

# Orientation of point nodes and non-unitary triplet pairing tuned by the easy-axis magnetization in $\text{UTe}_2$

Shunichiro Kittaka,<sup>1</sup> Yusei Shimizu,<sup>2</sup> Toshiro Sakakibara,<sup>1</sup> Ai Nakamura,<sup>2</sup> Dexin Li,<sup>2</sup> Yoshiya Homma,<sup>2</sup> Fuminori Honda,<sup>2</sup> Dai Aoki,<sup>2</sup> and Kazushige Machida<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8581, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*IMR, Tohoku University, Oarai, Ibaraki 311-1313, Japan*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, Ritsumeikan University, Kusatsu, Shiga 525-8577, Japan*

(Dated: February 19, 2020)

The gap structure of a novel uranium-based superconductor  $\text{UTe}_2$ , situated in the vicinity of ferromagnetic quantum criticality, has been investigated via specific-heat  $C(T, H, \Omega)$  measurements in various field orientations. The field  $H$  dependence of the specific heat at low  $H$  suggests the absence (occurrence) of low-energy quasiparticle excitations under  $H \parallel a$  ( $H \parallel bc$ ). Moreover, its angular  $\Omega(\phi, \theta)$  variation at 0.5 K shows a characteristic shoulder anomaly (a local minimum in  $H \parallel a$ ) at moderate (low) fields rotated within the  $ab$  and  $ac$  planes. These features can be attributed to the presence of point nodes in the superconducting gap along the  $a$  direction. Under the field orientation along the easy-magnetization  $a$  axis, unusual temperature dependence of the upper critical field at low fields together with a convex downward curvature in  $C(H)$  were observed. These anomalous behaviors can be explained on the basis of a non-unitary triplet state model with equal-spin pairing whose  $T_c$  is tuned by the magnetization along the  $a$  axis. From these results, the gap symmetry of  $\text{UTe}_2$  is most likely described by a vector order parameter of  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) = (\mathbf{b} + i\mathbf{c})(k_b + ik_c)$ .

Exotic superconductivity arising near ferromagnetic instability has been intensively studied for uranium-based superconductors [1], such as  $\text{UGe}_2$  [2],  $\text{URhGe}$  [3], and  $\text{UCoGe}$  [4]. These materials are itinerant ferromagnets but become superconducting even in the ferromagnetic phase. A remarkable feature is the upper critical field  $H_{c2}$  exceeding the Pauli-limiting field. Furthermore, field re-entrant (reinforced) superconductivity occurs under high magnetic fields along the hard-magnetization axis in  $\text{URhGe}$  and  $\text{UCoGe}$  [1, 5, 6], in which spins of Cooper pairs would be polarized along the field orientation or the hard-magnetization axes. These facts demonstrate that these uranium-based superconductors are promising candidates of spin-triplet superconductors. The results of NMR measurements suggest that ferromagnetic spin fluctuations play a key role in mediating superconductivity [7, 8].

Recently, a novel uranium-based superconductor  $\text{UTe}_2$  has been discovered [9] and becomes a hot topic in the research field of superconductivity. Notably, it becomes superconducting at a relatively high  $T_c$  of 1.6 K without showing a clear ferromagnetic transition. A first-order metamagnetic transition occurs under a magnetic field  $H$  at 35 T in  $H \parallel b$  with a critical end point at roughly 7 – 11 K [10, 11]. NMR measurements revealed a moderate Ising anisotropy and suggest the presence of longitudinal magnetic fluctuations along the easy-magnetization  $a$  axis above 20 K [12]. These facts imply that  $\text{UTe}_2$  is close to ferromagnetic quantum criticality. Similar to the other three uranium-based ferromagnets, formation of spin-triplet Cooper pairing has been indicated by small decrease in the NMR Knight shift [13] and the large  $H_{c2}$  exceeding the Pauli-limiting field [14–16]. Indeed, superconductivity survives up to an extreme high field of 35 T for  $H \parallel b$ , which is destroyed abruptly by the occurrence of a metamagnetic transition [14, 15]. Furthermore, re-entrant superconductivity arises under  $H$  beyond 40 T tilted away from

the  $b$  axis toward  $c$  axis by roughly 30 degrees [15]. These facts demonstrate that parallel spin pairing can be formed in  $\text{UTe}_2$ . In other words, the vector order parameter is favorably aligned to the plane perpendicular to the  $a$  axis (i.e.,  $\mathbf{d} \perp \mathbf{a}$ ) at low fields.

