## **Brief Reports**

Brief Reports are short papers which report on completed research which, while meeting the usual Physical Review standards of scientific quality, does not warrant a regular article. (Addenda to papers previously published in the Physical Review by the same authors are included in Brief Reports.) A Brief Report may be no longer than 3½ printed pages and must be accompanied by an abstract. The same publication schedule as for regular articles is followed, and page proofs are sent to authors.

## Free-energy formula for a superconducting alloy with localized states in the energy gap: Eliashberg formalism

S. Yoksan<sup>\*</sup> and A. D. S. Nagi

Department of Physics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L3G1 (Received 3 June 1987; revised manuscript received 14 January 1988)

We give a derivation of the formula for calculating the free-energy difference between the superconducting and the normal states of a weak-coupling superconductor with localized states within the energy gap (induced by magnetic impurities) by using the technique of couplingconstant integration. We use the Eliashberg formalism and the square-well model of the electron-phonon interaction.

Recently, Yamamoto and Nagi<sup>1</sup> (YN) derived a formula for calculating the free-energy difference  $\Omega_{S-N}$  between the superconducting and the normal states of a strong-coupling superconductor with localized states within the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer<sup>2</sup> (BCS) energy gap. These localized states arise in the problem of a low concentration of uncorrelated magnetic impurities in a superconductor when the scattering of a conduction electron from an impurity is treated exactly.<sup>3,4</sup> The formula derived in Ref. 1 is a nontrivial modification of the one given by Bardeen and Stephen<sup>5</sup> (for the electron-phonon system) to include the effect of magnetic impurities. The YN formula was used by Zarate and Carbotte<sup>6</sup> to numerically evaluate  $\Omega_{S-N}$ , the critical magnetic field, the specific-heat jump at the transition temperature  $T_c$ , and the critical-field deviation function. These calculations were done for the case when the host superconductor, containing magnetic impurities, is lead.

In Ref. 1, the single-particle Green's function was written by using the Eliashberg formalism<sup>7,8</sup> (EF) of the theory of superconductivity.<sup>9</sup> For calculating the properties of a strong-coupling superconductor, one needs the electron-phonon spectral density  $\alpha^2 F(\omega)$  and the Coulomb pseudopotential  $\mu^*$  for the host metal and usually detailed numerical work is required. For a weakcoupling superconductor, the properties can be calculated analytically within the EF if the square-well model<sup>9</sup> of the electron-phonon interaction (or the  $\lambda^{\Theta\Theta}$  model) is used. Although the  $\lambda^{\Theta\Theta}$  limit of  $\Omega_{S-N}$  for the superconducting alloy containing magnetic impurities can be written from Eq. (37) of Ref. 1, it is instructive to derive such a formula by using the well-known technique<sup>10</sup> of couplingconstant integration. This derivation is given in the present Brief Report. The single-particle Green's function for the conduction electrons of a strong-coupling superconductor containing paramagnetic impurities and having localized states within the energy gap is given by 1

$$G(\mathbf{K}, i\omega_n) = (i\tilde{\omega}_n \rho_3 - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{K}} - \tilde{\Delta}_n \rho_2 \sigma_2)^{-1} , \qquad (1)$$

where

$$\tilde{\omega}_n = \omega_n + \delta \tilde{\omega}_n + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \Gamma_{1l} \frac{U_n (1+U_n^2)^{1/2}}{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2} , \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{n} = \pi T \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} [\lambda(n-m) - \mu^{*}] \frac{1}{(1+U_{m}^{2})^{1/2}} + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1)\Gamma_{2l} \frac{(1+U_{n}^{2})^{1/2}}{\eta_{l}^{2} + U_{n}^{2}} , \qquad (3)$$

$$\delta \tilde{\omega}_n = \pi T \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda(n-m) \frac{U_m}{(1+U_m^2)^{1/2}} .$$
 (4)

In the above equations  $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{K}}$  is the single-particle energy,  $\sigma_i$ and  $\rho_i$  (i = 1, 2, 3), respectively, are Pauli matrices operating on the ordinary spin states and the electron-hole spin states,  $\omega_n = \pi (2n+1)T$  (*T* is temperature and *n* is an integer);  $U_n = \tilde{\omega}_n / \tilde{\Delta}_n$ ,  $\eta_l$  is the normalized position of a localized state within the BCS energy gap for the *l*th partial wave, and

$$2\Gamma_{1l} = 1/\tau_{1l} + 1/\tau_{2l} , \qquad (5)$$

$$2\Gamma_{2l} = 1/\tau_{1l} - 1/\tau_{2l} ,$$

where  $1/\tau_{2l}$   $(1/\tau_{1l})$  is the spin-flip (non-spin-flip) scattering rate from the magnetic impurities. Further  $\lambda(n-m)$  is the electron-phonon interaction parameter related to  $\alpha^2 F(\omega)$ . In the square-well model of the electron-phonon interaction (or the  $\lambda^{\Theta\Theta}$  model), one takes

$$\lambda(n-m) = \lambda \Theta(\omega_D - |\omega_n|) \Theta(\omega_D - |\omega_m|) , \quad (6)$$

