

Ferromagnetic Quantum Critical Point in Non-Centrosymmetric Systems

T. R. Kirkpatrick¹ and D. Belitz^{2,3}

¹ *Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA*

² *Department of Physics and Institute of Theoretical Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA*

³ *Materials Science Institute, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA*

(Dated: April 8, 2024)

Ferromagnetic quantum criticality in clean metals has proven elusive due to fermionic soft modes that drive the transition first order. We show that non-centrosymmetric metals with a strong spin-orbit interaction provide a promising class of materials for realizing a ferromagnetic quantum critical point in clean systems. The spin-orbit interaction renders massive the soft modes that interfere with quantum criticality in most materials, while the absence of spatial inversion symmetry precludes the existence of new classes of soft modes that could have the same effect.

Ferromagnetism in metals has provided one of the earliest examples of a quantum phase transition. Stoner [1] developed the eponymous mean-field theory that describes both the classical and the quantum ferromagnetic (FM) transition. Hertz [2] later argued that, in the quantum case (i.e., for the transition at zero temperature driven by a non-thermal control parameter) Stoner theory is exact, as far as the critical behavior is concerned, for all spatial dimensions $d > 1$. The reason is that the coupling between the statics and the dynamics at zero temperature ($T = 0$) lowers the upper critical dimension, above which the fluctuations neglected by mean-field theory are irrelevant, from $d_c^+ = 4$ in the classical case to $d_c^+ = 1$ in the quantum case. Hertz's renormalization-group (RG) treatment, as refined by Millis [3], agreed with results obtained by different methods by Moriya [4]. Collectively, this became known as the Hertz-Millis-Moriya (HMM) theory of FM quantum criticality.

These theoretical predictions were not borne out experimentally. In stoichiometric systems with minimal amounts of quenched disorder, and the quantum phase transition (QPT) driven by pressure, the transition almost invariably becomes first order if the Curie temperature is sufficiently low, and this is true for local-moment ferromagnets as well as for itinerant ones [5]. Notable exceptions are CeRh₆Ge₄ [6, 7] and UIr [8], which we will come back to. The reason for this failure of HMM theory is by now well known: A generic Fermi liquid, with a negligible spin-orbit interaction (more on this later), contains soft or massless two-particle excitations that couple to, and are rendered massive by, an external magnetic field or a magnetization [9, 10]. This coupling results in the free energy being a nonanalytic function of the magnetization, which in turn drives the FM QPT first order [11]. This mechanism is operative for local-moment ferromagnets as well as for itinerant ones, and also for canted ferromagnets and for ferrimagnets [12] as well as for magnetic nematics [13]; for a review, see Ref. 5. It has recently been shown that it also is operative in Dirac metals, i.e., systems where a linear band crossing is caused by a strong spin-orbit coupling [14–16], if for unobvious reasons. A nonzero temperature gives the soft modes a mass

and thus cuts off the first-order mechanism; this leads to a tricritical point in the phase diagram [11]. Similarly, an external magnetic field gives the soft modes a mass, which results in tricritical wings that emerge from the tricritical point in the temperature-pressure-field parameter space and end in quantum critical points (QCPs) at a nonzero field [17].

One way to avoid these conclusions, and realize a FM QCP in zero field, is to introduce quenched disorder, which has been predicted [11, 18] and observed [19] to restore a QCP. However, the resulting critical behavior is not described by HMM theory, but is substantially more complicated [20–22]. Experimental results are consistent with these predictions [23, 24]. Another possibility are one-dimensional or quasi-one-dimensional materials, see Ref. 25 for a model of FM quantum criticality in such systems.

