The Rashba E ect within the Coherent Scattering Form alism

G.Feve, W.D.Oliver,^y M.Aranzana, and Y.Yamamoto^z Quantum Entanglement Project, ICORP, JST E.L.Ginzton Laboratory, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

(D ated: A pril 14, 2024)

The in uence of spin-orbit coupling in two-dimensional systems is investigated within the framework of the Landauer-Buttiker coherent scattering formalism. This formalism usually deals with spin-independent stationary states and, therefore, it does not include a spin-orbit contribution to the current. In this article, we will rederive the coherent scattering formalism, accounting for the changes brought about by the spin-orbit coupling. A fler a short review of the features of spinorbit coupling in two-dimensional electron gases, we dene the creation/annihilaton operators in the stationary states of the spin-orbit coupling H am iltonian and use them to calculate the current operator within the Landauer-Buttiker formalism. The current is expressed as it is in the standard spin-independent case, but with the spin label replaced by a new label which we call the spin-orbit coupling label. The spin-orbit coupling e ects can then be represented in a scattering matrix which relates the spin-orbit coupling stationary states in di erent leads. This scattering matrix is calculated in the case of a four-port beam splitter, and it is shown to mix states with di erent spin-orbit coupling labels in a manner that depends on the angle between the leads. The form alism is then used to calculate the e ect of spin-orbit coupling on the current and noise in two examples of electron collision.

I. IN TRODUCTION

C oherent electron transport through nanostructures in cryogenic two-dimensional electron gas systems is inherently a quantum m echanical phenom enon. Several experin ents have dem onstrated certain aspects of this quantum behavior, whether it relies directly on the wave nature of the electron and can be probed through a current or conductance m easurem ent (e.g., quantized resistance in the quantum Halle ect¹, conduction m odes of a quantum point contact^{2,3}), or on the particle nature and quantum statistics of the electrons and can be probed through a noise m easurem ent (e.g., H anbury B row n and Tw iss-type experim ent^{4,5}, electron collision⁶, observation of the fractional charge in the fractional quantum Hall e ect^{7,8}). In addition, 2D electron gases could be used to study the fundam entalnon-local features of quantum mechanics through electron entanglem ent^{9,10,11,12,13,14}. All these experiments can be successfully explained within the coherent scattering form alism ^{15,16}, a theoretical tool describing coherent and non-interacting electron transport. This form alism relies on spin-independent stationary states in the leads of the device and, therefore, describes spin-independent transport. A lthough it is possible to add a local spin-dependent e ect directly in the scattering matrix, it is not possible in general to take into account spin e ects occurring over the whole system . One potentially important spin e ect occurring in the leads of the conductor is spin-orbit coupling. Any electric eld in the reference fram e of the laboratory generates a magnetic eld in the moving electron reference fram e, coupling the electron's orbital degrees of freedom with its spin. One can nd several sources of electric elds in sem iconductors. In three dimensional crystals, the periodic crystal potential generates the D resselhaus

e ect¹⁷, which induces a spin-splitting of the conduction band that is proportional to k^3 . In two-dimensional systems, the dominant term results from the asymmetry of the in-plane con ning potential. First introduced by Rashba¹⁸, this e ect causes a spin-splitting¹⁹ proportional to k, and it depends on the strength of the applied electric eld. Recently, there has been a growing interest in electronic devices which rely on the spin properties of the electrons. These spin-dependent devices m ay be inuenced by spin-orbit coupling e ects, or m ay even rely on it as, for example, in a coherent version of a spinpolarized eld e ect transistor^{20,21}. Therefore, it m ay be useful to include spin-orbit coupling in the coherent scattering form alism.

II. SPIN-ORBIT COUPLING IN TW O-DIMENSIONAL ELECTRON GASES

The spin-orbit coupling is governed by the following spin-orbit H am iltonian²², which is obtained using an expansion in v=c of the D irac equation

$$\hat{H}_{SO} = \frac{h}{(2m_0c)^2} r V (^{\hat{p}});$$
 (1)

where m_0 is the free electron mass, \hat{p} is the momentum operator, $\hat{r} = (\hat{x}; \hat{y}; \hat{z})$ are the Pauli spin matrices, V is the electrostatic potential, and r is the gradient operator so that r V is the electric eld. Electron transport in the presence of an electric eld results in a spin-orbit e ect which couples the electron spin and orbital degrees of freedom through the \hat{p} term. Here, we will neglect the bulk e ect arising from the periodic crystal potential (D resselhaus e ect) and consider only the e ect caused by the asymmetry of the con ning quantum well (Rashba e ect), as it is stronger than the D resselhaus effect in m ost two-dimensional heterostructures^{23,24,25}. Let z be the direction of con nement, perpendicular to the plane of motion. The asymmetry of the con ning potential along the z-direction results in a non-zero electric eld along the z-axis ($E = E_0 u_z$ throughout the article, where u_z represents a unit vector in the z-direction). The spin-orbit coupling term of the Ham iltonian can be written

$$\hat{H}_{SO} = \frac{1}{h} \begin{pmatrix} \uparrow & p \end{pmatrix}_{k} = i \begin{pmatrix} \uparrow_{y} \frac{\theta}{\theta_{x}} & \hat{\chi} \frac{\theta}{\theta_{y}} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (2)$$

where is the spin-orbit coupling constant and depends on the strength of the electric eld. It takes values in the range 1 to 10 10^{10} eV cm for a large variety of system s (InA s/G aSb²⁵, InA s/A ISb²⁶, In_xG a_{1 x}A s/In_xA l_{1 x}A s^{23,27} and G aA s/A l_xG a_{1 x}A s²⁸) depending on the shape of the con ning well. Using the standard e ective m ass approximation, we can deduce the system H am iltonian as the free H am iltonian plus the spin-orbit coupling H am iltonian

$$\hat{H} = \frac{p_{x}^{2} + p_{y}^{2}}{2m} - \frac{1}{h} (\hat{y} p_{x}^{2} - \hat{x} p_{y}^{2}); \qquad (3)$$

where m is always taken to be the elective mass. Since the operators $\hat{p_x}$ and $\hat{p_y}$ commute with \hat{H} , we can search for eigenstates of the form

$$j i = e^{i(k_x x + k_y y)} [j'' i + j'' i];$$
 (4)

where J'i and J'i label the up and down states of the z-component of the spin. We can now diagonalize the H am iltonian

