Non-adiabatic single-electron pump in a dopant-free GaAs/AlGaAs 2DEG
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We have realized quantized charge pumping using non-adiabatic single-electron pumps in dopant-free GaAs two-dimensional electron gases (2DEGs). The dopant-free III-V platform allows for ambipolar devices, such as p-i-n junctions, that could be combined with such pumps to form electrically-driven single photon sources. Our pumps operate at up to 0.95 GHz and achieve remarkable performance considering the relaxed experimental conditions: one-gate pumping in zero magnetic field and temperatures up to 5K, driven by a simple RF sine waveform. Fitting to a universal decay cascade model yields values for the figure of merit δ that compare favorably to reported modulation-doped GaAs pumps operating under similar conditions. The devices reported here are already suitable for optoelectronics applications, and with further improvement could offer a route to a current standard that does not require sub-Kelvin temperatures and high magnetic fields.

At low temperatures, non-adiabatic single-electron pumps show quantized current plateaus at \( I = n e f \), where \( e \) is the electron charge, \( f \) is the radio frequency (RF) of an ac signal applied to a local gate, and \( n \) is the number of electrons pumped from source to drain during each RF cycle. These pumps have been the subject of several reviews5–10 for applications in quantum metrology, and have been variously referred to as tunable-barrier pumps, one-parameter pumps, ratchet pumps, or dynamic quantum dots. They do not require an applied source-drain bias to drive current, operate at high frequencies (~GHz), and are distinct from adiabatic turnstile pumps,11,12 which require a finite source-drain bias and a minimum of two RF gates to operate (with typical \( f < 20 \) MHz).

The most commonly used pump architectures involve modulation-doped GaAs/AlGaAs two-dimensional electron gases (2DEGs),13–15 because of their simple operation (one-gate pumping), relative ease of fabrication, and high performance. The two lowest relative uncertainties in metrological measurements of pumped current in GaAs were ±0.20 ppm at \( f = 545 \) MHz15 and ±0.16 ppm at \( f = 600 \) MHz16 using low temperatures \((T < 100 \) mK\)), high magnetic fields \((B > 10 \) T\)), and shaped RF pulses. The ease of fabrication allows the positioning of non-invasive detectors17 near pumps, thus enabling to individually count pumped electrons and to identify error mechanisms,18,19 and allows the integration of pumps into more complex circuits, towards a self-referenced quantum current standard.20 Non-adiabatic pumps have also been realized in other material systems: graphene,21 InAs nanowires,22 and silicon.2,23–31

In some Si-based pumps, the dynamic quantum dot consists of an accidental charge trap located near the transport channel.23–26 Among the more conventional silicon-based pumps,2,27–31 the two lowest relative uncertainties in metrological measurements of pumped current were ±0.20 ppm at \( f = 1 \) GHz and \( T = 4 \) K,30 and ±0.27 ppm at \( f = 1 \) GHz and \( T = 0.3 \) K.31 Remarkably, those measurements were performed in zero magnetic field, and using only a simple RF sine wave.

One possible reason for the relative improved performance (in zero magnetic field, using only a simple RF sine waveform) of some Si pumps over modulation-doped GaAs pumps may be the ability of the former to generate higher electric fields locally. Indeed, experiments that vary the confinement-potential shape in GaAs quantum dots used as non-adiabatic single electron pumps have shown promising results.32,33 Improved pump performance relative to modulation-doped GaAs pumps could perhaps be obtained in GaAs-based dopant-free heterostructure-insulator-gate field effect transistor (HIGFET) geometry.34–36 Indeed, such accumulation mode transistors have already been used to produce Hall bars,37–42 quantum wires,43–46 and quantum dots,47–52 with demonstrated superior performance in terms of low disorder, suppressed random telegraph switching (RTS) events/noise, and cooldown-to-cooldown (even device-to-device) reproducibility relative to their GaAs modulation-doped counterparts.53

Since GaAs has a direct bandgap, dopant-free non-adiabatic single electron pumps could be useful for applications in quantum optoelectronics. For example, by juxtaposing a non-adiabatic single electron pump next to

