

Minigap in superconductor–ferromagnet junctions with inhomogeneous magnetization

D. A. Ivanov¹ and Ya. V. Fominov²

¹*Institute of Theoretical Physics, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland*

²*L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics RAS, 119334 Moscow, Russia*

(Dated: 11 November 2005)

We consider the minigap in a disordered ferromagnet (F) in contact with a superconductor (S) in the situation when the magnetization of the F is inhomogeneous in space and noncollinear. If the magnetization is strongly inhomogeneous, it effectively averages out, and the minigap survives up to the exchange field $h_c \sim (L/a)E_{\text{Th}}$, where L is the thickness of the F, a is the scale on which the magnetization varies, and E_{Th} is the Thouless energy. Technically, we use the “triplet” version of the Usadel equations including both singlet and triplet components of the Green’s functions. In many cases, the effect of disordered magnetization may be effectively included in the conventional Usadel equations as the spin-flip scattering term. In the case of low-dimensional magnetic inhomogeneities (we consider spiral magnetization as an example), however, the full set of “triplet” equations must be solved.

PACS numbers: 74.45.+c, 75.60.Ch, 74.78.Fk

A minigap in the spectrum of a normal metal in contact with a superconductor is one of the most prominent consequences of the superconducting proximity effect. In the diffusive limit, if the thickness of the normal metal L is larger than the coherence length, the characteristic scale of the minigap E_g is set by the Thouless energy $E_{\text{Th}} = D/L^2$, where D is the diffusion constant (we put $\hbar = 1$) [1]. If the normal metal is replaced by a ferromagnet, the exchange field h (measured in energy units) shifts the densities of states for the two spin subbands in the opposite directions, therefore the minigap in the spectrum closes at $h \sim E_{\text{Th}}$ [2]. However, this result applies only for the case of a single-domain ferromagnet where h is constant in space. A domain structure would effectively lead to averaging the nonuniform field $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r})$ acting on electrons, hence one can expect that the minigap would survive even at $h \gg E_{\text{Th}}$. In previous studies, the influence of inhomogeneous magnetization on the density of states was considered only in situations where the minigap is absent [3, 4], and the importance of triplet superconducting correlations was pointed out.

In this Letter, we study the minigap in the presence of inhomogeneous magnetization with the help of the Usadel equations in the form allowing for the triplet superconducting component [5]. We introduce a generalization of the well-known θ parametrization [6], which involves, in addition to θ , a complex vector function \mathbf{M} with the same number of components as for the exchange field \mathbf{h} (three in the general case).

The problem has three relevant energy scales: E_{Th} , h , and the energy $E_d = D/a^2$ associated with the length scale a over which the magnetization varies (typically, of the order of the domain size). Note that the superconducting gap Δ will not play any role as it is taken to be much larger than all the three energies. Throughout the paper we assume that the domains are small and that

the ferromagnetic exchange field is weak,

$$E_d \gg h, \quad E_d \gg E_{\text{Th}}, \quad (1)$$

making no assumption on the relative scale of h and E_{Th} .

First we consider a SF (or SFS) system with randomly oriented magnetization [Fig. 1(a)] described by the pair correlation function

$$\overline{\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r}')^*} = F(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'), \quad (2)$$

where the averaging is over ensemble. We assume that the integral of the correlation function $F(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ vanishes, and take a to be the corresponding length scale. Physically, this assumption means that the field \mathbf{h} averages out on the scale a (of the order of several domain sizes). We then find that in three dimensions (in the whole range of parameters, except at very low exchange fields and at energies near the minigap edge, see discussion below) the nonhomogeneous field \mathbf{h} may be effectively included in the conventional Usadel equation for θ as the spin-flip term [7] with the spin-flip rate

$$\Gamma_{sf} = -\langle \mathbf{h}\nabla^{-2}\mathbf{h} \rangle / D \sim h^2/E_d \quad (3)$$

(the averaging is over a region much larger than a). Note that our result is different from that for point-like impurities or disorder [7, 8], because we consider \mathbf{h} varying on length scales much larger than the elastic mean free path.

The SF system with constant Γ_{sf} in the F part has already been studied in detail [9]. The critical value of Γ_{sf} where the gap closes, is $\Gamma_{sf}/E_{\text{Th}} = \pi^2/16$, which translates into the critical value of the exchange field

$$h_c \sim (E_{\text{Th}}E_d)^{1/2}. \quad (4)$$

If the disorder is one- or two-dimensional, one cannot easily reduce the nonhomogeneous field \mathbf{h} to a spin-flip




FIG. 1: (a) SF junction with random domain order. (b) Schematic dependence of the minigap E_g on the effective spin-flip rate Γ_{sf} (see [9] for details); the spin-flip approximation is not applicable in the shaded region (see text for details). (c) and (d): SFS and SF junctions with spiral magnetic order.

term and needs to solve the full nonlinear set of equations. As an illustration we consider magnetic systems with the spiral magnetization [Figs. 1(c) and 1(d)]. Remarkably, the critical values of the exchange fields for those systems also have the order of magnitude (4).

