

Rashba spin-orbit coupling and spin precession in carbon nanotubes

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2005 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 17 5523

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0953-8984/17/36/008>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 129.252.86.83

The article was downloaded on 28/05/2010 at 05:54

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Rashba spin–orbit coupling and spin precession in carbon nanotubes

A De Martino and R Egger¹

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Heinrich-Heine-Universität, D-40225 Düsseldorf, Germany

E-mail: egger@thphy.uni-duesseldorf.de

Received 30 June 2005, in final form 3 August 2005

Published 26 August 2005

Online at stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/17/5523

Abstract

The Rashba spin–orbit coupling in carbon nanotubes and its effect on spin-dependent transport properties are analysed theoretically. We focus on clean non-interacting nanotubes with tunable number of subbands N . The peculiar band structure is shown to allow in principle Datta–Das oscillatory behaviour in the tunnelling magnetoresistance as a function of gate voltage, despite the presence of multiple bands. We discuss the conditions for observing Datta–Das oscillations in carbon nanotubes.

1. Introduction

Spintronics in molecular conductors is a field attracting more and more attention, both in fundamental physics as well as in application-oriented materials science [1]. Here the quantum-mechanical electronic spin is the central object controlling transport properties. For a conductor sandwiched between ferromagnetic leads, a different resistance can be observed depending on the relative orientation of the lead magnetizations. Quite often, the resistance is larger in the antiparallel configuration than in the parallel one, but sometimes also the reverse situation can be observed. It is useful to define the tunnel magnetoresistance (TMR), $\rho_t = (R_{AP} - R_P)/R_P$, as the relative difference of the corresponding resistances.

A particularly interesting material group in that context is the carbon nanotubes (CNTs); see [2, 3] for general reviews. Quite a number of experimental studies concerning spin transport through individual multi-walled (MWNT) or single-walled (SWNT) nanotubes contacted by ferromagnetic leads have been reported over the past few years [4–10]. In particular, the experiments of the Basel group [9, 10] used thin-film PdNi alloys as ferromagnetic leads in order to contact either SWNTs or MWNTs, where the shape anisotropy and the geometry of the set-up allowed the study of the spin dependence of the electrical transport. These experiments revealed *oscillatory* behaviour of the TMR as a function of the external gate voltage. Similar oscillations were predicted as a consequence of the gate voltage-tunable Rashba spin–orbit (SO)

¹ Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

interaction [11, 12] in a classic paper by Datta and Das some time ago [13]. Since Datta–Das oscillations have still not been observed experimentally, a thorough theoretical investigation of this effect in nanotubes is called for and provided here. Unfortunately, from our analysis below, we find that the weakness of SO couplings in nanotubes excludes an interpretation of these data in terms of the Datta–Das effect—they can, however, be explained in terms of quantum interference effects [10]. Nevertheless, we show that the presence of multiple bands in CNTs is not detrimental, and under certain circumstances, the effect may be sufficiently enhanced to be observable, e.g., by a tuning of the number of bands via external gates along the lines of [14]. In the original Datta–Das proposal [13], subband mixing was ignored, so different channels just added up coherently, but subband mixing was later argued to spoil the effect [15, 16]. In CNTs, the special band structure requires a careful re-examination of the Datta–Das idea in this context, and we shall show that the arguments of [15, 16] do not necessarily apply here.

Recent theoretical studies of spin-dependent transport in CNTs have mainly focused on the single-channel limit, taking into account electron–electron interactions within the framework of the Luttinger liquid theory [17–21] (see also [22–24] for related discussions on interacting quantum wires with Rashba SO coupling). Here we confine ourselves to the non-interacting problem in order to not overly complicate the analysis, but study the many-band case and details of the band structure. Interactions can be taken into account within the Luttinger liquid approach at a later stage, and may enhance the effect of SO couplings [22, 25]. We shall also neglect disorder effects. Mean free paths in high-quality SWNTs typically exceed $1\ \mu\text{m}$, while in MWNTs this may be a more severe approximation for some samples. However, high-quality MWNTs with ultralong mean free paths have also been reported recently [26].

The structure of this paper is as follows. In section 2 we derive the Rashba spin–orbit Hamiltonian from microscopic considerations. The resulting tight-binding SO Hamiltonian will be studied at low energy scales in section 3, where we derive its continuum form. In section 4, the consequences with regard to Datta–Das oscillations in the TMR are analysed. We shall always consider the zero-temperature limit, and (in most of the paper) put $\hbar = 1$.

