

# Interplay between magnetism and superconductivity in URhGe

V. P. Mineev

Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique, DSM/DRFC/SPSMS 38054 Grenoble, France  
(Dated: June 9, 2005)

The magnetization rotation transition occurs in the itinerant ferromagnet URhGe when the field about 12T is applied in direction perpendicular to spontaneous magnetization in the plane of the smallest magnetic anisotropy energy. The transition is accompanied by the maximum of resistivity in the normal state and by reentrance of superconductivity at lower temperatures in the field interval between 8 and 13 Tesla [Levy et al, Science, to be published (2005)].

We discuss the magnetization orientation transition and the modification of triplet pairing superconducting state coexisting with ferromagnetism up to the fields about 2 Tesla and then reappearing in the broad vicinity of the transition.

The nonsymmorphic space group crystal symmetry of ferromagnetic URhGe allows existence of antiferromagnetic ordering of magnetic moments of pairs of uranium atoms along a axis. We show that the amplitude of this weak antiferromagnetic ordering increases below the phase transition into superconducting state due to Cooper pairs spontaneous magnetism.

PACS numbers:

## I. INTRODUCTION

The new class of superconducting materials  $UGe_2$ ,<sup>1</sup>  $URhGe$ ,<sup>2</sup> and  $UIr_3$  has been revealed recently where the superconducting state coexists with itinerant ferromagnetic ordered state. The large band splitting and the high low temperature value of upper critical field<sup>5</sup> in uranium ferromagnetic superconductors point out that here we deal with Cooper pairing in the triplet state which earlier has been attributed with evidence only to superfluid phases of liquid Helium-3<sup>6</sup>. The discovery has brought into the open the intriguing possibility of unconventional mechanism of pairing or magnetically mediated superconductivity which is now under intensive investigation (see for instance<sup>7</sup> and references therein). At the same time essential progress was achieved in general phenomenological description of triplet superconducting states in ferromagnetic metals<sup>8,9,10</sup>.

The superconductivity of itinerant ferromagnets presents the particular example of multiband superconductivity<sup>11,12</sup>. Its another manifestation is recently found in conventional two band superconductor  $MgB_2$ <sup>13</sup>. The multiband effects also can be important in superconductors without inversion center (another hot point of up-to-date condensed matter physics (see<sup>12</sup> and references therein)).

The coming to light of superconductivity in any new material give rise the problem of determination of the type of the superconducting state. In particular it is always important to know: (i) what kind of superconductivity conventional or nonconventional we deal with (it means: is the symmetry of the order parameter lower than the symmetry of the crystal in the normal state or it is not<sup>14</sup>, (ii) is it singlet or triplet type of the Cooper pairing, (iii) are there the nodes in the superconducting quasiparticle spectrum, and if, yes, what kind of the nodes we deal with symmetry nodes or with occasional nodes, (iv) is the superconducting state magnetic or not, another words, does it possess spontaneous magnetic moment or it does not.

In the present paper we discuss the magnetic properties of ferromagnetic superconductor URhGe: first, the quite recently discovered<sup>15</sup> metamagnetic transition at the magnetic field about 12 Tesla directed perpendicular to spontaneous magnetization accompanied by the maximum of resistivity in the normal state and by reentrance of superconductivity at lower temperatures in the broad vicinity of this transition between 8 and 13 Tesla. We shall follow up the modifications of superconducting state in the ferromagnetic URhGe under magnetic field perpendicular to spontaneous magnetization and argue that the reentrance of the superconductivity under magnetic field is compatible with triplet Cooper pairing in this material.

Secondly, we shall describe the interplay between the nonunitary triplet superconductivity and the weak antiferromagnetism allowed by symmetry in this ferromagnet. The effect of stimulation of weak antiferromagnetism by the Cooper pairs magnetic moment will be demonstrated. The latter reveals the new possibility of direct experimental determination of spontaneous magnetism in URhGe superconducting state.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In the next Section we will describe the metamagnetic transition. Then, the overview of the triplet superconducting states in orthorhombic ferromagnets will be given, followed by the description of modifications acquired by superconducting state under magnetic field. In the last Section we present the symmetry analysis of the interplay between the ferromagnetism, antiferromagnetism and superconductivity in URhGe.

