E ect of point-contact transparency on coherent mixing of Josephson and transport supercurrents

Gholam reza Rashedi $^{\!\!\!1}$, Yuri A. Kolesnichenko $^{\!\!\!1;2}$

¹ Institute for Advanced Studies in Basic Sciences, 45195–159, Zanjan, Iran

² B.Verkin Institute for Low Temperature Physics Engineering of National

Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 47, Lenin ave, 61103, Kharkov, Ukraine

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

The in uence of electron rejection on dc Josephson e ect in a ballistic point contact with transport current in the banks is considered theoretically. The e ect of nite transparency on the vortex-like currents near the contact and at the phase di erence = ; which has been predicted recently¹, is investigated. We show that at low temperatures even a small rejection on the contact destroys the m entioned vortex-like current states, which can be restored by increasing of the temperature.

PACS num bers: 74.50.+ r, 73.23 Ad, 74.78 Db

I. INTRODUCTION

The investigations of Josephson e ect manifestations in di erent system s are continuing because of it's in portance both for basic science and industry. A point contact between two massive superconductors (S-c-S junction) is one of the possible Josephson weak links. A m icroscopic theory of the stationary Josephson e ect in ballistic point contacts between conventional superconductors was developed in². Later, this theory was generalized for a pinhole model in ³H e^{3,4}, for point contacts between "d-wave"^{5,6}, and triplet superconductors⁷. The Josephson e ect is the phase sensitive instrument for the analysis of an order parameter in novel (unconventional) superconductors, where current-phase dependencies I_J () may di er essentially from those in conventional superconductors 5,6,7. In some cases the model with total transparency of the point contact does not quite adequately correspond to the experim ent, and the electron re ection should be taken into account. The inuence of electron re ection on the Josephson current in

ballistic point contacts was rst considered by Zaitsev. He had shown that re ection from the contact not only changes the critical value of current, but also the currentsin (=2) at low tem perature phase dependence I_J () which has been predicted in². The current-phase dependence for sm all values of transparency, D 1, is transform ed to the $I_{\rm J}$ () sin , sim ilar to the planar tunnel junction. The e ect of transparency for point contact between unconventional (d-wave) superconductors is studied in the papers^{9,10,11}. The non-locality of Josephson current in point contacts was investigated in¹². The authors of d^2 concentrated on the in uence of magnetic eld on the zero voltage supercurrent through the junction. They found an periodic behavior in terms of magnetic

ux and demonstrated that this anom alous behavior is a result of a non-locality supercurrent in the junction. This observation was explained theoretically in¹³. Recently an in uence of transport supercurrent, which ow s in the contacted banks and is parallel to the interface, to the Josephson e ect in point contacts has been analyzed

theoretically¹. It was found that a non-local mixing of two superconducting currents results in the appearance of two vortex-like current states in vicinity of the contact, when the external phase di erence is . The Josephson current through superconducting weak link is a result of quantum interference between order param eters with phase di erence . O by jously, the nite re ection R = 1D of electrons from the Josephson junction suppresses this interference and it must in uence the vortex-like current states, which are predicted in¹. In this paper we study the e ect of nite transparency on the current-phase dependence and distribution of the superconducting current near the ballistic point contact in the presence of hom ogeneous current states far from the contact. W e show that at low tem peratures (T ! 0)the electron re ection destroys the mentioned vortex-like current states even for a very small value of re ection coe cient R 1:0 n the other hand we have found that, as the tem perature increases the vortices are restored and they exist for transparency as low as D = $\frac{1}{2}$ in the lim it ofT ! T_c. The organization of the rest of the paper is as follows. In Sec.II we describe the model of the point contact, quasiclassical equations for G reen's functions and boundary conditions. The analytical formulas for the G reen functions are derived for a ballistic point contact with arbitrary transparency. In Sec.III we apply them to analyze a current state in the ballistic point contact. The in uence of the transport current on the Josephson current and vice versa at the contact plane is considered. In Sec. IV we present the num erical results for the distribution of the current in the vicinity of the contact. We end in sec.V with some conclusions.

II. FORMALISM AND BASIC EQUATIONS

We consider the Josephson weak link as a microbridge between thin superconducting Im s of thickness d. The length L and width 2a of the microbridge, are assumed to be less than the coherence length $_0$. On the other hand, we assume that L and 2a are much larger than the Ferm iwavelength $_F$ and use the quasiclassical approach.

