

Local Pairing at U -impurities in BCS Superconductors

Ivar Martin and Philip Phillips
Loomis Laboratory of Physics
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1100 W.Green St., Urbana, IL, 61801-3080

We analyse here the role d -electrons on Anderson- U impurities play in superconductivity in a metal alloy. We find that phonon coupling at impurities counteracts the traditional effects which dominate T_c suppression in the non-magnetic limit. In some cases, we find that non-magnetic impurities can enhance T_c . Qualitative agreement is found between the predicted increase and the experimental data for VI-VI degenerate semiconductors doped with Tl or In. In the Kondo limit, a Fermi liquid analysis reveals that it is the enhancement in the density of states arising from the Kondo resonance that counteracts pair-weakening.

PACS numbers:72.10.Fk, 72.15.Nj, 75.20.Hr

When a non-magnetic Anderson- U impurity¹ is placed in a superconductor, two distinct mechanisms can operate to suppress the superconducting transition temperature, T_c . First, resonant scattering between the U -impurity and the conduction electrons leads to a broadening of the impurity levels. Such broadening increases the amplitude for binding conduction electrons on the impurity thereby inhibiting pair formation². Second, the on-site Coulomb repulsion leads to a weakening of the pairing interaction that keeps two electrons bound in a Cooper pair. As a result, T_c is suppressed^{3,4}.

In the non-magnetic limit, Kondo⁵ impurities also lead to pair-weakening. When $T < T_K$, the formation of a Kondo singlet state at each impurity quenches the local moment⁶. However, the conduction electrons forming the many-body resonance around each impurity are spin-polarized. Consequently, conduction electrons of opposite spin experience a net Coulomb repulsion when they visit a Kondo impurity⁷, thereby weakening the pair-interaction that holds a Cooper pair together.

In theoretical treatments of the pair-weakening effect⁸⁻¹¹, it is generally assumed that electrons on the impurities do not participate in superconductivity. That this view might not be entirely consistent can be seen from the early work of Ratto and Blandin (RB)³. Within an Anderson- U model in a BCS superconductor, Ratto and Blandin³ showed that the Cooper pair amplitude on a U impurity is non-zero. Hence, electron pairs annihilated on a U -impurity re-emerge in the conduction band as a Cooper pair. In addition, Suhl also suggested that local impurities should give rise to local regions of superconductivity¹².

In this work, we consider explicitly phonon-induced pairing on non-magnetic Anderson- U -impurities in a BCS superconductor. First, we show that the phonon coupling constants involving the impurity are at least as large as $\lambda_{kk'}$, the standard phonon coupling constant for the Cooper pairs in the conduction band. As a result, such local processes can lead to an enhancement, relative to previous treatments^{3,4,8} of T_c . While it is

well-known that pure potential scattering can enhance T_c in low- T_c materials¹³ through coupling to transverse phonon modes, the present work suggests that in the case of non-magnetic U -impurities, an additional channel is available to enhance T_c .

The starting point for our analysis is a collection of identical non-interacting (dilute limit) Anderson- U impurities

$$H_o = \sum_{k,\sigma} \epsilon_k a_{k\sigma}^\dagger a_{k\sigma} + \epsilon_d \sum_{i\sigma} a_{i\sigma}^\dagger a_{i\sigma} + \sum_{k,i\sigma} V_{ik} (a_{k\sigma}^\dagger a_{i\sigma} + a_{i\sigma}^\dagger a_{k\sigma}) + U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} \quad (1)$$

In Eq. (1), ϵ_d is the defect energy of the impurity, V_{ik} the overlap integral between a band state with momentum k and the i^{th} impurity, $a_{k\sigma}^\dagger$ creates an electron in the band, $a_{i\sigma}^\dagger$ creates an electron with spin σ on the i^{th} impurity and $n_{i\sigma} = a_{i\sigma}^\dagger a_{i\sigma}$. In the Hartree-Fock limit, each impurity level is broadened with a width $\Gamma = \rho_o \langle |V_{ik}|^2 \rangle$ where ρ_o is the density of states at the Fermi level. As a result of the hybridization of the localized level with electrons in the conduction band, the on-site Coulomb repulsion is felt by all electrons in the system. To include the pairing interactions in the superconducting state, we write the total Hamiltonian as $H = H_o + H_{\text{pair}}$ where H_{pair} contains the BCS interactions among all the electrons:

$$H_{\text{pair}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,k'} \lambda_{kk'} a_{k\uparrow}^\dagger a_{-k\downarrow}^\dagger a_{-k'\downarrow} a_{k'\uparrow} + \lambda_d \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} + \sum_{ik} \lambda_{ik} (a_{i\uparrow}^\dagger a_{i\downarrow}^\dagger a_{-k\downarrow} a_{k\uparrow} + h.c.) \quad (2)$$

where the λ 's are determined by the electron-phonon interaction. The last two terms in Eq. (2) account for local pairing on the U -impurity as well as scattering of Cooper pairs between the impurity and band states. In the non-magnetic limit, this problem has been solved previously without the last two terms^{3,4,9}.

It is instructive at the outset to establish the magnitude of the coupling constants in the last two terms in Eq. (2). To evaluate λ_d and λ_{ik} we expand the impurity states $|i\sigma\rangle = \sum_k \alpha_{i\sigma k\sigma} |k\sigma\rangle$ in terms of the k-states, $|k\sigma\rangle$, in the band. In the expansion for the impurity states, we relied on the completeness of the k-basis. If the bandwidth D is finite, the k-states do not form a complete set. However, what is essential here is that the band contain the states $|\epsilon_k - \epsilon_F| < \Gamma$. As is typically done, we assume that the matrix element $\lambda_{kk'} = \lambda_o$ is a constant for k-states with $|\epsilon_k - \epsilon_F|$ less than ω_D , the Debye frequency of the metal. In the estimates that follow, we will assume that $\omega_D > \Gamma$. Using the standard form for the electron-phonon interaction, $V_{ph} = \lambda_o a_{k+q\uparrow}^\dagger a_{k'-q\downarrow}^\dagger a_{k'\downarrow} a_{k\uparrow}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_d &= \langle i\uparrow, i\downarrow | V_{ph} | i\uparrow, i\downarrow \rangle \\ &= \lambda_o \sum_{k, k', q} \alpha_{i\uparrow, k+q\uparrow}^* \alpha_{i\downarrow, k'-q\downarrow}^* \alpha_{i\uparrow, k\uparrow} \alpha_{i\downarrow, k'\downarrow} = \lambda_o \sum_q g(q). \end{aligned}$$

From the orthogonality of the k-states, it follows that $\sum_k |\alpha_{i\sigma k\sigma}|^2 = 1$; hence, $g(q=0) = 1$. From the continuity of $g(q)$ it follows that $\lambda_d = \tilde{N}\lambda_o$, where \tilde{N} is proportional to the number of electrons in the conduction band. Hence, the on-site phonon interaction for the impurity electrons, is enhanced over the k-state pairing value. Consequently, the effective on-site Coulomb repulsion is reduced to $\tilde{U} = U + \lambda_d$. Similarly, the scattering matrix element

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ki} &= \lambda_{ik} = \langle i\uparrow, i\downarrow | V_{ph} | k\uparrow, -k\downarrow \rangle \\ &= \lambda_o \sum_q \alpha_{i\uparrow, k+q\uparrow}^* \alpha_{i\downarrow, -k-q\downarrow}^* \approx \lambda_o \end{aligned}$$

is also related to λ_o . An exact equality obtains if two conditions are true, namely $\langle x|d\rangle$ is real and $\alpha_{i\uparrow, k\uparrow} = \alpha_{i\downarrow, k\downarrow}$. As we will see, the presence of the mixing term λ_{ki} enhances the density of electron states participating in superconductivity. We will assume that λ_{ki} is a constant. Both effects, reduction of the on-site Coulomb repulsion and the enhancement of density of states at the Fermi level, play a positive role in superconductivity. *We show ultimately that they can conspire to increase T_c in the non-magnetic limit.*

