arXiv:cond-mat/9712166v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 15 Dec 1997

Large-scale superconductivity-induced conductance suppression in mesoscopic normal-superconducting structures.

R. Seviour*, C.J. Lambert* and M. Leadbeater+
* School of Physics and Chemistry, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YB, U.K.
+ Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme, Nöthnitzer Strasse 38, 01187 Dresden, Germany.
(January 16, 2014)

Experiments on hybrid superconducting normal-metal structures have revealed that even in the absence of tunnel junctions the onset of superconductivity can lead to a decrease in the electrical conductance by an amount many orders of magnitude greater than e^2/h. In this Letter we provide a theory of this phenomenon which shows that it originates from an instability in 4 - probe conductance measurements which is absent from 2-probe measurements. We compare the zero-bias, zero-temperature 4-probe conductances G_N and G_S of a normal diffusive metal in contact with a superconductor in both the normal (N) and superconducting (S) states respectively. In the absence of tunnel barriers, the ensemble average of the difference $\delta G = G_S - G_N$ vanishes, in agreement with quasi-classical theory. However we also predict that there exists macroscopic sample specific fluctuations in δG, which lie beyond quasi-classical theory and allow large negative values of δG to occur.

During the past few years, studies of the subgap conductance of hybrid normal-superconductor (N-S) structures have led to the identification of a small number of paradigms of phase-coherent transport. The earliest of these is the zero bias anomaly observed in normal-insulator-superconductor (N-I-S) structures [1] and the related finite bias anomaly found in N-S structures with clean interfaces. At high temperatures $T > T^*$ and bias-voltages $V > V^*$, where for a N-metal of length L and diffusion coefficient D, $k_B T^* = eV^* = \sqrt{(D/L^2)}$, the conductances of both types of structure vary as $1/\sqrt{T}$ and $1/\sqrt{V}$. For a clean interface there also exists a conductance maximum at V^*, T^* and therefore at low-temperature and voltage a re-entrance to the low-conductance state occurs [2,3] . This re-entrance phenomenon is also observed in a second paradigm of phase-coherent transport, which arises when a normal metal is in contact with two superconductors, whose order parameter phase difference ϕ can be varied by some external means. In this case the conductance is an oscillatory function of ϕ, with an amplitude which typically exhibits a maximum at T^* and V^* [2,4–10]. Unlike the Josephson current which decays exponentially with T/T^*, such conductance oscillations decay only as a power-law. A third signature of phase-coherent transport is the long-range nature of these effects, which typically decay as a power-law in L/L^*, where $L^* = \sqrt{(D/eV)}$. This behaviour is in sharp contrast with the exponential decay of the Josephson effect and has been observed in a number of experiments [11,12].

All of the above phenomena can be explained by quasi-classical theory and to large extent are well-understood. There are however two further phenomena which are as yet unexplained by current theories of phase-coherent transport, namely the macroscopic suppression of electrical conductance by superconductivity [12,13] and re-entrant paramagnetism in superconducting wires coated with normal metal [14]. Both of these effects have resisted detailed explanation, but must be understood if a complete theory of phase coherent transport is ever to be claimed. In this Letter we present a theory of the first of these phenomenon, which has been observed in several experiments [12,13], involving both non-magnetic (ie Silver) and magnetic (ie Nickel) N-components, in contact with a superconductor via a clean interface. In contrast with quasi-classical theories [15,16] which predict that when the superconductor is in its normal state, the zero temperature, zero-bias conductance G_N is identical to the conductance G_S in the superconducting state, these experiments show that the difference $\delta G = G_N - G_S$ can be of order G_N and with a sample-specific sign. Since tunnel barriers and grain boundaries are absent from such samples, this effect is an embarassment to current theory. At finite bias, quasi-classical theory [16] has shown that a negative δG is possible, but the effect discussed in [16] is too small to account for the large changes found experimentally. In this Letter we suggest an explanation of this phenomenon which lies outside quasi-classical theory.

