

Symmetry of superconducting states with two orbitals on a tetragonal lattice: application to $LaO_{1-x}F_xFeAs$

Yi Zhou^{1,2}, Weiqiang Chen¹ and Fu-chun Zhang¹

*Department of Physics, Center of Theoretical and Computational Physics,
The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China*

Department of Physics, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

We use group theory to classify the superconducting states of systems with two orbitals on a tetragonal lattice. The orbital part of the superconducting gap function can be either symmetric or anti-symmetric. For the orbital symmetric state, the parity is even for spin singlet and odd for spin triplet; for the orbital anti-symmetric state, the parity is odd for spin singlet and even for spin triplet. The gap basis functions are obtained with the use of the group chain scheme by taking into account the spin-orbit coupling. In the weak pairing limit, the orbital anti-symmetric state is only stable for the degenerate orbitals. Possible application to superconducting iron-based superconductivity is discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Symmetry plays an important role in study of superconductivity. By using the symmetry of the superconducting (SC) gap function, Ginzburg-Landau theory can be constructed and electromagnetic response and topological excitations can be inspected. In the past decades, the symmetry analyses to classify unconventional SC states have been focused on single-band superconductors, and have shed much light on our understanding of heavy-fermion and ruthenate superconductors[1].

Very recently, a new class of iron-based high temperature superconductors has been discovered with T_c as high as above 50K[2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. Experimentally, spin density wave (SDW) order has been observed in the parent compound $LaOFeAs$, but vanishes upon fluorine doping where the superconductivity appears[10, 11, 12]. Specific heat measurement as well as nuclear magnetic resonance suggested line nodes of the SC gap[13, 14, 15, 16]. The transition temperature estimated based on the electron-phonon coupling is low, and unlikely to explain the observed superconductivity[17]. It has been proposed that the superconductivity is of magnetic origin and is unconventional. Local density approximation (LDA) shows iron's $3d$ electrons dominate the density of states near the Fermi surfaces in the parent compound $LaOFeAs$ [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. In their calculations, there are three hole-like Fermi surfaces centered at the Γ point and two electron-like Fermi surfaces around the M point. By F-doping, the area of the three hole-like Fermi surfaces shrinks while the area of the two electron-like Fermi surfaces expands. The band structure obtained from the LDA may be well modeled by a tight-binding model with two orbitals (d_{xz} and d_{yz}) [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31]. Because of the multiple orbitals in the low energy physics, it is natural to raise the question how to generalize the symmetry consideration from single-band to multi-band cases.

In this paper, we will generalize the symmetry analyses developed for the single band SC state to systems with

two orbitals. We will use group theory to classify the allowed symmetry of the gap functions of the two-orbital SC state on a tetragonal lattice by including a spin-orbit coupling between the paired electrons. While our focus will be on the Fe-based compounds, some of our analyses may be applied to more general systems with two orbitals.

We arrange this paper as the following. In section II, we discuss the symmetries governing the system and how these symmetries affect the Hamiltonian and gap functions. In section III, we consider the possible two-orbital SC states on a tetragonal lattice. Section IV is devoted to summary and discussions. We also supply some appendices for details. In Appendix A, we show how the symmetries give rise to the requirements to the non-interacting Hamiltonian. In Appendix B, we specify the point group D_{4h} of lattice according to space group $P4/nmm$. In Appendix C, we discuss how the gap functions transfer under symmetry operations. In appendix D, we discuss the energy gap functions in the degenerate bands.

II. SYMMETRY OF GAP FUNCTION $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$

We consider a tetragonal lattice, appropriate for doped $LaOFeAs$. Since our primary interest is in the SC state, we will not consider the translational symmetry broken state such as the spin density wave state observed in the parent compound of $LaOFeAs$. The system is invariant under both time reversal and space inversion. The inversion symmetry suggests that the SC pairing is either even or odd in parity. We shall assume in this paper that the time reversal symmetry remains unbroken.

We consider a system described by Hamiltonian

$$H = H_0 + H_{pair} + H_{s-o} \quad (1)$$

where H_0 is non-interacting part, and H_{pair} is a pairing Hamiltonian, and H_{s-o} is the spin-orbit coupling of the Cooper pairs. We shall consider the SC state preserves

all the symmetries in H_0 except the $U(1)$ symmetry in electric charge and the spin rotational symmetry due to a weak H_{s-o} . We assume H_0 to be given by a tight-binding Hamiltonian

$$H_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1\alpha_2s} c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1s}^\dagger \xi_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1\alpha_2} c_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_2s}, \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha = 1, 2$ are the orbital indexes, which correspond to the two orbitals $3d_{xz}$ and $3d_{yz}$ in Fe , $s = \uparrow, \downarrow$ are the spin indexes. Note that for $LaOFeAs$, the actual crystal structure has two Fe -atoms in a unit cell due to the As atomic positions, which are allocated above and below the Fe -plane alternatively. For convenience, here we use the extended Brillouine zone, and the summation \mathbf{k} is in the extended zone. H_0 is invariant under symmetry transformation. This requires certain symmetries on $\xi_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1\alpha_2}$, which we will discuss in detail in Appendix A.




FIG. 1: Lattice structure of $LaOFeAs$. It is a tetragonal lattice with two Fe atoms per unit cell. The lattice constants are $a = b \simeq 4.03\text{\AA}$ and $c \simeq 8.74\text{\AA}$ [11], where a is the distance between two next nearest neighbor Fe atoms. (a) Origin choice 1 of space group $P4/nmm$, at $4m2$ and at $(-a/4, a/4, 0)$ from center ($2/m$). It can be chosen either at an Fe or at an O atom; (b) Origin choice 2 of space group $P4/nmm$, at center ($2/m$) and at $(a/4, -a/4, 0)$ from $4m2$. It can be chosen either at the midpoint of two nearest neighbor Fe atoms or at the midpoint of two nearest neighbor O atoms. Here $2/m$ denotes the two fold rotation C_2 and reflection m (see Appendix B for details). The origin choice 1 and 2 are different from each other by a shift of $(-a/4, a/4, 0)$ [33].

