

Nonlocality of Field-Emitted Electrons from a Superconductor

K. Yuasa,^{1,2} P. Facchi,^{3,4} Rosario Fazio,^{5,6} H. Nakazato,² I. Ohba,² S. Pascazio,^{7,4} and S. Tasaki⁸

¹Waseda Institute for Advanced Study, Waseda University, Tokyo 169-8050, Japan

²Department of Physics, Waseda University, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan

³Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bari, I-70125 Bari, Italy

⁴Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy

⁵International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA), via Beirut 2-4, I-34014 Trieste, Italy

⁶NEST-CNR-INFM & Scuola Normale Superiore, piazza dei Cavalieri 7, I-56126 Pisa, Italy

⁷Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy

⁸Department of Applied Physics and Advanced Institute for Complex Systems, Waseda University, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan
(October 24, 2008)

We propose to study entanglement and correlations in a coincidence experiment in the field emission from a superconductor. Electrons emitted in opposite directions exhibit positive correlations because of Cooper-pair bunching. They can be entangled in spin and violate Bell's inequality. The structure of the correlation function shows that the Andreev process plays a central role for this peculiar correlation.

PACS numbers: 79.70.+q, 03.65.Ud, 74.45.+c

Signatures of quantum statistics and of interactions can be unambiguously detected by correlation measurements. This is the case, for example, of a series of important experiments where bunching and antibunching of bosons and fermions have been measured [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Noise correlations have also been proved to be very important to test correlated states in cold atomic gases [7] and in quantum transport in nanostructures [8]. The aim of this work is to show that non-trivial correlation can be also observed in electron field emission.

When a bias voltage is applied to a sharp piece of material, a strong electrostatic field is realized at the tip, causing electron emission into vacuum. Due to advanced technology in single-electron detection, antibunching in the field emission has been already observed [5]. If the tip emitting the electrons is superconducting, the subtle correlations deriving from the condensation of Cooper pairs should have a clear manifestation in a coincidence experiment in the field emission, along the same lines as in Ref. [5]. Our analysis will show that a positive correlation is present when electrons are detected in opposite directions. This positive correlation can be viewed as bunching of Cooper pairs. In addition, as we shall see, under suitable conditions these electrons can violate a Bell inequality. The possibility of bringing to light this effect is supported, together with the observation of antibunching in the spectrum of emitted electrons [5], by another breakthrough in the field: the observation [9], in the field emission from a superconducting tip, of the quasi-particle gap [10].

The presence of a bunching-like behaviour in quantum transport through multiterminal superconductor-normal metal structures has been already pointed out through an analysis of current noise [8, 11]. Superconductors were also shown to be a source of entangled electrons. The generation and detection of entangled electrons in hy-

brid conductors has been discussed in a number of articles [12, 13, 14, 15, 16] (see also the review [17]). In particular we draw attention to Ref. [15], where the angular distributions of the emitted electrons from a superconductor have been discussed.

The experiment we propose here has clear similarities but, at the same time, important differences from previous work in this direction. First of all, in our opinion, a coincident measurement in field emission can reveal angular correlations due to pairing, which are very hard to see in transport. Moreover it allows to extract, by a proper orientation of the detectors, the fraction of electrons which are entangled in order to perform a test of Bell's inequalities. Although we confine our attention to superconducting emitters, it might be very interesting to explore other cases where entangled electrons can be produced in normal systems (see Ref. [18] for a review).

Our setup is sketched in Fig. 1. The Hamiltonian in 3D space reads $H = H_S + H_V + \lambda H_T$, with ($\hbar = 1$)

$$H_S = \sum_{s=\uparrow,\downarrow} \int d^3\mathbf{k} \omega_k \alpha_{\mathbf{k}s}^\dagger \alpha_{\mathbf{k}s}, \quad \omega_k = \sqrt{\varepsilon_k^2 + |\Delta|^2}, \quad (1)$$

$$H_V = \sum_{s=\uparrow,\downarrow} \int d^3\mathbf{p} \varepsilon_p c_{\mathbf{p}s}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{p}s}, \quad \varepsilon_p = \frac{p^2}{2m} - \mu, \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1: Field emission of electrons and coincident detections. The size of the emitting region at the tip is w and two of the emitted electrons are detected at r_1 and r_2 .

