# Evidence for Kosterlitz-Thouless and three-dimensional *XY* critical behavior in  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$

S. Weyeneth<sup>\*</sup> and T. Schneider

*Physik-Institut der Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland*

E. Giannini

*DPMC, University of Geneva, 24 Quai Ernest-Ansermet, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland* (Received 6 February 2009; revised manuscript received 17 April 2009; published 4 June 2009)

We present reversible magnetization data of a high-quality  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  single crystal and explore the occurrence of three-dimensional  $(3D)$ -*xy* critical behavior close to the bulk-transition temperature  $T_c$  and of Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) behavior. Below and above the presumed Kosterlitz-Thouless transition temperature *T*<sub>KT</sub> we observe the characteristic two-dimensional (2D)-*xy* behavior: a downward shift in the crossing point phenomenon toward  $T_{KT}$  as the field is decreased and sufficiently below  $T_{KT}$  the characteristic 2D-*xy* relationship between the magnetization and the in-plane magnetic penetration depth  $\lambda_{ab}$ . In contrast, the measured temperature dependence of the superfluid density does not exhibit the characteristic KT behavior around the presumed *T*KT. The absence of this feature is traced back to the 2D- to 3D-*xy* crossover setting in around and above  $T_{\text{KT}}$ . Invoking the Maxwell relation, the anomalous field dependence of the specific-heat peak is also traced back to the intermediate 2D-*xy* behavior. However, close to  $T_c$  we observe consistency with 3D-*xy* critical behavior in agreement with measurements of  $\lambda_{ab}$ .

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.79.214504](http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.79.214504)

PACS number(s): 74.72. - h, 74.25. Bt, 74.25. Dw

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The study of thermal fluctuations received a considerable impetus from the discovery of the cuprate superconductors[.1](#page-7-1)[–6](#page-7-2) It was realized that in these materials the critical regime where thermal fluctuations dominate can be attained and that some of them are in addition quasi-twodimensional  $(2D)$ .<sup>[7](#page-7-3)</sup> Furthermore, the systematics of the superconducting properties uncovered that the anisotropy is further enhanced with underdoping. $2.7$  In this quasi-2D limit one expects the thermodynamic properties to be close to those of a two-dimensional superconductor, or more precisely of a stack of decoupled two-dimensional superconducting sheets. Although approximate treatments have been invoked to describe the thermodynamic properties of such materials, the essential ingredient, the Kosterlitz-Thouless  $(KT)$  behavior of the associated zero-field transition,<sup>8</sup> has mostly not been taken into account. $9-11$  $9-11$  Only recently, this behavior was incorporated by combining Kosterlitz-Thouless renormalization group flows and explicit computations for plasmas[.12](#page-7-8) On this basis the field and temperature dependences of the magnetization density,  $m(H_c, T)$ , for temperatures *T* near to and below the KT transition temperature  $T_{\text{KT}}$ were determined for magnetic fields  $H_c$  applied perpendicular to the superconducting sheet. These results are interesting on three immediate fronts. First, the resulting trends in the magnetization appear to emerge from the recent  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  data of Li *et al.*<sup>[13](#page-7-9)</sup> for underdoped and optimally doped samples. Second, by contrast evidence for smeared three-dimensional (3D)-xy behavior stems from the measured temperature dependence of the in-plane magnetic penetration depth  $\lambda_{ab}$ .<sup>[14–](#page-7-10)[17](#page-7-11)</sup> Third, the magnetic field dependence of the specific-heat peak exhibits, opposite to the generic behavior, $4,6$  $4,6$  a shift to higher temperatures with increasing field strength[.18](#page-7-13)

In this study we present reversible magnetization data of a  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  single crystal and explore the evidence for

intermediate KT-2D-*xy*- and 3D-*xy* critical behavior. Below *T*=89.5 K $\simeq$  *T*<sub>KT</sub> we observe consistency with the KT behavior in terms of the characteristic  $m \propto \ln(H_c)$  dependence at fixed temperature. Furthermore, invoking the Maxwell relation  $\partial^2 M / \partial T^2 |_{H_c} = \partial (C/T) / \partial H_c |_{T}$  the anomalous field dependence of the specific heat peak is also traced back to 2D-*xy* behavior. However, close to the bulk-transition temperature  $T_c \approx 91.21$  K we observe consistency with 3D-*xy* critical behavior, consistent with previous measurements of the inplane magnetic penetration depth  $\lambda_{ab}$ <sup>[14,](#page-7-10)[16](#page-7-14)[,17](#page-7-11)</sup> In Sec. [II](#page-0-0) we sketch the theoretical background including the scaling relations for 2D- and 3D-*xy* critical behavior. Section [III](#page-1-0) is devoted to the experimental details, and in Sec. [IV](#page-2-0) we present the analysis of the data uncovering the evidence for 2D-*xy* and 3D-*xy* critical behavior in the respective temperature regimes. We close with a brief summary and some discussion.

#### **II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

<span id="page-0-0"></span>When thermal fluctuations dominate and the coupling to the charge is negligible a bulk superconductor is expected to exhibit sufficiently close to  $T_c$  3D-*xy* critical behavior. In this case the magnetization per unit volume,  $m=M/V$ , adopts the scaling form $2-6,19$  $2-6,19$ 

<span id="page-0-1"></span>
$$
\frac{m}{TH_c^{1/2}} = -\frac{Q^{\pm}k_B\xi_{ab}}{\Phi_0^{3/2}\xi_c}F^{\pm}(z), \quad F^{\pm}(z) = z^{-1/2}\frac{dG^{\pm}}{dz},
$$
\n
$$
z = x^{-1/2\nu} = \frac{(\xi_{ab0}^{\pm})^2|t|^{-2\nu}H_c}{\Phi_0}.
$$
\n(1)

In this form  $Q^{\pm}$  is a universal constant and  $G^{\pm}(z)$  is a universal scaling function of its argument, with  $G^{\pm}(z=0)=1$ . In addition  $\gamma = \xi_{ab}/\xi_c$  denotes the anisotropy,  $\xi_{ab}$  the zero-field in-plane correlation length, and  $H_c$  the magnetic field applied along the *c* axis. In terms of the variable *x* the scaling form

