Giant flux jumps through a thin superconducting Nb film in a vortex free region
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ABSTRACT

We measure the dynamics of magnetic field penetration into thin-walled superconducting niobium cylinders. It is shown that magnetic field penetrates through the wall of a cylinder in a series of giant jumps with amplitude 1−2 mT and duration of less than a microsecond in a wide range of magnetic fields, including the vortex free region. Surprisingly, the jumps take place when the total current in the wall, not the current density, exceeds a critical value. In addition, there are small jumps and/or smooth penetration, but their contribution reaches only ~ 20% of the total penetrating flux. The number of jumps decreases with increased temperature. Thermomagnetic instabilities cannot explain the experimental observations.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The study of magnetic flux penetration into superconductors has a longstanding scientific tradition. The physics of this phenomenon in type II superconductors, for the magnetic field parallel to the sample surface, is seemingly straightforward. For magnetic fields below \( H_{C1} \) (in the Meissner state) the fields are totally expelled from the sample. Whereas above \( H_{C1} \) the flux penetrates via Abrikosov vortices. However in real superconductors, due to defects the vortex distribution is not uniform and in this case the vortex lattice is in a metastable state. The metastable states of the vortices are the cause of numerous physical phenomena such as: flux creep, magnetic relaxation [1,2] and vortex avalanches, see review by Althuler and Johansen and references therein [3]. The explanation of vortex avalanches was given mainly in the framework of two models: thermomagnetic instabilities [4] and self-organized criticality (SOC) [5]. Bean’s critical state [6] is the basis for both models. This model is valid when the dimensions of the sample are much larger than London’s penetration depth, \( \lambda \), and correlation length, \( \xi \). In the case of a thin planar film it takes place in magnetic fields perpendicular to film surface. The avalanche-like penetration of magnetic flux into a type II superconductor was studied by numerous experimental methods. The most popular methods are magneto-optical imaging, micro-Hall-probe and pick-up coil experiments [3]. Subsequently in this paper we will focus mainly on experiments with a pick-up coil. In the long tradition of pickup coil experiments [7,8] voltage spikes that were induced in the pick-up coil by the magnetic moment jumps caused by a swept field were measured. Magnetic moment jumps at high field sweep rate, up to 0.1 T/s, were accompanied by increasing the sample temperature due to rapid motion of the vortex bundles [7,8]. Thermomagnetic instabilities are the cause of such heating [4]. However, at low sweep rates, the heating produced by a flux jump did not play a significant role [9,10]. The experimentally observed avalanche size distribution, which indicates the number of vortices in a moving bundle, is an exponential [9] or a power-law [10] function of the avalanche size. The latter experimental fact was used as a confirmation of SOC model [10]. It was demonstrated that the magnetic flux penetrates into the interior of the cylinder in two fashions. The first one is a smooth flux flow and the second one is jump like. The contribution of the smooth flow for a thick-walled cylinder was about 97% of the total penetrated flux [10]. Experiments reported in [10,11] were performed on hollow cylinders with large wall thickness \( d \gg \lambda \), i.e. in a mixed state. Concurrently, we have shown that for a thin-walled cylinders of Nb, \( d \leq \lambda \), an “avalanche”-like magnetic flux penetration occurs not only in magnetic fields higher but in...
lower than $H_A$ of the film itself, i.e. in the vortex free region [12]. The latter phenomenon is very interesting, and the physical reasons for it are not yet clear.

In this paper, we present a comprehensive experimental study of the dynamics of magnetic flux penetration into thin-walled superconducting Nb cylinders. The magnetic field penetrates through the walls of the cylinder in a series of giant jumps with magnetic field amplitude 1 - 2 mT and duration of less than a microsecond (exact timing cannot be resolved by our setup). The jumps take place when the total current in the wall, not the current density, exceeds some critical value. The giant jumps were observed in fields below and above $H_A$ of the Nb film itself. In addition to the avalanche-like penetration there is a smooth penetration and its contribution can reach about 20% of the total penetrated flux. This is in stark contrast with the previous experiments which were dominated by such a smooth penetration of flux [10]

### 2. Experimental details

#### 2.1. Samples and block diagram of experimental setup

Various thin-walled cylindrical samples with two cross-section shapes were prepared by dc magnetron sputtering of Nb on a rotated sapphire and glass substrates at room temperature (Bratislava) and at 300° C (Jerusalem). Sapphire substrates were manufactured by Gavish Ltd company (Israel). The cross-section dimensions of the long parallelepiped sapphire substrates were 1.4 by 3 mm. The corners of these substrates were rounded to a radius of 0.3 mm. A sketch of the rectangular sample is shown in Fig. 1. The glass substrate has a circular cross-section with a diameter of 3 mm. The lengths, film thicknesses, deposition temperatures and labels of the samples are presented in the Table 1.

