


REFERENCE

IC/85/203

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
THEORETICAL PHYSICS**



CM

EFFECT OF NON-PARABOLICITY OF THE BINDING ENERGY
OF A HYDROGENIC DONOR IN QUANTUM WELL WITH A MAGNETIC FIELD

K. Jayakumar

S. Balasubramanian

and

M. Tomak



**INTERNATIONAL
ATOMIC ENERGY
AGENCY**



**UNITED NATIONS
EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION**

1985 MIRAMARE-TRIESTE



International Atomic Energy Agency
and
United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS

EFFECT OF NON-PARABOLICITY ON THE BINDING ENERGY
OF A HYDROGENIC DONOR IN QUANTUM WELL WITH A MAGNETIC FIELD †

K. Jayakumar

School of Physics, Madurai Kamaraj Univeristy, Madurai 625021, India

S. Balasubramanian * and M. Tomak **

International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy.

ABSTRACT

A hydrogenic donor in a quantum well in the presence of a magnetic field perpendicular to the barrier is considered in the effective mass approximation. The non-parabolicity of the subband is included in the Hamiltonian by an energy-dependent effective mass. The donor binding energy is calculated variationally for different well widths and the effect of non-parabolicity is discussed in the light of recent experimental results.

MIRAMARE - TRIESTE

August 1985

† To be submitted for publication.

* Permanent address: School of Physics, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai-625021, India.

** Permanent address: Department of Physics, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many papers have appeared during the last few years on hydrogenic donors in a quantum well formed by a layer of GaAs between GaAlAs barriers ¹⁾. Due to technological developments in the preparation and characterization of the samples, experimental results are also now forthcoming. For example, Jarosik *et al.* ²⁾ have reported far-infrared magnetospectroscopic measurements on shallow donors in the central region of a GaAs quantum well. Greene and Bajaaj ³⁾ and Chaudhuri and Bajaaj ⁴⁾ have calculated the binding energies of the ground state and some of the low lying excited states by donors in a quantum well in the presence of a magnetic field along the growth axis. The experimental results in Ref.2 are in good agreement with the theoretical calculations.

Chaudhuri and Bajaaj ⁵⁾ in an earlier paper have reported their results on the effect of non-parabolicity on the energy levels of a hydrogenic donor in a quantum well. They have found pronounced effects on the binding energy for small well widths. In the light of new experiments such as those in Ref.2, it would be of interest to see the effect of non-parabolicity on the donor binding in the presence of a magnetic field. In the present work, we report our results, based on variational calculations, of the donor binding energy when a magnetic field is present, taking into account the non-parabolicity of the subband.

2. THEORY

The effective mass Hamiltonian for a hydrogenic donor in a GaAs quantum well with a magnetic field \vec{B} along the growth axis which will be taken as the z-axis is given by (with origin at the impurity at the centre of the well)

$$H = \frac{1}{\chi(E)} \left[-\nabla^2 + \frac{1}{4} \gamma^2 \rho^2 + \gamma L_z \right] - \frac{2}{r} + V_B(z) \quad (1)$$

where we have used the effective Bohr radius $a_B = \hbar^2 \epsilon_0 / m^* e^2$ as the unit of length and the effective Rydberg $R = m^* e^4 / 2 \epsilon_0^2 \hbar^2$ as the unit of energy. Using the numerical values of the static dielectric constant ϵ_0 and the electron effective mass m^* for GaAs, one has $a_B = 98.7 \text{ \AA}$ and $R = 5.83 \text{ MeV}$. γ in Eq.(1) is a dimensionless parameter given by

$$\gamma = e \hbar E / 2m^* c R. \quad (2)$$

L_z is the z component of the angular momentum and $\chi(E)$ is the non-parabolicity correction through an energy dependent effective mass. $\chi(E)$ is given by ⁵⁾

$$\chi(E) = 1 + (0.0436 E + 0.236 E^2 - 0.147 E^3) / 0.0665, \quad (3)$$

where E is in electron volts. $V_B(z)$ in Eq.(1) is the potential energy due to a symmetrical well of width L and height V_0 .

We choose the variational trial function of the form ⁴⁾

$$\psi(\rho, \phi, z) = N e^{-(a_1 r + b_1 \rho + c_1 z^2)} f(z), \quad (4)$$

where $f(z)$ is the exact ground state wave function for the particle in the one-dimensional well $V_B(z)$. The lowest energy eigenvalue for this problem gives the first electron subband energy E_{sb} which is the solution of the equation

$$\left(\frac{E}{V_0} \right)^{1/2} = \cos \left[\left[\chi(E) E \right]^{1/2} \frac{L}{2} \right]. \quad (5)$$

