

# Parafermionic states in rotating Bose-Einstein condensates

N. Regnault

Laboratoire Pierre Aigrain, D partement de Physique,  
24, rue Lhomond, 75005 Paris, France

Th. Jolicoeur

Laboratoire Pierre Aigrain, D partement de Physique,  
24, rue Lhomond, 75005 Paris, France and  
Laboratoire de Physique Th orique et Mod les Statistiques,  
Universit  Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay, France.

## Abstract

We investigate possible parafermionic states in rapidly rotating ultracold bosonic atomic gases at lowest Landau level filling factor  $\nu = k=2$ . We study how the system size and interactions act upon the overlap between the true ground state and a candidate Read-Rezayi state. We also consider the quasihole states which are expected to display non-Abelian statistics. We numerically evaluate the degeneracy of these states and show agreement with a formula given by E. Ardonne. We compute the overlaps between low-lying exact eigenstates and quasihole candidate wavefunctions. We discuss the validity of the parafermion description as a function of the filling factor.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Lm, 03.75.Kk, 73.43.Cd, 73.43.Nq

## I. INTRODUCTION

Rotating Bose-Einstein condensates display a wealth of interesting physics. One of the most striking achievements in this field is the observation of the Abrikosov lattice of vortices<sup>1,2</sup>. With increasing rotation speed, it has been predicted that this lattice will melt and is replaced by more exotic quantum phases. When the rotation frequency is close to the harmonic trapping frequency and strong confinement is applied along the rotation axis, strongly correlated states belonging to the family of quantum Hall liquid states should appear<sup>3,4,5,6</sup>.

Here we study bosonic atoms with only one hyperfine species (i.e. spinless bosons) in such regime. We assume that the temperature is low and the interactions are weak enough so that the lowest Landau level (LLL) approximation is valid. The system may then display the fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE) as in two dimensional electron systems (2DES) under strong magnetic field. The Coulomb interaction is replaced by the s-wave scattering between the ultracold atoms. An analog of the filling factor for 2DES can be defined: indeed  $\nu = N_v/N$  is the ratio between the number of atoms  $N$  and the number of vortices  $N_v$  that would be present in the system if it was a Bose condensate. The quantity  $N_v$  is the equivalent of the number of flux quanta in 2DES systems. In this regime, several fractions have been predicted. The most prominent one<sup>3</sup> appears at  $\nu = 1/2$ , for which the Laughlin state is the exact ground state<sup>7</sup>. Evidences for other fractions from the Jain principal sequence  $\nu = p/(p+1)$  such as  $\nu = 2/3$  and  $\nu = 3/4$  have been pointed out<sup>8</sup> and can be understood within the composite fermion theory<sup>9</sup>.

Hierarchical quantum Hall states are not the only interesting states that have been predicted below the critical filling factor where the lattice of vortices melt<sup>5</sup>. Due to the bosonic statistics, if we assume that the equivalent cyclotron gap is large enough, we can have filling factors greater than one and still stay entirely in the LLL. Within this hypothesis, even more exotic states should appear for fractions  $\nu = k/2$ . The first one is the Moore-Read (MR) state<sup>10</sup> (or Pfaffian state) that should occur<sup>4</sup> at  $\nu = 1$  ( $k = 2$ ). This state was first introduced to explain the fermionic fraction  $\nu = 5/2$  in 2DES. Higher  $k$  values are associated to the so-called Read-Rezayi (RR) states<sup>5,11</sup>. Because of the parafermionic behavior of these states, their excitations have surprising non-Abelian statistics. So far, there are no well-established physical situation where these states play a role. The original suggestion by Read and Rezayi is that they may explain the incompressible states observed in the second

Landau level on the banks of the elusive  $\nu = 5/2$  state.

The RR states (or clustered states) in ultracold rotating atomic gases have been already the focus of several works. Numerically exact diagonalizations of small systems have provided some hints of the presence of RR states. In the seminal work by Cooper, Wilkin and Gunn<sup>5</sup>, spectra in the torus geometry exhibit the special ground state degeneracy associated with the topology of the RR states and have excellent overlaps with the explicit RR trial wavefunctions. In the spherical geometry there is also a set of incompressible states with the special relationship between the flux and the number of particles of the RR states<sup>6</sup>. Extrapolation of the gap points to a non-zero value for the  $M/R = 1$  case, whereas the  $\nu = 3/2$  and  $\nu = 2$  results do not show clear evidence for a smooth thermodynamic limit. On the sphere geometry, the overlap is excellent for the  $M/R$  state and tend to a nonzero value as the system size increases<sup>8</sup>. A more recent work<sup>12</sup> has been done on the  $\nu = 3/2$  case. It shows that the overlap can be improved by adding a longer range dipole-dipole interaction

Our purpose is to go beyond existing studies and look at size effects for fractions  $\nu = 3/2; 2; 5/2$  using exact diagonalizations on the sphere. We also check if the quasihole ground states are present at these filling factors by evaluating overlap between subspaces spanned by these states and the lowest energy excitations of the delta function interaction, s-wave scattering system. Appearance of such quantum states with the correct degeneracy predicted by conformal field theory arguments is a strong hint of the validity of the RR state hypothesis.

