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The influence of gate-controlled two-electron exchange on the relaxation of nuclear polarization in small ensembles ($N \sim 10^6$) of nuclear spins is examined in a GaAs double quantum dot system. Waiting in the (2,0) charge configuration, which has large exchange splitting, reduces the nuclear diffusion rate compared to that of the (1,1) configuration. Matching exchange to Zeeman splitting significantly increases the nuclear diffusion rate.
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Precise control of single electron spins in quantum dots [1] can be used to provide a comparable degree of control of the polarization of small ensembles of nuclei, which couple to single confined electrons via the hyperfine interaction [2–5]. Ultimately, this control may provide a means of storing spin-based quantum information in nuclear ensembles [6,7]. The simplest such process is the induction of an out-of-equilibrium average polarization of the nuclear ensemble by dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP), where the “flip” of a polarized electron spin is accompanied by the “flop” of a nuclear spin [8]. In recent years, experimental studies of DNP have been extended from bulk systems [9,10] to the nanoscale [11–13], including quantum dots containing a small number of electrons [2–4,14–17]. DNP driven by spin-blocked transport can create feedback that leads to hysteretic and complex time-dependent currents [18–23], while gate-driven DNP leads to a simpler buildup of nuclear polarization, often saturating at surprisingly small levels [3,4].

This Letter reports time-dependent measurements of the induction and relaxation of DNP in a few-electron double quantum dot as a function of magnetic field and electron arrangement in the double dot. Cyclic evolution of the two-electron spin state, driven by gate pulses [3], repeatedly flips nuclear spins to create a small local DNP of order 1%. Relaxation is monitored by detecting the Overhauser field using high-bandwidth charge sensing [24]. In this work, it is shown that nuclear diffusion is sensitive to the exchange coupling of confined electrons, controlled experimentally through the spatial charge arrangement with fixed total charge. We find that electron-mediated coupling of nuclear spins [8,25] dominates nuclear diffusion.

The double dot is formed by Ti/Au gates patterned with electron beam lithography on the surface of a GaAs/Al$_{0.3}$Ga$_{0.7}$As heterostructure with two-dimensional electron gas with density $2 \times 10^{15}$ m$^{-2}$ and mobility 20 m$^2$/Vs, as shown in Fig. 1(a). Measurements were made in a dilution refrigerator at the base electron temperature of $\sim 120$ mK. A schematic energy-level diagram of the two-electron system is shown in Fig. 1(b), with the labels $(n, m)$ giving the number of electrons in the left and right dots. Quasistatic gate voltages control interdot tunnel coupling $t_e$, while the detuning $\epsilon$ from the (2,0)-(1,1) charge degeneracy is controlled by fast (nanosecond scale) voltage pulses [Fig. 1(a)]. The charge configuration of the double dot is detected by monitoring the conductance $G_{QPC}$ of an rf quantum point contact (rf QPC). $G_{QPC}$ controls the reflected power $\Gamma_{rf}$ of a 220 MHz rf carrier; following demodulation, this yields a voltage $V_{rf}$ that constitutes the charge sensing signal [24].

The mean total effective field experienced by electrons in (1,1) is $B_{tot} = B_0 + B_{nuc}$, where $B_0$ is the external field applied perpendicular to the two-dimensional electron gas plane and $B_{nuc} = (B_{L_{nuc}} + B_{R_{nuc}})/2$ is the Overhauser field averaged over left and right dots, due to $N \sim 10^6$ nuclear spins. The avoided crossing between the singlet ($S$) and the (1,1) $m_s = 1$ triplet ($T_+$) occurs at a value of $\epsilon$ [thick, green arrow in Fig. 1(b)] set by the total Zeeman energy, $E_{tot} = g\mu_BB_{tot}$, where $g = -0.4$ is the electron $g$ factor in GaAs, $\mu_B$ is the Bohr magneton, and $B_{tot}$ is the magnitude of $B_{tot}$. The gap and width of the avoided crossing are set by $E_{nuc}^\pm = g\mu_B\Delta B_{nuc}^\pm$, where $\Delta B_{nuc}^\pm$ is the magnitude of the component of $\Delta B_{nuc} = (B_{L_{nuc}} - B_{R_{nuc}})/2$ transverse to $B_{tot}$.