It would be very interesting if clean materials could be found in which the mechanism for a first-order transition is inoperative, so that a FM QCP in zero field can be realized in three-dimensional systems. In this Letter we show that a promising class of materials are systems with a strong spin-orbit coupling that are not centrosymmetric. Our central result is an equation of state that takes the form

$$h = r m - v m^3 \ln \left(\frac{1}{m^2 + \nu^2 + t^2} \right) + u m^3. \quad (1)$$

Here m , ν , and h are the dimensionless magnetization, spin-orbit coupling, and magnetic field, respectively, in atomic units. They are formally defined as follows. Let μ be the magnetization measured in units of μ_B per volume and E_{ex} the exchange splitting due to that magnetization, H the external magnetic field, E_{so} the splitting of the conduction band near the Fermi energy induced by the spin-orbit coupling, n_e the conduction-electron density, and T_F the Fermi temperature. Then $h = \mu_B H / k_B T_F$, $m = \mu / n_e \approx E_{\text{ex}} / k_B T_F$, and $\nu = E_{\text{so}} / k_B T_F$. $t = T / T_0$ is the dimensionless temperature, with T_0 a temperature scale that depends on microscopic details such as the band structure and the correlation strength. r is the control parameter, and $u > 0$ and $v > 0$ are

Landau parameters. u is generically of order unity. v is a measure of the strength of correlations in the system; for very strong correlations, $v \lesssim 0.1$.

We first discuss Eq. (1) in the context of the general FM QPT problem and give plausibility arguments for its functional form, then we discuss its implications, and finally we sketch its derivation.

To make Eq. (1) plausible, consider the case of a vanishing spin-orbit coupling, $\nu = 0$. Then we recover the equation of state that has been discussed before [5, 11]. The nonanalytic dependence of the free energy, and hence the equation of state, on the order parameter m at $T = 0$ is the result of ballistic soft modes that have been integrated out in order to express the free energy entirely in terms of the order parameter. The nonanalytic term dominates the quartic term in the free energy (or the cubic term in the equation of state), and its sign is negative, which leads to a first-order transition at $r = r_1 = v e^{-(1+u/v)}$ where the magnetization changes discontinuously from zero to $m_1 = e^{-(1+u/v)/2}$ [11]. A nonvanishing temperature gives the soft modes a mass, so $T > 0$ cuts off the singularity. As a result, there is a tricritical point at a temperature $T_{tc} = T_0 e^{-u/2v}$ [11]. In a magnetic field, tricritical wings emerge from the tricritical point that end in wing tips at $T = 0$ and $h = h_c = (4/3)v e^{-3u/2v-13/4}$ [17].

A spin-orbit interaction splits the conduction band and gives the soft modes a mass. However, in centrosymmetric systems a chiral degree of freedom leads to new soft modes that have the same effect as the original ones. Such metals were called Dirac metals in Refs. 14–16 in order to distinguish them from the ordinary, or Landau, metals with a negligible spin-orbit interaction. The net result is an equation of state that is again given by Eq. (1) with $\nu = 0$. This changes if spatial inversion symmetry is broken. The spin-orbit interaction still gives the soft modes a mass, but there is no chiral degree of freedom that leads to a new class of soft modes. One then obtains Eq. (1); the resulting phase diagram is shown in Fig. 1.

We now give a semi-quantitative discussion of Eq. (1), with the goal of identifying promising candidate materials that might realize a FM QCP in clean systems. The critical value ν_c of the dimensionless spin-orbit energy, above which the first-order transition is suppressed, is obviously the same as the dimensionless tricritical temperature t_{tc}^0 for $\nu = 0$: $\nu_c = e^{-u/2v}$. The tricritical temperature T_{tc}^0 for centrosymmetric materials, where ν is absent in the equation of state, is typically on the order of 10 K [5], albeit with a large spread that ranges from 1 K in URhGe to over 100 K in CoS₂. For the critical spin-orbit energy we thus have $E_{so}^c = k_B T_0 \nu_c = (T_F/T_0) k_B T_{tc}^0$. The temperature scale T_0 has been estimated in Ref. 18, which concluded that T_F/T_0 is typically on the order of 1,000 (as low as 750 in ZrZn₂ and as high as 3,500 in UGe₂). This implies that typically $E_{so}^c \approx 1$ eV, with a spread of a factor of up to 10 in either direction. If




Figure 1: Phase diagram in the space spanned by t , r , and ν based on Eq. (1). Shown are a flat surface of second-order transitions at $r = 0$ (solid, blue), a curved surface of first-order transitions (meshed, green), and a line of tricritical points delineating the two (red). In a given material ν will be fixed. For a given ν , r will be a complicated function of pressure and temperature.

we assume $T_F \approx 10^5$ K for a good metal, this implies $E_{so}^c/k_B T_F \approx 0.1$. It is illustrative to compare this with values of m_1 for $\nu = 0$, which typically fall into a range $m_1 \approx 0.05 - 0.25$ [5, 18].

