Pairing of C om posite Ferm ions, Laughlin C orrelations, and the Fractional Q uantum H all H ierarchy

A rkadiusz W ojs¹;², K yung-Soo Y l¹;³, and John J. Quinn¹ ¹University of Tennessee, K noxville, Tennessee 37996, USA ²W rocław University of Technology, 50-370 W rocław, Poland ³Pusan National University, Pusan 609-735, K orea

A novel hierarchy of fractional quantum Hall (FQH) states in the lowest Landau level (LL) is proposed to explain recently observed FQH fractions such as = 5=13, 3/8, or 4/11. Based on the analysis of their interaction pseudopotentials, it is argued that the Laughlin quasiparticles (particles/holes in a partially lled composite ferm ion LL) form pairs. These pairs are proposed to have Laughlin correlations with one another and to form condensed states at a sequence of fractions which includes all new fractions observed in experiment.

PACS num bers: 71.10 Pm , 73.43.-f

Introduction. Pan et al. [1] recently observed fractional quantum Hall (FQH) [2] m in in a in the diagonal resistivity of a two-dimensional electron gas at novel 11ing fractions of the lowest Landau level (LL). The new spin-polarized FQH states occur at lling factors outside the Jain sequence [3] of composite ferm ion (CF) states. Some of them, as = 4=11 or 4/13, appear in the Haldane hierarchy [4] of quasiparticle (QP) condensates, but their \hierarchical" interpretation was questioned [5] because of the specic form of the QP {QP interaction. Others, such as the = 3=8 or 3/10 states, do not belong to the Haldane hierarchy, and the origin of their incom pressibility is puzzling in an even more obvious way. Pan et al. take their observations as evidence for residual CF{CF interactions, but at the same time they ignore the theoretical investigations in which these interactions were studied in detail [5, 6, 7]. Consequently, they conclude that the origin of the observed FQH states rem ains unresolved. In this letter we propose an explanation for these new states involving form ation of QP pairs which display Laughlin correlations with one another.

First, we present brie y the connection between the CF m odel (equivalent to the m ean-eld C hern { Sim onstransform ation) [3] and the QP hierarchy [4, 5, 6] to show that the form of the \residual CF {CF interactions" is neither mysterious nor unknown. On the contrary, the pseudopotentials V (R) (de ned as dependence of pair interaction energy on relative pair angular m om entum) describing these interactions at short range have been calculated [5, 6, 7], and the long-range behavior can be readily understood from the nature of the (fractionally) charged QP's that interact with one another by the (repulsive) Coulomb potential. It is worth noting the impossibility of deriving V (R) from the literally understood CF picture, where it is interpreted as the di erence between Coulom b and gauge interactions between uctuations beyond the mean eld. Second, we recall two simple types of two-body correlations, Laughlin correlations and pairing, that may occur in an interacting system depending on the lling factor and on whether V (R) is superor subharm onic at the relevant range [8]. Then, knowing the QP {QP pseudopotential V_{QP} (R), we apply the concept of Laughlin condensed states of (bosonic) pairs (used earlier for the electrons in the n = 1 LL to describe such FQH states as = 5=2 or 7/3 [9]) to the particles or holes in a partially lled CF LL, i.e., to Laughlin quasielectrons (QE's) or quasiholes (QH's). Finally, we propose the existence of novel hierarchy FQH states in which the incom pressibility results from the condensation of QP pairs (QE₂'s or QH₂'s) into Laughlin correlated pair states. The series of FQH states derived from the parent = 1=3 state include all novel fractions reported by Pan et al.: = 5=13, 3/8, 4/11, and 6/17 for the QE's and = 5=17, 3/10, 4/13, and 6/19 for the QH's.

Standard num erical calculations for N electrons are not useful for studying the Laughlin correlated pair states because convincing results require too large values of N . For a meaningful test, at least three QP pairs need be considered. For = 4=11 this occurs for N = 18 electrons and the total ux 21 = 45, which seems beyond reach of exact diagonalization and explains the lack of earlier num erical evidence. In this letter we take advantage of the know ledge of the dom in ant features of V_{OE} (R) to diagonalize two interacting QE systems correspond-= 5=13 and 3/8. A though the results con m ing to nondegenerate ground states and an excitation gap, they should be considered as a mere illustration in support of our idea, while the most convincing arguments lie in the analysis of QP {QP pseudopotentials and in good agreem ent with experim ent. Som ewhat sim ilar, detailed calculations were recently carried out by M andal and Jain [10] in search of the = 4=11, 5/13, and 6/17 states. However, these authors did not study systems with the values of (N;21) predicted in ourm odel (and their results did not indicate incom pressibility).

