On the phase of oscillatory m icrow ave photoresistance and zero-resistance states

M . A . Zudov

Department of Physics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

(Received 19 June 2003)

W e present phenom enological analysis of the period and the phase of oscillatory m icrowave photoresistance $(OMP)^1$ and zero-resistance states $(ZRS)^{2,3}$ recently observed in 2D electron systems. The results demonstrate that as OMP evolves into ZRS with increasing m agnetic eld, the absolute value of the phase becomes progressively sm aller, decreasing roughly as 1=B. V intually eliminating a phase-shift and resulting in di erent periodicities for the maxim a and m inim a, such speci c dependence is supported by a simple m odel based on oscillatory density of states. Finally, it follows that ne structures rst reported in Ref. 3 can be viewed as an experimental evidence for multi-photon processes.

PACS num bers: 73.40.-c, 73.43.-f, 73.21.-b

Using innovative m icrowave (MW) photoconductivity spectroscopy of 2D electron systems (2DES) originally employed in experim ents on oscillatory m icrowave photoresistance $(OMP)^1$, two research groups have recently reported on a series of \zero-resistance states" (ZRS)^{2,3} emerging from the OMP minima in ultra-high quality samples. Manifesting a novel dissipationless regime, such states appear when the MW frequency, ! = 2 f, som ew hat exceeds the cyclotron frequency, $!_{c} = eB = m$, of the 2DES (m is the elective electron mass) and are characterized by an exponentially small low-temperature resistance and a classical Hall resistance. More recently, experiments have been extended to probe dc conductivity in C orbino rings of 2D E S revealing \zero-conductance states" (ZCS),⁴ in agreement with standard dc magneto-transport tensor relation. D iscovery of ZRS has triggered a surge of theoretical interest 5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25 and has been con med in independent experiments.^{16,26} As it was realized that even the mechanism of the originalOMP lacks understanding, the rst step forward was made by Durst et al^5 who related the phenomenon to radiation-induced in purity-assisted scattering (in fact, sim ilar ideas were proposed decades ago by Ryzhii.^{27,28}). Regardless of the microscopic nature of the OMP, it was established experim entally²⁹ that the sam plem obility favors OMP amplitude at the same time reducing background resistance. Therefore, one could intuitively expect that further in proving sam ple quality would eventually lead to zero or even negative resistance at the OMP minima. As the later scenario is not experimentally realized,^{2,3,4} Andreev et al⁷ presented strong arguments showing that a negative resistance (conductance) state, regardless of its origin, is intrinsically unstable. This instability leads to formation of current (electric eld) domains^{7,8,13} which give rise to ZRS(ZCS). As there are no new experiments available to date to test these or other theories, current understanding of the phenom enon appears far from com plete. Furtherm ore, while there seems to be a consensus about the period of the ZRS, the value of the phase seems to be controversial, even experimentally.^{2,3} Since the majority of proposed

OMP (ZRS) models seem to account for, and some [see, e.g. Ref. 2] even rely on a speci c value of the phase, we feel that it would be useful to address the origin of this discrepancy.

In this paper we present detailed analysis of the period and the phase of the OMP/ZRS, which, we hope, com plem ents original experim ental ndings.^{2,3} The results indicate that evolution of the OMP into ZRS with increasing m agnetic eld is accompanied by a dram atic reduction of the phase. We nd that in the ZRS regime the phase decreases roughly as 1=B and such dependence virtually elim inates a 1=4-cycle" phase shift attributed to ZRS by the authors of Ref. 2. While a speci c origin of such a dependence is not clear at this point, we show that, under reasonable assumptions, it is consistent with an idea⁵ that MW photoresistance roughly follows the derivative of the density of states (DoS). Finally, we show that ne structures rst reported in Ref. 3 can be viewed as an experimental evidence for multi-photon processes.

O ne of the puzzles surrounding experim ental reports is that, despite a great deal of sim ilarity between the data presented in Ref. 2 and that of Ref. 3, conclusions regarding the phase of the ZRS were quite di erent. M ani et al² have found the positions of them axim a/m inim a (, respectively) of both the OMP and ZRS to be described by:

where " $!=!_{c}$ and j is a positive integer. A coording to Eq. (1) maxima (m inima) appear blue (red)-shifted by a 1=4-cycle" from the cyclotron resonance harmonics, "_j = j, and the magnetoresistance can be viewed as a single-harmonic function with the phase, = 0.25.

