

Ultrasonic attenuation in a pseudogapped superconductor

A. V. Shtyk^{1,2} and M. V. Feigel'man^{3,4}

¹ *Physics Department, Harvard University, USA*

² *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Dolgoprudny, Moscow region, Russia*

³ *L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics,
Chernogolovka, 142432, Moscow region, Russia and*

⁴ *Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia*

(Dated: October 11, 2018)

We develop a theory of ultrasound decay rate α in a model of a superconductor with a large pseudogap Δ_P , and show that at low temperatures ($T \ll T_c$) the magnitude of the decay rate α is controlled by the ratio of T/Δ , where $\Delta \ll \Delta_P$ is a superconducting collective gap. Thus we propose new method to measure the collective gap Δ in a situation when strong pseudogap is present.

I. INTRODUCTION

Strongly disordered superconductors near quantum phase transition (QPT) into an insulator state became again an object of great interest during last decade, both on experimental side¹⁻⁹ and among theorists¹²⁻¹⁵ (references given above are certainly incomplete, due to a large number of papers in the field). On experimental side, revival of the interest to this subject comes about due to new methods which became available. In particular, low-temperature scanning tunneling spectroscopy makes it possible to study properties of superconducting state locally with a nanometer-scale resolution, which allowed to demonstrate^{1,2} an existence of a strong density-of-states (DoS) suppression at temperatures much above the superconducting transition T_c . In particular, amorphous InO_x films demonstrate virtually zero DoS at and around Fermi level at $T \leq 1.5T_c$. Such a phenomenon was called *pseudogap*, in analogy to the somewhat similar phenomenon known for under-doped high- T_c oxide superconductors. Experimentally, clear distinction between single-particle gap (pseudo-gap) Δ_P and collective superconducting gap Δ was made by means of Andreev contact spectroscopy¹⁰ of the same InO_x films.

Theoretically, it became possible to understand¹² the origin of a pseudogap as a result of an effective (phonon-mediated) electron-electron attraction acting between Anderson-localized electrons. A detailed semi-quantitative theory of superconductivity, starting from BCS-like model with localized single-electron states (near 3D Anderson localization transition) was developed in Ref.¹³, elaborating an approach proposed originally in¹⁶ and developed numerically in¹⁷. Qualitatively similar results were later obtained¹⁸⁻²⁰ by means of Renormalization Group methods developed for 2D systems. Application of ideas developed in¹³ was found to be useful²¹ to the understanding of unusual scaling of superconducting density versus superconducting gap, $\rho_s \propto \Delta^2$, as reported in Ref.²². A microwave absorption technique used in²² may present an alternative to Andreev spectroscopy^{10,11} for measurement of the genuine superconducting gap.

The present paper is devoted to development of a theory of still another phenomenon that is directly related

to the collective superconducting gap in disordered materials at very low temperatures near SIT. Namely, we consider attenuation rate $\alpha(\omega, T)$ of ultrasound wave propagating in a superconducting material with a well developed pseudogap $\Delta_P \gg \Delta$, at the temperature range $T \ll \Delta/k_B$ and at relatively low frequencies $\hbar\omega \ll k_B T$ (below the Boltzmann's constant k_B is set to unity). In the paper²³ we have shown that ultrasound attenuation rate is intrinsically related to the electron-phonon inelastic energy exchange, which becomes very inefficient at sub-Kelvin temperatures, leading to thermal instabilities and electron overheating²⁴ in a "neighbouring" insulating state of the same (or similar) materials^{5,25,26}. We identified in Ref.²³ a few mechanisms leading to (possibly strong) enhancement of the electron-phonon inelastic coupling due to the presence of slowly diffusing modes which may exist in an electronic liquid (particle density, magnetization density, etc.).

In Ref.²⁷ we have studied one more example of such a diffusion-controlled enhancement, now due to diffusion of thermal energy. This mechanism is quite universally present in any disordered conductor, while its relative strength (with respect to the standard local Pippard mechanism²⁸) may vary a lot. In particular, we have calculated²⁷ ultrasound attenuation $\alpha(\omega, T)$ for both s-wave and d-wave BCS-type superconducting states (as well as in normal doped Silicon); in the s-wave case both Pippard's and diffusion-controlled mechanisms provide an exponentially suppressed low-temperature attenuation $\alpha(\omega, T) \propto \exp(-\Delta/T)$, differing in preexponential factors.

For a pseudogapped superconductor with large single-particle gap Δ_P , all *local* inelastic electron-phonon processes are obviously suppressed $\propto \exp(-\Delta_P/T)$, while ultrasound attenuation due to energy diffusion mode are expected to contain exponential factors $\propto \exp(-\Delta/T)$, with smaller collective gap Δ . Thus it is natural to expect that low-temperature behavior of $\alpha(\omega, T)$ will be controlled by this latter mechanism. The purpose of the present paper is to calculate $\alpha(\omega, T)$ within the simplest model of a pseudogapped superconductor. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Sec.II we formulate our basic model for a superconductor with a large pseudogap and discuss its basic properties, Sec. III is

devoted to the derivation of the form of collective modes present in the superconducting state, then in Sec. IV we introduce simplest model of electron-phonon coupling relevant for the pseudogapped superconductor. Sec. V contains derivation of our main results: ultrasonic attenuation rate $\alpha(\omega, T)$ due to coupling between phonons and two collective superconducting modes (phase and amplitude modes) is derived. Sec. VI is devoted to a discussion of the role of long-range Coulomb interaction between electron pairs. Finally, Sec. VI contains our conclusions.

