



Non-invasive charge detection in surface-acoustic-wave-defined dynamic quantum dots

M. R. Astley, M. Kataoka, C. J. B. Ford, C. H. W. Barnes, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, I. Farrer, D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper

Citation: Applied Physics Letters **109**, 183501 (2016); doi: 10.1063/1.4966667 View online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4966667 View Table of Contents: http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/apl/109/18?ver=pdfcov Published by the AIP Publishing

Articles you may be interested in

Direct observation of dynamic surface acoustic wave controlled carrier injection into single quantum posts using phase-resolved optical spectroscopy Appl. Phys. Lett. **98**, 023109 (2011); 10.1063/1.3541881

Single electron pumping through a quantum dot-embedded carbon nanotube using surface acoustic wave Appl. Phys. Lett. **97**, 262110 (2010); 10.1063/1.3532852

Electrical detection of ambipolar acoustic carrier transport by surface acoustic waves J. Appl. Phys. **106**, 053708 (2009); 10.1063/1.3211861

Electron spin dynamics during transport using moving quantum dots AIP Conf. Proc. **893**, 1351 (2007); 10.1063/1.2730404

Dimensionality Control in GaAs Quantum Wells Dynamically-Modulated by Surface Acoustic Waves AIP Conf. Proc. **893**, 527 (2007); 10.1063/1.2729998



euse of AIP Publishing content is subject to the terms at: https://publishing.aip.org/authors/rights-and-permissions. Download to IP: 128.41.61.63 On: Thu, 24 Nov 2016



Non-invasive charge detection in surface-acoustic-wave-defined dynamic quantum dots

M. R. Astley,^{a)} M. Kataoka,^{b)} C. J. B. Ford, C. H. W. Barnes, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, I. Farrer,^{c)} D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper^{d)}

Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, J. J. Thomson Ave., Cambridge CB3 0HE, United Kingdom

(Received 28 June 2016; accepted 19 October 2016; published online 31 October 2016)

Using a non-invasive charge detection method, we detect a flow of electrons trapped in dynamic quantum dots. The dynamic quantum dots are defined by surface acoustic waves (SAWs) and move through a long depleted one-dimensional channel. A one-dimensional constriction is placed next to the SAW channel but in a separate circuit; the current induced by the SAWs through this detector constriction is sensitive to the number of electrons trapped in the SAW minima. We observe steps in the detector acoustoelectric current as the number of electrons carried by SAWs are varied as 1,2,3....*Published by AIP Publishing*. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4966667]

Surface acoustic waves (SAWs) can produce a quantised acoustoelectric current through an empty one-dimensional channel.¹ Electrons are carried through the SAW channel in dynamic quantum dots; on the acousto-electric current plateau, each dynamic quantum dot contains an integer number of electrons.² The fundamental properties of electrons confined to dynamic quantum dots in complex surface acoustic wave circuits have been the object of recent experimental^{3,4} and theoretical⁵ studies. Also, it has been proposed that the spins of single electrons in dynamic quantum dots could be used as qubits for a quantum computer.⁶ However, far fewer experimental techniques have been developed for probing the characteristics of dynamic quantum dots, as compared to static dots.^{7,8} For static quantum dots, one of the most powerful techniques is non-invasive charge detection:⁹ the conduction through a quantum point contact alongside the quantum dot is affected by the charge of electrons in the dot, and this effect has been widely used to probe the fundamental quantum properties of confined electrons.^{10–15}

Here, we report a non-invasive charge detection measurement in SAW dynamic quantum dots. In our device, a detector constriction, which is sensitive to the local electric potential, is created next to a SAW channel. The potential landscape at the detector is partially determined by the electrons within dynamic quantum dots in the SAW channel. Therefore, the current through the detector constriction senses the charge in the dynamic quantum dots. We describe this technique as *non-invasive* as the occupation state of the dot can be determined without requiring any direct measurement of the electron charge or current from the dynamic quantum dot itself.

