Christoph Schindler and Roland Zimmermann Humboldt-Universitat zu Berlin, Institut fur Physik Newtonstra e 15, 12489 Berlin, Germany

The exciton-exciton interaction is investigated for quasi-two-dimensional quantum structures. A bosonization scheme is applied including the full spin structure. For generating the elective interaction potentials, the Hartree-Fock and Heitler-London approaches are improved by a full two-exciton calculation which includes the van der W aals elect. W ith these potentials the biexciton form ation in bilayer systems is investigated. For coupled quantum wells the two-body scattering matrix is calculated and employed to give a modi ed relation between exciton density and blueshift. Such a relation is of central importance for gauging exciton densities in experiments which pave the way toward Bose-E instein condensation of excitons.

PACS num bers: 73.20 M f, 71.35.G g, 78.67 D e

I. IN TRODUCTION

Excitons (bound pairs of electron and hole) play a key role in sem iconductor optics, and their theoretical understanding has a long history.¹ Although excitons obey Bose statistics, the ferm ionic structure of their constituents is always in portant and forbids to treat excitons as nearly ideal Bose particles. Among the rst attempts for bosonization of excitons, we quote Refs.2{4. Both the ferm ionic exchange and the Coulom b forces between two excitons can be condensed into an e ective excitonexciton (XX) interaction potential. E orts for deriving XX potentials are abound in the literature, covering three-dimensional excitons in bulk sem iconductors as wellas quasi-two-dimensional excitons in quantum wells. However, alm ost all of these attem pts^{5} were restricted to the Hartree-Fock level, i.e., taking into account the XX interactions up to second order in the elem entary charge, e². Som etim es it has been claim ed that this would be enough for treating su ciently accurate the exciton gas at low density n_X . This is not correct since already at zero density, the single-exciton bound state calls for an in nite summation in powers of the Coulomb potential, and consequently the next term (linear in n_x) cannot be truncated either. It was not before 2001 that in a sem inalpaper by 0 kum ura and 0 gaw a⁹ the rst X X potential beyond Hartree-Fock¹⁰ for bulk sem iconductors has been constructed, in close analogy to the Heitler-London approximation in atom ic physics.

The interest in a proper description of XX interactions has been surely intensi ed by the actual search for Bose-E instein condensation of excitons, which has been predicted theoretically already decades ago.¹¹⁽¹³ D ue to the small exciton m ass com pared to atom ic systems, the critical tem perature for the condensate is expected to be a few kelvins for a density of 10^{17} cm³ in bulk G aAs, within easy reach experimentally. A fundamental problem, however, is the nite life time of the excitons, which hinders the relaxation into therm alequilibrium. O ne possible way out are coupled quantum wells (CQW s) which came into focus a few years ago.¹⁴⁽¹⁸ A static electric

eld in grow th direction forces electrons and holes to reside in adjacent quantum wells which are separated by a barrier. Due to this spatial separation, the indirect excitons exhibit extrem ely long life times, which is a good condition for reaching them al equilibrium. However, these spatially indirect excitons form dipoles leading to a strong and long-range repulsion, which com plicates the theoretical description as well as the experimental realization of a dense cold exciton gas.^{19,20} R ecently large progress has been reported for spatially indirect excitons in electrostatic²¹ as well as optical traps.^{22,23}

These practical dem ands led us to investigate the XX interaction in m ore detail, with special em phasis on coupled quantum wells. In particular, we improve on the Heitler-London-type treatment in Ref.9 by solving the four-particle Schrodinger equation for two electrons and two holes num erically. Before doing so we address the com plex spin structure of the exciton com posed of a spin 1/2 electron and a spin 3/2 heavy hole (Sec.II). The im portance of spin-dependent e ects in the exciton gas has been emphasized e.g., in Ref.24. In the lim it of immobile holes (theirm assbeing usually much larger than that of the electrons), we can derive a ective spin-dependent XX potentials (Sec.III) which contain in addition to the dipole-dipole repulsion and exchange e ects the weak van der W aals forces. The latter is of in portance to rectify a recent claim^{25,26} to have explained the bead pattern formation which appears at low temperatures in the ringshaped CQW emission.^{27{29}

W ith a proper XX interaction at hand, we are able to calculate biexciton states (excitonic molecules), which are well known from bulk semiconductors and have been observed in single quantum wells.^{30,31} Since biexciton energies have been calculated with high precision elsewhere,³² we use these results to judge our approximate treatment in Sec.IV. For the CQW situation sim – plied to a bilayer system, we identify the parameter values (essentially mass ratio and charge separation) which lim it the existence of biexcitons.

Addressing the many-exciton case, we will treat the excitons as e ective bosons with a renorm alized interaction potential, derived from the underlying electron-hole description.³³ A s an application, we investigate in Sec.V two realistic CQW structures. The numerically generated X X potentials are used to calculate two-exciton scattering phase shifts which are the m ain ingredient for a T-m atrix based quasi-particle dispersion³⁴. For the lowdensity case, we are able to calculate excitonic blueshift and scattering-induced broadening linear in n_X (Sec.V I). We nd a stunning reduction of the blueshift compared to the sim ple "capacitor form ula" and relate this nding to features in the XX pair-correlation function which due to the strong repulsion - resem bles m ore a Ferm igas than a free B ose gas (Sec.V II).

Conclusions are drawn in Sec.V III, while a few technical details are deferred to the Appendix.