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\frac{h^{2}k^{2}}{2m}}{k_{y} \text{ i } k_{x}} \frac{k_{y} + \text{ i } k_{x}}{\frac{h^{2}k^{2}}{2m}}$$
(5)

in this spin subspace. The eigenvalues are E (k) = $\frac{hk^2}{2m}$ k, and the associated eigenfunctions are

$$_{E_{+}} = \frac{e^{i(k_{x}x+k_{y}y)}}{p_{\overline{2}}} [e^{i_{\overline{2}}} J''i+e^{i_{\overline{2}}} J''i] \quad (6)$$

$$_{E} = \frac{e^{i(k_{x}x+k_{y}y)}}{\frac{p}{2}} [e^{i\frac{1}{2}} J'i e^{i\frac{1}{2}} J'i]$$
(7)

where is the angle between $k = (k_x; k_y)$ and the y-axis (see Fig. 1). The electrons feel a virtual magnetic eld in the 2D plane in a direction perpendicular to k. The spin is aligned or antialigned to this eld (see Fig. 1), so that $(k; S_{jE}_i) = =2$, and $(k; S_{jE_i}) = =2$, where $(k; S_{jE_i})$ is the angle between k and the spin S in the state E. The amplitude of the magnetic eld depends on the velocity of the electron and vanishes for k = 0, preventing a possible spin polarization in the system. The spin-orbit splitting is usually sm all compared to the kinetic energy of the electrons (0:15 m eV k_f 1:5 m eV for $E_f = 14$ m eV). Following



FIG.1: D inection of the virtual magnetic eld and spin. An electron with wave vector k in the presence of an electric eld $E = E_0 u_z$ feels a virtual eld B (k; E) perpendicular to k.

Ref. 15, we will introduce a transverse con nem ent in the leads of the conductor, allowing us to address the longitudinal transport m odes for each given transverse m ode. Focusing on one lead, , we will make two sim plifying assum ptions. First, we consider only a single independent transverse mode. Second, we neglect the 1D SO coupling e ect that this transverse con ning potential could create, since, to our know ledge, there is no experim ental veri cation of this e ect, and it is estimated to be much smaller than the Rashba e ect^{29} . W ithin these approxim ations, we can use our previous analysis to deduce the eigenstates and the associated energy dispersion diagram (see Fig. 2), with k lying in the direction x of the lead (making the angle with the y axis). We will now introduce three labels for the eigenstates that will prove useful in writing the creation and annihilation operators of these states. = a or b labels the direction of propagation from the sign of the group velocity v_q (a if $sgn(v_q) > 0$, b otherwise). The parameter k labels the longitudinal mode wavevector. The SO coupling label designates the two di erent branches of the en-

ergy dispersion diagram for a given k (+ branch and branch in Fig. 2). Using these labels, we nd the follow –



FIG.2: Energy dispersion diagram with SO coupling. The $k_0 = k^0 < 1$ range (a states) is deduced from Eq.(8) with $k^0 = k$. The $1 < k^0 < k_0$ range (b states) is then deduced from mirror symmetry ($k^0 = k$).

ing eigenstates and eigenvalues of the system from Eq. (6) and (7)

$$j;k; i = (y) \frac{e^{i kx}}{p \frac{1}{2}} [e^{i \frac{1}{2}} J'i + e^{i \frac{1}{2}} J'i]$$
$$E = \frac{hk^2}{2m} + k \qquad k_0 \qquad k < 1 \qquad (8)$$

= +1(1) when = a(b), and = +1(1)where when = + (). (y) is the normalized transverse wavefunction for the transverse mode under consideration. By convention, k is only taken in the range k < 1 for both the a and b states. We k₀ use = 1 to param eterize explicitly the appropriate wavevector range for the = a (b) propagation direction in the eigenstates' phase factor e^{i kx}. The eigenvalues in Fig. 2 can be deduced by m irror sym m etry. This convention allow sus to track the propagation direction throughout the calculation. We also notice in Fig. 2 that, for a given energy, the corresponding + and states with sam e label do not have the sam e wavevector:

k (E;) k (E;+) = k =
$$2k_0 = \frac{2m}{h^2}$$
: (9)

The states with = have their spin perpendicular to the direction of propagation v_g and in opposite directions, so that $(v_g; S_{jk}; i) = = 2$ and $(v_g; S_{jk;+i}) = = 2$ (see Fig. 3). It is important to notice that the



FIG.3: Direction of propagation and direction of the spin

= + () states do not coincide with the E_{+} E states, as it is v_q, and not k, which determ ines the direction of the spin (e.g., in Fig. 3, the spin of the + state is perpendicular to and on the right side of v_{α}). For example, in Fig. 2, the two de nitions are consistent for states with positive (negative) k^0 and group velocity v_q . However, they are inconsistent for positive (negative) \dot{k}^0 and negative (positive) vg. We choose here to link the direction of the spin to v_q (rather than k^0) through the (rather than E), because it is the group label = velocity which determ ines the direction of the current. Note that in the case without SO coupling, no di erentiation between v_{α} and k^0 is necessary since they always share the sam e sign.

