## Im purity-induced Local D ensity of States in a D -w ave Superconductor C arrying a Supercurrent

Degang Zhang,  $^{1}$  C.S.Ting,  $^{1}$  and C.R.Hu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Texas Center for Superconductivity and Department of Physics, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204, USA <sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas, 77843, USA

The local density of states (LDOS) and its Fourier component induced by a unitary in purity in a supercurrent-carrying d-wave superconductor are investigated. Both of these quantities possess a relection symmetry about the line passing through the in purity site and along the supercurrent if it is applied along the antinodal or nodal direction. With increasing supercurrent, both the coherence and resonant peaks in the LDOS are suppressed and slightly broadened. Under a supercurrent along the antinodal direction, the coherence peaks split into double peaks. The modulation wavevectors associated with elastic scatterings of quasiparticles by the defect from one constant-energy piece of the Ferm i surface to another are displayed as bright or dark spots in the Fourier space of the LDOS in age, and they may be suppressed or enhanced, and shifted depending on the applied current and the bias voltage.

PACS num bers: 74.25.-q, 74.20.-z, 74.62 D h

The understanding of the local physics in cuprate or high tem perature superconductors (HTS) is one of the m ost challenging problem s in condensed m atter physics today. Di erent from the conventionals-wave superconductors, the HTS have very com plex phase diagram s depending on doping and chem ical composition. It is also wellestablished that the superconducting order param eter in the cuprates has predom inantly d-wave symmetry [1]. The zero bias conductance peak (ZBCP) in the tunneling spectroscopy of a norm alm etal-cuprate superconductor junction with non-(n0m ) contact provides one of the direct evidences for this sym metry [2]. Due to the dwave nature of the order parameter, in purities inserted into cuprates can serve as an important tool to explore the physics of HTS. Theoretical calculations of the localdensity of states (LD 0 S) predicted that a strong potential scatterer could induce a resonance peak near the Ferm i level at sites near the in purity [3,4]. This resonant peak near zero-bias voltage was observed at and near the sites of Zn in purities in Bi2Sr2CaCu2O8+ by scanning tunneling m icroscopy (STM ) [5]. In addition, an interference pattern with four-fold symmetry was also detected in the STM im age [5].

W hen a superconductor carries a supercurrent  $(J_s)$ , C cooper pairs with nite m on entum appear in the system. This would drastically a lect the electronic structure of the superconductor including the elementary excitation spectrum, the order parameter symmetry, and the tunneling spectroscopy [6,7,8]. W ith increasing supercurrent velocity, the superconducting order parameter can be depressed. M eanwhile, the supercurrent density rst increases m onotonously and then arrives at a maximum value, which is called the critical current density. Beyond that, superconductivity becomes unstable and collapses to the norm al state. So the supercurrent in the stable regime can be also used as a probe to further understand the quasiparticle excitations in HTS.M oreover, a better understanding of the property of a superconductor under an applied  $J_s$  m ay have the potential for device applications.

In Ref. [7], we have studied the tunneling conductance characteristics between a norm alm etal and a d-wave superconductor (dSC) carrying a supercurrent parallel to the interface of the junction. It was shown that for su ciently large applied current, the midgap-surface-stateinduced ZBCP splits into two peaks in the tunneling regime. So far there exist no experimental measurements which could be used to compare with our theoretical predictions. The closest tunneling experim ent to the idea in Ref. [7] was done on YBCO under a spin injected current [9], it would be interesting to see that the sim ilar experiment will be performed on an HTS sample carrying a supercurrent in the near future. As a natural extension of our previous work [7], here we exam ine the LDOS induced by a strong defect which replaces a  $Cu^{2+}$ ion in the top CuO layer of a current carrying HTS. This strong defect could either be a unitary in purity like Zn<sup>2+</sup> or simply a Cu-vacancy, and is well known to induce a near-zero-bias resonant peak (NZBRP) next to the site of the defect in a dSC without  $J_s$  [3,4]. In the following, we investigate the LDOS im ages and their Fourier components for several values of the bias energy E and  $J_s$ . In addition the LDOS at sites next to and far away from the impurity as a functions of E are calculated and their behaviors under various J<sub>s</sub> will be presented and discussed.

