

## Mesoscopic Transport Beyond Linear Response

O. Heinonen and M. D. Johnson

Department of Physics, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32816

## Abstract

We present an approach to steady-state mesoscopic transport based on the maximum entropy principle formulation of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. Our approach is not limited to the linear response regime. We show that this approach yields the quantization observed in the integer quantum Hall effect at large currents, which until now has been unexplained. We also predict new behaviors of non-local resistances at large currents in the presence of dirty contacts.

73.50.Bk, 73.50.Fq, 73.50.Jt, 72.10.Bg

In this Letter, we propose a non-perturbative general approach to nonlinear nonequilibrium steady-state transport in mesoscopic systems. Our work is based on the maximum entropy approach (MEA) to nonequilibrium statistical mechanics [1], in which the density matrix is found by maximizing the information entropy of the system, subject to constraints which fix the expectation values of observables. Although the MEA should in principle be applicable to any nonequilibrium system, examples and explicit calculations have in practice been limited. In part this is because it is seldom possible to calculate the microstates of nonequilibrium systems. Moreover, it is difficult in general to determine whether the information entropy is equal to the thermodynamic entropy, as is needed, e.g., to identify the temperature in the density matrix derived from the MEA. The problem of steady-state mesoscopic transport, however, is uniquely well suited to this approach: the microstates can be calculated to obtain the exact density matrix, and recent work by Hershfeld [2] allows us to identify the temperature in the density matrix. Here we show how the MEA can be used to calculate nonlinear current-voltage relations in mesoscopic devices.

Our study was initially motivated by a very important but often neglected fact: the integer quantum Hall effect (IQHE) is exhibited even in systems driven by very large currents [3]. The IQHE can be viewed as a near-ideal manifestation of mesoscopic transport [4]. An elegant explanation of the IQHE at low currents is given by the Landauer-Buttiker (LB) approach [5] to mesoscopic transport. However, this approach is fundamentally a linear response theory [6,7], and, as we show below, fails to yield the quantization observed at high currents [8]. Hence the IQHE exhibits a 'simple' behavior (perfect quantization) far beyond the linear response regime. There exist other, general, approaches to nonequilibrium transport, such as various Green's function techniques [9-12]. These lead to quite complicated calculations even in the linear regime, and it is not clear whether they can yield the IQHE in the nonlinear regime. Any comprehensive theory of nonlinear mesoscopic transport must be able to explain the extraordinary quantization of the IQHE at high currents. One of our most important results is to show that this can in fact be explained within the MEA.

We consider a mesoscopic system consisting of a device (e.g. a Hall bar or a quantum

wire), to which  $M$  terminals, denoted by  $m$  ( $m = s; d; 1; 2; \dots; M-2$ ) are connected by straight leads long enough that evanescent modes emanating from the terminals decay to zero in the leads. A current  $I$  flows from the source  $s$  to the drain  $d$ . Electrons injected in states at one terminal can either be transmitted to another terminal, or reflected back. In either case, they lose their phase memory upon re-entering a terminal due to phase-randomizing scattering there. The electrons in the system are described by a complete orthogonal set of eigenstates  $j$  with energies  $\epsilon_j$ . Each eigenstate in general carries a net current  $i_m$ , from each terminal [13]. A particularly useful set of eigenstates for multi-terminal ( $M > 2$ ) systems are the scattering states [7,14]  $|j_{m,nk}^+\rangle$  used when the terminals are modeled as semi-infinite straight leads. The state  $|j_{m,nk}^+\rangle$  is incoming into the device from terminal  $m$ ;  $n$  and  $k$  denote the asymptotic wavenumber and subband index of the incoming wave. With a proper normalization [14], this state's net current,  $i_{m,0,m,nk}$ , at terminal  $m^0$  is related to the incoming current  $i_{m,nk}^0$  by  $i_{m,0,m,nk} = i_{m,nk}^0 (\delta_{m,0,m,nk} + \sum_{n',k'} t_{m,0,n',k',m,nk}^0)$ , where  $t_{m,0,n',k',m,nk}^0$  is the transition probability obtained from the scattering matrix in the  $|j_{m,nk}^+\rangle$  representation.

