

Crossed Andreev reflection at ferromagnetic domain walls

R. Mélin^{(1)*} and S. Peysson⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ *Centre de Recherches sur les Très basses températures (CRTBT)[†]
BP 166X, 38042 Grenoble Cedex, France*

⁽²⁾ *Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica, Universiteit van Amsterdam,
Valckenierstraat 65, 1018XE Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

We investigate several factors controlling the physics of hybrid structures involving ferromagnetic domain walls (DWs) and superconducting (S) metals. We discuss the role of non collinear magnetizations in S/DW junctions in a spin \otimes Nambu \otimes Keldysh formalism. We discuss transport in S/DW/N and S/DW/S junctions in the presence of inelastic scattering in the domain wall. In this case transport properties are similar for the S/DW/S and S/DW/N junctions and are controlled by sequential tunneling of spatially separated Cooper pairs across the domain wall. In the absence of inelastic scattering we find that a Josephson current can circulate across a domain wall in a half-metal ferromagnet. The sign of the Josephson current is random because the spin-up and spin-down electrons of the Cooper pairs see different realizations of disorder. We discuss the Josephson effect on the basis of an approximation valid in the long junction limit and for low interface transparencies.

I. INTRODUCTION

A simple way of obtaining correlated pairs of electrons in solid state devices is to extract Cooper pairs from a BCS superconductor. Devices based on this principle have focussed an important interest recently. For instance entangled pairs of electrons can be manipulated in double dot experiments [1]. Other devices involving a larger number of quantum dots have been proposed recently as a quantum teleportation experiment [2]. Devices involving several ferromagnetic electrodes connected to a superconductor have been investigated recently [3–6]. Noise correlations can also provide useful information about quantum entanglement [7].

Many phenomena are involved in the proximity effect at ferromagnet / superconductor (F/S) interfaces. For instance it is well established that the pair amplitude induced in a ferromagnetic metal oscillates in space. An interesting consequence is the possibility of fabricating S/F/S π -junctions in which the Josephson relation is $I = I_c \sin(\varphi + \pi)$ [8–15]. In F/S/F trilayers the superconducting transition temperature is larger in the antiferromagnetic alignment of the ferromagnetic electrodes [16,17] because a finite exchange field is induced in the superconductor in the ferromagnetic alignment. On the other hand there exist “non local” superconducting correlations coupling the two ferromagnetic electrodes that favor $\Delta_F > \Delta_{AF}$ (the zero-temperature superconducting order parameter is larger in the ferromagnetic alignment) [18,19]. It is also well known that the superconducting transition temperature of F/S multilayers oscillates as the thickness of the ferromagnetic layers is increased [20–25]. Several recent works have investigated new phenomena taking place in diffusive F/S heterostructures [26–31]. Other recent works were devoted to understand the interplay between Andreev reflection and spin polarization at a single F/S interface [32–34].

In a recent article M. Giroud *et al.* have proposed on the basis of experiments that the proximity effect at F/S interfaces could be strongly modified by the presence of Cooper pair-like states propagating along domain walls (DWs) [31]. These Cooper pair-like states correspond to pair states in which the spin-up and spin-down electrons propagate in a neighboring spin-up and spin-down magnetic domain. This proximity effect is not strictly speaking equivalent to the proximity effect at N/S interfaces. The reason is that the pair correlations induced in the N side of a N/S interface have entangled orbital and spin degrees of freedom [7]. By contrast for half-metal ferromagnets the wave function associated to the propagation of superconducting correlations along domain walls is given by the product state $|e, \alpha, \uparrow\rangle \otimes |e, \beta, \downarrow\rangle$, where α and β represent two points in neighboring magnetic domains. Another difference between a N/S interface and a multiterminal hybrid structure is that the incoming electron and the Andreev reflected hole propagate in different electrodes in multiterminal structures. As a consequence the Andreev reflected hole cannot follow the same trajectory as the incoming electron. This has important consequences regarding disorder averaging.

The purpose of our article is to investigate theoretically the mechanisms by which the Cooper pair-like state $|e, \alpha, \uparrow\rangle \otimes |e, \beta, \downarrow\rangle$ can propagate along a ferromagnetic domain wall and to investigate several new situations that may

*melin@grenoble.cnrs.fr

[†]U.P.R. 5001 du CNRS, Laboratoire conventionné avec l’Université Joseph Fourier

be the object of experiments in the future. In section III we discuss the perturbative transport formula of a S/DW junction in which the domain wall consists of many independent channels in parallel having a rotating magnetization. To discuss this model we use the spin \otimes Nambu \otimes Keldysh formalism described in section II. For the sake of obtaining analytical results we restrict the discussion to the transport formula obtained within lowest order perturbation theory.

If propagation in the ferromagnet is phase coherent then the pair state $|e, \alpha, \uparrow\rangle \otimes |e, \beta, \downarrow\rangle$ injected at one end of the domain wall can propagate to the other end. On the other hand if the phase coherence length l_ϕ is small compared to the size of the ferromagnetic region then inelastic scattering processes are strong and there are just a spin-up and a spin-down electron propagating independently in the spin-up and spin-down magnetic domains. There is no Josephson current but there exists crossed Andreev reflection taking place locally at each F/S interface, so that the conductance is larger in the presence of the domain wall.

In section IV we discuss the S/DW/N and S/DW/S junctions in a regime where transport properties are dominated by inelastic scattering in the domain wall. The domain wall is represented by two channels in parallel, with an opposite magnetization. This schematic model of domain wall is expected to capture the essential physics, and can be a useful comparison for more realistic studies involving numerical simulations that we plan to carry out in the future. We show that within lowest order perturbation the transport properties are governed by processes taking place locally at each interface once the summation over the different conduction channels has been carried out. The chemical potentials in the domain wall are determined by evaluating the current circulating through each interface and imposing current conservation.

In section V we consider the other situation where inelastic scattering within the domain wall can be neglected. In this situation a finite Josephson current circulates between the two superconductors of the S/DW/S junction. For half-metal ferromagnets the Josephson current is due only to crossed Andreev reflection taking place at the domain wall. For ferromagnets with a partial spin polarization the Josephson current is due to both π -junction and crossed Andreev reflection processes. Our theoretical description is valid in the regime where the length of the ferromagnetic region is large and the interfaces have a small transparency. In this case the Josephson current is given by lowest order processes times a geometrical factor that is different for the different types of junctions (namely the S/F/S π -junctions, the two-channel S/DW/S junction, the multichannel S/DW/S junction, ...)

Multichannel effects are discussed in section VI. Even though our discussion is based on ballistic models we can introduce disorder in the position of the sites at the interfaces. We find that the sign of the Josephson relation of the S/DW/S junction is random in the presence of disorder. This is due to the fact that the spin-up and spin-down electrons of the Cooper pairs propagate along different trajectories and thus see a different realization of disorder. As a consequence the product of the propagators of the spin-up and spin-down electrons acquires a random sign. By contrast the product would be positive for “local” processes. Final remarks are given in section VII.




FIG. 1. The device involving crossed Andreev reflection and elastic cotunneling with non collinear magnetizations. Electrode ending at site “a” is a ferromagnet with a magnetization pointing in the direction θ_a . Electrode ending at site “b” is a ferromagnet with a magnetization pointing in the direction θ_b .

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Spin \otimes Nambu \otimes Keldysh formalism

The direction of the magnetization is rotating in a ferromagnetic domain wall. To describe superconducting correlations in the presence of non collinear magnetizations we use a spin \otimes Nambu \otimes Keldysh formalism [35–37]. The

advanced Green's function is a 4×4 matrix:

$$\hat{G}_{i,j}^A(t, t') = -i\theta(t - t') \begin{bmatrix} \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle \\ \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle \\ \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}(t'), c_{i,\downarrow}(t)\} \rangle \\ \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\downarrow}^+(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle & \langle \{c_{j,\uparrow}(t'), c_{i,\uparrow}(t)\} \rangle \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

The Dyson equation relates the Green's functions of the connected system to the Green's functions of the disconnected system. In a compact notation the Dyson equation takes the form $\hat{G} = \hat{g} + \hat{g} \otimes \hat{\Sigma} \otimes \hat{G}$, where the symbol \otimes includes a summation over the sites of the network and a convolution over time variables. Since we consider stationary transport the convolution over time variables becomes a simple product after a Fourier transform is carried out. The Dyson equation for the Keldysh Green's function $\hat{G}^{+,-}$ is given by

$$\hat{G}^{+,-} = [\hat{I} + \hat{G}^R \otimes \hat{\Sigma}] \otimes \hat{g}^{+,-} \otimes [\hat{I} + \hat{\Sigma} \otimes \hat{G}^A], \quad (2)$$

where the self-energy $\hat{\Sigma}$ contains all the couplings present in the tunnel Hamiltonian. The tunnel Hamiltonian corresponding to Fig. 1 takes the form

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_{\sigma} [t_{a,\alpha} c_{a,\sigma}^+ c_{\alpha,\sigma} + t_{\alpha,a} c_{\alpha,\sigma}^+ c_{a,\sigma} + t_{b,\beta} c_{b,\sigma}^+ c_{\beta,\sigma} + t_{\beta,b} c_{\beta,\sigma}^+ c_{b,\sigma}]. \quad (3)$$

The current through the link $a - \alpha$ is given by

$$I_{a,\alpha} = \frac{e}{2h} \int \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{\sigma}_z [\hat{t}_{a,\alpha} \hat{G}_{\alpha,a}^{+,-} - \hat{t}_{\alpha,a} \hat{G}_{a,\alpha}^{+,-}] \right\} d\omega, \quad (4)$$

where the matrix $\hat{\sigma}_z$ is given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

and the Nambu representation of the hopping matrix elements is given by $\hat{t}_{a,\alpha} = t_{a,\alpha} \hat{\sigma}_z$, $\hat{t}_{\alpha,a} = t_{\alpha,a} \hat{\sigma}_z$, $\hat{t}_{b,\beta} = t_{b,\beta} \hat{\sigma}_z$, $\hat{t}_{\beta,b} = t_{\beta,b} \hat{\sigma}_z$.