QP {QP P seudopotential. The nature of QP correlations depends critically on the pseudopotential V_{QP} (R) describing their pair interaction energy V_{QP} as a function of relative pair angular momentum R. We have shown earlier [8, 9] that the correlations are of the Laughlin type



FIG.1: (a) Interaction pseudopotentials V (R) for a pair of QE's of the Laughlin = 1=3 state calculated for the system s of up to N = 12 electrons on a sphere. (b) Dependence of the leading QE pseudopotential coe cients corresponding to the sm allest values of R on N⁻¹. Extrapolation to N⁻¹! 0 corresponds to an in nite planar system.

(i.e., the particles tend to avoid pair states with one or more of the smallest values of R = 1, 3, ...) only if V (R) is \superhammonic" at the relevant values of R for a given lling factor (speci cally, at R = 2p - 1 for

 $(2p + 1)^{1}$, where p = 1, 2, ...). Laughlin correlations de ned in this way justify reapplication of the CF picture to the QP's to select the low est states of the whole m any-body spectrum, and lead to the incom pressible QP \daughter" states of the standard CF hierarchy [6]. The superharm onic repulsion is de ned as one for which V decreases m ore quickly than linearly as a function of the average particle{particle separation r^{2} for the consecutive pair eigenstates labeled by R. In spherical geom – etry [4], m ost convenient for nite-size calculations, this m eans that V increases m ore quickly than linearly as a function of L (L + 1), i.e., of the squared total pair angular m om entum L = 21 R, where l is the single-particle angular m om entum .

The qualitative behavior of the QP {QP interaction pseudopotential V_{OP} (R) at short range is well-known from numerical studies of small systems [5, 6, 7]. In Fig. 1(a) we compare $V_{O\,E}$ (R) calculated for the system s of N = 9 to 12 electrons. The zero of energy is not determ ined very accurately in nite system s, and an extrapolation to large N is needed to restore the positive sign of V_{OE} (R), as shown in Fig. 1(b). However, only the relative values are of importance, since adding a constant to V (R) does not a ect correlations and only shifts the whole many-body spectrum by a (dierent) constant. On the other hand, the repulsive character of the QP {QP interaction and the long-range behavior of V_{OP} (R) R¹⁼² follow from the fact that QP's are charged particles (the form of QP charge density a ects $V_{Q\,P}\,$ only at short range, com parable to the QP size).

C om bining the above arguments, it is clear that the dominant features of $V_{Q\,E}$ are the small value at R = 1 and a strong maximum at R = 3. This result is most

2

apparent in the calculation of Lee et al. [7]. A nalogous analysis for the QH's yields maxim a at R = 1 and 5, and nearly vanishing V_{OH} (3). In portantly, these conclusions do not require such assumptions as zero layer thickness w or in nite magnetic eld B, and thus they are readily applicable to the experim ental FQH system s. This is in contrast to the literally understood CF m odel in which the weak \residual" CF {CF interactions are said to result from partial cancellation of strong C oulom b and gauge interactions between the electrons. These two interactions have very di erent character and, for example, depend di erently on w or B [8]. This prevents drawing conclusions about even the sign of V_{OP} from the CF model alone (which nevertheless remains a useful picture for certain other properties of Laughlin QP's). Let us also note that while features in V_{OP} (R) reject the internal structure of Q P's interacting through bare C oulom b potential r^{1} , it may be convenient to picture QP's as V (r) point particles interacting through an appropriate m odel $(a^2 + (r b)^2)^{1=2}$ with potential, for example V_{OE} (r) a maximum at r = b corresponding to R = 3.

