

# Pair-distribution functions of correlated composite fermions

Arkadiusz Wójs<sup>1,2</sup>, Daniel Wodziński<sup>1</sup>, and John J. Quinn<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Wroclaw University of Technology, 50-370 Wroclaw, Poland*

<sup>2</sup>*University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA*

Pair-distribution functions  $g(r)$  of Laughlin quasielectrons (composite fermions in their second Landau level) are calculated in the fractional quantum Hall states at electron filling factors  $\nu_e = 4/11$  and  $3/8$ . A shoulder in  $g(r)$  is found, supporting the idea of cluster formation. The intra- and inter-cluster contributions to  $g(r)$  are identified, largely independent of  $\nu_e$ . The average cluster sizes are estimated; pairs and triplets of quasielectrons are suggested at  $\nu_e = 4/11$  and  $3/8$ , respectively.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Pm, 73.43.-f

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pan et al.<sup>1</sup> have recently observed the fractional quantum Hall (FQH) effect<sup>2,3</sup> in a spin-polarized two-dimensional electron gas (2DEG) at the  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$ ,  $\frac{3}{8}$ , and  $\frac{5}{13}$  fillings of the lowest Landau level (LL). In the composite fermion (CF) model,<sup>4,5</sup> these values correspond to the fractional fillings  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the second CF LL, respectively. In Haldane's hierarchy picture<sup>6</sup> of these states, Laughlin quasielectrons (QE's) fill (the same) fraction  $\nu$  of their LL. The most striking conclusion from Pan's discovery is that the CF's (or QE's) can also form incompressible states when partially filling a LL. This could not be predicted by a simple analogy with known fractional electron liquids (Laughlin,<sup>3</sup> Jain,<sup>4</sup> or Moore–Read<sup>7</sup> states), because of a different form of QE–QE interaction,<sup>8,9,10</sup> therefore yielding qualitatively different QE–QE correlations.

Although several numerical studies of interacting QE's have been reported<sup>10,11,12,13</sup> and ideas such as CF flavor-mixing,<sup>14</sup> QE pairing,<sup>15,16</sup> or stripes<sup>17</sup> were invoked, the correlations responsible for the FQHE at  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$  and  $\frac{3}{8}$  are not yet understood. It has not even been settled if these FQH states are isotropic, and the energies of liquid and solid phases were compared recently<sup>20</sup> (although the Laughlin form was arbitrarily assumed for the liquid).

Sometimes overlooked is a general connection<sup>18,19</sup> between the form of Haldane pseudopotential,<sup>21</sup> occurrence of Laughlin correlations, and the validity of CF transformation. Actually, the form of QE–QE interaction is known from independent calculations,<sup>8,9,10</sup> and Laughlin correlations among the QE's have been ruled out using both a general pseudopotential argument<sup>9</sup> and a direct analysis of many-QE wavefunctions.<sup>12</sup> In this paper we refer to the following well-established facts:

(i) The QE–QE Haldane pseudopotential<sup>21</sup> is known from exact diagonalization of the Coulomb interaction among electrons in the lowest LL.<sup>8,9,10</sup> Since there are no unchecked assumptions in such a calculation, it must be regarded a “numerical experiment.” Neither finite-size errors, lowest-LL restriction, finite 2DEG width, nor other details of realistic experimental systems affect the dominant feature of the pseudopotential which is the *lack of strong QE–QE repulsion at short range*.

(ii) The QE's *do not*<sup>9,12</sup> have Laughlin correlations at  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  corresponding to  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$ . The Moore–Read half-filled state *is not*<sup>12,22</sup> an adequate description of QE–QE correlations at  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$  corresponding to  $\nu_e = \frac{3}{8}$ .

(iii) A sequence of nondegenerate finite-size QE ground states with a gap, extrapolating to  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  has been found<sup>12</sup> on a sphere. Although spherical geometry is not adequate for studying crystal or other broken-symmetry phases, the identified states appear incompressible and have the lowest energy of all QE liquids (considerably below the Laughlin state).

