

Some comments on superconductivity in diborides

D.Kaczorowski, J.Klamut, A.J.Zaleski

Institute of Low Temperature and Structure Research, PAS, Wroclaw, Poland

Abstract

Short discussion trying to explain, why superconductivity revealed for some diborides is not always confirmed in experiments of different research groups.

The discovery of superconductivity in MgB_2 by Nagamatsu et al. [2] awakened superconductivity community who waited till satisfactory theory of high temperature superconductivity will be developed. Although it looks impossible, the phenomenon was discovered in very simple, two-component compound and its critical temperature was surprisingly high. The activities during the first month after the presentation of the results by Akimitsu [1] was the proof how well we are prepared for the study of new superconducting materials.

But MgB_2 is only a member of a rich family of diborides. So also the other members of this family (Li, Be, Al, Ti, Zr, Hf, V, Nb, Ta, Cr, Mo) became the subject of intensive studies of different groups.

Already in 1970 superconductivity was discovered by Cooper et al. [3] in NbB_2 with critical temperature equal to $T_c = 3.87$ K and in $\text{Zr}_{0.13}\text{Mo}_{0.87}\text{B}_2$ with T_c above 11 K.

Systematic study of diborides was conducted by Leyarowska et al. [4]. They looked for superconductivity in these compounds at temperatures down to 0.42 K and showed that only NbB_2 was superconducting at $T_c = 0.62$ K. They didn't check MgB_2 . (As an additional interesting fact it can be added that they also didn't check the compound UBe_{13} , which they had got, but which was beyond the scope of their study. We can only try to imagine what would be if superconductivity in heavy fermion UBe_{13} and MgB_2 had been discovered already in 1979...)

Reexamining of the properties of diborides led to interesting results. Some groups of researchers found superconductivity for compounds for which other groups found no such an effect.

Kaczorowski et al. [5] found superconducting transition at $T_c = 9.5$ K for TaB_2 and no superconductivity for TiB_2 , HfB_2 , VB_2 , NbB_2 or ZrB_2 . Although Felner [6] stated that BeB_2 is not superconducting, according to Young et.al [7] $BeB_{2.75}$ is superconducting with $T_c \approx 0.7$ K. Gasparov et al. [8] found ZrB_2 superconducting with $T_c = 5.5$ K and simultaneously they did not confirm superconductivity for TaB_2 and NbB_2 .

Superconductivity in TaB_2 was discovered in old, well aged material. Although from DC magnetization measurements it resulted that practically 100% of volume of the sample was superconducting, authors tried to prove that observed diamagnetic signal was not connected with some spurious phase. The main candidates for such phases were tantalum (or niobium) oxides and carbonates. But even if some of them have their critical temperatures similar to that measured in [5], their upper critical fields were much lower than measured TaB_2 being equal to $H_{c2}(0) = 2.3$ T. The only "impurity-type" explanation could be connected with the existence of some amount of tetragonal β -Ta, which could form superconducting phase with boron.

It also should be added that hydrogenation of superconducting TaB_2 resulted in rather significant hydrogen uptake above 30% and decrease of the amount of superconducting phase with the practically unchanged critical temperature [9]. This result also suggests that it is not tantalum oxide which is superconducting in the sample. It is also needless to say, that all tests to find oxygen or carbon using EDAX have failed.

Attempts to prepare the new material with the same composition i.e. TaB_2 resulted in obtaining compound which had transition temperature about 10K, but calculated volume of superconducting material was within few percent. Similar result of superconducting transition of small percentage of the sample volume of nominal composition TaB_2 was also obtained in Dresden [10] It was also found that small changes in relative amount of tantalum and boron resulted in material possessing quite different magnetic properties (this issue is

under systematic study now). Just these findings were the reason why the role of sub- and superstoichiometric compositions range in diborides was emphasized in [5].

Recently this preassumption was supported by the paper by Young et al. [7] where superconductivity was obtained in the material with meaningful excess of boron.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.Akimitsu, Symposium on Transition metal Oxides, Sendai, January 10, 2001
- [2] J.Nagamatsu, N.Nakagawa, T.Muramaka, Y.Zenitani, J.Akimitsu, Nature **410**, 63 (2001)
- [3] A.S.Cooper, E.Corenzerst, L.D.Longinotti, B.T.Matthias, W.H.Zachariasen, Proc.Natl.Acad.Sci. **67**, 313 (1970)
- [4] L.Leyarovska, E.Leyarovski, J.Less-Common Metals, **67**, 249 (1979)
- [5] D.Kaczorowski, A.J.Zaleski, O.J.Żogał, J.Klamut, condmat/0103571 (2001)
- [6] I.Felner, cond-mat/0102508 (2001)
- [7] D.P.Young, P.W.Adams, J.Y.Chan, F.R.Fronczek, cond-mat/0104063 (2001)
- [8] V.A.Gasparov, N.S.Sidorov, I.Izver'kova, M.P.Kulakov, cond-mat/0104323 (2001)
- [9] A.J.Zaleski, W.Iwasieczko, M.Tkacz, D.Kaczorowski, H.Drulis, O.J.Żogał, J.Klamut - to be published
- [10] K.Nenkov - private communication