## Selective coherent destruction of tunneling in a quantum -dot array

J.M.Villas-Bôas, 1,2 Sergio E.Ulloa, and Nelson Studart<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Nanoscale and Quantum Phenomena Institute,

Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701-2979

<sup>2</sup>Departam ento de F sica, Universidade Federal de Sao Carlos, 13565-905, Sao Carlos, Sao Paulo, Brazil

(D ated: A pril 14, 2024)

The coherent manipulation of quantum states is one of the main tasks required in quantum computation. In this paper we demonstrate that it is possible to control coherently the electronic position of a particle in a quantum dot array. By tuning an external ac electric eld we can selectively suppress the tunneling between dots, trapping the particle in a determ ined region of the array. The problem is treated non-perturbatively by a time-dependent H am iltonian in the electric mass approximation and using F loquet theory. We not that the quasienergy spectrum exhibits crossings at certain eld intensities that result in the selective suppression of tunneling.

PACS num bers: 78.67 H c, 72.20 H t, 73.40 G k K eywords: dynam ic localization, quantum dot, tunneling, ac eld

The search for a solid-state based quantum computer device has attracted a lot of interest in the physics com – munity recently. The ability to manipulate a quantum state and measure it is one of the most important and pressing challenges to be addressed in real implementations. Fortunately great advances in this area have been achieved recently. A good example of that are the Rabi oscillations observed in exciton states of self-assembled quantum dots (QDs).<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>

O ur work here is based on the coherent destruction of tunneling (CDT) of a driven two-level system,  $5^{5,6,7}$  in which the tunneling of one particle in a sym metric double well potential is suppressed for some special value of frequency and eld intensity. We propose a system in which one can selectively suppress the tunneling between individual quantum dots tuned by the external ac electric

eld. This e ect provides one with a di erent experim ental handle to control a quantum m echanical system. By suitable variation of the frequency and applied ac eld amplitude, one can precise the location of one electron in the multidot array. To dem onstrate this e ect, ourm odel employs an e ective m ass nearest-neighbor tight-biding approximation (NNTB).<sup>8,9,10</sup> The dynamics is analyzed using F loquet theory and the direct integration of the tim e-dependent Schrodinger equation.

The Ham iltonian for an electron in an array of identical QDs under a strong ac eld within NNTB is written as

$$H = X = T_{e} (a_{j+1}^{y} a_{j} + h c;) + eF dj a_{j}^{y} a_{j} cos(!t+);$$

$$j = j$$
(1)

where  $T_e$  is the hopping matrix element,  $a_j^{\gamma}$  and  $a_j$  are, respectively, the electron creation and annihilation operator in the dot j, e is the electronic charge, F is the eld intensity, d is the separation between dots, ! is the eld frequency, and is the phase of the drive eld. This phase, rst thought to be a non-relevant factor, is in fact quite an in portant parameter in the CDT at smaller frequency, as we have recently shown.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, a phase = 2 produces a much better dynamic localization

than any other possible phase  $% \mathcal{A}$  , and consequently it is our choice here.

Since H is periodic in time (H (t) = H (t + ), where = 2 =! is the period) we can make use of the standard F loquet theory<sup>7,12</sup> and write the solutions of the time-dependent Schrodinger equation as (t) = exp( i"t=h)u(t), where u(t), the so-called F loquet state, is also periodic in time with the same period , and " is the F loquet characteristic exponent or quasienergy, which can be obtained from the eigenvalue equation

H 
$$ih \frac{\theta}{\theta t} u(t) = "u(t):$$
 (2)

Note that this equation is similar to the timeindependent Schrödinger equation with H = H in  $\theta_t$ playing the role of a time-independent H am iltonian. Using this analogy we can explore a combined dynam ic parity operation:  $z \, ! \, z;t \, ! \, t + = 2$ , under which the operator H is invariant. As a consequence, each F bquet state is either even or odd under this operation.<sup>12</sup> Q uasienergies of di erent \dynam ic parity" m ay cross, while an avoided crossing is expected as a function of external param eters, such as the eld intensity, for states with the same parity.

