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#### Abstract

A novel hierarchy of fractional quantum H all ( 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 com posite ferm ion LL) form pairs. These pairs are proposed to have Laughlin correlations $w$ ith one another and to form condensed states at a sequence of fractions which includes all new fractions observed in experim ent.


PAC S num bers: 71.10 . Pm, $73.43 .-\mathrm{f}$

Introduction. Pan et al. $\overline{[1]}]$ recently observed fractional quantum H all ( FQH ) [2] m inim a in the diagonal resistivity of a two-dim ensionalelectron gas at novel lling fractions of the low est Landau level (LL). T he new spin-polarized FQ H states occur at lling factors outside the Jain sequence [ Som e of them, as $=4=11$ or $4 / 13$, appear in the H aldane hierarchy [i] ofquasiparticle (Q P) condensates, but their \hierarchical" interpretation was questioned ${ }_{\underline{5}}^{1} / 1$ because of the speci c form of the Q P \{QP interaction. O thers, such as the $=3=8$ or $3 / 10$ states, do not belong to the H aldane hierarchy, and the origin of their incom pressibility is puzzling in an even m ore obvious way. P an 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
 clude that the origin of the observed FQ H 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 w ith one another.

First, we present brie y the connection betw een the C F m odel (equivalent to the $m$ ean- eld $C$ hem \{ Sim ons trans-
 the form of the \residualCF \{CF interactions" is neither $m$ ysterious nor unknown. O n the contrary, the pseudopotentials $V(\mathbb{R})$ (de ned as dependence of pair interaction energy on relative pair angular $m$ om entum ) describing these interactions at short range have been calculated
 derstood from the nature of the (fractionally) charged QP's that interact w ith one another by the (repulsive) Coulomb potential. It is worth noting the im possibility of deriving $V(R)$ from the literally understood CF picture, where it is interpreted as the di erence betw een C oulom b and gauge interactions betw een uctuations beyond the $m$ ean eld. Second, we recall tw o sim ple types oftw o-body correlations, Laughlin correlations and pairing, that $m$ ay occur in an interacting system depending on the lling factor and on whether $V(R)$ is super-
or subharm onic at the relevant range [id]. Then, know ing the $Q P\left\{Q P\right.$ pseudopotential $V_{Q P}(\mathbb{R})$, we apply the concept of Laughlin condensed states of (bosonic) pairs (used earlier for the electrons in the $n=1 \mathrm{LL}$ to describe such FQH states as $=5=2$ or $7 / 3$ [ 1 ] $)$ to the particles or holes in a partially lled CF LL, i.e., to Laughlin quasielectrons ( $Q$ E's) or quasiholes ( Q H's). Finally, we propose the existence of novel hierarchy FQH states in which the incom pressibility results from the condensation of $Q P$ pairs ( $Q E_{2}$ 's or $Q H_{2}$ 's) into Laughlin correlated pair states. The series of $F Q H$ states derived from the parent $=1=3$ state include all novel fractions reported by P an et al: $=5=13,3 / 8,4 / 11$, and $6 / 17$ for the $Q E$ 's and $=5=17,3 / 10,4 / 13$, and $6 / 19$ for the $Q H$ 's.

Standard num erical calculations for N electrons are not usefulfor studying the Laughlin correlated pair states because convincing results require too large values of $N$. For a m eaningful test, at least three Q P pairs need be considered. For $=4=11$ this occurs for $N=18$ electrons and the total ux $21=45$, which seem $s$ 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 inant features of $V_{Q E}(R)$ to diagonalize two interacting QE system s corresponding to $=5=13$ and $3 / 8$. A though the results con m nondegenerate ground states and an excitation gap, they should be considered as a $m$ ere illustration in support of our idea, while the $m$ ost convincing argum ents lie in the analysis of Q P \{QP pseudopotentials and in good agree$m$ ent $w$ ith experim ent. Som ew hat sim ilar, detailed calculations were recently carried out by M andal and Jain [10 ${ }^{-1}$ ] in search of the $=4=11,5 / 13$, and $6 / 17$ states. H ow ever, these authors did not study system s w ith the values of $(\mathbb{N} ; 21)$ predicted in ourm odel (and their results did not indicate incom pressibility).
$Q P\{Q P$ Pseudopotential. The nature of $Q P$ correlations depends critically on the pseudopotential $V_{Q P}(R)$ describing their pair interaction energy $V_{Q P}$ as a function of relative pair angular $m$ om entum $R$. W e have show $n$ earlier


