

# Theory of the spin-galvanic effect and the anomalous phase-shift $\varphi_0$ in superconductors and Josephson junctions with intrinsic spin-orbit coupling

François Konschelle,<sup>1</sup> Ilya V. Tokatly,<sup>2,3</sup> and F. Sebastián Bergeret<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Centro de Física de Materiales (CFM-MPC), Centro Mixto CSIC-UPV/EHU, Manuel de Lardizabal 4, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*

<sup>2</sup>*Nano-Bio Spectroscopy group, Dpto. Física de Materiales, Universidad del País Vasco, Av. Tolosa 72, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*

<sup>3</sup>*IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, E-48011 Bilbao, Spain*

<sup>4</sup>*Donostia International Physics Center (DIPC), Manuel de Lardizabal 5, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*

(Dated: June 9, 2015)

Due to the spin-orbit coupling (SOC) an electric current flowing in a normal metal or semiconductor can induce a bulk magnetic moment. This effect is known as the Edelstein (EE) or magneto-electric effect. Similarly, in a bulk superconductor a phase gradient may create a finite spin density. The inverse effect, i.e. the creation of a supercurrent by an equilibrium spin polarization, may also exist in bulk superconductors. By exploiting the analogy between a linear-in-momentum SOC and a background SU(2) gauge field, we develop a SU(2) gauge-covariant formulation of the quasi-classic transport equations in order to deal with magneto-electric effects in superconductors. General expressions for the direct and inverse Edelstein effects are obtained, which are valid for arbitrary linear-in-momentum SOC and spin-splitting field. For Josephson junctions we find a direct connection between the inverse EE and the appearance of an anomalous phase-shift  $\varphi_0$  in the current-phase relation. In particular we show that this phase-shift is proportional to the equilibrium spin-current in the weak link. We also argue that our results are valid generically, beyond the particular case of linear-in-momentum SOC. Finally we propose experiments to verify our findings. The magneto-electric effects discussed in this study may find application in the emerging field of coherent spintronics with superconductors.

PACS numbers: 74.50.+r Tunneling phenomena; Josephson effects - 74.78.Na Mesoscopic and nanoscale systems - 85.25.Cp Josephson devices

Keywords: magneto-electric coupling ; Edelstein effect ;  $\varphi$ -Josephson junction ; anomalous current-phase relation ; spin-orbit ; spin-Hall ; magnetic texture ; transport equation ; gauge-covariant quasi-classic Green functions ;

## I. INTRODUCTION

The spin-orbit coupling (SOC) in semiconductors and normal metals is at the root of a number of interesting phenomena that originate from the coupling between the charge and spin degrees of freedom. Prototype of these phenomena is the spin Hall effect (SHE) [1–5] which consists in the creation of a spin polarized current by an electric field. Reciprocally, by means of the inverse SHE a spin current can create an electric field [6–8]. These effects allow to generate and detect spin polarized currents in non-magnetic materials [9–13], and are intensively studied because of their potential application in a novel direction of spintronics, which exploits the spin and charge currents coupling [14].

Another relevant effect in normal systems is related to the SOC. It consists in creating a stationary spin density  $S^a$ , along the  $a$ -direction in response to an electric field  $E_k$  applied in  $k$ -direction [15, 16]. Within linear response approximation this effect is described by

$$S^a(\omega) = \sigma_k^a(\omega) E_k(\omega), \quad (1.1)$$

where the sum over repeated indexes is implied here, and throughout this paper. In particular, in 2D systems with Rashba SOC, the applied electric field and the gener-

ated spin density are perpendicular to each other. This magneto-electric effect, sometimes called the *Edelstein effect* (EE), has been observed in experiments [17, 18]. The Edelstein conductivity  $\sigma_k^a(\omega)$  in Eq.(1.1) is related to the Kubo correlator  $\chi_k^a(\omega) = \left\langle \left\langle \hat{S}^a; \hat{j}_k \right\rangle \right\rangle_\omega$  of the spin and current operators,  $\sigma_k^a(\omega) = \chi_k^a(\omega) / i\omega$  [19]. Because of the gauge invariance in normal systems the function  $\chi_k^a(\omega)$  should vanish in the limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  (there is no response to a static vector potential), so the  $\sigma_k^a(0) = \sigma_k^a$  remains finite and describes the dc EE. It has been pointed out in Ref.[19] that this property, together with the Onsager reciprocity principle, implies that the inverse dc EE, also referred to as the spin-galvanic effect, consists in generating a charge current  $j_k$  by a steady spin polarization induced by a time-dependent magnetic field via the paramagnetic effect, *i.e.*

$$j_k = \sigma_k^a \left[ g\mu_B \dot{B}^a \right], \quad (1.2)$$

with the Landé  $g$ -factor,  $\mu_B$  the Bohr magneton, and  $\dot{B}^a$  the time derivative of the magnetic field along the  $a$ -axis. The inverse EE effect has also been observed in experiments [20, 21].

Similar magneto-electric and spin-galvanic effects should also exist in superconductors [22, 23]. However,

there the physical situation is different because in the presence of the superconducting condensate the gauge invariance does not forbid the existence of a finite static current-spin response function  $\chi_k^a$ . In contrast to the normal case, in a superconductor an equilibrium electric (super-)current can flow in the absence of an external electric field. The supercurrent  $\mathbf{j} = n_s \mathbf{v}_s$  (here  $n_s$  is the density of superconducting electrons and  $\mathbf{v}_s$  the velocity of the condensate) is proportional to the gradient of the macroscopic gauge-invariant phase  $\nabla \tilde{\varphi} = \nabla \varphi - e\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{v}_s$ , which is the physical field coupled to the current operator in the Hamiltonian of a superconductor. The existence of such a gauge-invariant field implies that the static response function  $\chi_k^a = \langle \langle \hat{S}^a; \hat{j}_k \rangle \rangle_{\omega=0}$  can be nonzero without violating the gauge invariance. In principle, a supercurrent flow can thus generate an equilibrium spin polarization according to the general linear response relation:

$$S^a = \chi_k^a \partial_k \tilde{\varphi}, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\partial_k = \partial/\partial x_k$ . This effect has been indeed demonstrated explicitly for a 2D superconductor with Rashba SOC by Edelstein, who calculated the proportionality tensor  $\chi_k^a$  at temperatures  $T$  close to the critical superconducting temperature  $T_c$ , in both pure ballistic [22] and diffusive [23] limits.

Because in the superconducting state the response function  $\chi_k^a$  at  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  is finite, the reciprocity of the EE effect becomes complete. In contrast to the normal case, in superconductors a static Zeeman field  $\mathbf{B}$  can induce a supercurrent  $j_k$ . Therefore, instead of Eq. (1.2) the following relation holds

$$j_k = e\chi_k^a h^a, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $h^a = g\mu_B B^a$ . An explicit expression of this type has been obtained in a particular case of a 2D ballistic superconductor with intrinsic Rashba SOC [24, 25].

It becomes clear from the equilibrium linear response relations, Eqs. (1.3-1.4), that the free energy of a superconductor with a SOC has a term of the Lifshitz-type

$$F_L = h^a \chi_k^a \partial_k \tilde{\varphi}. \quad (1.5)$$

Equations (1.3)-(1.4) then follow directly from the general thermodynamic definitions of the spin and current densities,  $\mathbf{S} = \delta F/\delta \mathbf{h}$  and  $\mathbf{j} = -\delta F/\delta \mathbf{A}$ .

In principle, equations (1.3) and (1.4) apply for bulk superconductors, but one can expect similar effects to occur also in a S-X-S Josephson junction, between two massive superconductors (S) and a normal or ferromagnetic bridge X with an intrinsic SOC.

In a Josephson junction the supercurrent depends on the phase difference  $\varphi$  between the superconducting electrodes. In the particular cases of a weak proximity effect or in the high-temperature regime ( $T \lesssim T_c$ ), the current phase relation is given by  $j = j_c \sin \varphi$ , where  $j_c$  is the critical Josephson current. The natural conjectures based

on Eqs. (1.3)-(1.4) are: (i) In accordance with Eq. (1.3), a supercurrent flowing in X may generate a spin polarization in the X bridge; (ii) In turn, from Eq. (1.4), a Zeeman (spin-splitting) field may induce a supercurrent through the junction, even if the phase difference between the electrodes vanishes.

In other words, the inverse EE is the cause of an anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  which modifies the current phase relation according to  $j = j_c \sin(\varphi + \varphi_0)$ , with a non-trivial (i.e., non equal to 0 or  $\pi$ ) equilibrium phase  $\varphi_0$ . This defines the so called  $\varphi_0$ -junctions, a subject that has been extensively studied in the past years in different systems, including conventional superconductors with SOC [26–38], with triplet correlations [39–43] or in contact with topological materials [44, 45], and also in hybrid systems with non-conventional superconductors [46–54], quantum dots [55–57], and hybrid ( $0 - \pi$ )-structures [58–61].  $\varphi_0$ -junctions may produce a self-sustained flux when embedded in a SQUID geometry [62], act as phase batteries in coherent circuits [63, 64], present a current asymmetry and act as a supercurrent rectifiers [55].

In the present work we develop a complete theory of the magneto-electric and spin-galvanic effects in hybrid superconducting structures and confirm the above conjectures. We focus on systems with linear in momentum SOC that can be conveniently described in terms of an effective background SU(2) gauge field. This allows us to use the SU(2) covariant quasi-classic equations for the Green's functions derived in Ref.[65–67]. We establish a connection between the tensor  $\chi_k^a$  in Eqs. (1.3-1.4) and the equilibrium spin-current  $\mathcal{J}_j^a$  [68, 69]. We show that in a generic S-X-S Josephson junction the condition for a nontrivial anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  to appear is that  $\mathcal{J}_j^a h^a \neq 0$ , where  $h^a$  can be either an external Zeeman field or the internal exchange field of a ferromagnet. Our SU(2) covariant formulation results in a simple and tractable system of equations to describe hybrid structures with arbitrary linear in momentum SOC, temperatures, degree of disorder, and quality of the hybrid interfaces. We also show that all qualitative physical results and most of the formal results in the diffusive limit are generically valid beyond the particular case of the linear in momentum SOC.

The structure of the paper is the following: In the next section we present a qualitative discussion of the superconducting proximity effect in structures with SOC and its connection with the spin diffusion in normal systems. This qualitative analysis allows us to guess the form of the quasi-classical equations for superconducting structures in the presence of generic spin fields and in particular to explicitly show the analogy between the charge-spin coupling in normal systems and the singlet-triplet coupling in superconducting ones. In section III we present our model, discuss the associated symmetries, and derive microscopically the quasi-classical equations for generic linear in momentum SOC. In section IV we used the derived equations to explore the magneto-electric effects in bulk superconductors. We generalize the previously

known results for the EE and its inverse obtained for 2D Rashba SOC [22–24, 70] to generic linear-in-momentum SOC, and relate them to the spin current and the SU(2) gauge-fields. In section V we explore the Josephson effect through a S-X-S diffusive junction and in section VI through a ballistic one. In both cases we show that the anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  is proportional to  $\mathcal{J}_i^a h^a$  and determine its dependence on other parameters of the structure, like temperature and length. We finally present our conclusions and discuss possible experimental setups to verify our predictions in Section VII.

## II. DIFFUSION OF SUPERCONDUCTING CONDENSATE IN THE PRESENCE OF SPIN-ORBIT COUPLING: HEURISTIC ARGUMENTS

Before developing the full quantum kinetic theory it is instructive to discuss at the qualitative level the main features of the proximity induced superconductivity in the presence of intrinsic SOC. For this sake we present a simple heuristic derivation of the equations describing the coupled motion of the singlet and triplet correlators induced in a normal metal from a bulk *s*-wave superconductor.

Let us consider a S-X-S junction, where X is a diffusive ferromagnet. We assume an equilibrium state and weak proximity effect in X. In such a case the system is fully described by the quasi-classical anomalous Green function  $\hat{f}(\mathbf{r})$ , which in general is a  $2 \times 2$  matrix in the spin space  $\hat{f} = f_s \hat{1} + f_t^a \sigma^a$ . Here the scalar  $f_s$  and the vector with components  $f_t^a$  describe the singlet and the triplet components of the condensate, respectively. In this section we show, that the functions  $f_s(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{f}_t(\mathbf{r})$  are reminiscent of the charge and spin density in the normal systems.

