

Voltage control of superconducting exchange interaction and anomalous Josephson effect

Jabir Ali Ouassou¹ and Jacob Linder¹

¹*Center for Quantum Spintronics, Department of Physics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway*

(Dated: September 22, 2022)

Exerting control of the magnetic exchange interaction in heterostructures is of both basic interest and has potential for use in spin-based applications relying on quantum effects. We here show that the sign of the exchange interaction in a spin-valve, determining whether the ferro- or antiferromagnetic configuration is favored, can be controlled via an electric voltage. This occurs due to an interplay between a nonequilibrium quasiparticle distribution and the presence of spin-polarized Cooper pairs. Additionally, we show that a voltage-induced distribution controls the anomalous supercurrent that occurs in magnetic Josephson junctions, obviating the challenging task to manipulate the magnetic texture of the system. This demonstrates that two key phenomena in superconducting spintronics, the magnetic exchange interaction and the phase shift generating the anomalous Josephson effect, can be controlled electrically. Our findings are of relevance for spin-based superconducting devices which in practice most likely have to be operated precisely by nonequilibrium effects.

Introduction.—Driving a condensed matter system out of equilibrium via a control parameter such as electric voltage is a fundamentally interesting scenario. It offers a way to alter the physical properties of the system in a controllable manner and can give rise to new types of quantum effects. In recent years, it has been realized that rich physics ensues when considering magnetic-superconducting heterostructures that are out of equilibrium [1–3]. This includes very large thermoelectric effects [4–6], large quasiparticle spin Hall effects [7], raising the paramagnetic limit of superconducting films [8], and supercurrent-induced magnetization dynamics [9–14]. The study of such effects is associated with the field of superconducting spintronics [15], where the aim is to create a synergy between spin-polarized order and superconductivity.

Historically, creating a nonequilibrium distribution of quasiparticle states in superconducting structures has been shown to give rise to interesting effects. A prominent example is the supercurrent transistor demonstrated in Ref. [16], where the direction of a Josephson effect (charge supercurrent) was tuned via a voltage-induced nonequilibrium distribution in a superconductor/normal-metal/superconductor junction [17]. In this Letter, we explore a spin-analogue of this effect. More precisely, we pose the question: can a *spin supercurrent* be controlled via the nonequilibrium mode induced by an electric voltage? Such a spin supercurrent exists when magnetic layers are added to the Josephson junction above and physically represents the exchange interaction between these layers [18, 19]. If the spin supercurrent—and in particular its sign—is controlled by a nonequilibrium distribution function, it allows the preferred magnetic configuration to be switched by an electric voltage. We show that this is indeed possible, and that it only requires small voltages below the superconducting gap Δ .

Additionally, we show that the recently experimentally observed anomalous phase shift in Josephson junctions [20] can be tuned via a nonequilibrium distribution of quasiparticles. This is induced via an electric current and permits a nonmagnetic way to control the anomalous Josephson effect, which removes the challenging requirement to manipulate the intricate noncollinear magnetic texture of structures that exhibit an anomalous supercurrent [21]. We predict large phase shifts that can be tuned by more than $\pi/2$ for voltages smaller than

the superconducting gap (~ 1 meV). This is two orders of magnitude smaller than the electric gate voltage that was used in Ref. [20] to observe the anomalous phase shift.

Methodology.—To determine the influence of nonequilibrium quasiparticle occupation in the system induced by an electric voltage, we use the quasiclassical theory of superconductivity. This framework is well-suited to address a range of physical phenomena occurring in mesoscopic heterostructures, including charge and spin supercurrents. We propose experimental setups for observing our predictions in Fig. 1. These setups should be experimentally feasible as they are similar to the setup used by Baselmans *et al.* [16], but with the addition of magnetic layers. In Fig. 1(a), an electric voltage injects a resistive charge current into a normal-metal wire. At the center of each wire, there is no net charge accumulation, but a surplus of *both* electrons and holes compared to the equilibrium situation. The superconducting and normal regions are interfaced by magnetic insulators, which influence each other via an exchange interaction. The quasiparticle injection described above alters the occupation of not only charge supercurrent-carrying states, as discussed in Refs. [16, 17, 22], but also the spin supercurrent-carrying states, which determine the exchange interaction between the magnetic insulators.