To address the problem of correlations at  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$ ,  $\frac{3}{8}$ , and  $\frac{5}{13}$  we calculate pair-distribution functions  $g(r)$  in the incompressible liquid ground states of up to  $N = 14$  QE's. Their comparison with the (known) curves of the Laughlin and Moore–Read states implies a different nature of the QE correlations in these novel FQH states. It shows that their incompressibility cannot be explained by a simple analogy between the QE and electron liquids, and suggests that different wavefunctions need be proposed for the correlated CF's. Unfortunately, the calculated  $g(r)$  are of little help in a precise definition of these wavefunctions, even though some qualitative statements can be made about the QE correlations.

From our finite-size results we identify and analyze the size-independent features in  $g(r)$ : the  $\sim r^2$  behavior at short range and a shoulder at a medium range, and argue that they are consistent with the idea<sup>12</sup> of QE cluster formation. Short- and long-range contributions to  $g(r)$  are found, describing correlations between the QE's from the same or different clusters. Both intra- and inter-cluster QE–QE correlations depend rather weakly on  $\nu$ . The average size of the clusters is estimated; it seems that the QE's form pairs at  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and triplets at  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$ . A similar analysis of  $g(r)$  carried out for the Moore–Read state reveals a qualitatively different behavior.

## II. MODEL

### A. Haldane sphere

The numerical calculations have been carried out in Haldane's spherical geometry,<sup>6</sup> convenient for the exact

study of short-range correlations. In this model, the lowest LL for particles of charge  $q$  is a degenerate shell of angular momentum  $l = Q$ . Here  $2Q$  is the strength of Dirac monopole in the center of the sphere defined in the units of elementary flux  $\phi_0 = hc/q$  as  $2Q\phi_0 = 4\pi R^2 B$ , the total flux of the magnetic field  $B$  through the surface of radius  $R$ . Using the usual definition of the magnetic length,  $\lambda = \sqrt{\hbar c/qB}$ , this can be written as  $\lambda^2 = R^2$ . In the following,  $\lambda$  denotes the QE magnetic length corresponding to the fractional charge  $q = -e/3$ .

The relative ( $\mathcal{R}$ ) and total ( $L$ ) pair angular momenta are related via  $L = 2l - \mathcal{R}$ . For fermions,  $\mathcal{R}$  is an odd integer, and it increases with increasing average pair separation  $\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle}$ . The interaction (within the lowest LL) is entirely determined by Haldane pseudopotential defined as the pair interaction energy  $V$  as a function of  $\mathcal{R}$ .

### B. Exact diagonalization

Recently, we have identified<sup>12</sup> the series of finite-size spin-polarized states that in the thermodynamic limit describe the FQHE at  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$  and  $\frac{3}{8}$ . To do so, we have carried out extensive exact-diagonalization calculations for interacting QE's (particles in the second CF LL). On Haldane sphere,  $N$  fermionic QE's were confined in a standard way to an angular momentum shell of degeneracy  $\Gamma = 2l + 1$ , corresponding to the QE filling factor  $\nu \sim N/\Gamma$ , and the Haldane QE-QE pseudopotential  $V(\mathcal{R})$  was taken from earlier calculations.<sup>8,9,10</sup>

Regardless of the electron layer width  $w$ , magnetic field  $B$ , or other experimental parameters, the dominant feature of  $V(\mathcal{R})$  is strong repulsion at  $\mathcal{R} = 3$ . This feature alone determines the wavefunctions at  $\frac{1}{3} \leq \nu \leq \frac{1}{2}$  (with the QE-QE correlations consisting of maximum possible avoidance of Haldane pair amplitude  $\mathcal{G}$  at  $\mathcal{R} = 3$ ), which are hence virtually insensitive to the (sample-dependent) details of  $V(\mathcal{R})$ . This justifies model calculations using  $V(\mathcal{R})$  of Refs. 8,9,10. Actually, a model pseudopotential as simple as  $V = \delta_{\mathcal{R},3}$  is sufficient to reproduce correct correlations and incompressibility at  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$  or  $\frac{3}{8}$ .

