

Optical response and spin relaxation in semiconductor systems under excitation with arbitrary polarization

U. Rossler

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg
and

Departamento de Física de Materiales, Universidad Autónoma, Cantoblanco, E-28049 Madrid
(March 22, 2002)

(accepted for publication in Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) 234 (2002))

The equations-of-motion for the density matrix are derived in a multiband model to describe the response of semiconductors (bulk or quantum well structures) under optical excitation with arbitrary polarization. The multiband model used, comprising the twofold conduction band and the fourfold topmost valence band (or heavy- and light-hole states), incorporates spin-splitting of the single-particle states. The interaction terms include besides the direct Coulomb coupling between carriers also the electron-hole exchange interaction, which together with the spin-splitting terms is responsible for spin relaxation. Applying the Hartree-Fock truncation scheme leads to a set of coherent semiconductor Bloch equations for the multiband case. This concept provides the theoretical frame for describing phenomena connected with optical response under excitation with arbitrary light polarization and spin relaxation: polarized optical response, polarization dynamics of VCSELs, spin relaxation, and the circular photovoltaic effect.

PACS Number: 72.25.Fe, 72.25.Rb, 78.47.+p

I. INTRODUCTION

The spin degree-of-freedom of electrons has recently attracted increasing attention in the context of spintronics.¹ In semiconductor quantum structures it is intimately connected with circularly polarized light that is frequently used to create spin-polarized carriers and to detect their lifetime with respect to spin relaxation in pump-probe experiments.^{2,4} The investigation of optical orientation and of the mechanisms of spin relaxation, first carried out in bulk semiconductors⁵, have become the basis for ongoing studies in semiconductor quantum wells (QW), which are the likely material structure to realize the spin transistor.⁶ Theoretical work devoted to spin relaxation makes use preferentially of the density matrix to describe the thermal expectation value of the spin as an observable.⁷ For spin-polarized electrons in the conduction band of a bulk semiconductor or in the lowest electron subband of a QW structure it is sufficient to have the 2×2 spin-density matrix and its time evolution due to generation/annihilation and scattering processes. However, an adequate modelling of polarized photoluminescence involving interband transitions, i.e. the calculation of the thermal expectation value of the dipole operator for circularly polarized light, requires the knowledge of the density matrix for conduction- and valence-band states in a multiband scheme.⁸ The dependence on the intensity of the exciting light is an important experimental aspect and should be included in the density matrix.⁹

For vertical-cavity surface-emitting lasers (VCSEL) the phenomenon of polarization instability has recently become a topic of interest.^{10,11} The VCSEL geometry allows for two independent polarizations of the laser light, while VCSEL modelling, using the optical or semiconductor Bloch equations (SBE), was based so far on the two-level system that does not account for polarization degrees-of-freedom.^{12,13} This deficiency has been removed partially by formulating a phenomenological set of optical (or Maxwell) Bloch equations for a pair of two-level systems, that can emit separately light with right or left circular polarization and which are coupled by spin- $\uparrow\downarrow$ processes.¹⁰

Semiconductor Bloch equations can be studied in different time regimes: the coherent regime – when the interband polarization is in phase with the exciting electromagnetic field – is characterized by the Rabi oscillations, while the quasi-equilibrium situation is described by the optical (linear or nonlinear) susceptibility. In extending the two-level system, showing one Rabi frequency, to a three (or actually six) level system, comprising the spin-degenerate conduction, heavy- and light-hole bands, Binder and Lindberg¹⁴ formulated a set of equations for the optical polarization functions and carrier distributions to describe coherent nonlinear response of this more realistic quantum-well model under excitation with circularly polarized light. This treatment includes band mixing due to heavy-light hole coupling in the Luttinger Hamiltonian and many-body effects in a Hartree-Fock (HF) truncation with single-particle self energies determined by the direct Coulomb interaction. This concept has been applied successfully in studies of the intervalence band coherence due to coupled optical Stark shifts.¹⁵ However, spin- $\uparrow\downarrow$ processes that become possible due to band structure effects or due to electron-hole exchange (not in the scope of these studies) were not considered. Several more recent papers reported on the observation of the circular photogalvanic effect (CPGE) in n- and p-doped semiconductor quantum well structures.¹⁶ This effect, originally predicted for bulk semiconductors¹⁷, is based on converting the helicity of light into a directed stationary current. It represents a nonlinear response of the system to the intense exciting light which can be described by a third rank tensor. The effect is caused by creating a nonequilibrium carrier distribution in the spin-split subbands by excitation with circularly polarized light. The dependence of the effect on the light intensity, i.e. its saturation behavior, bears information on the spin-relaxation and should allow to extract the characteristic times.¹⁸ A microscopic description of these phenomena requires the formulation of the nonlinear response under excitation with circular (in general elliptic) polarization.

Among the different mechanisms of spin relaxation¹⁹ those named after Dyakonov and Perel' (DP)⁷ and Bir, Aronov, and Pikus (BAP)²⁰ seem to dominate in semiconductor structures not containing magnetic impurities. The DP mechanism is a single-particle effect. It is intimately connected with spin-splitting of the electronic states caused by spin-orbit coupling and inversion asymmetry. The BAP mechanism results from electron-hole exchange scattering and depends on the carrier concentration resulting from doping or intense optical excitation. Both mechanisms are of the motional-narrowing type, i.e. the spin-relaxation rate is proportional to the momentum scattering time.^{21,22} In experiments with circularly polarized light in the visible spectral range electron-hole pairs are created (bipolar optical orientation) and spin relaxation takes place due to both mechanisms, a situation which was not accounted for so far in theoretical work. The BAP mechanism can be avoided in far-infrared experiments with monopolar spin orientation connected with transitions between electron (or hole) subbands.^{16,18}

