PHYSICAL REVIEW B **VOLUME 46, NUMBER 17** 1 NOVEMBER 1992-I

## Anisotropy and magnetic field dependence of the planar copper NMR spin-lattice relaxation rate in  $YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>4</sub>O<sub>8</sub>$

## M. Bankay, M. Mali, J.Roos, I. Mangelschots, and D. Brinkmann Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, 8001 Zürich, Switzerland (Received 30 July 1992)

We have measured the temperature and magnetic field dependence of the  ${}^{63}$ Cu nuclear spinlattice relaxation rate W and its anisotropy  $r$  at plain Cu(2) sites in normal and superconducting YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>4</sub>O<sub>8</sub>. Below  $T_c$  we observed that an applied magnetic field B || c enhances  $W = W_c$ , whereas  $B \perp c$  suppresses  $W = W_{ab}$ . Such a behavior seems to rule out the spin diffusion to the fluxoid cores and the fluxoid motion as being responsible for the effect. It indicates more an unexpected field-related breaking of the spin-rotation invariance in the superconducting state. The anisotropy r defined as the ratio  $W_{ab}/W_c$  is almost field and temperature independent in the normal state but develops a nonmonotonic temperature dependence below  $T_c$  with a flat minimum at 45 K in B = 5.17 T and a much more pronounced minimum at 55 K in  $B = 0.58$  T. A qualitatively similar behavior of r has been reported previously for  $YBa_2Cu_3O_7$ . Comparing r in both compounds, we note one essential difference at low B. Namely, the slope  $dr/dT$  just below  $T_c$  is large for YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7</sub> but almost zero for  $YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>4</sub>O<sub>8</sub>$ .

Nuclear magnetic resonance and neutron-scattering experiments have shown that spin fiuctuations in hightemperature superconductors have strong antiferromagnetic (AFM) correlations, which persist into the superconducting state. The study of the temperature and field dependence of the NMR spin-lattice relaxation rate  $W_{\alpha}$ , where  $\alpha = a, b$ , or c specifies the orientation of the static applied field B, and its anisotropy  $r = W_{ab}/W_c$  at the Cu plane site  $[(Cu(2)]$  may help to understand how these AFM correlations are affected by superconductivity.

Recently, it was reported<sup>1,2</sup> that in YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7</sub> (abbreviated 1-2-3) measurements of  $W_{\alpha}$  and r in the superconducting state appear to require a modification of theories such as that by Millis, Monien and Pines<sup>3</sup> but agree qualitatively with the orbital-d-wave fits by Bulut and Scalapino<sup>4,5</sup> and Lu.<sup>6</sup> In addition, Martindal et al.<sup>2</sup> found that in the superconducting state  $W_c$ , and to a lesser degree  $W_{ab}$ , become enhanced in a magnetic field, with the enhancement growing at lower temperature. A temperature-dependent anisotropy below  $T_c$  in 1-2-3 has also been studied in low magnetic field by Takigawa, Smith, and Hulst. "

We have reported previously<sup>8</sup> similar investigations of  $W_{\alpha}$  anisotropy and its field dependence for Cu(2) in the stoichiometric double-chain compound YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>4</sub>O<sub>8</sub> (1-2-4), which has the same Cu-0 plane structure as 1-2-3 but lower charge-carrier concentration. In particular, the Cu(2) rate  $W_c$ , field independent in the normal state, shows a field-dependent enhancement in the superconducting state that already begins 13 K above  $T_c$  in a 5.17 T field. Consequently the anisotropy  $r$  that is temperature and field independent above  $T_c + 13$  K ( $r = 3.3$ ) starts to diminish below this temperature. Down to 80 K the reduction of  $r$  is hardly noticeable. However, below that temperature  $r$  drops very rapidly to a value of 2.2 and after passing a flat minimum at 45 K it increases again at lower temperature.

Since in the superconducting state the change of r due to a magnetic field could be a secondary effect caused, for example, by fluxoid cores or by  $T_c$  suppression in a magnetic field, we decided to extend our previous highfield experiments to low fields, where the field-induced anisotropy effects may be neglected. In this Rapid Communication we will show that the anisotropy  $r$  behaves similarly as in 1-2-3, but with some pronounced differences. In addition, new results on the low-temperature behavior of  $W_{ab}$  and  $W_c$  will be presented.