II. MANY-EXCITON HAM ILTONIAN

To derive the many-exciton H am iltonian we follow the work of de-Leon and Laikhtman.^{8,35} The task is to nd the matrix elements of the electron-hole H am iltonian with an appropriate two-exciton wave function and to implement them into an elective bosonic H am iltonian for many excitons. The elective mass H am iltonian for

two electrons and holes reads

$$H_{2eh} = \frac{\sim^{2} e_{1}}{2m_{e}} \frac{\sim^{2} h_{1}}{2m_{h}} \frac{\sim^{2} e_{2}}{2m_{e}} \frac{\sim^{2} h_{2}}{2m_{h}}$$

$$+ v_{ee} (r_{e1} r_{e2}) + v_{hh} (r_{h1} r_{h2}) v_{eh} (r_{e1} r_{h1})$$

$$v_{eh} (r_{e2} r_{h2}) v_{eh} (r_{e1} r_{h2}) v_{eh} (r_{e2} r_{h1}); (1)$$

where the interaction part [second and third line of Eq.(1)] is composed of Coulomb interactions between particle a and b, which can be either electron (a = e) or hole (a = h),

$$v_{ab}(r) = \frac{e_0^2}{r}$$
 with $e_0^2 = \frac{e^2}{4_{0}}$: (2)

P lease note that the corresponding sign (attractive or repulsive) has been m ade explicit in Eq.(1).

We de ne exciton quantum eld operators $\frac{y}{s}$ (R) which create an exciton at exciton center-of-m ass (c.m.) position R with spin s, and $_{s}$ (R), which annihilates the same exciton. The subsequent H am ilton operator will be written as

with the exciton mass M = $m_e + m_h$ in the kinetic energy. W s1s2;s3s4 (R) is the spin and space-dependent pair interaction potential. In the following, it will be extracted from a careful study of the four-particle problem [Eq.(1)]. The exciton spin index $s = s_e + J_h$ is the sum of the electron spin ($s_e = 1=2$) and the heavyhole angular momentum $(J_h = 3=2)$. We neglect the light holes, which are separated due to the con nem ent e ects in the quasi-two-dim ensional quantum well (QW). Now, s runs over four values s = 1 (bright states) and s = 2 (dark states). Since electron and hole are ferm ions, we have to use a properly sym m etrized ansatz for both component's spin wave functions $p_{ee}^{p}(s_{e1};s_{e2})$ and $^{q}_{hh}$ (J_{h1}; J_{h2}), which make the overall wave-function antisymmetric with respect to the exchange of the electrons and the holes, respectively. The labels p and q denote the parity which can be symmetric (p = s) or antisymmetric (p = a). Together with the spatial part we write the total two-exciton wave function,

$$= {}^{p}_{q}(\mathbf{r}_{e1}; \mathbf{s}_{e1}; \mathbf{r}_{e2}; \mathbf{s}_{e2}; \mathbf{r}_{h1}; \mathbf{J}_{h1}; \mathbf{r}_{h2}; \mathbf{J}_{h2})$$

$$= {}^{p}_{q}(\mathbf{r}_{e1}; \mathbf{r}_{e2}; \mathbf{r}_{h1}; \mathbf{r}_{h2}) {}^{ep}_{ee}(\mathbf{s}_{e1}; \mathbf{s}_{e2}) {}^{q}_{hh}(\mathbf{J}_{h1}; \mathbf{J}_{h2});$$

$$(4)$$

where the upper label stands for the electron part, and the lower one for the hole part. P lease note that due to the ferm ionic nature of the particles, the parities of the spin part and of the spatial part have to be opposite to each other. Taking now the matrix elements of Eq.(1) with the ground state wave functions we get four di erent potentials,³⁶

$$U_{q}^{p} = {}_{q}^{p} H_{2eh}^{int} {}_{q}^{p} :$$
 (5)

Due to the one to one correspondence between the exciton spin and the spin of its constituents, it is possible to express the basis vectors in the space of symmetric and antisymm etric spin wave functions by the spin eigenstates of the excitons $js_1; s_2$ i. A fter a straightforward unitary transform ation one gets the interaction matrix elements W s1s2;s3s4 (R) as shown in Table I for columns $js_3s_4 i$ and row $shs_1s_2 j$. Here $U_q = 1=2 U_q^a U_q^s$ and sim ilar for the lower hole index. We can clearly see the block structure of the interaction which re ects the conservation of the total spin $s_1 + s_2 = s_3 + s_4$. The interaction channels can be classi ed as follows: There is the direct channel where an initial state js_1 ; s_2 i will rem ain unchanged. The other channel is of exchange type with a change in the initial state due to three di erent processes: Exchange of electrons, exchange of holes, and exchange of both simultaneously. The electron-hole exchange process (longitudinal-transverse splitting of the exciton) has



Table I: Spin structure of the exciton-exciton interaction W $_{\rm sls2;s3s4}$ (R) in quantum wells.



Table II: Spin structure of the exciton-exciton interaction W $_{\rm sls2;s3s4}$ (R) in the case of in nitely heavy holes.

been neglected already in the starting H am iltonian.

In a case where the hole m ass is much larger than the electron m ass, the exchange of holes becomes negligible and the four dierent potentials [Eq. (5)] collapse into two, $U^a = U_q^a$ and $U^s = U_q^s$, which correspond to wave functions properly symmetrized only with respect to the electrons. In this case the interaction part of the H am iltonian simplies to the form shown in Table II where $U = 1=2 (U^a \quad U^s)$ and can be cast into the form given in the Appendix, [Eq. (A1)].

