

# Spin splitting in open quantum dots

M. Evaldsson, I. V. Zozoulenko

*Department of Science and Technology (ITN), Linköping University, 601 74 Norrköping, Sweden*

M. Ciorga, P. Zawadzki, A. S. Sachrajda

*Institute for Microstructural Science, National Research Council, K1A 0R6, Ottawa, Canada*

(Dated: January 29, 2020)

We present results from a theoretical and experimental study of spin-splitting in small open lateral quantum dots (i.e. in the regime when the dot is connected to the reservoirs via leads that support one or more propagating modes). We demonstrate that the magnetoconductance shows a pronounced splitting of the conductance peaks (or dips) which persists over a wide range of magnetic fields (from zero field to the edge-state regime) and is virtually independent of magnetic field. A numerical analysis of the conductance and the dot eigenspectrum indicates that this feature is related to a lifting of the spin degeneracy in the corresponding closed dot associated with the interaction between electrons of opposite spin.

There has been a lot of interest recently in the spin properties of semiconductor quantum dots. This is due not only to the new fundamental physics that these devices exhibit but also to explore promising applications in the emerging fields of spintronics and quantum information. Small symmetric dots exhibit properties reminiscent of those of real atoms, including the formation of a shell structure filled according to Hund's rule that favors a ground state with maximum possible spin [1, 2]. Recent theoretical studies also predict that even in the case of large disordered or chaotic quantum dots, interactions can lift the spin degeneracy and lead to a spontaneous ground state magnetization [3, 4, 5, 6]. This view was however challenged in Refs. [7, 8] which demonstrated that in disordered dots states with minimum spin dominate.

Coulomb blockade (CB) experiments can be used to probe the nature of the spin states in quantum dots. In the single particle picture, if the quantum dot levels are spin-degenerate, every two neighboring CB peaks (corresponding to an odd number and even number of electrons with total spin respectively  $1/2$  and  $0$ ) would exhibit a spin pairing – a correlation in the peak position and amplitude when an external parameter (such as the magnetic field, a gate voltage, etc..) is varied. A majority of the experiments show little evidence of this spin pairing [9, 10, 11] other than for a few pairs of peaks. This experimental result is often taken as an indication of a ground state of nonminimal spin. However, no clear consensus has been reached in the interpretation of this observation, since other factors, e.g. gate-voltage induced shape deformation [12], spectral scrambling [13], may also explain the absence of spin pairing. It has been demonstrated recently that in the dots where both shape deformation and the strength of interaction are reduced, spin pairing dominates the parametric evolution of CB peaks [14].

Let us now turn to the *open dot* regime when electrons can freely enter and exit the dot via leads that support one or more propagating modes. In this case the charge

quantization no longer holds and one may expect that conductance is mediated by two independent channels of opposite spins resulting in a total spin  $S = 0$  in the dot. The degree of spin degeneracy in this regime was probed in Ref. [15] where the statistical analysis of the conductance fluctuations indicated that a dot was spin-degenerate at low magnetic fields. In the present paper we present experimental evidence that in small open dots two spin channels are correlated and therefore *the spin degeneracy may be lifted*.

In our previous study [16] we demonstrated that main features in the magnetoconductance of small open dots (number of electrons  $N \lesssim 100$ ) can be related, in a non-trivial way, to the underlying eigenspectrum of the corresponding closed dot. In the present study we focus on the most dominant fine structure of the magnetoconductance of the small open quantum dots, a pronounced splitting of conductance peaks (or dips). Our numerical analysis demonstrates that the observed spin splitting in the open dot conductance is related to a splitting of degenerate levels in the corresponding closed dot when the interaction between the electrons of opposite spin is taken into account.

A gate device layout scheme has been recently developed which enables the number of electrons confined within an electrostatically defined quantum dot to be controllably reduced to zero [17]. These few electron devices were used to study the spin properties of quantum dots in the CB regime using Coulomb and spin blockade spectroscopic techniques [18, 19]. The measurements in this paper are on these same devices but in the strongly coupled regime. Details of the two device designs devices and the AlGaAs/GaAs wafer used for the measurements are given in [18, 19]. For the open dot experiments the following experimental procedure was used. All the gates defining the quantum dot were swept simultaneously. The ranges of the sweeps on the individual gates were not identical but were chosen, making use of calibration measurements, to maintain the same conductance at

both the entrance and exit leads. Altogether measurements were made on four different quantum dots. Figure 1 illustrates typical experimental results. As can be seen clearly in the data there exists a remarkable splitting of all of the conductance peaks. The features discussed in this paper were present in all four dots and on several cooldowns. It is interesting to note that a related experimental observation provided evidence that these doublets were indeed spin pairs. One of the devices showed strong edge state Aharonov-Bohm (AB) oscillations (tunnelling through zero dimensional states associated with confined edge states) at higher magnetic fields. It was not possible to follow most doublets all the way to this AB edge state regime due to their strong field dependence which made them pass through different conductance plateaux regimes. However, a few of the doublets *could* be followed directly onto neighboring AB oscillations. An analysis of the period of the AB oscillations suggested they were spin resolved. The splitting of the conductance peaks is the main experimental result of this paper.




