

# Binding energy of negative trions at high magnetic fields in a CdTe quantum well

Paweł Redliński\*

Department of Physics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

(Dated: May 1, 2019)

We present results of numerical calculations of electronic states of an exciton and a trion ( $X^-$ ) in a CdTe quantum well at magnetic fields  $B$  up to 150 T. The exciton state and the trion states were computed using a variational procedure. We estimated the binding energy of  $X^-$  in a singlet state with the z-component of angular momentum  $L_z = 0$ , as well as the binding energy of the  $X^-$  in a triplet state with  $L_z = -\hbar$ . Recent experimental results show that even up to 44 T the binding energy of negative trion in a singlet state is bigger than in a triplet state. We show that at a critical field  $B_c \approx 65$  T the two binding energies cross and above  $B_c$  the binding energy of  $X^-$  in a triplet state is bigger than in the singlet state.

After the discovery of quantum mechanics at the beginning of the 20th century, the first to be studied to support new theory were light atoms and ions such as H,  $H^-$ ,  $H_2$  and He. Although only the non relativistic Schrödinger equation of the hydrogen atom can be solved analytically, these few-particle quantum systems can still be satisfactorily described using numerical methods. Analogous complexes can be found in semiconductor physics. An electron in the conduction band (which we will simply refer to as "an electron") is similar to the free electron, and the valence band hole (carrying positive charge) is an analog of the proton. By binding an electron and a hole we form exciton ( $X$ ) which is the analog of the hydrogen atom. Adding a second electron (or a second hole) to the exciton we then form a negatively (positively) *charged exciton*. The names negative ( $X^-$ ) or positive ( $X^+$ ) *trion* are also used as an alternative. These three-particle complexes are analogs of the  $H^-$  ion (the importance of which was first noted by 1983 Nobel prize laureate S. Chandrasekhar) and the  $H_2^+$  ion, respectively. By combining two excitons one can then form the bi-exciton state, which is a close analog of the  $H_2$  molecule. As in the case of the early universe, when light elements were formed first, in the last 100 years we are again discovering and studying 'light elements' in semiconductor physics<sup>1</sup>.

Let us take a closer look at the similarities and differences between the negatively charge exciton and the  $H^-$  ion. The main difference is that the characteristic energy scale (the effective Rydberg  $Ry^*$ ) and the characteristic length scale (the effective Bohr radius  $a_B^*$ ) are much smaller in semiconductor than in atomic physics. Typically, in a bulk CdTe  $Ry^* \approx 10$  meV and  $a_B^* \approx 70$  Å, first, this is because the effective masses of the electron and of the hole are smaller in a semiconductor than in the vacuum. And second, the dielectric constant  $\epsilon$  of a typical semiconductor (e.g. like CdTe) is around 10 while in atomic physics  $\epsilon = 1$ . This difference in the characteristic scale allows electric<sup>2</sup> and magnetic field-related phenomena to be studied in the laboratory using much lower values of the corresponding fields. For example, at  $B = 100$  T the cyclotron energy of a particle with the effective mass of  $0.5 m_0$  is  $\hbar\omega_c \approx 11.5$  meV  $\approx Ry^*$ , whereas in atomic physics the cyclotron energy is much smaller

than the Rydberg energy.

An additional advantage of using a semiconductor to study multi-particle complexes is the possibility of decreasing the dimensionality of the problem. Using semiconductor quantum wells<sup>3</sup> (QWs), quantum wires<sup>4</sup> and quantum dots<sup>5</sup>, we are able to study the properties of these complexes in quasi two-, quasi one- and quasi zero-dimensional systems, respectively. Decreasing dimensionality allows, for example, trion states to be experimentally observable, in contrast to the bulk case, where trion states have never been measured. In this report we concentrate on a quasi two-dimensional system consisting of type I quantum wells, see Refs. 3,9 and references therein.

We will consider a negatively charged exciton composed of two identical electrons and one hole. Because two identical particles are involved it is always possible<sup>6</sup> to factor the wave function into a spin-dependent part and an orbital-dependent part and at the same time to ascertain that the wave function is totally antisymmetric (Pauli exclusion principle). This implies that the trion can be found in a singlet or in a triplet state of the two electrons. Second, the orbital part of the trion wave function in a QW is characterized by the z-component of the total orbital angular momentum of three particles:  $L_z = 0, \pm\hbar, \pm 2\hbar, \dots$ . Generally the energy spectrum of the trion is quite complex but in this paper we will consider only the singlet state, with the z-component of the angular momentum  $L_z = 0$ ; and the triplet state, with  $L_z = -\hbar$ .

