Pressure-induced superconductivity in EuFe$_2$As$_2$ without a quantum critical point: magnetotransport and upper critical field measurements under high pressure
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Resistivity and Hall effect measurements of EuFe$_2$As$_2$ up to 3.2 GPa indicate no divergence of quasiparticle effective mass at the pressure $P_c$ where the magnetic and structural transition disappears. This is corroborated by analysis of the temperature ($T$) dependence of the upper critical field. $T$-linear resistivity is observed at pressures slightly above $P_c$. The scattering rates for both electrons and holes are shown to be approximately $T$-linear. When a field is applied, a $T^2$ dependence is recovered, indicating that the origin of the $T$-linear dependence is spin fluctuations.

PACS numbers: 74.25.Op,74.25.Dw,74.25.F.-,74.62.Fj

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery of superconductivity in LaFeAs(O,F) at $T_c = 26$ K,$^1$ considerable attention has been paid to iron-based superconductors (SCs) with a variety of crystal structures containing stacked iron-pnictide (or -chalcogenide) layers.$^2$ The maximum values of $T_c$ thus far achieved are 54-56 K$^{3,4}$ and 39 K$^5$ in the “1111” (RFeAsO; $R =$ rare earth) and “122” (AFE$_2$As$_2$; A = alkaline earth or Eu) groups, respectively. Despite intensive research, the detailed mechanism of the superconductivity, for example, the symmetry of the SC order parameter, remains highly controversial.$^7-12$ It has been revealed that iron-based SCs have a unique Fermi surface (FS) structure, typically consisting of two- or three-hole and two-electron sheets.$^{13,14}$ The 1111 and 122 parent compounds undergo FS reconstruction associated with an antiferromagnetic (AF) order of Fe moments at $T_0$. With the suppression of $T_0$ via dopings$^{15,16}$ or the application of pressure ($P$)$^{17,18}$ the superconducting (SC) ground state can be triggered. Hence, magnetic instability may play an important role in iron-based SCs.

One of the intriguing issues of iron-based SCs is the origin of non-Fermi-liquid (NFL) behavior in their transport properties, such as $T$-linear resistivity$^{16,17}$ which emerges as $T_0$ is suppressed. The existence of a quantum critical point (QCP), where the second-order transition temperature becomes zero, in iron-based SCs has theoretically been proposed$^{18}$ and has been demonstrated by the observation of a peak in the penetration depth, which is proportional to $(n/n^*)^{-1/2}$, at the optimal doping in the BaFe$_2$(As,P)$_2$ system$^{19}$ for example ($n$ and $m^*$ are the carrier number and quasiparticle effective mass, respectively).

However, the existence of a QCP does not appear to be universal in iron-based SCs nor is its relevance to the superconductivity clear, as suggested by phase diagrams of La-based 1111 systems$^{20,21}$ or the composition dependence of the penetration depth and Drude weight of optical conductivity, both of which are related to $n/m^*$, in the Ba(Fe$_{1-x}$Co$_x$)$_2$As$_2$ system$^{22,23}$ for example. In addition, it has been argued that the interpretation of the NFL-like behavior may not be straightforward owing to the multiband character of iron-based systems$^{24,25}$.

Pressure tuning of the electronic structures in stoichiometric compounds is a better means of studying a QCP than tuning by chemical substitution, which might obscure a QCP by the inevitably introduced randomness. We therefore study EuFe$_2$As$_2$ under applied pressure (Fig. 1). The transition temperature $T_0$ is about 190 K at ambient pressure, and the critical pressure $P_c$, where indications of the transition at $T_0$ disappear and bulk superconductivity appears, is 2.5-2.7 GPa$^{26,30}$ This sudden disappearance of $T_0$ is incompatible with a QCP. Although the Eu$^{2+}$ moments exhibit an AF order at $T_N \sim 20$ K, the ferromagnetic (FM) alignment can be achieved at only a few Tesla$^{21,22}$ and the spin disorder scattering can be minimized$^{21}$ Because of the large exchange field from the Eu$^{2+}$ moments to the conduction electron spins, the upper critical field $B_{c2}$ for the $P$-induced superconductivity is much smaller than for other iron-based SCs with similar $T_c$. These unique characteristics of EuFe$_2$As$_2$, thus, provide a significant opportunity to experimentally investigate the iron-based superconductivity with high $T_c$ of 30 K. Our measurements of transport properties and upper critical fields up to 3.2 GPa reported below show no evidence of diverging quasiparticle effective mass at $P_c$, indicating that the emergence of $P$-induced superconductivity in this clean system does not involve a QCP. However, it does not curtail the importance of spin fluctuations: we
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observe $T$-linear resistivity at pressures near $P_c$ and find that the Fermi liquid $T^2$ dependence can be recovered by the application of a magnetic field.

II. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

Single crystals of EuFe$_2$As$_2$ were grown by the Bridgman method from a stoichiometric mixture of the constituent elements. Resistivity and Hall effect were measured simultaneously by a conventional six-contact device. The applied pressure was determined at 4.2 K from the change in resistance of a calibrated Manganin wire. As in our previous works,
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FIG. 1: (Color online) $P-T$ phase diagram in EuFe$_2$As$_2$ with $RRR=13$ (circles, bottom axis) and $7.29$ (triangles, top axis), deduced from the resistivity measurements up to 3.2 GPa under zero field. The pressure is scaled with the critical value $P_c$. PM, AFM, and SC indicate the paramagnetic, antiferromagnetic, and superconducting states, respectively. For the SC phase, open and solid symbols indicate $T_c$ (onset) and $T_c$(zero resistivity), respectively. $T_c^{\text{on}}$ determined at $B=15$ T is also shown. Dashed curves are a guide to the eyes.
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FIG. 2: (Color online) Low-temperature data of $\rho(B)$ and $\rho_1(B)$ in EuFe$_2$As$_2$ ($RRR=13$) at $P =$ (a) 0 GPa, (b) 1.6 GPa, (c) 2.6 GPa, and (d) 3.2 GPa. Solid curves are fits to a multicarrier model.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

First, we discuss how electron and hole carriers evolve as a function of $P$ via multicarrier analysis. Figure 2(a) shows the low-$T$ data of transverse magnetoresistivity $\rho(B)$ and Hall resistivity $\rho_1(B)$ in EuFe$_2$As$_2$ ($RRR=13$) at ambient pressure. The $\rho(B)$ curves show a minimum (e.g., $\sim 2$ T at 2 K), which is attributable to the $B$-induced FM alignment of the Eu$^{2+}$ moments. At high fields, $\rho(B)$ shows positive magnetoresistance (MR), as expected from the cyclotron motion of electrons. $\rho_1(B)$ exhibits pronounced nonlinear behavior at low temperatures. The field-induced transition of the
Eu$^{2+}$ moments is not detectable in the $\rho_H(B)$ curves, indicating negligible effect of the Eu$^{2+}$ moments on the number of carriers. At pressures sufficiently below $P_c$, the $\rho_H(B)$ and $\rho(B)$ curves are qualitatively similar to those at ambient pressure except that the curvature in $\rho_H(B)$ and the magnitude of MR in $\rho_H(B)$ decreases with increasing $P$ [Fig. 2(b)]. In the vicinity of $P_c$, SC transitions due to the partial [Fig. 2(c)] or bulk superconductivity appears. In the high field normal state, $\rho(B)$ and $\rho_H(B)$ still slightly exhibit a positive MR and nonlinear behavior, respectively. As $P$ is increased to above $P_c$, $\rho_H$ exhibits nearly $B$-linear dependence [Fig. 2(d)], whereas $\rho$ indicates negative MR due to the suppression of spin fluctuations of the Fe ions except in the low-$T$ and high-$B$ regions where the cyclotron motion dominates.