## II. MAGNETIC ORIENTATION TRANSITION

URhGe has the orthorhombic crystal symmetry with ferromagnetic moment directed in the direction of  $c$  crystallography axis. The experimental observations of field dependences of magnetization along different crystallographic directions<sup>16</sup> as well as numerical calculations of magnetic anisotropy energy<sup>17</sup> yield the  $c$ -axis to be the easy magnetization axis and the  $a$  axis the hard magnetization axis. The magnetic anisotropy energy in  $a$ - $c$  plane is more than the four times larger than in  $b$ - $c$  plane meaning that URhGe is the  $b$ - $c$  easy magnetization plane ferromagnet. Following Ref.[17] one can write the  $b$ - $c$  plane anisotropy energy as

$$E_{anis}(\theta; H) = J \sin^2 \theta + (J = 4) \sin^2 2\theta - M H \sin \theta; \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta$  is the angle between  $c$  axis and total magnetization in  $b$ - $c$  plane, magnetic field  $H$  directed along  $b$  axis. The anisotropy energy may be considered as a part of the total Landau energy of ferromagnet in magnetic field

$$F = -j_z(T)M_z^2 + j_y M_y^2 + j_z M_z^4 + j_y M_y^4 + 2 j_{yz} M_z^2 M_y^2 - M_y H; \quad (2)$$

Here the  $y; z$  are directions of the spin axes pinned to  $(b; c)$  crystallographic directions correspondingly. At the temperatures below the Curie temperature  $j_z(T) < 0$  and in the absence of magnetic field the  $z$  component of magnetization has a finite value. The magnetic field creates the magnetization along its direction but decreases the magnetization parallel to  $c$ . This process is abruptly finished at some field then the  $M_z$  drops to zero. Another words, in a ferromagnet with magnetization directed along  $c$  axis under magnetic field directed along  $b$  axis there is the first order type transition between the states with magnetization projections  $(M_y; M_z)$  and  $(M_y; 0)$ . To prove this statement one must investigate the evolution of minimum of the free energy depending on two projections of magnetization. This is straightforward but a bit cumbersome problem. Instead, in assumption of constancy of magnetization modulus we do much easier investigation of anisotropy energy (1) depending of just one angular variable.

The anisotropy energy at  $H = 0$  has two minima: absolute at  $\theta_1 = 0$  and metastable at  $\theta_2 = \pi/2$  and one maximum in between of them given by  $\sin^2 \theta_m = (j_y + j_z)/2j_z$  that is  $\theta_m \approx 60^\circ$  if we take the numerical values of coefficients  $j_y = 4.4 \text{ meV}$  and  $j_z = 2.9 \text{ meV}$  found in Ref.[17]. The values of anisotropy energy in both minima decrease with increasing field but the metastable minimum  $E_{anis}(\theta = \pi/2; H)$  drops faster and at some field becomes deeper. Still at this point between two minima there is the maximum: It is easy to check by direct calculation that  $\partial^2 E_{anis}(\theta; H) / \partial \theta^2 |_{\theta = \pi/2}$  is positive at arbitrary magnetic field and the values of  $j_y$  and  $j_z$  parameters pointed out above. Hence we have the first order type transition from the state with finite  $M_z$  component of magnetization to the state there this component is absent.

The crystal symmetry is changed with magnetic field increasing. First, at zero field the magnetic symmetry group of the orthorhombic crystal with magnetization oriented along  $c$  axis is

$$D_2(C_2^z) = (E; C_2^z; K C_2^x; K C_2^y) \quad (3)$$

where  $K$  is the time reversal operation. Then at intermediate fields the magnetization has both  $M_b; M_c$  components and the crystal symmetry is decreased to monoclinic

$$C_2^x = (E; K C_2^x); \quad (4)$$

Finally after the first order type transition the orthorhombic symmetry is recreated but with magnetization directed along  $b$  direction

$$D_2(C_2^y) = (E; K C_2^z; K C_2^x; C_2^y) \quad (5)$$

## III. SUPERCONDUCTING STATES IN THE ORTHORHOMBIC FERROMAGNET WITH TRIPLET PAIRING

The symmetry description of all possible superconducting states in orthorhombic ferromagnets was given in<sup>9,11,12</sup>. We shortly repeat here the main points of this description. In an itinerant ferromagnetic metal the internal exchange field lifts the Kramers degeneracy of the electronic states. The electrons with spin "up" fill the states in some bands and the electrons with spin "down" occupy the states in other bands. Hence we have the specific example of multiband metal with states in each band filled by electrons with only one spin direction. Let us discuss for simplicity the two-band ferromagnet. If there is some pairing interaction, one can discuss intraband or spin "up" - spin "up" (spin "down" - spin "down") pairing of electrons, as well as interband or spin "up" - spin "down" pairing. In general the Fermi surfaces of spin up and spin down bands are situated in different places of the reciprocal space and have the different

