



Fig. 1. Pressure dependence of  $\Delta\gamma^*$  and  $\Delta H_c$ . The curve through the  $\Delta\gamma^*$  values represents a parabolic fit. The relative error in pressure was about 1%.

The critical field was determined from measurements of specimen magnetization versus applied field using an improved vibrating coil magnetometer [2]. The apparatus permitted isothermal comparison of two In specimens, one at  $p = 0$  and one mounted in a pressure cell<sup>†</sup>. The relative accuracy in  $\gamma$  is about  $2 \times 10^{-4}$ .

In fig. 1  $\Delta H_c$  at  $T = T_c$  and  $T = 0$  and  $\Delta\gamma^*$  ( $\gamma^* = \gamma/V$ ) are plotted against pressure. A linear least square fit of the  $\Delta\gamma^*$  values does not describe the observed behavior within the experimental errors. An excellent fit is obtained by a parabolic dependence of  $\Delta\gamma^*$  versus  $p$ . Using the pressure dependent compressibility [4] one obtains:

$$\gamma(p) = 1.6720 - 1.4 \times 10^{-5}p + 34 \times 10^{-10}p^2 \quad (2)$$

where  $p$  is in atm and  $\gamma$  in mJ/mole<sup>°K</sup> [2]<sup>††</sup>.

From fig. 1  $\partial H_c / \partial p$  was calculated.  $(\partial H_c / \partial p)_{T_c} = -6.87 \pm 0.05 \text{ G}/10^3 \text{ atm}$  and  $(\partial H_c / \partial p)_{T=0} = -4.52 \pm 0.05 \text{ G}/10^3 \text{ atm}$  are both higher than those of Collins et al. [6] which were derived

<sup>†</sup> Measurements of Gubser [3] give the following values for In:  $\gamma = 1.672 \text{ mJ/mole}^\circ\text{K}^2$  and  $H_0 = 281.53 \text{ gauss}$ . These values were used to define the temperature scale in the range below 1°K.

<sup>††</sup> The compressibility of  $2.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ atm}^{-1}$ , deduced from elastic constants by Chandrasekhar and Rayne [5] slightly modifies eq. (2). The revised values are:  $d \ln \gamma / d \ln V = 3.7$  for  $p = 0$  and  $1.9$  for  $p = 1000 \text{ atm}$ .

from the change in length which occurs at the transition from the normal to the superconducting state in a magnetic field.

In recent years several values of  $d \ln \gamma / d \ln V$  have been reported:  $1.0 \pm 0.5$  by Rohrer [7],  $2.9 \pm 0.8$  by Collins et al. [6], and  $1.5 \pm 0.3$  by Berman et al. [8]. From eq. (2) we get  $d \ln \gamma / d \ln V = 3.40 \pm 0.1$  for  $p = 0$  and  $1.80 \pm 0.05$  for  $p = 1000 \text{ atm}$  [5]. Our value for  $p = 0$  agrees fairly well with that of Collins. Berman et al. [8] extrapolated high pressure  $\gamma$ -values with relatively large errors. Although some of their main assumptions concerning the shape of the critical field curve for calculating  $\gamma$  are not valid, the difference in  $d \ln \gamma / d \ln V$  can be explained by considering the nonlinear decrease of  $\gamma$  below 1000 atm.

The pressure dependence of  $K$ , a characteristic superconducting constant,

$$K = 2\pi\gamma T_c^2 / V H_0^2 = 2\pi\gamma^* T_c^2 / H_0^2 \quad (3)$$

can be investigated since  $(\partial H_c / \partial p)_{T=0}$ ,  $\partial T_c / \partial p$ , and  $\partial \gamma^* / \partial p$  were measured independently. For  $p \rightarrow 0$  one finds  $dK/dp = (-0.25 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-6} \text{ atm}^{-1}$ . Going to higher pressures  $K$  increases due to the nonlinearity of  $\gamma^*(p)$ . At 1000 atm  $dK/dp$  is about  $3.4 \times 10^{-6} \text{ atm}^{-1}$ . A consequence of this is that the shape of the reduced critical field curve also changes under pressure. This was directly confirmed by temperature dependent measurements of  $\partial H / \partial p$ .

The author would like to thank Professor D. E. Mapother for his hospitality during this work and for helpful discussions.

#### References

1. J. E. Schirber and C. A. Swenson, Phys. Rev. 123 (1961) 1115.
2. D. U. Gubser and D. E. Mapother, Rev. Sci. Instr., to be published.
3. D. U. Gubser, to be published.
4. L. D. Jennings and C. A. Swenson, Phys. Rev. 112 (1958) 31.
5. B. S. Chandrasekhar and J. A. Rayne, Phys. Rev. 124 (1961) 1011.
6. J. G. Collins, J. A. Cowan and G. K. White, Cryogenics 7 (1967) 219.
7. H. Rohrer, Helv. Phys. Acta 33 (1960) 675.
8. I. V. Berman, N. B. Brandt and N. I. Ginzburg, Sov. Phys. JETP 26 (1968) 86.