II. MODEL HAMILTONIAN AND EFFECTIVE ACTION

According to the analysis developed in Ref.¹³, pseudogapped superconducting state can be realized in poor conductors where single-particle electron states are weakly localized (localization length L_{loc} is larger than mean distance between electrons which eventually participate in superconductivity), and effective Cooper attraction is present between electrons. For the last condition to be realized together with sufficient disorder needed for localization, Coulomb repulsion between conduction electrons should be strongly suppressed. This is the reason to start from the simplest model formulated in terms of "pseudo-spins" $1/2$ introduced originally by P.W.Anderson in²⁹:

$$H[\mathbf{S}_i] = -2 \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i S_i^z - \sum_{i>j=1}^N J_{ij} [S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y], \quad (1)$$

Here $S_i^+ = S_i^x + iS_i^y$ and $S_i^- = S_i^x - iS_i^y$ are operators which create (annihilate) a pair of electrons populating i -th localized eigenstate of the free-electron problem, while $S_i^z + 1/2$ counts the number of these pairs. Each localized eigenstate can be characterized by location of its maxima and by its eigenvalue ξ_i . Correspondingly, $2\xi_i$ is a local energy of a Cooper pair sitting on a "site" i . For simplicity, we assume sites i to be arranged into cubic lattice with an elementary cell of size a . Hamiltonian (1) acts in the reduced Hilbert space, spanned by localized electron pairs with zero total spin; single-electron population of any localized state is excluded, due to high extra energy $\Delta_P \gg \Delta$ associated with it (parity gap, see Ref.³⁰).

Magnitudes of ξ_i are random with a distribution function $p(\xi)$. We assume a box-shaped $p(\xi) = (2W)^{-1} \Theta(W - |\xi|)$ with energies in the interval $\xi \in (-W, W)$, although any distribution which is flat around Fermi energy position will lead to the same physical results. Then effective density of states (DoS) at the Fermi level is given by $\nu = 1/2Wa^3$. The second term of Eq.(1) describes hopping of Cooper pairs between the orbitals, that is equivalent to interaction between pseudospins. In the long-wavelength limit this (Fourier-transformed) interaction can be expanded in powers of small momenta \mathbf{k} ,

$$J(\mathbf{k}) = g [1 - R^2 k^2 + O(k^4)], \quad (2)$$

where $g \equiv J(\mathbf{0}) \sim J_{ij} \cdot R^3$ is the overall coupling strength and R can be interpreted as a typical interaction range (i.e. Cooper pair hopping range). According to Ref.¹³, we expect R to be somewhat larger than L_{loc} . The Hamiltonian (1) does not contain any remnants of long-range Coulomb repulsion between electrons; this is an idealized model which we are going to start from. We will discuss the role of (weak) Coulomb repulsion in the end of the paper. The same Hamiltonian (1) was employed in the paper³¹ to study quantum phase transition (QPT) between superconducting state (in spin terms, it is the state with nonzero average $\langle S_i^{x,y} \rangle$) and insulating state. In the present paper we will not consider specific features related to this QPT; instead, we are interested in the properties of collective excitations within well-developed superconducting state. This is why we choose to work here with the model of very large interaction (hopping) range $R \gg a$, and we will employ further a mean-field approximation based on this inequality. In this sense, our approach is similar to the usual semiclassical theory of superconductivity.

On a technical side, we choose Fedotov-Popov representation³² for spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ operators, that is useful to construct a diagrammatic approach and to study collective modes in the ordered state. It is shown in paper³² (see also some extension of this approach in³³) that exact representation of the partition function for interacting spin systems can be obtained by the representation of spin operators via a special kind of fermionic operators:

$$S_i^\alpha = (1/2) \psi_i^\dagger \sigma^\alpha \psi_i \quad (3)$$

where σ^α are three Pauli matrices and (anticommuting) two-component spinor operators $\psi(\tau), \psi^\dagger(\tau)$ obey the following boundary condition in the Matsubara imaginary time: $\psi(\tau + \beta) = i\psi(\tau)$, $\psi^\dagger(\tau + \beta) = -i\psi^\dagger(\tau)$, where $\beta = \hbar/T$. Following³³, we will refer to such a modified fermions as to "semions".

Using representation (3), we rewrite the original Hamiltonian in the form

$$H = - \sum_i \psi_i^+ \xi_i \sigma^z \psi_i - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i>j} J_{ij} (\psi_i^\dagger \sigma^\alpha \psi_i) (\psi_j^\dagger \sigma^\alpha \psi_j), \quad (4)$$

where in the interaction term the index $\alpha = x, y$. To treat the interaction term, we introduce a complex order parameter field Δ via Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation and integrate out semions. That results in the effective imaginary time action:

$$\mathcal{A}[\Delta] = - \text{Tr} [\Delta^* J^{-1} \Delta] + \text{Tr} \ln \left[i\varepsilon_l + \xi \sigma^z + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta \sigma^- + \Delta^* \sigma^+) \right]. \quad (5)$$

Matsubara energies here are of semionic nature and read as $\varepsilon_l = 2\pi T(l + 1/4)$, while traces go over all spaces.

