

Superconducting phase coherent electron transport in proximity conical ferromagnets

I. Sosnin, H. Cho, and V.T. Petrashov

Department of Physics, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, UK

A.F. Volkov

*Theoretische Physik III, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany and
Institute of Radioengineering and Electronics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 125009 Moscow, Russia*

(Dated: September 5, 2018)

We report superconducting phase-periodic conductance oscillations in ferromagnetic wires with interfaces to conventional superconductors. The ferromagnetic wires were made of Ho, a conical ferromagnet. The distance between the interfaces was much larger than the singlet superconducting penetration depth. We explain the observed oscillations as due to the long-range penetration of an unusual "helical" triplet component of the order parameter that is generated at the superconductor/ferromagnet interfaces and maintained by the intrinsic rotating magnetization of Ho.

PACS numbers: 72.15.Lh, 72.15.Qm, 74.45.+c

The superconducting proximity effects in normal (N) non-magnetic metals [1] can be described by the three characteristic length scales: the *coherence length* ξ_N , the electron *phase breaking length* L_ϕ , and the electron *mean free path*, l . The normal metal may become superconducting within ξ_N from the normal/superconducting (N/S) interfaces, while the superconductor-induced changes in the normal conductance may survive even longer distances up to L_ϕ . Here we specialize in proximity effects in thin films, where l belongs to the nanometer scale due to the elastic electron scattering. It is usually the smallest relevant length. The values of $\xi_N = \sqrt{\hbar D/k_B T}$ and $L_\phi = \sqrt{D\tau_\phi}$ may reach the micrometer scale at low temperatures; $D = v_F l/3$ is the electron diffusion coefficient, k_B is Boltzman constant, T is the temperature, v_F is the Fermi velocity, and τ_ϕ^{-1} is the electron phase breaking rate. Normal proximity conductors with the dimensions less than L_ϕ are, in essence, electron quantum interferometers showing periodic conductance oscillations as a function of superconducting phase difference between the N/S interfaces [2].

When the normal metal is substituted with a ferromagnet (F), the superconducting correlations and phase coherent effects are destroyed by exchange field within the ferromagnetic coherence length ξ_F which is equal to $\sqrt{\hbar D/I}$ when $I\tau/\hbar < 1$ and equal to l when $I\tau/\hbar > 1$, where I is the exchange splitting of conduction bands and τ is the elastic scattering time [3, 4]. The reason why conventional singlet superconducting correlations do not survive in a ferromagnet beyond ξ_F is well understood: the exchange field causes the splitting of spin-up and spin-down conduction bands so that a wavefunction of a singlet-state electron pair acquires a fast oscillating part due to the net momentum of the pair. The impurity scattering smears these oscillations and leads to the exponential decay of the condensate function.

The possibility of a long-range condensate penetration at distances much larger than ξ_F was not discussed until




FIG. 1: a) Magnetic structure of Ho: magnetization \mathbf{M} rotates by 30° each atomic layer along c -axis at an angle of 80° to this axis. b) Experimental set-up and SEM micrograph of $S/F/S$ junction area prepared by shadow evaporation.

recently when new experiments with F -wires contacting superconductors were undertaken [5, 6, 7]. The experiments were of two kinds: those with the measuring current flowing through the ferromagnetic conductors by-passing the superconductors and those with the current flowing through the F/S interfaces. Both could be interpreted as a manifestation of a long-range superconducting proximity effect. However, as the experiments strongly disagreed with the existing theory, efforts were made to explain the results in a way that didn't involve long-range superconducting correlations. Purely interfacial phenomena were suggested to explain the measurements with the current flowing through the F/S interface [8, 9]. As the interfacial phenomena were not able to account for the experiments with current bypassing the interfaces, an alternative explanation has been suggested based on long-distance domain redistribution at the onset of superconductivity [10]. However, the latter effect was

shown to be too small to account for the superconductor-induced changes in the resistance [11] reviving the question of anomalous long-range penetration of superconducting correlations into F . Several theories were put forward recently suggesting fundamentally new long-range proximity effects (see [12] and references therein). All of them involved a *triplet* component of superconductivity that can be generated near the F/S interfaces. However, the generation of the triplet component did not necessarily result in the long-range proximity effect. A successful theory had to provide a mechanism for survival of the triplet component in the presence of a strong electron scattering.

A mechanism for such a robust triplet proximity effect was suggested in [13]. The mechanism is operational in the presence of a rotating magnetization similar to that in the Bloch domain walls. To observe the effect experimentally a rotating magnetization near the interfaces needs to be created. The effect is predicted to be phase coherent with the phase-periodic oscillations in the conductance of F wires. Although there were many publications on transport in S/F structures [5, 6, 7, 8, 11], no such coherent oscillations have been reported up to date.