QP Pairing. It is evident that because V_{OE} (3) > V_{QE} (1), the QE system does not support Laughlin correlations. Instead, we expect that at least som e of the QE's will form pairs (QE_2) at R = 1. A paired state would be characterized by a greatly reduced fractional parentage G [8] from the strongly repulsive R = 3 state compared to the Laughlin correlated state, and have low er total interaction energy $E = \frac{1}{2}N(N + 1)^{-1}RG(R)V(R)$. Let us stress that such pairing is not a result of som e attractive QE {QE interaction, but due to an obvious tendency to avoid the most strongly repulsive R = 3 pair state. At su ciently high QE density this can only be achieved by having signi cant G (1), which can be interpreted as pairing into the QE_2 m olecules. By analogy, the QH pairing is expected in the low-energy R = 3 state. The range of QP lling factors O_{P} at which pairing can be considered is limited by the condition that the separation between the closest pairs must exceed the pair size. W hile for the QE pairs with R = 1 this is satisfied at any QE < 1, the QH pairing with R = 3 can only occur at $_{OH} < 1=3$.

Because of the lim ited know ledge of V_{QP} at interm ediate R, we cannot completely preclude pairing into larger molecules (e.g. QE_2 's with R = 5 or QH_2 's with R = 7) that m ight occur at approprietly lower values of $_{QP}$. We also realize that whether alloronly some of the QP's form pairs m ight depend on $_{QP}$, but here we concentrate on the simpler, complete-pairing scenario, discussed in the context of electrons partially lling the n = 1 LL [9].

Laughlin Correlations Between Pairs. Having established that the QP uid consists of QP₂ m olecules, the QP₂{QP₂ interactions need be studied to understand correlations. Here, the QP₂'s will be treated as bosons, although in two dimensions they can be easily converted to fermions by a transformation consisting of attachment of one ux quantum. The QP₂{QP₂ interaction is described by an elective pseudopotential V_{QP_2} (R) that includes the correlation elects caused by the fact that the two-pair wavefunction must be symmetric under exchange of the whole QP_2 bosons and at the same time antisymmetric under exchange of any pair of the QPfermions. This problem is analogous to that of interaction between the electron pairs in the n = 1 LL [9].

A lthough we do not know V_{QP_2} (R) accurately, we expect that since it is due to the repulsion between the QP's that belong to di erent QP₂ pairs, it m ight be superham onic at the range corresponding to the QP₂ {QP₂ separation. For example, the tendency to avoid the pair-QE state at R = 3 that is responsible for QE pairing is also expected to cause spatial separation of the QE2's in order to reduce the contribution to the parentage G (3) com ing from pairs of Q E's that belong to di erent Q E $_2$'s. Our num erical results for four QE's (calculations of the expectation value of the interaction energy for a model QE {QE pseudopotential in the eigenstates of a pairing interaction H am iltonian) seem to support this idea. H ow ever, in contrast to the n = 1 electron LL [9], the lack of accurate data for V_{OP} at the interm ediate range m akes such calculations uncertain.

Condensed Pair States. The assumption of Laughlin correlations between the QP2 bosons for the relevant values of OP implies the sequence of Laughlin condensed QP₂ states that can be conveniently described using the \com posite boson" (CB) m odel [9]. Let us use spherical geometry and consider the system of N $_1$ ferm ions (Q P's) each with (integral or half-integral) angular m om entum l_1 (i.e., in a LL of degeneracy $q_1 = 2l_1 + 1$). Neglecting the nite-size corrections, this corresponds to the lling factor $_1 = N_1 = g_1$. Let the ferm ions form $N_2 = \frac{1}{2}N_1$ bosonic pairs each with angular m om entum $l_2 = 2l_1 R_1$, where R $_{\rm 1}$ is an odd integer. The $\,$ lling factor for the system of pairs, de ned as $_2 = N_2 = g_2$ where $g_2 = 2l_2 + 1$, equals to $_2 = \frac{1}{4}$. The allowed states of two bosonic pairs are labeled by total angular momentum $L = 2l_2$ R 2, where R_2 is an even integer. O falleven values of R_2 , the low est few are not allow ed because of the Pauli exclusion principle applied to the individual ferm ions. The condition that the two-ferm ion states with relative angular m om entum smaller than R_1 are forbidden is equivalent to the elimination of the states with R $_2$ $4R_1$ from the two-boson Hilbert space. Such a \hard core" can be accounted for by a CB transform ation with 4R₁ m agnetic ux quanta attached to each boson [11]. This gives the e ective CB angular momentum $l_2 = l_2 2R_1 (N_2 1)$, e ective LL degeneracy $g_2 = g_2 = 4R_1 (N_2)$ 1), and effective lling factor $_2 = (_2^{1} 4R_1)^{1}$.