The equilibrium order parameter is determined by the self-consistency equation that follows from the variation

of the Action, Eq.(5), over Δ :

$$1 = \frac{g}{a^3} \int \frac{p(\xi)d\xi}{\sqrt{\xi^2 + \Delta^2}} \tanh \frac{\sqrt{\xi^2 + \Delta^2}}{T} \quad (6)$$

This yields $\Delta_0 = 2W e^{-1/\lambda}$ for zero-temperature order parameter and $T_c = 2.27W e^{-1/\lambda}$ for transition temperature. Here $\lambda \equiv \frac{g}{W a^3}$ is a dimensionless coupling constant. Action (5) will be used throughout our further analysis.

III. COLLECTIVE MODES: FLUCTUATIONS IN THE ORDERED STATE.

In a superconducting phase, for temperatures $T < T_c$, order parameter can be parametrized as

$$\Delta = (1 + \eta)\Delta_0 e^{i\varphi}, \quad (7)$$

revealing two collective modes: a massive (amplitude or Anderson-Higgs) mode η and a massless Goldstone boson, phase ϕ . Below we derive expressions for propagators of both these modes.

The action (5) can be expanded in fluctuations around the ground state Δ_0 . The quadratic Gaussian part describes dynamics of collective modes. Once expanded, the action gives the amplitude propagator

$$L_\eta^{-1}(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{\Delta^2}{a^3} \left[-J^{-1}(\mathbf{k}) + \Pi_{xx}(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) \right], \quad (8)$$

where Π_{xx} is a $\sigma_x - \sigma_x$ semionic correlator,

$$\Pi_{xx} = \oint_{\mathcal{H}, \xi} \text{tr} \sigma_x G(i\varepsilon_l) \sigma_x G(i\varepsilon_{l+n}). \quad (9)$$

Here the sign $\oint_{\mathcal{H}, \xi} = T \sum_l \int (d\xi/2W)$ and G is a basic building block of the diagrammatic technique, a semionic Green function that can be represented as

$$G(i\varepsilon_l) = \frac{1}{i\varepsilon_l + \mathbf{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \sum_{\pm} \left(\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{\mathbf{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2E} \right) \frac{1}{i\varepsilon_l \pm E} \quad (10)$$

with a vector $\mathbf{E} = (\Delta, 0, \xi)$, $E = \sqrt{\Delta^2 + \xi^2}$.

Calculation of the correlator gives

$$\Pi_{xx} = \oint_{\mathcal{H}, \xi} \left[\frac{\Delta^2}{E^2} \left(\frac{1}{i\varepsilon_{l+n} - E} \frac{1}{i\varepsilon_l - E} + (E \rightarrow -E) \right) + \frac{\xi^2}{E^2} \left(\frac{1}{i\varepsilon_{l+n} + E} \frac{1}{i\varepsilon_l - E} + (E \rightarrow -E) \right) \right], \quad (11)$$

where in the low-temperature $T \ll \Delta$ limit the first term gives a negligible exponentially small contribution, while the second term leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{xx} &= \int \frac{p(\xi)\xi^2 d\xi}{E^2} \cdot \frac{E}{E^2 + (\Omega_n/2)^2} \\ &= g^{-1} - W^{-1} \frac{\sqrt{4\Delta^2 + \Omega_n^2}}{|\Omega_n|} \text{arcsch} \left| \frac{\Omega_n}{2\Delta} \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$



FIG. 1: Self-energy of the collective superconducting mode (amplitude is shown on the left, with blue external lines, and phase is on the right, yellow lines). Black lines stand for semionic propagators.

where we made use of the self-consistency equation (6). Recalling the gradient expansion (2) we have an imaginary time amplitude propagator

$$L_\eta^{-1}(i\Omega_n, \mathbf{k}) = -\nu \left[\Delta^2 b \left(\frac{i\Omega_n}{2\Delta} \right) + \frac{v^2 k^2}{4} \right], \quad (13)$$

where we had introduced a velocity

$$v = \lambda^{-1/2} \Delta R \quad (14)$$

and a function

$$b(ix) = \sqrt{1+x^2} \frac{\text{arcsch}|x|}{|x|}. \quad (15)$$

The obtained propagator has branch a cut along $(-\infty, -2\Delta] \cup [2\Delta, +\infty)$ rather than a simple pole. The analytical continuation to real frequencies $i\Omega_n \rightarrow \Omega + i0$ gives for a retarded propagator

$$(L_\eta^R(\Omega, \mathbf{Q}))^{-1} = -\nu \left[\Delta^2 b^R \left(\frac{\Omega + i0}{2\Delta} \right) + \frac{v^2 k^2}{4} \right], \quad (16)$$

with a function

$$b^R(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{1-x^2} (\arcsin x/x) & |x| < 1 \\ \sqrt{1-x^2} \left[\frac{i\pi}{2} + \text{arch} x \right] & |x| > 1 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Note that the gap edge for amplitude excitations is located at the energy 2Δ , unlike usual BCS superconductors where energies of elementary fermionic excitations start from Δ (on the other hand, minimal energy needed to split a Cooper pair is always equal to 2Δ since two quasiparticles should be produced).