One of remaining questions for  $\text{UTe}_2$  is a large residual value of the Sommerfeld coefficient in the superconducting state, which is roughly half of the normal state value at  $T_c$ . Whereas a non-unitary spin-triplet state was suggested to explain this feature in the early stage [9], magnetic contribution was recently proposed as a possible origin because the entropy balance between superconducting and normal states is not satisfied [17]. Moreover, a primary question is the gap symmetry which is closely related to exotic pairing mechanisms. The presence of linear point nodes in the superconducting gap has been suggested from specific heat [9], nuclear relaxation rate  $1/T_1$  [13], penetration depth [17], and thermal conductivity [17] measurements. Although the results of recent STM experiments suggest a chiral order parameter [18], broken time-reversal symmetry in the superconducting state has not yet been detected from muon-spin-relaxation measurements [19]. Furthermore, there is little information on the orientation of gap nodes. These issues need to be clarified from further careful experiments.

In this study, we have performed a field-angle-resolved measurement of the specific heat  $C(T, H, \Omega)$  for  $\text{UTe}_2$ , which is a powerful tool to identify the nodal structure [20–24]. Low-energy quasiparticle excitations detected by  $C(T, H, \Omega)$  support that the superconducting gap possesses point nodes in the  $a$  direction alone. Furthermore, unexpected features, reminiscent of the Pauli-paramagnetic effect, were observed in  $H_{c2}(T)$  and  $C(H)$  under  $H$  along the easy-magnetization  $a$  axis, although the Pauli-paramagnetic effect cannot destroy spin-triplet pairing with  $\mathbf{d} \perp \mathbf{a}$  when  $H \parallel a$ . To solve this puzzle, we propose a vector order parameter  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) =$




FIG. 1: (a) Temperature dependence of  $C_e/T$  at 0 and 7 T for  $H \parallel a$ , where  $C_e = C - C_{\text{ph}} - C_{\text{N}}$ . (b) Temperature dependence of  $C_e/T$  at 7 T in various field orientations within the  $ab$  plane, where the field angle  $\phi$  is measured from the  $a$  axis. (c) Field-temperature phase diagram in three field orientations parallel to the  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  axes and (d) its enlarged view near  $T_c$ . Dashed, dotted, and solid lines represent initial slopes of  $H_{c2}(T)$  parallel to the  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  axes, respectively.

$(b + ic)(k_b + ik_c)$ , whose  $T_c$  is tuned by the easy-axis magnetization.

Single crystals of  $\text{UTe}_2$  were grown by chemical vapor transport method [9]. A single crystal with its mass of 5.9 mg weight was used in this study. The directions of the orthorhombic axes of the sample were confirmed by single crystal X-ray Laue photographs. The specific heat was measured using the quasi-adiabatic heat-pulse method in a dilution refrigerator. The addenda contribution was subtracted from the data shown below. The magnetic field was generated by using a vector magnet, up to 7 T (3 T) along the horizontal  $x$  (vertical  $z$ ) direction. By rotating the refrigerator around the  $z$  axis using a stepper motor, the magnetic-field direction was controlled three-dimensionally.

Figure 1(a) plots  $C_e/T$  in zero field and in the normal state (at 7 T for  $H \parallel a$ ) as a function of temperature. Here, the phonon and nuclear contributions ( $C_{\text{ph}}$  and  $C_{\text{N}}$ , respectively) are subtracted, i.e.,  $C_e = C - C_{\text{ph}} - C_{\text{N}}$ ; the Debye temperature is set to 125 K and  $C_{\text{N}} = 0.135H^2/T^2 \mu\text{J}/(\text{mol K})$  is obtained by using a nuclear spin Hamiltonian for  $^{123}\text{Te}$  and  $^{125}\text{Te}$  nuclei ( $I = 1/2$ ) with the natural abundances of 0.9 and 7%, respectively. In zero field, a superconducting transition is observed at  $T_c = 1.56$  K (onset). The jump size is as large as the previous results [16, 17], ensuring high quality of the present sample. At low temperatures below 0.2 K,  $C_e/T$  shows a rapid upturn on cooling, as already reported [17]. To satisfy the entropy-balance law, it is expected that the normal-state




FIG. 2: (a) Field dependence of the normal-state  $C_e/T$  at 1.8 K for  $H \parallel a$  and  $H \parallel b$ . (b)  $C_e/T$  at 1.8 K as a function of the azimuthal field angle  $\phi$ , taken under a rotating  $H$  within the  $ab$  plane, where the mirrored data with respect to  $\phi = 90^\circ$  are also plotted (open symbols). Each dataset in (b) is vertically shifted by 0.01 J/mol K<sup>2</sup>.

$C_e/T$  is enhanced with decreasing temperature, as proposed in Ref. 17. However, in the normal state at 7 T for  $H \parallel a$ ,  $C_e/T$  does not show a substantial upturn at low temperatures. This result suggests that the normal-state  $C_e/T$  varies with increasing  $H$ , as reported in the high-field measurements [25].

