

Cooper pair revisited: The case of quasiparticles with spin dependent masses

Jan Kaczmarczyk* and Jozef Spałek†
Marian Smoluchowski Institute of Physics,
Jagiellonian University,
ul. Reymonta 4, 30-059 Kraków, Poland
(Dated: October 26, 2019)

A simple approach to the single Cooper-pair bound state composed of quasiparticles with the spin-direction dependent masses (SDM) is formulated. We discuss the bound-pair properties which depend on its center-of-mass momentum \mathbf{Q} in an applied magnetic field accounted for in the Pauli limit. It turns out that in a sufficiently strong magnetic field the moving pair has greater binding energy than that at rest. The $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$ state is a prototype of the Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov (FFLO) state of condensed pairs. Spin dependence of the masses leads also to the quasiparticle-spin *distinguishability* in the quantum mechanical sense. That is, to the lack of the transposition symmetry of the wave function for the moving pair. This circumstance constitutes the fundamental difference between standard Cooper pair and that with the spin-split masses. The spin state of the latter is a mixture of singlet and the triplet components with $S^z = 0$.

Keywords: Cooper pair, spin-dependent masses, FFLO state, correlated electrons.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Cooper single-pair problem^{1,2} represents one of the model calculations of the Fermi-gas instability against the bound-pair formation. Its importance follows from the fact that the instability appears for an *arbitrarily weak* attractive interaction among the extra two fermions placed near the Fermi surface. The situation is different for strongly correlated electron (narrow-band) systems when a short-range repulsive interaction of the Hubbard type leads to the t-J model with the real-space intersite-pairing³ and in particular, to the formation of the *d*-wave type of condensed state. Nevertheless, the robustness of the Fermi-liquid state (in the form of an *almost localized Fermi liquid*, ALFL) even for strongly correlated narrow-band and heavy-fermion systems retains the relevance of the original Cooper pair problem with the pairing in reciprocal space. However, in the latter situation we have to deal with the systems with large quasiparticle masses (i.e. small Fermi energy) and particularly, with the spin-dependent effective masses^{4,5,6,7,8}, if an applied magnetic field is included in the considerations.

Spin-direction-dependent quasiparticle masses (SDM) have been observed recently in the heavy-fermion superconductor CeCoIn₅⁹ and other systems¹⁰ by means of the de Haas-van Alphen oscillations of magnetization in the applied magnetic field. SDM result from a relatively strong short-range (Hubbard) repulsive interaction. This last concept extends the idea of Landau Fermi liquid with many-body *spin-independent* renormalization of the particle mass¹¹. SDM appear in a clear manner for strongly-correlated systems, and the effect is particularly strong near the half filling of the narrow band. In addition to SDM, in CeCoIn₅ an unconventional, high-field superconducting state is claimed to appear concomitantly^{12,13}. This last state was proposed to be of the Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov (FFLO) nature^{14,15}, and is associated with formation of phase with a nonzero Cooper pair momentum \mathbf{Q} . Such state also appears in selected organic superconductors^{16,17}, although the spin dependent masses have not been detected there as yet. Hence, taking into account the above two novel properties (i.e. SDM and $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$), seems natural for the detailed analysis of Cooper-pair state in a correlated electron system which forms an ALFL. It turns out that SDM concept carries quite a few novel qualitative features already on this level. Among them are the transition from the regime of *spin-indistinguishable* to *spin-distinguishable* quasiparticles and the appearance of a mixture of spin-singlet and triplet components with total spin $S^z = 0$ in the latter state.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II we study the nontrivial effect of SDM on the form of the spin-part of the two-particle wave function in the simplest situation of the parabolic narrow band. In Sec. III the singlet and the so-called *specific-spin* solutions are discussed, as well as the relation of the latter to the *quasiparticle-spin distinguishability*. Sec. IV contains the numerical analysis, whereas in Sec. V we provide a brief overview of this mathematically simple, but physically subtle problem.

II. FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

Throughout this article, we consider the simplest situation: the parabolic dispersion relation for quasiparticles

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = \frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{k}^2}{2m_\sigma} - \sigma \epsilon_B, \quad (1)$$

where m_σ is the quasiparticle effective mass depending on spin and $\epsilon_B \equiv g\mu_B H/2$ is the Zeeman energy for electron with spin quantum number $\sigma = \pm 1$. The qualitative results do not depend on the detailed form of $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$, since for almost localized systems the spin-dependent mass enhancement factor is large and does not depend on the particle wavevector \mathbf{k} .

As in the standard Cooper problem, we consider ALFL forming a passive Fermi sea, and the extra pair of quasiparticles of the same type interacting via a pairing potential in the \mathbf{k} -space. Both the background Fermi liquid, and the pair have masses dependent on their spin direction (or equivalently, the system magnetization). We assume the form of mass spin dependence proposed earlier^{4,5} in the $U \rightarrow \infty$ limit (for its elementary derivation see Appendix A), i.e.

$$\frac{m_\sigma}{m_B} = \frac{1 - n/2}{1 - n} - \sigma \frac{n_\uparrow - n_\downarrow}{2(1 - n)} \equiv \frac{1}{m_B} (m_{av} - \sigma \Delta m/2), \quad (2)$$

where m_B is the bare band mass, $n_\sigma = \langle n_{i\sigma} \rangle$ is the average number of particles per atomic site (i) with spin σ , and $n = n_\sigma + n_{\bar{\sigma}}$ is the so-called band filling. Recently, Onari *et al.*⁸ considered the same problem for the Anderson-lattice case and have obtained quantitatively similar results: the spin majority particles (defined as $\sigma = \uparrow$) being lighter, and the mass difference increasing with the increasing magnetic polarization ($n_{f\uparrow} - n_{f\downarrow}$), where $n_\sigma \equiv n_{f\sigma}$ is the number of electrons in the σ -subband of a narrow f -band due to e. g. Ce^{3+} ions. The principal nontrivial ingredient of our formulation is contained in including the spin-dependent masses in the two-particle Hamiltonian. This factor alone leads to qualitatively new features of the bound-pair state, as discussed in the following.