The BCS Ham iltonian describing the impurity e ects in a dSC carrying a supercurrent can be written as

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} X & X \\ k & C_{k}^{+} & Q_{k} & + \\ k & k & k & k \end{pmatrix} (q_{k+q_{s}}^{+}, c_{k+q_{s}}^{+}, h) c_{k+q_{s}}^{+} + h c_{k}^{-}$$

$$+ V_{s} c_{0}^{+} c_{0}$$
; (1)

where  $_{k}$  is the band structure of the d-wave superconductor, is the chem ical potential to be determined by doping,  $V_{s}$  is the on site potential of the nonmagnetic impurity located at the center of lattice,  $q_{s} = (m = 2)v_{s}$  with  $v_{s}$  the supercurrent velocity, and m the mass of a C ooper pair,  $q_{s}(k) = q_{s}\cos(2)$  is the superconducting order parameter in the presence of  $J_{s}$ , is the angle between the wave vector k and the antinodal direction of the d-wave superconductor, and  $q_{s}$  is determined by the gap equation [7]

$$\ln \frac{0}{q} = \frac{Z}{d \cos^2(2) \ln [g() + \frac{P}{g^2()} - 1]}; \quad (2)$$

where

g() 
$$\frac{2q}{q} \frac{\cos()}{\cos(2)} j$$
;  $q \frac{q_s}{k_F}$ ;  $q \frac{q_s}{E_F}$ ; (3)

 $k_{\rm F}$  and  $E_{\rm F}$  are the Ferm i momentum and energy, respectively, is the angle between  $q_{\rm s}$  and the antinodal direction, and the integraton in Eq. (2) is from 0 to 2 with the constraint  $g^2$ () 1 0. The solutions of Eq. (2) with = 0 and  $\frac{1}{4}$  are presented in Fig. 1(a). In Ref. [7], we also derived the therm odynam ic critical currents  $j_{\rm sc}(0) = 0.238 {\rm env}_{\rm F}$  o at  $q = q_{\rm c}(0) = 0.35$  o and  $j_{\rm sc}(\frac{1}{4}) = 0.225 {\rm env}_{\rm F}$  o at  $q = q_{\rm c}(\frac{1}{4}) = 0.39$  o for supercurrent  $J_{\rm s}$  along the antinodal and nodal directions, respectively [see Fig. 1(b)]. Sim ilar results on the order parameter and the critical currents have also been obtained in Ref. [8].

The H am iltonian (1) is exactly soluble by the B ogoliubov transform ation and the G reen's function technique [10]. A fler a tedious but straightforward calculation, we obtain the expression for LDOS near a strong in purity in the unitary lim it (i.e.  $V_s$ ! 1)

$$(\mathbf{r}; !) = \frac{2}{N^2} \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\substack{k,k^0 \ ; \ 0 = 0; 1}}^{X} \mathbb{D} (\mathbf{q}_s; i!_n) \cos[(k \ k^0) \ r] \mathbf{f}_k^2 (\mathbf{q}_s) \sum_{\substack{k^0 \ 0 \ (k \ s)}}^2 (\mathbf{q}_s) b(\mathbf{q}_s; i!_n)$$

2(1) 
$$_{k}$$
 ( $q_{s}$ )  $_{k+1}$  ( $q_{s}$ )  $_{k^{\circ}}^{2}$  ( $q_{s}$ ) c( $q_{s}$ ; i!  $_{n}$ ) + (1)  $^{+ \circ}$   $_{k}$  ( $q_{s}$ )  $_{k+1}$  ( $q_{s}$ )  $_{k^{\circ}}$  ( $q_{s}$ ) (

a 
$$(q_s; i!_n) g G_k^0$$
  $(q_s; i!_n) G_{k^0}^0$   $(q_s; i!_n) j_{!_n!_{i+1}}$ ;

where N is the site number of lattice, and

$$E_{q_{s}}(k) = \frac{r}{[\frac{1}{2}(k+q_{s}+k+q_{s})]^{2}+[\frac{2}{q_{s}}(k)]};$$

$$E_{q_{s}}(q_{s}) = \frac{1}{2}[1+(1)]\frac{\frac{1}{2}(k+q_{s}+k+q_{s})}{[\frac{1}{2}(k+q_{s}+k+q_{s})]}];$$