On the other hand, Zudov et al^3 have reported that m ajor (j < 4) m axim a can be roughly tted to "⁺ j. As far as the m ajor m inim a are concerned, their positions, contrary to the m axim a, are not well de ned since ZRS span a wide range of the m agnetic eld. N aively one could take the ZRS center as its position but the higher tem perature data³ and apparent asym m etry of the m ajor m axim a³ rule against such single-harm onic picture. Therefore, Zudov et al³ have proposed that ZRS could also be viewed as a roughly periodic (in 1=B) sequence, with no apparent phase shift, although with a som ewhat enhanced periodicity [cf., Fig. 3 in Ref. 3]. Here we sum – m arize the observations of Ref. 3 as follows:

$$''_{j} = j; j^{<} 4$$
 (2)

where is a constant close to unity. Higher-order (j > 4) OM P were found to conform to Eq. (1) although such approach required a som ew hat reduced value of the e ective m ass (m $_{\rm b}$ = 0.064m $_0$), as opposed to m $_{\rm hi}$ = 0.068 obtained using Eq. (2) for j < 4.30

It immediately follows that, experimentally, the boundary of applicability of Eqs. (1) and (2), i.e., j 4,



FIG.1: (a) Solid (open) circles are experimental values of the phase, = "j j, extracted from the data³ (inset) taken at T = 0.9 K (T = 2.7 K) and f = 57 G H z. Solid lines: calculated using Eq. (7) form = 0.064 and = 0.3 K.D ashed lines are asymptotes of Eq. (7) calculated using the same parameters. (b) M agnetoresistance under M W illumination of f = 57 G H z taken at T = 0.9 K (also seen in the inset of Fig.1(a)) plotted as a function of ". Vertical lines are calculated using Eqs. (3), (7) for the maxima.

2

seem s to also separate the regimes of the OMP from that of the ZRS; being described by diment equations MW photoresistance for j > 4 corresponds to the OMP regime, while ZRS appear at j < 4. To reconcile Eqs. (1) and (2) we propose the following expression

$$"_{j} = j + ;$$
 (3)

where is now allowed to vary with ", approaching 0.25 as " increases. In what follows, we analyse the phase, j ", j, extracted from our experimental data,^{3,31} as a function of ".³²

In Fig. 1(a) we present the experimental value of the phase, , extracted from m agnetoresistance traces³ (see inset) taken at T = 0.9 K (solid circles) and T = 2.7K (open circles) for f = 57 GHz. Horizontal dashed lines mark a \ 1/4-cycle" phase-shift, which is readily observed in experim ent for both maxim a and minim a at "> 4. At " < 4, positions of the m in im a at low temperature cannot be accurately determ ined and we lim it our discussion to the maxim a positions (as discussed later in the text, m in in a positions are expected to follow sim ilar dependence). W ith decreasing "we observe a dram atic reduction of j $^+$ j roughly linear with ", i.e., $^+$ + ", with + 6:4 10² 1. We immediately note that, in agreem ent with earlier conclusions,³ such a dependence does not produce any phase-shift but a ects periodicity [cf., Eq. (2)]. Indeed, substituting this result into Eq. (3) one obtains $\mathbf{m}^+ = \mathbf{j} = (1 + \mathbf{j})$ (1 ⁺) j which is just Eq. (2). W e can now relate the phenom enological param eter ⁺ to the di erence between the e ective m asses extracted earlier³⁰ from the maxim a positions using Eq. (1)for j > 4 (m $_{lo} = 0.064$) and Eq. (2) (with + = 1) for j < 4 (m_{bi} = 0.068). We note that completely ignoring the phase-shift results in an overestimation of the m ass by approximately + %, consistent with the data of Fig. 1 (a). W hile the m in in a positions at " < 4 could be accessed at elevated tem peratures, e.g. T = 2.7 K, the extracted phase (open circles) does not seem to follow such a simple linear dependence on ". W hile the same is true for the maxim a at this T, the origin of such enhancem ent of the phase rem ains unclear.

It is interesting to exam ine the extracted phase in term softhe recent theoretical proposals. Here we chose a \toy m odel" proposed by D urst et a^{5} who suggested that M W photoresistance roughly follows the derivative of the D oS taken at E = h!. The condition describing the positions of the maxim a and m inim a in the OM P (ZR S) structure is then given by:

$$\frac{d^2 N (E)}{dE^2} = 0$$
 (4)

U sing a well-known fact that in weak magnetic eld the oscillatory part of the DoS behaves as $\cos(2 \text{ E} = h!_c)$, Eq. (1) is easily recovered. It is well known, however, that with increasing magnetic eld, cyclotron energy will eventually exceed the Landau level (LL) width and DoS will no longer be described by a single-harm onic function.

