arXiv:cond-mat/0408032v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 2 Aug 2004

Spin-dependent quasiparticle reflection and bound states at interfaces with itinerant antiferromagnets

I. V. Bobkova,[1] P. J. Hirschfeld,[2] and Yu. S. Barash[1]

[1] *Institute of Solid State Physics, Chernogolovka, Moscow reg., 142432 Russia*
[2] *Department of Physics, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611 USA*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We present a formulation of the quasiclassical theory of junctions between itinerant antiferromagnets (AF) and s-wave (sSC) and d-wave superconductors (dSC). For the simplest two-sublattice antiferromagnet on a bipartite lattice, we derive Andreev-type equations and show that their solutions lead to a novel channel of quasiparticle reflection. In particular, quasiparticles in a normal metal with energies less than or comparable to the antiferromagnetic gap experience spin-dependent retroreflection at antiferromagnet-normal metal (AF/N) transparent (100) and (110) interfaces. A relative phase difference of π between up spin and down spin quasiparticle reflection amplitudes is shown to lead to zero-energy interface bound states on AF/sSC interfaces. For an sSC/AF/sSC junction, these bound states are found to be split, due to a finite width of the AF interlayer, and carry the supercurrent. At AF/dSC interfaces we find no zero-energy bound states for both interface orientations we considered, in contrast with the case of (110) impenetrable surface of a dSC.

PACS numbers: 74.45.+c, 74.50.+r

Introduction. The study of electronic properties of superconductor-magnetic interfaces has enjoyed a renaissance in recent years, with increased interest in technological applications and advances in theory. Ferromagnetic layers can spin polarize quasiparticle currents and Zeeman split surface densities of states, with possible applications in spintronics. SFS junctions have been shown to display $0-\pi$ transitions with varying temperature, width, or orientational structure of magnetization of the ferromagnetic interlayer[1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9]. The quasiclassical theory of superconductivity, complemented with appropriate boundary conditions[10,11], has proven very successful in dealing with problems like superconducting-ferromagnetic interfaces. No quasiclassical theory of the antiferromagnetic state and, in particular, AF/SC interface exists, however.

On the other hand, there are many situations of fundamental and practical interest which involve antiferromagnet-superconductor interfaces (AF/SC). Initial results of experimental investigations of proximity and Josephson effects through this type of interfaces have been obtained only recently[12]. Some unusual properties for specific antiferromagnetic Josephson weak links have been studied theoretically for barriers built on a giant magnetoresistance multilayer or made of doped manganites in the metallic A-phase[13]. Many of the properties of high-temperature superconducting (HTS) cuprate materials are also thought to result from a competition between antiferromagnetic and superconducting order, and there are many naturally occurring situations and possible devices which might involve such boundaries. These include interfaces of insulating and highly doped cuprates or SC/AF/SC junctions, HTS grain boundaries where antiferromagnetism may play a role as a surface state, and the antiferromagnetism which has been observed in HTS vortex cores.

Quasiclassical equations describe spatial variations of physical quantities taking place over length scales which are long compared to atomic distances. The boundary conditions match slowly varying quantities at interfaces, where the equations themselves do not apply. We argue below that the assumption of slow variation of the sublattice magnetization allows a formulation of the quasiclassical approach to itinerant antiferromagnets, which we study with mean field theory. We have found a novel spin-dependent channel of normal metal (N) quasiparticle reflections from AF/N interfaces, associated with the structure of the antiferromagnetic order parameter as well as with a magnetic periodicity along the interface with component Q_y of the antiferromagnetic wave vector. Parallel to the interface, components of crystal momenta for outgoing and incoming quasiparticles differ by Q_y in the novel reflection channel, while differences between components normal to the interface depend on the shape of the Fermi surface. Specific channels of quasiparticle reflection have been theoretically found also in charge density waves (CDW) - normal metal junctions[14,15,16,17]. An excess quasiparticle reflection below the CDW gap in $NbSe_3$ has been experimentally identified in Ref. 18. We show below, for the simplest cases of (100) and (110) interfaces, that the spin dependence of quasiparticle reflections from boundaries with itinerant antiferromagnets results in dramatic consequences which do not appear at the nonmagnetic interfaces mentioned above, however. An important distinctive feature of the quasiparticle reflection we study below is the phase difference π of reflection amplitudes taken for spin-up and spin-down quasiparticles in the normal metal at an AF/N interface. As a result of this "π-shift", zero-energy interface bound states arise on AF/sSC transparent interfaces. By contrast, a d-wave superconductor, which in the case of a free (110) surface manifests Andreev zero energy bound states, shows no zero-energy states at AF/dSC transparent interfaces. For an sSC/AF/sSC junction, the zero-

