

# Odd-frequency Cooper Pairs and Their Effects on Surface Impedance

Yasuhiro Asano,<sup>1</sup> Alexander A. Golubov,<sup>2</sup> Yakov V. Fominov,<sup>3</sup> and Yukio Tanaka<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Applied Physics and Center for Topological Science  
& Technology, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-8628, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*Faculty of Science and Technology and MESA+ Institute of Nanotechnology,  
University of Twente, 7500 AE, Enschede, The Netherlands*

<sup>3</sup>*L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, RAS, 119334 Moscow, Russia*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Applied Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8603, Japan*  
(Dated: February 23, 2024)

We discuss dynamic response of odd-frequency Cooper pairs to electromagnetic field. By using the quasiclassical Green function method, we calculate the impedance ( $Z = R - iX$ ) of a normal metal thin film which covers a superconductor. In contrast to the standard relation (i.e.,  $R \ll X$ ), the impedance in spin-triplet proximity structures shows anomalous behavior (i.e.,  $R > X$ ) in the low frequency limit. This unusual relation is a result of the penetration of odd-frequency pairs into the normal metal and reflects the *negative Cooper pair density*.

PACS numbers: 74.25.nn, 74.45.+c, 74.78.Fk, 74.70.-b

Exotic superconductors with a gap function  $\Delta(\mathbf{k}, \omega_n)$  odd in Matsubara frequency  $\omega_n$  are called odd-frequency superconductors. Mysterious behavior of odd-frequency Cooper pairs is an intriguing issue in the physics of superconductivity and superfluidity [1, 2]. An odd-frequency superconductor might not exhibit essential properties of superconductivity such as the gapped quasiparticle spectrum and the standard diamagnetic Meissner effect. Unfortunately, the odd-frequency pairing state has never been yet detected experimentally in bulk materials. Odd-frequency Cooper pairs themselves, however, may exist in superconducting proximity structures. It was theoretically predicted in ferromagnet/superconductor junctions that spin-mixing due to spin-dependent potential should generate odd-frequency spin-triplet *s*-wave pairs [3–7]. Manifestations of triplet pairs were recently observed experimentally as a long-range Josephson coupling across ferromagnets [8–11]. An alternative way of creating odd-frequency pairs was suggested in proximity structures involving a normal metal attached to an odd-parity spin-triplet superconductor that belongs to the conventional even-frequency symmetry class. The parity-mixing due to inhomogeneity produces the odd-frequency pairs even in this case [12].

Although the experiments [8–11] catch a sign of odd-frequency pairs and theories [13–17] have predicted unusual properties of spin-triplet superconducting junctions, we have never had clear scientific evidences of odd-frequency pairs. This is because physical values focused in these studies include only *indirect* information of the frequency symmetry. The present paper shows that the surface impedance is a particular physical value which *directly* reflects the frequency symmetry of a Cooper pair. We predict anomalous features of a surface impedance which should make possible to detect odd-frequency pairs experimentally.

Surface impedance  $Z = R - iX$  reflects the dynamic




FIG. 1: (color online). (a) Typical behavior of the surface impedance in a conventional *s*-wave superconductor. (b) Proximity structure under consideration, where a thin film of a normal metal covers a superconductor.

response of Cooper pairs to electromagnetic field [18, 19]. The surface resistance,  $R$ , corresponds to resistance due to normal electrons. In conventional superconductors,  $R$  drops exponentially with decreasing temperature below superconducting transition temperature  $T_c$ . The reactance,  $X$ , represents power loss of electromagnetic field due to Cooper pairs. Typical temperature dependence of the surface impedance in a conventional superconductor is shown in Fig. 1(a). The positive amplitude of the Cooper pair density guarantees a robust relation  $R \ll X$  at low temperatures. The validity of the relation  $R < X$ , however, is questionable for odd-frequency Cooper pairs because the odd-frequency symmetry and *negative pair density* are inseparable from each other according to the standard theory of superconductivity [20]. In the present paper, we conclude that the unusual relation  $R > X$  can be observed in the presence of odd-frequency Cooper pairs at low frequency and at low temperature.

