Phases and phase transitions in spin-triplet ferrom agnetic superconductors

D .V .Shopova and D .I.U zunov $^{\ensuremath{\mathcal{N}}}$

CPCM Laboratory, G. Nadjakov Institute of Solid State Physics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, BG-1784 So a, Bulgaria.

A lso, M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Physik kom plexer System e, N othnitzer Str. 38, 01187 D resden, G erm any.

^y Corresponding author: uzun@ issp bas.bg

K ey words: superconductivity, ferrom agnetism , phase diagram , order param eter pro le.

PACS: 7420De, 7420Rp

Abstract

Recent results for the coexistence of ferrom agnetism and unconventional superconductivity with spin-tiplet C ooper pairing are reviewed on the basis of the quasi-phenom enological G inzburg-Landau theory. New results are presented for the properties of phases and phase transitions in such ferrom agnetic superconductors. The superconductivity, in particular, the mixed phase of coexistence of ferrom agnetism and unconventional superconductivity is triggered by the spontaneous m agnetization. The m ixed phase is stable whereas the other superconducting phases that usually exist in unconventional superconductors are either unstable, or, for particular values of the parameters of the theory, som e of these phases are metastable at relatively low temperatures in a quite narrow dom ain of the phase diagram. The phase transitions from the norm alphase to the phase of coexistence is of rst order while the phase transition from the ferrom agnetic phase to the coexistence phase can be either of st or second order depending on the concrete substance. The C ooper pair and crystal an isotropies are relevant to a more precise outline of the phase diagram shape and reduce the degeneration of the ground states of the system but they do not drastically in uence the phase stability dom ains and the therm odynam ic properties of the respective phases. The results are discussed in view of application to m etallic ferrom agnets as UGe_2 , $ZrZn_2$, URhGe.

1. Introduction

1.1. Notes about unconventional superconductivity

The phenom enon of unconventional Cooper pairing of ferm ions, i.e. the form ation of Cooper pairs with nonzero angular momentum was theoretically predicted [1] in

1959 as a mechanism of super uidity of Ferm i liquids. In 1972 the same phenom enon – unconventional super uidity due to a p-wave (spin triplet) Cooper pairing of ³H e atom s, was experimentally discovered in the mK range of temperatures; for details and theoretical description, see Refs. [2, 3, 4]. Note that, in contrast to the standard s-wave pairing in usual (conventional) superconductors, where the electron pairs are formed by an attractive electron-electron interaction due to a virtual phonon exchange, the widely accepted mechanism of the Cooper pairing in super uid ³H e is based on an attractive interaction between the fermions (³H e atom s) due to a virtual exchange of spin uctuations. Certain spin uctuation mechanisms of unconventional Cooper pairing of electrons have been assumed also for the discovered in 1979 heavy fermion superconductors (see, e.g., Refs. [5, 6, 7]) as wellas for som e classes of high-tem perature superconductors (see, e.g., Refs. [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]).

The possible superconducting phases in unconventional superconductors are described in the fram ework of the general G inzburg-Landau (GL) elective free energy functional [13] with the help of the symmetry groups theory. Thus a variety of possible superconducting orderings were predicted for dilerent crystal structures [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. A detailed therm odynamic analysis [11, 18] of the hom ogeneous (M eissner) phases and a renormalization group investigation [11] of the superconducting phase transition up to the two-loop approximation have been also performed (for a threeloop renormalization group analysis, see Ref. [23]; for elects of magnetic uctuations and disorder, see [24, 25]). We shall essentially use these results in our present consideration.

In 2000, experiments [26] at low temperatures (T 1 K) and high pressure (T 1 G P a) demonstrated the existence of spin triplet superconducting states in the metallic compound UG e_2 . This superconductivity is triggered by the spontaneous magnetization of the ferrom agnetic phase which exists at much higher temperatures and coexists with the superconducting phase in the whole domain of existence of the latter below T 1 K; see also experiments published in Refs. [27, 28], and the discussion in Ref. [29]. Moreover, the same phenomenon of existence of superconductivity at low temperatures and high pressure in the domain of the (T; P) phase diagram where the ferrom agnetic order is present has been observed in other ferrom agnetic metallic compounds ($ZrZn_2$ [30] and URhG e [31]) soon after the discovery [26] of superconductivity in UG e_2 .

In contrast to other superconducting m aterials, for example, ternaty and Chevrelphase compounds, where the e ects of magnetic order on superconductivity are also substantial (see, e.g., [32, 33, 34, 35]), in these ferrom agnetic compounds the phase transition temperature (T_f) to the ferrom agnetic state is much higher than the phase transition temperature (T_{FS}) from ferrom agnetic to a (m ixed) state of coexistence of ferrom agnetic magnetics and superconductivity. For example, in UG e₂ we have $T_{FS} = 0.8$ K whereas the critical temperature of the phase transition from paramagnetic to ferrom agnetic state in the same material is $T_f = 35$ K [26, 27]. One may reliably assume that in such kind of

m aterials the m aterial param eter T_s de ned as the (usual) critical tem perature of the second order phase transition from norm alto uniform (M eissner) supercondicting state in zero external magnetic eld is quite lower than the phase transition tem perature T_{FS} . Note, that the m entioned experiments on the com pounds UG e_2 , UR hG e_1 , and ZrZn₂ do not give any evidence for the existence of a standard norm alto-superconducting phase transition in zero external magnetic eld.

M oreover, it seems that the superconductivity in the m etallic compounds m entioned above, always coexists with the ferrom agnetic order and is enhanced by the latter. As claimed in Ref. [26] in these systems the superconductivity seems to arise from the same electrons that create the band m agnetism, and is most naturally understood as a triplet rather than spin-singlet pairing phenomenon. Note that all three m etallic compounds, m entioned so far, are itinerant ferrom agnets. Besides, the unconventional superconductivity has been suggested [36] as a possible outcom e of recent experiments in Fe [37], in which a superconducting phase was discovered at temperatures below 2 K at pressures between 15 and 30 G Pa. Note, that both vortex and M eissner superconductivity phases [37] are found in the high-pressure crystal modi cation of Fe which has a hexagonal close-packed lattice. In this hexagonal lattice the strong ferrom agnetism of the usual bcc iron crystal probably disappears [36]. Thus one can hardly claim that there is a coexistence of ferrom agnetism and superconductivity in Fe but the clear evidence for a superconductivity is also a rem arkable achievem ent.

1.2. Ferrom agnetism versus superconductivity

The in portant point in all discussions of the interplay of superconductivity and ferrom agnetism is that a sm allam ount of m agnetic in purities can destroy superconductivity in conventional (s-wave) superconductors by breaking up the (s-wave) electron pairs with opposite spins (param agnetic in purity e ect [38]). In this aspect the phenom enological argum ents [39] and the conclusions on the basis of the m icroscopic theory of m agnetic in purities in s-wave superconductors [38] are in a complete agreem ent with each other; see, e.g., Refs. [32, 33, 34, 35]. In fact, a total suppression of conventional (s-wave) superconductivity should occur in the presence of an uniform spontaneous m agnetization M, i.e. in a standard ferrom agnetic phase [39]. The physical reason for this suppression is the same as in the case of magnetic in purities, namely, the opposite electron spins in the s-wave C opper pair turn over along the vector M in order to lower their Zeem an energy and, hence, the pairs break down. Therefore, the ferrom agnetic order can hardly coexist with conventional superconducting states. In particular, this is the case of coexistence of uniform superconducting and ferrom agnetic states when the superconducting order parameter (x) and the magnetization M do not depend on the spatial vector \mathbf{x} .

But yet a coexistence of s-wave superconductivity and ferrom agnetism may appear in uncommon materials and under quite special circum stances. Furthermore, let us emphasize that the conditions for the coexistence of nonuniform (\vertex", \spiral", \spin-sinosoidal" or \helical") superconducting and ferrom agnetic states are less restrictive than that for the coexistence of uniform superconducting and ferrom agnetic orders. Coexistence of nonuniform phases has been discussed in details, in particular, experiment and theory of ternary and Chevrel-phase compounds, where such a coexistence seems quite likely; for a comprehensive review, see, for example, Refs. [32, 33, 34, 35, 40].

In fact, the only two superconducting systems for which the experimental data allow assumptions in a favor of a coexistence of superconductivity and ferrom agnetism are the rare earth ternary boride compound $ErRh_4B_4$ and the Chervel phase compound $H \circ M \circ_6 S_8$; for a more extended review, see Refs. [33, 41]. In these compounds the phase of coexistence most likely appears in a very narrow temperature region just below the Curie temperature T_f of the ferrom agnetic phase transition. At lower temperatures the magnetic moments of the rare earth 4f electrons become better aligned, the magnetization increases and the s-wave superconductivity pairs formed by the conduction electrons disintegrate.

1.3. Unconventional superconductivity triggered by ferrom agnetic order

We shall not extend our consideration over all important aspects of the long standing problem of coexistence of superconductivity and ferrom agnetism rather we shall concentrate our attention on the description of the new ly discovered coexistence of ferrom agnetism and unconventional (spin-triplet) superconductivity in the itinerant ferrom agnets UGe_2 , $ZrZn_2$, and URhGe. Here we wish to emphasize that the main object of our discussion is the superconductivity of these compounds and, at a second place in the rate of importance we put the problem of coexistence. The reason is that the existence of superconductivity in such itinerant ferrom agnets is a highly nontrivial phenom enon. As noted in Ref. [42] the superconductivity in these materials seems di cult to explain in terms of previous theories [32, 33, 35] and seem s to require new concepts to interpret the experim ental data.

We have already mentioned that in ternary compounds the ferror agtetism comes from the localized 4f electrons whereas the swave Cooper pairs are formed by conduction electrons. In UG e_2 and UR hG e the 5f electrons of U atoms form both superconductivity and ferror agnetic order [26, 31]. In $ZrZn_2$ the same double role is played by the 4d electrons of Zr. Therefore the task is to describe this behavior of the band electrons at a microscopic level. One may speculate about a spin- uctuation mediated unconventional Cooper pairing as is in case of ³H e and heavy fermion superconductors. These important issues have not yet a reliable answer and for this reason we shall con ne our consideration to a phenom enological level.

