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In this paper, we examine superconductivity in the presence of a coexisting antiferromagnetic long-range order. In a magnetic field, some types of antiferromagnet exhibit canted spin structures, which give rise to a net ferromagnetic moment proportional to the magnitude of the magnetic field. The ferromagnetic moment creates an exchange field on the conduction electrons by the Kondo interaction. When the Kondo interaction is antiferromagnetic, the exchange field reduces the effective Zeeman energy. As a result, the Pauli paramagnetic pair-breaking effect can be significantly reduced, and the upper critical field \( H_{c2} \) can largely exceed the Pauli paramagnetic limit \( H_P \) (Chandrasekhar and Clogston limit).

The analogous compensation mechanism in superconductors with uniformly aligned spins is known as the Jaccarino-Peter mechanism, which explains the field-induced superconductivity (FISC) in the compounds \( \text{Eu}_2\text{Sn}_3 \approx \text{Mo}_8\text{S}_8 \), \( \text{CePt}_3 \), and \( \lambda-(\text{BETS})_2\text{FeCl}_4 \). However, the resultant phase diagrams of the present mechanism are quite different from that of the Jaccarino-Peter mechanism. The superconductivity occupies a large single area including the zero field \( (H = 0) \) in the \( T-H \) phase diagram, while depending on the parameter values, the FISC may occur, where \( T \) and \( H \) denote the temperature and the magnetic field, respectively. In our previous papers, we have proposed this mechanism in a multilayer system in a parallel magnetic field. We have adopted such a system, because the reduction mechanism is clearly illustrated. In this paper, we extend the same mechanism to more general systems in the presence of the orbital pair-breaking effect. The magnitude and the temperature dependence of the resultant upper critical field can be similar to those of the spin-triplet superconductivity of equal spin pairing.

The present work was motivated by the heavy fermion antiferromagnetic superconductor \( \text{CePt}_3\text{Si} \) discovered recently. Due to the heavy quasi-particle mass, the orbital pair-breaking effect is much weaker than in conventional metals. Furthermore, the compound exhibits antiferromagnetic transition at \( T_{AF} \approx 2.2 \text{K} \) and superconducting transition at \( T_{c2}^{(0)} \approx 0.75 \text{K} \) at the zero field. The upper critical field \( H_{c2}(0) \approx 5 \text{T} \) at \( T = 0 \) is much larger than the Pauli paramagnetic limit estimated by the simplified formula \( H_P \approx 1.86[T/\text{K}] \times T_{c2}^{(0)}[\text{K}] \approx 1.4 \text{T} \). Such a large \( H_{c2} \) seems to suggest spin-triplet pairing, although the lack of inversion symmetry of this compound seems disadvantageous to spin-triplet pairing. Recently, Frigeri et al. have shown that spin-triplet pairing is not entirely excluded by the lack of inversion symmetry. Therefore, equal spin pairing may be the reason for a large \( H_{c2} \). In this paper, however, we propose another scenario based on antiparallel spin pairing including spin-singlet pairing. Samokhin et al. have carried out band structure calculations and proved within their theory that the order parameter must be an odd function of the momentum \( k \). We should note that this does not mean the occurrence of equal spin pairing. Hence, our scenario does not contradict their result.

In principle, we might be able to test these scenarios by rotating the magnetic field. The upper critical field \( H_{c2} \) must be highly anisotropic, if the large \( H_{c2} \) is due to equal spin pairing and the \( d \)-vector is fixed. For example, in the compound \( \text{CePt}_3\text{Si} \), the strong spin-orbit interaction favors a particular \( d \)-vector. For the magnetic field parallel to the \( d \)-vector, the upper critical field must be strongly suppressed. In contrast, the upper critical field can be nearly isotropic in the present mechanism. The Knight shift measurement might also give useful informations.

As mentioned above, the purpose of this study is to examine the present mechanism in the presence of the orbital pair-breaking effect. Therefore, we examine a three-dimensional system with an intercalated magnetic subsystem. We divide the magnetic subsystem into two sublattices, which we call A and B. We approximate the conduction electron system with an isotropic continuum system for simplicity.

