Im aging quasi-particle wavefunctions in quantum dots via tunneling spectroscopy

Massimo Rontani and Elisa Molinari

INFM National Research Center on nanoStructures and bioSystems at Surfaces (S3), and Dipartimento di Fisica,

Universita degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Em ilia, V ia Cam pi 213/A, 41100 Modena, Italy

(D ated: M arch 23, 2022)

We show that in quantum dots the physical quantities probed by local tunneling spectroscopies, namely the quasi-particle wavefunctions of interacting electrons, can considerably deviate from their single-particle counterparts as an elect of C oulom b correlation. From the exact solution of the few-particle H am iltonian for prototype dots, we nd that such deviations are crucial to predict wavefunction im ages at low electron densities or high magnetic elds.

PACS num bers: 73.21 La, 73.23 Hk, 73.20 Qt, 73.63 Kv

Current single-electron tunneling spectroscopies in sem iconductor quantum dots (QDs) [1, 2, 3] may provide spectacular im ages of the QD wavefunctions, both in real [4, 5, 6] and reciprocal space [7, 8, 9]. The measured intensities have been generally attributed to the probability densities of ground or excited single electron states occupying the dot. As pointed out by W ibbelho et al. [9], however, the role of other electrons lling the dot may actually be relevant. Indeed, QDs can be strongly interacting objects with a completely discrete energy spectrum, which in turn depends on the num ber of electrons, N [1, 3]. Therefore, orbitals can be ill-de ned, losing their meaning due to interaction. A lso, it is unclear how many electrons one should take into account to calculate the total density of states, as a particle tunnels into a Q D lled with N electrons. In this Letter we thus address the follow ing basic questions: W hat are the physical quantities that are actually probed by scanning tunneling m icroscopies (STM) [4, 5, 6] or m agneto-tunneling spectroscopies [7, 8, 9] of QDs? How do they depend on interactions? C an they deviate from the comm on singleparticle picture in physically relevant regimes? If only one many-body state is probed at time, then the signal is proportional to the probability density of the quasiparticle (QP) being injected into the interacting QD.We dem onstrate that the QP density dram atically depends on the strength of correlation inside the dot, and predict the wavefunction mapping to be a useful experimental tool to im age QPs, both in direct and reciprocal space.

The imaging experiments, in their essence, measure quantities directly proportional to the probability for transfer of an electron through a barrier, from an emitter, where electrons ll in a Ferm i sea, to a dot, with com – pletely discrete energy spectrum. In multi-term inal setups one can neglect the role of electrodes other than the emitter, to a rst approximation. The measured quantity can be the current [4, 7], the di erential conductance [5, 6, 8, 10], or the QD capacitance [9, 11], while the emitter can be the STM tip [4, 5, 6], or a n-doped G aAs contact [7, 8, 9, 10, 11], and the barrier can be the vacuum [4, 5, 6] as well as a A G aAs spacer [7, 8, 9, 10, 11].

A coording to the sem inal paper by Bardeen [12], the

transition probability (at zero tem perature) is given by the expression (2 =h) $\frac{1}{2}$ n ($_{\rm f}$), where M is the matrix element and n ($_{\rm f}$) is the energy density of the nalQD states. The common wisdom would predict the probability to be proportional to the total density of QD states at the resonant tunneling energy, $_{\rm f}$, possibly space-resolved since M would depend on the resonant QD orbital [13]. To proceed, let us assume that electrons from the emitter access through the barrier a single QD at a sharp resonant energy, corresponding to a unique, well de ned m any-body QD state, and reconsider the transition m atrix element M $_{\rm k,N}$ for transfer of an electron from emitter to QD. M $_{\rm k,N}$ is given by [recasting Eqs. (6-7) of R ef. 12 in second quantized form]:

Here jfkg;N 1i and jfk g;N i are two many-particle states of the entire system of sim ilar energies, with N 1 and N interacting electrons in the QD, respectively, and the remaining N_{tot} N + 1 and N_{tot} N electrons, respectively, in the emitter. The xed coordinate along the tunneling direction z appearing in (1), z_{bar} , can be everywhere in the barrier, and d is the in nites mal volume element. The fermionic eld operator ^(r), destroying an electron at position r (%;z), can be expanded over the basis of emitter and QD single-particle states, $_k$ and

 $_{i}$ i(r) \hat{c}_{i} , where i = k; , respectively [14]: (r) =and we take unitary volum e norm alization. We om it spin indexes and sum m ations for the sake of sim plicity. W e assum e that electrons in the em itter do not interact and are associated to the two sets of quantum numbers fkg and fk g, respectively, which dier in the occurrence of the index k labeling the electron which leaves the em itter and tunnels to the QD as jfkg;N li evolves to jfk g;N i. M oreover, we assume for convenience that the xy and z motions of electrons are separable, and that electrons in the QD alloccupy the same con ned single-particle state along z, QD (z), namely (r) = (%) _{QD} (z). Under these conditions we may factorize the matrix element as M $_{\rm k\,\textsc{,}N}$ / T $_{\rm k}$ M $_{\rm k\,\textsc{,}N}$, with

$$T_{k} = \frac{h^{2}}{2m} \qquad_{k} (z) \frac{\varrho_{QD}(z)}{\varrho_{Z}} \qquad_{QD} (z) \frac{\varrho_{k}(z)}{\varrho_{Z}} \qquad; \qquad (2)$$

where $_{k}$ (z) is the emitter state along z evanescent in the barrier, $_{k}$ (r) = $_{k}$ (%) $_{k}$ (z), and

$$X \xrightarrow{Z} M_{k,N} = K (%) (%) d\% hfkg; N 1jc_k^{V} c jfk g; N i:$$

Eventually assuming that the many-body states can be factorized into an emitter and a QD part, we obtain $\frac{7}{2}$

$$M_{k;N} = \sum_{k} (\%) '_{QD} (\%) d\%; \qquad (3)$$

where \prime_{QD} (%) is the quasi-particle (QP) wavefunction of the interacting QD system [15]:

$$'_{QD}$$
 (%) = hN 1j^(%) N i: (4)

Results (3-4) are the key for predicting wavefunction im ages both in realand reciprocal space. In STM , $_k$ (%) is the localized tip wavefunction; if we ideally assume it point-like and located at $%_0$ [13], i.e. $_k$ (%) (% ‰), then the signal intensity is proportional to \mathbf{j}_{OD} (\mathfrak{E}_0) $\mathbf{j}_{,0}$ which is the usual result of the one-electron theory [6, 13], provided the ill-de ned QD orbital is replaced by the QP wavefunction unambiguously de ned by Eq. (4). In magneto-tunneling spectroscopy, the emitter in-plane wavefunction is a plane wave, $_{k}$ (%) = e^{ik} %, and the matrix element (3) is the Fourier transform of $'_{\text{QD}}$, $M_{k,N} = \prime_{QD}$ (k). Again, we generalize the standard oneelectron result by substituting $\prime_{\rm QD}$ (k) for the QD orbital [then Eqs. (3-2) coincide with (A1-A2) of Ref. 8]. Note that $M_{k:N}$ is the relevant quantity also for intensities in space-integrated spectroscopies probing the QD addition energy spectrum [10, 11]. Consistently, in the noninteracting case, \prime _{QD} (%) reduces to the highest occupied one-electron orbital (%) [13]: in this lim it an electron tunnels from the emitter to the orbital (%) which resonates at the Ferm ienergy, with $N i = C^{V} N$ li. The latter regim e probably corresponds to m ost of the existing experimental evidence [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. However, it is interesting to analyze realistic scenarios that deviate from the one-electron picture.