III. SPIN-ORBIT COUPLING AND COHERENT SCATTER ING FORMALISM

The Landauer-Buttiker formalism relies on a second quantization formulation of quantum mechanics. The current is expressed as a function of the eld operator, which is expanded in the basis of the scattering states using the operators that create and destroy electrons in the leads of the conductor. A scattering state is a coherent sum of an incident wave in one lead and the outgoing waves it generates in all the other leads. The amplitude of each outgoing wave is given by the scattering matrix S, whose elements depend on the properties of the scatterer. As our nalgoal is to study the uctuations of the current, it is important to nd a simple way to express the time dependence of the current operator. This leads us to choose the stationary states in each lead for the purpose of expanding the eld operator. In our rederivation of the coherent scattering form alism, we will follow the same analysis as in Ref. 15, but introducing two important changes: we will rederive the expression of the current operator as a function of the eld operator, adding a new contribution coming from spin-orbit coupling, and we will expand the eld operator in the new stationary basis of the SO coupling Ham iltonian.

A. Calculation of the current operator

One way to nd the current operator for noninteracting electrons is to use the single-particle Schrodinger equation

$$ih\frac{\theta}{\theta t} = -\frac{h^2}{2m} \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta x^2} + \frac{\theta}{\theta y^2}\right) + i \left(-\frac{\theta}{y}\frac{\theta}{\theta x} - \frac{x}{\theta}\frac{\theta}{\theta y}\right);$$
(10)

where is a two-components spinor. The current operator j can be extracted from the conservation of charge equation $\frac{\theta}{\theta t} [e^{y}] + r : j = 0$; using Eq. (10) and its adjoint,

$$j_{x} = \frac{eh}{2mi} \frac{h}{e} \frac{y}{e} \frac{\theta}{ex} \frac{\theta}{ex} \frac{y}{h} \frac{1}{y} \frac{e}{h} \frac{y}{y}$$
(11)

$$j_y = \frac{eh}{2mi} \frac{y}{ey} \frac{d}{ey} \frac{d}{ey} + \frac{e}{h} \frac{y}{x}$$
(12)

We can identify the usual kinetic term of the current density

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{\mathrm{eh}^{\mathrm{h}}}{2\mathrm{m}\,\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{y}}\mathbf{r} \qquad \mathbf{r}^{\mathrm{y}} \stackrel{\mathrm{i}}{:} \qquad (13)$$

Note that SO coupling adds a new contribution proportional to that we call the SO coupling current density iso ,

$$j_{BO} = \frac{e}{h} y_{y} u_{x} + \frac{e}{h} y_{x} u_{y}$$
: (14)

In the fram ework of second quantization, becomes a eld operator, and we have to expand it using a convenient basis: the stationary states.

B. Expansion of the eld operator

The rst step is to de ne the creation (annihilation) operators for the SO coupling stationary states. We rst introduce the creation operators in the old spin basis: $a^{y}{}_{k''}$ ($\hat{b}^{y}{}_{k\#}$) creates an incoming (outgoing) electron with spin up (down) in the rst mode of lead with momentum k, in the state ja;k;"i (jb;k;#i), where j;k;"i = $e^{i kx}$ j'i. These standard operators satisfy the anticom - mutation relation $a_{;k;s}$; $\hat{a}^{y}{}_{;k^{0};s^{0}}$] = kk^{0} ss⁰, where s labels the spin of the electron. Through Eq. (8) we introduce $\hat{a}^{y}{}_{k}$, which creates an incoming electron in lead with momentum k and spin-orbit coupling label (not

to be confused with the spin s) satisfying the relation

$$a^{y}_{k} = \frac{1}{p} \left[e^{i - 2} a^{y}_{k} + e^{i - 2} a^{y}_{k} \right]$$
: (15)

K now ing the anticommutation relationships in the spin basis, we can calculate it in our new stationary basis to be

h i
$$a_{k;}$$
; $a_{k^{0};}^{y}$; $a_{k^{0}}^{y}$; $a_{k^{0}}^{y}$; (16)

where we used the relation 0 = 2 0 1. This result justi as our labeling of the SO coupling eigenstates and the use of the spin-orbit coupling label instead of the spin. The stationary states form a complete basis, and we can use them to expand the eld operator in lead . From now on, we will choose x and y as the reference axis (so that $= \frac{1}{2}$), speci cally tracking all of the angular dependence in the scattering matrix.

$$^{(x;y)} = \frac{X \quad X^{t}}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{k_{0}}^{k_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{k_{0}} \frac{e^{i \quad kx} (y)}{p I}$$
(17)

where \hat{b} is the annihilation operator in the incom – ing (outgoing) states and is a two-component spinor obtained from Eq. (8), setting = $\frac{1}{2}$

j;k; i =
$$\frac{e^{i kx} (y)}{\frac{p}{L}} \frac{\frac{1+i}{2}}{|\frac{1-i}{2}|}$$
; (18)

As shown in Fig. 4, its spin depends on the SO coupling state () and on the direction of propagation (a orb). At this point, it is more convenient to go from a discrete sum in k-space to a continuous integral in energy by de ning the operators $\hat{a}^{y}(E)$, which create electrons in the energy continuum. As our labeling de nes a one-to-one correspondence between (;k;_p) and (;E;), we can de ne unam biguously $\hat{a}^{y}(E) = (E) \hat{a}^{y}_{k}$, so that

h
â; (E);
$$a^{y}_{; 0}$$
 (E⁰) = 0 (E E⁰) (19)

where (E) is the density of states at energy E. A priori, (E) could depend on the spin-orbit coupling label, but



FIG.4: Direction of the spin of

one can check in Appendix A that it is not the case. Replacing the discrete sum overk by an integral over E and introducing the new operators and their time-dependence $a(E;t) = e^{-\frac{iE}{h}t}a(E)$, we nd

^(x;y;t) =
$$\frac{1}{P2} X^{Z_1}$$
, $E_0 \frac{dE}{h v_g(E)}$, (E) (y)
 $e^{i k (E;)x} e^{i \frac{E}{h}t}$ (20)

with $E_0 = \frac{m^2}{2h^2}$, and k has been replaced by k(E;) to remind us that, for a given energy, k depends on the spin-orbit coupling label .