Figure 3 shows the $T$ dependence of the Hall coefficient $R_H$, as defined by $d\rho_H/dB$ at $B = 0$, under several pressures. The enhancement of $|R_H(T)|$ below $T_0$ for $P < P_c$ indicates the destruction of substantial parts of the FS. For $P > P_c$ (inset), $|R_H(T)|$ still increases below $\sim 80$ K. Similar enhancement of $|R_H(T)|$ has been observed in the paramagnetic phase of BaFe$_2$(As,P)$_2$, and it has been argued that the behavior cannot be explained by a multiband picture for a Fermi liquid. However, in the present case, $|R_H|$ at 2.8 GPa is $2 \times 10^{-9}$ m$^2$/C (T $\sim T_c$), which corresponds to $\sim 0.16$ electron/Fe (e/Fe) in a single-carrier model. This value is comparable to the band-calculation value for BaFe$_2$As$_2$ (0.15 e/Fe), and hence can be accounted for within a simple two-carrier picture.

EuFe$_2$As$_2$ is a compensated metal with an equal number of electrons and holes, for which a simple two-carrier model predicts a linear $\rho_H$. The nonlinearity in $\rho_H(B)$ below $P_c$ thus indicates that more than two carriers contribute to the electronic transport. In the case of the sister compound BaFe$_2$As$_2$, a Shubnikov-de Haas oscillation study has shown that the Fermi surface in the AF phase consists of one hole and two electron pockets. In keeping with this, a three-carrier model can account for the nonlinear behavior of $\rho_H(B)$ as well as the $\rho(B)$ data for BaFe$_2$As$_2$. We therefore apply essentially the same three-carrier analysis to the obtained $\rho_H(B)$ and $\rho(B)$ data for EuFe$_2$As$_2$ at $P \leq P_c$, assuming one hole (H) and two electrons (E1 and E2) with density $n_i$, mobility $\mu_i$, and conductivity $\sigma_i$, deduced from multiscalar analysis. Solid and open symbols correspond to the results obtained at $\leq 10$ K and 20 K, respectively. One hole (H) and two types of electrons (E1 and E2) are considered for $P \leq P_c$ ($\sim 5.2$ GPa), whereas a simple two-band model with $n_H = n_{E1} = 7.5 \times 10^{-2}$ electrons/Fe (e/Fe) is assumed for $P > P_c$. The nonlinear behavior of $\rho_H(B)$ is thus understood in terms of the Fermi-liquid properties of the Fe carriers in the AF phase.
curves in Fig. 5(a) indicate the fits, which capture the overall features of the experimental results. The fitting gives \((n_H, n_{E1}, n_{E2}; \mu_H, \mu_{E1}, \mu_{E2}) = (6.6, 5.6, 0.92 \times 10^{-2} \text{ e/Fe}; 0.57, 0.57, 1.5 [10^3 \text{ cm}^2/\text{Vs}])\) for \(T = 2\,\text{K}\). The fitting errors are approximately 3\% for H and E1, and 20\% for E2. The parameter sets obtained at 20 and 30 K are comparable to those at 2 K. One can find the tendency that \(n_H \approx n_{E1} \approx n_{E2}\) and \(\mu_H \approx \mu_{E1} \ll \mu_{E2}\), similar to the case of BaFe\(_2\)As\(_2\). The magnitudes of the parameter sets, particularly \(\mu_i\), for EuFe\(_2\)As\(_2\) (\(RRR = 13\)) are comparable to those for as-grown samples of BaFe\(_2\)As\(_2\). For other pressures, a similar quality of fitting can be obtained.

At \(P > P_c\), we assume one electron carrier (E) and one hole carrier (H) with \(n_H = n_E\). In the analysis, the slope of \(\rho_H(B)\) and the \(\rho\) value at \(B = 0\) are used. To determine the parameter sets \((n_H, n_E; \mu_H, \mu_E)\) uniquely, we fix \(n_H = n_E = 7.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ e/Fe}\). A band-structure calculation suggests that the carrier density for BaFe\(_2\)As\(_2\) is 0.15 e/Fe. However, the shrinking of the FS has been observed in BaFe\(_2\)(As, P)\(_2\) and has been theoretically attributed to strong interband scattering. The volume of the FS is approximately halved as the optimal doping is approached in BaFe\(_2\)(As, P)\(_2\). We therefore use the halved value.