FIG. 1: Experimental conductance as a function of magnetic field  $B$  and gate voltage  $V_G$  obtained from different dots. The corresponding device layouts are shown in the insets. The lithographic size of the dots is  $\sim 450$ nm.

In order to model magnetoconductance through the dot we use tight-binding Hubbard Hamiltonian in the mean-field approximation [20, 21, 22, 23],  $H = H_\uparrow + H_\downarrow$ ,

$$H_\sigma = - \sum_{\mathbf{r}, \Delta} t_{\mathbf{r}, \Delta} a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{r}+\Delta\sigma} + U \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \langle a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma'}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma'} \rangle a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma, \sigma'$  describe two opposite spin states  $\uparrow, \downarrow$  (or  $\uparrow, \downarrow$ ),  $a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}^\dagger$  and  $a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}$  are the creation and annihilation operators at the lattice site  $\mathbf{r}$  for an electron with spin  $\sigma$ ,  $\Delta$  corresponds to nearest neighbors, and  $t_{\mathbf{r}, \Delta}$  is a hopping matrix between the neighboring sites where the magnetic field  $B$  is incorporated in a standard fashion as the phase factor in the form of Peierls' substitution [21], and the onsite Hubbard constant  $U$  describes Coulomb interaction between electrons of different spin. We use a model of a hard-wall confinement to describe an electrostatic confining potential from gates. The dot has a rectangular shape of the size  $0.21 \times 0.36 \mu\text{m}$  and is connected to infinite ideal leads of the width of  $w = 80$  nm (see below, inset to Fig. 3). The conductance of the dot is given by the

Landauer formula  $G = G_\uparrow + G_\downarrow = \frac{e^2}{h} (T_\uparrow + T_\downarrow)$ , where  $T_\sigma$  is the transmission coefficient for different spin channels. In order to calculate  $T_\sigma$  we introduce the retarded Green function  $\mathcal{G}_\sigma = (E - H_\sigma + i\epsilon)$  and employ the standard recursive Green function technique [21]. The expectation value for the electron number at site  $\mathbf{r}$  for the spin  $\sigma$  is given by

$$\langle N_{\mathbf{r}\sigma} \rangle = \langle a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{r}\sigma} \rangle = -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{E_F} \text{Im} [\mathcal{G}_\sigma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}, E)] dE, \quad (2)$$

where  $E_F$  is the Fermi energy, and  $\mathcal{G}_\sigma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}, E)$  is the Green function in the real space representation. Equations (1), (2) are solved self-consistently. Because all the poles of the Green function are in the lower complex plane, the integration path in Eq. (2) can be transformed into the upper complex plane where the Green's function is smoother than on the real axis. This also allows us to account for the bound states in the dot that are situated below the propagation threshold in the leads. In the calculations the lattice constant is chosen to be  $a = 10$  nm that insures that Eq. (1) with  $|t| = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^*a^2}$  corresponds to a continuous Schrödinger equation, with  $m^* = 0.067$  being the effective electron mass appropriate for GaAs. We neglect the Zeeman term as it appears to be unimportant in the chosen field interval. All the results presented in the paper correspond to a typical value of  $U = 3|t|$  [3, 22]. Note that the present Hamiltonian reproduces Hund's rule for the eigenspectrum of a closed parabolic dot [1, 2, 24].

Figure 2 shows a linear conductance vs magnetic field  $B$  and Fermi wave vector  $k_F$  which includes no spin or Coulomb effects ( $U = 0$ ). For a comparison the single-particle spectrum of the corresponding closed dot is superimposed onto conductance plot in order to underline the relationships between them. The eigenspectrum of the dot for the case of  $U = 3|t|$  is shown in Fig. 2 (b) for a representative  $k_F$  in the dot. The principle features of the single-particle eigenspectrum can still be traced in the eigenspectrum of Hubbard Hamiltonian (1). The spectrum of Eq. (1) is however shifted to higher energies because of the increased dot electrostatic potential due to the charge build-up described by Eq. (2). The major difference in comparison with the single-particle spectrum is that for certain regions of magnetic field the spin degeneracy is lifted and thus spin-up and spin-down eigenenergies are split. This effect can be understood as follows. Suppose, a particular eigenstate is spin-degenerate, close to  $E_F$ , and occupied by two electrons of opposite spin (let us concentrate for example on the eigenlevel that is close to the  $E_F$  in the interval marked by a dashed circle in Fig. 2 (b)). As magnetic field increases, the eigenenergy increases and eventually crosses  $E_F$ . If the Hamiltonian were spinless, this eigenstate would become totally unpopulated. However, because of the Hubbard term in Eq. (1), spin-up and spin-down electrons feel the Coulomb potential from electrons with opposite spin.




