

What is the correct exchange energy of the three dimensional electron liquid in a high magnetic field?

J. M. Morbec and K. Capelle*

Departamento de Física e Informática

Instituto de Física de São Carlos

Universidade de São Paulo

Caixa Postal 369, São Carlos, 13560-970 SP, Brazil

(Dated: December 2, 2018)

The exchange energy of the three-dimensional electron liquid in high magnetic fields was first calculated in the seventies, but it seems to have gone unnoticed that several frequently cited equations for what is apparently the same situation are mutually inconsistent. Here we revisit the original calculations [Danz and Glasser, *Phys. Rev. B* **4**, 94 (1971) and Banerjee et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 2384 (1974)], which apply to the case in which all electrons occupy the lowest Landau level and are fully spin polarized. We find that of three published equations for $e_x(n, B)$ only one correctly gives the exchange energy of the fully spin-polarized three-dimensional electron liquid in high magnetic fields, as a function of density and field strength. Generalizing this correct equation, we obtain similarly simple expressions for unpolarized and partially polarized systems. As a byproduct, we also generalize the Oliver-Perdew spin-scaling relations [Phys. Rev. A **20**, 397 (1979)] from spin-density-functional theory to current-density-functional theory. Finally, we give closed analytical expressions for lower fields, where the second Landau level has nonzero occupation, too.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Ca, 71.15.Mb, 71.70.Di, 97.60.Jd

I. INTRODUCTION

In a seminal paper, published in 1971, Danz and Glasser (hereafter DG) calculated the exchange energy, e_x , of a three-dimensional electron liquid in high magnetic fields, by means of Greens function techniques.¹ A key result are analytical expressions for the dependence of e_x on density n and magnetic field B , valid in the quantum limit, where the electrons are fully spin polarized and occupy only the spin-down sublevel of the lowest Landau level. In an equally important, and apparently completely independent, paper published in 1974, Banerjee, Constantinescu and Rehak² (hereafter BCR) also calculated this exchange energy, and obtained a result that looks very similar to that of DG.

The calculations of DG and BCR provided the background for a large body of later work on the exchange and correlation energy of electron liquids in high magnetic fields^{3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10} and are also frequently quoted as input for the local-density approximation to density-functional theory in strong magnetic fields.^{10,11,12,13,14} However, closer scrutiny reveals that the BCR and DG expressions are not identical. The issue becomes thornier because the DG paper itself reports various different analytical expressions, which are not equivalent among themselves. These observations suggest the question asked in the title of the present paper: what is the correct exchange energy of the three dimensional electron liquid in a high magnetic field? It is surprising that such a basic issue of many-body physics still is susceptible to such questioning. The present paper attempts to provide simple answers.

To this end we first revisit the original calculations, applying to the extreme limit in which only the lowest

Landau level (with Landau level quantum number $L = 0$) is occupied and the electrons are fully spin polarized ($\sigma = -1/2$). In Section II we present a critical review of published expressions for this case, and correct some minor mistakes in them.

In Section III we proceed to a first generalization of the corrected equations, by allowing occupation of the spin-up sublevel, too. This generalization results in analytical expressions valid for arbitrary polarized systems of the lowest Landau level. As a byproduct, we also generalize the Oliver-Perdew spin-scaling relations¹⁵ from spin-density-functional theory to current-density-functional theory.

In Section IV we generalize further, by relaxing the restrictions not only on the spin quantum number, but also on the Landau level quantum number. Analytical expressions for the exchange energy applying to systems in which $L = 0$ and $L = 1$ levels are occupied are derived, and compared to numerical results and to more restricted expressions previously available in the literature.

Section V ends the paper by comparing the range of applicability of the various expressions, and quantifying the range of magnetic fields and densities where each applies.

II. REVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF PREVIOUS RESULTS

A. High-field limit

In sufficiently high fields, quantified below, all electrons occupy the spin-down sublevel of the lowest Landau level, $L = 0$. If, moreover, $\epsilon_F/\hbar\omega_c \ll 1$, where ϵ_F

is the Fermi energy and $\omega_c(B) = eB/mc$ the cyclotron frequency, then only the bottom of this lowest level is occupied. Under these circumstances, DG¹ derive their equation (2.9) for the high-field exchange energy per volume, which can be written as

$$e_x(n, B) = \frac{\pi e^2 \hbar}{m\omega_c(B)} n^2 [\ln(p(n, B)) - 3 + C], \quad (1)$$

where $C = 0.57722$ is Euler's constant and $p(n, B) := 8\pi^4 \hbar^3 n^2 / (m^3 \omega_c(B)^3)$, where n is the electron density. As long as no higher levels are occupied, we also have $p = 4\epsilon_F / \hbar\omega_c$, but this equality breaks down if other spin states or Landau levels are involved, as they are in later sections of this paper.

In units in which $\hbar = c = 1$, Eq. (1) can be written as

$$e_x(n, B) = \frac{2\pi e^2}{eB} n^2 \left[\ln \left(\frac{n}{(eB)^{3/2}} \right) + 2.11788 \right], \quad (2)$$

which can be directly compared with the corresponding equation (47) of BCR,

$$e_x(n, B)^{BCR} = \frac{2\pi e^2}{eB} n^2 \left[\ln \left(\frac{n}{(eB)^{3/2}} \right) + 2.32918 \right], \quad (3)$$

featuring a different numerical value inside the brackets. This difference was also noticed in Refs. 4,5.

For sufficiently strong magnetic fields or low densities that value, be it 2.11788 or 2.32918, becomes negligible relative to the logarithmic term, and the DG and BCR expressions become identical, both reducing to

$$\frac{e_x(r_s, B)}{Ry} = -\frac{27}{4\pi} \frac{1}{a_0^3 r_s^6} \left(\frac{\hbar\omega_c}{Ry} \right)^{-1} \ln \left(0.141 r_s^2 \frac{\hbar\omega_c}{Ry} \right), \quad (4)$$

where $a_0 = \hbar^2 / (me^2)$ is the Bohr radius, $r_s^3 = 3 / (4\pi n a_0^3)$ is the usual density parameter, and e_x / Ry and $\hbar\omega_c / Ry$ denote exchange energy and cyclotron energy measured in Rydberg [$1Ry = e^2 / 2a_0 = 13.6eV$].

In DG this limit appears as their Eq. (1.1),

$$\frac{e_x(r_s, B)^{DG}}{Ry} = -\frac{27}{16\pi} \frac{1}{a_0^3 r_s^6} \left(\frac{\hbar\omega_c}{Ry} \right)^{-1} \ln \left(0.282 r_s^2 \frac{\hbar\omega_c}{Ry} \right), \quad (5)$$

which differs in two ways from Eq. (4): the numerical factor inside the logarithm is $0.282 = 2 \times 0.141$ and the prefactor is $27/16$, instead of $27/4$.

Faced with these inconsistencies, we have repeated the DG 1971 calculation, along the lines of the original paper, and reobtained Eq. (1). DG give many details on how the integrals arising from the exchange diagram were calculated, which allow us to check every step of their calculation. From this check, Eq. (1) [or, equivalently, Eq. (2)] emerges as correct.¹⁶ BCR, on the other hand, simply state that the evaluation of the integrals is "tedious", and do not give any details, so we cannot reproduce them step by step. Having redone the DG calculation, however, we




FIG. 1: Exchange energy per particle of a fully polarized system with all electrons in the lowest Landau level, as given by Eqs. (1), (4) and (6), as a function of the magnetic field B , at $r_s = 6$.

believe it to be correct. For a numerical confirmation, see below Eq. (19).

This settles the issue of Eq. (2) versus Eq. (3), but does not have any bearing on the extreme high-field limit of Eqs. (4) and (5). Rather simple algebra shows, however, that upon neglecting the constant term $3 - C$ relative to the logarithm, the correct limit is indeed Eq. (4). We suspect that DG inadvertently used Hartree units instead of Rydberg units ($1H = e^2/a_0 = 2Ry$ is the atomic unit of energy), but denoted them as Rydberg, as this would explain both the factor of 2 inside and the factor of 1/4 outside the logarithm.¹⁷

In summary, we find Eqs. (1) and (4) to be correct, and Eqs. (3) and (5) to be incorrect. This answers the question asked in the title of this paper, for the special situation in which $L = 0$, $p \ll 1$ and the system is fully polarized. All three restrictions can, however, be relaxed. The remainder of this paper is concerned with developing and comparing analytical expressions corresponding to weaker restrictions.

