

Novel Josephson effects between multi-gap and single-gap superconductors

D.F. Agterberg^{1,4}, Eugene Demler², and B. Janko^{3,4}

¹ Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201

² Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

³ Department of Physics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46617

⁴ Materials Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Argonne, IL 60439

Multi-gap superconductors can exhibit qualitatively new phenomena due to existence of multiple order parameters. Repulsive electronic interactions may give rise to a phase difference of between the phases of the order parameters. Collective modes due to the oscillation of the relative phases of these order parameters are also possible. Here we show that both these phenomena are observable in Josephson junctions between a single-gap and a multi-gap superconductor. In particular, a non-monotonic temperature dependence of the Josephson current through the junction reveals the existence of the phase differences in the multi-gap superconductor. This mechanism may be relevant for understanding several experiments on the Josephson junctions with unconventional superconductors. We also discuss how the presence of the collective mode resonantly enhances the DC Josephson current when the voltage across the junction matches the mode frequency. We suggest that our results may apply to MgB_2 , 2H-NbSe_2 , spin ladder and bilayer cuprates.

Multi-band superconductors have been the subject of theoretical investigation since the original work of Suh, Matthis, and Walker [1]. Experimentally, it has recently been shown that MgB_2 [2,7] and 2H-NbSe_2 [8] belong to this class. In this article we examine some qualitatively new features associated with superconductivity in the multi-band materials. We will focus on examining Josephson junctions between a multi-band superconductor and a single band superconductor. We show that such a junction can reveal important information about the role of electronic interactions in the pairing mechanism and further be used to detect superconducting collective modes specific to multi-band superconductors.

A phase difference of between the gap on different bands occurs when repulsive electronic interactions between the different bands play an important role in creating the superconducting state [9,13]. Such a mechanism has been argued to be relevant for the spin-ladder cuprate superconductors [14], with the gap being of opposite sign on the bonding and antibonding bands of the two legs of the ladder [10,11]. It has also been suggested that inter-band repulsive electronic interactions may be relevant to MgB_2 [12,13]. Below we show that the temperature dependence of the Josephson current between a multi-gap and a single-gap superconductor can reveal the existence of phase difference between the order parameter on the two bands participating in the superconducting state. Such a Josephson junction can also be used to detect a collective mode originally proposed by Leggett [15]. This mode may exist regardless of the relative sign of the order parameters in the two bands and involves an oscillation of their relative phase. It has been proposed theoretically for bilayer cuprates [16] and Sr_2RuO_4 [17] and observed experimentally in $\text{SmLa}_{0.8}\text{Sr}_{0.2}\text{CuO}_4$ [18].

In the following, we focus on a two-band superconductor with bands labelled by and . In spin-ladder

cuprates these would correspond to the anti-bonding and bonding bands of the two legs of the ladder. In MgB_2 , the band would correspond to the quasi-2D hole bands due to the π -bonding p_{xy} boron orbitals and the band would correspond to the 3D electron and 3D hole band due to the σ -bonding p_z boron orbitals [19]. To describe the superconducting state, we use a two-band BCS model in the clean limit. This model is parameterized by the interaction matrix that describes both the intra-band (V_{ii} and V_{jj}) and the inter-band matrix (V_{ij}) pair scattering elements. In the calculations presented below we employ the weak-coupling self-consistency gap equation $\Delta_i = T \sum_j N_j V_{ij} \Delta_j / (\Delta_i^2 + \epsilon_{ij}^2)$, where N_i is the density of states at the Fermi surface for band i and $\epsilon_{ij} = T(2n_i + 1)$. However we expect our results to apply even in the strong coupling regime.

