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In two-dimensional (2D) hole systems the inversion asymmetry induced spin splitting differs remarkably from its familiar counterpart in the conduction band. While the so-called Rashba spin splitting of electron states increases linearly with in-plane wave vector \( k \parallel \) the spin splitting of heavy hole states can be of third order in \( k \parallel \) so that spin splitting becomes negligible in the limit of small 2D hole densities. We discuss consequences of this behavior in the context of recent arguments on the origin of the metal-insulator transition observed in 2D systems.
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At zero magnetic field \( B \) spin splitting in quasi two-dimensional (2D) semiconductor quantum wells (QW’s) can be a consequence of the bulk inversion asymmetry (BIA) of the underlying crystal (e.g. a zinc blende structure) and of the structure inversion asymmetry (SIA) of the confinement potential. This \( B = 0 \) spin splitting is the subject of considerable interest because it concerns details of energy band structure that are important in both fundamental research and electronic device applications (Refs. 8 23 and references therein).

Here we want to focus on the SIA spin splitting which is usually the dominant part of \( B = 0 \) spin splitting in 2D systems. To lowest order in \( k \parallel \) SIA spin splitting in 2D electron systems is given by the so-called Rashba model, which predicts a spin splitting linear in \( k \parallel \). For small in-plane wave vector \( k \parallel \) this is in good agreement with more accurate numerical computations. For 2D hole systems, on the other hand, the situation is more complicated because of the fourfold degeneracy of the topmost valence band \( \Gamma^+_v \), and so far only numerical computations on hole spin splitting have been performed. In the present paper we will develop an analytical model for the SIA spin splitting of 2D hole systems. We will show that in contrast to the familiar Rashba model the spin splitting of heavy hole (HH) states is basically proportional to \( k \parallel \). This result was already implicitly contained in several numerical computations. But a clear analytical framework was missing. We will discuss consequences of this behavior in the context of recent arguments on the origin of the metal-insulator transition observed in 2D systems.

First we want to review the major properties of the Rashba model.

\[
H^{SO}_{6c} = \alpha \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{\sigma}. \tag{1}
\]

In this equation \( \mathbf{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z) \) denotes the Pauli spin matrices, \( \alpha \) is a material-specific prefactor, and \( \mathbf{E} \) is an effective electric field that results from the built-in or external potential \( V \) as well as from the position dependent valence band edge. For \( \mathbf{E} = (0, 0, E_z) \) Eq. (1) becomes (using explicit matrix notation)

\[
H^{SO}_{6c} = \alpha E_z \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k_- \\ k_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2}
\]

with \( k_\pm = k_x \pm i k_y \). By means of perturbation theory we obtain for the spin splitting of the energy dispersion

\[
E^{SO}_{6c}(k) = \pm (\alpha E_z) k \parallel \tag{3}
\]

where \( k = (k_x, k_y, 0) \). Using this simple formula several groups determined the prefactor \( \langle \alpha E_z \rangle \) by analyzing Shubnikov-de Haas (SdH) oscillations.

Equation (3) predicts an SIA spin splitting which is linear in \( k \parallel \). For small \( k \parallel \) \( \mathbf{E} \) Eq. (3) thus becomes the dominant term in the energy dispersion \( E^\pm_\perp(k) \), i.e., SIA spin splitting of electron states is most important for small 2D densities. In particular, we get a divergent van Hove singularity of the density-of-states (DOS) at the bottom of the subband which is characteristic for a \( k \parallel \) linear spin splitting. As an example, we show in Fig. 1 the self-consistently calculated subband dispersion \( E^\pm_\perp(k) \), DOS effective mass \( m^*/m_0 \), and spin splitting \( E^\pm_\perp(k) - E^\pm_\parallel(k) \) for an MOS inversion layer on InSb. For small \( k \parallel \) the spin splitting increases linearly as a function of \( k \parallel \), in agreement with Eq. (3). Due to nonparabolicity the spin splitting for larger \( k \parallel \) converges toward a constant.

The spin splitting results in unequal populations \( N_{\pm} \) of the two branches \( E^\pm_\perp(k) \). For a given total density \( N = N_+ + N_- \) and a subband dispersion \( E^\pm_\perp(k) = \langle \mu \rangle k^2 \parallel \pm \langle \alpha E_z \rangle k \parallel \) with \( \mu = h^2/2m^* \) we obtain

\[
N_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} N_\parallel \pm \frac{\langle \alpha E_z \rangle}{8\pi(\mu)^2} \sqrt{8\pi(\mu)^2 N_\parallel - \langle \alpha E_z \rangle^2}. \tag{4}
\]

This equation can be directly compared with, e.g., the results of SdH experiments.