B. Green's function of a ferromagnetic metal

Now we give the expressions of the Green's functions of a ferromagnetic metal. We first suppose that the spin quantization axis is parallel to the direction of the magnetization. The Green's function takes the form

$$\hat{g}(R, \omega) = \begin{bmatrix} g_{1,1}(R, \omega) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{2,2}(R, \omega) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{3,3}(R, \omega) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & g_{4,4}(R, \omega) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

The four diagonal elements are given by

$$g_{1,1}(R, \omega) = -\frac{m_{\uparrow} a_0^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R} \exp \left\{ -i \left(k_F^{\uparrow} + \frac{\omega}{v_F^{\uparrow}} \right) R \right\} \exp \left\{ -\left(\frac{R}{l_{\phi}} \right) \right\} \quad (7)$$

$$g_{2,2}(R, \omega) = \frac{m_{\downarrow} a_0^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R} \exp \left\{ i \left(k_F^{\downarrow} - \frac{\omega}{v_F^{\downarrow}} \right) R \right\} \exp \left\{ -\left(\frac{R}{l_{\phi}} \right) \right\} \quad (8)$$

$$g_{3,3}(R, \omega) = -\frac{m_{\downarrow} a_0^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R} \exp \left\{ -i \left(k_F^{\downarrow} + \frac{\omega}{v_F^{\downarrow}} \right) R \right\} \exp \left\{ -\left(\frac{R}{l_{\phi}} \right) \right\} \quad (9)$$

$$g_{4,4}(R, \omega) = \frac{m_{\uparrow} a_0^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R} \exp \left\{ i \left(k_F^{\uparrow} - \frac{\omega}{v_F^{\uparrow}} \right) R \right\} \exp \left\{ -\left(\frac{R}{l_{\phi}} \right) \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where we have introduced a Fermi wave vector mismatch as well as a mismatch between the spin-up and spin-down Fermi velocities. For generality we introduced a different mass for the spin-up and spin-down electrons, meaning that the spin-up density of states is different from the spin-down density of states. The local propagators are defined by

$$g_{1,1}^{\text{loc}} = g_{4,4}^{\text{loc}} = i \frac{a_0 k_F^\uparrow}{2\pi} \frac{m_\uparrow a_0^2}{\hbar^2} = i\pi\rho_F \left(\frac{1+P}{2} \right) \quad (11)$$

$$g_{2,2}^{\text{loc}} = g_{3,3}^{\text{loc}} = i \frac{a_0 k_F^\downarrow}{2\pi} \frac{m_\downarrow a_0^2}{\hbar^2} = i\pi\rho_F \left(\frac{1-P}{2} \right). \quad (12)$$

We also introduced phenomenologically in (7) – (10) an exponential decay of the correlations due to the presence of a finite coherence length l_ϕ in the ferromagnet. l_ϕ is usually smaller than the dimension of the ferromagnetic metal. In this case ferromagnetism can be treated semi-classically like in the theoretical description of the giant magnetoresistance [38–40]. However Aharonov-Bohm oscillations in a ferromagnetic nanoring have been reported recently [41]. The inner diameter of the Fe-Ni nanoring in Ref. [41] is 420\AA and the outer diameter is 500\AA .

We will use in section III the expression of the local Green's functions of a ferromagnetic metal with the quantization axis not parallel to the magnetization. We suppose that the direction of the exchange field is rotated by an angle θ around the x axis. We do not incorporate a rotation of angle φ around the z axis since this rotation just introduces simple phase factors. The local Green's function of the rotated ferromagnet takes the form

$$\hat{g}_{\text{loc}} = i\pi\tilde{\rho} \begin{bmatrix} 1 + P \cos \theta & 0 & -iP \sin \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - P \cos \theta & 0 & -iP \sin \theta \\ iP \sin \theta & 0 & 1 - P \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & iP \sin \theta & 0 & 1 + P \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{\rho} = (\rho_\uparrow + \rho_\downarrow)/2$ is the average density of states at the Fermi level and $P = (\rho_\uparrow - \rho_\downarrow)/(\rho_\uparrow + \rho_\downarrow)$ is the spin polarization at the Fermi level.

We will also use in section VI the expression of the full propagator $\hat{g}(R, \omega)$ of a rotated ferromagnet. The Green's function takes the form

$$\hat{g}(R, \omega) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{g}_{1,1} & 0 & \tilde{g}_{1,3} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{g}_{2,2} & 0 & \tilde{g}_{2,4} \\ \tilde{g}_{3,1} & 0 & \tilde{g}_{3,3} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{g}_{4,2} & 0 & \tilde{g}_{4,4} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where the diagonal elements are given by

$$\tilde{g}_{1,1} = \frac{1}{2}(g_{1,1} + g_{3,3}) + \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta (g_{1,1} - g_{3,3}) \quad (15)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{2,2} = \frac{1}{2}(g_{2,2} + g_{4,4}) + \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta (g_{2,2} - g_{4,4}) \quad (16)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{3,3} = \frac{1}{2}(g_{3,3} + g_{1,1}) + \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta (g_{3,3} - g_{1,1}) \quad (17)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{4,4} = \frac{1}{2}(g_{4,4} + g_{2,2}) + \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta (g_{4,4} - g_{2,2}), \quad (18)$$

where $g_{1,1}$, $g_{2,2}$, $g_{3,3}$ and $g_{4,4}$ are given by (7)-(10). The extra-diagonal elements are given by

$$\tilde{g}_{1,3} = -\tilde{g}_{3,1} = \frac{i}{2} \sin \theta (g_{3,3} - g_{1,1}) \quad (19)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{2,4} = -\tilde{g}_{4,2} = \frac{i}{2} \sin \theta (g_{2,2} - g_{4,4}). \quad (20)$$

C. 4×4 Green's functions of a superconductor

The Green's function of a superconductor takes the form

$$\hat{g}^{A,R}(R, \omega) = \begin{bmatrix} g(R, \omega) & f(R, \omega) & 0 & 0 \\ f(R, \omega) & g'(R, \omega) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g(R, \omega) & -f(R, \omega) \\ 0 & 0 & -f(R, \omega) & g'(R, \omega) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

The matrix elements of the Green's function are given by

$$g(R, \omega) = \frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R} \exp\left(-\frac{R}{\xi(\omega)}\right) \left\{ \sin(k_F R) \frac{-\omega}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}} - \cos(k_F R) \right\} \quad (22)$$

$$g'(R, \omega) = \frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R} \exp\left(-\frac{R}{\xi(\omega)}\right) \left\{ \sin(k_F R) \frac{-\omega}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}} + \cos(k_F R) \right\} \quad (23)$$

$$f(R, \omega) = \frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R} \exp\left(-\frac{R}{\xi(\omega)}\right) \sin(k_F R) \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}}, \quad (24)$$

where we supposed that $\omega < \Delta$. The coherence length is given by $\xi(\omega) = \hbar v_F / \sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}$.

D. 4×4 Green's functions of a superconductor in a uniform magnetic field

A uniform magnetic field h_S can penetrate in a superconductor if the superconductor is in a thin film geometry [42] and the magnetic field is parallel to the direction of the superconducting film. The effect of the magnetic field is a Zeeman splitting of the spin-up and spin-down quasiparticle bands. Let us suppose that the quantization axis is parallel to the orientation of the magnetic field. The 4×4 Green's function takes the form

$$g^{A,R}(R, \omega) = \begin{bmatrix} g_+(R, \omega) & f_+(R, \omega) & 0 & 0 \\ f_+(R, \omega) & g_+(R, \omega) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_-(R, \omega) & -f_-(R, \omega) \\ 0 & 0 & -f_-(R, \omega) & g_-(R, \omega) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

with $g_+(R, \omega) = g(R, \omega + h_S)$, $g'_+(R, \omega) = g'(R, \omega + h_S)$, $f_+(R, \omega) = f(R, \omega + h_S)$, $g_-(R, \omega) = g(R, \omega - h_S)$, $g'_-(R, \omega) = g'(R, \omega - h_S)$, $f_-(R, \omega) = f(R, \omega - h_S)$.

III. CROSSED ANDREEV REFLECTION AND ELASTIC COTUNNELING WITH NON COLLINEAR MAGNETIZATIONS

A. Transport formula

In this section we evaluate the transport formula corresponding to the device on Fig. 1 in which the magnetization of electrode “a” (“b”) makes an angle θ_a (θ_b) with the z -axis. Using the formalism described in section II we obtain the current per conduction channel through electrode “a” to lowest order in $t_{a,\alpha}$ and $t_{b,\beta}$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{a,\alpha} = & \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega 8\pi^2 t_\alpha^4 \tilde{\rho}_a^2 (1 - P_a^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2(\omega) [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a)] \\ & + \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b [1 + P_a P_b \cos(\theta_a - \theta_b)] \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta} g_{\beta,\alpha} \rangle \rangle \\ & \times [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a) - n_F(\omega - eV_b) + n_F(\omega + eV_b)] \\ & + \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b [1 - P_a P_b \cos(\theta_a - \theta_b)] \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta} f_{\beta,\alpha} \rangle \rangle \\ & \times [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a) + n_F(\omega - eV_b) - n_F(\omega + eV_b)]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

We have supposed that electrodes “a” and “b” are made of a large number of independent conduction channels in parallel so that we make an averaging over the microscopic phases in the propagators. Now if we consider that the same voltage is applied on both electrodes the conductance is given by local Andreev reflection and crossed Andreev reflection:

$$G = \frac{e^2}{h} 32\pi^2 t_\alpha^4 \tilde{\rho}_a^2 (1 - P_a^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2 + \frac{e^2}{h} 32\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b [1 - P_a P_b \cos(\theta_a - \theta_b)] \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta} f_{\beta,\alpha} \rangle \rangle. \quad (27)$$




FIG. 2. The device involving a S/DW junction between a superconductor and a ferromagnetic domain wall. The ferromagnet is modeled by a collection of independent channels with a rotating magnetization.