Let us consider a bilayer of a superconductor and a thin normal metal film as shown in Fig. 1(b), where  $W$  is the size of the superconductor and  $L$  is the thickness of the normal metal. We mainly consider spin-triplet *p*-wave symmetry in the superconductor and compare

results with those in spin-singlet  $s$ - and  $d$ -wave symmetries. In all cases, the superconductor belongs to the conventional even-frequency symmetry class. The even- and odd-frequency pairs penetrate into the normal metal for the spin-singlet and spin-triplet cases, respectively [13, 14, 21]. To calculate the complex conductivity in the normal metal, we first solve the quasiclassical Usadel equation [22] in the standard  $\theta$ -parametrization [23],  $\hbar D \nabla^2 \theta(\mathbf{r}, \epsilon) + 2i\epsilon \sin \theta(\mathbf{r}, \epsilon) = 0$ , where  $D$  is the diffusion constant of the normal metal and  $\epsilon$  is the quasiparticle energy measured from the Fermi level. In what follows, we consider the normal-metal/superconductor (NS) junction in two dimension as shown in Fig. 1(b). We choose  $W \gg L$  so that we can neglect  $y$  dependence of  $\theta$ . In the  $p$ -wave case, we assume that a spin-triplet Cooper pair consists of two electrons with opposite spin directions — this assumption does not break generality of the following argument. The Usadel equation is supplemented by the boundary condition at the NS interface which depends on the pairing symmetry of the superconductor [13, 24, 25],

$$\left. \frac{\partial \theta(x, \epsilon)}{\partial x} \right|_{x=0} = \frac{1}{L} \frac{R_D}{R_B} \frac{\langle F \rangle}{T_B}, \quad (1)$$

$$\langle F \rangle = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} d\gamma \frac{T_N \cos \gamma (f_s \cos \theta_0 - g_s \sin \theta_0)}{(2 - T_N) + T_N (g_s \cos \theta_0 + f_s \sin \theta_0)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the incident angle of a quasiparticle measured from the  $x$  axis,  $\theta_0 = \theta(x=0, \epsilon)$ , and  $R_D$  is the resistance of the normal metal. At the NS interface, a potential barrier described by  $v_0 \delta(x)$  suppresses the transmission probability  $T_B = \int_0^{\pi/2} d\gamma \cos \gamma T_N$  with  $T_N = \cos^2 \gamma / (z_0^2 + \cos^2 \gamma)$ ,  $z_0 = v_0 / (\hbar v_F)$ , and  $v_F$  being the Fermi velocity. As a result, the resistance of the NS interface becomes  $R_B = [(e^2 / \pi \hbar) (k_F W / \pi) T_B]^{-1}$ . The Green function in the superconductor depends on  $\gamma$  and the orientation angle  $\alpha$  in Fig. 1(b) as  $g_{\pm} = \epsilon / \sqrt{\epsilon^2 - |\Delta_{\pm}|^2}$  and  $f_{\pm} = i\Delta_{\pm} / \sqrt{\epsilon^2 - |\Delta_{\pm}|^2}$ , where  $\Delta_{\pm} = \Delta \Psi(\gamma_{\pm})$  with  $\Delta$  being the amplitude of the pair potential,  $\gamma_+ = \gamma - \alpha$  and  $\gamma_- = \pi - \gamma - \alpha$ . The form factor  $\Psi(\gamma)$  characterizes the pairing symmetry as  $\Psi(\gamma) = 1, \cos \gamma$ , and  $\cos 2\gamma$  for the  $s$ -,  $p$ -, and  $d$ -wave symmetries, respectively. At a particular orientation angle,  $p$ -wave with  $\alpha = 0$ ,  $p$ -wave with  $\alpha = \pi/2$ ,  $d$ -wave with  $\alpha = 0$ , and  $d$ -wave with  $\alpha = \pi/4$  correspond to the  $p_{x^-}$ ,  $p_{y^-}$ ,  $d_{x^2-y^2}$ , and  $d_{xy}$ -symmetry, respectively. In Eq. (2),  $g_s = (g_+ + g_-) / \xi$  with  $\xi = 1 + g_+ g_- + f_+ f_-$ , and  $f_s = (f_+ + f_-) / \xi$  for the spin-singlet pairing symmetry, while  $f_s = i(f_+ g_- - f_- g_+) / \xi$  for the spin-triplet one [13, 25]. For the chiral  $p$ -wave symmetry, when  $\Psi(\gamma) = e^{i\gamma}$ ,  $\theta$  obeys a boundary condition which is slightly different from Eq. (2) [14]. At the outer surface of the normal metal, we require  $\partial_x \theta(x, \epsilon)|_{x=-L} = 0$ . The normal and anomalous retarded Green functions are obtained as  $g(x, \epsilon) = \cos \theta(x, \epsilon)$  and  $f(x, \epsilon) = \sin \theta(x, \epsilon)$ , respectively.

