## **Possible Origin for Oscillatory Superconducting Transition Temperature in Superconductor**y**Ferromagnet Multilayers**

Th. Mühge,<sup>1</sup> N. N. Garif'yanov,<sup>2</sup> Yu. V. Goryunov,<sup>2</sup> G. G. Khaliullin,<sup>2</sup> L. R. Tagirov,<sup>3</sup> K. Westerholt,<sup>1</sup>

I. A. Garifullin, $^2$  and H. Zabel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut für Experimentalphysik–Festkörperphysik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 44780 Bochum, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Kazan Physicotechnical Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, 420029 Kazan, Russian Federation*

<sup>3</sup>*Kazan State University, 420008 Kazan, Russian Federation*

(Received 5 February 1996)

We have studied superconducting and magnetic properties of sputtered  $Fe/Nb/Fe$  trilayers. For a fixed Nb thickness and with changing Fe thickness,  $d_{\text{Fe}}$ , a nonmonotonic behavior of the superconducting transition temperature  $T_c$  was observed with a maximum at  $d_{Fe} \approx 10 \text{ Å}$ . The analysis of the magnetization data revealed that for  $d_{Fe} \le 7$  Å the Fe layer is nonmagnetic. The interpretation of the observed  $T_c$  behavior is attributed to the existence of this magnetically "dead" layer and the change of the interaction of the Cooper pairs with this layer at the onset of ferromagnetism for  $d_{\text{Fe}} \ge 7 \text{ Å}.$  [S0031-9007(96)01049-6]

PACS numbers: 74.80.Dm.74.50.+r, 74.62.–c

Since the advent of metal superlattice growth capabilities, the possibility to study proximity effects between layers with dissimilar intrinsic properties, such as superconductivity and ferromagnetism, has initiated much research activity [1]. For ferromagnetic (FM) layers sandwiched between superconducting (SC) layers it is expected that the critical temperature for the SC transition  $T_c$  decreases monotonically with increasing magnetic layer thickness. Interest in this topic increased considerably after Wong *et al.* [2] showed a nonmonotonic dependence of  $T_c$  as a function of the Fe layer thickness in  $V/Fe$  superlattices and with fixed V thickness. Shortly afterwards, the possibility for oscillation of  $T_c$  as a function of the FM layer thickness in SC/FM multilayers was demonstrated theoretically [3]. It was shown that at specific FM layer thicknesses the Josephson coupling between two SC layers can lead to a junction with an intrinsic phase difference  $\Delta \phi = \pi$  which, in turn, exhibits a higher  $T_c$  in comparison to the ordinary  $\Delta \phi = 0$ . Such so-called  $\pi$  junctions have been suggested earlier to arise also in the tunnel barriers containing magnetic impurities [4] and have been proposed recently for weak links of superconductors with *d*-wave pairing [5]. Although numerous experimental results were discussed in terms of  $\pi$  junctions, any unequivocal observation of  $\pi$  junction coupling has not yet been published.

The evidence for  $\pi$  coupling in SC/FM multilayers was sought experimentally in  $V/Fe$  [6], Nb/Gd [7,8], and Nb/Fe  $[9]$  systems. In V/Fe  $[6]$ , contrary to the previous results  $[2]$ ,  $T_c$  oscillations as a function of the iron thickness  $d_{Fe}$  were not observed. Negative results were also published for the  $Nb/Fe$  system [9]. At the same time, for  $Nb/Gd$ , a nonmonotonic dependence of  $T_c$  on the FM Gd-layer thickness  $d_{\text{Gd}}$  for fixed  $d_{\text{Nb}}$ values was reported by Strunk *et al.* [7] and by Jiang *et al.* [8]. For the explanation of the nonmonotonic  $T_c$ behavior two different models were proposed. Strunk *et al.* assumed that the obtained  $T_c$  behavior could be attributed to the change in the underlying pair-breaking mechanism due to the transition of the Gd layer from a paramagnetic to a FM state with increasing  $d_{\text{Gd}}$ . In contrast, Jiang *et al.* suggested that the oscillatory  $T_c$ behavior provides evidence for the predicted  $\pi$  coupling in SC/FM multilayers.