Figure 1(b) compares  $C_e(T)/T$  at 7 T in several field orientations within the  $ab$  plane. Here, the field angle  $\phi$  denotes the azimuthal angle measured from the  $a$  axis. Even with the same magnetic-field strength, the normal-state  $C_e/T$  at 1.5 K becomes larger with tilting  $H$  away from the  $a$  axis. Furthermore, the entropy-balance law is not satisfied between the data at  $\phi = 0^\circ$  and  $\phi \neq 0^\circ$ . These facts suggest that the normal-state  $C_e/T$  of  $\text{UTe}_2$  depends not only on the field strength but also on its orientation.

To examine the above possibility, the effects of  $H$  and its orientation on the normal-state  $C_e/T$  have been investigated as shown in Fig. 2. Indeed, the normal-state  $C_e/T$  changes with  $H$  at 1.8 K ( $> T_c$ ) and shows a characteristic field-angle  $\phi$  dependence under a rotating  $H$  within the  $ab$  plane. An anomalous peak-dip-peak feature in  $C_e(\phi)$  becomes evident around  $H \parallel b$  in the high-field region. This feature may be related to longitudinal spin fluctuations along the  $a$  axis because  $C_e(\phi)$  can be scaled approximately by the field component along the  $a$  axis,  $H_{\parallel a} = H \sin \theta \cos \phi$  [26]. The mechanism of this normal-state anomaly is beyond the scope of this paper and remains a future work.

Figures 3(a)-3(c) represent the field dependence of  $C_e(H)/T$  in three orientations along the  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  axes, respectively, in the superconducting state at 0.25 and 0.5 K. In the low-field region for  $H \parallel a$ , a rapid increase of  $C_e(H)$ , a hallmark of nodal quasiparticle excitations, was not observed at any temperature. By contrast, under  $H$  parallel to the  $b$  or  $c$  axis,  $C_e(H)$  increases rapidly at low fields, demonstrating the occurrence of low-energy quasiparticle excitations. These features are compatible with theoretical prediction for an axial state with two point nodes [see squares in Fig. 3(d)] [27]; the results suggests the presence of point nodes along the  $a$




FIG. 3: Field dependence of  $C_e/T$  along the (a)  $a$ , (b)  $b$ , and (c)  $c$  axes at 0.25 and 0.5 K in the low-field region below 1.5 T. (d)  $C_e(H)/T$  for  $H \parallel a$  at 0.15 K as a function of  $H/H_{c2}$  (circles), where  $\mu_0 H_{c2}$  is 6 T. Open (closed) squares are the normalized zero-energy quasiparticle density of states,  $N(E=0)/N_0$ , obtained from theoretical calculations for an axial state with two point nodes under  $H$  parallel (perpendicular) to the nodal direction (taken from Ref. 27).

direction alone, which is consistent with a chiral  $p + ip$  type pairing concluded from STM experiments [18].

With decreasing temperature as low as 0.15 K, a prominent peak appears around 0.2 T for  $H \parallel b$  and  $H \parallel c$  (see Supplementary Material [26]). This anomaly is probably related to the abnormal non-superconducting contribution in  $C(H)/T$  at low temperatures, which violates the entropy-balance law [17], and disturbs detection of low-energy quasiparticle excitations at this temperature. By contrast,  $C_e/T$  remains to exhibit no clear anomaly at low fields for  $H \parallel a$  [Fig. 3(d)].

In the high-field superconducting region for  $H \parallel a$ ,  $C_e(H)$  shows a convex downward curvature with increasing  $H$  at 0.15 K [Fig. 3(d)]. This high-field behavior is qualitatively different from the theoretical prediction for an axial state with two point nodes under  $H$  applied along the point-nodal direction [27] [open squares in Fig. 3(d)]. Instead, this feature is *apparently* similar to the Pauli-paramagnetic effect which breaks Cooper pairs to make spins polarized along the field orientation [28, 29]. However, the Pauli-paramagnetic effect is not allowed for  $UTe_2$  in  $H \parallel a$  because the  $a$  direction corresponds to the easy-magnetization axis and spins of triplet Cooper pairs ( $\mathbf{d} \perp \mathbf{a}$ ) can be polarized in this direction. Therefore, unusual mechanism of spin-triplet superconductivity is required for  $UTe_2$ .

