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We discuss the Josephson current between two noncentrosymmetric superconductors. The coexistence of superconducting order parameters between spin-singlet $\Delta_S$ and helical $p$-wave spin-triplet $\Delta_T$ enriches a variety of low-temperature behavior of Josephson current depending on their relative amplitudes. We will show that characteristic behaviors of the Josephson current for $\Delta_S > \Delta_T$ are clearly different from those for $\Delta_S < \Delta_T$. The topologically protected zero-energy surface bound states are responsible for the clear difference. We conclude that the Josephson current well reflects character of the topological surface states and the pairing symmetry of noncentrosymmetric superconductors.

PACS numbers: 74.45.+c, 74.50.+r, 74.25.F-, 74.70.-b

I. INTRODUCTION

Coexistence between the spin-singlet superconducting order parameters and spin-triplet one is the essential feature of noncentrosymmetric superconductors (NCS)\textsuperscript{1-4}. The absence of spatial inversion symmetry leads to spin-orbit coupling large enough to mix the spin-singlet component and spin-triplet one. The amplitude of the spin-singlet component $\Delta_S$ and that of the spin-triplet one $\Delta_T$ is a material parameter determined by the amplitude of spin-orbit coupling. The Rashba type spin-orbit coupling induces the helical $p$-wave spin-triplet order parameter which is the topologically nontrivial superconducting state\textsuperscript{15}. There have been several studies on superconducting properties coexisting of the spin-singlet $s$-wave and the spin-triplet helical $p$-wave symmetries\textsuperscript{6-12}. It is known that topologically protected states with linear dispersion appear at a surface of a NCS for $\Delta_T > \Delta_S$. Recent papers, however, have suggested a mixed order parameter spin-singlet $d$-wave and spin-triplet $p$-wave symmetries\textsuperscript{13,14}, which has been proposed for the interfacial superconductivity\textsuperscript{15}. Such pairing symmetry results in dispersionless surface bound state at the fermi level. A similar flat zero-energy surface states has also discussed in a NCS very recently\textsuperscript{16}. Physical values originated from the bulk region of a superconductor such as the specific heat and spin susceptibility are expected to be interpoled from those in the two limits: the pure spin-singlet case and the pure spin-triplet one. An open question is how physical values governed by the surface bound states behave as a function of the relative amplitude between $\Delta_T$ and $\Delta_S$. The present paper addresses this issue.

The surface bound states of unconventional superconductors have been theoretically discussed in heavy fermionic superconductors\textsuperscript{17}, the polar state of $^3$He\textsuperscript{18}, and high-$T_c$ cuprates\textsuperscript{19,20}. Experimentally, the presence of the surface bound states have been observed as the zero-bias anomaly\textsuperscript{21-23} of the scanning tunneling spectroscopy (STS) of hole-doped\textsuperscript{24,25} and electron-doped\textsuperscript{26} high-$T_c$ cuprates. The zero-bias anomaly has been observed also in the differential conductance of ramp-edge junctions of hole-doped high-$T_c$ cuprates\textsuperscript{27} and grain boundary junction of electron-doped high-$T_c$ cuprates\textsuperscript{28}. The presence of the surface bound states has been reinterpreted since the proposal for new classification of materials\textsuperscript{29}. The surface bound states at the zero energy are necessary to naturally connect a nontrivial topological integer number inside of an unconventional superconductor with the trivial topological number outside of the superconductor. The dispersion of the subgap states depends on the type of the topological number defined in superconductors. The chiral or helical superconductors give rise to dispersive surface bound states\textsuperscript{26}. On the other hand, dispersionless zero-energy states are formed under $d_{x^2-y^2}$ and $p_x$-wave symmetries.

In direct current Josephson effect, the surface bound states result in large $JcR_N/\langle \Delta_0/e \rangle$ values and the deviation of current-phase relationship from the sinusoidal function at low temperature\textsuperscript{29-30}, where $J_c$ is the critical Josephson current, $R_N$ is the normal resistance of a junction, and $\Delta_0$ is the amplitude of pair potential at the zero temperature. Such behavior is called low-temperature anomaly of Josephson current and is known to be sensitive to spectra of surface bound states\textsuperscript{29-33}. So far the Josephson effect between $s$-wave superconductor and a NCS has been reported\textsuperscript{34}. The low-temperature anomaly of the Josephson current has never been discussed yet.