In order to test the validity of these ideas, we prepared Fe/Nb/Fe-trilayer samples consisting of one single SC layer between two FM layers. Nevertheless, we observed a nonmonotonic  $T_c$  dependence on the  $d_{\text{Fe}}$  at fixed  $d_{\text{Nb}}$ , which looks very similar to the  $T_c$  behavior in Nb/Gd multilayers as reported by Jiang *et al.* [8]. Contrary to their interpretation, we conclude that the nonmonotonic  $T_c(d_{Fe})$ dependence occurs due to the existence of magnetically "dead" Fe layers near the interface and their properties changing drastically upon the onset of FM order.

The samples were prepared by rf sputtering techniques on  $Al_2O_3$  (1120) substrates at 300 K. Pure Ar (99.999%) at pressures of  $5 \times 10^{-3}$  mbar was used as a sputter gas. Very pure Nb (99.99%) and Fe (99.99%) targets were used for deposition. The growth rate was controlled by a quartz crystal monitor, and a rate of 0.1  $\rm \AA/sec$  was found to be optimal for the structural quality of the films.

To find the optimal growth conditions for the  $Fe/Nb/Fe$ trilayers, systematic resistivity measurements on single Nb films deposited under different conditions were performed. The  $T_c$  value and the residual resistivity  $\rho(10 \text{ K})$  were observed to be extremely sensitive to the preparation conditions. The highest obtained  $T_c$  for a single Nb film with  $d_{\text{Nb}} = 400 \text{ Å}$  was 7 K. For this film  $\rho(10 \text{ K}) \simeq$ 13  $\mu\Omega$  cm, decreasing monotonically with increasing  $d_{\text{Nb}}$ . This probably shows that the conduction electron scattering at grain boundaries is the main scattering process, because usually (see, e.g., [7] and references therein) the mean grain size is roughly proportional to the film thickness. We suppose that this scattering also leads to the socalled lifetime "broadening" of the electronic density of states [10] and to a correspondingly low  $T_c$  value (for pure bulk Nb  $T_c = 9.2$  K).

In order to study carefully the dependence of the SC parameters on the thickness  $d_{Fe}$ , it is essential that the samples are deposited in an identical fashion. Therefore sets of nine different Fe/Nb/Fe trilayer samples with different  $d_{\text{Fe}}$  at constant  $d_{\text{Nb}}$  were prepared within one run. Prior to the sample growth, a Nb layer of 30 Å thickness was deposited on the sapphire substrates as a buffer layer. After the deposition process all samples were covered with a protective Nb cap layer of 30 Å thickness.

In Fig. 1 x-ray reflectivity scans measured with Mo  $K\alpha_1$  radiation for three trilayers with different  $d_{\text{Fe}}$  and fixed  $d_{Nb}$  are shown. Fits with the Parratt formalism [11] show surface and interface roughnesses of less than  $6 \text{ Å}$ , indicating the high structural quality of our films. The film thickness obtained from the fit procedure coincides within 10%, with the thickness determined by the quartz crystal monitor during deposition. Using the Parratt fit, we also checked the  $d_{Nb}$  values within one set prepared simultaneously and did not find any scatter within the error bar of the fit of about 1%.

Magnetization measurements by a SQUID magnetometer did not indicate qualitative differences in the magnetization curves for samples with a  $d_{Fe}$  between 25 and 10 Å at fixed  $d_{Nb} = 400$  Å. The hysteresis loops show the typical square shape for ferromagnets and a coercive force  $H_c \approx 200$  Oe. The dependence of the saturation magnetization  $M_s$  on the reciprocal thickness of the Fe layers is shown in Fig. 2. For the samples with  $d_{\text{Fe}} \leq 7$  Å there is no contribution to the magnetization from the Fe layers.



FIG. 1. X-ray reflectivity scans measured with Mo  $K\alpha_1$ radiation for trilayers with different  $d_{Fe}$  and fixed  $d_{Nb}$  = 100 Å. The thicknesses of the Nb buffer and cap layer was 30 Å each. The solid line is obtained by model calculations using the Parratt formalism [9]. The multilayer structure is shown in the inset.

These results clearly show that a Fe layer of less than 7 Å thickness sandwiched between two Nb layers is nonferromagnetic. The same thickness of a magnetically dead Fe layer was obtained by Mattson *et al.* [12] in their sputtered Fe/Nb superlattices.