Considering the two entries in Table I with a first-order QPT for which E_{so} is known, MnSi and URhAl, it is plausible that E_{so} is not large enough to suppress the first-order mechanism. For the two entries with a QCP, UIr and CeRh₆Ge₄, the spin-orbit splitting E_{so} is not known. For a list of E_{so} values in non-centrosymmetric materials that are not ferromagnetic, see Ref. 35; they range from 0.004 eV to 0.2 eV. For interpreting these values it is important to keep in mind that E_{so} should be compared to the Fermi energy. For instance, in BiTeBr $E_{so} \approx k_B T_F$ [36]. $E_{so} \approx 0.2$ eV has been reported for CePt₃Si [37], which also is not ferromagnetic. If the spin-orbit coupling in CeRh₆Ge₄ were of similar strength, then it would be in the lower range of values that can plausibly be expected to be responsible for the observed QCP. In UIr one would expect an even higher value, which may well be the reason for the observed QCP.

Of the third group of materials listed in Table I, the first three are potential candidates for a pressure-induced QCP, but the values of E_{so} are not known. More generally, we conclude that promising candidates for a FM QCP are non-centrosymmetric materials with a large (≈ 1 eV or larger) spin-orbit splitting E_{so} of the conduction band near the Fermi energy.

We now sketch the derivation of Eq. (1); see the Supplemental Material for more details. In the absence of spatial inversion symmetry a single-particle Hamiltonian

Table I: Non-centrosymmetric pressure-tuned quantum ferromagnets. T_C = Curie temperature. T_{tc} = tricritical temperature. E_{so} = spin-orbit splitting of conduction band. ρ_0 = residual resistivity. n.a. = not available. N/A = not applicable. NPT = No pressure tuning to date. AFM = antiferromagnet. References are given only for properties not referenced in Ref. 5.

System	Space Group ^a	Order of QPT ^b	T_C/K ^c	T_{tc}/K	E_{so}/eV	Disorder ^d ($\rho_0/\mu\Omega cm$)	Comments
MnSi	P2 ₁ 3 (198)	1st	29.5	≈ 10	≈ 0.3 [26]	0.33	weak helimagnet
U ₃ P ₄	I $\bar{4}3d$ (220)	1st	138	32	n.a.	4	
UCoAl	P $\bar{6}2m$ (189)	1st	0	>11	n.a.	24	
URhAl	P $\bar{6}2m$ (189)	1st	≈ 30	≈ 11	≈ 1 [27]	≈ 65	
SmNiC ₂	Amm2 (38)	1st	≈ 4	>17 (?)	n.a.	2	
UIr	P2 ₁ (4)	2nd	46 - 1	N/A	n.a.	0.4 [28]	Multiple FM phases. 2nd order above 0.8 K
CeRh ₆ Ge ₄	P $\bar{6}m2$ (187)	2nd		N/A	n.a.	1.5	QCP with NFL transport behavior [6, 7]
Sm ₂ Fe ₁₂ P ₇	P $\bar{6}$ (174)	n.a.	6.3 [29]	N/A	n.a.	6 [29]	NPT
CePt ₃ B	P4mm (99)	n.a.	6 [30]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	NPT. AFM phase between 7.8K and 6K
CePdSi ₃	I4mm (107)	n.a.	2.78 [31]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	NPT. Multiple magnetic phases
UPtAl	P $\bar{6}2m$ (189)	n.a.	42.5 [32]	N/A	≈ 1 [33]	n.a.	T_C increases with pressure, no QPT observed
CeNiC ₂	Amm2 (38)	n.a.	≈ 2 [34]	N/A	n.a.	≈ 10 [34]	Transition to AFM under pressure

^a International Short Symbol (Number Index) from <https://materials.springer.com>

^b At the lowest T_C achieved.

