

Andreev-like Reflection in the Pfaffian Fractional Quantum Hall Effect

Ryoi Ohashi¹, Ryota Nakai², Takehito Yokoyama³, Yukio Tanaka¹, and Kentaro Nomura²

¹*Department of Applied Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8603, Japan*

²*Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan*

³*Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Meguro, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan*

We study tunnel transport between the edge of a Pfaffian fractional quantum Hall state and that of an integer quantum Hall state. Based on the duality argument between strong and weak tunnelings, we find that Andreev-like reflection appears for a strong tunneling regime. We calculate charge conductance in the weak and strong tunneling regimes for the low-voltage limit. In the weak tunneling limit, dI/dV is proportional to $V^{1/\nu}$ with bias voltage V and $\nu = 1/2$. On the other hand, in the strong tunneling limit, dI/dV is expressed by $(e^2/h)2\nu/(1+\nu)$ with correction term.

A fractional quantum Hall (FQH) effect is a phenomenon in which the Hall conductivity takes fractionally quantized values [1–3]. The fractional values are characterized by the filling factor ν , which is the ratio of the number of fluxes to the number of electrons. The most fundamental one is the FQH effect whose filling factor is of the form $\nu = 1/(2k+1)$ with an odd-denominator. For this state, a trial wave function was introduced by Laughlin[4] that is constructed in a single Landau level. The above states are limited to odd-denominator filling factors due to the restriction to preserving antisymmetry of fermions. However, Moore and Read proposed a wave function for FQH states with even-denominators and succeeded in describing a wider variety of FQH states.[5] This Pfaffian FQH state is associated with the correlation function of two-dimensional Ising conformal field theory. This state is suggested to exist in the $N = 1$ Landau level with $\nu = 5/2$. [6, 7]

At the edge of the FQH states, there is a gapless state due to the Chern Simons field defined in the bulk effective field theory [8]. This gapless state can be described as a Luttinger fluid by the bosonization technique, then quantum transport phenomena have been analyzed using edge states. One of the way to evaluate the charge transport is using point-contact.[9–15] There are two types of processes: one is quasiparticle tunneling through the bulk of a fractional quantum Hall liquid (FQHL). The other one is electron tunneling between two counter-propagating edges of two FQHLs. These two processes are related by the duality in the Laughlin and Pfaffian states.[9, 11, 16] In addition, a theoretical proposal for a point contact between the Laughlin FQH state and an integer quantum Hall (IQH) system has been presented.[17] This system also shows Andreev-like reflections in the strong coupling limit. Andreev-like reflections in this setup are analogous to Andreev reflections in superconducting junctions,[18, 19] where $k+1$ quasiparticles of fractional charge $e^* = \nu e = e/(2k+1)$ are injected on the FQH side and k quasiholes with fractional charge are returned as reflections, thus the process is that $(k+1)e^* - k(-e^*) = (2k+1)e^* = e$, which is the amount of transmission to the IQH side. The theoretical proposal of this Andreev-like reflection process was recently examined in an experiment.[20] Quasiparticle excitations in the Pfaffian FQH state exhibit non-Abelian statistics, and thus attracted a lot of attention from the viewpoint of quantum computation.[21–23] If it is possible to extract its non-Abelian statistics via transport phenomena, it will greatly facilitate the development of

physics.

In this letter, we extend the Andreev-like reflections to the Pfaffian FQH state and its transport phenomena are discussed. As a result, we confirm the existence of two reflection processes in the strongly coupled limit: The first is the normal reflection between quasiparticles and electrons with $2e^* = \nu^{(1)}e$; the second is the Andreev-like reflection by quasiparticles with $e^* = \nu^{(1)}e/2$. Here $\nu^{(1)} = 1/2$ is the filling factor in the $N = 1$ Landau level, and $\nu^{(1)}$ will be simply denoted ν in the following.




FIG. 1. Schematic image of the scattering process: m incoming electrons and n incoming quasiparticles are scattered into q and p outgoing electrons and quasiparticles respectively through electron tunneling. Quasiparticles (4)-(7) are applied according to the number of n and p . An elementary charge is $e^* = e/4$.

