High field magnetotransport and specific heat in YbAgCu$_4$
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Abstract

The electrical resistivity ($\rho$) and magnetoresistance of polycrystalline YbAgCu$_4$ have been measured at temperatures between 25 mK and 300 K, and at magnetic fields ($B$) up to 18 T. The magnetoresistance ($\rho(B) - \rho(0)/\rho(0)$) is positive at all temperatures below 200 K and reaches its maximum of 60% at 18 T and 25 mK. The field- and temperature-dependent resistivity does not scale in a simple way. The opposite sign of the magnetoresistance at ambient and high pressure can be explained qualitatively by crystal-field effects lifting the degeneracy of the $J = 7/2$ groundstate. The linear coefficient of the specific heat ($\gamma$) measured at fields up to 10 T shows a quadratic field dependence. We did not find a linear relation between $\gamma^2$ and $A$, the $T^2$-coefficient of the temperature-dependent resistivity, with the applied magnetic field as the implicit parameter.

YbAgCu$_4$ is one of the few Yb-based intermetallic compounds with a large linear coefficient of the specific heat $\gamma = 245$ mJ/mol K$^2$ [1]. Its temperature-dependent magnetic susceptibility and specific heat are described well by the Coqblin–Schrieffer model with $J = 7/2$ and a characteristic energy scale $T_0 \approx 160$ K [1,2]. Inelastic neutron scattering [3] finds no evidence for well-defined crystal-field excitations consistent with the susceptibility results. Application of pressure causes a rapid decrease in $T_{\text{max}}$, the temperature at which the resistivity is maximal, and an increase in the $T^2$-coefficient of the resistivity ($A$) [4,5], suggesting that $dT_0/dP < 0$. At sufficiently high pressures, it is distinctly possible that $T_0$ becomes much smaller than the crystal-field splitting of the $J$-multiplet, the ground state degeneracy is at least partially lifted and spin fluctuations increasingly dominate electrical transport at low temperatures. This possibility could provide a partial explanation for the significantly different magnetoresistive behavior of YbAgCu$_4$ at low and high pressures. At ambient pressure the magnetoresistance is positive for $T < 20$ K and fields $< 10$ T [4] but for pressures $> 70$ kbar, the magnetoresistance is strongly negative [5]. To explore in more detail the origin of these opposite behaviors at low and high pressure (at large and small $T_0$, respectively) the specific heat ($C$), of YbAgCu$_4$ was measured in fields to 10 T for temperatures $4 K \leq T \leq 10 K$ and the electrical resistivity at fields up to 18 T and temperatures between 25 mK and 300 K.

The preparation of polycrystalline samples has been described previously [5]. The electrical resistivity was measured using a four lead AC resistance bridge (LR-400) operating at 17 Hz. The magnetic field was applied perpendicularly to the current (transverse geometry) and was generated by a 20 T superconducting magnet at the National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Los Alamos Facility. The specific heat
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Fig. 1. (a) Resistivity $\rho$ as a function of temperature $T$ at magnetic fields of 0 (bottom curve), 6, 10, 14 and 18 T (top curve). Inset $\rho$ versus $T^2$ at the same fields. The lines are linear fits to the data. (b) Magnetoresistance $(\rho(B) - \rho(0))/\rho(0)$ as a function of magnetic field $B$ at different temperatures.

was measured in a small mass calorimeter utilizing a relaxation method.

Fig. 1(a) shows the temperature-dependent resistivity $\rho$ of $\text{YbAgCu}_4$ in magnetic fields from 0 to 18 T. For $T < 15$ K, the curves can be fitted to $\rho(T, B) = \rho_0(B) + A(B)T^2$, which is shown explicitly in the inset of Fig. 1(a). The magnetoresistance $(\rho(B) - \rho(0))/\rho(0)$ is positive for all temperatures <200K and reaches its maximum of 60% at 18 T and 25 mK. The monotonic evolution of the magnetoresistance with increasing temperature is shown in Fig. 1(b). At each temperature $\Delta \rho/\rho(0) \approx B^\alpha$, with $\alpha \approx 1.5$. The data shown in Fig. 1(a) do not scale in any simple way, contrary to what has been found for pressure-induced changes in the resistivity [6]. For example, plots of $\rho/\rho_0$ versus $T/T_o$, where $\rho_0$ and $T_o$ are the resistivity and temperature where $\partial \rho/\partial T$ is a maximum, do not scale, nor does plotting the data in a Kohler-form $\Delta \rho/\rho(0) = f(B/\rho(0))$, or as $\rho$ versus $T\sqrt{\Delta}$.

The specific heat divided by temperature $T$ is plotted in Fig. 2 as a function of $T^2$ for various applied fields. Solid lines are least square fits to the data and yield the linear coefficients $\gamma$, which are shown in Fig. 3 to increase linearly with $B^2$. With the usual assumption that $\gamma \propto 1/T_o$, this implies that $T_o$ is inversely proportional to $B^2$. From the linear relation $\gamma \propto \sqrt{A}$ found [7] for several heavy fermion compounds at zero field, $A$ would be expected to increase as $B^2$. Fig. 3 shows the measured change in $A$ as a function of $B^2$. Although $A(B)$ increases superlinearly in $B^2$ for $B \leq 12$ T, at higher fields $A$ varies approximately as $B^2$. The inset of Fig. 3 clearly demonstrates the absence of a linear correlation between $\gamma$ and $\sqrt{A}$ for $B \leq 10$ T. This is contrary to what was found [8] when pressure was the implicit variable.

Qualitatively the different field responses of $\text{YbAgCu}_4$ at zero and high pressures can be understood as follows. Okiji and Kawakami [9] have shown for the $J = 5/2$ Coqblin–Schrieffer model that $\gamma$ increases approximately quadratically with field for $B < 0.4 T_o$ ($B < 95$ T for $T_o = 160$ K). A similar situation is expected to hold for $J = 7/2$, i.e. $\text{YbAgCu}_4$ at ambient pressure. From the assumed relationship between $\gamma$ and $A$, therefore it would be expected that $A$ increases with $B$, as found at ambient pressure. On the other hand, for $J = 1/2$, $\gamma$ decreases strongly with field

Fig. 2. Specific heat $C$ divided by temperature $T$ as a function of $T^2$ at different magnetic fields ($0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10$ T, from bottom to top). The lines are linear least squares fits.
[9,10] and $A$ should also be found decreasing with the field, as observed at high pressures [5]. Although, a change in ground state degeneracy appears to account qualitatively for observations at ambient and high pressure, there remain quantitative questions to be addressed. The 10% increase in $\gamma$ at 10 T is larger than predicted, at least for $J = 5/2$. The large change in $\rho_0$ in the applied field, for either ambient or high pressures, lacks a simple explanation, as does the field dependence of $A$ and, more generally, of $\rho(T)$. Additional high field measurements on heavy fermion systems are now in progress to identify to what extent these features are general [11].
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