energy states are found to be split and carry a supercurrent. They can form low-temperature anomalies in the Josephson critical current through sSC/AF/sSC junctions. They also give rise to the zero-bias anomaly of the conductance of N/AF/sSC junctions.

Quasiparticle reflection at a smooth AF interface. We begin by considering electrons hopping on a square lattice with basis vectors $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$ (lattice constant a), with superconducting pairing Δ^{ij} and magnetization m^i.

$$H = -t\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\sigma} c^\dagger_{i\sigma}c_{j\sigma} + \sum_{i,j}(\Delta^{ij}c^\dagger_{i\uparrow}c^\dagger_{j\downarrow} + h.c.) + \sum_i m^i(n_{i\uparrow}-n_{i\downarrow}) - \mu\sum_i c^\dagger_{i\sigma}c_{i\sigma} \qquad (1)$$

We assume nearest neighbour hopping, and consider either s-wave pairing $\Delta^{ij} = -V_s\langle c_{i\downarrow}c_{i\uparrow}\rangle\delta_{ij} = \delta_{ij}\Delta^i_s$ or d-wave pairing $\Delta^{ij} = -V_d\langle c_{i\downarrow}c_{j\uparrow}\rangle = \Delta^{ij}_d\delta_{|i-j|,1}$ such that $\Delta^{ii\pm\hat{a}}_d = -\Delta^{ii\pm\hat{b}}_d$. The magnetization $m^i = -(V_m/2)\langle n_{i\uparrow}-n_{i\downarrow}\rangle$ as a function of site i is assumed to exhibit antiferromagnetic order, such that for the infinite lattice in the absence of local perturbations, $m^j = (-1)^{j_a+j_b}m$. In the more general case, the sublattice magnetization m is assumed to be slowly varying function on scales of the lattice spacing a. We assume always that m is nonzero only on one semi-infinite half-space, while Δ may be nonzero on the other; thus there is generally no additional potential barrier between the two systems, although we discuss the possibility.

The normal state electron band $\xi(\mathbf{k}) = -\mu - 2t(\cos k_a + \cos k_b)$ and the respective Brillouin zone is spanned by $k_{a,b} \in [-\pi,\pi]$, where momenta are given in units of a^{-1}. In describing quasiparticle reflections, it is convenient also to work in a coordinate system where x and y describe coordinates perpendicular and parallel to the interface, respectively. For a (100) interface, the band and the zone have the same forms in the x,y-coordinates. For a (110) interface, however, we have $\xi(\mathbf{k}) = -\mu - 4t\cos\left(k_x/\sqrt{2}\right)\cos\left(k_y/\sqrt{2}\right)$ and $k_x \in [-\sqrt{2}\pi,\sqrt{2}\pi]$, $k_y \in [-\pi/\sqrt{2},\pi/\sqrt{2}]$, on account of the periodic conditions along the surface.

