Shot noise in a di usive F-N-F spin valve

E.G.Mishchenko¹

¹Lym an Laboratory, Departm ent of Physics, Harvard University, MA 02138

Fluctuations of electric current in a spin valve consisting of a di usive conductor connected to ferrom agnetic leads and operated in the giant magnetoresistance regime are studied. It is shown that a new source of uctuations due to spin- ip scattering enhances strongly shot noise up to a point where the Fano factor approaches the full Poissonian value.

PACS num bers: 72.70.+ m, 72.25.-b, 75.47 De

Transport in various spintronic devices [1] containing ferrom agnet-param agnet interfaces is attracting a lot of attention. Considerable experimental and theoreticale orts have been directed towards the understanding of magnetoresistance, spin injection, spin accumulation, spin-orbit interaction, current-induced torque and other fascinating and challenging e ects (the vast and quickly expanding bibliography is far beyond the scope of this Letter). A dvances in technology and sample fabrication resulting in devices of nanoscale dimensions led them ethods and notions of spintronics to be the natural outgrows and further developments of the exciting and successful ideas of mesoscopics.

One of the issues outstanding in mesoscopic physics has been the phenom enon of the shot noise, i.e. current uctuations in nonequilibrium conductors [2]. In particular, an experim ental con mation 3] of the theoretically predicted 1=3-suppression (com pared to the Poissonan value characteristic for the transm ission of independent particles) of the noise signal in di usive conductors 4,5] is one of the milestones in the eld. Shot noise in ferrom agnetnorm alm etal constrictions is also evolving into a subject of much interest. Current uctuations in a F-quantum dot-F system in the Coulom b blockade regime were considered in Refs. [6, 7, 8, 9], noise in a quantum dot in the K ondo regime analyzed in R ef. [10], ballistic beam splitter with spin-orbit interaction discussed in Ref. [11]. Dependence of the shot noise in a di usive conductor attached to ferrom agnetic reservoirs on the relative angle between the magnetizations of reservoirs has been studied in Ref. [12] with the help of the circuit theory [13]. However, e ects of a spin- ip scattering on the uctuations of electric current in di usive conductors have been disregarded so far. In the present Letter we show them to make a profound e ect on the shot noise power.

The universal1=3-shot noise in a conventionaldi usive conductor is due to the interplay of the random impurity scattering and restrictions imposed by the Ferm i statistics. In the presence of ferrom agnetic contacts, how ever, the spin degeneracy is lifted with spin-up and spin-down electrons representing two di erent subsystems. The number of particles in each subsystem is not conserved (due to spin- ip scattering) leading therefore to a new class of uctuations. The situation here resem bles closely the uctuations of radiation in random optical media [4]. The absence of particle conservation in a gas of photons results in the enhancement of photon ux noise above the Poissonian value (also the result of bunching typical for bosons). With the notable di erence in statistics (Ferm i instead of Bose) the framework of stochastic di usion equations [15, 16] can be form ulated for the uctuations in disordered spintronic devices as well.



FIG.1: Spin valve consisting of a param agnetic di usive conductor (N) connected to ferrom agnetic leads (F) through tunnel contacts. C onduction bands in the leads are assumed to be completely spin-polarized. For sm all amount of spin- ip scattering the resistance to electric current is large when the m agnetizations are antiparallel ('o '-state of the valve), com – pared to the usual metallic resistance for the parallel con g-uration ('on'-state).

To dem onstrate this we discuss the most characteristic example of a spin value in the giant magnetoresistance regime, when the transport across the value is extremely sensitive to the intensity of a spin- ip scattering. Namely, we consider a di usive param agnetic conductor (N) sandwiched between two ideal ferrom agnetic (F) leads, Fig. 1. 'Ideal' means that electron distributions inside the leads are not a ected by the presence of the norm al region (a typical m esoscopic setup assuming the conduction and screening in the leads to be more e cient than in the conductor). In addition, we assume that conduction electrons are completely polarized inside the ferrom agnets, i.e. the population of carriers with a spin direction opposite to that of a magnet is fully depleted (half-m etallic ferrom agnets). Therefore, when the polarizations of the leads are antiparallel, a conduction electron cannot be transferred across the valve without changing its spin direction. As a result the resistance of a spin-lter is very large unless there is a substantial amount of spinip scattering inside the N-region. We assume the F-N interfaces to be spin-conserving but allow for the nite contact (tunnel) resistances R .

