

Effect of Subband Landau Level Coupling to the Linearly Dispersing Collective Mode in a Quantum Hall Ferromagnet

Yue Yu

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, P. O. Box 2735, Beijing 100080, China
(March 22, 2024)

In a recent experiment (Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 036803 (2001)), Spielman et al observed a linearly dispersing collective mode in quantum Hall ferromagnet. While it qualitatively agrees with the Goldstone mode dispersion at small wave vector, the experimental mode velocity is slower than that calculated by previous theories by a factor of about 0.55. A quantitative correction may be achieved by taking the subband Landau level coupling into account due to the finiteness of the layer thickness, which gives a better agreement with the experimental data. A method coupling the quantum fluctuation to the tunneling is briefly discussed.

PACS numbers: 73.43.-f, 71.35.Lk, 73.21.-b, 73.40.Gk

The fractional quantum Hall effects as well as most of related phenomena reflect the behavior of the ground states of the two-dimensional electron gas in high magnetic field at zero temperature [1,2]. However, a first experimental signal of the finite temperature phase transition in such systems has been recently observed by Spielman et al in a bilayer system for $\nu_T = 1$ [3,4]. This transition seems to be closely related to a Kosterlitz-Thouless transition into an earlier predicted broken symmetry state [5] which was akin to the Josephson tunneling in superconductivity. However, differing from the Josephson effect in which the zero-bias conductance at the zero temperature was divergent, the conductance peak in that experiment was finite even extrapolating to the zero-temperature. This phenomenon, with other intriguing novel properties, caused a set of theoretical research works [6-15] in which various scenarios have been suggested while there is still a variety of open issues (for a short review, see [16]).

Among these issues, we shall focus on the finite layer thickness affecting the tunneling through the tilted field, which was disregarded by literature. As a result from the zero thickness approximation, a quantitative discrepancy between the previous theoretical calculation and the experimental data already appeared. The precise description of the issue is as follows: In a recent experiment [4], Spielman et al observed a linearly dispersing collective mode in a small wave vector in bilayer two-dimensional electron systems, which was identified as the pseudospin Goldstone mode long expected. However, Figure 4 of their published paper showed the sound velocity, namely, the slope of the linear dispersion experimentally observed was smaller than that theoretically predicted by a factor of about 0.55. One argued that this discrepancy may result from the overestimate in the Hartree-Fock approximation used in the theoretical calculation, and the quantum fluctuation may repair this discrepancy. However, the present exact diagonalization result indicated that the correction from the quantum fluctuation does not seem to reach such a small factor [17]. Thereby, it is worth to look for other sources to influence the mode.

On the other hand, due to the dispersion proportional to the in-plane magnetic field, the finite thickness of the layers may affect it because the layer thickness is comparable to the interlayer spacing in the experiment. However, the previous theoretical treatments were essentially based on the zero-layer-thickness approximation. The experiences in the study of the quantum Hall system were that finite thickness effects often determine the quantitative consistence between the theory and experiment, e.g., the gap of Laughlin's state, and so on.

Moreover, for this bilayer system, the ground-state behavior is not well understood yet if there is a tilted field and the finite layer thickness is taken into account. We even do not have a satisfactory variational ground-state wave function. Thus, one may suspect whether this experimentally observed mode can be identified as the theoretically anticipated pseudospin Goldstone mode. In this paper, we deal with the experimental data through a theoretical model which attributes the finite thickness correction to the sound velocity. If the correction is positive, we may say that the identification can be accepted and otherwise it could be more suspect. In a composite boson picture when the field is tilted [18], while the composite bosons see an opposite effective perpendicular field with an equal magnitude in the mean-field state, they see a weakened effective parallel field B_k due to the finite layer thickness via the subband Landau-level coupling. Thus, one can apply the interlayer tunneling theory [8,7,10] to this composite boson system but the parallel field B_k is reduced to B_k . By using the Hartree-Fock estimate of the sound velocity [19,16], one can obtain the linear dispersing Goldstone mode in the same way as the theoretical line in Fig. 4 of [4] but q is replaced by $q = eB_k d/\hbar$. This dispersion has a substantial improvement to fit the experimental data. Thus, we have a positive correction. In the meanwhile, our composite boson formalism shows there is a coupling of the quantum fluctuation to the tunneling. However, a detailed discussion of the quantum fluctuation has exceeded the goal of the present work.

