Nonvanishing Energy Scales at the Quantum Critical Point of CeCoIn$_5$

Johnpierre Paglione,[1] M. A. Tanatar,[1,*] D. G. Hawthorn,[1] F. Ronning,[1] R. W. Hill,[1]
M. Sutherland,[1] Louis Taillefer,[1,2,†] and C. Petrovic[3]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto M5S 1A7, Canada*
[2]*Département de physique and RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke J1K 2R1, Canada*
[3]*Condensed Matter Physics Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA*
(Received 7 May 2004; revised manuscript received 4 May 2006; published 8 September 2006)

Heat and charge transport were used to probe the magnetic field-tuned quantum critical point in the heavy-fermion metal CeCoIn$_5$. A comparison of electrical and thermal resistivities reveals three characteristic energy scales. A Fermi-liquid regime is observed below T_{FL}, with both transport coefficients diverging in parallel and $T_{FL} \to 0$ as $H \to H_c$, the critical field. The characteristic temperature of antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations, T_{SF}, is tuned to a minimum but *finite* value at H_c, which coincides with the end of the T-linear regime in the electrical resistivity. A third temperature scale, T_{QP}, signals the formation of quasiparticles, as fermions of charge e obeying the Wiedemann-Franz law. Unlike T_{FL}, it remains finite at H_c, so that the integrity of quasiparticles is preserved, even though the standard signature of Fermi-liquid theory fails.

PACS numbers: 72.15.−v, 42.50.Lc, 71.10.Hf, 71.27.+a

The ongoing search for universality in systems tuned to a quantum critical point (QCP) has led to the discovery of a host of fascinating condensed matter systems which deviate from Landau's Fermi-liquid (FL) theory of metals. With dominant characteristic energy scales which become small or vanishing at a QCP, the Fermi energy no longer dictates the form of low-energy excitations, and so-called non-FL behavior prevails [1].

The extent to which zero-temperature critical fluctuations influence the fermionic degrees of freedom at a QCP is an open question. For instance, two leading theories predict quite different fates for the FL state. In the weak-coupling quantum spin-density wave (SDW) scenario [2,3], fluctuations are concentrated at hot spots on the Fermi surface, leading to a "mild" breakdown of FL theory: at the QCP, the electronic specific heat C/T shows a square-root divergence but remains finite in the $T \to 0$ limit [4], reflecting the fact that, below a *finite* characteristic temperature, the FL state is recovered on part of the Fermi surface. This scenario appears to be realized in CeNi$_2$Ge$_2$ [5] and CeIn$_3$ [6], and is usually accompanied by a $T^{3/2}$ dependence of resistivity [4]. In the strong-coupling "locally" critical scenario [7,8], fluctuations are thought to completely cover the Fermi surface, causing a logarithmic divergence of C/T and a vanishing characteristic temperature [8]. This leads to a "strong" breakdown of the quasiparticle picture [8]. This scenario is thought to be realized in YbRh$_2$Si$_2$ [5,9] and CeCu$_{5.9}$Au$_{0.1}$ [10], and is characterized by a T-linear resistivity at the QCP.

The comparison of heat and charge transport is one of a few experimental studies which can give access to information on the spectrum of critical fluctuations *and* their influence on fermionic excitations. A quintessential test of FL theory is the Wiedemann-Franz (WF) law, which states that the ratio of thermal (κ) to electrical (σ) conductivities

is a universal constant in the $T \to 0$ limit: $\kappa/\sigma T = L_0 \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{3}(\frac{k_B}{e})^2$. A violation of this law would imply a profound breakdown of the FL model, in the sense that low-lying excitations would no longer be quasiparticles of charge e obeying Fermi statistics. In addition, a comparison of $\kappa(T)$ and $\sigma(T)$ at finite temperatures provides information about the momentum and energy dependence of magnetic fluctuations, through their effect on quasiparticle scattering, and thus can also be used to probe the nature of a QCP.

In this Letter, we apply this approach to a system with tunable critical behavior in order to (i) test the WF law at the QCP and (ii) track the fluctuation spectrum as a function of tuning parameter. The material, CeCoIn$_5$, is a heavy-fermion metal which exhibits a magnetic field-tuned QCP characterized by a divergence in transport [11] and thermodynamic [12] quantities at a critical field H_c. With a readily accessible and continuous control parameter, this extremely clean, stoichiometric material offers a unique opportunity to study criticality via heat transport over the entire temperature range of relevance.