The  $H$ - $T$  phase diagram of the present sample is shown in Fig. 1(c), which summarizes the onset temperature and onset field of superconductivity determined from  $C_e(T)$  and  $C_e(H)$  measurements. The overall  $H_{c2}(T)$  behavior is consistent with




FIG. 4: Field-angle dependences of  $C_e/T$  at 0.5 K under several magnetic fields rotated within the (a)  $ab$ , (b)  $ac$ , and (c)  $bc$  planes, where  $\theta$  is a polar angle between the magnetic field and  $c$  axis. Numbers labeling the curves represent the magnetic field in tesla. Solid lines in (a)-(c) show  $C_e/T$  in zero field. Shoulder anomalies are indicated by arrows. In these figures, the mirrored data with respect to symmetric axes are also plotted (open symbols). (d) Calculated results of  $N(E=0)$  normalized by  $N_0$  for an axial state with two point nodes as a function of field angle, where  $\theta = 0^\circ$  is the direction of point nodes (taken from Ref. 30). (e) The gap structure possessing point nodes along the  $a$  direction.

the previous report from resistivity measurements [16]. In this study,  $H_{c2}(T)$  near  $T_c$  is precisely determined from the thermodynamic measurements [Fig. 1(d)]. In sharp contrast to  $H_{c2}(T)$  for  $H \parallel b$  and  $H \parallel c$ ,  $H_{c2}(T)$  for  $H \parallel a$  is clearly suppressed compared with the initial slope near  $H \sim 0$  [26]. Again, the Pauli-limiting-like behavior is observed for  $UTe_2$  in  $H \parallel a$ . A possible origin of these unusual phenomena will be discussed later.

To further investigate the gap anisotropy of  $UTe_2$ , the field-angle dependence of  $C_e/T$  has been measured at 0.5 K in a rotating  $H$  within the  $ab$ ,  $ac$ , and  $bc$  planes; the results are presented in Figs. 4(a)-(c), respectively. As depicted in Figs. 2,  $\theta$  ( $\phi$ ) denotes a polar (azimuthal) field angle measured from the  $c$  ( $a$ ) axis. At a low field of 0.2 T, a local minimum exists in  $H \parallel a$  ( $\phi = 0^\circ$ ,  $\theta = 90^\circ$ ). With increasing  $H$ ,  $C_e(\Omega)$  around  $H \parallel a$  is gradually enhanced, and a shoulder structure appears in both  $C_e(\phi = 0^\circ, \theta)$  and  $C_e(\phi, \theta = 90^\circ)$  at intermediate field

angles tilted slightly away from the  $a$  axis, as indicated by arrows. For  $H \parallel bc$ ,  $C_c(\phi = 90^\circ, \theta)$  does not change drastically with increasing  $H$  [see Fig. 4(c)], suggesting that the effect of  $H_{c2}(\theta)$  anisotropy is dominant even at low fields. This result supports that the superconducting gap has a rotational symmetry around the  $a$  axis.

It is noted that anomalous peaks are observed at  $\phi = \pm 90^\circ$  ( $\theta = 0^\circ$  and  $180^\circ$ ) in Fig. 4(a) [4(b)], whose widths become narrower with increasing  $H$  [26]. By contrast, such a sharp peak does not appear around  $H \parallel a$ . Plausibly, these anomalies are related to Ising-type spin fluctuations that are easily suppressed by  $H_{\parallel a}$ , similar to the case at 1.8 K [Fig. 2(b)], although detailed mechanisms remain unclear.

Let us discuss the gap symmetry of  $\text{UTe}_2$ . On theoretical grounds, the low-temperature specific heat is proportional to the zero-energy quasiparticle density of states  $N(E = 0)$ . The field and field-angle dependences of  $N(E = 0)$  calculated for a point-nodal superconductor were already reported in previous papers [27, 30]. The present observations in  $C(T, H, \Omega)$ , except for anomalous peaks in its angular dependence around  $H \perp a$ , are in good agreements with the calculated results based on a microscopic theory assuming the presence of linear point nodes in the gap along the  $a$  direction [30], as presented in Fig. 4(d). A slight deviation would mainly come from the effect of the  $H_{c2}$  anisotropy. The presence of linear point nodes has been indicated in the previous reports [9, 13, 17]. Therefore, the present results, evidencing their orientation along the  $a$  direction [Fig. 4(e)], lead to a conclusion that the orbital part of the order parameter for  $\text{UTe}_2$  is a chiral state  $k_b + ik_c$  or a helical state  $k_b c + k_c b$  belonging to the  $B_{3u}$  representation classified for strong spin-orbit coupling [31–34].

