

Nuclear magnetic resonance studies of pseudospin fluctuations in URu₂Si₂

K. R. Shirer,¹ J. T. Haraldsen,^{2,3} A. P. Dioguardi,¹ J. Crocker,¹ N. apRoberts-Warren,¹
 A. C. Shockley,¹ C.-H. Lin,¹ D. M. Nisson,¹ J. C. Cooley,⁴ M. Janoschek,^{5,*} K. Huang,⁵
 N. Kanchanavatee,⁵ M. B. Maple,⁵ M. J. Graf,² A. V. Balatsky,^{2,3,6} and N. J. Curro^{1,†}

¹*Department of Physics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA*

²*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

³*Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

⁴*Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*

⁵*Department of Physics, University of California,
 San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093-0319, USA*

⁶*NORDITA, Roslagstullsbacken 23, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*

(Dated: September 29, 2018)

We report ²⁹Si NMR measurements in single crystals and aligned powders of URu₂Si₂ in the hidden order and paramagnetic phases. The spin-lattice-relaxation data reveal evidence of pseudospin fluctuations of U moments in the paramagnetic phase. We find evidence for partial suppression of the density of states below 30 K, and analyze the data in terms of a two component spin-fermion model. We propose that this behavior is a realization of a pseudogap between the hidden order transition T_{HO} and 30 K. This behavior is then compared to other materials that demonstrate precursor fluctuations in a pseudogap regime above a ground state with long-range order.

PACS numbers: 76.60.-k, 75.30.Mb, 75.25.Dk, 76.60.Es

Despite more than twenty years since its discovery, URu₂Si₂ continues to attract considerable interest in the condensed matter community.^{1,2} This heavy fermion system develops a “hidden” order phase below $T_{HO} = 17.5$ K, and an unconventional superconducting state below 1.5 K.^{1,3} The nature of the hidden order (HO) phase remains controversial, but it clearly does not involve magnetic ordering of dipole moments.⁴ It may involve order of higher order multipoles,⁵ exotic spin, orbital or spin-orbital density waves,^{6–10} or hybridization between local moments and conduction electrons.^{11–13} Extensive neutron scattering and angle-resolved photoemission work has suggested that it has an itinerant nature and involves some type of Fermi surface instability.^{4,14–18}

Recent evidence has suggested that the hidden order is intimately connected with the onset of coherence of the Kondo lattice.^{19–22} In Kondo lattice systems the $5f$ electrons of the U are partially screened by the conduction electrons, leading to a renormalization of the electronic dispersion near the Fermi level. At high temperatures the $5f$ electrons remain localized and scatter the itinerant conduction electrons.^{19–22} Below a coherence temperature, T_{coh} , the f electrons hybridize with the conduction electrons, and the electronic dispersion reflects renormalized heavy quasiparticles. In other Kondo lattice systems coherence emerges as a crossover, but recent scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) results suggest that T_{coh} coincides with T_{HO} , and thus the HO parameter is in fact the hybridization gap.^{13,21,22}

A re-examination and re-analysis of previous thermodynamic and neutron scattering measurements under the context of HO gap fluctuations have revealed the possible existence of a pseudogap occurring before the HO state and starting around 30 K.²³ This analysis highlighted the presence of anomalies in magnetic susceptibility,⁶

point contact spectroscopy (PCS),²⁴ and neutron scattering measurements.^{14,25} Other thermodynamic probes (heat capacity, thermal expansion and ultrasound velocity) also register an anomaly between 25–30 K, where these are sensitive to changes in the elastic constants of the crystal lattice.^{26–29} A similar temperature scale has been observed in ultrafast and conventional optical spectroscopy, which found a suppression of low energy spectral weight below 30 K that may be associated with a pseudogap.^{30–32}

In contrast to the pseudogap and the aforementioned STM results, recent PCS work has attributed the suppression of conductance below 28 K to a hybridization gap.³³ As mentioned above, this suppression emerges well above T_{HO} and has been observed in earlier reports occurring around 22 K.²⁴ In general, reports concerning a suppression of the density of states (DOS) above T_{HO} have been mixed. Some specific heat and resistivity measurements² as well as several PCS experiments^{34–39} revealed no anomalies above T_{HO} . These discrepancies makes the overall results unreliable for the assessment of a pseudogap. We therefore look to investigate similar anomalies in nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) measurements.

