

# Stripe formation driven by space noncommutativity in quantum Hall systems

Guo-Zhu Liu and Sen Hu

Department of Mathematics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, 230026, P. R. China

We propose that the transport anisotropy observed in half-filled high Landau levels ( $N = 2$ ) is caused by the space noncommutativity effect, namely the Heisenberg uncertainty relation between the spatial coordinates of electrons. The stripe corresponds to a limit that one coordinate of a large number of particles is fixed at a certain value while its conjugate coordinate is completely uncertain. We make a renormalization group analysis and find that the noncommutativity effect is able to drive the stripe formation only at half-fillings  $\nu = 9/2; 11/2; 13/2$ ; etc., in agreement with experiments.

PACS numbers: 71.70.Dj, 73.43.-f, 11.10.Hi

The two-dimensional electron gas in a perpendicular magnetic field exhibits a class of fascinating phenomena at half Landau level (LL) fillings. At half-fillings, an electron captures two flux tubes to form a composite fermion [1, 2], which feels effectively zero net magnetic field. At  $\nu = 1/2$  and  $3/2$  of  $N = 0$  LL, the composite fermions constitute a gapless Fermi liquid [3, 4]. At  $\nu = 5/2$  and  $7/2$  of  $N = 1$  LL, the composite fermions are expected to undergo a Cooper pair instability and condense into an ordered superconducting state. Thus the fractional quantum Hall effect state observed in experiments [5] can be regarded as a p-wave BCS superconductor [6, 7, 8, 9]. The Meissner effect of superconductor accounts for the incompressibility. The Cooper pairing picture received strong supports from extensive numerical calculations [8, 9]. At half-fillings  $\nu = 9/2; 11/2; 13/2$  etc. of higher LLs ( $N = 2$ ), a strong transport anisotropy was observed [10, 11]. Specifically, the longitudinal resistance shows a high peak in one current direction and a deep minimum in its orthogonal direction, indicating that the electrons organize themselves into stripes for some reason. The success of composite fermion theory in understanding the half-fillings of  $N = 0$  and  $N = 1$  LLs motivates us to generalize it to the half-fillings of higher LLs ( $N = 2$ ). The question is: if composite fermions do exist at  $9/2; 11/2; 13/2$ ; etc., what is the underlying mechanism that drives the stripe formation? We propose that the space noncommutativity is the best candidate.

It is known that a Heisenberg uncertainty relation exists between the spatial coordinates [12, 13]. This can be seen from the electron wave function

$$\psi_{nk} = L^{-1/2} e^{iky} H_n(x + k^2 \ell^2) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\ell^2} |x + k^2 \ell^2|^2\right); \quad (1)$$

where  $H_n$  is the  $n$ th Hermite polynomial,  $\ell = \sqrt{\hbar c / eB}$  is the magnetic length and  $L$  is the sample size. The guiding center along the  $x$ -axis is determined by  $k$ , the  $y$ -component of momentum. Since  $y$  does not commute with the  $y$ -momentum,  $x$  and  $y$  do not commute and  $[x, y] = i\ell^2$ , with a noncommutative parameter that is of dimension (length)<sup>2</sup>. The idea of space-time noncommutativity or space-time quantization [14] was introduced into physics about sixty years ago. Its physical

implications [15] and mathematical structures [16] have been studied extensively, especially in the past several years. However, up to date it is not clear whether we live in this kind of world or not. The search for unambiguous experimental evidence of noncommutativity in high-energy physics appears to be quite difficult due to the ultra-high energy scale. On the contrary, it should be easier to detect its effects in condensed matter physics.

The Heisenberg uncertainty principle requires that  $x$  and  $y$  can only be determined simultaneously to the extent restricted by  $\ell^2$ . If one squeezes  $x \rightarrow 0$ , then  $y$  must tend to  $\infty$ , and vice versa. For a single particle, if its  $x$ -coordinate is fixed, then its  $y$ -coordinate is completely arbitrary. For a many-body system, if a macroscopically large number of particles have the same  $x$ -coordinate, then their motions are all confined to one straight line along the  $y$ -axis. This state, when thermally stable, can be identified as a stripe state. From the wave function (1), we know that if the fermions in a given LL have the same  $k$ , then their guiding centers would have the same  $x$ -coordinate. When stripes come into being, the fermions in one stripe would have the same wave functions. This is in contradiction to the Pauli exclusion principle. However, this conflict dissolves automatically if the composite fermions form Cooper pairs and behave effectively like bosons. It is reasonable to assume that the composite fermions form Cooper pairs at filling factors  $\nu = n/2$  with odd integer  $n \geq 5$ . In case of insignificant noncommutative effect, the Cooper pairs condense into a uniform superconducting state at zero temperature. If the noncommutative effect is strong, then a nonuniform or stripe state is more favorable. We study the first order phase transition to the stripe state using the renormalization group (RG) analysis within a noncommutative Ginzburg-Landau (GL) model. We find that the filling factor has a critical value, only beyond which the system develops stripe solutions. The critical value  $\nu_c = 2$  lies between  $7/2$  and  $9/2$ , in agreement with experiments.

