

# Josephson decoupling phase in inhomogeneous arrays of superconducting quantum dots

Sujit Sarkar

PoornaPrajna Institute of Scientific Research,  
4 Sadashivanagar, Bangalore 5600 80, India.

(Dated: December 17, 2018)

We present a study of quantum phase analysis of inhomogeneous and homogeneous arrays of superconducting quantum dots (SQD). We observe the existence of Josephson decouple (JD) phase only at the half filling for inhomogeneous array of SQD due to the fluctuation of Josephson couplings over the sites at half filling. In JD phase superconductivity disappears even in the absence of Coulomb blockade phase. We also observe that fluctuation of on-site Coulomb charging energy produces the relevant coupling term that yields Coulomb blockade gapped phase. The presence of nearest-neighbor and next-nearest-neighbor Coulomb interaction yields the same physics for inhomogeneous and homogeneous SQD.

PACS numbers:

**Introduction:** It is well known that the quantal phase ( $\phi$ ) of superconductor is coherent over the superconducting system; therefore, we expect the quantum properties of the electron to be visible at a macroscopic level [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. The Josephson effect is nothing but the manifestation of coherence of the superconducting quantal phase in the system. In this effect, the system is gaining energy to stabilize the superconducting phase. A superconducting phase is stable when the Josephson coupling ( $E_J$ ) between two superconductors separated by a junction, is larger than the Cooper pair charging energy ( $E_c$ ). This is the conventional wisdom in the literature of superconductivity [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. In this letter we raise the question for a nanostructure superconducting system whether this conventional wisdom is still valid for an inhomogeneous SQD system with fluctuating Josephson coupling. We will see that for inhomogeneous SQD array, our model system is in the insulating phase even in the absence of Coulomb blockade phase. Although the system has finite  $E_J$ , we characterize this phase as a Josephson decouple phase (JD) because it is not yielding any superconductivity in the system. In the present stage our model is completely the theoretical model of inhomogeneous SQD array which predicts the JD phase. We hope that the state of engineering of nanoscale superconducting system will find this type of system. Our prime motivation is to predict the JD phase, after the forty seven years of the discovery Josephson effect. We don't think that our model system is a perfect model of granular superconducting system because we have built the model to predict the JD phase only [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. In this study we also raise the question of the effect of on-site Coulomb charging energy and also fluctuations of it over sites. We will see that this effect is quite interesting. Apart from that we also study the effect of nearest-neighbor (NN) and next-nearest-neighbor (NNN) Coulomb interactions for inhomogeneous and homogeneous SQD.

## General field-theoretical formalism for inhomogeneous SQD and homogeneous SQD arrays:

At first we write down the model Hamiltonian of inhomogeneous SQD system with fluctuating (with a periodicity of two lattice sites, this model is sufficient to detect the JD phase) Josephson couplings with on-site charging energies and intersite interactions in presence of gate voltage. The Hamiltonian is written as

$$H = H_{J1} + H_{EC0} + H_{EC1} + H_{EC2}. \quad (1)$$

We recast the different parts of the Hamiltonian in quantum phase model as.

$$H_{J1} = -E_{J1} \sum_i (1 - (-1)^i \delta_1) \cos(\phi_{i+1} - \phi_i),$$

where  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi_{i+1}$  are quantal phase of the SQD at the point  $i$  and  $i+1$  respectively. Josephson couplings are fluctuating over the sites,  $E_{J1}(1 + \delta_1)$  and  $E_{J1}(1 - \delta_1)$  are the Josephson coupling strength for odd and even site respectively. We also consider the fluctuations of on-site Coulomb charging energy over the sites. This is represented as

$$H_{EC0} = \frac{E_{C0}}{2} \sum_i (1 - (-1)^i \delta_2) \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} - \frac{N}{2}\right)^2,$$

where  $E_{C0}$  is the on-site charging energy.  $E_{C0}(1 + \delta_2)$  and  $E_{C0}(1 - \delta_2)$  are the on site charging energies for odd and even sites respectively. All  $\delta$ 's are deviations of exchange couplings from the homogeneous SQD.  $H_{EC1}$  and  $H_{EC2}$  are respectively the Hamiltonians for nearest neighbor (NN) and next-nearest-neighbor (NNN) interactions between SQD. Now