[Eq. ([1](#page-0-1))] is similar to Prange's result for Gaussian fluctuations.<sup>20</sup> Approaching  $T_c$  the correlation lengths diverges as

$$
\xi_{ab,c} = \xi_{ab0,c0}^{\pm} |t|^{-\nu}, \quad t = T/T_c - 1, \quad \pm = \text{sgn}(t).
$$
 (2)

Supposing that 3D-*xy* fluctuations dominate the critical exponents are given  $by<sup>21</sup>$ 

$$
\nu \approx 0.671 \approx 2/3, \quad \alpha = 2 - 3\nu \approx -0.013, \tag{3}
$$

and there are the universal critical amplitude relations<sup> $2-4,19,21$  $2-4,19,21$  $2-4,19,21$  $2-4,19,21$ </sup>

$$
\frac{\xi_{ab0}}{\xi_{ab0}^+} = \frac{\xi_{c0}}{\xi_{c0}^+} \approx 2.21, \quad \frac{Q^-}{Q^+} \approx 11.5, \quad \frac{A^+}{A^-} = 1.07, \quad (4)
$$

<span id="page-1-9"></span><span id="page-1-8"></span>and

$$
A^{-} \xi_{a0} \xi_{b0} \xi_{c0} \simeq A^{-} (\xi_{ab0}^{-})^{2} \xi_{c0}^{-} = \frac{A^{-} (\xi_{ab0}^{-})^{3}}{\gamma} = (R^{-})^{3},
$$
  

$$
R^{-} \simeq 0.815, \tag{5}
$$

where  $A^{\pm}$  is the critical amplitude of the specific-heat singularity, defined as

$$
c = \frac{C}{Vk_B} = \frac{A^{\pm}}{\alpha} |t|^{-\alpha} + B,\tag{6}
$$

where *B* denotes the background. The anisotropy is then characterized in terms of

$$
\gamma = \frac{\xi_{ab}}{\xi_c} = \frac{\xi_{ab0}^+}{\xi_{c0}^+}.\tag{7}
$$

<span id="page-1-5"></span>Furthermore, in the 3D-*xy* universality class  $T_c$ ,  $\xi_{c0}$  and the critical amplitude of the in-plane magnetic penetration depth  $\lambda_{ab}$  are not independent but are related by the universal relation, $2-4,19$  $2-4,19$  $2-4,19$ 

$$
k_B T_c = \frac{\Phi_0^2}{16\pi^3} \frac{\xi_{c0}^2}{\lambda_{ab0}^2} = \frac{\Phi_0^2}{16\pi^3} \frac{\xi_{ab0}^2}{\gamma \lambda_{ab0}^2}.
$$
 (8)

<span id="page-1-7"></span>The existence of the magnetization at  $T_c$  of the magnetic penetration depth below  $T_c$  and of the magnetic susceptibility above  $T_c$  implies the following asymptotic forms of the scaling function, $2-4,19$  $2-4,19$  $2-4,19$ 

<span id="page-1-3"></span>
$$
Q^{\pm} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z}} \left. \frac{dG^{\pm}}{dz} \right|_{z \to \infty} = Q^{\pm} c_{\infty}^{\pm},
$$
  
\n
$$
Q^{-} \left. \frac{dG^{-}}{dz} \right|_{z \to 0} = Q^{-} c_{0}^{-} (\ln z + c_{1}),
$$
  
\n
$$
Q^{+} \frac{1}{z} \left. \frac{dG^{+}}{dz} \right|_{z \to 0} = Q^{+} c_{0}^{+},
$$
  
\n(9)

with the universal coefficients

<span id="page-1-4"></span>
$$
Q^-c_0^- \simeq -0.7
$$
,  $Q^+c_0^+ \simeq 0.9$ ,  $Q^{\pm}c_{\infty}^{\pm} \simeq 0.5$ ,  $c_1 \simeq 1.76$ . (10)

Noting that  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  is highly anisotropic ( $\gamma$  $\geq 1$ ,<sup>[22](#page-7-18)</sup> the system is expected to exhibit away from *T<sub>c</sub>* 2D-*xy* 

behavior. A characteristic property of 2D-superconductors emerges from the magnetic field dependence of the magnetization. Sufficiently below the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition temperature  $T_{KT}$  the magnetization is given by<sup>12</sup>

<span id="page-1-1"></span>
$$
m = -\frac{\pi \rho_s(T)}{2d\Phi_0} \left( 1 - \frac{k_B T}{\pi \rho_s(T)} \right) \ln \left( \frac{\Phi_0}{4\pi H_c a_0^2 \gamma_3} \right)
$$

$$
= -\left( \frac{\Phi_0}{32\pi^2 \lambda_{ab}^2(T)} - \frac{k_B T}{d\Phi_0} \right) \ln \left( \frac{\Phi_0}{4\pi H_c a_0^2 \gamma_3} \right), \qquad (11)
$$

where  $\rho_s$  is the 2D superfluid density, related to the in-plane magnetic penetration depth  $\lambda_{ab}$  via

$$
\rho_s(T) = \frac{d\Phi_0^2}{16\pi^3 \lambda_{ab}^2(T)}.
$$
\n(12)

Here *d* is the thickness of the independent superconducting sheets,  $\gamma_3$  is a parameter that vanishes as *T* approaches  $T_{\text{KT}}$ , and  $a_0$  is the microscopic short-distance cutoff length. Moreover,  $\rho_s(T_{\text{KT}})$  and  $T_{\text{KT}}$  are related by

$$
\rho_s(T_{\rm KT}) = \frac{2}{\pi} k_B T_{\rm KT},\tag{13}
$$

<span id="page-1-6"></span>while  $\rho_s(T)=0$  above  $T_{\text{KT}}$ . Below this universal Nelson-Kosterlitz jump  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T)$  increases as<sup>23[,24](#page-7-20)</sup>

$$
\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{\rm KT})/\lambda_{ab}^2(T) = \frac{T}{T_{\rm KT}} [1 + \hat{b}(T_{\rm KT} - T)^{1/2}].
$$
 (14)