In the absence of SOC, but in the presence of the exchange field  $\mathbf{h}$  the diffusion of the condensate is described by the well known linearized Usadel equations (see e.g. Ref. [71]),

$$D\nabla^2 f_s - 2|\omega_n| f_s + 2\mathbf{i} \operatorname{sgn}(\omega_n) h^a f_t^a = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

$$D\nabla^2 f_t^a - 2|\omega_n| f_t^a + 2\mathbf{i} \operatorname{sgn}(\omega_n) h^a f_s = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $D$  is the diffusion constant, and  $\omega_n$  is the Matsubara frequency. The terms  $\sim 2|\omega_n|$  are responsible for the decay of the superconducting correlations in the normal metal. The last terms in the left hand sides of Eqs. (2.1)-(2.2) describe the usual singlet-triplet coupling coming from the exchange field. It is worth emphasizing the presence of imaginary unit  $\mathbf{i}$  in the exchange field terms, which reflects the breaking of the time reversal symmetry. Because of this, the singlet-triplet conversion due to the exchange field is always accompanied with the phase shift of  $\pi/2$ . This point will be of primary importance in the following for understanding the origin of the anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$ .

To understand how the Usadel equations (2.1)-(2.2) is modified in the presence of SOC we recall the description of spin  $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})$  and charge  $n(\mathbf{r})$  densities diffusion in normal systems. The general spin diffusion equation in a normal conductor with SOC takes the form,

$$\partial_t S^a - D\nabla^2 S^a = \mathcal{T}^a, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}^a$  is a so called spin torque. In the absence of SOC  $\mathcal{T}^a = 0$  and hence spin is a conserved quantity which satisfies the usual diffusion equation. In non-centrosymmetric materials SOC acts as an effective momentum-dependent Zeeman field that causes precession of spins of *moving* electrons. This precession breaks conservation of the average spin, and shows up formally as a finite torque  $\mathcal{T}^a \neq 0$  in Eq. (2.3). In the diffusive regime the motion of the electrons consists of a random motion superimposed on an average drift caused by the density gradients. The spin precession related to these types of motion generate the corresponding contributions to the spin torque. To the lowest order in gradients the general expression for the torque can be written as follows [72–74],

$$\mathcal{T}^a = D [-\Gamma^{ab} S^b + 2P_k^{ab} \partial_k S^b + C_k^a \partial_k n]. \quad (2.4)$$

Here the first term describes the Dyakonov-Perel (DP) spin relaxation that originates from the spin precession of randomly moving electrons [1]. The positive definite matrix  $\Gamma^{ab}$  is the DP relaxation tensor with the eigenvalues equal to the inverse squares of the DP spin relaxation lengths. The other two contributions to the torque are related to the average motion of spins. In particular, the second term in the left hand side of Eq. (2.4) originates from the diffusive motion of spins caused by inhomogeneities of the spin density distribution. The corresponding spin precession is described by antisymmetric (spin rotation) matrices  $P_k^{ab} = -P_k^{ba}$  with  $\|\hat{P}\| \sim 1/\ell_{\text{so}}$ , where  $\ell_{\text{so}}$  is the spin precession length.

The last term in Eq. (2.4), which is proportional to the charge density gradient, can be called the spin-Hall torque. The charge density gradient generates the charge current which is then transformed to the spin current via the spin Hall effect. Precession of the spins driven by the charge density gradient, via the spin Hall effect, is the origin of the spin-Hall torque in Eq. (2.4). The spin-Hall torque is parameterized by the tensor  $C_k^a$  which is proportional to  $\theta_{\text{SH}}/\ell_{\text{so}}$ , where  $\theta_{\text{SH}}$  is the spin Hall angle – the conversion coefficient between the charge and the spin currents.

Equation (2.3) with the spin torque of Eq. (2.4) is commonly used in spintronics context to describe spin dynamics in semiconductors with intrinsic SOC [72–74]. In the stationary case the diffusion equations for the spin and charge densities reduce to

$$\nabla^2 n + C_k^a \partial_k S^a = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\nabla^2 S^a - \Gamma^{ab} S^b + 2P_k^{ab} \partial_k S^b + C_k^a \partial_k n = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

It is important to emphasize here that spin-charge coupling mediated by the spin-Hall torque ( $C_k^a$ ) is responsible for the EE. This can be seen directly from Eq. (2.6): A uniform charge density gradient produces a uniform spin density  $S^a = (\hat{\Gamma}^{-1})^{ab} C_k^b \partial_k n$ .

We can now construct the Usadel equations in the presence of SOC in analogy to the normal case. Since SOC does not violate the time reversal symmetry it acts in exactly the same way on the time-reversal conjugated states composing the Cooper pair. Therefore the diffusion of the singlet and the triplet condensates should be modified by SOC in complete analogy with the diffusion of the charge and spin densities in normal systems. The formal connection between the diffusion of the triplet condensate function  $f_t^a$  in superconductors and the spin density  $S^a$  in normal metals has been discussed recently in Ref. [66], and it has been also noticed in Ref. [29]. Hence, in order to include the effects of SOC in the Usadel equations all we need to do is to replace the diffusion operators (the Laplacians) in Eqs. (2.1) and (2.2) with the diffusion operators entering Eqs. (2.5) and (2.6), respectively. The result is the following system of equations describing a coupled diffusion of the singlet and triplet condensates in the presence of SOC,

$$\nabla^2 f_s - \kappa_\omega^2 f_s + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \left[ \mathbf{i} \frac{2h^a}{D} f_t^a + C_k^a \partial_k f_t^a \right] = 0 \quad (2.7)$$

$$\nabla^2 f_t^a - (\kappa_\omega^2 \delta^{ab} + \Gamma^{ab}) f_t^b + 2P_k^{ab} \partial_k f_t^b + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \left[ \mathbf{i} \frac{2h^a}{D} f_s + C_k^a \partial_k f_s \right] = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

In contrast to the normal case, in addition to the DP relaxation, both the  $f_s$  and  $f_t$  experience an additional decay proportional to the inverse decay length  $\kappa_\omega = \sqrt{2|\omega_n|/D}$ , due to the finite lifetime of the superconducting condensate in the normal metal.

The most important novel feature of Eqs. (2.7)-(2.8) is the presence of two mechanisms for the singlet-triplet coupling which are described by the two terms in the square brackets. The first mechanism is the above discussed Zeeman coupling related to the modification of the internal structure of the Cooper pair by the spin-splitting field  $\mathbf{h}$  [see Eqs. (2.1)-(2.2)]. The second channel of singlet-triplet coupling comes from the spin torque, which converts the gradient of  $f_s$  into  $f_t$  and vice versa, in a complete analogy with the EE in normal systems. The corresponding singlet-triplet ‘‘conversion amplitudes’’ have a relative phase shift of  $\pi/2$ , which is related to the different transformation properties of the Zeeman and spin-orbit fields with respect to the time reversal. Because of this phase shift one expects nontrivial interference effects. We will see in the next sections that the interference of these two singlet-triplet conversion channels is indeed responsible for the magneto-electric/spin-galvanic effects in superconductors, and, in particular, for the appearance of the intrinsic anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  in Josephson junctions.

Although the present heuristic derivation of Eqs. (2.7)-(2.8) may seem imprecise, it uncovers a simple, but deep

connection between the physics of inhomogeneous superconductors with SOC and the well known spintronics effects, such as the spin Hall effects and direct and inverse magneto-electric effects (EE). In Sec. III we present a rigorous derivation of the quasi-classical kinetic equations for superconductors with a linear in momentum SOC, which in the diffusive limit confirms the correctness of Eqs. (2.7)-(2.8). In the rest of the article we study in detail the physical consequences of the interference of the two singlet-triplet conversion channels and their connection with the theory of  $\varphi_0$ -Josephson junctions.

### III. THE MODEL AND BASIC EQUATIONS

In this section we introduce our model and discuss the symmetries associated with superconducting systems in the presence of spin-orbit coupling (SOC). We also present the derivation of the quasi-classical equations in the presence of linear in momentum SOC.

#### A. The Hamiltonian in the presence of generic SOC and symmetry arguments for the appearance of an anomalous phase

Our starting point is a general Hamiltonian describing a metal or a semiconductor with a linear in momentum SOC, an exchange field and superconducting correlations

$$H = \int dx \left[ \Psi^\dagger H_0 \Psi + \frac{V(x)}{2} (\bar{\Psi} \Psi)^\dagger (\bar{\Psi} \Psi) \right] \quad (3.1)$$

$$H_0 = \frac{(\hat{p}_i - \mathcal{A}_i)^2}{2m} - \mu + \mathcal{A}_0 + V_{\text{imp}} \quad (3.2)$$

with  $\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger (\mathbf{i}\sigma_2)$  and  $\Psi^t = (\Psi_\uparrow \Psi_\downarrow)$  a spinor of fermionic annihilation operators,  $\sigma_a$  the Pauli matrices acting in spin algebra,  $\mu$  the chemical potential,  $V(x)$  the strength of the two-body interaction, giving rise to superconductivity in some regions of space and  $V_{\text{imp}}$  the potential induced by non-magnetic impurities. Lower indices ( $i, j, k, \dots$ ) describe space variables, while upper indices ( $a, b, \dots$ ) will describe spin variables. In (3.2) the magnetic interactions appear in two places: as a SU(2) scalar potential  $\mathcal{A}_0 \equiv \mathcal{A}_0^a \sigma^a / 2$ , describing for example the intrinsic exchange field in a ferromagnet or a Zeeman field in a normal metal, and as a SU(2) vector potential  $\mathcal{A}_i \equiv \mathcal{A}_i^a \sigma^a / 2$ , describing the SOC. The latter is associated to the momentum operator  $\hat{p}_i = -i\partial_i$  in the form of a minimal coupling  $\hat{p}_i - \mathcal{A}_i$ . In practice, all the linear-in-momentum SOC can be represented as a gauge potential (see *e.g.* [75] or [76] and references therein). In the widely studied case of a free electron gas with Rashba SOC,  $\mathcal{A}_x^y = -\mathcal{A}_y^x = -\alpha$ , while in the presence of Dresselhaus SOC  $\mathcal{A}_x^x = -\mathcal{A}_y^y = \beta$ .

In analogy to electrodynamics one can define the four-potential  $\mathcal{A}_\mu$ . In such a case the SOC coupling enters



as the space sector ( $\mu = 1, 2, 3$  or  $\mu = x, y, z$ ) and the Zeeman field as the time sector ( $\mu = 0$ ). Following the analogy one can define the strength tensor

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}^a\sigma^a = \partial_\mu\mathcal{A}_\nu - \partial_\nu\mathcal{A}_\mu - \mathbf{i}[\mathcal{A}_\mu, \mathcal{A}_\nu], \quad (3.3)$$

and the electric and magnetic SU(2) fields

$$\mathcal{E}_k^a = \mathcal{F}_{0k}^a \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_i^a = \varepsilon_{ijk}\mathcal{F}_{jk}^a, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{ijk}$  is the Levi-Civita symbol.

In normal metals and semiconductors, the SHE and EE are consequences of the existence of a finite SU(2) magnetic field. For a pure-gauge vector potential the SOC can be gauged out [66], the SU(2) magnetic field is zero, and hence the SHE and EE do not appear [77]. Following our analogy, in the superconducting case an anomalous phase can only appear if the SU(2) magnetic field is finite. This explains why S-F-S junction without SOC do not present any magneto-electric effect, or equivalently, non anomalous phase. As it is well known, the ground state of S-F-S junctions corresponds to a phase difference either equal to 0 or to  $\pi$  [71, 78, 79].

Let us now provide a simple way to describe this effect from symmetry arguments. Let us consider a ballistic superconductor at  $T$  close to its critical temperature  $T_c$  and focus on the Ginzburg-Landau free energy. In such an expansion, a SOC is responsible for the presence of a first-order derivative of the order-parameter, the so-called Lifshitz invariant. Most of the original phenomenology in non-centrosymmetric superconductors originate from the Lifshitz invariant, see [25]. Assuming that its amplitude is constant but its phase position-dependent, the Lifshitz invariant reads  $F_L \propto T_i \nabla_i \varphi$  where  $T_i$  is a vector which has to be odd with respect to the time-reversal operation, and SU(2) invariant. As discussed in Ref. [35], to the lowest order in SOC the Lifshitz invariant for a superconductor can be expressed in terms of the SU(2) fields:

$$F_L \propto \text{Tr} \{ \mathcal{F}_{0j} \mathcal{F}_{ji} \} \partial_i \varphi = (\mathcal{E}^a \times \mathcal{B}^a) \cdot \nabla \varphi. \quad (3.5)$$

If we focus on the static case, the electric field is given by  $\mathcal{F}_{0j} = -\partial_j \mathcal{A}_0$ . Moreover we define the equilibrium spin current [69] in terms of the SU(2) magnetic field as  $\mathcal{J}_j = \tilde{\nabla}_i \mathcal{F}_{ij} = \partial \mathcal{F}_{ij} / \partial x_i - \mathbf{i}[\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{F}_{ij}]$ . If  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is spatially homogenous, for example induced by an external magnetic field, Eq. (3.5) reads [35]

$$F_L \propto \mathcal{A}_0^a \mathcal{J}_i^a \nabla_i \varphi. \quad (3.6)$$

This Lifshitz invariant agrees with the ones derived from microscopic considerations [80] or quasi-classic expansions [81] for a particular sort of SOC.

