Prediction of the spin triplet two-electron quantum dots in Si: towards controlled quantum simulations of magnetic systems
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Ground state of two-electron quantum dots in single-valley materials like GaAs is always a spin singlet regardless of what the potential and interactions are. This statement cannot be generalized to the multi-valley materials like n-doped Si. Here we calculate the spectrum of a two-electron Si quantum dot analytically and numerically and show for the first time that the dot with the lateral size of several nm can have the spin triplet ground state which is impossible in the single-valley materials. Predicted singlet-triplet level crossing in two-electron Si quantum dots can potentially establish the platform for quantum simulation of magnetic many-body systems based on the triplet quantum dots. We suggest several examples of such systems that open a way to controlled quantum simulations within the condensed matter setting.

I. INTRODUCTION

Electrons in Si have the valley degree of freedom, which makes them qualitatively different from electrons in atoms or in one-valley materials. In this paper we concentrate on properties of two-electron bound states in Si. In atomic physics the ground state of two bound electrons is always a spin singlet. This is a general property that is independent of potential well and interactions. The proof of this statement is based on that the ground state wave function in one-valley materials must have no nodes. This is no longer valid for multi-valley electrons such as electrons in Si, whose ground state wave functions can have arbitrary number of nodes. In this paper we, for the first time, predict the regime when the ground state of a tunable two-electron Si quantum dot is the spin triplet.

Tunable quantum dots are typically built in heterostructures where the potential along the z axis is presented by the layer edges and is much stronger than the lateral (x,y) potential that is controlled by the electrostatic gates. Tunneling between valleys lifts the valley degeneracy. Theoretical calculation of the single-electron valley splitting $\omega_0$ is itself a nontrivial tunneling problem that is very sensitive to the interface potential. The effect of Coulomb interaction in few electron Si quantum dots has been considered previously. The conclusion of Ref. was that the inter-valley Coulomb exchange effects are negligible for any size of the quantum dot. Hence the ground state of a two-electron dot in Si is always a spin singlet. Here we revisit this problem and predict values of the exchange matrix element by 2–3 orders of magnitude higher than that obtained in Ref. This makes a qualitative difference on the role of exchange Coulomb interaction. In particular, at the lateral size of a quantum dot smaller than several nm the exchange Coulomb interaction becomes larger than the valley splitting $\omega_0$ which experimental range is $\omega_0 \sim 0.1 – 1.5 \text{ meV}$, see Refs. This results in the triplet ground state which is a new physical phenomenon that has never been predicted before.

The singlet-triplet level crossing can be driven by the electrostatic gates controlling the quantum dot size and thus changing the ratio between the single-electron valley splitting $\omega_0$ and the exchange Coulomb matrix element. The tunable singlet-triplet level crossing can be used to create artificial multi-dot magnetic systems which exhibit strongly correlated many-body physics with externally driven quantum phase transitions. The spirit of this idea is similar to quantum simulations of the Mott-Hubbard model in arrays of quantum dots. However, absence of the charge dynamics in spin systems makes them almost insensitive to the Coulomb disorder which significantly reduces requirements to the quality of nanofabrication. The local spin measurements can be already done with the help of spin-polarized scanning tunneling microscopy. To be specific, we discuss Haldane spin 1 chain, the topological spin 1/2 edge states, and the quantum phase transition from Haldane chain to the “antiferromagnetic spin ladder”. We also discuss $O(3)$ quantum criticality in square arrays and underline quantum criticality in triangular arrays where the nature of quantum phase transition is not clearly understood theoretically.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we provide the theoretical model describing two-electron Si quantum dot. In Sec. III, we calculate the exchange Coulomb matrix element within the effective mass approximation. In Sec. IV, we calculate the Coulomb matrix elements exactly using the tight-binding electron wave function. The resulting low-energy spectrum of the two-electron quantum dot is presented in Sec. V. Possible applications of the triplet quantum dots for quantum simulations of the 1D and 2D spin-1 systems are proposed in Sec. VI. Conclusions are given in Sec. VII.
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\[ \sum_{i} c_{i+1,\sigma} c_{i,\sigma} + u c_{i+1,\sigma} c_{i,\sigma} + h.c. \]

\[ \langle \pm \rangle = \varphi_{\pm}(z) = e^{\pm i q z} \Phi(z), \] (5)

where \( \varphi(z) \) is the smooth envelope satisfying the Schrödinger equation:

\[ \left( \frac{p_z^2}{2m^*} + V(z) \right) \Phi(z) = E_0 \Phi(z). \] (6)