A. Hamiltonian with scalar effective masses and its limitations

First, a simple way of accounting for the different masses of quasiparticles is to insert them into the Hamiltonian "by hand", that is to assume that the first particle has the spin $\sigma = \uparrow \equiv 1$, and the mass $m_\uparrow \equiv m_1$, whereas the other one has spin $\sigma = \downarrow \equiv -1$, and mass $m_\downarrow \equiv m_2$. This is a standard procedure, since in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics the particle mass is an external, classical parameter. This assumption leads to the following form of the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_1^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_2} \nabla_2^2 - \sigma_1^z \epsilon_B - \sigma_2^z \epsilon_B + V(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2). \quad (3)$$

We neglect the effect of applied magnetic field on the electron orbital, because, the Maki parameter¹⁸ is in e.g. CeCoIn_5 very high ($\alpha^\parallel = 4.6$, $\alpha^\perp = 5.0$)¹², which means that the Pauli contribution dominates over the orbital effects. For the two-particle state with opposite spins, Hamiltonian (3) acts properly only on the wave function with the spin part of the form

$$\chi(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = |1 \uparrow \rangle |2 \downarrow \rangle. \quad (4)$$

This type of wave function will be called *specific-spin* in the following. If we applied the Hamiltonian to the wave function with different spin part, i.e. $\chi'(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = |1 \downarrow \rangle |2 \uparrow \rangle$, it would assign improperly mass $m_1 \equiv m_\uparrow$ to the first quasiparticle, whose spin is $\sigma = \downarrow$. For this reason, we may not construct for Hamiltonian (3) the proper singlet or triplet spin wave functions

$$\chi_{S,T}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|1 \uparrow \rangle |2 \downarrow \rangle \mp |1 \downarrow \rangle |2 \uparrow \rangle \right). \quad (5)$$

This means that by specifying that the first particle has the spin up, and the second the spin down we violate in an obvious manner the quasiparticle-spin *indistinguishability*. We discuss this problem in detail later, after introducing explicitly this effect in an invariant manner in the Hamiltonian.

One can illustrate the nontrivial character of the SDM by commenting on the simplest quantum system - the hydrogen atom. Namely, although the masses of proton and electron are vastly different, the total spin part of the

wave function is still the singlet. This is because the spins of those particles are completely detached from their masses. In effect, the spin part of the wave function is either pure singlet or triplet. On the contrary, in our situation with SDM, the spin quantum number is attached to the masses, so the spin transposition symmetry may be broken explicitly, as discussed in detail below.

B. Hamiltonian with masses in an invariant (operator) form

We construct next the Hamiltonian in such a way, that it properly assigns masses to quasiparticles depending on their spin direction in the applied magnetic field. The only way to do this is to introduce the mass operator $\hat{m}(\sigma_i^z) \equiv m_{av} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_i^z \Delta m$, where Δm need not to be specified at this point. Therefore, the two-particle Hamiltonian takes the form

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{av} - \sigma_1^z \Delta m} \nabla_1^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{av} - \sigma_2^z \Delta m} \nabla_2^2 - \sigma_1^z \epsilon_B - \sigma_2^z \epsilon_B + V(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2). \quad (6)$$

Now, the kinetic part assigns respective masses $m_1 = m_{av} - \Delta m/2$ and $m_2 = m_{av} + \Delta m/2$ to the particles depending on their spin z-component. With this Hamiltonian we can analyze any spin function; in particular, both the specific-spin wave function (4), as well as those describing the singlet or triplet states with the z-component of the total spin $S_1^z + S_2^z = 0$, which have obviously the form

$$\chi_{S,T}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|1 \uparrow\rangle |2 \downarrow\rangle \mp |1 \downarrow\rangle |2 \uparrow\rangle \right). \quad (7)$$

Additional advantage of the Hamiltonian (6) is the ability to describe transition between the *indistinguishable-quasiparticles* limit (for zero or low mass differences) and the *distinguishable-quasiparticles* case when $\epsilon_B > 0$ (see also Sec. III D). By distinguishable quasiparticles we mean here those described by a wave function without well-defined transposition symmetry (i.e. non-antisymmetric in our case). Such quasiparticles are distinguished by their mass due to the mass spin dependence.

