

SU (4) Skyrmions and Activation Energy Anomaly in Bilayer Quantum Hall Systems

Z.F. Ezawa¹ and G. Tsitsishvili²

¹Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai, 980-8578 Japan and

²Department of Theoretical Physics, A. Razmadze Mathematical Institute, Tbilisi, 380093 Georgia
(Dated: March 22, 2024)

The bilayer QH system has four energy levels in the lowest Landau level, corresponding to the layer and spin degrees of freedom. We investigate the system in the regime where all four levels are nearly degenerate and equally active. The underlying group structure is SU (4). At $\nu = 1$ the QH state is a charge-transferable state between the two layers and the SU (4) isospin coherence develops spontaneously. Quasiparticles are isospin textures to be identified with SU (4) skyrmions. The skyrmion energy consists of the Coulomb energy, the Zeeman energy and the pseudo-Zeeman energy. The Coulomb energy consists of the self-energy, the capacitance energy and the exchange energy. At the balanced point only pseudospins are excited unless the tunneling gap is too large. Then, the SU (4) skyrmion evolves continuously from the pseudospin-skyrmion limit into the spin-skyrmion limit as the system is transformed from the balanced point to the monolayer point by controlling the bias voltage. Our theoretical result explains quite well the experimental data due to Murphy et al. and Sawada et al. on the activation energy anomaly induced by applying parallel magnetic field.

I. INTRODUCTION

Exchange Coulomb interactions play key roles in various strongly correlated electron systems. They are essential also in quantum Hall (QH) systems [1, 2], where spins are polarized spontaneously as in ferromagnets. Much more interesting phenomena occur in bilayer QH systems due to exchange interactions. For instance, an anomalous tunneling current has been observed [3] between the two layers at the zero bias voltage. It may well be a manifestation of the Josephson-like phenomena predicted a decade ago [4]. They occur due to quantum coherence developed spontaneously across the layers [4, 5, 6].

Electrons in a plane perform cyclotron motion under strong magnetic field B_z and create Landau levels. When one Landau level is filled up the system becomes incompressible, leading to the integer QH effect. In QH systems the electron position is specified solely by the guiding center $X = (X; Y)$ subject to the noncommutative relation, $[X; Y] = i\ell_B^2$, with the magnetic length $\ell_B = \sqrt{\hbar/eB_z}$. The QH system provides us with a simple realization of noncommutative geometry. It follows from this relation that each electron occupies an area $2\pi\ell_B^2$ labelled by the Landau-site index. Electrons behave as if they were on lattice sites, among which exchange interactions operate.

In QH ferromagnets charged excitations are spin textures called skyrmions [7]. Skyrmions are identified experimentally [8, 9, 10] by measuring the number of flipped spins per one quasiparticle. Indeed, by tilting samples, the activation energy increases by the Zeeman effect, which is roughly proportional to the number of flipped spins. On the contrary, an entirely opposite behavior has been observed by Murphy et al. [11] in the bilayer QH system at the filling factor $\nu = 1$, where the activation energy decreases rapidly by tilting samples. It is called the activation energy anomaly because of this

unexpected behavior. Note that we expect an increase since the $\nu = 1$ bilayer QH system is a QH ferromagnet with spins spontaneously polarized. This anomalous decrease has been argued to occur due to the loss of the exchange energy of a pseudospin texture based on the bimeron model [6], where the spin degree of freedom is frozen. Here, the layer degree of freedom is referred to as the pseudospin: It is said to be up (down) when an electron is in the front (back) layer.

We investigate physics taking place in the lowest Landau level (LLL). Since each Landau site can accommodate four electrons with the spin and layer degrees of freedom, the underlying group structure is enlarged to SU (4). Let us call it the isospin SU (4) in contrast to the spin SU (2) and the pseudospin SU (2). We study charged excitations in the $\nu = 1$ bilayer QH system. A natural candidate is the SU (4) isospin texture to be identified with the SU (4) skyrmion [1, 12]. A specific feature of the SU (4) isospin texture is that it is reduced to the spin and pseudospin textures in certain limits.

At $\nu = 1$, electrons are transferable between the two layers continuously without breaking the QH effect [13]. Namely, the bilayer QH system can be continuously brought into the monolayer QH system by changing the density imbalance. It implies that a pseudospin texture at the balanced point must be continuously transformed into a spin texture at the monolayer point. It is natural that a pseudospin texture evolves into an isospin texture and then regresses to a spin texture in this process. The corresponding continuous transformation of the activation energy has already been observed experimentally by Sawada et al. [13, 14, 15]. In this paper we explain these experimental data [11, 14, 15] based on the excitation of SU (4) skyrmions.

In Section II we derive the Landau-site Hamiltonian governing bilayer QH systems, by extending the algebraic method employed previously to investigate multi-

component monolayer QH systems [16]. In Section III we rewrite the Landau-site Hamiltonian into the exchange-interaction form. The Coulomb potentials associated with the direct and exchange interactions are obtained analytically.

In Section IV the ground state is explored in the regime where the $SU(4)$ isospin coherence develops spontaneously. It is shown that the capacitance energy consists of two terms arising from the direct interaction, which is the standard one made of two planes, and from the exchange interaction, by way of which the capacitance energy becomes considerably smaller than the standard one for a small layer separation.

In Section V the excitation energy of an electron-hole pair is calculated exactly. A hole (electron) is the small size limit of a skyrmion (antiskyrmion), which is realized when the Zeeman gap ϵ_z and the tunneling gap ϵ_{tun} are very large. The exchange energy is very different whether the pair excites the spin or the pseudospin. Due to this difference the pseudospin excitations occur at the balanced point even if the tunneling gap is quite large. Our result explains why pseudospin excitations were observed in the experiment due to Terasawa et al. [15] in a sample having a very large tunneling gap ($\epsilon_{\text{tun}} \sim 33\text{K}$). In Section VI we study skyrmions in a microscopic theory, extending the approach [17] previously known for the monolayer system.

In Section VII the effective Hamiltonian is derived from the Landau-site Hamiltonian by making the derivative expansion. We introduce composite bosons together with the CP^3 field [12] to describe coherent excitations. In Section VIII we carry out an analysis of $SU(4)$ isospin textures identified with topological excitations called CP^3 skyrmions or equivalently $SU(4)$ skyrmions. A spin texture (spin-skyrmion) and a pseudospin texture (ppin-skyrmion) are special limits of an $SU(4)$ skyrmion. We estimate the excitation energy of one $SU(4)$ skyrmion. We show that, if a ppin-skyrmion is excited at the balanced point, it evolves continuously into a spin-skyrmion at the monolayer point via an $SU(4)$ skyrmion as the density imbalance is increased between the two layers.

In Section IX we investigate the activation energy anomaly by applying the parallel magnetic field between the two layers. We calculate explicitly the loss of exchange energy of one $SU(4)$ skyrmion, which is shown to be proportional to the capacitance term. Our theoretical result explains quite well both experimental data due to Murphy et al. [11] and Sawada et al. [14, 15].

Section X is devoted to discussions.

II. LANDAU-SITE HAMILTONIAN

Electrons perform cyclotron motion under perpendicular magnetic field B_z . The number of flux quanta passing through the system is $N_{\text{Bz}} = \Phi / \Phi_0$, where Φ is the area and $\Phi_0 = 2\pi\hbar c/e$ is the flux quantum. There are N_{Bz} Landau sites per one Landau level, each of which is

associated with one flux quantum and occupies an area $S = N_{\text{Bz}}^{-1} = 2\pi\hbar c/eB_z$. In the bilayer system an electron has two types of indices, the layer index (f, b) and the spin index (\uparrow, \downarrow) . One Landau site may accommodate four electrons. The filling factor is $\nu = N_{\text{Bz}}/N$ with N the total number of electrons.

The kinetic Hamiltonian is

$$H_K = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{d}^2 \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{D}_x - i\mathbf{D}_y) (\mathbf{D}_x + i\mathbf{D}_y) \mathbf{x}; \quad (2.1)$$

where \mathbf{d} stands for the four-component electron field, and $\mathbf{D}_k = i\hbar\partial_k + e\mathbf{A}_k$ is the covariant momentum. The kinetic Hamiltonian, which is invariant under the global $SU(4)$ transformation, creates Landau levels. Assuming a large Landau level separation we focus on physics taking place in the LLL. Then we may neglect the kinetic energy since it is common to all states.

We introduce 4×4 matrices S_a^{spin} and P_a^{ppin} generating the spin and pseudospin (ppin) $SU(2)$ groups, as summarized in Appendix A; in particular, $S_z^{\text{spin}} = \text{diag}(1, -1; 1, -1)$ and $P_z^{\text{ppin}} = \text{diag}(1; 1, -1; 1, -1)$. To avoid confusions we use S_a for the spin $SU(2)$ field, P_a for the pseudospin $SU(2)$ field ($a = x, y, z$) and \mathbb{A} for the isospin $SU(4)$ field ($\mathbb{A} = 1; 2; \dots; 15$).

The total Hamiltonian consists of the Coulomb term, the Zeeman term, the tunneling term and the bias term. The role of the bias term is to transfer electrons from one layer to the other by applying the bias voltage V_{bias} between the two layers.

The Coulomb interaction is decomposed into the $SU(4)$ -invariant and $SU(4)$ -noninvariant terms,

$$H_C^+ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{d}^2 \mathbf{x} \mathbf{d}^2 \mathbf{y} V^+(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}; \quad (2.2)$$

$$H_C^- = 2 \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{d}^2 \mathbf{x} \mathbf{d}^2 \mathbf{y} V^-(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) P_z(\mathbf{x}) P_z(\mathbf{y}); \quad (2.3)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$, $2P_a(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{P}_a^{\text{ppin}}(\mathbf{x})$ and

$$V^{\pm}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{e^2}{8\pi} \left[\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} \mp \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|^2 + d^2} \right] \quad (2.4)$$

with the layer separation d .

The Zeeman term is

$$H_Z = \epsilon_z S_z(\mathbf{x}); \quad (2.5)$$

where ϵ_z is the Zeeman gap and $2S_a = \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{S}_a^{\text{spin}}$. The tunneling and bias terms are combined into the pseudo-Zeeman term,

$$H_{PZ} = \epsilon_{\text{tun}} P_x(\mathbf{x}) - eV_{\text{bias}} P_z(\mathbf{x}); \quad (2.6)$$

where ϵ_{tun} is the tunneling gap.

The total Hamiltonian is

$$H = H_C^+ + H_C^- + H_Z + H_{PZ}; \quad (2.7)$$

We investigate the regime where the SU(4)-invariant Coulomb term H_C^+ dominates all other interactions. Note that the SU(4)-noninvariant Coulomb term vanishes, $H_C^- \rightarrow 0$, in the limit $d \rightarrow 0$.

We expand the electron field operator by a complete set of one-body wave functions $\psi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{h} \chi_{ij}$ in the LLL,

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^X c(i) \psi_i(\mathbf{x}); \quad (2.8)$$

where $c(i)$ is the annihilation operator at the Landau site j with $i = a, b$ and $b \neq a$,

$$\begin{aligned} f c(i); c^\dagger(j) g &= \delta_{ij}; \\ f c(i); c(j) g &= f c^\dagger(i); c^\dagger(j) g = 0; \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

It is impossible to choose an orthonormal complete set of one-body wave functions $\psi_i(\mathbf{x})$ in the LLL [18]. Hence

$\psi(\mathbf{x})$ does not satisfy the standard canonical anticommutation relation, as implies that an electron cannot be localized to a point within the LLL. Various interactions are projected to the LLL [16, 18, 19, 20] by expanding the electron field as in (2.8).

The projected density is given by $\rho(\mathbf{x}) = \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x})$ with the use of the field operator (2.8). Its Fourier transformation reads [16]

$$\rho(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2} e^{i \frac{2}{B} \mathbf{q}^2 = 4} \sum_{m,n} \text{Im} \sum_{j=1}^X e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j} \chi_{jm}^\dagger c_n; \quad (2.10)$$

where $X = (X; Y)$ is the guiding center obeying the non-commutativity $[X; Y] = i \frac{2}{B}$. Similar formulas hold for spin density operators and so on. Substituting them into (2.2) and (2.3) we find the projected Coulomb terms to be

$$H_C^+ = \sum_{m,n,i,j}^X V_{m,n,i,j}^+ c^\dagger(m) c^\dagger(i) c(j) c(n); \quad (2.11)$$

$$H_C^- = \sum_{m,n,i,j}^X V_{m,n,i,j}^- \left[\frac{p^\dagger p}{z} \right] \left[\frac{p^\dagger p}{z} \right] c^\dagger(m) c^\dagger(i) c(j) c(n) \quad (2.12)$$

with

$$V_{m,n,i,j} = \frac{1}{4} \int d^2 p V_D(\mathbf{p}) \text{Im} \sum_{j=1}^X e^{i \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{p}} \chi_{jm}^\dagger \chi_{in} e^{i \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{p}} \chi_{ij} \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$V_D(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{e^2}{8 \pi} \frac{1}{p^2} e^{i \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j} e^{i \frac{2}{B} \mathbf{p}^2 = 2}; \quad (2.14)$$

We also find

$$H_Z = \sum_{m,n}^X S_z(m; m); \quad (2.15)$$

$$H_{PZ} = \sum_{m,n}^X [S_A S_P x(m; m) + e V_{bias} P_z(m; m)]; \quad (2.16)$$

where

$$f(m; n) = \sum_{j=1}^X c^\dagger(m) c(n);$$

$$S_a(m; n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^X c^\dagger(m) \left[\frac{a^{sp, in}}{a} \right] c(n); \quad (2.17)$$

and a similar formula for $P_a(m; n)$. These formulas are derived precisely in the same way as for the multicomponent monolayer system with the replacement of the potential $V_{m,n,i,j}$ by $V_{m,n,i,j}^+$: See Section V in Ref. [16].

For a later convenience we represent the projected Coulomb Hamiltonians (2.11) and (2.12) as

$$H_D^+ = \sum_{m,n,i,j}^X V_{m,n,i,j}^+(m; n) (i; j); \quad (2.18)$$

$$H_D^- = 4 \sum_{m,n,i,j}^X V_{m,n,i,j}^- P_z(m; n) P_z(i; j); \quad (2.19)$$

In the momentum space the total Coulomb Hamiltonian reads

$$\begin{aligned} H_D &= \int d^2 p V_D^+(\mathbf{p}) b(\mathbf{p}) b(\mathbf{p}); \\ &+ 4 \int d^2 p V_D^-(\mathbf{p}) P_z(\mathbf{p}) P_z(\mathbf{p}); \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} b(\mathbf{p}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m,n}^X \text{Im} \sum_{j=1}^X e^{i \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j} \chi_{jm}^\dagger (m; n); \\ P_a(\mathbf{p}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m,n}^X \text{Im} \sum_{j=1}^X e^{i \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j} \chi_{jm}^\dagger P_a(m; n); \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

We call (2.20) the direct-interaction form of the Coulomb Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_C .