Here \( V(z) \) is the interface potential, \( p_z = -i \partial_z \) is the momentum operator along the \( z \) axis, \( m^* \approx 0.92 m \) is the effective mass, \( E_0 \) is the ground state energy.

The continuous limit is only applicable when two valleys are close i.e. \( q_0 \ll \pi/b \), however, in Si \( q_0 \approx 0.59 \pi/b \), the valley separation Eq. (5) is questionable. Further we provide exact numerical solution that does not require the continuous limit as well as the valley separation \( \Phi(z) \), but we believe that this simple analytical estimate provides an important insight to the problem. In the valley basis the single-particle Hamiltonian \( H \) has only off-diagonal matrix elements

\[ \langle + | H_z | - \rangle = - \langle - | H_z | + \rangle = \frac{\omega_0}{2}, \] (7)

where \( \omega_0 \) is the single-electron valley splitting.

\[ H_C = U_H \sum_{i} c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow} c_{i\downarrow} c_{i\uparrow} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} V_{ij} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\beta} c_{j\beta} c_{i\alpha}, \] (3)

\[ V_{ij} = \frac{V_0}{\sqrt{(i_x-j_x)^2 + (i_y-j_y)^2 + (i_z-j_z)^2}}, \] (4)

where \( V_0 = e^2/cb \) is the electron-electron interaction at nearest sites, \( e \) is the electron charge, \( \epsilon \) is the dielectric constant. In this paper we use the Coulomb parameters calculated in Ref. via DFT+U+V method: \( U_H \approx 3.5 eV, V_0 \approx 1.35 eV. \)
Two-electron matrix elements of the Coulomb interaction are presented in Fig. 1. The direct diagrams in Fig. 1(a) yield the same value and do not contribute to the two-electron level splitting. The diagrams where only one electron changes the valley index, Fig. 1(b), are exponentially suppressed \( \sim e^{-2q_0 d} \) due to the large difference \( \Delta q_2 = \pm 2q_0 \) between total initial and final momenta, see Appendix B. In the limit \( q_0 d \gg 1 \) we neglect them. The diagram in Fig. 1(c) corresponding to processes where the total momentum \( q_z \) is changed from \( 2q_0 \) to \(-2q_0 \) is doubly exponentially suppressed \( \sim e^{-4q_0 d} \) and we neglect it. The last diagram, Fig. 1(d), corresponds to the intervalley exchange scattering which is responsible for the singlet-triplet level crossing in two-electron Si quantum dots.

The Hubbard contribution to the exchange diagram, Fig. 1(d), within the EMA reads:

\[
M_{ex}^{(H)} = U_H b^3 \int \Phi^4(z)\phi^4(r) dz dr = U_H \frac{b^3}{d D^2},
\]

where we introduced the lateral size of the quantum dot \( D \) and the Si layer width \( d \) via the inverse participation ratios:

\[
\frac{1}{d} = \int \Phi^4(z) dz, \quad \frac{1}{D^2} = \int \phi^4(r) dr.
\]

The long-range Coulomb part of the interaction can be calculated analytically in the limit \( q_0 d \gg 1 \), see Appendix B:

\[
M_{ex}^{(V)} \approx \frac{\pi V_0 b}{q_0} \int \Phi^4(z)\phi^4(r) dz dr = \frac{\pi V_0}{(q_0 b)^2} \frac{b^3}{d D^2}.
\]

