JST-DFG Workshop on Nano-electronics, March 5-7, 2008, Aschen

Spin-polarized transport in ferromagnetic semiconductor / diffusive semiconductor / superconductor junctions

H. Takayanagi 烏柳 英明

International Center for Materials NanoArchitechtonics (MANA), NIMS, Tsukuba Tokyo University of Science, Tokyo

T. Akazaki NTT Basic Research Labs., Atsugi
Y. Sawa, T. Yokoyama, Y. Tanaka Nagoya University, Nagoya
A. A. Golubov University of Twente, The Netherlands
H. Munekata Tokyo Institute of Technology, Yokohama

Motivation

Superconductivity





Appearance of the new quantum phenomena

- Josephson current via ferromagnet
- Interplay between Andreev reflection or proximity effect and spin polarization

Nb/ferromagnetic p-InMnAs/Nb junction

S-F-S junction

Nb/n-InAs/ferromagnetic p-InMnAs junction

S-N-F junction

1. S-F-S junction Nb/p-InMnAs/Nb structure



Anomalous Hall effect



• Observation of anomalous Hall effect below ~15 K

• Reverse magnetic field is ~ 1000 gauss at 0.5 K.

T_C of Nb electrodes



$$T_C \sim 8.2 {
m K}$$

5

Temperature dependence of resistance



Differential conductance in N-F-N junction



Although the weak tunneling behavior is observed in low temperatures, we have obtained nearly linear voltage-dependence.

Differential conductance in S-F-N junction



We have obtained the conductance reduction within $V \sim 1.5$ mV.

cf. Nb superconducting energy gap $\Delta_{Nb} \sim 1.5 \text{ meV}$

Differential conductance in S-F-S junction



We have obtained the conductance reduction within $V \sim 3 \text{mV}$.

Comparison between all junctions



Discussion



In Andreev reflection process, the incident electron requires the opposite spin electron to be removed from the N region for conversion to Cooper pair.

Fig. 1. Supercurrent conversion at the superconductor-metal interface for spin polarizations of P = 0 and $P \rightarrow 100\%$. (A) Schematic of the process for P = 0 when the Andreev reflection is unhindered by a spin minority population at $E_{\rm F}$. The solid circles denote electrons and open circles denote holes. (B) Experimental measurement of the *I*-V and differential conductance dI/dV at T = 1.6 K via a superconducting Nb point contact on Cu. The vertical lines denote the bulk gap of Nb: $\Delta(T = 0) = 1.5$ meV. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conductance of $G_n = 0.194$ ohm⁻¹. (C) Schematic of process for $P \rightarrow 100\%$ when there is no supercurrent conversion at the interface. (D) Experimental *I*-V and dI/dV at T = 1.6 K via the Nb point contact on CrO₂. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conduct on CrO₂. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conduct on CrO₂. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conduct on CrO₂. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conduct on CrO₂. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conduct on CrO₂. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conduct on CrO₂. The dashed line is the normal state *I*-V for a conduct on CrO₂.

In case of S-F junctions, Andreev reflection is limited by the minority spin population.

R. J. Soulen Jr. et al., Science 282, p.86 (1998)

Our experimental results can be qualitatively understood by considering the suppression of Andreev reflection due to spin polarization in $p-In_{0.96}Mn_{0.04}As$.

Current injection to SFS JJ



2. S-N-F junction p-InMnAs/n-InAs/Nb structure



Cross-sectional view

Current injection from Nb



Current injection from p-InMnAs





Inverse proximity effect

Exchange field
Ferromagnetic

$$h_F$$
 ______ Superconductor
 $h_S(x) = h \exp(-x/\xi_S)$
 0 ______ X

Theoretical Model

Usadel Equation

$$D\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\hat{G}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\hat{G}\right) + i\left[\hat{H},\hat{G}\right] = 0$$

 \hat{G} : Green's function D: Diffusion constant

Mean free path $l \ll L$



Hamiltonian for spins

$$\hat{H} = \begin{cases} \left(\mathcal{E} + (-)h_F \right) \hat{\tau}_3 & -L \le x \le 0 \\ \left[\mathcal{E} + (-)h_S \left(x \right) \right] \hat{\tau}_3 + i\Delta(x)\hat{\tau}_2 & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

 $\mathcal{E} : \text{Quasiparticle energy}$ $\Delta(x) : \text{pair potential}$ $h_{F(S)} : \text{Exchange field in F(S)}$ $\hat{\tau}_i : \text{Pauri matrix } (i = 1, 2, 3)$

Boundary condition: Conservation at the interface

 $\Delta(x \rightarrow \infty) = \Delta_0$: Bulk value

Calculation Method



 $\xi_{F(S)}$: **F**(**S**) Coherence length

Model for the Experiment



V_i Virtual voltage for the current injection



Conductance for a FS-SF junction (1)



Zero-bias conductance peak by current injection



 V_i : Corrensponds to current injection



 $\frac{-V_i / \Delta_0 = 0}{-V_i / \Delta_0 = 0.5} \quad \frac{-V_i / \Delta_0 = 1}{-V_i / \Delta_0 = 1.5}$

Conductance for a FS-SF junction (2)

Inverse proximity effect





 V_i :Corresponds to current injection



Zero bias peak is suppressed by the synergistic effect of the current injection and exchange field in the S.



Comparison with experimental results





Summary

1. Nb/**p-InMnAs**/Nb junctions.

•Suppression of Andreev reflection due to spin polarization in p-InMnAs

2.Nb/n-InAs/ferromagnetic p-InMnAs junction

- We can study the conductance of two types of junctions; one is with the inverse proximity effect and the other is without the inverse effect.
- Our theoretical model explains both experimental results.