^c At ambient pressure for systems with a 1st order QPT; range as a function of pressure for systems with a 2nd order QPT.

^d For the highest-quality samples.

that captures the dominant effects of the spin-orbit interaction can be written [38]

$$H_0 = \xi_{\mathbf{k}} \sigma_0 + v_{so} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{k}) - \mathbf{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} . \quad (2)$$

Here $\xi_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu$ with $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ the single-particle energy-momentum relation and μ the chemical potential, \mathbf{h} is an external magnetic field, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ denotes the Pauli matrices with σ_0 the 2×2 unit matrix, and v_{so} is a coupling constant that represents the strength of the spin-orbit interaction. Invariance under time reversal (which flips the signs of both $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and \mathbf{k}) in the absence of a magnetic field requires $\boldsymbol{\Omega}(-\mathbf{k}) = -\boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{k})$. This implies that the spin-orbit term is not invariant under spatial inversion (which flips the sign of \mathbf{k} only).

The explicit form of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{k})$ depends on the space group; well-known examples are the Dresselhaus spin-orbit coupling for the zincblende structure, which is cubic in \mathbf{k} [39], and the Rashba-Sheka coupling for the wurtzite structure, which is linear in \mathbf{k} [40]. For definiteness, we will use the same form as in Refs. [14–16], namely,

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{k} . \quad (3)$$

The coupling constant v_{so} then is dimensionally a velocity. The broken inversion symmetry is the crucial difference between the current discussion and the Dirac metals considered in Refs. [14–16]. Spatial inversion symmetry requires the existence of an additional, chiral, pseudo-spin degree of freedom that is odd under parity. The

presence or absence of this degree of freedom qualitatively changes the soft-mode spectrum of the electron system, as we will now discuss.

The inverse Green function for the Hamiltonian H_0 in Eq. (2) is $G_k^{-1} = i\omega_m \sigma_0 - H_0$, with ω_m a fermionic Matsubara frequency and $k = (i\omega_n, \mathbf{k})$. In terms of quasiparticle resonances

$$F_k^\beta = 1 / (i\omega_n - \xi_{\mathbf{k}} - \beta |v_{\mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{h}|) , \quad (4a)$$

and spin matrices

$$M_\beta(\hat{e}) = (\sigma_0 + \beta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{e}) , \quad (4b)$$

with \hat{e} an arbitrary unit vector, we find

$$G_k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\beta=\pm} F_k^\beta M_\beta \left(\frac{v_{so} \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{h}}{|v_{so} \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{h}|} \right) . \quad (4c)$$

For a vanishing spin-orbit interaction the index β turns into minus the spin-projection index, and the spin-orbit interaction in zero field has an effect similar to that of a field in the absence of a spin-orbit interaction. In particular, $v_{so} \neq 0$ splits the doubly degenerate band. Now consider wave-vector convolutions of the Green function,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{\beta_1 \beta_2}(\mathbf{q}, i\Omega_n) &= \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} F_k^{\beta_1} F_{k-q}^{\beta_2} \\ &= \int \frac{d\Omega_{\mathbf{k}}}{4\pi} \frac{2\pi i N_F \text{sgn}(\omega_m) \Theta(-\omega_m(\omega_m - \Omega_n))}{i\Omega_n - v_F \hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbf{q} + (\beta_2 - \beta_1) |v_{so} k_F \hat{\mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{h}|} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here Ω_n is a bosonic Matsubara frequency, $q = (i\Omega_n, \mathbf{q})$, $d\Omega_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the angular integration measure with respect to \mathbf{k} , and the second line represents the leading contribution to the integral in the limit $\mathbf{q}, \Omega_n, \mathbf{h} \rightarrow 0$. These are the relevant ballistic soft modes. We have derived them for noninteracting electrons, but interactions cannot change their nature for reasons discussed in Refs. [14–16]. An inspection of Eq. (5) reveals the following. Convolutions of quasiparticle resonances F with different signs of the frequency (i.e., of retarded and advanced degrees of freedom) are soft as $\mathbf{q}, \Omega_n \rightarrow 0$ if $\beta_1 = \beta_2$. However, a magnetic field does not cut off this singularity. These modes therefore cannot contribute to a nonanalytic dependence of the free energy on the magnetic field or the magnetization. For $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$, on the other hand, the spin-orbit interaction gives the ballistic modes a mass even for $\mathbf{h} = 0$. For $v_{\text{so}} \neq 0$ there thus are no soft modes in a non-centrosymmetric system that can lead to a nonanalytic free energy, and this is the source of the parameter ν in Eq. (1) that cuts off the nonanalyticity. This conclusion does not hinge on the particular form of the spin-orbit interaction given in Eq. (3); any spin-orbit interaction will split the band and give the soft modes a mass, so the equation of state will have the same form.