III. FERMI SEA, WAVE FUNCTION, BINDING ENERGY

The starting equations determining the Fermi sea parameters are as follows:

$$\frac{m_\sigma}{m_B} = \frac{1 - n/2}{1 - n} - \sigma \frac{n_\uparrow - n_\downarrow}{2(1 - n)}, \quad (8)$$

$$n = n_\uparrow + n_\downarrow, \quad (9)$$

$$\epsilon_F = \frac{\hbar^2 k_{F\sigma}^2}{2m_\sigma} - \sigma \epsilon_B, \quad (10)$$

$$k_{F\sigma} = \left(6\pi^2 \frac{n_\sigma}{V} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (11)$$

where $\sigma = \pm 1$ is the electron spin, n is taken as the band filling (equal to the number of electrons per unit cell) and V is the elementary cell volume. Also, Eqs. (10) - (11) determine the expressions for the Fermi energy and the spin-subband Fermi wavevectors.

The wave function is decomposed into the spin and space parts

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \Phi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \chi(\sigma_1, \sigma_2), \quad (12)$$

with the space part given as a superposition of plane wave states, i.e.

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \Psi_{\mathbf{k}_1}(\mathbf{r}_1) \Psi_{\mathbf{k}_2}(\mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_2}. \quad (13)$$

This wave function is used next.

A. Singlet, triplet, and their inadequacy in describing the paired state

First, we note that the total spin operator does not commute with Hamiltonian (6)

$$[\mathcal{H}, (\hat{\mathbf{S}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{S}}_2)^2] \neq 0, \quad (14)$$

whereas \mathcal{H} does commute with \hat{S}_1^z and \hat{S}_2^z . This means that while the z-components of the *individual spins* represent good quantum numbers, the *total length does not*. To analyze this property, it is important to see that the spin-dependent denominators can be rewritten in the two equivalent forms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= - \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{av} - \sigma_i^z \Delta m} \nabla_i^2 - \epsilon_B \sigma_i^z \right] + V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) = \\ &\equiv - \frac{\hbar^2}{4m_{av}^2 - (\Delta m)^2} \sum_{i=1}^2 [(2m_{av} + \sigma_i^z \Delta m) \nabla_i^2 - \epsilon_B \sigma_i^z] + V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Taking $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i = (1/2)\hat{\sigma}_i$, one can easily prove the condition (14), as well as the property that $[\mathcal{H}, \hat{S}_i^z] = 0$. One sees that the spin wave function can be characterized by individual values $\sigma_1^z = \uparrow$ and $\sigma_2^z = \downarrow$ or vice versa, *but the two-particle spin state might not have a proper singlet or triplet symmetry* (7). Note also that the property (14) is independent of the form of pairing potential and is fulfilled also for $V(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = 0$. This may lead also to the normal-state corrections not discussed in detail here.

B. Solution for the specific-spin wave function

By starting from the wave function in the form (12) with the space part given by (13) and spin part $\chi(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = |1 \uparrow \rangle |2 \downarrow \rangle$, we can solve the Schrödinger equation (with any of the two Hamiltonians) in a similar manner as in the original Cooper problem¹. One of the differences is a nontrivial definition of the relative momentum when transforming the Hamiltonian to the center-of-mass and relative coordinates, namely

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{\mathbf{r}_1 m_1 + \mathbf{r}_2 m_2}{m_1 + m_2}; \quad \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2, \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2; \quad \mathbf{k} = \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 m_2 - \mathbf{k}_2 m_1}{m_1 + m_2}, \quad (17)$$

where \mathbf{Q} is the total momentum and \mathbf{k} is called by analogy to the standard Cooper problem the relative momentum¹⁹. After this transformation the Hamiltonian and wave function can be cast to the forms

$$H = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla_{\mathbf{r}}^2 - \sigma_1^z \epsilon_B - \sigma_2^z \epsilon_B + V(r), \quad (18)$$

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{V} e^{i\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{r}} |1 \uparrow \rangle |2 \downarrow \rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $M = m_1 + m_2$ and $\mu = m_1 m_2 / M$. Following standard procedure, we obtain the equation determining coefficients $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}$ and the eigenenergy E in the form

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} = -\frac{1}{N} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{k}'} V_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}'}}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{Q}} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - E}, \quad (20)$$

where $\epsilon_{\mathbf{Q}} \equiv \hbar^2 \mathbf{Q}^2 / 2M$, $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \hbar^2 \mathbf{k}^2 / 2\mu$ and N is the total number of particles. The interaction region has to be defined in a more general way, since we want to describe a system with nonequal Fermi vectors and possibly, with a non-zero center-of-mass momentum \mathbf{Q} , which is a constant of motion. We assume that a constant, attractive interaction takes place in the regions of \mathbf{k} -space for which both particles are at most at the distance $\hbar\omega_D$ above their Fermi surface, i.e.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Interaction region $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is the common part of W_1 and $W_2 + \mathbf{Q}$ shifted by $-\frac{m_1}{M}\mathbf{Q}$. The vectors \mathbf{k}_{ai} , are defined by $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_{ai}\sigma_i} = \epsilon_F + \hbar\omega_D$. Regions which contribute most to the pairing are marked as the three (green) ovals. For details see main text.

