

Different flavours of fermion quadrupling condensates in magic-angle twisted bilayer graphene

**Dr. Ilaria Maccari** SNSF Postdoctoral Fellow, ETH Zürich

ERG 2024 - Les Diablares



#### Acknowledgements



#### Today's talk



Egor Babaev (KTH Stockholm)



**Iulien** Garaud (University of Tours)



Johan Carlström (Stockholm University)



**Daniel Weston** (KTH Stockholm)

#### $\mu$ SR/NQR

Vadim Grinenko, Rajib Sarkar, Hans-Henning Klauss, TU Dresden, Germany/Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

Ba<sub>1-x</sub>K<sub>x</sub>Fe<sub>2</sub>As<sub>2</sub> single crystals Kunihiro Kihou and Chul-Ho Lee AIST, Tsukuba, Japan

AC specific heat and ultrasound Tino Gottschall, Gorbunov, Denis, Sergei Zherlitsyn, Jochen Federico Caglieris, Ilya Wosnitza HZDR, Dresden-Rossendorf, Germany

AC microcalorimetry Andreas Rydh, Stockholm University, Sweden

#### **STM Measurements**

Quanxin Hu, Yu Zheng, Fashi Yang, Yongwei Li, Chi-Ming Yim

Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

#### **X-Ray measurements**

Ilya Shipulin, Yongwei Li TU Dresden, Germany/ Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

#### Thermoelectrical transport

Shipulin, Nadia Stegani, Christoph Wuttke, Christian Heß

IFW Dresden, Germany/ CNR-Spin Genova, Italy

# Experiments

**ETH** zürich

Theory



Spontaneous breaking of the U(1) gauge symmetry



# How can we go beyond the pairing paradigm?





*I*.  $\psi_{i=1,2}(x) = |\psi_i(x)| e^{i\phi_i(x)}$  Two components:



## How can we go beyond the pairing paradigm?

0

*1* Multicomponent Superconductors*2* Multiple broken symmetries

Inter-component interaction



SC state breaking multiple symmetries in the GS

 $\psi_{i=1,2}(x) = |\psi_i(x)| e^{i\phi_i(x)} \text{ Two components:} \quad (e e) \quad (e) \quad (e)$ 

## How can we go beyond the pairing paradigm?

9

*!* Multicomponent Superconductors*?* Multiple broken symmetries

*3.* "Something" destroying coherence between Cooper pairs while preserving coherence between pairs of Cooper pairs





**ETH** zürich



Theoretische Physik



ETH zürich



8



**ETH** zürich







#### **ETH** zürich

11



**ETH** zürich

26.09.2024 12 Spontaneous Nernst (µV/K)

Seebeck, S (µV/K)

#### Monte Carlo results on an effective 3D multicomponent model The role of different intercomponent interactions

I. Maccari and E. Babaev Phys. Rev. B 105, 214520 (2022)

Mean-field models



- Renormalization group approach
- ✓ It accounts for the proliferation of topological phase excitations.
- ♦You need to properly account for the coupling between the different topological defects.
- Monte Carlo numerícal símulations
- They allow for a systematic and unbiased study of the proliferation of different topological defects and their interactions.





#### Monte Carlo results on an effective 3D multicomponent model The role of different intercomponent interactions

I. Maccari and E. Babaev Phys. Rev. B 105, 214520 (2022)

Starting point:

Three-component GL model with phase frustration

$$f = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \times \mathbf{A})^2 + \sum_i \frac{1}{2} |(\nabla + ie\mathbf{A})\psi_i|^2 + a_i |\psi_i|^2 + \frac{b_i}{2} |\psi_i|^4 + \sum_{i < j} \eta_{ij} |\psi_i| |\psi_j| \cos(\phi_i - \phi_j)$$

?

