Temperature-biased double-loop Josephson flux transducer
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We theoretically study the behavior of the critical current of a thermally-biased tunnel Josephson junction with a particular design, in which the electrodes of the junction are enclosed in two different superconducting loops pierced by independent magnetic fluxes. In this setup, the superconducting gaps can be modified independently through the magnetic fluxes threading the loops. We investigate the response of the device as a function of these driving magnetic fluxes, by changing the asymmetry parameter, i.e., the ratio between the low-temperature superconducting gaps \( \delta = \Delta_{10}/\Delta_{20} \), and the temperatures of the system. We demonstrate a magnetically controllable step-like response of the critical current, which emerges even in a symmetric junction, \( \delta = 1 \), and that depends on the different temperatures of the two electrodes. Finally, we discuss the optimal working conditions and the high response of the critical current to small changes in the magnetic flux, reporting good performances of the transducer, with a high transfer function that depends on the operating point and the quality of the junction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, several works demonstrated that a quite well-known device, a Josephson junction (JJ), can still deserve surprises when subject to a thermal gradient, i.e., unbalancing the temperatures at the two sides of the device. Thermal transport at the nanoscale and the research field of superconducting phase coherent caloritronics are attracting interest [1–10] due to the importance for the whole field of quantum technologies and quantum computing to master heat management at ultra-low temperatures. In this context, it was recently demonstrated that the Josephson transport [11–13] across a superconductor-insulator-superconductor (SIS) junction, formed by different superconductors residing at different temperatures, can show unexpected, and quite peculiar, features. Indeed, intriguing phenomena have been reported also in the Josephson transport, such as a steeper variation of the critical current, i.e., the maximum supercurrent that can flow across the junction, in response to a temperature bias [11]. Surprisingly, the critical current can even increase with the temperature, thus suggesting to apply this phenomenon for a wide-band threshold calorimeter [12]. Furthermore, strong nonlinear temperature biases can induce a spontaneous breaking of the particle-hole symmetry, generating even a bypolar thermoelectric effect [14, 15].

All the cases described so far, underly the importance of the alignment mechanism of the two superconducting singularities in the DOS and its anomalous components. This matching of the singularities can be triggered by different mechanisms determined by temperatures and/or biasing typically applied to junctions formed by different superconductors.

In this work, we propose an alternative junction configuration, shown in Fig. 1, formed by enclosing a superconducting loop around each electrode, and coupling the electrodes through a tunnel JJ. In this way, the magnetic flux through these loops gives an effective way to affect the superconducting gaps by only magnetic means, and thus to master the transport properties of the device. Specifically, we show how to magnetically tune the step-like response of the critical current, in both the symmetric and asymmetric junction case. Finally, we discuss how the effect of a loop area asymmetry reflects on the system response and its tunability. The setup discussed in this paper can be effectively used to mutually control the superconducting gaps by only magnetic means, and thus to master the transport properties of the device. Specifically, we show how to magnetically tune the step-like response of the critical current, in both the symmetric and asymmetric junction case. Finally, we discuss how the effect of a loop area asymmetry reflects on the system response and its tunability. The setup discussed in this paper can be effectively used to mutually control the superconducting gaps by only magnetic means, and thus to master the transport properties of the device.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we study

FIG. 1. Schematic of the device. The electrodes are formed by superconducting loops interrupted by small superconducting regions, which are tunnel-coupled through an insulating barrier (yellow). The left, \( S_1 \), and right, \( S_2 \), loops reside at different temperature, \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \), respectively, and are pierced by independent magnetic fluxes \( \Phi_i \) (with \( i = 1, 2 \)).
the behavior of the critical current by varying the magnetic fluxes driving of the device, at different values of the ratio between the critical temperatures of the two superconductors, both in the symmetric and asymmetric case. In Sec. III, we introduce the working principles of a magnetic flux-to-critical current transducer based on a temperature-biased device, describing also a simple measurement setup. In Sec. IV, the conclusions are drawn.

II. THE CRITICAL CURRENT

We assume a tunnel Josephson junction (JJ) formed by different BCS superconductors $S_1$ and $S_2$, with energy gaps $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ and residing at temperatures $T_1$ and $T_2$. This device can support a Josephson current [23, 24] with a maximum value given by the relation [25–28]

$$I_c(T_1, T_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi R} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[ f(\varepsilon, T_1) \Re \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(\varepsilon, T_1) \right] \Im \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2(\varepsilon, T_2) \right] + f(\varepsilon, T_2) \Re \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_2(\varepsilon, T_2) \right] \Im \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_1(\varepsilon, T_1) \right] \right] d\varepsilon \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $R$ is the normal-state resistance of the junction, $f(\varepsilon, T_j) = \tanh(\varepsilon/2k_BT_j)$, and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_j(\varepsilon, T_j) = \frac{\Delta_j(T_j)}{\sqrt{(\varepsilon+i\Gamma_j)^2 - \Delta_j^2(T_j)}} \quad (2)$$