$$(q_{s}) = \frac{1}{2} (\mu + (-1)) \frac{E_{q_{s}}(k)}{E_{q_{s}}(k)}$$

$$_{k0} (q_{s})_{k1} (q_{s}) = \frac{q_{s}(k)}{2E_{q_{s}}(k)};$$

$$G_{k}^{0}(q_{s};i!_{n}) = \frac{1}{i!_{n} \frac{1}{2}(k+q_{s} + q_{s}) + (1) E_{q_{s}}(k)};$$
$$a(q_{s};i!_{n}) = \frac{1}{N} \frac{X}{k} (q_{s})G_{k}^{0}(q_{s};i!_{n});$$

$$b(q_s; i!_n) = \frac{1}{N} X_{k;+1}(q_s)G_k^0 (q_s; i!_n);$$

$$c(q_{s};i!_{n}) = \frac{1}{N} X_{k} (1)_{k} (q_{s})_{k+1} (q_{s}) G_{k}^{0} (q_{s};i!_{n});$$

$$D(q_{s};i!_{n}) = \frac{1}{c^{2}(q_{s};i!_{n}) - a(q_{s};i!_{n})b(q_{s};i!_{n})}: (5)$$

Obviously, when a supercurrent is appplied, the quasiparticle energy has a momentum-dependent shift  $\frac{1}{2}(_{k+q_s} _{k+q_s})$  [see the bare Green's function  $G_k^0$  ( $q_s; i!_n$ ) in Eq. (5)], which leads to di erent gaps for di erent momentum directions of a quasi-particle. This strongly modi es the LDOS and its Fourier components patterns. We shall see that the variation of these patterns is sensitive to the supercurrent

(4)

applied and the bias voltage. However, they always have a re ection symmetry at an arbitrary energy if a supercurrent is applied along the antinodal or nodal directions. From Eqs.(4) and (5), we calculate the LDOS at several di erent energies and supercurrent velocities with the defect located at the center of a N = 400400 lattice. Here we adopt the band structure of  $B_{i_2}Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+}$  given by Norman et al.  $0:5951(\cos k_x + \cos k_v)=2 + 0:1636\cos k_x \cos k_v$ <sub>k</sub> =  $0:1117(\cos 2k_x \cos k_v +$  $0:0519(\cos 2k_x + \cos 2k_y)=2$  $\cos k_x \cos 2k_y$ )=2 + 0:0510 $\cos 2k_x \cos 2k_y$ (eV) [11] , which corresponds to that of free electrons with  $k_{\rm F}$  = 1:639 and  $E_{\rm F}$  = 0:4203 eV, for the chemical potential = 0:1238 eV for optim all doping (15%). Choosing  $_0 = 44 \text{ meV}$ , and  $_{\alpha}$  can be obtained from Fig. 1(a).

Fig. 2 shows the 20 20 im ages of the LDOS (r;!) at di erent energies and supercurrents with the impurity at its center. In order to understand the im age patterns in Fig. 2, we plot the schem atic Ferm i surface of an optim ally doped HTS in the st Brillouin zone as shown in Fig. 3. In an STM experiment and when a quasiparticle is created near the Ferm i surface at point 0, this quasiparticlem ay be scattered elastically by the defect to other equivalent points (such as A, B, C, D, E, F and G) near the Ferm isurface [12-16]. The wavevectors connecting 0 and the other points are referred as the m odulation wavevectors and they are labeled as  $q_A$ ,  $q_B$ , etc., up to  $q_{\rm F}$  . If the point O is at the m iddle of the Ferm i curve in Fig. 3, then the quasiparticle is at the nodal point. If 0 is moved to the zone boundary, then the quasiparticle is at the antinodal point. Because of the d-wave nature of the superconductivity, little energy is required to create a quasiparticle at the nodal point. But to create a quasiparticle at the antinodal point, a large bias energy in the order of the superconductivity gap is needed in an STM experim ent.

From Fig. 2, the LDOS at the impurity site vanishes regardless of the bias energies and the strength of  $J_s$ , and it has the strongest intensity at the sites next to the defect when the quasi-particle energy (or the bias voltage times e) ! = 0 m eV [see Fig. 2c(0)]. Near the impurity, the LDOS has a pattern of 4-fold sym metry with energy-dependent modulations in the absence of a supercurrent Fig. 2a(0) to 2e(0)].

W hen j! j = 0 and 16 meV, the resonant peaks still show up at (0; 1) and (1;0) and the modulation with the periodicity 2a is along  $45^0$  from the Cu-O bonds. For ! = 0 meV, the point 0 is at the nodal point, and the modulation in Fig. 2c(0) comes from the wavevector  $q_{\rm D}$  =  $q_{\rm E}$  in Fig. 3. For j! j = 16 meV, the pattern seems to be a result of combined contributions from  $q_{\rm B}$  and other modulation wavevectors along the directions (; ).