We write down a noncommutative GL model

$$S = \int d^2x \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \psi)^2 + m^2 \psi^2 + \frac{1}{4} V(\psi) \right]; \quad (2)$$

with the potential

$$V(\phi; \psi) = g_1 \phi^2 \psi^2 + g_2 \phi^4 \psi^2 : \quad (3)$$

The complex scalar field  $\phi(\mathbf{x})$  represents the Cooper pair of composite fermions. The noncommutative relation is  $[\phi, \psi] = \phi \psi - \psi \phi = i$ . Here, the noncommutative relation exists only between spatial coordinates, then the only nonzero components of the anti-symmetric matrix are  $\theta_{12} = \theta_{21} = \theta$ . The product of two functions is defined by [15]

$$(\phi \star \psi)(\mathbf{x}) = e^{\frac{i}{2} \theta_{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}} : \quad (4)$$

Note that there are two possible noncommutative quartic interaction terms with two coupling constants which should be treated on the same footing.

The commutative GL model enters a uniform ordered state at low temperatures. When the noncommutative effect becomes strong, a stripe state is possible [17, 18]. A powerful tool to study the phase transition to stripe state is the modern RG analysis developed by Shankar [19] and independently by Polchinski [20]. The stripe phase is characterized by the appearance of a  $k^4$  term which leads to a multi-critical Lifshitz point [21]. Such a term is generated when the system develops an anomalous dimension  $\gamma = 1$  for the scalar field [18]. Its basic idea is to identify the fixed point of the action and then study the interaction terms. The methods are standard and have been presented previously [18, 19, 20].

The free field action  $S_0$  in momentum space is

$$S_0 = \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} k^2 \phi(\mathbf{k}) \phi(\mathbf{k}) : \quad (5)$$

In modern RG theory, ultraviolet cutoff is interpreted as the energy scale above which the physics has no effects on the physics below it. We separate  $\phi(\mathbf{k})$  into slow modes  $\phi_s(\mathbf{k}) = \phi(\mathbf{k})$  for  $|\mathbf{k}| < \Lambda$  and fast modes  $\phi_f(\mathbf{k}) = \phi(\mathbf{k})$  for  $\Lambda < |\mathbf{k}|$  with  $\Lambda$  a number greater than unity. The fast modes in the partition function  $Z = \int D\phi e^S$  can be integrated out, leaving

$$S_0^0 = \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} k^2 \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) : \quad (6)$$

The free action  $S_0$  is a fixed point in the sense that it is invariant under the RG transformations

$$k^0 = s k; \quad \phi^0(k^0) = s^{-\frac{3}{2}} \phi(k) : \quad (7)$$

We next consider the mass term. After integrating out the fast modes and making RG transformation, we have

$$S_2^0 = \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \phi^0(k) \phi^0(k) : \quad (8)$$

Since  $r^0 = m^2 r = s^2 r$ , the mass term is enhanced under RG transformation and hence is relevant.

The quartic interaction term is

$$S_4 = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} (1) (2) (3) (4) u(1234) : \quad (9)$$

Here,  $\int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}}^R$  denotes  $\int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}}^R \prod_{i=1}^4 \frac{d^3 k_i^0}{(2\pi)^3} \delta(\sum_i k_i^0)$ . The vertex function  $u(1234)$  has the form

$$g_1 \cos\left(\frac{k_1 \wedge k_2}{2} + \frac{k_3 \wedge k_4}{2}\right) + g_2 \cos\left(\frac{k_1 \wedge k_3}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{k_2 \wedge k_4}{2}\right) : \quad (10)$$

To eliminate the fast modes, we adopt the standard cumulant expansion method and write the action as

$$S_4^0 = h S_4 i_{0f} + \frac{1}{2} h S_4^2 i_{0f} - h S_4 i_{0f}^2 + \dots ; \quad (11)$$

with  $h : \int_{0f}$  denoting functional integration over the fast modes.