In the LB formalism [5] it is assumed that each terminal is held at a local chemical potential  $\mu_m$ , so that electrons are injected into the device at each terminal with distributions  $f_{m,nk}^{LB} = 1/[e^{(\epsilon_{m,nk} - \mu_m)/kT} + 1]$ . For a two-terminal system at zero temperature and low voltages  $V = (\mu_s - \mu_d)/e$ , this gives a resistance  $R = h/(je^2\ell)$ . Here  $j$  is the number of occupied subbands and  $\ell$  is the total transmission probability at  $\mu_s$  [15]. This resistance is quantized in the absence of backscattering ( $\ell = 1$ ); this is the two-terminal version of the LB explanation of the low-current IQHE. However, when the voltage becomes greater than the subband spacing, the source injects electrons into the  $(j+1)$ st subband but the drain does not. Then, according to the LB approach, the resistance of an ideal system would lie between  $h/(je^2)$  and  $h/[(j+1)e^2]$ . The same conclusion is reached for the case of a multi-terminal system. (We point out that this argument has been invoked to explain the large-voltage failure of resistance quantization in quantum point contact experiments within the LB formalism [16].) Yet in precision IQHE measurements, the voltage is many times greater than the subband spacing and the resistance is nonetheless highly quantized [3]. Hartree inter-

actions moves subbands together and cannot change this conclusion. Exchange-correlation interactions could restore quantization if they caused a large energy separation (of order eV) between occupied and unoccupied subbands. However, the exchange-correlation energies in the fractional quantum Hall effect, for example, are only of the order of  $10^{-3} \hbar \omega_c$ . Thus linear response theory is unable to explain the cleanest experiments in mesoscopics: the quantization found in IQHE systems at large currents.

Let us now describe a general approach to nonlinear steady-state mesoscopic transport which resolves this. The thermodynamic variables which can be taken as known are the internal energy  $U$  and the particle number  $N$ . We add to these the net current  $I_m$  at each terminal (so that  $I_s = -I_d = I$  and  $I_m = 0; m \notin s; d$ ). Following the MEA [1], we then maximize the information entropy  $S_I = -c \sum_p p \ln p$ , subject to constraints on the average values of energy, particle number, and currents. Here  $c$  is an (as yet) unspecified constant, and  $p$  is the probability that the system is in a microstate. This can be written as the matrix element  $p = \langle j | \rho | j \rangle$  of the density matrix  $\hat{\rho}$ . Averages of an operator  $\hat{A}$  are given by  $\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \text{Tr} \hat{\rho} \hat{A} = \text{Tr} \hat{\rho} \hat{A}$ . The constraints are imposed by requiring that  $\langle \hat{H} \rangle = U$ ,  $\langle \hat{N} \rangle = N$ , and  $\langle \hat{I}_m \rangle = I_m$ . Here  $\hat{H}$ , and  $\hat{N}$  are, respectively, the Hamiltonian and particle number operators, and  $\hat{I}_m$  is the net current operator in lead  $m$  [18]. The constrained maximization gives the density matrix

$$\hat{\rho} = \exp [ -\beta ( \hat{H} - \mu \hat{N} + \sum_m \lambda_m \hat{I}_m ) ] : \quad (1)$$

In this expression  $\beta$  is the global chemical potential, associated with a global particle reservoir, and the intensive variables  $\lambda_m$  are Lagrangian multipliers associated with the constraints on the currents. Because of current conservation there are only  $M - 1$  independent current constraints, so we may choose  $\lambda_d = 0$ . The variable  $\beta$  is the product of  $c^{-1}$  and the variable conjugate to  $U$ . This density matrix has the general form which Hershfeld [2] recently showed exists quite generally in steady-state nonequilibrium systems; following his work we therefore identify  $\beta = 1/k_B T$ , where  $k_B$  is Boltzmann's constant and  $T$  the thermodynamic temperature. This identification also means that in this case the information and

thermodynamic entropies are identical (with  $c = k_B$ ).

