Steering the current flow in twisted bilayer graphene
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INTRODUCTION

Since its first experimental isolation almost two decades ago [1], graphene is surprising continuously with exceptional properties, making it probably the most studied material in the world with several potential device applications, see [2] for an introduction and [3] for a detailed overview. One of the most prominent properties is certainly the Dirac behavior of the electrons, making graphene a condensed matter analog for phenomena from quantum electrodynamics [4–6]. However, interesting characteristics are not limited to single layers of graphene but are found also in stacks of this material. For example, bilayer graphene (BG), while also being a gapless semiconductor, has a low-energy dispersion that is not linear but quadratic [7] and features anti-Klein tunneling [8,9].

Graphene research has shown recently a sudden ‘twist’ with the observation of unconventional superconductivity and Mott-like insulating states in twisted bilayer graphene (TBLG) [10,11], which has stimulated an avalanche of work, see [12,13] for an overview, and eventually initiated a new research field called twistronics [14,15]. The observed effects can be attributed generally to the emergence of flat bands at certain magic angles, the largest of them is slightly above 1.1 degree [16,17,18]. These flat bands are manifested in the density of states as van Hove singularities at electron densities accessible by electrostatic gating. As the electrons in these bands are densely packed in momentum space, they become strongly correlated [21,22]. Moreover, the twist angle allows to tune the flatness of the bands and therefore, the correlations, making TBLG an ideal platform to study and emulate strongly correlated systems [23]. Some of the discovered insulating states even show ferromagnetism, implying that these states are topological [29,31]. Below the magic angle, interesting effects like one-dimensional channels and electronic localization have been reported [35–38].

While most of the research is dedicated to the correlations at the magic angles, the effects caused by the structural changes of the energy bands have received less attention. In this direction, it has been demonstrated that TBLG shows a topological phase transition [39] and can be used as a valley filter, making it a candidate for applications in valleytronics [40,41]. The electronic transport in small TBLG samples (size about 3 nm) has been investigated, showing conductance oscillations as a function of the twist angle [42].

In this paper, we investigate the electrical transport in TBLG devices with a size of about 100 nm. The Green’s function method is applied to the established tight-binding model of TBLG to calculate numerically the current flow. We find that the current, injected at one edge of the bottom layer and detected at the edges of the top layer, is guided predominantly to one of the lateral edges. The current is directed to the opposite lateral edge, if the twist angle is reversed or if the electrons are injected in graphene’s valence band instead of the conduction band. We perform band structure calculations showing that the observed steering of the current is due to the trigonal shape of the energy bands at electron densities above the van Hove singularity due to the Moiré interference pattern. Moreover, we demonstrate that the deviated current is partially valley polarized as the energy bands depend on the valley degree of freedom, the steered current is partially valley polarized. Our findings show how to control and manipulate the current flow in TBLG. Technologically, they are of relevance for applications in twistronics and valleytronics.
Figure 1. Schematic representation of the studied TBLG device. It consists of two stacked graphene nanoribbons, where the upper layer is twisted by the angle θ with respect to the lower one that remains fixed. Electrons are injected through the source contact S at the left edge of the bottom layer (gray bar). They pass through the twisted bilayer region and are detected by three drain contacts $D_{τ/−/τ}$ at the edges of the top layer (blue, red, and green bars).

MODELING TWISTED BILAYER GRAPHENE

The studied device consists of two rectangular graphene nanoribbons that overlap in a certain region forming a graphene bilayer, see Figure 1. The bottom and top layer, separated by a distance of $d_0 = 0.343 \text{nm}$, have a size of $100 \times 60 \text{nm}$ and $86 \times 100 \text{nm}$ with a bilayer region of about $60 \times 60 \text{nm}$. The top layer can be twisted by the angle θ with respect to the bottom layer, which is kept fixed. In order to study the electrical transport through the system, a source contact S injects electrons at the left edge of the bottom layer. The injected current passes through the twisted bilayer region and is detected by three drain contacts $D_{τ/−/τ}$ at the edges of the top layer.