where  $\omega_D$  is the Debye cutoff frequency. In this model, Eq. (4) gives  $\delta \tilde{\omega}_n = \lambda \omega_n$  and Eqs. (2) and (3) are combined to give

$$U_n \phi = \omega_n (1+\lambda) + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \alpha_l \frac{U_n (1+U_n^2)^{1/2}}{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2} , \quad (7)$$

$$\phi = 2\pi T g N(0) \sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{1}{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}} , \qquad (8)$$

$$\alpha_{l} = \Gamma_{1l} - \Gamma_{2l} = \frac{n_{i}}{2\pi N(0)} (1 - \eta^{2}) , \qquad (9)$$

$$g = \lambda - \mu^* , \qquad (10)$$

$$N = \frac{\omega_D}{2\pi T} - \frac{1}{2} \quad , \tag{11}$$

where  $n_i$  is the impurity concentration and N(0) is one-

spin density of states for the conduction electrons in the normal state of the pure host metal (at the Fermi surface).

The free-energy difference  $\Omega_{S-N}$  can be calculated from the relation 10

$$\Omega_{S-N} = \int_0^g \delta\left[\frac{1}{g}\right] \phi^2 .$$
 (12)

Substituting (1/g) from Eq. (8) in Eq. (12) and doing partial integration, we obtain

$$\Omega_{S-N} = 2\pi T N(0) \sum_{n(\geq 0)} \left[ \frac{\phi}{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}} + 2 \int_{U_n}^{\infty} \frac{dU_n}{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}} \frac{d\phi}{dU_n} \right].$$
(13)

Evaluating  $d\phi/dU_n$  from Eq. (7), substituting it in Eq. (13) and after integration, we get

$$\Omega_{S-N} = -2\pi T N(0) \sum_{n(\geq 0)} \left\{ -\frac{\phi}{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}} + 2\omega_n (1+\lambda) \left[ \frac{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}}{U_n} - 1 \right] + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1)\alpha_l \left[ \frac{2}{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2} + \frac{1}{1-\eta_l^2} \ln \left[ \frac{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2}{1+U_n^2} \right] \right] \right\}.$$
(14)

Substituting  $\phi$  and  $\alpha_l$  from Eqs. (7) and (9), respectively, Eq. (14) gives

$$\Omega_{S-N} = -2\pi T N(0) \sum_{n(\geq 0)} \left[ \omega_n (1+\lambda) \left( \frac{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}}{U_n} + \frac{U_n}{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}} - 2 \right) \right] \\ -n_i T \sum_{n(\geq 0)} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \left[ \frac{1-\eta_l^2}{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2} + \ln \left( \frac{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2}{1+U_n^2} \right) \right],$$
(15)

which is our final result. Ignoring the difference between  $\delta \tilde{\omega}_n$  and its normal-state value  $\delta \tilde{\omega}_n^0$ , which in the  $\lambda^{\Theta\Theta}$  model is at most of the order  $(\Delta_0/\omega_D)^2$  ( $\Delta_0$  being the gap edge for the system with no magnetic impurities), the  $\lambda^{\Theta\Theta}$  limit of Eq. (37) of Ref. 1 agrees with Eq. (15).

Summarizing, we have derived a formula [Eq. (15)] for calculating the free-energy difference  $\Omega_{S-N}$  for a weak-coupling superconductor with localized states within the

energy gap by using the well-known technique<sup>10</sup> of coupling-constant integration. We have used the Eliashberg formalism and the square-well model of the electron-phonon interaction.

Financial support provided by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada is gratefully acknowledged.

- \*Permanent address: Department of Physics, Srinakharinwirot University, Prasarnmitr, Bangkok, Thailand.
- <sup>1</sup>H. Yamamoto and A. D. S. Nagi, Phys. Rev. B 30, 1573 (1984).
- <sup>2</sup>J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper, and J. R. Schrieffer, Phys. Rev. 108, 1175 (1957).
- <sup>3</sup>H. Shiba, Prog. Theor. Phys. 40, 435 (1968).
- <sup>4</sup>A. I. Rusinov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 56, 2047 (1969) [Sov. Phys. JETP 29, 1101 (1969)].
- <sup>5</sup>J. Bardeen and M. Stephen, Phys. Rev. **136**, A1485 (1964).
- <sup>6</sup>H. G. Zarate and J. P. Carbotte, Solid State Commun. **52**, 445 (1984).

- <sup>7</sup>G. M. Eliashberg, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **38**, 966 (1960) [Sov. Phys. JETP **11**, 696 (1960)].
- <sup>8</sup>G. M. Eliashberg, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **43**, 1005 (1962) [Sov. Phys. JETP **16**, 780 (1963)].
- <sup>9</sup>A recent review of the Eliashberg formalism of the theory of superconductivity is given by P. B. Allen and B. Mitrovic, in *Solid State Physics*, edited by H. Ehrenreich, F. Seitz, and D. Turnbull (Academic, New York, 1982), Vol. 37, pp. 1–92.
- <sup>10</sup>A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971), p. 449.