In this work, we only deal with the finite-thickness ef-

fect via the subband Landau-level coupling and neglect the others, say, affecting the Coulomb interaction due to the finite thickness. In order to deal with the subband Landau-level coupling analytically, we assume that the electron gas is confined in a plane by an infinite harmonic potential. Before going to the details, we argue that this choice of the confining potential may quantitatively correct the theoretical calculation without severely impacting the comparability between our calculation and the experimental data despite the fact that the realistic confining potential in the sample is essentially a finite square well. The harmonic well is very different from the square well in their excited spectra, for the harmonic spectrum is equal spaced while that of the square well is not. However, the temperature is extremely low so that only the lowest subband of the lowest Landau level is filled in the present situation. Thus, no excited spectra will be involved. In the ground state, one may variationally adjust the harmonic frequency such that the ground state wave function has the best shape, and let the subband energy equal that in a more realistic square well. In this sense, the harmonic potential may be a good approximation to a realistic potential, to give a quantitative correction due to the subband coupling. Such a harmonic potential has been chosen to deal with many quantum Hall systems to replace the realistic potential which is either triangular [20] or square [21]. It was also used to discuss a giant magnetoresistance induced by a parallel magnetic field [22].

We start from the problem of a single particle in a strong magnetic field which is tilted at an angle to the x-y plane. An in-plane field in the x-direction violates the two-dimensional rotational symmetry. By introducing a harmonic confining potential with the characteristic frequency in the z-direction, the electron is restricted to quasi-two-dimensions. The single-particle Hamiltonian can be diagonalized as $H_{sp} = \hbar \omega_y + \hbar \omega_z + \frac{1}{2} \omega_z^2 z^2$ with the diagonalized oscillators given by $\omega_y = (\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2)^{1/2}$; $\omega_z = (\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2)^{1/2}$, where $\omega_c = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_c + \frac{1}{2})$; $\omega_z = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_c + \frac{1}{2})$ and $\omega_z^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_c + \frac{1}{2})$; $\omega_z = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_c + \frac{1}{2})$. $z^0 = \frac{1}{\omega_z^2} z$. The vectors X are given by

$$X = \frac{1}{\omega_c + \frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\omega_c + \frac{1}{2}} \right); \quad \frac{1}{\omega_c + \frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\omega_c + \frac{1}{2}} \right); \quad \frac{1}{\omega_c + \frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\omega_c + \frac{1}{2}} \right); \quad (1)$$

The frequencies ω_c are given by $\omega_c^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2)$ $\frac{1}{2}(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) + 4\omega_z^2 \omega_c$; where $\omega_c = \omega_x$ ($\omega_c = \omega_x$) and $\omega_z^2 = \omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2$; ω_x and ω_z are the cyclotron frequencies corresponding to B_x and B_z . Here we have applied the unit $\hbar = \hbar c / e B_z = 1$. In addition, there is a conservation quantity $L = \omega_c^2 \omega_L$ with $\omega_L = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_c + \frac{1}{2})$ and $\omega_L^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_c + \frac{1}{2})$ irrespective of whether the tilted

angle $\theta = 0$ or not. To solve this single-particle problem, we seek the ground state which is the eigenfunction of L . It is useful to make a coordinate rotation with $\tilde{z} = z \cos \theta + z^0 \sin \theta$ and $z^0 = z^0 \cos \theta - \tilde{z} \sin \theta$ with \tilde{z} and z^0 determined by $[\tilde{z}, \tilde{z}] = [z, z] = 0$:

$$= \frac{(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) X_3}{(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) X_1} \frac{(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) X_3}{(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) X_1};$$

$$= \frac{2(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) X_3}{(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) X_1} \frac{X_3 X_1}{(\omega_c^2 + \omega_z^2) X_1}; \quad (2)$$

