

Current-Induced Entanglement of Nuclear Spins in Quantum Dots

Mikio ETO,* Takashi ASHIWA and Mikio MURATA

*Faculty of Science and Technology, Keio University,
3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan*

(Received August 5, 2003)

We propose an entanglement mechanism of nuclear spins in quantum dots driven by the electric current accompanied by the spin flip. This situation is relevant to a leakage current in spin-blocked regions where electrons cannot be transported unless their spins are flipped. The current gradually increases the components of larger total spin of nuclei. This correlation among the nuclear spins markedly enhances the spin-flip rate of electrons and hence the leakage current. The enhancement of the current is observable when the residence time of electrons in the quantum dots is shorter than the dephasing time T_2^* of nuclear spins.

KEYWORDS: quantum dot, entanglement, nuclear spins, hyperfine interaction, spin blockade, dephasing, super-radiance, Dicke effect

The spin relaxation of electrons in quantum dots is an important issue. The relaxation time must be sufficiently long for the implementation of quantum computing devices utilizing electron spins in quantum dots.¹⁾ The time has been examined experimentally by optical^{2,3)} and transport measurements.^{4,5)} Mechanisms of the spin relaxation have been investigated theoretically by, *e.g.*, hyperfine interaction,^{6–11)} spin-orbit interaction^{12,13)} and higher-order tunneling processes (cotunneling).^{14,15)}

In this letter, we study the unique properties of nuclear spin states in quantum dots, which stem from the spin relaxation of electrons through hyperfine interaction. In quantum dots, an electron occupying a particular level couples with numerous nuclear spins simultaneously through the interaction. Hence a spin flip of the electron results in a correlation among the nuclear spins. The correlation is an entanglement: we do not know which of the nuclear spins is flipped. We show that (i) the electric current accompanied by the spin flip significantly increases the correlation among nuclear spins, and (ii) the correlated state of nuclear spins markedly enhances the spin-flip rate of electrons. The direct dipole-dipole interaction between the nuclear spins is much smaller than the hyperfine interaction⁸⁾ and is thus disregarded. Its influence is discussed later.

This situation is relevant to a leakage current in the spin-blocked region where electrons cannot be transported unless the spins are flipped. In weakly coupled double quantum dots, Ono *et al.* have observed a current suppression when two electrons occupy the lowest energy level in each dot with parallel spins;⁵⁾ an electron tunneling from one dot to the other is forbidden by the Pauli exclusion principle (see Fig. 4). In this region, we predict that a leakage current accompanied by the spin flip in one of the dots is significantly enhanced by the nuclear spin entanglement. If our theory is verified, it would be the first observation of entanglement in solid-state devices.

Our mechanism is analogous to the current-induced dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP) in quantum Hall systems.^{16–19)} The DNP is created by electron scattering between spin-polarized edge states, accompanied by the spin flip. The DNP influences the electronic state and, in consequence, leads to a hysteresis in the longitudinal resistance.^{20,21)} Note that nuclear spins are entangled but not polarized in a specific direction in our case.

We examine a simple model for the spin-blocked quantum dots and discuss its relevance to a realistic situation

later. Our model is as follows. A quantum dot is connected to external leads, L , R , through tunnel barriers. The Coulomb blockade restricts the number of electrons in the dot to be N_{el} or $N_{\text{el}} + 1$. N_{el} electrons form a background of a spin singlet. From lead L on the source side, an extra electron tunnels into the dot and occupies a single level with an envelope wavefunction $\psi(\mathbf{r})$. The spin of the electron is either $|\uparrow\rangle$ ($S_z = 1/2$) or $|\downarrow\rangle$ ($S_z = -1/2$) with equal probability (we assume an easy-axis of electron spins in the z direction, *e.g.*, in a magnetic field). The electron stays for a long time by the spin blockade, interacting with N nuclear spins, \mathbf{I}_k (located at \mathbf{r}_k ; $k = 1, \dots, N$), through the hyperfine contact interaction. After the spin is flipped, the electron tunnels out to lead R on the drain side, and the next electron is immediately injected from lead L .

