

Models of Mixed Matter

V.I. Yukalov^{1,2} and E.P. Yukalova³

¹*Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

²*Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo,
CP 369, São Carlos 13560-970, São Paulo, Brazil*

³*Laboratory of Information Technologies,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

E-mails: *yukalov@theor.jinr.ru, yukalova@theor.jinr.ru*

Abstract

The review considers statistical systems composed of several phases that are intermixed in space at mesoscopic scale and systems representing a mixture of several components of microscopic objects. These types of mixtures should be distinguished from the Gibbs phase mixture, where the system is filled by macroscopic pieces of phases. The description of the macroscopic Gibbs mixture is rather simple, consisting in the consideration of pure phases separated by a surface, whose contribution becomes negligible in thermodynamic limit. The properties of mixtures, where phases are intermixed at mesoscopic scale, are principally different. The emphasis in the review is on the matter with phases mixed at mesoscopic scale. Heterogeneous materials composed of mesoscopic mixtures are ubiquitous in nature. A general theory of such mesoscopic mixtures is presented and illustrated by several condensed matter models. A mixture of several components of microscopic objects is illustrated by clustering quark-hadron matter.

Keywords: mixed matter, heterophase matter, mesoscopic mixture, nanophase mixture, phase fluctuations, mesoscopic phase separation, quark-hadron matter

PACS: 02.70.Rr; 05.30.-d; 05.40.-a; 05.70.Ce; 05.70.Fh; 12.38.Aw; 12.39.Mk; 12.90.+b; 64.60.-i; 64.60.Cn; 64.60.My; 64.70.Dv; 64.70.Kb; 67.80.-s; 67.80.Gb; 67.80.Mg; 74.25.-q; 74.62.-c; 75.10.-b; 77.80.-e; 77.80.Bh; 78.30.Ly

CONTENTS

1. Types of Phase Mixture
2. Mesoscopic Heterophase Mixture
3. Examples of Heterophase Materials
 - 3.1. Mixture of Ferromagnetic and Antiferromagnetic Phases
 - 3.2. Mixture of Magnetic and Paramagnetic Phases
 - 3.3. Mixture of Magnetic and Spin-Glass Phases
 - 3.4. Mixture of Phases with Different Magnetic Orientations
 - 3.5. Mixture of Ferroelectric and Paraelectric Phases
 - 3.6. Mixture of Different Crystalline Structures
 - 3.7. Mixture of Gaseous and Liquid Phases
 - 3.8. Mixture of Liquid and Solid Phases
 - 3.9. Mixture of Metallic and Nonmetallic Phases
 - 3.10. Mixture of Superconducting and Normal Phases
 - 3.11. Mixture of Metastable Amorphous Phases
 - 3.12. Mixture of Nonequilibrium Phases
4. Theory of Heterophase Systems
 - 4.1. Spontaneous Breaking of Equilibrium
 - 4.2. Statistical Ensembles and States
 - 4.3. Methods of Symmetry Breaking
 - 4.4. Weighted Hilbert Space
 - 4.5. Spatial Phase Separation
 - 4.6. Statistical Operator of Mixture
 - 4.7. Averaging over Phase Configurations
 - 4.8. Thermodynamic Potential of Mixture
 - 4.9. Observable Quantities of Mixture
 - 4.10. Statistics of Heterophase Systems
 - 4.11. Interphase Surface States
 - 4.12. Geometric Phase Probabilities
5. Models of Heterophase Systems
 - 5.1. Heterophase Heisenberg Model
 - 5.2. Role of Spin Waves
 - 5.3. Heterophase Ising Model
 - 5.4. Heterophase Nagle Model
 - 5.5. Model of Heterophase Antiferromagnet

- 5.6. Heterophase Hubbard Model
- 5.7. Heterophase Vonsovsky-Zener Model
- 5.8. Heterophase Spin Glass
- 5.9. Systems with Magnetic Reorientations
- 5.10. Model of Heterophase Superconductor
- 5.11. Stability of Heterophase States
- 5.12. Uniform Heterophase Superconductor
- 5.13. Anisotropic Heterophase Superconductor
- 5.14. Model of Heterophase Ferroelectric
- 5.15. Heterophase Crystalline Structure
- 5.16. Structural Phase Transition
- 5.17. Stability of Heterophase Solids
- 5.18. Solids with Nanoscale Defects
- 5.19. Theory of Melting and Crystallization
- 5.20. Model of Superfluid Solid
- 5.21. Relations between Chemical Potentials
- 5.22. Hamiltonian of Superfluid Solid
- 5.23. Possibility of Superfluid Crystals
- 6. Mixture of Microscopic Components
 - 6.1. Mixed Quark-Hadron Matter
 - 6.2. Stability of Multicomponent Mixture
 - 6.3. Theory of Clustering Matter
 - 6.4. Clustering Quark-Hadron Mixture
 - 6.5. Thermodynamics of Quark-Hadron Matter
- 7. Conclusion

1 Types of Phase Mixture

There are three types of mixtures consisting of several phases or components, macroscopic, mesoscopic, and microscopic. Macroscopic, or Gibbs, mixture consists of pieces of different pure phases having macroscopic sizes, for instance as is shown in Fig. 1. To form a thermodynamic phase, the substance has to have sizes l much larger than the mean interparticle distance a . The size of a phase l is called macroscopic, when it is of the order of the system size L , so that $a \ll l \sim L$. The phases are separated by a surface whose influence becomes negligibly small in the thermodynamic limit. The description of this kind of mixture reduces to the consideration of separate pure phases [1] complimented by the conditions of phase equilibrium. This simple case is not considered in the review.




Figure 1: Macroscopic Gibbs mixture.

Much more interesting is the case of mesoscopic mixtures, where the phases are intermixed in space so that at least one of the phases is randomly distributed inside another phase in the form of regions of mesoscopic size that is between the mean interparticle distance and the size of the system, $a \ll l \ll L$. Usually, mesoscopic size in condensed matter corresponds to nanoscale. This situation is schematically shown in Fig. 2. Many materials in nature are formed by such mesoscopic mixtures, as will be discussed below. This kind of materials is of the main interest in the present review.

The third type of mixed systems is presented by microscopic mixtures, where the particles that could form separate phases are intermixed on microscopic scales, as is shown in Fig. 3, so that the sample becomes a multicomponent composition, but not a multiphase system. However, such a multicomponent matter can exhibit mesoscopic fluctuations and even separate into phases composed of different particles. The microscopic mixture will be touched upon in the last section of the review and illustrated by the example of mixed quark-hadron matter.

Throughout the paper, we shall, as a rule, use the system of units, where the Planck constant and the Boltzmann constant are set to one. This will be done everywhere, except those places where concrete numerical values are evaluated.




Figure 2: Mesoscopic mixture of two phases.

2 Mesoscopic Heterophase Mixture

In order to characterize a mesoscopic mixture, it is necessary to recollect the main spatial and temporal scales typical of condensed matter.

The range of particle interactions is described by the interaction radius r_{int} . The mean interparticle distance a is connected with the mean particle density ρ as $\rho a^3 = 1$. The mean free path can be evaluated as

$$\lambda \sim \frac{1}{\rho r_{int}^2} \sim \frac{a^3}{r_{int}^2}. \quad (2.1)$$

The largest spacial scale is prescribed by the linear system size or the length of the region subject to the experimental observation, l_{exp} .

These spatial scales define the related temporal scales: The interaction time reads as

$$t_{int} \sim \frac{r_{int}}{v} \sim \frac{m r_{int}^2}{\hbar} \quad \left(v \sim \frac{\hbar}{m r_{int}} \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where v is the characteristic particle velocity. The local equilibration time is

$$t_{loc} \sim \frac{\lambda}{v} \sim \frac{m a^3}{\hbar r_{int}}. \quad (2.3)$$

In condensed matter, $r_{int} \sim a \sim 10^{-8}$ cm, while λ is of the order of a or only slightly larger. Then the interaction time is $t_{int} \sim 10^{-14}$ s and the local equilibration time is $t_{loc} \sim 10^{-13}$ s.

In dilute gas, where r_{int} can be much shorter than a , instead of r_{int} , one considers the scattering length a_s . Typical times could be $t_{int} \sim 10^{-8}$ s and $t_{loc} \sim 10^{-3}$ s.

In nuclear matter arising, e.g., in fireballs formed under heavy-ion collisions, the strong-interaction time is $t_{int} \sim 10^{-24}$ s and the local-equilibration time $t_{loc} \sim 10^{-23}$ s, while the fireball lifetime is $t_{exp} \sim 10^{-22}$ s.




Figure 3: Microscopic mixture composed of several kinds of particles.

Heterophase inclusions, arising inside the host phase, are mesoscopic, since their size is between the mean interparticle distance and the size of the experimentally studied region,

$$a \ll l_{het} \ll l_{exp} . \quad (2.4)$$

Usually, these inclusions are not frozen but can appear and disappear, because of which they are named heterophase fluctuations. Their lifetime has also to be mesoscopic, being between the local equilibration time and the time of experimental observation,

$$t_{loc} \ll t_{het} \ll t_{exp} . \quad (2.5)$$

To form an embryo of a phase, the size of a mesoscopic fluctuation l_{het} has to be at least an order larger than the mean interparticle distance which, for condensed matter, gives $l_{het} \sim 10a \sim 10^{-7}$ cm. Respectively, the lifetime of a phase fluctuation has to be essentially longer than the local equilibration time which results in $t_{het} \sim 10t_{loc} \sim 10^{-12}$ s. Thus typical mesoscopic fluctuations in condensed matter are of nanosize. However the size $l_{het} \sim 10^{-7}$ cm and lifetime $t_{het} \sim 10^{-12}$ s of heterophase fluctuations should be considered as low-boundary estimates.

To summarize, the main features of a mesoscopic heterophase mixture are as follows.

(i) The phase arising inside another phase appears in the form of mesoscopic embryos, with the sizes being between the interparticle distance and the size of the experimentally studied spatial region. This implies that not necessarily all, but at least one of the sizes has to be mesoscopic. For example, quantum vortices can be treated as embryos of the normal phase inside the superfluid phase. Although their length can be close to the system size, but the vortex radius is mesoscopic. Another example are dislocations in crystals, whose length can be comparable to the whole crystal sample, but whose radius is mesoscopic.

(ii) Heterophase fluctuations are not frozen, in the sense that their fractions are not prescribed, as for the case of fixed admixtures, but are defined by the material parameters and external conditions. Often, the fluctuations are of final lifetime, appearing and disappearing.

But this is not compulsory. The main is that their concentrations are self-consistently defined by the system parameters and external conditions.

(iii) Usually, heterophase fluctuations are randomly distributed in space. In some cases they can form spatial structures. The most important is that the weight, or probability, of these heterophase fluctuations be defined self-consistently in the sense explained above.

(iv) A system with heterophase fluctuations, strictly speaking, is quasi-equilibrium. This is because the notion of a phase requires the existence of at least local equilibrium. At the same time, dynamically, the appearance of such fluctuations assumes the occurrence of local instability. Overall, on the average, the system can be treated as equilibrium, since its space-averaged characteristics are constant.

Heterophase materials with mesoscopic fluctuations is not an exotic object but rather the typical situation in condensed matter as can be inferred from the books [2–4] and reviews [5–11]. Below some concrete examples are listed.

3 Examples of Heterophase Materials

There are numerous examples of materials that are formed not by a single phase but by a mixture of several phases, or where inside the host phase there occur nanosize regions of a competing phase. We do not plan to give an exhaustive enumeration of all available references on experimental data where the mesoscopic heterophase coexistence has been observed. There are thousands of such works. Here we mention only some typical situations, while many more references can be found in the reviews [5–11].

3.1 Mixture of Ferromagnetic and Antiferromagnetic Phases

In the pioneering article, Wollan and Koehler [12] reported their neutron diffraction study of the magnetic properties of the series of Perovskite-type compounds $\text{Ca}_x\text{La}_{1-x}\text{MnO}_3$. They found that the samples are mainly ferromagnetic, but also containing a small admixture of antiferromagnetic inclusions dispersed in the matrix as metastable bubbles. A number of other materials exhibit the coexistence of ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic clusters, for example in micromagnetic MnBi alloys [13], in many magnetic semiconductors, such as $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{MnO}_3$, $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{MnO}_3$, [14], in disordered Au_4Mn and Cu_3Mn [15], in alloys MnZn, $\text{Mn}_x\text{Cr}_{1-x}\text{Sb}$, $\text{FePd}_x\text{Pt}_{1-x}$, $\text{Sc}_{1-x}\text{Ti}_x\text{Fe}_2$, $\text{Zr}_x\text{Nb}_{1-x}\text{Fe}_2$, and $(\text{Mn}_{1-x}\text{Ni}_x)_3\text{B}_4$ [16], in manganites [17], such as $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{MnO}_3$ [18, 19], $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{MnO}_3$, $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Ba}_x\text{MnO}_3$ [20–26], $\text{La}_{5/8-x}\text{Pr}_x\text{Ca}_{3/8}\text{MnO}_3$ [27], $\text{Pr}_{0.5}\text{Ca}_{0.5-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{MnO}_3$ [28], $\text{Pr}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{MnO}_3$ [29], $\text{Pr}_{1-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{MnO}_3$ [30], and in many other colossal magnetoresistance materials [31–33].

3.2 Mixture of Magnetic and Paramagnetic Phases

Many materials exhibit the coexistence of magnetic (ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic) and paramagnetic phases. Thus, using the Mössbauer effect, the coexistence of antiferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases is observed in FeF_3 [34], in CaFe_2O_4 [35], and in a number of orthoferrites, such as LaFeO_3 , PrFeO_3 , NdFeO_3 , SmFeO_3 , EuFeO_3 , GdFeO_3 , TbFeO_3 , DyFeO_3 , YFeO_3 , HoFeO_3 , ErFeO_3 , TmFeO_3 , YbFeO_3 [36, 37]. Ferromagnetic cluster fluctuations, called

fermons or fluctuations, can arise inside a paramagnetic matrix of some semiconductors [38–42]. In magnetic materials, magnetic cluster excitations can occur in the paramagnetic region above T_c or above T_N [45–50], causing the appearance of spin waves in the paramagnetic phase, for instance in Ni, Fe, EuO, EuS, Pd₃Fe, and Gd [51–56]. The coexistence of ferromagnetic and nonmagnetic phases were also observed in Y₂Co₇, YCo₃, Co(S_xSe_{1-x})₂, Co(Ti_xAl_{1-x})₂, and Lu(Co_{1-x}Al_x)₂ [57, 58]. In colossal magnetoresistance materials, such as La_{1-x}Ca_xMnO₃ and La_{1-x}Sr_xCoO₃, one observes the coexistence of a paramagnetic insulating, or semiconducting, phase and a ferromagnetic metallic phase [59–61], while in La_{0.67-x}Bi_xCa_{0.33}MnO₃, paramagnetic and antiferromagnetic phases coexist [62]. Nanoscale phase separation into ferromagnetic and paramagnetic regions has been observed in the colossal magnetoresistance compound EuB_{5.99}C_{0.01} [63]. The regions of competing phases are of mesoscopic size between 10 Å and 100 Å.

3.3 Mixture of Magnetic and Spin-Glass Phases

Ferromagnetic and spin-glass phases coexist in many alloys, for instance in Au-Fe [64], Pd-Ni [65], Ni-Mn [66] alloys and in solid solutions, such as (CuCr₂Se₄)_x(Cu_{0.5}In_{0.5}Cr₂Se₄)_{1-x} and (CuCr₂Se₄)_x(Cu_{0.5}GaCr₂Se₄)_{1-x} [67]. Spin-glass phase can also coexist with an antiferromagnetic phase or with a paramagnetic phase [68, 69].

3.4 Mixture of Phases with Different Magnetic Orientations

Magnetic phases with different orientations of magnetic moments coexist in rare-earth magnets [71], in Fe_{1-x}Co_xCl₂ · 2H₂O [72], in yttrium iron garnets with substitution of Ru⁴ [73], and in Mn-Cu alloys [74]. Such mixtures occur around spin-reorientation transitions [75]. The regions of competing magnetization directions remind fluctuating domains or droplets, because of which they are called precursor fluctuations or local configuration fluctuations.

3.5 Mixture of Ferroelectric and Paraelectric Phases

In many materials around ferroelectric-paraelectric phase transitions there exist pretransitional effects caused by the arising clusters of competing phases [76–82]. This happens, e.g., in HCl, HCl-DCl, RbCaF₃, BaTiO₃, and SbSI. It is believed that these pretransitional fluctuations are responsible for the characteristic saggings of the Mössbauer-effect factor at the point of ferroelectric phase transitions [83–89].

Similar anomalous saggings of the Mössbauer factor happen at the Morin magnetic reorientation phase transition [90], structural transitions [91, 92], structural transitions accompanying superconducting transitions [93–96], and at structural transitions in macromolecular systems [97]. The typical depth of the Mössbauer-effect factor sagging is about 30% as compared to its value at the temperature above the phase transition.

3.6 Mixture of Different Crystalline Structures

In the vicinity of structural phase transitions, there appear the embryos of competing structures. Thus in He³-He⁴ solid solutions, in a wide range around the structural transition between the body-centered cubic (bcc) structural phase and hexagonal close packed (hcp) structure

there exists a mixture of both these phases randomly intermixed in space [98, 99]. This type of coexistence of different phases around first-order crystallographic transitions is typical of martensitic transformations [100–103]. The clusters of competing phases have the linear sizes of order $10 - 100 \text{ \AA}$. Similar pretransitional structural fluctuations exist around other structural transitions [4, 104–107] and in liquid crystals [108].

3.7 Mixture of Gaseous and Liquid Phases

A typical illustration of a two-phase mixture is the mixture of a gas and a liquid close to the evaporation-condensation point [109–115]. Before evaporation, there appear heterophase fluctuations in a liquid in the form of gas bubbles, and before condensation, there develop liquid droplets in a gas. A similar liquid-gas coexistence happens in exciton (electron-hole) systems in semiconductors, where one phase is formed by a more dense exciton liquid and the other phase is a less dense exciton gas [113, 116]. Another close example is the existence of vacancy rich regions in emulsion bilayers [117]. A general description of the nucleation dynamics can be found in Refs. [118, 119].

3.8 Mixture of Liquid and Solid Phases

Röntgen [120] was, probably, the first who has proposed that liquid water is not a single-phase fluid but a mixture of two components, a bulky icelike component and a less bulky normal liquid. This idea was developed by Brody [121] and Bernal and Fowler [122]. According to this picture, in the solid state below the melting point there occurs a fluctuational appearance of local regions of liquid phase and above the melting temperature there develop fluctuational crystalline clusters. Frenkel [2, 3] emphasized that such heterophase fluctuations are common for condensed matter and happen around almost all phase transitions. The role of heterophase fluctuations in the vicinity of melting points was studied by Bartenev [123–126] who stressed that the existence of these heterophase fluctuations explains thermodynamic anomalies occurring around the points of melting phase transitions.

A great number of experimental data confirm that liquids above the crystallization point contain heterophase fluctuations in the form of quasi-crystalline clusters [127–132]. The sizes of the clusters range from about 10 to 100 molecules [133]. The quasi-crystalline structure changes very quickly. The clusters themselves are not permanent entities but continuously form and dissociate under the influence of thermal fluctuations. The fluctuating cluster lifetime is much longer in comparison with molecular vibration periods of order of 10^{-13} s, but at the same time it must be shorter than the typical experimental measurement time of about 10^{-11} s, so that

$$10^{-13} \text{ s} \sim t_{loc} \ll t_{het} \ll t_{exp} \sim 10^{-11} \text{ s} ,$$

hence the reasonable estimate for the heterophase fluctuation lifetime is 10^{-12} s. The linear cluster size is typically of order of 10^{-7} cm [133–136]. Icelike heterophase fluctuations are especially noticeable in supercooled liquids [137–141], although they do exist on both sides of the usual melting-crystallization transition. Below the melting point, heterophase clusters are represented by regions of disorder created by defects, such as vacancies, interstitials, dislocations, and disclinations [142–145] and above the melting point, heterophase fluctuations are formed by quasi-crystalline clusters [127–132, 146]. The effects caused by the appearance of heterophase

fluctuations around the melting or crystallization point, are termed premelting and prefreezing, respectively [147–150].

Melting and crystallization have been studied by means of computer simulations using the Monte Carlo method [151] and molecular dynamic calculations [152–154]. These studies confirmed that around the point of the crystal-liquid phase transition there is a region of coexistence of solid-like and liquid-like phases. It is important that the melting transition is a first-order phase transition in either 3 or 2 dimensions [152–156]. This is contrary to speculations on the possible second-order melting transition in two dimensions [157, 158].

Heterophase fluctuations appear even without any external influence, although they arise more easily if in the system there exist impurities. Then around these impurities in solids there happens local premelting [159–161].

3.9 Mixture of Metallic and Nonmetallic Phases

The coexistence of solid and liquid phases can be accompanied by the coexistence of metallic and nonmetallic (dielectric or semiconductor) phases, where the metallic phase is liquid while the nonmetallic phase is solid. This type of coexistence occurs in liquid Te and Hg, in the liquid solutions In_2Te_3 , Ga_2Te_3 , Tl_2Te , Al_2Te_3 , $\text{Mg}_x\text{Bi}_{1-x}$, $\text{Te}_x\text{Se}_{1-x}$, $\text{Hg}_{1-x}\text{Cd}_x\text{Te}$, in the metal-ammonia solutions Li-NH_3 and Na-NH_3 [162–171], in sulfides of 3d metals [172], in bimetallic alloy clusters, such as Pd_6Ni_7 [173], and in manganites, e.g., in $\text{La}_x\text{MnO}_{1-\delta}$ [174]. The inhomogeneity in these materials is due to local density fluctuations, which causes a random spatial variation of conductivity. The metal-semiconductor transition is a continuous second-order phase transition.

3.10 Mixture of Superconducting and Normal Phases

A model representing low-temperature superconductors as a mixture of superconducting and “normal” components was suggested by Gorter and Casimir [175–177]. However, for the low-temperature superconductors, the two-fluid model is just an effective representation of a single superconducting phase, where the so-called “normal” component describes excitations above the ground state. The same concerns the two-fluid model of superfluid helium, where there exists a single superfluid phase and the “normal” component corresponds to particle excitations above the coherent ground state [178, 179].

Real mixtures of superconducting and normal phases have been observed in high-temperature superconductors [180–185]. The occurrence of such mixtures sometimes is called mesoscopic phase separation [186]. The normal phase is formed by insulating clusters or droplets. The phase separation is dynamic, the insulating and superconducting phases change their locations and shapes. The phase mixture often arises close to the structural instability of the lattice.

3.11 Mixture of Metastable Amorphous Phases

There exists a class of the so-called glass-forming liquids that solidify into a glassy state [4, 9, 10, 187–191]. Numerous experiments have found that both these liquid and solid states are, actually, heterophase systems consisting of a mixture of liquidlike and solidlike clusters. The glassification is a transition that can be discontinuous (first order), although more often it is a continuous transition.

Amorphous solids and glasses are metastable objects. Respectively, the mixtures of solidlike and liquidlike phases, forming these objects, are examples of metastable heterophase mixtures.

3.12 Mixture of Nonequilibrium Phases

Heterophase mixtures can arise as well in nonequilibrium systems. For example, electric current in a superconductor can display the so-called resistive states, where superconductivity coexists with normal state. This coexistence is not stationary. The gap, that is the order parameter for superconductivity, fluctuationally becomes zero for some period of time at random spatial regions. These regions of zero gap are the nuclei of normal phase [192].

Inside a laminar liquid flow, there can appear turbulent regions, arising stochastically in space and time, then disappearing, and then again spontaneously arising in random areas [193].

By subjecting a system of trapped bosonic atoms to an alternating external field, it is possible to create several nonequilibrium states housing the mixtures of Bose-condensed and uncondensed phases. Thus, a vortex turbulent state can be formed, where inside the Bose-condensed phase there exists a random bunch of quantum vortices playing the role of normal phase nuclei [194–197]. The other heterophase state occurs when inside the normal incoherent fluid there happens a cloud of randomly located Bose-condensed droplets [197–202]. This state represents *grain turbulence* or *droplet turbulence*.

4 Theory of Heterophase Systems

In this chapter, the basic ideas of the theory for describing mesoscopic heterophase mixtures are presented. Because of the importance of this topic and in order to avoid the following questions of how the concrete models are defined, the exposition of the basic theory is sufficiently comprehensive.

4.1 Spontaneous Breaking of Equilibrium

That was, probably, Boltzmann [203] who first advanced the idea that in a large system, that on average looks equilibrium, there can develop strongly nonequilibrium local fluctuations. This idea is called the Boltzmann fluctuational hypothesis. Actually, Boltzmann was talking about the Universe, but the same is applicable to any large system.

Mesoscopic heterophase fluctuations can emerge spontaneously [2,3,6,203], because of which this effect can be termed *spontaneous breaking of local equilibrium* [6]. Local defects and external fields can facilitate the emergence of these fluctuations.

There also exist systems, called stochasticity amplifiers, where even small external perturbations can be drastically strengthened [204]. Also, there are systems, where any weak initial noise can be transformed and result in strong fluctuations, characterized by the system properties, at any further times, being independent from the initial noise. These systems are termed stochasticity generators [204,205].

Suppose, we are studying an observable quantity $f(t, \xi)$ as a function of time and depending on an external noise of strength ξ . If the limits $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $\xi \rightarrow 0$ are not commutative, so that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} f(t, \xi) \neq \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t, \xi),$$

this property is called *stochastic instability* [6, 206]. The property of stochastic instability is responsible for the irreversibility of time [207–209].

In this way, there can exist two origins of heterophase fluctuations, even when the system as a whole looks equilibrium on average. These fluctuations can be produced by the system itself. Or they can be triggered by some weak external noise, that always exists, as far as there are no absolutely isolated systems, but only quasi-isolated [210, 211]. In both these cases, the properties of the fluctuations are completely characterized by the system parameters, under the given external conditions. Therefore in both the cases we can say that there occurs spontaneous breaking of local equilibrium. When the fluctuations correspond to a phase with a symmetry different from the surrounding matter, we can say that there happens *spontaneous local symmetry breaking or restoration* [6, 8, 212].

4.2 Statistical Ensembles and States

Before going to the specification of heterophase systems, we need to briefly recollect the main notions employed for describing statistical systems, keeping in mind the general case of quantum statistical systems. Here we give a brief account of notions that will be used in the following sections. More details can be found in Refs. [6, 213–216].

First, we have to define a Hilbert space of microstates

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{span}_n \{ \varphi_n \} \quad (4.1)$$

that is a closed linear envelope over an orthonormalized basis. The system state is described by a statistical operator $\hat{\rho}$ that is a semi-positive trace-one operator on \mathcal{H} . The pair $\{ \mathcal{H}, \hat{\rho} \}$ is a *quantum statistical ensemble*.

Local observables are represented by operators on \mathcal{H} forming the algebra of local observables \mathcal{A} . This is a von Neumann algebra that is a self-adjoint, closed in the weak operator topology subalgebra, containing the identity operator, of the algebra of all bounded operators on a Hilbert space. Observable quantities are the averages

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle \equiv \text{Tr} \hat{\rho} \hat{A} = \sum_n (\varphi_n, \hat{\rho} \hat{A} \varphi_n) \quad (4.2)$$

of operators $\hat{A} \in \mathcal{A}$. The trace is over \mathcal{H} . The collection of the averages of all observable quantities is the *statistical state*

$$\langle \hat{\mathcal{A}} \rangle = \{ \langle \hat{A} \rangle \} . \quad (4.3)$$

A special role is played by the order-parameter operator $\hat{\eta} \in \mathcal{A}$ that yields the order parameter

$$\eta = \langle \hat{\eta} \rangle \quad (4.4)$$

helping to distinguish different thermodynamic phases. Order parameters characterize the long-range order. A more general classification of thermodynamic phases, including those characterized by mid-range order, can be done by means of *order indices* [217, 218].

The notion of pure thermodynamic phases requires to consider the thermodynamic limit, when the number of particles in the system N and the system volume V tend to infinity, with their ratio, defining the particle density, tending to a constant,

$$N \rightarrow \infty , \quad V \rightarrow \infty , \quad \frac{N}{V} \rightarrow \text{const} . \quad (4.5)$$

Then the averages of the operators of local observables are proportional to the number of particles, because of which one has to consider the ratio $\langle \hat{A} \rangle / N$. If a system exhibits a phase transition, then there exists a region of parameters, where the thermodynamic limit yields the decomposition of the system state into pure states:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \langle \hat{A} \rangle = \sum_f \lambda_f \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \langle \hat{A}_f \rangle, \quad (4.6)$$

with the normalized coefficients

$$\sum_f \lambda_f = 1 \quad 0 \leq \lambda_f \leq 1.$$

Here \hat{A}_f is the representation of \hat{A} on a subspace $\mathcal{H}_f \subset \mathcal{H}$ of microstates associated with the f -phase. The index $f = 1, 2, \dots$ enumerates the phases. The limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ implies the thermodynamic limit (4.5). Respectively, the Hilbert space of microstates in that case becomes a direct sum of subspaces associated with the pure phases,

$$\mathcal{H} \mapsto \bigoplus_f \mathcal{H}_f \quad (N \rightarrow \infty). \quad (4.7)$$

The state decomposition (4.6) corresponds to the macroscopic Gibbs mixture, but not to a heterophase system with mesoscopic phase fluctuations. When the system possesses a symmetry described by a symmetry group, the decomposition into pure states (4.6) is the decomposition over the symmetry subgroups. In order to describe a particular pure state, it is necessary to select the microstates characterizing this particular symmetry subgroup.

4.3 Methods of Symmetry Breaking

The state decomposition arises when the system Hamiltonian is invariant with respect to a symmetry group, while a pure phase corresponds to a broken symmetry. The selection of a pure phase can be done in several ways. In order to separate a pure phase, it is possible to break the symmetry of the Hamiltonian using the Bogolubov method of quasi-averages [219–221].

Let the system be described by a Hamiltonian \hat{H} that is invariant with respect to a transformation forming a group. One introduces a Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{f\varepsilon} = \hat{H} + \varepsilon \hat{\Gamma}_f, \quad (4.8)$$

by adding to the initial Hamiltonian a term containing an operator $\hat{\Gamma}_f$ breaking the symmetry to a subgroup corresponding to the required phase f . Here ε is a real-valued parameter. For the operator of an observable \hat{A} , the quasi-average, selecting the representation corresponding to the f -phase, is

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \langle \hat{A}_f \rangle \equiv \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \langle \hat{A} \rangle_{f\varepsilon}. \quad (4.9)$$

In the right-hand side, the average is defined for the case of Hamiltonian (4.8). The limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ implies the thermodynamic limit (4.5). It is useful to stress that the limits here are not commutative. The thermodynamic limit has to necessarily be taken before the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Instead of taking two limits, it is possible to define *thermodynamic quasi-averages* [222,223] calculated with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_f = \hat{H} + \frac{1}{N^\gamma} \hat{\Gamma}_f, \quad (4.10)$$

in which $0 < \gamma < 1$. Then the thermodynamic quasi-average is

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \langle \hat{A}_f \rangle \equiv \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \langle \hat{A} \rangle_f, \quad (4.11)$$

where the right-hand side is calculated with Hamiltonian (4.10).

Among other methods of symmetry breaking, it is possible to mention the method of restricted trace or restricted Hilbert space, the method of boundary conditions, breaking of commutation relations, use of canonical transformations, analytical continuation, imposing symmetry conditions for correlation functions or Green functions, and mean-field approximations. The details can be found in Refs. [224–230].

4.4 Weighted Hilbert Space

All methods of symmetry breaking can be summarized by formulating the notion of the weighted Hilbert space [6–8]. Suppose, we are considering a system characterized by the Hilbert space (4.1). Let each member φ_n of the basis be associated with a weight $p_f(\varphi_n)$ describing how typical this basis member is for the phase f . The weights are normalized, so that

$$\sum_f p_f(\varphi_n) = 1, \quad 0 \leq p_f(\varphi_n) \leq 1.$$

The set of all weights is denoted as

$$p_f(\varphi) \equiv \{ p_f(\varphi_n) : \forall n \}. \quad (4.12)$$

The weighted Hilbert space is the Hilbert space with a weighted basis,

$$\mathcal{H}_f \equiv \{ \mathcal{H}, p_f(\varphi) \}. \quad (4.13)$$

The quantum statistical ensemble characterizing a phase f is the pair $\{\mathcal{H}_f, \hat{\rho}\}$. The statistical state associated with a phase f is the collection of the averages for the operators of local observables defined as

$$\langle \hat{A}_f \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \hat{\rho} \hat{A} \equiv \sum_n p_f(\varphi_n) (\varphi_n, \hat{A} \varphi_n). \quad (4.14)$$

The basis weights are to be such that the order parameter

$$\eta_f = \langle \hat{\eta}_f \rangle \quad (4.15)$$

would have the symmetry properties typical of the considered phase. Concrete models exemplifying this procedure will be given in the following sections.

4.5 Spatial Phase Separation

When a system consists of several thermodynamic phases, its spatial geometry can be described following the Gibbs idea of imagining that the phases are divided by a thin surface [231–234]. The Gibbs separating surface is standardly defined by considering thermodynamic quantities. In our case, we need to introduce a separating surface allowing for the additive, with respect to phases, representations of the operators of extensive observables. As we show below, the additivity of operators does not preclude from the possibility of defining interfacial effects on the macroscopic level.

The number of particles in the system is the sum

$$N = \sum_f N_f \quad (4.16)$$

of the particles in the phases composing the system. The system real space can be associated with the spatial orthogonal covering

$$\mathbb{V} = \bigcup_f \mathbb{V}_f, \quad \mathbb{V}_f \cap \mathbb{V}_g = \delta_{fg} \mathbb{V}_f. \quad (4.17)$$

Respectively, the system volume is the sum

$$V = \sum_f V_f \quad (V \equiv \text{mes} \mathbb{V}, V_f \equiv \text{mes} \mathbb{V}_f). \quad (4.18)$$

It is convenient to represent the topology of a composite system by using the manifold indicator functions [235] defined by the condition

$$\xi_f(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{V}_f \\ 0, & \mathbf{r} \notin \mathbb{V}_f \end{cases}, \quad (4.19)$$

with the properties

$$\sum_f \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) = 1, \quad \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) \xi_g(\mathbf{r}) = \delta_{fg} \xi_f(\mathbf{r})$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{V}} \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = V_f.$$

The collection of all manifold indicator functions (4.19) will be denoted as

$$\xi \equiv \{\xi_f(\mathbf{r}) : \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{V}, f = 1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (4.20)$$

In order to consider different shapes and locations of the phases, the spatial covering can be represented as being composed of the orthogonal subcoverings

$$\mathbb{V}_f = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_f} \mathbb{V}_{fi}, \quad \mathbb{V}_{fi} \cap \mathbb{V}_{gj} = \delta_{fg} \delta_{ij} \mathbb{V}_{fi}. \quad (4.21)$$

Then the manifold indicator functions(4.19) can be written as the sums

$$\xi_f(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} \xi_{fi}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{a}_{fi}) \quad (\mathbf{a}_{fi} \in \mathbb{V}_{fi}) \quad (4.22)$$

of the submanifold indicator functions

$$\xi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{V}_{fi} \\ 0, & \mathbf{r} \notin \mathbb{V}_{fi} \end{cases} . \quad (4.23)$$

Here \mathbf{a}_{fi} is a fixed vector associated with a spatial cell \mathbb{V}_{fi} . The collection of the manifold indicator functions (4.22) for a given phase f is denoted by

$$\xi_f \equiv \{\xi_f(\mathbf{r}) : \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{V}\} . \quad (4.24)$$

The Hilbert space of microscopic states is the tensor product

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \bigotimes_f \mathcal{H}_f \quad (4.25)$$

of the weighted Hilbert spaces described in the previous section. Space (4.25) can be called the *fiber space*.

In agreement with the additivity of extensive quantities, the related operators of observable quantities are additive, although being dependent on the spatial configuration of the phases. Thus the number-of-particle operator is

$$\hat{N}(\xi) = \bigoplus_f \hat{N}_f(\xi_f) , \quad (4.26)$$

and the energy operator is

$$\hat{H}(\xi) = \bigoplus_f \hat{H}_f(\xi_f) . \quad (4.27)$$

Here $\hat{N}_f(\xi_f)$ and $\hat{H}_f(\xi_f)$ are the representations of the corresponding operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_f , the notation ξ denotes the set of the manifold indicator functions (4.20) and ξ_f is the set (4.24) of the manifold indicator functions for a fixed f .

4.6 Statistical Operator of Mixture

The statistical operator of a mixture formed by different thermodynamic phases can be found from the minimization of an information functional [6–8]. The statistical operator is assumed to satisfy several conditions. First of all, this is the normalization condition

$$\text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi = 1 , \quad (4.28)$$

where the trace is over the fiber space (4.25) and the integral over ξ means a functional integral over the set (4.20) of the manifold indicator functions. The integration over the manifold indicator functions implies the averaging over a random phase distribution in the system space.

The system energy is given by the average

$$\text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \hat{H}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi = E . \quad (4.29)$$

And the total number of particles in the system is fixed by the condition

$$\text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \hat{N}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi = N . \quad (4.30)$$

Taking account of these conditions, the information functional in the Kullback-Leibler form [236, 237] reads as

$$I[\hat{\rho}] = \text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \ln \frac{\hat{\rho}(\xi)}{\hat{\rho}_0(\xi)} \mathcal{D}\xi + \alpha \left[\text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi - 1 \right] + \\ + \beta \left[\text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \hat{H}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi - E \right] + \gamma \left[\text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \hat{N}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi - N \right], \quad (4.31)$$

where α , β , and γ are Lagrange multipliers and $\hat{\rho}_0(\xi)$ is a trial statistical operator, with $1/\hat{\rho}_0$ meaning $(\hat{\rho}_0)^{-1}$.