III. EFFECTIVE INTERACTION POTENTIALS

To derive the spatial dependence of the interaction potentials introduced in Sec.II, approximations have been introduced in the literature. In the in nitely heavyhole limit, the Heitler-London ansatz is well known from atom ic physics and has recently been brought into exciton physics by 0 kum ura and 0 gawa.⁹ In a bulk sem iconductor, the two excitons resem ble a hydrogen m olecule in this limit. The problem of four particles (two electrons and two holes) simplies here to a two-particle problem for the electrons, while the hole-hole distance R enters as a parameter. Therefore, the Coulomb potential between the holes gives just a xed additional term in the H am iltonian. The two-exciton wave function can then be written as a properly antisymmetrized product of singleexciton wave functions in the 1s ground state (r), centered around the position of each hole. For the spatial part of the two-exciton wave function, we can write

$$r_{r_{1}}(r_{1};r_{2}) = \frac{1}{p_{\overline{2}}} \frac{(r_{1})(r_{2}-p_{\overline{R}})(r_{1}-R)(r_{1}-R)}{p_{\overline{1}-O^{2}(R)}};$$

(6)

7

with the wave function overlap,

$$D(R) = dr(r)(r R);$$
 (7)

which leads to the potentials,

$$U^{a}(R) = \frac{U_{d}(R) - U_{x}(R)}{1 + O^{2}(R)};$$

$$U^{a}(R) = \frac{U_{d}(R) + U_{x}(R)}{1 - O^{2}(R)};$$
(8)

with direct $U_d(R)$ and exchange $U_x(R)$ potential [explicit expressions are given in the Appendix, Eq.(A4) and Eq.(A5)].

A simplied version of the Heitler-London approximation, which has usually been applied to excitonic systems, 5,6,8,37 is the famous Hartree-Fock treatment where the normalization denominator in Eq.(6) is left out and is consequently missing in Eq.(8). This scheme e can easily be generalized to arbitrary hole masses. However, it leads to a nonlocal exchange potential⁵ and to problem s with the orthogonality of the basis states.³⁸

To improve over the approximations discussed so far, we have solved the Schrodinger equation for the two electrons numerically using the Lanczos algorithm, treating the holes as in nitely heavy and thus immobile. The equation to be solved reads

$$\frac{\sim^{2}}{2} (r_{1} + r_{2}) + v_{ee} (r_{2} r_{1}) + v_{hh} (R) v_{eh} (r_{1})$$
$$v_{eh} (r_{2}) v_{eh} (r_{2} R) v_{eh} (r_{1} R) {}^{p} (r_{1}; r_{2})$$
$$= (2B_{X} + U^{p} (R)) {}^{p} (r_{1}; r_{2});$$
(9)

where is the electron mass in the plane and B_X is the single-exciton binding energy. The zero of energy is chosen to be the band gap. Fig.1 shows the resulting electric interaction potentials in Hartree-Fock, Heitler-London, and full numerical quality exemplarily for a strictly two-dimensional system. We note the unphysical behavior of the Hartree-Fock antisymmetric potential which approaches zero for small distances. It also misses the proper sequence of the antisymmetric channel to be above the symmetric one for small distances.

This is the result of leaving out the norm alization denom inator in Eq. (6). Thus these problems are corrected in the Heitler-London treatment. Here also the antisym metric channel shows the expected C oulomb singularity of the hole-hole potential for small distances. In the full solution the energy is lowered compared to the Heitler-London approximation by a mutual deformation of the excitonic orbitals. P lease note that the van der W aals e ect is included due to the nonperturbative nature of the calculation.



Figure 1: E ective interaction potentials for the strictly two-dimensional system : full calculation results (solid lines), Heitler-London approximation (dashed lines), and Hartree-Fock approximation (dot-dashed lines) plotted vs distance in units of the three-dimensional (3D) (bulk) exciton Bohr radius $a_{\rm B}$. The vertical axis is given in units of the bulk exciton Rydberg energy Ry . Antisymmetric channels are displayed in gray, while symmetric channels have black lines.

W hile the considerations above are correct also in three dim ensions, we turn now to the two-dim ensional case of quantum structures. All vectors are to be understood as lying in the x-y plane, the z-axis being the growth direction.

We note that all interaction potentials in Fig.1 approach zero from positive values and hence show a repulsion for larger distances, although this is hardly seen in Fig.1. However, this behavior follows already from a multipole expansion of the direct potential U_d (R), which dominates the interaction at large distances. In such an approach we treat the exciton as a static charge distribution (r;z) with cylindrical sym metry and centered at zero cm. coordinate. The speci c form of (r;z) depends on the system under investigation and will be specied later. Due to the charge neutrality of the exciton the multipole expansion starts with the dipole term / 1=R³, where R denotes the in plane cm. distance of the two excitons. Up to the quadrupole term we obtain for the

asym ptotics

R ! 1 : U_d(R) =
$$\frac{e_0^2}{R^3}$$
 hzi²
+ $\frac{e_0^2}{R^5} \frac{9}{4} x^2 z^{2^2} + 3$ hzi z $3x^2 z^2$; (10)

where the angular brackets denote averaging over (r;z). For a bulk system with spherical symmetry we see in m ediately that the multipole expansion vanishes as expected. However, for the reduced symmetry of quasitwo-dimensional systems, we get nite multipoles also for in-plane circular symmetry. Even for the strictly twodimensional system, where z 0, there is a contribution from the quadrupole-quadrupole interaction $(/ 1=R^5)$. This holds as well for symmetric single QW s where hzi = 0 due to the mirror symmetry along the z-axis. The direct interaction thus falls o as a power law rather than exponentially, which has been overlooked in a recent investigation of the asymptotic XX potential.²⁵ In Fig.2 we compare the asymptotic behavior of the numerically calculated direct potential [Eq. (A 4)], and the result from the multipole expansion [Eq. (10)] using the strictly two-dimensional charge distribution for an im- 2 (r) and the usual mobile hole (r;z) =(z) (r) Coulomb potentials [Eq. (2)]. The multipole expansion holds for R & 9 a_B . The full solution shows the van der W aals e ect and lies below the direct potential. However, this e ect is not able to overcom e the repulsive nature of the asymptotic potential. To grasp this e ect a