The hyperfine interaction is expressed as

$$H_{\text{hf}} = 2 \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{I}_k, \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha_k \propto |\psi(\mathbf{r}_k)|^2$. $N \sim 10^5$ in GaAs quantum dots. We consider nuclear spins of $1/2$ for simplicity. We assume that the spin-flip rate from $|\downarrow\rangle$ to $|\uparrow\rangle$ ($|\uparrow\rangle$ to $|\downarrow\rangle$) is given by the perturbation of H_{hf} ,

$$\Gamma = A |\langle \Psi_{\text{fin}}; \uparrow(\downarrow) | H_{\text{hf}} | \Psi_{\text{init}}; \downarrow(\uparrow) \rangle|^2, \quad (2)$$

where Ψ_{init} and Ψ_{fin} are the initial and final states of nuclear spins, respectively.²²⁾ We first study the case of homogeneous coupling constants, $\alpha_k = \alpha$. This is a good approximation for the majority of nuclear spins since the distance between neighboring nuclei is much smaller than the size of the quantum dot. Then the Hamiltonian (1) is reduced to

$$H_{\text{hf}} = 2\alpha \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{I}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{I} = \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{I}_k$ is the total spin of nuclei. A generic case with inhomogeneous hyperfine coupling is examined later.

The Hamiltonian (3) [and also (1)] indicates that N nuclear spins interact with a common “field” of an electron spin although there is no direct interaction between them (dipole-dipole interaction between nuclear spins is weak and neglected). This field results in an entanglement among nuclear spins. To illustrate this, let us consider the simplest case of $N = 2$ and begin with a polarized state of nuclear spins $|I_z = 1/2\rangle_1 |I_z = 1/2\rangle_2$. An electron with spin $|\downarrow\rangle$ tunnels into the dot and is spin-flipped. Then the state of nuclear spins becomes

* E-mail address: eto@rk.phys.keio.ac.jp

$(|-1/2\rangle_1|1/2\rangle_2 + |1/2\rangle_1|-1/2\rangle_2)/\sqrt{2} = |J=1, M=0\rangle$, where J and M are the total spin and its z component, respectively. This is an entangled state; we do not know which of the nuclear spins is flipped. After the electron tunnels out of the dot, the next electron is injected with $|\downarrow\rangle$ (or $|\uparrow\rangle$) and interacts with this state of nuclear spins. The spin-flip rate for the second electron is given by $2A\alpha^2$. This value is twice the rate in the case of non-entangled states of nuclear spins, $|1/2\rangle_1|-1/2\rangle_2$ or $|-1/2\rangle_1|1/2\rangle_2$. In general, the capability of state $|J, M\rangle$ to flip an electron spin is $A\alpha^2(J \pm M)(J \mp M + 1)$.

Now we formulate the case of N nuclear spins. We assume that the initial state of the nuclear spins is

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{(0)} &= \sum_{I_{z,1}=\pm 1/2} \cdots \sum_{I_{z,N}=\pm 1/2} C(I_{z,1}, \dots, I_{z,N}) \\ &\times |I_{z,1}\rangle_1 |I_{z,2}\rangle_2 \cdots |I_{z,N}\rangle_N, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\{C(I_{z,1}, \dots, I_{z,N})\}$ are randomly distributed.²³⁾ By the transformation of the basis set into the eigenstates of the total spin J and its z component M of all the nuclei ($J \leq N/2$, $-J \leq M \leq J$), eq. (4) is rewritten as

$$\Psi^{(0)} = \sum_{J,M,\lambda} C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(0)} |J, M, \lambda\rangle, \quad (5)$$

with random coefficients $\{C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(0)}\}$ ($\sum_{J,M,\lambda} |C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(0)}|^2 = 1$). Index λ distinguishes states with the same J and M . The number of such states is

$$K(N, J) = (2J+1) \frac{N!}{\left(\frac{N+2J+2}{2}\right)! \left(\frac{N-2J}{2}\right)!}. \quad (6)$$