The Usadel equation for the Green's function \check{g} (which is a 4×4 matrix in the Nambu and spin spaces satisfying the normalization condition $\check{g}^2 = \check{1} \equiv \hat{\tau}_0 \hat{\sigma}_0$) has the form [5, 10]

$$D\nabla(\check{g}\nabla\check{g}) + iE[\hat{\tau}_3\hat{\sigma}_0, \check{g}] - i[\hat{\tau}_3(\mathbf{h}\hat{\sigma}), \check{g}] - \Delta[\hat{\tau}_1\hat{\sigma}_0, \check{g}] = 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{\tau}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ are the Pauli matrices in the Nambu and spin spaces, respectively; E is the energy; \mathbf{h} is the exchange field; Δ is the superconducting order parameter. For simplicity, we choose Δ to be real and do not consider systems with a phase difference.

The solution has the form

$$\check{g} = \hat{\tau}_3(g_0\hat{\sigma}_0 + \mathbf{g}\hat{\sigma}) + \hat{\tau}_1(f_0\hat{\sigma}_0 + \mathbf{f}\hat{\sigma}). \quad (6)$$

The normalization condition can be resolved by the parametrization

$$\begin{aligned} g_0 &= M_0 \cos \theta, & \mathbf{g} &= i\mathbf{M} \sin \theta, \\ f_0 &= M_0 \sin \theta, & \mathbf{f} &= -i\mathbf{M} \cos \theta, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with complex functions θ , M_0 , and \mathbf{M} , and with the constraint

$$M_0^2 - \mathbf{M}^2 = 1. \quad (8)$$

The Usadel equation (5) then yields one scalar and one vector equation:

$$(D/2)\nabla^2\theta + M_0(iE \sin \theta + \Delta \cos \theta) - (\mathbf{h}\mathbf{M}) \cos \theta = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (D/2)(\mathbf{M}\nabla^2 M_0 - M_0\nabla^2 \mathbf{M}) - \mathbf{M}(iE \cos \theta - \Delta \sin \theta) \\ - \mathbf{h}M_0 \sin \theta = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The density of states (summed over spin projections and normalized to the normal-metallic value) is standardly expressed via the retarded and advanced Green's functions, $\nu = \text{Tr}[\hat{\tau}_3\hat{\sigma}_0(\check{g}^R - \check{g}^A)]/8$, which yields

$$\nu = \text{Re } g_0 = \text{Re}(M_0 \cos \theta). \quad (11)$$

In the absence of ferromagnetism, $\mathbf{h} = 0$, $M_0 = 1$, $\mathbf{M} = 0$, and Eqs. (9) and (10) reduce to the conventional Usadel equation.

Below we consider SF and SFS systems and employ the rigid boundary conditions which imply that the bulk solution in the superconductor with constant Δ is valid up to the SF interface, and the Green's function is continuous. The rigid boundary conditions are applicable if the SF interface is transparent and the F material is much more disordered than the S one. Thus at SF interfaces

$$\theta = \pi/2, \quad M_0 = 1, \quad \mathbf{M} = 0, \quad (12)$$

where the first condition is justified since we consider energies $E \lesssim E_{\text{Th}}$, hence $E \ll \Delta$. The boundary conditions at the free surface of the F layer in the SF system are

$$d\theta/dz = 0, \quad dM_0/dz = 0, \quad d\mathbf{M}/dz = 0. \quad (13)$$

Below we consider Eqs. (9) and (10) in the F part where $\Delta = 0$; the superconducting correlations are induced due to the boundary conditions (12).