When we apply the theory to the compound \( \text{CePt}_3\text{Si} \),
the A and B sublattices are alternate layers of Ce atoms, and the spins on each layer are ferromagnetically ordered. The superconductivity and the antiferromagnetism may exist in the same degrees of freedom in this compound, but we simplify the situation by dividing the degrees of freedom into two coupled systems. We also ignore the spin-orbit interaction and the lack of inversion symmetry for simplicity, because they do not affect the present mechanism.

First, let us describe the spin structure in the magnetic subsystem. We consider the situation in which the antiferromagnetic transition occurs at a temperature much higher than the superconducting transition temperature, which is consistent with the observation in the compound CePt$_3$Si. Since the ordered state is rigid, we neglect the modification of the magnetic structure by the occurrence of superconductivity. Therefore, we consider the cases in which the magnetic subsystem is effectively described by the Hamiltonian

$$H_s = \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j + \sum_i g_s \mu_B H \cdot S_i,$$

where $g_s$ and $\mu_B$ denote the $g$-factor of the localized spins and the Bohr magneton. We define $z$ as the number of antiferromagnetic bonds for a given site. We set $J_{ij} = 0$ except for the nearest neighbor sites $(i,j)$. For the compound CePt$_3$Si, we assume that $J_{ij} = J_i < 0$ for $(i,j)$ on the same layer (the same sublattice), while $J_{ij} = J_i > 0$ for $(i,j)$ on the adjacent layers (the different sublattices). In this case, we have $z = 2$. We could examine other crystal structures. For example, we have $z = 6$ in the system on the cubic lattice. In any case, we assume that $J_{ij} = J > 0$ for the antiferromagnetic bonds.

We take the $x$-axis of the spin space as being in the direction antiparallel to the external field. Hence, we set $H = (H, 0, 0)$. The directions of the axes of the spin space do not necessarily coincide with the crystal axes in the present model. For $T \lesssim T_c^0 \ll T_{AF}$, we neglect the thermal fluctuations and regard the localized spins as classical variables. If we ignore the anisotropy energy of the localized spins in the magnetic layers, the sublattice magnetization appears in the direction perpendicular to the applied field, since it is energetically favored. Hence, we introduce the classical variable $\theta$ by

$$S_i = \vec{S}(\sin \theta, 0, \pm \cos \theta),$$

where we define the $z$-axis of the spin space as being in the direction of the sublattice magnetization. For the double sign $\pm$ in eq. (2), we adopt $+$ and $-$ signs when site $i$ belongs to the A and B sublattices, respectively. Here, we have introduced the magnitude of the localized spins $\vec{S}$ taking into account the shrinkage of spins by fluctuations. The total energy of the magnetic subsystem is expressed as

$$E(\theta) = NS \left[ -z J \vec{S} \cos 2\theta - 2h_s \sin \theta \right] + E_0,$$

where $E_0$ is a constant and $h_s \equiv g_s \mu_B H/2$. The total energy becomes minimum when

$$z J \vec{S} \sin \theta = h_s$$

for $h_s/|z J \vec{S}| \leq 1$, i.e., $H \leq 2z J \vec{S}/g_s \mu_B \equiv H_{AF}$. For a high field in which $H \geq H_{AF}$, the staggered moment disappears ($\theta = \pi/2$). From now on, we mainly consider a weak field $H \leq H_{AF}$, where the antiferromagnetic order persists. The localized spins are also described by the spin density

$$S(r) = \sum_i \delta^{(3)}(r - R_i) S_i,$$

where $R_i$ denotes the position of site $i$.