Figure 6 displays the \(P\) evolutions of \(n_i\), \(|\mu_i|\), and conductivity \(\sigma\). As the pressure approaches \(P_c\), \(n_i\) increases, while \(|\mu_i|\) decreases. It appears that \(n_i\) and \(|\mu_i|\) develop reasonably continuously to their values at \(P > P_c\). Neither of the \(P\) dependences of \(\mu_i (= e\tau_i/m^*_i)\) or \(\sigma (= e^2\tau_i n_i/m^*_i)\) suggests the divergence of \(m^*\) or \((n/m^*)^{-1}\) at \(P_c\).

We further substantiate the absence of a QCP by deriving the \(P\) dependence of the effective masses from \(B_{c2}\)–\(T_c\) phase diagrams under applied pressures. Figures 5(a) and (b) show \(\rho\) vs \(T\) at 2.6 and 3.0 GPa, respectively, in the \(RRR = 7\) sample under several \(B\) for \(B \parallel ab\). \(T_c\)
under each magnetic field is determined by the midpoint temperature of the SC transitions. Figure 5(c) shows the thus determined upper critical field $B_{c2}$ as a function of temperature for several pressures. It appears that $B_{c2}(0)$ is highest at $P \sim P_c$ and decreases with increasing $P$. In EuFe$_2$As$_2$, orbital and Pauli paramagnetic effects and magnetic Eu$^{2+}$ moments all play an important role in determining $B_{c2}$, which complicates the understanding of the obtained $B_{c2}$ vs $T_c$. In a previous paper, we analyzed $B_{c2}(T)$ data obtained at 2.5 GPa (also shown in Fig. 5(c)) using a multiple pair-breaking model that includes the antiferromagnetic exchange field $B_J$ due to magnetic Eu$^{2+}$ moments. We obtained the spin-orbit scattering parameter $\lambda_{so} = 2.4$, and the maximum of $|B_J|$ as $B_J^{m} = 75$ T, where the Maki parameter $\alpha = 3$ is fixed. It is known that $m^*$ is related to $\alpha$ through $m^* \propto \sqrt{\alpha/T_c}$ or $\alpha/\tau_0$ ($\tau_0$: residual resistivity) in the clean or dirty limit, respectively. Thus, we estimate $\alpha$ as a function of $P$ using the same model. As $\alpha$ is highly sensitive to other fitting parameters, we use the values of $\lambda_{so} = 2.4$ and $B_J^{m} = 75$ T for all the pressures. Dashed curves are fitting results using $\alpha$ and $T_c$ as free parameters. The inset of Fig. 5(c) shows the $P$ dependences of $\alpha/T_c$ and $\alpha/\tau_0$. The former exhibits only a modest increase, whereas the latter exhibits a decrease as $P_c$ is approached. This indicates that, either in the clean or dirty limit, there is no divergence of $m^*$ as the pressure approaches $P_c$.

We now address the issue of the NFL behavior. Figure 6(a) shows the $T$ dependence of $\rho$ under zero field in EuFe$_2$As$_2$ ($RRR = 13$) at several pressures. Solid curves are fits to $\rho = \rho_0 + C T^x$ ($C$: constant). To avoid the effect of Eu$^{2+}$ moments or superconductivity, we use data in a fitting range from 35 K (fixed) to several temperatures between 50 K and $T_0$. Figure 6(b) indicates the $P$ evolution of the exponent $x$. At $P \ll P_c$, Fermi liquid (FL) like behavior ($x \sim 2$) is observed. As the pressure approaches $P_c$, $x$ decreases rapidly and reaches approximately unity.

It has previously been proposed that the $T$-linear resistivity in iron-based SCs arises from the $T$-dependent carrier concentration and that the carrier scattering rate $\tau^{-1}$ obeys a standard FL $T^2$ law. We therefore show the $T$ dependence of $(m^*/m_0)/\tau = (e/m_0)\mu_i^{-1}$ at 2.9, 3.1, and 3.2 GPa ($P > P_c$) obtained from the above two-carrier analyses. The $x$ dependence of $\rho$ is fixed. As shown in Fig. 8, $\rho$ increases from $0.05$ and $0.1$ e/Fe gives a similar approximately $T$-linear dependence of $\rho$.