To go beyond quasi-classical theory, we adopt a general scattering approach to dc transport, which was initially developed to describe phase-coherent transport in dirty mesoscopic superconductors [17] and is based on fundamental current- voltage relations derived in [18,19]. For simplicity in this Letter, we focus solely on the zero-voltage, zero-temperature conductance, for the structure shown in figure 1(a), which captures the essential physics of the experimental setup of reference [13] and comprises a disordered superconductor of condensate potential μ, sandwiched between two pieces of diffusive normal metal. The latter is in contact with four normal reservoirs at voltages $v_j, j = 1, \ldots, 4$. Leads 1 and 2 carry a current I, while leads 3 and 4 carry no current and therefore form the voltage probes of a 4-probe conductance measurement. As in the experiments, the superconductor is

chosen to be longer than the superconducting coherence length, so that sub-gap quasi-particles are not transmitted through the superconducting region.

In the linear-response limit, at zero temperature, the conductance of a phase-coherent structure may be calculated from the fundamental current voltage relationship [18,19],

$$I_i = \sum_{j=1}^{4} a_{ij}(v_j - v), \tag{1}$$

The above expression relates the current I_i from a normal reseviour i to the voltage differences $(v_j - v)$, where $v = \mu/e$ and the sum is over the 4 normal leads connected to the scattering region. The a_{ij}'s are linear conbinations of the normal and Andreev scattering coefficients and in the absence of superconductivity satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^{L} a_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^{L} a_{ij} = 0$ in which case the left hand side of equation 1 becomes independent of v. In units of $2e^2/h$ [18,19], $a_{ii} = N_i + R_i^A - R_i^O$ and $a_{ij\neq i} = T_{ij}^A - T_{ij}^O$, where T_{ij}^A, T_{ij}^O are Andreev and normal transmission coefficents from probe j to probe i, R_i^A, R_i^O are Andreev and normal refelction coefficients from probe i and N_i is the number of open scattering channels in lead i.

As an aid to comparing transport coefficients in the normal and superconducting states, it is convenient to eliminate v from equation 1 by the following procedure suggested in [20,21], which yields

$$I_i = -\sum_{j=1}^{4} G_{ij} v_j \tag{2}$$

where

$$G_{ij} = -a_{ij} + x_i y_j / s \tag{3}$$

$$x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{4} a_{ij} \tag{4}$$

$$y_j = \sum_{i=1}^{4} a_{ij} \tag{5}$$

$$s = \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{4} y_j \tag{6}$$

Equation 2 is a fully quantum mechanical current - voltage relation which allows us to represent a multiprobe structure by an equivalent circuit, which for 4 probes is shown in figure 1 (b). In contrast with the normal case however, the "conductances" $G_{ij}(i \neq j)$ are not necessarily positive. Furthermore, as noted in [20,21] $G_{ij}(H) = G_{ji}(H^*)$, where H is the Hamiltonian of the system and therefore in the presence of a magnetic field, $G_{ij} \neq G_{ji}$.

Setting $I_1 = -I_2 = I, I_3 = I_4 = 0$ and solving equation 2 for the 4 probe conductance yields [20]

$$G = \frac{d}{(G_{42}G_{31} - G_{41}G_{32})} \tag{7}$$

where $d \geq 0$ is the determinant of the 3x3 matrix obtained by removing the third row and column from the matrix G_{ij} [1]. In what follows, we consider only the case where H is real (i.e. a real order parameter and no magnetic field), so that $G_{ij} = G_{ji}$.

As noted in [20] in the presence of disorder, the various transmission and reflection coeffcients can be computed by solving the Bogoliubov - de Gennes equation on a tight-binding lattice of sites, each labelled by an index i and possessing a particle (hole) degree of freedom $\psi(i)$ $(\phi(i))$. In the presence of local s-wave pairing described by a superconducting order parameter Δ_i, this takes the form

$$\begin{array}{ll} E\psi_i = & \epsilon_i\psi_i - \sum_\delta \gamma\left(\psi_{i+\delta} + \psi_{i-\delta}\right) + \left(\Delta_i\phi_i\right) \\ E\phi_i = & -\epsilon_i\phi_i + \sum_\delta \gamma\left(\phi_{i+\delta} + \phi_{i-\delta}\right) + \Delta_i^*\psi_i, \end{array} \tag{8}$$

