D.J.Reilly

Centre for Quantum Computer Technology, School of Physics, University of New South W ales, Sydney 2052, Australia

O ne dimensional (1D) quantum wires exhibit a conductance feature near 0:7  $2e^2 = h$  in connection with m any-body interactions involving the electron spin. W ith the possibility of exploiting this electron spin. W ith the possibility of exploiting this electron to explain this conductance anomaly. Here we present conductance calculations based on a simple phenom enological model for a gate-dependent spin gap that are in excellent agreement with experimental data taken on ultra-low-disorder quantum wires. Taken together the phenom enology and experimental data indicate that the 0:7 feature depends strongly on the potential probe of the contact region, where the reservoirs meet the 1D wire. M icroscopic explanations that may under-pin the phenom enological description are also discussed.

The quantization of conductance in ballistic quantum wires (QW s) form sone of the cornerstones of mesoscopic physics [1, 2]. A prominent and controversial exception to this well understood phenom ena is the conductance feature occurring between 0:5 0:7 2e<sup>2</sup>=h, below the rst conductance plateau, which has been observed in several di erent one dim ensional (1D) system s [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Strong evidence, initially uncovered by Thom as et al., [3] has linked the occurrence of this feature (and higher order features near 1:7  $2e^2=h$ ) with many-body interactions involving the electron spin. D riven by the possibility of exploiting this e ect for device applications based on the spin degree of freedom, e orts continue to focus on uncovering a detailed microscopic explanation for the origin of the conductance feature [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. The work presented here shows that a simple phenom enological model for the 0:7 conductance anom aly [17] is in excellent agreem ent with all of our data taken on ultra-low-disorder QW s. M otivated by the remarkable agreem ent between model and experiment, we discuss several microscopic descriptions that could account for the phenom enology. In addition, evidence is presented linking the conductance feature to the relative potentialm is m atch between the 1D QW and the two-dimensional (2D) contact reservoirs.

Extending our earlier work [17], the phenom enological description is as follows (see inset to Fig. 1(b)). Near pinch-o, at very low gate bias the probability of transm ission is equal for both spin-up and spin-down electrons. Our premise is that with increasing gate bias  $V_S$  an energy gap form s between up and down spins (or triplet and singlet states) and increases near linearly with 1D density  $n_{1D}$  . For the m om ent we defer discussion of the possible m icroscopic explanations for this gate dependent spin gap, and focus just on the phenom enology. Key to our model the Ferm i-level  $E_F = h^2 k_F^2 = 2m$ , where m is the electron e ective m ass and  $k_F$  is the Ferm i wave vector, is parabolic with density  $n_{1D}$  or gate bias  $V_S$  since  $k_F = (=2)n_{1D} = (=2)(CV_S = e)$ , where c is the capacitance between the gate and 1D electrons. Consistent with experim ental results [9, 17, 18, 19], at low tem peratures thism odel predicts a feature near 0:5  $2e^2 = h w hen$ E<sub>F</sub> exceeds the spin-down energy but is yet to cross the



FIG.1: Conductance calculations based on the model. In (a) = d E  $_{*\#}=dV_{\rm S}$  is small in comparison to (b). Low temperature is shown in blue (E=kT=80) and high temperature in red (E=kT=15). Inset to (a) is an AFM image of a QW device showing the 1D and 2D regions.  $V_{\rm T}$  and  $V_{\rm S}$  are the top gate and side gates respectively. Inset to (b) is a schematic of the model showing the Ferm i level  $E_{\rm F}$  and the spin gap E  $_{*\#}$ opening with gate bias,  $V_{\rm S}$ .

spin-up band edge. As the tem perature is increased the occurrence of a feature closer to 0:7  $2e^2$ =h is due to the continued opening of the spin-gap with increasing  $E_F$  so that the contribution to the current from the thermally excited electrons into the upper-spin band remains approximately constant over a small range in  $V_S$ . Although similar in spirit to the model of B nuus et al., [20] our picture is based on a spin-gap that is not xed, but density-dependent and in which 0.5 and 0.7 features do not co-exist. Further, in contrast to Ferm i-level pinning' [20] the model discussed here suggests that the spin-gap continues to open even as  $E_F$  is above the spin-up band-edge.

