

Spin relaxation in quantum dots due to e^- exchange with leads

A.B. VORONTSOV AND M.G. VAVILOV

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 53706, USA

ABSTRACT

- Quantum dot is a basis for many nano-technological applications. Electronic and magnetic (spin) properties of few*electron* systems are of a particular interest;
- Traditionally considered e^- spin relaxation channels in a quantum dot are intrinsic: associated with a) hyperfine coupling to nuclei and b) spin-orbit coupling in the dot;
- We explore an alternative spin-flip process that is due to electron exchange between dot and an electrode. We present a quantitative description of this spin-flip mechanism and the resulting current in a double dot system. We find values for the relaxation times that may be much shorter than those due to intrinsic mechanisms, and thus dominate the relaxation:

1 Introduction

1.1 Spin relaxation in quantum dots



1.2 Pauli spin blockade in double quantum dots

> Spin blockade - blocking of the charge current through the system due to arrangement of spin-dependent levels in the dot. [4, 5, 3, 6] Double dots in spin blockade regime can be used to experimentally measure spin relaxation time (Johnson'05 [7])



Intermediate Singlet: current flows

 $(1,0) \rightarrow (1,1)_S \rightsquigarrow (2,0)_S \rightarrow (1,0)$

 $(1,0) \rightarrow (1,1)_T \rightarrow \dots$ is blocked

Intermediate Triplet:

 $(1,1)_T \not\rightarrow (2,0)_T$ (energy)

 $(1,1)_T \nrightarrow (2,0)_S$ (spin)

(a) Consequent transport Right Left through a double dot. Initial (b) Energy level representation of state has one electron (with arbitransport through the dot. trary spin) on the Left island. Single electron steps:

- R Lead \rightarrow R Dot
- R Dot \rightarrow L Dot (can be blocked)
- L Dot \rightarrow L Lead (recovery of initial state)
- ▶ Once current is blocked it will take spin-flip ((1,1) triplet-singlet relaxation) time to unblock it [8]

Model and equations 2

2.1 Spin relaxation due to leads

▶ We assume that the intrinsic relaxation times are slow and the main spin-flip process is due to electron exchange with the leads : spin up leaves the dot and spin down enters back

 $\mathcal{H} = H_{\rm dot} + H_{\rm leads} + V$
$$\begin{split} H_{\text{leads}} &= \sum_{\alpha = L,R} \sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \xi_{\alpha \, \mathbf{k}} c^{\dagger}_{\alpha \, \mathbf{k} \, \sigma} c_{\alpha \, \mathbf{k} \, \sigma} \\ \text{- free electrons} \end{split}$$
α = L, R k, σ - free electrons H_{dot} - localized energy levels in the dots $V = \sum \sum \left(W_{\alpha k} d^{\dagger}_{\alpha \sigma} c_{\alpha k \sigma} + W^{*}_{\alpha k} c^{\dagger}_{\alpha k \sigma} d_{\alpha \sigma} \right)$ $\alpha = L, R \overline{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}$ - tunneling Hamiltonian

Rate equations from density matrix

- Density matrix equation $\dot{\tilde{\rho}}_i = -\sum \Gamma_{fi} \rho_{0i} + \sum \Gamma_{if} \rho_{0f}$
- Transition rates between electron states (leads \times dot) : $|i\rangle = |e_i\rangle \times |dot_i\rangle$ $\Gamma_{fi} = 2\pi\delta(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_f) \left| V_{fi} + \sum \frac{V_{fm}V_{mi}}{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_m} + \dots \right|$
- Environment (leads) relax much faster than dot states: define transition rates between dot states: $\gamma_{fi} = \text{Tr}_{e_i, e_f} \Gamma^{fi} \rho_{e_f}^0 \rho_{e_i}^0$



(a) First order: one-step processes $(1, 1)_{S,T} \leftrightarrow (1, 0)$ $\bar{\gamma}_1 = \Gamma_{\rm R} f(\Delta) , \quad \gamma_1 = \Gamma_{\rm R} [1 - f(\Delta)]$ (b) Second order: two jumps $(1, 1)_{S,T} \leftrightarrow (1, 1)_{S,T}$ $\frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \sum_{k} \mathcal{N}_{F} |W_{R,k}|^{4} \left| \frac{1}{\Delta - \xi_{k} + i0} \right|^{2} f(\xi_{k}) [1 - f(\xi_{k})] \approx \Gamma_{\mathbf{R}} \frac{T T_{\mathbf{R}}}{\Delta^{2}}$

Here $T_{R} = \frac{\hbar \Gamma_{R}}{2\pi}$, $\Gamma_{R} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} N_{f} |W_{R,k}|^{2}$, and $f(\xi_{k})$ - Fermi function. Similar to co-tunneling, [9, 10]

2.2 Rate equations





 $P_{\uparrow 0} + P_{\downarrow 0} + P_S + P_{T_0} + P_{T_+} + P_{T_-} = 1$ - Normalization

$\dot{P}_{S} = -(\gamma_{1} + \frac{3}{2}\gamma_{2})P_{S} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\gamma}_{1}(P_{\uparrow 0} + P_{\downarrow 0}) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2}(P_{T_{0}} + P_{T_{+}} + P_{T_{-}}) - \Gamma P_{S},$