In Fig. 1(b), the weak link is made from a ferromagnetic metal, but except for that, the setup is identical. When the magnetizations of the ferromagnetic insulators, \mathbf{m}_L and \mathbf{m}_R , form a nonzero spin chirality χ together with the magnetization of the metallic ferromagnet according to $\chi = \mathbf{m} \cdot (\mathbf{m}_L \times \mathbf{m}_R)$, an anomalous Josephson effect appears at zero phase difference between the superconductors. This phenomenon can be understood from the fact that the broken spin-degeneracy combined with the broken chirality symmetry of the system allows the Cooper pairs to gain a net additional phase φ_0 as they tunnel through the system. By using quasiparticle injection to change the occupation of charge supercurrent-carrying states, we show below that this anomalous Josephson current can be altered.

Both systems in Fig. 1 can be described by the Usadel equation for diffusive systems [3, 23–26],

$$i\xi^2 \nabla(\check{g} \nabla \check{g}) = [\hat{\Delta} + \mathbf{m} \cdot \hat{\sigma} + \varepsilon \hat{\tau}_3, \check{g}]/\Delta_0, \quad (1)$$

which determines the 8×8 quasiclassical Green function matrix

$$\check{g} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{g}^R & \hat{g}^K \\ 0 & \hat{g}^A \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Above, $\hat{\Delta} = \text{antidiag}(+\Delta, -\Delta, +\Delta^*, -\Delta^*)$, $\hat{\sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma, \sigma^*)$, $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$, σ_n are Pauli matrices in spin space, and $\hat{\tau}_n$ are Pauli matrices in Nambu space. The parameter Δ is the superconducting gap, which we take to be $\Delta_0 e^{\pm i\varphi/2}$ for the superconductors in Fig. 1, where Δ_0 is the zero-temperature bulk gap, and φ is the phase difference between them. The parameter m is the exchange field of a magnetic metal, which we take to be homogeneous. We consider weakly polarized ferromagnetic alloys such as PdNi with a low content of Ni, where the exchange field is of order 10 meV [27]. Finally, ξ is the diffusive coherence length, and ε the quasiparticle energy.

The components of the Usadel equation are related by the identities $\hat{g}^K = \hat{g}^R \hat{h} - \hat{h} \hat{g}^A$ and $\hat{g}^A = \hat{\tau}_3 \hat{g}^{R\dagger} \hat{\tau}_3$, which means that it is in general sufficient to solve for the retarded component \hat{g}^R and a distribution function \hat{h} . We numerically solved the equations for the retarded component using a Riccati-parametrization [28]. The magnetic insulators in Fig. 1(a–b) were treated as spin-active interfaces [5, 29–31], with all system parameters given in the captions of Figs. 2 and 3. As for the distribution function \hat{h} , we did not need to explicitly solve the kinetic equations [3, 8, 23, 24, 32–34], since an analytical solution is already known [17, 22, 35]:

$$\hat{h} = \frac{1}{2} [\tanh(\varepsilon + eV/2) + \tanh(\varepsilon - eV/2)] \hat{\tau}_0 \hat{\sigma}_0. \quad (3)$$

This result is valid near the centers of voltage-biased normal metals, including the weak links shown in Fig. 1. The charge and spin currents were determined from the numerically calculated Green functions using standard formulas [1, 3, 23–25].

Results.—The exchange interaction between two magnetic layers is a consequence of an equilibrium spin current J_s flowing from one to the other and exerting a torque τ by depositing spin angular momentum to the ferromagnet. The direction of the torque τ is determined by the polarization of the spin supercurrent. This means that reversing the spin supercurrent, one can control the magnetization configuration of the spin-valve to favor either a parallel or antiparallel alignment. A comparison between the properties of the exchange interaction in normal and superconducting system was provided in Ref. [9].

