SLAC-PUB-12704
cond-mat.supr-con: 0706.2660
August 2007

Stability of half-quantum vortices in $p_x + ip_y$ superconductors

Suk Bum Chung,[1] Hendrik Bluhm,[2] and Eun-Ah Kim[2]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA*
[2]*Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, USA*

(Dated: June 19, 2007)

We consider the stability conditions for half-quantum vortices in quasi two dimensional p_x+ip_y superconductor (such as Sr_2RuO_4 is believed to be) through energetics calculations. Although the predicted exotic nature of these excitations have recently attracted much attention but they have not been observed yet. We pay particular attention to the fact that an isolated half quantum vortex has a divergent energy cost in the bulk due to the associated *unscreened* spin current, which requires two half-quantum vortices with opposite spin winding to pair. We show that the stability of such a pair in bulk is enhanced when the ratio of spin superfluid density to superfluid density $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ is small. As a step towards stabilizing and observing these exotic excitations, we propose using various mesoscopic geometries. We find that certain mesoscopic geometries can selectively allow only single half-quantum vortices to enter the sample for small $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$.

The possibility of half-quantum vortices (1/2-qv's) in p_x+ip_y superconductors (SC's) has recently added a new 'spin' to the interest in such exotic SCs. The notion that such vortices in (quasi-) two dimensional (2D) superfluids are theoretically predicted to have Majorana fermion zero modes bound at vortex cores, which render vortex statistics non-Abelian[1, 2, 3, 4], drives the excitement. A realization of excitations with such exotic statistics is of interest on its own right. Moreover, the possibility of exploiting non-abelian statistics for topological quantum computation[5] adds technological interest as well.

1/2-qv's are topologically allowed in p_x+ip_y triplet superfluids due to their spin degrees of freedom. They were first sought after in thin films of ^{3}He-A[6]: the best known example of p_x+ip_y superfluid[7]. However, it is challenging to achieve a sufficiently thin parallel plate geometry and NMR experiments on ^{3}He-A thin films failed to detect 1/2-qv's[8]. Sr_2RuO_4, a layered perovskite, has recently emerged as a candidate material for a quasi-2D (*ab* plane) p_x+ip_y spin-triplet SC [9, 10, 11, 12], offering an alternate system to look for 1/2-qv's. Refs [3, 4] proposed experiments for probing and exploiting the exotic nature of the Majorana fermion core states of 1/2-qv's. Nevertheless, 1/2-qv's have not been observed in Sr_2RuO_4 [13, 14, 15]. For 1/2-qv's to be realized, it is crucial to carefully consider their energetics and schemes for stabilization.

In this letter, we investigate the stability of the *ab* plane 1/2-qv's through energetics calculations and discuss routes for their realization using mesoscopic samples. Vortex energetics in the context of Sr_2RuO_4 were first considered by Kee *et al.*[16] for vortices in the *bc* plane under a parallel field. They discussed the stability conditions for 1/2-qv's bound to a texture in the $\mathbf{d}$ vector (Eq. (1)). With the interest for the exotic statistics (which is only possible in 2D) in our minds, we focus on the *ab* plane vortices. Das Sarma *et al.* noted[3] that an out-of-plane field of the order of the spin-orbit decoupling field[17] can reduce the energy cost of 1/2-qv's in *ab* plane[3]. They further argued that 1/2-qv's may be energetically favorable compared to full qv's due to the smaller vorticity. However, as it was remarked in Ref.[18], an isolated 1/2-qv costs energy that is divergent in the system size due to its *unscreened* spin current. Hence free isolated 1/2-qv's cannot exist in the bulk. There are two ways to cut off this divergence: 1) two 1/2-qv's with opposite spin winding forming a pair in a bulk sample, 2) a 1/2-qv entering a mesoscopic sample. Through explicit energetics calculations, we find that 1/2-qv's can be stabilized when the ratio $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ is sufficiently small.