A simple way to make these heuristic arguments rigorous is through the Hartree-Fock decoupling of the Green function equations of motion method used by RB³. While more sophisticated methods exist,^{11,14,15} the work of RB³ is sufficient to describe the non-magnetic limit of the Anderson model. The linearized Hartree-Fock equations of motion for the creation operators can be written succinctly

$$\begin{aligned} [H, a_{k\sigma}^\dagger] &= \epsilon_k a_{k\sigma}^\dagger + \sum_i V_{ik} a_{i\sigma}^\dagger - \Delta_k^\dagger a_{-k-\sigma} \\ [H, a_{i\sigma}^\dagger] &= E a_{i\sigma}^\dagger + \sum_k V_{ik} a_{k\sigma}^\dagger - \Delta_i a_i^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

in terms of matrix elements of the gap,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k &= -\lambda_o \sum_{k'} \langle a_{k'\uparrow} a_{-k'\downarrow} \rangle - \sum_i \lambda_{ki} \langle a_{i\uparrow} a_{i\downarrow} \rangle \\ \Delta_i &= -\tilde{U} \langle a_{i\uparrow} a_{i\downarrow} \rangle - \lambda_{ki} \sum_{k'} \langle a_{k'\uparrow} a_{-k'\downarrow} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The Hartree-Fock on-site energy is $E = \epsilon_d + \tilde{U} \langle n_i \rangle$, with $\langle n_i \rangle = \langle n_{i\uparrow} \rangle = \langle n_{i\downarrow} \rangle$. The presence of λ_{ki} causes the gap equations to become coupled. In fact, it is through this coupling that the single-particle density of states becomes enhanced.

Let us define $\eta = \lambda_{ki}/\lambda_o$ and introduce the Green functions $G(p, q; t) = -\langle T [a_{p\sigma}(t) a_{q\sigma}^\dagger(0)] \rangle$ and $F^\dagger(p, q; t) = \langle T [a_{-p\downarrow}^\dagger a_{q\uparrow}^\dagger(0)] \rangle$. Here p or q represent either a local impurity or a band state. In terms of the discrete frequencies $\omega = \omega_n \equiv (2n+1)\pi T$, the Fourier components of the Green functions are defined as $G(p, q; t) = T \sum_\omega e^{-i\omega t} G_\omega(p, q)$. The gap equations, Eq. (4) are then linear combinations

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k^\dagger &= -\lambda_o T \sum_\omega \left(\sum_{k'} F_\omega^\dagger(k, k') + \eta \sum_i F_\omega^\dagger(i, i) \right) \\ \Delta_i^\dagger &= -T \tilde{U} \sum_{\omega} F_\omega^\dagger(i, i) - T \lambda_o \eta \sum_{k', \omega} F_\omega^\dagger(k', k'). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

of the F_ω^\dagger Green functions. The sum over k' in Eq.(5) is restricted over a momentum shell around the Fermi surface of width ω_D . Eq. (5) must be solved to obtain T_c . To facilitate this, we introduce the Hartree-Fock approximation to the Hamiltonian in the normal metal, \tilde{H}_o as well as the corresponding Green function, \tilde{G} . From the Hartree-Fock equation of motion, $(i\omega - \tilde{H}_o) \tilde{G}_\omega = 1$ and the Gor'kov equations¹⁶, $(i\omega - \tilde{H}_o) \tilde{G}_\omega + \Delta F_\omega^\dagger = 1$ and $(i\omega + \tilde{H}) F_\omega^\dagger + \Delta^\dagger G_\omega = 0$, it follows that to linear order in the gap, $F_\omega^\dagger(p, q) = \tilde{G}_{-\omega}(-\ell, -p) \Delta_\ell^\dagger \tilde{G}_\omega(\ell, q)$, where ℓ is summed over the k and i -states. This approximation is valid at and slightly below the critical temperature T_c where the gap first appears. If we now substitute this expression into the self-consistent gap equations (Eq.(5)) and average over the random position of the impurities as well as average products of Green functions, we obtain a quadratic equation,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + T_c \lambda_o \sum_{\omega, k} \left[\sum_{k'} S_\omega(k, k') + \eta n_s (S_\omega(k, i) + S_\omega(i, k)) \right] \\ + T_c \tilde{U} \sum_{\omega, j} S_\omega(i, j) = T_c^2 \lambda_o (\tilde{U} - \lambda_o \eta^2) \sum_{\omega, \omega', k, k'} [n_s S_\omega(i, k) \times \\ S_{\omega'}(k', i) - \sum_j S_\omega(k, k') S_{\omega'}(i, j)] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

for the transition temperature where n_s is the impurity concentration. We have introduced the average

$S_\omega(p, q) = \langle \tilde{G}_\omega(p, q) \tilde{G}_{-\omega}(-p, -q) \rangle_{av}$. In obtaining Eq. (6) we decoupled the gap from the average of the product of Green functions.

