

# Interference oscillations of microwave photoresistance in double quantum wells

S. Wiedmann<sup>1,3</sup>, G. M. Gusev,<sup>2</sup> O. E. Raichev,<sup>2\*</sup> T. E. Lamas,<sup>2</sup> A. K. Bakarov,<sup>2†</sup> and J. C. Portal<sup>1,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*GHMFL-CNRS, BP-166, F-38042, Grenoble, Cedex 9, France*

<sup>2</sup>*Instituto de Física da Universidade de São Paulo, CP 66318 CEP 05315-970, São Paulo, SP, Brazil*

<sup>3</sup>*INSA-Toulouse, 31077, Cedex 4, France and*

<sup>4</sup>*Institut Universitaire de France, Toulouse, France*

(Dated: November 6, 2018)

We observe oscillatory magnetoresistance in double quantum wells under microwave irradiation. The results are explained in terms of the influence of subband coupling on the frequency-dependent photoinduced part of the electron distribution function. As a consequence, the magnetoresistance demonstrates the interference of magneto-intersubband oscillations and conventional microwave-induced resistance oscillations.

PACS numbers: 73.23.-b, 73.43.Qt, 73.50.Pz

The phenomenon of microwave-induced resistance oscillations<sup>1–3</sup> (MIRO) in two-dimensional (2D) electron systems under perpendicular magnetic fields has attracted much interest.<sup>4</sup> These oscillations are periodic in the inverse magnetic field with a period determined by the ratio of the microwave radiation frequency  $\omega$  to the cyclotron frequency  $\omega_c$  and survive at high temperatures. Basically, the observed oscillatory photoconductivity is caused by the Landau quantization of electron states, though different microscopic mechanisms of this phenomenon are still under discussion.

The influence of microwave irradiation on the magnetotransport properties is currently under investigation in quantum wells with a single occupied subband. In our paper, we underline the importance of similar studies for the systems with two occupied 2D subbands, where the magnetotransport shows special new features as compared to the single-subband case. Apart from the commonly known Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations (SdHO), there exist the magneto-intersubband (MIS) oscillations of resistivity caused by periodic modulation of the probability of intersubband transitions by the magnetic field<sup>5,6</sup> (see Ref. 7 for more references). These oscillations survive at high temperatures, because they are not related to the position of the Landau levels with respect to the Fermi surface.

Our recent observation<sup>7</sup> of large-amplitude MIS oscillations at magnetic fields below 1 T in high-mobility double quantum wells (DQWs) has established that these oscillations are a well-reproducible feature of magnetotransport in such systems. The present measurements, supported by a theoretical analysis, suggest that the behavior of oscillating magnetoresistance in DQWs under microwave irradiation is caused by an interference of the physical mechanisms responsible for the MIS oscillations and con-

ventional MIRO. We have studied dependence of the resistance of symmetric balanced GaAs DQWs with wells widths of 14 nm and different barrier widths  $d_b = 1.4, 2,$  and  $3$  nm on the magnetic field  $B$  in the presence of microwave irradiation of different frequencies and at different temperatures and intensities of radiation.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Measured (upper panel) and calculated (lower panel) magnetoresistance of DQWs for different intensities of 170 GHz radiation at  $T = 1.4$  K. The effect of the radiation can be neglected for the attenuation of 60 dB.

\*Permanent address: Institute of Semiconductor Physics, Prospekt Nauki 45, 03028, Kiev, Ukraine

†Permanent address: Institute of Semiconductor Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

The samples have high mobility of  $10^6$  cm<sup>2</sup>/V s and high total sheet electron density  $n_s \simeq 10^{12}$  cm<sup>-2</sup>. The samples were mounted in a waveguide with different cross sections. The measurements were performed for perpendicular and parallel orientation of the current with respect to microwave polarization. The resistance  $R = R_{xx}$  was measured by using the standard low-frequency lock-in technique. No polarization dependence of the resistance has been observed. While similar results were obtained for samples with different barrier widths, the data reported here corresponds to 1.4 nm barrier samples. Without the irradiation, the magnetoresistance shows large-period MIS oscillations clearly visible starting from  $B = 0.1$  T, and it also shows small period SdHO superimposed on the MIS oscillation pattern at higher fields<sup>7</sup> (see Fig. 1). The subband separation in our structure,  $\Delta_{12} = 3.67$  meV, has been found from the MIS oscillation periodicity at low  $B$ .




FIG. 2: (Color online) Measured (upper panel) and calculated (lower panel) magnetoresistance of DQWs under 170 GHz irradiation for different temperatures. The inset shows the dependence of electron temperature  $T_e$  on the magnetic field. Weak oscillations of  $T_e$  are caused by oscillations of the absorbed radiation power.