In this paper, we theoretically calculate the Josephson current between two NCS\textsuperscript{35-38} based on a current formula\textsuperscript{37} in terms of the Andreev reflection coefficients of junctions. We assume a order parameter which is a mixture of the spin-singlet $s$-wave and the spin-triplet $p$-wave symmetries. We call such states as $s+p$ mixture. For $\Delta_T < \Delta_S$, the Josephson current saturates at low temperature as is described by the Ambegaokar-Baratoff formula\textsuperscript{38}. On the other hand for $\Delta_T > \Delta_S$, the Josephson current increases logarithmically with decreasing temperature ($T$). The interfacial bound state causes the low-temperature anomaly. The characteristic
behavior of the Josephson current does not changes gradually as a function of the relative amplitude between $\Delta_T$ and $\Delta_S$. The critical point $\Delta_T = \Delta_S$ clearly divides the qualitative feature of Josephson current.

In addition to $s+p$ mixture, we also consider two types of mixed order parameter between the spin-singlet $d_{xy}$-wave and the spin-triplet helical $p$-wave symmetries. We call such state as $d+p$ mixture. The feature of Josephson current are well characterized by the relative amplitude between $\Delta_T$ and $\Delta_S$. In some cases, the Josephson current increases as $1/T$ with decreasing temperature due to dispersionless zero-energy state. We will discuss the physics behind such clear qualitative change of the Josephson effect in terms of topologically protected zero-energy surface states. It is known that excitation of such surface bound states on superconductor are characterized by the Majorana fermion.\textsuperscript{28,39,40} Unusual phenomena peculiar to the Majorana fermion has been suggested theoretically\textsuperscript{41–43}.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss a theoretical model of Josephson junction consisting two NCS’s. In Sec. III, we show the calculated results of Josephson current for $s+p$ and $d+p$ mixtures. We summarize this paper in Sec. IV.

Let us consider a Josephson junction between two NCS’s as shown in Fig. 1, where the electric current flows in the $x$ direction and the junction width in the $y$ direction is $W$. We apply the periodic boundary condition in the $y$ direction. The Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) Hamiltonian in momentum space reads

$$H_{\text{BdG}}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{h}(k) & \hat{\Delta}(k) \\ -\Delta^*(k) & -\hat{h}^*(k) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{h}(k) = \xi_k \hat{\sigma}_0 + \lambda g \cdot \hat{\sigma},$$

$$\xi_k = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - \mu,$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_j$ for $j = 1 - 3$ are the Pauli matrices, $\hat{\sigma}_0$ is the unit matrix in spin space, $k_{F}(y)$ is the wavenumber in the $x(y)$ direction, $k_F$ is the Fermi wave number, $\mu$ is the chemical potential, and $\lambda$ is amplitude of the spin-orbit interaction. In this paper, we assume that $\lambda \ll \mu$. We consider the Rashba type spin-orbit coupling reflecting the noncentrosymmetry along the $z$ direction (i.e., $g = (k_y, -k_x, 0)/k_F$). Correspondingly, we choose the $d$-vector in the pair potential as $d = g$ as discussed in Ref. \textsuperscript{14}. As a consequence, the spin-triplet part of the pair potential has the helical $p$-wave symmetry. In this paper, we consider three types of mixed order parameter as follows

$$\hat{\Delta}(k) = \begin{cases} i(\Delta_T d \cdot \sigma + \Delta_S) \hat{\sigma}_2 & s + p, \\ i(\Delta_T d \cdot \sigma + \Delta_S \sin 2\gamma) \hat{\sigma}_2 & d + p \text{ I}, \\ i(\Delta_T d \cdot \sigma + \Delta_S \sin 2\gamma) \hat{\sigma}_2 & d + p \text{ II}, \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma$ is the incident angle of a quasiparticle as shown in Fig. 1, and $e^{i\gamma} = (k_x + ik_y)/k_F$. The first one consists of $s$-wave singlet and helical $p$-wave triplet components. The pair potential of $d+p$ I is the order parameter discussed in the interfacial superconductivity.\textsuperscript{14} Although the pair potential of $d+p$ II may not have a relation to any materials, we consider it for theoretical interest. The energy eigen values of Eq. 1 are $E = \pm E_\pm$ with $E_\pm = \sqrt{((\xi_k \pm \lambda)^2 + \Delta_\pm^2)}$ and

