Chaos in Andreev Billiards
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A new type of classical billiard—the Andreev billiard—is investigated using the tangent map technique. Andreev billiards consist of a normal region surrounded by a superconducting region. In contrast with previously studied billiards, Andreev billiards are integrable in zero magnetic field, regardless of their shape. A magnetic field renders chaotic motion in a generically shaped billiard, which is demonstrated for the Bunimovich stadium by examination of both Poincaré sections and Lyapunov exponents. The issue of the feasibility of certain experimental realizations is addressed.
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In the development of the understanding of chaos, a prominent role has been played by the class of classical mechanical systems known as billiards [1]. In such systems, particles are confined by a step-like, single-particle potential to a region of space within which they propagate ballistically. Unless the shape of the billiard is highly regular (e.g., circular), in which case the system is integrable, the motion of a particle is chaotic. Unpredictability, the hallmark of chaotic motion, can be diagnosed qualitatively by the morphologies of Poincaré sections, and more quantitatively by the corresponding Lyapunov exponents, the positivity of which signals the exponential sensitivity of trajectories to initial conditions.

A common feature of all versions of billiards studied to date [2] is that reflection at boundaries is specular, i.e., only the component of the velocity normal to the boundary is inverted. We refer to such versions as conventional billiards (CBs; see Fig. 1a, left). The purpose of this Letter is to explore the issue of classical chaos in a novel class of billiards, which have the property that scattering at boundaries is retro-reflective, i.e., all components of the velocity are inverted, as is depicted in Fig. 1a (right). We refer to such billiards as Andreev billiards (ABs). Although we are unaware of examples of such a reflection mechanism in the realm of classical physics, a well-known example exists in condensed matter physics: Andreev reflection of electronic quasiparticles (having energies in the superconducting gap $\Delta$) from the normal-to-superconductor interface [3]. Thus, we envisage ABs as normal (N) domains surrounded by superconductor (S). It is adequate to regard the motion of electronic quasiparticles as semiclassical, provided that the billiard size is much larger than their typical de Broglie wavelength.

The change from specular to Andreev reflection has a striking consequence in the context of chaos: whereas typical motion in a generically-shaped CB is chaotic, motion in ABs is integrable, regardless of the shape of the billiard. This integrability becomes evident from the observation (cf. Fig. 1a) that all motion occurs along chordal trajectories connecting only two points on the boundary: what system could be less ergodic?

The presence of a magnetic field $B$ substantially alters the situation (see Fig. 1b), giving rise to a Lorentz force that curves the trajectories $r(t)$ of quasiparticles according to the equation of motion $\dot{r} = (q/m) \times B$. Now, Andreev reflection inverts the quasiparticle charge $q$, mass $m$ and velocity $\dot{r}$, so that in the vicinity of the reflection point the acceleration of the outgoing hole is opposite to that of the incoming electron. Therefore, in a magnetic field the hole trajectory (dashed line in Fig. 1b) no longer retraces the electron trajectory (full line) [4], and vice versa, thus allowing the motion to explore the billiard. This raises the possibility of chaotic motion, a possibility that we explore in this paper. Our primary conclusion is that although in zero $B$ ABs are integrable regardless of their shape, integrability is destroyed by the application of magnetic field for all but highly regular shapes.

The study of ABs may provide an interesting link between two rapidly developing fields: mesoscopic chaos [5] and mesoscopic superconductivity [6]. The prominent virtue of ABs, viz., that they are integrable in zero $B$ regardless of shape and are rendered chaotic by nonzero $B$, makes them attractive from the experimental point of view. By comparison, the integrability of nanoscale CBs (e.g., in 2DEG heterostructures [7]) is immensely fragile, being readily destroyed by unintentional shape deformations or surface roughness. Therefore, to obtain nontrivial chaos in CBs, i.e., chaos caused by intentional choice of shape, one must use state-of-the-art nanofabrication technology. In contrast, an AB prepared without any special attention to shape will be integrable, nonintegrability of varying degree being achieved by adjusting an external parameter, viz., $B$ [8].

To explore qualitatively the implications of a magnetic field for the integrability of ABs, we focus on a planar two-dimensional AB in a magnetic field perpendicular to
the plane. We take the dynamics to be classical cyclotron motion with radius \( R_c \equiv \frac{mv}{qB} \) of a particle inside the billiard, supplemented by Andreev reflection at the boundary. The case of \( \text{CBs} \) in a magnetic field has been studied extensively \cite{3,10}, and the tangent map \cite{2,10} has proven to be a convenient approach. A tangent map is a variant of a Poincaré map, in which the state of the system is monitored only at collisions with the boundary, the remainder of the motion being obtained by a simple geometry. Thus, the problem reduces to one of following the sequence of reflection points generated by the particle as it explores the billiard.