In Fig. 2(a), we show that the nonequilibrium distribution function in the Josephson weak link determines the sign of the superconducting spin current that mediates the exchange interaction. The plot shows the spin supercurrent polarized in the $m_L \times m_R = z$ direction. The spin supercurrent drops approximately linearly from its maximum at zero to its minimum occurring at $eV/2 \approx 0.35\Delta_0$ and *changes sign* in between. As a result, the favored configuration of the magnetic insulators is changed from ferro- to antiferromagnetic by modifying the distribution of quasiparticles in the weak link with a voltage that is smaller than the superconducting gap. This corresponds to a voltage less than ~ 1 meV. We have numerically confirmed that the sign change of the spin supercurrent as a function of applied voltage occurs for a wide parameter range.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Suggested experimental setups. External voltage sources inject resistive charge currents into normal-metal wires (grey arrows). Near the centers of these wires, there is no net charge accumulation, but an excess of *both* electrons and holes compared to the equilibrium situation. These regions of the normal metals are then used as the weak links of magnetic Josephson junctions. (a) If the weak link is a normal metal, a spontaneous spin supercurrent $J_s \sim m_L \times m_R$ flows between the magnetic insulators (black arrow), where m_L and m_R refer to their magnetization directions. We show that this spin supercurrent can be reversed as a function of voltage, resulting in a voltage-controllable switching from ferro- to antiferromagnetic interactions between the magnets. (b) If the weak link is a ferromagnet, there will in addition be a spontaneous charge supercurrent $J_e \sim m \cdot (m_L \times m_R)$ flowing between the superconductors (black arrow), where m is the exchange field in the weak link. We show that this charge supercurrent can be tuned as a function of voltage, resulting in a voltage-controllable ground-state phase shift between the two superconductors.

Recently, the superconducting exchange coupling between ferromagnets was experimentally reported in Ref. [36]. By lowering the temperature below the superconducting critical temperature T_c , an antiferromagnetic effective exchange interaction was induced by the transition to the superconducting state. Here, we have shown that the superconducting exchange interaction can be toggled between ferro- and antiferromagnetic via electric voltage, providing a new mechanism compatible with

devices operating out-of-equilibrium for actively controlling the magnetic state. Physically, the sign change of the exchange interaction can be understood from the fact that the voltage alters the occupation of not only states carrying the spectral (energy-resolved) charge supercurrent through the junction, but also the spin supercurrent.

For a more thorough explanation of the effect, we have to consider the spectral spin supercurrents. The total spin supercurrent J_s can be expressed as an integral

$$J_s = J_{s0} \int_0^{\infty} d\varepsilon j_s(\varepsilon) h(\varepsilon), \quad (4)$$

where the spectral spin supercurrent j_s describes the spin supercurrent-carrying states available, and the distribution function $h(\varepsilon)$ describes which of these are occupied. The prefactor is $J_{s0} = (\hbar/2e^2)G_N\Delta_0$ where G_N is the normal-state Drude-conductance. According to Eq. (3) in the limit $T \rightarrow 0$, the distribution function at $\varepsilon > 0$ can be summarized as a step function $\Theta(\varepsilon - eV/2)$, where we assume a positive voltage V . Putting these equations together, we see that the spin supercurrent is basically just an integral of j_s from $\varepsilon = eV/2$ and up. In Fig. 2(b), we have plotted the numerically calculated spectral spin supercurrent as a function of energy. The result is primarily positive for $\varepsilon < 0.35\Delta_0$, and primarily negative for $\varepsilon > 0.35\Delta_0$. Since the equation above shows that the voltage $eV/2$ plays the role of a cutoff that determines which of these regions in energy space contribute to the total spin supercurrent, it becomes clear why the spin supercurrent can be switched via an electric voltage. The mechanism is thus similar to the charge supercurrent switching [17] in an S/N/S transistor setup with phase-biased superconductors.

Our second main result is that the voltage-controlled nonequilibrium quasiparticle distribution can be used to control the anomalous Josephson effect. Fig. 3(a) shows the phase shift as a function of applied voltage. As the phase increases from its minimum value $\varphi_0 \approx \pi/4$ at $eV/2 = 0.2\Delta_0$ to a maximum $\varphi_0 \approx \pi$ near $eV/2 = \Delta_0$, the phase shift is seen to be tuned by more than 120° within a voltage regime of ~ 1 meV. It is worth emphasizing that the voltage required here to change the φ_0 -shift is two orders of magnitude smaller than the gate voltage ~ 200 meV used in the recent experiment Ref. [20]. This suggests that the anomalous phase shift proposed in the present manuscript can be tuned with much less power dissipation than by using gated quantum dots.

