Solitonic Excitations in Linearly Coherent Channels of Bilayer Quantum Hall Stripes

C.B.Doiron,¹, R.Côte,^{1, y} and H.A.Fertig²

¹D epartem ent de physique and RQMP, Universite de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, J1K 2R1

²Department of Physics, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

(Dated: December 18, 2021)

In some range of interlayer distances, the ground state of the two-dimensional electron gas at lling factor = 4N + 1 w ith N = 0;1;2; ... is a coherent stripe phase in the H artree-Fock approximation. This phase has one-dimensional coherent channels that support charged excitations in the form of pseudospin solitons. In this work, we compute the transport gap of the coherent striped phase due to the creation of soliton-antisoliton pairs using a supercell m icroscopic unrestricted H artree-Fock approach. We study this gap as a function of interlayer distance and tunneling am plitude. O ur calculations con rm that the soliton-antisoliton excitation energy is lower than the corresponding H artree-Fock electron-hole pair energy. We com pare our results with estimates of the transport gap obtained from a eld-theoretic model valid in the lim it of slow ly varying pseudospin textures.

PACS num bers: 73.43.-f, 73.21 Fg, 73.20.Qt

I. IN TRODUCTION

It is well known that the ground state of the twodimensional electron gas (2D EG) in single layer quantum H all systems near half-odd integer lling factors in Landau levels N 2 i.e. for = 9=2;11=2;::: is a striped state responsible for a strong anisotropy in the conductivity tensor of the 2D EG. This state was predicted on the basis of Hartree-Fock calculations¹ and has been extensively studied experimentally.²

W hen the interlayer distance, d, in a bilayer quantum Hallsystem at lling factor is large, one expects the system to behave as two isolated two-dimensional electron gases (2DEG) with lling factor =2. It is then natural to infer that the ground state of the 2DEG in a bilayer should be a striped state at = 4N + 1 at su ciently large interlayer distances. On the other hand, it is known that, at = 4N + 1 interlayer interactions can lead to a hom ogeneous ground state with spontaneous phase coherence between the layers when the interlayer distance is comparable with the separation between electrons in a single layer. One might then conjecture that, as the interlayer separation is decreased, the striped state acquires a certain degree of coherence due to the interlayer interaction. This conjecture was rst studied by Brey and Fertig³ who showed that, as d is increased from zero the bilayer ground state goes from a uniform coherent state (UCS) at sm all interlayer separations to a coherent striped phase (CSP) at d d_1 and then into a modulated striped state (or an isotropic W igner crystal) at d d_2 . The interlayer coherence is lost in the modulated stripe state. The range $[d_1; d_2]$ increases with N.⁴

The coherent striped phase shown in Fig. 1 is a state where charge density waves in the two layers are shifted by =2 where is the period of the stripes in one layer. The most interesting aspect of the CSP is that in the regions where the charge densities in both layers \overlap" (in the plane of the two-dimensional electron gas (2DEG)), the electrons are electively in a linear superposition of states of the form j i = (Ri + Ji) = 2 where R ;L indicates the right and left wells. The interlayer coherence is then m aintained but only along linearly coherent regions (LC R's) whose width decreases as d increases. The C SP is most easily represented in the pseudospin language where an up (down) pseudospin is associated with the right (left) well. The C SP is a pseudospin density wave where the pseudospins oscillates in the xz plane and the LC R's are the one-dimensional regions where the pseudospins lie along the x direction in the xy plane.



FIG.1: Guiding center density in the right (dark surface) and left (light surface) wells and pseudospin pattern in the coherent stripe phase. The arrow indicates one linearly coherent channel (LCR).

In a previous work⁵, we have computed the collective excitations of the CSP and showed that the low energy modes of this phase could be described by an elective pseudospin wave ham iltonian. We have also show n^6 that the application of a parallel magnetic eld gives rise

to a very rich phase diagram for the 2DEG involving commensurate-incommensurate transitions with distinctive signatures in the collective excitations and tunneling I V.A very exhaustive study of the phase diagram of the 2DEG in the presence of a parallelm agnetic eld, in higher Landau levels, has also been published by Daw-W eiW ang et al.^{7,8}.

The band structure of the CSP is shown in Fig. 2. In the Hartree-Fock approximation, the energy gap of this system corresponds to the excitation of an electronhole pair in a coherent channel (a pseudospin ip in the xy plane) and is nite if the tunneling parameter t 6 0: An estimate of this gap, taking into account som e quantum uctuations, has been done by E. Papa et al.⁹. However, Brey and Fertig³ pointed out that, in analogy with spin (pseudospin) skyrm ion excitation in single (double) layer quantum Hall systems at = 1, the lowest-energy charged excitation should be a pseudospin soliton (or antisoliton) in a coherent channel and the gap should be given by the energy required to create a soliton-antisoliton pair. A pseudospin soliton of charge q = e corresponds to a 2 rotation of the pseudospin in the xy plane. As for skym ions or bim erons, the size of these solitons is determ ined by a competition between tunneling energy (which favors sm all solitons) and interwell exchange energy and Coulomb interaction which favors slowly varying pseudospin textures (large solitons).

In this work, we compute the energy gap of the CSP due to the excitation of a soliton-antisoliton pair as a function of tunneling and interlayer distance. We use a supercell m icroscopic unrestricted Hartree-Fock approach to extract the energy of a single soliton from that of a crystal of solitons localized in the LCR's at lling factor = 4N + 1 +. Our calculation shows that a soliton-antisoliton pair has a lower energy than the electron-hole pair so that these topological excitations will be in portant in determ ining the transport properties of the CSP. For completeness, we also compute the energy gap of the CSP using a simple eld-theoretic model based on the sine-G ordon H am iltonian where an exact solution for the pseudospin soliton can be obtained. This model does not contain all the term sincluded in the microscopic approach, but, for slow ly varying pseudospin textures, it should give a fair estim ate of the energy gap. W e actually improve on this model by taking into account that the channels have a width that depends on the interlayer distance d and also by taking into account the interaction of the pseudospins in di erent channels and the C oulom b interaction between di erent portions of the topological charge densities.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we describe the phase diagram of the 2D EG in the bilayer system at lling factors = 4N + 1 and = 4N + 1 + and de ne the dom ain of existence of the soliton crystal from which we want to compute the soliton energy. In Sec. III, we introduce the simple eld-theoretic model and the exact solution for the pseudospin sine-G ordon solution. 2

Section IV discusses the supercell method that we use to extract the energy of a single soliton from that of a crystal of solitons. The rem oval of the soliton-soliton energy is discussed in Sec. V. Section VI discusses our num erical results. We conclude in Sec. VII. Details of the derivation of the microscopic expression for the parameters of the eld-theoretic model are given in the appendix.



FIG.2: Band structure of the coherent stripe phase. The greyed states represent led states at = 4N + 1. The Hartree-Fock gap is also indicated. It corresponds to the excitation of an electron-hole pair in one of the linearly coherent channels.