To facilitate a solution for T_c , we note that the on-site repulsion \tilde{U} and the phonon coupling strength λ_o are of quite different magnitudes. Typically, $\tilde{U} \gg |\lambda_o|$. In this limit, Eq. (6) simplifies to an equation linear in the phonon coupling,

$$\frac{1}{|\lambda_o|} = T_c \sum_{\omega, k} \left[\sum_{k'} S_\omega(k, k') + 2\eta_{\text{eff}} n_s S_\omega(k, i) - n_s T_c \tilde{U}_{\text{eff}} \sum_{\omega', k'} S_{\omega'}(k, i) S_\omega(i, k') \right] \quad (7)$$

where the subscript “eff” indicates division by $(1 + \tilde{U} T_c \sum_{\omega, j} S_\omega(i, j))$.

The averages appearing in Eq. (7) can be evaluated straightforwardly following the ladder summation techniques. For example,³

$$\sum_{k, k'} S_\omega(k, k') \approx \frac{2\rho_o}{|\omega|} \tan^{-1} \frac{\omega_D}{|\omega|} - n_s \frac{\Gamma}{E^2 + (|\omega| + \Gamma)^2} + O(n_s^2) \quad (8)$$

The other averages are computed analogously. If we use these expressions for S_ω coupled with the standard BCS expression for the transition temperature, $(|\lambda_o| \rho_o)^{-1} = \ln(2e\gamma\omega_D/(\pi T_{co}))$, we obtain that

$$\ln \frac{T_c}{T_{co}} = n_s A \frac{\rho_d(\epsilon_F)}{\rho_o} \left[2\eta_{\text{eff}} - 1 - A \rho_d(\epsilon_F) \tilde{U}_{\text{eff}} \right] \quad (9)$$

where

$$A = \ln \left(2\gamma \sqrt{E^2 + \Gamma^2} / \pi T_{co} \right) - \frac{\Gamma}{E} \tan^{-1} \frac{E}{\Gamma} \quad (10)$$

$$\eta_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\eta}{1 + (U/\pi E) \tan^{-1}(E/\Gamma)}$$

with γ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. The corresponding expression for U_{eff} can be obtained from Eq. (10) by replacing η with U . The local density on the impurity, $\rho_d(\epsilon_F) = \Gamma/(\pi(E^2 + \Gamma^2))$, is given by the standard Lorentzian form¹. Recall the η dependence arises from the scattering from a Cooper pair between the band and localized states. Also $\tilde{U} < U$ as a result of the phonon coupling on U -impurities. The importance of these terms should now be clear. When $\eta_{\text{eff}} = 0$ and $\tilde{U} = U$, the correction to T_c is precisely the negative correction of RB³. For $\eta \neq 0$ and $\tilde{U} < U$, the transition temperature is enhanced relative to the predictions in earlier treatments of this problem⁸⁻¹¹. In fact, we compare in Fig. (1) the predictions of the present theory for the initial slope of T_c with the earlier predictions of RB³. For modest values of Γ and \tilde{U} , we find that non-magnetic impurities can actually enhance T_c in contrast to the suppression indicative

of pair-weakening. The magnitude of the increase in T_c is of $O(n_s \epsilon_F / (n_o \Gamma))$, where n_o is the conduction electron density.




FIG. 1. Theoretical values for the initial slope of T_c predicted from Eq. (9) as a function of the filling, $\langle n_d \rangle$, on the impurity. ρ_o is the density of states, n_s is the impurity concentration and $\Gamma = 2.0eV$ and $\tilde{U} = 0.5eV$.