The gap function of the two-orbital SC state can be generally written as

$$\Delta_{s_1s_2}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\mathbf{k}) = - \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}'\alpha_3\alpha_4 \\ s_3s_4}} V_{s_2s_1s_3s_4}^{\alpha_2\alpha_1\alpha_3\alpha_4}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}') \langle c_{\mathbf{k}'\alpha_3s_3} c_{-\mathbf{k}'\alpha_4s_4} \rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $V_{s_2s_1s_3s_4}^{\alpha_2\alpha_1\alpha_3\alpha_4}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}')$ is the effective attractive interaction. Hereafter we will use the matrix notation $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$ for the gap function.

To classify the symmetry of the SC gap function for multiple orbitals, we recall that in the single orbital case, the spin-orbit coupling of the Cooper pair plays an important role to the non s-wave superconductors, and the symmetry of the gap function is determined by the crystal point group of the lattice and the spin part of the gap function. In the two-orbital system, the orbital degree of freedom is usually coupled to the crystal momentum, hence to the spin via the spin-orbit coupling. Therefore, the spin, spatial, and the orbital parts are generally all related in the gap function.

Let us first discuss the crystal symmetry. The crystal structure of $LaOFeAs$ is shown in Fig. 1. The tetragonal crystal symmetry is characterized by the point group D_{4h} . The tetragonal point group may be specified according to the space group $P4/nmm$ of the compound, and the details will be discussed in Appendix B. There are five irreducible representations of D_4 group, denoted by Γ , including 4 one-dimensional representations (A_1, A_2, B_1 and B_2) and 1 two-dimensional representation (E)[34]. The tetragonal lattice symmetry requires H_0 to be a ‘‘scalar’’ or A_1 representation of D_4 . In the absence of spin-orbit coupling, spin is rotational invariant and we have both the point group symmetry and the spin rotational symmetry.

We now discuss the orbital degrees of freedom in connection with the crystal symmetry. The two orbitals d_{xz} and d_{yz} transform as E representation of D_4 . In general the orbital indexes d_{xz} and d_{yz} are not good quantum numbers because of the mixed term of the two orbitals in H_0 , and the two energy bands are not degenerate. In that case it is necessary to include the coupling of the orbital to spatial and spin degrees of freedom.

Without loss of generality, the gap function can be written as a linear combination of the direct products of the orbital part Ω and the spin part Δ^{spin} in a given representation Γ of the point group D_4 ,

$$\Delta(\Gamma; \mathbf{k}) = \sum_{m, \Gamma_{LS}, \Gamma_{\Omega}} \eta(\Gamma, m) \langle \Gamma, m | \Gamma_{LS}, m_{LS}; \Gamma_{\Omega}, m_{\Omega} \rangle \times \Delta^{spin}(\Gamma_{LS}, m_{LS}; \mathbf{k}) \otimes \Omega(\Gamma_{\Omega}, m_{\Omega}), \quad (4)$$

where both Δ^{spin} and Ω are 2×2 matrices, $\Delta_{s_1s_2}^{spin}$ dictates the pairing in spin space and $\Omega_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}$ dictates the pairing in orbital space, Γ_{LS} and Γ_{Ω} are irreducible representations of D_4 in spin and orbital spaces, respectively, m, m_{LS}, m_{Ω} are bases of representations $\Gamma, \Gamma_{LS}, \Gamma_{\Omega}$, respectively. $\langle \Gamma, m | \Gamma_{LS}, m_{LS}; \Gamma_{\Omega}, m_{\Omega} \rangle$ is the Clebsch-Gordan (CG) coefficient. Note that the \mathbf{k} -dependence is contained in Δ^{spin} , but not in Ω . Here $\eta(\Gamma, m)$ is the coefficient of the basis m of the representation Γ . The anti-symmetric statistics of two electrons requires

$$\Delta^T(-\mathbf{k}) = -\Delta(\mathbf{k}). \quad (5)$$

Below we will first discuss $\Delta^{spin}(\Gamma_{LS}; \mathbf{k})$ and $\Omega(\Gamma_{\Omega})$ separately, and then combine the two to form an irreducible representation Γ of D_4 . We follow Sigrist and

Ueda[1] and write $\Delta^{spin}(\mathbf{k})$ in terms of the basis functions $\psi(\Gamma, m; \mathbf{k})$ for the spin singlet $S = 0$ and $\mathbf{d}(\Gamma, m; \mathbf{k})$ for the spin triplet $S = 1$,

$$\Delta^{spin}(\Gamma, m; \mathbf{k}) = i[\sigma_0\psi(\Gamma, m; \mathbf{k}) + \sigma \cdot \mathbf{d}(\Gamma, m; \mathbf{k})]\sigma_2, \quad (6)$$

Here $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ is a scalar and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ is a vector under the transformation of spin rotation. For this reason, it is more convenient to use $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ instead of $\Delta^{spin}(\mathbf{k})$ to classify the pairing states.

Due to the fermionic anti-symmetric nature, the gap function must be anti-symmetric under the two particle interchange, or under a combined operations of space inversion, interchange of the spin indexes and interchange of the orbital indexes of the two particles. Let $P_{1,2}$ be the two particle interchange operator, and $P_{space}, P_{spin}, P_{orbital}$ be the interchange operator acting on the space, spin, and orbital, respectively, then the fermion statistics requires

$$P_{1,2} = P_{space}P_{spin}P_{orbital} = -1. \quad (7)$$

Since the system is of inversion symmetry, the pairing states must have either even parity $P_{space} = +1$ or odd parity $P_{space} = -1$. Furthermore, the total spin S of the Cooper pair is a good number, and this is so even in the presence of H_{s-o} , which breaks spin rotational symmetry but keeps inversion symmetry, so that does not mix the $S = 1$ with $S = 0$ states. Therefore, under the two particle interchange, the spin part of the gap function must be either symmetric ($P_{spin} = +1$, with $S = 1$) or anti-symmetric ($P_{spin} = -1$ with $S = 0$), represented by the vector \mathbf{d} or the scalar ψ in Eq. (6), respectively. Because of the inversion and spin symmetries, we have $P_{orbital} = \pm 1$.