II. PHASE DIAGRAM OF THE 2DEG AROUND = 4N + 1

In this section, we review the phase diagram of the 2D EG at lling factor = 4N + 1 where the coherent striped state is found and at lling factors slightly above = 4N + 1 in order to nd the range of interlayer distances where a crystal of solitons localized in the LC R's is stable. We need the energy of this soliton lattice in order to compute the gap energy as we explained in the introduction. To establish the phase diagram, we compute the energy of di erent electronic phases in the H artree-Fock approximation in order to nd the one that minimizes the total energy at a given value of ;d; and t. The order parameters for the di erent phases are the expectation values of the density operator projected onto the Landau level N of the partially lled Landau level (the guiding center density), i.e.,

where i; j are layer indices and X; X⁰ are guiding center coordinates¹⁰. We make the usual approximation of assuming that the led levels are inert. We also neglect Landau levelm ixing and assume that the electron gas in the partially led revel is fully spin polarized. In a crystalphase, $\sum_{j=1}^{ij} (q)$ is non zero only for q = G where G

Hartree and Fock interactions

and

$$X_{i;j}(N;M;q) = \frac{[m in (M;N)]!}{[m ax (M;N)]!} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dy \frac{y^{2}}{2} e^{y^{2}=2} L_{m in (N;M)}^{N,M,j} \frac{y^{2}}{2} i;j \frac{y}{2} J_{0}(q'y); \quad (3)$$

 $H_{i;j}(N;M;q) = \frac{1}{q} \lim_{i;j} (q) e^{-q^2 \cdot t^2} L_N^0 - \frac{q^2 \cdot t^2}{2} L_M^0 - \frac{q^2 \cdot t^2}{2};$

where L_N^M (x) is a generalized Laguerre polynomial, J_0 (x) is the zeroth-order Bessel function of the rst kind and the form factor

the Hartree-Fock energy per electron at total lling factor = 4N + e can be written as

$$\frac{E}{N_{e}} = " \frac{e^{2}}{2} ;$$
 (5)

with

$$\mathbf{"} = \frac{2\mathbf{e} \prod_{\substack{n \in N \\ N}}^{n} \prod_{\substack{i \neq j \\ i \neq j \\ j \neq j \\ i \neq$$

In this last equation, N $_{e}$ is the total number of electrons in the 2D EG, e is the tunneling strength (in units of $e^{2} = ', w$ ith the dielectric constant of the host m aterial and '= $\frac{p}{\sim c=eB}$ the m agnetic length).

The last two terms in Eq. (6) give the interaction between electrons in the lled levels and between electrons in the lled levels and electrons in the partially lled level N. As we will show later, the lled levels contribute to the quasiparticle energies, but not to the charge gap.

The set of h_N^{ij} (G) i's corresponding to one particular electronic phase is found by solving the equation of motion for the one-particle G reen's function in the Hartree-Fock approximation. The method is described in detail in Ref. 10.

The band structure of the CSP contains two bands Ε (X), as shown in Fig. 2. At exactly = 4N + 1, the lowest-energy band is completely led and the system is gapped even in the absence of tunneling. In fact, in the uniform coherent state that occurs for values of d for which stripe ordering had not set in, the band structure consists of two straight lines separated by a gap $UCS = 20 + 2X_{R,L} (N; N; 0) e^2 = ' w ith$ UCS ! 2@asd! 1 : In the CSP, the energy bands are periodically modulated in space with the maxima (minim a) of the valence (conduction) band at the locations of the LCR's. At the Hartree-Fock level, the energy gap is the energy needed to excite an electron from a maximum of the valence band to a minimum of the conduction band. This excitation corresponds to a single spin ip localized in one LCR. The decrease in the HF gap in the CSP is due not som uch to the reduction of $X_{R;L}$ (N;N;0) with d as to the increase in intralayer correlations that increases the with of the modulations in E (X). As d increases, the charge m odulations get sharper up to the point where the stripes becom e square waves at very large d. Correspondingly, the width of the LCR's decreases with d since interwell coherence and charge m odulation compete with each other.

In analogy with the excitations of skym ions in single quantum well and bim erons in bilayer systems at = 1, B rey and Fertig³ noted that a lower-energy excitation could be achieved by exciting a pseudospin soliton in the LCR instead of a simple electron-hole pair. The pseudospin soliton corresponds to a 2 rotation of the pseudospin in one LCR. A slow ly varying pseudospin con guration like that in a soliton has lower exchange energy than a single pseudospin ip but the cost in tunneling energy is increased. As for skyrm ions or bim erons, an optim al size for the soliton is obtained at given values of ;d and t. The energy cost for this optim al soliton should be com pared with the H artree Fock electron-hole pair excitation to determ ine whether or not these topological excitations are energetically favorable.

In a quantum Hall system, the relation between the charge density of the solitons and their pseudospin texture (at e = 1) is given by the Pontryagian density¹¹

h (r)i =
$$\frac{1}{8 \text{ N}}$$
 "_{abc}S_a (r) "_{ij}@_iS_b (r) @_jS_c (r) ; (7)

where " $_{ij}$ and " $_{abc}$ are antisymmetric tensors and S (r) is a classical eld with unit modulus representing the pseudospins and h (r) i is the guiding-center density. If we write a general solution as

$$S_x(r) = \sin(r) \cos'(r);$$
 (8)

$$S_y(r) = \sin (r) \sin' (r);$$
 (9)

$$S_{z}(r) = \cos(r);$$
 (10)

then the induced density takes the simple form

$$(r) = \frac{1}{4 N} \sin (r) [r'(r) r(r)] b:$$
 (11)

In a LCR, the polar angle of the pseudospins = =2. If a soliton is present in this LCR, then ' (r) rotates by 2 along the channel (oriented in the y direction). As discussed below, this is a generalization of a soliton in the sine-G ordon m odel¹². We also have that, in the CSP, r (r) \notin 0 in the LCR's and so the solitons carry a charge by virtue of Eq. (11).

In the case where pseudospin solitons are the lowestenergy excitations of the CSP, we expect that the ground state at = 4N + e will be a crystal of solitons localized in the LCR's. Table I shows that the range of interlayer distances where the CSP is the system 's ground state at = 4N + 1 increases with the Landau level index. In this work, we choose to study the phase diagram in Landau evel N = 2.W e show in Fig. 3 the energy per electron for di erent electronic phases in N = 2 as a function of interlayer distances and for three values of the tunneling parameter e = 0; 0:01 and 0:06: The lling factor is = 92. The contribution from the led levels is not included in this calculation since it depends only on and is thus the same for all phases. At sm all interlayer distances, where the ground state at = 9 is a UCS, the ground state at = 92 is a one-component hexagonal W igner crystal (HW C). In this phase, a crystal of electrons of pseudospin $S_x = 1=2$ and lling e = 0.2 sits on top of a liquid of pseudospins $S_x = +1=2$ and lling 9:0. There is no pseudospin texture in that state and, in particular, no bim erons in contrast with the situation in the lowest Landau eve^{13} where the ground state is a crystal of bim erons. In fact, we nd that bim eron excitations are not relevant in N = 2 even in the lim it of vanishing \mathfrak{e} .

For interlayer distances where the CSP is found at = 9, the ground state of the 2DEG at = 92 is a centered crystal of pseudospin solitons localized in the LCR's. We note that there are many possible choices for the lattice structure of this crystal, since solitons may or may not be present in every LCR, depending on the commensuration of the lattice of solitons and the underlying stripe state, and it is likely that there are phase

Landau level	d1= `	d2= `	D = '
0	12	1.65	0.45
1	8.0	1.45	0.65
2	0.6	1.6	1.00

TABLE I: Critical interlayer distances $d_1 = `$ and $d_2 = `$ at $\mathfrak{E} = 0$ for the transition UCS-CSP and CSP-modulated striped state. The last column gives the range of interlayer distances $D = ` = d_2 = ` d_1 = `$ for which the CSP is the ground state in Landau levelN :

transitions am ong these di erent states as the lling factor is varied. For the choice of param eters in this study, the lowest energy state has solitons in every channel. We found however that a similar state with solitons in every second channel but with the same lling factor has very nearly the same energy. Figure 4 shows an exam ple of the charge distribution as well as the pseudospin texture associated with a centered rectangular soliton crystal. Since the focus of this study is on the energetics of single solitons, we will use only the structure illustrated in Fig. 4 for our quantitative analysis below.

At large interlayer distances, we not that the ground state of the 2DEG at = 92 is a superposition of two shifted triangular bubble crystals¹ with partial lling e = 0.6 in each well. Because e > 0.5 the bubbles are clusters of holes and not electrons. We not that the number of holes per bubble is M = 3 in agreement with previous H artree-Fock calculation in single quantum well system s¹⁴.

