NSLS-II User's Meeting 2018

# Shedding Light on Atomically Thin Artificial Quantum Materials

## Kyle Shen

0

0 0

Department of Physics Cornell University

## transition metal oxide interfaces : a new frontier

## bulk materials



- switching transition metal ions
- chemical doping (cation substitution)
- lattice parameters (cation radius)

## interfaces



- broken symmetry @ interface
- lowered dimensionality
- chemical potential offsets
- epitaxial strain (lattice constants)

## interfaces made from complex quantum materials

- control of electron density
- dimensional confinement
- strength of interactions
- mass of the carriers
- magnetic interactions
- relativistic or classical

conventional materials (Si, GaAs, Ge...)

more exotic building blocks with tunable properties and interactions!

## conventional semiconductors



#### "correlated" quantum materials



#### the grand challenge : controlling & optimizing quantum materials

## prediction

Superconductivity?



P. Hansmann *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **103**, 016401 (2009)

synthesis







Courtesy of Schlom Group

## integrated ARPES & oxide MBE system



GORDON AND BETTY

UNDA

Darrell Schlom

## expanding the palette of available materials



J.W. Harter et al., PRL 109, 267001 (2012)

### recent examples in atomically thin interface materials

- quantum materials in the ultrathin limit : atomically thin LaNiO<sub>3</sub>
- enhanced high-T\_c superconductivity in monolayer FeSe grown on SrTiO\_3  $\,$

## Rare-earth nickelates RENiO3



Phil King (Kavli Fellow; now faculty @ St. Andrews Univ)



Masaki Uchida (JSPS Fellow; now Asst. Prof. U. Tokyo)



Haofei Wei



## metal-insulator transitions in ultrathin LaNiO3 films



LaNiO<sub>3</sub> is a correlated metal in bulk, but reducing its thickness below a few unit cells turns the system progressively more insulating

# bulk LaNiO<sub>3</sub> exhibits a large mass renormalization LaNiO<sub>3</sub>



in agreement with optical & thermodynamic measurements

P.D.C. King *et al*, *Nature Nanotechnology* **9**, 443 (2014) E.A. Nowadnick, J.P. Ruf et al., *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 245109 (2015)



P.D.C. King et al, Nature Nanotechnology 9, 443 (2014)

## Metal-insulator transition at 2 unit cells



## Electronic structure evolution with LaNiO3 thickness



#### ordering tendencies in low-dimensional nickelates Experimental Theoretical

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

B. Lau & A.J. Millis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 126404 (2013)

![](_page_12_Figure_4.jpeg)

M. Uchida et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 027001 (2011)

X

La.Sr

Μ

(¥) 1 200

0

0

strip

0.5

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

## Ordering instability likely onsets below 3 unit cells

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

## Scientific Needs from NSLS-II

 can we directly detect static spin/charge ordering stabilized in the ultrathin limit?

 can we observe short-ranged spin fluctuations before static long-ranged order onsets?

• what is the effect of octahedral rotations and/or polar distortions near the film-substrate interface?

## Ultrathin LaNiO<sub>3</sub>

![](_page_15_Figure_5.jpeg)

### recent examples in atomically thin interface materials

- quantum materials in the ultrathin limit : atomically thin LaNiO<sub>3</sub>
- enhanced high-T\_c superconductivity in monolayer FeSe grown on SrTiO\_3  $\,$

#### characteristics of superconductors

nature of the superconducting wavefunction

~ 99% of SC :  $\chi(s_1, s_2) \propto (|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)$ 

$$\Psi(r_1, s_1; r_2, s_2) = \phi(r_1, r_2)\chi(s_1, s_2)$$

$$iggl( egin{array}{c} arphi(r_1,r_2) & ext{spatial p} \ \chi(s_1,s_2) & ext{spin par} \end{array}$$

art

conventional BCS (Pb, Al, Nb), high Tc cuprates, Fe-SC

antisymmetric : spin singlet

very rare :  $\chi(s_1,s_2) \propto | \uparrow \uparrow 
angle$ symmetric : spin triplet

#### superconducting transition temperature (T<sub>c</sub>)

![](_page_17_Figure_8.jpeg)

highest T<sub>c</sub> known superconductor : H<sub>2</sub>S @ 203 K highest T<sub>c</sub> ambient SC : HgBa<sub>2</sub>Ca<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> @ 134 K highest T<sub>c</sub> Fe-based SC : SmFeAsO ~ 56 K

### interfacial enhancement of superconductivity

- idea of interfacial enhancement of SC dates back to Ginzburg (1964)
- small (10%) effects observed in metal films and cuprate thin films
- $\bullet$  in bulk, FeSe has a  $T_{\rm c}$  of 8 K, and is structurally the simplest of the Fe-based SCs
- initial measurements of  $\sim$  60-70 K  $T_{\rm c}{}^{\prime}{\rm s}$  of FeSe / SrTiO\_3 performed by STM and ARPES

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_6.jpeg)

V. Ginzburg. *Phys. Lett.* **13**, 101 (1964) M. Strongin *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 1320 (1968) I. Bozovic *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 107001 (2002) Q.Y. Wang *et al.*, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **29**, 017401 (2012)

### central questions about monolayer FeSe / SrTiO<sub>3</sub>

- what is the mechanism of the interfacial enhancement of  $\mathsf{T}_c?$
- how does the  $T_c$  measured spectroscopically compare to other probes?
- what happens to the superconductivity as the FeSe film gets thicker?

#### challenges

- superconductivity of FeSe / SrTiO<sub>3</sub> monolayer does not survive removal into air (unless samples are capped)
- capped samples appear to exhibit lower  $T_c$ 's when measured *ex situ* than reported by *in situ* spectroscopic probes
- a given sample is not measured by different techniques; T<sub>c</sub>'s cannot be compared

![](_page_19_Picture_8.jpeg)

## what happens as the FeSe film gets thicker?

in situ probes (ARPES, STM) see no gap for films thicker than 1 UC

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

• superconducting gap disappears for all films thicker > 1 uc

#### ex situ measurements on capped films

![](_page_20_Figure_5.jpeg)

SC observed for thicker capped films, but T<sub>c</sub> appears to decrease

interfacial FeSe layer surface-sensitivity cannot see buried interface?

![](_page_20_Picture_8.jpeg)

FeTe buffer

licon

aver

- capping layers believed to reduce  $\mathsf{T}_{\rm c}$ 

with film thickness

### ARPES measurements as a function of film thickness

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

no detectable SC gap

![](_page_21_Figure_5.jpeg)

- ARPES data for 3 unit cell sample nearly identical to bulk FeSe
- No observable SC gap measured down to base temperatures

#### 15 meV gap

100 K

81 K

63 K

54 K 45 K

30 K

16 K 8 K

-40

-80

#### gap closes ~ 60 K

![](_page_21_Figure_10.jpeg)

n

Energy (meV)

40

80