

This is a repository copy of *Meissner* screening as a probe for inverse superconductorferromagnet proximity effects.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/177014/

Version: Supplemental Material

Article:

Flokstra, MG, Stewart, R, Satchell, N orcid.org/0000-0003-1597-2489 et al. (6 more authors) (2021) Meissner screening as a probe for inverse superconductor-ferromagnet proximity effects. Physical Review B, 104 (6). L060506. ISSN 2469-9950

https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.104.L060506

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

Supplementary material for "Meissner screening as a probe for inverse superconductor-ferromagnet proximity effects" by M. G. Flokstra *et al.*

This supplementary material contains additional results obtained on samples using thicker normal metal layers, for both a Cu/Nb and Au/Nb based system. It also contains a direct comparison between the Cu(40nm)/Nb(50nm)/Co(2.4nm) and Nb(90nm)/Co(2.5) samples, which were grown and measured under near identical conditions. While not essential to the understanding or conclusions of the manuscript, specialist readers may find the additional information useful and informative.



FIG. S1: LE- μ SR results showing the average flux as a function of muon penetration depth obtained on a Cu/Nb/Co system (left panel) and Au/Nb/Co (right panel). The full sample layouts are X/Nb(46)/Co(2.4)/Nb(3)/Co(1.2)/Ta(7.5)/Si, with numbers indicating the layer thickness in nm and X either Cu(95) or Au(120). For both samples, flux expulsion is clearly observed down the lowest muon implantation energies used (e.g. lowest implantation depths). The measurement fields were approximately 300 Oe for the Cu sample and 100 Oe for the Au sample. Error bars for $\langle B(\langle x \rangle) \rangle$ are plotted for all measurements but too small (about 0.05 G) to be seen.



FIG. S2: Comparing the screening efficiency of a Cu/Nb bilayer with a a Nb layer of the same total thickness. Left panel: LE- μ SR results showing the average flux as a function of muon penetration depth obtained on a Nb(90)/Co(2.5)/Ta(4.5)/Si sample with numbers indicating the layer thickness in nm. Right panel: similar as the left panel, but for a Cu(40)/Nb(50)/Co(2.4)/Nb(3)/Si sample. The Ta(4.5) and Si(3) are both non-superconducting seed layers to improve growth quality of the adjacent Co layer. Error bars for $\langle B(\langle x \rangle) \rangle$ are plotted for all measurements but too small (about 0.2 G) to be seen. The effect of small differences in measurement temperature and Co layer thickness are, based on the various sample we have measured and the typical temperature dependence of the flux screening, not playing any dominant role in the observed flux screening of the two samples.