

Comment on "Conductance fluctuations in mesoscopic normal-metal/superconductor samples"

Recently, Hecker *et al.* [1] experimentally studied magnetoconductance fluctuations in a mesoscopic Au wire connected to a superconducting Nb contact. They compared the rms magnitude of these conductance fluctuations in the superconducting state ($\text{rms}(G_{NS})$) to that in the normal state ($\text{rms}(G_N)$) by increasing the magnetic field above the critical field of 2.5 T. It was reported that $\text{rms}(G_{NS})$ was about 2.8 ± 0.4 times larger than $\text{rms}(G_N)$, which should confirm the theoretical predicted enhancement factor of $2\sqrt{2} \simeq 2.8$.

In this Comment, we show that their claim is not justified. Although not explicitly mentioned in Ref. [1], we have to assume that the $\text{rms}(G)$ was calculated according to: $\text{rms}(G) = \text{rms}(R)/R^2$, where $\text{rms}(R)$ denotes the rms magnitude of the measured resistance fluctuations and R the total measured resistance. The point we want to make is that the authors did not take into account the presence of an incoherent series resistance R_{series} from the contacts, which is different when the Nb is in the superconducting or normal state. Since the measured $\text{rms}(R)$ only originates from the phase-coherent part of the disordered conductor, with resistance R_φ , the correct procedure is to calculate $\text{rms}(G)$ according to: $\text{rms}(G) = \text{rms}(R)/R_\varphi^2 = \text{rms}(R)/(R - R_{\text{series}})^2$. As shown below, when we correct for the presence of this series resistance, we find that $\text{rms}(G_{NS})$ is **not** significantly larger than $\text{rms}(G_N)$.

Their device consists of a narrow Au wire (Au^w , length $L = 1.0\mu\text{m}$, width $W = 0.13\mu\text{m}$) connected at its ends to a macroscopic Nb and Au contact (Nb^c or Au^c) via a rectangular shaped contact (Nb^r or Au^r , $L = 0.8\mu\text{m}$, $W = 1.6\mu\text{m}$). The total resistance is the sum of these five contributions: $R = R_{Nb}^c + R_{Nb}^r + R_{Au}^w + R_{Au}^r + R_{Au}^c$, where $R_{Nb}^c + R_{Nb}^r$ are zero in the superconducting state.

TABLE I. The measured resistance R_{NS} and uncorrected conductance fluctuations $\text{rms}(G_{NS})$ in the superconducting state at $T=50\text{mK}$ and $B=1\text{T}$, and the measured resistance R_N and the *corrected* conductance fluctuations $\text{rms}(G_N)$ in the normal state at $T=50\text{mK}$ and $B=4\text{T}$.

	sample 1	sample 2
$R_{NS} (\Omega)$	11.60	9.72
$R_N (\Omega)$	15.87	14.34
$\text{rms}(G_{NS}) (e^2/h)$	0.16 ± 0.02	0.14 ± 0.02
$\text{rms}(G_N) (e^2/h)$	0.109 ± 0.006	0.109 ± 0.009
$\text{rms}(G_{NS})/\text{rms}(G_N)$	1.5 ± 0.2	1.3 ± 0.2

Since the series resistances of the Au contact ($R_{Au}^c + R_{Au}^r \simeq 1.2R_\square^{Au} \simeq 1.1\Omega$) are small compared to phase-coherent resistance of the Au wire (10.5Ω), we will only correct for the series resistances of the Nb contact ($R_{Nb}^c + R_{Nb}^r \simeq 1.2R_\square^{Nb} \simeq 4.8\Omega$). This series resistance is only present in the normal state and is exactly equal to the increase in resistance when the magnetic field exceeds B_c (see Fig. 1 a)). We note that not only the macroscopic Nb contact is regarded to be incoherent, but the rectangular shaped Nb contact as well. Namely, the phase-breaking length $L_\varphi \equiv \sqrt{D\tau_\varphi}$ for Nb is expected to be reduced compared to $L_\varphi \simeq 0.6\mu\text{m}$ for Au by $\sqrt{D_{Au}/D_{Nb}} \simeq 2.5$, which implies that the resistance fluctuations from this Nb rectangle are strongly suppressed due to ensemble-averaging as well.

In Table I we have reproduced the measured (average) resistance of the two studied samples in the normal state and in the superconducting state. We did not correct $\text{rms}(G_{NS})$ [2]. The $\text{rms}(G_N)$ has been corrected as described above. As a result, the $\text{rms}(G_N)$ are a factor of $(R_N/R_{NS})^2 \simeq 2$ larger than reported in Ref. [1] and consequently the ratio $\text{rms}(G_{NS})/\text{rms}(G_N)$ becomes about 1.4 ± 0.2 . We doubt, however, that the remaining difference from 1 is significant, since the statistical error could well be larger than 0.2 due to the fact that only a few large fluctuations determine $\text{rms}(G_{NS})$ (see Fig. 1b) and Fig. 2).

In conclusion, we have argued that the measured $\text{rms}(G_{NS})$ is not significantly enhanced compared to $\text{rms}(G_N)$, and it remains an experimental challenge to observe the predicted enhancement factor of $2\sqrt{2}$.

S.G. den Hartog and B.J. van Wees
Department of Applied Physics and Materials Science
Centre
University of Groningen
Nijenborgh 4
9747 AG Groningen, The Netherlands

PACS numbers: 73.23.-b, 73.50.Jt, 74.80.-g

-
- [1] K. Hecker, H. Hegger, A. Altland, and K. Fiegle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1547 (1997).
[2] The reported values for $\text{rms}(G_{NS})$ are considerably smaller than the rms magnitude of the sample-specific conductance fluctuations of about $\text{rms}(G_{NS}) \simeq 1.0e^2/h$ observed in both a cross-shaped and a T-shaped 2-dimensional electron gas coupled to superconductors: S.G. den Hartog *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4954 (1996); S.G. den Hartog *et al.*, *ibid.* **76**, 4592 (1996). A comparison with the normal state values was not made in these experiments.