The leading term has the form

$$h \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} (s + \phi)_1 (s + \phi)_2 (s + \phi)_3 (s + \phi)_4 u(1234) i_{0f} : \quad (12)$$

In all the sixteen terms, we only care about the term with all slow modes and four terms with  $s s s s$ . All other terms either vanish or contribute only a constant.

The term with all slow modes is

$$S_{4f}^0 = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} s^0 (1^0) (2^0) (3^0) (4^0) u(1^0 2^0 3^0 4^0) : \quad (13)$$

after RG transformations. This is the tree-level quartic term and is a relevant perturbation. The noncommutative starproduct structure does not change under the RG transformations [18] and hence  $g_1^0 = g_1$  and  $g_2^0 = g_2$ .

We next consider the four terms that contain two slow modes and two fast modes. After calculating the loop integral of fast modes, we have

$$\frac{2}{2} (g_1 + g_2) \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right) \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) + \frac{g_2}{6} \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right) k^2 \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) : \quad (14)$$

The first term only corrects the mass term, so we do not care about it. The second term alters the kinetic term to

$$h \int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} \frac{u_2}{6} \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^2 k^2 \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) : \quad (15)$$

Here we define a dimensionless parameter  $u_2 = g_2^{-1}$  and write  $s = 1 + t$  with  $t$  infinitesimal. If we define

$$= \frac{u_2}{6} \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^2 ; \quad (16)$$

then, using the formula  $1 + t = s$ , we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j}} k^2 \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) \phi_s(\mathbf{k}) : \quad (17)$$

Now make the RG transformation  $k^0 = sk$ , then we know that the scalar field must transform as  $\phi(k^0) = s^{-\frac{5}{2}} \phi(k)$ . The anomalous dimension vanishes in commutative GL model. In the present case, its finite values is a consequence of the noncommutative effect [18]. Note that only the coupling constant  $g_2$  contributes to the anomalous dimension.

The anomalous dimension contains the quartic coupling constant  $u_2$ , so we should also investigate the RG flow of the quartic interaction term to one-loop order. The one-loop correction to the bare quartic term is

$$\frac{s}{8^{\frac{5}{2}}} (1 - \frac{1}{s}) \int_{k^0 k} \phi^0(1^0) \phi^0(2^0) \phi^0(3^0) \phi^0(4^0) P(1^0 2^0 3^0 4^0) \quad (18)$$

with the vertex function  $P(1^0 2^0 3^0 4^0)$

$$(g_1 + g_2)^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \cos\left(\frac{k_1^0 \wedge k_3^0}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{k_2^0 \wedge k_4^0}{2}\right) + \cos\left(\frac{k_1^0 \wedge k_2^0}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{k_3^0 \wedge k_4^0}{2}\right) + \cos\left(\frac{k_1^0 \wedge k_4^0}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{k_3^0 \wedge k_2^0}{2}\right) \right); \quad (19)$$

Using the identity

$$k_1^0 \wedge k_4^0 + k_3^0 \wedge k_2^0 = (k_1^0 \wedge k_2^0 + k_3^0 \wedge k_4^0); \quad (20)$$

the vertex function  $P(1^0 2^0 3^0 4^0)$  reduces to

$$(g_1 + g_2)^2 \left( \frac{3}{2} \cos\left(\frac{k_1^0 \wedge k_3^0}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{k_2^0 \wedge k_4^0}{2}\right) + \cos\left(\frac{k_1^0 \wedge k_2^0}{2} + \frac{k_3^0 \wedge k_4^0}{2}\right) \right); \quad (21)$$

It has the same form as  $u(1^0 2^0 3^0 4^0)$  in (13), then we can write down the general coupling parameters for the quartic term as

$$u_1^0 = su_1 - \frac{1}{2^{\frac{5}{2}}} (s^2 - s) (u_1 + u_2)^2 \quad (22)$$

$$u_2^0 = su_2 - \frac{3}{4^{\frac{5}{2}}} (s^2 - s) (u_1 + u_2)^2; \quad (23)$$

which then leads to the following RG flow equations

$$\frac{du_1}{dt} = u_1 - \frac{1}{2^{\frac{5}{2}}} (u_1 + u_2)^2 \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{du_2}{dt} = u_2 - \frac{3}{4^{\frac{5}{2}}} (u_1 + u_2)^2; \quad (25)$$

where  $u_1 = g_1^{-1}$ . It is easy to show that the fixed point locates at  $u_1 = 8^{-2} = 25$  and  $u_2 = 12^{-2} = 25$ .