Having found the Green functions, we can calculate the local complex conductivity  $\sigma_N(x, \omega) = \sigma_1 + i\sigma_2$  which

can be represented only by the retarded Green function as [26]

$$\frac{\sigma_1(x, \omega)}{\sigma_0} = \frac{1}{2\hbar\omega} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\epsilon [J(\epsilon + \hbar\omega) - J(\epsilon)] K_1, \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\sigma_2(x, \omega)}{\sigma_0} = \frac{1}{2\hbar\omega} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\epsilon [J(\epsilon + \hbar\omega) K_2 + J(\epsilon) K_3], \quad (4)$$

$$K_1 = f_I(\epsilon) f_I(\epsilon + \hbar\omega) + g_R(\epsilon) g_R(\epsilon + \hbar\omega), \quad (5)$$

$$K_2 = f_R(\epsilon) f_I(\epsilon + \hbar\omega) - g_I(\epsilon) g_R(\epsilon + \hbar\omega), \quad (6)$$

$$K_3 = f_R(\epsilon + \hbar\omega) f_I(\epsilon) - g_I(\epsilon + \hbar\omega) g_R(\epsilon), \quad (7)$$

with  $J(\epsilon) = \tanh(\epsilon / 2k_B T)$ ,  $g_R(\epsilon) = \text{Re}[g(x, \epsilon)]$ ,  $g_I(\epsilon) = \text{Im}[g(x, \epsilon)]$ ,  $f_R(\epsilon) = \text{Re}[f(x, \epsilon)]$ , and  $f_I(\epsilon) = \text{Im}[f(x, \epsilon)]$ . The local impedance in the normal metal is calculated from the complex conductivity as

$$Z_N(x, \omega) = R_N - iX_N = (1 - i) \sqrt{\frac{\hbar\omega}{\Delta_0} \frac{\sigma_0}{\sigma_N(x, \omega)}} Z_0, \quad (8)$$

where  $Z_0 \equiv \sqrt{2\pi\Delta_0 / \sigma_0 c^2 \hbar}$ ,  $\Delta_0$  is the amplitude of pair potential at  $T = 0$ , and  $\sigma_0$  is the Drude conductivity in the normal metal. The surface impedance in Fig. 1(a) is calculated from the above formula, taking the Green function of a uniform  $s$ -wave superconductor.

