arXiv:cond-mat/0510182v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 21 Oct 2005

2D SNS junction with Rashba spin-orbit interaction

Ol'ga Dimitrova and M. V. Feigel'man
L.D.Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kosygin str.2, Moscow, 119334, Russia
(Dated: March 23, 2022)

The effect of Rashba spin-orbital interaction upon supercurrent in S-2DEG-S proximity junctions is investigated in the clean limit. Generalization of Beenakker's formula for Andreev levels to the case of spin-orbital scattering is presented. Spin-orbit - induced splitting of Andreev bound-states is predicted for a junction of infinite width, and with non-vanishing normal backscattering at S/N interfaces. Semiclassical average of the Josephson current is however insensitive to the Rashba coupling as long as electron-electron interaction in 2DEG is neglected.

PACS numbers: 74.50.+r, 74.60.Jg, 71.70.Ej

I. INTRODUCTION

Josephson junctions of two superconductors via two-dimensional electron gas, (most usually implemented in the Nb/InAs/Nb structures) were actively studied both experimentally and theoretically, cf. e.g.[1,2,3,4,5,6]. Generic feature of all these devices is strong reduction of the experimentally measured product I_cR_N with respect to the theoretical predictions. In particular, this discrepancy is known for short junctions with high-quality S/N interfaces, demonstrated by measurement of a non-sinusoidal current-phase relation[6]. At the temperatures much below T_c, the parameter $I_cR_N \approx 0.22mV$ was measured in Ref. 6, to be compared with the Niobium superconductive gap $\Delta \approx 1.5meV$. Thus it seems natural to look for some effects which were not taken into account in the existing theory, cf. e.g.[7,8], but could be responsible for such a drastic suppression of the critical current.

An obvious candidate to be explored is the Rashba spin-orbital interaction[9] $H_R = \alpha[\sigma \times \mathbf{p}] \cdot \mathbf{n}$ known to exist in the 2DEG structures due to up-down asymmetry of the quantum well (here $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit vector normal to the plane of the 2DEG). In the InAs heterostructures this term is especially large (cf. Ref. 10), leading to the band splitting $\Delta_R = 2\alpha p_F \approx 5meV$, i.e. considerably larger than the Niobium superconductive gap. Therefore it seems natural that the account of the Rashba term might be important for analysis of the Josephson current in these devices. We also note in this relation the paper[11], where it was shown that persistent currents in mesoscopic metal rings should be modified strongly by SO coupling - which seems to point out the existence of similar effect upon the Josephson current.

However, it is frequently assumed that the spin-orbital interaction cannot influence proximity effect in superconductive structures, since it respects time-reversal invariance. This argument is not valid, however, when the critical Josephson current is considered, since the presence of a current already breaks down the time-reversal symmetry. More detailed arguments seem to come from recent papers[12,13], where the influence of both Rashba coupling and Zeeman magnetic field upon the critical current of S-N-S junctions was considered. In both these papers it was found that in the absence of the Zeeman term the Rashba interaction (if treated within the simplest model of equal Fermi velocities on both chiral branches) totally cancels out from the equations for Andreev levels. We will show, however, that this cancellation is not generic; rather it is due to different simplifications used in the papers mentioned: a model of completely transparent S/N interfaces was employed in Ref. 12, and a purely one-dimensional model used in Ref. 13.

It will be shown below that in the general case, when some normal backscattering at an arbitrary angle of incidence occurs at the S-N boundaries, the spin-orbital coupling does affect the energies of the Andreev levels and the supercurrent they carry on. We will show that the effect of SO interaction can be understood as being due to modification of the transmission channels defined by the scattering matrix $\check{S}$, which describes the junction properties in the normal state. For a model junction with infinite length (or periodic boundary conditions) in the direction transverse to the supercurrent, spin-orbit splitting of transmission eigenvalues is found, which results in splitting of each Andreev level into pair of spin-polarized levels, with phase-dependent energy difference $\delta E(\chi)$. Note, that $\delta E(0) = 0$, in agreement with the time-reversal invariance restored in the absence of the phase bias. The idea that the Andreev levels can be spin-splitted due to the SO coupling was proposed in Ref. 14 for a narrow (few-channel) junction. The SO effect we discuss in the present paper is different from the one presented in Ref. 14.

In this paper we consider the simplest two-dimensional model of ballistic S-2DEG-S junction (cf. e.g. Ref. 8) of infinite width in the lateral direction transverse to the current flow, see. Fig. 1. We neglect possible potential barriers at the S/N interfaces, assuming that the normal backscattering is due to Fermi-velocity mismatch only, and consider ballistic electron propagation along 2D structure between superconductive terminals. In the Sec. II of the paper we show that in the short junction limit (junction length $L \ll \xi_0 = \hbar v_F/\Delta$, where v_F is the Fermi-velocity of 2DEG) the positions of the Andreev levels can be expressed via the transmission eigenvalues $\mathcal{T}$ of the full scattering matrix $\check{S}$ in precisely the same way as was found by Beenakker [16] for junctions with spin-independent scattering. Then in Sec. III we present




FIG. 1: Two-dimensional model of a superconductor/Rashba 2DEG/superconductor Josephson junction infinite in direction perpendicular to the current (along y axis). The Rashba 2DEG region has thickness L; m/m_n is the effective mass and v_s/v_n is the Fermi velocity in the S/2DEG; φ is the angle between the velocity direction of a quasiparticle and the x axis in the 2DEG region; $\mathbf{n}$ is a unit vector normal to the plane of the 2DEG.

calculations of the scattering matrix $\check{S}$ for the simplest two-dimensional model of ballistic S-2DEG-S junction (cf. e. g. Ref. 8) of infinite width in the lateral direction transverse to the current flow, see. Fig. 1. We demonstrate explicitly spin-splitting of the transmission probabilities $\mathcal{T}_\pm(p_y)$ for the transmission channels characterized by the momentum component p_y. We show then, that the distribution function for the transmission probabilities $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ coincides with the one discussed by Melsen and Beenakker[18] in the absence of spin-orbital coupling. In the Sec. IV we derive expression for the Josephson current of a short junction and demonstrate that *average* current is insensitive to the Rashba coupling. In Sec.V we go beyond the short-junction limit: we derive an equation for spin-splitted Andreev levels for the junction with arbitrary L/ξ_0 ratio and demonstrate that their contribution to the average (semiclassical) supercurrent is insensitive to the SO coupling. Section VI is devoted to the discussion of applicability of our results to S-2DEG-S junctions of finite width and possible ways to detect spin-splitted Andreev levels. Finally, in Sec. VII we present our conclusions and discuss open problems; in particular, it is proposed that the account of electron-electron interaction *together* with Rashba coupling might be able to explain Josephson current.

II. SPECTRUM OF ANDREEV LEVELS

The excitation spectrum consists of the positive eigenvalues of the Bogolyubov-de Gennes (BdG) equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_\nu u^\alpha &= [\xi + U]^\alpha{}_\beta u^\beta + \Delta v^\alpha \\ \epsilon_\nu v^\alpha &= -[\xi^* + U^*]^\alpha{}_\beta v^\beta + \Delta^* u^\alpha,\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $(U^*)^\alpha{}_\beta = \hat{g}^{\nu\alpha}(U(\nu,\mu))^*\hat{g}_{\mu\beta}$, α,β are spinor indices, $\hat{g} = i\hat{\sigma}_y$ is a metric tensor in spin space; $\xi = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} - E_F$ is the kinetic energy of a quasiparticle (energies are measured relative to the Fermi energy);

$$u(\vec{r})^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} u(\vec{r}\uparrow) \\ u(\vec{r}\downarrow)\end{pmatrix}, \quad u_\alpha = \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}u^\beta, \quad u^\alpha = u_\beta\hat{g}^{\beta\alpha},$$
$$U(\sigma,\mu) = U^\sigma{}_\mu. \tag{2}$$

In our model in the normal region (mapped on Fig. 1 as "Rashba 2DEG") the operator $U = \alpha[\sigma\times\mathbf{p}]\cdot\mathbf{n}$ is the spin-orbit interaction, which preserves the time-reversal invariance. In the superconductors the Rashba term is absent, $U = 0$. The superconducting gap Δ is assumed to be a step-like function: equal to zero in the normal region, and its' modulus $|\Delta|$ constant and equal in both superconductors.

Equation which relates the excitation spectrum of the Josephson junction to the scattering matrix in the normal state $\check{S}$, was derived in Ref. 16:

$$\det[1 - r_{he}\check{S}_e(\epsilon)r_{eh}\check{S}_h(\epsilon)] = 0, \tag{3}$$

where

$$r_{he} = \gamma r_A, \quad r_{eh} = \gamma r_A^*, \quad r_A = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\chi/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\chi/2}\end{pmatrix},$$
$$\gamma = e^{-i\arccos(\epsilon/\Delta)}, \tag{4}$$

r_{he} is the Andreev reflection matrix for $e\to h$ scattering in the space of channels incident (reflected) on the left and right NS boundary, $\pm\chi/2$ are the phases of the left (right) superconductor, $\check{S}_{e(h)}$ is the electron (hole) scattering matrix of the normal state.

When no spin-dependent scattering is present, normal scattering matrix $\check{S}_e$ is trivial in spin space, i. e. proportional to the unit matrix $\hat{\sigma}_0$. Further on, within the short junction limit $L \ll \xi_0$, scattering matrices $\check{S}_{e,h}$ do not depend on energy, moreover $\check{S}_h = \check{S}_e^*$. Therefore Eq.(3) can be transformed to an explicit solution[16] for spin-degenerate Andreev levels, $\epsilon_j = \pm\sqrt{1 - \mathcal{T}_j\sin^2\frac{\chi}{2}}$, where $\mathcal{T}_j$ is the j-th eigenvalue of the transmission probability matrix $\hat{T}^\dagger\hat{T}$ (eigenvectors of this matrix define scattering channels). Below we show that solution of the same kind can be obtained when the spin-orbital scattering is present.

In the presence of spin-orbital interaction the scattering matrix in (3) becomes spin-dependent but still obeys time-reversal invariance. It makes possible to generalize Beenakker's derivation for Andreev levels in short

junction[20] using the following set of relations for the $\check{S}$-matrix:

$$\check{S}\check{S}^{\dagger}=1, \qquad \check{S}^{T}(-p_y)=\hat{g}^{T}\check{S}(p_y)\hat{g},$$
$$\check{S}_h(\epsilon,p_y)=\hat{g}^{T}\check{S}_e^{*}(-\epsilon,-p_y)\hat{g}, \qquad (5)$$

where the superscript ^{T} means full matrix transposition. The first relation in (5) is just a unitarity condition, the second one follows from the time-reversal invariance (we used here a transformation of the wave-functions upon time-reversal, $\psi^{t-r}(p_y)=\hat{g}\psi^{*}(-p_y)$). Finally, the third relation in (5) is due to a special symmetry of the Bogolyubov-de Gennes equations: $\psi_h(\epsilon,p_y)=\hat{g}^{T}\psi_e^{*}(-\epsilon,-p_y)$. It is important to note the sign change of the parameter p_y in the second and the third relations above: when all scattering states are characterized by a conserved momentum (p_y), the time-conjugation operation contains complex conjugation and $p_y\to -p_y$ inversion, since time reversal of the scattering matrix should change the sign of p_x only, while keeping p_y intact. In other terms, the additional $p_y\to -p_y$ operation is needed due to the use of scattering channels characterized by *complex* eigenfunctions $\propto e^{ip_y y}$. Usually in calculations of this kind a *real* basis of transmission channels is used, in which case such an additional operation would be absent.

Making use of relations (5), one can transform Eq. (3) into the form:

$$\det\left[\frac{1}{\gamma}\hat{g}^{T}\check{S}_e^{*}(\epsilon,p_y)\hat{g}r_A^{*}-\gamma r_A^{*}\hat{g}^{T}\check{S}_e^{*}(-\epsilon,p_y)\hat{g}\right]=0. \qquad (6)$$

For a short contact $L\ll\xi_0$, we neglect the energy-dependence of the scattering matrix in Eq. (6), and obtain a second order equation with respect to ϵ^2, which results in the following solution:

$$\epsilon_{s,\eta}(p_y)=\eta\Delta\sqrt{1-\mathcal{T}_s(p_y)\sin^2\frac{\chi}{2}}, \qquad (7)$$

where $\eta=\pm$ and $\mathcal{T}_s(p_y)$ are transmission probabilities - eigenvalues of the matrix $\hat{T}^{\dagger}\hat{T}$, depending on the spin index $s=\pm$ and the conserved momentum p_y. In general, $\mathcal{T}_+(p_y)\neq\mathcal{T}_-(p_y)$, thus four non-degenerate Andreev levels correspond to each p_y value, as shown in Fig.3 below. Note however, that full family of Andreev levels still contains pair-wise degeneracy within our model. Namely, degeneracy exists between states with $p_y=\pm|p_y|$. Below we consider a specific example of scattering problem relevant to S-2DEG-S structures, and calculate $\mathcal{T}_s(p_y)$ eigenvalues.

III. S-MATRIX AND TRANSMISSION EIGENVALUES

We are interested in the study of specific spin-orbital effects and thus will consider the simplest model of S/N boundaries, assuming that normal electron reflection is due to Fermi velocity mismatch only, $v_s\neq v_n$ (here v_s and v_n are the Fermi velocities in the superconductive metal and in the 2DEG correspondingly). Additional source of reflection due to an effective potential barrier at the interface (cf. e. g. Ref. 8) can be present, but does not affect our results qualitatively. Since the effective mass m_n in the 2DEG differs strongly from the effective mass m in the metallic superconductor (typically, $m_n/m\approx 0.03$ for 2D structures with InAs), the difference of these masses should be taken into account explicitly. Our first goal now is to find reflection/transmission amplitudes on single S/N interfaces (for the normal state of the superconductive metal S). We will follow Ref. 15, and use continuity equations which follow from the Schrodinger equation with space-dependent mass $m(x)$ and spin-orbital parameter $\alpha(x)$:

$$\left[\frac{\hat{p}_x}{m(x)}-\alpha(x)\right]\Psi\,|_N^S=0\,, \qquad \Psi\,|_N^S=0, \qquad (8)$$

where $F\,|_N^S$ denote $F(x=-\frac{L}{2}+0)-F(x=-\frac{L}{2}-0)$ for the left interface (cf. Fig. 1) and similarly for the right interface located at $x=L/2$. Further on, $P_F=mv_s$ and $p_F=m_nv_n$ are the Fermi-momenta in the S metal and in the 2DEG correspondingly; usually $p_F\ll P_F$, whereas v_s and v_n are of the same order of magnitude. Below we will assume that the parameter $\alpha/v_n\ll 1$ measuring the relative strength of the Rashba interaction is small in comparison with the Fermi-velocity mismatch, i.e. $\alpha\ll|v_s-v_n|$. Under this condition, reflection amplitudes at each of the S/N boundaries are determined by the ratio v_n/v_s only. Then the amplitudes of reflection and transmission are trivial in the spin space, e.g. $\overrightarrow{r}_1^{\alpha\beta}=\delta^{\alpha\beta}\overrightarrow{r}_1$, and so on. For an incident wave coming from $x=-\infty$, the amplitudes of reflection and transmission on the left (1) interface, are:

$$\overrightarrow{r}_1=\frac{w-1}{1+w}\,, \qquad \overrightarrow{t}_1=\frac{2}{1+w}, \qquad (9)$$

where $w=v_{nx}/v_{sx}$ is the ratio of the x-components of the electron velocities, with $v_{nx}=v_n\cos\varphi$ and $v_{sx}=\left[v_s^2-(\frac{m_n}{m})^2v_n^2\sin^2\varphi\right]^{1/2}\approx v_s$. Here φ is the angle between the velocity direction and the x axis in the 2DEG; note that v_{sx} is very close to v_s for any angle φ, since $(m_n/m)^2\ll 1$. Other reflection/transmission amplitudes are determined as follows:

$$\overleftarrow{r}_2=\overrightarrow{r}_1\,, \qquad \overleftarrow{t}_2=\overrightarrow{t}_1,$$
$$\overleftarrow{r}_1=\overrightarrow{r}_2=-\overrightarrow{r}_1\,, \qquad \overleftarrow{t}_1=\overrightarrow{t}_2=\frac{2w}{1+w}. \qquad (10)$$

The total scattering matrix $\check{S}$ of the S/Rashba 2DEG/S junction in the normal state, formed out of the "single boundary" amplitudes, Eq. (9), reads (similar equations can be written for $\hat{T}_2$ and $\hat{R}_2$):

$$\hat{T}_1=\overrightarrow{t}_2\hat{S}^r\left[1-\overleftarrow{r}_1(\hat{S}^l)^{-1}\overrightarrow{r}_2\hat{S}^r\right]^{-1}\overrightarrow{t}_1,$$

$$\hat{R}_1 = \overleftarrow{t}_1 (\hat{S}^l)^{-1} \overrightarrow{r}_2 \hat{S}^r \left[1 - \overleftarrow{r}_1 (\hat{S}^l)^{-1} \overrightarrow{r}_2 \hat{S}^r\right]^{-1} \overrightarrow{t}_1 + \\ + \overrightarrow{r}_1, \tag{11}$$

where $\hat{R}$ and $\hat{T}$ are the reflection and the transmission blocks of the scattering matrix:

$$\check{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{R}_1 & \hat{T}_2 \\ \hat{T}_1 & \hat{R}_2 \end{pmatrix}; \tag{12}$$

the index 1 in the amplitudes $\hat{R}$, $\hat{T}$ in Eq. (11) means that the equations are written for the case of an electron propagating from left to right. Matrices in the spin space $\hat{S}^{r(l)}$ describe spin rotation during the electron propagation across 2DEG region with the Rashba coupling between the two S/N boundaries. Explicit form of these matrices can be obtained by transformation of the plane-wave eigenmodes with definite chirality to the spin basis with definite S_y projection:

$$\hat{S}^r = e^{i\xi} \left[\cos A - i \sin A \sin\varphi \hat{\sigma}_x + i \sin A \cos\varphi \hat{\sigma}_z\right] \tag{13}$$
$$(\hat{S}^l)^{-1} = e^{i\xi} \left[\cos A - i \sin A \sin\varphi \hat{\sigma}_x - i \sin A \cos\varphi \hat{\sigma}_z\right].$$

Here $\xi(\epsilon) = k(\epsilon)L$, with $k(\epsilon) = k + m\epsilon/k$ and $k = p_F \cos\varphi$, is the main semiclassical phase and $A = m_n \alpha L/\cos\varphi$ is the additional phase due to spin rotation by Rashba coupling. Within our approximation $\alpha/v_n \ll 1$, the whole effect of the Rashba coupling is contained in the phase A which is not small if length L of the junction is comparable or larger than the spin-rotation length $L_0 = \hbar/m_n\alpha$.

We define, for further convenience, a new parameter $x = \log\frac{1+w}{1-w}$, where w is defined after Eq. (9). Then, combining Eqs. (11) and (13), we obtain a transmission matrix in the form:

$$\hat{T}_1 = T_0 + T_1\hat{\sigma}_x + T_3\hat{\sigma}_z, \\ \hat{T}_2 = T_0 + T_1\hat{\sigma}_x - T_3\hat{\sigma}_z, \tag{14}$$

with

$$T_0 = t \sinh(x - i\xi) \cos A, \\ T_1 = -i\, t \cosh(x - i\xi) \sin A \sin\varphi, \\ T_3 = i\, t \sinh(x - i\xi) \sin A \cos\varphi, \tag{15}$$

where we denoted

$$t = \frac{\sinh x}{\sinh^2(x - i\xi) + \sin^2 A \sin^2\varphi}. \tag{16}$$

.

The reflection matrix $\hat{R}$ has the form:

$$\hat{R}_1 = R_0 + R_1\hat{\sigma}_x + R_2\hat{\sigma}_y, \\ \hat{R}_2 = R_0 + R_1\hat{\sigma}_x - R_2\hat{\sigma}_y, \tag{17}$$

with

$$R_0 = t \left[\coth x \, \sin^2 A \, \sin^2\varphi - i\frac{\sin\xi}{\sinh x} \sinh(x - i\xi)\right],$$




FIG. 2: The spin-splitted transmission eigenvalues $\mathcal{T}_s$, $s = \pm 1$, as functions of the angle of propagation φ of the quasiparticles inside the 2DEG, plotted for a realistic S-2DEG-S junction with parameters $v_s = 7 \cdot 10^7$cm/s, $v_n = 5 \cdot 10^7$cm/s, $m = m_e$, $m_n = 0.035 m_e$, $m_n\alpha/\hbar = 5 \cdot 10^4$cm^{-1}, $L = 190$nm. For these parameters and for value of the superconducting gap $\Delta = 1.4$meV: (1) the length of the contact L is shorter than the coherence length, $\xi_0 = \hbar v_s/\Delta = 330$nm; (2) the Rashba velocity is much smaller than the Fermi velocity in the 2DEG, $\alpha/v_n \approx 0.03$; (3) the system is within the semiclassical limit, $p_F L/\hbar = m_n v_n L/\hbar \approx 30$; (4) the spin-orbital splitting $2\alpha p_F \approx 3.3$meV is larger than the superconducting gap Δ; (5) the S/N interfaces are almost transparent ($v_s/v_n \approx 1.4$), which allows a large experimental value of the critical current.

$$R_1 = \frac{i}{2}\, t \, \sin 2A \, \sin\varphi, \\ R_2 = \frac{i}{2}\, t \, \sin^2 A \, \sin 2\varphi. \tag{18}$$

Now we use Eqs. (14, 15) to obtain the transmission probabilities, as the eigenvalues of the matrix $\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \hat{T}^\dagger \hat{T}$:

$$\mathcal{T}_\pm(\xi, x(\varphi)) = \frac{\sinh^2 x}{\sinh^2 x + \sin^2(\xi \pm \frac{\beta}{2})}, \tag{19}$$

where the phase β defined via

$$\cos\beta = 1 - 2\sin^2\varphi \, \sin^2 A \tag{20}$$

is due to the Rashba interaction. Eq. (19) demonstrates explicitly spin-splitting of the transmission eigenvalues $\mathcal{T}_\pm$. Note that $\beta = 0$ and the splitting is absent for trajectories with $\varphi = 0$, which is the case of a purely 1-dimensional (single-channel) contact[13]. In the absence of normal reflection, i.e. at $x \to \infty$, all transmission eigenvalues are equal to unity and the spin-orbital effects disappear as well[12].

Spin-orbital effect upon $\mathcal{T}_\pm$ reduces, according to Eq. (19), to the shift of the main semiclassical phase, $\xi \to \xi \pm \beta/2$, in agreement with the result presented in Eq. (1) of Ref. 11. An example of the dependence of transmission eigenvalues $\mathcal{T}_\pm$ as functions of the incidence angle is shown in Fig.2. An important point to mention is that this dependence is even with respect to $\phi \to -\phi$ reflection, cf. Eq.(20). This symmetry reflects a "trace"

of the Kramers degeneracy which is known to exist for the transmission eigenvalues defined within the *real* basis of scattering states (note that the proof of Kramers degeneracy of transmission eigenvalues is by far more complicated[17] than original Kramers theorem for the degeneracy of energy levels). We characterize scattering states by complex travelling waves $e^{ip_y y}$, which leads to breakdown of time invariance. Therefore Kramers theorem is not applicable to our model and spin-splitting demonstrated in Eq.(19) may occur[23].

It follows from Eq. (19) that a semiclassical average of any physical quantity which can be expressed as a sum of terms containing individual $\mathcal{T}$ variables (i.e. does not contain cross-terms like $\mathcal{T}_+\mathcal{T}_-$), does not depend upon the SO coupling. Indeed, calculation of any average quantity in our model involves integration over momentum component p_y parallel to the interfaces (or on propagation angle φ, defined as $p_y = p_F \sin\varphi$). The integrand, as function of φ, contains fast oscillations with characteristic scale $1/p_F L$, and relatively slow dependence on $\cos\varphi$. It is convenient first to average over fast oscillations by going to probability distribution of transmission eigenvalues defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_\varphi(\mathcal{T}_\pm) = \int \delta(\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{T}_\pm(\xi, x(\varphi))\, d\xi. \tag{21}$$

Clearly, the presence of $\pm\beta$ phase-shift does not alter the form of the probability distribution, which is of the same form as considered, e.g. in Ref. 18 and independent on the spin-orbit coupling:

$$\mathcal{P}_\varphi(\mathcal{T}) = \frac{\tanh x}{2\mathcal{T}\sqrt{1-\mathcal{T}}\sqrt{\mathcal{T} - \tanh^2 x}}. \tag{22}$$

Now we consider, as the simplest example, calculation of the average conductivity of a junction in the normal state. It can be written as

$$G = G_Q \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos\varphi \frac{d\varphi}{\pi} \int \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}_\varphi(\mathcal{T})\, d\mathcal{T}. \tag{23}$$

Universality of the distribution function $\mathcal{P}_\varphi(\mathcal{T})$ leads to independence of the average conductance G, as well as of other quantities which can be expressed via this distribution functions, upon the spin-orbit phase A (remember that we neglected weak effects of the order of $\alpha/v_n \ll 1$). Note once again, that the above simple considerations could not be applied to calculation of any quantity which is *not additive* as a function of different transmission channels, i.e. which contains products of different transmission eigenvalues.

IV. JOSEPHSON CURRENT

Equation for the Andreev levels (7) together with Eq. (19) for transmission eigenvalues constitute the central result of the paper. Now one can calculate Josephson current[16]:




FIG. 3: The four spin-splitted Andreev levels $\pm\epsilon_s$, $s = \pm 1$, as a function of the superconducting phase difference χ, plotted for a value of the angle of propagation $\varphi = \pi/5$, and for a realistic S-2DEG-S junctions with parameters $v_s = 7\cdot 10^7$cm/s, $v_n = 5\cdot 10^7$cm/s, $\alpha \approx 0.2\cdot 10^7$cm/s, $m = m_e$, $m_n = 0.035 m_e$, $L = 190$nm.

$$I(\chi) = \frac{e\Delta^2}{2\hbar}\sin\chi \int \frac{L_y dp_y}{2\pi\hbar} \sum_{s=\pm 1} \frac{\mathcal{T}_s(p_y)}{\epsilon_{s,+}(\chi)} \tanh\frac{\epsilon_{s,+}(\chi)}{2T}. \tag{24}$$

Eq. (24) is applicable for the temperature-dependent Josepshson current in the short-junction limit. In the semiclassical limit $p_F L \to \infty$ the *average* Josephson current can be calculated with the use of the distribution function $\mathcal{P}_\varphi(\mathcal{T})$ given by Eq. (22) as follows:

$$I(\chi) = \frac{e\Delta}{2\hbar}\int_{-\pi/2}^{+\pi/2} \frac{d\varphi\cos\varphi}{\pi} \times \tag{25}$$
$$\int \mathcal{P}_\varphi(\mathcal{T})\, d\mathcal{T} \frac{\mathcal{T}\sin\chi}{\sqrt{1-\mathcal{T}\sin^2\frac{\chi}{2}}} \tanh\frac{\Delta\sqrt{1-\mathcal{T}\sin^2\frac{\chi}{2}}}{2T}.$$

Eq. (25) demonstrates independence of the average Josephson current on the spin-orbital coupling. Such an average current is a meaningful characteristic of a junction with both lateral sizes much longer than the Fermi wavelength, $L, L_y \gg \hbar/p_F$.

Oscillations of I_c as a function of the electron density, was discussed theoretically in Ref. 8 within the model very similar to the present one (but without Rashba coupling). It was argued that oscillations should appear due to the presence of normal resonances in a double-barrier structure, like the ones described in our Eq. (19) as a function of $\xi = p_F L\cos\varphi$. Strong spin-rotation effect expected at $L \geq L_0$, produces an additional phase $\beta \sim 1$ which leads to splitting of the resonances as a function of $p_F L$. As a result, at $L \geq L_0$ oscillations discussed in Ref. 8 will have a twice shorter period and reduced amplitude.

V. SPECTRUM EQUATION AND CURRENT FOR THE JUNCTION OF AN ARBITRARY LENGTH

In this section we find equations determining the Andreev levels for an arbitrary length of the contact, with the main purpose to demonstrate, that the semiclassical average of the Josephson current is independent upon the SO coupling for any L/ξ_0 ratio. Here we use alternative method of calculation: instead of expression of the Andreev levels via the transmission eigenvalues, we employ direct matching of wavefunctions obeying BdG equations in the 2DEG and both superconductive regions. To simplify calculations in this Section, we will consider here a model of equal effective masses, $m_n = m$.

Eigenfunctions of the BdG equation for the S-2DEG-S junction can be represented as 8-dimensional vectors, since they contain three 2-dimensional blocks: i) electron and hole components, ii) two spin projections, and iii) two direction of momentum in the x direction, $p_x = \pm p_F|\cos\varphi|$. Matching conditions for wavefunctions on both S/N interfaces consist of 16 scalar equations which relate 8 wavefunction components in the 2DEG region with 4 components in each of superconductive terminals (in the case of the subgap Andreev levels which decay exponentially into the bulk of the superconductors). The next step is to reduce this system of 16 equations down to 8 equations which couple together 4+4=8 amplitudes of wavefunctions in superconductors. The solvability condition for this system of 8 linear equations is equivalent to the condition of vanishing of the corresponding determinant, $g(\epsilon,\chi) = 0$, which is equivalent to the one defined in Eq. (6). After some tedious calculations, the equation $g(\epsilon,\chi) = 0$ can be transformed into the following form:

$$g(\epsilon,\chi) \equiv g_+(\epsilon,\chi)g_-(\epsilon,\chi) = 0\,, \quad \text{where}$$
$$g_\pm(\epsilon,\chi) = \cos 2\xi - Q\cos\beta \pm \sqrt{1-Q^2}\sin\beta\,, \qquad (26)$$

where the parameter β is defined in Eq. (20),

$$Q = \cos\Psi + \frac{4k^2K^2\Delta^2\,(\cos\Psi+\cos\chi)}{\left(K^2-k^2\right)^2\left(\Delta^2-\epsilon^2\right)}, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\Psi = 2\arctan\frac{2kK\epsilon}{(K^2+k^2)\sqrt{\Delta^2-\epsilon^2}} + \mathcal{E}, \qquad (27)$$

with $\mathcal{E} = 2m\epsilon L/k$ being the energy dependent part of the phase $\xi(\epsilon)$. Eqs. (26) demonstrate, that in the presence of the Rashba interaction, the Andreev levels are generically spin-splitted for the contact of an arbitrary length.

In the limit of vanishing spin-orbit interaction $\alpha = 0$, as well as for electron trajectories with $p_y = \varphi = 0$, the spectrum equation (26) reduces to the standard equation $\cos 2\xi = Q$ with a two-fold degenerate (due to the spin) solutions. In the special case of ideally transparent boundaries $p_F = P_F$ general spectrum equation (26) also reduces to the standard equation $\cos 2\xi = Q$, which now simplifies to

$$\cos\left(-\mathcal{E} + 2\arccos\frac{\epsilon}{\Delta}\right) = \cos\chi. \qquad (28)$$

For a relatively short contact with $0 < \mathcal{E} \ll 1$ we expand the Andreev spectrum equation (26) in powers of small parameter $\kappa = \frac{m\Delta L}{k}$, and find the first correction to the result (7) obtained in Sec.II for the $\kappa \to 0$ limit :

$$\epsilon_\pm = \Delta\sqrt{1-\mathcal{T}_\pm\sin^2\frac{\chi}{2}}\left(1-\kappa\mathcal{T}_\pm^{3/2}\left|\sin\frac{\chi}{2}\right|\coth\,x\right), \qquad (29)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_\pm$ are defined in Eq. (19).

In the general case of an arbitrary length of the contact, the spectral equation (26) is too complicated to be solved explicitly for the energies of the Andreev levels. Moreover, one should remember that for a junction of an arbitrary L/ξ ratio the continuous part of the spectrum (scattering states) contributes to the Josephson current as well as the localized levels we have considered. However, total Josephson current (carried by both localized Andreev levels and continuous part of the spectrum) can be found following the method presented in Ref. 21, in terms of the spectral function $g(\epsilon,\chi)$ itself.

We will use Eqs. (I.9), (A.48) and (A.49) from Ref. 21, modified in our case due to the presence of the spin-splitting, and the continuous scattering channels characterized by the transverse momentum p_y. Therefore the total current contains an integral over all p_y:

$$I_{\rm total}(\chi) = L_y\frac{4e}{\hbar}T\sum_{s=\pm}\int\frac{dp_y}{2\pi\hbar}\sum_{\omega_n>0}\partial_\chi\ln g_s(i\omega,\chi), \qquad (30)$$

here the summation goes over positive Matsubara frequencies: $\omega = 2\pi T(n+1/2)$, $n = 0, 1, ...$

Within the semiclassical limit ($Lp_F \gg 1$), calculation of the integral over p_y in Eq. (30) can be simplified by the same method which was used previously in the last part of Sec.III. Namely, we first average over the period of the fast oscillations of $\cos\xi \equiv \cos(kL)$ at a fixed angle φ, and then do the integration over φ. Integration $\int_0^\pi d\xi ...$ in Eq.(30) leads to the result which does not contain the spin-orbital phase β:

$$I_{\rm total}(\chi) = -L_y\cdot p_F\frac{4e}{\hbar^2}T\sum_{\omega_n>0}\int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}}\frac{d\varphi}{\pi}\cos\varphi\frac{\partial_\chi Q}{\sqrt{|1-Q^2|}}, \qquad (31)$$

where $Q \equiv Q(\epsilon = i\omega_n,\chi)$ as defined in Eq. (27), and we took into account that $dp_y = p_F\cos\varphi d\varphi$. Eq. (31) demonstrates that the semiclassical average of the Josephson current through the S/Rashba 2DEG/S contact *does not depend* on the Rashba coupling constant, and this result is valid for an arbitrary Fermi velocity mismatch and arbitrary length of the contact. We note however that this result is valid as long as electron-electron interaction in the 2DEG region is neglected.

VI. DISCUSSION

The above results were obtained for a model of an infinitely long junction in direction perpendicular to the

current, when due to the translational invariance the motion along y axis was completely determined by the wavevector p_y of the corresponding plane wave. An obvious generalization of such a model system would be a junction with periodic boundary conditions in y direction. In this case, all our results would stay intact, up to replacement of continuous p_y by the discrete set of wavevectors $p_n = 2\pi n/L_y$. Although being somewhat exotic for SNS junctions, such a geometry does not seem to be impossible, taking into account recent advances in fabrication of complicated InAs structures, cf. e.g.[22]. Usually, however, S-2DEG-S structure is of a finite length in y direction L_y with *closed* boundary conditions, so that the channel eigenstates are characterized by standing waves - mixtures of plane waves $e^{ip_yL_y}$ and $e^{-ip_yL_y}$. In presence of the Rashba term, the direction of the electron momentum is coupled to the direction of its spin, thus determination of correct standing-wave eigenstates is not trivial. The major effect of a finite $L_y \gg L_0$ will be the existence of a discrete set of transmission channels, $N_{ch} = 2L_y/\lambda_F$, where λ_F is the Fermi wavelength of the 2DEG. However, some qualitative effect of closed boundary conditions will occur: now one would deal with a real basis of scattering states, thus Kramers theorem for the transmission eigenvalues[17] would be applicable. It means that for closed boundary conditions and in the short-junction limit $L/\xi_0 \to 0$, no spin-splitting of Andreev levels may occur. In other terms, in a closed (in y direction) system Rashba coupling *modifies* transmission eigenvalues, but does not *split* it. How can we reconcile it with a natural idea that for very long L_y the type of boundary conditions should not be important? The point is that the total Andreev spectrum of the system is doubly degenerate for the periodic boundary conditions as well as for the closed ones. In the first case, the degeneracy is due to the symmetry of $\mathcal{T}_\pm(p_y)$ with respect to $p_y \to -p_y$ reflection, whereas in the second case it is due to Kramers theorem. In order to get global Andreev spectrum without degeneracy, the time-reversal symmetry should be broken. In particular, it happens if nonzero L/ξ_0 ratio is taken into account, as reported in Ref. 14. Another possibility might be related with an *open* sample geometry like the one used in Ref. 5, where additional current can be passed in the direction transverse to the supercurrent.

Individual Andreev levels could possible be observed experimentally by microwave spectroscopy or by measurement of tunnelling conductance into the 2DEG region from an additional point-like junction. One version of the former type of experiment was proposed theoretically, for a single-channel junction, in Ref. 19. In this case, resonant frequency is very high, of the order of $\Delta/\hbar$, since the only possible transitions are between the positive and the negative Andreev levels. This frequency is about 0.4 Thz for Nb terminals (considerably lower frequencies can be found in the case of a very small reflection probability, $1-\mathcal{T} \ll 1$ and a phase difference $\chi \approx \pi$). In many-channel junctions energy spacing between neighboring Andreev levels is reduced as $\delta\epsilon \sim \Delta/N_{ch}$, but usually (without spin-orbit coupling) it is not possible to observe microwave-induced transitions between levels which belong to different conduction channels. The reason is the momentum conservation: different transmission channels are characterized by different wavevectors $p_y/\hbar$ which are spaced by π/L_y, whereas photon wavelength $\lambda_{ph} = hc/\delta\epsilon$ is much longer than L_y, their ratio is of the order of $(E_F^{2DEG}/\Delta)(c/v_n) \sim 10^4$. It seems possible that this selection rule will not be effective in the considered situation with Rashba coupling, which modifies conduction channels considerably at $L_y \geq L_0$. The point is that now conduction channels will be defined in the entangled space of orbital and spin variables, thus there seems to be no reason for vanishing of the interchannel photon matrix element. However, this question will certainly need further investigation.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We investigated the dependence of Josephson currents in clean S-Rashba 2DEG-S proximity junctions upon the Rashba spin-orbit interaction. We have generalized the Beenakker's formula for the Andreev levels for the case of spin-orbital scattering and found that for the case of an infinitely wide junction (in direction transverse to the current), the Andreev levels are spin-splitted. This result is in agreement with papers [12,13], where the effect of Rashba spin-orbital interaction upon supercurrent was studied either[12] in the case of absence of normal backscattering at the interfaces ($p_F = P_F$), or in the one-dimensional case[13]. We have shown that the semiclassical average of the Josephson current is however insensitive to the Rashba coupling as long as electron-electron interaction in 2DEG is neglected.

Our results show therefore that the account of the Rashba spin-orbital interaction for the usual model of SNS junction without electron-electron interaction in the normal region is not sufficient to explain experimentally observed strong suppression of the I_cR_N parameter with respect to its theoretical value. We believe that to explain this suppression the electron-electron interaction should be taken into account together with the spin-orbital effects. We note that electron-electron interactions in both density-density and spin-spin channels are not weak in the 2DEG structures.

A related open problem is to find average spin polarization $\langle S_y \rangle$ in the 2DEG region, which is expected to exist at a nonzero supercurrent in the S-2DEG-S structure due to symmetry considerations, cf. e.g. Ref. 14. Note that a supercurrent-induced average spin polarization will induce, in the presence of electron-electron interaction, an effective Zeeman field which may strongly modify the Andreev levels as well as the Josephson current.

We are grateful to C. W. J. Beenakker, Ya. M. Blanter, I. V. Bobkova, A. M. Finkelstein, F. Giazotto, P. M. Ostrovsky, N. M. Shchelkachev and H. Takayanagi for

many useful discussions. This research was supported by the Dynasty Foundation and Landau-Juelich Scholarship (O.D.), by RFBR grants 04-02-16348 and 04-02-08159, by the Programm "Quantum Macrosphysics" of Russian Academy of Sciences, and by Russian Ministry of Education and Science via the contract RI-112/001/417. Part of this research was accomplished during the stay of O.Dimitrova at Laboratoire des Solides Irradies (Ecole Polytechnique, Paris) within the scope of the ENS-Landau collaboration programm.

[1] B. J. van Wees *et al*, Physica B **203**, 285 (1994)
[2] H. Takayanagi, J. B. Hansen and J. Nitta, Physica B **203**, 291 (1994)
[3] F. Giazotto *et al*, Journal of Superconductivity: Incorporating Novel Magnetism, **17**, 317 (2004); cond-mat/0207337
[4] A. Chrestin, T. Matsuyama and U. Merkt, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 8457 (1997)
[5] Th.Schäpers *et al*, Phys. Rev. **67**, 014522 (2003)
[6] M. Ebel *et al*, cond-mat/0407206
[7] A. Brinkman and A. A. Golubov, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 11297 (2000).
[8] A. Chrestin, T. Matsuyama and U. Merkt, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 498 (1994)
[9] E. I. Rashba, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad), **2**, 1224 (1960); [Sov. Phys.-Solid State **2**, 1109 (1960)].
[10] J. Nitta, T. Akazaki, H. Takayangai and T. Enoki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1335 (1997).
[11] Y. Meir, Y. Gefen and O. Entin-Wohlman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 798 (1989).
[12] E. Bezuglyi *et al*, Phys. Rev. B. **66** 052508 (2002).
[13] I. V. Krive *et al*, Fiz. Niz. Temp. **30**, 535 (2004).
[14] N. M. Chtchelkatchev and Yu. V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 226806 (2003).
[15] M. Khodas, A. Shekhter and A. M. Finkel'stein Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 086602 (2004).
[16] C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3836 (1991)
[17] P.A.Mello and J.-L.Pichard, J.Phys.I (Paris), **1**, 493 (1991).
[18] J. A. Melsen and C. W. J. Beenakker, Physica B **203**, 219 (1994).
[19] N. I. Lundin et al, *Superlattices and Microstructures, Vol. 20, No. 1, 1996*
[20] The idea of this calculation was communicated to us by N. M. Chtchelkatchev.
[21] N. M. Chtchelkatchev, Ph. D. Thesis (2002), L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, `http://nms.itp.ac.ru/phd_nms.pdf` (in Russian).
[22] T.Koga, Y.Sekine and J.Nitta, cond-mat/0504743; M.König, A.Tscheschetkin, E.M.Hankiewicz *et al*, cond-mat/0508396.
[23] We are grateful to C.W.J.Beenakker for the discussion of this point and bringing to our attention Ref. 17