## Theory of Interplay of Nuclear M agnetism and Superconductivity in AuIn<sub>2</sub>

M.L.Kulić<sup>2</sup>, A.I.Buzdin<sup>2</sup>, and L.N.Bulaevskii<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Festkorperforschung, Heisenbergstr. 1, 70569 Stuttgart, G em any

<sup>2</sup>Centre de Physique Theorique et de Modelisation, Universite Bordeaux I, CNRS-URA 1537 Gradignan Cedex, France

<sup>3</sup>Los A lam os National Laboratory, Los A lam os, NM 87545 U SA

(M arch 23, 2024)

The recently reported<sup>1</sup> coexistence of a magnetic order, with the critical temperature  $T_M = 35$  K, and superconductivity, with the critical temperature  $T_S = 207$  mK, in A uIn<sub>2</sub> is studied theoretically. It is shown that superconducting (S) electrons and localized nuclear magnetic moments (LM 's) interact dom inantly via the contact hyper ne (EX) interaction, giving rise to a spiral (or dom ain-like) magnetic order in superconducting phase. The electrom agnetic interaction between LM 's and S electrons is small compared to the EX one giving minor contribution to the formation of the oscillatory magnetic order. In clean samples (l>  $_0$ ) of A uIn<sub>2</sub> the oscillatory magnetic order should produce a line of nodes in the quasiparticle spectrum of S electrons giving rise to the power law behavior. The critical ed H  $_c$  (T = 0) in the coexistence phase is reduced by factor two with respect to its bare value.

e-m ail: kulic@ audreym pi-stuttgart m pg.de

The problem of the coexistence of magnetic (M) order and superconductivity (S) is a long-standing one, which was rst considered in 1956 theoretically by V. L.G inzburg<sup>2</sup>, and then intensively discussed after the discovery of the ternary rare earth (RE) compounds  $(RE)Rh_4B_4$  and  $(RE)Mo_6X_8$   $(X = S_rSe)^{3;4}$ . In many of these compounds both ferrom agnetic (F) and antiferrom agnetic (AF) orderings, which coexist with S, have been observed<sup>3;4</sup>. It turns out that S and AF orderings coexist in several of these compounds<sup>5</sup> usually down to T = 0 K, while S and m odi ed F (spiral) orderings coexist only in lim ited tem perature interval in  $ErRh_4B_4$ , HoM  $o_6S_8$  and H oM  $o_6 Se_8$ , due to their antagonistic characters<sup>3</sup>. A general theory of magnetic superconductors has been developed in Refs. 3,6,7, where possibilities for the coexistence of S and spiral or dom ain-like m agnetic order (which is the modi ed F order in the presence of superconductivity) have been elaborated quantitatively by including the exchange and electrom agnetic interaction of superconducting electrons and localized m agnetic m om ents (LM 's). To the sim ilar conclusion came also B lount and Varm a<sup>8</sup> by taking into account the electrom agnetic interaction only. Note, that some heavy ferm ions UPt<sub>3</sub>, URu<sub>2</sub>Si<sub>2</sub> etc. show the coexistence of the AF and S orderings, while S and oscillatory M order coexist in quaternary interm etallic compounds (RE)N  $\frac{1}{2}B_2C$ , see Ref. 9.

H ow ever, until recently it was in possible to investigate the interplay of S and nuclear magnetic order, because of lack of suitable materials. Thanks to the pioneering work on superconductivity and magnetism at ultra-low tem – peratures by P obel's group in G erm any<sup>1;10 {12</sup>, as well as of Lounasm aa's one in Finland<sup>13;14</sup>, at least two materials were discovered where S and nuclear M order seem to coexist. The rst one is metallic Rh, which is superconducting at  $T_{\rm S}$  = 325 K and whose nuclear moments might be ordered antiferrom agnetically at  $T_{\rm N}$  1 nK, see Refs. 15,16. There are also some hints on the AF

order at negative nuclear tem perature  $T_n$ . Rh is an interesting system because of its rather large K orringa constant ( $_1 T_e$ ) 10 s K, where is the spin-lattice relaxation time and  $T_e$  is the electronic tem perature. Large

(or  $_1$ ) in R h allow sto achieve very low nuclear tem peratures  $T_n \qquad T_e$ , as well as a realization of negative  $T_n$ . The problem of the competition of nuclear magnetism and S order in R h will be studied elsewhere.

