

Composite Fermions in Quantum Dots

J.K. Jain and T. Kawamura

Department of Physics, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, New York

11794-3800

(September 15, 2018)

Abstract

We demonstrate the formation of composite fermions in two-dimensional quantum dots under high magnetic fields. The composite fermion interpretation provides a simple way to understand several qualitative and quantitative features of the numerical results obtained earlier in exact diagonalization studies. In particular, the ground states are recognized as compactly filled quasi-Landau levels of composite fermions.

73.20.Dx, 73.20.Mf

arXiv:cond-mat/9409035v2 12 Sep 1994

Typeset using REVTeX

Composite fermions [1] provide simple insight into otherwise intriguing phenomena observed in two-dimensional electron systems (2DES) in high magnetic fields (B). The fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE) [2] is understood as the integer quantum Hall effect of composite fermions [1], and the experimental properties of the compressible state at the half-filled Landau level (LL) are explained in terms of a Fermi sea of composite fermions [3]. In earlier studies, the composite fermion (CF) theory has been tested numerically in geometries without edges, to simulate the bulk of a large 2DES, and found to work extremely well [4]. This work investigates its applicability to a two-dimensional quantum dot in high B , containing a few electrons in the presence of a confining potential. The charge density is expected to be non-uniform, the (local) filling factor is not necessarily a useful concept, and it is *a priori* not obvious that composite fermions should be formed in this system.

Two-dimensional semiconductor quantum dots containing a few electrons have recently been realized experimentally, and studied by tunneling [5], capacitance [6], and optical [7] spectroscopy. Since these measurements probe the energy levels of the many-body system of interacting electrons, there have been several theoretical studies calculating the eigen-spectrum as a function of the confining potential, the number of electrons (N), and the magnetic field (B). It has been found that the system exhibits a rather rich and complex energy spectrum [8–12]. However, no systematic way of understanding these results exists. This paper shows that the CF theory provides a simple and coherent explanation of a number of qualitative and quantitative features of the numerical results.

Following the usual practice, we consider in our numerical studies a model in which electrons, restricted to two dimensions, are confined by a parabolic potential of the form $\frac{1}{2}m^*\omega_0^2r^2$, where m^* is the effective mass of the electron. The single electron problem is essentially that of a harmonic oscillator, and can be solved exactly [13] for arbitrary B . This paper considers the limit of $B \rightarrow \infty$, so that the single particle states are labeled by a LL-index $n = 0, 1, \dots$ and an angular momentum index $l = -n, -n + 1, \dots$. The electrons are fully polarized, and occupy only the lowest LL (LLL). The Coulomb interaction conserves the total angular momentum $L = \sum_i l_i$, which will be used to label the many-body eigenstates.

In the limit $B \rightarrow \infty$ the eigenenergies of the many body system conveniently separate into an interaction part, $V(L)$, and a confinement part, $E_c(L)$: $E(L) = E_c(L) + V(L)$. The confinement energy has the simple form $E_c(L) = (\hbar/2)[\Omega - \omega_c]L$, relative to the LLL, where $\omega_c = eB/m^*c$ is the cyclotron frequency, and $\Omega^2 = \omega_c^2 + 4\omega_0^2$. The interaction energy $V(L)$ is the same as that of electrons without confinement, but at a magnetic field $\mathcal{B} = \Omega m^*c/e$. Therefore, it is sufficient to consider interacting electrons in the absence of any confining potential to determine $V(L)$. $V(L)$ will be expressed in units of $e^2/\epsilon a$ where $a = \sqrt{\hbar c/e\mathcal{B}}$ and ϵ is the dielectric constant of the background material. Figs. 1-3 shows $V(L)$ (for the lowest-energy state with a given L) as a function of L for $N = 3-6$. (The reason for the seemingly peculiar choice of the horizontal scale will become clear later.) Such curves have been obtained in a number of earlier calculations, but to our knowledge, no general intuitive way of understanding the shape of the curves, the positions of the cusps, or the structure of the states has been provided. We now investigate this problem in the context of the CF theory.

A composite fermion is obtained when an electron captures an even number ($2m$) of vortices of the wave function. Microscopically, the formation of composite fermions implies that the (unnormalized) low-energy wave functions of interacting electrons with total angular momentum L have the form:

$$\Psi_L = \mathcal{P} \prod_{j < k} (z_j - z_k)^{2m} \Phi_{L^*} \quad , \quad (1)$$

$$L = L^* + mN(N - 1) = L^* + 2mM \quad , \quad (2)$$

where Φ_{L^*} is the wave function of *non-interacting* electrons with total angular momentum L^* , $z_j = x_j - iy_j$ denotes the position of the j th electron, and \mathcal{P} projects the wave function on to the LLL of electrons, as appropriate for $B \rightarrow \infty$. The Jastrow factor binds $2m$ vortices to each electron of Φ_{L^*} to convert it into a composite fermion. We restrict L^* to the range $-M \leq L^* \leq M$, where $M = N(N - 1)/2$; the CF theory relates interacting electrons at arbitrary L to non-interacting electrons in this range with a suitable choice