We treat the degrees of freedom of the conduction electrons as a continuum model. The net spin moment $\vec{S} \sin \theta$ gives rise to the exchange field on the conduction electrons. In order to reproduce the exchange field, we employ an extended Kondo Hamiltonian defined as

$$H_K = \int d^3r \int d^3r' \sum_i \left[ S(r) \cdot \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} [\psi_\sigma(r') \sigma_{\sigma'}^\dagger \psi_{\sigma'}(r')] \right],$$

where $\sigma_{\sigma'}$ and $\psi_{\sigma'}(r)$ denote the Pauli matrices and the annihilation operator of the conduction electron at $r$. Here, we note that eq. (6) is used in the calculation of the order parameter $\Delta(r)$, which appreciably varies in the length scale of the coherence length $\xi \gg a$, where $a$ denotes the lattice constant. Therefore, after inserting eq. (5) in eq. (6), we replace the spin variable $S_i$ by the spatial average $\langle S \rangle_{\xi_i}$ over the volume $\xi_i$ on the order of $\xi^3$ near site $i$, which is defined as $\langle S \rangle_{\xi_i} \equiv \sum_{R_i \in \xi_i} S_i / \sum_{R_i \in \xi_i} 1$. Thus, we obtain

$$H_K \approx \int d^3r' \sum_i \langle S \rangle_{\xi_i} \cdot \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} \left[ \psi_{\sigma'}(r') \sigma_{\sigma'}^\dagger \psi_{\sigma'}(r') \right].$$

In actuality, the microscopic fluctuations omitted here may affect the superconductivity through the self-energy of the electrons. We regard those corrections to the normal state as being included in the effective mass $m^*$, if it exists. Since $\xi \gg a$, there are many localized spins in the volume $\xi_i$, the antiferromagnetic components of the spins vanish on average, while the ferromagnetic moment remains. Therefore, we obtain $\langle S \rangle_{\xi_i} \approx (\vec{S} \sin \theta, 0, 0)$. For specific lattice structures, this equation is satisfied exactly. Furthermore, we assume that the localized spins on $z\xi_i$ lattice sites around $r'$ take part in the Kondo interactions with the conduction electron at $r'$, and that all of these coupling constants are equal to $J_K$. Therefore, we obtain

$$H_K \approx h_{ex} \int d^3r' \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} \left[ \psi_{\sigma'}(r') \sigma_{\sigma'}^\dagger \psi_{\sigma'}(r') \right].$$
where \( h_{ex} \) denotes the exchange field \( h_{ex} = z_K J_K S \sin \theta \).

From eq. (4), we obtain

\[
h_{ex} = \frac{g_s H B}{2} z_K J_K H,
\]

(9)

for \( H \leq H_{AF} \). For \( H \geq H_{AF} \), we have \( h_{ex} = z_K J_K S \).

Taking into account the exchange field \( h_{ex} \) and the external field \( h \), the kinetic energy term of the conduction electron Hamiltonian is written as

\[
H_0 = \sum_{\sigma \sigma'} \int d^3 r \; \psi_\sigma^\dagger(r) \left[ \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^*} \left( \nabla - \frac{e}{c} A(r) \right)^2 \delta_{\sigma \sigma'} - (1 - \delta_{\sigma \sigma'}) \tilde{h} \right] \psi_{\sigma'}(r),
\]

(10)

where \( m^* \) and \( \tilde{h} \) denote the band effective mass and the renormalized Zeeman energy \( \tilde{h} = h - h_{ex} \), respectively. Here, we have defined \( h = \mu_e H \) and \( \mu_c = g_c \mu_B /2 \) where \( g_c \) denotes the g-factor of the conduction electrons. For \( H \leq H_{AF} \), we have

\[
\tilde{h} = \left( 1 - \frac{g_s z_K J_K}{g_c z J} \right) h = \left( 1 - \frac{J}{J_{AF}} \right) h
\]

(11)

obtained by eq. (4), where we have defined \( J_{AF} \equiv g_c z J / g_s z K \). In contrast, for \( H \geq H_{AF} \), we have \( \tilde{h} = h - z_K J_K S \).

In eq. (11), it is explicit that the Zeeman energy is reduced by the exchange field when \( J_K > 0 \). It is found that the reduction effect becomes maximum when \( J_K = J'_{AF} \). Obviously, this reduction mechanism is not affected by the anisotropy of the order parameter. Hence, we consider the s-wave superconductor as an example.

