

Fermi-liquid versus non-Fermi-liquid behavior in triple quantum dots

Rok Žitko¹ and Janez Bonča^{2,1}

¹*J. Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia*

²*Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia*

(Dated: February 6, 2022)

We study the effect of electron hopping in triple quantum dots modelled by the three-impurity Anderson model. We determine the range of hopping parameters where the system exhibits the two-channel Kondo effect and has non-Fermi-liquid properties in a wide temperature interval. As this interval is entered from above, the conductance through the side dots increases to a half of the conductance quantum, while the conductance through the system remains small. At lower temperatures the conductance through the system increases to the unitary limit as the system crosses over to the Fermi-liquid ground state. Measuring the differential conductance in a three terminal configuration provides an experimental probe into the NFL behavior.

PACS numbers: 75.30.Hx, 71.10.Hf, 72.10.Fk, 72.15.Qm

Quantum impurity models describe interaction between a point-like impurity with internal degrees of freedom and a continuum. The Kondo model of a magnetic impurity accounts for the screening of the impurity spin with decreasing temperature (the Kondo effect). Generalized Kondo models, such as the two-channel Kondo (2CK) model and the two-impurity Kondo (2IK) model, display NFL physics and quantum criticality, which are the central paradigms used to interpret the unusual behavior found in some systems at low temperatures. The 2CK model may explain unusual logarithmic temperature dependence of the magnetic susceptibility and linear vanishing of the quasiparticle decay rate in some Ce and U compounds at low temperatures [1]. The 2IK model was applied to study the competition between magnetic ordering and Kondo screening, which determines the ground state of the heavy-fermion compounds [2, 3].

Quantum dots provide tunable mesoscopic realizations of quantum impurity models [4, 5], where the relevant model is usually the ordinary single-channel Kondo or Anderson model [6]. The magnetic moment is either fully screened for a spin $S = 1/2$ impurity with Fermi-liquid (FL) ground state or underscreened for a $S > 1/2$ impurity with a singular FL ground state [7, 8]. Recently, several experimental realizations of the 2CK model using quantum dots have been proposed [9, 10, 11, 12]. In the system of three quantum dots – a small dot embedded between two larger dots – the channel asymmetry can be tuned to small values and NFL behavior was predicted in a limited temperature range [13].

We consider two related systems of three Anderson impurities coupled in series between two conduction channels. We analyze new behavior that results from the presence of two equivalent screening channels (as in the 2CK model) combined with either two-stage Kondo screening [4] or magnetic ordering [5], which both lead to a single uncompensated spin at intermediate temperatures. If the impurities are coupled only by exchange interaction, the system has a NFL ground state of the 2CK type with a residual $\ln 2$ zero-temperature entropy [1, 14]. In the experimentally relevant case where the exchange interaction is generated by the superexchange mechanism due to electron hopping, the channel symmetry is

broken and the system is described by the asymmetric 2CK model. We analyze the parameter ranges where NFL behavior is exhibited and identify the regime where the experimental observation is most likely.

Models. – We study the three-impurity models described by the Hamiltonian $H = H_b + H_{\text{imp}} + H_c$, where $H_b = \sum_{\mathbf{k}; \sigma} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ describes the left and right conduction lead ($\sigma = L, R$) and $H_c = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} V_{\mathbf{k}} (c_{L\mathbf{k}}^\dagger d_1 + c_{R\mathbf{k}}^\dagger d_3 + \text{H.c.})$ describes the coupling of the bands to the left and right impurity (numbered 1 and 3, while 2 is the impurity in the middle). H_{imp} is either the Hubbard Hamiltonian (model I)

$$H_{\text{imp}}^{\text{I}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{U}{2} (n_i - 1)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 t_{ij} d_i^\dagger d_{i+1} + \text{H.c.}; \quad (1)$$

where U is the on-site Coulomb electron-electron repulsion, $n_i = d_i^\dagger d_i$ is the electron number on site i and t is the inter-impurity hopping, or the exchange-only variant of the former (model II)

$$H_{\text{imp}}^{\text{II}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{U}{2} (n_i - 1)^2 + J S_1 \cdot S_2 + J S_2 \cdot S_3; \quad (2)$$

where $S_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} d_{i\alpha}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} d_{i\beta}$ is the spin operator on site i [$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the vector of Pauli matrices], and J is the exchange constant. We set J to the superexchange value of $J = 4t^2/U$ to relate the two models for $t \ll U$. Both models are particle-hole (p-h) symmetric. Replacing spin exchange interaction with hopping enables charge transfer between the channels and induces channel asymmetry [13, 15] which drives the system to a Fermi-liquid ground state [1].