F IG. 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) D ependence of the leading Q E pseudopotential coe cients corresponding to the $s m$ 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 $w$ ith one or $m$ ore of the smallest values of $R=1,3, \ldots$ ) only if $V(R)$ is \superharm onic" at the relevant values of $R$ for a given lling factor (speci cally, at $R=2 p \quad 1$ for $(2 p+1)^{1}$, where $\left.p=1,2, \ldots\right)$. Laughlin correlations de ned in this way justify reapplication of the CF picture to the Q P's to select the low est states of the w hole $m$ any-body spectrum, and lead to the incom pressible $Q P$ \daughter" states of the standard C F hierarchy [íl]. 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 [ $[\underline{l}]$, $m$ 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 totalpair angularm om entum $L=2 l R$, where $l$ is the single-particle angularm om entum.

The qualitative behavior of the $Q P\{Q P$ interaction pseudopotential $V_{Q P}(R)$ at short range is well-known
 $F$ ig. $111(a)$ we com pare $V_{Q E}(R)$ 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 $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Q}}(\mathrm{R})$, as shown in F ig. ${ }^{1} 1 \mathbf{1} 1 \mathrm{l}(\mathrm{b})$. H ow ever, only the relative values are of im portance, since adding a constant to $V(\mathbb{R})$ does not a ect correlations and only shifts the whole $m$ any-body spectrum by a (di erent) constant. On the other hand, the repulsive character of the $Q P\{Q P$ interaction and the long-range behavior of $V_{Q P}(R) \quad R^{1=2}$ follow from the fact that $Q P^{\prime}$ 's are charged particles (the form of QP charge density a ects $V_{Q P}$ only at short range, com parable to the $Q P$ size).

C om bining the above argum ents, it is clear that the dom inant features of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Q}} \mathrm{E}$ are the sm all value at $\mathrm{R}=1$ and a strong $m$ axim um at $R=3$. This result is $m$ ost
apparent in the calculation of Lee et al. [i] $\bar{i}]$. A nalogous analysis for the $Q H$ 's yieldsm axim a at $R=1$ and 5 , and nearly vanishing $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Q}} \mathrm{H}$ (3). Im portantly, these conclusions do not require such assum ptions as zero layer thickness w or in nite m agnetic eld $B$, and thus they are readily applicable to the experim entalFQH system s . This is in contrast to the literally understood C F m odel in which the weak \residual" C F \{C F interactions are said to result from partialcancellation ofstrong $C$ oulom $b$ and gauge interactions betw een the electrons. T hese tw o interactions have very di erent character and, for exam ple, depend di erently on w or B [8]i]. This prevents draw ing conclusions about even the sign of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Q} P}$ from the CF m odel alone (which nevertheless rem ains a usefulpicture for certain other properties of Laughlin $Q P$ 's). Let us also note that while features in $V_{Q P}(R)$ re ect the intemal structure of P 's interacting through bare C oulom b potential $V(r) \quad r^{1}$, it $m$ ay be convenient to picture $Q P^{\prime} s$ as point particles interacting through an appropriate m odel potential, for example $V_{Q E}(r) \quad\left(a^{2}+\left(\begin{array}{ll}r & b\end{array}\right)^{2}\right)^{1=2} w$ th a $m$ axim um at $r=b$ corresponding to $R=3$.