of m . At $L^* = -M$, the lowest-kinetic-energy state contains one electron in the lowest angular momentum state of each of the lowest N LL's. The kinetic energy of this state is given by $K(-M) = M\hbar\omega_c$ (relative to the LLL). The lowest-energy state at $L^* = M$ contains all electrons in the LLL, with kinetic energy equal to zero. [The CF states at the corresponding $L = (2m + 1)M$ are identical to the Laughlin states [14].] The $K(L^*)$ in the entire L^* range is plotted in Figs. 1-3 (the dashed line). (The cyclotron energy has been replaced by a quasi-cyclotron energy, the value of which will be obtained later. At the moment, we only consider the shape of the curve.) Clearly, the shape of $V(L)$, shifted by $2mM$, is remarkably similar to that of $K(L^*)$ [15]. In particular, the positions of all upward and downward cusps are predicted correctly. Note that we actually need the L^* spectrum only from 0 to M ; the other half (0 to $-M$) can be obtained from a reflection symmetry of the problem: the degeneracies at L^* and $-L^*$ are same; the wave functions are related by complex conjugation; the horizontal lines of one map into tilted lines of the other and vice versa (Figs. 1-3); and a cusp at L^* implies a cusp at $-L^*$.

An important theoretical goal in the quantum dot physics is to identify the (global) ground state as a function of N , B , and the strength of the confining potential, investigated in detail in Ref. [10]. It occurs at the minimum of $E_c(L) + V(L)$, and *is in general one of those states where there is a downward cusp*. For a fixed B , as the strength of the confining potential is increased, the area occupied by the electrons will decrease, and the ground state will progressively shift to downward-cusp states with smaller and smaller L . For example, for $N = 6$, ground states were found in [10] to occur at $L = 15, 21, 25, 30, 35, 39$, and 45 (at large Zeeman energy) as the strength of the confinement potential was varied. There are downward cusps at all corresponding L^* . Similarly, for $N = 5$, ground states occur at $L = 10, 15, 20, 25$, and 30, which again correspond to downward cusps [16].

All possible ground states possess a simple microscopic structure in terms of composite fermions. To see this, let us again start by considering non-interacting electrons in the range $-M \leq L^* \leq M$ and denote the number of electrons in the n th LL by N_n ($\sum_n N_n = N$). We then define ‘‘compact states’’ as those states in which the N_n electrons

fill the innermost ($l = -n, -n + 1, \dots, -n + N_n - 1$) single-particle states of the n th LL. We denote the compact states by $[N_0, N_1, \dots, N_s]$, where s is the index of the highest occupied LL. It is easy to see that *all possible ground states are compact*. (The inverse is clearly not true.) For other states, the total angular momentum can be reduced without increasing the kinetic energy by simply shifting the angular momentum of the electrons within the same LL; i.e., there can be no downward cusp. Thus, in determining the ground states of non-interacting electrons, it is sufficient to consider only the compact states. Figs. 1 and 2 display the compact state associated with each cusp; the two extreme states are $[N]$ and $[1, 1, \dots, 1]$.

The ground states of *interacting* electrons are then compact states of *composite fermions*, denoted by $[N_0, N_1, \dots, N_s]_{CF}$. Their wave functions are obtained according to Eq. (1), i.e., by multiplying the wave functions of compact electron states by the Jastrow factor, and then projecting on to the LLL. Since the wave function of a compact electron state is a single Slater determinant, the wave functions of compact composite fermion states contain no free parameters. Several compact states were studied in Ref. [17] in a different context. Some of the ground states of the present study were included there. In particular, the five electron states at $L = 30$ ($[5, 0]_{CF}$), $L = 25$ ($[4, 1]_{CF}$), and $L = 22$ ($[3, 2]_{CF}$) were found to have overlaps of 0.988, 0.993, and 0.998, respectively, with the corresponding exact ground state. Similarly, for $N = 6$, the composite fermion states at $L = 45$ ($[6, 0]_{CF}$), $L = 39$ ($[5, 1]_{CF}$), and $L = 35$ ($[4, 2]_{CF}$) had overlaps of 0.986, 0.994, and 0.991, respectively, with the corresponding true electron states. Other compact composite fermion states should provide equally good representations of the exact ground states.

