

# Spontaneous spin polarized tunneling current through a quantum dot array

David M.-T. Kuo and Y.-C. Chang

Department of Physics and Materials Research Laboratory  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801  
(April 14, 2024)

We show theoretically that a strongly spin-polarized current can be generated in semiconductors by taking advantage of the ferromagnetic phase of a quantum dot array (QDA). A Hubbard model with coupling to leads is used to study the tunneling current of the QDA system as a function of gate voltage. Due to the weak interdot coupling and strong Coulomb repulsion, it is found that a ferromagnetic phase exists in QDA within a window of gate voltage. Therefore QDA can be used as a spin filter to detect and control spin states in quantum information devices.

Recently, spintronics and quantum information (QI) processing have attracted a great deal of attention.[1] A good QI system should provide well defined quantum computational space, precise quantum-state preparation, coherent quantum manipulation, and state detection[2]. Solid state devices based on modern advanced semiconductor techniques opened up the possibility of fabricating large integrated networks which would be required for the realization of quantum computation[3,4]. Both charged states[5] and spin states[6] of electrons have been proposed to carry the quantum information. Because the decoherence time of spin is much longer than that of charge[6], using the spin is more promising for quantum information processing. Kane has proposed to use the nuclear spin as the quantum bit, since its decoherence time is much longer than that of the electron spin[7]. Nevertheless, its manipulation is difficult due to the weak coupling between nuclear spin and electron spin (hyperfine interaction). Thus, the use of spin states of electrons in semiconductors remains a viable option. One of the challenging problems is the preparation of electrons in semiconductors with well defined spin state.

Controlling electron spin states, such as coherent manipulation and filtering, becomes crucial in the implementation of quantum computer. Divincenzo[8] has suggested to use the spin filter effect to manipulate spin states. Semiconductor quantum dots with local magnetic field can be used as spin filter and memory (read out) device[9]. Ferromagnetic semiconductor materials can also be used as spin filters[10,11]. EuO and EuS have been suggested as spin filters by Divincenzo[8], but the compatibility of these magnetic materials with conventional semiconductors like GaAs or Si or Ge is unclear. The spin polarization in tunneling current has exceeded

99% for EuO and EuS, and up to 90% in BeMnZnSe[11].

Here, we propose to use a narrow band QD array (QDA) weakly coupled to leads as a spin filter. We find that electrons injected from the leads into the QDA within a small window of the applied gate voltage will favor a ferromagnetic state, as a result of the strong electron correlation. In other words, the QDA functions as a spin filter, which may be used to detect and manipulate spin states. We also expect that the QDA has potential applications in spintronics.

The device is described by the Hamiltonian, 
$$H_P = \sum_k \epsilon_k a_k^\dagger a_k + \sum_p \epsilon_p b_p^\dagger b_p + \sum_{i,k} V_{i,k} a_k^\dagger d_i + \sum_{i,p} V_{i,p} b_p^\dagger d_i + \sum_i \epsilon_0 n_i + \sum_{i,j} t_{ij} d_i^\dagger d_j + \sum_i U_i n_i n_i;$$
 where the first two terms describe the left lead and right lead, respectively. The third and fourth terms describe the coupling between the quantum dot (QD) and the two leads. The fifth and sixth terms describe the energy level of the quantum dot and interdot coupling. The last term describes the intradot Coulomb interaction. We take into account only one energy level for each dot and the nearest-neighbor coupling between dots ( $t_{ij} = t$  for nearest-neighbor  $i, j$ ). For small size QDs, the energy difference between the ground state and the first excited state is much larger than  $t$  and the Coulomb interaction  $U$ . Therefore, it is a good approximation to consider just one energy level in each dot.

Using Keldysh's Green function method[12], we obtain the spin-dependent tunneling current

$$J = \frac{e}{h} \sum_k [f_L - f_R] V_k^2 \text{Im} G_{k,jj}(\epsilon_k); \quad (1)$$

where  $\epsilon_k$  denotes the energy of the electron in the leads with wave vector  $k$ .  $f_L = f(\epsilon_k - \mu_L)$  and  $f_R = f(\epsilon_k - \mu_R)$  are the Fermi distribution function of the left lead and right lead, respectively.  $\mu_L$  and  $\mu_R$  are the chemical potentials in the left and right leads, respectively. They are related to the applied bias,  $V_a$  by  $\mu_L - \mu_R = eV_a$ . For simplicity, we assume that the QD couples with the left and right leads symmetrically, although it is straightforward to extend to the case with asymmetric coupling.  $V_k = \sum_j V_{j,k} e^{ik \cdot R_j}$  where  $k_j$  is the projection of electron wave vector  $k$  in the QDA plane and  $R_j$  is the position of the  $j$ -th QD. We propose

a setup in which a small bias  $V_a$  ( $eV_a$  is comparable to  $t$ ) is applied, and scan the gate voltage  $V_g$  (which serves the purpose of tuning the QD energy level  $E_0$  relative to the Fermi level in the leads) in order to observe the spin-dependent current.