The SC transition temperatures  $T_c$  were measured resistively in a standard four-terminal configuration and defined at the midpoint of the SC transition. In addition, ac magnetic susceptibility measurements were used to determine  $T_c$  for all samples. In this case the temperature corresponding to half the value of the transition signal was defined as  $T_c$ . Figure 3 shows the SC transitions observed by electrical resistivity and ac magnetic susceptibility measurements for four samples with different  $d_{Fe}$ . These sharp transitions confirm the high quality of our trilayer systems.

The  $T_c$  dependence on the Fe thickness obtained for two sets of trilayers with fixed  $d_{Nb} = 400 \text{ Å}$  is shown in Fig. 4. A strong initial  $T_c$  depression is observed up to  $d_{\text{Fe}} = 7$  Å. For larger  $d_{\text{Fe}}$   $T_c$  increases markedly, reaching a maximum at  $d_{\text{Fe}} \approx 10 \text{ Å}$  and then starts to decrease with a tendency of saturation for  $d_{\text{Fe}} \geq 20$  Å. We have observed similar nonmonotonic  $T_c$  behavior for two sets of samples with  $d_{Nb} = 350$  and 450 Å, respectively. It should be emphasized that the maximum of  $T_c$ at  $d_{\text{Fe}} \approx 10$  Å is outside of any possible experimental error bar.

The most important result in our present study is the pronounced maximum of  $T_c$  at  $d_{Fe} \approx 10$  Å (Fig. 4). As mentioned above, Jiang *et al.* [8] obtained results very similar to ours and interpreted them as the first evidence of  $\pi$  coupling in SC/FM multilayers [3]. Principally, one could assume that the coupling of the main SC Nb layer of our trilayer system with very thin Nb cap and bottom layers might give rise to a  $\pi$ -coupling effect, too. However, we can rule out this explanation for the following reasons: First we note that the difference in



FIG. 2. Saturation magnetization measured by a SQUID magnetometer at 10 K vs  $1/d_{Fe}$  for the samples with fixed  $d_{Nb} = 400$  Å. The solid line is a linear fit. Note that the sample with  $d_{\text{Fe}} = 7 \text{ Å}$  was measured with higher precision.



FIG. 3. Superconducting transition curves for samples with different  $d_{\text{Fe}}$  and fixed  $d_{\text{Nb}} = 400$  Å measured by electrical resistivity (a) and ac susceptibility (b).

the free energy as well as in  $T_c$  between a conventional and  $\pi$ -phase contact of two SC layers SC(1)/FM/SC(2) must vanish as  $d_1/d_2$  in the limit  $d_1 \ll d_2$  [here  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  denote the thicknesses of the SC(1) and SC(2)]. For our samples the ratio  $d_1/d_2$  is of the order of 0.1. This makes the  $\pi$  junction effect irrelevant in our case, even if assuming a difference between maximum and minimum in  $T_c(d_{\text{Fe}})$  caused by  $\pi$  coupling of the order of 1 K for a contact with  $d_1 = d_2$ . In addition, the amplitude of the order parameter in the top and bottom layers is expected to be strongly reduced by the lifetime broadening effect in thin Nb layers [13].

We believe that the most essential feature of FM/SC multilayers in which a nonmonotonic  $T_c$  behavior was observed is the disappearance of ferromagnetism below a critical thickness of the FM layers. We have shown in Fig. 2 that ferromagnetism vanishes at  $d_{\text{Fe}} \leq 7$  Å in our



FIG. 4.  $T_c$  vs  $d_{Fe}$  as determined by ac susceptibility (closed symbols) and resistivity (open symbols) measurements for samples with fixed  $d_{Nb} = 400$  Å. The triangles and circles correspond to two different sample sets. The dashed line is a guide for the eye.

 $Fe/Nb/Fe$  trilayers, for the Nb/Gd system FM vanishes for  $d_{\text{Gd}} \leq 12$  Å [7,8]. We suppose that the disappearance of FM order is due to alloying effects at the interface, since the value of the critical thickness is of the same order as the interfacial roughness obtained by the Parratt fit. Principally, the nonferromagnetic layers might be in a paramagnetic or in a nonmagnetic state. In our opinion, in either case it can cause the observed nonmonotonic  $T_c$ behavior.