2. Rashba spin–orbit coupling in nanotubes

We start by noting that transport effectively proceeds through the outermost shell of a MWNT only, such that we can take a single-shell model even when dealing with a MWNT. Experimentally and theoretically, it is understood that such a model works very well for good-quality MWNTs [2], essentially because only the outermost shell is electrically contacted and tunnelling between different shells is largely suppressed [27, 28]. Naturally, a single-shell description is also appropriate for SWNTs, where we assume a sufficiently large radius R such that occupation of multiple subbands can be possible. (For a MWNT, R denotes the radius of the outermost shell.) Depending on the electrochemical potential μ (doping level), we then have to deal with N spin-degenerate bands. We assume full quantum coherence (no dephasing), so that the usual Landauer–Büttiker approach applies, and exclude external magnetic fields or electric field inhomogeneities, say, due to the electrodes. We proceed to derive the Rashba SO interaction, H_{so} , for this problem. Notice that this is different from the intrinsic atomic SO interaction discussed in [18, 29]. In particular, the SO coupling in [18, 29] vanishes in the limit of large radius, which is not the case for the Rashba SO coupling that we discuss below. Though Ando’s SO coupling [18] could straightforwardly be included in our analysis, being gate voltage independent it could not change our conclusions relating to the gate voltage-dependent oscillations in the magnetoresistance and is neglected in what follows.

We first define a fixed reference frame $\mathcal{S} = \{\hat{Y}, \hat{Z}, \hat{X}\}$, with unit vector \hat{X} pointing in the axis direction and \hat{Z} perpendicular to the substrate on which the CNT is supposed to be

located. Next we introduce a second, local reference frame $\mathcal{S}_i = \{\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{t}_i, \hat{X}\}$ relative to each lattice site \vec{R}_i on the tube surface, where $\hat{\rho}_i$ and \hat{t}_i are unit vectors along the local normal and tangential (around the circumference) directions at \vec{R}_i , respectively. Using polar coordinates in the plane transverse to the tube axis, the relation between \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}_i is given by

$$\hat{\rho}_i = \cos \varphi_i \hat{Y} + \sin \varphi_i \hat{Z}, \quad \hat{t}_i = -\sin \varphi_i \hat{Y} + \cos \varphi_i \hat{Z}. \quad (1)$$

The position vector of a given carbon atom can then be written as $\vec{R}_i = R\hat{\rho}_i + X_i\hat{X}$. For later convenience, we also introduce another reference frame. For each pair of sites \vec{R}_i and \vec{R}_j , we define

$$\vec{R}_{ij} = \vec{R}_i - \vec{R}_j \equiv X_{ij}\hat{X} + \vec{\rho}_{ij}, \quad (2)$$

and denote the direction perpendicular to $\hat{\rho}_{ij}$ and \hat{X} as $\hat{\rho}_{ij}^\perp$. Then $\{\hat{\rho}_{ij}^\perp, \hat{\rho}_{ij}, \hat{X}\}$ constitutes a new local frame \mathcal{S}_{ij} , and one has

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{ij}^\perp &= \cos[(\varphi_i + \varphi_j)/2]\hat{Y} + \sin[(\varphi_i + \varphi_j)/2]\hat{Z}, \\ \hat{\rho}_{ij} &= -\sin[(\varphi_i + \varphi_j)/2]\hat{Y} + \cos[(\varphi_i + \varphi_j)/2]\hat{Z}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The $2p_z$ orbital at position \vec{R}_i can then be represented as

$$\chi_i(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_i) = \alpha(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_i) \cdot \hat{\rho}_i e^{-\beta|\vec{r} - \vec{R}_i|}, \quad (4)$$

where $4\alpha = (2\pi a_0^5)^{-1/2}$, $\beta = (2a_0)^{-1}$, $a_0 = \hbar^2/m_e^2 = 0.53 \text{ \AA}$ is the Bohr radius, and m is the electron's mass. We introduce an index i on the orbital in order to keep track of the atom at which it is centred. The wavefunction (4) is expected to be highly accurate for not too small R , where hybridization with the sp^2 orbitals is negligible.

At large distances from the tube, external gates generally produce an electric field perpendicular to the tube axis and the substrate. As has been shown in detail in previous works [30, 31], polarization effects of the CNT itself due to a transverse field result in a reduction of the externally applied field described by

$$E_0 = \frac{1}{1 + 2\alpha_{0yy}/R^2} E_{\text{ext}},$$

where α_{0yy} is the unscreened transverse static polarizability. Since α_{0yy} is approximately proportional to R^2 , the factor in front of E_{ext} practically equals a constant, ≈ 0.2 [30]. Then, assuming homogeneity, the electric field due to the gate can be written as

$$\vec{E} = E_0 \hat{Z}, \quad (5)$$

which in turn produces the (first-quantized) Rashba spin–orbit interaction [11, 12]. With standard Pauli matrices $\vec{\sigma}$ acting in spin space,

$$H_{\text{so}} = \frac{e\hbar}{4m^2c^2} \vec{E} \cdot (\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{p}). \quad (6)$$