Note the relation

$$\rho(\mathbf{q}) = e^{i \frac{2}{B} \mathbf{q}^2 = 4} b(\mathbf{q}); \quad (2.22)$$

between the two types of densities (2.10) and (2.21). Though $b(\mathbf{p})$ presents a useful tool to work with noncommutative geometry [16], it turns out that $\rho(\mathbf{q})$ describes the physical density [see (5.19)].

The density operator $b(\mathbf{p})$ satisfies the W_1 algebra [18, 19, 21],

$$[b(\mathbf{p}); b(\mathbf{q})] = \frac{i}{2} b(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}) \sin \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{B} \mathbf{p} \wedge \mathbf{q}; \quad (2.23)$$

For the SU(4) isospin field we may define

$$I_A(m; n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^X c^\dagger(m) [A] c(n); \quad (2.24)$$

where A is the generating matrices [See Appendix A], and

$$P_A(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m,n}^X \text{Im} \sum_{j=1}^X e^{i \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}_j} \chi_{jm}^\dagger I_A(m; n); \quad (2.25)$$

All of the density operators $b(p)$ and $b_A(p)$ form an algebra, which we have called $W_1(4)$ since it is the $SU(4)$ extension of W_1 . It gives the fundamental algebraic structure of the noncommutative system made of 4-component electrons. In general there arises the $W_1(N)$ algebra in the N -component QH ferromagnet.

We define classical densities $b^{cl}(p)$, $b_A^{cl}(p)$, $b_a^{cl}(p)$ and $b_{ab}^{cl}(p)$ by

$$b^{cl}(p) = \text{hs } \mathcal{P}(p) \mathcal{P} i; \quad b_A^{cl} = \text{hs } \mathcal{P}_A(p) \mathcal{P} i; \quad (2.26)$$

and so on, where $\mathcal{P} i$ represents a skyrmion state. In the coordinate space the relation

$$\sum_{A=1}^{N_X^2-1} b_A^{cl}(x) F b_A^{cl}(x) = \frac{1}{2N} b^{cl}(x) F \frac{N}{2\sqrt{2}} b^{cl}(x) \quad (2.27)$$

holds among the classical densities associated with the generators of the $W_1(N)$ algebra, where F stands for the Moyal star product. We demonstrate this formula in Appendix B. Remark the invariance of (2.27) under

$$\mathcal{P}^{cl}(x) \rightarrow \frac{N}{2\sqrt{2}} \mathcal{P}^{cl}(x); \quad (2.28)$$

This represents the electron-hole symmetry.

III. EXCHANGE INTERACTIONS

In classical theory the Coulomb energy is simply given by (2.2) with the use of the classical density $b^{cl}(x)$, but this is not the case in quantum theory. The exchange interaction emerges as an important interaction from the exchange integral over wave functions. We present a rigorous treatment of the direct and exchange energies valid in QH systems.

For this purpose we rewrite the microscopic Coulomb Hamiltonians (2.11) and (2.12) into entirely different forms. Based on an algebraic relation,

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{A=1}^{N_X^2-1} [A] [A] + \frac{1}{N}; \quad (3.1)$$

which holds for $SU(N)$ with A the generating matrices, these Coulomb Hamiltonians are equivalent to

$$H_X^+ = \sum_{m,n,j}^X V_{m,n,j}^+ \sum_{A=1}^{X^5} I_A(m;j) I_A(i;n) + \frac{1}{2N} (m;j) (i;n); \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$H_X = \sum_{m,n,j}^X V_{m,n,j} \sum_{A=1}^{X^5} I_A(m;j) I_A(i;n) + \frac{1}{2N} (m;j) (i;n); \quad (3.3)$$

where $N = 4$, $I_A(m;n)$ is defined by (2.24) and $I_{1;2;3;8;13;14;15} = +1$, $I_{4;5;6;7;9;10;11;12} = -1$. In the momentum space they read

$$H_X^+ = \sum_Z d^2 p V_X^+(p) \sum_{A=1}^{X^5} b_A(p) b_A(p) + \frac{1}{2N} b(p) b(p); \quad (3.4)$$

$$H_X = 4 \sum_Z d^2 p V_X(p) \sum_{A=1}^{X^5} b_A(p) b_A(p) + \frac{1}{2N} b(p) b(p); \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$V_X(p) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{B} \sum_Z d^2 k e^{i \frac{\sqrt{2}}{B} p \cdot k} V_D(k) \quad (3.6)$$

and $N = 4$.

We change the $SU(4)$ basis from A to a^{spin} , a^{ppin} and $a^{spin} b^{ppin}$ by way of the formula (A.6) in Appendix, which transforms variable $I_A(m;n)$ to a set of variables,

$$\begin{aligned} S_a(m;n) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_X c^y(m) (a^{spin}) c(n); \\ P_a(m;n) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_X c^y(m) (a^{ppin}) c(n); \\ R_{ab}(m;n) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_X c^y(m) (a^{spin} b^{ppin}) c(n); \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

The sum of (3.2) and (3.3) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} H_X &= \sum_{m,n,j} V_{m,n,j}^d [S_a(m;j) S_a(i;n) + P_a(m;j) P_a(i;n) \\ &\quad + R_{ab}(m;j) R_{ab}(i;n)] \\ &\quad + \sum_{m,n,j}^X V_{m,n,j} [S_a(m;j) S_a(i;n) + P_z(m;j) P_z(i;n) \\ &\quad + R_{az}(m;j) R_{az}(i;n)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{m,n,j}^X V_{m,n,j} (m;j) (i;n); \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$V_{m,n,j} = V_{m,n,j}^+ + V_{m,n,j}; \quad V_{m,n,j}^d = V_{m,n,j}^+ - V_{m,n,j}; \quad (3.9)$$

In the momentum space we find

$$\begin{aligned} H_X &= \sum_Z d^2 p V_X^d(p) [b_a(p) b_a(p) + b_a(p) b_a(p) \\ &\quad + b_{ab}(p) b_{ab}(p)] \\ &\quad + \sum_Z d^2 p V_X(p) [b_a(p) b_a(p) + b_z(p) b_z(p) \\ &\quad + b_{az}(p) b_{az}(p)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8} d^2 p V_X(p) b(p) b(p); \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$V_X(\mathbf{p}) = V_X^+(\mathbf{p}) + V_X^-(\mathbf{p}); \quad V_X^d(\mathbf{p}) = V_X^+(\mathbf{p}) - V_X^-(\mathbf{p}); \quad (3.11)$$

In (3.8) and (3.10) the summation $\sum_{a=xyz, b=xyz}^P$ over the repeated indices a and b is understood. We call (3.10) the exchange-interaction form of the Coulomb Hamiltonian H_C .

We have demonstrated that the Landau-site Hamiltonian H_C possesses two entirely different forms, the direct-interaction form H_D given by (2.20) and the exchange-interaction form H_X given by (3.10). They are equivalent, $H_D = H_X$, as the microscopic Hamiltonian. In this paper we are interested in the excitation energy $\hbar S_{\mathbf{p}}^{\pm}$ of a skyrmion state $|\mathbf{p}\rangle$. In a previous paper [6] we have presented a heuristic argument showing that

$$\hbar S_{\mathbf{p}}^{\pm} = H_D^{\text{cl}} + H_X^{\text{cl}}; \quad (3.12)$$

Here H_D^{cl} and H_X^{cl} are the Hamiltonians of the direct-interaction form (2.20) and of the exchange-interaction form (3.10), where the density operators $b(\mathbf{p})$, $b_A^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p})$, are replaced by the classical ones $b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{p})$, $b_A^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{p})$. We present a proof of this formula for the skyrmion state in Appendix B. Thus, the energy of a charge excitation consists of two well-separated pieces, the direct energy and the exchange energy.

IV. GROUND STATE

We first determine the ground state of the bilayer system in this section. For simplicity we start with the spin-frozen SU(2) bilayer system. We are concerned about the regime dominated by the SU(2)-invariant Coulomb interaction H_C^+ . Hence we define the ground state as an eigenstate of H_C^+ given by (2.11), and treat all other interactions as small perturbations.

The unperturbed ground-state energy is given by

$$H_C^+ |\mathbf{p}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{n}}^X V_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{j}}^+ |\mathbf{p}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{n}}^X N_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{n}} |\mathbf{p}\rangle \quad (4.1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{n}} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{n}}^X V_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{j}} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} d^2 k V_D(\mathbf{k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i^2=2} \frac{1}{B} \text{erfc} \left(d \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{B}} \right) \frac{1}{C}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{C} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{r}{2} \frac{e^2}{4} \frac{1}{B}; \quad (4.3)$$

We take $\frac{1}{C}$ as the Coulomb energy unit in this paper. The unperturbed system is equivalent to the monolayer

SU(2) QH ferromagnet, where all pseudospins are spontaneously polarized into one arbitrary direction in the SU(2) pseudospin space. The ground state may be expressed as

$$|\mathbf{p}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{n}}^Y \left(e^{i\theta_0=2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{C_F} c_F^Y(\mathbf{n}) + e^{i\theta_0=2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{C_B} c_B^Y(\mathbf{n}) \right) |\mathbf{p}\rangle; \quad (4.4)$$

by introducing two constant parameters θ_0 and θ_0 . We call θ_0 the imbalance parameter since it represents the density imbalance between the two layers. The ground state is a coherent state due to an infinite degeneracy with respect to θ_0 and θ_0 .

We then study the effect due to the SU(2)-noninvariant interaction. First, due to the capacitance effect (V_{mnij}) all pseudospins are polarized into one arbitrary direction within the pseudospin xy plane, implying that the electron density is balanced between the two layers ($\theta_0 = 0$). The symmetry SU(2) is broken into U(1). It is thus said that the bilayer QH system is an easy plane ferromagnet. Next, we apply the bias voltage to generate an imbalanced density state ($\theta_0 \neq 0$), where the symmetry is still U(1). Finally, the tunneling interaction breaks the symmetry completely by fixing $\theta_0 = 0$ in the state (4.4). Consequently, the ground state is the bonding state $|\mathbf{p}\rangle$ parametrized by the imbalance parameter θ_0 , which is (4.4) with $\theta_0 = 0$.

The generalization to the SU(4) bilayer system is trivial by adding the spin component. The ground state turns out to be the up-spin bonding state $|\mathbf{p}\rangle^{\uparrow}$ due to the Zeeman effect. It is convenient to represent the up-spin bonding state $|\mathbf{p}\rangle^{\uparrow}$ and the up-spin antibonding state $|\mathbf{p}\rangle^{\downarrow}$ as

$$|\mathbf{p}\rangle^{\uparrow} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}}^Y B_{\mathbf{n}}^Y(\mathbf{n}) |\mathbf{p}\rangle; \quad |\mathbf{p}\rangle^{\downarrow} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}}^Y A_{\mathbf{n}}^Y(\mathbf{n}) |\mathbf{p}\rangle; \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\mathbf{n}}^Y(\mathbf{n}) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{0}} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{0}} c_F^Y(\mathbf{n}) \\ A_{\mathbf{n}}^Y(\mathbf{n}) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{0}} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{0}} c_B^Y(\mathbf{n}) \end{aligned}; \quad (4.6)$$

The down-spin bonding state $|\mathbf{p}\rangle^{\downarrow}$ and the down-spin antibonding state $|\mathbf{p}\rangle^{\uparrow}$ are similarly defined.

We evaluate the ground state energy $E_g = \hbar S_{\mathbf{p}}^{\pm}$ by representing the Hamiltonians in terms of these operators. The ground-state energy per one site reads

$$E_g/N = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{SA S} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{0}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \text{eV}_{\text{bias}} \frac{1}{0} \right) z; \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\text{cap} = 4 \left(\frac{1}{D} \frac{1}{X} \right) \quad (4.8)$$

with

$$D = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{jn} V_{nnjj} = \frac{r}{2} \frac{d}{d_B} \frac{Q_0}{C}; \quad (4.9)$$

and x given by (4.2). The imbalance parameter Q_0 is determined to minimize the ground-state energy,

$$E_{\text{cap}}^0 + \frac{SAS}{1 - \frac{Q_0^2}{2}} = eV_{\text{bias}}; \quad (4.10)$$

as a function of the bias voltage.

The second term in the ground-state energy (4.7) is the capacitance energy,

$$E_g^{\text{cap}} = \frac{C_{\text{cap}}^0}{4} N = \frac{Q^2}{2C} S; \quad (4.11)$$

where $Q = \frac{1}{2}eQ_0$ is the charge imbalance and C is the capacitance per unit area. We rewrite (4.10) as

$$\frac{Q}{C} + V_{\text{junc}} = V_{\text{bias}}; \quad (4.12)$$

with

$$eV_{\text{junc}} = \frac{SAS}{1 - \frac{Q_0^2}{2}}; \quad (4.13)$$

When the tunneling interaction is absent ($SAS \neq 0$), (4.12) is reduced to

$$Q = CV_{\text{bias}}; \quad (4.14)$$

Eqs. (4.11) and (4.14) are the well-known formulas for the condenser, where the bias voltage V_{bias} is balanced with the electric potential $Q = C$ due to the charge difference Q between the two layers. In this case, a charge transfer between the two layers makes no work, since there exists no potential difference between the two layers.

When $SAS \neq 0$, the cancellation is imperfect as in (4.12). Thus, when a charge is moved from one layer to the other, it is necessary to supply an energy against the potential difference $V_{\text{junc}} = V_{\text{bias}} - Q = C$. Consequently, the pseudo-Zeeman energy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{PZ} &= \sum_{\#} [SAS P_x(x) + eV_{\text{junc}} P_z(x)] \\ &= P_x(x) + \frac{Q_0^2}{1 - \frac{Q_0^2}{2}} P_z(x) SAS; \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

or

$$H_{PZ} = \sum_m \left[P_x(m; m) + \frac{Q_0^2}{1 - \frac{Q_0^2}{2}} P_z(m; m) \right] SAS; \quad (4.16)$$

As $SAS \neq 0$, the pseudo-Zeeman energy vanishes even in imbalanced configuration ($Q_0 \neq 0$), and the total ground-state energy consists solely of the capacitance energy (4.11). In order to analyze charge excitations it is necessary to use (4.16) as the pseudo-Zeeman term in the total Hamiltonian (2.7).