Regarding a possible mechanism of anomalous behaviors in  $H_{c2}(T)$  and  $C_c(H)$  for  $H \parallel a$ , we here consider a phenomenological model based on Ginzburg-Landau framework in which the degeneracy of non-unitary order parameters  $d \propto (\mathbf{b} \pm i\mathbf{c})$  with equal spin pairing (i.e.,  $\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$  and  $\Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ ) is lifted by the easy-axis magnetization  $M_a$ ; one of the order parameters ( $\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ ) arises at  $T_c$  and the other ( $\Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ ) appears at a lower temperature. In this model,  $T_c$  of  $\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$  is written as  $T_c(M) = T_{c0} + \eta M_a$  [31, 35]. Here,  $\eta$  is a positive constant coefficient. In general,  $M_a$  has a non-linear component of  $H$ . Therefore, we can reasonably assume  $M_a(H, T) \sim M_0(T) + \alpha(T)H - \beta(T)H^2$  at low fields by using positive coefficients  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The spontaneous magnetization or the root-mean-square average of longitudinal magnetization fluctuations,  $M_0$ , breaks the degeneracy of  $\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$  and  $\Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}$  in zero field. Then, we obtain  $T_c(M_a) = T_{c0}^* + \eta[\alpha(T)H - \beta(T)H^2]$ , where  $T_{c0}^* = T_{c0} + \eta M_0$  ( $\sim 1.6$  K). From this equation, it is suggested that the slope of  $H_{c2}(T)$  is enhanced when  $H$  is sufficiently low [26], because of  $H_{c2}(T) \approx \zeta[T_c(M_a) - T]$  ( $\zeta$  is a positive coefficient), but the slope is suppressed at higher fields due to the non-linear term in  $M_a(H)$ . Indeed, the slope of  $H_{c2}(T)$  in  $H \parallel a$  for  $\text{UTe}_2$  becomes small at low temperatures (in high fields) [see Fig. 1(d)]. A similar behavior in  $H_{c2}(T)$  was also reported for a re-entrant superconductor  $\text{URhGe}$  along the magnetic-easy axis direction in the lower-

field superconducting phase [36]. Furthermore, the convex downward curvature in the low-temperature  $C_c(H)$  for  $H \parallel a$  [Fig. 3(d)] can also be explained qualitatively by this model; if we assume  $C_c(H)/C_c(H = 0) \sim H/H_{c2}(H)$  for the field direction parallel to the point nodes,  $C_c(H)/C_c(H = 0) \sim H/\zeta[T_c^* + \eta(\alpha H - \beta H^2)]$ . Under  $H$  along hard-magnetization axes, these unusual phenomena are not expected because  $M_a$  does not change significantly with  $H$ . Thus, the present study may capture universal nature of non-unitary equal-spin triplet superconductivity.

On the basis of these results, the order parameter  $(\mathbf{b} + i\mathbf{c})(k_b + ik_c)$  is a leading candidate for the novel superconductivity in  $\text{UTe}_2$ . In this case, a secondary superconducting transition is expected below  $T_c$ , which was recently suggested by a sudden drop of  $1/T_1$  around  $T \sim 0.15$  K [13]. In addition, a specific-heat anomaly was found within the superconducting state under hydrostatic pressure [37], suggesting a possible occurrence of multiple superconducting phases. In order to lift the degeneracy of the multiple order parameters in zero field, a spontaneous magnetization or very slow longitudinal spin fluctuations are needed. This requirement suggests a possibility that a short-range magnetic order develops in  $\text{UTe}_2$  above  $T_c$ , similar to the case of  $\text{UPt}_3$  [38, 39] which shows a double superconducting transition coupled with a short-range antiferromagnetic order [40, 41]. Although the proposed gap symmetry is not classified by group theory in  $D_{2h}$ , a chiral vector  $\mathbf{l}$  pointing to the magnetic-easy axis may stabilize the proposed pairing via the energy of  $\mathbf{l} \cdot \mathbf{M}$ . In the weak spin-orbit coupling case,  $\text{SO}(3)$  symmetry allows the  $\mathbf{b} + i\mathbf{c}$  state [31, 32].

In summary, we have performed field-angle-resolved measurement of the specific heat on  $\text{UTe}_2$ . Our results, in particular characteristic field evolution in  $C_c(\phi, \theta)$ , evidence that linear point nodes are located along the  $a$  direction in the superconducting gap. From this fact, the orbital part of the order parameter can be characterized by a chiral  $p$ -wave form  $k_b + ik_c$  or a helical state  $k_b c + k_c b$ . Furthermore, unusual  $H_{c2}(T)$  and  $C_c(H)$  behaviors have been found under  $H$  along the easy-magnetization  $a$  axis, which can be explained by a phenomenological model for a non-unitary equal-spin triplet pairing tuned by the easy-axis magnetization. On the basis of these findings, together with recent STM results [18], the vector order parameter  $d(\mathbf{k}) = (\mathbf{b} + i\mathbf{c})(k_b + ik_c)$  is a leading candidate for  $\text{UTe}_2$ .

We thank J. Flouquet, J. P. Brison, G. Knebel, K. Izawa, S. Hosoi and K. Ishida for fruitful discussion. We would like to thank all the support from Institute for Materials Research, Tohoku University in growing single-crystalline uranium-based samples using the joint research facility at Oarai. This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas ‘‘J-Physics’’ (JP15H05883, JP18H04306, JP15H05882, JP15H05884, JP15K21732) from MEXT, and KAKENHI (JP18H01161, JP17K05553, JP19H00646, JP15H0574, JP17K14328) from JSPS.