A remarkable achievement in this eld was recently done by Pobel's group by investigating AuIn<sub>2</sub>, where the coexistence of the nuclear ferror agnetism and superconductivity ( $T_s = 207 \text{ m K}$ ) was found<sup>10</sup>,<sup>11</sup> below  $T_M = 35 \text{ K}$ . Because of good them all coupling of nuclear magnetic moments to the conduction electrons in AuIn<sub>2</sub> (Korringa constant = 0:1 s K) the experiments were performed in them all equilibrium  $T_n = T_e$  down to T = 25 K. It was also found that AuIn<sub>2</sub> is a type-I superconductor with the bare critical eld  $H_{c0}$  (T = 0) = 14:5 G, which would be in absence of the F ordering, while in its presence  $H_c(T)$  is decreased, i.e.  $H_c = 8:7 \text{ G}$  at T = 25 K. The latter result is a hint that S and F orderings m ight coexist in the bulk down to T = 0.

In the following the coexistence of S and M order in  $A u In_2$  is studied in the fram ework of the m icroscopic theory of magnetic superconductors<sup>3;6</sup>. It considers interactions between LM 's and conduction electrons: a) via the direct hyper ne interaction { because of simplicity it is called the exchange (EX) one; b) via the dipolar magnetic eld B<sub>m</sub> (r) = 4 M (r), which is created by LM 's, it is called electrom agnetic (EM) interaction. The general H am iltonian which describes conducting electrons and nucleim om ents in AuIn<sub>2</sub> is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}} = d^{3}\mathbf{r}\mathbf{f}^{y}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}) \quad (\mathbf{r}) + [(\mathbf{r})^{y}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i}_{y}^{y}(\mathbf{r}) \\ + c\mathbf{r}] + \frac{\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r})^{2}}{V} + \sum_{i}^{X} J_{en} \quad (\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r})^{y}(\mathbf{r}) \quad \mathbf{I}_{i} \quad (\mathbf{r})$$

$$+\frac{[curlA (r)]^{2}}{8}g + \prod_{i}^{X} [B (r_{i})g_{n n}I_{i} + \hat{H}_{a}(I_{i})] + \hat{H}_{inp}: (1)$$

Here, (p), (r), A; Jen (r) and V are the quasiparticle energy, the superconducting order param eter, the vector potential, the hyper ne contact coupling between electronic spins (Paulim atrices) and localized nuclearm om ents (LM 's)  $I_i$  and the electron-phonon coupling constant respectively. The st three terms in Eq. (1) describe the superconducting mean-eld H am iltonian in the magnetic eld B (r) = curlA (r) due to LM 's and screening current, while the term  $\hat{H}_{im p}$  describes the electron scattering (including also the spin-orbit one) on nonm agnetic in purities. The term B (r\_i)g\_n \_n I\_i describes the dipole-dipole interaction of LM 's, as well as their interaction with the magnetic eld due to screening superconducting current { see more below.  $\hat{H_a}(I_i)$  is (together with the dipole-dipole interaction) responsible for magnetic anisotropy of LM 's. In the case of  $AuIn_2$ , which is simple cubic crystal, its form is unknown { see discussion below. Later we show that under experimental conditions reported in R efs. 1,10,11 the ferrom agnetic structure, which would be in absence of S order, is transform ed in the presence of superconductivity into spiral (or dom ain-like) one { depending on m agnetic anisotropy.