In order to provide a general theoretical frame for all these phenomena the equations-of-motion for the density matrix are formulated in a multiband model with the spin and polarization degrees-of-freedom being taken into account. The system Hamiltonian

$$H = H_0 + H^0(t) + H_{\text{Coul}} \quad (1)$$

consists of the single-particle part, $H_0 + H^0(t)$, describing the involved electron states and the interaction with the electromagnetic field, and the Coulomb interaction H_{Coul} . The multiband model comprises the twofold conduction,

heavy- and light-hole bands (or the respective lowest subbands in a QW structure) as in Ref.¹⁴ but includes the mechanisms of spin-splitting as origin of the DP mechanism. In Section II the equations of motion will be formulated by considering only the single-particle part of H in order to introduce the multiband model and to get familiar with the notation. Many-body effects (due to free carriers introduced by doping or created by optical excitation) are considered in Section III. Besides the direct Coulomb interaction between carriers also the electron-hole exchange coupling is taken into account. It gives rise to spin-flip processes and represents the origin of the BAP mechanism of spin-relaxation. By following Refs.^{12,14} the Hartree-Fock truncation is applied in Section IV to get a closed set of equations for the elements of the density matrix that describe the coherent part of the problem. They turn out to be more general than those known from the literature^{8,14} by taking into account both the polarization and spin degrees-of-freedom. In Section V these equations will be discussed with respect to simplifications (and including phenomenological damping) which allow to recover published results and to point out applications to new nonlinear response phenomena addressed here.

II. THE SINGLE-PARTICLE PART

The single-particle Hamiltonian H_0 is conveniently written in the second quantized form

$$H_0 = \sum_{m, \mathbf{k}} \epsilon_m(\mathbf{k}) a_m^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) a_m(\mathbf{k}) \quad (2)$$

where m, \mathbf{k} are the quantum numbers of a complete set of eigenstates with energy $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{k})$ and $a_m^\dagger(a)$ are creation (annihilation) operators of the corresponding states. For bulk semiconductors $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{k})$ denotes the energy bands, m the degeneracy within a given band, and \mathbf{k} the three-dimensional (3D) wave vector. In the following we restrict the basis to the lowest conduction band ($=c$) with $m_c = 1=2$ and the topmost valence band ($=v$) with $m_v = 3=2$ or $1=2$ for the heavy and light holes, respectively. The notation applies as well to QW structures with the lowest electron ($=c; m_c = 1=2$), heavy ($=v; m_v = 3=2$), and light hole ($=v; m_v = 1=2$) subbands and a 2D wave vector \mathbf{k} . (An extension to more subbands would require book keeping of subband indices, which is avoided here.) The single-particle energies $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{k})$ are obtained by diagonalizing a 2×2 (4×4) Hamiltonian for the conduction (valence) band states, which may include besides the diagonal free-particle kinetic energy also nonparabolic corrections from a higher order \mathbf{k}^2 decoupling.²³ This includes terms resulting from bulk-inversion asymmetry or from the asymmetry of the quantum well and lead to a removal of the spin-degeneracy of the (sub)bands.²⁴ Thus, the single-particle wave functions are expanded in a basis of band-edge ($\mathbf{k} = 0$) Bloch functions $u_{m0}(\mathbf{x})$ (\mathbf{x} comprising space and spin coordinates) which for the bulk semiconductor reads

$$u_{m\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \sum_{m0} C_{m m0}(\mathbf{k}) u_{m0}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

The coefficients $C_{m m0}(\mathbf{k})$ describe within a band the mixing of the band-edge states at finite \mathbf{k} ; for the valence band this includes coupling between heavy- and light-hole states. Note, that the angular-momentum classification is exact only at $\mathbf{k} = 0$, where $C_{m m0}(0) = \delta_{m m0}$. For QW structures (with z being the growth direction) the single-particle wave function takes the form

$$u_{m\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \sum_{m0} \binom{m}{m0}(\mathbf{k}; z) u_{m0}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (4)$$

Here $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y, 0)$ is the in-plane wave vector, $\mathbf{r} = (x, y, 0)$, and $\binom{m}{m0}(\mathbf{k}; z)$ are the subband functions including \mathbf{k} dependent mixing, while for $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$ we have $\binom{m}{m0}(\mathbf{k}; z) \neq \binom{m}{m0}(0; z) \delta_{m m0}$.

With this formulation of the single-particle states H_0 is block-diagonal in the band indices $= c, v$ and it is convenient to replace $a_{cm}(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow c_{cm}(\mathbf{k})$ for electrons and $a_{vm}(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow v_{vm}^\dagger(\mathbf{k})$ for holes (adopting the picture of holes as time-reversed electron states) and similar for the hermitian adjoint fermion operators. In this notation (using the Kramer's degeneracy $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon_m^*(\mathbf{k})$) H_0 (Eq. (2)) reads

$$H_0 = \sum_{m, \mathbf{k}} \epsilon_m(\mathbf{k}) c_{m c}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) c_{m c}(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{m, \mathbf{k}} \epsilon_m(\mathbf{k}) v_{m v}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) v_{m v}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (5)$$

Likewise the interaction with the electromagnetic field can be written

$$H^0(t) = \sum_{m, \mathbf{k}} \sum_{m', \mathbf{k}'} E(t) \hat{c}_{m c m'}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{c}_{m c}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) v_{m' v}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}') + \text{h.c.} \quad (6)$$

with the matrix of the dipole operator

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{m_c m_v}^{cv}(\mathbf{k}) = e \sum_{m_c^0 m_v^0} C_{m_c m_c^0}^c(\mathbf{k}) R_{m_c^0 m_v^0} C_{m_v^0 m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}) \quad (7)$$

for the bulk case (here $C_{m_c^0 m_v}^v(\mathbf{k})$ denote the expansion coefficients of the hole wave functions) and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{m_c m_v}^{cv}(\mathbf{k}) = e \sum_{m_c^0 m_v^0} \int_{-Z}^Z C_{m_c^0}^{(m_c)}(\mathbf{k}; z) R_{m_c^0 m_v^0} C_{m_v^0}^{(m_v)}(\mathbf{k}; z) dz : \quad (8)$$