A specific feature of the antiferromagnetic state, which is important in the derivation of quasiclassical equations, is the presence of rapidly oscillating term $m^j = (-1)^{j_a+j_b}m = \exp(i\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{j})m$, which results in slowly varying Andreev amlitudes with wave vector $\boldsymbol{k}+\boldsymbol{Q}$ in the equations for the amplitudes with the wave vector $\boldsymbol{k}$. In the case in question, $2\boldsymbol{Q}$ coincides with a basis vector of the reciprocal lattice of the nonmagnetic crystal. For this reason the quasiclassical equations can be written for pairs of entangled quasiparticle trajectories $\boldsymbol{k}$ and $\boldsymbol{k}+\boldsymbol{Q}$. As usual in the quasiclassical theory of superconductivity, we require that $\xi_s \equiv \hbar v_F/\Delta_{s,d} \gg a$, and similarly require that the magnetic "coherence length" $\xi_m \equiv \hbar v_F/|m| \gg a$. We also assume that the deviation from half-filling in the antiferromagnet is not large $\mu \ll \epsilon_F$. Otherwise the antiferromagnetic state would be unstable within the framework of a generic Hubbard-like model. Then μ should be included directly in the quasiclassical equations, not in the rapidly oscillating exponentials. Under this condition, the nesting relation is valid with quasiclassical accuracy and energies of normal state quasiparticles with momenta $\boldsymbol{k}_F$ and $\boldsymbol{k}_F+\boldsymbol{Q}$ both lie on the Fermi surface.

It is now convenient to collect into a Nambu 4-spinor the Andreev amplitudes $\psi^T_j \equiv (u_{j\sigma}(\boldsymbol{k}_F), u_{j\sigma}(\boldsymbol{k}_F+\boldsymbol{Q}), v_{j\bar{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{k}_F), v_{j\bar{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{k}_F+\boldsymbol{Q}))$, and to define the Pauli matrices ρ_α, τ_α in space of two quasiparticle trajectories ($\boldsymbol{k}$, $\boldsymbol{k}+\boldsymbol{Q}$) and in particle-hole space respectively.

Then the Andreev equations take the form:

$$\left(-\mu\tau_3\rho_0 - i\tau_3\rho_3 v_{F,x}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sigma m(x)\tau_0\rho_1 + \check{\Delta}(x)\right)\psi(x) = \varepsilon\psi(x). \qquad (2)$$

Here $v_{F,x} = \frac{\partial\xi(\boldsymbol{k}_F)}{\partial k_x}\big|_{\mu=0}$ is the Fermi velocity at half-filling, $\check{\Delta}(x) = \check{\Delta}_s(x) + \check{\Delta}_d(\boldsymbol{k}_F,x)$, $\check{\Delta}_s(x) = \sigma\rho_0\Delta_s(x)\frac{\tau_+}{2} + \sigma\rho_0\Delta^*_s(x)\frac{\tau_-}{2}$, $\check{\Delta}_d(\boldsymbol{k}_F,x) = \sigma\Delta_d(\boldsymbol{k}_F,x)\rho_3\frac{\tau_+}{2} + \sigma\Delta^*_d(\boldsymbol{k}_F,x)\rho_3\frac{\tau_-}{2}$. Quasiclassical Eqs.(2) do not apply in vicinity of quasiparticle momenta where $v_{F,x} = 0$. In particular, they do not apply near saddle points of quasiparticle energies where Van Hove singularities of the normal metal density of states take place. Since we will be interested mostly in transport across the interface, where the additional factor $v_{F,x}$ arises, these momenta do not contribute to the results noticeably and the conditions turn out not to be restrictive. Eqs.(2) are written for a quasiparticle spin direction σ ($\sigma = -\bar{\sigma} = \pm 1$), with the quantization axis along the magnetization at site $j_a = j_b = 0$. The quasiclassical equations for the superconducting side can be formulated also for $\mu \sim \varepsilon_F$. The parameter μ does not enter quasiclassical equations in this case and leads to a large Fermi velocity mismatch on the boundary. We have presented only the result (2) valid for $\mu \ll \varepsilon_F$, since we discuss primarily the case of a small Fermi velocity mismatch between a superconductor and an antiferromagnet. Eq.(2) also implies that no subdominant pairing channels are important in the problem, which we solve below with step-like (nonselfconsistent) profiles of the order parameters.