We consider a $\nu = 1/2$ Pfaffian FQHL-integer quantum Hall liquid (IQHL) junction with a point contact at $x = 0$ as shown in Fig. 1. Low-energy excitations of the FQH effect side are the modes that are localized near the edges since the bulk quantum Hall state has an energy gap. The edge states of the Pfaffian state are described as a conformal field theory with a central charge $c = 1 + \frac{1}{2}$. [5] The $c = 1/2$ part in the edge modes belongs to the same universality class as the critical point of the two-dimensional Ising model. The primary fields are the real fermion χ , the spin operator σ and unit operator 1.[24, 25] These modes are related to the pair breaking and the $h/2e$ quantum vortex excitations in the bulk.[5, 26] Meanwhile, the $c = 1$ part describes the Laughlin type excitations which correspond to the free boson theory.[8, 27, 28] We write this bosonic field as ϕ_c . On the other hand, we treat the IQHL as a one-dimensional chiral Fermi liquid that appears on the edge state of a $\nu = 1$ IQHL. Bosonized theory

is also applicable. Writing the latter bosonic field as ϕ_f , the edge theory is written as [5]

$$H = \int dx \left[-\frac{iv}{2} \chi \partial_x \chi + \frac{v}{4\pi} (\partial_x \phi_c)^2 + \frac{v}{4\pi} (\partial_x \phi_f)^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

where the field ϕ_c and ϕ_f satisfy the commutation relations:

$$[\phi_I(x), \phi_J(x')] = i\pi \delta_{IJ} \text{sgn}(x - x') \quad (2)$$

with $I, J = c, f$. For simplicity, we assume the velocities of edge modes are the same v . On the edge of the Pfaffian state side, the electron annihilation operator is given by [5]

$$\psi_{ec} = \chi e^{i\phi_c/\sqrt{v}}. \quad (3)$$

We neglect the lowest Landau level contribution. In the Pfaffian FQH state, there are four kinds of quasiparticles with charge. They are characterized by the following operators: [5, 16, 29]

$$\psi_{ve,1} = 1 e^{i\sqrt{v}\phi_c}, \quad (4)$$

$$\psi_{ve,\chi} = \chi e^{i\sqrt{v}\phi_c}, \quad (5)$$

$$\psi_{ve/2,\sigma} = \sigma e^{i\sqrt{v}\phi_c/2}, \quad (6)$$

$$\psi_{3ve/2,\sigma} = \sigma e^{i3\sqrt{v}\phi_c/2}. \quad (7)$$

Each exponential is assumed normal ordered. Eq. (4) corresponds to the Laughlin type quasiparticles and the rest are specific to the Pfaffian state. As noted by the indices of the above operators, a charge of these quasiparticles is ve , ve , $ve/2$ and $3ve/2$, respectively. Whereas, on the IQHL side, the electron operator is written as $\psi_{ef} = e^{i\phi_f}$. Then electron tunneling at $x = 0$ is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H_T &= \int dx t \delta(x) (\psi_{ec}^\dagger \psi_{ef} + \text{h.c.}) \\ &= \int dx \Gamma \delta(x) \chi \cos\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \phi_c - \phi_f\right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This model has two fixed points. One is a stable fixed point at $\Gamma = 0$ (weak coupling limit), and the other is an unstable fixed point at $\Gamma = \infty$ (strong coupling limit). The first case is trivial because it corresponds to two decoupled systems. To analyze the second fixed point, a duality symmetry is useful. For the edge theory of the $\nu = 1/(2k+1)$ Laughlin states, this symmetry is well known. [9, 30]

Let us consider the scattering process represented in Fig. 1. In the incoming state, we have m electrons on the Fermi liquid side with total charge me , and n quasiparticles on the Pfaffian FQHL side with total charge ne^* . Moreover, the outgoing state has q electrons with charge qe and p quasiparticles with charge pe^* . The probability amplitude for such a process is proportional to [17]:

$$\left\langle \eta_p^{\text{out}} e^{i\frac{\sqrt{v}}{2} p \phi_c^{\text{out}}} e^{iq\phi_f^{\text{out}}} \eta_n^{\text{in}} e^{-i\frac{\sqrt{v}}{2} n \phi_c^{\text{in}}} e^{-im\phi_f^{\text{in}}} \right\rangle \quad (9)$$

where the operators η are σ , χ or 1 in the $c = \frac{1}{2}$ part which are determined by p and n based on (4)-(7).

