

Paired Hall States versus Unidirectional CDW in Tilted Field for $\nu = \frac{5}{2}$

Yue Yu, Shi-Jie Yang and Zhao-Bin Su

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, P. O. Box 2735, Beijing 100080, China

We formulate the composite fermions in the presence of an in-plane magnetic field. As the in-plane field increases, if we assume the state at $\nu = 5/2$ turns into the mixed state between the unidirectional charge density wave domains and paired Hall state, we can phenomenologically fit the theoretically defined gap to the experimental measured results. We explain the destruction of the paired Hall states and then a phase transition from the paired Hall state to the unidirectional charge density wave from a symmetry point of view.

PACS numbers: 73.20.Dx, 73.40.Hm, 73.40.Kp, 73.50.Jt

There have appeared a bundle of enigmatic phenomena for half-filled Landau levels since the discovery of the Hall metallic state for $\nu = 1/2$ [1] and the Hall plateau for $\nu = 5/2$ [2]. Recently, a series of experiments revealed a novel anisotropic electronic transport for half-filled higher Landau levels [3–7]. It is widely believed that the highly anisotropic transport is related to the formation of the unidirectional charge density wave (UCDW) ground state, i.e., the stripe phase, [8–10] as well as the quantum and smectic and nematic phase induced by the fluctuations [11].

While the composite fermion (CF) metallic states at $\nu = 1/2$ was fairly well-understood [13], the enigma at $\nu = 5/2$ remains far to be revealed. The Hall plateau at $\nu = 5/2$ was explained as the appearance of the ground state of a spin-singlet pair [14] whereas the p -wave BCS paring of CF the spin-polarized or the Moore-Read(MR) Pfaffian wave function [15] may be another possibility [16], which was recently suggested to be favorable [17,18]. Studies by Eisenstein et al [19] in the tilted field have shown that the plateau disappears if the tilt angle θ exceeds a critical value. The explanation of the experiments from the point of view of the singlet-paring can be understood as a gain in Zeeman energy [20] while how the tilted field violates the spin-polarized paired Hall state is still in puzzle.

Recently, the experimental data showed by Pan et al [6] and Lilly et al [7] shed light on this puzzling problem. These experiments revealed the anisotropic transport property after the Hall plateau is destroyed by the tilt field and the current favors to flow along the direction perpendicular to the in-plane field. Two recent papers investigated the effect caused by the tilted field [21,22] but the phase transition mechanism from the quantum Hall state to the stripe phase was not touched.

In this paper, we would try to search the physical mechanism causing this phase transition. We explore that the many-body wave functions with the existence of the in-plane field. It is found that the Laughlin-like states can be defined and then the fractional quantum Hall effects (FQHE) and the Hall metallic state are not disturbed by the tilted field for the lowest Landau level (LLL). However, there are two kinds of instabilities of the CF Fermi surface for $\nu = 5/2$, the CF paired Hall

state and the UCDW of the electrons. Before arriving the critical tilt angle, the state may be the mixing between the paired Hall states and the UCDW domains. It is seen that the paired Hall gap decreases as the tilt angle increases. Moreover, it is shown that the theoretically defined gap decreases as the total external magnetic field. Through a phenomenological fit, our theoretical prediction for the gap function of the external magnetic field agreeing with what Eisenstein et al presented in an earlier experiment [20]. Thus, instead of the explanation based on a gain of the Zeeman energy, the spin-polarized explanation of the experiment is established. Exceeding the critical tilt angle, all UCDW domains connect together and form a global UCDW.

From the symmetry point of view, the Laughlin-type states are only the eigen state of the total magnetic translation operator whereas no longer those of the relative one. This implies that the motion of the center of mass of particles can not be separated from the relative motion. The lack of the quantum numbers labeling the relative motion of the particles leads to the pair was destroyed at a critical tilt angle for $\nu = 5/2$.