The device [shown in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b)] was made using a GaAs/AlGaAs heterostructure, which contained a two-dimensional electron gas (2DEG) 97 nm below the surface. The 2DEG had a mobility of $160 \text{ m}^2/\text{Vs}$ and a carrier density of $1.8 \times 10^{15} \,\text{m}^{-2}$, measured at $1.5 \,\text{K}$ in the dark. SAWs were generated by applying a resonant microwave signal from an Agilent 8648D signal generator to a transducer, made of 70 pairs of interdigitated fingers with a period of 1 μ m. The microwave signal was pulse-modulated using a Tektronix PG5110 pulse generator with a duty ratio of $10 \,\mu s$: 500 μ s to prevent heating of the sample by the SAW.¹⁶ The SAWs travelled across the surface of the chip to the NiCr/Au surface gates, shown in Fig. 1(b), that were situated 2.5 mm from the transducer. When a negative voltage was applied to the surface gates, the 2DEG below the gates was depleted, creating the SAW and detector channels. +0.3 V was applied to the surface gates during cool-down to minimise the random switching noise.¹⁷

The device operation is shown in Fig. 1(c): the SAW carries electrons into the normally empty SAW channel in dynamic quantum dots. The occupation of each dynamic quantum dot is controlled by the injector gate (G_{Ini})—as the voltage applied to the injector gate $(V_{injector})$ is swept; the acoustoelectric current through the SAW channel (I_{SAW}) takes on the quantised values of $I_{SAW} = nef$, where *n* is the integer occupation number of electrons in each dynamic quantum dot, e is the electron charge, and f is the frequency of the SAW (typically $\sim 2.7 \text{ GHz}$).¹ The electrons are carried along the channel to the central barrier region by the dynamic quantum dots (the SAW channel gate voltages G_{C1}-G_{C6} have been carefully tuned to avoid any abrupt changes in the gradient of the electric potential, which could otherwise lead to electrons escaping from the dynamic quantum dots¹⁸). A sufficiently negative bias is applied to the barrier gate (G_B) so that no electrons can escape across the barrier between the channels.³ However, the charge of the electrons in the SAW channel will couple capacitively to the detector channel constriction. Therefore, the detector channel current can be used to monitor the occupation of the dynamic quantum dots in the top channel.

Note that the current through a SAW channel is determined by the potential gradient at the channel entrance;¹⁸

^{a)}Present address: Cambridge Smart Diagnostics, 8 Shipp's Field, Waterbeach, Cambridge CB25 9HP, United Kingdom. Electronic mail: michael.astley@outlook.com.

^{b)}Present address: National Physical Laboratory, Hampton Rd., Teddington, Middlesex TW11 0LW, United Kingdom.

^{c)}Present address: Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, University of Sheffield, Mappin St., Sheffield S1 3JD, United Kingdom.

^{d)}Present address: Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, University College London, Torrington Place, London WC1E 7JE, United Kingdom.



FIG. 1. (a) Schematic of the device. (b) The scanning electron microscope image of the device surface gates. The gates are labeled as follows: detector channel gates (G_{D1} and G_{D2}), barrier gate (G_B), injector gate (G_{Inj}), and SAW channel Gates (G_{C1} – G_{C6}). Dark shaded gates were not used in this experiment, and were held at a voltage of +0.3 V (i.e., undefined). (c) Device operation: the electron occupation of a dynamic quantum dot is measured by observing the current flowing through the detector constriction.

current conservation requires that beyond this point, small changes to the potential landscape will not affect the SAW channel current. In our device, the SAW channel entrance is adjacent to the gate G_{Inj} , around 8 μ m from the detector constriction; too far for the detector constriction to affect the SAW channel current. Whereas, the channel entrance of the detector constriction is immediately adjacent to the SAW channel, this is highly sensitive to sense the charge in the dynamic quantum dots.