Weak Coupling Limit

We first consider the weak coupling limit. The interface of the junction behaves as a hard wall. Since the field ϕ_c and ϕ_f are decoupled, the Eq. (9) is also decoupled as

$$\left\langle e^{i\frac{\sqrt{v}}{2} p \phi_c^{\text{out}}} e^{-i\frac{\sqrt{v}}{2} n \phi_c^{\text{in}}} \right\rangle_c \left\langle e^{iq\phi_f^{\text{out}}} e^{-im\phi_f^{\text{in}}} \right\rangle_f \left\langle \eta_p^{\text{out}} \eta_n^{\text{in}} \right\rangle_{\text{Ising}}. \quad (10)$$

To make it non-zero, the condition

$$p = n, \quad q = m \quad (11)$$

and

$$\eta_p^{\text{out}} = \eta_n^{\text{in}} \quad (12)$$

must hold. These results correspond to the perfect reflections.

The perturbative calculations in the weak coupling regime have been done by Ref. 29 and references therein. As in the Ref. 17 and 29, it is better to introduce another basis:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_c \\ \phi_f \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tan \theta = \frac{1 + \sqrt{v}}{1 - \sqrt{v}}. \quad (13)$$

In terms of this new basis, the tunnel Hamiltonian is rewritten as

$$H_T = \int dx \Gamma \delta(x) \chi \cos \frac{1}{\sqrt{v'}} (\phi_1 - \phi_2) \quad (14)$$

where

$$v' = \frac{2v}{1+v}. \quad (15)$$

The scaling law for Γ is written as [29]

$$\frac{\Gamma(\Lambda)}{\Gamma(\Lambda_0)} = \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_0} \right)^{1/v' - 1/2} \quad (16)$$

where Λ_0 and Λ are bare and renormalized cut-offs, respectively. At high bias $eV > k_B T$, the renormalized cut-off is proportional to V . The non-linear $I - V$ characteristics are

$$I \propto \Gamma(\Lambda)^2 V \propto V^{1/v'+1}, \quad (17)$$

and the V -dependence of the differential conductance is

$$\frac{dI}{dV} \propto V^{1/v}. \quad (18)$$

Strong Coupling Limit

Now we consider the strong coupling limit. This case corresponds to the weak coupling limit in the dual description. [9, 11, 17, 29, 31–33] In other words, this is the case of the coupling $\tilde{\Gamma} = 0$ of the model with a tunneling Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H}_T = \int dx \tilde{\Gamma} \delta(x) \sigma \cos \frac{\sqrt{v'}}{2} (\tilde{\phi}_1 - \tilde{\phi}_2). \quad (19)$$

$\tilde{\phi}_1$ and $\tilde{\phi}_2$ are the dual fields of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 respectively.

The probability amplitude Eq. (9) is decoupled in terms of the dual field, and we have

$$\left\langle e^{i\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}p\tilde{\phi}_c^{\text{out}}} e^{-i\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}n\tilde{\phi}_c^{\text{in}}} \right\rangle \left\langle e^{iq\tilde{\phi}_f^{\text{out}}} e^{-im\tilde{\phi}_f^{\text{in}}} \right\rangle \left\langle \eta_p^{\text{out}} \eta_n^{\text{in}} \right\rangle_{\text{Ising}}. \quad (20)$$

As with the edge theory of the Laughlin state,[17] the dual and original fields are related as for the incoming quasiparticles

$$\tilde{\phi}_1^{\text{in}} = \phi_1^{\text{in}}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_2^{\text{in}} = \phi_2^{\text{in}} \quad (21)$$

and for the outgoing quasiparticles

$$\tilde{\phi}_1^{\text{out}} = \phi_2^{\text{out}}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_2^{\text{out}} = \phi_1^{\text{out}}. \quad (22)$$

Using these relation and Eq. (13), the amplitude Eq. (20) is rewritten as

$$\left\langle e^{i\left(-p\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}\sin 2\theta + q\cos 2\theta\right)\phi_c^{\text{out}}} e^{-i\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}n\phi_c^{\text{in}}} \right\rangle_c \left\langle e^{i\left(p\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}\cos 2\theta + q\sin 2\theta\right)\phi_f^{\text{out}}} e^{-im\phi_f^{\text{in}}} \right\rangle_f \left\langle \eta_p^{\text{out}} \eta_n^{\text{in}} \right\rangle_{\text{Ising}}. \quad (23)$$

Then, we find that in the case

$$\begin{aligned} -p\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}\sin 2\theta + q\cos 2\theta &= \frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}n \\ p\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{2}\cos 2\theta + q\sin 2\theta &= m \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\eta_p^{\text{out}} = \eta_n^{\text{in}}, \quad (25)$$

the amplitude is non-zero. Our issue is to calculate the selection matrix M [17]

