# Quasistates in a ring coupled to a reservoir and their relation to the Dicke e ect

Bernhard Wunsch and Alexander Chudnovskiy

I. Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Hamburg, Jungiusstr. 9, D {20355 Hamburg, Germany

(D ated: D ecem ber 23, 2021)

We study the energy spectrum and the persistent current in an ideal one-dimensional mesoscopic ring coupled to an external fermionic reservoir. The contact between ring and reservoir is described by a tunneling operator, which causes an indirect coupling between dimensional mesoscopic the reservoir. For strong coupling to the reservoir new quasistates with sharp eigenenergies develop inside the ring. The formation of long-living states at strong tunnel coupling to the reservoir is analogous to the Dicke e ect in optics, that was recently investigated in context of resonant scattering and resonant tunneling in solid state system s. O urm odel reproduces the results obtained in previous work based on the scattering matrix approach and furtherm ore it describes a new stable energy spectrum in the limit of strong coupling.

PACS num bers: 73.21 Ra, 73.23.-b

Experim ents on m esoscopic rings enable to study quantum e ects based on phase coherence. Two of its proven m anifestations are oscillations in the conductance of open rings connected to leads<sup>1,2</sup> and persistent currents inside closed rings<sup>3,4,5,6,7</sup>, both periodic with the m agnetic

eld applied perpendicular to the probe. In som e of the experiments both e ects can be measured on the same probe with the help of side gates that control the coupling between ring and reservoirs<sup>2,5</sup>. In recent optical experiments the energy spectra of quantum rings were studied<sup>7,8</sup>.

As phase coherence is the precondition of these phenom ena, the in uence of decoherence is of major interest. Recently, the suppression of quantum coherence in a mesoscopic system due to its coupling to an externalm acroscopic reservoir attracted much attention. If a smallm esoscopic system (quantum dot, quantum ring) is coupled by tunneling to an external reservoir of ferm ions (a lead) a phenom enon of level attraction is known to occur, which results in changes of occupation numbers, statistics of energy levels, and eventually the transport properties through the mesoscopic device<sup>9,10</sup>.

In the present paper we investigate the e ects of level attraction due to coupling to an external reservoir on the persistent current in a mesoscopic ring. We nd that the tunnel coupling in general leads to the suppression of the persistent current. How ever, with increasing coupling, the e ective level structure of the ring coupled to the reservoir changes. Due to level mixing through the reservoir, quasistates with sharp eigenenergies develop in the ring, which can be related to the Dicke e ect in optics<sup>11,12,13,14</sup>. Depending on the number of ring states coupled to the reservoir. The saturation value of the persistent current at large tunneling is crucially a ected by the detailed structure of the tunneling matrix elements. A



FIG.1: D i event setups for a coupled ring described within the tunnel H am iltonian form alism (a) or within the scattering matrix approach (b).

com plete suppression of the persistent current takes place only if all states of the ring are mixed by tunneling.

A ring coupled to a reservoir was investigated previously within the scattering matrix approach<sup>15,16,17,18,19,20</sup>, in which the ring is coupled via an ideal wire to the dissipative reservoir see Fig. 1 (b). But the development of long living states for strong coupling was not discussed there.

The work is organized as follows: A fler the introduction we explain our model in the next section. In section III the general results for the density of states (DOS) and the current density in the ring are presented. Thereafter these results are analyzed for di erent numbers of ring states that couple to the reservoir. In section V we relate our results to the Dicke e ect. A comparison with previous work based on the scattering matrix approach will be performed in section V I.F inally we will conclude our work.

#### II. M O D E L

The setup studied in this work is shown in Fig. 1 (a). Since the main purpose of this paper is to study the in-

uence of decoherence introduced by a tunnel contact to a ferm ionic reservoir (a lead) we con ned ourselves to an independent spinless electron m odel and assum ed the ring to be one-dimensional<sup>21</sup>. This simple model captures already the main features of the energy spectrum and exhibits the persistent current measured on rings in the ballistic transport regime<sup>5,7</sup>. The Ham iltonian of our model has the following form:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{m}^{X} \prod_{m} \hat{a}_{m}^{+} \hat{a}_{m} + \sum_{r} \sum_{r} \hat{b}_{r}^{+} \hat{b}_{r} + \sum_{m, r} t_{m, r} (\hat{a}_{m}^{+} \hat{b}_{r} + h c;);$$
(1)

where  $a_m^+$  and  $a_m^-$  ( $b_r^+$  and  $\hat{b}_r$ ) are the creation and annihilation operators for electrons in the ring (reservoir) with quantum number m (r). The eigenfunctions of the isolated ring are given by  $_m$  (') =  $e^{im'}$ , where m denotes the angular momentum in the ring, and ' is the angular coordinate around the ring. The corresponding eigenenergies are given by  $m_m^- = 4E_0 m + \frac{2}{0}$ , where denotes the magnetic ux through the ring,  $0 = \frac{h}{e}$  is

denotes the magnetic ux through the ring,  $_0 = \frac{2}{e}$  is the magnetic ux quantum, and the energy scale is given by  $E_0 = \frac{2}{8m R^2}$ . The ux dependence of the H am iltonian as well as the length of the ring is exclusively contained in the eigenenergies of the ring. The energies in the reservoir are denoted by  $E_r$ .