Heat and charge transport measurements were performed as described previously [13,14] on single crystals of CeCoIn$_5$ grown by the self-flux method [15] with $\rho_0 \simeq 0.1$ $\mu\Omega$ cm ($H \to 0$), for currents parallel to [100] and field parallel to [001]. A comparison of heat and charge resistivities reveals that scattering in CeCoIn$_5$ is practically identical to that observed in antiferromagnetic CeRhIn$_5$ above its ordering temperature, T_N [13], both being governed by a comparable spin-fluctuation scale T_{SF}. This confirms the magnetic nature of the QCP in CeCoIn$_5$ [16]. Moreover, in CeCoIn$_5$ T_{SF} is tuned by magnetic field towards a minimum but *finite* value at H_c, which accounts for the departure at low T from the T-linear resistivity. We show that, despite the presence of a non-FL $T^{3/2}$ power law in both electrical and thermal resistivities at H_c, the WF

law is still obeyed in the $T \to 0$ limit. This reveals a mild breakdown of FL theory in CeCoIn$_5$ consistent with the SDW model.

Fermi-liquid temperature, T_{FL}.—Previous resistivity measurements [11] have shown that a FL regime develops in CeCoIn$_5$ above its superconducting $H_{c2} = 5$ T, characterized by $\Delta\rho \equiv \rho - \rho_0 = AT^2$, with A diverging as $A(H) \propto (H - H_{c,A})^{-\alpha}$, where $H_{c,A} = 5.1$ T and $\alpha = 1.37 \approx 4/3$. Figure 1 presents an analysis of $\rho(T)$ and $\kappa(T)$ data obtained from a new sample with resistivity characterized by very similar fit parameters, namely $H_{c,A} = 5.0 \pm 0.1$ T and $\alpha = 1.29 \pm 0.1$. As a function of field, κ/T evolves from an almost divergent behavior at 5.25 T towards more FL-like saturation at higher fields. This is seen more clearly by plotting the electronic [17] thermal resistivity $w \equiv L_0 T/\kappa_e$ vs T^2, in the left inset of Fig. 1. This plot reveals a T^2 dependence of $w(T)$ (i.e. $\Delta w \equiv w - w_0 = BT^2$), observed below a characteristic temperature T_{FL} as high as 1.0 K at 12 T, which decreases steadily, so that $T_{FL} \to 0$ at H_c (see Fig. 4).

The field dependence of the slope B, which represents the contribution of electron-electron (*e-e*) scattering to thermal transport (analogous to A), is shown in the right inset of Fig. 1, together with $A(H)$. It is clear that $B(H)$ has the *same critical field dependence* as $A(H)$. Specifically, B is best fitted by a function $B(H) \propto (H - H_{c,B})^{-\beta}$ with parameters $H_{c,B} = 5.0 \pm 0.2$ T and $\beta = 1.34 \pm 0.1$, so that $H_{c,A} = H_{c,B} \equiv H_c = 5.0$ T and $\alpha = \beta$ (within error). Therefore, $A(H)$ and $B(H)$ differ only by a *field-independent* factor, $A/B = 0.47 \pm 0.03$. Since the ratio A/B is governed by the **q** dependence (i.e., is sensitive to the angular dependence) of *e-e* scattering around the

Fermi surface [18], this suggests that the anisotropy of quasiparticle scattering in CeCoIn$_5$ is unchanged by the field, even though A itself grows by a factor of 35, from 0.2 $\mu\Omega$ cm/K^2 at 16 T to 7 $\mu\Omega$ cm/K^2 at 6 T.

Quasiparticle temperature, T_{QP}.—As we approach the QCP, the ranges of T^2 thermal and electrical resistivities shrink to nothing (i.e., $T_{FL} \to 0$), whereupon both $\Delta\rho$ and Δw exhibit a different power-law dependence at low temperature, namely $T^{3/2}$ (see upper panels of Fig. 2). Remarkably, the $T \to 0$ extrapolations of $\rho(T)$ and $w(T)$ *within this non-FL regime* nevertheless converge to satisfy the WF law, so that $\rho_0 = w_0$ (within the $\pm6\%$ experimental accuracy on the ratio) not only far from H_c (e.g., at 10 T) but also right at H_c (i.e., at 5.25 T). This reveals that the breakdown of FL theory in CeCoIn$_5$ is not complete: while the expected T^2 dependence of the scattering rate is indeed violated at the QCP, *the integrity of the quasiparticles themselves is nonetheless preserved.*