$$H_{EC1} = E_{Z1} \sum_i n_i n_{i+1},$$

and

$$H_{EC2} = E_{Z2} \sum_i n_i n_{i+2},$$

where  $E_{Z1}$  and  $E_{Z2}$  are respectively the NN and NNN charging energies between the dots. We see that this model is sufficient to explain JD induced gapped phase of the system. In the phase representation,  $(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi_i})$  is the operator representing the number of Cooper pairs at the  $i$ th dot, and thus it takes only the integer values ( $n_i$ ). Hamiltonian  $H_{EC0}$  accounts for the influence of gate voltage ( $eN \sim V_g$ ).  $eN$  is the average dot charge induced by the gate voltage. When the ratio  $\frac{E_{J1}}{E_{C0}} \rightarrow 0$ , the SQD array is in the insulating state having a gap of the width  $\sim E_{C0}$ , since it costs an energy  $\sim E_{C0}$  to change the number of pairs at any dot. The exceptions are the discrete points at  $N = 2n + 1$ , where a dot with charge  $2ne$  and  $2(n + 1)e$  has the same energy because the gate charge compensates the charges of extra Cooper pair in the dot. On this degeneracy point, a small amount of Josephson coupling leads the system to the superconducting state.

Here we would like to recast our basic Hamiltonians in the spin language. During this process we follow Ref. [7] and [16]. We map this model to the spin chain model when on-site charging energy is larger Josephson coupling. Now

$$H_{J1} = -2 E_{J1} \sum_i (1 - (-1)^i \delta_1) (S_i^\dagger S_{i+1}^- + h.c),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{EC0} &= \frac{E_{C0}}{2} \sum_i (1 - (-1)^i \delta_2) (2S_i^Z - h)^2. \\ H_{EC1} &= 4E_{Z1} \sum_i S_i^Z S_{i+1}^Z, \\ H_{EC2} &= 4E_{Z2} \sum_i S_i^Z S_{i+2}^Z. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $h = \frac{N-2n-1}{2}$  allows the tuning of the system around the degeneracy point by means of gate voltage. Now we use Abelian bosonization method to solve this problem. We recast the spinless fermion operators in terms of field operators by this relation [17]:

$$\psi(x) = [e^{ik_F x} \psi_R(x) + e^{-ik_F x} \psi_L(x)] \quad (2)$$

where  $\psi_R(x)$  and  $\psi_L(x)$  describe the second-quantized fields of right- and left-moving fermions respectively and  $k_F$  is the Fermi wave vector. It is revealed from  $H_{EC0}$  that the applied external gate voltage on the dot systems appears as a magnetic field in the spin chain. In our system  $k_F$  will depend on the applied gate voltage. Therefore, one can study the effect of gate voltage through arbitrary  $k_F$ . We would like to express the fermionic fields in terms of bosonic field by the relation  $\psi_r(x) = \frac{U_r}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} e^{-i(r\phi(x) - \theta(x))}$ ,  $r$  is denoting the chirality of the fermionic fields, right (1) or left movers (-1). The operator  $U_r$  commutes with the bosonic field.  $U_r$  of different species commute and  $U_r$  of the same species anti-commute.  $\phi$  field corresponds to the quantum fluctuations (bosonic) of spin and  $\theta$  is the dual field of  $\phi$ . They are related by the relations  $\phi_R = \theta - \phi$  and  $\phi_L = \theta + \phi$ . After continuum field theoretical studies for arbitrary values of  $k_F$ , the model Hamiltonian be-