Stochastic di usion equations. The electron motion inside the N-region is di usive with the mean free path much smaller than the size of the valve L (but yet much larger than the Ferm iwavelength). At tem peratures low enough the inelastic (electron-phonon, electron-electron) scattering is suppressed (once the inelastic scattering length exceeds L). The electron distribution is therefore alm ost isotropic in momentum space and can be described by the spin and energy-dependent distribution functions f (x;), with = being a spin index: + corresponding to spin-up electrons and to spin-down electrons.

If the system is driven out of equilibrium (e.g. by applying a voltage bias to the leads), the distribution function becom es spatially inhom ogeneous resulting in the electric current (we assume the cross-sectional area of the valve to be equal to unity),

$$j(x; ;t) = -\frac{e^{\frac{2}{2}f(x;)}}{e^{\frac{2}{2}x}} + J(x; ;t);$$
 (1)

where $= e^2 D$ is the conductivity in the N-region, is the density of states per single spin direction and D is the di usion constant. The last term in Eq. 1) is the stochastic Langevin source. It has zero expectation value and a correlator that sim ilarly to the spinless case [5] is determ ined by the mean value of the electron distribution function,

$$\overline{J (x; ;t)J (x^{0}; ;t^{0})} = 2 \qquad \overline{f} (x;) [1 \quad f (x;)];$$

where we have abbreviated = $(x \ x^2) \ (^{0}) \ (t \ t^2)$ and assumed no summation over the repeated indexes. The stochastic source J is due to the random independent (i.e. Poissonian) events of spin-conserving scattering from disorder.

The particle conservation implies a second relation between the electric current and particle density (hereinafter we drop the arguments when it could not lead to confusion),

$$\frac{@f}{@t} + \frac{e}{@x} \frac{@j}{@x} = \frac{D}{2L_s^2} (f \qquad f) + L: \qquad (2)$$

The rst term in the right-hand side accounts for the average particle ow between states with opposite spins due to spin- ip scattering (custom ary in treating spin-dependent di usion problem s [7]). The spin- ip length L_s is assumed to be much larger than the mean free path but no restrictions as to its relation to the size of the system L are imposed. The last term in Eq. (2) is the Langevin source for the spin- ip scattering arising from random ness of a spin- ip process. It is similar to the stochastic terms for the uctuations of the number of

photons in disordered opticalm edia [15]. Its second mom ent is equal to the m ean ow between states with different spin directions,

$$\overline{L(x; ;t)L(x^{0}; {}^{0};t^{0})} = \frac{D}{2} \frac{X}{L_{s}^{2}} \overline{f} (1 \overline{f}): (3)$$

which utilizes the fact that spin-ip scattering events are independent and obey Poissonian statistics. In writing Eqs. (2-3) we suggested that the spin-ip scattering is energy-conserving. This assumption is well justi ed whenever a typical energy change during a spin-ip is sm all compared to the characteristic scale of the electron distribution (set by the temperature T or external bias eV).

The above equations must be supplemented with appropriate boundary conditions. We assume that the interface resistances at the left and right contacts are the same R. Since there is no charge accumulation in the system, the di usive currents 1 should match the tunneling currents through the interfaces. In particular, for the antiparallel value conguration the boundary conditions read,

$$j = \frac{1}{e^{R}} [f_{L} \quad f] + I_{L}; \quad j_{+} = 0; \text{ at } x = \frac{L}{2}$$

$$j_{+} = \frac{1}{e^{R}} [f \quad f_{R}] + I_{R}; \quad j = 0; \text{ at } x = \frac{L}{2}:$$
(4)

For the parallel con guration one has to interchange + and indexes in the second line of Eq. (4). The stochastic sources I_L and I_R accounting for the random ness of the electron tunneling through the interfaces have (at T = 0) the variance [18],

$$\overline{I_{i}(;t)I_{k}(^{0};t^{0})} = _{ik} (^{0}) (t t) \overline{eJ}(); (5)$$

here J() = j(x;) is the total current independent of the coordinate x, as readily seen from Eq. (2). The current at the contacts is due to electrons with a single spin direction only.