The first electron with $|\downarrow\rangle$ (or $|\uparrow\rangle$) enters the dot and interacts with $\Psi^{(0)}$ of nuclear spins. The spin-flip rate is $\Gamma^{(0)} = A\alpha^2 F^{(0)}$, where

$$F^{(0)} = \sum_{J,M,\lambda} |C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(0)}|^2 (J \pm M)(J \mp M + 1). \quad (7)$$

When $N \gg 1$, $|C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(0)}|^2$ can be replaced by $1/2^N$ (law of large number; fluctuation of $1/\sqrt{2^N}$ is neglected). Then $F^{(0)} = (1/2^N) \sum_{J,M} K(N, J) (J \pm M)(J \mp M + 1) \approx N/2$. Note that $\Gamma^{(0)} = (N/2)A\alpha^2$ is identical to the spin-flip rate which would be evaluated under the assumption that one of the nuclear spins is flipped with the electron spin.²⁴⁾

After the spin flip, the electron tunnels off the dot. The state of nuclear spins becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{F^{(0)}}} \sum_{J,M,\lambda} C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(0)} \sqrt{(J \pm M)(J \mp M + 1)} \\ &\times |J, M \mp 1, \lambda\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$\Psi^{(1)}$ includes more components of larger J and smaller $|M|$. The correlation among the nuclear spins increases each time an electron is injected, spin-flipped, and ejected out of the dot. After n such events, the state of nuclear spins is

$$\Psi^{(n)} = \sum_{J,M,\lambda} C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(n)} |J, M, \lambda\rangle, \quad (9)$$

$$C_{J,M \mp 1, \lambda}^{(n)} = \sqrt{\frac{(J \pm M)(J \mp M + 1)}{F^{(n-1)}}} C_{J,M, \lambda}^{(n-1)}, \quad (10)$$




Fig. 1. Distribution of (a) total spin J and (b) its z component in the state of nuclear spins. (a) $p(J) = \sum_{M,\lambda} |C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(n)}|^2$, and (b) $p(M) = \sum_{J,\lambda} |C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(n)}|^2$, where n is the number of transported electrons accompanied by the spin flip. The number of nuclear spins is $N = 100$. In eq. (10), we take the geometrical mean between upper and lower signs.

$$F^{(n)} = \sum_{J,M,\lambda} |C_{J,M,\lambda}^{(n)}|^2 (J \pm M)(J \mp M + 1). \quad (11)$$

$F^{(n)}$ is expressed as $F^{(n)} = f^{(n)}/f^{(n-1)}$ with

$$f^{(n)} = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{J,M} K(N, J) [(J \pm M)(J \mp M + 1)]^n. \quad (12)$$

Figure 1 shows the distribution of (a) the total spin J and (b) its z component M . With increasing n , the weight of larger J and smaller $|M|$ increases. This means that the total nuclear spins are developed in the plane perpendicular to the easy-axis of electron spins.

The correlation among the nuclear spins enhances the spin-flip rate. The rate for the $(n+1)$ th electron is given by $\Gamma^{(n)} = A\alpha^2 F^{(n)}$. Using eq. (12), we find that $F^{(n)} \approx (N/2)n$ for $1 \ll n \ll N/2$, and $F^{(n)} \approx (N/2)^2$ for $N/2 \ll n$. Therefore the spin-flip rate increases with n linearly ($\Gamma^{(n)} \approx n\Gamma^{(0)}$) and finally saturates ($\Gamma^{(n)} \approx (N/2)\Gamma^{(0)}$), as shown in Fig. 2(a).