The Rashba model (1) can be derived by purely group-theoretical means. The electron states in the lowest conduction band are \( s \) like (orbital angular momentum \( l = 0 \)). With spin–orbit (SO) interaction we have total angular momentum \( j = 1/2 \). Both \( \mathbf{k} \) and \( \mathbf{E} \) are polar vectors and \( \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E} \) is an axial vector (transforming according to the irreducible representation \( \Gamma_4 \) of \( T_d \)). Likewise, the spin matrices \( \sigma_x, \sigma_y, \) and \( \sigma_z \) form an axial vector \( \mathbf{\sigma} \). The dot product (1) of \( \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{\sigma} \) therefore transforms according to the identity representation \( \Gamma_1 \), in accordance with the theory of invariants of Bir and Pikus. In the \( \Gamma^+_v \) conduction band the scalar triple product (1) is the only term of first order in \( k \) and \( \mathbf{E} \) that is compatible with the symmetry of the band.
Now we want to compare the Rashba model with the SIA spin splitting of hole states. The topmost valence band is \( p \) like (1 = 1). With SO interaction we have \( j = 3/2 \) for the HH/LH states (\( \Gamma^w_6 \)) and \( j = 1/2 \) for the SO states (\( \Gamma^w_7 \)). For the \( \Gamma^w_6 \) valence band there are two sets of matrices which transform like an axial vector, namely \( J = (J_x, J_y, J_z) \) and \( \mathbf{J} = (J^z, J_y^z, J^z) \) (Refs. 22-24). Here \( J_x, J_y, J_z \) and \( J^z, J_y^z, J^z \) are the angular momentum matrices for \( j = 3/2 \). Thus we get

\[
H_{SO}^{8c} = \beta_1 \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{J} + \beta_2 \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{J}. \tag{5}
\]

Similar to the Rashba model the first term has axial symmetry with the symmetry axis being the direction of the electric field \( \mathbf{E} \). The second term is anisotropic, i.e., it depends on both the crystallographic orientation of \( \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{k} \). Using \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) theory we find that the prefactor \( \beta_2 \) is always much smaller than \( \beta_1 \), i.e., the dominant term in Eq. (5) is the first term. This can be easily understood by noting that the \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) coupling between \( \Gamma^w_6 \) and \( \Gamma^w_7 \) is isotropic, so that it contributes to \( \beta_1 \) but not to \( \beta_2 \). The prefactor \( \beta_2 \) stems from \( \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \) coupling to more remote bands such as the \( p \) antibonding conduction bands \( \Gamma^w_8 \) and \( \Gamma^w_7 \).

For \( \mathbf{E} = (0, 0, E_z) \) Eq. (5) becomes (using explicit matrix notation with \( j = 3/2 \) eigenstates in the order \( j_z = +3/2, +1/2, -1/2, -3/2 \))

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} k + & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} k + & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} k - \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} k + \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} k - & 0
\end{pmatrix}
+ \beta_2 E_z
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \frac{7}{8} \sqrt{3} k + & 0 & 3/4 k_+ \\
\frac{7}{8} \sqrt{3} k + & 0 & 5/2 k - & 0 \\
0 & 5/2 k + & 0 & \frac{7}{8} \sqrt{3} k - \\
3/4 k - & 0 & \frac{7}{8} \sqrt{3} k + & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\tag{6}
\]

Thus we have a qualitative difference between the spin splitting of electron and LH states which is proportional to \( k \) and the splitting of HH states which essentially is proportional to \( k^3 \). The former is most important in the low-density regime whereas the latter becomes negligible for small densities. Note that for 2D hole systems the first subband is HH like so that for low densities the SIA spin splitting is given by Eq. (5). In Eq. (6) the lengthy prefactors depend on the details of the geometry of the QW. Moreover, we have omitted a weak dependence on the direction of \( \mathbf{k} \). But the order of the terms with respect to \( k \) is independent of these details. It is crucial that, basically, we have

\[
\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2 \propto \Delta_0 \tag{9}
\]

with \( \Delta_0 \) the SO gap between the bulk valence bands \( \Gamma^w_6 \) and \( \Gamma^w_7 \), i.e., we have no SIA spin splitting for \( \Delta_0 = 0 \). This can be most easily seen if we express \( H_{kp} \) in a basis of orbital angular momentum eigenstates.