C. Current in the spin-orbit coupling basis

The current in lead is given by

$$Z = Z$$

 $\hat{f} = dy\hat{j}_{k} = dy(\hat{j}_{kK} + \hat{j}_{kSO}) = \hat{f}_{K} + \hat{f}_{SO}$: (21)

W e will begin by calculating the usual kinetic term $\, \hat{I}_{\! K}^{}$. Using Eq. (13), we have

$$\hat{f}_{K}(t) = \int_{0}^{X} \int_{0}^{X} dE dE^{0} \hat{f}_{K}^{0} (E; E^{0})^{+} (E^{0})^{0} (E^{0}) e^{i\frac{E^{-E^{0}}}{\hbar}t}$$
(22)

$$\hat{I}_{K}^{(n)} \circ (E; E^{0}) = \frac{eh}{2m i} \frac{i}{h} \frac{i}{v_{g}(E)v_{g}(E^{0})} [k(E;) + \circ k(E^{0}; {}^{0})] e^{i(-ok(E^{0}; {}^{0}) - k(E;))x};$$
(23)

We notice from Eq. (22) that the ! frequency of the current is given by $E = E^{0} + h!$. Follow ing Ref. 15, we calculate the current and noise in the zero-frequency limit, and m ake the approximation $k (E^{0};) k (E;)$ (as $E \in E^{0}$) for electrons having the same SO coupling label, and, using Eq. (9), $k (E^{0}; ^{0}) = k (E;) + k$ for electrons having di erent SO coupling labels. From Eq. (18), we also have, (with $e^{0} = 1$ if $e^{0}; 0$ otherwise)

) = 0 0 + 6 0 6 0:

This result is consistent with the fact that only electrons with the same direction of propagation and the same spin-orbit coupling label, or opposite direction of propagation and opposite spin-orbit coupling label, have the same spin.

In the =
0
 case, implying = 0 and k (E 0 ; 0) k (E;), we nd

$$\hat{f}_{K}^{\circ} (E; E^{\circ}) j_{=} = \frac{e}{h} \frac{k(E;)}{k(E; +) + \frac{m}{h^{2}}}$$
: (25)

In the \notin ⁰ case, implying \notin ⁰ and k(E⁰; ⁰) k(E;) + $\frac{2m}{h^2}$, so that k(E;) + $_0k^0(E; ^0) = \frac{2m}{h^2}$, we nd

(24)

$$\hat{I}_{K}^{0} (E; E^{0}) j_{6} = \frac{e}{h} \frac{\frac{m}{h^{2}}}{k(E; +) + \frac{m}{h^{2}}} e^{j(2k(E; +) + k)x} :$$
(26)

If we only consider the kinetic term of the current, a non-vanishing contribution for $\mathbf{6}^{-0}$ leads to term s like $\hat{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{y}}\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathbf{y}}\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ in the expression of the current, corresponding to electrons propagating in opposite directions.

Now, let us study the contribution of the spin-orbit coupling current \hat{I}_{SO} . Using Eq. (14) to calculate $\hat{I}_{SO}^{\circ}_{\circ}$ in Eq. (22) with $\kappa \, ! \, so$, we nd

$$\hat{I}_{SO}^{\circ} \circ (E; E^{\circ}) = \frac{e}{h} \frac{p}{p} \frac{h}{v_{g}(E)v_{g}(E^{\circ})} = \frac{e}{h} \frac{p}{p} \frac{h}{v_{g}(E)v_{g}(E^{\circ})}$$
(27)

$$\hat{I}_{SO}^{\circ} \circ (E; E^{\circ}) = \frac{e}{h} \frac{\frac{m}{h^{2}}}{k(E; +) + \frac{m}{h^{2}}} \qquad \circ \qquad \circ + e^{i (2k(E; +) + k)x} \qquad i \qquad (28)$$

W e can now calculate the value of the total current from Eq. (25), (26) and (28)

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}} \circ (\mathbf{E}; \mathbf{E}^{0}) = \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\mathbf{K}} \circ (\mathbf{E}; \mathbf{E}^{0}) + \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\mathbf{S}0} \circ (\mathbf{E}; \mathbf{E}^{0})$$
$$= \frac{\mathbf{e}}{\mathbf{h}} \circ \circ \mathbf{e} :$$
(29)

A lthough the spin-orbit coupling m ixes electrons having di erent directions of propagation when we consider only the kinetic term of the current, these contributions cancel when we add the spin-orbit coupling current I_{SO} , and we nd the standard form ula for the current operator,

$$\hat{f} = \frac{e}{h}^{X} \quad \overset{Z}{dE} \, dE \, dE^{0} [\hat{a}^{Y} (E) \hat{a} (E^{0}) \\ \hat{b}^{Y} (E) \hat{b} (E^{0})] e^{i\frac{E-E^{0}}{h}t}; \quad (30)$$

In this form ula, the de nition of the â (b) states as states with positive (negative) group velocity, and not necessar-

ily positive (negative) wavevector, is consistent with the fact that they carry the current in opposite directions. More importantly, the nal expression of the current is similar to the one found in Ref. 15, but with the spin index replaced by the spin-orbit coupling label = . The spin related to this new index depends on the direction of propagation, that is, the angle of the lead . Therefore, we expect a dependence in the scattering matrix relating the spin-orbit coupling states in leads with di erent orientations. As an example, we investigate the scattering matrix in the case of a four-port beam splitter (two input leads, two output leads) used in electron collisions. The scattering matrix relates the outgoing states in the outputs (\hat{b} states) to the incident states at the input (\hat{a} states)

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \sum_{0}^{X} \mathbf{S} \circ \hat{\mathbf{a}} \circ \mathbf{s}$$
(31)

FIG. 5: Four-port beam splitter

In the spin-independent transport case, as the beam splitter does not act on the spin degrees of freedom, the scattering m atrix does not m ix di erent spins (the scattering m atrix is diagonal in each subspace of spin: spin-up and spin-down). In this case the re ection and transm ission coe cients do not depend on the spin. How ever, when we include spin-orbit coupling, the situation ism ore com plicated, because the spin associated with the spin-orbit coupling label is di erent in each lead (the leads having di erent orientations). The conservation of the spin at the beam splitter then im plies that we have a m ixing of the spin-orbit states (o -diagonal elements in the scattering m atrix), and this m ixing becom es m ore im portant when the angle between the leads increases. A beam -







We note that the unitarity of the S matrix requires $jr_1^2 + jr_2^2 = R + T = 1$ and rt + tr = 0.