QP Pairing. It is evident that because $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{QE}}$ (3) > $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ (1), the Q E system does not support Laughlin correlations. Instead, we expect that at least som e of the $Q \mathrm{E}$ 's w ill form pairs $\left(Q E_{2}\right)$ at $R=1$. A paired state would be characterized by a greatly reduced fractional parentage $G\left[\frac{d}{6}\right]$ from the strongly repulsive $R=3$ state com pared to the Laughlin correlated state, and have low er total interaction energy $E=\frac{1}{2} N(\mathbb{N} \quad 1){ }_{R} G(R) V(R)$. Let us stress that such pairing is not a result of som e attractive $Q E\{Q E$ interaction, but due to an obvious tendency to avoid the $m$ ost 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 $Q E_{2} m$ olecules. By analogy, the $Q H$ pairing is expected in the low-energy $R=3$ state. $T$ he range of QP lling factors $Q P$ at which pairing can be considered is lim ited by the condition that the separation betw een the closest pairs $m$ ust exceed the pair size. $W$ hile for the $Q E$ pairsw ith $R=1$ this is satis ed at any $Q E<1$, the Q H pairing w ith $R=3$ can only occur at $Q H<1=3$.

Because of the lim ited know ledge of $V_{Q P}$ at interm ediate $R$, we cannot com pletely prechude pairing into larger molecules (e.g. $Q \mathrm{E}_{2}$ 's with $\mathrm{R}=5$ or $\mathrm{QH}_{2}$ 'swith $\mathrm{R}=7$ ) that $m$ ight occur at approprietly low er vahes of $Q \mathrm{P}$. W e also realize that whether allor only som e of the $Q P$ 's form pairs $m$ ight depend on $Q P$, but here we concentrate on the simpler, com plete-pairing scenario, discussed in the context of electrons partially lling the $\mathrm{n}=1 \mathrm{LL}$ (9, $\overline{1}$.

Laughlin C orrelations Betw en Pairs. H aving established that the $Q P$ uid consists of $Q P_{2}$ m olecules, the $Q P_{2}\left\{Q P_{2}\right.$ interactions need be studied to understand correlations. H ere, the $Q P_{2}$ ' s w ill be treated as bosons, although in tw o dim ensions they can be easily converted to ferm ions by a transform ation consisting of attach$m$ ent of one ux quantum. The $Q P_{2}\left\{Q P_{2}\right.$ interaction is
described by an e ective pseudopotential $V_{Q P_{2}}(R)$ that includes the correlation e ects caused by the fact that the two-pair w avefunction $m$ ust be sym $m$ etric under exchange of the whole $Q P_{2}$ bosons and at the same time antisym $m$ etric under exchange of any pair of the $Q P$ ferm ions. This problem is analogous to that of interaction betw een the electron pairs in the $n=1 \mathrm{LL}$ [

A though we do not know $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{P}_{2}}(\mathrm{R})$ accurately, we expect that since it is due to the repulsion between the $Q P$ 's that belong to di erent $Q P_{2}$ pairs, it $m$ ight be superharm onic at the range corresponding to the $Q P_{2}\left\{Q P_{2}\right.$ separation. For exam ple, the tendency to avoid the pair$Q E$ state at $R=3$ that is responsible for $Q E$ pairing is also expected to cause spatial separation of the $Q \mathrm{E}_{2}$ 's in order to reduce the contribution to the parentage $G$ (3) com ing from pairs of E 's that belong to di erent $Q \mathrm{E}_{2}$ 's. O ur num erical results for four Q E'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 $\left[\frac{9}{9}\right]$, the lack of accurate data for $V_{Q P}$ at the interm ediate range $m$ akes such calculations unœertain.
$C$ ondensed P air States. The assum ption of Laughlin correlations betw een the $Q P_{2}$ bosons for the relevant values of $Q P$ implies the sequence of Laughlin condensed $Q P_{2}$ states that can be conveniently described using the \com posite boson" (CB) m odel $\left[\frac{9}{-1}\right]$. Let us use spherical geom etry and consider the system of $N_{1}$ ferm ions ( $Q$ P's) each $w$ th (integral or half-integral) angular $m$ om entum $l_{1}$ (i.e., in a LL ofdegeneracy $g_{1}=2 l_{1}+1$ ). N eglecting 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 w ith angularm om entum $l_{2}=2 l_{1} \quad R_{1}$, where $R_{1}$ is an odd integer. The lling factor for the system of pairs, de ned as $2=\mathrm{N}_{2}=g_{2}$ where $g_{2}=2 l_{2}+1$, equals to $2=\frac{1}{4} 1$. The allowed states of two bosonic pairs are labeled by total angular $m$ om entum $L=2 l_{2} \quad R_{2}$, $w$ here $R_{2}$ is an even integer. O falleven values of $R_{2}$, the low est few are not allow ed because of the $P$ auliexclusion principle applied to the individual ferm ions. The condition that the two-ferm ion states $w$ ith relative angular m om entum sm aller than $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ are forbidden is equivalent to the elim ination of the states $w$ ith $R_{2} \quad 4 R_{1}$ from the tw o-boson H ibert space. Such a \hard core" can be accounted for by a CB transform ation with $4 \mathrm{R}_{1} \mathrm{~m}$ agnetic ux quanta attached to each boson $\left[\begin{array}{ll}{[11} \\ 1\end{array}\right]$. This gives the e ective CB angularm om entum $l_{2}=\bar{l}_{2} \quad 2 R_{1}\left(N_{2} \quad 1\right)$, e ective LL degeneracy $g_{2}=g_{2} \quad 4 R_{1}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} \quad 1\right)$, and effective lling factor ${ }_{2}=\left(2^{1} 4 R_{1}\right)^{1}$.

