

# Comments on ‘Rashba precession in quantum wire with interaction’

Yue Yu

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100080, China*  
(December 30, 2021)

In a recent Rapid Communication (Phys. Rev. B **63**, 121210(R) (2001)), Haüsler showed that the interaction between electrons in quantum wires may enhance the persistent spin current arising from Rashba spin-orbital coupling. In this Comments, we would like to point out that this ‘enhancement’ comes from a misunderstanding to the boosting persistent current in the Luttinger liquid theory. A correct calculation will not give such an enhancement of the persistent spin current. Meanwhile, we provide a Luttinger liquid theory with Rashba spin-orbital interaction by bosonization, which may show how the Rashba precession is in a Luttinger liquid.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Pm, 71.70.Ej, 73.21.-b

In a recent Rapid Communication, Rashba precession in quantum wires with interaction was discussed [1]. The author explained that the enhancement of the Rashba effect in the Shubnikov-de Hass measurement [2] may possibly caused by the interaction between the electrons in quantum wires. A bosonization form of the Luttinger liquid was used in order to describe this enhancement. The bosonized Hamiltonian the author obtained was (see eq. (5) in [1])

$$H = \sum_{\nu=\rho,\sigma} \frac{\pi}{4L} (v_{\nu N} M_{\nu}^2 + v_{\nu J} J_{\nu}^2) - m\alpha v_F J_{\sigma} + \sum_{q \neq 0} H_q. \quad (1)$$

Here, the author defined  $M_{\nu} = M_{\nu R} + M_{\nu L}$  and  $J_{\nu} = M_{\nu R} - M_{\nu L}$ . In Haldane’s original paper,  $M_{\nu R, L}$  are the particle numbers to be extra added to the ground state in the right- or left-movers [3]. They are integer. Now, there is a contradiction, i. e.,  $J_{\sigma}$  is an integer while in the ground state,  $\delta H / \delta J_{\sigma} = 0$  leads to

$$J_{\sigma, 0} = (2L/\pi) m\alpha v_F / v_{\sigma J}, \quad (2)$$

which is not an integer in general. On the other hand, eq.(2) was the central result that the author of [1] to claim the Rashba effect may be enhanced by interaction, because of which, the Rashba length becomes short for the repulsive interaction and Rashba effect is enhanced.

To solve the contradiction mentioned above and to see if the Rashba length is really shorted, we thoroughly go through the bosonization of the interaction electrons with Rashba effect in quantum wires. Consider the free electrons with Rashba spin-orbital term on a quantum wire. The Hamiltonian in a second quantization language reads

$$H = \int dx \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{a=\pm} \psi_a^*(x) [(-i\hbar\partial_x + aq_R)^2 - q_R^2] \psi_a(x) \\ = \sum_k \epsilon_a(k) c_{ka}^{\dagger} c_{ka}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\psi_a = \sqrt{1/2}(\psi_{\uparrow} - ia\psi_{\downarrow})$  for  $\psi_{\uparrow, \downarrow}$  being the electron fields with spin  $\uparrow$  and  $\downarrow$ ;  $c_{ka}$  is the Fourier component of  $\psi_a(x)$ ;  $q_R = m\alpha$  is Rashba wave vector; and

$$\epsilon_a(k) = \frac{1}{2m} [(k + aq_R)^2 - q_R^2]$$

is the dispersion relation. Linearizing the dispersion near the Fermi points  $\pm k_F$ , one has

$$H \approx H_R + H_L + E_0(M, J) = \sum_{k \sim k_F} v_{Fa}(k - k_F) c_{ka}^{\dagger} c_{ka} \\ - \sum_{k \sim -k_F} v_{F\bar{a}}(k + k_F) c_{ka}^{\dagger} c_{ka} + E_0(M, J), \quad (4)$$

where  $E_0(M, J)$  is the zero mode energy to be determined later;  $v_{Fa} = (k_F + aq_R)/m$  and  $v_{F\bar{a}} = (k_F - aq_R)/m$ . Define the density operators in the momentum space

$$\rho_{qa}^{R, L} = \sum_{k \sim \pm k_F} c_{k+q, a}^{\dagger} c_{ka}$$

which obey commutation relations

$$[\rho_{qa}^{R, L}, \rho_{q'a'}^{R, L}] = \frac{L}{2\pi} \delta_{a, a'} \delta q, q', \\ [H^{R, L}, \rho_{qa}^{R, L}] = \pm v_{Fa, \bar{a}} q \rho_{qa}^{R, L}. \quad (5)$$

