Evidence for time-reversal symmetry breaking in superconducting PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$
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Zero and longitudinal field muon spin rotation ($\mu$SR) experiments were performed on the superconductors PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ and LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$. In PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ below $T_c$, a spontaneous magnetization with a temperature variation resembling that of the superfluid density appears. This observation implies time-reversal symmetry (TRS) breaking in PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ below $T_c = 7.9$ K. This remarkably high $T_c$ for an anomalous superconductor and the weak and gradual change of $T_c$ and of the related specific heat anomaly upon La substitution in La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ suggests that the TRS breaking is due to orbital degrees of freedom of the Cooper pairs.

PACS numbers: 76.75.+i, 74.70.Dd, 74.25.Ha

I. INTRODUCTION

The large family of filled skutterudite compounds $\text{RT}_4\text{X}_{12}$ ($R =$ rare-earth, actinides, alkaline-earth, and alkali metals; $T =$ Fe, Ru, Os; $X =$ P, As, Sb) displays an astonishing diversity of physical properties among which superconductivity represents a particularly complex one. Within more than 20 isostructural skutterudite families, the compounds have a significant influence on these properties. Superconducting members of this family containing Pr have attracted considerable interest with PrOs$_4$Sb$_{12}$ being the most prominent one. While LaOs$_4$Sb$_{12}$ (critical temperature $T_c = 0.74$ K) is found to obey the classical BCS-theory, PrOs$_4$Sb$_{12}$ ($T_c = 1.85$ K) exhibits heavy-fermion behavior and unconventional superconductivity with time-reversal symmetry (TRS) breaking. Moreover, multiple superconducting phases and order parameters with nodes have been detected. Recent research efforts to elucidate the origin of the TRS breaking we synthesized PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ as that reported for PrOs$_4$Sb$_{12}$. Behaviors of the La and Pr compounds are similar. While these aspects of the superconducting states of PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ and PrOs$_4$Sb$_{12}$ are similar, the CEF splitting distinguishes the compounds. Having the same nonmagnetic singlet ground state, $\Gamma_1$, in PrOs$_4$Sb$_{12}$ the first excited triplet $\Gamma_4^{(2)} (E/k_B \approx 7 – 10$ K) strongly hybridizes with the ground state and the conduction electrons, generating the heavy-fermion state. In PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ the first excited CEF state is a different triplet ($\Gamma_4^{(1)}$) with a splitting of $\approx 8 - 10$ K. Below $T_c = 7.8$ K a spontaneous magnetization resembling the temperature dependence of the superfluid density was observed for PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$. No such anomaly is detected for LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$.

TRS breaking can lead to the appearance of a small magnetic moment of the superconducting condensate due to spin or orbital degrees of freedom of the Cooper pairs. Muon spin rotation ($\mu$SR) successfully detected this field in a number of unconventional and spin-triplet superconductors. Here, we report on detailed zero magnetic field (ZF) $\mu$SR experiments in PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ and LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$. The absolute value and the mechanism of ZF muon depolarization above $T_c$ in PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ are similar to that reported for PrOs$_4$Sb$_{12}$. Below $T_c = 7.8$ K a spontaneous magnetization resembling the temperature dependence of the superfluid density was observed for PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$. Due to the contrasting behaviors of the La and Pr compound and in order to elucidate the origin of the TRS breaking we synthesized...
samples of the solid solution La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ and studied the variation of $T_c$ and of the specific heat anomaly.

II. EXPERIMENTAL

The preparation procedures of the La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ samples are similar to that described previously.$^{23}$ The end member samples have residual resistance ratios $\rho_{300\,K}/\rho_0 \geq 30$ and the PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ sample showed crystallites up to 2 mm size. The zero and longitudinal field (ZF & LF) $\mu$SR experiments were performed on the DOLLY spectrometer at the $\pi$E1 beam line at the Paul Scherrer Institute (Villigen, Switzerland). In addition, a powdered sample of PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ was measured in ZF on the GPS spectrometer at the $\pi$M3 beam line. The samples were cooled in ZF or LF down to 1.5 K and $\mu$SR spectra were taken as a function of temperature. During ZF measurements, an active magnetic-field compensation with three orthogonal couples of Helmholtz coils was used in order to reduce the field at the sample to values lower than 3 $\times$ 10$^{-6}$ T. Typical counting statistics were $12 \times 10^6$ positron events per each particular data point. Magnetization was measured in a commercial SQUID magnetometer.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1 shows ZF and LF $\mu$SR time spectra for PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ at 1.5 K and 10 K. The spectra of several histograms were fitted simultaneously. Each histogram is described by the function:

$$N(t) = N_0 \exp(-t/\tau)(1 + A P(t)) + B,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\tau = 2.197019\,\mu$s is the muon lifetime, $N_0$ a proportionality coefficient, $B$ the background, $A$ the asymmetry, and $P(t)$ the muon depolarization function. Preliminary fits showed that the ZF muon depolarization is well described by a Kubo-Toyabe depolarization function reflecting a static Voigt field distribution, i.e. describing two mechanisms for the profile, one producing a Gaussian distribution and one producing a Lorentzian distribution.