Here, we report new NMR spin-lattice-relaxation measurements on both single crystal and powder samples of URu₂Si₂ that indicate the presence of spin fluctuations that become partially gapped below a temperature $T_{pg} \approx 30$ K. These observations are consistent with the emergence of a pseudogap prior to the HO state. Using a pseudospin fluctuation model, we show that fluctuations alone cannot explain the suppression of the NMR response between T_{HO} and 30 K. We therefore conclude that the existence of a pseudogap is needed to further suppress the modes of the hidden order.




FIG. 1. (Color Online) (a) The ^{29}Si spectrum at 18 K indicating the width of the NMR resonant frequency, centered at 99.695 MHz, and the frequencies around at which $(T_1 T)^{-1}$ was measured. (b) $(T_1 T)^{-1}$ as function of temperature for various values of frequency showing the consistency across the frequency range.

Resistivity and NMR Knight shift measurements indicated that a third temperature scale, $T_{coh} \approx 80$ K, is also evident.⁴⁰ However, while the 30 K feature is seen in the four-point correlation function of the spin-lattice-relaxation rate, it is not evident in the two-point correlation function of the Knight shift. This may be due to the difference between the dynamic and static scaling factors.

Polycrystalline samples of URu_2Si_2 were synthesized by arc-melting in a gettered argon atmosphere, and an aligned powder was prepared in an epoxy matrix by curing a mixture of powder and epoxy in an external magnetic field of 9 T. Single crystals were grown employing the Czochralski method in a Techno Search TCA 4-5 Tetra-Arc Furnace under a zirconium gettered argon atmosphere. The grown single crystals were confirmed in a D-8 Discover Bruker diffractometer. In conducting samples, aligned powders are useful to enhance the surface-to-volume ratio and hence the NMR sensitivity, and single crystals were measured to confirm consistency between independent samples. NMR measurements were carried out using a high homogeneity 11.7 T (500 MHz) Oxford Instruments magnet. In this field, T_{HO} is suppressed to 16 K.⁴¹ The ^{29}Si ($I = 1/2$, natural abundance 4.6%) spectra were measured by spin echoes, and the signal-to-noise ratio was enhanced by summing several (~ 100) echoes acquired via a Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill pulse sequence. The spin-lattice-relaxation rate T_1^{-1} was measured as a function of the angle between the alignment axis and the magnetic field \mathbf{H}_0 in order to properly align the sample, since T_1^{-1} is a strong function of orientation with a minimum for $\mathbf{H}_0 \parallel c$.

Figure 1 shows the measured NMR relaxation rate as function of frequency and temperature. There is no significant frequency dependence; we therefore use the average over all frequencies to determine the $(T_1 T)^{-1}$, shown in Fig. 2. Below T_{HO} , there is a clear change in the relaxation rate, as can be expected due to the development of long range order. However, there is also a clear




FIG. 2. (Color Online) (a) Frequency-averaged $(T_1 T)^{-1}$ versus T for the aligned powder (open circles), and the single crystal (filled squares). Different fits to 2D AFM spin fluctuations as described in Eq. 3 using an LAD (red solid line) and LSQ (blue solid line) fit method, as well as a LAD fit to a Curie-Weiss law (green solid line). (b) The extracted joint density of states (JDOS) showing the pseudogap suppression below 30 K and the residual carrier density in the HO state; same color legend as in panel (a). The JDOS drops by roughly 25% in the pseudogap region between 30 K and 16 K and by another 70% below the HO state.