We proceed to derive the second-quantized spin–orbit Hamiltonian within the tight-binding approximation. For that purpose, we need the matrix element of the momentum operator between two $2p_z$ orbitals $\vec{p}_{ij} = \langle \chi_i | \vec{p} | \chi_j \rangle$, from which we get the following form for the SO Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{so}} = g \sum_{ij} c_i^\dagger \left[(\vec{\sigma} \times \vec{p}_{ij}) \cdot \hat{Z} \right] c_j, \quad (7)$$

where the fermionic operator $c_{i\sigma}$ destroys an electron with spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ in the $2p_z$ orbital centred at \vec{R}_i , and $g = E_0/4m^2c^2$. For calculational convenience, the matrix element \vec{p}_{ij} can

be written as $g\vec{p}_{ij} = i(\vec{v}_{ij} + \vec{u}_{ij})$, where the spin-orbit vectors \vec{v}_{ij} and \vec{u}_{ij} are defined as

$$\vec{v}_{ij} = -g\alpha \int d^3\vec{r} \chi_i(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_i) \hat{\rho}_j e^{-\beta|\vec{r} - \vec{R}_j|}, \quad (8)$$

$$\vec{u}_{ij} = g\beta \int d^3\vec{r} \chi_i(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_i) \frac{\vec{r} - \vec{R}_j}{|\vec{r} - \vec{R}_j|} \chi_j(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_j). \quad (9)$$

Note that the moduli of \vec{v}_{ij} and \vec{u}_{ij} have the dimension of energy, and their sum (but not necessarily each term separately) is antisymmetric under exchange of i and j .

We first observe that the spin-orbit vectors connecting a site with itself clearly vanish, since $\langle \chi_i | \vec{p} | \chi_i \rangle = 0$. Let us then discuss spin-orbit vectors connecting different sites. Since the orbitals (4) decay exponentially, it is sufficient to consider only the case of nearest neighbours. We start with \vec{v}_{ij} . Shifting $\vec{r} \rightarrow \vec{s} + \vec{R}_i$ in equation (8) and using equation (4), we obtain

$$\vec{v}_{ij} = -g\alpha^2 \hat{\rho}_j \int d^3\vec{s} (\vec{s} \cdot \hat{\rho}_i) e^{-\beta s} e^{-\beta|\vec{s} + \vec{R}_{ij}|}.$$

Using $\vec{s} = s_{\parallel} \hat{R}_{ij} + \vec{s}_{\perp}$, we then rewrite the above integral as

$$\int d^3\vec{s} (\vec{s}_{\parallel} \hat{R}_{ij} + \vec{s}_{\perp}) \cdot \hat{\rho}_i e^{-\beta s} e^{-\beta\sqrt{(s_{\parallel}+d)^2 + s_{\perp}^2}},$$

where we use $|\vec{R}_{ij}| = d$, with the nearest-neighbour distance among carbon atoms in graphene $d = 1.42 \text{ \AA}$. Note that $\beta d = 1.34$. The second term in the brackets is odd in \vec{s}_{\perp} and thus vanishes, and we obtain

$$\vec{v}_{ij} = -g\alpha^2 \hat{\rho}_j \frac{2R}{d} \sin^2\left(\frac{\varphi_i - \varphi_j}{2}\right) d^4 \gamma_0, \quad (10)$$

where we have used $\hat{R}_{ij} \cdot \hat{\rho}_i = \frac{2R}{d} \sin^2\left(\frac{\varphi_i - \varphi_j}{2}\right)$ and the dimensionless numerical factor γ_0 :

$$\gamma_0 = \int dx dy dz x e^{-\beta d \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}} e^{-\beta d \sqrt{(x+d)^2 + y^2 + z^2}}.$$

For \vec{v}_{ji} , we find

$$\vec{v}_{ji} = g\alpha^2 \hat{\rho}_i \frac{2R}{d} \sin^2\left(\frac{\varphi_i - \varphi_j}{2}\right) d^4 \gamma_0.$$

Notice that, up to higher orders in d/R , the unit vectors $\hat{\rho}_{i,j}$ can be replaced by $\hat{\rho}_{ij}^{\perp}$, which makes clear that \vec{v}_{ij} is normal to the tube surface. Now $|\sin[(\varphi_i - \varphi_j)/2]|$ varies between zero (when the two sites are aligned in the axis direction) and $d/2R \ll 1$ (when the two sites are aligned in the circumferential direction). Thus, to zeroth order in d/R , \vec{v}_{ij} vanishes: it is a pure curvature effect, peculiar to nanotubes, which does not exist in graphene. In practice, \vec{v}_{ij} is tiny and certainly subleading to \vec{u}_{ij} , which turns out to be of order $(d/R)^0$. We shall therefore neglect it in what follows.