The TBLG device is modeled by the tight-binding Hamiltonian \[ H = H_b + H_t + H_⊥ \] (1)

where $H_b$ corresponds to the isolated bottom/top graphene layer while $H_⊥$ takes into account the interlayer coupling. The bottom and top layer’s Hamiltonians are the same as for pristine graphene

\[ H_{b/t} = t_0 \sum_{(n,m)} |n⟩⟨m| + \text{h.c.} \] (2)

where $|n⟩$ indicates the atomic state localized on the carbon atom at $r_n$ on either sublattice A or B. The sum runs over the nearest neighboring carbon atoms separated by the distance $a_0 = 0.142 \text{nm}$ and coupled with the energy $t_0 = -2.7 \text{eV}$. The interlayer Hamiltonian reads

\[ H_⊥ = \sum_{n,m} t_{nm}^⊥ |n⟩⟨m| + \text{h.c.} \] (3)

where the sum is over pairs of atomic states that belong to the bottom and top layer. The interlayer coupling is determined by the Slater-Koster formula

\[ t_{nm}^⊥ = \cos^2(γ)V_{ppσ}(r_{nm}) + [1 - \cos^2(γ)]V_{ppσ}(r_{nm}) \] (4)

where $V_{ppσ}$ is the direction cosine of $r_{nm} = r_m - r_n$ along the $z$ direction. The Slater-Koster parameters are defined as

\[ V_{ppσ}(r_{nm}) = \begin{cases} V_{pqσ}^0 \exp\left[ -\frac{r_{nm}}{d_0} \right], & \text{if } σ = 0, \\ V_{ppσ}^0 \exp\left[ -\frac{r_{nm}}{a_0} \right], & \text{if } σ = -1, \end{cases} \] (5)

with the tight-binding parameters \[ V_{pqσ}^0 = \begin{cases} 0.375 \text{eV}, & \text{if } σ = 0, \\ -2.7 \text{eV}, & \text{if } σ = -1. \end{cases} \] (6)

Band structure calculations

We model the band structure of TBLG using the low-energy continuum limit of \[ H_b \] for a single valley. This model describes small twist angles accurately ($θ < 10^°$). Each graphene layer is represented by a Dirac Hamiltonian

\[ H_{b/t}^± = \hbar v_F q \cdot (±σ_{x,y}^{θ_{b/t}}, \sigma_{z}^{θ_{b/t}}) \] (7)

where $v_F = 3a_0t_0/2$ and the ± signs correspond to the different valleys $K_{b/t}^±$, see Figure 2(a). The twist of the graphene layers is taken into account within the vector

\[ \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{x}^{θ_{b/t}} \\ \sigma_{y}^{θ_{b/t}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos θ_{b/t} - \sin θ_{b/t} \\ \sin θ_{b/t} \cos θ_{b/t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} σ_x \\ σ_y \end{pmatrix}, \] (8)

which consists of rotated Pauli matrices with $θ_b = 0^°$ (as the bottom layer is fixed) and $θ_t = θ$. We transform the interlayer Hamiltonian \[ H_⊥ \] to the reciprocal Fourier space

\[ H_⊥ = \sum_{k_b, k_t} \sum_{α, β} t_{α, β}(k_b, k_t) (k_t, β), \] (9)

where (apart from a normalization factor

\[ t_{α, β}(k_b, k_t) = \int \frac{d^2p}{2π} \sum_{r_b, r_t} e^{-i(k_b - p) r_b} t_{⊥}(p) e^{i(k_t - p) r_t}. \] (10)

The indices α and β indicate the two different carbon atoms (A/B) in each unit cell with the positions $r_b^α = r_b + τ_α$ and $r_t^β = r_t + τ_β$, respectively. The function $t_{⊥}(p)$ is the Fourier transform of the interlayer coupling \[ H_⊥ \]. Taking into account only the terms in leading order (using $|K_{b/t}^±| = 0.433 \text{eVÅ}^2$), we obtain in this way the band structure shown in Figure 2(b) along the blue path in (a), while constant energy contours are depicted in (c). Further details on these calculations can be found in \[ \text{[13]} \].
**The Green’s function method for electron transport**