An increase in the intensity of the radiation leads to the expected damping of the SdHO owing to electron heating, and also causes suppression of some groups of

MIS peaks, followed by the inversion (flip) of these peaks at high intensity, while the other MIS peaks are continuously enhanced by the irradiation. With increasing temperature, the inverted peaks go up and the enhanced peaks go down, so the conventional MIS oscillation picture is restored (Fig. 2). Measurements at different frequencies (Fig. 3) have confirmed that the selective peak flip is correlated with the radiation frequency and follows the periodicity determined by the ratio  $\omega/\omega_c$ . This allows us to attribute the observed effect to MIRO-related phenomena. However, the peak flip cannot be explained by a simple superposition of the factors  $\cos(2\pi\Delta_{12}/\hbar\omega_c)$  and  $-\sin(2\pi\omega/\omega_c)$  describing the MIS oscillations and the MIRO, respectively.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Measured (upper panel) and calculated (lower panel) magnetoresistance of DQWs at  $T = 1.4$  K for different frequencies of microwave excitation. The curves for 100 and 170 GHz are shifted up for clarity.

The theoretical explanation of our data is based on the physical model of Dmitriev *et al.*,<sup>8</sup> generalized to the two-subband case and improved by taking into account electrodynamic effects in the absorption of radiation by 2D layers.<sup>9–11</sup> We assume that the elastic scattering of electrons, including the intersubband scattering, is much stronger than the inelastic one, so the electron distribution function (averaged over the time pe-

riod  $2\pi/\omega$ ) under microwave excitation remains quasi-isotropic and common for both subbands, though essentially non-equilibrium. This energy distribution function,  $f_\varepsilon$ , is found from the kinetic equation  $G_\varepsilon(f) = -J_\varepsilon(f)$ , where  $G_\varepsilon$  is the generation term, and  $J_\varepsilon$  is the inelastic collision integral. Under the excitation by linearly polarized high-frequency electric field  $\mathbf{E}_t = \mathbf{E} \cos(\omega t)$ , weak enough to neglect the multi-photon processes, the generation term is written as

$$G_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{D_\varepsilon} \frac{e^2}{8\pi m\omega^2} \sum_{\pm} |E_\omega^{(\pm)}|^2 \left[ \Phi_\varepsilon^{(\pm)}(\omega)(f_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega} - f_\varepsilon) + \Phi_{\varepsilon-\hbar\omega}^{(\pm)}(\omega)(f_{\varepsilon-\hbar\omega} - f_\varepsilon) \right]. \quad (1)$$

where  $D_\varepsilon$  is the density of states,  $e$  is the electron charge, and  $m$  is the effective mass of electron. Next,  $E_\omega^{(\pm)} = E\lambda_\omega^{(\pm)}$ , where  $\lambda_\omega^{(\pm)} = [1 + 2\pi\sigma_\pm(\omega)/c\sqrt{\epsilon}]^{-1}$ , are the amplitudes of the circularly polarized components of electric field in the 2D plane, found from the Maxwell equations.<sup>9,10</sup> Here,  $\sigma_\pm(\omega)$  are the complex conductivities describing response of the electron system to the circularly polarized fields,  $c$  is the velocity of light, and  $\epsilon$  is the dielectric permittivity of the medium surrounding the quantum well. The functions  $\Phi_\varepsilon^{(\pm)}(\omega)$ , which describe the probability of electron transitions between the states with energies  $\varepsilon$  and  $\varepsilon + \hbar\omega$ , are written in terms of Green's functions as  $\Phi_\varepsilon^{(\pm)}(\omega) = \text{Re}(Q_{\varepsilon,\omega}^{AR(\pm)} - Q_{\varepsilon,\omega}^{AA(\pm)})$ , where

$$Q_{\varepsilon,\omega}^{ss'(+)} = \frac{2\omega c}{L^2} \sum_{nn'} \sum_{jj'} \sqrt{(n+1)(n'+1)} \sum_{p_y p'_y} \times \left\langle \left\langle G_\varepsilon^{jj',s}(n+1p_y, n'+1p'_y) G_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega}^{j',s'}(n'p'_y, np_y) \right\rangle \right\rangle, \quad (2)$$