Minimizing the information functional, we set $\gamma = -\beta\mu$ and introduce the grand Hamiltonian

$$H(\xi) \equiv \hat{H}(\xi) - \mu \hat{N}(\xi). \quad (4.32)$$

The parameter $\beta = 1/T$ implies the inverse temperature. The grand Hamiltonian acquires the form

$$H(\xi) = \bigoplus_f H_f(\xi_f) = \bigoplus_f \left[\hat{H}_f(\xi_f) - \mu \hat{N}_f(\xi_f) \right]. \quad (4.33)$$

Thus we find the statistical operator of the mixture

$$\hat{\rho}(\xi) = \frac{\hat{\rho}_0(\xi) \exp\{-\beta H(\xi)\}}{\text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}_0(\xi) \exp\{-\beta H(\xi)\}}. \quad (4.34)$$

If there is no any a priori information on the distribution of the heterophase regions, we have to set

$$\hat{\rho}_0(\xi) = \left(\text{Tr} \int \mathcal{D}\xi \right)^{-1}. \quad (4.35)$$

As a result, we come to the statistical operator

$$\hat{\rho}(\xi) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\{-\beta H(\xi)\}, \quad (4.36)$$

with the partition function

$$Z = \text{Tr} \int \exp\{-\beta H(\xi)\} \mathcal{D}\xi. \quad (4.37)$$

Specifying the operators of observables, we employ the second quantization representation and use the identity

$$\int_{\mathbb{V}_f} d\mathbf{r} = \int_{\mathbb{V}} \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (4.38)$$

The operator of energy for an f -th phase reads as

$$\hat{H}_f(\xi_f) = \int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left[-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + U(\mathbf{r}) \right] \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \\ + \frac{1}{2} \int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) \xi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}', \quad (4.39)$$

where $\psi_f(\mathbf{r})$ is the representation of a field operator on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_f , $U(\mathbf{r})$ is an external potential and $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$ is an interaction potential. The number-of-particle operator for the f -th phase is

$$\hat{N}_f(\xi_f) = \int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (4.40)$$

Here and in what follows, the integration over space, where the volume is not shown, assumes the integration over the whole system volume \mathbb{V} . The dependence of the field operators on the spatial variable is shown explicitly, while the internal degrees of freedom, such as spin, isospin, or like that, can be taken into account by representing the field operators as columns whose rows are labeled by these internal degrees of freedom.

4.7 Averaging over Phase Configurations

The thermodynamic phases are assumed to be distributed in space randomly. The averaging over their locations and shapes is denoted by the integration over the manifold indicator functions. For each given phase configuration, the system is nonuniform. The main idea of the approach to describing heterophase fluctuations, advanced in Refs. [238–244], is to reduce the nonuniform multiphase problem to a set of single-phase problems, which could be done by averaging over phase configurations. In the earlier papers, this averaging was assumed to lead to effective models. The explicit mathematical integration over the manifold indicator functions is accomplished in the papers [245–248] and summarized in the reviews [6–8].

Concretely, the idea is as follows. Suppose we are able to find the renormalized grand Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H} = -T \ln \int \exp\{-\beta H(\xi)\} \mathcal{D}\xi, \quad (4.41)$$

which requires to accomplish the averaging over phase configurations

$$\int \exp\{-\beta H(\xi)\} \mathcal{D}\xi = \exp(-\beta \tilde{H}), \quad (4.42)$$

then the partition function (4.37) becomes

$$Z = \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta \tilde{H}). \quad (4.43)$$

The renormalized Hamiltonian (4.41) already does not depend on the spatial phase distribution.

Now we need to define the functional integration over the manifold indicator functions. Let us introduce the variable

$$x_f \equiv \frac{1}{V} \int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (4.44)$$

and the set of these variables for all phases

$$x \equiv \{x_f : f = 1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (4.45)$$

Quantity (4.44), having the meaning of a varying geometric weight of an f -th phase, has the properties

$$\sum_f x_f = 1, \quad 0 \leq x_f \leq 1. \quad (4.46)$$

The differential measure $\mathcal{D}\xi$ can be separated into two parts,

$$\mathcal{D}\xi = \prod_f \mathcal{D}\xi_f dx , \quad (4.47)$$

characterizing the variation over the locations and shapes of the phases and over their geometric weights.

For the subcovering, defined in Sec. 8, the volume of a cell \mathbb{V}_{fi} is

$$v_{fi} \equiv \int \xi_{fi}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{a}_{fi}) d\mathbf{r} = \text{mes}\mathbb{V}_{fi} . \quad (4.48)$$

From the equality

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_f} v_{fi} = V_f \quad (4.49)$$

it follows that the number of small cells increases, so that

$$n_f \rightarrow \infty , \quad v_f \rightarrow 0 . \quad (4.50)$$

For the averaging over the locations and shapes of the regions containing an f -th phase, the differential measure can be written as

$$\mathcal{D}\xi_f = \lim_{n_f \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{i=1}^{n_f} \frac{d\mathbf{a}_{fi}}{V} , \quad (4.51)$$

where the limit (4.50) is understood. The averaging over the geometric weights of the phases corresponds to the differential measure

$$dx = \delta \left(\sum_f x_f - 1 \right) \prod_f dx_f , \quad (4.52)$$

where the normalization condition (4.46) is taken into account. Each weight can vary between 0 and 1.

Consider a functional

$$C_f(\xi_f) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_1) \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_2) \dots \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_m) C_f(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \dots d\mathbf{r}_m . \quad (4.53)$$

Replacing here ξ_f by x_f , in the sense of the substitution

$$C_f(x_f) = \lim_{\xi_f \rightarrow x_f} C_f(\xi_f) , \quad (4.54)$$

we come to the functional

$$C_f(x_f) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} x_f^m \int C_f(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \dots d\mathbf{r}_m . \quad (4.55)$$

The following theorem holds [246–248].

Theorem 1. *The averaging of functional (4.53) over the spatial locations and shapes of the f -th phase yields functional (4.55),*

$$\int C_f(\xi_f) \mathcal{D}\xi_f = C_f(x_f) . \quad (4.56)$$

Proof. To prove the theorem, it is possible to resort to the Dirichlet representation of the manifold indicator functions [246–248] or one can take into account that

$$\int \xi_{fi}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{a}_{fi}) d\mathbf{a}_{fi} = v_{fi} \quad (4.57)$$

and

$$\int \xi_{fi}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{a}_{fi}) \xi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{a}_{fi}) d\mathbf{a}_{fi} \leq v_{fi}^2 . \quad (4.58)$$

In the latter inequality, the quantities \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' are independent variables. Under the limit (4.50), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_f} \frac{v_{fi}^2}{V} \leq x_f \max_i v_{fi} \simeq 0 \quad (n_f \rightarrow \infty) ,$$

$$\sum_{i \neq j}^{n_f} \frac{v_{fi} v_{fj}}{V^2} \simeq x_f^2 \quad (n_f \rightarrow \infty) .$$

Therefore we come to the equalities

$$\int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) \mathcal{D}\xi_f = x_f \quad (4.59)$$

and

$$\int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}) \xi_f(\mathbf{r}') \mathcal{D}\xi_f = x_f^2 . \quad (4.60)$$

Continuing this procedure results in the general equality

$$\int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_1) \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_2) \dots \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_m) \mathcal{D}\xi_f = x_f^m , \quad (4.61)$$

from where Eq. (4.55) follows. \square

4.8 Thermodynamic Potential of Mixture

The grand thermodynamic potential of a mixed heterophase system

$$\Omega = -T \ln Z \quad (4.62)$$

is defined through the partition function (4.43), which is expressed through the renormalized Hamiltonian (4.41). Keeping in mind the method of averaging over phase configurations [6, 7] described in the previous section, the partition function reads as

$$Z = \int_0^1 \left[\prod_f \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \int \exp\{-\beta H_f(\xi_f)\} \mathcal{D}\xi_f \right] dx . \quad (4.63)$$

Expanding the exponential in powers of the Hamiltonian and using Theorem 1 of the previous section yields

$$\int \exp\{-\beta H_f(\xi_f)\} \mathcal{D}\xi_f = \exp\{-\beta H_f(x_f)\} . \quad (4.64)$$

For the grand Hamiltonian (4.32) specified in Eqs. (4.37) and (4.40), this gives

$$\begin{aligned} H_f(x_f) = & x_f \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left[-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + U(\mathbf{r}) - \mu \right] \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \\ & + \frac{1}{2} x_f^2 \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' . \end{aligned} \quad (4.65)$$

Then the partition function (4.63) becomes

$$Z = \int_0^1 \prod_f \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(x_f)\} dx . \quad (4.66)$$

Introducing the notation

$$\Omega_f(x_f) \equiv -T \ln \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(x_f)\} \quad (4.67)$$

results in the equality

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(x_f)\} = \exp\{-\beta \Omega_f(x_f)\} . \quad (4.68)$$

Then the partition function (4.66) takes the form

$$Z = \int_0^1 \exp\{-\beta \Omega(x)\} dx , \quad (4.69)$$

in which

$$\Omega(x) \equiv \sum_f \Omega_f(x_f) . \quad (4.70)$$

If the number of thermodynamic phases in the mixture is ν , then the partition function (4.69) reads as

$$Z = \int_0^1 e^{-\beta \Omega(x)} \delta\left(\sum_f x_f - 1\right) \prod_{f=1}^{\nu} dx_f . \quad (4.71)$$

The thermodynamic potential (4.70) is an extensive quantity that in the thermodynamic limit is proportional to the number of particles in the system N . It is convenient to define the reduced quantity

$$\omega(x) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \Omega(x) , \quad (4.72)$$

which in the thermodynamic limit is finite. Therefore the partition function (4.71) can be presented as

$$Z = \int_0^1 e^{-N\beta\omega(x)} \prod_{f=1}^{\nu-1} dx_f . \quad (4.73)$$

Defining the absolute minimum

$$\omega(w) \equiv \text{abs min}_x \omega(x) , \quad (4.74)$$

where the set of weights w_f is denoted as

$$w \equiv \{w_f : f = 1, 2, \dots, \nu\} . \quad (4.75)$$

By the Laplace method for large $N \gg 1$, we obtain

$$\int_0^1 e^{-N\beta\omega(x)} \prod_{f=1}^{\nu-1} dx_f \simeq e^{-N\beta\omega(w)} \prod_{f=1}^{\nu-1} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{N\omega_f''}} ,$$

where

$$\omega_f'' \equiv \frac{\partial^2 \omega_f(w_f)}{\partial w_f^2} > 0 .$$

Therefore the partition function (4.73) becomes

$$Z = e^{-\beta\Omega(w)} \prod_{f=1}^{\nu-1} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{N\omega_f''}} . \quad (4.76)$$

Since

$$\frac{\ln(N\omega_f'')}{N} \simeq 0 \quad (N \rightarrow \infty) ,$$

we find the grand thermodynamic potential

$$\Omega(w) \equiv N\omega(w) = \sum_f \Omega_f(w_f) , \quad (4.77)$$

in which

$$\Omega_f(w_f) = -T \ln \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(w_f)\} . \quad (4.78)$$

The weights w_f , by their definition, are the geometric probabilities of the phases, and they enjoy the properties

$$\sum_f w_f = 1 , \quad 0 \leq w_f \leq 1 . \quad (4.79)$$

In agreement with Eq. (4.74), these weights are the thermodynamic potential minimizers,

$$\Omega(w) = \text{abs min}_x \Omega(x) . \quad (4.80)$$

The results of the present section can be summarized as a theorem.

Theorem 2. *The grand thermodynamic potential of a heterophase system in the thermodynamic limit has the form*

$$\Omega(w) = -T \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta \tilde{H}) , \quad (4.81)$$

with the renormalized Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H} = \bigoplus_f H_f(w_f) . \quad (4.82)$$

In the case of Hamiltonian (4.65), the terms of the direct sum (4.82) are

$$H_f(w_f) = w_f \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left[-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + U(\mathbf{r}) - \mu \right] \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \frac{w_f^2}{2} \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' . \quad (4.83)$$

The geometric probabilities of the phases composing the system are the minimizers of the thermodynamic potential. \square

4.9 Observable Quantities of Mixture

The operators of observables $\hat{A}(\xi)$ act on the Hilbert space (4.25). The related observable quantities are the statistical averages of these operators,

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \hat{A}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi , \quad (4.84)$$

where the trace is over $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Similarly to the number-of-particle operator (4.26) and the energy operator (4.27), the operators of observables are given by the direct sums

$$\hat{A}(\xi) = \bigoplus_f \hat{A}_f(\xi_f) , \quad (4.85)$$

whose terms have the form

$$\hat{A}_f(\xi_f) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_1) \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_2) \dots \xi_f(\mathbf{r}_m) A_f(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \dots d\mathbf{r}_m . \quad (4.86)$$

The statistical average (4.84) reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{A} \rangle &= \frac{1}{Z} \int_0^1 \sum_f \int \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(\xi_f)\} \hat{A}_f(\xi_f) \times \\ &\times \prod_{g(\neq f)} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_g} \exp\{-\beta H_g(\xi_g)\} \prod_f \mathcal{D}\xi_f dx . \end{aligned} \quad (4.87)$$

The averaging over heterophase configurations [6, 7] is accomplished using Theorem 1. As a result, we get the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{A} \rangle &= \int_0^1 \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(x) \hat{A}(x) dx = \\ &= \int_0^1 \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(x) \hat{A}(x) \delta \left(\sum_f x_f - 1 \right) \prod_{f=1}^{\nu_f} dx_f = \int_0^1 \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(x) \hat{A}(x) \prod_{f=1}^{\nu_f-1} dx_f , \end{aligned} \quad (4.88)$$

with the operator of observable

$$\hat{A}(x) = \bigoplus_f \hat{A}_f(x_f) \quad (4.89)$$

and the statistical operator

$$\hat{\rho}(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\{-\beta H(x)\}, \quad (4.90)$$

in which the effective grand Hamiltonian is

$$H(x) \equiv \bigoplus_f H_f(x_f). \quad (4.91)$$

In view of the identity

$$\text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta H(x)\} = \exp\{-N\beta\omega(x)\}, \quad (4.92)$$

we can write

$$\text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(x) \hat{A}(x) = \frac{\exp\{-N\beta\omega(x)\} \bar{A}(x)}{\int_0^1 \exp\{-N\beta\omega(x)\} dx}, \quad (4.93)$$

where we use the notation

$$\bar{A}(x) \equiv \frac{\text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta H(x)\} \hat{A}(x)}{\text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta H(x)\}}. \quad (4.94)$$

Then the average (4.88) can be represented as

$$\int_0^1 \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(x) \hat{A}(x) dx = \frac{\int_0^1 \exp\{-N\beta\omega(x)\} \bar{A}(x) dx}{\int_0^1 \exp\{-N\beta\omega(x)\} dx}. \quad (4.95)$$

In the thermodynamic limit, when $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\int_0^1 \exp\{-N\beta\omega(x)\} \bar{A}(x) dx \simeq \exp\{-N\beta\omega(w)\} \bar{A}(w) \prod_{f=1}^{\nu_f-1} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{N\omega_f''}}, \quad (4.96)$$

where $\omega(w)$ is the absolute minimum of $\omega(x)$, in agreement with definition (4.74). Therefore we come to the equality

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \bar{A}(w) = \frac{\text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta \tilde{H}(w)\} \hat{A}(w)}{\text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta \tilde{H}(w)\}}, \quad (4.97)$$

in which

$$\hat{A}(w) = \bigoplus_f \hat{A}_f(w_f), \quad (4.98)$$

with

$$\hat{A}_f(w_f) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} w_f^m \int A_f(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \dots d\mathbf{r}_m. \quad (4.99)$$

These results can be summarized as a theorem

Theorem 3. *Observable quantities of a heterophase system in the thermodynamic limit can be represented by the statistical averages*

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \text{Tr} \int \hat{\rho}(\xi) \hat{A}(\xi) \mathcal{D}\xi = \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(w) \hat{A}(w), \quad (4.100)$$

with the statistical operator

$$\hat{\rho}(w) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\{-\beta\tilde{H}(w)\}, \quad (4.101)$$

partition function

$$Z = \text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta\tilde{H}(w)\}, \quad (4.102)$$

and the renormalized grand Hamiltonian $\tilde{H} = \tilde{H}(w)$. \square

4.10 Statistics of Heterophase Systems

For the convenience of the reader, let us summarize the main formulas describing a heterophase system [6, 7]. The latter is characterized by a renormalized Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H} = \tilde{H}(w) = \bigoplus_f H_f(w_f). \quad (4.103)$$

Similarly, the operators of observable quantities have the form

$$\hat{A}(w) = \bigoplus_f \hat{A}_f(w_f). \quad (4.104)$$

For instance, the number-of-particle operator is

$$\hat{N}(w) = \bigoplus_f \hat{N}_f(w_f), \quad (4.105)$$

where

$$\hat{N}_f(w_f) = w_f \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (4.106)$$

The observable quantities are given by the statistical averages

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(w) \hat{A}(w), \quad (4.107)$$

with the statistical operator

$$\hat{\rho}(w) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\{-\beta\tilde{H}(w)\} = \bigotimes_f \hat{\rho}_f(w_f) \quad (4.108)$$

and the partition function

$$Z = \text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta\tilde{H}(w)\} = \prod_f Z_f, \quad (4.109)$$

where

$$\hat{\rho}_f(w_f) = \frac{1}{Z_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(w_f)\}, \quad Z_f = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(w_f)\}. \quad (4.110)$$

Thus the observable quantities become

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \sum_f \langle \hat{A}_f \rangle, \quad (4.111)$$

with

$$\langle \hat{A}_f \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \hat{\rho}_f(w_f) \hat{A}_f(w_f) . \quad (4.112)$$

The grand thermodynamic potential reads as

$$\Omega = -T \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta \tilde{H}) = \sum_f \Omega_f(w_f) , \quad (4.113)$$

where

$$\Omega_f(w_f) = -T \ln \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_f} \exp\{-\beta H_f(w_f)\} . \quad (4.114)$$

The number of particles in an f -th phase can be found from the derivatives

$$N_f(w_f) = - \frac{\partial \Omega_f(w_f)}{\partial \mu} = - \left\langle \frac{\partial H_f(w_f)}{\partial \mu} \right\rangle . \quad (4.115)$$

The particle density of an f -th phase is

$$\rho_f \equiv \frac{N_f(w_f)}{V_f} = \frac{1}{V} \int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} , \quad (4.116)$$

where we take into account that the geometric probability of a phase has the form

$$w_f = \frac{V_f}{V} . \quad (4.117)$$

The average density of all particles in the system is

$$\rho \equiv \frac{N}{V} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_f N_f(w_f) = \sum_f w_f \rho_f . \quad (4.118)$$

The phase probabilities are the minimizers of the thermodynamic potential Ω . This implies that the system state corresponds to the minimal between the thermodynamic potential of the mixture $\Omega = \Omega(w)$, with the phase probabilities defined by the equations

$$\frac{\partial \Omega(w)}{\partial w_f} = 0 , \quad \frac{\partial^2 \Omega(w)}{\partial w_f^2} > 0 \quad \left(\sum_f w_f = 1 \right) , \quad (4.119)$$

and any of the pure states, so that

$$\Omega = \min\{\Omega(w), \Omega_f(1) : f = 1, 2, \dots\} . \quad (4.120)$$

In the same way, the phase probabilities can be defined as the minimizers of the system free energy $F = \Omega + \mu N$. Then the most stable state corresponds to the free energy

$$F = \min\{F(w), F_f(1) : f = 1, 2, \dots\} \quad (4.121)$$

providing the minimum for the set of the mixture free energy $F = F(w)$ and of the free energies $F_f(1)$ of possible pure phases occupying the whole system.

4.11 Interphase Surface States

It is important to stress that thermodynamic potentials as well as observables of a heterophase system are not simple linear combinations of the corresponding quantities for pure phases. Therefore all effects, related to the existence of surfaces separating the phases of the mixture, are taken into account. Actually, the introduction of separating surfaces acquires the meaning only on the thermodynamic level [232–234, 249] and does not contradict the formal additivity of operators (4.104) at the operator level. The definition of surface effects can be clearly illustrated by using the local-density approximation [250, 251].

Let us start with the definition of the surface free energy that is given as the difference

$$F_{sur} \equiv F - F_G \quad (4.122)$$

between the real free energy of a heterophase system F and the free energy of the Gibbs mixture

$$F_G = \sum_f F_f^G . \quad (4.123)$$

Recall that the Gibbs phase mixture is a mixture of uniform phases occupying each its part of the volume V_f of the whole system. Thus the surface free energy is the excess free energy caused by the nonuniformity of the system due to the coexistence of different phases,

$$F_{sur} = F - \sum_f F_f^G . \quad (4.124)$$

The free energy F_f^G of a phase occupying the volume V_f and the free energy $F_f(1)$ of this pure phase occupying the total system volume V are connected by the relation

$$\frac{F_f^G}{V_f} = \frac{F_f(1)}{V} ,$$

which yields

$$F_f^G = w_f F_f(1) . \quad (4.125)$$

Hence the surface free energy is

$$F_{sur} = F - \sum_f w_f F_f(1) . \quad (4.126)$$

The free energy of a heterophase system reads as

$$F = \sum_f F_f(w_f) . \quad (4.127)$$

Thus we come to the surface free energy

$$F_{sur} = \sum_f [F_f(w_f) - w_f F_f(1)] . \quad (4.128)$$

Since the system free energy F is not a linear combination of the energies $F_f(1)$, the surface free energy (4.128) is not zero.

Moreover, if a heterophase system is in an absolutely stable thermodynamic state, then the surface free energy is non-positive. This follows from the inequalities

$$F = \text{abs min } F(w) \leq \min_f F_f(1), \quad \min_f F_f(1) \leq \sum_f w_f F_f(1), \quad (4.129)$$

from where

$$F_{sur} \leq F - \min_f F_f(1) \leq 0. \quad (4.130)$$

Analogously, it is straightforward to introduce the surface grand potential or other thermodynamic potentials.

In the same way, it is possible to define the excessive term of an observable describing the difference between the corresponding operator average (4.111) in the case of a heterophase system and the sum of the related observables

$$A_f(1) \equiv \lim_{w_f \rightarrow 1} \langle \hat{A}_f \rangle \quad (4.131)$$

for the Gibbs mixture. Similarly to definition (4.126), the excessive part of an observable, due to the phase separation in the space, is

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle_{sur} \equiv \langle \hat{A} \rangle - \sum_f w_f A_f(1). \quad (4.132)$$

This, in view of Eq. (4.111), results in the surface observable

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle_{sur} = \sum_f \left[\langle \hat{A}_f \rangle - w_f A_f(1) \right]. \quad (4.133)$$

The set of all surface observables (4.133) forms the *interphase surface state*.

4.12 Geometric Phase Probabilities

In the description of heterophase systems, as compared to homogeneous systems, there appears a novel quantity, the geometric probability of phases

$$w_f = \frac{V_f}{V} \quad (f = 1, 2, \dots) \quad (4.134)$$

showing the fraction of the system volume occupied by the related thermodynamic phases. This quantity plays the role of an additional order parameter characterizing the system [6, 241, 252, 253]. The qualitative change of this probability parameter signifies that the system experiences a kind of a phase transition. The point of the standard phase transition is defined by the qualitative variation of a phase order parameter [1, 213, 224, 226, 254] or of order indices [217, 218, 255, 256]. In addition to the usual phase transitions, there can arise the point where a phase probability changes as follows. For instance, there is a phase probability that below some point, say below a temperature T_n , equals to one, hence there exists a pure f -th phase,

$$w_f(T) = 1 \quad (T < T_n). \quad (4.135)$$

However, above this point, the admixture of at least one other phase appears, so that

$$w_f(T) < 1 \quad (T > T_n) . \quad (4.136)$$

The point where a pure phase becomes mixed, due to the arising nuclei of another phase, can be named the *nucleation point*. In the above example, it is the *nucleation temperature*.

The nucleation at the point T_n can be either continuous, when

$$| w_f(T_n + 0) - w_f(T_n - 0) | = 0 \quad (4.137)$$

or discontinuous, such that

$$| w_f(T_n + 0) - w_f(T_n - 0) | > 0 . \quad (4.138)$$

Contrary to this, in the case of a phase transition between two pure phases, the process of nucleation is discontinuous, with the phase probability jumping between 1 and 0, and the nucleation point coincides with the phase transition point.

Phase probabilities enter in the expressions of observable quantities as well as in thermodynamic characteristics. For example, the number of particles in an f -th phase is

$$N_f = w_f \int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} . \quad (4.139)$$

This defines the phase fraction

$$n_f \equiv \frac{N_f}{N} \quad (4.140)$$

satisfying the normalization

$$\sum_f n_f = 1 , \quad 0 \leq n_f \leq 1 . \quad (4.141)$$

The density of an f -th phase is

$$\rho_f \equiv \frac{N_f}{V_f} = \frac{n_f}{w_f} \rho , \quad (4.142)$$

where ρ is the total average density

$$\rho \equiv \frac{N}{V} = \sum_f w_f \rho_f . \quad (4.143)$$

Then relation (4.139) becomes

$$\int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} = \frac{\rho_f}{\rho} N . \quad (4.144)$$

If the phases possess the same density, while being distinguished by other properties, say magnetic, electric, or structural, then the phase probabilities and phase fractions coincide,

$$w_f = n_f \quad (\rho_f = \rho) , \quad (4.145)$$

which follows from equation (4.142). In that case, expression (4.144) reduces to

$$\int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} = N \quad (\rho_f = \rho) . \quad (4.146)$$

5 Models of Heterophase Systems

In the present section, some typical models of heterophase systems are considered. We keep in mind mesoscopic phase mixtures whose theory is exposed in the previous Chapter 4. Numerous examples of such systems are listed in Chapter 3. We start with the model that, in particular, describes ferromagnets with paramagnetic fluctuations. However this model is generic for a large class of order-disorder systems, because of which it is described in detail, since many other models are treated analogously.

5.1 Heterophase Heisenberg Model

A typical model for ferromagnets is the Heisenberg model [257]. To take into account paramagnetic heterophase fluctuations, we follow the theory of Chapter 4 and, averaging out phase configurations, we obtain the effective Hamiltonian describing the mixture of ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases

$$\tilde{H} = H_1 \oplus H_2, \quad (5.1)$$

with the phase-replica Hamiltonians

$$H_f = \frac{N}{2} w_f^2 U - w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_{if} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{jf}. \quad (5.2)$$

Here U is a parameter characterizing the strength of effective direct interactions between the particles forming the system, while J_{ij} is an exchange interaction potential. In the standard Heisenberg model, the constant parameter U is usually omitted, since it does not influence the thermodynamics of the system. However for a heterophase system, the first term, with the parameter U , contains the phase probability w_f depending on thermodynamic variables, hence it cannot be neglected. Summation is over the lattice sites enumerated by the index $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The exchange interaction J_{ij} is of ferromagnetic type, which implies that $J_{ij} > 0$. The operator \mathbf{S}_{jf} is a representation of the spin operator for the f -th phase, acting on \mathcal{H}_f , and located at the lattice site j . The lattice is assumed to be ideal. In the present section, we keep in mind spin $S = 1/2$.

The phases are distinguished by the observable values of the average spin. The phase labeled by $f = 1$ is assumed to correspond to ferromagnetic state, while that labeled by $f = 2$, to paramagnetic state, so that

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \mathbf{S}_{j1} \right\rangle \neq 0, \quad \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \mathbf{S}_{j2} \right\rangle = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

It is convenient to introduce the relative average spins

$$\mathbf{s}_f \equiv \frac{1}{NS} \sum_j \langle \mathbf{S}_{jf} \rangle = \frac{2}{N} \sum_j \langle \mathbf{S}_{jf} \rangle \quad (5.4)$$

and to distinguish the phases by the order parameters

$$s_1 \neq 0, \quad s_2 = 0 \quad (s_f \equiv |\mathbf{s}_f|). \quad (5.5)$$

In the mean-field approximation

$$\mathbf{S}_{if} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{jf} = \langle \mathbf{S}_{if} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{S}_{jf} + \mathbf{S}_{if} \cdot \langle \mathbf{S}_{jf} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{S}_{if} \rangle \langle \mathbf{S}_{jf} \rangle ,$$

Hamiltonian (5.2) becomes

$$H_f = \frac{N}{2} w_f^2 \left(U + \frac{J}{2} s_f^2 \right) - J w_f^2 \mathbf{s}_f \cdot \sum_j \mathbf{S}_{jf} , \quad (5.6)$$

in which

$$J \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} > 0 . \quad (5.7)$$

The free energy of the mixture is

$$F = F_1 + F_2 , \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$F_f = - \frac{T}{N} \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H_f} = \frac{1}{2} w_f^2 \left(U + \frac{J}{2} s_f^2 \right) - T \ln \left[2 \cosh \left(\frac{J w_f^2 s_f}{2T} \right) \right] . \quad (5.9)$$

The order parameters can be found either directly from definition (5.4) or by minimizing the free energy (5.8) with respect to s_f . Both ways give the same equation

$$s_f = \tanh \left(\frac{J w_f^2 s_f}{2T} \right) . \quad (5.10)$$

This equation possesses a nonzero solution as well as the zero solution, in agreement with condition (5.5). In what follows, we measure the free energies and temperature in units of J and use the notation

$$u \equiv \frac{U}{J} . \quad (5.11)$$

For the ferromagnetic state of the mixture, we have

$$F_1 = \frac{1}{2} w_1^2 \left(u + \frac{1}{2} s_1^2 \right) - T \ln \left[2 \cosh \left(\frac{w_1^2 s_1}{2T} \right) \right] , \quad (5.12)$$

while for the paramagnetic state,

$$F_2 = \frac{1}{2} w_2^2 u - T \ln 2 . \quad (5.13)$$

Minimizing the free energy (5.8) with respect to w_f , under the normalization condition $w_1 + w_2 = 1$, we find the probability of the ferromagnetic phase

$$w_1 = \frac{2u}{4u - s_1^2} \quad (4u > s_1^2) . \quad (5.14)$$

For simplicity, below we use the notation

$$w_1 \equiv w , \quad w_2 = 1 - w . \quad (5.15)$$

A state is stable, provided it has the minimal free energy and satisfies stability conditions. For this purpose, we compare the free energy (5.8) of the mixed state, which takes the form

$$F = \left(w^2 - w + \frac{1}{2} \right) u + \frac{1}{4} w^2 s_1^2 - T \ln \left[4 \cosh \left(\frac{w^2 s_1}{2T} \right) \right], \quad (5.16)$$

under the order parameter

$$s_1 = \tanh \left(\frac{w^2 s_1}{2T} \right), \quad (5.17)$$

with probability (5.14), the free energy of the pure ferromagnetic phase

$$F_{fer} \equiv F_1(w_1 = 1) = \frac{1}{2} u + \frac{1}{4} s^2 - T \ln \left[2 \cosh \left(\frac{s}{2T} \right) \right], \quad (5.18)$$

under the order parameter

$$s = \tanh \left(\frac{s}{2T} \right), \quad (5.19)$$

and the free energy of the pure paramagnetic phase

$$F_{par} \equiv F_2(w_2 = 1) = \frac{1}{2} u - T \ln 2. \quad (5.20)$$

Also, we compare the free energy $F = F(w)$, given by Eq. (5.16), under probability (5.14) and the order parameter (5.17), with the free energy

$$F_0 \equiv F \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{4} u - T \ln 4 \quad (5.21)$$

of the degenerate paramagnetic state, with $w = 1/2$ and $s_1 = 0$.

The stability conditions for the mixed state, characterized by the free energy (5.16), are as follows. The state is an extremum, provided that the first derivatives are zero,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial w} = w \left(2u - \frac{1}{2} s_1^2 \right) - u = 0, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial s_1} = \frac{w^2}{2} \left[s_1 - \tanh \left(\frac{w^2 s_1}{2T} \right) \right] = 0.$$

The necessary and sufficient condition for the potential F to be minimal is the positivity of the Hessian matrix for all the variables s_1 and w . The elements of the Hessian matrix are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial w^2} &= 2u - \frac{1}{2} s_1^2 - \frac{w^2 s_1^2}{T} (1 - s_1^2), \\ \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial w \partial s_1} &= -\frac{w^3 s_1}{2T} (1 - s_1^2), \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial s_1^2} = \frac{w^2}{2} - \frac{w^4}{4T} (1 - s_1^2). \end{aligned}$$

The matrix is positive when all its principal minors are positive, which yields the stability conditions

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial w^2} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial w^2} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial s_1^2} - \left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial w \partial s_1} \right)^2 > 0.$$

The behavior of heterophase ferromagnets has been studied in Refs. [6, 7, 258–263]. The stable state is described by the minimal thermodynamic potential among F , F_{fer} , F_{par} , and F_0 .




Figure 4: Two branches of solutions for the thermodynamic potential F as a function of dimensionless temperature T for the parameters: (a) $u = 0.5$ and (b) $u = 0.7$. (c) The probability w of the thermodynamic phase. (d) the order parameter s_1 as a function of temperature. The stable branch is shown by solid line and the unstable one is shown by dashed-dotted line.

Generally, the potential F can have two branches and, respectively, two types of solutions for w and s_1 as is shown in Fig. 4. We have to choose the branch that is minimal. Overall, there exist the following qualitatively different types of behavior depending on the parameter u .

(i) $u \leq 0$. No stable heterophase states exist. Heterophase ferromagnet can only be metastable. Below the critical temperature $T_c = 1/2$, the pure ferromagnetic phase, with $w_1 = 1$, is absolutely stable. At the critical temperature $T_c = 1/2$ the system becomes paramagnetic through the phase transition of second order. The behavior of the thermodynamic potentials F_{fer} and F_{par} , the probability of the ferromagnetic fraction w , and of the order parameter s as functions of temperature, are shown in Fig. 5.

(ii) $0 < u < 0.5$. At low temperature, the free energy F_{fer} is lower than F_0 up to the temperature T_0 , where the first-order phase transition occurs from the pure ferromagnetic phase to the degenerate nonmagnetic phase with the free energy F_0 . The transition temperature is in the interval $0.090 < T_0 < 0.181$. The overall behavior is presented in Fig. 6.

(iii) $0.5 \leq u < 3/2$. In the region of temperatures $0 < T < T_0$, the system is a mixture of ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases. A first-order phase transition from the mixed state to the degenerate nonmagnetic state occurs at the temperature T_0 that lays in the interval $1/8 < T_0 < 0.182$. The first-order transition occurs when the free energies F and F_0 intersect.




Figure 5: Thermodynamic potentials F_{fer} and F_{par} , the probability w of the ferromagnetic phase, and the order parameter s_1 as functions of temperature T for $u = -0.5$. Second order phase transition takes place at $T_c = 0.5$.

This is illustrated in Fig. 7.

(iv) $u = 3/2$. At low temperature, the system is heterophase, with the free energy F , up to the transition temperature $T_c^* = 1/8$, where it becomes nonmagnetic, with the free energy F_0 . The temperature T_c^* is a tricritical point separating the lines of first- and second-order phase transitions (see [264, 265]).

(v) $u > 3/2$. Heterophase ferromagnet, with the free energy F , is stable at low temperatures. The second-order phase transition to the nonmagnetic phase, with the free energy F_0 , happens at the critical temperature $T_c^* = 1/8$. The corresponding behavior is shown in Fig. 8.

Having the expression for the free energy, it is straightforward to find other thermodynamic characteristics. Thus for the heterophase system, the relative internal energy is

$$E = \frac{\langle \tilde{H} \rangle}{N} = \left(w^2 - w + \frac{1}{2} \right) u - \frac{1}{4} w^2 s_1^2. \quad (5.22)$$

The relative entropy reads as

$$S = \frac{E - F}{T} = -\frac{w^2 s_1^2}{2T} + \ln \left[4 \cosh \left(\frac{w^2 s_1}{2T} \right) \right]. \quad (5.23)$$




Figure 6: Free energies, the probability of the ferromagnetic phase w , and the order parameter s_1 as functions of temperature T for $u = 0.2$. First-order phase transition occurs at temperature $T_0 = 0.144$ between the pure ferromagnetic phase with the free energy F_{fer} and the nonmagnetic phase with the free energy F_0 .

At the critical temperature T_c^* the critical exponents of the specific heat

$$C_H = \frac{\partial E}{\partial T} = T \frac{\partial S}{\partial T} \propto (-\tau)^\alpha \quad (5.24)$$

and of the order parameter $s_1 \propto (-\tau)^\beta$, where

$$\tau \equiv \frac{T - T_c^*}{T_c^*} \rightarrow -0,$$

experience a jump, when T_c^* becomes a tricritical point,

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} 0, & u \neq 3/2 \\ 1/2, & u = 3/2 \end{cases}, \quad \beta = \begin{cases} 1/2, & u \neq 3/2 \\ 1/4, & u = 3/2 \end{cases}.$$

The property $\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ remains valid. This behavior is typical of tricritical points [264].

The influence of an external magnetic field is considered in Ref. [266]. At zero temperature, the system is in a pure ferromagnetic state. However, at finite temperatures, for some interaction parameters, the system can exhibit a zeroth-order nucleation transition between the pure ferromagnetic phase and the mixed state with coexisting ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases.




Figure 7: Free energies, the probability of the ferromagnetic fraction w , and the order parameter s_1 as functions of temperature T for $u = 1$. First-order phase transition occurs at temperature $T_0 = 0.129$ between the mixed phase with the free energy F and the nonmagnetic phase with the free energy F_0 .

5.2 Role of Spin Waves

In the previous section, a ferromagnetic system with paramagnetic fluctuations is treated in the mean-field approximation. Heterophase fluctuations are nonlinear and mesoscopic, which principally distinguishes them from homogenous microscopic fluctuations [267]. Homogeneous fluctuations in ferromagnets are represented by spin waves [268, 269]. The characteristic time of spin fluctuations is defined by spin interactions, which gives $t_{\text{int}} \sim 10^{-14} - 10^{-13}$ s. The lifetime of heterophase paramagnetic fluctuations is about $t_{\text{het}} \sim 10^{-12}$ s. In the present section, we consider the interplay between heterophase paramagnetic fluctuations and spin waves [270] for the model with Hamiltonian (5.1).