W hen j! j = 44 meV, The point 0 moves to the zone boundary or the antinodal point. The modulation

3

wavevector  $q_F = 2$ . This would give rise to x- and yoriented (or Cu-O bond oriented)) stripe-like structure with the periodicity a in the LDOS around the in purity, and this can be seen clearly in Fig. 2a(0). The LDOS here also exhibits a checkerboard pattern close to the in purity site due to the combined e ect of the x- and y-oriented stripes.

W hen a supercurrent  $J_s$  is applid along the antinodal direction (i.e. = 0 along the x-direction), the intensities of the resonance peaks on points (0; 1) are higher than those on the points (1;0) at j! j= 0 and 16 m eV. N ear the critical current  $j_{sc}$  (0), the LDOS developes a modulation perpendicular to the direction of supercurrent at j! j = 16 m eV. W hen j! j = 44 m eV, the intensity of the modulation parallel to  $J_s$  becomes smaller than that perpendicular to  $J_s$ . W hen  $J_s$  is applied along the nodal direction (i.e. = =4 from the x-axis), the LDOS patterns only have m inor changes except that som e brighter spots near the defect site appear at j! j = 16 m eV. W e note that with increasing  $J_s$ , the maxim a of the LDOS at j! j= 0 and 44 m eV are suppressed while those at j! j = 16 m eV.

In order to further understand the supercurrent e ects, we also calculate the images for the Fourier component of the LDOS (FCLDOS) (see Fig. 4). It can be easily seen that the in uence of the applied suppercurrent on the FCLDOS is more dram atic than on the LDOS image. Here some modulation wavevectors corresponding to the elastic scattering of quasiparticles from one point of the Ferm i surface to another point as shown in Fig. 3 can be clearly identi ed in Fig. 4.

W hen ! = 0 m eV and  $q_s = 0$ , the modulation wavevectors  $q_A = q_c = q_f$  and  $q_D = q_E$  due to the nodal quasiparticle scattering are clearly seen in the FCLDOS patterns [Fig. 4c(0)]. We note that the dip at  $q_{D,E}$  has a strong intensity, which causes the LDOS to have a modulation along  $45^0$  to Cu-O bonds [Fig. 4c(0)]. At the critical currents  $J_{sc}(0)$  and  $J_{sc}(\frac{1}{4})$ , the dips are supressed, but their positions seem not to shift [Fig. 4c(1)] and 4c(2)].

However, at higher energy, the case becom esm ore com – plicated. At j! j = 16 m eV, the dips at  $q_A$  and  $q_F$  are clearly visible in the absence of supercurrent [F ig. 4b (0) and 4d (0)]. At four corners of the rst Brillouin zone, there are four arcs due to the scatterings of the quasiparticles by the defect from one equal-energy banana countor (e.g. arcs OB in Fig.2) to the opposite contour (e.g. arc DE in Fig. 3). It is these arcs that mainly produce the charge m odulation along  $45^{\circ}$  from the Cu-O bonds [F ig. 2b (0) and 2d (0)]. At ! = 16 m eV, we note that the peaks associated with  $q_B$  are absent. Instead, four new dips at  $q_2$  show up. W hen a  $J_s$  is applied, these peaks and arcs for j! = 16 m eV are supressed or enhanced, and even vanish near the critical current, but their position have little shift [see Fig. 4b (1), 4b (2), 4d (1) and 4d (2)].

W hen j! j = 44 meV, Fig. 4a(0) and 4e(0) show the

in ages of the FC LD O S associated with the scattering of antinodal quasiparticles. The peaks correspond to  $q_A$  and  $q_I$  are clearly seen here. The modulation wavevectors  $q_I$  are due to the superposition of those peak arcs induced by the scatterings of quasiparticles from one antinodal part of banana contour to the neighboring part. O by by the equal-energy banana contour becomes wide for  $J_s$  along the antinodal direction while it shrinks to a point for  $J_s$  along the nodal direction [Figs. 4a (1), 4a (2), 4e (1) and 4e (2)]. From Fig. 2 and Fig. 4, it can be seen clearly that the elect of J on the FC LD O S is much pronounced than that on LD O S.