First of all we shall discuss the case when the intermixed layer has localized moments but is in a paramagnetic state. It is obvious that this situation is realized in the Nb/Gd system due to the stability of the 4*f* magnetic moment of the Gd<sup>3+</sup> ion. In this case we expect a strong initial  $T_c$ depression with increasing magnetic layer thickness due to the proximity with the localized moments in the interface area [14] (analogous to the Abrikosov-Gor'kov mechanism of pair-breaking scattering in dilute magnetic alloys [15]). The appearance of FM order within the intermixed region when increasing the magnetic layer thickness will lead to an induced magnetic ordering of the whole intermixed area with a subsequent freezing out of the elastic spin-flip exchange scattering process of the conduction electrons in this region. This gives rise to a sudden increase in  $T_c$ ; when further increasing the magnetic layer thickness another basic mechanism of  $T_c$  depression due to the exchange field at the interface starts to come into play [3].

In our case the intermixed layer is most likely in the nonmagnetic state. We have analyzed the magnetic state of the Fe atoms close to the interface by high resolution magnetization measurements of a single Nb film and of a sample with  $d_{Fe} = 7 \text{ Å}$ . In the temperature range from 10 to 100 K and in a magnetic field up to 2500 Oe the magnetic susceptibility values were equal within the experimental error bars for both samples. We estimated that the maximum value of the error is a factor of 2 smaller than the expected magnetic susceptibility of paramagnetic Fe ions incorporated in the interface region. Moreover, in all measurements the scatter of the data points showed that the paramagnetic contribution to the magnetic susceptibility of the  $Fe/Nb/Fe$  trilayer is smaller than the magnetic susceptibility of a single Nb film. Therefore we conclude that in our system the interface area for  $d_{\text{Fe}} \le 7$  Å is nonmagnetic in accordance with Mössbauer results by Chien *et al.* [16].

The nonmagnetic state of the intermixed layer can easily be understood by the concept of virtual (resonant) *d* levels [17], formed by Fe ions dissolved in the host Nb metal. Strong mixing of *d* states with the host band suppresses the local moment of the Fe ions and leads to the appearance of resonant states near the Fermi level. Although these local virtual states are not usual pair breakers, since their contribution to elastic spin scattering is small, they strongly suppress superconductivity by inducing repulsive interactions between the conduction electrons. The origin of this repulsion is the inelastic

scattering of electrons on spin fluctuations of Fe-derived resonant levels. The scale for this local paramagnon mediated repulsion can roughly be estimated as  $n\lambda^2 \tau_{\text{sf}}$ , where  $n$  is the density of Fe ions in the intermixed region,  $\lambda$  is the coupling constant of the conduction electrons to *d*-spin density on the resonant level, and  $\tau_{sf}$  is the characteristic time scale for spin fluctuations on Fe ions.

Let us imagine that the layers with such resonant states form a trilayer system with the SC layer. In this case the Cooper limit for proximity systems works, with  $T_c$  given by de Gennes [18], as follows:

$$
T_c = 1.14 \theta_D \exp\left(-\frac{N_1(\epsilon_f)d_1 + N_2(\epsilon_f)d_2}{N_1^2(\epsilon_f)V_1d_1 + N_2^2(\epsilon_f)V_2d_2}\right), (1)
$$

where the subscripts 1 and 2 refer to the two materials,  $N_i(\varepsilon_f)$  is the electronic density of states at the Fermi level, *Vi* is the electron-electron interaction constant, and  $d_i$  is the layer thickness. Since this formula is strictly valid only for  $d_i < \xi_i$ , in order to sense the characteristic parameters of the interface area we consider the initial  $T_c$  depression for a Nb thickness  $d_1 = 100$  Å. We took for Nb layer  $V_1 = 0.0816 \text{ eV}$ ,  $N_1 = 3.07 \text{ states/eV}$ ,  $\theta_D = 325$  K. Assuming  $N_2 = N_1$ , we estimated  $V_2 =$ 0.046 eV. Bearing in mind our assumption about the Nb layer thickness, we conclude that the real value of  $V_2$  at the interface of our system is somewhat smaller. Such a weakening of net attraction in the interface region due to electron-paramagnon coupling is not unrealistic.