We start from the problem of a single particle in a strong magnetic field which is tilted an angle to the $x-y$ plane. An in-plane field in the x -direction violates the two-dimensional(2D) rotational symmetry. By introducing a harmonic confining potential with the character frequency Ω in the z -direction, the system is restricted to quasi-2D. To regard Laughlin's states, one takes the symmetric gauge. The single particle Hamiltonian can be diagonalized as $H_{s.p.} = \hbar\omega_- \alpha_\xi^\dagger \alpha_\xi + \hbar\omega_+ \alpha_z^\dagger \alpha_z$. The frequencies ω_\pm are given by [21]

$$\omega_\pm^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\Omega}^2 + \omega_c^2) \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\tilde{\Omega}^2 - \omega_c^2)^2 + 4|\tilde{\omega}|^2\tilde{\Omega}\omega_c}, \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{\omega} = \omega_x(\omega_c/\tilde{\Omega})^{1/2}$ and $\tilde{\Omega}^2 = \Omega^2 + \omega_x^2$; ω_x and ω_c are the cyclotron frequencies corresponding to B_x and B_z . α_ξ and α_z are the annihilation operators in the diagonal harmonic bases. Here we have applied the unit $l_c = \sqrt{\hbar c/eB_z} = 1$. In addition, there is a conservation quantity, the square of the magnetic translation in 2D, $L_\xi = \tilde{a}_L^\dagger \tilde{a}_L$ with $\tilde{a}_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_\xi + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\xi})$ and $\tilde{a}_L^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-\partial_{\bar{\xi}} + \frac{1}{2}\xi)$. If θ tends to zero, L_ξ is corre-

sponding to the angular momentum in 2D. To solve this single-particle problem, we seek the ground state which is the eigen function of L_ξ . It is useful to make a coordinate rotation with $\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi} = \xi + b\bar{\xi} + cz'$ and $\bar{z}' = z'$ with b and c determined by $[\alpha_\xi, \tilde{\xi}] = [\alpha_z, \tilde{\xi}] = 0$. The ground state wave functions are highly degenerate and of the form $\Psi_0(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}^*, \bar{z}') = f(\tilde{\xi})e^g$ with $g(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}^*, \bar{z}')$ being a quadratic form of $\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}^*, \bar{z}'$. The function $f(\tilde{\xi})$ is an arbitrary function of $\tilde{\xi}$ and The coefficients of g are determined by $\alpha_\xi e^g = \alpha_z e^g = 0$.

Notice that linear-independent wave functions $\tilde{\xi}^m e^g$ ($m=0,1,2,\dots$) are not the eigen functions of L_ξ . However, one can start from those linear-independent wave functions to construct the common eigen functions of $H_{s.p.}$ and L_ξ , which read $f_m(\tilde{\xi})e^g$, with $f_m(\tilde{\xi}) = \sum_{m'=0}^{M-1} f_{mm'} \tilde{\xi}^m$ for M being the number of Landau orbits. The coefficients $f_{mm'}$ are dependent on the in-plane field and confined by $f_{mm}(0) = 1$ and $f_{mm'}(0) = 0$ for $m \neq m'$ if $\theta = 0$. Those degenerate ground state wave functions are orthogonal and with the eigen value m of L_m .

After solving the single-particle problem, we turn to the many-body ground state wave function. To be enlightened by Laughlin's wave function for the vanishing tilt angle, we postulate the many-body ground states for $\nu = 1/\phi$ FQHE as $\Psi_0(\vec{r}_1, \dots, \vec{r}_N) = (\text{St}(f_0, \dots, f_{N-1}))^\phi e^{\sum_i g_i}$ where \vec{r}_i are the 3-d position vectors and St is standing for the Slater determinant of $f_0(\tilde{\xi}_{P(1)}), \dots, f_{N-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{P(N)})$. This wave function has the lowest eigen value of $L = \sum L_{\xi_i}$. For the small particle system, the postulated wave function seems to be different from Laughlin's wave function. However, if the numbers of both Landau orbits and particles are very large, one can assume the function $f_m(\tilde{\xi}_i) = \sum_{m'=0}^{N-1} f_{mm'} \tilde{\xi}_i^{m'}$ [23]. Thus, the Slater determinant is proportional to Vandermonde's determinant and then