a_1 , b_1 and c_1 in Eq.(4) are the variational parameters. In the expectation value of H with the wave function as in Eq.(4), the integrations with respect to ϕ and ρ are performed analytically and the remaining integration with respect to z is done numerically. The minimum of the expectation value of H with respect to the parameter a_1 , b_1 and c_1 is obtained. The donor ground state binding energy E_B is given by

$$E_B = E_{sb} + \gamma - \langle H \rangle_{\min}. \quad (6)$$

The results are presented in the next section.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The donor binding energy as a function of well width is presented in Fig.1 for two values of γ . Table 1 shows the numerical values of the different terms in the expectation value of the Hamiltonian. Just as in the zero field case presented in Ref.4 ⁶⁾ the non-parabolic effects are important, as can be seen from Fig.1, even in the presence of a magnetic field when the well widths are small. For small well widths, the electron wave function is more localized in real space and hence more delocalized in k-space, thus making it necessary to sample larger k values in the band. For $L \rightarrow 0$, the limiting values for the binding energy are different for the parabolic and non-parabolic cases. It is easy to see that $E_B(\text{non-parabolic})/E_B(\text{parabolic})$ has the limiting value (as $L \rightarrow 0$) $\chi(E_{sb})$ where $E_{sb} = V_0$ when $L = 0$. Fig.1 also shows that the non-parabolicity effects are significant when L is large. In the experiments of Jarosik *et al.* ²⁾ the sample had $L = 210 \text{ \AA} \approx 2 a_B$ and thus non-parabolicity effects are negligible. Also experimentally one sees the transition from $1s \rightarrow 2p_z$ states and hence to some extent there will be cancellation of the non-parabolicity effects. However since the excited states are more extended than the ground state, the non-parabolicity effects may be less pronounced for the excited states compared to the ground state. To some extent this is seen in the results for the zero magnetic field case reported in Ref.5.

From Table 1 one can see that the non-parabolicity affects not only the kinetic energy terms but also the potential energy terms through the wave function especially for small well widths.

In conclusion, we can say that non-parabolicity effects are quite pronounced for small well widths and magnetospectroscopic measurements performed with suitable samples should reveal this.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Two of the authors (S.B.) and (M.T.) would like to thank Professor Abdus Salam, the International Atomic Energy Agency and UNESCO for hospitality at the International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste.

REFERENCES

- 1) For a review see,
R.L. Greene and K.K. Bajaj, Sol. State Comm. 53, 1103 (1985).
- 2) N.C. Jarosik, B.D. McCombe, B.V. Sharabrook, J. Comas, J. Ralston and G. Wicks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54, 1283 (1985).
- 3) R.L. Greene and K.K. Bajaj, Phys. Rev. B31, 913 (1985).
- 4) S. Chaudhuri and K.K. Bajaj, Sol. State Comm. 52, 967 (1984).
- 5) S. Chaudhuri and K.K. Bajaj, Phys. Rev. B29, 1803 (1984).
- 6) For a comment see,
K. Jayakumar and S. Balsubramanian, to appear in Phys. Rev. B.

TABLE 1

Variation of different terms in the expectation value of H with well width L
for two different magnetic field parameter γ

γ	L	$\langle -v^2/\chi(E) \rangle$	$\langle \gamma^2 p^2/4\chi(E) \rangle$	$\langle -\frac{2}{r} \rangle$	$\langle v_B(z) \rangle$		
0.2	0.1	9.938	0.0030	-5.203	38.961		
		(7.814)	(0.0075)	(-3.865)	(42.683)		
	0.3	0.3	14.582	0.0042	-5.042	13.199	
			(14.459)	(0.0064)	(-4.432)	(14.983)	
		0.5	0.5	11.592	0.0054	-4.513	5.566
				(11.769)	(0.0067)	(-4.244)	(6.072)
	1.0	1.0	6.219	0.0076	-3.699	1.228	
			(6.268)	(0.0082)	(-3.626)	(1.273)	
	1.0	0.1	10.186	0.068	-5.395	38.904	
			(8.204)	(0.162)	(-4.087)	(42.527)	
		0.3	0.3	14.621	0.095	-5.230	13.385
				(14.676)	(0.141)	(-4.629)	(14.973)
0.5		0.5	11.796	0.122	-4.705	5.565	
			(12.017)	(0.148)	(-4.460)	(6.050)	
1.0	1.0	6.436	0.162	-3.903	1.233		
		(6.493)	(0.172)	(-3.847)	(1.285)		

Quantities in parenthesis are for parabolic case (with $\chi(E) = 1.0$).




Fig.1 Variation of the binding energy of the ground state of a donor (E_B) as a function of well width (L) for two different values of the magnetic field parameter γ ($\gamma = 1.0$ corresponds to $B = 67.4$ KG and $\gamma = 0.2$ corresponds to $B = 13.48$ KG) for Al concentration $x = 0.3$ which corresponds to $V_0 = 55.37$ R.

———— parabolic case;
 - - - - - non-parabolic case.