This formal result can be more clearly written in terms of a complete set of single-particle eigenstates  $j$  of  $\hat{H}$  and  $\hat{I}_m$ . The above density operator then gives the following thermal occupancies of single-particle states:

$$f_j = \frac{1}{1 + \exp \left[ \left( \epsilon_j - \mu_m + \frac{\hbar}{2} \frac{d\epsilon_j}{dt} \right) / k_B T \right]} \quad (2)$$

For illustration, consider this result in terms of the scattering states of a two-terminal system. In this case we can drop the terminal index  $m$ , and understand that  $k > 0$  corresponds to states injected by the source and  $k < 0$  to states injected by the drain. In an ideal system with  $t_{n0k^0, nk} = t_{n0k^0, -nk}$ , these states carry currents  $i_{nk}$ , and  $f_{nk} = 1 / [1 + \exp(\hbar(\epsilon_{nk} - \mu) / k_B T)]$ , where  $\mu = \mu_s$ . In the simplest case, with only one subband ( $n = 0$ ) occupied, this is similar to the LB result; the combination  $\mu + i_0 k t$  acts like an effective local chemical potential. However, with more than one subband occupied, or with nontrivial  $t$ 's, or at large voltages, our current-constrained equilibrium occupations cannot be described in terms of local chemical potentials. In the general case states are occupied up to different energies in each subband.

A voltmeter connected between the source and drain measures the work required to move a unit charge between them. In the LB formalism this voltage is simply  $(\mu_s - \mu_d)/e$ . Let us find the corresponding result for our distribution. We use the representation given by the scattering states  $j_{m,nk}^+$ , which have occupancies  $f_{m,nk}$ . For clarity here we will present the results for a two-terminal device. The generalization to the multi-terminal case is straightforward and will be presented elsewhere. The steady-state condition and the absence of inelastic scattering within the device allow us to define thermodynamic potentials of the electron distribution, just as for an equilibrium system [20]. For example, the equivalence in the present case between the information and thermodynamic entropies means that, as in equilibrium, here the Helmholtz free energy  $F = U - TS$ . The thermodynamic work  $W$  done on the system at constant temperature is then equal to the change in free energy,  $F = N + \sum_m \sum_{nk} I_m$ ; in the case of two terminals, this becomes  $F = N + I t$ , where

$I$  is the source-to-drain current, and  $\mu = \mu_s$ . Varying either of the variables  $\mu$  and  $\mu_m$  generally changes the occupancy of states injected by both terminals, by Eq. (2). Let  $\delta\mu$  refer to either of the variables  $\mu$ ;  $\mu_m$ , and let  $\delta I$  be the change in net current when  $\mu$  is varied with the other variable held fixed. Similarly let  $\delta N_m$  be the change in the occupancy of scattering states injected by terminal  $m$  when  $\mu_m$  is varied (with  $N_m = \sum_{nk} f_{m,nk}$  the total particle number injected at terminal  $m$ ), so that the change in free energy is  $\delta F = e(\delta N_s + \delta N_d) + \delta I$ . We obtain the potentials  $V_m$  at the terminals by interpreting this free energy change as the work done in adding electrons  $\delta N_m$  injected at each terminal against the voltage  $V_m$  at the terminal. Thus, a change  $\delta N_m$  occurs at a cost in work of  $e \delta N_m V_m$ . The total work is then  $e(\delta N_s V_s + \delta N_d V_d)$ , and equating this to  $\delta F$  for  $\mu = \mu_m$  gives two linearly independent equations

$$\sum_{m=s,d} \delta N_m (eV_m) = \delta I; \quad (3)$$

which must be solved for the unknown terminal voltages  $V_s$  and  $V_d$ . (In the  $M$ -terminal case, this becomes a set of  $M$  equations.) The resistance measured between source and drain is then  $R = (V_s - V_d)/I$ . The  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $N_m$  on the left-hand side of Eq. (3) is invertible, and the resulting potentials automatically are given relative to the global chemical potential  $\mu$ .