Eq. (3.6) confirms our guessed Eq. (1.5) and demonstrates that the Edelstein response tensor  $\chi_k^a$  behaves like the spin current tensor  $\mathcal{J}_i^a$ . Moreover, the form of  $F_L$  in Eq. (3.6) in terms of the equilibrium spin current, suggests that our results remain valid for any momentum

dependence of the SOC. We now proceed to derive the quasi-classical equations and provide a microscopic description of the magneto-electric effects in superconductors.

## B. The quasi-classical equations in the presence of SOC

In order to describe the transport properties of hybrid structures containing superconducting, normal (N) and/or ferromagnetic (F) layers with interfaces, arbitrary temperature and degree of disorder we have to go beyond the Ginzburg-Landau limit. We present here the quasi-classical equations [82–85] for the Green's functions in the presence of a non-Abelian gauge-field [65–67].

The basic transport equation derived from Hamiltonian (3.1) for the Wigner-transformed covariant Green functions  $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})$  in the time-independent limit reads [66]:

$$\frac{p_i}{m} \tilde{\nabla}_i \tilde{G} + \left[ \tau_3 (\omega_n - \mathbf{i}A_0) - \mathbf{i}\tilde{\Delta} + \frac{\langle \tilde{g} \rangle}{2\tau}, \tilde{G} \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \tau_3 \mathcal{F}_{0j} + v_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \frac{\partial \tilde{G}}{\partial p_j} \right\} = 0 \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\omega_n = 2k_B T \pi (n + 1/2)$  is the fermionic Matsubara frequency,  $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\varphi} \\ -e^{-i\varphi} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  is the ( $s$ -wave) gap parameter of amplitude  $\Delta$  and phase  $\varphi$ . The scattering at impurities is described within the Born approximation, where  $\tau$  is the elastic scattering time,  $\langle \tilde{g} \rangle$  is the GF matrix integrated over the quasiparticle energy, and  $\langle \dots \rangle$  describes the average over the Fermi momentum direction.

After integration of (3.7) over the quasiparticle energy and by using the fact that  $\tilde{G}$  is peaked at the Fermi level one obtains the generalized Eilenberger equation [35, 66]:

$$v_f \left( n_i \tilde{\nabla}_i \right) \tilde{g} + \left[ \tau_3 (\omega_n - \mathbf{i}A_0) - \mathbf{i}\tilde{\Delta}, \tilde{g} \right] - \frac{1}{2m} \left\{ n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \frac{\partial \tilde{g}}{\partial n_j} \right\} = -\frac{1}{2\tau} [\langle \tilde{g} \rangle, \tilde{g}] \quad (3.8)$$

where  $n_i$ ,  $i = x, y, z$  are the components of the Fermi velocity vector. When deriving (3.8) we have neglected corrections to the exchange term  $\mathcal{A}_0$  of the order of  $|\mathcal{A}_j|/p_F \ll 1$ . In fact, one sees from (3.7) that  $\{ \tau_3 \mathcal{F}_{0j}, \partial \tilde{G} / \partial p_j \}$  scales like  $\{ \mathcal{A}_j \partial / \partial p_j, -\mathbf{i} [\tau_3 \mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{G}] \}$  since  $\mathcal{F}_{0j} = -\mathbf{i} [\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_j]$ , and so it renormalizes the term  $-\mathbf{i} [\tau_3 \mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{G}]$  already present in (3.7). The correction to  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is of the order  $\mathcal{A}_j/p_F \ll 1$  and we neglect them from now on. In the Nambu space  $\tilde{g}$  reads

$$\tilde{g} = \begin{pmatrix} g & f \\ -\bar{f} & -\bar{g} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

where the blocks  $g$ ,  $f$  and their time-reversal conjugate  $\bar{g}$  and  $\bar{f}$  are matrices in the spin space. The function  $f$  is

the anomalous GF which describes the superconducting correlations.

From the knowledge of  $\check{g}$  one can calculate the charge current (density)

$$\mathbf{j} = -\frac{\mathbf{i}\pi e N_0 T}{2} \sum_{\omega_n} \text{Tr} \langle \mathbf{v}_F \tau_3 \check{g} \rangle \quad (3.10)$$

with  $e$  the electron charge and  $N_0$  the normal density of states for each spin. Whereas the spin polarization is given by

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mathbf{i}\pi N_0 T}{2} \sum_{\omega_n} \text{Tr} \langle \tau_3 \boldsymbol{\sigma} \check{g} \rangle \quad (3.11)$$

### C. Linearized quasi-classical equations in diffusive and pure-ballistic limits

In the present work we mainly consider two limiting cases: the pure ballistic one in which  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$  and the diffusive limit where  $\tau$  is a small parameter. The transport equation in the ballistic limit is directly obtained from (3.8) when neglecting the right-hand side. The diffusive limit is a bit more puzzling. Because of the anti-commutator in the l.h.s of Eq. (3.8), the normalization condition  $\check{g}^2 = 1$  does not hold directly and therefore the usual derivation of the Usadel equations cannot be carried out [86]. There is, however, a way out of this puzzle if one assumes that the amplitude of the anomalous GF's,  $f$  in (3.9) is small. Then the matrix GF (3.9) can be written as  $\check{g} \approx \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \tau_3 + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & f \\ -\bar{f} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and the linearized Eilenberger equation becomes an equation for  $f$

$$\begin{aligned} & (v_F n_i \tilde{\nabla}_i + 2\omega_n) f - \{\mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_0, f\} + 2\mathbf{i}\Delta \text{sgn}(\omega_n) + \\ & - \frac{1}{2m} \left\{ n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial n_j} \right\} = -\frac{\text{sgn}(\omega_n)}{\tau} (f - \langle f \rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

This linearization procedure is justified in two cases: either for temperatures close to the critical temperature  $T_c$  where the amplitude of the order parameter  $\Delta$  is small, or in S-X structures where the proximity effect is weak due to a finite interface resistance for arbitrary temperature.

In the diffusive limit one can expand  $f \approx f_0 + n_k f_k + \dots$ , in angular harmonics where  $\langle f \rangle = f_0 \gg f_k$ . We first average (3.12) over the angles in the momentum space:

$$\frac{v_F}{\text{dim}} \tilde{\nabla}_k f_k + \{\omega_n - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_0, f_0\} = -2\mathbf{i}\Delta \text{sgn}(\omega_n), \quad (3.13)$$

where  $\text{dim} = 1, 2, 3$  is the dimension of the system. Next we multiply Eq.(3.12) by  $n_k$  and average over the momentum direction to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_F \tilde{\nabla}_k f_0 + \{\omega_n - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_0, f_k\} - \frac{1}{2m} \{\mathcal{F}_{kj}, f_j\} = \\ - \frac{\text{sgn}(\omega_n)}{\tau} f_k. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Eqs. (3.13) and (3.14) constitute a closed set of coupled differential equations for  $f_0$  and  $f_k$ . In particular from Eq. (3.14) we can write  $f_k$  in terms of  $f_0$  up to terms of second order in  $\tau$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f_k \approx -\tau \text{sgn}(\omega_n) v_F \tilde{\nabla}_k f_0 - \tau^2 \frac{v_F}{2m} \{\mathcal{F}_{kj}, \tilde{\nabla}_j f_0\} \\ + \tau^2 v_F \{\omega_n - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{\nabla}_k f_0\} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Note that the Usadel equation was obtained in several works in the absence of gauge-fields, where one skipped the terms of the order  $\tau^2$ . We keep here these terms to describe magneto-electric effects [29, 35, 87].

The equations can be further simplified by noticing that the anti-commutator in the second line of Eq. (3.15) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \{\omega_n - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{\nabla}_k f_0\} = \tilde{\nabla}_k \{\omega_n - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_0, f_0\} \\ + \mathbf{i} \left\{ \tilde{\nabla}_k \mathcal{A}_0, f_0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

In virtue of (3.13), the first term in the right-hand-side of the last equation is in fact of order  $\tau$  and so this term in (3.15) is of order  $\tau^3$  and can be neglected. The second term reads  $\tilde{\nabla}_k \mathcal{A}_0 = -\mathbf{i}[\mathcal{A}_k, \mathcal{A}_0] = \mathcal{F}_{k0}$  for space-independent gauge-potential. This electric field renormalizes the paramagnetic effects  $\mathcal{A}_0$ , and is neglected in the following. Finally, we replace (3.15) into (3.13) to obtain the Usadel equation for  $f_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} -\text{sgn}(\omega_n) D \tilde{\nabla}^2 f_0 + \{\omega_n - \mathbf{i}\mathcal{A}_0, f_0\} \\ - \frac{\tau D}{2m} \left\{ \tilde{\nabla}_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \tilde{\nabla}_j f_0 \right\} = -2\mathbf{i}\Delta \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

with  $D = v_F^2 \tau / \text{dim}$  the diffusion constant. This equation is supplemented by the generalized Kupriyanov-Lukichev boundary condition [88]

$$\mathcal{N}_i \left[ \tilde{\nabla}_i f_0 + \frac{\tau \text{sgn}(\omega_n)}{2m} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \tilde{\nabla}_j f_0 \right\} \right]_{x_0} = -\gamma f_{\text{BCS}} \quad (3.18)$$

at an interface located at position  $x_0$  between a bulk superconductor described by the anomalous GF  $f_{\text{BCS}}$  and the X bridge. The interface is characterized by the transparency  $\gamma$  and normal vector of component  $\mathcal{N}_i$ . For a fully transparent interface, we impose the continuity of the GFs at the interface.

We now need to write the current and spin density in terms of the isotropic anomalous GFs. It is easy to verify, by checking its conservation, that in the linearized case the electric currents Eq. (3.10) is given by:

$$\mathbf{j} = \frac{\mathbf{i}\pi e N_0 T}{2} \sum_{\omega_n} \text{Tr} \langle \mathbf{v}_F f \bar{f} \rangle \text{sgn} \omega_n. \quad (3.19)$$

And correspondingly in the diffusive limit

$$j_i = \mathbf{i}\pi e N_0 D T \sum_{\omega_n} \text{Tr} \left\{ f_0 \tilde{\nabla}_i \bar{f}_0 - \bar{f}_0 \tilde{\nabla}_i f_0 + \frac{\tau \text{sgn}(\omega_n)}{2m} \left( f_0 \left\{ \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \tilde{\nabla}_j \bar{f}_0 \right\} + \bar{f}_0 \left\{ \mathcal{F}_{ij}, \tilde{\nabla}_j f_0 \right\} \right) \right\}. \quad (3.20)$$

The spin polarization (3.11) is more subtle to deal with in the linearized approximation, since the normalization condition do not apply in our case. In correspondence for the case without SOC, one may assume that it can be expressed in terms of the isotropic anomalous  $f$  as:

$$S^a = \mathbf{i}\pi N_0 T \sum_{\omega_n} \text{Tr} \langle \sigma^a f \bar{f} \rangle \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \quad (3.21)$$

with  $\langle \sigma^a f \bar{f} \rangle = \sigma^a f_0 \bar{f}_0$  in the diffusive limit. In the next section we will show a posteriori that these expressions leads to the known results in bulk systems in the presence of Rashba SOC.

For the following discussions it is convenient to write the anomalous GF  $f$  as the sum of singlet (scalar) and triplet (vector in spin space)  $f = f_s + f_t^a \sigma^a$ , and to expand all the spin variables in term of Pauli matrices:  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \mathcal{F}_{ij}^a \sigma^a / 2$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_\mu = \mathcal{A}_\mu^a \sigma^a / 2$ . From Eqs. (3.12) we obtain the equations for the singlet and triplet components in the ballistic case:

$$(v_F n_i \partial_i + 2\omega_n) f_s = -2\mathbf{i} \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \Delta + \left( \mathbf{i} \mathcal{A}_0^a + \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}^a}{2m} \frac{\partial}{\partial n_j} \right) f_t^a \quad (3.22)$$

$$v_F n_i \left( \tilde{\nabla}_i f_t \right)^a + 2\omega_n f_t^a = \left( \mathbf{i} \mathcal{A}_0^a + \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}^a}{2m} \frac{\partial}{\partial n_j} \right) f_s. \quad (3.23)$$

Equivalently, from Eq. (3.17) one obtains the equations for the singlet and triplet components in the diffusive case:

$$(\partial_i^2 - \kappa_\omega^2) f_s - 2\mathbf{i} \frac{\Delta}{D} + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \left[ \mathbf{i} \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^a}{D} + \frac{\tau}{2m} (\mathcal{J}_i \partial_i)^a \right] f_t^a = 0 \quad (3.24)$$

$$\left( \tilde{\nabla}_i \tilde{\nabla}_i f_t \right)^a - \kappa_\omega^2 f_t^a + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \left( \mathbf{i} \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^a}{D} + \frac{\tau}{2m} \mathcal{J}_i^a \partial_i \right) f_s = 0 \quad (3.25)$$

We write the covariant derivative as  $\tilde{\nabla}_i = \partial_i - \mathbf{i}[\mathcal{A}_i, \cdot] \equiv \partial_i + \hat{P}_i$ , where  $\hat{P}_i$  is a tensor dual to  $\mathcal{A}_i$  with components  $P_i^{ab} = \varepsilon^{abc} \mathcal{A}_i^c$ . Thus,  $\tilde{\nabla}_i \tilde{\nabla}_i = \partial_i^2 + 2\hat{P}_i \partial_i - \hat{\Gamma}$ , where  $\hat{P}_i \hat{P}_i = -\hat{\Gamma}$ . By noticing that  $(\tau/2m) \mathcal{J}_k^a = C_k^a$ , it is easy to verify that the diffusive equations Eqs. (3.24-3.25) are

identically to those derived in section II from heuristic arguments [Eqs.(2.7-2.8)]. One should emphasize though that while Eqs. (3.24-3.25) are derived for the particular case of linear in momentum SOC, Eqs.(2.7-2.8) suggest that the form of the diffusion equations remain the same for arbitrary momentum dependence.