is the anomalous Green’s function of the $j$-th superconductor [29]. In the previous equation, we included the phenomenological Dynes parameter $\Gamma_j = \gamma_j\Delta_{j0}$ [30], with $\Delta_{j0} = 1.764k_BT_{c,j}$ being the zero-temperature superconducting BCS gap [31] and $T_{c,j}$ is the critical temperature. The Dynes parameter [30, 32] would effectively describe a lifetime broadening, and it allows to reproduce the smearing of the IV characteristics at low voltages. In fact, a non-negligible $\gamma_j$ introduces states within the gap, $|\varepsilon| < \Delta_j$, in contrast with the ideal BCS case, which instead gives a zero-DOS within the gap [33, 34]. In this work we assume first $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma = [10^{-3} - 10^{-4}]$, i.e., values often used to describe realistic superconducting tunnel junctions [35–37], and then we explore how $\gamma_j$ affects the system response in Sec. III.

According to Eq. (1), the critical current of a temperature-biased tunnel JJ depends strongly on the superconductors forming the device, so that it is useful to define a gap-asymmetry parameter

$$\delta = \frac{\Delta_{10}}{\Delta_{20}} = \frac{T_{c,1}}{T_{c,2}}. \quad (3)$$

A suitable gap-asymmetry can be eventually achieved by using electrodes formed by a proximity-coupled superconductor-normal metal bilayer, in order to fine tune the critical temperature of the film, for example by appropriately adjusting the film thickness. Unfortunately, in such a case, to change the gap asymmetry one needs to grow another sample, so the fine tuning through magnetic fluxes discussed in the following is highly advantageous for experimental purposes.

For the sake of clarity, we use in this work a notation in which a tilde over a letter labels a dimensionless, normalized quantity. In particular, the quantities $\tilde{\Phi}_j = \Phi_j/\Phi_0$ (with $\Phi_0 = \hbar/2e$ being the magnetic flux quantum) and $\tilde{T}_j = T_j/\sqrt{T_{c,1}T_{c,2}}$ are the normalized magnetic flux and the normalized temperature of the $j$-th ring, respectively, and $I_c = \frac{2eR}{\sqrt{\Delta_{10}\Delta_{20}}}I_c = 2e\sqrt{\Delta_{10}\Delta_{20}}I_c$ is the normalized critical current of the device. The choice to normalize the temperatures with respect to the geometric mean of the critical temperatures, $\sqrt{T_{c,1}T_{c,2}}$, is convenient to treat asymmetric systems. Thus, the condition $T_1 = T_2$, i.e., the absence of a temperature gradient, corresponds to $\tilde{T}_1 = \tilde{T}_2$, regardless of the value of $\delta$. Anyway, in the case of asymmetric gaps, with this normalization there are some constraints on the admissible normalized temperatures to keep both electrodes superconducting, which indeed depend on the value of $\delta$. In fact, since $\tilde{T}_1 = \sqrt{\delta}T_1/T_{c,1}$ and $\tilde{T}_2 = \left(1/\sqrt{\delta}\right)T_2/T_{c,2}$, the requirement for superconductivity $T_j \leq T_{c,j}$ leads to the conditions

$$\tilde{T}_1 \leq \sqrt{\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{T}_2 \leq 1/\sqrt{\delta}. \quad (4)$$

As already shown in Ref. [12], a temperature gradient across a JJ formed by different superconductors, i.e., with $\delta \neq 1$, may affect its critical current in such a way to induce a steeper response. In particular, a critical current “jump” occurs when the electrodes reside at the temperatures at which the BCS gaps coincide and the singularities of the anomalous Green functions in the two superconductors match [29]. This phenomenon is the non-dissipative counterpart of the peaks observed in the quasiparticle charge and heat current flowing through a voltage-biased $S_1$-$I$-$S_2$ junction [29, 37–41], both determined by the alignment of the gap singularities of the BCS superconductors [29]. In Ref. [12] it was demonstrated that a requirement to observe this peculiar $I_c$ behavior is maintaining a temperature bias across the device. In other words, the fine control of temperatures is strictly necessary to observe this phenomenon. Instead, here we show how to relax this quite demanding requirement by proposing an alternative design of the device, which allows to accurately tune the superconducting gap. In fact, we demonstrate how to use magnetic fields, in the place of temperatures, to control the matching of singularities in the anomalous Green function, which gives rise to the critical current jumps. Moreover, the magnetic control of superconducting gaps makes it possible to observe the step-like response of $I_c$, if a temperature gradient is present, even in the symmetric-gap case, i.e., $\delta = 1$, in other words, in a device formed by electrodes of the same material.

