

January 01, 2008

## Electron transport in a slot-gate Si MOSFET

I. Shlimak

*Bar-Ilan University, Israel*

V. Ginodman

*Bar-Ilan University, Israel*

A. Butenko

*Bar-Ilan University, Israel*

K.-J. Friedland

*Paul-Drude Institut für Festkörperelektronik, Germany*

S. V. Kravchenko

*Northeastern University*

---

### Recommended Citation

Shlimak, I.; Ginodman, V.; Butenko, A.; Friedland, K.-J.; and Kravchenko, S. V., "Electron transport in a slot-gate Si MOSFET" (2008). *Physics Faculty Publications*. Paper 167. <http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20000778>

# Electron transport in a slot-gate Si MOSFET

I. Shlimak, V. Ginodman, and A. Butenko

*Jack and Pearl Resnick Institute of Advanced Technology,  
Department of Physics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel*

K.-J. Friedland

*Paul-Drude Institut für Festkörperelektronik, Hausvogteiplatz 5-7, 10117, Berlin, Germany*

S. V. Kravchenko

*Physics Department, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, U.S.A*

The transversal and longitudinal resistance in the quantum Hall effect regime was measured in a Si MOSFET sample in which a slot-gate allows one to vary the electron density and filling factor in different parts of the sample. In case of unequal gate voltages, the longitudinal resistances on the opposite sides of the sample differ from each other because the originated Hall voltage difference is added to the longitudinal voltage only on one side depending on the gradient of the gate voltages and the direction of the external magnetic field. After subtracting the Hall voltage difference, the increase in longitudinal resistance is observed when electrons on the opposite sides of the slot occupy Landau levels with different spin orientations.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The fabrication of Si-MOSFET samples with a narrow gate barrier or with narrow slots in the gate [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] has given rise to new experimental possibilities. In particular, samples with a narrow gate barrier [1, 2] were used for investigation of the backscattering of the edge current in the quantum Hall effect (QHE) regime, while the slot-gate geometry has permitted reliable measurements of a two-dimensional electron transport in case of low electron density [6]. In this work, we use the slot-gate geometry to measure the longitudinal resistance  $R_{xx}$  in the QHE regime for unequal electron densities along the sample. Our aim was to reveal the influence of the spin-flip process on the electron transport when electrons on the opposite sides of the slot occupy Landau levels (LL) with different spin orientations.

## II. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The sample with two narrow slots (100 nm) in the upper metallic gate was similar to that described earlier in Ref. [6] (see insert in fig. 1). Application of different gate voltages  $V_G$  to the gates  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  and  $G_3$  permitted one to maintain different electron densities  $n$  in different parts of the sample.

The sample resistance was measured at  $T = 40$  mK using a standard lock-in technique with the measuring current 20 nA at a frequency of 10.6 Hz. The electron mobility was  $\mu = 2.68 \text{ m}^2/\text{V} \cdot \text{s}$  at  $n = 0.83 \cdot 10^{16} \text{ m}^{-2}$ .

In the first series of experiments, all gates were connected. The magnetic field dependences of the Hall (transverse) resistance  $R_{xy}$  measured between probes  $V_2$ – $V_7$  are shown in fig. 1a. The “plateaus” are clearly seen only for Landau filling factors  $\nu \equiv hn/eB = 4$  and

$\nu = 6$  corresponding to the Hall resistances  $6.45 \text{ k}\Omega = 1/4(h/e^2)$  and  $4.3 \text{ k}\Omega = 1/6(h/e^2)$ , correspondingly. Clear “plateaus” in  $R_{xy}$  at  $\nu > 6$  are usually not observed in Si-MOSFET being “contaminated” by the “overshoot” effect [7, 8].

