The Quantum HallE ect: NovelExcitations and Broken Symmetries

Steven M.Girvin¹ Indiana University Department of Physics Bloomington, IN 47405 United States of America

c1998

¹ CSM.G irvin, 1998 Lectures delivered at Ecole d'Ete Les Houches, July 1998 To be published by Springer Verlag and Les Editions de Physique in 1999.

SM.Girvin

T hese lectures are dedicated to the m em ory of H einz Schulz, a great friend and a wonderful physicist.

C ontents

1	The	Quantum HallE ect	1
	1.1	Introduction	1
		1.1.1 W hy 2D Is Im portant	2
		1.1.2 Constructing the 2D EG	3
		1.1.3 W hy is D isorder and Localization Im portant?	4
	12	Classical and Sem i-Classical Dynamics	8
		12.1 Classical Approximation	8
		122 Sem i-classical Approximation	10
	1.3	Quantum Dynamics in Strong B Fields	11
	1.4	IQHE Edge States	17
	1.5	Sem iclassical Percolation Picture	21
	1.6	FractionalQHE	25
		1.6.1 The = 1 m any-body state	29
	1.7	NeutralCollective Excitations	38
	1.8	Charged Excitations	47
	1.9	FQHE Edge States	56
	1.10	Quantum HallFerrom agnets	58
		1.10.1 Introduction	58
		1.10.2 Coulom b Exchange	61
		1.10.3 Spin W ave Excitations	62
		1.10.4 E ective Action	66
		1.10.5 Topological Excitations	71
	1.11	Skyrm ion D ynam ics	84
		1.11.1 Skyme Lattices	89
	1.12	Double-Layer Quantum Hall Ferrom agnets	94
		1.12.1 Introduction	94
		1.12.2 Pseudospin Analogy	95
		1.12.3 Experim entalBackground	97
		1.12.4 Interlayer P hase C oherence	101
		1.12.5 Interlayer Tunneling and Tilted Field E ects	103
	1.13	A cknow ledgm ents	106
A	Low	est Landau Level P rojection	107

A Lowest Landau Level P rojection

iv		SM.Girvin
В	Berry's Phase and A diabatic Transport	111
В	115	

Chapter 1

The Quantum HallE ect

1.1 Introduction

The quantum Halle ect (QHE) is one of the most remarkable condensed-matter phenomena discovered in the second half of the 20th century. It rivals superconductivity in its fundamental signicance as a manifestation of quantum mechanics on macroscopic scales. The basic experimental observation is the nearly vanishing dissipation

and the quantization of the Hall conductance

$$_{xy} = \frac{e^2}{h}$$
(1.2)

of a real (as opposed to som e theorist's fantasy) transistor-like device (sim ilar in som e cases to the transistors in computer chips) containing a two-dimensional electron gas subjected to a strong magnetic eld. This quantization is universal and independent of all microscopic details such as the type of sem iconductor material, the purity of the sample, the precise value of the magnetic eld, and so forth. As a result, the e ect is now used to maintain¹ the standard of electrical resistance by metrology laboratories around the world. In addition, since the speed of light is now de ned, a measurement of e^2 -h is equivalent to a measurement of the ne structure constant of fundamental importance in quantum electrodynamics.

¹M aintain does not mean de ne. The SI ohm is de ned in terms of the kilogram, the second and the speed of light (form erly the meter). It is best realized using the reactive impedance of a capacitor whose capacitance is computed from rst principles. This is an extrem ely tedious procedure and the QHE is a very convenient method for realizing a xed, reproducible impedance to check for drifts of resistance standards. It does not how ever de ne the ohm. Eq. (1.2) is given in cgs units. When converted to SI units the quantum of resistance is h=e² (cgs) ! $\frac{z}{2}$ 25;812:80 (SI) where is the ne structure constant and Z 0 = 0 is the impedance of free space.

In the so-called integer quantum Halle ect (IQ HE) discovered by von K litzing in 1980, the quantum number is a simple integer with a precision of about 10¹⁰ and an absolute accuracy of about 10⁸ (both being limited by our ability to do resistance m etrology).

In 1982, T sui, Stom er and G ossard discovered that in certain devices with reduced (but still non-zero) disorder, the quantum number could take on rational fractional values. This so-called fractional quantum Hall e ect (FQHE) is the result of quite di erent underlying physics involving strong C oulom b interactions and correlations am ong the electrons. The particles condense into special quantum states whose excitations have the bizarre property of being described by fractional quantum numbers, including fractional charge and fractional statistics that are intermediate between ordinary B ose and Ferm i statistics. The FQHE has proven to be a rich and supprising arena for the testing of our understanding of strongly correlated quantum systems. With a simple tw ist of a dial on her apparatus, the quantum Hall experimentalist can cause the electrons to condense into a bew ildering array of new Vacua', each of which is described by a di erent quantum eld theory. The novel order param eters describing each of these phases are completely unprecedented.

We begin with a brief description of why two-dimensionality is important to the universality of the result and how modern sem iconductor processing techniques can be used to generate a nearly ideal two-dimensional electron gas (2DEG). We then give a review of the classical and sem i-classical theories of the motion of charged particles in a magnetic eld. Next we consider the limit of low temperatures and strong elds where a full quantum treatment of the dynamics is required. A fler that we will be in a position to understand the localization phase transition in the IQHE. We will then study the origins of the FQHE and the physics described by the novel wave function invented by Robert Laughlin to describe the special condensed state of the electrons. Finally we will discuss topological excitations and broken symmetries in quantum H all ferrom agnets.

The review presented here is by no means complete. It is primarily an introduction to the basics followed by a more advanced discussion of recent developments in quantum Hall ferrom agnetism. Among the many topics which receive little or no discussion are the FQHE hierarchical states, interlayer drag e ects, FQHE edge state tunneling and the composite boson [1] and ferm ion [2] pictures of the FQHE. A number of general review s exist which the readerm ay be interested in consulting $\beta\{11\}$

1.1.1 W hy 2D Is Important

As one learns in the study of scaling in the localization transition, resistivity (which is what theorists calculate) and resistance (which is what experim entalists m easure) for classical systems (in the shape of a hypercube) of size L are related by [12,13]

$$R = L^{(2 d)}$$
: (1.3)



valence band

Figure 1.1: Schem atic illustration of a G aA s/A IA s heterostructure quantum well. The vertical axis is band energy and the horizontal axis is position in the M BE growth direction. The dark circles indicate the Si^+ ions which have donated electrons into the quantum well. The lowest electric subband wave function of the quantum well is illustrated by the dashed line. It is common to use an alloy of G aA s and A IA s rather than pure A IA s for the barrier region as illustrated here.

Two dimensions is therefore special since in this case the resistance of the sam ple is scale invariant and $(e^2 = h)R$ is dimensionless. This turns out to be crucial to the universality of the result. In particular it means that one does not have to measure the physical dimensions of the sam ple to one part in 10^{10} in order to obtain the resistivity to that precision. Since the locations of the edges of the sam ple are not well-de ned enough to even contemplate such a measurement, this is a very fortunate feature of having available a 2DEG. It further turns out that, since the dissipation is nearly zero in the QHE states, even the shape of the sam ple and the precise location of the Hall voltage probes are alm ost completely irrelevant.

1.1.2 Constructing the 2DEG

There are a variety of techniques to construct two-dimensional electron gases. Fig. (1.1) shows one example in which the energy bands in a G aA s/A IA s heterostructure are used to create a 'quantum well'. Electrons from a Sidonor layer fall into the quantum well to create the 2D EG. The energy level ('blectric subband') spacing for the 'particle in a box' states of the well can be of order 10^3 K which is much larger than the cryogenic temperatures at which QHE experiments are performed. Hence all the electrons are frozen into the lowest electric subband (if this is consistent with the Pauli principle) but remain free to move in the plane of the G aA s layer form ing the well. The dynam ics of the electrons is therefore electricly two-dimensional even though the quantum well is not literally two-dimensional.

H eterostructures that are grown one atom ic layer at a time by M olecular B eam Epitaxy (M BE) are nearly perfectly ordered on the atom ic scale. In addition the Sidonor layer can be set back a considerable distance (0.5 m) to m inim ize the random scattering from the ionized Sidonors. Using these techniques, electron m obilities of 10^7 cm^2 =V s can be achieved at low temperatures corresponding to incredibly long mean free paths of 0.1 mm. As a result of the extrem ely low disorder in these systems, subtle electronic correlation energies come to the fore and yield a remarkable variety of quantum ground states, som e of which we shall explore here.

The same M BE and rem ote doping technology is used to m ake G aAs quantum well High E lectron M obility Transistors (HEM Ts) which are used in all cellular telephones and in radio telescope receivers where they are prized for their low noise and ability to am plify extrem ely weak signals. The same technology is widely utilized to produce the quantum well lasers used in com pact disk players.

1.1.3 W hy is D isorder and Localization Im portant?

Paradoxically, the extrem e universality of the transport properties in the quantum Hall regime occurs because of, rather than in spite of, the random disorder and uncontrolled imperfections which the devices contain. Anderson localization in the presence of disorder plays an essential role in the quantization, but this localization is strongly modil ed by the strong magnetic eld.

In two dimensions (for zero magnetic eld and non-interacting electrons) all states are localized even for arbitrarily weak disorder. The essence of this weak localization e ect is the current 'echo' associated with the quantum interference corrections to classical transport [14]. These quantum interference e ects rely crucially on the existence of time-reversal symm etry. In the presence of a strong quantizing magnetic eld, time-reversal symm etry is destroyed and the localization properties of the disordered 2D electron gas are radically altered. W e will shortly see that there exists a novel phase transition, not between a metal and insulator, but rather between two distinctly di erent insulating states.

In the absence of any impurities the 2DEG is translationally invariant and there is no preferred frame of reference.² As a result we can transform to a frame of reference moving with velocity \cdot relative to the lab frame. In this frame the electrons appear to be moving at velocity $+ \cdot$ and carrying current density

$$J = nev; \tag{1.4}$$

where n is the areal density and we use the convention that the electron charge is e. In the lab frame, the electrom agnetic elds are

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0} \tag{1.5}$$

 $^{^2\,}T$ his assumes that we can ignore the periodic potential of the crystal which is of course xed in the lab frame. W ithin the elective mass approximation this potential modiles the mass but does not destroy the Galilean invariance since the energy is still quadratic in the momentum.

The Quantum HallE ect

 $\vec{B} = B \hat{z}; \qquad (1.6)$

In the moving frame they are (to lowest order in v=c)

$$\vec{E} = \frac{1}{c} \nabla \vec{E}$$
(1.7)

$$\dot{B} = B \dot{z}; \qquad (1.8)$$

This Lorentz transform ation picture is precisely equivalent to the usual statement that an electric eld must exist which just cancels the Lorentz force $\frac{e}{c}$ v B in order for the device to carry the current straight through without de ection. Thus we have

$$\mathbf{f} = \frac{B}{nec} \mathbf{J} \quad \hat{B}:$$
(1.9)

The resistivity tensor is de ned by

$$E = J :$$
 (1.10)

Hence we can make the identi cation

$$= \frac{B}{nec} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 & +1\\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \tag{1.11}$$

The conductivity tensor is the matrix inverse of this so that

$$J = E;$$
 (1.12)

and

$$= = \frac{nec}{B} + 1 \quad 0 \tag{1.13}$$

Notice that, paradoxically, the system looks insulating since $_{xx} = 0$ and yet it looks like a perfect conductor since $_{xx} = 0$. In an ordinary insulator $_{xy} = 0$ and so $_{xx} = 1$. Here $_{xy} = \frac{nec}{B} \in 0$ and so the inverse exists.

The argument given above relies only on Lorentz covariance. The only property of the 2D EG that entered was the density. The argument works equally well whether the system is classical or quantum, whether the electron state is liquid, vapor, or solid. It simply does not matter. Thus, in the absence of disorder, the Hall e ect teaches us nothing about the system other than its density. The Hall resistivity is simply a linear function of magnetic eld whose slope tells us about the density. In the quantum Hall regime we would therefore see none of the novel physics in the absence of disorder since disorder is needed to destroy translation invariance. Once the translation invariance is destroyed there is a preferred frame of reference and the Lorentz covariance argument given above fails.

Figure (1.2) shows the remarkable transport data for a real device in the quantum Hall regime. Instead of a Hall resistivity which is simply a linear

5



Figure 1.2: Integer and fractional quantum Hall transport data showing the plateau regions in the Hall resistance $R_{\rm H}$ and associated dips in the dissipative resistance R. The numbers indicate the Landau level lling factors at which various features occur. A fler ref. [15].

The Quantum HallE ect



Figure 1.3: Persistent current circulating in a quantum Hall device having the C orbino geometry. The radial electric eld is maintained by the charges which can not ow back together because $_{xx}$ is nearly zero. These charges result from the radial current pulse associated with the azim uthal electric eld pulse produced by the applied ux (t).

function of magnetic eld, we see a series of so-called H all plateaus in which $_{\rm xy}$ is a universal constant

 $xy = -\frac{1}{e^2} \frac{h}{e^2}$ (1.14)

independent of all m icroscopic details (including the precise value of the m agnetic eld). A spociated with each of these plateaus is a dram atic decrease in the dissipative resistivity xx ! 0 which drops as much as 13 orders of m agnitude in the plateau regions. Clearly the system is undergoing som e sort of sequence of phase transitions into highly idealized dissipationless states. Just as in a superconductor, the dissipationless state supports persistent currents. These can be produced in devices having the Corbino ring geometry shown in q. (1.3). Applying additional ux through the ring produces a tem porary azim uthalelectric eld by Faraday induction. A current pulse is induced at right angles to the E eld and produces a radial charge polarization as shown. This polarization induces a (quasi-) perm anent radial electric eld which in turn causes persistent azim uthal currents. Torque m agnetom eter m easurem ents [16] have shown that the currents can persist 10[°] secs at very low tem peratures. A fter this time the tiny $_{\rm xx}$ gradually allows the radial charge polarization to dissipate. We can think of the azim uthal currents as gradually spiraling outwards due to the Hallangle (between current and electric eld) being very slightly less than 90 10¹³). (by

We have shown that the random impurity potential (and by implication Anderson localization) is a necessary condition for Hall plateaus to occur, but we have not yet understood precisely how this novel behavior comes about. That is our next task.

1.2 Classical and Sem i-Classical Dynam ics

1.2.1 Classical Approximation

The classical equations of motion for an electron of charge e m oving in two dimensions under the in uence of the Lorentz force $\frac{e}{c}v$ B' caused by a magnetic eld B' = B \hat{z} are

$$m x = \frac{eB}{c} y \tag{1.15}$$

$$m y = + \frac{eB}{c} \underline{x}:$$
 (1.16)

The general solution of these equations corresponds to motion in a circle of arbitrary radius R

$$r = R (\cos(!_{c}t+);\sin(!_{c}t+)):$$
(1.17)

Here is an arbitrary phase for the motion and

$$!_{c} = \frac{eB}{mc}$$
 (1.18)

is known as the classical cyclotron frequency. Notice that the period of the orbit is independent of the radius and that the tangential speed

$$v = R!_{c}$$
 (1.19)

controls the radius. A fast particle travels in a large circle but returns to the starting point in the same length of time as a slow particle which (necessarily) travels in a small circle. The motion is thus isochronous much like that of a harm onic oscillator whose period is independent of the amplitude of the motion. This apparent analogy is not an accident as we shall see when we study the Ham iltonian (which we will need for the full quantum solution).

B ecause of som e subtleties involving distinctions between canonical and m echanical m om entum in the presence of a magnetic eld, it is worth reviewing the form all agrangian and H am iltonian approaches to this problem. The above classical equations of motion follow from the Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{2}m \underline{x} \underline{x} - \frac{e}{c} \underline{x} A ; \qquad (120)$$

where = 1;2 refers to x and y respectively and A is the vector potential evaluated at the position of the particle. (We use the Einstein summation convention throughout this discussion.) Using

$$\frac{L}{x} = -\frac{e}{c} \times e A$$
(1.21)

TheQuantum HallE ect

and

$$\frac{L}{\underline{x}} = m \underline{x} \qquad \frac{e}{c} A \tag{1.22}$$

the Euler-Lagrange equation of motion becomes

$$m x = -\frac{e}{c} [0 A \quad (0 A)] \underline{x} : \qquad (1.23)$$

Using

$$\vec{B} = \vec{r} \quad \vec{A} \tag{1.24}$$

$$\mathsf{B} = \mathsf{Q} \mathsf{A} \tag{1.25}$$

shows that this is equivalent to eqs. (1.15{1.16).

Once we have the Lagrangian we can deduce the canonicalm om entum

$$p \qquad \frac{L}{\underline{x}} = m \underline{x} \qquad \frac{e}{c} A ; \qquad (1.26)$$

and the Ham iltonian

$$H [p;x] \qquad \underline{x} p \qquad L [x;x) = \frac{1}{2m} p + \frac{e}{c} A \qquad p + \frac{e}{c} A \qquad (1.27)$$

(Recall that the Lagrangian is canonically a function of the positions and velocities while the H am iltonian is canonically a function of the positions and m om enta). The quantity

$$p_{m ech} \quad p + \frac{e}{c}A \tag{128}$$

is known as the mechanical momentum. Ham ilton's equations of motion

$$\underline{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{\mathbf{\theta}\mathbf{H}}{\mathbf{\theta}\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{p}_{\mathrm{m}\,\mathrm{ech}} \tag{1.29}$$

$$\underline{p} = \frac{\underline{0}H}{\underline{0}x} = \frac{\underline{e}}{\underline{m}c} p + \frac{\underline{e}}{\underline{c}}A \quad (1.30)$$

show that it is the mechanicalm on entum , not the canonicalm on entum , which is equal to the usual expression related to the velocity $\$

$$p_{m ech} = m \underline{x} : \tag{1.31}$$

U sing H am ilton's equations of motion we can recover Newton's law for the Lorentz force given in eq. (1.23) by simply taking a time derivative of \underline{x} in eq. (1.29) and then using eq. (1.30).

The distinction between canonical and mechanical momentum can lead to confusion. For example it is possible for the particle to have a nite velocity

while having zero (canonical) m om entum ! Furtherm ore the canonical m om entum is dependent (as we will see later) on the choice of gauge for the vector potential and hence is not a physical observable. The m echanical m om entum, being simply related to the velocity (and hence the current) is physically observable and gauge invariant. The classical equations of m otion only involve the curl of the vector potential and so the particular gauge choice is not very in portant at the classical level. W e will therefore delay discussion of gauge choices until we study the full quantum solution, where the issue is unavoidable.

1.2.2 Sem i-classical Approximation

Recall that in the sem i-classical approximation used in transport theory we consider wave packets $_{R(t),K(t)}(x;t)$ made up of a linear superposition of B both waves. These packets are large on the scale of the de B roglie wavelength so that they have a well-de ned central wave vector K(t), but they are small on the scale of everything else (external potentials, etc.) so that they simultaneously can be considered to have well-de ned mean position R(t). (Note that K and R are parameters labeling the wave packet not arguments.) We then argue (and will discuss further below) that the solution of the Schrödinger equation in this sem iclassical limit gives a wave packet whose parameters K (t) and R (t) obey the appropriate analog of the classical H am ilton equations of motion

$$R_{-} = \frac{(h_{\vec{K},\vec{K}}) + j_{\vec{K},\vec{K}}}{(hK)}$$
(1.32)

$$hK_{-} = \frac{(h_{\vec{R},\vec{K}}) j_{\vec{R},\vec{K}} i}{(h_{\vec{R},\vec{K}})}$$
(1.33)

Naturally this leads to the same circular motion of the wave packet at the classical cyclotron frequency discussed above. For weak elds and fast electrons the radius of these circular orbits will be large compared to the size of the wave packets and the sem i-classical approximation will be valid. However at strong elds, the approximation begins to break down because the orbits are too small and because h! c becomes a signi cant (large) energy. Thus we anticipate that the sem i-classical regime requires h! c F, where F is the Fermi energy.

We have already seen hints that the problem we are studying is really a harm onic oscillator problem. For the harm onic oscillator there is a characteristic energy scale h! (in this case h!_c) and a characteristic length scale `for the zeropoint uctuations of the position in the ground state. The analog quantity in this problem is the so-called magnetic length

$$\frac{hc}{eB} = \frac{257A}{q} :$$
(1.34)

The physical interpretation of this length is that the area 2 $^{\circ}$ contains one

١

The Quantum HallE ect

quantum of magnetic ux $_0$ where³

$$_{0} = \frac{hc}{e}$$
(1.35)

That is to say, the density of magnetic ux is

$$B = \frac{0}{2^{-2}}:$$
 (1.36)

To be in the sem iclassical limit then requires that the Ferm i wavelength be small on the scale of the magnetic length so that k_F ' 1. This condition turns out to be equivalent to $h!_c$ _F so they are not separate constraints.

Exercise 1.1 Use the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization condition that the orbit have a circum ference containing an integral number of de Broglie wavelengths to nd the allowed orbits of a 2D electron moving in a uniform magnetic eld. Show that each successive orbit encloses precisely one additional quantum of ux in its interior. H int: It is important to make the distinction between the canonical momentum (which controls the de Broglie wavelength) and the mechanical momentum (which controls the velocity). The calculation is simplified if one uses the symmetric gauge $\tilde{A} = \frac{1}{2}\pi$ \tilde{B} in which the vector potential is purely azim uthal and independent of the azim uthal angle.

1.3 Quantum Dynam ics in Strong B Fields

Since we will be dealing with the H am iltonian and the Schrodinger equation, our rst order of business is to choose a gauge for the vector potential. O ne convenient choice is the so-called Landau gauge:

A (r) = xB \hat{y}

(1.37)

which obeys $\tilde{r} = B \hat{z}$. In this gauge the vector potential points in the y direction but varies only with the x position, as illustrated in g. (1.4). Hence the system still has translation invariance in the y direction. Notice that the m agnetic eld (and hence all the physics) is translationally invariant, but the H am iltonian is not! (See exercise 1.2.) This is one of m any peculiarities of dealing with vector potentials.

Exercise 1.2 Show for the Landau gauge that even though the H am iltonian is not invariant for translations in the x direction, the physics is still invariant since the change in the H am iltonian that occurs under translation is simply equivalent to a gauge change. Prove this for any arbitrary gauge, assuming only that the magnetic eld is uniform.

 $^{^3{\}rm N}$ ote that in the study of superconductors the $\,$ ux quantum $\,$ is de ned with a factor of 2e rather than e to account for the pairing of the electrons in the condensate.



Figure 1.4: Illustration of the Landau gauge vector potential $A = xB \circ$. The magnetic eld is perfectly uniform, but the vector potential has a preferred origin and orientation corresponding to the particular gauge choice.

The Ham iltonian can be written in the Landau gauge as

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} p_x^2 + (p_y + \frac{eB}{c}x)^2$$
(1.38)

Taking advantage of the translation sym m etry in the y direction, let us attem pt a separation of variables by writing the wave function in the form

$$_{k}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y}) = e^{\mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{f}_{k}(\mathbf{x}):$$
 (1.39)

This has the advantage that it is an eigenstate of p_y and hence we can make the replacement p_y ! hk in the Ham iltonian. A fler separating variables we have the elective one-dimensional Schrödinger equation

$$h_k f_k (x) = {}_k f_k (x);$$
 (1.40)

where

$$h_k = \frac{1}{2m}p_x^2 + \frac{1}{2m} = hk + \frac{eB}{c}x^2$$
: (1.41)

This is simply a one-dimensional displaced harm onic oscillator⁴

$$h_{k} = \frac{1}{2m}p_{x}^{2} + \frac{1}{2}m !_{c}^{2} x + k^{2}$$
(1.42)

 $^{^4\,\}rm T$ hus we have arrived at the harm on ic oscillator hinted at sem iclassically, but paradoxically it is only one-dimensional, not two. The other degree of freedom appears (in this gauge) in the y m om entum .

whose frequency is the classical cyclotron frequency and whose central position $X_k = k^2$ is (som ew hat paradoxically) determ ined by the y m om entum quantum number. Thus for each plane wave chosen for the y direction there will be an entire fam ily of energy eigenvalues

$$kn = (n + \frac{1}{2})h!_{c}$$
 (1.43)

which depend only on n are completely independent of the y m om entum hk. The corresponding (unnorm alized) eigenfunctions are

$$_{nk}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}_{L}} e^{iky} H_{n} (\mathbf{x} + k^{2}) e^{-\frac{1}{2^{2}} (\mathbf{x} + k^{2})^{2}}; \qquad (1.44)$$

where H $_{\rm n}\,$ is (as usual for harm onic oscillators) the nth H erm ite polynom ial (in this case displaced to the new central position X $_{\rm k})$.

Exercise 1.3 Verify that eq. (1.44) is in fact a solution of the Schrödinger equation as claim ed.

These harm onic oscillator levels are called Landau levels. Due to the lack of dependence of the energy on k, the degeneracy of each level is enormous, as we will now show. We assume periodic boundary conditions in the y direction. Because of the vector potential, it is impossible to simultaneously have periodic boundary conditions in the x direction. However since the basis wave functions are harm onic oscillator polynom ialsmultiplied by strongly converging gaussians, they rapidly vanish for positions away from the center position $X_0 = k^2$. Let us suppose that the sample is rectangular with dimensions L_x ; L_y and that the left hand edge is at $x = L_x$ and the right hand edge is at x = 0. Then the values of the wavevector k for which the basis state is substantially inside the sam ple run from k = 0 to $k = L_x = \sqrt{2}$. It is clear that the states at the left edge and the right edge di er strongly in their k values and hence periodic boundary conditions are impossible.⁵

The total number of states in each Landau level is then

$$N = \frac{L_y}{2} \int_{0}^{2} dk = \frac{L_x L_y}{2^2} = N$$
(1.45)

where

$$N \qquad \frac{B L_{x} L_{y}}{0} \tag{1.46}$$

is the num ber of ux quanta penetrating the sam ple. Thus there is one state per Landau level per ux quantum which is consistent with the sem iclassical result from Exercise (1.1). Notice that even though the fam ily of allowed wavevectors

 $^{^5\,}T$ he best one can achieve is so-called quasi-periodic boundary conditions in which the phase di erence between the left and right edges is zero at the bottom and rises linearly with height, reaching 2 N $L_x\,L_y=^{\nu^2}$ at the top. The eigenfunctions with these boundary conditions are elliptic theta functions which are linear combinations of the gaussians discussed here. See the discussion by Haldane in Ref. [3].

is only one-dimensional, we not that the degeneracy of each Landau level is extensive in the two-dimensional area. The reason for this is that the spacing between wave vectors allowed by the periodic boundary conditions $_{\rm k} = \frac{2}{L_{\rm y}}$ decreases while the range of allowed wave vectors $[0; L_{\rm x} = ^2]$ increases with increasing L. The reader may also worry that for very large samples, the range of allowed values of k will be so large that it will fall outside the rst B rilbuin zone forcing us to include band m ixing and the periodic lattice potential beyond the elective mass approximation. This is not true how ever, since the canonical momentum is a gauge dependent quantity. The value of k in any particular region of the sample can be made small by shifting the origin of the coordinate system to that region (thereby making a gauge transform ation).

The width of the harm onic oscillator wave functions in the nth Landau level is of order $\frac{p}{n}$. This is m icroscopic compared to the system size, but note that the spacing between the centers

$$= k^{2} = \frac{2^{2}}{L_{y}}$$
(1.47)

is vastly smaller (assuming $L_y >>$ '). Thus the supports of the di erent basis states are strongly overlapping (but they are still orthogonal).

Exercise 1.4 U sing the fact that the energy for the nth harmonic oscillator state is $(n + \frac{1}{2})h!_c$, present a sem i-classical argument explaining the result claimed above that the width of the support of the wave function scales as $P\frac{1}{n}$.

Exercise 1.5 U sing the Landau gauge, construct a gaussian wave packet in the lowest Landau level of the form

 $(x;y) = \sum_{1}^{Z_{+1}} a_k e^{iky} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(x+k\sqrt{2})^2};$

choosing a_k in such a way that the wave packet is localized as closely as possible around some point ${\tt R}$. W hat is the smallest size wave packet that can be constructed without mixing in higher Landau levels?

Having now found the eigenfunctions for an electron in a strong magnetic eld we can relate them back to the sem i-classical picture of wave packets undergoing circular cyclotron motion. Consider an initial sem iclassical wave packet located at some position and having some speci ed momentum. In the sem i-classical limit the mean energy of this packet will greatly exceed the cyclotron energy $\frac{h^2K^2}{2m}$ h! c and hence it will be made up of a linear combination of a large num ber of di erent Landau level states centered around $n = \frac{h^2K^2}{2m h! c}$

$$(\mathbf{x};t) = \sum_{n=1}^{X} L_{y} \frac{dk}{2} a_{n} (\mathbf{\tilde{k}}) _{nk} (\mathbf{x}) e^{i(n+\frac{1}{2})!} t:$$
(1.48)

Notice that in an ordinary 2D problem at zero eld, the complete set of plane wave states would be labeled by a 2D continuous momentum label. Here we

TheQuantum HallE ect

have one discrete label (the Landau level index) and a 1D continuous labels (the y wave vector). Thus the 'sum' over the complete set of states is actually a combination of a sum m ation and an integration.

The details of the initial position and momentum are controlled by the am – plitudes a_n (K). We can immediately see however, that since the energy levels are exactly evenly spaced that the motion is exactly periodic:

$$(x;t+\frac{2}{!_{c}}) = (x;t):$$
 (1.49)

If one works through the details, one nds that the motion is indeed circular and corresponds to the expected sem i-classical cyclotron orbit.