The setup that we discuss in this paper is partially inspired by the superconducting quantum interference single-electron transistor (SQUIDET) [42–46], which
FIG. 2. Normalized critical current as a function of the normalized magnetic fluxes $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_2$, at $\delta = 1$, $\tilde{T}_1 = 0.1$, and $\tilde{T}_2 = 0.1, 0.5$ and 0.9, see panels (a), (b), and (c), respectively. The horizontal short-dashed lines indicate the $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ values at which the curves in panels (d), (e), and (f) are calculated, while the vertical long-dashed lines indicate the $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ values at which the curves in panels (g), (h), and (i) are calculated. The legend in panel (d) refers also to panels (e) and (f), while the legend in panel (g) refers also to panels (h) and (i).

is in turn composed by two identical superconducting quantum-interference proximity transistors [47], playing respectively the role of source and drain electrodes and pierced by different magnetic fluxes. In such a setup, the superconducting rings are closed by short normal regions, where superconducting correlations affect locally the weak-link through the proximity effect. Indeed, a phase difference in the ring induces a strong modification of the spectrum of the island, where a minigap is opened [48, 49]. The loop geometry enclosing the superconducting electrode makes it possible to change the phase difference $\phi$ across the normal island through external magnetic fields. Thus, in the case of a short $N$ region satisfying the condition $E_{th} \gg \Delta$, where $E_{th} = \hbar D/L^2$ is the Thouless energy, with $D$ and $L$ being the diffusion constant and length of the region, respectively, the BCS-like spectrum with a flux-dependent induced gap reads as follow [50]

$$\Delta_{j,g}(T_j, \Phi_j) = \Delta_j(T_j) |\cos (\pi \Phi_j)|,$$

so that the spectral properties of the two electrodes of the tunnel JJ can be tuned via the external magnetic fluxes $\Phi_j$ through the ring areas. Recently, a magnetometer [51] and a thermal diode [52] based on this concept were also proposed.

The crucial difference in our device, with respect a SQUISET, is that the two superconducting rings enclose short superconducting regions, which in turn are tunnel-coupled through an insulating barrier, see Fig. 1, instead to be coupled to the Coulomb-blockaded island. For our setup, the critical current of the device is given by Eq. (1), but the superconducting gaps depend on the magnetic fluxes according to Eq. (5). Consequently, the dependence on the magnetic flux of the gaps is reflected first on the Green functions $F_j$, see Eq. (2), and then on the critical current $I_c$.

Here, we assume the independent control of the magnetic fluxes piercing the superconducting rings through independent local coils, as already done experimentally in Ref. [45]. Anyway, one can alternatively assume two different loop areas, and investigate the system response as a function of the single external magnetic field applied orthogonally to the rings plane. In such a case, the fluxes through the two rings are effectively different, and this gives the possibility to scan different values. Thus, our proposal offers the feasibility to fully control the superconducting gaps through magnetic fluxes and modulating the critical current of the device. In this manner, a crit-
critical current jump can be caught if a temperature bias is applied to the junction. Intriguingly, for this setup, the jump can be controlled even without the fine tuning of the temperatures, as it is instead required by using an asymmetric tunnel JJ [12]. In other words, even if the electrodes have still to reside at different temperatures, the fine-tuning is done by manipulating only the magnetic fields. The additional control knob offered by the magnetic flux makes it possible to observe the anomalous $I_c$ response also if the rings are made by the same superconductor, simplifying the experimental realization. This feature strongly distinguishes further our device from a simple temperature-biased tunnel JJ, which instead requires the asymmetry between the superconductors for observing the peculiar jumping behavior of $I_c$. For this reason, in the following we discuss first the symmetric-gap case, leaving aside the asymmetric case that will be however considered later on in the article.

### A. The symmetric-gap case

In this section we assume that the rings are made by the same superconductor, that is we impose $\delta = 1$. Figure 1 shows a possible experimental realization of the proposed device, where we indicate the magnetic fluxes, $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$, piercing the superconducting rings $S_1$ and $S_2$, which reside at temperatures $T_1$ and $T_2$, respectively.

We study the behavior of the critical current by changing the magnetic fluxes. Thus, the density plots in Fig. 2 show the behavior of the normalized critical current, $I_c$, as a function of the normalized magnetic fluxes, $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$, considering normalized temperatures equal to $\tilde{T}_1 = 0.1$ and $\tilde{T}_2 = 0.1, 0.5$, and $0.9$, see panels (a), (b), and (c), respectively [53]. In all these density plots we observe that for $\Phi_2 = 0.5$ the critical current is totally suppressed, since in this case the gap $\Delta_{j,0}$ is fully closed, see Eq. (5) [54].

The results in Fig. 2(a) are obtained assuming no thermal gradient across the system, i.e., $\tilde{T}_1 = \tilde{T}_2 = 0.1$. In this situation, changing the magnetic fluxes we observe only a modulation of $I_c$ due to the closing of the gaps, without the appearance of any jumps [see also Figs. 2(d) and (g)].