$$H_T = \sum_{s=\uparrow,\downarrow} \int d^3\mathbf{p} \int d^3\mathbf{k} (T_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{p}s}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}s} + T_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{k}}^* a_{\mathbf{k}s}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{p}s}), \quad (3)$$

where H_S is the Hamiltonian of the superconducting emitter, $a_{\mathbf{k}s}$ the fermionic operators of the quasiparticles, H_V describes the propagation of the electrons in vacuum, $c_{\mathbf{p}s}$ are fermionic operators and the (interaction) Hamiltonian λH_T describes the emission of the electrons from the superconductor into vacuum [10, 19, 20]. The energy of an electron in vacuum, ε_p , as well as that of a quasiparticle in the superconductor, ω_k , are measured from the Fermi level of the superconductor μ . Δ is the gap of the superconductor and the quasiparticle operators $a_{\mathbf{k}s}$ are related to the electron operators $a_{\mathbf{k}s}$ by a Bogoliubov transformation.

For the tunneling matrix elements we take [20]

$$T_{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{k}} = h(\mathbf{p})g(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}), \quad (4)$$

$$g(\mathbf{p}) = (2\pi)^{-3} e^{-p^2 w^2/2}, \quad h(\mathbf{p}) = (p/m)^{1/2} e^{\varepsilon_p/2E_C}, \quad (5)$$

where $g(\mathbf{p})$ characterizes the emitting region of size w and $\lambda h(\mathbf{p})$ the tunneling probability, that decays exponentially as the incident energy decreases [21], E_C being an energy scale that characterizes the energy dependence of the tunneling matrix elements.

The initial state of the system is $|\text{BCS}\rangle_S \otimes |0\rangle_V$ [22], where the first ket pertains to the electrons in the tip, the second to the electrons in vacuum. At time $t = 0$, the bias field is turned on, and the electrons start to tunnel through the surface potential. The emission process is dynamically described in 3D space with the Hamil-

tonian (1)–(3) and after a transient period it reaches a nonequilibrium steady state satisfying Wick's theorem [23], with a stationary beam of electrons emitted from the superconductor. Electron correlations are observed in this beam [20].

When the detectors do not resolve the spin states of the electrons, the probability of two joint detections, at $(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) = (1)$ and $(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) = (2)$, with $t_2 \geq t_1$, is proportional to

$$\rho^{(2)}(2; 1) = \sum_{s_1, s_2=\uparrow,\downarrow} \langle \psi_{s_1}^\dagger(1) \psi_{s_2}^\dagger(2) \psi_{s_2}(2) \psi_{s_1}(1) \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $\psi_s(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the field operator of the electrons in vacuum. Application of Wick's theorem yields

$$\rho^{(2)}(2; 1) = 4\gamma(2; 2)\gamma(1; 1) - 2|\gamma(2; 1)|^2 + 2|\chi(2; 1)|^2, \quad (7)$$

with

$$\gamma(2; 1) = \langle \psi_\uparrow^\dagger(2) \psi_\uparrow(1) \rangle = \langle \psi_\downarrow^\dagger(2) \psi_\downarrow(1) \rangle, \quad (8)$$

$$\chi(2; 1) = \langle \psi_\uparrow(2) \psi_\downarrow(1) \rangle = -\langle \psi_\downarrow(2) \psi_\uparrow(1) \rangle. \quad (9)$$