Figure 2: A sym ptotic behavior of the potentials on a double logarithm ic plot for the strictly two-dimensional system : full calculation (solid), Heitler-London (dashed) and multipole expansion (dot-dashed); sym metric states lie on top of antisym metric ones.

bit m ore quantitatively, we plot in Fig.3 the di erence between the direct potential from the approximations of rigid orbitals and a corresponding quantity for the full solution ($U_d^{full} = 1=2 (U^a + U^s)$). For very large distances R 10 a_B, we this di erence to a van derW aalspotential, i.e., a / $1=R^6$ power law (dashed line in Fig.3). The van derW aals law holds only for distances R & $9a_B$. For



Figure 3: The van der W aals e ect in the strictly twodimensional system. Deviation of the full calculation from the direct potential for asymptotic large distances (solid line) and tted van der W aals like potential / $1=R^{6}$ (dashed line).

sm aller distances higher-order e ects com e in and spoil the / 1=R 6 dependence.

W ith the derived e ective interaction potentials, we construct the two-dimensional Schrodinger equation for two excitons with mutual distance R in cm. space, where we introduce now the nite exciton mass $M = m_e + m_h$ in the kinetic term :

where m denotes the angular quantum number. P lease note the m issing factor of 2 in the denom inator of the kinetic term since we have to consider the reduced m ass of two excitons, x = M = 2.

IV. MODEL SYSTEM S

To test the reliability of our Bom-Oppenheim er-type m ethod, we calculate the biexciton binding energy $B_{X,X}$ from the lowest state of Eq.(11) with m = 0 for di erent m ass ratios = $m_e = m_h$ in the strictly two-dimensional limit. These results are compared in Fig.4 with variational calculations from the literature³² which are numerically exact. As expected, ourmethod produces exact results for = 0. For nonzero mass ratio we underestime at the binding energy slightly, e.g., for = 0.3 we have an error of 8%. Even for = 1 the error is only about 12%. We conclude that the method is a reasonable approximation for GaAs quantum structures (= 0.3), which will be under investigation in Sec.V. We plot the



Figure 4: Haynes factor $f_H = B_{X|X} = B_X$ for the di erent potentials in the strictly two-dimensional system : full calculation (solid line), Heitler-London potential (dashed line), and Hartree-Fock potential (dot-dashed line) plotted vs mass ratio = $m_e = m_h$. The dots are numerically exact values from Ref.32.

Haynes factor $f_H = B_{X|X} = B_X$ for the other approxim ations as well (for the strictly two-dimensional system, $B_X = 4Ry$). The Heitler-London approximation underestimates the biexciton binding energy signicantly. Hartree-Fock seems to do much better, but note that for small the Haynes factor is overestimated, which is in contrast to the variational principle.

A simple model for a coupled quantum well structure is the so-called bilayer system $:^{39}$ E lectrons and holes are con ned each in in nitely narrow planes with a separation d between the layers. This separation of unequal charges leads to a reduced C oulom b interaction between particles in di erent layers but leaves the potentials between particles of the same kind unchanged,

$$v_{\rm eh}(r) = \frac{p}{r^2 + d^2}; \quad v_{\rm ee}(r) = v_{\rm hh}(r) = \frac{e_0^2}{r};$$
 (12)

The charge distribution reads now (r;z) = (z) (r)

 $(z d)^{2}(r)$, and the expansion $\mathbb{E}q.(10)$] yields a nite dipole-dipole interaction / $1=R^3$, resulting in a strong long-range repulsion. For the many-exciton problem we are in particular interested in the biexciton formation. Fig.5 shows the biexciton binding energy versus charge separation for a mass ratio of = 0.3 and = 0:5. In both cases we nd a fast reduction of B_{XX} with increasing separation between the layers as expected. At a certain critical charge separation d_{crit}, denoted by arrow s in Fig.5, the biexciton ceases to exist. The same model system has been investigated by Tan et al.³⁹ using quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) technique. From their results at interm ediate values of d, which agree nicely with our own calculations, the authors suggested an exponential decay of B_{XX} for large d. The inset of Fig.5 shows the potential in the sym m etric channel for di erent values of

the charge separation. It is clearly seen how the potential minimum passes through zero with increasing d and vanishes completely if d is enlarged further (large arrow). Therefore a (nite) critical charge separation d_{crit} exists where the biexciton binding energy becomes zero due to the dom inant dipole-dipole repulsion. More recently this critical behavior was also observed in QMC calculations of Lee and Needs.⁴⁰ In Fig.6 we plot the critical charge



Figure 5: B iexciton binding energy in the bilayer system plotted vs charge separation at = 0.5 (solid line) and = 0.3 (dashed line). The arrows denote the corresponding critical charge separation $d_{\rm crit}$. Curves in the inset show the sym metric potential U^s (R) for d = 0.8, 0.9, 1.0, and 1.1 in units of the 3D exciton Bohr radius a_B .

separation vsm ass ratio. Below this curve, in the shaded area, bound states can be form ed, while above no biexcitons exist. For sm all we obtain a rapid decrease of the critical charge separation. For larger m ass ratios, on the other hand, the separation does not depend much on . This behavior resembles Fig.4, revealing a direct connection between biexciton binding energy and critical charge separation.

