

Violation of classical electrodynamics by composite fermions in the quantum Hall effect.

Keshav N. Shrivastava

School of Physics, University of Hyderabad,
Hyderabad 500046, India

We find that the composite fermion (CF) which is the magnetic flux quanta attached to the electron, although based on experimentally observed fractions in the quantum Hall effect, is inconsistent with the classical electrodynamics. It produces new quasiparticles which have the usual charge and spin but their rotation in a curved path does not produce magnetic field. This "zero-field" production is inconsistent with the classical electrodynamics. The attaching and detaching of magnetic flux quanta to the electron, also violates the theory of relativity.

Corresponding author: keshav@mailaps.org
Fax: + 91-40-3010145 Phone: 3010811.

1. Introduction

When a metal sheet is placed in a magnetic field along the z direction with the applied voltage along the y direction, there is a current in the x direction. This current is called the Hall current. The x component of the resistivity is the Hall resistivity which varies linearly with the applied field along z direction. In 1980 it was found that there is a plateau in the Hall resistivity in the xy plane at the value of $\rho_{xy} = h/e^2$ where i is an integer. Later on it was found that a plateau in the transverse resistivity also occurs at $i = 1/3$ so that this number need not be an integer. (We now believe that this quantization of resistivity is the result of flux quantization, and not due to "the structure" as was thought in the original work). In 1989, Jain^{1,2} constructed the denominator, $2p + 1$ by using $2p + 1$ so that one of the fractions is $1/(2p + 1) = 1/3$ and an even number, 2 is needed. It is proposed that there are two types of quasiparticles, the electrons and the composite fermions (CF). The magnetic field at the CF is less than at the electron,

$$B = B_0 - 2\pi n \phi_0 \quad (1)$$

where m is an integer, n is the number of electrons per unit area and ϕ_0 is the unit flux quantum, hc/e , with h as the Planck's constant, c the velocity of light and e , the charge of the electron. The number $2m$ may be written as $2m$ and the filling factor,

$$\nu = \frac{p}{2m p + 1} \quad (2)$$

For $m = 1$, $\nu = p/(2p + 1)$. When compared with the experimental data, the series of fractional charges, $p/(2p + 1)$ is found to be correct and there is no doubt that this is the correct series. In the beginning of this subject, it was thought that the denominators are odd numbers in the series which gives the fractional charge, i.e.,

$$\nu = \frac{1}{2p + 1} \quad (3)$$

Laughlin obtained the wave function of a quasiparticle of charge $e_{eff} = (1/3)e$. There is nothing against the quantum mechanics which teaches us to write wave functions but in quantum Hall effect it is the measurement of current and voltage which plays the

dominant role. An examination of the expression (1) shows that even number of flux quanta are attached to the electron. Let us examine, if this attachment of flux quanta is consistent with the classical electrodynamics.

2. Explanations

The Biot and Savart's law shows that when an electron travels in a circular orbit of radius, R , it produces a magnetic field. If the orbit is in the xy plane, then the field produced is in the z direction. One electron produces a field of B and the flux is quantized so that,

$$B = \frac{n \phi_0}{A} \quad (4)$$

where A is the area, which we can calculate if we know B . If $2n \phi_0$ is attached to one electron, the field will be given by B' instead of B where

$$B' = B + 2n \phi_0 / A \quad (5)$$

When the field B comes from the charge e , what happened to the charge corresponding to $2n \phi_0$? Therefore, we understand that $2n \phi_0$ is decoupled from the charge. The current I corresponds to field B but $2n \phi_0$,

$$B = \frac{2I}{cR} \quad (6)$$

where c is the velocity of light. We show the current I in Fig.1 which gives the field B so that I gives B but not B' . To get $2n \phi_0$, we detach it from I_2 and give it to B . Thus we have the CF which has a current of I and the field of $B + 2n \phi_0$ and the current I_2 with zero field. Thus we have two new quasiparticles, one of these is called the composite fermion (CF) and the other, a new quasiparticle, called the decomposite fermion (DF). What is the CF? The CF is the electron current I with field B to which an extra field has been added. Now, what is called DF? The DF is the current I_2 from which the field has been detached. Thus the composite fermion has a field of $B + 2n \phi_0$ and the decomposite fermion has a field of zero. In the classical electrodynamics, the current I gives the field B but the CF has a field of $B + 2n \phi_0$ and the DF has zero field. We have thus invented two new quasiparticles, the CF and the DF which are not the same as electrons. The CF

was suggested by Jain in 1989 to explain the quantum Hall effect and the DF has been found only in the present work. It is clear that both the CF as well as the DF are not consistent with the classical electrodynamics. The construction of a magnet is based on the Biot and Savart's law which is believed to be correct. Therefore both the CF and the DF are "incorrect". Dyakonov³ has said that although, many experimentalists support Jain's idea of CF moving in a field, NO BODY HAS SHOWN THEORETICALLY THE EXISTENCE OF CF AS (QUASI)FREE PARTICLES. Farid⁴ also pointed out that the reduced field formula is not correct.