Let us now turn to \vec{u}_{ij} . We shift $\vec{r} \rightarrow \vec{s} + (\vec{R}_i + \vec{R}_j)/2$ in equation (9), and rewrite \vec{u}_{ij} as the sum of two terms:

$$\vec{u}_{ij}^{(1)} = g\beta \int d^3\vec{s} \chi_i(\vec{s} - \vec{R}_{ij}/2) \chi_j(\vec{s} + \vec{R}_{ij}/2) \frac{\vec{s}}{|\vec{s} + \vec{R}_{ij}/2|}, \quad (11)$$

$$\vec{u}_{ij}^{(2)} = \frac{g\beta}{2} \vec{R}_{ij} \int d^3\vec{s} \chi_i(\vec{s} - \vec{R}_{ij}/2) \chi_j(\vec{s} + \vec{R}_{ij}/2) \frac{1}{|\vec{s} + \vec{R}_{ij}/2|}. \quad (12)$$

Writing again $\vec{s} = s_{\parallel} \hat{R}_{ij} + \vec{s}_{\perp}$, the computation of the above integrals leads, to the lowest non-vanishing order in d/R , to the following expressions:

$$\vec{u}_{ij}^{(1)} = g\beta\alpha^2 \vec{R}_{ij} d^4 \gamma_1 \equiv u_1 \vec{R}_{ij}, \quad (13)$$

$$\vec{u}_{ij}^{(2)} = \frac{g\beta}{2} \alpha^2 \vec{R}_{ij} d^4 \gamma_2 \equiv u_2 \vec{R}_{ij}, \quad (14)$$

with the dimensionless numerical factors

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \int dx dy dz \frac{xz^2 e^{-\beta d \sqrt{(x-1/2)^2 + y^2 + z^2}} e^{-\beta d \sqrt{(x+1/2)^2 + y^2 + z^2}}}{\sqrt{(x+1/2)^2 + y^2 + z^2}} \\ &\simeq -0.0375, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_2 &= \int dx dy dz \frac{z^2 e^{-\beta d \sqrt{(x-1/2)^2 + y^2 + z^2}} e^{-\beta d \sqrt{(x+1/2)^2 + y^2 + z^2}}}{\sqrt{(x+1/2)^2 + y^2 + z^2}} \\ &\simeq 0.3748. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

To lowest order in d/R , it does not make a difference whether we take the tangent unit vector at \vec{R}_j , \vec{R}_i , or at $(\vec{R}_i + \vec{R}_j)/2$. Hence we may write $\hat{\rho}_{ij} \rightarrow \hat{e}_{\varphi}$, where \hat{e}_{φ} is the unit tangent vector at $(\vec{R}_i + \vec{R}_j)/2$. We then get SO couplings along the axial and along the circumferential direction,

$$\vec{u}_{ij} = u \left[(\vec{R}_{ij} \cdot \hat{X}) \hat{X} + (\vec{R}_{ij} \cdot \hat{e}_{\varphi}) \hat{e}_{\varphi} \right], \quad (17)$$

with $u = u_1 + u_2$. Note that we have neglected a tiny component of \vec{R}_{ij} normal to the tube surface. The above discussion then results in the tight-binding Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + H_{\text{so}}$, where

$$H_0 = -t \sum_{\vec{r}, a} c_{\text{B}, \vec{r} + \vec{\delta}_a}^{\dagger} c_{\text{A}, \vec{r}} + \text{h.c.},$$

with $t \approx 2.7$ eV [3]. Here the \vec{r} denote all sublattice-A tight-binding sites of the lattice. Furthermore, the $\vec{\delta}_{a=1,2,3}$ are vectors connecting \vec{r} with the three nearest-neighbour sites which are all located on sublattice B [3]. Since we consider the limit $d/R \ll 1$, the $\vec{\delta}_a$ at each site effectively lie in the tangent plane to the tube surface at that site. The Rashba spin-orbit Hamiltonian then reads

$$H_{\text{so}} = iu \sum_{\vec{r}, a} c_{\text{B}, \vec{r} + \vec{\delta}_a}^{\dagger} \left[(\vec{\sigma} \times [(\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{X}) \hat{X} + (\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{e}_{\varphi}) \hat{e}_{\varphi}]) \cdot \hat{Z} \right] c_{\text{A}, \vec{r}} + \text{h.c.} \quad (18)$$

3. Continuum limit

Since we are interested in the low-energy long-wavelength properties, we now expand the electron operator around the Fermi points K, K' in terms of Bloch waves [3],

$$\frac{c_{p\vec{r}}}{\sqrt{S}} = e^{i\vec{K} \cdot \vec{r}} F_{1p}(\vec{r}) + e^{-i\vec{K} \cdot \vec{r}} F_{2p}(\vec{r}), \quad (19)$$

where $S = \sqrt{3}a^2/2$ is the area of the unit cell, $a = \sqrt{3}d$, and $p = \text{A/B}$ is the sublattice index. The $F_{\alpha p}$ are slowly varying electron field operators, and we choose the Fermi points at $\vec{K} = (4\pi/3a, 0)$ and $\vec{K}' = -\vec{K}$ [3]. We then expand $F(\vec{r} + \vec{\delta}) \simeq F(\vec{r}) + \vec{\delta} \cdot \nabla F(\vec{r})$ and use the bond vectors

$$\vec{\delta}_1 = \frac{a}{\sqrt{3}}(0, -1), \quad \vec{\delta}_2 = \frac{a}{2}(1, 1/\sqrt{3}), \quad \vec{\delta}_3 = \frac{a}{2}(-1, 1/\sqrt{3}). \quad (20)$$