The orbital part of the pairing matrix Ω is spanned in the vector space of (d_{xz}, d_{yz}) , which is an irreducible representation E of the point group D_4 . Thus Ω belongs to an irreducible representation given by $E \otimes E = A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus B_1 \oplus B_2$, which are all one-dimensional, hence simplifies the classification of the pairing states. According to the CG coefficients of D_4 group, up to a global factor, $\Omega = \sigma_0$ in representation A_1 , $\Omega = \sigma_3$ in B_1 , and $\Omega = \sigma_1$ in B_2 , which are all orbital symmetric: $P_{orbital} = +1$. $\Omega = \sigma_2$ in A_2 representation, which is orbital anti-symmetric: $P_{orbital} = -1$. In brief, A_1 and B_1 of Ω are representations for intra-orbital pairing, B_2 is for symmetric inter-orbital pairing and A_2 is for anti-symmetric inter-orbital pairing. For convenience, we choose Ω to be hermitian, so that $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ will be real.

The crystal point group of the lattice will dictate the allowed symmetry in \mathbf{k} space. The transformation of ψ and \mathbf{d} under symmetry operations can be found in Appendix C. In the next section, we will study the basis functions $\psi(\Gamma, m; \mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\Gamma, m; \mathbf{k})$, and combine them with the orbital part Ω to obtain the irreducible representations of group D_4 .

III. POSSIBLE TWO-ORBITAL SC STATES ON A TETRAGONAL LATTICE

We will use the group chain scheme to study the representation and the basis function of ψ and \mathbf{d} by assuming a spin-orbit coupling. In the group chain scheme, we begin with a rotational invariant system in both spin and spatial spaces. The representation of its symmetry group G can be decoupled into a spatial part $D_{(L)}$ and a spin part $D_{(S)}$, with \mathbf{L} the relative angular momentum of the Cooper pair,

$$D_{(G)} = D_{(L)} \otimes D_{(S)}, \quad (8)$$

In the presence of the spin-orbit coupling, $D_{(L)}$ and $D_{(S)}$ are no longer the irreducible representation of the rotational group, but the total angular momentum $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{S}$ is, and $D_{(J)}$ is the corresponding irreducible representation of the rotational group.

We now turn on a crystal field with tetragonal lattice symmetry group D_4 , so that the rotational group $SO(3)$ is reduced to D_4 , and $D_{(L)} \otimes D_{(S)}$ is reduced to a direct product of irreducible representations Γ_{LS} of group D_4 ,

$$D_{(L)} \otimes D_{(S)} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\Gamma_{LS}} D_{(\Gamma_{LS})}. \quad (9)$$

Including the coupling to the orbital part Ω , the representation $D_{(\Gamma_{LS})} \otimes D_{(\Gamma_{\Omega})}$ is decomposed into irreducible representations,

$$D_{(\Gamma_{LS})} \otimes D_{(\Gamma_{\Omega})} = \bigoplus_{\Gamma} D_{(\Gamma)}. \quad (10)$$

$D_{(\Gamma_{\Omega})}$ is one-dimensional, thus these representations have a very simple form.

Let us consider the even parity case. From Eq. (7), the SC gap function can be either orbital symmetric $P_{orbital} = +1$, spin singlet or orbital anti-symmetric $P_{orbital} = -1$, spin triplet. We list the SC gap basis functions for spin singlet and spin triplet according to the irreducible representations Γ in Table I and II respectively. The listed even pairing state include s -wave (extended s -wave), d -wave and g -wave. Here 0, $\bar{0}$, 2, $\bar{2}$, and 1 are natural notation for the five irreducible representations of D_{4h} ; A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 and E are Schönflies notation; Γ_{1-5} are Koster notation. According to Eq. (3), the gap function of the SC state is a linear combination of the basis functions in one irreducible representation Γ , and the basis functions belonging to different representations in Γ , e.g. A_{1g} and B_{2g} , will not mix with each other.

We are particularly interested in 2D (dimensional) or quasi-2D limiting cases, relevant to Fe-based SC compounds, where the gap function is k_z -independent, and the Fermi surface is cylinder-like. However, for completeness we also list in the Tables those 3-dimensional basic functions marked with 3D.

In the last column of each Table, we list the allowed energy zeroes in the quasiparticle dispersion determined

by the gap functions for the special case that the two energy bands are completely degenerate. The detailed calculations for the quasiparticle energies in the degenerate cases are given in Appendix D. We will discuss the quasiparticle properties for the non-degenerate cases in the discussion section below.

Similarly, for the odd parity pairing $P_{space} = -1$, we can have either orbital anti-symmetric $P_{orbital} = -1$, spin singlet, or orbital symmetric $P_{orbital} = 1$, spin triplet, which are listed in Table III and IV, respectively. For the spin triplet, we list p -wave, f -wave and h -wave states.

IV. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

In summary, we have studied the pairing symmetry of the two orbital superconducting states on a tetragonal lattice. Base on the symmetry consideration, we have classified symmetry allowed pairing states with the space inversion, spin, orbital, and the lattice symmetries by including a spin-orbit coupling. In addition to the even parity for the spin singlet and odd parity for the spin triplet pairings, familiar in the single band superconducting gap functions, which corresponds to orbital symmetric pairing in the two orbital systems, there are also even parity for spin triplet and odd parity for the spin singlet pairings, corresponding to orbital anti-symmetric pairing. The symmetry allowed gap basis functions are listed in the Tables I-IV in the text. In the orbital symmetric states, the gap basis functions within the same representation of the point group but with different orbital representations are allowed to combine to form a gap function.