In a symmetric double QD the levels present strictly di erent parity, and they may exhibit crossings with eld unless the symmetry is broken. If we vary the eld intensity, and the quasienergy levels cross, a CDT is expected, since a splitting between levels comes from this inter-dot tunneling. This CDT result is well known in the high frequency limit, and it occurs at eld values satisfying the zeroes of the Bessel function,  $J_0$  (eF d=h!) = 0. As we have shown in Ref. 12, and extended by C re eld, <sup>13</sup> CDT m ay also occur at low er frequency with decreasing degree of localization and at di erent intensities of the driven eld. The dynamics of the system can be drastically di erent, depending on the numbers of dots. We note that for this e ect to be observed, the frequency of the driven eld cannot be excessively high, com pared



FIG.1: (Color online) First Brillouin zone of quasienergies (in units of h!) as function of ac eld intensity (eF d=h!), for  $T_{\rm e}$ =h! = 0.2. Inset shows am pli cation of collapse region, showing crossings and anticrossing that follow a de nite pattern according to dynam ical symmetries. The two vertical lines indicate eld intensity  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  of pair crossings and are used later in numerical simulation.

with the tunneling probability between nearest dots, as otherwise the level splitting will be so sm all as to be unnoticeable. It should also be pointed out that in the lim it of an in nite number of identical QDs the levels form a m in iband with bandwidth of  $4T_{e}$ , and since there is an in nite num ber of levels in that range, they are in nitesim ally separated, so that even at low frequencies the levels collapse at the zeroes of the Bessel function. Notice that the applicability of the NNTB in that limit system has som e limitations.<sup>14,15,16</sup> The system considered here has just a few QDs and we assume weak coupling between them, so that the NNTB can be applied with con dence. Notice also that we are considering a di erent kind of dynam ic localization since we do not focus only in the probability to nd the particle in the same initial state, but in a determ ined region of the dot array that may not be necessarily the initial localized state. In fact the particle stays con ned to a determ ined multidot region of the array.

In our analysis, we focus on the dynam ics of four QDs. However, we show that similar results can be obtained for other numbers of QDs as well. In Fig. 1 we show the quasienergy spectrum as a function of the eld intensity for the ratio  $T_e=h! = 0.2$  exhibiting the strong dependence on eld amplitude and the expected collapse of the spectrum near eld values for which  $J_0$  (eF d=h!) = 0. Notice how ever, as shown in the inset, that the region of the level collapse is in fact a region with several crossings and anticrossings follow ing a well-de ned pattern given by the dynam ic parity. The two vertical lines in the inset are shown to indicate the two eld values,  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , where pairs of levels cross and are the choices of eld intensity used for the num erical simulations below.

Our num erical simulation is done by direct integration



FIG.2: (Color online) T in e evolution of probability to nd one particle in each one of the QDs in a four-dot array for  $eF_1d=h!$  ' 2:38, and starting the system with the particle in: (a) dot 1, and (b) dot 2. Lower panel is a schematic representation of the dynamics of the system, as seen in the respective time evolution of the occupation probability of each dot. The full circle represents the position of the particle at time zero, crosses indicate the suppression of tunneling through that barrier and arrows indicate that tunneling is possible.

of the time-dependent Schrodinger equation and followed by calculations of the occupation probability for di erent choices of initial conditions. In Fig. 2(a) we show the time evolution of the system for the eld intensity  $F_1$  corresponding to the st vertical line in the inset of Fig.1 ( $eF_1d=h!$  ' 2:38), assuming that at time zero the particle is in the rstQD.Notice that the particle is basically frozen in that dot, which means that for this choice of eld we can e ectively suppress the tunneling in the barrier between dots 1 and 2. This is what the bottom cartoon in Fig.2 represents, where the cross in the barrier indicates that the tunneling is not allowed and that the e ective interdot tunneling am plitude  $\mathbf{f}_{e}$ ! 0. On the other hand, if we start the system with the particle in dot 2, Fig. 2 (b) shows that the particle can tunnel back and forth between dots 2 and 3, while the e ective tunneling is not only suppressed between dots 1 and 2, but between 3 and 4 also. The bottom panel represents the dynam ics for this initial condition. We can then conclude that for this rst choice of eld intensity one can selectively block the tunneling of the electron through the outer barriers, so that the only open barrier for tunneling is the one in the middle.18

Let us now explore the second choice of eld intensity  $F_2$ , the second vertical line in the inset of Fig. 1, (eF<sub>2</sub>d=h! ' 2:4). This small but discernible tuning of



FIG. 3: (Color online) T in e evolution of the probability to nd a particle in one of the QDs for eF d=h! ' 2:40, starting the system with the particle in: (a) dot 1, and (b) dot 2. Lower panel is a schematic representation of the dynamics. Here, the middle barrier tunneling is suppressed.

the eld intensity yields a completely di erent result. At that point there are two crossings in the spectrum. In Fig. 3(a), we show the results when we start the system with the particle in dot 1, and in Fig. 3(b) starting in dot 2. The picture for both initial conditions does not change at all, except for a -phase in the oscillation (that is provided by the initial state). The elective tunnelings can be summarized in the respective bottom panels of that gure, and we can see that now we can block the tunneling between dots 2 and 3. Sim ilar behavior and conclusions are reached for initial conditions in either dot 3 or 4.