An important consequence of the coupling described by the tunneling operator in Eq. (1), is that the angular momentum is no longer conserved due to the new geom – etry, so that coupling to the same states in the reservoir induces an indirect interaction between the ring states. It is this interaction that determ ines the behavior of the system in the strong coupling regim e.

Let us discuss brie y the e ects of the neglected term s of the Hamiltonian given by Eq. (1). In the single particle picture a ring of nite width can be solved analytically<sup>22,23</sup>. We have used the one-dimensional energy spectrum to keep the calculations tractable, which is a good approximation for thin rings. The in uence of electron-electron interaction on the persistent current and the excitation spectrum has been shown to be negligible in an ideal narrow ring<sup>24</sup>. This is in agreement with experiments on a single ring within the ballistic transport regime' and with spectroscopy of nanoscopic sem iconducting rings<sup>7</sup>, for which the results can be explained within a single particle picture. Furtherm ore, for a high charge density inside the ring the Coulomb interaction is screened and does not contribute signi cantly. The e ect of spin is easily in plemented in our model as long as spin is conserved during the tunneling process. Like in the isolated case<sup>25</sup> the system can then be described by an independent sum of a spin up subsystem and a spin-down subsystem .

Following earlier work<sup>14</sup> we now estimate the tunneling matrix elements  $t_{m,r}$  dened by  $t_{m,r} = h_m jV j_r i$ , where the potential V denes the region of overlap between the wavefunctions in the ring and the reservoir and r denotes an eigenfunction in the reservoir. For a small contact the wavefunction of the reservoir can be taken out of the integral  $t_{m,r}$   $r(x_0)$  m(')Vd', so that

the dependence of the matrix element on the reservoir quantum number is contained in a separate factor, that is independent of the angularm on entum . For the calculation of the G reen's function of electrons in the ring the matrix elements appear in pairs like  $t_{m_{1},r}t_{m_{2},r}$ , so that the phase factor due the quantum number of the reservoir cancels out. A ssum ing furtherm ore that j $_{r}(x_{0})^{\frac{2}{2}}$  is constant<sup>14</sup>, the tunneling matrix element is independent of r:  $t_{m,r} = t_{m}$ .

The dependence of the tunneling matrix element on the ring quantum number can be estimated by inserting the eigenfunctions in the ring:  $t_m / \stackrel{, \circ}{,} e^{im \prime} = \frac{2}{m} \sin m \prime_0$ , where  $\prime_0$  describes the angular size of the contact. For small  $\prime_0$  and m the coupling is independent of m, whereas it is suppressed for higher m. In this paper we set the tunneling matrix elements constant for a given range of angular momenta of the eigenstates inside the ring. The tunneling matrix elements for other ring states are set to zero.

#### III. METHODSAND RESULTS

W ithin the described model the DOS in the ring can be calculated for arbitrary tunneling strength by means of a D yson equation for the G reen's function. Therefore, the obtained results are also valid for the strong coupling regime, in which the energy scale given by the tunneling is of the order of or larger than the interlevel spacing between consecutive ring states. To avoid superim posing e ects on the DOS in the ring due to the band structure of the reservoir we choose a constant density of states in the reservoir (E) = . Setting ~ = 1 the G reen's function for an electron in the ring has the follow ing form :

$$G_{m} (iE_{n}) = G_{m}^{0} (iE_{n}) + \frac{G_{m}^{0} (iE_{n})_{p}^{2} j_{1}^{2} (iE_{n})}{1 j_{1}^{2} (iE_{n})_{m_{1}} (G_{m_{1}}^{0} (iE_{n}))} (2)$$

with

$$(iE_n) = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ G_r^0 (iE_n) = i & sign(E_n); \end{bmatrix} (3)$$

where  $G_{m}^{0}$  (iE<sub>n</sub>) ( $G_{r}^{0}$  (iE<sub>n</sub>)) denotes the G reen's function of the isolated ring state (isolated reservoir state) given by  $G_{m}^{0}$  (iE<sub>n</sub>) = (iE<sub>n</sub> m)<sup>1</sup> ( $G_{r}^{0}$  (iE<sub>n</sub>) = (iE<sub>n</sub> E<sub>r</sub>)<sup>1</sup>), and E<sub>n</sub> denotes a M atsubara frequency. A di erent density of states in the reservoir can be taken into account rather straightforwardly as only the parameter is changed in Eq. (3).