IV. SPIN-ORBIT COUPLING AND NOISE IN ELECTRON COLLISIONS

W e will now use the expression of the current operator and the scattering matrix to calculate the current and noise in two experim ents using the four-port beam – splitter setup. The rst is an unpolarized electron collision, which has already been realized experim entally (see R ef. 6). The second is a spin-polarized electron collision.

A. Unpolarized electron collision

This experiment is a collision at a 50/50 beam splitter of electrons from leads 1 and 2 which are biased at E_f + eV: At zero temperature and without spin-orbit coupling, each electron with a speci c spin in lead 1 has an identical partner in lead 2. The Pauli exclusion principle then forbids us to nd these two electrons in the same output. We expect a total suppression of the partition noise. W ith spin-orbit coupling, we do not expect this result to be modi ed. It relies only on the full occupation of the energy eigenstates, which is not modi ed at zero temperature by SO coupling. We will con m this by studying the collision of four electrons at the same energy. The initial state is:

$$j_{i}i = a_{k;+;1}^{y}(E) a_{k^{0};;1}^{y}(E) a_{k;+;2}^{y}(E) a_{k^{0};;2}^{y}(E) j_{i};$$
(33)

From now on, we will drop the E, k and k^0 labels for the energy and the m om entum of the electrons, associating a + () SO coupling state with k (k^0) . The output state is found using the new scattering matrix with SO coupling using Eq. (31) and Eq. (32)

$$j_{fi} = \begin{array}{cccc} h & ih & i\\ r [\cos \hat{b}_{+3}^{y} + i\sin \hat{b}_{-3}^{y}] + t \hat{b}_{+4}^{y} & r [i\sin \hat{b}_{+3}^{y} + \cos \hat{b}_{-3}^{y}] + t \hat{b}_{-4}^{y} \\ h & ih & ih \\ t \hat{b}_{+3}^{y} + r [\cos \hat{b}_{+4}^{y} & i\sin \hat{b}_{-4}^{y}] & t \hat{b}_{-3}^{y} + r [i\sin \hat{b}_{+4}^{y} + \cos \hat{b}_{-4}^{y}] & j \hat{D} i \\ \end{array}$$

$$= \hat{b}_{+3}^{y} \hat{b}_{-3}^{y} \hat{b}_{+4}^{y} \hat{b}_{-4}^{y} \hat{D} i \qquad (34)$$

where we have used the relation $r^4 + t^4 = 2 r^2 t^2 = 1$. As expected, a full occupation of the two input states at energy E leads to a full occupation of the two output states as well. A calculation of the noise for the fully occupied outputs would show a complete suppression of the partition noise. The only di erence with the spinindependent transport case is that the colliding electrons at the sam e energy do not have the sam e m om entum (k ϵ k⁰). Therefore, the non-ideality in the noise suppression observed in R ef. 6 cannot be caused by the SO coupling.

B. Spin-polarized electron collision

In the previous example, an unpolarized collision cannot show any SO coupling e ect, because, starting with two quiet sources of electrons with fully occupied energy levels, all the transport statistics are governed by the Pauli exclusion principle independent of the SO coupling. However, this is not the case for a spin-polarized collision. A s the standard spin basis is not the stationary basis, and as the SO coupling scattering matrix m ixes different SO coupling states, some of the partition noise is recovered, depending on the SO coupling constant and on the angle between the colliding leads. We will conm this by calculating the non-equilibrium noise (of the electrons above the Ferm isea) between E_f and E_f + eV, assuming that the process of polarization does not e ect the transport in the conductor (for example, there is no magnetic eld in the conductor). The input state is then made of all the electrons with the same espin, for example spin-up, between k_f and k_{m ax} = k (E_f + eV). Following Ref. 15, we present the initial state and the current operator using the following notations

$$j_{i}i = \begin{cases} k_{Y}a_{x} \\ a_{1}^{y} (k) a_{2}^{y} (k) j 0 i \end{cases}$$
(35)
$$\hat{1}(t) = \frac{e}{h} \begin{cases} X & X & X \\ s & 0 \end{cases} dE dE^{0} e^{\frac{i(E-E^{0})t}{h}} A^{-s} = 0 \\ a^{Y} (E) a \circ (E^{0}) \end{cases}$$
(36)

where $k_{m ax}$ is given by $E_f + eV = \frac{h^2 k_{m ax}^2}{2m} D W e$ then use the current uctuation $\hat{f}(t) = \hat{f}(t)$ $\hat{f}(t)$ to calculate the uctuation correlation function.

$$\overset{D}{1} (t) \overset{E}{1} (0) = \frac{e^2}{h^2} \overset{X}{\underset{ss^0}{}} \overset{X}{\underset{ss^0}{}} \overset{X}{\underset{ss^0}{}} \overset{X}{\underset{ss^0}{}} \overset{X}{\underset{ss^0}{}} \overset{X}{\underset{ss^0}{}} \overset{Z}{\underset{st^0}{}} \overset{C}{\underset{st^0}{}} \overset{C}{\underset{st^0}{} \overset{C}{\underset{st^0}{}} \overset{C}{\underset{st^0}{}} \overset{C}{\underset{st^0}{} \overset{C}{\underset{st^0}{}} \overset{C}{} \overset{C}{\underset{st^0}{}}$$