Due to this, in regular magnetotransport, Shubnikovde Haas (SdH) e ect evolves into a quantum Halle ect (QHE) with increasing magnetic eld (or sam ple mobility). Intuitively, one could think that sim ilar magneticeld-driven transition might be responsible for the evolution of the OMP¹ into ZRS.^{2,3} Q ualitatively it is straightforward to see that as the DoS deviates from a sinusoidal form with increasing magnetic eld, the phase will be reduced rendering Eq. (1) invalid and therefore irrelevant to the ZRS regime.

For quantitative comparison with experiment we assume that LLs have Lorentzian shape characterized by a eld-independent width, $.^{33}$ Then the D oS can be written as:

N (E) =
$$\frac{1}{\frac{2}{2}} \frac{X}{0} \frac{(E - nh!_c)^2 + 2}{2};$$
 (5)

where n denotes the LL index and ${}_{0} = {}^{p} \overline{}_{h=eB}$ is the magnetic length. Experimentally we are constrained to the case of very high LLs (h! $E_{\rm F}, E_{\rm F}$ is the Fermi energy), therefore, the summation can be taken over innite limits yielding analytical solution. A fler introducing dimensionless units (" = $E = h!_{c}$, = $= h!_{c}$, and n (") = N (E) h! $_{c} {}^{2}_{0}$), one obtains:

$$n(") = \cos^2(") \tanh() + \sin^2(") \coth()^{-1}$$
 (6)

Substituting (6) in (4) (i.e., d^2n (")= $d^{"2}$ $j_{=!=!_{\circ}}$) and solving for " one obtains Eq. (3) with the phase of the form :

$$= \frac{1}{2} \arccos$$
(7)

where = 1=2 y + $p = \frac{1}{y^2}$ y + 9=4, y = $\cosh^2()$, and is the phase for the series of maxim a/m inima, respectively.

At lowerm agnetic elds (1), y 1, y 1 1, so 1=4 and Eqs. (3),(7) reduce to Eq. (1). One can also arrive at the same conclusion by noticing that in this limit, as mentioned earlier, the DoS becomes a single-harmonic function of ", i.e., n(") = $1+2\exp(2)\cos(2$ ").

M ore interesting results emerge at higher magnetic elds (1), when LLs become well separated. In this limit, y $p^{1+2}=2$, $1+2^{2}=3$, which leads to =3. One can also easily obtain the same result by considering an isolated Lorentzian line. W e in - m ediately note that the phase is decreasing as 1=B, in agreement with experimental data plotted in Fig. 1 (a), leading to j / 1=B [cf., Eq. (2)]:

$$j = \frac{h!}{h!_c} = \frac{p}{3};$$
 (8)

A few comments are appropriate. First, Eq. (8) is consistent with our experimental observations³ regarding the positions of the major maxim a and minima. O scillation order j for the maxim a and minima scales linearly

with ", with no apparent phase, but with di erent prefactors [cf., in Eq. (2)]; it is easy to see that since 1, as observed experim entally. Second, the 1. asymmetry of the ZRS portion of the magnetoresistance trace can now be understood, since Eq. (8) dictates oscillations to appear as closely-spaced maximum -minimum pairs, centered about integer values of " = j. Third, since experimentally OMP $(j^{>} 4)$ and ZRS $(j^{<} 4)$ conform to di erent resonant conditions (Eq. (1) and Eq. (2), respectively) this model suggests that ZRS develop from the OMP minima as a result of a magnetic-eld-driven transition taking place around $h!_c=2$ 1. Such a tran-= 3 reaches sition would roughly occur when = its low - eld lim it of 1/4. Indeed, it happens when $h!_{c}=2 =$ ⁷ 3=2 1. Finally, it is interesting to mention that Eq. (8) provides a direct experim entalm ethod to probe , which is not directly accessible in standard magnetotransport, both in SdH (1) and in QHE 1) regime. We also mention that more detailed (microscopic calculations within a self-consistent Bom approximation²² predict similar reduction of the phase with increasing magnetic eld.