B. Quantum limit

The condition $p \ll 1$, under which the simple analytical expression (1) and its ultra-high-field limit (4) were derived, is itself already a high-field limit of the more general expression¹

$$e_x(n, B) = \frac{e^2}{8\pi^3} \left(\frac{m\omega_c(B)}{\hbar} \right)^2 \left[C + \ln(p) - e^p Ei(-p) - p^{1/4} G_{23}^{22} \left(p \left| \begin{matrix} 3/4, 5/4 \\ 3/4, 3/4, 1/4 \end{matrix} \right. \right) \right], \quad (6)$$

which holds for arbitrary occupation of the spin-down sublevel of the lowest Landau level. In accordance with

common terminology, we refer to this situation as the quantum limit.

In Eq. (6) G_{23}^{22} is the Meijer G function¹⁸ and Ei is the exponential integral. This equation, originally derived in DG and reproduced by us in our attempts to find the source of the problems discussed in the previous subsection, is unaffected by the small problems we encountered in DG's equation (1.1) [corrected in our Eq. (4)], and by the typos appearing in some of the intermediate DG expressions.¹⁶ By means of Eq. (10) on p.146, Eq. (23) on p. 140 and Eq. (24) on p. 141 of Ref. 18, the present Eq. (6) can be reduced to the present Eq. (1), for $p \ll 1$.

In Fig. 1 we plot the exchange energy per particle (obtained by dividing our e_x , which is per volume, by the particle density n), as given by the full expression (6), and its high-field and ultra-high-field limits (1) and (4), respectively. Only the first of these is valid for the entire range of fields plotted there. The deviations of the other two from it illustrate the breakdown of the conditions under which they were derived.

To generate these curves we used the free-electron value of the electron mass m , requiring very high magnetic fields to attain the quantum limit $L = 0$. Such high fields are not without physical relevance. Continuous fields $\sim 40T$ and pulsed fields $\sim 10^4T$ can be produced in the laboratory, white dwarfs have surface fields of order $\sim 10^4T$, and neutron stars can have fields in excess of $10^8 - 10^9T$.

For effective masses smaller than the free-electron mass, the fields required to attain the quantum limit are considerably lower: The condition that only the $L = 0$ level is occupied is $l/(r_s a_0) < (2\sqrt{2}/(3\pi))^{1/3}$, where $l = \sqrt{\hbar c/(eB)}$ is the magnetic length. This condition involves masses and fields in the combination m^2/B , so that a reduction of m by a factor of 10 allows a reduction of B by a factor of 100. Lower densities (larger r_s) further lower the required fields.

III. GENERALIZATION TO ARBITRARILY POLARIZED SYSTEMS

Expression (6) is still subject to the restrictions of complete polarization and $L = 0$. In weaker fields, these restrictions cannot be maintained, and further generalizations are required. DG, and many other workers,^{2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10} proceed to rewrite the integrals by expansion in infinite series or evaluate them numerically. We find, however, that some progress can still be made analytically.

To this end, we first turn to generalizing Eq. (1) from full spin polarization to arbitrary spin polarization. This generalization can be performed quite easily by using some general properties of the exchange energy. The validity of the result, however, will depend on the value adopted for the effective g factor, as elucidated below.

To begin with, we recall that the exchange energy of an arbitrary many-body system (homogeneous or not, in




FIG. 2: Level scheme of the two lowest Landau levels ($L = 0$ and $L = 1$) and their spin splitting for different values of the electron g -factor.

a magnetic field or not) can be written as the sum of two contributions, one arising entirely from the spin up subsystem, the other from the spin down subsystem

$$E_x = \tilde{E}_x^\uparrow + \tilde{E}_x^\downarrow. \quad (7)$$

This decomposition is valid as long as there is a preferred axis used to define spin up and spin down. It only ceases to be valid in noncollinear situations, where the quantization axis changes as a function of space. The exchange energy then acquires a spin off-diagonal contribution,¹⁹ which, in principle, can be treated on the same footing as the diagonal term. Here, we are only concerned with collinear situations, occurring in unidirectional magnetic fields. Under these circumstances, Eq. (7) always holds.