for the QW case. Here the real electric field vector is $\mathbf{E}(t) = \mathbf{E}(\omega) e^{i\omega t} + \mathbf{E}^*(\omega) e^{-i\omega t}$ ($\mathbf{E}^*(\omega) = \mathbf{E}(\omega)^*$) and $R_{m_c^0 m_v^0}$, the matrix element of \mathbf{r} , is taken between the band-edge Bloch functions $u_{m_c^0}(\mathbf{x})$ and $u_{m_v^0}(\mathbf{x})$ (which are angular-momentum eigenfunctions). For light with arbitrary polarization propagating in the z -direction the complex field amplitudes can be written $\mathbf{E}(\omega) = E_0(\omega) (\mathbf{e}_x + \epsilon_y e^{i\omega})/2$ where the ϵ -sign indicates (for $\epsilon \neq 0$) the helicity of light. For $\epsilon = \pm 2$ this is the right and left circular polarization. The matrix elements of $\mathbf{E}(\omega) R_{m_c^0 m_v^0}$ are given in the following table ($R = \langle S_x, S_y, S_z \rangle = \pm \frac{1}{2}$):

$m_c = +\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{E_0 R}{2} (1 + i\epsilon)$	0	$\frac{E_0 R}{2} (1 - i\epsilon)$	0
$m_c = -\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{E_0 R}{2} (1 + i\epsilon)$	0	$\frac{E_0 R}{2} (1 - i\epsilon)$
$m_v =$	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$

The single-particle Hamiltonian $H_0 + H^0(t)$ is a sum of contributions from different wave vectors \mathbf{k} at each of which we have a six-level system according to the multiband model. In analogy with the two-level model of Refs.^{12,13} one can now formulate the equations of motion for the operators $c_{m_c}^Y, v_{m_v}^Y, v_{m_v} c_{m_c}$

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \partial_t \sum_{m_c} c_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{m_c^0} c_{m_c^0}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) &= \\ = \sum_{m_v} \mathbf{E}(t) \tilde{\alpha}_{m_c m_v}^{cv}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c^0}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) & \quad \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \partial_t \sum_{m_v} v_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{m_v^0} v_{m_v^0}^v(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) v_{m_v^0}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) &= \\ = \sum_{m_c} \mathbf{E}(t) \tilde{\alpha}_{m_c m_v}^{cv}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) & \quad \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \partial_t \sum_{m_c} c_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{m_v} v_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) &= \\ = \sum_{m_v^0} \mathbf{E}(t) \tilde{\alpha}_{m_c m_v^0}^{cv}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_v^0}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) & \quad \sum_{m_c^0} \mathbf{E}(t) \tilde{\alpha}_{m_c^0 m_v}^{cv}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c^0}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) : \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

These operators can be identified according to

$$\hat{c}_{m_c m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) = c_{m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t); \quad m_c; m_c = 1=2 \quad (12)$$

$$\hat{v}_{m_v m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) = v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t); \quad m_v; m_v = 1=2; 3=2 \quad (13)$$

$$\hat{P}_{m_v m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) = v_{m_v}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}^Y(\mathbf{k}; t) \quad (14)$$

with the operators \hat{c}^c (\hat{v}^v) of the spin density matrix for electrons (holes) and \hat{P}^Y of the interband polarization matrix. The matrix $\mathbf{E}(t) \tilde{\alpha}_{m_c m_v}^{cv}(\mathbf{k})$ is the multiband generalization to the (unrenormalized) Rabi frequency of the two-level model. When taking the thermal average of the matrix operators Eqs. (9)–(11) correspond to the single-particle parts of Eqs. (1)–(3) of Ref.¹⁴, which however do not include spin splitting of the electron and hole eigenstates. (Note, that in the present case the conduction- and valence-band Hamiltonians are diagonalized, see Eq. (5)).

III. THE MANY-BODY TERMS

In correspondence with the formulation of the single-particle part of the system Hamiltonian the Coulomb interaction

$$H_{\text{Coul}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\dagger} \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{y}}^{\dagger} \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{y}} \quad (15)$$

is decomposed by splitting the field operator

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}^e + \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}^h \quad (16)$$

into its electron and hole parts, where \mathbf{x} stands again for space and spin variables. Thus one obtains

$$H_{\text{Coul}} = H_{ee} + H_{hh} + H_{eh}^C + H_{eh}^X \quad (17)$$

where the individual terms have the same form for the bulk and QW case (time-dependence of the creation and annihilation operators is understood)

$$H_{ee} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{m_{c1} m_{c2} m_{c3} m_{c4} \\ m_{c3} m_{c4} \\ \mathbf{k} \mathbf{k}^0 \\ \mathbf{q}}} V_{m_{c1} m_{c2} m_{c3} m_{c4}}^{ee}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c1}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c2}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}^0 - \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c3}}(\mathbf{k}^0) c_{m_{c4}}(\mathbf{k}); \quad (18)$$

$$H_{hh} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{m_{v1} m_{v2} m_{v3} m_{v4} \\ m_{v3} m_{v4} \\ \mathbf{k} \mathbf{k}^0 \\ \mathbf{q}}} V_{m_{v1} m_{v2} m_{v3} m_{v4}}^{hh}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v1}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v2}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}^0 + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v3}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}^0) v_{m_{v4}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}); \quad (19)$$

$$H_{eh}^C = \sum_{\substack{m_{c1} m_{c2} m_{v1} m_{v2} \\ m_{v1} m_{v2} \\ \mathbf{k} \mathbf{k}^0 \\ \mathbf{q}}} V_{m_{c1} m_{c2} m_{v1} m_{v2}}^{eh,C}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c1}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c2}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_{v1}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}^0) v_{m_{v2}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}^0 + \mathbf{q}); \quad (20)$$

$$H_{eh}^X = \sum_{\substack{m_{c1} m_{c2} m_{v1} m_{v2} \\ m_{v1} m_{v2} \\ \mathbf{k} \mathbf{k}^0 \\ \mathbf{q}}} V_{m_{c1} m_{c2} m_{v1} m_{v2}}^{eh,X}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c1}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c2}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}^0 + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v1}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_{v2}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}^0); \quad (21)$$

They describe the interaction between electrons in the conduction band (H_{ee}), between holes in the valence band (H_{hh}), and the direct electron-hole Coulomb interaction (H_{eh}^C). These terms are known from previous treatments of the problem.^{9,12,14} The electron-hole exchange interaction (H_{eh}^X), however, has not been considered so far in the context of SBE.²⁵ Together with the spin-splitting mechanism in the single-particle part (Section II) it is the essential extension of the existing theory and will be discussed in the course of this paper.

