Comment on "Evidence for a Common High-Temperature Superconducting Effect in $La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}$ -CuO₄ and YBa₂Cu₃O₇"

In their Letter, Jean *et al.*¹ attempt to show a "common high-temperature superconducting effect in La_{1.85}-Sr_{0.15}CuO₄ and YBa₂Cu₃O₇." Although this work contains some interesting thoughts, there are also a few criticisms that we feel should be raised. In the interest of brevity, we confine the present discussion to the comparisons made between sintered La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO₄ (produced at the University of Houston) and single-crystal YBa₂Cu₃O₇ (grown and characterized at AT&T Bell Laboratories).

Harshman et al.² first showed that the temperature dependence of the positron annihilation lifetime τ in single-crystal YBa₂Cu₃O₇ (only a single lifetime was observed) was markedly different from that observed in the sintered material (usually exhibiting multiple lifetimes). Specifically, $\tau(T)$ for single-crystal YBa₂Cu₃O₇ was shown to increase with decreasing temperature below the superconducting transition temperature, T_c , whereas previous (and subsequent) measurements in sintered samples showed $\tau(T)$ to decrease with temperatures below T_c .³ Interpretation of the single-crystal data suggested that the positron is in a delocalized state, whereas localization (trapping) of positrons was suggested for the sintered samples. More recent studies in sintered YBa₂- $Cu_3O_{7-\delta}$ have also indicated strong dependences of the Doppler line shape (S parameter) on Cu-O chain disorder⁴ and e^+ implantation depth,⁵ emphasizing further the problems encountered with sintered materials.

In Fig. 3 of their paper,¹ Jean et al. compare their measurement of $\tau(T)$ in sintered La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO₄ with that observed² in single-crystal YBa₂Cu₃O₇. This comparison, which indicates a qualitative agreement between the two materials, is then used by Jean et al. as the basis for their generalized conclusion of a "common hightemperature superconducting effect." With the consideration of the differences already discussed between sintered and single-crystal YBa₂Cu₃O₇, however, there would seem to be little support for the extraction of farreaching implications by the comparison of the annihilation parameters for a sintered sample of one material with those extracted for a single-crystal sample of another. Indeed, another study⁵ of the positron annihilation parameters in sintered La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO₄ has yielded results contradicting those reported by Jean et al.¹ Specifically, S(T), as reported in Ref. 5, does not appear to exhibit any distinguishing features at T_c , but instead rises approximately linearly with temperature. Jean et al.¹ on the other hand, report a slope discontinuity in S(T) at $T_c = 33$ K, below which S(T) increases with decreasing temperature.

One also notices that the $\tau(T)$ data for single-crystal YBa₂Cu₃O₇ (Ref. 2) are actually incorrectly presented

in Fig. 3 of the Jean *et al.* paper.¹ This is because Jean *et al.*¹ make a transformation to reduced temperature (i.e., T/T_c) assuming a superconducting transition (onset) temperature of $T_c = 94$ K. In the original work,² however, T_c (onset) of these crystals is shown to be 84 K as measured with dc magnetization (see Fig. 1 of Ref. 2), which is in agreement with recent μ^+ spin-rotation measurements⁶ on the same crystals. The group at AT&T Bell Laboratories also made measurements with ac susceptibility which indicated a 95 K onset. However, unlike dc magnetization and μ^+ spin rotation which are both good probes of bulk properties, ac susceptibility is more sensitive to skin effects, resulting (in this case) in a misleadingly high T_c .

To summarize, it is clear that Jean *et al.* arrive at their conclusion largely from the observation that a selected set of data on sintered $La_{1.85}Sr_{0.15}CuO_4$ show a similar trend in the annihilation lifetime as previously observed² for single-crystal YBa₂Cu₃O₇. Unfortunately, it is equally clear that such an observation is not sufficient in the case of the sintered high- T_c materials.

D. R. Harshman, L. F. Schneemeyer, and J. V. Waszczak

AT&T Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974

Received 22 April 1988 PACS numbers: 74.70.Vy, 78.70.Bj

¹Y. C. Jean, J. Kyle, H. Nakanishi, P. E. A. Turchi, R. H. Howell, A. L. Wachs, M. J. Fluss, R. L. Meng, H. P. Hor, J. Z. Huang, and C. W. Chu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1069 (1988).

²D. R. Harshman, L. F. Schneemeyer, J. V. Waszczak, Y. C. Jean, M. J. Fluss, R. H. Howell, and A. L. Wachs, Phys. Rev. B 38, 848 (1988).

³Y. C. Jean, S. J. Wang, H. Nakanishi, W. N. Hardy, M. E. Hayden, R. F. Kiefl, R. L. Meng, H. P. Hor, J. Z. Huang, and C. W. Chu, Phys. Rev. B 36, 3994 (1987); S. G. Usmar, P. Sferlazzo, K. G. Lynn, and A. R. Moodenbaugh, Phys. Rev. B 36, 8854 (1987); L. C. Smedskjaer, J. L. Routbort, B. K. Flandermeyer, S. J. Rothman, and D. G. Legnini, Phys. Rev. B 36, 3903 (1987).

⁴E. C. von Stetten, S. Berko, X. S. Li, R. R. Lee, J. Brynestad, D. Singh, H. Krakauer, W. E. Pickett, and R. E. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2198 (1988).

 5 K. G. Lynn, S. G. Usmar, B. Nielsen, G. J. van der Kolk, I. Kanazawa, P. Sferlazzo, and A. R. Moodenbaugh, in *Thin Film Processing and Characterization of High-Temperature Superconductors*, edited by J. M. E. Harper, R. J. Cotton, and L. C. Feldman, AIP Conference Proceedings No. 165 (American Vacuum Society Series No. 3) (American Institute of Physics, New York, 1988).

⁶D. R. Harshman, L. F. Schneemeyer, J. V. Waszczak, G. Aeppli, R. J. Cava, B. Batlogg, L. W. Rupp, E. J. Ansaldo, R. F. Kiefl, G. M. Luke, T. M. Riseman, and D. Ll. Williams, to be published.