We briefly discuss the procedure to determine the rate anisotropy. For a strong magnetic field and pure magnetic relaxation the nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rate W involves fluctuating hyperfine fields  $H_{\alpha}$  perpendicular to the applied external field. In case of  $B \parallel c$  the rate may be expressed as  $W_c = \frac{3}{2}(H_a^2 + H_b^2)\gamma_n^2 \tau$ , where  $\gamma_n$  is the nuclear gyromagnetic ratio and  $\tau$  is the (isotropic) correlation time.<sup>9</sup> For  $B \perp c$ , the rate is  $W_{ab} = \frac{3}{2}(H_a^2 + H_c^2)\gamma_n^2 \tau$ , since a and b are not distinguishable for the Cu(2) site.

By a zero-field nuclear quadrupole resonance (NQR) experiment, only  $W_c$  can be obtained for the Cu(2) nuclei because the largest component  $V_{zz}$  of the axially symmetric electric-field gradient at the  $Cu(2)$  sites, defining the quantization direction, is parallel to the  $c$  axis. To determine  $W_{ab}$ , a nonvanishing magnetic field perpendicular to  $V_{zz}$  has to be applied. To keep the anisotropy effect of the applied magnetic field on  $T_c$  and relaxation possibly small, we studied the temperature dependence of r at rather low field of 0.58 T. <sup>A</sup> choice of appreciably lower fields is limited by the rapid deterioration of the signal to noise ratio  $S/N$  with decreasing field.  $S/N$ of the Zeeman splitted  $+1/2 \leftrightarrow -1/2$  resonance used in the experiment is proportional to the square of the applied field. Our measurements were performed on a caxis-oriented powdered sample imbedded in epoxy, with a random orientation of the  $a$  and  $b$  axis in the plane perpendicular to the c axis. The 1-2-4 powder used exhibits  $T_c = (81.0 \pm 0.5) K^{10}$ 

Since the quadrupole splitting of the Cu(2) nuclear spin levels is much larger than the Zeeman splitting for a small field, a special procedure is required to obtain the anisotropy of  $W^{2,7}$  For a weak magnetic field applied perpendicular to the  $c$  axis there is no obvious quantization axis, and therefore the relaxation of the Zeeman splitted  $+1/2 \longleftrightarrow -1/2$  resonance is caused by the inplane and the out-of-plane components of the fiuctuating hyperfine fields. For a spin- $\frac{3}{2}$  nucleus such as Cu(2), the magnetization recovery following an inversion pulse is described by

$$
M(t) = M(\infty) \left\{ 1 - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{3} \beta_k \exp\left(-\lambda_k W_c t\right) \right\} , \quad (1)
$$

where  $\sum \beta_k = 1$ . The  $\beta_k$  and  $\lambda_k$  are functions of the anisotropy  $r$  and of the ratio between the Zeeman  $\nu_L$  and the quadrupole frequency  $\nu_Q$ . In Fig. 1,  $\beta_k$  and  $\lambda_k$  are plotted as a function of r calculated for  $\nu_L = 6.44 \text{ MHz}$  $(B = 0.58$  T) and  $\nu_Q = 29.75$  MHz. Using the values of  $W_c$  as measured by NQR,<sup>11</sup> we fitted the magnetization recovery data by Eq. (1) to obtain  $\lambda$  and, hence, r.

Figure 2 shows the temperature dependence of the anisotropy ratio r measured in a low magnetic field  $B =$ 0.58 T (solid circles) and high magnetic field  $B = 5.17$  T (open circles). Within experimental errors of  $\pm 10\%$ , the weak field ratio  $r = 3.2$  in the normal conducting phase agrees with our previously reported high-field result  $r =$ 3.3.