The above discussion shows that the CF theory immediately identifies the possible ground states out of a large number of available states, and their microscopic structure. Now we come to the relative strengths of various cusps. For non-interacting electrons in the range $-M \leq L^* \leq M$, the cusp size, defined by $K(L^* + 1) + K(L^* - 1) - 2K(L^*)$, is the same for all cusps, equal to the cyclotron energy. This suggests [3] that all cusps of a given type of composite fermions might be of (roughly) equal size, with the size of the cusp at L defined as $E(L+1) + E(L-1) - 2E(L) = V(L+1) + V(L-1) - 2V(L)$. We plot in Fig.4 the sizes of

all cusps of Figs. 1-3, and also of those cusps of seven and eight electron systems which we can obtain numerically. They are indeed comparable for all cusps in a given m region (for fixed N), and can be interpreted as the quasi-cyclotron energy of composite fermions. (Some cusps are anomalously weak, e.g. the cusps at $L = 12$ and 24 for $N = 4$. These, however, often do not become ground states.) The cusps of the $m = 2$ composite fermions are smaller roughly by a factor of two to three. An abrupt change in the cusp size in experiments might thus be indicative of a transition from one kind of composite fermions to another.

These results demonstrate the validity of the CF picture, in which the LL's of electrons in Φ map into *quasi*-LL's of composite fermions, and the cyclotron energy ($\hbar\omega_c$) of electrons in Φ translates into a quasi-cyclotron energy of composite fermions. The quasi-cyclotron energy of the $m = 1$ composite fermions can be determined easily by evaluating the size of the *upward* cusp at $L = M + 1$, which we denote by $\hbar\omega^{CF}$. This requires a diagonalization of only a 2×2 matrix, since the Hilbert space size at $L = M$, $M + 1$, and $M + 2$ is 1, 1, and 2, respectively. (The calculation is more complicated for the $m = 2$ composite fermions.) The cusp sizes in Fig.4 are close to $\hbar\omega^{CF}$ thus determined [18]. Once $\hbar\omega^{CF}$ is determined, it is also possible to predict, with some accuracy (which is rather good close to $\nu = 1$), which of the possible ground states is the actual ground state for a given set of parameters, and a phase diagram can be produced. We will not do that here since it has already been done for small systems. Our objective here is to demonstrate that the CF theory is valid; a CF phase diagram for bigger systems (for which exact diagonalization is not possible) can be constructed easily if needed.

We have made above the (lowest-order) approximation of considering *strictly non-interacting* composite fermions, i.e., we assumed that the Coulomb interaction is *completely* exhausted in the formation of composite fermions. The residual interaction between composite fermions needs to be considered for a more detailed understanding. As a result of this interaction, the composite fermion states, which are degenerate in the above analysis, will form a band, with the band-width related to the strength of the residual interaction. This is why the the dashed straight lines map on to somewhat curved solid lines in Figs. 1-3. Also,

when the residual interaction is comparable to the quasi-cyclotron energy, which becomes more likely for large m , the composite-fermion description will become less trustworthy, and some of the weaker cusps will be washed out.

This study resolves several previously noted but unexplained features. (i) Earlier, there was no general understanding of the positions or the origin of the cusps. While it was felt that the physics underlying these cusps was similar to that of the fractional quantum Hall effect, no explicit connection had been made (with the exception of Laughlin states [14]). The present study shows that the underlying physics of the cusps here is indeed the same; they are also a manifestation of the existence of composite fermions. (ii) It had been noted earlier [8,9] that a subset of downward cusps appears at an interval of $\Delta L = N$. They appear, for example, at $L = 3, 6, 9$ for $N = 3$ and $L = 6, 10, 14, 18$ for $N = 4$. These are explained as corresponding to the compact states $[N]_{CF}$, $[N - 1, 1]_{CF}$, $[N - 2, 1, 1]_{CF}$, ..., $[1, 1, \dots, 1]_{CF}$. (iii) In Ref. [17], it was found that while some compact states provide an accurate description of the actual ground state, some do not. For example, $[3, 3]_{CF}$ and $[4, 4]_{CF}$ have rather poor overlaps with the actual ground states at the corresponding angular momenta. This was not understood at the time, but the reason is now clear: these states are *not* non-degenerate; $[3, 3]$ is degenerate with $[4, 1, 1]$, and $[4, 4]$ is not even a (possible) ground state. (iv) The Laughlin states, $[N]_{CF}$, were first studied in the disk geometry [14]. This geometry, however, has not proven useful for other FQHE states, despite several attempts (see, e.g., [9,17]). The reason is that, with the exception of $[N]_{CF}$, no filling factors may be associated with the cusps in the thermodynamic limit; they simply occur as composite fermions are promoted one by one to higher quasi-LL's. To understand this better, consider $2/5$, which one would like to identify with $[M, M]_{CF}$. However, there is no cusp at $[M, M]$ (for $M > 3$), since states with the same (kinetic) energy can be constructed at smaller angular momenta (e.g. $[M + 1, M - 2, 1]$). This is possible since an arbitrary number of electrons can be put in the LLL. If the size of the system were restricted, so that each LL had only a *finite* degeneracy, then a downward cusp at $\nu^* = 2$ (and by implication at $\nu = 2/5$) would result. Thus, for general FQHE states, either boundary conditions with strong confinement or compact

geometries are required.