A more detailed analysis of our analytical model shows that both \( H_{SO}^{8c} \) and \( H_{SO}^{8v} \) stem from a third order perturbation theory for \( k_z \), \( k = -\partial \phi_z \), and \( E_z \). This seems to be a rather high order. Nevertheless, the resulting terms are fairly large. In agreement with Refs. 8, 18, 19 this is a simple argument to resolve the old controversy based on an argument by Ando27 that spin splitting in 2D systems ought to be negligibly small because for bound states in first order we have \( \langle E_z \rangle = 0 \). We note that the present ansatz for the prefactors \( \alpha \) and \( \beta_1, \beta_2 \) is quite different from the ansatz in Ref. 10. We obtain \( H_{SO}^{8c} \) and \( H_{SO}^{8v} \) by means of Löwdin partitioning of the Hamiltonian whereas in Ref. 10 the authors explicitly introduced \( H_{SO}^{8c} \) into their model. Moreover, we evaluate the matrix elements of \( eE_z \) with respect to envelope functions for
the bound states whereas in Ref. 14 the authors considered matrix elements of $eE_z z$ with respect to bulk Bloch functions. The latter quantities are problematic because they depend on the origin of the coordinate frame.

As an example, we show in Fig. 3 the self-consistently calculated anisotropic subband dispersion $E_\pm(k_{||})$, DOS effective mass $m^*/m_0$, and spin splitting $\Delta E_\pm(k_{||}) - E_\pm(k_{||})$ for a [001] grown GaAs/Al$_{0.3}$Ga$_{0.7}$As heterostructure. The calculation was based on a $14 \times 14$ Hamiltonian $(\Gamma_5, \Gamma_7, \Gamma_6, \Gamma_8, \text{ and } \Gamma_9)$. It fully took into account both SIA and BIA. The weakly divergent van Hove singularity of the DOS effective mass at the subband edge indicates that the $k$ linear splitting is rather small. (Its dominant part is due to BIA.) Basically, the spin splitting in Fig. 3 is proportional to $k_{||}^2$.

Only for the crystallographic growth directions [001] and [111] the hole subband states at $k_{||} = 0$ are pure HH and LH states. For low-symmetry growth directions like [113] and [110] we have mixed HH-LH eigenstates even at $k_{||} = 0$, though often the eigenstates can be labeled by their dominant spinor component. The HH-LH mixing adds a $k$ linear term to the splitting $\Delta E_0$ of the HH states, which often exceeds $|\langle \beta_2 E_z \rangle| k_{||}$. However, this effect is still small when compared with the cubic splitting.

For a HH subband dispersion $E_\pm(k_{||}) = \langle \mu \rangle k_{||}^2 \pm \langle \beta_1 E_z \rangle k_{||}^3$ we obtain for the densities $N_\pm$ in the spin-split subbands

$$N_\pm = \frac{1}{2} N_s \pm \frac{\langle \beta_1 E_z \rangle}{\sqrt{2} \langle \mu \rangle} X \sqrt{\pi N_s (6 - 4/X)}$$

(10a)

with

$$X = 1 + \sqrt{1 - 4\pi N_s \left( \frac{\langle \beta_1 E_z \rangle}{\langle \mu \rangle} \right)^2}.$$  

(10b)

The spin splitting according to Eq. (10) is substantially different from Eq. (9). For electrons and a fixed electric field $E_z$ but varying $N_s$ the difference $\Delta N = N_+ - N_-$ increases like $N_s^{3/2}$ whereas for HH subbands it increases like $N_s^{3/2}$. Using a fixed density $N_s$ but varying $E_z$ it is more difficult to detect the difference between Eqs. (9) and (10). In both cases a power expansion of $\Delta N$ gives $\Delta N = a_1 |E_z| + a_2 |E_z|^3 + O(|E_z|^5)$ with $a_3 < 0$ for electrons and $a_3 > 0$ for HH subbands.

The proportionality (10) is completely analogous to the effective $g$ factor in bulk semiconductors. Lassnigg pointed out that the $B = 0$ spin splitting of electrons can be expressed in terms of a position dependent effective $g$ factor $g^*(z)$. In the following we want to discuss the close relationship between Zeeman splitting and $B = 0$ spin splitting from a more general point of view. Note that in the presence of an external magnetic field $B$ we have $k \times k = (-i\hbar \gamma/h)B$ and the Zeeman splitting in the $\Gamma_6$ conduction band can be expressed as

$$H_{6e}^Z = \frac{i\hbar}{e} g^* \frac{\mu_B}{2} k \times k \cdot \sigma = \frac{g^*}{2} \mu_B B \cdot \sigma$$

(11)

with $\mu_B$ the Bohr magneton. Thus apart from a prefactor we obtain the Rashba term $\Gamma_6$ from Eq. (11) by replacing one of the $k$'s with the electric field $E$. In the $\Gamma_6$ valley $\Gamma_6$ and we have two invariants for the Zeeman splitting $\Gamma_6$.