The distribution  $f$  in Eq. (2) has been written down in earlier work by Heinonen and Taylor [21], who used it to study current distributions, and more recently by Ng [19]. In these works it was argued that the lack of dissipation in a device without inelastic scattering permitted the ansatz of minimizing a free energy, subject to the current constraint. Here we have shown how this can be justified much more generally within the MEA, and the absence of dissipation makes it possible to determine all microstates. The second completely new point in the current work is our calculation of voltage from considerations of work. Ng, for example, simply assumed that the current-induced potential difference is proportional to the change in occupancies at the terminals. The validity of this assumption is not at all clear in, e.g., precision IQHE measurements where the Hall voltage is much greater than the

bulk Fermi energy. Furthermore, Ng failed to constrain particle number, and consequently predicted that even at small currents only states injected at the source (and not the drain) should be occupied. This appears unphysical.

We will illustrate our approach with two examples, turning first to the resistance of an ideal two-terminal system. For simplicity, we drop the terminal subscripts, and use eigenstates which satisfy periodic boundary conditions on a length  $L$  along the device. (This is only to choose a simple density of states; the final result does not depend on this particular boundary condition.) Suppose that current-carrying states have energies  $\epsilon_{nk} = \epsilon_n + \hbar^2 k^2 / 2m$  and carry currents  $ehk/mL$ . This can represent 1D transport, or a parabolically confined Hallbar. The occupancies are, by Eq. (2),  $f_{nk} = f(\epsilon_{nk} - \mu_{nk})$ , where  $f(\epsilon) = 1/(e^{\beta(\epsilon - \mu)} + 1)$ . Then  $f_{nk}$  is symmetric about  $k = \tilde{k} = (\epsilon_{nk} - \epsilon_n)/\hbar^2 = (k - \tilde{k})^2 / 2m$  so that  $\sum_{nk} i_{nk} = \sum_{nk} e_{nk} e$ , where  $e = \hbar^2 / 2mL$ . The electron number is  $N = \sum_n \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} dk f(\epsilon_{nk} - \mu_{nk})$ , and the total current is  $I = \sum_n \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} dk i_{nk} f(\epsilon_{nk} - \mu_{nk})$ . We convert the integrals over  $k$  to integrals over energy  $\epsilon_{nk}$ , and obtain  $N = \sum_n \int_{\epsilon_n}^{\epsilon_n + \hbar^2 \pi^2 / 2mL} d\epsilon_{nk} f(\epsilon_{nk} - \mu_{nk})$  where  $\rho_n(\epsilon) = (L/\pi) [2\hbar^2 (\epsilon - \epsilon_n)/m]^{1/2}$  is the 1D density of states. Similarly,  $I = eh(m/L) \sum_n \int_{\epsilon_n}^{\epsilon_n + \hbar^2 \pi^2 / 2mL} d\epsilon_{nk} f(\epsilon_{nk} - \mu_{nk})$ , so  $I = ehN$ . It is then simple to calculate  $I$  and  $N_m$ , in Eq. (3), with the integrals for  $N_m$  over  $k$  restricted to  $k > 0$  ( $k < 0$ ) for  $m = s(d)$ . The resulting expression for the voltage difference  $V_s - V_d$  obtained by inverting Eq. (3) is simplified by the symmetry of  $f_{nk}$  about  $e$ , and we find

$$R = (V_s - V_d)/I = \frac{h}{e^2} \sum_n \frac{1}{e^{\beta(\epsilon_n - \mu)} + 1} \quad (4)$$

If  $\mu$  exceeds only the band minima of the first  $j$  subbands (or Landau levels), then at zero temperature  $R = h/je^2$ . Finite-temperature corrections are exponentially small. This exact result is true regardless of the size of the voltage or current. This is perhaps our most important result; ours is the first mesoscopic transport theory which can explain the extremely accurate quantization seen in the IQHE far from the linear response regime. (We neglect the breakdown which occurs in the IQHE at very large current densities when other dissipative mechanisms turn on [22].) If, for  $I > 0$ , there are no states with  $k < 0$  occupied,

$R$  is not quantized; this appears to be the case with quantum point contacts at large currents [16]. We have numerically studied non-parabolic energies  $\epsilon_{nk}$  and multi-terminal systems and find in these cases the accuracy of the quantization is limited only by the numerical accuracy, so long as there are states with  $k < 0$  occupied.