suppression of $(T_1 T)^{-1}$ between 30 K and T_{HO} , which is indicative of the formation of a pseudogap. This linear pseudogap response is similar to the response predicted using gap fluctuations of the HO parameter by Haraldsen *et al.*²³ Figure 2 also shows the data acquired in a single crystal. The data clearly are reproducible across different samples, and our observations are independent of whether the sample has been subjected to strain in order to form the powder. We note that other groups have published similar data, albeit with less precision, but have not speculated on the origin of this suppression.^{42,43}

In order to quantify the observed pseudogap, it is important to clarify the origin of the spin-lattice-relaxation in the paramagnetic state. Inelastic neutron scattering experiments have shown the importance of spin fluctuations in URu_2Si_2 and their possible connection to the HO phase transition.^{4,14} Because of strong spin-orbit coupling neither spin nor orbital quantum numbers are conserved and instead fluctuations of the magnetic moment aligned along the c axis should be considered as pseudospin fluctuations,⁷⁻¹² where these fluctuations are based on the spin-orbit interaction of the j - j coupling scheme for the $j = 5/2$ sextet.⁴⁴ Furthermore, we will as-

sume that these fluctuations are the signature of a quantum phase transition (QPT), which is related to the HO transition and long-range antiferromagnetic (AFM) order found at pressure above 0.6 GPa.⁴⁵ Although this QPT is complicated by a first-order phase transition under pressure from the HO to AFM phase, the normal state to HO transition remains second order. Further corroborating the QPT scenario is the strong coupling between the HO and AFM in Rh-doped studies, which implies that there is a nearby instability to AFM at ambient pressure.⁴³ Such a scenario of dominant 2D fluctuations is supported by the noticeable anisotropy of magnetic correlation lengths $\xi_a/\xi_c \sim 4$, deduced from scans around neutron scattering peaks (1,0,0) and (1,0,2).⁴ Similar two-dimensional (2D) correlations were reported for the heavy fermion compounds $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$ and YbRh_2Si_2 .^{46,47}

Given the nature of 2D AFM pseudospin fluctuations, we argue that the longitudinal fluctuations of the z component of the total angular momentum ($\Delta_{j_z} = \pm 1$), seen in the four-point correlation function describing the $(T_1T)^{-1}$ data of Fig. 2, can be captured by the two-component spin-fermion model.⁴⁸ In Bang's model, critical spin modes originate from localized f -electron spins coupled to conduction electrons. Since it successfully explained the spin-lattice-relaxation rate in $\text{Pu}M\text{Ga}_5$ ($M=\text{Rh}, \text{Co}$) compounds (shown in Fig. 3), we expect the same to apply to URu_2Si_2 :

$$(T_1T)^{-1} \sim N_J(T) \times \xi(T)^z. \quad (1)$$

Here $N_J(T) \sim N^2(E_F)$ is the normalized joint density of states (JDOS) at the Fermi energy E_F , which accounts for any T -dependent suppression due to a pseudogap, and $\xi(T)$ is the magnetic correlation length of dynamic fluctuations with dynamic exponent z . The slowing down of fluctuations is given by the relaxation time $\tau \sim \xi^z$. For commensurate 2D AFM Heisenberg fluctuations near a QPT, one expects to find $z = 1$. In this case, the magnetic correlation length shows a universal scaling behavior when crossing from the quantum critical to quantum disordered state and is approximately given by:⁴⁹

$$\xi(T)^{-1} \sim \Delta + T \exp(-4\Delta/T), \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta \sim T_{QPT}$ is the pseudospin gap in the excitation spectrum of the quantum critical state above the crossover. Note that at exactly the critical point ($\Delta = 0$), the correlation length obeys $\xi^{-1} \sim T$ as $T \rightarrow 0$, characteristic of QPT phenomena.

