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Abstract. Superconductivity in the layered yttrium diboride dicarbide, YB$_2$C$_2$, has been revisited by means of specific heat, magnetic susceptibility and resistivity measurements down to 50 mK revealing a bulk superconducting transition at 1.0 K. Analysing the low temperature specific heat we obtain a Sommerfeld coefficient of the normal state electronic contribution, $\gamma = 3.1(1)\text{ mJ/mol K}^2$, and a Debye temperature, $\Theta_{D} = 680(10)\text{ K}$. The specific heat anomaly at $T_C$, $\Delta C \simeq 4.5\text{ mJ/mol K}$, thus, yields a thermodynamic ratio $\Delta C/\gamma T_C \simeq 1.4$ in close agreement with the BCS value. For polycrystalline Y$_{11}$B$_2$C$_2$ prepared by inductive melting we observe a pronounced resistive anomaly near 3.6 K which, however, corresponds to a rather spurious specific heat anomaly and is thus attributed to traces of YC$_2$ present in this sample.

1. Introduction
The discovery of superconductivity in RNi$_2$B$_2$C ($R =$ rare earth and Y) and MgB$_2$ [1, 2] attracted attention on metal borides and intermetallic borocarbides and especially on the low dimensional character of certain features of their electronic structure. An interesting intermetallic borocarbide with laminar structure [3, 4] is YB$_2$C$_2$ with a tetragonal lattice build by alternating layers of yttrium and B−C sheets. The latter are a flat network formed by distorted interconnected cyclobutadiene-like B−C rings which are markedly different from the hexagonal boron planes in MgB$_2$. A recent study of the electronic structure by Khmelevskyi et al. [6] suggested that the metallic conductivity of YB$_2$C$_2$ is due Y $d$-bands partially hybridized with $p_z$-states from the B−C planes and that large portions of the Fermi surface exhibit distinctive two-dimensional features which may cause interesting features of a superconducting state. Superconductivity of YB$_2$C$_2$ was reported by Sakai et al. [5] with $T_C \sim 3.6$ K which, however, is close to the $T_C$ of YC$_2$ [7]. In the present paper we re-investigated the appearance of bulk superconductivity in single phase YB$_2$C$_2$ by means of specific heat and magnetic susceptibility measurements down to 50 mK.

2. Experimental details
Polycrystalline material of Y$_{11}$B$_2$C$_2$ prepared by high frequency induction melting of ultra high purity elements: yttrium (Ames MPC [8], USA: 99.999%), isotope enriched boron $^{11}$B (Eagle-Pichler, USA: 99.999%, isotope purity 99.97%) and carbon (Alpha Aesar, USA: 99.9995%). Thereby, in a first step YC$_2$ ingots have been prepared and in a second step boron was added. The phase purity of the polycrystalline as cast material (sample 1) has been checked via powder x-ray diffraction (XRD). For Y$_{11}$B$_2$C$_2$ XRD reveals essentially single phase samples
with minor traces of YC₂. The latter is evident also from a spurious superconducting transition at 3.6 K visible in resistivity, susceptibility and specific heat data. In order to improve the phase purity, Y₁¹B₂C₂ was grown from the melt via the Czochralski method using a tri-arc furnace by Centorr Vacuum Industries. The Y₁¹B₂C₂ material obtained thereby (sample 2) showed clean single phase x-ray pattern (also magnetic susceptibility reveals a large reduction of the YC₂ diamagnetic impurity signal), significant texture and better mechanical stability.