In particular the form of Eq. (3.25) proves the full analogy between singlet-triplet and charge-spin coupling in diffusive systems. [*cf.* Eqs. (2.5-2.6)]. In Ref. [66], the analogy between the diffusion of spin in normal systems and the triplet components was discussed. Here we can extend this result and find that the tensor  $C_k^a$ , responsible for the SHE in normal systems, is an additional source for the singlet-triplet conversion and, as we will see in the next sections, is at the root of magneto-electric effects and the appearance of the anomalous phase in superconducting systems with intrinsic SOC in a spin-splitting field. Equations (3.22 -3.23) and (3.24-3.25) are the central equations of this work, which we now solve for different situations. In section VIB we go beyond the linearised approximation.

#### IV. THE EDELSTEIN EFFECT IN BULK SUPERCONDUCTORS FOR $T \rightarrow T_c$

In order to illustrate the usefulness of the SU(2) covariant quasi-classical equations presented above, we study here the magneto-electric effect and its inverse in bulk superconductors with an intrinsic SOC linear in momentum and derive the response coefficients in (1.3) and (1.4).

We assume that the superconducting order parameter  $\Delta$  is constant in magnitude but has a spatially dependent phase  $\Delta(\mathbf{r}) = |\Delta| e^{i\varphi(\mathbf{r})}$ , where  $\nabla\varphi$  is assumed to be a constant vector.

Let us first consider a diffusive superconductor. From (3.24) in the lowest order of  $\nabla\varphi$  one obtains

$$f_s \approx -\mathbf{i} \frac{|\Delta|}{|\omega_n|} e^{i\varphi}. \quad (4.1)$$

and hence one can easily obtain the lowest order correction to the triplet component from (3.25) :

$$f_t^a = \frac{|\Delta|}{|\omega_n|} \frac{\tau}{2m} \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \left( \hat{\Gamma} + \kappa_\omega^2 \right)^{-1} \Big|^{ab} \mathcal{J}_j^b \partial_j \varphi. \quad (4.2)$$

From Eq. (3.21) it becomes clear that the spin density is determined by the product of the singlet (4.1) and triplet (4.2) components which results in  $S^a = \chi_i^a \partial_i \varphi$  with

$$\chi_i^a = 4\pi N_0 \frac{\tau}{2m} T \sum_{\omega_n > 0} \frac{\Delta^2}{\omega_n^2} \left( \kappa_\omega^2 + \hat{\Gamma} \right)^{-1} \Big|^{ab} \mathcal{J}_i^b \quad (4.3)$$

This is the Edelstein result generalized for arbitrary linear in momentum SOC.

With the help of Eqs. (3.24-3.25) we can also obtain the inverse of EE, the so-called spin-galvanic effect. We

now assume a finite and spatially homogenous  $\mathcal{A}_0^a$  and a zero phase gradient. In such a case one can obtain  $f_t$  directly from Eq. (3.25), which is now proportional to  $\mathcal{A}_0^a$ . By substitution of this result into the expression for the current, Eq. (3.20), and by noticing that only the second line contributes to the current we obtain  $j_i = e\chi_i^a \mathcal{A}_0^a$ , with  $\chi_i^a$  given by Eq. (4.3) in agreement with Onsager reciprocity.

In short, we are able to derive in a few lines the tensor (4.3), which describes the EE and inverse EE. Moreover, the expression (4.3) is valid for arbitrary linear in momentum spin-orbit effect and generalizes the result obtained in Ref. [23] for the particular case of a Rashba SOC. If one assumes the same here, *i.e.*  $\mathcal{A}_x^y = -\alpha = -\mathcal{A}_y^x$  and all the other components equal to zero, one obtains from Eq. (4.3)

$$\chi_i^a = (\delta_{ix}^{ay} - \delta_{iy}^{ax}) 4\pi N_0 \frac{D\tau}{2m} T \sum_{\omega_n > 0} \frac{\Delta^2}{\omega_n^2} \frac{\alpha^3}{2|\omega_n| + D\alpha^2} \quad (4.4)$$

that coincides with the expression obtained in Ref. [23] after a lengthy calculation.

If we neglect in Eq. (4.2) the Dyakonov-Perel relaxation, then the triplet component is simply proportional to  $f_t^a \sim \mathcal{A}_0^a(\mathbf{r})$ . By substituting this into the expression for the current Eq. (3.20) one can easily show that

$$j_i = 4e\pi N_0 \frac{\tau}{2m} T \sum_{\omega_n > 0} \frac{\Delta^2}{\omega_n^2 \kappa_\omega^2} \mathcal{F}_{0j}^a \mathcal{F}_{ji}^a. \quad (4.5)$$

This expression suggests that a spatially inhomogenous magnetization together with SOC may also induce a finite supercurrent. In this case the spin-galvanic effect scales with the square of the SOC parameter, in contrast to the  $\alpha^3$  dependency found previously for spatially uniform magnetization.

The same effects can be explored in the pure ballistic limit, for which Eqs. (3.22-3.23) apply. The singlet component in the lowest order in the SOC is given by

$$f_s \approx -\mathbf{i} \frac{\Delta}{|\omega_n|} \left( 1 - \mathbf{i} \frac{v_F n_i}{2\omega_n} \partial_i \varphi \right) \quad (4.6)$$

whereas the triplet component can be obtained easily from Eq. (3.23)

$$f_t^a = -\frac{\Delta v_F}{2|\omega|\omega} \left( v_F n_i \hat{P}_i + 2\omega_n \right)^{-1} \Big|^{ab} \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}^b}{2m} \partial_j \varphi \quad (4.7)$$

By using Eq. (3.21) we obtain the Edelstein result  $S^a = \chi_j^a \partial_j \varphi$  but now for an arbitrary linear in momentum SOC

$$\chi_i^a = -2\pi \frac{N_0 v_F}{2m} T \times \sum_{\omega_n > 0} \frac{\Delta^2}{|\omega_n|^3} \left\langle \left( v_F n_i \hat{P}_i + 2\omega_n \right)^{-1} \Big|^{ab} n_j \mathcal{F}_{ji}^b \right\rangle \quad (4.8)$$

In the particular case of a 2D systems with Rashba SOC we recover the Edelstein result for a ballistic superconductor [22]:

$$\chi_i^a = \frac{\pi N_0 \Delta^2}{4v_F m} T \sum_{\omega_n > 0} \frac{(v_F \alpha)^3}{|\omega_n|^3 \left[ (2\omega_n)^2 + (v_F \alpha)^2 \right]} (\delta_{ix}^{ay} - \delta_{iy}^{ax}). \quad (4.9)$$

The agreement between our and Edelstein results proves the validity of the expression (3.21) in the linearised approximation.

To conclude this section we note that for Rashba SOC in both cases, diffusive (4.4) and ballistic (4.9),  $\chi_i^a$  is proportional to  $\alpha$  in the strong SOC limit (see also [81]), and to  $\alpha^3$  for weak spin-orbit interaction (see also [35]). So, nonetheless the quasi-classic formalism is able to recover in an elegant way some well established results obtained after cumbersome diagrammatics [22, 23], but it also allows some easy generalisations of them and it seems to be insensitive to the strength of the SOC.

## V. MAGNETO-ELECTRIC EFFECTS IN DIFFUSIVE JOSEPHSON JUNCTIONS

We now turn to the central topic of the present work which is the description of magneto-electric effects in S-X-S Josephson junctions and demonstrate their connection with the anomalous phase problem. We first consider the diffusive limit and postpone the discussion of ballistic junctions for the next section.

In particular we consider a S-X-S Josephson junction with an interlayer X of length L. We assume that the magnetic interactions are only finite in X and vanish in the S electrodes. Moreover, we assume that the structure has infinite dimension in the  $y-z$  plane and therefore the GFs only depend on the  $x$  coordinate. The superconducting bulk solutions in the leads are written as  $f_L = f_{\text{BCS}} e^{-i\varphi/2}$  and  $f_R = f_{\text{BCS}} e^{i\varphi/2}$ , in the left ( $x \leq -L/2$ ) and right ( $x \geq L/2$ ) electrodes respectively, with

$$f_{\text{BCS}} = \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{\omega_n^2 + \Delta^2}} \quad (5.1)$$

whereas the normal metal fills the region  $-L/2 \leq x \leq L/2$ .

We will consider the two types of highly resistive and perfectly transparent interfaces between the S and X parts. When the barrier transparency is low, the linearized approximation is justified for all temperatures, whereas for transparent barriers, one is limited to temperatures close to the critical temperature of the junction.

For the particular case of Rashba SOC in the X region and an in-plane exchange field the Josephson current has been calculated in Ref. [35]. It has been shown explicitly that the current-phase relation is given



by  $I = I_c \sin(\varphi - \varphi_0)$ . The anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  was calculated as a function of the strength of the spin fields, the temperature and the junction parameters. Here instead we focus in a generic linear-in-momentum SOC and we derive the expressions for the anomalous Josephson current in the lowest order of the spin fields. This will allow us to understand the link between the inverse EE and the  $\varphi_0$ -junctions.

### A. Diffusive junction with low transparency interfaces

We first consider a S-X-S diffusive Josephson junction with highly resistive S-X interfaces. In this limit the linearization of the quasi-classical equations is justified for all temperatures. Our goal here is to determine the Josephson current through the junction, which in the linearized regime is given by Eq. (3.20). The components of the condensate function  $f_s$  entering this expression, has to be obtained by solving the system (3.24)-(3.25) in the normal metal which couples the singlet with the triplet component. For the specific S-X-S geometry considered here this equations read:

$$(\partial_x^2 - \kappa_\omega^2) f_s + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \left[ \mathbf{i} \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^a}{D} + \frac{\tau}{2m} (\mathcal{J}_i \partial_i)^a \right] f_t^a = 0 \quad (5.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \tilde{\nabla}_i \tilde{\nabla}_i f_t \right)^a - \kappa_\omega^2 f_t^a + \\ & + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \left( \mathbf{i} \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^a}{D} + \frac{\tau}{2m} \mathcal{J}_i^a \partial_i \right) f_s = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

and the boundary conditions for the resistive interface (*cf.* Eq.(3.18)):

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \partial_x f_s + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \frac{\tau}{2m} \mathcal{J}_x^a f_t^a \right)_{x=\pm L/2} = \pm \gamma f_{R,L} \\ & \partial f_t^a|_{x=\pm L/2} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

The expression Eq.(3.20), can be simplified by calculating the current at the right interface ( $x = L/2$ ) and by using the boundary condition (5.4):

$$j_x = \mathbf{i} e \pi D N_0 T_c \gamma \sum_{\omega_n > 0} \text{Tr} \{ f_s \bar{f}_R - \bar{f}_s f_R \}_{x=L/2} . \quad (5.5)$$

It is clear from this equation that the correction to the current due to the spin-fields (the anomalous current) is proportional to  $\text{Im} [f_R^* \delta f_s(L/2)]$ , where  $\delta f_s$  is the first correction to the singlet component due to the gauge potentials. In the absence of a phase difference between the S electrodes  $f_R$  is real and the anomalous current is proportional to the imaginary part of the singlet component. According to Eq. (5.2), in the absence of spin-fields (exchange and SOC), there is no triplet component and the singlet component is real. Therefore no supercurrent flows at zero phase difference.

In the presence of spin-fields there are two sources for singlet-triplet conversion, as seen from the second term in the l.h.s of Eq. (5.3). The first one is the extensively studied mechanism for singlet-triplet conversion in S/F junctions via the intrinsic exchange field  $\mathcal{A}_0$  [71, 79]. Inclusion of SOC leads to an additional singlet-triplet conversion mechanism described by the last term in the l.h.s of Eq (5.3). As discussed in section II, the singlet-triplet conversion in this case corresponds to the charge-spin conversion in normal systems with SOC. Conversely, once the triplet component is created, both mechanisms will convert it back to singlet, as can be seen in Eq.(5.2).