It is convenient to use the particle density and spin density distributions as well as the corresponding Langevin sources,

$$f_{s}f_{s} = \frac{1}{2}(f_{+} f_{}); J_{s} = \frac{1}{2}(J_{+} J_{}):$$

C om bining Eqs. (1) and (2) we obtain (in the stationary regim e) the equations for the particle and spin distribution,

$$\frac{\varrho^2 f}{\varrho x^2} = \frac{e \varrho J}{\varrho x}; \quad \frac{\varrho^2 f_s}{\varrho x^2} = \frac{f_s}{L_s^2} + \frac{L}{D} + \frac{e \varrho J_s}{\varrho x}: \quad (6)$$

Note, that di erent Langevin term s (I; J; L) are independent and have zero cross-correlators.

Average electric current. The mean (averaged over time) solution of the equations (6) with the boundary conditions (4) is elementary and yields the distribution function,

$$\overline{f}$$
 (x) = $\frac{f_{\rm L} + f_{\rm R}}{2}$ $\frac{R_{\rm s}}{2R_{\rm 0}}$ [$f_{\rm L}$ $f_{\rm R}$] $\frac{x}{L_{\rm s}}$ M (x) ; (7)

with $R_s = L_s = standing$ for the characteristic resistance on a spin- ip length L_s . The total resistance R_0 and the function M (x) depend on the magnetization of the leads. For the antiparallel con guration,

$$R_0 = R_N + 2R + R_s \operatorname{coth} s; \quad M(x) = \frac{\cosh(x=L_s)}{\sinh s};$$
 (8)

while for the parallel con guration,

$$R_0 = R_N + 2R + R_s \tanh s; M(x) = \frac{\sinh (x=L_s)}{\cosh s}:$$
 (9)

Here s = $L=2L_s$ is the dimensionless measure of the amount of spin- ip scattering in the system, and $R_N = L=2$ is the resistance of the norm al region.

The total mean electric current calculated with the help of Eqs. (1) and (7) is determined by the total resistance,

$$\overline{J} = \begin{bmatrix} X & Z \\ \overline{J} & \overline{j} & \overline{j} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{eR_0} \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_L & f_R \end{bmatrix} = \frac{V}{R_0}; \quad (10)$$

Shot noise. To solve Eqs. (6) it is convenient to write the uctuating part of the distribution function in the form ,

$$f(x) = A + Bx + \frac{e}{2} dx^{0}G_{0}(x;x^{0})\frac{e}{e^{x^{0}}}$$
 (11)

$$f_{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \underset{Z}{A_{s}} \cosh (\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{L}_{s}) + B_{s} \sinh (\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{L}_{s}) + d\mathbf{x}^{0} G_{s}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^{0}) - \frac{e}{\theta} \frac{\partial J_{s}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{0}} + \frac{L}{D} ; \quad (12)$$

with the help of the G reen function vanishing at the interfaces,

$$G_{s}(x;x^{0}) = L_{s} \frac{\sinh (x_{<} = L_{s} + s) \sinh (x_{>} = L_{s} - s)}{\sinh (2s)};$$
 (13)

with $x_{<}$ ($x_{>}$) standing for the smaller (larger) of the two coordinates $x;x^{0}$. The function $G_{0}(x;x^{0})$ is determined from the same expression (13) with s! 0. The coe - cients A; A_s; B; B_s are to be determined from the boundary conditions (4). It should be pointed out that the distributions in the leads do not uctuate $f_{s} = f_{R} = 0$. The uctuation of the total current is determined by the coe cient B only, according to,

$$J = \frac{2}{e}B + \frac{2}{L}^{Z} dx J (x):$$
 (14)

