It is an underappreciated fact that the wave functions of electrons in the lowest Landau level describing the fractional quantum Hall effect have an azimuthal dependence $\propto \exp(-im\phi)$ with $m \geq 0$, seemingly in contradiction with the classical electron having positive angular momentum. We show here that the gauge-independent meaning of that quantum number $m$ is not angular momentum, but that it quantizes the distance of the center of the electron’s orbit from the origin, and that the physical angular momentum of the electron is positive and independent of $m$ in the lowest Landau levels. We note that textbooks and the original literature have managed to come up with wave functions that do have the seemingly correct azimuthal form $\propto \exp(+im\phi)$ but only on account of changing a sign on the way to that result.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The integer and fractional quantum Hall effects are well understood and form an established part of physics, with the crucial results found experimentally first [1, 2], and described theoretically later [3]. The theoretical description of the Hall effects starts with the quantization of the two spatial degrees of freedom of an electron confined to move in a plane (say, the $xy$ plane) under the influence of a magnetic field perpendicular to that plane (say, pointing in the positive $z$ direction, with magnitude $B$) [4]. Details of the quantization procedure and its results will be given in the sections following the Introduction. Here, in the Introduction, results are simply stated without derivations. For excellent lecture notes on the quantum Hall effects, see Refs. [5, 6].

A complete basis of spatial states $\{ |n,m\rangle \}$ can be constructed as eigenstates of two commuting operators. These eigenstates are labeled by two corresponding quantum numbers, $n$ and $m$. The first, $n$, has a clear physical meaning: it quantizes the electron’s energy in units of $\hbar \omega_B$, with

$$\omega_B = \frac{eB}{\mu}$$

the cyclotron frequency, the frequency with which a classical electron orbits a circle in the $xy$ plane. We use $\mu$ here to denote the electron’s (effective) mass so as to avoid confusion with the second quantum number $m$ that is the main focus here. $e > 0$ is the elementary charge. The charge of the electron is $-e$.

The eigenvalues of the (non-relativistic) single-electron Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{(\vec{p} + e\vec{A})^2}{2\mu}$$

are $E_n = (n + \frac{1}{2})\hbar \omega_B$ and can be found, unsurprisingly, without having to choose a gauge. The states with the lowest energy, those with $n = 0$, are known as the lowest Landau levels (abbreviated as LLL) [5].

The second quantum number, $m$, is the eigenvalue of a second operator that commutes with $H$. In the usual procedure one first fixes the gauge in a nice and convenient way, and one subsequently chooses an operator that commutes with $H$. For example, in the Landau gauge $\vec{A} = x\hat{e}_y$, the Hamiltonian is invariant under translations along the $y$ direction and so the operator $p_y$ commutes with the Hamiltonian. Similarly, the choice $\vec{A} = -y\hat{e}_x$ makes $p_x$ commute with $H$. In the so-called symmetric (or circular) gauge, $\vec{A} = B(-y\hat{e}_x + x\hat{e}_y)/2$, $H$ is rotationally invariant and so the $z$ component of the canonical angular momentum, $L_z$, commutes with $H$. In all three cases the second operator is not gauge invariant, which becomes obvious when one realizes that these three operators do not commute with $H$ for the other two choices of gauge. The corresponding eigenvalues, therefore, do not have a physical, gauge-independent meaning.

For the case of interest here, we consider the symmetric gauge, which is the most convenient gauge choice for describing the fractional quantum Hall effect [3]. In this case one ends up with wave functions whose dependence on the angle $\phi$ [in polar coordinates] is of the form $\exp(-im\phi)$ with $m \geq 0$. This result is a bit surprising given that the electrons in the classical limit all rotate counter-clockwise (and so have positive angular momentum $\hbar \phi$), whereas a particle with a wave function $\exp(-im\phi)$ would have negative or zero angular momentum for $m \geq 0$.