A lthough we derived an expression for the current operator in the SO coupling basis, it is mathematically more convenient in this case to express all the operators in the standard spin basis

$$\hat{a}^{y} (E) = \frac{[e^{i\frac{1}{2}}\hat{a}^{y}, (k(E;)) + e^{i\frac{1}{2}}\hat{a}^{y}, (k(E;))]}{\frac{P}{2D} (k)}$$
(40)

$$p \frac{\text{ith } D}{D} \frac{(k)}{(k)} \frac{\frac{dE(k;)}{dk}}{(k)} = \frac{h^2k}{m} + . Dening$$

$$\overset{\circ \ \infty \ \infty}{=} \frac{1}{4} \overset{h}{\underset{i::+}{\overset{(k_{\rm E}\ ;}{=}\ k_{\rm E}\ \infty),\ \infty)}} (k_{\rm E}\ ;,\ \circ \ k_{\rm E}\ \infty,\ \infty)\ n\ "(k_{\rm E}\ ;,\)\ [1\ n\ "(k_{\rm E}\ \circ,\ \circ)]$$

where k_E ; = $k_E \circ_i \circ_i \circ_i$ for $E = E^0 + k(\circ)$, so that $(k_E, k_E \circ \circ \circ_i \circ \circ \circ) = D(k)$ [$E = E^{00} + k(\circ \circ \circ)$]. After integration over $E^{\circ \circ \circ}$ and $E^{\circ \circ \circ}$ and making the approximation $D_+(k) = D(k)$, we nd

$${}^{Z} dE^{00} dE^{00} = \frac{1}{4}^{h} n_{*}(k_{E};) [1 n_{*}(k_{E}\circ;\circ)] + \circ \circ n_{*}(k_{E};) : (42)$$

We can replace D (k) by D₊ (k), because $\frac{D_{-}(k)}{D_{+}(k)} = \frac{\frac{h^{2}k}{D_{+}(k)}}{\frac{h^{2}k}{m}}$ 1+ $\frac{\frac{h^{2}k}{2m}}{\frac{h^{2}k}{2m}}$ 1, which follows from $\frac{\frac{h^{2}k}{2m}}{\frac{h^{2}k_{f}^{2}}{2m}}$ $\frac{\frac{k_{f}}{m}}{\frac{h^{2}k_{f}^{2}}{2m}} = \frac{E_{SO}(k_{f})}{E_{O}(k_{f})}$ 1 as the SO coupling is small. We will now calculate the power spectral density at zero frequency in output lead number 3, S₃₃ (0),

$$S_{33}$$
 (!) 2 dt e^{i!t}h ½ (t) ½ (0)i: (43)

From Eq. (38) and Eq. (42), we nd

where = 1 or 2, since we ignored scattering from output to output. n " (k_E ;) is the number of electrons in lead with spin up and momentum k_E ;

$$n "(k_{E};) = \\ \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ < 0 & \text{if } E & E_{f} + k_{f} \\ 1 & \text{if } E_{f} + k_{f} & E & E_{f} + eV + k_{m ax} \\ \end{array} \\ : 0 & \text{if } E_{f} + eV + k_{m ax} & E \end{array}$$

A sum ing that the SO coupling is weaker than the bias voltage, that is, $E_f + k_f = E_f + eV = k_{m ax}$, we have $n = (k_E;) [1 = n = (k_E; +)] \notin 0$ for $E_f = k_f = E_f + k_f$ and $n = (k_E; +) [1 = n = (k_E;)] \notin 0$ for $E_f + eV = k_{m ax} = E_f + eV = k_{m ax}$. Therefore, Eq. (44) becomes

$$S_{33}(0) = \frac{e^2}{2h} X X X A^{3s} A^{3s}$$

Given the scattering matrix calculated in Eq. (32), we nd

and

so that

$$S_{33}(0) = \frac{4e^2}{h} (k_f + k_{max}) T (1 T) sin^2$$
: (48)

A fler som e calculation, we nd the current and Fano factor to be

$$hI_3i = \frac{e^2V}{h}$$
(49)

F
$$\frac{S_{33}(0)}{hI_3i} = 4 \text{ eT} (1 \text{ T}) \sin^2 \frac{(k_f + k_{max})}{eV}$$
:
(50)

This result reveals two typical features of SO coupling: rst, the noise is proportional to the SO coupling constant, and second, it depends on the angle between the input leads 1 and 2. One can check that the obtained noise is identical to the partition noise for two independent leads where only a fraction $\left(\frac{(k_f + k_m a_x)}{eV}\right)$ of the electrons is colliding, and for which the noise is modiled by the factor \sin^2 . This result can also be explained using F ig. 6. In the inputs, the spin-up electron states between k_f and $k_m a_x$ are fully occupied. However, in terms of the SO coupling states, only the states between E $(k_f; +)$ and E $(k_m a_x;)$ are jointly occupied, giving no contribution to the noise as in the unpolarized case. Between E $(k_f;)$ and E $(k_f; +)$, only the states are lled, and



FIG.6: Energy diagram s with and without SO coupling

between E (k_{max} ;) and E (k_{max} ;+), only the + states are lled. These states do not have the same spin in leads 1 and 2 (their overlap is \cos^2), so that the Pauli exclusion principle does not fully suppress the noise, and the classical partition noise is partially recovered through the factor $\sin^2 = 1$ cos . In this treatment, we have assum ed that the SO coupling is sm all ($\frac{(k_{\rm f}+k_{\rm max})}{m}$ 1), so that $E(k_{f};+) = E(k_{max};)$. But, a typical value of the applied bias voltage is eV = 0:1 m eV, which is smaller than the typical values of energy splitting caused by the Rashba e ect (0:3 m eV 2 k_f 3 m eV). In this case, all the electrons contribute to the partition noise, and we have F = 4 eT (1)T) sinf . Depending on the angle between the leads, we can go from full noise suppression to the classical lim it of the partition noise. The modi cation of the noise caused by SO coupling in this collision experiment can in principle be measured, even for small values of the SO coupling constant.