Both Coulomb matrix elements, Eq. (8) and Eq. (10), scale as \( \propto 1/dD^2 \) or equivalently, as \( 1/N_Q \), where \( N_Q \) is total number of Si atoms in the quantum dot. For a dot with \( d = 1 \text{ nm} \) and \( D = 4 \text{ nm} \) we obtain the following value of the exchange Coulomb matrix element in meV:

\[
M_{ex} = M_{ex}^{(H)} + M_{ex}^{(V)} \approx 4.73(eV) \frac{b^3}{d D^2} \approx 0.74. \tag{11}
\]

This value is by more than two orders of magnitude larger than that from Ref. 2 (with appropriate dot size scaling) and it is comparable with the observed single electron valley splitting \( \omega_0 \approx 4.73 \text{ meV} \). In order to obtain the sizable exchange Coulomb matrix element \( \omega_0 \), we need the lateral size \( D \) of the quantum dot to be sufficiently small, namely \( D \lesssim 5 \text{ nm} \). We argue that it is realistic because gate defined \( D \approx 10 \text{ nm} \) quantum dots are already possible, e.g. see Ref. 2.

### IV. EXACT COULOMB MATRIX ELEMENTS

To support our analytical estimates, we present exact numerical solution of the problem. First, we calculate the single electron valley splitting \( \omega_0 \) for three different shapes of the interface potential: rectangular, parabolic, and parabolic with \( \delta \)-doping. In the latter case we model the impurity-doped monolayer by a positively charged plane creating the potential \( \delta V(i z) = \alpha b |i z| \), where \( \alpha \) is the electric field created by the charged plane. For further calculations we choose \( \alpha = 15.4 \text{ meV/nm} \). All interface potentials are chosen such that the inverse participation ratio \( d = 1 \text{ nm} \) in all cases. Energies of four lowest states as well as the ground state splitting \( \omega_0 \) are shown in Table I. The ground state splitting for the rectangular well is large, \( \omega_0 \sim 10 \text{ meV} \), while for the parabolic well \( \omega_0 \) is practically zero. This illustrates the well-known result that \( \omega_0 \) appears due to the sharp interface. The moderate \( \delta \)-doping allows to obtain intermediate values of \( \omega_0 \) that are consistent with the experiments. For example, the chosen value of \( \alpha = 15.4 \text{ meV/nm} \) is sufficient to give \( \omega_0 = 0.3 \text{ meV} \).

Using exact eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian Eq. (11), we calculate the interaction matrix elements \( M_{abcd} \), for different interface potentials, see Table II. Indexes \( a, b, c, d \in \{1, 2\} \) label first two single electron states that are split by \( \omega_0 \), see Table I. In the notation \( M_{abcd} \) the

### TABLE I. Energies of four lowest states and the ground state splitting \( \omega_0 = \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1 \) (given in meV) for different shapes of the interface potential. The size of the ground state in all cases is \( d = 1 \text{ nm} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>shape</th>
<th>( \varepsilon_1 )</th>
<th>( \varepsilon_2 )</th>
<th>( \varepsilon_3 )</th>
<th>( \varepsilon_4 )</th>
<th>( \omega_0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td>73.87</td>
<td>85.79</td>
<td>287.10</td>
<td>317.61</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parabolic</td>
<td>105.08</td>
<td>105.08</td>
<td>310.64</td>
<td>310.64</td>
<td>( 6 \times 10^{-9} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta )-doping</td>
<td>110.22</td>
<td>110.52</td>
<td>321.18</td>
<td>321.21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II. Nonzero Coulomb matrix elements \( M_{abcd} \) (meV) for rectangular, parabolic and \( \delta \)-doped interface potentials. The dot lateral size is \( D = 4 \text{ nm} \), the Si layer width \( d = 1 \text{ nm} \). We present the Hubbard, \( U_H \), and the long-range Coulomb contributions, \( V \), see Eq. (11), as well as their sum. For direct matrix elements we also present their values with subtracted charging energy \( U_C = M_{1122} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( M_{1111} )</th>
<th>( M_{2222} )</th>
<th>( M_{1122} )</th>
<th>( M_{1212} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_H )</td>
<td>115.92</td>
<td>117.40</td>
<td>116.52</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U + U_H )</td>
<td>116.44</td>
<td>117.96</td>
<td>116.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V + U_H - U_C )</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parabolic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_H )</td>
<td>115.96</td>
<td>115.96</td>
<td>115.84</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U + U_H )</td>
<td>116.50</td>
<td>116.50</td>
<td>116.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V + U_H - U_C )</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta )-doping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_H )</td>
<td>116.25</td>
<td>116.23</td>
<td>116.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U + U_H )</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V + U_H - U_C )</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V + U_H - U_C )</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagonalizing ω splitting particle states that are separated by the single-particle valley following effective Hamiltonian: 