The solution to this simple conundrum, as will be shown below in great detail, contains three parts: first, the quantum number $m$ in the usual construction is gauge dependent and has no physical meaning as such. Indeed, wave functions are always gauge dependent, and their gauge degree of freedom consists in a local phase factor, for example of the form $\exp(ikx)$ or $\exp(iky)$ or, indeed, $\exp(-im\phi)$. Just as in the Landau gauge a wave function of the form $\exp(iky)$ does not imply the electron has physical momentum $\hbar k$, so in the symmetric gauge a wave function $\exp(-im\phi)$ does not imply the electron has physical angular momentum $-m\hbar$. It is true it possesses $-m$ units of canonical angular momentum $L_z$, but
$L_z$ is a gauge-dependent quantity. (This is well-known, of course.)

Second, one can calculate what the physical, gauge-independent angular momentum is (relative to the origin) in the states constructed in the symmetric gauge. The expectation value of the $z$ component turns out to be $(2n+1)\hbar$; always positive and independent of $m$ (known, too: \[6, 9, 10\]). Even better, and not well-known \[11\], one can construct a gauge-independent operator for angular momentum relative to the center of the circular orbit. We will find here that the states $|n, m\rangle$ are, in fact, eigenstates of the $z$ component with eigenvalue $(2n+1)\hbar$, again independent of $m$.

Third, more constructively, one can choose a gauge-independent operator that commutes with the Hamiltonian, and thus construct a set of basis states for which both quantum numbers have a physical meaning. The physical meaning of the second quantum number found in the symmetric gauge turns out to be that of distance of the center of the orbit to the origin, not angular momentum.

The following two sections repeat in some detail the steps of the standard calculation of the wave functions of the Landau levels in the symmetric gauge. The point is to make sure we obtain the correct sign for their azimuthal dependence. Section \[IV\] then points out that the sign seems to be wrong, but then explains why it is, nonetheless, correct. The physical meaning of the quantum number $m$ is discussed in Section \[V\]. Section \[VII\] identifies different ways of either making a sign mistake, or changing the sign at some point during the calculation, so as to end up with the seemingly correct (but actually wrong) azimuthal dependence of the Laughlin wave functions \[3\].

The concluding Section specifies as to why this sign mistake could remain unnoticed for so long.

II. CLASSICAL HALL EFFECT

Except for using $\mu$ for the electron’s mass, we follow here the notational conventions from Ref. \[3\], those being the most careful notes on the quantum Hall effect the author has found.

The general solution to the classical equations of motion, $\mu \ddot{x}/dt^2 = -e\vec{E} \times \vec{B}$, with $\vec{B} = B\hat{z}$, is

$$x(t) = R \sin(\omega_B t + \phi)$$
$$y(t) = R \cos(\omega_B t + \phi)$$

with $\omega_B$ the cyclotron frequency. There are four constants of integration, $R, \phi, X, Y$. The energy of an electron in such a circular orbit is purely kinetic (the potential energy is zero)

$$E_{\text{class}} = \frac{1}{2}\mu(\omega_B R)^2.$$  

This is a highly degenerate class of solutions: the same circular motion (with the same radius and hence the same energy) can be around any center $(X, Y)$. This large degeneracy of energy eigenstates shows up in the quantum solution, too. The classical electron’s angular momentum relative to the center of the circular orbit, $(X, Y)$, points in the positive $z$ direction (or, rather, in the same direction as the magnetic field) and its magnitude is directly proportional to its energy:

$$L_z^{\text{class}} = m\omega_B R^2 = \frac{2E_{\text{class}}}{\omega_B}. \quad (5)$$

III. QUANTIZING THE HALL EFFECT

We describe the magnetic field through the vector potential, i.e., via $\vec{B} = \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{A}$. Questions of gauge are inevitable and will become important.

The Hamiltonian \[2\] for a single electron can be rewritten as

$$H = \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2\mu}, \quad (6)$$

with $\vec{p}$ the kinetic momentum (equal to $\mu d\vec{E}/dt$ in the Heisenberg picture) defined as

$$\vec{p} = \vec{p} + e\vec{A}.$$  

Here $\vec{p}$ is the canonical momentum. It’s the latter that satisfies (after quantizing the theory) the standard commutation relations with the position operator. That is, in the position representation we have the usual $\vec{p} = -i\hbar\vec{\nabla}$.