V. RESULTS FOR COUPLED QUANTUM W ELLS

W e turn now to realistic coupled quantum well structures, having G aA s as well material and barriers made of A l_xG a_{1 x}A s. In this case we treat the C oulom b interaction v_{ab} (r) in single sublevel approximation, ^{33,41} which is given by

$$v_{ab}(\mathbf{r}) = e_0^2 \quad dz^0 dz \frac{u_a^2(z^0) u_b^2(z^0 - z)}{r^2 + (z - z^0)^2}; \quad (13)$$

Here, r is again an in-plane vector, and $u_e(z)$ and $u_h(z)$ denote the con nem ent functions of the lowest sublevel for electron and hole. They enter as well the static charge distribution of the exciton: $(r;z) = u_h^2(z)$ (r)



Figure 6: Critical charge separation in units of the bulk exciton Bohr radius a_B plotted vsm ass ratio = $m_e = m_h$.

 u_{a}^{2} (z) ² (r). Fig.7 shows the e ective interaction potentials for a G aA s/A $l_{0:3}$ G $a_{0:7}$ A s coupled quantum well geom etry used by Butov²⁸ with a nom inal (i.e., center distance between the wells) charge separation of d = 12 nm(sam ple A in Table III). We see again the already discussed features of the three approximation levels. The energy gain when going from Heitler-London to the full calculation yields a minimum for the symmetric channel, which however is so weak that no biexcitons can be form ed. This feature strongly depends on the geometry of the quantum wells, which is illustrated in Fig.8. Here the full calculation potentials for sample A are compared to another one used by Snoke et al.⁴² where d = 14 nm(sam ple B in Table III). Due to the larger charge separation no m in im um can be seen in the symmetric channel. This observation is consistent with the results obtained for the idealized (bilayer) model discussed in Sec. IV.

Table III: D etails of the used CQW geometry together with the calculated binding energy $B_{\rm X}$ of the indirect exciton.

	Sam ple A	Sam ple B
W ellwidth L $_{\rm z}$ (nm)	8:0	10:0
Barrier width (nm)	4:0	4:0
d (nm)	12:0	14:0
d _e (nm)	10:8	12:7
Static eld (kV/cm)	30.0	36.0
B _X (meV)	4:0	3:5

W ith these results a simple explanation for the regular bead pattern in the luminescence ring at low temperatures²⁷⁽²⁹ has to be nuled out: It was speculated^{25,26} that the van der W aals e ect could overcome the dipole-dipole repulsion, resulting in an attraction between spatially indirect excitons, which would lead to a spontaneous patterning. Our calculation shows that this is not the case in agreem ent with recent experimental investigations.^{43,44} In R ef.25 the quadrupole-quadrupole



Figure 7: Interaction potentials for sample A: full calculation results (solid lines), Heitler-London potentials (dashed lines), and Hartree-Fock potentials (dot-dashed lines) plotted vs distance. Antisym metric channels have gray lines, while sym metric channels have black ones.

interaction in two-dimensional systems has been overlooked and hence the role of the van der W aals force overestim ated as discussed in Sec.IV.



Figure 8: C om parison of the full calculation results for sam ple A (solid lines) and sam ple B (dashed lines). A ntisym metric channels have gray lines, while sym metric channels have black ones.

VI. EXCITON BLUESHIFT AND BROADENING

W e turn now to the calculation of the interaction induced blueshift and broadening which can be observed in photolum inescence experim ents.^{42,45,46} In a point charge treatment of spatially indirect excitons, we have from Eq.(A4)

$$U_{d}(R) = v_{hh}(R) + v_{ee}(R) 2v_{eh}(R)$$
: (14)

P lugging in Eq.(12) for the bilayer system, one gets a dipole-dipole repulsion of the form

$$U_{d}(\mathbf{R}) = e_{0}^{2} \frac{2}{\mathbf{R}} = \frac{p}{\mathbf{R}^{2} + d^{2}} :$$
 (15)

A ssum ing a hom ogeneous exciton density $n_{\rm X}$, this leads to a blueshift,

$$_{0} = \int_{0}^{Z} d^{2}R U_{d} (R) n_{X} = d \frac{e^{2}}{0} n_{X} :$$
 (16)

Since this expression is consistent with the electrostatics of a plate capacitor, it is often referred to as capacitor form ula.⁴⁷ W e will derive a corrected form ula for the blueshift and the scattering-induced broadening using the electrice interaction potentials given in Fig.8. The exciton selfenergy is calculated in a T-m atrix approach.³⁴ In the low-density limit and assuming complete spin equilibrium, we write the two-body T-m atrix equation as

hq jT^p(z) jq⁰⁰ i = U^p_{q q⁰⁰}
$$X \frac{U^{p}_{q q^{0}}}{2_{q^{0}} \sim z} hq^{0} jT^{p}(z) jq^{00} i:$$
(17)