X-ray studies were carried out on a Siemens D-5000 diffractometer equipped with a graphite monochromator. Ac susceptibility and specific heat measurements (using a relaxation method [9]) in the temperature range 0.1 K – 1.6 K were each carried out on a bar-shaped 100 mg piece from the Czochralski grown Y₁¹B₂C₂ sample 2 in two different ³He/⁴He cryostat systems equipped with 15/17 T superconducting magnets. For experimental reasons the field was in different orientations, parallel and orthogonal to the longitudinal edge of the sample in ac susceptibility and specific heat measurements, respectively. This implies two markedly different demagnetization factors, a relatively small one for ac susceptibility and a larger one for specific heat. Zero-field specific heat measurements in the temperature range 3 K-130 K were carried out on ∼ 1.1 g sample 1 of Y₁¹B₂C₂ employing an adiabatic step-heating technique. Temperature dependent resistivity of Y₁¹B₂C₂ sample 2 was measured in a ³He cryostat (0.5 K up to 230 K) with current parallel to the Czochralski growth direction revealing a room temperature to normal state residual resistivity ratio, RRR ∼ 15 and zero-resistance below 1 K.

3. Experimental results and discussion
The low temperature specific heat of Y₁¹B₂C₂ shown as C/T vs. T in figure 1 reveals a sharp bulk superconducting transition at 1.0 K. The specific heat anomaly at Tc, ΔCp/T ∼ 4.5 mJ/molK² and the normal state specific heat with linear-T electronic Sommerfeld coefficient γ = 3.15 (5) mJ/molK² yields the thermodynamic ratio ΔCp/(γnTc) ∼ 1.43 which matches the figure expected from BCS theory. A direct comparison of the zero-field specific heat data (superconducting magnet demagnetized by a thermal cycle) with the weak coupling BCS result [10] indicated as solid line in figure 1 reveals remarkably close over-all agreement. The
Figure 3. Temperature dependent real part $\chi'$ (full symbols) and imaginary part $\chi''$ (open symbols) of the ac susceptibility of $\text{Y}^{11}\text{B}_2\text{C}_2$ sample ♯2 measured at an ac field amplitude of about 1 mT and superimposed dc fields as labeled.

Figure 4. Upper critical field $\mu_0 H_{c2}(T)$ as obtained from specific heat and ac susceptibility; the solid line indicates the thermodynamic critical field $\mu_0 H_c(T)$ as obtained from the BCS idealization of the zero-field specific heat data.

The superconducting gap $\Delta(0) \approx 1.76k_B T_c$ and thermodynamic critical field $\mu_0 H_c(0) \approx 7.8$ (4) mT is, thus, obtained from the BCS values as corresponding to the experimental Sommerfeld coefficient $\gamma$ and $T_c$ of $\text{Y}^{11}\text{B}_2\text{C}_2$. As the magnetic field strength increases (see some selected field values in figure 1), both the transition temperature and the anomaly right at $T_c$ are suppressed, constituting the temperature dependent upper critical field $\mu_0 H_{c2}(T)$ (see below the discussion and the phase diagram in figure 4).

Figure 2 displays temperature dependent specific heat $C/T$ vs. $T$ measured on $\sim 1.1$ g sample ♯1 of $\text{Y}^{11}\text{B}_2\text{C}_2$ from 3 to 130 K and the corresponding low temperature $C/T$ vs. $T^2$ data in the inset. The latter is analyzed in terms of electronic and lattice contributions, $C_p = C_e + C_{ph} \approx \gamma T + \beta T^3$ where $\gamma$ is the Sommerfeld coefficient and $\beta$ is related to the low temperature value of the Debye temperature by $\Theta_{D}^T = (1944 \cdot n/\beta)^{1/3}$ ($n = 5$ is the number of atoms per formula unit). From the linear fit of the $C/T$ vs. $T^2$ data (16 K$^2 - 120$ K$^2$) we obtain $\gamma = 3.05(1)$ mJ/mol K$^2$ (LT) and $\Theta_{D}^T = 680(10)$ K. A more detailed analysis of the overall temperature dependence of the specific heat in terms of Debye- and Einstein contributions reveals a marked deviation of $C_{ph}(T)$ from a simple Debye-function above about 20 K presumably due to yttrium modes with Einstein temperatures near 200 K, which cause the marked kink in $C/T$ seen in figure 2 at about 25 K. The spurious anomaly visible in the inset of figure 2 at about 16 K$^2$ is attributed to the superconducting transition of $\text{YC}_2$ impurities.