FIG. 1: The LLL contains four energy levels corresponding to the two layers and the two spin states. (We call them the g-level, s-level, p-level and r-level.) At $\mu = 1$ the ground state is the up-spin bonding state. An electron may be moved to any one of the other three levels to form an electron-hole pair excitation.

V. ELECTRON AND HOLE EXCITATIONS

As we see in the succeeding section, a skyrmion and an antiskyrmion are reduced to a hole and an electron in their small size limit. We analyze electron and hole excitations in this section to derive some exact results.

A. Electron-Hole Pair Excitation

One electron may be excited from the up-spin bonding state into the down-spin bonding state, the up-spin antibonding state or the down-spin antibonding state [FIG. 1]. These electron-hole states are

$$|j_s i\rangle = |j_j^B\rangle; |h_k^B\rangle = B_{\#}^Y(j) B_{\#}(k) |j\rangle; \quad (5.1)$$

$$|j_p i\rangle = |j_j^A\rangle; |h_k^B\rangle = A_{\#}^Y(j) B_{\#}(k) |j\rangle; \quad (5.2)$$

$$|j_r i\rangle = |j_j^A\rangle; |h_k^B\rangle = A_{\#}^Y(j) B_{\#}(k) |j\rangle; \quad (5.3)$$

We assume that an electron and a hole are separated far enough so that interactions between them are neglected. The energy matrix looks as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ h_s |j_s i\rangle & h_s |j_r i\rangle & 0 \\ @ & h_r |j_s i\rangle & h_r |j_r i\rangle & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & h_p |j_p i\rangle & 0 \end{pmatrix} A; \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_s |j_s i\rangle &= E_g + 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{X} + 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{2} X + z; \\ h_r |j_r i\rangle &= E_g + 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{X} - 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{2} X - \frac{Q_0^2}{2} \text{cap} + z + \frac{SAS}{1 - \frac{Q_0^2}{2}}; \\ h_p |j_p i\rangle &= E_g + 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{X} - 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{2} X - \frac{Q_0^2}{2} \text{cap} + \frac{SAS}{1 - \frac{Q_0^2}{2}}; \\ h_r |j_s i\rangle &= 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{2} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{Q_0^2}{2}} D; \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

We have $h_s |j_p i\rangle = h_r |j_p i\rangle = 0$, because the Hamiltonian does not flip the spin (it does not involve S_x and S_y).

The matrix (5.4) is diagonal at the balanced point. The minimum eigenvalue is the spin-excitation energy

$$h_s |j_s i\rangle = E_g + 2 \frac{Q_0^2}{X} + z; \quad (5.6)$$




FIG. 2: The energy of an electron-hole pair state is depicted as a function of the imbalance parameter σ_0 based on the formulas (5.5) and (5.10) with typical sample parameters as indicated. Three curves corresponds to the state $|j_{si}\rangle$, $|j_{sr}\rangle$ and $|j_{pi}\rangle$. We have normalized the activation energy of the pseudospin excitation to zero at $\sigma_0 = 0$.

or the ppin excitation energy

$$h_p |j_{pi}\rangle = E_g + 2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_x^2 + \Delta_{SAS} : \quad (5.7)$$

The pseudospin excitation occurs when

$$2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_x^2 > \Delta_{SAS} : \quad (5.8)$$

We remark that $2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_x^2 \approx 47K$ in a typical sample with $d \approx 231$ nm.

The matrix (5.4) is diagonal also at the monolayer point, where the spin excitation always occurs with the excitation energy

$$h_s |j_{si}\rangle = E_g + 2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_x^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_z^2 ; \quad (5.9)$$

since the energies of the other two modes diverge.

The two excitation states $|j_{si}\rangle$ and $|j_{ri}\rangle$ mix to make a new state, $|j_{sr}\rangle$, to lower the excitation energy except for $\sigma_0 = 0$ and $\sigma_0 = 1$. After diagonalization it is

$$h_{sr} |j_{sr}\rangle = E_g + 2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_{cap}^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_z^2 + \frac{1}{2} e_{SAS} \frac{1}{2} \frac{q}{(e_{SAS} - 4 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_D^2)^2 + 16 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} (1 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_D^2)^2} \quad (5.10)$$

with $e_{SAS} = \frac{\Delta_{SAS}}{\Delta_{SAS}} = 1 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} k_D^2$. Thus, when the condition (5.8) is satisfied, an electron is excited to the $|j_{pi}\rangle$ state at the balanced point, and it makes a sudden transition to the $|j_{sr}\rangle$ state, and finally transforms smoothly into the $|j_{si}\rangle$ state, as depicted in FIG. 2. The sudden transition would be smoothed out in a skyrmion-antiskyrmion excitation involving several electrons simultaneously.

B. Physical Densities

It is interesting to investigate a single electron excitation and a single hole excitation separately. For simplicity we analyze the SU(2) QH ferromagnet. One-electron excited state $|j_{+i}\rangle$ and one-hole excited state $|j_{-i}\rangle$ are given by

$$|j_{+i}\rangle = c_{\#}^{\dagger}(0) \sum_n^Y c_n^{\dagger}(n) |j_i\rangle; \quad |j_{-i}\rangle = \sum_{n \neq 0}^Y c_n^{\dagger}(n) |j_i\rangle; \quad (5.11)$$

where we have placed an electron or a hole at the momentum-zero state. Their classical densities are

$$b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{r}; n) = \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \langle \mathbf{r} | j_{\pm}(\mathbf{r}) c(\mathbf{n}) | j_{\pm} \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \langle \mathbf{r} | n | \mathbf{r} \rangle : \quad (5.12)$$

In the coordinate space, based on formula (2.21) it reads

$$b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) = \rho_0 \left(1 - 2e^{-r^2/2\ell_B^2} \right); \quad (5.13)$$

where ρ_0 is the electron density in the ground state. The hole density becomes negative at the origin,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) = -\rho_0 : \quad (5.14)$$

There is nothing wrong with this mathematically since the electron cannot be localized within the LLL. Nevertheless, we cannot accept this as a physical quantity.

We recall that the wave function of one electron with the angular momentum zero in the LLL is

$$\psi_0(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell_B^2}} e^{-r^2/4\ell_B^2}; \quad (5.15)$$

which leads to the density

$$b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) = |\psi_0(\mathbf{x})|^2 = \rho_0 e^{-r^2/2\ell_B^2} \quad (5.16)$$

at $r = 2\ell_B \Rightarrow \rho_0 = 1$. When we remove one electron from or add one electron to the filled up-spin level, the density becomes

$$b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) = \rho_0 - b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}); \quad (5.17)$$

and the hole density satisfies

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} b^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 : \quad (5.18)$$

This behavior is what we expect for the physical density at the origin.

It is easy to see that the Fourier transformations of (5.13) and (5.17) are related as

$$b_h^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{q}) = e^{-\ell_B^2 q^2/4} b_e^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{q}) : \quad (5.19)$$

This is precisely the relation (2.22) between the two types of the densities. We conclude that the projected density represents a physical quantity.

C. Direct and Exchange Energies

For simplicity we work still in the SU(2) QH ferromagnet. The electron-hole pair excitation energy is [22]

$$E_{\text{pair}} = \hbar_s H_c j_s i \quad E_g = 2x; \quad (5.20)$$

where

$$x = V_{0000} + \sum_{j \neq 0} V_{j00j} = \frac{0}{C}; \quad (5.21)$$

as is obtained by taking $d \rightarrow 0$ in (4.2) and (5.5). It follows from (2.13) that V_{0000} is the direct integral and V_{j00j} ($j \neq 0$) is the exchange integral. Hence, the Coulomb energy consists of the direct energy $H_D^{\text{cl}} = V_{0000}$ and the exchange energy $H_X^{\text{cl}} = \sum_{j \neq 0} V_{j00j}$.

We can express them in familiar forms. First, the classical energy associated with the density modulation (5.12) reads

$$H_D^{\text{cl}} = \sum_{m,n,i,j} V_{m,n,i,j} \quad \text{cl}(m;n) \quad \text{cl}(i;j) = V_{0000} \quad (5.22)$$

with $\text{cl}(m;n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2x d^2y V(x-y) \text{cl}(x) \text{cl}(y)$ (5.23)

$$H_D^{\text{cl}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2x d^2y V(x-y) \text{cl}(x) \text{cl}(y) \quad (5.23)$$

with $\text{cl}(x)$ being given by (5.16). This is the direct energy of the excitation. We next remark that the spin reads

$$S_x^{\text{cl}}(m;n) = S_y^{\text{cl}}(m;n) = 0; \quad S_z^{\text{cl}}(m;n) = \frac{1}{2} (\sum_{m,n} - \sum_{m=0,n=0}) \quad (5.24)$$

both for the electron or hole excitation. Substituting them into the exchange energy (3.2), or

$$H_X^{\text{cl}} = \sum_{m,n,i,j} V_{m,n,i,j} \sum_{a=xyz} S_a^{\text{cl}}(m;j) S_a^{\text{cl}}(i;n) + \frac{1}{4} \text{cl}(m;j) \text{cl}(i;n); \quad (5.25)$$

we reproduce $H_X^{\text{cl}} = \sum_{j \neq 0} V_{j00j}$. In the momentum space we have a more familiar expression,

$$H_X^{\text{cl}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2p V_X(p) \sum_{a=xyz} S_a^{\text{cl}}(p) S_a^{\text{cl}}(p) + \frac{1}{4} b^{\text{cl}}(p) b^{\text{cl}}(p); \quad (5.26)$$

Thus, the excitation energy of an electron or a hole presents us the simplest example of the decomposition formula (3.12) into the direct and exchange energies.

VI. SKYRMIONS IN MICROSCOPIC THEORY

We study skyrmions in a microscopic theory of the SU(2) QH ferromagnet, and then extend the scheme to the SU(4) bilayer QH ferromagnet. We set $\hbar_B = 1$ throughout in this section, where $\hbar_0 = 1/2$.

A. SU(2) Skyrmions

A skyrmion and an antiskyrmion are topological solitons in the nonlinear sigma model, and characterized by the nonlinear sigma field (normalized spin field),

$$S_x = \frac{x}{r^2 + \frac{1}{2}}; \quad S_y = \frac{y}{r^2 + \frac{1}{2}}; \quad S_z = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{r^2 + \frac{1}{2}}; \quad (6.1)$$

when it carries topological charge ± 1 . Actual skyrmions are much more complicated in the QH ferromagnet because the spin rotation modulates the electron density due to the $W_1(2)$ algebra. Nevertheless, a gross feature remains as it is [1].

Let $|\psi\rangle$ be the skyrmion state. Its spin field is given by [see (2.21)]

$$S_a^{\text{cl}}(p) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m,n} \text{Im} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2x \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2y \psi_a(m;n) \psi_i: \quad (6.2)$$

Due to the formula

$$\text{Im} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2x \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2y \frac{p \cdot m}{m!} \frac{k_y + ik_x}{(m+n)!} e^{k^2/2} L_m^n \frac{k^2}{2}; \quad (6.3)$$

we need to have $\text{hs} \psi_{x,y}(m;n) \psi_i = \sum_{m,n=1} \text{hs} \psi_z(m;n) \psi_i$ to be consistent with (6.1). Such a state is uniquely constructed as [17]

$$|\psi_{\text{sky}}\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^Y \psi(n) |n\rangle \quad (6.4)$$

with

$$\psi(n) = u(n) c_{\#}^Y(n) + v(n) c_{\#}^Y(n+1); \quad (6.5)$$

They satisfy the standard canonical commutation relations,

$$[|m\rangle; \psi(n)] = \delta_{m,n}; \quad [|\psi\rangle; |n\rangle] = 0; \quad (6.6)$$

provided $u^2(n) + v^2(n) = 1$. Note the state $|\psi_{\text{sky}}\rangle$ describes one hole state in the momentum-zero site when we set $u(n) = 0$ and $v(n) = 1$ for all n .

Similarly, the antiskyrmion state is given by [17]

$$|\psi_{\text{asky}}\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^Y \psi(n) c_{\#}^Y(0) |n\rangle \quad (6.7)$$

with

$$\psi(n) = u(n) c_{\#}^Y(n+1) + v(n) c_{\#}^Y(n); \quad (6.8)$$

The state $|\psi_{\text{asky}}\rangle$ describes one electron excited state in the momentum-zero site when we set $u(n) = 0$ and $v(n) = 1$ for all n . In what follow we only discuss the skyrmion case explicitly.

First we evaluate $b^{cl}(m;n) = \langle \psi_j(m;n) | \psi_i \rangle$ and others. The only nonvanishing components are [see (B.8) in Appendix B]

$$\begin{aligned} b^{cl}(m;m) &= u^2(m) + v^2(m-1); \\ b_z^{cl}(m;m) &= \frac{1}{2} u^2(m) - v^2(m-1); \\ b_x^{cl}(m;m+1) &= b_x^{cl}(m+1;m) = b_y^{cl}(m;m+1) \\ &= ib_y^{cl}(m+1;m) = \frac{1}{2} u(m)v(m); \quad (6.9) \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $v(-1) = 0$. They are converted into the momentum space based on the formula (2.21),

$$\begin{aligned} b^{cl}(k) &= \frac{1}{2} e^{k^2/4} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} u^2(m) + v^2(m-1) L_m(k^2/2); \\ b_z^{cl}(k) &= \frac{1}{4} e^{k^2/4} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} u^2(m) - v^2(m-1) L_m(k^2/2); \\ b_x^{cl}(k) &= \frac{ik_a}{2} e^{k^2/4} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{u(m)v(m)}{m+1} L_m^{(1)}(k^2/2); \\ b_y^{cl}(k) &= \frac{ik_a}{2} e^{k^2/4} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{u(m)v(m)}{m+1} L_m^{(1)}(k^2/2) \quad (6.10) \end{aligned}$$

after some calculation with the use of (6.3).

The electron number difference between the skyrmion state and the ground state is

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} [b^{cl}(m;m) - 1] \\ &= u^2(0) - 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} u^2(m) - u^2(m-1) = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

by pairwise cancellations, where we have used $v^2(m) = 1 - u^2(m)$, $m \geq 0$, and $v(-1) = 0$. Hence the skyrmion excitation removes one electron from the ground state. However, because the manipulation is too subtle, we give a concrete calculation taking an explicit example in (6.18).