The zero and longitudinal field $\mu$SR depolarization functions for the static Voigt field distribution were calculated using the general formula derived by R. Kubo, (Eq. 21 of Ref. 25). For Voigt-like functions this equation can be reformulated as follows:

$$P(t) = 1 - \frac{2Q'(t)}{\omega_0^2 t} \cos(\omega_0 t - j_0(\omega_0 t)) - 2 \int_0^t \frac{Q'(s) j_0'(\omega_0 s)}{s \omega_0} ds,$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $j_0(x) = \sin(x)/x$, $\omega_0 = \gamma_B B$ is the Larmor frequency corresponding to the applied longitudinal field $B$. For the Voigt function $Q(t) = \exp(- \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 t^2 - \lambda t)$, where $\sigma^2/\gamma_B^2$ is the second moment of the Gaussian distribution and $\lambda/\gamma_B$ is the half-width at half-maximum of the Lorentzian distribution, and finally the prime denotes the derivative.$^{24}$ In the limit of $\omega_0 \to 0$ (i.e. in the ZF situation), Eq 2 converges to the “golden formula” of Kubo,$^{25}$

$$P_{G,ZF}(t) = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} [Q(t) + Q'(t)t],$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)

and for the case of $Q(t) = \exp(- \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 t^2 - \lambda t)$ one finally gets the equation:

$$P_{G,ZF,V}(t) = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} (1 - \sigma^2 t^2 - \lambda t) \exp \left( - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 t^2 - \lambda t \right).$$ \hspace{1cm} (4)

Actually, a closer look at the data indicates that the ZF and LF data are best fitted using the depolarization function:

$$P(t) = P_G(t) \exp(-\lambda_d t),$$ \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $\lambda_d \simeq 0.020\,\mu$s$^{-1}$ (which is practically temperature independent) is a dynamical muon depolarization which does not decouple up to fields of 20 mT. Such dynamical depolarization is best seen in LF experiments. In Fig. 1 the fits obtained with Eq. 5 are shown with the solid red curves. The best fit to the data is obtained with field independent parameters $\sigma = 0.173\,\mu$s$^{-1}$, $\lambda = $...
as-prepared distribution (i.e. a situation with Pt, or Ge isotopes. Note that usually for a depolarization experiments suggest the presence of static muon depolarization curves calculated for the case of a static only field distribution (see the blue dotted curves in Fig. 1). Note that for such small values of $\lambda$ and $\lambda_d$, as in the present case, these parameters are strongly correlated in the ZF spectra. However, LF experiments allow us to disentangle this correlation. Zero and longitudinal field distribution assumed. Decoupling of this static field is well independent of temperature. In a second step, $\lambda$ was fixed to its average value $0.029 \mu s^{-1}$ and solely $\sigma$ was kept free. Figure 2 presents $\sigma(T)$ recorded in ZF for PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ and LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$, measured on two different spectrometers. For the Pr compound, above $T_c = 7.8$ K $\sigma$ is independent of temperature, as expected for depolarization due to nuclear moments.

However below $T_c$, one can observe a clear increase of the muon relaxation rate with decreasing temperature. Just below $T_c$ the data systematically decrease below the normal-state level showing a small dip. The rise of $\sigma$ starts only below $\approx 6.5$ K. There is no indication for a phase transition at this temperature from other measurements as, e.g., specific heat or the superfluid density.

The corresponding ZF depolarization rates $\sigma(T)$ for LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ with $T_c = 8.3$ K (obtained via Eq. $\ref{eq:1}$ with $\lambda = \lambda_d = 0$ and free parameter $\sigma$) are small and temperature-independent (see Fig. 2). No anomaly is resolved at $T_c = 8.3$ K. $\sigma$ for LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ is substantially smaller than in PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$, indicating that in PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ the dominant part of the relaxation is due to the presence of $^{141}$Pr nuclei.

