- 1. Introduction
- 2. Few Electron Dots
- 3. Double Quantum Dots
- 4. Kondo Effect
- **5. Open Dot Experiments**

Huibers, Ph.D. Thesis (1999) Huibers et al., PRL83, 5090 (1999)

Open Dot Regime

Open Dot



 V_{gate} set to allow $\ge 2e^2/h$ conductance through each point contact

·Dot is well-connected to reservoirs

•Transport measurements exhibit CF and Weak Localization

^{and} many open dot slides: A. Huibers and J. Folk

-0.85

 $V_{\rm pc1}$ (V)

 $g\left(e^{2}/h\right)$

1.4

-0.75

0.8 1.0 1.2

-0.7-

-0.8

-0.9

-0.95

 $r_{pc2}(V)$

Open Dot Regime: Conductance Fluctuations



intereference fluctuations as function of dot parameters

Two-Dimensional Quantum Dot



Goal: use quantum dot as a probe of quantum phase coherence



Chaotic:



1. Mostly chaotic/ergodic

2. Interesting physics& complete description

Quantum Interference in Open Dots





2D conductor: area = 2.0 μm² charge density = 2 10¹¹ e/cm²

 λ_F = Fermi wavelength = 50 nm V_F = Fermi velocity = 200 µm/ns E_F = Fermi energy = 7 meV

Dwell time in dot:200 psCrossing time:7 ps

30 bounces

bulk mean free path ℓ_{e} ~ 2- 10 μm

Weak Localization



At B=0, phase-coherent backscattering results in "weak localization"

Conductance dip at B=0





Quantum Correction: Weak Localization



magnetic field: AB-flux, cut off trajectories of area A> ϕ_0 B magnetoconductance

(assuming spinless electrons)

in a given magnetic field B, trajectories enclosing flux acquire additional Aharonov-Bohm phase:

$$\phi = \frac{2e}{\hbar} \int (\nabla \times A) \cdot d\vec{S} = \frac{2eBS}{\hbar}$$

when summing over all trajectories, this ϕ will effectively eliminate trajectories of area A>> ϕ_0 /B. (ϕ_0 =h/e)



Weak Localization: Measure of Dephasing



Weak Localization vs T



Low Temperature Saturation?



Huibers et al., PRL83, 5090 (1999)

electrons move with the Fermi velocity, electric fields in material appear as magnetic fields in the rest frame of the electron

these magnetic fields

- depend on magnitude of electron velocity (density dependence)
- couple to the electron spin via Zeeman coupling

→ spin-precessions

electric fields due to:

- heterointerface (Rashba)
- crystalline anisotropy in III-V zincblende crystal (*Dresselhaus*)

spin precession affects phase interference (2π in spin space gives -1 to phase)



presence of electric fields
$$\vec{E} = -\frac{1}{e}\vec{\nabla}V$$

electrons are moving in these electric fields

rest frame of electrons: effective magnetic field

 $\vec{B}_{so} = -\frac{\vec{v}}{c} \times \vec{E}$

magnetic moment $\vec{\mu} = \frac{e\vec{S}}{mc}$ of electron couples to \vec{B}_{so} $H_{so} = -\vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{B}_{so}$

electrons precess around B_{so} B_{so} depends on the electron momentum

spin rotation symmetry is broken, time reversal symmetry is NOT broken

Spin-Orbit Coupling due to Crystal Anisotropy



III-V Semiconductor

Zinkblende crystall structure: two interpenetrating fcc lattices with only Ga atoms on one lattice, only As on the other

absence of inversion symmetry

symmetry considerations:

$$H_{so} = \gamma(\sigma_x k_x (k_y^2 - k_z^2) + cycl.)$$

after size quantization (2D):

G. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. 100, 580 (1955)

$$\langle \mathbf{k_z} \rangle = \mathbf{0} \qquad \alpha = \gamma \langle \mathbf{k_z^2} \rangle$$

$$H_{D}^{(1)} = \alpha(\sigma_{x}k_{x} - \sigma_{y}k_{y})$$
$$H_{D}^{(3)} = \gamma(\sigma_{y}k_{y}k_{x}^{2} - \sigma_{x}k_{x}k_{y}^{2})$$

k-linear Dresselhaus term

k-cubic Dresselhaus term



coupling strength parameters β and γ can be determined from Band structure, for example in k·p approximation