We extract the hidden order and pseudogap suppressed JDOS $N_J(T)$ from the spin-lattice-relaxation rate. First we determine the spin gap from the fluctuation region above the onset of the pseudogap. Above 30 K, we fit $(T_1T)^{-1}$ to the expression in Eqs. (1) and (2) with dynamic exponent $z = 1$:

$$1/T_1T = N_J(T) \frac{A}{\Delta + T \exp(-4\Delta/T)} + B, \quad (3)$$




FIG. 3. (Color Online) (a) $(T_1T)/(T_1T)_{\min}$ as function of T/T_0 for URu_2Si_2 and $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_4\text{O}_8$. The arrows indicate the onset of the pseudogap in both materials. (b) The scaling behavior of $(T_1T)^{-1}/(T_1T_0)^{-1}$ as function of T/T_0 for URu_2Si_2 (black circles) as compared to other materials with AFM fluctuations.

with positive coefficients A and B , where B is a high temperature Korringa relaxation term that accounts for conduction bands not participating in the fluctuations, and assume that $N_J = 1$. We find that the data in Fig. 2 are best described by model parameters $\Delta \approx 1.9 T_{HO} = 30.1$ K, $A = 1.41 \text{ s}^{-1}$, $B = 9.03 \times 10^{-3} \text{ K}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $N_J(T) = 1$ for $T > 30$ K using the least-absolute deviation (LAD) method, rather than the least-square (LSQ) method, because it is less sensitive to scatter in the data, as shown in Fig. 2. While both LAD and LSQ give good overall fits over the entire temperature range, the LSQ fit yields a residual JDOS that is too small (nearly zero) to be consistent with specific heat measurements of a heavy mass and heavy-fermion superconductivity below 1.5 K. The primary difference between both fits is in the value of the B term. Furthermore, restricting the fitting window to higher temperatures leads to unphysically small Curie-Weiss temperatures that clearly contradict values obtained from extrapolation at higher temperatures, i.e., 100 – 300 K.¹ A comparison with Curie-Weiss-like local moment fluctuations, $\xi \sim 1/(T + T_{CW})$ and $T_{CW} \approx 90$ K, gives the worst fit and an unreasonably large residual JDOS in the HO state. Note that T_{CW} is similar to T_{coh} as measured by the Knight shift, where local moment behavior emerges above T_{coh} .⁴⁰ Next, we apply the fluctuation theory over the entire temperature range and divide out the experimental data to yield $N_J(T)$ by using Eq. (3) as shown in Fig. 2(b).

Clearly, the suppression of $(T_1T)^{-1}$ between $T_{pg} \sim 30$ K and $T_{HO} \sim 16$ K necessitates the existence of a pseu-

dogap, so that $N_J(T) < 1$ for $T < T_{pg}$, which reflects a suppression of the modes of the pseudospin fluctuations. Between T_{pg} and T_{HO} the JDOS is suppressed 25% and continues to be suppressed even more below T_{HO} , however, it remains finite ($\sim 6\%$) at 8.5 K, see the LAD curve in Fig. 2(b), in agreement with specific heat and STM measurements.^{21,22} The anomalous T -dependence of T_1 in the paramagnetic state also shows up in many other correlated electron systems as exemplified in Fig. 3. Optical measurements of URu_2Si_2 have also observed non-Fermi liquid behavior, as one might expect for a QPT.⁵⁰ In the high temperature superconducting cuprates, the pseudogap is manifested in the spin-lattice-relaxation rate data as a deviation from linearity in a plot of T_1T versus T .⁵¹ In fact, the qualitative behavior of T_1T in URu_2Si_2 is quite similar to that of $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_4\text{O}_8$, as seen in Fig. 3(a). In this case, the temperature axis is scaled by T_0 , where T_0 is either T_{HO} or T_c , the latter is the superconducting transition temperature. For both materials, T_1T exhibits a clear upturn at $\sim 1.8T_0$. For $T > T_{pg}$, the qualitative similarity is even more striking. Fig. 3(b) shows the inverse, $(T_1T)^{-1}$, versus T/T_0 for several high-temperature superconductors, heavy-fermion superconductors, and URu_2Si_2 . Although we cannot determine the origin of the observed pseudogap, we do note that when $(T_1T)^{-1}$ is normalized to remove the effects of different hyperfine couplings [$(T_1T)_0^{-1} = 1/2$ at $T = 4T_0$, where T_0 is the ordering temperature], the data scale with one another in the normal (paramagnetic) states for $T > 3T_0$, suggesting a connection between the nature of the ordering and the AFM pseudospin fluctuations driving the relaxation rate.⁵² Since the effects of 2D AFM spin fluctuations play a crucial role in a large class of