For simplicity we will restrict the remainder of our discussion to the lowest Landau level where the (correctly normalized) eigenfunctions in the Landau gauge are (dropping the index n = 0 from now on):

$$_{k}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}_{1=2}} e^{iky} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(x+k\sqrt{2})^{2}}$$
 (1.50)

and every state has the same energy eigenvalue $k = \frac{1}{2}h!_{c}$.

We imagine that the magnetic eld (and hence the Landau level splitting) is very large so that we can ignore higher Landau levels. (There are some subtleties here to which we will return.) Because the states are all degenerate, any wave packet made up of any combination of the basis states will be a stationary state. The total current will therefore be zero. We anticipate however from sem iclassical considerations that there should be some remnant of the classical circular motion visible in the local current density. To see this note that the expectation value of the current in the kth basis state is

$$hTi = e_{m}^{1} k p + e_{c}^{E} K$$
(1.51)

The y component of the current is

$$hJ_{y}i = \frac{e}{m^{1=2}} \int_{-1}^{Z} dx e^{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(x+k^{\sqrt{2}})^{2}} hk + \frac{eB}{c}x e^{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(x+k^{\sqrt{2}})^{2}}$$
$$= \frac{e!_{c}}{1=2} dx e^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x+k^{\sqrt{2}})^{2}} x+k^{\sqrt{2}}$$
(1.52)

We see from the integrand that the current density is antisym metric about the peak of the gaussian and hence the total current vanishes. This antisym metry (positive vertical current on the left, negative vertical current on the right) is the rem nant of the sem iclassical circular motion.

Let us now consider the case of a uniform electric eld pointing in the x direction and giving rise to the potential energy

V(r) = +eEx: (1.53)

This still has translation symmetry in the y direction and so our Landau gauge choice is still the most convenient. Again separating variables we see that the

solution is nearly the sam e as before, except that the displacem ent of the harm onic oscillator is slightly di erent. The Ham iltonian in eq. (1.54) becomes

$$h_{k} = \frac{1}{2m}p_{x}^{2} + \frac{1}{2}m!_{c}^{2} x + k^{2} + eEx:$$
(1.54)

C om pleting the square we see that the oscillator is now centered at the new position

$$X_{k} = k^{2} \frac{eE}{m!_{c}^{2}}$$
 (1.55)

and the energy eigenvalue is now linearly dependent on the particle's peak position X $_{\rm k}\,$ (and therefore linear in the y m om entum)

$$_{k} = \frac{1}{2}h!_{c} + eEX_{k} + \frac{1}{2}mv^{2}; \qquad (1.56)$$

where

$$v = \frac{E}{B}$$
: (1.57)

B ecause of the shift in the peak position of the wavefunction, the perfect antisym m etry of the current distribution is destroyed and there is a net current

$$hJ_{y}i = ev$$
 (1.58)

showing that v \hat{y} is simply the usual $\tilde{E} = B^2$ drift velocity. This result can be derived either by explicitly doing the integral for the current or by noting that the wave packet group velocity is

$$\frac{1}{h}\frac{\theta}{\theta k} = \frac{eE}{h}\frac{\theta X_k}{\theta k} = v$$
(1.59)

independent of the value of k (since the electric eld is a constant in this case, giving rise to a strictly linear potential). Thus we have recovered the correct kinem atics from our quantum solution.

It should be noted that the applied electric eld 'tilts' the Landau levels in the sense that their energy is now linear in position as illustrated in g.(1.5). This means that there are degeneracies between dierent Landau level states because dierent kinetic energy can compensate dierent potential energy in the electric eld. Nevertheless, we have found the exact eigenstates (i.e., the stationary states). It is not possible for an electron to decay into one of the other degenerate states because they have dierent canonical momenta. If how ever disorder or phonons are available to break translation symmetry, then these decays become allowed and dissipation can appear. The matrix elements for such processes are small if the electric eld is weak because the degenerate states are widely separated spatially due to the small tilt of the Landau levels.



Figure 1.5: Illustration of electron Landau energy levels $n + \frac{1}{2} h!_c vs.position x_k = k^2$. (a) Zero electric eld case. (b) Case with nite electric eld pointing in the + \hat{x} direction.

Exercise 1.6 It is interesting to note that the exact eigenstates in the presence of the electric eld can be viewed as displaced oscillator states in the original (zero E eld) basis. In this basis the displaced states are linear com – binations of all the Landau level excited states of the same k. Use rst-order perturbation theory to nd the amount by which the n = 1 Landau level is mixed into the n = 0 state. C on pare this with the exact amount of mixing computed using the exact displaced oscillator state. Show that the two results agree to rst order in E. Because the displaced state is a linear com bination of m ore than one Landau level, it can carry a nite current. G ive an argument, based on perturbation theory why the amount of this current is inversely proportional to the B eld, but is independent of the m ass of the particle. H int: how does the m ass a ect the Landau level energy spacing and the current operator?

1.4 IQ H E Edge States

Now that we understand drift in a uniform electric eld, we can consider the problem of electrons con ned in a Hall bar of nite width by a non-uniform electric eld. For simplicity, we will consider the situation where the potential V(x) is smooth on the scale of the magnetic length, but this is not central to the discussion. If we assume that the system still has translation symmetry in the y direction, the solution to the Schrödinger equation must still be of the form

$$(x;y) = p \frac{1}{L_y} e^{iky} f_k(x)$$
: (1.60)

The function f_k will no longer be a simple harm onic wave function as we found in the case of the uniform electric eld. However we can anticipate that f_k will



Figure 1.6: Illustration of a smooth con ning potential which varies only in the x direction. The horizontal dashed line indicates the equilibrium ferm i level. The dashed curve indicates the wave packet envelope f_k which is displaced from its nom inal position x_k k^{λ} by the slope of the potential.

still be peaked near (but in general not precisely at) the point X_k k^{Δ} . The eigenvalues $_k$ will no longer be precisely linear in k but will still re ect the kinetic energy of the cyclotron motion plus the local potential energy V (X $_k$) (plus sm all corrections analogous to the one in eq. (1.56)). This is illustrated in g. (1.6). We see that the group velocity

$$\mathbf{v}_{k} = \frac{1}{h} \frac{\mathbf{\theta}_{k}}{\mathbf{\theta}_{k}} \mathbf{\hat{y}} \tag{1.61}$$

has the opposite sign on the two edges of the sample. This means that in the ground state there are edge currents of opposite sign owing in the sample. The sem i-classical interpretation of these currents is that they represent 'skipping orbits' in which the circular cyclotron motion is interrupted by collisions with the walls at the edges as illustrated in g. (1.7).

O ne way to analyze the H alle ect in this system is quite analogous to the Landauer picture of transport in narrow wires [17,18]. The edge states play the role of the left and right moving states at the two ferm i points. Because (as we saw earlier) momentum in a magnetic eld corresponds to position, the edge states are essentially real space realizations of the ferm i surface. A H all voltage drop across the sam ple in the x direction corresponds to a di erence in electrochem icalpotential between the two edges. B orrowing from the Landauer form ulation of transport, we will choose to apply this in the form of a chem ical potential di erence and ignore any changes in electrostatic potential.⁶ W hat this does is increase the number of electrons in skipping orbits on one edge of the sam ple and/or decrease the num ber on the other edge. P reviously the net current due to the two edges was zero, but now there is a net H all current. To calculate this current we have to add up the group velocities of all the occupied

⁶T his has led to various confusions in the literature. If there is an electrostatic potential gradient then some of the net H all current m ay be carried in the bulk rather than at the edges, but the nal answer is the same. In any case, the essential part of the physics is that the only place where there are low lying excitations is at the edges.



Figure 1.7: Sem i-classical view of skipping orbits at the ferm i level at the two edges of the sample where the con ning electric eld causes E B drift. The circular orbit illustrated in the center of the sample carries no net drift current if the local electric eld is zero.

states

$$I = \frac{e}{L_{y}} \int_{1}^{L_{y}+1} dk \frac{L_{y}}{2} \frac{1}{h} \frac{e}{k} n_{k}; \qquad (1.62)$$

where for the moment we assume that in the bulk, only a single Landau level is occupied and n_k is the probability that state k in that Landau level is occupied. A ssum ing zero temperature and noting that the integrand is a perfect derivative, we have

$$I = \frac{e}{h} \int_{R}^{L} d = \frac{e}{h} [L_{R}]:$$
(1.63)

(To understand the order of lim its of integration, recall that as k increases, X $_k$ decreases.) The de nition of the Hall voltage drop is 7

 $(+ e)V_{H}$ $(+ e)[V_{R} V_{L}] = [R_{L}]:$ (1.64)

Hence

$$I = -\frac{e^2}{h} V_H ; \qquad (1.65)$$

where we have now allowed for the possibility that di erent Landau levels are occupied in the bulk and hence there are separate edge channels contributing

 $^{^{7}}$ To get the signs straight here, note that an increase in chem ical potential brings in m ore electrons. This is equivalent to a more positive voltage and hence a more negative potential energy eV. Since H N enters the therm odynamics, electrostatic potential energy and chem ical potential move the electron density oppositely. V and thus have the same sign of e ect because electrons are negatively charged.

to the current. This is the analog of having been' channels in the Landauer transport picture. In the Landauer picture for an ordinary wire, we are considering the longitudinal voltage drop (and computing $_{xx}$), while here we have the Hall voltage drop (and are computing $_{xy}$). The analogy is quite precise how ever because we view the right and left m overs as having distributions controlled by separate chem ical potentials. It just happens in the QHE case that the right and left m overs are physically separated in such a way that the voltage drop is transverse to the current. U sing the above result and the fact that the current ow s at right angles to the voltage drop we have the desired results

$$xy = \frac{e^2}{h};$$
 (1.67)

with the quantum number being an integer.

So far we have been ignoring the possible e ects of disorder. Recall that for a single-channel one-dimensional wire in the Landauer picture, a disordered region in the middle of the wire will reduce the conductivity to

$$I = \frac{e^2}{h} \int f_{j}^{2}; \qquad (1.68)$$

where $\int f d$ is the probability for an electron to be transmitted through the disordered region. The reduction in transmitted current is due to back scattering. Remarkably, in the QHE case, the back scattering is essentially zero in very wide samples. To see this note that in the case of the Hallbar, scattering into a backward moving state would require transfer of the electron from one edge of the sample to the other since the edge states are spatially separated. For samples which are very wide compared to the magnetic length (more precisely, to the Anderson localization length) the matrix element for this is exponentially small. In short, there can be nothing but forward scattering. An incoming wave given by eq. (1.60) can only be transmitted in the forward direction, at most su ering a simple phase shift k

$$_{out}(x;y) = \frac{1}{p - \frac{1}{L_y}} e^{iky} f_k(x):$$
(1.69)

This is because no other states of the same energy are available. If the disorder causes Landau levelm ixing at the edges to occur (because the con ning potential is relatively steep) then it is possible for an electron in one edge channel to scatter into another, but the current is still going in the same direction so that there is no reduction in overall transm ission probability. It is this chiral (unidirectional) nature of the edge states which is responsible for the fact that the H all conductance is correctly quantized independent of the disorder.

D isorder will broaden the Landau levels in the bulk and provide a reservoir of (localized) states which will allow the chem ical potential to vary sm oothly with density. These localized states will not contribute to the transport and so the H all conductance will be quantized over a plateau of nite width in B (or density) as seen in the data. Thus obtaining the universal value of quantized H all conductance to a precision of 10^{10} does not require ne tuning the applied B eld to a similar precision.

The localization of states in the bulk by disorder is an essential part of the physics of the quantum Hall e ect as we saw when we studied the role of translation invariance. We learned previously that in zero magnetic eld all states are (weakly) localized in two dimensions. In the presence of a quantizing magnetic eld, most states are strongly localized as discussed above. However if all states were localized then it would be in possible to have a quantum phase transition from one QHE plateau to the next. To understand how this works it is convenient to work in a sem iclassical percolation picture to be described below.

Exercise 1.7 Show that the number of edge channels whose energies lie in the gap between two Landau levels scales with the length L of the sample, while the number of bulk states scales with the area. Use these facts to show that the range of magnetic eld in which the chem ical potential lies in between two Landau levels scales to zero in the therm odynamic limit. Hence nite width quantized H all plateaus can not occur in the absence of disorder that produces a reservoir of localized states in the bulk whose number is proportional to the area.

1.5 Sem iclassical Percolation Picture

Let us consider a sm ooth random potential caused, say, by ionized silicon donors remotely located away from the 2DEG in the GaAs sem iconductor host. We take the magnetic eld to be very large so that the magnetic length is sm all on the scale over which the potential varies. In addition, we ignore the Coulom b interactions among the electrons.

W hat is the nature of the eigenfunctions in this random potential? W e have learned how to solve the problem exactly for the case of a constant electric eld and know the general form of the solution when there is translation invariance in one direction. W e found that the wave functions were plane waves running along lines of constant potential energy and having a width perpendicular to this which is very sm all and on the order of the magnetic length. The reason for this is the discreteness of the kinetic energy in a strong magnetic eld. It is im possible for an electron stuck in a given Landau level to continuously vary its kinetic energy. H ence energy conservation restricts its motion to regions of constant potential energy. In the limit of in nite magnetic eld where Landau level mixing is com pletely negligible, this con nem ent to lines of constant potential becom es exact (as the magnetic length goes to zero).

We are led to the following som ewhat paradoxical picture. The strong magnetic eld should be viewed as putting the system in the quantum limit in the sense that h!_c is a very large energy (comparable to $_{\rm F}$). At the same time (if one assumes the potential is smooth) one can argue that since the magnetic length is small compared to the scale over which the random potential varies,

the system is in a sem i-classical lim it where sm all wave packets (on the scale of ') follow classical E' B' drift trajectories.

From this discussion it then seems very reasonable that in the presence of a smooth random potential, with no particular translation symmetry, the eigenfunctions will live on contour lines of constant energy on the random energy surface. Thus low energy states will be found lying along contours in deep valleys in the potential landscape while high energy states will be found encircling m ountain tops' in the landscape. N aturally these extrem e states will be strongly localized about these extrem a in the potential.

Exercise 1.8 Using the Lagrangian for a charged particle in a magnetic eld with a scalar potential V (r), consider the high eld lim it by setting the mass to zero (thereby sending the quantum cyclotron energy to in nity).

- 1. Derive the classical equations of motion from the Lagrangian and show that they yield simple $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{B}$ drift along isopotential contours.
- 2. Find the momentum conjugate to the coordinate x and show that (with an appropriate gauge choice) it is the coordinate y:

$$p_x = -\frac{h}{v^2}y \tag{1.70}$$

so that we have the strange commutation relation

$$[x;y] = i^{2}$$
: (1.71)

In the in nite eld limit where '! 0 the coordinates commute and we recover the sem i-classical result in which e ectively point particles drift along isopotentials.

To understand the nature of states at interm ediate energies, it is useful to imagine gradually lling a random landscape with water as illustrated in g. (1.8). In this analogy, sea level represents the chem ical potential for the electrons. When only a small amount of water has been added, the water will ll the deepest valleys and form small lakes. As the sea level is increased the lakes will grow larger and their shorelines will begin to take on more complex shapes. At a certain critical value of sea level a phase transition will occur in which the shoreline percolates from one side of the system to the other. As the sea level is raised still further, the ocean will cover the majority of the land and only a few mountain tops will stick out above the water. The shore line will no longer percolate but only surround the mountain tops.

As the sea level is raised still higher additional percolation transitions will occur successively as each successive Landau level passes under water. If Landau levelm ixing is small and the disorder potential is sym metrically distributed about zero, then the critical value of the chemical potential for the nth perco-

22



Figure 1.8: Contour map of a smooth random landscape. Closed dashed lines indicate local mountain peaks. Closed solid lines indicate valleys. From top to bottom, the gray lled areas indicate the increasing bea level' whose shoreline nally percolates from one edge of the sample to the other (bottom panel). The particle-hole excitations live along the shoreline and become gapless when the shoreline becomes in nite in extent.

lation transition will occur near the center of the nth Landau level

$$_{n} = (n + \frac{1}{2})h!_{c}$$
: (1.72)

This percolation transition corresponds to the transition between quantized H all plateaus. To see why, note that when the sea level is below the percolation point, m ost of the sam ple is dry land. The electron gas is therefore insulating. W hen sea level is above the percolation point, m ost of the sam ple is covered with water. The electron gas is therefore connected throughout the m a prity of the sam ple and a quantized H all current can be carried. A nother way to see this is to note that when the sea level is above the percolation point, the con ning potential will make a shoreline along the full length of each edge of the sam ple to the other.

We can also understand from this picture why the dissipative conductivity $_{xx}$ has a sharp peak just as the plateau transition occurs. (Recall the data in g. (1.2).) Away from the critical point the circum ference of any particular patch of shoreline is nite. The period of the sem iclassical orbit around this is nite and hence so is the quantum level spacing. Thus there are sm all energy gaps for excitation of states across these real-space ferm i levels. Adding an in nitesimal electric eld will only weakly perturb these states due to the gap and the niteness of the perturbing matrix element which will be limited to values on the order of eED where D is the diam eter of the orbit. If how ever the shoreline percolates from one end of the sam ple to the other then the orbital



Figure 1.9: Illustration of edge states that wander deep into the bulk as the quantum Hall localization transition is approached from the conducting side. Solid arrows indicate the direction of drift along the isopotential lines. D ashed arrows indicate quantum tunneling from one sem i-classical orbit (edge state) to the other. This backscattering localizes the eigenstates and prevents transm ission through the sam ple using the 'edge' states (which become part of the bulk localized states).

period diverges and the gap vanishes. An in nitesimal electric eld can then cause dissipation of energy.

A nother way to see this is that as the percolation level is approached from above, the edge states on the two sides will begin taking detours deeper and deeper into the bulk and begin communicating with each other as the localization length diverges and the shoreline zig zags throughout the bulk of the sam ple. Thus electrons in one edge state can be back scattered into the other edge states and ultim ately rejected from the sam ple as illustrated in g.(1.9).

Because the random potential broadens out the Landau level density of states, the quantized H all plateaus will have nite width. As the chemical potential is varied in the regime of localized states in between the Landau level peaks, only the occupancy of localized states is changing. Hence the transport properties remain constant until the next percolation transition occurs. It is im portant to have the disorder present to produce this nite density of states and to localize those states.

It is known that as the (classical) percolation point is approached in two dimensions, the characteristic size (diameter) of the shoreline orbits diverges like

where measures the deviation of the sea level from its critical value. The shoreline structure is not smooth and in fact its circum ference diverges with a larger exponent 7=3 show ing that these are highly ram i ed fractalob jects whose circum ference scales as the 7=4th power of the diam eter.

So far we have assumed that the magnetic length is essentially zero. That is, we have ignored the fact that the wave function support extends a small distance transverse to the isopotential lines. If two di erent orbits with the same energy pass near each other but are classically disconnected, the particle can still tunnel between them if the magnetic length is nite. This quantum tunneling causes the localization length to diverge faster than the classical percolation model predicts. Numerical simulations indicate the localization length diverges like [19{22]

jj (1.74)

where the exponent (not to be confused with the Landau level lling factor!) has a value close (but probably not exactly equal to) 7=3 rather than the 4=3 found in classical percolation. It is believed that this exponent is universal and independent of Landau level index.

Experiments on the quantum critical behavior are quite di cult but there is evidence [23], at least in selected samples which show good scaling, that is indeed close to 7=3 (although there is some recent controversy on this point. [24]) and that the conductivity tensor is universal at the critical point. [21,25] W hy C oulom b interactions that are present in real samples do not spoil agreement with the numerical simulations is something of a mystery at the time of this writing. For a discussion of some of these issues see [13].

1.6 FractionalQHE

Under some circum stances of weak (but non-zero) disorder, quantized Hall plateaus appear which are characterized by simple rational fractional quantum numbers. For example, at magnetic elds three times larger than those at which the = 1 integer lling factor plateau occurs, the low est Landau level is only 1/3 occupied. The system ought to be below the percolation threshold and hence be insulating. Instead a robust quantized Hall plateau is observed indicating that electrons can travel through the sample and that (since $_{xx}$! 0) there is an excitation gap. This novel and quite unexpected physics is controlled by C oulom b repulsion between the electrons. It is best understood by rst ignoring the disorder and trying to discover the nature of the special correlated m anybody ground state into which the electrons condense when the lling factor is a rational fraction.

For reasons that will become clear later, it is convenient to analyze the problem in a new gauge

$$\vec{A} = \frac{1}{2} \vec{r} \quad \vec{B} \tag{1.75}$$

known as the sym m etric gauge. Unlike the Landau gauge which preserves translation sym m etry in one direction, the sym m etric gauge preserves rotational sym m etry about the origin. Hence we anticipate that angular m om entum (rather than y linear m om entum) will be a good quantum num ber in this gauge. For simplicity we will restrict our attention to the lowest Landau level only and (simply to avoid som e aw kw and m inus signs) change the sign of the B eld: B = B 2. W ith these restrictions, it is not hard to show that the solutions of the free-particle Schrodinger equation having de nite angular momentum are

$$r_{m} = \frac{1}{p \frac{1}{2 - \sqrt{2^{m} m!}}} z^{m} e^{\frac{1}{4} j z j^{2}}$$
(1.76)

where z = (x + iy) = is a dimensionless complex number representing the position vector <math>r (x; y) and m 0 is an integer.

Exercise 1.9 Verify that the basis functions in eq. (1.76) do solve the Schrodinger equation in the absence of a potential and do lie in the lowest Landau level. H int: Rewrite the kinetic energy in such a way that p A becomes B E.

The angular momentum of these basis states is of course hm. If we restrict our attention to the lowest Landau level, then there exists only one state with any given angular momentum and only non-negative values of m are allowed. This handedness' is a result of the chirality built into the problem by the magnetic eld.

It seems rather peculiar that in the Landau gauge we had a continuous onedimensional family of basis states for this two-dimensional problem. Now we nd that in a di erent gauge, we have a discrete one dimensional label for the basis states! Nevertheless, we still end up with the correct density of states per unit area. To see this note that the peak value of $\mathbf{j}_{\rm m}$ \mathbf{j} occurs at a radius of $R_{\rm peak} = \frac{1}{2m} \frac{1}{2}$. The area 2 $\frac{2}{m}$ of a circle of this radius contains m ux quanta. Hence we obtain the standard result of one state per Landau level per quantum of ux penetrating the sam ple.

Because all the basis states are degenerate, any linear combination of them is also an allowed solution of the Schrödinger equation. Hence any function of the form [26]

$$(x;y) = f(z)e^{-\frac{1}{4}\frac{j}{z}f}$$
 (1.77)

is allowed so long as f is analytic in its argument. In particular, arbitrary polynom ials of any degree ${\tt N}$

$$f(z) = \int_{j=1}^{N} (z - Z_j)$$
(1.78)

are allowed (at least in the therm odynam ic lim it) and are conveniently de ned by the locations of their N zeros $fZ_j; j = 1; 2; ...; N g$.

A nother useful solution is the so-called coherent state which is a particular in nite order polynom ial

f (z)
$$\frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2}} z e^{\frac{1}{4}}$$
: (1.79)

The wave function using this polynom ial has the property that it is a narrow gaussian wave packet centered at the position de ned by the complex number . Completing the square shows that the probability density is given by

$$j \quad j^{2} = jt \quad j^{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}jt} = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}jt} = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}jt} = j^{2}$$
(1.80)

This is the smallest wave packet that can be constructed from states within the lowest Landau level. The reader will nd it instructive to compare this gaussian packet to the one constructed in the Landau gauge in exercise (1.5).

Because the kinetic energy is completely degenerate, the e ect of C oulom b interactions among the particles is nontrivial. To develop a feel for the problem, let us begin by solving the two-body problem. Recall that the standard procedure is to take advantage of the rotational symmetry to write down a solution with the relative angular momentum of the particles being a good quantum number and then solve the Schrödinger equation for the radial part of the wave function. Here we nd that the analyticity properties of the wave functions in the lowest Landau level greatly simplies the situation. If we know the angular behavior of a wave function, analyticity uniquely de ness the radial behavior. Thus for example for a single particle, knowing that the angular part of the wave function is e^{im} , we know that the full wave function is guaranteed to uniquely be $r^m e^{im} e^{i \frac{1}{4} \frac{i}{p} \frac{1}{j}} = z^m e^{-\frac{1}{4} \frac{i}{p} \frac{j}{j}}$.

Consider now the two body problem for particles with relative angular momentum m and center of mass angular momentum M. The unique analytic wave function is (ignoring norm alization factors)

$$m_{M} (z_{1}; z_{2}) = (z_{1} z_{2})^{m} (z_{1} + z_{2})^{M} e^{\frac{1}{4} (\dot{z}_{1} \dot{f} + \dot{z}_{2} \dot{f})} :$$
 (1.81)

If m and M are non-negative integers, then the prefactor of the exponential is simply a polynom ial in the two arguments and so is a state m ade up of linear combinations of the degenerate one-body basis states 'm given in eq. (1.76) and therefore lies in the lowest Landau level. Note that if the particles are spinless ferm ions then m must be odd to give the correct exchange symmetry. Remarkably, this is the exact (neglecting Landau levelm ixing) solution for the Schrödinger equation for any central potential V ($j_{21} = j$) acting between the two particles.⁸ We do not need to solve any radial equation because of the powerful restrictions due to analyticity. There is only one state in the (lowest Landau level) H ilbert space with relative angular momentum m and center of m ass angular momentum M. Hence (neglecting Landau level mixing) it is an exact eigenstate of any central potential. mM is the exact answer independent of the H am iltonian!

The corresponding energy eigenvalue $v_{\rm m}\,$ is independent of M $\,$ and is referred to as the m th H aldane pseudopotential

$$v_{\rm m} = \frac{\rm Im \ M \ j \ j n \ M \ i}{\rm Im \ M \ j n \ M \ i}$$
(1.82)

 $^{^8}N$ ote that neglecting Landau level m ixing is a poor approximation for strong potentials V $\,$ h! $_{\rm c}$ unless they are very sm ooth on the scale of the magnetic length.



Figure 1.10: The Haklane pseudopotential V_m vs. relative angularm on entum m for two particles interacting via the Coulom b interaction. Units are $e^2 = \cdot$, where is the dielectric constant of the host sem iconductor and the nite thickness of the quantum well has been neglected.

The Haldane pseudopotentials for the repulsive C oulom b potential are shown in g. (1.10). These discrete energy eigenstates represent bound states of the repulsive potential. If there were no magnetic eld present, a repulsive potential would of course have only a continuous spectrum with no discrete bound states. However in the presence of the magnetic eld, there are electively bound states because the kinetic energy has been quenched. Ordinarily two particles that have a lot of potential energy because of their repulsive interaction can y apart converting that potential energy into kinetic energy. Here however (neglecting Landau levelm ixing) the particles all have xed kinetic energy. Hence particles that are repelling each other are stuck and can not escape from each other. O ne can view this sem iclassically as the two particles orbiting each other under the in uence of E B drift with the Lorentz force preventing them from ying apart. In the presence of an attractive potential the eigenvalues change sign, but of course the eigenfunctions rem ain exactly the sam e (since they are unique)!

The fact that a repulsive potential has a discrete spectrum for a pair of particles is (as we will shortly see) the central feature of the physics underlying the existence of an excitation gap in the fractional quantum Hall e ect. One m ight hope that since we have found analyticity to uniquely determ ine the two-body eigenstates, we m ight be able to determ ine m any-particle eigen-

TheQuantum HallE ect

states exactly. The situation is complicated however by the fact that for three or m one particles, the various relative angular m om enta L_{12} ; L_{13} ; L_{23} , etc. do not all commute. Thus we can not write down general exact eigenstates. We will however be able to use the analyticity to great advantage and m ake exact statem ents for certain special cases.

Exercise 1.10 Express the exact lowest Landau level two-body eigenstate

$$(z_1; z_2) = (z_1 \quad z_2)^3 e^{\frac{1}{4} I z_1 J + z_2 J g}$$

in terms of the basis of all possible two-body Slater determ inants.

E xercise 1.11 Verify the claim that the H aldane pseudopotential v_m is independent of the center of m ass angular m om entum $\,M\,$.

Exercise 1.12 Evaluate the Haldane pseudopotentials for the Coulomb potential $\frac{e^2}{r}$. Express your answer in units of $\frac{e^2}{r}$. For the specific case of = 10 and B = 10T, express your answer in Kelvin.

Exercise 1.13 Take into account the nite thickness of the quantum well by assuming that the one-particle basis states have the form

 $_{m}$ (z;s) = $'_{m}$ (z) (s);

where s is the coordinate in the direction norm alto the quantum well. W rite down (but do not evaluate) the form al expression for the Haldane pseudopotentials in this case. Qualitatively describe the e ect of nite thickness on the values of the di erent pseudopotentials for the case where the well thickness is approximately equal to the magnetic length.

1.6.1 The = 1 m any-body state

So far we have found the one- and two-body states. Our next task is to write down the wave function for a fully led Landau level. We need to nd

$$[z] = f[z] e^{\frac{1}{4} \int_{z_{j}}^{z_{j}} j^{2}}$$
(1.83)

where [z] stands for $(z_1; z_2; :::; z_N)$ and f is a polynom ial representing the Slater determ inant with all states occupied. Consider the simple example of two particles. We want one particle in the orbital '_0 and one in '_1, as illustrated schematically in g. (1.11a). Thus (again ignoring norm alization)

$$f[z] = \frac{(z_1)^0}{(z_1)^1} \frac{(z_2)^0}{(z_2)^1} = (z_1)^0 (z_2)^1 (z_2)^0 (z_1)^1$$

= $(z_2 z_1)$ (1.84)

S.M. Girvin



Figure 1.11: O obital occupancies for the maximal density led Landau level state with (a) two particles and (b) three particles. There are no particle labels here. In the Slater determ inant wave function, the particles are labeled but a sum is taken over all possible permutations of the labels in order to antisym – metrize the wave function.