As a second example, we consider a system with a ‘dirty’ source (a source with backscattering). The LB formalism involves only Fermi surface properties [6,7]. As a consequence [23], even in the presence of such ‘dirty contacts’, in the LB approach all Hall conductances are quantized and all longitudinal conductances are zero provided that no two dirty contacts are adjacent to one another. This in fact can only be true in the linear response regime. At finite current  $I$ , the net current at each terminal involves an integral over transmission probabilities, and resistances need then not be quantized. Consider as a simple example the four-terminal resistances in a system with a dirty source in the presence of a magnetic field, with only the lowest subband occupied. We find that only at very small currents do the resistances attain their ideal values (this is illustrated in Fig. 1). Even the LB approach, if applied naively beyond linear response, gives deviations in some resistances. To inject a given current despite back-reflection at the source requires  $\mu_s$  to be greater than its value in the ideal case. Then resistances between the source and the other terminals differ from the ideal values. Resistances not involving the source are still ideal (quantized or zero) in the LB formalism. In our approach, even the latter are non-ideal at finite currents (see Fig. 1) because the occupancies of electrons injected at terminal  $m$  depend on the transmission from all other terminals into  $m$  [Eq. (2)].

In the MEA observables enter the formalism as constraints. Consequently, we have included the presence of a current  $I$ , driven by a current source, as a constraint on the net current. The ability of this to describe the IQHE at large currents is not trivial and argues, we believe, for its validity. We note that the LB formalism can also be obtained from the MEA if the current source is assumed to constrain the particle number  $N_m$  injected at each terminal, rather than the current. These constraints are imposed by Lagrangian multipliers  $\mu_m$ , and the occupancies which result are precisely the LB distributions  $f_{m,nk}^{LB}$ . At low



currents the use of local chemical potentials can be justified using linear response theory, viewing the potential difference (or the associated electric field) as driving the current. This cannot be extended to high currents. Notice that in the MEA the driving force need not be represented by an operator in the Hamiltonian. Instead, the result of the driving (here, the current) enters as a constraint. In the MEA the LB distribution would arise if a current source could be thought of as an entity that controls particle number instead of current. One might suppose that this models a voltage source instead of a current source. If so, then the I-V curve at large currents and voltages would depend on whether voltage or (as is usual) current is applied [19]. (In the linear regime, both approaches give the same result.) This is possible in principle, since voltage differences correspond to work, which is not a thermodynamic state function. As we now show, this appears not to be the case, and distributions of the form Eq. (2) should in fact be expected in a steady-state dissipationless system. Consider an arbitrarily long ideal device in which electrons flow in their steady-state distributions with a net current. In the device the Hamiltonian (including electron-electron-electron interactions and electron-phonon interactions) is translationally invariant (neglecting Umklapp processes) and preserves the distributions. In the frame of reference moving with velocity  $v$  such that the net current vanishes, the electrons are then in equilibrium at some chemical potential  $\mu^0$ . Hence the occupancy of a state with energy  $\epsilon_{nk}^0$  is in this frame given by  $f(\epsilon_{nk}^0 - \mu^0)$ . By a Galilean transformation,  $\epsilon_{nk}^0 = \epsilon_{nk} + \hbar k v = \epsilon_{nk} + \epsilon_{nk}^v$ , where proportionality constants have been absorbed in  $\epsilon_{nk}^v$ , and differs from  $\mu^0$  by a constant. Since the occupancy of a state is the same in each frame, the distributions in the stationary frame are thus  $f(\epsilon_{nk} - \epsilon_{nk}^v)$ .

The distributions Eq. (2) lead to other observable phenomena. For example, they lead to dissipationless deviations in quantization in the IQHE when states in different subbands are mixed by short-range elastic scatterers [24]. This might explain recent observations in high-quality Si samples [25]. We have also used our formalism to explain the I-V characteristics of quantum point contacts [16] and the lack of current saturation at high voltages [26]. The approach we have presented includes nonlinear effects due to the current-dependent

electron distributions. At higher currents, other nonlinearities arise from distortions of the electron wavefunctions by the resulting electric field. This field is due to electron-electron interactions, which can easily be included in our approach at the Hartree level. In preliminary numerical calculations this causes no qualitative change in the picture.

This work was supported in part by the UCF Division of Sponsored Research.