III. FIELD-THEORETIC MODEL

W e use two di erent approaches to com pute the energy gap due to the excitation of soliton-antisoliton pairs. The rst one is a eld-theoretic calculation valid in the lim it of slow ly varying pseudospin textures. It is explained in this section. The second one is a m icroscopic approach where the energy of one soliton is computed from that of a crystal of solitons by removing the soliton-soliton interaction. W e call this m ethod the supercell approach. In principle, this second m ethod is not restricted to sm all gradient of the pseudospin texture and includes term s neglected in the eld-theoretic model. W e expect it to be m ore accurate than the eld-theoretic approach.

In the eld-theoretic approach, we evaluate the energy to create a pseudospin soliton by making a longwavelength expansion of certain terms in the Hartree-Fock Ham iltonian. We follow the procedure developed in details in Ref. 11. To keep the discussion as brief as possible, we give here only the main results of this model. Full details are provided in the appendix.

There are three main contributions to the energy needed to create a pseudospin texture in a LCR. Since in the ground state the in-plane pseudospin component in a LCR is fully polarized along S_x, adding a pseudospin



FIG. 3: Hartree Fock ground state energy per electron as a function of interlayer distances at lling factor = 92 and for (a) $\mathfrak{E} = 0$; (b) $\mathfrak{E} = 0.01$; (c) $\mathfrak{E} = 0.06$. The vertical lines indicate the position of the phase transitions.



FIG.4: Representation of the soliton crystal at $d= 12, \ell=0.01$ and =9.1 The distance between two solitons in a channelisa: (a) Guiding-center densities $_{RR}$ (x;y); $_{LL}$ (x;y) and (x;y) = $_{RR}$ (x;y) + $_{LL}$ (x;y) at y = 0; (b) pseudospin texture showing the solitons localized in the channels.

texture has a tunnel energy cost when t \notin 0 because of the interaction of the texture with the other channels. A second contribution comes from the interlayer exchange interaction which is responsible for the pseudospin sti – ness _s. As we mentioned above, the exchange interaction favors pseudospin textures that vary slow ly in space. A third contribution must be considered in our model in order to get agreem ent with the microscopic approach. It is the C oulom b interaction between di erent portions of the soliton in a channel. This interaction favors large solitons.

If the coherent channels are oriented along y and are considered as e ectively one-dimensional, then the energy cost to make a pseudospin texture on top of the ground state where all pseudospins point in the x direction in each channel is

$$E = \frac{Z}{dy} \frac{1}{2} s \frac{\theta'(y)}{\theta y}^{2} T [\cos'(y) 1] : (12)$$

where '(y) in the azim uthal angle of the pseudospins. Eq. (12) is valid if we ignore the third contribution mentionned above. The param eters $_{\rm s}$ and T are the elective sti ness and tunneling param eters. These param eters depend on the precise shape of the LCR 's as well as on the interaction between pseudospins of dilerent channels. In the appendix, we derive a microscopic expression for each of these param eters in term s of the order param eters of the CSP.W e show that the elective sti ness is given by

$$s = \frac{1}{16^{2} \cdot 2} \quad \frac{e^{2}}{2} \quad \frac{dq_{x} j (q_{x})^{2}}{2} \quad \frac{d^{2}X_{R;L} (N;N;q)}{dq_{y}^{2}} \quad \frac{dq_{x} j (q_{x})^{2}}{(13)}$$

7

where

$$(q_{x}) = \int_{G_{x}}^{X} h_{N}^{x} (G_{x}) i \frac{\sin [(G_{x} - q_{x}) = 4]}{(G_{x} - q_{x}) = 4}; \quad (14)$$

is a form factor that takes into account the shape of the channel centered at x = 0. A lso, is the interstripe distance in the $C \operatorname{SP}_{DD}G_x = 2 \operatorname{n}_{\overline{E} \, i} w$ ith n = 0; 1; 2; ... and $h_N^x (G_x)i = \operatorname{Re}_N^{R,L} (G_x)$: If we denote the parameter $\mathfrak{S}_x = 4 \operatorname{n} =$ and

$$J_{?}(q) = X_{R;L}(N;N;q);$$
 (15)

then the parameter T can be written as

$$T = \frac{1}{2^{2}} \frac{e^{2}}{2} \frac{4}{2} (q_{x} = 0) \frac{1}{2} \frac{X}{g_{x}} J_{2} (g_{x}; 0 j (g_{x}))^{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{L_{x}} \frac{X}{g_{x}} J_{2} (q_{x}; 0) j (q_{x}))^{2} :$$
(16)

The second and third terms in Eq. (16) come from the fact that, because of the pseudospin sti ness, there is an energy cost to rotate the pseudospins in one channel when the pseudospins in the other channels remain xed in their ground state position. The contribution of these two terms increases the elective tunneling strength T. Since the energy cost to create a pseudospin soliton is given by $E_s = 8^{T} \sqrt{sT}$ we see that this second term keeps E_s nite even when $\mathfrak{E} = 0$.

In this eld-theoretic model, the energy to create an antisoliton is the sam e as that needed to create a soliton and the charge gap is simply given by

=
$$16^{p}$$
 ______sT: (17)

From the energy functional of Eq. (12), we get that the static solution that m in in izes the energy m ust satisfy the sine-G ordon equation

$$\frac{\theta^2 \prime'(\mathbf{y})}{\theta \mathbf{y}^2} = \frac{T}{s} \sin \prime'(\mathbf{y}):$$
(18)

The sine-Gordon (or kink) soliton is a solution of this equation. It is given by

' (y) = 4 tan ¹ e
$$\frac{T}{s}$$
 (19)

The length of the soliton can be de ned as

$$L_{s} = \frac{s}{T} :$$
 (20)

W ith the energy functional of Eq. (12), we nd num erically that both $_{\rm s}$ and T decrease rapidly with d but the size of the soliton ${\rm L}_{\rm s}$ decreases with increasing d. This behavior is opposite to what we obtain in the microscopic calculation where the soliton size increases with d. A swe m entionned above, it is necessary to include the C oulom b interaction between di erent part of the solitons in order to get the soliton size to increase with d. This leads to the term (full details are given in the appendix)

$$E_{C \text{ oul}} = \frac{2}{32^{2}} \frac{Z}{dy} \frac{Z}{dy^{0}} \frac{d'(y)}{dy} V_{e} \quad (y \quad y^{0}) \frac{d'(y^{0})}{dy^{0}}$$
(21)

Inclusion of this term in in the energy functional introduces a nonlocal non-linear term in the di erential equation for the soliton and the resulting equation is very difcult to solve. Following S.G hosh and R.Rajaram an¹⁵ who use a similar procedure in their calculation of the energy of CP³ skyrmions in bilayers, we make the following approximation. We insert a pseudospin texture ' (y) = 4 tan ¹ e ^{y=L_s} into the total energy functional including the C oulom b integral and evaluate is as a function of L_s. We then minimize the total energy with re-

spect to the length L_s to obtain the energy and length of the soliton. In this way, we nd a soliton length that increases with d as in the microscopic approach. The procedure is described in details in the appendix.