The nonequilibrium Green’s function (NEGF) method is applied to study the electrical transport in the TBLG device. As detailed introductions into this method can be found in various textbooks [43–45], we summarize here briefly the essential equations. The Green’s function of the system is given by

\[ G = \left( E - H - \sum_p \Sigma_p \right)^{-1} \]

(11)

where \( E \) is the energy of the injected electrons and \( H \) is the tight-binding Hamiltonian (1). The contacts are modeled by the so-called wide-band model implying for these a constant energy-independent surface density of states [46]. It is taken into account in the Green’s function by means of the self-energies

\[ \Sigma_p = -i \sum_{n \in C_p} |n \rangle \langle n| \]

(12)

where the sum runs over the carbon atoms \( C_p \) attached to the contact \( p \in \{ S, D_{\uparrow, \downarrow}\} \), see the colored bars in Figure 1.

The transmission between a pair of contacts, \( i \) and \( j \), is given by

\[ T_{ij}(E) = \text{Tr}[\Gamma_i G T_j G^\dagger], \]

(13)

where the inscattering function associated to contact \( i \) is defined as \( \Gamma_i = -2i \text{Im}(\Sigma_i) \). The transmission determines the conductance for electrons of energy \( E \) between the selected pair of contacts, \( G_{ij} = e^2/h T_{ij} \). Finally, the local current flowing between the atoms \( n \) and \( m \) can be calculated by

\[ I_{nm}(E) = \text{Im}[T_{nm}^* (G^\dagger S G)_{nm}]. \]

(14)

**Calculating the longitudinal and the Hall resistance**

The longitudinal and the Hall resistance are defined as

\[ R_{xx} = \frac{V_{D_\uparrow} - V_S}{I_{SD_\downarrow}}, \quad R_{xy} = \frac{V_{D_\uparrow} - V_{D_\downarrow}}{I_{SD_\downarrow}}, \]

(15)

where the \( V_i \) are the potentials of the four contacts and \( I_{SD_\downarrow} \) is the current flowing between \( S \) and \( D_\downarrow \). To calculate these quantities within the Green’s function approach, we apply the Landauer-Büttiker equation for the total current at the \( j \)th contact [43–45]

\[ I_j(E) = \frac{e}{h} \sum_i T_{ij} (V_i - V_j), \]

(16)

and use the fact that the current is zero at the contacts \( D_{\uparrow, \downarrow} \) of unknown potential (due to the infinite internal resistance of a voltmeter). After some straightforward matrix algebra, we obtain finally [47, 48]

\[ R_{xx} = \frac{h}{e^2 T_{SD_\downarrow}} \sum_{ij} T_{ij} (M_{ij} T_{jD_\downarrow} - M_{ij} T_{jD_\uparrow}), \]

(17)

\[ R_{xy} = \frac{h}{e^2 T_{SD_\downarrow}} \sum_{ij} T_{Sj} (M_{ij} T_{jD_\uparrow} - M_{ij} T_{jD_\downarrow}) \]

where

\[ M^{-1} = \begin{cases} -T_{ij} & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \sum_{k \neq i} T_{ik} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \]

(18)

The sums in (17) are over the contacts \( D_{\uparrow, \downarrow} \) of unknown potential, whereas the sums in (16) and (18) are over all contacts in the device.

**Calculating the valley polarization**

The valley polarization of a state \( |\phi\rangle \) characterizes to which degree this state occupies the two valleys \( K^+ \) and \( K^- \).
Figure 3. Current flow in the TBLG device. The intralayer current (left and central column) is indicated by the black arrows and its density by the red color shading. The interlayer current density (right column) that goes from the bottom to the top layer is given by reddish colors, while for the opposite direction bluish colors are used. When both layers are aligned (row a), the current goes essentially straight through the system. When a positive twist angle is introduced (row b), the current density is steered to the upper drain contact $D_{\uparrow}$ at the top layer, while for a negative twist (row c) the current is guided to $D_{\downarrow}$.