Next, we recall that, according to the general theorems of current-density-functional theory (CDFT),^{20,21} the exchange energy of an arbitrary (collinear) many body system is a functional of the spin-resolved charge and current densities $n_\uparrow(\mathbf{r})$, $n_\downarrow(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{j}_\uparrow(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbf{j}_\downarrow(\mathbf{r})$, where $\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{j}_\uparrow(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{j}_\downarrow(\mathbf{r})$ is the paramagnetic current density, related to the gauge invariant physical current density by $\mathbf{j}_{\text{phys}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}) - (q/mc)n(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$. Hence,

$$E_x[n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow] = \tilde{E}_x[n_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow] + \tilde{E}_x[n_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow] \quad (8)$$

By symmetry, $E_x[n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow] = E_x[n_\downarrow, n_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow]$, so that the spin up and spin down contribution are given by the same functional, although their values for specific densities, \tilde{E}_x^\uparrow and \tilde{E}_x^\downarrow are, generally, different.

We now define two related functionals, the exchange energy of a spin unpolarized system²²

$$E_x^{NP}[n, \mathbf{j}] := E_x \left[\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n}{2}, \frac{\mathbf{j}}{2}, \frac{\mathbf{j}}{2} \right] \quad (9)$$

and that of a fully polarized system

$$E_x^{FP}[n, \mathbf{j}] := E_x[n, 0, \mathbf{j}, 0]. \quad (10)$$

By evaluating Eq. (8) at the densities of an unpolarized system, we obtain, after a little algebra,

$$\tilde{E}_x[n, \mathbf{j}] = \frac{1}{2} E_x^{NP}[2n, 2\mathbf{j}], \quad (11)$$

from which it follows that we can write E_x as

$$E_x[n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow] = \frac{1}{2} E_x^{NP}[2n_\uparrow, 2\mathbf{j}_\uparrow] + \frac{1}{2} E_x^{NP}[2n_\downarrow, 2\mathbf{j}_\downarrow], \quad (12)$$

which holds for arbitrary polarizations. By evaluating this at the densities of a fully polarized system, we find $\tilde{E}_x[n, \mathbf{j}] = E_x^{FP}[n, \mathbf{j}]$, which implies that the general exchange energy can also be written as

$$E_x[n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow] = E_x^{FP}[n_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow] + E_x^{FP}[n_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow]. \quad (13)$$

Equations (12) and (13) show that the exchange energy has the remarkable property that its functional form at arbitrary polarization is completely determined by either that at zero polarization or that at full polarization, without requiring interpolation between both limits or additional calculations inbetween them.²³ These equations are valid for arbitrary (collinear) situations, where the charge and current densities may vary in space, and have therefore been written in terms of functionals, not functions.

If its current dependence is ignored, Eq. (12) reduces to the spin-scaling relations of Oliver and Perdew,¹⁵ which are frequently used in spin-density-functional theory (SDFT) to connect spin-density functionals for arbitrarily polarized systems to density functionals obtained from many-body calculations for an unpolarized system.^{24,25,26} Equation (12) is the generalization of this spin scaling from SDFT to CDFT, and may be employed in the same way.

Equations reconstructing the general functional from the fully polarized limit, such as Eq. (13), are less used in DFT. Nevertheless, in the present context it is this alternative spin scaling that allows us to obtain the generalization of the DG expression to arbitrary spin polarization.