V. CONCLUSION

We have studied the in uence of SO coupling in the fram ework of the Landauer-Buttiker form alism . A short review of the e ect of SO coupling in 2DEGs (and more precisely of the Rashbae ect) has rem inded us of its main features: spin-splitting proportional to k, and stationary states of the spin perpendicular to the direction of propagation. The electron feels a magnetic eld perpendicular to the direction of propagation, with an amplitude proportional to the velocity. We have then included the e ects of SO coupling in the Landauer-Buttiker coherent scattering form alism . The SO coupling gave rise to two importantmodications. First, the addition of a SO coupling term in the Ham iltonian modi es the expression of the current operator, and an extra term directly related to SO coupling has to be included. Second, the expansion of the current operator is in the basis of the stationary states of SO coupling. The nal form ula for the current operator was found to be identical to the one derived in the spin-independent transport case, but with the spin

replaced by the SO coupling label, indicating the alignment of the spin on the virtual magnetic eld caused by the SO coupling. The main di erences introduced by the SO coupling then arise in the calculation of the scattering matrix relating the stationary states of SO coupling in di erent leads with di erent orientations. The direction of the virtual magnetic eld (and, consequently, the direction of the spin) depends on the direction of propagation which is di erent for each lead in general. Therefore, the scattering matrix is shown to mix states with di erent SO coupling labels, and the strength of thism ixing depends on the angle between the leads. The e ect of SO coupling on the current noise was then investigated in two examples of electron collision. In the unpolarized electron collision example, it is shown that the SO coupling does not modify the noise; this case is entirely determ ined by the Pauli exclusion principle. In contrast, the polarized case exhibits a contribution to the noise caused by SO coupling, which is proportional to the SO coupling constant and depends on the angle between the leads. A polarized electron collision experiment provides, in principle, another way to measure the strength of the Rashba splitting energy. Finally, this new form ulation of the current operator can be applied to other coherent scattering experiments in which one wants to investigate or incorporate the elects of SO coupling.

A cknow ledgm ents

The authors gratefully acknow ledge useful discussions with E.W aks, X.M aftre and the support of J.F.Roch. W e thank the Quantum Entanglem ent Project (ICORP, JST) for nancial support.W.D.O.gratefully acknow ledges additional support from MURI and the NDSEG Fellow ship Program.

APPENDIX A: DENSITY OF STATES W ITH SPIN-ORBIT COUPLING

In this appendix, we calculate the density of states and show that it does not depend on the SO coupling label , as is suggested by the symmetry between the + and states in the energy dispersion diagram (see Fig. 2),

$$E = \frac{h^2 k^2 (E;)}{2m} + k (E;)$$
 (A1)

$$v_g$$
 (E) = $\frac{1}{h} \frac{dE(k;)}{dk} = \frac{hk(E;)}{m} + \frac{h}{h}$: (A2)

From Eq. (9) we deduce

$$k(E;) = k(E;+) + (1)\frac{m}{h^2}$$
 (A3)

$$v_g$$
 (E) = $\frac{hk(E; +)}{m} + \frac{h}{h} = v_g(E)$ (A4)

$$(E) = \frac{(k)}{h v_{g}(E)} = \frac{L}{2} \frac{1}{h v_{g}(E)}$$
(A5)

APPENDIX B:SCATTERING MATRIX IN THE FOUR-PORT BEAM SPLITTER CASE

Here, we determ ine the scattering m atrix for the fourport beam splitter described in Fig. 5. The beam splitter is very sim ply approxim ated by a potential barrier at $V = V_0$ of length L. The plane is then divided into three areas of di erent potential (see Fig. 7) in which the solution of the Schrödinger equation is known. Starting with an



FIG.7:Re ected, refracted and transmitted waves in a beam - splitter

incident wave in lead number one, for example, we can calculate the rejected, refracted, and transmitted waves in lead 3 and 4, using the continuity of the wavefunction and its derivatives at the beam splitter interface (x= 0 and x= L). For example, let us start with an incident state at energy E with momentum $k_{\rm i}$ in the SO coupling state

= +. By the conservation of energy, the rejected wave in lead 3 is a superposition of the states $k_r (E; +); + i$ and $k_r (E;); i with$

]

$$k_r (E; +) = k_i (E; +) = k_r (E;) k:$$
 (B1)

The translational invariance of the beam splitter along the y-axis leads to the conservation of the y-com ponent of the m om entum

$$k_1 \cos_i = k_r (E; +) \cos_i = k_r (E;) \cos_i (B2)$$

We deduce that $\cos_i = \cos_{r+}$, but $\cos_i \notin \cos_r$. There is dispersion due to the SO coupling, leading to an angular separation between the + and states after re ection at the beam splitter (see Fig. 8). This angular separation is given by

$$r = \arccos[(1 \quad \frac{k}{k_r (E;)}) \cos_i] \in r_+ : \quad (B3)$$

Starting with an incident state with SO coupling label , the angular separation is

$$r_{r+} = \arccos[(1 + \frac{k}{k_r (E; +)}) \cos_i] \in r$$
 (B4)



FIG.8: angular separation after re ection at a beam splitter

In analogy with the the total re ection for incident angles below the critical angle in classical optics, we can even have $(1 + \frac{k}{k_r (E_i^+)}) \cos i > 1$, leading to a suppression of the relection in the + state for a small enough incident angle. We note that starting with a mixture of states in the incident beam of electrons, one + and could suppress the rejection of the + state, thus achieving a polarization of the beam. Although interesting, we will neglect this e ect of angular dispersion by considering only non-equilibrium electrons above the Ferm i energy for which $\frac{k}{k}$ 1 (as SO coupling is sm all com pared to the kinetic energy), and im portant incident angles ($_{i} = \frac{1}{4}$). In this case the angular separation is very 1). The equations of continusmall (= _r r+ ity of the wavefunction and its derivative are then much easier to solve, and one can nd that the incident, refracted, and rejected waves have the same spin at x=0, and the refracted and transmitted waves have the same spin at $x = L \cdot U \sin g Eq.(7)$ to nd the spin overlap between di erent leads we nd, starting with a + incident state.