$K^-$ in graphene. It can be calculated by the projection $P(k) = |\langle \psi(k) | \psi \rangle|^2$ onto the graphene eigenfunctions

$$\psi_n(k) = \begin{cases} e^{i k \cdot r_n}, & n \in A \\ \text{sign}(E) e^{i k \cdot (r_n - \delta)} f(k), & n \in B \end{cases}$$

where

$$f(k) = -t_0 \left[ e^{-i k \cdot a_1} + e^{-i k \cdot a_2} + e^{-i k \cdot (a_2 + a_3)} \right]$$

and $a_{1/2} = (3, \pm \sqrt{3}) a_1/2$ are the lattice vectors while $\delta = (1, 0) a_0$ is the vector connecting the sublattices $A$ and $B$. Within the Green’s function approach, this projection reads

$$P_i(k) = \langle \psi(k) | G^{\text{in}} | \psi(k) \rangle_{A_i}.$$  

(21)

It is calculated over a finite region $A_i$ of the system, see for example the gray-shaded regions in Figure 8 (top right), in order to assess the valley polarization locally. The spectral density $P_i(k)$ is integrated around the valleys

$$\mathcal{P}_i^\pm = \int_{\mathbf{k} \in K^\pm} d^2 k P_i(k)$$

(22)
Figure 4. Current flow in the TBLG device at electron energy $E = -270$ meV and a twist angle of $\theta = 2.9^\circ$. The steering of the current flow can be controlled by the electron energy, accessible experimentally through electrostatic gating. The color scaling is the same as in Figure 3. The black dots in the interlayer current indicate the regions of AA stacking symmetry.

Figure 5. Normalized transmission $T_{\uparrow \rightarrow \downarrow}$ for electrons at energy $E = 270$ meV as a function of the twist angle. For $1^\circ \lesssim \theta \lesssim 5^\circ$ a significantly larger fraction of the current is directed to contact $D_\uparrow$. When the twist angle is reversed the larger part of the current goes to contact $D_\downarrow$.

and the valley polarization is given by

$$P_i = \frac{P_i^+ - P_i^-}{P_i^+ + P_i^-}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

For $P_i = \pm 1$ the electrons are localized exclusively at the $K^\pm$ valleys and hence, are completely valley polarized, whereas for $P_i = 0$ they are completely unpolarized.

**CURRENT FLOW IN TBLG**

We start our discussion by analyzing in Figure 3 the local current flow in the TBLG device. In the absence of any twist (row a), we observe that the electrons, injected at energy $E = 270$ meV by the contact $S$ at the left edge of the bottom layer, flow essentially straight through the system towards the right edge of the top layer. Minor deviations to the lateral edges are observed, which can be attributed to both, the diffraction of the electrons and boundary effects. However, these currents go in approximately equal amounts to the upper and lower edge of the top layer. The interlayer current\(^1\) shows that at the edges of the bilayer region, the current is going from the bottom to the top layer (as expected due to the position of the contacts), while inside the bilayer region, it is oscillating between the layers.

When a twist angle of $\theta = 2.9^\circ$ is introduced (row b), the current changes its direction in the bilayer region. At the bottom of the bilayer region, the current is directed downwards, while at the top, it is propagating upwards. Eventually, the largest part of the current is directed to the drain contact $D_\uparrow$ at the upper edge of the top layer, while less current flows to the right and the bottom contacts, $D_\rightarrow$ and $D_\downarrow$. When the sign of the twist angle is reversed, $\theta = -2.9^\circ$ (row c), the current pattern is reversed as well and the main part of the current is directed to $D_\downarrow$.

The steering of the current flow can also be reversed by injecting the electrons in the valence band instead of the conduction band, see Figure 4. Similar to the case of aligned layers, the interlayer current shows that a large part of the current is passing to the top layer at the edges of the bilayer region, while it oscillates strongly inside the bilayer region. These oscillations are correlated with the regions of AA stacking symmetry, indicated by small black dots. The steering of the electrical transport

\(^1\) As the interlayer current shows some rare peaks, its maximum value is defined here as three standard deviations above the mean.
Figure 6. Normalized transmissions $T_{\uparrow/\rightarrow/\downarrow}$ as a function of the twist angle and the electron energy. The broad red regions that are present in $T_{\uparrow}$ but absent in $T_{\downarrow}$ (or vice versa) prove the steering of the current flow.