There is a potential barrier in the contact, resulting in a

nite probability for the electron that is to be rejected back. In the banks of superconductors a hom ogeneous current with a superconducting velocity v_s ow sparallel to the partition. We choose the y-axis along v_s and the x-axis perpendicular to the boundary; x = 0 is the boundary plane (see Fig.1). If the lm thickness d $_0$ then in the main approximation in terms of the parameter $d=_0$ the superconducting current depends on the coordinates in the plane of the lm = (x;y) only. The superconducting current in the quasiclassical approximation

$$j(;v_s) = 2 \text{ ien } (0)T \text{ hv}_F g(v_F;;v_s)i_{v_F}$$
 (1)

is de ned by the energy integrated G reen's function

$$b = b (!_n; v_F; ; v_s) = \begin{array}{c} g & f \\ f^+ & g \end{array} ;$$
 (2)

which in the ballistic case satis $% 10^{-10}$ estimates the set of the form 14,15

$$v_{\rm F} = \frac{0}{0} \dot{b} + \dot{b}_{3} + \dot{b}_{3} \dot{b}^{\dagger} = 0;$$
 (3)

with norm alization condition, $g^2 + ff^y = 1$. Here N (0) is the density of states at the Ferm i level, $e = !_n + ip_F$ y, v_F and p_F are the electron velocity and momentum on the Ferm i surface, $!_n = (2n + 1)$ T are the M atsubara frequencies, n is an integer number, v_s is the super uid velocity and T is the tem perature, $b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is the order parameter m atrix, b_3 is the P aulim atrix. Eqs.(3) should be supplemented by the equation for the super-

conducting order parameter
(;
$$v_s$$
;T) = 2 T hf (v_F ; ; v_s) i_{v_F} (4)

! n > 0

where is the constant of pairing interaction and h::: i_{v_F} is the averaging over directions of v_F . As it was shown in² in the zero approximation in terms of the small parameter $a = _0$ 1 for a self-consistent solution of the problem it is not necessary to consider Eq.(4). The model, in which the order parameter is constant in the two half-spaces (; v_s ;T) = (v_s ;T) exp(sgn(x) $\frac{i}{2}$) (is the phase di erence between superconductors), can be used. In the same approximation the velocity v_s does not depend on the coordinates. The Eq.(4) enables us to calculate a spatial distribution of the order parameter

() in the next order approximation in terms of the parameter $a=_0$: Solutions of Eqs.(3) should satisfy Zaitsev's boundary conditions (⁸) across the contact x = 0; jyj a and specular relation condition for x = 0; jyj a. In addition, far from the contact, solutions should coincide with the bulk solutions. The Zaitsev boundary conditions at the contact can be written $as^{8,9,10,15}$

$$\dot{a}^{1} = \dot{a}^{r} \quad \dot{a} \tag{5}$$



FIG.1: M odel of the contact as a slit in the thin insulating partition.



FIG.2: Josephson current j_J versus phase for $T=T_{\rm c}=$ 0.1, q= 0.5 and $j_0=4$ jejN (0) $v_{\rm F}\,T_{\rm c}$.

$$\frac{D}{2 D} \left(1 + \frac{\partial}{2} \right) \mathbf{b}^{r}; \mathbf{b}^{1} = \partial \mathbf{b}^{12}$$
(6)

where

$$\mathbf{b}^{r} = \mathcal{O}_{!}^{r} (\mathbf{v}_{F} ; \mathbf{x} = 0) + \mathcal{O}_{!}^{r} (\mathbf{v}_{F}^{0} ; \mathbf{x} = 0)$$
 (7)

$$\dot{\Phi}^{r} = \dot{\Phi}^{r}_{!} (v_{F}; x = 0) \quad \dot{\Phi}^{r}_{!} (v_{F}^{0}; x = 0)$$
 (8)

with v_F^{0} being the rection of v_F with respect to the boundary and D is the transparency coecient of point contact. Indexes l and r denote that the G reen function are taken at the left (x = 0) or right (x = +0) hand from the barrier. Sim ilar relations also hold for b^{1} and



FIG.3: Tangential current j_y versus phase for $T=T_{\rm c}=$ 0:1 and q= 0:5.

 a^{1} . In general, D can be momentum dependent. For simplicity in our calculations we assumed that D is independent of the Ferm i velocity direction.