Conversely, the density plot in Fig. 2(b), which is obtained at $\tilde{T}_2 = 0.5$, shows an abrupt change in color, i.e. a transition from light to dark shades of blue, which indicates a sudden change in the critical current by changing the magnetic fluxes. This phenomenon is highlighted in panel Fig. 2(e), where three selected profiles of $I_c$ as a function of $\Phi_2$ for different $\Phi_1$’s are shown as well. The situations plotted in this figure corresponds to the horizontal short-dashed lines in Fig. 2(b). We observe that all curves show a step-like response of $I_c$ at specific values of the magnetic flux $\Phi_2 = \Phi_2^*$. In panel (h) we show three other selected profiles of $I_c$ as a function of $\Phi_1$ at fixed values of $\Phi_2$, which correspond to the vertical long-dashed lines in Fig. 2(b). Also in this case we observe a critical current jump, despite these curves behave differently with respect that in Fig. 2(e). In fact, if we compare the profiles in Fig. 2(e) and (h), i.e., $I_c$ vs $\Phi_2$ and $I_c$ vs $\Phi_1$, respectively, looking the range $\Phi_2 \in [0 - 0.5]$ we note that $I_c(\Phi_2^*)$ reduces at the jump, while $I_c(\Phi_1^*)$ increases at the jump. This point becomes important discussing the performances and the working conditions of this device, see Sec. III.

From the density plot in panel (b) we also note that the critical current shows jumps only for $0.1 \leq \Phi_1 \leq 0.9$. This range of $\Phi_1$ values shrinks considerably by enlarging the temperature gradient, e.g., see Fig. 2(c) where the temperature of the right electrode is $\tilde{T}_2 = 0.9$, still imposing $\tilde{T}_1 = 0.1$. To understand why in some cases the step-like behavior does not emerge, we remind that this phenomenon stems from the alignment of the singularities in the Green’s functions $\mathcal{G}_j$, i.e., when the superconducting gaps coincide. In other words, making explicit the magnetic flux dependence, a jump appears only when

$$\Delta_1(\tilde{T}_1) \left| \cos \left( \pi \Phi_1 \right) \right| = \Delta_2(\tilde{T}_2) \left| \cos \left( \pi \Phi_2 \right) \right|. \quad (6)$$

For those values of $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$ for which the previous equation cannot be satisfied, the critical current shows no jumps. Clearly, according to Eq. (6), the “positions”
of the jumps, i.e., the values $\tilde{\Phi}_1^*$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_2^*$, depend on both the working temperatures and the asymmetry between the superconducting gaps. This point is discussed in the next section.

### B. The asymmetric-gap case

Here, we explore how the gap asymmetry $\delta$ affects the behavior of the critical current. In other words, we assume that the electrodes are made by different superconductors, still keeping the temperature gradient across the system. In particular, the results illustrated in Fig. 3(a) are obtained by imposing the temperatures $T_1 = 0.1$ and $T_2 = 0.7$. Here, the aim is to show how $\tilde{I}_c$ depends on $\delta$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_1$, when the value of the other magnetic flux is kept fixed, e.g., $\tilde{\Phi}_2 = 0$. First, we recall that, in the symmetric-gap case, i.e., $\delta = 1$, at these temperatures and $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ value we have no jumps in the $\tilde{I}_c$ response, see Fig. 2. This means that for these parameters Eq. (6) admits no solutions for any value of $\tilde{\Phi}_2$. Instead, by reducing $\delta$ the situation changes. In fact, for $\delta \lesssim 0.9$ we can find some values of $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ that solve Eq. (6), in correspondence of which $\tilde{I}_c(\tilde{\Phi}_2)$ undergoes two jumps. As the gap-asymmetry parameter reduces further, i.e., when $\delta \to 0$, the positions of these two $\tilde{I}_c$ jumps shift towards $\tilde{\Phi}_2 = 0.5$. This behavior is better illustrated in Fig. 3(b), where we highlight some selected $\tilde{I}_c(\tilde{\Phi}_2)$ profiles obtained at different $\delta$.

### C. The asymmetric-ring area case

In the previous sections, we assumed two independent magnetic fields percing the superconducting rings. This strategy, although offering the control upon two independent degrees of freedom, is demanding from the point of view of the device fabrication, which has to include two independent local coils. For this reason we discuss here an alternative approach, which takes advantages on the fact that the loop areas may, in principle, be different. In this way we introduce an additional degree of asymmetry, as in the case investigated in Ref. [44], and the device can be controlled by a single magnetic field threading the areas $A_j$ of both superconducting rings. In this case, we can conveniently define the area-asymmetry parameter

$$\alpha = \frac{A_1}{A_2} = \frac{\tilde{\Phi}_1}{\tilde{\Phi}_2}. \quad (7)$$

Since both the asymmetry parameters $\delta$ and $\alpha$ are given by structural and geometrical characteristics of the device, once a temperature gradient is established, the remaining control parameter is the magnetic field piercing the superconducting rings. This implies the possibility to investigate the response of the system as a function of only one magnetic flux, e.g., $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi}_1 = \alpha \tilde{\Phi}_2$.