The correlation function γ describes the state of single electrons, and, in particular, the (spin-summed) one-particle distribution of the emitted electrons is given by $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}, t) = 2\gamma(\mathbf{r}, t; \mathbf{r}, t)$. The correlation function χ describes the emission of *pairs* of electrons (with opposite spins). A second-order calculation for the coincident detections at $t_1 = t_2$ yields

$$\chi(2; 1) = \lambda^2 \int d^3\mathbf{k} u_k v_k \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}_1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}_2}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \frac{T_{\mathbf{p}_1\mathbf{k}} T_{\mathbf{p}_2(-\mathbf{k})}}{\varepsilon_{p_1} + \varepsilon_{p_2} - i0^+} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_{p_1} + \omega_k - i0^+} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{p_2} + \omega_k - i0^+} \right) e^{i\mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}_1} e^{i\mathbf{p}_2 \cdot \mathbf{r}_2}, \quad (10)$$

where u_k and v_k are the Bogoliubov amplitudes. Notice that, since $u_k v_k = \Delta/2\omega_k$, $\chi(2; 1)$ is proportional to the gap parameter Δ and vanishes when the emitter is in its normal state. At zero temperature, there is no contribution from the quasiparticle excitations and Eq. (10) is due to Andreev processes. In the absence of this contribution, the second term in (7) reduces the coincidence probability of finding two electrons close to each other within a small time delay, exhibiting antibunching. The pair correlation χ , on the other hand, enhances such coincidence probability. This is relevant for the occurrence of positive correlations [8, 11]. We now analyze these effects in greater details.

The normalized coincidence

$$Q(r, \theta) = \frac{\rho^{(2)}(2; 1)}{\rho^{(1)}(2) \rho^{(1)}(1)} \quad (11)$$

at $t_1 = t_2$, when the detectors are at the same distances $r_1 = r_2 = r$ from the tip, is plotted in Fig. 2 as a function of the angle θ between \mathbf{r}_1 and \mathbf{r}_2 , for normal and superconducting emitters. Here, $k_F = \sqrt{2m\mu} = 2\pi/\lambda_F$. The effects of superconductivity are manifest: a bunching peak appears at $\theta \simeq \pi$. Its origin is clear from the expression of the Andreev process (10) (γ is negligibly small at $\theta \simeq \pi$). This shows that electrons with opposite momenta \mathbf{k} and $-\mathbf{k}$ are emitted in pair through a virtual process and propagate with momenta \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 in vacuum, in approximately opposite directions (with unavoidable diffraction effects governed by the size of the emitting region w). The couple \mathbf{k} and $-\mathbf{k}$ reflects the Cooper-pair correlation in the emitter. Notice that the integrand of χ in (10) is symmetric under the exchange $\mathbf{k} \leftrightarrow -\mathbf{k}$. This is because the Cooper pair is in a sin-

glet spin state. This symmetry yields bunching, which is observed in opposite directions.

Bunching is therefore a signature of excess singlet pairs, when the emissions take place in opposite directions. It is then of great interest to discuss the nonlocal aspects of the phenomenon [12, 13, 14, 15, 17]. The spin state ϱ of the pair of emitted electrons is

$$\varrho \propto \left(\gamma(2;2)\gamma(1;1) - |\gamma(2;1)|^2 \right) \mathbb{1} + \left(|\gamma(2;1)|^2 + |\chi(2;1)|^2 \right) |\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|, \quad (12)$$

where $|\Psi^-\rangle = (|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ is the singlet state [the normalization factor is given by the two-particle distribution $\rho^{(2)}(2;1)$ in (7)]. Therefore, in general the entanglement of the singlet component is masked by the background.

The degree of entanglement is related to the height $\delta Q = Q(r, \theta) - 1$ of the bunching peak at $\theta = \pi$, which, for $k_F r \gg 1$, $\mu \gg E_C$, and $r/k_F w^2 \gg 1$, is given by the formula

$$\delta Q \sim \frac{\pi^2}{32K_1^2(|\Delta|/E_C)} \left| H_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{iw^2}{\pi^2\xi^2} - \frac{r}{2\pi^2 k_F \xi^2} \right) - \frac{4\Lambda e^{ir/2\pi^2 k_F \xi^2}}{\pi \sqrt{ir/k_F w^2}} \right|^2, \quad (13)$$

where $K_\nu(z)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind, $H_\nu^{(2)}(z)$ is the Hankel function of the second kind [24], $\xi = k_F/\pi m|\Delta|$ is Pippard's length, characterizing the correlation length of the superconductor, and Λ is a smooth bounded function of w , such that $\Lambda \simeq 1$ for $w \gtrsim \lambda_F$. The higher the bunching peak, the larger the entanglement, and Bell's inequality can also be violated. Notice that the electrons of each pair are emitted in opposite directions and one need not argue how to separate them.