<span id="page-1-2"></span>Note that Eq.  $(11)$  $(11)$  $(11)$  gives a simple relation between the superfluid density and the derivative of the magnetization, namely,

$$
\frac{dm}{d \ln(H_c)} = g(T) = \frac{\Phi_0}{32\pi^2 \lambda_{ab}^2(T)} - \frac{k_B T}{d\Phi_0}.
$$
 (15)

Furthermore, at criticality *m* depends on *H* in terms of<sup>12</sup>

$$
m = -\frac{k_B T_{\text{KT}}}{d\Phi_0} \ln \left( \gamma_1 \ln \frac{\Phi_0}{4 \pi H_c a_0^2 \gamma_2} \right),\tag{16}
$$

where  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are constants. Correspondingly, plots of *M* vs *T* at different fields should then exhibit a systematic drift of the "crossing phenomenon." Above  $T<sub>KT</sub>$  and for asymptotically small fields the magnetization is given by $12,30,31$  $12,30,31$  $12,30,31$ 

<span id="page-1-10"></span>
$$
m \simeq -\frac{k_B T}{2d\Phi_0^2} \xi_{ab}^2 H_c, \quad \xi_{ab} = \xi_{ab0} \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{b}}{(T/T_{\text{KT}} - 1)^{1/2}}\right),\tag{17}
$$

where  $\xi_{ab}$  is the Kosterlitz-Thouless correlation length.<sup>8</sup> The parameters  $\tilde{b}$  and  $\hat{b}$ , determining the temperature dependence of the magnetic penetration depth below the jump  $[Eq. (14)],$  $[Eq. (14)],$  $[Eq. (14)],$ are related by $24$ 

$$
\tilde{b}\hat{b} = \pi/(2T_{\text{KT}}^{1/2}) \approx 0.17 \text{ K}^{-1/2}.
$$
 (18)

#### **III. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS**

<span id="page-1-11"></span><span id="page-1-0"></span>Single crystals of  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  were grown with the floating zone (FZ) method, from direct crystallization from

<span id="page-2-1"></span>

FIG. 1. (Color online) Temperature dependence of the measured reversible magnetic moment of the studied  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  single crystal at various magnetic fields applied along the *c* axis. The inset depicts susceptibility measurements in 1 Oe in the ZFC and FC mode. The sharp onset of superconductivity points to a transition temperature close to  $T_c \approx 91.2$  K.

the melt (no solvent used). The feed rod was obtained from a commercial  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  powder after pressing and sintering to a shape of 7 cm in length and about 7 mm in diameter. The seed rod was made with a previously crystallized rod. After a first fast FZ melting at a rate of 24 mm/h in Ar, the crystal growth was performed at a slow rate of 0.2 mm/h in a  $7\%$  O<sub>2</sub>-93% Ar atmosphere, while both rods were counter-rotating at 18 rpm. The FZ growth was performed in a commercial two-mirror vertical furnace (from Cyberstar), equipped with two 1000 W halogen lamps. The growth conditions at the flat zone interface were kept stable for several days. A review of the growth technique can be found elsewhere. $25$  The as-grown crystals were easily cleaved from the crystallized boule and annealed at *T* = 500 °C for 50 h in 0.1% O<sub>2</sub>-99.9% Ar in order to tune and homogenize the oxygen content corresponding to the optimal doping level. Crystals with typical size of 1–5 mm and thickness of 0.05–0.1 mm could be extracted. The good crystalline quality of the samples was checked by x-ray diffraction and magnetic susceptibility measurements.

The Bi<sub>2</sub>Sr<sub>2</sub>CaCu<sub>2</sub>O<sub>8+ $\delta$ </sub> sample used in this work, a *V*  $\approx$ 4.6 $\times$ 10<sup>-5</sup> cm<sup>3</sup> single crystal, was chosen by its sharp low-field Meissner transition from several high-quality single crystals. The magnetization was measured in a magnetic property measurement system (MPMS) XL from Quantum Design, equipped with a reciprocating sample option. The inset in Fig. [1](#page-2-1) shows the measured susceptibility at *H<sub>c</sub>*  $= 1$  Oe applied along the *c* axis. It reveals a rather sharp transition at  $T_c \approx 91.2$  K and a well-saturated Meissner state, pointing to excellent quality. The volume of the sample was estimated by susceptibility measurements below  $T_c$  in the Meissner state with a magnetic field applied along the *ab* plane to minimize demagnetization effects. The extracted volume of  $V \approx 4.6 \times 10^{-5}$  cm<sup>3</sup> compares well with that estimated with an optical microscope. Figure [1](#page-2-1) summarizes the

<span id="page-2-2"></span>

FIG. 2. (Color online)  $M/H_c^{1/2}$  vs *T* yielding the estimate  $T_c$  $\simeq$ 91.21 K in terms of the crossing point at  $M/H_c^{1/2}$  ≈ -2.13  $× 10^{-7}$  emuOe<sup>-1/2</sup>.

measured temperature dependence of the magnetic moment at fields ranging from 25– 15 000 Oe applied along the *c* axis. After applying the magnetic field, well below  $T_c$  it was kept constant and the magnetic moment of the single crystal was measured at a stabilized temperature by moving the sample with a frequency of 0.5 Hz through a set of detection coils. The reversible superconducting diamagnetic magnetization,  $M = mV$ , was then obtained by comparing field-cooled (FC) and zero-field-cooled (ZFC) data. Due to a substantial pinning contribution at low magnetic field we omitted data below 25 Oe. A temperature-dependent normal-state paramagnetic background was subtracted.