Figure 4 presents a collection of density plots showing the normalized critical current $\tilde{I}_c$ in the case of loops with different areas threatened by the same magnetic field, as a function of the control flux $\tilde{\Phi}$ at different values of the gap asymmetry $\delta$. The temperature bias is fixed, i.e., $T_1 = 0.1$ and $T_2 = 0.7$, and the density plots are obtained assuming different area asymmetries, i.e., $\alpha = \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\}$. Interestingly, the condition $\alpha = 0$ implies a zero area $A_1$ of the ring $S_1$. In other words, this is equivalent to replace the loop geometry with a simple superconducting stripe for the cold electrode. On the opposite side, imposing $\alpha = 1$ means taking two rings with the same area. Thus, density plots in Fig. 4 serve to highlight the $\tilde{I}_c(\tilde{\Phi}, \delta)$ transition from the single-loop design, see Fig. 4(a) for $\alpha = 0$, to the identical-loops design, see Fig. 4(e) for $\alpha = 1$.

We observe that even in the single-loop device the critical current behaves peculiarly, see Fig. 4(a). Then, as $\alpha$ increases, the density plot becomes more and more asymmetric in $\tilde{\Phi}$. In particular, the right side of the contour plot, i.e., for $\tilde{\Phi} > 0.5$, tends to evidently distort when $\alpha \neq 0$. Conversely, the left side of the contour plot, i.e., for $\tilde{\Phi} < 0.5$, seems to be significantly affected by $\alpha$ only when it is very close to 1. Interestingly, for $\alpha = 0.75$ a new kink, placed at $\hat{\Phi} \approx 0.65$, appears in the $\tilde{I}_c$ profiles [see the red dashed line in Fig. 4(d)]. We observe that the position of this zero of $\tilde{I}_c$ depends only on the

---

**FIG. 4.** Normalized critical current as a function of $\delta$ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ in the case of asymmetric area loops, with the ratio between the loops areas equal to $\alpha = \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\}$. All panels are obtained for $T_1 = 0.1$ and $T_2 = 0.7$. 

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\tilde{I}_c$ profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The diagrams show the normalized critical current $\tilde{I}_c$ as a function of $\delta$ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ for different values of $\alpha$. Each panel corresponds to a different value of $\alpha$ as indicated in the legend. The temperature bias is fixed at $T_1 = 0.1$ and $T_2 = 0.7$. The red dashed line in Fig. 4(d) marks the position of the new kink in the $\tilde{I}_c$ profile for $\alpha = 0.75$. The zero of $\tilde{I}_c$ is observed only when $\alpha$ is very close to 1.
α value (plot not shown). Finally, in the identical-loops design, i.e., α = 1, no jumps are observed changing \( \Phi \), see Fig. 4(e). However, in this figure, we observe a clear change in the \( \vec{I}_c \) behavior, which is demonstrated by the light-to-dark transition of the density plot texture, at \( \delta \approx 0.87 \). This threshold gap asymmetry can be evaluated as that value that satisfies Eq. (6) at a given temperature gradient.

### III. FLUX-TO-CRITICAL CURRENT RESPONSE

The physical effects described so far could promptly find an application as a high sensitivity magnetic flux-to-critical current transducer. So in this section we delve into its sensing performances by adjusting the system parameter values to achieve the optimal operating conditions. In particular, we expect the steep change in the critical current to result in a very high sensitivity of the device for detecting small flux changes. Indeed, a tiny variation of the magnetic field \( \Phi_j \) induces a huge variation of the critical current. In this detection scheme the other magnetic flux \( \Phi_i \), with \( i \neq j \), serves as an additional knob for tuning the operating point of the detector.

When the device is employed as a magnetic flux to current transducer, an important figure of merit is the flux-to-current transfer function, defined as the derivative of the critical current with respect to the driving magnetic flux (critical current responsivity) [55–58]

\[
\vec{I}_{\Phi_j} = \left| \frac{\partial \vec{I}_c}{\partial \Phi_j} \right|.
\]  

(8)

Since \( \vec{I}_c \) and \( \Phi_j \) are normalized quantities, in non-normalized units the transfer function is

\[
I_{\Phi_j} = \frac{1}{2e\Phi_0} \frac{\Delta \Phi}{\sqrt{\delta R}} \vec{I}_{\Phi_j}.
\]  

(9)

In the case of a symmetric Nb-junction, \( T_{c1} = 9.2 \) K and \( \delta = 1 \), with \( R = 10 \) k\( \Omega \), one obtains \( \frac{\Delta \Phi}{2e\Phi_0 \sqrt{\delta R}} \approx 0.07 \mu \text{A}/\Phi_0 \) as the unit of measure of the transfer function. Moreover, we investigate also the height of the critical current jump, \( \Delta \vec{I}_c \), as a function of the various system parameters [59].