In fact, a num ber of reliable experim ental data for exam ple, the data about the coherence length and the superconducting gap [26, 27, 31, 30], are in favor of the conclusion about a spin-triplet C ooper pairing in these m etallic com pounds, although the m echanism of this pairing rem ains unclear. W e shall essentially use this reliable conclusion. Besides, this point of view is consistent with the experim ental observation of coexistence of superconductivity only in a low tem perature part of the ferrom agnetic dom ain of the phase diagram (T;P), which means that a pure (non ferrom agnetic) superconducting phase has not been observed. This circum stance is also in favor of the assumption of a spin-triplet superconductivity. Our investigation leads to results which con rm this general picture.

Besides, on the basis of the experimental data and conclusions presented for the rst time in Refs. [26, 29] and shortly afterwards con rm ed in Refs. [27, 28, 30, 31] one may reliably accept the point of view that the the superconductivity in these magnetic compounds is considerably enhanced by the ferrom agnetic order parameter M and, perhaps, it could not exist without this m echanism of ferrom agnetic trigger," or, in short, M -trigger." Such a phenom enon is possible for spin-triplet C coper pairs, where the electron spins point parallel to each other and their turn along the vector of the spontaneous magnetization M does not produce a break down of the spin-triplet C coper pairs but rather stabilizes them and, perhaps, stimulates their creation. W e shall describe this phenom enon at a phenom enological level.

1.4. Phenom enological studies

Recently, the phenom enological theory which explains the coexistence of ferrom agnetism and unconventional spin-triplet superconductivity of Landau-G inzburg type was developed [42, 43]. The possible low -order couplings between the superconducting and ferrom agnetic order parameters were derived with the help of general sym metry group arguments and several important features of the superconducting vortex state in the ferrom agnetic phase of unconventional ferrom agnetic superconductors were established [42, 43].

In this article we shall use the approach presented in Refs. [42, 43] to investigate the conditions for the occurrence of the M eissner phase and to dem onstrate that the presence of ferrom agnetic order enhances the p-wave superconductivity. Besides, we shall establish the phase diagram corresponding to m odel ferrom agnetic superconductors in a zero external m agnetic eld. We shall show that the phase transition to the superconducting state in ferrom agnetic superconductors can be either of rst or second order depending on the particular substance. We con rm the predictions m ade in Refs. [42, 43] about the symmetry of the ordered phases.

O ur investigation is based on the mean-eld approximation [13] as well as on familiar results about the possible phases in nonmagnetic superconductors with triplet (p-wave) C coper pairs [18, 11, 12]. Results from Refs. [44, 45, 46] will be reviewed and extended. In our preceding investigation [44, 45, 46] both C coper pair anisotropy and crystal anisotropy have been neglected in order to clarify the main elect of the coupling between the ferrom agnetic and superconducting order parameters. The phenom enological G L free energy is quite complex and the inclusion of these anisotropies is related with lengthy formulae and a multivariant analysis which obscures the nal results.

Here we shall take into account essential an isotropy e ects, in particular, the e ect of

the C ooper pair anisotropy on the existence and stability of the mixed phase, namely the phase of coexistence of superconductivity and ferrom agnetic order. We demonstrate that the anisotropy of the spin-triplet C ooper pairs modiles but does not drastically dhange the therm odynamic properties of this coexistence phase, in particular, in the most relevant temperature domain above the superconducting critical temperature T_s . The same is valid for the crystal anisotropy, but we shall not present a thorough therm odynamic analysis of this problem. The crystal anisotropy elect can be considered for concrete system swith various crystal structures [6, 18]. Here we indicate phase. Of course, our investigation conist the general concept [18] that the anisotropy reduces the degree of degeneration of the ground state and, hence, stabilizes the ordering along the main crystal directions.

There exists a form al sin ilarity between the phase diagram obtained in our investigation and the phase diagram of certain in proper ferroelectrics [47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52]. The variants of the theory of in proper ferroelectrics, known before 1980, were criticized in Ref. [52] for their oversin pli cation and inconsistency with the experimental results. But the further development of the theory has no such disadvantage (see, e.g., Ref. [50, 51]). We use the advantage of the theory of in proper ferroelectrics, where the concept of a \primary" order parameter triggered by a secondary order parameter (the electric polarization P_e) has been initially introduced and exploited (see Ref. [50, 51, 52]). The mechanism of the M-triggered superconductivity in itinerant ferrom agnets is form ally identical to the mechanism of appearance of structural order triggered by the electric polarization P_e in in proper ferroelectrics (P-trigger). Recently, the e ect of M-trigger has been used in a theoretical treatm ent of ferrom agnetic B ose condensates [53].

1.5. A im s of the paper

In the remainder of this paper we shall consider the GL free energy functional of unconventional ferror agnetic superconductors. Our aim is to establish the uniform phases which are described by the GL free energy presented in Section 2.1. M ore information about the justication of this investigation is presented in Section 2.2. Note, as also mentioned in Section 2.2, that we investigate a quite general GL model in a situation of a lack of a concrete information about the values of the parameters of this model for concrete compounds (UG e_2 , UR hG e_2 , $ZrZn_2$) where the ferrom agnetic superconductivity has been discovered. On one side this lack of information makes in possible a detailed comparison of the theory to the available experimental data but on the other side our results are not bound to one orm ore concrete substances but can be applied to any unconventional ferrom agnetic superconductors. In Section 3 we discuss the phases in nonmagnetic unconventional superconductors. In Section 4 the M -trigger e ect will be described in the simple case of a single coupling (interaction) between the magnetization M and the superconducting order parameter in an isotropic m odel of ferrom agnetic superconductors, where the anisotropy e ects are ignored. In Section 5

the e ect of another in portant coupling between the magnetization and the superconducting order parameter on the therm odynamics of the ferrom agnetic superconductors is taken into account. In Section 6 the anisotropy e ects are considered. In Section 7 we summarize and discuss our indings.

2. G inzburg-Landau free energy

Following Refs. [18, 42, 43] in this Chapter we discuss the phenomenological theory of spin-triplet ferrom agnetic superconductors and justify our consideration in Sections 3{6.

2.1. M odel

Consider the GL free energy functional

$$F [;M] = d^{3}xf(;M);$$
(1)

where the free energy density f(;M) (for short hereafter called \free energy") of a spin-triplet ferrom agnetic superconductor is a sum of ve term s:

$$f(;M) = f_{S}() + f_{F}^{0}(M) + f_{I}(;M) + \frac{B^{2}}{8} B M :$$
 (2)

In Eq. (2) = f_{j} ; j = 1; 2; 3g is the three-dimensional complex vector describing the superconducting order and B = (H + 4 M) = r A is the magnetic induction; H is the external magnetic eld, $A = fA_{j}$; j = 1; 2; 3g is the magnetic vector potential. The last two terms on the rhs. of Eq. (2) are related with the magnetic energy which includes both diamagnetic and paramagnetic elds in the superconductor (see, e.g., [32, 39, 54]).

In Eq. (2), the term f_s () describes the superconductivity for H = M 0. This free energy part can be written in the form [18]

$$f_{S}() = f_{grad}() + a_{s}jj^{2} + \frac{b_{s}}{2}jj^{4} + \frac{u_{s}}{2}j^{2}j^{2} + \frac{v_{s}}{2}\frac{X^{3}}{jj^{4}}jj^{4}; \qquad (3)$$

with

$$f_{grad}() = K_1(D_{i j}) (D_iD_j) + K_2[(D_{i i}) (D_{j j}) + (D_{i j}) (D_{j i})]$$
(4)
+ K_3(D_{i i}) (D_{i i});

where a sum m ation over the indices i; j (= 1; 2; 3) is assumed and the symbol

$$D_{j} = i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} + \frac{2jej}{c} A_{j}$$
(5)

of covariant di erentiation is introduced. In Eq. (3), $b_s > 0$ and $a_s = {}_s$ (T T_s), where s is a positive material parameter and T_s is the critical temperature of a standard second order phase transition which may take place at H = M = 0; $H = \frac{1}{2}H$ j and

M = M j. The parameter u_s describes the anisotropy of the spin-triplet C ooper pair whereas the crystal anisotropy is described by the parameter v_s [11, 18]. In Eq. (3) the parameters K_j , (j = 1;2;3) are related with the elective mass tensor of anisotropic C ooper pairs [18].

The term $f_F^0(M)$ in Eq. (2) is the following part of the free energy of a standard isotropic ferrom agnet:

$$f_{\rm F}^{0}(M) = c_{\rm f} \int_{j=1}^{X^{3}} j_{\rm f} M_{j} f^{2} + a_{\rm f} (T_{\rm f}^{0}) M^{2} + \frac{b_{\rm f}}{2} M^{4}$$
(6)

where r $_{j} = @=@x_{j}, b_{f} > 0$, and $a_{f} (T_{f}^{0}) = {}_{f} (T T_{f}^{0})$ is represented by the material parameter $_{f} > 0$ and the temperature T_{f}^{0} ; the latter di ers from the critical temperature T_{f} of the ferrom agnet and this point will be discussed below. In fact, through Eq. (2) we have already added a negative term ($2 M^{2}$) to the total free energy f(; M). This is obvious when we set H = 0 in Eq. (2). Then we obtain the negative energy ($2 M^{2}$) which should be added to $f_{F}^{0} (M)$. In this way one obtains the total free energy $f_{F} (M)$ of the ferrom agnet in a zero external magnetic eld, which is given by a modi cation of Eq. (6) according to the rule

$$f_{F}(a_{f}) = f_{F}^{0} a_{f}(T_{f}^{0}) ! a_{f}(T_{f}) ;$$
(7)

where $a_f = f(T - T_f)$ and

$$T_{f} = T_{f}^{0} + \frac{2}{f}$$
(8)

is the critical tem perature of a standard ferrom agnetic phase transition of second order. This scheme was used in studies of rare earth temary compounds [32, 54, 55, 56]. A lternatively [57], one may work from the beginning with the total ferrom agnetic free energy $f_F(a_f;M)$ as given by Eqs. (6) – (8) but in this case the magnetic energy included in the last two terms on the rhs. of Eq. (2) should be replaced with H ²=8. Both ways of work are equivalent.