## REFERENCES

E-mail address: ogh@physics.ucf.edu.

- [1] E.T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. 106, 620 (1957); Phys. Rev. 108, 171 (1957). For recent treatments, see, for example, W.T. Gandy, Jr., Foundations of Statistical Mechanics (Reidel, Dordrecht, Holland, 1988), Vols. 1 and 2, and H.S. Robertson, Statistical Thermophysics (P.T.R. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1993).
- [2] S. Hershfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 2134 (1993).
- [3] For example, the GaAs heterojunction used to maintain the resistance standard at NIST shows quantization to better than one part per billion at the  $\nu = 4$  plateau for  $eV_H > 16h/e$ .
- [4] The magnetic field strongly suppresses inelastic scattering in IQHE systems (see, for example, J.J. Palacios and C. Tejedor, Phys. Rev. B 44, 8157 (1991)). Such systems are therefore mesoscopic even though they are 'large'.
- [5] R. Landauer, Phils. Mag 21, 863 (1970); M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 1761 (1986); Phys. Rev. B 38, 9375 (1988).
- [6] A.D. Stone and A. Szafer, IBM J. Res. Develop. 32, 384 (1988).
- [7] H.J. Baranger and A.D. Stone, Phys. Rev. B 40, 8169 (1989).
- [8] There have been attempts by van Son and Klapwijk to qualitatively extend the Landauer-Buttiker formalism to the IQHE at large currents (P.C. van Son and T.M. Klapwijk, Europhys. Lett. 12, 429 (1990)). However, this appears unable to quantitatively explain the quantization of the Hall resistance at large currents.
- [9] L.P. Kadano and G. Baym, Quantum Statistical Mechanics (Benjamin, New York, 1962).
- [10] L.V. Keldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 47, 1515 (1964) [Sov. Phys. JETP 20, 1018 (1965)].

- [11] D.K. Ferry and C. Jacoboni, ed., Quantum Transport in Semiconductors (Plenum, New York, 1992).
- [12] M.J. McLennan, Y. Lee, and S. Datta, Phys. Rev. B 43, 13846, 1991.
- [13] We use the convention that current into the device is positive.
- [14] F. Sols, Ann. Phys. (NY) 214, 386 (1992).
- [15] We neglect electron spins for simplicity.
- [16] H. van Houten, C.W.J. Beenakker and B.J. van Wees in Ref. [17].
- [17] M. Reed, ed., Nanostructured Systems, (Vol. 35 of Semiconductors and Semimetals) (Academic Press, NY 1992).
- [18]  $\hat{I}_m$  can be defined in terms of an integral over matrix elements of the current density operator at terminal  $m$ , averaged over the lead (see Ref. [19]). The current operator so defined commutes with  $\hat{H}$ .
- [19] T.K. Ng, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 1018 (1992).
- [20] More general circumstances under which thermodynamic potentials can be defined out of equilibrium have been considered by R.J. Tykodi, Thermodynamics of Steady State (MacMillan, New York, 1967).
- [21] O. Heinonen and P.L. Taylor, Phys. Rev. B 28, 6119 (1982); Phys. Rev. B 32, 633 (1985).
- [22] M. Cage et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 1374 (1983).
- [23] M. Buttiker in Ref. [17], p. 255.
- [24] O. Heinonen and M.D. Johnson (submitted to Phys. Rev. B); O. Heinonen, Phys. Rev. B 46, 1901 (1992).
- [25] K. Yoshihiro, C.T. van Degriff, M.E. Cage and D. Yu, Phys. Rev. B 45, 14 204 (1992).

[26] M. D. Johnson and O. Heinonen (unpublished).

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. The resistance  $R_{sd;ld}$  measured between terminal 1 and the drain when current flows from source to drain in a four-terminal IQHE system with a dirty source. The device is a cross, with terminals 1 and 2 on opposite sides of the current flow. In an ideal system, this resistance is  $h/e^2$  at zero temperature. The curves are at temperatures  $T = 0.0025, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05$ , and  $0.1$  in units of  $h/e^2 k_B$ . The zero-current Fermi energy is  $1.32 h/e^2$ . Insert: The reflection probability  $r$  at the source for the lowest subband.