The T-matrix enters the quasiparticle self-energy as boson-direct (D) and boson-exchange (X),

$$_{k}(_{k}) = 4$$
 $_{q}^{X}$ $_{hq}jT^{D}(z)jqi+hqjT^{X}(z)jqi$
 $_{q}^{R}$ $n_{B} \frac{2}{2M}(k+2q)^{2}$; (18)

where ${\sim}z={\sim}^2q^2{=}M$ + i0 is put on shell and n_B () is the exciton distribution function, which is later taken as the low-density M axwell-Boltzm ann expression. The spin structure of the H am iltonian yields the following decomposition in the limit of immobile holes:

 $T^{D} = 3T^{a} + T^{s}$ and $T^{X} = 3=2T^{a}$ 1=2 T^{s} : (19)

The on-shell T-m atrix needed in Eq.(18) depends exclusively on the phase shifts ${}^{\rm p}_{\rm m}$ (q) via 48

hqjT^p(z)j qi =
$$\frac{2}{M} \frac{X}{m}$$
 (1)^m $\frac{4}{i \cot(\frac{p}{m}(q))}$: (20)

We have extracted the phase shifts from the asymptotics of the solution of the radial Schrodinger equation [Eq.(11)] for $E = -^2q^2 = M$. Results for the total complex scattering am plitude [curly bracket in Eq.(18)] are shown in Fig.9. P lease note that for large momenta q, the real part of the scattering am plitude approaches the prediction of the capacitor form ula but with an elective charge separation d_e which is somewhat below the nom inalone



Figure 9: Real (solid line) and imaginary (dashed line) parts of the scattering amplitude as a function of momentum for sample A.Included is the M axwell distribution at T = 100 K to show the relevant values for q. The ordinate has been norm alized to the capacitor value [Eq. (16)].

(third and forth row of Table III). This reduction is due to the spatial extension of electron and hole charges along z. A simple argument assuming connement wave functions for in nite barriers leads to $d_e = d = 0.1267 L_z$. This is quite close to the numerical value which follows from replacing the point charge potential [Eq.(15)] in Eq.(16) by the numerically derived one.

U sing the scattering am plitude, we calculate the quasiparticle shift and broadening at the dispersion edge (k = 0) and introduce correction factors f_1 (T), f_2 (T) to the capacitor form ula

$$_{0}(0) = d \frac{e^{2}}{0.5} n_{X} (f_{1}(T)) if_{2}(T)) :$$
 (21)

The real part of this quantity is the blueshift of the exciton due to the repulsive interaction, while the in aginary part can be associated with a nite broadening. P lease note that with the sign convention used, Im is negative. The correction factors shown in Fig.10 reduce the capacitor result dram atically. Therefore, the density for a measured blueshift would be underestimated by a factor of 10 at low temperatures. The broadening is of the same order of magnitude, which is consistent with experimental ndings.

VII. EXCITON EXCITON CORRELATION FUNCTION

The signi cant reduction of the quasiparticle shift com pared to the capacitor value can be explained with a strong depletion of the exciton gas around a given exciton due to the repulsive interaction. To grasp this repulsive correlation m ore directly we calculate the exciton pair-



Figure 10: Correction factors to the capacitor form ula in dependence on tem perature for sam ple A (solid lines) and sam – ple B (dashed lines). The upper panel shows f_1 (blueshift), while the lower one shows f_2 (broadening).

correlation function:

$$g_{ss^{0}}(\mathbb{R}) = \frac{D}{\frac{\sum_{s}^{y}(\mathbb{R}) - \sum_{s^{0}}^{y}(0) - \sum_{s^{0}}^{s}(0) - \sum_{s}^{y}(0)}{\sum_{s^{0}}^{y}(0) - \sum_{s^{0}}^{y}(0) - \sum_{s^{0}}^{z}(0)} = \frac{1}{n_{s}n_{s^{0}}} \frac{X}{kk^{0}q} e^{iqR} - \frac{y}{ks} \sum_{k^{0}+qs^{0}}^{y} - k^{0}s^{0}} + qs$$
(22)

It has the same spin structure as the T-m atrix. In the spin equilibrated situation investigated here, the exciton density $n_{\rm s}$ does not depend on spin. Sum m ing over both spin indices, we obtain with a partial wave decom position,

$$g(R) = \frac{P_{k \neq m} \exp \left(\frac{-\lambda^{2} k^{2}}{M k_{B} T} - \frac{n}{3 j_{m}^{a}(R) j_{r}^{2} + j_{m}^{s}(R) j_{r}^{2} + (1)^{m} - \frac{3}{2} j_{m}^{a}(R) j_{r}^{2} - \frac{1}{2} j_{m}^{s}(R) j_{r}^{2}}{4 k_{B} k_{B} T} e^{-\lambda k_{B$$

The results shown in Fig.11 re ect the strong repulsion of the excitons independent of the spin channel. It is interesting to compare with the pair-correlation function of ideal bosons and ferm ions having four spin degrees of freedom as well. O by iously in the present case, the repulsive interaction between excitons is much more in portant than the bosonic nature of their statistics.