Due to the diagonalization of the (sub)band Hamiltonians for electrons and holes (see Eqs. (2) and (4)) the interaction matrix elements depend on the expansion in terms of the band-edge Bloch functions. For the bulk system they read

$$V_{m_{c1} :: m_{c4}}^{ee}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) = v(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{m_c m_c^0} C_{m_{c1} m_c}^C(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{c2} m_c^0}^C(\mathbf{k}^0 - \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{c3} m_c^0}^C(\mathbf{k}^0) C_{m_{c4} m_c}^C(\mathbf{k}); \quad (22)$$

$$V_{m_{v1} :: m_{v4}}^{hh}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) = v(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{m_v m_v^0} C_{m_{v1} m_v}^V(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{v2} m_v^0}^V(\mathbf{k}^0 + \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{v3} m_v^0}^V(\mathbf{k}^0) C_{m_{v4} m_v}^V(\mathbf{k}); \quad (23)$$

$$V_{m_{c1} :: m_{c2}}^{eh,C}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) = v(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{m_c m_v} C_{m_{c1} m_c}^C(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{c2} m_c}^C(\mathbf{k}) C_{m_{v1} m_v}^V(\mathbf{k}^0 + \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{v2} m_v}^V(\mathbf{k}^0); \quad (24)$$

$$V_{m_{c1} :: m_{v2}}^{eh,X}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) = v(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{m_c m_v m_c^0 m_v^0} M_{m_c m_v m_c^0 m_v^0} C_{m_{c1} m_c}^C(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{c2} m_c^0}^C(\mathbf{k}^0 + \mathbf{q}) C_{m_{v1} m_v}^V(\mathbf{k}^0) C_{m_{v2} m_v^0}^V(\mathbf{k}) \quad (25)$$

with the expansion coefficients C^C for electron and C^V for hole wavefunctions. Here $v(\mathbf{q})$ is the Fourier transformed 3D Coulomb potential. For the QW case one has instead

$$V_{m_{c1} m_{c2} m_{c3} m_{c4}}^{ee}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0; \mathbf{q}) = v(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{m_c m_c^0} \int dz \int dz^0 e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^0)} \langle m_{c1} | \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{z} \rangle_{m_c^0} \langle m_{c2} | \mathbf{r}^0 - \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{z}^0 \rangle_{m_c^0} \langle m_{c3} | \mathbf{r}^0; \mathbf{z}^0 \rangle_{m_c^0} \langle m_{c4} | \mathbf{r}; \mathbf{z} \rangle_{m_c} \quad (26)$$

and corresponding expressions for V^{hh} ; $V^{eh,C}$; and $V^{eh,X}$, with the band-mixing at finite in-plane \mathbf{k} considered in the subband functions. Here $v(q)$ is the 2D Coulomb potential (see e.g.⁹ Eq. (A.18)). The Matrix M in the exchange interaction is due to the coupling of electron and hole angular momenta, known from studies of the nestructure splitting of excitons^{26,28} or of the BAP spin-relaxation mechanism^{21,22}. Without mixing of the band-edge states the interaction matrix elements V^{ee} ; V^{hh} , and $V^{eh,C}$ take much simpler forms as e.g. $V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{v_2}m_{c_2}}^{eh,C}(\mathbf{k};\mathbf{k}^0;\mathbf{q})$!

$v(q)_{m_{c_1}m_{c_2}m_{v_1}m_{v_2}}$ and $V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{c_2}m_{v_2}}^{eh,X}$! $v(q)M_{m_{v_1}m_{c_2}}^{m_{c_1}m_{v_2}}$ for the 3D (or bulk) case and similar for the QW case.