Therefore, we study \prime_{QD} (%) in a paradigm atic interacting case, and consider a few electrons in a twodimensional harmonic trap, which was proven to be an excellent model for dierent experimental setups [3]. The QD e ective-mass Hamiltonian is

$$H = \sum_{i}^{X^{N}} H_{0}(i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in j}^{X} \frac{e^{2}}{\beta_{i} \otimes_{j} j};$$
 (5)

with

$$H_{0}(i) = \frac{1}{2m}^{h} p - \frac{e}{c} A(\%)^{1_{2}} + m !_{0}^{2} \%^{2} = 2:$$
(6)

Here is the static relative dielectric constant of the host sem iconductor, and A (%) is the vector potential =2) associated with a static and uniform (A = B magnetic eld B along z, which reduces the cylindrical spatial sym m etry group of the system from D_{1h} , at B = 0, to $C_{1 h}$, when $B \in 0$, making it chiral. The QD wavefunction has an azim uthal quantum num berm, $'_{QD}$ (%) = $'_{QD}$ (%) $e^{im'}$, which is xed by the total angularmomenta M of N iand N li, $m = M_N M_{N-1}$, and can be expanded over the basis of Fock-Darw in (FD) orbitals ' nm (%) [1], eigenstates of the single-particle H am iltonian (6): $'_{QD}$ (%) = $\prod_{n=0}^{1} a_n '_{nm}$ (%), where n's are radial quantum numbers and an coe cients to be determ ined. We solve num erically the few-body problem of Eq. (5), for the ground state at di erent N 's, by m eans of the con guration interaction (C I) m ethod [16], where N i is expanded in a series of Slater determ inants built by lling in the FD orbitals with N electrons, and consistently with sym m etry constraints [16]. Then, we evaluate the matrix element (4), and nd the values of a_n for a truncated FD basis set.

There are two ways of arti cially tuning the strength of C oulom b correlation in Q D s: one is to dilute electron density, and the other is to turn on B. In both cases, at low enough densities or strong enough elds, electrons pass from a liquid" phase, where low energy motion is equally controlled by kinetic and C oulom b energy, to a \crystallized" phase, rem inescent of the W igner crystal in the bulk, where electrons are localized in space and arrange them selves in a geom etrically ordered con guration such that electrostatic repulsion ism inim ized [3, 20].

We rst consider reducing the density at B = 0. The typicalQD lateral extension is given by the characteristic dot radius ${}^{V}_{QD} = (h=m \ !_0)^{1=2}$, ${}^{V}_{QD}$ being the mean square root of % on the FD low est-energy level ${}^{\prime}_{00}$. A swe keep N xed and increase ${}^{V}_{QD}$, the C oulom b-to-kinetic energy ratio = ${}^{V}_{QD}=a_B$ [$a_B=h^2=(m \ e^2)$ is the electronic tive B ohr radius of the dot] [18] increases as well, driving the system into the \W igner" regime [21]. As a rough indication, consider that for 2 or low er the electronic ground state is liquid, while above 4 electrons form a \crystallized" phase [18].

Figure 1 shows ' $_{QD}$ vs. %, as up to six electrons are successively injected into a \liquid" QD with a realistic density of = 2 [10]. The QD lling sequence is well known [10, 11], in analogy with the Aufbau principle of atom ic physics: in the independent-electron picture (= 0, dashed lines), ' $_{QD}$ is the highest-energy occupied orbital which is lled by the electron added to the dot. How every, C oulom b correlation signi cantly spreads the wavefunction (solid lines) and moves the QP peak towards the QD edge. The spreading is caused by the increase of weights a_n of high-energy FD orbitals, as interaction is turned on; nevertheless, the behavior of ' $_{QD}$ around % 0 is dictated by its angular dependence, ' $_{QD}$ (%) / $_{S}^{jn j}$, while it decays like exp($_{S}^{2}=2_{OD}^{2}$) as



FIG.1: Quasi-particle wavefunction (solid line) vs.% for different (N 1)! N transitions, with = 2. The dashed line represents the non-interacting orbital (= 0). The ground states are (M;S) = (0,1/2), (0,0), (1,1/2), (0,1), (1,1/2), (0,0), for N going from 1 to 6, respectively. $S_z = 0$ ($S_z = 1=2$) if N is even (odd). The norm of the = 2 wavefunction is 1, 0.84, 0.84, 0.40, 0.37, 0.73, respectively. Insets: Totalgroundstate charge densities n (%) (arb.units) for N going from 1 (top left) to 6 (right bottom). The length unit is 'QD.