B. Conductance associated to a domain wall

Let us now consider the situation on Fig. 2 representing a S/DW contact between a superconductor and a magnetic domain wall. We suppose that the ferromagnetic metal is made of a collection of independent channels. The magnetization is rotating inside the domain wall meaning that the angle θ is a function of z : $\theta = \theta(z)$. We want to evaluate the difference $G^{(DW)} - G^{(0)}$ between the conductances $G^{(DW)}$ in the presence of the domain wall and $G^{(0)}$ in the absence of the domain wall. To obtain the conductance we sum the contributions of the different channels (see Fig. 2) and we obtain

$$G^{(DW)} - G^{(0)} = 4\pi^2 t^4 \tilde{\rho}^2 P^2 \left(\frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \right)^2 F(\xi_0, D), \quad (28)$$

where $\xi_0 = \hbar v_F / \Delta$ is the BCS coherence length at zero energy and D is the width of the domain wall. The function $F(\xi_0, D)$ is given by all possibilities of transmitting Cooper pairs across the junction:

$$F(\xi_0, D) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int dx \int dy \frac{1}{|x - y|^2} \exp \left(-\frac{2|x - y|}{\xi_0} \right) \sin^2 \left(\frac{\theta(y) - \theta(x)}{2} \right). \quad (29)$$

To obtain (29) we have supposed that the width of the domain wall is much larger than the Fermi wave-length so that we can average over the microscopic phase variables in the propagator $f_{\alpha,\beta}$ (see Eq. (24)).

Crossed Andreev reflection cannot take place between the channels separated by a distance much smaller than the width D of the domain wall because such channels have an almost parallel magnetization. Crossed Andreev reflection cannot take place either between channels separated by a distance much larger than the superconducting coherence length because of the exponential decay of the propagator $f_{\alpha,\beta}$. As a consequence the value of $G^{(DW)} - G^{(0)}$ is the largest if the width of the domain wall is small compared to the BCS coherence length. This is illustrated on Fig. 3 where we have represented the variation of the conductance as a function of ξ_0/D for the domain wall profile given by

$$\theta(z) = \arctan \left(\frac{z}{D} \right). \quad (30)$$

We see on Fig. 3 that the different conductance curves collapse on a single master curve if the conductance is plotted as a function of ξ_0/D . The function $F(\xi_0, D)$ can be evaluated analytically in the two limiting cases $\xi_0 \ll D$ and $\xi_0 \gg D$. Let us start with the case $\xi_0 \ll D$. We use the expansion $\theta(x) - \theta(y) \simeq (x - y)\theta'(x)$. We notice that $\theta(x)$ is a function of x/D : $\theta(x) = \Theta(x/D)$. Then we obtain

$$F(\xi_0, D) \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \frac{\xi_0}{D} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx [\Theta'(x)]^2. \quad (31)$$

In the other limit $\xi_0 \gg D$ we obtain $F(\xi_0, D) \simeq 4 \ln \xi_0/D$, in a qualitative agreement with Fig. 3. In the limit $\xi_0 \ll D$ the function $F(\xi_0, D)$ depends on the details of the domain wall profile whereas $F(\xi_0, D)$ is independent on the domain wall profile in the other limit $\xi_0 \gg D$.




FIG. 3. Variation of the conductance as a function of ξ_0/D . We used the domain wall profile given by (30) in a two-dimensional geometry. The distance between neighboring channels is $a_0 = 1$. We incorporated 2000 channels in the domain wall.

C. Exchange field in the superconductor due to the proximity effect

Now we come back to a system in which two ferromagnetic electrodes are connected to a superconductor. An exchange field can be generated in the superconductor because of the proximity effect. This was first observed in Ref. [16] in the case of insulating ferromagnets. An exchange field in a superconductor is a pair breaking perturbation. As a consequence in the F/S/F trilayer with insulating ferromagnets the order parameter is larger in the antiferromagnetic alignment of the ferromagnetic electrodes [16]. This was well verified in experiments with insulating ferromagnets [43,44]. The same effect is present with metallic ferromagnets [17,19] but in this case there exists also pair correlations induced in the ferromagnetic electrodes [18,19] that can modify the value of the self consistent order parameter.

We suppose that the magnetizations in electrodes “a” and “b” make an angle θ_a and θ_b and that an exchange field h_S is induced in the superconductor. Without loss of generality we suppose that the direction of the exchange field in the superconductor is parallel to the quantization axis. In terms of the g_+ , f_+ , g_- and f_- introduced in section II D the transport formula is found to be

$$I_{a,\alpha} = \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^4 \tilde{\rho}_a^2 [(f_+^2 + f_-^2) (1 - P_a^2 \cos^2 \theta_a) - 2f_+ f_- P_a^2 \sin^2 \theta_a] [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a)] \quad (32)$$

$$+ \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega 2\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \left\{ \left[\langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^+ g_{\beta,\alpha}^+ \rangle + \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^- g_{\beta,\alpha}^- \rangle \right] [1 + P_a P_b \cos \theta_a \cos \theta_b] \right. \\ \left. + 2 \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^+ g_{\beta,\alpha}^- \rangle P_a P_b \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \right\} \times [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a) - n_F(\omega - eV_b) + n_F(\omega + eV_b)] \quad (33)$$

$$+ \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega 2\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \left\{ \left[\langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^+ f_{\beta,\alpha}^+ \rangle + \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^- f_{\beta,\alpha}^- \rangle \right] [1 - P_a P_b \cos \theta_a \cos \theta_b] \right. \\ \left. - 2 \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^+ f_{\beta,\alpha}^- \rangle P_a P_b \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \right\} \times [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a) + n_F(\omega - eV_b) - n_F(\omega + eV_b)]. \quad (34)$$

The term (32) corresponds to local Andreev reflection. The term (33) corresponds to elastic cotunneling and the term (34) corresponds to crossed Andreev reflection. The term $\langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^+ g_{\beta,\alpha}^+ \rangle$ corresponds to a process in which a spin-up electron travels from electrode a to electrode b and comes back to electrode a as a spin-up electron. The term $\langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^+ g_{\beta,\alpha}^- \rangle$ corresponds to a process in which a spin-up electron travels from electrode a to electrode b , undergoes a spin precession in electrode b and comes back as a spin-down electron traveling from electrode b to electrode a .

Replacing the propagators involved in Eqs.(32), (33) and (34) by their expressions given in section II C leads to the transport formula to lowest order in h_S and ω :

$$I_{a,\alpha} = 8\pi^2 t_\alpha^4 \left(\frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{2\pi R_0} \right)^2 \left[1 + \frac{\omega^2 + h_S^2}{\Delta^2} \right] [1 - P_a^2] [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a)] \quad (35)$$

$$+ 2\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \left(\frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha,\beta}} \right)^2 \exp \left(-\frac{2R_{\alpha,\beta}}{\xi(\omega)} \right) \left\{ 1 + \left[1 + \frac{\omega^2}{\Delta^2} \right] P_a P_b \cos(\theta_a - \theta_b) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{h_S^2}{\Delta^2} P_a P_b \cos(\theta_a + \theta_b) \right\} \times [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a) - n_F(\omega - eV_b) + n_F(\omega + eV_b)] \quad (36)$$

$$+ 2\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \left(\frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha,\beta}} \right)^2 \exp \left(-\frac{2R_{\alpha,\beta}}{\xi(\omega)} \right) \left[1 + \frac{\omega^2 + h_S^2}{\Delta^2} \right] [1 - P_a P_b \cos(\theta_a - \theta_b)] \\ \times [n_F(\omega - eV_a) - n_F(\omega + eV_a) + n_F(\omega - eV_b) - n_F(\omega + eV_b)], \quad (37)$$

where $k_F R_0 = \pi/2$ is the ultraviolet cut-off used to define the local propagator involved in local Andreev reflection. We see that the crossed Andreev reflection term given by (36) is not identical to the elastic cotunneling term given by (37). This shows that the symmetry between elastic cotunneling and crossed Andreev reflection is broken by the exchange field in the superconductor. This can be illustrated by considering that electrode “b” is a normal metal: $P_b = 0$. The crossed conductance at zero voltage is finite if the exchange field h_S in the superconductor takes a finite value:

$$G_{a,b} = \frac{\partial I_a}{\partial V_b} = 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \left(\frac{2ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha,\beta}} \right)^2 \exp \left(-\frac{2R_{\alpha,\beta}}{\xi_0} \right) \left(\frac{h_S}{\Delta} \right)^2. \quad (38)$$

By comparison we have $G_{a,b} = 0$ if $h_S = 0$ because of a cancellation between the crossed Andreev reflection and elastic cotunneling conductances. We thus see that a crossed Andreev reflection experiment with a ferromagnetic and a normal metal electrode can give information about the existence of an induced exchange field in the superconductor. We see also from Eqs. (32), (33) and (34) that there is no precession of the electron spin around the direction of the exchange field in the superconductor. The absence of spin precession in the superconducting case can be contrasted with the metallic case (see Appendix A).




FIG. 4. The device considered in section IV. In (a) there is no domain wall in the junction. In (b) a domain wall is pinned in the junction.

IV. SEQUENTIAL TUNNELING OF COOPER PAIRS THROUGH A MAGNETIC DOMAIN WALL

Now we consider the junction on Fig. 4 in which a ferromagnetic wire is inserted in between two superconductors. In the absence of a domain wall in the ferromagnetic wire (see Fig. 4-(a)) the junction is just a S/F/S junction. In the presence of a domain wall (see Fig. 4-(b)) Cooper pair-like states arising from crossed Andreev reflection can be transmitted through the junction. As a consequence the conductance is larger in the presence of a magnetic domain wall. We consider two limiting cases:

- (i) Transport is dominated by inelastic scattering in the ferromagnetic domains. Because of inelastic scattering the distribution functions in the ferromagnetic domains relax to the Fermi distribution. This case is discussed in sections IV B, IV C and IV D.
- (ii) Transport through the domain wall is phase-coherent and there is a Josephson current circulating between the two ferromagnetic electrodes. This case is discussed in section V.




FIG. 5. The device considered in section IV C in which two single channel electrodes representing two magnetic domains are inserted in between a superconductor and a normal metal. The two electrodes ending at sites a and a' and sites b and b' are ferromagnetic. In sections IV D and V we suppose that the electrode containing the sites α' and β' is superconducting.