A nalytical continuation of the G reen's function on the real axes leads to the retarded G reen's function, whose im aginary part determ ines the (norm alized) spectral density of the ring states  $S_m$  (E) and the DOS in the ring (E)

$$S_{m} (E) = \frac{1}{-1} = G_{m}^{ret} (E) = -\frac{\frac{1}{(E - m_{m})^{2}}}{(1 + 2 (E)^{2})};$$
 (4)

$$(E) = \sum_{m}^{X} S_{m} (E) = \frac{\frac{e(E)}{eE}}{(1 + 2(E)^{2})};$$
(5)

with

$$(E) = \frac{X}{m_{1}} \frac{1}{E m_{1}}; = \pm^{2}; \qquad (6)$$

In the simplest case of only one ring state that couples to the reservoir, the DOS is given by a Lorentzian centered around the eigenenergy " $_0$  of the isolated state

(E) =  $\frac{1}{((E - \pi_0)^2 + \pi_0^2)}$ . For any coupling strength, the width of the maximum of the DOS is given by the coupling energy . For more coupling states and for strong coupling the spectral densities are not given by Lorentzians due to the elective interaction between different ring states, as is shown below.

The e ect of coupling on the persistent current in the ring is investigated by calculating the current density. It is obtained by sum m ing over the contributions of all ring states. As the current carried by an occupied isolated ring state is  $I_m = \frac{\varrho \, "_m}{\varrho}$ , the current density has the form :

$$j(E) = \frac{X}{e} - \frac{e^{m}}{e} S_{m}(E) = -\frac{e^{m}}{(1 + e^{2})} - \frac{e^{m}}{(1 + e^{2})} + \frac{e^{m}}{(1 + e^{2})} - \frac{e^{m}}{(1$$

The total persistent current is then given by  $I = R_1^1$  f(E) j(E) dE, where f(E) =  $\frac{1}{1 + \exp((E))}$  denotes the Fermi distribution.

An important consequence of a constant coupling strength for all coupled ring states is that the ratio between current density and DOS is independent of the coupling

$$\frac{j(E)}{(E)} = \frac{\frac{e}{(E)}}{\frac{e}{(E)}};$$
(8)

## IV . ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS FOR DIFFERENT NUM BERS OF COUPLED RING STATES

In the following we will analyze the results obtained above for di erent numbers of ring states that couple to the reservoir.

## A. Coupling of two ring states to the reservoir

Now we assume that the coupling between ring and reservoir is restricted to the two energetically lowest ring states. This can be motivated by selective tunneling with respect to the angular momentum of the ring states as discussed above. Furthermore for a magnetic ux close to  $= \frac{0}{2}$  this assumption is also a good approximation as long as the energy gap to the higher lying ring states is larger than the coupling energy . However we will not limit the coupling strength in the following discussion.

If only two ring states couple to the reservoir, the system can be well described by introducing two quasistates.



FIG.2:DOS (full line) and current density (dashed line) for weak coupling =  $0.2E_0$  and xed magnetic ux =  $\frac{0}{3}$ . The quasistates are energetically well separated and their spectral densities broaden with increasing coupling. The structures of current density and DOS are sim ilar, which reects low m ixing of the ring states. The grid lines show the eigenenergies of the isolated ring states.

For weak coupling, their DOS is given by:

$$S_{1;2} (E) = \frac{m}{E_{av}} \frac{q}{\frac{(m)^2}{4}} \frac{2}{2} + 2$$
 (9)

with

$$" = "_{m_1} "_{m_2}; E_{av} = E \frac{"_{m_1} + "_{m_2}}{2}:$$
 (10)

The strength of coupling is characterized by the tunneling energy de ned in Eq. 6), which has to be compared with the interlevel spacing "of the coupled ring states. W ithout coupling the quasistates coincide with the eigenstates of the isolated ring. Fig. 2 shows the DOS and the current density in the weak coupling regime de ned by  $\frac{(-1)^2}{4}$  <sup>2</sup> > 0. In this regime the spectral densities of the quasistates broaden with increasing coupling, thereby approaching each other.

At the critical coupling  $_{c} = \frac{j}{2}$  j the spectral densities of the quasistates are equal. Fig. 3 and 4 illustrate the DOS and the current density, if the coupling is increased to the strong coupling regime with  $> _{c}$ . A new quasistate with a sharp eigenenergy develops and is represented by the sharp peak in the DOS with a width sm aller than . The other quasistate contributes to the DOS within a broad energy range of a width larger than

This behavior of the DOS is well described by the spectral densities of the quasistates in the strong coupling regime:

$$S_{1;2} (E) = \frac{\mathbf{r}}{E_{av}^{2} + \frac{q}{2} - \frac{(\mathbf{r})^{2}}{4}} = \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2} (11)$$



FIG.3: DOS (full line) and current density (dashed line) for strong coupling =  $1.5 E_0$  and xed magnetic ux =  $-\frac{0}{3}$ . The DOS consists of a quasistate with a sharp eigenenergy and of a quasistate that contributes in a wide energy range. The asymmetric form of the current density (dotted line) differs substantially from the DOS, which shows strong mixing of the ring states.



FIG.4: DOS for strong coupling  $= 0.4E_0$  and xed m agnetic ux  $= 0.49_0$ . For nearly degenerate eigenenergies of the isolated ring states the strong coupling regime is reached already for small coupling strength and the dimension of the two quasistates is well resolved.

It is important to notice that the energies of the isolated ring states depend on the magnetic ux, while the coupling to the reservoir is assumed to be independent of the magnetic ux. In particular, the eigenenergies are degenerate at  $= n\frac{0}{2}$ , so that by changing the magnetic ux close to this degenerate value one nally enters the regime of strong coupling, for any nonzero coupling strength.

