

## Observation of Spin-Selective Tunneling in SiGe Nanocrystals

G. Katsaros,<sup>1,\*</sup> V. N. Golovach,<sup>1</sup> P. Spathis,<sup>1</sup> N. Ares,<sup>1</sup> M. Stoffel,<sup>2,†</sup> F. Fournel,<sup>3</sup> O. G. Schmidt,<sup>2</sup>  
L. I. Glazman,<sup>4</sup> and S. De Franceschi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*SPSMS, CEA-INAC/UJF-Grenoble 1, 17 Rue des Martyrs, F-38054 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute for Integrative Nanosciences, IFW Dresden, Helmholtzstrasse 20, D-01069 Dresden, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*CEA, LETI, MINATEC, F-38054 Grenoble, France*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520, USA*

(Received 20 July 2011; published 7 December 2011)

Spin-selective tunneling of holes in SiGe nanocrystals contacted by normal-metal leads is reported. The spin selectivity arises from an interplay of the orbital effect of the magnetic field with the strong spin-orbit interaction present in the valence band of the semiconductor. We demonstrate both experimentally and theoretically that spin-selective tunneling in semiconductor nanostructures can be achieved without the use of ferromagnetic contacts. The reported effect, which relies on mixing the light and heavy holes, should be observable in a broad class of quantum-dot systems formed in semiconductors with a degenerate valence band.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.246601

PACS numbers: 72.25.Dc, 71.70.Ej, 73.23.Hk, 73.63.Kv

The spin-orbit interaction (SOI) has become of central interest in recent years [1] because it enables an all-electrical manipulation of the spin. In the field of spin qubits, one of us [2] suggested the electrical control of localized spins by means of the electric-dipole spin resonance, and this scheme has been successfully used for spin rotations of electrons in quantum dots (QDs) [3,4]. Much earlier, Datta and Das [5] proposed a semiconductor transistor that would operate through a gate-controlled spin precession, mediated by the SOI. In this type of spin transistor, spin-polarized electrons are injected into the semiconductor from a ferromagnetic (FM) contact. The realization of an efficient spin injection has proven to be a difficult task [6,7]. Only recently, high spin-injection efficiencies were reported for FM contacts to semiconductors [8–10]. In nanostructures, however, experimental evidence of spin injection is not as strong and clear [11–15]. Here we show that the SOI in the valence band, quantified by the spin-orbital splitting  $\Delta_{\text{SO}}$ , provides an alternative way to obtain spin-selective tunneling without requiring FM electrodes.

At cryogenic temperatures, transport through QDs is dominated by the Coulomb blockade (CB) effect. In the CB regime, single-hole transport is suppressed and electrical conduction is due to second-order cotunneling (CT) processes [16]. We consider here the case of a QD with an odd number of holes and a spin-doublet ground state. A magnetic field  $B$  lifts the spin degeneracy by the Zeeman energy  $E_Z = g\mu_B B$ , where  $g$  and  $\mu_B$  are the hole  $g$  factor and Bohr magneton, respectively. Once the bias voltage across the QD exceeds the Zeeman energy,  $|eV| > E_Z$ , the inelastic CT processes can flip the QD spin, leaving the QD in the excited spin state; hereafter,  $e$  is the elementary charge ( $e > 0$ ). The onset of spin-flip inelastic CT manifests itself as a step in the differential conductance,

$G = dI/dV$ , at  $eV = \pm E_Z$  [17]. Our measurements reveal a pronounced asymmetry in the step height of  $G$  with respect to the polarity of  $V$ . The asymmetry is found to depend on the magnitude and direction of  $B$ .

This kind of asymmetry has recently been predicted by Paaske *et al.*, in a model with a rather generic form of the SOI interaction [18]. In order to understand the observed dependence of the asymmetry on the direction and magnitude of the magnetic field, we developed a theory specific for the degenerate valence band of a semiconductor with large  $\Delta_{\text{SO}}$ .

It is interesting to note that the transport characteristics of a QD with SOI coupled to normal leads are similar to those of a QD without SOI coupled to FM leads [19–21]. We illustrate this similarity in Fig. 1, where we consider the simplest case, in which the Zeeman interaction and the two spin-selective tunnel contacts have collinear quantization directions.