For energies just above the gap $b^R \simeq i\pi\sqrt{(x-1)/2}$, so that

$$(L_\eta^R(\Omega, \mathbf{Q}))^{-1} = -\nu \Delta^2 \left[i\pi \sqrt{\frac{\Omega - 2\Delta}{4\Delta}} + \frac{v^2 k^2}{4\Delta^2} \right], \quad (18)$$

$(\Omega > 2\Delta, |\Omega - 2\Delta| \ll \Delta)$

while for large energies $b^R \simeq i\pi/2 + \ln 2x$,

$$(L_\eta^R(\Omega, \mathbf{Q}))^{-1} = -\nu \Delta^2 \left[\frac{i\pi}{2} + \ln \frac{\Omega}{\Delta} + \frac{v^2 k^2}{4\Delta^2} \right]. \quad (19)$$

$(\Omega \gg 2\Delta)$

Finally, for small energies we have

$$(L_\eta^R(\Omega, \mathbf{Q}))^{-1} = -\nu\Delta^2 \left[1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{12\Delta^2} + \frac{v^2k^2}{4\Delta^2} \right] \quad (20)$$

($|\Omega| \ll 2\Delta$)

implying a zero temperature coherence length $\xi = v/2\Delta$.

Meanwhile, phase mode is gapless and relevant energies are well below the gap Δ . In other words we can safely expand the propagator in the frequency Ω_n . Performing a straightforward calculation and a subsequent analytical continuation we eventually have

$$(L_\phi^R(\Omega, \mathbf{k}))^{-1} = -\frac{\nu}{4} [-\Omega^2 + v^2k^2]. \quad (21)$$

Expressions derived in this Section for the propagators L_ϕ and L_η will be used below for the calculations of the phonon decay rate.

IV. ELECTRON-PHONON INTERACTION

Interaction with longitudinal phonons can be introduced via modulations of the Cooper pair hopping amplitude (i.e. pseudospin interaction constant) as

$$H_{\text{e-ph}}[\mathbf{S}_i] = \kappa \sum_{i,j=1}^N (J_{ij} \text{div} \mathbf{u}) [S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y] \quad (22)$$

with a coupling constant κ that is normally of order of unity, $\kappa \sim 1$. The choice of such a model for e-ph interaction in the effective Hamiltonian makes sense since the pair hopping term in the Hamiltonian originates from the original phonon-mediated Cooper attraction between electrons.

In a close parallel with electron-phonon interaction in a weakly disordered superconductors, the effect of an acoustic wave within adiabatic approximation in the limit




FIG. 2: Interaction vertex of the type phonon-collective superconducting-modes. Left: conversion of a phonon into two amplitude modes. Right: conversion into two phase modes. Black lines in the triangle stand for semionic propagators.



FIG. 3: Ultrasonic attenuation due to collective superconducting modes. Left figure shows contribution of the amplitude mode, when a phonon (red line) falls apart into two amplitude modes (blue lines). Exactly same process happens via phase modes (yellow lines), shown on the right.

$\omega, q \rightarrow 0$ is reduced to modulations of the dimensionless interaction constant

$$\lambda \rightarrow \lambda(1 - \kappa \text{div} \mathbf{u}). \quad (23)$$

Consecutively, changes of the coupling constant λ are most clearly revealed by the change in the ground state Δ_0 due to the exponential sensitivity of the former,

$$\Delta = 2W e^{-1/\lambda} \rightarrow \Delta \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{\lambda} \text{div} \mathbf{u} \right). \quad (24)$$

Eventually this gives electron-phonon interaction

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{e-ph}}[\Delta, \mathbf{u}] = -\text{Tr} (\Gamma_\eta \eta^2 + \Gamma_\phi \phi^2) \delta\Delta, \quad (25)$$

where $\delta\Delta = (\kappa/\lambda)\Delta \text{div} \mathbf{u}$ is the change of the order parameter under the lattice strain and vertices $\Gamma_{\eta, \phi}$ are defined by inverse propagators via Ward-like identities:

$$\Gamma_{\eta(\phi)} = \frac{\delta L_{\eta(\phi)}^{-1}}{\delta \Delta}. \quad (26)$$

Using explicit forms of the amplitude (13) and phase (21) propagators, one finds the part of action describing electron-phonon interaction:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{e-ph}}[\eta, \phi, \mathbf{u}] = \frac{\kappa_*}{W} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial(\Delta^2 b)}{\partial \ln \Delta} \eta^2 + \frac{v^2}{4} [(\nabla \eta)^2 + (\nabla \phi)^2] \right) \text{div} \mathbf{u}, \quad (27)$$

where we had introduced an “enhanced” coupling constant $\kappa_* = \kappa/\lambda$ and $b \equiv b(i\Omega_n/2\Delta)$ is a function given by Eq.(15).