Figure 3 displays the value of the bunching peak as functions of the parameters describing the system. It is obvious that Δ plays a significant role for entanglement, enhancing the role of superconductivity. By increasing




FIG. 2: (Color online) Normalized coincidence $Q(r, \theta)$ vs θ , for normal $\Delta = 0$ and superconducting $\Delta \neq 0$ emitters.

$|\Delta|$, the gap becomes wider, the Andreev emission becomes dominant and entanglement is enhanced. The parameter E_C appearing in (5) also works like a filter: by decreasing E_C , the contribution of single-particle emission is suppressed, the background is reduced, pair emissions become dominant and entanglement is enhanced. The oscillations of δQ (below the entanglement threshold) shown in the last panel of Fig. 3 for large values of r , are due to the asymptotic behavior of the Hankel function $H_0^{(2)}$.

It is interesting to discuss the effects of w on entanglement [12]. Electron pairs emitted from a smaller region bunch better and are more entangled. If the emitting region is larger, there is less guarantee that coincidence electrons originate from a common Cooper pair, and as a consequence entanglement is reduced. This explains the role of the ratio between the size of the emitting region and the extension of a Cooper pair w/ξ , appearing in the formula for the bunching peak (13) and governing the entanglement of the emitted pairs.

Finally, a smaller value of r yields more entanglement. This is because the wave packets of the emitted electrons spread as they propagate. Even if two electrons are detected at the same distance in opposite directions, this does not ensure that the two electrons originate from a common Cooper pair: there is an ambiguity to the extent of the spreads of the wave packets. Due to free-space propagation, the uncertainty at time $t \sim mr/k_F$ is $\lesssim \sqrt{t/m}$ and this value should be smaller than ξ for the two electrons to bunch. The bunching peak (13) actually decays like $\sim k_F \xi^2/r$ for $r \gg k_F \xi^2$ (with oscillation), but the length scale $k_F \xi^2$ is much longer than the extension of a Cooper pair ξ , and the slow decay r^{-1} reflects the




FIG. 3: (Color online) Peak value of $Q(r, \theta)$ at $\theta = \pi$. The line at $Q = 3/2$ indicates the threshold for entanglement (above which the pair of electrons is entangled) and the one at $Q = \sqrt{2}/(\sqrt{2}-1) \simeq 3.41$ is that for the violation of Bell's inequality (above which Bell's inequality is violated). The parameters are the same as in Fig. 2, and $\xi \simeq 33.8 \lambda_F$.

divergence in the quasiparticle spectrum.

It is important to check to which extent our results are robust in a non-ideal situation. To this end we analyzed both static fluctuations of the diameter w and the position \mathbf{r}_0 of the emitting tip. In particular, fluctuations are important only when they become of order of ξ . Moreover, one can show that the angular dependence of the peak is $\propto \exp\{-4k_F^2 w^2 \sin^2[(\pi - \theta)/4]\}$. Therefore, the effect should be visible as far as $\delta\theta k_F w/2 \lesssim 1$, where $\delta\theta$ is the angle deviation from π in the emission of the two correlated electrons due to local imperfections of the tip. This implies a maximum tolerable value of the roughness of the order of $1/\delta k = 1/k_F \delta\theta \simeq w/2$.

Field emission from a superconductor has already been observed with a Nb tip [9] and, we believe, the present analysis clarifies where to search nonlocal correlations of the emitted electrons. However, for a successful detection of the nonlocally correlated electron pairs, additional experimental requirements should be met. Energy resolution in the experiment should still be improved and the use of a tip with a higher value of the gap will certainly help in the detection. Energy selection close to the Fermi level would enhance correlations [12]. As mentioned before, correlations are actually increased by decreasing E_C (and suppressing emission from lower energies). It might also be worth devising a technique to reduce the spread of the wave packet in order to preserve the Cooper-pair correlation.