\[ E = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|12| + |21|) \]

The Coulomb matrix elements are in turn not sensitive to the details of interface and fully defined by the quantum dot geometry, see Eqs. (8), (10). From the relation \( M_{ex} \approx 2M_{1212} \), see Appendix B, and Table II it follows that \( M_{ex} \approx 0.5 \text{ meV} \), which is close to the crude analytical estimate (11).

\[ \begin{align*}
    \omega_0 &< \omega^* = \sqrt{\omega^2 - M_{1212}^2}, \\
    \omega &\approx \omega^* \approx 0.6 \text{ meV which is much smaller than the valley splitting } \omega_0 \approx 12 \text{ meV, so the ground state in this case is the spin singlet. However, for the parabolic and the } \delta \text{-doping models } \omega^* \approx 0.7 \text{ meV i.e. the ground state here is the spin triplet as } \omega_0 < \omega^*, \text{ see Table II.}
\end{align*} \]

VI. QUANTUM SIMULATIONS OF MAGNETIC SYSTEMS BASED ON THE TRIPLET QUANTUM DOTS

We further propose to use the triplet Si quantum dots as building blocks for simulation of quantum magnetic systems. Consider first a pair of two-electron quantum dots shown schematically in Fig. 3. The electron density shown by blue lines has width \( D = 4 \text{ nm} \). In absence of interaction this requires the depth of the lateral potential \( \sim 100 \text{ meV} \). Taking into account the charging energy \( U_C = M_{1122} \approx 116 \text{ meV} \), see Table II the depth of quantum dot potential should be at least 200 – 250 meV in order to accommodate two electrons. The size of the electron wave function \( D \) is controlled by the lateral gates and can drive the singlet-triplet level crossing inside the quantum dot. This allows us to consider a quantum dot as an effective site that can have spin zero, \( S = 0 \), in the singlet state or spin one, \( S = 1 \), in the triplet state. Let us also denote the on-site energy splitting \( E_T - E_S \) as \( \Delta \), where \( E_T (E_S) \) is the energy of the lowest triplet (singlet) state, see Eqs. (12), (13). Interaction between spins \( S_{12} \) in different quantum dots is due to the antiferromagnetic Anderson superexchange:

\[ H_J = J S_1 \cdot S_2, \quad J = \frac{4t^2}{U_C}, \]

where \( U_C \approx 116 \text{ meV} \) is the charging energy, \( t \) is the tunneling matrix element between the dots. Nontrivial many-body regime in an array of dots corresponds to \( J \sim \omega^* \sim \omega_0 \sim 1 \text{ meV} \). \( \omega^* \) is given in Eq. (15). It yields an estimate for the tunneling matrix element \( t \approx 5 \text{ meV} \) which corresponds to the distance between the dots \( R = 10 – 15 \text{ nm} \). Value of \( J \) is independently controllable by
the depth of the quantum well, see Fig. 3. Variation of the depth from 250 meV to 300 meV is changing J by several times.

Spin states of the single dot, S = 0, 1, can be described by a spin dimer consisting of two spins 1/2 with Hamiltonian \( H_d = \Delta (s_1 \cdot s_2) \), \( s_1 = s_2 = 1/2 \). \( \Delta = E_T - E_S \). Nearest dimers interact antiferromagnetically, Eq. [10]. Hence, using the bond operator representation, the array of dots can be mapped to an array of spin 1/2 dimers. It is well known that arrays of spin dimers manifest very rich many body physics. Here we point out only three specific examples illustrated in Fig. 4.