By calculating the commutators of the operators from Eqs. (12)–(14) with H_{Coul} one finds the following additional terms which are to be added to the Eqs. (9)–(11):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \sum_{\mathbf{i}} H_{Coul}; c_{m_c}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) = \\
& = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{m_c^0} \sum_{m_{c_1}m_{c_4}} V_{m_{c_1}m_{c_2}m_{c_3}m_{c_4}}^{ee}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_1}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c^0}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_4}}(\mathbf{k}) \\
& \quad V_{m_{c_1}m_{c_2}m_{c_3}m_{c_4}}^{ee}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_1}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c^0}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_{c_4}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) \\
& \quad \sum_{\mathbf{m}_{v_1}m_{v_2}} V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{v_2}m_c^0}^{eh,C}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c^0}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) \\
& \quad V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{v_2}m_c}^{eh,C}(\mathbf{k}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c^0}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) - v_{m_{v_2}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) v_{m_{v_1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{q}) \\
& + \sum_{\mathbf{m}_{v_1}m_{v_2}} V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{c_2}m_{v_2}}^{eh,X}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c^0}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v_2}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v_1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) \\
& \quad V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{c_2}m_{v_2}}^{eh,X}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c^0}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_{v_2}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) v_{m_{v_1}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) ; \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \sum_{\mathbf{i}} H_{Coul}; v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_v}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) = \\
& = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{m_v^0} \sum_{m_{v_1}m_{v_4}} V_{m_{v_1}m_{v_2}m_{v_3}m_{v_4}}^{hh}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v_1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_v^0}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v_4}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) \\
& \quad V_{m_{v_1}m_{v_2}m_{v_3}m_{v_4}}^{hh}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v_1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v^0}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_{v_4}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) \\
& \quad \sum_{m_{c_1}m_{c_2}} V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{v_2}m_{c_2}}^{eh,C}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v^0}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) \\
& \quad V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{v_2}m_{c_2}}^{eh,C}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_v^0}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_1}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) \\
& + \sum_{m_{c_1}m_{c_2}} V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{c_2}m_{v_2}}^{eh,X}(\mathbf{k}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_1}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_2}}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v^0}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) v_{m_v}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k}) \\
& \quad V_{m_{c_1}m_{v_1}m_{c_2}m_{v_2}}^{eh,X}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_1}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c_2}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) v_{m_v^0}^{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) ; \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \langle v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle = \\
& = \sum_{m_{c1} m_{c3} m_{c4}} V_{m_{c1} m_{c3} m_{c4}}^{ee}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_{c1}}^v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c4}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) c_{m_{c3}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) \\
& + \sum_{m_{v1} m_{v2} m_{v3}} V_{m_{v2} m_{v1} m_{v3}}^{hh}(\mathbf{k}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v2}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{v3}}^v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) \\
& + \sum_{m_{c2} m_{v1}} \sum_{m_v^0} V_{m_{c2} m_{v1} m_v^0}^{eh,C}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_{c2}}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) c_{m_v^0}^v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) v_{m_{v1}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) \\
& + \sum_{m_{c2} m_{v1}} \sum_{m_v^0} V_{m_{c2} m_{v1} m_v^0}^{eh,C}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c2}}^v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) v_{m_{v1}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) \\
& + \sum_{m_{c2} m_{v1}} \sum_{m_v^0} V_{m_{c2} m_{v1} m_v^0}^{eh,X}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}) c_{m_{c2}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_v^0}^v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) \\
& + \sum_{m_{c2} m_{v1}} \sum_{m_v^0} V_{m_{c2} m_{v1} m_v^0}^{eh,X}(\mathbf{k}; \tilde{\mathbf{k}}; \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c2}}^v(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) c_{m_{c2}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}) v_{m_{v1}}(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}) : \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Equations (27) and (29) reduce to Eqs. (A 29) and (A 28), respectively, of Ref.⁹ when the band mixing and the exchange terms are neglected. The characteristic effect of the Coulomb interaction is to add four-operator terms to the equations of motion of the two-operator terms, thus giving rise to a hierarchy of such equations which can be solved only approximately. The choice of the method will depend on the scenario that is to be described: the relevant time scale (to distinguish between the coherent or quasi-equilibrium regime), the carrier density, or the power of the driving electric field.^{12;13;31}

IV. THE COHERENT DENSITY-MATRIX EQUATIONS

A set of equations describing the coherent regime can be derived by following Refs.^{12;13} and applying the HF truncation to factorize the four-operator terms. By taking their expectation values and keeping only factors, which are diagonal in the wave vector

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{m_c}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}; t) & \rightarrow \langle c_{m_c}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle = \langle c_{m_c}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \\
v_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) & \rightarrow \langle v_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle = \langle v_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \\
v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}; t) & \rightarrow \langle v_{m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) c_{m_c}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle = P_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t)
\end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

one finds a closed set of equations for the components of the density matrix

$$\begin{aligned}
i\hbar \partial_t \langle c_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) \rangle + \langle c_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \langle c_{m_c}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & = \\
= + \sum_{m_{cm_v}} \langle c_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) P_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & - \langle c_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle P_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \\
+ \sum_{m_v^0} \langle c_{m_{cm_v^0}}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle c_{m_v^0}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & - \langle c_{m_{cm_v^0}}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle c_{m_v^0}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \\
+ \langle c_{m_{cm_v^0}}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle c_{m_v^0}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & - \langle c_{m_{cm_v^0}}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle c_{m_v^0}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \quad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
i\hbar \partial_t \langle v_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}) \rangle + \langle v_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \langle v_{m_v}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & = \\
= \sum_{m_{cm_v}} \langle c_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) P_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & - \langle c_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle P_{m_{cm_v}}(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \\
+ \sum_{m_v^0} \langle v_{m_{vm_v^0}}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle v_{m_v^0}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & - \langle v_{m_{vm_v^0}}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle v_{m_v^0}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \\
+ \langle v_{m_{vm_v^0}}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle v_{m_v^0}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle & - \langle v_{m_{vm_v^0}}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \langle v_{m_v^0}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) \rangle \quad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
i\hbar\partial_t + \epsilon_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) - \epsilon_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}) P_{m_c m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) = \\
= + \sum_{m_c m_v} \epsilon_{m_c m_v}^0(\mathbf{k}; t) (\sum_{m_v m_v} \epsilon_{m_v m_v}^0(\mathbf{k}; t)) \sum_{m_c} \epsilon_{m_c m_v}^0(\mathbf{k}; t) \epsilon_{m_c m_c}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \\
+ \sum_{m_c} P_{m_c m_v}^0(\mathbf{k}; t) \epsilon_{m_c m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) + \sum_{m_v} \epsilon_{m_v m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) P_{m_c m_v}^0(\mathbf{k}; t) :
\end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

These equations are generalizations of Eqs. (1)–(3) in Ref.¹⁴ in that they include the spin-splitting mechanisms in the single-particle part and by considering also the electron-hole exchange interaction in the electron and hole self energies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_{m_c m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}; t) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{m_c m_c} V_{m_c m_c m_c m_c}^{ee}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) \epsilon_{m_c m_c}^e(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; t) \\
+ \sum_{m_v m_v} V_{m_c m_v m_v m_c}^{eh, X}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}) \epsilon_{m_v m_v}^h(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; t)
\end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_{m_v m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}; t) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{m_v m_v} V_{m_v m_v m_v m_v}^{hh}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) \epsilon_{m_v m_v}^h(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; t) \\
+ \sum_{m_c m_c} V_{m_c m_v m_v m_c}^{eh, X}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) \epsilon_{m_c m_c}^e(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; t) :
\end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The renormalized dipole matrix reads

$$\epsilon_{m_c m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) = E(t) \alpha_{m_c m_v}^{cv}(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{\mathbf{q}} V_{m_c m_v m_v m_c}^{eh, C}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) P_{m_c m_v}^0(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; t) \quad (36)$$

and differs from the corresponding expression in Ref.¹⁴ (Eq. (6)) only by the alternative choice of the basis.