In order to quantify our observations, we show in Figure 5 the normalized transmission

$$T_{\uparrow/\rightarrow/\downarrow} = \frac{T_{SD_{\uparrow/\rightarrow/\downarrow}}}{T_{SD_{\uparrow/\rightarrow/\downarrow}} + T_{SD_{\downarrow/\rightarrow/\downarrow}} + T_{SD_{\downarrow}}}$$

between the source and the three drain contacts. For a broad range of twist angles, roughly between 1 and 5 degree, a significantly larger fraction of the current is guided towards the contact $D_\uparrow$ as to the contacts $D_{\rightarrow}$ or $D_{\downarrow}$. For negative twist angles, the situation is reversed and the larger part of the current goes to the contact $D_{\downarrow}$. Note that the transmission curves are in good approximation symmetric, $T_{\uparrow/\downarrow}(\theta) \approx T_{\downarrow/\uparrow}(-\theta)$, which can be expected as the overall structure of the Moiré interference pattern of the two layers is the same for positive and negative twist angles. However, due to the finite size of the investigated device, the precise position of the pattern can change (for example, the position of the AA regions) leading to the observed minor deviations from the symmetry of the transmission curves.

In Figure 6 we show the normalized transmissions to the three drain contacts as a function of the twist angle and the electron energy. The broad red colored regions in $T_{\uparrow/\rightarrow/\downarrow}(\theta,E)$ confirm that for a wide range of (experimentally accessible) parameters a significantly larger part of the electric current is steered towards one of the lateral contacts $D_{\uparrow/\downarrow}$. The red region in $T_{\downarrow}$ indicates the parameter region, where the current passes essentially straight.

In TBLG, observed qualitatively in the current flow patterns in Figure 3 and Figure 4 is the main finding of this paper and will be analyzed in the following in detail.

In the following we neglect the subtle detail that some twist angles do not generate a Moiré pattern.
Figure 8. Valley polarization of the current in the TBLG device, calculated in the shaded rectangular regions as indicated in the device sketch. The current, injected unpolarized (region $A_{\downarrow}$), is valley polarized in the lateral regions $A_{\uparrow}$, whereas it remains unpolarized in $A_{\rightarrow}$.

Having demonstrated the steering of the current flow in the TBLG device, we are left to understand this behavior. This can be done by analyzing the constant energy contours of the bandstructure, see Figure 2 (c), which have a trigonal shape within a certain energy range. In Figure 7 (a), we show the energy contours at $E = 270$ meV around the $K^+$ valley within the monolayer region (turquoise circle) and the twisted bilayer region (blue triangles) for a twist angle of $\theta = 2.9^\circ$. The directional change of the current can be understood by the kinematical construction $^3$. The injected electron beam is indicated by the orange arrow perpendicular to the monolayer contour. The black line, with an inclination of $\theta$, represents the conservation of the momentum component parallel to the boundary of the two regions. Its intersection point with the energy contour in the bilayer region determines the direction of the current flow in that region, see the red arrow perpendicular to the bilayer contour. The direction of the current flow, which is initially aligned approximately parallel to the $k_x$ axis, is rotated upwards, due to the trigonal shape of the energy contour and the twist angle. The diffraction of the injected electron beam leads to non-zero $k_y$ values, which

$^3$ Note that instead of using a twisted line connecting the energy contours in the two regions, one could rotate also the contours in the bilayer region, see for example the small red hexagon in Figure 2 (a).
Figure 9. Current flow in the TBLG device at electron energy $E = 135 \text{ meV}$ and a twist of $\theta = 2.9^\circ$. Steering of the current flow to one of the lateral edges cannot be observed as the energy contours for these parameters are no longer triangular.