The longitudinal resistance  $R_{xx}$  was measured across the gap between voltage probes  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  ( $R_{12}$ ) and without the gap, between probes  $V_2$  and  $V_3$  ( $R_{23}$ ). In zero magnetic field,  $R_{12}$  is 1.5 times larger than  $R_{23}$  (fig. 1b) due to the distance between probes 1 and 2 being 1.5 times larger than that between probes 2 and 3. Therefore, the longitudinal resistance is not affected by the existence of the narrow slot in the gate. In other words, in our sample, the narrow slot in the upper gate does not lead to the existence of a potential barrier. It is remarkable, however, that at magnetic fields above 10 T, both resistance curves merge. This can be explained by the influence of the edge channels [9, 10], so that the length between probes becomes irrelevant.

In case of different gate voltages  $V_{G1} \neq V_{G2}$  ( $V_{G3}$  was always equal to  $V_{G2}$ ), the difference in the transverse Hall voltages  $\Delta V_H \equiv V_{18} - V_{27}$  appears.  $\Delta V_H$  is added to the longitudinal voltage  $V_{xx}$  only on one side of the sample, depending on the gradient of the gate voltage  $\nabla V_G$ , which makes the longitudinal resistance non-symmetric: for  $V_{G1} < V_{G2}$  at given direction of the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $\Delta V_H$  was added to the voltage  $V_{12}$ , while for  $V_{G1} > V_{G2}$ ,  $V_{12}$  remains unchanged (fig. 2a,b). On the opposite side of the sample, the situation is reverse:  $\Delta V_H$  is added to the voltage drop  $V_{87}$  for  $V_{G1} > V_{G2}$ . It was shown in Ref. [3] that the sample side where  $\Delta V_H$  is added to  $V_{xx}$  is determined by the vector product  $\mathbf{B} \times \nabla V_G$ . Different values of  $V_{xx}$  on the opposite sides of the sample mean that in order to analyse the longitudinal resistance in the case of different gate voltages, one need to subtract properly the contribution of the Hall voltage difference.

In another set of experiments, conducted at  $T =$




FIG. 1: *a* — transverse resistance  $R_{xy}$  as a function of magnetic field at fixed gate voltages  $V_G = 7, 10, 12$  V; *b* — longitudinal resistance  $R_{xx}$  measured between probes  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ ,  $R_{12}$  (1) and between probes  $V_2$  and  $V_3$ ,  $R_{23}$  (2) at  $V_G = 7$  V. The insert shows the schematics of the slot-gate sample.

300 mK, the magnetic field was fixed at 8 Tesla, while the gate voltage was varied. First, all gates were connected and  $V_H$  was measured between probes  $V_1$  and  $V_8$  (figure 3, blue line). Using the data shown in fig. 1*a*, one can conclude that the “plateau” at around  $V_G = 10$  V corresponds to the filling factor  $\nu = 6$ , while the “plateaus” at around  $V_G = 7$  V and  $V_G = 13$  V correspond to  $\nu = 4$  and  $\nu = 8$ , correspondingly.

Figure 4*a* shows  $V_{xx}$  measured simultaneously on both sides of the sample between probes  $V_1$ – $V_2$  and probes  $V_8$ – $V_7$ .  $V_{G2} = 10$  V was kept constant, while  $V_{G1}$  was varied from 5 V to 15 V. In this experiment, the gradient of the gate voltage undergoes a sign change at  $V_{G1} = 10$  V. If the direction of the magnetic field is reversed, the curves trade places. The difference between the two curves  $\Delta V_{xx}$  plotted as a function of  $V_{G1}$  (fig. 3, red line) practically coincides with  $V_H(V_{G1})$ . This fact allows us to subtract properly the contribution of the Hall voltage




FIG. 2: Longitudinal resistance  $R_{12}$  measured when  $V_{G1} \neq V_{G2}$ . *a* —  $R_{12}$  measured when  $V_{G1} < V_{G2}$  ( $V_{G1} = 7$  V,  $V_{G2} = 12$  V) (curve 2);  $R_{12}$  for the case of equal gate voltages  $V_{G1} = V_{G2} = 7$  V is shown for comparison (curve 1); *b* —  $R_{12}$  measured when  $V_{G1} > V_{G2}$  ( $V_{G1} = 12$  V,  $V_{G2} = 7$  V) (curve 2),  $R_{12}$  for the case of equal gate voltages  $V_{G1} = V_{G2} = 12$  V is shown for comparison (curve 1).

difference: one need to take into account only the lower parts of the both curves. The result is shown in fig. 4*b*.