$$\Psi_0(\vec{r}_1, \dots, \vec{r}_N) \propto \Pi_{i < j} \tilde{\xi}_{ij}^\phi e^{\sum_i g_i}, \quad (2)$$

which is exactly the Laughlin-Jastrow form for $\tilde{\xi}_{ij} = \tilde{\xi}_i - \tilde{\xi}_j$. For $\nu = 1/2$, a similar boson-type Laughlin-Jastrow form is also contained in the wave function. Thus, the composite particle picture is still valid. In other words, we can make an anyon transformation

$$\Psi(\vec{r}_1, \dots, \vec{r}_N) = \Pi_{i < j} \left[\frac{\tilde{\xi}_{ij}}{|\tilde{\xi}_{ij}|} \right]^\phi \Phi(\vec{r}_1, \dots, \vec{r}_N). \quad (3)$$

A statistical gauge field, therefore, is introduced,

$$\tilde{a}_\alpha(\vec{r}_i) = -\tilde{\phi} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{x}_{ij}^\beta}{|\tilde{\xi}_{ij}|^2}, \quad \tilde{a}_z(\vec{r}_i) = -\frac{\tilde{\phi} \tilde{\Omega}^{1/2}}{\omega_c^{1/2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{c \tilde{y}_{ij}}{|\tilde{\xi}_{ij}|^2}, \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\xi} = \tilde{x} + i\tilde{y}$; $\tilde{\epsilon}_{12} = 1+b$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{21} = -1+b$. This statistical gauge field gives an associated statistical magnetic field $\tilde{b} = \nabla \times \tilde{a}$ with its components

$$b_z(\vec{\xi}_i) = -2\pi\tilde{\phi} \sum_{j \neq i} \delta^{(2)}(\xi_{ij}), \quad (5)$$

$$b_x(\vec{\xi}_i) = 2\pi\tilde{\phi}(1+b)^{-1}(\tilde{\Omega}/\omega_c)^{1/2}c \sum_{j \neq i} \delta^{(2)}(\xi_{ij}), \quad (6)$$

$$b_y(\vec{\xi}_i) = 0.$$

Hence, at the mean-field approximation, the perpendicular magnetic field can be cancelled by taking the particle density $\rho(\vec{\xi}_i) = \sum_{j \neq i} \delta^{(2)}(\xi_{ij})$ as its average value $\bar{\rho} = \frac{\nu}{2\pi l_c^2}$ for $\nu = 1/\tilde{\phi}$. This gives the composite particles in the zero perpendicular effective field. However, the in-plane field is enhanced by the parallel statistical magnetic field. A convenient gauge choice is to take $\tilde{a}_y = B_x z$ and leave the rest to \tilde{a}_z . Thus, the residual vector potential under the mean-field approximation points to the \hat{z} -direction and does not affect the normal transport behaviors in the plane [24].

Now, turn to the second Landau level. We assume the mixing between Landau levels can be neglected. Thus, the second Landau level can be treated as the LLL except the interaction between particles is renormalized due to the screening of the electrons in the LLL. In the absence of the in-plane field, the enigmatic even-denominator Hall plateau was observed for $\nu = 5/2$ [2]. An in-plane field, however, rapidly smashes the Hall plateau as the magnetic field is tilted [19]. Theoretically, as we have mentioned, recent numerical simulations favor the spin-polarized ground state [17,18]. However, in the first glimpse, the p -wave paired Hall state can only be affected by the tilted field gently. Therefore, a new explanation of the tilted field experiments has to be constructed.

In fact, there are two kinds of the instabilities of the CF Fermi surface, the CF paired Hall state and the UCDW of the electrons. The p -wave paired Hall state has an excitation gap $\Delta(k) = \Delta_F(k/k_F)$ for $k > k_F$ and $\Delta(k) = \Delta_F(k_F/k)$ for $k < k_F$ [16], where $\Delta_F = \Delta(k_F)$. The energy difference between the paired state and the CF Fermi sea can be obtained by using the standard expressions, i.e.,

$$E_{gs} - E_{gn} = 2N(0) \int_0^{\epsilon_D} d\epsilon \left[\epsilon - \frac{2\epsilon^2 + \Delta(k)^2}{2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 + \Delta(k)^2}} \right], \quad (7)$$

where ϵ_D is a cut-off. For $\Delta_F \ll \min\{\epsilon_F, \epsilon_D\}$, one has

$$E_{gs} - E_{gn} = -\frac{1}{2}N(0)\Delta_F^2, \quad (8)$$

i.e., to the zeroth order, the above energy difference is cut-off independent.

