

2

AD-A237 468



OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Grant N00014-90-J-1193

TECHNICAL REPORT No. 52

Reply to Comment on 'Light-Induced Drift of Quantum-Confined Electrons in Semiconductor Heterostructures' by A. A. Grinberg and S. Luryi

by

Mark I. Stockman, Lakshmi N. Pandey and Thomas F. George

Prepared for publication

in

Physical Review Letters

Departments of Chemistry and Physics
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14260

June 1991

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.



Handwritten notes and a checkmark on the right side of the page.

A-1

91-02935



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0182

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) UBUFFALO/DC/91/TR-52		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Depts. Chemistry & Physics State University of New York	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Fronczak Hall, Amherst Campus Buffalo, New York 14260		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER Grant N00014-90-J-1193	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO
		TASK NO	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Reply to Comment on 'Light-Induced Drift of Quantum-Confined Electrons in Semiconductor Heterostructures' by A. A. Grinberg and S. Luryi			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Mark I. Stockman, Lakshmi N. Pandey and Thomas F. George			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT	13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) June 1991	15. PAGE COUNT 4
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Prepared for publication in the <i>Physical Review Letters</i>			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	
			CONFINED ELECTRONS
			PHOTON DRAG
			SEMICONDUCTOR HETEROSTRUCTURES
			POLARIZATION
			LIGHT-INDUCED DRIFT
			MOMENTUM
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The effect of light-induced drift of quantum-confined electrons in semiconductor heterostructures is discussed.			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. David L. Nelson		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 696-4410	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

Stockman, Pandey, and George's Reply: In the first paragraph of their Comment,¹ Grinberg and Luryi stated that the effect of light-induced drift (LID) of quantum-confined electrons described in Ref. 2 "is identical to the photon-drag effect (PDE) observed experimentally³ ... and discussed in detail theoretically^{4,5}", adding that, in their opinion, "LID can be viewed as a special case of PDE". Here we will address a scientific question about the identity of the effects described in Refs. 2 and 4,5, and, generally, the relation between LID and PDE.

In Ref. 1 any photocurrent in bulk, whose existence is due to photon momentum k , is called PDE. But, in isotropic or centrosymmetric media at rest, a photocurrent is always directed along k . Hence, in the definition of Ref. 1, PDE is simply a synonym of a photocurrent or photogalvanic effect. In contrast to this, LID of particles, as originally suggested⁷, is a well-defined effect which takes place if: (i) the particles have different internal states, (ii) the dispersion law of the particles does not depend (or weakly depends) on the internal state (parallel bands for electrons), and (iii) their translational (momentum) relaxation depends on the internal state. One of the distinctive features of LID is that the particle flux is an antisymmetric function of the light frequency detuning from the absorption line, and only "dependence of the flux direction on the photon energy"⁴ does not suffice. Clearly, the resonant PDE in bulk Ge, which is referred to in Ref. 1, does not conform to the above requirements and is not LID.

Originally, the idea of effects described in Ref. 2 and Refs. 4,5 has been suggested by Dykhne, Roslyakov and Starostin⁶ as an exact counterpart of LID in gases⁷. However, in Ref. 6 no quantitative description of the effect is given. In our paper,² we refer to Ref. 6 and give a qualitative and quantitative theory. The effects considered in Refs. 2 and Refs. 4,5 are, in fact, very close to the original suggestion of Ref. 6 and, consequently, to each other, but not identical. The main distinction between them is that in Ref. 2 the effect is based on the difference of the momentum relaxation rates ν_m and ν_n in different subbands m and n , while in Refs. 4 and 5 the effect, as it is quantitatively described, is based on the difference in the lifetimes. In our case² the rate difference $\nu_m - \nu_n$ originates from the scattering of electrons by impurities, whose density should be nonuniform across the well, and state-dependent wave function of electrons. In Refs. 4 and 5, the difference

of lifetimes is due to the optical-phonon emission in the upper subband.

We have considered² optically linear and nonlinear effects, and also have found the temperature dependence and the difference in the relaxation rates. From all these results, only the linear effect is studied in Refs. 4 and 5. In these works, no distinction is made between population-, polarization- and momentum-relaxation rates, and the photocurrent j is, in our opinion, found incorrectly. For instance, in Ref. 4 the current in its spectral maximum is $j \propto (\tau_m - \tau_n)/\gamma$ [see Eqs. (7) and (8) in Ref. 4], with $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}(\tau_m^{-1} + \tau_n^{-1})$ [Eq. (3)], where τ_m and τ_n are the lifetimes of the corresponding subbands⁴ (in Ref. 5, τ_m and τ_n are named momentum relaxation times, but, nevertheless, the relation between j and τ_m, τ_n remains the same). We believe the correct result [see Eqs. (5) and (7) in Ref. 2] to be $j \propto (\nu_m^{-1} - \nu_n^{-1})/\Gamma$, where ν_m and ν_n are the momentum-relaxation rates, which are, generally, completely different from τ_m^{-1} and τ_n^{-1} , and $\Gamma = \frac{1}{2}(\tau_m^{-1} + \tau_n^{-1}) + \Gamma_{mn}$ is the polarization-relaxation rate with Γ_{mn} as the dephasing contribution.