In section II, we give an overview of the clustered states and their excitations while section III is devoted to the conformal field theory (CFT) formulation. Section IV is a brief description of the numerical method we use. In section V, we give the results for the overlap of the ground states. We discuss how the system size, longer range or higher order n-body interaction impact on the overlap. Section VI is devoted to the quasihole excitations. In addition to the overlap values, we also give numerical evaluation of quasihole degeneracy on sphere for fractions  $\nu = 1; 3/2; 2; 5/2$  and compare them to a formula due to Aroon<sup>13</sup> to check the validity of the conformal field theory approach.

## II. PARAFERMIONIC STATES

For the sake of simplicity, we use the disk geometry in this section. In the symmetric gauge, the LLL one-body wave functions are given by :

$$\phi_m(z) = \frac{1}{2^m m!} z^m e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2}; \quad (1)$$

where  $z = x + iy$  and we take the magnetic length  $l_b$  to be equal to unity. Any  $N$ -body wave function of particles in the LLL can be written as a polynomial  $P$  in the particle  $z_i$  coordinates :

$$\Psi(z_1, \dots, z_N) = P(z_1, \dots, z_N) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_i |z_i|^2}; \quad (2)$$

From now on, we drop the global Gaussian factor. The  $k$ -type RR state is the exact zero energy ground state of the pure  $(k+1)$ -body  $\delta$ -function interaction hamiltonian :

$$H_k^{RR} = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_{k+1}} X^{(2)}(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}) \dots X^{(2)}(z_{i_k}, z_{i_{k+1}}); \quad (3)$$

The corresponding wave function can be written<sup>14</sup> :

$$\Psi_k^{RR} = \sum_{0 \leq r < s \leq N=k} X^0(z_{(kr+1)}, \dots, z_{(kr+k)}) Y(z_{(ks+1)}, \dots, z_{(ks+k)}); \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & (z_1, \dots, z_k; z_{k+1}, \dots, z_{2k}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{k+1}) \\ & (z_1, \dots, z_{k+2}) (z_2, \dots, z_{k+2}) (z_2, \dots, z_{k+3}) \\ & \dots (z_k, \dots, z_{2k}) (z_k, \dots, z_{k+1}); \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The sum is over all permutations of  $N$  elements such that  $(1) < (k) < \dots < (N-k+1)$ . The number of particles  $N$  must be a multiple of  $k$ .

These states are also referred to as clustered states because the wavefunction (4) vanishes when  $k+1$  or more particles are at the same position. The  $k$ -type RR state is associated to

the filling factor  $\nu = k=2$ . Each RR state is the zero-energy ground state of its corresponding Hamiltonian with the smallest total angular momentum.

The simplest case  $k = 1$  corresponds to the usual Laughlin wave function :

$$\Psi_{\text{Laughlin}} = \prod_{i < j}^Y (z_i - z_j)^2 \quad (6)$$

and is the exact ground state for rotating bosons with s-wave scattering at  $\nu = 1/2$  whose effective Hamiltonian is given by :

$$H_{\text{LLL}} = g \sum_{i < j}^X (r_i - r_j)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad g = \frac{\hbar^2}{8m} \sim \frac{1}{2} \frac{a_s}{l_z} \quad (7)$$

where  $a_s$  is the s-wave scattering length,  $l_z$  is the characteristic length of the  $\hat{z}$  axis oscillator which is used for 2d confinement, and  $\omega_c$  is the cyclotron rotation frequency.

The case  $k = 2$  is the so called MR/Pfaffian state. It can be rewritten as :

$$\Psi_{\text{Pfaffian}} = \text{Pf} \frac{1}{z_i - z_j} \prod_{i < j}^Y (z_i - z_j) ; \quad (8)$$

where Pf stands for the pfaffian defined as :

$$\text{Pf}(A) = \sum_{(1) (2) \dots (N)}^X A_{(1) (2)} A_{(3) (4)} \dots A_{(N-1) (N)} ; \quad (9)$$

where  $A$  is a skew-symmetric  $N \times N$  matrix ( $N$  even), the sum runs over all permutations of the index with  $N$  values and  $\text{sgn}$  is the signature of the permutation.

If we deviate from the clustered state at filling factor  $k=2$  by adding vortices (or flux quanta in the 2DES analog), quasihole excitations are generated. For each added vortex,  $k$  quasiholes are nucleated. For the Laughlin state, quasihole ground state wave functions can easily be obtained. Any function of the form :

$$\Psi_{\text{Laughlin}}^{\text{qh}} = P(z_1, \dots, z_N) \Psi_{\text{Laughlin}} ; \quad (10)$$

where  $P$  is a symmetric polynomial, corresponds to a zero-energy many quasihole state. For one quasihole at position  $w_1$ , the polynomial  $P$  is just  $\prod_i (z_i - w_1)$ . Read and Rezayi have also obtained an explicit formula in the case of the MR state<sup>15</sup> for two quasiholes at positions  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  :

$$\Psi_{\text{Pfaffian}}^{2\text{qh}} = \text{Pf} \frac{f(z_i, z_j; w_1, w_2)}{z_i - z_j} \prod_{i < j}^Y (z_i - z_j) ; \quad (11)$$

with  $f(z_i, z_j; w_1, w_2) = (z_i - w_1)(z_j - w_2) + (z_i - w_2)(z_j - w_1)$ . In the general case, the quasihole ground states can be written down using the CFT formulation. This formalism also reveals their non-Abelian statistics.

