

## Persistent Currents Modulated by the Andreev Reflection Phase Shift

Mun Dae Kim<sup>1</sup> and Jongbae Hong<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup>Center for Theoretical Physics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea<sup>2</sup>School of Physics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea

(Dated: July 15, 2022)

We study the persistent currents in the normal/superconducting (NS) loop modulated by the phase shift produced by Andreev reflection at NS junction. The persistent currents show the periodic nature in threading magnetic flux with period  $h=2e$  regardless of the system parameters, such as the thickness of the normal sector, when energy level splitting  $E$  is smaller than the pair potential. We find that the persistent currents take after the Josephson type formula,  $I \propto \sin(\pi \Phi_{\text{ext}} / \Phi_0)$ , in the limit  $E \ll \Delta$ .

PACS numbers:

Physically interesting superconducting loops with junctions are the superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) and the normal/superconductor (NS) loop. Both are mesoscopic size and yield persistent currents when a magnetic flux threads the loop. These systems attract further interest recently in connection with promising current qubits for quantum computer. The thickness of the Josephson junctions in SQUID loop is smaller than the superconducting correlation length, but that of normal segment of NS loop is larger than the superconducting correlation length and smaller than the coherence length. The persistent current in the former system flows by tunneling the Josephson junction, while that in the latter by the long range proximity effect.

Since these two loops are very different in nature, we can anticipate a different current-phase relation for NS loop, but it was not shown in previous studies for the superconductor/normal/superconductor (SNS) hybrid junction [1, 2, 3] and for the NS loop [4, 5] in connection with the Andreev reflection process [6]. For the periodicity of the persistent current of NS loop there has been an disagreement. The theoretical studies [4, 5] show that the period of the persistent current deviates from the superconducting flux quantum  $\Phi_0=2$  with  $\Phi_0 = h/e$  as soon as the thickness of normal segment becomes finite. But the experiments of the Andreev interferometer [7] always show the periodicity of  $\Phi_0=2$ .

The excitation spectrum and the currents owing through the junction can be obtained by solving the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) equation with appropriate boundary conditions. The current described by the motion of a pair of electron and hole in the normal sector changes into that by a Cooper pair in the superconducting sector. There is an intermediate region near the edge of superconductor, where the current is described by the quasiparticles [1]. Then the current carried by the electrons and the holes in the normal sector should be the same as that carried by quasiparticles in the intermediate region. This is just the current conservation condition at the NS junction. In addition, in solving the BdG equation, we consider the average energy of a pair of electron

and hole at Fermi level in normal sector and that of a pair of quasiparticles in superconducting sector as a dynamic variable instead of a constant chemical potential. The values of the dynamic variables are determined by the free energy minimum condition.

In this Letter, solving the BdG equation with above conditions, we first demonstrate that the persistent currents in NS loop are modulated by the phase shift  $2\pi$  induced by the Andreev reflection process at NS boundaries. In the low energy shift limit  $E \ll \Delta$ , the persistent currents take after the Josephson type formula,  $I \propto \sin(\pi \Phi_{\text{ext}} / \Phi_0)$ , in contrast to the case with Josephson junction where  $I \propto \sin(\Phi_{\text{ext}} / \Phi_0)$  [8, 9] where  $\Phi_{\text{ext}}$  is the phase difference across the Josephson junction. Next the persistent current in NS loop shows a periodic behavior in threading flux with a period of superconducting flux quantum  $\Phi_0=2$  where  $\Phi_0 = h/e$  regardless of the system parameters. Our result is consistent with the experiments of the Andreev interferometer [7]. Finally we point out that the two persistent current states for nearly vanishing external flux can be a good candidate for a qubit due to the low noise from the external magnetic field source.