Applying the standard theory of superconductivity to the present system, we obtain the integral equation for the superconducting transition temperature \( T_c \).

\[
\ln \frac{T_c}{T_{c(0)}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty dx \frac{1}{c} \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin \theta \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{\kappa'}{4} x^2 \sin^2 \theta \right) \cos(2 \tilde{h}' x) - 1 \right],
\]

(12)

where \( T_{c(0)} \) denotes the zero-field transition temperature, and we have defined \( \kappa' \equiv (v_F / 2 c T_c(0))^{2} |e| H / c \) and \( \tilde{h}' = \tilde{h} / 2 c T_c \). Here, we have ignored the possibility of the Fulde-Ferrell-Larkin-Ovchinnikov state. The extension to include it is straightforward.

From the form of \( \kappa' \), it is convenient to define a constant

\[
\kappa_m = \left( \frac{v_F}{2 c T_c(0)} \right)^2 \frac{2 |e|}{c},
\]

(13)

with which we can write \( \kappa' = \kappa_m H (T_{c(0)}/T_c)^2 \).

We also define the ratio of the scales of the paramagnetic and orbital effects as

\[
r_m = \frac{h / 2 c T_{c(0)}}{\kappa_m H} = \frac{g_s \pi T_{c(0)} m^*}{8 e_F m},
\]

(14)

where \( e_F \equiv m^* v_F^2 / 2 \).

Equation (12) is solved numerically. Figure 1 shows the results for \( r_m = 0.8 \) and \( J_K < J'_{AF} \). It is found that the upper critical field is enhanced as \( J_K \) increases up to \( J'_{AF} \). When \( J_K \neq 0 \), the upper critical field \( H_{c2} \) can exceed the Pauli paramagnetic limit \( H_P(T) \). In particular, for \( J_K \sim J'_{AF} \), the upper critical field \( H_{c2} \) can reach fourfold the Pauli limit \( H_P \). When \( J_K = J'_{AF} \), the pure orbital limit \( H_{c20}(T) \) is recovered. For larger \( r_m \), i.e., weaker
orbital effect, the ratio $H_{c2}/H_P$ increases.

If there is a temperature region in which $H_{c2}(T) > H_{AF}$ in Fig. 1, the curve of $H_{c2}(T)$ should be modified there so that it saturates more rapidly, because the exchange field is constant for $H > H_{AF}$. In the scale of the right vertical axis, $H = H_{AF}$ gives $r_m a_m H_{AF} = g_e J S^2/2\pi g_J T_c^{(0)}$. Hence, if $g_e / g_s > 1$ or if $zJS^2/T_c^{(0)} \sim T_{AF}/T_c^{(0)} \gg 1$, the upper critical field $H_{c2}(T)$ does not exceed $H_{AF}$ in the whole temperature region.

In a high-field region in which $H \geq H_{AF}$, where the spins are aligned uniformly, the mechanism is reduced to the Jaccarino-Peter mechanism. In this case, the Zeeman energy completely vanishes at $H = zK J S / \mu_e \equiv H_{cent}$. Therefore, if $H_{cent} + H > H_{AF}$ is satisfied, we need to examine the possibility of FISC. Since $H_{cent}/H_{AF} = J_K / J_{AF}$, FISC occurs only when $J_K \gtrsim J_{AF}$.

Figure 2 shows the critical fields for $J_K = 1.2 J_{AF}$, $r_m = 0.8$ and $a_m H_{cent} = 1$. This set of the parameter values gives $a_m H_{AF} \approx 0.83$, and if $g_s = g_e = 2$, $T_{AF} \sim zJS = 2\pi g_J T_c^{(0)} r_m a_m H_{AF}/g_e \sim 4 T_c^{(0)}$. In Fig. 2, we find an area of FISC inside the region of $H_{c2}(T) > H > H_{AF}$.