This scenario for restoring a FM QCP in zero field is qualitatively different from the case of a gapless Dirac metal discussed in Ref. 16, where the relevant soft modes exist, but do not couple to the order parameter. The class of candidate materials for this scenario is much smaller than for the one discussed here, since it requires a special lattice symmetry. The current mechanism is also very different from the effects of quenched disorder in the absence of a spin-orbit interaction: Disorder provides a mass under the logarithm in Eq. (1) just as ν does, but it also leads to new soft modes that are diffusive in nature and provide an additional nonanalytic contribution to the equation of state.

In summary, we have shown that non-centrosymmetric systems with a large spin-orbit coupling provide a platform for the realization of a FM QCP in clean systems in zero field, a goal that had eluded all experimental efforts for a long time. Two materials in which this may already have been observed are UIr and CeRh₆Ge₄, but more detailed studies of the quantum critical behavior are needed to support this suggestion.

We conclude with a few comments about likely features of the resulting critical theory for a non-centrosymmetric metal with a strong spin-orbit interaction. As mentioned after Eq. (4), the effects of v_{so} are similar to those of a magnetic field for $v_{\text{so}} = 0$. As a result, the Gaussian vertex for the 3-component of the magnetization has two eigenvalues with the structure of Hertz theory for a ferromagnet, with a dynamical exponent $z = 3$, while the remaining eigenvalue has the structure of Hertz theory for an antiferromagnet, with $z = 2$, and the latter will lead to corrections to the leading scaling behavior that results

from the former. For instance, for the scaling of the critical temperature with the control parameter $r = p - p_c$ for a pressure-tuned transition one expects $T_c \propto (-r)^\tau$ with an effective exponent τ that is smaller than the standard HMM value $\tau = 3/4$. This is consistent with a recent experiment that found $\tau = 3/5$ in CeRh₆Ge₄ [6], but a more detailed investigation is needed. More generally, it is not clear whether the QCP whose existence we have discussed, and which Eq. (1) provides a mean-field description for, is in the HMM universality class for some systems, or for any systems. In particular, for Kondo lattice systems, such as CeRh₆Ge₄ [6, 7], questions arise about the interplay between the Kondo effect and quantum criticality. This topic has been discussed predominantly for antiferromagnets [41], but various proposals have been debated for ferromagnets as well [7, 25, 42]. If HMM theory is not applicable, then the electrical resistivity in particular may not be governed by Mathon’s $T^{5/3}$ law [43], but reflect a different “strange metal” behavior [7]. Also, FM analogs of the effects discussed for antiferromagnets in Ref. 44 might affect the critical behavior. These questions, as well as the interplay of the spin-orbit interaction with quenched disorder, are open problems.

We thank Manuel Brando, Piers Coleman, Hisashi Kotegawa, and Uli Zülicke for discussions.