A. The different time scales

Similarly to Ref. [45] we notice that three time scales are involved in out-of-equilibrium transport through a ferromagnetic domain wall:

- (i) The transport dwell time τ_d being the time taken by an electron to travel through one of the magnetic domains.
- (ii) The energy relaxation time τ_E . Because of inelastic scattering the distribution function in the out-of-equilibrium conductor relaxes to the Fermi distribution. This relaxation takes place on a time scale τ_E .
- (iii) The spin-flip time τ_{sf} being the time above which spin-flip scattering is relevant.

We suppose in this section that $\tau_E \ll \tau_d \ll \tau_{sf}$. The distribution function in the intermediate magnetic domains is thus well approximated by a Fermi distribution. The chemical potential of spin-up electrons is different from the chemical potential of spin-down electrons.

B. Perturbative transport formula

In this section we discuss the perturbative transport formula of the S/DW/N junction on Fig. 5. The full transport formula to order t^4 is evaluated in Appendix B. The expression of $I_{a,\alpha}^{(\uparrow)}$ contains two kinds of terms: the terms (B1) – (B3) describe processes taking place locally at the interfaces between the superconductor and the ferromagnetic electrodes without propagation in the ferromagnetic electrodes. The terms (B4) – (B7) involve a propagation in the ferromagnetic electrodes. The two kinds of terms would contribute if electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') were single channel electrodes. We consider here that electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') are multichannel electrodes and we average the current over the microscopic phases. Once this averaging is done only the “local” terms survive in the transport formula given by

$$I_{a,\alpha}^{(\uparrow)} = -4\pi^2 t_\alpha^4 \tilde{\rho}_a^2 f_{\text{loc}}^2 [1 - P_a^2] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega + \mu_{a,\downarrow})] \quad (39)$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle [1 + P_a] [1 + P_b] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu_{b,\uparrow})] \quad (40)$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle [1 + P_a] [1 - P_b] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega + \mu_{b,\downarrow})]. \quad (41)$$

The term (39) corresponds to local Andreev reflection at the interface $a - \alpha$. The term (40) corresponds to elastic cotunneling through the superconductor and the term (41) corresponds to crossed Andreev reflection.

A similar calculation can be carried out at interface (a', α') . Once the average over the microscopic phase variables is carried out we find

$$I_{a',\alpha'}^{(\uparrow)} = -4\pi^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \rho' [1 + P_a] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu')] \quad (42)$$

$$+ 8\pi^4 t_{\alpha'}^4 (\tilde{\rho}_a)^2 (\rho')^2 [1 + P_a]^2 [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu')] \quad (43)$$

$$+ 8\pi^4 t_{\alpha'}^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \langle \rho_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle [1 + P_a] [1 + P_b] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{b,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu')], \quad (44)$$

where (42) and (43) describe electron tunneling from the electrode (a, a') into the normal metal and (44) describes elastic cotunneling from electrode (b, b') to electrode (a, a') .

C. Sequential tunneling through the S/DW/N junction

In this section we discuss out-of-equilibrium transport in a S/DW/N junction on the basis of the two-channel model shown on Fig. 5. We suppose that a voltage $V = 0$ is applied on the superconductor and a voltage V' is applied on the normal metal. The spin-up and spin-down chemical potentials in the two magnetic domains (a, a') and (b, b') are determined in such a way that current is conserved. In general there are four unknown chemical potentials ($\mu_{a,\uparrow}$, $\mu_{a,\downarrow}$, $\mu_{b,\uparrow}$ and $\mu_{b,\downarrow}$) that can be determined from four equations for current conservation. There exist two cases in which the 4×4 system of equations can be reduced to a 2×2 system of equations:

- (i) Half-metal ferromagnets where there is only one spin population in each of the ferromagnetic electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') . This case is treated in the main body of the article.
- (ii) The symmetric case where the two electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') have identical density of states and where $t_\alpha = t_\beta$ and $t_{\alpha'} = t_{\beta'}$. This case is treated in Appendix C.

Let us consider half-metal ferromagnets: $P_a = 1$, $P_b = -1$. The transport formula is found to be

$$\frac{I_{\text{tot}}}{V'} = \frac{16\pi^2}{\mathcal{D}} t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho_{b,\downarrow} (\rho')^2 \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle [1 - 2\pi^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho'] [1 - 2\pi^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{b,\downarrow} \rho'], \quad (45)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} = & t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho' \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle [1 - 2\pi^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho'] + t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{b,\downarrow} \rho' \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle [1 - 2\pi^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{b,\downarrow} \rho'] \\ & + t_{\alpha'}^2 t_{\beta'}^2 (\rho')^2 [1 - 2\pi^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho'] [1 - 2\pi^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{b,\downarrow} \rho']. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We note ρ_N a typical value of the density of states either in the superconductor or in the ferromagnetic and normal metal electrodes. We first suppose that $t_\alpha^2 \rho_N$ and $t_\beta^2 \rho_N$ are small compared to $t_{\alpha'}$ and $t_{\beta'}$. The transport formula takes the same form as in the case where the ferromagnetic electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') are in equilibrium:

$$\frac{I_{\text{tot}}}{V'} = 16\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho_{b,\downarrow} \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle. \quad (47)$$

In the other limiting case where $t_\alpha^2 \rho_N$ and $t_\beta^2 \rho_N$ are large compared to $t_{\alpha'}$ and $t_{\beta'}$ we find

$$\frac{I_{\text{tot}}}{V'} = 16\pi^2 \rho' \frac{t_{\alpha'}^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho_{b,\downarrow}}{t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} + t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{b,\downarrow}}. \quad (48)$$

We note $g_a = 16\pi^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho'$ and $g_b = 16\pi^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \rho_{b,\downarrow} \rho'$ the conductances associated to the interfaces (a', α') and (b', β') . The total conductance is given by $1/G_{\text{tot}} = 1/g_a + 1/g_b$. The two interfaces are thus in series which is because transport is mediated by crossed Andreev reflection: a spin-up electron from the normal metal is transferred at site a' , travels to site a , is reflected as a spin-down hole at site b . The spin-down hole travels to site b' and is transferred in the normal metal at site β' . As a consequence of this transport process the two interfaces (a', α') and (b', β') are coupled in series.

D. Sequential tunneling through the S/DW/S junction

We consider the same model as in the preceding section but now the electrode on the right is superconducting (see Fig. 5). We show that the properties of the S/DW/S junction are similar to the properties of the S/DW/N junction. We suppose that a voltage V is applied on the left electrode and a voltage V' is applied on the right electrode. We consider a regime in which inelastic scattering in the ferromagnetic electrodes is strong enough so that the transport dwell time is much larger than the energy relaxation time (see section IV A). Moreover we suppose that inelastic scattering is strong enough so that there is no Josephson effect.

We consider that the ferromagnetic electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') are half-metal ferromagnets: $P_a = 1$, $P_b = -1$. The total current is given by

$$\frac{I_{\text{tot}}}{V' - V} = 16\pi^2 \rho_{a,\uparrow} \rho_{b,\downarrow} \frac{t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle}{t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle + t_{\alpha'}^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle}. \quad (49)$$

If we note $g = 16\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \langle\langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle\rangle$ and $g' = 16\pi^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \langle\langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle\rangle$ the conductances associated to crossed Andreev reflection at the contacts with each of the two superconductors we see that the total conductance is such that

$$\frac{1}{G_{\text{tot}}} = \frac{1}{g} + \frac{1}{g'}. \quad (50)$$

which is the expected result since electron pairs travel in series through the two superconductors.

V. S/DW/S JOSEPHSON JUNCTION

Now we consider the S/DW/S junction on Fig. 5 in which the right electrode is superconducting. We suppose that $\tau_E \sim \tau_d \ll \tau_{sf}$ or $\tau_E < \tau_d \ll \tau_{sf}$ so that the two superconductors can be coupled coherently through the two ferromagnetic channels, therefore giving rise to a finite Josephson current. We suppose that the two electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') are half-metal ferromagnets with antiparallel spin orientations. The case of a partial spin polarization and non collinear spin orientations will be discussed in section VI.

The Nambu representation of the hopping matrix elements is given by

$$\hat{t}_{\alpha,a} = \begin{bmatrix} t_\alpha e^{-i(\varphi-\chi)/4} & 0 \\ 0 & -t_\alpha e^{i(\varphi-\chi)/4} \end{bmatrix} \quad (51)$$

$$\hat{t}_{\beta,b} = \begin{bmatrix} t_\beta e^{-i(\varphi+\chi)/4} & 0 \\ 0 & -t_\beta e^{i(\varphi+\chi)/4} \end{bmatrix} \quad (52)$$

$$\hat{t}_{a',\alpha'} = \begin{bmatrix} t_{a',\alpha'} e^{-i(\varphi-\chi)/4} & 0 \\ 0 & -t_{a',\alpha'} e^{i(\varphi-\chi)/4} \end{bmatrix} \quad (53)$$

$$\hat{t}_{b',\beta'} = \begin{bmatrix} t_{b',\beta'} e^{-i(\varphi+\chi)/4} & 0 \\ 0 & -t_{b',\beta'} e^{i(\varphi+\chi)/4} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (54)$$

where φ is the difference between the superconducting phases in the right and left electrode and χ is the magnetic flux through the loop. We have the relations $\hat{t}_{a,\alpha} = (\hat{t}_{\alpha,a})^*$, $\hat{t}_{b,\beta} = (\hat{t}_{\beta,b})^*$, $\hat{t}_{a',\alpha'} = (\hat{t}_{\alpha',a'})^*$ and $\hat{t}_{b',\beta'} = (\hat{t}_{\beta',b'})^*$. The equilibrium current flowing from site α to site a is given by

$$I_{\alpha,a} = \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega n_F(\omega) \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{\sigma}^z \left[\hat{t}_{\alpha,a} \left(\hat{G}_{a,\alpha}^A - \hat{G}_{a,\alpha}^R \right) - \hat{t}_{a,\alpha} \left(\hat{G}_{\alpha,a}^A - \hat{G}_{\alpha,a}^R \right) \right] \right\}. \quad (55)$$

The Green's functions are 2×2 matrices since we do not discuss non collinear magnetizations for the moment.