F inally, the term

$$f_{I}(;M) = i_{0}M:() + M^{2}j_{j}^{2}:$$
 (9)

in Eq. (2) describes the interaction between the ferrom agnetic order parameter M and the superconducting order parameter [42, 43]. The $_0$ -term is the most substantial for the description of experimentally found ferrom agnetic superconductors [43] while the M 2 j 2 (term makes the model more realistic in the strong coupling limit because it gives the opportunity to enlarge the phase diagram including both positive and negative values of the parameter a_s . This allows for an extension of the domain of the stable ferrom agnetic order up to zero temperatures for a wide range of values of the material parameters and the pressure P. Such a picture corresponds to the real situation in ferrom agnetic compounds.

In Eq. (9) the coupling constant $_0 > 0$ can be represented in the form $_0 = 4 J$, where J > 0 is the ferror agnetic exchange parameter [43]. In general, the parameter

for ferrom agnetic superconductors m ay take both positive and negative values. The values of the material parameters (T_s , T_f , $_s$, $_f$, b_s , u_s , v_s , b_f , K $_j$, $_0$ and) depend on the choice of the concrete substance and on intensive therm odynamic parameters, such as the tem perature T and the pressure P.

2.2. W ay of treatm ent

The total free energy (2) is a quite complex object of theoretical investigation. The various vortex and uniform phases described by this complex model cannot be investigated within a single calculation but rather one should focus on concrete problem s. In Ref. [43] the vortex phase was discussed with the help of the criterion [58] for a stability of this state near the phase transition line T_{c2} (H); see also, Ref. [59]. In case of H = 0 one should apply the same criterion with respect to the magnetization M for small values of j jnear the phase transition line T_{c2} (M) as performed in Ref. [43]. Here we shall be interested in the uniform phases, namely, when the order parameters and M do not depend on the spatial vector x 2 V (V is the volume of the superconductor). Thus our analysis will be restricted to the consideration of the coexistence of uniform (M eissner) phases and ferrom agnetic order. W e shall perform this investigation in details and, in particular, we shall show that the main properties of the uniform phases can be given within an approximation in which the crystal anisotropy is neglected. Moreover, some of the main features of the uniform phases in unconventional ferrom agnetic superconductors can be reliably outlined when the Cooper pair anisotropy is neglected, too.

The assumption of a uniform magnetization M is always reliable outside a quite close vicinity of the magnetic phase transition and under the condition that the superconducting order parameter is also uniform, i.e. that vortex phases are not present at the respective temperature domain. This conditions are directly satis ed in type I superconductors but in type II superconductors the temperature should be su ciently low and the external magnetic eld should be zero. Moreover, the mentioned conditions for type II superconductors may turn insu cient for the appearance of uniform superconducting states in materials with quite high values of the spontaneous magnetization. In such cases the uniform (Meissner) superconductivity and, hence, the coexistence of this superconductivity with uniform ferrom agnetic order may not appear even at zero temperature. Up to now type I unconventional ferrom agnetic superconductors have not been yet found whereas the experimental data for the recently discovered compounds UGe_2 , URhGe, and $ZrZn_2$ are not enough to conclude de nitely either about the lack or the existence of uniform superconducting states at low and ultra-low temperatures.

In all cases, if real materials can be described by the general GL free energy (1) – (9), the ground state properties will be described by uniform states, which we shall investigate. The problem about the availability of such states in realmaterials at nite temperatures is quite subtle at the present stage of research when the experimental data

are not enough. We shall assume that uniform phases may exist in some unconventional ferrom agnetic superconductors. Moreover, we indiconvenient to emphasize that these phases appear as solutions of the GL equations corresponding to the free energy (1) - (9). These arguments completely justify our study.

In case of a strong easy axis type of magnetic anisotropy, as is in $UG \in [26]$, the overall complexity of mean-eld analysis of the free energy f (; M) can be avoided by performing an $\$ ing -like" description: M = (0;0;M), where M = ∱ jisthe m agnetization along the \z-axis." Further, because of the equivalence of the \up" and \down" physical states (M) the therm odynam ic analysis can be performed within the \gauge" M 0. But this stage of consideration can also be achieved without the help of crystal anisotropy arguments. When the magnetic order has a continuous sym m etry one m ay take advantage of the sym m etry of the total free energy f(;M)and avoid the consideration of equivalent them odynam ic states that occur as a result of the respective symmetry breaking at the phase transition point but have no e ect on therm odynamics of the system. In the isotropic system one may again choose a gauge, in which the magnetization vector has the same direction as z-axis ($M_{z} = M_{z} = M$) and this will not in uence the generality of therm odynam ic analysis. Here we shall prefer the alternative description within which the ferrom agnetic state may appear through two equivalent \sup and $\operatorname{dow} n$ dom ains with m agnetizations M and (M), respectively.

We shall perform the mean-eld analysis of the uniform phases and the possible phase transitions between such phases in a zero external magnetic eld (H = 0), when the crystal anisotropy is neglected ($v_s = 0$). The only exception will be the consideration in Sec. 3, where we brie y discuss the nonmagnetic superconductors ($M \neq 0$). For our aim s we use notations in which the number of parameters is reduced. Introducing the parameter

$$b = (b_{s} + u_{s} + v_{s})$$
(10)

we rede ne the order param eters and the other param eters in the following way:

Having in m ind our approximation of uniform and M and the notations (10) - (11), the free energy density f (; M) = F (; M)=V can be written in the form

$$f(;M) = r^{2} + \frac{1}{2} + 2 \prod_{1 > 2} M \sin(2 \prod_{1 > 1}) + \prod_{1 > 2} M^{2} + tM^{2} + \frac{1}{2} M^{4}$$
(12)
$$2w \prod_{1 > 2}^{2} \sin^{2}(2 \prod_{1 > 1}) + \prod_{1 > 3}^{2} \sin^{2}(1 \prod_{3 > 1}) + \prod_{2 > 3}^{2} \sin^{2}(2 \prod_{3 > 1}) + \prod_{2 > 3}^{$$

Note, that in this free energy the order parameters and M are de ned per unit volume.

The equilibrium phases are obtained from the equations of state

$$\frac{\partial f(_{0})}{\partial t} = 0; (13)$$

where the series of symbols can be de ned as, for example, = f g = $(M; _1; :::; _3; _1; :::; _3); _0$ denotes an equilibrium phase. The stability matrix F of the phases $_0$ is de ned by

$$\hat{F}(_{0}) = fF(_{0})g = \frac{e^{2}f(_{0})}{e^{2}e^{2}};$$
 (14)

An alternative treatment can be done in terms of the real $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ j \end{pmatrix}$ and in aginary $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ j \end{pmatrix}$ parts of the complex numbers $_{j} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ j \end{pmatrix} + i \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ j \end{pmatrix}$. The calculation with the moduli $_{j}$ and phase angles $_{j}$ of $_{j}$ has a minor disadvantage in cases of strongly degenerate phases when some of the angles $_{j}$ remain unspecied. Then one should consistently use the properties of the respective broken continuous symmetry. Alternatively, one may do an alternative analysis with the help of the components $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ j \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ j \end{pmatrix}$.

In order to avoid any am biguity in our discussion let us note that we often use the term $\end{equation}$ of a phase in order to indicate that it appears in experiments. This means that the phase, we consider, is either stable or metastable, in quite rare cases, when certain special special experimental conditions allow the observation of metastable states in equilibrium. When a solution (phase) of Eq. (13) is obtained it is said that the respective phase $\end{equation}$, of course, under some $\end{equation}$ are conditions" that are imposed on the parameters f g of the theory. But this is just a registration of the fact that a concrete phase satis es Eq. (13).

The problem about the therm odynam ic stability of the phases that are solutions of Eq. (13) is solved with the help of the matrix (14) and, if necessary, with an additional analysis including the comparison of the free energies of phases which correspond to minim a of the free energy in one and the same domain of parameters f g. Then the stable phase will be the phase that corresponds to a global minim um of the free energy. Therefore, when we discuss experimental situation in which some phase exists according to the experimental data, this means that it is a global minimum of the free energy, a fact determined by a comparison of free energies of the phases. If other minima of the free energy exist in a certain domain of parameters f g then these minima are metastable equilibria, i.e. metastable phases. If a solution of Eq. (13) is not a minimum, it corresponds to an (absolutely) unstable equilibrium and the matrix (14) corresponding to this unstable phase is negatively de nite.

W hen we determ ine the m inim a of the free energy by the requirement for a positive de niteness of the stability matrix (14), we are often faced with the problem of a \m arginal" stability, i.e. the matrix is neither positively nor negatively de nite. This

is often a result of the degeneration of the states (phases) with broken continuous symmetry, and one should distinguish these cases. If the reason for the lack of a clear positive de niteness of the stability matrix is precisely the mentioned degeneration of the ground state, one may reliably conclude that the respective phase is stable. If there is another reason, the analysis of the matrix (14) turns insu cient for our aim s to determ ine the respective stability property. These cases are quite rare and happen for very particular values of the parameters $f_{\rm c}$.

3. Pure superconductivity

Let us set M 0 in Eq. (12) and brie y sum marize the known results [18, 11] for the \pure superconducting case" when the magnetic order cannot appear and magnetic e ects do not a ect the stability of the norm aland uniform (M eissner) superconducting phases. The possible phases can be classified by the structure of the complex vector order parameter = $(_{1}; _{2}; _{2})$. We shall often use the moduli vector $(_{1}; _{2}; _{3})$ with magnitude = $(_{1}^{2} + _{2}^{2} + _{3}^{2})^{1=2}$ but we must not forget the values of the phase angles j.

The norm alphase (0,0,0) is always a solution of the Eqs. (13). It is stable for r 0, and corresponds to a free energy f = 0. Under certain conditions, six ordered phases [18, 11] occur for r < 0. Here we shall not repeat the detailed description of these phases [18, 11] but we shall brie y mention their structure.