-
- [1] E. C. Stoner, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **165**, 372 (1938).
 - [2] J. Hertz, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 1165 (1976).
 - [3] A. J. Millis, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 7183 (1993).
 - [4] T. Moriya, *Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism* (Springer, Berlin, 1985).
 - [5] M. Brando, D. Belitz, F. M. Grosche, and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 025006 (2016).
 - [6] H. Kotegawa, E. Matsuoka, T. Uga, M. Takemura, M. Manago, N. Chikuchi, H. Sugawara, H. Tou, and H. Harima, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **88**, 093702 (2019).
 - [7] B. Shen, Y. Zhang, Y. Komijani, M. Nicklas, R. Borth, A. Wang, Y. Chen, Z. Nie, R. Li, X. Lu, et al., Nature **579**, 51 (2020).
 - [8] T. Kobayashi, S. Fukushima, H. Hidaka, H. Kotegawa, T. Akazawa, E. Yamamoto, Y. Haga, R. Settai, and Y. Onuki, Physica B **378-380**, 355 (2006).
 - [9] D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and T. Vojta, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 9452 (1997).
 - [10] J. Betouras, D. Efremov, and A. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 115112 (2005).
 - [11] D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and T. Vojta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4707 (1999).
 - [12] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 134451 (2012).
 - [13] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 105701 (2011).
 - [14] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 085109 (2019).
 - [15] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, EPL **127**, 57003 (2019).
 - [16] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B **100**,

- 174433 (2019).
- [17] D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and J. Rollbühler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 247205 (2005).
- [18] Y. Sang, D. Belitz, and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 207201 (2014).
- [19] T. Goko, C. J. Arguello, A. Hamann, T. Wolf, M. Lee, D. Reznik, A. Maisuradze, R. Khasanov, E. Morenzoni, and Y. J. Uemura, npj Quantum Materials **2**, 44 (2017).
- [20] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 14364 (1996).
- [21] D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, M. T. Mercaldo, and S. Sessions, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 174428 (2001).
- [22] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 127203 (2014).
- [23] K. Huang, S. Eley, P. F. S. Rosa, L. Civale, E. D. Bauer, R. E. Baumbach, M. B. Maple, and M. Janoschek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 237202 (2016).
- [24] B. C. Sales, K. Jin, H. Bei, J. Nichols, M. F. Chisholm, A. F. May, N. P. Butch, A. D. Christianson, and M. A. McGuire, npj Quantum Materials **2**, 33 (2017).
- [25] Y. Komijani and P. Coleman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 157206 (2018).
- [26] The helical pitch wave number in MnSi is $k_{\text{so}} \approx 0.033 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ [45], and the spin-orbit splitting will be on the order of $E_{\text{so}} \approx v_{\text{F}} k_{\text{so}} \approx (k_{\text{so}}/k_{\text{F}})T_{\text{F}}$. With $k_{\text{F}} \approx 1 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ and $T_{\text{F}} \approx 10^5 \text{ K}$ this yields $E_{\text{so}} \approx 3,300 \text{ K}$.
- [27] J. Kuneš, P. Novák, M. Diviš, and P. M. Oppeneer, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 205111 (2001).
- [28] T. Akazawa, H. Hidaka, H. Kotegawa, T. C. Kobayashi, T. Fujiwara, E. Yamamoto, Y. Haga, R. Settai, and Y. Ōnuki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73**, 3129 (2004).
- [29] M. Janoschek, R. E. Baumbach, J. J. Hamlin, I. K. Lum, and M. B. Maple, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **23**, 094221 (2011).
- [30] D. Rauch, S. Süllow, M. Bleckmann, A. Buchsteiner, N. Stücker, H. H. Klaus, H. Luetkens, and E. Bauer, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **391**, 012055 (2012).
- [31] D. Ueta, Y. Ikeda, and H. Yoshizawai, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **85**, 104703 (2016).
- [32] F. Honda, T. Eto, G. Oomi, V. Sechovský, A. V. Andreev, N. Takeshita, and N. Mōri, Czech. J. Phys. **52**, 263 (2002).
- [33] A. V. Andreev, M. Diviš, P. Javorský, K. Prokeš, V. Sechovský, J. Kuneš, and Y. Shiokawa, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 144408 (2001).
- [34] S. Katano, M. Ito, K. Shibata, J. Gouchi, Y. Uwatoko, K. Matsubayashi, H. Soeda, and H. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 100501(R) (2019).
- [35] M. Smidman, M. B. Salomon, H. Q. Yuan, and D. F. Agterberg, Rep. Progr. Phys. **80**, 036501 (2017).
- [36] Y. Tokura and N. Nagaosa, Nature Commun. **9**, 3740 (2018).
- [37] K. V. Samokhin, E. S. Zijlstra, and S. K. Bose, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 094514 (2004).
- [38] M. I. Dyakonov, in *Spin Physics in Semiconductors*, edited by M. I. Dyakonov (Springer, Berlin, 2008), p. 1.
- [39] G. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. **100**, 580 (1955).
- [40] E. I. Rashba and V. I. Sheka, Fiz. Tverd. Tela **2**, 162 (1959), an English translation can be found in G. Bihlmayer et al, New J. Phys. **17**, 050202 (2015).
- [41] P. Gegenwart, Q. Si, and F. Steglich, Nat. Phys. **4**, 186 (2008).
- [42] S. J. Yamamoto and Q. Si, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **107**, 15704 (2010).
- [43] J. Mathon, Proc. Roy. Soc. London **306**, 355 (1968).
- [44] P. Wölfle and E. Abrahams, Phys. Rev. B. **84**, 041101 (2011).
- [45] C. Pfleiderer, G. J. McMullan, S. R. Julian, and G. G. Lonzarich, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 8330 (1997).