As we have remarked before, it is necessary to construct physical densities from the densities (6.10) by way of (5.19). The procedure is simply to replace $e^{k^2/4}$ with $e^{k^2/2}$ therein. We make the Fourier transformation of the physical densities with the aid of the formula [see formula (2.19.12.6) in Ref.[23]]

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} k dk k^m e^{k^2/2} J_m(kr) L_n^{(m)}(k^2/2) \\ = \frac{1}{n!} \frac{r^{2-n}}{2} r^m e^{r^2/2}; \quad (6.12) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} d e^{ikx} &= 2 J_0(kr); \\ \frac{1}{2i} \int_0^{\infty} d \frac{k_j}{k} e^{ikx} &= \frac{x_j}{r} J_1(kr); \quad (6.13) \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $x = (r \cos \theta; r \sin \theta)$. The physical densities reads

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{cl}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} e^{r^2/2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} u^2(m) + v^2(m-1) \frac{r^{2-n}}{2}; \\ S_z^{cl}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} e^{r^2/2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{u^2(m) - v^2(m-1)}{n!} \frac{r^{2-n}}{2}; \\ S_x^{cl}(x) &= \frac{x}{2} e^{r^2/2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{u(m)v(m)}{n!(n+1)} \frac{r^{2-n}}{2}; \\ S_y^{cl}(x) &= \frac{y}{2} e^{r^2/2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{u(m)v(m)}{n!(n+1)} \frac{r^{2-n}}{2} \quad (6.14) \end{aligned}$$

in the coordinate space.

In order to make a further analysis we make an ansatz[17] on functions $u(m)$ and $v(m)$,

$$u^2(n) = \frac{n!^2}{n+1+n!^2}; \quad v^2(n) = \frac{n+1}{n+1+n!^2}; \quad (6.15)$$

The densities can be expressed in terms of the Kummer function $M(a;b;x)$,

$$M(a;a+1;x) = a \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{(n+a)n!}; \quad (6.16)$$

as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n!^2+1} e^{\frac{1}{2}r^2} M(n!^2; n!^2+2; r^2/2); \\ S_z(x) &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{1}{2}r^2} M(n!^2; n!^2+1; r^2/2) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \frac{n!^2}{n!^2+1} e^{\frac{1}{2}r^2} M(n!^2+1; n!^2+2; r^2/2); \\ S_x(x) &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{x}{n!^2+1} e^{\frac{1}{2}r^2} M(n!^2+1; n!^2+2; r^2/2); \\ S_y(x) &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{y}{n!^2+1} e^{\frac{1}{2}r^2} M(n!^2+1; n!^2+2; r^2/2); \quad (6.17) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the formula (13.4.3) of Ref.[24] to derive $\rho(x)$. The electron number of the skyrmion excitation is

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int_0^{\infty} d^2x \int_0^{\infty} dz \rho(r) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!^2+1} \int_0^{\infty} dz e^{z/2} M(n!^2; n!^2+2; z/2) dz = 1; \quad (6.18) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is checked via order by order integration with respect to z . There is no ambiguity in this derivation contrary to that in (6.11).

The skyrmion with the ansatz (6.15) has a peculiar feature. It is reduced to a hole for $n! = 0$, where the density $\rho(x)$ approaches the ground-state value exponentially fast. However, for all $n! \neq 0$, with the use of the formula (13.1.4) of Ref.[24], we find

$$\rho(x) \sim \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n!^2+1} \frac{2}{r^4}; \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 1; \quad (6.19)$$

where we have set $\alpha^2 = 2!^2$. Furthermore, we find

$$\begin{aligned} S_x(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{r^2}; \quad S_y(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{y}{r^2}; \\ S_z(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{z^2}{r^2}; \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 1: \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

They agree with the asymptotic behaviors of the density and the spin field of a sufficiently large skyrmion we discuss later: See (8.16). It is easy to see that the number of the flipped spin diverges for all $\alpha \neq 0$. Consequently, small skyrmions cannot be discussed based on this ansatz.

B. SU(4) Skyrmions

The generalization to the SU(4) bilayer system is straightforward. The ground state is given by the up-spin bonding state. The skyrmion state is given by

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{sky}}^Y = \sum_{n=0}^Y \psi(n) \mathcal{B}_n^Y; \quad (6.21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(n) &= u_r(n) A_{\#}^Y(n) + u_p(n) A_{\#}^Y(n) \\ &+ u_s(n) B_{\#}^Y(n) + v(n) B_{\#}^Y(n+1) \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

with constraint, $u_r^2(n) + u_p^2(n) + u_s^2(n) + v^2(n) = 1$. The hole state $B_{\#}^Y(0) \mathcal{B}_n^Y$ is given by setting $v(n) = 1$ and $u_s(n) = u_p(n) = u_r(n) = 0$ for all n .

There are three types of antiskyrmions,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\text{asky}}^s &= \sum_{n=0}^Y \psi_s(n) B_{\#}^Y(0) \mathcal{B}_n^Y; \\ \mathcal{B}_{\text{asky}}^p &= \sum_{n=0}^Y \psi_p(n) A_{\#}^Y(0) \mathcal{B}_n^Y; \\ \mathcal{B}_{\text{asky}}^r &= \sum_{n=0}^Y \psi_r(n) A_{\#}^Y(0) \mathcal{B}_n^Y; \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_s(n) &= u_r(n) A_{\#}^Y(n) + u_p(n) A_{\#}^Y(n) \\ &+ u_s(n) B_{\#}^Y(n+1) + v(n) B_{\#}^Y(n+1); \\ \psi_p(n) &= u_r(n) A_{\#}^Y(n) + u_p(n+1) A_{\#}^Y(n) \\ &+ u_s(n) B_{\#}^Y(n) + v(n) B_{\#}^Y(n+1); \\ \psi_r(n) &= u_r(n) A_{\#}^Y(n+1) + u_p(n) A_{\#}^Y(n) \\ &+ u_s(n) B_{\#}^Y(n) + v(n) B_{\#}^Y(n+1); \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

They are reduced to three different electron excited states $B_{\#}^Y(0) \mathcal{B}_n^Y$, $A_{\#}^Y(0) \mathcal{B}_n^Y$ and $A_{\#}^Y(0) \mathcal{B}_n^Y$ when we set $v(n) = 1$ and $u_s(n) = u_p(n) = u_r(n) = 0$ for all n : See FIG. 1.

There are important SU(2) limits of SU(4) skyrmions. When we set $u_p(n) = u_r(n) = 0$, $\mathcal{B}_{\text{sky}}^s$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{asky}}^s$

describe a skyrmion and an antiskyrmion where only spins are excited. We call them the spin-skyrmion and the spin-antiskyrmion. Similarly, when we set $u_s(n) = u_r(n) = 0$, $\mathcal{B}_{\text{sky}}^p$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{asky}}^p$ describe a skyrmion and an antiskyrmion where only pseudospins are excited. We call them the ppin-skyrmion and the ppin-antiskyrmion.

It is a dynamical problem which skyrmion-antiskyrmion pairs are excited thermally. As we have shown, as far as electron-hole pairs are concerned, only pseudospins are excited at the balanced point unless the tunneling gap is too large, while only spins are excited at the monolayer point. This is the case also for skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair excitations. However, in general, all components are excited to lower the total energy, which leads to genuine SU(4) skyrmions. Contrary to the case of the electron-hole limit, the transition from the ppin-skyrmion at the balanced point ($\phi_0 = 0$) to the spin-skyrmion at the monolayer point ($\phi_0 = 1$) will occur continuously via a genuine SU(4) skyrmion since the matrix elements of the total Hamiltonian \hat{H} between various skyrmion states are nonvanishing.

VII. EFFECTIVE HAMILTONIANS

It is very hard to calculate the skyrmion excitation energy with use of the microscopic states (6.21) and (6.23) since they involve infinitely many functions $u_s(n)$, $u_p(n)$, $u_r(n)$ and $v(n)$. In this paper we construct the effective theory by making the derivative expansion of the Hamiltonian. Thus, strictly speaking, our approximation is good only for large skyrmions. Nevertheless, its application even to small skyrmions would present us invaluable results otherwise unavailable. We wish to develop a microscopic theory in a future work.

Our analysis is based on the decomposition formula (3.12) into the direct and exchange energy terms. In what follows we represent the classical density $\psi^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x})$ simply by $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ since we use only classical fields.

We first identify the SU(4)-invariant direct Coulomb term as the self-energy,

$$H_{\text{self}} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2x d^2y \psi(\mathbf{x}) V^+(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \psi(\mathbf{y}); \quad (7.1)$$

We then make the derivative expansion of the SU(4)-invariant exchange term H_X^+ . We rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} H_X^+ &= \frac{1}{2} \int d^2x d^2z V_X^+(z) \int d^2p \psi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{8} b(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}) b(\mathbf{x}); \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

Since $V_X(z)$ is short ranged,

$$\begin{aligned} V_X(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{2} \int d^2p e^{i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}} V_X(\mathbf{p}) \\ &= V(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2} e^{i\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{2}} e^{x^2 = 2 \frac{1}{2}}; \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

it is a good approximation to make the Taylor expansion of $\psi(x+z)$ and $b(x+z)$ to the nontrivial lowest order of z ,

$$\psi(x+z)\psi(x) = \psi(x)\psi(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} z_i z_j \partial_i \psi(x) \partial_j \psi(x); \quad (7.4)$$

where a partial integration is understood in the integrand of (7.2). Equivalently, we make the momentum expansion of the potential (3.6),

$$V_X(p) = V_X(0) + \frac{1}{8} J_s p^2 + O(p^4); \quad (7.5)$$

where

$$V_X(0) = 2 \frac{v_B^2}{1} \int_0^h e^{d^2=2 \frac{v_B^2}{1} \text{erfc } d} d = \frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{v_B} \frac{0}{C}; \quad (7.6)$$

and

$$J_s = \frac{1}{2} J_s \quad J_s^d; \quad (7.7)$$

with

$$J_s = \frac{1}{8} \frac{0}{C}; \quad (7.8)$$

$$\frac{J_s^d}{J_s} = \frac{2}{\frac{d}{v_B}} + 1 + \frac{d^2}{\frac{v_B^2}{2}} e^{d^2=2 \frac{v_B^2}{2} \text{erfc } d} d = \frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{v_B}; \quad (7.9)$$

The zeroth order term in p^2 is proportional to the integral

$$\int d^2x \psi(x)\psi(x) + \frac{1}{8} \int d^2x b(x)b(x) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{v_B} \int d^2x b(x); \quad (7.10)$$

which is a Casimir invariant obtained by integrating the relation (2.27). Note that the star product becomes an ordinary product within the integrand. We may neglect the term $\frac{1}{8} \int d^2x b(x)b(x)$, because it represents the total number of electrons and is fixed to the ground-state value in excitations of skyrmion-antiskyrmion pairs. Consequently, we obtain

$$H_X^{+e} = \frac{2J_s^+}{2} \int d^2x \partial_k \psi(x) \partial_k \psi(x) + \frac{1}{2N} \partial_k b(x) \partial_k b(x) \quad (7.11)$$

as the effective Hamiltonian. Here and hereafter the summation over the repeated index in ∂_k is understood.

We next derive the effective Hamiltonian from the $SU(4)$ -noninvariant terms H_C . The zeroth order term in p^2 yields the capacitance energy as the leading term,

$$H_{\text{cap}} = 2 \frac{v_B^2}{\text{cap}} \int d^2x \psi_z(x) \psi_z(x); \quad (7.12)$$

where we have used the identity (7.10). The capacitance energy (U_{cap}) consists of two terms; the one

(U_D) arising from the direct interaction H_D , which is the standard capacitance energy of a condenser made of two planes with separation d , and the other (U_X) from the exchange interaction H_X . The exchange effect makes the capacitance energy quite small for a small layer separation [25]. We note that our capacitance formula (4.8) is different from the one assumed in some literature [6, 26].

Collecting all the first order terms in p^2 from the exchange Hamiltonian (3.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_X^{SU(4)} = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_B v_B^4 J_s [\partial_k b]^2 \\ & + 4 \sum_B v_B^4 J_s^d \left[\partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} + \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} + \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \partial_k \psi_{ab}^{i_2} \right. \\ & \left. + 8 \sum_B v_B^4 J_s \left[\partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} + \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \partial_k \psi_z^{i_2} + \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \partial_k \psi_{az}^{i_2} \right] \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

where the summation over repeated indices a and b is understood.

It is worthwhile to take two important limits of $H_X^{SU(4)}$. When all electrons are moved to the front layer, by setting $\psi = (\psi^f; \psi^f; 0; 0)$, the nonvanishing elements are $\psi_a = \psi_a^f$ and $\psi_{az} = \psi_a^f$ in (7.13), and we find

$$H_X^{\text{spin}} = \frac{2J_s}{2} \sum_B \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \partial_k \psi_a^{i_2} \quad (7.14)$$

for the spin-ferromagnet. Similarly, when the spin degree of freedom is frozen, the nonvanishing elements are $\psi_a = \psi_a''$ and $\psi_{az} = \psi_a''$ in (7.13), and we find

$$H_X^{\text{ppin}} = \frac{2J_s^d}{2} \sum_{a=x/y} \partial_k \psi_a''(x) \partial_k \psi_a''(x) + \frac{2J_s}{2} \partial_k \psi_z''(x) \partial_k \psi_z''(x) \quad (7.15)$$

for the pseudospin-ferromagnet.

To discuss the Goldstone modes we may set $b(x) = 0$ since the ground state is robust against the density fluctuation. By setting $\psi_a^f = S_a$, (7.14) becomes an $O(3)$ nonlinear sigma model describing the spin-ferromagnet Hamiltonian [7] with the spin stiffness J_s . By setting $\psi_a'' = P_a$, (7.15) becomes an anisotropic $O(3)$ nonlinear sigma model describing the pseudospin-ferromagnet Hamiltonian [6] with the interlayer stiffness J_s^d .