Aiming at using the random-phase approximation, we define the magnon operators

$$b_{jf} = S_{jf}^x + iS_{jf}^y, \quad b_{jf}^\dagger = S_{jf}^x - iS_{jf}^y. \quad (5.25)$$

Hence the spin operators are

$$\begin{aligned} S_{jf}^x &= \frac{1}{2} (b_{jf}^\dagger + b_{jf}), & S_{jf}^y &= \frac{i}{2} (b_{jf}^\dagger - b_{jf}), \\ S_{jf}^z &= \frac{1}{2} - \hat{n}_{jf}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$




Figure 8: Free energies, the probability of the ferromagnetic fraction w , and the order parameter s_1 as functions of temperature T for $u = 3$. Second-order phase transition between the heterophase state, with the free energy F , and the nonmagnetic phase, with the free energy F_0 , occurs at the critical point $T_c = 1/8$.

where

$$\hat{n}_{jf} \equiv b_{jf}^\dagger b_{jf} \quad (5.27)$$

is the operator of magnon density. The magnon operators satisfy the commutation relations

$$[b_{if}, b_{jf}] = 0, \quad [b_{if}, b_{jf}^\dagger] = \delta_{ij}(1 - 2\hat{n}_{jf}), \quad (5.28)$$

and the property

$$b_{jf}^2 = 0. \quad (5.29)$$

Then Hamiltonian (5.2) takes the form

$$H_f = \frac{N}{2} w_f^2 \left(U - \frac{J}{2} \right) + w_f^2 J \sum_j \hat{n}_{jf} - w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \left(\hat{n}_{if} \hat{n}_{jf} + 2b_{if}^\dagger b_{jf} \right). \quad (5.30)$$

In what follows, we use the causal Green functions [271–273] also called propagators. The magnon propagator is

$$G_{ijf}(t) = -i \langle \hat{T} b_{if}(t) b_{jf}^\dagger(0) \rangle, \quad (5.31)$$

where \hat{T} is the chronological operator. The Fourier transforms for the propagator read as

$$G_{ijf}(t) = \frac{1}{\rho} \int G_f(\mathbf{k}, \omega) e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij} - \omega t)} \frac{d\mathbf{k} d\omega}{(2\pi)^4},$$

$$G_f(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij} \int G_{ijf}(t) e^{-i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij} - \omega t)} dt, \quad (5.32)$$

where $\rho = N/V$ is the spin density and $\mathbf{r}_{ij} \equiv \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j$.

In the evolution equation for the magnon propagator we resort to the random-phase approximation

$$\langle b_{if}^\dagger b_{if} b_{jf}^\dagger b_{lf} \rangle = \langle b_{if}^\dagger b_{if} \rangle \langle b_{jf}^\dagger b_{lf} \rangle. \quad (5.33)$$

In this approximation, we get the equation

$$[\omega - \omega_f(\mathbf{k})] G_f(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = s_f, \quad (5.34)$$

with the magnon spectrum

$$\omega_f(\mathbf{k}) = w_f^2 s_f [J - J(\mathbf{k})]. \quad (5.35)$$

Here the Fourier transformation for the interaction is employed,

$$J_{ij} = \frac{1}{\rho} \int J(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}, \quad J(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}}.$$

If the magnon density is small, magnons can approximately be treated as bosons. This can be assumed for the ferromagnetic phase, for which the solution to equation (5.34) becomes

$$G_1(\mathbf{r}, \omega) = s_1 \left[\frac{1 + n_1(\mathbf{k})}{\omega - \omega_1(\mathbf{k}) + i0} - \frac{n_1(\mathbf{k})}{\omega - \omega_1(\mathbf{k}) - i0} \right], \quad (5.36)$$

with the magnon momentum distribution

$$n_1(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\coth \frac{\omega_1(\mathbf{k})}{2T} - 1 \right]. \quad (5.37)$$

For the order parameter (5.5), according to (5.26), we have

$$s_f = 1 - \frac{2}{N} \sum_j \langle \hat{n}_{jf} \rangle. \quad (5.38)$$

For the ferromagnetic phase, the relation

$$\langle \hat{n}_{j1} \rangle = i G_{jj1}(-0) = \frac{s_1}{\rho} \int n_1(\mathbf{k}) \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \quad (5.39)$$

gives the equation for the order parameter

$$\frac{s_1}{\rho} \int \coth \left[\frac{\omega_1(\mathbf{k})}{2T} \right] \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = 1. \quad (5.40)$$

For the paramagnetic phase, where $s_2 = 0$, Eq. (5.38) yields

$$\langle \hat{n}_{j2} \rangle = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (5.41)$$

while the evolution equation (5.34) reduces to

$$\omega G_2(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 0 . \quad (5.42)$$

An approximate solution for the latter is

$$G_2(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = -i\pi\delta(\omega) , \quad (5.43)$$

which gives

$$G_{ij2}(t) = -\frac{i}{2} \delta_{ij} . \quad (5.44)$$

The probability of the ferromagnetic phase $w \equiv w_1$ is defined as the minimizer of the free energy

$$F = -\frac{T}{N} \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta\tilde{H}} . \quad (5.45)$$

This yields the condition

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial w} = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} \right\rangle = 0 , \quad (5.46)$$

which gives

$$w = \frac{U - 2\Phi_2}{2(U - \Phi_1 - \Phi_2)} , \quad (5.47)$$

where the notation for the energy of spin interactions is introduced,

$$\Phi_f \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \langle \mathbf{S}_{if} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{jf} \rangle . \quad (5.48)$$

In the random phase approximation, the interaction energy of the ferromagnetic phase is

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{J}{4} - \frac{s_1(1+s_1)}{2\rho} \int [J - J(\mathbf{k})] n_1(\mathbf{k}) \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} , \quad (5.49)$$

while the interaction energy of the paramagnetic phase is $\Phi_2 \approx 0$.

Using the notation

$$u \equiv \frac{U}{J} , \quad (5.50)$$

and measuring temperature in units of J , we find [270] the probability of the ferromagnetic phase at low temperature

$$w \simeq w_0 - \frac{6\pi\zeta(5/2)}{u w_0^3 \rho a_0^3} \left(\frac{T}{2\pi}\right)^{5/2} - \frac{45\pi^2\zeta(7/2)}{2u w_0^5 \rho a_0^3} \left(\frac{T}{2\pi}\right)^{7/2} . \quad (5.51)$$

Here w_0 is the probability at zero temperature,

$$w_0 \equiv \frac{2u}{4u - 1} \quad (5.52)$$

and a_0 is the effective interaction radius defined by the relation

$$a_0^2 \equiv \frac{1}{3N} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{J_{ij}}{J} r_{ij}^2 . \quad (5.53)$$

At zero temperature, the mixed state can exist when $u > 1/4$.

The consideration of the system behavior at the point of the phase transition from the mixed state to the paramagnetic state shows that in the system with spin waves the transition is of first order, while without spin waves it would be of second order.

5.3 Heterophase Ising Model

Taking account of heterophase fluctuations in the frame of the ferromagnetic Ising model results in the effective Hamiltonian [274]

$$\tilde{H} = H_1 \oplus H_2, \quad H_f = \frac{N}{2} w_f^2 U - \frac{1}{2} w_f^2 J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sigma_{if} \sigma_{jf}, \quad (5.54)$$

where the summation is over the nearest neighbors and $\sigma_{jf} = \pm 1$.

We consider the two-dimensional model that enjoys an exact solution. Employing the transfer-matrix approach, we notice that the maximal eigenvalue corresponds to the completely ordered phase, while the minimal eigenvalue corresponds to the disordered phase [275]. Then the order parameters discriminating the ordered and disordered phases are

$$s_f = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \langle \sigma_{jf} \rangle \quad (f = 1, 2), \quad (5.55)$$

under condition (5.5).

The free energy reads as

$$F = \frac{1}{2} [w^2 + (1-w)^2] U - T(\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2) - T \ln(2 \sinh \alpha_2), \quad (5.56)$$

where

$$\Lambda_f = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\pi \int_0^\pi \ln [\cosh^2 \alpha_f - (\cos \vartheta + \cos \vartheta') \sinh \alpha_f] d\vartheta d\vartheta'$$

and

$$\alpha_f \equiv w_f^2 \frac{J}{T}.$$

The equation for the ferromagnetic probability has the form (5.47) but with the interaction energies

$$\Phi_f = \frac{1}{2} + (-1)^{f+1} \frac{\sinh \alpha_f - 1}{\sinh \alpha_f + 1} K(\varphi_f) \cosh \alpha_f, \quad (5.57)$$

in which

$$K(\varphi_f) = \int_0^\pi \frac{d\vartheta}{\sqrt{1 - \varphi_f \sin^2 \vartheta}}, \quad \varphi_f = \frac{8 \sinh \alpha_f \cdot \cosh^2 \alpha_f}{(1 + \sinh \alpha_f)^4}.$$

The phase transition of second order from the mixed state to the paramagnetic phase occurs at the critical temperature

$$T_c^* = \frac{1}{4 \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})}. \quad (5.58)$$

The specific heat at the transition temperature behaves as

$$C_V \simeq \frac{32[\ln(1 + \sqrt{2})]^3}{\pi(u + 0.348)} \ln^2(-\tau) \quad (\tau \rightarrow -0). \quad (5.59)$$

However the mixed state is metastable, since its free energy is larger than the free energy of the pure ferromagnetic phase.

5.4 Heterophase Nagle Model

Nagle [276] considered a one-dimensional spin model with the Hamiltonian containing competing short-range and long-range interactions. The total interaction can be written [277] in the form

$$J_{ij} = \alpha J_0 \delta_{|i-j|=1} + (1 - \alpha) \bar{J}_{ij} . \quad (5.60)$$

Here J_0 is the intensity of the nearest-neighbor interactions, \bar{J}_{ij} is a long-range interaction with the properties

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \bar{J}_{ij} = 0 , \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} \bar{J}_{ij} \neq 0 , \quad (5.61)$$

and α is a crossover parameter. In what follows, the mean long-range interaction is assumed to be positive,

$$J \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} \bar{J}_{ij} > 0 . \quad (5.62)$$

The heterophase generalization [278] of the Nagle model is characterized by the Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H} = H_1 \oplus H_2 , \quad H_f = \frac{N}{2} w_f^2 U - \frac{1}{4} w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \sigma_{if} \sigma_{jf} , \quad (5.63)$$

where $\sigma_{jf} = \pm 1$. We consider a mixture of ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases, so that the order parameter is the same as in (5.55), with $s_1 \neq 0$ and $s_2 = 0$.

Using the transfer-matrix method [254], we find the free energy of the system

$$\begin{aligned} F = & \left(w^2 - w + \frac{1}{2} \right) U - \frac{1}{4} w^2 \left[\alpha T - (1 - \alpha) J s_1^2 \right] - \\ & - T \ln \left[\cosh \varphi + \sqrt{\sinh^2 \varphi + \exp(-4\varphi_1)} \right] - T \ln(2 \cosh \varphi_2) , \end{aligned} \quad (5.64)$$

where $w \equiv w_1$ and

$$\varphi \equiv w^2 \frac{(1 - \alpha) J s_1}{2T} , \quad \varphi_1 \equiv w^2 \frac{\alpha J_0}{4T} , \quad \varphi_2 \equiv (1 - w)^2 \frac{\alpha J_0}{4T} .$$

In what follows, we introduce the dimensionless parameters

$$u \equiv \frac{U}{J} , \quad g \equiv \frac{J_0}{J} \quad (5.65)$$

and measure temperature in units of J . For the ferromagnetic order parameter, we have

$$s_1 = \frac{\sinh \varphi}{\sqrt{\sinh^2 \varphi + \exp(-4\varphi_1)}} . \quad (5.66)$$

The ferromagnetic probability is defined as the minimizer of the free energy. For instance, at zero temperature, this gives

$$w_0 = \frac{2u - |\alpha| g}{4u - 1 + \alpha - (\alpha + |\alpha|) g} . \quad (5.67)$$

Depending on the parameters, the system can be either purely ferromagnetic or representing a ferromagnet with paramagnetic fluctuations [278]. At low temperature, the ferromagnetic order parameter behaves as

$$s_1 \simeq 1 - 2 \exp \left\{ - \frac{w_0^2}{T} (1 - \alpha + 4\alpha g) \right\}. \quad (5.68)$$

The critical temperature, defined by the condition $s_1(T_c) = 0$, is given by the equation

$$T_c = \frac{1 - \alpha}{8} \exp \left(\frac{\alpha g}{8T_c} \right). \quad (5.69)$$

There exists a tricritical surface, given by a relation $u = u_3(g, \alpha)$, where the order of the phase transition changes between second and first. The critical exponents, describing the behavior of the specific heat C_V , order parameter s_1 , susceptibility χ , and the ferromagnetic probability w , defined by the relations

$$C_V \propto |\tau|^{-\alpha}, \quad s_1 \propto |\tau|^\beta, \quad \chi \propto |\tau|^\gamma, \quad w - \frac{1}{2} \propto |\tau|^\varepsilon$$

on the tricritical surface experience a jump, so that outside the surface, one has

$$\alpha = 0, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \gamma = 1, \quad \varepsilon = 1 \quad (u \neq u_3), \quad (5.70)$$

while on the tricritical surface,

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \gamma = 1, \quad \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \quad (u = u_3). \quad (5.71)$$

The condition $\alpha + 2\beta + \gamma = 2$ is always valid.

5.5 Model of Heterophase Antiferromagnet

Antiferromagnets are characterized by two sublattices having opposite average magnetizations. In each of sublattices there can occur heterophase fluctuations representing disordered paramagnetic phase. The model of such a heterophase antiferromagnet is defined as follows [279, 280].

Let us consider two sublattices, A and B , the lattice A , enumerated by the indices $\{i, j\}$, and the lattice B , by the indices $\{l, m\}$. The particles forming the sublattices interact directly with the strengths U_A inside the sublattice A and U_B , in the sublattice B , respectively. The direct interaction between the nodes of different sublattices is denoted by U_{AB} . Also, there are exchange interactions J_{ij}^A and J_{lm}^B between the spins inside each sublattice, as well exchange interactions J_{jl}^{AB} between the spins of different sublattices. The corresponding spins are denoted as \mathbf{S}_{j1} and \mathbf{S}_{j2} for the sublattice A , and as \mathbf{S}_{l1} and \mathbf{S}_{l2} for the sublattice B . The probabilities of the magnetic and paramagnetic phases are denoted as w_{A1} and w_{A2} in the sublattice A and as w_{B1} , and w_{B2} in the sublattice B . Thus the Hamiltonian reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= H_1 \oplus H_2, \\ H_f &= \frac{N_A}{2} w_{Af}^2 U_A - w_{Af}^2 \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij}^A \mathbf{S}_{if} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{jf} + \frac{N_B}{2} w_{Bf}^2 U_B - w_{Bf}^2 \sum_{l \neq m} J_{lm}^B \mathbf{S}_{lf} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{mf} + \end{aligned}$$

$$+ N_{AB} w_{Af} w_{Bf} U_{AB} + 2w_{Af} w_{Bf} \sum_{jl} J_{jl}^{AB} \mathbf{S}_{jf} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{lf} , \quad (5.72)$$

where

$$N_{AB} \equiv \frac{1}{2} (N_A + N_B) .$$

The order parameters for the sublattices are defined as nonzero magnetizations for the magnetic phase,

$$\mathbf{C}_A \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{N_A} \sum_{j=1}^{N_A} \mathbf{S}_{j1} \right\rangle \neq 0 , \quad \mathbf{C}_B \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \mathbf{S}_{l1} \right\rangle \neq 0 , \quad (5.73)$$

and zero magnetizations for the paramagnetic phase,

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{N_A} \sum_{j=1}^{N_A} \mathbf{S}_{j2} \right\rangle = 0 , \quad \left\langle \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \mathbf{S}_{l2} \right\rangle = 0 . \quad (5.74)$$

Taking into account the normalization conditions

$$w_{A1} + w_{A2} = 1 , \quad w_{B1} + w_{B2} = 1 , \quad (5.75)$$

it is possible to simplify the notation by defining

$$w_A \equiv w_{A1} , \quad w_{A2} = 1 - w_A , \quad w_B \equiv w_{B1} , \quad w_{B2} = 1 - w_B . \quad (5.76)$$

Considering the case of the sublattices with the equal number of sites,

$$N_A = N_B \equiv N , \quad (5.77)$$

we look for the free energy

$$F = - \frac{1}{2N} T \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}} . \quad (5.78)$$

We employ the mean-field approximation and define the average exchange interactions

$$J_A \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij}^A , \quad J_B \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l \neq m} J_{lm}^B , \quad J_{AB} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{jl} J_{jl}^{AB} , \quad (5.79)$$

and effective fields

$$h_A \equiv w_A^2 J_A C_A - w_A w_B J_{AB} C_B , \quad h_B \equiv w_B^2 J_B C_B - w_A w_B J_{AB} C_A . \quad (5.80)$$

We assume that the average spins \mathbf{C}_A and \mathbf{C}_B are directed along the same axis, say the z -axis, and are opposite to each other, so that the order parameters are $C_A = C_A^z$ and $C_B = C_B^z$. For these order parameters, we get

$$C_A = S_A B_{S_A}(x_A) , \quad C_B = -S_B B_{S_B}(x_B) , \quad (5.81)$$

where S_A and S_B are the corresponding spin values and $B_S(x)$ is the Brillouin function

$$B_S(x) = \frac{2S+1}{2S} \coth \left(\frac{2S+1}{2S} x \right) - \frac{1}{2S} \coth \left(\frac{x}{2S} \right) ,$$

with the notation

$$x_A \equiv \frac{2S_A}{T} h_A, \quad x_B \equiv \frac{2S_B}{T} h_B.$$

Then for the free energy, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F = & \frac{1}{2} \left(w_A^2 - w_A + \frac{1}{2} \right) U_A + \frac{1}{2} w_A^2 J_A C_A^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(w_B^2 - w_B + \frac{1}{2} \right) U_B + \frac{1}{2} w_B^2 J_B C_B^2 + \\ & + \frac{1}{2} (2w_A w_B - w_A - w_B + 1) U_{AB} - w_A w_B J_{AB} C_A C_B - \\ & - \frac{T}{2} \ln \frac{\sinh \left(\frac{2S_A+1}{2S_A} x_A \right)}{\sinh \left(\frac{x_A}{2S_A} \right)} - \frac{T}{2} \ln \frac{\sinh \left(\frac{2S_B+1}{2S_B} x_B \right)}{\sinh \left(\frac{x_B}{2S_B} \right)} - \\ & - \frac{T}{2} \ln(2S_A + 1) - \frac{T}{2} \ln(2S_B + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.82)$$

The analysis of the derived free energy [280] shows that, depending on the system parameters, the mixed antiferromagnetic-paramagnetic state can become stable and thermodynamically preferable, as compared to the pure antiferromagnetic phase. The phase transition between the mixed state and paramagnetic state can be of second as well as of first order.

5.6 Heterophase Hubbard Model

A heterophase Hubbard model describing the mixture of ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases is studied in Ref. [281]. The total Hamiltonian of each phase f contains the terms corresponding to delocalized band electrons and electrons localized on ions,

$$\tilde{H} = H_1 \oplus H_2,$$

$$H_f = H_f^{band} + H_f^{ion} + H_{fCoul}^{ion-ion} + H_{fexch}^{ion-ion} + H_{fCoul}^{band-ion} + H_{fexch}^{band-ion}. \quad (5.83)$$

Here the first term describes quasi-free band electrons, the second term, the electrons localized on ions, the third term, the direct Coulomb interactions of ion electrons, the fourth term, the exchange interactions of ion electrons, the fifth and sixth terms describe the direct Coulomb and exchange interactions between the band and ion electrons. The band electron wave functions are the Bloch waves $|nk\rangle$, where n is the band number and k is quasi-momentum. The band electron field operators pertaining to the f -phase are $c_{fnk\sigma}$, with σ being the spin index. The ion electrons of an f -th phase are characterized by the localized wave functions $|fj\gamma\rangle$, where j is the site index and γ is the set of quantum numbers including the number of electrons ν localized on the ion shell, the total ion spin S (or the orbital momentum J), and the z -projection m of the total spin S^z (or the orbital momentum J^z). Thus $|fj\gamma\rangle = |fj\nu Sm\rangle$. The ion electrons are represented by the Hubbard operators

$$\chi_{fj}^{\gamma\delta} \equiv |fj\gamma\rangle\langle\delta jf| \quad (5.84)$$

describing the change of the ion state in the f -th phase and the site j from $|fj\gamma\rangle$ to $|fj\delta\rangle$. The exchange interactions of the ion electrons localized on an ion j in the f -th phase are written through the spin operators \mathbf{S}_{fj} localized at a site j .

The phases are distinguished by their magnetization, being either nonzero for ferromagnetic phase or zero for paramagnetic phase. The properties of this model are similar to other heterophase models describing the mixture of ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases, although the consideration is essentially more complicated [281].

5.7 Heterophase Vonsovsky-Zener Model

Another model comprising the mixture of ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases is the heterophase generalization [282] of the Vonsovsky-Zener model [283,284]. The system Hamiltonian can be represented as the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= H_1 \oplus H_2 \\ H_f &= H_f^s + H_f^d + H_f^{dd} + H_{fCoul}^{dd} + H_{fexch}^{dd} + H_{fCoul}^{sd} + H_{fexch}^{sd} . \end{aligned} \quad (5.85)$$

Here: the first term corresponds to quasi-free electrons,

$$H_f^s = w_f \sum_{nk\sigma} (\varepsilon_{nk} - \mu) c_{fnk\sigma}^\dagger c_{fnk\sigma} , \quad (5.86)$$

where n is a band index, k is quasi-momentum, and σ is a spin index; the second term corresponds to single-particle localized electrons,

$$H_f^d = w_f \sum_{mj\sigma} (E_m - \mu) d_{fmj\sigma}^\dagger d_{fmj\sigma} , \quad (5.87)$$

where m is a quantum number of a localized electron and j is a lattice index; the third term describes the on-site interactions of localized electrons,

$$\begin{aligned} H_f^{dd} &= \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_j \left[\sum_{m\sigma} U_m \hat{n}_{fmj\sigma} \hat{n}_{fmj\sigma} + \sum_{m \neq m'} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} V_{mm'} \hat{n}_{fmj\sigma} \hat{n}_{fm'j\sigma'} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{m \neq m'} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} I_{mm'} d_{fmj\sigma}^\dagger d_{fm'j\sigma'}^\dagger d_{fmj\sigma'} d_{fm'j\sigma} \right] ; \end{aligned} \quad (5.88)$$

the fourth term, to the intersite direct Coulomb interactions of localized electrons,

$$H_{fCoul}^{dd} = \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{mm'} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} V_{ij} \hat{n}_{fmi\sigma}^\dagger \hat{n}_{fm'j\sigma'}^\dagger ; \quad (5.89)$$

the fifth term, to the intersite exchange interactions of localized electrons,

$$H_{fexch}^{dd} = \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{mm'} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} I_{ij} d_{fmi\sigma}^\dagger d_{fm'j\sigma'}^\dagger d_{fmi\sigma'} d_{fm'j\sigma} ; \quad (5.90)$$

the sixth term, to the direct Coulomb interaction between conducting and localized electrons,

$$H_{fCoul}^{sd} = w_f^2 \sum_{nn'} \sum_{kk'} \sum_{mj} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} G_{kk'}^{nn'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{a}_j} c_{fn'k'\sigma}^\dagger d_{fmj\sigma'}^\dagger d_{fmj\sigma'} c_{fnk\sigma} ; \quad (5.91)$$

and the seventh term describes the exchange interaction of conducting and localized electrons,

$$H_{fexch}^{sd} = w_f^2 \sum_{nn'} \sum_{kk'} \sum_{mj} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} J_{kk'}^{nn'} e^{i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\cdot\mathbf{a}_j} c_{fn'k'\sigma}^\dagger d_{fmj\sigma'}^\dagger c_{fnk\sigma} d_{fmj\sigma} . \quad (5.92)$$

Depending on the system parameters, the model demonstrates the existence of pure ferromagnetic phase and mixed ferromagnetic-paramagnetic state. The phase transition between the mixed state and paramagnetic phase can be of second as well as of first order [282].

5.8 Heterophase Spin Glass

Spin glass can be described by the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model [285,286]. This model can be generalized by taking into account the possible appearance of paramagnetic fluctuations inside the spin-glass phase [278,287]. The Hamiltonian of the heterophase model reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= H_1 \bigoplus H_2 , \quad H_f = H_f(\{J_{ij}\}) , \\ H_f(\{J_{ij}\}) &= \frac{N}{2} w_f^2 U - w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \sigma_{if} \sigma_{jf} , \end{aligned} \quad (5.93)$$

where $\sigma_{jf} \pm 1$ and the exchange interaction is distributed by the Gaussian law

$$p(J_{ij}) = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2\pi}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{N}{2J^2} \left(J_{ij} - \frac{J_0}{N} \right)^2 \right\} . \quad (5.94)$$

Setting the mean $J_0 = 0$ excludes the possibility of ferromagnetic phase. The randomness of the exchange interactions corresponds to the frozen disorder, which implies that the frozen free energy

$$F(\{J_{ij}\}) = -\frac{T}{N} \ln \text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta \tilde{H}(\{J_{ij}\})\} \quad (5.95)$$

has to be averaged over the interactions,

$$F = \langle\langle F(\{J_{ij}\}) \rangle\rangle \equiv \int F(\{J_{ij}\}) \prod_{i \neq j} p(J_{ij}) \frac{dJ_{ij}}{J} . \quad (5.96)$$

The phases are distinguished by the Edwards-Anderson [288] order parameter

$$q_f \equiv \langle\langle (\langle \sigma_{jf} \rangle^2) \rangle\rangle . \quad (5.97)$$

The spin glass phase is indexed by $f = 1$ and the paramagnetic phase, by $f = 2$. Then

$$q_1 \neq 0 , \quad q_2 = 0 . \quad (5.98)$$

The calculation of the free energy involves the use of the replica trick

$$\ln Z = \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n} (Z^n - 1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial n} Z^n .$$

This makes it possible to write

$$F = -\frac{T}{N} \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n} (Z(\{J_{ij}\}) - 1) , \quad (5.99)$$

where

$$Z(\{J_{ij}\}) \equiv \text{Tr} \exp\{-\beta \tilde{H}(\{J_{ij}\})\} . \quad (5.100)$$

Employing the replica trick gives the free energy

$$\begin{aligned} F = & \frac{1}{2} [w^2 + (1-w)^2] U - \frac{1}{4} w^4 (1-q)^2 \frac{J^2}{T} - \frac{1}{4} (1-w)^2 \frac{J^2}{T} - \\ & - T \ln 2 - T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) \ln \left[2 \cosh \left(w^2 q^{1/2} \frac{J}{T} x \right) \right] dx , \end{aligned} \quad (5.101)$$

in which

$$w \equiv w_1 , \quad q \equiv q_1 , \quad p(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} .$$

For the spin glass order parameter, we get

$$q = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) \tanh^2 \left(w^2 q^{1/2} \frac{J}{T} x \right) dx . \quad (5.102)$$

Minimizing the free energy with respect to w results in the equation

$$w^3(1-q)^2 - (1-w)^3 - u(2w-1)T = 0 , \quad (5.103)$$

where $u \equiv U/J$ and temperature is measured in units of J .

At low temperature $T \rightarrow 0$, the spin-glass order parameter is

$$\begin{aligned} q \simeq 1 - \frac{u_0}{2} T - u_0 (u_0 - u) T^{4/3} \quad (u < u_0) , \\ q \simeq 1 - \frac{u_0}{2} T - \frac{T^2}{\pi} \quad (u \geq u_0) , \end{aligned} \quad (5.104)$$

where

$$u \equiv \frac{U}{J} , \quad u_0 \equiv 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} = 1.595769 . \quad (5.105)$$

At this low temperature, the spin-glass probability reads as

$$\begin{aligned} w \simeq 1 - (u_0 - u) T^{1/3} \quad (u < u_0) , \\ w \simeq 1 \quad (u \geq u_0) . \end{aligned} \quad (5.106)$$

Specific heat is positive, although divergent,

$$\begin{aligned} C_V \simeq \frac{1}{6} (u - u_0)^{4/3} T^{-2/3} \quad (u < u_0) , \\ C_V \simeq \frac{(\pi^3 - 6)}{24\pi} u_0 T \quad (u \geq u_0) . \end{aligned} \quad (5.107)$$

However, the entropy can become negative and divergent,

$$S \simeq -\frac{1}{4} (u_0 - u)^{4/3} T^{-2/3} \quad (u < u_0),$$

$$S \simeq \ln 2 - \frac{1}{2\pi} = 0.53399 \quad (u \geq u_0), \quad (5.108)$$

similarly to the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick case [285,286], which is connected with the instability of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick solution for the low-temperature spin glass [289].

In the vicinity of the critical point

$$T_c = \frac{1}{4} \quad (q = 0), \quad (5.109)$$

the spin-glass order parameter behaves as

$$q \simeq (-\tau) \quad \left(\tau \equiv \frac{T - T_c}{T_c} \right) \quad (5.110)$$

and the phase probability is

$$w \simeq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\tau^2}{4(u-3)}. \quad (5.111)$$

The stability condition

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial w^2} \simeq 2J(u-3) > 0 \quad (T \rightarrow T_c) \quad (5.112)$$

shows that the phase transition between the spin-glass and paramagnetic phases is of second order, provided that $u > 3$. The value $u = 3$ corresponds to a tricritical point, where the transition changes to first order one. For $u < 3$, the transition is of first order.

Thus, the system ground state could be the pure spin glass phase, since $w = 1$ at $T = 0$. However, when $u < u_0$, the system is not stable at low temperature, similarly to the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick case [285,286]. For $u > u_0$, the mixed state becomes partially stable, as far as the specific heat and entropy demonstrate the normal behavior. Unfortunately, the corresponding free energy is not minimal. The system regains stability for the use of the solution for the order parameter with broken replica symmetry [290]. By numerical analysis, it is possible to show that the free energy with broken replica symmetry, representing the mixed state of spin glass with paramagnetic fluctuations, is lower than the free energy of the pure spin glass phase [287].

5.9 Systems with Magnetic Reorientations

Materials, exhibiting the phase transitions of magnetization reorientation, are often characterized by the coexistence of phases with different directions of magnetization [40,41]. A material with coexisting magnetic phases, with different orientations of magnetization, is described as follows [278,291–293].

Let us consider a system in zero magnetic field, where four phases can coexist, so that $f = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Three of the phases correspond to magnetic states with their magnetizations along one of the mutually orthogonal axes and the fourth is the paramagnetic phase. The role of the order parameter is played by the set of four quantities

$$s_f = \left\langle \frac{1}{NS} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{jf}^f \right\rangle, \quad s_4 = 0 \quad (f = 1, 2, 3, 4), \quad (5.113)$$

where S_{jf}^f is an f component of the spin operator localized at a site j of the f -th phase. The first three quantities are the reduced magnetizations $s_f \neq 0$ along the axes $f = 1, 2, 3$, while the fourth phase is paramagnetic with $s_4 \equiv 0$.

In view of the existence of four phases, the space of microscopic states is the fiber space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3 \otimes \mathcal{H}_4 \quad (5.114)$$

of four weighted Hilbert spaces. Respectively, the Hamiltonian is the direct sum

$$\tilde{H} = \bigoplus_{f=1}^4 H_f \quad (5.115)$$

of four terms

$$H_f = \frac{w_f^2}{2} N U - w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j}^N \left(J_{ij}^f S_{if}^f S_{jf}^f \right) . \quad (5.116)$$

The order parameter can be written as the vector

$$\mathbf{s} = s_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + s_2 \mathbf{e}_2 + s_3 \mathbf{e}_3 , \quad s_4 = 0 , \quad (5.117)$$

where \mathbf{e}_α is a unit vector along the axis α .

If all four phases are present, then the minimization condition

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_f} = 0 \quad \left(\sum_{f=1}^4 w_f = 1 \right) \quad (5.118)$$

yields the equations for the phase probabilities

$$w_f = \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^4 \frac{U - 2\Phi_f}{U - 2\Phi_\alpha} \right)^{-1} \quad (f = 1, 2, 3, 4) , \quad (5.119)$$

in which

$$\Phi_\alpha = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij}^\alpha \langle S_{i\alpha}^\alpha S_{j\alpha}^\alpha \rangle . \quad (5.120)$$

Similarly, when some of the probabilities are identically zero, say $w_4 \equiv 0$, then the minimization condition

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial w_f} = 0 \quad \left(\sum_{f=1}^3 w_f = 1, w_4 = 0 \right) \quad (5.121)$$

gives the equations for the phase probabilities

$$w_f = \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{U - 2\Phi_f}{U - 2\Phi_\alpha} \right)^{-1} \quad (f = 1, 2, 3) . \quad (5.122)$$

Altogether, it is necessary to analyze 15 possible cases:

1. $w_1 \neq 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$, $w_3 \neq 0$, $w_4 \neq 0$,
2. $w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$, $w_3 \neq 0$, $w_4 \neq 0$,
3. $w_1 \neq 0$, $w_2 \equiv 0$, $w_3 \neq 0$, $w_4 \neq 0$,
4. $w_1 \neq 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$, $w_3 \equiv 0$, $w_4 \neq 0$,
5. $w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \equiv 0$, $w_3 \neq 0$, $w_4 \neq 0$,
6. $w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$, $w_3 \equiv 0$, $w_4 \neq 0$,
7. $w_1 \neq 0$, $w_2 \equiv 0$, $w_3 \equiv 0$, $w_4 \neq 0$,
8. $w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \equiv 0$, $w_3 \equiv 0$, $w_4 \equiv 1$,
9. $w_1 \neq 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$, $w_3 \neq 0$, $w_4 \equiv 0$,
10. $w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$, $w_3 \neq 0$, $w_4 \equiv 0$,
11. $w_1 \neq 0$, $w_2 \equiv 0$, $w_3 \neq 0$, $w_4 \equiv 0$,
12. $w_1 \neq 0$, $w_2 \neq 0$, $w_3 \equiv 0$, $w_4 \equiv 0$,
13. $w_1 \equiv 1$, $w_2 \equiv 0$, $w_3 \equiv 0$, $w_4 \equiv 0$,
14. $w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \equiv 1$, $w_3 \equiv 0$, $w_4 \equiv 0$,
15. $w_1 \equiv 0$, $w_2 \equiv 0$, $w_3 \equiv 1$, $w_4 \equiv 0$.

The system state is described by the minimal of the free energies corresponding to these cases.

The analysis has been done in the mean-field approximation [278,291–293], when the Hamiltonian (5.116) takes the form

$$H_f = w_f^2 \frac{N}{2} U - w_f^2 J_f N \left(\frac{2}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{jf}^f - C_f \right) C_f , \quad (5.123)$$

in which

$$C_f \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{jf}^f \right\rangle = S s_f . \quad (5.124)$$

Then the total free energy, for spin one-half, reads as

$$F = \sum_{f=1}^3 \left\{ w_f^2 \left(\frac{U}{2} + J_f C_f^2 \right) - T \ln \left[2 \cosh \left(\frac{w_f^2 J_f C_f}{T} \right) \right] \right\} + w_4^2 \frac{U}{2} - T \ln 2 , \quad (5.125)$$

where

$$J_f \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij}^f . \quad (5.126)$$

For concreteness, we set that the average exchange interactions are arranged in the order

$$0 < J_1 < J_2 < J_3 . \quad (5.127)$$

The conditions

$$s_f(T_f) = 0 \quad (f = 1, 2, 3) \quad (5.128)$$

define the reorientation temperatures, the largest of which is the critical temperature

$$T_c \equiv \sup_f T_f \quad (5.129)$$

of the ferromagnet-paramagnet phase transition.

The temperature, where there appears the f -th phase, is called the f -th phase nucleation temperature, where for example

$$\begin{aligned} w_f(T) &= 0 & (T < T_{fn}) , \\ w_f(T) &> 0 & (T > T_{fn}) . \end{aligned} \quad (5.130)$$

The average spin along the f -th axis is given by the equation

$$C_f = \frac{1}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{w_f^2 J_f C_f}{T}\right) . \quad (5.131)$$

The overall picture of the transitions between the stable solutions can be represented in the following scheme describing the phase transitions and their order depending on the value of the parameter

$$u \equiv \frac{U}{J_3} . \quad (5.132)$$

In the square brackets, zero implies the absence of magnetization along the related axis $f = 1, 2, 3$, and plus means the existence of magnetization along the corresponding axis. The arrow shows the increase of temperature.

For $u < 0$, there exists a single phase transition of second order at the temperature $T_c = J_3/2$, which is represented as

$$[0 \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{1}{2}]{T_c} [0 \ 0 \ 0] .$$

For the range $0 < u < 0.5$, there may happen either the reorientation transitions

$$[0 \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{2}{2}]{T_{n_1}} [+ \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{2}{2}]{T_{n_2}} [+ \ + \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{1}{1}]{T_0} [0 \ 0 \ 0] ,$$

or the sequence of the transitions

$$[0 \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{1}{1}]{T_{n_1}} [+ \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{2}{2}]{T_{n_2}} [+ \ + \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{1}{1}]{T_0} [0 \ 0 \ 0] ,$$

or the transitions

$$[0 \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{1}{1}]{T_{n_1}=T_{n_2}} [+ \ + \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{1}{1}]{T_0} [0 \ 0 \ 0] .$$

In the range $0.5 < u \leq 9/4$, we have the first-order phase transition

$$[0 \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{1}{1}]{T_0} [0 \ 0 \ 0] .$$

And for $u > 9/4$, the following sequence of phase transitions occurs,

$$[+ \ + \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{2}{2}]{T_{n_1}} [0 \ + \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{2}{2}]{T_{n_2}} [0 \ 0 \ +] \xrightarrow[\frac{2}{2}]{T_c} [0 \ 0 \ 0] .$$

More details can be found in Refs. [278, 291–293].

5.10 Model of Heterophase Superconductor

High-temperature superconductors are known to often be heterophase, being composed of the mixture of superconducting and normal phases. Actually, it is widely accepted that the majority of high-temperature superconductors, such as cuprates, possess the principal property distinguishing them from the conventional low-temperature superconductors. This property is mesoscopic phase separation, implying that not the whole volume of a sample is superconducting but it is separated into nanosize regions of superconducting and normal phases. There exist numerous experiments confirming the occurrence of the phase separation in high-temperature superconductors, as is summarized in Refs. [181, 183–185]. For instance, in high-temperature superconductors there appear the so-called stripes that are self-organized networks of charges inside small bubbles of $100 - 300\text{\AA}$ fluctuating at the time scale 10^{-12} s [294].

A model of a heterophase superconductor was advanced [295, 296], yet before the high-temperature superconductors had been discovered [297]. The models with isotropic gap [296, 298–301], as well as with anisotropic gap [302, 303] have been suggested.