We have studied the low-temperature magnetotransport properties of individual SiGe self-assembled QDs with a base diameter  $d \approx 80$  nm and a height  $w \approx 20$  nm. A schematic of a typical QD contacted with Al electrodes is shown in Fig. 2(a). For such QDs, the hole wave function is generally composed of both heavy holes (HHs) and light holes (LHs). Because of the confinement and compressive strain, the degeneracy between the HH and LH branches, present in bulk at the  $\Gamma$  point, is lifted. In Fig. 2(b), we illustrate the interaction between a HH and a LH branch in the 2D case. The split-off band is far away in energy due to a large  $\Delta_{\text{SO}}$ . HHs and LHs are states of angular momentum  $\frac{3}{2}$  with projections  $\pm \frac{3}{2}$  and  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$ , respectively. In the QD, the states consist of a mixture of HH and LH wave functions. In spite of a predominant HH character, symmetry considerations on the constituent Bloch functions imply that, for a realistic device geometry, tunneling to and from the QD




FIG. 1 (color online). Spin-selective tunneling in (a) a QD coupled to FM leads and (b) a QD with SOI coupled to non-magnetic leads. Upon applying a forward (backward) bias,  $|eV| \geq E_Z$ , the cotunneling processes indicated by the solid (dashed) arrows become allowed. In both (a) and (b), the tunnel rate,  $\Gamma \equiv \pi\nu|t|^2$ , differs for each Zeeman sublevel of the QD. In (a), it is the density of states  $\nu$  that brings about the spin selectivity of the tunneling. In (b), the spin selectivity is caused by the tunneling amplitude  $t$ , which depends on the spinor wave functions at the point of tunneling. In the valence band, the  $B$  field efficiently makes  $\Gamma$  spin dependent by affecting the mixing between heavy and light holes. Since the inelastic CT current is proportional to  $\Gamma_{\uparrow}^L \Gamma_{\downarrow}^R$  for the forward bias and to  $\Gamma_{\uparrow}^R \Gamma_{\downarrow}^L$  for the reverse bias, an asymmetric  $G(V)$  is expected whenever  $\Gamma_{\uparrow}^L \Gamma_{\downarrow}^R \neq \Gamma_{\uparrow}^R \Gamma_{\downarrow}^L$ .

states takes place via the LH wave functions. Since LHs cannot be factorized into orbital and spin components, an applied magnetic field induces a spatial variation in the relative orbital “weights” of the two spins. Therefore, the ratio of tunneling amplitudes for “up” and “down” spins will depend on the position of the contacts. In a 2D geometry, this effect should be highly anisotropic since only a perpendicular field has an effect on orbital motion.

The measurements have been performed in a dilution refrigerator with a base temperature of 15 mK. The stability diagram,  $G(V_G, V)$ , of a QD device is shown in the inset of Fig. 2(c). This device has a charging energy of about 1–2 meV, and the orbital level separation is some hundreds of  $\mu\text{eV}$ . The diamond-shape region delimited by dashed lines highlights the CB regime for an odd number of confined holes. While  $G$  is generally suppressed within this CB diamond, a  $G$  resonance can be identified at  $V = 0$ , providing a clear signature of the Kondo effect [22,23]. At finite  $B$ , this resonance is split by the Zeeman effect as shown in Figs. 2(c) and 2(d) for perpendicular and parallel  $B$ , respectively.

For perpendicular  $B$  [Fig. 2(c)], the splitting of the Kondo peak is clearly asymmetric with respect to a sign change in  $V$ . The asymmetry in  $G$  arises at the onset of spin-flip inelastic CT (i.e., for  $|eV| > E_Z$ ). For parallel  $B$ , however, the asymmetry is practically absent [Fig. 2(d)]. To further investigate this anisotropy, a sequence of  $G(V)$  traces was taken while rotating a 3 T field in a plane perpendicular to the substrate. The resulting data,  $G(\theta, V)$ , are shown in Fig. 2(e), with  $\theta$  being the angle between  $\mathbf{B}$  and the substrate plane. Along with a variation in the Zeeman splitting of the Kondo peak, caused by the