III. CURRENT PHASE DEPENDENC ES FOR JOSEPHSON AND TANGENTIAL CURRENTS.

Making use of the solution of Eilenberger equations (3), we obtain the following expression for the current density (1) at the slit:

$$j_{cont} = j(x = 0; jyj < a; ;v_s) =$$
 (9)

4 eN (0) v_F T
$$X$$
 b Im $\frac{e i D^{-2} \sin \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2}}{2 D (\sin \frac{1}{2})^{2}}$ b

where, = $p \frac{p}{e^2 + 2}$, $b = v_F = v_F$ is the unit vector and = sgn(v_x). We should require Re > 0; which

xes the sign of the square root to be $\text{sgn}(p, v_s)$. In the case, $v_s \notin 0$, the current (9) has both j_r and j_r components. The tangential current j_r depends on the order parameters phase dimension of the second state of the transport current j_r on the banks, in other words the total current is not equal to the vector sum of Josephson and transport currents. For the case $v_s = 0$, at the contact the tangential current is zero and the normal component, i.e. the Josephson current is as found for the nite transparent contact in^2 . Detaching explicitly the Josephson current j_r and the spatially hom ogeneous (transport) current j_r that is produced by the super uid velocity v_s , we can write the current as the sum of three term s: j_r , j_r , and the "interference" current j_{int} . A lso



FIG. 4: Tangential current j_y versus the transparency D at = and q = 0.5.

we have

$$j_{cont} = j_{J} (; D; v_{s}) + j_{T} (v_{s}) + j_{int} (; D; v_{s})$$
 (10)

The "interference" current takes place in the vicinity of the contact, where both coherent currents $j_{\rm I}$ () and $j_{\rm I}$ (v_s) exist (see also the next section). At rst we consider the current density (9) for tem peratures close to the critical tem perature (T_c T T_c). From Eqs. (9) at the contact we obtain:

$$j_{J}(;D;v_{s}) = \frac{1}{2}AD \sin e_{x}$$
 (11)

$$j_{\rm f}$$
 (v_s) = $\frac{1}{3}$ A ke_y; (12)

$$j_{int}(;D;v_s) = \frac{1}{3}AkD(1 \cos)e_y:$$
 (13)

where $A = \frac{1}{16} j_0 \frac{2}{T_c^2}$, $k = \frac{14 \& (3)}{3} \frac{v_s p_F}{T_c}$, e_i is the unit vector in the i direction. This consideration shows how the current is a ected by the interplay of Josephson and transport currents. At the contact the "interference" current j_{int} is anti-parallel to j_T and if the phase di erence =, $j_{int} = 2D j$. When there is no phase di erence (at = 0), we obtain $j_{int} = 0$. So at transparency values D up to $\frac{1}{2}$ the total tangential current at the contact ows in the opposite direction to the transport current. Thus, for such D in the vicinity of the contact, two vor-

tices should exist. At arbitrary temperatures $T < T_c$ the current-phase relations can be analyzed num erically. In our calculations we de ne the parameter, q, in which $q = \frac{p_F v_s}{c}$ and $_0 = (T = 0; v_s = 0)$. The value of





FIG.5: Vector plot of the current for = , q = 0.5, $T=T_c$ = 0.1 and D = 0.95. Axes are marked in units of the contact size a.

q can be in the range $0 < q < q_c$ and it's critical value q, corresponds to the critical current in the hom ogeneous current state¹⁶. At T = 0, $q_c = 1$ and the gap does not depend on q. In Fig 2 and Fig 3, we plot the Josephson and tangential currents at the contact as functions of at tem peratures far from the critical (nam ely, $T = 0.1T_{c}$) and forq = 0.5 and fordi erent values of transparency D. Far from = , the tangential current is not disturbed by the contact, it tends to its value on the bank. The Josephson current-phase relation is the sam e as when the transport current is absent. How ever, when tends to , for the highly transparent contact (D = 1;0:9) the tangential current becom es anti-parallel to the bulk current. But for D = 0.7 the "interference" current is strongly suppressed and the tangential current ows parallel to the bulk current. In Fig.4, we plot $j_y (D) = j_T + j_{int}$ at

= for di erent tem peratures. These plots show that by increasing the tem perature a counter- ow $\frac{1}{2}$ (D) < 0 exists in a wider interval of transparency D_c (T) < D = 1 and D_c (T ! T_c) ! $\frac{1}{2}$: This num erical result coincides with analytical results (12,13).