Figure 11: Exciton pair-correlation function vs distance at a temperature of T = 6K. The solid line refers to the calculated exciton-exciton potential for sam ple A. The dashed line represents ideal bosons, while the dot-dashed line holds for ideal ferm ions.

much richer spin structure with spatially dependent interaction potentials than with just contact interactions. This is due to non trivial exchange processes of the ferm ionic constituents. For the spatially dependence of the potentials, we com pared three di erent levels of approximation: The Hartree-Fock and the Heitler-London approximations as well as a newly introduced full numerical solution of the two exciton problem . We found a principal failure of the Hartree-Fock treatment, which is cured in the Heitler-London approach. The quality of the latter, how ever, turns out to be quite poor, com pared to num erically exact results. W ith our calculated potentials we have investigated bilayer system s and two di erent CQW s. The charge separation d plays a fundam ental role: By tuning d a transition happens from system swith possible biexciton form ation to those where biexcitons are not bound due to the stronger XX repulsion. For two realistic CQW structures we have calculated the quasiparticle shift and broadening at the band edge which govern roughly the photolum inescence line shape. At low tem peratures, we found a dram atic reduction of the blueshift compared to a naive treatment of the CQW as plate capacitor. The broadening turns out to be of the sam e order as the blueshift.

A cknow ledgm ents

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In the investigation of the many-exciton problem in semiconductor quantum structures, we have found a Num erous stim ulating discussions with Leonid Butov, Boris Laikhtman, V incenzo Savona, and D ave Snoke are gratefully acknow ledged.

Appendix A :

In the lim it of in nitely heavy holes, the interaction part of the many-exciton H am iltonian (Table II) can be written as^{33}

$$H_{X X}^{int} = \frac{1}{2}^{Z} dR dR^{0} U^{a} (R R^{0})^{X} \frac{y}{s} (R) \frac{y}{s^{0}} (R^{0}) \frac{y}{s^{0}} ($$

For the simpli cations of contact potentials $U^{p}(\mathbb{R} \mathbb{R}^{0}) = U^{p}(\mathbb{R} \mathbb{R}^{0})$, our result agrees with the one derived by de-Leon and Laikhtman.⁸ This can be seen as follows: Plugging the contact potentials into Eq. (A1) the integration over \mathbb{R}^{0} can be carried out immediately,

$$H_{XX}^{int} = \frac{1}{2} U^{a} \frac{X}{dR} \int_{s^{0}}^{x} R \int_{s^{0}}^{y} R \int_{s^{0}}^{y} R \int_{s^{0}}^{y} R \int_{s^{0}}^{s} R \int_{s^{0}}^{x} R \int_{s^{0}}^{x} R \int_{s^{0}}^{x} R \int_{s^{0}}^{x} R \int_{s^{0}}^{x} R \int_{s^{0}}^{y} R \int_{s^{0}}^{y} R \int_{s^{0}}^{y} R \int_{s^{0}}^{y} R \int_{s^{0}}^{x} R \int_{s^{$$

In this lim it, the third row of Eq. (A 1) gives no contribution. We can also drop the H eaviside step function by inserting a factor of 1=2 to account for the double counting in the sum over s and s⁰ and get

$$H_{XX}^{int} = \frac{1}{2} U^{a} \frac{X}{dR} \int_{s^{0}}^{x} (R) \int_{s^{0}}^{y} (R) \int_{s^{0}}^{y} (R) \int_{s^{0}}^{y} (R) \int_{s}^{x} (R) \int_{s}^{x} (R) \int_{s}^{x} (R) \int_{s^{0}}^{x} (R) \int_$$

In the language of the H artree Fock approximation, we can trade the symmetric and the antisymmetric potentials for the direct and the exchange ones. For arbitrary hole masses, U_d (R) and U_x (R) have been derived in the literature.⁶ For immobile holes they reduce to the direct potential,

$$U_{d}(R) = v_{hh}(R) + dr dr^{0} (r)v_{ee}(r r^{0}) (r^{0} R) (r^{0} R) (r^{0} r^{0} R); \qquad (A4)$$

and the exchange potential,

$$U_{x}(R) = O^{2}(R)v_{hh}(R) \qquad drdr^{0}(r)(r R)v_{ee}(r r^{0})(r^{0}(r) + 2O(R)) drv_{eh}(r)(r)(r R): (A5)$$

Taken in the contact lim it U^a = U_d + U_x and U^s = U_d U_x, Eq. (A 3) can be written as

$$H_{XX}^{int} = \frac{1}{2} U_{d} \overset{Z}{dR} \overset{X}{}_{s}^{y}(R) \overset{Y}{}_{s^{0}}(R) \overset{Y}{}_{s^{0}}(R) \overset{Y}{}_{s}(R) \overset{X}{}_{s}(R) \overset{X}{}$$

Г

The Fourier transform of this result yields the Ham iltonian derived in Ref.8.

Electronic address: Christoph.Schindler@wsi.tum.de

7

¹ R.Knox, Theory of Excitons, Solid State Physics Suppl. 5

(A cadem ic, New York, 1963).