We evaluate the electric current $I(t)$. The time interval between n th and $(n+1)$ th electron transports is $\Delta t^{(n)} \approx 1/\Gamma^{(n)}$. The current as a function of t , $I(t) = e\Gamma^{(n)}$ at $t = \sum_{j=0}^n \Delta t^{(j)}$, is shown in Fig. 2(b). The approximate form of $\Gamma^{(n)}$ yields an asymptotic form of the current,

$$\begin{cases} I(t) \approx e\Gamma^{(0)} e^{\Gamma^{(0)} t} & (t \ll t_{\text{sat}}) \\ I(t) \approx e(N/2)\Gamma^{(0)} & (t_{\text{sat}} \ll t). \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

The current grows significantly with time and finally saturates. The saturation time is given by $t_{\text{sat}} = \ln(N/2)/\Gamma^{(0)}$, where $\Gamma^{(0)}$ is the spin-flip rate of an electron with the uncorrelated state of nuclear spins.

Up to now, we have examined the case of homogeneous hyperfine coupling in the quantum dot, $\alpha_k = \alpha$. Generally, the coupling constant α_k depends on the position of the nucleus due to the spatial variation of $\psi(\mathbf{r})$.




Fig. 2. (a) Spin-flip rate $\Gamma^{(n)}$ as a function of n (number of transported electrons accompanied by spin flip) and (b) electric current $I(t)$ as a function of time t , with homogeneous hyperfine coupling. The number of nuclear spins is $N = 100$. We take the geometrical mean between upper and lower signs in eq. (12).

With this inhomogeneous coupling, (i) the total spin J is no longer a good quantum number, and (ii) the correlated state of nuclear spins is dephased. During the stay of an electron in the dot [$\tau \sim 1/\Gamma^{(0)} = 2/(A\alpha^2 N)$], each term in eq. (4) gains a phase factor $e^{i\omega\tau}$ with $\omega = \pm \sum_k \alpha_k I_{z,k}/\hbar$. This factor diminishes the correlation if the residence time τ is sufficiently long.

To examine these effects, we perform numerical calculations in the case of $\alpha_k \propto \exp[-((k-1)/x_0)^2]$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, N$; $\frac{1}{N} \sum_k \alpha_k = \alpha$). The number of nuclear spins is $N = 14$. Electrons with spin $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$ are injected into the dot alternately. For the initial state of nuclear spins, $\Psi^{(0)}$, the random average is taken over the coefficients $\{C(I_{z,1}, \dots, I_{z,N})\}$ in eq. (4).

Figure 3 presents the spin-flip rate $\Gamma^{(n)}$ with $x_0 = \infty$ (homogeneous coupling; broken line) and with $x_0 = 10$ and $\alpha\tau/\hbar = 0, 10, 20$, and 40 (solid lines). When the dephasing effect is negligible ($\tau = 0$), the spin-flip rate is significantly enhanced by the entanglement of nuclear spins, even with finite x_0 . The behavior of $\Gamma^{(n)}$ is characterized by the effective number of nuclear spins which couple to the electron spin ($N \rightarrow N_{\text{eff}} \approx x_0$ in the previous discussion). With an increase in the residence time of electrons in the dot, τ , the enhancement of $\Gamma^{(n)}$ becomes less prominent, and is negligible when τ is larger than the dephasing time of nuclear spins by the inhomogeneous hyperfine field.

In actual quantum dots, there are other origins of the dephasing of nuclear spins, *e.g.*, dipole-dipole interaction. Generally, as long as the dephasing time T_2^* exceeds τ , our mechanism appears robust against the dephasing effects because the spin flip of electrons drives the nuclear spins to be correlated every time.