The temperature dependent ac susceptibility of $\text{Y}^{11}\text{B}_2\text{C}_2$ sample ♯2 measured at a frequency of 40 Hz and an ac field amplitude of about 1 mT is displayed in figure 3. The slightly lower value of $T_c \approx 0.85$ K measured in zero dc-field (as compared to the zero-field specific heat result) is attributed to a small remanent field of about 1–2 mT in the 17 T magnet after field demagnetization. The ac susceptibility data obtained with additional dc field of 10 mT on the other hand yield a larger value of the field dependent $T_C$ as compared to the field dependent specific heat data in figure 1 and, thus, imply a slightly larger value of the upper critical field $\mu_0 H_{c2}(0)$. Figure 4 compares these $\mu_0 H_{c2}(T)$ data with the thermodynamic critical field $\mu_0 H_c(T)$
as obtained from the free energy difference between the superconducting and normal state, \( \Delta F(T) = F_n - F_s = \mu_0 H_c^2(T)/2 \). The thermodynamic critical field \( \mu_0 H_c(T) \) indicated by the solid line in figure 4 lies close to the upper critical field data obtained from specific heat, thus, pointing towards type-I superconductivity. The fact that \( \mu_0 H_c(T) \) obtained from field dependent specific heat data lies slightly below \( \mu_0 H_c(T) \) obtained from zero-field thermodynamic data may be the consequence of the limited resolution of the magnet power supply in this very low field regime (vertical error bars in figure 4 indicate a rough estimate) and/or a consequence of the relatively large demagnetization factor of the sample geometry with field oriented perpendicular to the longitudinal edge. The ac susceptibility data obtained with a different magnet system and a sample geometry with a small demagnetization factor \( N \sim 0.15 \), lie above the \( \mu_0 H_c(T) \) line, thus, indicating weak type-II superconductivity with an upper critical field \( \mu_0 H_c(0) \) still being very close to the thermodynamic critical field \( \mu_0 H_c(0) \).

In order to obtain an estimate for the electron-phonon mass enhancement factor we compare the experimental Sommerfeld coefficient \( \gamma = 3.14 \text{ mJ/mol K}^2 \) with bare Sommerfeld coefficient \( \gamma_b \sim 2.1 \text{ mJ/mol K}^2 \). The latter corresponds to the bare electronic density of states at the Fermi energy, \( N(E_F) \approx 0.9 \text{ states/eV f.u.} \), as obtained from electronic structure calculations reported in reference [6] via \( \gamma = \pi^2 k_B^2 N(E_F)/3 \). The relation \( \lambda = \gamma_b/\gamma - 1 \), thus, yields a value for the electron phonon mass enhancement \( \lambda \sim 0.4 \) which is in close agreement with the value obtained with the Mc Millan formula [11]

\[
T_c = \frac{\Theta_D}{1.45} \exp \left( -\frac{1.04(1 + \lambda)}{\lambda - \mu^*(1 + 0.62\lambda)} \right). \tag{1}
\]

Taking the experimental values of \( T_c = 1.0 \text{ K} \) and \( \Theta_D = 680 \text{ K} \) and assuming a typical value \( \mu^* = 0.13 \) for the Coulomb pseudopotential, McMillan formula yields almost exactly \( \lambda = 0.4 \). The close agreement of these two independent estimates of the electron-phonon mass enhancement corroborates the reliability of the \textit{ab initio} results.

4. Conclusions

The re-investigation single phase \( \text{YB}_2\text{C}_2 \) by means of specific heat and magnetic susceptibility measurements revealed bulk superconductivity with weak coupling BCS features below a transition temperature \( T_C = 1 \text{ K} \). The observation of type-I or at least weak type-II superconductivity with \( H_c(0) \sim H_c(0) \), i.e. Ginzburg-Landau parameter \( \kappa \sim 1/\sqrt{2} \) is rather exceptional among multinary compounds. Earlier reported signatures of a superconducting near 4K have been identified as spurious anomalies also in the present samples which, however, are clearly related to the presence of \( \text{YC}_2 \) impurities and, thus, extrinsic.
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