\textit{A priori}, our phase space is four-dimensional: two components of the position in the plane and two conjugate momenta. Energy conservation constrains the magnitude of the momentum, leaving one freedom, which (as we are using the tangent map) we take to be the angle \( \alpha \) between the velocity \( \mathbf{v} \) and the tangent to the boundary (see Fig. 1c). In addition, the fact that reflections take place on the boundary leaves one further freedom, which we take to be the arclength \( s \) along the boundary. Then the (continuous time) dynamics is replaced by the (discrete) map: \( \{ s, \alpha \} \rightarrow \{ s', \alpha', s, \alpha \} \), embodying cyclotron motion followed by Andreev reflection. For the sake of convenience, we monitor only reflections of quasi-particles of the same (say, electron) type. (Thus, e.g., for the sequence of reflections \( 0 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \) shown in Fig. 1c, only reflections 0 and 2 are used to construct Poincaré sections.)

First, consider the case of an AB of arbitrary shape at \( B = 0 \). In this case, all trajectories, such as that depicted in the right billiard of Fig. 1a, are trivially periodic, and the Poincaré section for a given trajectory reduces to a single point, completely determined by the initial conditions. We analyze the case of \( B \neq 0 \) for the example of an AB in the shape of a Bunimovich stadium \cite{13}, as shown in the top row of Fig. 1b. Figure 1c shows Poincaré sections (bottom row) for a selection of initial conditions, along with typical trajectories (top row). For convenience, we introduce the dimensionless magnetic field \( \beta \equiv R/R_c \propto B \) and the tangential momentum \( p \equiv \cos \alpha \). For the case of a weak field (\( \beta = 0.02 \), left column), \( \{ s, p \} \) space is apparently foliated by well-defined curves, each curve corresponding to a particular initial condition. Although it appears that the motion is integrable, when viewed at a finer scale one sees the breakdown of foliation, as shown in the inset. Thus, the motion is in fact weakly chaotic, as we have also confirmed by examining the corresponding Lyapunov exponent. In intermediate fields (for which the cyclotron radius is much smaller than the billiard size), particles move along skipping trajectories. On the scale of a typical skip, there is little distinction between motion over straight and semi-circular segments of the boundary and, therefore, the motion is less sensitive to the billiard shape. As a result, the Poincaré section exhibits a (partial) re-entrance of integrability, i.e., the “dust” that arises in intermediate fields is reorganized into some structures, as is seen in the bottom row (for \( \beta = 10 \)). This structure bears a certain resemblance to that found in weak fields, thus indicating a trend towards less chaotic behavior. As with \( \text{CBs} \), chaos is most pronounced for intermediate fields, becoming less pronounced in both the weaker and stronger field regimes.

To provide quantitative support for the suggestion of chaos inferred from the inspection of Poincaré sections, we now turn to the computation of Lyapunov exponents, which characterize the rate of exponential divergence of trajectories having initial conditions nearby in phase space. This is accomplished by investigating the stability of the tangent map via the adaptation to \( \text{ABs} \) of the method of Refs. \cite{2,10}. Consider the situation depicted in Fig. 1c. From the kinematics of circular motion we have:

\[ v_i^r - \omega_c \times r_1 = v_0 - \omega_c \times r_0, \]

where \( \omega_c = qB/m \) and \( r_{0,1} \) are the radius-vectors of the reflection points; other notations are defined in Fig. 1c. The tangent map is derived by varying this equation with respect to \( s \) and \( p \), and relating the deviations of two nearby trajectories \( \delta \mathbf{q} \equiv \{ \delta s, \delta p \} \) before (\( \delta \mathbf{q}_0 \)) and after (\( \delta \mathbf{q}_1 \)) reflection from point 1: \( \delta \mathbf{q}_1 = T_{1,0} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_0 \). After some straightforward algebra, we find that \( T_{1,0} \) is given by:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
R_c \sigma_\chi & -R_c \sigma_\chi \\
R_c \sigma_\chi & R_c \sigma_\chi \\
\rho_0 \sigma_\alpha & \rho_0 \sigma_\alpha \\
\rho_0 \sigma_\alpha & \rho_0 \sigma_\alpha \\
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\sigma_\alpha - \sigma_\alpha \\
\sigma_\alpha - \sigma_\alpha \\
\rho_0 & \rho_0 \\
\rho_0 & \rho_0 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\sigma_\chi \\
\sigma_\chi \\
\rho_0 & \rho_0 \\
\rho_0 & \rho_0 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where \( \rho_{0,1} \) are the radii of curvature of the billiard boundary at the reflection points 0 and 1, \( \sigma(\phi) \equiv \sin \phi \), and \( \chi \) is defined in Fig. 1b; \cite{12}. After \( N \) bounces, the separation \( \delta \mathbf{q}_N \) is determined by the matrix \( T_{N,0} = \prod_{j=1}^{N} T_{j, j-1} \). The largest Lyapunov exponent associated with a given trajectory is calculated as \( \lambda = \lim_{N \to \infty} \lambda_N \) where

\[
\lambda_N = N^{-1} \log \left| \text{Tr} \frac{T_{N,0} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_0}{2} \right| + \sqrt{(\text{Tr} T_{N,0} / 2)^2 - 1}. \tag{1}
\]