FIG. 2: (a) The conductance  $G = G(k_F, B)$  for  $U = 0$ . Solid lines depict the eigenspectrum of the corresponding closed dot. (b) The eigenspectrum of the corresponding closed dot for the same strength of  $U = 3t$ . Dotted line indicates  $k_F$ . (c), (d) The conductance  $G = G(B, k_F)$  for  $U = 3t$ . Note that because of a large computation time the conductance is shown only for two representative regions.

Thus, if only one of the electrons, say spin-up, remains in the dot, it does not feel the electrostatic potential from its spin-down fellow electron it was sharing the same eigenlevel with, because the latter is no longer in the dot. As the results, the effective potential for the spin-up electron drops abruptly when the spin-down electron leaves the dot. This results in abrupt drop of the eigenvalue for the spin-up electron and hence lifting of the spin-degeneracy of the spectrum. As the magnetic field increases further the eigenlevel under consideration (now singly occupied) raises and eventually crosses  $E_F$  (at  $B \sim 0.08T$ ). The level thus becomes totally depopulated and therefore the effective potentials for spin-up and spin-down electrons become equal. This, in turn, leads to the restoration of the spin degeneracy. Note that the origin of the spin-splitting of the eigenspectrum of the quantum dot described above is conceptually similar to the Anderson model of the formation of the localized magnetic states on solute ions in nonmagnetic metals [20].

The spin splitting in the quantum dot eigenspectrum leads to a splitting of the conductance peaks/dips which become doublets as illustrated in Fig. 2(c),(d). A detailed analysis of the doublet formation and its relation to splitting of the eigenlevels of the corresponding closed dot is discussed in Fig. 3. Note that in a closed dot *all* states in a vicinity of  $E_F$  equally contribute to the spin splitting. In contrast, in an open dot, the states strongly coupled to the leads (with wide resonant broadenings  $\Gamma$ ) have very little effect on the spin splitting. This is be-




FIG. 3: (a) Conductance of the open quantum dot  $G = G(B)$  for spin-up and spin-down electrons,  $G_\uparrow$  and  $G_\downarrow$ , respectively. (b) magnetospectrum of the related closed dot;  $k_F w / \pi = 1.165$ . (c) Number of spin-up and spin-down electrons in the open quantum dot,  $N_\uparrow$  and  $N_\downarrow$ , respectively. (d) Total spin of the electrons in the related open quantum dot,  $S = \frac{1}{2}|N_\uparrow - N_\downarrow|$ . Insets illustrate the current density for spin-up and spin-down electrons in the open dot.

cause of a short lifetime of these states  $\tau \sim \hbar/\Gamma$  that is not long enough to provide a sufficient charge build-up in the dot. In the  $B$ -field interval of Fig. 3, there are two eigenstates in the vicinity of  $E_F$ , labelled as *A* and *B*. An analysis of the eigenfunction and linear conductance ( $U = 0$ ) shows that the state *B* is strongly coupled to the leads and thus provide a nonresonant channel of transport with  $T \approx 1$ . In our further analysis we therefore will concentrate only on the state *A* that is weakly coupled to the leads and thus responsible for a resonant channel of the conductance and the splitting of the peaks. When magnetic field  $B \lesssim B_1$ , this state is empty, see Fig. 3 (b). When this eigenstate approaches  $E_F$  it splits because of the reasons discussed in the preceding paragraph. As the transport through the dot at zero temperature occurs at  $E_F$ , the spin-up resonant state will affect the conductance more strongly than the spin-down resonant state. This is because the former is situated at  $E \approx E_F$ , whereas the later is shifted from  $E_F$  by the distance determined by effective electrostatic potential from the spin-up electrons, see Fig. 3 (a),(b). Therefore, the first dip in the doublet is caused by spin-up electrons. (Note that unlike the CB regime the resonant state in an open dot can give rise to either a peak or a dip depending on the interference condition,). As the magnetic field increases further, the spin-up resonant state moves farther away from  $E_F$ , whereas the spin-down state moves towards  $E_F$ . At some field  $B_2$  the distances from the resonant states to  $E_F$  becomes equal and both states contribute equally to the conductance. For  $B \gtrsim B_2$  the spin-down resonant state