Stability Analysis – The order parameter of a triplet SC takes a matrix form in the spin space [12, 18]:

$$\hat{\Delta}(\mathbf{k}) = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}(\mathbf{k}) & \Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow}(\mathbf{k}) \\ \Delta_{\downarrow\uparrow}(\mathbf{k}) & \Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}(\mathbf{k}) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} -d_x + id_y & d_z \\ d_z & d_x + id_y \end{bmatrix}. \tag{1}$$

The triplet pairing requires $\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \Delta_{\downarrow\uparrow}$ and the $\mathbf{k}$ dependent vector $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ was introduced to parameterize the gap function. For each $\mathbf{k}$, the unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{k})$ represents the symmetry direction with respect to the rotation of Cooper pair spin. In a $p_x + ip_y$ SC, the $\mathbf{k}$ dependence of $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ is determined by the pairs having finite angular momentum projection $m = 1$ directed along $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$. Hence

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) = \Delta_0 \hat{\mathbf{d}} \exp(i\varphi_{\hat{\mathbf{k}}\hat{\mathbf{l}}}) |\hat{\mathbf{k}} \times \hat{\mathbf{l}}|, \tag{2}$$

where $\varphi_{\hat{\mathbf{k}}\hat{\mathbf{l}}}$ is the azimuthal angle $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$ makes around $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$. For a (quasi-)2D system, Eq. (2) simplifies, since the $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$ is fixed to the *c*-axis ($\pm z$ direction) confining $\mathbf{k}$ to the *ab*-plane:

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) = \Delta_0 \hat{\mathbf{d}} \exp(i\varphi_{\hat{\mathbf{k}}}), \tag{3}$$

for a single domain, where $\varphi_{\hat{\mathbf{k}}}$ is the azimuthal angle $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$ makes around the *c*-axis. Notice that there are two independent continuous symmetries associated with the order parameter matrix in Eq. (2) and (3): the spin rotation symmetry SO_2 around the unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$, and the $U(1)$ symmetry which is the combination of a gauge transformation and an orbital rotation around $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$ [19]. When $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$ is

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

Work supported in part by US Department of Energy contract DE-AC02-76SF00515

fixed, we denote the 'orbital phase' associated with this combined $U(1)$ symmetry by χ.

It is the spin degree of freedom represented by the **d**-vector which allows for the existence of half-quantum vortices. In a singlet (single component) superconductor, 1/2-qv's are forbidden by the requirement of single valuedness of the order parameter. However in the $p_x + ip_y$ SC, each component of the order parameter matrix can remain single valued by simultaneously rotating the **d**-vector by π while the orbital phase χ winds by π. Since only χ couples to the magnetic vector potential, this type of topological defect only carries a flux of $hc/4e$, i.e. half a superconducting flux quantum $\Phi_0 = hc/2e$. From Eq. (1), one can intuitively characterize a 1/2-qv as a vortex with a single unit of vorticity for one of the spin components and zero vorticity for the other [20].

In the absence of an external magnetic field, the spin-orbit (dipole) coupling favors alignment of $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$, making 1/2-qv's energetically costly [6, 19]. However, Knight-shift measurement on Sr_2RuO_4 by Murakawa *et al.* [17] suggests that a sufficiently large magnetic field H >200 G ($< H_{c2} \sim 750$ G [12]) along the c-axis may neutralize the dipolar interaction by fixing the **d**-vector orientation to the ab-plane (or RuO_2 plane). While this opens the possibility of 1/2-qv's, the associated **d**-vector bending introduces 'hydrodynamic' spin terms in the gradient free energy. In the following, we will determine their effect on the stability of half-quantum vortices.