The Hamiltonian of a heterophase superconductor has the general form

$$\tilde{H} = H_1 \bigoplus H_2, \quad H_f = H_f^{kin} + H_f^{int}, \quad (5.133)$$

consisting of the sum of a kinetic term and interaction term. The kinetic term reads as

$$H_f^{kin} = w_f \sum_s \int \psi_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) [\hat{K}_f(\mathbf{r}) - \mu] \psi_{sf}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (5.134)$$

where $\psi_{sf}(\mathbf{r})$ is the field operator of a charged Fermi particle with spin s in the phase f . The interaction term has the form

$$H_f^{int} = \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{ss'} \int \psi_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{s'f}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{V}_f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \psi_{s'f}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{sf}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}', \quad (5.135)$$

in which \hat{V}_f is an interaction operator for two particles in the phase f . This operator is symmetric,

$$\hat{V}_f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \hat{V}_f(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}). \quad (5.136)$$

The superconducting and normal thermodynamic phases can be distinguished by their order indices [217, 218, 255, 304] or the order parameters. For the superconducting phase, the role of the order parameter is played by the non-zero anomalous average

$$\langle \psi_{s1}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{s'1}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \neq 0, \quad (5.137)$$

with the anomalous average for the normal phase being identically zero,

$$\langle \psi_{s2}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{s'2}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \equiv 0. \quad (5.138)$$

The field operator can be expanded over a complete set of functions,

$$\psi_{sf}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_k c_{sf}(\mathbf{k}) \varphi_k(\mathbf{r}). \quad (5.139)$$

For a uniform system, one takes the plane waves and for a crystalline structure, one uses Bloch functions.

In that way, we meet the following matrix elements: the kinetic transport matrix

$$K_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \equiv (\varphi_k, \hat{K} \varphi_p), \quad (5.140)$$

the vertex

$$V_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) \equiv (\varphi_k \varphi_{k'}, \hat{V}_f \varphi_{p'} \varphi_p), \quad (5.141)$$

and the effective interaction

$$J_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \equiv -V_f(\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}). \quad (5.142)$$

Due to the symmetry property (5.136), we have

$$V_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = V_f(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}'), \quad J_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) = J_f(-\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{p}).$$

The kinetic Hamiltonian acquires the form

$$H_f^{kin} = w_f \sum_s \sum_{kp} [K_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) - \mu \delta_{kp}] c_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{sf}(\mathbf{p}) \quad (5.143)$$

and the interaction part becomes

$$H_f^{int} = \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{ss'} \sum_{kk'} \sum_{pp'} V_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) c_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{s'f}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}') c_{s'f}(\mathbf{p}') c_{sf}(\mathbf{p}). \quad (5.144)$$

Then we use the Hartree-Fock-Bogolubov approximation [305] and consider the restricted space comprising the processes with conserved spin and momentum, so that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{s'f}(\mathbf{k}') &= \delta_{ss'} \delta_{kk'} c_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{sf}(\mathbf{k}), \\ c_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{s'f}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}') &= \delta_{-ss'} \delta_{-kk'} c_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{-sf}^\dagger(-\mathbf{k}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.145)$$

Introduce the momentum distribution

$$n_f(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \sum_s \langle c_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{sf}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \quad (5.146)$$

and the anomalous average

$$\sigma_f(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \langle c_{-sf}(-\mathbf{k}) c_{sf}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle. \quad (5.147)$$

The resulting Hamiltonian can be diagonalized by means of the Bogolubov canonical transformation

$$c_{sf}(\mathbf{k}) = u_f(\mathbf{k}) a_{sf}(\mathbf{k}) + v_f(\mathbf{k}) a_{-sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}), \quad (5.148)$$

in which

$$|u_f(\mathbf{k})|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \frac{\omega_f(\mathbf{k})}{\varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k})} \right], \quad |v_f(\mathbf{k})|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \frac{\omega_f(\mathbf{k})}{\varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k})} \right]. \quad (5.149)$$

Here we have defined the effective single-particle spectrum

$$\omega_f(\mathbf{k}) = K_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}) + w_f M_f(\mathbf{k}) - \mu \quad (5.150)$$

and the excitation spectrum

$$\varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{\Delta_f^2(\mathbf{k}) + \omega_f^2(\mathbf{k})}, \quad (5.151)$$

with the mass operator

$$M_f(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \sum_p \left[V_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}) - \frac{1}{2} V_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \right] n_f(\mathbf{p}) \quad (5.152)$$

and the gap

$$\Delta_f(\mathbf{k}) = w_f \sum_p J_p(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \sigma_f(\mathbf{p}). \quad (5.153)$$

As a result, the Hamiltonian reduces to

$$H_f = w_f \sum_s \sum_k \varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k}) a_{sf}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) a_{sf}(\mathbf{k}) + w_f C_f \quad (5.154)$$

with the nonoperator term

$$C_f = \sum_k \left[\omega_f(\mathbf{k}) - \varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k}) + \Delta_f(\mathbf{k}) \sigma_f(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{1}{2} w_f M_f(\mathbf{k}) n_f(\mathbf{k}) \right]. \quad (5.155)$$

The momentum distribution becomes

$$n_f(\mathbf{k}) = 1 - \frac{\omega_f(\mathbf{k})}{\varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k})} \tanh \frac{w_f \varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k})}{2T} \quad (5.156)$$

and the anomalous average is

$$\sigma_f(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\Delta_f(\mathbf{k})}{2\varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k})} \tanh \frac{w_f \varepsilon_f(\mathbf{k})}{2T}. \quad (5.157)$$

The anomalous average is the order parameter distinguishing the superconducting and normal phases, so that

$$\sigma_1(\mathbf{k}) \neq 0, \quad \sigma_2(\mathbf{k}) \equiv 0. \quad (5.158)$$

This yields the distinction for the gap in the superconducting and normal phases,

$$\Delta_1(\mathbf{k}) \neq 0, \quad \Delta_2(\mathbf{k}) \equiv 0. \quad (5.159)$$

5.11 Stability of Heterophase States

The existence of a heterophase state implies the stability of the state with respect to the variation of phase probabilities. For grand thermodynamic ensemble, we need to consider the grand thermodynamic potential

$$\Omega = -T \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}}, \quad (5.160)$$

where $\beta \equiv 1/T$. The extremum of the grand potential with respect to $w \equiv w_1$, with $w_2 = 1 - w$, yields the equation defining the phase probability w ,

$$\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial w} = \left\langle \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} \right\rangle = 0. \quad (5.161)$$

This extremum is a minimum provided that

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Omega}{\partial w^2} = \left[\left\langle \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{H}}{\partial w^2} \right\rangle - \beta \left\langle \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} \right)^2 \right\rangle \right] > 0. \quad (5.162)$$

Since the second term in the last inequality is positive, the necessary condition for the minimum is

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{H}}{\partial w^2} \right\rangle > 0. \quad (5.163)$$

Introducing the notations

$$\langle H_f^{kin} \rangle \equiv w_f Q_f, \quad \langle H_f^{int} \rangle \equiv \frac{w_f^2}{2} \Phi_f, \quad (5.164)$$

from (5.161), we get the equation for the phase probability

$$w = \frac{\Phi_2 + Q_2 - Q_1}{\Phi_1 + \Phi_2} \quad (5.165)$$

and from (5.163), we find the stability condition

$$\Phi_1 + \Phi_2 > 0. \quad (5.166)$$

For the heterophase superconductor, we have

$$\Phi_f = \sum_k M_f(\mathbf{k}) n_f(\mathbf{k}) - 2 \sum_{kp} J_p(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \sigma_f(\mathbf{k}) \sigma_f(\mathbf{p}). \quad (5.167)$$

Then the stability condition (5.166) yields

$$\sum_f \sum_k M_f(\mathbf{k}) n_f(\mathbf{k}) > 2 \sum_{kp} J_1(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \sigma_1(\mathbf{k}) \sigma_1(\mathbf{p}). \quad (5.168)$$

The gap equation (5.154) reads as

$$\Delta_f(\mathbf{k}) = w_f \sum_p J_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \frac{\Delta_f(\mathbf{p})}{2\varepsilon_f(\mathbf{p})} \tanh \frac{w_f \varepsilon_f(\mathbf{p})}{2T}. \quad (5.169)$$

A positive solution for the gap requires that

$$J_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) > 0 \quad (5.170)$$

in the region of momenta making the main contribution to the summation. Therefore a necessary condition for (5.168) is

$$\sum_f \sum_k M_f(\mathbf{k}) n_f(\mathbf{k}) > 0. \quad (5.171)$$

This implies that there should exist in the system sufficiently strong repulsive interactions. The first candidate for this is the Coulomb interaction of charge carriers. Thus we come to the requirement:

Conclusion 1. *Heterophase state in a superconductor can exist only in the presence of repulsive interactions, such as Coulomb interactions.*

5.12 Uniform Heterophase Superconductor

For the case of a uniform system, it is reasonable to deal with the plane waves

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}, \quad (5.172)$$

where V is the system volume. Since the gap for the normal phase is trivial, $\Delta_2(\mathbf{k}) \equiv 0$, it is necessary to consider only the gap of the superconducting phase. It is convenient to define

$$J_1(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} J(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}). \quad (5.173)$$

To simplify notations, we can omit the index 1 in the expressions related to the superconducting phase, such as

$$\Delta_1(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \Delta(\mathbf{k}), \quad \varepsilon_1(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \varepsilon(\mathbf{k}), \quad \omega_1(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \omega(\mathbf{k}).$$

Taking into account that in the thermodynamic limit the replacement

$$\frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \mapsto \int \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3}$$

is valid, where the integration is over all values of the momentum, from Eq. (5.169) we come to the equation for the gap of a uniform heterophase superconductor

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = w \int J(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \frac{\Delta(\mathbf{p})}{2\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})} \tanh \frac{w\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})}{2T} \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (5.174)$$

The charge carriers interact with each other in two ways, through attractive interactions induced by phonon exchange and repulsive Coulomb interactions [306,307], which can be denoted as

$$J(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) = J_{ph}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) + J_C(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}). \quad (5.175)$$

The phonon-exchange part is

$$J_{ph}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{|\alpha|^2}{\omega_{ph}^2 - [\omega(\mathbf{k}) - \omega(\mathbf{p})]^2}, \quad (5.176)$$

with the electron-phonon coupling

$$\alpha = - \frac{4\pi i Z_{ion} e_0^2}{k_F (1 + \varkappa^2/k_F^2)} \left(\frac{\rho_{ion}}{m_{ion}} \right)^{1/2}$$

and the characteristic phonon frequency ω_{ph} . Here e_0 is the charge of the carriers, k_F is the Fermi momentum defined by the equation $\omega(k_F) = 0$, \varkappa^{-1} is the screening radius of charge interactions, and ρ_{ion} , m_{ion} , and Z_{ion} are the density, mass, and charge of an ion. The Fermi momentum approximately is $k_F \approx (3\pi^2 \rho_e)^{1/3}$, where ρ_e is electron density.

The term due to the screened Coulomb interactions is

$$J_C(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) = - \int \Phi_C(\mathbf{r}) e^{-i(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{p})\cdot\mathbf{r}} d\mathbf{r}, \quad \Phi_C(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{e_0^2}{r} e^{-\varkappa r}, \quad (5.177)$$

which gives

$$J_C(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) = - \frac{4\pi e_0^2}{|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}|^2 + \varkappa^2}, \quad (5.178)$$

where the notation (5.142) with the sign minus is taken into account. The screening radius \varkappa^{-1} is defined by the expression

$$\varkappa^2 = \frac{4}{a_B} \left(\frac{3}{\pi} \rho_e \right)^{1/3},$$

where $a_B = 1/(m_e e_0^2)$ is the Bohr radius. Thus we have

$$J(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{|\alpha|^2}{\omega_{ph}^2 - [\omega(\mathbf{k}) - \omega(\mathbf{p})]^2} - \frac{4\pi e_0^2}{|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}|^2 + \varkappa^2}. \quad (5.179)$$

The main contribution to integral (5.174) comes from the momentum p that is close to the Fermi momentum k_F . To simplify the gap equation (5.174), let us average the effective interactions over spherical angles,

$$J(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \lim_{p \rightarrow k_F} \frac{1}{4\pi} \int J(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) d\Omega(\mathbf{p}). \quad (5.180)$$

This gives

$$J(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{|\alpha|^2}{\omega_{ph}^2 - \omega^2(\mathbf{k})} - J_C(\mathbf{k}), \quad (5.181)$$

where

$$J_C(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\pi e_0^2}{kk_F} \ln \left| \frac{(k + k_F)^2 + \varkappa^2}{(k - k_F)^2 + \varkappa^2} \right|. \quad (5.182)$$

The gap equation (5.174) can be approximated by the equation

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = wJ(\mathbf{k}) \int \frac{\Delta(\mathbf{p})}{2\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})} \tanh \frac{w\varepsilon(p)}{2T} \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (5.183)$$

The condition for the existence of a nontrivial gap is

$$\frac{|\alpha|^2}{\omega_{ph}^2 - \omega^2(\mathbf{k})} - J_C(\mathbf{k}) > 0. \quad (5.184)$$

At the Fermi surface, this reduces to the condition

$$\frac{|\alpha|^2}{\omega_{ph}^2} - J_C(k_F) > 0, \quad (5.185)$$

where

$$J_C(k_F) = \frac{\pi e_0^2}{k_F^2} \ln \left(1 + 4 \frac{k_F^2}{\varkappa^2} \right). \quad (5.186)$$

This is similar to the Bardeen-Cooper-Schriber criterion of superconductivity, [308, 309], however in our case [296, 300, 301] the characteristic phonon frequency depends on the probability of superconducting phase,

$$\omega_{ph} = \sqrt{w} \omega_0, \quad (5.187)$$

where ω_0 is the characteristic phonon frequency for a pure superconducting phase.

Defining the ion plasma frequency

$$\omega_{ion} \equiv 2Z_{ion} e_0 \left(\frac{\pi \rho_{ion}}{m_{ion}} \right)^{1/2} \quad (5.188)$$

translates condition (5.185) to the form

$$\frac{\omega_{ion}^2}{\omega_{ph}^2} > \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \frac{\varkappa^2}{k_F^2} \right) \ln \left(1 + 4 \frac{k_F^2}{\varkappa^2} \right) . \quad (5.189)$$

For $\varkappa \sim k_F$, the right-hand side of the above inequality is close to one, hence giving $\omega_{ion} > \omega_{ph}$. Taking into account the phonon frequency softening, defined in (5.187), we come to the criterion

$$\frac{\omega_{ion}}{\sqrt{w} \omega_0} > 1 . \quad (5.190)$$

In that way, we see that the mesoscopic phase separation facilitates the appearance of superfluidity. Despite that in a pure bad conductor, without heterophase states, there may be no superfluidity because of the inequality $\omega_{ion} < \omega_0$, in a heterophase system the criterion (5.190) can become valid, since $w < 1$. Thus we can conclude:

Conclusion 2. *Phase separation enables the appearance of superconductivity in a heterophase sample even if it were impossible in pure-phase matter.*

Considering the gap equation (5.183) at the Fermi surface, we define the gap

$$\Delta \equiv \Delta(k_F) , \quad (5.191)$$

the density of states

$$N(\omega) \equiv \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{dS(\omega)}{|\partial\omega(\mathbf{k})/\partial\mathbf{k}|_{k=k(\omega)}} , \quad (5.192)$$

where the integration is over the Fermi surface given by the equation $\omega(\mathbf{k}) = 0$, and the effective coupling parameter

$$\Lambda \equiv w N(0) \left[\frac{|\alpha|^2}{w\omega_0^2} - J_C(k_F) \right] . \quad (5.193)$$

Assuming that the main contribution to the integral (5.183) comes from a narrow region around the Fermi surface, where ω varies between zero and ω_{ph} , we get the gap equation

$$\int_0^{\omega_{ph}} \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 + \omega^2}} \tanh \left(\frac{w\sqrt{\Delta^2 + \omega^2}}{2T} \right) d\omega = 1 . \quad (5.194)$$

The equation for the critical temperature, where $\Delta = 0$, is

$$\Lambda \int_0^{\omega_{ph}} \frac{1}{\omega} \tanh \left(\frac{w\omega}{2T_c} \right) d\omega = 1 . \quad (5.195)$$

In the case of weak coupling, the critical temperature reads as

$$T_c \simeq 1.14 w^{3/2} \omega_0 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{\Lambda} \right) \quad (\Lambda \ll 1) \quad (5.196)$$

and for strong effective coupling, it becomes

$$T_c \simeq \frac{1}{2} w^{3/2} \Lambda \omega_0 \quad (\Lambda \gg 1). \quad (5.197)$$

In order to clearly show the dependence of the critical temperature on the phase probability, let us define the coupling parameter λ and the Coulomb parameter μ^* corresponding to the pure superconducting phase,

$$\lambda \equiv N(0) \frac{|\alpha|^2}{\omega_0^2}, \quad \mu^* \equiv N(0) J_C(k_F). \quad (5.198)$$

Then the effective coupling (5.193) reads as

$$\Lambda = \lambda - w\mu^*. \quad (5.199)$$

Define the dimensionless critical temperature

$$t_c \equiv \frac{T_c}{\omega_0}. \quad (5.200)$$

Then equation (5.195) for the critical temperature takes the form

$$(\lambda - w\mu^*) \int_0^1 \tanh\left(\frac{w^{3/2}}{2t_c} x\right) \frac{dx}{x} = 1. \quad (5.201)$$

The probability of the superconducting phase depends on thermodynamic parameters, such as temperature, and on the system parameters, such as the electron-phonon coupling, characteristic phonon frequency, density of states, effective Coulomb interaction, and doping of the material with admixtures. If the crystalline structure does not change at the phase transition, then the phase probabilities, defined as the minimizers of the thermodynamic potential, are equal at the transition point, where the gap becomes zero. However, if the superconducting transition is accompanied by a structural transition, the situation can be more complicated, so that the phase probabilities might be not equal at the transition point due to different effective interactions $V_f(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})$. Keeping in mind this possibility, it is possible to consider the phase probability w as a variable between 0 and 1. The variation of w , for instance due to doping, changes the critical temperature in a nonmonotonic way. As is seen from (5.201), the critical temperature tends to zero when w tends to zero and also when w tends to λ/μ^* . For good conductors, one has $\mu^* \ll \lambda$, hence the limit λ/μ^* for w cannot be achieved. However, for bad conductors, corresponding to high-temperature superconductors, the limit λ/μ^* can be reached, since for them $\mu^* > \lambda$. The typical for high-temperature superconductors bell shape of the critical temperature, as a function of the superconducting fraction w , is demonstrated in Fig. 9, Fig. 10, and Fig. 11.

5.13 Anisotropic Heterophase Superconductor

The gap of a high-temperature superconductor is known to often display anisotropic dependence on momentum. Numerous experiments point at the predominantly d -wave symmetry of the superconducting order parameter [310,311], though in some cases one claims that the isotropic




Figure 9: Critical temperature T_c of superconducting phase transition as a function of the superconducting fraction w for the electron-phonon coupling $\lambda = 1$ and different effective Coulomb couplings: $\mu^* = 1$ (dotted line), $\mu^* = 3$ (dashed-dotted line), $\mu^* = 5$ (dashed line), and $\mu^* = 10$ (solid line).

s -wave symmetry can be dominant [312]. The majority of experiments evidence the existence of the mixed $s + d$ pairing in cuprates, which describes well experimental data [311].

To describe the anisotropy [302, 303], one may introduce a basis $\{\chi(\mathbf{k})\}$ of functions characterizing the lattice symmetry, with the index $i = 1, 2, \dots$ enumerating irreducible representations of the symmetry group. The basis is assumed to be orthonormal and complete,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \chi_i^*(\mathbf{k}) \chi_j(\mathbf{k}) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \sum_i \chi_i^*(\mathbf{k}) \chi_i(\mathbf{p}) = \delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{p}}.$$

The effective interaction $J_1(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p})$ can be expanded over this basis,

$$J_1(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \chi_i(\mathbf{k}) \chi_j^*(\mathbf{p}), \quad (5.202)$$

together with the gap,

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_i \Delta_i \chi_i(\mathbf{k}). \quad (5.203)$$

Then the gap equation (5.169) reduces to

$$\Delta_i = \sum_j A_{ij} \Delta_j, \quad (5.204)$$

where

$$A_{ij} \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \frac{w J_{ij}}{2\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})} \tanh\left(\frac{w\varepsilon(\mathbf{p})}{2T}\right) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{p}) \chi_j(\mathbf{p}), \quad (5.205)$$

with the summation over the Brillouin zone.




Figure 10: Critical temperature T_c of superconducting transition as a function of the superconducting fraction w for the electron-phonon coupling $\lambda = 3$ and different effective Coulomb couplings: $\mu^* = 3$ (dashed-dotted line), $\mu^* = 5$ (dashed line), and $\mu^* = 10$ (solid line).

The system of uniform algebraic equations (5.204) enjoys nontrivial solutions, provided that

$$\det(\hat{1} - \hat{A}) = 0, \quad (5.206)$$

with $\hat{1}$ being the unity matrix and the elements of the matrix \hat{A} being given in (5.205).

The effective interaction (5.202) includes the attractive part caused by the electron-phonon interaction and a repulsive part due to the direct Coulomb interaction. This means that J_{ij} has the structure

$$J_{ij} = \left(\frac{|\alpha|^2}{w\omega_0^2} - J_C(k_F) \right) b_{ij}. \quad (5.207)$$

At the critical temperature, we have

$$A_{ij}(T_c) = \sum_p \frac{wJ_{ij}}{2\omega(\mathbf{p})} \tanh\left(\frac{w\omega(\mathbf{p})}{2T_c}\right) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{p}) \chi_j(\mathbf{p}). \quad (5.208)$$

The density of states can be written as

$$N_{ij}(\omega) \equiv \sum_p \delta(\omega - \omega(\mathbf{p})) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{p}) \chi_j(\mathbf{p}), \quad (5.209)$$

with the normalization condition

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} N_{ij}(\omega) d\omega = \delta_{ij}.$$

Replacing the summation over momenta by the integration over the Brillouin zone,

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbb{B}} \mapsto \frac{1}{\rho_e} \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3},$$




Figure 11: Critical temperature T_c of superconducting transition as a function of the superconducting fraction w for the electron-phonon coupling $\lambda = 5$ and different effective Coulomb couplings: $\mu^* = 5$ (dashed-dotted line), $\mu^* = 7$ (dashed line), and $\mu^* = 10$ (solid line).

we have

$$N_{ij}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\mathbb{B}} \delta(\omega - \omega(\mathbf{p})) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{p}) \chi_j(\mathbf{p}) \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (5.210)$$

Then Eq. (5.208) can be represented as

$$A_{ij}(T_c) = w J_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{N_{ij}(\omega)}{2\omega} \tanh\left(\frac{w\omega}{2T_c}\right) d\omega. \quad (5.211)$$

Assuming again that the density of states is the largest on the Fermi surface and quickly diminishes outside it after the effective phonon frequency ω_{ph} , we come to the equation

$$A_{ij}(T_c) = w J_{ij} N_{ij}(0) \int_0^{\omega_{ph}} \tanh\left(\frac{w\omega}{2T_c}\right) \frac{d\omega}{\omega}. \quad (5.212)$$

Introducing the electron-phonon coupling and effective Coulomb interaction for the pure anisotropic superconductor,

$$\lambda_{ij} \equiv N_{ij}(0) \frac{|\alpha|^2}{\omega_0^2} b_{ij}, \quad \mu_{ij} \equiv N_{ij}(0) J_C(k_F) b_{ij}, \quad (5.213)$$

reduces the effective coupling matrix to the form

$$\Lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ij} - w\mu_{ij}. \quad (5.214)$$

Taking account of relation (5.187) gives

$$A_{ij}(T_c) = \Lambda_{ij} \int_0^1 \tanh\left(\frac{w^{3/2}\omega_0}{2T_c} x\right) \frac{dx}{x}. \quad (5.215)$$

The critical temperature is defined by equation (5.206), with the matrix \hat{A} having the elements (5.215).

Defining the quantity $A_{eff}(T_c)$ by the equation

$$1 - A_{eff}(T_c) \equiv \det (\hat{1} - \hat{A}) \quad (5.216)$$

and the effective coupling Λ_{eff} by the relation

$$A_{eff}(T_c) = \Lambda_{eff} \int_0^1 \tanh \left(\frac{w^{3/2} \omega_0}{2T_c} x \right) \frac{dx}{x}, \quad (5.217)$$

we come to the equation for the critical temperature

$$\Lambda_{eff} \int_0^1 \tanh \left(\frac{w^{3/2}}{2t_c} x \right) \frac{dx}{x} = 1 \quad (5.218)$$

having the same form as equation (5.201) for an isotropic superconductor, except that now, instead of the coupling Λ , we have Λ_{eff} .

The analysis of the properties of anisotropic heterophase superconductors [302, 303] allows us to make the following conclusions.

(i) Mesoscopic phase separation in superconductors can be thermodynamically stable only in the presence of repulsive Coulomb interactions.

(ii) Phase separation enables the appearance of superconductivity in a heterophase sample even if it were impossible in pure-phase matter.

(iii) Phase separation is crucial for the occurrence of superconductivity in bad conductors.

(iv) The critical temperature for a mixture of gap waves is higher than the critical temperature related to any pure gap wave from this mixture.

(v) In bad conductors, the critical temperature as a function of the superconducting fraction has the bell shape.

(vi) Phase separation softens the single-particle energy dispersion.

(vii) Mesoscopic phase separation suppresses the contribution of d -wave superconductivity and enhances that of s -wave superconductivity.

5.14 Model of Heterophase Ferroelectric

Dipolar ferroelectrics, exhibiting order-disorder phase transitions, mathematically are similar to magnetic systems, except that instead of magnetic moments they possess electric dipolar moments [79, 313]. Taking account of paraelectric fluctuations in ferroelectrics is accomplished in the same way as taking into account paramagnetic fluctuations in ferromagnets [314–317].

It is illustrative to show how the ferroelectric model can be derived. Let us start with the standard Hamiltonian of a heterophase system

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= H_1 \oplus H_2 \\ H_f &= w_f \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) H_0(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \\ &+ \frac{w_f^2}{2} \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}', \end{aligned} \quad (5.219)$$

where the field operators pertain to either boson or fermion statistics, which is not of great importance for well localized particles. Here

$$H_0(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + U(\mathbf{r}) \quad (5.220)$$

is a single-particle term, with an external potential $U(\mathbf{r})$. Keeping in mind a periodic solid, we expand the field operators over Wannier functions,

$$\psi_f(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{nj} c_{njf} w_n(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_j) , \quad (5.221)$$

with n being the band index and \mathbf{r}_j , a vector of a particle location. Intending to consider an insulating state, we assume that Wannier functions are well localized [318].

Substituting expansion (5.221) into Hamiltonian (5.219) gives

$$\begin{aligned} H_f &= w_f \sum_{ij} \sum_{mn} E_{ij}^{mn} c_{mif}^\dagger c_{njf} + \\ &\frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{\{j\}} \sum_{\{n\}} \Phi_{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4}^{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} c_{n_1 j_1}^\dagger c_{n_2 j_2}^\dagger c_{n_3 j_3} c_{n_4 j_4} , \end{aligned} \quad (5.222)$$

where

$$E_{ij}^{mn} \equiv \int w_m(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) H_0(\mathbf{r}) w_n(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_j) d\mathbf{r} \quad (5.223)$$

and $\Phi_{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4}^{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4}$ are the matrix elements of the interaction potential over Wannier functions.

Considering a lattice with one particle in each lattice site, it is necessary to impose the no-double-occupancy constraint

$$\sum_n c_{nj}^\dagger c_{nj} = 1 \quad c_{mj} c_{nj} = 0 . \quad (5.224)$$

In the case of an insulating lattice, with well localized particles, the no-hopping condition is valid,

$$c_{mi}^\dagger c_{nj} = \delta_{ij} c_{mj}^\dagger c_{nj} . \quad (5.225)$$

Then Hamiltonian (5.222) reads as

$$\begin{aligned} H_f &= w_f \sum_j \sum_{mn} E_{jj}^{mn} c_{mj}^\dagger c_{nj} + \\ &+ \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\{n\}} V_{ij}^{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} c_{n_1 i}^\dagger c_{n_2 j}^\dagger c_{n_3 j} c_{n_4 i} , \end{aligned} \quad (5.226)$$

with

$$V_{ij}^{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \equiv \Phi_{ijji}^{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} \pm \Phi_{ijij}^{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4} ,$$

where the upper sign is for the Bose and the lower, for Fermi statistics.

In ferroelectrics with the order-disorder phase transition, a lattice site is formed by a double well. To describe the motion of a particle between the wells of a double well, it is necessary to

consider at least two lowest energy levels, corresponding to the ground state and the first excited state, so that in what follows we take $n = 1, 2$. The typical situation is when the ground-state wave function is symmetric with respect to spatial inversion, while the wave function of the first excited state is antisymmetric,

$$w_1(-\mathbf{r}) = w_1(\mathbf{r}) , \quad w_2(-\mathbf{r}) = -w_2(\mathbf{r}) .$$

Taking into account that the interaction potential is symmetric, such that

$$\Phi(-\mathbf{r}) = \Phi(\mathbf{r}) ,$$

we see that the matrix elements where the energy indices enter in odd numbers, are zero, for instance

$$V_{ij}^{mmmm} = V_{ij}^{mnmn} = V_{ij}^{mnmn} = V_{ij}^{nmmn} = 0$$

for $m \neq n$. The nonzero elements enter the following expressions in the combinations

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij} &\equiv \frac{1}{4} (V_{ij}^{1111} + V_{ij}^{2222} + 2V_{ij}^{1221}) , & B_{ij} &\equiv \frac{1}{4} (V_{ij}^{1111} + V_{ij}^{2222} - 2V_{ij}^{1221}) , \\ C_{ij} &\equiv \frac{1}{2} (V_{ij}^{2222} - V_{ij}^{1111}) , & I_{ij} &= -2V_{ij}^{1122} . \end{aligned} \quad (5.227)$$

Introducing the notations for the matrix elements of kinetic energy,

$$K_{ij}^{mn} \equiv \int w_m^*(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) w_n(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_j) d\mathbf{r} \quad (5.228)$$

and of the external potential,

$$U_{ij}^{mn} \equiv \int w_m^*(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) U(\mathbf{r}) w_n(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_j) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (5.229)$$

and using the symmetry properties, we find

$$E_{ij}^{mn} = \delta_{mn} K_{jj}^{nn} + U_{jj}^{mn} , \quad K_{jj}^{mn} = \delta_{mn} K_{jj}^{nn} . \quad (5.230)$$

Also, let us introduce the notations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{p}_j^2}{2m} &\equiv \frac{1}{2} (K_{jj}^{11} + K_{jj}^{22}) , & U_0 &\equiv \frac{1}{2N} \sum_j (U_{jj}^{11} + U_{jj}^{22}) , \\ E_0 &\equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_j (E_{jj}^{11} + E_{jj}^{22}) = \sum_j \frac{\mathbf{p}_j^2}{2m} + U_0 N . \end{aligned} \quad (5.231)$$

The quantity

$$\Omega_j \equiv E_{jj}^{22} - E_{jj}^{11} + w_f \sum_i C_{ij} \cong E_{jj}^{22} - E_{jj}^{11} \quad (5.232)$$

is the frequency of tunneling between the wells of a double well. The value of Ω_j depends on the shape of the double well and can be varied in a wide range [319]. The expression

$$B_j \equiv -E_{jj}^{12} - E_{jj}^{21} = -U_{jj}^{12} - U_{jj}^{21} \quad (5.233)$$

plays the role of an external field acting on a particle in the j -th lattice site.

Employing the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} c_{1jf}^\dagger c_{1jf} &= \frac{1}{2} + S_{jf}^x, & c_{2jf}^\dagger c_{2jf} &= \frac{1}{2} - S_{jf}^x, \\ c_{1jf}^\dagger c_{2jf} &= S_{jf}^z - i S_{jf}^y, & c_{2jf}^\dagger c_{1jf} &= S_{jf}^z + i S_{jf}^y, \end{aligned} \quad (5.234)$$

we obtain the operators

$$\begin{aligned} S_{jf}^x &= \frac{1}{2} \left(c_{1jf}^\dagger c_{1jf} - c_{2jf}^\dagger c_{2jf} \right), & S_{jf}^y &= \frac{i}{2} \left(c_{1jf}^\dagger c_{2jf} - c_{2jf}^\dagger c_{1jf} \right), \\ S_{jf}^z &= \frac{1}{2} \left(c_{1jf}^\dagger c_{2jf} + c_{2jf}^\dagger c_{1jf} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.235)$$

satisfying the algebra of spin one-half operators, because of which they are called pseudospin operators. The above transformations are valid for Bose as well as for Fermi statistics. In that way, Hamiltonian (5.226) reduces to the form

$$\begin{aligned} H_f &= w_f E_0 - w_f \sum_j \left(\Omega_j S_{jf}^x + B_j S_{jf}^z \right) + \\ &+ w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j} \left(\frac{1}{2} A_{ij} + B_{ij} S_{if}^x S_{jf}^x - I_{ij} S_{if}^z S_{jf}^z \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.236)$$

If the tunneling frequency Ω_j and the transverse interaction B_{ij} are small and can be neglected, then the Hamiltonian H_f reduces to the Heisenberg form considered in Sec. 5.1. The similar form of the Hamiltonian H_f occurs for double-well optical lattices [320, 321], macromolecular systems [322], and granular Bose condensate [323]. The role of phonon degrees of freedom on the order-disorder phase transition has also been studied [324, 325].

5.15 Heterophase Crystalline Structure

In addition to phonon vibrations, crystalline structures can exhibit structural phase transitions and heterophase structural fluctuations [326–329]. The Hamiltonian of a heterophase system, where two crystalline structures coexist, can be written as in (5.219). The following idea is to consider the ground state of the system characterized by this Hamiltonian and to describe the collective excitations by means of phonon variables [330, 331]. For this purpose, we expand the field operators over Wannier functions of the lowest-level band

$$\psi_f(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_j c_{jf} w(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{jf}), \quad (5.237)$$

omitting the band index. This reduces Hamiltonian (5.219) to the form similar to (5.226),

$$H_f = w_f \sum_j E_{jff} c_{jf}^\dagger c_{jf} + \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{ij} V_{ijf} c_{if}^\dagger c_{jf}^\dagger c_{jf} c_{if}. \quad (5.238)$$

Then we employ the no-double-occupancy constraint (5.224) and no-hopping condition (5.225) that now read as

$$c_{jf}^\dagger c_{jf} = 1, \quad c_{jf} c_{jf} = 0, \quad c_{if}^\dagger c_{jf} = \delta_{ij}. \quad (5.239)$$

As a result, we come to the Hamiltonian

$$H_f = w_f \sum_j \left(\frac{\mathbf{p}_{jf}^2}{2m} + U_{jf} \right) + \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{ij} V_{ijf}, \quad (5.240)$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}_{jf}^2 &\equiv \int w^*(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{jf}) (-\nabla^2) w(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{jf}) d\mathbf{r}, \\ U_{jf} &\equiv \int w^*(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{jf}) U(\mathbf{r}) w(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{jf}) d\mathbf{r}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.241)$$

The phase probabilities are defined as the minimizers of thermodynamic potential. We again can simplify the formulas by using the notation $w_1 \equiv w$ and $w_2 = 1 - w$. The Hamiltonian (5.240) depends on the phase probabilities explicitly as well as implicitly through the values under summation. If we neglect the implicit dependence on the phase probabilities and consider the case without external fields, then the minimization of the free energy gives the equation

$$w = \frac{\Phi_2 + K_2 - K_1}{\Phi_1 + \Phi_2}, \quad (5.242)$$

where

$$K_f \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{p}_{jf}^2}{2m} \right\rangle, \quad \Phi_f \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N V_{ijf} \right\rangle. \quad (5.243)$$

Excitations above the ground state are described by phonon degrees of freedom. For this purpose, the vectors \mathbf{r}_{jf} , showing the location of a particle in the vicinity of the vector of a lattice site \mathbf{a}_{jf} in the f -th phase, is represented as

$$\mathbf{r}_{jf} = \mathbf{a}_{jf} + \mathbf{u}_{jf}, \quad (5.244)$$

so that

$$\mathbf{a}_{jf} \equiv \langle \mathbf{r}_{jf} \rangle, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_{jf} \rangle = 0. \quad (5.245)$$

Expanding the interaction $V_{ijf} = V(\mathbf{r}_{if} - \mathbf{r}_{jf})$ in powers of the deviation \mathbf{u}_{jf} up to the second order transforms Hamiltonian (5.240) into the expression

$$H_f = w_f \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{p}_{jf}^2}{2m} + \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\beta} u_{if}^\alpha u_{jf}^\beta + \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} V(\mathbf{a}_{ijf}), \quad (5.246)$$

in which

$$\Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 V(\mathbf{a}_{ijf})}{\partial a_{if}^\alpha \partial a_{jf}^\beta}, \quad \mathbf{a}_{ijf} \equiv \mathbf{a}_{if} - \mathbf{a}_{jf}. \quad (5.247)$$

Introducing phonon operators b_{ksf} by the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{jf} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}} \sum_{ks} \frac{\mathbf{e}_{ksf}}{\sqrt{m\omega_{ksf}}} \left(b_{ksf} + b_{-ksf}^\dagger \right) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{jf}}, \\ \mathbf{p}_{jf} &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2N}} \sum_{ks} \sqrt{m\omega_{ksf}} \mathbf{e}_{ksf} \left(b_{ksf} - b_{-ksf}^\dagger \right) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{jf}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.248)$$

where \mathbf{e}_{ksf} are the polarization vectors of the crystalline lattice in the f -th phase, reduces Hamiltonian (5.246) to the form

$$H_f = w_f \sum_{ks} \omega_{ksf} \left(b_{ksf}^\dagger b_{ksf} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{w_f^2}{2} N A_f , \quad (5.249)$$

where

$$A_f \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} V(\mathbf{a}_{ijf}) \quad (5.250)$$

and the phonon frequency is defined by the equation

$$\frac{w_f}{m} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\beta=1}^3 \Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\beta} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{ijf}} e_{ksf}^\beta = \omega_{ksf}^2 e_{ksf}^\alpha . \quad (5.251)$$

To separate the explicit dependence on the phase probabilities, let us introduce the frequency

$$\varepsilon_{ksf}^2 \equiv \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\beta} e_{ksf}^\alpha e_{ksf}^\beta e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{ijf}} . \quad (5.252)$$

Then the phonon frequency reads as

$$\omega_{ksf} = \sqrt{w_f} \varepsilon_{ksf} . \quad (5.253)$$

Hamiltonian (5.249) becomes

$$H_f = w_f^{3/2} \sum_{ks} \varepsilon_{ksf} \left(b_{ksf}^\dagger b_{ksf} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{w_f^2}{2} N A_f . \quad (5.254)$$

With Hamiltonian (5.254), it is straightforward to find the kinetic energy K_f ,

$$K_f = \frac{1}{4N} \sum_{ks} \omega_{ksf} \cosh \left(\frac{w_f \omega_{ksf}}{2T} \right) \quad (5.255)$$

and the potential energy Φ_f ,

$$\Phi_f = A_f + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\beta} \langle u_{if}^\alpha u_{jf}^\beta \rangle \quad (5.256)$$

defined in (5.243). Here the deviation-deviation correlation function is

$$\langle u_{if}^\alpha u_{jf}^\beta \rangle = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{2N} \sum_{ks} \frac{e_{ksf}^\alpha e_{ksf}^\beta}{m \omega_{ksf}} \coth \left(\frac{w_f \omega_{ksf}}{2T} \right) . \quad (5.257)$$

The average of Hamiltonian (5.246) reads as

$$\langle H_f \rangle = w_f K_f N + \frac{w_f^2}{2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\beta} \langle u_{if}^\alpha u_{jf}^\beta \rangle + \frac{w_f^2}{2} A_f N , \quad (5.258)$$

while (5.254) gives

$$\langle H_f \rangle = 2w_f K_f N + \frac{w_f^2}{2} A_f N . \quad (5.259)$$

Comparing these two forms results in the relations

$$w_f \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta}^3 \Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\beta} \langle u_{if}^\alpha u_{jf}^\beta \rangle = 2K_f \quad (5.260)$$

and

$$w_f \Phi_f = w_f A_f + 2K_f . \quad (5.261)$$

The free energy is $F = F_1 + F_2$, where

$$F_f = \frac{w_f^2}{2} A_f + \frac{T}{N} \sum_{ks} \ln \left[2 \sinh \left(\frac{w_f \omega_{ksf}}{2T} \right) \right] . \quad (5.262)$$

Minimizing the free energy with respect to the probability $w \equiv w_1$ yields

$$w = \frac{A_2 + 3(K_2 - K_1)}{A_1 + A_2} . \quad (5.263)$$

As is easy to check, expression (5.263) coincides with (5.242), if relation (5.261) is taken into account.