The simplest ordered phase is of type $(_1;0;0)$ with equivalent domains: $(0;_2;0)$ and $(0;0;_3)$. Multi-domain phases of more complex structure also occur, but we shall not always enumerate the possible domains. For example, the \two-dimensional" phases can be fully represented by domains of type $(_1;_2;0)$ but there are also other two types of domains: $(_1;0;_3)$ and $(0;_2;_3)$. As we consider the general case when the crystal anisotropy is present (v \in 0), this type of phases possesses the property $j_{ij} = j_{jj}$.

The two-dimensional phases are two and have di erent free energies. To clarify this point let us consider, for example, the phase $(_1;_2;0)$. The two complex numbers, $_1$ and $_2$ can be represented either as two-component real vectors, or, equivalently, as rotating vectors in the complex plane. One can easily show that Eq. (12) yields two phases: a collinear phase, when $(_2 \quad _1) = k (k = 0; \quad 1; ...)$, i.e. when the vectors $_1$ and $_2$ are collinear, and another (noncollinear) phase when the same vectors are perpendicular to each other: $(_2 \quad _1) = (k + 1=2)$. Having in m ind that $j_1 j = j_2 j = \stackrel{P}{=} \overline{2}$, the dom ain $(_1; _2; 0)$ of the collinear phase is given by $(_1; 1; 0) \stackrel{P}{=} \overline{2}$. Sim ilar representations can be given for the other two dom ains of these phases.

In addition to the mentioned three ordered phases, three other ordered phases exist. For these phases all three components $_{j}$ have nonzero equilibrium values. Two of them have equal to one another moduli $_{j}$, i.e., $_{1} = _{2} = _{3}$. The third phase is of the type $_{1} = _{2} \in _{3}$ and is unstable so it cannot occur in real systems. The two three-dimensional phases with equal moduli of the order parameter components have dimensional phases and, hence, dimensional structure. The dimension between any couple of angles $_{j}$ is given by $_{=3}$ or $_{p}^{2}$ =3. The characteristic vectors of this phase can be of the form ($e^{i} = 3; e^{i} = 3; 1$) = $\frac{1}{3}$ and ($e^{2i} = 3; e^{i2} = 3; 1$) = $\frac{1}{3}$. The second stable three dimensional phase is \real", i.e. the components $_{j}$ lie on the real axis; ($_{j}$ $_{p}^{i}$) = k for any couple of angles $_{j}$ and the characteristic vectors are (1; 1;1) = $\overline{3}$. The stability properties of these ve stable ordered phases were presented in details in Refs. [18, 11].

W hen the crystal anisotropy is not present (v = 0) the picture changes. The increase of the level of degeneracy of the ordered states leads to an instability of som e phases and to a lack of som e noncollinear phases. Both two- and three-dimensional real phases, where $(j \ j) = k$, are nomore constrained by the condition i = j but rather have the freedom of a variation of the moduli j under the condition $^2 = r > 0$. The two-dimensional noncollinear phase exists but has a marginal stability [11]. All other noncollinear phases even in the presence of a crystal anisotropy (v \in 0) either vanish or are unstable; for details, see R ef. [11]. This discussion demonstrates that the crystal anisotropy stabilizes the ordering along the main crystallographic directions, low ers the level of degeneracy of the ordered state related with the spontaneous breaking of the continuous symmetry and favors the appearance of noncollinear phases.

The crystal eld e ects related to the unconventional superconducting order were established for the rst time in Ref. [18]. In our consideration of unconventional ferromagnetic superconductors in Sec. 4{7 we shall take advantage of these e ects of the crystal anisotropy. In both cases v = 0 and $v \in 0$ the matrix (14) indicates an instability of three-dimensional phases (all $j \in 0$) with an arbitrary ratios $_{i}=_{j}$. As already mentioned, for $v \in 0$ the phases of type $_{1} = _{2} \in _{3}$ are also unstable whereas for v = 0, even the phase $_{1} = _{2} = _{3} > 0$ is unstable.

4. Sim ple case of M -triggered superconductivity

Here we consider the W alker-Sam okhin m odel [43] when only the M $_{1\ 2}$ coupling between the order parameters and M is taken into account (> 0, $_1 = 0$). Besides, we shall neglect the anisotropies (w = v = 0). The uniform phases and the phase diagram in this case were investigated in Refs. [44, 45, 46]. Here we sum marize them ain results in order to make a clear comparison with the new results presented in Sections 5 and 6. In this Section we set $_3$ 0 and use the notation = ($_2$ 1). The symmetry of the system allows to introduce the notations without a loss of generality of the consideration.

4.1. Phases

The possible (stable, m etastable and unstable) phases are given in Table 1 together with the respective existence and stability conditions. The stability conditions dene the domain of the phase diagram where the respective phase is either stable or m etastable [13]. The norm al (disordered) phase, denoted in Table 1 by N always ex-

0) but is stable for t > 0, r > 0. The superconductivity ists (for all tem peratures T phase denoted in Table 1 by SC1 is unstable. The same is valid for the phase of coexistence of ferrom agnetism and superconductivity denoted in Table 1 by CO2. The N (phase, the ferror agnetic phase (FM), the superconducting phases (SC1(3) and two of the phases of coexistence (CO1{3) are generic phases because they appear also in 0). When the M $_{1}$ ₂{coupling is not present, the phases the decoupled case (SC1{3 are identical and represented by the order parameter where the components i participate on equal footing. The asterisk attached to the stability condition of \the second superconductivity phase" (SC 2), indicates that our analysis is insu cient to determ ine whether this phase corresponds to a minimum of the free energy. As we shall see later the phase SC2, as well as the other two purely superconducting phases and the coexistence phase CO1, have no chance to become stable for \bigcirc 0. This is so, because the non-generic phase of coexistence of superconductivity and ferrom agnetism (FS in Table 1), which does not exist for = 0 is stable and has a lower free energy in their dom ain of stability. Note, that a second dom ain (M < 0) of the FS phase exists and is denoted in Table 1 by FS. Here we shall describe only the rst domain (FS). The domain FS is considered in the same way.

The cubic equation for M corresponding to FS (see Table 1) is shown in Fig.1 for = 12 and t= 02. For any > 0 and t, the stable FS therm odynam ic states are given by $r(M) < r_m = r(M_m)$ for $M > M_m > 0$, where M_m corresponds to the maximum of the function r(M). Functions M_m (t) and M_0 (t) = $(t + {}^2=2)^{1=2} = {}^p \overline{3}M_m$ (t) are drawn in Fig. 2 for = 12. Functions r_m (t) = $4M_m^3$ (t)= for t < ${}^2=2$ (the line of circles in Fig. 3) and r_e (t) = t^{-1} for t < 0 de ne the borderlines of stability and existence of FS.

Phase	order param eter	existence	stability dom ain
Ν	j = M = 0	always	t> 0;r> 0
FΜ	$_{j} = 0, M^{2} = t$	t< 0	$r > 0, r^2 > {}^{2}t$
SC 1	$_{1} = M = 0, ^{2} = r$	r< 0	un <i>s</i> table
SC 2	$^{2} = r, = k, M = 0$	r< 0	(t> 0)
SC 3	$_1 = _2 = M = 0, ^2_3 = r$	r< 0	r< 0,t> 0
C01	$_{1} = _{2} = 0, ^{2}_{3} = r, M^{2} = t$	r< 0,t< 0	r< 0,t< 0
C O 2	$_1 = 0$, $^2 = r$, $= _2 = k$, $M^2 = t$	r< 0,t< 0	un <i>s</i> table
FS	$2 \frac{2}{1} = 2 \frac{2}{2} = 2 = r + M$, $_3 = 0$	M > r	$3M^2 > (t + ^2=2)$
	= 2 (k 1=4), $r = (^{2} 2t)M 2M^{3}$		M > 0
FS	$2 \frac{2}{1} = 2 \frac{2}{2} = \frac{2}{2} = (r + M), 3 = 0$	M > r	$3M^2 > (t + ^2=2)$
	= 2 (k + 1=4), $r = (2t^{2})M + 2M^{3}$		M < 0

TABLE 1. Phases and their existence and stability properties $[= (_2 _1), k = 0; 1; :::]$.

4.2. Phase diagram

We have outlined the domain in the (t, r) plane where the FS phase exists and is a minimum of the free energy. For r < 0 the cubic equation for M (see Table 1) and



Figure 1: h = r=2 as a function of M for = 12, and t = 02.



Figure 2:M versust for = 12: the dashed line represents M $_0$, the solid line represents M $_{\rm eq}$, and the dotted line corresponds to M $_{\rm m}$.



Figure 3: The phase diagram in the plane (t, r) with two tricritical points (A and B) and a triple point C; = 12. The domains of existence and stability of the phases N, FM and FS are shown.

the existence and stability conditions are satisfied for any M 0 provided t ². For $t < {}^{2}$ the condition M M₀ have to be fullled, here the value M₀ = ($t + {}^{2}=2$)¹⁼² of M is obtained from r(M₀) = 0. Thus for r = 0 the N-phase is stable fort ${}^{2}=2$, on the other hand FS is stable fort ${}^{2}=2$. For r > 0, the requirement for the stability of FS leads to the inequalities

$$\max -\frac{r}{m} M_{m} < M < M_{0};$$
 (15)

where $M_m = (M_0 = \frac{p}{3})$ and M_0 should be the positive solution of the cubic equation of state from Table 1; $M_m > 0$ gives a maximum of the function r(M); see also Figs. 1 and 2.

The further analysis leads to the existence and stability dom ain of FS below the line AB given by circles (see Fig. 3). In Fig. 3 the curve of circles starts from the point A with coordinates ($^{2}=2$, 0) and touches two other (solid and dotted) curves at the point B with coordinates ($^{2}=4$, $^{2}=2$). Line of circles represents the function r (M_m) r_{m} (t) where

$$r_{\rm m}$$
 (t) = $\frac{4}{3\overline{3}} \cdot \frac{2}{2} \cdot t^{3=2}$: (16)

Dotted line is given by $r_e(t) = \frac{p}{t_i}$. The inequality $r < r_m(t)$ is a condition for the stability of FS, whereas the inequality $r = r_e(t)$ for $(t) = \frac{2}{t_i}$.

the existence of FS as a solution of the respective equation of state. This existence condition for FS has been obtained from M > r (see Table 1).