VIII. SEMICLASSICAL ANALYSIS

We use bosonic variables to describe coherent excitations such as spin and pseudospin textures. In so doing we introduce the composite-boson (CB) field [27, 28]. The CB theory of QH ferromagnets is formulated as follows [12]. The CB field $\psi(x)$ is defined by making a singular phase transformation to the electron field $\psi(x)$,

$$\psi(x) = e^{ie\phi(x)} \psi(x); \quad (8.1)$$

where the phase $\phi_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$ attaches one flux quantum to each electron via the relation,

$$\nabla_{ij} \phi_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}); \quad (8.2)$$

We then introduce the normalized CB field $n(\mathbf{x})$ by

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) = n(\mathbf{x}) \chi(\mathbf{x}); \quad (8.3)$$

where $\chi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \\ \chi_3 \\ \chi_4 \end{pmatrix}$, and the 4-component field $n(\mathbf{x})$ obeys the constraint $n^\dagger n = 1$: Such a field is the CP^3 field [29]. The isospin operators are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} S_a(\mathbf{x}) &= \chi(\mathbf{x}) S_a(\mathbf{x}) \chi(\mathbf{x}); \quad S_a(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} n^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \sigma_a^{\text{spin}} n(\mathbf{x}); \\ P_a(\mathbf{x}) &= \chi(\mathbf{x}) P_a(\mathbf{x}) \chi(\mathbf{x}); \quad P_a(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} n^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \sigma_a^{\text{ppin}} n(\mathbf{x}); \end{aligned} \quad (8.4)$$

and so on, with $n = (n^{\text{r}}, n^{\text{f}}, n^{\text{b}}, n^{\text{b}\dagger})^T$. They are

$$\begin{aligned} S_x^g &= 0; \quad S_y^g = 0; \quad S_z^g = \frac{1}{2}; \\ P_x^g &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}}; \quad P_y^g = 0; \quad P_z^g = \frac{1}{2} \frac{z}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}}; \end{aligned} \quad (8.5)$$

and $R_{ab}^g = 0$ except for $R_{zx}^g = P_x^g$ and $R_{zz}^g = P_z^g$ in the ground state.

We investigate charged excitations at $\nu = 1$. Charged excitations are topological solitons in incompressible QH liquids. To describe them we introduce the dressed CB field by [1, 12]

$$\psi'(\mathbf{x}) = e^{A(\mathbf{x})} \psi(\mathbf{x}); \quad (8.6)$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ is given by (8.1) and $A(\mathbf{x})$ is given by

$$A(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{B}} d^2 y \ln \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|}{2|\mathbf{B}|} \quad (y) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{B}} d^2 y \quad (8.7)$$

The kinetic Hamiltonian (2.1) is rewritten as

$$H_K = \frac{1}{2M} \int_{\mathbf{B}} d^2 x \quad \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) (\mathbf{D}_x - i\mathbf{D}_y) (\mathbf{D}_x + i\mathbf{D}_y) \psi(\mathbf{x}); \quad (8.8)$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ is the four-component dressed CB field with $z = ye^{2A}$, and $D_j = \nabla_j + i(\nabla_{jk} + \nabla_{jk})A(\mathbf{x})$.

The LLL condition follows from the kinetic Hamiltonian (8.8),

$$(\mathbf{D}_x + i\mathbf{D}_y) \psi = \frac{i}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \psi = 0; \quad (8.9)$$

where $z = (x + iy)/2|\mathbf{B}|$. It implies that the N -body wave function is analytic and symmetric in N variables,

$$S_{CB}[z] = h^0 j(\mathbf{x}_1) \dots j(\mathbf{x}_N) \chi(\mathbf{x}_1) \dots \chi(\mathbf{x}_N); \quad (8.10)$$

It is easy to verify [1, 12] that the electron wave function is $S[\mathbf{x}] = S_{CB}[z] S_{\text{Laughlin}}[\mathbf{x}]$, where $S_{\text{Laughlin}}[\mathbf{x}]$ is the Laughlin wave function [30].

The analysis is quite simple when the function is factorized, $S_{CB}[z] = \prod_r S(z_r)$. Then it follows that $S(z) = h(\mathbf{x})i$ and that $\ln(\mathbf{x})i = S(z) = j(z)j$. The lightest topological soliton is described by the nontrivial simplest wave function $(S^{\text{B}}, S^{\text{B}\dagger}, S^{\text{A}}, S^{\text{A}\dagger}) = (z; s; p; r)$, which we call the SU(4) skyrmion. Thus, a skyrmion is characterized by its shape parameters s, p and r representing how it is excited to energy levels B^\dagger, A^\dagger and A^\dagger , respectively [FIG 1]. In terms of the layer CP^3 field it reads

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{\text{r}} \\ n^{\text{f}} \\ n^{\text{b}} \\ n^{\text{b}\dagger} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix} = C(z) \begin{pmatrix} z \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} + \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ z \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} + \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad (8.11)$$

with the normalization factor $C(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(z^2 + 2)}}$ with $\frac{z^2}{2} = \frac{s^2}{2} + \frac{p^2}{2} + \frac{r^2}{2}$. When $s = p = r = 0$, it is reduced to

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{\text{r}} \\ n^{\text{f}} \\ n^{\text{b}} \\ n^{\text{b}\dagger} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix} = C(z) \begin{pmatrix} z \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} + \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ z \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} + \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad (8.12)$$

which describes a spin texture reversing only spins: This is identified with the microscopic spin-skyrmion in (6.21). When $s = p, r = 0$, it is reduced to

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{\text{r}} \\ n^{\text{f}} \\ n^{\text{b}} \\ n^{\text{b}\dagger} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix} = C(z) \begin{pmatrix} z \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} + \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ z \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} + \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \\ \frac{p}{1 + \frac{z^2}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad (8.13)$$

which describes a pseudospin texture reversing only pseudospins: This is identified with the microscopic ppin-skyrmion in (6.21).

A skyrmion excitation modulates the density around it, $\rho_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x})$, according to the soliton equation [12],

$$\frac{1}{4} r^2 \ln \rho_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) - \rho_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) + \rho_0 = J_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}); \quad (8.14)$$

which follows from the LLL condition (8.9): $J_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the topological (Pontryagin number) density, which is calculated as

$$J_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{4(\frac{z^2}{2})^2}{[r^2 + 4(\frac{z^2}{2})^2]^2} \quad (8.15)$$

for the SU(4) skyrmion (8.11). The soliton equation is solved iteratively, and the first order term is

$$\rho_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) \approx J_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{4(\frac{z^2}{2})^2}{[r^2 + 4(\frac{z^2}{2})^2]^2}; \quad (8.16)$$

This is good for a very smooth skyrmion ($r = 1$).

The antiskyrmion configuration is related to the skyrmion configuration by

$$\begin{aligned} S_x^{\text{asky}} &= S_x^{\text{sky}}; & S_y^{\text{asky}} &= -S_y^{\text{sky}}; & S_z^{\text{asky}} &= S_z^{\text{sky}}; \\ P_x^{\text{asky}} &= P_x^{\text{sky}}; & P_y^{\text{asky}} &= -P_y^{\text{sky}}; & P_z^{\text{asky}} &= P_z^{\text{sky}}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.17)$$

A skyrmion (antiskyrmion) induces the modulation of the spin and the pseudospin,

$$\begin{aligned} S_a^{(a)\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) &= S_a^{(a)\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) S_a^{(a)\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) S_a^g; \\ P_a^{(a)\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) &= P_a^{(a)\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) P_a^{(a)\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) P_a^g; \end{aligned} \quad (8.18)$$

where S_a^g and P_a^g are the ground-state values (8.5), and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) &= S_0 + S_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}); \\ P_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) &= P_0 + P_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}); \end{aligned} \quad (8.19)$$

where $S_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x})$ is given by (8.16).

It is actually the energy of a skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair,

$$E_{\text{pair}} = \frac{1}{2} (E_{\text{sky}} + E_{\text{asky}}); \quad (8.20)$$

that is observed experimentally. We estimate the excitation energy $E_{\text{sky}} = \hbar S \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\beta}$ of one skyrmion [31]. For simplicity we set $r = 0$ in the SU(4) skyrmion (8.11). This approximation reduces the validity of some of our results. Indeed, we have found that the mixing between the excitation modes to the s-level and the r-level lowers the energy of the electron-hole pair state [FIG 2]. Nevertheless, we use this approximation to reveal an essential physics of SU(4) skyrmions, because otherwise various formulas become too complicated to handle with. By an essential physics we mean a continuous transformation of the SU(4) skyrmion from the ppin-skyrmion limit to the spin-skyrmion limit in contrast to the case of the electron-hole excitation.

Thus we study a skyrmion parametrized by two shape parameters s and p with $2 = \frac{s^2}{s^2 + p^2} + \frac{p^2}{s^2 + p^2}$. We calculate the SU(4) generators (8.4) for this field configuration,

$$\begin{aligned} S_x^{\text{sky}} &= \frac{sX}{r^2 + \frac{2}{2}}; & S_y^{\text{sky}} &= \frac{sY}{r^2 + \frac{2}{2}}; & S_z^{\text{sky}} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\frac{2}{s}}{r^2 + \frac{2}{2}}; \\ P_x^{\text{sky}} &= \frac{\cos}{2} \frac{pX \sin + \frac{2}{p} \cos}{r^2 + \frac{2}{2}}; & P_y^{\text{sky}} &= \frac{pY}{r^2 + \frac{2}{2}}; \\ P_z^{\text{sky}} &= \frac{\sin}{2} + \frac{pX \cos + \frac{2}{p} \sin}{r^2 + \frac{2}{2}}; \end{aligned} \quad (8.21)$$

and similar expressions for $R_{\text{abp}}^{\text{sky}}$, where $s = 2 \frac{s}{s^2 + p^2}$, $p = 2 \frac{p}{s^2 + p^2}$, $2 = 4 \left(\frac{1}{s^2 + p^2} \right)^2$, $\cos = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{s^2}}$ and $\sin = \frac{2}{s}$.

The skyrmion energy consists of the Coulomb energy, the Zeeman energy and the pseudo-Zeeman energy. The Coulomb energy consists of the self-energy, the capacitance energy and the exchange energy.

The dominant one is the self-energy (7.1),

$$E_{\text{self}} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2x d^2y S_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) V^+(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) S_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{y}); \quad (8.22)$$

After a straightforward calculation we find

$$E_{\text{self}} = \frac{1}{8} E_C^0 \int d^2x \int d^2y [K_1(z)]^2 \frac{1}{1 + e^{\frac{4}{2} \frac{z}{2}}} dz; \quad (8.23)$$

See (C.5) in Appendix C. It depends only on the total skyrmion scale $\frac{1}{s^2 + p^2}$, since the Coulomb term H_D^+ depends only on the total density $S_{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x})$.

The capacitance energy is given by (7.12), or

$$H_{\text{cap}} = 2 \int d^2x \int d^2y P_z^{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) P_z^{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{y}); \quad (8.24)$$

It is calculated in (C.7) in Appendix C. The leading term is

$$E_{\text{cap}} \approx \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{0} \right)_{\text{cap}} N_{\text{ppin}}(p); \quad (8.25)$$

where $N_{\text{ppin}}(p)$ is the number of flipped pseudospins to be defined by (8.34).

In evaluating the exchange energy (7.13), we set $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ since the skyrmion charge is spread over a large domain. (See Appendix B for the result without making the approximation.) Using (8.21) we obtain

$$E_X = 4 \left(J_s^+ - \frac{1}{3} J_s - \frac{2}{2} \frac{p}{2} - \frac{2}{2} \frac{s}{2} \right) \left(1 + 2 \frac{2}{2} \frac{2}{0} \right); \quad (8.26)$$

It contains shape parameters explicitly via the SU(4)-noninvariant term. The SU(4)-invariant part of (7.13) is the SU(4) nonlinear sigma model yielding a topological invariant value $4 J_s^+$. In the spin-skyrmion limit it is reduced to

$$E_X^{\text{spin}} = 4 \left(J_s^+ + J_s \frac{2}{0} \right); \quad (8.27)$$

which yields the well-known formula [7], $E_X^{\text{spin}} = 4 J_s$, at the monolayer point ($0 \rightarrow 1$). In the ppin-skyrmion limit it is reduced to

$$E_X^{\text{ppin}} = 4 \left(J_s^+ - \frac{1}{3} J_s \right) = \frac{4}{3} J_s + 2 J_s^d; \quad (8.28)$$

which is independent of the imbalance parameter 0 .

The Zeeman energy of one skyrmion is

$$E_Z = \int d^2x \int d^2y S_z^{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x}) N_{\text{spin}}(s) S_z(\mathbf{y}); \quad (8.29)$$

where N_{spin} is the number of flipped spins. Neglecting the term which is cancelled out in a skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair excitation due to the relations (8.18), we obtain

$$N_{\text{spin}}(s) = \int d^2x \frac{4 \left(\frac{s}{s^2 + p^2} \right)^2}{r^2 + 4 \left(\frac{1}{s^2 + p^2} \right)^2} \approx \frac{2}{s^2} N; \quad (8.30)$$

with

$$N = 2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{2}{4 \frac{2}{B}} \right); \quad (8.31)$$

where the divergence has been cut off at r' with a typical coherence length.

The pseudo-Zeeman energy (4.15) is

$$E_{PZ} = \int_{SAS} d^2x \left[P_x^{sky}(x) + \frac{P_z^{sky}(x)}{1 - \frac{2}{0}} \right] : (8.32)$$

We extract the terms which are not cancelled out in a skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair excitation. It is equal to

$$E_{PZ} = \frac{N_{ppin}(p)}{1 - \frac{2}{0}} SAS; (8.33)$$

where N_{ppin} is the number of flipped pseudospins,

$$N_{ppin}(p) \sim \frac{2}{p} N; (8.34)$$

We have cut off the divergence as in (8.30).

The total excitation energy is

$$E_{sky} = E_X + E_{self} + E_{cap} + E_Z + E_{PZ} (8.35)$$

with (8.26), (8.23), (8.25), (8.29) and (8.33). Skyrmion parameters s and p with $2 = \frac{2}{s} + \frac{2}{p}$ are to be determined by minimizing the excitation energy (8.35). According to an examination of (8.35) presented in Appendix D, provided

$$\frac{4 J_s}{3} > \frac{1}{2} cap + Z + SAS \frac{2}{p} N; (8.36)$$

ppin-skyrmions are excited at the balanced point ($\sigma_0 = 0$): See (D.3). Then, it evolves continuously into a spin-skyrmion at the monolayer point ($\sigma_0 = 1$) via a generic skyrmion ($s, p \neq 0$). As we have stated, to simplify calculations we have set $r = 0$ in the SU(4) skyrmion (8.11). When we allow a skyrmion to be excited into the r -level ($r \neq 0$), a genuine SU(4) skyrmions ($s, p, r \neq 0$) would be excited except at the monolayer point, as illustrated in FIG. 3. Compare this with FIG. 2.

