The physical picture behind the oscillating sign of drag in high Landau levels

Ra Bistritzer and Ady Stern
Department of Condensed Matter Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, 76100, Israel.

We consider the oscillating sign of the drag resistivity and its anomalous temperature dependence discovered experimentally in a bi-layer system in the regime of the integer quantum Hall effect. We attribute the oscillating sign to the effect of disorder on the relation between an adiabatic momentum transfer to an electron and the displacement of its position. While in the absence of any Landau level mixing a momentum transfer $\hbar q$ implies a displacement of ql_H^2 (with l_H being the magnetic length), Landau level mixing induced by short range disorder adds a potentially large displacement that depends on the electron's energy, with the sign being odd with respect to the distance of that energy from the center of the Landau level. We show how the oscillating sign of drag disappears when the disorder is smooth and when the electronic states are localized.

PACS numbers:

Coulomb drag in bi-layer systems at high Landau levels has been an active area of research in the last few years, both theoretically and experimentally. This research has been initiated by the puzzling results obtained in a series of experiments[2,3,4], where the longitudinal drag resistivity $_D$ was measured in the presence of strong magnetic fields and large Landau level filling factors.

In a typical drag experiment[1], a current $j^{(a)}$ is driven through one layer, the active layer, while no current is permitted to flow in the other layer, the passive layer. The longitudinal drag resistivity is defined by

$$E^{(p)} = {}_D j_y^{(a)}; \qquad (1)$$

where $E^{(p)}$ is the component of the induced electric field in the passive layer that is parallel to $j^{(a)}$.

Experimentally, two anomalous features of $_D$ at low temperatures were discovered. The first is a sign that oscillates when the density difference between the two layers is varied: when the Landau level filling factors of the two layers differ by an even number $_D$ is positive, i.e., has the same sign as at zero magnetic field. In contrast, it becomes negative when the filling factors of the two layers differ by an odd number. The second anomaly is the non monotonous dependence of $_D$ on the temperature T. For high temperatures, $_D$ has a quadratic dependence on T, similar to that observed at zero magnetic field. However, as temperature is decreased to low enough values there is a sudden increase of $|_D|$. As the temperature is further decreased $|_D|$ decreases, finally reaching zero in the limit of $T \to 0$. Both anomalous features occur at the same range of temperatures.

The experimental observations were theoretically addressed in several works[5,6,7,8]. An important step towards their understanding has been carried out by Gornyi et al.[8], who used the Self Consistent Born Approximation (SCBA), and found the sign of $_D$ to oscillate as the densities of the layers are varied. The non-monotonous temperature dependence of $_D$ was obtained as well, albeit its Arrhenius functional form at low temperature was missed. Although the SCBA calculation is generally consistent with the experimental observation, the physical picture behind its results is obscure.

In this work we study $_D$ in a way that makes this physical picture transparent. We show that the oscillating sign of $_D$ originates from the effect of disorder on the relation between an adiabatic momentum transfer to an electron and the displacement of its position. Coulomb drag stems from scattering processes in which an energy ω, T and a momentum q are transferred from one layer to another (we set $\hbar = 1$ throughout this paper). In the limit of low temperature, ω is very small, and the transfer of momentum is adiabatic. When disorder is weak enough to allow any Landau level mixing to be neglected, this momentum transfer implies a displacement of ql_H^2. We find that with the inclusion of lowest order Landau level mixing, the combined effect of a short range disorder and the rapidly oscillating wave functions characteristic of high Landau levels results in an additional displacement. The sign of this displacement depends on the electron's energy relative to the center of its Landau level, and its magnitude becomes large in the limit of a high Landau level. The electron's energy is typically the chemical potential, and thus $_D$ develops oscillations with respect to the variation of the chemical potential in either one of the layers. Furthermore, we show that the non-monotonic temperature dependence originates from the strong oscillations in the density of states characteristic of well separated Landau levels.