The CB's de ned in this way condense into their only allowed $l_2 = 0$ state ($_2 = 1$) when the corresponding ferm ion system has the maximum density at which pairing is still possible, $_1 = R_1^{-1}$. At lower lling factors, the CB LL is degenerate and the spectrum of all allowed states of the N₂ CB's represents the spectrum

TABLE I: The = 1=3 hierarchy of Laughlin states of QP pairs. Fractions in boldface have been reported in Ref. [1].

q	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
QE	2/3	1/2	2/5	1/3	2/7	1/4	2/9	1/5
	5/13	3/8	7/19	4/11	9/25	5/14	11/31	6/17
QН	2/7	1/4	2/9	1/5	2/11	1/6	2/13	1/7
	5/17	3/10	7/23	4/13	9/29	5/16	11/35	6/19

of the corresponding paired ferm ion system . In particular, using the assumption of the superharm onic form of boson {boson repulsion, condensed CB states are expected at a series of Laughlin lling factors $_2 = (2q)^{1}$. Here, 2q is an even integer corresponding to the num ber of additional magnetic ux quanta attached to each CB in a subsequent CB transformation, $l_2 ! l_2 =$ 1), to describe Laughlin correlations beb q**(N** 2 tween the original CB's of angular momentum 1. From the relation between the ferm ion and CB lling factors, $_{1}^{1} = (4_{2})^{1} + R_{1}$, we not the following sequence of fractions corresponding to the Laughlin condensed pair states, $1^{1} = q=2 + R_1$. Finally, we set $R_1 = 1$ for the QE's and $R_1 = 3$ for the QH's, and use the hierarchy equation [5], $1 = 2p + (1 Q_P)^{1}$, to calculate the following sequences of electron lling factors, , derived from the parent = $(2p + 1)^{1}$ state

$$^{1} = 2p + 1$$
 (2 + q=2) 1 ; (1)

where \setminus "corresponds to the QE's and \setminus +" to the QH's. Remarkably, all the fractions reported by Pan et al. are am ong those predicted for the = 1=3 parent and listed in Tab. I. Note also that the same values of q = 1, 2, 4, and 8 describe both observed Q E and Q H states. This indicates sim ilarity of the QE {QE and QH {QH pseudopotentials and suggests that both V_{QE_2} and V_{QH_2} may be superharm onic only at the corresponding four values of R (in such case, remaining fractions of Tab. I could not be observed even in most ideal sam ples). A nother possibility is only partial pairing of QP's at some of the lling factors. Since the pseudopotentials for QP's of di erent Laughlin states are quite sim ilar [5], let us also list the fractions of the = 1=5 hierarchy corresponding to q = 1, 2, 4, and 8: = 5=23, 3/14, 4/19, and 6/29 for the QE's and = 5=27, 3/16, 4/21, and 6/31 for the Q H 's.

Numerical Results. As an illustration, we perform ed exact-diagonalization calculations on a sphere for system s of Q E 's interacting through a model pseudopotential with only one coe cient, V $_{QE}$ (3) = 1. Because a harmonic pseudopotential does not change the many-body eigenstates and only shifts the energy spectrum by a term that is linear in L (L + 1), such choice of V_{QE} means that we neglect all anharmonic contributions to the QE {QE interaction except for the strongest one at R = 3 [5, 6, 7].

In a num erical calculation it is important to account



FIG.2: Low energy spectra (energy E as a function of total angularm om entum L) of 16 Q E's at $2l_{QE} = 25$ corresponding to $_{QE} = 2=3$ and = 5=13 (a) and 10 Q E's at $2l_{QE} = 17$ corresponding to $_{QE} = 1=2$ and = 3=8 (b).

for the nite-size corrections when calculating N $_1$ and l_1 corresponding to a given . As an example for = 5=13corresponding to OE $_{1} = 2=3$ and q = 1, we pick $N_1 = 18$ and calculate $N_2 = \frac{1}{2}N_1 = 9$, $l_2 = 1$ NQE $q(N_2)$ 1) = 8, $l_2 = l_2 + 2R_1 (N_2 - 1) = 24$, and nally $2l_1 = l_2 + 1 = 25$. This Q E system represents N = 21_{0 E} $N_1 + 2l_1$ 1 = 42 electrons at 21 = 2 (l_1 1) + 2p (N 1) = 105. For = 3=8 corresponding to $_1$ = 1=2 and q = 2, we pick $N_1 = 10$ and calculate $N_2 = 5$, $l_2 = 8$, $l_2 = 16$, and nally $2l_1 = 17$. This system represents N = 26 and 21 = 65. Let us note that the values of (N;21) used here di er from those of R ef. [10] where pairing between QP's was not considered. The energy spectra for these two systems are shown in Fig. 2. They both show a nondegenerate (L = 0) ground state and a nite gap.