At zero external magnetic field: any BTRS quadrupling fermionic condensate in the type-11 regime  $(e \to 0)$ 

#### What are we missing?

+Andreev-Bashkin interaction

A. F. Andreev and E. P. Bashkin, Sov. Phys. JETP 42, 164 (1975); A. J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. 47, 331 (1975).

$$f = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \times \mathbf{A})^2 + \sum_i \frac{1}{2} |(\nabla + ie\mathbf{A})\psi_i|^2 + a_i |\psi_i|^2 + \frac{b_i}{2} |\psi_i|^4 + \sum_{i < j} \eta_{ij} |\psi_i| |\psi_j| \cos(\phi_i - \phi_j) - \nu \sum_{j > i} \vec{J}_j \cdot \vec{J}_i$$

#### Mapping to a two-component London effective model

J. Garaud, M. Sílaev, and E. Babaev, Physica C 533, 63 (2017)

$$f = \frac{1}{2} \left( \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{\rho_i}{2} \left( \nabla \phi_i - e\mathbf{A} \right)^2 - \nu \left( \nabla \phi_1 - e\mathbf{A} \right) \cdot \left( \nabla \phi_2 - e\mathbf{A} \right) + \eta_2 \cos[2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)]$$

Phase frustration via a biquadratic Josephson coupling



symmetry of the normal state U(1) $U(1)xZ_2$ U(1) $U(1)xZ_2$ tuning parameter

Monte Carlo results on an effective 3D multicomponent model  
The role of different intercomponent interactions  
1. Maccarl and E. Babaev Phys. Rev. B 105, 214520 (2020)  

$$f = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \times A)^2 + \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{\rho_i}{2} (\nabla \phi_i - eA)^2 - \nu (\nabla \phi_1 - eA) \cdot (\nabla \phi_2 - eA) + \eta_2 \cos[2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)]$$
Phase frustration via a biquadratic  
Josephson coupling  
Two possible chiralities:  

$$\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 1$$

$$f = \frac{1-\nu}{4} (\nabla \phi_1 + \nabla \phi_2 - 2eA)^2 + \frac{1+\nu}{4} (\nabla \phi_1 - \nabla \phi_2)^2 + \eta_2 \cos[2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)] + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \times A)^2$$

$$+ e: coupling with the EM field  $\rightarrow$  Increasing e decreases the cost of (1,1) vortices  

$$+ \eta_2: biquadratic Josephson coupling  $\rightarrow$  Increasing  $\eta_2$  increases the cost of domain walls$$$$

 $\star \nu$ : : Current-current interaction  $\rightarrow$  Increasing  $\nu$  decreases the relative cost of phase sum fluctuations



#### Monte Carlo results on an effective 3D multicomponent model symmetry of the normal state temperature The role of different intercomponent interactions $Z_2$ U(1) I. Maccari and E. Babaev Phys. Rev. B 105, 214520 (2022) BTRS U(1) $U(1) \times Z_2$ Extreme type-II limit: $\lambda \to \infty \longrightarrow e = 0$ $f = \frac{1-\nu}{4} \left( \nabla \phi_1 + \nabla \phi_2 \right)^2 + \frac{1+\nu}{4} \left( \nabla \phi_1 - \nabla \phi_2 \right)^2 + \eta_2 \cos[2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)];$ tuning parameter Z<sub>2</sub> Ising parameter Helicity modulus sum (superfluid stiffness) m=+1 m= -1 $\Upsilon^{\mu}_{+} = \frac{1}{L^2} \frac{\partial^2 F(\{\phi'_i\})}{\partial \delta^2_{\mu}} \bigg|$ $[\phi_1 - \phi_2]_{-\pi,\pi} > 0 \qquad \qquad [\phi_1 - \phi_2]_{-\pi,\pi} < 0$ Fermion quadrupling condensate with TRSB **Binder cumulant** $\begin{pmatrix} \phi_1'(\mathbf{r}) \\ \phi_2'(\mathbf{r}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1(\mathbf{r}) + \delta \cdot \mathbf{r}_\mu \\ \phi_2(\mathbf{r}) + \delta \cdot \mathbf{r}_\mu \end{pmatrix}.$ $U = \frac{\langle m^4 \rangle}{3 \langle m^2 \rangle^2}$ $T_c$ $T_c^{Z_2}$ U(1) transition $Z_2$ transition $\nu = 0.6$ $\nu = 0.6$ 2432 0.42.462.48 2.302.25TT**ETH** zürich

Theoretische Physik

26.09.2024 16



**ETH** zürich

17



**ETH** zürich

18

I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, *Phys. Rev. B* 107 (6), 064501 (2023)

MATBG promising candidate to stabilize fermion quadrupling condensates

- 1.  $2D \longrightarrow$  more phase fluctuations
- 2. Single-band SC unconventional ground state (multicomponent)