shape. That is why pairing of electrons from the different bands occurs just in the case of nesting of some pieces of the corresponding Fermi surfaces. In such the situation, similar to SDW or CDW ordering, the superconducting ordering is formed by Cooper pairs condensate with finite momentum known as Fulde-Ferrel-Larkin-Ovchinnikov state. We shall not discuss here this special possibility. So we neglect by pairing of electronic states from different bands giving Cooper pairs with zero spin projection. Hence, the only superconducting state should be considered it is the state with triplet pairing and the order parameter given by

$$d(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2} [ (\mathcal{X} + i\mathcal{Y}) \psi_+(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k}) + (\mathcal{X} - i\mathcal{Y}) \psi_-(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k}) ] \quad (6)$$

Superconducting states  $d(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k})$  with different critical temperatures in the ferromagnetic crystals are classified in accordance with irreducible co-representations of the magnetic group  $M$  of crystal<sup>8,9</sup>. All the co-representations in ferromagnets with orthorhombic symmetry are one-dimensional. However, they obey of multicomponent order parameters determined through the coordinate dependent pairing amplitudes: one per each band populated by electrons with spins "up" or "down". For the two-band ferromagnet under discussion, they are

$$\psi_+(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k}) = \psi_1(\mathbf{R}) f_+(\mathbf{k}); \quad \psi_-(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k}) = \psi_2(\mathbf{R}) f_-(\mathbf{k}) \quad (7)$$

The coordinate dependent complex order parameter amplitudes  $\psi_1(\mathbf{R})$  and  $\psi_2(\mathbf{R})$  are not completely independent:

$$\psi_1(\mathbf{R}) = j_1(\mathbf{R}) \mathcal{P}^{i\mathbf{R}}; \quad \psi_2(\mathbf{R}) = j_2(\mathbf{R}) \mathcal{P}^{i\mathbf{R}} \quad (8)$$

Being different by their moduli they have the same phase with an accuracy  $\pi$ . The latter property is due to the consistency of transformation of both parts of the order parameter under the time reversal.

The general forms of odd functions of momentum directions of pairing particles on the Fermi surface  $f_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = f_x(\mathbf{k}) \mp i f_y(\mathbf{k})$  for the different superconducting states in ferromagnets can be found following the procedure introduced in<sup>9</sup>. We shall not repeat it here but just write the order parameter corresponding to "conventional" superconductivity in a orthorhombic ferromagnet with magnetic moment oriented along  $\hat{c}$  direction. The symmetry group of such a crystal is given by eqn.(3). The "conventional" superconducting state obeys the same symmetry (3) as the normal state and only the gauge symmetry is broken. The general form of the order parameter  $d(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k})$  given by eqns (6)-(7) compatible with symmetry (3) is obtained by the following choice of the functions  $f_{\pm}(\mathbf{k})$ :

$$f_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = k_x (u_1 \mp u_4) + i k_y (u_2 \mp u_3); \quad (9)$$

where  $u_1, \dots, u_4$  are real functions of  $k_x^2, k_y^2, k_z^2$ . From the expression for the order parameter one can conclude that the only symmetry dictated nodes in quasiparticle spectrum of conventional superconducting states in orthorhombic ferromagnets are the nodes lying on the northern and southern poles of the Fermi surface  $k_x = k_y = 0$ . A long with superconducting state given by eqn (9) there is another equivalent superconducting state transforming as  $\psi_-(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k})$ . One can prove<sup>9</sup> that these two states coexist in the same ferromagnetic crystal but in domains with the opposite direction of magnetization.

All the superconducting states in the orthorhombic ferromagnets and in particular the conventional superconducting state are non-unitary and obey the Cooper pair spin momentum

$$S = i\hbar d \quad d i = \frac{\hbar}{2} j_1 \psi_1 - j_2 \psi_2 \quad (10)$$

and Cooper pair angular momentum

$$L = i\hbar d \quad k \frac{\partial}{\partial k} d i = \frac{i}{2} \hbar \left( k \frac{\partial}{\partial k} \psi_1 - \psi_1 + \psi_2 k \frac{\partial}{\partial k} \right) \psi_2 \quad (11)$$

where the angular brackets denote the averaging over  $\mathbf{k}$  directions. As the consequence, the magnetic moment of ferromagnet changes at the transition to the ferromagnetic superconducting state<sup>12</sup>. We shall denote this change as  $M_s$ .