We examine the condition (8.36) numerically. When we adopt typical values of sample parameters ($\sigma_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{11}/\text{cm}^2$ and $d = 231\text{\AA}$), we find the capacitance (4.8) to be $cap \sim 132\text{K}$ while the exchange-energy difference to be $4 J_s = 3 \sim 5.4\text{K}$. The condition is hardly satisfied. Here, we question the validity of the standard identification of the layer separation, $d = d_b + d_w$, where $d_w \sim 200\text{\AA}$ is the width of a quantum well and $d_b \sim 31\text{\AA}$ is the separation of the two quantum wells. In this identification the electron cloud is assumed to be localized in the center of each quantum well. However, it is a dynamical problem. Let us minimize the ppin-skyrmion energy as a function of d . The minimum is found to be achieved at $d < d_b$. Namely, the energy increases monotonously for $d > d_b$. Then, it would be reasonable to use $d = d_b$ as the layer separation to estimate the energy of the ppin-skyrmion. When we choose $d \sim 31\text{\AA}$ we find $cap \sim 4.5\text{K}$. Then, the condition (8.36) is satisfied in some parameter regions, where ppin-skyrmions are excited.




FIG. 3: The skyrmion energy is estimated as a function of the imbalanced parameter σ_0 with sample parameters $SAS = 1\text{K}$, and $\sigma_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{11}/\text{cm}^2$. The experimental data are taken from Terasawa et al.[15]. Solid lines show the energies of a ppin-skyrmion and a spin-skyrmion, normalized to the data at the balanced point and the monolayer point, respectively. The experimental data would be explained by the excitation of a genuine SU(4) skyrmion.

However, the condition (8.36) cannot be taken literally, because it rules out excitations of large ppin-skyrmions ($\frac{2}{p} \gg 1$) against experimental indications[11, 14, 15]. It seems that the exchange energy has been underestimated by making the derivative expansion. It is necessary to go beyond the present approximation to fully understand the problem.

We proceed to estimate the energies of a spin-skyrmion and a ppin-skyrmion in all range of σ_0 , because their estimation is much more reliable than that of a generic SU(4) skyrmion. We use sample parameters $\sigma_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{11}/\text{cm}^2$, $d = 31\text{\AA}$ and $SAS = 1\text{K}$, and normalize the energy to the experimental data[15] at the monolayer point for a spin-skyrmion and at the balanced point for a ppin-skyrmion. Recall that the absolute value of the activation energy cannot be determined theoretically because they depend essentially on samples.

First, we calculate the energy of a spin-skyrmion as a function of σ_0 by setting $s = s$ and $p = 0$ in (8.35). The skyrmion scale, to be determined by minimizing this, depends on σ_0 very weakly. We obtain $N_{spin}(\sigma_0) \sim 3.5$ as in the monolayer QH ferromagnet[1, 12]. We have depicted the excitation energy E_{sky}^{spin} in FIG. 3, where it is normalized to the data at the monolayer point.

Next, we calculate the energy of a ppin-skyrmion as a function of σ_0 by setting $s = 0$ and $p = p$ in (8.35). There is an important remark. The effective tunneling gap diverges as $\sigma_0 \rightarrow 1$ unless $SAS = 0$. Furthermore, the minimum pseudospin flip is $N_{ppin} = 1$ for a skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair. Hence, the pair excitation energy (8.20) diverges as

$$E_{pair} \sim \frac{SAS}{1 - \frac{2}{0}}; (8.37)$$

and ppin-skyrmions are not excited at the monolayer

point ($\theta = 0$). We have depicted the excitation energy $E_{\text{sky}}^{\text{ppin}}$ in FIG. 3, where it is normalized to the data at the monolayer point. In so doing we have used the full expression (C 7) for the capacitance energy E_{cap} since other terms are as important as (8.25) for a ppin-skyrmion of an ordinary size.

IX. ACTIVATION ENERGY ANOMALY

We have studied how one skyrmion evolves continuously from the balanced point ($\theta = 0$) to the monolayer point ($\theta = 1$) by changing its shape. It is important how to distinguish various shapes of skyrmions experimentally. As is well known, as the sample is tilted, the activation energy of a spin-skyrmion increases due to the Zeeman energy. On the contrary, the activation energy of a ppin-skyrmion decreases due to the loss of the exchange energy. Thus, the tilted-field method provides us with a remarkable experimental method [11, 14] to reveal the existence of various shapes of a skyrmion in bilayer QH systems.

As the sample is tilted, the parallel magnetic field B_k is penetrated between the two layers. We take the symmetric gauge generalized as

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{2}B_z \mathbf{y} + B_k z; \frac{1}{2}B_z \mathbf{x}; 0; \quad (9.1)$$

where the two layers are placed at $z = \pm d/2$. In the kinetic Hamiltonian (2.1) the covariant momentum is now different between the two layers,

$$\begin{aligned} D_x &= i\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{B}}y + \frac{eB_k d}{2} \frac{z}{d} \frac{ppin}{z}; \\ D_y &= i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{B}}x; \end{aligned} \quad (9.2)$$

Consequently, the LLL condition (8.9) is modified as

$$\begin{aligned} (D_x + iD_y) \psi(x; B_k) &= 0 \\ &= i\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{2}m \frac{z}{d} \frac{ppin}{z} \right) \psi(x; B_k) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (9.3)$$

with

$$m = \frac{edB_k}{\hbar v_F}; \quad (9.4)$$

We may solve the LLL condition (9.3) for the one-body wave function $\psi(x; B_k) = \psi(x; B_k) \psi(z)$ as

$$\psi(x; B_k) = \exp \left(\frac{i}{2} m \frac{z}{d} \frac{ppin}{z} x \right) \psi(z); \quad (9.5)$$

Accordingly, the skyrmion configuration acquires different phase factors between the two layers,

$$\psi(x; B_k) = \exp \left(\frac{i}{2} m \frac{z}{d} \frac{ppin}{z} x \right) \psi(x; 0); \quad (9.6)$$




FIG. 4: The activation energy at $\theta = 1$ is plotted as a function of the tilting angle in several samples with different tunneling gaps Δ_{SAS} . It shows a rapid decrease towards the critical angle θ^* , and then becomes almost constant. The data are taken from Murphy et al. [11]. They are well fitted by the theoretical formula (9.11), where the activation energy decreases in the commensurate phase and becomes constant in the incommensurate phase. To fit the data, we have adjusted the activation energy at $\theta = 0$ with the experimental value, and assumed that the number of flipped pseudospins N_{ppin} is constant for all values of the tilting angle.

where $\psi(x; 0)$ is the configuration (8.11) in the absence of the parallel magnetic field. Various isospin fields are given by (8.4) with this CP^3 field.

We first consider the balanced configuration ($\theta = 0$), where we assume ppin-skyrmions are excited [FIG. 3]. The excitation energy at $B_k = 0$ is given by,

$$E_{\text{sky}}^{\text{ppin}}(0) = E_X^{\text{ppin}}(0) + E_{\text{self}} + E_{\text{cap}} + N_{\text{ppin}} \Delta_{\text{SAS}}; \quad (9.7)$$

where $E_X^{\text{ppin}}(0)$ is the exchange energy (8.28) in the absence of the parallel magnetic field. We analyze how the exchange Hamiltonian (7.15) is affected by the parallel magnetic field. Subtracting the ground-state energy we easily deduce the B_k dependence of the excitation energy,

$$E_X^{\text{ppin}}(B_k) = E_X^{\text{ppin}}(0) + E_X^{\text{ppin}}(B_k) \quad (9.8)$$

with

$$E_X^{\text{ppin}}(B_k) = 2 \int_{\text{S}}^d \frac{1}{m} d^2x P_z^{\text{sky}}(\mathbf{x})^2; \quad (9.9)$$

where P_z^{sky} is the skyrmion pseudospin component in the absence of the parallel magnetic field and given by (8.21).

We note that $E_X^{\text{ppin}}(B_k)$ is proportional to the capacitance energy (7.12). Thus the leading order term is

found to be

$$E_X^{\text{ppin}}(B_k) \propto \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{d^2 J_s^d}{B} N_{\text{ppin}} \tan^2 \theta; \quad (9.10)$$

where $\tan \theta = B_k/B_0$ and N_{ppin} is the number of pseudospins flipped around the skyrmion. All other terms in (9.7) are unaffected by the parallel magnetic field [1]. Thus, the excitation energy decreases as the tilting angle increases. The rate of the decrease depends on the number N_{ppin} of flipped pseudospins and the amount of the penetrated magnetic field B_k .

It has been shown [1, 6] that, when the parallel magnetic field B_k increases more than a certain critical point, the phase transition occurs in the bilayer QH system: It is the commensurate-incommensurate transition point B_k . In the incommensurate phase the penetrated magnetic field is not increased more than B_k , because the excess magnetic field $B_k - B_k$ is eaten up to create penetrated sine-Gordon vortices between the layers. Hence, the activation energy becomes flat for $\theta > \theta_c$, where $\tan \theta_c = B_k/B_0$.

Hence, from (9.8) and (9.10) the excitation energy is

$$E_{\text{sky}}^{\text{ppin}}(B_k) = E_X^{\text{ppin}}(0) + E_{\text{self}} + E_{\text{cap}} + N_{\text{ppin}} S_{\text{AS}}; \quad (9.11)$$

where we have absorbed $E_X^{\text{ppin}}(B_k)$ into the effective tunneling gap,

$$S_{\text{AS}} = \begin{cases} S_{\text{AS}} - (2/\sqrt{2}) \frac{d^2 J_s^d}{B} \tan^2 \theta & \text{for } \theta < \theta_c \\ S_{\text{AS}} & \text{for } \theta > \theta_c \end{cases}; \quad (9.12)$$

At each angle θ , in principle, it is necessary to minimize the total excitation energy (9.11) and determine the scale parameter θ_c . However, since the energy change (9.12) is quite small compared with the total energy, we may treat it as a small perturbation. Namely, we may assume that the flipped pseudospin number N_{ppin} is a constant independent of θ . This reminds us of experimental data [32, 33], where the flipped spin number N_{spin} is nearly constant by tilting the sample in the excitation of spin-skyrmions.

We have fitted the data due to Murphy et al. [11] in FIG. 4 by assuming an appropriate flipped pseudospin number N_{ppin} per one skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair. We summarize the result in a table.

sample	A	B	C	D
S_{AS}	0.81	0.86	4.43	8.53
N_{ppin}	18	24	2.1	1.5

(9.13)

It takes a large value in samples with $S_{\text{AS}} < 1$ K but take a small value in samples with $S_{\text{AS}} > 4$ K. Recall spin-skyrmion excitations in the monolayer QH system, where the flipped spin number remains small when the

Zeeman energy is moderate but becomes quite large when the Zeeman energy is almost zero.

We proceed to analyze excitations of SU(4) skyrmions (9.6) with (8.11) in imbalanced coexistence, where the exchange Hamiltonian is given by (7.13). After some calculation we find that the exchange-energy loss $E_X^{\text{SU}(4)}(B_k)$ is again proportional to the capacitance energy, and the leading order term is

$$E_X(B_k) \propto \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{d^2 J_s^d}{B} (1 - \frac{B_0}{B}) N_{\text{ppin}} \tan^2 \theta; \quad (9.14)$$

which is reduced to (9.10) in the balanced point.

Hence, in the commensurate phase ($\theta < \theta_c$) the excitation energy turns out to be

$$E_{\text{sky}}(B_k) = E_X(0) + E_{\text{self}} + E_{\text{cap}} + N_{\text{spin}} \frac{P}{1 + \tan^2 \theta} + N_{\text{ppin}} S_{\text{BAB}} \quad (9.15)$$

with

$$S_{\text{BAB}} = P \frac{1}{1 + \tan^2 \theta} S_{\text{AS}} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{d^2 J_s^d}{B} (1 - \frac{B_0}{B}) \tan^2 \theta; \quad (9.16)$$

In the incommensurate phase ($\theta > \theta_c$) it is given by this formula by replacing $\tan^2 \theta$ with $\tan^2 \theta_c$. Here, the commensurate-incommensurate transition point increases slowly as [34]

$$\theta_c = (1 - \frac{B_0}{B})^{1/4}; \quad (9.17)$$

as the imbalance parameter B_0 increases.

Experiments have been carried out by Sawada et al. [14] in bilayer samples (FIG. 5), where the activation energy was measured at $\theta = 1$ by controlling both the tilting angle and the imbalance parameter B_0 . Their data are interpreted based on the theoretical result (9.15) as follows. We focus on the behavior of the activation energy E_{sky} by changing the tilting angle at each fixed imbalance parameter. The relevant term in (9.15) is

$$E_{\text{sky}}(\theta) = N_{\text{spin}} \frac{P}{1 + \tan^2 \theta} + N_{\text{ppin}} \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{d^2 J_s^d}{B} (1 - \frac{B_0}{B}) \tan^2 \theta \quad (9.18)$$

for $\theta < \theta_c$. By adjusting the theoretical curve to the data at the point $\theta = 0$, we fit the data by this curve throughout the observed range of the tilting angle θ . As seen in FIG. 5, the fitting is quite good when by assuming constant values of N_{spin} and N_{ppin} throughout the range of θ . A deviation of the theoretical curve from the data for large tilting angles $\theta > 70^\circ$ would be due to effects not taken into account in the above analysis. For instance, when the parallel magnetic field becomes too large, the soliton lattice becomes too dense in the incommensurate phase and would destabilize skyrmions. We summarize the numbers N_{spin} and N_{ppin} per one skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair determined by this fitting in a table.




FIG. 5: The activation energy at $\mu = 1$ is plotted as a function of θ in one sample ($\Delta_{SAS} = 11$ K, $\rho_0 = 0.6 \times 10^{11}/\text{cm}^2$) with different imbalance parameter σ_0 . It shows a decrease towards the critical angle θ^* , and then begin to increase for $\sigma_0 = 0.3$ and $\sigma_0 = 0.7$. The data are taken from Sawada et al.[14]. To fit the data by the theoretical formula (9.15), we have adjusted the activation energy at $\theta = 0$ with the experimental value, and assumed that the flipped spin number N_{spin} and the flipped pseudospin number N_{ppin} are constant for all values of the tilting angle.

As the sample is tilted, N_{spin} increases and N_{ppin} decreases. In particular, both spins and pseudospins are flipped unless $\sigma_0 = 0$ or $\sigma_0 = 1$. We conclude that the SU(4) skyrmion evolves continuously from the ppin-skyrmion limit to the spin-skyrmion limit as σ_0 increases from 0 to 1.