V. ULTRASONIC ATTENUATION

The ultrasonic attenuation α can be conveniently expressed via an acoustic Q -factor

$$Q^{-1} = \frac{\alpha}{\omega} = \frac{1}{\rho_m \omega^2} \text{Im} \Sigma_{\text{ph}}^A, \quad (28)$$

where Σ_{ph}^A is an advanced phonon self-energy defined on real frequencies. Phonon spectrum is assumed to be acoustic, $\omega(q) = sq$, with sound velocity $s \ll v$, i.e. the phonon propagator reads as

$$D^A(\omega, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\rho_m [(\omega - i0)^2 - s^2 \mathbf{q}^2] - \Sigma_{\text{ph}}^A}. \quad (29)$$

A. Phase mode

Ultrasonic attenuation due to interaction with the phase mode is given by processes in which acoustic phonon falls apart into two phasons,

$$\Sigma_{\text{ph-}\phi}(i\omega_n, \mathbf{q}) = \int_{m, \mathbf{k}} |\Gamma_\phi(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q})|^2 \times \times L_\phi(i\Omega_m, \mathbf{k}) L_\phi(i\Omega_{m+n}, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}), \quad (30)$$

where the electron phonon interaction vertex Γ_ϕ follows from Eq.(27),

$$\Gamma_\phi(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}) = iq \frac{\kappa_* \nu v^2}{4} [\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q})]. \quad (31)$$

$$\Sigma_{\text{ph-}\phi}(i\omega_n, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{\kappa_*^2 \nu^2 v^4}{16} q^2 \int_{m, \mathbf{k}} [\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q})]^2 \times \times L_\phi(i\Omega_m, \mathbf{k}) L_\phi(i\Omega_{m+n}, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}), \quad (32)$$

Analytical continuation is performed in a standard fashion and gives for the imaginary part of phonon self-energy:

$$\text{Im } \Sigma_{\text{ph-}\phi}(\omega, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{\kappa_*^2 \nu^2 v^4}{8} q^2 \int_{\Omega, \mathbf{Q}} [\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q})]^2 \times \times [B(\Omega + \omega) - B(\Omega)] \times \times \text{Im } L_\phi^R(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) \text{Im } L_\phi^R(\Omega + \omega, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) \quad (33)$$

with $B(x) = \coth x/2T$. Since

$$\text{Im } L_\phi^R(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{2\pi}{\nu v k} \left(\delta(\Omega - vk) - \delta(\Omega + vk) \right), \quad (34)$$

as it follows from Eq.(21), we eventually get

$$Q_{\text{ph-}\phi}^{-1} = \frac{2\pi^4 \kappa_*^2}{15} \frac{T^4}{\rho_m s v^4}, \quad (35)$$

where we had assumed that $\omega(v/s) \ll T$. The result can also be rewritten as

$$Q_{\text{ph-}\phi}^{-1} = \frac{2\pi^4}{15} \kappa_*^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{R} \right)^4 \left(\frac{T}{\Delta} \right)^4, \quad (36)$$

where $a_0 = (\rho_m s)^{-1/4}$ by order of magnitude is equal to a material lattice constant and R is a typical interaction radius.

B. Amplitude mode

The contribution of amplitude mode η to the phonon decay rate is due to rare (at $T \ll \Delta$) collective excitation with energies close to the threshold $\Omega = 2\Delta$. In this energy region the electron-phonon interaction vertex is singular:

$$\Gamma_\eta(i\Omega_k) \simeq i\kappa_* \nu q \frac{\Delta^2 b \left(\frac{i\Omega_k}{2\Delta} \right)}{1 + (\Omega_k/2\Delta)^2}. \quad (37)$$

where Ω stands for the energy of collective mode and phonon energy $\omega \rightarrow 0$. This singularity comes from the shift of the energy gap position 2Δ induced by phonons via the lattice strain. For real frequencies close to the gap, we obtain for the absolute square of this vertex:

$$|\Gamma_\eta(\Omega)|^2 \simeq \frac{\pi^2}{4} \kappa_*^2 \nu^2 q^2 \frac{\Delta^5}{|\Omega - 2\Delta|}. \quad (38)$$

If phonon energy ω becomes non-negligible, the singularity in the vertex Γ is washed out as

$$\frac{1}{\Omega - 2\Delta} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\Omega - 2\Delta)(\Omega + \omega - 2\Delta)}} \quad (39)$$

The propagator of the amplitude mode is given by Eq.(18); in particular its imaginary part is equal to

$$\text{Im } L_\eta^R(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{4}{\nu} \frac{\gamma \Delta^2}{\Delta^4 \gamma^2 + v^4 k^4}, \quad (40)$$

$$(\gamma = 2\pi \sqrt{(\Omega - 2\Delta)/\Delta})$$

where it is assumed that $0 < \Omega - 2\Delta \ll \Delta$.

Similarly to the phason contribution (33), for the ultrasonic attenuation due to the acoustic phonon decay into two amplitude excitations we have

$$\text{Im } \Sigma_{\text{ph-}\eta}(\omega, \mathbf{q}) = \int_{\Omega, \mathbf{Q}} |\Gamma_\eta(\Omega, \omega)|^2 \times \times [B(\Omega + \omega) - B(\Omega)] \times \times \text{Im } L_\eta^R(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) \text{Im } L_\eta^R(\Omega + \omega, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}). \quad (41)$$

This integral has an infrared divergence that is regularized by phonon frequency ω , the leading contribution comes mainly from energies $(\Omega - 2\Delta) \sim \omega$. Finally, for the amplitude contribution to the inverse quality factor we find

$$Q_{\text{ph-}\eta}^{-1} = \frac{64\sqrt{\pi}}{3} \kappa_*^2 \frac{\Delta^4}{\rho_m s^2 v^3} \left(\frac{\Delta}{T} \right) \left(\frac{\omega}{\Delta} \right)^{3/4} e^{-2\Delta/T} \quad (42)$$