To this end we note, first, that expressions (1), (4) and (6) are given as functionals of the spin densities and the magnetic field, and not of the spin and current densities. The transition from one set of variables to the other is affected by recalling that in the uniform electron liquid in a unidirectional magnetic field $\mathbf{j}_{\text{phys}}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv 0$, so that $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{j}, n) = (mc/q)\nabla \times (\mathbf{j}/n)$. From Eq. (13) we thus have

$$e_x(n_\uparrow, n_\downarrow, \mathbf{j}_\uparrow, \mathbf{j}_\downarrow) = e_x^{FP} \left(n_\uparrow, B = \frac{mc}{q} \nabla \times \left(\frac{\mathbf{j}_\uparrow}{n_\uparrow} \right) \right) + e_x^{FP} \left(n_\downarrow, B = \frac{mc}{q} \nabla \times \left(\frac{\mathbf{j}_\downarrow}{n_\downarrow} \right) \right) \quad (14)$$

where $e_x^{FP}(n, B)$ is the per-volume or per-particle exchange energy of the uniform electron liquid in magnetic field B , given, *e.g.* by expressions (1), (4) or (6). Note that we do not distinguish functionals of the current from




FIG. 3: Full curves: Exchange energy per particle, given by Eq. (20) evaluated for an unpolarized system, as a function of $r_s^{-1} \propto n^{1/3}$. Dashed curves: Continuation of the $L = 0$ expression into the $L = 1$ regime, illustrating the impact of the additional terms present in Eq. (20) for $L = 1$. Upper set of two curves: $g = 2$ and $B = 1.4448 \times 10^4 T$. Until $1/r_s = 0.166$ (corresponding to $r_s = 6.023$) only the $L = 0$ level is occupied and Eq. (20) reduces to Eq. (6). Lower set of two curves: $g = 0$ and $B = 1.1474 \times 10^4 T$. Until $1/r_s = 0.186$ (corresponding to $r_s = 5.366$) only the $L = 0$ level is occupied and Eq. (20) reduces to Eq. (19).

those of the magnetic field by a new symbol, since they can always be distinguished through their arguments. Equation (14) provides the exchange energy for arbitrarily polarized systems, as a function of the spin-resolved charge and current densities.

By evaluating the general expression (14) at the densities of an unpolarized system, we find

$$e_x^{NP}(n, \mathbf{j}) = e_x \left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n}{2}, \frac{\mathbf{j}}{2}, \frac{\mathbf{j}}{2} \right) \quad (15)$$

$$= 2e_x^{FP} \left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{mc}{q} \nabla \times \left(\frac{\mathbf{j}/2}{n/2} \right) \right) = 2e_x^{FP} \left(\frac{n}{2}, B(\mathbf{j}, n) \right) \quad (16)$$

so that

$$e_x^{NP}(n, B) = 2e_x^{FP} \left(\frac{n}{2}, B \right). \quad (17)$$

Application of this last equality to Eq. (1) yields, *e.g.*,

$$e_x^{NP}(n, B) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi e^2 \hbar}{m \omega_c(B)} n^2 \left[\ln \left(\frac{p}{4} \right) - 3 + C \right], \quad (18)$$

while application to Eq. (6) yields

$$e_x^{NP}(n, B) = \frac{e^2}{4\pi^3} \left(\frac{m \omega_c(B)}{\hbar} \right)^2 \left[C + \ln \left(\frac{p}{4} \right) - e^{p/4} Ei \left(-\frac{p}{4} \right) - \left(\frac{p}{4} \right)^{1/4} G_{23}^{22} \left(\frac{p}{4} \middle| \begin{matrix} 3/4, 5/4 \\ 3/4, 3/4, 1/4 \end{matrix} \right) \right] \quad (19)$$

Equation (18) allows an independent numerical test of our above statement that the DG expression (1) is correct, because Ref. 9 reports a fully numerical evaluation




FIG. 4: Difference in exchange energy per particle with and without a magnetic field, as a function of $\lambda^2 = [\sqrt{2}\pi^2 n_0^\downarrow l(B)^3]^2$, where n_0^\downarrow is the occupation of the spin down sublevel of the $L = 0$ level and $l(B)^2 = \hbar c/(eB)$ is the magnetic length. For $\lambda^2 \leq 1$ only the $L = 0$ level is occupied, while for $1 < \lambda^2 \leq 2$ levels $L = 0$ and $L = 1$ are occupied. This form of representing Eq. (20) was chosen to permit comparison of our analytical result with the numerically obtained data in Fig. 3 of Ref. 10. As there, we chose $g = 0$ to keep the system unpolarized for all values of B , and chose $r_s = 1$.

of the exchange energy in strong magnetic fields for a spin unpolarized situation. (Even in the highest fields the system remains unpolarized if $g = 0$.) The present analytical expression (18) is in perfect agreement with numerical data extracted from figure 2(b) of Ref. 9, whereas the alternative expression (3), scaled to the unpolarized case, deviates from the numerical data by $\sim 10\%$ for $r_s \in (1, 6)$.