The physical mechanism behind the voltage-controlled phase shift can be understood as follows. The total supercurrent flowing in a Josephson junction with a finite spin-chirality χ has two contributions according to $J_e = J_{c1} \sin \varphi + J_{c2} \cos \varphi$ where $J_{c2} \sim \chi$ [37–39]. The latter term is responsible for the anomalous supercurrent at zero phase difference, as can be seen by rewriting the current-phase relation to the form $J_e = J_c \sin(\varphi - \varphi_0)$ where φ_0 depends on the relative magnitude of J_{c1} and J_{c2} . From previous works considering S/N/S transistors [16, 17], it is known that the conventional term J_{c1} can be forced to change sign by inducing a nonequilibrium energy distribution, corresponding to a $0-\pi$ transition. Precisely at this transition point, only the anomalous part $\cos \varphi$




FIG. 2: (Color online) Numerical results for the setup in Fig. 1(a). (a) Spin supercurrent J_s as a function of applied voltage. The voltage shifts the distribution function in the weak link of the Josephson junction, and causes the spin supercurrent to change sign at $eV/2$ well below Δ_0 . Since the spin supercurrent mediates the exchange interaction between the magnets, the sign reversal implies a switch from ferro- to antiferromagnetic interactions. The magnetic insulators were modeled as spin-active interfaces with polarization $P = 70\%$, tunneling conductance $G_T = 0.3G_N$, and spin-mixing conductance $G_\varphi = 1.25G_T$. The normal-metal weak link has a length $L_N = \xi$ and conductance G_N . (b) Spectral spin supercurrent j_s as a function of energy. Note that j_s changes its sign at higher energies, which explains why manipulating the distribution function can reverse the spin supercurrent J_s .




FIG. 3: (Color online) Phase shift causing the anomalous Josephson effect in the system depicted in Fig. 1(b). We have used the same interfacial parameter set as in Fig. 2 and set the length $L_F = 0.5\xi$ and exchange field $m = 5\Delta_0$ for the ferromagnetic metal weak link.

remains which is seen in the red curve ($eV/2 = 0.5\Delta_0$) of Fig. 3(b). As one moves away from the $0-\pi$ transition point, the critical supercurrent may increase since now both J_{c1} and J_{c2} contribute to J_e . This matches well with the $eV/2 = 0.3\Delta_0$ and $eV/2 = 0.6\Delta_0$ curves in Fig. 3. Additionally, since the ratio J_{c1}/J_{c2} changes rapidly around the $0-\pi$ transition point corresponding to $eV/2 = 0.5\Delta_0$, we would expect the anomalous phase shift to also vary rapidly near this voltage. This is confirmed by the results in Fig. 3(a).

The electrically tunable anomalous phase shift could be of interest for the purpose of designing a phase battery. Similarly to how conventional batteries store a potential difference which can drive resistive currents, an anomalous Josephson junction provides a built-in phase difference which could be used to drive supercurrents. Recent works on magnetic Josephson junctions have taken steps toward realizing such a phase control [21].

Conclusion.—We have investigated the influence of nonequilibrium quasiparticle modes on a superconducting spin-valve and discovered two effects. First, the voltage-controlled distribution function controls the magnitude and sign of the

superconducting exchange interaction, toggling the preferred configuration of the spin-valve from ferro- to antiferromagnetic. Moreover, we show that the same basic setup controls the anomalous Josephson effect in a junction with finite spin-chirality, obviating the requirement to manipulate the magnetic texture of the system. We believe this two phenomena may be of interest for the design of nonequilibrium superconducting devices that exploit spin-dependent quantum effects.

Acknowledgments

We thank O. Bolme and V. Risinggård for discussions. The numerics was performed on resources provided by UNINETT Sigma2—the national infrastructure for high performance computing and data storage in Norway. This work was supported by the Research Council of Norway through grant 240806, and its Centres of Excellence funding scheme grant 262633 “*QuSpin*”.