Using Eq. (8) we can now relate the phenom enological param eter to , i.e., = 3h! 0.3 K 2:7 K, as expected). W e can also roughly (h! estimate the number of developed ZRS, as h! = (2)in agreem entwith experim ent. U sing Eqs. (3), (7) we now com pute the maxim a positions for the whole range of " for comparison with experimental data.³ In Fig. 1 (b) we present the results of such calculations shown by vertical lines along with experim ental trace for f = 57 GHzadopted from Ref. 3, but now replotted as a function of ". W hile it was shown before³⁰ that Eq. (1) works well only for " > 4 and Eq. (2) for " < 4, Eqs. (3),(7) provide excellent agreem ent over the whole range of ", both in OMP and ZRS regimes. In Fig. 1 (a) we now present , calculated using Eq. (7) for m = 0.064 and = 0.3K (solid lines), and again observe good agreem ent with low -tem perature experim ental data.³ D ashed lines crossing around $p = \frac{p}{3}$ (4 represent asymptotes of Eq. (7), i.e., 0:25 (1) and 1). Experim entally, we observe that this crossing point roughly

m arks a transition from OMP to ZRS [cf. Fig. 1(b)]. An enhancem ent of the phase at higher T can now be related to the therm albroadening of LLs.

Once we have established that OMP can be viewed as maximum -minimum pairs associated with integer j and positioned around "= j, we can try to generalize Eq. (3) for the processes involving multiple photons. While it seems unlikely that such higher-order processes would be readily resolved experimentally, our data³ suggest that such a scenario deserve close examination, especially in light of recent theoretical comments.^{5,17,34} For the case of m-photon processes and 1, the maximum -minimum pairs are to appear roughly symmetrically around fractional " and the expression (3) ism odi ed as follows (here



FIG. 2: M agnetoresistance under MW illumination of frequency (a) 57 G H z and (b) 31.5 G H z. Vertical lines are drawn at " = j=m = 3/2, 5/2 (a) and 1/2, 2/3 (b). Vertical arrows, placed symmetrically about j=m mark maximum minimum pairs at " $_{jm} = j=m$ $_{jm}$.

we do not attempt to calculate $_{jm}$):

$$"_{jm} = \frac{j}{m} \qquad jm \qquad (9)$$

where m = 2;3;4:::. For instance, two-photon processes (m = 2) would reveal them selves as a series of maximum -minimum pairs close to half-integer values of ", e.g. 1/2, 3/2, 5/2,.... To prove the feasibility of such

scenario, we present in Fig. 2(a) the magnetoresistance data³ taken under illum ination with MW radiation of f = 57 GHz but now plotted over the narrow range of ". Maximum-minimum pair centered at " = 3=2 and m arked by vertical arrows is clearly observed and sim ilar structure seems to develop around " = 5=2. W hile such secondary peaks appearing at " > 1 m ay be possibly explained by other mechanisms, structures emerging at " < 1 present stronger support for multi-photon transitions as these naturally allow to enter the region of " < 1. In Fig. 2(b) we show magnetoresistance data³⁵ for f = 31.5 GHz and focus on the region of " < 1. The structure centered around " = 1=2 is com parable in am plitude to the primary single-photon structure around " = 1. We notice that this feature is best observed at low MW frequencies³ and quickly disappears at f > 40GHz as it gradually shifts into SdH regime. In addition, there appears yet another maxim um -m in im um pair close to " = 2=3 which would suggest an even less-likely, threephoton process. Based on the good agreem ent of the positions, we believe that secondary peaks rst observed in Ref. 3 are due to multi-photon processes as described by Eq. (9) for m = 2. The test for such a conclusion would be the system atic power-dependence experiments which are deferred for future studies.

In sum m ary, we have studied the period and the phase of the MW photoresistance over the wide range of ", covering both OMP and ZRS regimes. A sOMP evolves into ZRS with increasing magnetic eld we observe a dram atic reduction of the phase, which decreases roughly as 1=B. Such a decrease results in di erent periodicities for the maxim a and minima, but both exhibit no apparent phase-shift, in agreement with our earlier report.³ Assum ing that MW photoresistance follows the derivative of the DoS_{r}^{5} ZRS and OMP can be viewed as two different experim ental regim es separated by the condition $h!_{c}=2$ 1. Despite obvious oversim pli cation, such an intuitive m odel seem s to capture the behavior of the ZRS position/phase quite well but we do not rule out other explanations. Finally, we identify additional structures rst reported in Ref. 3 as resulting from multi-photon processes taking place around fractional values of ", e.g. 1=2;3=2;

W e would like to thank R.R.Du, V.A.Apalkov, and M.G.Vavilov for reading the manuscript and valuable remarks. This work is supported by DARPA.