comes

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= H_0 + 2\frac{E_{J1}}{2\pi\alpha}\delta_1 \int dx : \cos(2\sqrt{K}\phi(x) - (2k_F - \pi)x) : \\ &+ \frac{hE_{C0}}{\pi\alpha} \int dx \partial_x \phi(x) \\ &+ \frac{2hE_{C0}\delta_2}{\pi\alpha} \int (-1)^x : \cos(2\sqrt{K}\phi(x) + 2k_F x) : dx \\ &+ \frac{4E_{Z1}}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int : \cos(4\sqrt{K}\phi(x) - \\ &(G - 4k_F)x - 2k_F a) : dx \\ &+ \frac{4E_{Z2}}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int : \cos(4\sqrt{K}\phi(x) + \\ &(G - 4k_F)x - 4k_F a) : dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The Bosonized Hamiltonians for homogeneous SQD can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H_2 &= H_0 + \frac{hE_{C0}}{\pi\alpha} \int dx \partial_x \phi(x) \\ &+ \frac{4E_{Z1}}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int : \cos(4\sqrt{K}\phi(x) \\ &- (G - 4k_F)x - 2k_F a) : dx \\ &+ \frac{4E_{Z2}}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \\ &\int : \cos(4\sqrt{K}\phi(x) + (G - 4k_F)x - 4k_F a) : dx \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \left( \frac{v}{2\pi} + \frac{8E_{C0}}{\pi^2} - \frac{2E_{J1}^2}{E_{C0}} \right) \\ &\int dx [ : (\partial_x \theta)^2 : + : (\partial_x \phi)^2 : ] \\ &+ (16E_{C0} - 4\frac{E_{J1}^2}{E_{C0}}) \\ &\int dx : (\partial_x \theta - \partial_x \phi)(\partial_x \theta + \partial_x \phi) : \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here,  $H_0$  is the non-interacting part of the model Hamiltonian,  $v$  is the velocity of low energy excitations, one of the Luttinger liquid parameter and the other is  $K$ . And  $G$  is the reciprocal lattice vector.

*Results and physical interpretation:* Here we study the relevant physics for single Cooper pair in alternate site for inhomogeneous and homogeneous SQD system (here  $k_F = \frac{\pi}{2}$  because the system is at half-filling). The effective Hamiltonian for the inhomogeneous SQD reduce

to

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1 = & H_0 + 2\frac{E_{J1}}{2\pi\alpha}\delta_1 \int dx : \cos(2\sqrt{K}\phi(x)) : \\
& + hE_{C0} \int (\partial_x \phi(x)) dx \\
& + 2\frac{hE_{C0}}{\pi\alpha}\delta_2 \int dx : \cos(2\sqrt{K}\phi(x)) : \\
& - \frac{4(E_{Z1} - E_{Z2})}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int dx : \cos(4\sqrt{K}\phi(x)) : .
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Our model Hamiltonian consists of three sine-Gordon couplings. The second term of the Hamiltonian arises due to fluctuations of Josephson coupling. It yields the gapped phase of the system. The anomalous scaling dimension of this term is  $2K$ . This phase is spontaneous, i.e., infinitesimal variation of NN Josephson coupling around sites is sufficient to produce this state. When  $E_c$  is larger than  $E_J$  the system is in the gapped phase due to the Coulomb blockade effect. If we consider the case when  $E_J$  is much smaller than  $E_C$  then one should naively think that the system is in the superconducting phase but the situation here is quite different due to the fluctuations of Josephson coupling, it produces the gap state in the system and blocks the superconducting phase of the system. We term this phase as Josephson decoupling phase because it is not yielding any superconducting phase due to the tunneling at different SQD; this phase is present even in the absence of Coulomb blockade. This gapped state prevails until the applied gate voltage is sufficient to break this gapped phase [18]. This prediction is absent in all previous studies of superconductivity [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 16, 19, 20, 21]. The third term of the Hamiltonian arises due to constant Coulomb charging energy; it promotes the system in different charge quantized state due to the variation of applied gate voltage. The fourth term of the Hamiltonian is due to the fluctuations of on-site Coulomb charging energy. It is like the staggered magnetization of the system. It's

anomalous scaling dimension is also  $2K$ . Therefore, the system is in the mixed gapped state when both terms are present. The fourth term arises due to the NN and NNN interactions; the anomalous scaling dimension of this term is  $4K$ . Therefore the physics of gapped state is mainly governed by the second and the fourth term of the Hamiltonian.

Effective Hamiltonian for homogeneous SQD array is

$$\begin{aligned}
H_2 = & H_0 - \frac{4(E_{Z1} - E_{Z2})}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int \cos(4\sqrt{K}\phi(x)) dx \\
& + \frac{hE_{C0}}{\pi\alpha} \int \partial_x \phi dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

When  $E_{Z2}$  exceed some critical value, the ground state of the system is dimerized and doubly degenerates. The dimerized ground state is the product of spin singlet of adjacent sites [22]. When  $E_{Z2}$  is less than a critical value the physics of the system is governed by the  $E_{Z1}$  and the gapped phase of the system is alike to spin-fluid phase of the system. In this model Hamiltonian, there is no relevant sine-Gordon coupling term present due to the variation of Josephson coupling. Therefore there is no JD phase for homogeneous SQD. We also study our model Hamiltonian for different densities (by varying  $k_F$ ) but we are unable to find JB phase for any other fillings for both inhomogeneous and homogeneous SQD array.