Our model is relevant to the experimental situation of double quantum dots shown in Fig. 4. A spin blockade takes place when the spin of an incident electron in dot L is parallel to that of an electron trapped in dot R .⁵⁾ We assume a magnetic field in which the Zeeman energy for electrons, E_Z , is much larger than α in H_{hf} , whereas the Zeeman energy for nuclear spins is negligible. The electron-phonon interaction is taken into account for the




Fig. 3. Spin-flip rate $\Gamma^{(n)}$ as a function of n (number of transported electrons accompanied by spin flip), when the hyperfine coupling constants are $\alpha_k \propto \exp[-(k-1)/x_0]$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, N$; $\frac{1}{N} \sum_k \alpha_k = \alpha$). $N = 14$ with $x_0 = 10$ (solid lines) or ∞ (broken line). The residence time of the first electron in the dot, τ , is (a) $\alpha\tau/\hbar = 0$, (b) 10, (c) 20, and (d) 40. $\Gamma^{(n)}$ is averaged over the random distribution of initial states. The error bars denote the variation of $\Gamma^{(n)}$.

energy conservation in the spin flip.^{6,7)} The Hamiltonian in the dots is $H = H_{\text{el}} + H_{\text{ph}} + H_{\text{T}} + H_{\text{hf}} + H_{\text{el-ph}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{el}} &= \sum_{j=L,R} \left[\sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} (\varepsilon_j - E_Z S_z) n_{j,\sigma} + U n_{j,\uparrow} n_{j,\downarrow} \right], \\ H_{\text{ph}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \hbar \omega_{\mathbf{q}} b_{\mathbf{q}}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{q}}, \\ H_{\text{T}} &= T \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} (a_{R,\sigma}^\dagger a_{L,\sigma} + a_{L,\sigma}^\dagger a_{R,\sigma}), \\ H_{\text{el-ph}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{q}} (\beta_{L,\mathbf{q}} n_L + \beta_{R,\mathbf{q}} n_R) (b_{\mathbf{q}}^\dagger + b_{-\mathbf{q}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{j,\sigma}^\dagger, a_{j,\sigma}$ ($b_{\mathbf{q}}^\dagger, b_{\mathbf{q}}$) are creation and annihilation operators, respectively, for an electron in dot j (a phonon), $n_{j,\sigma} = a_{j,\sigma}^\dagger a_{j,\sigma}$ and $n_j = n_{j,\uparrow} + n_{j,\downarrow}$.²⁵⁾

In the spin blockade of $|L \uparrow\rangle |R \uparrow\rangle$, an electron tunneling to $|R \downarrow\rangle |R \uparrow\rangle$ is accompanied by the spin flip in one of the dots, *e.g.*, dot L , and emission of a phonon of $\hbar \omega_{\mathbf{q}} = \delta E = \varepsilon_L - (\varepsilon_R + U) - E_Z$. The transition rate is $\Gamma = A |\langle \Psi_{\text{fin}}^{(L)}; \downarrow | H_{\text{hf}} | \Psi_{\text{init}}^{(L)}; \uparrow \rangle|^2$ with

$$A = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \left(T \frac{\beta_{L,\mathbf{q}} - \beta_{R,\mathbf{q}}}{E_Z \delta E} \right)^2 D_{\text{ph}}(\delta E) [N_{\text{ph}}(\delta E) + 1]$$

in the lowest order of $H_{\text{T}} + H_{\text{hf}} + H_{\text{el-ph}}$. Here, D_{ph} is the density of states for phonons and N_{ph} is the number of phonons.²⁶⁾ This agrees with eq. (2).

Besides eq. (2), we have assumed that the nuclear spin state is a pure state after an electron tunnels out from dot state $|R \downarrow\rangle |R \uparrow\rangle$ to lead R and is detected by current measurement.²²⁾ For this assumption to be valid, the following higher-order tunneling processes (cotunneling)^{4,14,15)} must be disregarded: (i) third-order processes in which an electron tunnels out from dot R to lead R , an electron tunnels from dot L to dot R , and finally an electron tunnels into dot L from lead L , or (ii) second-order processes in which an electron tunnels out from dot L (R) to lead L (R), and another electron tunnels in from lead L (R) to dot L (R). In the presence of such processes and hyperfine couplings, the nuclear




Fig. 4. An experimental situation of double quantum dots. A spin blockade takes place when the spin of an incident electron in dot L is parallel to that of the electron trapped in dot R .⁵⁾ The leakage current in the spin-blocked region is relevant to our theory.

spin state would be entangled with electron states in the leads. Then our calculations would no longer be justified.