The self-energy terms have to be evaluated by summing over pairs of angular momenta for electrons and holes and thus couple to all components of the electron or hole density-matrix. Take, e.g., the equation of motion for $\epsilon_{m_c m_c}^e(\mathbf{k}; t)$: the diagonal terms with $\epsilon_{m_c m_c}^c$ and $\epsilon_{m_c m_c}^c$ renormalize the single-particle energies, while the off-diagonal terms correspond to spin-flip scattering. The latter can be due to electron-electron interaction modified by band-mixing but also to electron-hole exchange interaction. In fact, by neglecting in the self-energy, Eq. (34), the band-mixing it can be seen that the electron-electron interaction (because of $V_{m_c m_c m_c m_c}^{ee}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}) \epsilon_{m_c m_c}^e(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}; t)$) does not contribute to spin-flips while the second term (from electron-hole exchange interaction) retains the sum over m_v, m_v and couples electron and hole angular momenta. As it flips an electron spin simultaneously with a hole spin (if holes are present), it can be identified as the origin of the BAP mechanism. The self-energy corrections due to V^{ee} and V^{hh} contain the spin-scattering processes mediated by band-mixing in combination with spin-orbit coupling. They are more efficient for holes (due to their p-character), while spin-orbit coupling in the electron states (sometimes called Rashba²⁹ and Dresselhaus term³⁰) results from band-mixing at finite \mathbf{k} . Thus Eqs. (31)–(33) represent an extension of the coherent SBE^{12,13} to the multiband case and arbitrary polarization of the driving electromagnetic field, which goes beyond Ref.¹⁴ by including the spin-flip processes. These equations provide the theoretical background to describe experiments in the coherent regime that address the spin-degree of freedom like spin-echo or four-wave mixing experiments with elliptically polarized light (in the latter case one could go beyond the HF truncation by using the dynamically controlled truncation scheme³¹).

In closing this section a compact form of the Eqs. (31)–(33) is presented which becomes possible by making use of matrix notation.³² In the sixfold space of the multiband model used here the Hamiltonian $H_0(\mathbf{k}) + \epsilon(\mathbf{k})$ (without the coupling to the electromagnetic field) is block diagonal with 2 × 2 and 4 × 4 diagonal blocks for the single particle and self-energy parts of conduction $H_0^c(\mathbf{k}) + \epsilon^c(\mathbf{k})$ and valence band states $H_0^v(\mathbf{k}) + \epsilon^v(\mathbf{k})$, respectively. The interaction with the electromagnetic field, described by the matrix $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}; t)$ of the (renormalized) dipole interaction, couples between the valence and conduction band states and has off-diagonal blocks only. Similarly, the 6 × 6 density matrix $\rho(\mathbf{k}; t)$ consists of diagonal blocks, the 2 × 2 electron density matrix ρ^e and the 4 × 4 hole density matrix ρ^h , and off-diagonal blocks for the interband polarization P (the upper right 2 × 4 block) and its hermitian conjugate. Written with these matrices Eqs. (31)–(33) take the compact form of the Liouville-von Neumann equation

$$i\hbar\partial_t \rho(\mathbf{k}; t) = [H_0(\mathbf{k}) + \epsilon(\mathbf{k}; t), \rho(\mathbf{k}; t)] \quad (37)$$

where $[\ddot{::}]$ indicates the antisymmetrized matrix product.

V. DISCUSSION

This Section is devoted to the demonstration that Eqs. (31)–(33) provide the theoretical frame for describing different scenarios of current interest which are related to excitation with arbitrary light polarization and spin relaxation. These scenarios will be (i) the coupled two-level systems considered by San Miguel et al.¹⁰ in order to treat the polarization dynamics in VCSELs, (ii) the quasi-equilibrium limit leading to a generalized inhomogeneous equation for the interband polarization matrix and (for the low-density limit) to the multiband Wannier-exciton equation, (iii) spin relaxation of optically oriented electrons which at the same time are due to the DP and BAP mechanisms, and (iv) the circular photogalvanic effect with interband excitation.

(i) Following San Miguel et al.¹⁰ in their phenomenological treatment of polarization dynamics in VCSELs one has to consider only the two-level systems consisting of heavy hole ($m_v = 3/2$) and electron states ($m_c = 1/2$) which are dipole coupled by circularly polarized light. Thus Eqs. (31)–(33) are simplified by neglecting the light-hole states and the band mixing. For circular polarization the matrix of Rabi frequencies (without renormalization) takes the form

$m_{cm_v} = m_{c, 1/2} m_{v, 3/2}$. The diagonal terms of Eqs. (31) and (32) can be combined to write the equation-of-motion for the population inversion $D = \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^e + \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^e - \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^h - \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^h$ as

$$\partial_t D = -\frac{1}{\tau_{jj}} D + \frac{2}{\hbar} \text{Im} (P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}} + P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}) \quad (38)$$

where radiative decay is considered phenomenologically by the first term on the right hand side. This equation is (except for cavity effects, not considered here, and after adapting the notation) identical with Eq. (2.5) of Ref.¹⁰. Likewise the equation-of-motion for the spin polarization $d = \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^e + \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^h - \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^e - \frac{1}{2} f_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^h$ is obtained in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t d = & -\frac{1}{\tau_{jj}} d + \frac{2}{\hbar} \text{Im} (P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}} - P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}) \\ & + \frac{1}{i\hbar} \left(c_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^c e_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^e - e_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^e c_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^c - \frac{\hbar}{2} v_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^v + v_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^v \frac{\hbar}{2} \right) : \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