We have calculated the Lyapunov exponents for a wide selection of initial conditions \( \{ s_0, p_0 \} \) and values of \( B \). A typical sequence \( \lambda_N \) is shown in Fig. 2. The convergence of \( \lambda_N \) to a non-zero value as \( N \to \infty \) provides evidence for the exponential divergence of nearby trajectories, i.e., chaos.

We now turn to the issue of possible experimental realizations of \( \text{ABs} \). In one possible scheme, an \( \text{AB} \) is formed...
by surrounding a 2DEG with a superconducting contact \[13\]. The chaotic nature of the motion can be diagnosed either by passing normal current through the structure and measuring the conductance, as with nanoscale CBs \[6\], or by studying, e.g., via STM, correlations in real-
and energy-space, which provide signatures of classical chaos at the quantum level \[13\]. The primary demand on the experimental realization of all billiards, including ABs, is that the motion of the electrons inside the billiard be ballistic. Our analysis of Poincaré sections and corresponding Lyapunov exponents shows that when \( R_c \sim L \sim R \), chaos is established after a few bounces, and thus it will not be masked by impurity scattering provided that \( L, R \ll \ell_c \), where \( \ell_c \) is the elastic mean free path of the N region. On the other hand, \( B \) should not exceed the (lower) critical field of the superconductor \( B_c \) and, hence, \( B_c > R_c^\text{min} = \gamma_F/eB_c \), where \( \gamma_F \) refers to the N region.

Thus, it is sufficient to have \( \ell_c \gtrsim R_c^\text{min} \).

Taking parameters for the Nb/InAs structure studied recently (density of electrons \( n_e = 9 \times 10^{11} \text{cm}^{-2} \), Ref. \[6\]; \( B_c \approx 2000 \text{G} \)) we obtain \( \ell_c \gtrsim 0.6 \mu \text{m} \), which is accessible via current nanofabrication technologies. (E.g., \( \ell_c \approx 3.5 \mu \text{m} \) in Ref. \[4\].) A drawback of the scheme described above is that the superconductor and the 2DEG are metallurgically distinct, and thus the probability for normal scattering at the interface is nonzero, at the expense of the Andreev reflection, which results in billiard having a mixed AB/CB character. This drawback can be eliminated by employing the proximity effect. The AB is formed in a region of a superconductor where the superconductivity has been suppressed, either due to the vicinity of a normal metal island (see Ref. \[14\]), or (with a type I superconductor) by the application of a magnetic field, which creates domains of N phase. As such a scheme eliminates metallurgical boundaries between N and S, reflection is of purely the Andreev type.

An interesting direction of further research would be to explore the quantum mechanics of ABs. At least three directions are immediately apparent: (i) spectral geometry and the Weyl-Kac problem; (ii) energy-level statistics, random matrix approaches and universality; and (iii) spatial structure of quasiparticle wavefunctions.
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FIG. 2. Top row: a typical trajectory for a Bunimovich-stadium-shaped AB ($L = R$) for 3 values of the magnetic field: (a) $\beta = 0.02$; (b) $\beta = 0.33$; (c) $\beta = 10$. Bottom row: Poincaré sections in these fields constructed by following the first 1000 bounces for the trajectories starting with $\alpha_0 = 10^\circ, 20^\circ, \ldots, 170^\circ$ (cf. Fig. 1b) from random points on the perimeter of the billiard. Thin vertical lines on Poincaré sections separate regions corresponding to straight (wider) and semi-circular (narrower) segments of the billiard boundary. In the Poincaré sections for the weak field, flat segments result from almost-chordal motion across a single semicircle. (Only flat regions would occur for a circular billiard.) Similarly, curved regions result from trajectories connecting any two of the four distinct segments of the boundary. Inset: segment (indicated by arrow) of the foliation, magnified ($x \times \sim 10; y \times \sim 50$). Ticks on the stadium boundaries mark the points $s = 0$; filled circles indicate the start of trajectories $s_0$. We choose units in which the billiard perimeter is unity.

FIG. 3. Lyapunov functions $\lambda_N$ [log-scale; see Eq. (1)] vs number of bounces $N$ for: (b) $\beta = 0.33$; (c) $\beta = 10$. The associated trajectories are shown at the top of Fig. 2. For $\beta = 0.02$ (not shown) we find $\lambda \approx 0.002$. 