3. The decomposite fermion (DF)

The decomposite fermion (DF) is created when CF is formed. Since the magnetic field of $2n\phi_0$ has been detached from the electron, what is left is a particle with spin and orbit but no magnetic field. Once the magnetic field has been detached from the electron it will not emit light. Similarly, light signals will not reach it. This will be a dark object and there will be no way of seeing it. No electromagnetic signal will reach it nor will it emit any. However, it has a finite mass so that formation of CF will result into overall reduction of mass. Since some of the electrons will be lost by detachment of magnetic fields, there is overall loss of mass. The DF will stay in a dark region. The GaAs is electrically neutral. When charge goes to the dark region, the GaAs will become positively charged. In this way large positive charge will collect on the GaAs and a current will flow due to formation of CF.

As a further clarification, the electrons in a curved path produce a field. When this field is removed, what is left is a particle of charge e and spin s but no magnetic field. This particle is called the detached fermion (DF). This quasiparticle is not consistent with the classical electrodynamics. Since the magnetic vector has been detached from the spin and charge, the DF will not be consistent with the hypotheses of the "special theory of relativity."

4. Comments on CF.

We have shown⁵ that the CF is a large object and hence it is impossible that it has the same density as the electron. The CF model of Jain^{1,2} which is used to understand the quantum Hall effect requires that the density of CF should be the same as that of the electron. Therefore, the CF model is internally inconsistent. We have shown⁶ that the expression for the effective field at the CF site is not correct. We have shown⁷ that the phenomenology of the CF is not correct. The experimentalists have been misguided to claim that CF has been observed. In fact⁴, the observation has nothing to do with the CF. The CF should be a fermion by definition but it is found that they cease to be fermions⁹.

In fact all of the experimental data published in the PRL 1998-2001 is in agreement with the angular momentum model¹⁰.

5. Conclusions

The CF model^{1,2} of the quantum Hall effect is internally inconsistent. It violates the laws of the classical electrodynamics. The formation of the CFs requires that there should exist DFs. Thus flux quanta are attached to the electron or detached from the electron. In the later case, it is clear that the CF violates the "special theory of relativity." Kukushkin et al¹¹ were misguided to make a claim that they observed "flux attached" CFs. These authors¹¹ actually did not observe the CFs. What they observed is not a CF.

The correct theory of the quantum Hall effect is given in ref.12.

6. References

1. J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 199 (1989).
2. K. Park and J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 4200 (1998).
3. M. I. Dyakonov, cond-mat/0209206.
4. B. Farid, cond-mat/0003064.
5. K. N. Shrivastava, cond-mat/0209057.

6. K .N .Shrivastava, cond-m at/0207391.
7. K .N .Shrivastava, cond-m at/0204627.
8. K .N .Shrivastava, cond-m at/0202459.
9. K .N .Shrivastava, cond-m at/0105559.
10. K .N .Shrivastava, cond-m at/0201232.
11. I.V .Kukushkin et al, Nature 415, 409 (2002).
12. K N .Shrivastava, Introduction to quantum Hall effect,
Nova Science Pub. Inc., N .Y . (2002).

Note: Ref.12 is available from :

Nova Science Publishers, Inc.,
400 Oser Avenue, Suite 1600,
Hauppauge, N .Y .. 11788-3619,
Tel.(631)-231-7269, Fax: (631)-231-8175,
ISBN 1-59033-419-1 US\$69.
E-m ail: novascience@Earthlink.net

Fig.1: The current I produces a field B where the radius of curvature is R . This is called the Biot and Savart's law. The current I_2 produces a field $2n_o$. This $2n_o$ is detached from I_2 and attached to I to make a field of $B+2n_o$. Thus the quasiparticle which has a field of $B+2n_o$ is called CF. This leaves a particle of current I_2 with zero field called DF. We show that CF-DF model is inconsistent with classical electrodynamics and relativity.

This figure "CF2Fig.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/cond-mat/0209666v1>