## Electron Localization in the Quantum H all R egim e

Ra aele Resta

INFM DEMOCRITOS National Simulation Center, via Beirut 2, I{34014 Trieste, Italy

and D ipartim ento di F isica Teorica, U niversita di Trieste,

Strada Costiera 11, I{34014 Trieste, Italy

()

The theory of the insulating state discrim inates between insulators and metals by means of a localization tensor, which is nite in insulators and divergent in metals. In absence of time-reversal symmetry, this same tensor acquires an o diagonal imaginary part, proportional to the dc transverse conductivity, leading to quantization of the latter in two-dimensional systems. I provide evidence that electron localization in the above sense is the common cause for both vanishing of the dc longitudinal conductivity and quantization of the transverse one in quantum H all uids.

W.Kohn showed in 1964 that the insulating state of matter re ects a peculiar organization of the electrons in their ground state: the cause for the insulating behavior is electron localization [1,2]. Such localization, however, manifests itself in a very subtle way, fully elucidated much later. In 1999 Resta and Sorella [3] de ned a tensor which provides a quantitative measure of Kohn's localization, and has a common root with the modern theory of polarization [4{6]. This \localization tensor" is an intensive property characterizing the ground wavefunction as a whole: it is nite in any insulator and divergent in any metal. A further advance on this line was provided in 2000 by Souza, W ilkens, and M artin [7]. I am going to refer to these results altogether as to the \theory of the insulating state" (T IS) [8]: so far, it has only considered tim e-reversal-invariant system s. I show here that, in absence of tim e-reversal sym m etry, the T IS localization tensor [3,7,8] is naturally endowed with a nonvanishing in aginary part. For a two-dimensional system, the imaginary part is quantized whenever the real part is non divergent, and is proportional to dc transverse conductivity. I show here that the theory of the quantum Halle ect (particularly in the form ulation of Niu, Thouless, and Wu [9]) has a very direct and previously unsuspected relationship to T IS, and in fact can be regarded as a consequence of the latter. In order to predict whether the dc transverse conductivity of any two-dimensional many-electron system is quantized, it is enough to inspect electron localization in the ground state: this is the major result of the present Letter.

Phenom enologically, an insulating material is characterized by vanishing dc longitudinal conductivity. In this sense, an electron uid in the quantum Hall regime is in fact an insulator, independently of what establishes such regime (e.g. disorder). A coording to T IS the many-body wavefunction is then localized. From the present view – point, electron localization is the common cause for both vanishing of the longitudinal dc conductivity and quantization of the transverse one; the two features stem here from the same form alism. The present view may appear at odds with the established one, which in the quantum – Hall regime focusses on the extended states more than on the localized ones [10]; but it is worth stressing that the T IS localization tensor is a global geometric property characterizing the ground wavefunction, not the individual one-electron states.

In the nalpart of this Letter I also show how T IS works for noninteracting electrons in the lowest Landau level. W hile disorder is obviously essential for producing a quantum H all uid, a at substrate potential is used here to provide analytical results. At complete lling the (real) trace of the localization tensor is shown to be equal to the squared m agnetic length, while the (im aginary) antisymmetric part of the same tensor provides the H all conductivity; at fractional lling the real part diverges while the imaginary part is ill de ned. This con rm s our main message: inspecting the groundstate localization is enough to predict quantization of transverse conductivity.

The TIS localization tensor [3], also known as second cumulant moment hr r i<sub>c</sub> of the electron distribution [7,8], is an intensive property having the dimensions of a squared length, and whose only ingredient is the many-body ground wavefunction j<sub>0</sub>i. In the cases dealt with so far, periodic boundary conditions were adopted; these are easily modi ed to accom odate a macroscopic magnetic eld [9]. If j<sub>0</sub>i is an N -electron wavefunction periodic with period L in all Cartesian coordinates r<sub>j</sub>; separately, we de ne

= (2 = L)e, where e is a unit vector along, and

$$j_{0}(0)i = j_{0}i; j_{0}()i = e^{i\frac{2}{L} \int_{j-1}^{L} r_{j}}; j_{0}i:$$
 (1)

According to T IS, the localization tensor is [3,7,8]:

$$hr r i_{c} = \frac{L^{2}}{4^{2}N} \ln \frac{h_{0}()j_{0}()i}{h_{0}()j_{0}(0)ih_{0}(0)j_{0}()i}; (2)$$

where the therm odynam ic lim it is understood. In the existing literature tim e-reversal sym m etry is assumed: the tensor is then real. W hen tim e-reversal invariance is absent, this same tensor is endowed with an o -diagonal in aginary part, which | as shown below | is particularly relevant for two-dim ensional system s.