In the region on the left of the point B in Fig. 3, the FS phase satis as the existence condition M > r only below the dotted line. In the domain conned between the lines of circles and the dotted line on the left of the point B the stability condition for FS is satis ed but the existence condition is broken. The inequality $r_{\rm c}(t)$ is the stability condition of FM for 0 (t) 2 =4. For (t) 2 =4 the FM phase is stable for all $r_{\rm c}(t)$.

In the region con ned by the line of circles AB, the dotted line for $0 < (t) < {}^{2}=4$, and the t axis, the phases N, FS and FM have an overlap of stability domains. The same is valid for FS, the SC phases and CO1 in the third quadrant of the plane (t, r). The com parison of the respective free energies for r < 0 shows that the stable phase is FS whereas the other phases are metastable within their domains of stability.

The part of the t-axis given by r = 0 and $t > {}^{2}=2$ is a phase transition line of second order which describes the N-FS transition. The same transition for $0 < t < {}^{2}=2$ is represented by the solid line AC which is the equilibrium transition line of a rst order phase transition. This equilibrium transition curve is given by the function

$$r_{eq}(t) = \frac{1}{4} 3$$
 ² + 16t)¹⁼² M_{eq}(t); (17)

where

$$M_{eq}(t) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{p}{2}}}^{\frac{h}{2}} 8t + \frac{1}{2} + 16t^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
(18)

is the equilibrium value (jum p) of the magnetization. The order of the N-FS transition changes at the tricritical point A .

The dom ain above the solid line AC and below the line of circles for t > 0 is the region of a possible overheating of FS. The dom ain of overcooling of the N-phase is conned by the solid line AC and the axes (t > 0, r > 0). At the triple point C with coordinates $[0, r_{eq}(0) = {}^{2}=4]$ the phases N, FM, and FS coexist. For t < 0 the straight line

$$r_{eq}(t) = \frac{2}{4} + jj;$$
 $^{2}=4 < t < 0;$ (19)

describes the extension of the equilibrium phase transition line of the N-FS rst order transition to negative values of t. For t < (2 =4) the equilibrium phase transition FM -FS is of second order and is given by the dotted line on the left of the point B (the second tricritical point in this phase diagram). A long the rst order transition line r_{eq} (t) given by Eq. (19) the equilibrium value of M is M $_{eq}$ = =2, which implies an equilibrium order parameter jump at the FM -FS transition equal to (=2 $\frac{P}{J_{eq}}$). On the dotted line of the second order FM -FS transition the equilibrium value of M is equal to that of the FM phase (M $_{eq}$ = $\frac{P}{J_{eq}}$). Note, that the FM phase does not exists below T_s and this seem s to be a disadvantage of the model (12) with $_{1}$ = 0.

The equilibrium phase transition lines of the FM-FS and N-FS transition lines in Fig. 3 can be expressed by the respective equilibrium phase transition temperatures T_{eq} de ned by the equations $r_e = r(T_{eq})$, $r_{eq} = r(T_{eq})$, $r_{eq} = r(T_{eq})$, and with the help of the relation M $_{eq} = M$ (T_{eq}). This leads to some limitations on the possible variations of the parameters of the theory. For example, the critical temperature (T_{eq} = T_c) of the FM-FS transition of second order ($^2=4 < t$) is obtained in the form $T_c = (T_s + 4 \text{ JM} = s)$, or, using M = ($q_f =)^{1=2}$,

$$T_c = T_s \frac{T}{2} + \frac{T}{2}^2 + T (T_f T_s);$$
 (20)

where $T_f > T_s$, and $T = (4 J)^2 f = \frac{2}{s}$ is a characteristic tem perature of them odel (12) with $_1 = w = v = 0$. The investigation of the conditions for the validity of Eq. (20) leads to the conclusion that the FM -FS continuous phase transition (at $^2 < t$) is possible only if the following condition is satis ed:

$$T_{f} \quad T_{s} > = (\& + \overset{P}{\overline{\&}})T ; \qquad (21)$$

where $\& = \frac{2}{s} = 4b \frac{2}{f}$. This means that the second order FM FS transition should disappear for a su ciently large {coupling. Such a condition does not exist for the rst order transitions FM FS and N-FS.

Taking into account the gradient term (4) in the free energy (2) should lead to a depression of the equilibrium transition temperature. As the magnetization increases with the decrease of the temperature, the vortex state should occur at temperatures which are lower than the equilibrium temperature T_{eq} of the hom ogeneous (M eissner) state. For example, the critical temperature (T_c) corresponding to the inhom ogeneous (vortex) phase of FS-type has been evaluated [43] to be lower than the critical temperature (T_c) = 4 $_B M = _s$ ($_B = \frac{1}{2}p_{T}=2m c - Bohrm agneton$). For J $_B$, we have $T_c = T_c$.

For r > 0, namely, for temperatures $T > T_s$ the superconductivity is triggered by the magnetic order through the -coupling. The superconducting phase for $T > T_s$ is entirely in the (t;r) domain of the ferrom agnetic phase. Therefore, the uniform supeconducting phase can occur for $T > T_s$ only through a coexistence with the ferrom agnetic order.

In the next Sections we shall focus on the temperature range $T > T_s$ which seems to be of main practical interest. We shall not dwell on the superconductivity in the fourth quadrant (t > 0;r < 0) of the (t;r) diagram where pure superconductivity phases are possible in systems with $T_s > T_f$ (this is not the case for UG e₂, UR hG e, and $ZrZn_2$). Besides, we shall not discuss the possible m etastable phases in the third quadrant (t < 0;r < 0) of the (t;r) diagram.

4.3. M agnetic susceptibility

Consider the longitudinal magnetic susceptibility $_1 = (_V = V)$ per unit volume [46]. The external magnetic eld H = (0;0;H) with H = (0f=0M) has the same direction as the magnetization M. We shall calculate the quantity $= {p - f_1}$ for the equilibrium therm odynamic states $_0$ given by Eq. (13). Having in m ind the relations (11) between M and M, and between and 'we can write

$$^{1} = \frac{d}{dM_{0}} \qquad \frac{@f}{@M} \qquad " ; \qquad (22)$$

where the equilibrium magnetization M₀ and equilibrium superconducting order parameter components $'_{0j}$ should be taken for the respective equilibrium phase (see Table 1, where the su x \0" of , , and M has been om itted; hereafter the same su x will be often om itted, too). Note that the value of the equilibrium magnetization M in FS is the maxim alnonnegative root of the cubic equation in M given in Table 1.

Using Eq. (22) we obtain the susceptibility of the FS phase in the form

$$^{1} = ^{2} + 2t + 6M^{2}$$
: (23)

The susceptibility of the other phases has the usual expression

$$^{1} = 2t + 6M^{2}$$
: (24)

Eq. (24) yields the known results for the paramagnetic susceptibility ($_{\rm P}$ = 1=2t; t > 0), corresponding to the norm all phase, and for the ferror agnetic susceptibility ($_{\rm F}$ = 1=4 j; t < 0), corresponding to FM. These susceptibilities can be compared with the susceptibility of FS. As the susceptibility of FS cannot be analytically calculated for the whole dom ain of stability of FS, we shall consider the close vicinity of the N-FS and FM -FS phase transition lines.

Near the second order phase transition line on the left of the point B (t < 2 =4), the magnetization has a smooth behaviour and the magnetic susceptibility does not exhibit any singularities (jump or divergence). For t > 2 =2, the magnetization is given by M = (s + s₊), where

$$s = \frac{r}{4} \frac{(t^2 = 2)^3}{27} + \frac{r}{4}^{2^{-1} = 2^{-1} = 3}$$
 (25)

For r = 0, M = 0, whereas for j rj (t ²=2) and r = 0 one may obtain M r=(2t ²) 2t. This means that in a close vicinity (r < 0) of r = 0 along the second order phase transition line (r = 0;t > ²) the magnetic susceptibility is well described by the paramagnetic law _P = (1=2t). For r < 0 and t ! ²=2, we obtain $M = (r=2)^{1=3}$ which yields

$$^{1} = 6 \frac{jrj}{2}^{2=3}$$
: (26)

On the phase transition line AC we have

$$M_{eq}(t) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{p}{2}}}^{\frac{h}{2}} 8t + {}^{2} + 16t^{1-2^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$
(27)

and, hence,

¹ = 4t
$$\frac{2}{4}$$
 ² 1 3 1 + $\frac{16t}{2}$ ¹⁼²[#] : (28)

At the tricritical point A this result yields ${}^{1}(A) = 0$, whereas at the triple point C with coordinates $(0, {}^{2}=4)$ we have $(C) = (2 = {}^{2})$. On the line B C we obtain M = =2 and, hence,

$$^{1} = 2t + \frac{^{2}}{2}$$
: (29)

At the tricritical point B with coordinates $(^{2}=4, ^{2}=2)$ this result yields 1 (B) = 0. In order to investigate the magnetic susceptibility tensor we shall slightly extend the fram ework of out treatment by considering arbitrary orientations of the vectors H and M. We shall denote the spatial directions (x; y; z) as (1; 2; 3).

The components of the inverse magnetic susceptibility tensor

$$^{1}_{1} = ^{1}_{p} \overline{b_{f}} = ^{1}_{ij} \overline{b_{f}}$$
(30)

can be represented in the form

$$_{ij}^{1} = 2(t + M^{2})_{ij} + 4M_{i}M_{j} + i \frac{0}{0}(t' - t')_{i};$$
 (31)

where M and $'_{j}$ are to be taken at their equilibrium values: M₀, $'_{0j}$, $_{0j}$. The last term in the rh.s. of Eq. (28) is equal to zero for all phases in Table 1 except for FS (and FS). When the last term in Eq. (29) is equal to zero we obtain the known result the susceptibility tensor for second order phase transitions (see, e.g., Ref. [13]).