## III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

### A. Energy spectra

The numerical results carried out for  $N \leq 14$  (two sample spectra are displayed in Fig. 1) showed<sup>12</sup> a sequence of nondegenerate (i.e., at the total angular momentum  $L = 0$ ) ground states at  $2l = N/\nu - \gamma$  with  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\gamma = 7$ . The significant and well-behaved (as a function of  $N$ ) excitation gap along this sequence strongly suggests that it represents the infinite  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$  FQH state observed in experiment.<sup>1</sup> The value  $\gamma \neq 3$  precludes Laughlin correlations among QE's in this state (earlier ruled out indirectly, based on the form of QE-QE pseudopotential<sup>9</sup>),




FIG. 1: Excitation energy spectra (energy  $E$  as a function of total angular momentum  $L$ ;  $E_0$  is the ground state energy) of  $N$  interacting QE's on a sphere, at the values of CF LL degeneracy  $\Gamma = 2l + 1$  corresponding to the incompressible ground states at the QE filling factors  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  (a) and  $\frac{1}{2}$  (b).

i.e., an idea that the  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$  state is simply a Haldane hierarchy state of Laughlin-correlated CF's. While the exact correlations in this (known only numerically for a few consecutive  $N$ ) ground state have not yet been defined, their vanishing degeneracy ( $L = 0$ ) implies that they describe a QE liquid, rather than a broken-symmetry state (such as liquid-crystal nematic states proposed<sup>23</sup> in the context of FQHE at different values of  $\nu$ ).

Another sequence was anticipated at  $2l = 2N - \gamma$  to represent the infinite  $\nu_e = \frac{3}{8}$  FQH state. However, the only ground state with a significant gap and remaining outside of the  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  sequence (or its particle-hole symmetric  $\nu = \frac{2}{3}$  sequence at  $2l = \frac{3}{2}N + 2$ ) occurs<sup>12</sup> for  $N = 14$  and  $2l = 25$  (and it also has  $L = 0$ ). These values of  $(N, 2l)$  happen to belong to a  $2l = 2N - 3$  series representing the Moore-Read (pfaffian) paired state, but the overlap between the two turns out nearly zero.<sup>12,22</sup> Moreover, the ground states for the two neighboring even (as appropriate for a hypothetically paired state) values of  $N = 12$  and  $16$  (and  $2l = 21$  and  $29$ ) have  $L > 0$  and no gap, the value of  $2l = 17$  for  $N = 10$  coincides with the  $\nu = \frac{2}{3}$  sequence (so that only for  $N > 8$  can the filling factor  $\nu$  be meaningfully assigned), and we are unable to compute the spectra for  $N \geq 18$ . Nevertheless, despite little evidence available from numerical diagonalization, the ground state for  $N = 14$  and  $2l = 25$  (and its particle-hole counterpart at  $N = 12$  and the same  $2l = 25$ ) may possibly represent the  $\nu_e = \frac{3}{8}$  FQH state (i.e., have similar correlations causing incompressibility).

### B. Pair-distribution functions

The QE-QE pair-distribution functions  $g(r)$  have been calculated for the incompressible many-QE ground states as expectation values of the appropriate pair interaction,

$$g(r) = (2/N)^2 \langle \delta(R\theta - r) \rangle. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\theta$  is the relative angle on a sphere, so that  $r$  measures interparticle distance along the surface (rather than




FIG. 2: QE–QE pair-distribution functions  $g(r)$  of the incompressible ground states at different QE filling factors  $\nu$ . (a) curves for  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and different QE numbers  $N$ ; (b) curves for QE’s at different  $\nu$  (thick lines) compared to some known incompressible states of electrons.

chord distance). More accurately,  $r$  is the distance between the centers of extended QE’s (note that in the calculation of many-QE wavefunctions, the system of QE’s is mapped onto the lowest LL of point charges interacting through an effective pseudopotential). The prefactor in Eq. (1) ensures proper normalization,  $g(\infty) \rightarrow 1$ . Denoting infinitesimal area by  $dS = 2\pi R^2 d(\cos\theta)$  or (in magnetic units) by  $ds = dS/2\pi\lambda^2$ , we get an equivalent normalization condition,

$$\int [1 - g(r)] ds = \frac{2l}{N} \rightarrow \nu^{-1} \quad (2)$$

in large systems. Since  $ds = l d(\cos\theta)$ , a “local filling factor” can also be defined as  $\nu(r) = dN/ds = (N/2l) g(r)$ , and it satisfies  $\nu(\infty) = \nu$  and  $\int \nu(r) ds = N - 1$ .