The energy of the long living state depends on the magnetic ux, as it is given by the average energy of the two coupled states. Therefore, the system shows A haronov-Bohm type behavior even in the strong coupling regime. Correspondingly the persistent current saturates in the lim it of strong coupling and does not vanish.

The value of the saturated persistent current is obtained by noting that the ratio between current density



FIG.5: D ependence of the persistent current on the m agnetic ux through the ring for a coupling of two ring states to the reservoir ( $= 4 E_0$ ). Relative to the persistent current in an isolated ring (full line), the persistent current is reduced and sm oothed for increasing coupling (long dashed line  $= 0.2 E_0$ ). In the strong coupling regime (short dashed line,  $= 5 E_0$ ) the current saturates and the saw tooth form is restored.

and DOS is independent of the coupling. In the limit of strong coupling, the long living state is centered at the average energy of the coupling states and carries the current I =  $\frac{I_{m_1} + I_{m_2}}{2}$ , while the strongly coupling state carries a current of I =  $\frac{I_{m_1} + I_{m_2}}{4}$ .

Therefore, the value of the saturated persistent current is either  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the current in the isolated ring, depending on whether the Ferm i energy lies below or above the energy of the long-living state. For the latter case, F ig. 5 shows the persistent current as a function of the magnetic

ux for di erent coupling param eters. In the strong coupling regim e (short dashed line) the current saturates and the saw tooth form of the current is restored.

# B. Coupling of a nite number of ring states to the reservoir

A generalization of the simpli ed two levelm odel is obtained by considering the coupling of m ore ring states to the reservoir. Thereby at least all states with an eigenenergy below the Ferm i energy are coupled to the reservoir.

The calculation of the DOS and the current density is performed in the appendix. In the strong coupling regine the system develops long living states between the energetically adjacent states of the isolated ring whenever the tunneling energy exceeds the interlevel spacing between the corresponding eigenenergies of the isolated ring. These new quasistates are more pronounced at small energies as illustrated in Fig. 6. The reason is that the energy scale connected with the coupling is the same for all states =  $\frac{1}{2}$  whereas the interlevel spacing between adjacent ring states increases with their respective energies.

Like in the two level system the persistent current satu-



FIG.6:DOS in the strong coupling regime =  $5E_0$  for four coupled ring states (dotted line) and eight coupled states (full line). The sm aller the interlevel spacing the more pronounced are the new quasistates. M agnetic ux =  $\frac{1}{2}$  is xed.



FIG.7: Dependence of the persistent current on the coupling strength for di erent numbers of coupled states and xed magnetic ux  $= -\frac{0}{3}$ . The numbers of coupled states are listed according to the value at which the persistent current saturates. There are ve eigenenergies of the isolated ring below the Fermi energy  $= 25 E_0$ .

rates in the lim it of strong coupling at a generally nonzero value. Thereby the saturation value of the persistent current depends strongly on the num ber of coupled states. It decreases with increasing num ber of coupled ring states, but it also shows an odd-even e ect with the num ber of coupled states as illustrated in Fig. 7. B oth features have their origin in the alternating sign of the current carried by consecutive ring states.

#### C. Coupling of all ring states to the reservoir

A coording to our discussion of the tunneling matrix elements in section II a coupling of all ring states to the reservoir is realized in the lim it of a point contact. It is an appealing feature of our model that a simple analytical form ula for the DOS in the ring and the current density can be given for this lim iting case:

$$(E) = -\frac{\frac{1}{x}\sin x \cos^{2} \cos x + 1 \cos x \cos^{2}}{2(\sin x)^{2} + \frac{4E_{0}^{2}x^{2}}{4} \cos^{2} \cos x} (12)$$

$$y = \frac{4}{E} = \frac{1}{E_0}$$
 and the dimensionless  $ux^2 = 2 = \frac{1}{0}$ .  
To obtain the DOS given in Eq. (12) we have used

V

(E) = 
$$\frac{X^{2}}{E} = \frac{1}{E} = \frac{1}{2E_{0}x} = \frac{2}{2E_{0}x} \frac{\sin x}{\cos^{2} \cos x}$$
: (13)

Fig. 8 illustrates the developm ent of the DOS with increasing coupling. For sm all coupling the DOS shows Lorentz broadened maxim a around the eigenenergies of the isolated ring states with a width given by the coupling energy . This indicates that for small coupling each ring state couples independently to the reservoir and does not interact with the other ring states. Analyzing Eq. (12) the DOS shows maxima in the weak coupling regime at the energies where the second term of the denom inator disappears, which happens exactly at the eigenenergies of the isolated ring states. At the m agnetic ux = 0.4  $_{\odot}$  used in the calculations represented in Fig. 8, these eigenenergies are grouped in pairs. Each pair consists of ring states with angular momenta m and m 1.