### III. CFT APPROACH

There is an elegant way to introduce RR states involving CFT<sup>11</sup>. The key idea<sup>10</sup> is to express the wave function as a correlator using the algebra of the  $Z_k$  parafermions<sup>16</sup>. This algebra is defined a set of fields  $\psi_l(z); \dots; \psi_{k-1}(z)$  obeying the following operator product expansion (OPE) :

$$\psi_l(z) \psi_{l^0}(z^0) = d_{l,l^0}(z-z^0)^{-(l^+-l^0-l^+l^0)} \\ \psi_{l+l^0}(z^0) + \dots (l^0 < lk); \quad (12)$$

$$\psi_l(z) \psi_{l^0}^Y(z^0) = d_{l,l^0}^Y(z-z^0)^{-(l^+-l^0-l^+l^0)} \\ \psi_{l-l^0}(z^0) + \dots^0 < (l-l^0); \quad (13)$$

$$\psi_l(z) \psi_l^Y(z^0) = (z-z^0)^{-2-l^+} \\ I + \frac{2}{c} \psi_l(z-z^0)^2 T(z^0) + \dots; \quad (14)$$

$$T(z) \psi_l(z^0) = \frac{1}{(z-z^0)^2} \psi_l(z^0) \\ + \frac{1}{z-z^0} \partial \psi_l(z^0) + \dots : \quad (15)$$

where  $\psi_l^Y = \psi_{k-l}$ ,  $T(z)$  is the stress-energy tensor,  $l^+$  is the conformal weight of the field  $\psi_l$ ,  $c$  is the theory central charge and  $d_{l,l^0}$  are numerical coefficients. The algebra of  $Z_k$  parafermions corresponds to the choice  $l^+ = l(k-1)=k$  leading to the central charge  $c = 2(k-1)=(k+2)$  and to uniquely determined  $d_{l,l^0}$  coefficients.

Read and Rezayi have shown that the following wave function :

$$\Psi_k^{RR,CFT} = \langle \psi_{l^+}(z_1) \dots \psi_{l^+}(z_N) \rangle \prod_{i < j}^Y (z_i - z_j)^{2=k}; \quad (16)$$

is equivalent to expression (4). One can easily show that this expression vanishes quadratically as  $k+1$  particles go to the same point using the OPE rules above (12-15). Within this formalism, it has been argued that the zero energy quasihole states can be built by inserting a spin field for each quasihole into the correlator of (16). For  $k=2$ , this spin field is equivalent to the magnetization operator of the Ising model. In the Ising case, the fusion rules are given by :

$$\psi_{l^+}(z) \psi_{l^+}(z^0) = \frac{1}{(z-z^0)^{1=2}} \psi_{l^+}(z^0); \quad (17)$$

$$\psi_{l^+}(z) \psi_{l^+}^Y(z^0) = \frac{1}{(z-z^0)^{1=8}} I + (z-z^0)^{3=8} \psi_{l^+}(z^0); \quad (18)$$

For  $n = 2$  quasiholes, the candidate state is then :

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\text{Paffian}}^{n \text{ qh}} = & \langle \psi_1(z_1) \cdots \psi_1(z_N) \psi_1(w_1) \cdots \psi_1(w_n) \rangle \\ & \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} \prod_{i, p=1}^n (z_i - w_p)^{\frac{1}{2}} : \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The fusion rule (18) leads to a non-trivial degeneracy of the quasihole states : there are  $2^{n-1}$  ways to fuse the spin operators leading to a non zero correlator, thus giving as many different wavefunctions. This so-called intrinsic degeneracy is the key of non-Abelian statistics : exchanging two quasihole coordinates of a given quasihole state will result in a linear combination of states of the same family instead of an overall multiplicative phase factor. In the case of the spherical geometry that we will discuss later, an additional (extrinsic) degeneracy arise from the Laughlin-like part of Eq.(20). Determining the multiplet decomposition of quasihole states in such a case is a challenging task<sup>13,15,17</sup> and constitutes a non-trivial check of the CFT approach when compared to numerical calculations. More details will be given in section VI.

For  $k > 2$ , the spin field that we have introduced has to be replaced by one of the primary field operators of the  $Z_k$  parafermion algebra. The guess is to use the operator  $\psi_1$  which minimizes the charge of the quasiholes. The wavefunction (19) can then be generalized to :

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_k^{n \text{ qh}} = & \langle \psi_1(z_1) \cdots \psi_1(z_N) \psi_1(w_1) \cdots \psi_1(w_n) \rangle \\ & \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^{\frac{2}{k}} \prod_{i, p=1}^n (z_i - w_p)^{\frac{1}{k}} : \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The fusion rules involving  $\psi_1$  are more complex<sup>16,18</sup> but the same remarks as for the  $k = 2$  case apply, meaning they lead to non-Abelian statistics. Notice that for  $k = 3$ , such states have been proposed to be a robust way to implement quantum computation<sup>19</sup>.