 $f = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{A})^2 + \sum_{i=1,2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} |(\vec{\nabla} - ie\vec{A})\Delta_i|^2 \right] + V(\Delta_1, \Delta_2); \quad V(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) = 2K |\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2 \left[ \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1 \right]$  $\begin{cases} \Delta_1 = |\Delta_1| e^{i\phi_1}; \\ \Delta_2 = |\Delta_2| e^{i\phi_2}; \\ |\Delta_1|^2 + |\Delta_2|^2 = \rho^2 = 1. \end{cases} \begin{cases} \Delta_1 = |\cos(\frac{\gamma}{2})| e^{i\phi_1}; \\ \Delta_2 = |\sin(\frac{\gamma}{2})| e^{i\phi_2}; \end{cases} \qquad V(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) = \frac{K}{2} \sin^2(\gamma) [\cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1] \end{cases}$ K > 0K < 0 $K < 0; \lambda > 0$  $\phi_{12} = \pi/2, \gamma = \pi/2)$ SC + BTRS  $= 0, v = \pi/3$ Nematic SC  $U(1) \times Z_3$  $U(1) \times Z_2$  $(\theta_{12} = indef, \gamma = r$  $V_{6}(\Delta_{1},\Delta_{2}) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left[ (\Delta_{1} - i\Delta_{2})^{3} (\Delta_{1}^{*} - i\Delta_{2}^{*})^{3} + c.c. \right]$ To be added to lift the accidental degeneracy

Two complementary regions of parameter space describing a chiral (K>0) and a nematic (K<0) SC

#### **ETH** zürich

Theoretische Physik

I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. B 107 (6), 064501 (2023)

Large-scale Monte Carlo simulations K > 0e = 0 $f = \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \left[ |\Delta_1|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_1 + |\Delta_2|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_2 \right]^2 + \frac{|\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2}{2\rho^2} \left[ \vec{\nabla} (\phi_1 - \phi_2) \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + 2K |\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2 \left[ \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1 \right]$  $\rho^2 = |\Delta_1|^2 + |\Delta_2|^2 = 1$ \*We looked at the limit of very large penetration length, so we neglect the coupling to the vector potential K > 0Two possible chiralities:  $\phi_1 - \phi_2 = \pm \frac{\pi}{2}$ **BKT transition**  $T_{Z_2}$  TRSB transition  $T_{BKT}$  $T_{c}^{Z_{2}} < T_{BKT}$ ?  $T_{BKT} < T_c^{Z_2}?$  $T_{RKT} = T_{c}^{Z_{2}}?$ Fractional vortices + DW string SC vortices  $Z_2$  DW **Trigger BKT transition** Trigger BKT and  $Z_2$  transition Trigger  $Z_2$  transition

## Stabilising fermion quadruplets is not easy...

Chiral and nematic SC in 3D

\* "Absence of Ginzburg-Landau mechanism for vestigial order in the normal phase above a two-component superconductor"
P. T. How et al., Phys. Rev. B 107, 104514 (2023)

\* "First order SC phase transition in a chiral p+ip system" H. H. Haugen et al., Phys. Rev. B 104, 104515 (2021).

Preemptive first-order phase transition



#### **ETH**zürich Theoretische Physik

I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. B 107 (6), 064501 (2023)

Large-scale Monte Carlo simulations K>0 e = 0 $f = \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \left[ |\Delta_1|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_1 + |\Delta_2|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_2 \right]^2 + \frac{|\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2}{2\rho^2} \left[ \vec{\nabla} (\phi_1 - \phi_2) \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + 2K |\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2 \left[ \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1 \right]$ •2D three-band

 $\rho^2 = |\Delta_1|^2 + |\Delta_2|^2 = 1$ \*We looked at the limit of very large penetration length, so we neglect the coupling to the vector potential



**ETH** zürich

In other models this phase was found only with very strong Josephson coupling

0.75

0.7

0.65Θ

model with

phase

 $- \beta_{\mathbb{Z}_2} - \beta_{\mathrm{U}(1)}$ 

 $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry bro-

ken. Algebraically decaying U(1)-phase.

I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. B 107 (6), 064501 (2023)

Large-scale Monte Carlo simulations K>0

$$f = \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \left[ |\Delta_1|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_1 + |\Delta_2|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_2 \right]^2 + \frac{|\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2}{2\rho^2} \left[ \vec{\nabla} (\phi_1 - \phi_2) \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + 2K |\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2 \left[ \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ ($$

 $\rho^2 = |\Delta_1|^2 + |\Delta_2|^2 = 1$ 

Great, but...