This is the low est possible order polynom ial that is antisymmetric. For the case of three particles we have (see g. (1.11b))

$$f[z] = \begin{pmatrix} (z_1)^0 & (z_2)^0 & (z_3)^0 \\ (z_1)^1 & (z_2)^1 & (z_3)^1 & = z_2 z_3^2 & z_3 z_2^2 & z_1^1 z_3^2 + z_1^1 z_1^2 + z_1 z_2^2 & z_2^1 z_1^2 \\ (z_1)^2 & (z_2)^2 & (z_3)^2 \\ & = & (z_1 & z_2) (z_1 & z_3) (z_2 & z_3) \\ & = & \begin{pmatrix} y^3 \\ (z_1 & z_2) & (z_1 & z_3) & (z_2 & z_3) \\ & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$
(1.85)

This form for the Slater determ inant is known as the Vanderm onde polynom ial. The overall minus sign is unimportant and we will drop it.

The single Slater determ inant to 11 the rst N angular momentum states is a simple generalization of eq. (1.85)

$$f_{N}[z] = (z_{1} \quad z_{j}):$$
 (1.86)

To prove that this is true for general N, note that the polynom ial is fully antisym metric and the highest power of any z that appears is z^{N-1} . Thus the highest angular momentum state that is occupied is m = N -1. But since the antisym metry guarantees that no two particles can be in the same state, all N states from m = 0 to m = N -1 must be occupied. This proves that we have the correct Slater determ inant.

Exercise 1.14 Show carefully that the Vanderm onde polynom ial for N $\,$ particles is in fact totally antisymmetric.

O ne can also use induction to show that the Vanderm onde polynom ial is the correct Slater determ inant by writing

$$f_{N+1}(z) = f_{N}(z) \sum_{i=1}^{Y^{i}} (z_{i} - z_{N+1})$$
(1.87)

TheQuantum HallE ect

which can be shown to agree with the result of expanding the determ inant of the (N + 1) (N + 1) m atrix in term s of the m inors associated with the (N + 1)st row or column.

Note that since the Vanderm onde polynom ial corresponds to the lled Landau level it is the unique state having the maximum density and hence is an exact eigenstate for any form of interaction among the particles (neglecting Landau levelm ixing and ignoring the degeneracy in the center of mass angular momentum).

The (unnorm alized) probability distribution for particles in the led Landau level state is

$$j[z]j^{2} = \bigvee_{i < j}^{W} z_{j} j^{2} e^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} z_{j} j^{2}}$$
(1.88)

This seems like a rather complicated object about which it is hard to make any useful statements. It is clear that the polynomial term tries to keep the particles away from each other and gets larger as the particles spread out. It is also clear that the exponential term is small if the particles spread out too much. Such simple questions as, 'Is the density uniform?', seem hard to answer how ever.

It turns out that there is a beautiful analogy to plasm a physics developed by R.B.Laughlin which sheds a great deal of light on the nature of this m any particle probability distribution. To see how this works, let us pretend that the norm of the wave function

$$Z \qquad Z$$
$$Z \qquad d^{2}z_{1} ::: \qquad d^{2}z_{N} j_{[z]}^{2} \qquad (1.89)$$

is the partition function of a classical statistical mechanics problem with Boltzmann weight

$$j[z]j^2 = e^{U_{class}}$$
 (1.90)

where

 $\frac{2}{m}$ and

$$U_{class} = m^2 \sum_{i < j}^{X} (ln j_{2} z_{j} j) + \frac{m}{4} \sum_{k} j_{2k} j^{2}$$
: (1.91)

(The parameter m = 1 in the present case but we introduce it for later convenience.) It is perhaps not obvious at rst glance that we have made trem endous progress, but we have. This is because U_{class} turns out to be the potential energy of a fake classical one-component plasm a of particles of charge m in a uniform ('jellium') neutralizing background. Hence we can bring to bear well-developed intuition about classical plasm a physics to study the properties of j j². P lease remember however that all the statements we make here are about a particular wave function. There are no actual long-range logarithm ic interactions in the quantum Ham iltonian for which this wave function is the approximate groundstate.

To understand this, let us rst review the electrostatics of charges in three dimensions. For a charge Q particle in 3D, the surface integral of the electric eld on a sphere of radius R surrounding the charge obeys

$$d\vec{A} = 4 Q :$$
 (1.92)

Since the area of the sphere is 4 R^2 we deduce

$$\dot{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{r}) = Q \frac{\dot{\mathbf{r}}}{\mathbf{r}^2} \tag{1.93}$$

$$r'(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{Q}{r} \tag{1.94}$$

and

$$\tilde{r} = r^2 r = 4 Q^{-3} (r)$$
 (1.95)

where ' is the electrostatic potential. Now consider a two-dimensional world where all the eld lines are con ned to a plane (or equivalently consider the electrostatics of in nitely long charged rods in 3D). The analogous equation for the line integral of the norm all electric eld on a circle of radius R is Z

$$ds = 2 Q$$
 (1.96)

where the 2 (instead of 4) appears because the circum ference of a circle is 2 R (and is analogous to 4 R^2). Thus we nd

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{Q\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{r} \tag{1.97}$$

$$r(r) = Q = \ln \frac{r}{r_0}$$
 (1.98)

and the 2D version of Poisson's equation is

$$\tilde{r} = r^2 r = 2 Q^2 (r)$$
: (1.99)

Here r_0 is an arbitrary scale factor whose value is in m aterial since it only shifts ' by a constant.

W e now see why the potential energy of interaction among a group of objects with charge m $\,$ is

$$U_{0} = m^{2} \int_{\substack{i < j}}^{X} (\ln j z_{i} z_{j}) :$$
 (1.100)

(Since z = (x + iy)=' we are using $r_0 =$ '.) This explains the rst term in eq. (1.91).

To understand the second term notice that

$$r^{2} \frac{1}{4} \dot{p} \dot{p} = \frac{1}{2} = 2_{B}$$
(1.101)

32

Ζ
TheQuantum HallE ect

where

В

$$\frac{1}{2^{-\varrho}}$$
: (1.102)

Eq. (1.101) can be interpreted as Poisson's equation and tells us that $\frac{1}{4}$ jc f represents the electrostatic potential of a constant charge density _B. Thus the second term in eq. (1.91) is the energy of charge m objects interacting with this negative background.

Notice that 2 $^{\circ}$ is precisely the area containing one quantum of ux. Thus the background charge density is precisely $B = _0$, the density of ux in units of the ux quantum.

The very long range forces in this fake plasm a cost huge (fake) energy'unless the plasm a is everywhere locally neutral (on length scales larger than the D ebye screening length which in this case is comparable to the particle spacing). In order to be neutral, the density n of particles must obey

$$nm + B = 0$$
 (1.103)
) $n = \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{2^{-2}}$ (1.104)

since each particle carries (fake) charge m. For our lled Landau level with m = 1, this is of course the correct answer for the density since every single-particle state is occupied and there is one state per quantum of ux.

We again emphasize that the energy of the fake plasm a has nothing to do with the quantum H am iltonian and the true energy. The plasm a analogy is merely a statement about this particular choice of wave function. It says that the square of the wave function is very small (because U_{class} is large) for congurations in which the density deviates even a small am ount from $1=(2^{-2})$. The electrons can in principle be found anywhere, but the overwhelm ing probability is that they are found in a conguration which is locally random (liquid-like) but with negligible density uctuations on long length scales. We will discuss the nature of the typical congurations again further below in connection with g. (1.12).

W hen the fractional quantum Hall e ect was discovered, Robert Laughlin realized that one could write down a many-body variational wave function at lling factor = 1=m by simply taking the mth power of the polynom ial that describes the lled Landau level

$$f_{N}^{m}[z] = \int_{\substack{i < j}}^{Y^{n}} (z_{i} - z_{j})^{m} :$$
(1.105)

In order for this to remain analytic, m must be an integer. To preserve the antisymmetry m must be restricted to the odd integers. In the plasma analogy the particles now have fake charge m (rather than unity) and the density of electrons is $n = \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{2^{-1/2}}$ so the Landau level lling factor $= \frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{3}; \frac{1}{5}; \frac{1}{7}$, etc. (Later on, other wave functions were developed to describe more general states in the hierarchy of rational fractional lling factors at which quantized H all plateaus were observed [3,4,6,8,9].)

The Laughlin wave function naturally builds in good correlations among the electrons because each particle sees an m-fold zero at the positions of all the other particles. The wave function vanishes extrem ely rapidly if any two particles approach each other, and this helps m inim ize the expectation value of the C oulom b energy.

Since the kinetic energy is xed we need only concern ourselves with the expectation value of the potential energy for this variational wave function. D espite the fact that there are no adjustable variational parameters (other than m which controls the density) the Laughlin wave functions have proven to be very nearly exact for almost any realistic form of repulsive interaction. To understand how this can be so, it is instructive to consider a model for which this wave function actually is the exact ground state. Notice that the form of the wave function guarantees that every pair of particles has relative angular m om entum greater than or equal to m. One should not make the m istake of thinking that every pair has relative angular m om entum precisely equal to m. This would require the spatial separation between particles to be very nearly the same for every pair, which is of course in possible.

Suppose that we write the H am iltonian in terms of the H aldane pseudopotentials

$$V = \bigvee_{\substack{m \ \circ = 0 \ i < j}}^{\chi^2} V_{m \circ P_{m} \circ (ij)}$$
(1.106)

where P_m (ij) is the projection operator which selects out states in which particles i and j have relative angular momentum m. If $P_m \circ (ij)$ and $P_m \circ (jk)$ commuted with each other things would be simple to solve, but this is not the case. However if we consider the case of a hard-core potential' de ned by $v_m \circ = 0$ form $^0 \quad$ m, then clearly them th Laughlin state is an exact, zero energy eigenstate

$$V_{m}[z] = 0:$$
 (1.107)

This follows from the fact that

$$P_{m} \circ (ij)_{m} = 0$$
 (1.108)

for any m 0 < m since every pair has relative angular momentum of at least m.

Because the relative angularm on entum of a pair can change only in discrete (even integer) units, it turns out that this hard core model has an excitation gap. For example for m = 3, any excitation out of the Laughlin ground state necessarily weakens the nearly ideal correlations by forcing at least one pair of particles to have relative angular momentum 1 instead of 3 (or larger). This costs an excitation energy of order v_1 .

This excitation gap is essential to the existence of dissipationless ($_{xx} = _{xx} = 0$) current ow. In addition this gap means that the Laughlin state is stable against perturbations. Thus the di erence between the Haldane pseudopotentials v_m for the C oulom b interaction and the pseudopotentials for the

The Quantum HallE ect



Figure 1.12: C on parison of typical con gurations for a completely uncorrelated (Poisson) distribution of 1000 particles (left panel) to the distribution given by the Laughlin wave function for m = 3 (right panel). The latter is a snapshot taken during a M onte C arlo simulation of the distribution. The M onte C arlo procedure consists of proposing a random trial m ove of one of the particles to a new position. If this m ove increases the value of $j j^2$ it is always accepted. If the m ove decreases the value of $j j^2$ by a factor p, then the m ove is accepted with probability p. A fler equilibration of the plasm a by a large number of such m oves one nds that the con gurations generated are distributed according to $j j^2$. (A fler R.B. Laughlin, Chap. 7 in [3].)

hard core model can be treated as a small perturbation (relative to the excitation gap). Num erical studies show that for realistic pseudopotentials the overlap between the true ground state and the Laughlin state is extrem ely good.

To get a better understanding of the correlations built into the Laughlin wave function it is useful to consider the snapshot in g. (1.12) which shows a typical con guration of particles in the Laughlin ground state (obtained from a M onte C arb sam pling of j f) compared to a random (Poisson) distribution. Focussing rst on the large scale features we see that density uctuations at long wavelengths are severely suppressed in the Laughlin state. This is easily understood in terms of the plasm a analogy and the desire for local neutrality. A simple estimate for the density uctuations $_{q}$ at wave vector q can be obtained by noting that the fake plasm a potential energy can be written (ignoring a constant associated with self-interactions being included)

$$U_{class} = \frac{1}{2L^2} \frac{X}{q^2} \frac{2m^2}{q^2} q q$$
(1.109)

where L^2 is the area of the system and $\frac{2}{q^2}$ is the Fourier transform of the logarithm ic potential (easily derived from r^2 (ln (r)) = 2^{-2} (r)). At long wavelengths (q² n) it is legitimate to treat q as a collective coordinate of an elastic continuum. The distribution e U_{class} of these coordinates is a gaussian



Figure 1.13: P bt of the two-point correlation function h(r) 1 g(r) for the Laughlin plasm a with ¹ = m = 3 (left panel) and m = 5 (right panel). Notice that, unlike the result form = 1 given in eq. (1.112), g(r) exhibits the oscillatory behavior characteristic of a strongly coupled plasm a with short-range solid-like bcal order.

and so obeys (taking into account the fact that q = (q))

$$h_{q}_{q} = L^2 \frac{q^2}{4 m}$$
: (1.110)

We clearly see that the long-range (fake) forces in the (fake) plasma strongly suppress long wavelength density uctuations. We will return more to this point later when we study collective density wave excitations above the Laughlin ground state.

The density uctuations on short length scales are best studied in real space. The radial correlation g(r) function is a convenient object to consider. g(r) tells us the density at r given that there is a particle at the origin

$$g(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{N(N-1)}{n^{2}Z} d^{2}z_{3} ::: d^{2}z_{N} j(0;r;z_{3};::;z_{N})^{2}$$
(1.11)

where Z h j i, n is the density (assumed uniform) and the remaining factors account for all the dimensity of particles that could contribute. The factors of density are included in the denominator so that $\lim_{r \ge 1} g(r) = 1$.

Because the $m\ =\ 1$ state is a single Slater determ in ant g (z) can be computed exactly

$$g(z) = 1 \quad e^{\frac{1}{2}\dot{z}\dot{z}\dot{f}}$$
: (1.112)

Fig. (1.13) shows num erical estimates of h(r) 1 g(r) for the cases m = 3and 5. Notice that for the = 1 = m state g(z) $\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{2m} for small distances.$ Because of the strong suppression of density uctuations at long wavelengths, g(z) converges exponentially rapidly to unity at large distances. For m > 1, gdevelops oscillations indicative of solid-like correlations and, the plasm a actually The Quantum HallE ect

freezes⁹ at m 65. The C oulom b interaction energy can be expressed in terms of $q(z) as^{10}$

$$\frac{h \, j y \, j \, i}{h \, j \, i} = \frac{nN}{2} \, \frac{Z}{d^2 z} \, \frac{e^2}{j z j} [g(z) \, 1]$$
(1.113)

where the (1) term accounts for the neutralizing background and is the dielectric constant of the host sem iconductor. We can interpret g(z) 1 as the density of the exchange-correlation hole' surrounding each particle.

The correlation energies per particle for m = 3 and 5 are [27]

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{h_{3} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j}_{3i}}{h_{3j_{3}i}} = 0.4100 \quad 0.0001 \tag{1.114}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{h_{5} \mathbf{y} \mathbf{j}_{5} \mathbf{i}}{h_{5} \mathbf{j}_{5} \mathbf{i}} = 0.3277 \quad 0.0002 \tag{1.115}$$

in units of $e^2 = '$ which is 161 K for = 12.8 (the value in <u>G</u> aAs), B = 10T. For the led Landau level (m = 1) the exchange energy is $\frac{p}{8}$ as can be seen from eqs. (1.112) and (1.113).

Exercise 1.15 F ind the radial distribution function for a one-dimensional spinless free electron gas of density n by writing the ground state wave function as a single Slater determ inant and then integrating out all but two of the coordinates. Use this rst quantization method even if you already know how to do this calculation using second quantization. H int: Take advantage of the following representation of the determ inant of a N N matrix M in terms of permutations P of N objects.

$$Det M = \begin{array}{cc} X & Y^{N} \\ P & (1)^{p} & M_{jP_{j}} \\ P & j=1 \end{array}$$

Exercise 1.16 U sing the same method derive eq. (1.112).

 $^{^9}$ T hat is, M onte C arlo simulation of j j² shows that the particles are most likely to be found in a crystalline con guration which breaks translation symmetry. Again we emphasize that this is a statement about the Laughlin variational wave function, not necessarily a statement about what the electrons actually do. It turns out that for m 7 the Laughlin wave function is no longer the best variational wave function. One can write down wave functions describing W igner crystal states which have lower variational energy than the Laughlin liquid.

 $^{^{10}}$ T his expression assumes a strictly zero thickness electron gas. O there ise one must replace $\frac{e^2}{jz\,j}$ by $\frac{e^2}{jz\,j^2+s^2}$ $\overset{K_{+\,1}}{\longrightarrow} ds \frac{p\frac{\mathcal{F}\left(s\right)j^2}{jz\,j^2+s^2}}{y}$ where F is the wavefunction factor describing the quantum well bound state.

1.7 Neutral Collective Excitations

So far we have studied one particular variational wave function and found that it has good correlations built into it as graphically illustrated in Fig. 1.12. To further bolster the case that this wave function captures the physics of the fractional H all e ect we must now demonstrate that there is nite energy cost to produce excitations above this ground state. In this section we will study the neutral collective excitations. We will exam ine the charged excitations in the next section.

It turns out that the neutral excitations are phonon-like excitations sim ilar to those in solids and in super uid helium. We can therefore use a simple modi cation of Feynman's theory of the excitations in super uid helium [28,29].

By way of introduction let us start with the simple harm onic oscillator. The ground state is of the form

$$_{0}(x) e^{x^{2}}$$
: (1.116)

Suppose we did not know the excited state and tried to make a variational ansatz for it. Norm ally we think of the variational method as applying only to ground states. However it is not hard to see that the rst excited state energy is given by

$$1 = \min \frac{h \not \exists j i}{h j i}$$
(1.117)

provided that we do the minimization over the set of states which are constrained to be orthogonal to the ground state $_0$. One simple way to produce a variational state which is automatically orthogonal to the ground state is to change the parity by multiplying by the rst power of the coordinate

$$_{1}(x) x e^{x}$$
: (1.118)

Variation with respect to of course leads (in this special case) to the exact rst excited state.

W ith this background let us now consider the case of phonons in super uid ${}^{4}\text{He}$. Feynm an argued that because of the Bose statistics of the particles, there are no low -lying single-particle excitations. This is in stark contrast to a ferm i gas which has a high density of low -lying excitations around the ferm i surface. Feynm an argued that the only low -lying excitations in ${}^{4}\text{He}$ are collective density oscillations that are well-described by the follow ing fam ily of variational wave functions (that has no adjustable parameters) labeled by the wave vector

$$\kappa = \frac{p}{N} \kappa_{\kappa} 0 \tag{1.119}$$

where $_0$ is the exact ground state and

Ĩř

The Quantum HallE ect



Figure 1.14: (a) C on guration of particles in which the Fourier transform of the density at wave vector k is non-zero. (b) The Fourier amplitude will have a sim ilar magnitude for this con guration but a di erent phase.

is the Fourier transform of the density. The physical picture behind this is that at long wavelengths the uid acts like an elastic continuum and $_{\rm R}$ can be treated as a generalized oscillator norm alm ode coordinate. In this sense eq. (1.119) is then analogous to eq. (1.118). To see that $_{\rm R}$ is orthogonal to the ground state we simply note that

$$h_{0}j_{\tilde{\kappa}}i = \frac{p}{N} \frac{1}{N} h_{0}j_{\tilde{\kappa}}j_{0}i$$
$$= \frac{p}{N} \frac{1}{N} d^{3}R e^{i\tilde{\kappa}R} h_{0}j(r)j_{0}i; \qquad (1.121)$$

where

$$(\mathbf{r}) = 1$$
 $(\mathbf{r}_{j} = \mathbf{R})$ (1.122)

is the density operator. If $_0$ describes a translationally invariant liquid ground state then the Fourier transform of the mean density vanishes for k $\in 0$.

There are several reasons why $_{k}$ is a good variational wave function, especially for small k. First, it contains the ground state as a factor. Hence it contains all the special correlations built into the ground state to make sure that the particles avoid close approaches to each other without paying a high price in kinetic energy. Second, $_{k}$ builds in the features we expect on physical grounds for a density wave. To see this, consider evaluating $_{k}$ for a conguration of the particles like that shown in g. (1.14a) which has a density modulation at wave vector k. This is not a conguration that maxim izes $j_{0}f$, but as long as the density modulation is not too large and the particles avoid close approaches, $j_{0}f$ will not fall too far below its maximum value. More importantly, $j_{k}f$ will be much larger than it would for a more nearly uniform distribution of positions. As a result $j_{k}f$ will be large and this will be a likely conguration of the

particles in the excited state. For a con guration like that in g. (1.14b), the phase of $_{\text{K}}$ will shift but j $_{\text{K}}$ j will have the same magnitude. This is analogous to the parity change in the harm onic oscillator example. Because all di erent phases of the density wave are equally likely, $_{\text{K}}$ has a mean density which is uniform (translationally invariant).

To proceed with the calculation of the variational estim at for the excitation energy (k) of the density wave state we write

$$(k) = \frac{f(k)}{s(k)}$$
(1.123)

where

$$f(k) = f(H = E_0) j_{R};$$
 (1.124)

with E $_0$ being the exact ground state energy and

$$s(k) \quad h_{k}j_{k}i = \frac{1}{N}h_{0}j_{k}^{y}j_{0}i:$$
 (1.125)

We see that the norm of the variational state s(k) turns out to be the static structure factor of the ground state. It is a measure of the mean square density uctuations at wave vector k. Continuing the harmonic oscillator analogy, we can view this as a measure of the zero-point uctuations of the norm al-mode oscillator coordinate $_{k}$. For super uid ⁴He s(k) can be directly measured by neutron scattering and can also be computed theoretically using quantum M onte C arb m ethods [30]. We will return to this point shortly.

 $E\,xercise$ 1.17 Show that for a uniform liquid state of density n, the static structure factor is related to the Fourier transform of the radial distribution function by \$Z\$

$$s(k) = N_{k:0} + 1 + n d^{3}r e^{ik r} [g(r) 1]$$

The numerator in eq. (1.124) is called the oscillator strength and can be written

$$f(k) = \frac{1}{N} \int_{0}^{D} j_{k}^{Y} [H; _{k}] j_{0}$$
(1.126)

For uniform systems with parity symmetry we can write this as a double commutator $% \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$

$$f(k) = \frac{1}{2N} \begin{bmatrix} D & h & i & E \\ 0 & \frac{y}{k}; [H; _{k}] & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(1.127)

from which we can derive the justi ably fam ous oscillator strength sum rule

$$f(k) = \frac{h^2 k^2}{2M} :$$
 (1.128)

TheQuantum HallE ect

where M is the (band) m ass of the particles.¹¹ R em arkably (and conveniently) this is a universal result independent of the form of the interaction potential between the particles. This follows from the fact that only the kinetic energy part of the H am iltonian fails to commute with the density.

Exercise 1.18 Derive eq. (1.127) and then eq. (1.128) from eq. (1.126) for a system of interacting particles.

W e thus arrive at the Feynm an-B ijl form u la for the collective m ode excitation energy

$$(k) = \frac{h^2 k^2}{2M} \frac{1}{s(k)}:$$
(1.129)

We can interpret the rst term as the energy cost if a single particle (initially at rest) were to absorb all the momentum and the second term is a renorm alization factor describing momentum (and position) correlations among the particles. One of the remarkable features of the Feynm an-B ijl form ula is that it m anages to express a dynamical quantity (k), which is a property of the excited state spectrum, solely in terms of a static property of the ground state, namely s(k). This is a very powerful and useful approximation.

Returning to eq. (1.119) we see that $_{k}$ describes a linear superposition of states in which one single particle has had its momentum boosted by hk. We do not know which one however. The summation in eq. (1.120) tells us that it is equally likely to be particle 1 or particle 2 or ..., etc. This state should not be confused with the state in which boost is applied to particle 1 and particle 2 and ..., etc. This state is described by a product

which can be rewritten

$$\sum_{k}^{8} = \exp \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_$$

showing that this is an exact energy eigenstate (with energy N $\frac{h^2k^2}{2M}$) in which the center of mass momentum has been boosted by N h \tilde{k} .

In super uid ⁴H e the structure factor vanishes linearly at sm all wave vectors

so that (k) is linear as expected for a sound mode

$$(k) = \frac{h^2}{2M} \frac{1}{k}$$
(1.133)

 $^{^{11}}$ Later on in Eq. (1.137) we will express the oscillator strength in terms of a frequency integral. Strictly speaking if this is integrated up to very high frequencies including interband transitions, then M is replaced by the bare electron m ass.



Figure 1.15: Schem atic illustration of the phonon dispersion in super uid liquid ${}^{4}\text{He}$. For sm all wave vectors the dispersion is linear, as is expected for a gapless G oldstone m ode. The roton m inimum due to the peak in the static structure factor occurs at a wave vector k of approxim ately 20 in units of inverse A. The roton energy is approximately 10 in units of K elvins.

from which we see that the sound velocity is given by

$$c_s = \frac{h}{2M} \frac{1}{2}$$
: (1.134)

This phonon mode should not be confused with the ordinary hydrodynamic sound mode in classical uids. The latter occurs in a collision dom inated regime ! 1 in which collision-induced pressure provides the restoring force. The phonon mode described here by $_{\rm R}$ is a low-lying eigenstate of the quantum H am iltonian.

At larger wave vectors there is a peak in the static structure factor caused by the solid-like oscillations in the radial distribution function g(r) similar to those shown in Fig. 1.13 for the Laughlin liquid. This peak in s(k) leads to the so-called roton minimum in (k) as illustrated in g. (1.15).

To better understand the Feynm an picture of the collective excited states recall that the dynam ical structure factor is de ned (at zero tem perature) by

$$S(q;!) = \frac{2}{N} = \frac{y}{q} ! \frac{H = E_0}{h} = 0 :$$
 (1.135)

The static structure factor is the zeroth frequency moment

$$s(q) = \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} \frac{d!}{2} S(q;!) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \frac{d!}{2} S(q;!)$$
(1.136)

(with the second equality valid only at zero tem perature). Similarly the oscillator strength in eq. (1.124) becomes (at zero tem perature)

$$f(q) = \int_{1}^{Z} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d!}{2} h! S(q;!) = \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d!}{2} h! S(q;!): \qquad (1.137)$$

The Quantum HallE ect

Thus we arrive at the result that the Feynm an-Bijl form ula can be rewritten

$$(q) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{K_1} \frac{d!}{2} h! S(q;!)}{\prod_{i=1}^{K_1} \frac{d!}{2} S(q;!)};$$
(1.138)

That is, (q) is the mean excitation energy (weighted by the square of the density operator matrix element). Clearly the mean exceeds the minimum and so the estimate is variational claimed. Feynman's approximation is equivalent to the assumption that only a single mode contributes any oscillator strength so that the zero-temperature dynamical structure factor contains only a single delta function peak

$$S(q;!) = 2 S(q) ! \frac{1}{h} (q) :$$
 (1.139)

Notice that this approximate form satisfies both eq. (1.136) and eq. (1.137) provided that the collective mode energy (q) obeys the Feynman-Bijl form ula in eq. (1.129).

Exercise 1.19 For a system with a homogeneous liquid ground state, the (linear response) static susceptibility of the density to a perturbation U = V_{q-q} is dened by

 $h_{q}i = (q)V_{q}$: (1.140)

U sing rst order perturbation theory show that the static susceptibility is given in terms of the dynam ical structure factor by

$$(q) = 2 \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \frac{d!}{2} \frac{1}{h!} S(q;!): \qquad (1.141)$$

U sing the single mode approximation and the oscillator strength sum rule, derive an expression for the collective mode dispersion in terms of (q). (Your answer should not involve the static structure factor. Note also that eq.(1.140) is not needed to produce the answer to this part. Just work with eq.(1.141).)

As we mentioned previously Feynman argued that in ${}^{4}\text{H}e$ the Bose symmetry of the wave functions guarantees that unlike in Ferm i systems, there is only a single low-lying mode, namely the phonon density mode. The paucity of low-energy single particle excitations in boson systems is what helps make them super uid{there are no dissipative channels for the current to decay into. Despite the fact that the quantum Hall system is made up of fermions, the behavior is also reminiscent of super uidity since the current ow is dissipationless. Indeed, within the bom posite boson' picture, one views the FQHE ground state as a bose condensate [1,9,10]. Let us therefore blindly make the single-mode approximation and see what happens.

From eq. (1.110) we see that the static structure factor for the m th Laughlin state is (for sm all wave vectors only)

$$s(q) = \frac{L^2}{N} \frac{q^2}{4 m} = \frac{1}{2} q^2 r^2; \qquad (1.142)$$

where we have used $L^2 = N = 2^{-2}m$. The Feynman-Bijl form ula then yields¹²

$$(q) = \frac{h^2 q^2}{2M} \frac{2}{q^2 r^2} = h!_c: \qquad (1.143)$$

This predicts that there is an excitation gap that is independent of wave vector (for small q) and equal to the cyclotron energy. It is in fact correct that at long wavelengths the oscillator strength is dom inated by transitions in which a single particle is excited from the n = 0 to the n = 1 Landau level. Furtherm ore, K ohn's theorem guarantees that the mode energy is precisely $h!_c$. Eq. (1.143) was derived speci cally for the Laughlin state, but it is actually quite general, applying to any translationally invariant liquid ground state.

O nem ight expect that the single mode approximation (SM A) will not work well in an ordinary Ferm i gas due to the high density of excitations around the Ferm i surface.¹³ Here however the Ferm i surface has been destroyed by the magnetic eld and the continuum of excitations with di erent kinetic energies has been turned into a set of discrete inter-Landau-level excitations, the low est of which dom inates the oscillator strength.