Consider the FS phase, where j depends on M j. Now we can choose again M = (0;0;M) and use our results for the equilibrium values of j, and M (see Table 1). Then the components \prod_{ij}^{1} corresponding to FS are given by

$$_{ij}^{1} = 2 (t + M^{2})_{ij} + 4M_{i}M_{j}^{2}_{i3}$$
: (32)

Thus we have $\lim_{i \in j} = 0$,

$$_{11}^{1} = _{22}^{1} = 2 (t + M^{2});$$
 (33)

and $_{33}^{1}$ coincides with the inverse longitudinal susceptibility 1 given by Eq. (23). 4.4. Entropy and speci c heat

The entropy S(T) S=V = V@(f=@T) and the speci c heat C(T) C=V = T(@S=@T) per unit volum eV are calculated in a standard way [13]. We are interested in the jumps of these quantities on the N-FM, FM-FS, and N-FS transition lines. The behaviour of S(T) and C(T) near the N-FM phase transition and near the FM-FS

phase transition line of second order on the left of the point B (Fig. 3) is known from the standard theory of critical phenomena (see, e.g., Ref. [13] and for this reason we focus our attention on the phase transitions of type FS-FM and FS-N for (t > 2 =4), i.e., on the right of the point B in Fig. 3.

Using the equations for the order parameters and M (Table 1) and applying the standard procedure for the calculation of S, we obtain the general expression

$$S(T) = p \frac{s}{b}^{2} p \frac{f}{b} M^{2}$$
: (34)

The next step is to calculate the entropies S_{FS} (T) and S_{FM} of the ordered phases FS and FM. Note, that use the usual convention $F_N = V f_N = 0$ for the free energy of the N-phase and, hence, we must set S_N (T) = 0.

Consider the second order phase transition line $(r = 0, t > {}^{2}=2)$. Near this line $S_{FS}(T)$ is a smooth function of T and has no jump but the speci c heat C_{FS} has a jump at $T = T_{s}$, i.e. for r = 0. This jump is given by

$$C_{FS}(T_s) = \frac{{}^2_s T_s}{b} 1 \frac{1}{1 - 2t(T_s) = {}^2}$$
 : (35)

The jump C $_{FS}$ (T $_{s}$) is higher than the usual jump C (T $_{c}$) = T $_{c}$ ²=b known from the Landau theory of standard second order phase transitions [13].

The entropy jump $~S_{\rm AC}$ (T) $~S_{\rm FS}$ (T) on the line AC is obtained in the form

$$S_{AC}(T) = M_{eq} \frac{p}{4b} 1 + 1 + \frac{16t}{2} \frac{p}{p-M_{eq}} M_{eq} ;$$
 (36)

where M_{eq} is given by Eq. (18). From Eqs. (18) and (36), we have S(t = 2 = 2) = 0, i.e., S(T) becomes equal to zero at the tricritical point A. Besides we not from Eqs. (18) and (36) that at the triple point C the entropy jump is given by

$$S(t=0) = \frac{2}{4} \frac{p^{s}}{b} + \frac{p^{f}}{b} :$$
 (37)

On the line BC the entropy jump is de ned by $S_{BC}(T) = [S_{FS}(T) - S_{FM}(T)]$. We obtain

$$S_{BC}(T) = \frac{1}{2}j \frac{2}{4} \frac{p^{s}}{b} + \frac{p^{f}}{b} :$$
 (38)

At the tricritical point B this jump is equal to zero as it should be. The calculation of the speci c heat jump on the rst order phase transition lines AC and BC is redundant for two reasons. Firstly, the jump of the speci c heat at a rst order phase transition di ers from the entropy by a factor of order of unity. Secondly, in caloric experiments where the relevant quantity is the latent heat Q = T S(T), the speci c heat jump can hardly be distinguished.

4.5. Note about a sim pli ed theory

The consideration in this Section as well as in Sections 5 and 6 can be performed within an approximate scheme, known from the theory of improper ferroelectrics (see, e.g., Ref. [52]). The idea of the approximation is in the supposition that the order parameter M is small enough so that one can neglect M⁴-term in the free energy. W ithin this approximation one easily obtains from the data for FS presented in Table 1 or by a direct calculation of the respective reduced free energy that the order parameters and M of FS are described by the simple equalities r = (M) 2) and M = (=2t) 2 . Of course, one may perform this simple analysis from the very beginning. For ferroelectrics this approximation gives a substantial departure of theory from experiment [52]. In general, the dom ain of reliability of such an approximation should be the close vicinity of the ferrom agnetic phase transition, i.e. tem peratures near to the critical tem perature T_f . On the other hand, this discussion is worthwhile only if the \primary" order parameter also exists in the same (narrow) temperature domain (> 0). Therefore this approximation has some application in systems, where T_s T₊.

For $T_s < T_f$, one may simplify our thorough analysis by a supposition for a relatively small value of the modulus of the superconducting order parameter. This approximation should be valid in some narrow temperature domain near the line of second order phase transition from FM to FS.

5. E ect of sym m etry conserving coupling

Here we consider the case when both coupling parameters and $_1$ are dimensional from zero. In this way we shall investigate the elect of the symmetry conserving $_1$ -term in the free energy on the therm odynamics of the system. Note that when is equal to zero the analysis is quite easy and the results are known from the theory of bicritical and tetracritical points [13, 50, 60, 61]. For the problem of coexistence of conventional superconductivity and ferrom agnetic order this analysis ($= 0; _1 \in 0$) was made in Ref. [32]. Once again we postpone the consideration of anisotropy elects by setting w = v = 0. The present analysis is much more dimensional that in Sec. 4, and cannot be performed only by analytical calculations; rather, some complementary numerical analysis is needed. Our investigation is based to a great extent on analytical calculations but a numerical analysis has been also performed in order to obtain concrete conclusions.

5.1. Phases

The calculations show that for temperatures $T > T_s$, i.e., for r > 0, we have three stable phases. Two of them are quite simple: the norm al (N –) phase with existence and stability domains shown in Table 1, and the FM phase with the existence condition t < 0 as shown in Table 1, and a stability domain de ned by the inequalities $r > _1t$ and

$$r > _{1}t + t:$$
 (39)

The third stable phase for r > 0 is a more complex variant of the mixed phase FS and its domain FS, discussed in Section 4. The symmetry of the FS phase coincides with that found in [43]

Let us also mention that for r < 0 ve pure superconducting (M = 0, > 0) phases exist. Two of these phases, ($_1 > 0$; $_2 = _3 = 0$) and ($_1 = 0$; $_2 > 0$; $_3 > 0$) are unstable. Two other phases, ($_1 > 0$; $_2 > 0$; $_3 = 0$; $_2 = _1 + _k$) and ($_1 > 0$; $_2 > 0$; $_3 > 0$; $_2 = _1 + _k$; $_3$ { arbitrary; k = 0; 1;:::) show a marginal stability for t> $_1r$.

Only one of the ve pure superconducting phases, namely, the phase SC 3, given in Table 1, is stable. In the present case of $_1 \in 0$ the values of $_j$ and the existence domain of SC 3 are the same as shown in Table 1 for $_1 = 0$ but the stability domain is di erent and is given by t> $_1$ r. When the anisotropy elects are taken into account the phases exhibiting marginal stability within the present treatment may receive a further stabilization. Besides, three other mixed phases (M \in ; > 0) exist for r < 0 but one of them is metastable (for $_1^2 > 1$; t < $_1$ r, and r < $_1$ t) and the other two are absolutely unstable. Here the therm odynamic behaviour for r < 0 is much more abundant in phases than in the case of improper ferroelectrics with two component prim ary order parameter [50]. However, at this stage of experimental needs about the phases for tem peratures T < T_s is not of prim ary interest and for this reason we shall focus on the relatively higher tem perature dom ain r > 0.

The FS phase is described by the following equations:

$$_{1} = _{2} = \frac{p}{2}; \quad _{3} = 0;$$
 (40)

$$^{2} = (M r_{1}M^{2});$$
 (41)

$$(1 \quad {}^{2}_{1})M^{3} \quad \frac{3}{2} \quad {}_{1}M^{2} + t \quad \frac{2}{2} \quad {}_{1}r \quad M \quad \frac{r}{2} = 0;$$
 (42)

and

$$(_{2} _{1}) = \frac{1}{2} + 2$$
 k; (43)

(k = 0; 1; ...). The upper sign in Eqs. (41) - (43) corresponds to the FS dom ain in which sin (2 1) = 1 and the lower sign corresponds to the FS dom ain. Here we have a generalization of the two-dom ain phase FS discussed in Section 4 and for this reason we use the same notations. The analysis of the stability matrix (14) for these phase dom ains shows that FS is stable for M > 0 and FS is stable for M < 0, just like our result in Section 4. As these dom ains belong to the same phase, namely, have the same free energy and are therm odynam ically equivalent, we shall consider one of



Figure 4: The phase diagram in the (t;r) plane for = 12; $_1 = 0.8$ and w = 0.

them, for example, FS.Besides, our analysis of Eqs. (40) - (43) shows that FS exists and is stable in a broad domain of the (t;r) diagram, including substantial regions corresponding to r > 0.

5.2. Phase stability and phase diagram

In order to outline the phase diagram (t;r) we shall use the information given above for the other three phases which have their own domains of stability in the (t;r) plane: N, FM, and FS. The phase diagram for concrete parameters of and ₁ is shown in Fig. 4. The phase transition between the normal and FS phases is of rst order and goes along the equilibrium line AC. It is given by the equation:

$$\mathbf{r}_{eq}(t) = \frac{M_{eq}}{(_1M_{eq} = 2)} (1 - _1^2)M_{eq}^2 + \frac{3}{2} M_{eq} + (t - _2^2) :$$
(44)

The equilibrium value M $_{eq}$ on the line AC is found by setting the equilibrium free energy f_{FS} ($_0$) of FS equal to zero, i.e. equal to the free energy ($f_N = 0$) of the N-phase. We have obtained the equilibrium energy f_N as a function of the magnetization:

$$f_{FS} = \frac{M^{2}}{2(M_{1} = 2)^{2}}$$

$$(45)$$

$$(1 \quad {}^{2}_{1})M^{4} + {}^{1}M^{3} + 2 t(1 \quad {}^{2}_{1}) \quad \frac{2}{8} M^{2} \quad 2 \quad {}^{1}tM + t(t \quad \frac{2}{2});$$

where $M = M_{eq}$ (hereafter the su x \eq" will be often om itted).

