## Volume 29A, number 6



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:

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

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

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

† 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.

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

## PHYSICS LETTERS

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  $\dot{p} = 0$  and  $1.80 \pm 0.05$  for  $\dot{p} =$ = 1000 atm [5]. Our value for  $\dot{p} = 0$  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,

$$K = 2\pi\gamma T_{\rm c}^2 / V H_{\rm o}^2 = 2\pi\gamma^* T_{\rm c}^2 / H_{\rm o}^2$$
(3)

can be investigated since  $(\partial H_c/\partial p)_{T\to 0}$ ,  $\partial T_c/\partial p$ , and  $\partial \gamma^*/\partial p$  were measured independently. For  $p \to 0$  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

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

2 June 1969