The samples were inserted into a multi-layer pick-up copper coil of 14 layers, length $L = 15$ mm and total number of the turns $N = 2100$ turns, which was placed in a commercial superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) magnetometer, MPMS5, Quantum Design. External magnetic field, $H_0$, was directed parallel to the long axis of the sample and pick-up coil. The superconducting magnet of the SQUID magnetometer was driven by an arbitrary waveform generator, Agilent 33250A, and a home-built amplifier. The applied field was slowly changed with a rate of: 0.4, 0.8, or 1.6 mT/s from zero to 0.186 T and then back to zero. The voltage spikes induced by a swept magnetic field were measured by an InfiniVision, DSO-X 3024A, Agilent oscilloscope with bandwidth 200 MHz. Time resolution of the whole system is order of 0.1 μs. An additional channel of the oscilloscope was used for magnetic field measurement. Fig. 2 shows a block diagram of the experimental setup.

#### 2.2. Pick-up coil calibration

To calibrate the pick-up coil we wound a small probe coil with $n_p = 30$ turns and radius $a_p = 2$ mm under the pick-up coil and drove it by a current jump. A magnetic flux $\Phi_1$ induced in one turn of the pick-up coil by a linear circular current $J$ with radius $a$ is [13]

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{\mu_0 J}{4\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{\ar_1 \cos(\phi) d\phi}{(a_1^2 + r_1^2 + z_1^2 - 2a_1r_1\cos(\phi))^{1/2}}, $$

where $z$ is the distance between these two circles which are parallel to each other, $\mu_0$ is permeability of vacuum and $r_1$ is radius of the turn in $l^{th}$ layer of the pick-up coil. From this expression we get the magnetic flux through the one layer of pick-up coil

$$\Phi = \frac{\mu_0 a^2 J n}{4\pi L} \Phi_1(r/a, z/a, L/a),$$

where

$$\Phi_1(r, z, l) = r \int_0^\pi d\phi \cos(\phi) \ln \left( \frac{(1 + r^2 + (l - z)^2 - 2r\cos(\phi))^{1/2} + (l - z)}{(1 + r^2 + z^2 - 2r\cos(\phi))^{1/2} - z} \right),$$

is a dimensionless function, $z$ is the Z-coordinate of the circular current and $n$ is a number of turns in one layer of the pick-up coil ($n \approx 150$). The coordinates of the pick-up coil ends are 0 and $L$, see inset in Fig. 2. Fig. 3 shows $\Phi_1(z)$ for two values of radius $a$, 1.16
and 1.5. For \( n_p \) turns of the probe coil of radius \( a_p \) and length \( l_p \ll L \), located in a center of the pick-up coil, \( z_0 = L/2 \), we obtain

\[
\Phi = \mu_0 n_p a_p^2 \int_0^{\infty} \Phi_q(r_l/a_p, L/2a_p, L/a_p).
\]

Now we assume that a thin-walled circular hollow tube with length \( l_c \), radius \( a_t \), and wall thickness \( d \ll a_t \) is inserted symmetrically into the pick-up coil and \( \Delta H \) is the difference between magnetic fields inside and outside the tube. In this case the surface current density in the wall is \( J = \Delta H \). Flux that this current creates in one layer of the pick-up coil is

\[
\Phi_l = \frac{\mu_0 \Delta H a_t^2 n}{4\pi} \frac{d}{L} \int_{\Delta z} dz/\Phi_t(r_l/a_t, z/a_t, L/a_t)
\]

\[
= \frac{\mu_0 \Delta H a_t^2 n}{4\pi} \frac{d}{L} \Phi_{tl},
\]

where \( \Delta z \) is a distance between the edges of the tube and pick-up coil. The \( \Phi_t \) can be calculated by a numerical integration of the data presented in Fig. 3. Equation (5) for a circular tube is applied for a rectangular tube with the same cross section area.