In contrast to Eq. (38), additional terms containing off-diagonal elements of the density and self-energy matrices occur on the right hand side. When identifying these terms as $\frac{2}{\tau_s} d$, describing spin relaxation³³, one recovers Eq. (2.6) of Ref.¹⁰. Finally Eq. (33) can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}} = & \frac{1}{\tau} + i! P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}} + \frac{i}{\hbar} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} (D - d) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{\hbar} c_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^c P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}} - P_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}} v_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^v \right) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $h! = c_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^c(\mathbf{k}) - v_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}^v(\mathbf{k})$ and a phenomenological damping of the interband polarization was added. The last term (having a similar structure as that of Eq. (39)) can be understood as a contribution to this damping and combined with the first term to obtain Eq. (2.4) of Ref.¹⁰. Thus the phenomenological Maxwell-Bloch equations (especially those of Ref.¹⁰ except for cavity effects) result as a special case of Eqs. (31)–(33) and give them a microscopic justification including an interpretation of the spin-relaxation times, which will become more transparent in the following.

(ii) Equations (31)–(33) in combination with Eqs. (27)–(29) involve different time-scales in the evolution of the density matrices for electrons and holes. Scattering due to terms neglected in the HF truncation lead on the sub-ps time-scale to a loss of coherence concomitant with separate thermal equilibrium of electrons and holes (of different spin) that decays by spin relaxation and electron-hole recombination. This quasi-equilibrium can be described by replacing

$$f_{m_c m_v}^e(\mathbf{k}; t) \rightarrow f_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) f_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k}; t); \quad f_{m_v m_v}^h(\mathbf{k}; t) \rightarrow (1 - f_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k})) f_{m_v}^h(\mathbf{k}; t) \quad (41)$$

where $f_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}); f_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k})$ are the Fermi-Dirac distribution functions for conduction and valence band states, with quasi-Fermi levels depending on $m_c; m_v$. For this case the complex conjugate of Eq. (33) may be reformulated by making partial use of the matrix notation (introduced at the end of section IV): The matrix elements $P_{m_c m_v}$ form the matrix of the interband polarization $P(\mathbf{k}; t)$, $f_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) - f_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k})$ $P_{m_c m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t)$ can be replaced by $[H_0(\mathbf{k}); P(\mathbf{k}; t)]_{m_c m_v}$, and the terms containing self-energies by $[H_0(\mathbf{k}); P(\mathbf{k}; t)]_{m_c m_v}$. Thus, Eq. (33) takes the form

$$i\hbar \partial_t P_{m_c m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) = [H_0(\mathbf{k}) + \Sigma(\mathbf{k}; t); P(\mathbf{k}; t)]_{m_c m_v} = (f_{m_c}^c(\mathbf{k}) - f_{m_v}^v(\mathbf{k})) P_{m_c m_v}(\mathbf{k}; t) : \quad (42)$$

As in Eq. (40) (to which it is related) one could add a phenomenological damping term. Equation (42) is the generalization of the RPA equation for the interband polarization (see Ref.¹³) to the multiband case.

It is interesting here to simplify to the case without band-mixing, for which the electron-electron and hole-hole interactions become diagonal in the spin indices in contrast with the electron-hole exchange interaction. The latter contributes to the off-diagonal elements of the electron self-energy matrix $\Sigma^c(\mathbf{k})$ for nonvanishing hole concentration, thus indicating its relation to the BAP mechanism of spin relaxation.²² Further specialization to the low-density limit leads to the multiband generalization of the Wannier-exciton Schrödinger equation.

(iii) Spin relaxation of electrons due to spin-orbit coupling combined with momentum scattering is described usually starting from an equation of motion for the electron spin-density matrix $\rho^e(\mathbf{k}; t)$.^{5,7} Such an equation is obtained from Eq. (31) by applying matrix notation as in Section IV but now only for the 2×2 electron block and identifying the first term on the r.h.s. as the generation matrix $G(\mathbf{k}; t)$ (see also Ref.³⁴)

$$\partial_t \rho^e(\mathbf{k}; t) = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\mathbf{H}_0^c(\mathbf{k}) + \Sigma^c(\mathbf{k}); \rho^e(\mathbf{k}; t)] + \sum_{\mathbf{k}^0} W(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0) \rho^e(\mathbf{k}; t) - \rho^e(\mathbf{k}^0; t) = G(\mathbf{k}; t); \quad (43)$$

where we have added the last term on the l.h.s. to account for momentum scattering with phonons and (nonmagnetic) impurities. Equation (43) is a generalized form of equations used in the context of spin relaxation due to the DP mechanism in that it combines the single-particle spin-relaxation mechanism due to spin-orbit coupling (DP) with the many-body mechanisms considered in the electron self-energy Σ^c , in particular the one caused by the electron-hole exchange interaction (BAP). To the best of our knowledge such a unified description of both mechanisms does not yet exist in the literature. A similar equation following from Eq. (32) for the 4×4 hole-density matrix $\rho^h(\mathbf{k}; t)$ could be used to calculate the hole-spin relaxation.

(iv) Reported measurements of the photogalvanic effects (PGE) in QW structures have been performed with mid- and far-infrared light on p- and n-doped samples.^{16,18} The nonlinear excitation with elliptic polarization creates non-equilibrium populations of different spin states by intersubband transitions which in combination with scattering processes result in a stationary current density described by

$$\mathbf{j} = -e \mathbf{E}^{(1)} \mathbf{E}^{(2)}; \quad (44)$$

It is ruled by a third rank tensor (similar to $\chi^{(2)}$ for second harmonic generation) that has nonvanishing components only in (so-called gyrotropic) systems lacking inversion symmetry. It can be decomposed into contributions from linear and circular polarization. An alternative formulation of this stationary current density is given by³⁴

$$\mathbf{j} = e \text{Tr}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}) \quad (45)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is a component of the velocity operator. As discussed in the literature the evaluation of Eq. (45) requires to consider the off-diagonal elements of $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^\dagger$, where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ contains the nonlinear dependence on the electric field amplitude of the exciting light. The theory developed here does not directly apply to this situation but can be adapted to account for nonlinear intersubband excitation. On the other hand investigations of the CPGE with optical (or valence to conduction band) excitation, to which the concept presented here applies, are conceivable. An aspect of particular interest of PGE measurements is the dependence of the saturation behavior on the light polarization, which as an alternative to time-resolved experiments provides the possibility to detect the spin-relaxation time. Future work has to show how this dichroism of the PGE saturation can be described in the frame of the concept presented here.