For lling factor = 1 the Pauliprinciple prevents any intra-level excitations and the excitation gap is in facth! c as predicted by the SM A. How ever for < 1 there should exist intra-Landau-level excitations whose energy scale is set by the interaction scale $e^2 =$ 'rather than the kinetic energy scale h!c. Indeed we can form ally think of taking the band m ass to zero (M ! 0) which would send h!c ! 1 while keeping $e^2 =$ ' xed. Unfortunately the SM A as it stands now is not very useful in this limit. W hat we need is a variational wave function that represents a density wave but is restricted to lie in the H ilbert space of the low est Landau level. This can be form ally accomplished by replacing eq. (1.119) by

$$\kappa = \kappa m$$
(1.144)

where the overbar indicates that the density operator has been projected into the lowest Landau level. The details of how this is accomplished are presented in appendix A.

The analog of eq. (1.123) is

$$(k) = \frac{f(k)}{s(k)}$$
(1.145)

where f and s are the projected oscillator strength and structure factor, respectively. As shown in appendix A

$$s(k) \qquad \frac{1}{N} {}^{D} {}^{F}_{k} {}^{F}_{k} j_{m} = s(k) \qquad 1 \quad e^{\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{F}_{f}^{2} \cdot 2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ = s(k) \quad s_{=1}(k): \qquad (1.146)$$

 $^{^{12}{\}rm W}$ e will continue to use the symbol M $\,$ here for the band m ass of the electrons to avoid confusion with the inverse $\,$ lling factor m .

 $^{^{13}\,}T$ his expectation is only partly correct how ever as one discovers when studying collective plasm a oscillations in system s with long-range C oulom b forces.

TheQuantum HallE ect

This vanishes for the led Landau level because the Pauli principle forbids all intra-Landau-level excitations. For the m th Laughlin state eq. (1.142) show sus that the leading term in s(k) for small k is $\frac{1}{2}k^{2-2}$. Putting this into eq. (1.146) we see that the leading behavior for s(k) is therefore quartic

$$s(k) = a(k')^4 + \dots$$
 (1.147)

We can not compute the coe cient a without nding the k 4 correction to eq. (1.142). It turns out that there exists a compressibility sum rule for the fake plasm a from which we can obtain the exact result [29]

$$a = \frac{m}{8} \frac{1}{2} (1.148)$$

The projected oscillator strength is given by eq. (1.127) with the density operators replaced by their projections. In the case of ⁴He only the kinetic energy part of the H am iltonian failed to commute with the density. It was for this reason that the oscillator strength came out to be a universal number related to the m ass of the particles. W ithin the lowest Landau level how ever the kinetic energy is an irrelevant constant. Instead, after projection the density operators no longer commute with each other (see appendix A). It follows from these commutations that the projected oscillator strength is proportional to the strength of the interaction term. The leading sm all k behavior is [29]

$$f(k) = b \frac{e^2}{(k')^4} + \dots$$
 (1.149)

where b is a dimensionless constant that depends on the details of the interaction potential. The intra-Landau level excitation energy therefore has a nite gap at sm all k

$$(k) = \frac{f(k)}{s(k)} - \frac{b}{a} \frac{e^2}{k} + O(k^2) + \dots$$
 (1.150)

This is quite di erent from the case of super uid ${}^{4}\text{He}$ in which the mode is gapless. However like the case of the super uid, this in agnetophonon' mode has a in agnetoroton' minimum at nite k as illustrated in g. (1.16). The gure also shows results from numerical exact diagonalization studies which demonstrate that the single mode approximation is extremely accurate. Note that the magnetoroton minimum occurs close to the position of the smallest reciprocal lattice vector in the W igner crystal of the same density. In the crystal the phonon frequency would go exactly to zero at this point. (Recall that in a crystal the phonon dispersion curves have the periodicity of the reciprocal lattice.)

B ecause the oscillator strength is alm ost entirely in the cyclotron m ode, the dipole m atrix element for coupling the collective excitations to light is very sm all. They have how ever been observed in R am an scattering [33] and found to have an energy gap in excellent quantitative agreem ent with the single m ode approxim ation.



Figure 1.16: C om parison of the single m ode approxim ation (SM A) prediction of the collective m ode energy for lling factors = 1=3;1=5;1=7 (solid lines) with sm all-system num erical results for N particles. C rosses indicate the N = 7; = 1=3 spherical system, triangles indicate the N = 6; = 1=3 hexagonal unit cell system results of H aldane and R ezayi [31]. Solid dots are for N = 9; = 1=3 and N = 7; = 1=5 spherical system calculations of Fano et al. [32] A rrows at the top indicate the m agnitude of the reciprocal lattice vector of the W igner crystal at the corresponding lling factor. Notice that unlike the phonon collective m ode in super uid helium shown in g. (1.15), the m ode here is gapped.

F inally we remark that these collective excitations are characterized by a well-de ned wave vector K despite the presence of the strong magnetic eld. This is only possible because they are charge neutral which allows one to de ne a gauge invariant conserved momentum [34].

1.8 Charged Excitations

- **N**T

Except for the fact that they are gapped, the neutralm agnetophonon excitations are closely analogous to the phonon excitations in super uid ${}^{4}\text{He}$. We further pursue this analogy with a search for the analog of vortices in super uid lm s. A vortex is a topological defect which is the quantum version of the familiar whirlpool. A reasonably good variational wave function for a vortex in a two-dimensional lm of ${}^{4}\text{He}$ is

Here is the azim uthal angle that the particle's position makes relative to \hat{R} , the location of the vortex center. The function f vanishes as r approaches \hat{R} and goes to unity far away. The choice of sign in the phase determ ines whether the vortex is right or left handed.

The interpretation of this wave function is the following. The vortex is a topological defect because if any particle is dragged around a closed loop surrounding R, the phase of the wave function winds by 2. This phase gradient means that current is circulating around the core. Consider a large circle of radius centered on R. The phase change of 2 around the circle occurs in a distance 2 so the local gradient seen by every particle is ^= . Recalling eq. (1.131) we see that locally the center of mass momentum has been boosted by $\frac{h}{2}$ so that the current density of the whirlpool falls o inversely with distance from the core.¹⁴ N ear the core f falls to zero because of the bentrifugal barrier' associated with this circulation. In a more accurate variational wave function the core would be unchanged.

W hat is the analog of all this for the lowest Landau level? For $^+$ we see that every particle has its angularm on entum boosted by one unit. In the lowest Landau level analyticity (in the symmetric gauge) requires us to replace e^i by z = x + iy. Thus we are led to the Laughlin quasi-hole' wave function

 $^{^{14}\,}T$ his slow algebraic decay of the current density m eans that the total kinetic energy of a single vortex diverges logarithm ically with the size of the system . This in turn leads to the K osterlitz T houless phase transition in which pairs of vortices bind together below a critical tem perature. As we will see below there is no corresponding nite tem perature transition in a quantum H all system .

where Z is a complex number denoting the position of the vortex and m is the Laughlin wave function at lling factor = 1=m. The corresponding antivortex (quasi-electron' state) involves z_i suitably projected (as discussed in App.A.):

$$Z_{Z}[z] = \frac{\dot{Y}^{i}}{\sum_{j=1}^{j=1}} 2\frac{\theta}{\theta z_{j}} Z_{m}[z]$$
(1.153)

where as usual the derivatives act only on the polynomial part of $_{\rm m}$. All these derivatives make somewhat di cult to work with. We will therefore concentrate on the quasi-hole state $^+$. The origin of the names quasi-hole and quasi-electron will become clear shortly.

Unlike the case of a super uid lm, the presence of the vector potential allows these vortices to cost only a nite energy to produce and hence the electrical dissipation is always nite at any non-zero temperature. There is no nite temperature transition into a super uid state as in the K osterlitz T houless transition. From a eld theoretic point of view, this is closely analogous to the Higg's mechanism [1].

Just as in our study of the Laughlin wave function, it is very useful to see how the plasm a analogy works for the quasi-hole state

$$j_{z}^{+} j = e^{U_{class}} e^{V}$$
 (1.154)

where U_{class} is given by eq. (1.91), = 2=m as before and

$$X^{N}$$

 $V m (ln j_{z_{j}} Z j):$ (1.155)
 $j=1$

Thus we have the classical statistical mechanics of a one-component plasm a of (fake) charge m objects seeing a neutralizing jellium background plus a new potential energy V representing the interaction of these objects with an 'm purity' located at Z and having unit charge.

Recall that the chief desire of the plasm a is to maintain charge neutrality. Hence the plasm a particles will be repealed from Z. Because the plasm a particles have fake charge m, the screening cloud will have to have a net reduction of 1=m particles to screen the impurity. But this means that the quasi-hole has fractional ferm ion number! The (true) physical charge of the object is a fraction of the elementary charge

$$q = \frac{e}{m}$$
: (1.156)

This is very strange! How can we possibly have an elementary excitation carrying fractional charge in a system made up entirely of electrons? To understand this let us consider an example of another quantum system that seems to have fractional charge, but in reality doesn't. Im agine three protons arranged in an equilateral triangle as shown in g. (1.17). Let there be one electron in



F igure 1.17: Illustration of an electron tunneling among the 1S orbitals of three protons. The tunneling is exponentially slow for large separations which leads to only exponentially sm all lifting of what would otherwise be a three-fold degenerate ground state.

the system . In the spirit of the tight-binding model we consider only the 1S orbital on each of the three lattice sites'. The B loch states are

$$_{k} = \frac{1}{p} \frac{X^{3}}{3} e^{ikj} jji$$
(1.157)

where jji is the 1S orbital for the jth atom. The equilateral triangle is like a linear system of length 3 with periodic boundary conditions. Hence the allowed values of the wavevector are $k = \frac{2}{3}$; = 1;0;+1. The energy eigenvalues are

$$_{k} = E_{1S} \quad 2J \cos k$$
 (1.158)

where E_{1S} is the isolated atom energy and J is the hopping matrix element related to the orbital overlap and is exponentially small for large separations of the atom s.

 $T\ he\ pro\ jection\ operator\ that\ m\ easures\ w\ hether\ or\ not\ the\ particle\ is\ on\ site\ n\ is$

P_n jihnj: (1.159)

Its expectation value in any of the three eigenstates is

$$h_k \mathcal{P}_n j_k i = \frac{1}{3}$$
: (1.160)

This equation $\sin p \ln p$ rejects the fact that as the particle tunnels from site to site it is equally likely to be found on any site. Hence it will, on average, be found on a particular site n only 1/3 of the time. The average electron number per site is thus 1/3. This however is a trivial example because the value of the measured charge is always an integer. Two-thirds of the time we measure

zero and one third of the time we measure unity. This means that the charge uctuates. One measure of the uctuations is

$$p \frac{r}{hP_n^2 i - hP_n i^2} = \frac{r}{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{9}} = \frac{p}{\frac{2}{3}}; \qquad (1.161)$$

which shows that the uctuations are larger than the mean value. This result is most easily obtained by noting $P_n^2 = P_n$.

A characteristic feature of this 'in poster' fractional charge $\frac{e}{m}$ that guarantees that it uctuates is the existence in the spectrum of the Ham iltonian of a set of m nearly degenerate states. (In our toy example here, m = 3.) The characteristic time scale for the charge uctuations is h = w here is the energy splitting of the quasi-degenerate manifold of states. In our tight-binding example h=J is the characteristic time it takes an electron to tunnel from the 1S orbital on one site to the next. As the separation between the sites increases this tunneling time grow sexponentially large and the charge uctuations become exponentially slow and thus easy to detect.

In a certain precise sense, the fractional charge of the Laughlin quasiparticles behaves very di erently from this. An electron added at low energies to a = 1=3 quantum H all uid breaks up into three charge 1/3 Laughlin quasiparticles. These quasiparticles can move arbitrarily far apart from each other¹⁵ and yet no quasi-degenerate manifold of states appears. The excitation gap to the rst excited state remains nite. The only degeneracy is that associated with the positions of the quasiparticles. If we in agine that there are three in purity potentials that pin down the positions of the three quasiparticles, then the state of the system is uniquely specied. Because there is no quasidegeneracy, we do not have to specify any more information other than the positions of the quasiparticles. Hence in a deep sense, they are true elementary particles whose fractional charge is a sharp quantum observable.

O f course, since the system is made up only of electrons, if we capture the charges in som e region in a box, we will always get an integer num ber of electrons inside the box. However in order to close the box we have to locally destroy the Laughlin state. This will cost (at a minimum) the excitation gap. This may not seem in portant since the gap is small | only a few K elvin or so. But in agine that the gap were an M eV or a G eV. Then we would have to build a particle accelerator to close the box' and probe the uctuations in the charge. These uctuations would be analogous to the ones seen in quantum electrodynam ics at energies above $2m e^{2}$ where electron-positron pairs are produced during the m easurem ent of charge form factors by m eans of a scattering experiment.

Put another way, the charge of the Laughlin quasiparticle uctuates but only at high frequencies =h. If this frequency (which is 50G H z) is higher than the frequency response limit of our voltage probes, we will see no charge uctuations. We can form alize this by writing a modi ed projection operator [35] for the charge on some site n by

$$P_{n}^{()} P P_{n}P$$
 (1.162)

 $^{^{15}\}mathrm{R}$ ecall that unlike the case of vortices in super uids, these objects are uncon ned.

The Quantum HallE ect

where $P_n = jnihnjas$ before and

$$P^{()}$$
 ($H + E_0$) (1.163)

is the operator that projects onto the subset of eigenstates with excitation energies less than $P_n^{()}$ thus represents a measurement with a high-frequency cuto built in to represent the nite bandwidth of the detector. Returning to our tight-binding example, consider the situation where J is large enough that the excitation gap = $1 \cos^2_2 J$ exceeds the cuto . Then

$$P^{()} = \begin{array}{c} X^{1} \\ j_{k} i (_{k} + _{k_{0}}) h_{k} j \\ = 1 \\ = j_{k_{0}} i h_{k_{0}} j \end{array}$$
(1.164)

is simply a projector on the ground state. In this case

$$P_{n}^{()} = j_{k_{0}} i \frac{1}{3} h_{k_{0}} j$$
(1.165)

and

$$D \qquad E \qquad D \qquad E_{k_0} \quad \mathbb{P}_n^{()} \quad J^2 \qquad k_0 \qquad k_0 \quad \mathbb{P}_n^{()} \quad j_{k_0} = 0:$$
(1.166)

The charge uctuations in the ground state are then zero (as measured by the nite bandwidth detector).

The argument for the Laughlin quasiparticles is similar. We again emphasize that one can not think of a single charge tunneling among three sites because the excitation gap remains nite no matter how far apart the quasiparticle sites are located. This is possible only because it is a correlated many-particle system.

To gain a better understanding of fractional charge it is useful to compare this situation to that in high energy physics. In that eld of study one knows the physics at low energies | this is just the phenom ena of our everyday world. The goal is to study the high energy (short length scale) lim it to see where this low energy physics com es from . W hat force laws lead to our world? Probing the proton with high energy electrons we can tem porarily break it up into three fractionally charged quarks, for exam ple.

C ondensed m atter physics in a sense does the reverse. We know the phenom ena at high' energies (i.e. room tem perature) and we would like to see how the known dynam ics (C oulom b's law and non-relativistic quantum m echanics) leads to unknown and surprising collective e ects at low tem peratures and long length scales. The analog of the particle accelerator is the dilution refrigerator.

To further understand Laughlin quasiparticles consider the point of view of `atland' physicists living in the cold, two-dimensional world of a = 1=3 quantum Hall sample. As far as the atlanders are concerned the `vacuum' (the Laughlin liquid) is completely inert and featureless. They discover how ever that the universe is not completely empty. There are a few elementary particles around, all having the same charge q. The atland equivalent of Benjam in

Franklin chooses a unit of charge which not only makes q negative but gives it the fractional value 1=3. For some reason the F latlanders go along with this.

F latland cosm ologists theorize that these objects are 'bosm ic strings', topological defects left over from the big cool down' that followed the creation of the universe. F latland experim entalists call for the creation of a national accelerator facility which will reach the unprecedented energy scale of 10 K elvin. W ith great e ort and expense this energy scale is reached and the accelerator is used to sm ash together three charged particles. To the astonishm ent of the entire world a new short-lived particle is tem porarily created with the bizarre property of having integer charge!

There is another way to see that the Laughlin quasiparticles carry fractional charge which is useful to understand because it shows the deep connection between the sharp fractional charge and the sharp quantization of the Hall conductivity. In agine piercing the sam ple with an in nitely thin magnetic solenoid as shown in g. (1.18) and slow ly increasing the magnetic ux from 0 to $_{0} = \frac{hc}{c}$ the quantum of ux. Because of the existence of a nite excitation gap

the process is adiabatic and reversible if performed slow ly on a time scale long compared to h=.

Faraday's law tells us that the changing ux induces an electric eld obeying I

$$d\mathbf{r} \ \mathbf{E} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{\mathbf{d}}{\mathbf{d}t} \tag{1.167}$$

where is any contour surrounding the ux tube. Because the electric eld contains only Fourier components at frequencies ! obeying h! < , there is no dissipation and $_{xx} = _{yy} = _{xx} = _{yy} = 0$. The electric eld induces a current density obeying

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y} \ \mathbf{J} \quad \mathbf{\hat{z}} \tag{1.168}$$

so that

$$_{xy}$$
 J $(2 dr) = \frac{1}{c} \frac{d}{dt}$: (1.169)

The integral on the LHS represents the total current owing into the region enclosed by the contour. Thus the charge inside this region obeys

$$x_{y} \frac{dQ}{dt} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{d}{dt} :$$
 (1.170)

After one quantum of ux has been added the nalcharge is

$$Q = \frac{1}{c} x_{y} 0 = \frac{h}{e} x_{y}:$$
(1.171)

T hus on the quantized H all plateau at lling factor where $xy = \frac{e^2}{h}$ we have the result

$$Q = e:$$
 (1.172)

Reversing the sign of the added ux would reverse the sign of the charge.



Figure 1.18: C onstruction of a Laughlin quasiparticle by adiabatically threading ux (t) through a point in the sample. Faraday induction gives an azim uthal electric eld E (t) which in turn produces a radial current J (t). For each quantum of ux added, charge e ows into (or out of) the region due to the quantized H all conductivity $e^2 = h$. A ux tube containing an integer num ber of ux quanta is invisible to the particles (since the A haranov phase shift is an integer multiple of 2) and so can be rem oved by a singular gauge transform ation.

The nalstep in the argument is to note that an in nitesimal tube containing a quantum of ux is invisible to the particles. This is because the Aharonov-Bohm phase factor for traveling around the ux tube is unity.

$$\exp i\frac{e}{hc}^{1}$$
 A $dr = e^{2i} = 1$: (1.173)

Here A is the additional vector potential due to the solenoid. A ssum ing the ux tube is located at the origin and making the gauge choice

$$\vec{A} = {}_{0} \frac{\hat{A}}{2 r}; \qquad (1.174)$$

one can see by direct substitution into the Schrödinger equation that the only e ect of the quantized ux tube is to change the phase of the wave function by

$$! \frac{Y}{j} \frac{z_{j}}{z_{j}} = e^{i_{j}}$$
(1.175)

The rem oval of a quantized ux tube is thus a 'singular gauge change' which has no physicale ect.

Let us reiterate. A diabatic insertion of a ux quantum changes the state of the system by pulling in (or pushing out) a (fractionally) quantized amount of charge. Once the ux tube contains a quantum of ux it e ectively becomes invisible to the electrons and can be removed by means of a singular gauge transform ation.

Because the excitation gap is preserved during the adiabatic addition of the ux, the state of the system is fully speci ed by the position of the resulting quasiparticle. A s discussed before there are no bw -lying quasi-degenerate states. This version of the argum ent highlights the essential in portance of the fact that $_{xx} = 0$ and $_{xy}$ is quantized. The existence of the fractionally quantized H all transport coe cients guarantees the existence of fractionally charged elementary excitations

These fractionally charged objects have been observed directly by using an ultrasensitive electrom eter m ade from a quantum dot [36] and by the reduced shot noise which they produce when they carry current [37].

Because the Laughlin quasiparticles are discrete objects they cost a non-zero (but nite) energy to produce. Since they are charged they can be therm ally excited only in neutral pairs. The charge excitation gap is therefore

$$_{c} = _{+} +$$
 (1.176)

where is the vortex/antivortex (quasielectron/quasihole) excitation energy. In the presence of a transport current these therm ally excited charges can move under the in uence of the Hall electric eld and dissipate energy. The resulting resistivity has the A mhenius form

$$_{\rm xx} = \frac{h}{e^2} e^{-e^2}$$
 (1.177)

where is a dimensionless constant of order unity. Note that the law of mass action tells us that the activation energy is $_{\rm c}$ =2 not $_{\rm c}$ since the charges are excited in pairs. There is a close analogy between the dissipation described here and the ux ow resistance caused by vortices in a superconducting lm.

Theoretical estimates of $_{\rm c}$ are in good agreement with experimental values determined from transport measurements [38]. Typical values of $_{\rm c}$ are only a few percent of e²= `and hence no larger than a few K elvin. In a super uid time-reversal symmetry guarantees that vortices and antivortices have equal energies. The lack of time reversal symmetry here means that $_{+}$ and can be quite di erent. Consider for example the hard-core model for which the Laughlin wave function $_{\rm m}$ is an exact zero energy ground state as shown in eq. (1.107). Equation (1.152) shows that the quasihole state contains $_{\rm m}$ as a factor and hence is also an exact zero energy eigenstate for the hard-core interaction. Thus the quasihole costs zero energy. On the other hand eq. (1.153) tells us that the derivatives reduce the degree of hom ogeneity of the Laughlin polynom ial and therefore the energy of the quasilectron m ust be non-zero in the hard-core model. At lling factor = 1=m this asymmetry has no particular signi cance since the quasiparticles m ust be excited in pairs.

Consider now what happens when the magnetic eld is increased slightly or the particle number is decreased slightly so that the lling factor is slightly smaller than 1=m. The lowest energy way to accommodate this is to inject m quasiholes into the Laughlin state for each electron that is removed (or for each m $_0$ of ux that is added). The system energy (ignoring disorder and interactions in the dilute gas of quasiparticles) is

$$E_{+} = E_{m} \qquad N m_{+} \qquad (1.178)$$

where E_m is the Laughlin ground state energy and N is the number of added holes. Conversely for lling factors slightly greater than 1=m the energy is (with + N being the number of added electrons)

$$E = E_m + N m$$
 : (1.179)

This is illustrated in g. (1.19). The slope of the lines in the gure determines the chemical potential

$$= \frac{0E}{0} = m :$$
 (1.180)

The chemical potential su ers a jump discontinuity of m ($_{+}$ +) = m $_{c}$ just at lling factor = 1=m. This jump in the chemical potential is the signature of the charge excitation gap just as it is in a sem iconductor or insulator. Notice that this form of the energy is very rem iniscent of the energy of a type-II superconductor as a function of the applied magnetic eld (which induces vortices and therefore has an energy cost E β).

Recall that in order to have a quantized Hall plateau of nite width it is necessary to have disorder present. For the integer case we found that disorder localizes the excess electrons allowing the transport coe cients to not change



Figure 1.19: Energy cost for inserting N electrons into the Laughlin state near lling factor = 1=m. The slope of the line is the chemical potential. Its discontinuity at = 1=m m easures the charge excitation gap.

with the lling factor. Here it is the fractionally-charged quasiparticles that are localized by the disorder.¹⁶ Just as in the integer case the disorder m ay ll in the gap in the density of states but the DC value of $_{\rm xx}$ can remain zero because of the localization. Thus the fractional plateaus can have nite width.

If the density of quasiparticles becomes too high they may delocalize and condense into a correlated Laughlin state of their own. This gives rise to a hierarchical family of H all plateaus at rational fractional lling factors = p=q (generically with q odd due to the P auli principle). There are several dierent but entirely equivalent ways of constructing and viewing this hierarchy which we will not delve into here [3,4,6].

1.9 FQHE Edge States

We learned in our study of the integer QHE that gapless edge excitations exist even when the bulk has a large excitation gap. Because the bulk is incompressible the only gapless neutral excitations must be area-preserving shape distortions such as those illustrated for a disk geom etry in g. (1.20a). Because of the con ning potential at the edges these shape distortions have a characteristic velocity produced by the E B drift. It is possible to show that this view of the gapless neutral excitations is precisely equivalent to the usual Ferm i gas particle-hole pair excitations that we considered previously in our discussion of edge states. Recall that we argued that the contour line of the electrostatic potential separating the occupied from the empty states could be viewed as a real-space analog of the Ferm i surface (since position and m om entum are equivalent in the Landau gauge). The charged excitations at the edge are sim ply ordinary electrons added or rem oved from the vicinity of the edge.

 $^{^{16}}N$ ote again the essential in portance of the fact that the objects are 'elem entary particles'. That is, there are no residual degeneracies once the positions are pinned down.



Figure 1.20: A rea-preserving shape distortions of the incom pressible quantum Hall state. (a) IQ HE Laughlin liquid \forall roplet' at = 1. (b) FQ HE annulus at = 1=m formed by injecting a large number n of ux quanta at the origin to create n quasiholes. There are thus two edge modes of opposite chirality. Changing n by one unit transfers fractional charge e from one edge to the other by expanding or shrinking the size of the central hole. Thus the edge modes have topological sectors labeled by the W inding number'n and one can view the gapless edge excitations as a gas of fractionally charged Laughlin quasiparticles.

In the case of a fractionalQHE state at = 1=m the bulk gap is caused by Coulomb correlations and is smaller but still nite. Again the only gapless excitations are area-preserving shape distortions. Now however the charge of each edge can be varied in units of e=m. Consider the annulus of Hall uid shown in g. (1.20b). The extension of the Laughlin wave function $_m$ to this situation is

This simply places a large number n 1 of quasiholes at the origin. Following the plasm a analogy we see that this looks like a highly charged impurity at the origin which repels the plasma, producing the annulus shown in g. (120b). Each time we increase n by one unit, the annulus expands. We can view this expansion as increasing the electron number at the outer edge by 1=m and reducing it by 1=m at the inner edge. (Thereby keeping the total electron number integral as it must be.)

It is appropriate to view the Laughlin quasiparticles, which are gapped in the bulk, as being liberated at the edge. The gapless shape distortions in the H all liquid are thus excitations in a 'gas' of fractionally charged quasiparticles. This fact produces a profound alteration in the tunneling density of states to inject an electron into the system. An electron which is suddenly added to an edge (by tunneling through a barrier from an external electrode) will have very high energy unless it breaks up into m Laughlin quasiparticles. This leads to an orthogonality catastrophe' which sim ply m eans that the probability for this process is smaller and smaller for nal states of low er and low er energy. A s a result the current-voltage characteristic for the tunnel junction becomes non-linear [17,39,40]

$$I V^{m}$$
: (1.182)

For the led Landau level m = 1 the quasiparticles have charge q = em = eand are ordinary electrons. Hence there is no orthogonality catastrophe and the I-V characteristic is linear as expected for an ordinary metallic tunnel junction. The non-linear tunneling for the m = 3 state is shown in g. (1.21).

1.10 Quantum HallFerrom agnets

1.10.1 Introduction

Naively one m ight in agine that electrons in the QHE have their spin dynam ics frozen out by the Zeem an splitting g_BB . In free space with g = 2 (neglecting QED corrections) the Zeem an splitting is exactly equal to the cyclotron splitting h_c^{1} 100 K as illustrated in g. (1.22 a). Thus at low tem peratures we would expect for lling factors < 1 all the spins would be fully aligned. It turns out how ever that this naive expectation is incorrect in G aAs for two reasons. First,



Figure 1.21: Non-linear current voltage response for tunneling an electron into a FQHE edge state. Because the electron must break up into m fractionally charged quasiparticles, there is an orthogonality catastrophe leading to a powerlaw density of states. The attening at low currents is due to the nite tem perature. The upper panel shows the = 1=3 H all plateau. The theory [17,39] works extrem ely well on the 1/3 quantized H all plateau, but the unexpectedly sm ooth variation of the exponent with m agnetic eld away from the plateau shown in the lower panel is not yet fully understood. (A fter M.G rayson et al., Ref. [41].



Figure 1.22: (a) Landau energy levels for an electron in free space. Numbers label the Landau levels and + () refers to spin up (down). Since the g factor is 2, the Zeem an splitting is exactly equal to the Landau level spacing, $h!_c$ and there are extra degeneracies as indicated. (b) Same for an electron in G aAs. Because the electric m ass is small and g 0:4, the degeneracy is strongly lifted and the spin assignments are reversed.

TheQuantum HallE ect

the smalle ective mass (m = 0.068) in the conduction band of G aAs increases the cyclotron energy by a factor of m = m 14. Second, spin-orbit scattering tum bles the spins around in a way which reduces their e ective coupling to the external magnetic eld by a factor of 5 m aking the g factor 0.4. The Zeem an energy is thus som e 70 times smaller than the cyclotron energy and typically has a value of about 2K, as indicated in g. (1.22 b).

This decoupling of the scales of the orbital and spin energies means that it is possible to be in a regime in which the orbital motion is fully quantized $(k_B T \quad h!_c)$ but the low-energy spin uctuations are not completely frozen out $(k_B T \quad g_{B} B)$. The spin dynamics in this regime are extremely unusual and interesting because the system is an itinerant magnet with a quantized H all coe cient. As we shall see, this leads to quite novel physical elects.