In model I three different regimes are expected as t is decreased [16]: molecular-orbital (MO) Kondo regime, antiferromagnetic spin-chain (AFM) Kondo regime and two-stage Kondo (TSK) regime. In MO regime, two electrons occupy bonding molecular orbital, while the third electron in non-bonding orbital develops local moment which is Kondo screened. In AFM regime, three on-site local moments bind at $T = J = 4t^2/U$ into a rigid antiferromagnetic spin-chain




Figure 1: (Color online) Charge fluctuations and spin-spin correlations of model I (lines without symbols) and model II (lines with symbols) as a function of the inter-dot coupling t (for model I) or corresponding $J = 4t^2/U$ (for model II). The molecular-orbital (MO) regime is characterized by large on-site charge fluctuations, the antiferromagnetic spin-chain regime (AFM) by negative spin correlations of neighboring spins 1-2 and positive correlation of spins 1-3, and the two-stage Kondo regime (TSK) by vanishing spin correlations.

with total spin $1=2$; this is followed by the screening of the collective spin. In TSK regime, the moments are quenched successively: on left and right dot at the upper Kondo temperature $T_K^{(1)}$, while on middle dot at an exponentially reduced lower Kondo temperature $T_K^{(2)}$ [16, 17, 18, 19]. All three regimes become qualitatively similar at sufficiently low temperature: the remaining degree of freedom is one spin $1=2$ coupled to two Fermi liquids. The most general effective Hamiltonian describing model I that is allowed by the symmetries is the 2CK model with broken channel symmetry. Between TSK and AFM regimes, we identify a wide crossover region where NFL behavior is experimentally most accessible.

Model II has AFM and TSK regimes separated by the crossover regime. There is clearly no MO regime; instead, the AFM regime extends to the region of high J , where the two models describe very different physical systems. Since the left and right conduction channels are not communicating (in the sense that there are no $L \leftrightarrow R$ cotunneling processes), the channel symmetry is maintained and a stable 2CK NFL ground state is expected for all J . In both models (I and II) NFL behavior sets in at the highest temperature in the crossover regime.

Results. – We performed calculations using the numerical renormalization group (NRG) method ($\epsilon = 4$) [20]. We assumed a constant density of states $\rho_0 = 1/(2D)$, where $2D$ is the band-width, and a constant hybridization strength $V = \rho_0 J_{KF} J$. In Fig. 1 we show the ground state expectation values of charge fluctuations $(\delta n_i)^2 = \langle n_i^2 \rangle - \langle n_i \rangle^2$ and spin-spin correlations between neighboring $S_1 \otimes S_2$ and be-




Figure 2: (Color online) Impurity susceptibility and entropy for model I (full lines) and model II (dashed line) with $J = 4t^2/U$. Lozenges are a fit to Bethe-Ansatz results for one-channel Kondo model (multiplied by two and shifted by $1=4$) and squares are a fit to NRG results for 2CK model. *Inset:* $T_K^{(2)} = aT_K^{(1)} \exp(-bT_K^{(1)}/J)$ scaling of the second Kondo temperature of model I. $a = 0.97$, $b = 4.4$, $T_K^{(1)} = D \approx 1 \times 10^{-5}$.

tween side impurities $S_1 \otimes S_2$. For model I, the smooth cross-over from MO to AFM regime, predicted to occur on the scale of $t_1 \approx U/2 \approx 0.35D$ [16], is reflected in the decrease of charge fluctuations and the increase of spin-spin correlations. The cross-over from AFM to TSK regime occurs when $J \approx T_K^{(1)}$ or $t_2 \approx 1.7 \times 10^{-3}D$: as t decreases past t_2 the spin-spin correlations tend toward zero as the spins decouple. For model II, the results in the TSK regime match closely those of model I, while in the AFM regime near $t \approx t_1$ the differences become notable. Large values of J suppress charge fluctuations on side-dots, $(\delta n_1)^2 \rightarrow 0$, while local moments on impurities tend to form a well developed AFM spin-chain (for comparison, in isolated three-site spin chain $\langle S_1 \otimes S_2 \rangle = 1=2$ and $\langle S_1 \otimes S_3 \rangle = 1=4$).