The starting point of our analysis is the appropriate Ginzburg-Landau (GL) gradient free energy in its most general from in the London limit [19]:

$$f_{\rm grad} = \frac{1}{2}[\rho_{\rm s} v_s^2 - (\rho_{\rm s} - \rho_{\rm s}^{\parallel})(\hat{\mathbf{l}}\cdot\mathbf{v_s})^2] + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\hbar}{2m}\right)^2 \sum_i [\rho_{\rm sp}(\nabla \hat{d}_i)^2 - (\rho_{\rm sp} - \rho_{\rm sp}^{\parallel})(\hat{\mathbf{l}}\cdot\nabla\hat{d}_i)^2] + K_{ij}^{mn}\partial_i \hat{l}_m \partial_j \hat{l}_n + C_{ij}(v_{\rm s})_i(\nabla\times\hat{l})_j + \frac{1}{8\pi}(\nabla\times\mathbf{A})^2, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{v_s}$ is the superflow velocity, m is the fermion mass, and $\rho_{\rm s}$, $\rho_{\rm s}^{\parallel}$ and $\rho_{\rm sp}$, $\rho_{\rm sp}^{\parallel}$ are components of the superfluid and spin fluid density matrix, respectively. Note that these are rank-two matrices, since there is one symmetry direction, $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$, for the orbital degree of freedom. For a 2D single-domain, the fact that $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$ is fixed leads to great simplification. The superflow velocity $\mathbf{v_s}$ is then $(\hbar/2m)(\nabla\chi - 2e\mathbf{A}/\hbar c)$, as in a conventional s-wave SC. For vortex lines along the c-axis, $\rho_{\rm s\parallel}$ and $\rho_{\rm sp\parallel}$ are projected out of the problem due to the absence of any variation along the $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$ direction (c-axis), and the superfluid and spin current densities can be regarded as scalars. When $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ is restricted to the ab-plane, it can be parametrized as $\hat{\mathbf{d}} = (\cos\alpha, \sin\alpha, 0)$, and the free energy becomes

$$f_{\rm grad}^{\rm 2D} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\hbar}{2m}\right)^2\left[\rho_{\rm s}\left(\nabla_\perp\chi - \frac{2e}{\hbar c}\mathbf{A}\right)^2 + \rho_{\rm sp}\left(\nabla_\perp\alpha\right)^2\right] + \frac{1}{8\pi}(\nabla\times\mathbf{A})^2, \quad (5)$$



FIG. 1: The energy difference (see the text) as a function of pair size, using $\xi = 0.4\lambda$ for Sr_2RuO_4 for different values of $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$: $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} = 0.3$ (the blue solid curve), $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} = 0.4$ (the purple dashed curve), and $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} = 0.7$ (the red dotted curve). The energy per unit length is in units of $\Phi_0^2/16\pi^2\lambda^2$.

with the last term accounting for screening of the supercurrent, which is absent for the case of ^{3}He-A thin film [6, 21]. This decouples the 'superflow' energy (dependent on χ and **A**) and the **d**-vector bending energy, which depends on α.

We note that an isolated 1/2-qv cannot exist inside an infinitely large system, as was pointed out in Ref. [18]. Unlike a full qv which only costs screened super current self energy, a single 1/2-qv costs a spin current energy that diverges logarithmically

$$\epsilon_{\rm sp} = \frac{\pi}{4}\left(\frac{\hbar}{2m}\right)^2 \rho_{\rm sp} \ln\left(\frac{R}{\xi}\right) \quad (6)$$

per unit length, where ξ is the core radius and R the lateral sample dimension. The divergence in Eq. (6) is due to the *absence of screening*, for the $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$-winding (the $\nabla\alpha$ term in Eq. (5)) does not couple to the electromagnetic gauge field.