Recently there appeared two articles<sup>7,8</sup> concerning, among other things, the binding energy of the negatively charged excitons in CdTe QW structure. In both experiments the quantum structure was almost identical: in the first group (Ref. 7) trion states were studied using a QW with the width  $L = 100$  Å while the second group (Ref. 8) used a wider quantum well,  $L = 120$  Å. The magnesium content in the barriers given by the authors was almost the same in both cases: 13.5% and 15%, respectively. We believe that the main difference concerning both structures is related to the fact that in the first experiment the carrier concentration was estimated to be 20 times larger than in the second experiment. Both groups claim that they did not find any evidence of crossing between the




FIG. 1: Binding energy of the exciton with angular momentum  $L_z=0$  as a function of magnetic field  $B$ . The binding energy depends primarily on the in-plane heavy hole mass.

binding energies of the single and the triplet states up to highest external magnetic fields available to them (35 T and 44 T, respectively). On the other hand the photoluminescence spectra of both experiments show crossing between singlet and triplet states around  $B = 24$  T.

In this report we show that the binding energy of the triplet state of  $X^-$  ( $L_z = -\hbar$ ) is larger than the binding energy of the singlet state ( $L_z = 0$ ) at high magnetic fields, above  $B_c \approx 65$  T. The calculation procedure is based on our previous considerations presented in Ref. 9. In the calculations we assume the valence band barriers to be  $V_h = 80$  meV, and the conduction band barriers to be  $V_e = 180$  meV, which we believe correspond to a 15% Mg content in the barriers. Our quantum well width is fixed at  $L = 120$  Å, and we use the following materials parameters: the mass of the hole (heavy hole) in the growth (001) direction  $m_{hz} = 0.48 m_0$ ; the mass of the heavy hole in the plane of the QW  $m_{hp} = 0.37 m_0$ ; the electron mass  $m_e = 0.096 m_0$ ; and dielectric constant  $\epsilon = 10.4$ . These parameters are assumed to be the same in the QW and in the barriers.

Because we are considering binding energies of the exciton and of the trion, we can ignore the Zeeman part of the interaction between the spins of the particles in an external magnetic field<sup>9,10</sup>. Schematically the Hamiltonian of the exciton ( $N=2$ ) or the trion ( $N=3$ ) system can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 H(N) &= \sum_{i=1}^N T_i(B) + \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N V_{i,j}^{Coul} \quad (1) \\
 &= H_0(N) + H_{int}(N).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here  $H_0(N)$  is the sum of the kinetic energies  $T_i(B)$  of the  $i^{th}$  particle in an external magnetic field  $B$ , and  $H_{int}(N)$  is the sum of the Coulomb interaction energies  $V_{i,j}^{Coul}$




FIG. 2: Binding energy of  $X^-$  as a function of magnetic field  $B$ . The calculation is made for the singlet state with  $L_z=0$  and for the triplet state with  $L_z = -\hbar$ . At  $B = 0$  the triplet state is not bound. At  $B_c \approx 65$  T the binding energies of the singlet and triplet states cross. The vertical dashed line indicates the largest magnetic field (44 T, Ref. 8) which had been experimentally accessible to study the  $X^-$  complexes in a CdTe quantum well.

between particles  $i$  and  $j$ .

In order to calculate the binding energy of the trion, we must first calculate the binding energy of the exciton. The calculation involving  $X^-$  are much less complicated than those involving  $X$ , because of the larger number of degrees of freedom in the case of the trion. In Fig. 1 we show the dependence of the binding energy of  $X$  up to 150 T. Only the optically-active  $X$  state with the  $z$ -component of the angular momentum  $L_z = 0$  is shown. The calculations reproduces well known functional form dependence ( $\sim \sqrt{B}$ ) of this state as a function of the magnetic field<sup>11</sup>. At  $B = 0$  the binding energy is about 15 meV, i. e.,  $1.5 Ry^*$ .