For strong coupling however the DOS forms sharp peaks at  $E = n^2 E_0$ , independently of the magnetic ux. These maxim a are more and more pronounced with increasing coupling. A nalyzing again Eq. (12) the roots of the rst term in the denom inator determ ine the positions of the maxim a in the strong coupling regime. The energies of the quasistates can be understood from the following requirements. The quasistates lie energetically between each two neighbor states of the isolated ring. Moreover, the suppression of persistent current and A haronov-Bohm e ect demands the energies of the quasistates to be independent of the magnetic ux. The positions of the quasistates  $E = n^2 E_0$  are the only points satisfying both requirements above. Therefore, no quasistates at other energies can form at strong coupling.

The critical coupling at which the transition between weak and strong coupling occurs depends on the interlevel spacing between the ring states and hence on the energy and on the magnetic ux. As illustrated in Fig.8 the critical coupling grows with energy proportional to

<sup>•</sup> E and the quasistates are developed rst between pairs of ring states. For only two coupling states it was shown that the critical coupling is given by  $_{c} = \frac{j}{2}$  j which is also a good estimation for the critical coupling at which the quasistates at  $E_{m} = (2m + 1)^{2}E_{0}$  develop:

$$c \qquad \frac{{}^{m} {}_{m} {}_{1} {}^{m} {}_{m}}{p} = 2 (1 \ 2 {}_{0}) (2m + 1) E_{0}$$
$$= 0 {}^{m} {}_{4} \frac{2}{E_{m} E_{0}} : \qquad (14)$$



FIG.8: Density plot of DOS as a function of the coupling for xed magnetic ux = 0.4  $_0$  (the magnitude of the DOS increases going from black to white). For weak coupling the maxim a are located at the eigenenergies of the isolated ring states whereas for strong coupling quasistates at E =  $n^2 E_0$  develop. The critical coupling thereby depends on the energy as E with di erent prefactors for even or odd n as indicated by the dashed lines (0.4 E, E).

As a guide to the eye, the dependence  $_{c} (E_{m})$  is shown by the low er lying dashed line in F ig. 8. Correspondingly the second dashed line in F ig. 8 shows at which coupling strength the other half of long living states develop at  $E = (2n)^{2} E_{0}$ .

In contrast to the coupling of two ring states, the eigenenergies of the long living states are now independent of the magnetic eld, which indicates the localization of those states. Consequently, the Aharonov-Bohm e ect disappears, which is accompanied by a continuous suppression of the persistent current with increasing coupling as illustrated in Fig. 9.

The current density inside the ring can be calculated with the help of Eq. (7) and is given by:

$$j(E) = -\frac{\frac{(e)(E)}{(e)}}{1 + \frac{2}{2}(E)^{2}} = \frac{4 \frac{E_{0}}{2} x \sin x \sin^{2}}{(e)^{2} \sin x)^{2} + \frac{4E_{0}^{2} x^{2}}{4} \cos^{2} \cos^{2} x^{2}}; (15)$$

For weak coupling the current density shows Lorentz broadened maxim a with alternating sign around the eigenenergies of the isolated ring states. In the strong coupling regime how ever it shows antisymmetric peaks around the eigenenergies  $E = n^2 E_0$  of the new ly evolved quasistates. A nalyzing Eq. (15) the current density has



FIG.9: D ependence of the persistent current on the m agnetic ux through the ring for di erent coupling strengths and for coupling of all ring states. The persistent current is continuously suppressed with increasing coupling and vanishes in the lim it of strong coupling. For all lines, there are ve states below the Ferm i energy =  $25E_0$ .

the same denom inator as the DOS given in Eq. (12). However, the numerator disappears at the eigenenergies  $E = n^2 E_0$  of the quasistates and therefore causes the antisymmetric peaks.

The asymmetric behavior of the current density causes a suppression of the total persistent current with increasing coupling to the reservoir which is illustrated in Fig. 9.

The continuous suppression of the persistent current with increasing coupling can also be understood with the help of the coupling-independent ratio between current density and DOS, which is given by

$$\frac{j(E)}{(E)} = \frac{4 \frac{E_0}{0} x \sin x \sin^2}{\frac{1}{x} \sin x \cos^2 \cos x + 1 \cos x \cos^2} \quad (16)$$

In contrast to the coupling of only two ring states this ratio vanishes at eigenenergies of the quasistates that develop in the strong coupling regime, so that eventually the persistent current will also vanish in the limit of strong coupling. Therefore, the quasistates do not carry current in contrast to the coupling of two ring states where the long living quasistate carries the current I =  $\frac{I_{m_1} + I_{m_2}}{2}$ .

## V. CONNECTION TO THE DICKE EFFECT

Studying the energy spectrum of a ring coupled to a reservoir, we showed that due to the coupling of di erent ring state coherent collective states develop inside the ring. These quasistates lead to a new sharp energy spectrum as illustrated in Fig. 4, 6, 8. The same mechanism is known in optics as Dicke e  $ect^{1,12}$ . O riginally, the Dicke e ect describes how atoms in an atom ic gas can form a coherent collective state when they are coupled by an electrom agnetic eld with a wavelength bigger

than the distance between the radiating atom s. These collective states have a sharp eigenenergy and lead to a signi cant reduction of the D oppler width in atom ic spectroscopy. In optics, the long living states with a sm all spectral width are called subradiant and the broad states that couple strongly to the light are called superradiant.