$$\Delta_\pm(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \Delta_S \pm \Delta_T, & s + p, \\ \Delta_S \sin 2\gamma \pm \Delta_T, & d + p \text{ I}, \\ (\Delta_S \pm \Delta_T) \sin 2\gamma, & d + p \text{ II}. \end{cases}$$

To represent the wave function of a quasiparticle, we need another values of the pair potential defined by $\hat{\Delta}_\pm(\gamma) = \Delta_\pm(\pi - \gamma)$

$$\hat{\Delta}_\pm(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \Delta_S \pm \Delta_T, & s + p, \\ -\Delta_S \sin 2\gamma \pm \Delta_T, & d + p \text{ I}, \\ -\Delta_S \sin 2\gamma \pm \Delta_T, & d + p \text{ II}. \end{cases}$$
The wave function in the left superconductor is obtained as

$$\Psi_L(x,y) = \Phi_L \left[ \begin{array}{c} u_+ \\ -ie^{i\gamma}u_+ \\ ie^{i\gamma}u_- \\ -ie^{i\gamma}v_+ \\ v_- \\ \end{array} \right] e^{ik_xx} + \left[ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{v}_+ \\ ie^{i\gamma}\tilde{v}_+ \\ -ie^{i\gamma}\tilde{v}_- \\ u_+ \\ \tilde{u}_- \\ \end{array} \right] e^{-ik_xx}$$

$$A_+ \quad A_-$$

$$B_+ \quad B_-$$

$$u_\pm = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} (1 + \Omega_\pm)}, \quad v_\pm = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} (1 - \Omega_\pm)}$$

$$s_\pm = \frac{\Delta_\pm}{\Omega_\pm}, \quad \tilde{s}_\pm = \frac{\tilde{\Delta}_\pm}{\tilde{\Omega}_\pm}, \quad \Phi_j = \text{diag} \left\{ e^{i\varphi_j/2}, e^{i\varphi_j/2}, e^{-i\varphi_j/2}, e^{-i\varphi_j/2} \right\},$$

where $a_\pm$ and $b_\pm$ are the amplitudes of incoming waves, $A_\pm$ and $B_\pm$ are the amplitudes of outgoing waves, and $\varphi_j$ for $j = L$ or $R$ is the macroscopic phase of a superconductor. In the same way, the wave function in the right superconductor is represented by

$$\Psi_R(x,y) = \Phi_R \left[ \begin{array}{c} u_+ \\ -ie^{i\gamma}u_+ \\ ie^{i\gamma}u_- \\ -ie^{i\gamma}v_+ \\ v_- \\ \end{array} \right] e^{ik_xx} + \left[ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{v}_+ \\ ie^{i\gamma}\tilde{v}_+ \\ -ie^{i\gamma}\tilde{v}_- \\ u_+ \\ \tilde{u}_- \\ \end{array} \right] e^{-ik_xx}$$

with $C_\pm$ and $D_\pm$ being amplitudes of outgoing waves. At the junction interface, we introduce the potential barrier described by $V_0\delta(x)$. Throughout this paper, we fix $z_0 = (V_0m)/(\hbar^2k_F) = 5$, which leads to the transmission probability of the insulating barrier $T_B = \int_0^{\pi/2} d\gamma \cos^2 \gamma/(\Omega_0^2 + \cos^2 \gamma)$ being about 0.01. By eliminating $C_\pm$ and $D_\pm$ using a boundary condition, it is possible to obtain the reflection coefficients,

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_+ \\ A_- \\ B_+ \\ B_- \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{r}_{ee} & \hat{r}_{eh} \\ \hat{r}_{he} & \hat{r}_{hh} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_+ \\ a_- \\ b_+ \\ b_- \end{bmatrix},$$