In this context, the compound CePt$_3$Si corresponds to the case of $H_{cent} \gg H_{AF}$, i.e., $J_K > J_{AF}$, and $r_m > 1$. In contrast, the compound CePb$_3$Si has two possibilities, i.e., $J_K \gtrsim J_{AF}$ and $J_K \lesssim J_{AF}$. For the former case, FISC might be observed at very high fields, if $H_{c20}(0) \gtrsim H_{cent} \gtrsim H_{AF}$. In the compound UPd$_2$Al$_3$, it was observed that $T_{AF} = 14.3$ K and $T_c^{(0)} = 2.0$ K. Such a high $T_{AF}$ suggests small $J_K / J_{AF}$, so that the reduction of the paramagnetic effect is not pronounced. This coincides with the experimental fact that $H_{c2} < H_P$ and the absence of FISC in the compound UPd$_2$Al$_3$. Generally speaking, the difference in the experimental results $T_{AF} \approx 1.1$ K, 2.2 K, and 14.3 K in CePb$_3$, CePb$_3$Si, and UPd$_2$Al$_3$, respectively, is consistent in the present theory with their phase diagrams, if their $J_K$’s are of the same order.

Here, the condition $r_m \sim 1$ can be satisfied in heavy-fermion superconductors, but not in conventional metals, because $r_m \propto q_c T_c^{(0)}/m^* c^2 = g_e T_c^{(0)}/(e_f)(m^*/m)$. Also in the scenario with equal spin pairing, we need $r_m$ of order 1, in order to reproduce a large ratio of $H_{c2}/H_P$ as observed.

In conclusion, we have shown that the Pauli paramagnetic pair-breaking effect can be considerably reduced in antiferromagnetic superconductors, even in the presence of the orbital pair-breaking effect, unless $r_m \ll 1$. One of the necessary conditions for the occurrence of the present mechanism is that the Kondo exchange coupling constant $J_K$ is positive and comparable to the scale of the antiferromagnetic exchange energy $J_{AF}$. The present result may explain the high $H_{c2}$ observed in the compound CePt$_3$Si. The phase diagrams of the compounds CePt$_3$Si and CePb$_3$ can be understood within a unified framework. The positive $J_K$ can be attributed to superexchange or kinetic exchange processes. Hence, the condition $J_K \sim J \sim J_{AF}$ can be satisfied, because the antiferromagnetic exchange interaction $J$ originates from exchange processes similar to those for $J_K$ in the same crystal structure. The hybrid ruthenate-cuprate compound RuSr$_2$GdCu$_2$O$_8$ is another possible candidate of the present mechanism, if one applies a parallel magnetic field to it. The antiferromagnetic long-range order with weak ferromagnetism due to the canted spin structure has been observed in this compound at zero field.

The author wishes to thank Y. Matsuda and T. Oguchi for useful discussions, K. V. Samokhin for useful comments, and N. Metoki for informing us of their paper. This work was partly supported by a Grant-in-Aid for COE Research, No.13CE2002, and a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), No.16540320, of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.