The introduction of the spin degree of freedom means that we are dealing with the QHE in multicom ponent systems. This subject has a long history going back to an early paper by Halperin [42] and has been reviewed extensively [4,43, 44]. In addition to the spin degree of freedom there has been considerable recent interest in other multicom ponent systems in which spin is replaced by a pseudospin representing the layer index in double well QHE systems or the electric subband index in wide single well systems. Experiments on these systems are discussed by Shayegan in this volume [45] and have also been reviewed in [44].

Our discussion will focus primarily on ferrom agnetism near lling factor = 1. In the subsequent section we will address analogous e ects for pseudo-spin degrees of freedom in multilayer system s.

1.10.2 Coulom b Exchange

W e tend to think of the integer QHE as being associated with the gap due to the kinetic energy and ascribe importance to the Coulomb interaction only in the fractionalQHE.How ever study of ferrom agnetism near integer lling factor

= 1 has taught us that C oulow b interactions play an important role there as well [46].

M agnetism occurs not because of direct m agnetic forces, but rather because of a combination of electrostatic forces and the Pauliprinciple. In a fully ferrom agnetically aligned state all the spins are parallel and hence the spin part of the wave function is exchange sym m etric

$$j i = (z_1; \dots; z_N) j'''''' \dots (1.183)$$

The spatial part of the wave function must therefore be fully antisymmetric and vanish when any two particles approach each other. This means that each particle is surrounded by an 'exchange hole' which thus lowers the Coulomb energy per particle as shown in eq. (1.113). For lling factor = 1

$$\frac{hV\,i}{N} = \frac{e^2}{8}, \quad 200K \tag{1.184}$$

This energy scale is two orders of magnitude larger than the Zeeman splitting and hence strongly stabilizes the ferrom agnetic state. Indeed at = 1 the

ground state is spontaneously fully polarized at zero tem perature even in the absence of the Zeem an term. Ordinary ferrom agnets like iron are generally only partially polarized because of the extra kinetic energy cost of raising the ferm i level for the majority carriers. Here however the kinetic energy has been quenched by the magnetic eld and all states in the lowest Landau level are degenerate. For = 1 the large gap to the next Landau level means that we know the spatial wave function essentially exactly. It is simply the single Slater determ inant representing the fully led Landau level. That is, it is m = 1 Laughlin wave function. This simple circum stance makes this perhaps the world's best understood ferrom agnet.

1.10.3 Spin W ave Excitations

S

It turns out that the low -lying 'n agnon' (spin wave) excited states can also be obtained exactly. Before doing this for the QHE system let us remind ourselves how the calculation goes in the lattice Heisenberg model for N local moments in an insulating ferrom agnet

$$H = J S_{i} S_{j} S_{j}^{z}$$

$$= J S_{i} S_{j}^{z} + \frac{1}{2} S_{i}^{+} S_{j} + S_{i} S_{j}^{+}$$

$$K S_{j}^{z} = J S_{i}^{z} S_{j}^{z} + \frac{1}{2} S_{i}^{+} S_{j} + S_{i} S_{j}^{+}$$

$$K S_{j}^{z} = J S_{j}^{z} + \frac{1}{2} S_{j}^{+} + S_{j} S_{j}^{+} + S_{j} S_{j}^{z}$$

$$K S_{j}^{z} = J S_{j}^{z} + \frac{1}{2} S_{j}^{+} + S_{j} S_{j}^{+} + S_{j} S_{j}^{z}$$

$$K S_{j}^{z} = J S_{j}^{z} + \frac{1}{2} S_{j}^{+} + S_{j} S_{j}^{+} + S_{j} S_{j}^{z}$$

The ground state for J > 0 is the fully ferrom agnetic state with total spin S = N = 2. Let us choose our coordinates in spin space so that $S_z = N = 2$. Because the spins are fully aligned the spin- ip term s in H are ine ective and (ignoring the Zeem an term)

H j""" ::: "i =
$$\frac{J}{4}$$
N_b j""" ::: "i (1.186)

where N_b is the number of near-neighbor bonds and we have set h = 1. There are of course 2S + 1 = N + 1 other states of the same total spin which will be degenerate in the absence of the Zeem an coupling. These are generated by successive applications of the total spin low ering operator

$$X^{N}$$
 S_j (1.187)

It is not hard to show that the one-m agnon excited states are created by a closely related operator

$$S_{q} = \sum_{j=1}^{X^{N}} e^{iq R_{j}} S_{j}$$
(1.189)

The Quantum HallE ect

where q lies inside the B rillouin zone and is the m agnon wave vector. 17 D enote these states by

$$j_{q}i = S_{q} j_{0}i \qquad (1.190)$$

where j $_0$ i is the ground state. Because there is one ipped spin in these states the transverse part of the H eisenberg interaction is able to move the ipped spin from one site to a neighboring site

$$H j_{q}i = E_{0} + + \frac{JZ}{2} j_{q}i$$

$$\frac{J}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{X X^{N}} e^{iq R_{j}} S_{j+i} j_{0}i \qquad (1.191)$$

$$H j_q i = (E_0 + q) j_q i$$
 (1.192)

where z is the coordination number, $\widetilde{}$ is summed over near neighbor lattice vectors and the m agnon energy is \$9

$$_{q} = \frac{Jz}{2} \cdot 1 = \frac{1}{z} \times e^{iq} \cdot iq^{-} + (1.193)$$

For small q the dispersion is quadratic and for a 2D square lattice

$$\frac{Ja^2}{4}q^2 + (1.194)$$

where a is the lattice constant.

This is very dimension from the result for the antiferrom agnet which has a linearly dispersing collective mode. There the ground and excited states can only be approximately determined because the ground state does not have all the spins parallel and so is subject to quantum uctuations induced by the transverse part of the interaction. This physics will reappear when we study non-collinear states in QHE magnets away from lling factor = 1.

The magnon dispersion for the ferrom agnet can be understood in terms of bosonic 'particle' (the ipped spin) hopping on the lattice with a tight-binding model dispersion relation. The magnons are bosons because spin operators on di erent sites commute. They are not free bosons how ever because of the hard core constraint that (for spin 1/2) there can be no more than one ipped spin per site. Hence multim agnon excited states can not be computed exactly. Som e nice renorm alization group arguments about magnon interactions can be found in [47].

The QHE ferrom agnet is itinerant and we have to develop a som ew hat di erent picture. N evertheless there will be strong sim ilarities to the lattice H eisenberg m odel. The exact ground state is given by eq. (1.183) with

$$(z_1; :::; z_N) = {Y \atop (z_i \quad z_j) e^{-\frac{1}{4} P} {}_{k} {}^{j z_k j^2}}:$$
 (1.195)

 $^{^{17}}W$ e use the phase factor e iq $^{R}{}_{j}$ here rather than e^+ iq $^{R}{}_{j}$ sim ply to be consistent with S $_{q}$ being the Fourier transform of S $_{i}$.

To nd the spin wave excited states we need to nd the analog of eq. (1.190). The Fourier transform of the spin low ering operator for the continuum system is

$$S_{q} = e^{iq r_{j}} S_{j}$$
(1.196)

where r_j is the position operator for the jth particle. Recall from eq. (1.144) that we had to modify Feynm an's theory of the collective mode in super uid helium by projecting the density operator onto the H ilbert space of the lowest Landau level. This suggests that we do the same in eq. (1.196) to obtain the projected spin ip operator. In contrast to the good but approximate result we obtained for the collective density mode, this procedure actually yields the exact one-m agnon excited state (much like we found for the lattice model).

U sing the results of appendix A , the projected spin lowering operator is

$$S_{q} = e^{\frac{1}{4}j_{1}j_{2}^{2}} \prod_{j=1}^{N} q(j) S_{j}$$
 (1.197)

where q is the complex number representing the dimensionless wave vector q' and $_q(j)$ is the magnetic translation operator for the jth particle. The com - mutator of this operator with the C oulom b interaction H am iltonian is

$$[H;S_{q}] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in 0}^{X} v(k) + k ;S_{q}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in 0}^{X} v(k) + k ;S_{q} + k ;S$$

W e will shortly be applying this to the fully polarized ground state j i. As discussed in appendix A, no density wave excitations are allowed in this state and so it is annihilated by $_k$. Hence we can without approximation drop the second term above and replace the rst one by

$$[H;S_{q}]ji = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in 0}^{X} v(k) \quad k; \quad k;S_{q} \quad ji \qquad (1.199)$$

Evaluation of the double commutator following the rules in appendix A yields

$$[H;S_{\alpha}]ji = {}_{q}S_{\alpha}ji \qquad (1.200)$$

where

$$q \qquad \sum_{k \in 0}^{X} e^{\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{j}^{2}} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{k}) \sin^{2} \frac{1}{2} q^{k} :$$
 (1.201)

Since j i is an eigenstate of H , this proves that $S_q\,$ j i is an exact excited state of H with excitation energy $_q.$ In the presence of the Zeem an coupling $_q\,!\,_q\,+\,$.



F igure 1.23: Schem atic illustration of the QHE ferrom agnet spinwave dispersion. There is a gap at small k equal to the Zeem an splitting, $_{\rm Z}$. At large wave vectors, the energy saturates at the Coulom b exchange energy scale $_{\rm X}$ + $_{\rm Z}$ 100K .

This result tells us that, unlike the case of the density excitation, the singlemode approximation is exact for the case of the spin density excitation. The only assumption we made is that the ground state is fully polarized and has = 1.

For small q the dispersion starts out quadratically

$$_{\rm q}$$
 A $\dot{\rm q}$ (1.202)

w ith

$$A = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k \in 0}^{X} e^{\frac{1}{2}k^{2}} v(k) k^{2}$$
(1.203)

as can be seen by expanding the sine function to lowest order. For very large q \sin^2 can be replaced by its average value of $\frac{1}{2}$ to yield

 ${}_{q} {}^{x} v(k) e^{\frac{1}{2}jkj^{2}}:$ (1.204)

Thus the energy saturates at a constant value for q! 1 as shown in g. (123). (Note that in the lattice model the wave vectors are restricted to the rst Brillouin zone, but here they are not.)

W hile the derivation of this exact result for the spin wave dispersion is algebraically rather simple and looks quite sim ilar (except for the LLL projection) to the result for the lattice Heisenberg model, it does not give a very clear physical picture of the nature of the spin wave collective mode. This we can obtain from eq. (1.197) by noting that $_q(j)$ translates the particle a distance $q = 2^2$. Hence the spin wave operator S_q ips the spin of one of the particles and translates it spatially leaving a hole behind and creating a particle-hole



Figure 1.24: Illustration of the fact that the spin ip operator causes translations when projected into the lowest Landau level. For very large wave vectors the particles is translated completely away from the exchange hole and loses all its favorable C oulom b exchange energy.

pair carrying net momentum proportional to their separation as illustrated in g. (1.24). For large separations the excitonic C oulom b attraction between the particle and hole is negligible and the energy cost saturates at a value related to the C oulom b exchange energy of the ground state given in eq. (1.113). The exact dispersion relation can also be obtained by noting that scattering processes of the type illustrated by the dashed lines in g. (1.24) m ix together Landau gauge states

$$c_{k q_{v}; \#}^{y} c_{k; "}^{y} j^{"""""1}$$
 (1.205)

with di erent wave vectors k. Requiring that the state be an eigenvector of translation uniquely restricts the mixing to linear combinations of the form

X
e
$${}^{ikq_{x}'^{2}} c_{k}^{y} q_{y}, \#} c_{k}, "j"""""i:$$
 (1.206)

E valuation of the C oulom b m atrix elements shows that this is indeed an exact eigenstate.

1.10.4 E ective A ction

It is useful to try to reproduce these m icroscopic results for the spin wave excitations within an elective eld theory for the spin degrees of freedom. Let m(r) be a vector eld obeying m = 1 which describes the local orientation of the order parameter (the magnetization). Because the C oulom b forces are spin independent, the potential energy cost can not depend on the orientation of mbut only on its gradients. Hence we must have to leading order in a gradient expansion

$$U = \frac{1}{2} \int_{s}^{Z} d^{2}r \, (m \, (m \, \frac{1}{2}n \, d^{2}r \, m^{2})) \, (1.207)$$

where s is a phenom enological spin sti ness' which in two dimensions has units of energy and n $\frac{1}{2}$ is the particle density. We will learn how to evaluate it later.

We can think of this expression for the energy as the leading terms in a functional Taylor series expansion. Symmetry requires that (except for the Zeem an term) the expression for the energy be invariant under uniform global rotations of m. In addition, in the absence of disorder, it must be translationally invariant. Clearly the expression in (1.207) satisfies these symmetries. The only zero-derivative term of the appropriate symmetry is m which is constrained to be unity everywhere. There exist terms with m ore derivatives but these are irrelevant to the physics at very long wavelengths. (Such terms have been discussed by Read and Sachdev [47].)

To understand how time derivatives enter the elective action we have to recall that spins obey a rst-order (in time) precession equation under the inuence of the local exchange eld.¹⁸ Consider as a toy model a single spin in an external eld \sim .

$$H = h S$$
 (1.208)

The Lagrangian describing this toy model needs to contain a rst order time derivative and so must have the form (see discussion in appendix B)

$$L = hS f m A [m] + m + (m m 1)g$$
 (1.209)

where $S = \frac{1}{2}$ is the spin length and is a Lagrange multiplier to enforce the xed length constraint. The unknown vector A can be determined by requiring that it reproduce the correct precession equation of motion. The precession equation is

$$\frac{d}{dt}S = \frac{i}{h}[H;S] = i [S;S]$$

$$= S \qquad (1210)$$

$$S = \tilde{S} \qquad (1211)$$

which corresponds to counterclockwise precession around the magnetic eld.

W e m ust obtain the sam e equation of m otion from the Euler-Lagrange equation for the Lagrangian in eq. (1.209)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{L}{m} = 0$$
(1.212)

which may be written as

$$+ 2 m = F m_{-}$$
 (1.213)

where

 $^{^{18}}$ T hat is, the C oulom b exchange energy which tries to keep the spins locally parallel. In a H artree-Fock picture we could represent this by a term of the form $\hbar(r) = s(r)$ where (r) is the self-consistent eld.

and $(m \text{ eans } \frac{(m-1)}{(m-1)})$ (not the derivative with respect to some spatial coordinate). Since F is antisymmetric let us guess a solution of the form

$$F = m :$$
 (1.215)

Using this in eq. (1.213) yields

$$+2 m = m m_{...}$$
 (1.216)

Applying m to both sides and using the identity

weobtain

$$(m) = m m (m m):$$
 (1.218)

The last term on the right vanishes due to the length constraint. Thus we nd that our ansatz in eq. (1.215) does indeed make the Euler-Lagrange equation correctly reproduce eq. (1.211).

Eq. (1.215) is equivalent to

$$\tilde{r}_{m} = \tilde{r}_{m} \qquad (1.219)$$

indicating that A is the vector potential of a unit magnetic monopole sitting at the center of the unit sphere on which m lives as illustrated in g. (1.25). Note (the always confusing point) that we are interpreting m as the coordinate of a ctitious particle living on the unit sphere (in spin space) surrounding the monopole.

Recalling eq. (1.20), we see that the Lagrangian for a single spin in eq. (1.209) is equivalent to the Lagrangian of a massless object of charge S, located at position m, moving on the unit sphere containing a magnetic monopole. The Zeem an term represents a constant electric eld ~ producing a force ~S on the particle. The Lorentz force caused by the monopole causes the particle to orbit the sphere at constant 'latitude'. Because no kinetic term of the form m_m enters the Lagrangian, the charged particle is massless and so lies only in the lowest Landau level of the monopole eld. Note the similarity here to the previous discussion of the high eld limit and the sem iclassical percolation picture of the integer H all e ect. For further details the reader is directed to appendix B and to H aldane's discussion of monopole spherical harm onics [48].

If the 'charge' m oves slow ly around a closed counterclockw is path m (t) during the time interval [0;T] as illustrated in g. (1.25), the quantum amplitude

$$e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{0}^{R_{T}} dtL}$$
(1.220)

contains a Berry's phase [49] contribution proportional to the $\[magnetic ux'\]$ enclosed by the path

$$e^{iS \int_{0}^{R_{T}} dtm_{L} A} = e^{iS \int_{0}^{H} dtm} :$$
 (1.221)
The Quantum HallE ect



Figure 1.25: M agnetic monopole in spin space. A rrows indicate the curl of the Berry connection \tilde{r} A emanating from the origin. Shaded region indicates closed path m (t) taken by the spin order parameter during which it acquires a Berry phase proportional to the monopole ux passing through the shaded region.

As discussed in appendix B, this is a purely geometric phase in the sense that it depends only on the geometry of the path and not the rate at which the path is traversed (since the expression is time reparameterization invariant). Using Stokes theorem and eq. (1219) we can write the contour integral as a surface integral

$$e^{iS \stackrel{H}{\sim} dm} = e^{iS \stackrel{R}{\sim} d^{\sim} f \stackrel{R}{\sim}} = e^{iS}$$
(1.222)

where $d^{\sim} = m d$ is the directed area (solid angle) element and is the total solid angle subtended by the contour as viewed from the position of the monopole. Note from g. (1.25) that there is an ambiguity on the sphere as to which is the inside and which is the outside of the contour. Since the total solid angle is 4 we could equally well have obtained¹⁹

$$e^{+ iS(4)}$$
: (1.223)

Thus the phase is an biguous unless S is an integer or half-integer. This constitutes a 'proof' that the quantum spin length must be quantized.

Having obtained the correct Lagrangian for our toy model we can now readily generalize it to the spin wave problem using the potential energy in eq. (1.207)

$$L = hSn d^{2}r \underline{m} (r) A [re] m^{2} (re)$$

 $^{^{19}\,{\}rm T}\,{\rm he}$ change in the sign from + i to $\,$ i is due to the fact that the contour switches from being counterclockwise to clockwise if viewed as enclosing the 4 $\,$ area instead of the area.

SM.Girvin

The classical equation of motion can be analyzed just as for the toy model, however we will take a slightly di erent approach here. Let us look in the low energy sector where the spins all lie close to the \hat{z} direction. Then we can write

$$m = m^{x}; m^{y}; \frac{p}{1} \frac{1}{2} m^{x} m^{x} \frac{m^{y} m^{y}}{1}$$

$$m^{x}; m^{y}; 1 \frac{1}{2} m^{x} m^{x} \frac{1}{2} m^{y} m^{y} :$$
(1.225)

Now choose the 'symmetric gauge'

$$A^{\sim} = \frac{1}{2} (m^{y}; m^{x}; 0)$$
 (1.226)

which obeys eq. (1219) for m close to \hat{z} .

7.

Keeping only quadratic terms in the Lagrangian we obtain

$$L = hSn d^{2}r \frac{1}{2}(\underline{m}^{y}m^{x} \ \underline{m}^{x}m^{y})$$

$$1 \frac{1}{2}m^{x}m^{x} \frac{1}{2}m^{y}m^{y}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}s d^{2}r (\underline{0} \ m^{x}\underline{0} \ m^{x} + \underline{0} \ m^{y}\underline{0} \ m^{y}): (1.227)$$

This can be conveniently rewritten by de ning a complex eld

$$L = Snh d^{2}r \frac{1}{4} \qquad \frac{\overset{0}{i}}{\overset{0}{t}} \qquad \frac{\overset{0}{i}}{\overset{0}{t}} \qquad \frac{\overset{0}{i}}{\overset{0}{t}} \qquad 1 \frac{1}{2} \qquad \frac{1}{2} \overset{1}{_{s}} d^{2}r \overset{0}{i} \qquad (1.228)$$

The classical equation of motion is the Schrodinger like equation

$$+ ih\frac{\theta}{\theta t} = \frac{s}{nS}\theta^2 + h \quad : \tag{1.229}$$

This has plane wave solutions with quantum energy

$$_{k} = h + \frac{s}{nS}k^{2}$$
: (1.230)

We can t the phenom enological sti ness to the exact dispersion relation in eq. (1.202) to obtain

$$_{s} = \frac{nS}{4} \sum_{k \in 0}^{X} e^{\frac{1}{2}k\hat{j}^{2}} v(k)\hat{j}\hat{j}:$$
(1.231)

70



Figure 1.26: Illustration of a skyrm ion spin texture. The spin is down at the origin and gradually turns up at in nite radius. At intermediate distances, the XY components of the spin exhibit a vortex-like winding. Unlike a U (1) vortex, there is no singularity at the origin.

Exercise 1.20 D erive eq. (1.231) from rst principles by evaluating the bss of exchange energy when the Landau gauge = 1 ground state is distorted to m ake the spin tum ble in the x direction

$$j i = \int_{k}^{Y} \cos \frac{k}{2} c_{k}^{y} + \sin \frac{k}{2} c_{k\#}^{y} j Di$$
(1.232)

where $k = k^2$ and $= \frac{\theta}{\theta x}$ is the (constant) spin rotation angle gradient (since $x = k^2$ in this gauge).

1.10.5 Topological Excitations

So far we have studied neutral collective excitations that take the form of spin waves. They are neutral because as we have seen from eq. (1.197) they consist of a particle-hole pair. For very large momenta the spin- ipped particle is translated a large distance q 2^{2} away from its original position as discussed in appendix A. This looks locally like a charged excitation but it is very expensive because it bases all of its exchange energy. It is sensible to inquire if it is possible to make a cheaper charged excitation. This can indeed be done by taking into account the desire of the spins to be locally parallel and producing a sm ooth topological defect in the spin orientation [46,50{56] known as a skyrm ion by analogy with related objects in the Skyrm em odel of nuclear physics [57]. Such an object has the beautiful form exhibited in g. (1.26). Rather than having a single spin suddenly ip over, this object gradually turns over the spins as the center is approached. At interm ediate distances the spins have a vortex-like

con guration. However unlike a U (1) vortex, there is no singularity in the core region because the spins are able to rotate downwards out of the xy plane.

In nuclear physics the Skyrm e model envisions that the vacuum is a Yerrom agnet' described by a four component eld subject to the constraint

= 1. There are three m assless (i.e. linearly dispersing) spin wave excitations corresponding to the three directions of oscillation about the ordered direction. These three m assless modes represent the three (nearly) m assless pions $^+$; 0 ; . The nucleons (proton and neutron) are represented by skyrm ion spin textures. Rem arkably, it can be shown (for an appropriate form of the action) that these objects are ferm ions despite the fact that they are in a sense m ade up of a coherent superposition of (an in nite number of) bosonic spin waves.

We shall see a very similar phenom enology in QHE ferrom agnets. At lling factor , skyrm ions have charge e and fractional statistics much like Laughlin quasiparticles. For = 1 these objects are ferm ions. Unlike Laughlin quasiparticles, skyrm ions are extended objects, and they involve m any ipped (and partially ipped) spins. This property has profound in plications as we shall see.

Let us begin our analysis by understanding how it is that spin textures can carry charge. It is clear from the Pauli principle that it is necessary to ip at least some spins to locally increase the charge density in a = 1 ferrom agnet. W hat is the su cient condition on the spin distortions in order to have a density uctuation? Remarkably it turns out to be possible, as we shall see, to uniquely express the charge density solely in term s of gradients of the local spin orientation.

Consider a ferror agnet with local spin orientation \mathfrak{m} (r) which is static. As each electron travels we assume that the strong exchange eld keeps the spin following the local orientation \mathfrak{m} . If the electron has velocity \underline{x} , the rate of change of the local spin orientation it sees is $\underline{\mathfrak{m}} = \underline{x} \frac{\theta}{\theta x} - \mathfrak{m}$. This in turn induces an additional Berry's phase as the spin orientation varies. Thus the single-particle Lagrangian contains an additional rst order time derivative in addition to the one induced by the magnetic eld coupling to the orbitalm otion

$$L_0 = -\frac{e}{c} \underline{x} A + hSm A [m]: \qquad (1.233)$$

Here A refers to the electrom agnetic vector potential and A refers to the monopole vector potential obeying eq. (1219) and we have set the mass to zero (i.e. dropped the $\frac{1}{2}$ M x x term). This can be rewritten

$$L_0 = -\frac{e}{c} \underline{x} (A + a)$$
 (1.234)

where (with $_0$ being the ux quantum)

a
$$_{0}S = \frac{\theta}{\theta x} m A [m]$$
 (1.235)

represents the Berry connection', an additional vector potential which reproduces the Berry phase. The additional fake m agnetic ux due to the curl of the The Quantum HallE ect

Berry connection is

$$b = \frac{\theta}{\theta x} a$$

$$= {}_{0}S \quad \frac{\theta}{\theta x} \quad \frac{\theta}{\theta x} m \quad A \quad [m]$$

$$= {}_{0}S \quad \frac{\theta}{\theta x} \quad \frac{\theta}{\theta x} m \quad A \quad [m]$$

$$+ \frac{\theta}{\theta x} m \quad \frac{\theta m}{\theta x} \quad \frac{\theta A}{\theta m} : \qquad (1.236)$$

The rst term vanishes by symmetry leaving

$$b = {}_{0}S \qquad \frac{@m}{@x} \quad \frac{@m}{@x} \quad \frac{1}{2}F \qquad (1.237)$$

where F is given by eq. (1.215) and we have taken advantage of the fact that the remaining factors are antisymmetric under the exchange \$. Using eq. (1.215) and setting S = $\frac{1}{2}$ we obtain

$$b = _{0} \sim (1.238)$$

where

$$\sim \frac{1}{8} \qquad {}^{abc}m^{a}@m^{b}@m^{c}$$
$$= \frac{1}{8} \qquad m \qquad @m \qquad @m \qquad (1.239)$$

is (for reasons that will become clear shortly) called the topological density or the Pontryagin density.

In agine now that we adiabatically deform the uniform ly magnetized spin state into some spin texture state. We see from eq. (1.238) that the orbital degrees of freedom see this as adiabatically adding additional ux b(r). Recall from eq. (1.171) and the discussion of the charge of the Laughlin quasiparticle, that extra charge density is associated with extra ux in the am ount

$$= \frac{1}{c} x_y b \tag{1.240}$$

Thus we have the remarkable result that the changes in the electron charge density are proportional to the topological density.

Our assumption of adiabaticity is valid as long as the spin uctuation frequency is much lower than the charge excitation gap. This is an excellent approximation for = 1 and still good on the stronger fractional Hall plateaus.

It is interesting that the ferm ionic charge density in this model can be expressed solely in terms of the vector boson eld m(r), but there is something

even more signicant here. The skyrm ion spin texture has total topological charge

$$Q_{top} = \frac{1}{8} d^2 r \quad m \quad Qm \quad Qm \quad (1.242)$$

which is always an integer. In fact for any smooth spin texture in which the spins at in nity are all parallel, Q_{top} is always an integer. Since it is in possible to continuously deform one integer into another, Q_{top} is a topological invariant. That is, if $Q_{top} = 1$ because a skyrm ion (anti-skyrm ion) is present, Q_{top} is stable against smooth continuous distortions of the eld m. For example a spin wave could pass through the skyrm ion and Q_{top} would remain invariant. Thus this charged object is topologically stable and has ferm ion number (i.e., the number of ferm ions (electrons) that ow into the region when the object is form ed)

$$N = Q_{top} : \qquad (1.243)$$

For = 1, N is an integer (1 say) and has the ferm ion number of an electron. It is thus continuously connected to the single ipped spin example discussed earlier.

We are thus led to the remarkable conclusion that the spin degree of freedom couples to the electrostatic potential. Because skyrm ions carry charge, we can a ect the spin con guration using electric rather than magnetic elds!

To understand how Q_{top} always turns out to be an integer, it is useful to consider a simpler case of a one-dimensional ring. We follow here the discussion of [58]. Consider the unit circle (known to topologists as the one-dimensional sphere S₁). Let the angle [D;2] parameterize the position along the curve. Consider a continuous, suitably well-behaved, complex function () = $e^{j'()}$ de ned at each point on the circle and obeying j j= 1. Thus associated with each point is another unit circle giving the possible range of values of (). The function () thus de nes a trajectory on the torus S₁ S₁ illustrated in g. (1.27). The possible functions () can be classified into dimensional other winding number n 2 Z

n
$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{2} d \frac{i}{d}$$

= $\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{2} d \frac{d'}{d} = \frac{1}{2} ['(2) + '(0)];$ (1.244)

Because the points = 0 and = 2 are identified as the same point

$$(0) = (2) (2) (2) (0) = 2$$
 integer (1.245)

and so n is an integer. Notice the crucial role played by the fact that the topological density $\frac{1}{2} \frac{d'}{d}$ is the Jacobian for converting from the coordinate

in the dom ain to the ∞ ordinate ' in the range. It is this fact that m akes the integral in eq. (1244) independent of the detailed local form of the mapping

74



Figure 1.27: Illustration of mappings ' () with: zero winding number (left) and winding number + 2 (right).

' () and depend only on the overall winding number. As we shall shortly see, this same feature will also turn out to be true for the Pontryagin density.

Think of the function ' () as de ning the path of an elastic band wrapped around the torus. Clearly the band can be stretched, pulled and distorted in any smooth way without any elect on n. The only way to change the winding number from one integer to another is to discontinuously break the elastic band, unwind (or wind) some extra turns, and then rejoin the cut pieces.

A nother way to visualize the hom otopy properties of mappings from S_1 to S_1 is illustrated in g. (1.28). The solid circle represents the domain and the dashed circle represents the range '. It is useful to imagine the circle as being an elastic band (with points on it labeled by coordinates running from 0 to 2) which can be lifted up' to the ' circle in such a way that each point of lies just outside the image point ' (). The gure illustrates how the winding num ber n can be interpreted as the num ber of times the domain circle wraps around the range ' circle. (Note: even though the elastic band is Stretched' and may wrap around the ' circle m ore than once, its coordinate labels still only run from 0 to 2.) This interpretation is the one which we will generalize for the case of skyrm ions in 2D ferrorm agnets.