IV. THE SUPERCELL M ICROSCOPIC HARTREE-FOCK METHOD

Let $"_{CSP}$ be the energy per electron in the CSP at = 4N + 1 and magnetic eld B_0 in units of $e^2 = 1_0$. If the num ber of electrons is kept constant and the magnetic eld is decreased (to B_1) or increased (to B_2) such that the lling factor becomes = 4N e, then a nite density $n_{qp} = je$ 1j=2 $\frac{v_{1,2}^2}{1}$ of quasiparticles (solitons for e > 1and antisolitons for e < 1) are created in the CSP.At zero tem perature, we expect these quasiparticles to crystallize and to be localized in the LCR's of the CSP. In the lim it where only one quasiparticle is created (e! 1), we can de ne the quasiparticle energy as

$$E_{qp} = \lim_{N_{qp}!} \frac{1}{je} \frac{1}{j} = \frac{e^2}{1j} = \frac{e^2}{1j} = \frac{e^2}{1j} = \frac{e^2}{1j} = \frac{e^2}{1j} = \frac{e^2}{1j} = \frac{1}{2}$$
(22)

where $"_{SC}$ is the energy per electron in the soliton crystal (SC) in units of e² = 'with N $_{\rm qp}$ solitons and E $_{\rm qp}^+$ E $_{\rm qp}$ is the energy to create one soliton (antisoliton).

The quasiparticle energy de ned in this way, with the number of electrons kept constant, is refered to as the \proper" quasiparticle energy by M orf and Halperin¹⁶. O ther de nitions are also possible. For example, the \gross" quasiparticle energies (or chem icalpotentials) are de ned by

=
$$E (N_e = N + 1) E (N_e = N);$$
 (23)

=
$$E(N_e = N)$$
 $E(N_e = N 1)$; (24)

where N is the degeneracy of the Landau levels at a magnetic eld B_0 such that = 4N + 1: The energy E (N % M) is the total energy of the CSP, and E (N % M1) is the total energy of the CSP with one more (less) particle in the form of a soliton (antisoliton). In this case, the magnetic eld is kept constant while the number of particles changes. At zero tem perature, this is precisely the de nition of the chem ical potentials at lling factors slightly above or below = 4N + 1:

The di erent de nitions of the the quasiparticle energies lead to di erent num erical values. As discussed by M acD onald and G irvin¹⁷, how ever, the num erical value of the gap, ; is the same for both de nitions so that we can w rite

> $= E_{ap}^{+} + E_{ap}$: (25)

W ith the form alism described in Sec. II, we can easily com pute the Hartree-Fock energy of a crystal of solitons located in the coherent channels of the bilayer. That is, we can compute $"_{SC}$, nd E_{qp} and then the energy gap. However, there are several di culties with this method

would require in nite matrices in the equation of motion for the single-particle G reen's function. In this work, we have succeeded in computing "sc at lling as small as e = 1 0:02: The second di culty is that, when a nite density of quasiparticles is present, "sc includes the interaction energy between quasiparticles. This interaction energy must be computed and removed from " $_{\rm SC}$: A third di culty is related to the size of the solitons (antisolitons). In Sec. III, we saw that the soliton size becomes very large when the tunneling energy e! 0 or when d is large. In this case the size of the soliton is not given by Eq. (20) but is lim ited by the lattice constant of the soliton crystal. The quasiparticle energy, then, cannot be computed reliably when the tunneling term is too sm all or the interlayer distance too big.

We now describe in more details our evaluation of E m: To avoid computing num erically the energy of the antisoliton crystalas wellas that of the soliton crystal, we use the particle-hole symmetry of the Hamiltonian around = 4N + 1 to relate the energies of the two crystals with the same lling of quasiparticles. We de ne state 0 as the CSP at = 4N + 1, state 1 as the soliton crystal at $_1 = 4N + e_1$ and state 2 as the crystal of antisolitons at $_2 = 4N + e_2$. The lling factors $e_2 = 2 e_1$ so that the lattice constants a1 and a2 of the two crystals are related by $1=a_1 = 2=a_2$. The Hartree-Fock energy per electron of the three states are given by Eq. (6) which we rewrite here as

$$\frac{E_{m}}{N_{e}} = \frac{e_{m}}{m} \, "_{m} \, (e_{m}) + \frac{1}{m} \, (e_{m}) \, \frac{e^{2}}{m} \, : \quad (26)$$

W e have de ned

$$"_{m} (e_{m}) = \frac{2e}{e_{m}} Reh_{N}^{R;L} (0) i_{m}$$
(27)
$$+ \frac{1}{2e_{m}} X X D E D E
 H_{i;j} (N;N;G)_{N}^{i;i} (G)_{m}^{j;j} (G)_{m}$$
(27)
$$\frac{1}{2e_{m}} X X_{i;j} (N;N;G)_{N}^{i;j} (G)_{N}^{j;j} (G)_{m}^{j;j} (G)_{m}^{j;i} (G)_{m}^$$

which is the energy per electron in the partially led level. The last term in Eq. (26) is the interaction energy with the lled level with

$$(e_1) = 2_1 2e_1;$$
 (28)

where

$$A_{1} = \frac{X X}{n \leq N n^{0} \leq N} X_{R;R} (n; n^{0}; 0);$$
(29)

$$Z_{2} = \sum_{n < N}^{X} X_{i;i} (n; N; 0) :$$
(30)

From Eqs. (23) and (24), it is easy to see that the cyclotron and Zeem an energies do not contribute to the transport gap and so can be ignored in Eq. (26). This is also true of the led levels since their contribution to the quasiparticle energies are given by

$$E_{qp f:l:}^{+} = \lim_{N_{qp}!} \frac{1}{1 \frac{j}{je_{1}}} \frac{1}{1j} \frac{e^{2}}{1} \frac{1}{1} (e_{1}) \quad (31)$$

$$= \lim_{N_{qp}!} \frac{1}{1 \frac{j}{je_{1}}} \frac{1}{1j4N + 1} (1) \frac{e^{2}}{1}$$

$$= \frac{e^{2}}{1} \frac{1}{2} (2 + 3) (1) \frac{e^{2}}{1} (1) \frac{e^{$$

and

$$E_{qp f:l:} = \lim_{N qp ! 1} \frac{2}{je_2} \frac{e^2}{1j} \frac{1}{2} (e_2)$$
(32)
$$\frac{e^2}{0} \lim_{N qp ! 1} \frac{2}{je_2} \frac{1}{1j4N + 1} (1)$$
$$= \frac{e^2}{0} \frac{1}{2} (e_2) + 3 (1)$$

so that $E_{qp f:l:}^{+} + E_{qp f:l:}^{-} = 0$: In deriving these two equations, we have used

$$\frac{e^2}{r_1} = \frac{e^2}{r_0} \frac{r_1}{r_1} = \frac{e^2}{r_1} (33)$$

From the electron-hole symmetry, we get

$$\mathbf{"}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{e}_1}{2 \ \mathbf{e}_1} \quad \mathbf{"}_1 + \frac{\mathbf{e}_1 \ 1}{\mathbf{e}_1} \quad X \ (0) \ ; \qquad (34)$$

where

$$X (0) = X_{R;R} (N;N;0)$$
: (35)

Note that Eq. (34) is exact only in the limit where N $_{\rm qp}$! 1 because the inter-well Hartree and Fock interactions contained in "_m depend on the ratio d=' and we have d='_1 f d='_2.

Combining all results, we have for the energy gap

$$= \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{e_1} e_1 \frac{r}{0} + \frac{r}{0} \frac{1}{2} u_1 \frac{e^2}{0} (36) + \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{0} \frac{r}{0} \frac{1}{2} (0) 2 e_{CSP} \frac{e^2}{0} ; (37)$$

where we have de ned

$$"_{CSP} = \frac{1}{4N + 1} \mathbf{E}_{CSP} :$$
 (38)

Simplifying, we get nally

$$= \lim_{! 0} 2 \frac{e_1}{!} \mathbf{u}_1 \frac{2}{!} \mathbf{e}_{CSP} + X (0) \frac{e^2}{!} : (39)$$

W e rem ark that the change in the m agnetic length 'due to the change in the m agnetic eld m akes no contribution to the energy gap. W e could have ignored it in Eq. (26). In fact, the gap de ned using Eq. (22) and taking $e^2 = i_1 = e^2 = i_0$ is the so-called neutral energy gap¹⁷ and it is equal to the other two gaps that we introduced in this section.