We consider the weak coupling regime[12,13,14] in which

$$_D = \frac{{}^{(p)}_{yx}\,{}^{(a)}_{xy}}{8T}\int \frac{d\omega}{2}\sum_q |U_{q\omega}|^2 \frac{{}^{(p)}_x(q,\omega,B)\,{}^{(a)}_x(q,\omega,B)}{\sinh^2(\omega/2T)}; \qquad (2)$$

where ${}^{(p)}_{yx}$ and ${}^{(a)}_{xy}$ are respectively the Hall resistivities of the passive and active layers, U is the screened interlayer interaction and B is the magnetic field. Most importantly, is the rectification function relating a scalar potential $V_{q\omega}$ of wave vector q and frequency ω to the DC current it creates in a second order response:

$$j_{dc} = \sum_{q\omega} \, _{q\omega} |_{q\omega}|^2. \qquad (3)$$

The function is a vector, with a longitudinal component $_{\parallel}$ parallel to the wave vector q and a transverse

component $_?$ perpendicular to q. For symmetry reasons, satisfies

$$_k(q;!;B) = \quad _k(\ q;!;\ B) \tag{4}$$

$$_?(q;!;B) = \quad _?(\ q;!;\ B) \tag{5}$$

$$(\ q;!;B) = \quad (q;!;B): \tag{6}$$

Eq. (6) is valid provided is averaged over disorder.

Given Eqs.(2{6) and the experimental observation of positive ^{D} for identical layers, it is clear that the drag resistivity is dominated by the contribution of $_?$. Thus, the oscillations of the sign of ^{D} and its T dependence should originate from the dependence of $_?$ on !, q and the Landau level lling factor (or, equivalently, the chemical potential). In particular, the density dependence of the sign of ^{D} must originate from a dependence of the sign of $_?$ on the chemical potential[7,8].

In view of Eq.(5) we nd it more convenient to de ne the Hall rectification function

$$_H(q;!) \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad _?(q;!;B) + \ _?(\ q;!;\ B): \tag{7}$$

We consider a model of non{interacting electrons subjected to a magnetic eld B and a disorder potential V_d. The single layer Hamiltonian is then,

$$H = \sum_j \quad \frac{1}{2m}\ p_j \quad A(r_j)\ ^2 + V_d(r_j) \ : \tag{8}$$

This Hamiltonian can, in principle, be diagonalized by single particle states with energies f g and wave functions f g. Hence, the unperturbed Green functions obtain a simple single particle form, and in the basis of exact single particle states $_H$ is given by the triangle diagrams[13,14].

As we show below, within this model,

$$_H(q;!) = \sum \quad x \quad T \ : \tag{9}$$

where

$$T \quad 2\ j(_q) \quad j^2\ [n_F(\ ) \quad n_F(\ )]\ (\quad !\ ) \tag{10}$$

and

$$x \quad (x) \quad (x) \ : \tag{11}$$

Hereafter the $\hat{y}$ direction is set parallel to q, $_q$ is the density operator, n_F is the Fermi distribution function, and (x) is the expectation value of the position x with respect to the single particle state j i. We discuss below the way Eq.(9) is to be understood for extended states, for which this expectation value may be ill de ned.

Eq.(9) gives a very simple physical explanation to the Hall rectification current $_H(q;!)jV_{q!}j^2$. The application of a time and space dependent potential $V_{q!}$ induces transitions between single particle states. The net rate for transitions between the states and is given by Fermi's golden rule to be T $jV_{q!}j^2$. A transition from a state to a state involves also a translation of the electron's position given by x , and thus induces a current. The total current involves a sum over all possible transitions, and hence Eq.(9).

Furthermore, Eq.(9) clari es that the sign of $_H$ is determined by the preferred direction of the induced transitions. Put di erently, to determine that sign one should identify the states and that make the most signi cant contribution to T , and determine the sign of the displacement x associated with their transition.

With the imaginary part of the polarization operator being Im = T we nd it instructive below to express $_H$ in terms of Im . One can view the ratio between them as the characteristic displacement for a particular q;! and chemical potential.

In our discussion we are guided by the experimental conditions to focus on well separated Landau levels, large lling factors and q k_F, with k_F being the Fermi momentum. We denote the uppermost lled Landau level by n, and consider the limit of low temperatures. We also nd it convenient to measure all energies with respect to $(n + 1=2)!_c$, the center of the n'th Landau level.