A similarly strong (nearly the same value of $\sigma$) hyperfine-enhanced nuclear muon depolarization was observed in the isostructural PrOs$_{4-x}$Ru$_x$Sb$_{12}$ compounds. The authors explain the relaxation by a Van-Vleck-like admixture of magnetic excited CEF states into the nonmagnetic $\Gamma_1$ ground state of Pr$^{3+}$ by the nuclear hyperfine coupling. This hybridization strongly increases the strength of the interactions between the $^{141}$Pr nuclear spins and the muon spins as well as within the $^{141}$Pr nuclear spin system. Lei Shu et al. observe that this relaxation is dynamic due to the relatively low energy $(E/k_B = 7-10$ K for $x = 0)$ of the first exited CEF level $\Gamma_4^{(2)}$ of Pr$^{3+}$ with a spin-spin correlation time $\tau_c$ $\simeq 0.2–0.6$ $\mu s^{-1}$. For PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$, the first exited CEF level $\Gamma_4^{(1)}$ is found at $E/k_B = 120–130$ K in agreement with our observation of a quasi-static nuclear magnetism of Pr. The very small population of all exited CEF states at $T \approx T_c = 7.8$ K is the reason for this behavior and the negligible Cooper-pair breaking in PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$. The origin of the additional dynamic relaxation $\lambda_d$ in the present case is unknown. To reduce the magnitude of $\lambda_d$ in LF the LF Larmor precession frequency should exceed the characteristic fluctuations of magnetic field probed in the sample. Since it does not decouple up to 20 mT one estimates the characteristic fluctuation frequency larger than $\nu > 2\pi \gamma \cdot 0.02 = 17$ MHz.

Figure 3 shows the susceptibility measurements for the series of La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ samples. The magnetic susceptibility $\chi(T)$ of the La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ samples becomes temperature-independent below $\sim 20$ K (see Fig. 3) and the amplitude simply scales with the Pr content $x$, as expected for a single-ion CEF effect. No detectable Curie-like contributions indicating localized magnetic impurities (e.g. Pr$^{3+}$ ions on different crystallographic sites or in secondary phases) are observed. The inset of Fig. 3 displays the dependence of $T_c$ on $x$ in La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$. This dependence is weak and the small sagging of the curve below the linear relationship may be due to the

FIG. 2: (Color online) Temperature dependence of the muon depolarization rate $\sigma$ in "as-prepared" (▲) and powdered (■) samples of PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ and in "as-prepared" LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ (●) as obtained by Eq. $\ref{eq:5}$. The lines are guides to the eye (see text).
weak crystallographic disorder introduced by the statistical occupation of the 2a site. Specific heat data (not shown) reveal that also the size of the specific heat jump \( \delta c_p/\gamma T_c \) at \( T_c \) varies linearly with the Pr content \( x \). This is in contrast to the observations in the series La\( _{1-x} \)Pr\( _x \)Os\( _4 \)Sb\( _4 \) where \( \delta c_p/\gamma T_c \) shows a strongly non-linear variation with \( x \). For the substitution series PrOs\( _{4-x} \)Ru\( _x \)Sb\( _4 \) even a strong depression of \( T_c \) well below that of both end members is observed.\(^{8,25,31}\)

In the ZF \( \mu \)SR data (Fig. 2) it can be seen that for PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) the data show the presence of an additional depolarization below \( T_c \). In addition, our data seems to reveal a small dip of \( \sigma(T) \) just below \( T_c \). At the moment we do not have an explanation for this dip. Most plausible would be the presence of diluted magnetic centers separated on distances of order of the magnetic penetration depth \( \Lambda \simeq 120 \text{ nm} \). In such a case, a reduction of \( \sigma \) is expected due to screening of the magnetic field by the superfluid condensate. The required concentration of such impurities would be of the order of \( 0.01 - 0.1\% \) [from \( \sigma(T>T_c) \)]. Clearly, such impurities are not present in our samples as can be concluded from the absence of an upturn in the magnetic susceptibilities toward low temperatures (see Fig. 2). Another possibility for this dip could be a coupling of Pr nuclei with free carriers. Below \( T_c \) the density of states at the Fermi level \( N_F \) drops. Hence, in case of a Körtinga-like coupling it is expected that the muon relaxation will drop \( \alpha N_F^p \). However, the observation of quasi-static magnetism of the Pr nuclei contradicts this assumption.