In the following, we consider a device formed by identical superconductors, i.e., \( \delta = 1 \), and the independent control of the magnetic fields. We discuss only the figures of merit in the case of a monotonic variation of \( \vec{I}_c \) at the jump, e.g., the \( \vec{I}_c \) vs \( \Phi_2 \) curves in Fig. 2(e). In fact, in the case of a non-monotonic \( \vec{I}_c \), e.g., \( \vec{I}_c \) vs \( \Phi_1 \) curves in Fig. 2(h), the \( \vec{I}_c \) slope changes around a jump and thus we expect a multi-peaked \( \vec{I}_{\Phi_2} \) transfer function, even crossing zero around the peak. This is why in view of a flux-to-current transducer, in the following we focus only on the analysis of the single-peaked transfer function, \( \vec{I}_{\Phi_2} \). This means to study the effects that a change in \( \Phi_2 \) produces in \( \vec{I}_c \), using the magnetic field \( \Phi_1 \) only as a control knob to tune the position of the optimal working point of the device.

In Fig. 5 we present the \( \vec{I}_{\Phi_2} \) vs \( \Phi_2 \) profiles obtained by numerical differentiation of the data shown in Fig. 2(e) for \( \widetilde{T}_1 = 0.1 \) and \( \widetilde{T}_2 = 0.5 \). As expected, the transfer function is highly peaked in correspondence of each \( I_c \) jump, that is when \( \Phi_2 = \Phi_2^* \) (these values are marked by vertical dashed lines). These spikes are a clear demonstration of the high sensitivity to magnetic fluxes of the device. A magnetometer done with feedback loop kept at the optimal operating point promises a very high transfer function and, correspondingly, a very high sensitivity [58]. In particular, the maximum transfer function, i.e., that is its value exactly at the \( \vec{I}_c \) jump, approaches the values \( I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}} \simeq \{11, 160, \text{ and } 220\} \) at the driving fields \( \Phi_1 = \{0.1, 0.3, \text{ and } 0.4\} \), respectively.

Certainly, the height of the \( \vec{I}_{\Phi_2} \) peaks depends on the steepness of the jump, which in turn depends on its “position”, \( \Phi_2^* \), that is on the value of the driving field \( \Phi_1 \). In fact, from Fig. 5(a) one could figure out that when \( \Phi_1 \) tends to the value 0.5, also \( \Phi_2^* \rightarrow 0.5 \). In this case, the jump of \( \vec{I}_c \) becomes more sharp, thus making its derivative larger. However, we can reasonably expect that \( I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}} \) vanishes for \( \Phi_1 = 0.5 \), since at this magnetic flux the superconducting gap is fully suppressed and, as a consequence, the jump disappears. This remark suggests that one can search the optimal flux value as the \( \Phi_1 \) value at which the sensitivity reaches a maximum. Similarly, we can look for the optimal working temperatures, such as the temperatures that maximize the sensitivity.

To find the optimal working conditions, we show in Fig. 6(a), (b), and (c) the behavior of both the maximum transfer function, \( \vec{I}_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}} \), (left axis, red symbols) and the height of the critical current jump, \( \Delta \vec{I}_c \), (right axis, blue symbols) as a function of \( \Phi_1 \) (at fixed \( \widetilde{T}_2 = 0.65 \) and \( \widetilde{T}_1 = 0.1 \)), \( \widetilde{T}_2 \) (at fixed \( \widetilde{T}_1 = 0.1 \) and \( \Phi_1 = 0.38 \)), and \( \widetilde{T}_1 \).
In summary, the flux-to-current transfer function of a symmetric device, i.e., with $\delta = 1$, can be maximized by making the electrodes to reside at the temperatures $\bar{T}_2 \simeq 0.65$ and $\bar{T}_1 \simeq 0.1$ and setting the driving magnetic flux to the value $\Phi_1 \simeq 0.38$. In this case, the

![Diagram](image-url)

**FIG. 6.** Maximum flux-to-current transfer function $\tilde{I}_{\Phi_2}^{\max}$ (left axis, red symbols) and height of the critical current jump $\Delta \tilde{I}_c$ (right axis, blue symbols) versus: (a) $\Phi_1$ at fixed $\bar{T}_2 = 0.65$ and $\bar{T}_1 = 0.1$; (b) $\bar{T}_2$ at fixed $\Phi_1 = 0.38$ and $\bar{T}_1 = 0.1$; (c) $\bar{T}_1$ at fixed $\tilde{\Phi}_1 = 0.38$ and $\bar{T}_2 = 0.65$. The insets show the position, $\tilde{\Phi}_2$, of the $I_c$ jump. The other parameters are $\delta = 1$ and $\gamma = 10^{-4}$.

(at fixed $\bar{T}_2 = 0.65$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_1 = 0.38$), respectively, setting $\delta = 1$ and $\gamma = 10^{-4}$.