Below  $T_c$ , both the high- and low-field r values decrease. While the high-field values level off around  $r =$ 2.2,<sup>8</sup> the low-field r passes a pronounced minimum at 55 K, increases again at lower temperatures and reaches at 30 K a value of 5.7. We did not continue our low-field measurements below 30 K because of an inhomogenious distribution of  $W_c$  seen in zero-field NQR arising most probably from extrinsic effects as disorder and impurities. Figure 3 compares our low field  $r$  values for 1-2-4



FIG. 1. Calculated r dependence of  $\beta_k$  and  $\lambda_k$  for  $\nu_L =$ 6.44 MHz ( $B = 0.58$  T) and  $\nu_Q = 29.75$  MHz.  $\beta_3$  is zero and not plotted.



FIG. 2. Temperature dependence of Cu(2) spin-lattice relaxation rate anisotropy  $r$  for YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>4</sub>O<sub>8</sub> in two different magnetic fields  $B = 0.58$  T ( $\bullet$ ) and  $B = 5.17$  T ( $\circ$ ).

with those of Takigawa, Smith, and  $Hulst<sup>7</sup>$  for 1-2-3. The arrows indicate the value of r above  $T_c$  for 1-2-4 and 1-2-3. The two sets of data are quite similar. However, the minimum of  $r$  in 1-2-4 seems to be deeper and is positioned about  $0.1T/T_c$  lower than in 1-2-3. The upturn of r with decreasing temperature is much more pronounced as compared to 1-2-3.

New explanations of the temperature dependence of  $r$  in the superconducting state have been presented recently by Bulut and Scalapino<sup>4,5</sup> and by  $Lu^6$  using a BCS pairing theory. Both groups use spin-singlet pairing and assume temperature-dependent energy-level broadening and include pair-creation and -annihilation terms in the calculation of the susceptibility. They also include an



FIG. 3. Cu(2) spin-lattice relaxation rate anisotropy  $r$ vs the reduced temperature  $T/T_c$  in a weak magnetic field:  $YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>4</sub>O<sub>8</sub>$  in  $B = 0.58$  T ( $\bullet$ ) and  $YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7</sub>$  in  $B = 0.44$  $\mathrm{T}$  ( $\Delta$ ) (Ref. 7).

anisotropic on-site and an isotropic transferred hyperfine coupling of the  $Cu(2)$  nuclei to  $Cu(2)$  electron spins. Figure 2 of Ref. 2 compares the theoretical results with experimental data for 1-2-3.

The sharp decrease of  $r$  just below  $T_c$  and its upturn at lower temperature is in qualitative agreement with these theories, which predict such a behavior as a result of nodes in the gap (d-wave pairing). In addition, the change of r close to the normal-to-superconducting transition reveals the importance of coherence factors.

However, our data for 1-2-4 exhibit just below  $T_c$  a much softer decrease of r; the derivative  $dr/dT$  is almost zero at  $T_c$ . It remains to be shown whether such a behavior can be reproduced by the above-mentioned theories. Thus, at present it cannot be decided whether our anisotropy data for 1-2-4 favor d-wave pairing or not. Theoretical calculations of  $r$  for 1-2-4 by Eremin and Markendor $f^{12}$  are in progress.

We now discuss the field dependence of the relaxation rate. We have measured  $W_{ab}$  and  $W_c$  in strong, weak and zero fields in an oriented powder sample. A summary of the temperature dependence of the absolute values is given in Fig. 4. The results normalized to the respective rate at  $T_c$  are plotted as a function of the reduced temperature  $T/T_c(B)$  in Figs. 5 and 6. The  $T_c$  values for a fixed field were derived from  $H_{c2}$  measurements done on a 1-2-4 single crystal by Bucher et  $al$ .<sup>13</sup>

We first note that  $W_c$  depends more strongly on the field than  $W_{ab}$  does. The field dependence increases with decreasing temperature. At  $T = 0.4T_c$  the highfield rate becomes about twice as large as the zero-field rate. A similar enhancement has been found in  $1-2-3$ .<sup>2</sup> On the other hand,  $W_{ab}$  exhibits quite a different behavior. Down to about T =  $0.7T_c$ , an applied field slightly



FIG. 4. Spin lattice relaxation rates vs temperature for  $Cu(2)$  for different magnetic fields and orientations. The triangles are for  $B \perp c$  and the circles for  $B \parallel c$ .