Consider first 1D array, Fig. 4(a). If \( \Delta < 0 \) and \(|\Delta| \gtrsim J\), the array represents Haldane spin chain, and hence, the topological spin 1/2 edge states can be observed experimentally. Increasing \( \Delta \), \( \Delta \to +0 \), one drives the Haldane chain through the quantum phase transition to the “antiferromagnetic spin ladder”. This would allow to observe fractionalization of spin excitations at the transition.

The 2D array of tunable dots (spin dimers) on square lattice, Fig. 4(b), manifests the O(3) quantum critical physics driven by variation of \( \Delta \), see e.g. Ref. 20. This physics is well understood theoretically, but experimentally it has been observed only in 3D spin-dimerized compounds. The 2D O(3) physics is different and it has never been observed experimentally.

The 2D array on triangular lattice, Fig. 4(c), is especially interesting. If \( \Delta < 0 \) and \(|\Delta| \gtrsim J\), this is the spin 1 antiferromagnet on the triangular lattice. Increasing \( \Delta \), \( \Delta \to +0 \), must drive the system to the quantum disordered state. Such an experiment can shed the light on the nature of this quantum phase transition which is not clearly understood theoretically.

**VII. CONCLUSIONS**

In conclusion, we predict theoretically the singlet-triplet level crossing in two-electron Si quantum dots. This phenomenon is especially remarkable as such a level crossing is not possible in single-valley materials. The level crossing can be controlled by electrostatic gates. It opens opportunity for controlled quantum simulations of magnetic systems where single magnetic site is given by a triplet quantum dot. Here we suggest to simulate 1D spin systems (e.g. Haldane spin 1 chain hosting topological spin 1/2 edges states) and 2D arrays of quantum dots that are expected to have rich critical phenomena not yet observed experimentally.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank Dimitrie Culcer, Susan Coppersmith, Andre Saraiva, Joe Salfi, and Alexander Yaresko for very important stimulating discussions. D.M and O.P.S acknowledge support of the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence in Future Low-Energy Electronics Technologies (project number CE17010039) and funded by the Australian Government. D.M acknowledges support of the Georg H. Endress foundation.

**Appendix A: FOLDED AND UNFOLDED BRILLOUIN ZONES**

Eigenstates of the 1D Hamiltonian Eq. 11 are plane waves:

\[
|q⟩ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}} \sum_{i_z} e^{iqb i_z} e^{i \xi_{iz}} |0⟩ \tag{A1}
\]

with the spectrum \( E_q = 2N \), \( 2N \) is the total number of Si atoms in the chain. Two minima of the dispersion correspond to \( \pm q_0 \). \( q_0 = \cos(–v /4u)/b \approx 0.59π/b \). This is the “unfolded” description, see Fig. 4.

We could alternatively consider the Si chain with the elementary cell consisting of two atoms, such that new lattice spacing is \( a = 2b = 2.7 \) Å, see Fig. 6. The wave function that accounts for the unit cell structure is then the following:

\[
|k⟩ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i_z} e^{ik a i_z} (αξ_{iz}^+ + βη_{iz}^+) |0⟩ \tag{A2}
\]

where \( ξ_{iz}^+ = c_{2iz}^+ (η_{iz}^+ = c_{2iz+1}^+) \) is the electron creation operator at the “circle” (“square”) cite of the lattice, see Fig. 5. \( N \) is the total number of unit cells in the lattice. The corresponding dispersion \( ε_k(k) \) and the Bloch amplitudes \( B_k(k) \) are the following:

\[
ε_±(k) = ε_0 + 2u \cos(ka) ± 2v \cos(kα/2), \tag{A3}
\]

\[
B_{±}(k) = \left( \begin{array}{c} α \\ β \end{array} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \\\n±e^{ika/2} \end{array} \right). \tag{A4}
\]

This is the “folded” description, see Fig. 6. Here we use quasimomentum \( k \) for the “folded” case, \( –π/a < k < π/a \) and \( q \) for the “unfolded” case, \( –π/b < q < π/b \).