In Fig. 2 we plot the impurity contribution to susceptibility and entropy. The ground state of model I is nondegenerate, $s_{\text{imp}} = 0$, and the impurities are fully screened for all t . In MO regime the system undergoes single-channel Kondo screening with T_K that increases with t and becomes constant for $t \approx U$, see Fig. 3. In AFM regime, the binding of spins is most clearly discernible in the curves calculated at $t=D \approx 0.05$ which show a kink in s_{imp} at $3 \ln 2$ (local




Figure 3: (Color online) Cross-over scales of models I and II as functions of the inter-dot coupling. The magnetic screening temperature T_{scr} is defined by $T_{\text{scr}}(T_{\text{scr}}) = (g_B)^2 = 0.07$; it is equal to the Kondo temperature when screening is due to the single-channel Kondo effect. T_K is here defined as $s_{\text{imp}}(T_K) = k_B \ln 2 = 4$.

moment formation), followed by an exponential decrease to $s_{\text{imp}} = \ln 2$ at $T_K = U$. The Kondo screening in AFM regime is of single-channel type for $t/D \leq 0.02$. Between $t/D = 0.02$ and t_2 there is a *cross-over regime* with NFL-like properties. Here magnetic ordering competes with the single-channel Kondo screening of left and right impurity. The magnetic moment is rapidly quenched at $T = T_{\text{scr}} J$, yet the entropy does not go to zero but exhibits a $\ln 2 = 2$ NFL plateau. At still lower temperature T , NFL fixed point is destabilized by the channel asymmetry and the system crosses over to the FL ground state characteristic of the conventional Kondo model. Note that in this regime T_{scr} is high while T_K is low (Fig. 3), making this range suitable for experimental study of NFL physics.

In TSK regime, the left and right impurity are screened by the single-channel Kondo effect at temperature $T_K^{(1)}$ that is nearly the same for all t . t_2 (Fig. 3). The central impurity is screened by the 2CK effect at $T_K^{(2)}$, below which the system is near the NFL fixed point with $\ln 2 = 2$ entropy. In the inset to Fig. 2 we show that $T_K^{(2)}$ scales as $T_K^{(2)} / T_K^{(1)} \exp(-b T_K^{(1)} J)$, as expected for the TSK effect [17, 18, 19].

Model II has a stable NFL ground state. For low J , it has a TSK regime where the Kondo temperature $T_K^{(2)}$, determined by J , is lower than that of the corresponding model I, set by $\max(J_1, J_2) = J_1 > J$ (Fig. 3). In the *crossover regime* physical properties of model II for $T > T_K$ match closely those of model I. In AFM regime, the Kondo temperature is a non-monotonous function of J . The energy required to break the doublet spin-chain state increases with J and the effective Kondo exchange constant J_K / J decreases. T_K therefore decreases exponentially with increasing J .

Fixed points. – By comparing NRG eigenvalue flows, we have verified that for any $t \neq 0$ the model I flows to the same strong coupling FL fixed point. The spectrum is a combination




Figure 4: (Color online) NRG eigenvalue flow of model I ($\alpha = 2$, $z = 1$) in the cross-over regime (below) and the corresponding impurity entropy (above). The states are classified according to the total isospin and total spin quantum numbers, (I, S) . Black full strips correspond to FL spectrum. Gray (red online) hatched strips are at energies (after rescaling by 1.296) $1=8, 1=2, 5=8, 1$ [14].