IV. SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE CURRENT NEAR THE CONTACT.

In this section we consider the spatial distribution of the current near the ori ce. The superconducting current (1) can be written as

$$j(;v_s) = j_{T_c} \frac{T}{T_c} \lim_{t > 0} hb Im g(;v_s) i_{c_F}; \quad (14)$$

FIG.6: Vector plot of the current for = , q = 0.5, T = T_c = 0.1 and D = 0.7.

where, $j_0 = 4$ jejN (0) $v_F T_c$. We should note that although the current (14) depends only on the coordinates in the Implane, the integration over velocity directions b is carried out over all of the Ferm is phere as in a bulk sample. This method of calculation is correct only for specular re ection from the lm surfaces when there is no back scattering after electron interaction with them . At a point, = (x;y), all ballistic trajectories can be categorized as transit and non-transit trajectories (see, Fig.1). For the transit trajectories "1" (their re ected counterparts marked by "3" in Fig.1) a projection \mathbf{b}_k of the vector to the lm plane belongs to the angle at which the slit is seen from the point ; $b_k 2$ (); and for nontransit (m arked by "2" in Fig.1) $b_k \ge$ (). For transit trajectories the G reen's functions satisfy boundary conditions on both banks and at the contact. The non-transit trajectories should satisfy the specular re ection condition (or Zaitsev's boundary conditions (5)-(6) for D = 0at x = 0; $\dot{y}\dot{y}$ a). Then for the current at T_c Т T_{c} we obtain an analytical form ula

$$j(;;D;v_s) =$$
 (15)

$$j_c D$$
 hsin $b sgn(v_x) + k(1 \cos b b_y i_{p_1,2})$ $\frac{1}{2} k h b b_y i_p$

where, $j_c(T;v_s) = \frac{j_e N}{8} \frac{(0)v_F}{T_c} \frac{^2(T;v_s)}{T_c}$. To illustrate how the current ow snear the contact, we plot the Fig.5 and Fig.6, for = and temperatures much smaller than critical ($T=T_c = 0.1$), and for di erent values of transparency. At such value of the phase there is no Josephson current and at the large D = 0.95 the current is disturbed in such a way that there are two anti-symmetric vortices close to the ori ce (see Fig. 5). For the such temperature at D = 0.7 the vortices are absent in Fig. 6.





FIG.7:Vectorplot of the current for = ,q= 0.5, D = 0.7, and T=T_c = 0.85.

FIG.8: Tangential current j_y versus the tem perature T at = and q = 0.5.

N ear the critical tem perature $(T = T_c = 0.85)$ the vortexlike currents are restored for D = 0.7 (see Fig.7). Far from the ori ce (at the distances 1 $_0$ a) the Josephson current is spread out and the current is equal to its value at in nity. Considering the current distributions and current-phase diagram s, we observed that:

1). For xed values of tem perature and super uid velocity, by decreasing the transparency the vortex-like current disappears at $D = D_c$ (T); 0.5 D_c (T) < 1

2). For interm ediate values of transparency D (D $_{\rm c}$ (T) < D < 1) by increasing the temperature the vortex-like currents, which were destroyed by the e ect of electron re ection at the contact, m ay be restored.

It is clear that both Josephson and "interference" currents are the result of the quantum interference between two coherent states. By decreasing the transparency the interference e ect will be weaker and these two currents will decrease, while the transport current will rem ain constant. On the other hand, the presence of vortices depends on the result of com petition between transport and "interference" current. Thus, by decreasing the transparency the tunneling and consequently the "interference" current will decrease and vortices m ay be destroyed (12,13). Sim ilar to the case D = 1 in¹, at high values of transparency, the "interference" current can dom inate the transport current and tangential current can be antiparallel to the transport current, thus the vortices appear. But for low transparency the tangential current will be parallel to the transport current and the vortices disappear.

The second point is an anom abus tem perature behavior of the e ect. The vortices are the result of the coherent current m ixing. One could expect that by increasing the tem perature the vortices would disappear whereas, for interm ediate values of transparency, by increasing the tem – perature the vortices will be restored. As considered in F ig.6 and F ig.7 for the transparency D = 0.7 the vortices at low tem perature are absent but at high tem perature they are present. In the plots for tangential current versus transparency, F ig. 4 we can observe this phenom enon (appearance of the counter- ow near the contact at high tem peratures).