A pair of 1/2-qv's with opposite windings in $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ (i.e., one with $n_{\rm sp} = +1/2$ and the other with $n_{\rm sp} = -1/2$) would be free of such divergent energy cost. The energy per unit length of a pair of 1/2-qv's separated by r_{12} is

$$E_{\rm pair}^{\rm half}(r_{12}) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Phi_0^2}{16\pi^2\lambda^2}\left[\ln\left(\frac{\lambda}{\xi}\right) + K_0\left(\frac{r_{12}}{\lambda}\right) + \frac{\rho_{\rm sp}}{\rho_{\rm s}}\ln\left(\frac{r_{12}}{\xi}\right)\right], \quad (7)$$

where K_0 is a modified Bessel function. The first term of Eq. (7) is the *screened* self-energy of superflow. The second term accounts for the magnetic interaction between the vortices, and the third term, in which the logarithmic divergence of Eq. (6) is canceled out by the interaction term, is purely due to spin flow. However, such a pair is topologically equivalent to a single full qv (see Fig. 1(a-b)) with the self-energy

$$E^{\rm full} = \pi\left(\frac{\hbar}{2m}\right)^2 \rho_{\rm s}\ln\left(\frac{\lambda}{\xi}\right) = \frac{\Phi_0^2}{16\pi^2\lambda^2}\ln\left(\frac{\lambda}{\xi}\right), \quad (8)$$

where $\lambda = \frac{mc}{2e\sqrt{\pi\rho_s}}$ is the London penetration depth. Hence the most relevant question, regarding the stability of 1/2-qv's in the bulk of a SC is whether a pair of 1/2-qv's can be generated by the decay of a full qv. (Note that Eqs. (7-8) are approximately equal at $r_{12} = \xi$.)[29]

Using parameters relevant to Sr_2RuO_4 in Eq. (7), we find that a 1/2-qv pair in bulk Sr_2RuO_4 will only be stable if $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ satisfy certain conditions. In Fig. 1, we plot $E^{\rm half}_{\rm pair}(r_{12}) - E^{\rm full}$ for $r_{12} > \xi$, using parameters plausible for Sr_2RuO_4. We used $\kappa \equiv \lambda/\xi = 2.5$ based on the experimental value $\lambda_{ab} \approx 152$ nm [12, 13] and the estimated value of the Ginzburg-Landau coherence length $\xi_{ab} \sim 66$ nm [12]. For all three values of $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ shown, a finite equilibrium pair size $r_{\rm equil} > \xi$ exists. However, we note that while the London approximation predicts a minimum of the energy difference $E^{\rm half}_{\rm pair}(r_{12}) - E^{\rm full}$ at a finite value $r_{12} = r_{\rm equil}$ for $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} < 1$, the London limit is only valid when $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ is small enough to give $r_{\rm equil} > \xi$.

We now discuss the ratio between the neutral spin superfluid density $\rho_{\rm sp}$ and the charged mass superfluid density $\rho_{\rm s}$ in Eq. (5) . In the case of ^{3}He, the $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ ratio has been derived theoretically in terms of Landau parameters [7, 19, 21, 22]. Using sum rules for the longitudinal current-current correlation, Leggett showed that $\rho_{\rm sp} < \rho_{\rm s}$ [22]. This follows from the fact that the mass current is conserved even in the presence of interactions due to Galilean invariance, while the spin current is not, since a corresponding symmetry is absent. In the case of Sr_2RuO_4, the lattice breaks the Galilean invariance. However, since all interactions that scatter the mass current also must scatter spin current, but not vice versa, one still expects $\rho_{\rm sp} < \rho_{\rm s}$ [22]. While the actual value of $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ is unknown for Sr_2RuO_4, it has recently been measured to be ~ 0.3 near $T = 0$ in ^{3}He-A [21]. Since many Fermi liquid properties of Sr_2RuO_4, such as the mass renormalization ratio, are similar to that of ^{3}He [12], $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ for Sr_2RuO_4 is also not anticipated to be much larger than ~ 0.4. If so, the 1/2-qv pair would have a robust energy minimum (see Fig. 1).