- $\dot{P}_{T_0} = -(\gamma_1 + \frac{3}{2}\gamma_2)P_{T_0} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\gamma}_1(P_{\uparrow 0} + P_{\downarrow 0}) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_2(P_S + P_{T_+} + P_{T_-}),$
- $\dot{P}_{T_{+}} = -(\gamma_{1} + \gamma_{2})P_{T_{+}} + \bar{\gamma}_{1}P_{\uparrow 0} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2}(P_{S} + P_{T_{0}}),$
- $\dot{P}_{T_{-}} = -(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)P_{T_{-}} + \bar{\gamma}_1 P_{\downarrow 0} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_2 (P_S + P_{T_0}).$

3 Results

3.1 Eigenmodes - spin/charge relaxaton

► Consider Left-Right dot in contact with Right lead and $\Gamma = 0$ (no escape to Left dot); No magnetic field: introduce $P_0 = P_{\uparrow 0} = P_{\downarrow 0}$ and $P_{T_1} = P_{T_+} = P_{T_-}$ Remove probability P_0 (unoccupied right dot) and diagonalize equations

Eigenmodes of double dot system dynamics:

$\dot{P}_{\eta}(t) + \Gamma_{\eta}P_{\eta}(t) = J_{\eta} , \eta = 1, 2, 3:$			
$P_1 = P_{T_0} - P_{T_1},$	$\Gamma_1=\Gamma_s,$	$J_1 = 0$	(spin);
$P_2 = 3P_S - (P_{T_0} + 2P_{T_1}),$	$\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_s,$	$J_2 = 0$	(spin);
$P_3 = P_S + (P_{T_0} + 2P_{T_1}),$	$\Gamma_3=\Gamma_c,$	$J_3 = 2\bar{\gamma}_1$	(charge).

- $\Gamma_{\rm s} = \gamma_1 + 2\gamma_2$ spin relaxation $\Gamma_{\rm c} = \Gamma_{\rm R} [1 + f(\Delta)]$ - charge relaxation rate
- Note: electron exchange between single dot and a lead is described by $P_2 = P_{\uparrow} - P_{\downarrow}$ (with rate Γ_s) and $P_3 = P_{\uparrow} + P_{\downarrow}$ (with rate Γ_c).

3.2 Spin blockade current

• Current : escape $(1, 1)_S \rightsquigarrow (2, 0)_S$ $f(\Delta)$ $2\Gamma_{c}\Gamma$ $I(t) = e\Gamma P_S(t) \Rightarrow$ Stationary: I = e $1 + f(\Delta)$ $4\Gamma_{\rm s} + \Gamma(3 + \Gamma_{\rm s}/\Gamma_{\rm c})$ This expression describes the entire profile of the current in spin block ade, both peak (resonant exchange with the lead) and blockade valley. In these two limits I-expression also simplifies to

$$\begin{split} \Gamma_{\rm s} \gg \Gamma : & I = \frac{1}{2} e \Gamma \frac{f(\Delta)}{1 + f(\Delta)}, \quad \text{(peak)} \\ \Gamma_{\rm s} \ll \Gamma : & I = \frac{1}{2} e \Gamma_{\rm s}, \quad \text{(valley, } f(\Delta) \approx 1) \end{split}$$

The valley dominated by algebraic tail: $\Gamma_{\rm s}=\Gamma_{\rm R}[1-f(\Delta)]+2\gamma_2(\Delta)$ where $\gamma_2 = \Gamma_{\rm R}^2 \frac{\acute{T}}{\Delta^2} \frac{\hbar}{2\pi}$

3.3 Current profiles : examples



Current through a double dot system in the spin blockaded regime. The dotted (dashed) lines show asymptotes due to first (second) order processes that dominate peak(valley). Panel (d) shows a fit to measured current (circles) along a line-cut of the spin blockade peak reported in [3].



3.4 Spin relaxation times from experiment



Conclusions

- ▶ We presented a simple theory for spin relaxation via leads
- ▶ It explains the current profile in spin-blockade experiment on Si : peaks and valley
- ▶ Electron exchange with the leads may dominate intrinsic mechanisms (HF and SO) of spin relaxation in dots
- > Triplet-Singlet relaxation rate (for a given experimental geometry/coupling to the leads $\Gamma_{\rm R}$): peaks $\tau_{s0} \sim 0.2 \ ns$

blockade $\tau_s \sim 2 \ \mu s$.

References

- [1] R.Hanson et al. ., Rev. Mod. Phys. 79, 1217 (2007).
- [2] I. Zutić et al. ., Rev. Mod. Phys. 76, 323 (2004).
- [3] N. Shaji et al. ., Nature Physics, 4 540 (2008).
- [4] K. Ono et al. ., Science 297, 1313 (2002).
- [5] A. C. Johnson et al. ., Phys. Rev. B 72, 165308 (2005).
- [6] H. W. Liu et al. ., Phys. Rev. B 77, 073310 (2008).
- [7] A. C. Johnson et al. ., Nature 435, 925 (2005).
- [8] F.H.L. Koppens et al. ., J. Appl. Phys. 101, 081706 (2007).
- [9] D.V. Averin, Yu.V. Nazarov, Single Charge Tunneling, ed. H. Grabert and H. Devoret,
- (Plenum, New York 1992)
- [10] H.-A. Engel, D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B 65, 195321 (2002).

Acknowledgements

We thank the UW experimental group for providing data and figures. Special thanks to C. Simmons for analysis of experimental data.

We are grateful to I2CAM for travel financial support