---

a) corresponding author: francois.sfigakis@uwaterloo.ca
b) baugh@uwaterloo.ca
FIG. 1. (a) Diagram of gate layout design A (view from above). Only the outline of $V_{\text{topgate}}$ is visible (black dashed line). (b) Cross-sectional view of gate layout design A, along the cut indicated by the red dotted line in panel a. (c) Measurement circuit diagram and scanning electron microscope (SEM) image of a single-electron pump in a dopant-free 2DEG with gate layout design A, similar to device A1. All fine gates ($V_{qpc1}$, $V_{qpc2}$, $V_{\text{exit}}$, and $V_{\text{ent}}$) were written by electron beam lithography. There are three levels of gates, each separated by a dielectric. A one-dimensional channel, defined electrostatically by gates $V_{qpc1}$ and $V_{qpc2}$, is connected at both ends to a 2DEG (source and drain ohmic contacts $\implies$) induced by a global topgate $V_{\text{topgate}}$ deposited on top of the device (not shown in panel c). Entrance and exit barrier gates ($V_{\text{ent}}$ and $V_{\text{exit}}$) are used to form a dynamically driven quantum dot (white dot); they are isolated from $V_{qpc1}$ and $V_{qpc2}$ by 30 nm of SiO$_2$. The topgate is isolated from the recessed AuGeNi ohmic contacts and $V_{qpc}$ gates by 300 nm of SiO$_2$. By RF modulation of the entrance barrier voltage, electrons are collected from the 2DEG source and ejected into the 2DEG drain (see Fig. 2), resulting in a time-averaged quantized current $I = nef$ (see Fig. 3) measured by a DC current pre-amplifier at the 2DEG drain (∇). Note there is no bias applied between source and drain.

FIG. 2. All data taken at $T = 1.4$ K. (a) Electron density versus $V_{\text{topgate}}$ in wafer G371. (b) Gate leakage characteristics of $V_{\text{topgate}}$. (inset) Mobility versus electron density in wafer G371. (c) Gate leakage characteristics of $V_{qpc}$, while $V_{\text{topgate}} = +5$ V. (d) Potential energy diagram showing the pumping mechanism, in a cut along the arrow in Fig. 1 at three distinct stages of a single RF cycle: loading, capture, and ejection. Loading. The entrance barrier $V_{\text{ent}}$ is brought below the Fermi level $E_F$ (dashed black line) and many electrons (blue circles) load into the dot from the source 2DEG. Capture. As the entrance barrier is raised, electrons back-tunnel into the source 2DEG. Higher energy electrons have faster backtunneling rates $\Gamma_{i+1} > \Gamma_i$. A small number of electrons are captured and remain in the quantum dot as the entrance barrier is raised. Ejection. When the entrance barrier rises above that of the exit barrier $V_{\text{exit}}$, a fixed number of electrons are ejected from the quantum dot into the drain 2DEG. The entrance barrier is then lowered back to the loading stage in the next RF cycle. Adapted from Ref. 29.

In this Letter, we demonstrate non-adiabatic single-electron pumps in dopant-free GaAs 2DEGs suitable for quantum optoelectronics applications, with one-gate pumping, operating in zero magnetic field at temperatures of up to $T = 5$ K, and using a simple RF sine waveform up to 0.95 GHz. Three samples in total were measured (A1, A2, and B1), using two different gate layouts, design A and design B. All three samples demonstrated quantized charge pumping.

Samples A1-A2 (B1) were fabricated on wafers G371 (G370), grown by molecular beam epitaxy with the following sequence of layers: starting from a 3" semi-insulating (SI) GaAs (100) substrate, a 200 nm GaAs buffer, a 20-period smoothing superlattice composed of a 2.5 nm GaAs layer and 2.5 nm Al$_0.3$Ga$_0.7$As layer, a 500 nm GaAs layer, a 80 nm (65 nm) Al$_0.3$Ga$_0.7$As barrier for samples A1-A2 (B1), and a 10 nm GaAs cap layer. There was no doping anywhere in the structure. Using the field effect from a topgate, a 2DEG is induced (enhancement of a “lateral” p-i-n junction in the same device, one could realize an all-electrical, high-rate, and high-fidelity single photon source. The first building block of such a single photon sources is of course a lateral p-i-n junction, already realized in a dopant-free GaAs/AlGaAs system by us and others. The second building block would be the non-adiabatic single electron pump, not previously demonstrated in dopant-free GaAs/AlGaAs.
on the device. It is negligible; the slope of the IV curve gate to either the ohmic contacts or to any other gate age between the $V_n$.

