

QHE of Bilayer Systems in the Presence of Tunneling

– $\nu = 1/q$ case –

Kentaro NOMURA and Daijiro YOSHIOKA

Department of Basic Science, University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Tokyo, 153-8902, Japan

(September 4, 2018)

Transport properties of bilayer quantum Hall systems at $\nu = 1/q$, where q is an odd integer, are investigated. The edge theory is used for the investigation, since tunneling between the two layers is assumed to occur on the edge of the sample because of the bulk incompressibility. It is shown that in the case of the independent Laughlin state tunneling is irrelevant when $\nu < 1/2$ in the low temperature and long wave length limit. The temperature dependence of two-terminal conductance of the system in which only one of the two layers is contacted with electrode is discussed.

72.10.-d, 73.20.Dx, 73.40.Hm

The fractional quantum Hall(FQH) effect appears in two-dimensional electron systems in a strong magnetic field. Recently a large number of studies have been made on bilayer quantum Hall states. These systems are two dimensional electron systems in double-quantum-well, and various ground states under interlayer interactions have been studied. [1] One of the direction of developments is the transport phenomena. It has become possible to fabricate bilayer systems in which the two layers can be contacted separately, and some transport properties have been studied experimentally. [2,3] In one experiment, Ohno et al. studied transport for a systems in which contact was made to one layer while the other was left floating. [3] When the system was tuned to equal layer densities to maximize coupling due to tunneling, they found that the transport coefficient were usually nearly identical to those measured when both layers were connected. However, near the integer quantum Hall plateaux, the Hall resistivity almost doubled in the floating layer case. Yoshioka and MacDonald studied the influence of interlayer tunneling upon the longitudinal and transverse resistance in the framework of non-interacting electron and successfully explained the behavior at the integer plateaux. [4,5] This experiment is done at 1.5K which is too high to observe the fractional quantum Hall plateaux. Since then no one has done experiment in a situation where fractional quantum Hall plateau is observed. It is not obvious that the FQH plateaux behave similarly to the IQH plateaux in the presence of tunneling. If the behavior is different, it will reflect the properties of the FQHE edge states. Therefore it is worth while to study the behavior of the FQH plateau both experimentally and theoretically. The purpose of the present paper is to theoretically investigate what happens to the FQH plateau in the presence of tunneling between the layers. We will show that the plateau at $\nu = 1/q$, where $q > 1$, can behave differently from that at $\nu = 1$.

In this paper we consider bilayer systems at filling factor $1/q$ each, where q is an odd integer. The electrodes are attached to only one of the layers, and influence of the other layer on the two-terminal and Hall conductances

are investigated. The edge states, which determine the transport properties, are influenced by the coupling, since the excitation at the edge is gapless. [6,7] So we first explain how the bilayer edge is described by the two component chiral Tomonaga-Luttinger liquid theory in the absence of tunneling. Then we add the effect of tunneling, which occurs only at the edges. The edge state of the multicomponent quantum Hall systems is studied by MacDonald and Haldane. [8] According to them, two distinct phase should be considered. They are parameterized by K -matrix: [9]

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} m \pm 1 & m \\ m & m \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

and

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 2m \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2m \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where m is even integer which is related to the bulk filling factors of the both layers ν as $\nu = 1/(2m \pm 1) = 1/q$. When $\nu = 1$ these two states are equivalent. They describe standard hierarchical state and independent Laughlin state, respectively. We describe the edge state of bilayer FQH systems as follows:

$$S_0 = \int d\tau dx \mathcal{L}_0[\phi],$$

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \sum_{IJ} \frac{i}{4\pi} K_{IJ} \frac{\partial \phi_I^+}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \phi_J^-}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{8\pi} v_{IJ} \left(\frac{\partial \phi_I^+}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \phi_J^+}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \phi_I^-}{\partial x} \frac{\partial \phi_J^-}{\partial x} \right), \quad (3)$$

where x is the coordinate along the edge, pseudo spin $I, J = \uparrow\downarrow$ corresponds to two layers, $\phi_I^\pm = \phi_I^u \pm \phi_I^l$ with $\phi_I^u(\phi_I^l)$ being the edge boson fields propagating along the upper(lower)boundary of the I layer, v_{IJ} encodes the non universal interactions, and we assume $v_{11} = v_{22}, v_{12} = v_{21}$.

