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: Kliashberg formalism

S. Yoksan* and A. D. S. Nagi

Department of Physics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L3Gl (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' (YN) derived a formula for calculating the free-energy difference Ω_{S-N} between the superconducting and the normal states of a strong-coupling superconductor with localized states within the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer² (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 perconductor when the scattering or a conduction electron from an impurity is treated exactly.^{3,4} The formula derived in Ref. ¹ is a nontrivial modification of the one given by Bardeen and Stephen⁵ (for the electron-phonon system) to include the effect of magnetic impurities. The YN formula was used by Zarate and Carbotte⁶ to numerically evaluate Ω_{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^{7,8} (EF) of the theory of superconductivity. 9 For calculating the properties of a strong-coupling superconductor, one needs the electron-phonon spectral density $\alpha^2 F(\omega)$ and the Coulomb pseudopotential μ^* 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 model⁹ of the electron-phonon interaction (or the $\lambda^{\Theta\Theta}$ model) is used. Although the λ^{Θ} limit of Ω_{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 technique¹⁰ 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 $¹$ </sup>

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

where

in the energy gap is given by¹
\n
$$
G(\mathbf{K}, i\omega_n) = (i\tilde{\omega}_n \rho_3 - \varepsilon_{\mathbf{K}} - \tilde{\Delta}_n \rho_2 \sigma_2)^{-1},
$$
\n
$$
\tilde{\omega}_n = \omega_n + \delta \tilde{\omega}_n + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \Gamma_{1l} \frac{U_n (1+U_n^2)^{1/2}}{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2},
$$
\n
$$
\tilde{\omega}_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{2l+1}{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2} \right)
$$

$$
\tilde{\Delta}_n = \pi T \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\lambda (n-m) - \mu^* \right] \frac{1}{(1+U_m^2)^{1/2}} + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \Gamma_{2l} \frac{(1+U_n^2)^{1/2}}{\eta_l^2 + U_n^2}, \tag{3}
$$

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

In the above equations $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{K}}$ is the single-particle energy, σ_i and ρ_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); $U_n = \tilde{\omega}_n / \tilde{\Delta}_n$, η_l is the normalized position of a localized state within the BCS energy gap for the *l*th partial wave, and

$$
2\Gamma_{1l} = 1/\tau_{1l} + 1/\tau_{2l} \tag{5}
$$

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

where $1/\tau_{2l}$ ($1/\tau_{1l}$) is the spin-flip (non-spin-flip) scatter ing rate from the magnetic impurities. Furthe is the electron-phonon interaction parameter related $2\Gamma_{2l} = 1/\tau_{1l} - 1/\tau_{2l}$,
where $1/\tau_{2l}$ ($1/\tau_{1l}$) is the spin-flip (non-spin-flip) scatter-
ing 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

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

where ω_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

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

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

$$
a_l = \Gamma_{1l} - \Gamma_{2l} = \frac{n_i}{2\pi N(0)} (1 - \eta_l^2) , \qquad (9)
$$

$$
g = \lambda - \mu^* \tag{10}
$$

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

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 Ω_{S-N} can be calculated from the relation¹⁰

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

Substituting $(1/g)$ from Eq. (8) in Eq. (12) and doing

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

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

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

Substituting ϕ and α_l from Eqs. (7) and (9), respectively, Eq. (14) gives

$$
\left[\frac{1}{10}(1 + 1)^{2} \left[\frac{1}{10} + U_{n}^{2} - 1 - \eta^{2} \right] \left[1 + U_{n}^{2} \right] \right] \right]
$$

stituting ϕ and α_{l} from Eqs. (7) and (9), respectively, Eq. (14) gives

$$
\Omega_{S-N} = -2\pi TN(0) \sum_{n(\geq 0)} \left[\omega_{n} (1 + \lambda) \left(\frac{(1 + U_{n}^{2})^{1/2}}{U_{n}} + \frac{U_{n}}{(1 + U_{n}^{2})^{1/2}} - 2 \right) \right]
$$

$$
-n_{i} T_{n} \sum_{n(\geq 0)} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) \left[\frac{1 - \eta_{l}^{2}}{\eta_{l}^{2} + U_{n}^{2}} + \ln \left(\frac{\eta_{l}^{2} + U_{n}^{2}}{1 + U_{n}^{2}} \right) \right],
$$
(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 λ model is at most of the order $({\Delta_0}/{\omega_D})^2$ (${\Delta_0}$ being the ga 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 Ω_{S-N} for a weakcoupling superconductor with localized states within the energy gap by using the well-known technique¹⁰ 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.
- ¹H. Yamamoto and A. D. S. Nagi, Phys. Rev. B 30, 1573 (1984).
- ²J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper, and J. R. Schrieffer, Phys. Rev. 108, 1175 (1957).
- 3H. Shiba, Prog. Theor. Phys. 40, 435 (1968).
- ⁴A. I. Rusinov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 56, 2047 (1969) [Sov. Phys. JETP 29, 1101 (1969)l.
- 5J. Bardeen and M. Stephen, Phys. Rev. 136, A1485 (1964).
- ⁶H. G. Zarate and J. P. Carbotte, Solid State Commun. 52, 445 (1984).
- ⁷G. M. Eliashberg, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 38, 966 (1960) [Sov. Phys. JETP 11,696 (1960)].
- ⁸G. M. Eliashberg, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 43, 1005 (1962) [Sov. Phys. JETP 16, 780 (1963)l.
- ⁹A recent review of the Eliashberg formalism of the theory of superconductivity is given by P. 8. Allen and 8. Mitrovic, in Solid State Physics, edited by H. Ehrenreich, F. Seitz, and D. Turnbull (Academic, New York, 1982), Vol. 37, pp. 1-92.
- $10A$. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971), p. 449.