A . The characteristic parameters of A  $u \mbox{I} n_2$ 

The magnetic critical tem perature  $T_M = 35$  K is very small compared to  $T_S$ 02 K, and it is much larger than the characteristic dipole-dipole tem perature em ( 1 K), see below. This fact allows us to estimate the hyper ne contact interaction between electrons and LM 's, which is characterized by the parameter  $h_{ex}$  =  $J_{en}$  (0) $n_m$  j  $hI_i$ i j, where  $n_m$  is the concentration of LM 's. The indirect exchange energy (via conduction electrons) between the LM 's of nuclei is characterized by the RKKY tem perature  $e_x = N (0)h_{e_x}^2 = n_m$ , where N (0) is the electronic density of states at the Ferm i level The  $3 \quad 1\hat{\theta}^2 \text{ cm }^3$ . crystallographic structure gives n<sub>m</sub> N (0) is obtained by knowing H  $_{c0}$  (T = 0) = 14:5 G, see Refs. 1,10, which gives N (0) 0:64  $1\hat{0}^4$  erg 1 cm  $^3$ . Since  $T_M$  (= 35 K) is predom inantly due to the indirect exchange interaction between In nucleim om ents one has  $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{M}}$ <sub>ex</sub>, which gives h<sub>ex</sub> 1 K.N ote that one has  $h_{ex} > 0$  ( 0:36 K), which gives rise to a gapless quasiparticle spectrum in S state below  $T_M$  in clean samples (1 > 0) of AuIn<sub>2</sub>, see below.

The electrom agnetic (EM) dipole-dipole interaction between LM 's is characterized by  $_{em} = 2 n_m^{-2}$ , where  $= g_{n-n} I$ : In case of the In nuclei in the AuIn<sub>2</sub> cubic crystal one has ' 5.5 n, i.e.  $_{em}$  1.2 K ( $T_M$ ), which m eans that the dipole-dipole interaction does not contribute to  $T_M$  in AuIn<sub>2</sub>. How ever, it m akes the m agnetic structure transverse in S state, see below.

From  $_0$  (' 1:76 T<sub>S</sub>) and v<sub>F</sub> 1:68 18 cm /s<sup>10;11</sup> one gets  $_0$  ' 10<sup>5</sup> A, while from the resistivity m easurem ents<sup>1;11</sup>, where RRR=500, one obtains 1 3:6 10<sup>4</sup> A. A coordingly, the spin-orbit scattering m eanfree path is very large, i.e.  $l_{so} > 3:6$  10<sup>4</sup> A, because one always has  $l_{so} > 1$ . Note that  $l < _0$  and the system is in the dirty (but not very dirty) limit. The London penetration depth \_L 200 A is estimated from  $H_{co}$ and by knowing \_0 and l, which means that AuIn<sub>2</sub> is the type I superconductor at temperatures where S and M orderings coexist. >From the above analysis we estimate the parameter ( $h_{ex} = h_1^2 = 0.1$ . It is small and dirty limit may be used to treat e ect of exchange eld on superconductivity. This simpli es the theoretical analysis given below. Here =  $l=v_f$  is the electron scattering time.

B. Theoretical analysis of A u  $\rm In_2$ 

It was shown in Refs. 3,6,17 that when the electron spin-orbit interaction is weak, i.e. when  $l_{\rm so}=1$   $(k_{\rm F}^{-1}~_0=1^2)^{2=3}$ , there is a peak in the spin susceptibility in the superconducting state at nonzero wave vector Q. This means that in the superconducting state an oscillatory magnetic order is more favorable than the F one. In AuIn<sub>2</sub> one has  $k_{\rm F}$  = 1.45A  $^1$  and thus the condition for an oscillatory magnetic order is  $l_{\rm so}$ 