The $I_{\Phi_2}^{\max}$ vs $\tilde{\Phi}_1$ curve in Fig. 6(a) is characterized by a non-monotonic profile with a maximum at $\tilde{\Phi}_1 = 0.38$. Regarding the low-fluxes behavior of data in Fig. 6(a), we observe that, at $\bar{T}_2 = 0.65$, $\bar{T}_1 = 0.1$, and $\delta = 1$, Eq. (6) admits solutions only for $\tilde{\Phi}_1 \gtrsim 0.164$. At low $\tilde{\Phi}_1$, the $I_c$ jump is quite smooth being placed close to $\tilde{\Phi}_2 \sim 0$, see the inset of Fig. 6(a), but despite this its height $\Delta \tilde{I}_c$ is still sizable. On the other side, for $\tilde{\Phi}_1 \rightarrow 0.5$ also the jump position tends to $\tilde{\Phi}_2 \rightarrow 0.5$, so that the critical current tends to vanish due to the reduced gap, and both $I_{\Phi_2}^{\max}$ and $\Delta \tilde{I}_c$ tends to zero. Thus, also the $\Delta \tilde{I}_c$ curve shows a maximum, roughly located at $\tilde{\Phi}_1 \sim 0.35$.

Also the $I_{\Phi_2}^{\max}$ vs $\bar{T}_2$ curve in Fig. 6(b) behaves non-monotonically showing an evident maximum. Conversely, $\Delta \tilde{I}_c$ vs $\bar{T}_2$ monotonically increases in this case.
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**FIG. 7.** Flux-to-current transfer function $\tilde{I}_{\Phi_2}$ as a function of $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ at different values of the Dynes parameter $\gamma$, at a fixed $\Phi_1 = 0.38$. The magnetic flux $\tilde{\Phi}_2^*$ at which $I_c$ shows a jump is highlighted. In the inset: Maximum flux-to-current transfer functions $I_{\Phi_2}^{\max}$ (i.e., calculated at $\tilde{\Phi}_2 = \tilde{\Phi}_2^*$) as a function of $\gamma$. (b) Fitting parameter $k$ as a function of $\tilde{\Phi}_1$, see Eq. (10). The other parameters are: $\delta = 1$, $\bar{T}_1 = 0.1$, $\bar{T}_2 = 0.65$.

Clearly, both figures of merit vanish for low $\bar{T}_2$'s (specifically, for $\bar{T}_2 = \bar{T}_1$ there is no thermal gradient along the system and, thus, no critical current jump). Then, $I_{\Phi_2}^{\max}$ increases up to a maximum at $\bar{T}_2 = 0.65$ [see Fig. 6(b)], and it finally reduces again for $\bar{T}_2 \rightarrow 1$. In fact, in this conditions the jump position $\tilde{\Phi}_2^*$ clearly shifts towards zero, see the inset of Fig. 6(b), making the $I_c$ step smoother, but still sizable (and this is why the jump height $\Delta \tilde{I}_c$ still remains quite large even at high $\bar{T}_2$ values).

Finally, the behaviors of both $I_{\Phi_2}^{\max}$ and $\Delta \tilde{I}_c$ are monotonically decreasing as a function of $\bar{T}_1$, see Fig. 6(c), showing a plateau for $\bar{T}_1 \lesssim 0.1$ and then reducing until vanishing for $\bar{T}_1 = \bar{T}_2$. This is clearly due the fact that lowering the thermal gradient reduces the critical current jump. We observe also that the jump position $\tilde{\Phi}_2^*$ is only slightly affected by a change of $\bar{T}_1$, as shown in the inset of Fig. 6(c).

In summary, the flux-to-current transfer function of a symmetric device, i.e., with $\delta = 1$, can be maximized by making the electrodes to reside at the temperatures $\bar{T}_2 \simeq 0.65$ and $\bar{T}_1 \simeq 0.1$ and setting the driving magnetic flux to the value $\Phi_1 \simeq 0.38$. In this case, the
FIG. 8. Readout scheme including a dc SQUID.

normalized maximum transfer function approaches the value $\sim 2500$, that, in non-normalized units and assuming $T_{c_1} = 9.2$ K, $\delta = 1$, $R = 10$ kΩ, and $\gamma = 10^{-4}$, is equal to $I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}} \sim 175 \mu\Phi_0$. We additionally stress that the sensitivity can be further optimized by assuming an asymmetric device, that is made by different superconductors. In fact, the value $I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}} \sim 3400$, corresponding to $I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}} \sim 240 \mu\Phi_0$, is reached in the case of $\delta = 0.4$, assuming fixed values for the other parameters (plot not shown).