The overall temperature dependence is best captured by plotting the (normalized) Lorenz ratio, $L/L_0 \equiv \kappa_e/L_0\sigma T \equiv \rho(T)/w(T)$, shown in the lower panel of Fig. 2. The convergence of $\rho(T)$ and $w(T)$ shows up as a rapid upturn in L/L_0 with decreasing T, wherefrom it is aimed at unity. We define as T_{QP} the onset of this upturn,

FIG. 2 (color online). Upper panels: comparison of thermal [$w(T)$; open symbols] and electrical [$\rho(T)$; solid symbols] resistivities at the critical field (5.25 T), plotted vs $T^{3/2}$ (left), and in the FL regime (at 10 T), plotted vs T^2 (right). Lower panel: normalized Lorenz ratio, $L/L_0 \equiv \kappa_e/L_0\sigma T \equiv \rho(T)/w(T)$, vs T. Dashed lines show the ratio of the low-temperature power laws, namely $(\rho_0 + aT^\alpha)/(w_0 + bT^\alpha)$, with $\alpha = 3/2$ and 2, for 5.25 and 10 T, respectively. The quasiparticle temperature, T_{QP}, marked by arrows, is defined as the temperature below which $L(T)$ starts to rise, aiming towards unity.


FIG. 1 (color online). Thermal conductivity of CeCoIn$_5$, plotted as κ/T vs T (main panel) and as electronic [17] thermal resistivity $w = L_0 T/\kappa_e$ vs T^2 (left inset), for $H \parallel [001]$. The data in the left inset, offset for clarity, are for $H = 6, 7, 8, 10,$ and 12 T (bottom to top); lines are linear fits valid up to $T = T_{FL}$, the Fermi-liquid temperature, marked by an arrow for $H = 10$ T. Right inset: field dependence of the T^2 Fermi-liquid coefficients of charge and heat transport.

which is also the temperature below which $\Delta\rho$ and Δw have both reached their asymptotic power-law behavior. *We view T_{QP} as the temperature below which quasiparticles form.* In the inset of Fig. 3, we plot T_{QP} as a function of field. Away from the QCP, for $H \gtrsim 10$ T, T_{QP} coincides with T_{FL}, so that quasiparticles exhibit the standard T^2 behavior as they form. However, as one approaches the QCP, for $H < 10$ T, the upturn in $L(T)$ starts above T_{FL}, and T_{QP} remains finite as T_{FL} vanishes. Therefore, quasiparticles still form at the QCP of CeCoIn$_5$, even though they do not show the standard FL signature of T^2 resistivity. This is reminiscent of the observation that quantum oscillations are still present at H_c, while standard Lifshitz-Kosevich theory fails [19]. For a complete breakdown of quasiparticles at the QCP, one would need to have seen $T_{QP} \to 0$, in addition to the usual condition $T_{FL} \to 0$. It transpires that *T_{QP} is a new and fundamental temperature scale for quantum criticality.*

Spin-fluctuation temperature, T_{SF}.—A recent study of CeRhIn$_5$ [13] has shown the usefulness of examining not only the ratio, but also the *difference* between thermal and electrical resistivities, given by $\delta \equiv 1/\kappa_e - \rho/L_0 T$ [20]. Physically, $\delta(T)$ is due to those scattering processes in which the energy of the conduction electron is changed but not its direction, thereby affecting κ but not σ [21]. It is plotted in Fig. 4 for both CeCoIn$_5$ and CeRhIn$_5$. We begin by describing its behavior in CeRhIn$_5$, where the electronic scattering rate was observed to be directly proportional to the entropy of the magnetic system (specifically, $w \propto S_{mag}$, the magnetic entropy) [13].