The singlet-triplet-singlet conversion at the lowest orders in perturbation with respect to the spin-fields is schematized in Fig. 1. The black arrows represent the singlet-triplet conversion due to the exchange field which implies a  $\pi/2$  phase shift due to the  $\mathbf{i}$  factor in front of  $\mathcal{A}_0$  in Eqs. (5.2-5.3). The red arrows represent the singlet-triplet conversion due to the SOC, specifically due to the coupling term in Eqs. (5.2-5.3) proportional to  $\mathcal{J}_i^a \partial_i$ . No additional phase is associated with this latter process. If one follows the black path, *i.e.* the singlet-triplet-singlet conversion only due to the exchange field, the resulting contribution to the singlet component acquires a minus sign (a  $\pi$  shift) and it is proportional to  $\mathcal{A}_0^2$ . This means that there is no anomalous phase  $0 < \varphi_0 < \pi$  induced and hence no Josephson current flows when  $\varphi = 0$ . Similarly, if one follows the red path the resulting singlet component also remains real with no change of sign. From Fig.1 it becomes clear that a nontrivial  $\varphi_0$  only appears from the "cross-term" path that consist in one black and one red arrow. In other words, the mutual action of exchange field and SOC is at the root of a finite  $\varphi_0$  and hence of a supercurrent even at zero phase difference. In this case the contribution to this current in the lowest order of the spin fields, is proportional to  $\mathcal{A}_0^a \mathcal{J}_i^a \partial_i f_s$  between the exchange field and the spin-current tensor, as anticipated in the introduction.

In order to quantify this effect and calculate  $\varphi_0$  in the S-X-S junctions it is convenient to introduce the singlet and triplet propagators associated with Eqs. (5.2-5.4):

$$\begin{aligned} & (\partial_x^2 - \kappa_\omega^2) K_s(x, x') = -\delta(x - x') \\ & \partial_x K_s(x, x')|_{x_1=\pm L/2} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \left( \partial_x + \hat{P}_x \right)^2 + \hat{P}_y^2 + \hat{P}_z^2 - \kappa_\omega^2 \right] \hat{K}_t(x, x') = -\delta(x - x') \\ & \left( \partial_x + \hat{P}_x \right) \hat{K}_t(x_1, x_2) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Thus, Eqs. (5.2-5.4) can be re-written as a set of integral




Figure 1. Schematic representation of the singlet-triplet-singlet conversion process at the lowest order with respect to the spin-fields. Black arrows represent the action of the exchange field, whereas red arrows encode the effect of the singlet-triplet coupling term due to the SOC. Only mixed red-black paths lead to the appearance of an anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  in the singlet component and hence to a supercurrent in a S-X-S junction even without a phase bias between the S electrodes

equations

$$f_s(x) = f_s^{(0)}(x) - \frac{\tau \mathcal{J}_x^a}{2m} [K_s(x, L/2) f_t^a - K_s(x, -L/2)] + \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dx_1 K_s(x, x_1) \times \left[ \mathbf{i} \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^b}{D} K_s(x_1, y) + \frac{\tau}{2m} \mathcal{J}_x^b \partial_{x_1} \right] f_t^b(x_1), \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$f_t^a(x) = \text{sgn}(\omega_n) \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dx_1 \times \left[ K_t^{ab}(x, x_1) \left( \mathbf{i} \frac{\mathcal{A}_0^b}{D} + \frac{\tau}{2m} \mathcal{J}_1^a \partial_{x_1} \right) f_s(x_1) \right]. \quad (5.9)$$

Here  $f_s^{(0)} = \gamma \left( K_s \left( x, \frac{L}{2} \right) f_R + K_s \left( x, -\frac{L}{2} \right) f_L \right)$  and the second term in Eq. (5.8) takes into account the boundary condition (5.4)

The  $K_s$  propagator can be obtained from Eq. (5.6)

$$K_s(x_1, x_2) = \frac{\cosh \kappa_\omega (L - |x_1 - x_2|) + \cosh \kappa_\omega (x_1 + x_2)}{2\kappa_\omega \sinh \kappa_\omega L}, \quad (5.10)$$

whereas the equations for the triplet kernel, Eqs.(5.7), can be written in the form of an integral equation which is convenient for the subsequent perturbative analysis:

$$\hat{K}_t(x_1, x_2) = e^{-\hat{P}_x x_1} K_s(x_1, x_2) e^{\hat{P}_x x_2} + e^{-\hat{P}_x x_1} \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy K_s(x_1, y) e^{\hat{P}_x y} \hat{\Gamma}_\perp \hat{K}_t(y, x_2) \quad (5.11)$$

where  $\hat{\Gamma}_\perp = -\hat{P}_y^2 - \hat{P}_z^2$ .

In the lowest order of the gauge potentials one can obtain the correction  $\delta f_s$  to the singlet component by substituting the result 5.10 into Eqs. ((5.8)-(5.9)). We consider here only the "cross-term" correction  $\delta f_s$  proportional to both the exchange field  $\mathcal{A}_0$  and the spin-current  $\mathcal{J}_i$  and which is responsible for the anomalous phase-shift:

$$\delta f_s(L/2) = \mathbf{i} \mathcal{A}_0^a \mathcal{J}_x^b \frac{\tau \gamma}{2mD} \times \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy_1 \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dy_2 K_t^{ab}(y_2, y_1) \frac{\cosh[\kappa_\omega (y_1 - y_2)]}{\kappa_\omega \sinh \kappa_\omega L} \quad (5.12)$$

In principle, one has all the elements to solve Eqs. (5.8-5.9), for example recursively by performing a perturbative expansion in the gauge potentials. Here, in order to get analytical compact expressions we restrict our analysis to the short junction limit, *i.e.*  $L \ll \min(\kappa_\omega^{-1}, |\mathcal{A}_k|^{-1})$ . In this case  $K_s \approx \kappa_\omega^{-2} L^{-1}$  (*cf.* Eq. (5.10)) and from Eq. (5.11) it is easy to verify that  $K_t$  reads

$$\hat{K}_t \approx \frac{(\kappa_\omega^2 + \hat{\Gamma}_\perp)^{-1}}{L}. \quad (5.13)$$

We are interested in calculating the anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  which can be obtained by noticing that the current (5.5) can be written as

$$j_x = j_c \sin(\varphi - \varphi_0) \approx j_c \sin \varphi - \varphi_0 j_c \cos \varphi.$$

The anomalous phase  $\varphi_0$  can be obtained by setting  $\varphi = 0$  and dividing by the critical current  $j_c$  in the absence of SOC. In the short junction limit this is given by:

$$j_c = 4e\pi D N_0 T_c \gamma^2 \sum_{n>0} \frac{f_{\text{BCS}}^2}{\kappa_\omega^2 L} \quad (5.14)$$

We follow this procedure and from Eq.(5.5) and Eqs. (5.12-5.13) one obtains

$$\varphi_0 \approx \frac{\tau}{2mD} L \frac{\sum_{n>0} \frac{f_{\text{BCS}}^2}{\kappa_\omega^2} \mathcal{A}_0^a (\kappa_\omega^2 + \hat{\Gamma}_\perp)^{-1} \Big|^{ab} \mathcal{J}_x^b}{\sum_{n>0} \frac{f_{\text{BCS}}^2}{\kappa_\omega^2}}. \quad (5.15)$$

This expression clearly shows the relation between the appearance of the anomalous phase,  $\varphi_0$ , and the inverse Edelstein effect in bulk systems. Both, the Josephson current (proportional in the linearized case to  $\varphi_0$ ) and the bulk supercurrent are proportional to  $\mathcal{A}_0 \mathcal{J}_x$ , *i.e.* both are generated from the mutual action of the exchange field and the SOC.

It is worth noticing that in the present case of low transparent interfaces, the anomalous phase grows linearly with  $L$ , the length of the junction (5.15). In the

next subsection we show that in the case of a transparent barrier the anomalous phase behaves like  $L^3$ .

In the particular case of a 2D situation, with a SOC coupling of Rashba (described by the parameter  $\alpha$ ) and Dresselhaus ( $\beta$ ) type we obtain from Eq. (5.15):

$$\varphi_0 \approx \frac{\tau L}{2m} \frac{\sum_{\omega_n > 0} \frac{f_{\text{BCS}}^2 (\beta A_0^x - \alpha A_0^y)(\alpha^2 - \beta^2)}{\kappa_\omega^2 (2\omega_n + D(\alpha^2 + \beta^2))}}{\sum_{\omega_n > 0} \frac{f_{\text{BCS}}^2}{\kappa_\omega^2}}. \quad (5.16)$$

Besides controlling the anomalous phase and hence the Josephson current by tuning the external magnetic field, this expression also suggests that the current can be controlled by tuning the Rashba SOC by means of an external gate. In the particular case that  $\alpha = \beta$  the anomalous phase is zero and no supercurrent will flow.

### B. Diffusive junction with transparent interfaces

We now briefly consider the limit of a full transparent barrier. In that case one assumes continuity of the quasi-classic Green functions at the S-X interfaces. The problem is then formally the same as in the previous section, except that the second equations in (5.6) and (5.7), for the propagators  $K_s$  and  $\hat{K}_t$  are replaced by:

$$\hat{K}_{s,t}(x_1, x_2) \Big|_{x_1 = \pm L/2} = 0 \quad (5.17)$$

respectively. In this case one should remove the second term in Eq. (5.8) and  $f_s^{(0)}(x) = f_L [\sinh(L/2 - x) / \sinh(\kappa_\omega L) + f_R \sinh(L/2 + x) / \sinh(\kappa_\omega L)]$ .

Now the singlet propagator is given by:

$$K_s(x_1, x_2) = \frac{\cosh \kappa_\omega (x_1 + x_2) - \cosh \kappa_\omega (L - |x_1 - x_2|)}{2\kappa_\omega \sinh \kappa_\omega L}. \quad (5.18)$$

In the short junction limit  $K_s$  is proportional to  $L$  and it is temperature independent. From Eq. (5.11)  $\hat{K}_t \sim K_s$ . Thus, in this case the anomalous phase-shift is also temperature independent and proportional to

$$\varphi_0 \propto \frac{\tau L^3}{mD} \mathcal{A}_0^a \mathcal{J}_x^a. \quad (5.19)$$

In contrast to the case of finite barrier resistance, Eq. (5.15), the anomalous phase scale with  $L^3$ . This means that in short junctions a finite barrier resistance between the S and the normal metal favors the growth of  $\varphi_0$ . These results generalize those presented recently in Ref.[35] for the particular case of Rashba SOC.

We can then conclude that the anomalous phase, at lowest order in the gauge potentials, is proportional to  $\mathcal{A}_0^a \mathcal{J}_x^a$ , independently of the type of interface.

## VI. MAGNETO-ELECTRIC EFFECTS IN BALLISTIC JOSEPHSON JUNCTIONS

We now consider a pure ballistic S-X-S junction. Again the junction is along the  $x$ -axis and the two superconducting electrodes at position  $x \leq -L/2$  and  $x \geq L/2$ . The spin fields, both exchange and SOC, are only finite in the X region. We also assume that the interfaces between X and S are perfectly transparent.

In order to make a connection with the diffusive structures studied in the previous section, we start analyzing the S-X-S junction for temperatures close to the critical temperature. In the second subsection we derive analytical expressions for the anomalous current at arbitrary temperature.

### A. Ballistic junction at $T \rightarrow T_c$

We first study the S-X-S junction close to the critical temperature. The solutions for the singlet and triplet components in equations (3.22) and (3.23) can be written as propagation in two directions  $f_{s,t}(-L/2 \leq x \leq L/2) = f_{s,t}^>(x) \Theta(\omega_n/n_x) + f_{s,t}^<(x) \Theta(-\omega_n/n_x)$  with

$$f_s^< = \frac{\Delta(L/2)}{|\omega|} e^{-2\omega_n(x-L/2)/v_F n_x} + \int_{L/2}^x \frac{dy}{v_F n_x} \times e^{-2\omega_n(x-y)/v_F n_x} \left( \mathbf{i} \mathcal{A}_0^a + \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}^a}{2m} \frac{\partial}{\partial n_j} \right) f_t^{a<}(y) \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$f_t^{a<} = \int_{L/2}^x \frac{dy}{v_F n_x} e^{-2\omega_n(x-y)/v_F n_x} \times \left( e^{-\hat{P}_i n_i (x-y)/n_x} \right)^{ab} \left( \mathbf{i} \mathcal{A}_0^b + \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}^b}{2m} \frac{\partial}{\partial n_j} \right) f_s^{a<}(y). \quad (6.2)$$

In the opposite propagation direction  $f_{s,t}^>$  are found from  $f_{s,t}^<$  by substituting  $L/2 \rightarrow -L/2$ .