We start our analysis from the disordered system [Fig. 1(a)]. To reduce the effect of the inhomogeneous field \mathbf{h} to a spin-flip term, we use the self-consistent scheme for determining the spin-flip rate Γ_{sf} : We first solve the conventional ‘‘spin-flip’’ Usadel equation

$$(D/2)\nabla^2\theta + iE \sin \theta - 2\Gamma_{sf} \sin \theta \cos \theta = 0. \quad (14)$$

We expect that variations of \mathbf{h} in space lead to the effective averaging of the magnetization, hence the vector part \mathbf{M} of the Green's function is small. Thus we substitute the solution of Eq. (14) into the linearized version of the vector Usadel equation (10) to obtain

$$((D/2)\nabla^2 + iE \cos \theta)\mathbf{M} = -\mathbf{h} \sin \theta. \quad (15)$$

This equation is solved for \mathbf{M} with the appropriate boundary conditions, and further Γ_{sf} is found self-consistently as

$$\Gamma_{sf} = \langle \mathbf{h}\mathbf{M}/(2 \sin \theta) \rangle, \quad (16)$$

where the average is taken over a region much larger than the characteristic scale of variation of the field \mathbf{h} .

For this scheme to work, not only must we require $|\mathbf{M}| \ll 1$, but the (typically stronger) condition $|\mathbf{M}|^2 \ll \Gamma_{sf}/E_{\text{Th}}$ [since in the scalar Usadel equation (9) we neglect the quadratic in \mathbf{M} term while keeping Γ_{sf}].

Equation (15) is an inhomogeneous linear equation on \mathbf{M} . We consider energies $E \lesssim E_{\text{Th}}$, hence $|\theta| \sim 1$, and

the $(iE \cos \theta)$ term affects the Green's function of the linear operator in the left-hand side at a length scale of order L . It can be neglected if it produces a small relative correction to \mathbf{M} , which in turn depends on the number of dimensions in which $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r})$ varies. While we always consider 3D samples, \mathbf{h} can either depend on all the three coordinates or be a function of only two (quasi-2D films) or one (quasi-1D wires) coordinate. Without the $(iE \cos \theta)$ term, the Green's function of Eq. (15) is $G \propto 1/r$ in 3D, $G \propto \ln r$ in 2D, and $G \propto r$ in 1D. The inaccuracy introduced due to neglecting the $(iE \cos \theta)$ term is

$$\delta \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) = - \int \delta G(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1) \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{r}_1) \sin \theta(\mathbf{r}_1) d^d \mathbf{r}_1, \quad (17)$$

where the correction δG is negligible at length scales smaller than L . A straightforward estimate using the correlation function (2) with the vanishing integral $\int F(\mathbf{r}) d^d \mathbf{r} = 0$ gives

$$\frac{|\delta \mathbf{M}|^2}{|\mathbf{M}|^2} \sim (a/L)^{d-2}. \quad (18)$$

Therefore we can neglect the $(iE \cos \theta)$ term in 3D, can obtain order-of-magnitude estimates in this way in 2D, and cannot do it in 1D. Note that we have also neglected the effect of boundaries. It can be taken into account via ‘‘mirror charges’’ (of the same or opposite sign for the boundaries at which $\mathbf{M} = 0$ or $d\mathbf{M}/dx = 0$, respectively), and can be neglected under the same conditions.

Now we assume that the disorder is three-dimensional and neglect the $(iE \cos \theta)$ term in Eq. (15). Further, since \mathbf{h} varies in space much faster than θ , we find $\mathbf{M} = -(2/D)(\nabla^{-2} \mathbf{h}) \sin \theta$, and Eq. (16) immediately leads to the effective spin-flip scattering rate (3). That expression may be interpreted as the electrostatic energy of the ‘‘charges’’ \mathbf{h} . Estimating $\Gamma_{sf} \sim h^2 a^2/D$ and $|\mathbf{M}|^2 \sim h^2 a^4/D^2$ translates our assumptions on the smallness of \mathbf{M} into the conditions (1) which thus confirm our linearization in \mathbf{M} .

However, to finally justify the spin-flip approximation, we must avoid one more danger: the noninvertibility of the ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ $-[(D/2)\nabla^2 + iE \cos \theta]$. The calculations above were made without taking this possibility into account. At the same time, this happens exactly at the gap edge at $\Gamma_{sf} = 0$ (i.e., at zero exchange field \mathbf{h}). Indeed, below the gap $\theta = \pi/2 + i\vartheta$, where ϑ is real. Parametrizing the solutions of the Usadel equation at $\Gamma_{sf} = 0$ by ϑ_0 , the value of ϑ at the free F surface in the SF junction or in the center of the F layer in the SFS junction, and taking into account that the normal-metallic minigap E_g is the maximum value of $E(\vartheta_0)$, we see that $d\vartheta/d\vartheta_0$ is the zero-energy eigenfunction of the above ‘‘Hamiltonian’’.