These vectors are given in a fixed reference frame for a 2D graphene sheet, and we must then perform a rotation to longitudinal and circumferential directions via the chiral angle. This rotation results in fixed phases that can be absorbed in the definition of $F_{\alpha p}$ and do not appear in final results. This is of course expected from the $U(1)$ symmetry emerging at low energies in the dispersion relation of graphene [3]. After some algebra, the usual Dirac Hamiltonian for the kinetic term follows:

$$H_0 = v \int d^2\vec{r} F^\dagger \left[(T_0 \otimes \tau_2 \otimes \sigma_0) (-i\partial_x) + (T_3 \otimes \tau_1 \otimes \sigma_0) (-i\partial_y) \right] F, \quad (21)$$

where $v = \sqrt{3}at/2 \simeq 8 \times 10^5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ is the Fermi velocity, and x, y are longitudinal and circumferential coordinates, respectively, with $0 < y \leq 2\pi R$. Finally, T_i and τ_i are also Pauli matrices that now act in the space of Fermi (K, K') points and sublattice space (A, B), respectively. For $i = 0$, these are defined as 2×2 unit matrices.

The low-energy limit of the SO term (18) can be obtained in the following way. First we observe that

$$\left[(\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{X})\hat{X} + (\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{e}_\varphi)\hat{e}_\varphi \right] \times \hat{Z} = -(\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{X})\hat{Y} - \sin(y/R)(\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{e}_\varphi)\hat{X}.$$

Here the only approximation is the assumption that the bond vectors lie in the plane tangent to the nanotube surface at \vec{r} . Second, by using the bond vectors (20) and taking into account the chiral angle η between the fixed direction on the graphite sheet and the circumferential direction on the nanotube, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_a c_{\vec{r}+\vec{\delta}_a}^\dagger (\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{X}) c_{\vec{r}} &\approx \frac{-3d}{2} \left(F_{B1}^\dagger e^{-i\eta} F_{A1} + F_{B2}^\dagger e^{i\eta} F_{A2} \right), \\ \sum_a c_{\vec{r}+\vec{\delta}_a}^\dagger (\vec{\delta}_a \cdot \hat{e}_\varphi) c_{\vec{r}} &\approx \frac{-3d}{2} \left(iF_{B1}^\dagger e^{-i\eta} F_{A1} - iF_{B2}^\dagger e^{i\eta} F_{A2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we take into account exactly the relative orientation of the bond vectors with respect to the directions \hat{X} and \hat{e}_φ for a generic nanotube, which is encoded in the chiral angle η . The constant phases $e^{\pm i\eta}$ can be absorbed by appropriately redefining the operators as $F_{A2} \rightarrow e^{-i\eta} F_{A2}$ and $F_{B1} \rightarrow e^{-i\eta} F_{B1}$, and the final result can be written down in the form

$$H_{so} = \int d^2\vec{r} F^\dagger \left[u_{\parallel} T_0 \otimes \tau_1 \otimes \sigma_2 + u_{\perp} \sin(y/R) T_3 \otimes \tau_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \right] F, \quad (22)$$

with $u_{\parallel} = u_{\perp} = 3du/2$. For the sake of generality, we continue to use different coupling constants u_{\perp} and u_{\parallel} . It is worthwhile to mention that the leading term for the Rashba spin-orbit coupling in a CNT, equation (22), does not depend on longitudinal momentum. This is due to the peculiar band structure of graphene with its isolated Fermi (K) points. In the above derivation, we also find terms that are linear in momentum, i.e., contain spatial derivatives of the electron operators. Such terms only produce tiny renormalizations of the velocities and will be neglected here. The second term in equation (22) allows for spin flips and mixes transverse subbands.

From now on, for simplicity, we consider just a single Fermi point, say, K . After the global $SU(2)$ rotation $\sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_3$ in spin space, we get in compact notation

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = v \left[-i\tau_1 \partial_y - i\tau_2 \partial_x \right]. \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{so} = u_{\parallel} \tau_1 \sigma_3 + u_{\perp} \sin(y/R) \tau_2 \sigma_2. \quad (24)$$

Note that the exact spectrum of $\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{so}$ with $u_{\perp} = 0$ can be obtained straightforwardly. In general, however, due to the smallness of the SO coupling (see below), it is enough to treat \mathcal{H}_{so} perturbatively. The following detailed derivation is then necessary to correctly evaluate the effect of the SO coupling, and moreover it is interesting and important for the generalization to

the interacting case, and for the analysis of features involving the electron wavefunction (for instance electron-phonon interactions).

