

# Topologically induced vortex magnetance of a quantum device

P. Exner, P. Šeba and A.F. Sadreev<sup>†</sup>,

*Nuclear Physics Institute, Academy of Sciences, 250 68 Řež near Prague*

*and*

*Doppler Institute, Czech Technical University, Břehová 7, 115 19 Prague, Czech Republic*

P. Středa and P. Feher

*Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences, Cukrovarnická 10, 162 00 Prague, Czech Republic*

(February 1, 2008)

## Abstract

We consider resonant vortices around nodal points of the wavefunction in electron transport through a mesoscopic device. With a suitable choice of the device geometry, the dominating role is played by single vortices of a preferred orientation. To characterize strength of the resulting magnetic moment we have introduced a magnetance, the quantity defined in analogy with the device conductance. Its basic properties and possible experimental detection are discussed.

PACS: 73.20.Dx, 73.50.Yg, 47.32.-y

The topological structure of quantum mechanical wavefunctions is responsible for many observable phenomena. One of its prominent consequences is existence of vortices. They have already been observed in macroscopic quantum systems, rotating superfluid helium and superconductors. In general, their existence is connected with the time reversal symmetry breaking. The first example of the such topological effect was already given in the very early days of the quantum theory. It concerns the probability current density of a single electron defined conventionally by

$$\vec{j}(\vec{r}) = (\hbar/m^*) \text{Im} \left( \bar{\psi}(\vec{r}) \vec{\nabla} \psi(\vec{r}) \right) \quad (1)$$

which may be nontrivial once the wavefunction  $\psi$  is complex. In systems with open geometry a nonzero probability current refers to an electron transport through the system, i. e. from the source to a drain. Dirac<sup>1</sup> pointed out that the quantum probability current may exhibit a vortex structure around nodal points (zeros) of the corresponding wavefunction. The effect was later discussed by Hirschfelder<sup>2</sup>. Recently it has been demonstrated numerically that the current in topologically nontrivial devices exhibits pronounced vortices the form and magnitude of which changes quickly with the energy<sup>3-7</sup> and applied magnetic field<sup>8</sup>. The experimental evidence of their existence is of the particular interest.

The direct consequence of a vortex is a non-zero magnetic moment, which has to depend on the applied current in a similar way as the device conductance. The natural physical quantity representing a vortex structure strength is thus the device magnetance given by the ratio of the magnetic moment and applied voltage drop. To analyse the effect of vortices to the electron transport and magnetance we will limit our consideration to devices with two-dimensional gas of spinless electrons. Main attention will be paid to the simple device formed by a piece of the one-dimensional wire with tangentially attached circular cavity (a quantum dot) as sketched in Fig. 1. It may be expected that there appears a dominating circulating current in analogy with the classical gas flow. This structure is thus the natural candidate for an experimental attempt to observe electron vortices.

The vortices are closely related with the topological structure of the phase. To be more

explicit, let us write the wavefunction as

$$\psi = \sqrt{\rho} e^{iS}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\rho$  is the probability density of the particle and  $S$  is the corresponding phase. The latter is defined modulo  $2\pi$  and assumes conventionally values in the interval  $[0, 2\pi)$ . In the two-dimensional case it is possible to identify the configuration space with a region in the complex plane and to treat a possible multivaluedness of  $S$  in terms of its analytical structure, especially cuts and branching points corresponding to different Riemannian sheets of this function.

Existence of a branching point on the phase Riemannian surface implies appearance of a vortex in the corresponding quantum probability flow<sup>2</sup>. Inserting (2) into (1) we get

$$\vec{j}(\vec{r}) = \frac{\hbar}{m^*} \rho(\vec{r}) \vec{\nabla} S(\vec{r}). \quad (3)$$

The vector  $\vec{v} = (\hbar/m^*) \vec{\nabla} S$  can be regarded as a velocity of the corresponding probability flow. For a closed curve  $\Gamma$  the vorticity of  $\vec{v}$  along  $\Gamma$  is thus

$$\oint_{\Gamma} \vec{v} \cdot d\vec{l} = \frac{\hbar}{m^*} \delta S = 2\pi \frac{\hbar}{m^*} m; \quad m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \quad (4)$$

where  $\delta S$  is the phase change when winding once around the curve. Since the wave function (2) must be single-valued, the difference  $\delta S$  can only equal to a multiple of  $2\pi$ . If the phase  $S$  has no singularities inside  $\Gamma$ , the contour can be shrunk into a point in which case the vorticity is zero. If, on the other hand,  $\Gamma$  encircles a nodal point of  $\psi$ , the phase is ambiguous at this point and the integer  $m$  may be nonzero. In this situation the corresponding probability current exhibits a vortex centered at the nodal point.