Similar with the discussion of Fig 1, expressions (6.1) and (6.2) show explicitly the underlining physics of the junction and the effect of the SOC. If the SOC is zero, the exchange field  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is the only source of triplet correlations that lead to the well known properties of S-F-S junctions (see [71, 79] for reviews). Notice again the imaginary unit  $\mathbf{i}$  in front of the  $\mathcal{A}_0$  terms and hence the  $\pi/2$  phase shift. In the case of a finite SOC the gauge-field,  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ , is an additional source of triplet correlations. In the ballistic case,  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  mixes not only singlet-triplet but also  $s$  and  $p$ -wave like correlations [89]. The term  $e^{-\hat{P}_i n_i x/n_x}$  in (6.2) leads to a momentum dependent rotation of the triplet component in the spin-space. In the lowest order in the spin fields the origin of the phase  $\varphi_0$  can be understood as follows. According to (3.19), the first correction to the current proportional to  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is determined by the singlet

components  $f_s$ . This is obtained from Eq. (6.1), after substitution of  $f_t^a$  from (6.2). If we assume a vanishing phase-difference between the superconducting electrodes, the first nontrivial contribution to the current in the expansion has the same form as in the bulk and in diffusive junctions, *i.e.*  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}^a \partial_{n_j} \left( e^{-\hat{P}_i n_i x / n_x} \right)^{ab} \mathcal{A}_0^b \approx P_j^{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ij}^a \mathcal{A}_0^b$ .

This term is proportional to  $\mathcal{J}_i^b \mathcal{A}_0^b$  which corresponds to the inverse Edelstein effect (*cf.* Eq. (3.6)).

In fact, for a short junction at the leading order and for small spin-orbit coupling, one obtains from (6.1)

$$j_x(\varphi = 0) = -\frac{e\pi N_0 v_F L^3}{m v_F^2} \frac{\Delta^2 T_c}{3} \times \sum_{n \geq 0} \left\langle \frac{|n_x| e^{-2\omega_n L / v_F |n_x|}}{\omega_n^2 n_x^2} n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}^a \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial n_j} \frac{P_i^{ab} n_i}{n_x} \right] \mathcal{A}_0^b \right\rangle. \quad (6.3)$$

We next simplify this expression in order to keep only the term which can survive the angular averaging, and notice that  $P_j^{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ji}^b = \mathcal{J}_i^a$  is the spin current, and that  $\mathcal{A}^{ab} = -\mathcal{A}^{ba}$  whereas  $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = -\mathcal{F}_{ji}$  by definition. Thus, one obtains

$$j_x(\varphi = 0) = \frac{e N_0 v_F \Delta L^3}{4 m \pi} \frac{\Delta}{6 T_c} \mathcal{J}_i^a \mathcal{A}_0^a \times \sum_{n \geq 0} \left\langle \frac{e^{-(2n+1)L/\xi_T |n_x|} |n_x| n_i^2}{4(2n+1)^2 n_x^2} \right\rangle, \quad (6.4)$$

for the anomalous current at zero phase-difference, with  $\xi_T = \hbar v_F / 2\pi k_B T_c$ . Eq.(6.4) clearly shows that the anomalous current generated without a phase difference is nothing but a proximity induced inverse Edelstein effect: the spin-polarization  $\mathcal{A}_0^a$  is transmuted in a charge current via the spin-current  $\mathcal{J}_i^a$ .

## B. Arbitrary temperatures

We now focus on an arbitrary temperature and calculate the current up to the first order in the spin fields. After a lengthy calculation shown in the appendix A one obtains

$$j_x \approx j_x^{(0)} + j_x^{(1)} + \dots \quad (6.5)$$

$$j_x^{(0)} = -8e\pi N_0 v_F T \sum_{n \geq 0} \langle |n_x| M \rangle \quad (6.6)$$

$$j_x^{(1)} = 2e\pi N_0 v_F \frac{\mathcal{J}_x^a \mathcal{A}_0^a L^3}{3m v_F^2} T \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} \left\langle \frac{|n_x|}{n_x^2} M \right\rangle \quad (6.7)$$

$$M = \Im \left\{ \tanh \left( \frac{\omega_n L}{v_F |n_x|} + \operatorname{arcsinh} \frac{\omega_n}{\Delta} - i \frac{\varphi}{2} \right) \right\} \quad (6.8)$$

We then conclude that (restoring dimension)

$$\varphi_0 \propto \frac{\hbar L^3}{m v_F^2} \mathcal{J}_x^a \mathcal{A}_0^a = \frac{\hbar L^3}{2E_F} \mathcal{F}_{xi}^a \mathcal{F}_{i0}^a \quad (6.9)$$

at the lowest order in the gauge-fields and for a short junction. As in all previous examples the  $\varphi_0$  is proportional to the magneto-electric response  $\mathcal{J}_x^a \mathcal{A}_0^a$ .

## VII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion we have demonstrated that the inverse Edelstein effect and the appearance of an anomalous phase-shift  $\varphi_0$  in Josephson junctions are the two sides of the same coin. We presented a full SU(2) covariant quasi-classic formalism that allows to study these magneto-electric phenomena in bulk and hybrid superconducting structures. With the help of our quasi-classic equations we demonstrate that the SU(2) gauge-fields are the only objects of relevance in the phenomenology of the  $\varphi_0$ -shift, and show that  $\varphi_0 \propto \mathcal{A}_0^a \mathcal{J}_i^a = \mathcal{F}_{0j}^a \mathcal{F}_{ji}^a$ , *i.e.* to the SU(2) electric and magnetic fields. This result holds for both ballistic and diffusive systems and for arbitrary barrier resistance between the superconductor and normal metal.

So far a few experiments have been dedicated to spin-orbit effects in superconducting heterostructures [90, 91] with peculiar emphasis on the manipulation of the proximity effect by a gate voltage, see also [92–95] for modern renewal of the field using strong spin-orbit systems. Recently a magneto-electric effect has been measured [96] in proximity induced systems, and so it seems there is no current technological difficulties dealing with SOC. It has also been proposed that the magneto-electric phase-shift  $\varphi_0$  produces some backaction effect in principle easily measurable in Shapiro steps experiments [97].

In order to verify our findings we propose here two possible setups based on recent experiments: One possibility is to measure the supercurrent through a lateral Josephson junction consisting of two superconducting electrodes grown on top of an atomically thin disordered Pb (normal) wetting layer, as the one used in Ref. [98]. One indeed expects that the Pb layer has a strong SOC and therefore applying a magnetic field in the plane of the Pb layer should generate a finite supercurrent through the junction. According to our previous results and assuming that the layer has a 2D generic SOC described by a combination of Rashba and Dresselhaus terms:  $\hat{A}_x = -\alpha\sigma^y + \beta\sigma^x$  and  $\hat{A}_y = \alpha\sigma^x - \beta\sigma^y$  the measured supercurrent should be proportional to

$$j_s \propto (\alpha^2 - \beta^2) (h_x \beta + h_y \alpha).$$

and thus exhibits both angular dependency with respect to the magnetic field, in addition to a gate voltage dependency modifying the ratio between Dresselhaus and Rashba interactions. In particular for a field perpendicular to the 2D gas the effect should vanishes.



Another possible experimental setup to prove the existence of the anomalous  $\varphi_0$  phase consists of a superconducting ring interrupted by a semiconducting link with a strong SOC, similar to the one used recently in Ref. [99] for the characterization of the current phase relation of a Nb/3D-HgTe/Nb junction. If, instead of the topological insulator, one uses a semiconductor with strong SOC and one grows the structure in such a way that the S ring is electrically isolated from the semiconductor (for instance using an additional insulating barrier), then applying a field in the plane of the ring creates a circulating current. This supercurrent can be measured by a second loop as proposed in Ref. [99].

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

F.K. thanks F. Hassler and G. Viola for daily stimulating discussions, as well as A.I. Buzdin for insightful discussions. F.K. is grateful for support from the Alexander von Humboldt foundation during his stay in the JARA-Institute for Quantum Information at RWTH-Aachen, Germany, where part of this work was done. The work of F.S.B. was supported by Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (MINECO) through the Project No. FIS2011-28851- C02-02 and the Basque Government under UPV/EHU Project No. IT-756-13.

### Appendix A: Calculation of the current in a ballistic short junction for arbitrary temperature

In this appendix we derive Eqs. (6.6)-(6.7).

We need to obtain the full matrix  $\check{g}$  in order to calculate the current from its generic expression (3.10). To simplify the problem we solve (3.8) in the limit  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , assuming that the term proportional to  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  is small. At zeroth order the ballistic equation reduces to a rotation equation

$$v_F n_i \frac{\partial \check{g}^{(0)}}{\partial x_i} = \mathbf{i} \left[ \tau_3 (\mathbf{i}\omega_n + \mathcal{A}_0) + v_F n_j \mathcal{A}_j + \check{\Delta}, \check{g}^{(0)} \right] \quad (\text{A1})$$

which admits for solution

$$\check{g}^{(0)} = \check{u}(x) \check{g}_0^{(0)} \check{u}^{-1}(x) + \check{g}_\infty \quad (\text{A2})$$

with a constant matrix  $\check{g}_0^{(0)}$ , the constant solution

$$\left[ \tau_3 (\mathbf{i}\omega_n + \mathcal{A}_0) + v_F n_j \mathcal{A}_j + \check{\Delta}, \check{g}_\infty \right] = 0 \quad (\text{A3})$$

which gives the bulk contribution deep inside the superconductor, and the propagator

$$\check{u}(x) = \exp \left[ \mathbf{i} \frac{\tau_3 (\mathbf{i}\omega_n + \mathcal{A}_0) + v_F n_j \mathcal{A}_j + \check{\Delta}}{v_F n_x} x \right] \quad (\text{A4})$$

when neither  $\mathcal{A}_0$  nor  $\check{\Delta}$  nor  $\mathcal{A}_j$  depends on the position, as we will suppose from now on.

To write the explicit form of  $\check{u}$ , we supposed a junction along the  $x$ -axis, whereas the transverse dimensions of the junction are large. Thus we write the propagator along the  $x$ -direction only. This is merely a notational simplification without consequence on the conclusions for the  $\varphi_0$ -junction. It might nevertheless change some subtle properties of the Josephson system, see *e.g.* [100] where the lateral confinement of a 2D junction results in a change of the current-versus-magnetic-flux pattern, both in ballistic and diffusive systems. Focusing here on the  $\varphi_0$ -phase shift, we disregard such possibilities. Importantly, the junction is *not* unidimensional since we keep the sum  $n_j \mathcal{A}_j$  containing the lateral projections of the Fermi velocity.

The propagator (A4) displaces the Green-function  $\check{g}_0$  from the position  $x = 0$  (chosen as a reference position for commodity) to the point  $x$  in a medium with superconducting and magnetic properties. One sees from its definition (A3) that  $[\check{g}_\infty, \check{u}] = 0$ , and so  $\check{g}_\infty$  can not be dragged by the application of the transport operator (A4). In fact,  $\check{g}_\infty$  corresponds to the bulk solution of a superconductor. As we will see in a moment (see (A8) below), the solutions of  $\check{u}$  in a superconductor are evanescent waves, so the contribution  $\check{u} \check{g}_0^{(0)} \check{u}^{-1}$  vanishes deep inside the superconductor, whereas the contribution  $\check{g}_\infty$  subsists there. Clearly  $\check{g}_\infty$  would not need to be defined if we used position-dependent quantities, especially a position-dependent  $\check{\Delta}$ . An alternative way to avoid to discuss  $\check{g}_\infty$  is to use the so-called Ricatti parameterisation, see [101, 102].

At first-order in the gauge-field, one has

$$v_F n_i \frac{\partial \check{g}^{(1)}}{\partial x_i} - \left\{ \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}}{2m}, \frac{\partial \check{g}^{(0)}}{\partial n_j} \right\} = \mathbf{i} \left[ \tau_3 (\mathbf{i}\omega_n + \mathcal{A}_0) + v_F n_j \mathcal{A}_j + \check{\Delta}, \check{g}^{(0)} \right] \quad (\text{A5})$$

and thus the general solution writes

$$\check{g}^{(1)} = \check{u}(x) \check{g}_0^{(1)}(x) \check{u}^{-1}(x) \quad (\text{A6})$$

with a position-dependent  $\check{g}_0^{(1)}$  matrix, which reads *e.g.*

$$\check{g}_0^{(1)} = \check{g}_1 + \int_0^x \frac{dz}{v_F n_x} \left[ \check{u}^\dagger(z) \left\{ \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}}{2m}, \frac{\partial \check{g}^{(0)}}{\partial n_j} \right\} \check{u}(z) \right] \quad (\text{A7})$$

with  $\check{g}_1$  a constant matrix (the explicit expression for  $\check{g}_1$  depends on the lower bound of the integral in  $\check{g}_0^{(1)}$ ).