and  $Q_{\varepsilon,\omega}^{ss'(-)}$  is given by the permutation of the indices,  $n+1 \leftrightarrow n$  and  $n'+1 \leftrightarrow n'$ , in the arguments of Green's functions in Eq. (2). The Green's functions  $G$ , retarded (R) and advanced (A), are determined by interaction of electrons with static disorder potential in the presence of magnetic field. They are written in the representation given by the product of the ket-vectors  $|j\rangle$  and  $|np_y\rangle$ , describing the 2D subbands and the Landau eigenstates, respectively. Here  $j = 1, 2$  numbers the electron subband of the quantum well,  $n$  is the Landau level number, and  $p_y$  is the continuous momentum (the Landau gauge is used). The double angular brackets in Eq. (2) denote random potential averaging. The conductivities  $\sigma_\pm(\omega)$  are expressed in terms of the functions (2) as

$$\sigma_\pm(\omega) = i \frac{e^2 n_s}{m\omega} + \frac{e^2}{2\pi m\omega} \int d\varepsilon \left[ (f_\varepsilon - f_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega}) Q_{\varepsilon,\omega}^{AR(\pm)} + f_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega} Q_{\varepsilon,\omega}^{AA(\pm)} - f_\varepsilon Q_{\varepsilon,\omega}^{RR(\pm)} \right]. \quad (3)$$

In the limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , Eq. (3) gives the dc conductivity components  $\sigma_d = \text{Re}(\sigma_+ + \sigma_-)/2$  and  $\sigma_\perp = \text{Im}(\sigma_+ - \sigma_-)/2$ .

Analytical evaluation of the correlation functions in Eq. (2) can be done in the case of relatively weak magnetic fields, by using the self-consistent Born approximation and by expanding the Green's functions in powers of small Dingle factors. In application to balanced DQWs, where the subband energy separation is typically small compared to the Fermi energy, we assume that the difference in subband populations is small compared to  $n_s$ . It is justified for our samples where the Fermi energy (17 meV) is much larger than  $\Delta_{12}/2 = 1.8$  meV. The difference between quantum lifetimes of electrons in the two subbands,  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ , (and between the corresponding transport times) is also small, so we neglect it everywhere except the Dingle exponents. In the first order in the Dingle factors  $d_j = \exp(-\pi/\omega_c \tau_j)$ , the generation term acquires the following form:

$$G_\varepsilon = \mathcal{G}_\omega [r_\omega^{(0)} + (r_\omega^{(0)} - r_\omega^{(1)})g_\varepsilon - r_\omega^{(1)}g_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega}] \times (f_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega} - f_\varepsilon) + \{\omega \rightarrow -\omega\}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_\omega = \frac{\pi e^2 E^2 n_s \tau_{tr}}{8m^2 \omega^2}, \quad g_\varepsilon = \sum_{j=1,2} d_j \cos \frac{2\pi(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_j)}{\hbar\omega_c}, \quad (5)$$

$$r_\omega^{(0)} = \sum_{\pm} \frac{|\lambda_\omega^{(\pm)}|^2}{1 + s_\pm}, \quad r_\omega^{(1)} = \sum_{\pm} \frac{|\lambda_\omega^{(\pm)}|^2 s_\pm}{(1 + s_\pm)^2}, \quad (6)$$

$s_\pm = (\omega \pm \omega_c)^2 \tau_{tr}^2$ , and  $\tau_{tr}$  is the transport time, common for both subbands in our approximation.

The kinetic equation is solved by representing the distribution function as a sum  $f_\varepsilon^0 + \delta f_\varepsilon$ , where the first term slowly varies on the scale of cyclotron energy, while the second one rapidly oscillates with energy.<sup>8</sup> The first term satisfies the equation  $\mathcal{G}_\omega r_\omega^{(0)} (f_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega}^0 + f_{\varepsilon-\hbar\omega}^0 - 2f_\varepsilon^0) = -J_\varepsilon(f^0)$ . Assuming that the electron-electron scattering controls the electron distribution, one can approximate  $f_\varepsilon^0$  by a heated Fermi distribution,  $f_\varepsilon^0 = \{1 + \exp[(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_F)/T_e]\}^{-1}$ . The electron temperature  $T_e$  is found from the balance equation  $P_\omega = P_{ph}$ , where  $P_\omega = \int d\varepsilon \varepsilon D_\varepsilon G_\varepsilon(f^0) = \text{Re}[\lambda_\omega^{(+)}|^2 \sigma_+(\omega) + |\lambda_\omega^{(-)}|^2 \sigma_-(\omega)] E^2/4$  is the power absorbed by the electron system and  $P_{ph} = -\int d\varepsilon \varepsilon D_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon(f^0)$  is the power lost to phonons. The second term satisfies the equation