materials above the superconducting transition, and possibly in the mediation of superconductivity, it is quite likely that the long-range HO state evolves out of pseudospin fluctuations as well. Recent theoretical scenarios falling into this general class of fluctuation mediated HO state are the spin-orbit-density and hybridization wave,⁹⁻¹³ and pseudospin-density wave due to crystal-field split ground states.⁸

In conclusion, we have demonstrated the existence of a hidden order pseudospin gap $\Delta \approx 1.9T_{HO} = 30.1$ K that is consistent with other probes, extracted the JDOS through a fitting of the NMR relaxation time data, and compared this behavior to other materials with known pseudogap behavior. It is our hope that other experiments will investigate this region and the connection between the hidden order and antiferromagnetic state and the proposed pseudogap behavior.

We thank T. Das, P. Coleman, P. Riseborough, J. Mydosh, and T. Durakiewicz for stimulating discussions. Work at UC Davis and LANL was supported by the UC Lab Research Fee Program and the NNSA under the Stewardship Science Academic Alliances program through U.S. DOE Research Grant No. DE-FG52-09NA29464. JTH and AVB acknowledge support for work performed, in part, by the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies, an Office of Science User Facility operated for the U.S. DOE Office of Science by LANL (Contract No. DE-AC52-06NA25396) and AVB acknowledges support by Nordita. MJ gratefully acknowledges financial support by the Alexander von Humboldt foundation. Research at UCSD was supported by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG02-04ER46105.

* Current Address: Condensed Matter and Magnet Science Group, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

† curro@physics.ucdavis.edu

¹ T. T. M. Palstra, A. A. Menovsky, J. vandenBerg, A. J. Dirkmaat, P. H. Kes, G. J. Nieuwenhuys, and J. A. Mydosh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2727 (1985).

² J. A. Mydosh and P. M. Oppeneer, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 1301 (2011).

³ Y. Kasahara, T. Iwasawa, H. Shishido, T. Shibauchi, K. Behnia, Y. Haga, T. D. Matsuda, Y. Onuki, M. Sigrist, and Y. Matsuda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 116402 (2007).

⁴ C. Broholm, J. K. Kjems, W. J. L. Buyers, P. Matthews, T. T. M. Palstra, A. A. Menovsky, and J. A. Mydosh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1467 (1987).

⁵ K. Hanzawa, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **310**, e166 (2007).

⁶ M. B. Maple, J. W. Chen, Y. Dalichaouch, T. Kohara, C. Rossel, M. S. Torikachvili, M. W. McElfresh, and J. D. Thompson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 185 (1986).

⁷ P. Chandra, P. Coleman, J. A. Mydosh, and V. Tripathi, *Nature* **417**, 831 (2002).

⁸ V. P. Mineev and M. E. Zhitomirsky, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 014432 (2005).

⁹ T. Das, *Sci. Rep.* **2**, (2012).

¹⁰ P. S. Riseborough, B. Coqblin, and S. G. Magalhães, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 165116 (2012).

¹¹ S. Elgazzar, J. Ruzs, M. Amft, P. M. Oppeneer, and J. A. Mydosh, *Nat. Mater.* **8**, 337 (2009), 0809.2887.

¹² P. Chandra, P. Coleman, and R. Flint, *Nature* **493**, 621 (2013).