- ¹ M.A.Zudov, R.R.Du, J.A.Simmons, and J.L.Reno, cond-m at/9711149; Phys.Rev.B 64, 201311 (R) (2001).
- ² R.G.Mani, J.H.Smet, K.Von Klitzing, V.Narayanamurti, W.B.Johnson, and V.Umansky, Nature 420, 646 (2002).
- ³ M.A.Zudov, R.R.Du, L.N.P fei er, K.W. W est, condm at/0210034; Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 046807 (2003).
- ⁴ C.L.Yang, M.A.Zudov, T.A.Knuuttila, R.R.Du, L. N.Pfei er, and K.W.West, cond-m at/0303472.
- ⁵ A.C.Durst, S.Sachdev, N.Read, and S.M.Girvin, condm at/0301569.
- ⁶ J. C. Phillips, cond-m at/0212416; cond-m at/0303181; cond-m at/0303184.
- ⁷ A. V. Andreev, I. L. Aleiner, and A. J. Millis, condmat/0302063.
- ⁸ P.W .Anderson and W .F.Brinkman, cond-mat/0302129.
- ⁹ J. Shi and X. C. Xie, cond-m at/0302393; condm at/0303141.

- ¹⁰ A.A.Koulakov and M.E.Raikh, cond-m at/0302465.
- ¹¹ A.F.Volkov, cond-m at/0302615.
- ¹² S.A.M ikhailov, cond-m at/0303130.
- ¹³ F.S.Bergeret, B.Huckestein, and A.F.Volkov, condm at/0303530.
- ¹⁴ I.A.Dm itriev, A.D.M irlin, and D.G.Polyakov, condm at/0304529.
- 15 M.V.Cherem isin, cond-m at/0304581.
- ¹⁶ S.I.D orozhkin, cond-m at/0304604.
- ¹⁷ X.L.Leiand S.Y.Liu, cond-m at/0304687.
- ¹⁸ P.H.Rivera and P.A.Schulz, cond-m at/0305019.
- ¹⁹ V.Ryzhii and V.Vyurkov, cond-m at/0305199.
- ²⁰ D.H.Lee and J.M.Leinaas, cond-m at/0305302.
- ²¹ V Ryzhii, cond-m at/0305454.
- ²² M.G. Vavilov and I.L.A leiner, cond-m at/0305478.
- ²³ R.K lesse and F.M erz, cond-m at/0305492.
- 24 A.F.Volkov and V.V.Pavlovskii, cond-m at/0305562.
- ²⁵ V Ryzhii and A Satou, cond-m at/0306051.
- ²⁶ R.L.W illett, K.W. W est, L.N.P fei er, Bull.Am.Phys. Soc. 48, 459 (2003).
- ²⁷ V.I.Ryzhii, Fiz. Tverd. Tela 11, 2577 (1969) [Sov. Phys. Solid State 11, 2078 (1970)].
- ²⁸ V. I. Ryzhii, R. A. Suris, and B. S. Shcham khalova, Sov. Phys. Sem icond. 20, 1299 (1986), Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn. 20, 2078 (1986) [Sov. Phys. Sem icond. 20, 1299 (1986)].
- ²⁹ M.A.Zudov, Ph.D. thesis, University of Utah, unpublished (1999).
- ³⁰ M.A.Zudov, C.L.Yang, R.R.Du, L.N.Pfeier, K.W.

West, Bull. Am . Phys. Soc. 48, 460 (2003).

- 31 O ur sam ples were A $l_{0:24}$ G $a_{0:76}$ A s/G aA s/A $l_{0:24}$ G $a_{0:76}$ sym metrically -doped quantum wells grown by molecular beam epitaxy, with a mobility = 2:5 10^7 cm 2 /V s and an electron density $n_{\rm e}$ = 3:5 10^{11} cm 2 . For additional sam ple parameters and experimental details the reader is referred to R ef. 3.
- 32 Here, we chose m = 0.064m $_{\rm 0}$ deduced from the OMP regime because it encompasses, experimentally, a much wider range of " as compared to the ZRS regime. We notice an apparent discrepancy between the deduced m = 0.064m $_{\rm 0}$ and the generally accepted value of 0.068m $_{\rm 0}$ for G aAs. The di erence (6%) well exceeds experimental uncertainties.
- 33 W hile a choice of a lineshape of the LLs (e.g., gaussian or Lorentzian) is not particularly in portant for our discussion, we notice that the assumption regarding the B independent width of the LL contradicts to the generally accepted $^{\rm B}$ -dependence obtained using a self-consitent B om approximation, which would lead to a $^{\rm P}$ -dependence of the phase, .W hether high-tem perature data presented in F ig. 1(b) indicate such dependence remains to be clar-i ed by future experiments.W e also note that our choice was successfully used in SdH form alism .
- ³⁴ M.G.Vavilov and I.L.A leiner, unpublished.
- ³⁵ M.A.Zudov, R.R.Du, L.N.Pfeier, K.W.West, unpublished.