$$r_\omega^{(0)} [\delta f_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega} + \delta f_{\varepsilon-\hbar\omega} - 2\delta f_\varepsilon] - \frac{\delta f_\varepsilon}{\tau_{in} \mathcal{G}_\omega} = r_\omega^{(1)} [g_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega} (f_{\varepsilon+\hbar\omega}^0 - f_\varepsilon^0) + g_{\varepsilon-\hbar\omega} (f_{\varepsilon-\hbar\omega}^0 - f_\varepsilon^0)], \quad (7)$$

where we have used the relaxation time approximation for the collision integral,  $J_\varepsilon(\delta f) \simeq -\delta f_\varepsilon/\tau_{in}$ , with inelastic relaxation time  $\tau_{in}$ . Solution of this equation is

$$\delta f_\varepsilon \simeq \frac{\hbar\omega_c}{2\pi} \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon^0}{\partial \varepsilon} \frac{A_\omega}{2} \sum_{j=1,2} d_j \sin \frac{2\pi(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_j)}{\hbar\omega_c}, \quad (8)$$

$$A_\omega = \frac{\mathcal{P}_\omega (2\pi\omega/\omega_c) \sin(2\pi\omega/\omega_c) r_\omega^{(1)}}{1 + \mathcal{P}_\omega \sin^2(\pi\omega/\omega_c) r_\omega^{(0)}}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_\omega = 4\mathcal{G}_\omega r_\omega^{(0)} \tau_{in}$ .

Using the energy distribution function found above, one can calculate the dc resistivity  $\rho_{xx} = \sigma_d/(\sigma_d^2 + \sigma_\perp^2)$ :

$$\frac{\rho_d}{\rho_0} = 1 - 2\mathcal{T}_e g_{\varepsilon_F} + \frac{\tau_{tr}}{\tau_{11}^{tr}}(d_1^2 + d_2^2) + 2\frac{\tau_{tr}}{\tau_{12}^{tr}}d_1d_2 \\ \times \cos\left(\frac{2\pi\Delta_{12}}{\hbar\omega_c} - \frac{A_\omega}{2}\left(d_1^2 + d_2^2 + 2d_1d_2\cos\frac{2\pi\Delta_{12}}{\hbar\omega_c}\right)\right), \quad (10)$$

where  $\rho_0 = m/e^2 n_s \tau_{tr}$  is the zero-field Drude resistivity and  $\Delta_{12} = \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1$  is the subband separation. The second term, proportional to  $g_{\varepsilon_F}$ , describes the SdHO. The third and the fourth terms describe positive magnetoresistance and the MIS oscillations,<sup>7</sup> respectively; these terms are written under condition of classically strong magnetic fields,  $\omega_c \tau_{tr} \gg 1$ . Here,  $\tau_{11}^{tr} = \tau_{22}^{tr}$  and  $\tau_{12}^{tr}$  are the intrasubband and intersubband transport scattering times, which contribute to the total transport time according to  $1/\tau_{tr} = 1/\tau_{11}^{tr} + 1/\tau_{12}^{tr}$ . The term proportional to the oscillating factor  $A_\omega$  describes modification of the oscillatory resistivity under photoexcitation. Another effect of the excitation is the electron heating, which increases thermal suppression of the SdHO, described by the factor  $\mathcal{T}_e = (2\pi^2 T_e / \hbar\omega_c) / \sinh(2\pi^2 T_e / \hbar\omega_c)$ .

The most essential feature of the resistivity given by Eq. (10) is the presence of the product of the oscillating factors  $\cos(2\pi\Delta_{12}/\hbar\omega_c)$  and  $\sin(2\pi\omega/\omega_c)$ , which corresponds to an interference of the MIS oscillations with the MIRO. The interference takes place because the photoexcitation involves both subbands [see Eqs. (8) and (9)], so the scattering-induced coupling between the subbands, which oscillates as  $\cos(2\pi\Delta_{12}/\hbar\omega_c)$ , modifies the amplitude of the oscillating photocurrent. Usually, the microwave quantum energy is smaller than the subband separation, and the magnetoresistance shows fast MIS oscillations modulated by a slow MIRO component  $\propto -\sin(2\pi\omega/\omega_c)$ .