In Fig. 2 we show the binding energy of the  $X^-$  in singlet and triplet configurations with  $L_z = 0$  and  $L_z = -\hbar$ , respectively. We see immediately that at  $B = 0$  T the only bound state is a singlet state. In our notation this means that the binding energy of the triplet state is negative. The crossing between the singlet and the triplet states appears at the crossing field  $B_c = 65$  T. Such a crossing is expected at some magnetic field  $B = B_c$  because, as was discussed by Whittaker and Shields in Ref. 3, at very high magnetic field the triplet state is the ground state of the  $X^-$ . The question remains: *What is the value of the crossing field  $B_c$ ?* The value of  $B_c$  is substantially smaller as compared to the corresponding value in the case of the  $H^-$  ion, where  $B_c$  of thousands of Tesla is expected. Looking at Fig. 2, the slopes of both curves are relatively small. This feature is a disadvantage from our point of view, because it means that small changes in the slopes of the curves can substantially change their

TABLE I: The ground state energy of a free three-particle system calculated exactly and calculated using our approach at  $B=50, 100$  and  $150$  T. The last row indicates the difference between the two procedures. Even at  $B=150$  T our approach gives very good agreement with the exact value.

B [T]	50	100	150
exact value [meV]	68.12	136.24	204.35
our estimation [meV]	68.14	136.28	204.42
difference [meV]	0.02	0.04	0.07

crossing point  $B_c$ . Our results can be directly compared to results of the experiment done by Astakhov *et al.* In Fig. 3c the Authors plotted binding energy of trion in singlet state with  $L_z = 0$  (in their notation  $T_s$ ) and in triplet state with  $L_z = -\hbar$  (in their notation  $T_{td}$ ). Both energies do not cross up to  $B=44$  T. We want to stress that the *photoluminescence spectra* of both experiments show crossing between singlet and triplet states around 24 T but photoluminescence energy is *not* the same as binding energy.

In order to test our approach, we have applied the following procedure. In our algorithm we removed the Coulomb interaction term  $H_{int}(N)$  from Eq. (1) and then applied our minimalization procedure. This allowed us to compare numerical results with exact values. Table I show such a comparison for the case of  $X^-$ . It is seen that at up to 150 T the difference between our numerical

method and the exact result is not greater than 0.1 meV. Additionally, the relative error even at  $B = 150$  T is only  $3 * 10^{-4}$ . A similar analysis was made for the case of the exciton, where we obtained even better results: at  $B = 150$  T difference between the exact value and our results of minimalization is only  $10^{-4}$  meV. This procedure is the first of two testing procedures which we applied to our calculations concerning the problem of the trion. The second procedure was to show the convergence of the results when the number of base functions increases<sup>3</sup>, similar to that already used in our previous paper<sup>9</sup>.

In conclusion, our numerical procedure of calculating magnetic field at which binding energies of the  $X^-$  in singlet and in triplet states are crossing was applied to the CdTe/CdMgTe quantum well structure. We found that above  $B_c = 65$  T the binding energy of  $X^-$  triplet state with  $L_z = -\hbar$  is larger than the binding energy of the trion singlet state with  $L_z = 0$ . Up to now there is no experimental evidence to confirm these findings. We believe however, that the application of pulsed magnetic field techniques should make it possible to demonstrate the phenomenon of the singlet-triplet trion crossing at fields near  $B_c = 65$  T.

This material is based in part upon work supported by the NSF DMR02-10519. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

\* Electronic address: pawel.redlinski.1@nd.edu

<sup>1</sup> M. A. Lampert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **1**, 450 (1958).

<sup>2</sup> L. C. O. Dacal and J. A. Brum, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 033306 (2003).

<sup>3</sup> D. M. Whittaker and A. J. Shields, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 15185 (1997).

<sup>4</sup> T. Otterburg, D. Y. Oberli, M. A. Dupertuis, B. Dwir, E. Pelucchi, and E. Kapon, Phys. Stat. Sol. (c) **1**, 526 (2004).

<sup>5</sup> W. Xie, Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) **226**, 347 (2001).

<sup>6</sup> D. C. Mattis, *The theory of magnetism* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin; New York, 1988-v).

<sup>7</sup> Y. Imanaka, T. Takamasu, G. Kido, G. Karczewski, T. Wo-

jtowicz, and J. Kossut, Jour. of Superconductivity **18**, 215 (2005).

<sup>8</sup> G. V. Astakhov, D. R. Yakovlev, V. V. Rudenko, P. C. M. Christianen, T. Barrick, S. A. Crooker, A. B. Dzyubenko, W. Ossau, J. C. Maan, G. Karczewski, et al., Phys. Rev. B **71**, 201312(R) (2005).

<sup>9</sup> P. Redliński and J. Kossut, Semicond. Sci. Technol. **17**, 237 (2002).

<sup>10</sup> T. Vanhoucke, M. Hayne, M. Henini, and V. V. Moshchalkov, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 041307(R) (2002).

<sup>11</sup> J. Blinowski and T. Szwacka, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 10231 (1994).