\$! 1. The QP amplitude is strongly suppressed in the (N 1)! N tunneling processes involving the N = 4 open-shell ground state, with respects to other additions (Fig. 1). This is a spin-blockade e ect, since the total spin, S, is maximum at N = 4 (S = 1 according to H und's rule [10]), and we assume that its z-component is zero, $S_z = 0$. Besides, the general trend is that the QP wavefunction norm, hence the integrated experimental signal, diminish as N and increase (see also Fig. 2).

Note that the interpretation of tunneling spectroscopy in terms of the total density, $n(%) = N j^{y}(%)^{(k)} N = N$, is inconsistent with our point of view, as it is seen by comparing QP wavefunctions of Fig. 1 with total densities for the corresponding N - electron states (insets). While total densities and QP probabilities resemble each other up to the addition of the second electron, after the third electron tunnels into the dot they can be clearly discrim inated in the laboratory: QP probabilities have a strong angular dependence (hybridizing degenerate states with m) and a node at the QD center, while total densities are approximately



FIG.2: Top: Quasiparticle wavefunction vs. % for di erent values of , as the 6-th electron tunnels into the QD. The wavefunction norm, for going from 0.5 to 10, is 0.97, 0.73, 0.48, 0.32, 0.22, 0.15, respectively. Bottom : Six-electron total density n (%) vs. %. The ground states for N = 5;6 are (M;S) = (1;1=2); (0;0), respectively, for all .

circular (exactly, for N = 4;6) and led.

As one reduces the density, the appearance of QP wavefunctions dram atically changes. In Fig. 2 we study the injection of the 6th electron, as goes from 0.5 up to 10. Note that = 0.5, 2, 4 (equivalent to G aAs lateral con nem ent energies $h!_0 = 47, 3.0, 0.74 \text{ meV}$, respectively), typically correspond to di erent experim entalQD devices, such as self-assembled [8, 22], vertical mesa etched [10], and 2DEG-depletion QDs [11]. A sixelectron W igner molecule form s for > 4, with one electron localized at the QD center, and the remaining ve arranged on an outer ring, at the vertices of a regular pentagon [18, 23, 24]. The crystallization is clearly seen in the bottom panel of Fig. 2, where, as increases, the total density develops one peak at % = 0, for the central electron, and another one, close to $\% = 3^{\circ}_{OD}$, for the outer ring. Sim ilarly, the ve-electron molecule is a hollow pentagon [18, 23]. In the top panel of Fig. 2 we see that the Q P wavefunction is strongly a ected by electron localization: while for < 4 it somehow resembles the non-interacting FD orbital (n;m) = (0; 1), being spread uniform ly across the dot, for > 4 it develops a well form ed peak close to the outer-ring position. The QP weight in the region inside the ring is strongly depleted, eventually appearing as a shoulder of the main peak. We conclude that, in the crystallized phase, the 6th electron can only enter the external ring, with negligible probability of being located into the center. For smaller N, we nd that electrons just enter the outer ring, since the pertinent geom etrical phases are hollow regular polygons [25].