The ground state wave functions are highly degenerate and of the form $\psi_0(\tilde{z}; \tilde{z}^0) = f(\tilde{z}) e^g$ with $g(\tilde{z}; \tilde{z}^0)$ being a quadratic form of $\tilde{z}; \tilde{z}^0$ whose coefficients are determined by $e^g = z e^g = 0$. The function $f(\tilde{z})$ is an arbitrary function of \tilde{z} .

Notice that linear-independent wave functions $\psi_m e^g$ ($m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) are not the eigen functions of L . However, one can start from those linear-independent wave functions to construct the common eigen functions of H_{sp} and L , which read $f_m(\tilde{z}) e^g$ with $f_m(\tilde{z}) = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} f_{m m^0} \tilde{z}^m$ for M being the number of Landau orbits and $M = N$ for $\theta = 1$. The coefficients $f_{m m^0}$ are dependent on the in-plane field and confined by $f_{m m^0}(0) = 1$ and $f_{m m^0}(0) = 0$ for $m \neq m^0$ if $\theta = 0$. Those degenerate ground state wave functions are orthogonal and with the eigen value m of L .

After solving the single-particle problem, we turn to the many-body ground state wave function. The common Laughlin's state or Halperin's (111)-state for the vanishing tilted angle is no longer a good variational wave function. However, to be enlightened by them, we postulate the many-body ground states for $\theta = 1$ as

$$\psi_0(\mathbf{r}_1; \dots; \mathbf{r}_N) = \text{St}(f_0; \dots; f_{N-1}) \exp\left(-\sum_i g_i\right) \mathcal{PSSi};$$

where \mathbf{r}_i are the three-dimensional position vectors and St is the Slater determinant of $f_0(\tilde{z}_{(1)}); \dots; f_{N-1}(\tilde{z}_{(N)})$. \mathcal{PSSi} denotes the possible layer coherence, which is either pseudospin fully polarized or coherent. Although the quantity $L = \sum_i L_i$ is no longer conserved due to the interaction, there is a conserved quantity $L + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbf{a}_i^y \cdot \mathbf{a}_j$. The constructed state is the eigenstate of this quantity with eigen value 0. Due to $M = N$, one has exactly

$$\psi_0(\mathbf{r}_1; \dots; \mathbf{r}_N) / \left(\prod_{i < j} (\tilde{z}_i - \tilde{z}_j) \right) \exp\left(-\sum_i g_i\right) \mathcal{PSSi}; \quad (3)$$

where, for the balanced bilayer system, $i = 1; \dots; N = 2$ and $1 + N = 2; \dots; N$ denote the particles in layers 1 and 2, respectively. The spatial part of this wave function goes back to Halperin's (111)-state for $B_k = 0$. Corresponding to the system in the experiment of Spielman et al [34], the coherent state is given by

$$\mathcal{PSSi} = j! \dots i!;$$

$$j! i = \frac{1}{j! i!} (j! i + e^{i' j} j! i); \quad (4)$$

if one uses $j, \#i$ to represent the electron in the upper or lower layer.