$$V_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} = \begin{cases} -V_0, & \text{for } \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_1\uparrow}, \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_2\downarrow}, \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'_1\uparrow}, \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}'_2\downarrow} \in [\epsilon_F, \epsilon_F + \hbar\omega_D], \\ 0, & \text{in other cases,} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{Q} are related to \mathbf{k}_1 , and \mathbf{k}_2 via transformation (16) and (17) (the same holds for the vectors pairs \mathbf{k}' , \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{k}'_1 , \mathbf{k}'_2). We call $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ the region in \mathbf{k} -space in which the interaction is nonzero (cf. Fig. 1). It can be shown that $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}} = [W_1 \cap (W_2 + \mathbf{Q})] - \frac{m_1}{M}\mathbf{Q}$, where by adding a vector to the region in \mathbf{k} -space we mean the whole region shifted by that vector. Also, $W_i = \{\mathbf{k} | \epsilon_F \leq \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}\sigma_i} \leq \epsilon_F + \hbar\omega_D\}$, $i = 1, 2$. In this notation, equation for the binding energy $\Delta \equiv 2\epsilon_F - E$ becomes

$$\frac{N}{V_0} = \frac{V}{8\pi^3} \int_{\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}} \frac{d^3k}{\epsilon_{\mathbf{Q}} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - 2\epsilon_F + \Delta} \equiv \frac{V}{8\pi^3} \int_{\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}} \frac{d^3k}{\delta\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_1\uparrow} + \delta\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_2\downarrow} + \Delta}, \quad (22)$$

where $\delta\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_i\sigma_i} \equiv \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_i\sigma_i} - \epsilon_F$ with $i = 1, 2$ is the measure of the quasiparticle energy with respect to the Fermi energy. From this form of the equation for Δ we can deduce that the regions of reciprocal space contributing most to the pairing are those for which $\delta\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_i\sigma_i} \simeq 0$ (see Fig. 1). Large part of the space fulfills this condition if $|\mathbf{Q}| \simeq \Delta k_F \equiv k_{F1} - k_{F2}$. Therefore, we can anticipate that the pair will have maximum binding energy when the pair center-of-mass momentum is close to the Fermi vector splitting, i.e. when $|\mathbf{Q}| \simeq \Delta k_F$, consistent with the results for the FFLO state²⁰.

The equation (22) for the gap Δ has to be solved numerically for each $|\mathbf{Q}|$ and the final solution in our approximation is the one with the largest binding energy. In the case of Cooper pair at rest ($\mathbf{Q} = 0$), equation (22) can be solved analytically. Such analytic solution depends on which of the two vectors $\mathbf{k}_{ai} = \frac{1}{\hbar} \sqrt{2m_i(\epsilon_F + \sigma_i\epsilon_B + \hbar\omega_D)}$ is larger, namely

$$\Delta = \begin{cases} \frac{\hbar\omega_D \frac{M}{m_1}}{e^C - 1} - (\epsilon_B M - \epsilon_F \Delta m) \frac{1}{e^C - 1} \left(\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} e^C \right), & \text{for } k_{a1} \geq k_{a2}, \\ \frac{\hbar\omega_D \frac{M}{m_2}}{e^C - 1} - \frac{1}{m_2} (\epsilon_B M - \epsilon_F \Delta m), & \text{for } k_{a1} < k_{a2}, \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where $C \equiv \frac{2\pi^2 \hbar^2 N}{V V_0 k_{F1} \mu}$. In zero magnetic field we have that $C = \frac{2}{V_0 \bar{\rho}(\epsilon_F)}$ and expression (23) properly reproduces the Cooper result $\Delta = 2\hbar\omega_D / (\exp(\frac{2}{V_0 \bar{\rho}(\epsilon_F)}) - 1)$, where $\bar{\rho}(\epsilon_F)$ is the average density of states per particle.

C. Is the singlet state a proper eigenstate?

As has already been said, Hamiltonian (6) does not commute with the total spin $\hat{\mathbf{S}}^2$. This means that the singlet and the triplet states are not a good basis for the problem considered. Nevertheless, we can still analyze energy for the singlet spin function (and we can think of it as a superposition of eigenfunctions with spin parts $|1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle$ and $|1 \downarrow\rangle|2 \uparrow\rangle$). This means, we can take

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle - |1 \downarrow\rangle|2 \uparrow\rangle). \quad (24)$$

Solution of the Schrödinger equation in this case is quite cumbersome and will not be presented in detail here. It can be shown that, for the resulting equations not to be contradicting, the interaction has to be introduced as nonzero in the region (for derivation see Appendix B)

$$W^* = \left\{ \mathbf{k} = \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 m_2 - \mathbf{k}_2 m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \mid \mathbf{k}_1 \in W_1 \cap W_2 \wedge \mathbf{k}_2 \in W_2 \cap W_1 \wedge \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 \right\}, \quad (25)$$

or equivalently,

$$W^* = \overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}} \cap \left(-\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbf{Q} \frac{\Delta m}{M} \right). \quad (26)$$

The replacement of $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ with W^* presents the only difference in the case of pure singlet state, with respect to the that for the specific-spin state $|1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle$ or $|1 \downarrow\rangle|2 \uparrow\rangle$. This interaction region coincides with $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ if and only if $\mathbf{Q} = 0$. As a result, the energy of the singlet state in the case of Cooper pair at rest is identical to the energy for the specific-spin states. For a moving pair ($\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$) the interaction region is reduced, and the binding energy for the singlet state decreases rapidly with increasing $|\mathbf{Q}|$, whereas that for the specific-spin states can become even larger (see Fig. 4).