**Conclusions:** We have predicted the evidence for the Josephson decouple phase for inhomogeneous SQD only at half-fillings. This is the first prediction of Josephson decoupled phase in the literature for these type of system. There is no evidence of Josephson decouple phase for homogeneous SQD. We have also predicted the interesting behavior of the system due to the fluctuating on-site Coulomb charging energy. Our prediction of Josephson decoupling phase after the forty seven years of Josephson effect; we hope that evidence of this JD phase will be verified experimentally as the Josephson effect has verified experimentally after the theoretical prediction.

- 
- [1] B. D. Josephson, Phys. Lett. **1**, 251 (1962).  
[2] B. D. Josephson, Adv. Phys. **14**, 419 (1965).  
[3] P. G. de Gennes *Superconductivity in Metals and Alloys*, W. A. Benjamin, New York (1969).  
[4] J. Bardeen, L.N. Cooper and J. R. Schriffer, Phys. Rev. **106**, 162 (1957).  
[5] J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper and J. R. Schriffer, Phys. Rev. **108**, 1175 (1957).  
[6] L. N. Cooper, Phys. Rev. **104**, 1189 (1956).  
[7] S. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 014528 (2007).  
[8] P. W. Anderson, in Lectures on the Many-Body Problems, Volume 2 (Academic, New York, 1964).  
[9] B. Abeles, Phys. Rev. B **15**, (1977) 2828.  
[10] Y. Shapira and G. Deutscher, Phys. Rev. B **27**, (1983) 4463.  
[11] H. Jaeger, D. Haviland, B. Orr, A. Goldman, Phys. Rev. B **40** (1989), 182.  
[12] B. G. Orr, H. M. Jaeger, A. M. Goldman and C. G. Kuper, Phys. Rev. Lett **56**, (1986) 378.  
[13] S. Chakravarty *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 7256.  
[14] K. B. Efetov, Sov. Phys. JETP, (1980) 2017.  
[15] E. Simanek, Sol. State. Comm **31**, (1979) 419.  
[16] L. I. Glazman and A. I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3786 (1997).  
[17] T. Giamarchi in *Quantum Physics in One Dimension* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 2004).  
[18] Here we discuss the effect of gate voltage on homogeneous and non-homogeneous SQD and the charge quantization physics. From an energetic point of view, when a Cooper pair added to SQD, the new electrostatic energy with

added Cooper pair is smaller than the corresponding energy in the absence of Cooper pair

$$\frac{1}{2C}(|Q| - |2e|)^2 \leq \frac{Q^2}{2C} \Rightarrow Q \geq |2e|. \quad (9)$$

Therefore we need a bias  $|V| \geq \frac{2e}{2C}$  for current to flow. Hence Cooper pair transport is unfavorable when  $|V| \leq \frac{2e}{2C}$ , this is the Coulomb blocked phase for non-homogeneous and homogeneous SQD. When we added an extra Cooper pair to the SQD, we expect a spikes in conductance, i.e, the steps in correspondence to the biases that overcome charging energies with increasing number of Cooper pair. When one kept fixed the bias and gate voltage ( $V_g$ ) applied to SQD (with capacitance  $C_g$ ). The applied gate voltage will vary densities of Cooper pair in SQD. In presence of N Cooper pair in SQD, the electrostatic energy  $E_N = \frac{(2Ne)^2}{2e_g} - 2V_g N|e|$ . Adding of

extra Cooper pair is favorable when the above energy is minimized w.r.t number of Cooper pair, it implies  $|V_g| = \frac{|2e|}{C_g}(N + 1/2)$ . At these gate voltage the current has a discontinuity. Therefore we define the charge quantized state when the applied gate voltage is away from the optimum gate voltage point and also for  $|V| < \frac{2|e|}{2c}$ .

- [19] K. K. Likharev in *Dynamics of Josephson junction and circuits* (Gordon and Breach 1988).
- [20] K. K. Likharev, Y. Y. Naveh and D. Averin in *Physics of high  $J_c$  Josephson junction and prospects of their RSFQ VLSI application* IEEE Trans on Appl. Supercond **11**, 1056.
- [21] A. Barone and G. Paterno in *Dynamics of Josephson Junction and Circuits*, Gordon and Breach, Philadelphia.
- [22] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. B **25**, 4925 (1982), and ibid **26**, 5247 (1982).