Figure 10. Longitudinal resistance $R_{xx}$ (blue curve) and Hall resistance $R_{xy}$ (red curve) as a function of energy for the TBLG device at a twist angle of $\theta = 2.9^\circ$. The steering of the current flow to one of the lateral edges generates a non-local Hall resistance. The DOS (in arbitrary units) is indicated by the gray color shading.

are taken into account by the opaque rectangle centered around the black line. Its intersection points with the TBLG contours lead to the small red arrows that still point all towards $D_\uparrow$.

In Figure 7(b), we repeat the above analysis for electrons in the $K^-$ valley, where the trigonal energy contours are rotated by $180^\circ$ compared to the $K^+$ valley. In this case, we find that the current is dispersed strongly to all three drain contacts. As the injected electrons occupy equivalently the two valleys, the kinematical construction proves that the larger part of the current is steered upwards. When the twist angle is reversed to $\theta = -2.9^\circ$ (or, equivalently, the electron energy is changed to $E = -270 \text{ meV}$), the triangular contours are rotated by $180^\circ$ and the current is directed predominantly to the bottom, see Figure 7(c,d).

Our analysis shows furthermore that the electrons in different valleys are steered in different directions, and therefore, the current flow to the lateral edges is partially valley polarized. To confirm this, we show in Figure 8 the valley polarization, calculated by means of (23) in specific regions of the device, see the shaded rectangles. The current close to the injecting source contact (region $A_S$) and the current passing straight through the device (region $A_{\rightarrow}$) are largely unpolarized. In contrast, the current that is directed to the lateral edges is valley polarized in opposite valleys, see the regions $A_\uparrow$ and $A_{\downarrow}$.

As the steering of the current flow is due to the trigonal shape of the energy contours, it disappears when the contours change towards the isotropic shape. This is the case, for instance, when the energy of the electrons is lowered below the van Hove singularity of the Moiré interference pattern, see the current flow in Figure 9 at $E = 135 \text{ meV}$ and Figure 2(b-c).

Finally, we show in Figure 10 the longitudinal and Hall resistance of the device, quantities that are commonly accessible in experiments. The steering of the current flow towards one of the lateral edges leads to a non-zero Hall resistance. The DOS, indicated by the gray color shading, shows features similar to the Hall resistance and highlights implicitly the energy bands causing the current steering. The red dashed line indicates the region where the Hall resistance has not been calculated, because in this region the Fermi wavelength is larger than the system size and the calculation would suffer from finite-size effects. Our findings of a non-local resistance are loosely related to those reported recently by Ma and coworkers[34]. In that work, the non-local resistance is generated by a topological state in the superconducting gap, while here the trigonal shape of the energy contours generates the non-local signal in a different parameter regime.
CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that the current flow in TBLG can be steered by the twist angle. Even more important, the direction is reversed if the electrons are injected in the valence band instead of the conduction band (or vice versa), making it possible to control the current flow in TBLG devices through electric gates. This directional control of the current flow in TBLG is observed for a broad range of experimentally accessible parameters, see Figure 6.

We have explained the steering by the trigonal shape of the energy contours in the bilayer region using the kinematical construction, which also proved that the deviated currents are partially valley polarized, see Figure 8. However, this construction is based on a continuum model of the bilayer, it is naturally not able to explain why the currents in the bottom and top layer of the bilayer region flow in almost orthogonal directions, see Figure 3.

A splitting of the current flow due to the trigonal warping of graphene’s energy bands has been reported before at the van Hove singularity of monolayer graphene [49, 51]. However, the steering in TBLG appears at experimentally accessible electron energies and can be controlled by the twist angle and electric gating.

The proposed device allows to control and manipulate the current flow in TBLG. Technologically, it is of relevance for nanoelectronic applications and will ramp the rising field of twistronics. At this point, we can only speculate but the possibility to tune the direction of the current flow by gates could be used to construct a new type of graphene twist-transistor. Moreover, the fact that the steered current is partially valley polarized may be used to process not only the electron charge but also its valley degree of freedom.
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