#### IV . NUMERICAL METHOD

We use exact diagonalizations to study if the RR states are relevant to the physics of the fast rotating boson gases at filling factor  $\nu = k=2$ . Numerical calculations can be done on various geometry such as the disk, the torus or the sphere. The disk geometry is plagued by edge effects and thus closed geometries are preferred when dealing with bulk properties. In this paper, all calculations are done on the spherical geometry<sup>20</sup>. Due to the  $SU(2)$

symmetry, states can be classified with respect to their total angular momentum  $L$  and its projection along one axis  $L_z$ . Solutions of the one-body problem are given by the monopole harmonics<sup>21</sup> (a generalization of the spherical harmonics), which take the following form in the LLL :

$$Y_m(u;v) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{(2S+1)!}{(S-m)!(S+m)!} u^{S+m} v^{S-m}; \quad (21)$$

where  $m$  is the projection of the angular momentum,  $-S \leq m \leq S$ ,  $u$  and  $v$  are the spinor components in spherical coordinates :

$$u = \cos(\theta/2) e^{i\phi/2}; \quad v = \sin(\theta/2) e^{-i\phi/2}; \quad (22)$$

The radius  $R$  of the sphere is related to the number of vortices (or flux quanta in the 2DES language)  $N$  that pierce it :

$$R = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N} \quad (23)$$

The one particle angular momentum  $S$  is such that  $2S = N$ . Due to sphere topology, the relation between the number of particles  $N$  and  $N$  for a given fraction is linear with a non-zero shift. For each trial wavefunction for a given fraction, there is a unique shift, which is a characteristic of the quantum Hall state. In the case of parafermionic states, the relation between the magnetic flux and the number of particles is given by :

$$N = \frac{2}{k} N - 2 \quad (24)$$

This can be deduced from the expression of the (4) on the sphere by applying a stereographic projection. Formally, we just have to drop the gaussian factor and make the substitution :

$$(z_i - z_j)^{-1} \rightarrow (u_i v_j - u_j v_i) : \quad (25)$$

The two-body interaction is completely characterized by a set of  $2S+1$  numbers  $fV_m$  called the pseudo-potentials<sup>22</sup>. The integer  $m$  is the relative angular momentum between the two particles. For spinless bosons, only even- $m$  potentials are relevant.  $s$ -wave scattering interaction corresponds to the case where all pseudo-potentials are equal to zero except  $V_0$ . Longer range interactions involve additional pseudopotentials, the next one for spinless bosons being  $V_2$ . Thus, adding some  $V_2$  component allows to test the effect of longer range interactions. Comparison between the RR states or their quasihole excitations with the true



ground states is achieved by computing overlaps. For two states  $|j_i\rangle$  and  $|j_i\rangle$ , the overlap is defined as  $O = |\langle j_i | j_i \rangle|^2$ . This definition can be extended to the case of subspaces of same dimension  $N$  and spanned by vector sets  $\{|j_i\rangle\}$  and  $\{|j_i\rangle\}$ :

$$O = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N |\langle j_i | j_i \rangle|^2 : \quad (26)$$

Both exact ground states and RR/quasihole candidate ground states are evaluated using exact diagonalizations of the associated Hamiltonian. Numerical diagonalizations are achieved using Lanczos-like algorithm or full diagonalization algorithm in a given  $L_z$  subspace. In the case of  $k+1$ -body hardcore interaction, the matrix are being less and less sparse with increasing  $k$  value, requiring more memory and CPU time and making convergence harder to reach. Moreover due to the  $L_z$ -only restriction on the Hilbert space, looking at the quasihole ground states require the evaluation of highly degenerate eigenstates. Thus we can reach lower system sizes compared to the ground state.

## V. GROUND STATE OVERLAPS

We look at the overlap between the RR ground state and the exact ground state. Tables I to IV display the overlaps for various fractions between the RR state and the two-body hardcore interaction Hamiltonian ground state for different sizes. We also include overlaps with other ground states such as Coulomb interaction or  $n$ -body hardcore interactions. In the particular case where  $N = 4$ , the overlap is equal to one. This is due to the dimension of the Hilbert subspace in the  $L = 0$  sector when  $S = 1$  which is equal to one.

Some of the results presented in table I have already been published<sup>8</sup>. They show that the Pfaffian state is a good description of the physics at  $\nu = 1$ . As already noticed, longer range interactions tend to improve the overlap.

For the  $\nu = 3/2, 5/2$  fractions, the situation is not so clear. Fewer values can be obtained and the overlap is non-monotonic with respect to the size of system, making dubious convergence to the thermodynamic limit. If we consider long-range interaction like Coulomb interaction, overlaps are improved, but we still get the same non-monotonic behavior. The same remarks are valid for the comparison with the  $n$ -body hardcore interaction ( $2 \leq n \leq k$ ): the overlaps are closer to unity as  $n$  tends towards  $k+1$ .

To ascertain the role of longer-range interaction, we follow the method proposed in ref.(12) for  $\nu = 3/2$ . We add a  $V_2$  contribution to the two-body hardcore interaction. Figure 1 shows the overlaps as a function of the ratio  $V_2=V_0$  for the four filling factors  $\nu = 1; 3/2; 2$  and  $5/2$ . The conclusions we can draw are similar to ref.(12) : long-range interactions help to stabilize the parafermionic ground state. Note that the drop of the overlap for large values of  $V_2=V_0$  is correlated to a similar effect in the gap value (see figure 2) and is thus related to the loss of incompressibility.