The quasiparticles in a normal/superconducting (NS) loop with threading external magnetic flux  $\Phi_{\text{ext}}$  can be




FIG. 1: A normal/superconducting loop with length  $L$ .  $k$  and  $\lambda$  denote the wave vector of an electron in normal sector and a quasiparticle in superconducting sector, respectively.

described by the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_0 & \\ & H_0 + \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u(z) \\ v(z) \end{pmatrix} = E \begin{pmatrix} u(z) \\ v(z) \end{pmatrix}; \quad (1)$$

where  $H_0 = (\hbar^2 \partial_z^2 - eA = c) = 2m_e$  with the electron mass  $m_e$ ,  $A = \int_{tot}^L$  is the vector potential with the circumference of loop  $L$  and  $\int_{tot} = \int_{ext} + \int_{ind}$  is the sum of the external  $\int_{ux}$  and the induced  $\int_{ux}$ . The wave functions  $u(z)$  and  $v(z)$  for a superconducting loop without junction threaded by an AB  $\int_{ux}$  contain extra factor due to gauge invariance such as  $u(z) = C e^{i(\int_{e+2f=L})z}$  and  $v(z) = C e^{i(\int_{h-2f=L})z}$ , where  $\int_{tot=0} = eAL = \hbar$ . Uniform flow of persistent current is derived by the BdG equation with the pair potential,  $\Delta(z) = e^{i(\int_{e-h+2f=L})z} \Delta$

For the NS loop shown in Fig. 1, the wave function  $\Psi = (u(z) v(z))^T$  of a pair of electron and hole in normal sector ( $0 < z < d$ ) and for a pair of quasiparticles in the intermediate region of superconducting sector ( $d < z$  and  $z < L$ ) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} u(z) &= \begin{cases} A e^{i(k_0 + \frac{2}{L}f)z} \\ B e^{i(k_1 - \frac{2}{L}f)z} \end{cases} & (0 < z < d) \\ v(z) &= \begin{cases} C e^{i(\int_{e+2f=L})z + i} \\ D e^{i(\int_{h-2f=L})z + i} \end{cases} & (d < z) \\ &= \begin{cases} C e^{i(\int_{e+2f=L})z + i} \\ D e^{i(\int_{h-2f=L})z + i} \end{cases} & (z < L); \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The additional phase factor in quasiparticle wave function in superconductor is introduced to describe the phase shift due to the Andreev reflections at the NS interfaces. Here, a notable point is that the wave vectors  $k_e$  and  $k_h$  of quasiparticles in the previous work are the same. It is, however, natural to discriminate the wave vectors of quasiparticles like those of particles  $k_0$  and  $k_1$  in the normal sector in order to satisfy the current conservation condition. Therefore, we introduce different wave vectors,  $k_e$  and  $k_h$ , for the quasiparticles in the intermediate region of superconducting sector.

This equation can be solved easily for the normal sector in which  $\Delta(z) = 0$ , and yields the relations for  $k_e$  and  $E$  such that

$$E = \frac{\hbar^2}{4m_e} (k_0^2 + k_1^2); \quad (3)$$

$$E = \frac{\hbar^2}{4m_e} (k_0^2 - k_1^2); \quad (4)$$

Here  $E$  is the average energy of a pair of electrons in normal sector and  $E$  is the energy splitting due to the persistent current. The external  $\int_{ux} f$  splits the degenerate levels at  $f = 0$  into two levels,  $\hbar^2 k_0^2 = 2m_e E + E$  and  $\hbar^2 k_1^2 = 2m_e E - E$ .

When we are to obtain the quasiparticle spectrum of the superconductor, we can set the average energy of the particle and the holes in Eq. (3) equal to the

chemical potential, since the particle levels and the hole levels are symmetric. But, for calculating the persistent current in the NS loop, in Eq. (3) need not be the constant chemical potential. For example, we consider a simple superconducting loop without junction. The average energy of two particles at Fermi level is different from the chemical potential such that  $E = (1/2)(\hbar^2 = 2m_e)(k_{F-2f=L}^2 + (k_{F+2f=L})^2) \neq (\hbar^2 = 2m_e)k_F^2 = \mu$ . Thus for NS loop cannot be set as a constant chemical potential but should be a dynamic variable to be determined.