Since the electrons in the quantum Hall state are strongly correlated, when an electron tunnels from one layer to another, the fluxes combined with the electron also move accompanying the electron. If the magnetic field is not tilted, the fluxes accompanying the electron do not move in the tunneling because they are perpendicular to the x-y plane. However, if the field is tilted, the fluxes accompanying the electron no longer lie in the x-y plane due to $\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{z} \neq 0$. Thus, the electron tunneling causes the flux hopping from one layer to another. This can not be reflected in the single electron tunneling picture. A better formalism is the composite boson formalism. The single composite boson tunneling counts the charge tunneling and the flux hopping simultaneously. Hence, we use the composite boson formalism. According to (3), for a $\nu_T = 1$ state, the composite boson theory in a tilted magnetic field can be achieved by the anyon transformation in the spatial wave function [18]

$$(\mathbf{r}_1; \dots; \mathbf{r}_N) = \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} (\mathbf{r}_1; \dots; \mathbf{r}_N): \quad (5)$$

In terms of Ref. [18], this transformation gives a statistical gauge field, a $(\mathbf{r}_i) = \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{ij}}{j_{ij}^2}; a_z(\mathbf{r}_i) = \frac{\sim 1+2}{i!} \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} \frac{\mathbf{y}_{ij}}{j_{ij}^2}$; where $\sim = \mathbf{x} + i\mathbf{y}$; $\gamma_2 = 1 +$ and $\gamma_{21} = 1 +$. The corresponding statistical magnetic field $\tilde{b} = r \cdot a, ie.,$

$$b_z(\tilde{r}_i) = 2 \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij}^{(2)}(\tilde{r}_{ij});$$

$$b_k(\tilde{r}_i) = 2(1 + \gamma)^{-1} (\sim = i!_c)^{1+2} \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij}^{(2)}(\tilde{r}_{ij}): \quad (6)$$

In the mean field approximation, $b_z = 2B_z$, while b_k partially cancels B_k . The effective parallel magnetic field seen by the composite boson reads

$$B_k = (1 - (\sim = i!_c) \gamma) \sim = i!_c B_k - D B_k: \quad (7)$$

We shall see that $D \ll 1$ and the equality holds if $i!_c = 0$. Since $\gamma = (1 + \gamma) / \frac{i!_k}{i!_c} + O(\frac{i!_k^3}{i!_c^3})$ for $i!_k \ll i!_c$, D is almost independent of B_k for the parameters used in [4]. The inter-layer tunneling operator reads

$$T = \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} \frac{y}{j_{ij}} (\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) e^{iA_z d} \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} \frac{y}{j_{ij}} (\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) + h.c.$$

$$= \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} \frac{y}{j_{ij}} (\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) e^{i(A_z - a_z)d} \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} \frac{y}{j_{ij}} (\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) + h.c.; \quad (8)$$

where $\int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij}$ and $\int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij}$ denote the electron and composite boson creation operators in the upper layer respectively, etc. d is the interlayer spacing. A_z is the the z-axial component of the vector potential of the external magnetic field and

a_z is that corresponding to $\tilde{b}(\mathbf{r})$. Thus, in the mean field approximation, $\sim = i!_c \frac{i!_k}{i!_c} e^{i \sim = i!_c \frac{i!_k}{i!_c} \frac{y}{j_{ij}}} (\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{\#}), A_z - a_z = D B_k x$ and the tunneling Hamiltonian reads

$$T = \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} \int \prod_{ij} \tilde{j}_{ij} \frac{t}{2} \cos(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}); \quad (9)$$

where the effective wave vector $\mathbf{q} = D \mathbf{q}$ instead of $\mathbf{q} = 2 B_k d = 0$. Thus, the theory [17] applied to the electron can also apply to the composite boson because the anyon transformation is carried out in the spatial wave function and does not change the particle density and the pseudospin coherence state. The only difference in the final result from that in the electron's case is replacing q by q . That is, for small q , the linear dispersion is given by vq . However, all measurements in the experiment by Spielman et al [4] correspond to B_k , namely, q . To compare with the experimental data, the dispersion may be written as

$$vq = D vq = v' q: \quad (10)$$

Due to $D \ll 1$, v' is smaller than v by a factor D . If we use the Hartree-Fock value of the sound velocity to estimate v , the dispersion is exactly what is plotted in Fig. 4 of [4] except that q is replaced by q' ; or in the wave vector q , the sound velocity v is renormalized non-perturbatively to v' . This renormalization is remarkably different from that by the quantum fluctuation in the zero-thickness theory and is the result of the strong correlation of the electrons.