As rst shown by Souza, W ilkens, and Martin [7] by means of a uctuation-dissipation theorem, the real part of the localization tensor is related to a frequency integral of the longitudinal conductivity, which is nite in any insulator and divergent in any m etal:

$$Z_{1} \frac{d!}{!} Re \qquad (!) = \frac{e^{2}N}{hL^{d}} Re hr^{2} i_{c}$$
$$= \frac{e^{2}}{4 hL^{d}} \ln \ln 0 (0) j_{0} () j_{1}^{2} () (3)$$

I am going to extend this result, in order to address the o diagonal in aginary part of the localization tensor as well, and additionally to consider cases where a m acroscopic magnetic eld is present. Specializing from now on to a two-dimensional system, we notice that Eq. (3) is size-invariant in form .

I assume the system as isotropic in the xy plane, with a magnetic eld B along z. Therefore  $_{11} = _{22}$ , while the o diagonalelem ent is purely antisym metric:  $_{12} =$ The Kubo formula for the conductivity tensor is:

$$(!) = \frac{ie^{2}}{h! L^{2}} \lim_{\substack{! \ 0+\\ n \in 0}} \frac{X_{0}}{h! D^{2}} \frac{h_{0} \dot{y}_{1} h_{n} h_{n} \dot{y}_{10}}{! P_{0} P_{0} P_{0}} \frac{h_{0} \dot{y}_{1} h_{n} h_{n} \dot{y}_{10}}{! P_{0} P_{0} P_{0}} ; (4)$$

where  $!_{0n} = (E_n \quad E_0) = h$  are the excitation frequencies. I then focus on the the two quantities:

$$Re_{12}(0) = \frac{2e^{2}}{hL^{2}}Im \sum_{n \in 0}^{X} \frac{h_{0}\dot{y}_{1}j_{n}ih_{n}\dot{y}_{2}j_{0}i}{!_{0n}^{2}}; \quad (6)$$

where the r.h.s. member are written as to emphasize the common structure. Notice that we have taken the lim it ! 0 at nite L. In transport theory the interest is in evaluating as a continuous function of !, by sm oothing the singularities in Eq. (4): this can be done by keeping the \dissipation" nite while performing the therm odynam ic lim it rst [11]. The order of the two lim its is irrelevant here, since Eq. (5) is an integrated property, and Eq. (6) is dissipation less.

In order to transform the sum over the excited states into a ground-state property, it is expedient to consider the many-body H am iltonian with a tw ist" (or ux")

$$\hat{H}(k) = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i \quad hk + \frac{e}{c} A^2 + \hat{V};$$
 (7)

where  $\hat{V}$  comprises the one-body substrate potential and the electron-electron interaction. We indicate the ground state of Eq. (7) as j(k)i, with  $j(0)i = j_{0}i$ ; straightforward perturbation theory yields

$$j(k)i' j_{0}i+k \int_{n \in 0}^{X} j_{n}i\frac{h_{n}j^{0}j_{0}i}{!_{0n}};$$
 (8)

$$h_{n} j = (0) i = h_{n} j j j_{0} i = !_{0n}; \quad n \in 0$$
 (9)

where the velocity operator is  $\hat{v} = r_k \hat{H}(k) = h$ , and  $\hat{e}$ 0=0k . Strictly speaking, the perturbation expansion holds for a conventional insulator where the Ferm i gap does not vanish in the thermodynamic limit. More generally, owing to Eq. (5), it also holds whenever (!) goes to zero fast enough at small !, i.e. for Re any insulator [7].