The Hamiltonian of eq.(8) has been used to describe all of the paradigms [1-11]. In the normal diffusive region of figure 1(a), the on-site energy ϵ_i is chosen to be a random number, uniformly distributed over the interval $\epsilon_0 - W/2$ to $\epsilon_0 + W/2$, whereas in the clean N-regions $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_0$. In the S-region, the order parameter is set to a constant, $\Delta_i = \Delta_0$, while in all other regions, $\Delta_i = 0$. The nearest neighbour hopping element γ merely fixes the energy scale (ie the band-width), whereas ϵ_0 determines the band-filling. In what follows we choose $\gamma = 1$. By numerically solving for the scattering matrix of equation 8, exact results for the dc conductance can be obtained and therefore if large negative values of δG were not obtainable from such an approach, one would have to conclude that the experiments of [13] are not describable by mean-field BCS theory. In what follows, we employ an exact recursive Greens function technique to compute the scattering matrix of the structure of figure 1a. To obtain results which are typical of a normal metal, large-scale simulations are carried out, in which the sample dimensions are two orders of magnitude larger than the Fermi wavelength.

Figure 2(a) shows results for ten different disorder realizations both in the normal state ($\Delta_0 = 0$) and in the

[1] As a simple example, for a symmetric structure where $G_{13} = G_{24}$ $G_{12} = G_{34}$ and $G_{14} = G_{23}$ equation 7 reduces to

$$G_i = \frac{2(G_{43} + G_{42})(G_{43} + G_{41})}{G_{42} - G_{41}}$$

superconducting state ($\Delta_0 = 0.1$). As is seen from figure 2(a), for certain disorder realizations the normal state conductance G_N is much greater than the conductance G_S in the superconducting state, yielding a large negative value for $\delta G = G_S - G_N$. In contrast the ensemble average of δG, obtained by ensemble averaging over 500 disorder realisations, is negligible compared to G_N, in agreement with quasiclassical theory. As a prelude to the above simulations, to ensure that the disordered metal is diffusive, the conductance G_N was calculated as a function of length L with Δ_0 set to zero. In the diffusive region, the mean free path l is independent of length and in units of the lattice spacing is given by $l = (h/2e^2)G_N L/M$, where M is the sample width. For the system used in figure 2(a), $L = M = 200$ sites, $\epsilon_0 = 0.2$ $W = 2.0$ and $l \approx 4.5$.

The fact that large negative values of δG are describable by equation 7 is a central result of this Letter. By examining individual scattering coefficients, we now argue that this effect arises from the occurrence of small denominators in equation 7. Indeed, in the normal state, if by chance $G_{42}G_{31} \approx G_{41}G_{32}$ then G_N will be anomalously large. In this case, if the onset of superconductivity causes the denominator to increase, then a large negative δG can occur.

Figure 2(c) shows the products $G_{42}G_{31}$ and $G_{41}G_{32}$ for each of the normal state samples in figure 2(a). As an example, figure 2(a) shows that for sample no. 5, the normal state conductance is relatively large, while figure 2(c) shows that $G_{42}G_{31}$ and $G_{41}G_{32}$ are approximately equal. Figure 2(b) shows the corresponding conductances when the samples are superconducting. As one might intuitively expect, the onset of superconductivity causes an increase in $G_{42}G_{31}$. Nevertheless the associated increase in the denominator of equation 7 leads to a large-scale decrease in the 4-probe conductance G.

The aim of this Letter is to demonstrate that the phenomenon of large-scale superconductivity-induced conductance suppression in metallic mesoscopic structures can be understood through an exact solution of the Bogoliubov - de Gennes equation. The results of figure 2 demonstrate that for specific disorder realizations, as a consequence of an instability due to a small denominator in equation 7, the onset of superconductivity can decrease the total conductance, even though the individual conductances (G_{ij}) may increase and even though the fluctuations in the G_{ij}'s are merely of order e^2/h. Since the ensemble averaged total conductances for both the normal and superconducting state are equal, this phenomenon is not contained in a quasi-classical description.

In addition to the calculations leading to figures 2, we have carried out extensive numerical simulations of two-probe structures and in no-case have we found large negative conductance changes in the diffusive limit. Figure 3 shows results for 10 disorder realizations obtained for a N-S structure of width M = 150 sites comprising a semi-infinte crystalline N-lead, in contact with a N-diffusive region of length L = 30, which in turn makes contact via a clean interface to a semi-infinte crystalline S-lead. In all cases δG is negative and of order e^2/h. A detailed analysis of the Lyapunov exponents shows that this is a consequence of the weak localisation effect predicted in [22], which is too small to account for the large-scale effect described in this Letter.