### **IV. DATA ANALYSIS**

<span id="page-2-0"></span>We are now prepared to analyze the magnetization data. To estimate the bulk  $T_c$  we invoke Eqs. ([1](#page-0-1)), ([9](#page-1-3)), and ([10](#page-1-4)), revealing that the plot  $m/H^{1/2}_{\text{L}\text{C}}$  vs *T* should exhibit a crossing point at  $T_c$ . Here  $m/(TH_c^{1/2})$  adopts with Eq. ([7](#page-1-5)) the value  $m/(T_c H_c^{1/2}) = -0.5 k_B \gamma \Phi_0^{-3/2}$ . According to Fig. [2,](#page-2-2) showing  $M/H_c^{1/2}$  vs *T* there is a crossing point at  $T_c \approx 91.21$  K where *M*<sub>/</sub> $H_c^{1/2}$  ≈ −2.13 × 10<sup>-7</sup> emuOe<sup>-1/2</sup>. With *V* ≈ 4.6  $\times 10^{-5}$  cm<sup>3</sup>, where  $m=M/V$ , it yields for the anisotropy [Eq.  $(7)$  $(7)$  $(7)$ ] the estimate,

$$
\gamma = \xi_{ab0} / \xi_{c0} \simeq 69,\tag{19}
$$

<span id="page-2-3"></span>compared to  $\gamma \approx 133$  for an underdoped sample with  $T_c$  $\simeq$  84.2 K and in reasonable agreement with earlier estimates for optimally doped samples.<sup>22[,26](#page-7-24)</sup> Given this rather large anisotropy the 2D- to 3D-*xy* crossover is expected to occur rather close to the bulk  $T_c$ .

A characteristic feature of a 2D superconductor is the crossing phenomenon occurring at fixed magnetic fields and above  $T_{\text{KT}}$  in the plot *M* vs  $T^{2,12}$  $T^{2,12}$  $T^{2,12}$  $T^{2,12}$  A glance at Fig. [3](#page-3-0) reveals that this phenomenon is well confirmed above  $T=89.5$  K  $\simeq T_{\text{KT}}$ . Indeed, there is as predicted a downward shift in the

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

FIG. 3. (Color online)  $M$  vs  $T$  at various magnetic fields exhibiting a crossing phenomenon shifting toward  $T_{KT} \approx 89.5$  K from above as the field is decreased.

"crossing point" toward  $T_{KT}$  from above as the field is decreased.<sup>12</sup> The same behavior was also observed in the highly anisotropic Tl-1223, Bi-2201, and underdoped La2−*x*Sr*x*CuO4 single crystals[.2](#page-7-4)[,27–](#page-7-25)[29](#page-7-26)

To substantiate 2D-*xy* behavior further we invoke Eq. ([11](#page-1-1)) in terms of the plot  $M$  vs  $H_c$  shown in Fig. [4.](#page-3-1) The solid lines in Fig. [4](#page-3-1)(a) indicate that sufficiently below  $T_{\text{KT}} \approx 89.5$  K the 2D relation  $[Eq. (15)]$  $[Eq. (15)]$  $[Eq. (15)]$  between the superfluid density and the derivative of the magnetization with respect to the logarithm of the field is for small fields well obeyed, so in this temperature regime the system indeed behaves as a stack of essentially decoupled two-dimensional Kosterlitz-Thouless films with  $T_{\text{KT}} \approx 89.5$  K. However, close to the bulk  $T_c$  $\approx$ 91.21 K one expects 3D-*xy* critical behavior. In this case and in the magnetic field range considered here the limit *z*  $\rightarrow \infty$  is then approached. Here Eqs. ([1](#page-0-1)), ([9](#page-1-3)), and ([10](#page-1-4)) imply the limiting behavior

$$
m = -\frac{Q^+ c_{\infty}^+ k_B \xi_{ab} T}{\Phi_0^{3/2} \xi_c} H_c^{1/2} \simeq -\frac{0.5 k_B \xi_{ab}^+ T}{2 \Phi_0^{3/2} \xi_{c0}^+} H_c^{1/2}.
$$
 (20)

<span id="page-3-2"></span>Figure [4](#page-3-1)(b), depicting *M* vs  $H_c$  close to  $T_c \approx 91.21$  K at *T*= 91, 91.25, and 91.5 K, shows that this expectation is well confirmed. According to this, approaching  $T_c$  the system undergoes a 2D- to 3D-*xy* crossover. It implies that the characteristic 2D-*xy* critical behavior, including the jump of the superfluid density at  $T_{\text{KT}}$  [Eqs. ([13](#page-1-6)) and ([14](#page-1-2))], is removed.

To clarify this point we invoke Eq.  $(11)$  $(11)$  $(11)$  to determine the temperature dependence of  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2$  sufficiently below  $T_{\text{KT}}$ . Setting  $M(H_c, T) = f(T) + g(T) \cdot \ln(H_c)$ ,  $g(T)$  is then given by Eq.  $(15)$  $(15)$  $(15)$  and follows from plots as shown in Fig.  $4(a)$  $4(a)$ in terms of the slope of the straight lines. For  $d=30$  Å we obtain for  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T)$  the data points shown in Fig. [5.](#page-4-0) For comparison we included the *ab*-plane microwave surface impedance data of Lee *et al.*[15](#page-7-27) for a high-quality  $Bi<sub>2</sub>Sr<sub>2</sub>CaCu<sub>2</sub>O<sub>8</sub>$  single crystal, plotted in terms of the superfluid density, assuming  $\lambda_{ab}(0) = 1350$  Å. Sufficiently below

<span id="page-3-1"></span>

FIG. 4. (Color online)  $M$  vs  $H_c$  at various fixed temperatures. (a) From *T*=82 to 90.7 K. The straight lines indicate the characteristic 2D relation between the superfluid density and the derivative of the magnetization with respect to the logarithm of the field  $[Eq. (15)],$  $[Eq. (15)],$  $[Eq. (15)],$ valid in the low-field regime as long as pinning contributions are negligible. (b) *M* vs  $H_c$  at *T*=91, 91.25, and 91.5 K. The solid line is  $M = -2.13 \times 10^{-7} \cdot H_c^{1/2}$  emu indicating the characteristic 3D-*xy* behavior at  $T_c$  in terms of Eq. ([20](#page-3-2)).