$$j_t i = t_k; + i \quad j_r i = r [\cos_i k; + i + i \sin_i k; i]$$
(B5)

where j_ti is the transm itted wave (into lead 4) and j_ri the rejected wave (into lead 3). As the transm itted wave has the same direction of propagation as the incident wave, there is no mixing of the SO coupling states, and we have only the usual transm ission coecient t. For the rejected wave, the direction is changed and we have to mix the different SO coupling states to obtain the same spin as the incident wave on the interface with the beam splitter. If we start now with a incident state, we nd

$$j_t i = t_k; i_j r i = r [isin_i_k; +i + cos_i_k; i]:$$
(B6)

The same analysis can be done for an incident state in lead 2 with $_{i}$ replaced by $_{i}$. We then deduce the whole scattering matrix:

$$S = \begin{cases} 2 & r \cos_{i} & ir \sin_{i} & t & 0 \\ 6 & ir \sin_{i} & r \cos_{i} & 0 & t & 7 \\ t & 0 & r \cos_{i} & ir \sin_{i} & 5 \\ 0 & t & ir \sin_{i} & r \cos_{i} \end{cases}$$
(B7)

also at ENS Cachan, 61 avenue du president W ilson, 94235 Cachan Cedex, France

- ^y E lectronic address: woliver@ stanford.edu
- ^z also at NTT Basic Research Laboratories, 3-1 M orinosato-W akam iya Atsugi, K anagawa, 243-01 Japan
- ¹ K. von Klitzing, G. Dorda, and M. Pepper, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 494 (1980).
- ² B.J.van W ees, H.van Houten, C.W.J.Beenakker, J.G. W illiam son, L.P.K ouwenhoven, D.van der M arel, and C. T.Foxon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 848 (1988).
- ³ D.A.W haram, T.J.Thornton, R.Newbury, M.Pepper, H.Ahmed, J.E.F.Frost, D.G.Hasko, D.C.Peacock, D.A.Ritchie, and G.A.C.Jones, J.Phys.C 21, L209 (1988).
- ⁴ M. Henny, S. Oberholzer, C. Strunk, T. Heinzel, K. Ensslin, M. Holland, and C. Schonenberger, Science 284, 296 (1999).
- ⁵ W .D.O liver, J.K im, R.C.Liu, and Y.Yam am oto, Science 284, 299 (1999).
- ⁶ R.C.Liu, B.O dom, Y.Yam am oto, and S.Tanucha, Nature 391, 263 (1998).
- ⁷ R.de-Picciotto, M. Reznikov, M. Heiblum, V. Umansky, G. Bunin, and D. Mahalu, Nature 389, 162 (1997).
- ⁸ L. Sam inadayar, D. C. G lattli, Y. Jin, and B. Etienne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2526 (1997).
- ⁹ G.Burkard, D.Loss, and E.V.Sukhorukov, Phys.Rev.B 61, 16 303 (2000).
- ¹⁰ X.Maître, W.D.Oliver, and Y.Yam am oto, Physica E 6, 301 (2000).
- ¹¹ W.D.Oliver, R.C.Liu, J.Kim, X.Maître, L.DiCarlo, and Y.Yamamoto, in Quantum Mesoscopic Phenomena and Mesoscopic Devices in Microelectronics, edited by I. O.Kulik and R.Ellialtioghu, NATO ASI, Series C, Vol. 559 (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 457-466, 2000).

- ¹² R. Ionicioiu, P. Zanardi, and F. Rossi, Phys. Rev. A 63, 050101 (R) (2001).
- ¹³ P.Recher, E.V. Sukhorokov, and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B 63, 165314 (2001).
- ¹⁴ W .D.O liver, F.Yam aguchi, and Y.Yam am oto, quantph/0107084.
- ¹⁵ M.Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B 46, 12 485 (1992).
- ¹⁶ T.M artin, and R.Landauer, Phys. Rev. B 45, 1742 (1992).
- ¹⁷ G.D resselhaus, Phys. Rev. 100, 580 (1955).
- ¹⁸ E. I. Rashba, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) 2, 1224 (1960) [Sov. Phys. Solid State 2, 1109 (1960)].
- ¹⁹ Yu.A.Bychkov, and E.I.Rashba, Pism a Zh.Eksp.Teor. Fiz. 39, 66 (1984) [JETP Lett. 39, 78 (1984)].
- ²⁰ S.D atta, and B.Das, Appl. Phys. Lett. 56, 665 (1990).
- ²¹ F.M ireles, and G.K irczenow, Phys. Rev. B 64, 024426 (2001).
- ²² L.I.Schi, Quantum M echanics (M oG raw H ill, N ew Y ork, 1968).
- ²³ B.Das, S.Datta, and R.Reifenberger, Phys.Rev.B 41, 8278 (1990).
- ²⁴ G.L.Chen, J.Han, T.T.Huang, S.Datta, and D.B. Janes, Phys. Rev. B 47, 4084 (1993).
- ²⁵ J. Luo, H. M unekata, F. F. Fang, and P. J. Stiles, Phys. Rev. B 41, 7685 (1990).
- ²⁶ J.P.Heida, B.J.van W ees, J.J.Kuipers, T.M.Klapwijk, and G.Borghs, Phys. Rev. B 57, 11 911 (1998).
- ²⁷ J.N itta, T.A kazaki, and H.Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 1335 (1997).
- ²⁸ T. Hassenkam, S. Pedersen, K. Baklanov, A. Kristensen, C. B. Sorensen, P. E. Lindelof, F. G. Pikus, and G. E. Pikus, Phys. Rev. B 55, 9298 (1997).
- ²⁹ A.V.Moroz, and C.H.W.Barnes, Phys. Rev. B 60, 14 272 (1999).