

# Resolving the order parameter of High- $T_c$ Superconductors through quantum pumping spectroscopy

Colin Benjamin

Institute of Physics, Sachivalaya Marg, Bhubaneswar 751 005, Orissa, India  
(dated: December 26, 2021)

The order parameter of High- $T_c$  superconductors through a series of experiments has been quite conclusively demonstrated to not be of the normal  $s$  wave type. It is either a pure  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave type or a mixture of a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave with a small imaginary  $s$  wave or  $d_{xy}$  wave component. In this work a distinction is brought out among the four types, i.e.,  $s$  wave,  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave,  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave types with the help of quantum pumping spectroscopy. This involves a normal metal double barrier structure in contact with a High- $T_c$  superconductor. The pumped current, heat and noise show different characteristics with change in order parameter revealing quite easily the differences among these.

PACS numbers: 73.23.Ra, 05.60.Gg, 74.20.Rp, 72.10.Bg

## I. INTRODUCTION

One of the outstanding issues of High- $T_c$  superconductor research involves the identification of the order parameter symmetry and the underlying mechanism<sup>1,2</sup>. Although a host of experiments have indicated the order parameter symmetry to be of a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave type<sup>3,4</sup>, there are theoretical works<sup>5,6,7,8</sup> which indicate that an imaginary  $s$  wave or  $d_{xy}$  wave component is necessary to explain some of the experimental results. These experimental results<sup>9</sup> being notably the splitting of the zero energy peak in conductance spectra which indicates the presence of an imaginary  $s$  wave or  $d_{xy}$  wave component which would break the time reversal symmetry. Many theoretical attempts have been made to bring out the differences among the different order parameters. The first theoretical attempts were made by Hu in Ref.[10] where the existence of a sizable areal density of midgap states on the  $110g$  surface of a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor was brought out. Further using tunneling spectroscopy, Tanaka and Kashiwawa in Ref.[11] brought out the fact that zero bias conductance peaks (which were seen earlier in many experiments<sup>12</sup>) are formed when a normal metal is in contact with a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor enabling a distinction between  $s$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductors. A shot noise analysis by Zhu and Ting in Ref.[13] also revealed differences between  $s$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductors. Further inclusion of phase breaking effects<sup>4</sup> in double barriers formed by normal and superconducting electrodes revealed a double peaked structure in case of  $s$  wave while a dramatic reduction of zero bias maximum for  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductors. These are in addition to many other works which involve spin polarized transport in ferromagnet-superconductor junctions<sup>15,16,17</sup> which reveal differences between different possible High- $T_c$  order parameters. In a recent review, Deutscher<sup>18</sup> has used the Andreev-saint James reflections to indicate the presence of an additional imaginary component in the order parameter. Also in another review<sup>19</sup>, Lofwander, et. al., arrived at some conclusive arrivals for  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductivity in the cuprates. Recently, Ng and Varna<sup>20</sup> studied some of the proposed order parameters and also suggested new experiments to bring out the subtle differences among these. In this work we apply the principles of quantum adiabatic pumping to bring out the differences between the different types of order parameters. Quantum adiabatic pumping involves the transport of particles without the application of any bias voltage. This is done by varying in time at least two independent parameters of the mesoscopic system out of phase. The physics of the adiabatic quantum pump is based on two independent works by Brouwer in Ref.[21] and by Zhou, et. al., in Ref.[22] which built on earlier works by BTP in Ref.[23]. The first experimental realization of an adiabatic quantum pump was made in Ref.[24]. The phenomenon of quantum adiabatic pumping has been extended to pump a spin current<sup>25</sup> also it has been used in different mesoscopic systems like quantum hall system<sup>26</sup>, Luttinger liquid based mesoscopic conductor<sup>27</sup>, in the context of quantized charge pumping due to surface acoustic waves<sup>28</sup>, a quantum dot in the kondo regime<sup>29</sup>, and of course in the context of enhanced pumped currents in hybrid mesoscopic systems involving a superconductor<sup>30,31</sup>. In Ref.[30], Jian Wang, et. al., showed that Andreev reflection at the junction between a normal metal and a superconductor (of  $s$  wave type) can enhance the pumped current as much as four times that in a purely normal metal structure. M. B. Lauboe in Ref.[31] showed that for slightly asymmetric coupling to the leads, this enhancement can be slightly increased. Recently, Taddei, et. al. in Ref.[32], generalized the adiabatic quantum pumping mechanism wherein several superconducting leads are present.

This work is organized as follows—After generalizing the formula for the adiabatically pumped current through a normal metal lead in presence of a High- $T_c$  superconductor, we derive the amount of pumped charge current into the normal metal in the vicinity of a High- $T_c$  superconductor with different types of order parameter symmetry. Next we focus on the heat transported and noise generated in the pumping process in case of each of the specific order

parameter symmetries. Finally we juxtapose all the obtained results in case of different order parameter symmetry in the amount of pumped current, heat and noise to have some conclusive arrivals and to propose experiments which would fulfill this theoretical proposal.




FIG. 1: The model system. A normal metal double barrier structure in proximity with a High  $T_c$  superconductor. The double barrier structure is modeled by two delta barriers distance  $a$  apart.