In the charge-pseudo spin basis, [10] $\phi_{c,s} = (\phi_\uparrow \pm \phi_\downarrow)/2$, the two-components can be separated:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 = & \left(\frac{i}{2\pi K_\rho} \frac{\partial \phi_c^+}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \phi_c^-}{\partial x} + \frac{v_c}{4\pi K_\rho} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \phi_c^+}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial \phi_c^-}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right] \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{i}{2\pi K_\sigma} \frac{\partial \phi_s^+}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \phi_s^-}{\partial x} + \frac{v_s}{4\pi K_\sigma} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \phi_s^+}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial \phi_s^-}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $K_\rho = \pm 1/(2m \pm 1) = \pm \nu$, $K_\sigma = 1$ for standard hierarchical state, $K_\rho = K_\sigma = \nu$ for independent Laughlin state, and $v_{c,s} = 2(v_{11} \pm v_{12})$ are velocities of charge mode, and spin mode, respectively. [11]

On the boundary electron field operator is given by [13,12]

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_I^u &= \sqrt{\rho_0} \exp(iq\phi_c^u \pm i\phi_s^u), \\ \psi_I^l &= \sqrt{\rho_0} \exp(-iq\phi_c^l \mp i\phi_s^l), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for standard hierarchical state, and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_I^u &= \sqrt{\rho_0} \exp(i\phi_I^u/\nu), \\ \psi_I^l &= \sqrt{\rho_0} \exp(-i\phi_I^l/\nu), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

for independent Laughlin state. In these equations ρ_0 is electron density in the bulk.

Now we go on to discuss tunneling between the two layers. The tunneling is described by the following Hamiltonian.

$$H_{\text{tun}} = \int dx \left(t(x) \psi_\uparrow^\dagger(x) \psi_\downarrow(x) + h.c. \right), \quad (7)$$

where $t(x)$ is the tunneling amplitude. In the ideal system the tunneling occurs uniformly, and $t(x)$ is independent of x . On the other hand, if the impurity assisted tunneling is dominant, $t(x)$ depends on spatial distribution of the impurities. We first consider the former case. Then Eq.(7) is written in terms of boson fields as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{tun}} &= \int d\tau dx \, t \left(\psi_\uparrow^{u\dagger} \psi_\downarrow^u + \psi_\uparrow^{l\dagger} \psi_\downarrow^l + h.c. \right) \\ &= u \int d\tau dx \, \cos\left(\frac{\phi_s^+}{K_\sigma}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\phi_s^-}{K_\sigma}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $u = 4\rho_0 t$ is coupling constant.

We suppose the limit where the tunneling amplitude is very weak, and calculate the scaling dimension of the tunneling amplitude. We introduce a energy-momentum cut off Λ , then bosonic column vector field is given as

$$\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{0 < |\mathbf{p}| < \Lambda} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{p}), \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (\tau, x)$ is 1 + 1 dimensional space-time vector, and $\mathbf{p} = (\omega, k)$ is energy-momentum vector. We divide the field ϕ_Λ into slow and fast modes such as

$$\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_{\Lambda'}(\mathbf{x}) + h(\mathbf{x}), \quad (10)$$

where

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\Lambda' < |\mathbf{p}| < \Lambda} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{p}). \quad (11)$$

Integrating out $h(\mathbf{x})$, we obtain an effective action for slow modes $\phi_{\Lambda'}$:

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\phi_{\Lambda'} e^{-S'[\phi_{\Lambda'}]}. \quad (12)$$

Here we keep only the first order terms with respect to the coupling constant u , then we obtain

$$u(\Lambda') = u(\Lambda) \exp(-G_s(0)/K_\sigma^2) \left(\frac{\Lambda'}{\Lambda}\right)^{-2}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_{c,s}(\mathbf{x}) &= \langle h_{c,s}^\pm(\mathbf{x}) h_{c,s}^\pm(0) \rangle_h \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}h \, h_{c,s}^\pm(\mathbf{x}) h_{c,s}^\pm(0) e^{-S[h]} / \int \mathcal{D}h \, e^{-S[h]} \\ &= K_{\rho,\sigma} \frac{|d\Lambda|}{\Lambda} J_0(\Lambda|\mathbf{x}|), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and $|d\Lambda| = \Lambda - \Lambda'$.