Acknowledgment: The work was performed at the Universidad Autónoma in Madrid with support from the Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (Premio "A. von Humboldt - J.C. M. Utis" 2000). Partial support came from the Volkswagen foundation and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).

REFERENCES

-
- ¹ G. A. Prinz, Phys. Today 48, 58 (1995).
 - ² T. C. Damen, L. Vina, J. E. Cunningham, J. Shah, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 3432 (1991).
 - ³ A. P. Heberle, W. W. Rühle, and K. Ploog, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 3887 (1994).

- ⁴ Y. Ohno, R. Terauchi, T. Adachi, F. Matsukura, and H. Ohno, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4196 (1999).
- ⁵ G. E. Pikus and A. N. Titkov in *Optical Orientation*, F. Meier, B. P. Zakharchenya, Eds. (Elsevier Science Publ., Amsterdam, 1984).
- ⁶ S. Datta and B. Das, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **56**, 665 (1990).
- ⁷ M. I. Dyakonov and V. I. Perel', *Fiz. Tverd. Tela* **13**, 3581 (1971) [*Engl. trans. Sov. Phys. Solid State* **13**, 3023 (1972); M. I. Dyakonov and V. Yu. Kachorovskii, *Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn.* **20**, 178 (1986) [*Engl. trans. Sov. Phys. Semicond.* **20**, 110 (1986)].
- ⁸ R. Binder and S. W. Koch *Progr. Quantum Electron.* **19** 307 (1995).
- ⁹ G. Khitrova, H. M. Gibbs, F. Jahnke, M. Kira, and S. W. Koch, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, 1591 (1999).
- ¹⁰ M. San Miguel, Q. Feng, and J. V. Moloney, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 1728 (1995).
- ¹¹ H. Ando, T. Sogawa, and H. Gotoh, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **73**, 566 (1998).
- ¹² M. Lindberg and S. W. Koch, *Phys. Rev.* **38**, 3342 (1988).
- ¹³ H. Haug and S. W. Koch: *Quantum theory of the optical and electronic properties of semiconductors*, World Scientific Singapore (1993).
- ¹⁴ R. Binder and M. Lindberg, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 2830 (2000).
- ¹⁵ M. E. Donovan, A. Schulzgen, J. Lee, P.-A. Blanche, N. Peyghambarian, G. Khitrova, H. M. Gibbs, I. Rumyantsev, N. H. Kwong, R. Takayama, Z. S. Yang, and R. Binder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 237402-1 (2001).
- ¹⁶ S. D. Ganichev, H. Ketterl, W. Prettl, E. L. Ivchenko, and L. E. Vorob'ev, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **77**, 3146 (2000); S. D. Ganichev, E. L. Ivchenko, S. N. Danilov, J. Erom s, W. Wegscheider, D. Weiss, W. Prettl, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4385 (2001).
- ¹⁷ E. L. Ivchenko and G. E. Pikus, *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **27**, 640 (1978).
- ¹⁸ S. D. Ganichev, S. N. Danilov, V. V. Bel'kov, E. L. Ivchenko, M. Bichler, W. Wegscheider, D. Weiss, and W. Prettl, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 57401 (2002).
- ¹⁹ L. J. Sham, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **5**, A 51 (1993).
- ²⁰ G. L. Bir, A. G. Aronov, and G. E. Pikus, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **42**, 705 (1975).
- ²¹ M. Z. M aiale, E. A. de Andrada e Silva, and L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 15776 (1993).
- ²² M. Z. M aiale and M. H. Degani, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 13771 (1997).
- ²³ U. Rossler, *Solid State Commun.* **49**, 943 (1984).
- ²⁴ L. W issinger, U. Rossler, R. W inkler, B. Jusserand, and D. Richards, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 15375 (1998); J. P. Lu, J. B. Yau, S. P. Shukla, M. Shayegan, L. W issinger, U. Rossler, and R. W inkler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1282 (1998).
- ²⁵ an exception is J. R. Kuklinski and S. Mukamel *Phys. Rev. B* **44** 11253 (1991).
- ²⁶ M. M. Denisov and V. P. Markarov, *phys. stat. sol. (b)* **56**, 9 (1973).
- ²⁷ U. Rossler and H.-R. Trebin, *Phys. Rev. B* **23**, 1961 (1981).
- ²⁸ S. Jorda, U. Rossler, and D. Broido, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 1669 (1993).
- ²⁹ E. I. Rashba, *Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad)* **2**, 1224 (1960) [*Sov. Phys. Solid State* **2**, 1109 (1960)].
- ³⁰ P. D. Dresselhaus, C. M. A. Papavassiliou, R. G. Wheeler, and R. N. Sacks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 106 (1992).
- ³¹ V. M. Axt and A. Stahl, *Z. Phys. B* **93**, 195 and 205 (1994); M. Lindberg, Y. Z. Hu, R. Binder, and S. W. Koch, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 18060 (1994).
- ³² U. Rossler, C. Tejedor, and L. Vina, in: *Proc. 26th Intern. Conf. Physics of Semiconductors*, Edinburgh 2002.
- ³³ More precisely, one can identify $\frac{1}{in} (\frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{2})$ as $\frac{2}{s} (\frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{2})$ and similar for the hole contributions, with different spin-relaxation times for electrons and holes. In Ref.¹⁰ $\tau_s^e = \tau_s^h$ has been explicitly assumed.
- ³⁴ E. L. Ivchenko and G. Pikus: *Superlattices and other heterostructures: Symmetry and optical phenomena*, Springer Series in Solid State Sciences **110** (Springer, Berlin 1995).