So in the vicinity of the point $\Gamma_{sf} = 0$, $E = E_g$, the spin-flip approximation breaks down. In this region, the zero mode becomes a low-energy mode with a small

nonzero energy E_0 . Expanding $\mathbf{M} = \sum c_i \mathbf{M}_i$ in the basis of the normalized eigenfunctions \mathbf{M}_i of the ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ in the left-hand side of Eq. (15), we find that the contribution of the low-energy mode is determined by

$$c_0 = \frac{1}{E_0} \int d^d \mathbf{r} (\mathbf{h} \mathbf{M}_0) \sin \theta. \quad (19)$$

Using the correlation function (2), we estimate $|\overline{c_0}|^2$. Finally the condition $|\overline{c_0 \mathbf{M}_0}|^2 \ll \Gamma_{sf}/E_{Th}$ that the contribution from the low-energy mode is small, yields

$$E_0/E_{Th} \gg (a/L)^{d/2}. \quad (20)$$

The energy E_0 grows as we go away from the gap-closing point at $\Gamma_{sf} = 0$, $E = E_g$. The perturbation theory yields

$$E_0/E_{Th} \sim \max \left(\sqrt{|E - E_g|/E_{Th}}, \Gamma_{sf}/E_{Th} \right). \quad (21)$$

The combination of Eqs. (20) and (21) determines a small region near the $\Gamma_{sf} = 0$, $E = E_g$ point [shown as the shaded region in Fig. 1(b)] where the spin-flip approximation (with the effective rate Γ_{sf}) breaks down due to the noninvertibility of the linear operator in Eq. (15).

Summarizing, the Usadel equations (9) and (10) in the 3D problem reduce to the conventional Usadel equation (14) with the spin-flip rate (3) if the conditions (1) and (20) are satisfied.

The above discussion in terms of the spin-flip approximation applies to the 3D case and should give an order-of-magnitude estimate in the 2D case. In 1D setups (with the field \mathbf{h} depending only on one of the coordinates), one generally needs to solve the full nonlinear set of Eqs. (9) and (10). Below we present an analysis of the two examples [SFS and SF systems, see Fig. 1(c) and 1(d), respectively] with the *regular* spiral magnetic structure: $\mathbf{h} = h(\cos kz, \sin kz, 0)$, where the z direction is perpendicular to the SF interface(s). In both the examples we are unable to analytically find the full dependence of the minigap on the strength of the field h , but we calculate the critical value h_c at which the minigap closes.

SFS case. We consider the ferromagnet of length $2L$ [Fig. 1(c)] with the rigid boundary conditions (12) at the SF interfaces. With these boundary conditions and at zero energy it is possible to perform a derivation similar to that in the disordered 3D case. To find the gap-closing point, we find the minimal value of h at which the $E = 0$ solution with $\theta = \pi/2$ has a bifurcation (a gapless solution forks out). Linearizing in $(\theta - \pi/2)$ and in \mathbf{M} at $E = 0$, we solve Eq. (15) by $\mathbf{M} = 2\mathbf{h}/(Dk^2)$. The boundary conditions are satisfied by adding a nonoscillating linear in z term of the same order of magnitude. Substituting \mathbf{M} in the linearized scalar Usadel equation, we find

$$[(D/2)\nabla_z^2 + 2h^2/(Dk^2)](\theta - \pi/2) = 0 \quad (22)$$

with the boundary conditions $\theta(0) = \theta(2L) = \pi/2$. The bifurcation occurs at

$$h_c^{\text{SFS}} = (\pi/4)Dk/L. \quad (23)$$

We verify that the linearization over \mathbf{M} is justified under the conditions (1) (with $E_d = Dk^2$) which, in turn, reduce to the single requirement $kL \gg 1$ at $h \sim h_c^{\text{SFS}}$. Note that Eq. (23) formally coincides with the expression (3) in combination with the critical value of Γ_{sf} from [9].

SF case. Now we consider one half of the above SFS junction: the SF junction with the ferromagnet of length L [Fig. 1(d)]. In this case, the open boundary conditions cannot be satisfied at small \mathbf{M} . [Physically, \mathbf{M} is enhanced because electrons incident on the outer F surface through the field $\mathbf{h}(z)$, feel the same $\mathbf{h}(z)$ after reflection, hence the effective average of \mathbf{h} is nonzero.] Thus we need to solve the full nonlinear Eq. (10) at $E = 0$. Below the gap, \mathbf{M} is real, and it is convenient to introduce the new complex function $m(z) = M_1 + iM_2$ (where M_1 and M_2 are the components of the vector \mathbf{M}). Then in the new complex notation Eq. (10) takes the form

$$(D/2)[m'' - m(M_0^{-1}M_0'')] + he^{ikz} = 0, \quad M_0 = \sqrt{1 + mm^*} \quad (24)$$

with the boundary conditions $m(0) = 0$ and $m'(L) = 0$. We separate rapidly oscillating modes,

$$m = b_0 + b_1 e^{ikz} + b_{-1} e^{-ikz} + \dots, \quad (25)$$

and keep only the leading ones (the amplitudes b_n are slow functions of z and decrease in magnitude with increasing $|n|$, as we verify below). After a straightforward algebra, the amplitudes b_1 and b_{-1} are found to be

$$b_1 = \frac{h}{Dk^2} (2 + |b_0|^2), \quad b_{-1} = \frac{h}{Dk^2} b_0^2. \quad (26)$$