¹³ Y. Dubi and A. V. Balatsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 086401 (2011).

¹⁴ C. R. Wiebe, J. A. Janik, G. J. MacDougall, G. M. Luke, J. D. Garrett, H. D. Zhou, Y.-J. Jo, L. Balicas, Y. Qiu, J. R. D. Copley, Z. Yamani, and W. J. L. Buyers, *Nat. Phys.* **3**, 96 (2007).

¹⁵ F. Bourdarot, E. Hassinger, S. Raymond, D. Aoki, V. Taufour, L.-P. Regnault, and J. Flouquet, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **79**, 064719 (2010).

¹⁶ G. L. Dakovski, Y. Li, S. M. Gilbertson, G. Rodriguez, A. V. Balatsky, J.-X. Zhu, K. Gofryk, E. D. Bauer, P. H. Tobash, A. Taylor, J. L. Sarrao, P. M. Oppeneer, P. S. Riseborough, J. A. Mydosh, and T. Durakiewicz, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 161103 (2011).

¹⁷ S. Chatterjee, J. Trinckauf, T. Hanke, D. E. Shai, J. W. Harter, T. J. Williams, G. M. Luke, K. M. Shen, and

- J. Geck, arXiv: (2012), [1211.5312](#).
- ¹⁸ F. L. Boariu, C. Bareille, H. Schwab, A. Nuber, P. Lejay, T. Durakiewicz, F. Reinert, and A. F. Santander-Syro, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 156404 (2013).
- ¹⁹ A. C. Hewson, *The Kondo Problem to Heavy Fermions* (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- ²⁰ K. Haule and G. Kotliar, *Nat Phys* **5**, 796 (2009).
- ²¹ A. R. Schmidt, M. H. Hamidian, P. Wahl, F. Meier, A. V. Balatsky, J. D. Garrett, T. J. Williams, G. M. Luke, and J. C. Davis, *Nature* **465**, 570 (2010).
- ²² P. Aynajian, E. H. da Silva Neto, C. V. Parker, Y. Huang, A. Pasupathy, J. Mydosh, and A. Yazdani, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**, 10383 (2010).
- ²³ J. T. Haraldsen, Y. Dubi, N. J. Curro, and A. V. Balatsky, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 214410 (2011).
- ²⁴ K. Hasselbach, J. R. Kirtley, and P. Lejay, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 5826 (1992).
- ²⁵ J. A. Janik, H. D. Zhou, Y.-J. Jo, L. Balicas, G. J. MacDougall, G. M. Luke, J. D. Garrett, K. J. McClellan, E. D. Bauer, J. L. Sarrao, Y. Qiu, J. R. D. Copley, Z. Yamani, W. J. L. Buyers, and C. R. Wiebe, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **21**, 192202 (2009).
- ²⁶ W. Schlabitz, J. Baumann, B. Pollit, U. Rauchschwalbe, H. Mayer, U. Ahlheim, and C. Bredl, in *Ten Years of Superconductivity: 1980 - 1990*, Perspectives in Condensed Matter Physics, Vol. 7, edited by H. Ott (Springer Netherlands, 1993) pp. 89–95.
- ²⁷ N. H. van Dijk, F. Bourdarot, J. C. P. Klaasse, I. H. Hagmusa, E. Brück, and A. A. Menovsky, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 14493 (1997).
- ²⁸ A. de Visser, F. E. Kayzel, A. A. Menovsky, J. J. M. Franse, J. van den Berg, and G. J. Nieuwenhuys, *Phys. Rev. B* **34**, 8168 (1986).
- ²⁹ B. Wolf, W. Sixl, R. Graf, D. Finsterbusch, G. Bruls, B. Luthi, E. Knetsch, A. Menovsky, and J. Mydosh, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **94**, 307 (1994).
- ³⁰ D. A. Bonn, J. D. Garrett, and T. Timusk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1305 (1988).
- ³¹ M. K. Liu, R. D. Averitt, T. Durakiewicz, P. H. Tobash, E. D. Bauer, S. A. Trugman, A. J. Taylor, and D. A. Yarotski, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 161101 (2011).