A. Lowest order transport formula

The transport formula given by (55) can be evaluated to lowest order in t . The spectral supercurrent defined by

$$I_{\alpha,a}^{(\uparrow)} = \frac{e}{h} \int d\omega n_F(\omega) I_{\alpha,a}^{(\uparrow)}(\omega) \quad (56)$$

is found to be

$$I_{\alpha,a}^{(\uparrow)}(\omega) = \frac{4\pi^4}{(a_0 k_F^\uparrow)^2} t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} \rho_F^2 (1+P)^2 \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{a,a'}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{b,b'}} f_{\alpha,\beta} f_{\alpha',\beta'} \exp \left\{ - \left(\frac{R_{a,a'} + R_{b,b'}}{l_\phi} \right) \right\} \sin \left\{ k_F^\uparrow (R_{a,a'} - R_{b,b'}) + \frac{\Delta}{v_F^\uparrow} (R_{a,a'} + R_{b,b'}) \right\} \sin \varphi, \quad (57)$$

where ρ_F and P are defined by (11). As a consequence of the form (57) of the supercurrent we see that

- (i) A reversal of the current-phase relation takes place if the spin-up and spin-down ferromagnetic channels have a different length. This has important consequences for the multichannel case discussed in section VI where there is a distribution of the lengths R_{a_k, a'_l} .

- (ii) The supercurrent is not modulated by the magnetic flux applied on the junction. This is because there is a cancellation of the phase factors involving the circulation of the vector potential between the two branches. Namely a spin-up electron traveling from a' to a acquires a phase opposite to the one of the Andreev-reflected spin-down hole traveling from b to b' . By contrast the same calculation carried out for the F/S/F junction shows that the supercurrent is modulated by the magnetic flux.
- (iii) As a consequence of the factor $f_{\alpha,\beta}f_{\alpha',\beta'}$ the supercurrent obtained from lowest order perturbation theory decays exponentially with the distance $R_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $R_{\alpha',\beta'}$ between the two contacts. The characteristic length scale is $\xi(\omega) = \hbar v_F / \sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega^2}$. We show in section VB that this exponential decay does not occur in the approach based on the determination of the Andreev bound states [46–48]. The reason is that the product $f_{\alpha,\beta}f_{\alpha',\beta'}$ should be evaluated at the frequency ω_0 of the Andreev bound states which is very close to the superconducting gap Δ and we have thus $\xi(\omega_0) \gg R_{a,a'}, R_{b,b'}$.

B. Andreev bound states

We deduce from (55) that to order t^4 the spin-up current through electrode (a, a') is given by

$$I_{\alpha,a}^{(\uparrow)} = -2i \frac{e}{\hbar} t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} \sin \varphi \int_0^{+\infty} d\omega f_{\alpha,\beta}(\omega) f_{\alpha',\beta'}(\omega) \left\{ \frac{g_{a,a'}^{A,11} g_{b,b'}^{A,22}}{\text{Det}[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^A]} - \frac{g_{a,a'}^{R,11} g_{b,b'}^{R,22}}{\text{Det}[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^R]} \right\}, \quad (58)$$

where $\tilde{K}^{A,R}$ is the 4×4 matrix involved in the Dyson equation $[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^{A,R}] \tilde{G}^{A,R} = \tilde{g}^{A,R}$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - K_{a,a}^{1,1} & -K_{b,a}^{2,1} & -K_{a',a}^{1,1} & -K_{b',a}^{2,1} \\ -K_{a,b}^{1,2} & 1 - K_{b,b}^{2,2} & -K_{a',b}^{1,2} & -K_{b',b}^{2,2} \\ -K_{a,a'}^{1,1} & -K_{b,a'}^{2,1} & 1 - K_{a',a'}^{1,1} & -K_{b',a'}^{2,1} \\ -K_{a,b'}^{1,2} & -K_{b,b'}^{2,2} & -K_{a',b'}^{1,2} & 1 - K_{b',b'}^{2,2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G_{a,a}^{1,1} \\ G_{a,b}^{1,2} \\ G_{a,a'}^{1,1} \\ G_{a,b'}^{1,2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} g_{a,a}^{1,1} \\ 0 \\ g_{a,a'}^{1,1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

where we used the notation $K_{a,a}^{1,1} = t_{a,\alpha}^{1,1} g_{\alpha,\alpha} t_{\alpha,a}^{1,1} g_{a,a}^{1,1}$, $K_{b,a}^{2,1} = t_{b,\beta}^{2,2} f_{\beta,\alpha} t_{\alpha,a}^{1,1} g_{a,a}^{1,1}$, etc. In the limit of a long junction $R \gg a_0$ the matrix $\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^{A,R}$ is block-diagonal because the Andreev bound states do not couple the two superconductors. There exist two bound states associated to the interfaces (α, a) and (β, b) and two bound states associated to the interfaces (α', a') and (β', b') . The secular equation for the bound states living at the interfaces (α, a) and (β, b) takes the form

$$1 + i\pi^2 \rho_F \rho_N (t_\alpha^2 + t_\beta^2) \frac{\omega_0}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 - \omega_0^2}} + (\pi^2 \rho_F \rho_N)^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \frac{z^2 \Delta^2 - \omega_0^2}{\Delta^2 - \omega_0^2} = 0, \quad (60)$$

where ρ_N and ρ_F are the density of states in the superconductor and in the half-ferromagnetic electrodes, and where we used the notation $z = \sin[k_F R] / (k_F R)$. In the case $t = t_\alpha = t_\beta$ and in the tunnel limit $\pi t^2 \rho_N \rho_F \ll 1$ the solution of (60) takes the form

$$\omega_0^2 = \Delta^2 [1 + (\pi^2 t^2 \rho_N \rho_F)^2 (1 \pm z)^2]. \quad (61)$$

The supercurrent is easily deduced from (58):

$$I_S = \frac{16\pi^9}{(a_0 k_F^\uparrow)^2 (a_0 k_F)^2 \hbar} \Delta t^4 \rho_N^2 \rho_F^2 (1 + P)^2 \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha,\beta}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha',\beta'}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{a,a'}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{b,b'}} \sin[k_F R_{\alpha,\beta}] \sin[k_F R_{\alpha',\beta'}] \quad (62)$$

$$\exp \left\{ - \left(\frac{R_{a,a'} + R_{b,b'}}{l_\phi} \right) \right\} f(z, z') \cos \alpha \sin \varphi, \quad (63)$$

where α is defined by

$$\alpha = k_F^\uparrow (R_{a,a'} - R_{b,b'}) + \frac{\Delta}{v_F} (R_{a,a'} + R_{b,b'}), \quad (64)$$

and where $f(z, z')$ is a geometrical prefactor of order unity.

Now in section VI we generalize our results to incorporate more realistic ingredients, namely multichannel effects, the effects of a partial spin polarization and non colinear magnetizations.

VI. MULTICHANNEL EFFECTS




FIG. 6. Schematic representation of the Josephson junction containing a domain wall with a rotating magnetization.

We consider in this section the multichannel S/DW/S junction on Fig. 6 in which the ferromagnetic metal is made of a collection of independent channels. We suppose that the magnetization in the channel n makes an angle θ_n with the z -axis. The situation $\theta_n = 0$ corresponds to the multichannel π -junction.

A. Derivation of the transport formula

The supercurrent is given by

$$I_S = \frac{1}{2} \frac{e}{h} \int_0^{+\infty} d\omega \sum_n \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{\sigma}^z \left[\hat{t}_{\alpha_n, a_n} \left(\hat{G}_{a_n, \alpha_n}^A - \hat{G}_{a_n, \alpha_n}^R \right) - \hat{t}_{a_n, \alpha_n} \left(\hat{G}_{\alpha_n, a_n}^A - \hat{G}_{\alpha_n, a_n}^R \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (65)$$

where the Green's functions are 4×4 matrices. The supercurrent to order $t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} I_S = & -i \frac{e}{h} t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \sin \varphi \int_0^{+\infty} d\omega \sum_{m,n} f_{\alpha_m, \alpha_n} f_{\beta_m, \beta_n} \\ & \times \left\{ \frac{(g_m^{2,2,A} + g_m^{4,4,A})(g_n^{1,1,A} + g_n^{3,3,A})}{\text{Det}[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^A]} - \frac{(g_m^{2,2,R} + g_m^{4,4,R})(g_n^{1,1,R} + g_n^{3,3,R})}{\text{Det}[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^R]} \right. \\ & \left. + \cos(\theta_n - \theta_m) \left[\frac{(g_m^{2,2,A} - g_m^{4,4,A})(g_n^{1,1,A} - g_n^{3,3,A})}{\text{Det}[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^A]} - \frac{(g_m^{2,2,R} - g_m^{4,4,R})(g_n^{1,1,R} - g_n^{3,3,R})}{\text{Det}[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}^R]} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where $g_n^{i,i} = g_{a_n, b_n}^{i,i}$ is i -th Nambu component of the propagator connecting the two extremities of the ferromagnetic channel number n . The supercurrent takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} I_S = & \frac{16\pi^5}{(a_0 k_F)^2} \frac{e}{h} \Delta t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \sin \varphi \rho_N^2 \exp \left[-\frac{2R}{l_\phi} \right] \sum_{m,n} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_m, \alpha_n}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}} \sin[k_F R_{\alpha_m, \alpha_n}] \sin[k_F R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}] \\ & \times \left\{ A_{m,n}^{(+)} + A_{m,n}^{(-)} \cos(\theta_m - \theta_n) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_{m,n}^{(\sigma)} = & \frac{2\pi^4}{a_0^2 k_F^\uparrow k_F^\downarrow} \rho_F^2 (1 - P^2) \cos[k_F^\uparrow R_n - k_F^\downarrow R_m] + \sigma \frac{\pi^4}{(a_0 k_F^\uparrow)^2} \rho_F^2 (1 + P)^2 \cos[k_F^\uparrow (R_m - R_n)] \\ & + \sigma \frac{\pi^4}{(a_0 k_F^\downarrow)^2} \rho_F^2 (1 - P)^2 \cos[k_F^\downarrow (R_m - R_n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

In the derivation of (67) we have expanded $\text{Det}[\tilde{I} - \tilde{K}]$ to order t^2 so that we cannot obtain the geometrical prefactor with this method.