σ_0	0	0.3	0.6	0.7	1
N_{spin}	0	0.64	2.3	2.8	7.0
N_{ppin}	1.9	1.8	1.5	0.68	0

(9.19)

It is interesting to study the same problem in a sample having a very large tunneling gap. Terasawa et al.[15] have measured the activation energy by controlling the tilting angle at the balanced point in a sample with $\Delta_{SAS} \sim 33$ K. We have fitted their data [FIG. 6] by the ppin-excitation formula (9.11) and by the generic formula (9.15). It is difficult to fit the data if pure pseudospin excitations are assumed since it is required that $N_{ppin} = 1$ per one pair. A better fitting is obtained if spins and pseudospins are excited simultaneously since N_{ppin} may take a smaller value than 1. Such a simultaneous excitation is allowed at the balanced point as explained in Appendix D.

In passing we comment on the original mechanism [6, 35, 36] proposed to explain the activation energy anomaly based on the exchange-energy loss of bimeron excitations.




FIG. 6: The activation energy at $\mu = 1$ is plotted as a function of θ in a sample ($\Delta_{SAS} = 33$ K, $\rho_0 = 1.0 \times 10^{11}/\text{cm}^2$). The data are taken from Terasawa et al.[15]. To fit the data by the theoretical formula, we have adjusted the activation energy at $\theta = 0$ with the experimental value. We have also assumed that N_{spin} and N_{ppin} are constant for all values of the tilting angle. A better fitting is obtained as indicated by a solid line when both spins and pseudospins are excited.

A bimeron has the same quantum numbers as a skyrmion, and it can be viewed as a deformed skyrmion with two meron cores with a string between them. The bimeron excitation energy consists of the core energy, the string energy and the Coulomb repulsive energy between the two cores. It is argued that the parallel magnetic field decreases the string tension and hence the bimeron activation energy. Clearly the mechanism works well only when the string length is much larger than the core size. A microscopic calculation has already revealed[37] that the meron core size is large enough to invalidate the naive picture. Furthermore, the skyrmion is almost as small as the hole itself in samples with large tunneling gap. On the contrary, in our mechanism the decrease of the exchange energy follows simply from the phase difference induced by the parallel magnetic field between the wave functions associated with the two layers, and it is valid even for small skyrmions.

X. DISCUSSION

We have investigated the dynamics of bilayer QH systems based on an algebraic method inherent to the non-commutative plane with $[X, Y] = i\frac{\hbar}{B}$. The noncommutativity induced by the LLL projection implies that the electron position cannot be localized to a point but to a Landau site occupying an area $2\pi\frac{\hbar}{B}$. We have derived the Landau-site Hamiltonian H_C akin to the lattice Hamiltonian. It has two entirely different forms, the direct-interaction form H_D and the exchange-interaction form H_X . They are equivalent, $H_D = H_X$, as the microscopic Hamiltonian. Nevertheless, the energy of a charge excitation consists of two well-separated pieces, the direct energy H_D^{cl} and the exchange energy H_X^{cl} .

One of our new contributions is the derivation of vari-

ous LLL-projected Coulomb potentials in analytic forms. For instance, we have revealed a new form of the capacitance energy (7.12) with $\epsilon_{\text{cap}} = 4(\epsilon_D - \epsilon_X)$. It is a sum of the direct and exchange Coulomb interaction effects, where the direct effect yields the well-known result from the planar condenser proportional to the layer separation, while the exchange effect gives a quite large negative contribution to it when the layer separation is small enough.

We have explored various aspects of SU(4) skyrmions at $\theta = 1$. In particular we have studied a skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair in its small size limit (electron-hole pair) and its large size limit.

The excitation energy of an electron-hole pair is exactly calculable. We have obtained the excitation energy as a function of the imbalance parameter ϕ_0 . The result is quite interesting: At the balanced point ($\phi_0 = 0$) the pseudospin excitation occurs provided the tunneling gap is not too large ($\epsilon_{\text{SAS}} - \epsilon_Z < 2\epsilon_X$). A peculiar feature is that, as ϕ_0 increases, the spin excitation occurs suddenly because the excitation involves just one electron or hole. At the monolayer point ($\phi_0 = 1$) only spins are excited always. We have also extended the microscopic theory of skyrmions [17] to our framework. However, a quantitative analysis is yet to be carried out.

We then have estimated the SU(4) skyrmion excitation energy as a function of ϕ_0 based on the effective Hamiltonian valid for very smooth isospin textures. In typical samples it tips only pseudospins at the balanced point. As ϕ_0 increases, it evolves continuously to tip both spins and pseudospins, and finally tips only spins at the monolayer point. We have then calculated how the excitation energy changes as the sample is tilted. Our formula has explained quite well the activation energy anomaly found by Murphy et al. [11] at the balanced point by excitations of pseudospins, and also found by Sawada et al. [14] at various values of ϕ_0 by simultaneous excitations of spins and pseudospins. Though our formulas are derived for sufficiently smooth skyrmions, they have turned out to be quite good at least with the use of phenomenological values of N_{spin} and N_{ppin} . We wish to develop a microscopic theory to analyze small skyrmions in a future work. In conclusion, the activation energy anomaly is explained by the loss of the exchange energy of SU(4) skyrmions, which are reduced always to spin-skyrmions at the monolayer point and mostly to pseudospin-skyrmions at the balanced point.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank M. Eliashvili, Y. Hirayama, N. Kumada, D. K. K. Lee, K. Muraki, A. Sawada and D. Terasawa for fruitful discussions on the subject. One of the authors (ZFE) is grateful to the hospitality of Theoretical Physics Laboratory, RIKEN, where a part of this work was done.

APPENDIX A: GROUP SU(4)

The special unitary group SU(N) has $(N^2 - 1)$ generators. In the standard representation [38], we denote them as T_A , $A = 1; 2; \dots; \frac{N^2-1}{2}; N+1$, and normalize them as

$$\text{Tr}(T_A T_B) = 2\delta_{AB} \quad (\text{A1})$$

They are characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} [T_A; T_B] &= 2if_{ABC} T_C; \\ f_A T_B g &= \frac{4}{N} \delta_{AB} g + 2d_{ABC} T_C; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

where f_{ABC} and d_{ABC} are the structure constants of SU(N). We have $T_A = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_A$ (the Pauli matrix) with $f_{ABC} = \epsilon_{ABC}$ and $d_{ABC} = 0$ in the case of SU(2).

This standard representation is not convenient for our purpose because the spin group is SU(2) \times SU(2) in the bilayer electron system with the four-component electron field $\psi = (\psi^a; \psi^b; \psi^c; \psi^d)$. Embedding SU(2) \times SU(2) into SU(4) we define the spin matrix by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{spin}_x &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; & \text{spin}_y &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \\ \text{spin}_z &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

and similarly the pseudospin matrix by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ppin}_x &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1_2 \\ 1_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; & \text{ppin}_y &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i1_2 \\ -i1_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \\ \text{ppin}_z &= \begin{pmatrix} 1_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1_2 \end{pmatrix}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where 1_2 is the unit matrix in two dimensions. Nine remaining matrices are products of the spin and pseudospin matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{spin}_a \text{ppin}_x &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ a & 0 \end{pmatrix}; & \text{spin}_a \text{ppin}_y &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ia \\ ia & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \\ \text{spin}_a \text{ppin}_z &= \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & -a \end{pmatrix}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Let us denote them as T_A , $A = 1; 2; \dots; 15$, where T_{x0} , etc., $T_4 = T_{0x}$, etc., $T_7 = T_{xx}$, $T_8 = T_{xy}$, etc. with $T_{a0} = \text{spin}_a$; $T_{0a} = \text{ppin}_a$; $T_{ab} = \text{spin}_a \text{ppin}_b$. They are

related with the standard SU (4) generators as

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_{x0} &= \frac{1}{3} + \frac{13}{3}i; \quad T_{y0} = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{14}{3}i; \\
 T_{z0} &= \frac{1}{3} + \frac{15}{3}i; \\
 T_{0x} &= \frac{4}{3} + \frac{11}{3}i; \quad T_{0y} = \frac{5}{3} + \frac{12}{3}i; \\
 T_{0z} &= \frac{2}{3} + \frac{15}{3}i; \\
 T_{xx} &= \frac{6}{3} + \frac{9}{3}i; \quad T_{xy} = \frac{10}{3} + \frac{7}{3}i; \quad T_{xz} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{13}{3}i; \\
 T_{yx} &= \frac{10}{3} + \frac{7}{3}i; \quad T_{yy} = \frac{6}{3} + \frac{9}{3}i; \quad T_{yz} = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{14}{3}i; \\
 T_{zx} &= \frac{4}{3} + \frac{11}{3}i; \quad T_{zy} = \frac{5}{3} + \frac{12}{3}i; \\
 T_{zz} &= \frac{3}{3} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{15}{3}i; \quad (A6)
 \end{aligned}$$

The normalization condition reads

$$\text{Tr}(T_{ab}T_{cd}) = 4 \delta_{ac} \delta_{bd}; \quad (A7)$$

which is different from the standard one (A1).

APPENDIX B: DECOMPOSITION FORMULA

The Landau-site Hamiltonian H_C possesses two entirely different forms, the direct-interaction form H_D and the exchange-interaction form H_X . They are equivalent, $H_D = H_X$, as the microscopic Hamiltonian. On the other hand, the excitation energy consists of two well-separated pieces, the direct energy and the exchange energy. In this appendix we derive the decomposition formula (3.12),

$$H_C |i\rangle = H_D^{\text{cl}} |i\rangle + H_X^{\text{cl}} |i\rangle; \quad (B1)$$

for skyrmion excitations. We also prove the algebraic relation (2.27), or

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{A=1}^{N_X-1} b_A^{\text{cl}}(x) F b_A^{\text{cl}}(x) + \frac{1}{2N} b^{\text{cl}}(x) F b^{\text{cl}}(x) &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b^{\text{cl}}(x); \\
 (B2)
 \end{aligned}$$

that holds among the classical densities associated with the generators of the $W_{-1}(N)$ algebra.

We consider a skyrmion state in the SU(N) QH ferromagnet,

$$|i\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^Y |Y(n)\rangle |i\rangle; \quad (B3)$$

where

$$|Y(n)\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{X}} u(\mathbf{n}) c^Y(\mathbf{n}) + v(\mathbf{n}) c^Y(\mathbf{n}+1); \quad (B4)$$

They satisfy the standard canonical commutation relations,

$$[|(\mathbf{m}); Y(\mathbf{n})\rangle] = \delta_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}}; \quad [|\mathbf{m}\rangle; |(\mathbf{n})\rangle] = 0; \quad (B5)$$

provided

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\mathbf{X}} u(\mathbf{n}) u^Y(\mathbf{n}) + v(\mathbf{n}) v^Y(\mathbf{n}) &= 1; \\
 \sum_{\mathbf{X}} v^Y(\mathbf{n}) u(\mathbf{n}+1) &= 0; \quad (B6)
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$c(\mathbf{n}) |i\rangle = [u(\mathbf{n}) |(\mathbf{n})\rangle + v(\mathbf{n}-1) |(\mathbf{n}-1)\rangle] |i\rangle; \quad (B7)$$

from which the only nonvanishing components of two-point correlation functions are found to be

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle c(\mathbf{n}) c(\mathbf{n}) \rangle_i &= u(\mathbf{n}) u(\mathbf{n}) + v(\mathbf{n}-1) v(\mathbf{n}-1); \\
 \langle c(\mathbf{n}) c(\mathbf{n}+1) \rangle_i &= u(\mathbf{n}) v(\mathbf{n}); \quad (B8)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle c(\mathbf{n}) c(\mathbf{n}) \rangle_i = \langle S_{\mathbf{j}}^z(\mathbf{n}) c(\mathbf{n}) |i\rangle$ and so on. We also derive

$$\begin{aligned}
 c(\mathbf{j}) c(\mathbf{n}) |i\rangle &= [u(\mathbf{j}) |(\mathbf{j})\rangle + v(\mathbf{j}-1) |(\mathbf{j}-1)\rangle] \\
 &\quad [u(\mathbf{n}) |(\mathbf{n})\rangle + v(\mathbf{n}-1) |(\mathbf{n}-1)\rangle] |i\rangle; \quad (B9)
 \end{aligned}$$

Four-point correlation functions $\langle c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c^Y(\mathbf{i}) c(\mathbf{j}) c(\mathbf{n}) \rangle_i$ are complicated. Nevertheless, taking into account the angular-momentum conservation ($V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} = \delta_{\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{j}}$) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c^Y(\mathbf{i}) c(\mathbf{j}) c(\mathbf{n}) \\
 = V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c(\mathbf{n}) c^Y(\mathbf{i}) c(\mathbf{j}) \\
 V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c(\mathbf{j}) c^Y(\mathbf{i}) c(\mathbf{n}) : \quad (B10)
 \end{aligned}$$

This is the general expression allowing to express all kind of Coulomb energies in the exact form.

It follows from (B10) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\mathbf{X}} V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c^Y(\mathbf{i}) c(\mathbf{j}) c(\mathbf{n}) \\
 = V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{n}) c^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{i}; \mathbf{j}) - V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}}^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{n}; \mathbf{i}; \mathbf{j}); \quad (B11)
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$\sum_{\mathbf{X}} c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c(\mathbf{j}) c^Y(\mathbf{i}) c(\mathbf{n}) : \quad (B12)$$

Here we use the algebraic identity (3.1) to find

$$\sum_{\mathbf{X}} c^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{n}; \mathbf{i}; \mathbf{j}) = 2 I_A^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{j}) I_A^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{i}; \mathbf{n}) + \frac{1}{2N} c^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{m}; \mathbf{j}) c^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{i}; \mathbf{n}); \quad (B13)$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_C &= \sum_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} \sum_{\mathbf{X}} V_{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} \langle c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c^Y(\mathbf{i}) c(\mathbf{n}) c(\mathbf{j}) \rangle_i \\
 &= E_D + E_X; \quad (B14)
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$E_D = \sum_{m,n,i,j} V_{m,n,i,j}^{cl}(\mathbf{m};n) I_A^{cl}(\mathbf{i};j); \quad (B15)$$

$$E_X = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m,n,i,j} V_{m,n,i,j} \sum_{A=1}^X I_A^{cl}(\mathbf{m};j) I_A^{cl}(\mathbf{i};n) + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j} c^{cl}(\mathbf{m};j) c^{cl}(\mathbf{i};n); \quad (B16)$$

Now, E_D and E_X are identical to (2.18) and (3.2) when we replace $(\mathbf{m};n)$ and $I_A(\mathbf{m};n)$ with $c^{cl}(\mathbf{m};n)$ and $I_A^{cl}(\mathbf{m};j)$. Hence, we have established the decomposition formula (B1) rigorously.

