

Reply to comment by T. Terashima *et al.* on “Quantum criticality and nodal superconductivity in the FeAs-based superconductor KFe₂As₂”

J. K. Dong,¹ S. Y. Zhou,¹ T. Y. Guan,¹ H. Zhang,¹ Y. F. Dai,¹ X. Qiu,¹ X. F. Wang,² Y. He,² X. H. Chen,² S. Y. Li^{1,*}

¹*Department of Physics, Surface Physics Laboratory (National Key Laboratory), and Laboratory of Advanced Materials, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

²*Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Science at Microscale and Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

(Dated: May 14, 2018)

PACS numbers: 74.70.Xa, 74.20.Rp, 74.25.fc, 74.40.Kb

In our recent Letter [1], we report the demonstration of a field-induced antiferromagnetic quantum critical point (QCP) and nodal superconductivity in KFe₂As₂. The evidences for a QCP include non-Fermi-liquid $\rho(T) \sim T^{1.5}$ at the upper critical field $H_{c2} = 5$ T and the development of a Fermi liquid state with $\rho(T) \sim T^2$ when further increasing the field. The coefficient A of the T^2 term also tends to diverge towards $H_{c2} = 5$ T.

Terashima *et al.* [2] point out that our $H_{c2}(\text{onset}) = 5$ T, determined from the onset of the resistive transition, is much higher than their $H_{c2} = 1.25$ T, determined from the midpoint of the resistive transition. They attribute this large difference in H_{c2} to the broad resistive transition of our sample, which indicates inhomogeneity in the sample. Therefore, they doubt if the $\rho(T) \sim T^{1.5}$ behavior of resistivity at $H_{c2}(\text{onset}) = 5$ T relates to quantum criticality. Their recent de Haas-van Alphen (dHvA) results [3] also do not support our proposed QCP at $H_{c2}(\text{onset}) = 5$ T in KFe₂As₂.

Recently, we have measured another KFe₂As₂ single crystal (S2). As seen in Fig. 1(a), the 10-90% transition width of S2 is 0.32 K, much smaller than 1.35 K of previous reported sample (S1) in Ref. [1]. This suggests that S2 is more homogenous than S1. The sample S2 also has lower residual resistivity $\rho_0 = 1.49 \mu\Omega \text{ cm}$, and higher residual resistivity ratio (RRR) $\rho(290 \text{ K})/\rho_0(3 \text{ T}) = 265$. In Fig. 1(b), $\rho(T)$ of S2 manifests $T^{1.5}$ dependence from $T_c(\text{onset})$ up to 11 K in zero field. From Fig. 1(c), $H_{c2}(\text{onset}) = 3$ T is obtained for S2, where $\rho(T) \sim T^{1.5}$ persists down to 50 mK. When further increasing the field, the $\rho(T) \sim T^2$ Fermi-liquid behavior is observed at lowest temperature for S2.

Since $H_{c2}(\text{onset})$ of S2 is significantly smaller than that of S1, we realize that the non-Fermi-liquid behavior of $\rho(T)$ at $H_{c2}(\text{onset})$ does not determine a QCP at $H_{c2}(\text{onset})$ for KFe₂As₂. In fact, for CeCoIn₅, while specific heat data demonstrated a QCP at the bulk $H_{c2} = 5$ T, non-Fermi-liquid $\rho(T) \sim T$ down to lowest temperature was found at higher field $H = 6$ T [4]. We attribute this misfit to the inhomogeneity of the sample. At the

QCP $H_{c2} = 5$ T, while the bulk of the CeCoIn₅ sample obeys $\rho(T) \sim T$, the rest of the sample still shows resistive transition, thus one can not observe $\rho(T) \sim T$ at the QCP. With increasing field, at $H = 6$ T, the bulk of the sample slightly develops $\rho(T) \sim T^2$ behavior, which balances the remaining resistive drop of the rest part of the sample, and gives an accidental $\rho(T) \sim T$ behavior. Only for extremely homogeneous sample with nearly zero resistive transition width, one may not notice this misfit since $H_{c2}(\text{onset})$ is almost equal to the bulk H_{c2} . We believe that this is also the case for KFe₂As₂, and the QCP, if exists, may locate at the bulk H_{c2} as in CeCoIn₅.

Since the bulk of KFe₂As₂ have developed Fermi liquid state at $H = 5$ T, it is not surprising that dHvA oscillations were observed in a field range near 5 T [3]. For our high-quality sample S2, we also find that the coefficient A ($= 0.0649, 0.0533, \text{ and } 0.0508 \mu\Omega \text{ cm/K}^2$ for 5, 8, and 12 T, respectively) shows a slower field dependence than that of sample S1. This is consistent with the near constant effective mass m^* in the field range $7 < H < 17.65$ T [3], which is far away from the QCP (if exists) near the bulk $H_{c2} \approx 1.25$ T.

In summary, we agree with Terashima *et al.* that $H_{c2}(\text{onset}) = 5$ T is not a QCP for KFe₂As₂. The non-Fermi-liquid $\rho(T) \sim T^{1.5}$ at $H_{c2}(\text{onset})$ and the development of a Fermi liquid state with $\rho(T) \sim T^2$ when further increasing the field only suggest a QCP at the bulk H_{c2} . Bulk measurements, such as specific heat, are needed to confirm this field-induced QCP at H_{c2} in KFe₂As₂.

* E-mail: shiyan.li@fudan.edu.cn

-
- [1] J. K. Dong *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 087005 (2010).
 - [2] T. Terashima *et al.*, proceeding Comment, Phys. Rev. Lett. **xxx**, xxxxxx (2010).
 - [3] T. Terashima *et al.*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **79**, 0537002 (2010).
 - [4] A. Bianchi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 257001 (2003).




FIG. 1: (Color online). (a) Low-temperature resistivity of KFe₂As₂ single crystals S1 and S2 in zero magnetic field. (b) The same data in (a) plotted as ρ vs $T^{1.5}$. The solid lines are fits to $\rho = \rho_0 + AT^{1.5}$. (c) ρ vs $T^{1.5}$ for sample S2 in $H = 2, 3, 4, 5,$ and 8 T (data sets are offset for clarity). The solid line is a fit of the $H = 3$ T data between 50 mK and 4 K. The dash lines are guides to the eye for the deviation from the $T^{1.5}$ dependence.