In this Letter we report the first measurements of the superconducting phase-periodic conductance oscillations in proximity F wires with distance between the F/S interfaces more than order in magnitude larger than the *singlet* magnetic coherence length ξ_{F0} . We explain the observed oscillations as a direct result of the long range triplet proximity effect predicted in [13].

A rotating magnetization is insured by the use of Ho, a conical ferromagnet with intrinsic helical magnetic structure shown in Fig. 1 a [15]. The total magnetic moment of $10.34\mu_B$ (μ_B is the Bohr magneton) in Holmium belongs to a cone with opening angle $\alpha = 80^\circ$ and rotates making a helix along the c -axis with turning angle $\theta = 30^\circ$ per inter-atomic layer with a net moment of $1.7\mu_B$ per atom. Above 21K the conical ferromagnetic structure transforms into a spiral antiferromagnetic structure ($\alpha = 90^\circ$) with Neel temperature of 133K.

The measured structure had the geometry of Andreev interferometer shown in Fig. 1 b. The S wires were made of Al, a conventional s -wave superconductor. Six samples were fabricated with the distance, L_F , between the F/S interfaces equal to 50, 120, 150, 160, 200, and 250 nm. The samples were fabricated using electron-beam lithography and the shadow evaporation technique. This method allowed us to make the whole structure without breaking vacuum thus avoiding the formation of Ho oxide barriers at the Ho/Al interfaces. The films were thermally deposited at 6×10^{-7} mbar. First, 40 nm of Ho was evaporated at an angle -14° , then 60 nm of Al, at $+14^\circ$. Thus, an Al loop is created with a Ho segment. The area of the superconducting loop was close to $20\mu^2$. Figure 1 b shows sample geometry and an SEM micro-

graph of the F/S part in one of the measured samples. The resistance of the structure was measured using standard four probe technique with electrodes connected as shown in Fig. 1 b, at low frequencies and temperatures between 0.27 and 40 K with a magnetic field up to 2 T applied perpendicular to the substrate. The resistivity ρ was in the range 80 - 90 $\mu\Omega\text{cm}$ for Ho and 0.5 - 0.6 $\mu\Omega\text{cm}$ for Al.




FIG. 2: a) Magnetoresistance of detached Ho films at different temperatures. b) Temperature dependence of the resistance of hybrid Ho/Al structure of Fig. 1 b at $H = 0$. Inset: Temperature dependence of the resistance at different Ho/Al interface resistance. Solid line: $R_b = 49.5\Omega$; dashed line: $R_b = 87.8\Omega$; dotted line: $R_b = 102.4\Omega$. c) Differential voltage-current characteristics at different temperatures in zero magnetic field for sample shown in Fig.1 b. Curves are offset for clarity.

Direct measurements of the magnetoresistance of Ho films *detached* from superconductors (otherwise deposited in the same conditions as our hybrid structures) showed ferromagnetic behavior observed earlier [14]. The magnetoresistance shows typical for Ho change of the sign between 10K and 0.3K (see Fig. 2 a). The inset in Figure 2 b shows the temperature dependence of the resistance of our hybrid structure (Fig. 1 b). The sharp drop at $T = 1.2$ K corresponds to the superconducting transition of Al wire and shows that its superconducting properties are practically not affected by the underlying Ho film. At lower temperatures the resistance increases. The increase correlates with the interface resistance as in Ref. [7]. Figure 2 c shows the differential resistance of the hybrid structure at various temperatures. At low temperatures an increase in the differential resistance at decreasing voltage is seen, similar to the increase at lowering temperature of Fig. 2 b. The resistance increase at low temperatures/voltages is characteristic to the structures with low transparency interfaces [7, 8, 9].

The results of measurements of the oscillations in the resistance of Ho wires as a function of the superconducting phase difference between their interfaces to super-




FIG. 3: a) Magnetoresistance oscillations of the sample shown in Fig. 1b measured at $T = 0.27\text{K}$ as a function of normalized external flux through the loop. Sample resistance is 94.3Ω . b) Fourier spectrum of the oscillations confirming the $hc/2e$ periodicity.