We can think of the equivalence class of mappings having a given winding number as an element of a group called the hom otopy group $_1(S_1)$. The group operation is addition and the winding number of the sum of two functions, '() '₁()+'₂(), is the sum of the two winding numbers $n = n_1 + n_2$. Thus $_1(S_1)$ is isomorphic to Z, the group of integers under addition.

Returning now to the ferrom agnet we see that the unit vector order parameterm de ness a mapping from the plane R₂ to the two-sphere S₂ (i.e. an ordinary sphere in three dimensions having a two-dimensional surface). Because we assume that m = 2 for all spatial points far from the location of the skyrm ion, we can safely use a projective map to 'compactify' R₂ into a sphere S₂. In this process all points at in nity in R₂ are mapped into a single point on S₂, but since m (r) is the same for all these di erent points, no harm is done. We are thus interested in the generalization of the concept of the winding number



Figure 1.28: A di erent representation of the mappings from to '. The dashed line represents the domain and the solid line represents the range'. The domain is lifted up' by the mapping and placed on the range. The winding number n is the number of times the dashed circle wraps the solid circle (with a possible minus sign depending on the orientation).

TheQuantum HallE ect



Figure 1.29: In nitesimal circuit in spin space associated with an in nitesimal circuit in real space via the mapping m(r).

to the mapping S_2 ! S_2 . The corresponding hom otopy group $_2(S_2)$ is also equivalent to Z as we shall see.

Consider the following four points in the plane and their in ages (illustrated in g. (1.29)) under the mapping

(x;y)	!	m (x;y)	
(x + dx;y)	!	m (x + dx;y)	
(x;y+ dy)	!	m (x;y + dy)	
(x + dx; y + dy)	!	m (x + dx; y + dy):	(1.246)

The four points in the plane de ne a rectangle of area dxdy. The four points on the order parameter (spin) sphere de ne an approxim ate parallelogram whose area (solid angle) is

d! [m (x + dx;y) m (x;y)] [m (x;y + dy) m (x;y)] m (x;y)

$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 m (m (m dxdy)
= 4 ~ dxdy: (1.247)

Thus the Jacobian converting area in the plane into solid angle on the sphere is 4 times the Pontryagin density \sim . This means that the total topological charge given in eq. (1.242) must be an integer since it counts the number of times the compacti ed plane is wrapped around the order parameter sphere by the mapping. The wrapping' is done by lifting each point r in the compacti ed plane up to the corresponding point m(r) on the sphere just as was described for $_1(S_1)$ in g. (1.28).

For the skym ion illustrated in g. (1.26) the order parameter function m (r)

was chosen to be the standard form that m in in izes the gradient energy [58]

$$m^{x} = \frac{2 r \cos(r')}{r^{2} + r^{2}}$$
(1.248a)

$$m^{y} = \frac{2 r \sin(r')}{r^{2} + r^{2}}$$
(1.248b)

$$m^{z} = \frac{r^{2}}{2 + r^{2}}$$
(1.248c)

where (r;) are the polar coordinates in the plane, is a constant that controls the size scale, and ' is a constant that controls the XY spin orientation. (Rotations about the Zeem an axis leave the energy invariant.) From the gure it is not hard to see that the skyrm ion mapping wraps the com pacti ed plane around the order parameter sphere exactly once. The sense is such that $Q_{top} = 1$.

Exercise 1.21 Show that the topological density can be written in polar spatial coordinates as $\begin{array}{l} \sim = \frac{1}{4} \ \mathrm{rr} & \frac{\mathrm{@rr}}{\mathrm{@r}} & \frac{\mathrm{@rr}}{\mathrm{@}} \\ \mathrm{U} \text{ se this result to show} \\ \sim = & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{2}{2 + r^2} \end{array}^2$ and hence $\begin{array}{l} Q_{\mathrm{top}} = & 1 \\ \mathrm{for the skyrm ion m apping in eqs. (1.248a\{1.248c\}). \end{array}$

It is worthwhile to note that it is possible to write down simple microscopic variational wave functions for the skyrm ion which are closely related to the continuum eld theory results obtained above. Consider the following state in the plane [51]

$$= \begin{array}{ccc} Y & z_{j} \\ & & 1 \end{array};$$
(1.249)

where $_1$ is the = 1 lled Landau level state $(_j)$ refers to the spinor for the jth particle, and is a xed length scale. This is a skym ion because it has its spin purely down at the origin (where $z_j = 0$) and has spin purely up at in nity (where $\dot{z}_j j$). The parameter is simply the size scale of the skym ion [46,58]. At radius the spinor has equal weight for up and down spin states (since $\dot{z}_j j =$) and hence the spin lies in the XY plane just as it does for the solution in eq. (1248c). Notice that in the limit ! 0 (where the continuum e ective action is invalid but this microscopic wave function is still sensible) we recover a fully spin polarized lled Landau level with a charge-1

TheQuantum HallE ect

Laughlin quasihole at the origin. Hence the number of ipped spins interpolates continuously from zero to in nity as increases.

In order to analyze the skym ion wave function in eq. (1.249), we use the Laughlin plasma analogy. Recall from our discussion in sec. 1.6.1 that in this analogy the norm of $, Tr_{fg} D[z]j^2$ is viewed as the partition function of a C oulom b gas. In order to compute the density distribution we simply need to take a trace over the spin

$$Z = D[z]e^{2} P_{j} \log \frac{1}{2} e^{2} \log \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{k} \log (\frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{4}) + \frac{1}{4}} e^{\frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}}} (1.250)$$

This partition function describes the usual logarithm ically interacting C oulom b gas with uniform background charge plus a spatially varying in purity background charge $_{\rm b}$ (r),

_b(r)
$$\frac{1}{2}r^{2}V(r) = +\frac{2}{(r^{2}+2)^{2}};$$
 (1.251)

V (r) =
$$\frac{1}{2} \log (r^2 + r^2)$$
: (1.252)

For large enough scale size ', local neutrality of the plasm a [59] forces the electrons to be expelled from the vicinity of the origin and in plies that the excess electron number density is precisely $_{\rm b}$ (r), so that eq. (1.251) is in agreem ent with the standard result [58] for the topological density given in ex.1.21.

Just as it was easy to nd an explicit wave function for the Laughlin quasihole but proved di cult to write down an analytic wave function for the Laughlin quasi-electron, it is similarly di cult to make an explicit wave function for the anti-skym ion. Finally, we note that by replacing z^{n} by z^{n}_{n} , we can generate a skym ion with a Pontryagin index n. Exercise 1.22 The argument given above for the charge density of the microscopic skym ion state wave function used local neutrality of the plasma and hence is valid only on large length scales and thus requires 'Find the complete microscopic analytic solution for the charge density valid for arbitrary , by using the fact that the proposed manybody wave function is nothing but a Slater determinant of the single particle states $_m$ (z),

$$m(z) = \frac{z^{m}}{2 2^{m+1}m!m+1+\frac{z}{2}} z^{m} e^{\frac{jz^{2}j}{4}}$$
(1.253)

Show that the excess electron number density is then

n ⁽¹⁾ (z)
$$\int_{m=0}^{N_{X} 1} j_{m}(z) j^{2} \frac{1}{2};$$
 (1.254)

which yields

$$n^{(1)}(z) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} d - \frac{2}{2} e^{-\frac{jz \cdot j^{2}}{2}(1-j)} (jz \cdot j^{2} + 2) - 1 : \qquad (1.255)$$

Similarly, nd the spin density distribution S^z (r) and show that it also agrees with the eld-theoretic expression in eq. (1.248c) in the large limit.

The skyrm ion solution in eqs. (1248a{1248c}) m in in izes the gradient energy $\rm Z$

$$E_0 = \frac{1}{2} s d^2 r @ m @ m :$$
 (1.256)

Notice that the energy cost is scale invariant since this expression contains two integrals and two derivatives. Hence the total gradient energy is independent of the scale factor and for a single skyrm ion is given by [46,58]

$$E_{0} = 4 \quad {}_{s} = \frac{1}{4} \quad (1.257)$$

where $_1$ is the asymptotic large q limit of the spin wave energy in eq. (1.201). Since this spin wave excitation produces a widely separated particle-hole pair, we see that the energy of a widely separated skyrm ion-antiskyrm ion pair $\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4}$ is only half as large. Thus skyrm ions are considerably cheaper to create than simple ipped spins.²⁰

Notice that eq. $(1\,257)$ tells us that the charge excitation gap, while only half as large as naively expected, is nite as long as the spin stiness $_{\rm s}$ is nite. Thus we can expect a dissipation less H all plateau. Therefore, as emphasized by Sondhiet al. [46], the C oulom b interaction plays a central role in the = 1 integer H alle ect. W ithout the C oulom b interaction the charge gap would simply be the tiny Zeem an gap. W ith the C oulom b interaction the gap is large even

 $^{^{20}\,\}rm T$ his energy advantage is reduced if the nite thickness of the inversion layer is taken into account. The skyrm ion m ay in som e cases turn out to be disadvantageous in higher Landau levels.

The Quantum HallE ect

in the limit of zero Zeem an energy because of the spontaneous ferrom agnetic order induced by the spin stiness.

At precisely = 1 skymmion/antiskymmion pairs will be thermally activated and hence exponentially rare at low temperatures. On the other hand, because they are the cheapest way to inject charge into the system, there will be a nite density of skymmions even in the ground state if \notin 1. Skymmions also occur in ordinary 2D magnetic lm s but since they do not carry charge (and are energetically expensive since _s is quite large) they readily freeze out and are not particularly important.

The charge of a skym ion is sharply quantized but its number of ipped spins depends on its area ². Hence if the energy were truly scale invariant, the number of ipped spins could take on any value. Indeed one of the early theoretical motivations for skym ions was the discovery in numerical work by Rezayi [46,60] that adding a single charge to a led Landau level converted the maximally ferrom agnetic state into a spin singlet. In the presence of a nite Zeem an energy the scale invariance is lost and there is a term in the energy that scales with ² and tries to minimize the size of the skym ion. Competing with this how ever is a Coulomb term which we now discuss.

The Lagrangian in eq. (1.224) contains the correct leading order terms in a gradient expansion. There are several possible terms which are fourth order in gradients, but a particular one dom inates over the others at long distances. This is the H artree energy associated with the charge density of the skyrm ion

$$V_{\rm H} = \frac{1}{2} {}^{\rm Z} {}^{\rm Z} {}^{\rm Z} {}^{\rm Z} {}^{\rm Z} {}^{\rm Q} {}^{\rm C} {$$

where

$$=\frac{e}{8} m \ \theta m \ \theta m \qquad (1.259)$$

and is the dielectric constant. The long range of the C oulom b interaction makes this electric constant. The long range of the C oulom b interaction makes this electric term three gradient term that distinguishes it from the other possible term s at this order. R ecall that the C oulom b interaction already entered in low er order in the computation of $_{\rm s}$. That how ever was the exchange energy while the present term is the H artree energy. The H artree energy scales like $\frac{e^2}{2}$ and so prefers to expand the skyrm ion size. The competition between the C oulom b and Zeem an energies yields an optim alnum ber of approxim ately four ipped spins according to m icroscopic H artree Fock calculations [61].

Thus a signi cant prediction for this model is that each charge added (or removed) from a lled Landau level will ip several (4) spins. This is very di erent from what is expected for non-interacting electrons. As illustrated in g. (1.30) removing an electron leaves the non-interacting system still polarized. The Pauli principle forces an added electron to be spin reversed and the magnetization drops from unity at = 1 to zero at = 2 where both spin states of the low est Landau level are fully occupied.

D irect experimental evidence for the existence of skyrmions was rst obtained by Barrett et al. [62] using a novel optically pumped NMR technique.

Figure 1.30: Illustration of the spin congurations for non-interacting electrons at lling factor = 1 in the presence of a hole (top) and an extra electron (bottom).

The Ham iltonian for a nucleus is [63]

$$H_{N} = {}_{N} I^{Z} + I s \qquad (1.260)$$

where I is the nuclear angular momentum, $_{\rm N}$ is the nuclear Zeem an frequency (about 3 orders of magnitude smaller than the electron Zeem an frequency), is the hyper ne coupling and s is the electron spin density at the nuclear site. If, as a rst approximation we replace s by its average value

$$H_{\rm N}$$
 ($_{\rm N}$ + hs²i) I² (1.261)

we see that the precession frequency of the nucleus will be shifted by an am ount proportional to the magnetization of the electron gas. The magnetization deduced using this so-called K night shift is shown in g. (1.31). The electron gas is 100% polarized at = 1, but the polarization drops o sharply (and symmetrically) as charge is added or subtracted. This is in sharp disagreement with the prediction of the free electron model as shown in the gure. The initial steep slope of the data allows one to deduce that 3.5{4 spins reverse for each charge added or removed. This is in excellent quantitative agreement with Hartree-Fock calculations for the skyrm ion model [61].

O ther evidence for skyrm ions com es from the large change in Zeem an energy with eld due to the large number of ipped spins. This has been observed in transport [64] and in optical spectroscopy [65]. Recall that spin-orbit e ects in G aA s m ake the electron g factor 0:4. Under hydrostatic pressure g can be tuned towards zero which should greatly enhance the skyrm ion size. Evidence for this e ect has been seen [66].



Figure 1.31: NM R K night shift m easurement of the electron spin polarization near lling factor = 1. Circles are the data of Barrett et al. [62]. The dashed line is a guide to the eye. The solid line is the prediction for non-interacting electrons. The peak represents 100% polarization at = 1. The steep slope on each side indicates that m any (4) spins ip over for each charge added (or subtracted). The observed symmetry around = 1 is due to the particle-hole symmetry between skyrmions and antiskyrmions not present in the free-electron m odel.



Figure 1.32: NMR nuclear spin relaxation rate $1=T_1$ as a function of lling factor. A fler Tycko et al. [68]. The relaxation rate is very small at = 1, but rises dram atically away from = 1 due to the presence of skym ions.

1.11 Skyrm ion Dynam ics

NMR [62] and nuclear speci c heat [67] data indicate that skymmions dram atically enhance the rate at which the nuclear spins relax. This nuclear spin relaxation is due to the transverse term s in the hyper ne interaction which we neglected in discussing the K night shift

$$\frac{1}{2} (I^{+}s + I s^{+}) = \frac{1}{2} : I^{+} S_{q} + hc.; : (1.262)$$

The free electron m odelwould predict that it would be in possible for an electron and a nucleus to undergo m utual spin ips because the Zeem an energy would not be conserved. (Recall that $_{\rm N}$ 10³.) The spin wave model shows that the problem is even worse than this. Recall from eq. (1201) that the spin C oulom b interaction m akes spin wave energy m uch larger than the electron Zeem an gap except at very long wavelengths. The lowest frequency spin wave excitations lie above 20{50 G H z while the nuclei precess at 10{100 M H z. Hence the two sets of spins are unable to couple electricely. At = 1 this simple picture is correct. The nuclear relaxation time T₁ is extrem ely long (tens of m inutes to m any hours depending on the tem perature) as shown in g. (1.32). However the gure also shows that for € 1 the relaxation rate 1=T₁ rises dram atically and T₁ falls to 20 seconds. In order to understand this dram atic variation we need to develop a theory of spin dynam ics in the presence of skyrm ions.

TheQuantum HallE ect

The $1=T_1$ data is telling us that for f 1 at least some of the electron spin uctuations are orders of magnitude lower in frequency than the Zeem an splitting and these low frequency modes can couple strongly to the nuclei. One way this might occur is through the presence of disorder. We see from eq. (1.262) that NMR is a local probe which couples to spin ip excitations at all wave vectors. Recall from eq. (1.197) that lowest Landau level projection im plies that S_q contains a translation operator $_q$. In the presence of strong disorder the Zeem an and exchange cost of the spin ips could be compensated by translation to a region of lower potential energy. Such a mechanism was studied in [69] but does not show sharp features in $1=T_1$ around = 1.

We are left only with the possibility that the dynam ics of skyrm ions som enow involves low frequency spin uctuations. For simplicity we will analyze this possibility ignoring the elects of disorder, although this may not be a valid approximation.

Let us begin by considering a ferrom agnetic = 1 state containing a single skyrm ion of the form parameterized in eqs. $(1.248a\{1.248c\})$. There are two degeneracies at the classical level in the elective eld theory: The energy does not depend on the position of the skyrm ion and it does not depend on the angular orientation '. These continuous degeneracies are known as zero modes [58] and require special treatment of the quantum uctuations about the classical solution.

In the presence of one or more skyrm ions, the quantum H all ferrom agnet is non-colinear. In an ordinary ferrom agnet where all the spins are parallel, global rotations about the magnetization axis only change the quantum phase of the state | they do not produce a new state.²¹ Because the skyrm ion has distinguishable orientation, each one induces a new U (1) degree of freedom in the system. In addition because the skyrm ion has a distinguishable location, each one induces a new translation degree of freedom. As noted above, both of these are zero energy m odes at the classical level suggesting that they m ight well be the source of low energy excitations which couple so e ectively to the nuclei. We shall see that this is indeed the case, although the story is som ew hat com plicated by the necessity of correctly quantizing these m odes.

Let us begin by nding the elective Lagrangian for the translation mode [8]. We take the spin conguration to be

$$m(r;t) = m_0 r R(t)$$
 (1.263)

where m_0 is the static classical skyrm ion solution and \tilde{K} (t) is the position degree of freedom. We ignore all other spin wave degrees of freedom since they are gapped. (The gapless U (1) rotation mode will be treated separately below.) Eq. (1.224) yields a Berry phase term $\frac{7}{2}$

$$L_0 = hS d^2 r \underline{m} A [\underline{m}] n(\underline{r})$$
(1.264)

 $^{^{21}}$ R otation about the Zeem an alignment axis is accomplished by R = $e^{\frac{1}{h}'S^{z}}$. But a colinear ferrom agnet ground state is an eigenstate of S^z, so rotation leaves the state invariant up to a phase.

where

$$\underline{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{R} - \frac{\underline{\theta}}{\underline{\theta} \mathbf{r}} \mathbf{m}_{0} \left(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{R} \right)$$
(1.265)

and unlike in eq. (1.224) we have taken into account our new-found know ledge that the density is non-uniform

$$n(re) = n_0 + \frac{1}{8}$$
 reg (re) (1.266)

The second term in eq. (1.266) can be shown to produce an extra Berry phase when two skyrm ions are exchanged leading to the correct m inus sign for Ferm i statistics (on the = 1 plateau) but we will not treat it further. Eq. (1.264) then becomes

$$L_0 = + hR_{-} a(r)$$
 (1.267)

where the vector potential'

7.

$$a(r)$$
 Sn₀ d^2r (0 m)A (1.268)

has curl

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta R}a = \frac{\theta}{\theta r}a$$

$$= Sr_0 \quad d^2r \theta f(\theta m)A g$$

$$= Sr_0 \quad d^2r (\theta m) (\theta m) \frac{\theta A}{\theta m}$$

$$= \frac{Sr_0}{2}^Z d^2r \quad \theta m \quad \theta m F$$

$$= 2 r_0 Q_{rop} \qquad (1.269)$$

Thus eq. (1.267) corresponds to the kinetic Lagrangian for a massless particle of charge eQ_{top} moving in a uniform magnetic eld of strength $B = \frac{0}{2^{-\sqrt{2}}}$. But this of course is precisely what the skyrm ion is [8].

We have kept here only the lowest order adiabatic time derivative term in the action.²² This is justiled by the existence of the spin excitation gap and the fact that we are interested only in much lower frequencies (for the NMR).

If we ignore the disorder potential then the kinetic Lagrangian simply leads to a Ham iltonian that yields quantum states in the lowest Landau level, all of which are degenerate in energy and therefore capable of relaxing the nuclei (whose precession frequency is extremely low on the scale of the electronic Zeem an energy).

Let us turn now to the rotational degree of freedom represented by the co-ordinate ' in eqs. (1248a{1248c}). The full Lagrangian is complicated and

86

 $^{^{22}}$ There m ay exist higher-order tim e-derivative term s which give the skyrm ion a m ass and there will also be dam ping due to radiation of spin waves at higher velocities. [70]

contains the degrees of freedom of the continuous eld \mathfrak{m} (r). We need to introduce the collective coordinate ' describing the orientation of the skyrm ion as one of the degrees of freedom and then carry out the Feynm an path integration over the quantum uctuations in all the in nite number of remaining degrees of freedom $.^{23}$ This is a non-trivial task, but fortunately we do not actually have to carry it out. Instead we will simply write down the answer. The answer is some functional of the path for the single variable ' (t). We will express this functional (using a functional Taylor series expansion) in the most general form possible that is consistent with the symm etries in the problem. Then we will attempt to identify the meaning of the various terms in the expansion and evaluate their coe cients (or assign them values phenom enologically). A fler integrating out the high frequency spin wave uctuations, the low est-order symm etry-allow ed terms in the action are

$$L_{\prime} = hK '_{+} + \frac{h^2}{2U} '_{-}^2 + :::$$
 (1.270)

A gain, there is a rst-order term allowed by the lack of tim e-reversal sym m etry and we have included the leading non-adiabatic correction. The full action involving m (r;t) contains only a rst-order tim e derivative but a second order term is allowed by sym m etry to be generated upon integrating out the high frequency uctuations. W e will not perform this explicitly but rather treat U as a phenom enological tting parameter.

The coe cient K can be computed exactly since it is simply the Berry phase term . Under a slow rotation of all the spins through 2 the Berry phase is (using eq. (B 22) in appendix B)

$$Z$$

 $d^{2}rn(r)(S2)[1 n_{0}^{2}(r)] = \frac{1}{h} \int_{0}^{Z} L_{r} = 2 K :$ (1.271)

(The non-adiabatic term gives a 1=T contribution that vanishes in the adiabatic lim it T ! 1 .) Thus we arrive at the important conclusion that K is the expectation value of the number of overturned spins for the classical solution $\mathfrak{m}_0(\mathbf{r})$. We emphasize that this is the Hartree-Fock (i.e., classical') skyrm ion solution and therefore K need not be an integer.

The canonical angular m om entum conjugate to ' in eq. (1.270) is

$$L_z = \frac{L'}{L'} = hK + \frac{h^2}{U}'$$
 (1.272)

and hence the Ham iltonian is

$$H_{\prime} = L_{z}'_{-} L_{\prime}$$

$$= hK_{+} + \frac{h^{2}}{U}'_{-} - hK_{-} \frac{h^{2}}{2U}'_{-}^{2}$$

$$= + \frac{h^{2}}{2U}'_{-}^{2} = \frac{U}{2h^{2}} (L_{z} - hK_{-})^{2}$$
(1.273)

 $^{^{23}}$ E xam ples of how to do this are discussed in various eld theory texts, including R a jaram an [58].

Having identi ed the Ham iltonian and expressed it in terms of the coordinate and the canonicalm om entum conjugate to that coordinate, we quantize H_{\cdot} by simply making the substitution

$$L_z ! = \frac{i\hbar}{\theta'}$$
(1.274)

to obtain

$$H_{\prime} = + \frac{U}{2} \qquad \frac{i}{2} \frac{\theta}{\eta} K^{2} : \qquad (1.275)$$

This can be interpreted as the Ham iltonian of a (charged) XY quantum rotor with moment of inertia $h^2=U$ circling a solenoid containing K ux quanta. (The Berry phase term in eq. (1.270) is then interpreted as the Aharonov-Bohm phase.) The eigenfunctions are

$$_{m}$$
 (') = $\frac{1}{2}e^{im}$ (1276)

and the eigenvalues are

$$m = \frac{U}{2} (m - K)^2 :$$
 (1.277)

The angularm on entum operator L_z is actually the operator giving the number of ipped spins in the skyrm ion. Because of the rotational symmetry about the Zeem an axis, this is a good quantum number and therefore takes on integer values (as required in any quantum system of nite size with rotational symmetry about the z axis). The ground state value of m is the nearest integer to K. The ground state angular velocity is

$$'_{-}=\frac{\partial H'}{\partial L_z}=\frac{U}{h}$$
 (m K): (1.278)

Hence if K is not an integer the skyrm ion is spinning around at a nite velocity. In any case the actual orientation angle ' for the skyrm ion is completely uncertain since from eq. (1.276)

$$j_{m}(')_{j}^{2} = \frac{1}{2}$$
 (1.279)

' has a at probability distribution (due to quantum zero point motion). We interpret this as telling us that the global U (1) rotation symmetry broken in the classical solution is restored in the quantum solution because of quantum uctuations in the coordinate '. This issue will arise again in our study of the Skyrm e lattice where we will not that for an in nite array of skyrm ions, the symmetry can sometimes remain broken.

M icroscopic analytical [71] and num erical [61] calculations do indeed nd a family of low energy excitations with an approximately parabolic relation between the energy and the number of ipped spins just as is predicted by

88



Figure 1.33: Electronic structure of the skyrm ion lattice as determ ined by numerical Hartree-Fock calculations for lling factor = 1:1 and Zeem an energy $0.015\frac{e^2}{2}$. (a) Excess charge density (in units of $1=(2^{-2})$) and (b) Twodimensional vector representation of the XY components of the spin density. The spin sti ness makes the square lattice more stable than the triangular lattice at this lling factor and Zeem an coupling. Because of the U (1) rotational symmetry about the Zeem an axis, this is simply one representative member of a continuous family of degenerate Hartree-Fock solutions. A fiter B rey et al. [71].

eq. (1.277). As mentioned earlier, K 4 for typical parameters. Except for the special case where K is a half integer the spectrum is non-degenerate and has an excitation gap on the scale of U which is in turn some fraction of the C oulom b energy scale 100 K. In the absence of disorder even a gap of only 1 K would make these excitations irrelevant to the NM R.W e shall see how ever that this conclusion is dram atically altered in the case where m any skyrm ions are present.

1.11.1 Skyrm e Lattices

For lling factors slightly away from = 1 there will be a nite density of skym ions or antiskym ions (all with the same sign of topological charge) in the ground state [56,72,73]. Hartree-Fock calculations [72] indicate that the ground state is a Skyme crystal. Because the skym ions are charged, the C oulom b potential in eq. (1.258) is optimized for the triangular lattice. This is indeed the preferred structure for very small values of j 1 jwhere the skym ion density is low. However at moderate densities the square lattice is preferred. The Hartree-Fock ground state has the angular variable ' j shifted by between neighboring skym ions as illustrated in g. (1.33). This `antiferrom agnetic' arrangement of the XY spin orientation minim izes the spin gradient energy and would be frustrated on the triangular lattice. Hence it is the spin sti ness that stabilizes the square lattice structure.

The Hartree-Fock ground state breaks both global translation and global

U (1) spin rotation symmetry. It is a kind of 'supersolid' with both diagonal

$$G^{z} hs^{z}(\mathbf{r}) s^{z}(\mathbf{r}^{0}) i \qquad (1.280)$$

and o -diagonal

$$G^{?} = s^{+}(\mathbf{r}) s (\mathbf{r}^{0})$$
 (1.281)

long-range order. For the case of a single skyrm ion we found that the U (1) symmetry was broken at the Hartree-Fock (classical) level but fully restored by quantum uctuations of the zero mode coordinate '. In the therm odynamic limit of an in nite number of skyrm ions coupled together, it is possible for the global U (1) rotational symmetry breaking to survive quantum uctuations.²⁴ If this occurs then an excitation gap is not produced. Instead we have a new kind of gapless spin wave G oldstone mode [74,75]. This mode is gapless despite the presence of the Zeem an eld and hence has a profound e ect on the NM R relaxation rate. The gapless G oldstone mode associated with the broken translation symmetry is the ordinary magneto-phonon of the W igner crystal. This too contributes to the nuclear relaxation rate.

In actual practice, disorder will be important. In addition, the NMR experiments have so far been performed at temperatures which are likely well above the lattice melting temperature. Nevertheless the zero temperature lattice calculations to be discussed below probably capture the essential physics of this non co-linear magnet. Namely, there exist spin uctuations at frequencies orders of magnitude below the Zeem an gap. At zero temperature these are coherent G oldstone modes. Above the lattice melting temperature they will be overdam ped di usive modes derived from the G oldstone modes. The essential physics will still be that the spin uctuations have strong spectral density at frequencies far below the Zeem an gap.

It turns out that at long wavelengths the magnetophonon and U (1) spin modes are decoupled. We will therefore ignore the positional degrees of freedom when analyzing the new U (1) mode. We have already found the U (1) Ham iltonian for a single skyrm ion in eq. (1.275). The simplest generalization to the Skyrm e lattice which is consistent with the symmetries of the problem is

$$H = \frac{U}{2} X_{j} (\hat{K}_{j} K)^{2} J_{niji}$$
(1.282)

where $\hat{K_j}$ $\frac{i\theta}{\theta'_j}$ is the angularm on entum operator. The globalU (1) symmetry requires that the interactive term be invariant if all of the 'j's are increased by a constant. In addition H must be invariant under 'j ! 'j + 2 for any single skymmion. We have assumed the simplest possible near-neighbor coupling, neglecting the possibility of longer range higher-order couplings of the form $\cos n('_i '_j)$ which are also symmetry allowed. The phenomenological

 $^{^{24} {\}rm Loosely}$ speaking this corresponds to the in nite system having an in nite moment of inertia (for global rotations) which allows a quantum wave packet which is initially localized at a particular orientation ' not to spread out even for long times.

coupling J must be negative to be consistent with the 'antiferrom agnetic' X Y order found in the Hartree-Fock ground state illustrated in g. (1.33). However we will nd it convenient to instead make J positive and compensate for this by a 'gauge' change' $_{j}$! $'_{j}$ + on one sublattice. This is convenient because it makes the coupling Yerrom agnetic' rather than 'antiferrom agnetic.'