FIG. 2 (color online). (a) Schematic of a QD device fabricated from a SiGe self-assembled nanocrystal grown on a silicon-on-insulator substrate having a heavily doped handle wafer which is used as a back gate [24]. (b) Qualitative band diagram of a Ge-rich SiGe quantum well illustrating the effect of quantum confinement along the growth ( $z$ ) direction: HH and LH branches are split at  $k_x = k_y = 0$  and anticross at finite  $k_x$  or  $k_y$ . In our system, the splitting energy  $\Delta_z \sim \gamma_2/mw^2$  is much smaller than the spin-orbital energy  $\Delta_{SO}$ . The red (blue) dots indicate that many other HH (LH) subbands exist before the first LH (split-off) subband is encountered. (c)  $G(V)$  for different perpendicular  $B$  fields from 0.5 to 3 T. The traces have been shifted by  $0.06 \times 2e^2/h$  for clarity. Inset:  $G(V_G, V)$  for a 75-mT perpendicular field needed to suppress the superconductivity of the Al electrodes. ( $V_G$  spans a range of 850 mV and  $V$  ranges from  $-3.5$  to  $3.5$  mV.) (d)  $G(V)$  for different parallel fields from 1 to 8 T. The traces have been shifted by  $0.06 \times 2e^2/h$  for clarity. The Zeeman splitting of the Kondo peak is asymmetric in (c) and symmetric in (d). (e) Angular dependence of the split Kondo peak for a fixed  $V_G$  and  $B = 3$  T. Superimposed  $G(V)$  traces for  $\theta = 0, 30, 60,$  and  $90$  deg. The V-shape dip of  $G$  at zero bias observed in (c)–(e) is caused by electron-electron interaction in disordered leads [30,31].

$\theta$ -dependent hole  $g$  factor [24], the asymmetry becomes progressively more pronounced when going from  $\theta = 0$  (or  $180^\circ$ ) towards  $\theta = 90^\circ$ .

The asymmetry observed in  $G(V)$  can be quantified by  $A = \frac{G_- - G_+}{G_- + G_+}$ , where  $G_{\pm} = G(\pm E_Z/e)$ . The detailed  $A(\theta)$  dependence, extracted from Fig. 2(e), is shown in Fig. 3(a).  $A \approx 0$  for  $\theta = 0$  (or  $180^\circ$ ) and it increases monotonically up to 0.2 for  $\theta$  approaching  $90^\circ$ ; the  $A(B)$  dependence is shown in Fig. 3(b). By sweeping the magnetic field from




FIG. 3 (color online). Asymmetry parameter  $A$  as a function of (a)  $\theta$  and (b) perpendicular  $B$ . We note that, by subtracting the elastic CT contribution from  $G(V)$ ,  $A$  becomes larger than 0.5. The top inset in (b) shows the evolution of the Kondo peak while sweeping  $B_z$  from  $-1$  to  $1$  T. The lower inset shows two characteristic line traces taken at  $-1$  T [gray (red)] and  $1$  T (black) demonstrating that  $A(B_z) = A(-B_z)$ .

negative to positive values [see insets in Fig. 3(b)], we further observe that the asymmetry  $A$  obeys the relation

$$A(B_z) = A(-B_z). \quad (1)$$

The same qualitative behavior described above was observed in a second device, which did not display Kondo effect; see Supplemental Material [25]. The asymmetry  $A$  reaches 0.4 at 3 T for that device. We remark that, although the first device shows larger conductance due to the Kondo effect, the asymmetry  $A$  in both devices is a consequence of spin-dependent tunnel rates [26].

In order to understand the microscopic origin of the measured effect, we represent the Luttinger Hamiltonian [27] as a block matrix in the basis of HH ( $h$ ) and LH ( $l$ ) states,

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_{hh} & H_{hl} \\ H_{lh} & H_{ll} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

In  $H_{hh}$  and  $H_{ll}$ , we discard all terms that vanish in the 2D limit ( $w/d \rightarrow 0$ ), whereas in  $H_{hl}$  and  $H_{lh}$ , we keep only the leading-order terms. A systematic expansion around the 2D limit is outlined in the Supplemental Material [25]. The blocks  $H_{hh}$  and  $H_{ll}$  assume a familiar form

$$H_{hh/ll} = \frac{\gamma_1 \pm \gamma_2}{2m} (k_x^2 + k_y^2) + \frac{\gamma_1 \mp 2\gamma_2}{2m} k_z^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mu_B \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot g_{h/l} \cdot \mathbf{B} + U(x, y) + V_{h/l}(z), \quad (3)$$