The difference between the results of Ref. 2 and Refs. 4,5 is essential in both quantitative and qualitative respects. Quantitatively, considering the two above given relations, their relevant parameters are different. In particular, the magnitude of Γ may exceed γ by one order of magnitude or even more due to the dominating contribution of the dephasing term Γ_{mn} (see Ref. 2 for additional discussion). Qualitatively, in our case², the momentum relaxation is due to collisions with impurities, which can be mainly elastic, in accord with the original LID.⁷ This is advantageous for achieving a large difference $\nu_m^{-1} - \nu_n^{-1}$ without increasing the width Γ , thus obtaining high current j . In contrast, the shortening of the subband lifetime, in particular by phonon emission as suggested in Ref. 4, necessarily causes an increase of Γ and diminishes the current.

The difference $\nu_m - \nu_n$ can be controlled by the characteristics of the quantum well, in particular, by the modulation doping. For instance, in the case² of doped barrier regions we have $\nu_n > \nu_m$, while δ -doping of the well center would result in $\nu_n < \nu_m$. The reason for this is that the wave function of the excited subband $|n\rangle$ has a node in the well center and is, therefore, less perturbed by impurities. In contrast, the effect of optical phonons, considered in Ref. 4, always yields $\tau_m^{-1} < \tau_n^{-1}$.

On the ground of the above arguments, we do not agree with the above quoted

statements of Ref. 1.

This research was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research.

Mark I. Stockman, Lakshmi N. Pandey and Thomas F. George

Departments of Chemistry and Physics & Astronomy

Center for Electronic and Electro-optic Materials

239 Fronczak Hall, State University of New York at Buffalo

Buffalo, New York 14260

¹ A. A. Grinberg and S. Luryi, preceding Comment.

² M. I. Stockman, L. N. Pandey, and T. F. George. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 3433 (1990).

³ A. D. Wieck, H. Sigg, and K. Ploog. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 463 (1990).

⁴ S. Luryi. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 2263 (1987).

⁵ A. A. Grinberg and S. Luryi. *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 87 (1988)

⁶ A. M. Dykhne, V. A. Roslyakov, and A. N. Starostin, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **254**, 599 (1980) [translation: *Sov. Phys. Dokl.* **25**, 741 (1980)].

⁷ F. Kh. Gel'mukhanov and A. M. Shalagin, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **29**, 773 (1979) [translation: *JETP Lett.* **29**, 711 (1979)].

ABSTRACT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Dr. Paul Ballentine
CVC Products
525 Lee Rd., P.O. Box 1886
Rochester, NY 14627

Dr. Paul Barbara
Department of Chemistry
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0431

Dr. Andrew Baronavski
Code 6111/Chemistry Division
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. R.P.H. Chang
Dept. Mat. Sci. & Eng.
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60208

Dr. John Crowell
Department of Chemistry
University of California
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Mark D'Evelyn
Department of Chemistry
Rice University, P.O. Box 1892
Houston, TX 77251

Dr. Frank DiSalvo
Department of Chemistry
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Arthur Ellis
Department of Chemistry
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. John Eyler
Department of Chemistry
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Dr. James Garvey
Department of Chemistry
State University of New York
Buffalo, NY 14214

Dr. Robert Gedridge
Code 3854/Chemistry Division
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, CA 93555-6001

Dr. Steven George
Department of Chemistry
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Tom George
Dept. of Chemistry & Physics
State University of New York
Buffalo, NY 14260

Dr. Robert Hamers
Department of Chemistry
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. Paul Hansma
Department of Physics
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Charles Harris
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. John Hemminger
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. Roald Hoffmann
Department of Chemistry
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Leonard Interrante
Department of Chemistry
Rensselaer Polytech. Institute
Troy, NY 12181

Dr. Eugene Irene
Department of Chemistry
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. Zakya Kafafi
Code 6551
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Larry Kesmodel
Department of Physics
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47403

Dr. Fred King
Dept of Chem, P.O. Box 6045
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506-6045

Dr. Max Lagally
Dept. Metall. & Min. Eng.
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. Stephen Lieberman
Marine Env. Branch/Code 522
Naval Ocean Systems Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. M. C. Lin
Department of Chemistry
Emory University
Atlanta, GA 30322

Dr. Horia Metiu
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Larry Miller
Department of Chemistry
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0431

Dr. Daniel Neumark
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. David Ramaker
Department of Chemistry
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052

Dr. Gary Rubloff
IBM T.J. Watson Research Center
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Dr. Howard Schmidt
Schmidt Instruments, Inc.
2476 Bolsover, Suite 234
Houston, TX 77005

Dr. Richard Smalley
Department of Chemistry
Rice University, P.O. Box 1892
Houston, TX 77251

Dr. Gerald Stringfellow
Dept. of Materials Sci. & Eng.
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dr. Galen Stucky
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. H. Tachikawa
Department of Chemistry
Jackson State University
Jackson, MI 39217-0510

Dr. William Unertl
Lab. for Surface Sci. & Tech.
University of Maine
Orono, ME 04469

Dr. Terrell Vanderah
Opt. Elec. Matis Brch/Code 3854
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, CA 93555

Dr. John Weaver
Dept. of Chem. & Mat. Sciences
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Brad Weiner
Department of Chemistry
University of Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931

Dr. Paul Weiss
Department of Chemistry
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. Robert Whetten
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. R. Stanley Williams
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Nicholas Winograd
Department of Chemistry
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. Aaron Wold
Department of Chemistry
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

Dr. Vicki Wysocki
Department of Chemistry
VA Commonwealth University
Richmond, VA 2384-2006

Dr. John Yates
Department of Chemistry
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260