The sum over excited states appearing in Eqs. (5) and (6) can then be transform ed into:

$$X = \frac{h_{0} j j_{n} i h_{n} j j_{0} i}{!_{0n}^{2}}$$
(10)  
= h@ (0) j@ (0) i h@ (0) j (0) ih (0) j@ (0) i

The real part of Eq. (10) is the quantum metric tensor de ned by Provost and Vallee [12], evaluated at k =0; the imaginary part is the corresponding curvature (divided by two).

So far, we have specied neither the magnetic gauge nor the boundary conditions. We choose the Landau gauge and the usual magnetic boundary conditions [9] for translations by L of each coordinate x<sub>i</sub> and y<sub>i</sub>. These require the total  $ux BL^2$  across the system to be an integer number N  $_{s}$  of ux quanta  $_{0}$  = hc=e. At lling the density is then

$$n_0 = \frac{N_s}{L^2} = \frac{1}{2 l^2}; \qquad (11)$$

where  $l = (hc = eB)^{1=2}$  is the magnetic length.

If the insulating ground state is nondegenerate at any k, the eigenstate j (k) i assum es a sim ple form whenever the k-coordinates are integer multiples of 2 =L. For instance, if k coincides with one of the vectors de ned above, then j(k)i coincides with Eq. (1) apart from a phase factor which is irrelevant here: in fact the two wavefunctions obey the same Schrodinger equation and the same magnetic boundary conditions. The case of degenerate ground states has been considered as well [13]. We then discretize the derivatives in Eq. (10) using the special vectors of Eq. (1) and replacing  $h_0() j_0(0)i' 1 + lnh_0() j_0(0)i$ , as usual when dealing with Berry phases [14]. The result is

$$h^{(2)}(0) j^{(2)}(0) i h^{(0)}(0) j^{(2)}(0) i (0) j^{(2)}(0) i (12)$$

$$V \frac{L^{2}}{4^{2}} \ln \frac{h_{0}()j_{0}()j_{0}() j_{0}()}{h_{0}()j_{0}(0) j_{0}()} = N hr r i_{c}$$

Replacing the realpart of Eq. (12) into Eqs. (5) and (10) one recovers the Souza-W ilkens-M artin sum rule, Eq. (3), which is nondivergent in the insulating case.

The imaginary part of Eq. (12) shares the same convergence properties as the real one, after Eq. (10); in the insulating case it takes the form of a discrete Berry phase [14] over the three-point path in k-space from 0 to  $_1$  to  $_2$  to 0. However, since Berry phases are de ned m odulo 2, this expression does not provide a unique value. The ambiguity is rem oved by replacing the Berry phase, i.e. the loop integral of the Berry curvature. We therefore evaluate the imaginary part of Eq. (10) as

$$Im h \theta_{1} (0) j \theta_{2} (0) i$$

$$= \frac{L^{2}}{4^{2}} Im \qquad dk_{1} \qquad dk_{2} h \theta_{1} (k) j \theta_{2} (k) i; \quad (13)$$

in the lim it of large L. The dim ensionless integral equals

 $C_1$ , where  $C_1$ , known as the rst Chem number, is a topological integer [9,15,16] characterizing the electron distribution. The imaginary part of the localization tensor is then

Im 
$$hxyi_{c} = \frac{1}{N}$$
 Im  $h@_{1}$  (0)  $j@_{2}$  (0) i  
$$= \frac{1}{4} \frac{L^{2}}{N} C_{1} = \frac{L^{2}}{2} C_{1}:$$
(14)

Upon replacement of the previous expressions into Eq. (6) we retrieve the sem inal result of N iu, Thouless, and W u [9]:

Re <sub>12</sub> (0) = 
$$\frac{e^2}{h}C_1$$
: (15)

This was originally obtained by an analysis of the G reen function, under the hypothesis that the system has a Ferm i gap; in the present approach the presence of a Ferm i gap | possibly in the weak sense outlined above|

is a necessary and su cient condition for the convergence of Eq. (10) in the therm odynamic limit. But this property, belonging to the excitations of the system, is transformed here into a pure ground-state property, owing to a uctuation-dissipation theorem. As far as the longitudinal conductivity is concerned, a quantum – Hall uid is no di erent from any other insulator, and its wavefunction is localized in the sense of TIS [3,7,8]. I have shown that, owing to such localization, any twodimensional insulatorm ay display a quantized transverse conductance in absence of time-reversal symmetry (even in absence of a macroscopic B eld [17]).