Resolving a set of linear algebraic equations (obtained from the boundary conditions) with respect to B we did not the uctuation of the total energy-resolved current,

$$J(;t) = \frac{R}{R_{0}} [I_{L} + I_{R}] + \frac{R_{N}}{R_{0}L} X^{Z} dx K (x)J (x) + \frac{L_{s}}{eR_{0}D} dx M (x)L (x);$$
(15)

where the kernel function K (x) depends on the value con guration,

$$K (\mathbf{x}) = 1 \qquad \frac{\frac{\sinh (\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{L}_s)}{\sinh s}; \quad \text{antiparallel;}}{\frac{\cosh (\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{L}_s)}{\cosh s}; \quad \text{parallel:}}$$
(16)

The static shot noise power determ ined as the zero-frequency transform of the current-current correlation function S = dt h J(t) J(0)i can now be calculated from Eq. (15) with the help of the correlation functions for the Langevin sources,

$$S = e\overline{J} \frac{2R^{2}}{R_{0}^{2}} + \frac{R_{N}}{R_{0}^{2}L} X \frac{Z}{d dx} [K^{2}(x)\overline{f}(1 \overline{f}) + M^{2}(x)\overline{f}(1 \overline{f})]: (17)$$

Substituting the m ean distribution functions (7) into Eq. (17) and evaluating the spatial integrals we obtain the nal expressions for the dimensionless noise-to-current

ratio, $F = S = \overline{eJ}$, also known as the Fano factor,

F _{#"} =	$\frac{r^2 s^2}{2p_{\#}^2} +$	$\frac{s + \cosh s}{2p_{\#}} + \frac{s}{2p_{\#}^3}$		$\frac{s[5 \cosh (4s)] + 2\sinh (2s)}{8s\sinh^4 s}$			$\frac{s^2}{3}$	scoths;	(18)
F _{##} =	$\frac{r^2 s^2}{2r^2} +$	$\frac{s + \tanh s}{2\pi} +$	$\frac{1S}{1} + \frac{S}{2}$	s[5	cosh (4s)]	2 sinh (2s)	$\frac{s^2}{2}$	stanhs ;	(19)
	2p##	2p##	2p _# #		8scosh⁼s				

with $p = R_0 = R_s$ being the dimensionless total resistance: $p_{\#} = s(r+1) + coth s$ for the antiparallel con guration and $p_{\#\#} = s(r + 1) + tanh s$ for the parallel con guration. W e also introduced the dim ensionless tunneling resistance $r = 2R = R_N$.

Figs. 2 and 3 illustrate the Fano factor behavior with the spin- ip intensity s for di erent values of the contact resistance r for antiparallel and parallel valve con gurations respectively. Let us rst discuss the regime of transparent F-N interfaces r = 0. For large spin- ip scattering, s! 1, the shot noise approaches the universal value F = 1=3 independent of the relative m agnetization of the leads. This is obvious since an injected electron quickly loses its polarization. For intermediate values, s > 1, the noise is slightly increased by spin- ip scattering both for paralleland antiparallel spin valve con gurations. For small spin - ip intensity, s < 1, the noise behavior is com pletely di erent. In the parallel con quration the Fano factor is returned to its universal value 1=3, which is easy to understand by realizing that electric current is transferred predom inantly by the spin-down states. In the antiparallel con guration, how ever, the sm all-am ount of spin-ip scattering is responsible for the nite conductance itself. The spin- ip induced uctuations contribute to the noise comparably to the disorder-induced uctuations. The noise power is therefore enhanced reaching ultim ately the full Poissonian value usually re ective of the independent electron transmission, like in a tunnel junction or a Shottky vacuum diode.