\( ε_−(k) \) corresponds to the lower branch of dispersion, see Fig. 6. Minima of \( ε_−(k) \) are at \( ±k_0, k_0 = 2 \arccos(v/4u)/a \approx 0.82π/a \). The corresponding wave function \( \psi_−(z) \) can be written as

\[
\psi_−(z) = e^{ika} B_−(k), \tag{A5}
\]

where \( B_−(k) \) is the Bloch amplitude, Eq. [A4]. The overlap of Bloch amplitudes corresponding to two minima of the dispersion is then the following:

\[
|B_−^\dagger_−(−k_0) \cdot B_−(−k_0)| = \cos \left( \frac{k_0 a}{2} \right) = \frac{v}{4u} \approx 0.28 . \tag{A6}
\]
In this paper we use the “unfolded” description as it does not involve the Bloch amplitudes Eq. \( \text{[4]} \). However, in Ref.\( ^2 \) the “folded” description was used. The overlap of Bloch functions corresponding to different valleys, Eq. \( \text{[4]} \), was largely underestimated in Ref.\( ^2 \). This is the main reason why our result for the exchange Coulomb matrix element is more than two orders of magnitude higher than that in Ref.\( ^2 \) (with the appropriate dot size scaling).

Appendix B: ANALYTIC ESTIMATE OF THE EXCHANGE INTEGRAL

Here we take the continuous limit and use the effective mass approximation (EMA) to calculate the electron wave function \( \psi(z, r) \). It is convenient to work in the valley basis, see Eq. \( \text{[6]} \). Coulomb matrix elements, see Fig. \( \text{[1]} \) consist of the Hubbard and the long-range part. The long-range Coulomb part reads:

\[
M_{\mu\mu',\nu'\nu}^{(V)} = \frac{e^2}{\epsilon} \int \frac{e^{i\phi_1(\mu-\mu')z_1}e^{i\phi_0(\nu'-\nu')z_2}}{\sqrt{(z_1-z_2)^2 + (r_1-r_2)^2}} \Phi(z_1)\Phi(z_2) \frac{d^2r_1}{d^2z_1} \frac{d^2r_2}{d^2z_2} , \quad (B1)
\]

where \( \mu, \nu, \mu' = \pm 1 \) (\( \mu', \nu' = \pm 1 \)) are valley indexes of the initial (final) states, \( \epsilon \) is the dielectric constant. The Hubbard part is especially simple due to its short-range nature:

\[
M_{\mu\mu',\nu'\nu}^{(H)} = U_H b^3 \int e^{i\phi_0(\mu+\nu-\mu'-\nu')} \Phi(z) \frac{d^2r}{d^2z} , \quad (B2)
\]

In the limit \( q_0d \gg 1 \) the Hubbard matrix elements with \( \mu + \nu - \mu' - \nu' \neq 0 \) are negligible due to the quickly oscillating exponential factor. Therefore, we only consider \( M_{\mu\mu',\nu'\nu}^{(H)} \) that conserve total valley quantum number i.e. \( \mu + \nu - \mu' - \nu' = 0 \), see Fig. \( \text{[1]} (a),(d) \). All such matrix elements take the same value \( M_{\mu\nu}^{(H)} = U_H b^3/dD^2 \) presented in Eq. \( (8) \), \( d \) and \( D \) are defined through the inverse participation ratios, see Eq. \( (9) \).