Measured by scope signal is a linear function of the emf in the pick-up coil. This has been checked experimentally. The response of a linear system is linear with the input signal. As for any linear system the measured by scope signal \( V(t) \) due to the change the magnetic flux through the all pick-up coil layers, \( \Phi_f = \sum \Phi_l \), is

\[
V(t) = \int_0^t d\tau K(t - \tau) \frac{d\Phi_f(t)}{dt}.
\]

where \( K(t) \) is the response to the \( \delta \)-like flux jump. The integral

\[
\overline{Q} = \int_0^\infty V(t)dt = \Delta \Phi t \int_0^\infty K(t)dt
\]

is proportional to the total change of magnetic flux in the pick-up coil.

The change of magnetic field inside a tube can be found from the time dependent voltage in the pick-up coil and the response to the current jump in the probe coil from

\[
\mu_0 \Delta H = n_p \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{a_p^2}{a_t^2} \Phi_t(r_l/a_p, L/2a_p, L/a_p) \right) \frac{\overline{Q}_p}{\overline{Q}_t} \approx 10^{-4} \frac{\overline{Q}_p}{\overline{Q}_t},
\]

where \( \overline{Q}_{p,s} = \int_0^\infty V_{p,s}(t)dt \) which were calculated for \( V(t) \) obtained in experiments with the probe coil and sample. Parameter \( D \) in Eq. (8) was calculated and it is approximately equal 2.2 for samples F1, F8, F15 and G3a, 1.8 and 3.7 for samples G21 and G7, respectively. In calculations of this parameter we took into account that the radius of the first layer of the pick-up coil is 2 mm and the last one 4 mm. Fig. 4 shows a signal in the pick-up coil in response to the current jump in the probe coil. We have to note that integral \( \int_0^\infty K(t)dt \) drops out of the formula (8).

3. Experimental results

Fig. 5 presents the voltage pulse sequence for sample G21 at 4.7 K. The sample was zero field cooled (ZFC). Then the field was slowly ramped with a rate of 0.8 mT/s to 0.186 T and then swept back to zero. Each vertical line in Fig. 5 is actually the time dependent voltage signal as shown in Fig. 6. The signal changes its polarity when the magnetic field starts to decrease. Increasing the rate to 1.6 mT/s did not cause any considerable change. Note that slowly ramping magnetic field induces a small voltage on a pick-up coil due to smooth flux or small jumps’ penetration. This small voltage cannot be detected by our setup. The magnetic field \( H_0 \) at which \( n \)th jump takes place and total number of jumps varies from run to run. Fig. 7 demonstrates few subsequent measurements of \( H_0 \) at 4.7 K for F8 sample after ZFC at each run.

The total number of jumps dramatically decreases with temperature and they completely disappear near 5.6 K, as shown in Fig. 8 panel a. The temperature dependences of \( \Delta H_0 \) (Eq. (8)) and \( H_n \) for the first three jumps of sample F8 are presented in Fig. 8 panels b and c, respectively. The first jump at 4.7 K occurs in field \( \mu_0 H_1 \approx 2.1 \) mT (Fig. 8(a)) and at this jump \( \mu_0 \Delta H_1 \approx 2.1 \) mT, Fig. 8(b). Thus, after the first jump the field inside the cylinder equals the external one. Estimation of the relative role of large jumps on the flux penetration can be obtained from data shown in Fig. 9. This figure shows the calculated field inside a
Fig. 6. Signals at $\mu_0H_0 = 13$ mT in ascending and descending fields that was observed in sample G21.

Fig. 7. (Color online) Magnetic field at which the jump was observed, $H_n$, as a function of jump number $n$. Subsequent measurements were repeated and done after ZFC. Inset shows an expanded view of these curves at low magnetic fields.

cylinder after $n$ jumps, $H_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Delta H_i$, for sample G7 as a function of the jump number assuming that all penetrations are via large jumps only. The maximal value after 49 jumps of $\mu_0H_n$ for sample G7 is $\approx 0.157$ T - average value of $\mu_0\Delta H$ per one jump is about 3.2 mT. The average magnetization of sample G7 at $\mu_0H_0 = 0.186$ T is $\mu_0m = \approx -3$ mT. The magnetic induction inside the cylinder $B = \mu_0(H_0 + m)$ $\approx 0.183$ T, and the average $\mu_0\Delta H$ per one jump is $\approx 3.7$ mT. It means that only $\approx 0.5$ mT per jump penetrate through the wall via small jumps and/or smooth flux penetration. These data show that the field penetrates through the walls via large jumps and the contribution of other undetected small jumps and/or smooth penetration are small. This is in contrast with reported 97% contribution for fields above $H_{c1}$ in a thick-walled cylinder [10].