We rst discuss the expectation value (x) . The single particle states j i may be written as $j_0i + j_1i$, where j_0i is composed of states of the n'th Landau level, and j_1i is composed of states of other Landau levels. To leading order in the disorder potential, $j_0i = \sum_k C_k jnki$, where fjnkig are the n'th Landau level wave functions of a clean system in the Landau gauge, A = B (0;x). The coe cients C_k and the leading order approximation to the energies are found within rst order degenerate perturbation theory to satisfy,

$$\sum_p \quad hnkjV_d jnpiC_p = \quad C_k : \tag{12}$$

The Landau level mixing part, j_1i, is calculated by means of rst order non-degenerate perturbation theory and is of rst order in the ratio $V_d=!_c$. Within that order,

$$(x) \quad = h_0jx_0j_0i \quad i!_c^{-2}\ h_0j[v_x;V_d]j_0i: \tag{13}$$

where we use the decomposition

$$r = r_0 \quad \hat{z}\ \frac{v}{!_c} \tag{14}$$

of the position operator r, with r_0 the guiding center coordinate and v the velocity operator. In Eq. (13) the rst term is the expectation value of the guiding center coordinate x_0, and the second term is the expectation value of $v_y=!_c$, which becomes non-zero only due to the Landau level mixing induced by disorder. Note that $[v_x;V_d(x)] / @_xV_d(x)$. The shift of the position induced by the disorder is proportional to the expectation value of the electric eld experienced by the electron.

We now turn to discuss the states $j_0i;j_0i$. Within the semiclassical approximation,

$$h_0j_qj_0i = J_0(qR_c)h_0je^{\ iqy_0}j_0i \tag{15}$$

with R_c being the cyclotron radius of the n'th Landau level. Thus, in order to analyze the most significant transitions, we consider two states: the first is a single particle eigenstate $|\psi_0\rangle$ with an energy ϵ, in the vicinity of the chemical potential μ. The second state, $|\psi_0'\rangle \equiv e^{iqy_0}|\psi_0\rangle$, is a state defined in such a way that the potential $V(q,\omega)$ couples it most effectively to $|\psi_0\rangle$: its momentum is shifted by q relative to that of $|\psi_0\rangle$, and it is projected to the n'th Landau level. Furthermore, focusing on the low temperature limit of Eqs. (2,10) we look for those cases for which the expectation value of the energy of $|\psi_0'\rangle$ equals ϵ, and find the implications of this condition on $\langle x\rangle$.

When the chemical potential is in a region of localized states, $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_0'\rangle$ are both localized, and the expectation value of the velocity, the second term in (13), vanishes. Therefore,

$$\langle x^{(loc)}\rangle = \langle\psi_0|x_0|\psi_0\rangle - \langle\psi_0'|e^{iqy_0}x_0e^{-iqy_0}|\psi_0'\rangle = ql_H^2, \quad (16)$$

and

$$\sigma_H^{(loc)} = 2ql_H^2\,\mathrm{Im}\,\chi_{q,\omega}. \quad (17)$$

The sign of σ_H is then independent of μ.

When the states $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_0'\rangle$ are extended the second term in (13) no longer vanishes and

$$\langle x^{(ext)}\rangle = ql_H^2 + \frac{1}{\omega_c}(v(q) - v(0)), \quad (18)$$

where $v(q) \equiv \partial_q\epsilon(\psi,q)$ with

$$\epsilon(\psi,q) \equiv \int dr\,|\psi_n(x - ql_H^2, y)|^2 V_d(x,y) \quad (19)$$

being the energy of the state $e^{iqy_0}|\psi_0\rangle$. For a slowly varying potential changing on a scale of $\delta \gg R_c$ the second term of Eq.(18) is of the order of $ql_H^2\frac{V_d l_H^2}{\omega_c \delta^2}$ which is negligible compared to ql_H^2. When that happens relation (17) between σ_H and $\mathrm{Im}\,\chi$ still holds, although $\mathrm{Im}\,\chi$ now reflects the extended nature of the single particle states.