In our work di erent ring states are coupled by the ferm ionic reservoir, which is therefore the counterpart of the electrom agnetic eld in optics.

Recently a similar system was investigated in the context of resonant scattering<sup>14</sup>. T.V. Shahbazyan and S. E.U loa studied the electronic states of a system consisting of a 2D electron gas, which is tunnel coupled to an array of pointlike, single level quantum dots. The localized states in the dots are coupled to each other via the tunneling into and out of the delocalized states of the 2D gas. Under certain conditions a coherent collective state is form ed that is located in the quantum dot array.

O ne can draw direct analogy between the physical entities entering the model of  $\operatorname{Ref}^{14}$  and our model. The states of the locally distributed quantum dots correspond in our system to the discrete ring states, whereas the 2D electron gas corresponds to the ferm ionic reservoir. In both models the underlying physics consists in the form ation of collective quasistates with narrow spectral linew idths as the tunnel coupling exceeds som e critical value. In ourm odel the form ation of the collective quasistates a ects the persistent current inside the loop, while the coherent collective state located in the quantum dot array leads to a reduction of the electron mobility in the 2D electron gas.

Furtherm ore, T.V. Shahbazyan and S.E.U lba show ed that if the discrete states in the quantum dots are energetically degenerate then their DOS mainly consists of a sharp peak and a very low and broad background. Thereby a fraction of up to  $1 \quad \frac{1}{N}$  of the states contribute to the sharp peak in the DOS whereas the small remaining part contributes to the DOS in a wide energy range<sup>14</sup>. This is in agreement with our system, for which in the strong coupling regime a single quasistate hybridizes strongly with the reservoir and become sextrem ely broad, whereas all other quasistates show up as sharp m axim a in the DOS.

However we want to stress two major di erences to our work. In our work all ring states couple to the reservoir at the same point, whereas in Ref.<sup>14</sup> the interacting subsystem s are spatially separated. Therefore, the electron has to propagate inside the 2D electron gas between consecutive tunneling events. This causes an additional phasefactor in the tunneling matrix elements that destroys coherence. In order that coherent collective states are form ed, the average distance between di erent dots has to be of the order of or sm aller than the Ferm iw avelength. Sim ilarly, the originalD icke e ect in optics takes place only if the distance between the atom s of the gas is of the order of or sm aller than the wavelength of the light. This additional phase coherence length is absent in our m odel, as all the ring states are localized within the same sm all volum e.

Furtherm ore, within our model the interlevel spacing between the ring states can be adjusted system atically by changing the magnetic eld. Consequently, the regime of strong coupling can be reached by changing the magnetic

eld rather than the coupling itself. In contrast, the energy distribution of an array of localized states cannot be m odi ed by applying a m agnetic eld, since the energies of di erent localized states have the sam e m agnetic eld dependence.

## VI. COM PARISON TO THE SCATTERING M ATRIX APPROACH

The e ect of dissipation on the persistent current in a one dimensional ring was examined in previous work already, using the model depicted in Fig. 1 (b)<sup>15</sup>. The analysis of that work was based on the scattering matrix, that describes the e ect of the junction between the one-dimensional wire and the ideal ring. This approach requires the use of a continuous basis of wavefunctions in the ring and the am plitudes inside the ring are related by the Aharonov-Bohm phase matching condition. In the frame of the scattering approach only energetically degenerate wavefunctions inside the ring are mixed by the coupling. In contrast, the tunnel H am iltonian, uses the discrete eigenstates of the isolated ring, that already satisfy the phase matching, and the coupling leads to a mixing of states with di erent unperturbed eigenenergies.

Recently it was shown that calculations based on the scattering matrix approach or the tunnel H am iltonian give the same transm ission through an A haronov-B ohm interferom eterw ith a single-level quantum dot in at least one of the arm  $s^{26,27}$ . In the following we show that for a coupled ring how ever there are di erences between both approaches. In particular, the scattering matrix approach used in Ref.<sup>15</sup> fails to predict the form ation of additional quasistates at very strong coupling due to the mixing of eigenstates of the ring that are energetically far from each other.

The scattering matrix used in Ref.<sup>15</sup> depends on a single free parameter called " that can be identied with the coupling strength between ring and reservoir. Furtherm ore, the authors lim ited the coupling strength " 0:5 to keep the matrix real. The restriction to 0 a real matrix with a single free parameter is not su cient to describe a general unitary 3x3 m atrix like it was already anticipated by the authors. As a consequence of the restricted range of coupling, the scattering m atrix approach used in Ref.<sup>15</sup> fails to describe the mixing of eigenstates of the ring that are energetically far from each other. Therefore, even for maximum coupling only one group of quasistates develops within the scattering matrix approach, with eigenenergies either at  $E = (2n)^2 E_0$ or at  $E = (2n + 1)^2 E_0$  depending on the magnetic ux through the ring.