As the magnetic field is tilted, the paired gap decreases. Furthermore, eq.(6) means the local statistical in-plane field varies as the local particle density if there is an in-plane field. Then, the density fluctuation causes the effective in-plane field fluctuation. When one of CF's in a pair of CF's is in the region where the effective in-plane field is strongly enhanced the additional magnetic energy

may break the pair into the normal CF's. In terms of thermodynamics, the gap relates to the in-plane field by

$$\frac{1}{2}N(0)|\Delta_F(B_x)|^2 = \frac{1}{4\pi l} \int_{-l/2}^{l/2} dz \int_{B_x}^{B_p} \tilde{b}_x dB'_x, \quad (9)$$

where $B_p = \sqrt{B_{\text{tot},p}^2 - B_z^2}$ is defined by the paired Hall gap at $\theta = 0$; l is the thickness of the layer; and \tilde{b}_x is the distribution of the magnetization in the \hat{z} -direction. The boundary condition is $\tilde{b}_x(l/2) = \tilde{b}_x(-l/2) = \bar{b}_x$ which is the average of b_x in the plane, i.e., the mean-field value of b_x . (This is non-linear to B_x . However, this non-linearity is very small since θ is small. We can still assume $\bar{b}_x = \gamma B_x$.) If we thought this is the gap observed in the experiment, B_p would equal to $B_{x,c}$ and (9) could be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2}N(0)|\Delta_F(B_{\text{tot}})|^2 = \frac{\gamma\Lambda}{8\pi}(B_{x,c}^2 + B_z^2 - B_{\text{tot}}^2), \quad (10)$$

where $B_{\text{tot}}^2 = B_z^2 + B_x^2$; Λ is a factor related to the enhancement of the critical field due to the thin film in which the penetration depth of the in-plane magnetic field is larger than l . However, the gap function depending quadratically on B_{tot} in (10) is qualitatively different from that in the experiment by Eisenstein et al [20]. This means that the explanation to the experiment from the mixed state like the superconducting thin film may not work. Moreover, if such a mixed state worked, one would observe an anisotropic transport with the easy direction along the B_x -direction. This is just opposite to the experimental observation. The reason for the CF Fermi liquid not working is that the CF Fermi sea may not be a good variational ground state. It has been known that the ground state may be the UCDW perpendicular to the in-plane field if $\theta > \theta_c$, which has been supported by recent numerical calculations [22]. The experiments have also supplied the evidence that the stripe favor such an orientation [7,6]. Thus, when the effective in-plane magnetic field exceed a critical value in a domain, the CF's pairs are broken and the normal CFs energetically favor to change back to the electrons. The electrons forms a UCDW domain. Because b_x increases as B_x , the number and size of UCDW domains increase. After all, these domains all connection together at the critical tilted angle. The question is if the cohesive energy for the electrons in a very small domain when B_x is very small is still negative? To answer this question, we note that unlike in the real zero- or one-dimensional system, all electrons in the bulk they are not confined in a small region by any barrier or potential and the single-electron wave function is still taken its two-dimensional version. Although the charging effect is not important for CF's due to the neutrality of the bulk CF excitation, it comes over when CFs move into these domains because of the possible UCDW instability. According to ref. [8], the cohesive energy is not dependent on the length of the stripes if the single-particle wave function takes its two-dimensional version.

Thus, the cohesive energy E_{coh} for the electrons in the small domain can be calculated in the Hartree-Fock approximation as done in literature [8,9,21,22]. Several particular values are listed in table 1.