The long-range part of Eq. \( (B1) \) is a bit trickier. In order to evaluate it, we use the momentum representation. We define the Fourier transform of the lateral electron density:

\[
\rho(q) = \int \phi^2(r)e^{-iq\cdot r}d^2r , \quad (B3)
\]

Using \( \rho(q) \), we can rewrite Eq. \( (B1) \) as follows:

\[
M_{\mu\mu',\nu'\nu}^{(V)} = \frac{e^2}{\epsilon} \int \frac{2\pi q}{q} |\rho(q)|^2 v(q) dq \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} ; \quad v(q) = \int dz_1 dz_2 e^{i\phi_0(\mu-\mu')z_1}e^{i\phi_0(\nu'-\nu')z_2}e^{-|q|z_1-z_2} \Phi(z_1)\Phi(z_2) . \quad (B4)
\]

Using the Fourier transform of the quantum well electron density

\[
R(k) = \int \Phi^2(z)e^{-ikz} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{\pi}} , \quad (B5)
\]

one can represent the form-factor \( v(q) \) in the following form:

\[
v(q) = q \int \frac{R(k)R^*(k+q_0(\mu+\nu-\mu'-\nu')) dk}{q^2 + (k + (\mu-\mu')q_0)^2} \frac{d^2k}{\pi} . \quad (B6)
\]

Eq. \( (B6) \) is exact. Notice again that if \( \mu + \nu - \mu' - \nu' \neq 0 \), then the function under the integral Eq. \( (B6) \) is small everywhere because \( R(k) \) is non-zero at \( |k| \lesssim 1/d \) (uncertainty principle) and \( q_0 \gg 1/d \sim |k| \). Therefore, only the diagrams with \( \mu + \nu - \mu' - \nu' = 0 \) contribute, see Fig. \( \text{[1]} (a),(d) \). The diagrams in Fig. \( \text{[1]} (a) \) correspond to \( \mu = \mu' \), \( \nu = \nu' \) and give the direct Coulomb matrix elements that are all equal and do not influence the level ordering in a two-electron quantum dot. The diagram in Fig. \( \text{[1]} (d) \) is the exchange Coulomb interaction which corresponds to \( \mu - \mu' = \pm 2 \):

\[
v_{ex}(q) = q \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|R(k)|^2 dk}{q^2 + (k + 2q_0)^2} \frac{d^2k}{\pi} . \quad (B7)
\]
In the limit $q_0 d \gg 1$ we can neglect $k$-dependence and $q$-dependence in the denominator as $k \lesssim 1/d \ll q_0$ and $q \lesssim 1/D \ll q_0$:

$$v_{ex}(q) \approx \frac{2q}{(2q_0)^2} \int \frac{|R(k)|^2 \,dk}{2\pi} = \frac{q}{2q_0^2} \int \Phi^4(z) \,dz. \tag{B8}$$

Substituting $v_{ex}(q)$ into Eq. (B4), we get the estimate for the long-range contribution to the exchange Coulomb matrix element presented in Eq. (10):

$$M^{(V)}_{ex} \approx \frac{2\pi e^2}{\epsilon q_0^2} \int \Phi^4(z) \phi^4(z) \,dz = \frac{\pi V_0}{(q_0 b)^2} \frac{b^3}{D^2}. \tag{B9}$$

where $V_0 = e^2/\epsilon b$ is the Coulomb repulsion at nearest sites.

We cannot compare directly the matrix element $M^{(H)}_{ex} = M^{(H)}_{ex} + M^{(V)}_{ex}$ with the numerical calculations because the valley wave functions, Eq. (5), are not exact single-electron eigenfunctions due to the valley splitting $\omega_0$. True wave functions are some linear combinations of the valley wave functions $|\pm\rangle$. In case of symmetric interface potential $V(-z) = V(z)$ the true wave function must also be symmetric or anti-symmetric, so the good basis is $|1\rangle = \sqrt{2} \cos(q_0 z)$, $|2\rangle = \sqrt{2} \sin(q_0 z)$ instead of $|\pm\rangle = e^{\pm i\phi_0 z}$ used above. Using the linearity, one can represent the matrix elements $M_{abcd}$, $a, b, c, d \in \{1, 2\}$, in the new basis through the matrix elements in the valley basis. In the matrix element $M_{abcd}$ the state $a$ ($c$) scatters to the state $b$ ($d$). In particular, $M_{1212} = M_{ex}/2$ which is used to compare the numerical result with the analytical estimate.