Normal/AF interface. We now apply Eqs.(2) to the problem of electron reflection at AF/N interfaces. The initial and final states of an electron reflected from AF/N interface belong to the bulk of the normal metal. We find that the incoming electron with a momentum $\boldsymbol{k}_F$ acquires in a reflection event the momentum $\boldsymbol{k}_F+\boldsymbol{Q}$. The antiferromagnetic wave vector on the square lattice is $\boldsymbol{Q} = (\pi,\pi)$, with respect to the crystal axes. In the x,y-coordinate system, $\boldsymbol{Q} = (\pi,\pi)$ for (100) interface and $\boldsymbol{Q} = (\sqrt{2}\pi, 0)$ in the (110) case. The quasiparticle velocity $v_{a,b} = 2t\sin k_{a,b}$ changes its sign when the momentum varies by $\boldsymbol{Q}$. Hence, quasiparticles experience retroreflection at AF/N interfaces. Since $v_{F,y} = 0$ for a (110) inter-

face at half-filling, in this particular case quasiparticles move along the interface normal, so that retroreflection and specular reflection coincide. We note that, beyond the quasiclassical approximation, $\boldsymbol{Q}$ is not a difference between incoming and outgoing momenta anymore and the condition for retroreflection is broken.

For energies below the quasiparticle gap in the antiferromagnet we find the following reflection amplitudes for electrons at the AF/N interface (for both orientations):

$$r_{AF,\sigma} = \frac{(\mu+\varepsilon) - i\sqrt{m^2-(\mu+\varepsilon)^2}}{\sigma m}, \quad |\mu+\varepsilon| < m. \quad (3)$$

Reflection amplitudes for quasiparticle energies above the gap $|\mu+\varepsilon| > m$ are obtained from Eq.(3) with the substitution $i\sqrt{m^2-(\mu+\varepsilon)^2} \to \mathrm{sgn}(\mu+\varepsilon)\sqrt{(\mu+\varepsilon)^2-m^2}$.

The retroreflection at an AF/N interface is analogous, to some extent, to Andreev reflection at an SC/N interface. In particular, bound states arise in AF/N/AF mesoscopic systems for energies below the antiferromagnetic gap, analogously to Andreev subgap states in SC/N/SC systems. The eigenenergies of these states are determined by the equation $\varepsilon+\mu = \frac{|v_{F,x}|}{d}(\varphi+\pi n)$, with integer n and $\varphi = \arccos[(\varepsilon+\mu)/m]$. For sufficiently large width $d \gg \xi_m$ of the normal metal layer, and considering quasiparticles with subgap energies $|\varepsilon+\mu| \ll m$, we obtain the simple, explicit expression $\varepsilon_n + \mu = \frac{\pi|v_{F,x}|}{d}(n+\frac{1}{2})$. As is known, in SC/N/SC systems electrons and holes with the same momenta and opposite velocities form Andreev bound states, which carry electric current. However, due to different nature of AF and SC order parameters, in AF/N/AF systems electrons with momenta $\boldsymbol{k}$ and $\boldsymbol{k}+\boldsymbol{Q}$ and opposite velocities are coherently entangled and the bound states themselves do not carry electric current.

Until now we have not discussed nonmagnetic channels for quasiparticle reflection, which are present both on account of Fermi velocity mismatch in a normal metal and an antiferromagnet and/or due to potential barriers at the interface. Potential barriers themselves form specular quasiparticle reflection, as usual. If the characteristic parameters t and μ in two identically oriented half-spaces are close to each other, the reflection coefficient of conventional specular reflection arising due to a mismatch of Fermi velocities is of order $(m/t)^2$. Furthermore, crystal momentum can change in a reflection process by a reciprocal crystal vector along the surface. Due to a difference between reciprocal crystal vectors at the interface and in the bulk, specific crystal periodicity along a particularly oriented surface or interface can result in additional channels for quasiparticle reflection[19].