Temperature dependence of the Josephson current A sign difference between and can only be detected through a phase sensitive experiment. Here we examine the Josephson current through a junction between a multi-band superconductor and a single-band superconductor. The Josephson current through such a junction can be found once the boundary conditions for the quasi-classical equations have been specified. This has been done by Zaitsev [20] (see also Ref. [21]) and generalized by Mazin et al. [22] to multi-band superconductors. The resulting current through the junction with multi-band superconductors on both the right side R and the left side L is

$$I_S = \frac{T}{e} \sum_{i,j} X_{ij} \frac{1}{R_{N_{ij}}} \sin(\phi_{L_i} - \phi_{R_j}) \quad (1)$$

$$X_{ij} = \frac{\Delta_{L_i}(T) \Delta_{R_j}(T)}{\Delta_{L_i}^2(T) + \epsilon_{L_i}^2 + \Delta_{R_j}^2(T) + \epsilon_{R_j}^2}$$

where

ϕ_{L_i} is the phase of ψ_{L_i} , $R_{N,ij}^{-1} = m \ln R_{L_i}^{-1}; R_{R,j}^{-1} g$ with $(A R_{L_i}(R_j))^{-1} = \frac{2e^2}{h} R_{N,ij}^{-1} \frac{D_{ij} v_{n,i;L_i}(R_j) d^2 S_{L_i}(R_j)}{(2)^3 v_{F,i;L_i}(R_j)}$, A is the junction area, $d^2 S_{L_i}$ denotes the area element of Fermi surface L_i , and D_{ij} is the probability for a quasiparticle to tunnel from band i in L to band j in R . The total junction resistance is given by $R_N^{-1} = \sum_{ij} R_{N,ij}^{-1}$. The functions $\phi_{L_i}(R_j)(T)$ take on the bulk values, as is justified for s-wave superconductors near non-magnetic insulating surfaces.

Here we consider the simplest case of a Josephson junction between a conventional single-band superconductor R and a two-band superconductor (L_i , $i = f, g$). We consider a geometry for which both bands contribute to the transport and assume that the conductance through the junction is limited by the two-band superconductor. In our calculations we take $V_f = 0$ and $V_g = 0.35 V_f$ with a density of states ratio $N_f/N_g = 1.35$ (V_f is taken negative so that the two gaps are of opposite sign). Physically, this corresponds to a purely induced gap on the f band (this interaction simulates that of MgB_2 [3]). We consider two possible values for $R_N = R_{N_f} = 2$ and $R_{N_g} = 1$. Assuming a BCS theory for the single-band superconductor we find the results shown on Figs. 1 and 2. The most important feature for $R_N = 1$ is that the maximum in the Josephson current occurs at finite temperature, not at zero temperature. This maximum occurs due to thermal effects. At high temperatures, the thermally excited quasiparticles easily deplete the Josephson current arising from the overlap of the order parameter with the smaller amplitude in the multiband superconductor, and the order parameter of the conventional, single band superconductor. However, as the temperature is lowered, the contribution from the band with the smaller gap becomes more important, which leads to a downturn in the total Josephson current. The behavior for $R_N = 2$ is even more striking. In this case the Josephson current becomes zero at some temperature. This remarkable behavior occurs because the f band is assumed to have the smaller gap but the larger conductivity through the junction. The values of T_c that allow for a vanishing I_c can be found analytically when $T_c^R = T_c^L$. This can be done by comparing the sign of I_S given by Eq. 5 at $T = 0$ and at $T = T_c^L$. If the sign changes then there must be a zero in I_c . For $T = T_c^L$,

$$I_S = \frac{F \sum_R (T) j_R}{4Te} \sin(\phi_L - \phi_R) \frac{j_L(T) j_R}{R_N} - \frac{j_L(T) j_R}{R_N}$$

where $F \sum_R (T) j_R$ is a function which has no simple form (except for $T_c^R = T_c^L$ where $F \sum_R (T) j_R = j_R(T) j_R$). For $T = 0$, [21] and $j_L(0) j_R > j_R(0) j_R$,

$$I_S = \frac{\sin(\phi_L - \phi_R)}{R_N} \frac{1}{e} j_R(0) \mathcal{K}^p \frac{1}{1 - (j_R(0) j_R - j_L(0) j_R)^2} - \frac{1}{R_N} \frac{1}{e} j_L(0) \mathcal{K}^p \frac{1}{1 - (j_L(0) j_R - j_R(0) j_R)^2} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{K}(x)$ is a complete elliptic integral of the first kind. For $j_L(0) j_R < j_R(0) j_R$, $j_L(0) j_R$ and $j_R(0) j_R$ should be interchanged in the term proportional to $j_R(0) j_R$ in Eq. 2. For example, if $j_f = 2j_g$, $j_g = 3j_f$ then the zero in I_c exists for $3.0 > T > 1.7$. Note that in the temperature region where the Josephson current vanishes, higher order terms in the Josephson coupling should be included in the theory. This will not be done here.