Although the above analysis implies that a pair of half quantum vortices can be stable against *combining* into a single full qv, the vortex core energy, which we have not taken into account, can make stop a single full qv from *decaying* into a pair of half quantum vortices. Since the core interactions may be substantial for $r_{12} \lesssim \xi$, it is not guaranteed that the finite equilibrium separation in our analysis corresponds to a global energy minimum. In the case of a merely local minimum, a finite separation $r_{\rm equil} > 0$ would only represent a metastable state, whose formation depends on the history of the sample. In this case, a full vortex would not decay into two 1/2-qv's. If $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ is so large that $r_{\rm equil} \lesssim \xi$, it is possible for even a local minimum to be absent. However if $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} \sim 0.4$, as in the case of ^{3}He, this is rather unlikely.

Mesoscopic geometries – Given that the experimentally unknown core interaction may be significant, and neutron scattering [13] and vortex imaging [14, 15] found no evidence for vortex dissociation in macroscopic samples, we propose utilizing mesoscopic geometries. A sample size of order λ would promote the chance of a 1/2-qv entering by cutting off the divergent spin current energy and reducing the effect of supercurrent screening. Here we discuss a thin slab and a cylinder as two examples.

We find that a slab of thickness $L = 2\lambda$ (see Fig. 2) will only permit a entry of 1/2-qv if $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} < (2\xi/\lambda)K_1(2\xi/\lambda)$. Consider the Gibbs free energy for a vortex at position x in the slab (see Fig. 2), with winding numbers $n_{\rm s}$ and $n_{\rm sp}$ in ϕ and α, respectively, and a uniform applied field H: ($n_{\rm s} = n_{\rm sp} = 1/2$ and $n_{\rm s} = 1$, $n_{\rm sp} = 0$ for a 1/2-qv and a full qv, respectively)

$$G(x;\, n_{\rm s}, n_{\rm sp}) = \varepsilon_{\rm m}(x;\, n_{\rm s}) + \sum_{\delta=\mp}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{j-1}\varepsilon_{\rm bc}(|x-x_j^{\delta}|;\, n_{\rm s}, n_{\rm sp}). \quad (9)$$

Here, $\varepsilon_{\rm m}(x;\, n_{\rm s})$ is the energy (per unit sample thickness) due to the interaction with the Meissner current:

$$\frac{\varepsilon_{\rm m}(x;\, n_{\rm s})}{\Phi_0^2/(4\pi\lambda)^2} = n_{\rm s}\frac{H}{\Phi_0/4\pi\lambda^2}\frac{\cosh(x/\lambda) - \cosh[(L-2\xi)/2\lambda]}{\cosh(L/2\lambda)}. \quad (10)$$

The second line of Eq. (9) accounts for the boundary condition of vanishing current normal to each surface. We solve the boundary condition using an infinite set of image vortices at positions $x_j^{\mp} \equiv (-1)^j(x' \mp jL)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, \infty$ with vorticities $(-1)^j n_{\rm s,sp}$. Between a vortex with winding number $(n_{\rm s}, n_{\rm sp})$ in the slab and each of its image vortices at a distance r from it, there is an interaction energy (per unit sample thickness):

$$\frac{\varepsilon_{\rm bc}(r;\, n_{\rm s}, n_{\rm sp})}{\Phi_0^2/(4\pi\lambda)^2} = -n_{\rm s}^2\left[K_0\left(\frac{r}{\lambda}\right) - K_0\left(\frac{2\xi}{\lambda}\right)\right] + n_{\rm sp}^2\frac{\rho_{\rm sp}}{\rho_{\rm s}}\ln\left(\frac{r}{2\xi}\right). \quad (11)$$

We plot $G(x;\, 1, 0)$ and $G(x;\, 1/2, 1/2)$ in Fig. 2(b) for $H = 3.0\Phi_0/4\pi\lambda^2$ and $L = 2\lambda$ for $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} = 0.4$. For those parameters, clearly only the 1/2-qv is stable inside the sample. The energy difference between the two types of vortices at the center is estimated to be much larger than k_BT_c at low enough temperatures (as large as $10^4 k_BT_c/\mu$m at $T \sim 100$ mK). Hence, the entry of a 1/2-qv into the slab will be favored over that of a full qv.