These examples represent an exciting result since by simply tuning the eld intensity from  $F_1$  to  $F_2$ , one can choose which barrier is allowed or blocked for tunneling. Notice that this dot or site selectivity is achieved despite the ac eld being applied to the entire structure, which suggests interesting applications. Notice, moreover, that the amount of eld intensity needed to change this condition is relative to the frequency of the driving eld, i.e., the ratio  $T_e=h!$  . It is also interesting that the separation between the two tunneling suppressing elds is not a monotonic function of  $T_e=h!$ . Figure 4(a) shows how these two crossing points change with the ratio  $T_e=h!$ . The solid line shows the rst crossing at eld intensity  $F_{1}$ , and the dashed line is the result for  $F_2$ . Notice that in the high frequency regime (sm aller ratio  $T_e=h!$ ) the crossings occur very close to each other and at eld intensities satisfying the condition  $J_0$  (eF d=h!) = 0. As a result, all barriers present a suppression of tunneling at the same



FIG.4: (Color online) (a) Crossing in the collapse region as indicated by vertical lines in the inset of Fig.1, as function of the ratio  $T_e=h!$ . In the high frequency lim it (lower ratio  $T_e=h!$ ) the crossings occur basically at the same point (zeroes of Bessel function). Inset shows am pli cation of quasienergy spectrum for  $T_e=h! = 0.7$ . (b) E scape probability for a particle initially in one region of the quantum dot array. Solid red line is for the equivalent rst crossing and represents the escape probability of the QD 1, considering this dot as the initial condition. D otted blue line continuation shows  $F_1$  when the crossing and represents escape probability of the rst twoQD s assuming that the system starts in QD 1.

value of eld intensity in the high frequency regim e.<sup>17</sup> For low er frequencies and given  $T_e$ , the crossings become e separated and di erent barriers are selectively closed at di erent elds. At even low er frequency  $T_e=h! > 0.4$ , the rst crossing disappears (indicated by the dotted blue line continuation) as the coupling between quasienergy levels one and tree, and two and four increases. This results in an e ective gap in the quasienergy spectrum (see inset of Fig. 4 (a) for  $T_e=h! = 0.7$ ) that basically kills the CDT for that value of eld intensity and frequency.

To better understand how good is this CDT at values of eld given by  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  we can monitor the maximum probability for the particle tunneling out of the region of dots we are considering (see R ef. 12). Lower values for this represent a good CDT.Figure 4 (b) shows the escape probability for eld intensities  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  provided by the crossings in Fig.4 (a), as function of the ratio  $T_e=h!$  (frequency). The solid line is the result for the rst crossing  $F_1$ , and is the escape probability out of dot 1, de ned as the maximum value reached by  $P_2 + P_3 + P_4$ , assuming that the system starts with the particle in dot 1. The



FIG. 5: (Color online) Collapse region of the rst Brillouin zone of quasienergies (in units of h!) as function of the ac eld intensity (eF d=h!), for  $T_e=h! = 0.2$  for: (a) an array of six QDs and (b) an array of ve QDs. Lower cartoons are the schem atic representation of the dynam ic of the respective arrays of QDs at eld intensity at crossing points given by  $F_1$ and  $F_2$ .

same result is clearly obtained if the system starts with the particle in dot 2 and one monitors the maximum probability to nd it in dot 1. The dotted blue line that follows the solid red line in Fig. 4 (b) is the result for eld values  $F_1$  at frequencies when there are no more crossing, but a gap in the quasienergy spectrum. Notice this goes to unity quickly as the elective tunneling becomes possible as a result of having a gap in the quasienergy spectrum. The dashed green line in Fig. 4 (b) is the result for the second level crossing eld  $F_2$ , representing the escape probability of the dots 1 and 2 (since for this choice of eld we suppress the tunneling between dots 2 and 3), which is the maximum value reached by  $P_3 + P_4$ starting the system with the particle in either dots 1 or 2. Notice that for frequencies around  $\rm T_e=h!$  '0.3 the system still presents a good CDT for both crossings, and they occurs at eld intensity with signi cant separation.