Experimentally, T_c has been observed to increase when transition metals were doped into Ti¹⁷. Anderson¹⁸ has suggested that transition metals such as Fe are non-magnetic in Ti and hence might possibly increase T_c . While the present theory is consistent with the experimental trends, the agreement should not be taken as a confirmation because the experimental samples contained unusually high dopant concentrations¹⁷. Further experiments are needed on such samples in the dilute impurity regime to determine if non-magnetic impurities do in fact increase T_c . However, in the context of degenerate semiconductors such as PbTe and SnTe doped with Tl and In, respectively, the observed superconductivity has been attributed to arise solely from impurity states¹⁹. In SnTe doped with In, T_c was increased by an order of magnitude with a 1% In-impurity level. More striking is the behavior in PbTe. In this material, superconductivity with a transition temperature of $T_c = 1 - 2K$ was observed only upon doping with Tl. Dopants such as Na yield no superconductivity down to temperatures of $T = .009K$. Experimentally and theoretically²⁰, it is now well-accepted that local-phonon coupling at the dopant impurities is largely responsible for superconductivity in these semiconductors. In addition, the impurities are thought to be in the extreme mixed-valence regime as the on-site repulsion is much less than the hybridization energy²⁰. The large dielectric constant ($\epsilon^{\text{PbTe}} \approx 33$) is primarily responsible for the lowering of the on-site Coulomb repulsion. For the experimentally relevant carrier concentrations and an impurity doping level of 1%, we estimate that $n_s/n_o \sim 1$ and $\epsilon_F \sim .8eV$. Also, Γ has been estimated¹⁹ to range between .01 to .1eV. For

$\Gamma = .1\text{eV}$, we estimate the magnitude of the relative increase in T_c to be $O(n_s\epsilon_F/(n_o\Gamma)) \approx 10$ which is qualitatively consistent with the increase seen experimentally.

We can extend this analysis to the non-magnetic limit, $T < T_K$, of the Kondo problem. In this limit $\langle n_i \rangle = 1/2$. Below T_K , a Kondo system is described by a screened impurity in a Landau Fermi liquid with relatively weak quasi-particle interactions⁷. Sakurai⁹ has shown that the non-magnetic limit of the Hartree-Fock treatment of an Anderson impurity can be used to describe a Kondo system for $T < T_K$ by making the following transformation: 1) $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma/\tilde{\chi}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and 2) $\tilde{U}_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^d = \pi\Gamma\tilde{\chi}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$. We have introduced the vertex function $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^d$ for the inelastic scattering of a pair of d-electrons of opposite spin. Below T_K , the susceptibilities are given by $\tilde{\chi}_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \tilde{\chi}_{\uparrow\uparrow} = \pi\Gamma/(4T_K)$. To calculate the transition temperature, we also need an expression for η_{eff} . According to Eq. (9), η and U are rescaled in the same way. Hence, in the ladder approximation, the value of η_{eff} can be obtained by comparing two diagrams which correspond to $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^d$ (see Fig. (2a)), and the diagram for the scattering of a pair of k-electrons into a pair of d-electrons as shown in Fig. (2b). We obtain that $\eta_{\text{eff}} = \eta(\pi\Gamma)^2/(4T_K\tilde{U})$. Hence, the initial slope in T_c is

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_{co}} = \frac{n_s}{4\rho_o T_K} A' \left(\frac{2\pi\Gamma\eta}{\tilde{U}} - A' \right). \quad (11)$$

where $A' = \ln(8\gamma(T_K/\pi^2 T_{co})) - 1$.




FIG. 2. a) The vertex part of $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow}^d$ in the ladder approximation. b) the corresponding vertex for the scattering of a pair of k-electrons into a pair of d-electrons.

To make contact with the Fermi-liquid picture of the Kondo problem, we rewrite this expression in the suggestive form

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_{co}} \approx \frac{n_s}{\rho_o T_K} \ln \left(\frac{T_K}{T_{co}} \right) \left(2\eta - \ln \left(\frac{T_K}{T_{co}} \right) \right) \quad (12)$$

where we have used the fact that in the Kondo limit²¹, $\pi\Gamma = \tilde{U} = 4T_K/w$ with w the Wilson number and we

have dropped all irrelevant constants. Within the Fermi-liquid picture, $T_c \propto T_K \exp(\lambda^{-1})$ where λ is the dimensionless phonon coupling. In this expression, T_K replaces ω_D because electrons which are further away from the Fermi level than T_K are strongly scattered. In the presence of U -impurities, there are two corrections to the dimensionless coupling constant λ . First, we must include the enhancement in the density of states arising from the Kondo resonance. This enhancement⁷ scales as n_s/T_K . In addition, we must include the repulsion between quasi-particle states of opposite spin. The repulsion energy is essentially T_K below the Kondo temperature^{7,21}. Within the quasi-particle picture, this repulsion is spread over $(\rho_o T_K)^2$ states because there are two electrons participating in each scattering event. Hence, the change in the dimensionless coupling constant is given by²²

$$\frac{\delta\lambda}{\lambda} = \frac{\delta\rho}{\rho_o} + \frac{\delta V}{V} = \frac{n_s}{\rho_o T_K} + \frac{n_s}{\lambda\rho_o T_K} \quad (13)$$