In the intermediate region of superconducting sector for  $z > d$ , however, the BdG equation must be solved with the pair potential  $\Delta(z) = e^{i(\int_{e+h})z + 2\int_{f=L}}$ . Then the BdG equation becomes  $[(\hbar^2 = 2m_e) \partial_z^2 + e^{2i} \Delta] \Psi = E \Psi$ . Representing  $\Psi_e$  and  $\Psi_h$  such as  $\Psi_e = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\Psi_h = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}$  we get an expression for  $k_e$  and  $E$ ,

$$E = \frac{\hbar^2}{4m_e} (k_0^2 + k_1^2) (1 + \cos 2\phi) \quad (5)$$

$$E = \frac{\hbar^2}{4m_e} (k_0^2 - k_1^2) (1 + \cos 2\phi) + \cos 2\phi \quad (6)$$

with  $\cos 2\phi = (\sin 2\phi = \hbar^2 k_0^2 - k_1^2)^2$ ,  $\phi_0 = m_e \sin 2\phi = \hbar^2 k_0^2$  and  $\phi_1 = m_e \sin 2\phi = \hbar^2 k_1^2$ . For  $z < L$ , we can also solve the BdG equation and find that  $\Psi_e = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\Psi_h = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

The phase matching conditions for the wave function of Eq. (2) at  $z = d$  and  $z = L$  are given by  $\hat{A} e^{ik_0 d} \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix} = \hat{B} e^{ik_1 d} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix} = \hat{C}; \hat{A} e^{i(\int_{e+2f=L})L + i} = \hat{B} e^{i(\int_{h-2f=L})L + i} = \hat{D}$ ; where  $\hat{A}; \hat{B}; \hat{C}$  and  $\hat{D}$  represent the phase part of the coefficients,  $A; B; C$  and  $D$ , respectively. The condition for there being a solution leads to the boundary condition

$$k_0 k_1 + \frac{2}{L} 2f d + \phi_0 \phi_1 + \frac{2}{L} 2f (L - d) = 4\pi n; \quad (7)$$

This condition corresponds to a periodic boundary condition for the wave function in Eq. (2). The former part of Eq. (7) represents the phase evolution of a pair of electron and hole through the normal sector with thickness  $d$  and the latter part that of a Cooper pair through the superconducting sector with thickness  $(L - d)$ . The additional phase  $4\pi n$  is the sum of the phase changes  $2\pi$  due to the Andreev reflections at each boundary.

The condition of current conservation at NS interface will be given by using the representation of the  $\int_{ux} j = (1/2m) [ (\hbar \partial_z = c) \Psi_e - (\hbar \partial_z = c) \Psi_h ]$  with the wave function in Eq. (2) such as

$$k_0 k_1 = \phi_0 \phi_1 - 2q; \quad (8)$$

The Cooper pairs in superconducting sector then should carry the current  $I = n_c 2eh 2q = m_c$  with the density of Cooper pairs  $n_c$  and  $m_c = 2m_e$ .

Since an extra variable is introduced, we need one more independent relation. That is given by the requirement of free energy minimum [10]. Since the intermediate region of superconducting sector is so thin that we neglect the energy of this region in the free energy expression and consider only the energy of Cooper pairs. In superconducting sector the Cooper pairs carry the persistent current corresponding to the Cooper pair wave vector  $2q = q_0 - q_1$  and the energy of a Cooper pair can be written as  $(\hbar^2 = 2m_c) (2q)^2$  with  $m_c = 2m_e$ . Therefore the total free energy per particle can be written as  $U_{\text{tot}} = (1=2) (\hbar^2 = 2m_e) (k_0^2 + k_1^2) (d=L) + (1=2) (\hbar^2 = 2m_c) (q_0 - q_1)^2 (1 - d=L) U_0$ , where the constant  $U_0$  is the minimum total energy. From the condition  $dU_{\text{tot}}/dq = 0$ , we obtained the equation,

$$\begin{aligned} & (q_0 + q_1) + (q_0 - q_1) \frac{L}{d} + \frac{(2m \sin 2)^2}{2 \hbar^4} \frac{d_0}{d} \\ & + (q_0 + q_1) - (q_0 - q_1) \frac{L}{d} + \frac{(2m \sin 2)^2}{2 \hbar^4} \frac{d_1}{d} \\ & = \frac{2}{2} \frac{q_0^2 + q_1^2}{2} \frac{2m}{\hbar^2} \sin 4; \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the expressions for  $d_0 = d$  and  $d_1 = d$  can be obtained by differentiating Eqs. (3)–(8).