At high temperature, $\delta(T)$ goes to zero, not because the overall scattering has decreased, for that keeps increasing monotonically with T (tracking S_{mag}), but because direction-conserving processes have become ineffective. This occurs when T exceeds the characteristic temperature T_{SF} of spin fluctuations, which then have insufficient energy to scatter electrons through the thermal layer [21]. We define T_{SF} to be the temperature where $\delta(T) \to 0$ [22]. In CeRhIn$_5$, $T_{SF} \simeq 8$ K [13], the temperature where, interestingly, neutron studies found antiferromagnetic correlations to set in [23]. As temperature is decreased below T_{SF}, $\delta(T)$ starts to rise, and keeps rising until T_N, where it takes an abrupt cusplike dive, as a gap opens in the fluctuation spectrum upon ordering. At T well below T_N, the electron system eventually enters a FL state characterized by: (1) a linear rise in $\delta(T)$ up to $T_{FL} \simeq 1.5$ K, from the T^2 dependence of both w and ρ; (2) a low mass enhancement, with $A = 0.02$ $\mu\Omega$ cm/K^2 [13], and (3) the WF law, $\delta(T) \to 0$ at $T \to 0$.

Turning to CeCoIn$_5$, one can see from Fig. 4 that at high temperature $\delta(T)$ curves for all fields can be collapsed onto the $\delta(T)$ curve for CeRhIn$_5$ above T_N, upon normalizing T by T_{SF}. The values of T_{SF} needed for this scaling are plotted in Fig. 3. By inspection, one can see that CeCoIn$_5$ at $\simeq$ 15 T is equivalent to CeRhIn$_5$ for $T > 4$ K, in the sense that the two materials have the same $\rho(T)$ and $\delta(T)$, the same $T_{SF} \simeq 8$ K and even the same $T_{FL} \simeq 1.5$ K. Therefore, *the electrons are scattered by the same antiferromagnetic fluctuations in both materials.* The difference occurs

FIG. 3 (color online). Evolution of characteristic energy scales in CeCoIn$_5$ vs magnetic field. The Fermi-liquid temperature T_{FL} is the end of the T^2 regime in $w(T)$ (squares). The quasiparticle temperature T_{QP} is the onset of the low-T upturn in $L(T)$ (diamonds). The spin-fluctuation temperature T_{SF} is reached when $\delta(T) = 0$ at high T (circles). Error bars for T_{QP} and T_{FL} are smaller than the size of symbols. Note that $T_{QP} = T_{FL}$ at $H = 10$ T and above. To the right, we also show T_{SF} and T_{FL} for CeRhIn$_5$ (at $H = 0$).


FIG. 4 (color online). Difference between electronic thermal resistivity and electrical resistivity of CeCoIn$_5$, labeled δ, as a function of reduced temperature T/T_{SF}, where T_{SF} is obtained by making all curves at different fields (as indicated) match at high temperature. The corresponding data for antiferromagnetic CeRhIn$_5$ in zero field is also shown (thick black line). Inset: temperature dependence of electrical resistivity at the critical field, with the arrow indicating the position of T_{SF}. The line is a linear fit to the data above 8 K.

below 4 K: while the magnetic moments in CeRhIn$_5$ order at $T_N = 3.8$ K, they never do in CeCoIn$_5$ where the entropy remains high all the way down to the FL regime, leading to a large mass enhancement, with a coefficient $A = 0.2$ $\mu\Omega$ cm/K^2 (at 16 T) [11], 1 order of magnitude larger than in CeRhIn$_5$.

As the field is decreased towards H_c, T_{SF} steadily drops towards a minimum value of 4.4 K at H_c (see Fig. 3). This shows that the antiferromagnetic fluctuations in CeCoIn$_5$ are indeed tuned by the magnetic field. Note, however, that T_{SF} does not vanish at H_c. This fact is an important new element in our understanding of quantum criticality in CeCoIn$_5$. In particular, it elucidates why the resistivity does not display a single power law at the QCP: as shown in the inset of Fig. 4, $\rho(T)$ at H_c is linear down to 5 K, but then drops as it crosses T_{SF}, to eventually go over to a $T^{3/2}$ dependence.

A finite T_{SF} suggests that the energy of magnetic fluctuations remains finite even at the QCP, as found with neutrons in CeNi$_2$Ge$_2$ [24], which also obeys the WF law [25] as does Sr$_3$Ru$_2$O$_7$ at its field-tuned QCP [26]. Together with a $T^{3/2}$ dependence at H_c, also observed in CeIn$_3$ under both applied field [6] and pressure [27], and in CeCoIn$_5$ under pressures that restore the Fermi-liquid state at low T [28], this is consistent with Gaussian-type fluctuations predicted in the SDW model [2–4]. This presumably indicates that magnetic fluctuations in the CeIn$_3$ planes of CeCoIn$_5$ and in bulk CeIn$_3$ itself have a similar character.