## VI. QUASIHOLE EXCITATIONS

If we believe that the parafermionic description is relevant for the fractions  $\nu = k/2$ , then quasihole excitations should also be present. Studying quasihole excitation on the sphere geometry is interesting on its own. Indeed, non-Abelian statistics is related to the quasihole ground state degeneracy. We can sort these states by their orbital quantum numbers  $L$  and  $L_z$ . Evaluating the degeneracy of each sector is already a non trivial task. A formula was found for the Pfaffian case by Read and Rezayi<sup>15</sup>. Gurarie and Rezayi<sup>17</sup> have also an algorithm to compute the degeneracy in the  $\nu = 3/2$  case. Finally, Ardonne has proposed an expression for the degeneracy valid for any  $\nu = k/2$  value. We briefly describe how we extract the multiplet decomposition of the quasihole degenerate states from Ardonne's formula in an Appendix. Comparison of degeneracy values obtained using the CFT approach with the results of numerical exact diagonalizations is a way to validate the CFT approach. Numerical computations have been performed for the Pfaffian<sup>15</sup> at  $\nu = 1$  and also<sup>17</sup> for the  $\nu = 3/2$  case. We give here additional values for these two fractions (tables V and VI). We also compute degeneracies for  $\nu = 2$  and  $\nu = 5/2$  which haven't been published before (see tables VII and VIII). The results we obtain are in agreement with Ardonne's formula.

To test the validity of the quasihole hypothesis, we compute the overlap at a given fraction  $\nu = k/2$  and for  $k$  quasiholes between the subspace spanned by the quasihole states of the  $k+1$ -body hardcore Hamiltonian (3) and the lowest energy states of the short-range problem at each  $L$  value. In each  $(L; L_z)$  sector, we thus consider the  $N_L^{k,q}$  lowest energy eigenstates where  $N_L^{k,q}$  is the degeneracy for  $q$  quasihole ground states at filling factor  $\nu = k/2$  with angular momentum  $L$  ( $N_L^{k,q}$  is  $L_z$  independent) as candidates for the non-Abelian quasihole states. The corresponding overlap  $O_L^{k,q}$  is evaluated using definition Eq.(26). In order to

easily characterize the agreement with the whole set of quasihole states for all  $L$  values, we introduce a total overlap defined as :

$$O^{k,q} = \frac{\sum_L N_L^{k,q} (2L+1) O_L^{k,q}}{\sum_L N_L^{k,q} (2L+1)}; \quad (27)$$

which is just another way to write the total overlap with respect to the subspace spanned by all quasihole states.

Our results are given in tables IX, X, XI and XII for fractions  $\nu = 1; 3/2; 2$  and  $5/2$  and  $q = k$  quasiholes. The success of the quasihole description is quite impressive at  $\nu = 1$ . However the agreement becomes increasingly worse with higher  $k$  values. Notice that for a given system with fixed  $k$  and  $N$  values, the smallest overlap is obtained for the largest  $L$  total momentum. Due to its high  $L_z$  degeneracy, it plagues the total overlap. This certainly means that fewer quasihole excitations with non-Abelian statistics are present in the pure hard-core model than in the  $k+1$ -body system. We can also add more quasiholes. Table XIII displays the results for  $q = 2k$  at  $\nu = 1$ . Considering the high degeneracy we are looking at (up to 336 for  $N = 12$ ), the overlaps are quite good especially if we do not take into account the ones associated to the largest total momentum. The effect of longer range interaction is similar to the ground state case : adding some  $V_2$  component tends to improve the overlap. In figure 3, we have plotted the total overlap as a function of  $V_2=V_0$  for fractions  $\nu = 1; 3/2; 2$ . There is now a maximum of the overlap for a moderate amount of longer-range interactions.

## VII. CONCLUSION

Existence of quasiparticles with non-Abelian statistics is an exciting question of modern physics. The possible appearance of such quasiparticles in rotating ultracold boson gases is a strong motivation to experimentally reach the corresponding regime. At filling factor  $\nu = 1$ , we have shown that the pairing scheme of Moore and Read extends to the quasihole excitations. The degeneracy we observe is exactly that predicted by the CFT approach and the overlap of the subspaces spanned by the quasiholes shows that they are likely to be relevant at this fraction. Concerning the RR states for larger filling factors their overlaps with the ground state of the pure hard-core model are much less impressive and the size dependence is irregular, as was already observed in the gap values. We have found a set of

degenerate states with the quantum numbers predicted for quasiholes generated from the RR states by addition of  $\nu$  quanta, they have also the features expected from the CFT approach. Again the overlaps (now for subspaces taken as a whole) are much less impressive. It is highly unlikely that the RR states are relevant for large  $k$  values. Adding long-range interactions like a second pseudopotential  $V_2$  certainly strengthen these RR states and their quasiholes states. So to construct in practice a RR state one may have to re-tune the interaction potential between ultracold atoms. It is likely however that the Pfaffian at  $\nu = 1$  is the most conveniently implemented state for manipulation of non-Abelian statistics (but it does not support universal quantum computation<sup>19</sup>).

### VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Chiachen Chang and Jainendra Jain for useful discussions. We thank IDRIS-CNRS for a computer time allocation.

