J. L. Tholence, J. Appl. Phys. **57**, 3082 (1985).
- 11) D. Jaccard, J. Flouquet, Z. Fisk, J. L. Smith, and H. R. Ott, J. Physique Lett. **46**, 1811 (1985); D. Jaccard, J. Flouquet, P. Lejay, and J. L. Tholence, J. Appl. Phys. **57**, 3082 (1985).
- 12) D. Einzel, P. J. Hirachfeld, F. Gross, B. S. Chandrasekhar, K. Andres, H. R. Ott, J. Beuers, Z. Fisk, and J. L. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2513 (1986).
- 13) H. R. Ott, E. Felder, A. Bernasconi, Z. Fisk, J. L. Smith, L. Taillefer, and C. Lonzarich, Proc. 1118 (to be published).
- 14) B. S. Shivaram, Y. H. Jeong, T. F. Rosenbaum, and D. G. Hinks, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1078 (1986).

Z. FISK/Experimental Perspectives on Heavy Electron Metals

- 15) S. E. Lambert, Y. Dalichaouch, M. B. Maple, J. L. Smith, and Z. Fisk, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 1619 (1986).
- 16) Reported by R. H. Heffner, International Conference on Valence Fluctuations, Bangalore, 1983.
- 17) A. de Visser, J. C. P. Klaasse, M. van Sprang, J. J. M. Franse, A. Menovsky, and T. T. M. Palstra, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 54-57, 375 (1986); A. P. Ramirez, B. Batlogg, E. Bucher, and A. S. Cooper, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 1072 (1986); G. R. Stewart, A. L. Giorgi, J. O. Willis, and J. O'Rourke, Phys. Rev. B34, 4629 (1986).
- 18) G. Aeppli, C. Broholm, J. K. Kjems, and E. Bucher, preprint.
- 19) C. Broholm, J. K. Kjems, W. J. L. Buyers, P. Mathews, T. T. M. Palstra, A. A. Menovsky, and J. A. Mydosh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 1467 (1987).
- 20) C. Broholm, J. K. Kjems, G. Aeppli, Z. Fisk, J. L. Smith, S. M. Shapiro, G. Shirane, and H. R. Ott, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 917 (1987).
- 21) J. O. Willis, Z. Fisk, G. R. Stewart, and H. R. Ott, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. 54-57, 395 (1986).
- 22) G. Aeppli and C. M. Varma, private communication.
- 23) S. Barth, H. R. Ott, F. N. Gygax, B. Hitti, E. Lippelt, A. Schenck, and C. Baines, Proc. LT 18 (to be published).
- 24) J. O. Willis, R. H. Aiken, Z. Fisk, E. Zirngiebl, J. D. Thompson, H. R. Ott, and B. Batlogg, Proc. Int. Conf. Valence Fluctuations, Bangalore (1987) to be published.
- 25) H. R. Ott, H. Rudiger, E. Felder, Z. Fisk, and J. D. Thompson, Phys. Rev. 35, 1452 (1967).
- 26) H. R. Ott, H. Rudiger, E. Felder, Z. Fisk, and B. Batlogg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 1595 (1985).