Below we shall discuss some limiting cases. First, we consider the weak pairing coupling limit. In this case, we can diagonalize H_0 firstly to obtain the two energy bands. H_{pair} in Eq. (1) is to induce a pairing of electrons near the Fermi surfaces within a very small energy window. If the two energy bands are not degenerate, then the two Fermi surfaces do not coincide with each other, and the pairing will only occur between electrons in the same band, since the energy mis-match of the two electrons with opposite momentum in the two bands will not lead to the SC instability in the weak coupling limit. The issue is then reduced to the two decoupled single band problem. Because the intra-band pairing is between symmetric orbitals, all the states with orbital anti-symmetric pairings such as those listed in Tables II and III will not be realized. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the present work and the single band analysis[1]. In terms of the orbital picture, the intra-band pairing gap function is described by a linear combination of the orbital representations $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_3$ in each representation of Γ .

The strong pairing coupling case is more complicated, and possibly more interesting. The symmetry analyses we outlined in this paper may serve as a starting point. The pairing interaction may overcome the energy mis-

match of the paired inter-band electrons to lead to the superconductivity. In a recent exact diagonalization calculation for a two orbital Hubbard model on a small size system, Dagotto et al. have found an inter-orbital pairing with spin triplet and even parity with the gap function to be $\cos k_x + \cos k_y$ [32]. Their pairing state corresponds to E_g representation in Table II, and provides a concrete example of the orbital anti-symmetric pairing state. Generally we may argue that the gap structure will be gapless with Fermi arcs for 2D systems unless the pairing coupling is strong enough to overcome all the mis-matched paired electrons in the momentum space. An example has been given in Ref.[24] of Dai Xi et al. and also discussed by Wang[36]. This seems to essentially rule out any possibility for line nodes in the orbital anti-symmetric pairing state in the strong pairing coupling limit. A nodal in quasi-particle energy requires the gap function to vanish. As a result, the pairing strength near this nodal will not be strong enough to overcome the energy mis-match of the inter-band paired electrons. Therefore, a nodal in quasi-particle energy implies a Fermi arc in this case.

Another interesting limit is the two orbitals are completely degenerate: $\xi_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1, \alpha_2} = \xi_{\mathbf{k}}\delta_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}$. The system has an orbital $SU(2)$ symmetry. In this case, our analyses are most relevant, and all the classified states listed in the Tables could be stable even in the weak pairing interaction. Because of the orientational dependence of the orbitals in crystal, such degeneracies may not be easy to realize. A possible realization is on the materials with two-fold pseudospin symmetry or two-valley degeneracy such as in graphene. While the point group will depend on the precise crystal symmetry concerned, but some general features discussed in this paper may be applied to those systems.

We now discuss the band structure in the extended zone and the reduced zone. Because of the positions of As atoms, the translational lattice symmetry is reduced and the Brillouine zone is halved. In general, such a translational symmetry reduction may lead to hopping matrix between momentum \mathbf{k} and $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q}$ in the extended zone, with $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi, \pi)/a'$ and $a' = a/\sqrt{2}$ is the lattice constant of reduced unit cell. However, for the two orbitals d_{xz}, d_{yz} , the point group symmetry prohibits the hybridization between states at \mathbf{k} and $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q}$, if we only consider intra-layer hopping. The tight-binding Hamiltonian adopted by both Qi et al.[28] and by Lee and Wen[26] explicitly illustrate the vanishing of the mixing term. Therefore, we may discuss the SC symmetry using the extended zone and using H_0 given in Eq. (2). In the extended zone, there is only one Fermi point for each \mathbf{k} , hence the bands are not degenerate. In the weak pairing coupling limit, all the orbital anti-symmetric pairing states will be irrelevant, and the weak coupling theory will naturally lead to the orbital symmetric states.

Near the completion of the present work, we learned of the similar work by Wan et al.[36], who considered SC symmetry for two-orbital pairing Hamiltonian. Our re-

TABLE I: Superconducting gap basis functions $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ on tetragonal lattice for even parity, orbital symmetric and spin singlet pairing states. Γ : representation of D_4 . The listed notations are natural, or Schönflies and Koster (in parentheses). Ω : orbital representation, σ_0 is the identity matrix, and $\sigma_{1,2,3}$ are Pauli matrices. Listed gaps properties are for the two completely degenerate orbitals. k_z -dependent basis functions are marked with (3D), listed for completeness.

Γ	basis $\psi(\mathbf{k})$	Ω	gap
0 (A_{1g}, Γ_1^+)	$1, k_x^2 + k_y^2, k_z^2$ (3D)	σ_0	line nodal, or full gap
	$k_x^2 - k_y^2$	σ_3	
	$k_x k_y$	σ_1	
$\tilde{0}$ (A_{2g}, Γ_2^+)	$k_x k_y (k_x^2 - k_y^2)$	σ_0	line,full
	$k_x k_y$	σ_3	
	$k_x^2 - k_y^2$	σ_1	
2 (B_{1g}, Γ_3^+)	$k_x^2 - k_y^2$	σ_0	line,full
	$1, k_x^2 + k_y^2, k_z^2$ (3D)	σ_3	
	$k_x k_y (k_x^2 - k_y^2)$	σ_1	
$\tilde{2}$ (B_{2g}, Γ_4^+)	$k_x k_y$	σ_0	line,full
	$k_x k_y (k_x^2 - k_y^2)$	σ_3	
	$1, k_x^2 + k_y^2, k_z^2$ (3D)	σ_1	
1 (E_g, Γ_5^+)	$(k_x k_z, k_y k_z)$ (3D)	$\sigma_0, \sigma_3, \sigma_1$	

TABLE II: Superconducting gap basis functions $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ on tetragonal lattice for even parity, orbital anti-symmetric and spin triplet pairing states. Notations are the same as in Table I.