The above discussion may qualitatively explain the large initial  $T_c(d_{\text{Fe}})$  depression in Fig. 4, but the  $T_c$ jump at  $d_{\text{Fe}} \approx 10$  Å still remains unexplained. We have concluded that above  $d_{Fe} = 7$  Å a FM Fe layer occurs in the middle of the dead Fe layer. This induces a strong internal field and a Zeeman splitting of the resonant *d* levels in the intermixed region. Concomitantly local spin fluctuations discussed above become strongly suppressed. Then the repulsion between the electrons also decreases, causing an increase of  $T_c$ .

In summary, we have studied in detail the magnetic and SC properties of FM/SC/FM triple layer system using Fe/Nb/Fe samples as an example. The first conclusion from our results is that the experimental finding of Jiang *et al.* [8] cannot be taken unambiguously as an evidence for the existence of a  $\pi$  coupling [3]. Second, we deduced that in  $Fe/Nb/Fe$  trilayers the nonmonotonic behavior in  $T_c(d_{\text{Fe}})$  occurs due to the existence of a magnetically dead Fe-rich layer near the Nb/Fe interface. It is argued that the effective electron-electron attractive interaction in this layer is weakened considerably, giving rise to a strong initial  $T_c$  depression up to  $d_{\text{Fe}} = 7$  Å. For larger  $d_{Fe}$  the appearance of a FM layer within the magnetically dead layer moderates the destructive effect on superconductivity. This is due to the suppression of spin fluctuations mediating the repulsion between electrons by the induced internal field. This leads to an increase of the  $T_c$  value. With further increase of  $d_{Fe}$  the ordinary  $T_c$  depression by the exchange field of the FM layer becomes predominant.

We would like to thank J. Podschwadeck and C. Leschke for technical support and Dr. M. Khusainov for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG-ZA161/6-1) and by the Russian Fund for Fundamental Research (Project 96-02-16332a), which are gratefully acknowledged.

- [1] B. Y. Jin and J. B. Ketterson, Adv. Phys. **38**, 189 (1989).
- [2] H. K. Wong, B. Y. Jin, H. Q. Yang, J. B. Ketterson, and J. E. Hillard, J. Low Temp. Phys. **63**, 307 (1986).
- [3] Z. Radović, M. Ledvij, L. Dobrosavljević, A. I. Buzdin, and J. R. Clem, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 759 (1991), and references therein.
- [4] L. N. Bulaevskii, V. V. Kuzii, and A. A. Sobyanin, Pis'ma Zh. Exp. Teor. Fiz. **25**, 314 (1977) [JETP Lett. **25**, 290 (1977)].
- [5] M. Segrist and T. M. Rice, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61**, 4283 (1992).
- [6] P. Koorevaar, Y. Suzuki, R. Coehoorn, and J. Aarts, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 441 (1994).
- [7] C. Strunk, C. Sürgers, U. Paschen, and H. v. Löhnesen, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 4053 (1994).
- [8] J.S. Jiang, D. Davidović, D.H. Reich, and C.L. Chien, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 314 (1995).
- [9] G. Verbanck, C. D. Potter, R. Schad, P. Belien, V. V. Moschalkov, and Y. Bruynseraede, Physica (Amsterdam) **235–240C**, 3295 (1994).
- [10] L. R. Testardi and L. F. Mattheiss, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41**, 1612 (1978).
- [11] L. G. Parratt, Phys. Rev. **95**, 354 (1954).
- [12] J.E. Mattson, C.H. Sovers, A. Berger, and S.D. Bader, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3252 (1992).
- [13] We found that Nb layers with  $d_{Nb} = 30 \text{ Å}$  are not SC above 1.7 K when covered by a Fe layer with  $d_{\text{Fe}} \geq 5$  Å.
- [14] O. Entin-Wohlman and S. Alexander, J. Low Temp. Phys. **24**, 229 (1976).
- [15] A. A. Abrikosov and L. P. Gor'kov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **39**, 1781 (1960); Sov. Phys. JETP **12**, 1243 (1961).
- [16] C.L. Chien, K.M. Unruh, and S.H. Liou, J. Appl. Phys. **53**, 7756 (1982).
- [17] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **124**, 41 (1961).
- [18] P. G. de Gennes, Rev. Mod. Phys. **36**, 225 (1964).