Comparing it with "phason" contribution (35,36) we note that phase and amplitude mechanisms lead to completely different behaviors in function of ultrasound frequency ω and temperature T . In particular, amplitude contribution scales as $\omega^{3/4}$ while the phase one is ω -independent. The ratio of both contributions is given by

$$\frac{Q_{\text{ph-}\eta}^{-1}}{Q_{\text{ph-}\phi}^{-1}} = \frac{480}{\underbrace{\pi^{7/2}}_{=8.73}} \left(\frac{v}{s} \right) \left(\frac{\Delta}{T} \right)^5 \left(\frac{\omega}{\Delta} \right)^{3/4} e^{-2\Delta/T} \quad (43)$$

Asymptotically, at $T/\Delta \rightarrow 0$, phase contribution dominates, although there is a range of relatively small T/Δ , where the main contribution comes from the amplitude mode. In any case, gapless phason mode is an artifact of the model with completely absent Coulomb interaction; as we will see in the next Section, even rather weak

long-range Coulomb interaction pushes the energy of the lowest collective excitations to 2Δ .

The result (42) can be compared to the similar formula from Ref.²⁷, with ultrasound attenuation in a usual s-wave superconductor leading to $Q^{-1} \propto \exp(-\Delta/T)$. The difference by factor 2 in the exponent is important, and it is due to different statistical weights of excitations in two models: while in BCS theory independent electron and hole quasiparticles appear due to breaking of any Cooper pair, a pseudospin superconductor supports single-particle excitations with the lowest energy 2Δ .

VI. ROLE OF COULOMB INTERACTION

In this Section we consider modifications caused by the long-range Coulomb interaction that was neglected previously in this paper. The major effect of Coulomb interaction upon the low-temperature symmetry-broken state is formation of the spectral gap Δ_ϕ for the phase mode

by the Anderson-Higgs mechanism. We will see that Δ_ϕ is usually large in comparison with the amplitude gap Δ , thus the actual threshold for all inelastic processes at $T = 0$ is determined by Δ . For the same reason, at low T total phonon decay rate is proportional to $\exp(-2\Delta/T)$, while power-law contribution (36) usually disappears.

We consider effectively 3-dimensional problem and employ the simplest way to introduce Coulomb interaction between electron pairs:

$$H[\mathbf{S}_i] = -2 \sum_{i=1}^N (\xi_i + \Phi_i) S_i^z - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N J_{ij} [S_i^- S_j^+ + S_i^+ S_j^-] - \sum_{i<j} \Phi_i \left(\frac{4\pi e^2}{\epsilon |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|} \right)^{-1} \Phi_j, \quad (44)$$

where in the last term a matrix inversion is implied. Repeating the same steps used above to derive (5) from (1), we come now to the action of the following form:

$$\mathcal{A}[\Delta] = -\text{Tr} [\Delta^* J^{-1} \Delta] + \text{Tr} \ln \left[i\varepsilon_l + (\xi + \Phi) \sigma^z + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta \sigma^- + \Delta^* \sigma^+) \right] - \text{Tr} \left[\Phi_i \left(\frac{4\pi e^2}{\epsilon |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|} \right)^{-1} \Phi_j \right]. \quad (45)$$

In the approximation of constant DoS, phase and amplitude modes are decoupled, and the whole effect of Coulomb interaction is to provide a mass to a previously gapless phase mode due to mixing between Φ and $d\phi/dt$. The corresponding part of the action reads

$$\mathcal{A}[\phi, \Phi] = -\nu \Delta^2 \text{Tr} \left[\left(-\frac{v^2 k^2}{4\Delta^2} + \Pi_{yy} \right) \phi^2 + 2\Pi_{yz} \phi \cdot \left(\frac{\Phi}{\Delta} \right) + (\Pi_{zz} + \nu^{-1} V^{-1}(k)) \cdot \left(\frac{\Phi}{\Delta} \right)^2 \right] \quad (46)$$

where $V(q) = 4\pi e^2 / \epsilon q^2$ is Coulomb propagator and semionic polarization functions $\Pi_{\alpha\beta}$, with $\alpha, \beta \in (y, z)$ are defined similar to Eq.(9); calculation of the trace over semionic modes leads to

$$\Pi_{yy}(x) = -\frac{x}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} \text{arcsh } x, \quad (47)$$

$$\Pi_{yz}(x) = i \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} \text{arcsh } x, \quad (48)$$

$$\Pi_{zz}(x) = \frac{1}{x\sqrt{1+x^2}} \text{arcsh } x, \quad (49)$$

where $x = \Omega_n / 2\Delta$. Next we integrate out electric potential Φ and obtain the phase-only action in the form

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{eff}}[\phi] = -\nu \Delta^2 \int_{\xi} \text{Tr} \left[\phi \left(-\frac{v^2 k^2}{4\Delta^2} + \Pi_{yy} - \frac{\Pi_{yz}^2}{\Pi_{zz} + \nu^{-1} V^{-1}} \right) \phi \right]. \quad (50)$$