Figure 2 shows the effect of sweeping the injector gate. The SAW channel current (solid line) shows the plateaux at multiples of 8.7 pA, which is $I_{SAW} = nef$ reduced by the 1 : 50 pulse ratio;¹⁹ the locations of plateaux are also shown by the minima in the differential of the SAW current. I_{det} , the crosstalk-induced current in detector channel (see below), can be seen to clearly follow the features in I_{SAW} , despite the fact that the gate being swept is ~8 μ m away from the



FIG. 2. (a) Current produced in the SAW channel (dotted line) and detector constriction (solid line) as a function of the injector gate voltage. (b) Differential of the SAW channel (dotted line) and detector constriction (solid line) currents.

detector circuit and would therefore be expected to have a negligible direct coupling to the detector current. However, I_{det} is sensitive to changes in the local potential landscape. The electrons, which make up the acousto-electric current, are carried through the channel in dynamic quantum dots, and so they are out of equilibrium with the reservoir 2DEGs. This excess charge in the dynamic quantum dots will increase the local electric potential; thus as the current carried in the dynamic quantum dots increases, the detector constriction becomes more closed and the magnitude of the detector current decreases.

Note that the current through the detector circuit is negative. This is because the channel is sufficiently open for the current to be dominated by crosstalk (current generated by the interaction between the free-space electromagnetic wave and the SAW²⁰ rather than being a true acoustoelectric charge-pump current-it is experimentally known that crosstalk current can be positive or negative depending on various conditions (frequency, SAW amplitude, gate geometry)^{19,21} for reasons that are not fully understood. The crosstalk current is more sensitive to changes in the local potential landscape than an acoustoelectric charge-pump current, and also has the advantage that it is approximately linear over tens of picoamp variation and so gives a uniform sensitivity, whereas if a charge-pump current was used in the detector circuit then the current plateau would lead to a non-linear sensitivity.

Figure 3(a) shows the differential of the top channel current as a function of the injector gate voltage and the power applied to the transducer. The acoustoelectric current plateaux are clearly visible as the dark bands in the plot. Figure 3(b) shows the equivalent data for the detector channel the features in the top channel current are reproduced in the detector constriction current (the voltage applied to the



FIG. 3. The differentials of the currents in the SAW and detector channels with respect to the injector gate voltage: (a) SAW channel and (b) detector constriction, where the SAW current is transported through the SAW channel in dynamic quantum dots; (c) SAW channel, and (d) detector constriction, where the SAW channel gate voltages have been backed off to allow an open one-dimensional channel of electrons to form in the SAW channel.

detector gate (G_{D1}) is adjusted to reset the detector constriction current to -10 pA at the start of each sweep, because the detector channel current is strongly sensitive to the transducer power).

To demonstrate that it is the confined non-equilibrium charge in the dynamic quantum dots rather than the mere presence of electric current that controls the detector channel current, the voltages applied to the SAW channel gates G_{C2} - G_{C6} were backed off so that the channel was populated by an electron Fermi sea in the region defined by G_{C2} - G_{C6} . In this regime, the electrons are pumped over the constriction at the injector gate and the current flows through the open 1D channel, but the SAW will be screened by the free electrons in the channel so that electrons are not confined to dynamic quantum dots as they pass the detector, and there is no net increase in the charge close to the detector constriction. The differentials of the SAW channel and detector constriction are shown in Figs. 3(c) and 3(d).

The SAW channel behaves in a similar way to that as in Figs. 3(a) and 3(b), but the detector current does not record any features, as there is no non-equilibrium charge confined in dynamic quantum dots to change the channel current. This demonstrates that it is the non-equilibrium charge confined to dynamic quantum dots, which creates an effect in the detector current, and not merely the fact that a current is flowing through the SAW channel.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that a detector circuit may be used to observe the occupation of a SAWdefined dynamic quantum dot. The measurement is carried out non-invasively by using the effect of the change in the local electric potential caused by the non-equilibrium charge contained in the dynamic quantum dot. This technique is expected to be widely used as increasingly complex SAW devices are developed,^{22,23} as non-invasive charge detection will be necessary both to test each component of a multiplestage SAW circuit and to probe fundamental quantum effects in SAW devices (for example, as a "which path" detector²⁴ in a SAW quantum interferometer⁵).

This work was funded by the UK EPSRC. M.R.A. and I.F. thank Toshiba for funding.