It is easy to see that the magnitude of D is determined by the ratios $i!_k = i!_c$ and $i!_c =$. Since the tunneling peak is destroyed in a small tilted angle, say $B_k = 0.6$ T (thus the critical value of the ratio is $i!_k = i!_c = 0.3$ for $n_T = 5.2 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ because $B_z = 2$ T) [4], one can consider the small ratio $i!_k = i!_c$ only. In fact, one finds that D is almost independent of B_k if $i!_k = i!_c < 0.2$. In Table 1, we list the magnitudes of D for $i!_k = i!_c = 0.2$.

$\frac{i!_c}{i!_k}$	0.10	0.40	0.50	0.80	1.00	1.25	1.67	2.50
D	1.00	0.90	0.86	0.76	0.70	0.65	0.60	0.55

Table 1 The magnitudes of D for the different ratios $\frac{i!_c}{i!_k}$ and $\frac{i!_k}{i!_c} = 0.2$.

The first column in Table 1 implies that it is back to the result got by ignoring the finite thickness. The last value of D reaches the experimental data but the corresponding ratio $\frac{i!_c}{i!_k} = 2.5$ is too large for the sample. In the experiment sample, the square well has the width $a = 18 \text{ nm}$. The magnetic length $l_B = 17 \text{ nm}$ for the density $n_T = 5.2 \times 10^{10}$ and $\nu_T = 1$. The ratio $i!_k = i!_c$ is dependent on the heights of the square well. For the potentials with the infinite height on two sides of the well, $i!_c = \frac{a^2}{2l_B^2} = 0.11$ and $D = 0.99$ if we determine by $\frac{1}{2} h E_0 = \frac{2h^2}{2m a^2}$. If this was the case, there would be almost no finite thickness effect. However, the wells

in the real bilayer systems are finite and asymmetric. The single particle ground state energy may be lowered substantially. If the potential V_1 on one side is lower than V_2 on the other side, the ratio is given by

$$\kappa_c = (k_{\perp})^2;$$

where k_{\perp} is determined by the solution of the equation $ka = \frac{\sin^{-1}(k=k_1) - \sin^{-1}(k=k_2)}{2mV_1/\hbar}$. Thus, the ratio is dependent on the heights of the well on both sides. Assuming $V_1 = V_2$ and for a typical well with $V_1 = 2\hbar^2/(ma^2)$, the value of k^2 may reduce to $0.15/a^2$. Hence,

$$\kappa_c = a^2 = (0.15/a^2) \quad 0.7 \quad \text{and} \quad D = 0.78:$$

The details of the well heights were not reported in [3,4]. We do not expect that the result stemming from the mean field approximation can completely twist the experiment. However, what we can say is that the finite thickness correction drives the theoretical results to a positive direction to be consistent with the experimental data. There may be other sources to improve the theoretical result. Especially, the quantum fluctuations may be very important because it lowers the stiffness and then attenuates the slope. Typically, the quantum fluctuation may lower the stiffness by a factor 0.80 and then a factor 0.89 to the sound velocity according to an exact diagonalization result by Moon et al [17]. Combining this factor with the factor from the finite thickness correction, the theoretical result may have a good agreement with the experimental data.

Before finishing this paper, we would like to point out that the composite boson formalism we used here introduces a coupling of the phase ϕ to the quantum fluctuation other than that discussed in literature [17]. Note that from (8) to (9), we use the mean field approximation. That is, a_z in $A_z - a_z = A_z - a$ has been neglected. The gauge fluctuation couples to the phase in the tunnel Hamiltonian is given by

$$T = \frac{t}{2} [\cos(\phi - qx) \cos(a_z d) + \sin(\phi - qx) \sin(a_z d)]; \quad (11)$$

Obviously, the gauge fluctuation will weaken the tunneling, then the charged gap Δ_{SAS} . We will leave further discussion of this aspect to a separate work [23].