FIG. 4: Conductance of the quantum dot,  $G_\uparrow$  and  $G_\downarrow$  (a), and the number of spin-up and spin-down electrons,  $N_\uparrow$  and  $N_\downarrow$  (b), as a function of  $k_F$  at  $B = 0$ . Inset shows a corresponding eigenspectrum in the vicinity of  $B = 0$ .

becomes dominant and thus the second dip in the doublet is due to spin-down electrons. Eventually, when  $B \approx B_3$  both resonant states become populated and the spin degeneracy is lifted. Insets in Fig. 3 show the current density in the dot illustrating the role played by the bound states in formation of dips in the conductance doublet. Figure 3 (c) shows the electron number  $N$  and total spin polarization  $S = \frac{1}{2}|N_\uparrow - N_\downarrow|$  inside the open quantum dot. It demonstrates that neither  $N$  nor  $N_\uparrow, N_\downarrow$  are integer. This is in contrast to the case of a weakly coupled dots in the Coulomb blockade regime when  $N$  is always integer. Note that similar effects of spin splitting have been investigated in a number of model systems [23]. In addition, spontaneous spin splitting has been suggested as the origin of the “0.7-anomaly” in the conductance of a quantum point contact [25].

The splitting of the conductance peaks/dips is the most pronounced manifestation of spin polarization in an open dot. However, the spin degeneracy in the dot can be lifted even when the conductance does not show an apparent doublet formation. This is illustrated in Fig. 4 where the dot conductance is plotted in the region containing three closely spaced eigenstates as shown in the inset. In this region the spacing between the levels is smaller than the energy splitting between spins-up and spins-down. As the result, more than one eigenstate can contribute to a particular peak/dip, and the conductance shows an erratic behavior where it is not possible to identify well-defined spin-split doublets (Fig. 4 (a)). Nevertheless, in the given energy interval the electron density shows a pronounced polarization as indicated in Fig. 4 (b).

It is interesting to note that practically all resonant peaks have a characteristic asymmetric shape as a function of  $k_F$ . This is a signature of a Fano resonance that occurs in an open dot because of an interference between a resonant channel (related to a spin-resolved resonant

state) and a non-resonant one (originated from the contributions from the tails of neighboring levels) [26].

In conclusion, we find experimentally that conductance peaks and dips are split in small few electron open quantum dots. The numerical analysis of the conductance and the dot eigenspectrum demonstrates that this effect is related to a spin splitting in the corresponding closed dot when the interactions between the electrons with opposite spins is taken into account.

Financial support from the National Graduate School in Scientific Computing (M.E.) and the Swedish Research Council (M.E. and I.V.Z) is acknowledged. A.S.S would like to acknowledge support from the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research.

- 
- [1] S. Tarucha *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3613 (1996).
  - [2] M. Koskinen, M. Manninen, and S. M. Reimann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1389 (1997).
  - [3] R. Berkovits, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2128 (1998).
  - [4] A. V. Andreev and A. Kamenev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3199 (1998).
  - [5] P. W. Brouwer, Y. Oreg, and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **60** R13 977 (1999)
  - [6] H. U. Baranger, D. Ullmo, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. B **61** R2425 (2000).
  - [7] P. Jacquod and A. D. Stone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3938 (2000).
  - [8] K. Hirose and N. S. Wingreen, Phys. Rev. **65**, 193305 (2002).
  - [9] U. Sivan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1123 (1996).
  - [10] F. Simmel, T. Heinzel, and D. A. Wharam, Europhys. Lett. **38**, 123 (1997).
  - [11] S. R. Patel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4522 (1998).
  - [12] R. O. Vallejos, C. H. Lewenkopf, and E. R. Mucciolo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 677 (1998).
  - [13] S. R. Patel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5900 (1998).
  - [14] S. Lüscher *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2118 (2001).
  - [15] J. A. Folk *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2102 (2001).
  - [16] I. V. Zozoulenko *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1838 (1999).
  - [17] M. Ciorga *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **61** (2000) R16315.
  - [18] P. Hawrylak *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **59** 2801 (1999).
  - [19] M. Ciorga *et al.*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **88** (2002) 256804.
  - [20] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **124**, 41 (1961).
  - [21] P. A. Lee and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 882 (1981).
  - [22] L. E. Henrickson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 4482 (1994).
  - [23] S. Nonoyama *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 2667 (1994); Y. Takagaki, Y. Tokura, and S. Tarucha, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 15 462 (1996); H. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 1578 (1997).
  - [24] I. I. Yakimenko, A. M. Bychkov, and K.-F. Berggren, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 165309 (2001).
  - [25] K. J. Thomas *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 135 (1996); C.-K. Wang and K.-F. Berggren, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 14 257 (1996).
  - [26] J. Göres *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 2188 (2000).