The results for the  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  sequence at  $2l = 3N - 7$  are shown in Fig. 2(a). Similarity of all four curves is evident, indicating size-independent form of correlations (hence, describing an infinite system), with a well-developed shoulder around  $r \approx 2.5\lambda$ . Similar shoulders occur in  $g(r)$  of all incompressible ground states at  $\nu = \frac{2}{3}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}$  (the  $\nu = \frac{2}{3}$  sequence at  $2l = \frac{3}{2}N + 2$  is obtained from  $2l = 3N - 7$  by replacing  $N$  with  $\Gamma - N$ , while at  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$  there are two particle–hole conjugate sequences at  $2l = 2N - 3$  and  $2N + 1$ , denoted by  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}^{\pm}$ ). The four curves representative of  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\frac{2}{3}$ , and  $\frac{1}{2}^{\pm}$  are shown in Fig. 2(b). They are all clearly different from those marked with thin lines and describing correlations known for other incompressible FQH states (full LL, Laughlin  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  state, or Moore–Read half-filled state). This is a direct indication of a different nature of QE–QE correlations responsible for the FQHE at  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$  and  $\frac{3}{8}$ .

Let us stress that although the QE–QE interactions are not known with great accuracy, the correlation functions in Fig. 2 are rather insensitive to the details of  $V(\mathcal{R})$ , as long as the dominant repulsion occurs at  $\mathcal{R} = 3$  (which seems to be universally true in the systems studied experimentally). This insensitivity is reminiscent of the Laughlin wavefunction, which also very accurately de-




FIG. 3: Gaussian deconvolution of the QE–QE pair distribution functions  $g(r)$ : dots – data of Fig. 2(b); lines – fits.

TABLE I: Gaussian deconvolution parameters for QE–QE pair-distribution functions shown in Figs. 2(b) and 3.

$\nu$	$A_0$	$\delta_0$	$\sigma_0$	$A_1$	$\delta_1$	$\sigma_1$	$A_2$	$\delta_2$	$\sigma_2$
1/3	1	0	1.0989	0.3450	3	0.9412	-0.1199	5.6905	1.0298
2/3	1	0	1.0419	0.1535	3	0.9361	-0.0530	5.6655	0.9987
1/2 <sup>+</sup>	1	0	1.0626	0.2034	3	0.9475	-0.0741	5.4041	1.1011
1/2 <sup>-</sup>	1	0	1.0896	0.2755	3	0.9431	-0.1005	5.4156	1.0903

scribes the actual  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  ground state for a wide class of electron–electron pseudopotentials. However, while the avoidance of  $\mathcal{R} = 1$  by the electrons in the lowest LL can be elegantly described by flux attachment in the CF picture, no similar model has been proposed yet for the avoidance of  $\mathcal{R} = 3$  by the QE’s. Therefore, knowing the  $g(r)$  curves of QE’s and understanding their correlations, we still cannot write their wavefunctions.

### C. Gaussian deconvolution

The curves of Fig. 2(b) can be accurately deconvoluted using Gaussians,  $G(r/\lambda) = A \exp[-(r/\lambda - \delta)^2/2\sigma^2]$ . This is shown in Fig. 3 where the symbols mark the exact data of Fig. 2(b) and the lines give the (nearly perfect) fits using three Gaussians,  $g = 1 - G_0 - G_1 - G_2$  (sufficient for  $r \leq 6\lambda$ ). The fitted values of  $[A_i, \delta_i, \sigma_i]$  for all four curves are listed in Tab. I. Note that  $A_0 = 1$ ,  $\delta_0 = 0$ , and  $\delta_1 = 3$  for all curves (the latter value being least obvious, but probably resulting from the avoidance of the same  $\mathcal{R}_3 = 3$  by the QE’s at all values of  $\nu$ ). The values of the  $G_2$  parameters are not very meaningful when the next term in the approximation ( $G_3$ ) is neglected. The clearest difference between the four curves is in  $A_1$ .

### D. Short/long-range deconvolution

It appears more physically meaningful to decompose  $g(r)$  into  $g_0 = 1 - \exp(-r^2/2\lambda^2)$  describing a full lowest




FIG. 4: (a) Ratio of QE–QE pair-distribution functions  $g(r)$  to  $g_0(r)$  of a full lowest LL for different incompressible QE ground states; (b) the “remainder”  $g_{\text{diff}}(r)$  defined by Eq. (3).