In order to exam ine the change of modulation wavevectors with  $\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{s}}$  , we present the FCLDOS along the antinodal and nodal directions at ! = 0 m eV and for several supercurrent strengths in Fig. 5.W ith increasing the supercurrent velocity, the dips associated with  $q_{A,C,F}$  are suppressed and nally disappear [see Fig. 5 (a) and 5 (c)]. However, the dips corresponding to  $q_{D,E}$  are only suppressed for  $J_s$  along the antinodal direction or = 0 while they are rst enhanced, then weakened, and have a tiny shift for the  $J_s$  along the nodal direction or  $= \frac{1}{4}$ [Fig. 5(b) and 5(d)]. Sim ilar results hold at higher energy. We note that the dips at jgj = 1.6 in Fig. 5(a) and 5 (c) cannot be induced by quasiparticle scatterings, which are also suppressed with increasing  $J_s$ . We think that these dips at  $q_{A,C,F}$  and  $q_{D,E}$  are due to the manifestation of quasiparticle destructive interference due to the sign change of the d-wave gap function on the Ferm i surface.

We have obtained the LDOS and FCLDOS induced by a strong defect such as a Zn in purity. Now we turn our attention to the STM experiments. In the STM experiments [5], a zero bias resonant peak was observed at the Zn sites. However, theoretical calculations give a vanishing LDOS at the in purity sites, contrary to the experimental observation (see Fig. 2). Because of a Bi atom in the top (BiO) layer and, more importantly, an O atom in the second (SrO) layer block the tunneling current coming from the STM tip to directly probe the impurity site [17], the experimentally observed LDOS at the impurity or Cu site should be approximately equal to the sum of those on four nearest neighbor sites around it [18], i.e.

where denote the nearest neighbor sites of the impurity or Cu ions.

Taking into account this blocking e ect, we present  $expt(\mathbf{R};!)$  curves at the impurity site (0;0) and the points (0; 1), (1; 1) and (2;0) for several  $J_s$  along = 0 and = =4, respectively in Fig. 6. Obviously, the NZBRP on the impurity site and its neighbor sites are strongly suppressed and only slightly broadened with increasing  $J_s$  in both directions. No splitting is clearly visible. On the other hand, the superconducting coherence peaks show s som e suppression and splitting near the critical current along the antinodal direction with = 0 while their separation widens with increasing  $J_s$  along the nodal direction with = =4. We further notice that the suppression of the NZBRP is insensitive to the direction of  $J_s$ . A relevant work [20] studied the NZBRP due to a unitary in purity in the presence of a magnetic

eld and away from the vortex cores. The magnetic eld e ect was considered by including the D oppler shifts [21] in the energies of the quasiparticles and it thus generates circulating supercurrent in the sample which is similar but not identical to the case we studied. The NZBRP displayed in Fig. 1 of Ref. [20] and Fig. 6 in the present paper are both suppressed by the magnetic eld B or J<sub>s</sub>, but it appears that their LD O S due to the in purity seem to lose a lot of spectral weight while ours practically rem ains as a constant as B or J<sub>s</sub> increases. Further work is needed in order to understand the di erence between these two works.

In summary, we have investigated the supercurrent e ects on the impurity resonance states in d-wave superconductors. The LDOS and FCLDOS patterns induced by a strong impurity have a rejection symmetry if a supercurrent is applied along the antinodal or nodal directions. The suppression and broadening of the resonant peak and the superconducting coherence peaks are due to the anisotropic gap induced by a supercurrent. Future STM experiments need to be performed in order to test these predictions. On the other hand, them idgap-surface-state-induced ZBCP in the tunneling conductance characteristics between a norm alm etal and a d-wave superconductor (dSC)[7] boks similar to the strong impurity induced NZBRP.But their dependences on the applied supercurrent  $J_s$  are quite different.

W hen strong defects such as Cu vacancies and m icrocrystals with edges exposed to (110) direction are both present on the surface of a HTS sample, STM experim ents should be able to distinguish them by analyzing the  $J_s$  dependences of the zero-bias conductance peak induced by an isolated defect and that induced by the surface m idgap states.

The authors wish to thank Prof. S.H.Pan for helpful D iscussions. This work was supported by the Texas C enter for Superconductivity and A dvanced M aterials at the University of Houston and by the Robert A.W elch Foundation (Ting).