However, $\Delta T_c = -T_c \delta\lambda/\lambda^2$. Consequently, the initial slope in T_c from the heuristic Fermi-liquid arguments

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_{co}} = \frac{n_s}{\rho_o T_K} \ln \left(\frac{T_K}{T_{co}} \right) \left(1 - \ln \left(\frac{T_K}{T_{co}} \right) \right) \quad (14)$$

is identical in form to the more exact expression derived in Eq. (12) because η is $O(1)$. The second term in both of these expressions is the standard pair-weakening effect, whereas the first is a positive correction arising from the enhancement in the density of states at a Kondo impurity. In the strong-coupling regime, $|\lambda| > 1$, Eq. (13) predicts that Kondo impurities can enhance T_c . We conclude then that non-magnetic impurities by virtue of local phonon pairing can counteract the standard T_c suppressing effects and in some cases actually enhance T_c . Experimental systems on which this prediction can be tested are the transition metal alloy Ti(Fe) and degenerate semiconductors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank P. Nozieres for assistance with the Fermi liquid formulation and A. Castro Neto, E. Fradkin, Y. Wan, W. Beyerman, Z. Fisk for useful discussions and V. Chandresekhar for pointing out reference 13 to us and A. L. Shelankov for pointing out his related work (see ref. 20) and the application to IV-VI compounds. This work is supported in part by the NSF grants No. DMR94-96134.

¹ P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **124**, 41 (1961).

- ² M. J. Zuckermann, Phys. Rev. **140**, A899 (1965).
- ³ C. F. Ratto and A. Blandin, Phys. Rev. **156**, 513 (1967).
- ⁴ A. B. Kaiser, J. Phys. C. **3**, 410 (1970).
- ⁵ J. Kondo, Prog. Theor. Phys. **32**, 37 (1964).
- ⁶ K. Yosida, Phys. Rev. **147**, 223 (1966).
- ⁷ P. Nozieres, J. Low Temp. Phys. **17**, 31 (1974).
- ⁸ T. Matsuura, S. Ichinose, and Y. Nagaoka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **57**, 713 (1977).
- ⁹ A. Sakurai, Phys. Rev. B **17**, 1195 (1978).
- ¹⁰ N. E. Bickers and G. E. Zwicknagl, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 6746 (1987).
- ¹¹ L. S. Borkowski and P. J. Hirschfeld, J. Low Temp. Phys. **96**, 185 (1994).
- ¹² a.) H. Suhl, Low-Temperature Physics, lectures at Les Houches, 1961, edited by C. De Witt, B. Dreyfus, and P. G. de Gennes (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1962), p. 258. b.) See also H. Suhl, D. R. Fredkin, J. S. Langer, and B. T. Matthias, Phys. Rev. Lett. **9**, 63 (1962).
- ¹³ D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 47 (1987).
- ¹⁴ Y. Yosida, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **46**, 244 (1970).
- ¹⁵ M. Salomaa, Solid State Comm. **38**, 815 (1981); B. Horvatic and V. Zlatic, ibid. **54**, 957 (1985).
- ¹⁶ L. P. Gor'kov, Sov. Phys. JETP **2**, 1364 (1959).
- ¹⁷ B. T. Matthias, A. C. Compton, H. Suhl, and E. Corenzwit, Phys. Rev. **115**, 1597 (1959).
- ¹⁸ P. W. Anderson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **50**, 191 (1978).
- ¹⁹ I. A. Chernik and S. N. Lykov, Sov. Phys. Solid state **23**, 1724 (1981); G. S. Bushmarina, I. A. Drabkin, V. V. Kompaniets, R. V., Parfen'ev, D. V. Shamshur, and M. A. Shakhov, Sov. Phys. Solid State **28**, 612 (1986).
- ²⁰ A. L. Shelankov, Solid State Comm. **62**, 327 (1987).
- ²¹ A. C. Hewson, The Kondo Problem to Heavy Fermions (Cambridge University Press, 1993), Chaps. 5 and 10.
- ²² P. Nozieres, private communication.