FIG. 7. The notations used in the multichannel S/DW/S junction. R is the distance between the superconducting electrodes, L the width of the ferromagnetic electrodes and D is the distance between the ferromagnetic electrodes.

B. Two spatially separated channels with antiparallel magnetizations

We consider in this section the multichannel S/DW/S junction model represented on Fig. 7 in which the domain wall is schematically represented by two conduction channels in parallel with an antiparallel magnetization. This model is similar to the one considered in section V except that here each ferromagnetic electrode contains many channels. We suppose that R is small compared to the phase coherence length l_ϕ in the ferromagnetic electrodes. We consider also that each ferromagnetic electrode is a half-metal ferromagnet. The transport formula is easily deduced from (67):

$$I_S = \frac{32\pi^9}{(a_0 k_F)^2 (a_0 k_F^\uparrow)^2} \frac{e}{h} \Delta t^4 \rho_N^2 \rho_F^2 (1+P)^2 G(R, L, D) \sin \varphi, \quad (69)$$

with

$$G(R, L, D) = \sum_{k,l,m,n} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_k, \beta_l}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha'_m, \beta'_n}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{a_k, a'_m}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{b_l, b'_n}} \sin[k_F R_{\alpha_k, \beta_l}] \sin[k_F R_{\alpha'_m, \beta'_n}] \cos\left[k_F^\uparrow (R_{a_k, a'_m} - R_{b_l, b'_n})\right]. \quad (70)$$

To simulate the effect of disorder we introduce randomness in the distribution of the sites at the interface: the y coordinate of the point a_k is $y_{a_k} = ka_0 + \delta y_k$, where δy_k is uniformly distributed in the interval $[0, a_0]$. Small values of k_F correspond to a small amount of randomness in the distribution of the phase factors $\sin[k_F R_{\alpha_k, \beta_l}] \sin[k_F R_{\alpha'_m, \beta'_n}] \cos[k_F^\uparrow (R_{a_k, a'_m} - R_{b_l, b'_n})]$. We have shown on Fig. 8 the distribution of $G(R, L, D)$ calculated for many realization of disorder. We see that $G(R, L, D)$ is positive for small values of k_F whereas the sign of $G(R, L, D)$ is random for larger values of k_F . It is expected that the random sign in the Josephson current is not a specificity of our particular choice of disorder but should exist also in the presence of paramagnetic impurities in the ferromagnetic electrodes. In both cases the spin-up and spin-down electrons of the Cooper pair acquire different phase factors because they see a different realization of disorder due to the fact that they propagate in different electrodes. The case of paramagnetic impurities will be tested by numerical simulations in a forthcoming publication.

C. A domain wall with a rotating magnetization

1. Case of half-metal ferromagnets

Now we consider a Josephson junction containing a domain wall with a rotating magnetization. We first suppose that the domain wall is a collection of independent half-metallic channels (see Fig. 6). The supercurrent is deduced from (67):

$$I_S = \frac{32\pi^9}{(a_0 k_F)^2 (a_0 k_F^\uparrow)^2} \frac{e}{h} \Delta t^4 \rho_N^2 \rho_F^2 (1+P)^2 H(D) \sin \varphi, \quad (71)$$

with




FIG. 8. Distribution of conductance. We used the geometry on Fig. 7 with $R = 20$, $D = 20$ and $L = 20$ and we introduced disorder in the position of the sites at the interfaces. The values of the Fermi wave-vectors are such that $k_F = k_F^\uparrow$. We used 10000 realizations of disorder for each value of k_F .

$$H(D) = \sum_{k,l} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_k, \beta_l}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha'_k, \beta'_l}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{a_k, a'_k}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{b_l, b'_l}} \quad (72)$$

$$\times \sin[k_F R_{\alpha_k, \beta_l}] \sin[k_F R_{\alpha'_k, \beta'_l}] \cos[k_F^\uparrow (R_{a_k, a'_k} - R_{b_l, b'_l})] \sin^2\left(\frac{\theta_k - \theta_l}{2}\right),$$

where D is the width of the domain wall (see equation (30)). We introduce randomness in the position of the sites at the interface. Large values of k_F correspond to strong randomness and in this case there is an equal probability of finding a positive or negative value of the supercurrent (see Fig. 9). This is the main result of our article.




FIG. 9. Distribution of conductance in the model containing a domain wall with a rotating magnetization. We used the geometry on Fig. 6. The length of the ferromagnetic region is $R = 5$ and we included $L = 100$ channels in the transverse direction. We introduced disorder in the position of the sites at the interfaces, as described in the text. The values of the Fermi wave-vectors are such that $k_F = k_F^\uparrow$. We used 10000 realizations of disorder for each value of k_F .

In the case of small randomness we can make an interesting connection with the S/DW junction considered in section IIIB. Let us consider that the domain wall is fully two-dimensional. The function $H(D)$ is given by

$$H(D) = \sum_{k,l,m,n} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_k, \alpha_l}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_k, \beta_m}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_l, \beta_n}} \exp\left(-\frac{R_{\alpha_k, \beta_m}}{l_\phi}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{R_{\alpha_l, \beta_n}}{l_\phi}\right) \quad (73)$$

$$\times \sin[k_F R_{\alpha_k, \alpha_l}] \sin[k_F R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}] \sin^2\left[\frac{\theta_k - \theta_l}{2}\right],$$

where α_k and α_l are two sites in the left interface, and β_m and β_n are two sites in the right interface. We use the

notation $y_{b_m} = y_{a_k} + z$ and $y_{b_n} = y_{a_l} + z'$. Then we have

$$\exp\left(-\frac{R_{\alpha_k, \beta_m}}{l_\phi}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{R_{\alpha_l, \beta_n}}{l_\phi}\right) \simeq \exp\left(-\frac{2R}{l_\phi}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{z^2 + (z')^2}{2Rl_\phi}\right), \quad (74)$$

and we deduce that z and z' are of order $\sqrt{Rl_\phi}$ which is supposed to be much smaller than the width D of the domain wall. With this assumption the dependence on θ_k and θ_l is just given by (73) since the electron outgoing at site β_n sees the same magnetization as the electron incoming at site α_l . Because of the factor $\sin^2[\theta_k - \theta_l]/2$, $|y_k - y_l|$ is of order D , much larger than $|z|$ and $|z'|$. As a consequence we use the approximation $R_{\beta_m, \beta_n} \simeq R_{\alpha_k, \alpha_l}$ as well as $R_{\alpha_l, \beta_n} \simeq R$, $R_{\alpha_k, \beta_m} \simeq R$. Making the integrations over z and z' leads to

$$H(D) = \frac{1}{8\pi} \frac{l_\phi}{R} \exp\left(-\frac{2R}{l_\phi}\right) \exp(-k_F^2 R l_\phi) F(\xi_0 = +\infty, D), \quad (75)$$

where $F(\xi_0, D)$ is given by (29). We thus see that in the clean limit the supercurrent through the S/DW/S junction is proportional to the current through the S/DW junction in the limit where the coherence length of the superconductor is very large, and equal to the transverse dimension of the ferromagnet.

2. Case of a partial spin polarization

If the ferromagnetic domain wall has a partial spin polarization there exists simultaneously a π -junction behavior and crossed Andreev reflection. The conductance in the absence of the domain wall can be deduced from (67):

$$I_S^{(0)} = \frac{64\pi^9}{a_0^4 k_F^2 k_F^\uparrow k_F^\downarrow} \frac{e}{h} \Delta t^4 \sin \varphi \rho_N^2 \rho_F^2 (1 - P^2) \exp\left(-\frac{2R}{l_\phi}\right) \times \sum_{m,n} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_m, \alpha_n}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}} \sin[k_F R_{\alpha_m, \alpha_n}] \sin[k_F R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}] \cos[k_F^\uparrow R_n - k_F^\downarrow R_m], \quad (76)$$

and corresponds to a π -junction behavior. In this case transport properties are controlled by local processes with $m = n$. The sign of the Josephson current is non-random if $k_F^\uparrow - k_F^\downarrow$ is sufficiently small. The difference between the conductances in the presence and in the absence of the domain wall is given by

$$I_S^{(DW)} - I_S^{(0)} = \frac{16\pi^5}{(a_0 k_F)^2} \frac{e}{h} \Delta t^4 \sin \varphi \rho_N^2 \exp\left(-\frac{2R}{l_\phi}\right) \sum_{m,n} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha_m, \alpha_n}} \frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}} \sin[k_F R_{\alpha_m, \alpha_n}] \sin[k_F R_{\beta_m, \beta_n}] \times (1 - \cos(\theta_m - \theta_n)) \left\{ \frac{2\pi^4}{a_0^2 k_F^\uparrow k_F^\downarrow} \rho_F^2 (1 - P^2) \cos[k_F^\uparrow R_n - k_F^\downarrow R_m] - \frac{\pi^4}{(a_0 k_F^\uparrow)^2} \rho_F^2 (1 + P)^2 \cos[k_F^\uparrow (R_m - R_n)] \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\pi^4}{(a_0 k_F^\downarrow)^2} \rho_F^2 (1 - P)^2 \cos[k_F^\downarrow (R_m - R_n)] \right\}. \quad (77)$$

We recognize a term containing $\cos[k_F^\uparrow R_n - k_F^\downarrow R_m]$ corresponding to a π -junction behavior, and the two other terms containing $\cos[k_F^\uparrow (R_m - R_n)]$ and $\cos[k_F^\downarrow (R_m - R_n)]$ corresponding to crossed Andreev reflection. The crossed Andreev reflection term leading to a random sign of I_S dominates if the Fermi level spin polarization is strong enough.