W ithin the accessible range of the coupling strength

for the scattering matrix approach, the results for the DOS and the current density in the ring are qualitatively the same as the ones obtained in this paper. In particular, both form alism s show Lorentz broadened m axim a in the density of states around the eigenenergies of the isolated ring states in the weak coupling lim it and the ratio between current density and DOS is independent of coupling. Furtherm ore both form alism s show level attraction as shown in Fig. 10 for the scattering matrix approach. However, within the scattering matrix approach the quasistates develop at the same coupling strength whereas for the tunnel Ham iltonian the quasistates with lower eigenenergies are developed at smaller coupling strength. This di erence between the approaches can be com pensated by choosing an energy dependent coupling strength (E) =  $0^{-1}$  E (with zero coupling for negative energies in the reservoir) for which both models nearly coincide. Another consequence of the energy dependent coupling is that for sm all coupling the width of the Lorentz broadened maxima increases like E.

Furtherm ore, in both form alisms the coupling is assum ed to be independent of the magnetic ux, while the energy spectrum for the isolated ring is of course ux dependent. Therefore, the transition between weak and strong coupling is also ux dependent. This can be seen in Fig. 11 for the scattering matrix approach and in Fig. 12 for the tunnel H am iltonian approach. The quasistates are the more pronounced the closer the ux is to the values = n<sub>0</sub> or =  $\frac{0}{2}$  corresponding to a degenerate energy spectrum. Fig. 11 also illustrates that even for maximum coupling only one group of quasistates is form ed within the scattering matrix description, nam ely at E =  $(2n + 1)^2 E_0$  for  $0.25 < \frac{1}{0} = \frac{1}{0} < 0.25$  or at E =  $(2n)^2 E_0$  for  $0.25 < \frac{1}{0} = 0.5$ .

#### VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper we studied the energy spectrum and the persistent current of a ring coupled to a reservoir. Both of these quantities are accessible in experiments. The DOS can be measured by means of optical spectroscopy or by m easuring the charging energy  $^{7,8}$  ,  $w\,hereas\,the\,cur$ rent density is accessible by m easuring the m agnetization as a function of the Ferm i energy (at low tem peratures  $j() = \frac{\partial I}{\partial a}$ . We have shown that for strong coupling the system has a new, well de ned level structure form ed by quasistates with sharp eigenenergies. The physicalm echanism leading to the developm ent of collective quasistates has been explained in previous work on resonant tunneling and scattering in solid states<sup>14</sup> and is related to the Dicke e  $ect^{11,12}$ . We derived analytical form ulas for the DOS and the current density in the ring, and analyzed their dependence on the tunneling strength between ring and reservoir as well as on the num ber of coupled states. Thereby the number of coupled states depends on the geometrical form of the contact. It was shown that for a nite num ber of coupling states, the persistent current is



FIG.10: Density plot of DOS as a function of energy and coupling for the scattering matrix formalism and for a xed magnetic ux = 0.44  $_0$  (the magnitude of the DOS increases going from black to white). For small coupling, the DOS shows maxima at the eigenenergies of the isolated ring states, that are grouped in pairs. W ith increasing coupling, the states of each pair approach each other and develop new long living states at E =  $(2n + 1)^2 E_0$ . Thereby each long living state is form ed at the same coupling strength.

rather robust against coupling and does only vanish if all ring states couple to the reservoir. Our model can reproduce the results obtained in previous work based on the scattering matrix approach and furtherm ore it describes how the system reaches a new stable energy spectrum in the lim it of strong coupling.

Finally we note, that the experimental realization of strong tunnel coupling is achieved by creation of a quantum well in the contact area between the reservoir and the ring. The quantum wellmodi es the dynamical motion of the charge carriers, which manifests itself in the formation of sharp quasistates is the ring.

#### VIII. APPENDIX

For the calculation of the DOS and the current density in the ring it is useful to express (E) =  $\begin{bmatrix} m & 2 \\ m & m & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} m & 2 \\ m & m & m \end{bmatrix}$  with the help of the digam m a function (z) =  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & (z) \\ (z) \end{bmatrix}$ .

$$(E) = \frac{m_1(E)}{4} \frac{m_1(E)}{E_0E} \frac{1+m_2(E) + \frac{1+m_2(E)}{1+m_2(E)}}{4}$$

(17)



FIG.11: Density plot of DOS as a function of energy and magnetic uxwithin the scattering matrix form alism form aximum coupling " = 0.5. Pronounced maxim a are developed at the energies  $E = n^2 E_0$  with n odd or even depending on the ux. This e ect gets stronger for a ux close to = 0 and

 $\frac{0}{2}$ , corresponding to degenerate eigenenergies. At those values of ux, the width of the maximum goes to zero. These results can be reproduced within the tunnel H am iltonian for: =  $0.6^{\circ}$  E<sub>0</sub>E



FIG. 12: Density plot of DOS as a function of energy and magnetic ux within the tunnel H am iltonian form alism. The system is in the strong poupling regime and the coupling is energy dependent =  $2^{12} E_{0}E$ . The DOS shows maxim a at  $E = n^{2}E_{0}$  that are particularly pronounced at = 0 and  $= \frac{-0}{2}$ , where the width of the maximum goes to zero.