Eq. (15) seems to legislate integer quantization of the Hall conductance in all circum stances, contrary to experimental evidence. For fractional llings, Ref. [9] assumes then a degenerate ground state, whose di erent components are uncoupled and m acroscopically separated. The degeneracy problem has been thoroughly discussed in the literature (for a review, see Ref. [18]); the present Letter has nothing to add.

In the m etallic case both sums in Eqs. (5) and (6) do not converge: the former is positively divergent while the latter is indeterminate. Therefore TIS formally de nes the diagonal elements of the localization tensor as in nite [3,7,8] (delocalized ground wavefunction). The o -diagonal element hxyi<sub>c</sub> however, remains ill de ned, and the Kubo formula, Eq. (6) is invalid. The transverse dc conductivity is therefore not quantized as in Eq. (15) and has to be evaluated by di erent means, e.g. classically [10].

In the nal part of this Letter we specialize to noninteracting electrons and to the integer quantum H all e ect. In the noninteracting case (and only in this case) the real part of the localization tensor, Eq. (2), has a m eaningful expression in terms of the one-body reduced density m atrix [8,19]:

Rehrri<sub>c</sub> = 
$$\frac{1}{2N}^{Z}$$
 drdr<sup>0</sup> (r r<sup>0</sup>) (r r<sup>0</sup>) j<sup>(1)</sup> (r;r<sup>0</sup>)<sup>2</sup>;  
(16)

where single occupancy is assumed. The integral converges whenever the density matrix vanishes fast enough at large  $jr r^0 j$ ; therefore the localization tensor discriminates between insulators and metals by measuring via Eq. (16) the \nearsightedness" [20] of the electron distribution. Our major, very general, result implies that the niteness of Eq. (16) warrants quantization of dc transverse conductivity.

Noninteracting electrons are kept in the quantum H all regime by disorder, and an analytical implementation of the present formalism is obviously not possible. In order to demonstrate how the theory works, I consider the academical case of a at substrate potential, with noninteracting electrons in the lowest Landau level. I show explicitly that the system is insulating, in the sense of T IS, at complete lling, and metallic otherwise.

For complete lling (= 1) the system is uniform with density  $n_0$ , Eq. (11); the modulus of the density matrix is gauge-invariant and equals  $n_0 \exp [(r r^0)^2 = (41^2)]$ . The trace of the localization tensor  $hr^2 i_c = hx^2 i_c + hy^2 i_c$  is

$$hr^{2}i_{c} = \frac{1}{2n_{0}} \sum_{\substack{Z \\ I \\ 0}}^{Z} dr r^{2} j^{(1)} (0;r) j^{2}$$
$$= n_{0} dr r^{3} e^{r^{2} = (2j^{2})} = j^{2}; \qquad (17)$$

and therefore it equals precisely the squared magnetic length.

The case of B = 0 is qualitatively diment: the density matrix is polynomial (instead of exponential) in  $jr r^0 j$  and not nearsighted enough to make the integral in Eq. (16) convergent. Therefore the real part

of the localization tensor is form ally in nite, as expected, while its im aginary part vanishes owing to time-reversal symmetry. At nite B values, instead, the convergence of the realpart of the tensor (hence the insulating nature of the system) can be regarded as the cause for quantization of the transverse conductivity.

Any single-determ inant wavefunction is invariant by unitary transformations of the occupied orbitals among them selves, and in particular by transformations which localize the orbitals; in the general case the localized orbitals are not eigenstates of the singleparticle Hamiltonian. The real part of the localization tensor, Eq. (16), provides an important bound for such transformations [8,19]. Suppose one looks for orbitals which are optimally localized in one Cartesian direction say x, and delocalized along y. These orbitals have been called \herm aphrodite orbitals" in Ref. [19]: their quadratic spread in the x direction is minimum and equals the tensor element  $hx^2i_c$ .