The theory basically includes three junction parameters: the thickness of normal metal  $L$ , strength of the potential barrier  $z_0$ , and the diffusion constant in the normal metal  $D$ , which are converted to  $R_D/R_B$ ,  $E_{\text{Th}} = \hbar D / L^2$ , and  $z_0$  with  $E_{\text{Th}}$  being the Thouless energy. As we discuss later on, the results shown below depend on these parameters only quantitatively. Thus we fix them at  $R_D/R_B = 1$ ,  $E_{\text{Th}} = 0.5\Delta_0$ , and  $z_0 = 2.5$  throughout this paper, which leads to  $T_B \approx 0.1$  and  $L \approx 2.7\xi_{T_c}$  with  $\xi_{T_c} = \sqrt{\hbar D / 2\pi k_B T_c}$  being the coherence length. We add a small positive imaginary part  $i\epsilon_{\lambda}$  to energy to provide the retarded causality and to obtain reasonable convergence of the integration in Eqs. (3) and (4). In real junctions,  $i\epsilon_{\lambda}$  stems from inelastic scatterings of a quasiparticle due to phonon or electron-electron interaction. We fix  $\epsilon_{\lambda}$  at  $0.01\Delta_0$ .

First, we compare the retarded Green functions at the surface of the normal metal ( $x = -L$ ) for the  $s$ -wave symmetry in Fig. 2 (a)(b) with those for the chiral  $p$ -wave in (d)(e). The real part of the normal Green function  $g_R(\epsilon)$  is the quasiparticle density of states normalized by the normal density of states at the Fermi level. The normal Green function always satisfies  $g(-\epsilon) = [g(\epsilon)]^*$  irrespective of pairing symmetry as shown in (a) and (d). In the  $s$ -wave case,  $g_R(\epsilon)$  shows a minigap for  $|\epsilon| < \Delta_N \sim 0.15\Delta_0$ . In chiral  $p$ -wave case,  $g_R$  in (d) shows a large peak around  $\epsilon = 0$ , which can be understood as the penetration of midgap Andreev resonant states into the normal metal. The formation of midgap Andreev resonant states due to a sign change of the pair potential is a common feature at surfaces of unconventional superconductors [27]. The penetration of




FIG. 2: (color online). The retarded Green functions at the surface of the normal metal for the  $s$ -wave (a)-(b) and the chiral  $p$ -wave symmetry (d)-(e). The solid and broken lines represents the real and imaginary part of the Green function, respectively. In (c) and (f),  $K_s$  is the spectral pair density and is corresponding to the kernel of the imaginary part of complex conductivity at  $\omega \rightarrow 0^+$ .

such states into a normal metal is possible only for spin-triplet junctions [13, 15]. The feature of the anomalous function  $f_R(\epsilon)$  depends on the pairing symmetry of the superconductor. The results in (b) show that  $f_R(\epsilon)$  is an even function of  $\epsilon$  and  $f_I(\epsilon)$  is an odd function of  $\epsilon$  (i.e.,  $f(-\epsilon) = [f(\epsilon)]^*$ ). This relation means the presence of the even-frequency Cooper pairs in the normal metal and always holds for spin-singlet NS structures. The results in (e), however, show that  $f_R(\epsilon)$  is an odd function of  $\epsilon$  and  $f_I(\epsilon)$  is an even function of  $\epsilon$  (i.e.,  $f(-\epsilon) = -[f(\epsilon)]^*$ ) [21]. This relation represents the penetration of odd-frequency Cooper pairs into the normal metal and holds for spin-triplet NS structures.