Solving the coupled equations (7), (8) and (9) numerically with two equations obtained by eliminating  $q_0$  and




FIG. 2: (a) Excitation spectrum of the NS loop. The solid (dashed) line for  $f < 0$  ( $f > 0$ ) shows the ground state energy. (b) Persistent currents corresponding to the energy levels in (a). (c) Phase shifts at SN boundaries. The solid (dashed) line corresponds to the energy level in (a) and the persistent current in (b) represented by the solid (dashed) lines.

$E$  from Eqs. (3)–(6), we plot the excitation spectrum and the persistent current of the loop as a function of external flux  $f$  as shown in Fig. 2 (a) and (b). Figure 2 (a) shows the energy levels of two solutions of the BdG equation which are degenerate at  $f = 0.25$ . In Fig. 2 (b) we show the persistent current corresponding to the energy levels in (a). The persistent current,  $I = n_c 2eh 2q = m_c \frac{d}{d}$ , can be written by  $I = I_0 2q = \tilde{\phi}_0$ , where  $I_0 = n_c 2eh \tilde{\phi}_0 = m_c$  and  $\tilde{\phi}_0 = 2m_e \phi_0 = \hbar^2$  is a gap potential chosen arbitrary. In Fig. 2 (c) we show the phase shift  $2\eta$  for the lower level in (a).

For a given value of  $f$ , we can see several persistent currents flowing clockwise and counterclockwise, of which the persistent current at ground state corresponds to the solid line for  $f < 0$  and the dashed line for  $f > 0$  in Fig. 2 (b). In Fig. 3 the persistent current at ground state are plotted for several values of  $L$  and  $d$ , which shows that the amplitudes have the dependence on  $L$  and  $d$  while the periodicity in threading flux are fixed at the superconducting flux quantum. We calculated the persistent currents varying the value of thickness of normal sector  $d$  with fixed values of  $L$  and  $d$ , but found that both the periodicity and the amplitude of persistent current do not depend on the value of  $d$ .

We think the reason is that the boundary condition in Eq. (7) can be rewritten as  $(k_0 - k_1)L = 4 + 4f = 2\pi n$  using Eq. (8) and, in the total free energy representation above Eq. (9), the energies of persistent currents per unit length in the normal sector and in the superconducting sector are the same due to current conservation. The physically relevant factor for the periodicity is the existence of Andreev reflection process, not the thickness of the normal sector. In the previous studies [4, 5] the periodicity deviates from  $\phi_0 = 2$  as soon as the thickness of the normal segment  $d$  becomes finite. However, to our knowledge, there is no experimental evidence observing that phenomena. In fact, in the experiments for the Andreev interferometer [7] the oscillation period is exactly the superconducting flux quantum regardless of the system parameters. This is consistent with present results.

We can introduce a new current-phase relation different from the well-known relation for the Josephson junction by fitting the persistent current of this work to a simple formula such that

$$I = C_0 I_0 \frac{r}{\phi_0} \sin(\pi = 2 \pi (L; ; f)); \quad (10)$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant given as  $C_0 = 0.707 \frac{\phi_0}{L} = 2$ . The persistent currents expressed by the formula of Eq. (10) are indicated by various marks in Fig. 3. One can see that the fitting of formula (10) to the data by numerical calculation works very well especially when  $1=L \tilde{\phi}_0 = \phi_0$ , in other words, for low energy splitting,  $E \ll \tilde{\phi}_0$ , since  $E / 1=L^2$ . By comparing the numerical results with the relation in Eq. (10) we show that