of two FL spectra: one for odd-length and one for even-length free electron Wilson chain [20]. Odd channel gathers a $\pi/2$ phase shift, while even channel has zero phase shift. Since the conductance is given by $G = G_0 \sin^2(\phi_0 - \phi_e)$ with $G_0 = 2e^2/h$, the system is fully conducting in its low-temperature ground state for any non-zero t . Weak perturbations of the form $H^0 = \sum_i V n_i$ are marginal, therefore the triple quantum dot system has an extended region of high conductance as a function of the gate voltage [16]. The unstable intermediate temperature fixed-point spectrum of model I is in agreement with the conformal field theory predictions for the 2CK model [14] (Fig. 4). The same fixed point is obtained for all J in model II.

Robustness of the NFL regime. – In model I, the channel symmetry is broken intrinsically by the inter-impurity hopping, which contributes a left-right cotunneling term of the form $J_{LR} S_L^x (S_R^x + S_{RL}^x)$ to the effective Hamiltonian (S_{LR} is the left-right spin operator $S_{LR} = \sum_{kk^0} C_{Lk}^\dagger C_{Rk^0}^\dagger$) [13]. The impurities then couple to a symmetric and anti-symmetric combination of channels with exchange constants $J_{S/A} = J_{\text{avg}} \pm J_{LR}$. The asymmetry parameter $A = J_{LR} / J$ with $J = J_S + J_A = 2 J_{\text{avg}}$ and $J = J_S - J_A = 2 J_{LR}$. Estimating J_S and J_A for $t/D = 0.005$ using the Schrieffer-Wolff transformation we obtain $A^2 \approx 10^{-6}$, to be compared with $T = T_{\text{scr}} \approx 10^{-5}$ determined by the NRG calculation. The discrepancy appears due to competing magnetic ordering and Kondo screening (and emerging two-stage Kondo physics); simple scaling approach fails in this case.

We have performed a range of calculations for various perturbations for $t/D = 0.005$. The $\ln 2 = 2$ NFL plateau persists even for large deviations from the p-h symmetry ($H^0 = \sum_i V n_i$ up to $V=U/2$), for broken left-right symmetry or parity ($H^0 = \sum_i (n_{1i} - n_{2i})$ up to $V=U/2$), and for unequal




Figure 5: (Color online) Dynamic properties of model I in the AFM (dashed lines) and in the cross-over regime (full lines). Upper panel: on-site spectral function $A_1(\omega)$ of the left dot. Lower panel: out-of-diagonal spectral function $A_{13}(\omega)$ squared. Temperature T is of order T_K , T_K is of order T_{scr} .

on-site repulsion parameters U_i . The only “dangerous” perturbations are those that increase the channel asymmetry; these can be compensated in experiments by tuning on-site energies and hybridization strengths.

Transport properties. – The qualitative temperature dependence of the zero-bias conductance through the system can be inferred in a very rough approximation from the frequency dependence of the spectral functions. The conductance through the system is given by $G_{serial} = G_0 / 4(A_{13})^2$ [21] and the conductance through a side dot in three terminal configuration by $G_{side} = G_0 A_1$ [22]. The appropriately normalized spectral densities are shown in Fig. 5 for the cases of cross-over regime with a NFL region and AFM regime with no discernible NFL behavior. In the NFL region ($t/D = 0.005$ and $T < T_{scr}$), the conductance $G_{side} = 2G_0$, while $G_{serial} = 0$. The increase of the conductance through the system at $T > T_{scr}$ is concomitant with the cross-over from NFL to FL fixed point, since charge transfer (or, equivalently, channel asymmetry) destabilizes the NFL fixed point like in the two-impurity case [15]. In the AFM regime with no NFL region, both conductances increase below the same temperature scale, *i.e.* $T < T_{scr}$. Measuring G_{side} and G_{serial} could therefore serve as an experimental probe for observation of NFL physics.

In $A_1(\omega)$, the Hubbard peak at $U=2$ corresponds to adding an electron to the site, while the “magnetic-excitation” peak at J appears when, after adding an electron, the electron with the opposite spin hops from the impurity into the band. This breaks the AFM spin chain, increasing the energy by J . This magnetic peak evolves into a “molecular-orbital” peak at the energy of the non-bonding orbital (for t in MO regime) or into the Kondo peak of the side dot (for t in TSK regime). Note also the different approach to the $\omega = 0$ limit in FL and NFL cases.