The numerical analysis of the free energy (45) as a polynomial of M shows that the expression in the curly brackets has one positive zero in the interval of values of t from $t = {}^{2}=2$ (point A in Fig. 4) up to t = 0, where $M_{t=0} = {}^{2}=2({}_{1}+1)$. As far as the obtained values for M are in the interval 0 M < ($=2_{1}$) the existence condition of FS, namely,

$${}^{2} = \frac{M (M^{2} + t)}{(=2 \ _{1}M)} \quad 0;$$
(46)

is also satis ed.

At the triple point C with coordinates $t = 0, r = {}^{2}=4({}_{1}+1)$ three phases (N, FM, and FS) coexist. To nd the magnetization M on the equilibrium curve BC of the rst order phase transition FM -FS for t< 0, we use the equality $f_{FM} = f_{FS}$, or, equivalently,

$$\frac{(M^{2} + t^{2})^{2}}{2(M_{1} = 2)^{2}} \frac{h}{2} \qquad M (1 + 1) \frac{ih}{2} + M (1 1) = 0; \qquad (47)$$

Then the function $r_{eq}(t)$ for t < 0 will have the form

$$r_{eq}(t) = \frac{2}{4(1+1)} t;$$
 (48)

This function describes the line BC of rst order phase transition (see Fig. 4) which term instead the tricritical point B with coordinates

$$t_{\rm B} = \frac{2}{4(1+1)^2}; \quad r_{\rm B} = \frac{2(2+1)}{4(1+1)^2};$$
 (49)

To the left of the tricritical point the second order phase transition curve is given by the relation,

$$r_{e}(t) = t + t_{1}t;$$
 (50)

which coincides with the stability condition (39) of FM . This line intersects t-axis for $t = \begin{pmatrix} 2 = \frac{2}{1} \\ p & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and is well de ned also for r < 0.0 n the curve $r_e(t)$ the magnetization is $M = \begin{bmatrix} p & 1 \\ p & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and the superconducting order parameter is equal to zero (= 0). The function $r_e(t)$ has a maximum at the point $(t;r) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 = 4 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$; here $M = (=2_1)$. When this point is approached the second derivative of the free energy with respect to M tends to in nity, but as we shall see later the inclusion of the anisotropy of triplet pairing sm ears this singularity. The result for the curves $r_{FS}(t)$ of equilibrium phase transitions (N-FS and FM-FS) can be used to de ne the respective equilibrium phase transition temperatures T_{FS} .

W e shall not discuss the region, t > 0, r < 0, because we have supposed from the very beginning of our analysis that the transition temperature for the ferrom agnetic order T_f is higher then the superconducting transition temperature T_s, as i is for the



Figure 5: The dependence M (t) as an illustration of stability analysis for = 1.2 and $_1 = 0.8$.

known unconventional ferrom agnetic superconductors. But this case may become of substantial interest when, as one may expect, materials with $T_f < T_s$ will be discovered. The stability conditions of FS can be written in the general form

$$\frac{M^{2} + {}_{1}M}{M_{1}} \frac{t^{2}=2}{=2} = 0;$$
(51)

$$\frac{1}{M_{1}} = 2 \left[1 \left(1 \right)^{2} \right] M^{3} \frac{3}{4} \left(1 \right)^{2} M^{2} \frac{3}{4} \left(1 \right)^{2} M^{2}$$

Our consideration of the stability conditions (51) - (53) together with the existence condition Eq. (46) of the phase FS is illustrated by the picture shown in Fig. 5.

For 0 t 2 =2 and 0 < M < (=2₁) conditions (46) and (51) are satisfied. Condition (53) is a cubic equation in M (t) which for the above values of the parameter thas three real roots, one of them negative. The positive roots, M (t) > 0, as function of t are drawn by circles in Fig. 5 and it is obvious that the condition (53) will be satisfied for those values of M (t) that are between the two circled curves. The smaller positive root of Eq. (53) intersects t-axis for t = 2 =2 (point A in Fig. 5). Note, that M = =(2₁) is given by the horizontal dashed line. For t 2 (2 $^{2}_{1}$)=4 the stability condition (51) has two real roots shown by curves with crosses in Fig. 5. For The point S in Fig. 5 with coordinates $\begin{pmatrix} 2 = (4 \ 1^2); = (2 \ 1) \end{pmatrix}$ is singular in sense that lh.s. of conditions (51) and (53) go to in nity there. When $t > \begin{pmatrix} 2 = 4 \ 1^2 \end{pmatrix}$ the existence condition (46) implies $= (2 \ 1) < M < P$ t. The stability condition (53) is always satisfied (two complex conjugate roots and one negative root) and condition (51) will be fullled for values of M between the two curves denoted by crosses in Fig. 5.

5.3. D iscussion

The shape of the equilibrium phase transition lines corresponding to the phase transitions N-SC, N-FS, and FM-FS is similar to that for the simpler case $_1 = 0$ and we shall not dwell on the variation of the size of the phase dom ains with the variations of the parameter $_1$ from zero to values constrained by the condition $_1^2 < 1$. Besides one m ay generalize our treatment (Section 4) of the magnetic susceptibility tensor and the therm al quantities in this more complex case and to demonstrate the dependence of these quantities on 1. We shall not dwell on these problem s. But an important qualitative di erence between the equilibrium phase transition lines shown in Figs. 1 and 4 cannot be om itted. The second order phase transition line r_{e} (t), shown by the dotted line on the left of point B in Fig. 1, tends to large positive values of r for large negative values of t and remains in the \second quadrant" (t < 0; r > 0) of the plane (t;r) while the respective second order phase transition line in Fig. 4 crosses the t-axis $^{2}=^{2}_{1}$ and is located in the third quadrant (t < 0;r < 0) for all in the point t =possible values t < 2 = $^{2}_{1}$. This means that the ground state (at 0 K) of systems with $_1 = 0$ will be always the FS phase whereas two types of ground states, FM and FS, are allowed for system s with $0 < \frac{2}{1} < 1$. The latter seem s m ore realistic in view of com parison of theory and experim ent, especially, in ferrom agnetic com pounds like UGe_2 , $URhGe_1$, and $ZrZn_2$. The neglecting of the 1-term does not allow to describe the experim entally observed presence of FM phase at quite low tem peratures and relatively low pressure P.

The nalaim of the phase diagram investigation is the outline of the (T;P) diagram. Important conclusions about the shape of the (T;P) diagram can be made from the form of the (t;r) diagram without an additional information about the values of the relevant material parameters (a_s, a_f; :::) and their dependence on the pressure P. One should know also the characteristic temperature T_s, which has a lower value than the experimentally observed [26, 27, 28, 30, 31] phase transition temperature (T_{FS} 1K) to the mixed (FS) phase. A supposition about the dependence of the parameters a_s and a_f on the pressure P was made in Ref. [43]. Our results for T_f T_s show that the phase transition temperature T_{FS} varies with the variation of the system parameters (s; f;:::) from values which are much higher than the characteristic temperature T_s.

6. A nisotropy e ects

W hen the anisotropy of the C ooper pairs is taken in consideration, there will be not drastic changes in the shape the phase diagram for r > 0 and the order of the respective phase transitions. Of course, there will be some changes in the size of the phase dom ains and the form use for the therm odynam ic quantities. The parameter w will also insert a slight change in the values of the therm odynam ic quantities like the magnetic susceptibility and the entropy and speci c heat jumps at the phase transition points.

Besides, and this seem s to be the main anisotropy e ect, the w-and v-term s in the free energy lead to a stabilization of the order along the main crystal directions which, in other words, means that the degeneration of the possible ground states (FM, SC, and FS) is considerably reduced. This means also a smaller number of marginally stable states which are encountered by the analysis of the de niteness of the stability matrix (14). All anisotropy e ects can be veried by the investigation of the free energy (12) which includes the w-and v-term s.

W e have m ade the above general conclusions on the basis of a detailed analysis of the e ect of the C ooper pair anisotropy (w -) term, as well as on the basis of a prelim inary analysis of the total free energy (12), where the crystal anisotropy (v-) term is also taken into account. Here we shall present our basic results for the e ect of the C ooper pair anisotropy on the FS phase; the crystal anisotropy is neglected (v = 0).

The dimensionless anisotropy parameter w = u = (u + u) can be either positive or negative depending on the sign of u. Obviously when u > 0, the parameter w will be positive too (0 < w < 1). We shall illustrate the in uence of Cooper-pair anisotropy in this case. The order parameters (M, j, j) are given by Eqs. (40), (43),

$$^{2} = \frac{M r_{1}M^{2}}{(1 w)} 0;$$
 (54)

and

$$(1 \quad w \quad {}^{2}_{1})M^{3} \quad \frac{3}{2} \quad {}_{1}M^{2} + t(1 \quad w) \quad \frac{2}{2} \quad {}_{1}r \quad M \quad \frac{r}{2} = 0;$$
 (55)

where the meaning of the upper and lower sign is the same as explained just below Eq. (43). We consider the FS dom ain corresponding to the upper sign in the Eq. (54) and (55). The stability conditions for FS read,

$$\frac{(2 w) M r_{1} M^{2}}{1 w} 0; (56)$$

$$\frac{1}{1} \frac{2w}{w} (M Wr W_1 M^2) > 0;$$
 (57)

and

$$\frac{1}{1 w} 3(1 w {}_{1}^{2})M^{2} + 3 {}_{1}M + t(1 w) \frac{2}{2} {}_{1}r 0:$$
(58)

For M \Leftrightarrow (=2₁) we can express the function r (M) dened by Eq. (54), substitute the obtained expression for r (M) in the existence and stability conditions (54)–(57) and do the analysis in the same way as for w = 0. The calculations show that in the domain r > 0, FS is stable for w < 0.5, when w = 0.5 there is a marginal stability, and for w > 0.5 the FS-phase is unstable (0 < w < 1).

The results can be used to outline the phase diagram and calculate the therm odynam ic quantities. This is performed in the way explained in the preceding Sections.