*T*KT we observe reasonable agreement with the 2D-*xy* prediction ( $\bullet$ ) and the measured  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T)$  ( $\blacksquare$ ). Accordingly, in this regime the expulsion of vortices from the KT phase dominates. Here we also observe consistency with the characteristic KT behavior indicted by the dash-dot-dot line Eq. ([14](#page-1-2))]. However, around  $T_{\text{KT}}$ , indicated by the horizontal and KT lines, the measured  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T)$  does not exhibit any evidence for the characteristic jump from  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{\text{KT}})$  to zero for  $T>T_{\text{KT}}$ . In contrast agreement with the leading 3D-*xy* critical behavior is observed (solid line), revealing the removal of the characteristic jump in  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T)$  at  $T_{KT}$  due to the 2Dto 3D-*xy* crossover. To explore the effect of the 3D-*xy* fluctuations further, we use the critical amplitude,  $1/\lambda_{ab0}^2 = 5$ 

<span id="page-4-0"></span>

FIG. 5. (Color online)  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T)$  vs *T*.  $\bullet$ : derived from the mag-netization with the aid of Eq. ([11](#page-1-1)) rewritten as  $M(H_c, T) = f(T)$  $+g(T) \cdot \ln(H_c)$  and  $d=30$  Å; **.** experimental data derived from Lee *et al.* (Ref. [15](#page-7-27)) with  $\lambda_{ab}(T=0) = 1350$  Å. The solid line is  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T) = 1/\lambda_{ab0}^2(1 - T/T_c)^{2/3}$  with  $1/\lambda_{ab0}^2 = 5 \times 10^9$  cm<sup>-2</sup> and  $T_c$ = 91.21 K indicating 3D-*xy* critical behavior. The dashed line is the KT-line  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T) = 3.64 \times 10^6 \cdot T$  cm<sup>-2</sup> [Eq. ([13](#page-1-6))], the dotted one  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T_{\text{KT}}) = 3.26 \times 10^8$  cm<sup>-2</sup> with  $T_{\text{KT}} = 89.5$  K, and the dash-dot-dot one is Eq. ([14](#page-1-2)) with  $\hat{b} \approx 1 \text{ K}^{-1/2}$ .

 $\times 10^{9}$  cm<sup>-2</sup> and  $T_c$ =91.21 K to obtain from the universal relation  $[Eq. (8)]$  $[Eq. (8)]$  $[Eq. (8)]$  the estimate

$$
\xi_{c0} \simeq 2.9 \text{ \AA} \tag{21}
$$

for the amplitude of the *c*-axis correlation length. The occurrence of 3D-*xy* critical behavior then requires that  $\xi_c(T)$  $=\xi_{c0}$   $|t|^{-2/3}$  exceeds *d* considerably, yielding with *d*=30 Å and  $T_c$ = 91.21 K for the onset of 3D fluctuations the lower bound *T*90.24 K. Furthermore, around and above *T*  $= 91$  K the 3D-*xy* critical regime is attained [see Fig. [4](#page-3-1)(b)]. So the occurrence of KT behavior in  $1/\lambda_{ab}^2(T)$  is restricted to temperatures below  $T_{\text{KT}} \approx 89.5$  K.

On the other hand, the small amplitude of the *c*-axis correlation length leads with  $\gamma = 69$  [Eq. ([19](#page-2-3))] to a rather large amplitude of the in-plane correlation length,  $\xi_{ab0} = \gamma \xi_{c0}$  $\approx$  200 Å and with the universal relation [Eq. ([5](#page-1-8))] to a very small amplitude of the specific-heat singularity,

$$
A^{-} = \frac{0.815^3}{\gamma^2 (\xi_{c0})^3} \approx 4.7 \times 10^{-6} \text{ Å}^{-3},\tag{22}
$$

in comparison with  $A^{-}$   $\approx$  6.8  $\times$  10<sup>-4</sup> Å<sup>-3</sup> in optimally doped YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7- $\delta$ </sub> and 1.7 × 10<sup>-3</sup> Å<sup>-3</sup> in <sup>4</sup>He.<sup>2</sup> This small critical amplitude renders it difficult to observe 3D-*xy* critical behavior in the specific heat of  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}^{18}$  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}^{18}$  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}^{18}$ 

Considering Eqs.  $(1)$  $(1)$  $(1)$ ,  $(9)$  $(9)$  $(9)$ , and  $(10)$  $(10)$  $(10)$  consistency with 3D-*xy* critical behavior also requires that the data scale below  $T_c$  as

<span id="page-4-1"></span>

FIG. 6. (Color online)  $-|t|^{-2/3}M/T$  vs  $H_c|t|^{-4/3}$  for  $T < T_c$  at various applied magnetic fields. The solid line is Eq.  $(25)$  $(25)$  $(25)$  and the dashed one Eq.  $(26)$  $(26)$  $(26)$ .

<span id="page-4-2"></span>
$$
|t|^{-2/3}\frac{m}{T} = -\frac{Q^{-}c_{0}^{-}k_{B}}{\Phi_{0}\xi_{c0}} \left[ \ln\left(\frac{(\xi_{ab0}^{-})^{2}}{\Phi_{0}}H_{c}|t|^{-4/3}\right) + c_{1} \right], \quad z \to 0,
$$
\n(23)

and

$$
|t|^{-2/3}\frac{m}{T} = -\frac{Q^{-}c_{\infty}^{-}k_{B}\xi_{ab0}}{\Phi_{0}^{3/2}\xi_{c0}}(H_{c}|t|^{-4/3})^{1/2}, \quad z \to \infty,
$$
 (24)

<span id="page-4-3"></span>respectively. In Fig. [6](#page-4-1) we plot  $-|t|^{-2/3}M/T$  vs  $H_c|t|^{-4/3}$  for *T*  $T_c$  at various applied magnetic fields. The solid line is Eq.  $(23)$  $(23)$  $(23)$  in terms of

<span id="page-4-5"></span>
$$
-|t|^{-2/3}\frac{M}{T} = -3.32 \times 10^{-6} [\ln(H_c|t|^{-4/3}) - 11.23] \text{ (emuK}^{-1}),
$$
\n(25)

and the dashed one

$$
-|t|^{-2/3}\frac{M}{T} = 2.3 \times 10^{-9} (H_c|t|^{-4/3})^{1/2} \text{ (emuK}^{-1)} \qquad (26)
$$

<span id="page-4-4"></span>corresponds to the limit [Eq. ([24](#page-4-3))]. While the  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \propto z$  $\rightarrow \infty$  limiting behavior (dashed curve) is well confirmed we observe with decreasing *z* substantial deviations from the data collapse on a single curve.