Eq. (39) can also be written as

$$= 2E _{qp}^{+} + [2"_{CSP} + X (0)] \frac{e^2}{'_0} : \qquad (40)$$

In the lowest Landau level, the energy gap at = 1 is due to the excitation of a bim eron-antibim eron pair and the energy per electron_{ii} in the UCS is $"_{UCS}(d) = e \frac{1}{4} X(0) + xe_d(0)$ where $xe(0) = X_{R,L}(N;N;0)$. Eq. (40) can then be written, for this special case, as

$$= 2E_{qp}^{+} + 2["_{UCS}(d) = 0; t = 0] = \frac{e^2}{0};$$
(41)

which is just the form we used in Ref. 13.

V. INTERACTION BETW EEN QUASIPARTICLES

W ith the simpli cations introduced in the preceding section, the energy $"_{SC}$ that enters Eq. (22) and Eq. (39) is given by

$$"_{SC} = \frac{2e}{e} \operatorname{Re} h^{R;L}(0)i \qquad (42)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2e} \underset{i;j \in G}{\overset{i;j \in G}{=} 0} H_{i;j}(G) \overset{i;i}{=} (G) \overset{j;j}{=} (G)$$

$$\frac{1}{2e} \underset{i;j \in G}{\overset{X \times X}{=} } X_{i;j}(G) \overset{i;j}{=} (G) \overset{j;i}{=} (G) ;$$

where, to simplify the notation, we have left in plicit the index N of the Landau level. The soliton crystal is a superposition of a CSP with order parameters i_{j} (G) (computed at = 4N + 1) and a pure soliton crystal (PSC) with order parameters i_{j} (G) such that

i;j (G) = i;j (G) + i;j (G) : (43)

If we insert this decomposition into Eq. (42), we nd

$$"_{SC} = "_{CSP} (e) + "_{CSP PSC} + "_{PSC};$$
 (44)

where

+

$$"_{C SP} (e) = \frac{2e}{e} \operatorname{Re} h^{R;L} (0)i \qquad (45)$$

$$\frac{1}{2e} X X \\
 \frac{1}{2e} A^{K,T} (G) i;j (G) i;j (G) \\
 \frac{1}{2e} X X \\
 \frac{1}{2e} A^{K,T} (G) i;j (G) i;j (G) i;j (G) i;j (G)$$

is the energy per electron of the CSP (i.e. $"_{CSP}$ (e) = $\frac{1}{e} \mathbf{e}_{CSP}$),

$$\mathbf{u}_{PSC} = \frac{2\mathbf{e}}{\mathbf{e}} \operatorname{Re} h^{R;L}(0)\mathbf{i} \qquad (46)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\mathbf{e}} \overset{X \ X}{\underset{i;j \ G \ 0}{\text{i}}} H_{i;j}(G) \overset{i;i}{\underset{j \ i'j \ G \ 0}{\text{i}}} (G) \overset{j;j}{\underset{i;j \ G \ 0}{\text{i}}} (G)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\mathbf{e}} \overset{X \ X}{\underset{i;j \ G \ 0}{\text{i}}} X_{i;j}(G) \overset{i;j}{\underset{j \ i'j \ G \ 0}{\text{i}}} (G) \overset{j;i}{\underset{i;j \ G \ 0}{\text{i}}} (G)$$

is the energy per electron of the PSC and

is the interaction energy (per electron) between the CSP and the PSC .

The contribution " $_{\rm PSC}$ causes problem because it contains not only the energy to create the N $_{\rm qp}$ solitons but also the interaction energy between the solitons. ! This interaction energy goes away in the limit 0. As we said, however, we cannot go to arbitrarily sm all num erically because solving the equation of motion for the single-particle G reen's function then involves diagonalizing very large matrices. W e must then nd a way to remove the interaction energy in $"_{PSC}$. Two methods can be used. The rst one is to replace $"_{\texttt{PSC}}$ by $"_{\texttt{PSC}}$ "int where "int is the M adelung energy of the crystal of charged quasiparticles, assum ing the quasiparticles to be point particles¹³. We refer to this method as the M adelung" method. In the ! 0, the quasiparticles are very far apart lim it. and, if they have an isotropic charge distribution, it is a reasonable approximation. In the second method, which we refer to as the \form factor" method, we completely replace $"_{PSC}$ ^{i;j} (G) by the energy

 $N_{qp} "_{PSC} \frac{i_{j}j}{qp}(q)$ where "_{PSC} $\frac{i_{j}j}{qp}(q)$ is the energy per electron of a \crystal" of only one quasiparticle. In the case of solitons, which are quite extended and highly anisotropic objects it is necessary to use this second approach.

To evaluate $"_{PSC} \xrightarrow{i;j}_{qp} (q)$, we make use of the fact that, when the quasiparticles are very far apart (lim it e ! 1) so that there is no overlap of the density or spin texture due to di erent quasiparticles, then we may think of the order param eters in real space as given by

$$h_{i;j}(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{array}{c} X \\ h_{i;j}(\mathbf{r} \ R); \end{array}$$
(48)

where R is a lattice site. W e know that

$$i_{rj}(r) = \frac{1}{V} \bigvee_{G}^{X} (G) e^{iG};$$
 (49)

but it is not possible to get $h_{i;j}$ (r) from this equation. W e must make an approximation. Since we work in the low-density lim it for the quasiparticles, it is a good approximation to assume that for a \crystal" of one quasiparticle

where $v_{\rm c}$ is the volum e of the unit cell centered at r= 0: Fourier transforming Eq. (50), we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & & & & & & \\ {}^{i;j}(q)_{qp} & = & dr e^{iq \ r \ i;j}(r)_{qp} & & (51) \\ & & & & & \\ & & & &$$

where the form factor

$$(q \quad G) = \frac{1}{v_c} \int_{v_c}^{Z} dr e^{iq} \tilde{e}^{iG} \tilde{f}$$
(52)

depends on the shape of the unit cell of the soliton crystal.

It now remains to compute the Hartree-Fock energy corresponding to the density and pseudospin textures given by the h_{i;j} (q) i_{qp} 's. The energy is still given by an pequation similar to Eq. (46) where the summation $\frac{1}{2e}$ _G is now replaced by $\frac{1}{2e}$ _q. To go from the sum to the integral, we use

$$\frac{1}{2e} \int_{q}^{X} (:::) ! \frac{S}{2e} \left[\frac{dq}{(2)^{2}} (:::) \right]$$
(53)
$$! \frac{2 N^{e}_{e}}{2e^{2}} \left[\frac{dq}{(2)^{2}} (:::) : \right]$$

Aso, because i;j (0) 1=N, we introduce a new eld i;j (q) by the de nition

$$j^{j}(q) = N, \quad ij_{j}(q) = 0$$
 (54)

W ith this last de nition, we have

$$= \frac{N_{qp} \prod_{PSC} X_{qp}^{ij}(q)}{e} (55)$$

$$= \frac{X_{qp}^{X} Z_{qp}^{2}}{e} \frac{\frac{dq^{2}}{(2)^{2}} H_{i;j}(q)}{\frac{dq^{2}}{(2)^{2}} X_{i;j}(q)} (q)^{i;j}(q)^{j;j}(q)$$

As a test of our \form factor" method, we have com puted the energy gap due to the creation of bin eronantibin eron pairs at = 1 in the lowest Landau level N = 0: Figure 5 shows the energy gap computed from a triangular lattice of bin erons at = 1:02 and e = 0.0025: In this case, the M adelung and form factor methods give identical results at sm all interlayer distances while the M adelung m ethod slightly overestim ates the energy gap at higher distances. The di erence between the two approches at large d is due to the fact that the charge density pro le of the bim eron becom es m ore and m ore anisotropic as d increases. A lso, the C oulom b interaction is stronger between point particles than between extended particles so that the M adelung approach overestim ates the gap energy.