Under a gauge transformation

$$\vec{A} \rightarrow \vec{A} + \vec{\nabla}\lambda(\vec{r}),$$  

the wave function of our electron will change, too:

$$\psi(\vec{r}) \rightarrow \exp\left(-\frac{i\epsilon\lambda(\vec{r})}{\hbar}\right)\psi(\vec{r}). \quad (9)$$

An example of a gauge-invariant (and measurable/physical) quantity is $\langle \psi | \vec{p} | \psi \rangle = m\vec{p} = \langle \vec{r} \rangle$ whereas $\langle \vec{p} \rangle = \langle \psi | \vec{p} | \psi \rangle \rightarrow \langle \psi | \vec{p} | \psi \rangle - e\vec{\nabla}\lambda(\vec{r})$ is gauge dependent (and so unphysical/not measurable). Now note that the $x$ and $y$ components of $\vec{p}$ do not commute with each other:

$$[\pi_x, \pi_y] = [-i\hbar\nabla_x + eA_x, -i\hbar\nabla_y + eA_y]$$
$$= -i\hbar e\nabla_x A_y + i\hbar e\nabla_y A_x = -i\hbar eB. \quad (10)$$

Their (gauge-invariant) commutator is in fact a constant (since we assume $B$ is constant), just like the commutator for $x$ and $p$. And since the Hamiltonian $H$ is a sum of the squares of $\pi_x$ and $\pi_y$, what we get is mathematically equivalent to a 1D simple harmonic oscillator (SHO). We can define operators

$$a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar eB}}(\pi_x - i\pi_y) \quad (11)$$
and its hermitian conjugate
\[ a^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar eB}}(\pi_x + i\pi_y) \tag{12} \]
such that \([a, a^+] = 1\), and so they behave exactly as the lowering and raising operators for the 1D SHO. Indeed, we can rewrite \(H\) as
\[ H = \hbar\omega_B(a^+a + \frac{1}{2}), \tag{13} \]
with eigenenergies \(E_n = (n + \frac{1}{2})\hbar\omega_B\) for nonnegative integer \(n\). These energy levels are referred to as Landau levels. The \(n = 0\) states form the lowest Landau level (LLL). We can define a magnetic length
\[ l_B = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{eB}} \tag{14} \]
and rewrite \(a\)
\[ a = \frac{l_B}{\sqrt{2\hbar}}(\pi_x - i\pi_y) \tag{15} \]
such that it is manifestly dimensionless.

We can find a second quantum number \(m\) and have a complete set of basis states \([n, m]\) describing the spatial degrees of freedom of our electron, by finding a second hermitian operator that commutes with \(H\). Let us first follow the standard procedure and fix the gauge before constructing that second operator. In the symmetric gauge, define
\[ \tilde{x} = \rho - e\tilde{A}. \tag{16} \]
The commutator
\[ [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] = +i\hbar eB \tag{17} \]
differs in sign from \([\pi_x, \pi_y]\) but is still constant. We can construct another pair of lowering and raising operators (note the sign difference compared to the definitions of \(a\) and \(a^+\)) by defining
\[ b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar eB}}(\pi_x + i\pi_y), \tag{18} \]
and its hermitian conjugate
\[ b^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar eB}}(\pi_x - i\pi_y), \tag{19} \]
such that \([b, b^+] = 1\).

Importantly, the new operators in the circular gauge commute with \(\tilde{\pi}\). And so we can construct states that are eigenstates of both \(H\) (with energy \(E_n\)) and of \(b^+b\) (with nonnegative integer eigenvalues \(m\)). Namely, starting with the "ground state" \([0, 0]\) that is annihilated by both \(a\) and \(b\), we construct
\[ |n, m\rangle = \frac{(a^+)^n(b^+)^m}{\sqrt{n!m!}} |0, 0\rangle. \tag{20} \]