From Eq. ([26](#page-4-4)) we derive with  $V=4.6\times10^{-5}$  cm<sup>3</sup>, where  $m = M/V$ , the estimate

$$
\gamma = \xi_{ab0} / \xi_{c0} \simeq 68, \tag{27}
$$

in reasonable agreement with  $\gamma = \xi_{ab0}^{\gamma} / \xi_{cQ}^{\gamma} \approx 69$  [Eq. ([19](#page-2-3))], derived from the crossing point in  $\ddot{M}/H_c^{1/2}$  vs *T* shown in Fig. [2.](#page-2-2) The apparent failure of 3D-*xy* scaling outside the limit  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \propto z \rightarrow \infty$  is then attributable to the 3D- to 2D-*xy* crossover. In particular, very small magnetic fields would be required to attain the limit  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \propto z \to 0$  with reduced temperatures *t* in the range where 3D-*xy* fluctuations dominate.

<span id="page-5-0"></span>

FIG. 7. (Color online)  $-|t|^{-2/3}M/T$  vs  $H_c|t|^{-4/3}$  for  $T>T_c$  at various applied magnetic fields. The solid line is Eq.  $(30)$  $(30)$  $(30)$  and the dashed one Eq.  $(31)$  $(31)$  $(31)$ .

Indeed, given our evidence for 2D-*xy* behavior above  $T_{KT}$  $\simeq$  89.5 K in terms of the crossing phenomenon (Fig. [3](#page-3-0)) and 3D-*xy* critical behavior above  $T=91$  K [Fig. [4](#page-3-1)(b)], transforming to  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} = 2 \times 10^6$  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} = 2 \times 10^6$  Oe for  $H_c = 600$  Oe. Figure 6 reveals that below this value pronounced deviations from the expected data collapse occur, so in this regime 3D-*xy* scaling fails because 3D fluctuations no longer dominate. Nevertheless, at much lower fields the limit  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \propto z \to 0$  should be attainable, leading to the asymptotic behavior indicated by the solid line  $[Eq. (25)]$  $[Eq. (25)]$  $[Eq. (25)]$  in Fig. [6.](#page-4-1)

Noting again that the occurrence of 3D behavior requires that the *c*-axis correlation length  $\xi_c = \xi_c^{\pm} |t|^{-2/3}$  exceeds the interlayer spacing *d* it is clear that the 3D- to 2D-*xy* crossover is not restricted to temperatures below  $T_c$ . Given the universal ratio  $\xi_{c0}^+ \simeq \xi_{c0}^-/2.21$  [Eq. ([4](#page-1-9))] it even follows that above  $T_c$  the 3D-*xy* critical regime is even much narrower. Considering then the limits  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \propto z \to 0$  and  $z \to \infty$  above  $T_c$ , Eqs. ([1](#page-0-1)), ([9](#page-1-3)), and ([10](#page-1-4)) yield the scaling forms

$$
|t|^{-2/3}\frac{m}{T} = -\frac{Q^+c_0^+k_B(\xi_{ab0})^2}{\Phi_0^2\xi_{c0}}H_c|t|^{-4/3}, \quad z \to 0 \tag{28}
$$

<span id="page-5-1"></span>and

$$
|t|^{-2/3}\frac{m}{T} = -\frac{Q^+c_{\infty}^+ k_B \xi_{ab0}^+}{\Phi_0^{3/2} \xi_{c0}^+} (H_c|t|^{-4/3})^{1/2}, \quad z \to \infty.
$$
 (29)

<span id="page-5-2"></span>In Fig. [7](#page-5-0) we depicted  $-|t|^{-2/3}M/T$  vs  $H_c|t|^{-4/3}$  for  $T>T_c$  at various applied magnetic fields. The solid line is Eq. ([28](#page-5-1)) in terms of

$$
-|t|^{-2/3}M/T = 2 \times 10^{-13}H_c|t|^{-4/3} \text{ (emuK}^{-1)} \qquad (30)
$$

<span id="page-5-4"></span>and the dashed one

$$
-|t|^{-2/3}M/T = 2.3 \times 10^{-9} (H_c|t|^{-4/3})^{1/2} \text{ (emuK}^{-1}), \quad (31)
$$

<span id="page-5-3"></span>corresponding to the limit  $[Eq. (29)]$  $[Eq. (29)]$  $[Eq. (29)]$ . Note that Eqs.  $(26)$  $(26)$  $(26)$  and ([31](#page-5-3)) fully agree with each other and with that confirm  $Q^+ c_{\infty}^+ = Q^- c_{\infty}^-$  [Eq. ([10](#page-1-4))]. In analogy to Fig. [6](#page-4-1) we observe that

<span id="page-5-5"></span>

FIG. 8. (Color online)  $-M/(TH_c^{1/2})$  vs  $|t|H_c^{-3/4}$  at various applied magnetic fields. The dashed line is Eq.  $(31)$  $(31)$  $(31)$ .

the  $z \rightarrow \infty$  limiting behavior is well confirmed, while substantial deviations from a data collapse on a single curve set in for  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \le 2 \times 10^6$  Oe. Here the crossover to 2D-*xy* behavior sets in and 3D-*xy* scaling fails. Nevertheless, in the limit  $H_c \rightarrow 0$  and reduced temperatures *t* in the range where 3D-*xy* fluctuations dominate, the limit  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \propto z \rightarrow 0$ should be attainable. It is indicated by the solid line Eq.  $(30)$  $(30)$  $(30)$ ] in Fig. [7.](#page-5-0)

According to Eq.  $(1)$  $(1)$  $(1)$  one expects that the data plotted as  $M/(TH_c^{1/2})$  vs  $|t|H_c^{-3/4}$  should fall on two branches. An upper branch corresponding to  $T > T_c$  and a lower one for  $T < T_c$ . A glance at Fig. [8,](#page-5-5) depicting this plot clearly reveals the flow to 3D-*xy* critical behavior by approaching  $T_c$  ( $|t|=0$ ) and in particular consistency with the leading 3D-*xy* critical behavior below  $|t|H_c^{-3/4} = 10^{-5}$  Oe<sup>-3/4</sup>.