D. Quasiparticle distinguishability

The wave function of fermions has to be antisymmetric with respect to transposition of spin and space coordinates

$$(\mathbf{r}_1, \sigma_1) \leftrightarrow (\mathbf{r}_2, \sigma_2). \quad (27)$$

For the Cooper pair this implies, that

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = -\Psi(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_1). \quad (28)$$

It turns out that the Cooper pair at rest (with singlet spin part) has the proper symmetry even for $m_1 \neq m_2$, a very interesting result. Therefore, as long as $\mathbf{Q} = 0$ leads to the minimum energy state, the wave function is antisymmetric and describes *indistinguishable quasiparticles*.

For sufficiently strong applied magnetic field the state with $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$ becomes the stable state and the pair has to be either in the $|1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle$ state or in the $|1 \downarrow\rangle|2 \uparrow\rangle$ state. Such wave function does not have the symmetry (28) and the transition to *distinguishable quasiparticles* takes place. The difference between the two situations has been illustrated schematically in Fig. 2.

A word of explanation is most proper at this point. Namely, the microscopic many-body Hamiltonian (Hubbard or Anderson-lattice, for example) respects the particle indistinguishability. This microscopic model is approximated here by an effective quasiparticle picture with the SDM^{4,5,6,7,8}. The effective Hamiltonian taking into account those masses violates the indistinguishability in an obvious manner (see relation (14)). However, this quasiparticle picture has been confirmed experimentally^{9,10} for the normal state. Therefore, this fact suggests that there is a *qualitative* difference between the *Landau Fermi liquid* and the *almost localized (local) Fermi liquid*. It remains to be seen whether this picture holds true also for the superconducting state. In a separate paper²¹ we show that the spin-direction dependence of the mass essentially extends the stability of the FFLO state, prototype of which is the Cooper pair with $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Behavior of the spin part of the wave function under transposition of particles for Cooper pair at rest (antisymmetry) and moving Cooper pair (no definite symmetry).

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In the numerical analysis we assume the following values of parameters, emulating the heavy-fermion systems: $n = 0.97$, $V = 161 \text{ \AA}^3$ (taken for CeCoIn₅), $m_{av} \equiv m_B \frac{1-n/2}{1-n} = 304 m_0$, $\hbar\omega_D = 32.5 K$ and $V_0/N = 40 K$. Such large value of $\hbar\omega_D$ is taken because the pairing in CeCoIn₅ is of real space character. Additionally, for other values of $\hbar\omega_D$ another maximum in the binding energy appears (between $\mathbf{Q} = 0$ and $|\mathbf{Q}| = \Delta k_F$). Energy of this solution is maximally 5 mK higher than that for $\mathbf{Q} = 0$. Therefore, with this third solution no new physics is incorporated in our study, and it might only blur the image presented. For the assumed parameters, the Fermi energy is $\epsilon_F = 46 \div 47 K$, i. e. of the same magnitude as $\hbar\omega_D$ and V_0/N . Before we turn to the interacting case, we present the results for the background Fermi sea with SDM.

A. Fermi sea of quasiparticles

The equations describing the Fermi sea characteristics were introduced earlier (8) - (11). They can be easily solved numerically by their reduction to a single equation for n_σ

$$\frac{n n_1^{2/3}}{(n - n_1)(2m_{av} - m_B) + m_B n_1} = \frac{n(n - n_1)^{2/3}}{n_1(2m_{av} - m_B) + m_B(n - n_1)} + \frac{4\epsilon_B}{\hbar^2} \left(\frac{V}{6\pi^2} \right)^{2/3}. \quad (29)$$

The Fermi sea characteristics are summarized in Fig. 3. The mass difference, the Fermi vector splitting and magnetization grow linearly with the field. Therefore, the approximated expressions in the field up to 20 T are

$$n_\uparrow - n_\downarrow = \chi H, \quad (30)$$

$$m_\sigma(H) = m_{av} - \sigma m_B \frac{\chi}{2(1-n)} H, \quad (31)$$

$$n_\sigma(H) = \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma \chi H. \quad (32)$$

In our numerical study we obviously used the full expressions (8) - (11).

B. Discussion: Cooper pair state

Solving the gap equation (22) provides us with the dependence of Δ on the Cooper pair center-of-mass momentum \mathbf{Q} , in an applied field H , as shown in Fig. 4. For high enough fields the maximum binding energy appears for $|\mathbf{Q}| \simeq \Delta k_F$. The moving-pair state becomes stable for the field above about 2.5 T. Note also, that the full singlet configuration (dot-dashed lines) has much smaller binding energy than the specific-spin state (solid lines).

The binding energy as a function of the field is plotted in Fig. 5. The case with SDM gives rise to much higher critical fields above which the pair is destabilized by the Pauli effect. The reason behind this robustness of the state




FIG. 3: (Color online) Fermi sea properties as a function of applied magnetic field H . The dashed lines in the lower right-hand panel represent data for spin-independent masses. Note the greater Fermi wavevector splitting in that case meaning that SDM act in the opposite way than the Zeeman term effect, as reflected also in the greater binding energy in the applied field.




FIG. 4: (Color online) Binding energy of the specific-spin (solid lines) and singlet states (dot-dashed lines) as a function of center-of-mass momentum \mathbf{Q} and for selected values of applied field. Note the rapid decrease of binding energy of the singlet state. The bound state with $|\mathbf{Q}| \neq 0$ becomes stable above the field $H \simeq 2.5 T$. The arrows mark the state with maximum value of binding energy.

for $\Delta m \neq 0$ is the smaller Fermi wavevector splitting Δk_F for this case (c.f. Fig. 3), which in turn leads to the larger interaction region $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. One can say, that the effect of SDM acts in the opposite direction than the Zeeman-term influence and compensates this influence to a degree.