Certainly, below the phase transition of a ferromagnet to the superconducting state its magnetic moment is screened by the London supercurrents flowing around the surface of the specimen<sup>4</sup>. In the case of UGe<sub>2</sub> and URhGe this screening is, however, uncomplete just because the size of ferromagnetic domains<sup>18</sup> and the London penetration depth  $\lambda_L$  have the same order of magnitude  $\sim 10^4$  cm. It is known<sup>14,19</sup> that even in the absence of the external field the Abrikosov vortices penetrate into the bulk ferromagnet if the spontaneous ferromagnetic moment exceeds the lower critical field  $M_0 > H_{c1}$ . In presence of domain structure this criterium is modified<sup>20</sup> as follows  $M_0 > H_{c1} (\lambda_L/w)^{2/3}$ ,

here  $\lambda$  is the London penetration depth and  $w$  is the domain wall thickness. To operate with measurable values one can rewrite this inequality as

$$M_0 > \frac{0}{w} \frac{2=3}{2} H_{c2} \quad (12)$$

Here  $H_{c2} = 2T$  is the upper critical field,  $\lambda = 2 \cdot 10^6$  cm is the coherence length,  $\kappa = 50 - 100$  is the Ginzburg-Landau parameter. The value of spontaneous magnetization in URhGe is  $10^2 = 2$  G. Taking the domain wall width as  $w = 10^7 - 10^6$  cm we see that just the opposite inequality takes place. Hence in the absence of the external field the domain structure in URhGe is vortex free.

#### IV. FIELD INDUCED SUPERCONDUCTIVITY

As we already mentioned the magnetization orientation transition is accompanied at low temperatures<sup>15</sup> (below 0.4 K) by reappearance of superconductivity. The phenomenon of magnetic field induced superconductivity is known more than two decades. First it was discovered in pseudoternary molybdenum halogenides  $Eu_xSn_{1-x}Mo_6S_8$ <sup>21</sup>. The orbital critical field in these materials is likely sufficiently high due to large impurity scattering. Hence, the critical field value is mostly controlled by paramagnetic limiting mechanism. Moreover, the formation of antiferromagnetic state below 1K ( $T_c = 4$  K) completely suppresses superconductivity. But in the fields above 4 Tesla the superconducting state reappears. The common belief is that it is due to Jaccarino-Peter effect<sup>22</sup> consisting of compensation of the external applied field by the internal exchange field of magnetic ions with magnetic moments oriented by high external field. Similar phenomenon has been observed in two-dimensional organic superconductor  $(\text{BEDT})_2\text{FeCl}_4$ <sup>23,24</sup>. The very high orbital field value is maintained here by the field orientation parallel to conducting layers. A gain due to Jaccarino-Peter mechanism the high field reentrance of superconductivity occurs.

The quite different situation happens in URhGe. First of all, even in the low field region the superconducting state exists till about 2 Tesla<sup>5</sup>. That is about 4 times larger than paramagnetic limiting field. The latter means that we deal with triplet superconductivity and the critical field entirely determined by the orbital mechanism. Here we always tell about the field orientation parallel to b axis that is perpendicular equilibrium direction of magnetization. Then, after suppression of superconductivity it reappears at the field about 8 Tesla and persists till about 13 Tesla<sup>5</sup>.

The analysis made in the paper Ref.[5] shows that among the superconducting states (6)-(9) the best fit for the upper critical field temperature behavior gives one-band superconducting state with the order parameter

$$d(\mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k}) = (\hat{x} + i\hat{y})k_x \quad (13)$$

As it was described above, under the field influence the magnetization rotates in the bc plane from c direction until it suddenly proves to be oriented parallel to b axis at the field value 12 Tesla. We already pointed out that during the process of magnetization rotation the crystal symmetry is changed from (3) to (5). The order parameter form (13) is compatible with all these symmetry transformations if we choose the  $\hat{y}$  axis lying in the plane perpendicular to the total magnetization direction, such that  $\hat{x} \cdot \hat{y} = M/M$ . It is worth noting that similarly one can consider a multiband superconducting state.