where the axes  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  point along the main crystallographic directions, with  $z \equiv [001]$  being the direction of the strongest quantization. After the expansion around the 2D limit, the kinetic momentum operators  $k_x$  and  $k_y$  contain only the component  $B_z$ , whereas  $k_z$  is independent of  $\mathbf{B}$ . In Eq. (3) and below,  $\gamma_1$ ,  $\gamma_2$ ,  $\gamma_3$ ,  $\kappa$ , and  $q$  denote the Luttinger parameters [27] and  $m$  denotes the bare electron mass. The Pauli matrices  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$  represent the remaining pseudospin degree of freedom in each block. We choose the following pseudospin basis [28]:

$$\begin{aligned} |\uparrow\rangle_h &= |3/2, -3/2\rangle, & |\downarrow\rangle_h &= |3/2, +3/2\rangle, \\ |\uparrow\rangle_l &= |3/2, +1/2\rangle, & |\downarrow\rangle_l &= |3/2, -1/2\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In the  $(x, y, z)$  frame, the tensors of the  $g$  factor are diagonal:  $g_h = \text{diag}(0, 0, -6\kappa)$  and  $g_l = \text{diag}(4\kappa, 4\kappa, 2\kappa)$ , where we neglected, for simplicity, the terms proportional to the smallest Luttinger parameter  $q$ . The minus sign in  $(g_h)_{zz}$  is due to our basis choice in Eq. (4). In Eq. (3), we included an in-plane confining potential  $U(x, y)$ . The motion along  $z$  is confined to an infinitely deep square well, with different offsets,  $V_h$  and  $V_l > V_h$ , due to strain.

The blocks  $H_{hl}$  and  $H_{lh}$  are given by

$$H_{hl} = (H_{lh})^\dagger = i \frac{\sqrt{3}\gamma_3}{m} (k_x \sigma_y + k_y \sigma_x) k_z. \quad (5)$$

These blocks intermix HHs and LHs, such that the wave function of the hole in a given QD state assumes the general form  $\Psi = \alpha\Psi_h + \beta\Psi_l$ . In terms of the true-spin states, such a wave function consists of a superposition of the spin-up ( $\uparrow$ ) and spin-down ( $\downarrow$ ) states entangled with the orbital degrees of freedom:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{r}) &= \Phi_1(\mathbf{r}) \uparrow + \chi_1(\mathbf{r}) \downarrow, \\ \Psi_{\downarrow}(\mathbf{r}) &= \chi_2(\mathbf{r}) \uparrow + \Phi_2(\mathbf{r}) \downarrow, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\uparrow$  and  $\downarrow$  denote the components of the Kramers doublet in the QD. Focusing on the first HH subband, we obtain by perturbation theory:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1(\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{\sqrt{2}\gamma_3}{m} \mathcal{U}_- k_- \psi_h(x, y) \sum_n f_n^l(z) \frac{\langle f_n^l | k_z | f_1^h \rangle}{E_1^h - E_n^l}, \\ \chi_1(\mathbf{r}) &= \mathcal{U}_- \psi_h(x, y) f_1^h(z) + \frac{2\gamma_3}{m} Z k_- \psi_h(x, y) \\ &\quad \times \sum_n f_n^l(z) \frac{\langle f_n^l | k_z | f_1^h \rangle}{E_1^h - E_n^l}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and similar expressions for  $\Phi_2(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\chi_2(\mathbf{r})$ , obtained from Eq. (7) by replacing  $\mathcal{U}_- \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_+$ ,  $k_- \rightarrow k_+$ , and  $\psi_h(x, y) \rightarrow \psi_h^*(x, y)$ . In our notation,  $\mathcal{U}_\pm = \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \times (X \pm iY)$  and  $k_\pm = \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (k_x \pm ik_y)$ . The Bloch amplitudes  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $Z$  describe the valence band in the absence of SOI. In blocks  $H_{hh}$  and  $H_{ll}$ , the motion along  $z$  separates; we denote the corresponding eigenenergies and eigenfunctions by  $E_n^{h/l}$  and  $f_n^{h/l}(z)$ , respectively.