There’s a countably infinite degeneracy of each eigenenergy \(E_n\). We can use the operators \(a\) and \(b\) to write down explicit wave functions [which inevitably are gauge dependent] that go with the eigenstates \([n, m]\). In particular, the state \([0, 0]\) satisfies two equations
\[ a|0, 0\rangle = 0; \quad b|0, 0\rangle = 0. \tag{21} \]

We can turn these two equations into differential equations, as follows. Substituting the definitions of \(\pi_x\) and \(\pi_y\) we have
\[ a = \frac{l_B}{\sqrt{2\hbar}}(\pi_x - i\pi_y) \]
\[ a^+ = \frac{l_B}{\sqrt{2\hbar}}(\frac{\hbar}{i} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) + \frac{\hbar}{2l_B^2}(-y - ix)) \tag{22} \]

It is useful to define the two independent complex variables \(z = x - iy\) and \(\bar{z} = x + iy\) and rewrite
\[ a = -i\sqrt{2} \left( \frac{l_B}{\sqrt{2\hbar}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{z}{4l_B^2} \right), \]
\[ a^+ = -i\sqrt{2} \left( \frac{l_B}{\sqrt{2\hbar}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} - \frac{\bar{z}}{4l_B^2} \right), \]
\[ b = -i\sqrt{2} \left( \frac{l_B}{\sqrt{2\hbar}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{z}{4l_B^2} \right), \]
\[ b^+ = -i\sqrt{2} \left( \frac{l_B}{\sqrt{2\hbar}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} - \frac{\bar{z}}{4l_B^2} \right). \tag{23} \]

Note \(b, b^+\) commute with \(a, a^+\). Now we obtain the general form of the wave functions for the LLL (\(n = 0\)) states. Namely, \(a\psi_0(z, \bar{z}) = 0\) is solved by
\[ \psi_0(z, \bar{z}) = f(z) \exp(-z\bar{z}/4l_B^2) \tag{24} \]
for any analytic function \(f(z)\). The state \([0, 0]\) also satisfies \(b|0, 0\rangle = 0\) and that equation has a similar solution, but with a general analytic function \(g(\bar{z})\) as prefactor. The only function that is independent of both \(z\) and \(\bar{z}\) is the constant function, and so we conclude the wave function of the \([0, 0]\) state has the (properly normalized) form
\[ \psi_{0,0}(z, \bar{z}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi l_B^2}} \exp(-z\bar{z}/4l_B^2). \tag{25} \]

The higher-order wave functions in the LLL can be obtained by applying the raising operator \(b^+\) \(m\) times, which gives \(m\) factors of \(z\):
\[ \psi_{0,m}(z, \bar{z}) = \frac{i^m}{\sqrt{2\pi l_B^2 m!}} \left( \frac{z}{\sqrt{2l_B}} \right)^m \exp(-z\bar{z}/4l_B^2). \tag{26} \]

**IV. ANGULAR MOMENTUM**

The wave functions \([20]\) have one peculiar property: in polar coordinates \((\rho, \phi)\) we have \(z = x - iy = \rho[\cos \phi - i \sin \phi] = \rho \exp(-i\phi)\), and so
\[ \psi_{0,m} \propto \exp(-im\phi). \tag{27} \]
But don’t the electrons actually only move in the counterclockwise direction and have positive angular momentum and so should have wave functions \( \propto \exp(+im\phi) \)?

First note that wave functions are not gauge independent, and recall that the gauge freedom consists exactly in being able to multiply wave functions by local phase factors, of which \( \exp(-im\phi) \) is an example. That is, that phase factor by itself has no physical meaning. The wave functions are eigenstates of the canonical angular momentum operator \( L_z \), which in polar coordinates representation is given by \( L_z = -i\hbar \partial / \partial \phi \). But \( \langle L_z \rangle = -m\hbar \) is not gauge invariant.

Second if we want to know what angular momentum an electron in the state \( |n,m\rangle \) possesses, we should use the kinetic angular momentum \( \vec{r} \times \vec{\pi} \) which is gauge invariant (for more on gauge and angular momentum in this context, see Ref. [9]). In polar coordinates \((\rho, \phi)\) the vector potential in the symmetric gauge is

\[
\vec{A} = \frac{eB}{2} \hat{\rho}. \tag{28}
\]

This will give an additional contribution to the kinetic angular momentum proportional to \( \vec{r} \times \hat{\rho} \) which does point in the positive \( z \) direction and (more than) compensates for the \( -m\hbar \) term one gets from \( L_z \).