Beyond the possible observation of this small dip, the main observation is the increase of \( \sigma \) upon lowering the temperature below \( T_c \). Such an increase cannot be explained by a Pr–Pr RKKY-coupling, since it would reduce the muon depolarization below \( T_c \) (\( \propto N_F^p \)), in contrast to our observation. The influence of external fields can be excluded, since true zero field was controlled with high precision and, moreover, the Meissner effect automatically shields any fields in the superconducting state. Note, only for the heavy-fermion superconductor PrOs\(_4\)Sb\(_{12}\) a similar spontaneous magnetization was detected to appear below \( T_c \) whereas there is no change of \( \sigma \) in PrRu\(_4\)Sb\(_{12}\) at \( T_c \). In both of these samples a nearly similar muon depolarization was observed above \( T_c \). The electronic specific heat coefficient \( \gamma \) and \( N_F \) are small for PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\).\(^{13,16}\) In addition, our measurements of two different samples of PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) (“as-prepared” and powdered) on two different spectrometers with the same result and no anomaly at \( T_c \) for LaPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) strongly supports that the enhanced depolarization below \( T_c \) is an intrinsic property of the superconducting state of PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\).

The enhanced muon depolarization below \( T_c \) gives evidence of time-reversal symmetry (TRS) breaking in PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\). TRS breaking can be realized for spin- or orbital multi-component (vector-) order parameters that may have an internal phase degree of freedom between the components.\(^{23}\) An example is the chiral \( p \)-wave triplet state proposed for Sr\(_2\)RuO\(_4\).\(^{32}\) and the E\(_2g\) triplet state for UPt\(_3\).\(^{23}\) Triplet pairing has been proposed – and heavily debated – for PrOs\(_4\)Sb\(_{12}\).\(^{17,18,35}\) For PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) we recently reported\(^{16}\) that the superfluid density fits well to the expectations of a chiral \( p \)-wave form of the gap function \( |\Delta| = \Delta_0 |k_x| \pm i |k_y| \) with a gap-to-\( T_c \) ratio \( \Delta_0/T_c = 2.6 \) similar to that of PrOs\(_4\)Sb\(_{12}\).\(^{24,36}\) Most interestingly, the \( T_c \) of PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) is larger than that of other proposed spin-triplet superconductors which have \( T_c \) values \( < 2.7 \text{ K} \).\(^{9,22,24}\)

For LaPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) we observe no indications for (or an unresolvably small) TRS breaking. Unfortunately, our investigations of the gap symmetry are inconclusive at the moment; however a nodeless gap and spin-singlet pairing has been concluded from NMR relaxation data for LaPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\).\(^{40}\) The weak variation of \( \Delta(T) \) and of \( \delta c_p/\gamma T_c \) with the Pr-content \( x \) in La\( _{1-x} \)Pr\( _x \)Pt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) indicates that the order parameters of the end members are compatible and not separated by a first-order phase transition. Thus, it is plausible that PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) is also a spin-singlet superconductor. In this case, the observation of TRS breaking in the condensate requires that the gap function belongs to a complex orbitally degenerate representation leading to an internal orbital moment of the Cooper pairs. In such a state superconductors are induced around nonmagnetic impurities which in turn generate a condensate magnetic moment density with a spatial extension of the order of the coherence length \( \xi \). Such a complex spin-singlet state of \( T_g \) symmetry with point nodes along the cubic axes has actually been proposed in Ref.\(^{43}\) to explain the TRS breaking in PrOs\(_4\)Sb\(_{12}\) and as an alternative to the spin-triplet model. The orbital moment of the Cooper pairs may vary and in this way the seemingly conflicting observations of a TRS broken state for PrPt\(_4\)Ge\(_{12}\) and of no visible TRS breaking for the La compound as well as a continuous changeover in...
La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ may appear.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, zero field $\mu$SR measurements on PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ and LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ showed that the dominant contribution for the muon relaxation comes from the Pr nuclei. Below $T_c$ in PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ we observe an additional muon depolarization with a temperature variation resembling that of the superfluid density while no anomalous effect was seen for LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$. This observation indicates TRS breaking in the superconducting state of PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ with an extraordinary high $T_c$. We have argued that the origin of the TRS breaking is the unconventional multi-component nature of the order parameter. From the present experiments no definite conclusion can be made whether this is due to the spin or orbital degeneracy of the Cooper pairs. The $T_c$ of 7.8 K for PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ seems to be rather high for spin-triplet pairing. In the series La$_{1-x}$Pr$_x$Pt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ the $T_c$ as well as the size of the related specific heat anomaly vary almost linearly with the Pr content $x$. Together with the absence of TRS breaking for LaPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$ this renders a spin-triplet Cooper pairing for these compounds, including PrPt$_4$Ge$_{12}$, unlikely, since one would expect strong effects for incompatible superconducting order parameters. Due to the high tetrahedral symmetry, orbital degeneracies are present which allow for a complex spin-singlet gap function with an internal phase. Such a kind of pairing with orbital degeneracy also breaks TRS and may lead to a condensate with a magnetic moment density.

Part of this work was performed at the Swiss Muon Source ($\mu$SR), Paul Scherrer Institute (PSI, Switzerland).
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