Therefore, we can write down the bosonized Hamiltonian which satisfying the commutation relation (5)

$$H_B = \sum_{q > 0, a} v_{Fa} q b_{qa}^{\dagger} b_{qa} + \sum_{q > 0, a} v_{F\bar{a}} q \tilde{b}_{qa}^{\dagger} \tilde{b}_{qa} + E(M, J), \quad (6)$$

where  $b_{qa} = \sqrt{2\pi/qL} \rho_{qa}^R$  and  $\tilde{b}_{qa} = \sqrt{2\pi/qL} \rho_{qa}^{\bar{R}}$ . Differing from a well-known bosonized Luttinger liquid Hamiltonian, the left- and right- mover Hamiltonians have different sound velocities. Now, we determine the zero mode energy. The ground state energy is given by

$$E_0 = \int_{-k_F}^{k_F} dk \sum_a n_a(k) \epsilon_a(k), \quad (7)$$

where  $n_a(k) = 1/2\pi$ . The zero mode excitations include adding extra particle to the ground state and boosting the Fermi sea by  $k \rightarrow k - \pi J_a/L$ . That is, the energy increments are

$$\delta_M E = \sum_a \left\{ \int_{-k_F - \pi M_a}^{k_F + \pi M_a} - \int_{-k_F}^{k_F} \right\} n_a(k) \epsilon_a(k), \\ \delta_J E = \sum_a \left\{ \int_{-k_F - \pi J_a/L}^{k_F - \pi J_a/L} - \int_{-k_F}^{k_F} \right\} n_a(k) \epsilon_a(k). \quad (8)$$

It is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned}
E_0(M, J) &= \delta_M E + \delta_J E \\
&= v_F \sum_{\nu=\rho, \sigma} \frac{\pi}{4L} (M_\nu^2 + J_\nu^2) - q_R v_F J_\sigma \\
&= v_F \sum_{\nu=\rho, \sigma} \frac{\pi}{4L} (M_\nu^2 + \tilde{J}_\nu^2) - \frac{L}{\pi} v_F^2 q_R^2, \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $M_\rho = \sum_a M_a$ ,  $M_\sigma = \sum_a a M_a$  and so on;  $\tilde{J}_\rho = J_\rho$  and  $\tilde{J}_\sigma = J_\sigma - (2L/\pi)q_R v_F$ . According to Haldane [3], the periodic boundary condition gives  $(-1)^{M_\nu} = (-1)^{\tilde{J}_\nu}$ . Namely,  $M_\nu$  and  $\tilde{J}_\nu$  are integer and have the same odd-even.

A full Luttinger liquid Hamiltonian by adding the interaction between electrons is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= H_B + H_I \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q>0, a} [q(v_F a + U_{qa})(b_{qa}^\dagger b_{qa} + b_{qa} b_{qa}^\dagger) \\
&\quad + q(v_F \bar{a} + U_{q\bar{a}})(\tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}}^\dagger \tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}} + \tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}} \tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}}^\dagger) \\
&\quad + qV_{qa}(b_{qa}^\dagger \tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}}^\dagger + \tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}}^\dagger b_{qa}^\dagger + b_{qa} \tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}} + \tilde{b}_{q\bar{a}} b_{qa})] \\
&\quad + \frac{\pi}{4L} \sum_{\nu} \{v_F(M_\nu^2 + \tilde{J}_\nu^2) + 2[U_{0\nu}(M_{\nu, R}^2 + M_{\nu, L}^2) \\
&\quad + 2V_{0\nu}M_{\nu, R}M_{\nu, L}]\} + \text{constant}. \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the relation between the integers, i.e.,  $M_\nu = M_{\nu, R} + M_{\nu, L}$  and  $\tilde{J}_\nu = M_{\nu, R} - M_{\nu, L}$ , one has