The optimal momentum value $|\mathbf{Q}|$ vs. H is displayed in Fig. 6. One observes a discontinuous change of $|\mathbf{Q}|$ above the field $\simeq 2.5 T$ from $|\mathbf{Q}| = 0$ to $|\mathbf{Q}| \simeq \Delta k_F$. At this point the specific-spin wave function provides the stable solution. At the same time, we have a transformation from the *spin-indistinguishable* to *spin-distinguishable* quasiparticles. In this manner, we have a model situation in which the question of distinguishability of quasiparticles can be investigated.




FIG. 5: (Color online) Pair binding energy as a function of magnetic field for the cases with the spin-dependent (solid lines) and the spin-independent (dot-dashed lines) masses of quasiparticles. Note higher critical fields (as marked by the solid circles on the x -axis) for pair breaking in the former case. Analytic solution reproduces properly the dependence for $\mathbf{Q} = 0$ state. The uppermost solid circle marks the transition from $\mathbf{Q} = 0$ to $|\mathbf{Q}| \simeq \Delta k_F$. The state with $\Delta m = 0$ and $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$ is nonphysical and is presented for comparison.




FIG. 6: (Color online) Optimal Cooper pair center-of-mass momentum versus magnetic field. For high enough fields $|\mathbf{Q}| \simeq \Delta k_F$. The regimes with spin-singlet and specific-spin wave functions are also shown. The solid circle at the end marks the Pauli limiting critical field.

V. AN OVERVIEW

The spin-dependent effective masses of quasiparticles (SDM) appear in all approximate theories^{4,5,6,7,8} of correlated narrow-band electrons in the applied magnetic field. Here, we have presented solution of the Cooper pair problem with SDM. The Hamiltonian has been formulated in two ways: with the *scalar* masses and with *operator* masses, the latter being more appropriate for the study of the two-particle pairing. The latter Hamiltonian also allows for systematic studies of the question of *quasiparticle-spin distinguishability*. The resulting stable solution has an antisymmetric wave function and describes spin-singlet state for Cooper pair at rest ($\mathbf{Q} = 0$), even if $m_1 \neq m_2$. However, the $\mathbf{Q} = 0$ singlet solution is energetically degenerate with the specific-spin solution. For higher magnetic field, the solution with $\mathbf{Q} = 0$ becomes less favorable energetically, and the transition to a moving-Cooper pair state $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$ takes

place. The moving Cooper-pair wave function has no definite transposition symmetry in the spin coordinates. With the transition to a moving Cooper-pair state there appears also that from *indistinguishable quasiparticles* to their *distinguishable correspondants*. This also leads to the admixture of the triplet component with $S^z = 0$ to the singlet state for $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$, as the *specific-spin* function is a superposition: $|1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle = (|singlet\rangle + |triplet\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. We think that the quasiparticle-spin distinguishability is thus indispensable, as the quasiparticles have different masses which represent their external characteristic, with the value of spin quantum number labeling them.

The whole approach was formulated in the simplest possible manner to single out the most important physical consequences of introducing the *spin-direction dependent quasiparticle masses*. The condensed state of pairs with SDM is treated separately²². Also, the spin-dependent masses with specific-spin wave function will lead to corrections to the normal-state properties.

Acknowledgments

We thank Jakub Jędrak for a discussion. The work was supported by Ministry of Higher Education and Science, Grants Nos. 1 P03B 001 29 and N N202 173735. The project was performed under the auspices of the COST P-16 Grant of the European Science Foundation, entitled "*Emergent Behavior in Correlated Matter*" (ECOM).

APPENDIX A: ELEMENTARY DERIVATION OF THE SPIN-DEPENDENT MASS ENHANCEMENT FACTOR

The mass enhancement factor in a strongly correlated system can be understood on the intuitive ground in the following manner. Usually, it is the most decisive factor in determining the quasiparticle density of states^{4,5,6,7,8}, so the argument is carried out for featureless (rectangular) form of the density of states in the bare band (here taken per site and one spin direction), i.e.

$$\rho(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{W}, & \text{for } -\frac{W}{2} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{W}{2} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where W is the bare bandwidth. In such situation the bare band energy per site is

$$\left(\frac{E_B}{N}\right)_{U \rightarrow 0} = \int_{-\frac{W}{2}}^{\mu} \epsilon \rho(\epsilon) d\epsilon = -\left(\frac{W}{2}\right) \sum_{\sigma} n_{\sigma}(1 - n_{\sigma}), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the chemical potential is defined from

$$n_{\sigma} = \int_{-\frac{W}{2}}^{\mu} \rho(\epsilon) d\epsilon. \quad (\text{A3})$$

On the other hand, for strongly correlated electrons ($U \rightarrow \infty$) the corresponding energy of itinerant electrons is²³

$$\left(\frac{E_B}{N}\right)_{U \rightarrow \infty} = -\left(\frac{W}{2}\right) \sum_{\sigma} n_{\sigma}(1 - n). \quad (\text{A4})$$

