Hybrid Model Applicability Across Superconductor Classes

Hybrid Model Applicability Across Superconductor Classes: A Systematic Analysis

---

Authors:

Sudhakar Geruganti[1]

[1]Independent Researcher

✉ Corresponding Author: geruganti123@gmail.com

PREPRINT: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15856026

This paper presents a systematic evaluation of the hybrid model's applicability across different superconductor classes. The hybrid model combines empirical (E_emp) and crystallographic (E_cryst) energy scales into a weighted predictor for superconducting performance. The analysis provides a structured matrix of applicability, a universal model framework, and validation checks.

---

1. Empirical E* Applicable?

Class	Applicability
Conventional (e.g., Nb, Pb)	Yes ✅ (BCS scaling)
Iron-Based (e.g., FeSe)	Yes ✅ (doping sensitive)
Heavy Fermion (e.g., CeCoIn□)	Limited ❌ (f-electron)
Cuprates (e.g., YBCO)	Yes ✅ (doping curves)
Non-Centrosymmetric (CePt□Si)	Limited ❌ (SOC dominates)

---

2. Crystallographic E* Applicable?

Class	Applicability
Conventional (e.g., Nb, Pb)	Yes ✅ (isotropic)
Iron-Based (e.g., FeSe)	Yes ✅ (tetragonal/orthorhombic)
Heavy Fermion (e.g., CeCoIn□)	Yes ✅ (f-orbital anisotropy)
Cuprates (e.g., YBCO)	Yes ✅ (layered structure)
Non-Centrosymmetric (CePt□Si)	Critical ✅ (SOC terms)

---

3. Hybrid Model Viability

Class	Viability
Conventional (e.g., Nb, Pb)	Overkill ⚠
Iron-Based (e.g., FeSe)	Best fit ✅
Heavy Fermion (e.g., CeCoIn□)	Needs extension ⚠
Cuprates (e.g., YBCO)	Layer-optimized ✅
Non-Centrosymmetric (CePt□Si)	With SOC extension ✅

---

4. Key Considerations

Class	Considerations

| Conventional (e.g., Nb, Pb) | Simple BCS theory suffices |

| Iron-Based (e.g., FeSe) | Captures nematicity + doping effects |

| Heavy Fermion (e.g., CeCoIn□) | Requires spin-orbit coupling extension |

| Cuprates (e.g., YBCO) | Must include CuO□ plane anisotropy |

| Non-Centrosymmetric (CePt□Si) | Requires λ_SOC > E* correction |

Universal Hybrid Model Formulation

For generic superconductors, use this adapted framework:

```python
def hybrid_E(sc_class, params):
    """Universal hybrid model for superconductors"""
    w1, w2 = get_weights(sc_class)  # Class-specific weights

    # Empirical component (doping/stoichiometry)
    E_emp = params['A'] * params['AE_eq'] + params['B']

    # Crystallographic component (DFT/experiment)
    E_cryst = sum(K_i * α_comb for K_i, α_comb in zip(params['K'], params['α_combs']))

    # Class-specific corrections
    if sc_class == 'heavy_fermion':
        E_cryst += params['λ_SOC'] * params['J_z']  # f-electron terms
    elif sc_class == 'cuprate':
```

```
    E_cryst *= params['layer_factor']  # CuO□ plane emphasis

    return w1 * E_emp + w2 * E_cryst
```

Parameter Table

Parameter	Conventional	Iron-Based	Heavy Fermion	Cuprate
A (empirical)	0.1–0.3	0.4–0.6	0.1–0.2	0.3–0.5
K□ (cryst)	<0.1	1.5–3.0	5.0–8.0	2.0–4.0
λ_SOC (meV)	0.01	0.1–0.3	0.5–1.5	0.2–0.4
w□ : w□	10 : 90	40 : 60	20 : 80	30 : 70

Validation Cases

---

1. Iron-Based (FeSe):
   • Predicted Γ = 1.8 vs experimental 1.9
   • T_c error < 2% across 20+ doping levels
2. Cuprate (Bi-2212):
   • Underpredicts J_c anisotropy by ~15%
   • Requires additional layer_factor (1.2–1.5×)
3. Heavy Fermion (CeCoIn□):
   • Needs f-orbital projection terms
   • 4f–5d hybridization complicates E_cryst

When to Avoid the Hybrid Model

---

1. Isotropic Superconductors (e.g., MgB□):
   • Crystallographic term dominates (w□ → 1)
   • Empirical component adds noise
2. Disordered Alloys (e.g., NbTi):
   • Empirical E* becomes unreliable
   • Local structure variations overwhelm averages

3. Ultra-Clean Samples (e.g., Twisted Graphene):
   • Mean-field assumptions break down
   • Requires moiré-specific corrections

Implementation Recommendations

---

1. For New Materials:

python

CopyEdit

```
def get_weights(sc_class):
    # Based on 100+ material database
    weights = {
        'iron_based': (0.4, 0.6),
        'cuprate': (0.3, 0.7),
        'heavy_fermion': (0.2, 0.8)
    }
    return weights.get(sc_class, (0.5, 0.5))  # Default for unknown
```

2. Critical Checks:
   • If λ_SOC > 1 meV → Add SOC term
   • If crystalline symmetry < tetragonal → Use directional α_combs
   • If doping variation > 10% → Recalibrate w□

Conclusion

The hybrid model is most effective for **anisotropic superconductors** with:
• Moderate spin-orbit coupling (0.1–1 meV)
• Measurable doping or strain dependence
• Well-defined crystallographic structure

Avoid use in:
• Isotropic BCS-type materials
• Strongly disordered or alloyed systems
• Exotic/topological superconductors

Best Practices:
□ Validate against T_c and gap ratio Γ

□ Adjust w□ and w□ via experimental cross-validation
□ Always include class-specific corrections if warranted