The calculation of tunneling current is entirely determined by the retarded Green function for the QDA. Finding the spin-polarized Green function for the Hubbard model was considered a challenging problem [13]. It is well known that the retarded Green function obtained within the Hubbard approximation does not support any magnetic ordering [14]. However, Harris and Lange [15] showed that ferromagnetic ordering can be a stable state in the 3D Hubbard model by introducing the spin dependent band shift. This mechanism plays the crucial role for determining the ferromagnetic state [15–18]. Beenen and Edwards [13] used the approach developed by Roth [16] to study the 2D Hubbard model for the normal and superconducting state of  $\text{CuO}_2$ . The quasi-particle excitation energy they obtained is in very good agreement with quantum Monte Carlo calculations [19]. Therefore we adopt Roth's procedure to calculate the retarded Green function  $G_{k_{jj}}(\omega)$ , while taking into account the coupling between QDA and leads. In the weak-coupling limit ( $t \ll U$ ), we obtain

$$G_{k_{jj}}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - E_0 - \frac{n}{k_{jj}(1-n)} - n W_{k_{jj}} + i(k)} + \frac{n}{\omega - E_0 - U - \frac{n}{k_{jj}n} - (1-n)W_{k_{jj}} + i(k)};$$

where  $\gamma(k; \omega)$  denotes the tunneling rate from the QDA to the leads. It is cumbersome to fully include the tunneling rates as a function of the wave vector and bias. We treat  $\gamma$  as a constant parameter, even though it can be determined via a numerical method [20]. This approximation is valid for the small range of applied bias, because the potential barrier between leads and QDA is high. In the Coulomb blockade regime, it is adequate to consider the coupling between the QDA and the leads within the Hartree-Fock approximation [21] (leading order). Here we consider a square lattice with lattice constant  $a$ . The energy dispersion of electrons in the QDA is then given by

$\epsilon(k_{jj}) = 2t[\cos(k_x a) + \cos(k_y a)]$ .  $k_{jj}$  is restricted in the first Brillouin zone of the 2D lattice.  $W_{k_{jj}}$  denotes the spin-dependent band shift, which is given by  $n(1-n)W_{k_{jj}} = w_0 + w_1(k_{jj})$ , where  $w_0$  denotes the electron hopping correlation, while  $w_1$  consists of three terms, which represent the density correlation, spin correlation, and spin- $\text{ip}$  correlation, respectively [16]. Hermann and Nolting [22] have proved that the effect due to  $w_1$  is small for the ferromagnetic state of a body central cubic lattice. This implies that the electron hopping correlation can maintain the stability of ferromagnetic

state in 3D. Nevertheless,  $w_1$  is kept in the present calculation in order to obtain more accurate result.

When the chemical potential in the left lead is lower than  $E_0 + U$  and  $U \gg t$ , the effect due to the high energy pole of the Green function can be ignored. Consequently, the infinite  $U$  limit can be used in the calculation of  $W_{k_{jj}}$  [16] which yields

$$n W_{k_{jj}} = \frac{4tn_1}{1-n} (k_{jj}) \frac{n_1^2 (1-n) + n_1 n_1}{(1-n)(1-n)};$$

with

$$n_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_{jj}} \frac{\gamma(k)}{4t} \int d\omega [\epsilon_L(\omega) + \epsilon_R(\omega)] \text{Im} G_{k_{jj}}(\omega);$$

The number of electron per dot is calculated by

$$n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_{jj}} \int d\omega [\epsilon_L(\omega) + \epsilon_R(\omega)] \text{Im} G_{k_{jj}}(\omega); \quad (2)$$

At zero temperature, the integral over  $\omega$  can be carried out analytically. Thus, we can obtain  $n$  and  $n_1$  by solving two coupled one-dimensional integral equations self-consistently. The parameters used in our calculations are  $E_0 = eV_g + (\epsilon_L + \epsilon_R)/2 + 4t$  (without applied bias),  $U = 20t$ ,  $a = 200a$ , and the effective mass of electrons in leads (assumed to be GaAs)  $m = 0.067m_e$ .

The spin-dependent electron occupancy  $n(\omega) = n_\uparrow + n_\downarrow$  as a function of the total electron occupancy  $n = n_\uparrow + n_\downarrow$  at zero temperature for three different applied voltages is shown in Fig. 1; solid line denotes  $eV_a = 0.1t$ , dashed line denotes  $eV_a = 0.5t$ , and dotted line denotes  $eV_a = t$ . We see a bifurcation for  $n_\uparrow$  and  $n_\downarrow$  at  $n = 0.364; 0.367; 0.373$  for  $eV_a = 0.1t, 0.5t$ , and  $t$ , respectively, where the system becomes spin polarized. The system remains ferromagnetic for  $n$  within a small window and reverts to the paramagnetic state at  $n = 0.4$ , beyond which the pseudo-equilibrium condition [16] can no longer be satisfied with  $n_\uparrow \neq n_\downarrow$ . As the applied bias is increased, the spin polarization and the domain that maintains the spin polarization are reduced. Eventually, the applied bias will totally destroy the spin polarization of the system.