Weak Antilocalization

 $|\mathsf{i}
angle$ initial state: $|\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{f}}\rangle = \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{N}} \dots \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{2}} \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{1}} |\mathsf{i}\rangle = \mathsf{R} |\mathsf{i}\rangle$ final (forward): $|\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{b}}\rangle = \mathbf{R}_{1}^{-1}\mathbf{R}_{2}^{-1}\dots\mathbf{R}_{N}^{-1}|\mathbf{i}\rangle = \mathbf{R}^{-1}|\mathbf{i}\rangle$ (TRS) final (backward): $R = R_N \dots R_2 R_1 \qquad R^{\dagger} R = 1$ $R^{-1} = R^{\dagger}$ R_i: spin rotations $\langle \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{b}} | \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{f}} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{i} | \mathbf{R}^2 | \mathbf{i} \rangle$ interference term R_5 R_3 assuming strong spin-orbit coupling, summing over all trajectories is equivalent to averaging R² over sphere R_6 R_2

*

R₁

 $\overline{\langle f_f \, \big| \, f_b \rangle} = - \frac{1}{2} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{destructive interference} \\ \text{opposite sign for Magnetoconductance} \end{array}$

Mechanisms of Spin-Orbit Coupling

Elliott-Yafet

- electric field of atoms/impurities felt during scattering events
- spins precess during scattering events
- spins are invariant between scattering
- spin obrbit spin relaxation time
- dominant mechanism in Au $\tau_{\text{so}} \propto \tau_{\text{tr}}$



Dyakonov-Perel

- built in electric fields of material
- spin precessions during ballistic travel
- elastic scattering leaves spin invariant
- usually small rotations between scattering assumed, giving a random spin walk, $\tau_{so}^{-1} = \Omega^2 \tau$
- dominant in GaAs heterostructures











small dot
weak localization (WL)
SO coupling supressed

predicted theoretically by: A. Khaetskii and Y. Nazarov, PRB **61**, 12639 (2000). B. Halperin et al., PRL **86**, 2106 (2001). I. Aleiner and V. Fal'ko, PRL **87**, 256801 (2001).





New Random Matrix Theory (SO coupling & B_{II})

$$\left< \delta g \right> = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{N}{4} \left\{ -\frac{4b^2 + 2G_C F_C}{\left(4G_C b^2 + G_C^2 F_C - 16a_x^2 F_C x^2\right)} - \frac{4G_C b^2}{F_C \left(4G_C b^2 + G_C^2 F_C - 16a_x^2 F_C x^2\right)} + \frac{4a^2}{F_C \left(4a^2 + F_C\right)} \right\}$$

spin-orbit parameters

$$a_{x}^{2} = \pi \kappa \frac{E_{T}}{\Delta} \left(\frac{A}{\lambda_{1}\lambda_{2}} \right)^{2} \text{ (AB like SO term)}$$

$$a^{2} = \left(\left(\frac{L_{1}}{\lambda_{1}} \right)^{2} + \left(\frac{L_{2}}{\lambda_{2}} \right)^{2} \right) a_{x}^{2} \text{ (spin flips)}$$

$$h^{2} = \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\frac{E_{Z}}{\Delta} \right)^{2} \left(\frac{\Delta}{E_{T}} \right) \left(\frac{L}{\lambda_{so}} \right)^{2} \text{ (SO + B}_{||})$$

$$N_{C} = N + 2h^{2} + \gamma_{\phi} \qquad F_{C} = N_{C} + h^{2}$$

$$G_{C} = N_{C} + 2 \left(a^{2} + a_{x}^{2} \right) - h^{2}$$

 $\label{eq:constraint} \begin{array}{ll} \mbox{magnetic fields} \\ x^2 = \pi \ \kappa \bigg(\frac{E_T}{\Delta} \bigg) \bigg(\frac{2 e B_\perp A}{h} \bigg)^2 & \mbox{perpendicular} \\ b = \pi \frac{g \mu_B B_\parallel}{\Delta} & \mbox{parallel} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{ll} \lambda_1, \ \lambda_2 & \mbox{SO length along crystal axes} \\ \lambda_{so} = \sqrt{\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2} & \mbox{average SO length} \\ \nu_{so} = \sqrt{\lambda_1 / \lambda_2} & \mbox{SO anisotropy} \\ \gamma_{\phi} & \mbox{decoherence rate} \\ \kappa & \mbox{geometry dependent constant} \end{array} \end{array}$

Jan-Hein Cremers, Piet Brouwer, Vladimir Fal'ko, Phys. Rev. B68, 125329 (2003)



low density material (CEM)



Suppression of Spin-Orbit Coupling in Dots