- ¹J. M. Shilton, V. I. Talyanskii, M. Pepper, D. A. Ritchie, J. E. F. Frost, C. J. B. Ford, C. G. Smith, and G. A. C. Jones, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **8**, L531 (1996).
- ²A. M. Robinson and V. I. Talyanskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 247202 (2005).
- ³M. R. Astley, M. Kataoka, C. J. B. Ford, C. H. W. Barnes, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, I. Farrer, D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 156802 (2007).
- ⁴M. Kataoka, M. R. Astley, A. L. Thorn, D. K. L. Oi, C. H. W. Barnes, C. J. B. Ford, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, I. Farrer, D. A. Ritchie *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 156801 (2009).
- ⁵R. Rodriquez, D. K. L. Oi, M. Kataoka, C. H. W. Barnes, T. Ohshima, and A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. B 72, 085329 (2005).
- ⁶C. H. W. Barnes, J. M. Shilton, and A. N. Robinson, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 8410 (2000).
- ⁷L. P. Kouwenhoven and C. M. Marcus, Phys. World 11, 35 (1998).
- ⁸L. P. Kouwenhoven, D. G. Austing, and S. Tarucha, Rep. Prog. Phys. 64, 701 (2001).
- ⁹M. Field, C. G. Smith, M. Pepper, D. A. Ritchie, J. E. F. Frost, G. A. C. Jones, and D. G. Hasko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1311 (1993).
- ¹⁰J. Cooper, C. G. Smith, D. A. Ritchie, E. H. Linfield, Y. Jin, and H. Launois, Phys. E 6, 457 (2000).
- ¹¹J. M. Elzerman, R. Hanson, L. H. W. van Beveren, B. Witkamp, L. M. K. Vandersypen, and L. P. Kouwenhoven, Nature 430, 431 (2004).
- ¹²J. M. Elzerman, R. Hanson, L. H. W. van Beveren, L. M. K. Vandersypen, and L. P. Kouwenhoven, Appl. Phys. Lett. 84, 4617 (2004).
- ¹³S. Gustavsson, R. Leturcq, B. Simovic, R. Schleser, T. Ihn, P. Studerus, K. Ensslin, D. C. Driscoll, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 076605 (2006).
- ¹⁴T. Fujisawa, T. Hayashi, R. Tomita, and Y. Hirayama, Science **312**, 1634 (2006).
- ¹⁵K. MacLean, S. Amasha, I. P. Radu, D. M. Zumbuhl, M. A. Kastner, M. P. Hanson, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 036802 (2007).
- ¹⁶R. J. Schneble, M. Kataoka, C. J. B. Ford, C. H. W. Barnes, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, I. Farrer, D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper, Appl. Phys. Lett. 89, 122104 (2006).
- ¹⁷M. Pioro-Ladrière, J. H. Davies, A. R. Long, A. S. Sachrajda, L. Gaudreau, P. Zawadzki, J. Lapointe, J. Gupta, Z. Wasilewski, and S. Studenikin, Phys. Rev. B 72, 115331 (2005).
- ¹⁸M. Kataoka, C. H. W. Barnes, H. E. Beere, D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper, Phys. Rev. B 74, 085302 (2006).
- ¹⁹M. Kataoka, C. J. B. Ford, C. H. W. Barnes, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, H. E. Beere, D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper, J. Appl. Phys. **100**, 063710 (2006).
- ²⁰V. I. Talyanskii, J. M. Shilton, M. Pepper, C. G. Smith, C. J. B. Ford, E. H. Linfield, D. A. Ritchie, and G. A. C. Jones, Phys. Rev. B 56, 15180 (1997).
- ²¹M. R. Astley, M. Kataoka, R. J. Schneble, C. J. B. Ford, C. H. W. Barnes, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, H. E. Beere, D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper, Appl. Phys. Lett. **89**, 132102 (2006).
- ²²R. P. G. McNeil, M. Kataoka, C. J. B. Ford, C. H. W. Barnes, D. Anderson, G. A. C. Jones, I. Farrer, and D. A. Ritchie, Nature 477, 439 (2011).
- ²³S. Hermelin, S. Takada, M. Yamamoto, S. Tarucha, A. D. Wieck, L. Saminadayar, C. Bäuerle, and T. Meunier, Nature 477, 435 (2011).
- ²⁴E. Buks, R. Schuster, M. Heiblum, D. Mahalu, and V. Umansky, Nature 391, 871 (1998).