Let us discuss the curve shown in fig. 4*b*. Keeping constant  $V_{G2} = 10$  V means that electrons underneath the gate  $G_2$  always occupy the sixth LL with spin “down” (see fig. 3 and the inset). When  $V_{G1}$  is varied from 9 V to 11 V, electrons across the slot occupy the same (6th) LL and, therefore, have the same spin orientation. However, when  $7 \text{ V} < V_{G1} < 9 \text{ V}$  and  $12 \text{ V} < V_{G1} < 14 \text{ V}$ , the electrons underneath the gate  $G_1$  occupy “spin up” LLs 4 and 8, correspondingly. At both filling factors  $\nu = 4$  and 8 (indicated in the figure by arrows), the longitudinal resistance increases compared to the  $\nu = 6$  case. Possible reason for this resistance increase is some additional scattering [11, 12] due to the necessity for electrons to flip their spins when crossing the slot.




FIG. 3: Dependence of the Hall voltage  $V_H$  on the gate voltage at fixed magnetic field  $B = 8$  T (blue line, left scale). The inset shows distribution of Landau levels in a Si-MOSFET with cyclotron, spin and valley splittings indicated. Numbers correspond to the integer values of the filling factor  $\nu$ . The difference of the longitudinal voltages measured on the opposite sides of the sample  $\Delta V_{xx} = V_{87} - V_{12}$  is plotted as a function of  $V_{G1}$  at fixed  $V_{G2} = 10$  V for comparison (red line, right scale).

### Acknowledgments

I. S. thanks V. T. Dolgoplov and A. A. Shashkin for fruitful discussion and the Erick and Sheila Samson Chair




FIG. 4: *a* — longitudinal voltages across the slot  $V_{87}$  and  $V_{12}$  as a function of  $V_{G1}$  at fixed  $V_{G2} = 10$  V and  $B = 8$  T, *b* — lower part of the curves: no contribution of the Hall voltage difference.

of Semiconductor Technology for financial support. We are grateful to A. Bogush and A. Belostotsky for assistance.

- 
- [1] R. J. Haug, A. H. MacDonald, P. Streda, and K. von Klitzing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2797 (1988).
  - [2] S. Washburn, A. B. Fowler, H. Schmid, and D. Kern, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2801 (1988).
  - [3] A. B. Berkut, Yu. V. Dubrovskii, M. S. Nunuparov, M. I. Reznikov, and V. I. Talyanskii, *JETP Lett.* **44**, 324 (1986).
  - [4] S. L. Wang, P. C. van Son, S. Bakker, and T. M. Klapwijk, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **3**, 4297 (1991).
  - [5] P. C. van Son, S. L. Wang, and T. M. Klapwijk, *Surface Science* **263**, 284 (1992).
  - [6] A. A. Shashkin, S. V. Kravchenko, V. T. Dolgoplov, and T. M. Klapwijk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 086801 (2001).
  - [7] C. A. Richter, R. G. Wheeler, R. N. Sacks, *Surface Science* **263**, 270 (1992).
  - [8] I. Shlimak, V. Ginodman, A. B. Gerber, A. Milner, K.-J. Friedland, and D. J. Paul, *Europhys. Lett.* **69**, 997 (2005).
  - [9] P. L. McEuen, A. Szafer, C. A. Richter, B. W. Alphenaar, J. K. Jain, A. D. Stone, R. G. Wheeler, and R. N. Sacks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 2062 (1990).
  - [10] V. T. Dolgoplov, G. V. Kravchenko, and A. A. Shashkin, *Solid State Commun.* **78**, 999 (1991).
  - [11] M. Büttiker, *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 7906 (1990).
  - [12] K. Vakili, V. P. Shkolnikov, E. Tutuc, N. C. Bishop, E. P. De Poortere, and M. Shayegan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 176402 (2005).