FIG. 2: (a)A slab of thickness $L = 2\lambda = 0.304\mu$m in an external field H. (b) $G(x)$ (see Eq. (9)) in units of $\Phi_0^2/(4\pi\lambda)^2$ for a full-qv (blue solid curve) and for a 1/2-qv (red dashed curve) at $H = 212G \sim 3.0\Phi_0/4\pi\lambda^2$, for $\xi = 0.4\lambda$ and $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} = 0.4$.

However, the fact that many vortices will enter the slab at different positions along its length more or less at once complicates both further theoretical modeling and experiments. Thus, we also consider cylindrical samples, which can only accommodate single vortices (of either type) if the radius is small enough [23]. For example, the fabrication of a sub-micron disk of Sr_2RuO_4, while challenging, is within reach of available technologies such as focused ion beam (FIB) milling. The entry of a vortex or fluxoid in a cylinder or annulus geometry can be detected as an abrupt change in the magnetization as H is ramped up. As in the case of a thin slab, a 1/2-qv can be energetically favored for small enough $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ due to the suppression of the supercurrent screening.

For simplicity, we only compare the free energies for fluxoids trapped in a thin, hollow cylinder. Although the fabrication of this geometry is significantly more challenging, it has the additional advantage over a filled cylinder or disk of eliminating the core. For a long, thin hollow cylinder of radius R and thickness $d \ll \lambda, R$, the London approximation is nearly accurate [24], and one can obtain the Gibbs free energy per unit length for fluxoids of either type in the presence of an external field H from Eq. (5) via a Legendre transformation:

$$\frac{G(n_{\rm s}, n_{\rm sp})}{\Phi_0^2/8\pi R^2} = \beta \left[\frac{1}{1+\beta} \left(n_{\rm s} - \frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} \right)^2 + \frac{\rho_{\rm sp}}{\rho_{\rm s}} n_{\rm sp}^2 \right] - \left(\frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0} \right)^2 . \tag{12}$$

We defined $\beta \equiv dR/2\lambda^2$[25], and $\Phi \equiv \pi R^2 H$, the flux through the cylinder. It is the presence of the $n_{\rm sp}^2$ term in Eq. (12), which is the only difference from the s-wave case, that allows for the 1/2-qv possibility of $n_{\rm s} = n_{\rm sp} = 1/2$. At $\Phi/\Phi_0 = 1/2$, $G(1/2, 1/2) < G(1, 0) = G(0, 0)$ if $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s} < (1+\beta)^{-1}$ and a 1/2-qv will have lower energy than a full qv. The vorticity could be detected by monitoring the magnetization, as it was done for bilayer Al rings, which effectively form a two-component SC [26].

Conclusion – Vortices with a fraction of a flux quantum, which are topologically allowed in any multi-component superconductors (SC), tend to be energetically unfavorable [27]. We considered the vortex energetics of $p_x + ip_y$ SC in the London limit using a GL formalism. For an isolated 1/2-qv, we noted the importance of controlling a logarithmically divergent energy due to the unscreened spin current. While such divergence is regulated in a pair of 1/2-qv's of opposite spin winding, $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ needs to be sufficiently small in order to make finite separation in such a pair (meta-)stable. Given the fragile nature of 1/2-qv's in bulk samples, we propose using mesoscopic geometries to look for 1/2-qv's.

Although we predict that pairs of 1/2-qv's can indeed be energetically favored over full qv's in bulk samples and a single 1/2-qv can be stable in a mesoscopic samples, if $\rho_{\rm sp}/\rho_{\rm s}$ is sufficiently small, a number of real material features can affect the existence or complicate the observation of 1/2-qv's in Sr_2RuO_4. Such features include locking of the **d**-vector within the RuO_2 plane, proliferation of microscopic domain walls, significant core energy effects, and boundary scattering. Nonetheless, given the exciting promise associated with these exotic excitations, our analysis forms a point of departure in the quest of realizing 1/2-qv's in Sr_2RuO_4 or other candidate materials for exotic superconductivity, such as UPt_3 [28].