The Josephson current can be calculated based on a formula after applying the continuation $E \to i\omega_n = i(2n+1)\pi T$,

$$J = \frac{e}{2h} \sum_{k_y} T \sum_{\omega_n} \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{\Delta}{\Omega_{n+}} \frac{0}{\Omega_{n-}} \hat{r}_{ee} - \frac{\Delta}{\Omega_{n+}} \frac{0}{\Omega_{n-}} \hat{r}_{eh} \right],$$

with $\Omega_{n\pm} = \sqrt{\Omega_0^2 + \Delta^2_{\pm}}$ and $\tilde{\Omega}_{n\pm} = \sqrt{\tilde{\Omega}_0^2 + \tilde{\Delta}^2_{\pm}}$. We introduce a parameter $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ to tune the mixing rate between the spin-singlet and spin-triplet components as

$$\Delta_S = \alpha \Delta, \quad \Delta_T = (1 - \alpha)\Delta,$$

where the dependence of $\Delta$ on temperature $T$ is described by the BCS theory. The energy spectra of subgap state at a surface of NCS is calculated from Eq. (10) with a boundary condition $\Psi_R(0,y) = 0$.

**III. RESULTS**

At first, we summarize the energy spectra of subgap state at a surface of superconductor in Fig.2. In $s + p$ mixture, energy of bound state satisfies

$$(E^2 - \Delta_+ \Delta_-) \cos^2 \gamma + \Omega_+ \Omega_-(1 + \sin^2 \gamma) = 0. \quad (14)$$

It has been already known that the surface bound state is absent for $\Delta_S > \Delta_T$, whereas the surface bound states with the linear dispersion exist for $\Delta_S > \Delta_T$ as shown in (a).

In $d + p$ I mixture, energy of the surface bound state
\[ E^2 (1 + \cos^2 \gamma) + \sin^2 \gamma (\Delta^2 + \Delta^2 + \Omega^2 + \Omega^2) = 0. \]  

The equation has two solutions. The first one is \( E = 0 \) which is allowed for \( |\sin \gamma| \geq \Delta T/\Delta S \) as shown in Fig. 2(b). The dispersionless zero-energy bound states are a direct consequence of the \( d_{xy} \) wave symmetry. Therefore such flat zero-energy state is absent for \( \Delta S < \Delta T \). The second solution is given by

\[ E = \pm \sin \gamma \sqrt{\Delta^2 - \Delta^2 \sin^2 \gamma}. \]  

for \(|\tan \gamma| < \Delta T/(2\Delta S)\) as shown in Fig. 2(b) and (c).

In \( d + p \) II mixture, energy of the surface bound states satisfies

\[ E^2 (1 + \sin^2 \gamma) + \cos^2 \gamma (\Delta^2 + \Delta^2 + \Omega^2 + \Omega^2) = 0. \]

The equation has two solutions. The first one is \( E = 0 \) for all \( \gamma \) which is possible only when \( \Delta S > \Delta T \) as shown in Fig. 2(d). The second solution is given by

\[ E = \pm 2 \cos^2 \gamma \sqrt{\Delta^2 - \Delta^2 \sin^2 \gamma}. \]

which is allowed for \(|\sin \gamma| < \sqrt{\Delta S/\Delta T}\) as shown in Fig. 2(e).