- 
- [1] D. Aoki, K. Ishida, and J. Flouquet, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 022001 (2019).
- [2] S. S. Saxena, P. Agarwal, K. Ahilan, F. M. Grosche, R. K. W. Haselwimmer, M. J. Steiner, E. Pugh, I. R. Walker, S. R. Julian, P. Monthoux, G. G. Lonzarich, A. Huxley, I. Sheikin, D. Braithwaite, and J. Flouquet, *Nature* **406**, 587 (2000).
- [3] D. Aoki, A. Huxley, E. Ressouche, D. Braithwaite, J. Flouquet, J. P. Brison, E. Lhotel, and C. Paulsen, *Nature* **413**, 613 (2001).
- [4] N. T. Huy, A. Gasparini, D. E. de Nijs, Y. Huang, J. C. P. Klaasse, T. Gortenmulder, A. van Visser, A. Hamann, T. Görlach, and H. v. Löhneysen, *Nature* **413**, 613 (2001).
- [5] F. Lévy, I. Sheikin, B. Grenier, and A. D. Huxley, *Science* **309**, 1343 (2005).
- [6] D. Aoki, T. D. Matsuda, V. Taufour, E. Hassinger, G. Knebel, and J. Flouquet, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **78**, 113709 (2009).
- [7] T. Hattori, Y. Ihara, Y. Nakai, K. Ishida, Y. Tada, S. Fujimoto, N. Kawakami, E. Osaki, K. Deguchi, N. K. Sato, and I. Satoh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 066403 (2012).
- [8] Y. Tokunaga, D. Aoki, H. Mayaffre, S. Krämer, M.-H. Julien, C. Berthier, M. Horvatić, H. Sakai, S. Kambe, and S. Araki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 216401 (2015).
- [9] S. Ran, C. Eckberg, Q.-P. Ding, Y. Furukawa, T. Metz, S. R. Saha, I.-L. Liu, M. Zic, H. Kim, J. Paglione, and N. P. Butch, *Science* **365**, 684 (2019).
- [10] A. Miyake, Y. Shimizu, Y. J. Sato, D. Li, A. Nakamura, Y. Homma, F. Honda, J. Flouquet, M. Tokunaga, and D. Aoki, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 063706 (2019).
- [11] W. Knafo, M. Vališka, D. Braithwaite, G. Lapertot, G. Knebel, A. Pourret, J.-P. Brison, J. Flouquet, and D. Aoki, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 063705 (2019).
- [12] Y. Tokunaga, H. Sakai, S. Kambe, T. Hattori, N. Higa, G. Nakamine, S. Kitagawa, K. Ishida, A. Nakamura, Y. Shimizu, Y. Homma, D. Li, F. Honda, and D. Aoki, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 073701 (2019).
- [13] G. Nakamine, S. Kitagawa, K. Ishida, Y. Tokunaga, H. Sakai, S. Kambe, A. Nakamura, Y. Shimizu, Y. Homma, D. Li, F. Honda, and D. Aoki, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 113703 (2019).
- [14] G. Knebel, W. Knafo, A. Pourret, Q. Niu, M. Vališka, D. Braithwaite, G. Lapertot, M. Nardone, A. Zitouni, S. Mishra, I. Sheikin, G. Seyfarth, J.-P. Brison, D. Aoki, and J. Flouquet, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 063707 (2019).
- [15] S. Ran, I.-L. Liu, Y. S. Eo, D. J. Campbell, P. M. Neves, W. T. Fuhrman, S. R. Saha, C. Eckberg, H. Kim, D. Graf, F. Balakirev, J. Singleton, J. Paglione, and N. P. Butch, *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 1250 (2019).
- [16] D. Aoki, A. Nakamura, F. Honda, D. Li, Y. Homma, Y. Shimizu, Y. J. Sato, G. Knebel, J.-P. Brison, A. Pourret, D. Braithwaite, G. Lapertot, Q. Niu, M. Vališka, H. Harima, and J. Flouquet, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 043702 (2019).
- [17] T. Metz, S. Bae, S. Ran, I.-L. Liu, Y. S. Eo, W. T. Fuhrman, D. F. Agterberg, S. Anlage, N. P. Butch, and J. Paglione, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 220504(R) (2019).
- [18] L. Jiao, S. Howard, S. Ran, Z. Wang, J. O. Rodriguez, M. Sigrist, Z. Wang, N. Butch, V. Madhavan, arXiv:1908.02846.
- [19] S. Sundar, S. Gheidi, K. Akintola, A. M. Cote, S. R. Dunsiger, S. Ran, N. P. Butch, S. R. Saha, J. Paglione, and J. E. Sonier, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 140502(R) (2019).
- [20] T. Sakakibara, S. Kittaka, and K. Machida, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 094002 (2016).
- [21] T. Sakakibara, A. Yamada, J. Custers, K. Yano, T. Tayama, H. Aoki, and K. Machida, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **76**, 051004 (2007).
- [22] S. Kittaka, Y. Shimizu, T. Sakakibara, Y. Haga, E. Yamamoto, Y. Ōnuki, Y. Tsutsumi, T. Nomoto, H. Ikeda, and K. Machida, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **85**, 033704 (2016).
- [23] Y. Shimizu, S. Kittaka, T. Sakakibara, Y. Tsutsumi, T. Nomoto, H. Ikeda, K. Machida, Y. Homma, and D. Aoki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 037001 (2016).
- [24] Y. Shimizu, S. Kittaka, S. Nakamura, T. Sakakibara, D. Aoki, Y. Homma, A. Nakamura, and K. Machida, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 100505(R) (2017).
- [25] S. Imajo, Y. Kohama, A. Miyake, C. Dong, M. Tokunaga, J. Flouquet, K. Kindo, and D. Aoki, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **88**, 083705 (2019).
- [26] See Supplemental Material for details of (I) anomalous behaviors in specific heat, (II) field orientation effect on  $T_c$  at low fields, and (III) phenomenological model for non-unitary spin-triplet pairing.
- [27] P. Miranović, N. Nakai, M. Ichioka, and K. Machida, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 052501 (2003).
- [28] M. Ichioka and K. Machida, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 064502 (2007).
- [29] K. Machida and M. Ichioka, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 184515 (2008).
- [30] Y. Tsutsumi, T. Nomoto, H. Ikeda, and K. Machida, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 224503 (2016).
- [31] K. Machida and T. Ohmi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 850 (2001).
- [32] J. F. Annett, *Adv. Phys.* **39**, 83 (1990).
- [33] J. Ishizuka, S. Sumita, A. Daido, and Y. Yanase, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 217001 (2019).
- [34] A. H. Nevidomskyy, arXiv:2001.02699.
- [35] K. Machida, arXiv:2002.00183.
- [36] F. Hardy and A. D. Huxley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 247006 (2005).
- [37] D. Braithwaite, M. Vališka, G. Knebel, G. Lapertot, J.-P. Brison, A. Pourret, M. E. Zhitomirsky, J. Flouquet, F. Honda, and D. Aoki, *Commun. Phys.* **2**, 147 (2019).
- [38] K. Machida, M. Ozaki, and T. Ohmi, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **58**, 4116 (1989).
- [39] K. Machida and M. Ozaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 3293 (1991).
- [40] S. M. Hayden, L. Taillefer, C. Vettier, and J. Flouquet, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 8675 (1992).
- [41] T. Trappmann, H. v. Löhneysen, and L. Taillefer, *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 13714 (1991).