The only free parameter in this phenomenological model is the rate at which the spin gap  $E_{\#}$  opens with gate bias  $V_S$ : = d  $E_{\#}=dV_S$ . This rate governs the detailed shape and position of the feature as a function of temperature. Fig. 1 shows calculations based on this



FIG.2: (a) Shows the calculated tem perature dependence of the 0:7 feature in the regime of Fig. 1(a). (b) D ata taken on a point contact device at tem peratures T = 0.5-3K (blue to black)  $n_{2D} = 2:1 \quad 10^{11}$ =cm<sup>2</sup>. (c) C alculated conductance for the low tem perature case of Fig. 1(b) (red) and data taken on a l = 1 m long wire at T = 100m K,  $n_{2D} = 4:6 \quad 10^{11}$ =cm<sup>2</sup> (black). (d) shows the calculated in-plane m agnetic eld dependence of the 0:7 feature. B = 0 (left) to B = 0:1 E (right), traces are o set for clarity.

m odel for two di erent spin-gap rates,  $_1 < _2$ . The conductance is calculated in a very simple way in an effort to show the simplicity of the model. It is assumed that in the linear response regime, with a small bias applied between the left and right leads the conductance is approxim ated by:

$$Z_{1}$$
  
G = 2e<sup>2</sup>=h ( 0f=0E)T(E)dE (1)

where  $U_L$  is the bottom of the band in the left lead, f is the Ferm i function  $f = (1 = \exp((E_{\#} E_F) = kT) + 1)$ and  $E_{\#}$  are separately the spin-up and down sub-band edges. A ssum ing that tunneling leads to broadening on a much smaller scale than thermal excitation, we use a classical step function for the transmission probability  $T(E) = (E_F E_{\#})$  where (x) = 1 for  $x > E_{\#}$ and (x) = 0 for  $x < E_{\#}$ . Under this simplication the linear response conductance of each spin-band is well approximated by just the Ferm i probability for thermaloccupation multiplied by the conductance quantum :  $G e^2 = h f$ .

C om paring F ig. 1 (a) and 1 (b) we note that the shape of the feature is characterized by both  $= d E_{\#}=dV_S$  and kT relative to the 1D sub-band spacing E. In F ig. 1 (a) a feature near 0:7  $2e^2$ =h occurs even at low tem – peratures, since the spin-gap opens slow ly (1) as  $E_F$  crosses  $E_{\#}$  so that the Ferm i function also overlaps  $E_{\#}$  by an am ount. C ontrasting this behavior, F ig. 1 (b) illustrates the regime where the spin-gap opens rapidly with  $V_S$  (increased 2). In this case the low tem perature conductance tends tow ands 0:5  $2e^2$ =h, after  $E_F$  crosses  $E_{\#}$ .

and rise from 0:5 to 0:7  $2e^2=h$ .

W e now turn to compare the results of our model with data taken on ultra-low-disorder QW s free from the disorder associated with modulation doping. Although the fabrication and operation of these devices has been described elsewhere [21], we reiterate that they enable separate control of both the 2D and 1D densities (see inset Fig1. (a)). Fig. 2(a) and 2(b) compare the calculated tem perature dependence of the 0:7 feature to data taken on a quantum point contact device. The only parameters of the model that were adjusted are the sub-band energy spacing (E) and the rate at which the spin gap opens () (setting an arbitrary gate capacitance c). As is evident, this model is in good agreement with the shape and dependence of the 0:7 feature with temperature. Continuing with our comparison between model and experiment, Fig. 2 (c) shows data taken on a QW of length l = 1 m at T = 100m K (black) and calculated conductance based on the model (red), where is now greater than in Fig. 2(a). Note the non-monotonic behavior of the conductance (near 0:6  $2e^2=h$ ) which we have observed for many of our devices. This oscillatory structure can be traced to the parabolic dependence of  $E_F$  and linear dependence of  $E_w$  with  $V_S$  in the model.

Extending the model to include a Zeem an term: E \*\*#  $CV_S$  g  $_BBS$ , where g is the in-plane electron g factor, B is the magnetic eld,  $_B$  is the Bohrm agnetron and S = 1=2, Fig. 2(d) shows the calculated in-plane magnetic eld dependence of the 0:7 feature. The calculated traces strongly resemble the experimental results of Thom as et al., and C ronenwett et al.,  $\beta$ , 10], in which the feature near 0:7  $2e^2$ =h evolves smoothly into the Zeem an spin-split plateau at 0:5  $2e^2$ =h with increasing in-plane magnetic eld. A similar but weak dependence is also seen for the 1:7  $2e^2$ =h feature, where has been reduced in the calculations.

The data shown in Fig. 2(c) was taken with  $n_{2D} = 4.6 \quad 10^{11} = \text{cm}^2$ . In comparison to Fig. 2(b) where  $n_{2D} = 2.1 \quad 10^{11} = \text{cm}^2$ , the high  $n_{2D}$  data (Fig. 2(c)) shows a feature closer to 0.5  $2e^2 = h$  and exhibits non-monotonic behavior. In the context of the model, is the only parameter varied to achieve a twith both the high and low  $n_{2D}$  data.