The opposite extreme is exemplified by

$$V_d(r) = \sum_j \delta(r - r_j)U_j \quad (20)$$

describing point like impurities. We assume the impurities' positions $\{r_j\}$ to be random, and their strengths U_j to be symmetric around zero. For the simplicity of the calculations, we use a rather crude approximation for the $|nki$ states,

$$|nki = \frac{e^{iky}}{\sqrt{R_c L_y}}\cos(k_F(x - k l_H^2))\,\theta_{R_c}(x - k l_H^2) \quad (21)$$

where L_y is the system's length in the $\hat{y}$ direction and $\theta_R(x)$ is a smoothed step function that equals one for $x^2 \ll R^2$ and zero otherwise. For any fixed x, Eq. (21) becomes exact in the limit $n \to \infty$. Within the approximation (21), the Bessel function in (15) is replaced by a cosine. It follows from Eqs.(20,21) that

$$\epsilon(\psi,q) = (R_c L_y)^{-1}\sum_{pp'j} C_p\,C_{p'}U_j e^{i(p-p')y_j}\cos(\varphi_{jp} + qR_c)\cos(\varphi_{jp'} + qR_c)\,\theta_{R_c}(x_j - pl_H^2)\,\theta_{R_c}(x_j - p'l_H^2), \quad (22)$$

where $\varphi_{jp} = k_F(x_j - pl_H^2)$. Since $q \ll k_F$ we neglected the change in the argument of the θ functions. Making the assumption that for any y, the disorder potential averages to zero when integrated over x, i.e., $\int dx V_d(x,y) = 0$, we obtain from Eq.(22) a relation between the velocity $v(0)$ and the energies ϵ and μ:

$$\mu - \epsilon = \cos(2qR_c) - \frac{1}{2R_c}v(0)\sin(2qR_c). \quad (23)$$

Being interested in the low frequency limit of (10), we look for states $|\psi_0\rangle$ for which $\epsilon = \mu$. For these states,

$$v(0) = -2R_c\tan(qR_c). \quad (24)$$

At low temperatures μ and hence the sign of $v(0)$ depends on the position of μ relative to the center of the Landau level. By interchanging the role of states $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi_0'\rangle$ we find $v(q) = -v(0)$. Thus,

$$\sigma_H^{(ext)} \sim 2ql_H^2 + 4R_c\frac{\omega_c}{\omega_c}\tan(qR_c)\,\mathrm{Im}\,\chi_{q,\omega}. \quad (25)$$

The second term in the brackets is the crucial disordered-induced contribution to the displacement, whose sign changes as μ crosses the center of the Landau level. This contribution, which stems from the second term in (18), becomes larger than the first term for a certain range of q. Although it is sub-leading in V_d/ω_c, this range is made large at high Landau levels due to the dependence of (24) on R_c, a dependence that originates from the rapid oscillations of the wave functions on the scale of the Fermi wavelength. When this range is large enough, the change of sign of σ_H as a function of μ leads to the sign variations of D [8]. We note that within approximation (21) $\mathrm{Im}\,\chi_{q,\omega} \propto \cos^2(qR_c)$ so that $\sigma_H^{(ext)}$ is finite for all qR_c.

Eq.(25) is similar to the SCBA result[8]. The two results differ only in the replacement of Bessel functions by trigonometric ones. The discrepancy may result from approximation (21) that neglected the increase in the wave function amplitude as the classical turning points are approached.

The extended states lie at the center of the Landau level whereas the localized states lie at its ends. Thus, if the chemical potential lies in the region of the localized states, the contribution of $\sigma_H^{(ext)}$ will show activated behavior at low temperatures. The relative weight of the contributions of localized and extended states is difficult to estimate, but it is possible that this activated behavior is the source of that seen in the experiments.

The above physical understanding of σ_H sheds light on the non monotonous temperature dependence of D.

As shown in (9), $_H$ is a weighted sum over all possible single electron transitions. The transition strength T , which is a measure of the net transition rate between the two states, is non zero only if $=$ $+ !$. From Eq.(2) it follows that $!$. T . For well separated Landau levels, $!_c$, with being the Landau level's width. At low temperatures, T , the phase space for scattering increases with temperature. Hence, $_H$ and ^{D} increase with temperature as well. However, for T $!_c$ the difference in occupations $n_F( )$ $n_F( )$ scales as $1=T$ and decreases with increasing temperature. Consequently so does the net transition rate between these states, as well as $_H$ and ^{D} . Finally, for T $!_c$ inter Landau level transitions become possible and ^{D} returns to increase with temperature. To fully account for the temperature dependence of ^{D} the temperature dependence of the screened inter-layer interaction, U, must be incorporated as well[8]. Nevertheless, the above physical picture remains intact.