\section{A. s+p}

In Fig. 3 we show the calculated results of Josephson current for \( s + p \) mixture. In Fig. 3(a), we plot the critical Josephson current as a function of temperature for several choices of \( \alpha \) satisfying \( \Delta S > \Delta T \). The Josephson current is normalized by \( J_0 = \pi \Delta_0/(2eR_N) \), where \( R_N \) is the normal resistance of the junction. In the case of metallic superconductor junctions, the Josephson critical current becomes \( J_0 \) at the zero temperature. In Fig. 3(b), we show the current-phase relationship (CPR) at a low temperature \( T = 0.001T_c \) for \( \alpha = 1, 0.8 \) and 0.6, where \( \varphi = \varphi_L - \varphi_R \) is the phase difference across the junction. The critical Josephson current saturates at low temperature and the CPR is sinusoidal for \( \alpha = 1, 0.8 \) and 0.6. Thus the Josephson current for \( \Delta S > \Delta T \) obeys the Ambegaokar-Baratoff relation because there is no surface zero-energy states. In Fig. 3(c) and (d), we respectively show the dependence of critical current on temperature and the CPR at a low temperature for several choices of \( \alpha \) satisfying \( \Delta S < \Delta T \). The results in Fig. 3(c) and (d) show qualitatively different behavior from those in Fig. 3(a) and (b), respectively. The critical Josephson current in Fig. 3(c) increases with decreasing temperature even far below \( T_c \). This behavior is called low-temperature anomaly of Josephson current. The resonant tunneling through the surface bound state at the zero energy is responsible for the anomaly. Such zero-energy state is
possible \(\sin \gamma = 0\) as shown in Fig. 2(a). According to previous papers, the Josephson critical current increases logarithmically with decreasing temperature for \(\alpha = 0\). The results for \(\alpha = 0.2\) and 0.4 also show the logarithmic low-temperature anomaly. Consequently, the contribution of higher harmonics slightly deviates the CPR from the sinusoidal relation as shown in Fig. 3(d). Thus the characteristic feature of Josephson current qualitatively changes at the singular point of \(\Delta S = \Delta_T\).

B. \(d+p\) I

Next, we show the calculated results of Josephson current for \(d+p\) I mixture as shown in Fig. 4. The temperature dependence of critical current for \(\alpha = 1\), 0.8, and 0.6 satisfying \(\Delta S > \Delta_T\) show the low-temperature anomaly as shown in Fig. 4(a). The critical current increases as \(T^{-1}\) with decreasing temperature at \(\alpha = 1\). The results for \(\alpha = 0.8\) and 0.6 also show such power-law like low-temperature anomaly. Corresponding CPR shown in Fig. 4(b) indicates jump at \(\varphi = \pi\) because of the contributions of higher harmonics. In this case, the surface bound state are energetically localized at \(E = 0\) as shown in Fig. 2(b). The resonant tunneling through such zero-energy states causes the strong low-temperature anomaly. For \(\Delta S < \Delta_T\), on the other hand, the Josephson current in Fig. 4(c) and (d) have properties similar to those in Fig. 3(c) and (d), respectively. The critical current indicates the logarithmic low-temperature anomaly. The presence of the zero-energy surface bound state at \(\sin \gamma = 0\) in Fig. 2(c) explains the similarity. Thus the characteristic feature of Josephson current for \(d+p\) I mixture also qualitatively changes around the point of \(\Delta S = \Delta_T\).

The large deviation of CPR from the sinusoidal function in Fig. 4(b) can be seen only at low temperature. According to an analytical expression of Josephson current for \(\alpha = 1\), the higher harmonics contribute to the Josephson current when the temperature is much smaller than \(\sqrt{T_B}\Delta_0\). Here \(T_B\) is the transmission probability of the tunnel junction and is about 0.01 in the present calculation. In Fig. 5 we show CPR for a higher temperature at \(T = 0.1T_c\). In both Figs. 4(a) and (b), the CPR deviates from the sinusoidal relation only slightly at \(T = 0.1T_c\). On the other hand, the amplitudes of the Josephson current remain sufficiently larger value than \(J_0\).