10<sup>2</sup>l. Since by de nition  $\frac{1}{2}$  > 1 we see that the spin-orbit interaction does not play any role in the formation of the magnetic structure in the coexistence phase of AuIn2. The magnetic order can be a spiral or dom ainlike one, depending on the magnetic anisotropy, see below. The problem is now reduced to the study of electrons moving in an oscillatory (with the wave vector Q) exchange and magnetic eld  $h_{ex}$  (R) =  $h_{ex}$  S(R), B (R) = curlA (R) respectively. By using the Eilenberger equations for the norm alg! (v;R) and anom alous f: (v;R) electronic G reen's function, where the superconducting order parameter (R) is a solution of the selfconsistency equation (R) = 2 g  $_{!}$  dn f<sub>!</sub> (R;n)=4 (q = N (0)V is the electron-phonon coupling constant) one obtains the free-energy functional of the system  $F_{SM}$  f ;  $S_Q$  ; Q g. It may be presented as a sum of magnetic ( $F_M$  ), superconducting ( $F_S$  ) and interacting ( $F_{int}$ ) parts, i.e.  $F_{SM} f$ ;  $S(R)g = F_S f g + F_M fS_Q$ ; Qg + $F_{int}f$ ;  $S_{0}$ ; Qg). By assuming that: a)  $E_{s}=F_{int} > 1$ ,  $E_s = N(0)^2 = 2n_m$  { this is indeed fullled in AuIn<sub>2</sub>, where E<sub>s</sub>=F<sub>int</sub> 100, and b) the Ferm i surface is isotropic { it is also ful lled in AuIn, one gets the freeenergy F<sub>SM</sub>

$$F_{s}f g = \frac{1}{2}N(0)^{-2}\ln\frac{e^{-\frac{2}{0}}}{2};$$

$$F_{int} = F_{int}^{ex} + F_{int}^{em} = F_{int}^{ex} + \frac{X}{2} \frac{3^{-2}e^{m} jS_{Q;2}}{v_{F}Q(LQ)^{2}};$$
(2)

Here the term s F\_{int}^{ex} and F\_{int}^{em} in Eq. (2) describe the exchange EX and EM interaction of superconducting electrons with LM 's respectively. F\_{int}^{ex}, and F\_M depend on  $h_{ex}$ , S<sub>Q</sub>, l, <sub>0</sub> etc. We consider only those cases which m ight be important for the physics of AuIn<sub>2</sub>.

1:Dirty case  $(l < _0)$ . This case is realized in AuIn<sub>2</sub> as reported in Refs.1,10, where 1 3:6 10<sup>th</sup> A and  $_0$  10<sup>th</sup> A. Im mediately below the magnetic critical temperature

 $T_{M}~=~35~$  K the magnetization is small and  $F_{M}~$  has the form

$$F_{M} = \int_{Q}^{X} f_{ex m}^{1}(Q)[jS_{Q}; f + jS_{Q}; f]$$

$$= \int_{Q}^{Q} f_{em}^{1}[Q][jS_{Q}; f]$$

where Q  $S = Q S_{Q;k}$  and  $m^{1}(T;Q) = (T e_{x}) = e_{x} + Q^{2}=12k_{F}^{2}$ . Here,  $k_{F} = 1.45 A^{-1}$  is the Ferm iwave vector. The isotropic term  $F_{0}fS_{Q}^{2}g$  (per LM) describes higher order term s in  $S_{Q}^{2}$ , while  $F_{a}$  (per LM) describes m agnetic anisotropy of the system, see discussion below.

Since the sample of  $AuIn_2$  is in dirty lim it 1 { it holds 1, see below,  $(h_{ex} = h^2)$ 0:1 also Q l 1, themean-free path drops out from the term  $F_{int}^{ex}$  in Eq. (2). Since we consider the spiral (helical) structure with the amplitude  $S_0$ , which contains only one harmonic Q. Then the sum over Q in Eqs. (2),(3) drops out and one obtains  $F_{int}^{ex} =$  $s_{ex}=2v_FQ$ . By minimizing  $F_{SM}$  f ;  $S_Q$  ; Q g with respect to ;  $S_Q$  and Q one gets the spiral magnetic structure at T very near  $T_M$ with the wave vector Q  $_{\rm S}$  = (3  $k_{\rm F}^2$  =  $_0$ )  $^{1=3}$  5  $10^2$ A  $^1$  and the period is L<sub>S</sub> = 2 = Q<sub>S</sub> 120 A - see Fig:1a. Note, one has  $Q_s 1 = 10^3$ , i.e. the required 1 is ful lled in AuIn<sub>2</sub>. In theoretical condition Ql this case the EM interaction in Eq. (2) is negligible, ie.  $F_{int}^{em} = F_{int}^{ex}$  ( $_{em} = _{ex} _{L}^{2}Q^{2}$ ) < 10<sup>-2</sup> and the spiral magnetic structure is due to the e ective EX interaction between electrons and LM 's (of In nuclei) mainly. However, the magnetic dipole-dipole interaction between In ex), m akes the structure nuclei, although sm all ( em tran*s*verse (Q S = 0) due to the term  $em jS_{0,k} j$  in Eq.(3).