The CB's de ned in this way condense into their only allowed $l_{2}=0$ state $\left(2_{2}=1\right)$ when the corresponding ferm ion system has the $m$ axim um density at which pairing is still possible, $1=\mathrm{R}_{1}{ }^{1}$. At lower lling factors, the CB LL is degenerate and the spectrum of all allow ed states of the $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{CB}$ 's represents the spectrum

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

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

of the corresponding paired ferm ion system. In particular, using the assum ption of the superharm onic form of boson \{boson repulsion, condensed CB states are expected at a series of Laughlin lling factors $2=(2 q)^{1}$. Here, 2 q is an even integer corresponding to the num ber of additionalm agnetic ux quanta attached to each CB in a subsequent CB transform ation, $l_{2}$ ! $l_{2}=$ $l_{2} \quad q\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} \quad 1\right)$, to describe Laughlin correlations betw een the originalCB's of angular mom entum $l_{2}$. From the relation between the ferm ion and CB lling factors,
${ }_{1}^{1}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}4 & l^{1}\end{array}\right)^{1}+\mathrm{R}_{1}$, we nd the follow ing sequence of fractions corresponding to the Laughlin condensed pair states, $1^{1}=q=2+R_{1}$. Finally, we set $R_{1}=1$ for the $Q E ' S$ and $R_{1}=3$ for the $Q H^{\prime} s$, and use the hierarchy
 follow ing sequences of electron lling factors, , derived from the parent $=(2 p+1)^{1}$ state

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{1}=2 p+1 \quad(2+q=2)^{1} ; \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\backslash$ " corresponds to the QE 's and $\backslash+$ " to the QH 's. $R$ em arkably, all the fractions reported by P an et al are am ong those predicted for the $=1=3$ parent and listed in Tab. 1 . 1. N ote also that the sam e values of $q=1,2,4$, and 8 describe both observed QE and QH states. This indicates sim ilarity of the QE\{QE and QH\{QH pseudopotentials and suggests that both $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{EE}_{2}}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{QH}_{2}} \mathrm{~m}$ ay be superharm onic only at the corresponding four values of $R$ (in such case, rem aining fractions of $T$ ab. II could not be observed even in $m$ ost ideal sam ples). A nother possibility is only partial pairing of P 's at som e of the lling factors. Since the pseudopotentials for $Q P$ 's of di erent Laughlin states are quite sim ilar []$=$ 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 $Q E^{\prime} \mathrm{S}$ and $=5=27,3 / 16,4 / 21$, and $6 / 31$ for the $Q H$ 's.
$N$ um erical Results. A s an illustration, we perform ed exact-diagonalization calculations on a sphere for system $s$ of $Q E$ 's interacting through a m odel pseudopotentialw th only one coe cient, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{QE}}(3)=1$. Because a har$m$ onic pseudopotential does not change the $m$ any-body eigenstates and only shifts the energy spectrum by a term that is linear in $L(L+1)$, such choige of $V_{Q E} m$ eans that we neglect all anharm onic contributions to the QE\{QE interaction except for the strongest one at $R=3$ [్ర