### IX. APPENDIX

Our purpose is to show how we can get the multiplet degeneracy for the quasihole states from Ardonne's formula. The formula gives access to the intrinsic degeneracy and is derived from the truncated characters of the  $Z_k$  algebra (or  $su(2)_k = u(1)$ ). These truncated characters can be written as :

$$Y_n(x; q; k) = \sum_{a_i} q^{\frac{1}{2} a_i C_{k-1} a_i} x^{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \binom{a_i}{4} \frac{1}{k} + ((I_{k-1} - C_{k-1}) a)_i \binom{3}{5}; \quad (28)$$

where the  $q$ -deformed binomial is defined as follow :

$$\binom{m}{p}_q = \frac{Q_m}{Q_p} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m (1 - q^i)}{\prod_{i=1}^p (1 - q^i) \prod_{i=1}^{m-p} (1 - q^i)}; \quad (29)$$

and is equal to zero if  $p > m$  or  $m; p < 0$ .  $n$  is the number of quasiholes. It is linked to the number of added quantum vortices by the relation  $n = k - \nu$ .  $I_{k-1}$  is the identity  $(k-1)$  dimensional matrix and  $C_{k-1} = 2A_{k-1}^{-1}$  where  $A_{k-1}$  is the Cartan matrix of the  $su(k)$  algebra :

$$(A_{k-1})_{i;j} = 2 \delta_{i;j} - \delta_{i-1;j-1} - \delta_{i+1;j+1}; \quad (30)$$

$a = (a_1; \dots; a_{k-1})$  is a vector of  $k-1$  non-negative integer such that  $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} ia_i = F$  where  $F$  is a multiple of  $k$ . When we look at a system of  $N$  bosons, we are only interested in the values  $F = 0; k; 2k; \dots; N$ .  $F$  has to be understood as the number of unclustered bosons. In the simplest case  $k = 2$ ,  $N - F$  corresponds to the number of parafermionic fields that appear when using OPE. Each  $q$ -polynomial in front of given  $x^F$  monomial, is associated to the multiplet decomposition of the intrinsic degeneracy of a given  $F$  value. It will be of the form :

$$\sum_{L=0}^P n_L \sum_{L_z=-L}^L q^{+L_z}; \quad (31)$$

where  $\sum$  is a global shift of the  $q$  power and  $n_1$  is the number of multiplet of momentum 1. Thus the multiplet decomposition of the intrinsic degeneracy can be directly read-out from the polynomial expression.

For example, let evaluate (28) for  $k = 3; n = 6$ , For the  $N = 6$  bosons case, we only need the partial development given in (32) up to  $x^6$  :

$$Y_6(x; q; 3) = 1 + x^3 q^4 + q^3 + q^2 + x^6 q^6 + \dots \quad (32)$$

Thus the multiplet decomposition for the intrinsic degeneracy is one singlet  $L = 0$  for  $F = 0$ , one multiplet  $L = 1$  for  $F = 3$  and one singlet  $L = 0$  for  $F = 6$ . The extrinsic part gives the following multiplet: one singlet  $L = 0$  for  $F = 6$ , one multiplet  $L = 3$  for  $F = 3$ , one multiplet for  $L = 0; 2; 3; 4; 6$  for  $F = 0$ . Using the standard momentum addition rules, we get the result display in table VI.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> K.W. Madison, F. Chevy, W. Wohlleben, and J. Dalibard, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 806 (2000); F. Chevy, K. Madison, and J. Dalibard, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2223 (2000)
- <sup>2</sup> J.R. Abo-Shaeer, C. Raman, J.M. Vogels, and W. Ketterle, Science 292, 476 (2001).
- <sup>3</sup> N.K. Wilkin, J.M. F. Gunn and R.A. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2265 (1998)
- <sup>4</sup> N.K. Wilkin and J.M. F. Gunn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 6 (2000)
- <sup>5</sup> N.R. Cooper, N.K. Wilkin, and J.M. F. Gunn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 120405 (2001).

- <sup>6</sup> N . Regnault and Th . Jolicoeur, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 030402 (2003); Phys. Rev. B 69, 235309 (2004) .
- <sup>7</sup> R . B . Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 1395 (1983) .
- <sup>8</sup> C . Chang, N . Regnault, Th . Jolicoeur and J . K . Jain, Phys. Rev. A 72, 013611 (2005) .
- <sup>9</sup> J . K . Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 199 (1989); Physics Today 53 (4), 39 (2000); Physica E 20, 79 (2003) .
- <sup>10</sup> G . Moore and N . Read, Nucl. Phys. B 360, 362 (1991) .
- <sup>11</sup> N . Read and E . H . Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B 59, 8084 (1999) .
- <sup>12</sup> E . H . Rezayi, N . Read and N . R . Cooper, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 160404 (2005) .
- <sup>13</sup> E . Ardonne, J. Phys. A 35 447 (2002) .
- <sup>14</sup> A . Cappelli, L . S . Georgiev and I . T . Todorov, Nucl. Phys. B 599, 499 (2001) .
- <sup>15</sup> N . Read and E . H . Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B 54, 16864 (1996) .
- <sup>16</sup> A . B . Zamolodchikov and V . A . Fateev, Sov. Phys. JETP 62, 215 (1985) .
- <sup>17</sup> V . Gurarie and E . H . Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B 61, 5473 (2000) .
- <sup>18</sup> D . Gepner and Z . Qiu, Nucl. Phys. B 285, 423 (1987) .
- <sup>19</sup> M . H . Freedman, A . Kitaev, M . J . Larsen, and Z . Wang, Bull. AM S, 40, 31 (2003) .
- <sup>20</sup> G . Fano, F . Ortolani, and E . Colombo, Phys. Rev. B 34, 2670 (1986) .
- <sup>21</sup> T . T . Wu and C . N . Yang, Nucl. Phys. B 107, 365 (1976); Phys. Rev. D 16, 1018 (1977) .
- <sup>22</sup> F . D . M . Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 605 (1983) .