θ	0^0	7.2^0	14.4^0	20.4^0
$E_{\text{coh}}(K)$	-6.251	-6.252	-6.253	-6.255

Table 1 The typical values of the cohesive energy versus B_{tot} . The in-plane field is chosen to be perpendicular to the stripes [27].

We have given a mixed state picture between the paired Hall state and the UCDW. To exactly evaluate the microscopic parameters γ and Λ are difficult because their bare mean field value have to be strongly renormalized by the gauge fluctuation. Here we take a phenomenological method to deal with. The real energy gap of the Fermi momentum k_F , $\Delta(B_{\text{tot}})$, which is assumed being observed in the experiment, is given by

$$\Delta(B_{\text{tot}}) = \Delta_F(B_{\text{tot}}) - |E_{\text{coh}}(B_{\text{tot}})|, \quad (11)$$

according to the mixed state picture. The parameters $\Delta_F(B_z)$ (or the combination of the parameters $\gamma\Lambda/2\pi N(0)$) and $B_{\text{tot},p}$ can be determined by the experimental value of $\Delta(B_z)$ and the vanishing gap at $B_{\text{tot}} = B_{\text{tot},c}$, i.e., $\Delta(B_{\text{tot},c}) = 0$ with $B_{\text{tot},c}$ read out from the experimental data. However, the experimentally measured gap at $\theta = 0$ is 0.11 K which is one order differing from the theoretical calculation ($\sim 2K$). This discrepancy may come from the residual disorder in the sample [25]. A first order approximation to deal with the disorder is simply to minus a constant Γ in the right hand side of (11) [26] such that $\Delta(0) = 0.11K$. The energy gap Δ versus B_{tot} , then, can be calculated, which is plotted in Fig. 1. A fit to the experiment data is shown. It is emphasized that instead of the exactly linear energy gain from the Zeeman energy in the earlier spin unpolarized model, our result is not a rigorously straight line, which seems to be more reasonable in comparing with the experiment data. In fact, the curve drawn in Fig.1 comes from the very beginning part of the descent parabola of B_{tot} pluses the cohesive energy which slightly decreases as B_{tot} increases.

We can understand the destruction of the paired Hall gap from symmetry point of view. Recall the MR Pfaffian wave functions [15], the CF pair has the eigen value $l = -1$ of the relative angular momentum, i.e., the p -wave pairing. With the tilted field, we can also separate the conservation operator $L = \sum L_{\xi_i}$ into two parts one of which is corresponding to the motion of the center of mass in $\hat{\xi}$ -plane and another to the relative motion. Defining $\Xi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \xi_i$ and $\delta_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{i+1} - \xi_i)$, L is divided into $L = L(\Xi) + L(\delta)$. It is easy to see that $\sum_i g_i$ can also be written as $g(\Xi) + g(\delta)$. However, Slater determinant does not consist of $f_m(\Xi)$ and $f_m(\delta)$. This means that the wave function of the ground state is neither the eigen wave function of $L(\Xi)$ nor of $L(\delta)$. For example, although Laughlin's states (2) can be written

into the form of $F(\delta)e^{g(\Xi)}$ with $F(\delta) = \Pi_{i<j}(\tilde{\xi}_{ij})^{\tilde{\phi}}e^{g(\delta)}$, neither $F(\delta)$ nor $e^{g(\Xi)}$ is the eigen state of $L(\delta)$ or $L(\Xi)$, respectively. Thereby, we see that the relative motion of the particles is not independent of the motion of the center of mass due to the tilted field. A single pair can not be labeled by a well-defined quantum number. Furthermore, the paired Hall states, especially the MR Pfaffian wave function are not eigen states of L (then $L(\Xi)$ and $L(\delta)$). Certainly, in a very weak in-plane field, the effect of the field can be thought as a perturbation, and pairs may still be identified. As θ increasing, the mixing between the motion of the center of mass and the relative motion is stronger. Finally, a phase transition from the paired Hall to a compressible liquid takes place. Since the CFs are disintegrated at $B_{\text{tot},c}$ and the level crossing from the paired Hall state to the UCDW happens in the ground state. The effective magnetic field contributing to the entropy has a sudden jump from $B_x^* = B_x - \bar{b}_x$ to B_x . Therefore, this phase transition is the first order one.