Let us consider in more detail the \( z \) component of the gauge-invariant kinetic angular momentum relative to the origin

\[
\mathcal{L}_z = x\pi_y - y\pi_x. \tag{29}
\]

Using the same operators \(a\) and \(b\) we defined before, we have in the symmetric gauge [once we know we have a gauge-invariant operator, we can perform calculations of its expectation values and eigenvalues in any gauge we find convenient]

\[
\mathcal{L}_z = \hbar (2a^+a + 1 - b^+a^+ - ba). \tag{30}
\]

We thus get the gauge-independent result

\[
\langle n, m \mid \mathcal{L}_z \mid n, m \rangle = (2n + 1)\hbar. \tag{31}
\]

This value is positive and independent of \( m \). (Note that the states \( |n, m\rangle \) are not eigenstates of \( \mathcal{L}_z \): indeed, the kinetic angular momentum does not commute with \( H \). Kinetic angular momentum of the electron is not conserved, in spite of rotational symmetry [13]. What is conserved is the total angular momentum, which includes a contribution from the EM fields the electron produces.) The expectation value of angular momentum in other states can be negative (recall footnote 8) thanks to the presence of the last two terms in (30). In particular, if we define coherent states \( |\alpha, \beta\rangle \) as eigenstates of \( a \) and \( b \), respectively, with complex eigenvalues \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) we get

\[
\langle \alpha, \beta \mid \mathcal{L}_z \mid \alpha, \beta \rangle = (2| \alpha |^2 + 1 - \beta^* \alpha^* - \beta \alpha)\hbar, \tag{32}
\]

and this can be made negative, for example, by choosing \( \beta = K\alpha^* \) with \( K \) real and \( \alpha \neq 0 \), and \( K \) sufficiently large:

\[
K > 1 + \frac{1}{2|\alpha|^2}. \tag{33}
\]

If, on the other hand, we define the angular momentum relative to the center of the orbit \((X,Y)\), then we obtain [see below for the definitions of the operators \( X \) and \( Y \); see also [11] for a discussion of this angular momentum]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_z = (x - X)\pi_y - (y - Y)\pi_x = \frac{\pi_x^2 + \pi_y^2}{eB} = \frac{2H}{\omega_B}, \tag{34}
\]

and we see that in quantum mechanics, too, this quantity is directly proportional to the Hamiltonian, just as we found for the classical electron orbits (cf. Eq. [5]). Obviously, this angular momentum is always strictly positive for any state.

\section{V. Gauge-Invariant Basis}

Let us return to the classical parametrization of the circular orbits. The coordinates of the center of the circle, \( X \) and \( Y \), correspond in the quantized theory to these two operators:

\[
X = x - \frac{\pi_y}{m\omega_B}, \quad Y = y + \frac{\pi_x}{m\omega_B}. \tag{35}
\]

Both operators commute with \( H \)—indeed, \( X \) and \( Y \) are conserved for the classical orbits—but they do not commute with each other:

\[
[X,Y] = il_B^2. \tag{36}
\]

Physically, this means we can’t quite localize the circular orbits in the \( xy \) plane. Since the operators \( X \) and \( Y \) are gauge-invariant and commute with the Hamiltonian, we could use them to construct a gauge-independent set of basis states. In fact, since the commutator \([X,Y]\) is a constant, we can define

\[
\begin{align*}
c &= \frac{X + iY}{l_B\sqrt{2}} \\
c^+ &= \frac{X - iY}{l_B\sqrt{2}} \tag{37}
\end{align*}
\]

such that \([c,c^+] = 1\). Then we can construct eigenstates of the operator \(c^+c \) in the usual way, with nonnegative integer eigenvalues, say \( k \). The physical meaning of \( k \) is clear, given that

\[
X^2 + Y^2 = (2c^+c + 1)l_B^2. \tag{38}
\]