Supplemental Material for  
**Orientation of point nodes and non-unitary triplet pairing tuned by the easy-axis magnetization in UTe<sub>2</sub>**

Shunichiro Kittaka,<sup>1</sup> Yusei Shimizu,<sup>2</sup> Toshiro Sakakibara,<sup>1</sup> Ai Nakamura,<sup>2</sup> Dexin Li,<sup>2</sup> Yoshiya Homma,<sup>2</sup> Fuminori Honda,<sup>2</sup> Dai Aoki,<sup>2</sup> and Kazushige Machida,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8581, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*IMR, Tohoku University, Oarai, Ibaraki 311-1313, Japan*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, Ritsumeikan University, Kusatsu, Shiga 525-8577, Japan*

(Dated: February 19, 2020)

### I. Anomalous behaviors in specific heat

Figures S1(a)-S1(b) show the field dependences of the specific-heat data  $C_e/T$  of UTe<sub>2</sub> in three field orientations parallel to the  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  axes at several temperatures. An anomaly at  $H_{c2}$  can be detected only for  $H \parallel a$  because of the limit of our measurement system. With decreasing temperature as low as 0.15 K, a prominent peak develops around 0.2 T for  $H \parallel b$  and  $H \parallel c$ . This anomaly may be related to the abnormal behavior in  $C_e/T$  at low temperatures, which breaks the entropy-balance law. Unfortunately, this anomaly disturbs investigation of low-energy quasiparticle excitations at low temperatures.

Figures S2(a) and S2(b) show the field-angle  $\phi$  dependence of  $C_e/T$  at 0.15 and 0.5 K, respectively, in a rotating magnetic field within the  $ab$  plane. At high fields above 5 T, a specific-heat jump at  $H_{c2}$  is clearly detected in  $C_e(\phi)$ . Furthermore, anomalous field-angle dependence is observed around  $H \parallel b$  and  $H \parallel c$  above 1 T; a peak develops and becomes sharper with increasing  $H$ . At 0.15 K, although the  $H_{c2}$  anomaly becomes small due to the suppression of the specific-heat jump at  $T_c(H)$ , the peak anomaly remains observed clearly. Such a peak anomaly does not arise around  $H \parallel a$ .