U sually superconducting currents are m onotonic and descendant functions of tem perature. Josephson and transport currents have this property, but about the tangential current j_v , the situation is totally di erent. At high values of transparency the j_v has similar behavior to the two other currents, but at low and interm ediate values of transparency at = it has a non-monotonic dependence on the temperature and this is the origin of the anom alous tem perature behavior of vortices. As the tem perature increases, the tangential current st increases and then decreases. In Fig.8 we plotted the tangential current ("interference"+ transport current) versus the tem perature for di erent values of transparency. W e observed that for interm ediate values of transparency 0.5 < D < 1, at low tem peratures and = the tangential current has anom alous dependence on the tem perature. The reason for this dependence is that the "interference" current ows in the opposite direction to the transport current. This current is suppressed by the re ection, but with increasing of the tem perature it decreases slow ly than the transport current. As a consequence of that with increasing of T the tangential current can change its sign and vortices appear. W e found that for low values of transparency 0 < D < 0.5 the "interference" current cannot dom inate the transport current and in addition the tangential current has the sam e direction

as the transport current for any tem perature $T < T_c$:

V. CONCLUSION

W e have studied theoretically the stationary Josephson e ect in the ballistic point contact with transport current on the banks in the model S-c-S taking into account the re ection of electrons from the contact. The contact is subject to two external factors: the phase di erence

and the transport current tangential to the boundary of the contact. As it was shown in¹, in the contact with direct conductivity at = and near the orice the tangential current ows in the opposite direction to the transport current, and there are two anti-symmetric vortex-like structures. The transparency e ect on the vortex-like currents has a central role in our paper. By decreasing the transparency $D_c < D < 1$ the vortex-like current is destroyed. The critical value of $D = D_c$ (T) depends on the temperature T and D_c (T ! 0) ! 1; D_c (T ! T_c) ! $\frac{1}{2}$, so that we can never in daily of the transparency is destroyed.

- ¹ YuA. Kolesnichenko, AN. Omelyanchouk, S. N. Shevchenko, Phys. Rev. B. 67 172504 (2003).
- ² I.O. Kulik and A.N. Omelyanchouk, Fiz. Nizk. Temp., 4, 296 (1978) (Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys., 4, 142 (1978)).
- ³ J.Kurkijarvi.Phys.Rev.B, 38, 11184 (1988).
- ⁴ S.Y ip, Phys. Rev. Lett., 83, 3864 (1999).
- ⁵ M H S.Amin, A N.Omelyanchouk, A M.Zagoskin Phys. Rev.B, 62, R6131 (2000).
- ⁶ M.Fogelstrom, S.Y ip and J.Kurkijarvi.Physica C 294, 289 (1998).
- ⁷ R.M ahm oodi, SN.Shevchenko and YuA.Kolesnichenko, Fiz.NizkTemp 28, 262 (2002) (Sov.J.Low Temp.Phys. 28,184 (2002))
- ⁸ A.V.Zaitsev, JETP 59 1015 (1984).
- ⁹ M H S. Amin, A N. Omelyanchouk, and A M. Zagoskin, Phys. Rev. B 63, 212502 (2001); M H S. Amin, A N. Omelyanchouk, SN. Rashkeev, M. Coury, and A M.

for transparency values low er than $\frac{1}{2}$. This anom alous tem perature behavior of the vortices is the result of nonm onotonic dependence of the interference current on the tem perature. The principal possibility of the realization of the considered e ect in an experiment was described in the paper¹: A superconducting long thin-wall cylinder (with thickness of the wall d less than London penetration depth) with two cuts, such as a distance between them is smaller than coherence length ₀; is placed in m agnetic eld, which is parallel to the cylinder axis. A space between the cuts plays a role of the point contact. The phase di erence is governed by the externalm agnetic ux. The transport current j ow s through two large contacts at the ends of the cylinder.

A cknow ledgm ent

We would like to thank M. Zareyan and SN. Shevchenko for their helpful discussions.

Zagoskin, Physica B 318, 162 (2002).

- ¹⁰ Yu.S.Barash, A.V.Galaktionov, and A.D.Zaikin, Phys. Rev.B.52 665 (1995).
- ¹¹ T.Lofwander, V.S.Shum eiko, G.W endin, Supercond.Sci. Technol. 14, R 53 (2001).
- ¹² JPHeida, BJ. van W ees, T M K lapwik, and G Borghs, PhysRevB 57, R5618 (1998).
- ¹³ V Barzykin and A M Zagoskin, Superlatt. and M icrostr., 25,797 (1999); Urs.Lederm an, A lban L.Fauchere, and G ianniB latter, PhysRev B 59, R 9027 (1999); M H S Am in, A N Om elyanchouk, and A M Zagoskin, Low Temp Phys. 27,616 (2001).
- ¹⁴ G.Eilenberger, Z.Phys., 214, 195 (1968).
- ¹⁵ W. Belzig, F.K.W ilhelm, C.Bruder, G. Schon and A. Zaikin, Superlatt. and M icrostruc. 25, 1251 (1999).
- ¹⁶ J.Bardeen, Rev.M od.Phys., 34, 667 (1962).