7.Conclusion

We have done an investigation of the M-trigger e ect in unconventional ferrom agnetic superconductors. This e ect due to the M $_{1\ 2}$ -coupling term in the GL free energy consists of bringing into existence of superconductivity in a domain of the phase diagram of the system that is entirely in the region of existence of the ferrom agnetic phase. This form of coexistence of unconventional superconductivity and ferrom agnetic order is possible for tem peratures above and below the critical tem perature $T_{\rm s}$, which corresponds to the standard phase transition of second order from normal to M eissner phase { usual uniform superconductivity in a zero external magnetic edd, which appears outside the domain of existence of ferrom agnetic order. Our investigation has been mainly intended to clarify the therm odynam is behaviour at tem peratures $T_{\rm s} < T < T_{\rm f}$, where the superconductivity cannot appear without the mechanism of M-triggering. We have described the possible ordered phases (FM and FS) in thism ost interesting tem perature interval.

The C opper pair and crystal anisotropies have also been investigated and their main e ects on the therm odynamics of the triggered phase of coexistence have been established. In discussions of concrete real material one should take into account the respective crystal symmetry but the variation of the essential therm odynamic properties with the change of the type of this symmetry is not substantial when the low symmetry and low order (in both M and) -term is present in the free energy.

Below the superconducting critical temperature T_s a variety of pure superconducting and mixed phases of coexistence of superconductivity and ferrom agnetism exists and the therm odynamic behavior at these relatively low temperatures is more complex than in known cases of improper ferroelectrics. The case $T_f < T_s$ also needs a special investigation.

Our results are referred to the possible uniform superconducting and ferrom agnetic states. Vortex and other nonuniform phases need a separate study.

The relation of the present investigation to properties of real ferrom agnetic com pounds, such as UGe_2 , URhGe, and $ZrZn_2$, has been discussed throughout the text. In these real com pounds the ferrom agnetic critical tem perature is much larger than the super-conducting critical tem perature ($T_f = T_s$) and that is why the M-triggering of the spin-triplet superconductivity is very strong. Moreover, the $_1$ -term is important to stabilize the FM order up to the absolute zero (0 K), as is in the known spin-triplet fer-

29

rom agnetic superconductors. The neglecting [43] of the symmetry conserving $_1$ -term prevents the description of the known real substances of this type. More experimental information about the values of the material parameters ($a_s; a_f; ...$) included in the free energy (12) is required in order to outline the thermodynamic behavior and the phase diagram in terms of thermodynamic parameters T and P. In particular, a reliable know ledge about the dependence of the parameters a_s and a_f on the pressure P, the value of the characteristic temperature T_s and the ratio $a_s=a_f$ at zero temperature are of primary interest.

A cknow ledgm ents:

D IU thanks the hospitality of MPI-PKS-D resden. Financial support by SCENET (Parm a) and JINR (D ubna) is also acknow ledged.

References

- L.P.Pitaevskii, Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz.37 (1959) 1794 [Sov.Phys.JETP, 10 (1960) 1267].
- [2] A.J.Leggett, Rev. M od. Phys. 47 (1975) 331.
- [3] D.Vollhardt and P.W ole, The Super uid Phases of Helium 3 (Taylor & Francis, London, 1990).
- [4] G.E.Volovik, The Universe in a Helium D roplet (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003).
- [5] G.R. Stewart, Rev. M od. Phys. 56 (1984) 755.
- [6] M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Rev. M od. Phys. 63 (1991) 239.
- [7] V.P.M ineev, K.V. Sam okhin, Introduction to Unconventional Superconductivity (G ordon and B reach, Am sterdam, 1999).
- [8] M. Sigrist and T. M. Ruce, Z. Phys. B. Condensed Matter 68 (1987) 9.
- [9] J.F.Annett, M.Randeria, and S.R.Renn, Phys. Rev. B 38 (1988) 4660.
- [10] G.E.Volovik, JETP Lett. 48 (1988) 41 Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 48 (1988)
 39].
- [11] E.J.Blagoeva, G.Busiello, L.DeCesare, Y.T.Millev, I.Rabu o, and D.I. Uzunov, Phys. Rev. B 42 (1990) 6124.
- [12] D. I. U zunov, in: Advances in Theoretical Physics, ed. by E. Caianiello (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1990), p. 96.

- [13] D. I. U zunov, Theory of Critical Phenom ena (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1993).
- [14] J.F.Annett, Contemp. Physics 36 (1995) 323.
- [15] D.J.Van Harlingen, Rev. Mod. Phys. 67 (1995) 515.
- [16] C.C.T suei and J.R.K irtly, Rev. M od. Phys. 72 (2000) 969.
- [17] G.E.Volovik and L.P.Gorkov, JETP Lett. 39 (1984) 674 [Pis'm a Zh.Eksp. Teor.Fiz.39 (1984) 550].
- [18] G.E.Vobvik and L.P.Gorkov, Sov. Phys. JETP 61 (1985) 843 [Zh.Eksp.Teor. Fiz. 88 (1985) 1412].
- [19] K.Ueda and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 31 (1985) 7114.
- [20] E.I.B.bunt, Phys. Rev. B 32 (1985) 2935.
- [21] M. Ozaki, K. Machida, and T. Ohmi, Progr. Theor. Phys. 74 (1985) 221.
- [22] M. Ozaki, K. Machida, and T. Ohmi, Progr. Theor. Phys. 75 (1986) 442.
- [23] S.A. Antonenko and A. I. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. B 94 (1994) 15901.
- [24] G.Busiello, L.DeCesare, Y.T.M illev, I.Rabu o, and D.I.Uzunov, Phys. Rev. B 43 (1991) 1150.
- [25] G.Busiello, and D.I.Uzunov, Phys. Rev. B 42 (1990) 1018.
- [26] 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 (2000) 587.
- [27] A. Huxley, I. Sheikin, E. Ressouche, N. Kernavanois, D. Braithwaite, R. Calem czuk, and J. Flouquet, Phys. Rev. B 63 (2001) 144519–1.
- [28] N. Tateiwa, T. C. Kobayashi, K. Hanazono, A. Amaya, Y. Haga. R. Settai, and Y. O nuki, J. Phys. Condensed M atter, 13 (2001) L17.
- [29] P.Coleman, Nature 406 (2000) 580.
- [30] C. P eiderer, M. Uhlatz, S. M. Hayden, R. Vollmer, H. v. Lohneysen, N. R. Berhoeft, and G. G. Lonzarich, Nature 412 (2001) 58.
- [31] D. Aoki, A. Huxley, E. Ressouche, D. Braithwaite, J. Flouquet, J-P. Brison, E. Lhotel, and C. Paulsen, Nature 413 (2001) 613.
- [32] S.V. Vonsovsky, Yu.A. Izyum ov, and E.Z.Kurm aev, Superconductivity of Transition M etals (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1982).

- [33] M.B.Maple and F.Fisher (eds), Superconductivity in Ternary Compounds, Parts I and II, (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1982).
- [34] S.K. Sinha, in: Superconductivity in Magnetic and Exotic Materials, ed. by T. Matsubara and A.Kotani (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1984).
- [35] A. Kotani, in: Superconductivity in Magnetic and Exotic Materials, ed. by T. Matsubara and A. Kotani (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1984).
- [36] S.S.Saxena and P.B.Littlewood, Nature 412 (2001) 290.
- [37] K.Shim izu, T.Kikura, S.Furom oto, K.Takeda, K.Kontani, Y.Onuki, K.Am aya, Nature 412 (2001) 316.
- [38] A.A.Abrikosov and L.P.Gorkov, Zh.Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 39 (1960) 1781 [Sov. Phys. JETP 12 (1961) 1243].
- [39] V.L.Ginzburg, Zh.Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 31 (1956) 202 [Sov. Phys. JETP 4 (1957) 153].
- [40] A. I. Buzdin, L. N. Bulaevskii, S. S. Krotov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 85 (1983) 678
 [Sov. Phys. JETP 58 (1983) 395].
- [41] K.Machida and H.Nakanishi, Phys. Rev. B 30 (1984) 122.
- [42] K.Machida and T.Ohmi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 850.
- [43] M.B.Walker and K.V.Samokhin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 (2002) 207001-1.
- [44] D.V. Shopova, and D.I.Uzunov, Phys. Lett. A 313 (2003) 139.
- [45] D.V. Shopova, and D.I.Uzunov, J.Phys. Studies 7 (2003) No 4 (in press); see also, cond-m at/0305602
- [46] D.V. Shopova, and D.I.Uzunov, Compt. Rend. Acad. Bulg. Sciences, 56 (2003) 35; see also, a corrected version in: cond-m at/0310016.
- [47] Yu.M. Gufan and V.I. Torgashev, Sov. Phys. Solid State 22 (1980) 951 Fiz. Tv. Tela 22 (1980) 1629].
- [48] Yu.M. Gufan and V.I. Torgashev, Sov. Phys. Solid State 23 (1981) 1129.
- [49] L.T.Latush, V.I.Torgashev, and F.Smutny, Ferroelectrics Letts. 4 (1985) 37.
- [50] J-C. Toledano and P. Toledano, The Landau Theory of Phase Transitions (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1987).
- [51] Yu.M.Gufan, Structural Phase Transitions (Nauka, Moscow, 1982); in Russian.
- [52] R.A.Cowley, Adv. Phys. 29 (1980) 1.

- [53] Q.Gu, Phys. Rev. A 68 (2003) 025601.
- [54] E.I.B bunt, and C.M. Vam a, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 1079.
- [55] H.S.Greenside, E.I.Blount, and C.M.Varma, Phys. Rev. Lett. 46 (1980) 49.
- [56] T.K.Ng, and C.M. Varm a, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 (1997) 330.
- [57] C.G.Kuper, M. Revzen, and A. Ron, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 1545.
- [58] A.A.Abrikosov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 32 (1957) 1442 [Sov. Phys. JETP, 5 (1957) 1174].
- [59] E.M. Lifshitz and L.P.Pitaevskii, Statistical Physics, II Part (Pergam on Press, London, 1980) [Landau-Lifshitz Course in Theoretical Physics, Vol. IX].
- [60] K.S.Liu, and M.E.Fisher, J.Low Temp. Phys. 10 (1973) 655.
- [61] Y. Im ry, J. Phys. C: Cond. M atter Phys. 8 (1975) 567.