Γ	basis $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$	Ω	gap
0 (A_{1g}, Γ_1^+)	$\hat{z}, (k_x^2 + k_y^2)\hat{z}, (k_x^4 + k_y^4)\hat{z}, k_x^2 k_y^2 \hat{z}$	σ_2	line,full
$\tilde{0}$ (A_{2g}, Γ_2^+)	$k_z (k_x \hat{y} - k_y \hat{x})$ (3D)	σ_2	
2 (B_{1g}, Γ_3^+)	$(k_x^2 - k_y^2)\hat{z}; k_z (k_x \hat{x} - k_y \hat{y})$ (3D)	σ_2	line
$\tilde{2}$ (B_{2g}, Γ_4^+)	$k_x k_y \hat{z}; k_z (k_x \hat{x} + k_y \hat{y})$ (3D)	σ_2	line
1 (E_g, Γ_5^+)	$(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), (k_x^2 \hat{x}, k_y^2 \hat{y}), (k_y^2 \hat{x}, k_x^2 \hat{y}), (k_x k_y \hat{x}, k_x k_y \hat{y});$ $(k_z^2 \hat{x}, k_z^2 \hat{y}), (k_x k_z \hat{z}, k_y k_z \hat{z})$ (3D)	σ_2	line,full

sults are similar to theirs, with the difference that we have included a spin-orbit coupling term in our group theory analysis, while this term was not explicitly included in Ref.[36]. As a result, our classification for the spin triplet states is not the same as theirs. Such difference may be amplified when we discuss some behaviours related to spin degrees of freedom. We also note that similar group theory analysis were carried out for the two band pairing Hamiltonian by Wang et al.[35]. Since they adopted the bands instead of the orbitals, a direct comparison is not apparent. We become aware of another related work[37] after completing the present work too.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Prof. T.K. Ng and X. Dai for useful discussions and HKSAR RGC grants for partial financial support.

APPENDIX A: THE SYMMETRY OF $\xi_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1\alpha_2}$ IN EQ.(2)

In this appendix, we will discuss the symmetry requirement of $\xi_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1\alpha_2}$. The non-interacting Hamiltonian given by Eq.(2) should keep invariant under any symmetry transformation of point-group D_4 , hence H_0 belongs to the representation A_1 . This symmetry Requirement will affect the choice of $\xi_{\mathbf{k}\alpha_1\alpha_2}$. For convenience, we use the 2×2 matrix form $\hat{\xi}_{\mathbf{k}}$ in orbital space, thus $\hat{\xi}_{\mathbf{k}}$ can be rewritten in terms of Pauli matrices, $\hat{\xi}_{\mathbf{k}} = \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^0 \sigma_0 + \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^1 \sigma_1 + \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \sigma_2 + \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^3 \sigma_3$. Similarly to the case of Ω , $\phi_{\mathbf{k}s}^\dagger \sigma_0 \phi_{\mathbf{k}s}$, $\phi_{\mathbf{k}s}^\dagger \sigma_1 \phi_{\mathbf{k}s}$, $\phi_{\mathbf{k}s}^\dagger \sigma_2 \phi_{\mathbf{k}s}$ and $\phi_{\mathbf{k}s}^\dagger \sigma_3 \phi_{\mathbf{k}s}$ transform as A_1, B_2, A_2 and B_1 respectively, where $\phi_{\mathbf{k}s} = (c_{\mathbf{k}1}, c_{\mathbf{k}2})^T$. Using the CG coefficients of $D_4 - C_4$ group chain[34], we find that $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^0, \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^1, \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2$ and $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^3$ transform as A_1, B_2, A_2 and B_1 respectively. Some examples of

TABLE III: Superconducting gap basis functions $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ on tetragonal lattice for odd parity, orbital anti-symmetric and spin singlet pairing state. Notations are the same as in Table I.

Γ	basis $\psi(\mathbf{k})$	Ω	gap
0 (A_{1u}, Γ_1^-)	k_z (3D)	σ_2	
$\tilde{0}$ (A_{2u}, Γ_2^-)	$k_z(k_x^4 - 6k_x^2k_y^2 + k_y^4)$ (3D)	σ_2	
2 (B_{1u}, Γ_3^-)	$k_z(k_x^2 - k_y^2)$ (3D)	σ_2	
$\tilde{2}$ (B_{2u}, Γ_4^-)	$k_xk_yk_z$ (3D)	σ_2	
1 (E_u, Γ_5^-)	(k_x, k_y)	σ_2	line

TABLE IV: Superconducting gap basis functions $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ on tetragonal lattice for odd parity, orbital symmetric and spin triplet pairing states.

Γ	basis $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$	Ω	gap
0 (A_{1u}, Γ_1^-)	$k_x\hat{x} + k_y\hat{y}; k_z\hat{z}$ (3D)	σ_0	line,full
	$k_x\hat{x} - k_y\hat{y}$	σ_3	
	$k_y\hat{x} + k_x\hat{y}$	σ_1	
$\tilde{0}$ (A_{2u}, Γ_2^-)	$k_y\hat{x} - k_x\hat{y}$	σ_0	line,full
	$k_y\hat{x} + k_x\hat{y}$	σ_3	
	$k_x\hat{x} - k_y\hat{y}$	σ_1	
2 (B_{1u}, Γ_3^-)	$k_x\hat{x} - k_y\hat{y}$	σ_0	line,full
	$k_x\hat{x} + k_y\hat{y}; k_z\hat{z}$ (3D)	σ_3	
	$k_y\hat{x} - k_x\hat{y}$	σ_1	
$\tilde{2}$ (B_{2u}, Γ_4^-)	$k_y\hat{x} + k_x\hat{y}$	σ_0	line,full
	$k_y\hat{x} - k_x\hat{y}$	σ_3	
	$k_x\hat{x} + k_y\hat{y}; k_z\hat{z}$ (3D)	σ_1	
1 (E_u, Γ_5^-)	$(k_x\hat{z}, k_y\hat{z}); (k_z\hat{x}, k_z\hat{y})$ (3D)	$\sigma_0, \sigma_3, \sigma_1$	line