LL<sup>24</sup> and a (properly normalized) “remainder”  $g_{\text{diff}}$ ,

$$g(r) = \alpha g_0(r) + (1 - \alpha) g_{\text{diff}}(r). \quad (3)$$

For each  $g(r)$ , parameter  $\alpha$  is calculated as the limit of  $g/g_0$  at  $r \rightarrow 0$ . It is clear from Fig. 4(a) that  $g(r)$  is accurately approximated by  $\alpha g_0(r)$  within a finite area or a radius  $\sim \lambda$  for all four ground states of Fig. 2(b). The numerical values of  $\alpha$  are 0.772, 0.804, 0.856, and 0.899 for  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}^-$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}^+$ , and  $\frac{2}{3}$ , respectively. Evidently,  $\alpha$  is size-dependent (e.g., the pair of values for  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}^\pm$  must converge to the same thermodynamic limit).

The four curves  $g_{\text{diff}}(r)$  calculated from Eq. (3) are plotted in Fig. 4(b). Symbols and lines mark the exact data and the three-gaussian fits of Tab. I, respectively. We note that: (i) For the pairs of particle–hole conjugate states ( $N = 12, 18$  at  $2l = 29$  and  $N = 12, 14$  at  $2l = 25$ ), the  $g_{\text{diff}}(r)$  curves are *identical*. (ii) The curves obtained for  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  are very similar (and possibly identical in large systems); they all vanish at short range and have a minimum at  $r \approx 3\lambda$  and a maximum at  $r \approx 5.5\lambda$ .

## IV. DISCUSSION

### A. QE clustering

Some information about the form of QE–QE correlations can be easily deduced from the form of interaction pseudopotential  $V(\mathcal{R})$ , which is simply the interaction hamiltonian defined only for those pair states allowed in the lowest LL. In low-energy many-body states the particles generally tend to avoid pair eigenstates with high interaction energy, which means minimization of the corresponding Haldane pair amplitude  $\mathcal{G}$ . If repulsion  $V$  decreases sufficiently quickly<sup>18</sup> as a function of  $\mathcal{R}$  (the exact criterion being<sup>19</sup> that  $V$  decreases sublinearly as a function of  $\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle}$ ), the smallest value of  $\mathcal{R} = 1$  is avoided. This Laughlin type of correlation is elegantly described by attachment of  $2p = 2$  fluxes to each particle in the CF transformation. In a Laughlin-correlated state, each

particle avoids being close to any other particle (as much as possible at a given finite  $\nu$ ).

When short-range repulsion weakens ( $V$  at  $\mathcal{R} = 1$  decreases compared to  $V$  at  $\mathcal{R} \geq 3$ ), Laughlin correlations disappear and can be replaced by pairing or formation larger clusters. Pairs<sup>15,16</sup> or clustering<sup>12</sup> were suggested by several authors for the QE’s. This idea was justified by an observation that QE–QE pseudopotential nearly vanishes at  $\mathcal{R} = 1$  and is strongly repulsive at  $\mathcal{R} = 3$ , causing an increase of  $\mathcal{G}(1)$  and a simultaneous decrease of  $\mathcal{G}(3)$  compared to the Laughlin-correlated state.<sup>12</sup>

The assumption that QE’s form clusters naturally explains a shoulder in  $g(r)$ , and allows one to interpret  $g_0$  and  $g_{\text{diff}}$  as the intra- and inter-cluster QE–QE correlations, i.e. the short- and long-range contributions to  $g$ , corresponding to the QE pairs belonging to the same or different clusters, respectively. The vanishing of  $g_{\text{diff}}(r)$  at short-range reflects isolation of QE’s belonging to different clusters. The reason why  $g_{\text{diff}}$  is not positive definite is that intra-cluster correlations are accurately described by  $g_0$  only within a certain radius. In other words, the actual inter-cluster contribution to  $g$  is not *exactly* given by  $g_{\text{diff}}$  defined by Eq. (3). Nevertheless, the following two conclusions remain valid: (i) the intra- and inter-cluster QE–QE correlations are similar at  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\frac{2}{3}$ , with the respective correlation-hole radii  $\varrho_0 \sim \lambda$  and  $\varrho_1 \sim 4\lambda$ ; and (ii) the cluster size  $K$  depends on  $\nu$ .