We now come to the e ect of a strong magnetic eld parallel to the tunneling direction z.AsB increases, the

(N	1)	! N	= 1	= 1=2	= 1=3	= 1=4	= 1=
	1!	2	1.00	1.00	0.500	0.707	0.250
	2 !	3	1.00	0.430	0.336	0.190	0.106
	3!	4	1.00	0.520	0.270	0,201	0.0649
	4 !	5	1.00	0.158	0.239	0.0650	0.0507
	5 !	6	1.00	0.294	0.210	0.0541	0.0274

TABLE I: Absolute value of the m odulation coe cient ja $_0$ jof the quasi-particle wavefunction ' $_{Q,D}$ (%) = a_0 ' $_{Om}$ (%), where m = (N 1)=, for di erent (N 1)! N tunneling processes and lling factors .

kinetic energy is quenched, Landau bands of alm ost degenerate FD levels being form ed. M increases due to C oulom b repulsion, since the higherm, the outer the FD orbital [26]. In correspondence of \mbox{m} agic" values of M, the ground state turns out to be particularly stable [26]: this family of incom pressible [27] states has been varioulsy regarded as rem inescent of fractional quantum H all e ect (FQHE) states in two-dimensional electron layers [3], or as a collection of W ignermolecules [28].

In analogy with FQHE, it is convenient to introduce the lling factor , de ned as = N (N 1)=2M, and to consider only FD levels in the lowest Landau band and full spin-polarization, which turns out to be a reasonable approximation at high B [3]. In realistic situations, there are signi cant B ranges where is constant as N is changed [3, 29]. At = 1, the interacting states are maximum density droplets [3, 30], namely incompressible disks of alm ost uniform density, $N = \binom{N-1}{m=0} \binom{N}{c_{0m}} \binom{1}{p}$ i, and $\binom{N}{QD}$ is simply the highest occupied FD state, $\binom{N}{ON} \binom{1}{1}$, because dat the edge of the dot, which is being led by the tunneling electron, with $a_n = \binom{N-1}{n}$.

$$'_{QD} (\) = '_{n=0,m=N-1} (\) :$$
 (7)

Equation (7) is a rem arkable result: while the total electron density is a uniform disk, the measured squared modulus of QP wavefunction will be an annulus of the same radius as the charge distribution. If < 1, the wavefunction will be still proportional to the FD orbital $'_{n=0,m}$, with m = (N)1) = and $a_0 \in 1$, namely $'_{QD}$ (%) = $a_0 '_{n=0,m}$ (%). The only e ect of strong correlation in these regimes is to modulate the amplitude of the non-interacting wavefunction via the coe cient a 0. Table I shows the calculated values of a for various tunneling processes at particularly stable lling factors. Except for some cases, $j_{a_0} j m$ on otonously decreases as dim inishes or as N increases. E.g., at = $1=5 j_{a_0} j$ is reduced by two order of m agnitudes with respect to = 1, when the 6th electron enters the dot. Table I shows that interaction enforces very e ectively the orthogonality of incom pressible states [31], and therefore we expect that, as a high eld com ponent is applied parallel to z, tunneling is strongly suppressed by the reduction of the matrix

element $M_{k,N}$ [Eq.(3)]: a purely many-body mechanism, the single-particle matrix element T_k [Eq.(2)] being left unchanged by the eld.

In conclusion, we have shown that quasi-particle wavefunctions of QDs are extremely sensitive to electronelectron correlation, and may dier from single-particle states in physically relevant cases. This result is of interest to predict the real-and reciprocal-space wavefunction im ages obtained by tunneling spectroscopies, as well as the intensities of addition spectra of QDs. Close com – parison with experiment is not yet possible in the case of Ref. [9], where many dots are probed at once and the connement is too strong. Promising sam ples are also those of Refs. [10, 11], allowing for access to a single dot and full controlof N. We hope that our results will stimulate further experiments. We believe that our ndings will be important also for other strongly con ned systems, like e.g. nanostructures at surfaces [32].

We thank O.S.W ibbeho and A.Lorke for inspiring discussions about their experiment. This paper is supported by M IUR-FIRB RBAU01ZEM L, M IUR-COFIN 2003020984, IT.INFM Calc.Par.2004, MAE-DGPCC.