Figures S3(a)-S3(c) plot  $C_e(\phi)/T$  at 0.15, 0.5, and 1.8 K, respectively, as a function of the  $a$ -axis component of the magnetic field, i.e.,  $H_{\parallel a} = H \sin \theta \cos \phi$ . A sharp peak or dip exists in  $C_e(H_{\parallel a})$  centered at  $H_{\parallel a} = 0$  whose width is robust against the magnetic-field strength at any temperature. These results suggest that the specific heat in both normal and superconducting states is affected by longitudinal spin fluctuations along the  $a$  axis, which can be easily suppressed by  $H_{\parallel a}$ .

### II. Field orientation effect on $T_c$ at low fields

Figure S4 compares the temperature dependences of  $C_e/T$  at 0.2 T for  $H \parallel a$  and  $H \parallel c$ . Although the low-temperature  $H_{c2}$  is smaller in  $H \parallel a$  than in  $H \parallel c$ ,  $T_c(H)$  at 0.2 T is higher in  $H \parallel a$ . This result demonstrates that the initial slope of  $H_{c2}(T)$  near  $T_c$  is larger in  $H \parallel a$ . By contrast, at a slightly higher magnetic field of 0.75 T,  $T_c(H)$  becomes lower in  $H \parallel a$ . These features clearly evidence that  $H_{c2}(T)$  is suppressed on cooling compared with its initial slope at  $H \sim 0$  for  $H \parallel a$ .

### III. Phenomenological model for non-unitary spin-triplet pairing

In general, spin-triplet pairing ( $S = 1$ ) has spin degrees of freedom. Therefore, its multiple order parameters can be coupled with a magnetization. Here, we consider the case of non-unitary order parameters  $\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$  and  $\Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ , whose spins can be polarized along the easy-magnetization axis. If there exists a spontaneous magnetization or the root-mean-square average of longitudinal spin fluctuations along the easy-magnetization axis ( $M_a$ ), the degeneracy of  $\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$  and  $\Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}$  is lifted and their transition temperatures are split. In this case, an onset  $T_c$  can be described as

$$T_c(M_a) = T_{c0} + \eta M_a \quad (1)$$

with a positive constant coefficient  $\eta$ . In general, the low-temperature  $M_a$  roughly behaves as

$$M_a(H, T) \sim M_0^*(H) - b(H)T^2. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $M_0^*$  is the temperature-independent part of  $M_a$ . Because the temperature dependence of the upper critical field can be simply described as

$$H_{c2}(T) \sim \zeta[T_c(M_a) - T], \quad (3)$$

the slope of  $H_{c2}(T)$  near  $H \sim 0$  can be expressed as

$$\frac{dH_{c2}}{dT} = \zeta \frac{dT_c}{dM_a} \frac{dM_a}{dT} - \zeta \quad (4)$$

$$= -2\eta\zeta b(H)T - \zeta \quad (5)$$

The first term in the right-hand side of eq. (5) reinforces the initial slope of  $H_{c2}(T)$ .

When we apply the magnetic field along the easy-magnetization axis,  $M_a$  usually changes significantly with a non-linear term at low fields; e.g.,

$$M_a(H) \sim M_0(T) + \alpha(T)H - \beta(T)H^2. \quad (6)$$

Then,  $T_c(M_a)$  changes as

$$T_c(M_a) = T_{c0}^* + \eta\alpha H - \eta\beta H^2, \quad (7)$$

where  $T_{c0}^* = T_{c0} + \eta M_0$ . The second term in the right-hand side of eq. (7) contributes to the increase of  $T_c$ ; if it is dominantly large, the initial slope of  $H_{c2}(T)$  near  $H \sim 0$  can even become positive. When the third term develops in the high-field region, the enhancement of  $T_c$  is suppressed, and a relatively small slope can occur in  $H_{c2}(T)$  at low temperatures in high fields. These features qualitatively match the experimental observations for UTe<sub>2</sub>.




FIG. S1: Field dependence of  $C_e/T$  at (a) 0.15, (b) 0.25, and (c) 0.5 K in three orientations along the  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  axes.






FIG. S2: Field-angle  $\phi$  dependence of  $C_e/T$  at (a) 0.15 and (b) 0.5 K in several magnetic fields rotated within the  $ab$  plane, where  $\phi$  is the field angle measured from the  $a$  axis.




FIG. S3:  $C_e(\phi)/T$  at (a) 0.15, (b) 0.25, and (c) 0.5 K in several magnetic fields rotated within the  $ab$  plane ( $\theta = 90^\circ$ ) plotted as a function of the  $a$ -axis component of the magnetic field  $H_{\parallel a} = H \cos \phi$ .




FIG. S4: Temperature dependence of  $C_e/T$  at (a) 0.2 and (b) 0.75 T for  $H \parallel a$  and  $H \parallel c$ .