Similar form of  $g(r)$  was found<sup>23</sup> for broken-symmetry Laughlin states, in which the shoulder results from angular averaging of an anisotropic function  $g(r, \phi) \sim r^2$  or  $r^6$ , depending on  $\phi$ . However, the present case of QE’s is different, because  $g(r)$  is isotropic (wavefunctions have  $L = 0$ ) and the shoulders result from *radial* averaging of inter- and intra-cluster correlations, (beginning as  $\sim r^2$  and a higher power of  $r$  at short range, respectively).

### B. Average cluster size

In a clustered state, the (average) cluster size  $K$  is connected to  $\alpha$ , and the form of  $g_{\text{diff}}$  depends on correlations between the clusters. The values of  $K$  at  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}$  can be estimated by comparison of the actual parameters  $\alpha$  with those predicted for the hypothetical states of  $N$  particles arranged into  $N/K$  independent  $K$ -clusters. By independence of the clusters we mean that inter-cluster correlations do not affect the local filling factor  $\nu(r)$  at short range. For a single cluster, which on a sphere is the  $K$ -particle state with the maximum total angular momentum  $L = Kl - \frac{1}{2}K(K - 1)$ , the  $\nu_K(r)$  depends on the surface curvature and thus (through  $R/\lambda = \sqrt{l}$ ) on  $2l$ .

We have calculated the prefactors  $\beta_K$  of the short-range approximation  $\nu_K(r) \approx \beta_K g_0(r)$  for different values of  $K$  and  $2l$  and listed some in Tab. II (note that  $\nu_2(r)$  is known exactly). These coefficients are to be compared with  $\beta = (N/2l)\alpha$  of the incompressible  $N$ -QE states obtained from diagonalization. Of course, this approach is somewhat questionable as one generally can-

TABLE II: Parameters  $\beta_K$  of the short-range approximation  $\nu(r) \sim \beta g_0(r)$  obtained for independent clusters of size  $K$ .

$2l$	$\beta_2$	$\beta_3$	$\beta_4$	$\beta_5$	$\beta_6$
25	0.2768	0.4196	0.5110	0.5765	0.6269
29	0.2730	0.4134	0.5029	0.5669	0.6159
60	0.2609	0.3938	0.4778	0.5372	0.5821
$\infty$	0.2500	0.3763	0.4555	0.5110	0.5527




FIG. 5: (a) Pair-distribution functions  $g(r)$  of lowest  $L = 0$  states of finite systems corresponding to  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ , for pseudopotentials of electrons in the first and second LL, and of CF's in the second LL. (b) The total  $g(r)$  and "remainder"  $g_{\text{diff}}(r)$  curves of the Moore-Read  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$  state; circles mark a fitting linear combination of the curves for Laughlin states.

not deduce the precise cluster size from the short-range behavior of  $g(r)$  for the following reasons: (i)  $K$  is not a well-defined (conserved) quantum number; (ii)  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  states occur for all  $N$  (not only those divisible by two or three) which means that all clusters cannot have the same  $K$ ; (iii) parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are size-dependent and their extrapolation to large systems is not very reliable based on limited number of  $N$ -QE systems we are able to diagonalize; (iv) inter-cluster exchange of QE's makes the "independent-cluster" picture only an approximation.

Fortunately, we can use the Moore-Read states (known to be paired<sup>7,22</sup>) as a test. Our calculation (for details see Sec. IV C) for  $N = 14$  and  $2l = 25$  gives  $\beta_{\text{MR}} = 0.336$ , somewhat larger than  $\beta_2$ . Hence, we shall assume that  $\beta_K$  in general underestimates the actual value of  $\beta$  in a many-body  $K$ -clustered state.

For the QE's, we got  $\beta = 0.319 \approx \beta_{\text{MR}}$  for  $N = 12$  and  $2l = 29$  ( $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$ ), and  $\beta = 0.479$  for  $N = 14$  and  $2l = 25$  ( $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$ ; directly comparable with the Moore-Read state). With appropriate reservation, we can hence risk a hypothesis that QE's (on the average) form pairs at  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and triplets at  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$  (possible triplet formation might turn out especially intriguing in the context of parafermion statistics<sup>25</sup>).