In conclusions, we have constructed the CF when the magnetic field is tilted. While Laughlin-like states are well-defined in the LLL, the p -wave paired Hall state can be unstable because of the residual in-plane field. A competition between the instabilities of the CF Fermi surface to the formation of the CDW and the paired Hall state leads to the mixed state we considered here. Finally, the UCDW takes energetically over the paired Hall state, which transforms the incompressible state to the compressible state. One found that theoretically defined gap versus B_{tot} is well fitted to the experimental results.

This work was supported in part by the NSF of China.

[1] H. W. Jiang, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeiffer and K. W. West. Phys. Rev. B **40**, 12013 (1989).
[2] R. Willett, J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard and J. H. English, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1776 (1987).
[3] M. P. Lilly, K. B. Cooper, J. P. Eisenstein, L. N. Pfeiffer and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett., **82**, 394 (1999).
[4] R. R. Du, D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. Baldwin, and K. W. West, Solid Stat. Commun., **109**, 389 (1999).
[5] M. Shayegan, H. C. Manoharan, S. J. Papadakis, E. P. DePoortere, Physica E **6**, 40 (2000).
[6] W. Pan, R. R. Du, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. Baldwin and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 820 (1999).
[7] M. P. Lilly, K. B. Cooper, J. P. Eisenstein, L. N. Pfeiffer and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 824 (1999).
[8] A. A. Koulakov, M. M. Fogler and B. I. Shklovshii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 499 (1996); Phys. Rev. B **54**, 1853 (1996).
[9] R. Moessner and J. T. Chalker, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 5006 (1996).

[10] E. H. Rezayi, F. D. M. Haldane and Kun Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1292 (1999).
[11] E. Fradkin and S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 8065 (1999); E. Fradkin, S. A. Kivelson, E. Maniatis and K. Nho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1982 (2000).
[12] H. A. Fertig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3693 (1999).
[13] B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 7312 (1993).
[14] F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. Lett., **60**, 956 (1988).
[15] G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 362, (1991).
[16] M. Greiter, X. G. Wen and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3205 (1991); Nucl. Phys. B **374**, 567 (1992). K. Park, V. Melik-Alaverdian, N. E. Bonesteel and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 10167 (1998). N. E. Bonesteel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 984 (1999).
[17] R. H. Morf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1505 (1998).
[18] E. H. Rezayi and F. D. M. Haldane, cond-mat/9906137.
[19] J. P. Eisenstein, R. L. Willett, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard and J. H. English, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 997 (1988).
[20] J. P. Eisenstein, R. L. Willett, H. L. Stormer, L. N. Pfeiffer and K. W. West, Surf. Sci. **229**, 31 (1990).
[21] T. Stanescu, I. Martin and P. Phillips, cond-mat/9905116, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.
[22] T. Jungwirth, A. H. MacDonald, L. Smrcka and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 15574 (1999).
[23] This is exact if $\nu = 1$, i.e., $N = M$. For fractional filling of the Landau level, one can assume a truncation such that $f_{mm'} = 0$ if $m \geq N$ or $m' \geq N$.
[24] For this point, see S. M. Girvin and A. H. MacDonald, in *Perspectives in Quantum Hall Effects*, p213, ed. by S. Das Sarma and A. Pinczuk, (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1997).
[25] W. Pan, J.-S. Xia, V. Shvarts, E. D. Adams, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. Baldwin and K. W. West, cond-mat/9907356.
[26] See, e.g., J.P. Eisenstein in the book in ref. [24].
[27] Even this choice is in the wrong direction with respect to the experiment, this is still does not affect the fitting result in Fig. 1 too serious because the anisotropy of E_{coh} is only of several mK.

Fig. 1 The paired gap Δ vs the total field B_{tot} . The triangles are the experimental data from ref. [20] and the solid line is the theoretical result. $B_{\text{tot},c} \approx 4.05\text{T}$ can be read out from the extrapolation. $B_z = 3.75\text{T}$.




Fig.2