5.16 Structural Phase Transition

The existence of heterophase fluctuations of competing structures is especially noticeable in the vicinity of structural phase transitions. Several quantities that can be measured are connected with the mean-square deviation that for the f -th phase reads as

$$r_f^2 \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \langle u_{jf}^\alpha u_{jf}^\alpha \rangle . \quad (5.264)$$

With Eq. (5.257), the mean-square deviation becomes

$$r_f^2 = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{ks} \frac{1}{m\omega_{ksf}} \coth \left(\frac{w_f \omega_{ksf}}{2T} \right) . \quad (5.265)$$

Defining the frequency averaged over polarizations gives

$$\omega_{kf}^2 = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{s=1}^3 \omega_{ksf}^2 = w_f \varepsilon_{kf}^2 , \quad (5.266)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{kf}^2 = \frac{1}{3m} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\alpha} \Phi_{ijf}^{\alpha\alpha} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{a}_{ijf}} . \quad (5.267)$$

In the Debye approximation [332], for the mean-square deviation we obtain [327,328,330,331] the form

$$r_f^2 = \frac{9w_f}{2m\Theta_f} \int_0^1 x \coth\left(\frac{\Theta_f}{2T} x\right) dx, \quad (5.268)$$

in which the effective Debye temperature

$$\Theta_f \equiv w_f^{3/2} T_{Df} \quad (5.269)$$

is expressed through the Debye temperature T_{Df} of a pure phase f . Due to the existence of heterophase fluctuations, the mean-square deviation in each phase depends on the phase probability w_f . At the point of a structural phase transition, the probability of structures is close to $w_f \approx 1/2$, which results in the increase of the mean-square deviations in each structure [327,328].

The mean-square deviation is related to the Mössbauer factor or Debye-Waller factor for an f -th phase,

$$f_{Mf} = \exp(-q^2 r_f^2), \quad (5.270)$$

in which q is the momentum of a gamma-quantum in the case of the Mössbauer effect and the momentum of a Röntgen quantum or a neutron momentum in the case of the Debye-Waller factor. The averaged factor for the whole sample is

$$f_M = w_1 f_{M1} + w_2 f_{M2}. \quad (5.271)$$

The Mössbauer and Debye-Waller factors exhibit anomalous behaviour at the points of phase transitions, such as cusps and saggings [333–342]. It was shown [343,344] that these anomalies cannot be explained by the appearance of soft modes. But such anomalies can be explained by the existence of heterophase fluctuations increasing in the vicinity of phase transitions [345–351].

Depending on temperature, the mean-square deviation can be written as

$$r_f^2 = \frac{9}{4mw_f^{1/2}T_{Df}} \quad (T = 0) \quad (5.272)$$

at zero temperature and as

$$r_f^2 \simeq \frac{9T}{mw_f^2T_{Df}^2} \quad (T \gg \Theta_f) \quad (5.273)$$

at finite temperature. These expressions show that the appearance of heterophase fluctuations, when the phase probability w_f becomes less than one, increases the mean-square deviation, hence diminishes the Mössbauer factor. The sharp decrease of the Mössbauer factor at phase transitions explains the cusp-shape anomaly observed at different phase-transition points.

Sound velocity also exhibits anomalous behavior in the vicinity of phase transitions [328]. The sound velocity of a pure phase f in the Debye approximation can be defined by the relation

$$T_{Df} = c_f k_D \quad (k_D^3 = 6\pi^2\rho), \quad (5.274)$$

where k_D is the Debye momentum and ρ is the average density of the sample. In this approximation, the phonon spectrum ω_{ksf} of a heterophase system takes the form

$$\omega_{ksf} = s_f k \quad (0 \leq k \leq k_D), \quad (5.275)$$

with the sound velocity

$$s_f = \sqrt{w_f} c_f . \quad (5.276)$$

The average sound velocity through a heterophase sample is

$$s = w_1 s_1 + w_2 s_2 = w_1^{3/2} c_1 + w_2^{3/2} c_2 . \quad (5.277)$$

To estimate the variation of the sound velocity caused by heterophase fluctuations, let us consider the case where the sound velocities in competing pure heterophase structures are close to each other, so that $c_f \approx c$. Then the average sound velocity in a heterophase system is

$$s \approx \left(w_1^{3/2} + w_2^{3/2} \right) c . \quad (5.278)$$

If at the point of the phase transition, w_f approximately equals 1/2, then the average sound velocity diminishes to $s \approx 0.7c$.

5.17 Stability of Heterophase Solids

Solids are characterized by localized particles. In the case of crystals, particles form crystalline lattices, while in amorphous solids the particle location in a sample is random. Particle localization is described by mean-square deviation. When this deviation becomes close to half-distance between the nearest neighbors, the solid gets unstable. The condition

$$\frac{r_f}{a} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (5.279)$$

is called the Lindemann criterion of stability [352]. This criterion defines the stability boundary of solid state [330, 331, 353, 354]. For heterophase materials, this criterion includes the phase probability w_f , so that the stability condition can essentially change, as compared to that of a pure phase.

Studying the mean-square deviation in the Debye approximation, it is instructive to consider a sample in arbitrary space dimensionality $d = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Then the sum over momenta can be reduced to the integral,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_k \mapsto \frac{2}{(4\pi)^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2) \rho} \int_0^{k_D} k^{d-1} dk , \quad (5.280)$$

where k_D is the Debye momentum, or Debye radius,

$$k_D = \sqrt{4\pi} \left[\frac{d}{2} \Gamma \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) \rho \right]^{1/d} , \quad (5.281)$$

with $\rho a^d = 1$, ρ being the average density and a , the average distance between the nearest neighbors.

In a pure f -th phase, the mean-square deviation is expressed through the Debye temperature

$$T_{Df} = c_f k_D = \sqrt{4\pi} \frac{D_f}{m} \left[\frac{d}{2} \Gamma \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) \right]^{1/d} , \quad (5.282)$$

in which

$$c_f = \sqrt{\frac{D_f}{m}} a \quad (5.283)$$

is the sound velocity in a pure phase and

$$D_f = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\alpha=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 V(\mathbf{a}_{ij})}{\partial a_{jf}^\alpha \partial a_{jf}^\alpha} \quad (5.284)$$

is the dynamic parameter equal to the dynamical matrix in the nearest-neighbor approximation.

In a heterophase system, the role of Debye temperature is played by expression (5.269). Then Eq. (5.265) takes the form

$$r_f^2 = \frac{w_f d^2}{2m\Theta_f} \int_0^1 x^{d-2} \coth\left(\frac{\Theta_f}{2T} x\right) dx . \quad (5.285)$$

At low temperature, this gives

$$r_f^2 \simeq \frac{d^2}{2(d-1)mT_{Df} \sqrt{w_f}} \quad (T \ll \Theta_f) . \quad (5.286)$$

Introducing the characteristic kinetic energy

$$E_K \equiv \frac{1}{2ma^2} , \quad (5.287)$$

we get the stability criterion

$$\frac{E_K}{T_{Df}} < \frac{d-1}{4d^2} \sqrt{w_f} \quad (T \ll \Theta_f) . \quad (5.288)$$

This shows that an infinite one-dimensional crystal cannot exist. For a two-dimensional crystal, we have

$$\frac{E_K}{T_{Df}} < \frac{\sqrt{w_f}}{16} \quad (T \ll \Theta_f , d = 2) \quad (5.289)$$

and for a three-dimensional crystal,

$$\frac{E_K}{T_{Df}} < \frac{\sqrt{w_f}}{18} \quad (T \ll \Theta_f , d = 3) . \quad (5.290)$$

At high temperature, the mean-square deviation reads as

$$r_f^2 = \frac{Td^2}{(d-2)mT_{Df}^2 w_f^2} \quad (T \gg \Theta_f) , \quad (5.291)$$

which yields the stability criterion

$$\frac{E_K}{T_{Df}} < \frac{(d-2)T_{Df}}{8Td^2} w_f^2 \quad (T \gg \Theta_f) . \quad (5.292)$$

Hence, there are no one- and two-dimensional infinite crystals, while for a three-dimensional crystal, we have

$$\frac{E_K}{T_{Df}} < \frac{T_{Df}}{72T} w_f^2 \quad (T \gg \Theta_f, d = 3). \quad (5.293)$$

Since in a heterophase system $w_f < 1$, the stability boundary diminishes as compared to a pure system.

The above criteria are derived for spatially infinite solids. For finite solids, it is necessary to take into account finite-size effects that limit the smallest wave vector by

$$k_{min} = \frac{\pi}{L} \quad (L = N^{1/d} a). \quad (5.294)$$

Then in the mean-square deviation (5.285), the integral has to be limited from below by the value

$$x_{min} = \frac{k_{min}}{k_D} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2[(d/2)\Gamma(d/2)]^{1/d} N^{1/d}}. \quad (5.295)$$

For one-dimension, the latter is

$$x_{min} = \frac{1}{N} \quad (d = 1),$$

while for two dimensions,

$$x_{min} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{N}} \quad (d = 2).$$

At low temperature, for a one-dimensional crystalline chain, it follows

$$r_f^2 \simeq \frac{\ln N}{2mT_{Df} \sqrt{w_f}} \quad (T \ll \Theta_f, d = 1). \quad (5.296)$$

Then the stability criterion gives the largest number of particles that are able to form a finite chain,

$$N < \exp\left(\frac{T_{Df} \sqrt{w_f}}{4E_K}\right) \quad (T \ll \Theta_f, d = 1). \quad (5.297)$$

At high temperature, for a one-dimensional chain, we have

$$r_f^2 \simeq \frac{NT}{mT_{Df}^2 w_f^2} \quad (T \gg \Theta_f, d = 1). \quad (5.298)$$

The stability criterion results in the inequality

$$N < \frac{T_{Df}^2 w_f^2}{8TE_k} \quad (T \gg \Theta_f, d = 1). \quad (5.299)$$

For a two-dimensional solid at high temperature, we find the mean-square deviation

$$r_f^2 \simeq \frac{T \ln N}{mT_{Df}^2 w_f^2} \quad (T \gg \Theta_f, d = 2), \quad (5.300)$$

which limits the largest number of particles by the value

$$N < \exp\left(\frac{T_{Df}^2 w_f^2}{8TE_K}\right) \quad (T \gg \Theta_f, d = 2). \quad (5.301)$$

The obtained stability conditions demonstrate that heterophase fluctuations diminish the possible size of finite solids.

5.18 Solids with Nanoscale Defects

There exists a large class of solids containing nanoscale defects, such as pores, cracks, dislocations, heterophase embryos, and polymorphic inclusions [4, 355–359]. Such solids can be considered as heterophase systems composed of two phases with different density [360–365]. The system Hamiltonian has the standard form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= H_1 + H_2 , \\ H_f &= w_f \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} - \mu \right) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} w_f^2 \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}' . \end{aligned} \quad (5.302)$$

The number of particles in an f -th phase of the heterophase mixture is

$$N_f = w_f \int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} \quad (5.303)$$

occupying the volume V_f , so that the density of an f -th phase is

$$\rho_f \equiv \frac{N_f}{V_f} = \frac{1}{V} \int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} . \quad (5.304)$$

The average density of the total system is

$$\rho \equiv \frac{N}{V} = w_1 \rho_1 + w_2 \rho_2 . \quad (5.305)$$

The phases differ from each other by their densities, such that

$$\rho_1 > \rho_2 . \quad (5.306)$$

Thus the first phase can be called dense, while the second, rarefied.

It is also convenient to introduce the lattice filling factor

$$\nu \equiv \frac{N}{N_L} = \frac{\rho}{\rho_L} , \quad (5.307)$$

the density of lattice sites

$$\rho_L \equiv \frac{N_L}{V} , \quad (5.308)$$

and the dimensionless phase density

$$x_L \equiv \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_L} . \quad (5.309)$$

Then the equality (5.305) reduces to

$$\nu = w_1 x_1 + w_2 x_2 \quad (5.310)$$

and the condition (5.306) becomes

$$x_1 > x_2 . \quad (5.311)$$

The field operators can be represented as expansions over the localized orbitals $\varphi_{nj}(\mathbf{r})$ [256]. Here n is a band index, $j = 1, 2, \dots, N_L$ is the label enumerating lattice sites. Let c_{njf} be the annihilation operator of a particle in a band n at a lattice site j , in a phase f , and the variable e_{jf} take the values 0 or 1, depending on whether the site j is free or occupied by a particle.

Supposing that the considered temperatures are much lower than the energy gap between the lowest and excited levels allows us to resort to the single-band approximation writing down the field-operator expansion as

$$\psi_f(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} e_{jf} c_{jf} \varphi_j(\mathbf{r}) . \quad (5.312)$$

Assuming that each lattice site can host not more than one particle imposes the unipolarity condition

$$c_{jf}^\dagger c_{jf} = 1 , \quad c_{jf} c_{jf} = 0 . \quad (5.313)$$

We consider a good isolator, where the intersite transitions are suppressed, so that the only surviving matrix elements are the diagonal elements

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_0 &\equiv \int \varphi_j^*(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \varphi_j(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} , \\ \Phi_{ij} &\equiv \int \varphi_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \varphi_j^*(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \varphi_j(\mathbf{r}') \varphi_i(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' . \end{aligned} \quad (5.314)$$

Then we get the Hamiltonian

$$H_f = \frac{1}{2} w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j}^{N_L} \Phi_{ij} e_{if} e_{jf} - w_f (\mu - \varepsilon_0) \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} e_{jf} . \quad (5.315)$$

The phase density (5.304) reads as

$$\rho_f \equiv \frac{N_f}{V_f} = \rho_L \frac{1}{N_L} \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} e_{jf} \right\rangle \quad (5.316)$$

and the dimensionless density (5.309) becomes

$$x_f \equiv \frac{\rho_f}{\rho} = \left\langle \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} e_{jf} \right\rangle . \quad (5.317)$$

Minimizing the grand potential

$$\Omega = -T \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \tilde{H}} \quad (5.318)$$

with respect to the phase probabilities $w_1 \equiv w$ and $w_2 = 1 - w$ gives the probability of a dense phase

$$w = \frac{\Phi_2 + (\varepsilon_0 - \mu)(x_2 - x_1)}{\Phi_1 + \Phi_2} , \quad (5.319)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_f &\equiv \frac{1}{N_L} \int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}' = \\ &= \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{i \neq j}^{N_L} \Phi_{ij} \langle e_{if} e_{jf} \rangle .\end{aligned}\quad (5.320)$$

By a canonical transformation, it is possible to introduce pseudospin operators,

$$e_{jf} = \frac{1}{2} + S_{jf}^z, \quad S_{jf}^z = e_{jf} - \frac{1}{2} .\quad (5.321)$$

Then Hamiltonian (5.315) acquires the pseudospin form

$$\begin{aligned}H_f &= \frac{N_L}{8} [w_f^2 \Phi - 4w_f (\mu - \varepsilon_0)] + \frac{1}{2} [w_f^2 \Phi - 2w_f (\mu - \varepsilon_0)] \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} S_{jf}^z + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} w_f^2 \sum_{i \neq j}^{N_L} \Phi_{ij} S_{if}^z S_{jf}^z ,\end{aligned}\quad (5.322)$$

in which

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{i \neq j}^{N_L} \Phi_{ij} .\quad (5.323)$$

This shows that the model is similar to a model of a magnetic system with the order parameters

$$s_f \equiv 2 \langle S_{jf}^z \rangle = \frac{2}{N_L} \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} \langle S_{jf}^z \rangle\quad (5.324)$$

satisfying the inequality

$$s_1 > s_2\quad (5.325)$$

because of the relation

$$x_f = \frac{1}{2} (1 + s_f)\quad (5.326)$$

and condition (5.311).

The probability (5.319) is derived from the equation

$$\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial w} = \left\langle \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} \right\rangle = 0 .\quad (5.327)$$

This equation defines a minimum, provided that

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Omega}{\partial w^2} = \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{H}}{\partial w^2} \right\rangle - \beta \left\langle \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} \right)^2 \right\rangle > 0 .\quad (5.328)$$

The latter inequality yields the necessary condition

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{H}}{\partial w^2} \right\rangle > 0 .\quad (5.329)$$

Note that on the mean-field level, one has

$$\left\langle \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} \right)^2 \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} \right\rangle^2 = 0. \quad (5.330)$$

Thus the condition of w to be a minimizer for Ω agrees with (5.329).

In the mean-field approximation,

$$\Phi_f = \Phi x_f^2, \quad (5.331)$$

hence condition (5.329) reduces to the inequality

$$\Phi > 0. \quad (5.332)$$

Hamiltonian (5.315) in the mean-field approximation reads as

$$\frac{H_f}{N_L \Phi} = -\frac{1}{2} w_f^2 x_f^2 + (w_f^2 x_f - \mu^* w_f) \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{j=1}^{N_L} e_{jf}, \quad (5.333)$$

with the effective chemical potential

$$\mu^* = \frac{\mu - \varepsilon_0}{\Phi}. \quad (5.334)$$

Equation (5.319) yields

$$w = \frac{x_2^2 + \mu^*(x_1 - x_2)}{x_1^2 + x_2^2}, \quad (5.335)$$

from where we find

$$\mu^* = \frac{w_1 x_1^2 - w_2 x_2^2}{x_1 - x_2}. \quad (5.336)$$

Equality (5.310) can be used for getting the probability of the dense phase

$$w = \frac{\nu - x_2}{x_1 - x_2}. \quad (5.337)$$

Measuring temperature in units of Φ , for the grand potential (5.318), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Omega}{N_L \Phi} &= \frac{1}{2} w_1^2 x_1 (1 - x_1) + \frac{1}{2} w_2^2 x_2 (1 - x_2) - \frac{1}{2} \mu^* - \\ &- T \ln \left\{ 4 \cosh \left(\frac{w_1^2 x_1 - \mu^* w_1}{2T} \right) \cosh \left(\frac{w_2^2 x_2 - \mu^* w_2}{2T} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.338)$$

Minimizing the grand potential with respect to the order parameters x_f , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2x_1 &= 1 + \tanh \left\{ \frac{w_1 x_2 (w_1 x_1 - w_2 x_2)}{2(x_1 - x_2)T} \right\}, \\ 2x_2 &= 1 + \tanh \left\{ \frac{w_2 x_1 (w_1 x_1 - w_2 x_2)}{2(x_1 - x_2)T} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.339)$$

Numerical investigations show that the two-density heterophase system can be stable only for small filling factor

$$0 < \nu < \frac{1}{2} \quad (5.340)$$

in the region between the lower nucleation temperature T_n , depending on the filling factor ν , and the upper nucleation temperature

$$T_n^* = \frac{\nu}{(1 - 2\nu) \ln[(1 - \nu)/\nu]} . \quad (5.341)$$

5.19 Theory of Melting and Crystallization

In crystals below the melting point there can exist regions of disorder, such as pores, cracks, dislocations, and heterophase fluctuations that play the role of liquid-like embryos [2,3,366,367]. In their turn, above the melting point, there exist fluctuating crystal-like clusters representing the germs of crystalline state. The fluctuating coexistence of the corresponding crystalline and liquid states can be treated in the frame of the theory of heterophase systems [243,368].

Spatial densities play the role of order parameters, so that the crystalline density is periodic over the lattice vectors,

$$\rho_1(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{a}) = \rho_1(\mathbf{r}) , \quad (5.342)$$

while the liquid density is constant,

$$\rho_2(\mathbf{r}) = \rho . \quad (5.343)$$

It is also possible to define the order parameter

$$\Delta \rho_f \equiv \max_{\mathbf{r}} \frac{\rho_f(\mathbf{r})}{\rho} - 1 \quad (5.344)$$

that is nonzero for the crystalline phase and zero for the liquid phase.

Starting with the standard Hamiltonian of a two-phase mixture

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= H_1 \oplus H_2 , \\ H_f &= w_f \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} - \mu \right) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} w_f^2 \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' , \end{aligned} \quad (5.345)$$

where $V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ is the bare interaction potential, we meet the problem of dealing with divergences caused by the fact that bare interaction potentials are usually represented by strongly singular functions, such that the integral

$$\int V(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \longrightarrow \infty$$

diverges.

This problem can be avoided by employing correlated approximations [305]. Consider, for instance, the system potential energy

$$E_{pot} = \left\langle \frac{w^2}{2} \int \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \right\rangle . \quad (5.346)$$

If we resort to the Hartree-Fock approximation, while the interaction potential is not integrable, the potential energy diverges. The way out of this pitfall is the use, e.g., of the Kirkwood approximation [369]

$$\langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = g(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \rangle, \quad (5.347)$$

where $g(\mathbf{r})$ is the pair correlation function that can be found from the measured structural factor

$$g(\mathbf{r}) = 1 + \frac{1}{\rho} \int [S(\mathbf{k}) - 1] e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (5.348)$$

The other way was suggested by Bogolubov [370] by defining the pair correlation function through the modulus squared of the wave function describing the relative motion of the pair of particles. In the Kirkwood approximation the potential energy

$$E_{pot} = \left\langle \frac{w_f^2}{2} \int \rho_f(\mathbf{r}) \rho_f(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \right\rangle \quad (5.349)$$

is finite, since the correlated potential

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \equiv g(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \quad (5.350)$$

is integrable,

$$\int \Phi(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} < \infty. \quad (5.351)$$

Beginning from the Kirkwood approximation, it is possible to develop an iterational procedure for Green functions, where all approximations contain only the correlated potential (5.350) and no divergences arise [371–374].

The chemical potential is defined by the total number of particles

$$N = N_1 + N_2, \quad (5.352)$$

with the number of particles in each phase

$$N_f = w_f \int \rho_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (5.353)$$

Minimizing the grand potential and introducing the notations

$$\begin{aligned} K_f &\equiv \frac{1}{N} \int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r}, \\ \Phi_f &\equiv \frac{1}{N} \int \langle \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_f^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}') \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}', \\ x_f &\equiv \frac{\rho_f}{\rho} = \frac{1}{N} \int \rho_f(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \end{aligned} \quad (5.354)$$

gives us the probability of the crystalline phase

$$w = \frac{\Phi_2 + K_2 - K_1 + \mu(x_1 - x_2)}{\Phi_1 + \Phi_2}. \quad (5.355)$$

Then the quantities related to the crystalline phase are to be calculated with the methods appropriate for a periodic structure, while those for the liquid phase, by the methods describing a uniform system. The behavior of the crystalline probability (5.355) characterizes the solid state and the probability $1 - w$ describes the liquid state [243, 368]. The typical behavior of the solid-state probability, as a function of temperature in energy units is shown in Fig. 12.




Figure 12: Solid-state probability as a function of temperature in energy units. The lines correspond to the following states: AB —stable crystal with small admixture of liquid droplets; BC —metastable overheated crystal; CD —unstable state; DE —overcooled liquid state; EF —stable liquid state with crystal clusters.

5.20 Model of Superfluid Solid

If there exist liquid-like embryos inside a solid composed of Bose particles, then it may happen that these liquid-like regions could exhibit the property of superfluidity. Andreev and Lifshits [375] assumed that superfluidity in quantum crystals could be due to the motion of delocalized vacancies. Chester [376] argued that superfluidity should arise in any quantum Bose crystal at sufficiently low temperatures.

Formally, a superfluid crystal can be connected with the simultaneous breaking of translational and gauge symmetries in a system. If this double breaking could be allowed, then, in the frame of the same system, crystalline diagonal order, typical of solids, could coexist with off-diagonal order related to superfluid flow. That is, an unusual object "superfluid solid" could arise. An ideal crystalline state is known to prohibit such a spontaneous double symmetry breaking. But superfluidity can appear if inside a crystal there occur mesoscopic regions of disorder, such as grain boundaries and screw dislocations.

In order to describe a superfluid object it has been natural to turn to a coherent system characterized by the coherent-field equation first published by Bogolubov [377] in 1949 and since then republished numerous times, e.g., [219–221]. Gross [378–383] investigated this equation and showed that it possesses periodic solutions imitating solid state. At the same time, due to its coherent nature, this equation corresponds to a Bose-condensed system, hence enjoying superfluidity. Periodic solutions describing a coherent quantum crystal have been studied by Kirzhnits and Nepomnyashchii [384].

There have been numerous attempts to observe superfluidity in quantum crystals, especially in solid ^4He , where it could be due to the presence of dislocations (see reviews [385–389]). Trapped quantum gases with dipolar interactions can exhibit the simultaneous breaking of translational and gauge symmetries [387, 388], although periodically modulated gases are anyway gases but not solids.

Strictly speaking, the simultaneous breaking of translational and gauge symmetries is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for the existence of a superfluid solid. Thus this double breaking happens in metastable quantum Bose gases, while they, nevertheless, are gases but not solids. From the other side, a solid is not compulsorily ideally periodic, but localized molecules

can be randomly distributed in space, as in amorphous solids. In addition, superfluidity can occur without gauge symmetry breaking [388].

The assumption that Bose-condensed, hence superfluid, local states can arise in crystals with regions of disorder was advanced in Refs. [243, 368, 388]. The coexistence of solid-like and liquid-like regions in the frame of the theory of heterophase systems is described as follows.

Let us consider a system of N particles, among which N_{sol} particles compose a crystalline structure, while N_{liq} particles form liquid-like nanosize embryos, so that

$$N_{sol} + N_{liq} = N . \quad (5.356)$$

Respectively, the volumes occupied by the phases are V_{sol} and V_{liq} , such that

$$V_{sol} + V_{liq} = V . \quad (5.357)$$

The related geometric probabilities are

$$w_{sol} \equiv \frac{V_{sol}}{V} , \quad w_{liq} \equiv \frac{V_{liq}}{V} , \quad (5.358)$$

thence they are normalized,

$$w_{sol} + w_{liq} = 1 . \quad (5.359)$$

The particle fractions are

$$n_{sol} \equiv \frac{N_{sol}}{N} , \quad n_{liq} \equiv \frac{N_{liq}}{N} , \quad (5.360)$$

also being normalized,

$$n_{sol} + n_{liq} = 1 . \quad (5.361)$$

The densities of the corresponding phases are

$$\rho_{sol} \equiv \frac{N_{sol}}{V_{sol}} , \quad \rho_{liq} \equiv \frac{N_{liq}}{V_{liq}} , \quad (5.362)$$

which gives the relations

$$w_{sol} \rho_{sol} = n_{sol} \rho , \quad w_{liq} \rho_{liq} = n_{liq} \rho . \quad (5.363)$$

The average system density is

$$\rho \equiv \frac{N}{V} = w_{sol} \rho_{sol} + w_{liq} \rho_{liq} . \quad (5.364)$$

When the phases differ by their structure but not by their density, the probabilities and fractions coincide,

$$n_{sol} = w_{sol} , \quad n_{liq} = w_{liq} \quad (\rho_{sol} = \rho_{liq} = \rho) . \quad (5.365)$$

The numbers of particles forming the solid and liquid phases can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} N_{sol} &= \langle \hat{N}_{sol} \rangle , & \hat{N}_{sol} &= w_{sol} \int \psi_{sol}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{sol}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} , \\ N_{liq} &= \langle \hat{N}_{liq} \rangle , & \hat{N}_{liq} &= w_{liq} \int \psi_{liq}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} . \end{aligned} \quad (5.366)$$

Here and in what follows, we consider boson field operators. Keeping in mind ^4He , we study spinless particles.

If in the liquid phase there occurs Bose-Einstein condensation, then the global gauge symmetry becomes broken [178, 373, 390, 391]. The symmetry breaking is conveniently described by the Bogolubov shift

$$\psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) = \eta(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_1(\mathbf{r}) , \quad (5.367)$$

in which

$$\eta(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \langle \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \quad (5.368)$$

is the condensate wave function, while $\psi_1(\mathbf{r})$ is the field operator of the normal phase, such that

$$\langle \psi_1(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = 0 . \quad (5.369)$$

The condensate function and the field operator of the normal phase are independent variables orthogonal to each other,

$$\int \eta^*(\mathbf{r}) \psi_1(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = 0 . \quad (5.370)$$

The gauge symmetry breaking defines the condensate density

$$\rho_0(\mathbf{r}) = |\eta(\mathbf{r})|^2 = |\langle \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle|^2 \quad (5.371)$$

and, respectively, the number of condensed particles

$$N_0 = w_{liq} \int \rho_0(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = w_{liq} \int |\eta(\mathbf{r})|^2 d\mathbf{r} . \quad (5.372)$$

The number of uncondensed particles is

$$N_1 = \langle \hat{N}_1 \rangle , \quad \hat{N}_1 = w_{liq} \int \psi_1^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_1(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} . \quad (5.373)$$

Thus the number of particles in the liquid-like phase reads as

$$N_{liq} = N_0 + N_1 , \quad (5.374)$$

so that the total number of particles in the system is

$$N = N_{sol} + N_{liq} = N_{sol} + N_0 + N_1 . \quad (5.375)$$

The density of condensed and uncondensed particles in the liquid phase is defined as

$$\rho_0 \equiv \frac{N_0}{V_{liq}} , \quad \rho_1 \equiv \frac{N_1}{V_{liq}} , \quad (5.376)$$

respectively. Hence

$$\rho_0 + \rho_1 = \rho_{liq} . \quad (5.377)$$

The corresponding particle fractions inside the liquid phase are

$$n_0 \equiv \frac{N_0}{N_{liq}} = \frac{\rho_0}{\rho_{liq}} , \quad n_1 \equiv \frac{N_1}{N_{liq}} = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_{liq}} , \quad (5.378)$$

so that

$$n_0 + n_1 = 1 . \quad (5.379)$$

It is possible to define the particle fractions with respect to the total number of particles

$$\bar{n}_0 \equiv \frac{N_0}{N} = n_{liq} n_0 , \quad \bar{n}_1 \equiv \frac{N_1}{N} = n_{liq} n_1 , \quad (5.380)$$

for which

$$\bar{n}_0 + \bar{n}_1 = n_{liq} . \quad (5.381)$$

5.21 Relations between Chemical Potentials

For a system with several components there exist the corresponding chemical potentials whose relations with each other are prescribed by the condition of equilibrium and the imposed constraints. For example, let us consider the equilibrium between the component consisting of N_{sol} particles forming the solid phase and the component of N_{liq} particles constituting the liquid phase, with the total number of particles $N = N_{sol} + N_{liq}$ being fixed. The latter implies that

$$\delta N_{sol} + \delta N_{liq} = 0 . \quad (5.382)$$

The condition of equilibrium, under fixed temperature and volume, tells us that

$$\delta F = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_{sol}} \delta N_{sol} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_{liq}} \delta N_{liq} = 0 . \quad (5.383)$$

Introducing the corresponding chemical potentials

$$\mu_{sol} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_{sol}} , \quad \mu_{liq} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_{liq}} , \quad (5.384)$$

and using (5.382) yields

$$(\mu_{sol} - \mu_{liq}) \delta N_{sol} = 0 \quad (5.385)$$

for arbitrary N_{sol} . This requires the equality of the chemical potentials,

$$\mu_{sol} = \mu_{liq} \equiv \mu . \quad (5.386)$$

Now, let us N_{sol} and N_{liq} be fixed and consider the equilibrium between N_0 condensed particles and N_1 uncondensed particles. The latter means that

$$\delta N_{sol} = 0 , \quad \delta N_0 + \delta N_1 = 0 . \quad (5.387)$$

Therefore the condition of equilibrium reads as

$$\delta F = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_0} \delta N_0 + \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_1} \delta N_1 = 0 . \quad (5.388)$$

With the notation

$$\mu_0 = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_0} , \quad \mu_1 = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_1} , \quad (5.389)$$

we have

$$(\mu_0 - \mu_1) \delta N_0 = 0 . \quad (5.390)$$

If N_0 would be arbitrary, the chemical potentials would coincide. However N_0 is not arbitrary, but it is fixed by the condition of gauge symmetry breaking (5.368), according to which the number of condensed particles is given by normalization (5.372), hence $\delta N_0 = 0$. Actually, the normalization condition (5.372) is another form of the gauge-symmetry breaking condition (5.368). Therefore the chemical potentials are not obliged to coincide and, generally, can be different [392–395].

Thus the inequality of the chemical potentials μ_0 and μ_1 is the direct consequence of the gauge-symmetry breaking. If, accepting the gauge-symmetry breaking, one sets by force the equality of these potentials, then there arises the well-known Hohenberg-Martin [396] dilemma, when either there appears a gap in the spectrum of excitations, which contradicts the condition of condensate existence and the Hugenholtz-Pines [397] relation, or thermodynamic equalities become invalid. In both these cases, the system becomes unstable [392–395]. On the other hand, equating by force these chemical potentials results in the zero anomalous self-energy [398], which is equivalent to the absence of gauge-symmetry breaking [392–395].

The relation between the chemical potentials μ , μ_0 , and μ_1 can be found from the definition

$$\mu = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_{liq}} . \quad (5.391)$$

Expanding the derivative

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial N_{liq}} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_0} \frac{\partial N_0}{\partial N_{liq}} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial N_1} \frac{\partial N_1}{\partial N_{liq}}$$

and using the notation for the chemical potentials (5.389) gives

$$\mu = \mu_0 \frac{\partial N_0}{\partial N_{liq}} + \mu_1 \frac{\partial N_1}{\partial N_{liq}} .$$

From the equalities $N_0 = n_0 N_{liq}$ and $N_1 = n_1 N_{liq}$, under given n_0 and n_1 , we get

$$\frac{\partial N_0}{\partial N_{liq}} = n_0 , \quad \frac{\partial N_1}{\partial N_{liq}} = n_1 . \quad (5.392)$$

Thus we come to the relation

$$\mu = \mu_0 n_0 + \mu_1 n_1 . \quad (5.393)$$

5.22 Hamiltonian of Superfluid Solid

The grand Hamiltonian of a superfluid solid has the form

$$\tilde{H} = H_{sol} \oplus H_{liq} . \quad (5.394)$$

Here the Hamiltonian part describing the solid phase is

$$H_{sol} = \hat{H}_{sol} - \mu \hat{N}_{sol} ,$$

$$\hat{H}_{sol} = w_{sol} \int \psi_{sol}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \psi_{sol}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} +$$

$$+ \frac{w_{sol}^2}{2} \int \psi_{sol}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{sol}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_{sol}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{sol}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}' \quad (5.395)$$

and the part corresponding to the liquid phase reads as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{liq} &= \hat{H}_{liq} - \mu_0 N_0 - \mu_1 \hat{N}_1 - \hat{\Lambda}, \\ \hat{H}_{liq} &= w_{liq} \int \psi_{liq}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \\ &+ \frac{w_{liq}^2}{2} \int \psi_{liq}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{liq}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}'. \end{aligned} \quad (5.396)$$

The interaction potential $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$ is assumed to represent an effective potential taking account of pair correlations, so that it is integrable.

The expression

$$\hat{\Lambda} = \int \left[\lambda(\mathbf{r}) \psi_1^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) + \lambda^*(\mathbf{r}) \psi_1(\mathbf{r}) \right] d\mathbf{r} \quad (5.397)$$

is introduced for canceling in the Hamiltonian the terms linear in the field operators ψ_1 , which is required for satisfying condition (5.369).