Hence, the order parameter shape is stable in respect to the magnetization rotation. This is an important observation but it does not explain the reentrance of superconductivity in the high field region. Leaving this problem for the future investigations we only note here that if the first order type transition is very weak, another words if it is close to the second order, then in vicinity of it one can expect appearance of well developed magnetic fluctuations possibly stimulating of electrons pairing.

#### V. WEAK ANTIFERROMAGNETISM IN SUPERCONDUCTING URhGe

The interesting observation has been done in the paper<sup>25</sup> and discussed in more details in<sup>17</sup>. The uranium atoms in the orthorhombic unit cell of URhGe form two "pairs" (1,2) and (3,4) called  $U_I$  and  $U_{II}$ . These pairs of atoms can be translated each other by means of nonprimitive translations, that means the URhGe crystal lattice is related to nonsymmorphic space group. It is easy to check that under the group (3) transformations accompanying by nonprimitive translations the magnetic moments of uranium atoms behave as follows

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^z &: U_I(M_x; M_y; M_z) \rightarrow U_{II}(M_x; M_y; M_z) \\ KC_2^x &: U_I(M_x; M_y; M_z) \rightarrow U_{II}(M_x; M_y; M_z) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K C_2^y & : U_I (M_x; M_y; M_z) \neq U_I (M_x; M_y; M_z) \\
K C_2^y & : U_{II} (M_x; M_y; M_z) \neq U_{II} (M_x; M_y; M_z)
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The symmetry (3) is possible when  $M_y = 0$  but magnetization of pair (1,2) is transformed to the magnetization of pair (3,4) as  $(M_x; 0; M_z) \neq (M_x; 0; M_z)$ . Hence along with the ferromagnetic moment  $M_z$  along c axis, there is possibility of antiferromagnetic ordering of  $M_x$  component of U pairs (1,2) and (3,4) along a axis producing noncollinear magnetic ordering in a c plane without a further decrease of magnetic symmetry. This type of ordering was reported in the paper<sup>25</sup> as result of neutron powder diffraction experiments. The authors have found the magnetic moments of U atoms  $0.26 \mu_B$  canted in a c plane with angle of  $30^\circ$ . More recent measurements on the polycrystals<sup>2</sup> do not reproduce the data of Ref.[22]. The reported value of AFM component in a c plane has a magnitude smaller than  $0.06 \mu_B$ , but FM ordered component of  $0.37 \mu_B$  is aligned along c axis. These data are in good agreement with LSDA calculations Ref.[7] yielding the AFM component of  $0.03 \mu_B$  and FM component  $0.293 \mu_B$ . To be complete one must mention the recent single-crystal experiments<sup>26</sup> that report no AFM component, but suggest the collinear ordering of magnetization confined in bc plane. This type of magnetization direction being away from high symmetry axis means the decrease of orthorhombic symmetry to monoclinic symmetry due to appearance of ferromagnetism. This is in principle possible but demands from our point the further experimental confirmation.

So, in URhGe we have FM ordering along c axis and tiny AFM ordering along a axis of the oppositely directed magnetic moments of  $U_I$  and  $U_{II}$  pairs of uranium atoms. The Landau free energy expansion has the following form

$$F = z(T)M_z^2 + zM_z^4 + L_x L_x^2 + M_z L_x; \tag{15}$$

where  $L_x = M_x(U_I) - M_x(U_{II})$  is staggered AF magnetization.

Here below the Curie temperature  $z(T) < 0$  and the ferromagnetic moment has nonzero equilibrium value  $M_z^2$   $z=2z$ . At the same time unlike the positive value of  $L_x$  the finite AF magnetization appears

$$L_x = \frac{M_z^2}{2L_x} \tag{16}$$

induced by the ferromagnetism. The smallness of  $L_x$  is determined by the interaction coefficient. The situation reminds the wellknown phenomenon of the weak ferromagnetism<sup>27</sup> allowed by symmetry in antiferromagnetic crystals and induced by small relativistic Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction. Here we have just the opposite situation: the antiferromagnetic moment allowed by symmetry in ordered ferromagnetically crystal is induced by small relativistic interaction. One can call this phenomena by weak antiferromagnetism.