## II. THEORY OF THE PUMPED CHARGE CURRENT

The model system is shown in Fig. 1. It consists of a normal metal double barrier structure in junction with a High- $T_c$  superconductor. The double barrier structure is modeled by two delta barrier's of strengths  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ , a distance ' $a$ ' apart. Quantum pumping is enabled by adiabatic modulations in the strength of the delta barriers, i.e.,  $V_1 = V_0 + V_p \sin(\omega t)$  and  $V_2 = V_0 + V_p \sin(\omega t + \phi)$ , where  $V_p$  is the strength of the pumping amplitude. Andreev reflection mechanism<sup>33,34</sup> is what takes place when a normal metal is brought in contact with a superconductor. The scattering matrix for the entire system is given by:

$$S_{NS}(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} S_{ee}(\omega) & S_{eh}(\omega) \\ S_{he}(\omega) & S_{hh}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

wherein  $S_{ee}(\omega)$ ;  $S_{eh}(\omega)$ ;  $S_{he}(\omega)$ ;  $S_{hh}(\omega)$  are  $1 \times 1$  matrices, since we are considering single channel leads. The explicit analytical form of the expressions are given by<sup>35</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ee}(\omega) &= S_{11}(\omega) + \frac{S_{12}(\omega)^h S_{22}(\omega)^e S_{21}(\omega)}{1 - e^{i\phi} S_{22}(\omega)^h S_{22}(\omega)^e}; \\ S_{he}(\omega) &= \frac{S_{12}(\omega)^e S_{21}(\omega)}{1 - e^{i\phi} S_{22}(\omega)^h S_{22}(\omega)^e}; \\ S_{eh}(\omega) &= \frac{S_{12}(\omega)^h S_{21}(\omega)}{1 - e^{i\phi} S_{22}(\omega)^h S_{22}(\omega)^e}; \\ S_{hh}(\omega) &= S_{11}(\omega) + \frac{S_{12}(\omega)^e S_{22}(\omega)^h S_{21}(\omega)}{1 - e^{i\phi} S_{22}(\omega)^h S_{22}(\omega)^e}; \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with,  $e^{i\phi} = e^{i \arccos[\frac{V_1}{V_2}] + i(k_h)}$ ;  $e^{-i\phi} = e^{i \arccos[\frac{V_2}{V_1}] + i(k_e)}$ ;

$$e^{i(k_e)} = \frac{(k_e)}{j(k_e)j}; \text{ and } e^{i(k_h)} = \frac{(k_h)}{j(k_h)j}; \quad (3)$$

where,  $(k_e)$  and  $(k_h)$  are the phase of the order parameter for electronic like quasiparticles and hole like quasiparticles respectively, with  $k_e$  and  $k_h$  being the respective wavevectors for the electronic like quasiparticles and hole like quasiparticles<sup>14</sup>.

From Refs.[30,31], the adiabatically pumped electronic current into the normal lead in presence of the High- $T_c$  superconducting lead is given by-

$$I_e = \frac{w q_e}{2} \int_0^Z d \left[ \frac{dN_L^e}{dV_1} \frac{dV_1}{dt} + \frac{dN_L^e}{dV_2} \frac{dV_2}{dt} \right]; \quad (4)$$

The quantity  $dN_L^e/dV$  (wherein, the subscript  $L$  denotes left lead or the normal lead) is the electronic injectivity given at zero temperature by

$$\frac{dN_L^e}{dV_j} = \frac{1}{2} = [\mathcal{S}_{ee} \partial_{V_j} S_{ee} + S_{eh} \partial_{V_j} S_{eh}] \quad (5)$$

In the above equation and below,  $\text{Im}$  represents the imaginary part of the quantity in parenthesis. Similarly, the adiabatically pumped hole current into the normal lead in presence of the High- $T_c$  superconducting lead is given by-

$$I_h = \frac{w q_h}{2} \int_0^Z d \left[ \frac{dN_L^h}{dV_1} \frac{dV_1}{dt} + \frac{dN_L^h}{dV_2} \frac{dV_2}{dt} \right]; \quad (6)$$

The quantity  $dN_L^h/dV$  (wherein, the subscript  $L$  denotes left lead or the normal lead) is the hole injectivity given at zero temperature by

$$\frac{dN_L^h}{dV_j} = \frac{1}{2} = [\mathcal{S}_{hh} \partial_{V_j} S_{hh} + S_{he} \partial_{V_j} S_{he}] \quad (7)$$

with  $q_e = -q_h$  as per the usual convention, and in the weak pumping regime the adiabatically pumped electronic current similar to the analysis in Refs.[21,30], is given by<sup>36</sup>-

$$I_e = \frac{w q_e \sin(\phi) V_p^2}{2} = [\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} \partial_{V_2} S_{ee} + \partial_{V_1} S_{eh} \partial_{V_2} S_{eh}] \quad (8)$$

and the adiabatically pumped hole current in the weak pumping regime is

$$I_h = \frac{w q_h \sin(\phi) V_p^2}{2} = [\partial_{V_1} S_{hh} \partial_{V_2} S_{hh} + \partial_{V_1} S_{he} \partial_{V_2} S_{he}] \quad (9)$$

while for a normal metal structure, the expression for the pumped electronic current in the weak pumping regime is given by-

$$I_N = \frac{w q_e \sin(\phi) V_p^2}{2} = [\partial_{V_1} S_{11} \partial_{V_2} S_{11} + \partial_{V_1} S_{21} \partial_{V_2} S_{21}] \quad (10)$$