In quantum devices three basic topological situations can occur (see Fig. 1) :

(a) A phase cut starts and ends at the boundary of the system. This is typical for integrable systems. As a simple example, consider the transport through a straight quantum waveguide of the width  $w$  parallel to the  $x$ -axis. If the incident wave is in the  $n$ -th transverse mode, the wavefunction has the form

$$\psi_{k,n}(x, y) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi w}} e^{ikx} \sin \frac{\pi n y}{w} \quad , \quad (5)$$

where  $n$  is the mode number and  $\hbar^2(k^2 + \pi^2 n^2/w^2)/2m^*$  is the particle energy. In this case the phase  $S = kx$  is monotonically increasing in the longitudinal direction and its cuts are located at the segments  $x = 2\pi j/k$ ,  $j = \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots$ , parallel to the  $x$ -axis. Their endpoints lie at the boundary,  $y = 0, w$ . They are physically irrelevant being not branching points.

(b) The cut starts at the boundary and ends at some nodal point inside the system. The internal endpoint is a branching point which is related to a single vortex.

(c) The cut connects two nodal points of the wavefunction. Both endpoints are branching points which corresponds to a pair of vortices rotating in opposite directions.

To define the vortex magnetance we will follow the scattering approach<sup>9</sup>, generally accepted in the transport theory of quantum devices. To establish conductance of a two terminal device, infinitely long ideal leads are placed between the device (scattering region) and electron reservoirs (source and drain) allowing an explicit asymptotic form of scattering wave functions. The obtained transmission coefficient  $T(E)$  is used to relate the applied current  $\mathcal{J}$  and the chemical potential difference between reservoirs,  $\Delta\mu$ . In the limiting case of vanishing  $\Delta\mu$  and at zero temperature the electron transport is determined by properties of electrons at the Fermi energy  $E_F$  and we have

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{e}{h} T(E_F) \Delta\mu \quad . \quad (6)$$

The applied current is responsible for a non-zero momentum of the system. It can be divided into two parts: momentum of the center-of-mass and the momentum due to electron motion relative to the center-of-mass. The later one originates in circulating currents giving rise to a magnetic moment  $\vec{M} \equiv (0, 0, M)$  representing their strength. Momentum of the center-of-mass is controlled by the current density within the ideal leads only. Note that in the considered limit of infinitely long ideal leads the mass center momentum cannot be affected by a device of finite dimensions.

In the simplest case of one-dimensional ideal leads having a common axis the momentum of the center-of-mass can easily be evaluated. It is controlled by the product  $T(E_F)\vec{j}_0(\vec{r})$  with  $\vec{j}_0(\vec{r})$  being the current density within the system without the scattering region (the device is replaced by the lead). In this case we get the vortex magnetance in the following form:

$$\frac{\vec{M}(E_F)}{\Delta\mu} = \frac{eg(E_F)}{2c} \int (\vec{j}(\vec{r}) - T(E_F)\vec{j}_0(\vec{r})) \times \vec{r} d^2r, \quad (7)$$

where  $g(E)$  denotes the density of device states. The magnetance defined by this way characterizes the vortex structure of the studied device and it is invariant with respect to coordinate system translations.

The expression, Eq.(7), is applicable to the device sketched in Fig. 1. To stress the effect of the device geometry the flat potential is assumed within the device area demarcated by hard walls. The relevant wave functions are thus eigenfunctions of the Schrödinger equation for free electrons with zero values at the boundaries of the device and ideal leads.

To estimate the magnetance of the considered device, let us first summarize wavefunction properties of the separated circular cavity. In polar coordinates eigenfunctions are determined by zeros of Bessel functions  $J_m$  at the cavity radius  $R$  and we have

$$\psi_{l,m}^{\pm}(r, \theta) = c_{l,m} J_m(k_{l,m}r) e^{\pm im\theta} , \quad (8)$$

where  $k_{l,m} = x_{l,m}/R$  with  $x_{l,m}$  being the  $l$ -th zero of the Bessel function  $J_m$ , and  $c_{l,m}$  is the normalization factor. The quantum number  $m$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) represents the angular momentum  $\pm(\hbar/m^*)m$  which is closely related to the vorticity defined by Eq.(4). The eigenstates of spinless electrons are two-fold degenerated with respect of the sign of the momentum.

Only the azimuthal component of the probability current density for given eigenenergy  $E_{l,m}$  might be nonzero and it is given as follows

$$j_{\theta}(r) = A_{l,m} \frac{\hbar}{m^*} \frac{m}{r} c_{l,m}^2 J_m^2(k_{l,m}r) , \quad (9)$$

where  $A_{l,m}$  is given by the difference of weight factors,  $A_{l,m} = |a_{l,m}^{(+)}|^2 - |a_{l,m}^{(-)}|^2$ , representing amplitudes  $a_{l,m}^{(+)}$  and  $a_{l,m}^{(-)}$  of eigenfunctions with positive and negative values of the orbital momentum, respectively. In the equilibrium case the problem has time reversal symmetry requiring equality of weight factors and the total momentum vanishes.