conducting Al are shown in Figure 3 a. The phase difference was created by magnetic flux through the S loop with the F segment (Fig. 1 b). The period of oscillations corresponded to the flux quantum $\Phi_0 = hc/2e = 2 \times 10^{-7} \text{Gcm}^2$ through the area of the loop with the corresponding sharp peak in the Fourier spectrum of oscillations (Fig. 3 b). The zero-field resistance of the structure of Fig. 3 with Al in superconducting state was $R = 94.3\Omega$. This resistance can be written as a sum of contributions from three Ho/Al barriers, R_b , and that from ferromagnetic wires, R_F ; $R \approx R_F + (3/2)R_b$. In our structures R_F is approximately equal to the sheet resistance that is measured to be 20Ω , so the relative amplitude of conductance oscillations is estimated as $\Delta R/R_F \approx 10^{-4}$. The oscillations have maximum resistance in zero magnetic fields. Specially fabricated test N/S structures with similar geometry and R_b values also showed maximum resistance in zero magnetic field. Out of six measured F/S structures the oscillations were observed in three samples with L_F equal to 50nm, 120 nm and 150 nm. The longer

wires of 160, 200nm and 250nm did not show oscillations within our experimental sensitivity of $\Delta R/R$ about 10^{-5} .

To estimate l , we use the value of $\rho l \approx 5 \times 10^{-5} \mu\text{cm}^2$ calculated using data [18, 19]. This gives us $l \approx 6\text{ nm}$. Another estimate can be made using the residual resistance ratio (RRR) of our Ho films. The measured $RRR = R(300\text{K})/R(0.3\text{K}) \approx 1.5$ suggesting that l in our samples is approximately equal to the electron-phonon mean free path at room temperature that is on the same order as the above estimate. Using $v_F = 10^8 \text{cm/s}$ we also obtain electron elastic scattering time $\tau = 6 \times 10^{-15} \text{s}$ and diffusion constant $D = 20 \text{cm}^2/\text{s}$. We estimate the value of I in Ho using experimental data for the spin polarization, P , of conduction electrons in Ho $P = 7\%$ [16]. In the free electron model we get

$$I = 2P\epsilon_F, \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon_F = 7.7 \text{eV}$ is Fermi energy of Ho. Thus, (1) predicts $I \approx 1.1 \text{eV}$. Another estimation of I can be made using the value of the magnetic moment per atom due to conduction electrons, $\mu_{CE} = 0.34 \mu_B$ [16], which gives $I \approx 0.84 \text{eV}$ in reasonable agreement with the above estimation. Thus, in our case the parameter $I\tau/\hbar \approx 10$ corresponding to the clean limit, so that $\xi_{F0} \approx l$.

The observed resistance oscillations prove that the phase coherence has been established in our ferromagnetic wires through the length L_F up to 150nm. Such a long-range phase coherence cannot be explained by proximity effect involving penetration of singlet order parameter. The upper limit for the singlet penetration length ξ_{F0} , as we mentioned before is equal to l . Such short penetration depth rules out singlet proximity effect as it is attenuated by the factor $\exp(-\xi_{F0}/L_F) = 2 \times 10^{-9}$ at $L_F = 120 \text{nm}$. This is in line with the value of $\xi_{F0} = 1.2 \text{nm}$ obtained from experiments on SFS Josephson junctions with ferromagnetic layer made of Gd [17] another rare-earth element with ferromagnetism due to localized 4f electrons and indirect exchange splitting of conduction bands similar to Ho, however, without ferro-cone magnetization structure.

The "helical" triplet superconductivity contains states with spin projections $s = \pm 1$ that are insensitive to the exchange field, as all other triplet mechanisms considered recently [20, 21, 22]. However its condensate function being odd in the Matsubara frequency (the so called *odd* triplet superconductivity) is even in the momentum p and and therefore, unlike other unconventional condensates, is not destroyed by the presence of non-magnetic impurities thus surviving much longer distances than the mean free path of quasiparticles. It is generated in the presence of inhomogeneity of magnetization at the F/S interfaces. Such inhomogeneities, hence the effect, can in principle exist in "usual" ferromagnets within the domain walls explaining experiments [5, 6, 7]. However, no existing technology can create them in a controlled

way at the F/S interfaces with nanoscale precision. In our Ho conductors the helical magnetization is an intrinsic property. The value of the helical triplet coherence length, ξ_{F1} , depends on I , τ , the period of magnetization rotation in space, L_M , and their relationships. The generalized formula for ξ_{F1} valid for arbitrary relation between I and $\hbar\tau^{-1}$ can be written as [23]:

$$\xi_{F1}^{-1} = \sqrt{2\pi k_B T / \hbar D + Q^2 / (1 + (2I\tau/\hbar)^2)}, \quad (2)$$

where $Q = 2\pi/L_M$, L_M is the period of magnetization rotation. In Ho $L_M = 6.74$ nm. Substituting values for I and τ in (2), we estimate $\xi_{F1} \approx 24$ nm.