FIG. 3: Persistent currents at ground state, which correspond to solid (dashed) line for  $f < 0$  ( $f > 0$ ) in Fig. 2 (b). The scattered marks are given by the current relation in Eq. (10). Inset shows the constant  $C_0$  converges to about 0.707.

the values of  $C_0$  converge to about 0.707 in the limit  $E$  as shown in the inset of Fig. 3. The main difference in the current relation between the NS junction and the Josephson tunnel junction is the dependence on gap function;  $I = \sin(\pi/2) / \tilde{\Delta}$  for NS junction while  $I = \sin \pi / \tilde{\Delta}$  for Josephson tunnel junctions [1].

Recently quantum computing with the persistent current qubit using the two current states of the loop with Josephson junctions operating at  $f = 0.5$  has been actively studied [11]. But, due to the severe decoherence problem, the two qubit coherent oscillation has not yet been achieved experimentally. One of the main causes for decoherence is the noise due to the external magnetic field source. In Fig. 2 (a) we can see the degenerate ground states at  $f = 0$ . These states have the persistent currents flowing oppositely and the different Andreev reflection phase shifts as shown in Fig. 2 (b) and (c). The coherent single qubit oscillations can be performed by applying a microwave resonating with the energy level shift of two quantum states at  $f = 0$ . Since the noise from the external magnetic field source will be very much low at  $f = 0$ , the qubit using the two current states in NS loop may have a much low decoherence.

In summary, we study the persistent currents of the NS loop. In order to satisfy the current conservation condi-

tion we consider that the pair of quasiparticles have different wave vectors. Since the average energy of a pair of particles should be a dynamic variable, we introduce the free energy minimum condition. The persistent currents are determined by the Andreev reflection phase shift  $2\pi$ . In the limit  $E \ll \tilde{\Delta}$  we derive a new current-phase relation which has the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  dependence on the gap potential. The periodicity of persistent current is always the superconducting flux quantum  $\phi_0 = 2$  regardless of system parameters. The results show that the persistent current states in NS loop can be used for a qubit with low decoherence.

This work was supported by Korea Research Foundation Grant No. KRF-2003-070-C00020.

- 
- [1] P. G. de Gennes, Superconductivity of Metals and Alloys (Benjamin, New York, 1966).
  - [2] I. O. Kulik, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 57, 1745 (1969) [Sov. Phys. JETP 30, 944 (1970)].
  - [3] G. E. Blonder, M. Tinkham, and T. M. Klapwijk, Phys. Rev. B 25, 4515 (1982).
  - [4] M. Buttiker and T. M. Klapwijk, Phys. Rev. B 33, 5114 (1986).
  - [5] J. Cayssol, T. Kontos, and G. Montambaux, Phys. Rev. B 67, 184508 (2003).
  - [6] A. F. Andreev, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 46, 1823 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP 19, 1228 (1964)]; 49, 655 (1965) [22, 455 (1966)].
  - [7] B. Reulet, A. A. Kozhevnikov, D. E. Prober, W. Belzig, and Yu. V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 066601 (2003); P. Charlat, H. Courtois, Ph. Gandit, D. Mailly, A. F. Volkov, and B. Pannetier, ibid. 77, 4950 (1996); H. Pothier, S. Gueron, D. Esteve, and M. H. Devoret, ibid. 73, 2488 (1994).
  - [8] M. Tinkham, Introduction to Superconductivity (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1996).
  - [9] V. Ambegaokar and A. Baratoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10, 486 (1963).
  - [10] M. D. Kim, D. Shin, and J. Hong, Phys. Rev. B 68, 134513 (2003).
  - [11] Caspar H. van der Wal, A. C. J. ter Haar, F. K. Wilhelm, R. N. Schouten, C. J. P. M. Hamans, T. P. Orlando, Seth Lloyd, and J. E. Mooij, Science 290, 773 (2000); I. Chiorescu, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Hamans, and J. E. Mooij, ibid. 299, 1869 (2003).