Now we substitute expressions for $\Pi_{\alpha\beta}$ into Eq.(50) and obtain inverse phase propagator in the form

$$L_\phi^{-1}(i\Omega_n) = \frac{\nu v^2 k^2}{4} \left[1 + \frac{\epsilon W \Omega_n^2}{4\pi e^2 v^2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\epsilon W k^2}{4\pi e^2} \right) \frac{\Omega_n}{2\Delta} \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\Omega_n}{2\Delta} \right)^2} \right)^{-1} \right]. \quad (51)$$

This expression should be analytically continued to the real energy axis, $i\Omega_n \rightarrow \Omega + i0$, which leads to

$$(L_\phi^R(\Omega, k))^{-1} = \frac{\nu v^2 k^2}{4} \times \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\epsilon W \Omega^2}{4\pi e^2 v^2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\epsilon W k^2}{4\pi e^2} \right) \frac{\frac{\Omega}{2\Delta} \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{\Omega}{2\Delta}\right)^2}}{\arcsin \frac{\Omega}{2\Delta}} \right)^{-1} & \Omega < 2\Delta \\ 1 - \frac{\epsilon W \Omega^2}{4\pi e^2 v^2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\epsilon W k^2}{4\pi e^2} \right) \frac{\frac{\Omega}{2\Delta} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Omega}{2\Delta}\right)^2 - 1}}{\ln \left[\frac{\Omega}{2\Delta} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Omega}{2\Delta}\right)^2 - 1} \right]^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}}} \right)^{-1} & \Omega \geq 2\Delta \end{cases}. \quad (52)$$

Propagator of the phase mode (52) possesses (at $k = 0$) two types of singularities in the complex plane of Ω : a branch cut along $(-\infty, -2\Delta] \cup [2\Delta, +\infty)$ and a simple pole at the plasmon frequency

$$\Delta_\phi = \sqrt{4\pi e^2 \nu v^2 / \epsilon} \quad (53)$$

At small momenta k the pole (53) shifts according to $\Omega(k) = \sqrt{\Delta_\phi^2 + v_{\phi*}^2 k^2}$ and $v_{\phi*} = v \times \frac{\Delta_\phi}{2\Delta} \left(\ln \frac{\Delta_\phi}{\Delta} \right)^{-1/2}$.

The key point for further analysis is the relation between amplitude gap Δ and plasmon gap Δ_ϕ . For the phase mode to be well-defined at $k > 0$, its energy gap Δ_ϕ should be below 2Δ , otherwise imaginary part appears in the inverse propagator (52) at the mass shell of the massive phase mode. In such a case, actual threshold for all inelastic processes is given by 2Δ and phase mode itself is irrelevant.

Estimates below show that usually $\Delta_\phi \geq 2\Delta$ indeed. Instead of using model-dependent relation (53), we rewrite Δ_ϕ in terms of observables:

$$\Delta_\phi^2 = \frac{4\pi e^2 \hbar^2 \rho_s}{\epsilon e^2} \quad (54)$$

where ρ_s is the superfluid density defined via London relation for supercurrent, $\mathbf{j} = -\rho_s \mathbf{A}/c$. Next, we use the estimate²¹ for superfluid density of pseudogapped superconductor, $\rho_s \sim \nu_0 e^2 R^2 \Delta^2 / \hbar^2$, to obtain

$$\frac{\Delta_\phi^2}{4\Delta^2} \approx \frac{\pi e^2}{\epsilon} \nu_0 R^2 \quad (55)$$

Although the model used in²¹ is different from our present one (here we employ a very large interaction range R to use mean-field approximation, while in²¹ hopping of pairs via Mott-type pair resonances was assumed), the results for the ratio Δ_ϕ/Δ are similar in both models.

To get some feeling of relevant numbers, we use parameters known for amorphous superconducting InO_x : for the density of states we take³⁴ an estimate $\nu_0 \sim 2 \cdot 10^{33} \text{erg}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-3}$; for the estimate of effective hopping range R we can use the value of superconducting coherence length $\xi_0 \approx 4 - 5 \text{ nm}$ extracted from H_{c2} measurements in less disordered superconducting InO_x in Ref.³⁵. Combining all together, we find $\approx 500/\epsilon$ for the R.H.S.

of Eq.(55). Unfortunately, effective dielectric constant of InO_x in the insulating phase was not yet measured.

Another approach to the problem one can try is a purely theoretical one: consider non-interacting Anderson insulator with a localization length L_{loc} and find its dielectric response at $T = 0$. Such a program was realized recently³⁶ numerically; for the 3D case it results in $\epsilon \approx 3e^2 \nu_0 L_{loc}^2$. Substituting this estimate into Eq.(55), one finds surprisingly simple and universal result: $\Delta_\phi/2\Delta \approx R/L_{loc} > 1$. Thus we conclude that most probably plasmon gap is too large for the phase mode to be relevant for ultrasound decay.

However, the above conclusion can be incorrect for some special highly polarizable materials with a very high intrinsic dielectric constant, like SrTiO_3 with its $\epsilon > 10^4$. Very light doping of SrTiO_3 makes it superconducting^{37,38}. Such a superconductor may have unusually small phason gap $\Delta_\phi \ll \Delta$; in this case the results (35,36) for ultrasound decay into phase mode might be relevant.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown in this paper that phonon decay rate in pseudogapped superconductor at low temperatures $T \ll T_c$ is determined by its collective modes. The amplitude mode has a threshold energy $2\Delta < \Delta_P$, so its contribution to the decay of low-frequency phonons is given by Eq.(42). It is proportional to $\exp(-2\Delta/T)$ and dominates over "usual" single-particle contribution which is $\propto \exp(-\Delta_P/T)$. Thus measurements of ultrasound attenuation rate may provide an additional way to determine the value of the collective gap.