Fig. 10 (a) depicts $H_n$ as function of the jump number $n$ for samples F1 and F15 with wall thickness 60 and 300 nm, respectively. The jumps for sample F1 disappear when the applied field exceeds 0.11 T, whereas for sample F15 the last jump was observed around 0.15 T. The average difference between $H_n$ of neighboring $\mu_0dH_{eq} = \mu_0(H_n - H_{n-1})$ in ascending field equals $\approx 1.7$ and $\approx 2.5$ mT for samples F1 and F15, respectively. For the first 20 jumps at low fields, $\mu_0H_0 \leq 32.0$ mT, the $\mu_0dH_{eq}$ decreases to $\approx 1.4$ and 1.6 mT for samples F1 and F15, respectively. The inset to Fig. 10(a) shows an expanding view of $H_n$ versus $n$ at low fields. The magnetic field that penetrates during each jump $\Delta H_i$ depends on the change in field from the previous jump, $H_i - H_{i-1}$, as it is shown Fig. 10(b) for samples F1 and F15. Inset to Fig. 10(b) presents $\Delta H_i$ as a function of $H_n$ for several first jumps. These data are scattered and the difference between these two sets is not essential regardless of the fivefold difference in the walls thickness.

Fig. 11 (a) shows $H_n$ as a function of $n$ for samples G3a and G7 at 4.7 K with different cross-section shape. The average field distance between adjacent jumps, $dH_{av}$, is lower for sample G3a.

Fig. 8. (Color online) Panel a: The total jump number in ascending field versus temperature. Panel b: Temperature dependence of the first three field jumps, $\Delta H_{n}$, see Eq. [8]. Panel c: Magnetic field of the first three jumps as a function of temperature. The number near the curves in panels b and c is the jump number. The data presented in all three panels were obtained in an ascending field at a sweep rate of 0.8 mT/s.

Fig. 9. (Color online) $H_n$ and $H_m$ as a function of jump number for sample G7.
and then amplitude of the field jump $\Delta H_n$ is also lower than for sample G7, Fig. 11b. The total number of jumps in ascending field as a function of temperature for G7 and G3a samples is presented in Fig. 12a. Temperature dependences of $\Delta H_1(T)$ for samples G3a and G7 are demonstrated in Fig. 12(b). The comparison of these two sets of experimental data shows that there are quantitative differences between samples G3a and G7. The difference of the responses the samples G3a and G7 could be associated with the structure of the films, shape of the substrate and type of the substrates. However, it is evident that qualitatively the data for these two samples are similar because the waveforms for two samples is actually the same and values of $H_n$, $\Delta H_n$ varies from run to run.

![Fig. 10. (Color online) Panel a: Magnetic field of jump as a function of jump number for F1 and F15 samples. The first 100 jumps are shown only. Expanded view for the first five jumps is presented in inset. Panel b: $\Delta H_n$ as a function of $H_n - H_{n-1}$ for F1 and F15 samples. $\Delta H_n$ as a function of the magnetic field is shown at the inset to panel b.](image)

![Fig. 11. Panel a: $H_n$ as a function of jump number for samples G3a and G7 at 4.7 K. Panel b: Field dependence of $\Delta H_n$ for samples G3a and G7.](image)

![Fig. 12. Panel a: The total number of jumps for samples G3a and G7 versus temperature in ascending magnetic field. Panel b: $\Delta H_1$ as a function of temperature for G3a and G7 samples.](image)

4. Discussion

The most striking phenomenon observed here is the magnetic field “avalanche”-like penetration into thin-walled cylinder under external fields below $H_{c1}$. Estimations the $H_{c1}$ and $H_{c2}$ of the walls were obtained from the magnetization curve of the film which was deposited on planar substrate during the fabrication of a cylindrical sample. Fig. 13 demonstrates ascending branch of the magnetization curve of a planar film in magnetic field parallel to its surface. $H_{c1}$ was defined by the deviation from linearity the magnetization curve at low fields and it is $\approx 35.0$ mT. Using data for $H_{c1}$ and $\mu_0 H_{c2} \approx 0.9$ T, see Fig. 13, we can estimate $\lambda$ and $\xi$. It turns out that $\lambda \approx 120$ nm and $\xi \approx 20$ nm at 4.5 K. Film thickness of our samples varies from 60 to 300 nm. For films with such thicknesses $H_{c1}$ is a weak function of the thickness [15]. Although the method of $H_{c1}$ determination is not accurate, jumps of the magnetic
moment into cylindrical samples were observed at fields of 2 - 4 mT, which are significantly lower than $\mu_0 H_1$ regardless of any uncertainty. Fig. 14 shows magnetization curves of the G7 sample at 4.5 and 6 K (upper panel). The lower panel of this figure demonstrates an expanded view of these curves at low magnetic fields. One can see that after the jump the superconducting state is restored see Fig. 14, lower panel. Above a specific jump at low fields the magnetic moment is a linear function of a magnetic field with $dM/dH_0$ that corresponds to complete screening.