The threshold voltage for the 2DEG to start forming is typically less than 10 pA, tested up to a difference of 4 $\mu$A.

FIG. 3. All measurements were performed at $T = 1.4$ K. (a–c) Quantized pumped current (black dots) in samples A1, A2, and B1. The dashed horizontal lines indicate the predicted current quantization values $I = n e f$, and the solid yellow lines are fits of the first quantized current plateau to eqn. (1). The figure of merit $\delta$ determined from the fits are stated. Insets have the same units as the main figures. Individual panels show quantized current in: (a) device A1 at $f = 500$ MHz, (b) device B1 at $f = 500$ MHz, (c) device A1 at (main) $f = 850$ MHz and (inset) $f = 950$ MHz. (d) Pump map of device A1. The colorscale represents the derivative $dI_{pump}/dV_{dc}$. Current plateaus are labeled according to the number of electrons pumped per RF cycle.

mode) at the GaAs/AlGaAs interface located 90 nm (75 nm) below the surface for wafer G371 (G370). Transport through the single-electron pump was oriented along the high electron mobility crystal direction [110]. Details for the fabrication of recessed ohmic contacts are otherwise identical to and extensively described in Ref. 38. Other fabrication details are described in Figure 1.

At $V_{topgate} = 0$, the bandstructure is nearly flat since there is no intentional doping, and there are no carriers – whether electrons or holes – anywhere in the heterostructure. A positive voltage beyond a threshold value must be applied for a 2DEG to form. Figure 2a shows that the threshold voltage for the 2DEG to start forming is $V_{topgate} = 0.5$ V.

Figure 2b shows typical leakage current from a topgate to either the ohmic contacts or to any other gate on the device. It is negligible; the slope of the IV curve yields an isolation resistance of (1.0±0.2) TΩ. Gate leakage between the $V_{qpc}$ gates and the $V_{ent}/V_{exit}$ gates is typically less than 10 pA, tested up to a difference of 4 Volts. Figure 2c shows typical gate leakage between $V_{qpc}$ gates and the 2DEG, with a soft breakdown occurring at $V_{qpc} = +0.97$V. This is consistent with similar gate leakage tests on dopant-free quantum point contacts reported in the literature (see Fig. 2b in Ref. 50). The higher operating voltages without gate leakage of surface gates in dopant-free devices can be explained by the absence of doping in the $i$-AlGaAs layer. The latter is in effect a better insulator than doped $n$-AlGaAs in conventional 2DEGs, where surface gates leak at +0.7 V and often at much lower voltages.

Unlike all other gate voltages, $V_{ent}$ is an RF gate: $V_{ent} = V_{dc} + V_{rf} \sin(2\pi ft)$, where $V_{dc}$ and $V_{rf}$ are DC and RF voltages, respectively, combined together using a bias tee. Note the “box” shape of the $V_{qpc}$ gates in Fig. 1: its purpose is specifically to exclude the 2DEG from forming in the vicinity of the $V_{ent}$ gate, and thus eliminate parasitic coupling between the 2DEG and $V_{ent}$ and the associated RF heating of electrons in the reservoirs. Under the combined actions of the $V_{qpc}$, $V_{exit}$, $V_{ent}$, and $V_{topgate}$ gates, a quantum dot forms and dissolves during every RF cycle (see Fig. 2d), which is why non-adiabatic pumps are sometimes called dynamic quantum dots.