We keep in mind that this discussion is qualitative since we have not evaluated rigorously the geometrical prefactor which is expected to be different in the presence or absence of the domain wall. Nevertheless the qualitative conclusions are expected to be correct.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude we have presented a detailed investigation of several mechanisms involved in transport across several junctions involving ferromagnetic domain walls (S/DW, S/DW/N and S/DW/S junctions). The role of non collinear magnetization was studied for the S/DW junctions. We supposed that the domain wall was made of many independent channels in parallel. Using a spin \otimes Nambu \otimes Keldysh formalism we have derived the form of lowest order transport

formula valid for an arbitrary profile of magnetization. We find that the conductance is a scaling function of ξ_0/D , where ξ_0 is the zero-energy BCS correlation length and D is the width of the domain wall. Because of the proximity effect an exchange field can be induced in the superconductor. Neglecting the spatial variation of the exchange field, we have derived the transport formula and shown that there was no spin precession around the axis of the exchange field. We discussed the transport formula of the S/DW/N junction. We have shown that to lowest order only the processes taking place locally at each interface played a role. These processes are: elastic cotunneling through the superconductor, crossed Andreev reflection, electron tunneling from the ferromagnet to the normal metal and elastic cotunneling through the normal metal. We described the transport of Cooper pairs across the S/DW/N and S/DW/S junctions in a regime where transport is dominated by inelastic scattering but spin is conserved. With these assumptions the local distribution function within the domain wall is a Fermi distribution with a different spin-up and spin-down chemical potential. This model provides a detailed description of the sequential tunneling of Cooper pairs across the S/DW/N and S/DW/S junctions. We described the Josephson effect in a S/DW/S junction. In the case of the multichannel S/DW/S junction we find that the sign of the Josephson relation is random because the spin-up and spin-down electrons of the Cooper pair propagate in different electrodes and thus see different realizations of disorder.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge fruitful discussions with H. Courtois, D. Feinberg M. Giroud and B. Pannetier.

APPENDIX A: SPIN PRECESSION IN THE METALLIC CASE




FIG. 10. The device considered in appendix A. Electrode ending at site “a” is a ferromagnet with a magnetization pointing in the direction θ_a . Electrode ending at site “b” is a ferromagnet with a magnetization pointing in the direction θ_b .

In this appendix we consider the junction on Fig. 10 in which two ferromagnetic electrodes with non collinear magnetizations are connected to a normal metal [49,50]. Our goal is to provide a comparison with the superconducting case presented in section III C. We suppose that a magnetic field h is applied on the normal metal and that the only effect of the magnetic field is to generate Zeeman splitting. The crossed conductance $G_{a,b} = \partial I_a / \partial V_b$ associated to elastic cotunneling takes the form

$$G_{a,b} = 8\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \left(\frac{ma_0^2}{\hbar^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{2\pi R_{\alpha,\beta}} \right)^2 \left\{ 1 + P_a P_b \cos \theta_a \cos \theta_b \right. \\ \left. + P_a P_b \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \cos \left\{ [k_{F,\uparrow} - k_{F,\downarrow}] R_{\alpha,\beta} + eV_b \left[\frac{1}{v_{F,\uparrow}} - \frac{1}{v_{F,\downarrow}} \right] R_{\alpha,\beta} \right\} \right\}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Spin precession can have two origins: (i) the term $[k_{F,\uparrow} - k_{F,\downarrow}] R_{\alpha,\beta}$ describes oscillations of the conductance due to a mismatch in the Fermi wave-vectors; (ii) the term $\left[\frac{1}{v_{F,\uparrow}} - \frac{1}{v_{F,\downarrow}} \right] R_{\alpha,\beta}$ describes oscillations in the conductance due to a mismatch in the Fermi velocities.

APPENDIX B: PERTURBATIVE TRANSPORT FORMULA OF THE TWO CHANNEL S/DW/N JUNCTION

In this appendix we provide a derivation of the transport formula of the S/DW/N model represented on Fig. 5.

1. Transport at interface (a, α)

The current through each link of the network on Fig. 5 is given by the transport formula (4). The spin-up current through the link $\alpha - a$ is found to be

$$I_{a,\alpha}^{(\uparrow)} = -4\pi^2 t_\alpha^4 \tilde{\rho}_a^2 f_{\text{loc}}^2 [1 - P_a^2] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega + \mu_{a,\downarrow})] \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 [1 + P_a] [1 + P_b] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu_{b,\uparrow})] \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_\beta^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 [1 + P_a] [1 - P_b] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega + \mu_{b,\downarrow})] \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho_{a,a'}^\uparrow \rho_{a,a'}^\downarrow f_{\text{loc}}^2 [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega + \mu_{a,\downarrow})] \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} \rho_{a,a'}^\uparrow \rho_{b,b'}^\uparrow g_{\alpha,\beta} g_{\alpha',\beta'} [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu_{b,\uparrow})] \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} \rho_{a,a'}^\uparrow \rho_{b,b'}^\downarrow f_{\alpha,\beta} f_{\beta,\alpha} [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega + \mu_{b,\downarrow})] \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} \text{Im} \left[g_{a,a'}^{\uparrow R} g_{b,b'}^{\uparrow A} \right] g_{\alpha,\beta} g_{\alpha',\beta'} n_F(\omega - \mu'), \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $\mu_{a,\uparrow}$ and $\mu_{a,\downarrow}$ are the spin-up and spin-down chemical potentials in electrode (a, a') , $\mu_{b,\uparrow}$ and $\mu_{b,\downarrow}$ are the spin-up and spin-down chemical potentials in electrode (b, b') , and μ' is the chemical potential in the normal metal. After phase averaging we obtain three contributions to the transport formula: local Andreev reflection given by (39), elastic cotunneling through the superconductor given by (40) and crossed Andreev reflection given by (41).

2. Transport at interface (a', α')

The same calculation can be carried out at interface (a', α') . The transport formula is found to be

$$I_{a',\alpha'}^{(\uparrow)} = 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b g_{\alpha',\beta'}^A g_{\alpha',\beta'}^R [1 + P_a] [1 + P_b] n_F(\omega - \mu_{b,\uparrow}) \quad (\text{B8})$$

$$- 8\pi^4 t_\alpha^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \rho_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 [1 + P_a] [1 + P_b] n_F(\omega - \mu')$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \rho' [1 + P_a] [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu')]$$

$$+ 8\pi^4 t_\alpha^4 (\tilde{\rho}_a)^2 (\rho')^2 [1 + P_a]^2 [n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}) - n_F(\omega - \mu')]$$

$$- 8\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho' g \text{Re} \left[g_{a,a'}^\uparrow \right] \rho_{a,a'}^\uparrow n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow})$$

$$+ 2\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 (\rho')^2 \left(g_{a,a'}^{\uparrow R} \right)^2 n_F(\omega - \mu')$$

$$- 2i\pi t_\alpha^2 t_{\alpha'}^2 \rho' g \left(g_{a,a'}^{\uparrow A} \right)^2 n_F(\omega - \mu')$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} g_{\alpha,\beta} \rho_{a,a'}^\uparrow \text{Im} \left[g_{\alpha',\beta'}^A g_{b,b'}^{\uparrow A} \right] n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow})$$

$$+ 2i\pi t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} g_{\alpha,\beta} \rho_{b,b'}^\uparrow \left[g_{\alpha',\beta'}^A g_{a,a'}^{\uparrow R} + i\pi \rho' g_{a,a'}^{\uparrow A} \right] n_F(\omega - \mu_{b,\uparrow})$$

$$+ 2i\pi t_\alpha t_\beta t_{\alpha'} t_{\beta'} g_{\alpha,\beta} \rho_{\alpha',\beta'} \left[g_{a,a'}^{\uparrow R} g_{b,b'}^{\uparrow R} - i\pi \tilde{\rho}_b (1 + P_b) g_{a,a'}^{\uparrow A} \right] n_F(\omega - \mu')$$

$$- 4\pi^2 t_\alpha^2 t_{\beta'}^2 \tilde{\rho}_a \tilde{\rho}_b \text{Re} \left[\left(g_{\alpha',\beta'}^A \right)^2 \right] [1 + P_a] [1 + P_b] n_F(\omega - \mu_{a,\uparrow}).$$

After averaging over the phase variables we obtain the transport formula given by Eqs. (42) – (44) that contains only two processes: tunneling from site a' to site α' and elastic cotunneling from site b' to site a' .

APPENDIX C: TRANSPORT FORMULA OF THE SYMMETRIC TWO-CHANNEL S/DW/N AND S/DW/S JUNCTIONS

In this appendix we consider S/DW/N and S/DW/S junctions with two symmetric channels. With this model we confirm the results obtained in the main body of the article for the asymmetric junction with half-metal ferromagnets. We suppose that the two channels have an identical density of states: $\tilde{\rho}_a = \tilde{\rho}_b$, that the tunnel matrix elements are identical in the two channels: $t = t_\alpha = t_\beta$, $t' = t_{\alpha'} = t_{\beta'}$, and that the two channels have an opposite spin polarization: $P_a = P$ and $P_b = -P$. Then there exists a simple symmetry relation between the chemical potentials in the two ferromagnetic electrodes: $\mu_{a,\uparrow} = \mu_{b,\downarrow}$ and $\mu_{a,\downarrow} = \mu_{b,\uparrow}$.

1. The S/DW/N junction

In the limiting case $t \ll t'$ we have $\mu_{a,\uparrow} \simeq V'$. The transport formula is identical to the case where electrodes (a, a') and (b, b') are in equilibrium:

$$\frac{I_{\text{tot}}}{V'} = 32\pi^2 t^4 \tilde{\rho}^2 (1 - P^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2 + 32\pi^2 t^4 \tilde{\rho}^2 (1 + P^2) \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle. \quad (\text{C1})$$

In the case of half-metal ferromagnets ($P = 1$) only the term corresponding to crossed Andreev reflection is non-zero and Eq. (C1) is equivalent to Eq. (47).

In the limiting case $\rho_N t' \ll \rho_N t \ll 1$ and $t' \ll \rho_N t^2$ the current is the sum of a contribution due to local Andreev reflection and a contribution due to crossed Andreev reflection: $I_{\text{tot}} = I_{\text{AR}} + I_{\text{CAR}}$, with

$$\frac{I_{\text{AR}}}{V'} = \frac{32\pi^2 (t')^2 \tilde{\rho} \rho' (1 - P^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2 \left(\langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \right)}{(1 - P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle^2 \right] + (1 + P^2) \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 + \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \right]} \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$\frac{I_{\text{CAR}}}{V'} = \frac{16\pi^2 (t')^2 \tilde{\rho} \rho' \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \left[(1 + P^2) \left(\langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \right) + 2P^2 \left(f_{\text{loc}}^2 - \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \right) \right]}{(1 - P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle^2 \right] + (1 + P^2) \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 + \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \right]}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

In the case of half-metal ferromagnets (C2) and (C3) are equivalent to (48).