The energy per particle of the solid phase consists of the kinetic energy

$$K_{sol} = \frac{w_{sol}}{N} \int \langle \psi_{sol}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \psi_{sol}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} \quad (5.398)$$

and the potential interaction energy

$$\Pi_{sol} = \frac{w_{sol}^2}{2N} \int \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \langle \psi_{sol}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{sol}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{sol}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{sol}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}'. \quad (5.399)$$

Similarly, for the liquid phase, the kinetic energy is

$$K_{liq} = \frac{w_{liq}}{N} \int \langle \psi_{liq}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} \quad (5.400)$$

and the potential energy is

$$\Pi_{liq} = \frac{w_{liq}^2}{2N} \int \Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \langle \psi_{liq}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{liq}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{liq}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}'. \quad (5.401)$$

The kinetic energy of the liquid phase is the sum

$$K_{liq} = K_0 + K_1 \quad (5.402)$$

of the condensate energy

$$K_0 = \frac{w_{liq}}{N} \int \eta^*(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \eta(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (5.403)$$

and the kinetic energy of uncondensed particles

$$K_1 = \frac{w_{liq}}{N} \int \langle \psi_1^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} \right) \psi_1(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r}. \quad (5.404)$$

The internal energy per particle of the whole system is

$$E_0 = \frac{\langle \tilde{H} \rangle}{N} + \mu = \frac{\langle \hat{H}_{sol} \rangle}{N} + \frac{\langle \hat{H}_{liq} \rangle}{N} . \quad (5.405)$$

The averages of the grand Hamiltonians are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle H_{sol} \rangle}{N} &= K_{sol} + \Pi_{sol} - \mu n_{sol} \\ \frac{\langle H_{liq} \rangle}{N} &= K_{liq} + \Pi_{liq} - \mu n_{liq} , \end{aligned} \quad (5.406)$$

where

$$\mu n_{liq} = \mu_0 \bar{n}_0 + \mu_1 \bar{n}_1 .$$

The latter expression is equivalent to (5.393). In that way, the internal energy becomes

$$E_0 = K_{sol} + \Pi_{sol} + K_{liq} + \Pi_{liq} . \quad (5.407)$$

The grand potential

$$\Omega = -T \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta \tilde{H}) = \Omega_{sol} + \Omega_{liq} \quad (5.408)$$

is the sum of the terms

$$\Omega_{sol} = -T \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H_{sol}) , \quad \Omega_{liq} = -T \ln \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta H_{liq}) . \quad (5.409)$$

The phase probabilities w_{sol} and w_{liq} are defined as the minimizers of the thermodynamic potential.

5.23 Possibility of Superfluid Crystals

Low temperatures favor the appearance of superfluidity. Therefore, trying to understand whether this property could arise in quantum crystals, it is reasonable to study first of all the case of zero temperature.

The crystalline state can be characterized using the self-consistent harmonic approximation [328, 330, 332, 353]. Then for the kinetic energy (5.398) in the Debye approximation, we find

$$K_{sol} = \frac{3\rho_{sol}}{4\rho} T_D w_{sol}^{3/2} , \quad (5.410)$$

with the Debye temperature

$$T_D = \left[\frac{2\nu\rho_{sol}}{3m\rho} \sum_j \sum_\alpha \frac{\partial^2 \Phi(\mathbf{a}_j)}{\partial a_j^\alpha \partial a_j^\alpha} \right]^{1/2} , \quad (5.411)$$

with ν being the filling factor, that is the number of particles in a lattice site. The potential energy of the crystal reads as

$$\Pi_{sol} = \frac{\rho_{sol}}{2\rho} \left(u_0 w_{sol}^2 + \frac{3}{4} T_D w_{sol}^{3/2} \right) , \quad (5.412)$$

where

$$u_0 = \nu \frac{\rho_{sol}}{\rho} \sum_j \Phi(\mathbf{a}_j) . \quad (5.413)$$

The average density of the crystalline state practically coincides with the density of the liquid-like state, differing from it only by the structure. The crystalline state is periodic, while the liquid state is uniform. In what follows, we keep in mind the closeness of these densities setting

$$\rho_{sol} = \rho_{liq} = \rho .$$

The liquid Bose-condensed state is well described by the self-consistent Hartree-Fock-Bogolubov theory developed in Refs. [178, 179, 392, 393, 395, 399–405]. The interaction strength is characterized by the gas parameter

$$\gamma \equiv \rho^{1/3} a_s = \frac{m}{4\pi} \rho^{1/3} \Phi_0 , \quad (5.414)$$

where a_s is a scattering length and

$$\Phi_0 \equiv \int \Phi(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = 4\pi \frac{a_s}{m} . \quad (5.415)$$

The gas parameter is proportional to the ratio of a typical potential energy to the characteristic kinetic energy,

$$\frac{\rho\Phi_0}{E_K} = 8\pi \gamma \quad \left(E_K \equiv \frac{\rho^{2/3}}{2m} \right) . \quad (5.416)$$

The latter is also called the zero-point energy. The dimensionless sound velocity is denoted by

$$s \equiv \frac{mc}{\rho^{1/3}} , \quad (5.417)$$

where c is a dimensional sound velocity.

For the fraction of uncondensed particles, we have

$$n_1 = \frac{s^3}{3\pi^2} w_{liq}^{3/2} , \quad (5.418)$$

so that the condensate fraction is

$$n_0 = 1 - \frac{s^3}{3\pi^2} w_{liq}^{3/2} . \quad (5.419)$$

The sound velocity satisfies the equation

$$s^2 = 4\pi\gamma (n_0 + \sigma) , \quad (5.420)$$

where σ is the anomalous average

$$\sigma = \frac{8}{\sqrt{\pi}} (\gamma w_{liq})^{3/2} \left[n_0 + \frac{8}{\sqrt{\pi}} (\gamma w_{liq})^{3/2} \sqrt{n_0} \right]^{1/2} . \quad (5.421)$$

For the liquid phase, we have the kinetic energy

$$K_{liq} = \frac{16s^5}{15\pi^2} w_{liq}^{7/2} E_K \quad (5.422)$$

and the potential energy

$$\Pi_{liq} = 4\pi\gamma w_{liq}^2 (1 + n_1^2 - 2n_1\sigma - \sigma^2) E_K . \quad (5.423)$$

In what follows, it is convenient to pass to dimensionless quantities, measuring the energy in units of E_K . Thus the dimensionless internal energy is

$$E \equiv \frac{E_0}{E_K} = E(w) , \quad (5.424)$$

where we use the notation

$$w_{sol} \equiv w , \quad w_{liq} = 1 - w . \quad (5.425)$$

The dimensionless Debye temperature reads as

$$t_D \equiv \frac{T_D}{E_K} . \quad (5.426)$$

The depth of the potential well (5.413) in dimensionless form becomes

$$u \equiv \frac{|u_0|}{E_K} . \quad (5.427)$$

Summarizing the energy parts gives the dimensionless internal energy

$$E = \frac{9}{8} t_D w^{3/2} - \frac{u}{2} w^2 + \frac{16s^5}{15\pi^2} (1 - w)^{7/2} + 4\pi\gamma (1 - w)^2 (1 + n_1^2 - 2n_1\sigma - \sigma^2) . \quad (5.428)$$

The phase probabilities are the minimizers of the free energy under the normalization condition $w_{sol} + w_{liq} = 1$. Our aim is to find out whether the regions of disorder arising inside a crystal can support superfluidity. Since the latter is a low-temperature phenomenon, its appearance is most probable at low temperatures. Therefore, we shall concentrate at zero temperature. In that case, the free energy reduces to the internal energy. Thus the probability of the solid phase is defined by the conditions

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial w} = 0 , \quad \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial w^2} > 0 . \quad (5.429)$$

The energy $E = E(w)$ of the heterophase crystal with superfluid regions of disorder has to be compared with the energy $E(w \equiv 1)$ of the pure crystalline phase, when $w \equiv 1$, and with the energy $E(w \equiv 0)$ of the pure liquid phase, when $w \equiv 0$.

To accomplish numerical investigation, we need to fix the following quantities: the number of particles at a lattice site ν , the interaction potential, the Debye temperature t_D , the depth of the potential well at the lattice site u , and the effective interaction strength γ . Let us consider solid ^4He forming the hexagonal closest packed (hcp) lattice with 12 nearest neighbors for each atom and one atom at a lattice site. The interaction between atoms can be described [332] by the Lennard-Jones potential with the parameters $\varepsilon = 10.2$ K and $\sigma_0 = 2.556\text{\AA}$. More often, one uses the Aziz [406–408] potential. The properties of hcp solid ^4He have been studied in Monte Carlo numerical simulations and in experiments [409–416]. For the pressure 25.3 bar at zero temperature, the density of solid ^4He along the melting line is $\rho_{sol} = 0.0288\text{\AA}^{-3}$. The

density of liquid ${}^4\text{He}$ near the freezing line is $\rho_{liq} = 0.0262\text{\AA}^{-3}$. This shows that at the solid-liquid transition the density does not change much, since $\rho_{sol}/\rho_{liq} = 1.1$. Hence it is possible to accept that $\rho_{sol} \approx \rho_{liq} \approx \rho$. The Debye temperature is $T_D = 25$ K. The zero-point energy is $E_K = 0.572$ K. The Debye temperature in units of E_K is $t_D = T_D/E_K = 43.7$. The scattering length is $a_s = 2.203$ \AA, which gives $\gamma = 0.677$. The potential well (5.413) is connected with the static potential energy

$$E_{sol}^{pot} = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i \neq j} \Phi(\mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{a}_j) = \frac{1}{2} u_0 ,$$

which equals -31.3 K [416], hence $u_0 = -62.6$ K. In the units of E_K , this gives $u = |u_0|/E_K = 109$.

We solve numerically the system of equations (5.417) to (5.421), with the solid phase probability w being the minimizer of the internal energy (5.428). We fix the Debye temperature $t_D = 43.7$, the interaction strength $\gamma = 0.677$, and vary the potential depth u . Figure 13 presents the energy $E = E(u)$ of the heterophase crystal as a function of u , compared to the energy of the pure crystal $E_{w=1}(u)$ and the energy $E_{w=0}(u)$ of the pure superfluid liquid. The heterophase crystal is stable for $u < 75.58$. In the region $75.78 < u < 76.39$ it is metastable. And it cannot exist for more deep wells with $u > 76.39$, where the most stable is the pure crystalline phase. Figure 14 shows the Bose-condensed fraction $n_0 = N_0/N_{liq}$ with respect to the number of particles in the liquid state, while $\bar{n}_0 = N_0/N$ is the Bose-condensed fraction with respect to the total number of particles N in the system. The anomalous averages normalized to the number of particles in the liquid phase, $\sigma(u)$, and normalized to the total number of particles, $\bar{\sigma}(u)$, are shown in Fig. 15.




Figure 13: Energy $E(u)$ of a heterophase crystal with superfluid fluctuations (solid line); the energy $E_{w=1}(u)$ of the pure crystalline phase (dash-dotted line); the energy $E_{w=0}(u)$ of the pure liquid phase (dashed line). The critical region of the transition between heterophase superfluid crystal and the pure crystalline state is detailed in Fig. 13b.

Since for the solid ${}^4\text{He}$, with the melting density, the depth of the potential well $u = 109$ is far above the critical depth $u_c = 75.58$ above which superfluid properties in a crystal are not able to arise, we have to conclude that, in the frame of the present model, solid ${}^4\text{He}$ cannot contain any Bose-condensed fraction, hence it does not support a superfluid fraction. However, in principle, heterophase superfluid solids could exist, provided the potential well u is sufficiently shallow.




Figure 14: Bose-condensed fractions with respect to the number of particles in the liquid phase, $n_0(u)$ (solid line), and with respect to the total number of particles, $\bar{n}_0(u)$ (dash-dotted line).

6 Mixture of Microscopic Components

As is discussed in Sec. 1, there are three types of mixed matter, macroscopic Gibbs mixture, mesoscopic heterophase mixture, and the mixture of several microscopic components, such as atoms, molecules, or other particles that could be treated as elementary. In this type of mixture, all constituents are uniformly distributed in space, as is shown in Fig. 3, so that neither of the components forms a separate phase. In some cases, the components can separate in space, as a result of which the macroscopic phases could be formed, as in Fig. 1. But here we will pay the main attention to the situation when the constituents are uniformly intermixed in space, exactly as in Fig 3. For concreteness, we consider the mixture of quarks and hadrons that can be created in heavy-ion or nuclear collisions.

6.1 Mixed Quark-Hadron Matter

At high temperatures and/or densities, hadronic matter is expected to undergo a transition to quark-gluon plasma, where quarks and gluons are no longer confined inside hadrons but can propagate much further in extent than the typical sizes of hadrons. This is called deconfinement transition. It is assumed to be possible under heavy-ion or nuclear collisions. It is supposed to exist in the early universe at a time on the order of microseconds after Big Bang, when temperature was high enough for the elementary degrees of freedom of quantum chromodynamics to be in a deconfined state. The quark-gluon plasma can also exist in the interior of neutron stars. More details can be found in the review articles [417–434].

An important question is: How does the deconfinement transition occur? If it is a phase transition between pure phases of hadron matter and quark-gluon plasma, then, it seems, quark degrees of freedom should be unobservable in hadron matter. But if it is a gradual crossover, then quark degrees of freedom could somehow show up in nuclear matter and, probably, even in nuclei. Blokhintsev [435] suggested that even in cold nuclear matter there can fluctuationally




Figure 15: Anomalous averages, normalized to the number of particles in the liquid phase, $\sigma(u)$ (solid line), and normalized to the total number of particles $\bar{\sigma}(u)$ (dash-dotted line).

arise dense objects, called fluctons, composed of more than three quarks. Dense multi-quark formations in nuclei were assumed to be the cause of the cumulative effect advanced by Baldin [436–440]. Multi-quark clusters can appear in nuclei even at normal nuclear density [441–443]. These works suggest that hadron and quark degrees of freedom could coexist forming a kind of quark-hadron mixture.

As has been explained above, there can exist three types of mixtures depending on the relation between the spatial sizes of the three characteristic length scales, mean interparticle distance a , the size l_{het} of regions occupied by a competing phase inside a host phase, and the size of the system l_{exp} . The Gibbs phase separation, as shown in Fig. 1, corresponds to a macroscopic mixture, where $a \ll l_{het} \sim l_{exp}$. Figure 2, where $a \ll l_{het} \ll l_{exp}$, illustrates a mesoscopic mixture, and Fig. 3 represents a uniformly mixed system of microscopic particles.

The principal question is: What kind of mixture do we keep in mind with respect to mixed quark-hadron matter? Generally, one talks about the possible existence of a mixed quark-hadron phase that can arise in colliding heavy ions or nuclei, in the interior of neutron stars, or in the early Universe, a few microseconds after the Big Bang. Below we shall follow the ideas of clustering nuclear matter we started in the collaboration with Baldin [444–448]. This approach has also been developed and summarized in the articles [427, 428, 449–453].

When ions of nuclei are relativistically accelerated towards each other, they resemble not spheres but rather disks due to the Lorentz contraction. After they collide, a fireball is formed, as is shown in Fig. 16. The first question that arises is: Can the methods of statistical equilibrium (or quasi-equilibrium) physics be used for the description of a fireball? For this, the fireball lifetime has to be much longer than the time of local equilibration. The fireball lifetime is of order 10^{-22} s. The local equilibration time can be estimated as $t_{loc} \sim \lambda/c$, where λ is mean free path and c is light velocity [427]. The mean free path is of the order of 1 fm. Therefore the local equilibration time is $t_{loc} \sim 10^{-24} - 10^{-23}$ s. This is much shorter than the fireball lifetime 10^{-22} s, hence equilibrium (quasi-equilibrium) statistical mechanics is applicable.




Figure 16: Formation of a fireball under heavy-ion or nuclear collisions.

When talking about mixed quark-hadron phase, one usually assumes the situation typical of first-order phase transitions resulting in a macroscopic phase separation, as in Fig. 1. However, this phase separation requires the use of the Maxwell construction (see [453]), when in the equation of state, defining the dependence of pressure $P(V)$ on volume, there appears a horizontal line where the pressure derivative is zero, or close to zero, if the separating surface energy is taken into account, $\partial P/\partial V \rightarrow 0$. Because of this, the isothermal compressibility diverges.

This implies that the state with the macroscopic phase separation is unstable, so that very weak fluctuations quickly destroy it and intermix the phases [453].

One often mentions the case of water-vapor separation in a test-tube as an example of the situation under a first-order phase transition, where the macroscopic mixture looks stable. However, one should not forget that, in addition to the surface energy, the macroscopic water-vapor mixture is stabilized by gravity. Also, being inside a test-tube, the mixture is isolated from external perturbations, while the real systems, such as fireballs, are not isolated from surrounding.

The other type of spatial separation could be due to the stratification of different kinds of hadrons. However the stratification is a slow process requiring the time of the order of $(R/a)t_{loc} \sim 10^{-22}$ s. Here $R \sim 10$ fm is the fireball radius and a means interparticle distance. This stratification time equals the fireball lifetime. Hence, it seems, the stratification of different hadron components will not occur during the fireball lifetime. In this way, it is possible to assume that in a fireball there is neither first-order phase separation nor component stratification. Thus under mixed quark-hadron matter we keep in mind a uniformly mixed system, as shown in Fig. 3.

6.2 Stability of Multicomponent Mixture

Even when the fireball lifetime is much longer than the time of the components separation, anyway these components can form a stable equilibrium mixture. The condition of mixture

stability can be derived in the following way.

Consider N_{com} different components, which are enumerated by the indices $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N_{com}$. The physical details of the components will be specified a bit later. For a while, we can keep in mind that an i -th component is composed of a particular type of quark clusters. The number of clusters in an i -th component is N_i .

The interaction energy of a mixture of the components, written in the Hartree approximation, is

$$E_{mix} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \int_V \bar{\rho}_i(\mathbf{r}) \Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \bar{\rho}_j(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}', \quad (6.1)$$

where the density of the i -th component clusters for a uniform system is

$$\bar{\rho}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{N_i}{V}. \quad (6.2)$$

With the notation

$$\Phi_{ij} \equiv \int_V \Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (6.3)$$

we have

$$E_{mix} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \Phi_{ij} \frac{N_i N_j}{V}. \quad (6.4)$$

Adding the single-particle (single-cluster) energy

$$E'_{mix} = \sum_i \int_V U_i(\mathbf{r}) \bar{\rho}_i(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (6.5)$$

yields the total internal energy

$$E_{mix}^{tot} = E_{mix} + E'_{mix}. \quad (6.6)$$

Assuming that the external fields are approximately uniform, $U_i(\mathbf{r}) = U_i$ gives the single-cluster energy

$$E'_{mix} = \sum_i U_i N_i. \quad (6.7)$$

The mixture free energy writes as

$$F_{mix} = E_{mix}^{tot} - T S_{mix}, \quad (6.8)$$

with the entropy

$$S_{mix} = S_0 + \Delta S_{mix}, \quad (6.9)$$

where S_0 is the entropy of a non-mixed system, while the entropy of mixing is

$$\Delta S_{mix} = N \Delta s_{mix} \quad \left(N = \sum_i N_i \right), \quad (6.10)$$

and the reduced entropy of mixing per particle being

$$\Delta s_{mix} = - \sum_i n_i \ln n_i \quad \left(n_i \equiv \frac{N_i}{N} \right). \quad (6.11)$$

When the components are separated, the interaction energy has the form

$$E_{sep} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \int_{V_i} \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) \Phi_{ii}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \rho_i(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' . \quad (6.12)$$

In a uniform system, the density is

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{N_i}{V_i} . \quad (6.13)$$

Keeping in mind the separation into macroscopic Gibbs phases allows us to accept that

$$\int_V \Phi_{ii}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = \int_{V_i} \Phi_{ii}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} .$$

Therefore the interaction energy of separated components reads as

$$E_{sep} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \Phi_{ii} \frac{N_i^2}{V_i} . \quad (6.14)$$

The total internal energy of separated components is

$$E_{sep}^{tot} = E_{sep} + E'_{sep} , \quad (6.15)$$

with the single-cluster energy

$$E'_{sep} = \sum_i \int_{V_i} U_i(\mathbf{r}) \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} . \quad (6.16)$$

For uniform fields, we get

$$E'_{sep} = \sum_i U_i N_i = E'_{mix} . \quad (6.17)$$

Thus the free energy of a separated system is

$$F_{sep} = E_{sep}^{tot} - T S_{sep} , \quad (6.18)$$

with $S_{sep} \approx S_0$.

The mixed state is stable, as compared to the separated state, provided that

$$F_{mix} < F_{sep} . \quad (6.19)$$

From here, it follows that

$$E_{mix} - T \Delta S_{mix} < E_{sep} . \quad (6.20)$$

Using the identity

$$\frac{V}{V_i} = \sum_j \frac{V_j}{V_i}$$

transforms (6.14) into

$$E_{sep} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \Phi_{ii} \frac{N_i^2 V_j}{V V_i} . \quad (6.21)$$

The separated state is mechanically stable, if the partial pressures coincide,

$$P_i = P_j, \quad P_i = - \frac{\partial F_{sep}}{\partial V_i}. \quad (6.22)$$

Since

$$P_i = \frac{1}{2} \Phi_{ii} \left(\frac{N_i}{V_i} \right)^2, \quad (6.23)$$

we have

$$\frac{P_i}{P_j} = \frac{\Phi_{ii}}{\Phi_{jj}} \left(\frac{N_i V_j}{N_j V_i} \right)^2 = 1, \quad (6.24)$$

from where

$$\frac{V_j}{V_i} = \frac{N_j}{N_i} \sqrt{\frac{\Phi_{jj}}{\Phi_{ii}}}. \quad (6.25)$$

In that way, we obtain

$$E_{sep} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \frac{N_i N_j}{V} \sqrt{\Phi_{ii} \Phi_{jj}}. \quad (6.26)$$

So that the condition of mixture stability (6.20) becomes

$$\sum_{ij} \frac{N_i N_j}{2V} \left(\Phi_{ij} - \sqrt{\Phi_{ii} \Phi_{jj}} \right) < N T \Delta s_{mix}. \quad (6.27)$$

Applying the identity

$$N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij} N_i N_j$$

results in the inequality

$$\sum_{ij} \frac{N_i N_j}{2V} \left(\Phi_{ij} - \sqrt{\Phi_{ii} \Phi_{jj}} - \frac{2T}{\rho} \Delta s_{mix} \right) < 0. \quad (6.28)$$

Assuming that the latter inequality is to be valid for any N_i and N_j , we obtain the condition of mixture stability

$$\Phi_{ij} < \sqrt{\Phi_{ii} \Phi_{jj}} + \frac{2T}{\rho} \Delta s_{mix}, \quad (6.29)$$

where $\rho \equiv N/V$.

Generally, this is a sufficient condition for the mixture stability. As is evident, this condition requires that both Φ_{ii} and Φ_{jj} be of the same sign. Temperature makes mixing easier. The components may be immiscible at zero temperature, but can become miscible at finite temperature.

6.3 Theory of Clustering Matter

Clusters composed of particles forming bound states can be treated as separate types of particles [454]. Detailed mathematical representation for clustering matter has been suggested in Refs. [455–462]. The approach describing quark-hadron matter as a type of clustering matter has been developed [427, 428].

Let us consider a system composed of different types of particles, say quarks, antiquarks, gluons, and various multi-quark clusters (or bags) formed of two quarks (mesons), three quarks (nucleons), and multi-quark clusters (including anti-multi-quark clusters). Let the elementary particles, that is, quarks, antiquarks, and gluons, be enumerated by an index α , while the composite particles be enumerated by the index i . Thus the Fock space of the considered system is the *cluster space*

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigotimes_{\alpha} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha} \bigotimes_i \mathcal{F}_i . \quad (6.30)$$

In many cases, it is convenient to introduce the general enumeration of all particles by means of a multi-index $n = \alpha, i$.

The system constituents are characterized by several specific numbers. The compositeness number z_n shows the number of elementary particles composing the bound cluster of the n -th type. The other numbers characterizing a cluster of the n -th type are the baryon number B_n , strangeness S_n , and charge Q_n .

The balance between the particles composing the system is regulated by the chemical potentials. If the average density

$$\rho = \sum_n z_n \rho_n \quad \left(\rho_n \equiv \frac{N_n}{V} \right) \quad (6.31)$$

is given, the chemical potentials μ_i of the i -th type quark clusters are connected with the free quarks and antiquark chemical potentials through the relation

$$\mu_q = -\mu_{\bar{q}} = \frac{\mu_i}{z_i}, \quad \mu_g = 0, \quad (6.32)$$

while the gluon chemical potential being zero. When the baryon density of matter

$$\rho_B \equiv \frac{N_B}{V} = \sum_i B_i \rho_i \quad (6.33)$$

is known, this defines the baryon potential μ_B . If the strangeness density

$$\rho_S \equiv \frac{N_S}{V} = \sum_i S_i \rho_i \quad (6.34)$$

is conserved, the strangeness potential μ_S is defined. Similarly, the fixed density of charge

$$\rho_Q \equiv \frac{N_Q}{V} = \sum_i Q_i \rho_i \quad (6.35)$$

sets the charge potential μ_Q . The general relation between the chemical potentials reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \mu_i \rho_i &= \mu_B \sum_i B_i \rho_i + \mu_S \sum_i S_i \rho_i + \mu_Q \sum_i Q_i \rho_i = \\ &= \mu_B \rho_B + \mu_S \rho_S + \mu_Q \rho_Q, \end{aligned} \quad (6.36)$$

which implies the relation between the chemical potentials

$$\mu_i = \mu_B B_i + \mu_S S_i + \mu_Q Q_i . \quad (6.37)$$

Defining the corresponding baryon, strangeness, and charge numbers

$$N_B = \sum_i B_i N_i, \quad N_S = \sum_i S_i N_i, \quad N_Q = \sum_i Q_i N_i, \quad (6.38)$$

it is straightforward to introduce the related number operators

$$\hat{N}_B = \sum_i B_i \hat{N}_i, \quad \hat{N}_S = \sum_i S_i \hat{N}_i, \quad \hat{N}_Q = \sum_i Q_i \hat{N}_i, \quad (6.39)$$

so that

$$\sum_i \mu_i \hat{N}_i = \mu_B \hat{N}_B + \mu_S \hat{N}_S + \mu_Q \hat{N}_Q. \quad (6.40)$$

Finally, it is important to keep in mind that when constructing the effective Hamiltonian of the clustering matter, one often employs the terms containing thermodynamic parameters, such as temperature and density. Then it is necessary to supplement the Hamiltonian with a correcting term providing the validity of the thermodynamic relations for the pressure, internal energy, and entropy,

$$\begin{aligned} P &= -\frac{\Omega}{V} = -\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial V}, \\ E &= \frac{1}{V} \langle \hat{H} \rangle = T \frac{\partial P}{\partial T} - P + \sum_i \mu_i \rho_i, \\ S &= \frac{\partial P}{\partial T} = \frac{1}{T} \left(E + P - \sum_i \mu_i \rho_i \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.41)$$

as well as for the densities

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i &= \frac{1}{V} \langle \hat{N}_i \rangle = \frac{\partial P}{\partial \mu_i}, \\ \rho_B &= \frac{\partial P}{\partial \mu_B}, \quad \rho_S = \frac{\partial P}{\partial \mu_S}, \quad \rho_Q = \frac{\partial P}{\partial \mu_Q}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.42)$$

In this way, if the energy Hamiltonian is \hat{H} , then the grand Hamiltonian is

$$H = \hat{H} - \sum_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha} \hat{N}_{\alpha} - \sum_i \mu_i \hat{N}_i + CV, \quad (6.43)$$

where CV is a correcting term.

The probability of an n -th component is

$$w_n \equiv \frac{z_n \rho_n}{\rho}, \quad (6.44)$$

which implies

$$w_{\alpha} \equiv \frac{\rho_{\alpha}}{\rho}, \quad w_i \equiv \frac{z_i \rho_i}{\rho}.$$

As is clear, the normalization condition is valid:

$$\sum_n w_n = 1, \quad 0 \leq w_n < 1. \quad (6.45)$$

In addition, the system thermodynamic stability has to be checked, such as the positiveness and finiteness of specific heat and isothermal compressibility:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq C_V < \infty & \quad \left(C_V \equiv \frac{\partial E}{\partial T} \right) , \\
0 \leq \kappa_T < \infty & \quad \left(\kappa_T \equiv - \frac{1}{V} / \frac{\partial P}{\partial V} \right) .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.46}$$

Often, when modeling Hamiltonian (6.43), one includes the terms containing thermodynamic parameters, e.g. the density of clusters ρ_n or temperature T . Then, in order that thermodynamic relations (6.41) and (6.42) be valid, it is necessary to impose the *conditions of statistical correctness* [427, 428] having the form

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \rho_n} \right\rangle = 0 , \quad \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial T} \right\rangle = 0 . \tag{6.47}$$

This defines the correcting term CV prescribing the equations for the function $C = C(\rho_n, T)$. Without imposing these conditions, the model thermodynamics is not reliable. For instance, one constantly employs the excluded-volume approximation without using the correcting term, which makes this approximation incorrect.

6.4 Clustering Quark-Hadron Mixture

The energy Hamiltonian of quark-hadron matter can be written as a sum of two terms,

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_1 + \hat{H}_z , \tag{6.48}$$

where the first term describes the unbound particles with the compositeness number $z_\alpha = 1$, i.e. quarks, antiquarks, and gluons, while the second term describes hadron clusters with the compositeness number $z_i \geq 2$. Particles are characterized by the field operators

$$\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) = [\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, \sigma_\alpha)] , \quad \psi_i(\mathbf{r}) = [\psi_i(\mathbf{r}, \sigma_i)] ,$$

which are the columns with respect to the internal degrees of freedom σ_α and σ_i .

The Hamiltonian of the unbound particles is

$$\hat{H}_1 = \sum_\alpha \int \psi_\alpha^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(\sqrt{-\nabla^2 + m_\alpha^2} + U_\alpha \right) \psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} , \tag{6.49}$$

with the potential U_α describing the effective interactions between the unbound particles and between the unbound particles and clusters. This potential should satisfy the *color-confinement condition*

$$U_\alpha \rightarrow \infty \quad (\rho \rightarrow 0) \tag{6.50}$$

and the *asymptotic-freedom condition*

$$U_\alpha \rightarrow 0 \quad (\rho \rightarrow \infty) . \tag{6.51}$$

Thus it can be represented by the expression

$$U_\alpha = \frac{A^{1+\nu}}{\rho^{\nu/3}} \quad (6.52)$$

parameterized with A and ν .

The cluster Hamiltonian reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_z = & \sum_i \int \psi_i^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(\sqrt{-\nabla^2 + m_i^2} + U_i \right) \psi_i(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \int \psi_i^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_j(\mathbf{r}') \psi_i(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' . \end{aligned} \quad (6.53)$$

The effective field U_i takes into account the interactions between the clusters and unbound particles, hence it has to be zero when the latter are absent, that is

$$U_i \rightarrow 0 \quad (\rho_1 \rightarrow 0) . \quad (6.54)$$

For example, this effective field can be accepted in the form

$$U_i = z_i A^{1+\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\rho^{\nu/3}} - \frac{1}{\rho_z^{\nu/3}} \right) . \quad (6.55)$$

Here and in what follows, we take into account that the average density ρ is the sum of the density of unbound particles and of the cluster density, so that

$$\rho_1 \equiv \sum_\alpha \rho_\alpha , \quad \rho_z \equiv \sum_i z_i \rho_i \quad (\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_z) . \quad (6.56)$$

The cluster interactions, resorting to the potential scaling [427, 428]

$$\frac{\Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r})}{z_i z_j} = \frac{\Phi_{ab}(\mathbf{r})}{z_a z_b} , \quad (6.57)$$

can be expressed through the nucleon-nucleon interactions,

$$\Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{z_i z_j}{9} \Phi_{NN}(\mathbf{r}) , \quad (6.58)$$

taken, e.g., in the form of the Bonn potential [463].

Another type of the potential scaling can be represented with the relation

$$\frac{\Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r})}{m_i m_j} = \frac{\Phi_{ab}(\mathbf{r})}{m_a m_b} .$$

Note that under the validity of the potential scaling the condition of mixture stability (6.29) reduces to the positiveness of the entropy of mixing, which is certainly true.

The correcting term is defined by the conditions of statistical correctness (6.47), which for the considered case read as

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \rho} \right\rangle = 0 , \quad \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \rho_z} \right\rangle = 0 .$$

This yields

$$C = \frac{\nu}{3-\nu} A^{1+\nu} (\rho^{1-\nu/3} - \rho_z^{1-\nu/3}) . \quad (6.59)$$

In the particular case of $\nu = 2$, we have

$$C = 2A^3 (\rho^{1/3} - \rho_z^{1/3}) , \quad U_\alpha = \frac{A^3}{\rho^{2/3}} .$$

6.5 Thermodynamics of Quark-Hadron Matter

Keeping in mind that the system made of quark-hadron matter is sufficiently large to be treated as uniform, it is possible to resort to the Fourier transformation for the field operators,

$$\psi_n(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_k a_n(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} , \quad (6.60)$$

where the operators

$$a_n(\mathbf{k}) = [a_n(\mathbf{k}, \sigma_n)]$$

are the columns with respect to the internal degrees of freedom. The potentials of cluster interactions also are assumed to allow for the Fourier transformation,

$$\bar{\Phi}_{ij}(\mathbf{k}) = \int \Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} d\mathbf{r} , \quad \Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k \bar{\Phi}_{ij}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} . \quad (6.61)$$

In particular, the notation

$$\Phi_{ij} \equiv \int \Phi_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = \bar{\Phi}_{ij}(0) \quad (6.62)$$

will be used.

The Hamiltonian (6.49) of unbound particles takes the form

$$\hat{H}_1 - \sum_\alpha \mu_\alpha N_\alpha = \sum_\alpha \sum_k \omega_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) a_\alpha^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) a_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) , \quad (6.63)$$

with the spectrum

$$\omega_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{k^2 + m_\alpha^2} + U_\alpha - \mu_\alpha . \quad (6.64)$$

Recall that the chemical potentials for gluons and quarks are $\mu = 0$ and $\mu_q = -\mu_{\bar{q}}$.

The momentum distribution of unbound particles is

$$n_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \langle a_\alpha^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) a_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) \rangle = \frac{\zeta_\alpha}{\exp\{\beta\omega_\alpha(\mathbf{k})\} \mp 1} , \quad (6.65)$$

with ζ_α being the degeneracy factor and, in the right-hand side, the upper sign is for Bose-Einstein statistics, while the lower, for Fermi-Dirac statistics. For gluons and quarks,

$$\zeta_g = 2 \times (N_c^2 - 1) , \quad \zeta_q = 2 \times N_f \times N_c , \quad (6.66)$$

where N_c is the number of colors and N_f , number of flavors. For three colors, we have

$$\zeta_g = 16 , \quad \zeta_q = 6N_f \quad (N_c = 3) .$$

The cluster Hamiltonian (6.53) can be simplified in the Hartree-Fock approximation yielding

$$\hat{H}_z - \sum_i \mu_i N_i = \sum_i \sum_k \omega_i(\mathbf{k}) a_i^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) a_i(\mathbf{k}) + R_{HF}, \quad (6.67)$$

with the spectrum

$$\omega_i(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{k^2 + m_i^2} + U_i + \sum_j \Phi_{ij} \rho_j \pm \frac{1}{V} \sum_p n_i(\mathbf{p}) \bar{\Phi}_{ii}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) - \mu_i \quad (6.68)$$

and a nonoperator term

$$R_{HF} = -\frac{V}{2} \sum_i \left[\rho_i \sum_j \Phi_{ij} \rho_j \pm \frac{1}{V^2} \sum_{kp} \bar{\Phi}_{ii}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) n_i(\mathbf{k}) n_i(\mathbf{p}) \right]. \quad (6.69)$$

The momentum distribution of clusters reads as

$$n_i(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \langle a_i^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) a_i(\mathbf{k}) \rangle = \frac{\zeta_i}{\exp\{\beta\omega_i(\mathbf{k})\} \mp 1}, \quad (6.70)$$

where again the upper sign is for Bose-Einstein statistics, while the lower, for Fermi-Dirac statistics.

The average densities for unbound particles and clusters are

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\alpha &= \frac{1}{V} \int \langle \psi_\alpha^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k n_\alpha(\mathbf{k}) \\ \rho_i &= \frac{1}{V} \int \langle \psi_i^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i(\mathbf{r}) \rangle d\mathbf{r} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k n_i(\mathbf{k}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.71)$$

Employing the central-peak approximation [179, 464]

$$\sum_p n_i(\mathbf{p}) \bar{\Phi}_{ii}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) \cong \bar{\Phi}_{ii}(\mathbf{k}) \sum_p n_i(\mathbf{p}),$$

we get

$$\frac{1}{V} \sum_p n_i(\mathbf{p}) \bar{\Phi}_{ii}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) \cong \rho_i \bar{\Phi}_{ii}(\mathbf{k}). \quad (6.72)$$

Then the cluster spectrum becomes

$$\omega_i(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{k^2 + m_i^2} + U_i + \sum_j \Phi_{ij} \rho_j \pm \rho_i \bar{\Phi}_{ii}(\mathbf{k}) - \mu_i \quad (6.73)$$

and the nonoperator remainder (6.69) takes the form

$$R_{HF} = -\frac{V}{2} \sum_i \rho_i \left(\sum_j \Phi_{ij} \rho_j \pm \rho_i \bar{\Phi}_{ii} \right). \quad (6.74)$$

For the grand thermodynamic potential

$$\Omega = -T \ln \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H} ,$$

with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \hat{H}_1 - \sum_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha} \hat{N}_{\alpha} + \hat{H}_z - \sum_i \mu_i \hat{N}_i + CV , \quad (6.75)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= \mp T \sum_{\alpha} \zeta_{\alpha} \sum_k \ln \left[1 \pm \frac{n_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k})}{\zeta_{\alpha}} \right] \mp \\ &\mp T \sum_i \zeta_i \sum_k \ln \left[1 \pm \frac{n_i(\mathbf{k})}{\zeta_i} \right] + R_{HF} + CV . \end{aligned} \quad (6.76)$$

Hence the pressure is

$$\begin{aligned} P &= -\frac{\Omega}{V} = \pm T \sum_{\alpha} \zeta_{\alpha} \int \ln \left[1 \pm \frac{n_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k})}{\zeta_{\alpha}} \right] \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \pm \\ &\pm T \sum_i \zeta_i \int \ln \left[1 \pm \frac{n_i(\mathbf{k})}{\zeta_i} \right] \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} - R_{HF} - CV . \end{aligned} \quad (6.77)$$

From here, it is straightforward to find all system thermodynamic characteristics and the weights of all particles (6.44). The quark-hadron mixture is stable. Deconfinement is found to be a sharp crossover, in good agreement with the QCD lattice simulations [431, 434, 465–469]. In the case of a crossover, there is no a precise point where the phase transition occurs. The deconfinement temperature can be conditionally defined as the point where the derivatives of observables have a maximum, which defines the deconfinement temperature around 170 MeV. Of course, considering different observables can result in slightly different deconfinement temperatures, which is the common situation for crossovers. Numerical simulations [427, 428] show that pion clusters survive till around $2T_c$.