Figure 1: From left to right and top to bottom : overlap between the RR state and the ground state of longer range interaction Hamiltonian as a function of  $V_2/V_0$  at filling factors  $\nu = 1; 3/2; 2$  and  $5/2$ .




Figure 2: Gap of the longer range interaction Hamiltonian as a function of  $V_2/V_0$  at filling factors  $\nu = 1$  (a) and  $\nu = 3/2$  (b).

N	$O_{k=1}$	$O_{l=r}$
4	1.0	1.0
6	0.9728	0.9728
8	0.9669	0.9771
10	0.9592	0.9659
12	0.8844	0.9165
14	0.8858	0.9213
16	0.8833	0.9170

Table I: Overlaps at  $\nu = 1$  between the Pfaffian obtained as the ground state of the 3-body hardcore interaction Hamiltonian and the ground state of the 2-body hardcore interaction or the Coulomb interaction ( $l=r$ ) Hamiltonian.



N	$O_{k=1}$	$O_{k=2}$	$O_{l=r}$
6	1.0	1.0	1.0
9	0.9642	0.9891	0.9642
12	0.8647	0.9702	0.8904
15	0.9189	0.9788	0.9307
18	0.6774	0.9239	0.7226

Table II: Overlaps at  $k=3$  between the RR state obtained as the ground state of the 4-body hardcore interaction hamiltonian and the ground state of the  $k+1$ -body hardcore interaction or the Coulomb interaction ( $l=r$ ) hamiltonian.

N	$O_{k=1}$	$O_{k=2}$	$O_{k=3}$	$O_{l=r}$
8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
12	0.9636	0.9811	0.9949	0.9636
16	0.7801	0.8919	0.9753	0.8037
20	0.8822	0.9499	0.9874	0.8985

Table III: Overlaps at  $k=2$  between the RR state obtained as the ground state of the 5-body hardcore interaction hamiltonian and the ground state of the  $k+1$ -body hardcore interaction or the Coulomb interaction ( $l=r$ ) hamiltonian.

N	$O_{k=1}$	$O_{k=2}$	$O_{k=3}$	$O_{k=4}$	$O_{l=r}$
10	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
15	0.9659	0.9789	0.9902	0.9975	0.9659
20	0.7455	0.8291	0.9165	0.9798	0.7644

Table IV: Overlaps at  $k=5$  between the RR state obtained as the ground state of the 6-body hardcore interaction hamiltonian and the ground state of the  $k+1$ -body hardcore interaction or the Coulomb interaction ( $l=r$ ) hamiltonian.




Figure 3: Upper part: total overlap for as a function of  $V_2=V_0$  at filling factors  $\nu = 1$  with two quasiholes (a,  $\Delta\Phi = 1$ ) and four quasiholes (b,  $\Delta\Phi = 2$ ). Lower part: total overlap as a function of  $V_2=V_0$  at filling factors  $\nu = 3/2$  (c) and  $\nu = 2$  (d) for  $\Delta\Phi = 1$ .

N		#	L =	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
4	1	6	1	0	1																			
4	2	20	1	0	2	0	1																	
4	3	49	1	0	2	1	2	0	1															
4	4	100	2	0	2	1	3	1	2	0	1													
6	1	10	0	1	0	1																		
6	2	50	2	0	2	1	2	0	1															
6	3	168	0	3	1	4	2	3	2	2	0	1												
6	4	444	3	1	5	3	7	3	6	3	4	2	2	0	1									
8	1	15	1	0	1	0	1																	
8	2	105	2	0	3	1	3	1	2	0	1													
8	3	462	3	1	5	4	7	4	6	3	4	2	2	0	1									
8	4	1530	5	2	10	7	14	10	14	9	12	7	8	4	5	2	2	0	1					
8	5	4191	6	5	16	14	23	20	26	21	25	19	20	14	15	9	9	5	5	2	2	0	1	
10	1	21	0	1	0	1	0	1																
10	2	196	2	0	4	1	4	2	3	1	2	0	1											
12	1	28	1	0	1	0	1	0	1															
12	2	336	3	0	4	2	5	2	5	2	3	1	2	0	1									
14	1	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1														

Table V : Number of multiplets of states at zero energy for the three-body Hamiltonian for  $\ell = 1$  for added quantum numbers. # is the total number of degenerate states.

N		#	L =	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
6	1	10	0	1	0	1																
6	2	50	2	0	2	1	2	0	1													
6	3	165	0	2	1	4	2	3	2	2	0	1										
6	4	427	3	0	4	3	6	3	6	3	4	2	2	0	1							
6	5	944	0	4	2	7	5	8	7	8	5	7	4	4	2	2	0	1				
6	6	1869	4	1	7	5	11	7	13	9	12	9	10	6	8	4	4	2	2	0	1	
9	1	20	0	1	1	0	1															
9	2	175	0	3	1	5	2	3	2	2	0	1										
9	3	870	2	6	7	8	9	9	7	8	5	4	3	2	0	1						
9	4	3122	6	5	14	14	21	17	23	18	20	16	16	10	11	6	5	3	2	0	1	
12	1	35	1	0	1	1	1	0	1													
12	2	490	4	1	6	4	8	4	7	3	4	2	2	0	1							
15	1	56	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1												

Table VI: Number of multiplets of states at zero energy for the four-body Hamiltonian for  $\ell = 3=2$  for added quantum numbers. # is the total number of degenerate states. L values for rows with a star, have to be understood as  $L = 1=2$ .