Attaching a wire the wavefunctions  $\psi(r, \theta)$  given by Eq.(8) become modified by a coupling with plane waves. Assuming a small window between wire and cavity, much less than  $R$ , wave functions  $\psi(r, \theta)$  will only be slightly modified. The main effect will be a level broadening represented by the spectral density  $g_{l,m}(E)$  with sharp maxima at energies  $E \cong E_{l,m}$ . Wave functions representing states with the same direction of the probability flow in the window region will be much easily matched together than those with opposite flow directions. In the current carrying regime the amplitude of cavity wave functions matched with incident plane wave will be thus enhanced giving rise to circulating currents. Corresponding magnetance may be estimated by choosing a proper value of the  $A_{l,m}(E)$  entering Eq.(9). Inserting the current density  $j_\theta(r)$ , Eq.(9), into expression for the magnetance, Eq.(7), we get

$$\frac{M(E_F)}{\Delta\mu} \cong \mu_B^* \sum_{l,m} A_{l,m}(E_F) m g_{l,m}(E_F) \quad , \quad (10)$$

where  $\mu_B^* = e\hbar/2m^*c$  is the effective Bohr magneton. Due to the dominating role of the spectral density  $g_{l,m}(E)$  a resonance character of the magnetance is expected. Since  $g_{l,m}(E)$  is proportional to  $m^*$  the magnetance is of the purely topological origin.

As an example, the energy dependence of the magnetance and the transmission coefficient close to the resonance for  $l = 1$  and  $m = 3$  is shown in Fig. 2. Corresponding current density distribution for  $E_F$  indicated by arrow is presented in Fig. 1. Four phase-cut endpoints represent vortex centers. Three of them are located close to the cavity center giving rise to pronounced circulating current. For fixed window region the broadening of cavity levels becomes weaker for larger radius  $R$  giving rise to more pronounced resonances as seen in Fig. 3a. For  $R > 1.8w$  more complicated resonance structure appears due to states with different quantum numbers  $l$ .

For a quite well separated resonance the magnetance peak height may be estimated by equality of the current originated in the cavity eigenfunction, Eq.(8), and that of the single wire, Eq.(5), in the common region, i.e. in the area of overlapping circular and strip regions. This condition gives:

$$A_{l,m}(E_r) \frac{\hbar g(E_r)}{m^*} m \int_{R-d}^R c_{l,m}^2 J_m^2(k_{l,m} r) \frac{dr}{r} \cong \frac{1}{h} \frac{1}{\pi w} \int_{w-d}^w \sin^2 \frac{\pi y}{w} dy \quad , \quad (11)$$

where  $d$  is the width of the common region,  $d = w + R - y_0$  with  $y_0$  being the distance of the cavity center from the bottom wire edge. This estimation is in good agreement with the values obtained by direct evaluation of the Eq.(7), as shown in Fig. 3a.

The above amplitude estimation, Eq.(11), assumes an *ideal* coupling allowing an easy transfer of the incident wave with transmission coefficient  $T$  approaching unity. Out of the *ideal* coupling a reflection will take place and  $T$  will decrease. However, far enough from the resonance the mixing of plane waves with eigenfunction of the separated cavity becomes less effective and transmission will be enhanced. This typical energy dependence is shown in Fig. 2b.

At finite temperatures the magnetance is given by the following expression

$$\frac{M(\mu, T)}{\Delta\mu} = - \frac{1}{\Delta\mu} \int \frac{\partial f_0(E)}{\partial \mu} M(E) dE \quad , \quad (12)$$

where  $f_0(E)$  denotes the Fermi–Dirac distribution function and  $M(E)$  is the zero temperature magnetic moment given by Eq.(7). The resulting magnetance at a non-zero temperature is shown in Fig. 3b. For high enough temperatures resonances will fully be smeared out and the magnetance should approach values obtained by a semiclassical treatment. Since the averaged density of states  $g$  scales with the cavity area  $\langle g \rangle \cong (m^*/h\hbar) E_F \pi R^2$  and  $m \sim R/w$ , the approximate scaling of the magnetance with  $R^3$  is expected.

The semiclassical description of the studied ballistic transport can be based on the billiard model<sup>10</sup>. Electrons are injected uniformly over the wire width  $w$  and with the probability  $\frac{1}{2} \cos \phi$  along the direction represented by the angle  $\phi$  with respect of the wire axis. As

expected, the resulting magnetance, shown in Fig. 3b, approaches mean values obtained by full quantum–mechanical treatment.