We now turn to the derivation of Eq.(9). In terms of the exact eigenstates f g and exact energies f g,

$$_? (q;!) = \sum_i \int \frac{d}{2} (v_x) \quad (_q) \quad (_q) \quad F(; ; ;!); \quad (26)$$

where F is determined by the standard Keldysh technique[9,10,11]. The inversion of the magnetic field leaves the energies unchanged while transforming f g $!$ f g. Thus, the second term of $_H$, given by Eq.(7), can be related to the first term. As evident from Eq.(3) the rectification function is real. Hence

$$_H (q;!) = \sum \int \frac{d}{2} \mathrm{Im} f(v_x) \quad (_q) \quad (_q) \quad g \quad \mathrm{Re}\, G^r( ) G^r(+ !) \quad G^a(+ !) G^a( ) \quad (n_F( ) \quad n_F(+ !)) \quad + \quad ; \quad (27)$$

where G^r and G^a are, respectively, the retarded and advanced Green functions. After some straightforward manipulations of which we particularly note the use of Heisenberg's equation of motion, (v_x) $=$ $i(\quad)(x)$, we obtain

$$_H (q;!) = 2 \sum \quad (n_F( ) \quad n_F( )) \quad (\quad ! \quad) \quad \mathrm{Re} \quad (x _q) \quad (_q) \quad (x) \; j(_q) \; j^2 + \quad \frac{ _q ! \quad _q}{ ! \; !} : \quad (28)$$

Adding the q $q;! \; !$ term explicitly and using $[x; _q] = 0$ we obtain Eq.(9).

Eq.(28) is valid provided that x is finite. This is certainly true for localized states. It follows from Eqs.(14,16) that x is finite for extended states as well since (x_0) (x_0) q_H^2, despite the fact that both of these expectation values are ill defined.

In summary, we studied the drag resistivity, ^{D} , for well separated high Landau levels, focusing on the dependence of the Hall rectification function $_H$ on the chemical potential and temperature T. Using the basis of exact single particle eigenstates, we expressed $_H$ as a sum over transitions induced by the potential $V_q!$. The contribution of each transition is the product of its rate by the displacement it induces. For localized states the displacement is q_H^2 , yielding a sign of $_H$ that is independent of . For extended states this displacement is augmented by another contribution, induced by the disorder potential. The sign of the latter contribution is odd with respect to the distance of from the center of the Landau level. For high enough Landau levels this contribution dominates and induces oscillations in ^{D} as a function of density difference between the layers. The non monotonous dependence of ^{D} on T is a consequence of the strong oscillations in the density of states of well separated Landau levels. The difference between $_H$ for localized and extended states may account for the activated T dependence of ^{D} . Our results for $_H$ of extended states with short range disorder are in agreement with the SCBA results of Gornyi et al.[8], and unravel the physical picture behind this approximation.

We are grateful to B.I. Halperin, A. Mirlin and F. von Oppen for instructive discussions, and to the US–Israel BSF and Israel Science Foundation for financial support.

[1] T.J. Gramila et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 1216 (1991)
[2] X.G. Feng et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3219 (1998)
[3] J.G.S. Lok et al., Phys. Rev. B 63, 041305 (2001)
[4] K. Muraki et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 246801 (2004)
[5] M.C. Bosanger et al Rev. B 56, 10314 (1997)
[6] A.V. Khaetskii and Y.V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. B 59, 7551 (1999)
[7] F. von Oppen, S.H. Simon, and A. Stern, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 106803 (2001)
[8] I.V Gornyi, A.D. Mirlin, and F. von Oppen, Phys. Rev. B 70, 245302 (2004)
[9] H. Haug, A-P Jauho, Quantum Kinetics in Transport and Optics of Semiconductors, Springer (1996)
[10] Langreth D.C., Linear and Nonlinear Electron Transport in Solids, ed. by Devreese J.T., Van Doren E., Plenum, New York (1976)
[11] J. Rammer and H. Smith, Rev. Mod. Phys. 58, 323 (1986)
[12] L Zheng and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B 48, 8203 (1993)
[13] A. Kamenev, and Y. Oreg, Phys. Rev. B 52, 7516 (1995)
[14] K. Flensberg et al., Phys. Rev. B 52, 14761 (1995)