Supplemental Material for “Ferromagnetic Quantum Critical Point in Non-Centrosymmetric Systems”:

DERIVATION OF THE EQUATION OF STATE

In this supplemental section we provide a derivation of the equation of state, Eq. (1) in the main text. The logic of the arguments is the same as in Ref. 1.

A: Magnetic order parameter coupled to conduction electrons

Consider conduction electrons, described by Grassmannian spinor fields $\bar{\psi}$, ψ , in the presence of a fluctuating magnetization described by a bosonic field \mathbf{m} . The partition function for this coupled boson-fermion problem is

$$Z = \int D[\mathbf{m}]D[\bar{\psi}, \psi] e^{-S[\mathbf{m}, \bar{\psi}, \psi]}, \quad (\text{S1})$$

and the action consists of three distinct parts,

$$S[\mathbf{m}, \bar{\psi}, \psi] = S_m[\mathbf{m}] + S_F[\bar{\psi}, \psi] + S_c[\mathbf{m}, \bar{\psi}, \psi]. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Here S_m and S_F describe the magnetization and the fermions, respectively, in isolation, and S_c describes the coupling between the two. The latter has the form of a Zeeman coupling,

$$S_c[\mathbf{m}, \bar{\psi}, \psi] = -c \int dx \mathbf{m}(x) \cdot \mathbf{n}_s(x) \quad (\text{S3})$$

between the magnetization and the electronic spin density

$$\mathbf{n}_s(x) = \bar{\psi}(x) \boldsymbol{\sigma} \psi(x). \quad (\text{S4})$$

Here c is a coupling constant, $x = (\mathbf{x}, \tau)$ comprises the real-space position \mathbf{x} and the imaginary-time variable τ , and $\int dx = \int_V d\mathbf{x} \int_0^{1/T} d\tau$, with V the system volume and T the temperature. The structure of the coupling term, Eq. (S3), is completely general and reflects the fact that the spins of the conduction electrons will be subject to the effective field generated by the magnetization. It is valid independent of the origin of the magnetization, which can be due to the conduction electrons, or due to local moments, or a combination of the two [1, 2].

Now we treat the magnetization in a mean-field approximation, i.e., we replace the fluctuating field \mathbf{m} by its average $\langle \mathbf{m}(x) \rangle = m \hat{z}$ that we take to point in the z -direction. The order-parameter action S_m then becomes a Landau theory, and the effect of the fermions can be described by formally integrating out the latter. This leads to a correction to the Landau action given by

$$\delta S[m] = -\ln \int D[\bar{\psi}, \psi] e^{-S_F[\bar{\psi}, \psi] + cm \int dx n_s(x)} \propto \ln Z[m] \quad (\text{S5})$$

where n_s is the z -component of \mathbf{n}_s , and

$$Z[m] = \langle e^{cm \int dx n_s(x)} \rangle_F \quad (\text{S6})$$

and $\langle \dots \rangle_F$ denotes an average with respect to the action S_F .