$$H = \sum_{\nu=\rho, \sigma} \frac{\pi}{4L} (v_{\nu N} M_\nu^2 + v_{\nu J} J_\nu^2) - q_R v_\sigma J_\sigma + \sum_{q \neq 0} H_q, \tag{11}$$

where  $v_{\nu N}$  and  $v_{\nu J}$  relate to  $v_F$  by Haldane controlling parameters determined by the interaction [3]. Differing from eq. (2), the persistent spin current in the ground state determined by (11) is simply

$$J_{\sigma, 0} = (2L/\pi)m\alpha, \tag{12}$$

which is not renormalized by the interaction.

To doubly check (12), we take another formalism of the Luttinger liquid. The Luttinger liquid theory can be re-formalized by using the exclusion statistics language [4]. In this formalism, the Haldane controlling parameters, e.g.,  $e^{-2\varphi_\nu}$ , are identified as the exclusion statistical parameters, say  $\lambda_\nu$ . We consider the ground state energy (7). Due to the  $\lambda_\nu$ -exclusion, the density distribution of the fermi sea is given by

$$n_\nu(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi\lambda_\nu} \tag{13}$$

for  $|k| < k_F$  but not simply  $\frac{1}{2\pi}$  [4]. Adding the extra particles corresponds to enlarge the Fermi sea, i.e., in terms of (13),  $\pm k_F \rightarrow \pm(k_F + \pi\lambda_\nu M_\nu/L)$ . Boosting the Fermi sea is still given by  $k \rightarrow k - \pi J_\nu/L$ . Therefore,

similar to (8), the increments of the energy due to the zero mode excitations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_M E &= \frac{\pi}{4L} \sum_{\nu} (\lambda_\nu v_F) M_\nu^2 + \dots, \\
\delta_J E &= \frac{\pi}{4L} \sum_{\nu} (v_F/\lambda_\nu) J_\nu^2 - q_R (v_F/\lambda_\sigma) J_\sigma, \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $v_F \lambda_\nu \equiv v_{\nu N}$  and  $v_F/\lambda_\nu \equiv v_{\nu J}$ ; '...' is proportional to  $M_\nu$  and can be absorbed into the re-definition of the chemical potential. Once more, we obtain the persistent spin current (12) but not (2).

In conclusions, we have shown that the interaction between electrons does not renormalize the persistent spin current. Therefore, the experimentally observed enhancement of the Rashba effect is not related to the interaction in the way described by Ref. [1]. However, the interaction does affect the Rashba procession. It may be seen from  $\sum_{q \neq 0} H_q$  in (11). Although the different sound velocities in the left- and right-movers implies it is not an ordinary conformal field theory with  $c = 1$  in each 'a'-sector, this  $H_q$  may be diagonalized. So the sound velocities  $v_{Fa}$  and  $v_{F\bar{a}}$  then the Rashba  $q_R$  will be renormalized. Again due to the technique of the ordinary conformal field theory can not be directly applied, many details need to work out in order to see the Rashba procession with interaction. These have gone beyond the scope of this Comments and we will publish them in a separate paper.

This work was supported in part by the NSF of China.

- 
- [1] W. Häusler, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 121210(R) (2001).
  - [2] J. Nitta, T. Akazaki, H. Takayanagi, and T. Enoki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1335 (1997). G. Engels, J. Lange, T. Schäpers, and H. Lüth, Phys. Rev. B **55**, R1958 (1997). T. Schäpers, G. Engels, J. Lange, T. Klocke, M. Hollfelder, and H. Lüth, J. Appl. Phys. **83**, 4324 (1998). C.-M. Hu, J. Nitta, T. Akazaki, H. Takayanagi, J. Osaka, P. Pfeffer, and W. Zawadzki, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 7736 (1999). D. Grundler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 6074 (2000). T. Matsuyama, R. Kürsten, C. Meßner, and U. Merkt, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 15588 (2000).
  - [3] D. M. Haldane, J. Phys. C **14**, 2585 (1981).
  - [4] Y. S. Wu and Yue Yu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 890 (1995). Y. S. Wu, Yue Yu and H. X. Yang, Nucl. Phys. B **604**, 551 (2001).