- [2] C.-R.Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1526 (1994).
- [3] A.V.Balatsky, M.I.Salkola, and A.Rosengren, Phys. Rev.B 51, 15547 (1995).

<sup>[1]</sup> C.C.T suei and J.R.K irtley, Rev.M od.Phys. 72, 969 (2000) and the references therein.

- [4] M. I. Salkola, A. V. Balatsky and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev.Lett. 77, 1841 (1996).
- [5] S. H. Pan, E. W. Hudson, K. M. Lang, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, and J. C. Davis, Nature, (London) 403, 746 (2000).
- [6] A. M. Zagoskin, Quantum Theory of Many-Body System s: Techniques and Applications (Springer, 1998).
- [7] Degang Zhang, C.S.Ting, and C.R.Hu, Phys. Rev.B 70, XXXXX (2004); cond-m at/0312545.
- [8] I.K havkine, H.-K. Kee, and K. Maki, cond-m at/0405236.
- [9] J. Ngai, Y. C. Tseng, P. Morales, V. Pribiag, J. Y. T. Wei, F. Chen, and D. D. Perovic, Appl. Phys. Lett. 84, 1907 (2004).
- [10] C.Pepin and P.A.Lee, Phys.Rev.B 63, 054502 (2001).
- [11] M.R.Noman, M.Randeria, H.Ding, and J.C.Cam puzano, Phys. Rev. B 52, 615 (1994).
- [12] J.E.Homan, K.McElroy, D.H.Lee, K.M.Lang, H. Eisaki, S.Uchida, and J.C.Davis, Science 297, 1148 (2002).
- [13] K.M cE hoy, R.W. Sim monds, J.E.Ho man, D.H.Lee, J.O renstein, H.E isaki, S.Uchida, and J.C.Davis, Nature (London) 422, 592 (2003).
- [14] Qiang-Hua W ang and D.H. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 67, 020511 (R) (2003).
- [15] Degang Zhang and C. S. Ting, Phys. Rev. B 67, 100506(R) (2003); Phys. Rev. B 69, 012501 (2004).
- [16] Lingyin Zhu, W .A.Atkinson, and P.J.Hirschfeld, Phys. Rev.B 69,060503 (R) (2004).
- [17] Q.W ang and C.R.Hu, unpublished.
- [18] J.-X. Zhu, C.S. Ting, and C.-R. Hu, Phys. Rev. B 62, 6027 (2000). For an alternative model, see Ref. 19.
- [19] I. Martin, A. V. Balatsky, and J. Zaanen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 097003 (2002).

[20] K.V. Sam okhin, Phys. Rev. B 68, 104509 (2003).

[21] G. E. Volovik, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Theor. Fiz. 58, 457 (1993). [JETP Lett. 68, 469 (1993)].

Fig. 1: Dependences of the superconducting order parameter on the norm alized supercurrent-velocity parameter q for a d-wave superconductor (a) and the corresponding dependences of supercurrent density on q (b).

Fig. 2: The 20 20 im ages of the LDOS (r;!) at ! = 44 meV, 16 meV, 0 meV, 16 meV and 44 meV (from top to bottom) and q = 0;  $q_c(0)$  and  $q_c(\frac{1}{4})$  (from left to right) for a unitary in purity at its center.

Fig. 3: Schem atic Ferm i surface of high- $T_c$  cuprate superconductor. The modulation wave vectors connecting di erent points of the Ferm i surface with the same energy gap are shown in the absence of a supercurrent.

Fig. 4: The FCLDOS at ! = 44 meV, 16 meV, 0 meV, 16 meV and 44 meV (from top to bottom) and  $q = 0;q_c(0)$  and  $q_c(\frac{1}{4})$  (from left to right) in the rst Brillouin zone for a unitary defect.

Fig. 5: The FCLDOS along the antinodal and nodal directions at ! = 0 m eV and di erent supercurrents for a unitary defect.

Fig. 6: The predicted, blocking-model-corrected LDOS  $_{\rm expt}$  (R;!) at the sites (0;0); (0; 1); (1; 1) and (2;0) (from top to bottom) for supercurrents along the antinodal (left) and nodal (right) directions, when a unitary in purity is located at the (0;0) site. Solid: q = 0, dash:  $q = 02^{-0}$  and dot:  $q = q_c$  ().

This figure "P5Fig1.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "P5Fig2.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "P5Fig3.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "P5Fig4.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "P5Fig5.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "P5Fig6.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from: