Scattering by m agnetic and spin-orbit im purities and the Josephson current in superconductor-ferrom agnet-superconductor junctions.

F.S. Bergeret¹, A.F. Volkov^{2;3}; and K.B.E fetov^{2;4}

Universidad Autonoma de Madrid,

E-28049 M adrid, Spain

⁽²⁾ Theoretische Physik III,

Ruhr-Universitat Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁽³⁾ Institute for Radioengineering and Electronics of Russian Academy of

Sciences,11-7 M okhovaya str., M oscow 125009, Russia

⁽⁴⁾L.D.Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics RAS,

119334 Moscow, Russia

We analyze the Josephson current in a junction consisting of two superconductors (S) and a ferrom agnetic layer (F) for arbitrary in purity concentration. In addition to non-m agnetic in purities, we consider also magnetic ones and spin-orbit scattering. In the lim it of weak proximity e ect we solve the linearized E ilenberger equation and derive an analytical expression for the Josephson critical current valid in a broad range of parameters. This expression enables us to obtain not only known results in the dirty and clean lim its but also in a interm ediate region of the impurity concentration, which may be very important for comparison with experimental data.

I. IN TRODUCTION

N egative Josephson coupling has been predicted almost three decades ago [1, 2]. Bulaevskii et al [1] obtained this coupling from a model of a tunnel Josephson junction containing magnetic impurities. By tunneling from one superconductor to the other, electrons are scattered by these impurities. Explicit calculations led the authors of Ref.[1] to the conclusion that under certain conditions the Josephson critical current I_c m ight change its sign.

Later on, Buzdin et al. suggested that a similar behavior might take place provided the insulating barrier was substituted by a ferrom agnetic m etallic layer (F)[3]. Since then, the 0- transition, i.e. the change of sign of I_c , has been the focus of study of m any theoretical works (see [4, 5, 6] and references therein).

However, in spite of the theoretical progress, the 0- transition has been observed only recently in SFS junctions with characteristic thicknesses of the F layer of the order 100 A or less [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. Although a qualitative explanation for the observed drops of I_c as a function of thickness or temperature could be given in the fram ework of the known theories, a quantitative description is, in many cases, still lacking. This is due to the fact that the authors of the theoretical works considered either the pure ballistic case [3, 15, 16, 17, 18] or the dirty lim it using the U sadel equation [19, 20]. In the pure ballistic case, the critical current I_c oscillates with the period $v_F = 2h$ as a function of the thickness 2d of the F layer, where v_F is the Ferm ivelocity and h the exchange eld in the ferrom agnet. In the di usive lim it, both the period of oscillation and the decaying length of the function I_c (2d) are equal to D = 2h, where $D = v_F^2 = 3$ is the classical di usion coe cient and is the momentum relaxation time due to the in purity scattering.

The di usive limit is realized provided either the exchange energy h is not too large or the m ean free path l is short enough. M ore precisely, the condition h <<1 should be fulled. However, in m any experiments this is not the case. In particular, in those performed with strong ferrom agnets [9, 12, 14]. Theory considering an arbitrary value of h and l has been presented in Ref. [21], where the E ilenberger equation for the condensate has been solved in the weak proximity e ect limit. In particular, it was shown that in a quasiballistic case (or in case of strong ferrom agnets), i.e., when the condition

$$h >> 1 \tag{1}$$

is full led, the critical current oscillates with the period $v_{\!F}$ =2h and decreases exponentially over the m ean free path l= $v_{\!F}$.

In all theoretical works mentioned above the ferrom agnet was modeled as a norm alm etal with an exchange eld acting on the spin of the conduction electrons, while depairing factors such as spin-dependent (SD) scattering on magnetic in purities, condensate ow (due to an internal magnetic eld in F) and spin-orbit (SO) scattering have not been taken into account, although they may play an important role in the proximity elect.

The e ect of the spin-orbit scattering on the critical Josephson current in SFS junctions in the di usive limit has been studied in Ref. [22, 23] and in a recent work [24], where it was shown that the SO interaction a ects the

characteristic length of the decay of the critical current with increasing the thickness of F.A ko in the di usive limit the e ect of the scattering on magnetic in purities was considered in Refs. 24, 25].

Less attention has been paid though to the study of depairing e ects in the quasiballistic regime when the condition (1) is fulled. An attempt to solve the Eilenberger equation with account for the SO and SD scattering and for arbitrary 1 was undertaken in Ref. [26]. However, the solution suggested by the authors of the latter work is valid only in the di usive limit. As we will see, in the limit determined by Eq.(1), the expression obtained in Ref. [26] is a small part of the total solution. The SD scattering was also considered in a recent work [27] in the case of a weak proximity e ect and arbitrary mean free path 1. Unlike Ref.[21], the authors suggested an approximate solution for the Eilenberger equation and neglected the SO scattering. Therefore, the problem of calculating the Josephson current I_J in a general case of arbitrary mean free path 1 taking into account di erent depairing mechanisms remained unsolved.

In this paper, we attack this problem calculating the current I_J through an SFS structure in the general case of an arbitrary mean free path 1 taking into account diverse depairing mechanisms. Following the method presented in Ref.[21] we solve in the next section the Eilenberger equation for the case of the spin dependent scattering on magnetic in purities. As in Refs.[21, 26, 27], we assume that the proximity elect is weak, i.e., that the amplitude of the condensate function induced in the ferrom agnet is small. This assumption is reasonable even for low temperatures due to the large mism atch of the electronic parameters of the superconductor and ferrom agnet resulting in a strong relection at the S/F interfaces. U sing the exact solution obtained for the condensate function we derive a general expression for the Josephson critical current through the SFS system. This expression can be used for calculating the current at arbitrary in purity concentration. In particular, we calculate I_c in the di usive and the quasi-ballistic limit. In section III we consider the elect of the SO scattering on the critical current I_c for these two cases.

II. SOLUTION FOR THE EILENBERGER EQUATION AND DERIVATION OF THE JOSEPHSON CURRENT

We consider an SFS layered structure. The thickness of the F layer is 2d and the F/S interfaces are located at x = -d. The thickness of the S layers is assumed to be in nite. Scattering of electrons by magnetic impurities in a bulk superconductor has institute on studied by A brikosov and G or kov 28] using microscopic G meen's functions. For non-hom ogeneous nite system s it is more convenient to use quasiclassical G meen's functions determ ined by the equations derived by E ilenberger, Larkin and O vchinnikov [29, 30]. In order to justify the applicability of the E ilenberger equation, we also assume that the distance between the superconductors, i.e. the thickness of the F layer, is larger than the mean free path 1 (see Refs. B1, 32)) We consider the case of a weak proximity elect, i.e. when the amplitude of the elements of the condensate matrix function \hat{f} is assumed to be small: $\hat{f}_{j} < 1$. In this case one can linearize the E ilenberger equation that in the presence of the scattering on non-magnetic and magnetic impurities takes the form [5, 6, 24, 33]

$$sgn!_{3}lerf + (f) = (1 2_{z_{2}})hfi + {}_{2}hfi$$
 (2)

where $^{1}_{3}$ is the z-component of the Paulim atrices $^{2}_{t} = v_{F} = v_{F}$ is unit vector in the direction of the Fermi velocity, $= 1 + 2(j! j \quad ih_{!})_{t}; ! \quad !_{n} = T(2n + 1)$ is the M atsubara frequency $h_{!} = hsgn!$, $_{t}^{1} = _{N}^{1} + _{M}^{1} t$ is the total scattering rate and $_{N}$ is the momentum relaxation time due to scattering by nonmagnetic in purities. The rate $_{M}^{1} t = _{M}^{1} = (1 + _{z} + _{?})$ is the total scattering rate due to scattering by magnetic in purities. The parameters $_{z}$; $_{?}^{2}$ characterize the spin-dependent scattering. The potential of interaction with magnetic in purities can be written in the form

$$U(r) = U_{o}(r) + U_{S}(r)S = S;$$

where the potential $U_0(r)$ describes interaction with a spin-independent part of magnetic in purities. The in purity spin S is assumed to be classical. The coe cients z and z are given by $z = [jJ_S f^2 = jJ_0 f^2]_1S_z^2 = S^2$ and $z = [jJ_S f^2 = jJ_0 f^2]_1S_z^2 = S^2$ and $z = [jJ_S f^2 = jJ_0 f^2]_1S_z^2 = S^2$. These coe cients are related to a spin-dependent scattering rate m^1 used in Ref. [24]. For example, $z = 2(M = m)S_z^2 = S^2$. The angle brackets denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z; z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denote averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denoted as: $z = (z = M_t) = (M_t + N_t)$ and z are denoted averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denoted as: $z = (z = M_t) = (M_t + N_t)$ and z are denoted averaging over angles. The coe cients z are denoted as: $z = (Z_t = M_t) = (M_t + N_t)$ and z are denoted averaging over angles.

In the general case the condensate function f is a 4 4 m atrix in the particle-hole (G or kov-N am bu) spin space. However, in the case of a hom ogeneous magnetization considered here and in the absence of the spin-orbit scattering (the SO scattering will be taken into account in the next section), the function f is diagonal in the spin space. Then, the function f_+ in Eq. (2) is de ned as $f_+ = f$ with = 1 (is the spin index), while the other diagonal element is given by $\hat{f} = f_{22} = \hat{f}_{+}$ (h). In the present case of a planar geometry, the function \hat{f} depends only on the coordinate x.

It is convenient to represent \hat{f} as a sum of a symmetric and antisymmetric part with respect to the momentum direction: $\hat{f}(x) = \hat{s}(x) + \hat{a}(x)$. As follows from Eq.(2), the antisymmetric part $\hat{a}(x)$ is related to the symmetric one by the expression

$$\hat{a} = \text{sgn!}(\underline{l} =)^{3} \hat{e} \hat{s} = \hat{e} x$$
 (3)

while the symmetric part s(x) in the ferrom agnetic region (d < x < d) obeys the equation

$${}^{2}L^{2}\theta^{2}s = \theta x^{2} {}^{2}s = (h) [(1 2_{z} {}^{2})hs i + {}^{2}hs i]$$
(4)

where $l = v_F t$ is the mean free path and $v_x = v_F = cos$. These two equations should be complemented by the boundary condition [34]

$$\hat{a}_{k=d} = () \operatorname{sgn!}_{3} \hat{f}_{s} ; > 0$$
 (5)

where () = T ()=4 and T () is the transmission coe cient. The latter is assumed to be small and therefore the matrix $\hat{f_s}$ in the superconductor has its bulk form $\hat{f_s}$ (d) = f_s ($_2 \cos(\prime = 2)$ $_1 \sin(\prime = 2)$), where $f_s = = \frac{p}{12 + 2}$. Note that the boundary condition Eq. (5) does not take into account spin- ip processes at the interface. Boundary conditions for magnetically active interfaces were derived in Ref. [35] and used in Ref. [36] by calculating the supercurrent through a pure ballistic halfmetallic layer.

In order to derive an expression for the Josephson critical current avoiding straightforward but cumbersom e calculations we rst neglect the term s proportional to $_{?}$. This term will be included again at the end of this section where we will present the nalexpression for the current. The way how to obtain the solution of E quations (4-5) was presented in Ref. [21]. One form ally extends the solution over the whole x-axis, performs a Fourier transform ation and obtains nally the transform ed function \$ from an algebraic equation. Following this scheme we obtain an expression describing the spatial dependence of the condensate function

$$\hat{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{Z}{2} \frac{dk}{2} \frac{2}{M_{k}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{1}{m_{k}(\mathbf{x})} \hat{f}_{s,n} \exp(ikd(2n+1)) ik\mathbf{x}) \quad (1 \quad 2_{z})N^{-1} \frac{()}{M_{k}(\mathbf{x})} +$$
(6)

with $\hat{f}_{s,n} = f_s [\hat{f}_2 \cos(\ell = 2) + (1)^n \hat{f}_1 \sin(\ell = 2)]$, M_k () = $(k \ 1)^2 + 2$ and N = 1 (1 2 z) M_k^{-1} ()i. The average M_k^{-1} ()i can easily be calculated (we drop the subindex)

$$h_{k}^{1}()i = \frac{1}{kl} \tan^{-1} \frac{kl}{kl} = \frac{1}{2ikl} \ln(\frac{i \quad kl}{i \quad +kl})$$
(7)

The x-dependence of the condensate function, in particular, its exponential decay is determ ined by the singular points of the integrand in the complex k plane of Eq. (6). From Eq. (7) one can immediately see, that the function in the integrand has poles at kl= i =j jand branch points at kl= i. The poles lead to the exponential decay of s(x) like $s_{pol}(x) = C_{pol}(x) = pol(x) = (d + x) = lj$ (in the vicinity of the left superconductor), whereas the branch points lead to term s in the solution that decay as $s_{br}(x) = C_{br}(x) = (d + x) = l$ (where d < x): This means that in the limit T < 1 the term s $s_{pol}(x)$ exponentially decrease over an angle-dependent distance of the order of the mean free path l. On the other hand, the term s $s_{br}(x)$ decay exponentially over an angle-independent distance of the order l. Both the term s, $s_{pol}(x)$ and $s_{br}(x)$, oscillate with the periods $h=v_F$ j jand $h=v_F$, respectively. The amplitudes $C_{pol}(x)$ and $C_{br}(x)$ and solve the system.

In the general case their calculation is rather complicated and a numerical analysis is needed. However, as we will see in the next paragraphs, in the quasi-ballistic and di usive cases one can obtain explicit expressions for the condensate function \$(x). If one is interested in an interm ediate case it is convenient for numerical calculations to perform the integration overmomentum in Eq. (6) taking into account the relation (see, for example [37])

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
X^{d} & & X^{d} \\
& & \exp{(i2nkd)} = & & X^{d} \\
& & & d \\
& & & d \\
& & & m = & 1
\end{array}$$
(8)

where $k_m = m = d$:

W riting the condensate matrix as $s = s_1^{1} + s_2^{2}$ one nally obtains

$$s_{1} = \frac{1}{d} \frac{X^{d}}{m_{m} = 1} \frac{\exp[i(x=d 1)(2m+1) = 2]}{M_{2m+1}} (1 2_{z})(N_{2m+1})^{1} \frac{()}{M_{2m+1}()} + f_{s}\sin' = 2 (9)$$

$$s_{2} = \frac{1}{d} \frac{X^{2}}{m_{m} = 1} \frac{\exp[i(x=d \ 1)m]}{M_{2m}} (1 \ 2_{z})(N_{2m})^{-1} \frac{()}{M_{2m}()} + f_{s}\cos' = 2$$
(10)

where $M_m = (1 m = 2d)^2 + {}^2$ and $N_m = 1 (1 2_z)$ hl= M_m i.K nowing the condensate function induced in the ferrom agnetic region one can calculate the Josephson dc current I_J through the SFS junction. This current is given by

$$I = (iT=4) (e^{2}=h) (f_{F}^{2} S={}^{2})Tr _{3} _{0} [s(d) f_{s}(d)]$$
(11)
$$!= 1$$

where $[s_{f_s}] = s_s f_s s_{r_0}$ is the unit matrix and the symbol Tr stands for the trace over the 4 d matrices (see [21]).

U sing Eq.(6), one can write the current in the form $I = I_c \sin'$ with

$$I_{c} = A (2 T)Re \int_{m=1}^{X^{d}} f_{s}^{2} (1)^{m} h () \frac{1}{d} \frac{1}{M_{m}^{+} ()} \left[\frac{1}{N_{m}^{+}} (1 - 2_{z}) \frac{0}{M_{m}^{+} (0)} - \frac{1}{M_{m}^{+} (0)} + \frac{1}{M_{m}^{+} (0)} \right]$$
(12)

where $A = ((e^2 = h)) (k_F^2 S = 2)$ and M_m () M_m^+ (). Eq.(12) is the most general expression for the Josephson current in terms of the solution of the Eilenberger equation. In the next sections we give expressions for the critical current I_c in the quasiballistic and di usive limits.

The quasiballistic case: j j>> 1

The quasiballistic case corresponds either to a strong ferrom agnet (h > 1) or to a clean sample (T > 1). As follows from Eq.(7), in this case N 1 and the second term in the square brackets in Eq.(6) is much larger than the rst one. Calculating the residue at the pole kl = i = j; we obtain for s(x) = s(x)

$$\$(x) = ()f_{s} - \frac{\cosh(x=L_{qb}())}{\sinh(d=L_{qb}())} \cos(\ell'=2) + \frac{\sinh(x=L_{qb}())}{\cosh(d=L_{qb}())} \sin(\ell'=2)$$
(13)

with the length L_{qb} () characterizing the quasi-ballistic case de ned as L_{qb} () = lj \neq .

It is seen for example that in the vicinity of the left superconductor, i.e., at 1 << (x + d)=1 << d=1 the condensate function s(x) oscillates with the period $v_F = hjjdecaying$ over the angle-dependent mean free path ljj:s(x)

exp(kx=lj) [21]. Thus, if the exchange energy is large, h > 1, the function s(x) experiences m any oscillations over the decay length 1. Note that the period of oscillations and the decay length strongly depend on the angle = cos.

This result contradicts the conclusion of Ref.[26] where the solution for Eq.(4) was taken in a form of an exponential function with an angle-independent exponent. As can be understood from Eq.(6), the solution obtained in Ref.[26] is not general and corresponds only to a contribution from the branch points, i.e., from the rst term in the square brackets in Eq.(4). However, in the limit of large this term is small compared to the other one (see [38]).

We see from Eq. (4) that in the quasiballistic case the depairing leads only to a renorm alization of the scattering time t_{t} .

The main contribution to the critical Josephson current in the quasiballistic regime stems from the second term in the square brackets in Eq. (12). Calculating the residues at the poles of $\frac{2}{k}$ (⁰), we obtain (cf. Ref. [21])

$$I_{c} = A (2 T) \int_{1}^{X^{1}} f_{s}^{2} R e \frac{\int_{1}^{0} f_{s}^{2} (0)}{\sinh (2d = L_{qb} (0))}$$
(14)

If the thickness of the F layer considerably exceeds the value of L_{qb} (1), one obtains for the critical current I_c

$$I_{c} = A (2 T) \int_{1}^{X} f_{s}^{2} (1) \frac{\sin (4hd = v_{F})}{4hd = v_{F}} \exp \left[(2d = 1) (1 + 2!_{t}) \right]$$
(15)

Eqs. (14-15) twell recent experim ental data 9, 12]

In the di usive limit the conditions h , T << 1 hold and the characteristic length of the spatial variation of \$(x) is much larger than the mean free path l. Therefore, we obtain from the following expressions for the parameters: N_k = $\frac{2}{dif}$ + (1 2 z) (kl)²=3 and k² M_k() 1 (cf Eq. (7)).

The behavior of $\hat{s}(x)$ at distances from the superconductors larger than the mean free path 1 is determined by the residue of the pole in N_k. Equation (6) nally yields

$$\hat{s}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3(1-z)} h(z) \, \mathrm{if}_{s} \, \gamma_{2} \frac{\cosh(\mathbf{x}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{dif}})}{\sinh(\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{dif}})} \cos(\mathbf{x}'=2) + \gamma_{1} \frac{\sinh(\mathbf{x}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{dif}})}{\cosh(\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{dif}})} \sin(\mathbf{x}'=2)$$
(16)

where $\frac{2}{\text{dif}} = \frac{1}{z} + 2(j! j \text{ in}_{!})_{t}$; and the characteristic length L_{dif} of the condensate decay in F is $L_{\text{dif}} = \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{(1 - 2)_{z} = 3} \frac{2}{\frac{1}{\text{dif}}} = \frac{p}{3}$:

If the exchange energy h is much smaller than the spin-dependent scattering rate, $h_t << z$, we obtain for the characteristic length $L_{dif} = 3 z = D_{sp}=2$; where sp = z. Thus, as expected, the decay length in this case is related to the spin-dependent relaxation time (see, for example, [39]). In the opposite limit, $h \ge \frac{1}{3h} z = p (1-2)(1+1) D = h$. Note that in this case the condensate function both decays and oscillates on the same length D = h:

If one takes into account an internal magnetic edd B inside the ferror agnet given by B = 4 M, the length I_{thif} in the lim it $h_t << z$ is equal to: $L_{\text{dif}} = 1 = \frac{P}{(2dB = 0)^2 + (D_{sp} = 2)^{-1}}$, where M is the magnetization in F and 0 = hc = e is the magnetic ux quantum (see, e.g., 40]).

In the di usive limit, the critical Josephson current L is determined by the set term in the square brackets of Eq. (12), i.e., by the poles of the function N_k^{-1} . Then, we nd

$$I_{c} = A (2 T) \int_{1}^{X^{1}} p \frac{1}{3f_{s}^{2}Re} \frac{1}{\frac{2}{dif}} \frac{1}{\sinh(2d=L_{dif})}$$
(17)

where L_{dif} is de ned in Eq.(6).

An alternative way to obtain Eq.(17) is to solve the U sadel equation, which was done in m any publications [5, 19, 24, 25].

For an arbitrary value of the parameter h_t the critical current can be computed from Eq. (12). In Fig. 1 we show the dependence of the absolute value of I_c on the thickness 2d of the ferrom agnet for dimensional error values of h_t taking into account only the scattering by non-magnetic impurities, i.e. when M_t^{-1} ! 0.0 ne can readily observe the crossover from the dimension case (h_t = 0.2), when the decay length and the period of the oscillations are the same D_{--}^{--} ; to the quasiballistic case (h_t = 2.2), when the period of the oscillations is $v_F = h$ while the decay length is of the order of the mean free path 1.

To simplify numerical calculations, we assume that the transmission parameter () is peaked at = 1 and replace it in Eq.(12) by a delta-function, i.e. we assume that only electrons with momentum direction perpendicular to the S/F interface are transmitted (the angle-dependence of "the transmission coe cient" () depends on properties of the S/F interface). Another limit (() = const) was assumed in Refs.[9, 12] where the expression for I_c derived in Ref. [21] in the absence of depairing mechanisms was used for comparison between theory and experimental data. In Fig. 2 we represent the critical current as a function of 2d for three di erent values of the parameter h_t . O ne can see that in all cases an increase of $_z$ leads to a decrease of the amplitude of the condensate in the ferror agnet.

Finally we write down the expression for the critical current for the case when perpendicular uctuations of the exchange eld are taken into account, i.e., when $_{?}$ is nite. In that case we obtain for the critical current a rather cum bersom e form ula

$$I_{c} = A (2 T) Re \int_{n=1}^{X^{1}} f_{s}^{2} (1)^{n} h (1) \frac{1}{d} \frac{2}{M_{n}^{+}(1)} \frac{2}{N_{n}^{+}} \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{j} + \frac{1}{j} h(M_{n}^{+})^{-1} \frac{1}{12}^{2}$$

$$(1 2_{z} 2) + N_{n} \frac{0}{M_{n}^{+}(0)} \frac{2}{0} 2 \frac{1}{j} + \frac{1}{j} (M_{n}^{+})^{-1} (0) \frac{1}{0} \frac{1}{0} \frac{1}{0} \frac{1}{0} \frac{1}{0} \frac{1}{10} \frac{1}{0} \frac{1}{0} \frac{1}{10} \frac$$



FIG. 1: Dependence of the absolute value of the Josephson critical current I_c on the thickness 2d of the ferrom agnetic layer for di erent values of h. Here = 0:1 and T = 0:05.0 nly scattering by non-m agnetic in purities is considered.

This equation can be evaluated only num erically. We represent the function $I_c(d)$ for dimension of ? in Fig. 3. Note that, again, with increasing ? the amplitude of the condensate decreases. This is clear from the physical point of view because any depairing factors lead to a suppression of the condensate amplitude.

III. SPIN-ORBIT SCATTERING

In this section we consider in uence of the spin-orbit (SO) scattering on the Josephson current. For simplicity we neglect the spin-dependent scattering analyzed in the preceding Section. In the presence of the SO scattering, the condensate function is no longer diagonal in the spin space. Therefore, instead of the 2 $2 \text{ matrix } \hat{f}$, we have to introduce a more complicated 4 4 matrix f (see for example [6]).

The Josephson current in SFS junctions in the presence of the SO interaction was analyzed in the di usive lim it in Ref. [22]. Here we focus on the opposite quasiballistic lim it.

The linearized Eilenberger equation for f has the form

$$sgn!_{3}lerf + ^{f} = hfi _{so}hfi_{so};$$
(19)

In Eq. (19), $l = v_F t; t^{1} = t^{1} + (2=3) t^{1};$ where and so are the momentum relaxation time due to a potential scattering and the spin orbit scattering time, $r t^{2} = t^{2}$, $r t^{3} = t^{3}$

$$hfi = (1=4) d f(); hfi_{so} = (1=4) d {}^{0}e_{i}^{0}e_{k}^{0} (S e)_{i}f({}^{0}) (S e)_{k};$$
(20)

where the vector S has components $S_i: S = (^{1}; ^{2}; ^{3}, ^{3}):$

A s before, we represent f as a sum of the antisym m etric and sym m etric parts: f = a + s, where the antisym m etric part a is expressed in terms of the sym m etric function as $a = -\frac{1}{3} \operatorname{sgn}! \operatorname{s=0}^{3} x$ and the sym m etric part obeys the equation

$$e_{1}^{2}l^{2} e_{2}^{2} s = x^{2} + x^{2} s = x^{2} [\text{If i}_{so} + 2(e_{1})] f_{s,n} (x d(2n+1))]; \qquad (21)$$



FIG.2: Dependence of the absolute value of Josephson critical current I_c on the thickness 2d of the ferrom agnetic layer for dierent values of h and z. Here t = 0.1, T t = 0.05 and x = 0. W ithout loss of generality we have set N^{-1} ! 0.



FIG. 3: Dependence of the the absolute value of Josephson critical current I_c on the thickness 2d of the ferrom agnetic layer for h = 1.2 and di erent values of 2.0 ther parameters are taken as in Fig. 1.

Taking into account the structure of the \hat{f}_s matrix in the spin space we see that the matrix $f_{s,n}$ coincides with the one presented above, $f_{s,n} = \hat{f}_{s,n}$.

Our task now is to solve Eq.(21). The presence of the term of the SO scattering makes this task more di cult than previously. In order to simplify the problem, we use the usual smallness of $_{\rm so}$ [28]. An additional simplication comes from using the quasiballistic case when the value of j j is large.

In order to nd the solution of Eq. (21) we represent the Fourier transform s_k in a form of an expansion in the smallparameter $s_0: s_k = S_k + S_k$.

In zero order approximation in so and in the main approximation in the parameter j jwe obtain

$$S_{k} = 2^{l_{k}} M_{k}^{(1)} (e_{1}) f_{s;n} \exp(ikd(2n+1));$$
(22)

where \hat{M}_k (e₁) is a 2 2-m atrix in spin-space with component (1,1) equals to M _{k+} (e₁) and component (2,2) to M _{k+} (e₁). A lthough the matrix S_k is diagonal in the spin space, the correction S_k is not. It is equal to

$$S_{k} = {}^{\wedge}M_{k}^{-1}()_{so}hS_{k}({}^{0})i_{so}$$
 (23)

U sing Eqs.(22), (20), one can represent the average hS_k (0) i_{so} as

$$hS_{k} (^{0})i_{so} = h\hat{S}_{k0} (^{0}) \quad ^{0}A_{0} \quad \hat{S}_{k3} (^{0}) \quad ^{3}A_{3} + 2^{3}\hat{S}_{k0} (^{0}) \quad i(^{1}A_{1} \quad ^{2}A_{2})i$$
(24)

where $A_0 = A_0$ (; ⁰) = $e_1^{02} (e_3^2 - e_2^2) + e_2^{02} (e_3^2 - e_1^2) + e_3^{02} (e_1^2 + e_2^2); A_3 = A_3$ (; ⁰) = $e_1^{02} (e_3^2 + e_2^2) + e_2^{02} (e_3^2 + e_1^2) + e_3^{02} (e_1^2 + e_2^2); A_3 = A_3$ (; ⁰) = $e_1^{02} (e_3^2 + e_2^2) + e_2^{02} (e_3^2 + e_1^2) + e_3^{02} (e_1^2 + e_2^2); A_3 = A_3$ (; ⁰) = $e_1^{02} (e_3^2 + e_2^2) + e_2^{02} (e_3^2 + e_1^2) + e_3^{02} (e_1^2 + e_2^2); A_3 = A_3$ (; ⁰) = $e_1^{02} (e_3^2 + e_2^2) + e_2^{02} (e_3^2 + e_1^2) + e_3^{02} (e_1^2 + e_2^2); A_1 = e_1^{02} e_2 e_3; A_2 = e_2^{02} e_1 e_3$. The matrices $\hat{S}_{k0;3}$ are dened with the help of the relation $S_k = A_0 (S_k + A_3 - S_{k3})$. Using Eq.(22) we obtain

$$\hat{S}_{k0} = 2 \ln_1 \hat{F}_s \ln_{\frac{+}{M_{k+}}}; \hat{S}_{k3} = 2 \ln_1 \hat{F}_s R e_{\frac{+}{M_{k+}}}$$
(25)

where $\hat{F_s} = \prod_{n=1}^{P} \hat{f_{s,n}} \exp(ikd(2n+1))$ and the matrix $\hat{f_{s,n}}$ has been introduced in Eq.(6).

Note that due to the last two terms in Eq.(24) the condensate matrix S_k contains not only the triplet component with the zero projection on the z-axis but also the triplet components of the type "";##. However, in the lowest order in so these components do not contribute to the Josephson current because they are odd functions with respect to the inversion $e_{1;2}$.

The correction Ic to the Josephson current due to spin orbit scattering is given by the expression

$$I_{c} = A (2 \text{ iT})Tr^{3} \circ_{0} \frac{dk}{2} e_{1} [S_{k}(); f_{s}(d)] \exp(ikd);$$
(26)

Finally, we obtain the correction I to the critical current originating from the SO scattering

$$I_{c} = A (2 T) \frac{1}{d} \int_{n;!=1}^{X^{l}} f_{s}^{2} he_{1}e_{1}^{0} () ()^{0} [A_{0}Im \frac{+}{M_{2n}^{+}()}Im \frac{+}{M_{2n}^{+}()} + A_{3}Re \frac{+}{M_{2n}^{+}()}Re \frac{+}{M_{2n}^{+}()}]i \circ (27)$$

The structure of this equation is similar to the one of the contribution of the structure in the square brackets in Eq.(12) to the Josephson current. This contribution is also small in comparison with the current I_c determined by Eq.(14) with $L_{qb}() = lj = and l = v_F t$, where $t^{-1} = t^{-1} + (2=3) t^{-1}$. This small correction to the critical current I_c can be calculated numerically. In the di usive case the SO scattering has been studied in Refs.5, 19, 24, 25].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

A ssum ing a weak proximity elect we have derived the exact expression for the Josephson current through an SFS junction for arbitrary in purity concentration and in the presence of spin-dependent scattering. In the quasiballistic and di usive limits this expression takes a simple form. In the former case, the parameter 1=(h) is small. In the main approximation the expression for the critical Josephson current is reduced to Eq.(14) that agrees with the corresponding equation of Ref.[21] provided the momentum relaxation time is replaced as: $(1 + z)^{-1} + (2=3)^{-1}$. Therefore, the deparing leads only to a renormalization of the mean free path 1 that determines the decay of the condensate function in F and of the Josephson critical current I_c . O scillations of these quantities have the period $v_F = h$.

In the di usive case the oscillation period and the decay of the critical current I_c are determined by the value of the product h_{dep} where the time $_{dep}$ is de ned as $_{dep} = m \inf_{D} f_{sp}; so}$. If the exchange energy lies in the interval $_{dep}^{1} < h < _{1}^{1}$, then the period of the oscillations of I_c is $2^{\frac{D}{D}} \int_{dep} = (h_{dep})$ and the decay length is $\frac{D}{D} \int_{dep} I_{dep}$. In the lim it $h < _{dep}^{1}$ the period of oscillations and the decay length are determined by the value $\frac{D}{D} = h$. The general expression, Eq.(12), may serve for num erical calculation of the critical current in the interm ediate region of parameters.

A cknow ledgm ent

W e would like to thank M .K haritonov for useful discussions and com m ents. This work was supported by SFB 491. A F.V. thanks the DFG for nincial support within the program M ercator-G astprofessoren". F.S.B. acknow ledges funding by the Ram on y Cajal program.

[1] LN.Bulaevskii, V.V.Kuzii, and AA.Sobyanin, JETP Lett. 25, 290 (1977).

- [3] A J. Buzdin, L N. Bulaevskii, and S.V. Panjukov, JETP Lett. 35, 178 (1982).
- [4] A A.Golubov, M.Yu.Kupriyanov, and E.Il'ichev, Rev.Mod.Phys. 76, 411 (2004).
- [5] A.I.Buzdin, Rev.M od.Phys. 77, 935 (2005).
- [6] F.S.Bergeret, A.F.Volkov, K.B.E fetov, Rev.Mod.Phys. 77, 1321 (2005).
- [7] V. V. Ryazanov, V. A. Oboznov, A. Yu. Rusanov, A. V. Veretennikov, A. A. Golubov, and J. Aarts, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 2427 (2001).
- [8] T.Kontos, M.Aprili, J.Lesueur, F.Genét, B.Stephanidis, and R.Boursier, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 137007 (2002).
- [9] Y.Blum, A.Tsukemik, M.Karpovski, and A.Palevski, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 187004 (2002).
- [10] A.Bauer, J.Bentner, M.Aprili, M.L.Della Rocca, M.Reinwald, W.Wegscheider, and C.Strunk, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 217001 (2004).
- [11] H.Sellier, C.Baraduc, F.Le och, and R.Calem czuk, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 257005 (2004).
- [12] V. Shelukhin, A. Tsukemik, M. Karpovski, Y. Blum, K B. Efetov, A F. Volkov, T. Champel, M. Eschrig, T. Lofwander, G. Schoen, A. Palevskiet, Phys. Rev. B 73, 174506 (2006).

^[2] Note that Kulik (I.O.Kulik, Sov.Phys.JETP 22, 841 (1966)) seems to be the rst who obtained a formula for the Josephson critical current I_c in an SIS junction taking into account possible spin- ip processes in the insulator layer I.A possibility of the negative critical current I_c follows from this formula.

- [13] V.Zdravkov, A.Sidorenko, G.Obern eier, S.G sell, M.Schreck, C.Muller, S.Horn, R.Tidecks, and L.R.Tagirov, Phys. Rev.Lett. 97, 057004 (2006).
- [14] JW A.Robinson, S.Piano, G.Burnell, C.Bell, and M.G.Blamire, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 177003 (2006).
- [15] P.H.Barsic, O.T.Valls, and K.Halterman, Phys. Rev. B 73, 144514 (2006).
- [16] I.Petkovic, N.M. Chtchelkatchev, and Z.Radovic, Phys. Rev. B 73, 184510 (2006).
- [17] B.Kastening, D.K.Morr, L.Al, K.Bennem ann, cond-m at/0610283.
- [18] E.Vecino, A.M art n-Rodero and A.Levy Yeyati, Phys. Rev. B 64, 184502 (2001)
- [19] A.J.Buzdin and M.Yu.Kupriyanov, JETP 53, 321 (1991).
- [20] A.J.Buzdin, B.Bujicic, and M.Yu.Kupriyanov, JETP 74, 124 (1992).
- [21] F.S.Bergeret, A.F.Volkov, K.B.Efetov, Phys. Rev. B 64, 134506 (2001).
- [22] E A.Dem ler, G B.Amold, and M R.Beasley, Phys.Rev.B 55, 15174 (1997).
- [23] S.Oh, Y H K in , D. Youm , and M R. Beasley, Phys. Rev. B 63, 052501 (2000).
- [24] M. Faure, A. I. Buzdin, A. A. Golubov, and M. Yu. Kupriyanov, Phys. Rev. B 73, 064505 (2006).
- [25] M. Houzet, V. Vinokur, and F. Pistolesi, Phys. Rev. B 72, 220506 (R) (2005).
- [26] D.Yu.Gusakova, M.Yu.Kupriyanov, and A.A.Golubov, Pisma v ZhETF 83, 487 (2006).
- [27] O.Kashuba, Ya.M.Blanter, V.I.Faľko, cond-m at/0610299.
- [28] A A . A brikosov and L P.G or kov, JETP 15, 752 (1962).
- [29] G.Eilenberger, Z.Phys.B 214, 195 (1968).
- [30] A J. Larkin and Y N. Ovchinnikov, in Nonequilibrium Superconductivity, edited by D. N. Langenberg and A. I. Larkin (Elservier, Am sterdam, 1984).
- [31] A. Shelankov and M. Ozana, Phys. Rev. B 61, 7077 (2000).
- [32] A.V.Galaktionov and A.D.Zaikin, Phys. Rev. B 65, 184507 (2002).
- [33] F.S.Bergeret, A.F.Volkov, and K.B.Efetov, Phys. Rev. B 66, 184403 (2002).
- [34] A.V.Zaitsev, JETP 59, 1015 (1984).
- [35] A.M illis, D.Rainer and J.A.Sauls, Phys. Rev. B 38, 4504 (1988).
- [36] M. Eschrig, J. Kopu, J. C. Cuevas and G. Schoen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 137003 (2003).
- [37] A A . A brikosov, Fundam entals of the theory of m etals, (N orth-H olland, 1988) page 424.
- [38] A F. Volkov, F.S. Bergeret, K.B. E fetov, cond-m at/0606528.
- [39] G.Deutscher and P.G. de Gennes, Superconductivity, vol. 2 Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1969).
- [40] A F. Volkov, A.V. Zaitsev, and T.M. Klapwijk, Physica C 210, 21 (1993).