The tunneling amplitudes  $t_{\sigma_s}^i$  are found as

$$t_{\sigma_s}^i = \sum_{u=X,Y,Z} T_u \langle u, \sigma | \Psi_s(\mathbf{r}_i) \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $T_u$  is the coupling strength between Bloch amplitude  $u$  and the lead, and  $\langle u, \sigma | \Psi_s(\mathbf{r}_i) \rangle$  are the projections of the QD eigenstates  $\Psi_s(\mathbf{r})$ , see Eq. (6), onto the product state of Bloch amplitude  $u$  and spinor  $|\sigma\rangle$ . The tunneling amplitudes in Eq. (8) depend on the point of tunneling,  $\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{r}_L, \mathbf{r}_R$ , the component of the true spin in the lead,  $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ ,

and the component of the Kramers doublet on the dot,  $s = \uparrow, \downarrow$ . We remark that  $T_X$ ,  $T_Y$ , and  $T_Z$  appear in Eq. (8) as phenomenological parameters. They depend on the details of the metal-semiconductor interface and cannot be determined within the  $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$  theory used here. We find

$$t_{\sigma s}^i \propto \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\Phi}_1(\mathbf{r}_i) & \bar{\chi}_2(\mathbf{r}_i) \\ \bar{\chi}_1(\mathbf{r}_i) & \bar{\Phi}_2(\mathbf{r}_i) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\bar{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\bar{\chi}_i(\mathbf{r})$  are obtained from Eq. (7) by replacing  $Z \rightarrow T_Z$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{\pm} \rightarrow \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(T_X \pm iT_Y)$ .

The spin selectivity of the tunneling is best seen in the matrix of the tunnel rates,  $\Gamma_{ss'} = \pi \sum_{\sigma} t_{\sigma s}^* \nu_{\sigma} t_{\sigma s'}$ . With  $\nu_{\uparrow} = \nu_{\downarrow}$  (case of non-FM leads) we find, up to a common factor,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{\uparrow\uparrow} & \Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow} \\ \Gamma_{\downarrow\uparrow} & \Gamma_{\downarrow\downarrow} \end{pmatrix} \propto \begin{pmatrix} |\bar{\Phi}_1|^2 + |\bar{\chi}_1|^2 & \bar{\Phi}_1^* \bar{\chi}_2 + \bar{\chi}_1^* \bar{\Phi}_2 \\ \bar{\Phi}_2^* \bar{\chi}_1 + \bar{\chi}_2^* \bar{\Phi}_1 & |\bar{\Phi}_2|^2 + |\bar{\chi}_2|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

At  $B = 0$ , time-reversal symmetry requires that

$$\Phi_2(\mathbf{r}) = [\Phi_1(\mathbf{r})]^* \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2(\mathbf{r}) = -[\chi_1(\mathbf{r})]^*, \quad (11)$$

leading to  $\Gamma_{\uparrow\uparrow} = \Gamma_{\downarrow\downarrow}$  and  $\Gamma_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \Gamma_{\downarrow\uparrow} = 0$  in Eq. (10).

At  $B \neq 0$ , however, the orbital effect of the  $B$  field modifies the functions  $\Phi_i(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\chi_i(\mathbf{r})$ , such that the relations in Eq. (11) are no longer satisfied. In general, the matrix  $\Gamma_{ss'}$  has nonzero off-diagonal elements. Since it is a Hermitian matrix, there exists a direction in space,  $\mathbf{M}$ , such that a rotation of the quantization axis to the direction of  $\mathbf{M}$  makes the rate matrix diagonal,  $\Gamma = \text{diag}(\Gamma_{\uparrow}, \Gamma_{\downarrow})$ , with  $\Gamma_{\uparrow} \geq \Gamma_{\downarrow}$ . To quantify the spin selectivity of the tunneling, we define

$$|\mathbf{M}| = \frac{\Gamma_{\uparrow} - \Gamma_{\downarrow}}{\Gamma_{\uparrow} + \Gamma_{\downarrow}}. \quad (12)$$

In respect to transport,  $\mathbf{M}$  is analogous to the polarization vector of the FM lead. Indeed, the maximum of spin selectivity in tunneling from a FM is achieved when the FM is a half-metal, e.g.,  $\nu_{\uparrow} \neq 0$  and  $\nu_{\downarrow} = 0$ . This extreme case corresponds to  $M = 1$  and can be approached in our case by increasing  $B_z$ .