We thank B. Cho, C. Oshima, and F. Taddei for discussions. This work is supported by the bilateral Italian-Japanese Projects II04C1AF4E of MUR, Italy, by the Joint Italian-Japanese Laboratory of MAE, Italy, by the EU through the Integrated Project EuroSQIP, by the Grant for The 21st Century COE Program at Waseda University, the ‘‘Academic Frontier’’ Project at Waseda University, and a Special Coordination Fund for Promoting Science and Technology from MEXT, Japan, and by the Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) from JSPS, Japan.

[1] M. Yabashi, K. Tamasaku, and T. Ishikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 140801 (2001); G. Scarcelli, V. Berardi, and Y. Shih, *ibid.* **96**, 063602 (2006).
 [2] M. Yasuda and F. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3090 (1996); A. Öttl *et al.*, *ibid.* **95**, 090404 (2005); M. Schellekens *et al.*, Science **310**, 648 (2005).
 [3] T. Rom *et al.*, Nature (London) **444**, 733 (2006); T. Jeltens *et al.*, *ibid.* **445**, 402 (2007).

[4] M. Henny *et al.*, Science **284**, 296 (1999); W. D. Oliver *et al.*, *ibid.* **284**, 299 (1999).
 [5] H. Kiesel, A. Renz, and F. Hasselbach, Nature (London) **418**, 392 (2002).
 [6] M. Iannuzzi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 080402 (2006).
 [7] E. Altman, E. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 013603 (2004).
 [8] Ya. M. Blanter and M. Büttiker, Phys. Rep. **336**, 1 (2000).
 [9] K. Nagaoka *et al.*, Nature (London) **396**, 557 (1998).
 [10] J. W. Gadzuk, Surf. Sci. **15**, 466 (1969).
 [11] M. P. Anantram and S. Datta, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 16390 (1996); J. Torrès and T. Martin, Eur. Phys. J. B **12**, 319 (1999); T. Gramspacher and M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 8125 (2000); F. Taddei and R. Fazio, *ibid.* **65**, 134522 (2002);
 [12] P. Recher, E. V. Sukhorukov, and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 165314 (2001); P. Recher and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 267003 (2003).
 [13] N. M. Chtchelkatchev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 161320 (2002); O. Sauret, D. Feinberg, and T. Martin, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 245313 (2004).
 [14] P. Samuelsson, E. V. Sukhorukov, and M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 157002 (2003).
 [15] E. Prada and F. Sols, Eur. Phys. J. B **40**, 379 (2004); New J. Phys. **7**, 231 (2005).
 [16] L. Faoro, F. Taddei, and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 125326 (2004).
 [17] G. Burkard, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **19**, 233202 (2007).
 [18] C. W. J. Beenakker, in *Quantum Computers, Algorithms and Chaos*, Vol. 162 of International School of Physics Enrico Fermi, edited by G. Casati *et al.* (IOS Press, Amsterdam, 2006), pp. 307–347; arXiv:cond-mat/0508488.
 [19] M. H. Cohen, L. M. Falicov, and J. C. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **8**, 316 (1962); J. Bardeen, *ibid.* **9**, 147 (1962); R. E. Prange, Phys. Rev. **131**, 1083 (1963); V. Ambegaokar and A. Baratoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 486 (1963); **11**, 104(E) (1963).
 [20] K. Yuasa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 043623 (2008).
 [21] The tunneling probability should not be a function of ε_p but rather of the energy associated with the normal motion to the potential surface. In the following discussion, however, we shall look at far field $k_{Fr} \gg 1$, for which this setting is valid.
 [22] We concentrate on the low temperature case and neglect temperature effects.
 [23] D. Ruelle, J. Stat. Phys. **98**, 57 (2000); W. Aschbacher *et al.*, in *Open Quantum Systems III*, edited by S. Attal, A. Joye, and C.-A. Pillet (Springer, Berlin, 2006), pp. 1–66; S. Tasaki and J. Takahashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **165**, 57 (2006).
 [24] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, 7th ed., edited by A. Jeffrey and D. Zwillinger (Academic Press, Orlando, 2007).