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \end{pmatrix} &= M \begin{pmatrix} m \\ n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu} & \frac{\nu}{1+\nu} \\ \frac{1}{1+\nu} & -\frac{1}{1+\nu} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m \\ n \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

To make sure the relation to the transmission and the reflection probabilities of the electrons, let a large number m of the electrons and zero quasiparticles as incident states in the presence of an external voltage. The reflection and transmission probabilities of the electrons are given as

$$R_e = \frac{q}{m} = M_{11} = \frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu} \quad (27)$$

$$T_e = \frac{(\nu e/2)p}{em} = \frac{\nu}{2} M_{21} = \frac{2\nu}{1+\nu}. \quad (28)$$

Similarly, for the quasiparticle, we have the probabilities given as

$$R_{\nu e/2} = \frac{p}{n} = M_{22} = -\frac{1-\nu}{1+\nu} \quad (29)$$

$$T_{\nu e/2} = \frac{eq}{(\nu e/2)n} = \frac{2}{\nu} M_{12} = \frac{2}{1+\nu}. \quad (30)$$

Note the relations: $T_e = 1 - R_e$ and $T_{\nu e/2} = 1 - R_{\nu e/2}$ hold. So the two-terminal conductance is calculated as

$$G = \frac{e^2}{h} T_e = \nu \frac{e^2}{h} T_{\nu e/2} = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{2\nu}{1+\nu}. \quad (31)$$

At $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$ we find that there are two elementary processes: (a) normal reflection of the two $2e^*$ quasiparticles and the electron, and (b) Andreev-like reflection of 3 quasiparticles with total charge $3e^*$ in the initial state and the final state with one transmitted electron and one quasihole, as shown in Fig. 2. The latter process is analogous to an Andreev reflection at a normal metal-superconductor (N-S) interface.[18, 19] Our selection rules which were derived from the dual theory are different from that considered in Ref. 11 and 16. For the Andreev reflection in the N-S junction, the energy gap of the S side is essential. In our case, we can think of the energy gap for a quasiparticle excitation as infinite on the IQHL side.




FIG. 2. Two elementary process at $\nu = 1/2$: (a) normal reflection and (b) Andreev-like reflection. FQHL plays the role of normal metal. An elementary charge is $e^* = e/4$.

Next, we consider the correction for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in the strong coupling regime. Counting the conformal dimension, we have the renormalization group equation for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as

$$\frac{d\tilde{\Gamma}}{dl} = \left[1 - \left(\frac{\nu'}{4} + \frac{1}{16} \right) \right] \tilde{\Gamma}. \quad (32)$$

Then the correction of the current is proportional to

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(\Lambda_0)^2 \Lambda^{2[(\frac{\nu'}{4} + \frac{1}{16}) - 1]} V. \quad (33)$$

At high bias $eV > k_B T$, the renormalized cut-off Λ can be V . We assume the Landauer formula (31) holds in such a large voltage regime. So we can consider a $\frac{1}{V}$ -expansion in the strong coupling regime, where $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is small. The V -dependence

of the differential conductance is given by

$$\frac{dI}{dV} = \frac{e^2}{h} \left(\frac{2\nu}{1+\nu} \right) - \lambda V^{-\alpha} \quad (34)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{15}{8} - \frac{\nu}{1+\nu}, \quad (35)$$

and λ is a constant which is proportional to $\tilde{\Gamma}(\Lambda_0)^2$. The behavior of the differential conductance in both weak and strong tunneling regimes is illustrated in Fig. 3.




FIG. 3. A schematic behavior of the normalized differential conductance is drawn as a function of the bias voltage V .

Finally, to compare the experimental situation, we extend the above model for the system with a $\nu = 5/2$ FQHL and a $\nu = 3$ IQHL as shown in Fig. 4. The $\nu = 5/2$ FQHL can be regarded as a system in which $\nu = 2 = 1 + 1$ and $\nu = 1/2$ coexist.[29] The usual coupling occurs between each $\nu = 2$ liquids, and the extra $\nu = 1/2$ and $\nu = 1$ liquids represent this study. Thus, the differential conductance value increases due to the $\nu = 2$ coupling term.




FIG. 4. Schematic illustration of coupling in a feasible model.