Our analysis was given for four QDs, but the same behavior can be obtained for other nite number of dots. The quasienergy spectrum presents two crossings,  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , in the collapse region as we can see in F ig. 5 (a) for six and (b) for veQDs, respectively. The rst crossing  $F_1$ basically suppresses the tunneling between dots 1 and 2, and between the two last QDs. This result is schematically represented in the bottom cartoons for  $F_1$  for either ve or six Q D s. The second crossing in the spectrum, F 2, suppress the tunneling between pairs of quantum dots, for example, in the six QD s cases, the tunneling between dots 2 and 3, and 4 and 5 as schem atically represented in the lowerbottom panelofF ig.5(a). An interesting result appears for odd num bers of Q D s, since in this case there is a di erent number of even and odd states. This fact allows for the dot in the middle to become a true trap for the particle, since tunneling in both directions can be suppressed. For example, the case of veQDs for the second crossing,  $F_2$ , as schem at ically represented by the low erbottom cartoon of Fig. 5 (d), suppress the tunneling between the dots 2 and 3, and 3 and 4. So, if we could start the system, or manipulate it, in a state localized in that dot and choose this value of eld intensity (F  $_2$  ) we could in principle trap the particle in the middle of the quantum -dot array.

In conclusion, we have show n that it is possible to suppress selectively the tunneling between quantum dots by a simple tuning from  $F_1$  to  $F_2$ , the intensity of an applied ac eld. W ith this tool one could manipulate the position of the particle in a quantum dot array, and assist in its initialization and control.

This work was partially supported by FAPESP, US DOE grant no. DE-FG02-91ER45334 and the CMSS Program at Ohio University.

- <sup>1</sup> T.H.Stievater, X iaoqin Li, D.G.Steel, D.G ammon, D.S. Katzer, D.Park, C.Pierm arocchi, and L.J.Sham, Phys. Rev.Lett. 87, 133603 (2001).
- <sup>2</sup> H.Kamada, H.Gotoh, J.Temmyo, T.Takagahara, and H. Ando, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 246401 (2001).
- <sup>3</sup> H.Htoon, T.Takagahara, D.Kulik, O.Baklenov, A.L. Holmes Jr., and C.K.Shih, Phys.Rev.Lett. 88, 087401 (2002).
- <sup>4</sup> A. Zrenner, E. Beham, S. Stu er, F. Findeis, M. Bichler, and G. Abstreiter, Nature (London) 418, 612 (2002).
- <sup>5</sup> F.G rossm ann, T.D ittrich, P.Jung, and P.Hanggi, Phys. Rev.Lett. 67, 516 (1991).
- <sup>6</sup> R.Bavliand H.Metiu, Phys.Rev.A 47, 3299 (1993).
- <sup>7</sup> M.Grifoniand P.Hanggi, Phys.Rep. 304, 229 (1998).
- <sup>8</sup> M. Holthaus and D. W. Hone, Phys. Rev. B 49, 16605 (1994).
- <sup>9</sup> P.H.Rivera and P.A.Schulz, Phys. Rev.B 61, R7865

(2000).

- <sup>10</sup> P.A. Schulz, P.H. Rivera, and N. Studart Phys. Rev. B 66, 195310 (2002)
- <sup>11</sup> J. M. Villas-Bôas, S. E. Ulloa, and N. Studart, unpublished.
- <sup>12</sup> J.M. Villas-Bôas, W. Zhang, S.E. Ulloa, P.H. Rivera, and N. Studart, Phys. Rev. B 66, 085325 (2002).
- <sup>13</sup> C.E.Cre eld, Phys.Rev.B 67, 165301 (2003).
- <sup>14</sup> P.D om achuk, C.M. de Sterke, J.W an, and M.M.D ignam, Phys. Rev. B 66, 165313 (2002).
- <sup>15</sup> M.M.Dignam and C.M. de Sterke, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 046806 (2002).
- <sup>16</sup> X.-G.Zhao, J.Phys.Condens.M atter 6, 2751 (1994).
- $^{17}$  M .Holthaus and D .Hone, Phys.Rev.B 47, 6499 (1993)
- $^{18}$  From the time evolution, one can see that  $P_{\rm e}$  for the mid-dle/open barrier is  $P_{\rm e}$  '  $T_{\rm e}{=}80$ .