In order to illustrate the origin of the spin selectivity, we focus on the special case,  $T_X = T_Y = 0$  and  $T_Z \neq 0$ , and refer to this tunneling model as the  $Z$  model. In the  $Z$  model,  $\mathbf{M}$  is parallel to the  $z$  axis. Tunneling to the hole states is possible only due to the admixture of the LH subbands. Furthermore, in this model, the spin selectivity is determined by the fact that  $\bar{\chi}_1(\mathbf{r}) \propto k_- \psi_h(x, y)$  and  $\bar{\chi}_2(\mathbf{r}) \propto k_+ \psi_h^*(x, y)$ , whereas  $\bar{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{r}) \equiv 0$ . Using this information in Eqs. (10) and (12), we specify  $\psi_h(x, y)$  to the Fock-Darwin states [29]. Therefore, we assume that  $U(x, y)$  in Eq. (3) is given by  $U(\rho) = m^* \omega_0^2 \rho^2 / 2$ , where  $m^*$  is the effective mass for in-plane motion,  $\omega_0$  is the oscillator frequency of the harmonic potential, and  $\rho^2 = x^2 + y^2$ . For the first two states ( $n = 0$  and  $m = 0, -1$ ), we obtain

$$M_z = -\frac{\omega \omega_c}{\omega^2 + \omega_c^2 / 4}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\omega = \sqrt{\omega_0^2 + \omega_c^2 / 4}$  and  $\omega_c = eB_z / m^* c$ . For these states,  $M_z$  depends on  $B_z$  but not on  $\rho$ ; see Fig. 4(a). For  $B_z \neq 0$ , the contacts will exhibit spin-dependent tunnel rates with the same polarization value  $M_z$  regardless of position of the tunneling point. In such a case, no asymmetry in the inelastic CT is expected.

For higher energy levels,  $M_z$  may depend on  $\rho$ ,

$$M_z = \left[ \frac{\omega}{\omega_c} f(\rho) + \frac{\omega_c}{4\omega} \frac{1}{f(\rho)} \right]^{-1}, \quad (14)$$

where  $f(\rho)$  is given for arbitrary  $n$  and  $m$  in the Supplemental Material [25]. We consider further the state  $n = 0$  and  $m = 1$ , for which  $f(\rho) = 2\hbar / (m^* \omega \rho^2) - 1$ . Now  $M_z$  depends both on  $B_z$  and on  $\rho$ ; see Fig. 4(a). The spin polarization of two contacts positioned arbitrarily on a QD may differ significantly from each other; see, e.g., points  $\rho_L$  and  $\rho_R$  in Fig. 4(a). The asymmetry in the inelastic CT is related to  $\Delta M_z = M_z(\rho_L) - M_z(\rho_R) \neq 0$ .  $\Delta M_z$  increases with  $B_z$  [Fig. 4(b)], displaying at the same time strong dependence on the  $B$ -field direction [Fig. 4(c)], in good qualitative agreement with the results in Fig. 3.

Finally, our theory also explains the symmetry relation in Eq. (1). On the one hand, the spin-selective part of  $\Gamma_{ss'}$  is proportional to  $B_z$  and therefore it changes sign when flipping the direction of the magnetic field. On the other hand, the Zeeman energy also changes sign when flipping the direction of the magnetic field, exchanging thus the roles of the ground and the excited state. Therefore,  $A$  does not change upon  $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow -\mathbf{B}$ .

The described joint effect of SOI and Zeeman splitting explains our experimental findings. In addition, it opens the door to an original scheme for measuring Rabi spin oscillations in QDs confining holes. Let us consider a spin-1/2 QD in the CB regime under a perpendicular  $B$  of the order of a few T. In such a case, a transport characteristic of the type shown in Fig. 2(c) is to be expected. For  $V = 0$ , no current flows through the QD. Yet we suggest that a finite current could be generated by a resonant rf field (at




FIG. 4 (color online). (a) Tunneling polarization  $M_z$  as a function of the space coordinate  $\rho$  for two Fock-Darwin states ( $n, m$ ) as indicated and for  $\omega_c = 0.1\omega_0$ . (b)  $B$ -field dependence of the difference  $\Delta M_z = M_z(\rho_L) - M_z(\rho_R)$ , for the values of  $\rho_L$  and  $\rho_R$  indicated in (a). (c)  $\Delta M_z$  as a function of  $\theta$  for a fixed value of  $|\mathbf{B}|$ . The value of  $|\mathbf{B}|$  corresponds to  $\omega_c = \omega_0$  at  $\theta = 90^\circ$ .