The amplitude of the triplet component f_{F1} of condensate function can be written as [23]

$$f_{F1}(x) = \frac{R_F}{R_b} \frac{\hbar Q v_F}{2I} \exp\left(-\frac{x}{\xi_{F1}}\right), \quad (3)$$

where x is a space coordinate away from an F/S interface and $x = 0$ at the interface. The factor $\exp(-x/\xi_{F1})$ accounts for exponential decay of condensate wavefunction over the characteristic length ξ_{F1} from F/S interface, a good approximation when $x \gg \xi_{F1}$. We use this form because $L_F > \xi_{F1}$. The amplitude of resistance oscillations depends on interference of condensate wavefunctions generated at both interfaces and can be estimated as [23]

$$\Delta R = R_F \left(\frac{R_F}{R_b}\right)^2 \left(\frac{l}{L_M} \frac{\pi \hbar}{I \tau}\right)^2 \times \exp(-L_F/\xi_{F1}), \quad (4)$$

Substituting experimental values in (4) we obtain $\Delta R = 1.2$ m Ω in a reasonable agreement with experimentally observed amplitudes (see Fig 3 a).

Note that although in the main approximation the singlet component penetrates over a small distance ξ_{F0} , the coupling of singlet and triplet order parameters means that there will be a long-range, of the order ξ_{F1} , penetration of singlet component. However, contribution to resistance from this long-range part of the singlet component is smaller than the that of the triplet component by the parameter $(Qv_F l / I \xi_{F1})^2 = 4 \times 10^{-2}$, so it can be neglected here.

In conclusion, we have observed superconducting phase-periodic conductance oscillations in ferromagnetic wires with helical magnetization coupled to a singlet superconductor. The length of the wires was much larger than the singlet order parameter penetration depth ruling out the conventional proximity effect. We explain the

oscillations as due to the long range penetration of unusual helical triplet component of superconductivity that is generated in ferromagnetic conductors in the presence of rotating magnetization.

The work was supported by EPSRC grant ARF/001343 (UK) and by SFB grant 491(Germany). VTP and IS thank V. Edelstein for fruitful discussions.

-
- [1] C.J. Lambert and R. Raimondi, J. Phys.: Condens. Matt. **10**, 901 (1998).
 - [2] V.T. Petrashov, V.N. Antonov, P. Delsing, and T. Claesson, Phys. Rev. Lett., **74**, 5268 (1995).
 - [3] F.S. Bergeret, A.F. Volkov and K.B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 134506 (2001).
 - [4] I. Baladie and A. Buzdin, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 224514 (2001).
 - [5] V.T. Petrashov, V.N. Antonov, S.V. Maksimov, R.S. Shaikhaidarov, JETP Lett. **59**,523 (1994); V.T. Petrashov, Czech. J. Phys. **46**, 3303 (1996).
 - [6] M. Giroud, H. Courtois, K. Hasselbach, D. Mailly, and B. Pannetier, Phys. Rev. B **58**, R11872 (1998).
 - [7] V.T. Petrashov, I.A. Sosnin, I. Cox, A. Parsons, and C. Troadec, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3281 (1999).
 - [8] J. Aumentado and V. Chandrasekhar, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 54505 (2001).
 - [9] W. Belzig, A. Brataas, Y.V. Nazarov, and G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 9726 (2000).
 - [10] S.V. Dubonos, A.K. Geim, K.S. Novoselov, and I.V. Grigorieva, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 220513(R) (2002).
 - [11] P. Nugent, I. Sosnin and V.T. Petrashov, J. Phys.: Condens. Matt. **16**, L509 (2004).
 - [12] F.S. Bergeret, A.F. Volkov and K.B. Efetov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 4 (2005).
 - [13] F.S. Bergeret, A.F. Volkov and K.B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4096 (2001).
 - [14] R.L. Singh, Phys. Rev. B, **15** 4174 (1977).
 - [15] W.C. Koehler, J.W. Cable, M.K. Wilkinson, and E.O. Wollan, Phys. Rev. **151**, 414 (1966).
 - [16] R. Meservey, D. Paraskevopoulos, and P.M. Tedrow, Phys. Rev. B, **22**, 1331 (1980).
 - [17] O. Bourgeois, P. Gandit, J. Lesuer, A. Sulpice, X. Grison, and J. Chaussy, Eur. Phys. J. B **21**, 75 (2001).
 - [18] R. Ratnalingam and J.B. Sousa, Phys. Lett., **30A**, 8 (1969).
 - [19] C. Reale, Appl. Phys., **2**, 183 (1973).
 - [20] A. Kadigrobov, R. I. Shekhter and M. Jonson, Europhys. Lett. **54**, 394 (2001).
 - [21] M. Eschrig, J. Kopu, J. C. Cuevas, and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 137003 (2003).
 - [22] V.M. Edelstein, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 020505(R) (2003).
 - [23] A.F. Volkov, unpublished.