In conclusion, we have considered the subband Landau level coupling in the interlayer tunneling of the bilayer quantum Hall system. It is found that this coupling may quantitatively affect the linear dispersion of the pseudospin Goldstone mode. A further improvement to the linear dispersion requires more sample parameters, especially, the heights of the confining potential as well as to develop a reliable method to count the correction from the quantum fluctuation.

This work was supported in part by the NSF of China.

- [1] The Quantum Hall Effect, ed. by R.E. Prange and S.M. Girvin (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987).
- [2] Perspectives in Quantum Hall Effects, ed. by S. Das Sarma and A. Pinczuk (Wiley, New York, 1997).
- [3] I.B. Spielman, J.P. Eisenstein, L.N. Pfeiffer, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5808 (2000).
- [4] I.B. Spielman, J.P. Eisenstein, L.N. Pfeiffer, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 036803 (2001).
- [5] X.G. Wen and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1811 (1992). Z.F. Ezawa and A. Iwazaki, Phys. Rev. B 48, 15189 (1993).
- [6] J. Schliemann, S.M. Girvin, and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1849 (2001).
- [7] A. Stern, S. Das Sarma, M.P.A. Fisher and S.M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 139 (2000).
- [8] L. Balents and L. Radzihovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1825 (2000).
- [9] A. Stern, S.M. Girvin, A.H. MacDonald and Ning Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1829 (2000).
- [10] M. Fogler and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1833 (2000).
- [11] Y.B. Kim, C. Nayak, E. Demler, N. Read and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B 63, 205315 (2001).
- [12] Y.N. Joglekar, and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 196802 (2001).
- [13] M.Y. Veilleux, L. Balents and M.P.A. Fisher, e-print: cond-mat/0105118.
- [14] A. Burkov, J. Schliemann, A.H. MacDonald and S.M. Girvin, Physica E 12, 28 (2002).
- [15] Yue Yu, e-print: cond-mat/0206261.
- [16] S.M. Girvin, e-print: cond-mat/0202374.
- [17] K. Moon, H. Mori, K. Yang, S.M. Girvin, A.H. MacDonald, L. Zheng, D. Yoshioka and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 51, 5138 (1995); K. Yang, K. Moon, L. Belkhir, H. Mori, S.M. Girvin, A.H. MacDonald, L. Zheng, and D. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. B 54, 11644 (1996).
- [18] Yue Yu, Shijie Yang and Zhaobin Su, Phys. Rev. B 62, 15371 (2000); Shijie Yang, Yue Yu and Jingbin Li, Phys. Rev. B 65, 073302 (2002).
- [19] S.M. Girvin and A.H. MacDonald, in [2].
- [20] V. Halonen, P. Pietilainen and T. Chakraborty, Phys. Rev. B 41, 10202 (1990); The Quantum Hall Effects, 2nd edn by T. Chakraborty and P. Pietilainen, (New York, Springer, 1995).
- [21] T. Stanescu, I. Martin and P. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1288 (2000). T. Jungwirth, A.H. MacDonald, L. Smrcka and S.M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. B 60, 15574 (1999).
- [22] S. Das Sarma and E.H. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5596 (2000).
- [23] For example, we can discuss the commensurate-incommensurate phase transition [24] investigated in [17]. The weaker tunneling, the weaker critical parallel field. Then, our critical field $B_{k,c}$ differs from that in [17] a factor about $\frac{1}{\hbar^2 a_z d} = D$.
- [24] S.Q. Murphy, J.P. Eisenstein, G.S. Boebinger, L.N. Pfeiffer and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 728 (1994).