The very simple QE {QE pseudopotential we used did not give the expected L = 0 ground state in every case we tested. However, the lowest L = 0 state was always the lowest state for small values of L which suggests that it m ight become an absolute ground state if the appropriate harm onic term was included in V_{QE} . Further numerical studies of the energy spectra and of the coe cients of fractional parentage G m ay clarify whether this is caused by the use of an oversim pli ed m odel pseudopotential or perhaps only partial QE pairing at $_{QE} < 1=2$.

Conclusions. We have studied the QP {QP interactions leading to novel spin-polarized FQH states in the low est LL.U sing the know ledge of QP {QP pseudopotentials and a general dependence of the form of correlations on the super- or subharm onic behavior of the pseudopotential, we have shown that QP's form pairs over a certain range of lling factor $_{QP}$. Then, we argued that the correlations between the QP pairs should be of Laughlin

type and proposed a hierarchy of condensed paired QP states, in analogy to the paired states in the excited electron LL studied earlier. The proposed hierarchy of fractions agrees rem arkably well with the recent experiment of Pan et al. [1]. However, more detailed calculations are needed to understand why only som e of the predicted states were observed. In particular, further studies might verify the possibility of only partial pairing and form ation ofm ixed liquids containing both paired and unpaired QP's at lling factors corresponding to q > 2. Also, the whole = 1=5 hierarchy is yet to be con med experim entally. F inally, stability of the proposed states against spin excitations at low Zeem an energy needs to be tested, as a partially polarized = 4=11 state was suggested by Park and Jain [12], and its particle-hole conjugate, = 7=11, appears unpolarized in experim ent [1].

This work was supported by Grant DE+FG 02-97ER45657 of the Materials Science Program { Basic Energy Sciences of the U.S. Dept. of Energy. AW acknow ledges support from Grant 2P 03B 02424 of the Polish KBN.KSY acknow ledges support from Grant R14-2002-029-01002-0 of the KOSEF. The authors thank Jennifer J.Quinn and Josef Tobiska for helpful discussions.

- [1] W. Pan, H.L. Storm er, D.C. Tsui, L.N. Pfeier, K.W.
 Baldwin, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 016801 (2003).
- [2] D.C.Tsui, H.L.Stormer, and A.C.Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1559 (1982).
- [3] J.K.Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 199 (1989).
- [4] F.D.M.Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 605 (1983).
- [5] A.W ojs and J.J.Quinn, Phys. Rev. B 61, 2846 (2000).
- [6] P.Sitko, S.N.Yi, K.-S.Yi, and J.J.Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 3396 (1996); P.Sitko, K.-S.Yi, and J.J.Quinn, Phys. Rev. B 56, 12417 (1997).
- [7] S.-Y.Lee, V.W. Scarola, and J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 256803 (2001).
- [8] A.W ojs and J.J.Quinn, Philos.M ag.B 80,1405 (2000);
 Acta Phys.Pol. A 96, 593 (1999); J.J.Quinn and A.
 W ojs, J.Phys.: Condens.M atter 12, R265 (2000).
- [9] A.W ojs, Phys. Rev. B 63, 125312 (2001); A.W ojs and J.J.Quinn, Physica E 12, 63 (2002).
- [10] S. S. M andal and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. B 66, 155302 (2002).
- [11] Jennifer J. Quinn and J. Tobiska, (unpublished); A.T. Benjamin, Jennifer J. Quinn, J. J. Quinn, and A.Wojs, J. Combinat. Theory A 95, 390 (2001).
- [12] K.Park and J.K.Jain, Phys.Rev.B 62, R13274 (2000); I.Szlufarska, A.W ojs, and J.J.Quinn, Phys.Rev.B 64, 165318 (2001).