We proceed to prove the algebraic relation (B2) for the skyrmion state (B3). From (B12) we define

$$X(\mathbf{m};n) = \sum_{i,j} X(\mathbf{m};n;\mathbf{i};j) I_{ij} = \sum_j c^Y(\mathbf{m}) c(j) c^Y(j) c(n); \quad (B17)$$

Using (B6) and (B8) we find the only nonvanishing values to be given by

$$X(n;n) = u^Y(n)u(n) + v^Y(n-1)v(n-1); \\ X(n;n+1) = [X(n+1;n)] = u^Y(n)v(n); \quad (B18)$$

which implies that $X(\mathbf{m};n) = c^{cl}(\mathbf{m};n)$. Combining this with (B13) we obtain

$$I_A^{cl}(\mathbf{m};l) I_A^{cl}(l;n) + \frac{1}{2N} c^{cl}(\mathbf{m};l) c^{cl}(l;n) = \frac{1}{2} c^{cl}(\mathbf{m};n); \quad (B19)$$

This is equivalent to (B2) in the coordinate space.

APPENDIX C: COULOMB ENERGIES

We estimate the Coulomb self-energy of one skyrmion in the bilayer QH ferromagnet. It is defined by

$$E_{self} = \int d^2q \, q_{sky}^2 V^+(q) q_{sky}^2 V^-(q) \quad (C1)$$

with

$$V^+(q) = \frac{e^2}{8\pi q} (1 + e^{qd}); \quad (C2)$$

The density modulation $q_{sky}(\mathbf{x})$ is given by (8.16) for a large skyrmion. Its Fourier component reads

$$q_{sky}(q) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2x e^{iqx} q_{sky}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{q}{2} K_1(q); \quad (C3)$$

where we have set $\mu = 2\pi/B$. To calculate the energy we use (6.13) and

$$\int_0^\infty dr \frac{r^{n+1} J_n(qr)}{(r^2 + \frac{1}{2})^{m+1}} = \frac{q^{m-n-m}}{2^m m!} K_{n-m}(\frac{q}{2}); \quad (C4)$$

where $K_n(z) = K_{-n}(z)$ is the modified Bessel function: See the formula (11.4.44) in Ref.[24]. Now it is straightforward to derive

$$E_{self} = \frac{E_C^0}{8} \int_0^\infty z^2 [K_1(z)]^2 (1 + e^{-\frac{q}{2}z}) dz \quad (C5)$$

as the Coulomb self-energy of one skyrmion.

The SU(4)-noninvariant term yields the capacitance energy (8.24),

$$E_{cap} = 2 \int d^2x \, P_z^{sky}(\mathbf{x}) P_z^{sky}(\mathbf{x}); \quad (C6)$$

where $P_z^{sky}(\mathbf{x})$ is given by (8.18). After some calculation we obtain

$$\frac{E_{cap}}{cap} = \frac{\frac{2}{24}}{\frac{2}{24}} + (1 - \frac{2}{0}) \frac{2}{p} A(\frac{2}{p}) + \frac{2}{4} \frac{1}{\frac{2}{2}} - 1 \frac{2}{\frac{2}{2}} \\ + \frac{2}{0} \frac{1}{10} \frac{2}{2} + 2 \frac{2}{3} \frac{4}{4}; \quad (C7)$$

where $\frac{2}{p} = 2\pi/B$ and $\frac{2}{p} = 2\pi/B$: $A(\frac{2}{p})$ is divergent logarithmically,

$$A(\frac{2}{p}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{r^2 + \frac{2}{2}} - \frac{2}{(r^2 + \frac{2}{2})^3} r^3 dr; \quad (C8)$$

We take the divergent term as the leading contribution for the pseudospin component,

$$E_{cap} \sim \frac{1}{2} (1 - \frac{2}{0}) cap N_{ppin}(\frac{2}{p}) \quad (C9)$$

with (8.34).

Finally we present the formula for the exchange energy (7.13) for a general SU(4) skyrmion (8.11). After a straightforward but tedious calculation we obtain

$$E_X^{SU(4)} = 4 J_s^+ (1 + \frac{1}{10} \frac{1}{4} - 4 J_s \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{140} \frac{3}{4}) \\ + 4 J_s (\frac{2}{3} + \frac{3}{14} \frac{1}{4} - \frac{q}{0} \frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{1} \frac{2}{0} \frac{r}{2} - \frac{s}{2}) \\ + 4 J_s (\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{140} \frac{19}{4} \frac{2}{0} - \frac{s}{2}) \\ + 4 J_s (1 - \frac{2}{0}) \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{140} \frac{1}{4} - \frac{r}{2} \\ + 4 J_s \frac{q}{0} \frac{1}{1} \frac{2}{0} \frac{2}{3} + \frac{9}{70} \frac{1}{4} - \frac{s}{2} \frac{r}{2}; \quad (C10)$$

By setting $r = 0$, this is reduced to $E_X^{SU(4)} = E_X + E_X$ with (8.26), where

$$E_X = \frac{4}{10} J_s^+ \frac{4}{140} \frac{2}{6} J_s \\ + \frac{4}{140} \frac{2}{8} \frac{3}{4} - 19 \frac{2}{s} \frac{2}{s} + 30 \frac{4}{s} J_s; \quad (C11)$$

The correction term is small for a large skyrmion.

APPENDIX D: CONTINUOUS TRANSFORMATION

Based on the skyrmion-energy formula (8.35) we verify that, if a ppin-skyrmion ($s = 0$, $p = 1$) is excited at the balanced point, it evolves continuously into a spin-skyrmion ($s = 1$, $p = 0$) via a generic skyrmion ($s, p \notin 0$) as the imbalance parameter α_0 increases.

We summarize the total skyrmion energy (8.35) as a function of $\alpha = \frac{z^2}{s^2 + p^2}$, $z = (s^2 + p^2)^{1/2}$ and α_0 in the following form,

$$E_{\text{sky}}(\alpha; \alpha_0) = \frac{4 J_s^+}{3} \alpha^2 z^2 + A(\alpha; \alpha_0) z + B(\alpha; \alpha_0); \quad (\text{D } 1)$$

where

$$A(\alpha; \alpha_0) = \frac{4 J_s}{3} (1 + \frac{\alpha_0^2}{2}) \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \text{cap}^2 N + z^2 N - \frac{\text{SAS}}{1 + \frac{\alpha_0^2}{2}} z^2 N \quad (\text{D } 2)$$

with (8.31). The explicit expression of $B(\alpha; \alpha_0)$ is not necessary. The variable z is limited in the range $0 \leq z \leq 1$.

We start with the balanced point ($\alpha_0 = 0$), where $E_{\text{sky}}(\alpha; \alpha_0)$ is a linear function of z . Let us assume

$$A(\alpha; \alpha_0) > 0 \quad \text{at} \quad \alpha_0 = 0: \quad (\text{D } 3)$$

Then the energy is minimized at $z = 0$ or $s = 0$, where ppin-skyrmions are excited. We now increase α_0 from

$\alpha_0 = 0$. As far as $A(\alpha; \alpha_0) > 0$, ppin-skyrmions have the lowest energy. Due to the SAS term, $A(\alpha; \alpha_0)$ decreases and vanishes at $\alpha_0 = \alpha_p$,

$$A(\alpha; \alpha_0) = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad \alpha_0 = \alpha_p: \quad (\text{D } 4)$$

Then it becomes negative for $\alpha_0 > \alpha_p$, and the energy is minimized at $z = z_{\text{min}}$ with

$$z_{\text{min}} = \frac{3}{8 J_s^+ \alpha_0^2} A(\alpha; \alpha_0); \quad (\text{D } 5)$$

Because z_{min} increases continuously from $z_{\text{min}} = 0$ at $\alpha_0 = \alpha_p$, the spin component (s) is excited gradually to form a generic skyrmion ($s, p \notin 0$). The point z_{min} increases and achieves at $z_{\text{min}} = 1$ at $\alpha_0 = \alpha_s$,

$$A(\alpha; \alpha_0) = \frac{8 J_s^+ \alpha_0^2}{3} \quad \text{at} \quad \alpha_0 = \alpha_s; \quad (\text{D } 6)$$

where the pseudospin component (p) vanishes continuously.

We conclude that, if $A(\alpha; \alpha_0) > 0$ at $\alpha_0 = 0$, ppin-skyrmions are excited for $0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha_p$, generic skyrmions are excited for $\alpha_p < \alpha_0 < \alpha_s$, and finally spin-skyrmions are excited for $\alpha_s < \alpha_0 \leq 1$. The transition occurs continuously as illustrated in FIG. 3, with the critical points α_p and α_s being fixed by (D 3) and (D 6). On the other hand, generic skyrmions are excited at the balanced point if $A(\alpha; \alpha_0) < 0$ and $z_{\text{min}} < 1$ at $\alpha_0 = 0$, and spin skyrmions are excited at the balanced point if $A(\alpha; \alpha_0) < 0$ and $z_{\text{min}} = 1$ at $\alpha_0 = 0$.

-
- [1] Z.F. Ezawa, Quantum Hall Effects: Field Theoretical Approach and Related Topics (World Scientific, 2000).
 - [2] S. Das Sarma and A. Pinczuk (eds), Perspectives in Quantum Hall Effects (Wiley, 1997).
 - [3] I.B. Spielman, J.P. Eisenstein, L.N. Pfeiffer and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 (2000) 5808.
 - [4] Z.F. Ezawa and A. Iwazaki, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 6 (1992) 3205; Phys. Rev. B 47 (1993) 7295; 48 (1993) 15189.
 - [5] Z.F. Ezawa, Phys. Rev. B 55 (1997) 7771.
 - [6] K. Moon, H. Mori, K. Yang, S.M. Girvin, A.H. MacDonald, L. Zheng, D. Yoshioka and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 5138.
 - [7] S.L. Sondhi, A. Karlhede, S.A. Kivelson and E.H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B 47 (1993) 16419.
 - [8] S.E. Barrett, G.D. Abbagh, L.N. Pfeiffer, K.W. West and R. Tycko, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 5112.
 - [9] E.H. Aifer, B.B. Goldberg and D.A. Broido, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 (1996) 680.
 - [10] A. Schmeier, J.P. Eisenstein, L.N. Pfeiffer and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 4290.
 - [11] S.Q. Murphy, J.P. Eisenstein, G.S. Boebinger, L.N. Pfeiffer and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 728.
 - [12] Z.F. Ezawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 3512.
 - [13] A. Sawada, Z.F. Ezawa, H. Ohno, Y. Horikoshi, O. Sugie, S. Kishimoto, F. Matsukura, Y. Ohno and M. Yasumoto, Solid State Comm. 103 (1997) 447.
 - [14] A. Sawada, D. Terasawa, N. Kumada, M. Morino, K. Tagashira, Z.F. Ezawa, K. Muraki, T. Saku and Y. Hirayama, Physica E 18 (2003) 118.
 - [15] D. Terasawa, M. Morino, K. Nakada, S. Kozumi, A. Sawada, Z.F. Ezawa, N. Kumada, K. Muraki, T. Saku and Y. Hirayama, Physica E 22 (2002) 52.
 - [16] Z.F. Ezawa, G. Tsitsishvili and K. Hasebe, Phys. Rev. B 67 (2003) 125314.
 - [17] H.A. Fertig, L. Brei, R. Cote and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B 50 (1994) 11018.
 - [18] S. Iso, D. Karabali, and B. Sakita, Phys. Lett. B 196, 143 (1992).
 - [19] A. Cappelli, C. Trugenberger, and G. Zambra, Nucl. Phys. B 396 (1993) 465.
 - [20] S.M. Girvin and T. Jach, Phys. Rev. B 29 (1984) 5617.
 - [21] S.M. Girvin, A.H. MacDonald and P.M. Platzman, Phys. Rev. B 33 (1986) 2481.
 - [22] C. Kallin and B.I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B 30 (1991) 5655.
 - [23] A.P. Rudnikov, Yu.A. Brychkov and O.I. Marichev, Integrals and Series, vol.2: Special Functions (Gordon and

Beach, 1988)

- [24] M .Abramowitz and I.A .Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions (Dover Publications, New York 1972).
- [25] It is found that $\epsilon_D \sim 56K$ and $7.6K$ while $\epsilon_x \sim 23K$ and $6.5K$ for the layer separation $d = 231\text{\AA}$ and 31\AA , respectively. (We have taken $\epsilon_0 = 1.2 \cdot 10^{11}/\text{cm}^2$.) In our analysis the capacitance energy is given by (7.12), where $\epsilon_{cap} = 4(\epsilon_D - \epsilon_x) \sim 132K$ and $4.5K$ for $d = 231\text{\AA}$ and 31\AA , respectively. In some literature [6, 26] it is assumed that $\epsilon_{cap} = \epsilon_x$. The capacitance energy becomes quite small for a small layer separation due to the exchange interaction.
- [26] E .Demler and S .Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 3895.
- [27] S .M .G irvin and A .H .M acDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58 (1987) 1252.
- [28] N .Read, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 (1989) 86.
- [29] A .D 'Adda, A .Luscher and P .D 'Vecchia, Nucl. Phys. B 146 (1978) 63.
- [30] R .B .Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50 (1983) 1395.
- [31] In computing the activation energy of a skyrmion or an antiskyrmion, one needs to know the chemical potential to remove or add an electron to the system [6]. However, this problem does not exist as far as we consider a skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair because the number of electrons is unchanged. Thus, when we calculate the skyrmion energy, we actually consider the energy of a skyrmion in a well-separated skyrmion-antiskyrmion pair.
- [32] N .Kumada, A .Sawada, Z .F .Ezawa, S .Nagahama, H .Azuha, K .Muraki, T .Saku and Y .Hirayama, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. 69 (2000) 3178.
- [33] S .Melinte, E .G rivei, V .Bayot and M .Shayegan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 2764.
- [34] C .B .Hanna and A .H .M acDonald and S .M .G irvin, Phys. Rev. B 63 (2001) 125305.
- [35] K .Yang and A .H .M acDonald, Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 17247.
- [36] N .Read, Phys. Rev. B 52 (1995) 1926.
- [37] L .Brey, H .A .Fertig, R .Cote and A .H .M acDonald, Phys. Rev. B 54 (1996) 16888.
- [38] M .Gell-Mann and Y .Ne'eman, The eight-fold Way (Benjamin, New York, 1964).