Clearly, none of the Ansätze (A2) and (A6) can be used to describe a Josephson system, since this later presents position-dependent superconducting gap and/or magnetic interaction. So we now specialize the solutions  $\check{g}^{(0)}$  and  $\check{g}^{(1)}$  to the different regions of the junction presented in the head of this section. In that situation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\check{g}\left(x \leq -\frac{L}{2}\right) &= e^{-i\tau_3 \frac{\varphi}{4}} [S_L g_L \tau_+ S_L^{-1} + \check{g}_\infty] e^{i\tau_3 \frac{\varphi}{4}} \\ \check{g}\left(x \geq \frac{L}{2}\right) &= e^{i\tau_3 \frac{\varphi}{4}} [S_R g_R \tau_- S_R^{-1} + \check{g}_\infty] e^{-i\tau_3 \frac{\varphi}{4}}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A8})$$

$$\check{g}_\infty = \frac{\tau_3 \omega_n + \tau_2 \Delta}{\sqrt{\omega_n^2 + \Delta^2}} = \frac{\tau_3 \sinh \eta + \tau_2}{\cosh \eta} \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$S_{L,R} = \left(e^{\eta/2} + \mathbf{i}\tau_1 e^{-\eta/2}\right) e^{\tau_3 \cosh \eta (x \pm L/2)/\xi_0} \quad (\text{A10})$$

for the solutions in the superconducting electrodes, with the parameters  $\sinh \eta = \hbar \omega_n / \Delta$  for notational convenience, and  $\xi_0 = \hbar v_F / \Delta$  the superconducting coherence length. The  $g_{L,R}$  are some constant matrices in the spin-space found by boundary condition, the matrices  $\tau_\pm$  select the physically acceptable decaying evanescent waves in (A8), and we expand  $g_{L,R} \approx g_{L,R}^{(0)} + g_{L,R}^{(1)} + \dots$  in power of  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ . In the normal region, the solution reads

$$\begin{aligned}\check{g}\left(-\frac{L}{2} \leq x \leq \frac{L}{2}\right) &= \check{u}_0(x) \check{g}_0 \check{u}_0^\dagger(x) + \\ &+ \check{u}_0(x) \check{g}_0^{(1)}(x) \check{u}_0^\dagger(x) + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A11})$$

$$\check{g}_0^{(1)}(x) = \check{g}_1 + \int_0^x \check{\mathfrak{G}}(z) \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$\check{\mathfrak{G}}(z) = \frac{dz}{v_F n_x} \check{u}_0^\dagger(z) \left\{ \frac{n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij}}{2m}, \frac{\partial \check{u}_0(z) \check{g}_0 \check{u}_0^\dagger(z)}{\partial n_j} \right\} \check{u}_0(z)$$

with  $\check{u}_0 = \check{u}(\Delta = 0)$  from (A4). Note that  $\check{u}_0$  is unitary when  $\Delta = 0$ . The matrices  $\check{g}_0$  and  $\check{g}_1$  will be obtained by boundary condition. We parameterise

$$\check{u}_0(x) = e^{-\omega_n \tau_3 x / v_F n_x} \begin{pmatrix} u_+ & 0 \\ 0 & u_- \end{pmatrix}$$

$$u_\pm(x) = \exp \left[ \mathbf{i} \frac{\pm \mathcal{A}_0 + v_F n_j \mathcal{A}_j}{v_F n_x} x \right] \quad (\text{A13})$$

for later commodity.

We suppose continuity of the Green functions at the left and right boundaries. It results a system of 8 equations with 4 unknowns (we count a matrix in the spin-space as one unknown, since the problem can be solved in the Nambu space). Nevertheless, the particle-hole symmetry reduces the number of independent equations by one half, and so the problem is well-defined. We match the Green functions at the boundaries for each perturbed contribution. At zeroth order we have

$$\check{g}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & -f_0 \\ f_0 & \bar{g}_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$g_0 = \frac{\bar{U}U^\dagger - UU^\dagger - 2\mathbf{i} \sin 2\chi}{2 \cos 2\chi + \text{Tr} \{UU^\dagger\}} \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$f_0 = 2\mathbf{i} \frac{e^{-i\chi}U + e^{i\chi}\bar{U}}{2 \cos 2\chi + \text{Tr} \{\bar{U}U^\dagger\}} \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$U = u_+^\dagger \left(\frac{L}{2}\right) u_- \left(\frac{L}{2}\right); \quad \bar{U} = u_+ \left(\frac{L}{2}\right) u_-^\dagger \left(\frac{L}{2}\right) \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$\chi = \frac{\mathbf{i}\omega_n L}{v_F |n_x|} + \frac{\varphi}{2} + \mathbf{i} \text{arcsinh} \frac{\omega_n}{\Delta} \quad (\text{A18})$$

whereas  $\bar{g}_0 = \mathcal{T}g_0\mathcal{T}^{-1}$  and  $\bar{f}_0 = \mathcal{T}f_0\mathcal{T}$ , with  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{K}\mathbf{i}\sigma_2$ , the time-reversal operator (or equivalently  $\{\check{g}_0, \mathcal{P}\} = 0$ , with  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{K}\tau_2\sigma_2$  the charge-reversal operator, see [Konschelle, Bergeret & Tokatly, *in preparation*] for more details). We here give only the contribution corresponding to the positive projection of the Fermi velocity, the negative projection can be found by usual substitutions.

At first-order in the gauge-field, we define

$$\check{g}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} g_1 & -f_1 \\ f_1 & \bar{g}_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\mathfrak{G}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{G} & -\check{\mathfrak{F}} \\ \check{\mathfrak{F}} & \mathfrak{G} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A19})$$

as the Nambu space representation of (A12), from which the components  $\mathfrak{G}, \check{\mathfrak{F}}, \dots$  are easily obtained, once  $\check{g}_0$  injected in (A7). Once again, only two equations (say the one for  $g_1$  and the one for  $f_1$ ) are linearly independent due to the particle-hole symmetry. One obtains after a few algebra

$$\begin{aligned}g_1 &= -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \int_0^{-L/2} + \int_0^{L/2} \right] \mathfrak{G} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} \mathfrak{G} \cdot g_0 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} \check{\mathfrak{F}} \cdot \bar{f}_0.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A20})$$

To simplify the expressions, we next calculate  $\langle v_x \text{Tr} \{g_1\} \rangle$  which enters into the expression (3.10). Then the first-line of (A20) disappears due to the angular averaging (it's a total derivative) whereas the second line combines thanks to the normalization condition  $g_0^2 - f_0 \bar{f}_0 = 1$  (this condition is valid for the zeroth order solution only, since this last one was obtained without the gauge-field). So one obtains

$$\text{Tr} \langle v_x g_1 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} \langle |v_x| \text{Tr} \{f_0 \cdot \check{\mathfrak{F}} - \check{\mathfrak{F}} \cdot \bar{f}_0\} \rangle \quad (\text{A21})$$

where all  $n_x$  have been replaced by  $|n_x|$  in the expressions for  $f_0, \check{\mathfrak{F}}$  and their time-reversal conjugates. Next we apply the angular derivative  $\partial_n^j$  on the  $\check{u}_0$ 's. Actually, the derivative of the  $e^{-\tau_3 \omega_n x / v_F |n_x|}$ -like terms disappears in the trace, since they generically look like  $\langle \text{Tr} \{n^i \mathcal{F}_{ij} \delta_{jx} C\} \rangle$  with  $C$  a  $c$ -number, whereas the matrix  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  is traceless. Some other terms vanish or can be

simplified using the property that  $\langle \partial A / \partial n_j \rangle = 0$  with  $A$  any periodic matrix. In addition  $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$  is angle-independent (it is clearly momentum independent from the beginning). After several algebras one may have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \langle v_x g_1 \rangle &= \int_{-L}^L dz \left[ \text{Tr} \left\langle \frac{|n_i| \mathcal{F}_{ij}}{m} |Z|^2 \left\{ U, \frac{\partial U^\dagger}{\partial n_j} \right\} \right\rangle \right] \\ &+ \int_{-L}^0 dz \left[ \text{Tr} \left\langle Z^2 \frac{|n_i| \mathcal{F}_{ij}}{m} \left\{ U \left( \frac{z+L}{|n_x|} \right), \frac{\partial U^\dagger}{\partial n_j} \right\} \right\rangle \right] \\ &+ \int_0^L dz \left[ \text{Tr} \left\langle Z^{*2} \frac{|n_i| \mathcal{F}_{ij}}{m} \left\{ U \left( \frac{z-L}{|n_x|} \right), \frac{\partial U^\dagger}{\partial n_j} \right\} \right\rangle \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A22})$$

with the rule that, when not precise, the matrix  $U = u_+^\dagger u_-$  is evaluated at the point  $z/|n_x|$ , and with

$$Z = \frac{e^{i\chi}}{2 \cos 2\chi + \text{Tr} \{ U(L/|n_x|) \}}. \quad (\text{A23})$$

Using the well-known expression for the derivative of an exponential of operator, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_n^j U^\dagger &= -\mathbf{i} u_+^\dagger \left( \frac{z}{|n_x|} \right) \frac{2z}{v_F n_x^2} \mathcal{A}_0 \delta_{jx} u_- \left( \frac{z}{|n_x|} \right) \\ &+ \mathbf{i} u_+^\dagger \int_0^{\frac{z}{|n_x|}} ds \left( u_- \mathcal{A}_j u_-^\dagger - u_+ \mathcal{A}_j u_+^\dagger \right)_s u_- \left( \frac{z}{|n_x|} \right) \\ &\approx -\mathbf{i} u_+^\dagger \left[ \frac{2z}{n_x^2 v_F} \mathcal{A}_0 \delta_{jx} + \mathbf{i} \frac{z^2}{n_x^2 v_F} [\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_j] \right] u_- \left( \frac{z}{|n_x|} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$

the last line following an expansion in  $s$  of the integral of the second line (and thus an expansion at first order of the exponentials:  $u_\pm(s) \approx 1 \mp \mathbf{i} \mathcal{A}_0 s \pm \mathbf{i} v_i \mathcal{A}_i s$ ). At this level of approximation, one can suppose all the other  $u_\pm \approx 1$ . Then the  $\delta_{jx}$  contribution disappears in the  $z$ -integrations in (A22), and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \langle v_x g_1 \rangle &\approx -\frac{L^2}{m v_F} \text{Tr} \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{i} (Z^2 - Z^{*2})}{n_x^2} |n_i| \mathcal{F}_{ij} \mathcal{A}_0 \delta_{xj} \right\rangle \\ &- \frac{\mathbf{i} L^3}{3 m v_F} \text{Tr} \left\langle \frac{(Z + Z^*)^2}{n_x^2} |n_i| \mathcal{F}_{ij} \mathcal{F}_{j0} \right\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A25})$$

where the first term vanishes by angular averaging. One more time one has  $\text{Tr} \{ n_i \mathcal{F}_{ij} \mathcal{F}_{j0} \} = n_i \mathcal{J}_i^a \mathcal{A}_0^a$  and so we verify the correspondence between the inverse Edelstein effect and the spontaneous generation of a phase across a Josephson system. The expansion in (A24) corresponds to the limit  $\mathcal{A}_0 L / v_F \ll 1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_i L \ll 1$ . So in this limit, at the leading order one has  $\text{Tr} \{ U(L/|n_x|) \} \approx 1$  in (A15) and (A23).

- 
- [1] M. Dyakonov and V. Perel, *JETP Letters* **13**, 467 (1971).
- [2] J. E. Hirsch, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, 1834 (1999), [arXiv:cond-mat/9906160](#).
- [3] M. Dyakonov and A. Khaetskii, in *Spin Physics in Semiconductors*, Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences, Vol. 157, edited by M. Dyakonov (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006) Chap. 8, pp. 211–243.
- [4] Y. K. Kato, R. C. Myers, A. C. Gossard, and D. D. Awschalom, *Science (New York, N.Y.)* **306**, 1910 (2004).
- [5] J. Wunderlich, B. Kaestner, J. Sinova, and T. Jungwirth, *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 47204 (2005), [arXiv:cond-mat/0410295](#).
- [6] S. O. Valenzuela and M. Tinkham, *Nature* **442**, 176 (2006), [arXiv:cond-mat/0605423](#).
- [7] M. Morota, Y. Niimi, K. Ohnishi, D. H. Wei, T. Tanaka, H. Kontani, T. Kimura, and Y. Otani, *Physical Review B* **83**, 174405 (2011), [arXiv:1008.0158](#).
- [8] M. Isasa, E. Villamor, L. E. Hueso, M. Gradhand, and F. Casanova, *Physical Review B* **91**, 024402 (2014), [arXiv:1407.4770](#).
- [9] E. Saitoh, M. Ueda, H. Miyajima, and G. Tatara, *Applied Physics Letters* **88**, 182509 (2006).
- [10] K. Ando, S. Takahashi, K. Harii, K. Sasage, J. Ieda, S. Maekawa, and E. Saitoh, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 036601 (2008).
- [11] T. Kimura, Y. Otani, T. Sato, S. Takahashi, and S. Maekawa, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 156601 (2007), [arXiv:cond-mat/0609304](#).
- [12] K. Uchida, J. Xiao, H. Adachi, J. Ohe, S. Takahashi, J. Ieda, T. Ota, Y. Kajiwara, H. Umezawa, H. Kawai, G. E. W. Bauer, S. Maekawa, and E. Saitoh, *Nature materials* **9**, 894 (2010), [arXiv:1009.5766](#).
- [13] Y. Kajiwara, K. Harii, S. Takahashi, J. Ohe, K. Uchida, M. Mizuguchi, H. Umezawa, H. Kawai, K. Ando, K. Takanashi, S. Maekawa, and E. Saitoh, *Nature* **464**, 262 (2010).
- [14] C. Ciccarelli, K. M. D. Hals, A. Irvine, V. Novak, Y. Tserkovnyak, H. Kurebayashi, A. Brataas, and A. Ferguson, *Nature Nanotechnology* **10**, 50 (2014), [arXiv:1411.2779](#).
- [15] A. Aronov and Y. Lyanda-Geller, *JETP Letters* **50**, 431 (1989).
- [16] V. Edelstein, *Solid State Communications* **73**, 233 (1990).
- [17] Y. K. Kato, R. C. Myers, A. C. Gossard, and D. D. Awschalom, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 176601 (2004), [arXiv:cond-mat/0403407](#).