Another property where KT behavior in terms of the 2Dto 3D-*xy* crossover should be observable is the magnetic field dependence of the specific peak. Indeed, in  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  this peak shifts<sup>18</sup> opposite to the generic behavior[.4](#page-7-12)[,6](#page-7-2) Given the Maxwell relation,

$$
\left. \frac{\partial^2 M}{\partial T^2} \right|_{H_c} = \frac{\partial}{\partial H_c} (C/T)|_T,
$$
\n(32)

<span id="page-5-6"></span>relating magnetization and specific heat, this abnormality should also be observable in  $\partial^2 M / \partial^2 T |_{H_c}$ . A glance at Fig. [9](#page-6-0) depicting  $\partial^2 M / \partial T^2 \vert_{H_c}$  vs *T* for various magnetic fields reveals consistency with the anomalous shift in the specificheat peak. Indeed the dip shifts toward higher temperatures.

Noting that the anomalous shift occurs slightly above  $T_{\text{KT}} \approx 89.5$  K, it is indeed expected to reflect 2D-*xy* behav-ior. To check this conjecture we invoke expression ([17](#page-1-10)) for

<span id="page-6-0"></span>

FIG. 9. (Color online)  $\frac{\partial^2 M}{\partial T^2} \big|_{H_c}$  vs *T* at various  $H_c$  according to Eq.  $(32)$  $(32)$  $(32)$ . The dotted line indicates the locations of the respective minima  $T_p(H_c)$ .

the magnetization valid above  $T_{KT}$  in the limit  $H_c \rightarrow 0$ . Although this limit is not attained in the field range considered here, *m* is expected to scale as  $m \approx -\left[k_B T/(2d\Phi_0^2)\right] \xi_{ab}^2 f(H_c)$ with  $f(H_c) = H_c$  for  $H_c \rightarrow 0.32$  $H_c \rightarrow 0.32$  Accordingly,  $\partial^2 M / \partial T^2 |_{H_c}$  diverges at  $T_{\text{KT}}$ . However, there is the magnetic field induced finite-size effect preventing the correlation length  $\xi_{ab}$  to grow beyond the limiting magnetic length  $L_{H_c} = [\Phi_0/(aH_c)]^{1/2}$ where  $a \approx 3.12$ .<sup>3[–6](#page-7-2)</sup> As a consequence, in finite fields the divergence is removed by a dip. Its minimum occurs at  $T_p$ given by

$$
\xi_{ab}(T_p) = L_{H_c} = [\Phi_0/(aH_c)]^{1/2}.
$$
 (33)

<span id="page-6-2"></span>In Fig. [10](#page-6-1) we show  $T_p$  vs *H* derived from the data depicted in Fig. [9.](#page-6-0) For comparison we included

<span id="page-6-1"></span>

FIG. 10. (Color online)  $T_p$  vs  $H_c$  determined from the data de-picted in Fig. [9.](#page-6-0) The solid line is Eq. ([34](#page-6-3)) with  $T_{\text{KT}}=89.5$  K,  $\tilde{b}$  $\approx$  0.3, *a*=3.12, and  $\xi_{ab0}$ =84 Å.

$$
T_p(H_c) = T_{\text{KT}} \left\{ 1 + \left[ 2\tilde{b}/\text{ln}\left(\frac{\Phi_0}{a\xi_{ab0}^2 H_c}\right) \right]^2 \right\},\tag{34}
$$

<span id="page-6-3"></span>resulting from Eqs.  $(17)$  $(17)$  $(17)$  and  $(33)$  $(33)$  $(33)$ , for a realistic set of parameters. Apparently, the characteristic shift toward higher temperatures and the  $ln(H_c)$  behavior are well confirmed and the values for  $\tilde{b}$  [Eq. ([17](#page-1-10))] and  $\hat{b}$  [Eq. ([14](#page-1-2))] are reasonably consistent with the relation  $\tilde{b}\hat{b} = \pi/(2T_{\text{KT}}^{1/2}) \approx 0.17 \text{ K}^{-1/2}$  [Eq. ([18](#page-1-11))]. Furthermore, the observed  $H_c$  dependence of  $T_p$  down to 25 Oe also implies that the lateral extent  $L_{ab}$  of the homogenous regions exceeds  $L_H \approx 3640$  Å. Indeed, in the opposite case  $(L_{ab} < L_{H_c}) T_p$  would be independent of  $H_c$ . Thus,  $L_{ab}$  > 3640 Å uncovers a remarkable sample homogeneity. Nevertheless it appears to be unlikely that the asymptotic  $H_c \rightarrow 0$  is experimentally attainable. Here  $T_p(H_c)$  follows from  $\xi_{ab} = \xi_{ab0} |T_p|^{-2/3} = L_{H_c}$  so

$$
T_p = T_c \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{a H_c (\xi_{ab0})^2}{\Phi_0} \right)^{3/4} \right],
$$
 (35)

whereupon  $T_p$  shifts with increasing field to lower tempera-tures, as observed in a variety of less anisotropic cuprates.<sup>4[,6](#page-7-2)</sup>