FIG. 5. Temperature dependence of the normalized Cu(2) spin-lattice relaxation rate  $W_c$  divided by  $T/T_c$  in  $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$  for  $B = 0$  T ( $\bullet$ ) and  $B = 5.17$  T ( $\circ$ ).

enhances the relaxation rate as previously observed in 1- 2-3.<sup>2,14</sup> However, below  $0.7T_c$  the enhancement gives way to a suppression that becomes more evident at lower temperatures. At  $0.35T_c$  the high 5.17-T field reduces  $W_{ab}$ to about 40% of the value measured in the low 0.58-T field. Such an unique field dependence is in contrast to the behavior of  $W_{ab}$  in 1-2-3.

The opposite response of  $W_{ab}$  and  $W_c$  to the application of a magnetic field seems to rule out the possibility that fluxoid cores or thermally activated fluxoid motions cause the field dependence as it has been discussed for 1- 2-3.<sup>2</sup> To account for the opposite response of  $W_{ab}$  and  $W_c$ an unexpected field-related breaking of the spin-rotation invariance in the superconducting state has to be considered. Finally, we want to stress the fact that in 1-2-4 the high field  $W_c$  is larger than the NQR rate from the lowest temperatures used in our experiment, up to  $T_c$  + 13 K (see Fig. 4). This is in contrast with a recent obser-



FIG. 6. Temperature dependence of the normalized Cu(2) spin-lattice relaxation rate  $W_{ab}$  divided by  $T/T_c$  in  $YBa_2Cu_4O_8$  for  $B = 0.58$  T ( $\bullet$ ) and  $B = 5.17$  T ( $\circ$ ).

vation by Borsa et  $al$ , <sup>14</sup> who found in the temperature region just above  $T_c$  an opposite behavior for 1-2-3 and  $La<sub>1.85</sub>Sr<sub>0.15</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub>.$ 

In conclusion, our new data for 1-2-4 and the comparison with results from 1-2-3 clearly show that at the moment there is no consistency with regard to the influence of an applied magnetic field on the planar copper spin-lattice relaxation rates in the superconducting state and the normal state just above  $T_c$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Schweizerischer Nationalfonds for partial support of this work.

- <sup>1</sup>S.E. Barrett, J.A. Martindale, D.J. Durand, C.H. Pennington, C.P. Slichter, T.A. Friedmann, J.P. Rice, and D.M. Ginsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 108 (1991).
- <sup>2</sup>J.A. Martindale, S.E. Barrett, C.A. Klug, K.E. O'Hara, S.M. DeSoto, C.P. Slichter, T.A. Friedmann, and D.M. Ginsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 702 (1992).
- <sup>3</sup>A.J. Millis, H. Monien, and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. B 42, 167 (1990).
- $4N.$  Bulut and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B 45, 2371 (1992).
- <sup>5</sup>N. Bulut and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 706 (1992).
- $6$ .P. Lu, Mod. Phys. Lett. B 6, 547 (1992).
- M. Takigawa, J.L. Smith, and W.L. Hulst, Phys. Rev. B 44, 7764 (1991).
- <sup>8</sup>H. Zimmermann, M. Mali, M. Bankay, and D. Brinkmann, Physics C 185-189, 1145 (1991).
- <sup>9</sup>C.H. Pennington, D.J. Durand, C.P. Slichter, J.P. Rice, E.D. Bukowski, and D.M. Ginsberg, Phys. Rev. B 39, 2902 (1989).
- ${}^{10}$ D. Zech (private communication).
- <sup>11</sup>H. Zimmermann, M. Mali, D. Brinkmann, J. Karpinski, E. Kaldis, and S. Rusiecki, Physica C 159, 681 (1989).
- $12$ M. Eremin and R. Markendorf (private communication).
- <sup>13</sup>B. Bucher, J. Karpinski, E. Kaldis, and P. Wachter, Physica C 167, 324 (1990).
- <sup>14</sup>F. Borsa, A. Rigamonti, M. Corti, J. Ziolo, O. Hyun, and D.R. Torgeson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 698 (1992).