FIG. 1. Temperature dependence of the Δ_σ and Δ_π .




FIG. 2. Temperature dependence of the Josephson current between a two gap superconductor (with $T_c = 41$ K) and a single-band superconductor with various T_c^R as given in the plot. The parameter $R_N = R_{N_f} = R_{N_g}$. Note that the $I_c R_N$ products for $R_N = 2$ pass through zero to make the graph clearer, the actual values will remain positive.

Fig. 2 was determined for only one choice of the parameters V_f, V_g . We have explored a much wider parameter range and have found that there are three criteria for the observation of this finite temperature maximum or the vanishing of the Josephson current: (1)–the gaps are of opposite sign; (2)–the smaller gap is smaller than the that of the single-band superconductor (note the larger gap can be larger or smaller than the gap of the single band superconductor); and (3)–both bands must contribute to the conductance through the junction (the effect always occurs for $R_N = 1$ when the first two conditions are satisfied). Since superconductivity in spin ladder cuprates [10] represents a likely testing ground for the predicted

behavior, it is worthwhile discussing the gap structure more carefully. In this case the relative phase difference arises from repulsive interactions between the bonding () and anti-bonding () bands of the two legs of the ladder. In general, the density of states is not the same for the and bands [11]. If a large on-site Coulomb repulsion exists, then the gap structure is easily determined by the constraint that the on-site pairing amplitude is zero. In particular, $\epsilon_{k_i} = 0$, which implies $N_{\uparrow} = N_{\downarrow}$ for all temperatures (e.g. the Fermi surface with the bigger density of states has the smaller gap). We have commented that the finite temperature maximum in I_c (as seen in Fig. 2) occurs for this gap structure when $\epsilon = 1$. It is useful to point out that there have been at least three experiments where the Josephson current exhibits a peak at finite temperatures (similar to Fig. 2 for $\epsilon = 1$): in a UBe_3/Ta junction [23], a YBCO/Pb junction [24], and a $\text{Pb}/\text{Sr}_2\text{RuO}_4/\text{Pb}$ junction [25]. In all three cases, the suspected unconventional nature of UBe_3 , YBCO , and Sr_2RuO_4 have been argued to be responsible for this behavior [23,24,26]. However, all these materials have multiple bands and perhaps the explanation given above is relevant. One can also give simple generalizations of the discussion above to the cases of more complicated junction geometries in which different k-points on the Fermi surface play the role of separate bands.

Collective mode-assisted tunnelling Here we show that Leggett's collective mode resonantly couples to the DC Josephson current of a junction between the two-band superconductor and a single-band superconductor. The gaps need not be of opposite sign as in the previous section. Consider a superconductor that has two superconducting order parameters ψ_1 and ψ_2 , coming from two bands, with a Josephson coupling between them. Let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be their respective phases. First, let us derive Leggett's mode from the microscopic equations of motion. We define $\epsilon = \frac{V_1^2 - V_2^2}{2}$, the chemical potential difference between the two bands $\epsilon = \mu_1 - \mu_2$, and charge imbalance between the two bands $L = Q_1 - Q_2$. They are related through an appropriate compressibility and the relation $L = \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \mu}$. When the two bands are out of equilibrium, there is internal Josephson current $J_c \sin(2\phi)$ and some internal dissipative current J_d . From charge conservation and using the relation $[L; \phi] = 2ie$ we have

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t} = J_c \sin(2\phi) \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\hbar}{e} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t^2} = J_c \sin(2\phi) - \frac{\hbar}{e} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} \quad (4)$$

So, there is a collective mode at energy $\hbar \omega_0^2 = 2eJ_c = \hbar$ with dissipation set by J_d . As discussed in [15] such simplified discussion is appropriate only when $V_1^2 < V_2^2$; $V_1 > V_2$. The energy of the collective mode can

also be expressed using parameters of the original microscopic Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0 = (8J_V; \psi_1 \psi_2) \psi_1^\dagger \psi_2^\dagger [(N_1 + N_2)V_1; V_2; \psi_1 \psi_2]^{1=2}$. If the condition $V_1^2 < V_2^2$ is not satisfied, there is no sharp mode but a broad continuum of excitations corresponding to a transfer of electrons between the two bands. For simplicity we focus the analysis in this paper on the case when a sharp collective mode exists, and provide a qualitative discussion of the opposite situation, when only a broad continuum of excitations is present.