We probe the $S$-$T_+$ resonance using the pulse sequence shown in Fig. 2(b), which first prepares $(2,0)S$ at $(P)$ then separates the electrons $(S)$ for a time $\tau_S$ before returning to $(2,0)$ for measurement $(M)$ for time $\tau_M \sim 5$ $\mu$s. The Pauli spin blockade ensures that only the (1,1) singlet returns to $(2,0)$, with triplets blocked for a time $T_+$. In this way, the two-electron spin state is mapped to a charge configuration that is detected with the rf QPC. Cycling this sequence yields a feature at $(M)$ in the (2,0) region, indicated by white lines in Fig. 1(c). Once calibrated, $V_{rf}$ gives the probability $1-P_S$ that an initial singlet evolved into $T_+$ during the separation interval $\tau_S$. Fitting the time-averaged function $P_S(\tau_S)$ gives an inhomogeneous dephasing time,
FIG. 1 (color online). (a) False-color SEM image of a representative double dot with an integrated rf-QPC charge sensor. (b) Energy-level diagram of the two-electron system. The green arrow points to the $S-T_+$ avoided crossing. (c) $V_L$ around the (2,0)-(1,1) charge transition during cycling of the probe sequence. A plane has been subtracted. The region indicated is the same as Fig. 1(e). For cycle rates below 1 MHz, the position of the resonance indicates $B_{\text{tot}}$. The color scale is the same as Fig. 1(e). For cycle rates below 1 MHz, the position of the resonance indicates $B_{\text{tot}}$. The influence of the probe sequence is examined [28]. (d) Singlet return probability $P_S$ as a function of separation time $\tau_S$, yielding a $T_2^* \sim 15$ ns. $B_0 = 8$ mT. (e) Singlet return probability $P_S$ as a function of the left gate bias $V_L$ and magnetic field $B_0$. The dashed line converts the position of the resonance in $V_L$ to $B_{\text{tot}}$. $T_2^* \sim 15$ ns. The dependence of the $S-T_+$ resonance position (in $V_L$, with $V_R$ fixed) on $B_0$ in the range $B_0 = 5$–18 mT, in the absence of a polarization, serves as a calibration to determine $B_{\text{tot}}$ when nuclear polarization is present [29].

DNP is investigated using a three-step “pump-pause-probe” sequence: The pump sequence starts from a singlet in (2,0) then moves adiabatically through the $S-T_+$ resonance, flipping an electron and flipping a nuclear spin—in principle, once per cycle at a rate of 4 MHz [3]. The “probe” sequence [Figs. 2(a) and 2(b)] also starts with a singlet in (2,0) but moves to the $S-T_+$ resonance, providing a measure of $B_{\text{tot}}$. A cycle rate of 200 kHz is used for the probe sequence and does not induce DNP, as seen in Fig. 2(c). Pump and probe cycles are separated by a static “pause” of duration $\Delta t$.

The pump sequence creates a steady-state DNP of order ~10 mT, which, in the absence of a pause, relaxes during the probing cycle on a time scale $\tau_R = 8$ s, found by fitting an exponential to $B_{\text{tot}}(t)$ [Fig. 3(c)]. Increasing $B_0$ from 8 mT to 10 mT doubles the time taken for $B_{\text{tot}}$ to return to $B_0$. This increase in $\tau_R$ with $B_0$ saturates above $B_0 \sim 10$ mT, so that there is little change in relaxation time at $B_0 = 15$ mT compared to the $B_0 = 10$ mT data, consistent with the measured field dependence of nuclear fluctuations [27]. We also note that at $t = 0$, $B_{\text{tot}}$ appears nearly independent of $B_0$. This suggests that the pump sequence ceases to produce polarization above a certain value of $B_{\text{tot}}$, qualitatively consistent with previous measurements [3]. The measured relaxation rate cannot account for the small steady-state polarization (~10 mT), and we are led to conclude that there must be a significant decrease in the efficiency of the polarization cycle with increasing $B_{\text{nuc}}$.

The effect of pausing in (2,0) between the pump and probe sequences can be seen in Fig. 4(b), which shows that more than half the polarization remains after pausing for 30 s in (2,0)S [Fig. 4(c)]. Once the probe sequence is initiated after the pause, $B_{\text{tot}}$ once again decays with $\tau_R \sim 8$ s. The influence of the probe sequence is examined further by introducing multiple pause intervals in (2,0), interleaved with probe cycles [Fig. 4(d)].
The dependence of the nuclear relaxation time $\tau_R$ on the two-electron spin state during the pause duration is shown in Fig. 4(f). Pausing for the duration of $\Delta t$ in the $(2,0)$ state yields $\tau_R = 56$ s [red data in Fig. 4(f)], while pausing in $(1,1)$ yields $\tau_R = 26$ s [green data in Fig. 4(f)]. We ascribe these different relaxation times to a nuclear spin diffusion constant that depends on the two-electron spin state. With diffusion dominated by the shortest dimension of the dot, perpendicular to the electron gas, we approximate the diffusion constant $D = \sigma_z^2/\tau_R$ based on an estimate of the width of the wave function, $\sigma_z \approx 7$ nm. This gives $D \sim 1 \times 10^{-14}$ cm$^2$/s for the case of pausing in $(2,0)$, consistent with earlier optical measurements of nuclear diffusion in GaAs [10]. Activation of the probe sequence increases diffusion to $D \sim 7 \times 10^{-14}$ cm$^2$/s.