Now consider the spin susceptibility of the fermions in an effective magnetic field $\mathfrak{h} = cm$, which is given by the spin-density correlation function

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(m) &= \frac{T}{V} \int dx dy \langle (n_s(x) - \langle n_s(x) \rangle_{S_{\mathfrak{h}}}) (n_s(y) - \langle n_s(y) \rangle_{S_{\mathfrak{h}}}) \rangle_{S_{\mathfrak{h}}} \\ &= \frac{T}{V} \int dx dy \langle n_s(x) n_s(y) \rangle_{S_{\mathfrak{h}}} - \frac{V}{T} (\langle n_s(x) \rangle_{S_{\mathfrak{h}}})^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S7})$$

of fermions governed by an action

$$S_{\mathfrak{h}} = S_F + \mathfrak{h} \int dx n_s(x) \quad (\text{S8})$$

Now we observe

$$d \ln Z[m]/dm = \frac{V}{T} c \langle n_s(x) \rangle_{S_b} \quad (\text{S9})$$

and

$$d^2 \ln Z[m]/dm^2 = \frac{V}{T} c^2 \chi(m) \quad (\text{S10})$$

as well as $\ln Z[m=0] = \ln 1 = 0$ and $(d \ln Z[m]/dm)_{m=0} = c \int dx \langle n_s(x) \rangle_F = 0$. Equations (S10) and (S5) therefore imply

$$\delta S[m] \propto \frac{-V}{T} c^2 \int_0^m dm_1 \int_0^{m_1} dm_2 \chi(m_2) \quad (\text{S11})$$

The renormalized mean-field theory for the magnetization in the presence of a physical magnetic field h that incorporates the coupling of the conduction electrons to the magnetic order parameter is thus given by an effective action

$$S_{\text{eff}}[m] = \frac{r}{2} m^2 + \frac{u}{4} m^4 + O(m^6) - hm + \delta S[m] \quad (\text{S12})$$

B: The spin susceptibility, and the renormalized mean-field equation of state

In Sec. A we saw that we need the magnetic-field dependence spin susceptibility of the conduction electrons as input. In an ordinary Landau Fermi liquid the spin susceptibility is a nonanalytic function of the field, see Refs. 1, 3, 4 and the discussion after Eq. (5) in the main text. In three spatial dimensions, and at zero temperature, the leading nonanalyticity is

$$\chi(h \rightarrow 0) = \chi(h=0) - \chi_2 h^2 \ln(h) \quad (\text{S13})$$

with $\chi_2 > 0$ a positive coefficient. This nonanalyticity is the result of soft two-particle excitations in the Fermi liquid that are rendered massive by a magnetic field and also by a nonzero temperature. A spin-orbit interaction also gives the soft modes a mass, as explained in the context of Eq. (5) in the main text. In a centrosymmetric Dirac Fermi liquid, as defined in the main text and in Refs. 5–7, chiral degrees of freedom provide a new class of soft modes, and the spin susceptibility is still given by Eq. (S13) [5]. However, in the absence of spatial inversion symmetry no such compensation mechanism is available. With h , t , and ν the magnetic field, temperature, and spin-orbit coupling strength in atomic units, we then have

$$\chi(m) = \text{const.} - (\chi_2/2) \ln(m^2 + t^2 + \nu^2) \quad (\text{S14})$$

Equations (S11, S12), and (S14) then yield an equation of state that has the structure of Eq. (1) in the main text.

-
- [1] M. Brando, D. Belitz, F. M. Grosche, and T. R. Kirkpatrick, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 025006 (2016).
 - [2] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 134451 (2012).
 - [3] D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and T. Vojta, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 9452 (1997).
 - [4] J. Betouras, D. Efremov, and A. Chubukov, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 115112 (2005).
 - [5] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 085109 (2019).
 - [6] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, *EPL* **127**, 57003 (2019).
 - [7] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 174433 (2019).