Summarizing our observations, we can state that (1) fluctuations near the field-tuned QCP in CeCoIn$_5$ are antiferromagnetic in nature, as revealed by the scaling of $\delta(T)$ curves for CeCoIn$_5$ relative to CeRhIn$_5$; (2) the characteristic temperature scale of fluctuations, T_{SF}, is tuned to a minimum but nonvanishing value at the QCP; (3) T_{SF} correlates well with the end of the T-linear regime in the electrical resistivity, thus accounting for the lack of a single power law in $\rho(T)$ at the QCP; (4) at H_c, both electrical and thermal resistivities exhibit a $T^{3/2}$ dependence below a second nonvanishing characteristic temperature, T_{QP}; (5) even in the presence of such non-FL behavior, the Wiedemann-Franz law holds in the $T \to 0$ limit at H_c.

These findings point to a mild, incomplete breakdown of Fermi-liquid theory in CeCoIn$_5$, characterized by a nonvanishing T_{QP}, the temperature below which fermionic quasiparticles of charge e appear to still form, even at the QCP where the usual T^2 Fermi-liquid regime has shrunk to nothing ($T_{FL} \to 0$). This seems to be in line with the spin-density wave scenario of quantum criticality, even though it requires that the Kondo temperature, effectively removing local moments from the problem, be higher than $T_{SF} \simeq$ 4 K, and the single-impurity Kondo temperature in dilute Ce$_{1-x}$La$_x$CoIn$_5$ alloys was determined to be ~1.5 K [29].

*Permanent address: Institute of Surface Chemistry, N.A.S. Ukraine, Kyiv 03164, Ukraine.
†Electronic address: Louis.Taillefer@USherbrooke.ca

[1] G. R. Stewart, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 797 (2001).
[2] J. A. Hertz, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 1165 (1976); A. J. Millis, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 7183 (1993).
[3] T. Moriya, *Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism* (Springer, Berlin, 1985).
[4] T. Moriya and T. Takimoto, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64**, 960 (1995); A. Rosch, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 4945 (2000).
[5] P. Gegenwart et al., J. Low Temp. Phys. **133**, 3 (2003).
[6] T. Ehibara et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 246401 (2004); A. V. Silhanek et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 206401 (2006).
[7] Q. Si et al., Nature (London) **413**, 804 (2001).
[8] P. Coleman et al., J. Phys. Condens. Matter **13**, R723 (2001).
[9] J. Custers et al., Nature (London) **424**, 524 (2003).
[10] A. Schroder et al., Nature (London) **407**, 351 (2000).
[11] J. Paglione et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 246405 (2003).
[12] A. Bianchi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 257001 (2003).
[13] J. Paglione et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 216602 (2005).
[14] M. A. Tanatar et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 067002 (2005).
[15] C. Petrovic et al., J. Phys. Condens. Matter **13**, L337 (2001).
[16] F. Ronning et al., Phys. Rev. B **73**, 064519 (2006).
[17] Apart from the main panel of Fig. 1, where raw data is shown, we always use the *electronic* component $\kappa_e = \kappa - \kappa_p$, obtained by subtracting a phonon contribution as described previously [13]. Note that κ_p is negligible below ~1 K.
[18] J. T. Schriempf et al., Phys. Rev. **187**, 959 (1969).
[19] A. McCollam et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 186401 (2005).
[20] This definition of δ differs from that of [13] by an overall factor of T, but it now conforms to that used in theoretical calculations, such as in [21].
[21] A. B. Kaiser, Phys. Rev. B **3**, 3040 (1971).
[22] T_{SF} is a characteristic temperature analogous to the Debye temperature Θ_D in metals with dominant electron-phonon scattering, where indeed $\delta(T) \to 0$ at $T \simeq \Theta_D$.
[23] W. Bao et al., Phys. Rev. B **65**, 100505 (2002).
[24] H. Kadowaki et al., Phys. Rev. B **68**, 140402(R) (2003).
[25] S. Kambe et al., J. Low Temp. Phys. **117**, 101 (1999).
[26] F. Ronning et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 067005 (2006).
[27] N. D. Mathur et al., Nature (London) **394**, 39 (1998).
[28] V. A. Sidorov et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 157004 (2002).
[29] S. Nakatsuji et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 106402 (2002).