Secondly, we show the local impedance at the surface of the normal metal  $Z_N(-L, \omega)$  as a function of temperature at a small  $\hbar\omega$  fixed at  $0.01\Delta_0$  in Fig. 3. Here the local impedance  $Z_N(-L, \omega)$  approximately describes the impedance of the normal metal because  $\sigma_N(x, \omega)$  depends on  $x$  weakly for  $L \approx \xi_{T_c}$ . In the  $s$ -wave symmetry, the results show conventional behavior totally consistent with those in Fig. 1(a). Namely, both  $R_N$  and  $X_N$  decrease with decreasing  $T$  at low temperatures with keeping the relation  $R_N \ll X_N$ . The results for  $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -symmetry in (b) show qualitatively the same feature as those in the  $s$ -wave case. For  $d_{xy}$ - and  $p_y$ -symmetries, a relation  $R = X$  always holds irrespective of  $\omega$  and  $T$  (results are not shown) because there is no proximity effect in the normal metal [25, 28]. In this case, the impedance reflects only the skin effect of the normal metal. In the chiral  $p$ -wave symmetry in (c), on the other hand,  $R_N$  become larger than  $X_N$  for  $T < T_c$ . A similar behavior can be seen also in the  $p_x$ -wave symmetry for  $T < T^* \sim 0.4T_c$  as shown in (d). The impedance clearly exhibits different

characteristic behaviors depending on the pairing symmetry of the superconductor. In Figs. (c) and (d),  $\sigma_2$  changes its sign to negative. It is easy to confirm that the sign change of  $\sigma_2$  results in  $R_N > X_N$  in Eq. (8). Thus  $R_N > X_N$  is a robust and universal property of odd-frequency Cooper pair.

To understand characteristic feature of complex conductivity at small  $\omega$ , we analyze the spectral pair density defined by

$$K_s(\epsilon) = f_R(\epsilon)f_I(\epsilon) - g_R(\epsilon)g_I(\epsilon) = \text{Im}f^2(\epsilon), \quad (9)$$

which appears in the integrand of  $\sigma_2$  in Eq. (4) at very small  $\omega$ . The spectral pair density contains full information about the frequency symmetry of Cooper pairs. In the  $s$ -wave case,  $K_s$  is mostly positive for  $\epsilon > 0$  and has a positive peak around  $\epsilon = \Delta_N$  as shown in Fig. 2(c). Since  $K_s$  is an odd function of  $\epsilon$  according to its definition, we only show the results for  $\epsilon > 0$ . On the other hand in the chiral  $p$ -wave symmetry as shown in Fig. 2(f),  $K_s$  is mostly negative for  $\epsilon > 0$  and has a large negative peak near  $\epsilon = 0$  due to the odd-frequency symmetry. The Cooper pair density in the normal metal  $n_s = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\epsilon J(\epsilon)K_s(\epsilon)$  is positive for the  $s$ -wave case and is negative for the chiral  $p$ -wave one. As a result,  $\sigma_2$  is positive for the  $s$ -wave case and is negative for the chiral  $p$ -wave case. Therefore we conclude that the negative  $\sigma_2$  is the *direct* consequence of the odd-frequency symmetry of Cooper pairs. This argument generally holds when  $\hbar\omega$  is smaller than all energy scales relating to the proximity effect. The smallest energy scale at the present calculation is the peak width of the Green function shown in Fig. 2(a)-(d). Indeed we have confirmed that  $T^*$  in Fig. 3(d) increases to  $T_c$  with decreasing  $\omega$ . The conclusion does not change even if we vary the junction parameters such as  $R_D/R_B$ ,  $E_{\text{Th}}$ , and  $z_0$ , since these parameters do not affect the frequency symmetry of Cooper pairs.

Next, we briefly discuss physics behind the negative  $\sigma_2$  based on a phenomenological theory. Under the proximity effect, the electric current in the normal metal may be described by two contributions:  $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}_N + \mathbf{j}_S$  with the normal current  $\mathbf{j}_N = \sigma_0 \mathbf{E}$  and the supercurrent  $\mathbf{j}_S = -\frac{n_s e^2}{mc} \mathbf{A} = i \frac{n_s e^2}{m\omega} \mathbf{E}$  with  $m$  being the mass of electron [29]. The complex conductivity then becomes  $\sigma_1 + i\sigma_2 = \sigma_0 + i \frac{n_s e^2}{m\omega}$ . The positive value of  $n_s$  is indispensable for explaining the Meissner effect. This argument can be easily confirmed when we calculate the static magnetic field by solving the current  $\mathbf{j}_S$  with  $\nabla \times \mathbf{H} = \frac{4\pi}{c} \mathbf{j}_S$ . In the case of odd-frequency pairs, however,  $n_s$  becomes negative, which implies absence of the Meissner effect. This fact also significantly modifies the impedance of a NS bilayer defined by