If the two-point correlation function in the real space  $\langle \phi(x) \phi(0) \rangle \sim x^{-1}$  tends to zero at large distances, then the fixed point is stable in the sense that a uniform ordered phase will be formed at zero temperature. When the noncommutative effect is strong enough, the correlation function diverges at large distances and a nonuniform stripe state is reached [18]. The critical point that

separates the uniform and non-uniform phases is determined by  $\beta_c = 1$ .

The anomalous dimension depends on  $\beta^2$ , so the next step is to choose an appropriate ultraviolet cutoff. The noncommutative parameter is determined by the magnetic length,  $\ell_c = \ell_c^2 = \hbar c / eB$ . A naive expectation is to choose the inverse magnetic length as the ultraviolet cutoff,  $\Lambda = \ell_c^{-1}$ , then  $\beta^2 = 1$ . We believe that this is not an appropriate choice since it erases the difference between different LLs. Instead, we assume that there is an average length scale  $\ell_e$  of fermions on all LLs and define  $\beta = \ell_e^{-1}$ . The effective area each fermion occupies is then given by  $2\ell_e^2$ . The wave pockets of fermions do not overlap with each other due to the Coulomb repulsion between them. The total area of the two-dimensional plane is denoted as  $A$ , then the actual fermion number is  $A = 2\ell_e^2$ . The degeneracy of each LL is  $A = 2\ell_e^2$ . The filling factor is the ratio of the actual fermion number and the level degeneracy, thus at  $\nu = n/2$  we have

$$\frac{n}{2} = \frac{A = 2\ell_e^2}{A = 2\ell_e^2} = \frac{\nu^2}{\ell_e^2} = \nu^2; \quad (26)$$

Now the anomalous dimension becomes

$$= \frac{u_2}{6^{\frac{5}{2}}} (\nu^2)^2 = \frac{n^2}{50}; \quad (27)$$

It is a remarkable result that the filling factor appears in the anomalous dimension. Setting  $\beta = 1$  gives the critical value  $n_c = 7.07$ . Only for  $n > n_c$ , the noncommutative effect is able to form stripes. This result shows that stripes exist at  $\nu = 9/2; 11/2; 13/2$ ; etc; but not at  $\nu = 5/2$  and  $7/2$ . This is well consistent with transport experimental observations.

The transport measurements [10, 11, 22] observed an anisotropy of resistance at half-fillings of  $N = 2$  LLs at temperatures,  $T < 0.1$  K. At  $\nu = 9/2$ , faithful Hall-bar measurements [22] found that the anisotropy of resistances along the two principle directions is as high as  $7:1$ . This can be explained as follows. Once the noncommutative effect drives the formation of stripes along some direction, the resistance in this direction reduces rapidly down to nearly vanishing and this kind of stripe is in fact a one-dimensional superconductor on a two-dimensional noncommutative plane. However, the resistance in the orthogonal direction is enhanced significantly because of the small quantum tunnelling between neighboring stripes. We believe that the noncommutative effect should play an essential role in forming stripes primarily due to the experimental fact: when the resistance in one direction reaches a high peak, the resistance in the orthogonal direction reaches a deep minimum [10, 11]. Obviously, there is a competition between the mobility of carriers in the easy direction and the hard direction. The space noncommutativity naturally provides such a competition since the Heisenberg uncertainty principle

requires that the particle is more localized in one direction, it is more extended in the orthogonal direction.

The transport anisotropy is previously interpreted as the formation of charge density wave (CDW) state, which was predicted [23, 24] to exist at half-llings of high LLs before the experimental observations. This line of thought tackles the problem from a microscopic calculation based on the Hartree-Fock approximation, while we study the phase transition using the standard RG analysis in an effective mean-field theory. Within the CDW theory, the ground states of half-llings of  $N = 1$  and  $N = 2$  LLs are fundamentally different. However, the experimental fact that an in-plane magnetic field can turn the  $\nu = 5/2$  fractional quantum Hall state into a highly anisotropic state [25] strongly indicates a common property shared by the ground state of  $\nu = 5/2$  and that of  $\nu = 9/2; 11/2; 13/2$ ; etc.. According to our scenario, they are actually intimately related with each other. They both undergo a Cooper pairing instability of composite fermions. The crucial difference is that the system condenses into a uniform ordering phase at  $\nu = 5/2$  and  $7/2$  but is driven by the noncommutative effect to condense into a nonuniform ordering phase at  $\nu = 9/2; 11/2; 13/2$ ; etc.. Thus we see that the composite fermion concept offers a unified description of not only the odd-denominator fractional quantum Hall effects [1, 2] but the half-llings of all LLs.