In this paper, we consider the Pfaffian FQHL-IQHL junction. In the strong coupling limit, the selection rule shows the normal reflection for quasiparticles with charge $2e^* = \nu e$ and Andreev-like reflection for elementary quasiparticles with charge $e^* = \nu e/2$. The current-voltage characteristics are calculated in the weak and strong coupling regimes. In the weak tunneling limit, dI/dV is proportional to $V^{1/\nu}$. On the other hand, in the strong tunneling limit, dI/dV is expressed by $(e^2/h)2\nu/(1+\nu)$ with correction term $-\lambda V^{-\alpha}$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

R.O. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant No. JP21J15526). R.N. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant No. JP17K17604). T.Y. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant No. JP30578216) and the JSPS-EPSRC Core-to-Core program "Oxide Superspin". Y.T. was supported by Scientific Research (A) (KAKENHI Grant No. JP20H00131), and Scientific Research (B) (KAKENHI Grant No. JP20H01857). K.N. was supported by KAKENHI (Grant No. JP20H01830) and by CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency (Grant No. JPMJCR18T2).

-
- [1] K. v. Klitzing, G. Dorda, and M. Pepper: Phys. Rev. Lett. **45** (1980) 494.
 - [2] D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer, and A. C. Gossard: Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 1559.
 - [3] R. Willett, J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Störmer, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard, and J. H. English: Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** (1987) 1776.
 - [4] R. B. Laughlin: Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983) 1395.
 - [5] G. Moore and N. Read: Nucl. Phys. B **360** (1991) 362.
 - [6] M. Greiter, X.-G. Wen, and F. Wilczek: Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 3205.
 - [7] M. Greiter, X.-G. Wen, and F. Wilczek: Nucl. Phys. B **374** (1992) 567.
 - [8] X.-G. Wen: *Quantum Field Theory of Many-Body Systems: From the Origin of Sound to an Origin of Light and Electrons* (OUP Oxford, 2004).
 - [9] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher: Phys. Rev. B **46** (1992) 15233.
 - [10] K.-i. Imura and K. Ino: Solid State Commun. **107** (1998) 497.
 - [11] K. Nomura and D. Yoshioka: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **70** (2001) 3632.
 - [12] T. Ito, K. Nomura, and N. Shibata: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **81** (2012) 083705.
 - [13] F. P. Milliken, C. P. Umbach, and R. A. Webb: Solid State Commun. **97** (1996) 309.
 - [14] M. Dolev, M. Heiblum, V. Umansky, A. Stern, and D. Mahalu: Nature **452** (2008) 829.
 - [15] A. M. Chang: Rev. Mod. Phys. **75** (2003) 1449.
 - [16] P. Fendley, M. P. A. Fisher, and C. Nayak: Phys. Rev. B **75** (2007) 045317.
 - [17] N. P. Sandler, C. d. C. Chamon, and E. Fradkin: Phys. Rev. B **57** (1998) 12324.
 - [18] A. F. Andreev: Sov. Phys. JETP **20** (1965) 1490.
 - [19] G. E. Blonder, M. Tinkham, and T. M. Klapwijk: Phys. Rev. B **25** (1982) 4515.

- [20] M. Hashisaka, T. Jonckheere, T. Akiho, S. Sasaki, J. Rech, T. Martin, and K. Muraki: Nat. Commun. **12** (2021) 2794.
- [21] C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma: Rev. Mod. Phys. **80** (2008) 1083.
- [22] A. Y. Kitaev: Ann. Phys. **303** (2003) 2.
- [23] R. S. K. Mong, D. J. Clarke, J. Alicea, N. H. Lindner, P. Fendley, C. Nayak, Y. Oreg, A. Stern, E. Berg, K. Shtengel, and M. P. A. Fisher: Phys. Rev. X **4** (2014) 011036.
- [24] A. Belavin, A. Polyakov, and A. Zamolodchikov: Nucl. Phys. B **241** (1984) 333.
- [25] P. Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Sénéchal: *Conformal field theory* (Springer, 1996).
- [26] M. Milovanović and N. Read: Phys. Rev. B **53** (1996) 13559.
- [27] X.-G. Wen: Phys. Rev. B **41** (1990) 12838.
- [28] X.-G. Wen: Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **6** (1992) 1711.
- [29] E. Fradkin: *Field Theories of Condensed Matter Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- [30] L. Saminadayar, D. C. Glatli, Y. Jin, and B. Etienne: Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 2526.
- [31] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher: Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992) 1220.
- [32] A. Furusaki and N. Nagaosa: Phys. Rev. B **47** (1993) 3827.
- [33] C. de C. Chamon and E. Fradkin: Phys. Rev. B **56** (1997) 2012.