In our calculations, we have used Eq. (10) with  $d_1 = d_2 = \exp(-\pi/\omega_c\tau)$  and  $\tau_{12}^{tr} = \tau_{11}^{tr} = 2\tau_{tr}$ , which is a good approximation for balanced DQWs.<sup>7</sup> We have taken into account heating of electrons by the field and dependence of the characteristic times  $\tau$ ,  $\tau_{tr}$ , and  $\tau_{in}$  on the electron temperature  $T_e$ . The latter was determined by using the collision integral for interaction of electrons with both deformation and piezoelectric potentials of acoustic phonons. The inelastic scattering time  $\tau_{in}$  is assumed to scale with the temperature as  $T_e^{-2}$ , with  $\hbar/\tau_{in} = 4$  mK at  $T_e = 1$  K, according to the theoretical estimates for electron-electron scattering<sup>8</sup> applied to our samples. The temperature dependence of the transport time  $\tau_{tr}$  and quantum lifetime  $\tau$  of electrons in

our samples has been empirically determined by analyzing temperature dependence of zero-field resistance and MIS oscillation amplitudes.<sup>7</sup> The microwave electric field  $E \simeq 2.5$  V/cm is estimated by fitting calculated amplitudes of magnetoresistance oscillations to experimental data; the corresponding electron heating is in agreement with the observed suppression of the SdHO amplitudes.

The results of the calculations, shown in the lower parts of Figs. 1 - 3, are in good agreement with experiment, and capture all qualitative features of the resistance dependence on the magnetic field, temperature, radiation power, and frequency. Note that the heating of electrons by microwaves is not strong at  $\omega_c \simeq \omega$  (see inset to Fig. 2) because of radiative broadening of the cyclotron resonance<sup>10,11</sup> in our samples. The only feature that is not described by the theory is the observed reduction in the MIS oscillation frequency<sup>7</sup> at  $B \gtrsim 0.25$  T, which is possibly related to a decrease in the subband separation owing to enhanced Coulomb correlations and/or modification of screening in magnetic fields.

Understanding the MIRO physics requires comparison of measured photoresistance with the results provided by existing theories. Among the physical mechanisms<sup>12</sup> responsible for the MIRO, the inelastic mechanism,<sup>8,12</sup> describing the oscillations as a result of microwave-induced change of the isotropic part of electron distribution function, is predicted to dominate at moderate radiation power, owing to a large ratio of  $\tau_{in}/\tau$ , which is of the order  $10^2$  under typical experimental conditions, including our experiment. The observed insensitivity of the MIRO to the polarization of incident radiation, and  $T^{-2}$  scaling of the oscillatory photoresistance amplitude<sup>11</sup> are in favor of the inelastic mechanism. We have shown that application of the basic principles of the inelastic mechanism theory<sup>8</sup> to the systems with two-subband occupation confirms the reliability of theoretical estimates for the inelastic relaxation time and leads to a satisfactory explanation of the new features reported in this paper.

In conclusion, we have presented experimental and theoretical studies of oscillatory magnetoresistance in DQWs under microwave irradiation. The new kind of interference oscillations observed in these systems appears because the photoinduced part of the electron distribution, which oscillates as a function of microwave frequency, is modified owing to subband coupling and becomes also an oscillating function of the subband separation.

This work was supported by CNPq, FAPESP (Brazilian agency), COFECUB-USP (Uc Ph 109/08), and with microwave facilities from ANR MICONANO.

[1] M. A. Zudov, R. R. Du, J. A. Simmons, and J. R. Reno, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 201311(R) (2001).

[2] R. G. Mani, J. H. Smet, K. von Klitzing, V. Narayana-

murti, W. B. Johnson, and V. Umansky, Nature **420**, 646 (2002).

[3] M. A. Zudov, R. R. Du, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West,

- Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 046807 (2003).
- [4] For a recent review, see A. Dmitriev, F. Evers, I. V. Gornyi, A. D. Mirlin, D. G. Polyakov, and P. Wolffe, *Physica status solidi (b)*, **245**, 239 (2008).
  - [5] V. Polyanovsky, *Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn.* **22**, 2230 (1988).
  - [6] T. H. Sander, S. N. Holmes, J. J. Harris, D. K. Maude, and J. C. Portal, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 13856 (1998).
  - [7] N. C. Mamani, G. M. Gusev, T. E. Lamas, A. K. Bakarov, and O. E. Raichev, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 205327 (2008).
  - [8] I. A. Dmitriev, M. G. Vavilov, I. L. Aleiner, A. D. Mirlin, and D. G. Polyakov, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 115316 (2005).
  - [9] K. W. Chiu, T. K. Lee, and J. J. Quinn, *Surf. Sci.* **58**, 182 (1976).
  - [10] S. A. Mikhailov, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 165311 (2004).
  - [11] S. A. Studenikin, M. Potemski, A. Sachrajda, M. Hilke, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 245313 (2005).
  - [12] I. A. Dmitriev, A. D. Mirlin, and D. G. Polyakov, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 245320 (2007).