We believe that the results of figure 2 capture the essential physics of the experiments of [13], although measured values for the conductances G_{ij} are not available, thereby making a quantitative comparison impossible. The crucial question is whether or not the condition $G_{42}G_{31} \approx G_{41}G_{32}$ is satisfied in the normal-state. Although the experimental samples are somewhat elongated, this condition may arise as a consequence of additional disorder at the ends of the sample, where contact with the leads is made. For the future, it would be of interest to carry out an experiment on shorter samples, with a length:width ratio less than or of order unity, since the denominator of equation 7 will be small. The sign of δG will be sample dependent and therefore by switching on a magnetic field, fluctuations in G_{ij} of order e^2/h should generate both positive and negative macroscopic fluctuations in δG. Indeed there is no restriction on the sign of G_N and G_S and therefore such an experiment would also illustrate the prediction of superconductivity-induced negative 4-probe conductances discribed in reference [20].

[1] A. Kastalsky, A.W. Kleinsasser, L.H. Greene, F.P. Milliken, and J.P. Harbison, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3026 (1991).

[2] van Wees B J,Dimoulas A , Heida J P, Klapwijk T M, Graaf W.v.d. and Borghs G, 1994 Physica **B203** 285

[3] Charlat P, Courtois H, Gandit Ph, Mailly D, Volkov A F and Pannetier B 1996 Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 4950 and 1996 Czech J. Phys. **46** 3107

[4] H. Pothier, S. Gueron, D. Esteve, and M.H. Devoret, Physica **B203**, 226 (1994).

[5] A.Dimoulas et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 602 (1995).

[6] den Hartog S G, Kapteyn C M A, van Wees B J, Klapwijk T M, and Borghs G 1996 Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 4954

[7] Petrashov V, Antonov V N, Delsing P and Claeson T 1994 JETP Letters **60**

[8] V. Petrashov et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 5268 (1995).

[9] Y.V. Nazarov and T.H. Stoof, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 823 (1996).

[10] A. Volkov, N. Allsopp and C.J. Lambert, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **8** L1-L6 (1996)

[11] Courtois H, Gandit Ph, Mailly D and Pannetier B 1996 Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** 130

[12] Petrashov V T, Antonov V N, Maksimov S V and

Shaikhaidarov R Sh 1993b JETP Lett. **58** 49
[13] V.T. Petrashov and V.N. Antonov, JETP Lett. **54** (1991) 241
[14] P. Visani, A.C. Mota and A. Pollini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** 1514 (1990), A.C. Mota, P. Visani, A. Pollini and K. Aupke, Physica **B197** 95 (1994)
[15] Y.V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1420 (1994).
[16] Wilhelm F K, Zaikin A D and Courtois H 1997 cond-mat/9705225
[17] Lambert C J and Hui V C 1990 Physica B **165** 1107
[18] C.J. Lambert, J. Phys.: Condensed Matter **3**, 6579 (1991).
[19] C.J. Lambert, V.C. Hui, and S.J. Robinson, J.Phys.: Condens. Matter, **5**, 4187 (1993).
[20] N Allsopp et al, J. Phys. Condens. Matter 10475 **6** (1994)
[21] C.J. Lambert, Physica B **203**, 201 (1994), and references therein.
[22] C. W. J. Beenakker Phys. Rev. **B47** 15763 (1992)




FIG. 1. Fig 1(a) The N-S-N structure analyzed numerically. Fig 1(b) The equivalent quantum resistor network representing the structure shown in figure 1 (a), where the G_{ij} are given by equation 3.




FIG. 2. 2(a) Results for the electrical conductance G_N,G_S of the structure shown in figure 1a, for 10 samples of differing disorder realizations. 2(b) Results for the products $G_{41}G_{32}$ and $G_{42}G_{31}$ for each of the 10 samples from figure 2(a), when the system is in the superconducting state. 2(c) Results for the products $G_{41}G_{32}$ and $G_{42}G_{31}$ for each of the 10 samples from figure 2(a), when the system is in the normal state.




FIG. 3. Numerical results for 10 disorder realisations, obtained for the N-S geometry shown in the insert.