$$Z_{\text{NS}} = R_{\text{NS}} - iX_{\text{NS}} = \bar{Z}_N \frac{Z_S \cos \bar{k}_n L - i\bar{Z}_N \sin \bar{k}_n L}{\bar{Z}_N \cos \bar{k}_n L - iZ_S \sin \bar{k}_n L}, \quad (10)$$

where  $Z_S$  is the impedance of the superconductor shown




FIG. 3: (color online). Local impedance at a surface of the normal metal (i.e.,  $x = -L$ ) versus temperature at  $\hbar\omega = 0.01\Delta_0$  for (a)  $s$ -wave, (b)  $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave, (c) chiral  $p$ -wave, and (d)  $p_x$ -wave symmetry. The impedance of a NS bilayer versus temperature for (e)  $s$ -wave and (f) chiral  $p$ -wave symmetry.

in Fig. 1(a). Since  $L$  being comparable to  $\xi_{T_c}$ , the conductivity depends on  $x$  only slightly in the normal metal, which enables us to define spatially averaged values: the conductivity  $\bar{\sigma}_N = \int_{-L}^0 dx \sigma_N(x)/L$ , the impedance  $\bar{Z}_N = -i\sqrt{4\pi i\omega/(c^2\bar{\sigma}_N)} = \bar{R}_N - i\bar{X}_N$ , and the wavenumber of electromagnetic field  $\bar{k}_n = \sqrt{i4\pi\omega\bar{\sigma}_N/c^2}$ . The sign change of  $\sigma_2$  results in the real value of  $\bar{k}_n$  reflecting the absence of the Meissner effect. In Fig. 3, we show the impedance of a NS bilayer as a function of temperature for  $s$ -wave in (e) and chiral  $p$ -wave NS junctions in (f), where we assume the resistivity of a normal metal  $\rho = \sigma_0^{-1}$  is about  $2 \times 10^{-6}[\Omega \cdot \text{cm}]$ . In the  $s$ -wave symmetry, the impedance of the NS bilayer (e) shows the conventional relation  $R_{NS} < X_{NS}$ . In the chiral  $p$ -wave symmetry, on the other hand,  $R_{NS}$  goes beyond  $X_{NS}$  at low temperature. In addition, the absence of the Meissner effect in the normal metal causes the sign change of  $X_{NS}$  in the present results. Using relations  $\bar{X}_N \ll \bar{R}_N$  and  $Z_S \approx -iX_S$ , it is possible to show  $X_{NS} \approx 0$  at  $\bar{R}_N/X_S = \tan\{\text{Re}(\bar{k}_n L)\}$ .

Finally, we briefly discuss realistic structures for observing the unusual relation  $R > X$ . In experiments, it is possible to measure the impedance of a bilayer. One example is a bilayer consisting of a normal metal and  $\text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4$  [30]. Since the pairing symmetry in  $\text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4$  is spin-triplet chiral- $p$ , the anomalous relation  $R > X$  as shown in Fig. 3(f) would be observed in experiments. At the same time, since our qualitative result is based on the symmetry of the induced superconducting state, the proposed effect can also be observed in conventional superconductor/ferromagnet structures where the odd-frequency state is also generated and can be spatially separated [3]. An example of this type is a bilayer of Nb/CrO<sub>2</sub>, where only odd-frequency pairs can penetrate

into the half-metallic ferromagnet CrO<sub>2</sub> [4–6, 8].