Since the sensitivity of the device essentially relies upon the sharpness of the $I_c$ jump, it in turn depends also on the value of the phenomenological Dynes’s parameters as it was discussed in Ref. [12]. Thus, in Fig. 7(a) we report the impact of $\gamma$ on the transfer function. This figure serves to illustrate the behavior of $I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}}$ versus $\Phi_2$ in a neighborhood of a jump, at a few values of $\gamma$, and imposing the optimal working conditions $T_1 = 0.1$, $T_2 = 0.65$, and $\gamma = 0.38$. Here, the aim is to evidence how the sensitivity depends also on $\gamma$. As expected, we observe that the lower $\gamma$, the more peaked is $I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}}$. In particular, as it is demonstrated clearly in the inset of Fig. 7(a), the maximum transfer function decreases by increasing $\gamma$ as

$$I_{\Phi_2}^{\text{max}} = \frac{k}{\gamma}. \quad (10)$$

Specifically, from the fit of the data in the inset of Fig. 7(a) we obtain the value $k \approx 0.26$.

Indeed, the fitting coefficient $k$ in Eq. (10) is a function of both the position and the steepness of the jump: this means that, if we fix the temperatures, $k$ depends only on the choice of the $\Phi_1$ value. In Fig. 7(b) we show that $k$ changes non-monotonically with $\Phi_1$. Finally, since a given driving flux $\Phi_1$ matches a specific value of $k$, according to Eq. (10), an experimental measurement of the steepness of the critical current jump could, in principle, give also an estimate of the value of the Dynes parameter $\gamma$.

Finally, we observe that the information content we are interested in can be extracted through a non-dispersive scheme, depicted in Fig. 8, that uses a standard dc-SQUID, drawn in gray in the figure, along the lines of the readout strategy for proximity Josephson sensors discussed in Ref. [60]. In such a scheme the current flowing in the inductance $L$ is changed when the critical current $I_c$ in the double-ring device is modified. In fact, a constant bias current $I_b$ divides into two parts, i.e., one flowing through the double-ring branch and the other ($I_c$) through a load inductor ($L$), which is mutually coupled to the dc SQUID. The variation of the critical current $I_c$ produces a large enhancement of the Josephson kinetic inductance $L_K = \hbar/(2eI_c)$, which in turn results in a modification of $I_c$, thus producing a magnetic field which is detected by the SQUID. Other schemes, which resort to dispersive measurements, are also possible, but we do not investigate them further.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, in this paper we explored the behavior of the critical current, $I_c$, of a Josephson junction with a very specific design. In fact, we considered a tunnel Josephson junction formed by different superconductors, which reside at different temperatures, enclosed in two different superconducting loops, pierced by independent magnetic fluxes. These driving fluxes allow the independent control of the superconducting gaps. We discussed the behavior of $I_c$ as a function of the driving magnetic fluxes, by changing both the temperatures of the electrodes and the ratio, $\delta$, between the critical temperatures of the superconductors. In particular, at a fixed temperature bias, we demonstrated the emergence of a steplike response of $I_c$ when the system is driven by magnetic fluxes at which the BCS superconducting gaps coincide. This peculiar steplike response appears even in the symmetric junction case, that is when $\delta = 1$.

We also discussed the optimal working conditions to increase the transfer function of a flux-to-critical current transducer, considering also the relevant figures of merit. In this case, we also illustrated how the value of the Dynes parameter in the superconductors influences the sharpness of the $I_c$ transition, being an important factor to increase the sensitivity.

The proposed setup can be imaged as a novel superconducting flux transducer [58], where the sensitivity to magnetic fluxes is determined by non-equilibrium temperature conditions. The feasibility of controlling the superconducting gaps, and therefore the transport properties, by means of magnetic fluxes allows to relax the rather tight requirement of fine tuning of the temperatures of the two electrodes previously discussed. Indeed, once a temperature difference across the system has been established, we only need to adjust the magnetic fluxes to establish the operating point properly, so to highlight the steep jump of the critical current. Furthermore, we can go in search of the best conditions that give a more abrupt response, or a more intense jump, simply by changing the magnetic flux.
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We note clearly that for δ = 1 both temperatures are normalized to the same critical temperature, i.e, \( T_j = T_j/T_c \) with \( j = 1, 2 \).

This is a clear consequence of the fact that, in general, according to the Ambegaokar-Baratoff relation [61] the critical current is proportional to \( I_c \propto \sqrt{\Delta_{20}} \).


The height of the critical current jump, \( \Delta I_c \), is obtained estimating first the full width at half maximum, \( 2\phi \), of the Lorentzian function used to fit the \( \partial I_c/\partial \Phi \) profile around a peak, and then as the absolute value of the difference between the \( \tilde{l}c(\tilde{\Phi}_j) \) values calculated at a distance \( \pm 3\phi \) from the \( \tilde{l}c \) jump position, \( \tilde{\Phi}_j \), that is \( \Delta I_c = \tilde{l}c(\tilde{\Phi}_j - 3\phi) - \tilde{l}c(\tilde{\Phi}_j + 3\phi) \).