Figure 3 demonstrates quantized current plateaus at the expected average number of electrons pumped per RF cycle, $\langle n \rangle$ for all three samples (A1, A2, B1). The universal decay cascade model is fit to the $\langle n \rangle = 1$ quantized current plateaus, with the resulting curve (yellow solid line) over the experimental data:

$$I = e f \sum_{n=1,2} \exp \left( -\exp \left[ -a(V_{exit} - V_0) + \delta(n-1) \right] \right)$$

where $a$ and $\delta$ are fitting parameters, and $V_0$ is the position in gate voltage of the first plateau. The parameter $\delta$ is often used as a figure of merit for non-adiabatic single electron pumps. The larger the value of $\delta$, the better the current quantization (flatter plateau and steeper plateau steps) and its accuracy. For example, $\delta = \ln(\Gamma_2/\Gamma_1) + E_c/\Delta_{ptb}$, where $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are the tunneling rates during the capture stage of the RF cycle (see Fig. 2d), $E_c$ is the maximum charging energy of the dynamic quantum dot, and $\Delta_{ptb}$ is the plunger-to-barrier ratio of the entrance gate $V_{ent}$. It can be further shown that $\ln(\Gamma_2/\Gamma_1) \sim E_c/k_B T_0$, where $T_0$ is the transition temperature between the thermal hopping regime and the quantum tunneling regime. $\delta$ can be expressed in terms of only the charging energy $E_c$ of the dynamic quantum dot.

The values of $\delta$ obtained from the fits to eqn. (1) in devices A1, A2, and B1 (see Figs. 3a and 3b) compare favourably with those from the literature in GaAs-based pumps (see Fig. 3a in Ref. 76, Fig. 5 in Ref. 13, Fig. 2c in Ref. 32, and Fig. 2a in Ref. 33), in identical or closest experimental conditions. The latter means at the same frequency $f$, in zero magnetic field, using a simple RF sinewave (not shaped RF pulses), without samples undergoing bias cooling, and using symmetric gate.
voltage configurations (corresponding to $V_{qpc1} = V_{qpc2}$ in our case). Indeed, large magnetic fields, \cite{footnote2} shaped RF waveforms, \cite{footnote3} bias cooling, \cite{footnote4} and asymmetric gate voltage configurations for the dynamic quantum dot \cite{footnote5,footnote6} are all experimental techniques known to significantly increase the value of $\delta$. For example, even modestly increasing magnetic field on sample A1 increased its figure of merit from $\delta = 16.4$ at $B = 0$ T to $\delta = 20.4$ at $B = 5$ T (not shown). We therefore do not compare our results to the state of the art in GaAs-based pumps for quantum metrology, \cite{footnote7,footnote8,footnote9,footnote10} since high magnetic fields and/or shaped RF pulses are routinely used. Furthermore, we do not compare our results to state of the art Si-based pumps \cite{footnote11,footnote12,footnote13,footnote14,footnote15,footnote16,footnote17,footnote18,footnote19,footnote20,footnote21,footnote22} because p-i-n junctions in Si do not emit light, the first component of our proposed all-electrical single photon source.

The $\delta$ values obtained in Figure 3 are suitable for quantum optoelectronic applications. In quantum optics, the lowest second order correlation function $g(2)(\tau) = \langle I(t)I(t+\tau) \rangle/\langle I(t) \rangle^2$ at $\tau = 0$ for single photon sources in the literature currently range from $g(2)(0) = 0.0004$ to $g(2)(0) = 0.003$ \cite{footnote23,footnote24,footnote25,footnote26,footnote27,footnote28,footnote29,footnote30}. These values correspond to relative uncertainties in undesirable two-photon coincidences ranging from 400 ppm to 3000 ppm, and are theoretically equivalent to $7.6 < \delta < 9.9$ in the decay cascade model for single electron pumps. \cite{footnote31} All the $\delta$ from samples in this paper exceed this range of values. It would thus appear that the pumping mechanism in a dopant-free single electron pump, if the latter were integrated into a single photon source, would not be a limiting factor in the performance of the source.