The tiny value of weak antiferromagnetic ordering in URhGe has not been revealed experimentally<sup>2</sup>. It was pointed out that the AF component is smaller than  $0.06 \mu_B$ . It does not contradict to the theoretically calculated value<sup>17</sup> yielding antiferromagnetic component  $0.03 \mu_B$ . The measurements of such a small magnetic moments are in frame of experimental resolution. We note that much smaller values of staggered magnetization have been successfully measured in heavy fermionic materials  $URu_2Si_2$ <sup>28</sup> and  $UPt_3$ <sup>29</sup>. The experiment<sup>2</sup> has been performed on the polycrystalline specimens at temperatures above  $2K$  that is inside of ferromagnetic region (the Curie temperature is  $T_c = 9.5K$ ) but well above the superconductivity appearance (the critical temperature of superconducting transition is  $T_s = 0.3K$ ). As we pointed out the superconductivity in URhGe obeys its own ferromagnetic moment<sup>30</sup> directed parallel to the magnetic moment of ferromagnetic normal state. It causes the additional stimulation of the amplitude of staggered antiferromagnetic moment

$$L_x = \frac{M_z^2 + sM_s}{2L_x}; \tag{17}$$

Hence, below the transition to the superconducting state one can expect the increasing of staggered antiferromagnetic magnetization. The experimental evidence of this type behavior can serve by the direct verification of our understanding of specific superconductivity in ferromagnetic URhGe as nonunitary superconductivity of Cooper pairs with triplet pairing.

## V I. C O N C L U S I O N

In conclusion, we have demonstrated an appearance of abrupt change of magnetization orientation in ferromagnetic URhGe under magnetic field perpendicular to spontaneous magnetization direction. Then the form of the superconducting order parameter compatible with all intermediate magnetic crystal symmetries has been found.