The deconfinement transition being a continuous crossover, becomes smoother with increasing baryon density. The deconfinement at a fixed low temperature and rising baryon density is due to the disintegration of hadrons into unbound quarks. When both the temperature and baryon density increase, the deconfinement is a result of the hadron disintegration combined with the generation from the vacuum of quarks and gluons.

Multiquark clusters, especially six-quark clusters, can exist at normal nuclear density. Since the quark clusters with even number of quarks behave as bosons, they can experience Bose-Einstein condensation. Thus at low temperature, six-quark clusters are shown [427, 428] to Bose-condense. Strictly speaking, the actual Bose condensation phase transition, requiring global gauge symmetry breaking, cannot occur in fireballs that are finite objects. However, even for finite quantum systems one can define *asymptotic symmetry breaking* [470], when the properties of a finite system asymptotically approach those of a system in the thermodynamic limit.

The crossover nature of the deconfinement transition rules out those predictions that have been based on a sharp first-order phase transition. This concerns the interpretation of signals of the quark-gluon plasma in heavy-ion collisions and the hadronization scenario related to the evolution of the early universe after the Big Bang. More details can be found in Refs. [427, 428].

7 Conclusion

There exist three types of mixed statistical systems that, for brevity, can be called macroscopic, mesoscopic, and microscopic mixtures. The first type is the well known Gibbs macroscopic mixture consisting of several spatially separated phases of macroscopic size. The description of this type of mixture has been developed quite a time ago, yet since Gibbs, and does not meet principal theoretical problems.

Mesoscopic mixture consists of a matrix of one phase inside which there appear the regions of mesoscopic size of another phase. The term "mesoscopic" implies that the characteristic linear size of the appearing germs of a competing phase is much larger than the mean interparticle distance, but much smaller than the linear system size. Usually, the characteristic size of a competing phase, at least in one direction, is of nanoscale. Generally, the embryos of a competing phase can vary their size in time, even can disappear and then appear again, thus fluctuating in space and time, because of which they are called heterophase fluctuations. The description of this type of mixture is of great difficulty, since the system is nonuniform and, strictly speaking, nonequilibrium. The review presents the theory allowing for the statistical description of heterophase systems and illustrates this theory for several typical statistical models as well as for such exotic systems as superfluid crystals.

In the third case, a microscopic mixture is considered consisting of several components of microscopic objects that can be termed particles. In general, this microscopic mixture can disintegrate into spatially separated macroscopic phases. The condition of stability of a microscopic mixture at finite temperature is derived. The theory of clustering matter composed of microscopic objects is developed. The approach is applied to quark-hadron mixture that can arise in heavy-ion and nuclear collisions. It is assumed to occur in the early universe at a time on the order of microseconds after Big Bang. And it is also supposed to exist in the interior of neutron stars.

It is useful to mention that there can arise systems combining two types of mixtures. For example, a microscopic multicomponent mixture can exhibit inside itself the mesoscopic droplets of phases composed of a single kind of particles, thus presenting a multicomponent heterophase matter. As another kind of illustration, we can imagine that inside a mixed quark-hadron matter there can appear fluctuating mesoscopic regions of quark-gluon plasma. The investigation of such complex multicomponent heterophase systems is the goal for future studies.

Acknowledgements

One of the authors (V.I.Y.) remembers with gratitude numerous highly useful discussions on the problems touched in this review he has had in former years with A.M. Baldin, J.L. Birman, A.J. Coleman, and D. Ter Haar. We are grateful to our co-authors for collaboration.

References

- [1] R. Kubo, *Thermodynamics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968).
- [2] J. Frenkel, *Kinetic Theory of Liquids* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1946).
- [3] J.I. Frenkel, *Statistical Physics* (Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 1948).
- [4] A.S. Bakai, *Polycluster Amorphous Solids* (Sinteks, Kharkov, 2013).
- [5] Y.L. Khait, Kinetic many-body theory of short-lived large energy fluctuations of small numbers of particles in solids and its applications, *Phys. Rep.* **99**, 237–340 (1983).
- [6] V.I. Yukalov, Phase transitions and heterophase fluctuations, *Phys. Rep.* **208**, 395–489 (1991).
- [7] V.I. Yukalov, Mesoscopic phase fluctuations: General phenomenon in condensed matter, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **17**, 2333–2358 (2003).
- [8] V.I. Yukalov, Systems with symmetry breaking and restoration, *Symmetry*, **2**, 40–68 (2010).
- [9] A.S. Bakai, Heterophase liquid states: Thermodynamics, structure, dynamics, *Condens. Matter Phys.* **17**, 43701 (2014).
- [10] O. Bakai, Viscous flow of glass-forming liquids and glasses, *Springer Proc. Phys.* **171**, 103–137 (2015).
- [11] M.Y. Kagan, K.I. Kugel, and A.L. Rakhmanov, Electronic phase separation: Recent progress in the old problem, *Phys. Rep.* **916**, 1–105 (2021).
- [12] E.O. Wollan and W.C. Koehler, Neutron diffraction study of the magnetic properties of the series of Perovskite-type compounds, *Phys. Rev.* **100**, 545–563 (1955).
- [13] N.P. Grazhdankina, Y.S. Bersenev, I.V. Medvedeva, M.A. Novikov, and A.R. Koemets, Investigation of mictomagnetic MnBi alloys, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **52**, 297–303 (1980).
- [14] E.L. Nagaev, *Physics of Magnetic Semiconductors* (Mir, Moscow, 1983).
- [15] H. Suzuki and J. Harada, Local order and magnetic properties of disordered Au₄Mn and Cu₃Mn, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **31**, 69–70 (1983).
- [16] T. Moriya, *Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism* (Springer, Berlin, 1985).
- [17] M. Marder, N. Papanicolaou, and G.C. Psaltakis, Phase separation in a $t - J$ model, *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 6920–6932 (1990).
- [18] G. Allodi, R. De Renzi, G. Guidi, F. Licci, and M.W. Pieper, Electronic phase separation in lanthanum manganites: Evidence from ⁵⁵Mn NMR, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 6036–6046 (1997).
- [19] G. Allodi, R. De Renzi, and G. Guidi, ¹³⁹La NMR in lanthanum manganites: Indication of the presence of magnetic polarons from spectra and nuclear relaxation, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 1024–1034 (1998).

- [20] H. Yi and J. Yu, Double-exchange model with background superexchange interaction: Phase diagram of $\text{La}_{1-x}\text{A}_x\text{MnO}_3$ manganites, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 11123–11126 (1998).
- [21] S. Yunoki, J. Hu, A.L. Malvezzi, A. Moreo, N. Furukawa, and E. Dagotto, Phase separation in electronic models for manganites, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 845–848 (1998).
- [22] S. Yunoki and A. Moreo, Static and dynamic properties of the ferromagnetic Kondo model with direct antiferromagnetic coupling between the localized t_{2g} electrons, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 6403–6413 (1998).
- [23] E. Dagotto, S. Yunoki, A.L. Malvezzi, A. Moreo, J. Hu, S. Capponi, D. Poilblanc, and N. Furukawa, Ferromagnetic Kondo model for manganites: Phase diagram, charge segregation, and influence of quantum localized spins, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 6414–6427 (1998).
- [24] A.M. Balagurov, V.Y. Pomjakushin, D.V. Sheptyakov, V.L. Aksenov, N.A. Babushkina, L.M. Belova, A.N. Taldenkov, A.V. Inyushkin, P. Fischer, M. Gutmann, L. Keller, O.Y. Gorbenco, and A.R. Kaul, Effect of oxygen isotope substitution on the magnetic structure of $(\text{La}_x\text{Pr}_{1-x})_{0.7}\text{Ca}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 383–387 (1999).
- [25] H. Yi, J. Yu, and S.I. Lee, Coexistence of antiferromagnetic and ferromagnetic phase for ferromagnetic Kondo lattice model, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **7**, 509–512 (1999).
- [26] C. Kapusta, P.C. Riedi, M. Sikora, and M.R. Ibarra, NMR probe of phase segregation in electron doped mixed valence manganites, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4216 (2000).
- [27] V. Podzorov, M. Uehara, M.E. Gershenson, T.Y. Koo, and S.W. Cheong, Giant $1/f$ noise in perovskite manganites: Evidence of the percolation threshold, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 3784–3787 (2000).
- [28] S. Krupicka, Z. Jirak, J. Hejtmanek, M. Marysko, P. Novak, M.M. Savosta, and R. Sonntag, Phase separation in structural and magnetic transitions in $\text{Pr}_{0.5}\text{Ca}_{0.5-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{MnO}_3$, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **13**, 6813–6834 (2001).
- [29] H. Sha, F. Ye, P. Dai, J.A. Fernandez-Baca, and D. Mesa, Signature of magnetic phase separation in the ground state of $\text{Pr}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{MnO}_3$, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 052410 (2008).
- [30] A.K. Pramanik and A. Banerjee, Phase separation and the effect of quenched disorder in $\text{Pr}_{0.5}\text{Sr}_{0.5}\text{MnO}_3$, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **20**, 275207 (2008).
- [31] E.L. Nagaev, Colossal-magnetoresistance materials: Manganites and conventional ferromagnetic semiconductors, *Phys. Rep.* **346**, 387–531 (2001).
- [32] I. Sudheendra and C.N.R. Rao, Electronic phase separation in the rare-earth manganites $(\text{La}_{1-x}\text{Ln}_x)_{0.7}\text{Ca}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ ($\text{Ln} = \text{Nd}, \text{Gd}, \text{and Y}$), *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **15**, 3029–3040 (2003).
- [33] V.B. Shenoy and C.N.R. Rao, Electronic phase separation and other novel phenomena and properties exhibited by mixed-valent rare-earth manganites and related materials, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A* **366**, 63–82 (2008).

- [34] U. Bertelsen, J. Knudsen, and H. Krogh, Mössbauer effect in FeF_3 , *Phys. Status Solidi* **22**, 59–64 (1967).
- [35] H. Yamamoto, T. Osaka, H. Watanabe, and M. Fukase, Mössbauer effect study of spin relaxation in CaFe_2O_4 , *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **24**, 275–279 (1968).
- [36] M. Eibschütz, S. Shtrikman, and D. Treves, Mössbauer studies of Fe^{57} in orthoferrites, *Phys. Rev.* **156**, 562–577 (1967).
- [37] L. Levinson, M. Luban, and S. Shtrikman, Mössbauer studies of Fe^{57} near the Curie temperature, *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 864–870 (1969).
- [38] M.A. Krivoglaz, Fluctuon states of electrons, *Phys. Usp.* **16**, 856–877 (1974).
- [39] E.L. Nagaev, Ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic semiconductors, *Phys. Usp.* **18**, 863–892 (1975).
- [40] K.P. Belov, *Rare-Earth Magnets and Their Applications* (Nauka, Moscow, 1980).
- [41] K.P. Belov, Y.D. Tretyakov, I.V. Gordeev, L.I. Koroleva, and Y.A. Kesler, *Magnetic Semiconductors – Chalcogenide Spinels* (Moscow State University, Moscow, 1981).
- [42] M. Reissner, W. Steiner, J. Kappler, P. Bauer, and M. Besnus, Magnetic behaviour of $\text{Y}(\text{Fe}_x\text{Al}_{1-x})_2$ alloys, *J. Phys. F* **14**, 1249–1260 (1984).
- [43] V.F. Kumeishin and O.A. Ivanov, Investigation of relaxation processes in nickel near the Curie temperature by means of nuclear gamma-resonance, *Phys. Met. Metallogr.* **40**, 1295–1299 (1975).
- [44] V.G. Baryakhtar, I.M. Vitebsky, and D.A. Yablonsky, Theory of creation of nuclei at magnetic first order phase transition between paramagnetic and magneto-ordered phases, *Phys. Solid State.* **19**, 347–352 (1977).
- [45] M. Goldman, Nuclear dipolar magnetic ordering, *Phys. Rep.* **32**, 1–47 (1977).
- [46] H. Reimann, H. Hagen, F. Waldner, and H. Arend, Observation of excitation of the anti-ferromagnetic mode in the paramagnetic state of $(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{NH}_3)_2\text{CuCl}_4$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 1344–1346 (1978).
- [47] S. Bhargava and N. Zeeman, Mössbauer study of $\text{Ni}_{0.25}\text{Zn}_{0.75}\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_4$: spin fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. B* **21**, 1717–1724 (1980).
- [48] T.M. Uen and P.K. Tseng, Mössbauer-effect studies on the magnetic properties of the Ni-Zn-ferrite system, *Phys. Rev. B* **25**, 1848–1859 (1982).
- [49] J. Srivastava, K. Muraleedharan, and R. Vijayaraghavan, On anomalous Mössbauer spectra in spinel ferrites, *Phys. Lett. A* **104**, 482–486 (1984).
- [50] B. Hälg, A. Furrer, and O. Vogt, Coexistence of different short-range-ordered spin fluctuations in $\text{Ce}_{1-x}(\text{LaY})_x\text{Sb}$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 1388–1391 (1985).

- [51] J.W. Lynn, Temperature dependence of the magnetic excitations in iron, *Phys. Rev. B* **11**, 2624–2637 (1975).
- [52] S.H. Liu, Magnetic excitations above the critical temperature, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 2979–2985 (1976).
- [53] J.W. Lynn and H.A. Mook, Temperature dependence of the dynamic susceptibility of nickel, *Phys. Rev. B* **23**, 198–206 (1981).
- [54] J.W. Cable, R.M. Nicklow, and N. Wakabayashi, Temperature dependence of the magnetic excitations in gadolinium, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 1710–1719 (1986).
- [55] J.W. Lynn and H.A. Mook, Nature of the magnetic excitations above T_c in Ni and Fe, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **54**, 1169–1170 (1986).
- [56] J.W. Cable and R.M. Nicklow, Spin dynamics of Gd at high temperatures, *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 11732–11741 (1989).
- [57] T. Goto, T. Sakakabara, and M. Yamaguchi, Coexistence of nonmagnetic and ferromagnetic Co in Y_2Co_7 and YCo_3 hydrides, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **54**, 1085–1086 (1986).
- [58] A. Shinogi, T. Saito, and K. Endo, Coexistence of nonmagnetic and magnetic Co in cubic Laves phase compounds $Lu(Co_{1-x}Al_x)_2$, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **56**, 2633–2636 (1987).
- [59] M. Jaime, P. Lin, S.H. Chun, M.B. Salamon, P. Dorsey, and M. Rubinshtein, Coexistence of localized and itinerant carriers near T_C in calcium-doped manganites, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 1028–1032 (1999).
- [60] R.D. Merithew, M.B. Weissman, F.M. Hess, P. Spradling, E.R. Nowak, J. O’Donnell, J.M. Ekstein, Y. Tokura, and Y. Tomioka, Mesoscopic thermodynamics of an inhomogeneous colossal-magneto-resistive phase, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 3442–3445 (2000).
- [61] J. Baio, G. Barucca, R. Caciuffo, D. Rinaldi, J. Mira, J. Rivas, M.A. Senaris-Rodriguez, and D. Fiorani, Phase separation, thermal history and magnetic behavior of Sr doped $LaCoO_3$, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **12**, 9761–9770 (2000).
- [62] J.R. Sun, B.G. Shen, J. Gao, Y. Fei, and Y.P. Nie, Presence of a paramagnetic phase well below the ferromagnetic onset in $La_{0.67-x}Bi_xCa_{0.33}MnO_3$, *Eur. Phys. Lett.* **62**, 732–738 (2003).
- [63] I. Batko, M. Batkova, V.H. Tran, U. Keiderling, and V.B. Filipov, Evidence for magnetic phase separation in colossal magnetoresistance compound $EuB_{5.99}C_{0.01}$, *Solid State Commun.* **190**, 23–27 (2014).
- [64] M. Gabay and G. Toulouse, Coexistence of spin-glass and ferromagnetic orderings, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 201–203 (1981).
- [65] T.D. Cheung and J.S. Kouvel, Spin-glass-like distribution of interaction fields in Pd-Ni alloys, *Phys. Rev. B* **28**, 3831–3837 (1983).

- [66] W. Abdul-Razzaq and J.S. Kouvel, Spin glassiness and ferromagnetism in disordered Ni-Mn, *J. Appl. Phys.* **55**, 1623–1627 (1984).
- [67] L.I. Koroleva and A.I. Kuzminich, Spin-glass state and its suppression by indirect exchange through current carriers in the system of solid solutions, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **84**, 1882–1886 (1983).
- [68] M. Matsuda, M. Fujita, K. Yamado, R. Birgeneau, Y. Endoh, and G. Shirane, Electronic phase separation in lightly doped $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 134515 (2002).
- [69] R.W. Li, J.R. Sun, Q.A. Li, S.Y. Zhang, and B.G. Shen, Structure, magnetic properties and phase separation of $\text{Nd}_{0.5}\text{Ca}_{0.5}\text{Mn}_{1-x}\text{Ga}_x\text{O}_3$ ($0 \leq x \leq 0.1$), *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **265**, 248–256 (2003).
- [70] K. Emmerich, E. Lippelt, R. Neuhaus, H. Pinkvos, C. Schwink, F.N. Gygax, A. Hintermann, A. Schenck, W. Studer, and A.J. van der Wal, Experimental evidence for spatial inhomogeneous spin freezing in CuMn, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 7226–7232 (1988).
- [71] K.P. Belov, A.K. Zvezdin, A.M. Kadomtseva, and R.Z. Levitin, Spin-reorientation transitions in rare-earth magnets, *Phys. Usp.* **19**, 574–596 (1976).
- [72] H. Miwa, Phase diagram of random mixtures of antiferromagnets with competing anisotropy, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **34**, 1455–1456 (1983).
- [73] G. Balestrino, F. Scarinci, and A. Tucciarone, Magnetic phase transitions in $\text{YIG}(\text{Ru}^{4+})$, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **44**, 249–253 (1984).
- [74] M.W. Long, Spontaneous local symmetry breaking in frustrated antiferromagnets: Non-collinear impurities in MnCu alloys, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **2**, 5383–5402 (1990).
- [75] A.I. Belyaeva, Y.N. Stelmakov, and V.A. Potakova, Visual study of spin reorientation phenomenon in DyFeO_3 near the Morin temperature, *Phys. Solid State* **19**, 3124–3129 (1977).
- [76] H.E. Cook, Droplet model for central phonon peaks, *Phys. Rev. B* **15**, 1477–1488 (1977).
- [77] A. Rigamonti and G. Brookeman, ^{35}Cl nuclear quadrupole resonance study of the ferroelectric transition in HCl and in the mixed crystals HCl-DCl, *Phys. Rev. B* **21**, 2681–2694 (1980).
- [78] J. Brookeman and A. Rigamonti, Pretransitional clusters and heterophase fluctuations at first-order phase transitions in crystals, *Phys. Rev. B* **24**, 4925–4930 (1981).
- [79] A.D. Bruce and R.A. Cowley, *Structural Phase Transitions* (Taylor and Francis, London, 1981).
- [80] A. Gordon and J. Genossar, Precursor order clusters at ferroelectric phase transitions, *Physica B*, **125**, 53–62 (1984).
- [81] A. Gordon, Heterophase fluctuations in ferroelectrics, *J. Phys. C* **20**, L111–L114 (1987).

- [82] K.A. Müller and T. Thomas, Eds., *Structural Phase Transitions* (Springer, Berlin, 1991).
- [83] V.G. Bhide and M.S. Multani, Mössbauer effect in ferroelectric BaTiO₃, Phys. Rev. A **139**, 1983–1990 (1965).
- [84] V.A. Bokov, V.P. Romanov, and V.V. Chekin, The Mössbauer effect on Sn¹¹⁹ in case of ferroelectric phase transition in Ba(Ti_{0.8}Sn_{0.2})O₃ solid solution, Phys. Solid State **7**, 1886–1891 (1965).
- [85] T.G. Gleason and J.C. Walker, Mössbauer effect study of the ferroelectric transitions in Potassium Ferrocyanide Trihydrate and Ferric Ammonium Sulfate Dodecahydrate, Phys. Rev. B **188**, 893–897 (1969).
- [86] A.P. Jain, S.N. Shringi, and M.L. Sharma, Temperature-dependent optical mode in antiferroelectric PbZrO₃ by the Mössbauer effect, Phys. Rev. B **2**, 2756–2759 (1970).
- [87] J. Canner, C. Yagnik, R. Gerson, and W. James, Mössbauer-effect studies of the phase transition in antiferroelectric PbZrO₃ and ferroelectric PbTi_{0.02}Zr_{0.2}O₃, J. Appl. Phys. **42**, 4708–4712 (1971).
- [88] V.G. Bhide and M.S. Hegde, Mössbauer effect for Fe⁵⁷ in ferroelectric Lead Titanate, Phys. Rev. B **5** 3488–3498 (1972).
- [89] I.P. Suzdalev, *Dynamical Effects in Gamma-Resonance Spectroscopy* (Atomizdat, Moscow, 1979).
- [90] O. Nikolov, T. Ruskov, T. Tomov, A. Kadomtseva, I. Krinetskii, and M. Lukina, Gallium substitution for Fe³⁺ ions and its influence on the phase transitions in dysprosium orthoferrite, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **44**, 181–186 (1984).
- [91] I. Dezsi, L. Keszthelyi, B. Molnar, and L. Pocs, Mössbauer effect study of phase transition in ice, Phys. Lett. **18**, 28–29 (1965).
- [92] V.A. Tsurin, N.P. Filippova, A.M. Sorkin, L.Y. Kobelev, L.L. Nugaeva, and A.P. Stepanov, Mossbauer-spectrum temperature-dependence anomalies of YBa₂Cu₃O_{9-y}, JETP Lett. **46**, 459–461 (1987).
- [93] V.M. Cherepanov, M.A. Chuev, S.S. Yakimov, V.Y. Goncharov, and S.A. Smirnov, Anomalous behavior of the temperature dependence of the parameters of the Mossbauer spectra of the superconducting ceramics YBa₂Cu_{2.95}Fe_{0.05}O_{7-y}, JETP Lett. **47**, 424–427 (1988).
- [94] V.M. Cherepanov, M.A. Chuev, S.S. Yakimov, V.Y. Goncharov, S.A. Smirnov, and A.A. Bush, Anomalies in the temperature dependence of the Mossbauer-effect probability for impurity tin nuclei in a 1–2–3 superconducting ceramic, JETP Lett. **49**, 435–438 (1989).
- [95] V.M. Cherepanov, M.A. Chuev, S.S. Yakimov, and V.Y. Goncharov, Phonon spectrum softening near temperatures of superconducting and structural transitions in HTSC 1–2–3 Ceramics, Hyperf. Interact. **65**, 1257–1260 (1990).

- [96] V.E. Egorushkin, A.I. Lotkov, and S.V. Anokhin, Physical nature of the anomalies in the temperature dependence of the probability of the Mössbauer effect near phase transitions, *Russ. Phys. J.* **34**, 997–999 (1991).
- [97] I. Nowik, E. Bauminger, S. Cohen, and S. Ofer, Spectral shapes of Mössbauer absorption and incoherent neutron scattering from harmonically bound nuclei in Brownian motion: Applications to macromolecular systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 2291–2299 (1985).
- [98] B.N. Eselson, V.N. Grigoriev, V.G. Ivantsov, E.Y. Rudavsky, D.G. Sanikidze, and I.A. Serbin, *Solutions of Quantum Liquids He³-He⁴* (Nauka, Moscow, 1973).
- [99] B.N. Eselson, V.G. Ivantsov, V.A. Koval, E.Y. Rudavsky, and I.A. Serbin, *Properties of Liquid and Solid Helium* (Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1982).
- [100] A.T. Kosilov, Dissipative properties of materials with thermoelastic martensite conversion, *Russ. Phys. J.* **28**, 380–389 (1985).
- [101] V.G. Pushin, V.V. Kondrat'ev, and V.N. Khachin, Pretransformation phenomena and martensitic transformations in titanium nickelide alloys, *Russ. Phys. J.* **28**, 341–355 (1985).
- [102] A. Gibaud, A. Bulou, A. Le Bail, J. Nouet, and C. Zeyen, A premartensitic phase in KAlF₄: Neutron and x-ray scattering evidence, *J. Phys. (Paris)* **48**, 1521–1532 (1987).
- [103] G. Van Tendeloo, D. Broddin, C. Leroux, D. Schryvers, L. Tanner, J. Van Landuyt, and S. Amelindex, Electron microscopy observations of pretransitional effects in alloys, *Phase Trans.* **27**, 61–71 (1990).
- [104] V.J. Emery, S.A. Kivelson, and H.Q. Lin, Phase separation in the t-J model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 475–478 (1990).
- [105] J.R. Morris and R.J. Gooding, Exactly solvable heterophase fluctuations at a vibrational-entropy-driven first-order transition, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1769–1772 (1990).
- [106] X. Zhu, H. Zabel, I. Robinson, E. Vieg, J. Dura, and C. Flynn, Surface-induced heterophase fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 2692–2695 (1990).
- [107] A. Gibaud, S. Shapiro, J. Nouet, and H. Yoo, Phase diagram of KMn_{1-x}Ca_xF₃ ($x < 0.05$) determined by high-resolution x-ray scattering, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, 2437–2443 (1991).
- [108] V.A. Kizel and S.I. Panin, Fluctuation phenomena under melting of holesteric mesophase of liquid crystals, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **66**, 105–112 (1987).
- [109] M. Volmer, *Kinetik der Phasenbildung* (Steinkopff, Dresden, 1939).
- [110] V.A. Akulichev, *Cavitation in Cryogenic and Boiling Liquids* (Nauka, Moscow, 1978).
- [111] J. Kertész, Existence of weak singularities when going around the liquid-gas critical point, *Physica A* **161**, 58–62 (1989).
- [112] O. Bakai, Mesoscopic equation of state of the heterophase fluid and its application to description of the liquid-gas asymmetry, *J. Mol. Liq.* **235**, 135–148 (2017).

- [113] O. Bakai, M. Bratchenko, and S. Dyuldy, Three-state mesoscopic model of a heterophase fluid in application to the gas-liquid and dielectric-semiconductor-metal transformations in expanded mercury, *J. Mol. Liq.* **260**, 245–260 (2018).
- [114] O. Bakai, M. Bratchenko, and S. Dyuldy, On the singularity of the liquid-gas coexistence curve diameter, *Ukr. J. Phys.* **65**, 802–809 (2020).
- [115] O. Bakai, The van der Waals idea of pseudo associations and the critical compressibility factor, *Condens. Matter Phys.* **23**, 13603 (2020).
- [116] T.M. Rice, J.C. Hensel, T.G. Phillips, and G.A. Thomas, *Electron-Hole Liquid in Semiconductors* (Academic, New York, 1977).
- [117] D. Exerowa and D. Kashchiev, Hole-mediated stability and permeability of bilayers, *Contemp. Phys.* **27**, 429–461 (1986).
- [118] K. Kelton and A.L. Greer, *Nucleation in Condensed Matter: Applications in Materials and Biology* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2010).
- [119] V.G. Dubrovskii, *Nucleation Theory and Growth of Nanostructures* (Springer, Berlin, 2014).
- [120] W.C. Röntgen, Ueber die Constitution des flüssigen Wassers, *Ann. Phys. (Berlin)* **45**, 91–97 (1892).
- [121] V.E. Brody, On the theory of specific heat in the vicinity of transition points, *Phys. Zeit.* **23**, 197–202 (1922).
- [122] J.D. Bernal and R.H. Fowler, A theory of water and ionic solution with particular reference to Hydrogen and Hydroxyl ions, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1**, 515–548 (1933).
- [123] G.M. Bartenev, On the theory of anomalous phenomena in the vicinity of melting points, *Russ. J. Phys. Chem.* **22**, 587–592 (1948).
- [124] G.M. Bartenev, Thermal expansion near melting points, *Russ. J. Phys. Chem.* **23**, 1075–1079 (1948).
- [125] G.M. Bartenev, Specific heat near melting points, *Russ. J. Phys. Chem.* **24**, 1016–1020 (1950).
- [126] G.M. Bartenev, Elasticity of crystals near melting points, *Russ. J. Phys. Chem.* **24**, 1437–1441 (1950).
- [127] I.Z. Fisher, *Statistical Theory of Liquids* (Chicago University, Chicago, 1964).
- [128] O.Y. Samoilov, *Structure of Aqueous Electrolyte Solutions and the Hydration of Ions* (Consultants Bureau, New York, 1965).
- [129] N. Dass and N. Gilra, Refractive index of liquids on supercooling water, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **21**, 2039–2042 (1966).

- [130] N.K. Gilra, Precrystallization theory applied to ultrasonic velocity in supercooled water, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **23**, 1431–1431 (1967).
- [131] N. Gilra and N. Dass, Precrystallization theory applied to surface-free energy of the water-ice interface, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **24**, 910–912 (1968).
- [132] N.K. Gilra, Homogeneous nucleation temperature of supercooled water, *Phys. Lett. A* **28**, 51–52 (1968).
- [133] N.H. Fletcher, *The Chemical Physics of Ice* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1970).
- [134] V.P. Skripov and V.P. Koverda, *Spontaneous Crystallization of Supercooled Liquids* (Nauka, Moscow, 1984).
- [135] W. Hayes, Premelting, *Contemp. Phys.* **27**, 519–532 (1986).
- [136] S.P. Gabuda and A.G. Lundin, *Internal Mobility of Solids* (Nauka, Novosibirsk, 1986).
- [137] D.H. Rasmussen and A.P. MacKenzie, Clustering in supercooled water, *J. Chem. Phys.* **59**, 5003–5013 (1973).
- [138] R.J. Speedy and C.A. Angell, Isothermal compressibility of supercooled water and evidence for a thermodynamic singularity at -45 C, *J. Chem. Phys.* **65**, 851–858 (1976).
- [139] E. Trinh and R. Apfel, The sound velocity in metastable liquid water under atmospheric pressure, *J. Chem. Phys.* **69**, 4245–4251 (1978).
- [140] G. D’Arrigo, Sound propagation in moderately supercooled liquids: A comparison with water, *J. Chem. Phys.* **75**, 921–928 (1981).
- [141] G. D’Arrigo, Heterophase fluctuations and thermodynamic properties in supercooled water, *Nuovo Cimento B* **61**, 123–140 (1981).
- [142] A.R. Ubbelohde, *The Molten State of Matter* (Wiley, New York, 1978).
- [143] J.M. Ziman, *Models of Disorder* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1979).
- [144] M. Wadati, Quantum field theory of crystals and extended objects, *Phys. Rep.* **50**, 87–155 (1979).
- [145] F. Borsa, M. Corti, A. Rigamonti, and S. Torre, Diffusion and phononlike excitations in intercalated graphite from ^{133}Cs NMR and relaxation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 2102–2105 (1984).
- [146] B. Steffen and R. Hosemann, Paracrystalline microdomains in monoatomic liquids: Three-dimensional structure of microdomains in liquid lead, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 3232–3238 (1976).
- [147] M.A. Anisimov, *Critical Phenomena in Liquids and Liquid Crystals* (Gordon and Breach, Philadelphia, 1991).

- [148] J.H. Bilgram, Dynamics at the liquid transition: Experiments at the freezing point, *Phys. Rep.* **153**, 1–89 (1987).
- [149] M. Fontana, F. Brehat, and B. Wyncke, A central peak as a premelting feature in NaNO_3 spectra, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **2**, 9125–9132 (1990).
- [150] J. Rousset, E. Duval, and A Boukenter, Dynamical structure of water: Low-frequency Raman scattering from a disordered network and aggregates, *J. Chem. Phys.* **92**, 2150–2154 (1990).
- [151] J. Barker and D. Henderson, What is liquid? Understanding the states of matter, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **48**, 587–672 (1976).
- [152] A.N. Lagarkov and V.M. Sergeev, Molecular dynamics method in statistical physics, *Phys. Usp.* **21**, 566–588 (1978).
- [153] P. Choquard and J. Clerouin, Cooperative phenomena below melting of the one-component two-dimensional plasma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 2086–2089 (1983).
- [154] Y. Hiwatary, Free volumes and liquidlike clusters in soft-core liquids and glasses, *J. Chem. Phys.* **76**, 5502–5507 (1982).
- [155] S.M. Stishov, Entropy, disorder, melting, *Phys. Usp.* **31**, 52–67 (1988).
- [156] J.A. Zollweg and G.V. Chester, Melting in two dimensions, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 11186–11189 (1992).
- [157] J.M. Kosterlitz and D.J. Thouless, Two-dimensional physics, *Prog. Low Temp. Phys. B* **7**, 373–433 (1978).
- [158] M.N. Barber, Phase transitions in two dimensions, *Phys. Rep.* **59**, 375–409 (1980).
- [159] E.A. Stern and K. Zhang, Local premelting about impurities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1872–1875 (1988).
- [160] H. Schechter, E.A. Stern, Y. Yacoby, R. Brenner, and Z. Zhang, Anomalous local hopping of Sn impurities in lead, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 1400–1403 (1989).
- [161] E.A. Stern, P. Livins, and Z. Zhang, Thermal vibration and melting from a local perspective, *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 8850–8860 (1991).
- [162] M. Cohen and J. Jortner, Inhomogeneous transport regime in disordered materials, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30**, 699–702 (1973).
- [163] M. Cohen and J. Jortner, Conduction regimes in expanded liquid mercury, *Phys. Rev. A* **10**, 978–996 (1974).
- [164] J. Jortner and M. Cohen, Metal-nonmetal transition in metal-ammonia solutions, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 1548–1568 (1976).
- [165] M. Cohen and J. Jortner, Electronic structure and transport in liquid Te, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 5255–5260 (1976).

- [166] Y. Tsuchya, S. Takeda, S. Tamaki, Y. Waseda, and E. Seymour, Evidence for structural inhomogeneity in liquid In_2Te_3 , *J. Phys. C* **15**, 2561–2575 (1982).
- [167] Y. Tsuchiya and E. Seymour, Thermodynamic properties of the selenium-tellurium system, *J. Phys. C* **15**, L687–L695 (1982).
- [168] Y. Tsuchya, S. Takeda, S. Tamaki, and E. Seymour, Structural inhomogeneity and valence fluctuations in IIIb-Te liquid semiconductors, *J. Phys. C* **15**, 6497–6512 (1982).
- [169] D. Chandra, Anomalous volume expansion in $\text{Hg}_{1-x}\text{Cd}_x\text{Te}$ melts: An analysis employing the inhomogeneous structure model, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 7206–7212 (1985).
- [170] S. Takeda, H. Okazaki, and S. Tamaki, Shottky-type specific heat in liquid Se-Te alloys, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 7452–7454 (1985).
- [171] A.R. Regel, V.M. Galzov, and S.G. Kim, Acoustic study of structural variations under the heating of semiconductor and semimetal melts, *Phys. Techn. Semicond.* **20**, 1353–1357 (1986).
- [172] G.V. Loseva, S.G. Ovchinnikov, and G.A. Petrakovsky, *Metal-Dielectric Transition in Sulfides of 3d-Metals* (Nauka, Novosibirsk, 1983).
- [173] G.E. Lopez and D.L. Freeman, A study of low temperature heat capacity anomalies in bimetallic alloy clusters using J-walking Monte Carlo methods, *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 1428–1435 (1993).
- [174] P. Gao, T.A. Tyson, Z. Liu, M.A. DeLeon, and C. Dubourdieu, Optical evidence for mixed phase behavior in manganites films, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 220404 (2008).
- [175] C.J. Gorter, The two fluid model for superconductors and Helium II, *Prog. Low Temp. Phys.* **1**, 1–16 (1955).
- [176] J.R. Schrieffer, *Theory of Superconductivity* (Benjamin, New York, 1964).
- [177] E.A. Lynton, *Superconductivity* (Methuen, London, 1969).
- [178] V.I. Yukalov, Basics of Bose-Einstein condensation, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **42**, 460–513 (2011).
- [179] V.I. Yukalov, Theory of cold atoms: Bose-Einstein statistics, *Laser Phys.* **26**, 062001 (2016).
- [180] V. Hizhnyakov and E. Sigmund, High- T_c superconductivity induced by ferromagnetic clustering, *Physica C* **156**, 655–666 (1988).
- [181] J.C. Phillips, *Physics of High- T_c Superconductors* (Academic, Boston, 1989).
- [182] V. Hizhnyakov, E. Sigmund, and M. Schneider, Magnetic interactions and dynamics of holes in CuO_2 planes of high- T_c superconducting materials, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, 795–800 (1991).
- [183] G. Benedek and K.A. Müller, Eds., *Phase Separation in Cuprate Superconductors* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).

- [184] E. Sigmund and K.A. Müller, Eds., *Phase Separation in Cuprate Superconductors* (Springer, Berlin, 1994).
- [185] S.A. Kivelson, I.P. Bindloss, E. Fradkin, V. Oganesyan, J.M. Tranquada, A. Kapitulnik, and C. Howald, How to detect fluctuating stripes in the high-temperature superconductors, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 1201–1242 (2003).
- [186] L.P. Gorkov and A.V. Sokol, Phase stratification of an electron liquid in the new superconductors, *JETP Letters* **46**, 420–423 (1987).
- [187] J.I. Spielberg and E. Gelerinter, Further studies on the molecular dynamics of the glass transition and the glass state using EPR probes, *Phys. Rev. B* **30**, 2319–2323 (1984).
- [188] M.I. Klinger, Soft atomic configurations, medium-range order and universal properties of glasses, *Comments Condens. Matter Phys.* **16**, 137–152 (1992).
- [189] A.S. Bakai and E.W. Fischer, Nature of long-range correlations of density fluctuations in glass-forming liquids, *J. Chem. Phys.* **120**, 5235–5252 (2004).
- [190] A.S. Bakai, On low-temperature polyamorphous transformations, *Low Temp. Phys.* **32**, 868–876 (2006).
- [191] N. Lazarev and A. Bakai, Theoretical strength and homogeneous sliding in metallic glass: Exactly solvable model, *J. Mech. Behav. Mater.* **22**, 119–128 (2013).
- [192] B.I. Ivlev and N.B. Kopnin, Theory of current states in narrow superconductor channels, *Phys. Usp.* **27**, 206–227 (1984).
- [193] M.I. Rabinovich and M.M. Sushchik, The regular and chaotic dynamics of structures in fluid flows, *Phys. Usp.* **33**, 1–35 (1990).
- [194] V.I. Yukalov, Turbulent superfluid as continuous vortex mixture, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **7**, 467–476 (2010).
- [195] R.F. Shiozaki, G.D. Telles, V.I. Yukalov, and V.S. Bagnato, Transition to quantum turbulence in finite-size superfluids, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **8**, 393–397 (2011).
- [196] J.A. Seman, E.A.L. Henn, R.F. Shiozaki, G. Roati, F.J. Poveda-Cuevas, K.M.F. Magalhães, V.I. Yukalov, M. Tsubota, M. Kobayashi, K. Kasamatsu, and V.S. Bagnato, Route to turbulence in a trapped Bose-Einstein condensate, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **8**, 691–696 (2011).
- [197] V.S. Bagnato and V.I. Yukalov, From coherent modes to turbulence and granulation of trapped gases, *Porg. Opt. Sci. Photon.* **1**, 377–401 (2013).
- [198] V.I. Yukalov, A.N. Novikov, and V.S. Bagnato, Formation of granular structures in trapped Bose-Einstein condensates under oscillatory excitations, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **11**, 095501 (2014).
- [199] V.I. Yukalov, A.N. Novikov, and V.S. Bagnato, Strongly nonequilibrium Bose-condensed atomic systems, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **180**, 53–67 (2015).