In summary, we have theoretically studied the impedance ( $Z = R - iX$ ) of a bilayer consisting of a normal metal and a superconductor. For spin-singlet superconducting proximity structures, we found the conventional and robust relation  $R \ll X$ . For spin-triplet ones,  $R$  can be larger than  $X$  and  $X$  may change sign as a function of temperature at low  $T$ . On the basis of obtained results, we propose a method to analyze the spin-symmetry of Cooper pairs in a superconductor and to detect odd-frequency superconductivity.

This work was supported by KAKENHI on Innovative Areas “Topological Quantum Phenomena”(No. 22103002). Ya.V.F. was supported by the RFBR (Grant No. 11-02-00077-a), the Russian Federal Agency of Education and Science (Contract No. P799), and the program “Quantum physics of condensed matter” of the RAS.

- 
- [1] V. L. Berezinskii, JETP Lett. **20**, 287 (1974).
  - [2] A. Balatsky and E. Abrahams, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 13125 (1992).
  - [3] F. S. Bergeret, et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4096 (2001); Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 1321 (2005).
  - [4] Y. Asano, Y. Tanaka, and A. A. Golubov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 107002 (2007).
  - [5] V. Braude and Yu. V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 077003 (2007).
  - [6] M. Eschrig and T. Löfwander, Nature Phys. **4**, 138 (2008).
  - [7] J. Linder, T. Yokoyama, A. Sudbø, and M. Eschrig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 107008 (2009).
  - [8] R. S. Keizer et. al., Nature **439**, 825 (2006).
  - [9] M. S. Anwar, F. Czeschka, M. Hesselberth, M. Porcuc, J. Aarts, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 100501(R) (2010).
  - [10] T. S. Khaire, M. A. Khasawneh, W. P. Pratt, Jr., and N. O. Birge, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 137002 (2010).
  - [11] J. W. A. Robinson, J. D. S. Witt, and M. G. Blamire, Science **329**, 59 (2010).
  - [12] Y. Tanaka, A. A. Golubov, S. Kashiwaya, and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 037005 (2007); Y. Tanaka, Y. Tanuma, A. A. Golubov, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 054522 (2007).
  - [13] Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 012507 (2004).
  - [14] Y. Tanaka, Y. Asano, A. A. Golubov, and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 140503(R) (2005).
  - [15] Y. Asano, Y. Tanaka, and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 097007 (2006).
  - [16] Y. Asano, Y. Tanaka, A. A. Golubov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 107002 (2007).
  - [17] Ya. V. Fominov, JETP Lett. **86**, 732 (2007).
  - [18] D. C. Mattis and J. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. **111**, 412 (1958).
  - [19] S. B. Nam, Phys. Rev. **156**, 470 (1967).
  - [20] A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gorkov, and I. E. Dzyaloshinski, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics* (Dover, New York, 1975). The negative pair density, discussed in the present paper, implies that the corresponding coefficient describing the response of the current to the vector potential, becomes negative in equations of the

- standard theory of superconductivity.
- [21] Y. Tanaka and A. A. Golubov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 037003 (2007).
  - [22] K. D. Usadel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 507 (1970).
  - [23] In a normal metal, the anomalous Green function  $\sin\theta$  corresponds to  $\hat{\tau}_1$  ( $\hat{\tau}_2$ ) component of Nambu space in spin-triplet (spin-singlet) NS junctions.
  - [24] Yu. V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1420 (1994); Superlattices Microstruct. **25**, 1221 (1999).
  - [25] Y. Tanaka, Yu. V. Nazarov, and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 167003 (2003).
  - [26] Ya. V. Fominov, L. I. Glazman, and M. Houzet, in preparation.
  - [27] Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 3451 (1995).
  - [28] Y. Asano, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 014511 (2001).
  - [29] M. Tinkham, *Introduction to superconductivity* (Dover, New York, 2004).
  - [30] Y. Maeno, et. al., Nature **372**, 532 (1994).