If Coulomb interaction between conduction electrons is very strongly suppressed due to high intrinsic dielectric constant $\epsilon \geq 10^3$, an additional contribution from the phase mode may be present, see Eq.(36). Different dependences of the amplitude and phase contributions to the decay rate on frequency and temperature make it possible to identify both contributions separately.

We are grateful to L. B. Ioffe and V. E. Kravtsov for useful discussions. Research of M.V.F. was partially supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant # 14-42-00044. The research was also partially supported by the RF Presidential Grant No. NSh-10129.2016.2.

-
- ¹ B. Sacépé, Th. Dubouchet, C. Chapelier *et al*, Nature Physics 7, 239 (2011)
- ² B. Sacépé, C. Chapelier, T. I. Baturina *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 157006 (2008)
- ³ S.P. Chockalingam, M. Chand, A. Kamlapure, *et al*, Phys. Rev. B 79, 094509 (2009)
- ⁴ G. Sambandamurthy, L.W. Engel, A. Johansson, D. Shahar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 107005 (2004)
- ⁵ M. Ovadia, B. Sacepe and D. Shahar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 176802 (2009)
- ⁶ V. F. Gantmakher and V. T. Dolgoplov, Phys. Usp. 53, 149 (2010).
- ⁷ A. Goldman, N. Markovic, Phys. Today 51, 39 (1998).
- ⁸ M. Chand, G. Saraswat, A. Kamlapure, *et al*, Phys. Rev. B 85, 014508 (2012)
- ⁹ E. F. C. Driessen, P. C. J. J. Coumou, R. R. Tromp, P. J. de Visser, T. M. Klapwijk, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 107003 (2012)
- ¹⁰ Th. Dubouchet, PhD thesis, Neel Institute, Grenoble (2010)
- ¹¹ C. Chapelier, invited talk at the Chernogolovka conference 2015, http://intgroup.itp.ac.ru/prog_conf2015.html.
- ¹² M. V. Feigel'man, L. B. Ioffe, V. E. Kravtsov and E. A. Yuzbashyan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 027001 (2007)
- ¹³ M. V. Feigel'man, L. B. Ioffe, V. E. Kravtsov and E. Cuevas, Ann. Phys. 325, 1390 (2010)
- ¹⁴ G. Lemari, A. Kamlapure, D. Bucheli, Phys. Rev. B 87, 184509 (2013)
- ¹⁵ Y. Loh, M. Randeria, N. Trivedi, *et al*, Phys. Rev. X 6, 021029 (2016)
- ¹⁶ M. Ma, P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 32, 5658 (1985).
- ¹⁷ A. Ghosal, M. Randeria, N. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. B 65, 014501 (2001).
- ¹⁸ I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 017002 (2012)
- ¹⁹ I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin Phys. Rev. B 92, 014506 (2015)
- ²⁰ I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin Phys. Rev. B 93, 205432 (2016)
- ²¹ M. V. Feigelman and L. B. Ioffe, Phys. Rev. B 92, 100509(R) (2015)
- ²² D. Sherman, Uwe S. Pracht, B. Gorshunov *et al*, Nature Physics (2015), 10.1038/nphys3227
- ²³ A. V. Shtyk, V. E. Kravtsov and M. V. Feigelman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 166603 (2013)
- ²⁴ B. L. Altshuler, I. Aleiner, V. E. Kravtsov and I. Lerner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 176803 (2009)
- ²⁵ F. Ladieu, M. Sanquer, and J. Bouchaud, Phys. Rev. B 53, 973 (1996).
- ²⁶ Tal Levinson, A. Doron, I. Tamir, *et al*, arXiv:1606.07089
- ²⁷ A. V. Shtyk and M. V. Feigelman, Phys. Rev. B 92, 195101 (2015)
- ²⁸ A. B. Pippard, Phil. Mag. 46, 1104 (1955)
- ²⁹ P. W. Anderson, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 11, 26 (1959)
- ³⁰ K. A. Matveev and A. I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3749 (1997)
- ³¹ M. V. Feigelman, L. B. Ioffe, M. Mezard, Phys. Rev. B 82, 184534 (2010)
- ³² V.N. Popov and S.A. Fedotov, Sov. Phys. - JETP 67, 535 (1988)
- ³³ M.N. Kiselev, R. Oppermann, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 5631 (2000)
- ³⁴ Zvi Ovadyahu, private communication.
- ³⁵ B. Sacépé, J. Seidemann, M. Ovadia *et al* Phys. Rev. B 91, 220508(R) (2015)
- ³⁶ M. V. Feigel'man, D. A. Ivanov and E. Cuevas, to be published.
- ³⁷ C. S. Koonce, M. L. Cohen, J. F. Schooley, W. R. Hosler, and E. R. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. 163, 380 (1967)
- ³⁸ Xiao Lin, C. W. Rischau, C. J. van der Beek, B. Fauqu, and K. Behnia Phys. Rev. B 92, 174504 (2015)