In the end, we note that the edge-wave description of Ref. [12] is applicable only to the region close to $\nu = 1$ where there are no cusps (this region grows with N). Lee and Wen have found that the (approximate) degeneracy of the low-energy states at $3M + L^*$ is equal to that of non-interacting electrons at $M + L^*$ [19]; this is also straightforwardly understandable in the CF approach.

In conclusion, this work demonstrates that the composite fermion approach provides useful insight into the results of the exact diagonalization study of quantum dots in high magnetic fields. A large number of features are explained in a simple, economical, and systematic manner. This work was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research under Grant no. N00014-93-1-0880, and by the NSF under Grant no. DMR93-18739.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199 (1989); Phys. Rev. B **41**, 7653 (1990); Adv. Phys. **41**, 105 (1992).
- [2] D.C. Tsui, H.L. Stormer, and A.C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1559 (1992).
- [3] B.I. Halperin, P.A. Lee, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 7312 (1993).
- [4] G. Dev and J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2843 (1992); X.G. Wu, G. Dev, and J.K. Jain, *ibid.* **71**, 153 (1993).
- [5] V.J. Goldman, B. Su and J.E. Cunningham in *Nanostructures and Mesoscopic Systems*, edited by W.P. Kirk and M.A. Reed (Academic, NY 1991), p. 173; B. Su, V.J. Goldman, and J.E. Cunningham, Science **255**, 313 (1992); Phys. Rev. B **46**, 9644 (1992).
- [6] R.C. Ashoori, H.L. Stormer, J.S. Weiner, L.N. Piferfer, K.W. Baldwin, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 613 (1993); Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3088 (1992).
- [7] B. Meurer, D. Heitman, and K. Ploog, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1371 (1992);
- [8] P.A. Maksym and T. Chakraborty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 108 (1990); Phys. Rev. B **45**, 1947 (1992). For recent reviews, see, T. Chakraborty, Comments Condens. Matter Phys. **16**, 35 (1992); M.A. Kastner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **64**, 849 (1992).
- [9] S.M. Girvin and T. Jach, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 5617 (1984).
- [10] S.-R. Eric Yang, A.H. MacDonald and M.D. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3194 (1993).
- [11] X.C. Xie, S. Das Sarma, and Song He, PRB **47**, 15942 (1993); B.L. Johnson and G. Kirczenow, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 10563 (1993); P. Hawrylak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3347 (1993).
- [12] M. Stone, H.W. Wyld, and R.L. Schultz, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 14156 (1992).
- [13] V. Fock, Z. Phys. **47**, 446 (1928); C.G. Darwin, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **27**, 86

- (1930); G.W. Bryant, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1140 (1987).
- [14] R.B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).
- [15] Similar feature had been noted by B. Rejaei [Phys. Rev. B**48**, 18016 (1993)] for electrons interacting with a model hard-core interaction.
- [16] Not all downward cusp states become ground states. For example, the states at $L = 27$ and 33 for six electrons, which correspond to $L^* = -3$ and 3, do not become ground states [10]. In this case, the CF theory provides an interesting explanation. Consider $L^* = -3$. The energy of this state (in the dashed curve) lies above the straight lines joining the two downward cusps on either side, i.e., it would never become the ground state. Same is true for $L^* = 3$. This explanation, however, does not always work.
- [17] G. Dev and J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 1223 (1992).
- [18] The size of the upward cusp at $L = M + 1$ ($\hbar\omega^{CF}$) is given by 0.1486, 0.1348, 0.1240, 0.1153, 0.1081, 0.1020 (in units of $e^2/\epsilon a$) for $N = 3$ to 8, respectively.
- [19] D.H. Lee and X.G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1765 (1991).

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. This figure shows the exact interaction energy of the lowest energy state as a function of the total angular momentum L for $N = 3$ interacting electrons (solid lines). The dashed line marked by $m = 0$ shows the kinetic energy $K(L^*)$ of non-interacting electrons with $L^* = L$. The filled circles on the dashed line indicate the downward-cusp states. The dashed curve has been vertically shifted for clarity.

Fig. 2. Same as in Fig. 1 for $N = 4$.

Fig. 3. Same as in Fig. 1 for $N = 5$ and 6.

Fig. 4. This figure shows the cusp sizes (defined in the text) measured in units of the size of the first upward cusp (at $L = M + 1$) of the $m = 1$ composite fermion [18]. The filled symbols refer to the cusps of the $m = 2$ composite fermions.