We give a brief discussion of several relevant problems. First, the RG analysis does not tell us the precise orientation of the stripe. The orientation should depend on the crystal structure of materials [10, 11]. Since the system has a translational invariance along the stripe direction, the stripe would prefer to align itself in the direction that respects this symmetry. Second, the anisotropy of resistance was found [10, 11] to be largest at  $\nu = 9/2$  and decrease with growing lling factor index  $n$ . The reason is presumably that as  $n$  grows, the quantum fluctuation increases, resulting in increasing quantum tunnelling between stripes. In addition, it was found that a strong in-plane magnetic field can pin down the orientation of stripes [25]. It is currently not known how to understand this experimental fact using the noncommutative effect.

It is interesting to notice a similarity of the phase transition to stripe state driven by the uncertainty relation of spatial coordinates to the phase transition from a Mott insulator with the local particle number being fixed to a superfluid with the phase of boson wave function being fixed [26]. The latter is controlled by the Heisenberg uncertainty relation between the local particle number and the phase of the boson wave function. The stripe state, Mott insulator state and superfluid state all correspond to a limit that one physical variable takes a fixed value

while the conjugate variable that does not commute with it is completely uncertain.

The space noncommutativity is a profound concept in physics. Only experiments can tell us whether the real world is a noncommutative space or not. We hope the results in this paper shed some light on the search for space noncommutativity in nature.

G.Z.L. would like to thank Yong-Shi Wu, Zheng-Wei Wu and Fei Xu for very helpful discussions. G.Z.L. is supported by the NSF of China No. 10404024.

- 
- [1] J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 199 (1989).
  - [2] O. Heinonen (ed.), Composite Fermion (World Scientific, New York, 1998).
  - [3] B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B 47, 7312 (1993).
  - [4] R. Willett et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 3846 (1993).
  - [5] R. Willett et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 1776 (1987).
  - [6] G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. B 360, 362 (1991).
  - [7] M. G. Reiter, X.-G. Wen and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 3205 (1991); Nucl. Phys. B 374, 567 (1992).
  - [8] R. Morf, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1505 (1998); E. H. Rezayi and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 4685 (2000).
  - [9] V. W. Scarola, K. Park, and J. K. Jain, Nature (London) 406, 863 (2000).
  - [10] M. P. Lilly et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 394 (1999).
  - [11] R. R. Du et al., Solid State Commun. 109, 389 (1999).
  - [12] S. M. Girvin and T. Jach, Phys. Rev. B 29, 5617 (1984).
  - [13] J. Bellissard, A. van Elst, and H. Schultz-Baldes, cond-mat/9411052.
  - [14] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. 71, 38 (1947).
  - [15] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73, 977 (2001).
  - [16] A. Connes, Noncommutative Geometry (Academic Press, Inc.; New York, 1994).
  - [17] S. S. Gubser and S. L. Sondhi, Nucl. Phys. B 605, 395 (2001).
  - [18] G.-H. Chen and Y.-S. Wu, Nucl. Phys. B 622, 189 (2002).
  - [19] R. Shankar, Rev. Mod. Phys. 66, 129 (1994).
  - [20] J. Polchinski, in Proceedings of 1992 Theoretical Advanced Studies Institute in Elementary Particle Physics, edited by J. Harvey and J. Polchinski (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993).
  - [21] R. M. H. Homreich, M. Luban, and S. Shtrikman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 1678 (1975).
  - [22] For a review, see M. M. Fogler, cond-mat/0111001.
  - [23] A. A. Koulakov, M. M. Fogler, and B. I. Shklovskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 499 (1996); M. M. Fogler, A. A. Koulakov, and B. I. Shklovskii, Phys. Rev. B 54, 1853 (1996).
  - [24] R. Moessner and J. T. Chalker, Phys. Rev. B 54, 5006 (1996).
  - [25] W. Pan et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 820 (1999); M. P. Lilly et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 824 (1999).
  - [26] M. G. Reiner et al., Nature (London) 415, 39 (2002).