Eq. (1.282) is the Ham iltonian for the quantum XY rotor model, closely related to the boson Hubbard model [76{78]. Readers familiar with superconductivity will recognize that this model is commonly used to describe the superconductor-insulator transition in Josephson arrays [76,77]. The angular momentum eigenvalue of the \hat{K}_j operator represents the number of bosons (C ooper pairs) on site j and the U term describes the charging energy cost when this number deviates from the electrostatically optimal value of K. The boson number is non-negative while \hat{K}_j has negative eigenvalues. However we assume that K 1 so that the negative angular momentum states are very high in energy.

The J term in the quantum rotor model is a mutual torque that transfers units of angular momentum between neighboring sites. In the boson language the wave function for the state with m bosons on site j contains a factor

$$_{m}('_{j}) = e^{im'_{j}}$$
 (1.283)

The raising and low ering operators are thus²⁵ e^{i'j}. This shows us that the cosine term in eq. (1.282) represents the Josephson coupling that hops bosons between neighboring sites.

For U J the system is in an insulating phase well-described by the wave function

$$('_{1};'_{2}; :::;'_{N}) = \bigvee_{j}^{Y} e^{im '_{j}}$$
 (1.284)

where m is the nearest integer to K. In this state every rotor has the same xed angular momentum and thus every site has the same xed particle number in the boson language. There is a large excitation gap

and the system is insulating.²⁶

C learly $j \neq 1$ in this phase and it is therefore quantum disordered. That is, the phases f' $_j$ g are wildly uctuating because every con guration is equally likely. The phase uctuations are nearly uncorrelated

$$\mathbf{h}\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{i}'\mathbf{j}}\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{i}'\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{i} \quad \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{j}}\cdot\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{j}} : \tag{1.286}$$

 $^{^{25}}$ These operators have matrix elements h m +1 je^{+ i'} j m i = 1 whereas a boson raising operator would have matrix element 5 m + 1. For K 1, m K and this is nearly a constant. A rguments like this strongly suggest that the boson H ubbard model and the quantum rotor model are essentially equivalent. In particular their order/disorder transitions are believed to be in the same universality class.

²⁶An exception occurs if jn K $j = \frac{1}{2}$ where the gap vanishes. See [78].

For J U the phases on neighboring sites are strongly coupled together and the system is a superconductor. A crude variational wave function that captures the essential physics is

р

$$('_{1};'_{2};:::;'_{N}) = \int_{hiji}^{L} \cos(('_{i}, '_{j})) (1.287)$$

where is a variational parameter [79]. This is the simplest ansatz consistent with invariance under $'_j$! $'_j$ + 2. For J U, 1 and $j \stackrel{2}{j}$ is large only for spin con gurations with all of the XY spins locally parallel. Expanding the cosine term in eq. (1.282) to second order gives a harm onic H am iltonian which can be exactly solved. The resulting gapless spin waves' are the Goldstone m odes of the superconducting phase.

For sim plicity we work with the Lagrangian rather than the Ham iltonian

$$L = \sum_{j}^{X} hK '_{-j} + \frac{h^{2}}{2U} '_{-j}^{2} + J \sum_{hiji}^{X} \cos('_{i} '_{j})$$
(1.288)

The Berry phase term is a total derivative and can not a ect the equations of motion 27 D ropping this term and expanding the cosine in the harmonic approximation yields

$$L = \frac{h^2}{2U} X'_{j} \frac{J}{-j} \frac{J}{2} \frac{J}{hiji} X'_{j}^{2} (1289)$$

This phonon' model has linearly dispersing gapless collective modes at small wavevectors

$$h!_{q} = {}^{p} \overline{UJ} qa$$
(1.290)

where a is the lattice constant. The parameters U and J can be xed by tting to microscopic Hartree-Fock calculations of the spin wave velocity and the magnetic susceptibility (boson compressibility') [61,75]. This in turn allows one to estimate the regime of lling factor and Zeem an energy in which the U (1) symmetry is not destroyed by quantum uctuations [75].

Let us now translate all of this into the language of our non-colinear QHE ferrom agnet [74,75]. Recall that the angularm on entum (the 'charge') conjugate to the phase angle ' is the spin angularm on entum of the overturned spins that form the skyrm ion. In the quantum disordered 'insulating' phase, each skyrm ion has a well de ned integer-valued 'charge' (number of overturned spins) much like we found when we quantized the U (1) zero mode for the plane angle ' of a single isolated skyrm ion in eq. (1276). There is an excitation gap separating the energies of the discrete quantized values of the spin.

The super uid' state with broken U (1) symmetry is a totally new kind of spin state unique to non-colinear magnets [74, 75]. Here the phase angle is

 $^{^{27}}$ In fact in the quantum path integral this term has no e ect except for time histories in which a 'vortex' encircles site j causing the phase to wind '_j (h) = '_j (0) 2 . We explicitly ignore this possibility when we make the harm onic approximation.

well-de ned and the number of overturned spins is uncertain. The o -diagonal long-range order of a super uid becomes

$$hb_{j}^{y}b_{k}i! he^{i'j}e^{i'k}i$$
(1.291)

or in the spin language²⁸

$$s^{+}(r)s(r^{0})$$
: (1.292)

Thus in a sense we can interpret a spin ip interaction between an electron and a nucleus as creating a boson in the super uid. But this boson has a nite probability of disappearing' into the super uid bondensate' and hence the system does not have to pay the Zeem an price to create the ipped spin. That is, the super uid state has an uncertain number of ipped spins (even though S^z_{tot} commutes with H) and so the Zeem an energy cost is uncertain.

In classical language the skyrm ions locally have nite (slow ly varying) x and y spin components which act as elective magnetic elds around which the nuclear spins precess and which thus cause I^z to change with time. The key here is that s^x and s^y can, because of the broken U (1) symmetry, uctuate very slow ly (i.e. at M Hz frequencies that the nuclei can follow rather than just the very high Zeem an precession frequency).

Detailed numerical calculations [75] show that the Skymme lattice is very e cient at relaxing the nuclei and 1=T₁ and is enhanced by a factor of 10^3 over the corresponding rate at zero magnetic eld. We expect this qualitative distinction to survive even above the Skryme lattice melting temperature for the reasons discussed earlier.

Because the nuclear relaxation rate increases by orders of magnitude, the equilibration time at low temperatures drops from hours to seconds. This means that the nuclei come into therm all equilibrium with the electrons and hence the lattice. The nuclei therefore have a well-de ned temperature and contribute to the speci c heat. Because the temperature is much greater than the nuclear Zeem an energy scale 1 m K, each nucleus contributes only a tiny am ount

 $k_{B} \frac{2}{T^{2}}$ to the speci c heat. On the other hand, the electronic speci c heat per particle $k_{B} \frac{T}{T_{ferm i}}$ is low and the electron density is low. In fact there are about 10⁶ nucleiper quantum well electron and the nuclei actually enhance the speci c heat m ore than 5 orders of m agnitude [67]!

Supprisingly, at around 30 mK there is a further enhancement of the specic cheat by an additional order of magnitude. This may be a signal of the Skyrm e lattice melting transition [67,75,80], although the situation is somewhat murky at the present time. The peak can not possibly be due to the tiny amount of entropy change in the Skyrm e lattice itself. Rather it is due to the nuclei in the thick A IA's barrier between the quantum wells.²⁹

 $^{^{28}}$ There is a slight complication here. Because the XY spin conguration of the skyrm ion has a vortex-like structure hs⁺ i hš^{*} + is^y i winds in phase around the skyrm ion so the bose condensation' is not at zero wave vector.

 $^{^{29} {\}rm For \ som}$ we hat complicated reasons it may be that the barrier nuclei are e-ciently dipole coupled to the nuclei in the quantum wells (and therefore in therm al equilibrium) only due to

1.12 Double-Layer Quantum HallFerrom agnets

1.12.1 Introduction

We learned in our study of quantum H all ferrom agnets that the C oulom b interaction plays an important role at Landau level lling factor = 1 because it causes the electron spins to spontaneously align ferrom agnetically and this in turn profoundly alters the charge excitation spectrum by producing a gap.³⁰ A closely related e ect occurs in double-layer systems in which layer index is analogous to spin [43,44,81]. Building on our know ledge of the dynam ics of ferrom agnets developed in the last section, we will use this analogy to explore the rich physics of double-layer system s.

N ovel fractional quantum H all e ects due to correlations [82] in multicom – ponent systems were anticipated in early work by Halperin [42] and the now extensive literature has been reviewed in [43]. There have also been recent interesting studies of systems in which the spin and layer degrees of freedom are coupled in novel ways [83,84].

A s described in this volum e by Shayegan [45], m odern M BE techniquesm ake it possible to produce double-layer (and multi-layer) two-dimensional electron gas system s of extrem ely low disorder and high m obility. A s illustrated schem atically in F ig. (1.34), these system s consist of a pair of 2D electron gases separated by a distance d so sm all (d 100A) as to be comparable to the typical spacing between electrons in the same layer. A second type of system has also recently been developed to a high degree of perfection [85]. These systems consist of single wide quantum wells in which strong m ixing of the two low est electric subbands allows the electrons to localize them selves on opposites sides of the well to reduce their correlation energy. W e will take the point of view that these system s can also be approximately viewed as double-well system s with som e e ective layer separation and tunnel barrier height.

As we have already learned, correlations are especially in portant in the strong magnetic eld regim e because all electrons can be accommodated within the lowest Landau level and execute cyclotron orbits with a common kinetic energy. The fractional quantum Hall e ect occurs when the system has a gap form aking charged excitations, i.e. when the system is incompressible. Theory has predicted [42,82,86] that at some Landau level lling factors, gaps occur in double-layer system s only if interlayer interactions are su ciently strong. These theoretical predictions have been con med [87]. More recently work from several di erent points of view [88{93}] has suggested that inter-layer correlations can also lead to unusual broken symmetry states with a novel kind of spontaneous phase coherence between layers which are isolated from each other except for inter-layer C oulom b interactions. It is this spontaneous interlayer phase coherence which is responsible [43,51,73,94] for a variety of novel features seen in

the critical slow ing down of the electronic motion in the vicinity of the Skyrm e lattice melting transition.

 $^{^{30}\}text{B}$ ecause the charged excitations are skyrm ions, this gap is not as large as naive estim ates would suggest, but it is still nite as long as the spin sti ness is nite.



Figure 1.34: Schem atic conduction band edge prole for a double-layer twodimensional electron gas system. Typical widths and separations are W d 100A and are comparable to the spacing between electrons within each inversion layer.

the experim ental data to be discussed below [44,81].

1.12.2 Pseudospin Analogy

W ewillmake the simplifying assumption that the Zeem an energy is large enough that uctuations of the (true) spin order can be ignored, leaving out the possibility of mixed spin and pseudospin correlations [83,84]. W e will limit our attention to the lowest electric subband of each quantum well (or equivalently, the two lowest bands of a single wide well). Hence we have a two-state system that can be labeled by a pseudospin 1/2 degree of freedom. P seudospin up m eans that the electron is in the (lowest electric subband of the) upper layer and pseudospin down m eans that the electron is in the (lowest electric subband of the) bw er layer.

Just as in our study of ferrom agnetism we will consider states with total lling factor "+ $_{\#} = 1$. A state exhibiting interlayer phase coherence and having the pseudospins ferrom agnetically aligned in the direction de ned by polar angle and azim uthalangle' can be written in the Landau gauge just as for ordinary spin

$$j i = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} Y & n \\ \cos(= 2)c_{k}^{y} + \sin(= 2)e^{i'}c_{k\#}^{y} & j$$
 (1.293)

Every k state contains one electron and hence this state has = 1 as desired. Note how ever that the layer index for each electron is uncertain. The amplitude to nd a particular electron in the upper layer is $\cos(=2)$ and the amplitude to nd it in the lower layer is $\sin(=2)e^{i'}$. Even if the two layers are completely independent with no tunneling between them, quantum mechanics allows for the som ew hat peculiar possibility that we are uncertain which layer the electron is in.

For the case of ordinary spin we found that the C oulom b interaction produced an exchange energy which strongly favored having the spins locally parallel. U sing the fact that the C oulom b interaction is completely spin independent (it is only the P auli principle that indirectly induces the ferrom agnetism) we wrote down the spin rotation invariant e ective theory in eq. (1.224). Here we do not have full SU (2) invariance because the interaction between electrons in the same layer is clearly stronger than the interaction between electrons in opposite layers. Thus for example, if all the electrons are in the upper (or lower) layer, the system will look like a charged capacitor and have higher energy than if the layer occupancies are equal. Hence to leading order in gradients we expect the elective action to be modil ed slightly

L =	Ъ	d ² rfhSnm_(r)	A [m-]	(ஊ) (m	m	1)g		
	Ζ	$d^2r \frac{1}{2} s^{0} m 0$	m +	m ^z m ^z	m ^z	ntm×	:	(1.294)

The spin stiness $_{\rm s}$ represents the SU (2) invariant part of the exchange energy and is therefore som ewhat sm aller than the value computed in eq. (1.231). The coe cient is a measure of the capacitive charging energy.³¹ The analog of the Zeem an energy represents an external electric eld applied along the MBE grow th direction which unbalances the charge densities in the two layers. The coe cient t represents the amplitude for the electrons to tunnel between the two layers. It prefers the pseudospin to be aligned in the x direction because this corresponds to the spinor

$$\frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}}$$
 1 (1.295)

For the m om ent we will assume that both t and vanish, leaving only the term which breaks the pseudospin rotational symmetry. The case < 0 would represent Vising anisotropy'. Clearly the physically realistic case for the capacitive energy gives > 0 which represents so-called basy plane anisotropy'. The energy is m inimized when m^z = 0 so that the order parameter lies in the

 $^{^{31}\}text{W}$ e have taken the charging energy to be a local quantity characterized by a xed, wave vector independent capacitance. This is appropriate only ifm z (r) represents the local charge imbalance between the layers coarse-grained over a scale larger than the layer separation. A ny wave vector dependence of the capacitance will be represented by higher derivative terms which we will ignore.

The Quantum HallE ect

XY plane giving equal charge densities in the two layers. Thus we are left with an elective XY model which should exhibit long-range o -diagonal order³²

$$(x) = \lim_{x \to \infty} x (x) + \lim_{x \to \infty} y (x)$$
 (1.296)

The order is b -diagonal' because it corresponds m icroscopically to an operator

$$(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{hs}^{+}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{h}^{Y}(\mathbf{r})_{\#}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i}$$
 (1.297)

which is not diagonal in the s^z basis, much as in a super uid where the eld operator changes the particle number and yet it condenses and acquires a nite expectation value.

O ne other comment worth making at this point is that eq. (1.297) shows that, unlike the order parameter in a superconductor or super uid, this one corresponds to a charge neutral operator. Hence it will be able to condense despite the strong magnetic eld (which lls charged condensates with vortices and generally destroys the order).

In the next subsection we review the experimental evidence that long-range XY correlations exist and that as a result, the system exhibits excitations which are highly collective in nature. A fler that we will return to further analysis and interpretation of the elective Lagrangian in eq. (1.294) to understand those excitations.

1.12.3 Experim ental Background

As illustrated by the dashed lines in g. (1.34), the lowest energy eigenstates split into symmetric and antisymmetric combinations separated by an energy gap $_{SAS} = 2t$ which can, depending on the sample, vary from essentially zero to m any hundreds of K elvins. The splitting can therefore be much less than or greater than the interlayer interaction energy scale, $E_c = \hat{e} = d$. Thus it is possible to make system s which are in either the weak or strong correlation lim its.

W hen the layers are widely separated, there will be no correlations between them and we expect no dissipation less quantum H all state since each layer has [95] = 1=2. For sm aller separations, it is observed experimentally that there is an excitation gap and a quantized H all plateau [81,85,96]. This has either a trivial or a highly non-trivial explanation, depending on the ratio $_{SAS}=E_c$. For large $_{SAS}$ the electrons tunnel back and forth so rapidly that it is as if there is only a single quantum well. The tunnel splitting $_{SAS}$ is then analogous to the electric subband splitting in a (wide) single well. All symmetric states are occupied and all antisymmetric states are empty and we simply have the ordinary = 1 integer H all e ect. C orrelations are irrelevant in this limit and the excitation gap is close to the single-particle gap $_{SAS}$ (or h! c, whichever is sm aller). W hat is highly non-trivial about this system is the fact that the

 $^{^{32} \}rm At\,$ nite temperatures (r) will vanish but will have long-range algebraically decaying correlations. Above the Kosterlitz-Thouless phase transition temperature, the correlations will fall o exponentially.



Figure 1.35: Phase diagram for the double layer QHE system (after M urphy et al. [81]). Only samples whose parameters lie below the dashed line exhibit a quantized H all plateau and excitation gap.

= 1 quantum Hall plateau survives even when SAS E_c. In this lim it the excitation gap has clearly changed to become highly collective in nature since the observed [81,85] gap can be on the scale of 20K even when SAS 1 K. Because of the spontaneously broken XY symmetry [51,73,88,89,92], the excitation gap actually survives the limit $_{SAS}$! 0! This cross-over from single-particle to collective gap is quite analogous to that for spin polarized single layers. There the excitation gap survives the lim it of zero Zeem an splitting so long as the Coulomb interaction makes the spin stiness non-zero. This e ect in double-layer systems is visible in q. (1.35) which shows the QHE phase diagram obtained by M urphy et al. [44,81] as a function of layer separation and tunneling energy. A = 1 quantum Hall plateau and gap is observed in the regime below the dashed line. Notice that far to the right, the single particle tunneling energy dom inates over the coulom b energy and we have essentially a one-body integer QHE state. However the QHE survives all the way into $_{SAS} = 0$ provided that the layer separation is below a critical value d= $'_{B}$ 2. In this lim it there is no tunneling and the gap is purely m any-body in origin and, as we will show, is associated with the remarkable pseudospin ferrom agnetic' quantum state exhibiting spontaneous interlayer phase coherence.

A second indication of the highly collective nature of the excitations can be



Figure 1.36: The charge activation energy gap, , as a function of tilt angle in a weakly tunneling double-layer sample ($_{SAS} = 0.3K$). The solid circles are for lling = 1, open triangles for = 2=3. The arrow indicates the critical angle $_{c}$. The solid line is a guide to the eye. The dashed line refers to a simple estimate of the renormalization of the tunneling amplitude by the parallelm agnetic eld. Relative to the actual decrease, this one-body e ect is very weak and we have neglected it. Inset: A menius plot of dissipation. The low temperature activation energy is = 8:66K and yet the gap collapses at a much lower temperature scale of about 0:4K (1=T 2:5). (A fler M upphy et al. [81]).

seen in the A mhenius plots of them ally activated dissipation [81] shown in the inset of g. (1.36) The low temperature activation energy is, as already noted, much larger than $_{\rm SAS}$. If were nevertheless somehow a single-particle gap, one would expect the A mhenius law to be valid up to temperatures of order . Instead one observes a fairly sharp leveling o in the dissipation as the temperature increases past values as low as 0.05. This is consistent with the notion of a them ally induced collapse of the order that had been producing the collective gap.

The third signi cant feature of the experim ental data pointing to a highlyordered collective state is the strong response of the system to relatively weak m agnetic elds B_k applied in the plane of the 2D electron gases. In g. (1.36) we see that the charge activation gap drops dram atically as the m agnetic eld is tilted (keeping B_2 constant).

W ithin a model that neglects higher electric subbands, we can treat the electron gases as strictly two-dimensional. This is in portant since B_k can a ect the system only if there are processes that carry electrons around closed loops containing ux. A prototypical such process is illustrated in g. (1.37). An



Figure 1.37: A process in a double-layer two-dimensional electron gas system which encloses ux from the parallel component of the magnetic eld. One interpretation of this process is that an electron tunnels from the upper layer to the lower layer (near the left end of the gure). The resulting particle-hole pair then travels coherently to the right and is annihilated by a subsequent tunneling event in the reverse direction. The quantum amplitude for such paths is sensitive to the parallel component of the eld.

TheQuantum HallE ect

electron tunnels from one layer to the other at point A, and travels to point B. Then it (or another indistinguishable electron) tunnels back and returns to the starting point. The parallel eld contributes to the quantum amplitude for this process (in the 2D gas limit) a gauge-invariant A haronov-B ohm phase factor exp (2 i = $_0$) where is the enclosed ux and $_0$ is the quantum of ux.

Such loop paths evidently contribute signi cantly to correlations in the system since the activation energy gap is observed to decrease very rapidly with B_k, falling by factors of order two or more until a critical eld, B_k 0.8T, is reached at which the gap essentially ceases changing [81]. To understand how remarkably smallB_k is, consider the following. We can de ne a length L_k from the size of the loop needed to enclose one quantum of ux: L_kB_kd = $_0$. (L_k[A] = 4:137 10^5 =d[A]B_k[T].) For B_k = 0.8T and d = 150A, L_k = 2700A which is approximately twenty times the spacing between electrons in a given layer and thirty times larger than the quantized cyclotron orbit radius ` (hc=eB₂)¹⁼² within an individual layer. Signi cant drops in the excitation gap are already seen at elds of 0.1T in plying enorm ous phase coherent correlation lengths m ust exist. A gain this shows the highly-collective long-range nature of the ordering in this system .

In the next subsection we shall brie y outline a detailed m odel which explains all these observed e ects.

1.12.4 Interlayer P hase C oherence

The essential physics of spontaneous inter-layer phase coherence can be examined from a microscopic point of view $[51,73,90{92}]$ or a macroscopic C hem-Sim ons eld theory point of view [51,73,88,89], but it is perhaps most easily visualized in the simple variational wave function which places the spins purely in the XY plane [51]

$$j i = \int_{k}^{Y} \int_{k_{\#}}^{n} c_{k_{\#}}^{y} e^{i'} j Di; \qquad (1.298)$$

Note for example, that if ' = 0 then we have precisely the non-interacting single Slater determ inant ground state in which electrons are in the sym metric state which, as discussed previously in the analysis of the electrice Lagrangian in eq. (1.294), minim izes the tunneling energy. This means that the system has a de nite total number of particles (= 1 exactly) but an inde nite number of particles in each layer. In the absence of inter-layer tunneling, the particle number in each layer is a good quantum number. Hence this wave function represents a state of spontaneously broken symmetry [51,88,89] in the same sense that the BCS state for a superconductor has inde nite (total) particle number but a de nite phase relationship between states of di erent particle number.

In the absence of tunneling (t = 0) the energy can not depend on the phase angle ' and the system exhibits a global U (1) symmetry associated with conservation of particle number in each layer [88]. One can in agine allowing ' to

vary slow ly with position to produce excited states. G iven the U (1) symmetry, the elective Hartree-Fock energy functional for these states is restricted to have the leading form

$$H = \frac{1}{2} s^{2} d^{2}rrr'f + \dots$$
 (1.299)

The origin of the nite spin sti ness' $_{\rm s}$ is the loss of exchange energy which occurs when ' varies with position. Imagine that two particles approach each other. They are in a linear superposition of states in each of the layers (even though there is no tunneling!). If they are characterized by the same phase ', then the wave function is symm etric under pseudospin exchange and so the spatial wave function is antisymm etric and must vanish as the particles approach each other. This lowers the C oulom b energy. If a phase gradient exists then there is a larger amplitude for the particles to be near each other and hence the energy is higher. This loss of exchange energy is the source of the nite spin sti ness and is what causes the system to spontaneously in agnetize'.

We see in mediately that the U (1) symmetry leads to eq. (1.299) which denes an elective XY model which will contain vortex excitations which interact logarithm ically. [97,98] In a superconducting in the vortices interact logarithm ically because of the kinetic energy cost of the supercurrents circulating around the vortex centers. Here the same logarithm appears, but it is due to the potential energy cost (loss of exchange) associated with the phase gradients (circulating pseudo-spin currents).

Hartree-Fock estimates [51] indicate that the spin stiness $_{\rm s}$ and hence the Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) critical temperature are on the scale of 0.5 K in typical samples. Vortices in the ' eld are reminiscent of Laughlin's fractionally charged quasiparticles but in this case carry charges $\frac{1}{2}$ e and can be left- or right-handed for a total of four ' avors' [51,73]. It is also possible to show [51,94] that the presence of spontaneous magnetization due to the nite spin stiness m eans that the charge excitation gap is nite (even though the tunnel splitting is zero). Thus the QHE survives [51] the lim it $_{\rm SAS}$! 0.

Since the 'charge' conjugate to the phase ' is the z component of the pseudo spin S^z, the pseudospin 'supercurrent'

$$\mathcal{J} = {}_{\mathrm{s}}\tilde{r} \,\, \prime \tag{1.300}$$

represents oppositely directed charge currents in each layer. Below the K T transition temperature, such current ow will be dissipationless (in linear response) just as in an ordinary super uid. Likewise there will be a linearly dispersing collective G oldstone m ode as in a super uid [51,73,88{90}] rather than a m ode with quadratic dispersion as in the SU (2) sym m etric ferrom agnet. (This is som ew hat akin to the di erence between an ideal bose gas and a repulsively interacting bose gas.)

If found, this K osterlitz-T houless transition would be the st example of a nite-temperature phase transition in a QHE system. The transition itself has not yet been observed due to the tunneling amplitude t being signi cant in samples having the layers close enough together to have strong correlations. A s TheQuantum HallE ect

we have seen above how ever, signi cante ects which im ply the existence of longrange XY order correlations have been found. W hether or not an appropriate sam ple can be constructed to observe the phase transition is an open question at this point.

Exercise 1.23 Following the method used to derive eq. (1.230), show that the collective mode for the Lagrangian in eq. (1.294) has linear rather than quadratic dispersion due to the presence of the term. (A ssum e = t =0.) Hint: Consider small uctuations of the magnetization away from m =(1;0;0) and choose an appropriate gauge for A for this circum stance. P resent a qualitative argument that layer in balance caused by does not fundamentally change any of the results described in this section but rather simply renormalizes quantities like the collective mode velocity. That is, explain why the = 1 QHE state is robust against charge im balance. (This is an important signature of the underlying physics. Certain other interlayer correlated states (such as the one at total lling = 1=2) are quite sensitive to charge im balance [43].)

1.12.5 Interlayer Tunneling and Tilted Field E ects

As mentioned earlier, a nite tunneling amplitude t between the layers breaks the U (1) symmetry % f(x) = 0

$$H_{e} = \frac{Z}{d^{2}r} \frac{1}{2} s \dot{r}' \dot{f} nt \infty s'$$
 (1.301)

by giving a preference to symmetric tunneling states. This can be seen from the tunneling H am iltonian

$$H_{T} = t d^{2}r \frac{y}{\pi}(r) + \frac{y}{\pi}(r) - r(r)$$
(1.302)

which can be written in the spin representation as

Ζ

$$H_{T} = 2t d^{2}rS^{x}(r)$$
: (1.303)

(Recall that the eigenstates of S^{\times} are symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of up and down.)

As the separation d increases, a critical point d is reached at which the magnetization vanishes and the ordered phase is destroyed by quantum uctuations [51,73]. This is illustrated in g. (1.35). For nite tunneling t, we will see below that the collective mode becomes massive and quantum uctuations will be less severe. Hence the phase boundary in g. (1.35) curves upward with increasing $_{SAS}$.

The introduction of nite tunneling amplitude destroys the U (1) symmetry and makes the simple vortex-pair con guration extremely expensive. To lower the energy the system distorts the spin deviations into a domain wallor String'



Figure 1.38: M eron pair connected by a domain wall. Each m eron carries a charge =2 which tries to repel the other one.
The Quantum HallE ect

connecting the vortex cores as shown in g. (1.38). The spins are oriented in the x direction everywhere except in the central dom ain wall region where they tum ble rapidly through 2. The dom ain wallhas a xed energy per unit length and so the vortices are now con ned by a linear 'string tension' rather than logarithm ically. We can estimate the string tension by exam ining the energy of a dom ain wall of in nite length. The optim al form for a dom ain wall lying along the y axis is given by

$$(x) = 2 \arcsin [tanh (x)];$$
 (1.304)

where the characteristic width of the string is

$${}^{1} = \frac{2 {}^{2} {}^{s}}{t} {}^{\frac{1}{2}} :$$
(1.305)

The resulting string tension is

$$T_0 = 8 \frac{t_s}{2^{-2}} = (1.306)$$

Provided the string is long enough (R 1), the total energy of a segment of length R will be well-approxim ated by the expression

$$E_{pair}^{0} = 2E_{mc}^{0} + \frac{e^{2}}{4R} + T_{0}R:$$
 (1.307)

This is minimized at $R = \frac{p}{e^2=4T_0}$. The linear connement brings the charged vortices closer together and rapidly increases the C oulomb energy. In the limit of very large tunneling, the meron pair shrinks and the single-particle excitation (hole or extra spin-reversed electron) limit must be recovered.

The presence of parallel eld B $_{\rm k}~$ eld can be conveniently described with the gauge choice

$$\mathbf{A}_{k}^{\prime} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{B}_{k}\mathbf{\hat{z}} \tag{1.308}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\hat{z}}$ is the growth direction. In this gauge the tunneling amplitude transform s to

t!
$$te^{iQx}$$
 (1.309)

and the energy becom es

$$H = d^{2}r \frac{1}{2}s \dot{f}' \dot{f} \frac{t}{2v} \cos(t' Qx)$$
(1.310)

where $Q = 2 = L_k$ and L_k is the length associated with one quantum of ux for the loops shown in g.1.37. This is the so-called Pokrovsky-Talopov model which exhibits a commensurate-incommensurate phase transition. At low B_k , Q is small and the low energy state has ' Qx; i.e. the local spin orientation tumbles'. In contrast, at large B_k the gradient cost is too large and we have ' constant. It is possible to show [51,94] that this phase transition sem iquantitatively explains the rapid drop and subsequent leveling o of the activation energy vs. B_k seen in g. (1.36).