Extending this phenom enological link between and  $n_{\rm 2D}$ , Figs. 3 (a) & 3 (b) compare the model with additional data taken on a l = 1 m QW at T = 100m K. The di erent traces shown in each of the Figures correspond to an increasing top gate bias  $V_{\rm T}$  or  $n_{\rm 2D}$  (right to left) for the experimental data and an increasing spin gap rate = d E  $_{\#}=dV_{\rm g}$  (right to left) for the calculations. W ith increasing  $V_{\rm T}$  (data) or (calculations) the conductance feature exhibits an evolution from a slight shoulder feature near 0:7  $2e^2=h$  to a broader feature, approaching 0:5  $2e^2=h$ .

The dependence of the 0:7 feature with  $n_{2D}$  has long been debated, with di erent groups observing con icting results [9, 18, 19, 22, 23]. We now present results that indicate that the strength and position of the fea-



FIG.3: Comparison of data taken on a l = 1 m wire with calculations based on the model. (a) D ata taken at T = 100m K for  $n_{\rm 2D}$  = 2 4.6  $10^{11}$  =cm  $^2$  right to left. (b) C alculations for E =kT = 54, with increasing (arb. units) right to left. D ue to the electrostatics of the devices the experimental data shifts in  $V_{\rm S}$  with increasing  $n_{\rm 2D}$  and in-turn the calculated traces have also been o set to aid in comparison with the data.

ture is linked not to the absolute value of  $n_{2D}$  , but to the mism atch between the potential of the 1D and 2D regions. Fig. 4 shows data taken on a l = 0.5 m QW5  $10^{11}$  = cm<sup>2</sup> and V<sub>S2</sub> is in which  $n_{2D}$  is xed at  $n_{2D}$ swept negative, reducing the conductance (see Fig. 4 inset diagram ). Traces from left to right correspond to  $V_{S2}$ sweeps, as  $V_{S1}$  is stepped m ore negative and  $V_T$  ( $n_{2D}$ ) is held constant. The e ect of stepping  $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{S1}}$  negative is to increase the electrostatic con nem ent, m aking the relative potential di erence between the 2D and 1D regions larger. Sim ilar to the data in Fig. 3, the feature grows in strength and lowers in conductance as V<sub>S1</sub> is stepped negative, although in this case  $n_{2D}$  is not varied. Unlike the behavior expected from an impurity in the 1D channel, these results are reproducible when  $V_{S1}$  and  $V_{S2}$  are interchanged and the direction of the side-gate con nem ent potential is reversed. This data indicates that the position and strength of the 0:7 feature depends not on the absolute value of  $n_{2D}$  , but the relative di erence between the 1D and 2D potentials.

Returning to the phenom enological model, we again draw a link between the 1D-2D potential pro le and . The inset to Fig. 4 shows calculations based on the model for di ering values of , spanning the regime shown in the experimental results (main plot Fig. 4). As is increased from left to right the feature evolves from a slight in ection to a strong non-monotonic feature consistent with the experimental data.

Finally we compare our phenom enology with the dependence of the 0:7 feature with applied source – drain (SD) bias. Such m easurem ents are key since they perm it the evolution of the 1D band-edge energies to be studied as a function of  $V_S$ . Fig. 5 compares the di erential conductance (di=dv) of a l = 0.5 m QW (Fig. 5(a)) to calculations based on the model (Fig. 5(b)). For sm all



FIG.4: C on parison of data taken on a l= 0.5 m wire (right) with calculations based on the model (inset). In the experiment  $n_{2D}$  is xed at 5  $10^{11}$  cm<sup>2</sup> and  $V_{S2}$  is swept negative, reducing the conductance (see inset diagram for gate con guration). Traces from left to right correspond to  $V_{S2}$  sweeps, as  $V_{S1}$  is stepped more negative. For calculations (inset) is increased in linear steps from left to right with E = kT = 54 (traces o -set).