FIG. 5: The energy gap due to the excitation of a bin eronantibin eron pair = 1 computed using the form factor or the M adelung method and compared with the Hartree-Fock energy gap to the excitation of an electron-hole pair.

To check the convergence of the supercell approach as the lattice constant gets very large, we show in Fig. 6 the energy gap of the UCS at $= 1 \mod \text{puted}$ at dierent values of from a crystal of bim erons. The dierent curves in this gure are for di erent values of the tunneling strength. The real gap of the system is, of course, de ned for ! 1:W e see that the gap converges m ore rapidly to its ! 1 value when the tunneling is stronger. This is understandable since the size of a bim eron decreases when € increases and, for su ciently strong €, this size is independent of the lattice constant even at relatively high . For sm aller € the gap converges to its ! 1 value, but only at lower lling . In the application of the supercell technique to the soliton gap in the next section, we will use the form factor method to rem ove the interaction energy. As we have just shown, this method is more appropriate in the case where the quasiparticle is highly anisotropic in shape.



FIG.6: Energy gap of the UCS at $= 1 \mod puted$ by the supercell approach using the form factor m ethod. The di erent curves are for di erent values of the tunneling strength e:

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We now discuss our numerical results for the energy gap of the CSP. Our calculations are done in Landau level N = 2 around = 9 using the form factor method. Figures 7 (a)-(c) contain our main results. Dierents gaps are plotted as a function of the interlayer distance for tunnelings (a) e = 0.007; (b) e = 0.01; and (c) e = 0.02. The lled line is u_{CS} ; the energy needed to create an ordinary electron-hole pair from the coherent liquid state at = 9:At = 9, the liquid state is unstable for $d > d_1$ where the coherent striped state is the ground state. The Hartree-Fock gap represented by the curve with the lled squares is given by the energy to create an electron-hole pair in a coherent channel (see Fig. 2 where this gap is de ned). The other curves give the energy gap calculated in the supercell method for dierent lling factors

and the energy gap calculated with the eld-theoretic approach explained in the appendix.

From Fig. 7, it is clear that, in the CSP, the energy needed to create a soliton-antisoliton pair is sm aller than that needed to create an electron-hole pair for typical experimental values of the tunneling parameter \mathfrak{E} . The transport gap is thus determined by the creation of these topological excitations (as it was the case for skyrmions in quantum H all ferrom agnet at = 1 or with bin erons in bilayer quantum H all systems).¹³ Figures 7 (a)-(c) show a rapid decrease of the energy gap near the transition between the coherent liquid and the CSP that should be observable experimentally. The curves corresponding to di erent lling factors show that the convergence of the supercell m ethod is quite good near the liquid-CSP



FIG.7: D i erent energy gaps in the UCS and CSP calculated as a function of the interlayer distance d= and for di erent values of the tunneling parameter. For the supercell method, the gap is evaluated at di erent lling factors to show the convergence of the results to the true gap at = 9. The gradient approximation refers to the eld-theoretic method.

transition but slow at larger values of interlayer distances. This slow convergence is due to the fact that the size of the soliton increases with interlayer distance as shown in Fig. 8 and the shape of the soliton is then restricted by the lattice constant as we explained previously. As d= ' increases, it becom es necessary to go to low er lling factors to achieve convergence, som ething we cannot do num erically. In any case, the soliton gap is always lower than the Hartree-Fock gap at higher values of d=' since our approach overestim ates the energy gap. Increasing € decreases the size of the solitons, however, so that it is possible to achieve better convergence by increasing the value of the tunneling parameter **€**. This is seen by comparing Fig. 7 (a), (b) and (c). Notice also that, for sm aller solitons, the soliton gap is closer to the Hartree-Fock result, as expected.



FIG.8: Soliton size calculated with the supercell (lled symbols) and eld-theoretic (empty symbols) methods as a function of the interlayer distance at = 9:02: In the supercell approach the size of the soliton is found by thing they dependent dence of the phase in a channel with ' (y) = 4 tan ¹ e $y^{y=L_s}$:

We also show in Fig. 7 the gap calculated with the eld-theoretic m ethod (see Eq. (17)). This gap has the same qualitative behavior with interlayer distance, except at small d near the phase transition. It is larger than the gap calculated in the m icroscopic approach. As we explain in the appendix, the eld-theoretic result is incorrect at smalld or large \mathfrak{e} (g. 7 (c)) where the stripes are not fully developped. At large d, we cannot say how di erent the two gaps (m acroscopic and eld-theoretic) are because the gap found in the m icroscopic approach has not yet converged at the lowest lling factor we can achieve.

In the eld-theoretic method, the soliton size, L_s ; is obtained by the procedure outlined in Sec. III . When

the Coulomb interaction between parts of the soliton is properly included, we nd num erically that L increases with d as in the supercell calculation. Both approaches give the sam e trend for the soliton length. The detailed behaviour with d=' is quite di erent, how ever. Cearly, the eld-theoretic calculation does not capture all the subtleties of the W e recall that, as the interlayer distance increases, the width of the LCR's becomes smaller. The behavior of the soliton size may be understood as arising from the Coulom b energy, which favors spreading the charge of the soliton. Our results are plotted in Fig. 8. In this gure, we see that the supercelland eld-theoretic results do not m atch for large E. This is again due to the fact that the stripes are not fully form ed at large @ so that the expression of Eq. (A.32) for the topological charge is not correct. As expected, Fig. 8 shows that the soliton size decreases with €.

We have neglected quantum uctuations in our calculation. These uctuations increases in importance as d= ' increases. They renorm alize the pseudospin sti ness and will probably also change the size of the solitons and the quantitative values of the energy gaps. Inclusion of these uctuations is, how ever, beyond the scope of this paper.

VII. CONCLUSION

W e have computed the energy gap due to the creation of a soliton-antisoliton pair in the linearly coherent channel of the coherent striped phase found in higher Landau levels in a bilayer quantum H all system. W e have com – puted this gap using a m icroscopic unrestricted H artree-Fock approach as well as a eld-theoretic approach valid in the lim it of slow ly varying pseudospin texture. W ith both m ethods, we nd that the this energy gap is low er in energy than the H artree-Fock gap due to the creation of an electron-hole pair in a coherent channel (a single spin ip) so that solitonic excitations must play an im – portant role in the transport properties of the coherent striped phase.

VIII. ACKNOW LEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by a research grant (for R C.) and graduate research grants (for C.B.D.) both from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). H A F. acknow ledges the support of NSF through G rant No.DMR-0454699.

APPEND IX :M ICROSCOPIC EXPRESSIONS FOR THE PARAM ETERS OF THE FIELD -THEORETIC MODEL

In this appendix we present the details of the derivation of the m icroscopic expressions for the parameters $_{\rm s}$ and T used in the eld-theoretic model of Sec. III. We

drop the Landau level index N here since all order param eters are to evaluated in the partially led level N . We begin by de ning the pseudospin density operators

$$(q) = {}^{R}; {}^{R}(q) + {}^{L}; {}^{L}(q);$$
 (A.1)

$$_{z}(q) = \frac{1}{2} R^{R}(q) L^{L;L}(q) ;$$
 (A 2)

$$_{x}(q) = \frac{1}{2} \qquad {}^{R;L}(q) + {}^{L;R}(q); \qquad (A.3)$$

$$y(q) = \frac{1}{2i} R^{R,L}(q) R^{L,R}(q) : (A.4)$$

The total H artree Fock energy of the electrons in the partially led level for an unbiased bilayer can be written as

$$E_{HF} = " \frac{e^2}{2};$$
 (A.5)

where

W e have introduced the interactions

$$J_{z}(q) = H_{R;R}(q) H_{R;L}(q) X_{R;R}(q);$$
 (A.7)

$$(q) = H_{R;R}(q) + H_{R;L}(q) X_{R;R}(q);$$
 (A.8)

and

$$J_{?}(q) = X_{R;L}(q)$$
: (A.9)

In Eq. (A.6), $H_{R;R}$ (0) = $H_{R;L}$ (0) = 0 because of the interaction between the 2D EG and the positive background of the donors.