2. The S/DW/S junction

In the case of the S/DW/S junction the total current is the sum of the local Andreev reflection and crossed Andreev reflection terms:

$$\frac{I_{\text{AR}}}{V' - V} = \frac{128\pi^2}{\mathcal{D}'} t^4 (t')^4 \tilde{\rho}^4 f_{\text{loc}}^2 (1 - P^2) \left\{ \left[t^4 \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + (t')^4 \langle \langle g_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \left[(1 - P^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2 + (1 + P^2) \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right. \\ \left. + \left[t^4 \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + (t')^4 \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \left[(1 + P^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2 + (1 - P^2) \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right\} \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$\frac{I_{\text{CAR}}}{V' - V} = \frac{128\pi^2}{\mathcal{D}'} t^4 (t')^4 \tilde{\rho}^4 \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle (1 + P^2) \left\{ \left[t^4 \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + (t')^4 \langle \langle g_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \left[(1 - P^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2 + (1 + P^2) \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right. \\ \left. + \left[t^4 \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + (t')^4 \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \left[(1 + P^2) f_{\text{loc}}^2 + (1 - P^2) \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right\}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

with

$$\mathcal{D}' = 4t^8 \tilde{\rho}^2 \left\{ (1 - P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle^2 \right] + (1 + P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right\} \\ + 4(t')^8 \tilde{\rho}^2 \left\{ (1 - P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle g_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle^2 \right] + (1 + P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle g_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right\} \\ + 4t^4 (t')^4 \tilde{\rho}^2 \left\{ (1 - P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle g_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle + 2 \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right. \\ \left. + (1 + P^2) \left[f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle + f_{\text{loc}}^2 \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle g_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle + \langle \langle f_{\alpha',\beta'}^2 \rangle \rangle \langle \langle g_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle \right] \right\}. \quad (\text{C6})$$

If the contacts with the two superconductors are identical we have $t = t'$, $f_{\alpha,\beta} = f_{\alpha',\beta'}$ and $g_{\alpha,\beta} = g_{\alpha',\beta'}$ from what we deduce

$$\frac{I_{\text{AR}}}{V' - V} = 4\pi^2 t^4 \rho^2 f_{\text{loc}}^2 (1 - P^2) \quad (\text{C7})$$

$$\frac{I_{\text{CAR}}}{V' - V} = 4\pi^2 t^4 \rho^2 \langle \langle f_{\alpha,\beta}^2 \rangle \rangle (1 + P^2), \quad (\text{C8})$$

where we used the notation $\tilde{\rho} = \rho/2$ for the spin-up or spin-down density of state in the ferromagnetic electrodes. Eqs. (C7) and (C8) in the limit $P = 1$ are in agreement with Eq. (49) in the limit of a symmetric contact. In the symmetric case the conductance is thus equal to the conductance associated to a single superconductor divided by two, in agreement with Eq. (50).

- [1] M. S. Choi, C. Bruder and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 13569 (2000);
P. Recher, E. V. Sukhorukov and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 165314 (2001).
- [2] O. Sauret, D. Feinberg, and T. Martin cond-mat/0203215.
- [3] G. Deutscher and D. Feinberg, App. Phys. Lett. **76**, 487 (2000).
- [4] G. Falci, D. Feinberg, and F.W.J. Hekking, Europhysics Letters **54**, 255 (2001).
- [5] R. Mélin, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **13**, 6445 (2001);
R. Mélin, Proceedings of the XXXVIth Rencontres de Moriond, T. Martin and G. Montambaux Eds., EDP Sciences (2001).
- [6] R. Mélin and D. Feinberg, Eur. Phys. J. B **26**, 101 (2002).
- [7] G. B. Lesovik, T. Martin and G. Blatter, Eur. Phys. J. B **24**, 287 (2001);
N. M. Chtchelkatchev, G. Blatter, G.B. Lesovik and T. Martin, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 161320 (R) (2002).
V. Bouchiat, N. Chtchelkatchev, D. Feinberg, G.B. Lesovik, T. Martin and J. Torres, cond-mat/0206005.
- [8] P. Fulde and A. Ferrel, Phys. Rev. **135**, A550 (1964).
- [9] A. Larkin and Y. Ovchinnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 762 (1965).
- [10] M.A. Clogston, Phys. Rev. Lett. **9**, 266 (1962).
- [11] E.A. Demler, G.B. Arnold and M.R. Beasley, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 15174 (1997).
- [12] A.I. Buzdin, L.N. Bulaevskii, and S.V. Panyukov, JETP Lett. **35**, 178 (1982) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **35**, 147 (1982)].
A. Buzdin, B. Bujicic, and M. Yu. Kupriyanov, Sov. Phys. JETP **74**, 124 (1992) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **101**, 231 (1992)].
- [13] V.V. Ryazanov, V.A. Oboznov, A. Yu. Rusanov, A.V. Veretennikov, A.A. Golubov, J. Aarts, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2427 (2001).
- [14] T. Kontos, M. Aprili, J. Lesueur, and X. Grisson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 304 (2001).
- [15] M. Zareyan, W. Belzig, Yu. V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 308 (2001).
- [16] P.G. de Gennes, Phys. Letters **23**, 10 (1966).
- [17] I. Baladie, A. Buzdin, N. Ryzhanova and A. Vedyayev, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 054518 (2001);
I. Baladie and A. Buzdin, cond-mat/0209466.
- [18] V. Apinyan and R. Mélin, Eur. Phys. J. B **25**, 373 (2002).
- [19] H. Jirari, R. Mélin and N. Stefanakis, cond-mat/0204610.
- [20] A.I. Buzdin and M. Yu. Kupriyanov, JETP Lett. **52**, 487 (1990);
A.I. Buzdin, M. Yu. Kupriyanov and B. Vujicic, Physica C **185 - 189**, 2025 (1991).
- [21] J.S. Jiang, D. Davidović, D.H. Reich, and C.L. Chien, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 314 (1995).
- [22] C.L. Chien, J.S. Jiang, J.Q. Xiao, D. Davidović, and D.H. Reich, J. Appl. Phys. **81**, 5358 (1997).
- [23] L.V. Mercaldo, C. Attanasio, C. Coccorese, L. Maritato, S.L. Prischepa, and M. Salvato, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 14 040 (1996).
- [24] J.S. Jiang, D. Davidović, D.H. Reich, and C.L. Chien, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 6119 (1996).
- [25] Th. Muhge, N.N. Garif'yanov, Yu. V. Goryunov, G.G. Khaliullin, L.R. Tagirov, K. Westerholt, I.A. Garifullin, and H. Zabel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1857 (1996).
Th. Muhge, K. Westerholt, H. Zabel, N.N. Garif'yanov, Yu. V. Goryunov, I.A. Garifullin, and G.G. Khaliullin, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 8945 (1997).
- [26] M.D. Lawrence and N. Giordano, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **39**, L563 (1996).
- [27] V.A. Vas'ko, V.A. Larkin, P.A. Kraus, K.R. Nikolaev, D.E. Grupp, C.A. Nordman, and A.M. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1134 (1997).
- [28] M. Giroud, H. Courtois, K. Hasselbach, D. Mailly, and B. Pannetier, Phys. Rev. B **58**, R11872 (1998).
- [29] V.T. Petrashov, I.A. Sosnon, I. Cox, A. Parsons, and C. Troadec, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3281 (1999).
- [30] A.T. Filip, B.H. Hoving, F.J. Jedema, B.J. van Wees, B. Dutta, and S. Borghs, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 9996 (2000).
- [31] M. Giroud, K. Hasselbach, H. Courtois, D. Mailly and B. Pannetier, cond-mat/0204140.
- [32] M.J.M. de Jong and C.W.J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1657 (1995).
- [33] R.J. Soulen *et al.*, Science **282**, 85 (1998).
- [34] S.K. Upadhyay *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3247 (1998).
- [35] M.V. Feigel'man, A.I. Larkin and M.A. Skvortsov, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 12361 (2000).
- [36] D. Huertas-Hernando, Yu. V. Nazarov and W. Belzig, cond-mat/020411.
- [37] Z.Y. Zeng, B. Li and F. Claro, cond-mat/0301264.
- [38] T. Valet and A. Fert, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 7099 (1993);
T. Valet and A. Fert, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **121**, 378 (1993);
A. Fert, T. Valet, and J. Barnas, J. Appl. Phys. **75**, 6693 (1994);
A. Fert, J.L. Duvail, and T. Valet, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 6513 (1995).
- [39] M.A.M. Gijs and G. Bauer, Adv. in Physics **46**, 285 (1997).
- [40] R. Mélin and D. Denaro, Eur. Phys. J. B **18**, 149 (2000).
- [41] S. Kasai, T. Niiyama, E. Saitoh and H. Miyajima, App. Phys. Lett. **81**, 316 (2002).
- [42] P. M. Tedrow and R. Meservey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 192 (1971);
P. M. Tedrow and R. Meservey, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 318 (1973);
R. Meservey and P. M. Tedrow, Phys. Rep. **238**, 173 (1994).
- [43] G. Deutscher and F. Meunier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **22**, 395 (1969).
- [44] J.J. Hauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 374 (1969).

- [45] Y. Tserkovnyak and A. Brataas, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 094517 (2002).
- [46] J.C. Cuevas, A. Martin-Rodero and A. Levy Yeyati, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 7366 (1996).
- [47] A. Martin-Rodero, F.J. Garcia-Vidal and A. Levy Yeyati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 554 (1994).
- [48] A. Levy Yeyati, A. Martin-Rodero and F.J. Garcia-Vidal, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 3743 (1995).
- [49] D. Huertas Hernando, Yu. V. Nazarov, A. Brataas and G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 5700 (2000).
- [50] F.J. Jedema, A.T. Filip and B.J. van Wees, Nature **410**, 345 (2001);
F.J. Jedema, H.B. Heersche, A.T. Filip, J.J.A. Baselmans and B.J. van Wees, Nature **416**, 713 (2002).