In a num erical calculation it is im portant to account


FIG.2: Low energy spectra (energy E as a function of total angularm om entum L) of 16 Q 's at $2 l_{\mathrm{E}}=25$ corresponding to $Q E=2=3$ and $=5=13$ (a) and $10 Q E$ 's at $2 \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{E}}=17$ corresponding to $Q E=1=2$ and $=3=8$ (b).
for the nite-size corrections $w$ hen calculating $N_{1}$ and $l_{1}$ corresponding to a given. As an example for $=5=13$ corresponding to $Q E \quad 1=2=3$ and $q=1$, we pick $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{QE}} \quad \mathrm{N}_{1}=18$ and calculate $\mathrm{N}_{2}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~N}_{1}=9, l_{2}=$ $q\left(N_{2} \quad 1\right)=8, l_{2}=l_{2}+2 R_{1}\left(\mathbb{N}_{2} \quad 1\right)=24$, and nally $2 l_{\mathrm{E}} \quad 2 l_{1}=l_{2}+1=25$. T his $Q \mathrm{E}$ system represents $\mathrm{N}=$ $N_{1}+2 l_{1} \quad 1=42$ electrons at $21=2\left(\begin{array}{ll}l_{1} & 1\end{array}\right)+2 p\left(\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{N} & 1\end{array}\right)=$ 105. For $=3=8$ corresponding to $1=1=2$ and $q=2$, we pick $N_{1}=10$ and calculate $N_{2}=5, I_{2}=8, l_{2}=16$, and nally $2 l_{1}=17$. This system represents $\mathrm{N}=26$ and $21=65$. Let us note that the values of $(\mathbb{N} ; 21)$ used here di er from those of $R$ ef. [10 Q P's was not considered. The energy spectra for these tw $o$ system $s$ are show $n$ in $F$ ig. $\overline{12}$. They both show a nondegenerate $(L=0)$ ground state and a nite gap.

The very simple QE \{QE pseudopotentialwe used did not give the expected $L=0$ ground state in every case we tested. H ow ever, the low est $L=0$ state $w$ as alw ays the low est state for sm all values of $L$ which suggests that it $m$ ight becom e an absolute ground state if the appropriate harm onic term was included in $V_{Q E}$. Further num erical studies of the energy spectra and of the coe cients of fractionalparentage G m ay clarify w hether th is is caused by the use of an oversim pli ed $m$ odelpseudopotentialor perhaps only partialQE pairing at $Q \mathrm{E}<1=2$.

Conclusions. We have studied the QP $\{Q P$ interactions leading to novel spin-polarized $F Q H$ states in the low est LL. U sing the know ledge of Q P \{ Q P pseudopotentials and a generaldependence of the form of correlations on the super-or subharm onic behavior of the pseudopotential, we have show $n$ that $Q P$ 's form pairs over a certain range of lling factor $Q P$. Then, we argued that the correlations betw een the QP pairs should be of Laughlin
type and proposed a hierarchy of condensed paired Q P states, in analogy to the paired states in the excited electron LL studied earlier. The proposed hierarchy of fractions agrees rem arkably well w th the recent experim ent of P an et al. [1] 1 . H ow ever, m ore detailed calculations are needed to understand why only som e of the predicted states w ere observed. In particular, further studiesm ight verify the possibility of only partial pairing and form ation ofm ixed liquids containing both paired and unpaired $Q P$ 's at lling factors corresponding to $q>2$. A lso, the whole $=1=5$ hierarchy is yet to be con m ed experi$m$ 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]
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