So RG equation is written as

$$\frac{du}{dl} = \left(2 - \frac{1}{K_\sigma}\right) u, \quad (15)$$

where $e^l = \Lambda/\Lambda'$. It shows that when $K_\sigma < 1/2$, the tunneling is irrelevant; and when $K_\sigma > 1/2$, it is relevant. In the following we consider both cases.

First we consider the case of $\nu (= 1/q) < 1/2$ independent Laughlin state. Since the irrelevancy of the tunneling, the layer which is applied source-drain voltage is described by the fixed point which corresponds to the single layer QH systems in the long wave length and low energy limit. Then in this limit the Hall conductance and two-terminal conductance are given by $G_H = G_T = \nu e^2/h$. At finite temperature there should be corrections to two-terminal conductance.

This correction can be obtained by calculating the tunneling current between the layers by Fermi's golden rule:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{tun}} &= 2\pi e \sum_n |\langle n | H_{\text{tun}} | o \rangle|^2 \delta(E_n - E_o - eV) \\ &= \frac{t^2 e}{2\pi} \int dx dx' d\omega \, G_\uparrow^>(x - x', \omega - eV) \\ &\quad \text{times } G_\downarrow^<(x - x', \omega), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $G_I^<$ and $G_I^>$ are the Green's functions. These can be expressed as

$$G_I^>(x, \omega) = \int dt \, e^{i\omega t} \langle \psi_I^\dagger(x, t) \psi_I(0, 0) \rangle. \quad (17)$$

This is related to the imaginary-time Green's function

$$G_I(x, \tau) = \langle T_\tau [\psi_I^\dagger(x, \tau) \psi_I(0, 0)] \rangle \quad (18)$$

via analytic continuation, $G_I^>(x, t) = G_I(x, \tau \rightarrow it)$.

In terms of conformal theory, electron operator is the vertex operator which has conformal dimension $\Delta = 1/2\nu$. So we have

$$\langle \psi_I^\dagger(z) \psi_I(z') \rangle \sim \frac{1}{(z - z')^{1/\nu}} \quad (19)$$

where $z = x - ic\tau$, and c is velocity of single layer edge mode.

Therefore tunneling density is given as

$$G_I^>(x, \omega) \sim \omega^{1/\nu-1} e^{i\omega(x-x'-i\alpha)/c} \theta(\omega), \quad (20)$$

and one obtains

$$I_{\text{tun}} \sim \int_0^{eV} d\omega \omega^{2/\nu-4} \sim V^{2/\nu-4} V. \quad (21)$$

This tunneling current gives rise to backscattering of the current. At the finite temperature T , we can put the voltage V to T . So the the correction of two-terminal conductance is given as $G_T - \nu e^2/h \propto -T^{2q-4}$. This result is consistent with our renormalization group analysis.

In the other cases: $\nu = 1 > 1/2$ independent Laughlin state and standard hierarchical state, u scales to a large value, then our RG equation Eq.(15) cannot be relied on. However, u should scale to a finite value. The vicinities of the electrodes are non equilibrium, and Hall conductance varies from $2\nu e^2/h$, when u is scaled to large value, to $\nu e^2/h$. Since these behavior at $\nu = 1$ is investigated in ref.(4), we do not discuss them in the present paper.

Far from the source and drain electrodes, the systems are expected to achieve the equilibrium state in which chemical potentials of the two layers are equal. Actually ϕ_s is massive. To see this, we suppose u is infinite. Because of dominancy of S_{tun} , ϕ_s is given by a solution of the equation of motion, and it is constant. Then spin mode has an infinite gap. Even when u is finite, spin mode has a finite gap. Therefore low-energy excitations are charged modes only. This means that it is rather stable to flow current on both edges of layers under the perturbation of the source-drain voltage, and it can be concluded that this situation is an equilibrium state. Therefore if one first assigns a definite value of the current, then the measured voltage is half of the single layer case. So the Hall conductance on this area at $\nu = 1 > 1/2$ independent Laughlin state and spin singlet state must be $G_H = 2\nu e^2/h$ according to the Landauer-Buttiker's picture.