[1] B. S. Chandrasekhar: App. Phys. Lett. 1 (1962) 7.
[2] A. M. Clogston: Phys. Rev. Lett. 9 (1962) 266.
[3] H. Shimahara: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 71 (2002) 713.
[4] H. Shimahara: Physica B 329-333 (2003) 1442.
[5] V. Jaccarino and M. Peter: Phys. Rev. Lett. 9 (1962) 290.
[6] H. W. Meul et al.: Phys. Rev. Lett. 53 (1984) 497.
[7] C. L. Lin et al.: Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 2541.
[8] S. Uji et al.: Nature 410 (2001) 908.
[9] O. Cipas, R. H. McKenzie and J. Merino: Phys. Rev. B 65 (2002) 100502R.
[10] H. Shimahara: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 71 (2002) 1644.
[11] M. Hozet, A. Buzdin, L. Bulaevski and M. Maley: Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 (2002) 227001.
[12] E. Bauer et al.: Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 027003.
[13] P. A. Frigeri, D. F. Agterberg, A. Koga and M. Sigrist: Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 097001.
[14] K. V. Samokhin, E. S. Zijlstra and S. K. Bose: Phys. Rev. B 69 (2004) 094514.
[15] According to the theory in ref. [14], the electron states are nondegenerate almost everywhere in the momentum space because of strong spin-orbit coupling, and Cooper pairing occurs between electrons with $(k, n)$ and $(-k, n)$, which have the same energy $\epsilon_n(k) = \epsilon_n(-k)$, where $n$ denotes the band index. Since the states with $(k, n)$ and $(-k, n)$ are connected by the time reverse transformation, they cannot be equal spin states. If the state with $(k, n)$ is up-spin rich, the state with $(-k, n)$ must be down-spin rich. Thus, the pair of the electrons with $(k, n)$ and $(-k, n)$ experiences the Pauli paramagnetic pair-breaking effect. In ref. [21], it is shown that the paramagnetic suppression of superconductivity is nonzero in all directions in general, and the Knight shift has an unusual anisotropy of the temperature dependence.
[16] N. Metoki et al.: J. Phys. Condens. Matter 16 (2004) L207.
We define the coupling constant $J_{ij}$ as one including the corrections from the conduction electrons. In actuality, the influence of the conduction electron may not be included completely only through such corrections, because various spin structures other than the canted structure can occur \[31\]. However, we neglect such possibilities phenomenologically, and consider only the cases in which the magnetic subsystem is effectively described by eq. \[10\].

[17] E. Helfand and N. R. Werthamer: Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 686.
[18] K. Scharnberg and R. A. Klemm: Phys. Rev. B 22 (1980) 5233.
[19] I. A. Luk’yanchuk and V. P. Mineev: Sov. Phys. JETP 66 (1987) 1168.
[20] H. Shimahara, S. Matsuo and K. Nagai: Phys. Rev. B 53 (1996) 12284.
[21] H. Shimahara and D. Rainer: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 66 (1997) 3591.
[22] In the present scale, the Pauli limit $H_P = \Delta_0/\sqrt{2}\mu_B$ at $T = 0$ corresponds to $a_mH_P = hP/2r_m\pi T_c(0) = g_e/4\sqrt{2e^\gamma}\pi r_m$, where $\gamma = 0.57721 \ldots$. Therefore, we obtain $a_mH_P \approx 0.2/r_m$, if $g_e \approx 2$.
[23] It was observed that $H_{\text{cent}} \gtrsim 14$ T and $H_{\text{AF}} \approx 5$ T \[4\], which give $J_K \gg J'_AF$. Furthermore, since the FISC was observed for $H \gtrsim 14$ T, $H_{c20}(0) \gg 14$ T must be satisfied, while $H_P \gtrsim 1.86 \times 0.6 \sim 1.1$ T, since $T_c(0) \gtrsim 0.6$ K. Hence, we obtain $r_m \sim 0.2H_{c20}/H_P \gg 3 \gg 1$.
[24] If $J_K$’s are on the same order in the compounds CePb$_3$ and CePt$_3$Si, it is expected that $H_{\text{cent}} \gtrsim 14$ T in the compound CePt$_3$Si. Furthermore, comparing the values of $T_c(0)$ and $T_{\text{AF}}(0)$ of the two compounds, it seems plausible that $H_{c20}(0)$ should be much larger than 14 T, and that $H_{\text{AF}} \sim 10$ T. In this case, the condition $H_{c20}(0) > H_{\text{cent}} > H_{\text{AF}}$ is satisfied.
[25] C. Geibel et al.: Z. Phys. B 84 (1991) 1.
[26] W. E. Pickett, R. Weht and A. B. Shick: Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999) 3713.
[27] H. Shimahara and S. Hata: Phys. Rev. B 62 (2000) 14541.
[28] K. Nakamura and A. J. Freeman: Phys. Rev. B 66 (2002) 140405R.
[31] M. Hamada and H. Shimahara: Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 3027; J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 65 (1996) 552.