- ³² J. Levallois, F. Lévy-Bertrand, M. K. Tran, D. Stricker, J. A. Mydosh, Y.-K. Huang, and D. van der Marel, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 184420 (2011).
- ³³ W. K. Park, P. H. Tobash, F. Ronning, E. D. Bauer, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, and L. H. Greene, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 246403 (2012).
- ³⁴ J. G. Rodrigo, F. Guinea, S. Vieira, and F. G. Aliev, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 14318 (1997).
- ³⁵ R. Escudero, F. Morales, and P. Lejay, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 15271 (1994).
- ³⁶ Y. Naidyuk, O. Kvitnitskaya, A. Jansen, P. Wyder, C. Geibel, and A. Menovsky, *Low Temp. Phys.* **27**, 493 (2001).
- ³⁷ Y. Naidyuk, O. Kvitnitskaya, A. Nowack, I. Yanson, and A. Menovsky, *Physica B: Cond. Mat.* **218**, 157 (1996).
- ³⁸ A. Nowack, Y. Naidyuk, P. Chubov, I. Yanson, and A. Menovsky, *Z.Phys. B Con. Mat.* **88**, 295 (1992).
- ³⁹ X. Lu, F. Ronning, P. H. Tobash, K. Gofryk, E. D. Bauer, and J. D. Thompson, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 020402 (2012).
- ⁴⁰ K. R. Shirer, A. C. Shockley, A. P. Dioguardi, J. Crocker, C. H. Lin, N. apRoberts Warren, D. M. Nisson, P. Klavins, J. C. Cooley, Y.-f. Yang, and N. J. Curro, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**, E3067 (2012).
- ⁴¹ N. Harrison, M. Jaime, and J. A. Mydosh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 096402 (2003).
- ⁴² Y. Kohori, K. Matsuda, and T. Kohara, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **65**, 1083 (1996).
- ⁴³ S. H. Baek, M. J. Graf, A. V. Balatsky, E. D. Bauer, J. C. Cooley, J. L. Smith, and N. J. Curro, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 132404 (2010).
- ⁴⁴ T. Hotta and K. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 104518 (2003).
- ⁴⁵ H. Amitsuka, K. Matsuda, I. Kawasaki, K. Tenya, M. Yokoyama, C. Sekine, N. Tateiwa, T. Kobayashi, S. Kawarazaki, and H. Yoshizawa, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **310**, 214 (2007).
- ⁴⁶ O. Stockert, H. v. Löhneysen, A. Rosch, N. Pyka, and M. Loewenhaupt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5627 (1998).
- ⁴⁷ P. Gegenwart, Q. Si, and F. Steglich, *Nat Phys* **4**, 186 (2008).
- ⁴⁸ Y. Bang, M. J. Graf, N. J. Curro, and A. V. Balatsky, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 054514 (2006).
- ⁴⁹ S. Chakravarty, B. I. Halperin, and D. R. Nelson, *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 2344 (1989).
- ⁵⁰ U. Nagel, T. Uleksin, T. Rõ om, R. P. S. M. Lobo, P. Lejay, C. C. Homes, J. S. Hall, A. W. Kinross, S. K. Purdy, T. Munsie, T. J. Williams, G. M. Luke, and T. Timusk, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**, 19161 (2012).
- ⁵¹ R. L. Corey, N. J. Curro, K. OHara, T. Imai, C. P. Slichter, K. Yoshimura, M. Katoh, and K. Kosuge, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 5907 (1996).
- ⁵² N. Curro, T. Caldwell, E. Bauer, L. Morales, M. Graf, Y. Bang, A. Balatsky, J. Thompson, and J. Sarrao, *Nature* **434**, 622 (2005).