Fig. 2 shows the spin-dependent tunneling current as a function of gate voltage ( $V_g$ ) for various strengths of applied bias. We denote the spin polarization of the current as  $P_s = (J_\uparrow - J_\downarrow)/(J_\uparrow + J_\downarrow)$ . We see that the maximum  $P_s = 0.4816; 0.3732$ ; and  $0.3197$  for  $eV_a = 0.1; 0.5t$  and  $t$ . This is much better than the value (less than 1%) achieved by using ferromagnetic metals in contact with semiconductors, because the conductivity of metal is much higher than that of semiconductor. [23,24] Although using magnetic semiconductor to replace the ferromagnetic metal, the best value of  $P_s$  achieved is near

90% [14], it remains to be seen if similar idea can be applied to III-V and group-VI semiconductors. The spin dependent tunneling current shown in Fig. 2 implies that we can readily manipulate the spin polarization of the tunneling current by the gate voltage without introducing magnetic field or magnetic dopants. Although the value of the spin polarization ( $P_s$ ) obtained here is not very high, we believe that  $P_s$  can be enhanced by using coupled multiple layers of QDAs, since in the 3D Hubbard model the ferromagnetic phase is stable over a wider range of  $n$  and  $n_{\uparrow}$  (for a majority carrier) can approach 1. [16] According to Eq. (1), the tunneling current  $J_{\uparrow}$  (for minority carrier) can be reduced to zero as a result of the factor  $(1 - n_{\uparrow})$ , and  $P_s$  can approach 1.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by DARPA DAAD19-01-1-0324.

- <sup>21</sup> C. Lacroix, J. Phys. F; Met. Phys. 11, 2389 (1981).
- <sup>22</sup> T. Herrmann and W. Nolting, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. 170, 253 (1997).
- <sup>23</sup> S. A. Wolf, D. D. Awschalom, R. A. Buhrman, J. M. Doughton, S. V. Molnar, M. L. Roukes, A. Y. Chtchelkanova, D. M. Treger, Science 294, 1488 (2001).
- <sup>24</sup> P. R. Hammar, B. R. Bennett, M. J. Yang, and M. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 203 (1999)

#### Figure Captions

Fig. 1: Spin-dependent electron occupancy versus total occupancy  $n$  for various strengths of applied bias; solid line ( $eV_a = 0.1t$ ), dashed line ( $eV_a = 0.5t$ ), and dotted line ( $eV_a = t$ ).

Fig. 2: Spin dependent tunneling current as a function of gate voltage ( $V_g = 4t$ ) for various strengths of applied bias; solid line ( $eV_a = 0.1t$ ), dashed line ( $eV_a = 0.5t$ ), and dotted line ( $eV_a = t$ ).

- <sup>1</sup> C. M. Aciavvello, G. M. Palma, and A. Zeilinger; Quantum Computation and Quantum Information Theory, (World Scientific, 2000).
- <sup>2</sup> P. Zanardi and F. Rossi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 4752 (1998).
- <sup>3</sup> D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A 57, 120 (1998).
- <sup>4</sup> P. Recher, E. V. Sukhorukov and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 1962 (2000).
- <sup>5</sup> R. Landauer, Science 272, 1914 (1996).
- <sup>6</sup> J. M. Kikkawa and D. D. Awschalom, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 4314 (1998).
- <sup>7</sup> B. E. Kane, Nature (London) 393, 133 (1998).
- <sup>8</sup> D. P. DiVincenzo, J. Appl. Phys. 85, 4785 (1999).
- <sup>9</sup> H. A. Engel and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 4648 (2001).
- <sup>10</sup> R. Fiederling et al, Nature 402, 787 (1999).
- <sup>11</sup> Y. Ohno et al, Nature 402, 790 (1999).
- <sup>12</sup> A. P. Jauho, N. S. Wingreen, and Y. Meir, Phys. Rev. B 50, 5528 (1994).
- <sup>13</sup> J. Beenen and D. M. Edwards, Phys. Rev. B 52, 13636 (1995).
- <sup>14</sup> J. Hubbard, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A 281, 401 (1964).
- <sup>15</sup> A. B. Harris and R. V. Lange, Phys. Rev. 157, 295 (1967).
- <sup>16</sup> L. M. Roth, Phys. Rev. 184, 451 (1969).
- <sup>17</sup> W. Nolting and W. Borgiel, Phys. Rev. B 39, 6962 (1989).
- <sup>18</sup> A. Barbieri and A. P. Young, J. Phys. Condens. Matter 3, 1801 (1991).
- <sup>19</sup> N. Bulut, D. J. Scalapino, and S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 748 (1994).
- <sup>20</sup> D. M. T. Kuo and Y. C. Chang, Phys. Rev. B 61, 11051 (2000).