The same qualitative features of the magnetance are expected for any cavity defined by a potential of the circular symmetry. We have found that resonances are very stable with respect of the radius modulation ( $\Delta R(\theta)/\langle R \rangle < 0.1$ ) and potential fluctuations less than the energy level separation of the unperturbed cavity. Interaction between electrons, which was not taken into account, should not change the magnetance structure qualitatively. However, we expect enhanced magnetance due to the electron-electron friction.

Impurity potentials within wire area have destructive effect to the magnetance. They suppress the transmission coefficient and consequently the current flow along window between wire and cavity, which is responsible for the magnetance peak height as discussed above, Eq.(11). They also give rise to additional vortices of the uncontrollable orientation within the wire region. The resulting richer magnetance structure can be much easily smeared out by the temperature. This destructive effects will be even more effective for wider, multimode, wires.

In real systems the probability to have impurities within wire region might be lowered by the shortening of the wire length. Similar device, but with centrally attached wires represented by point contacts, have already been realized<sup>11</sup>. The proper design could also allow to control cavity area by top gates. To observe resonances the energy level separation of the isolated cavity has to be larger than the thermal energy  $k_B T$ . For the device fabricated from a GaAs-AlGaAs heterostructure it limits the cavity radius,  $R[\mu\text{m}] < 0.2/\sqrt{T[\text{K}]}$ . For example, assuming  $R \sim 0.5\mu\text{m}$  resonances could be indicated by a fluxmeter allowing measurements with accuracy  $10^2 \mu_B$ , which is in principle within experimental reach<sup>12</sup>. The contribution of non-circulating currents cannot be easily excluded by experimental setup as has been done in our theoretical treatment. Under the standard conditions of the fixed applied current it will be, however, responsible for a monotonic background only.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research has been partially supported by the DTP Foundation as well as by the Grants INTAS-RFBR 95-657 and GACR 202-0218/96-98. The support obtained from the Theoretical Physics Foundation in Slemeno is also greatly acknowledged.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>†</sup> permanent address: Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences, 660036 Krasnoyarsk, Russia
- <sup>1</sup> P.A.M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A 133**, 60 (1931).
- <sup>2</sup> J.O. Hirschfelder, J. Chem. Phys. **67**, 5477 (1977).
- <sup>3</sup> K.-F. Berggren, and Zheng-Li Ji, Phys. Rev. **B 47**, 6390 (1993).
- <sup>4</sup> S. Chaudhuri, S. Badyopadhyay, and M. Cahay, Phys. Rev. **B 45**, 11126 (1992).
- <sup>5</sup> P Exner, P. Šeba, M. Tater, and D. Vaněk, J. Math. Phys. **37**, 4867 (1996).
- <sup>6</sup> V.M. Ramaglia, F. Ventriglia, and G.P. Zucchelli, Phys. Rev. **B 48**, 2445 (1993); **B 52**, 8372 (1993).
- <sup>7</sup> Hua Wu, D.W.L. Sprung, *Phys. Lett.* **A183**, 413 (1993).
- <sup>8</sup> K.N.Pichugin, and A.F.Sadreev, JETP **82**, 290 (1996).
- <sup>9</sup> D.S. Fisher, and P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. **B 23**, 6851 (1981).
- <sup>10</sup> C.W. Beenakker, and H. van Houten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1857 (1989).
- <sup>11</sup> B.J. van Wees, L.P. Kouwenhoven, C.J.P.M. Harmans, G.J. Williamson, C.E.Timmering, M.E.I. Broekaart, C.T. Foxon, and J.J. Harris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2523 (1989).
- <sup>12</sup> A.K. Geim, S.V. Dubonos, I.V. Grigorieva, J.G.S. Lok, J.C. Maan, X.Q. Li, F.M. Peeters, and Yu.V. Nazarov, *will appear in Superlattices and Microstructures* (1997).

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. The model device geometry with phase cuts (solid lines) for the energy indicated in Fig. 2 by the arrow. The window between wire and the cavity equals to  $5/4$  of the wire width  $w$  and the cavity radius  $R = 5w/3$ . Corresponding current density is illustrated by arrows.

FIG. 2. Energy dependence of the magnetance  $M/\Delta\mu$  (a) and transmission coefficient  $T$  (b) in the vicinity of the resonance for  $l = 1$  and  $m = 3$ . Device geometry is the same as that in Fig. 1 and  $E_1$  denotes the energy of the lowest transversal mode  $E_1 = (\pi^2\hbar^2)/(2m^*w^2)$ .

FIG. 3. Magnetance  $M/\Delta\mu$  at zero temperature (a) and at the temperature  $0.05 E_1/k_B$  (b) as function of the cavity radius for fixed window width  $5w/4$ . The dashed line represents estimation for resonance maxima, Eq.(11). The dashed-dotted line is the result of the semiclassical treatment.