We now discuss what happens if there is Josephson coupling between the two-gap superconductor and another single gap superconductor. Let ϕ_3 be the superconducting phase of this other superconductor. The charge balance equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t} = J_c \sin(2\phi) + J_1 \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_3) + J_2 \sin(\phi_2 - \phi_3) \quad (5)$$

If we introduce $\phi = \frac{\phi_1 + \phi_2}{2} - \phi_3$, we have

$$\frac{\hbar}{e} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t^2} + \frac{\hbar}{e} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = J_c \sin(2\phi) + J_1 \sin(\phi + \phi_0) + J_2 \sin(\phi - \phi_0) \quad (6)$$

When there is a constant voltage between the two superconductors we have $\phi = 2eVt/\hbar = \phi_0 + \phi_1$. Assuming that ϕ_0 is small, we can solve the last equation for

$$\phi(t) = \frac{e}{\hbar} \text{Im} \int_0^t \frac{(J_1 - J_2)e^{i\phi_0} g}{[\frac{2}{\hbar} + i\phi_0^2 + i\phi_1^2]} dt \quad (7)$$

If we average the total current $I_{\text{tot}} = J_1 \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_3) + J_2 \sin(\phi_2 - \phi_3)$ over time we find

$$I_{\text{tot}} = \frac{e}{2\hbar} \frac{\frac{2eV}{\hbar} (J_1 - J_2)^2}{[(\phi_0^2 + \frac{4e^2 V^2}{\hbar^2})^2 + (\frac{2eV}{\hbar})^2]} \quad (8)$$

We therefore have a resonance enhancement of the DC current when voltage matches the energy of the Leggett mode. If the experiments are done at finite current this will show up as Fiske steps. There is a simple physical interpretation of this result based on the picture of the Leggett's mode as a bound state between quasiparticles in the two bands [15]. Consider a process where an electron from one band of a multi-gap superconductor traverses the junction, gets Andreev reflected from the single gap superconductor and comes back as a hole into the other band. During both crossings the quasiparticle acquires an energy eV , so we end up with a pair of quasiparticles that has energy $2eV$. When this energy matches the energy of the bound state $\hbar \omega_0$ this process gets resonantly enhanced and we find a peak in the DC current. This suggests a generalization of the above discussion to multiple traversals of the junction by particles and holes resulting in the creation of a Leggett exciton.

In this more general case we can expect peaks in $I(V)$ at voltages $V_n = \hbar\omega_0/(2en)$, where n is any integer. A related scenario has been discussed recently by Auerbach and Altman [27] to explain a subgap structure in the high T_c junctions. Their proposal includes the creation of a pair of magnetic $S = 1$ excitons rather than a single $S = 0$ exciton as in our case. When the sharp resonance is absent we expect that there will be no peak in the DC current but a jump starting from some threshold voltage. This may be interpreted as a collection of small peaks coming from the continuum of two quasiparticle excitations and is similar to the usual IV characteristics for Josephson junctions. It is useful to point out that sharp peaks in $I(V)$ for Josephson junctions (or Fiske steps, when the experiments are done at a fixed current) may also arise from the Swihart waves [28]. One should be able to separate the two mechanisms since the energy of the resonances coming from Swihart waves depend on the geometry of the junction, whereas the energy of the Leggett's mode depends on the material properties only.