We have also neglected the spin-orbit (SO) interaction, which may play a role in the spin relaxation of electrons in quantum dots.^{12,13)} The coexistence of hyperfine and SO interactions would complicate the evolution of the nuclear spin state although the state remains pure (a linear combination of spin-flipped and -unflipped states) in this case. Its analysis is beyond the scope of the present study.

In conclusion, we have proposed a current-induced entanglement of nuclear spins in a quantum dot. The current accompanied by spin flip in the quantum dot gradually increases the correlation among nuclear spins when the residence time of electrons in the dot does not exceed the dephasing time of nuclear spins T_2^* . The correlated state of nuclear spins significantly enhances the spin-flip rate of electrons. A relevant situation to this theory is the leakage current in spin-blocked regions.

The time dependence of the leakage current $I(t)$ shown in Fig. 2(b) may be observed in the experiment using a sequence of NMR pulses. The nuclear spins are randomized by each pulse. By tuning the interval of the pulses, Δt , $I(\Delta t)$ can be measured. Quantitatively, the dephasing time of nuclear spins is estimated to be $T_2^* \sim 1$ ns in a case of GaAs quantum dots.⁸⁾ The saturation time of $I(t)$ is of the order of the residence time of electrons in quantum dots [$t_{\text{sat}} = \ln(N/2)\tau$ in eq. (13)], which should be shorter than T_2^* .

Finally, we comment on an analogy between our mechanism and the Dicke effect of superradiance.^{27,28)} In the spontaneous emission of photons from N atoms with two levels (pseudo-spin $S_z = \pm 1/2$), all the atoms could interact with a common electromagnetic field. The emission of photons is significantly enhanced if N atoms are excited initially. This is due to the formation of the pseudo-spin state $|J, M\rangle$ with $J = N/2$. Starting from $|J, J\rangle$, the state of N atoms changes like a cascade, $|J, J\rangle$, $|J, J-1\rangle, \dots$, emitting photons rapidly. A similar effect has been proposed for the emission of phonons from N equivalent quantum dots.^{28,29)} The atoms (quantum dots) correspond to the nuclear spins in our model, and the emission of photons (phonons) to the spin flip of electrons. A major difference is the initialization. N excited states must be prepared by pumping in the Dicke effect, whereas such initialization is not necessary in our mechanism.

The authors are indebted to L. P. Kouwenhoven for the suggestion of the experiment using NMR pulses. They gratefully acknowledge discussions with K. Kawamura, R. Fukuda, S. Komiyama, T. Inoshita, A. Shimizu, K. Ono, G. E. W. Bauer, and S. I. Erlingsson. This work

was partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research in Priority Areas “Semiconductor Nanospintronics” (No. 14076216) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan.