C. \(d+p\) II

Finally, we show the calculated results of Josephson current for \(d+p\) II mixture as shown in Fig. 6. The temperature dependence of critical current for several \(\alpha\) satisfying \(\Delta S > \Delta_T\) indicate the strong low-temperature anomaly as shown in Fig. 6(a) and (b). The critical current increases with decreasing temperature for \(T^{-1}\) and the CPR at a low temperature shows the jump at \(\varphi = \pi\). The zero-energy surface bound states are possible for all \(\gamma\) as shown in Fig. 6(d). The presence of the flat zero-energy states explains the similarity of the results in Fig. 4(a) and (b) to those shown in Fig. 4(a) and (b), respectively. The calculated results for \(\alpha = 0.4\), 0.2 and 0 satisfying \(\Delta S < \Delta_T\) are shown in Fig. 6(b) and (d). On the contrary, the results for \(\Delta S < \Delta_T\) in Fig. 6(c) and (d) has properties similar to those in Fig. 6(a) and (b). Namely, the Josephson current saturates at low temperature and the CPR is sinusoidal at low temperature. The zero-energy state at \(\sin \gamma = \pm 1\) exists as shown in Fig. 6(c). Although this zero-energy state appears as a results of the resonant Andreev reflection, it does not
so much affect the Josephson current. The wavenumber \( \sin \gamma = \pm 1 \) means \( k_x = \cos \gamma = 0 \). Thus a quasiparticle does not have momenta in the current direction in the zero-energy state. When we consider huge spin-orbit coupling, it has been pointed out that the flat zero-energy states appear for \( \sin \gamma > 1 - 2\lambda/\mu \). In such case, the flat zero-energy state may cause the low-temperature anomaly. This statement, however, is still unclear in realistic junctions with a thick insulating barrier because the contribution of a quasiparticle is exponentially small. Within the approximation of \( \lambda/\mu \ll 1 \), there is no effective zero-energy state which causes the low-temperature anomaly for \( \Delta_S < \Delta_T \). Therefore the Josephson current in Fig. 6(c) and (d) show qualitatively the same behavior as those in Fig. 6(a) and (b), respectively. Thus the characteristic feature of Josephson current for \( d + p \) II also qualitatively changes around the point of \( \Delta_S = \Delta_T \).

At \( \Delta_S = 0 \), subgap state with the linear dispersion appears around \( \sin \gamma = 0 \) as mathematically shown in Eq. (13). This zero-energy state, however, is not a result of the resonant Andreev reflection but is a result of a node in the pair potential. Thus \( \Delta_S = 0 \) cannot be a critical point. Actually, the results for \( \alpha = 0 \) in Fig. 6(c) show the saturation of the Josephson critical current at low temperature.

![FIG. 6: (color online). Results for \( d + p \) II. The critical Josephson current is plotted as a function of temperature in (a) and (c). The current-phase relationship is show at low temperature \( T = 0.001T_c \).](image)

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have theoretically studied the Josephson current between two noncentrosymmetric superconductors based on the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equation and a general current formula. We have assumed three types of order parameter which consists of spin-singlet \( \Delta_S \) and spin-triplet components \( \Delta_T \) at the same time. The Josephson current for \( \Delta_S > \Delta_T \) shows clearly the different characteristic behavior from those for \( \Delta_S < \Delta_T \) for all pairing symmetries. The clear difference can be understood by analyzing the topologically protected zero-energy states at a surface of noncentrosymmetric superconductor. The dispersionless zero-energy bound states are responsible for strong low-temperature anomaly of Josephson current in which the Josephson critical current increases as \( 1/T \) with decreasing temperature. The surface state with linear dispersion causes the weak low-temperature anomaly in which the Josephson critical current increases logarithmically with decreasing temperature. When the surface zero-energy state is absent, the Josephson current obeys the Ambegaokar-Baratoff formula.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by KAKENHI (No. 22540355) and the "Topological Quantum Phenomena" (No. 22103002) Grant-in Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of Japan.

1 E. Bauer, G. Hilscher, H. Michor, Ch. Paul, E. W. Scheidt, A. Gribanov, Yu. Seropegin, H. Noël, M. Sigrist, and P. Rogl, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 027003 (2004).
2 K. Togano, P. Badica, Y. Nakamori, S. Orimo, H. Takeya, and K. Hirata, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 247004 (2004).
3 M. Nishiyama, Y. Inada, and Guo-qing Zheng, Phys. Rev. B 71, 220505R (2005).
4 P. A. Frigeri, D. F. Agterberg, A. Koga and M. Sigrist, Phys. Rev. lett. 92, 097001 (2004); P. A. Frigeri, D. F. Agterberg, and M. Sigrist, New J. Phys. 6, 115 (2004).
5 M. Sato, Phys. Rev. B 73, 214502 (2006). M. Sato and S. Fujimoto, Phys. Rev. B 79, 094504 (2009).
Y. Tanaka, T. Yokoyama, A. V. Balatsky, and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B 79, 060505R (2009).