The presence of contacts with the nite resistance r changes the noise-to-current ratio. For large spin- ip scattering,

$$F_{\#} = F_{\#} = \frac{1}{2(r+1)} + \frac{r^2}{2(r+1)^2} - \frac{1}{6(r+1)^3};$$

the Fano factor is increased monotonously from F = 1=3to F = 1=2 by changing r from zero to in nity. Exactly opposite, how ever, happens for antiparallel con guration with low spin- ip scattering ('o '-state of the value), s <1, where the presence of contacts actually suppresses the noise power.

The stochastic di usion equations presented here allow for the discussion of the time-dependent problem saswell, e.g. frequency dependence of the noise power. W ithout spin- ip scattering the noise spectrum is white as a result. of the Debye screening [2]. Shot noise in a spin value is di erent since uctuations of spin density do not require

uctuations of charge density. M athem atically it is illustrated by the existence of the new (spin-ip) frequency scale $D = L_s^2$. The calculations would be similar to those perform ed for the phononic noise spectrum [16].

Fruitful discussions with B. Halperin, D. Davidovic and E.Dem ler are gratefully appreciated. This material is based on work supported by the NSF under grant PHY-01-17795 and by the Defence Advanced Research Program sAgency (DARPA) under Award No. MDA 972-01-1-0024.

- [1] Sem iconductor Spintronics and Quantum Computation, eds. D.D. Awschalom, D. Loss, and N. Samarth (Springer, Berlin, 2002).
- [2] YaM. Blanter and M. Buttiker, Phys. Rep. 336, 1 (2000).
- [3] A.H. Steinbach, J.M. Martinis, and M.H. Devoret, Phys. Rev.Lett.76, 3806 (1996).
- [4] C W J. Beenakker and M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B 46, 1889 (1992).
- [5] K E.Nagaev, Phys. Lett. A 169, 103 (1992).
- [6] B.R. Bulka, J. Martinek, G. Michalek and J. Bamas, Phys.Rev.B 60,12 246 (1999).
- [7] B.R.Bulka, Phys. Rev. B 62, 1186 (2000).
- [8] R.Lu, Z.-R.Liu, preprint, cond-m at/0210350.
- [9] F.M. Souza, J.C. Egues, A.P. Jauho, preprint, cond-m at/0209263.
- [10] R. Lopez and D. Sanchez, preprint, cond-m at/0302125.
- [11] J.C. Egues, G. Burkard and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89,176401 (2002).
- [12] Ya. Tserkovnyak and A. Brataas, Phys. Rev. B 64, 214402 (2001).
- [13] A. Brataas, Yu.V. Nazarov, and G.E. Bauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2481 (2000); Eur. Phys. J. B 22, 99 (2001).
- [14] C W J. Beenakker, in Di usive W aves in Complex M edia, edited by J.-P. Fouque, ATO ASISer. C 531 (K luwer, Dordrecht, 1999).
- [15] E.G. Mishchenko and C.W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. Lett.83,5475 (1999).
- [16] E.G.Mishchenko, M.Patra and C.W.J.Beenakker, Eur. Phys.J.D 13,289 (2001).
- [17] P.C. van Son, H. van K am pen, and P.W yder, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 2271 (1987).
- [18] This form ula holds for T = 0 only. To consider the effects of thermal uctuations one needs a more general expression for the intrinsic noise of a tunnel barrier, $\overline{I(;t)I(^{0};t^{0})} = (^{0})(t t^{0})R^{-1}\overline{n}_{L}(1 \overline{n}_{R}) + \overline{n}_{R}(1 t^{0})R^{-1}\overline{n}_{L}(1 t^{0})R^{ \overline{n}_L$)], where n_L and n_R are the distribution functions at the left and right side of the barrier.





FIG. 2: Fano factor $F_{\#}$ versus the spin- ip intensity for di erent values of the contact resistance: r = 0 (solid line), r = 1 (dashed), r = 3 (dotted), r = 10 (dot-dashed).

FIG.3: Fano factor $F_{\#\#}$ versus the spin- ip intensity for di erent values of the contact resistance: r = 0 (solid line), r = 1 (dashed), r = 3 (dotted).