It was shown that particular nonsymmorphic symmetry of ferromagnetic URhGe allows existence of antiferromagnetic ordering of pairs of uranium atoms along a axis. The amplitude of this weak antiferromagnetic order must increase below the phase transition into superconducting state. The experimental verification of this is the direct test for detection of ferromagnetic moment of Cooper pairs.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> S.S. Saxena, P. Agarwal, K. Ahilan, F.M. Grosche, R.K.W. Hasselwimmer, M.J. Steiner, E. Pugh, I.R. Walker, S.R. Julian, P. Monthoux, G.G. Lonzarich, A. Huxley, I. Sheikin, D. Braithwaite, and J. Fluquet, Superconductivity on the border of itinerant-electron ferromagnetism *Nature* 406, 587 (2000).
  - <sup>2</sup> D. Aoki, A. Huxley, E. Ressouche, D. Braithwaite, J. Fluquet, J.-P. Brison, E. Lhotel and C. Paulsen, Coexistence of superconductivity and ferromagnetism in URhGe *Nature* 413, 613 (2001).
  - <sup>3</sup> T. Akazawa, H. Hidaka, T. Fujwara, T. Kobayashi, E. Yamamoto, Y. Haga, R. Settai, and Y. Onuki, Pressure-induced superconductivity in ferromagnetic UIr without inversion symmetry, *J Phys.: Condens. Matter* 16 L29 (2004).
  - <sup>4</sup> A. Huxley, I. Sheikin, E. Ressouche, N. Kemavanois, D. Braithwaite, R. Calken czuk, and J. Fluquet, UGe<sub>2</sub>: A ferromagnetic spin-triplet superconductor *Phys. Rev. B* 63, 144519 (2001).
  - <sup>5</sup> F. Hardi and A. D. Huxley, P-wave superconductivity in the ferromagnetic superconductor URhGe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 94, 247006 (2005).
  - <sup>6</sup> A. Leggett, A theoretical description of the new phases of liquid <sup>3</sup>He *Rev Mod Phys.* 47, 331 (1975).
  - <sup>7</sup> T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Coexistence of ferromagnetism and superconductivity, *Phys Rev. B* 67, 024515 (2003).
  - <sup>8</sup> K.V. Samokhin and M.B. Walker, Symmetry of the order parameter in superconducting ZrZn<sub>2</sub>, *Phys. Rev. B* 66, 024512 (2002).
  - <sup>9</sup> V.P. Mineev, Superconducting states in ferromagnetic metals *Phys Rev. B* 66, 134504 (2002).
  - <sup>10</sup> I.A. Fomin, G ap nodes in the superconducting phase of the itinerant ferromagnet UGe<sub>2</sub>, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 95, 940 (2002).
  - <sup>11</sup> V.P. Mineev and T. Champe, Theory of superconductivity in ferromagnetic superconductors with triplet pairing *Phys. Rev. B* 69, 144521 (2004).
  - <sup>12</sup> V.P. Mineev Superconductivity in ferromagnetic metals and in compounds without inversion centre, *Int. Journ. Mod Phys. B* 18, 2963 (2004).
  - <sup>13</sup> Special issue of *MgB<sub>2</sub>* *Physica (Amsterdam)* 385C, 1-305 (2003).
  - <sup>14</sup> V.P. Mineev and K.V. Samokhin, Introduction to Unconventional Superconductivity, Gordon and Breach, New York, 1999.
  - <sup>15</sup> F. Levy, F. Hardi, I. Sheikin, B. Grenier, and A. D. Huxley Field induced superconductivity in the ferromagnetic superconductor URhGe, *Science*, to be published (2005).
  - <sup>16</sup> A. D. Huxley, private communication.
  - <sup>17</sup> A. B. Shick Electronic and magnetic structure of URhGe, *Phys Rev. B* 65, 180509(R) (2002)
  - <sup>18</sup> S. Sakarya, N. H. van Dijk, E. Brück Determination of the magnetic domain size in the ferromagnetic superconductor UGe<sub>2</sub> by three dimensional neutron depolarization, *Phys. Rev. B* 71, 174417 (2005).
  - <sup>19</sup> G.E. Volovik and L.P. Gor'kov Superconducting classes in heavy fermions systems, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 88, 1412 (1985) [*Sov Phys. JETP* 61, 843 (1985)].
  - <sup>20</sup> M. Faure and A. I. Buzdin Domain structure in a Superconducting Ferromagnet, *Phys Rev Lett.* 94, 187202 (2005).
  - <sup>21</sup> H.W. Meul, C. Rossel, M. Decroux, O. Fisher, G. Remenyi, A. Briggs Observation of Magnetic-Induced Superconductivity, *Phys Rev Lett.* 53, 497 (1984).
  - <sup>22</sup> V. Jaccarino, M. Peter, Ultra-high-eld superconductivity *Phys Rev Lett.* 9, 290 (1962).
  - <sup>23</sup> S.J. Ji, H. Shinagawa, T. Terashima, T. Yakabe, Y. Terai, M. Tokumoto, A. Kobayashi, H. Tanaka, H. Kobayashi Magnetic-eld-induced superconductivity in a two-dimensional organic conductor, *Nature* 410, 908 (2001).
  - <sup>24</sup> L. Balicas, J.S. Brooks, K. Storr, S.J. Ji, M. Tokumoto, H. Tanaka, H. Kobayashi, A. Kobayashi, V. Barzykin, and L.P. Gor'kov Superconductivity in an Organic Insulator at Very High Magnetic Fields *Phys Rev Lett.* 87, 067002 (2001).
  - <sup>25</sup> V.H. Tran, R. Troc, G. Andre Magnetic ordering in URhSi and URhGe, *Journ. Mag Mat.* 186, 81 (1998).
  - <sup>26</sup> K. Prokes, T. Tahara, Y. Echizen, T. Takabatake, T. Fujita, I. H. Hagsa, J.C.P. K. Kaasse, E. B. Nueck, F.R. de Boer, M. D. Ivis, V. Sechovsky Electronic properties a URhGe single crystal, *Physica B* 311, 220 (2002).
  - <sup>27</sup> I.E. Dzyaloshinskii, Thermodynamic theory of weak ferromagnetism of Antiferromagnets, *J Phys Chem Solids*, 4, 241 (1958).
  - <sup>28</sup> C. Broholm, H. Lin, P. T. Matthews, T. E. Mason, W. J. L. Buyers, M. F. Collins, A. A. Menovsky, J. A. Mydosh, and J. K. Janssen Magnetic excitations in the heavy-fermion superconductor URu<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub>, *Phys. Rev. B* 43, 12809 (1991) and references therein.
  - <sup>29</sup> N. H. van Dijk, P. Rodiere, B. Fak, A. Huxley, J. Fluquet Weak antiferromagnetic order and superconductivity in UPt<sub>3</sub> studied by neutron scattering, *Physica B* 319, 220 (2002) and references therein.
  - <sup>30</sup> The magnetic moment in domains of URhGe is screened completely (see the discussion at the end of Section III).