On cooling,  $S_0^2$  grows and higher order terms of  $S_0^2$ must be included in  $F_M$  as well as magnetic anisotropy  $F_a$ . However, in AuIn<sub>2</sub>, which is simple cubic structure, only higher order term s contribute to F<sub>a</sub> (per LM ), i.e.  $F_a = D (S_x^4 + S_y^4 + S_z^4)$ . One expects that D < em (or more realistic D em, see below). However, if D fulls the condition (D =  $_{\rm ex})^{3=4}$  > 0.25 (k\_F  $_0)^{-1=2}$ (one should have  $D = e_x > 10^{-3}$  in the case of AuIn<sub>2</sub>) the spiral structure is transformed into a striped onedim ensional transverse dom ain structure<sup>3;6</sup> - see F ig:1b. The condition on D means that the domain-wall thickness should be much smaller than the period of the domain structure. The magnetic energy (per LM 's) in the case of the dom ain magnetic structure is given by  $e_x S_Q^2 + (S_Q^2; T)Q = , w here F_0 (S_Q^2)$  $F_{M} = F_{0} (S_{0}^{2})$ containsterm sofhigher order in  $S_0^2$ . Here =  $k_F^{1} w S_0^2$ is the surface energy of the domain wall, and w  $0.58(_{ex}D)^{1=2}$  in the case of rotating B loch wall (where  $_{\rm ex}$ ). The wave vector of the domain structure D  $Q_{\,D}$  , obtained by m in in izing  $F_{\,S\,M}$  , at  $T\,\,-\,T_{M}\,$  is given by Q  $_{\rm D}$   $2\,(_{ex}=~_{w}\,k_{F}~_{0}\,)^{1=2}$  . Note, the wave vector of the dom ain structure Q  $_{\rm D}$   $\,$  is sm aller than Q  $_{\rm S}\,$  for the spiral. Because of the simple cubic structure of AuIn<sub>2</sub> it is more probable that  $D = e_x < 10^{-3}$  than opposite,

which means that  $A\,u\,\text{In}_2\,$  is the strong candidate to be the

rst system where superconductivity coexists with spiral m agnetic order down to T = 0, see below. N am ely, it turns out that at T = 0 the m agnetic energy per LM is  $F_{\rm M}$   $_{\rm ex}$  = 35 K, while the superconducting energy per LM is  $F_{\rm S}$  4 K. However, the interaction energy (per LM) is very small,  $F_{\rm int}$  10 $^2$  K. This result m eans that even at T = 0 the loss of energy due to the interaction,  $F_{\rm int}$ , is much smaller than the gain due to the condensation energy  $F_{\rm S}$ , i.e.  $F_{\rm S}$  +  $F_{\rm int}$   $F_{\rm S}$  < 0, and the oscillatory m agnetic structure and S order coexist in AuIn<sub>2</sub> down to T = 0.



FIG.1. (a) The spiral magnetic structure S (x), with the period  $L_S$  in the superconducting phase for small anisotropy  $D = _{ex} < 10^{-3}$ . (b) The dom ain-like magnetic structure S (x), with the period  $L_D$  in the superconducting phase for appreciable anisotropy  $D = _{ex} > 10^{-3}$ .