The eigenvalues of \mathcal{H}_0 are given by

$$\epsilon_{an\sigma}(q) = av\sqrt{k_{\perp}^2(n) + q^2} \equiv a\epsilon_n(q), \quad (25)$$

where $k_{\perp}(n) = (n + n_0)/R$ denotes the transverse momentum, q the longitudinal one, $a = \pm$ labels the conduction/valence band, and $\sigma = \pm$ the spin. Here $n_0 = 0$ for intrinsically metallic shells, but generally it can be taken as $0 \leq n_0 \leq 1/2$ to take into account chirality gaps or orbital magnetic fields along \hat{X} . The transverse subbands are labelled with integer values $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{N} - 1$, where $\mathcal{N} = 2(N^2 + M^2 + NM)/\text{gcd}(2M + N, 2N + M)$ for (N, M) tubes [3]. \mathcal{N} is typically much larger than the actual number $N = [k_F R]$ of occupied subbands, where we define $k_F = \mu/v$ with the doping level μ that we assume positive here. The velocity v_n for electrons in subband n at the Fermi level (in the absence of H_{s0}) and the corresponding Fermi momentum q_n are then given by

$$v_n = v\sqrt{1 - [(n + n_0)/(k_F R)]^2}, \quad q_n = k_F v_n/v. \quad (26)$$

The eigenvalues (25) are spin independent and thus doubly degenerate. The corresponding eigenstates are denoted as $|nqa\sigma\rangle$, where $|n\rangle$ and $|q\rangle$ are respectively plane waves in circumferential and longitudinal directions. In coordinate representation they read

$$\psi_{nqa\sigma}(x, y) \equiv \langle x, y | nqa\sigma \rangle = \frac{e^{ik_{\perp}(n)y}}{\sqrt{2\pi R}} e^{iqx} \xi_{na}(q) \otimes \chi_{\sigma}, \quad (27)$$

with the bispinor (in sublattice space)

$$\xi_{n,a=\pm}(q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta_n(q)/2} \\ \pm e^{-i\theta_n(q)/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad e^{i\theta_n(q)} = \frac{v(k_{\perp}(n) - iq)}{\epsilon_n(q)}. \quad (28)$$

A different, and here more convenient, basis is given by the sublattice states $|nqp\sigma\rangle$. Their coordinate representation is

$$\psi_{nqp\sigma}(x, y) = \frac{e^{ik_{\perp}(n)y}}{\sqrt{2\pi R}} e^{iqx} \xi_p \otimes \chi_{\sigma}, \quad (29)$$

where $p = A, B$ and

$$\xi_A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \xi_B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Their usefulness stems from the fact that the $|nqp\sigma\rangle$ can be factorized as

$$|nqp\sigma\rangle = |n\rangle|q\rangle \otimes |p\sigma\rangle, \quad |p\sigma\rangle = \xi_p \otimes \chi_{\sigma}, \quad (30)$$

where $|p\sigma\rangle$ is independent of n and q . Using this basis, we can expand the field operator $F(\vec{r})$ on the tube surface as

$$F(\vec{r}) = \sum_{n,p,\sigma} \int \frac{dq}{2\pi} \psi_{nqp\sigma}(x, y) c_{np\sigma}(q) = \sum_n F_n(x) \langle y | n \rangle, \quad (31)$$

where the operator $c_{np\sigma}(q)$ destroys an electron in the state $|nqp\sigma\rangle$, and we introduce the 1D field operators $F_n(x)$. Alternatively, using the basis of eigenstates of H_0 , $F(\vec{r})$ can be expanded as

$$F(\vec{r}) = \sum_{n,a,\sigma} \int \frac{dq}{2\pi} \psi_{nqa\sigma}(x, y) c_{na\sigma}(q), \quad (32)$$

where the operators $c_{na\sigma}(q)$ destroy conduction ($a = +$) or valence ($a = -$) electrons with spin σ in subband n . Notice that in what follows the spin index is left implicit. The relation between the operators c_{na} and c_{np} is easily found to be

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{n+}(q) \\ c_{n-}(q) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta_n(q)/2} & e^{i\theta_n(q)/2} \\ e^{-i\theta_n(q)/2} & -e^{i\theta_n(q)/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{nA}(q) \\ c_{nB}(q) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

We now proceed by treating the spin-orbit Hamiltonian using perturbation theory. First, we diagonalize $H_0 - \mu N$ for a fixed transverse subband n :