The interaction used in the previous section is such that the Leggett's collective mode is absent. However, that form of interaction corresponds to a very specific circumstance, when superconductivity in one of the bands is induced entirely by the other band. Clearly, this need not be the case, as the Cooper instability could be present in both bands independently. Therefore, the actual interaction for the candidate multi-gap superconductor materials are, in general, different from the simple, and rather specific model interaction we used above. We note that an interlayer exciton has been recently observed in the c-axis optical conductivity experiments on $\text{SmLa}_{0.8}\text{Sr}_{0.2}\text{CuO}_4$ by D. Dulic et al. [18]. This mode may be understood as a particular realization of the Leggett's exciton where the two bands correspond to the individual layers in a bilayer. Leggett's mode was also argued to exist in MgB_2 and in Sr_2RuO_4 [17]. All of these materials are promising candidates for observing novel Josephson phenomena discussed in this paper. Conclusions Inspired by a series of recent experimental developments strongly supporting multiband superconductivity in a variety of compounds, we have examined the Josephson effect between such multiband superconductors and single-band superconductors. We have shown that this can be a rather powerful probe of new physics associated with multiple phases in the multiband superconductors. In particular, such junctions can be used to detect the phase difference between the multiple gaps of the multiband superconductor, and consequently provide experimental support for the presence of repulsive interband interactions. This would add considerable support to the notion that an adequate description of the novel multiband superconductors must go beyond models considering electron-phonon interaction alone. We have also pointed out, that such hybrid Josephson junctions are capable of detecting collective

modes arising from the fluctuations in the relative phase between these gaps. Such an experiment, if successful, would be the first indication that Leggett's mode, proposed more than three decades ago, is in fact exhibited by these novel multi-gap superconductors.

We would like to thank Prof. A. A. Abrikosov, Dr. G. W. C.rabtree, Dr. K. E. G ray, Dr. D. Hinks, Dr. W. K. Kwok, Dr. G. Karapetrov, Prof. J. F. Zasadzinski and Mr. H. Schmidt for useful discussions. We are especially grateful to Dr. G. W. C rabtree and Dr. W. K. Kwok for their hospitality during our stay at the Materials Sciences Division of Argonne National Laboratory, where this research program was initiated. This research was supported in part by U.S.DOE, Office of Science, under contract No. W-31-109-ENG-38. D.F.A. was also supported by the Research Corporation.

-
- [1] H. Suhl, B. T. Matthias, and L. R. Walker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 3, 552 (1959).
 - [2] J. Nagamatsu, et al., Nature 410, 63 (2001).
 - [3] F. Bouquet et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 047001-1 (2001).
 - [4] P. Szabo et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 137005-1 (2001).
 - [5] X. K. Chen et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 157002-1 (2001).
 - [6] S. T. Suda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 177006-1 (2001).
 - [7] F. G. Gubilo et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 177008-1 (2001).
 - [8] T. Yokoya et al., Science 294, 2518 (2001).
 - [9] J. Kondo, Prog. Theor. Phys. 29, 1 (1963).
 - [10] E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice, Nature 271, 618 (1996), and references therein.
 - [11] B. Normand, D. F. Agterberg, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 4296 (1999).
 - [12] M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 70, 1218 (2001).
 - [13] K. Yamaji, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 70, 1476 (2001).
 - [14] J. H. Schon et al., Science 293, 2430 (2001).
 - [15] A. J. Leggett, Prog. Theor. Phys. 36, 901 (1966).
 - [16] W. C. Wu and A. Gri n, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 158 (1995).
 - [17] D. F. Agterberg, T. M. Rice, and M. Sigrist, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3374 (1997).
 - [18] D. Dulic et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 4144-4147 (2001).
 - [19] J. Krotus et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 4656 (2001).
 - [20] A. V. Zaiste v, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 59, 1015 (1984).
 - [21] V. Ambegaokar and A. Barat o, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10, 486 (1963).
 - [22] I. I. Mazin, A. A. Golubov, and A. D. Zaikin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2574 (1995).
 - [23] S. Han et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 238 (1986).
 - [24] I. Iguchi and Z. Wen, Phys. Rev. B 49, 12388 (1994).
 - [25] R. Jin et al., Phys. Rev. B 59, 4433 (1999).
 - [26] C. Hone rcam p and M. Sigrist, Prog. Theor. Phys. 100, 53 (1998).
 - [27] A. Auerbach and E. Altman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 3480 (2000).
 - [28] A. A. Abrikosov, Fundamentals of the theory of metals, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1988).