Figure 3c shows pumping current at frequencies approaching 1 GHz. As expected, current quantization degrades with increasing frequency. Indeed, to achieve high $\delta$ values, the following conditions must be satisfied: (i) $hf \ll \Gamma_L$ in the loading phase, (ii) $hf \gg \Gamma_L$ in the capturing phase, and (iii) $hf \ll \Gamma_R$ in the ejection phase, where $\Gamma_L$ is the backtunneling rate from the dynamic quantum dot towards the source 2DEG and $\Gamma_R$ is the tunneling rate towards the drain 2DEG. As frequency increases, at least one of these conditions, most likely the loading condition, is not met. \cite{footnote32,footnote33,footnote34} Nevertheless, it appears that a single photon source using an integrated undoped single electron pump could operate at $f = 850$ MHz without harming its $g(2)(0)$, a frequency that is competitive with state of the art single photon sources in the literature.

Figure 3d shows a pump map \cite{footnote35} of device A1. Of note, RTS events were rarely seen in these devices, and the first quantized plateau extends over a wide gate voltage range (~80 mV for $V_{exit}$ and more than 400 mV for $V_{ent}$, along the longest cut of either axis). For comparison, the $\langle n \rangle = 1$ plateau in state-of-the-art GaAs-based pumps is only 20-40 mV long in exit gate voltage. \cite{footnote1,footnote12,footnote13,footnote14} This suggests dopant-free single-electron pumps could be robust against small changes in the experimental control parameters \cite{footnote36}, a requirement for any primary metrological standard. \cite{footnote15,footnote16,footnote17,footnote18,footnote19,footnote20,footnote21,footnote22}

Figure 4 shows four quantized current plateaus at $T = 1.4$ K in sample B1. However, this sample degraded significantly between the measurements of Fig. 3b and Fig. 4, such that we’ll refer to this sample thereafter as B1’. Its $\langle n \rangle = 1$ plateau now yields a smaller $\delta = 11.4$, and is transitioning from the decay cascade regime to the thermal regime. \cite{footnote80} At $T = 3.5$ K, the $\langle n \rangle = 1$ plateau is well into the thermal regime. Nonetheless, despite the lowest $\delta$ reported here and hence the smallest charging energy $E_c$ of the dynamic quantum dot, the $\langle n \rangle = 1$ plateau remains quantized at temperatures up to 5 K, easily accessible in typical optical cryostats. Since we would expect samples A1/A2/B1 (with $16.4 < \delta < 22.5$) to remain in the decay cascade regime at much higher temperatures than sample B1’, we therefore do not believe temperatures up to 5 K prevent undoped single electron pumps from being integrated into single photon sources.

Possible applications for non-adiabatic single electron pumps extend beyond standards for current \cite{footnote37} in quantum metrology and single photon sources in quantum optoelectronics. Such applications include a voltage standard \cite{footnote38} in quantum metrology, but also the fields of single electronics \cite{footnote39} and single electron optics. \cite{footnote40} In the latter, non-adiabatic single electron pumps have already made an impact on the field, with a trapping/counting scheme for hot electrons, \cite{footnote41} partitioning of on-demand electron pairs, \cite{footnote42} and on-demand emission of electron pairs with deterministically controlled exchange symmetry. \cite{footnote43}

In conclusion, we have demonstrated non-adiabatic single electron pumps in dopant-free GaAs/AlGaAs 2DEGs operating at near-GHz frequencies, high temperature, and zero magnetic field. Given the experimental conditions, these pumps have achieved remarkable performance, and are promising as key components in optoelectronic applications such as photonic sources. If their accuracy could be further improved, they offer a possible route towards more accessible quantum standards for...
current, by significantly reducing the complexity of the measurement infrastructure required (dilution refrigerators, large superconducting magnets, and high frequency hardware for shaped RF pulses).
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In principle, a poor lever arm for $V_{\text{out}}$ and $V_{\text{exit}}$ could account for the large voltage range of the current plateaus. However, the gates in device A1 displayed large lever arms. Generally, we have observed that samples with poor gate lever arms tend to produce low-quality (small $\delta$) current quantization, which is certainly not the case for device A1.