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^{(n)} - \mu N^{(n)} &= v \int dx F_n^\dagger [k_\perp(n)\tau_1 + (-i\partial_x)\tau_2 - \mu] F_n \\ &= \sum_{a=\pm} \int \frac{dq}{2\pi} [a\epsilon_n(q) - \mu] c_{na}^\dagger c_{na}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we expand around the Fermi points $\pm q_n$ defined in equation (26), which introduces right- and left-movers, $r = \pm = \text{R/L}$, as the relevant low-energy degrees of freedom. For small deviations k from $\pm q_n$, Taylor expansion yields $\epsilon_n(\pm q_n + k) \simeq \mu \pm v_n k$, where v_n is given in equation (26). Since we assumed $\mu > 0$, we may now restrict ourselves to the conduction band, $a = +$. For the Hamiltonian, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^{(n)} - \mu N^{(n)} &= \sum_{r=\pm} v_n \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} (rk) c_{nr}^\dagger(k) c_{nr}(k) \\ &= \sum_{r=\pm} v_n \int dx \psi_{nr}^\dagger (-ir\partial_x) \psi_{nr}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_{nr}(k) \equiv c_{n+}(r q_n + k)$ and $\psi_{nr}(x) = \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} e^{ikx} c_{nr}(k)$. This introduces R/L-moving 1D fermion operators for each subband n (and spin σ). The relation of these 1D fermions with the original operator $F_n(x)$ is given by

$$F_n(x) = e^{iq_n x} \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{e^{ikx}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta_n(q_n)/2} \\ e^{-i\theta_n(q_n)/2} \end{pmatrix} c_{nR}(k) + e^{-iq_n x} \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} \frac{e^{ikx}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta_n(q_n)/2} \\ e^{i\theta_n(q_n)/2} \end{pmatrix} c_{nL}(k). \quad (34)$$

Notice that, while in general the unitary transformation from sublattice space to the conduction/valence band description depends on the longitudinal momentum, in the continuum limit, one can use the transformation directly at the Fermi momenta. This is consistent with the neglect of band curvature effects implicit in the linearization of the dispersion relation, which is unproblematic away from van Hove singularities associated with the onset of new subbands [32]. At these points, the concept of R/L-movers breaks down, and some of our conclusions below may change.

Next we express the Rashba Hamiltonian (24) in terms of R/L-movers. The first term results in

$$H_{\text{so}}^{\parallel} = \frac{u_{\parallel} v}{\mu} \sum_{nr} k_{\perp}(n) \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} c_{nr}^\dagger(k) \sigma_3 c_{nr}(k). \quad (35)$$

The presence of the factor $k_{\perp}(n)$ results from a careful treatment of the phases in equation (34). In equation (35) we omit an additional term mixing right- and left-movers. This term contains a rapidly oscillating factor $e^{\pm 2iq_n x}$ and therefore is strongly suppressed by momentum conservation. The second term in equation (24) again contains the oscillating phase factor $e^{\pm i(q_n \pm q_{n+1})x}$, which leads to a drastic suppression of H_{so}^{\perp} at low energies and long wavelengths. Of course, this argument relies in an essential way on the smallness of the coupling u_{\perp} , as one expands around the Hamiltonian H_0 . We conclude that away from van Hove singularities, the only important Rashba term is given by $H_{\text{so}}^{\parallel}$ in equation (35). This term has the appearance of a static homogeneous but *channel-dependent magnetic field*.

4. Oscillatory TMR effects in nanotubes

In this section we will analyse the consequences of our findings regarding spin–orbit couplings in CNTs—see equations (35)—for the observability of spin-precession effects encoded in the Datta–Das oscillations of the TMR. On the basis of our expressions, it is possible to estimate the order of magnitude of this effect.

For a concrete estimate, let us put $E_0 = 0.2eV_G/(\kappa D)$, where D is the gate–tube distance, V_G the gate voltage, and κ denotes the dielectric constant of the substrate. For a given channel n , the Rashba-induced energy splitting is then easily estimated as

$$\frac{\Delta E_n}{eV_G} = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \frac{0.6 dv}{\mu} \frac{|n + n_0|}{R} \frac{\alpha^2 \beta d^4 \lambda_c^2}{4\kappa D},$$

where $\lambda_c = \hbar/mc = 3.86 \times 10^{-13}$ m is the Compton length. Plugging in the definition of α, β , we get

$$\frac{\Delta E_n}{eV_G} = \frac{0.6(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)}{256\pi\kappa} (d/a_0)^5 \frac{\lambda_c^2}{Da_0} \frac{|n + n_0|}{k_F R}. \quad (36)$$

Bands with small n are only weakly split, and hence do not contribute to oscillatory TMR behaviour. This argument suggests that Datta–Das oscillations could in principle survive in a CNT, even when there are many channels. The major contribution will come just from the few bands with the largest n .

To estimate the accumulated phase difference due to the different precession length of the two split eigenstates, let us put $(n + n_0)/(k_F R) \rightarrow 1$, which represents the dominant contribution, and set $\kappa = 1$. Then equation (36) gives as an order-of-magnitude estimate

$$\Delta E/(eV_G) \approx 2 \times 10^{-6} a_0/D. \quad (37)$$

Even when assuming a very close-by gate, this gives only a tiny splitting, in retrospect justifying perturbation theory. This splitting now translates into a momentum splitting $\Delta k_n = \Delta E/v_n$, and hence into a precession phase mismatch along the CNTs of length L [13]. For the n th band, this phase difference is

$$\Delta\phi_n = \Delta k_n L \approx 2 \times 10^{-6} \frac{L}{D} \frac{eV_G}{\hbar v_n/a_0}. \quad (38)$$

This phase difference should be of order 2π to allow for the observation of Datta–Das oscillatory TMR effects [13].