Acknowledgments We are grateful to A.J. Leggett, M. Stone, K. Moler, V. Vakaryuk, A. Fetter, H.-Y. Kee, C. Kallin, S. Kivelson, P. Oreto for their insights and many helpful discussions. SC has been supported by University of Illinois Applied Mathematics Fellowship and NSF Grant No. DMR 06-03528, HB by DOE under Contract No. DE-AC02-76SF00515, and EAK by the Stanford Institute for Theoretical Physics.

[1] D. A. Ivanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 268-7 (2001); A. Stern *et al.*, **70**, 205338 (2004); M. Stone and S. B. Chung, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 014505 (2006).
[2] N. Read, D. Green, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 10267 (2000).
[3] S. Das Sarma *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 220502(R) (2006)
[4] S. Tewari *et al.*, cond-mat/0703717 (2007).
[5] A. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **303**, 2 (2003).
[6] M. M. Salomaa and G. E. Volovik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1184 (1985).
[7] A. J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 331 (1975).
[8] P. Hakonen *et al.*, Physica B **160**, 1 (1989).
[9] T. M. Rice and M. Sigrist, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **7**, L643 (1995).
[10] K. Ishida *et al.*, Nature **396**, 658 (1998); J. A. Duffy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5412 (2000).
[11] G. M. Luke *et al.*, Nature **394**, 558 (1998); K. D. Nelson *et al.*, Science **306**, 1151 (2004); F. Kidwingira *et al.*, Science **314**, 1267 (2006); J. Xia *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 167002 (2006).
[12] A. P. Mackenzie and Y. Maeno, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 657 (2003).
[13] T. M. Riseman *et al.*, Nature **396**, 242 (1998).
[14] V. O. Dolocan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 097004 (2005).
[15] P. Björsson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **72** 012504 (2006).
[16] H.-Y. Kee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 9275(R) (2000)
[17] H. Murakawa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 167004 (2004).
[18] M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63**, 239 (1991).
[19] D. Vollhardt and P. Wölfle, *The Superfluid Phases of Helium 3*, (Taylor & Francis 1990); G. E. Volovik, *Exotic Properties of Superfluid* ^{3}*He*, (World Scientific, 1992).
[20] A. J. Leggett and S. Yip, *Helium 3*, Modern problems in condensed matter sciences **26** (Elsevier, 1990).
[21] H. Y. Kee and K. Maki, cont-mat/0702344; M. Yamashita *et al.*, AIP proceedings **850**, 185 (2006).
[22] A. J. Leggett, Ann. Phys. **46**, 76 (1968).
[23] A. Geim *et al.*, Nature **390**, 259, (1995).
[24] A. J. Leggett and V. Vakaryuk, private communications.
[25] A. Griffin, Solid State Commun. **4**, 245 (1966).
[26] H. Bluhm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 237002 (2006).
[27] E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 067001-1 (2002).
[28] H. Tou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1374 (1996); M. J. Graf *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 14393 (2000).
[29] Eq. (7) suggests an entropy driven transition of Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless type at $T_{\rm KT}$ below

T_c. The onset temperature T_{KT} is at $k_B T_{\mathrm{KT}} = \frac{1}{8}\frac{T_c - T_{\mathrm{KT}}}{T_c}\frac{\rho_{\mathrm{sp}}}{\rho_{\mathrm{s}}} d \left(\frac{\Phi_0}{4\pi\lambda}\right)^2$, where d is the sample thickness. However, experimental values of λ and T_c suggests $T_{\mathrm{KT}} \approx T_c$.