\*We looked at the limit of very large penetration length, so we neglect the coupling to the vector potential

- Why do vortices proliferate always at lower temperatures than domain walls?
- At very small values of K, finite-size effects become prominent, are the two transition still split apart in the thermodynamic limit?
- What is the role of relative density fluctuations?

## RG approaches could be crucial to shed light on these main questions

Related, but different model previously studied via RG:
 G. Bighin et al, PRL 123, 100601 (2019)

Coupled XY models studied with an interlayer coupling  $\propto \cos(\phi_1-\phi_2)$ 



Working in progress with Benjamin Liégeois, Chitra Ramasubramanian, and Nicolò Defenu



Theoretische Physik

I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. B 107 (6), 064501 (2023)

I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, In preparation (2024)

MATBG promising candidate to stabilize fermion quadrupling condensates

- 1.  $2D \longrightarrow$  more phase fluctuations
- 2. Single-band SC unconventional ground state (multicomponent)



 $f = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{A})^2 + \sum_{i=1,2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} |(\vec{\nabla} - ie\vec{A})\Delta_i|^2 \right] + V(\Delta_1, \Delta_2); \quad V(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) = 2K |\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2 \left[ \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1 \right]$  $\begin{cases} \Delta_1 = |\Delta_1| e^{i\phi_1}; \\ \Delta_2 = |\Delta_2| e^{i\phi_2}; \\ |\Delta_1|^2 + |\Delta_2|^2 = \rho^2. \end{cases} \begin{cases} \Delta_1 = |\cos(\frac{\gamma}{2})| e^{i\phi_1}; \\ \Delta_2 = |\sin(\frac{\gamma}{2})| e^{i\phi_2}; \end{cases} \qquad V(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) = \frac{K}{2} \sin^2(\gamma) [\cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1] \end{cases}$ K > 0K < 0 $K < 0; \lambda > 0$  $b_{12} = \pi/2, \gamma = \pi/2)$ SC + BTRS  $= 0. v = \pi/3$ Nematic SC  $U(1) \times Z_3$  $U(1) \times Z_2$  $(\theta_{12} = indef, \gamma = \pi)$  $V_{6}(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left[ (\Delta_{1} - i\Delta_{2})^{3} (\Delta_{1}^{*} - i\Delta_{2}^{*})^{3} + c \cdot c \right]$ To be added to lift the accidental degeneracy Two complementary regions of parameter space describing a chiral (K>0) and a nematic (K<0) SC

**ETH** zürich

I. Maccari, J. Carlström and E. Babaev, In preparation (2024)

Large-scale Monte Carlo simulations K < 0

$$f = \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \left[ |\Delta_1|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_1 + |\Delta_2|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_2 \right]^2 + \frac{|\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2}{2\rho^2} \left[ \vec{\nabla} (\phi_1 - \phi_2) \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[$$



I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, In preparation (2024)

**Large-scale Monte Carlo simulations** *K* < 0

$$f = \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \left[ |\Delta_1|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_1 + |\Delta_2|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_2 \right]^2 + \frac{|\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2}{2\rho^2} \left[ \vec{\nabla} (\phi_1 - \phi_2) \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{\gamma}{2} \left[ \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1 \right] + \lambda \left[ \cos(3\gamma) + 3\cos(\gamma)\sin^2(\gamma)\sin^2((\phi_1 - \phi_2)) \right]$$

Nematic  $Z_3$  phase transition





I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, In preparation (2024)

Large-scale Monte Carlo simulations K < 0

$$f = \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \left[ |\Delta_1|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_1 + |\Delta_2|^2 \vec{\nabla} \phi_2 \right]^2 + \frac{|\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2}{2\rho^2} \left[ \vec{\nabla} (\phi_1 - \phi_2) \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|)^2 + (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_2|)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\vec{\nabla} |\Delta_1|^2 |\Delta_2|^2 \left[ \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) - 1 \right] + \lambda \left[ \cos(3\gamma) + 3\cos(\gamma)\sin^2(\gamma)\sin^2((\phi_1 - \phi_2)) \right] \right]$$



These preliminary results seem to suggest:

 $T_{BKT} > T_c^{Z_3}$ 

Charge-4e SC phase?





17.09.2024

26

## Conclusions and future directions

two real materials.