AF/SC interface. Eqs.(2) apply also to AF/SC interfaces. The solution of these equations in the absence of potential barriers and/or a Fermi velocity mismatch shows zero-energy interface states in the system. These states take place for arbitrary relation between $m \ll \varepsilon_F$ and $\Delta_s \ll \varepsilon_F$ and for $|\mu| < m$, which garantees the existence of the antiferromagnetic gap for electrons and holes. The zero-energy states at the AF/sSC interface arise as a combined effect of Andreev reflection from the superconducting halfspace and the antiferromagnetic retroreflection from the antiferromagnetic side. The origin of the zero-energy surface states is closely connected with the magnetic properties of the quasiparticle reflection. This can be easily seen in the particular case $m \gg \Delta_s$, where quasiparticle reflection from the antiferromagnet can be described with reflection amplitudes (3) for the AF/N interface. According to Eq.(3), antiferromagnetic ordering results in opposite signs of reflection ampltudes for electrons with spin up and down. Quasiparticles with energies below the antiferromagnetic gap do not penetrate in the bulk of the itinerant AF, $r_{AF,\sigma} = \exp(i\Theta_\sigma)$. This takes place in the absence of potential barriers, i.e. for a transparent interface. Quasiparticles in the superconducting halfspace can be described in terms of standard Andreev equations for Andreev amplitudes $\tilde{\psi}_i^T(\boldsymbol{k}_F) \equiv (\tilde{u}_{i\uparrow}(\boldsymbol{k}_F), \tilde{u}_{i\downarrow}(\boldsymbol{k}_F), \tilde{v}_{i\uparrow}(\boldsymbol{k}_F), \tilde{v}_{i\downarrow}(\boldsymbol{k}_F))$ complemented with the boundary conditions $\tilde{\psi}^{out}_{i=0}(k_y+Q_y) = \check{S}\tilde{\psi}^{in}_{i=0}(k_y)$. The Andreev amplitudes $\tilde{\psi}^{in}$ contain solutions for quasiparticles moving towards the interface ($v_{F,x} < 0$), in contrast with $\tilde{\psi}^{out}$. The $\check{S}$-matrix for the AF/N boundary takes the form $\check{S} = \left(r_{AF,\uparrow}\frac{1+\sigma_3}{2} + r_{AF,\downarrow}\frac{1-\sigma_3}{2}\right)\tau_0$. Thus, the problem of a superconducting halfspace with AF/SC interface can be formulated for quasiparticles below the antiferromagnetic gap in a form identical to that obtained for an impenetrable ferromagnetic surface. The spectrum of Andreev bound states $\varepsilon_B = \pm\Delta\cos(\Theta/2)$, where $\Theta = \Theta_\uparrow - \Theta_\downarrow$, is well studied for the latter problem[11]. As follows from Eq.(3), for the antiferromagnetic boundary $\Theta = \pi$. This leads, indeed, to zero-energy surface bound states on the AF/sSC interface.

Let now a d-wave superconductor make a junction with an antiferromagnet without potential barriers and/or substantial Fermi velocity mismatch. The AF/dSC interface is closed for quasiparticles in the superconductor with energies below the antiferromagnetic gap. However, no low-energy surface bound states with $|\varepsilon_B| \ll m$ (in particular, no zero-energy states) form in the case in question for any interface-to-crystal orientation. This follows directly from solutions of Eqs.(2) and the continuity of Andreev amplitudes at the boundary. This can be also explained qualitatively as a combined result of the antiferromagnetic retroreflection and the change of sign of the d-wave order parameter. The difference π between phases of reflection amplitudes (3) can be effectively ascribed to the variation of the phase of the order parameter also. In order to see this, one can introduce auxiliary quantities $\tilde{u}^{au}_\sigma(x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F,\varepsilon) = \tilde{u}_\sigma(x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F,\varepsilon)e^{-i\sigma\Theta/2}$, $\tilde{v}^{au}_{\bar{\sigma}}(x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F,\varepsilon) = \tilde{v}_{\bar{\sigma}}(x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F,\varepsilon)e^{i\sigma\Theta/2}$ into Andreev equations and boundary conditions, taken for the outgoing momentum $\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F$. Andreev amplitudes for incoming momentum $\boldsymbol{k}_F$ are kept unchanged. Then the problem becomes, formally, identical to the one for magnetically inactive impenetrable boundary and the effective order parameter for the outgoing momenta $\Delta_{eff,\sigma}(x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F) = e^{-i\sigma\Theta}\Delta(x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F)$. Since the d-wave order parameter $\Delta_d(\boldsymbol{k}_F,x_i) = 2\Delta_d^{ii+\hat{a}}(\cos k_a -$