Substituting these amplitudes in Eq. (24) and parameterizing $b_0 = -ie^{ikL} \sinh \varphi$, we arrive at the effective equation on $\varphi(z)$:

$$\varphi'' + \frac{\varkappa^2}{2} \sinh \varphi \cosh \varphi = 0 \quad (27)$$

with the boundary conditions

$$\varphi(0) = 0, \quad \varphi'(L) = \varkappa \cosh \varphi(L), \quad (28)$$

where $\varkappa = 2h/(Dk)$. The solution to this equation must be substituted back into the scalar Usadel equation (9) to find the bifurcation point of the solution $\theta = \pi/2$. Again, we need to take into account not only the smooth part of θ , but also the oscillating modes at $\pm k$. After solving for those modes, we arrive at the effective equation on the smooth component of θ :

$$[\nabla_z^2 + \varkappa^2 \cosh^2 \varphi] (\theta - \pi/2) = 0 \quad (29)$$

with the boundary conditions

$$\theta(0) = \pi/2, \quad \theta'(L) = \varkappa [\theta(L) - \pi/2] \sinh \varphi(L). \quad (30)$$

At the bifurcation point, this homogeneous linear equation acquires a nonzero solution. Numerically, we find that this happens at

$$h_c^{\text{SF}} = 0.2977(Dk/L). \quad (31)$$

Having found h_c^{SF} , we can check that $b_0 \sim 1$, $b_{\pm 1} \sim 1/kL$, $b_{\pm 2} \sim 1/(kL)^2$, etc., confirming the validity of the expansion (25). Note that the critical strength of \mathbf{h} has the same order of magnitude as in the SFS case [and thus also agrees with the estimate (4)], but it has a smaller numerical prefactor.

In conclusion, we have shown that SF and SFS systems with random three-dimensional domain disorder admit an effective description in terms of the spin-flip rate Γ_{sf} . We have also considered SF and SFS junctions with spiral magnetic order, where the spin-flip approximation does not hold. In all the systems considered, the minigap survives up to the exchange fields of the order (4), i.e., much larger than E_{Th} . For an experimental observation of the effects described in the present paper, it is crucial to use weak ferromagnets with a very fine domain structure, so that the main constraints (1) are satisfied.

Ya.V.F. was supported by the RFBR Grants Nos. 04-02-16348 and 04-02-08159, the RF Presidential Grant No. MK-3811.2005.2, the Russian Science Support Foundation, the program ‘‘Quantum Macrophysics’’ of the RAS, CRDF, and the Russian Ministry of Education.

-
- [1] A. A. Golubov and M. Yu. Kupriyanov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **69**, 805 (1989).
 [2] R. Fazio and C. Lucheroni, *Europhys. Lett.* **45**, 707 (1999).
 [3] F. S. Bergeret, A. F. Volkov, and K. B. Efetov, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 064513 (2003).
 [4] A. F. Volkov, Ya. V. Fominov, and K. B. Efetov, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 184504 (2005).
 [5] F. S. Bergeret, A. F. Volkov, and K. B. Efetov, *cond-mat/0506047*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* (to be published).
 [6] W. Belzig *et al.*, *Superlattices Microstruct.* **25**, 1251 (1999).
 [7] A. A. Abrikosov and L. P. Gor'kov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **12**, 1243 (1961).
 [8] M. Houzet, V. Vinokur, and F. Pistolesi, *cond-mat/0505514*.
 [9] B. Crouzy, E. Bascones, and D. A. Ivanov, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 092501 (2005).
 [10] Our Green's function is related to the one used in [5], \check{g}_{BVE} , via a rotation $\check{g} = \check{U} \check{g}_{\text{BVE}} \check{U}^\dagger$ with $\check{U} = (1 + i\hat{\tau}_3 \hat{\sigma}_3)(1 - i\hat{\sigma}_3)/2$ (plus inessential change of sign of \mathbf{h}). We prefer this definition because then the Usadel equation possesses explicit symmetry with respect to rotations of the exchange field \mathbf{h} .