N		#	L =	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
8	1	15	1	0	1	0	1																	
8	2	105	2	0	3	1	3	1	2	0	1													
8	3	440	2	1	4	3	6	4	6	3	4	2	2	0	1									
8	4	1379	4	1	7	5	11	7	12	8	11	7	8	4	5	2	2	0	1					
8	5	3591	4	3	10	9	16	14	19	16	20	16	18	13	14	9	9	5	5	2	2	0	1	
12	1	35	1	0	1	1	1	0	1															
12	2	490	4	1	6	4	8	4	7	3	4	2	2	0	1									
12	3	3311	6	6	15	16	22	19	25	20	21	17	17	11	11	6	5	3	2	0	1			
16	1	70	1	0	2	0	2	1	1	0	1													

Table V II: Number of multiplets of states at zero energy for the five-body Hamiltonian for  $\ell = 2$  for added quantum numbers. # is the total number of degenerate states.

N		#	L =	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
10	1	21	0	1	0	1	0	1											
10	2	196	2	0	4	1	4	2	3	1	2	0	1						
10	3	1001	0	4	3	7	6	9	7	9	6	7	4	4	2	2	0	1	
15	1	56	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1									
15	2	1176	0	7	4	12	8	12	9	11	6	8	4	4	2	2	0	1	

Table V III: Number of multiplets of states at zero energy for the six-body Hamiltonian for  $\ell = 5=2$  for added quantum numbers. # is the total number of degenerate states. L values for rows with a star, have to be understood as  $L = 1=2$ .

N	$O_{2;2}$	$O_0^{2;2}$	$O_1^{2;2}$	$O_2^{2;2}$	$O_3^{2;2}$	$O_4^{2;2}$	$O_5^{2;2}$	$O_6^{2;2}$	$O_7^{2;2}$
4	1.0	1.0		1.0					
6	0.8579		0.9994		0.7972				
8	0.8760	0.9857		0.8884		0.8569			
10	0.8661		0.9111		0.8334		0.8287		
12	0.6800	0.9651		0.8007		0.8392		0.5015	
14	0.6825		0.7685		0.7059		0.7417		0.611

Table IX : Overlap of the lowest energy exact wavefunctions and the Pfaffian two quasihole wavefunctions at  $\nu = 1$ .

N	$O_{3;3}$	$O_0^{3;3}$	$O_1^{3;3}$	$O_2^{3;3}$	$O_3^{3;3}$	$O_4^{3;3}$	$O_5^{3;3}$	$O_6^{3;3}$	$O_7^{3;3}$
6	1.0		1.0		1.0				
9	0.7933		0.9561	0.7065		0.7803			
12	0.6289	0.8221		0.7317	0.8579	0.5735		0.4897	
15	0.4440		0.7965	0.5754	0.5856	0.4440	0.7572		0.0009

Table X : Overlap of the lowest energy exact wavefunctions and the  $k = 3$  three quasihole wavefunctions at  $\nu = 3/2$ . L values for rows with a star, have to be understood as  $L = 1/2$ .

N	$O_{4;4}$	$O_0^{4;4}$	$O_1^{4;4}$	$O_2^{4;4}$	$O_3^{4;4}$	$O_4^{4;4}$	$O_5^{4;4}$	$O_6^{4;4}$	$O_7^{4;4}$	$O_8^{4;4}$
8	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0				
12	0.5282	0.9938		0.6555	0.7601	0.6714		0.2194		
16	0.3697	0.6691		0.7779		0.6376	0.1112	0.2387		0.0957

Table XI: Overlap of the lowest energy exact wavefunctions and the  $k = 4$  four quasihole wavefunctions at  $\nu = 2$ .

N	$O_{5,5}$	$O_{0,5}$	$O_{1,5}$	$O_{2,5}$	$O_{3,5}$	$O_{4,5}$	$O_{5,5}$	$O_{6,5}$	$O_{7,5}$
10	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		
15	0.5507		0.6998	0.7666	0.8554	0.6399	0.8110		0.2827

Table X II:  $O$  overlap of the lowest energy exact wavefunctions and the  $k = 5$  ve quasihole wavefunctions at  $\nu = 5/2$ .  $L$  values for rows with a star, have to be understood as  $L = 1/2$ .

N	$O_{2,4}$	$O_{0,4}$	$O_{1,4}$	$O_{2,4}$	$O_{3,4}$	$O_{4,4}$	$O_{5,4}$	$O_{6,4}$	$O_{7,4}$	$O_{8,4}$	$O_{9,4}$	$O_{10,4}$	$O_{11,4}$	$O_{12,4}$
4	0.9807	1.0		1.0		0.9572								
6	0.8541	0.9998		0.9741	0.9764	0.9369		0.5590						
8	0.8458	0.9036		0.9407	0.9197	0.8155	0.7370	0.8620		0.8184				
10	0.6692	0.8991		0.8269	0.7729	0.8281	0.7291	0.8090	0.4411	0.5091		0.2898		
12	0.5788	0.7964		0.7970	0.8253	0.7832	0.7756	0.5882	0.5654	0.5572	0.4255	0.4489		0.0692

Table X III:  $O$  overlap of the lowest energy exact wavefunctions and the Pfaffian four quasihole wavefunctions at  $\nu = 1$ .