with

$$_{m}(E) = m \frac{r}{\frac{E}{4E_{0}}} + \frac{!}{0};$$
 (18)

$${}^{+}_{m}$$
 (E) = m +  $\frac{E}{4E_{0}}$  +  $\frac{E}{0}$  : (19)

W ith the help of Eq. (5), (7) the DOS and the current density in the ring can be calculated, using the polygam – mafunction  $^{(1)}(z) = \frac{\theta}{\theta | z}$  (z).

$$(E) = 2^{p} \frac{1}{E_{0}} (E) + \frac{p}{E} \frac{1}{m_{1}} (E) + \frac{1}{m_{1}} (E) = \frac{16E_{0}}{E^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{1}{1} + \frac{2}{E} (E)^{2} ; \qquad (20)$$

$$j(E) = - \frac{1}{0} m_{1}^{(1)}(E) m_{1+m_{2}}^{(1)}(E) + \frac{1}{m_{1}} m_{1}^{(1)}(E) + \frac{1}{m_{1}} m_{2}^{(1)}(E) = 4 \frac{p}{E_{0}E} \frac{1}{1+2} m_{2}^{(2)}(E)^{2}$$
(21)

with

$$r = \frac{1}{4E_{0}} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{$$

#### IX. ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to D.P fannkuche for illum inating discussions. Financial support form SFB 508 is gratefully acknow ledged. E lectronic address: bwunsch@physnet.uni-hamburg.de

- <sup>1</sup> S.W ashburn and R.A.W ebb, Rep.Prog.Phys.55, 1311 (1992).
- <sup>2</sup> A. Fuhrer, S. Luscher, T. Ihn, T. Heinzel, K. Ensslin, W. Wegscheider, and M. Bichler, Nature 413, 822 (2001).
- <sup>3</sup> L.P.Levy, G.D olan, J.D unsm uir, and H.B ouchiat, Phys. Rev.Lett. 64 (17), 2074 (1990).
- <sup>4</sup> V. Chandrasekhar, R. A. Webb, M. J. Brady, M. B. Ketchen, W. J. Gallagher, and A. Kleinsasser, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (25), 3578 (1991).
- <sup>5</sup> D.M ailly, C.Chapelier, and A.Benoit, Phys.Rev.Lett. 70(13), 2020 (1993).
- <sup>6</sup> E. M. Q. Jariwala, P. Mohanty, M. B. Ketchen, and R. Webb, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (8), 1594 (2001).
- <sup>7</sup> A.Lorke, R.J.Luyken, A.O.G ovorov, and J.P.K otthaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 (10), 2223 (2000).
- <sup>8</sup> R.J.W arburton, C.Scha ein, D.Haft, F.Bickel, A.Lorke, K.Karrai, J.M.Garcia, W.Schoenfeld, and P.M.Petro, Nature 405, 926 (2000).
- <sup>9</sup> A.L.Chudnovskiy and S.E.Ulloa, Phys. Rev. B 63, 165316 (2001).
- <sup>10</sup> A.L. Chudnovskiy and S.E. Ulloa, Physica E 12, 819 (2002).
- <sup>11</sup> R.H.Dicke, Phys. Rev 89 (2), 472 (1953).
- <sup>12</sup> R.H.Dicke, Phys. Rev 93(1), 99 (1954).
- <sup>13</sup> T.V.Shahbazyan and M.E.Raikh, Phys. Rev.B.49 (24),

17123 (1994).

- <sup>14</sup> T.V. Shahbazyan and S.E.Ulloa, Phys. Rev. B. 57 (11), 6642 (1998).
- <sup>15</sup> M.Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B. 32 (3), 1846 (1985).
- <sup>16</sup> M. Buttiker, Y. Im ry, and M. Y. Azbel, Phys. Rev. A. 30 (4), 1982 (1984).
- <sup>17</sup> D.Takaiand K.Ohta, Phys. Rev. B. 48 (19), 14318 (1993).
- <sup>18</sup> A.M. Jayannavar and P.S.Deo, Phys. Rev. B. 49(19), 13685 (1994).
- <sup>19</sup> E.Akkem ans, A.Auerbach, J.E.Avron, and B.Shapiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1), 76 (1991).
- <sup>20</sup> P.A.Mello, Phys. Rev. B. 47 (24), 16358 (1993).
- <sup>21</sup> H.-F. Cheung, Y. Gefen, E. K. Riedel, and W. H. Shih, Phys. Rev. B. 37 (11), 6050 (1988).
- <sup>22</sup> W .C.Tan and J.C.Inkson, Sem icond. Sci. Technol. 11, 1635 (1996).
- <sup>23</sup> W .C.Tan and J.C.Inkson, Phys. Rev. B. 60 (8), 5626 (1999).
- <sup>24</sup> T. Chakraborty and P. Pietilainen, Phys. Rev. B. 50 (12), 8460 (1994).
- <sup>25</sup> D. Loss and P. Goldbart, Phys. Rev. B. 43 (16), 13762 (1991).
- $^{26}$  B.K ubala and J.K onig, Phys.Rev.B.65, 245301 (2002).
- <sup>27</sup> B.Kubala and J.Konig, Phys.Rev.B.67, 205303 (2003).