Figure 8 shows $\rho(T)$ at 2.9 GPa ($\sim P_c$) under several fields of up to 15 T. The FL $T^2$ behavior is gradually restored with increasing $B$. To estimate the $T$ variation of the exponent $x$ under applied fields, we fit the data to $\rho = \rho_0 + C T^x$ in several temperature ranges. The inset of Fig. 8 shows the $T$ variation of $x$ under 0, 8, and 15 T. Under zero field, the $x$ value is close to one. Under applied fields of 8 and 15 T, with decreasing $T$, the $x$ value increases from $\sim 1$ and approaches $\sim 2$. This clearly indicates that the origin of the $T$-linear resistivity is spin fluctuations. As is well known, spin fluctuation theories predict $T$-linear resistivity for two-dimensional nearly AF metals. To our knowledge, there has been no observation of a $B$-induced change in the resistivity exponent from 1 to 2 in iron-based SCs. The present observation is most likely to result from the fact that the conduction carrier spins are influenced by the large exchange field from the Eu$^{2+}$ moments, in addition to the externally applied field. That is, as soon as the Eu$^{2+}$ moments are fully aligned by the applied field, the conduction electrons feel a large exchange field of $-B_J^{m} = -75$ T, which effectively suppresses the spin fluctuations.
IV. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, our analyses of magnetotransport and upper critical fields in EuFe$_2$As$_2$ under high pressure indicate that there is no QCP at $P_c$ in this pure compound, which is in sharp contrast to the observation in BaFe$_2$(As,P)$_2$\textsuperscript{13,15}. On the other hand, we have shown that the scattering rates for both electrons and holes are approximately $T$-linear for $P > P_c$. The recovery of the FL $T^2$ dependence of $\rho$ at high fields clearly indicates that spin fluctuations are the origin of the anomalous scattering. It appears that systematic analyses of spin (and/or orbital) fluctuations based on the electronic structures of individual materials, beyond a generic scenario based on a QCP, are necessary to elucidate the mechanism of iron-based superconductivity.
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Appendix

The procedure for the three carrier analysis used in simultaneously fitting the obtained $\rho$ and $\rho_B$ data of EuFe$_2$As$_2$ is shown below. This procedure is essentially the same as that used in the recent work on the sister compound BaFe$_2$As$_2$\textsuperscript{41}.

Tensor components of the electrical conductivity, $\sigma_{xx}$ (=$\sigma_{yy}$) and $\sigma_{xy}$ (= $-\sigma_{yx}$), for three carriers can be expressed in the following forms using those of the electrical resistivity, $\rho_{xx}$ (= $\rho_{yy}$=$\rho$) and $\rho_{xy}$ (= $-\rho_{yx}$=$\rho_B$):

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{\rho_{xx}}{\rho_{xx}^2 + \rho_{xy}^2} = \frac{1}{\left(1 + (\mu_i B)^2\right)^2}$$

$$\sigma_{xy} = \frac{\rho_{xy}}{\rho_{xx}^2 + \rho_{xy}^2} = \frac{3}{\left(1 + (\mu_i B)^2\right)^2}$$

where $q_i$, $n_i$, and $\mu_i$ are the charge, density, and mobility of the $i$th carrier, respectively, and the tensors of the electrical conductivity $\sigma$ and resistivity $\rho$ have the forms:

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{xx} & \sigma_{xy} \\ -\sigma_{xy} & \sigma_{xx} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{xx} & \rho_{xy} \\ -\rho_{xy} & \rho_{xx} \end{pmatrix}$$

From Eq. (1), $\rho_{xx}$ and $\rho_{xy}$ can be written as follows:

$$\rho_{xx} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{3} q_i n_i \mu_i^2}{1 + (\mu_i B)^2}$$

$$\rho_{xy} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{3} q_i n_i \mu_i^2}{1 + (\mu_i B)^2}$$
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