We remark that we have also obtained Eq. (18) and (19) by direct evaluation of the exchange diagram for unpolarized systems ($g = 0$), along the lines of the original DG paper. This calculation, however, is much more laborious than the use of generalized spin-scaling relations and in the end leads to the same result.

Next, we address the question of the limits of validity of the above results. A key assumption, of both the calculation of DG and ours, is that the only occupied Landau level is the $L = 0$ one. DG make the additional assumption that only the spin down sublevel of the $L = 0$ Landau level is occupied. If the free-electron value $g = 2$ is used, the spin up sublevel of the $L = 0$ Landau level becomes degenerate with the spin down sublevel of the $L = 1$ Landau level. This degeneracy is removed if $g \neq 2$, which may occur as a consequence of electron-electron interactions or of the medium the electrons propagate in. Nonzero occupation of the up *and* down sublevels of $L = 0$ is only consistent with unoccupied $L > 0$ levels if $|g| < 2$. This is illustrated in Fig. 2. As a consequence, there are two distinct cases:

(i) For $|g| \geq 2$, the requirement that all electrons occupy the lowest Landau level, $L = 0$, is only compatible with full spin polarization. In this case, the original DG formulas (1), (4) (with the minor corrections discussed above) and (6) apply directly.

(ii) For $|g| < 2$, the restriction to $L = 0$ is consistent with any n_\uparrow and n_\downarrow . The general result in this case is Eq. (14), and both special cases, Eq. (6) and (19), are physically possible.

IV. GENERALIZATION TO THE SECOND LANDAU LEVEL

The extension of the DG calculation to include the next Landau level, $L = 1$, is laborious, but possible.²⁷ Three types of terms contribute: one, $e_x^{(0)}$, arises from $L = 0$ and reduces to the DG result if only the $L = 0, \sigma = -1/2$ level is occupied, another, $e_x^{(1)}$, arises from $L = 1$, and a third, $e_x^{(0,1)}$, from inter-level exchange, involving contributions from $L = 0$ and $L = 1$. As a function of the occupation numbers n_L^σ of the spin up and down sublevels of the $L = 0$ and $L = 1$ Landau levels, the final result can be written

$$e_x(n_0^\uparrow, n_0^\downarrow, n_1^\uparrow, n_1^\downarrow, B) = \frac{e^2}{8\pi^3} \left(\frac{m\omega_c}{\hbar}\right)^2 \sum_\sigma \left[e_x^{(0)}(n_0^\uparrow, n_0^\downarrow, n_1^\uparrow, n_1^\downarrow, B) + e_x^{(0,1)}(n_0^\uparrow, n_0^\downarrow, n_1^\uparrow, n_1^\downarrow, B) + e_x^{(1)}(n_0^\uparrow, n_0^\downarrow, n_1^\uparrow, n_1^\downarrow, B) \right] \quad (20)$$

where

$$e_x^{(0)}(n_0^\uparrow, n_0^\downarrow, n_1^\uparrow, n_1^\downarrow, B) = C + \ln \left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_0^{\sigma^2} \right) - \exp \left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_0^{\sigma^2} \right) Ei \left(-\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_0^{\sigma^2} \right) - \left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_0^{\sigma^2} \right)^{1/4} G_{23}^{22} \left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_0^{\sigma^2} \middle| \begin{matrix} 3/4, 5/4 \\ 3/4, 3/4, 1/4 \end{matrix} \right), \quad (21)$$