So far we have discussed tunneling due to the uniform overlap of the wave functions. Now we consider the effect of impurity scattering. First let's consider a situation where impurities are sparse. Tunneling at each impurities occurs independently. We represent the outcome of such tunneling by a single effective impurity at the each side of the edge. [14] This situation resemble Grayson's

experiment. [15] In this case the tunneling amplitude can be written as point contact type [16]

$$t(x)^{u,l} = t \delta(x - x_0^{u,l}), \quad (22)$$

where $x_0^{u,l}$ is the position of the impurity. Then the tunneling term S_{tun} is replaced by

$$S_{\text{tun}} = u \int d\tau \cos \frac{\phi_s^+(0, \tau)}{K_\sigma} \cos \frac{\phi_s^-(0, \tau)}{K_\sigma} \quad (23)$$

where we put $x_0^u = x_0^l = 0$. To calculate the scaling dimension, we consider effective action S^{eff} , which is defined as [17]

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}\phi \exp(-S_0 - S_{\text{tun}}[\phi_s(o, \tau)]) \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\theta \mathcal{D}\lambda \exp[-S_0[\phi] - S_{\text{tun}}[\theta(\tau)] \\ &\quad + \int d\tau \lambda(\tau) (\theta(\tau) - \phi_s(0, \tau))] \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\theta \exp(-S^{\text{eff}}[\theta]). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

After integrating out, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S^{\text{eff}}[\theta] &= \sum_\omega \frac{\omega}{2\pi K_\sigma} (\theta^+(-\omega)\theta^+(\omega) + \theta^-(-\omega)\theta^-(\omega)) \\ &\quad + u \int d\tau \cos\left(\frac{\theta^+}{K_\sigma}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\theta^-}{K_\sigma}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

As before we integrate out the fast mode to obtain

$$u(\Lambda') = u(\Lambda) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{K_\sigma^2} G(0)\right) \left(\frac{\Lambda'}{\Lambda}\right)^{-1}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$G(\tau) = K_\sigma \frac{|d\Lambda|}{\Lambda} e^{i\Lambda\tau}. \quad (27)$$

Then the RG equation reads

$$\frac{du}{dl} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{K_\sigma}\right)u. \quad (28)$$

Thus if $\nu < 1$ tunneling is irrelevant for independent Laughlin state and two-terminal conductance behaves as $G_T(T) = \nu e^2/h - \alpha T^{2/\nu-2}$ similarly to the point contact experiment. [18]

For the other cases, tunneling is marginal. When $\nu = 1$, interaction can be neglected, so we can use the Landauer-Buttiker transport theory. Then the electrons partially transmit between the two layers, and Hall conductance is almost independent of temperature.

Next we consider a situation where impurities are not sparse, and tunneling at each impurities can not be treated independently. This case is modeled by random Gaussian distribution for $t(x)$ with

$$P_{[t(x)]} = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2W} \int dx t(x)^2\right). \quad (29)$$

Then

$$\overline{t(x)t(x')} = W\delta(x-x'). \quad (30)$$

The effect of this potential is investigated by Gimarchi and Schulz in the theory of localization of interacting one dimensional electrons systems, [19] and by Kane, Fisher, and Polchinski in QH edge. [10] In order to treat this potential, we use the replica trick, [20] Noting the relation;

$$\ln Z = \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n} (Z^n - 1), \quad (31)$$

when we consider the average of free energy, we calculate $\overline{Z^n}$ in place of $\overline{\ln Z}$, where n is the number of replicas. The former average is written as

$$\overline{Z^n} = \int \left(\prod_i \mathcal{D}\phi_i \right) \overline{\exp(-\sum_i S[\phi_i])}. \quad (32)$$

Then effective action can be expressed as

$$\overline{\exp(-\sum_i S[\phi_i])} = \exp(-S^{av}), \quad (33)$$

$$S^{av} = \sum_i S_0[\phi_i] - \sum_{ij} 2W \int d\tau d\tau' dx \cos\left(\frac{\phi_{s,i}^+(x, \tau) - \phi_{s,j}^+(x, \tau')}{K_\sigma}\right) \times \cos\left(\frac{\phi_{s,i}^-(x, \tau) - \phi_{s,j}^-(x, \tau')}{K_\sigma}\right). \quad (34)$$

In this case W plays a role of a coupling constant. According to refs.(10) and (19) RG equation of W is written as

$$\frac{dW}{dl} = \left(3 - \frac{2}{K_\sigma}\right)W. \quad (35)$$

If $K_\sigma < 2/3$ it is irrelevant, then the values of Hall conductance does not change at zero temperature. On the other hand, if $K_\sigma = 1 > 2/3$ randomness is relevant. As mentioned above ϕ_s is massive, then Hall conductance is $G_H = 2e^2/h$ at zero temperature.