The presence of strongly confined electrons is expected to affect nuclear spin diffusion in two opposing ways. Suppressing diffusion, electrons couple nonuniformly with the nuclei and create an inhomogeneous Knight shift, lifting the degeneracy between nuclear dipoles and preventing them from flip-flopping with each other. The Knight shift gives rise to a frequency shift of order $\lambda = \Delta \nu_{0}/\hbar|\langle \psi(r_{i}) \rangle|^{2}$ for nuclear spin at position $r_{i}$, electron wave function $\psi$, and hyperfine constant $A$, ($\nu_{0}$ is the unit cell volume for GaAs and $\hbar$ is Planck’s constant). The change of this shift from site to site in the lattice is given by $\Delta \nu_{0}/\hbar = A \sum_{nuc} \left( \langle \psi(r_{i}) \rangle^{2} \right)$.

The dependence of the nuclear relaxation time $\tau_R$ on the two-electron spin state during the pause duration is shown in Fig. 4(f). Pausing for the duration of $\Delta t$ in the $(2,0)$ state yields $\tau_R = 56$ s [red data in Fig. 4(f)], while pausing in $(1,1)$ yields $\tau_R = 26$ s [green data in Fig. 4(f)]. We ascribe these different relaxation times to a nuclear spin diffusion constant that depends on the two-electron spin state. With diffusion dominated by the shortest dimension of the dot, perpendicular to the electron gas, we approximate the diffusion constant $D = \sigma_z^2/\tau_R$ based on an estimate of the width of the wave function, $\sigma_z \approx 7$ nm. This gives $D \sim 1 \times 10^{-14}$ cm$^2$/s for the case of pausing in $(2,0)$, consistent with earlier optical measurements of nuclear diffusion in GaAs [10]. Activation of the probe sequence increases diffusion to $D \sim 7 \times 10^{-14}$ cm$^2$/s.

The presence of strongly confined electrons is expected to affect nuclear spin diffusion in two opposing ways. Suppressing diffusion, electrons couple nonuniformly with the nuclei and create an inhomogeneous Knight shift, lifting the degeneracy between nuclear dipoles and preventing them from flip-flopping with each other. The Knight shift gives rise to a frequency shift of order $\lambda = \Delta \nu_{0}/\hbar|\langle \psi(r_{i}) \rangle|^{2}$ for nuclear spin at position $r_{i}$, electron wave function $\psi$, and hyperfine constant $A$, ($\nu_{0}$ is the unit cell volume for GaAs and $\hbar$ is Planck’s constant). The change of this shift from site to site in the lattice is given by $\Delta \nu_{0}/\hbar = A \sum_{nuc} \left( \langle \psi(r_{i}) \rangle^{2} \right)$.
this contribution is expected to be negligible. Varying the tunnel barriers to the leads while keeping the number of electrons on each dot fixed in (2,0) or (1,1) produced little variation in decay time of the polarization. At the $S$-$T_2$ resonance, the exchange energy is effectively “canceled” by the Zeeman energy, allowing rapid flipping of electrons that readily mediate rapid exchange of nuclear spins. This is the likely explanation for the enhanced diffusion observed during the probe sequence.

For our double-dot system, the largest nuclear polarization achievable using a gate pump sequence was shown to be $\approx 1\%$ [3]. Based on our measurement of $\tau_R$, we emphasize that this maximum steady-state DNP cannot be limited by rapid diffusion of polarization out of the dots. Rather, these results indicate that the pump sequence strongly decreases in efficiency with increasing polarization. Such a scenario is consistent with the idea of dark state formation [30], in which the nuclear system is driven to a configuration where it does not interact with the electron spins used in the pump sequence. Hyperfine-mediated nuclear dynamics in quantum dots have been considered theoretically in the context of spin-preserving processes [25,31–34], but measurements of the nuclear relaxation in systems that allow for the removal of a single electron have only recently been reported [2]. For two-electron systems, the measurements presented here bring to light the role of electron exchange, which, as we have shown, can lead to a suppression of hyperfine-mediated nuclear spin diffusion.
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