Conclusion. – In a wide interval around the p-h symmet-

ric point, the triple quantum dot system has a FL ground state with high conductance at $T = 0$. The different regimes exhibit different approaches to this fixed point. The most likely candidate for observing 2CK behavior is the cross-over regime with competing magnetic ordering and Kondo screening, $J \sim T_K$. In this regime the NFL behavior occurs in a wide temperature range and it is fairly robust against various perturbation that do not additionally increase the channel asymmetry. The signature of the NFL behavior can be detected by measuring G_{side} and G_{serial} in a three terminal configuration. Properly choosing parameters of the triple quantum dot system to set it into the crossover regime represents a road map for observation of NFL behavior.

We remark that all systems of quantum dots described as Kondo or Anderson impurities that are coupled to two noninteracting leads belong to the same class of quantum impurity problems with four (spin and channel) flavors of bulk fermions [3, 23]. The boundary conformal field theory approach allows for systematic determination of all possible non-trivial (NFL) fixed points. It would be interesting to investigate the *inverse problem* of finding the microscopic Hamiltonians which renormalize to these points. Since RG transformations are not invertible, this appears as a formidable task that would involve considerable guesswork. Nevertheless, its resolution would provide important insight into a variety of possible experimental realizations of mesoscopic NFL systems with *purely local* interactions.

The authors acknowledge useful discussions with A. Ramšak and the financial support of the SRA under Grant No. P1-0044.

-
- [1] D. L. Cox and A. Zawadowski, Adv. Phys. **47**, 599 (1998).
 - [2] B. A. Jones, C. M. Varma, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 125 (1988).
 - [3] I. Affleck, A. W. W. Ludwig, and B. A. Jones, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 9528 (1995).
 - [4] W. G. van der Wiel, S. D. Franceschi, J. M. Elzerman, S. Tarucha, L. P. Kouwenhoven, J. Motohisa, F. Nakajima, and T. Fukui, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 126803 (2002).
 - [5] N. J. Craig, J. M. Taylor, E. A. Lester, C. M. Marcus, M. P. Hanson, and A. C. Gossard, Science **304**, 565 (2004).
 - [6] M. Pustilnik and L. Glazman, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **16**, R513 (2004).
 - [7] W. Koller, A. C. Hewson, and D. Meyer, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 045117 (2005).
 - [8] P. Mehta, N. Andrei, P. Coleman, L. Borda, and G. Zarand, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 014430 (2005).
 - [9] Y. Oreg and D. Goldhaber-Gordon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 136602 (2003).
 - [10] F. B. Anders, E. Lebanon, and A. Schiller, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 201306(R) (2004).
 - [11] M. Pustilnik, L. Borda, L. I. Glazman, and J. von Delft, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 115316 (2004).
 - [12] C. J. Bolech and N. Shah, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 036801 (2005).
 - [13] T. Kuzmenko, K. Kikoin, and Y. Avishai, Europhys. Lett. **64**, 218 (2003).

- [14] I. Affleck, A. W. W. Ludwig, H.-B. Pang, and D. L. Cox, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 7918 (1992).
- [15] G. Zarand, C.-H. Chung, P. Simon, and M. Vojta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 166802 (2006).
- [16] R. Žitko, J. Bonča, A. Ramšak, and T. Rejec, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 153307 (2006).
- [17] M. Vojta, R. Bulla, and W. Hofstetter, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 140405(R) (2002).
- [18] R. Žitko and J. Bonča, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 035332 (2006).
- [19] P. S. Cornaglia and D. R. Grempel, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 075305 (2005).
- [20] K. G. Wilson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 773 (1975).
- [21] C. Caroli, R. Combescot, P. Nozieres, and D. Saint-James, J. Phys. C **4**, 916 (1971).
- [22] Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2601 (1993).
- [23] J. M. Maldacena and A. W. W. Ludwig, Nucl. Phys. B **506**, 565 (1997).