$$e_x^{(0,1)}(n_0^\uparrow, n_0^\downarrow, n_1^\uparrow, n_1^\downarrow, B) = 4 \ln \left(\frac{n_0^\uparrow + n_1^\uparrow}{n_0^\sigma - n_1^\sigma} \right) + 2 \exp \left(\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma - n_1^\sigma)^2 \right) Ei \left(-\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma - n_1^\sigma)^2 \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2 \exp\left(\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma + n_1^\sigma)^2\right) \text{Ei}\left(-\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma + n_1^\sigma)^2\right) \\
& + \left(\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma - n_1^\sigma)^2\right)^{1/4} G_{23}^{22}\left(\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma - n_1^\sigma)^2 \left| \begin{matrix} 3/4, 5/4 \\ 3/4, 3/4, 1/4 \end{matrix} \right.\right) \\
& - \left(\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma + n_1^\sigma)^2\right)^{1/4} G_{23}^{22}\left(\frac{2\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} (n_0^\sigma + n_1^\sigma)^2 \left| \begin{matrix} 3/4, 5/4 \\ 3/4, 3/4, 1/4 \end{matrix} \right.\right) \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
e_x^{(1)}(n_0^\uparrow, n_0^\downarrow, n_1^\uparrow, n_1^\downarrow, B) = & C + \ln\left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2}\right) \text{Ei}\left(-\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2}\right) \\
& - \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2}\right)^{1/4} G_{23}^{22}\left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2} \left| \begin{matrix} 3/4, 5/4 \\ 3/4, 3/4, 1/4 \end{matrix} \right.\right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2}\right) \exp\left(\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2}\right) \text{Ei}\left(-\frac{8\pi^4 \hbar^3}{m^3 \omega_c^3} n_1^{\sigma^2}\right). \quad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

An illustration of this formula, Fig. 3 displays the exchange energy for a combination of densities and magnetic fields for which both $L = 0$ and $L = 1$ levels contribute, and compares it with the (erroneous) use of the $L = 0$ expressions (6) (for $g = 2$) and (19) (for $g = 0$) alone, in the same regime.

As a check of the algebra, Fig. 4 presents a comparison with the numerical data of Ref. 10 for the difference between exchange energy with and without magnetic fields. To simplify the comparison we adopted in Fig. 4 and its caption the same notation used in Ref. 10, which differs from that used elsewhere in the present paper.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Four different expressions for the exchange energy of the three-dimensional electron liquid in high magnetic fields have been investigated in this work. The most general of these is our Eq. (20), which we obtained here under the only restriction that $L < 2$. In the quantum limit, $L = 0$, and Eq. (20) reduces to the DG result (6) or to our Eq. (19), depending on whether $g = 2$ or $g = 0$. The correct high-field limit of Eq. (6) is Eq. (1), and the correct ultra-high-field limit is Eq. (4).

Figure 5 illustrates the validity of these four expressions. The restrictions $L = 0$ and $L \leq 1$ are precisely defined and easily applied. The restriction $p \ll 1$ which leads to Eq. (1) and the condition $\left|\ln\left(\frac{n}{(eB)^{3/2}}\right)\right| \gg$

2.11788, which leads to Eq. (4), are less precisely defined, and we simply adopt as validity criterium that $p \leq 0.05$ and that 2.11788 is less than 5% of the logarithmic term. The curves represent the lowest magnetic fields for which the indicated expression is valid. To generate these curves we used the free-electron values of the electron mass m and g-factor, requiring very high magnetic fields to satisfy the validity conditions of each expression. Effective masses smaller than the free-electron mass considerably lower these fields, for the same reason as above.

In summary, in this paper we have (i) found that the DG result for the exchange energy of a fully polarized three-dimensional electron liquid in the lowest Landau level differs from the BCR result, and settled this dispute in favour of DG; (ii) found a small inconsistency in the ultra-high-field limit, as given by DG, and corrected it; (iii) derived generalized spin-scaling relations applicable to any current-carrying system, regardless of strength of the magnetic field, (iv) used these relations to generalize the DG expression to unpolarized and to partially polarized systems; (v) extended the previous results to include the second lowest Landau level; and (vi) quantified the range of validity of each of the analytical expressions.

This work was supported by FAPESP and CNPq. We thank G. Vignale for useful remarks on an earlier version of this manuscript.

* Electronic address: capelle@ifsc.usp.br

¹ R. W. Danz and G. L. Glasser, Phys. Rev. B **4**, 94 (1971).

² B. Banerjee, D. H. Constantinescu and P. Rehak, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 2384 (1974).