$\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^{0,1,2,3}$ are shown in the following,

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^0 &= 1, \cos k_x + \cos k_y, \cos k_x \cos k_y, \\ \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^1 &= \sin k_x \sin k_y, \\ \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 &= \sin k_x \sin k_y (\cos k_x - \cos k_y), \\ \xi_{\mathbf{k}}^3 &= \cos k_x - \cos k_y.\end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX B: THE POINT GROUP D_{4h}

Here we would like to specify the tetragonal point group according to the $LaOFeAs$ space group $P4/nmm$. [33] In real space, the point group is neither usual $D_{4h} = D_4 \otimes \sigma_h$ nor usual D_4 generated by $\{C_{4z}, C_{2y}\}$, where σ_h is the reflection refer to xy plane, C_{4z} is the four-fold rotation around z axis, and C_{2y} is the two-fold rotation around y axis. However, it contains two subgroups, refer to two different origin choice of the lattice. One is a subgroup of D_{4h} generated by $\{C_{4z}\sigma_h, C_{2y}\sigma_h\}$, which is also a D_4 group (or to be precise, D_{2d} , an isomorphic group to D_4) with origin choice 1 as shown in Fig. 1(a). The other subgroup is the direct product of inversion symmetry group I and cyclic group C_{2xy} with origin choice 2 as shown in Fig. 1(b).

The transformation of (x, y, z) under this symmetry operations can be found in Tables V and VI. Hence in \mathbf{k} -space, it is still a tetragonal point group D_{4h} .

TABLE V: Eight symmetry operations of D_{2d} (an isomorphic group to D_4) will generate eight general positions. Where ‘‘general’’ is defined as the following: A set of symmetrical equivalent points is said to be in ‘‘general position’’ if each of its points is left invariant only by the identity operation but by no other symmetry operation of the space group. The origin choice is 1.

group element	general position
E	(x, y, z)
$C_{4z}\sigma_h$	$(y, -x, -z)$
$(C_{4z}\sigma_h)^2$	$(-x, -y, z)$
$(C_{4z}\sigma_h)^3$	$(-y, x, -z)$
$C_{2y}\sigma_h$	$(-x, y, z)$
$C_{2y}\sigma_h C_{4z}\sigma_h$	$(-y, -x, -z)$
$C_{2y}\sigma_h (C_{4z}\sigma_h)^2$	$(x, -y, z)$
$C_{2y}\sigma_h (C_{4z}\sigma_h)^3$	$(y, x, -z)$

There are five irreducible representation of D_4 group, four of them, A_1, A_2, B_1 and B_2 are one-dimensional representations, and one of them, E is two-dimensional

TABLE VI: Four symmetry operations and corresponding general positions of group $I \times C_{2xy}$. The origin choice is 2.

group element	general position
E	(x, y, z)
C_i	$(-x, -y, -z)$
C_{2xy}	(y, x, z)
$C_i C_{2xy}$	$(-y, -x, -z)$

representation. All these five representations are representations of group D_{4h} too. However, there are two two-dimensional irreducible representations E' and E'' of D_{4h} group, neither of them is the representation of group D_4 . Naively, E' and E'' can be viewed as subrepresentations of irreducible representation of $J = 1/2$ and $J = 3/2$ representations of group $SU(2)$. Since the representations E' and E'' can not result in quadratic terms in Hamiltonian or Ginzburg-Landau free energy, we will not discuss them in this paper.

APPENDIX C: TRANSFORMATION OF GAP FUNCTIONS

It is not $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$ but $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ transform as representations of symmetry group. In this appendix, we list the transformations of $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ under various symmetry operations. Firstly, under a point-group transformation g , $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} g\psi(\mathbf{k}) &= \psi\left(D_{(G)}^-(g)\mathbf{k}\right), \\ g\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) &= D_{(G)}^+(g)\mathbf{d}\left(D_{(G)}^-(g)\mathbf{k}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (C1)$$

where $D_{(G)}^\pm(g)$ is the representation in three-dimensional space with positive (spin-space) or negative (\mathbf{k} -space) respectively. Secondly, time-reversal transformations of $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ take the forms,

$$K\psi(\mathbf{k}) = \psi^*(-\mathbf{k}), K\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) = -\mathbf{d}^*(-\mathbf{k}). \quad (C2)$$

Considering the anti-symmetric nature of Fermion system, see Eq. (5), will lead to

$$\psi(-\mathbf{k}) = \psi(\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{d}(-\mathbf{k}) = -\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}), \quad (C3)$$

for symmetric Ω and

$$\psi(-\mathbf{k}) = -\psi(\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{d}(-\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}), \quad (C4)$$

for anti-symmetric Ω . Hence, combining the above and the hermitian choice of Ω 's, the time-reversal invariance conditions for $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})$ become

$$\psi^*(\mathbf{k}) = \psi(\mathbf{k}), \mathbf{d}^*(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}), \quad (C5)$$

since under time-reversal transformation, Ω transforms as

$$K\Omega = \Omega^*. \quad (C6)$$

APPENDIX D: ENERGY GAP FUNCTIONS IN THE DEGENERATE BANDS

The energy gap of the superconducting states indeed depends on the details of interaction, especially, depends on the ratio of $\delta t/\lambda$, where δt is the energy scale of the splitting of two bands and λ is the energy scale of pairing potential. In the the ‘‘strong coupling’’ limit $\delta t \ll \lambda$, we expect the energy gap is close to $\delta t = 0$ case, say, two bands are degeneracy. A small perturbation proportional to $\delta t/\lambda$ will not change the energy gap very much, e.g. close the full gap or change from full gap to line nodal gap. In the weak coupling limit $\lambda \ll \delta t$, the situation may be very different from strong coupling limit, which is discussed in Ref.[36]. So that we will focus on the strong coupling limit and assume two degenerate bands in the following.