2. Clean lim it (1 > 0). The present experiments were performed on dirty (but not very dirty) AuIn2 sam ples, where 1 < 0. In that case the motion of Cooper pairs in the coexistence phase is di usive and there is an isotropization of the quasiparticle spectrum. This m eans that the oscillatory m agnetic structure acts like magnetic impurities { for similarity and di erences of e ects of magnetic impurities and the oscillatory magnetic structure see Ref. 3. However, it would be interesting to perform experiments on clean AuIn<sub>2</sub> samples with l > 0 { for instance on samples with a residual resistivity ratio RRR> 1500. Namely, it was shown in Refs. 3,7 that the oscillatory magnetic order in clean superconductors can give rise to the gapless quasiparticle spectrum with nodes on a line at the Ferm i surface if  $h_{ex} > 0$ . This is just the case in AuIn<sub>2</sub>, where  $h_{ex}$ 1 K and 0.36 K. In the clean lim it the quasiparticle motion is anisotropic in the presence of an oscillatory magnetic structure with the wave vector Q, and the

quasiparticle energy vanishes on lines at the Ferm i surface given by  $v_F \quad Q = 0$  if  $h(T) = \frac{1}{2k}S_Q(T) > 0$ , see Ref. 3. In this case the density of states for E < 0 is  $N_s(E) = N(0)(Eh = 0v_FQ_d)h(4 = 0)$  for the domain structure and  $N_s(E) = N(0)(Eh = 0v_FQ_d)$  for the spiral one.  $N_s(E)$  can be experimentally obtained by measuring voltage dependence of the tunneling conductivity in the S{N junction with AuIn<sub>2</sub> being in the coexistence phase.

## C.E ectofmagnetic eld

Because of very sm all interaction energy one expects that the critical eld  $H_c$  (T) does not vanish down to T = 0. Indeed, equating G ibbs energy for superconducting state and that of norm al ferrom agnetic state one gets

$$F_{S} + F_{M} + F_{int} = F_{M}^{0} - \frac{H_{c}^{2}}{8} M$$
 (4)

and if one de nes  $H_{SM}$  [8 ( $F_M^0$   $F_M$   $F_S$   $F_{int}$ )]<sup>1=2</sup>

$$H_{c} = \frac{q}{H_{SM}^{2} + (4 M_{0})^{2}} + 4 M :$$
(5)

At T  $T_M$  the magnetization M is saturated, i.e. М  $M_0 = 5:5n_m$  n. Because  $F_{int}$  $F_{S}$ ;  $F_{M}$  one has small di erence in magnetic energy of oscillatory state,  $F_{M}~$  and that of ferrom agnetic state,  $F_{M}^{\ 0}$  . As re- $H_{c0}(0) = [8 (F_{s}^{0})]^{1=2}$ . The experimental sult,H<sub>SM</sub> values<sup>1</sup> are  $H_{c0}(0)$ 14:5 G and 4  $M_0$ 11 G which gives H <sub>c</sub> (0) 7 G. It was found experimentally that 8:7 G at T = 25 K, and thus our estimate is rea-Н<sub>с</sub> sonable. Nonzero value of H  $_{\rm c}$  (0) in AuIn $_2$  is in a contrast to the case of magnetic type II superconductors ErR h<sub>4</sub>B<sub>4</sub> and  $\text{HoM}\ \text{o}_6\text{S}_8\text{,}$  where  $\text{H}\ _{\text{c}}\ (\!T\!$  ) tends to zero [as well as H  $_{\rm c2}$  (T)]at T ! T<sub>M</sub> , because in these compounds one has  $F_{\rm S}$  jnear som e tem perature  $T_{\rm S\,2} < \,T_{\rm M}$  . At F<sub>int</sub> ∱<sub>N</sub>  $T > T_{\rm M}$  one obtains H  $_{\rm c}$  = H  $_{\rm c}^{0}$  = (1 + 4  $_{\rm M}$  ) in absence of dem agnetization e ects, where M(T) = m = (T)ex) and  $_{em}$  =  $_{em}$  =6 : The change of the slope of H  $_{\rm c}$  (T ) takes place at T very near  $T_M$  . The experimental broadening of the transition in the magnetic eld can be due to the polycrystalinity of the sample, where even sm allm agnetic an isotropy of the crystallites can produce percolation-like broadened resistive transition in magnetic eld<sup>18;19</sup>.

In conclusion, we found, that superconductivity coexists with a domain-like magnetic structure if the anisotropy parameter D is not too small, i.e.  $D = _{ex} > 10^{-3}$ . We estimate the period  $L_D = _{00} 300$  A for D = 1 K. In the opposite case,  $D = _{ex} < 10^{-3}$ , the magnetic structure is spiral with the period  $L_S = 120$  A. The realization of the spiral structure in AuIn<sub>2</sub> is more probable due to the simple cubic structure of this compound and accordingly due to small magnetic anisotropy.