### III. PUMPED CURRENT FOR DIFFERENT ORDER PARAMETERS

In Ref.[30], the pumped current for a NS system (where the superconductor is of s-wave type) has been shown to be four times of that in a purely normal metal junction. The system considered in Ref.[30] is also a double delta barrier structure. We re-derive the results for the pumped current in a normal metal-s-wave superconductor junction and subsequently derive the results for the pumped current in a normal metal- $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor junction, for the pumped current in a normal metal- $d_{x^2-y^2} + i d_{xy}$  wave superconducting junction and finally for the pumped current in a normal metal- $d_{x^2-y^2} + i d_{xy}$  wave superconducting junction. We consider in the examples below as well as in the succeeding sections the fermi energy to match the chemical potential of the superconducting lead so that  $\mu = 0$ . In which case, from Eq. 2 we have  $S_{ee} = S_{hh}$ . The system we consider is a normal metal double barrier structure at resonance in junction with a High- $T_c$  superconductor. The resonance condition in the normal metal quantum dot structure is exemplified by the fact that the reflection coefficients are zero while the transmission coefficients are unity. Thus,  $\mathcal{R}_{11} = \mathcal{R}_{22} = 0$ , while  $\mathcal{R}_{12} = \mathcal{R}_{21} = 1$ , with  $S_{12} = S_{21} = e^{2ika}$  for the double barrier quantum dot at resonance. Further from Eq. 2, we have,  $S_{eh} = 1$  and  $S_{he} = e^{-2ika}$ , with this we get  $\partial_{V_j} S_{eh} = \partial_{V_j} S_{he} = 0$ ; for  $j = 1, 2$ : Thus, by the arguments above the pumped electron and hole currents are exactly one and the same in both magnitude as well as direction and reduce to-

$$I_h = I_e = \frac{w q_e \sin(\phi) V_p^2}{2} = [\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} \partial_{V_2} S_{ee}] \quad (11)$$

Further for the double barrier structure at resonance from Eq. 2, one has the normal scattering amplitude,  $S_{ee} = S_{11} + e^{-2ika} (S_{12})^2 S_{22}$ , and for the partial derivatives appearing in Eq. 11, we have  $\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} = \partial_{V_1} S_{11} + e^{-2ika} (S_{12})^2 \partial_{V_1} S_{22}$ , with the help of the dyson equation,  $\partial_{V_j} G^r = G^r_j G^r_j$ , and the Fisher-Lee relation,  $S = 1 - i2kG^r$ , one can

easily derive  $\partial_{V_1} S_{11} = \frac{i}{2k}$ , and  $\partial_{V_1} S_{22} = \frac{i}{2k} (S_{12})^2$ . Thus for a double barrier quantum dot at resonance, we have for the partial derivatives appearing in Eq. 11,

$$\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} = \frac{i}{2k} (1 - h e); \text{ and } \partial_{V_2} S_{ee} = \frac{i}{2k} e^{4ika} (1 - h e); \quad (12)$$

With these formulas in mind we herein below derive the results for the pumped charge current for a normal metal double barrier structure in junction with a High- $T_c$  superconductor, which we assume to have  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave,  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave order parameters. For the sake of completeness and comparison we rederive the already known results for a pure normal metal structure and that of a normal metal double barrier structure in junction with an isotropic  $s$  wave superconductor.

A pure normal metal double barrier structure: From the discussion above the pumped current in case of a normal metal double barrier structure at resonance reduces to (from Eq.10)–

$$I_N = \frac{w q_p \sin(\theta) V_p^2}{4 k^2} \sin(4ka) \quad (13)$$

An isotropic  $s$  wave superconductor: For a normal  $s$  wave superconductor which is isotropic  $(k_h) = (k_e) = i$  and  $h = e = i$ . Thus,  $\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} = \frac{i}{k}$ , and  $\partial_{V_2} S_{ee} = \frac{i}{k} e^{4ika}$ , and therefore in the weak pumping regime for an isotropic  $s$  wave superconductor in junction with a normal metal double barrier heterostructure the pumped current denoted by  $I(NS)$  is four times that in a pure normal metal structure<sup>30</sup>,

$$I(NS) = 4I(N); \text{ with } I_N \text{ as given in Eq. 13.} \quad (14)$$

$d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor: Now we consider the case of a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor, in junction with a normal metal double barrier structure at resonance. The effective order parameter of the  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor for electron like quasiparticles is  $(k_e) = d \cos(2\theta_s)$  and for hole like quasiparticles it is  $(k_h) = d \cos(2\theta_s + 2\theta_m)$ , with  $\theta_s$  being the injection angle between the electron wave vector  $(k_e)$  and the  $x$ -axis, while  $\theta_m$  is the misorientation angle between the  $a$  axis of the crystal and the interface normal. Now for a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor with a (110) orientation,  $\theta_m = \pi/4$ . Thus,  $(k_e) = d \sin(2\theta_s)$  and  $(k_h) = d \sin(2\theta_s)$ . In light of this we have,  $e^{i(k_e)} = 1$ , and  $e^{i(k_h)} = 1$  and thus  $e = i$  and  $h = i$ , therefore we have  $\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} = \partial_{V_2} S_{ee} = 0$ , and hence in the weak pumping regime for a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor in junction with a normal metal double barrier heterostructure the pumped current denoted by  $I(ND)$  regardless of the injection angle is zero.

$$I(ND) = 0 \quad (15)$$

$d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave superconductor: Now, we consider the order parameter of the High- $T_c$  superconductor to be a mixture of the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  type. The  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  component has a (110) oriented surface, with  $\theta_m = \pi/4$ . The effective order parameter for electron and hole like quasiparticles becomes:

$$(k_e) = d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s; \text{ and } (k_h) = d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s;$$

For the phases of the pairing symmetries for electron and hole like quasiparticles, we have–

$$e^{i(k_e)} = e^{\frac{d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s}{d^2 \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \frac{s^2}{2}}}; \text{ and } e^{i(k_h)} = e^{\frac{d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s}{d^2 \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \frac{s^2}{2}}}$$

and hence, the product  $h e$  reduces to–

$$h e = \frac{d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s}{d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s}$$

and finally for the partial derivatives appearing in Eq. 11 one has–

$$\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} = \frac{s}{k (d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s)} \text{ and } \partial_{V_2} S_{ee} = \frac{s e^{4ika}}{k (d \sin(2\theta_s) + i s)} \quad (16)$$

Thus, the pumped charge current reduces to:

$$I(N D s) = \frac{w q_p \sin(\theta) V_p^2}{k^2} \frac{\frac{2}{s}}{d^2 \sin^2(2s) + \frac{2}{s}} \sin(4ka) \quad (17)$$

From Eq. 13 and Eq. 17, the ratio of the pumped current in presence of the High- $T_c$  superconductor to that in a pure normal metal double barrier structure becomes:

$$\frac{I(N D s)}{I(N)} = 4 \frac{\frac{2}{s}}{d^2 \sin^2(2s) + \frac{2}{s}} \quad (18)$$

From the expression it is evident that the maximum enhancement of the pumped current is 4 times of that in a pure normal metal structure. Depending on the relative magnitudes of  $s$  and  $d$  and the injection angle  $s$  the ratio  $I(N D s)/I(N)$  can be as low as zero as in the pure  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  case or as large as 4 as in the pure  $s$  wave case.

$d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave superconductor: Finally, we consider the order parameter of the High- $T_c$  superconductor to be a mixture of the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  type. The order parameter for electron like quasiparticles is:  $(k_e) = d \cos(2s - 2) + i \frac{0}{d} \sin(2s - 2)$  while for hole like quasiparticles it becomes:  $(k_h) = d \cos(2s + 2) + i \frac{0}{d} \sin(2s + 2)$ . The  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  and  $d_{xy}$  component have a (110) oriented surface, with  $\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$ . Thus,

$$(k_e) = d \sin(2s) - i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s); \text{ and } (k_h) = d \sin(2s) - i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s):$$

For the phases of the order parameter for electron and hole like quasiparticles we have:

$$e^{i(k_e)} = \frac{d \sin(2s) - i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s)}{d^2 \sin^2(2s) + \frac{0^2}{d^2} \cos^2(2s)}; \text{ and } e^{i(k_h)} = \frac{d \sin(2s) - i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s)}{d^2 \sin^2(2s) + \frac{0^2}{d^2} \cos^2(2s)}$$

and hence the product  $h \cdot e$  reduces to:

$$h \cdot e = \frac{d \sin(2s) + i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s)}{d \sin(2s) - i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s)}$$

Further, for the partial derivatives of the scattering amplitudes appearing in Eq. 11, we have

$$\partial_{V_1} S_{ee} = \frac{\frac{0}{d} \cos(2s)}{k(d \sin(2s) - i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s))} \text{ and } \partial_{V_2} S_{ee} = \frac{\frac{0}{d} \cos(2s) e^{4ika}}{k(d \sin(2s) + i \frac{0}{d} \cos(2s))} \quad (19)$$

and thus the pumped current into the normal metal lead for this order parameter becomes,

$$I(N D d^0) = \frac{w q_p \sin(\theta) V_p^2}{k^2} \frac{\frac{0^2}{d^2} \cos^2(2s)}{d^2 \sin^2(2s) + \frac{0^2}{d^2} \cos^2(2s)} \sin(4ka) \quad (20)$$

Furthermore, the ratio of the pumped current in presence of the High- $T_c$  superconductor with pairing symmetry of the type  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  to that in a pure normal metal double barrier structure (see Eq. 13) is

$$\frac{I(N D d^0)}{I(N)} = 4 \frac{\frac{0^2}{d^2} \cos^2(2s)}{d^2 \sin^2(2s) + \frac{0^2}{d^2} \cos^2(2s)} \quad (21)$$

From the above expression it is evident that the maximum enhancement of the pumped current is 4 times of that in a pure normal metal structure. Depending on the relative magnitudes of  $\frac{0}{d}$  and  $d$  and of course also depending on the injection angle the ratio  $I(N D d^0)/I(N)$  can be as low as zero as in the pure  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  case or as large as 4 as in the pure  $s$  wave case.

To conclude this section we have seen contrasting results in all the four cases, while as seen before for the  $s$  wave case there is four fold enhancement as compared to the normal metal case, in case of a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor there is no pumped current at all, and for the case of  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave superconductor the enhancement depends on the relative magnitude of the components as well as the injection angle. To probe the dependence of the injection angle and relative magnitudes of the different components in the cases where we have considered mixed pairing symmetry, we in figure 2 plot the the ratio of the pumped current in presence of the High- $T_c$




FIG. 2: The ratio of the pumped current for double barrier quantum dot at resonance in junction with a High- $T_c$  superconductor to that in a pure normal metal double barrier structure. The panels: (a) The magnitude of the subdominant component in the mixed order parameter cases is 10% of the dominant component, (b) The magnitude of the subdominant component in the mixed order parameter cases is half of the dominant component and (c) The magnitude of the subdominant component in the mixed order parameter cases is equal to the dominant component.

superconductor as function of the injection angle for different ratios of the relative magnitudes where mixed pairing symmetry is considered along with the pure  $s$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave cases.

From the figure 2, it is quite evident that the  $s$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave cases are completely independent of injection angle. Furthermore, one can clearly see that whatever the strength of the subdominant component in the mixture i.e.,  $s$  or  $d_{xy}$  for the injection angle  $\theta_s = 0; \frac{\pi}{2}$ , one has for the pumped current in  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave cases four times that in the pure normal metal structure. Also it is evident especially for the relative magnitudes of the subdominant component in the mixture being around half more, that there is a marked difference between the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave cases at injection angles  $\theta_s = \frac{\pi}{4}$ , while for the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave case the pumped current is almost same as that in a normal metal structure in figure 2(b), in figure 2(c) it is almost twice of that in a normal metal structure, but in both figures 2(b), and figure 2(c) the pumped current in the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave case is zero at the same injection angle values. These differences can be easily exploited in distinguishing the different pairing symmetries considered here.

#### IV. PUMPED HEAT AND NOISE

A time dependent scatterer always generates heat flows and can be considered as a mesoscopic (phase coherent) heat source which can be useful for studying various thermoelectric phenomena in mesoscopic structures. The adiabatic quantum pump thus not only generates an electric current but also heat current which can be expressed as the sum of noise power and the Joule heat dissipated<sup>39,40,41</sup>. In this section we look into the heat pumped and the noise generated for the various order parameters of the High- $T_c$  superconductors considered above to further unravel the differences among them.

The expressions for pumped heat and noise in the presence of a superconducting ( $s$  wave) lead have been earlier derived earlier in Ref.[40]. Below we extend the description to include the  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave,  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave superconductors. The pumped current in Eq. 4, can be re-expressed as follows-

$$I = \frac{wq}{2} \sum_{j=1,2}^Z \text{Im} \left( \frac{dE}{d\theta_j} \right) \sum_{i=1}^X \frac{dV_j}{dt} = (S_{ee} \partial_{V_j} S_{ee} + S_{eh} \partial_{V_j} S_{eh}) \frac{dV_j}{dt} \quad (22)$$

In the above equation,  $\text{Im}$  represents the imaginary part of the quantity in parenthesis. Furthermore, as in the adiabatic regime,  $\partial_t S = i[\partial_{V_1} S, \partial_{tX_1} + \dots]$ , and from complex algebra  $[S_{ee}, \partial_t S_{ee}] = i[S_{ee}, \partial_t S_{ee}]$ , the pumped current becomes-

$$I = \frac{wq}{2} \int_0^Z dE \int_0^Z dt [S_{N_S} ff(E + i\frac{\mathcal{Q}_t}{2}) - f(E)gS_{N_S}^y]_{ee} \quad (23)$$

with  $S_{N_S}$  being the  $2X2$  matrix as defined in Eq.1. In the above equation the Fermi Dirac distribution is expanded to first order in  $\mathcal{Q}$  only and  $[\dots]_{ee}$  represents the  $ee^{th}$  element of the quantity in brackets.

The heat current pumped is defined as the magnitude of the electric current multiplied by energy measured from the Fermi level.

$$H = \frac{1}{8} \int_0^Z dE (E - E_F) [S_{N_S}(E;t) ff(E + i\frac{\mathcal{Q}_t}{2}) - f(E)gS_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{ee} \quad (24)$$

Expanding  $f(E + i\frac{\mathcal{Q}_t}{2})$  up-to second order one gets a non-vanishing contribution to the heat current in the zero temperature limit as-

$$H = \frac{1}{8} \int_0^Z dt [\mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}(E;t) \mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{ee} \quad (25)$$

and since two parameters are being varied, we have

$$H = \frac{1}{8} \int_0^Z dt \sum_{i,j=1,2}^X [\mathcal{Q}_{V_i} S_{ee} \mathcal{Q}_{V_j} S_{ee} + \mathcal{Q}_{V_i} S_{eh} \mathcal{Q}_{V_j} S_{eh}] \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial t} \frac{\partial V_j}{\partial t} \quad (26)$$

By integrating the above expression up-to  $\mathcal{Q} = 2$  we get the pumped current in the weak pumping regime as:

$$H = \frac{w^2 V_p^2}{16} \left[ \sum_{=e,h}^X \mathcal{P}_{V_1} S_e^2 + \sum_{=e,h}^X \mathcal{P}_{V_2} S_e^2 + 2\cos(\phi) \sum_{=e,h}^X <(\mathcal{Q}_{V_1} S_e - \mathcal{Q}_{V_2} S_e) \right] \quad (27)$$

$<$  refers to the real part of the quantity in parenthesis. Similar to the above one can derive expressions for the noise and pulse heat dissipated. The expression for the heat current can be re-expressed as -

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{8} \int_0^Z dt [\mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}(E;t) S_{N_S}^y(E;t) S_{N_S}(E;t) \mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{ee} \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \int_0^Z dt \sum_{=e,h}^X [\mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}(E;t) S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{ee} [S_{N_S}(E;t) \mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{ee} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The diagonal term is identified as the pulse heat while the off-diagonal element is the noise power<sup>40</sup>.

$$\begin{aligned} H &= J + N; \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \int_0^Z dt [\mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}(E;t) S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{ee} [S_{N_S}(E;t) \mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{ee} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8} \int_0^Z dt [\mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}(E;t) S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{eh} [S_{N_S}(E;t) \mathcal{Q}_t S_{N_S}^y(E;t)]_{he} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Similar to the analysis for the pumped heat current, the pulse heat dissipated and the noise power can be expressed in the weak pumping regime as

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{16} \left[ \sum_{=e,h}^X \mathcal{P}_e \mathcal{Q}_{V_1} S_e^2 + 2 <(S_{ee} S_{eh} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1} S_{ee} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1} S_{eh})g + \sum_{=e,h}^X \mathcal{P}_e \mathcal{Q}_{V_2} S_e^2 + 2 <(S_{ee} S_{eh} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2} S_{ee} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2} S_{eh})g \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\cos(\phi) \sum_{=e,h}^X \mathcal{P}_e^2 <(\mathcal{Q}_{V_1} S_e - \mathcal{Q}_{V_2} S_e) + <(S_{eh} S_{ee} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1} S_{eh} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2} S_{ee}) + <(S_{ee} S_{eh} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1} S_{ee} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2} S_{eh})g \right] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

while the noise power is given as below :

$$N = \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{16} \left[ f_{eh}^2 \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 + 2 \cos(\theta) \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}} + f_{eh}^2 \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2 + 2 \cos(\theta) \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}} \right] + \cos(\theta) \left[ f_{eh}^2 \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 + \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}} + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}} \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2 \right] \quad (31)$$

Now for our considered system, i.e., a double barrier quantum dot at resonance, we have seen in the previous section that  $\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{he}} = \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{eh}} = 0$  regardless of the order parameter symmetry of the High- $T_c$  superconductor and hence the expressions for the pumped heat, noise and pulse heat dissipated reduce to-

$$H = \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{16} [\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2 + 2 \cos(\theta) \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}] \quad (32)$$

$$J = \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{16} \mathcal{F}_{ee}^2 [\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2 + 2 \cos(\theta) \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}] \quad (33)$$

$$N = \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{16} \mathcal{F}_{he}^2 [\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2 + 2 \cos(\theta) \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}] \quad (34)$$

For our chosen system, i.e., the double barrier quantum dot at resonance in junction with the High- $T_c$  superconductor when  $\theta = 0$ , we have,  $\mathcal{F}_{ee}^2 = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{he}^2 = 1$ , therefore,  $J = 0$  and  $H = N$ .

Now analyzing the above expressions for the different order parameters, we have-

s wave superconductor: In the s wave case as we have already seen  $\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} = 2\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{11}} = \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}} = 2\mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{11}} = \mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{12}} = \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{12}}$ . With this, the expression for the heat current pumped which is equal to the noise power reduces to-

$$H = N = \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{8 k^2} [1 + \cos(\theta) \cos(4ka)] \quad (35)$$

Thus as is evident from the expression for the pumped noise, the quantum pump is non-optimal<sup>12</sup> (or, non-noiseless), only in the special case when  $4ka = (2n+1)\pi$  and  $\theta = 2n\pi$ , with  $n = 0; 1; \dots$  is the optimality condition met. Of course,  $\theta = 2n\pi$  implies that in this case there is no charge current as well.

$d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor: In this case as also seen earlier, we have  $\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}} = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}} = 0$ . Thus there is no heat pumped neither any noise generated nor any pulse heat dissipated. Thus the pump in conjunction with a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave superconductor is cent-percent optimal for any configuration of the parameters and under any condition.

$d_{x^2-y^2} + i s$  wave superconductor: From the previous section, we have  $\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}$  for the order parameter in this case, with this the pumped heat which is same as the noise generated in the pumping process reduces to:

$$H = N = \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{8 k^2} \frac{\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2}{\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2} [1 + \cos(\theta) \cos(4ka)]$$

Denoting the noise generated in the s wave case by  $N_0$ , we have the noise generated for this case becoming just  $N_0 \frac{\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2}{\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2}$ .

$d_{x^2-y^2} + i d_{xy}$  wave superconductor: From the previous section, we have  $\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}$  for this case too, with this the pumped heat which is same as the noise generated in the pumping process reduces to:

$$H = N = \frac{V_p^2 w^2}{8 k^2} \frac{\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 \cos^2(2\theta_s)}{\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2 \cos^2(2\theta_s)} [1 + \cos(\theta) \cos(4ka)]$$

Denoting the noise generated in the s wave case by  $N_0$ , we have the noise generated for this case becoming just  $N_0 \frac{\cos^2(2\theta_s)}{\mathcal{F}_{V_1 S_{ee}}^2 \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \mathcal{F}_{V_2 S_{ee}}^2 \cos^2(2\theta_s)}$ .

To end this section we have seen that the pumped heat and noise generated in the pumping process can also show marked differences for the various order parameters considered. In the s wave, the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + i s$  wave and the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + i d_{xy}$  wave cases the system is non-optimal while in the  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave case it is cent percent optimal. Furthermore in the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + i d_{xy}$  wave case the pump may be turned optimal in some special situations as seen in Figure 3. These situations would help in differentiating between the order parameters for the mixed parameter cases. Especially for Figures 3(b) and 3(c) as it is quite clear that the pump is optimal (or, noiseless) in case of the  $d_{x^2-y^2} + i d_{xy}$  wave superconductor at injection angles  $\theta_s = \pi/4$ .






FIG. 3: The noise generated for double barrier quantum dot at resonance in junction with a High  $T_c$  superconductor.  $N_0$  denotes the noise generated for the  $s$  wave case. The panels: (a) The magnitude of the subdominant component in the mixed order parameter cases is 10% of the dominant component, (b) The magnitude of the subdominant component in the mixed order parameter cases is half of the dominant component and (c) The magnitude of the subdominant component in the mixed order parameter cases is equal to the dominant component.

Order Parameter!	$s$ wave	$d_{x^2-y^2}$ wave	$d_{x^2-y^2} + is$ wave	$d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$ wave
Pumped#				
Charge	$\frac{I(N S)}{I(N)} = 4$	0	$\frac{I(N D S)}{I(N)} = \frac{\frac{2}{s}}{\frac{2}{d} \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \frac{2}{s}}$	$\frac{I(N D d^0)}{I(N)} = \frac{\frac{0}{d} \cos^2(2\theta_s)}{\frac{2}{d} \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \frac{0}{d} \cos^2(2\theta_s)}$
Heat	$H_0$	0	$H_0 \frac{\frac{2}{s}}{\frac{2}{d} \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \frac{2}{s}}$	$H_0 \frac{\frac{0}{d} \cos^2(2\theta_s)}{\frac{2}{d} \sin^2(2\theta_s) + \frac{0}{d} \cos^2(2\theta_s)}$
Noise	Non-Optimal	Optimal	Non-Optimal	Non-Optimal

TABLE I: A comparative analysis of pumped charge, heat and noise in cases of  $s$  wave,  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave,  $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$  wave superconductors in conjunction with a normal metal double barrier structure.  $[H_0 = \frac{V_F^2 w^2}{8 k^2} [1 + \cos(\theta) \cos(4ka)]]$ , Optimal for injection angles  $\theta_s = \pi/4$  (see section Pumped Heat and Noise).

## V. EXPERIMENTAL REALIZATION

Although theoretical examples in quantum pumping phenomena are quite abundant, experiments in this field are very much lacking. Till date there have been notably four experiments in Refs.[24,43,44] and a quantum spin pump in Ref.[25(b)]. The last reference deal with a quantum dot which with application of an inplane magnetic field can pump a pure spin current. One can suitably modify these experiments and place the quantum dot in junction with a High- $T_c$  superconductor. The resonant condition of the quantum dot can be easily established by applying a suitable gate voltage which will enable resonant transport through the quantum dot. After this the two delta barriers can be two gates which control the charge on the dot, modulating these two gates in time will enable a pumped charge (also heat and noise) current to flow. This set-up can easily establish the results arrived at in this work and hopefully give more clues in building a correct theory for High  $T_c$  superconductors.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude we have given a simple procedure to distinguish various order parameters proposed in the context of High- $T_c$  superconductivity. In Table 1 above we juxtapose the results obtained in this work. The pumped charge current, heat pumped and noise generated for the four cases considered, that of the  $s$  wave,  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  wave,

$d_{x^2-y^2} + i s$  wave and  $d_{x^2-y^2} + i d_{xy}$  wave vary markedly which easily reveals the differences among the three.

- 
- E-Mail me at: colin\_ben@indiatimes.com or at, colin@sa.infn.it; Homepage: <http://www.iopb.res.in/~colin>; Present Address: Dipartimento di Fisica "E. R. Caianello", Università degli Studi di Salerno, Via S. Allende, I-84081 Baronissi (SA), Italy
- <sup>1</sup> C. Buder, Phys. Rev. B 41, 4017 (1990); C. Buder, G. B. Lattar, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B 42, R4812 (1990).
  - <sup>2</sup> M. Sigrist and T. M. Rice, Rev. Mod. Phys. 63, 239 (1991).
  - <sup>3</sup> D. J. van Haarlingen, Rev. Mod. Phys. 67, 515 (1995).
  - <sup>4</sup> C. C. T. Sui and J. R. Kirtley, Rev. Mod. Phys. 72, 969 (2000).
  - <sup>5</sup> N. Stefanakis and N. Flytzanis, Phys. Rev. B 64, 024527 (2001); N. Stefanakis, Phys. Rev. B 64, 224502 (2001).
  - <sup>6</sup> Y. A. Sano, Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. B 69, 134501 (2004).
  - <sup>7</sup> Y. A. Sano, Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, cond-mat/0302287.
  - <sup>8</sup> M. Matsumoto and H. Shiba, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 64, 3384 (1995).
  - <sup>9</sup> J. R. Kirtley, et. al., Phys. Rev. B 51, R12057 (1995).
  - <sup>10</sup> C. R. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1526 (1994); J. Yang and C. R. Hu, Phys. Rev. B 50, R16766 (1994).
  - <sup>11</sup> Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3451 (1995).
  - <sup>12</sup> Th. Becherer, C. Stölzel, G. Adrian and H. Adrian, Phys. Rev. B 47, R14650 (1993); T. Walsh, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 6, 125 (1992) and references therein.
  - <sup>13</sup> Jian-Xin Zhu and C. S. Ting, Phys. Rev. B 59, R14165 (1999).
  - <sup>14</sup> M. Belogolovskii, Phys. Rev. B 67, 100503(R) (2003); M. Belogolovskii, et. al., Phys. Rev. B 59, 9617 (1999).
  - <sup>15</sup> I. Zutic and O. T. Valls, Phys. Rev. B 61, 1555 (2000); I. Zutic, J. Fabian and S. Das Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys. 76, 323 (2004).
  - <sup>16</sup> T. Hirai, et. al., cond-mat/0210693.
  - <sup>17</sup> S. Kashiwaya, Y. Tanaka, N. Yoshida and M. R. Beasley, Phys. Rev. B 60, 3572 (1999).
  - <sup>18</sup> G. Deutscher, cond-mat/0409225.
  - <sup>19</sup> T. Lofwander, V. S. Shumeiko and G. Wendin, cond-mat/0102276.
  - <sup>20</sup> Tai-Kai Ng and C. M. Varma, Phys. Rev. B 70, 054514 (2004).
  - <sup>21</sup> P. W. Brouwer, Phys. Rev. B 58, R10135 (1998).
  - <sup>22</sup> F. Zhou, B. Spivak and B. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 608 (1999).
  - <sup>23</sup> M. Buttiker, H. Thomas and A. Pretre, Z. Phys. B: Condensed Matter 94, 133 (1994).
  - <sup>24</sup> M. Switkes, C. M. Marcus, K. Campman and A. C. Gossard, Science 283, 1905 (1999); M. Switkes, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University (1999).
  - <sup>25</sup> E. R. Mucciolo, C. Chamion and C. M. Marcus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 146802, (2002); S. K. Watson, R. M. Potok, C. M. Marcus and V. Umansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 258301 (2003); J. Wu, B. Wang, and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 66, 205327 (2002); W. Zheng, et al., Phys. Rev. B 68, 113306 (2003); P. Shama and C. Chamion, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 096401 (2001); T. Aono, Phys. Rev. B 67, 155303 (2003); M. G. Overmale, F. Taddei and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. B 68, 155324 (2003); P. Shama and P. W. Brouwer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 166801 (2003); R. Benjamin and C. Benjamin, Phys. Rev. B 69, 085318 (2004); Yadong Wei, L. Wan, B. Wang and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 70, 045418 (2004); K. Yu Bliokh and Yu P Bliokh, quant-ph/0404144; F. Zhou, Phys. Rev. B 70, 125321 (2004); A. B. Rataas and Y. Tserkovnyak Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 087201 (2004); M. Yang and S.-S. Lee, Phys. Rev. B (to be published); E. Sela and Y. Oreg, cond-mat/0407089; C. Bena and L. Balents, cond-mat/0406437; Y. Tserkovnyak, A. B. Rataas, G. E. W. Bauer, and B. I. Halperin, cond-mat/0409242.
  - <sup>26</sup> M. Blaauw, Phys. Rev. B 68, 205316 (2003); cond-mat/0307166.
  - <sup>27</sup> R. Citro, N. Andrei and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. B 68, 165312 (2003); S. Das and S. Rao, cond-mat/0410025.
  - <sup>28</sup> Amnon Aharony and O. Entin-Wohlman, Phys. Rev. B 65, 241401(R) (2002); V. Kashcheyevs, M. Sc. thesis (2002).
  - <sup>29</sup> B. Wang and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 65, 233315 (2002).
  - <sup>30</sup> Jian Wang, Yadong Wei, Baigeng Wang and Hong Guo, Appl. Phys. Lett. 79, 3977 (2001).
  - <sup>31</sup> M. Blaauw, Phys. Rev. B 65, 235318 (2002).
  - <sup>32</sup> F. Taddei, M. G. Overmale and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. B 70 052510 (2004).
  - <sup>33</sup> A. F. Andreev, Sov. Phys. JETP 19, 1228 (1964); P. DeGennes and D. S. James, Phys. Letters 4, 151 (1963).
  - <sup>34</sup> C. W. J. Beenakker, Rev. Mod. Phys. 69, 731 (1997).
  - <sup>35</sup> C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. B 46, R12841 (1992).
  - <sup>36</sup> see citation 27 in B. Wang and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 66 201305(R) (2002); Jian Wang, Private communication (2004).
  - <sup>37</sup> V. Gasparian, T. Christen and M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. A 54, 4022 (1996).
  - <sup>38</sup> D. S. Fisher and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 23, R6851 (1981).
  - <sup>39</sup> B. Wang and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 66, 125310 (2002).
  - <sup>40</sup> B. Wang and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 66, 201305(R) (2002).
  - <sup>41</sup> M. M. Oskalets and M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B 66, 035306 (2002); M. M. Oskalets and M. Buttiker, cond-mat/0407292.
  - <sup>42</sup> J. E. Avron, A. Elgart, G. M. Graf, and L. Sadun, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 236601 (2000); J. E. Avron, A. Elgart, G. M. Graf, and L. Sadun, math-ph/0305049; Kai Schnee, Dissertation (2002).
  - <sup>43</sup> L. D'Carlo, C. M. Marcus and J. S. Harris, Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 246804 (2003).

<sup>44</sup> E. M. H ohberger, A. Lorke, W. W egscheider and M. B ichler, Appl. Phys. Lett. 78, 2905 (2001).