## **V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION**

Even though the mechanism of superconductivity in the cuprates remains a mystery the associated phase-transition properties can be understood as consequences of thermal fluctuations within the framework of the theory of critical phenomena. In this work we presented and analyzed reversible magnetization data of the highly anisotropic  $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$  for magnetic fields applied along the *c* axis of the high-quality single crystal. We examined the occurrence of 3D-*xy* critical behavior close to the bulk-transition temperature  $T_c$  and of Kosterlitz-Thouless behavior. Below *Tc* and above the presumed Kosterlitz-Thouless transition temperature  $T<sub>KT</sub>$  we observed, in agreement with the theoretical prediction[,12](#page-7-8) a downward shift in the "crossing point" toward  $T_{\text{KT}}$  from above as the field is decreased. Sufficiently below  $T_{KT}$  we verified the characteristic 2D-*xy* relationship between the magnetization and the in-plane magnetic penetration depth. $12$  In contrast, we have seen that the measured temperature dependence of the superfluid density does not exhibit the characteristic KT behavior (Nelson-Kosterlitz jump) around the presumed  $T_{\text{KT}}$ . The absence of this feature was traced back to the 2D- to 3D-*xy* crossover setting in around and above  $T_{\text{KT}}$ . Indeed, in the limit  $H_c|t|^{-4/3} \rightarrow \infty$  we established clear evidence for 3D-*xy* critical behavior above and below  $T_c$ , while in the opposite limit  $(H_c|t|^{-4/3}\rightarrow 0)$  its failure was attributed to the dimensional crossover. Invoking the Maxwell relation  $\partial^2 M / \partial^2 T |_{H} = \partial (C/T) / \partial H_c |_{T}$  the anomalous field dependence of the specific-heat peak was also traced back to the intermediate 2D-*xy* behavior.<sup>18</sup> Implications include: first, sufficiently below  $T_{KT}$  the isotope and pressure effects on  $dm/d \ln(H_c)$  at fixed temperature *T* and the in-plane magnetic penetration depth  $\lambda_{ab}(T)$  are not independent but related by Eq.  $(15)$  $(15)$  $(15)$ . Second, the bulk-transition

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This work was partially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation and the EU Project CoMePhS.

\*wstephen@physik.uzh.ch

- <span id="page-7-0"></span><sup>1</sup>G. Blatter, M. V. Feigel'man, V. B. Geshkenbein, A. I. Larkin, and V. M. Vinokur, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 1125 (1994).
- <span id="page-7-1"></span>2T. Schneider and J. M. Singer, *Phase Transition Approach to High Temperature Superconductivity* Imperial College Press, London, 2000).
- <span id="page-7-4"></span>3T. Schneider, in *The Physics of Superconductors*, edited by K. Bennemann and J. B. Ketterson (Springer, Berlin, 2004), p. 111.
- <span id="page-7-29"></span><sup>4</sup>T. Schneider, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **20**, 423201 (2008).
- <span id="page-7-12"></span>5S. Weyeneth, T. Schneider, N. D. Zhigadlo, J. Karpinski, and H. Keller, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **20**, 135208 (2008).
- 6S. Weyeneth, T. Schneider, Z. Bukowski, J. Karpinski, and H. Keller, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **20**, 345210 (2008).
- <span id="page-7-2"></span><sup>7</sup>T. Schneider, Physica B **326**, 289 (2003).
- <sup>8</sup> J. M. Kosterlitz, J. Phys. C 7, 1046 (1974).
- <span id="page-7-5"></span><span id="page-7-3"></span><sup>9</sup>L. N. Bulaevskii, M. Ledvij, and V. G. Kogan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3773 (1992).
- <span id="page-7-6"></span><sup>10</sup> J. Mosqueira, L. Cabo, and F. Vidal, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 064521  $(2007).$
- <sup>11</sup> J. Mosqueira and F. Vidal, Phys. Rev. B 77, 052507 (2008).
- <span id="page-7-7"></span>12V. Oganesyan, D. A. Huse, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 094503 (2006).
- <span id="page-7-8"></span>13L. Li, Y. Wang, M. J. Naughton, S. Ono, Y. Ando, and N. P. Ong, Europhys. Lett. **72**, 451 (2005).
- <span id="page-7-9"></span>14T. Jacobs, S. Sridhar, Q. Li, G. D. Gu, and N. Koshizuka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4516 (1995).
- <span id="page-7-27"></span><span id="page-7-10"></span>15Shih-Fu Lee, D. C. Morgan, R. J. Ormeno, D. Broun, R. A. Doyle, J. R. Waldram, and K. Kadowaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 735 (1996).
- <span id="page-7-14"></span>16K. D. Osborn, D. J. Van Harlingen, Vivek Aji, N. Goldenfeld, S.

Oh, and J. N. Eckstein, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 144516 (2003).

- <sup>17</sup> T. Schneider and D. Di Castro, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 024502 (2004).
- <span id="page-7-11"></span>18A. Junod, A. Erb, and C. Renner, Physica C **317-318**, 333  $(1999).$
- <span id="page-7-13"></span><sup>19</sup> J. Hofer, T. Schneider, J. M. Singer, M. Willemin, H. Keller, C. Rossel, and J. Karpinski, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 1332 (1999).
- <span id="page-7-15"></span><sup>20</sup> R. E. Prange, Phys. Rev. B 1, 2349 (1970).
- <span id="page-7-16"></span> $^{21}$  A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Phys. Rep. **368**, 549 (2002).
- <span id="page-7-17"></span>22S. Watauchi, H. Ikuta, H. Kobayashi, J. Shimoyama, and K. Kishio, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 064520 (2001).
- <span id="page-7-18"></span>23D. R. Nelson and J. M. Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 1201  $(1977).$
- <span id="page-7-19"></span>24V. Ambegaokar, B. I. Halperin, D. R. Nelson, and E. D. Siggia, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 1806 (1980).
- <span id="page-7-20"></span>25A. Revcolevschi and J. Jegoudez, Prog. Mater. Sci. **42**, 321  $(1997).$
- <span id="page-7-23"></span>26A. Piriou, Y. Fasano, E. Giannini, and O. Fischer, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 184508 (2008).
- <span id="page-7-24"></span>27G. Triscone, A. Junod, and R. E. Gladyshevskii, Physica C **264**, 233 (1996).
- <span id="page-7-25"></span>28G. Triscone, M. S. Chae, M. C. de Andrade, and M. B. Maple, Physica C 290, 188 (1997).
- 29H. Iwasaki, F. Matsuoka, and K. Tanigawa, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 14624 (1999).
- <span id="page-7-26"></span><sup>30</sup>T. Schneider, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 174517 (2007).
- <span id="page-7-21"></span>31B. I. Halperin and D. R. Nelson, J. Low Temp. Phys. **36**, 599  $(1979).$
- <span id="page-7-22"></span><sup>32</sup> T. Schneider, EPL **79**, 57005 (2007).
- <span id="page-7-30"></span><span id="page-7-28"></span><sup>33</sup>T. Schneider, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 134514 (2003).