Due to two degenerate bands, the effective mean field Hamiltonian in \mathbf{k} -space can be written as an 8×8 matrix,

$$\hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{\mathbf{k}}\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0 & \Delta(\mathbf{k}) \\ \Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) & -\xi_{\mathbf{k}}\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (D1)$$

with the basis $\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{k}} = (c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow 1}, c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow 2}, c_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow 1}, c_{\mathbf{k}\downarrow 2}, c_{-\mathbf{k}\uparrow 1}^\dagger, c_{-\mathbf{k}\uparrow 2}^\dagger, c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow 1}^\dagger, c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow 2}^\dagger)^T$. The indices in the 4×4 matrices $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$ and $\xi_{\mathbf{k}}\sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0$ are arranged as the following, by direct products the former two indices denote spin space and the later two denote two orbitals. It is easy to know the energy dispersion,

$$E_{\mathbf{k}\mu} = \pm \sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}\mu}^2}, \quad (D2)$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}\mu}^2$ is one of the eigenvalues of the matrix $\Delta(\mathbf{k})\Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k})$. For degenerate bands, the minimum of $|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}\mu}|$ is the energy gap. For simplicity, we will focus on the k_z -independent pairing with a cylinder-like Fermi surface which is the case of LaOFeAs most likely.

At first, we will consider the even parity, orbital anti-symmetric, spin triplet pairing states in Table II. Orbital anti-symmetric states have only one component σ_2 in the Ω part. Gap function is of the form, $\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = i[\sigma \cdot \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k})]\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2$, thus $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}\mu}^2 = |\mathbf{d}|^2 \pm |\mathbf{d} \times \mathbf{d}^*|$. For the time-reversal invariant state, $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}^*$, the gapless condition follows as $|\mathbf{d}|^2 = 0$. For B_{1g} and B_{2g} states, they are d -wave states and have line nodal gap at Fermi surfaces. A_{1g} states can be of either s -wave or extend s -wave. The s -wave state is of full gap while the extended s -wave state possibly has line nodal gap at Fermi surface, e.g., the state $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) = \cos k_x \cos k_y \hat{z}$. The E_g representation involves s -wave, extend s -wave and d -wave states. The s -wave state is fully gapful, the d -wave state has line nodal gap, the extended s -wave state can be either fully gapful or of line nodal gap.

Then we consider the odd parity, orbital symmetric, spin triplet pairing states in Table IV. Orbital symmetric states have three components $\sigma_{0,1,3}$ in the Ω part. Gap function can be written as

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = i[\sigma \cdot \mathbf{d}_0(\mathbf{k})]\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_0 + i[\sigma \cdot \mathbf{d}_1(\mathbf{k})]\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 + i[\sigma \cdot \mathbf{d}_3(\mathbf{k})]\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_3, \quad (\text{D3})$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mathbf{k})\Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) &= \left[(|\mathbf{d}_0|^2 + |\mathbf{d}_1|^2 + |\mathbf{d}_3|^2) \sigma_0 + i(\mathbf{d}_0 \times \mathbf{d}_0^* + \mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_1^* + \mathbf{d}_3 \times \mathbf{d}_3^*) \cdot \sigma \right] \otimes \sigma_0 \\ &+ [(\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_1^* + \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_0^*) \sigma_0 + i(\mathbf{d}_0 \times \mathbf{d}_1^* + \mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_0^*) \cdot \sigma] \otimes \sigma_1 \\ &+ [(\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_3^* + \mathbf{d}_3 \cdot \mathbf{d}_0^*) \sigma_0 + i(\mathbf{d}_0 \times \mathbf{d}_3^* + \mathbf{d}_3 \times \mathbf{d}_0^*) \cdot \sigma] \otimes \sigma_3 \\ &+ [(\mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_3^* - \mathbf{d}_3 \times \mathbf{d}_1^*) \cdot \sigma - i(\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_3^* - \mathbf{d}_3 \cdot \mathbf{d}_1^*) \sigma_0] \otimes \sigma_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D4})$$

For a time-reversal invariant state, $\mathbf{d}_i^*(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{d}_i(\mathbf{k})$, $i = 0, 1, 3$, so that the above can be simplified as

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k})\Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) = (\mathbf{d}_0^2 + \mathbf{d}_1^2 + \mathbf{d}_3^2) \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_0 + 2(\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_1) \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_1 + 2(\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_3) \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_3 + 2(\mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_3) \cdot \sigma \otimes \sigma_2. \quad (\text{D5})$$

We obtain

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}\mu}^2 = (\mathbf{d}_0^2 + \mathbf{d}_1^2 + \mathbf{d}_3^2) \pm 2\sqrt{(\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_1)^2 + (\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_3)^2 + (\mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_3)^2}. \quad (\text{D6})$$

Gapless condition reads

$$\mathbf{d}_0^2 + \mathbf{d}_1^2 + \mathbf{d}_3^2 = 2\sqrt{(\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_1)^2 + (\mathbf{d}_0 \cdot \mathbf{d}_3)^2 + (\mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_3)^2}. \quad (\text{D7})$$

Careful analysis shows node can appear only when at least one of $|\mathbf{d}_0|$, $|\mathbf{d}_1|$ and $|\mathbf{d}_3|$ vanish. So that E_u states in Table IV are of line nodal gap. The other four representation A_{1u} , A_{2u} , B_{1u} and B_{2u} can be of either line nodal or full gap. For example, for an A_{1u} states in Table IV which consists of two components in the Ω part, $\mathbf{d}_0(\mathbf{k}) = \sin k_x \hat{x} + \sin k_y \hat{y}$, $\mathbf{d}_3(\mathbf{k}) = \sin k_x \hat{x} - \sin k_y \hat{y}$ and $\mathbf{d}_1(\mathbf{k}) = 0$, nodal lines will appear at $\sin k_x = 0$ and $\sin k_y = 0$. And any A_{1u} states in Table IV which con-

sists of only one component in the Ω part is of full gap.