We now introduce a unitless and unitary pseudospin eld S (r), with = x;y;z related to the guiding center density operators in the pseudospin form alism by the relation

$$S(r) = 4 \sqrt{2}N h(r)i;$$
 (A.10)

and a projected¹⁹ electron density by the relation

$$n(r) = N h(r)i:$$
 (A.11)

U sing the de nition of the pseudospin operators S (r) and taking the Fourier transform of Eq. (A.6), we have

$$\mathbf{"} = \frac{\mathbf{e}}{2 \cdot 2^{2}} \operatorname{drS}_{x}(\mathbf{r}) \qquad (A.12)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{8 \cdot 2} \operatorname{dr} \operatorname{dr}^{0} J_{?}(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r}^{0}) S_{?}(\mathbf{r}) \quad \$ \quad (\mathbf{r}^{0})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{8 \cdot 2} \operatorname{dr} \operatorname{dr}^{0} S_{z}(\mathbf{r}) J_{z}(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r}^{0}) S_{z}(\mathbf{r}^{0})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{dr} \operatorname{dr}^{0} n(\mathbf{r}) \quad (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r}^{0}) n(\mathbf{r}^{0}):$$

W riting S $\,$ (r) in spherical coordinates, it is easy to describe the CSP ground state as

$$S_x(r)_{CSP} = \sin(x);$$
 (A.13)

$$S_{y}(r)_{CSP} = 0;$$
 (A.14)

$$S_{z}(r)_{CSP} = \cos(x);$$
 (A.15)

while the density $\ln(r)i = cst$ is uniform. For a state where there is a spin texture only in the channel centered at x = 0 (channel 0) while the other channels remain in their CSP ground state con guration (we recall that is the interstripe distance), we write

$$S_{x}(r) = \begin{cases} (x) \cos'(y); & \text{if } jx j = \frac{1}{4}; \\ \sin(x); & \text{if } jx j > \frac{1}{4}; \end{cases}$$
(A.16)

$$S_{y}(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} (\sin (\mathbf{x}) \sin' (\mathbf{y}); & \text{if } \mathbf{\dot{x}} \mathbf{j} = \frac{1}{4}; \\ 0; & \text{if } \mathbf{\dot{x}} \mathbf{j} > \frac{1}{4}; \end{cases}$$
(A.17)

$$S_{z}(r) = S_{z}(r)_{CSP}$$
; (A.18)

$$n(r) = n(r)_{CSP} + n(r)$$
: (A.19)

In these equations, (\mathbf{x}) is given by its value in the CSP. Dening

where C_i corresponds to the i-th channel of width =2 centered at x_i and $\begin{array}{c} R \\ C_i \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} R_{x_i+} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} A \\ x_i \end{array}$, it is easy to show that the energy di erence between the this last state and the CSP ground state i.e. the energy to create one soliton in

a channel is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & = \frac{e}{2 \sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{Z} \sum_{j=1}^{Z} dx \sin_{j}(x) dy [\cos'(y) 1] \\ & + \frac{1}{4 \sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{Z} dy dy^{0} J_{i;0} (y y^{0}) [\cos'(y^{0}) 1] \\ & + \frac{1}{8 \sqrt{2}} dy dy^{0} J_{0;0} (y y^{0}) [\cos('(y) '(y^{0})) 1] \\ & + \frac{1}{8 \sqrt{2}} dx dx^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} n(r) \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} dr dr^{0} \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} dr dr^{0} \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} dr dr^{0} \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} dr dr^{0} \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} dr dr^{0} \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} dr dr^{0} \\ & + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}}$$

The rst two terms contribute to the elective tunnelling term T while the third term is directly related to the pseudospin sti ness of the system. The fourth term takes into account the Coulomb interaction between dierent parts of the soliton and the last term is the interaction between the charge of the soliton and that of the CSP. In an antisoliton, this fith contribution would have exactly the same value but with opposite sign so that this last term does not contribute to the transport gap.

1. Calculation of the pseudospin sti ness \rm_s

To extract the pseudospin sti ness from the third term of Eq. (A 21), we make a long-wavelength expansion of the $\cos('(y) - '(y^0))$ 1 term. This expansion is possible if the pseudospin texture varies slow ly in comparison with $J_{0;0}(y)$. We get

$$\frac{1}{8} \frac{Z}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{Z}{dy} \frac{Z}{dy^{0} J_{0;0} (y \ y^{0}) [\cos(' \ (y) \ ' \ (y^{0})) \ 1]}{= \frac{1}{16} \frac{Z}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{Z}{dy^{0} y^{02} J_{0;0} (y^{0})} \frac{Z}{dy} \frac{d' \ (y)}{dy} \frac{2}{dy} :$$
(A 22)

Comparing this last result with Eq. (12), we see that

$$_{\rm s} = \frac{1}{8^{-2}}^{\rm Z} dy y^2 J_{0;0} (y)$$
: (A 23)

The pseudospin sti ness can be written, more explicitely as

with L_x and L_y the length and width of the sample. This allows the integrals over x and x^0 to be totally decoupled.

In fact, de ning the form factor

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & & & & & & \\ (q_x) & = & & dx \sin & (x) e^{iq_x x} & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\$$

we can write

$$s = \frac{1}{16^{2} \sqrt{2}} dq_{x} j (q_{x}) \frac{2}{J} \frac{d^{2}J_{?} (q)}{dq_{y}^{2}} = (A 26)$$

The form factor (q_x) takes into account the in uence of the shape of the charge m odulation along the x axis in the CSP phase on the e ective pseudospin sti ness in the one dimensional sine-G ordon m odel.

2. Calculation of the tunneling param eter T

The elective tunnel coupling T can be extracted from the rst two terms of Eq. (A 21). The rst term renormalizes the tunnel coupling in the 1D elective theory, taking into account that interlayer coherence exists only in the LCR's. This rst term is simply

$$\frac{e}{2^{12}}$$
 (0) dy [cos' (y) 1]: (A 27)

The second contribution to the elective tunnel coupling comes from the exchange energy between channel0 (where a pseudospin texture was created) and the other channels. In these other channels, the in-plane pseudospin component is totally polarized along the x direction and the exchange interaction between channel i and channel 0 favors a con guration in channel 0 where the pseudospin is also polarized along + x, just like the simple tunnel coupling \mathfrak{E} . In other words, there is an energy cost, even in the absence of tunneling, to make a rotation of the pseudospins in one channel because of the interaction with the pseudospins in the other channels.