 $V_{SD}$  equation (1) for the conductance can be extended to nite V<sub>SD</sub>, where di=dv is a weighted average of two zero- $V_{\text{SD}}$  conductances, one for a potential of E  $_{\text{F}}$  +  $~eV_{\text{SD}}$  , and the other for E  $_{\rm F}$   $\,$  (1  $\,$  )eV  $_{\rm S\,D}$  , where  $\,$  characterizes the symmetry of the potential drop across the QW [24]. In line with this picture Fig. 5 (c) is a schematic showing the energies of the S and D potentials relative to the spinband edges, in connection with the conductance features shown in the data and calculations. Case (1) corresponds to a  $V_{SD} = 0$  conductance of 0:6  $2e^2 = h$  which increases  $2e^2 = h$  with the application of a bias as shown to 0:8 in case (2). In case (3), the S and D potentials di er by one sub-band (two spin-bands) and the di=dv exhibits the well known half-plateaus at 1:5  $2e^2 = h$  due to the averaging of G at S (2  $2e^2=h$ ) and D (1 2e<sup>2</sup>=h).

A ddressing case (4), we focus on the 1.25  $2e^2$ =h features seen in the data near  $V_{SD}$  8m V (Fig. 5(a)) which are mirrored in the calculations (Fig. 5(b)). To our know ledge, these features have not previously been discussed. In the context of ourm odel the 1.25 features are due to S and D di ering by 3 spin-bands and provide evidence that the spin energy gap remains open well below the Fermi level. Below the rst plateau a cusp feature is observed in both the data and calculations shown in Fig. 5 case (1). In the context of ourm odel this cusp arises as the spin gap opens with  $V_S$  so that a larger SD bias is needed before S (or D) cross E \*, and increase the conductance. In regard to this cusp feature, we again note the rem arkable resemblance between the experimental data and calculations based on the m odel.

Having presented our model and shown it to be in ex-

cellent agreem ent with experim ental data taken on ultralow-disorder QW s, we now discuss m icroscopic explanations that m ay under-pin this phenom enology. These include spontaneous spin polarization [25], the K ondo effect [10, 11, 13], backscattering of electrons by acoustic phonons [15] and W igner-crystallization [14]. The notion of a spontaneous spin polarization, originally suggested by Thom as et al, [3] has rem ained controversial in connection with exact theory forbidding a ferrom agnetic ground state in 1D [26]. This issue however, is com plicated by the presence of 2D reservoirs that contact the 1D region and recent calculations [16] that include reservoirs suggest a bifurcation of ground and m etastable states in association with a spin polarization. The existence of a spin-gap in connection with such a polarized state provides a conceptual picture underlying the phenom enology presented here.

Our phenomenology may also be consistent with a K ondo-like m echanism recently proposed to explain the 0:7 feature [11, 13, 27]. In the context of a K ondo picture the model discussed here is suggestive of a scenario just above the K ondo tem perature  $T_K$  , where spin screening is incomplete and a (charging) energy gap develops between singlet and triplet states. Recent measurements by de Picciotto et al., [5] also point to the importance of screening. Perhaps the dependence of  $E_{\pi\#}$  on  $V_S$ and the sensitivity of the feature to the 2D-1D coupling is linked to T<sub>K</sub> , which is a function of the hybridization energy associated with electrons tunneling from the reservoirs into the QW [11]. Note how ever, that the cusp feature occurring at nite SD bias (discussed above), is in contrast to the K ondo-like zero-bias anom aly (ZBA) observed by Cronenwett et al., below T = 100m K [10]. At T > 300m K how ever, the ZBA seen by C ronenwett et al, evolves into a cusp feature like that seen in our data and calculations (see Fig. 2(a) in [10]), presum ably due to a cross-over from T <  $T_{\rm K}\,$  to T >  $T_{\rm K}$  . P revious investigations indicate the strength of the cusp is strongly dependent on  $n_{2D}$  [17]. In this sense the absence of a ZBA in our results maybe linked to the dierence in  $n_{2D}$  (relative to the 1D potential) between our samples and those exam ined by C ronenwett et al.,  $(n_{2D} = 1:1 \quad 10^{11} = \text{cm}^2)$ for C ronenwett et al., and  $n_{2D} = 4:0 \quad 10^{11}=$ cm<sup>2</sup> for our 1= 0.5 m wire shown in Fig. 5(a)). Such an interpretation is again consistent with TK being a function of  $n_{2D}$  or the 2D-1D coupling. In the context of our phenom enology this implies  $T_K$  is related to  $\cdot$ .