The factor $(1 - n)$ expresses the fact that the hopping of the electron between the neighbors takes place when there is no other electron present on neighboring site. Combining (A2) and (A4) one can write down that

$$\left(\frac{E_B}{N}\right)_{U \rightarrow \infty} = -\left(\frac{W}{2}\right) \sum_{\sigma} q_{\sigma} n_{\sigma}(1 - n_{\sigma}) = \sum_{k < k_F, \sigma} q_{\sigma} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

with $q_{\sigma} = (1 - n)/(1 - n_{\sigma})$ is the spin dependent, \mathbf{k} -independent renormalization factor. We write now the quasiparticle energy in the form $E_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = q_{\sigma} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + (q_{\sigma} - 1)\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} + \Sigma(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})$, where $\Sigma(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})$ is the self-energy part (its real part) induced by the correlations. Defining the mass via the standard Fermi-liquid relation

$$\left(\frac{m^*}{m_B}\right)^{-1} = 1 + \frac{\partial \Sigma(\omega)}{\partial \omega} \Big|_{\omega = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

we obtain that $m^* \equiv m_{\sigma} = m_B 1/q_{\sigma} = m_B(1 - n_{\sigma})/(1 - n)$, which is equivalent to (2).

APPENDIX B: BINDING ENERGY FOR GENERAL ANTISYMMETRIC STATE

We consider here the most general wave function antisymmetric with respect to transposition of particles (27) and show that its binding energy decreases with the increasing center-of-mass momentum \mathbf{Q} and is lower than the energy of the specific-spin state (4). Spin states with a well-defined transposition symmetry (singlet and triplet with $S^z = 0$) are described by the following wave functions

$$\chi_S(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle - |1 \downarrow\rangle|2 \uparrow\rangle), \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$\chi_T(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle + |1 \downarrow\rangle|2 \uparrow\rangle). \quad (\text{B2})$$

Therefore, we can expand the general antisymmetric wave function in the basis of singlet and triplet wave functions.

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \lambda \Phi_S(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \chi_S(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) + \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2} \Phi_A(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \chi_T(\sigma_1, \sigma_2). \quad (\text{B3})$$

Where Φ_S is symmetric and Φ_A antisymmetric under $(\mathbf{r}_1 \leftrightarrow \mathbf{r}_2)$ and λ is characterizing the degree of mixing. We underline once again that (B3) is the most general antisymmetric wave function.

We express the functions Φ_A and Φ_S as a superposition (we take $V = 1$ for simplicity)

$$\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2} \Phi_A(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \left(e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_2} - e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_2 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_1} \right), \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$\lambda \Phi_S(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \left(e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_2} + e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_2 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_1} \right). \quad (\text{B5})$$

Therefore, the wave functions have the proper symmetry by construction. Setting either $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} = 0$ or $\beta_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} = 0$, we obtain the singlet or triplet wave functions, respectively. Note that the binding energy for the triplet state vanishes for the s -wave pairing. We consider the Cooper problem with the wave function (B3) and Hamiltonian in the form (6).

As we already have said, the natural basis of the spin wave functions is spanned by the specific-spin wave functions. For this reason, we transform the wave function (B3) to the form

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \left[\left(\lambda_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_2} + \gamma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_2 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_1} \right) |1 \uparrow\rangle|2 \downarrow\rangle - \left(\gamma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_2} + \lambda_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1 \mathbf{r}_2 + i\mathbf{k}_2 \mathbf{r}_1} \right) |1 \downarrow\rangle|2 \uparrow\rangle \right], \quad (\text{B6})$$

where the new coefficients are given by

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \equiv \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} + \alpha_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} \equiv \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2} - \alpha_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Following the standard but cumbersome procedure, we obtain the following two equations for those expansion coefficients

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{k}'} + \gamma_{-\mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{Q} \frac{\Delta_m}{M}} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} + \gamma_{-\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q} \frac{\Delta_m}{M}}) V_{\mathbf{k}' \mathbf{k}}}{\frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{Q}^2}{2M} + \frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{k}'^2}{2\mu} - E}, \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{k}'} + \gamma_{-\mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{Q} \frac{\Delta_m}{M}} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} + \gamma_{-\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q} \frac{\Delta_m}{M}}) V_{(-\mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{Q} \frac{\Delta_m}{M})(-\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q} \frac{\Delta_m}{M})}}{\frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{Q}^2}{2M} + \frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{k}'^2}{2\mu} - E}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

For the above equations not to be contradictory, the matrix elements of the pairing potential have to be identical

$$V_{(-\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{Q}\frac{\Delta m}{M})(-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\frac{\Delta m}{M})} = V_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{k}}. \quad (\text{B11})$$

If this condition is fulfilled, Eqs. (B9) and (B10) are equivalent. We introduce the potential in the standard form with a constant attraction

$$V_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} = \begin{cases} -V_0, & \text{for } \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' \in W^*, \\ 0, & \text{for } \mathbf{k} \notin W^* \vee \mathbf{k}' \notin W^*. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B12})$$

Now, the condition (B11) is fulfilled if and only if W^* has the following property

$$W^* = -W^* + \mathbf{Q}\frac{\Delta m}{M}. \quad (\text{B13})$$

Clearly, the region $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is not a good choice for W^* , but by making use of it we can construct a proper interaction region as follows

$$W^* = \overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}} \cap (-\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbf{Q}\frac{\Delta m}{M}). \quad (\text{B14})$$