- [18] A. Y. Silov, P. A. Blajnov, J. H. Wolter, R. Hey, K. H. Ploog, and N. S. Averkiev, *Applied Physics Letters* **85**, 5929 (2004).
- [19] K. Shen, G. Vignale, and R. Raimondi, *Physical Review Letters* **112**, 1 (2014), arXiv:1311.6516.
- [20] S. Ganichev, E. Ivchenko, V. Bel'kov, S. Tarasenko, M. Sollinger, D. Weiss, W. Wegscheider, and W. Prettl, *Nature* **417**, 153 (2002).
- [21] J. C. Rojas Sánchez, L. Vila, G. Desfonds, S. Gambarelli, J. P. Attané, J. M. De Teresa, C. Magén, and A. Fert, *Nature communications* **4**, 2944 (2013).
- [22] V. M. Edelstein, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, 2004 (1995).
- [23] V. M. Edelstein, *Physical Review B* **72**, 1 (2005).
- [24] S. K. Yip, *Physical Review B* **65**, 144508 (2002), arXiv:cond-mat/0110140.
- [25] E. Bauer and M. Sigrist, *Non-Centrosymmetric Superconductors*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 847 (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012).
- [26] I. V. Krive, A. M. Kadigrobov, R. I. Shekhter, and M. Jonson, *Physical Review B* **71**, 214516 (2004), arXiv:cond-mat/0409063.
- [27] A. I. Buzdin, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 107005 (2008), arXiv:0808.0299.
- [28] J.-F. Liu and K. Chan, *Physical Review B* **82**, 125305 (2010).
- [29] A. G. Mal'shukov, S. Sadjina, and A. Brataas, *Physical Review B* **81**, 060502 (2010).
- [30] A. A. Reynoso, G. Usaj, C. A. Balseiro, D. Feinberg, and M. Avignon, *Physical Review B* **86**, 214519 (2012), arXiv:1212.2786.
- [31] T. Yokoyama, M. Eto, and Y. V. Nazarov, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **82**, 054703 (2013), arXiv:1212.5390.
- [32] T. Yokoyama, M. Eto, and Y. V. Nazarov, (2014), arXiv:1402.0305.
- [33] T. Yokoyama and Y. V. Nazarov, *Europhysics Letters (EPL)* **108**, 47009 (2014), arXiv:1408.4034.
- [34] G. Campagnano, P. Lucignano, D. Giuliano, and A. Tagliacozzo, (2014), arXiv:1408.3953.
- [35] F. S. Bergeret and I. V. Tokatly, (2014), arXiv:1409.4563.
- [36] F. Konschelle, (2014), arXiv:1408.4533.
- [37] I. Kulagina and J. Linder, (2014), arXiv:1406.7016.
- [38] S. V. Mironov, A. S. Mel'nikov, and A. I. Buzdin, (2014), arXiv:1411.1626.
- [39] V. Braude and Y. V. Nazarov, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 077003 (2007), arXiv:cond-mat/0610037.
- [40] Y. Tanaka, A. Golubov, S. Kashiwaya, and M. Ueda, *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 037005 (2007).
- [41] M. Eschrig, T. Löfwander, T. Champel, J. C. Cuevas, J. Kopu, and G. Schön, *Journal of Low Temperature Physics* **147**, 457 (2007), arXiv:cond-mat/0610212.
- [42] R. Grein, M. Eschrig, G. Metalidis, and G. Schön, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 227005 (2009), arXiv:0904.0149.
- [43] J.-F. Liu and K. Chan, *Physical Review B* **82**, 184533 (2010).
- [44] Y. Tanaka, T. Yokoyama, and N. Nagaosa, *Physical Review Letters* **103**, 107002 (2009), arXiv:0907.2088.
- [45] F. Dolcini, M. Houzet, and J. S. Meyer, arXiv (2015), arXiv:1503.01949.
- [46] V. Geshkenbeim and A. I. Larkin, *JETP Letters* **43**, 395 (1986).
- [47] S. Yip, *Physical Review B* **52**, 3087 (1995).
- [48] Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, *Physical Review B* **56**, 892 (1997).
- [49] M. Sigrist, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **99**, 899 (1998).
- [50] S. Kashiwaya and Y. Tanaka, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **63**, 1641 (2000).
- [51] Y. Asano, Y. Tanaka, M. Sigrist, and S. Kashiwaya, *Physical Review B* **67**, 184505 (2003).
- [52] Y. Asano, Y. Tanaka, M. Sigrist, and S. Kashiwaya, *Physical Review B* **71**, 214501 (2005).
- [53] P. Brydon, B. Kastening, D. Morr, and D. Manske, *Physical Review B* **77**, 104504 (2008), arXiv:0709.2918.
- [54] Y. Rahnavard, D. Manske, and G. Annunziata, *Physical Review B* **89**, 214501 (2014).
- [55] A. A. Reynoso, G. Usaj, C. Balseiro, D. Feinberg, and M. Avignon, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 107001 (2008), arXiv:0808.1516.
- [56] A. Zazunov, R. Egger, T. Martin, and T. Jonckheere, *Physical Review Letters* **103**, 147004 (2009), arXiv:0909.3036.
- [57] A. Brunetti, A. Zazunov, A. Kundu, and R. Egger, *Physical Review B* **88**, 144515 (2013), arXiv:1305.3816.
- [58] A. I. Buzdin and A. Koshelev, *Physical Review B* **67**, 220504 (2003).
- [59] E. Goldobin, D. Koelle, R. Kleiner, and A. I. Buzdin, *Physical Review B* **76**, 224523 (2007).
- [60] E. Goldobin, D. Koelle, R. Kleiner, and R. G. Mints, *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 227001 (2011), arXiv:1110.2326.
- [61] H. Sickinger, A. Lipman, M. Weides, R. G. Mints, H. Kohlstedt, D. Koelle, R. Kleiner, and E. Goldobin, *Physical Review Letters* **109**, 107002 (2012), arXiv:1207.3013.
- [62] R. Mints, *Physical Review B* **57**, R3221 (1998).
- [63] A. I. Buzdin, *Journal de Physique IV (Proceedings)* **131**, 213 (2005).
- [64] A. I. Buzdin, *Physical Review B* **72**, 100501 (2005).
- [65] F. S. Bergeret and I. V. Tokatly, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 117003 (2013), arXiv:1211.3084.
- [66] F. S. Bergeret and I. V. Tokatly, *Physical Review B* **89**, 134517 (2014), arXiv:1402.1025.
- [67] F. Konschelle, *The European Physical Journal B* **87**, 119 (2014), arXiv:1403.1797.
- [68] E. Rashba, "Spin currents in thermodynamic equilibrium: The challenge of discerning transport currents," (2003), arXiv:cond-mat/0311110.
- [69] I. V. Tokatly, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 106601 (2008), arXiv:0802.1350.
- [70] D. Agterberg and R. Kaur, *Physical Review B* **75**, 064511 (2007), arXiv:cond-mat/0612216.
- [71] F. S. Bergeret, A. F. Volkov, and K. B. Efetov, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **77**, 1321 (2005).
- [72] A. G. Mal'shukov, L. Y. Wang, C. S. Chu, and K. A. Chao, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 146601 (2005), arXiv:cond-mat/0506724.
- [73] T. D. Stanescu and V. Galitski, *Physical Review B* **75**, 125307 (2007), arXiv:cond-mat/0611165.
- [74] M. Duckheim, D. L. Maslov, and D. Loss, *Physical Review B* **80**, 235327 (2009), arXiv:0909.1892.
- [75] J. Fröhlich and U. Studer, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **65**, 733 (1993).
- [76] B. Berche and E. Medina, *European Journal of Physics* **34**, 161 (2013), arXiv:1210.0105.



- [77] Note that, in a one dimensional system described by the Hamiltonian Eq. (3.2) the gauge-potential is always a pure-gauge and therefore 1D problem should not exhibit any magneto-electric effect. Nevertheless, the above argument does not apply for topological 1D channel, where a  $\varphi_0$ -effect has been discussed [44, 45], since the dispersion relation is not quadratic in that case [38].
- [78] A. Golubov, M. Kupriyanov, and E. Il'ichev, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **76**, 411 (2004).
- [79] A. I. Buzdin, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **77**, 935 (2005).
- [80] V. P. Mineev and K. V. Samokhin, *Physical Review B* **78**, 7 (2008), arXiv:0807.3021.
- [81] M. Houzet and J. S. Meyer, arXiv (2015), arXiv:1502.04504.
- [82] G. Eilenberger, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **214**, 195 (1968).
- [83] A. I. Larkin and Y. N. Ovchinnikov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **28**, 1200 (1969).
- [84] K. D. Usadel, *Physical Review Letters* **25**, 507 (1970).
- [85] N. B. Kopnin, *Theory of nonequilibrium superconductivity* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
- [86] D. N. Langenberg and A. I. Larkin, *Nonequilibrium superconductivity* (North-Holland, 1986).
- [87] A. Mal'shukov and C. Chu, *Physical Review B* **78**, 104503 (2008), arXiv:0801.4419.
- [88] M. Y. Kupriyanov and V. F. Lukichev, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **67**, 1163 (1988).
- [89] L. P. Gor'kov and E. Rashba, *Physical Review Letters* **87**, 37004 (2001).
- [90] H. Takayanagi and T. Kawakami, *Physical Review Letters* **54**, 2449 (1985).
- [91] V. Kresin, *Physical Review B* **34**, 7587 (1986).
- [92] P. Samuelsson, A. Ingerman, G. Johansson, E. V. Bezuglyi, V. S. Shumeiko, G. Wendin, R. Kursten, A. Richter, T. Matsuyama, and U. Merkt, *Physical Review B* **70**, 4 (2003), arXiv:cond-mat/0311344.
- [93] Y.-J. Doh, J. A. van Dam, A. L. Roest, E. P. a. M. Bakkers, L. P. Kouwenhoven, and S. De Franceschi, *Science (New York, N.Y.)* **309**, 272 (2005), arXiv:cond-mat/0508558.
- [94] J. Xiang, A. Vidan, M. Tinkham, R. M. Westervelt, and C. M. Lieber, *Nature nanotechnology* **1**, 208 (2006).
- [95] H. A. Nilsson, P. Samuelsson, P. Caroff, and H. Q. Xu, *Nano letters* **12**, 228 (2012), arXiv:1204.3936.
- [96] T. Wakamura, H. Akaïke, Y. Omori, Y. Niimi, S. Takahashi, A. Fujimaki, S. Maekawa, and Y. Otani, *Nature Materials*, 1 (2015).
- [97] F. Konschelle and A. I. Buzdin, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 017001 (2009), arXiv:0810.4286.
- [98] L. Serrier-Garcia, J. C. Cuevas, T. Cren, C. Brun, V. Cherkez, F. Debontridder, D. Fokin, F. S. Bergeret, and D. Roditchev, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 157003 (2013), arXiv:1401.8102.
- [99] I. Sochnikov, L. Maier, C. a. Watson, J. R. Kirtley, C. Gould, G. Tkachov, E. M. Hankiewicz, C. Brüne, H. Buhmann, L. W. Molenkamp, and K. A. Moler, *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 066801 (2014), arXiv:1410.1111.
- [100] V. Barzykin and A. M. Zagoskin, *Superlattices and Microstructures* **25**, 797 (1998), arXiv:cond-mat/9805104.
- [101] N. Schopohl and K. Maki, *Physical Review B* **52**, 490 (1995).
- [102] N. Schopohl, (1998), arXiv:cond-mat/9804064.