There are two possible superconducting states of a hollow cylinder in a magnetic field parallel to its axis: (i) a metastable state with the internal magnetic field different from the external one and non-zero total current in the wall, and (ii) a stable state with equal magnetic fields and zero total current in the wall. For these two states the maximal current density in the wall is actually the same as follows from the solution of the London equation [14]. This solution for a planar film in a magnetic field parallel to the film surface is presented in Fig. 15. Our experiment shows that the total current, not the current density, in the wall is a main parameter which could determine a jump. If the critical current density defines the jump, one could expect that the second jump will occur immediately after the first jump, because maximal current density on the outer side will be approximately the same as before the jump. However, after the jump field inside the cylinder could reach value of the field outside, the total current will be close to zero. If the total current equals zero the currents on the different surfaces of the film opposite to each other and could block the rise of a new jump right after the previous one. Detailed discussion of this problem is beyond the scope of the present paper.

We consider that the physical reason of these jumps is a singularity of the magnetic field at the end faces of the cylinder. The importance of the end faces in thin-walled superconducting cylinders at high frequencies was already discussed in literature many years ago [16]. The authors of this paper argued that the distortion of the magnetic force lines near the end faces is responsible for the observed absorption peculiarities at high frequencies. However, to draw a definite conclusion about the role of the end faces it is necessary to solve the problem of the flux penetration into thin-walled cylinder of finite length. To the best of our knowledge, this problem has not yet been solved.

The jumps disappear with increasing temperature. Fig. 8(a) and Fig. 14, lower panel. This resembles the thermomagnetic instability that is often observed in superconductors [3,4]. The thermomagnetic scenario requires the presence of vortices in the walls.

Fig. 13. Magnetization curve of a planar film at 4.5 K. Inset: Expanded view of $M(H)$ at low magnetic fields.

Fig. 14. Upper panel: Magnetization curves of G7 sample at 4.5 and 6 K after ZFC. Lower panel: Expanded view of magnetization curves at low magnetic fields.

Fig. 15. (Color online) Current density in a film with thickness $3\lambda$ as function of coordinate for two cases, first $H_{in} = H_{out}$ - red line and second $H_{in} = 0$ - black line.
In an infinite planar film, in a parallel magnetic field, vortices should only exist at fields larger than \( H_{c1} \). This field is much larger than the fields at which firsts jumps were observed. Together with this our experiment shows that the field of a first jump \( H_1 \) increases with temperature whereas below \( H_1\, \frac{dM}{dH_0} \) does not depend on the temperature. This is demonstrated for samples F8 and G7 in Figs. 8c and 14, respectively. Thermomagnetic instability implies that the critical current decreases with increasing temperature. Here we are faced with the opposite case. At 6 K the first jump takes place for a larger magnetic field, larger total current in the wall, than at 4.5 K. We would like to note that the standard approach to thermomagnetic instability [3,4] is not applicable to the circumstances of our experiment. The theory requires the existence of the Bean critical state in the film [6]. But in a thin film with thickness equal to the size of one or two vortices, the Bean critical state cannot arise.

5. Conclusion

We have studied the dynamics of flux penetration into thin-walled superconducting niobium cylinders. It was shown that magnetic flux penetrates through the walls in a series of giant jumps with duration less than a microsecond. In addition, there is another flux penetration mechanism which contributes \( \approx 20\% \) to the total penetrated flux. The current density in the wall does not play an essential role in the observed phenomena. Jumps start when the total current in the wall exceeds some critical value. The jumps were observed at a temperature of 4.5 K and completely disappeared at \( \approx 7\, \text{K} \). Such behavior resembles the thermomagnetic instability of vortices but it was observed in fields far below the \( H_{c1} \) of the films, i.e. in a vortex-free state. We consider the possibility that the instability at the end faces of the sample could be the cause of these jumps.
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