³ N. J. M. Horig, R. W. Danz, and M. L. Glasser, Phys. Rev.

A **6**, 2391 (1972).

⁴ K. Yonei and T. Motomochi, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **59**, 3571 (1990).

⁵ I. Fushiki, E. H. Gudmundsson and C. J. Pethick, Astrophys. J. **342**, 958 (1989).




FIG. 5: Validity of the four expressions discussed here. The curves represent the lowest magnetic fields for which the indicated expression is valid, for the free-electron value of m and $g = 2$. For all $B(r_s)$ above the full curve Eq. (20), with arbitrary values of n_0^\downarrow , n_0^\uparrow , and n_1^\downarrow may be applied. For $g = 2$, n_1^\uparrow must be zero to avoid degeneracy with the $L = 2$ Landau level, not included in the formula. For $g < 2$, the occupation n_1^\uparrow is arbitrary, too. For $B(r_s)$ above the dashed curve only the lowest Landau level is occupied, and Eq. (6) becomes valid, too. For $B(r_s)$ above the dotted curve the high-field limit (1) becomes valid. The inset shows the values of $B(r_s)$ above which the ultra-high-field limit (4) is valid. The high-field portion of this plot is relevant principally to astronomical situation, such as white dwarfs and neutron stars. However, effective masses $m^* = \gamma m$ rescale all B values by $B \rightarrow \gamma^2 B$. Small effective masses and low densities thus bring these fields into the laboratory range.

- ⁶ I. Fushiki, E. H. Gudmundsson, C. J. Pethick and J. Yngvason, *Ann. Phys.* **216**, 29 (1992).
⁷ D. Lai, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 629 (2001).
⁸ M. Steinberg and J. Ortner, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 15460 (1998).
⁹ Y. Takada and H. Goto, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **10**, 11315 (1998).
¹⁰ P. Skudlarski and G. Vignale, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 8547

- (1993).
¹¹ G. Vignale, P. Skudlarski and M. Rasolt, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 8494 (1992).
¹² A. K. Dara and S. K. Gosh, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 4653 (1990).
¹³ P. Jones, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 1338 (1985).
¹⁴ K. Capelle and E. K. U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1872 (1997).
¹⁵ G. L. Oliver and J. P. Perdew, *Phys. Rev. A* **20**, 397 (1979).
¹⁶ Some other equations of Ref. 1 are in need of minor corrections: in their Eq. (2.3), the exponent of the last exponential should be $-\hbar n \omega_c s$ instead of $-\hbar n \omega_c s/2$, and in their Eq. (2.6) $(\bar{r}^2 + r_z^2)^{1/2}$ should be $(\bar{r}^2 + r_z^2)^{-1/2}$. These problems seem to be mere misprints, however, since their correction leads to Eq. (1) [= Eq.(2.9.) of DG] as published in DG and reproduced by us. The wrong factors in Eq. (4) [=Eq.(1.1.) of DG], on the other hand, are completely independent of these corrections, as is the difference between the DG and BCR expressions.
¹⁷ After completion of this work we became aware of footnote 22 of A. R. P. Rau, R. O. Mueller and L. Spruch, *Phys. Rev. A* **11**, 1865 (1975), which confirms our suspicion regarding Eq. (5).
¹⁸ Y. L. Luke, *The special functions and their approximations* Vol.I (Academic Press, New York, 1969).
¹⁹ K. Capelle and L. N. Oliveira, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 15228 (2000).
²⁰ G. Vignale and M. Rasolt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2360 (1987).
²¹ G. Vignale and M. Rasolt, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 10685 (1988).
²² NP standing for “not polarized” — the more natural choice of UP (unpolarized) may lead to confusion with the spin up contribution.
²³ This property is shared by the noninteracting kinetic energy, but not by the correlation energy.
²⁴ J. P. Perdew, A. Ruzsinszky, J. Tao, V. N. Staroverov, G. E. Scuseria, G. I. Csonka, *J. Chem. Phys.* **123**, 062201 (2005).
²⁵ J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
²⁶ K. Capelle and G. Vignale, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5546 (2001).
²⁷ J. M. Morbec, Ph.D. thesis, University of São Paulo, 2008 (in preparation, copy available upon request).