For a state \( |n,k\rangle \), the integer \( k \) thus tells us how far from the origin the circular orbit is displaced. This reflects perfectly the degeneracy of the classical solutions [14].
VI. CHANGES OF SIGN

Even though the seemingly strange features of the \( \exp(-im\phi) \) lowest Landau level wave functions can be explained away, the literature has remarkably often followed a different path. One change of sign somewhere along the derivation makes one end up with wave functions (in the symmetric gauge) that behave like \( \exp(+im\phi) \). Here is a sample:

Laughlin in his original paper [8] chooses as Hamiltonian \( H \propto (\vec{p} - e\vec{A})^2 \). Now that would be perfectly correct, if only \( e \) were negative. However, given that he also gives the (positive) cyclotron energy explicitly as \( \hbar eB/\mu \), \( H \) contains a sign mistake, thus leading to wave functions \( \propto \exp(+im\phi) \). That particular mistake has been copied many times.

For example, the well-known textbook [10] states explicitly that the electron charge is \(-e\), then states (incorrectly) that the Hamiltonian is \( H \propto (\vec{p} - e\vec{A})^2 \) and subsequently concludes (incorrectly) that the angular momentum \( L_z \) equals a non-negative integer times \( \hbar \). The same applies to the textbook [11] on fractional statistics. (And there are more examples in the literature on the fractional quantum Hall effect and its use in topological quantum computing.)

The lecture notes of Ref. [5] perform the correct calculation, but the direction of the magnetic field is flipped just before calculating the wave functions “in order to get rid of an annoying minus sign.”

The insightful notes on the quantum Hall effect [4] carefully perform the whole calculation correctly, but then in the very end choose as angular momentum operator \( J = i\hbar(x\partial_y - y\partial_x) \), correctly concluding that \( J \vec{0}, m \rangle = m\hbar \vec{0}, m \rangle \). \( J \), however, equals \(-L_z\). Then \( z = x - iy \) is incorrectly written as \( \rho \exp(+i\phi) \) thus leading to Laughlin’s wave functions \( \propto \exp(+im\phi) \).

(The calculations have been done correctly [6, 18], of course, but without comments on the seemingly incorrect sign of the “angular momentum.”)

VII. CONCLUSION

The literature on the fractional quantum Hall effect is often found to contain a sign change (of the electron’s charge, the magnetic field, the vector potential, or the angular momentum operator) and sometimes a sign mistake committed during the calculation of the lowest Landau level wave functions. This change of sign leads to wave functions with an (incorrect) azimuthal dependence \( \exp(+im\phi) \) rather than \( \exp(-im\phi) \) with \( m \geq 0 \). An obvious question is why such a sign mistake would not be noticed earlier. The answer probably is that, as far as the author knows, the only \( m \)-dependent physical property of the lowest Landau levels one actually makes use of (for example, to count the number of states per unit area in that level) is the distance of the electron’s orbit from the origin. But that distance (rather than angular momentum) happens to be the correct gauge-invariant meaning of the quantum number \( m \). Similarly, for a two-electron Laughlin wave function \( \propto (z_1 - z_2)^m(z_1 + z_2)^M \) neither \( m \) nor \( M \) is a physical angular momentum (pertaining to the relative and center-of-mass motion, respectively). Rather, \( m \) gives the relative distance between one electron and the other’s orbit, while \( M \) gives the distance of the center-of-mass orbit to the origin.

[4] The electron’s spin degree of freedom may be ignored for present purposes.
[12] Note that by applying \( a^+ \) (which is gauge-invariant) we do get higher-level Landau states with higher angular momentum in the right direction (we get extra factors \( \propto z^k \exp(\pm i\phi) \). Also note that in order to have a complete set of square-integrable 2D wave functions we do need functions with azimuthal dependence \( \exp(ik\phi) \) for all \( k \) in \( \mathbb{Z} \) (Saumya Biswas, private communication).
This result can also be used to count how many states there are in the LLL inside a macroscopic area $A$, and one obtains the standard answer $\mathcal{N} = A/2\pi l_B^2$.