Similar consideration will lead to the results for spin singlet states shown in Table I and Table III. Of course, when the ratio $\delta t/\lambda$ becomes large, the situation may change. This change strongly depends on the details of both pairing states and the Hamiltonian. For example, for an s -wave with $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}) = \hat{z}$, and $\Omega = \sigma_2$, Fermi arc may appear when δt and λ is comparable.

-
- [1] M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Rev. Mod. Phys. **43**, 239 (1991).
[2] Y. Kamihara, H. Hiramatsu, M. Hirano, R. Kawamura, H. Yanagi, T. Kamiya and H. Hosono, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **130**, 3296 (2008).
[3] G. F. Chen, Z. Li, D. Wu, G. Li, W. Z. Hu, J. Dong, P. Zheng, J. L. Luo, and N. L. Wang, arXiv:0803.3790 (2008).
[4] X. H. Chen, T. Wu, G. Wu, R. H. Liu, H. Chen and D. F. Fang, arXiv:0803.3603 (2008).
[5] Z. A. Ren, J. Yang, W. Lu, W. Yi, G. C. Che, X. L. Dong, L. L. Sun, Z. X. Zhao, arXiv:0803.4283 (2008).
[6] Z.A. Ren, W. Lu, J. Yang, W. Yi, X.L. Shen, Z.C. Li, G.C. Che, X.L. Dong, L.L. Sun, F. Zhou and Z.X. Zhao, arXiv:0804.2053 (2008).
[7] C. Wang, L.J. Li, S. Chi, Z.W. Zhu, Z. Ren, Y.K. Li, Y.T. Wang, X. Lin, Y.K. Luo, X.F. Xu, G.H. Cao and Z.A. Xu, arXiv:0804.4290 (2008).
[8] Z.A. Ren, G.C. Che, X.L. Dong, J. Yang, W. Lu, W. Yi, X.L. Shen, Z.C. Li, L.L. Sun, F. Zhou and Z.X. Zhao, arXiv:0804.2582 (2008).
[9] H.H. Wen, G. Mu, L. Fang, H. Yang and X.Y. Zhu, Europhys. Lett. **2**, 17009 (2008).
[10] J. Dong, H. J. Zhang, G. Xu, Z. Li, G. Li, W. Z. Hu, D. Wu, G. F. Chen, X. Dai, J. L. Luo, Z. Fang and N. L. Wang, arXiv:0803.3426 (2008).
[11] Clarina de la Cruz, Q. Huang, J. W. Lynn, J.Y. Li, W. Ratcliff II, J. L. Zarestky, H. A. Mook, G. F. Chen, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang and P.C. Dai, arXiv:0804.0795 (2008).
[12] M. A. McGuire, A. D. Christianson, A. S. Sefat, R. Jin, E. A. Payzant, B. C. Sales, M. D. Lumsden and D. Mandrus, arXiv:0804.0796 (2008).
[13] G. Mu, X. Zhu, L. Fang, L. Shan, C. Ren and H.H. Wen, Chin. Phys. Lett. **25**, 2221 (2008).
[14] K. Ahilan, F. L. Ning, T. Imai, A. S. Sefat, R. Jin, M.A. McGuire, B.C. Sales and D. Mandrus, arXiv:0804.4026 (2008).
[15] Y. Nakai, K. Ishida, Y. Kamihara, M. Hirano, H. Hosono, arXiv:0804.4765 (2008).
[16] K. Matano, Z.A. Ren, X.L. Dong, L.L. Sun, Z.X. Zhao and Guo-qing Zheng, arXiv:0806.0249 (2008).
[17] L. Boeri, O. V. Dolgov, A. A. Golubov, arXiv:0803.2703, (2008).

- [18] D. J. Singh and M. H. Du, arXiv:0803.0429 (2008).
- [19] K. Haule, J. H. Shim and G. Kotliar, arXiv:0803.1279 (2008).
- [20] G. Xu, W. Ming, Y. Yao, X. Dai, S. C. Zhang and Z. Fang, arXiv:0803.1282 (2008).
- [21] I.I. Mazin, D.J. Singh, M.D. Johannes and M.H. Du, arXiv:0803.2740 (2008).
- [22] C. Cao, P. J. Hirschfeld and H.P. Cheng, arXiv:0803.3236 (2008).
- [23] F.J. Ma and Z.Y. Lu, arXiv:0803.3286 (2008).
- [24] X. Dai, Z. Fang, Y. Zhou. F. C. Zhang, arXiv:0803.3982 (2008).
- [25] T. Li, arXiv:0804.0536 (2008).
- [26] P.A. Lee and Xiao-Gang Wen, arXiv:0804.1739 (2008).
- [27] Z.Y. Weng, arXiv:0804.3228 (2008)
- [28] X.L. Qi, S. Raghu, C.X. Liu, D. J. Scalapino and S.C. Zhang, arXiv:0804.4332 (2008).
- [29] Zi-Jian Yao, Jian-Xin Li and Z. D. Wang, arXiv:0804.4166 (2008).
- [30] Q.M. Si and E. Abrahams , arXiv:0804.2480 (2008).
- [31] T.A. Maier, D.J. Scalapino, arXiv:0805.0316 (2008).
- [32] M. Daghofer, A. Moreo, J.A. Riera, E. Arrigoni and E. Dagotto, arXiv:0805.0148 (2008).
- [33] *International tables for crystallography, Volume A, Space-Group Symmetry*, 4th Edition, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Nertherlands (1996).
- [34] P.H. Butler, *Point Group Symmetry Applications: Methods and Tables*, Plenum Press, New York (1981).
- [35] Z.H. Wang, H. Tang, Z. Fang and X. Dai, arXiv:0805.0736 (2008).
- [36] Y. Wan and Q.H. Wang, arXiv:0805.0923 (2008).
- [37] J.R. Shi, arXiv:0806.0259 (2008).