- 1) D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo: Phys. Rev. A **57** (1998) 120.
- 2) M. Paillard, X. Marie, P. Renucci, T. Amand, A. Jbeli and J. M. Gerard: Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 1634.
- 3) A. S. Lenihan, M. V. Gurudev Dutt and D. G. Steel: Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002) 223601.
- 4) T. Fujisawa, D. G. Austing, Y. Tokura, Y. Hirayama and S. Tarucha: Nature **419** (2002) 278.
- 5) K. Ono, D. G. Austing, Y. Tokura and S. Tarucha: Science **297** (2002) 1313.
- 6) S. I. Erlingsson, Yu. V. Nazarov and V. I. Fal’ko: Phys. Rev. B **64** (2001) 195306.
- 7) S. I. Erlingsson and Yu. V. Nazarov: Phys. Rev. B **66** (2002) 155327.
- 8) I. A. Merkulov, Al. L. Efros and M. Rosen: Phys. Rev. B **65** (2002) 205309.
- 9) Y. B. Lyanda-Geller, I. L. Aleiner and B. L. Altshuler: Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 107602.
- 10) A. V. Khaetskii, D. Loss and L. Glazman: Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002) 186802.
- 11) J. Schliemann, A. V. Khaetskii and D. Loss: Phys. Rev. B **66** (2002) 245303.
- 12) A. V. Khaetskii and Yu. V. Nazarov: Phys. Rev. B **61** (2000) 12639.
- 13) A. V. Khaetskii and Yu. V. Nazarov: Phys. Rev. B **64** (2001) 125316.
- 14) D. V. Averin and Yu. V. Nazarov: Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 2446.
- 15) M. Eto: Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **40** (2001) 1929.
- 16) B. E. Kane, L. N. Pfeiffer and K. W. West: Phys. Rev. B **46** (1992) 7264.
- 17) K. R. Wald, L. P. Kouwenhoven, P. L. McEuen, N. C. van der Vaart and C. T. Foxon: Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 1011.
- 18) D. C. Dixon, K. R. Wald, P. L. McEuen and M. R. Melloch: Phys. Rev. B **56** (1997) 4743.
- 19) T. Machida, S. Ishizuka, T. Yamazaki, S. Komiyama, K. Muraki and Y. Hirayama: Phys. Rev. B **65** (2002) 233304.
- 20) S. Kronmüller, W. Dietsche, K. von Klitzing, G. Denninger, W. Wegscheider and M. Bichler: Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 4070.
- 21) J. H. Smet, R. A. Deutschmann, W. Wegscheider, G. Abstreiter and K. von Klitzing: Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 2412.
- 22) We assume that the final state of nuclear spins is a pure state, not a mixed state with electron states $|\uparrow\rangle$ or $|\downarrow\rangle$, after the electron tunnels out of the dot. We observe a spin flip of electron by the leakage current in a spin-blocked situation, whereas we cannot observe which of the nuclear spins was flipped. In a spin-flip process, a phonon may be emitted. However, if the wavelength of the phonon is much longer than the nucleus-nucleus distance, we do not obtain such information on the nuclear spins.
- 23) $\Psi^{(0)}$ is different from $\Psi^{(0)'} = (c_1|1/2\rangle_1 + d_1|-1/2\rangle_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (c_N|1/2\rangle_N + d_N|-1/2\rangle_N)$, with random coefficients $\{c_k, d_k\}$, in which the nuclear spins are not entangled at all. Numerical calculations using $\Psi^{(0)'}$, however, yield qualitatively the same results as those in Fig. 3 obtained using $\Psi^{(0)}$. See M. Eto, T. Ashiwa and M. Murata: in preparation.
- 24) Hence the entanglement of nuclear spins cannot be observed by optical experiments in which the spin relaxation of single excitations is measured.^{2,3)}
- 25) A similar model has been studied by T. Brandes and B. Kramer: Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 3021.
- 26) For the transition rate from $|L\downarrow\rangle|R\downarrow\rangle$ to $|R\uparrow\rangle|R\downarrow\rangle$, δE is replaced by $\delta E' = \delta E + 2E_Z$. Note that the spin of an incident electron in dot L is parallel or anti-parallel to the spin of an electron trapped in dot R , with equal probability. In the latter case, the spin blockade does not occur; the electron tunnels in the second dot and finally out to lead R immediately. The current is the sum of the currents with and without spin flip.
- 27) R. H. Dicke: Phys. Rev. **93** (1954) 99.
- 28) T. Brandes: *Interacting Electrons in Nanostructures*, eds. R. Haug and H. Schoeller (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2001).
- 29) T. Brandes, J. Inoue and A. Shimizu: Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 3952.