In this paper we have shown the following.

(a) In the case of independent Laughlin state at $\nu < 1/2$ (1/3, 1/5, ...), the Hall conductance at zero temperature is equal to that of the single layer under any mechanism of tunneling. At low temperature T -dependence of the two-terminal conductance is given as

$$G_T(T) = \nu \frac{e^2}{h} - \alpha T^{2/\nu-4}, \quad (36)$$

for the ideal uniform tunneling case,

$$G_T(T) = \nu \frac{e^2}{h} - \alpha T^{2/\nu-2}, \quad (37)$$

for the local impurities, and

$$G_T(T) = \nu \frac{e^2}{h} - \alpha T^{4/\nu-6}, \quad (38)$$

for the random impurities, where α depends on the details of the sample.

(b) In the other case: $\nu = 1$ and standard hierarchical state at any ν . In the presence of the uniform overlap of the wave functions or random impurities, Hall conductance on the middle region of the sample is given as

$$G_H = 2\nu \frac{e^2}{h}, \quad (39)$$

because of pseudo-spin gap. If the local impurities cause tunneling, two-terminal conductance is non universal and almost independent of temperature, since tunneling is marginal.

All above arguments apply only to $\nu = 1/(\text{odd-integer})$ QH state. We will study the transport phenomena in hierarchical [21] and paired [22,23] QH states, and finite size correction is to be discussed later.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to K. Imura, Y. Morita, and M. Ogata for useful discussion. This work is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 10640301 from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture.

-
- [1] S.M. Girvin and A.H. MacDonald: in *Perspectives in Quantum Hall Effect*, ed. S. Das Sarma and A. Pinczuk (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1997).
 - [2] J.P. Eisenstein, L.N. Pfeiffer and K.W. West: *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **57** (1990) 2324.
 - [3] Y. Ohno, M. Foley, and H. Sakaki: *Phys. Rev. B* **54** (1996) R2319.
 - [4] D. Yoshioka, A.H. MacDonald: *Phys. Rev. B* **53** (1996) R16168.
 - [5] D. Yoshioka: *Physica E1* (1997) 167.
 - [6] X.G. Wen: *Phys. Rev. B* **43** (1991) 11025.
 - [7] X.G. Wen: *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **6** (1992) 1711.
 - [8] I.A. McDonald and F.D.M. Haldane: *Phys. Rev. B* **53** (1996) 15845.
 - [9] X.G. Wen and A. Zee: *Phys. Rev. B* **46** (1992) 2290.
 - [10] C.L. Kane, M.P.A. Fisher, J. Polchinski: *Phys. Rev. Lett* **72** (1994) 4129.

- [11] In the actual system v_c should be larger than v_s due to the long-range Coulomb interaction. The value of these velocities will not affect our discussion here.
- [12] K. Imura and N. Nagaosa: Phys. Rev. B **57** (1998) R6826.
- [13] X.G. Wen: Phys. Rev. B **41** (1990) 12838.
- [14] If the local impurity exists on only one side, the transport properties are not effected.
- [15] M. Grayson, D.C. Tsui, L.N. Pfeiffer, K.W. West and A.M. Chang: Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 1062.
- [16] We regard the intensity of the tunneling amplitude as same on the both edges, because the difference of them does not make any influence to the transport.
- [17] C.L.Kane and M.P.A. Fisher: Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992) 1220. A. Furusaki and N. Nagaosa: Phys. Rev. B **47** (1993) 3827.
- [18] F. Milliken, C. Umbach, and R. Webb: Solid State Commun. **97** (1996) 309.
- [19] T. Giamarchi and H.J. Schulz: Phys. Rev, B **37** (1988) 325.
- [20] S.F. Edwards and P.W. Anderson: J. Phys. C**5** (1975) 965.
- [21] F.D.M. Haldane: Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 605.
- [22] F.D.M. Haldane and E.H. Rezay: Phys. Rev. Lett **60** (1988) 956
- [23] G. Moore and N. Read: Nucl. Phys. B **360** (1991) 362