- ² T.Usui, Progr. Theor. Phys. 23, 787 (1960).
- ³ L.V.Keldysh and A.N.Kozlov, Sov.Phys.JETP 27,521 (1968).
- ⁴ E.Hanamura and H.Haug, Phys.Rep. 33, 209 (1977).
- ⁵ C.Ciuti, V.Savona, C.Pierm arocchi, A.Quattropani, and P.Schwendim ann, Phys. Rev. B 58, 7926 (1998).
- ⁶ J.-i. Inoue, T.Brandes, and A.Shim izu, Phys.Rev.B 61, 2863 (2000).
- ⁷ G.Rochat, C.Ciuti, V.Savona, C.Piem arocchi, A.Quattropani, and P.Schwendimann, Phys. Rev. B 61, 13856 (2000).
- ⁸ S.Ben-Tabou de-Leon and B.Laikhtman, Phys.Rev.B 63, 125306 (2001).
- ⁹ S. Okumura and T. Ogawa, Phys. Rev. B 65, 035105 (2001).
- ¹⁰ An early attemp including some features of the Heitler-London m ethod to excitons is found in: A. I. Bobrysheva, phys. stat. sol. 16, 337 (1966).
- ¹¹ S.A. Moskalenko, Sov. Phys. Solid State 4, 199 (1962), (Engl. Transl.).
- ¹² Y.E. Lozovik and V. I. Yudson, JETP Lett. 22, 274 (1975).
- ¹³ L.V.Keldysh and Y.V.Kopaev, Sov.Phys.Solid State 6, 2219 (1965), (Engl.Transl.).
- ¹⁴ L.V. Butov, A. Zrenner, G. Abstreiter, G. Bohm, and G.W eim ann, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 304 (1994).
- ¹⁵ V. B. Tim ofeev, A. V. Larionov, M. Grassi-Alessi, M. Capizzi, and J.M. Hvam, Phys. Rev. B 61, 8420 (2000).
- ¹⁶ L.V.Butov, C.W.Lai, A.L.Ivanov, A.C.Gossard, and D.S.Chem la, Nature 417, 47 (2002).
- ¹⁷ D.Snoke, S.Denev, Y.Liu, L.P fei er, and K.W est, Nature 418, 754 (2002).
- ¹⁸ D. Snoke, Science 298, 1368 (2002).
- ¹⁹ R.Rapaport, G.Chen, and S.H.Sim on, Phys. Rev. B 73, 033319 (2006).
- ²⁰ G.Chen, R.Rapaport, L.N.P eifer, K.W est, P.M.Platzman, S.Simon, Z.Voros, and D.Snoke, Phys. Rev. B 74, 045309 (2006).
- ²¹ Z. Voros, D. W. Snoke, L. P fei er, and K. W est, Phys. Rev.Lett. 97, 016803 (2006).
- ²² A.T.Hammack, M.Griswold, L.V.Butov, L.E.Smallwood, A.L.Ivanov, and A.C.Gossard, Phys.Rev.Lett. 96, 227402 (2006).
- ²³ A. T. Hammack, L. V. Butov, L. Mouchliadis, A. L. Ivanov, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. B 76, 193308 (2007).

- ²⁴ G.Aichmayr, M. Jetter, L.Vina, J.Dickerson, F.Camino, and E.E.Mendez, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 2433 (1999).
- ²⁵ V.I.Sugakov, Solid State Comm. 134, 63 (2005).
- ²⁶ C.S.Liu, H.G.Luo, and W.C.Wu, J.Phys.: Condens. M atter 18, 9659 (2006).
- ²⁷ L.V. Butov, A.C. Gossard, and D.S. Chem la, Nature 418, 751 (2002).
- ²⁸ L.V.Butov, Solid State Comm. 127, 89 (2003).
- ²⁹ D.Snoke, Y.Liu, S.Denev, L.P fei er, and K.W est, Solid State Comm. 127, 187 (2003).
- ³⁰ D.A.Kleinman, Phys. Rev. B 28, 871 (1983).
- ³¹ R. C. Miller, D. A. Kleinman, A. C. Gossard, and O. Munteanu, Phys. Rev. B 25, 6545 (1982).
- ³² J. Usukura, Y. Suzuki, and K. Varga, Phys. Rev. B 59, 5652 (1999).
- ³³ R.Zim m erm ann and C.Schindler, Solid State Comm. 144, 395 (2007).
- ³⁴ R.Zimmermann, phys.stat.sol. (b) 243, 2358 (2006).
- ³⁵ S.Ben-Tabou de-Leon and B.Laikhtm an, Europhys.Lett. 59, 728 (2002).
- ³⁶ J. J. Forney, A. Quattropani, and F. Bassani, Il Nuovo C in ento 22, 153 (1974).
- ³⁷ R.Zimmermann, Solid State Comm. 134, 43 (2005).
- ³⁸ B. Laikhtm an, J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 19, 295214 (2007).
- ³⁹ M.Y.J.Tan, N.D.D rum m ond, and R.J.Needs, Phys. Rev.B 71, 033303 (2005).
- ⁴⁰ R.M. Lee and R.N eeds (2008), private communication.
- ⁴¹ S. de-Leon and B. Laikhtman, Phys. Rev. B 61, 2874 (2000).
- ⁴² D.W. Snoke, Y.Liu, Z.Voros, L.P fei er, and K.W est, Solid State Comm. 134, 37 (2005).
- ⁴³ R.Rapaport, G.Chen, D.Snoke, S.H.Simon, L.Pfeier, K.West, Y.Liu, and S.Denev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 117405 (2004).
- ⁴⁴ S.Yang, A.V.M intsev, A.T.Hammack, L.V.Butov, and A.C.Gossard, Phys. Rev. B 75, 033311 (2007).
- ⁴⁵ L.V.Butov, A. Im am oglu, A.A. Shashkin, V.T.Dolgopolov, A.V.M intsev, S. Feklisov, K.L.Campman, and A.C.Gossard, phys.stat.sol. (a) 178, 83 (2000).
- ⁴⁶ V.Negoita, D.W. Snoke, and K.Eberl, Phys. Rev. B 61, 2779 (2000).
- ⁴⁷ X.Zhu, P.B.Littlewood, M.S.Hybertsen, and T.M.Rice, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 1633 (1995).
- ⁴⁸ S.A.Morgan, M.D.Lee, and K.Burnett, Phys.Rev.A 65, 022706 (2002).