It is also proposed that in the case of very clean  $AuIn_2$  samples with RRR> 1500 there is a line, given by  $v_F = Q = 0$ , at the Ferm i surface with nodes in the quasiparticle spectrum in the coexistence phase. It would

be interesting to study this regime experimentally, because in that case therm odynamic and transport properties show power law behavior.

W e would like to devote this paper to the pioneer in the eld of magnetic superconductors V italii Lazarevich G inzburg on the occasion of his 80-th aniversary. M L K.acknow ledges U niversit e Bordeaux for kund hospitality and O.Andersen, L.Hedin, H.-U.Habern eier, C.Irslinger, Y.Leroyer, M.Mehring, K.-D.Schotte and V S.Oudovenko for support.

- <sup>1</sup> S.Rehm ann, T.Herm annsdorfer and F.Pobel, Phys.Rev. Lett. 78, 1122 (1997).
- <sup>2</sup> V L.G inzburg, Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz. 31, 202 (1956).
- <sup>3</sup> L N. Bulaevskii, A J. Buzdin, M L. Kulic and S.V. Panyukov, Adv. Phys., 34, 175 (1985); Sov. Phys. Uspekhi 27, 927 (1984).
- <sup>4</sup> M B. Maple, H C. Ham maker and L D. W oolf, in Superconductivity in Ternary Compounds II, Topics in Current Physics, ed. M B. Maple and . Fischer, Springer Verlag, v. 34, (1982).
- <sup>5</sup> A.I.Buzdin, L.N.Bulaevskii, Sov.Phys.Uspekhi29, 412, (1986).
- <sup>6</sup> L.N. Bulaevskii, A.I. Buzdin, M.L. Kulic and S.V. Panyukov, Phys. Rev. B 28, 1370 (1983).
- <sup>7</sup> L.N. Bulaevskii, M.L. Kulic and A.I. Rusinov, Solid State Comm., 30, 59 (1979); J.Low Temp. Phys., 39, 256 (1980).
- <sup>8</sup> E J. B bunt and C M . Varm a, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 1079 (1979).
- <sup>9</sup> L.J. Chang, C.V. Tom y, D.M. Paul and C.R itter, Phys. Rev.B 54, 9031 (1996).
- <sup>10</sup> T.Herm annsdorfer and F.Pobel, J.Low Tem p.Phys., 100, 253 (1995).
- <sup>11</sup> T.Herm annsdorfer, P.Sm eibidl, B.Schroder-Sm eibidland F.Pobel, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, 1665 (1995).
- <sup>12</sup> F. Pobel, Physics Today, January 1993; Physikalische Blatter, 50, 853 (1994); Physica B 197, 115 (1994).
- <sup>13</sup> O. V. Lounasm aa, Physics Today, O ctober 1989; P. H akonen and O. V. Lounasm aa, Science 265, Septem ber 1994; P. Hakonen, O. V. Lounasm aa and A. O ja, J. M agn. and M agn. M at. 100, 394 (1991).
- <sup>14</sup> A S. O ja and O N. Lounasm aa, Rev. M od. Phys., 69, 1 (1997).
- <sup>15</sup> Ch. Buchal, F. Pobel, R M. Mueller, M. Kubota and JR. Owers-Bradley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 64 (1983).
- <sup>16</sup> P.J.Hakonen, R.T.Vuorinen, and JE.Martikainen, Phys. Rev.Lett. 70, 2818 (1993).
- <sup>17</sup> M. Kaufman and O. Entin-W ohlman, Physica, B69, 77 (1976).
- <sup>18</sup> L N .Bulaevskii, A I.Buzdin, M L.Kulic, Solid State Com ., 41, 309 (1981); Phys.Lett. A 85, 169 (1981).
- <sup>19</sup> A.J. Buzdin and L.N. Bulaevskii, Fiz. Nizkih, Temp. 6, 1528 (1980).