Interestingly, a similar temperature dependent crossover has been described in the theoretical work of Schmeltzer, where a short QW is coupled to Luttinger liquid leads [28] (see also [29]). Further, recent work by Seelig and Matveev [14, 15] also describes a tem – perature dependent correction to the conductance and the presence of a ZBA as arising from the backscattering of electrons by acoustic phonons and in connection with W igner-Crystallization. A lthough suggestive, further work is needed to see how these pictures m ight relate to the phenomenology discussed here. Finally we



FIG. 5: (a) di=dv data taken on a l = 0.5 m QW at T = 100 m K. Each trace is for a di erent side gate bias,  $V_s$ . (b) C alculations based on the phenom enological model. di=dv is plotted as a function of the di erence in S-D potential in units of the sub-band spacing E. (c) is a schem atic showing how the positions of S and D relate to the observed conductance features.

also m ention that calculations based on our m odel (not show n) are in excellent agreem ent with the recent high-B data of G raham et al., [30] and the shot noise m easurem ents of R oche et al., [31]. This agreem ent provides a further indication that our phenom enology is of general relevance and not unique to our sam ples or experim ents.

In conclusion, a phenom enological model has been shown to be in excellent agreement with data taken on ultra-low-disorderQW s. In comparing model and experiment, the only free parameter of the model, , appears to be linked to the potential mism atch between the 2D reservoirs and 1D region. This model provides a means of linking detailed microscopic explanations to the functional form of the 0:7  $2e^2$ =h conductance feature uncovered in experiments. Such a link is of crucial importance if this e ect is to be exploited in novel spintronic devices.

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council. The Author would like to acknowledge a Hewlett-Packard Fellowship and thank Y. Meir, K-F. Berggren, C.M. Marcus and B. I. Halperin for num erous helpful conversations and T.M. Buehler, J.L.O'Brien, A.J.Ferguson, N.J.Curson, S.Das Samma, A.R. Ham ilton, A.S.D zurak and R.G. Clark for fruitful discussions. The Author is indebted and thankful to L.N. Pfei er and K.W. West of Bell Laboratories for providing the excellent heterostructures that lead to this work.

<sup>[\*]</sup> em ail: djr@ phys.unsw .edu.au

<sup>[1]</sup> B.J.van W ees et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (9), 848 (1988).

- [2] D.A.W haram et al, J.Phys.C 21(8), L209 (1988).
- [3] K.J.Thom as et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1), 135 (1996).
- [4] A.Kristensen et al, Phys.Rev.B 62, 10950 (2000).
- [5] R.de Picciotto et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 036805 (2004).
- [6] T.Morimoto et al, Appl. Phys. Lett. 82, 3952 (2003).
- [7] J.P.Bird and Y.Ochiai, Science 303, 1621 (2004).
- [8] M.J.Biercuk et al., arX iv cond-m at/0406652 ? (2004).
- [9] D.J.Reilly et al, Phys.Rev.B 63, R121311 (2001).
- [10] S. M. Cronenwett et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 226805 (2002).
- [11] Y.Meir, K.Hirose, and N.S.W ingreen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 196802 (2002).
- [12] P. S. Comaglia and C. A. Balseiro, arX iv condm at/0304168 (2003).
- [13] K.Hirose, Y.Meir, and N.S.W ingreen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 026804 (2003).
- [14] K.A.Matveev, Phys.Rev.Lett. 92, 106801 (2004).
- [15] G.Seelig and K.A.M atveev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 176804 (2003).
- [16] A. A. Starikov, I. I. Yakim enko, and K. F. Berggren, Phys. Rev. B. 67, 235319 (2003).

- [17] D.J.Reilly et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89, 246801 (2002).
- [18] K. J. Thom as et al., Phys. Rev. B. 61 (20), R13365 (2000).
- [19] K.S.Pyshkin et al, Phys.Rev.B. 62, 15842 (2000).
- [20] H.Bruus, V.V.Cheianov, and K.Flensberg, Physica E ? (2000).
- [21] B.E.K ane et al, Appl. Phys. Lett. 72 (26), 3506 (1998).
- [22] K.J.Thom as et al, Phys. Rev. B 58 (8), 4846 (1998).
- [23] S.Nuttinck et al, Jpn.J.Appl.Phys. 39, L655 (2000).
- [24] L.Mart n-Moreno et al, J.Phys.C 4, 1323 (1992).
- [25] C.-K. W ang and K.-F. Berggren, Phys. Rev. B 54 (20), R14257 (1996).
- [26] E. Lieb and D. Mattis, Phys. Rev. 125, 164 (1962).
- [27] P.E.Lindelof, Proc. SP IE Int. Soc. Opt. Eng. 4415, 77 (2001).
- [28] D. Schmeltzer, arX iv cond-m at/0211490 (2002).
- [29] L.Bartosch, M.Kollar, and P.Kopietz, Phys. Rev. B. 67, 092403 (2003).
- [30] A.C.Graham et al, Phys.Rev.Lett.91, 136404 (2003).
- [31] P.Roche et al, arX iv cond-m at/0402194 ? (2004).