Such interaction region has a physical meaning, as we can rewrite it in the form

$$W^* = \left\{ \mathbf{k} = \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 m_2 - \mathbf{k}_2 m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \mid \mathbf{k}_1 \in W_1 \cap W_2 \wedge \mathbf{k}_2 \in W_2 \cap W_1 \wedge \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 \right\}, \quad (\text{B15})$$

$$W_i = \left\{ \mathbf{k} \mid \epsilon_F \leq \frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{k}^2}{2m_i} - \sigma_i \epsilon_B \leq \epsilon_F + \hbar\omega_D \right\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (\text{B16})$$

meaning that the interaction takes place in the regions of \mathbf{k} -space, for which not only both particles are at most $\hbar\omega_D$ Fermi level, but also if we exchanged their wavevectors ($\mathbf{k}_1 \leftrightarrow \mathbf{k}_2$), they are still at most $\hbar\omega_D$ above their Fermi surface.

The equation for the binding energy can be obtained from (B9) after summing up over $\mathbf{k}' \in W^*$ and dividing by $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in W^*} (\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} + \gamma_{-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{Q}\frac{\Delta m}{M}})$. In effect, we have that

$$\frac{N}{V_0} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in W^*} \frac{1}{\frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{Q}^2}{2M} + \frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{k}^2}{2\mu} - E}. \quad (\text{B17})$$

This equation has the same form as the one obtained for the *specific-spin* state, the only difference being the appearance of the interaction region W^* instead of $\overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. From this very fact follows automatically the lower binding energy for the antisymmetric state (B3), as $W^* \subset \overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. For the case of pair at rest ($\mathbf{Q} = 0$), both states (specific-spin and antisymmetric) have equal binding energy, because then $W^* = \overline{W}_{\mathbf{Q}=0}$. The numerical results show that the binding energy of the antisymmetric state decreases linearly with the increasing \mathbf{Q} (see Fig. 4).

* Electronic address: jan.kaczmarczyk@uj.edu.pl

† Electronic address: ufspalek@if.uj.edu.pl

¹ L. Cooper, Phys. Rev. **104**, 1189 (1956).

² M. Randeria, J.-M. Duan, and L.-Y. Shieh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 981 (1989).

³ K. Byczuk, J. Spałek, and W. Wójcik, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 14134 (1992).

⁴ J. Spałek and P. Gopalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2823 (1990).

⁵ P. Korbel, J. Spałek, W. Wójcik, and M. Acquarone, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R2213 (1995); for brief review see: J. Spałek, Physica B **378-380**, 654 (2006); phys. stat. solidi (b) **243**, 70 (2006) (Editor's choice).

⁶ J. Bauer and A. C. Hewson, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 035118 (2007).

⁷ J. Bauer, arXiv:cond-mat/0804.2974.

⁸ S. Onari, H. Kontani, and Y. Tanaka, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **77**, 023703 (2008).

- ⁹ A. McCollam, S. R. Julian, P. M. C. Rourke, D. Aoki, and J. Flouquet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 186401 (2005).
- ¹⁰ I. Sheikin, A. Gröger, S. Raymond, D. Jaccard, D. Aoki, H. Harima, and J. Flouquet, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 094420 (2003); M. Takashita, H. Aoki, T. Terashima, S. Uji, K. Maezawa, R. Settai and Y. Onuki, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **65**, 515 (1996).
- ¹¹ L. D. Landau *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **30**, 1058 (1956) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **3**, 920 (1957)].
- ¹² K. Kumagai, M. Saitoh, T. Oyaizu, Y. Furukawa, S. Takashima, M. Nohara, H. Takagi, and Y. Matsuda, [arXiv:cond-mat/0605394](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0605394) (2006).
- ¹³ C. F. Miclea, M. Nicklas, D. Parker, K. Maki, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, G. Sparn, and F. Steglich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 117001 (2006).
- ¹⁴ P. Fulde and R. A. Ferrel, *Phys. Rev.* **135**, A550 (1964).
- ¹⁵ A. I. Larkin and Yu. N. Ovchinnikov, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **47**, 1136 (1964) [*Sov. Phys. JETP*, **20**, 762 (1965)].
- ¹⁶ J. Singleton, J. A. Symington, M-S. Nam, A. Ardavan, M. Kurmoo, and P. Day, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **12**, L641 (2000)
- ¹⁷ R. Lortz, Y. Wang, A. Demuer, R. H. M. Böttger, B. Bergk, G. Zwirnagl, Y. Nakazawa, and J. Woznitza, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 187002 (2007).
- ¹⁸ K. Maki, *Phys. Rev.* **148**, 362 (1966).
- ¹⁹ P. Wróbel, Z. Strypan, J. Kaczmarczyk, and J. Spalek, *Acta Phys. Polon. A* **109**, 541 (2006).
- ²⁰ H. Shimahara, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 12760 (1994).
- ²¹ J. Spalek, M. Maška, M. Mierzejewski, J. Kaczmarczyk, [arXiv/cond-mat:0809.1799](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0809.1799) (2008).
- ²² M. Maška, M. Mierzejewski, J. Kaczmarczyk, and J. Spalek, in preparation.
- ²³ J. Spalek, A. M. Oleś, and J. M. Honig, *Phys. Rev. B* **28**, 6802 (1983).