(2021)



0.01

0.00

20

25

K

40

 $\Delta T_c$ 

0.6

0.

0.4

 $T_{c}$ 

★ I. Maccari and E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. B 105, 214520 (2022)
 ★ I. Shipulin, N. Stegani, I. Maccari, et al., Nature Communications 14, 6734 (2023)
 • Twisted-bilayer graphene may be a promising candidate for the observation of fermion quadruplets above T<sub>c</sub>

• Fermion quadrupling condensates are novel fascinating states of matter so far observed only in

V. Grinenko, D. Weston, F. Caglieris, C. Wuttke, C. Hess, T. Gottschall, I. Maccari, et al., Nature Physics 17, 1254–1259

- ★ I. Maccari, J. Carlström and E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. B 107 (6), 064501 (2023)
  - ★ I. Maccari , J. Carlström and E. Babaev, In preparation (2024)



- How to manipulate the nucleation of specific topological excitations?
- →What are the new emergent properties of these states?

Thank you for your attention!











**ETH** zürich

I. Maccari and E. Babaev Phys. Rev. B 105, 214520 (2022)





V. Grinenko, et al., Nat. Phys. 17, 1254 - 1259 (2021).



# PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT

Backup slides

V. Grinenko, et al., Nat. Phys. 17, 1254 - 1259 (2021).



**Extended Data Fig. 6 | Ultrasound data.** Temperature dependence of the relative change of the sound velocity (left) for the longitudinal  $(c_{11} + c_{12} + 2c_{66})/2$ and transverse  $(c_{11} - c_{12})/2$  acoustic modes with subtracted background (see Fig. S3 in the supplementary information) compared with temperature dependence of the magnetic susceptibility in  $B \parallel ab = 0.5$  mT (right) measured after cooling in zero magnetic field (ZFC) and cooling in the applied field (FC). The data for the samples with x = 0.71, 0.81, and 1 are shown in panels (a), (b), and (c), respectively. The sample with x = 0.81 exhibits a kink in the velocity of the transverse acoustic mode at a position which agrees with the onset of the broad feature in the specific heat shown in Extended Data Fig. 8 for the same sample. The position of the kink agrees with the position of the  $Z_2$  transition indicated by the thermal transport experiments for the sample with  $x \approx 0.8$  (Fig. 2 in the main text).



V. Grinenko, et al., Nat. Phys. 17, 1254 - 1259 (2021).



The residual resistivity  $\rho_0$  very weakly dependent on doping

$$\rho(T) = \rho_0 + A_{FL}T^2$$



$$F = \frac{\mathbf{J}^{2}}{2e^{2}\varrho^{2}} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{B}^{2} + \sum_{i}\frac{1}{2}(\nabla|\psi_{i}|)^{2} + a_{i}|\psi_{i}|^{2} + \frac{b_{i}}{2}|\psi_{i}|^{4} + \sum_{i$$



Spontaneous Magnetic Fields











#### No CDW evidences from STM data



Figure S3. STM data for the sample  $S_{\rm NP}$  (a) STM Topograph recorded from the disordered surface of a  ${\rm Ba}_{1-{\rm x}}{\rm K}_{\rm x}{\rm Fe}_{2}{\rm As}_{2}$  sample with x = 0.77 (image size:  $(50 \times 50){\rm nm}^{2}$ ,  $V_{\rm b} = 80{\rm mV}$ ,  $I_{\rm t} = 100{\rm pA}$ ). The disordered surface was likely caused by the mixture of Ba atoms and K atoms. (b)  ${\rm d}I/{\rm d}V - V$  spectrum taken from a defect-free position (the red point) on the surface shown in (a) (Spectroscopic set-point:  $V_{s} = 10{\rm mV}$ ,  $I_{s} = 200{\rm pA}$ , amplitude of bias modulation used  $V_{\rm mod} = 0.25{\rm mV}$ ), showing a "V"-shaped superconducting gap. The black circle was experiment result. Red solid curve was fitting result using double-gap Dynes equation with a larger gap ( $\Delta_{2} = 3.1{\rm meV}$ ) and a smaller gap with node( $\Delta_{1} = 2.1{\rm meV}$ ). There is no "CDW" gap feature in the spectrum.

## SC vortices carrying a temperature-de



Yusuke Iguchi et al. Science 380, 1244 - 1247 (2023)