$\cos k_b$) changes its sign when the wavevector changes by $\boldsymbol{Q}$, we obtain $\Delta_d(x,\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F) = -\Delta_d(x,\boldsymbol{k}_F)$ for $\tilde{\boldsymbol{k}}_F = \boldsymbol{k}_F + \boldsymbol{Q}$. Thus, an outgoing quasiparticle sees an effective superconducting order parameter with an additional phase $\pi - \Theta$ as compared with the order parameter for the incoming trajectory. For the antiferromagnetic interface $\Theta = \pi$ and the total phase variation of the effective order parameter in a reflection event vanishes.

Interface potential barriers open a channel of specular reflection. A combined description of specular reflection and retroreflection includes more complicated boundary conditions, where S-matrix connects $\tilde{\psi}_0^{out}(k_y), \tilde{\psi}_0^{out}(k_y + Q_y)$ with $\tilde{\psi}_0^{in}(k_y), \tilde{\psi}_0^{in}(k_y + Q_y)$ and contains both off-diagonal and diagonal components in momentum space. This modifies the effects of retroreflection. The zero-energy surface states will be split at an AF/I/sSC interface and reach the value of the superconducting gap in the limit of impenetrable insulating interlayer. The opening of conventional channels of reflection on the AF/I/dSC interface will result in interface subgap states. For a (110) interface orientation, the subgap states will evolve with decreasing barrier transparency to the well known zero-energy surface states in d-wave superconductors. For large potential barriers, the antiferromagnet weakly splits the zero-energy states. A mismatch of Fermi velocities similarly results in conventional channels of reflection. For a small mismatch, the energies of subgap states on the AF/dSC interface will be situated close to the superconducting gap. If the mismatch (e.g. the magnetization) increases, the subgap states on the (110) interface will move towards lower energies. We believe this to be the origin of the subgap states on the AF/dSC (110) interface obtained recently in Ref. 20 on the basis of numerical studies for a large mismatch of Fermi surfaces.

Josephson current through SC/AF/SC junction. The zero-energy surface states arising on the AF/sSC interface will be split for an AF interlayer with finite width l. The split can be considered as an effect of tunneling between zero-energy states on two boundaries of the AF layer. If no potential barriers are present on the boundaries and $l \ll \xi_s$, $m \gg \Delta_s$, we find the following energies for interface states: $\varepsilon_B = \pm\sqrt{D}|\Delta_s \cos(\chi/2)|$, where $D(k_y) = 4K(k_y)(K(k_y)+1)^{-2}$ is the transparency of the N/AF/N junction and $K(k_y) = \exp(2ml/|v_{F,x}(k_y)|)$. These states carry the Josephson current

$$J = \int\limits_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \frac{dk_y}{\pi} 2e\sqrt{D}|\Delta_s| \sin\frac{\chi}{2} \tanh\frac{\sqrt{D}|\Delta_s|\cos\dfrac{\chi}{2}}{2T} \quad , \quad (4)$$

which differs from the Ambegaokar-Baratoff result. In the particular case of large interlayer width, $K, D \ll 1$, there are low-energy states in the junction which result in low-temperature anomalous behavior of the critical current. This behavior is similar to what can happen in tunnel junctions with d-wave superconductors or S/F/S junctions with low-energy interface states[8,11,21].