Away from a van Hove singularity, equation (38) predicts that oscillations appear on a gate voltage scale of the order of 10^6 to 10^7 V for $L \approx D$, which would make Datta–Das oscillations unobservable. This argument also shows that this interpretation can be ruled out for the parameters relevant for the Basel experiment [10]. From equation (38), we can then suggest several ways to improve the situation. First, one should use very long CNTs, while at the same time keeping the gate very close, and second, an enhancement can be expected close to van Hove singularities. Of course, very close to a van Hove singularity, some of our arguments above break down, but the general tendency can nevertheless be read off from equation (38). Furthermore, electron–electron interactions can also enhance spin–orbit effects [22, 25].

To conclude, we have presented a detailed microscopic derivation of Rashba spin–orbit coupling in carbon nanotubes. It turns out that the Rashba SO coupling is small, and therefore the prospects for observing spin-precession effects like Datta–Das oscillations in the tunnelling magnetoresistance are not too favourable. However, for very long CNTs, close-by gates, and in the vicinity of a van Hove singularity, the requirements for observability of these effects could be met in practice.

Acknowledgments

We thank T Kontos and C Schöenberger for motivating this study. Support by the DFG (Gerhard–Hess programme) and by the EU (DIENOW network) is acknowledged.

References

- [1] Zutic I, Fabian J and Das Dharma S 2004 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76** 323
- [2] Forró L and Schöenberger C 2001 *Top. Appl. Phys.* **80** 1
- [3] Ando T 2005 *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **74** 777
- [4] Tsukagoshi K, Alphenaar B W and Ago H 1999 *Nature* **401** 572
- [5] Zhao B, Mönch I, Vinzelberg H, Mühl T and Schneider C M 2002 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **80** 3144
- [6] Kim J R, So H M, Kim J J and Kim J 2002 *Phys. Rev. B* **66** 233401
- [7] Chakraborty S, Walsh K M, Alphenaar B W, Liu L and Tsukagoshi K 2003 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **83** 1008
- [8] Hoffer X, Klinkke C, Bonard B M, Gravier L and Wegrowe J E 2004 *Europhys. Lett.* **67** 103
- [9] Sahoo S, Kontos T, Schöenberger C and Sürgers S 2005 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **86** 112109
- [10] Sahoo S, Kontos T, Furer J, Hoffmann C and Schöenberger C 2005 unpublished preprint
- [11] Rashba E I 1960 *Fiz. Tverd. Tela* **2** 1224
Rashba E I 1960 *Sov. Phys.—Solid State* **2** 1109 (Engl. Transl.)
- [12] Bychkov Y and Rashba E I 1984 *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **17** 6039
- [13] Datta S and Das B 1990 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **56** 665
- [14] Stojetz B, Miko C, Forró L and Strunk C 2005 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** 186802
- [15] Mireles F and Kirczenow G 2001 *Phys. Rev. B* **64** 024426
- [16] Valin-Rodríguez M, Puente A and Serra L 2003 *Eur. Phys. J. B* **34** 359
- [17] Balents L and Egger R 2001 *Phys. Rev. B* **64** 035310
- [18] Ando T 2000 *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **69** 1757
- [19] De Martino A, Egger R, Hallberg K and Balseiro C A 2002 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** 206402
- [20] De Martino A, Egger R, Murphy-Armando F and Hallberg K 2004 *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **16** S1437
- [21] Häusler W 2004 *Phys. Rev. B* **70** 115313
- [22] Häusler W 2001 *Phys. Rev. B* **63** 121310
- [23] Governale M and Zülicke U 2002 *Phys. Rev. B* **66** 073311
- [24] Gritsev V, Japaridze G, Pletyukhov M and Baeriswyl D 2005 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** 137207
- [25] Chen G H and Raikh M E 1999 *Phys. Rev. B* **60** 4826
- [26] Urbina A, Echeverría I, Pérez-Garrido A, Díaz-Sánchez A and Abellán J 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** 106603
- [27] Bachtold A, Strunk C, Salvétat J P, Bonard J M, Forró L, Nussbaumer T and Schöenberger C 1999 *Nature* **397** 673
- [28] Schöenberger C, Bachtold A, Strunk C, Salvétat J P and Forró L 1999 *Appl. Phys. A* **69** 283
- [29] Chico L, López M P and Muñoz M C 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** 176402
- [30] Benedict L X, Louie S G and Cohen M L 1995 *Phys. Rev. B* **52** 8541
- [31] Krčmar M, Saslow W and Zangwill A 2003 *J. Appl. Phys.* **93** 3495
- [32] Hügler S and Egger R 2002 *Phys. Rev. B* **66** 193311