For electrons in the lowest Landau level at complete lling, any unitary transformation of the occupied orbitals among them selves leads to Ham iltonian eigenstates, owing to energy degeneracy. In this case the herm aphrodite orbitals are easily identied with the Landau-gauge orbitals [10]:

$$_{k}$$
 (r) /  $e^{ik_{y}y}e^{(x+k_{y})^{2}/(22^{2})}$ : (18)

In fact these orbitals are plane-wave-like in the y direction, while their quadratic spread in the x direction equals precisely  $hx^2i_c = l^2=2$ .

Next, we consider a single case study at fractional

where the longitudinal conductivity does not vanish and therefore according to T IS | the ground state is delocalized. It is expedient to switch to the central gauge, where the single-particle orbitals are:

$$m(z) = p \frac{1}{2 2^{m} m! 1} z^{m} e^{\frac{jz}{2} z^{2} = 4};$$
(19)

where  $z = (x \quad iy)=1$ . Any state with fractional lling is nonuniform. A possible state with = 1=2 is built by occupying the odd-m orbitals only, i.e.:

This density matrix is not nearsighted: taking for instance  $z^0 = z$  we have

<sup>(1)</sup> (z; z) = 
$$\frac{1}{2 l^2} e^{\frac{j}{2} j^2 = 2} \sinh(jz j^2 = 2);$$
 (21)

which clearly does not vanish at large jzj. The integral in Eq. (16) is positively divergent, providing a form ally in nite real part of the localization tensor, as expected. Because of the above general considerations, the corresponding imaginary part is ill-de ned and the transverse conductivity is not quantized.

In conclusion, I have shown quite generally that the T IS localization tensor [3,7,8]| besides discriminating between insulators and metals on the basis of longitudinal conductivity | also yields very directly the transverse dissipationless dc conductivity in the insulating case, as e.g. in a quantum H all uid. It is enough to inspect electron localization in order to predict whether the dc transverse conductivity is quantized. The localization tensor is a pure ground-state property and has a geometric nature: it coincides in fact with the quantum metric-and-curvature tensor of P rovost and Vallee [12] (divided by N), Eqs. (10) and (12). Both the real and the in aginary parts of the T IS localization tensor carry an outstanding physicalm eaning.

W ork partly supported by  ${\rm ON\,R}$  through grant N 00014–03–1–0570.

- [1] W .Kohn, Phys.Rev.133, A171 (1964).
- [2] W.Kohn, in Many{Body Physics, edited by C.DeW itt and R.Balian (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1968), p. 351.
- [3] R.Resta and S.Sorella, Phys.Rev.Lett.82, 370 (1999).
- [4] R.D.King-Sm ith and D.Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B 47, 1651 (1993); R.Resta, Rev. M od. Phys. 66, 899 (1994).
- [5] R.Resta, Phys.Rev.Lett. 80, 1800 (1998).
- [6] R. M. Martin, Electronc Structure: Basic Theory and Practical M ethods (C am bridge University Press, 2004), Chap. 22.
- [7] I. Souza, T. W ilkens, and R. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B 62, 1666 (2000).
- [8] R. Resta, J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 14, R 625 (2002).
- [9] Q. Niu, D. J. Thouless, and Y. S. W u, Phys. Rev. B 31, 3372 (1985).
- [10] D.Yoshioka, The Quantum HallE ect (Springer, Berlin, 2002).
- [11] E.Akkermans, J.Math.Phys. 38, 1781 (1997).
- [12] J. P. Provost and G. Vallee, Commun. M ath Phys. 76, 289 (1980).
- [13] A. A. A ligia and E. R. Gagliano, Physica C 304, 29
   (1998); A. A. A ligia, Europhys. Lett. 45, 411 (1999).
- [14] R.Resta, J.Phys.: Condens.M atter 12, R107 (2000).
- [15] M.Kohm oto, Ann. Phys. 160, 343 (1985).
- [16] D. J. Thouless, Topological Quantum Numbers in Nonrelativistic Physics (World Scientic, Singapore, 1998).
- [17] F.D.M.Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2015 (1988).
- [18] M. Stone, Quantum Hall E ect (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1992), Chap. 3.
- [19] C. Sgiarovello, M. Peressi, and R. Resta, Phys. Rev. 64, 115202 (2001).
- [20] W .Kohn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 3168 (1996).