It is possible to extract a simple form for this coupling from the second term of Eq. (A 21) since

$$X Z dy J_{i;0} (y) = \frac{1}{L_x} X X J_{2} (q_x; 0) j (q_x) j e^{iq_x (x_1 x_0)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{L_x} J_{2} (q_x; 0) j (q_x) j e^{iq_x (x_1 x_0)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{L_x} J_{2} (q_x; 0) j (q_x) j e^{iq_x (x_1 x_0)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{L_x} J_{2} (q_x; 0) j (q_x) j (q_x) z e^{iq_x (x_1 x_0)}$$

with $x_n = n = 2$ the center-to-center distance between channels n and 0. Because there is a sum over the channels, the sum on the wave-vectors q_x reduces to a sum over the reciprocal lattice vectors of a 1D lattice of lattice constant =2, noted \mathfrak{S}_x , and

$$\frac{1}{2} X Z Z
\frac{1}{2} y dy dy^{0} J_{i;0} (y y^{0}) [\cos ' (y^{0}) 1]
= \frac{1}{2} X J_{?} (\mathfrak{G}_{x}; 0) j (\mathfrak{G}_{x})^{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{L_{x}} X J_{?} (q_{x}; 0) j (q_{x})^{2}:
(A 29)$$

Combining the two terms, we nd

$$I = \frac{1}{2^{-\sqrt{2}}} \frac{1}{2} (0) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{X}{X}} J_{?} (e^{-\frac{X}{X}}) e^{-\frac{2}{2}} (A.30)$$
$$e^{-\frac{2}{2}} \frac{1}{2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{X}{X}} J_{?} (q_{x}; 0) j (q_{x})^{\frac{2}{2}} :$$

3. Sine-Gordon soliton and the Coulom b energy

If we combine the tunneling and exchange terms, we nd that the energy cost to make one soliton localized in a channel of the CSP is given by Eq. (12). As we mentionned in Sec. III, the static solution that minim izes this energy functional is the sine-G ordon (or kink) soliton ' (y) = 4 tan ¹ e^{$\frac{q}{1} \frac{1}{s}y}$:}

W e now add to Eq. (12) the Coulom b interaction energy between di erent parts of the soliton

$$E_{Coul} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \frac{Z}{dr} dr^{0} n(r) (r r^{0}) n(r^{0}) :$$
(A.31)

To relate $n(r^0)$ to the angles and ', we use the definition of the topological charge density given in Eq. (11). We assume that, in the one-soliton state, only ' (y) changes along a channel and that (r) is given by its value in the CSP.We have

$$n (r) = \frac{1}{4} r' (r) (r \cos (r)) b (A 32)$$
$$= \frac{1}{4} \frac{d' (y)}{dy} \frac{d}{dx} \cos (x) :$$

At this point, we must remark that if we use the sine-Gordon solution in Eq. (A.32) and integrate the projected density n(r) in a channel, we nd $R_{+}^{R_{+}} = \frac{1}{4} dx_{-1} dy n(r) = 1$ only if $\cos(x)$ varies from 1 to + 1 in the channelie. only in the limit or large interlayer distances where the stripes are fully developped. In consequence, we do not expect our eld-theoretic model to be valid near the transition between the UCS and the CSP.

We insert Eq. (A.32) into Eq. (A.31), and de ne the

form factor (for a channel centered at x = 0)

$$A (q_{x}) = \int_{C_{0}}^{C_{0}} dx e^{iq_{x}x} \frac{d}{dx} \cos(x) \qquad (A.33)$$
$$= i \int_{G_{x}}^{X} h_{z} (G_{x}) iG_{x} \frac{\sin(q_{x} - G_{x}) = 4}{(q_{x} - G_{x}) = 4};$$

and the elective interaction V_e (y y⁰) in a channel

$$V_{e} (y y^{0}) = \frac{1}{S} (q_{x})^{2} (q) e^{iq_{y}} (y y^{0}) : (A.34)$$

We then nd for the Coulomb interaction

$$E_{Coul} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{32^{2}} \frac{Z}{dy} \frac{Z}{dy^{0}} \frac{d'(y)}{dy} V_{e} \quad (y \quad y^{0}) \frac{d'(y^{0})}{dy^{0}};$$
(A.35)

If we add the contribution E_{Coul} to Eq. (12) and m inim ize the energy with respect to ' (y), we nd that it introduces a nonlocal term to the sine-G ordon equation. The resulting equation is then very di cult to solve. To

Current address: Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Basel, 4056 Basel, Switzerland.

- $^{\text{y}}\,$ E lectronic address: R ene $\mathcal L$ ote
@ U sherbrooke.ca
- ¹ 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); R. Moessner and J.T.Chalker, Phys.Rev.B 54, 5006 (1996); M.M.Fogler and A.A.Koulakov, Phys.Rev.B 55, 9326 (1997). For a review of the bubble and stripe phases in higher Landau levels, see M.Fogler in High Magnetic Fields: Applications in Condensed Matter Physics and Spectroscopy, ed.by C.Berthier, L.P.Levy, G.Martinez (Springer-Verlag, Berlin), 99 (2002).
- ² M.P.Lilly, K.B.Cooper, J.P.Eisenstein, L.N.Pfei er and K.W.West, Phys.Rev.Lett.82, 394 (1999); R.R.Du, D.C.Tsui, H.L.Stormer, L.N.Pfei er, K.W.Baldwin and K.W.West, Solid State Comm. 109, 389 (1999).
- ³ L.Brey and H.A.Fertig, Phys.Rev.B 62, 10268 (2000).
- ⁴ D. Bouchiha, M. Sc. Thesis, Universite de Sherbrooke, 2002.
- ⁵ R.Côte and H.A.Fertig, Phys.Rev.B 65, 085321 (2002).
- ⁶ R.Côte, H.A.Fertig, J.Bourassa, and D.Bouchiha, Phys. Rev.B 66, 205315 (2002).
- ⁷ Daw-W eiW ang, Eugene D em ler, and S.D as Samm a, Phys. Rev.B 68, 165303 (2003).
- ⁸ E.Dem ler, D.-W. Wang, S.DasSarma, and B.I.Halperin, Solid State Comm. 123, 243 (2002).

get an approximation for the Coulomb energy, we decided to proceed in the following way. We take, as a trial solution, the kink soliton

' (y) = 4 tan
$$\frac{h}{1} e^{y=L_s}$$
; (A.36)

where \mathbf{L}_{s} is the width of the soliton. The C oulom b energy is then

$$E_{C \text{ oul}}(L_{s}) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{32^{2}} dq \, A \, (q_{k})^{2} (q) \, \text{sech}^{2} - \frac{q_{y} L_{s}}{2} (q) \, \text{sech}^{2} - \frac{q_{y} L_{s}}{2} (A \, 37)$$

The total energy for the soliton is

$$E = 4 \frac{s}{L_s} + 4TL_s + E_{Coul}(L_s)$$
: (A.38)

We nd L_s by m inimizing numerically the total energy E. In our numerical calculation, we use $(q) = H_N(q)$ instead of Eq. (A.8). This is also the interaction considered in similar calculations¹¹,¹². The use of Eq. (A.8) leads to non-physical results.

- ⁹ Em iliano Papa, John Schliem ann, A. H. M acD onald, and M atthew P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 67, 115330 (2003).
- ¹⁰ R.Côte and A.H.M acD onald, Phys.Rev.Lett. 65, 2662 (1990); R.Côte and A.H.M acD onald, Phys.Rev.B 44, 8759 (1991).
- ¹¹ K.Moon, H.Mori, Kun Yang, S.M.Girvin, A.H.Mac-Donald, L. Zheng, D. Yoshioka, and Shou-Cheng Zhang, Phys.Rev.B 51, 5138 (1995).
- ¹² R.Rajaram an, Solitons and Instantons, (North-Holland, New York, 1989).
- ¹³ L.Brey, H.A.Fertig, R.Côte, and A.H.M acDonald, Phys.Rev.B 54, 16888 (1996).
- ¹⁴ R.Côte, C.B.Doiron, J.Bourassa, and H.A.Fertig, Phys. Rev.B 68, 155327 (2003).
- ¹⁵ S. Ghosh and R. Rajaram an, Phys. Rev. B 63, 035304 (2000).
- ¹⁶ R.Morfand B.I.Halperin, Phys.Rev.B 33, 2221 (1986).
- ¹⁷ A.H.M acD onald and S.M.G irvin, Phys. Rev. B 34, 5639 (1986).
- ¹⁸ Lynn Bonsalland A.A.M aradudin, Phys. Rev. B 15, 1959 (1977).
- ¹⁹ The relation between the true density and the guiding center density is given by n (q) = N (q)F (q) where F (q) is a form factor that depends on the Landau level index. In this work we use call n (q) = N (q) the projected density.