

Comment on "Coexistence of Superconductivity and Ferromagnetism in Ferromagnetic Metals [1]"

Yogesh N. Joglekar¹ and Allan H. MacDonald²

¹ Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544,

² Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

We argue that a single-band itinerant electron model with short-range interactions, proposed by Karchev et al. [1], cannot describe the coexistence of superconducting and ferromagnetic order.

In a recent Letter [1] Karchev et al. proposed a model for the coexistence of s-wave superconductivity and ferromagnetism, in which both orders arise from itinerant electrons. It has been investigated further in a recent preprint [2]. The results presented in [1] are based on a model with a local electron-electron interaction of the form $\sum_r S_r S_{r\#} = 2 \sum_r n_{r\uparrow} n_{r\#}$. In this comment, we point out that the Hubbard-Stratonovich (HS) transformation used in [1] predicts an ordered state even in the case of non-interacting electrons. Although the HS approach is attractive for the physical transparency it brings to the study of quantum fluctuations in ordered states, it tends not to describe the microscopic competition between different possible types of order well. The evidently incorrect inference mentioned above, and the well-known [3] property that HS transformation can be used to derive Hartree or Fock but not Hartree-Fock mean-field equations, are examples of this difficulty. In this comment we show explicitly that the model considered in [1], when treated by a Hartree-Fock mean-field theory, leads to a physically sensible phase diagram that does not support simultaneous ferromagnetism and s-wave superconductivity [4].

Using the identity $S_r S_{r\#} = 3(n_{r\uparrow} + n_{r\#}) - 3n_{r\uparrow} n_{r\#} = 2$, the local interaction can be written as $\sum_r S_r S_{r\#} = 2 \sum_r (1 - n_{r\uparrow} n_{r\#})$ for arbitrary \mathbf{r} , where $\mathbf{J} = (J - 4g)/3 = 4g/3$. In [1] ordered states can occur even for the non-interacting case, $\mathbf{J} = 0 = g$, indicating breakdown of the HS mean-field theory. To cast the subsequent discussion in a transparent Hartree-Fock language, we perform a particle-hole transformation on the down-spin, $c_{\mathbf{r}} \rightarrow c_{\mathbf{r}}^\dagger$. The Hamiltonian expressed in terms of d-fermions is given by

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} d_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger [\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - g(1 - \sigma)] d_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \sum_{\sigma} \frac{\mathbf{J}}{2} S_r S_{r\#} + \frac{g}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} (1 - \sigma) (n_{r\uparrow}^d + n_{r\#}^d)^2 \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - g/2$ is energy measured from a shifted chemical potential, $n_{r\sigma}^d (S_r)$ is the number (spin) operator for d-fermions at position \mathbf{r} , and we have used the identities $S_r S_{r\#} = S_r S_{r\#}$ and $2n_{r\uparrow} n_{r\#} = (3n_{r\uparrow}^d + n_{r\#}^d) - (n_{r\uparrow}^d + n_{r\#}^d)^2$ to derive Eq.(1). In this language s-wave superconductivity corresponds to nonzero $\hat{x}\hat{y}$ spin-

polarization for the d-fermions. The local interaction above is the sum of density ($g n_{\mathbf{d}}^2 = 2$) and isotropic spin-dependent ($g_s S \cdot S = 2$) contributions which give rise to Hartree mean-fields $g n_{\mathbf{d}}/2$ and $g_s \sim \mathbf{m}/4$, and exchange mean-fields $g(n_{\mathbf{d}}/2 + \sim \mathbf{m}_R)/2$ and $g(3n_{\mathbf{d}}/2 - \mathbf{m})/8$ respectively. Here $n_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{m}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger d_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ is the average d-fermion number (spin) density, $g_n = g(1 - \sigma)$, $g_s = \mathbf{J}$, and we have used $S_r S_{r\#} = \sum_{\sigma} d_{r\sigma}^\dagger d_{r\sigma} d_{r\#}^\dagger d_{r\#}$ (2)

) to evaluate the mean-field contributions from the spin-dependent interaction. Although the Hartree and exchange contributions individually depend on \mathbf{r} , the Hartree-Fock mean-field Hamiltonian is independent of this arbitrary parameter, thereby satisfying a minimum requirement for physically meaningful conclusions. In contrast, a naive HS approach which includes only the Hartree (or exchange) self-energy gives an unphysical \mathbf{r} -dependent mean-field Hamiltonian [1, 2].

The resulting Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \left[\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \frac{gM}{2} (1 - \sigma) \right] d_{\mathbf{k}} \quad (2)$$

is easily diagonalized to yield the quasiparticle energies $E_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \pm \sqrt{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \frac{g^2 M^2}{4}}$. Here M is the ferromagnetic order parameter and $\mathbf{m} = g m_x = 2$ is (purely real) superconducting order parameter. The self-consistent equations for M and \mathbf{m} are

$$M = \frac{2}{Z} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} [1 - n_+(\mathbf{k}) - n_-(\mathbf{k})]; \quad (3)$$

$$1 = 2g \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{n_-(\mathbf{k}) - n_+(\mathbf{k})}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \frac{g^2 M^2}{4}}; \quad (4)$$

These equations are similar to Eqs.(6) and (7) in [1] but contain only one effective coupling constant g . For $g < 0$ Eq.(4) implies that $\mathbf{m} = 0$, and it follows from Eq.(3) that $M \neq 0$ solutions can occur only if $g < g_c$ where g_c is determined by Stoner's criterion. For $g > 0$ we get the BCS solution, $\mathbf{m} \propto \exp(-1/gN)$, and Eq.(3) implies that $M = 0$.

We conclude that coexistence of superconductivity and ferromagnetism requires physics beyond that of a single-band model with short-range interactions, and that HS based mean-field approximations must be used with caution [7, 8], especially when separate terms in the inter-

action Hamiltonian are represented by different auxiliary fields.

[1] N.I. Karchev et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 846 (2001).

[2] J. Jackiewicz et al, cond-mat/0302449.

[3] J.W. Negele and H.O. Rland, Quantum Many Body Systems

(Addison Wesley, New York, 1988).

[4] We do not concentrate on the energies or regimes-of-validity of various mean-field phases [5, 6] because the HS mean-field theory breaks down at an earlier stage.

[5] Y. Zhou et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 069701 (2003).

[6] R. Shen et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 069702 (2003).

[7] A.K. Kerman et al, Ann. Phys. 148, 436 (1983).

[8] Y.N. Joglekar and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B 64, 155315 (2001).