### C. Comparison with Moore-Read state

The evolution of  $g(r)$  when going from the lowest electron LL to the second CF LL (i.e., from  $\text{LL}_0$  to  $\text{CF-LL}_1$ ) is clear when using a model pseudopotential  $V_\zeta(\mathcal{R}) = \zeta \delta_{\mathcal{R},1} + (1 - \zeta) \delta_{\mathcal{R},3}$ . For  $\zeta \approx 0$  or 1, the correlations (avoidance of  $\mathcal{R} = 1$  or 3) are insensitive to  $\zeta$ , and both Laughlin and QE-QE correlations are accurately reproduced by  $V_0$  and  $V_1$ , respectively. Modeling correlations among electrons in  $\text{LL}_1$  (the second LL) is more difficult, because they are very sensitive to the exact form of  $V(\mathcal{R})$  at the corresponding  $\zeta \sim \frac{1}{2}$ . As a result, the  $N$ -electron Coulomb eigenstates in  $\text{LL}_1$  are more susceptible to finite-size errors than in  $\text{LL}_0$  or  $\text{CF-LL}_1$ . In large systems, a good trial state is only known at  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$  (Moore-Read state), and much less is established about the correlations at  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$ . Still, the  $g(r)$  curves for electrons in  $\text{LL}_1$  must certainly fall between the two extreme curves for  $\zeta = 0$  and 1 (and differ from both of them). This is shown in Fig. 5(a) for both  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

The exact Moore-Read wavefunctions were calculated on a sphere for  $N \leq 14$  and  $2l = 2N - 3 = 25$  by diagonalizing a short-range three-body repulsion.<sup>22</sup> In Fig. 5(a) we only plotted  $g(r)$  for  $N = 14$  because the  $N = 12$  curve is too close to be easily distinguished. The values of  $\alpha = 0.602$  and  $0.600$  for  $N = 12$  and  $14$ . The  $g_{\text{diff}}(r)$ , also shown, is positive definite, very different from the QE curves in Fig. 4(b), and rather close to  $g_1(r)$ , where  $g_p$  describes a Laughlin  $\nu = (2p + 1)^{-1}$  state. Assuming  $\alpha_{\text{MR}} = \frac{3}{5}$  and expanding  $g_{\text{diff}}$  into  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  in accordance with Eq. (2) one obtains an approximate formula

$$g_{\text{MR}}(r) \approx \frac{3}{5} g_0(r) + \frac{3}{10} g_1(r) + \frac{1}{10} g_2(r), \quad (4)$$

marked with the circles in Fig. 4(b) that appears to be quite accurate (the largest finite-size error is in  $g_2$  calculated for only  $N = 8$ , while  $g_1$  is for  $N = 12$ ).

The fact that  $g_{\text{diff}}$  is positive and rather featureless (similar to  $g_p$ ) for the Moore-Read wavefunction is in contrast with the result for QE's. This difference may indicate that the QE clusters cannot be understood as literally as Moore-Read pairs. Indeed, even the lack of correlation between the occurrence of  $L = 0$  ground states (or size of the excitation gap) and the divisibility of  $N$  by  $K = 2$  or 3 precludes such a simple picture. The fact that  $g_{\text{diff}}(r \sim 3\lambda) < 0$  could mean that the average relative (with respect to center of mass) angular momentum  $\mathcal{R}_K$  of the QE clusters is much larger than  $\mathcal{R}_K^{\text{min}} = \frac{1}{2}K(K - 1)$ . Certainly,  $\mathcal{R}_K$  is only conserved for an isolated cluster, but it is possible that the QE clusters are more relaxed due to cluster-cluster interaction than the Moore-Read pairs are. This would make  $g_0$  underestimate the radius of the actual intra-cluster QE-QE correlation hole, and explain the negative sign of  $g_{\text{diff}}$ .

## V. CONCLUSION

From exact numerical diagonalization on Haldane sphere, we obtained the energy spectra and wavefunctions of up to  $N = 14$  interacting Laughlin QE's (CF's in the second LL). We identified the series of finite-size liquid ground states with a gap, which extrapolate to the experimentally observed incompressible FQH states at  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$ ,  $\frac{3}{8}$ , and  $\frac{5}{13}$ . In these states, we calculated QE-QE pair-distribution functions  $g(r)$ , and showed that they increase as  $\sim r^2$  at short range and have a pronounced shoulder at a medium range. This behavior supports the idea of QE cluster formation, suggested earlier from the analysis of QE-QE interaction pseudopotential. The  $g(r)$  is decomposed into short- and long-range contributions, interpreted as correlations between the QE's from the same or different clusters. The intra-cluster contribution to  $g(r)$  is that of a full LL, and the remaining term identified with the inter-cluster QE-QE correlations appears to be the same in all three  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\frac{2}{3}$  states. The

(average) cluster size on the other hand does depend on  $\nu$ , and we present arguments which suggest that the QE's form pairs at  $\nu = \frac{1}{3}$  and triplets at  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$ .