-
- [1] M. Eschrig. Rep. Prog. Phys. **78**, 104501 (2015).
 [2] D. Beckmann. J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **28**, 163001 (2016).
 [3] F.S. Bergeret, M. Silaev, P. Virtanen, and T.T. Heikkilä. arXiv:1706.08245
 [4] M.S. Kalenkov, A.D. Zaikin, and L.S. Kuzmin. Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 147004 (2012).
 [5] P. Machon, M. Eschrig, and W. Belzig. Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 047002 (2013).
 [6] S. Kolenda, M.J. Wolf, and D. Beckmann. Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 097001 (2016)
 [7] T. Wakamura, H. Akaike, Y. Omori, Y. Niimi, S. Takahashi, A. Fujimaki, S. Maekawa, and Y. Otani. Nature Materials **14**, 675–678 (2015).
 [8] J.A. Ouassou, T.D. Vethaak, and J. Linder. arXiv:1803.07076
 [9] X. Waintal and P.W. Brouwer. Phys. Rev. B **65**, 054407 (2002).
 [10] E. Zhao and J.A. Sauls. Phys. Rev. B **78**, 174511 (2008).
 [11] J. Linder and T. Yokoyama. Phys. Rev. B **83**, 012501 (2011).
 [12] C. Holmqvist, W. Belzig, and M. Fogelström. Phys. Rev. B **86**, 054519 (2012).
 [13] R. Takashima, S. Fujimoto, and T. Yokoyama. Phys. Rev. B **96**, 121203(R) (2017).
 [14] I.V. Bobkova, A.M. Bobkov, and M.A. Silaev. Phys. Rev. B **98**, 014521 (2018).
 [15] J. Linder and J.W.A. Robinson. Nature Physics **11**, 307 (2015).
 [16] J.J.A. Baselmans, A.F. Morpurgo, B.J. van Wees, and T.M. Klapwijk. Nature **397**, 43 (1999).
 [17] F.K. Wilhelm, G. Schön, and A.D. Zaikin. Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1682 (1998).
 [18] J.C. Slonczewski. Phys. Rev. B **39**, 6995 (1989).
 [19] F.S. Nogueira and K.-H. Bennemann. EPL **67**, 620 (2004).
 [20] D.B. Szombati, S. Nadj-Perge, D. Car, S.R. Plissard, E.P.A.M. Bakkers, L.P. Kouwenhoven. Nat. Phys. **12**, 568 (2016).
 [21] J.A. Glick *et al.*. Sci. Adv. **27**, 7 (2018).
 [22] T.T. Heikkilä, W.K. Wilhelm, and G. Schön. EPL **51**, 434 (2000).
 [23] V. Chandrasekhar. In *Superconductivity* (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008) pp. 279–313.
 [24] W. Belzig, F.K. Wilhelm, C. Bruder, G. Schön, and A.D. Zaikin. Superlattices and Microstructures **25**, 1251 (1999).
 [25] J. Rammer and H. Smith. Rev. Mod. Phys. **58**, 323 (1986).
 [26] K.D. Usadel. Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 507 (1970).
 [27] T. Kontos, M. Aprili, J. Lesueur, and X. Grison. Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 304 (2001).
 [28] N. Schopohl. arXiv:cond-mat/9804064.
 [29] M. Eschrig, A. Cottet, W. Belzig, and J. Linder. New J. Phys. **17**, 083037 (2015).
 [30] A. Cottet, D. Huertas-Hernando, W. Belzig, and Y.V. Nazarov. Phys. Rev. B **80**, 184511 (2009).
 [31] A. Cottet. Phys. Rev. B **76**, 224505 (2007).
 [32] I.V. Bobkova and A.M. Bobkov. JETP Lett. **101**, 118 (2015).
 [33] M. Silaev, P. Virtanen, F.S. Bergeret, and T.T. Heikkilä. Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 167002 (2015).
 [34] F. Aikebaier, M.A. Silaev, and T.T. Heikkilä. arXiv:1712.08653.
 [35] H. Pothier, S. Guéron, N.O. Birge, D. Esteve, and M.H. Devoret. Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3490 (1997).
 [36] Y. Zhu, A. Pal, M. Blamire, and Z.H. Barber. Nature Materials **16**, 195 (2017).
 [37] I. Kulagina and J. Linder. Phys. Rev. B **90**, 054504 (2014).
 [38] Y. Asano, Y. Sawa, Y. Tanaka, and A. Golubov. Phys. Rev. B **76**, 224525 (2007).
 [39] R. Grein, M. Eschrig, G. Metalidis, and G. Schön. Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 227005 (2009).