- [200] V.I. Yukalov, A.N. Novikov, and V.S. Bagnato, Realization of inverse Kibble-Zurek scenario with trapped Bose gases, *Phys. Lett. A* **379**, 1366–1371 (2015).
- [201] V.I. Yukalov, A.N. Novikov, and V.S. Bagnato, Characterization of nonequilibrium states of trapped Bose-Einstein condensates, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **15**, 065501 (2018).
- [202] V.I. Yukalov, A.N. Novikov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, Characteristic quantities for nonequilibrium Bose systems, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **1508**, 012006 (2020).
- [203] L. Boltzmann, *Lectures on Gas Theory* (University of California, Berkeley, 1964).
- [204] Y.I. Neimark and P.S. Landa, *Stochastic and Chaotic Oscillations* (Springer, Dordrecht, 1992).
- [205] J.I. Neimark, *Mathematical Models in Natural Science and Engineering* (Springer, Berlin, 2003).
- [206] V.I. Yukalov, Stochastic instability of quasi-isolated systems, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 056118 (2002).
- [207] V.I. Yukalov, Irreversibility of time for quasi-isolated systems, *Phys. Lett. A* **308**, 313–318 (2003).
- [208] V.I. Yukalov, Expansion exponents for nonequilibrium systems, *Physica A* **320**, 149–168 (2003).
- [209] V.I. Yukalov, Decoherence and equilibration under nondestructive measurements, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **327**, 253–263 (2012).
- [210] V.I. Yukalov, Existence of a wave function for a subsystem, *Moscow Univ. Phys. Bull.* **25**, 49–53 (1970).
- [211] V.I. Yukalov, Concept of distinctness for quantum subsystems, *Moscow Univ. Phys. Bull.* **26**, 22–26 (1971).
- [212] V.I. Yukalov, Spontaneous restoration of broken symmetry, *Phys. Lett. A* **85**, 68–71 (1981).
- [213] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics* (Benjamin, New York, 1969).
- [214] J. Dixmier, *Les C^* -Algebres et Leurs Representations* (Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1969).
- [215] G.G. Emch, *Algebraic Methods in Statistical Mechanics and Quantum Field Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1972).
- [216] O. Bratteli and D. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (Springer, New York, 1979).
- [217] V.I. Yukalov, Matrix order indices in statistical mechanics, *Physica A* **310**, 413–434 (2002).

- [218] V.I. Yukalov, Order indices and entanglement production in quantum systems, *Entropy* **22**, 565 (2020).
- [219] N.N. Bogolubov, *Lectures on Quantum Statistics* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1967), Vol. **1**.
- [220] N.N. Bogolubov, *Lectures on Quantum Statistics* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1970), Vol. **2**.
- [221] N.N. Bogolubov, *Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2015).
- [222] V.I. Yukalov, Statistical theory of heterophase fluctuations, *Physica A* **108**, 402–416 (1981).
- [223] V.I. Yukalov, Method of thermodynamic quasiaverages, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **5**, 3235–3253 (1991).
- [224] R. Brout, *Phase Transitions* (Benjamin, New York, 1965).
- [225] G.L. Sewell, Stability, equilibrium and metastability in statistical mechanics, *Phys. Rep.* **57**, 307–342 (1980).
- [226] Y.G. Sinai, *Theory of Phase Transitions* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1982).
- [227] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, Spontaneous symmetry breaking and critical phenomena, in *International School on High Energy Physics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1983), pp. 223–313.
- [228] N.N. Bogolubov, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, The concept of quasiaverages and spaces of states, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **60**, 921–931 (1984).
- [229] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, *Phase States and Transitions* (JINR, Dubna, 1985).
- [230] V.I. Yukalov, Methods for breaking the symmetry of statistical systems, in *Current Group Analysis*, Ed. by F.G. Maksudov and K.A. Rustamov (Elm, Baku, 1989), pp. 250–258.
- [231] J.W. Gibbs, *Collected Works* (Longmans, New York, 1928).
- [232] S. Ono and S. Kondo, *Molecular Theory of Surface Tension in Liquids* (Springer, Berlin, 1960).
- [233] A.I. Rusanov, Thermodynamics of solid surfaces, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* **23**, 173–247 (1996).
- [234] A.I. Rusanov, Surface thermodynamics revisited, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* **37**, 111–239 (2005).
- [235] N. Bourbaki, *Théorie des Ensembles* (Hermann, Paris, 1958).
- [236] S. Kullback and R.A. Leibler, On information and sufficiency, *Ann. Math. Stat.*, **22**, 79–86 (1951).
- [237] S. Kullback, *Information Theory and Statistics* (Wiley, New York, 1959).
- [238] V.I. Yukalov, Remarks on quasiaverages, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **26**, 274–281 (1976).

- [239] V.I. Yukalov, Model of a hybrid crystal, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **28**, 652–660 (1976).
- [240] V.I. Yukalov, Quantum crystal with jumps of particles, *Physica A* **89**, 363–372 (1977).
- [241] V.I. Yukalov, Phase transitions and spontaneous symmetry breaking, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1978), pp. 437–444.
- [242] V.I. Yukalov, A new method in the theory of phase transitions, *Phys. Lett. A* **81**, 249–251 (1981).
- [243] V.I. Yukalov, A method to consider metastable states, *Phys. Lett. A* **81**, 433–435 (1981).
- [244] V.I. Yukalov, Spaces of states for heterophase systems, *Physica A* **110**, 247–256 (1982).
- [245] V.I. Yukalov, Effective Hamiltonians for systems with mixed symmetry, *Physica A* **136**, 575–587 (1986).
- [246] V.I. Yukalov, Renormalization of quasi-Hamiltonians under heterophase averaging, *Phys. Lett. A* **125**, 95–100 (1987).
- [247] V.I. Yukalov, Procedure of quasiaveraging for heterophase mixtures, *Physica A* **141**, 352–374 (1987).
- [248] V.I. Yukalov, Lattice mixtures of fluctuating phases, *Physica A* **144**, 369–389 (1987).
- [249] A.I. Rusanov, Problems of surface thermodynamics, *Pure Appl. Chem.* **64**, 111–124 (1992).
- [250] S. Kjelstrup and D. Bedeaux, *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics of Heterogeneous Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2008).
- [251] D. Bedeaux and S. Kjelstrup, Fluid-fluid interfaces of multi-component mixtures in local equilibrium, *Entropy* **20**, 250 (2018).
- [252] V.I. Yukalov, Phase probabilities as order parameters, in *Current Topics in Statistical Physics*, Ed. by I.R. Yukhnovsky (Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1989), Vol. 2, pp. 114–120.
- [253] V.I. Yukalov, Additional order parameters for heterogeneous systems, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by A.A. Logunov (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), pp. 298–312.
- [254] V.I. Yukalov and A.S. Shumovsky, *Lectures on Phase Transitions* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).
- [255] A.J. Coleman and V.I. Yukalov, Order indices and mid-range order, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* **5**, 1679–1686 (1991).
- [256] A.J. Coleman and V.I. Yukalov, *Reduced Density Matrices* (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
- [257] W. Heisenberg, On the theory of ferromagnetism, *Zeitschr. Phys.* **49**, 619–636 (1928).
- [258] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, An exactly solvable model of a ferromagnet with paramagnetic nuclei, *Dokl. Phys.* **25**, 361–363 (1980).

- [259] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, On specific heat anomalies in magnets, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **83**, 582–584 (1981).
- [260] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, Problem of description of heterophase fluctuations at phase transitions, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1981), pp. 238–260.
- [261] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, Exact solutions for heterophase ferromagnets, *Physica A* **110**, 518–534 (1982).
- [262] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, Equilibrium nucleation: A new type of phase transition, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **117**, 617–621 (1985).
- [263] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, Heterophase states in physical systems, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **16**, 569–592 (1985).
- [264] I. Lawrie and S. Sarbach, Theory of tricritical points, *Phase Trans. Crit. Phenom.* **9**, 2–163 (1984).
- [265] V.I. Yukalov, Tricritical phenomena in strongly fluctuating systems, in *Statistical Mechanics and Theory of Phase Transitions*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (Samara University, Samara, 1989), pp. 12–20.
- [266] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Zeroth-order nucleation transition under nanoscale phase separation, *Symmetry* **13**, 2379 (2021).
- [267] V.I. Yukalov, On the difference between homophase and heterophase fluctuations, in *Problems of Statistical Physics and Field Theory*, Ed. by Y.I. Zaparovanny (Moscow University, Moscow, 1987).
- [268] S.V. Tyablikov, *Methods in the Quantum Theory of Magnetism* (Springer, New York, 1967).
- [269] A.I. Akhiezer, V.G. Baryakhtar, and S.V. Peletminskii, *Spin Waves* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968).
- [270] V.I. Yukalov, Interplay between mesoscopic and microscopic fluctuations in ferromagnets, *Physica A* **262**, 467–482 (1999).
- [271] L.P. Kadanoff and G. Baym, *Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (Benjamin, New York, 1962).
- [272] V.L. Bonch-Bruевич and S.V. Tyablikov, *The Green Function Method in Statistical Mechanics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1962).
- [273] V.I. Yukalov, *Statistical Green's Functions* (Queen's University, Kingston, 1998).
- [274] V.B. Kisilinsky, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, Metastable heterophase system of the Ising type. *Phys. Lett. A* **109**, 254–256 (1985).
- [275] L. Onsager, Crystal statistics: A two-dimensional model with an order-disorder transition, *Phys. Rev.* **65**, 117–149, (1944).

- [276] J.F. Nagle, Ising chain with competing interactions, *Phys. Rev. A* **2**, 2124–2128 (1970).
- [277] V.B. Kislinsky and V.I. Yukalov, Crossover between short- and long-range interactions in the one-dimensional Ising model, *J. Phys. A* **21**, 227–232 (1988).
- [278] V.I. Yukalov, Stabilizing role of mesoscopic fluctuations in spin systems, *Physica A* **261**, 482–498 (1998).
- [279] I.K. Kudryavtsev, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, On a model of hybrid antiferromagnet, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1981), pp. 318–325.
- [280] M.A. Boky, I.K. Kudryavtsev, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, Model of antiferromagnet with heterophase fluctuations, *Fizika* **19**, 263–284 (1987).
- [281] M.A. Boky, I.K. Kudryavtsev, and V.I. Yukalov, Critical temperature in heterophase Hubbard model, *Solid State Commun.* **63**, 731–735 (1987).
- [282] M.A. Boky and V.I. Yukalov, Generalization of the Vonsovsky-Ziener model for heterogeneous systems, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1984), Vol. **1**, pp. 170–176.
- [283] S.V. Vonsovsky, *Magnetism* (Wiley, New York, 1974).
- [284] V.Y. Irchin, S.V. Vonsovsky and a contemporary model description of magnetism, *Phys. Met. Metallogr.* **110**, 602–641 (2010).
- [285] D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, Solvable model of a spin-glass, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 1792–1795 (1975).
- [286] S. Kirkpatrick and D. Sherrington, Infinite-ranged models of spin-glasses, *Phys. Rev. B* **17**, 4384–4403 (1978).
- [287] V.B. Kislinsky and V.I. Yukalov, Modified Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model for heterophase spin glass, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1984), Vol. **1**, pp. 344–349.
- [288] S.F. Edwards and P.W. Anderson, Theory of spin glasses, *J. Phys. F* **5**, 965–974 (1975).
- [289] J.R.L. De Almeida and D.J. Thouless, Stability of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick solution of a spin glass model, *J. Phys. A* **11**, 983–990 (1978).
- [290] G. Parisi, The order parameter for spin glasses: A function on the interval 0 – 1, *J. Phys. A* **13**, 1101–1112 (1980).
- [291] A.A. Bakasov and V.I. Yukalov, Microscopic theory of spin reorientations: Heterophase approach and basic model, *Physica A* **157**, 1203–1226 (1989).
- [292] A.A. Bakasov and V.I. Yukalov, Microscopic theory of spin reorientations: Thermodynamics and nucleation phenomenon, *Physica A* **162**, 31–66 (1989).

- [293] V.I. Yukalov, Microscopic theory of spin reorientations: General analysis, *Physica A* **167**, 833–860 (1990).
- [294] A. Bianconi, Superstripes, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **14**, 3289–3297 (2000).
- [295] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, Microscopic model of a superconductor with normal-state nuclei, *Dokl. Phys.* **27**, 709–711 (1982).
- [296] V.I. Yukalov, *On the model of heterophase superconductor* (JINR, Dubna, 1985).
- [297] J.G. Bednorz and K.A. Müller, Possible high T_c super-conductivity in the Ba-La-Cu-O system, *Z. Phys. B* **64**, 189–193 (1986).
- [298] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, Two-fluid superconductor as an example of heterophase systems, *Phys. Many-Part. Syst.* **14**, 24–28 (1988).
- [299] A.S. Shumovsky and V.I. Yukalov, On a new formula for temperature of superconducting transition, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1988), pp. 434–443.
- [300] V.I. Yukalov, Heterostructural fluctuations in superconductors, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **6**, 91–107 (1992).
- [301] A.J. Coleman, E.P. Yukalova, and V.I. Yukalov, Superconductors with mesoscopic phase separation, *Physica C* **243**, 76–92 (1995).
- [302] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Mesoscopic phase separation in anisotropic superconductors, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 224516 (2004).
- [303] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Statistical theory of materials with nanoscale phase separation, *J. Supercond. Nov. Magn.* **27**, 919–924 (2014).
- [304] A.J. Coleman and V.I. Yukalov, Relation between microscopic and macroscopic characteristics of statistical systems, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **10**, 3505–3515 (1996).
- [305] V.I. Yukalov, Theory of cold atoms: Basics of quantum statistics, *Laser Phys.* **23**, 062001 (2013).
- [306] D. Pines, *Elementary Excitations in Solids* (Benjamin, New York, 1963).
- [307] J.M. Ziman, *Principles of the Theory of Solids* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1972).
- [308] J. Bardeen, L.N. Cooper, and J.R. Schrieffer, Microscopic theory of superconductivity, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 162–163 (1957).
- [309] J. Bardeen, L.N. Cooper, and J.R. Schrieffer, Theory of superconductivity, *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 1175–1203 (1957).
- [310] J. Van Harlingen, Phase-sensitive tests of the symmetry of the pairing state in the high-temperature superconductors: Evidence for $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **67**, 515–535 (1995).

- [311] C. Tsuei and J.R. Kirtley, Pairing symmetry in cuprate superconductors, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **72**, 969–1016 (2000).
- [312] V. Kabanov, J. Demsar, B. Podobnik, and D. Mihailovic, Quasiparticle relaxation dynamics in superconductors with different gap structures: Theory and experiments on $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1497–1506 (1999).
- [313] R. Blinc and B. Zeks, *Soft Modes in Ferroelectrics and Antiferroelectrics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1974).
- [314] E.K. Bashkirov and V.I. Yukalov, On microscopic theory of heterophase states in ferroelectrics, in *Selected Topics in Classical and Quantum Physics*, Ed. by Y.I. Granovsky (Samara University, Samara, 1983), pp. 99–107.
- [315] E.K. Bashkirov and V.I. Yukalov, Heterophase phenomena in ferroelectrics, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1984), Vol. 1, pp. 76–82.
- [316] V.I. Yukalov, Heterophase fluctuations in ferroelectrics, *Ferroelectrics* **82**, 11–24 (1988).
- [317] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Nanoscale phase separation in ferroelectric materials, *J. Supercond. Nov. Magn.* **29**, 3119–3126 (2016).
- [318] N. Marzari, A.A. Mostofi, J.R. Yates, I. Souza, and D. Vanderbilt, Maximally localized Wannier functions: Theory and applications, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 1419–1475 (2012).
- [319] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Asymptotic properties of eigenvalues in variational calculations for double-well oscillators, *J. Phys. A* **29**, 6429–6442 (1996).
- [320] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Mesoscopic disorder in double-well optical lattices, *Laser Phys.* **21**, 1448–1458 (2011).
- [321] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Double-well optical lattices with atomic vibrations and mesoscopic disorder, *Laser Phys.* **22**, 1070–1080 (2012).
- [322] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Statistics of multiscale fluctuations in macromolecular systems, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **116**, 8435–8448 (2012).
- [323] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Statistical models of nonequilibrium Bose gases, *Rom. Rep. Phys.* **67**, 159–185 (2015).
- [324] A.M. Akhmeteli, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, Spin-phonon interaction in a model of hybrid ferromagnet, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1981), pp. 300–306.
- [325] V.I. Yukalov, Spin-phonon interactions in heterophase ferromagnets, *Physica A* **155**, 519–544 (1989).
- [326] V.I. Yukalov, Properties of crystals with local symmetry breaking, in *Symmetry and Structural Properties of Condensed Matter*, Ed. by W. Florek, T. Lulek, and M. Mucha (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991), pp. 141–152.

- [327] V.I. Yukalov, Influence of structural fluctuations on the dynamical characteristics of solids, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **229**, 239–243 (1994).
- [328] V.I. Yukalov, Statistical mechanics of structural fluctuations, *Physica A* **213**, 500–524 (1995).
- [329] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Crystal symmetry and time scales, in *Symmetry and Structural Properties of Condensed Matter*, Ed. by T. Lulek, B. Lulek, and A. Wal (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001), pp. 383–393.
- [330] V.I. Yukalov, Destiny of optical lattices with strong intersite interactions, *Laser Phys.* **30**, 015501 (2020).
- [331] V.I. Yukalov, From optical lattices to quantum crystals, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **1508**, 012008 (2020).
- [332] R.A. Guyer, The physics of quantum crystals, *Solid State Phys.* **23**, 413–499 (1969).
- [333] V.G. Bhide and M.S. Multani, Mössbauer effect in ferroelectric BaTiO₃, *Phys. Rev. A* **139**, 1983–1990 (1965).
- [334] V.G. Bhide and G.K. Shenoy, Temperature dependent lifetimes of nonequilibrium Fe⁵⁷ ions in CoO from the Mössbauer effect, *Phys. Rev.* **147**, 306–310 (1966).
- [335] V.G. Bhide and M.S. Hegde, Mössbauer effect for Fe₅₇ in ferroelectric lead titanate, *Phys. Rev. B* **5**, 3488–3499 (1972).
- [336] V.G. Bhide, *Mössbauer Effect and its Applications* (McGraw-Hill, New Delhi, 1973).
- [337] F.G. Owens, C.P. Poole, and H.A. Farrach, Eds. *Magnetic Resonance of Phase Transitions* (Academic, New York, 1979).
- [338] B.V. Thosar and P.K. Iyengar, Eds. *Advances in Mössbauer Spectroscopy: Application to Physics, Chemistry and Biology* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1983).
- [339] A.R. Bishop, S.R. Shenoy, and S. Sridhar, Eds. *Intrinsic Multiscale Structure and Dynamics in Complex Electronic Oxides* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
- [340] T. Egami, and S.J. Billinge, *Underneath the Bragg Peaks* (Pergamon, Amsterdam, 2003).
- [341] K.A. Müller and A. Bussmann-Holder, Eds. *Superconductivity in Complex Systems* (Springer, Berlin, 2004).
- [342] D. Sirdeshmukh, L. Sirdeshmukh, and K.G. Subhadra, *Micro- and Macro-Properties of Solids* (Springer, Berlin, 2006).
- [343] G. Meissner and K. Binder, Debye-Waller factor, compressibility sum rule, and central peak at structural phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. B* **12** 3948–3955 (1975).
- [344] K. Binder, G. Meissner, and H. Mais, Equation of state, Debye-Waller factor, and electrical resistivity of ferroelectrics near their critical point, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 4890–4898 (1976).

- [345] V.I. Yukalov, Mössbauer effect in magnetic materials, in *Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Ed. by N.N. Bogolubov (JINR, Dubna, 1988), pp. 444–467.
- [346] V.I. Yukalov, Mössbauer-effect probability for heterogeneous matters, *Solid State Commun.* **69**, 393–395 (1989).
- [347] V.I. Yukalov, Magnetic anomalies under Mössbauer effect, in *Physics of Transition Metals*, Ed. by V.G. Baryakhtar (Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1989), Vol. 2, pp. 165–168.
- [348] V.I. Yukalov, Collective effects during nuclear gamma-resonance, in *Proceedings of Workshop on Gravitational Wave Emitter and Detector*, Ed. by A.F. Pisarev (JINR, Dubna, 1989), pp. 66–73.
- [349] V.I. Yukalov, Anomalous saggings of Mössbauer effect probability at phase transitions, *Hyperf. Interact.* **55**, 1165–1168 (1990).
- [350] V.I. Yukalov, Influence of radiation damage on Mössbauer effect probability, *Hyperf. Interact.* **56**, 1657–1660 (1990).
- [351] V.I. Yukalov, Mössbauer spectroscopy of heterophase systems, in *Topics in Application of Nuclear Raiiation*, Ed. by Y.F. Babikova (Energoatomizdat, Moscow, 1991), pp. 33–38.
- [352] F.A. Lindemann, The calculation of molecular vibration frequencies, *Z. Phys.* **11**, 609–612 (1910).
- [353] V.I. Yukalov and K. Ziegler, Instability of insulating states in optical lattices due to collective phonon excitations, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 023628 (2015).
- [354] V.I. Yukalov and K. Ziegler, Phonon instability of insulating states in optical lattices, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **691**, 012014 (2016).
- [355] A.H. Cottrell, *Dislocations and Plastic Flow in Crystals* (Oxford University, London, 1953).
- [356] J. Friedel, *Dislocations* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1967).
- [357] J.M. Ziman, *Models of Disorder* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1979).
- [358] J.P. Hirth and J. Lothe, *Theory of Dislocations* (Wiley, New York, 1982).
- [359] D. Hull and D. Bacon, *Introduction to Dislocations* (Elsevier, Oxford, 2001).
- [360] V.I. Yukalov, Properties of solids with pores and cracks, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **3**, 311–326 (1989).
- [361] E.P. Kadantseva and V.I. Yukalov, Thermodynamics of solids with regions of disorder, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **3**, 465–472 (1989).
- [362] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Chaotic lattice-gas model, *Physica A* **213**, 482–499 (1995).

- [363] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Possibility of turbulent crystals, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **15**, 2433–2453 (2001).
- [364] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Optical lattice with heterogeneous atomic density, *Laser Phys.* **25**, 035501 (2015).
- [365] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Statistical theory of structures with extended defects, in *Mechanics and Physics of Structured Media*, Ed. by I. Andrianov, S. Gluzman, and V. Mityushev (Elsevier, London, 2022), pp. 417–443.
- [366] J.O. Hirschfelder, C.F. Curtiss, and R.B. Bird, *Molecular Theory of Gases and Liquids* (Wiley, New York, 1954).
- [367] A.R. Ubbelohde, *Melting and Crystal Structure*, (Oxford University, London, 1965).
- [368] V.I. Yukalov, Theory of melting and crystallization, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 436–446 (1985).
- [369] J.G. Kirkwood, *Quantum Statistics and Cooperative Phenomena* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1965).
- [370] N.N. Bogolubov, On the theory of superfluidity, *J. Phys. (Moscow)* **11**, 23–32 (1947).
- [371] V.I. Yukalov, On the description of quasiparticles by Green functions, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **17**, 1244–1248 (1973).
- [372] V.I. Yukalov, Strongly interacting particles with strongly singular potentials, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **28**, 1237–1254 (1989).
- [373] V.I. Yukalov, Principal problems in Bose-Einstein condensation of dilute gases, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **1**, 435–461 (2004).
- [374] V.I. Yukalov, Statistical systems with nonintegrable interaction potentials, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 012106 (2016).
- [375] A.F. Andreev and I.M. Lifshits, Quantum theory of defects in crystals, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **29**, 1107–1113 (1969).
- [376] G.V. Chester, Speculations on Bose-Einstein condensation and quantum crystals, *Phys. Rev. A* **2**, 256–258 (1970).
- [377] N.N. Bogolubov, *Lectures on Quantum Statistics* (Ryadyanska Shkola, Kiev, 1949).
- [378] E.P. Gross, Unified theory of interacting bosons, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 161–162 (1957).
- [379] E.P. Gross, Classical theory of boson wave fields, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **4**, 57–74 (1958).
- [380] E.P. Gross, Quantum theory of interacting bosons, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **9**, 292–324 (1960).
- [381] E.P. Gross, Periodic ground states in the many-body problem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **4**, 599–601 (1960).
- [382] E.P. Gross, Structure of a quantized vortex in boson systems, *Nuovo Cimento* **20**, 454–477 (1961).

- [383] E.P. Gross, Hydrodynamics of a superfluid condensate, *J. Math. Phys.* **4**, 195–207 (1963).
- [384] D.A. Kirzhnits and Y.A. Nepomnyashchii, Coherent crystallization of quantum liquid, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **32**, 1191–1197 (1971).
- [385] N. Prokof'ev, What makes a crystal supersolid? *Adv. Phys.* **56**, 381–402 (2007).
- [386] A.B. Kuklov, N.V. Prokof'ev, and B.V. Svistunov, How solid is supersolid? *Physics* **4**, 109 (2011).
- [387] M. Boninsegni and N.V. Prokof'ev, Supersolids: What and where are they? *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 759–776 (2012).
- [388] V.I. Yukalov, Saga of superfluid solids, *Physics* **2**, 49–66 (2020).
- [389] D.V. Fil and S.I. Shevchenko, Supersolid induced by dislocations with superfluid cores, *Low Temp. Phys.* **48**, 429–451 (2022).
- [390] V.I. Yukalov, Nonequivalent operator representations for Bose-condensed systems, *Laser Phys.* **16**, 511–525 (2006).
- [391] V.I. Yukalov, Bose-Einstein condensation and gauge symmetry breaking, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **4**, 632–647 (2007).
- [392] V.I. Yukalov, Fluctuations of composite observables and stability of statistical systems, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 066119 (2005).
- [393] V.I. Yukalov, Self-consistent theory of Bose-condensed systems, *Phys. Lett. A* **359**, 712–717 (2006).
- [394] V.I. Yukalov, Representative ensembles in statistical mechanics, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **21**, 69–86 (2007).
- [395] V.I. Yukalov, Representative statistical ensembles for Bose systems with broken gauge symmetry, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **323**, 461–499 (2008).
- [396] P.C. Hohenberg and P.C. Martin, Microscopic theory of superfluid helium, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **34**, 291–359 (1965).
- [397] N.M. Hugenholtz and D. Pines, Ground-state energy and excitation spectrum of a system of interacting bosons, *Phys. Rev.* **116**, 489–506 (1959).
- [398] A.A. Nepomnyashchii and Y.A. Nepomnyashchii, Contribution to the theory of a spectrum of a Bose system with condensate at small momenta, *JETP Lett.* **21**, 1–2 (1975).
- [399] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Bose-Einstein condensed gases with arbitrary strong interactions, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 063623 (2006)
- [400] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Condensate and superfluid fractions for varying interactions and temperature, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 013602 (2007).

- [401] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Bose-Einstein condensation in self-consistent mean-field theory, *J. Phys. B* **47**, 095302 (2014)
- [402] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Ground state of a homogeneous Bose gas of hard spheres, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 013627 (2014).
- [403] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Bose-Einstein condensation temperature of weakly interacting atoms, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **14**, 073001 (2017).
- [404] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Local condensate depletion at trap center under strong interactions, *J. Phys. B* **51**, 085301 (2018).
- [405] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Hartree-Fock-Bogolubov method in the theory of Bose-condensed systems, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **51**, 823–828 (2020).
- [406] R.A. Aziz, V.P.S. Nain, and J.S. Carley An accurate intermolecular potential for helium, *J. Chem. Phys.* **70**, 4330–4342 (1979).
- [407] R.A. Aziz, W.J. Meath, and A.R. Allnatt, On the Ne-Ne potential-energy curve and related properties, *Chem. Phys.* **78**, 295–309 (1983).
- [408] R.A. Aziz, F.R.W. McCourt, and C.C.K. Wong, A new determination of the ground state interatomic potential for He₂, *Mol. Phys.* **61**, 1487–1511 (1987).
- [409] J.A. Hodgdon and F.H. Stillinger, Inherent structures in the potential energy landscape of solid ⁴He, *J. Chem. Phys.* **102**, 457–464 (1995).
- [410] D.M. Ceperley, R.O. Simmons, and R.C. Blasdell, Kinetic energy of liquid and solid ⁴He, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 115–118 (1996).
- [411] S.O. Diallo, J.V. Pearce, R.T. Azuah, and H.R. Glyde, Quantum momentum distribution and kinetic energy in solid ⁴He, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 075301 (2004).
- [412] H.J. Maris and S. Balibar, Supersolidity and the thermodynamics of solid Helium, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **147**, 539–547 (2007).
- [413] C. Cazorla, G.E. Astrakharchik, J. Casulleras, and J. Boronat, Bose-Einstein quantum statistics and the ground state of solid ⁴He, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 013047 (2009).
- [414] S.A. Vitiello, Helium atoms kinetic energy at temperature $T = 0$, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **162**, 154–159 (2011).
- [415] M.H.W. Chan, R.B. Hallock, and L. Reatto, Overview on solid ⁴He and the issue of supersolidity, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **172**, 317–363 (2013).
- [416] C. Casorla and J. Boronat, Simulation and understanding of atomic and molecular quantum crystals, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 035003 (2017).
- [417] E.V. Shuryak, Quantum chromodynamics and the theory of superdense matter, *Phys. Rep.* **61**, 71–158 (1980).

- [418] J. Rafelsky, Formation and observation of the quark-gluon plasma, *Phys. Rep.* **88**, 331–348 (1982).
- [419] H. Satz, Critical behaviour in finite temperature QCD, *Phys. Rep.* **88**, 349–364 (1982).
- [420] R. Hagedorn, Multiplicities, p_T distributions and the expected hadron \rightarrow quark-gluon phase transition, *Riv. Nuovo Cimento* **6**, 1–50 (1983).
- [421] J. Cleymans, R. Gavai, and E. Suhonen, Quarks and gluons at high temperatures and densities, *Phys. Rep.* **130**, 217–292 (1986).
- [422] H. Stöcker and W. Greiner, High-energy heavy ion collisions: Probing the equation of state of highly excited hadronic matter, *Phys. Rep.* **137**, 277–392 (1986).
- [423] R. Clare and D. Strottman, Relativistic hydrodynamics and heavy ion reactions, *Phys. Rep.* **141**, 177–280 (1986).
- [424] L. McLerran, The physics of the quark-gluon plasma, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **58**, 1021–1064 (1986).
- [425] H. Reeves, Big Bang nucleosynthesis and the quark-hadron phase transition, *Phys. Rep.* **201**, 335–354 (1991).
- [426] C. Adami and G.E. Brown, Matter under extreme conditions, *Phys. Rep.* **234**, 1–71 (1993).
- [427] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Thermodynamics of strong interactions, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **28**, 37–65 (1997).
- [428] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Multichannel approach to clustering matter, *Physica A* **243**, 382–414 (1997).
- [429] N.K. Glendenning, Phase transitions and crystalline structures in neutron star cores, *Phys. Rep.* **342**, 393–447 (2001).
- [430] H. Satz, States of strongly interacting matter, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **616**, 126–137 (2003).
- [431] R.A. Soltz, C. DeTar, F. Karsch, S. Mukherjee, and P. Vranas, Lattice QCD thermodynamics with physical quark masses, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **65**, 379–402 (2015).
- [432] A. Ayala, Hadronic matter at the edge: A survey of some theoretical approaches to the physics of the QCD phase diagram, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **761**, 012066 (2016).
- [433] W. Busza, K. Rajagopal, and W. van der Schee, Heavy ion collisions: The big picture, and the big questions, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **68**, 1–49 (2018).
- [434] J.N. Guenther, Overview of the QCD phase diagram, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **57**, 136 (2021).
- [435] D.I. Blokhintsev, On the fluctuations of nuclear matter, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **6**, 995–999 (1958).
- [436] A.M. Baldin, Physics of relativistic nuclei, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **8**, 429–477 (1977).

- [437] M.I. Strikman and L.L. Frankfurt, Probing few nucleon correlations in deuteron and nuclei in high energy scattering, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **11**, 571–629 (1980).
- [438] A.V. Efremov, Quark-parton picture of the cumulative production, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **13**, 613–634 (1982).
- [439] A.M. Baldin and A.A. Baldin, Relativistic nuclear physics: Relative 4-velocity space, symmetries of solutions, correlation depletion principle, similitude, intermediate asymptotics, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **29**, 577–630 (1998).
- [440] S.S. Shimanskiy, in *Relativistic Nuclear Physics: From Hundreds of MeV to TeV* (JINR, Dubna, 2019), pp. 179–186.
- [441] A.P. Kobushkin and V.P. Shelest, Problems of relativistic quark dynamics and quark structure of deuteron, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **14**, 1146–1192 (1983).
- [442] M.M. Makarov, Dibaryon resonances, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **15**, 941–981 (1984).
- [443] V.V. Burov, V.K. Lukyanov, and A.I. Titov, Multiquark systems in nuclear processes, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **15**, 1249–1295 (1984).
- [444] A.M. Baldin, R.G. Nazmitdinov, A.V. Chizhov, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, Coexistence of a hadron phase and a hexaquark phase in nuclear matter, *Dokl. Phys.* **29**, 952–954 (1984).
- [445] A.M. Baldin, R.G. Nazmitdinov, A.V. Chizhov, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, On heterogeneous states in nuclear matter, in *Multiquark Interactions and Quantum Chromodynamics*, Ed. by A.M. Baldin (JINR, Dubna, 1984), pp. 531–543.
- [446] A.M. Baldin, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, *Statistical Methods of Describing Quark Degrees of Freedom* (JINR, Dubna, 1985).
- [447] A.M. Baldin, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, Quark matter as a statistical system, *Phys. Many-Part. Syst.* **10**, 10–18 (1986).
- [448] A.V. Chizhov, R.G. Nazmitdinov, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, Statistical model of coexisting multiquark clusters, *Nucl. Phys. A* **449**, 660–672 (1986).
- [449] V.I. Yukalov, Conditions for nuclear matter lasers, *Laser Phys.* **8**, 1249–1256 (1998).
- [450] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Equation of state in quantum chromodynamics, in *Relativistic Nuclear Physics and Quantum Chromodynamics*, Ed. by A.M. Baldin and V.V. Burov (JINR, Dubna, 2000), Vol. 2, pp. 238–245.
- [451] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Do we understand what is deconfinement? in *Relativistic Nuclear Physics and Quantum Chromodynamics*, Ed. by A.M. Baldin, V.V. Burov, and A.I. Malakhov (JINR, Dubna, 2001), Vol. 1, pp. 109–126.
- [452] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Coherent nuclear radiation, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **35**, 348–382 (2004).

- [453] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Models of mixed hadron-quark-gluon matter, Proc. Sci. (ISHEPP) **2012**, 046 (2012).
- [454] D. Ter Haar, *Elements of Statistical Mechanics* (Rinehart, New York, 1956).
- [455] S. Tani, Scattering involving a bound state, Phys. Rev. **117**, 252–260 (1960).
- [456] S. Weinberg, Elementary particle theory of composite particles, Phys. Rev. **130**, 776–782 (1963).
- [457] S. Weinberg, Systematic solution of multiparticle scattering problems, Phys. Rev. B **133**, 232–256 (1964).
- [458] S. Weinberg, Phenomenological Lagrangians, Physica A **96**, 327–340 (1979).
- [459] M.D. Girardeau, Second-quantization representation for systems of atoms, nuclei, and electrons, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 1416–1418 (1971).
- [460] M.D. Girardeau, Second-quantization representation for a nonrelativistic system of composite particles: Generalized Tani transformation and its iterative evaluation, J. Math. Phys. **16**, 1901–1919 (1975).
- [461] M.D. Girardeau, Second-quantization representation for a nonrelativistic system of composite particles: Kinematical properties of the multispecies Tani transformation, J. Math. Phys. **19**, 2605–2613 (1978).
- [462] M.D. Girardeau and J.D. Hilbert, Fock-Tani representation for the quantum theory of reactive collisions, Physica A **97**, 42–74 (1979).
- [463] R. Machleidt, K. Holinde, and C. Elster, The Bonn meson-exchange model for the nucleon-nucleon interaction, Phys. Rep. **149**, 1–89 (1987).
- [464] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, Bose-condensed atomic systems with nonlocal interaction potentials, Laser Phys. **26**, 045501 (2016).
- [465] Y. Aoki, G. Endrodi, Z. Fodor, S. Katz, and K. Szabo, The order of the quantum chromodynamics transition predicted by the standard model of particle physics, Nature **443** 675–678 (2006).
- [466] F. Karsch, Lattice results on QCD at high temperature and non-zero baryon number density, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **62**, 503–511 (2009).
- [467] S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, S.D. Katz, S. Krieg, C. Ratti, and K. Szabo, Is there still any T_c mystery in lattice QCD? Results with physical masses in the continuum limit, J. High Energy Phys. **2010**, 73 (2010).
- [468] A. Bazavov et al., Chiral and deconfinement aspects of the QCD transition, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 054503 (2012).
- [469] O. Philipsen, The QCD equation of state from the lattice, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **70**, 55–107 (2013).

[470] J.L. Birman, R.G. Nazmitdinov, and V.I. Yukalov, Effects of symmetry breaking in finite quantum systems, *Phys. Rep.* **526**, 1–91 (2013).