The qualitative difference between the  $g(r)$  curves obtained here for correlated CF's and those known for the Laughlin and Moore-Read liquids of electrons are another indication that the origin of incompressibility at  $\nu_e = \frac{4}{11}$ ,  $\frac{3}{8}$ , and  $\frac{5}{13}$  is different. Of other hypotheses invoked in literature and mentioned here in the introduction, the broken-symmetry states cannot be excluded by our calculation in spherical geometry. However, we anticipate that the QE's form a liquid (studied in this paper) also in experimental samples, because of the whole series of isotropic ground states with a gap occurring in finite systems of different size.

The authors thank W. Pan, W. Bardyszewski, and L. Bryja for helpful discussions. This work was supported by Grant DE-FG 02-97ER45657 of the Materials Science Program – Basic Energy Sciences of the U.S. Dept. of Energy and Grant 2P03B02424 of the Polish KBN.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> W. Pan, H. L. Störmer, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. Baldwin, and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 016801 (2003); conjugate  $\nu = 7/11$  state was first observed by V.J. Goldman and M. Shayegan [Surface Sci. **229**, 10 (1990)].
- <sup>2</sup> D. C. Tsui, H. L. Störmer, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1559 (1982).
- <sup>3</sup> R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).
- <sup>4</sup> J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199 (1989).
- <sup>5</sup> A. Lopez and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 5246 (1991); B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 7312 (1993).
- <sup>6</sup> F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 605 (1983).
- <sup>7</sup> G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 362 (1991).
- <sup>8</sup> P. Sitko, S. N. Yi, K.-S. Yi, and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3396 (1996).
- <sup>9</sup> A. Wójs and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 2846 (2000).
- <sup>10</sup> S.-Y. Lee, V. W. Scarola, and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 256803 (2001); Phys. Rev. B **66**, 085336 (2002).
- <sup>11</sup> S. S. Mandal and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 155302 (2002).
- <sup>12</sup> A. Wójs, K.-S. Yi, and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 205322 (2004).
- <sup>13</sup> C.-C. Chang and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 196806 (2004).
- <sup>14</sup> M. R. Peterson and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 046402 (2004); J. H. Smet, Nature **422**, 391 (2003).
- <sup>15</sup> M. Flohr and K. Osterloh, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 235316 (2003).
- <sup>16</sup> A. Wójs, K.-S. Yi, and J. J. Quinn, Acta Phys. Pol. A **103**, 517 (2003); J. J. Quinn, A. Wójs, and K.-S. Yi, Phys. Lett. A **318**, 152 (2003).
- <sup>17</sup> N. Shibata and D. Yoshioka, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **72**, 664 (2003); J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73**, 1 (2004); J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73**, 2169 (2004).
- <sup>18</sup> F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 237 (1985).
- <sup>19</sup> A. Wójs and J. J. Quinn, Philos. Mag. B **80**, 1405 (2000); Acta Phys. Pol. A **96**, 593 (1999); J. J. Quinn and A. Wójs, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **12**, R265 (2000).
- <sup>20</sup> M. O. Goerbig, P. Lederer, and C. M. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 216802 (2004); Phys. Rev. B **69**, 155324 (2004).
- <sup>21</sup> F. D. M. Haldane, *The Quantum Hall Effect*, edited by R. E. Prange and S. M. Girvin, (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987), chapter 8, pp. 303–352.
- <sup>22</sup> A. Wójs and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 045324 (2005).
- <sup>23</sup> K. Musaelian and R. Joynt, J. Phys: Condens. Matter **8**, L105 (1996); O. Ciftja and C. Wexler, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 045306 (2002); Phys. Rev. B **65**, 205307 (2002).
- <sup>24</sup> B. Jancovici, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 386 (1981).
- <sup>25</sup> N. Read and E. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 8084 (1999).