Exercise 1.24 Derive eq. (1.304) for the form of the 'soliton' that m in im izes the energy cost for the H am iltonian in eq. (1.301).

1.13 A cknow ledgm ents

Much of my work on the quantum Hall e ect has been in collaboration with A llan M acD onald. The more recent work on quantum Hall ferror agnets has also been done in collaboration with M. Abolfath, L.Belkhir, L.Brey, R.Côte, H.Fertig, P.Henelius, K.Moon, H.Mori, J.J.Palacios, A.Sandvik, H.Stoof, C.Timm, K.Yang, D.Yoshioka, S.C.Zhang, and L.Zheng. It is a pleasure to acknow ledge many useful conversations with S.Das Sarm a, M.P.A.Fisher, N. Read, and S.Sachdev.

It is a pleasure to thank M s. D aphne K lem m e for her expert typesetting of m y scribbled notes and Jairo Sinova for num erous helpful com m ents on the m anuscript.

This work was supported by NSF DMR-9714055.

Appendix A

Lowest Landau Level Projection

A convenient formulation of quantum mechanics within the subspace of the lowest Landau level (LLL) was developed by Girvin and Jach [26], and was exploited by Girvin, M acD onald and P latzm an in the magneto-roton theory of collective excitations of the incom pressible states responsible for the fractional quantum Halle ect [29]. Here we brie y review this form alism. See also Ref. [8].

We rst consider the one-body case and choose the symmetric gauge. The single-particle eigenfunctions of kinetic energy and angular momentum in the LLL are given in Eq. (1.76)

$$_{m}(z) = \frac{1}{(2 \ 2^{m} \ m \ !)^{1=2}} \ z^{m} \ \exp \ \frac{\dot{z}\dot{z}}{4} ;$$
 (A.1)

where m is a non-negative integer, and z = (x + iy)='. From (A.1) it is clear that any wave function in the LLL can be written in the form

(z) = f(z) e
$$\frac{\frac{yz}{4}}{4}$$
 (A 2)

where f (z) is an analytic function of z, so the subspace in the LLL is isom orphic to the H ilbert space of analytic functions [8,26,99]. Follow ing B argm an [26,99], we de ne the inner product of two analytic functions as

$$(f;g) = d(z) f(z) g(z);$$
 (A.3)

where

Ζ

d (z) (2)¹ dxdy e
$$\frac{jz j^{2}}{2}$$
: (A.4)

Now we can de ne bosonic ladder operators that connect $_m$ to $_{m-1}$ (and which act on the polynom islpart of $_m$ only):

2

$$a^{y} = \frac{p^{z}}{2}; \qquad (A 5a)$$

SM.Girvin

$$a = \frac{p}{2} \frac{q}{q_z}; \qquad (A.5b)$$

so that

$$a^{y}'_{m} = \frac{p_{m+1}'_{m+1}}{p_{m}}$$
 (A.6a)

$$a'_{m} = m'_{m 1};$$
 (A.6b)

$$(f;a^{y}g) = (af;g);$$
 (A.6c)

$$(f;ag) = (a^{y}f;g):$$
 (A.6d)

All operators that have non-zero matrix elements only within the LLL can be expressed in terms of a and a^{y} . It is essential to notice that the adjoint of a^{y} is not z = 2 but a 20 = 0 z, because z connects states in the LLL to higher Landau levels. Actually a is the projection of z = 2 onto the LLL as seen clearly in the following expression:

$$(f; \frac{z}{p-2}g) = (\frac{z}{p-2}f;g) = (a^{y}f;g) = (f;ag):$$

Sowe nd

$$\overline{z} = 2\frac{\theta}{\theta z}; \qquad (A.7)$$

where the overbar indicates projection onto the LLL. Since \overline{z} and z do not commute, we need to be very careful to properly order the operators before projection. A little thought shows that in order to project an operator which is a combination of z and z, we must rst norm all order all the z's to the left of the z's, and then replace z by \overline{z} . With this rule in mind and (A.7), we can easily project onto the LLL any operator that involves space coordinates only.

For example, the one-body density operator in momentum space is

$$_{q} = \frac{1}{PA} e^{iq r} = \frac{1}{PA} e^{\frac{i}{2}(q z + qz)} = \frac{1}{PA} e^{\frac{i}{2}qz} e^{\frac{i}{2}qz};$$

where A is the area of the system , and $q = q_x + iq_y$. Hence

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{PA} e^{iq \frac{\theta}{\theta z}} e^{\frac{i}{2}q z} = \frac{1}{PA} e^{\frac{jqj^2}{4}} q; \qquad (A.8)$$

where

$$q = e^{\frac{iq}{\theta z} \frac{\theta}{z^2} \frac{i}{z} q z}$$
(A.9)

is a unitary operator satisfying the closed Lie algebra

$$q_{k} = q_{k} e^{\frac{1}{2}q^{k}};$$
 (A 10a)

$$[q; k] = 2i_{q+k} \sin \frac{q^k}{2};$$
 (A.10b)

108

TheQuantum HallE ect



Figure A 1: Illustration of magnetic translations and phase factors. When an electron travels around a parallelogram (generated by q k q k) it picks up a phase = 2 — $q^k k$, where is the ux enclosed in the parallelogram and 0 is the ux quantum.

where q^k $k^{(q)}$ $k^{(2)}$. We also have $q_k q_k = e^{iq^k}$. This is a fam iliar feature of the group of translations in a magnetic edd, because q^k is exactly the phase generated by the ux in the parallelogram generated by $q^{(2)}$ and $k^{(2)}$. Hence the 's form a representation of the magnetic translation group [see Fig. (A.1)]. In fact q translates the particle a distance $q^{(2)}$ q. This means that di erent wave vector components of the charge density do not commute. It is from here that non-trivial dynam ics arises even though the kinetic energy is totally quenched in the LLL subspace.

This form alism is readily generalized to the case of many particles with spin, as we will show next. In a system with area A and N particles the projected charge and spin density operators are

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{A} \frac{X^{N}}{e^{-iq r_{1}}} = \frac{1}{A} \frac{X^{N}}{e^{-iq r_{1$$

$$\overline{S_{q}} = \frac{1}{\overline{P}_{\overline{A}}} \sum_{i=1}^{X^{N}} \overline{e^{iq r_{i}}} S_{i} = \frac{1}{\overline{P}_{\overline{A}}} \sum_{i=1}^{X^{N}} e^{\frac{jqj^{2}}{4}} q^{(i)} S_{i}; \quad (A \text{ 11b})$$

where $_q$ (i) is the magnetic translation operator for the ith particle and S_i is the th component of the spin operator for the ith particle. We immediately nd that unlike the unprojected operators, the projected spin and charge density

operators do not com m ute:

$$[k;S_{q}] = \frac{2i}{pA} e^{\frac{jk+qj^{2}-jkj^{2}-jqj^{2}}{4}} \overline{S_{k+q}} \sin \frac{k^{2} q}{2} \in 0:$$
 (A.12)

This implies that within the LLL, the dynam ics of spin and charge are entangled, i.e., when you rotate spin, charge gets m oved. As a consequence of that, spin textures carry charge as discussed in the text.

Appendix B

Berry's Phase and A diabatic Transport

Consider a quantum system with a Ham iltonian H_R which depends on a set of externally controlled parameters represented by the vector \mathbb{R} . A sume that for some domain of \mathbb{R} there is always a nite excitation gap separating the ground state energy from the rest of the spectrum of H_R. Consider now the situation where the parameters \mathbb{R} (t) are slow by varied around a closed loop in parameter space in a time interval T

$$\mathbb{R}(0) = \mathbb{R}(\mathbb{T}): \tag{B.1}$$

If the circuit is transversed su ciently slow ly so that h=T min where min is the minimum excitation gap along the circuit, then the state will evolve adiabatically. That is, the state will always be the local ground state $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ R \\ (t) \end{pmatrix}$ of the instantaneous H am iltonian H $_{R (t)}$. G iven the complete set of energy eigenstates for a given \tilde{R}

the solution of the time-dependent Schrodinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{(x;t)}{(t)} = H_{R(t)} \quad (x;t) \tag{B.3}$$

is

$$(\mathbf{r}; t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ R \\ (t) \end{pmatrix} e^{i} (t) e^{i} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{0}^{R} dt^{0} e^{(0)}} \\ + a_{j}(t) \int_{R(t)}^{(j)} e^{i(t)} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{0}^{R} dt^{0} e^{(0)}} \\ (B.4)$$

The adiabatic approximation consists of neglecting the admixture of excited states represented by the second term. In the limit of extrem ely slow variation

of \Re (t), this becomes exact as long as the excitation gap remains nite. The only unknown at this point is the Berry Phase [49] (t) which can be found by requiring that (r;t) satisfy the time-dependent Schrodinger equation. The LHS of eq. (B.3) is

$$ih\frac{(le)}{(le)} = h_{-}(t) + \frac{(le)}{(le)}(t)$$

$$+ ihR_{-} \frac{(le)}{(le)}(t) + \frac{(le)}{(le)}(t) + e^{i(t)} e^{-i(t)} e^{-i(t)} e^{-i(t)} e^{-i(t)}$$

$$(B.5)$$

if we neglect the a_j (t) for j > 0. The RHS of eq. (B.3) is

-

1

$$H_{R(t)} (r;t) = {(0) \atop R(t)} (r;t)$$
(B.6)

within the same approximation. Now using the completeness relation

$$\frac{@}{@R} \xrightarrow{(0)}{R} = \frac{X}{(j)} \xrightarrow{(j)}{(j)} \xrightarrow{(0)}{(j)} \frac{@}{@R} \xrightarrow{(0)}{R} : (B.7)$$

In the adiabatic lim it we can neglect the excited state contributions so eq. (B.5) becom es

$$ih\frac{\theta}{\theta t} = h_{t}(t) + ihR_{r} \qquad \stackrel{(0)}{\kappa} \frac{\theta}{\theta R} \qquad \stackrel{(0)}{\kappa} + \stackrel{(0)}{\kappa} : \qquad (B.8)$$

Thismatches eq. (B.6) provided

$$\begin{array}{cccc} (t) = i \mathbb{R} & (t) & \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{R} & (t) \\ \mathcal{R} & (t) \\ \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{R} & \mathcal{R} \\ \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{R} & \mathcal{R} \\ \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{R} & \mathcal{R} \\ \end{pmatrix} & (B.9) \\ \end{array}$$

The constraint

gauge invariant phase

Notice that there is a kind of gauge freedom here. For each
$$R$$
 we have a di erent set of basis states and we are free to choose their phases independently. We can think of this as a gauge choice in the parameter space. Hence _ and are 'gauge dependent' quantities. It is often possible to choose a gauge in which _ vanishes. The key insight of Berry [49] how ever was that this is not always the case. For some problem s involving a closed-circuit in parameter space the

is non-zero. This is a gauge invariant quantity because the system returns to its starting point in parameter space and the arbitrary phase choice drops out of the answer. This is precisely analogous to the result in electrodynam ics that the line integral of the vector potential around a closed loop is gauge invariant. In fact it is useful to de ne the Berry connection' A on the parameter space by

A
$$(\vec{R}) = i$$
 $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vec{R} \\ \theta \\ R \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta \\ \theta \\ R \end{pmatrix}$ (B.11)

The Quantum HallE ect

which gives the suggestive form u = T

$$Berry = d\mathbf{R} \quad A(\mathbf{r}): \tag{B.12}$$

Notice that the Berry's phase is a purely geometric object independent of the particular velocity R_{-} (t) and dependent solely on the path taken in parameter space. It is often easiest to evaluate this expression using Stokes theorem since the curl of A is a gauge invariant quantity.

As a simple example [49] let us consider the Aharonov-Bohm e ect where A will turn out to literally be the electrom agnetic vector potential. Let there be an in nitely long solenoid running along the z axis. Consider a particle with charge q trapped inside a box by a potential V

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} p \frac{q}{c} \tilde{A}^{2} + V r \tilde{R} (t) : \qquad (B.13)$$

The position of the box is moved along a closed path \tilde{R} (t) which encircles the solenoid but keeps the particle outside the region of magnetic ux. Let ⁽⁰⁾ r R (t) be the adiabatic wave function in the absence of the vector potential. Because the particle only sees the vector potential in a region where it has no curl, the exact wave function in the presence of \tilde{A} is readily constructed

where the precise choice of integration path is immaterial since it is interior to the box where A has no curl. It is straightforward to verify that $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ R \\ (t) \end{pmatrix}$ exactly solves the Schrödinger equation for the Ham iltonian in eq. (B.13) in the adiabatic limit.

The arbitrary decision to start the line integral in eq. (B.14) at \hat{R} constitutes a gauge choice in parameter space for the Berry connection. Using eq. (B.11) the Berry connection is easily found to be

$$A (\mathcal{R}) = + \frac{q}{hc} A (\mathcal{R})$$
(B.15)

and the Berry phase for the circuit around the $\,$ ux tube is simply the A haronov-B ohm phase $_{\rm T}$

$$B_{\text{erry}} = dR \quad A = 2 - \frac{1}{0}$$
(B.16)

where is the ux in the solenoid and $_0$ hc=q is the ux quantum .

As a second example [49] let us consider a quantum spin with Hamiltonian

$$H = (t) S:$$
 (B.17)

The gap to the rst excited state is hj~jand so the circuit in parameter space must avoid the origin $\sim = 0$ where the spectrum has a degeneracy. C learly the adiabatic ground state has

$$\sum_{i=1}^{D} \sum_{j=1}^{(0)} S = hS \frac{1}{j j} :$$
 (B.18)

If the orientation of ~ is de ned by polar angle $\$ and azim uthal angle ', the sam e m ust be true for hSi. An appropriate set of states obeying this for the case S = $\frac{1}{2}$ is

$$j_{i'} i = \frac{\cos \overline{2}}{\sin \overline{2}} e^{i'}$$
 (B.19)

since these obey

h ;
$$\beta^{z}j$$
 ; $i = hS \cos^{2} - \sin^{2} - hS \cos^{2} (B 20)$

and

h ;
$${}^{5}S^{x} + iS^{y}j$$
 ; $i = ; S^{+}$; $= hS \sin e^{i'}$: (B 21)

C onsider the B erry's phase for the case where $\widetilde{}$ rotates slow ly about the z axis at constant $\widetilde{}$

$$Berry = i d' ;' \frac{\theta}{\theta'} ;'$$

$$= i d' \cos \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{1}{2} e^{i'} 0$$

$$= i d' \cos \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{1}{2} e^{i'} i \sin \frac{1}{2} e^{i'}$$

$$= S d' (1 \cos 3)$$

$$= S d' a \cos^{0} = S$$

$$B 22)$$

$$B 22)$$

where is the solid angle subtended by the path as viewed from the origin of the parameter space. This is precisely the Aharonov-Bohm phase one expects for a charge S particle traveling on the surface of a unit sphere surrounding a magnetic monopole. It turns out that it is the degeneracy in the spectrum at the origin which produces the monopole [49].

Notice that there is a singularity in the connection at the 'south pole' = . This can be viewed as the D irac string (solenoid containing one quantum of ux) that is attached to the monopole. If we had chosen the basis

the singularity would have been at the north pole. The reader is directed to Berry's original paper [49] for further details.

In order to correctly reproduce the Berry phase in a path integral for the spin whose H am iltonian is given by eq. (B.17), the Lagrangian must be

$$L = hS f m A + m + (m m 1)g$$
 (B.24)

where m is the spin coordinate on a unit sphere, enforces the length constraint, and

$$\tilde{r}_{m} = \tilde{m}$$
 (B.25)

is the monopole vector potential. As discussed in the text in section 1.10, this Lagrangian correctly reproduces the spin precession equations of motion.

B ib liography

- [1] S.M. G irvin in Chap. 10 and App. I of Ref. [3]; S.M. G irvin and A.H. M acD onald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 1252 (1987); S.-C. Zhang, H. Hansson, and S.K ivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 82 (1989); N. Read, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 86 (1989); D.-H. Lee and M. P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 903 (1989).
- [2] For review s and extensive references see the Chapters by B.I.H alperin and by J.K. Jain in Ref. [6].
- [3] The Quantum HallE ect, 2nd Ed., edited by Richard E. Prange and Steven M.Girvin (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990).
- [4] T. Chakraborty and P. Pietilainen, The Fractional Quantum Hall E ect (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1988).
- [5] Allan H.MadDonald, Quantum Hall E ect: A Perspective (Kluwer Academ ic Publishers, 1989).
- [6] Perspectives in Quantum Hall E ects, Edited by Sankar Das Sarma and Aron Pinczuk (W iley, New York, 1997).
- [7] Introduction to the Theory of the Integer Q uantum HallE ect, M. Jan en, O. Viehweger, U. Fastenrath, and J. Hajdu (VCH, Weinheim, New York, 1994).
- [8] Quantum HallE ect, edited by Michael Stone (World Scientic, Singapore, 1992).
- [9] S.K ivelson, D.H. Lee and S.-C. Zhang, Scienti c American, M arch, 1996, p. 86.
- [10] Shou Cheng Zhang, Int. J. M od. Phys. B 6, 25 (1992).
- [11] A.H.M acDonald, in M esoscopic Quantum Physics, Les Houches, Session LX I, eds.E.Akkermans, G.M ontam baux, J.-L.P ichard and J.Zinn-Justin (North Holland, Am sterdam, 1995).
- [12] Patrick A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. 57, 287 (1985).

- [13] S.L. Sondhi, S.M. Girvin, J.P. Carini, D. Shahar, Colloquium in Rev. M od. Phys. 69, 315 (1997).
- [14] G.Bergmann, Phys. Rep. 107, pp. 1{58 (1984).
- [15] H.L.Stormer, Physica B 177, 401 (1992).
- [16] J.P.Eisenstein, H.L.Stormer, V.Narayanamurti, A.Y.Cho, A.C.Gossard, and C.W. Tu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 875 (1985).
- [17] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B46, 7268 (1992); op. cit. 15233 (1992); Phys. Rev. B51, 13449 (1995). C. L. Kane, M. P. A. Fisher and J. Polchinksi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 4129 (1994).
- [18] M.Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B38, 9375 (1988).
- [19] Bodo Huckestein, Rev. Mod. Phys 67, 357 (1995) and num erous references therein.
- [20] J.T.Chalker and P.D.Coddington, J.Phys. C21, 2665 (1988); D.H.Lee, Z.W ang, and S.Kivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 4130 (1993).
- [21] Y. Huo and R. N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 1375 (1992); Y. Huo, R. E. Hetzel, and R. N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 481 (1990).
- [22] S.Das Samma, Chap. 1 in Ref. [6].
- [23] H.P.W ei, D.C.Tsui, Mikko A.Paalanaen and A.M.M.Pruisken, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 1294 (1988); H.P.W ei, S.Y.Lin, D.C.Tsui, and A.M.M. Pruisken, Phys. Rev. B 45, 3926 (1992).
- [24] D. Shahar, M. Hilke, C.C. Li, D.C. Tsui, S.L. Sondhi, J.E. Cunningham and M. Razeghi, Solid State Comm. 107, 19 (1998).
- [25] Universality at integer quantum Hall transitions, Kun Yang, D. Shahar, R.N.Bhatt, D.C.Tsui, M. Shayegan LANL preprint, cond-m at/9805341.
- [26] S.M. Girvin and T. Jach, Phys. Rev. B29, 5617 (1984).
- [27] D. Levesque, J. J. W eiss, and A. H. M acD onald, Phys. Rev. B 30, 1056 (1984).
- [28] R.P.Feynman, Statistical Mechanics (Benjamin, Reading, 1972).
- [29] S.M. Girvin, A.H. MacDonald and P.M. Platzman, Phys. Rev. B 33, 2481 (1986).
- [30] D.M.Ceperley, Rev. Mod. Phys. 67, 279 (1995).
- [31] F.D.M. Haldane and E.H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54, 237 (1985).
- [32] G.Fano, F.Ortolani, and E.Colombo, Phys. Rev. B34, 2670 (1986).

TheQuantum HallE ect

- [33] A.Pinczuk, B.S.Dennis, L.N.Pfeier, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 3983 (1993).
- [34] C.Kallin and B.I.Halperin, Phys. Rev. B 30, 5655 (1984); Phys. Rev. B 31, 3635 (1985).
- [35] A.Goldhaber and S.A.K ivelson, Physics Lett. B255, 445 (1991).
- [36] V.Goldman and B.Su, Science 267, 1010 (1995).
- [37] R. de-Picciotto, M. Reznikov, M. Heiblum, V. Umansky, G. Bunin, and D. Mahalu, Nature 389, 162 (1997); L. Sam inadayar, D. C. Glattli, Y. Jin and B. Etienne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2526 (1997).
- [38] R.L.W illett, H.L.Stormer, D.C.Tsui, A.C.Gossard, and J.H.English, Phys. Rev. B37, 8476 (1988).
- [39] Claudio de C. Cham on and Eduardo Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B 56, 2012 (1997).
- [40] X.G.Wen, Phys. Rev. B43, 11025 (1991); Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2206 (1990);
 Phys. Rev. B44, 5708 (1991); Int. J. M od. Phys. B6, 1711 (1992).
- [41] M. Grayson, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeier, K. W. West, and A. M. Chang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1062 (1998).
- [42] B. I. Halperin, Helv. Phys. Acta 56, 75 (1983).
- [43] S.M.Girvin and A.H.MacDonald, Chap. 5 in Ref. [6].
- [44] J.P.Eisenstein, Chap.2 in Ref. [6].
- [45] M . Shayegan, in this volum e.
- [46] S.L. Sondhi, A.Karlhede, S.A.Kivelson, and E.H.Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B 47, 16419 (1993).
- [47] N.Read and S.Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 3509 (1995).
- [48] F.D.M.Haldane, Chap.8 in Ref. [3].
- [49] M.V.Berry, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A 392, 45 (1984); For reviews see: Geometric Phases in Physics, ed. by Frank W ilczek and Alfred Shapere, (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1989).
- [50] D.H.Lee and C.L.Kane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 1313 (1990).
- [51] K. Moon, H. Mori, Kun Yang, S. M. Girvin, A. H. MacDonald, L. Zheng,
 D. Yoshioka, and Shou-Cheng Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 51, 5138 (1995).
- [52] A.G.Green, I.I.Kogan and A.M.Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B 53, 6981 (1996).
- [53] J.P.Rodriguez, Europhys. Lett. 42, 197 (1998).

- [54] M. Abolfath and M. R. E jehadi, Phys. Rev. B58, 10665 (1998); M. Abolfath, Phys. Rev. B58, 2013 (1998); M. Abolfath, J. J. Palacios, H. A. Fertig, S. M. G irvin and A. H. M acD onald, Phys. Rev. B56, 6795 (1997).
- [55] W .Apeland Yu.A.Bychkov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2188 (1997).
- [56] A.G.Green, I.I.Kogan, and A.M. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B54, 16838 (1996).
- [57] T.H.R. Skyme, Proc. Royal Soc. (London) A 262, 233 (1961); A.A. Belavin and A.M. Polyakov, JETP Lett., 22, 245 (1975).
- [58] R.Rajaram an, Solitons and Instantons (North Holland, Am sterdam), 1982.
- [59] Tin-Lun Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 874 (1994).
- [60] E.H.Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B36, 5454 (1987); Phys. Rev. B43, 5944 (1991).
- [61] H.A.Fertig, L.Brey, R.Côte, A.H.MacDonald, A.Karlhede, and S. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B55, 10671 (1997); H.A.Fertig, L.Brey, R.Côte, and A.H.MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B50, 11018 (1994).
- [62] S.E.Barrett, G.Dabbagh, L.N.Pfeier, K.W. West, and R.Tycko, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 5112 (1995).
- [63] C.P.Slichter, Principles of magnetic resonance, 3rd ed.(Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1990).
- [64] A.Schmeller, J.P.Eisenstein, L.N.Pfeier, and K.W.West, Phys.Rev. Lett. 75 4290 (1995).
- [65] E.H.Aifer, B.B.Goldberg, and D.A.Broido, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 680 (1996); M.J.Manfra, E.H.Aifer, B.B.Goldberg, D.A.Broido, L.Pfeier, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. B54, R17327 (1996).
- [66] D.K.Maude, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 4604 (1996); D.R. Leadley, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 4246 (1997).
- [67] V. Bayot, E. Grivei, S. Melinte, M. B. Santos, and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4584 (1996); V. Bayot, E. Grivei, J.M. Beuken, S. Melinte, and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1718 (1997).
- [68] R. Tycko, S. E. Barrett, G. Dabbagh, L. N. P fei er, and K. W. West, Science 268, 1460 (1995).
- [69] D in itriAntoniou and A.H.M adD onald, Phys. Rev. B43, 11686 (1991).
- [70] H.A.Fertig, L.Brey, R.Côte, A.H.M add onald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 1572 (1996).
- [71] A.H.M acD onald, H.A. Fertig, and Luis Brey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 2153 (1996).

TheQuantum HallE ect

- [72] L.Brey, H.A. Fertig, R.Côte, and A.H.M adD onald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2562 (1995).
- [73] Kun Yang, K. Moon, L. Zheng, A. H. MacDonald, S. M. Girvin, D. Yoshioka, and Shou-Cheng Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 732 (1994).
- [74] Subir Sachdev and T. Senthil, Annals of Physics 251, 76 (1996).
- [75] R.Côte, A.H.M adD onald, Luis Brey, H.A.Fertig, S.M.G irvin, and H. T.C.Stoof, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 4825 (1997).
- [76] M in-ChulCha, M.P.A.Fisher, S.M.G irvin, M ats W allin, and A.Peter Young, Phys. Rev. B 44, 6883 (1991).
- [77] Erik S.S rensen, M ats W allin, S.M.G irvin and A.Peter Young, Phys. Rev.Lett. 69, 828 (1992); M ats W allin, Erik S.S rensen, S.M.G irvin, and A.P.Young, Phys. Rev. B49, 12115 (1994).
- [78] M.P.A.Fisher, P.B.W eichman, G.Grinstein and D.S.Fisher, Phys. Rev. B40, 546 (1989).
- [79] A.E.Rana and S.M.Girvin, Phys. Rev. B48, 360 (1993).
- [80] Carsten Timm, S.M. Girvin and H.A. Fertig, Phys. Rev. B58, 10634 (1998).
- [81] S.Q.Murphy, J.P.Eisenstein, G.S.Boebinger, L.N.Pfeier, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 728 (1994).
- [82] T.Chakraborty and P.Pietilainen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 2784 (1987); E.H.
 Rezayi and F.D.M.Haldane, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. 32, 892 (1987); Song
 He, S.D as Sarm a and X.C.Xie, Phys. Rev. B 47, 4394 (1993); D.Yoshioka,
 A.H.M acD onald, and S.M.G irvin, Phys. Rev. B 39, 1932 (1989).
- [83] V ittorio Pellegrini, A ron P inczuk, B rian S.D ennis, A nnette S.P laut, Loren N.P fei er, and K en W.W est, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 310 (1997).
- [84] S.D as Sam a, Subir Sachdev, Lian Zheng, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 917 (1997);
 Phys. Rev. B 58, 4672 (1998).
- [85] M.B. Santos, L.W. Engel, S.W. Hwang, and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. B44, 5947 (1991); T.S.Lay, Y.W. Suen, H.C.M anoharan, X.Ying, M. B. Santos, and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. B50, 17725 (1994).
- [86] For a brief review of the fractional quantum Hall e ect in double-layer system s see A. H. M acD onald, Surface Science 229, 1 (1990).
- [87] Y.W. Suen et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 1379 (1992); J.P.E isenstein et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 1383 (1992).
- [88] X.G.W en and A.Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1811 (1992); X.G.W en and A.Zee, Phys. Rev. B 47, 2265 (1993).

- [89] Z.F.Ezawa and A.Iwazaki, Int. J. of M cd. Phys., B19, 3205 (1992); Z.
 F.Ezawa and A.Iwazaki, Phys. Rev. B47, 7295 (1993); Z.F.Ezawa, A.
 Iwazaki, Phys. Rev. B48, 15189 (1993); Z.F.Ezawa, Phys. Rev. B51, 11152 (1995).
- [90] A.H.M acD onald, P.M. P latzm an, and G.S.Boebinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 775 (1990)
- [91] Luis Brey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 903 (1990); H.A. Fertig, Phys. Rev. B 40, 1087 (1989).
- [92] R.Côte, L.Brey, and A.H.MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B46, 10239 (1992); X.
 M.Chen and J.J.Quinn, Phys. Rev. B45, 11054 (1992).
- [93] Tin-Lun Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 874 (1994) and unpublished.
- [94] K.Moon, H.Mori, Kun Yang, Lot Belkhir, S.M.Girvin, A.H.MacDonald, L.Zheng and D.Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. B 54, 11644 (1996).
- [95] A single-layer system at Landau level lling factor = 1=2 has no charge gap but does show interesting anom alies which may indicate that it form s a liquid of composite ferm ions. For a discussion of recent work see B. I. Halperin, Patrick A. Lee, and N icholas Read, Phys. Rev. B 47, 7312 (1993) and work cited therein.
- [96] G.S.Boebinger, H.W. Jiang, L.N. Pfei er, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 1793 (1990); G.S.Boebinger, L.N. Pfei er, and K.W. West, Phys. Rev. B45, 11391 (1992).
- [97] Lectures on P hase Transitions and the R enorm alization G roup, N igelG oldenfeld (A ddison W esley, R eading, 1992).
- [98] Adriaan M. J. Schakel, Boulevard of Broken Symmetries,' submitted to Phys. Rep., LANL preprint cond-m at/9805152.
- [99] V.Bargman, Rev. M od. Phys. 34, 829 (1962).

120