Conclusions. We have developed the quasiclassical theory of itinerant antiferromagnets under the assumption of slow spatial variations of the *sublattice* magnetization and near-nesting of the metallic band. The quasiclassical equations, written for pairs of entangled quasiparticle trajectories, provide a powerful tool for study of a host of new problems related to interfaces with antiferromagnetic materials. As important applications of this formalism, we have shown that quasiparticles in normal metals are retroreflected from the antiferromagnet, and studied bound state formation at interfaces with superconductors. We have further shown that Andreev zero-energy surface states are formed at an interface between an antiferromagnet and an s-wave superconductor. These bound states do not arise on interfaces with a d-wave superconductor for any interface orientation. We demonstrated that the Josephson current in sSC/AF/sSC junction is strongly influenced by the low-energy interface states and differs from the conventional Ambegaokar-Baratoff result. In analogy with other situations[22], one can expect that, after introducing some effective order parameters, the self-consistent calculations do not modify low-energy bound states and, in particular, their contribution to the Josephson current. Our formalism in the present paper is based on the Andreev equations, but we have derived also the Eilenberger equations for itinerant antiferromagnets and respective boundary conditions. Based on these equations, we plan to explore with self-consistent calculations proximity effects for AF/SC interfaces as well as the problems of the Josephson current and the low-bias conductance in a longer work.

Acknowledgments. We thank S.N. Artemenko and V.V. Ryazanov for useful discussions. This work was supported by grant NSF-INT-0340536 (I.V.B., P.J.H., and Yu.S.B.). I.V.B. and Yu.S.B. also acknowledge the support by grant RFBR 02-02-16643 and scientific programs of Russian Ministry of Science and Education and Russian Academy of Sciences. I.V.B. thanks the support from Forschungszentrum Jülich (Landau Scholarship) and the Dynasty Foundation.

[1] V.V. Ryazanov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2427 (2001).
[2] T. Kontos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 137007 (2002).
[3] W. Guichard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 167001 (2003).
[4] A. Bauer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 217001 (2004).
[5] A.I. Buzdin *et al.*, JETP Lett. **35**, 178 (1982) [Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **35**, 147 (1982)].
[6] A.I. Buzdin *et al.*, Sov. Phys. JETP **74**, 124 (1992) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **101**, 231 (1992)].
[7] N.M. Chtchelkatchev *et al.*, JETP Lett. **74**, 323 (2001) [Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **74**, 357 (2001)].
[8] Yu.S. Barash, I.V. Bobkova, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 144502 (2002).
[9] Yu.S. Barash *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 140503 (2002).
[10] A. Millis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 4504 (1988).

[11] M. Fogelström, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 11812 (2000).
[12] C. Bell *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 144517 (2003).
[13] L.P. Gor'kov, V. Kresin, Appl. Phys. Lett. **78**, 3657 (2001).
[14] A. L. Kasatkin, E. A. Pashitskii, Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys. **10**, 640 (1984); Sov. Phys. Solid State **27**, 1448 (1985).
[15] M.I. Visscher, G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 2798 (1996).
[16] B. Rejaei, G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 8487 (1996).
[17] S.N. Artemenko and S.V. Remizov, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **65**, 50 (1997) [JETP Lett. **65**, 53 (1997)].
[18] A.A. Sinchenko *et al.*, JETP Lett. **64**, 285 (1996); Phys. Rev. B **60**, 4624 (1999).
[19] V.F. Gantmakher, Y.B. Levinson, *Carrier Scattering in Metals and Semiconductors*, Elsevier Science Ltd., 1987.
[20] B.M. Andersen, P. Hedegard, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 104515 (2002).
[21] Yu.S. Barash *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4070 (1996).
[22] Yu.S. Barash, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 678 (2000).