frequency  $f = E_Z/h$ ) capable of inducing coherent oscillations between the Zeeman-split states of the QD. In fact, as the excited  $\uparrow$  state becomes populated it can decay to the ground  $\downarrow$  state by an inelastic CT process—a hole tunnels out of the QD from the  $\uparrow$  state being replaced by another hole tunneling into the  $\downarrow$  state. Because  $\uparrow$  and  $\downarrow$  states have tunnel couplings with opposite asymmetries, in a configuration such as the one depicted in Fig. 1(b) the most favorable CT relaxation process would involve the transfer of a hole from the right to the left contact. Hence a net dc current could be driven by a continuous resonant irradiation. In addition, combining rf bursts with synchronized  $V_G$  pulses may enable the coherent control of the QD pseudospin states. In this scheme, well-defined pseudospin rotations would be performed in the deep CB regime (i.e., during a negative  $V_G$  pulse), whereas pseudospin readout would take place in the CT regime.

We acknowledge J. Paaske for helpful discussions and A. Rastelli and H. von Kaenel for providing the STM image used in Fig. 2(a). The work was supported by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (through the ACCESS and COHESION projects), U.S. DOE Contract No. DE-FG02-08ER46482 (Yale), and the Nanosciences Foundation at Grenoble, France. G. K. acknowledges support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

---

\*Present address: Institute for Integrative Nanosciences, IFW Dresden, Helmholtzstrasse 20, D-01069 Dresden, Germany.

g.katsaros@ifw-dresden.de

†Present address: Institut Jean Lamour, UMR CNRS 7198, Nancy-Université, BP 239, F-54506 Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy, France.

- [1] R. Winkler, *Spin-Orbit Coupling Effects in Two-Dimensional Electron and Hole Systems* (Springer, New York, 2003).
- [2] V. N. Golovach, M. Borhani, and D. Loss, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 165319 (2006).
- [3] K. C. Nowack *et al.*, *Science* **318**, 1430 (2007).
- [4] S. Nadj-Perge *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **468**, 1084 (2010).
- [5] S. Datta and B. Das, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **56**, 665 (1990).
- [6] I. Žutić *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 323 (2004).
- [7] E. I. Rashba, *Semicond. Sci. Technol.* **23**, 114015 (2008).
- [8] H. C. Koo *et al.*, *Science* **325**, 1515 (2009).
- [9] I. Appelbaum *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **447**, 295 (2007).
- [10] C. H. Li *et al.*, *Nature Commun.* **2**, 245 (2011).
- [11] K. Tsukagoshi *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **401**, 572 (1999).
- [12] S. Sahoo *et al.*, *Nature Phys.* **1**, 99 (2005).
- [13] K. Hamaya *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 081302(R) (2008).
- [14] F. A. Zwanenburg *et al.*, *Nano Lett.* **9**, 2704 (2009).
- [15] E.-S. Liu *et al.*, *Nano Lett.* **10**, 3297 (2010).
- [16] S. De Franceschi *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 878 (2001).
- [17] A. Kogan *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 166602 (2004).
- [18] J. Paaske, A. Andersen, and K. Flensberg, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 081309(R) (2010).
- [19] S. Loth *et al.*, *Nature Phys.* **6**, 340 (2010).
- [20] I. Weymann *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 113301 (2005).
- [21] D. Bing, L. Xiao-Lin, and N. J. M. Horing, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **48**, 1099 (2007).
- [22] D. Goldhaber-Gordon *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **391**, 156 (1998).
- [23] O. Klochan *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 076805 (2011).
- [24] G. Katsaros *et al.*, *Nature Nanotech.* **5**, 458 (2010).
- [25] See Supplemental Material at <http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.246601> for the data of the second device and the expansion of the Luttinger Hamiltonian around the 2D limit.
- [26] To exclude experimental artifacts, we verified that  $A$  changes sign upon exchanging the source and drain leads.
- [27] See Eq. (45) in J. M. Luttinger, *Phys. Rev.* **102**, 1030 (1956).
- [28] The advantage of this choice is that the pseudospin transforms under the time reversal as a spin 1/2, i.e.,  $|\uparrow\rangle \rightarrow |\downarrow\rangle$  and  $|\downarrow\rangle \rightarrow -|\uparrow\rangle$ .
- [29] V. Fock, *Z. Phys.* **47**, 446 (1928); C. G. Darwin, *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **27**, 86 (1931).
- [30] B. L. Altshuler and A. G. Aronov, *Electron-Electron Interactions in Disordered Systems* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1985).
- [31] F. Pierre *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1590 (2001).