- [1] L. Jacak, P. Hawrylak, and A. Wojs, Quantum dots (Springer, Berlin, 1998).
- [2] D.Bimberg, M.Grundmann, N.N.Ledentsov, Quantum dot heterostructures, (Wiley, New York, 1999).
- [3] S.M. Reim ann and M. Manninen, Rev. Mod. Phys. 74, 1283 (2002).
- [4] B.G randidier et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 85, 1068 (2000).
- [5] O.M illo et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, (2001).
- [6] T. Maltezopoulos et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 196804 (2003).
- [7] E.E.V dovin et al., Science 290, 122 (2000).
- [8] A. Patane et al, Phys. Rev. B 65, 165308 (2002).
- [9] 0.S.W ibbelho et al., cond-m at/0409125.
- [10] S. Tarucha et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3613 (1996).
- [11] R.C.A shoori, Nature 379, 413 (1996).
- [12] J.Bardeen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 6, 57 (1961).
- [13] J. Terso and D. R. Hamann, Phys. Rev. B 31, 805 (1985); J. Terso, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 440 (1986).
- [14] k and are not mutually orthogonal, since they are not eigenstates of the whole system H am iltonian [12].
- [15] The quantity is also known as the spectral density amplitude of the one-electron propagator resolved in real space: for analogous treatments in many-body tunneling theory see e.g. J.A. Appelbaum and W.F.Brinkman, Phys. Rev. 186, 464 (1969); T.E. Feuchtwang, Phys.Rev.B 10, 4121 (1974), and refs. therein.
- [16] For details on our CI approach see R ef. 17. H ere we in plem ented a parallel version of our CI code, allowing for using a FD basis set at B = 0 as large as 36 orbitals, and for diagonalizing m atrices of linear dimensions up to 10⁶. As a convergence test, we could accurately reproduce Quantum M onte C arlo ground state energies up to = 8 and N = 6 [18]. D etails will be given in R ef. 19.
- [17] M.Rontaniet al, Phys.Rev.B 69, 85327 (2004).

- [18] R.Egger et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 3320 (1999); 83, E 462 (1999).
- [19] M. Rontani, C. Cavazzoni, D. Bellucci, and G. Goldoni, unpublished.
- [20] M. Rontani, G. Goldoni, and E. Molinari, in R. Fazio et al. (eds.), New directions in mesoscopic physics, p. 361 (K huwer, Netherlands, 2003).
- [21] The dimensionless ratio is the QD analog to the density parameter $r_{\rm s}$ in extended system s.
- [22] M. Fricke et al., Europhys. Lett. 36, 197 (1996).
- [23] F.Bolton and U.Rossler, Superlatt.M icrostruct.13, 139 (1993); V.M.Bedanov and F.M.Peeters, Phys. Rev.B 49, 2667 (1994).
- [24] M.Rontaniet al, Europhys. Lett. 58, 555 (2002).
- [25] There is a complication for the 3 ! 4 process, since, for between 4 and 6, the three-electron ground state becomes fully spin-polarized [18], and the symmetry of the QP wavefunction changes from m = 1 to m = 0. Correspondingly, the 2 ! 3 channel is fully spin-blocked.
- [26] P.A.Maksym and T.Chakraborty, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 108 (1990).
- [27] R.B.Laughlin, Phys.Rev.B 27, 3383 (1983).
- [28] See e.g. P.A. Maksym et al., J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 12, R 299 (2000), and refs. therein.
- [29] T. H. Oosterkamp et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 2931 (1999).
- [30] A. H. M acD onald, S.-R. E. Yang, and M. D. Johnson, Aust. J. Phys. 46, 345 (1993).
- [31] C.Yannouleas and U.Landman, Phys. Rev. B 68, 35326 (2003).
- [32] See e.g. P. Jarillo-H errero et al., Nature 429 389 (2004).