A. B. Vorontsov, I. Vekhter, and M. Eschrig, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 127003 (2008).

S. Fujimoto, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 76, 051008 (2007).

Y. Yanase, and M. Sigrist, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 77 124711 (2008).

J. Linder and A. Sudbo, Phys. Rev. B 76, 054511 (2007).

C. Iniotakis, N. Hayashi, Y. Sawa, T. Yokoyama, U. May, Y. Tanaka, and M. Sigrist, Phys. Rev. B 76, 012501 (2007).

C. K. Lu and S. Yip, Phys. Rev. B 80, 024504 (2009).

Y. Tanaka, Y. Mizuno, T. Yokoyama, K. Yada, and M. Sato, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 097002 (2010).

K. Yada, S. Onari, Y. Tanaka, and J. Inoue, Phys. Rev. B 80, 140509R (2009).

N. Reyren, S. Thiel, A. D. Caviglia, L. Fitting, Kourkoutis, G. Hammerl, C. Richter, C. W. Schneider, T. Kopp, A.-S. Retschi, D. Jaccard, M. Gabay, D. A. Muller, J.-M. Triscone, and J. Mannhart, Science 317, 1196 (2007).

P. M. R. Brydon, A. P. Schnyder, and C. Timm, arXiv:1104.2257.

L. J. Buchholtz and G. Zwicknagl, Phys. Rev. B 23, 5788 (1981).

J. Hara and K. Nagai, Prog. Theor. Phys. 74, 1237 (1986).

C. R. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1526 (1994).

Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3451 (1995); S. Kashiwaya and Y. Tanaka, Rep. Prog. Phys. 63, 1461 (2000).

Y. Asano, Y. Tanaka, and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. B 69, 134501 (2004).

S. Kashiwaya, Y. Tanaka, M. Koyanagi, H. Takashima, and K. Kajimura, Phys. Rev. B 51, 1350 (1995).

J. Y. T. Wei, N. -C. Yeh, D. F. Garrigus, and M. Strasik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, (1998) 2542.

A. Biswas, P. Fournier, M. M. Qazilbash, V. N. Smolyanov, H. Balcì, and R. L. Greene, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 207004 (2002).

I. Iguchi, W. Wang, M. Yamazaki, Y. Tanaka, and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. B 62, R6131 (2000).

B. Chesca, M. Seifried, T. Dahm, N. Schopohl, D. Koelle, R. Kleiner, and A. Tsukada, Phys. Rev. B 71, 104504 (2005); M. Wagenknecht, D. Koelle, R. Kleiner, S. Graser, N. Schopohl, B. Chesca, and A. Tsukada, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 227001 (2008); N. P. Armitage, P. Fournier, and R. L. Greene, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 2421 (2010).

C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 146802 (2005).

X-L. Qi, T. L. Hughes, S. Raghu, and S-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 187001 (2009).

Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. B 53, R11957 (1996).

Y. S. Barash, H. Burkhardt, and D. Rainer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 4070 (1996).

Y. S. Barash, A. M. Bobkov and M. Fogelström, Phys. Rev. B 64, 214503 (2001).

Y. Asano and K. Katabuchi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 71, 1974 (2002).

H.-J. Kwon, K. Sengupta, and V. M. Yakovenko, Eur. Phys. J. B 37, 349 (2004).

N. Hayashi, C. Iniotakis, M. Machida, and M. Sigrist, Physica C 468, 844 (2008).

R. P. Kaur, D. F. Agterberg, and M. Sigrist, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 137002 (2005).

A. Sumiyama, K. Nakatsuji, Y. Tsuji, Y. Oda, T. Yasuda, R. Settai and Y. Onuki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 74, 3041 (2005).

Y. Asano, Phys. Rev. B 64, 224515 (2001).

V. Ambegaokar and A. Baratoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10, 486 (1963).

F. Wilczek, Nature Phys. 5, 614 (2009).

L. Fu and C. L. Kane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 096407 (2008).

L. Fu and C. L. Kane, Phys. Rev. B 79, 161408R (2009).

Y. Asano, Y. Tanaka, and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 056402 (2010).

P. A. loselevich and M. V. Geigel’man, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 077003 (2011).

K. Yada, M. Sato, Y. Tanaka, and T. Yokoyama, Phys. Rev. B 83, 064505 (2011).