Here, the first term is the isotropic contribution, and the second term is the anisotropic part. It is well-known that in all common semiconductors for which Eq. (12) is applicable the dominant contribution to $H_{6e}^Z$ is given by the first term proportional to $\kappa$ whereas the second term is rather small. Analogous to $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ the isotropic $k \cdot p$ coupling between $\Gamma_8$ and $\Gamma_6$ contributes to $\kappa$ but not to $q$. The latter stems from $k \cdot p$ coupling to more remote bands such as $\Gamma_8$ and $\Gamma_7$.

Several authors used an apparently closely related intuitive picture for the $B = 0$ spin splitting which was based on the idea that the velocity $v_{||} = h/k_{||}/m^*$ of the 2D electrons is Lorentz transformed into a magnetic field $B$ so that the $B = 0$ spin splitting becomes a Zeeman splitting in the electron’s rest frame. However, this magnetic field is given by $B = |v_{||}| c^2 |E_z|$ (SI units) and for typical values of $E_z$ and $v_{||}$ we have $B \sim 2 \ldots 20 \times 10^{-7}$ T which would result in a spin splitting of the order of $5 \times 10^{-9} \ldots 5 \times 10^{-5}$ meV. On the other hand, the experimentally observed spin splitting is of the order of $0.1 \ldots 10$ meV. The $B = 0$ spin splitting requires the SO interaction caused by the atomic cores. In bulk semiconductors this interaction is responsible for the SO gap $\Delta_0$ between the valence bands $\Gamma_8$ and $\Gamma_7$ which appears in Eq. (9). The SO interaction is the larger the larger the atomic number of the constituting atoms. In Si we have $\Delta_0 = 44$ meV whereas in Ge we have $\Delta_0 = 296$ meV. Therefore, SIA spin splitting in Si quantum structures is rather small.

Recently, spin splitting in 2D systems has gained renewed interest because of an argument by Pudalov which relates the metal-insulator transition (MIT) in low-density 2D systems with the SIA spin splitting. Based on the Rashba model, it was argued that the SIA spin splitting “results in a drastic change of the internal properties of the system even without allowing for the Coulomb interaction.” However, as we have shown above, this argument is applicable only to electron and LH states. The MIT has been observed also in pure HH systems in, e.g., Si/SiGe QW’s. As noted above, SO interaction and spin splitting in these systems are rather small so that it appears unlikely that here the broken inversion symmetry of the confining potential is responsible for the MIT. We note that in Si 2D electron systems the effective $g$ factor is enhanced due to many body effects. It can be expected that similar effects are also relevant for the $B = 0$ spin splitting.

In conclusion, we have analyzed the SIA spin splitting in 2D electron and hole systems. In 2D hole systems the splitting differs remarkably from its familiar counterpart in the conduction band. For electron states it increases linearly with in-plane wave vector $k_{||}$ whereas the spin splitting of heavy hole states can be of third order in $k_{||}$. We have discussed consequences of this behavior in the
context of recent arguments on the origin of the metal-insulator transition observed in 2D systems.
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2 The spin-split eigenstates contain equal contributions of up and down spinor components which reflects the fact that for \( B = 0 \) the system has a vanishing magnetic moment. However, the eigenstates are circularly polarized, and recently some authors have used the term “chiral splitting” instead of “spin splitting” (e.g., Ref. [9]).
25 In the same way we can derive \( H^{(3)} \) for other blocks of a multiband Hamiltonian; e.g., for \( H^{(2)} \) we get Eq. [1].
27 For a second-order term such as \( \langle h_i | k_{\perp} | c_j \rangle \cdot \langle c_j | k_{\perp} | h_k \rangle \cdot \langle h_i | E_{\parallel} z | h_k \rangle \), we have only one energy denominator of the order of the fundamental gap \( E_g \); the second denominator is given by the subband spacing. Note that \( 1/m^* \propto 1/E_g \), i.e., both spin splitting and \( \hbar^2 k_{\perp}^2/(2m^*) \) scale like \( E_g^{-1} \). If we restrict ourselves to the Luttinger Hamiltonian we get Eq. [1] from a second order perturbation theory for \( E_{\parallel} z \) and the off-diagonal terms \( \gamma_3 k_{\parallel} k_{\perp} \). Here, the energy denominator \( E_g \) is contained in the Luttinger parameter \( \gamma_3 \).